UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 93—PART 10

JANUARY 3, 1947, TO APRIL 1, 1947

(PAGES A1 TO A1434)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1947

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
JAN 29 '48

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Address of Hon. Tom C. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Tom C. Clark, the Attorney General of the United States, presented at the winter quarterly meeting of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, Dallas, Tex., December 11, 1946:

Present happenings and forebodings of happenings emphasize the necessity of conservation of fuel, irrespective of type, as a bulwark against unforeseen national emergency.

The importance of fuel in the economic life of this Nation cannot be overemphasized.

Every governmental resource should enjoy the cooperation of capital and labor in all reasonable efforts made to protect America from national disaster brought on by insufficient fuel supply.

The Interstate Oil Compact Commission was executed in this city February 16, 1935, and was subsequently ratified by 17 oil- and gas-producing States.

The declared purpose of the agreement between the compacting States is "to conserve oil and gas by prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause."

Each ratifying State has agreed that it would enact laws, or, if laws had been enacted to continue them in force, to accomplish within limits the prevention of:

1. The operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

2. The flooding with water of any strata capable of producing either oil or gas or both oil and gas in paying quantities.

3. The avoidable escape into the air or the wasteful burning of gas from a natural-gas well.

4. The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

5. The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing or operation of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas or loss in the ultimate recovery thereof.

6. The inefficient, excessive, or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

The States agree to deny excessive withdrawal to oil producers in violation of State laws and to provide penalties for the waste of oil or gas.

It is important to recognize that article 5 of the compact provides that it is not the purpose to authorize the States joining therein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof or creating or perpetuating a monopoly, or promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

The provisions of article 5, as written, if practiced, are entirely in accord with the American principle of condemning all practices in violation of the antitrust laws of this Nation.

The compact commission has no power to pass, or compel any State to pass, any conservation law. However, a study of the laws enacted by the various States proves the direct influence of the commission upon their enactment.

Consideration of the compact commission was first presented to Congress in a House resolution which was combined with a petition for the creation of a Federal Petroleum Administrative Board. Serious questions were raised concerning the advisability of such a board. Shortly thereafter there was introduced Public Resolution 64, which gave the approval of the Congress to the formation of the compact. This resolution was finally approved on August 27, 1935, in accordance with the constitutional requirements of article 1, section 10, of the Constitution.

The compact thereafter became an official document approved by the Congress of the United States.

The compact, by its original terms, was a 2-year agreement. Thereafter it was extended by Congress and by the action of the States each 2 years until 1943, when it was extended for 4 years. It now expires by its terms in 1947 unless renewed.

In practically every instance State legislative action relating to the compact has been by almost unanimous vote. Congress likewise has been nearly unanimous in its various approvals of the compact. At the time of each approval the President of the United States and the governors of the member States have given it unequivocal support.

Oil was discovered by the Drake well in 1859, just prior to the Civil War. During the first 40 years of oil production only about 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil were produced, or slightly more than one-half of the 1944 production.

In the period from 1859 to 1900 there was little or no market for such products as gasoline, fuel oil, and lubricating oil. The situation at the beginning of the century is evidenced by a statement in an advertisement by one of the oil companies appearing a few years ago: "1900 was a long time ago. Then we featured lamp oil, axle grease, and candles. If you insisted, we would sell you some gasoline, but we didn't keep much on hand."

Beginning with the year 1900 the importance of petroleum in the economic life of this Nation increased steadily to a point where the safety of the Nation and the world was dependent upon an adequate United States oil supply.

The need for protective measures and practices as a means of conservation of gas and oil became immediately apparent. Many laws, rules, and regulations looking to the prevention of waste and protection of oil and gas have been inaugurated.

In 1900 the Supreme Court of the United States fully established the right of the State to control and regulate oil and gas production for the prevention of waste in its decision in the famous case of *Ohio Oil Co.* v. *Indiana* (177 U. S. 212), wherein the Supreme Court declared the power in the State to regulate by law the manner in which gas and oil may be appropriated and thus prevent their destruction.

During the period 1900 to 1920 crude-oil production increased in an average daily rate of approximately 50,000 barrels. No one contributing factor seems to have had pronounced effect.

Expanded highway systems resulting in increased motor-vehicle usage made possible the rapid increase which was later to follow.

It was estimated that the United States in 1918 was consuming 60,000 barrels a day more than it was producing. The realization of such a shortage led to efforts on the part of the Federal Government to encourage exploration.

A comparison drawn between the situation at the end of World War I and the situation at the end of World War II is interesting. In 1918 demand exceeded production capacity. In August 1945 demand approached total capacity. This fact points to the necessity for encouraging further the development of maximum efficient production for peacetime purposes.

Congress recently enacted a measure improving the administrative practices involved in the leasing of Government lands and establishing royalty rate at a flat 12½ percent, thus increasing the incentive for wildcat operation. The establishing of a flat royalty at a rate which continued during the existence of the oil lease affords an opportunity to the industry for increased search and discovery of new oil.

Immediately prior to the execution of the interstate oil compact the Federal Government exercised considerable jurisdiction in the matter of oil. The national question in those days was whether the functions of conservation and accompanying control of production and gathering of oil and gas should be delegated to the Federal Government or handled by the States. The question was determined by the fact that the problem of conservation varies so widely from one area or section to another that the

whole Nation could not be under one absolute uniform treatment. It became clear that the solutions to oil-conservation problems can best be handled locally, in the various States, acting in cooperation with each other for the general welfare of the Nation.

No satisfactory national solution of the problem can be maintained without the assistance of the Federal Government by preventing interstate transportation of oil and byproducts thereof produced in violation of State laws, rules and regulations, and by furnishing information as to supply and demand and controlling imports.

Control of imports of oil is a very vital Federal function. The domestic industry should not be faced with the ruinous competition of cheap foreign oils and at the same time our reserves should not be depleted to supply the world without compensating imports. It is, indeed, fortunate that thus far the good work done by the conservation authorities has prevented us from being forced to import our crude supplies.

Membership of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission has grown from 6 to 17 States, which today produce approximately 90 percent of this Nation's gas and 80 percent of its oil.

The commission has enlarged its associate membership for the additional States which may not have production but which have good prospects for the finding of necessary new oil.

The commission is to be congratulated upon its achievements.

The great advances made in secondary recovery, pressure maintenance, reinjection programs, and cooperative unit operations are entirely due to the untiring efforts of the staff of the commission in carrying on its engineering studies for the purpose of conservation

Today more than ever the official interest in the work of the compact commission increases in importance.

It is generally known, but perhaps not generally understood, that through the activities of the compact commission practically every important geologist, engineer, physicist, economist, and other men of science have taken a vital interest in the program of the commission in its efforts to conserve our national resources in oil and gas.

A majority of the oil and gas industry has since the beginning been interested in conservation programs. Today it is heartening to the Government to know that this interest of industry representatives is steadily increasing and the compact commission has the unanimous support and approval of all companies, major and independent, and of the individuals engaged in all branches of the oil and gas industry.

Recent developments in the fuel situation of this Nation will, I feel sure, result in increased public interest in all States of the Union, whether or not they are oil or gas producing. The man in the street today knows his dependence upon the fuel industry, whether coal, gas, or oil, however far the center of this industrial activity may be from his home.

During World War II the oil and gas problem of America received consideration from the Petroleum Administration for War. The compact commission will continue to undertake the solution of those problems which will best serve the principles of conservation of oil and gas, to the end that there may be the greatest ultimate recovery of both these natural resources for the Nation. This undertaking calls for continued cooperation between all departments of the Government and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. Such cooperation will protect our peacetime economy without fear of national disaster resulting from depletion of reserves.

The President recently requested that there be established within the Department of the Interior an organization which would "assure coordination in peacetime of the Federal Government's many interests in petroleum and petroleum products and associated hydrocarbons." The President believes that "to the extent possible one agency must bear the primary responsibility for providing a focal point for leadership and information for the numerous agencies of the Federal Government dealing with petroleum."

There has now been established within the Department of the Interior an Oil and Gas Division whose functions are to assist in the execution of the President's views, serving as a clearing house for current statistical data and other educational information relating to oil and gas and to make recommendations with respect to developments in the petroleum fields as they relate to its adequacy and availability to meet the current and future needs of the Nation.

The maintenance of continued close relationship between the Department of the Interior and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission is of vital importance in the conservation of the fuel supply of this Nation.

National interest increases State responsibility. The efforts of the individual State, however, are made more effective as adopted in other producing States. The failure on the part of any one State to protect its reserves results in a future disproportionate drain upon the States which have adopted sound conservation policies.

The Interstate Oil Compact Commission has been exceedingly helpful in this situation. Continued efforts are, however, necessary if we are to safeguard against future emergency

The future welfare of this Nation depends upon national oil security, availability of a reasonably priced supply of petroleum products and the maintenance of a health industry. Conservation alone may not be sufficient. Conservation must be supplemented by utilization of the best in technological advice In this respect advances in the development of synthetic fuels must be made. Cooperation carried on with the advice of the industries and the programs for synthetic fuels now being developed will supply our peacetime economy and help prevent future disastrous emergencies.

I would say a word upon the necessity of the prevention of the undermining of the faithful public service rendered by the commission by those who, in the mantle of conservation, seek selfish interest at the expense of their neighbor. Small independent refiners shall not be forced into bankruptcy by reason of industry practices, if any there are, which would deny them full opportunity to participate in available production. The Department of Justice will not allow collusive control of markets to injure the American people.

Free enterprise in this Nation shall and must be preserved.

Selfish interests shall not dominate or exterminate the small man to protect the large. American business, large or small, must play the game according to American ideals to the end that competition and increasing competition may be preserved.

The coming atomic age will not end the need for oil and gas. Its original use will, in all probability, be limited to power plants for cities and industries. Over the years, atomic energy may displace low-priced gas and residual oil. Cost of electricity and steam may be lowered so that gas and distillate fuel oils may be replaced for certain purposes. American genius may be counted upon to compensate for any loss resulting to the fuel industry upon the arrival of the atomic age.

During World War II the armed forces of America never lacked oil in proper quantity at the proper place. This is a special tribute to the resourcefulness, untiring effort, and magnificent accomplishment of the industry.

Where Is the Twenty-one Billion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to say that there have been several sessions of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries examining into the disclosures of the audit of the Maritime Commission for the period ended June 30, 1943, which has been suppressed for a long period of time and evidently first came to public notice after insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 23, 1946.

This sampling and simple audit of vouchers does not cover a transaction by transaction audit of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, but in spite of that it has uncovered that ships were certified as seagoing after they were laying in port for repairs, that false entries on the books were made at the direction of those responsible for the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, that the Kaiser syndicate was advanced $2,000,000 and the books of the Maritime Commission showed that they paid it to Kaiser for ship construction, that thousands of dollars were paid for entertainment and ship launchings, that $250,000 was authorized for memory courses as part of ship construction, that more than $200,000,000 were paid up to November 1943 as fees for building ships where the Federal Government had paid for the land, paid for the buildings on the land, paid for the machinery on the land, paid for the labor to build the ships, paid for the material that went into the ships, paid for all administrative help concerning the building of the ships and paid for so-called executive brains up to $25,000 a person, that there is absolutely no check and accounting of property purchased by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration except that which they make themselves, and that no independent agency or auditor of the Government has made a periodic check of $21,000,000,000 worth of property purchased by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration as to whether the property went into ships, whether it was given away, or whether it still is in existence and with the Government.

With this as a sample of the uncoverings growing out of a voucher audit which does not authorize an "air-tight audit" where every transaction is examined, where it is made certain that the Government receives property for the money, where it is made certain what became of every item of property, where it is made certain what has become of every item of money, where it is made certain what has been destroyed or thrown away by waste and extravagance, and where it has been made certain what money has been given away, especially where they paid money on the basis of moral assets and not on investment, with no special investigators and

under-cover investigation as to fraud covering the use of Government money and especially property.

With this simple sampling to June 30, 1943, what has become of this expenditure of $21,000,000,000? The public and the taxpayers are entitled to know what became of the money, what became of the property, what became of the records, and what became of the people who assisted in the questionable transactions.

The members of the Maritime Commission were informed by the Comptroller General in 1942 that the records of Mr. Anderson were not available to check and examine the 1942 statement of the Maritime Commission, yet the members of the Maritime Commission approved this conduct and lack of records of its transactions, wished Mr. Anderson well, and kept him on the job to further complicate the expenditure of $21,000,000,000 by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, and only in February 1946 did Mr. Anderson leave the Maritime Commission after the Comptroller General's report of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, first came to public attention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1946.

I have introduced a resolution whereby the Comptroller General has the full and complete right and is directed to make an airtight audit and examination as detailed in the resolution so that the American people and the taxpayers of this country can definitely know what became of $21,000,000,000 spent by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration during the period of the war.

I include the resolution herewith:

A bill to authorize a special investigation, examination, and complete audit of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration by the Comptroller General

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to cause a special investigation and audit to be made (in addition to any investigation and audit heretofore made) of all accounts and transactions of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration showing the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds, and the acquisition, receipt and disposition of property by such agencies, beginning with respect to each agency on January 1, 1939, or the date of creation of such agency, whichever is later, and continuing to the date of enactment of this act. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the investigation and audit shall include the following:

(a) An item-by-item examination of all accounts showing receipts, disbursements, and application of public funds;

(b) Any expenditure made without authority of law;

(c) Any acquisition, receipt, or disposition of property made without authority of law;

(d) Any property acquired or disposed of at a monetary loss to the United States;

(e) All contracts for services, agencies, charters, property, ships, and payments and contracts for payments covering property and services over and above OPA prices and ceilings;

(f) Any waste, inefficiency, or extravagance in the expenditure of public funds;

(g) Any waste, inefficiency, or extravagance in the acquisition, receipt, or disposition of property;

(h) Any cooperation, encouragement, or assistance rendered to any person, firm, association, or corporation having a contract with the United States under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, by either of such agencies, in tax minimization or tax avoidance by placing earnings under such contract in tax-exempt funds or otherwise;

(i) Any fraud or illegal acts committed by any person connected with the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration in connection with the receipt, disbursement, or application of any public funds, or the acquisition or disposition of any property;

(j) Any fraud or illegal acts committed by any person, firm, association, or corporation having a contract with the United States under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, in connection with the receipt, disbursement, or application of any public funds or the acquisition or disposition of any property under such contract.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making the special investigation and audit of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, the Comptroller General may use any officer or employee now under his jurisdiction and is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such additional accountants, special investigators, attorneys, officers, experts, and employees as he deems necessary without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General shall report to the Congress as soon as practicable the results of his investigation and audit, together with such recommendations as he deems advisable.

A New Great Movement in the Interests of the Masses and of Progressive Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am inserting in the RECORD news accounts from the Chicago Sun and the New York Times of January 5 of the formation at a meeting here in Washington last week of a new liberal organization called Americans for Democratic Action, formed for the purpose of strengthening American democracy.

I know that millions of patriotic and progressive Americans will welcome formation of this organization, with its firm declaration for a native American progressive democracy, and will flock to join with the outstanding American leaders who were named to the organizing committee and to the committee of the whole.

This is one organization which, by its ringing declaration against all authoritarian government, guards itself from the start against the unfair, malicious, and unfounded charges of Communist taint which reactionaries, and especially Republicans, have hurled against other liberal and democratic organizations in the past. As a lifelong progressive Democrat, I welcome the advent of Americans for Democratic Action, and I hope, and feel sure, that its ranks will be swelled by millions of Americans who look to the future, not to the past, and to the New World, not to the old.

The text of the news stories follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of January 5, 1947]

DEMOCRATIC ACTION "FRONT" FORMED; ONLY REDS BARRED

WASHINGTON, January 4.—A new political organization named "Americans for Democratic Action" was set up here tonight by a group of 150 which said that membership was barred to Communists and their fellow travelers.

As the first of six basic principles, the group endorsed expansion of the New Deal program.

An organizing committee of 23 was appointed, including Leon Henderson, former Office of Price Administration Administrator; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; Wilson Wyatt, former Housing Expediter; Elmer Davis, radio commentator; and Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers (CIO).

HER NAME LEFT OFF

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, widow of the late President, was named chairman of the temporary program committee, but at her request her name was left off the organizing group. She pleaded pressure of other duties, including membership on the United States delegation to the United Nations.

The meeting and the newborn political front were sponsored by the Union for Democratic Action, which invited the delegates to a night and day session beginning here last night.

COMMUNISTS REJECTED

"We reject any association with Communists or sympathizers with communism in the United States as completely as we reject any association with Fascists or their sympathizers," said a brief statement issued as the closed conference broke up.

The statement listed the six principles as follows:

"1. The New Deal program must be expanded to insure decent levels of health, nutrition, shelter, and education.

"2. Civil liberties must be protected from concentrated wealth and overcentralized government. They must be extended to all Americans regardless of race, color, creed, or sex.

"3. Any sound foreign policy requires a healthy and prosperous domestic economy.

"4. The United States must continue to give full support to the United Nations. The conference endorses the American plan for international control of atomic energy.

"5. Because the interests of the United States are the interests of freemen everywhere, America must furnish political and economic support to democratic and freedom-loving peoples the world over.

"6. Within the general framework of present American foreign policy, steps must be taken to raise standards of living and support civil and political freedoms everywhere."

[From the New York Times of January 5, 1947]

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY LIBERALS FORM A GROUP ON RIGHT—OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM IS A MAJOR TENET OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION—ROOSEVELT MEN INCLUDED—PROGRAM CALLS FOR EXPANSION OF NEW-DEAL EFFORTS AND AID FOR UNITED NATIONS

WASHINGTON, January 4.—A group of 130 men and women committed to the propagation of liberal ideals and rejecting collaboration with Communists and their sympathizers established today a new organization called Americans for Democratic Action.

The historic significance of their decision was the cleavage which it creates in the American liberal movement. A week ago in New York another group formed the Progressive Citizens of America. The primary issue

between the two is the attitude toward individuals who hew to the Communist Party line in the United States.

Today's meeting was an invitation affair sponsored by the Union for Democratic Action, an organization formed nearly 5 years ago. The UDA nominally remains in existence, but it is expected that it will be dissolved as the new and expanded body overcomes the problems of organization machinery. An organizing committee of 25 was appointed to carry on the program begun by the conference.

The conference participants included many who were associated with the administration of the late President Roosevelt, including his widow and his son, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. There also were leaders from unions in the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations and from independent labor groups.

FIRST GOALS OUTLINED

The immediate objective, it was agreed, was a reconstruction of the liberal movement, free of totalitarian influence from either the left or the right. The conferees agreed that no formal manifesto resolving all the problems of the Nation and the world could be drafted at a 1-day meeting, but reported complete harmony on these basic principles:

1. The New-Deal program must be expanded to insure decent levels of health, nutrition, shelter, and education.

2. Civil liberties must be protected from concentrated wealth and overcentralized government. They must be extended to all Americans regardless of race, color, creed, or sex.

3. Any sound foreign policy requires a healthy and prosperous domestic economy.

4. The United States must continue to give full support to the United Nations. The conference endorses the American plan for international control of atomic energy.

5. Because the interests of the United States are the interests of freemen everywhere, America must furnish political and economic support to democratic and freedom-loving peoples the world over.

6. Within the general framework of present American foreign policy steps must be taken to raise standards of living and support civil and political freedoms everywhere. These policies are in the great democratic tradition of Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. We reject any association with Communists or sympathizers with communism in the United States as completely as we reject any association with Fascists or their sympathizers. Both are hostile to the principles of freedom and democracy on which this Republic has grown great.

HENDERSON IS A BACKER

The choice of a chairman or president was believed to lie between Leon Henderson, former OPA Administrator, and Wilson W. Wyatt, former Housing Expediter. It was Mr. Henderson who formally moved to establish the new organization. The organizing committee of which both are members was to select a chairman and other officers in week-end meetings and to draft a proposed program of action.

Although the organization has third-party possibilities eventually, sentiment for that course now was not significant. Mrs. Roosevelt was reported to have indicated in a speech that the preferable course now was to attempt to work within the Democratic Party and to help shape that party's program.

Pending a decision on financing, she called for subscriptions and promptly raised $5,000, in addition to $4,300 which was contributed at a dinner last night.

Mrs. Roosevelt said the liberals were fighting both Communists and Fascists and must not lose sight of either. They are not trying to tell Russians what kind of government they should have, she said, but they do not want communism in this country or in any democratic country.

Mrs. Roosevelt also emphasized that the policy of the organization should not be merely negative, but should seek affirmatively to promote the welfare of this country and of democratic nations throughout the world.

CIO IS A PARTICIPANT

Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, said two difficulties would confront the organization. One was that some persons would be afraid to be called "Red-baiters." The other was a belief that the organization would accept anyone merely because he was anti-Communist. He said both ideas should be rejected.

While the CIO was a participant through personal representatives of President Philip Murray, the question of the CIO's position in the divided liberal movement was not clearly resolved. The PCA last week named Mr. Murray one of its vice chairmen, although he was not personally present.

Barry Bingham, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, answering questions at a news conference, said the primary areas of disagreement with the PCA could be found in points 5 and 6 of the ADA statement. These referred to "the interests of freemen everywhere" and to the rejection of Communist sympathizers.

Conferees named to the organizing committee were as follows:

Charles G. Bolte, New York City, chairman, American Veterans Committee; Elmer Davis, Washington; George Edwards, Detroit, president, Detroit Common Council; Ethel S. Epstein, New York City; Leon Henderson, Washington; Hubert Humphrey, mayor of Minneapolis; Mrs. Clyde Johnson, Cincinnati; Reinhold Niebuhr, New York City; Edward Prichard Jr., Paris, Ky.; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., New York City; Frank W. McCulloch, Chicago; Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, Washington; Bishop William Scarlett, St. Louis; Walter White, New York City, president, Association for Advancement of Colored People; Wilson W. Wyatt, Louisville, Ky.; Harvey Brown, president, International Association of Machinists, independent; David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies Garment Workers, A. F. of L.; Hugo Ernst, Cincinnati, president, Hotel and Restaurant Workers, A. F. of L.; B. F. McLaurin, international representative, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, A. F. of L.; James Killen, Washington, vice president, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Workers; John Green, Camden, N. J., president, Shipbuilding Workers, CIO; Walter P. Reuther, president, United Automobile Workers, CIO; Willard Townsend, president, United Transport Service, CIO; Samuel Wolchok, president, Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Workers, CIO; James Loeb, Jr., Washington, secretary.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Members of the committee of the whole were announced as follows:

Stewart Alsop, Jack Altman, Douglas Anderson, Eugenie Anderson, George Baldanzi, Robert Bendiner, Andrew Biemiller, Barry Bingham, Genevieve Blatt, Dr. William Bohn, Chester Bowles, Evelyn Brandt, Harvey Brown, Andrew Brown, James B. Carey, John A. Carroll, Alison E. Carter, Marquis Childs, Jerry Clifford, George Cranmore, Kenneth Crawford, Nelson Cruikshank, Max Danish, A. Powell Davies, Elmer Davis, Charles Douds, David Dubinsky, John Edelman, George Edwards, Margaret Edwards, Emily Ehle, Ethel S. Epstein, Hugo Ernst, Morris Ernst, Herbert L. Fedder, Louis Fischer, Bernard Fleishman.

J. Kenneth Galbraith, Leo Gamow, Adolph Gerner, Richard Gilbert, David Ginsberg, A. P. Goldblum, Lester Granger, John Green, James Greer, John J. Grogan, Louis Harris, Gilbert Harrison, A. J. Hayes, Mortimer Hays, Allan Haywood, Anna Arnold Hedgman, Leon Henderson, the Reverend George Higgins, Melvin D. Hildreth, Dan Hoan, Johannes Hoeber, Sal Hoffman, Carl Holderman, Edward Hollander, Sidney Hollander, Chet Holifield, Frank Hook, Robert W. Hudgens, Gardner Jackson, F. Ernest Johnson, Mrs. Clyde Johnson, Morse Johnson, James S. Killen, Chester Kerr, Herman Koppelmann, Leon J. Kowal, Martin Kyne, Joseph P. Lash, Trude Pratt Lash, Leo Lerner, Mrs. Newman Levy, Alfred Baker Lewis, Sarah Limbach, Dr. Eduard Lindeman, James Loeb, Mrs. Alex Lowenthal.

Frank McCulloch, A. M. McDowell, Jean McIntyre, B. F. McLaurin, Eugene Messner, Nathaniel Minkoff, Don Montgomery, Edgar A. Mowrer, William L. Munger, Arthur Naftalin, Reinhold Niebuhr, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, S. K. Padover, Cornelia B. Pinchot, Nelson P. Poynter, Paul A. Porter, Joseph Rauh, Jr., Florence Reisenstein, Walter P. Reuther, Emil Rieve, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Marvin Rosenberg, William Rosenblatt, James Rowe, Jr., Alex E. Salzman, the Rt. Rev. William Scarlett, Harry Schachter, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., August Scholle, Boris Shishkin, Anthony Wayne Smith, Miss Laurence Stapleton, Tom Stokes, Barney Taylor, Mrs. M. E. Tilly, Willard S. Townsend, Jay Turner, Jerry Voorhis, George Weaver, James Wechsler, Edward Weyler, Walter White, Samuel Wolchok, Wilson Wyatt, Hortense Young, Abraham Zwerdling.

A Republican Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Republican Program," delivered by me on January 3, 1947, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The organization of the United States Senate today was blocked by a filibuster conducted by a few southern Senators against the swearing in of 35 newly elected Senators. They took this action because the Senate refused to seat at this time Senator BILBO, of Mississippi, who is charged by the Mead war investigating committee with improperly using his high office as United States Senator for his personal gain in his dealings with war contractors. The Republicans, and a number of Democrats, constituting about two-thirds of the hold-over Senators, took the position that Senator BILBO should be required to step aside temporarily until the Senate was organized and the President delivered his message on the State of the Union. The BILBO supporters took the utterly indefensible position that in spite of the opinion of two-thirds of the Senate, the Senate should not be organized at all unless Senator BILBO was first sworn in. I hope that BILBO's supporters may recede from this position tomorrow. Otherwise it will probably be necessary to hold the Senate in continuous session from Monday morning until organization is effected.

It can only be said that such a clear abuse of the filibuster power will probably lead to a complete change in the rules of the United States Senate.

The House of Representatives has now a Republican majority of 57. When a Sen-

ate is organized, the Republicans have a majority of 6.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

The responsibility of the legislative program, therefore, falls primarily on Congress, although President Truman, of course, has a veto power even in that field. It should be pointed out further that we still have a Democratic President, and that his powers are equal to and in many respects greater than those of Congress. He has the constitutional power to execute the laws, which gives him a wide freedom of choice in determining how any legislative policy shall be worked out. In the field of foreign affairs the Constitution confers upon the President full power to deal with foreign nations without consulting Congress, and the legislation setting up the United Nations, the International Fund, the International Bank, and many other international institutions greatly increases his power in foreign affairs. In fact, about all that Congress has retained is the right to cut off funds where the foreign policy requires an appropriation.

Undoubtedly Congress can deprive the President of certain powers in the domestic field, but if the people desire to retain certain established programs, it is not possible to tell the President in detail how those programs shall be administered.

Nevertheless the Republican Party will have great power in determining many domestic programs requiring legislative action. In the foreign field at the present time there is a general agreement between the two parties on our political policies throughout the world, and there was no substantial difference on this issue in the election.

THE REPUBLICAN MANDATE

The main issue of the election was the restoration of freedom and the elimination or reduction of the constantly increasing interference with family life and with business by autocratic Government bureaus and autocratic labor leaders. This was the issue made by the Republicans, and the overwhelming vote for their candidates showed that the people desired reconversion and the resumption of progress in the United States on the basis of those principles of freedom which have insured our progress for 160 years.

It is to President Truman's credit that when the people spoke he changed his mind on the most outstanding of these controls and hastily accepted the verdict of the people. Even before the election he removed meat control. Afterward he almost abolished all price control. Then he greatly reduced housing control and fired Wilson Wyatt. He has just declared that hostilities are ended and thereby eliminated the operation of some 50 laws, some of them of great importance, like the ending of the farm price guaranty in 1948 instead of 1949, and the repeal of some billion and a half of excise taxes. Before the election he had fought bitterly to retain price control unmodified, and recommended the increase of housing control. Only last week he wrote Senator WILEY that the question of war powers was a very complicated one, that he was having a complete survey made and would later make suggestions to Congress on the subject. He did not stop to make those suggestions. There is some evidence that he would accept labor measures even more sweeping than those which he vetoed last year in the Case bill.

I welcome the President's actions, but let us remember that it was all brought about by the battle which the Republicans made last year against the President, and the campaign issues made by them and approved by the people. With the President's change of heart, it is likely that there will be much less controversy between the President and this Republican Congress than between the President and the last Democratic Congress.

With regard to a Republican program, I have no right to declare what that program will be. It will be determined by the 246 Republican House Members and the 51 Senate Members. Many of them are new men who have not had time to study the problems before Congress in detail, and it must be some time before a program is determined. I can only state in a general way my own views of what a program should be.

IMMEDIATE PROBLEMS

Roughly the program divides itself into immediate action required, and a long-term program of peacetime progress, though perhaps these two cannot be divided by a sharp line. The immediate program must be designed primarily to cleaning away the rubble of the war and the New Deal to prepare the way for constructive building in the future. We must correct 14 years of confusion and unfilled promises. We must complete the transition from war to peace. We must modify control so as to release the productive energies of industry, labor, and agriculture. We must straighten out the finances and put the Government on a pay-as-you-go basis. We must reduce a government swollen with war powers to proper peacetime proportions. The general purpose of the program is to restore to the people the freedom of initiative and enterprise on which sound progress rests. A lot of the program may look to be negative, but essentially it is a constructive job like clearing the ground after a great catastrophe so that people may plan and build anew.

END GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

The first task, therefore, is the ending of controls, partially accomplished by the President's own actions. There are, however, a number of laws, dependent on the various declarations of emergency and on the duration of the war, which President Truman did not terminate. These should be definitely repealed, preserving only those which should form part of a more permanent program such as the maintenance of American troops in Germany and Japan. In removing these controls, various special problems arise which must be dealt with by legislation. The whole emergency-housing program should be recast. Special legislation will have to be adopted relating to sugar and probably wool. These are only samples of transition legislation.

An immediate study should be made of the various prewar and New Deal laws, in order to eliminate many of the powers of the administrative boards and confine them to the real purpose of the various acts. During the New Deal period every statute was drafted by smart lawyers in the broadest possible terms to give the unlimited executive power which was the very essence of New Deal policy. If Congress wishes to continue these programs the scope of each program should be definitely determined by law.

LABOR

The second program relates to labor. The people have resented the interference to their daily lives brought about by the exercise of arbitrary power by labor-union leaders almost as much as they have resented the interferences by Government. Often the labor action has been encouraged by the Government. The Republican Party has frequently declared its belief that the solution of employer-employee relations rests on a sound system of collective bargaining. In the early part of the century all of the power of collective bargaining rested with the employer, and he abused that power. By a series of laws, such as the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the Wagner Act, Congress attempted to redress the balance. Perhaps these laws would not have gone too far if they had not been supplemented by many rulings of executive boards and by many court decisions which carried the laws far beyond the original intention of Congress. The result has been to shift the balance of power so that it is too far over on the side of labor unions. If arbitrary power exists, arbitrary labor leaders are bound to use it, and every other labor leader has been forced to use it or lose his power. As I see it, the job of Congress is to reverse some of the things which have been done by law, regulation, or decision until employer and employee can meet on a fairly equal basis, and neither be tempted to insist on unreasonable demands because of the excessive power given to obtain them. The Republican Party last year supported a bill to require labor unions to engage in collective bargaining and making them responsible in court for violation of their collective-bargaining contracts. It is generally admitted that labor unions desiring to be certified as collective-bargaining agents should register and furnish financial reports to their members. The bill last year also set up Federal mediation machinery to establish an independent mediation board, operating impartially between employer and employee. It is generally felt that in recent years the Government boards have strengthened the hands of labor unions by almost taking their side in every controversy. The bill also provided that foremen could not be considered employees for the purpose of the Wagner Act, but as part of management. The bill also outlawed the secondary boycott by which unions have tried to bring pressure to support their claims through threats and injury to innocent third parties, and have actually shut out from certain markets goods made by members of unions of which they did not approve.

All of these legislative proposals were sound measures last year when they were vetoed by the President, and they are sound today. They will be included in any Republican-sponsored labor bill. Many additional proposals have been made, such as:

1. The outlawing of closed shop.
2. Some limitation on the power of Nation-wide monopoly bargaining which brings about the Nation-wide strikes that interfere so seriously with the welfare of the people.
3. Measures intended to limit violence in labor disputes.
4. Proposals for a labor court and compulsory arbitration.

None of these four proposals has received as yet sufficient study. The Republicans propose that hearings be started immediately on all of these proposals so that a bill may be reported to the Senate by March 1. The committee may determine that some of these proposals are without merit, or that they require a more fundamental study than can be made during the next 2 months. If it approves any additional measures, they can be added to the program already approved and reported out in one bill. I believe most Republicans feel that they have a mandate from the people to adopt legislation which will put employer-employee relations on a basis just to all and discourage the strikes which have so seriously interfered with the welfare and progress of the people.

TAXATION

Republicans have stated their intention of reducing the expenses of Government and cutting the personal income tax. The present burden of taxation seriously hampers the welfare of the entire people. Single men or women earning $1,200 a year, on which it is difficult enough to live, have to pay $110 in taxes. The President of the United States, receiving $75,000 a year, pays $10,000 in taxes. The very wealthy pay up to 90 percent and certainly have no incentive to take a risk in the new ventures which create employment, or do otherwise than invest their money in municipal bonds. These taxes are so burdensome that there is a constant effort to redress them by increasing wages and salaries. Of course, that means increased costs, increased prices, and inflation. It is

essential that total personal income taxes be reduced by 20 percent and this can be done if the Budget does not exceed $34,000,000,000. The President has somewhat complicated the problem by removing one-third of the excise tax on liquor and various other luxuries, but these could be restored. There is no reason why the Budget shouldn't be far below $34,000,000,000 without interfering in any way with the strength of our military forces throughout the world. Such a reduction is the Republican program. Tax reduction must be contingent on the reduction of expenses and a balanced budget.

MISCELLANEOUS LEGISLATION

There are a number of housecleaning jobs to be done. We intend to propose a constitutional amendment limiting Presidents to two 4-year terms; also an amendment to eliminate what is left of the poll-tax as a condition of voting in five or six States. The minimum wage law must be revised, and something done to eliminate the windfall claims resulting from the Supreme Court opinions on portal-to-portal pay.

I feel very strongly that some action should be taken toward the unification of the armed services. A careful study of the different plans proposed by the Army, the Navy, and others should be immediately begun, and the best one of these put into effect. Action should be taken to return the enlistment in the Army to a volunteer basis as rapidly as possible.

BASIC PROBLEMS

And so we come to the broad program for the future. After 14 years of unfilled promises by the New Deal, these great challenges of our times remain unanswered:

1. How to eliminate business crises without imposing a socialistic control to deaden the productivity of a free system.

2. How to reduce strikes and turn labor-management warfare into cooperation.

3. How to insure constantly improved sustenance, housing medical care, greater security for the aged and the unfortunate, and more widespread education for all our people. In short, how to make our communities better places in which to live and work.

4. How to improve and strengthen the United Nations set-up to secure peace and justice throughout the world without compromising the liberty of any nation.

The Republican Party recognizes these as great goals of a good society. They know that such goals cannot be achieved by empty promises, and they propose to deal with them by legislation and study.

They propose to back wholeheartedly the economic study and constant report required by the full-employment bill as that bill was rewritten by the Republicans in Congress. Unless business crises can be greatly reduced in intensity, they fully realize there is serious danger of this country turning to regimentation and socialism as a solution.

Whatever labor bill may be adopted, a much broader study of all employer-employee relations should be promptly begun in the labor field, calling in the leaders of all the groups to insure cooperation and the best expert advice.

HOUSING

I am particularly interested myself in the fields of housing, medical care and education. A committee under my chairmanship made a complete study of the long-range housing program and prepared a bill to cover all phases of the housing program. This includes increased Government assistance through insurance and otherwise for the construction of rental housing, an urban redevelopment plan which will make slum areas available for private housing, and a limited public housing program to provide quarters for persons with subnormal income. I intend to join in reintroducing these measures, although it may be wise to divide them into several different proposals. Nothing is more important if we wish to give children born in the United States an equal opportunity to make progress in life than decent home conditions. Because of the cost of housing, it is impossible in my opinion to get rid of the slums and provide decent housing for the lowest income families unless public housing is part of the over-all program. It should never be necessary to build public housing in an amount more than 10 percent of the total new construction in any year.

EDUCATION

I believe also that there should be some assistance by the Federal Government to insure that no child shall be illiterate simply because the State in which he lives is unable to provide an adequate education. If a State makes an effort greater than the national average and is still unable to provide the minimum necessary to give children at least an opportunity for a minimum education, then I believe the Federal Government should assist that State. In this field, as in all public welfare measures, Federal legislation should absolutely assure to the States and local governments complete power over the administration of their own health and welfare. Furthermore, the Federal aid cannot be so great that it imposes a burden of taxation which deters the very initiative necessary to produce the taxes. I do feel very strongly that the Federal Government should assist in putting a floor under absolutely essential services. I believe the American people think that in a country as productive as the United States, we can and should eliminate extreme poverty, hardship, and lack of opportunity for American children.

HEALTH

So, also, in the health field, we are proposing a program to assist the States and local governments in making their treatment of the indigent and medically indigent more systematic and complete. We should encourage the formation of plans for voluntary health insurance to be available to those who wish to take it out. On the other hand, we strenuously oppose the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which attempts to impose a complete system of compulsory sickness insurance on all the people in the United States. That plan would tax the people to raise four or five billion dollars a year to pour into Washington to be used by a Federal bureau to pay all the doctors to give free medical care to all the people of the United States. It is not only a socialization of medicine, but it is the federalization of medicine. No other measure before the American people proposes such a tremendous increase in the right of the Federal Government to interfere with the daily lives of the people. It flies in the face of every principal for which the Republican Party stands.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

We are also proposing a measure to set up a permanent scientific foundation to promote research in many fields. Our measure creates a scientific council of 50 leading scientists to select the director and determine the scope of the work. This is a substantial modification of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill of the last session which authorized the President to appoint a director with 15 bureau chiefs and an elaborate organization, directly subject to political pressure.

AGRICULTURE

One of the most serious problems relates to agricultural prices and the development of a permanent agricultural program. For 2 years the guarantees of 92 percent of parity by the Government will assure good farm prices. During that time we must work out a permanent program, designed to keep the general average level of farm prices in line with the price of industrial products. Several Republican committees have been working on this subject, and a program will probably be developed for presentation to the 1948 session.

FOREIGN TRADE

In the field of foreign trade the Republican Party is not so much inclined as Henry Wallace and the New Dealers to make huge loans on a scale which probably will never be repaid, but they do favor reasonable assistance to nations trying to get on their feet. Export trade based on lending is artificial and uncertain and inflationary. When the lending stops, as it must if its extent is too great, the boom collapses, as it did in 1929, and the resulting unemployment threatens the security of the Nation.

There is no doubt that we require and will import huge quantities of goods, but we do not favor the importation of goods which we make ourselves in such quantity and at such prices as will destroy any American industry providing a substantial part of American consumption. In other words, we favor reasonable tariffs, but not free trade.

FOREIGN POLICY

In the general field of foreign political policy, I have great confidence that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, under the leadership of Senator VANDENBERG, will continue the bipartisan support of Secretary Byrnes' policy in Europe and develop cooperation in other fields throughout the world where the results have not been so satisfactory.

In short, the Republicans will set in motion at once a new program, and bring it to a conclusion as soon as the present ground is clear through the adoption of necessary emergency action. In every field they will invite counsel from the best minds, initiate studies, and recommend measures for future enactment.

Hall Announces Radio Program for Eighth Consecutive Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include therein a radio speech I made recently to the people of my district:

The new Congress is now assembled. Great hope for the future exists in Washington. The people have spoken. They want America dedicated to attaining peace. They want this country to prosper and to grow.

As your Representative, I want you people in the Triple Cities and elsewhere in my district to write me more than you ever have before.

Let me know what you are thinking, how you feel the country ought to be run. Let me hear about your problems and what injustices if any you are enduring. Tell me about how you think we can improve the Nation and raise our standard of living.

Be sure to let me know if I can help you in Washington or back home. A letter to me will only cost you 3 cents and a little time spent in writing it. As I am in a position to help you, this small effort may be worth a lot to you.

I will be on the air every Saturday evening at 6:55 over Station WNBF. Don't fail to listen and don't hesitate to write me in Washington.

President Wilson's Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy under Woodrow Wilson and more recently Ambassador to Mexico. The subject of this most interesting and timely address is Wilson's Prophecy Will Be Realized.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILSON'S PROPHECY WILL BE REALIZED

(By Josephus Daniels, under the auspices of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation on the anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, December 28, 1946)

A great man (who was crowned one day)
Imagined a great deed;
He shaped it out of cloud and clay,
He touched it finely till the seed
Possessed the flower; from heart and brain;
He fed it with large thoughts humane,
To help a people's need.

He brought it out into the sun—
They blessed it to his face.
A great pure deed, that has undone
So many bad and base!
O generous deed, heroic deed,
Come forth, be perfected, succeed,
Deliver by God's grace!

Then sovereigns, statesmen, north and south
Rose up in wrath and fear,
And cried protesting by one mouth
"What monster have we here?
A great deed at this hour of day?
A great just deed—and not for pay?
Absurd—or insincere."

But he stood sad before the sun
(The peoples felt their fate)
"The world is many—I am one;
My great deed was too great.
God's fruit of justice ripens slow;
Men's souls are narrow; let them grow.
My brothers, we must wait."

If Elizabeth Barrett Browning had set out to make a pen picture of what many thought was the tragedy of Woodrow Wilson and put into words his thoughts when his countrymen in 1919-20 lacked the vision to translate the League of Nations into the chart and compass of a world just emerged from war and longing for peace, she could not have better divined the danger to humanity's hopes.

Wilson, however, never lost faith that, though his generation stumbled, the day would come that the vision splendid he had shaped would bless mankind. In his inmost soul he felt that the mission of the Prince of Peace would bring release from war and insure the fruits of peace to peoples long looking out of darkened windows.

Wilson not only looked into the future but, in the years between, predicted what would occur in the years from the rejection of the League to World War II. When in the summer of 1919 he made his swing as far as the Pacific to stem the tide against ratification of the Covenant, Wilson made this prediction that showed he had prophetic ken:

"I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time. What the Germans used were toys as compared with what would be used in the next war."

On the ninetieth anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, the greatest apostle of peace, the best appraisement of his greatness is to recall that he never lost faith in the goal to which his life was consecrated. He died in the supreme confidence that what blind statesmen rejected in 1919-20 would become the chief cornerstone of the predestined warless world.

How do I know of his deathless faith that the Covenant of Peace would one day light the path of mankind? Not a great while before he fell in sleep, paying what proved to be my last visit to my revered chief, I could not refrain from expressing my depression and fear of the future bereft of the promise of his League of Nations. I remember he had come limping into the library when we talked in the house of his retirement on S Street in Washington. But his mind and his faith were unimpaired. He had more faith than I. In my discouragement I told him my cherished dream of lasting peace had been shattered by the rejection of the League of Nations and the return of the nations to imperialistic dreams or small isolationist concerns.

He had been, as he said, "broken at the wheel," but in that hour this man, who was the greatest casualty of World War I, placed his good hand on my shoulder. He said very seriously and with solemn reassurance: "Do not fear about the things we have fought for. They are sure to prevail. They are only delayed."

He paused a moment, and confidently but in limping voice, with characteristic quaintness added: "And I will make this concession to providence. It may come in a better way than we proposed."

That prophecy is being fulfilled in our day. Though, like Moses of old, Wilson was denied entrance into the Promised Land he had explored, his mantle fell on my young assistant as Secretary of the Navy, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I have always counted it a great privilege that fortune made me the tie between these two supremely great prophets and creators of peace. Inspired by like devotion, Roosevelt, who gave his strength and life to our leadership in World War II, took up the quest for peace when he called the nations into conclave at San Francisco. Lasting peace was clearly also closest to his heart's desire. He put his hope and faith in a speech which he did not live to deliver but which is a great guide for us still. In that speech he said:

"The work, my friends, is peace, more than an end of this war—an end to the beginning of all wars. Yes, an end, forever to this impractical, unrealistic settlement of the differences between governments by the mass killing of peoples. * * *

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubt of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

We need to remember above all else the faith of these two leaders—and appropriate it. The only shadow that rests on the world as we celebrate Wilson's birthday is the delay of the United Nations in achieving the peace compact for which it was brought into being. It has been months since the fighting ceased. Because the Covenant of the League was signed at Versailles only 7 months after the armistice, a spirit of defeatism has taken hold of many people today on account of the longer delay after World War II. They should remember that, as World War II was wider in scope and raised more difficult problems than World War I, the drafting of an instrument to reach all over the world is the supreme challege to the statesmanship and the diplomacy of the ages.

Will the men chosen for the high achievement be able to rise above archaic traditions, love of far-flung empire, ambition for territory and exploitation, the imposition of creeds and ideologies upon other peoples, and perfect a chart that outlaws war? Will they be able to redeem the promise made to the millions who fought and those who made the supreme sacrifice to attain universal and lasting peace? These questions disturb the serenity of the Christmas season and give anxiety on Woodrow Wilson's anniversary.

Let us look back for encouragement to the conflict in Paris before the League of Nations was fashioned. Differences today are akin to those which separated the Big Four of World War I. Then Wilson felt impelled to order the *George Washington* to take him home unless agreements were expedited. Orlando returned to Rome, where bitter disagreement surged. Clemenceau lacked faith in anything but arms. Lloyd George demanded acknowledgment of Britain's naval supremacy. Smaller nations crowded into Paris seeking aims of their own. But, in the end—at least for a time in the world's hope—wisdom and consecration to peace rose superior to national aims, and in the historic hall of Versailles all the Allied Nations overcame differences and with stately ceremony appended their names to the first world pledge to end war.

Let none be affrighted because the goal of the League of Nations was not realized. If it failed in the largest promise it was not because it lacked the Divine spark, or failed to contain provision for such changes as would perfect its aims. The defect was chiefly because, sad to say, two of the greatest nations—the United States and Russia—were a. w. o. l.

Today, recalling Wilson's prophecy and Roosevelt's faith, and heartened by the recent declaration for disarmament and the approach to agreements at New York, we celebrate Wilson's birthday in the confidence that his prophecy will come true and that the covenant will be signed and kept by all the peoples of the world.

I confidently predict that before another Christmas the Peace Assize will usher in the reign of peace on earth, and that the terms of Wilson's prophecy: "Providence will bring peace in a better way" than men have dreamed since the angels long ago at this season voiced their hopes and God's promise beside a star in the skies.

Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech I delivered in Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, September 29, 1946, at a dedication of a monument to three brothers who lost their lives in the service of our country. The brothers were Albert, Bernard, and Carmen Campagnone, and were residents of Lawrence, Mass.:

It is fitting and proper that we come together in human fellowship on this common, which is the heart of our community. From North Lawrence and South Lawrence, from Tower Hill and Prospect Hill, we meet in solemn requiem to dedicate this monument to a sublime sacrifice, and in so doing dedicate ourselves to that great task for which Albert, Bernard, Carmen—three brothers of the Campagnone family—gave the last full measure of their devotion.

On this Sunday morning in our separate churches we went to worship the Creator of all life according to our separate faiths. This afternoon we gather before this public altar to put aside all distinctions of race and creed. We join as men and women who are equal in the sight of God to honor the sacrifices which have been made, in the name of human dignity, by the Campagnone family. Before this supreme giving we become aware of the faint glow of divinity that lives in the spirit of our fellow men. Before this standard of service we bow our heads in humble tribute. Conscious of our own shortcomings, we pray that in the days remaining to us we, the living, may redeem the faith which the Campagnone brothers had in us.

Never did the people of Lawrence owe so much to so few.

Three brothers gave up all the promise of their young lives that we might live.

They bought with their precious life's blood and with the triple shock of bereavement—a price which no other family in Lawrence has been called upon to pay—they bought at fearful cost this second chance for us.

What are we going to do with this second chance?

The tributes which we offer this day will mean but little if we fall back into the narrow interests of personal living and neglect, or forget the responsibilities which we owe to our community, to our Nation, and to the world.

The old world which we knew before 1941 is gone, consumed by the fires of a global war. The new world we must build. It can be built only through cooperation, as each one of us learns that he must give the best that is in him to the making of that world. The sum total of our giving, in body and mind and spirit, will build a world of peace, security, and progress in which the machines of man's invention will be used to ennoble life and not destroy it.

The Campagnone boys died to defeat the barbarism which threatened to overwhelm us. They have won for us a second chance to build a civilization that will be worthy of their giving.

For us that job begins here in Lawrence.

We have come, this day, to dedicate a monument to a supreme example of service. In the true spirit of this dedication let us search our hearts and ask ourselves if we are fully awake to the needs of our times. Is each one of us doing his or her level best to measure up to the mature thinking and cooperative action that is required of all? Only by so doing, can we, as free men, solve the challenging problems of this new age.

In our human relationships, at our work, in our play, and in the day-to-day responsibilities of citizenship are we using every dynamic resource of our minds and hearts to improve democracy? Make no mistake about it, my friends, democracy depends, not upon leaders, but upon you. It will develop, insuring a better government, a better educational system, and a fairer distribution of the products of our skill and labor through voluntary teamwork. In our community, that forward progress will be animated and strengthened by the example we honor today.

Not far from here, three Campagnone boys grew up in a home that trained them to live up to the finest tradition of American manhood. From this common, we can see the schools and the spires of the churches where they learned the eternal truths of the mind and the spirit. Over there is the playground where they spent many of the happiest hours of their boyhood in the physical joy of developing their bodies as they learned to play the game. How well they played, above and beyond the average call of civic responsibility, we commemorate today.

Out of the eternity to which they have gone, their voices seem to come back to us, urging us to fight clean and hard, for that is the American way. Fight on in peace against ignorance and greed and fear and hate. Fight and, if need be, die for that which is right.

For the lives of the three Campagnone brothers came to have a meaning and purpose as they fought and died to save us from evil. We can do no less than to carry on with their courage and their unselfishness to help win a decent world for all.

Many, many years ago, when our unity was endangered by the terrible agony of a civil war, a great President of our United States, upon hearing that a Mrs. Bixby of Boston had lost two sons in that conflict, wrote her a letter of sympathy. In it he said: "I feel how weak and fruitless must be any word of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may mitigate the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

That letter was signed: "Abraham Lincoln."

We are assembled here today to dedicate a monument to a greater sacrifice. Here at the crossroads of our community life, by the friendly paths along which many people walk and where generations yet unborn will some day pause and read and wonder, we consecrate this tablet of bronze and stone to the memory of three gallant brothers.

To their survivors—Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Campagnone, Anthony, Angela, and to the widow of Albert—we offer the deepest respect and homage of the people of Lawrence, of Massachusetts, and of our United States of America.

We meet not only to dedicate a monument but to dedicate ourselves. May we hold the example of the Campagnone brothers close to our hearts as a living memorial that will inspire us and our posterity to build the better life, in the cause of which they gave theirs in triple devotion.

Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, one of the great daily newspapers in the city of Detroit, Mich., has put on a campaign urging the people in that great metropolitan area to write to their Congressman in regard to the sugar shortage. As a result of the above-mentioned campaign, I have received numerous letters and protests.

Sugar is an essential of life and one of the most widely used foods. The shortage of this commodity is well known by everyone, and no one deplores the condition more than Members of Congress.

Cuba is the greatest source of sugar in the world. Since 1941, its entire crop has been purchased by the United States. During 1946, however, the administration invited other nations to take most of it for their use.

Furthermore, the production of sugar in continental United States has not only been discouraged by the New Deal administration over the last 10 years but actually restricted and reduced.

This condition must and shall be corrected. Sugar is not a matter of legislation; it is one of production and distribution.

Blow Aimed at Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President is about to enter into negotiations with foreign nations to reduce tariff by another 50 percent. This is another step toward free trade and a blow aimed at American agriculture.

The so-called, but misnamed, Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act enacted in 1934 is the source of authority under which the President proposes to lower the tariffs on competitive imports, especially on foreign agricultural products.

I am sure the free-trade advocates will recall that it was their contention in 1934 that the trade-agreement bill, if and when enacted, would make for peace. The trade-agreement bill was passed but, instead of resulting in peace, it was the prelude to the most devastating war in recorded history. So much for that. The record shows that when it was proposed to extend the Trade Agreements Act from March 1, 1937, to June 12, 1940, it was claimed by its advocates that it would stimulate our exports. Did it? It failed to such an extent that the dictators in the Axis group of nations were urged to buy munitions to the limit of their capacity. Why was this done? The purpose was to build up the promised exports. Thus the trade-agreement advocates armed Japan and assisted in arming Hitler. Ten million tons of steel were rushed to Japan, and also airplane engines, oil, and other war materials, resulting later in a deplorable shortage of these materials to provide for our own national defense. All this was done by the low-tariff trade-agreement advocates in an effort to prove that the trade-agreement program had increased exports. Our boys paid for this un-American program with their blood and thousands paid with their lives.

I wonder if the American people in the light of the ghastly experience under the trade agreements will again yield to the craven hypocrisy of a conscienceless group of internationalists masquerading as idealists and peace promoters.

I am delighted to know that the South has become aware of the disastrous consequences to their agriculture from the low-tariff policy inaugurated under the trade agreements.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief filed by the Association Southern Commissioners of Agriculture protesting the pro-

posed reduction in the tariff rates on American agricultural products by another 50 percent:

ARGUMENT IN BRIEF COMPREHENDING THE VIEWS OF ASSOCIATION SOUTHERN COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSAL TO NEGOTIATE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH AUSTRALIA, BELGIUM, BRAZIL, CANADA, CHILE, CHINA, CUBA, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, FRANCE, INDIA, LEBANON (SYRO-LEBANESE CUSTOMS UNION), LUXEMBURG, NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY, UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, UNITED KINGDOM

This argument in brief submitted by the Association Southern Commissioners of Agriculture is intended to express the collective views of the commissioners with regard to tariff and other concessions that might be made within the scope of the Trade Agreements Act and in the negotiations with each of the 18 foreign nations with whom the President has proclaimed negotiations are to begin.

Whereas section 350 (2) of the Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, as amended, gives expression to the purpose of the act and states it to be in part that:

"For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production"; and

Whereas section 350 (a) of the Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, as amended, further provides that:

"* * * The President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

"(1) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and,"

Whereas section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, as amended, provides that:

"Before any foreign trade agreement is concluded with any foreign government or instrumentality thereof under the provisions of this act, reasonable public notice of the intention to negotiate an agreement with such government or instrumentality shall be given in order that any interested person may have an opportunity to present his views to the President.'

It is pursuant to these several sections, and particularly section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, that now comes the Association Southern Commissioners of Agriculture:

(1) To exhibit for the benefit of the President the association's interest in the proposed foreign trade agreements under discussion, and

(2) To point out to the President the economic overburden to southern agriculture which would ensue from Presidential exercise of power to effectuate the proposed agreements, and

(3) To make prayer to the President that the trade agreements proposals now under discussion for the reasons hereinafter set forth be not enacted with any of the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon (Syro-Lebanese Customs Union), Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and United Kingdom.

(4) To point out still further to the President that under the favored-nations clause any and all concessions granted on any and every product to any one of the above nations is ipso facto extended to all so-called agreement nations in the world, regardless of whether or not negotiations are even at this time being considered with respect to that particular nation.

For example: Any concession made to Canada or to Australia, such as on meats or meat products, will open our domestic markets to a veritable flood of similar meat products—canned corned beef, roast beef, chicken, and the like, from the Argentine, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Brazil, as well as to any and all European and Asiatic nations.

Arguments later to be advanced will show that the pending negotiations, contemplating the reduction of existing protective tariff rates, which result in opening our domestic markets to a flood of foreign agricultural products from the world is, in effect, a violation of the act when viewed in the light of the declared purpose of Congress in enacting the same.

The Association Southern Commissioners of Agriculture is, as the name connotes, a confederation of the commissioners of agriculture of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, Tennessee, and Virginia.

Your petitioners, the commissioners of the above-enumerated States, function in their respective States under constitutional authority and statutory regulations. They were elected by the people or, as in the case of four, were appointed by the Governor who was elected by the people.

Each in his official capacity operates his office through a State-wide tax-supported agricultural organization set up to meet the economic requirements of agriculture under the constitutional authority and the statutory regulations of his particular State.

May we here point out that the State commissioners of agriculture are ever in close and understanding contact with their farmer constituents; that they are fully cognizant of the moral, the physical, the spiritual and the economic requirements of their people; that we know their hopes, their needs, their wants, and their ambitions.

These agricultural commissioners, individually and collectively, address this their prayer in behalf of their constituencies and in so doing are operating under the declared principle of its association members: strictly in conformity with constitutional authority exercised within statutory regulations, supplemented by rules and a set of bylaws adopted by them for the purpose of facilitating and dispatching public business pursuant to the good-will objectives and purposes of their association.

The 37,000,000 of citizens of the great southland and their duly elected State officials, the southern commissioners of agriculture, are each one sprung from the loins of those who for more than 100 years carried the standards of the Democratic Party in never-ending struggle, and even on the field of battle, paid to support the economic theory and doctrine of free trade versus the protective tariff.

For reasons hereafter to be enumerated these stalwart and democratic southern peoples, after long trials, and due to the kaleidoscopic changes attending the national economy of the United States in a more modern world, are with reluctance compelled to burn all bridges behind them and to make prayer to their Chief Executive that he now retain in behalf of their agricultural products the vestiges of tariff protection which still remain of the act of 1930. That he do so in order to keep the markets of these United States open to them for the sale of their American produced crops of fats, foods, feeds and fibers, and without an undue overburden of competition from foreign producers of identical crops.

It is unnecessary to recapitulate the historic privations endured by the people of the cotton South, whose agricultural economy was hitherto hinged to a one-crop system. Neither is it necessary to recall to you, sir, the hardships endured by our people during the world-wide depression of the late 1920's. Then we had an annual production of upward of 18,000,000 bales, spindles of the world geared to spin American staple; cotton, then king, had maintained the balance of trade against the world for these United States and for upward of half a century.

In the midst of world-wide depression in the early 1930's, a beneficent and sympathetic Executive as well as an understanding Congress addressed themselves to solving our problem. There was much talk then as to whether the increase in existing cotton supplies was merely an increase in the annual carry-over or was it a cotton surplus. But that is beside the point.

Conferences were held. Extended hearings took place in the Halls of Congress and in the cotton-producing States themselves. Action programs were promulgated. Effective legislation was instituted. Enabling acts and finances were quickly made available from the Federal Treasury, to put these legislative programs into effect.

Our cotton production was reduced. Our acres were measured. A plow up campaign was instituted. Markets, domestic as well as foreign, were controlled. We were told where and what to plant, in what quantities and to what grades; where, when, and how to market our production at what prices; and to whom.

Yes, we were suffered even to endure penalties for noncompliance with multitudinous administrative rulings and failures to act in accordance with Federal regulation under the various crop controls, Agricultural Adjustment Act, Bankhead bills, domestic allotments, marketing, grading, and other statutes.

Of necessity, as stated by the Chief Executive, all of this was experiment by the trial and error method. But, by and with the encouragement of a continuing sympathetic and truly Democratic controlled national administration, the Cotton South went along with the entire program. The Nation's peerless leader, from his Georgia homestead, taught the southern farmers not by word alone but by deed and in action on his own lands the value of diversification of crops, of compliance to regulation * * *, of cooperation, of soil-conservation practices and marketing controls—all in the hope that the great benefits then expected and forecast would flow out of the program.

This program has now been in effect for more than a decade. Its adaptation to the South has been attended by costly social legislation—the organization of labor, old-age pensions, social security, minimum wage laws, increased income taxes, increased rail rates, and other increased charges and costs of production—the net result of which, from a financial standpoint, can be summed up by saying that while cotton prices have about been doubled, our production has been decreased from eighteen to approximately nine million bales per year, and with the cotton-reduction program has gone a large part, if not all, of our foreign markets for cotton.

At the same time costs for fertilizer, feeds, seeds, fuel for agricultural operations, fencing, agricultural machinery, ginning, rail rates, taxes, and other increased production and marketing charges were geared to a higher standard of social existence.

From the standpoint of net income and purchasing power derived from over-all cotton production, it is highly debatable whether or not the South has made any marked financial improvement whatever under the new order that now obtains.

On the other hand, agricultural extension courses, teaching good soil-building and soil-utilization practices, stressing the need for diversification of crops as expounded by the United States as well as State departments of agriculture, have brought new and untold wealth and happiness to our section of the country.

We look now to our fruitful orchards and to the ever-increasing dairy and beef herds that graze in our southern woodland pastures. We count the tremendous increase in our swine herds, our annual increase in inspected packing-house slaughter. We look to our creameries, our margarine and peanut butter, and to our cheese plants, to our new potato starch industry, to our increased poultry and egg production, and to trainload after trainload of early spring vegetables, berries, peaches, plums, and melons which now flow into northern markets, made possible under the new agricultural economy that has been builded for our people.

It can in truth be said that in spite of the aftermath of World War II and all the so-called regimentation to which our peoples have been or have subjected themselves, that out of the new system has been born a tremendously increased measure of spiritual happiness and creature comforts to our cotton South today.

Somewhere in the Sacred Book it is written that "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away." Quite recently due to forces which have not as yet been assessed or discovered, the price of cotton fell more than 10 cents a pound in one single month. Concomitant with that decline in price comes notice of a very small crop this year under federally imposed controls.

With it, however, comes notice of a tremendous cartel set up in the British Empire, financed in Parliament with an approximation of $850,000,000. This cartel, working under the British system of marketing, will undertake to control the cotton markets of the world in behalf of British economy and can only do so to the detriment of our own southern markets in behalf of British and other foreign growths of cotton staple.

Arguments later will be advanced and demonstrations made that this action on the part of the British Government, entirely apart from other reasons, gives rise to the question as to whether or not any trade agreement whatever should be negotiated with the United Kingdom of Great Britain, while the actions of the British cotton cartel remains in obscurity.

As this is being written, it is evident that the American cotton planter finds himself in a precarious situation with respect to his foreign markets since the production of the cotton crop this year as produced under Federal control, is but slightly more than ample to service the needs and requirements of the American people themselves. Cotton, no longer king, can no longer balance world trade.

Now comes from the Committee on Reciprocity, Presidential notice of proposals not alone to reduce the tariffs on cotton manufactures and semimanufactures, which tended to secure the home market to the southern cotton planter, but in these trade agreements negotiations proposal is made to reduce the protective tariff rates on many other competing fibers.

Apparently unmindful of the terrific increased production of synthetic fibers due to wartime expansion in the wartime United States, the cotton South by virtue of the trade-agreements program is to lose more and more of its American cotton markets to the war industries not alone of America but now of Europe, turned from making munitions of war to the manufacture of rayon, nylon, and other synthetic fibers, filaments, yarns, threads, noils, and other semi and manufactured synthetic fibers for future export to the United States.

A further proposal is made to reduce the tariff rates which in a large measure permitted us profitably to increase our herds of beef cattle and milk cows. Not alone do pending trade-agreement negotiations propose the reduction of tariff rates on livestock and the meat products thereof, but on butter, cheese, milk, and cream, be it condensed, evaporated, or dried.

The Committee on Reciprocity also makes proposals to barter our home markets for eggs in the shell, dried or frozen eggs, egg yolks, and egg albumens. A downward revision in these tariffs is, at this time, unthinkable to any sound agricultural economist.

Argument might be advanced that the increased importations of these products are percentagewise, small in comparison with total annual consumption within the Nation and therefore not important either to the southern agricultural economy or to the national economy as a whole.

Take the matter of butter imports which undoubtedly will flow out of the enactment of any one of several of the trade agreements either through unilateral, bilateral, or multilateral trade.

It should be noted at this point that the butter situation in the United States at this very moment is daily under the scrutiny of the Federal Government which Government, until some 2 months ago, was paying a subsidy of 13 cents a pound to the producers thereof. It should be noted also that the tariff rate now on butter is 14 cents per pound.

In addition to many other commodities, the Commodity Credit Corporation throughout the last year has been called upon many times to make purchases of butter in local markets in order to maintain the parity floor for this commodity set by the Congress of the United States, and under present statutes they will be thus compelled to issue these prices for the next 2 years.

In the face of this costly Government subsidy, Mr. President, let the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture submit for your consideration the notable and historic fact that the arrival one time in the New York market of a single shipload of butter from New Zealand in one single day depressed the American market prices an average of 5 cents per pound.

Will the Federal Government attempt to maintain a floor and support prices on the foreign butter to follow the enactment of these treaties?

The largest single income item to the average southern cotton planter, outside of the cotton staple itself, is the price that he receives for the compliment of cottonseed produced with his cotton that is because of the value of the cottonseed-oil content from which, among other items, is produced margarine. Proposal is made in pending negotiations now to reduce the existing tariff rates on both cottonseed oil and margarine. It is to be noted also that decreased rates of duty on competing edible oils and fats, as well as on margarine, are to be made the subject of negotiations for tariff reductions.

What a travesty on economic justice for the Committee on Reciprocity to barter away the American market for butter, cottonseed oil, oleo, and other margarine oils, as well as many other oils, fats, and directly competing oil-bearing seeds, by reducing the tariff to the foreign producers when at the same time the United States Government itself maintains a tax of 10 cents a pound and imposes that tax even on a southern cotton planter if he wishes to produce and sell colored margarine from the cottonseed oil he himself produced.

In addition thereto, many of the States north of the Mason and Dixon's line, following the pattern set by the Federal Government, impose prohibitive license fees and State taxes against margarine, an American-produced agricultural product of our own cotton South, when offered to the people of the United States by the southern producers thereof.

One among the many hundreds of agricultural products upon which proposal is made to negotiate tariff reduction is that of potatoes. Under date of November 26, 1946, Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture, addressing the Honorable ELMER THOMAS, chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, pointed out the precarious position of the American farmer with respect to the production and marketing of the present potato crop.

Wrote the Secretary of Agriculture on that date:

"The basic relationship between our agricultural price support commitments and production levels for the various crops involved is one of the most fundamental questions before us at this time. * * * While this situation will have more serious implications for the future, if domestic or foreign demand for the products of our farms falls off materially, it is also of immediate concern. We are having," wrote the United States Secretary of Agriculture, "very real trouble with potatoes this year. In calling this whole question to your attention I should like to review the potato program—in light of the difficulties we are having in carrying out price support commitments with this first of the major postwar surplus crops."

The Secretary of Agriculture then goes into lengthy detail with respect to the present potato situation in the United States. He tells of the harvest, the surplus, the acreage cultivated, the dollar values. He tells of our downward adjustment in production goals * * * and despite their every activity, * * * advises the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry "the situation in 1946 is much worse than it was in 1945."

The Secretary then gives a graphic picture as to how the Department has endeavored to get rid of these potatoes by distributing them to school lunches and free of charge to approved public institutions, of diversion of Government stores to starch mills and as livestock feeds, to the manufacture of alcohol, and, among other facts which have to be faced, continues to write:

"Reports will soon begin to appear, telling how potatoes are rotting in the fields or going to waste in other places. This is an unpleasant situation, but it is a stark reality we must face. The over-all cost to the Government for the 1946 potato support program is estimated at $100,000,000. Of this amount the Department will recover, roughly, $20,000,000, leaving a net cost to the Government of approximately $80,000,000."

Mr. President, now hear the Association Southern Commissioners of Agriculture well on this point.

In that letter the Secretary of Agriculture advises the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture that the Federal Government has on hand at this very moment 90,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes costing the United States Government a net loss of $80,000,000, that they are not in such storage as will prevent them from freezing this winter; that they cannot be absorbed by the American starch mills, and yet, and at this very time the committee on reciprocity contemplates bartering away the American markets for starches in general and potato starch in particular by proposing how

to further reduce the protective tariff on potato starch in order to open the potato starch markets of the United States to foreign producers of potato starch.

Not alone, Mr. President, do they contemplate reducing the protective tariff on the potato starch but, unthinkably so, on white or Irish potatoes, while the Federal Government owns nearly 90,000,000 bushels.

As it is, Mr. President, with potatoes and potato starch, so it is with corn and with corn starch. Negotiations are to be conducted that will look to the reduction or further abatement of tariff rates that will at one and the same time shut down the corn starch factories of the United States and open our home markets to the flood of hundreds of millions of pounds (imports in some past years have been in excess of half a billion pounds) of cassava, tapioca, sago, arrowroot, and other farinaceous substances and starch-bearing products imported from foreign lands to be sold directly in competition with corn starch, in this, the banner corn-crop year of corn production in these United States.

Advices just received from the Department of Agriculture are to the effect that "the starches made from culled sweetpotatoes were found wholly adequate in making adhesives for use on the back of United States postage stamps and flaps of envelopes; that until quite recently white-potato starches had historically been used for that purpose." What a sad commentary on the economies of our national life is the fact that one of the specialists of the United States Department of Agriculture presumes that this letter will reach your desk, Mr. President, carried by a postage stamp not stuck either with American-produced white- or sweet-potato starch, but with an adhesive made from imported cassava roots, upon which the committee of reciprocity wants to negotiate a reduction in tariff, while 80,000,000 bushels of potatoes now owned by the Government rot in storage.

It is not considered amiss here to insert a list which will exhibit a few of the many products indigenous to the Southern States and some of those directly competitive therewith upon which proposal is made to reduce the tariff rates now afforded the American producers:

Cattle.
Live and dressed poultry.
Meat and meat products.
Lard and lard substitutes.
Oleomargarine, other edible oils and fats.
Milk and cream: Condensed, evaporated, dried.
Butter.
Cheese.
Fish and fish products.
Eggs: In shell, dried, frozen.
Egg yolks and egg albumens.
Leather and hides.
Whale oil, seal, cod, and other marine and fish oils.
Barley, buckwheat, oats, and rye.
Rice, rice meal, and broken rice.
Wheat and wheat flour.
Barley malt.
Oil cake and oil-cake meal of soybean, linseed, peanut.
Dry and ripe beans, limas, peas, lentils.
Tamarinds, grapefruit, limes.
Pineapples.
Apples.
Berries and raisins.
Apricots, prunes, and peaches.
Coconuts, peanuts, walnuts, others.
Broken nuts and nut products.
Peanut butter, etc.
Cottonseed and other vegetable oils and fats.
Molasses and sugar sirups.
Honey.
Oil seeds: castor bean, copra, palm kernel, perilla, babassu nuts, and other oil-bearing seeds and nuts.
Tung, coconut, palm, perilla, and linseed oil.
Tobacco and tobacco manufactures.
Cotton manufactures and semimanufactures.
Woolen manufactures and semimanufactures.
Rayon and other synthetic textiles.
Rayon filaments, staples, yarns, threads, noils, waste.
Rayon fabrics, wearing apparel, gloves, hosiery, handkerchiefs, mufflers, laces, embroideries, ribbons, and other manufactures.
Wood and wood manufactures.
Peanuts: shelled, not shelled, blanched, salted, prepared or preserved, and peanut butter.
Peas: green and ripe peas and chick peas.
Onions, white and Irish potatoes.
Tomatoes in their natural state.
Rutabagas, turnips.
Eggplant.
Cucumbers.
Squash.
Celery.
Lettuce.
Cabbage and all other vegetables not especially provided for.

It is indefensible that any executive agency of the Government in support of what has been proven to be an unsound economic theory would today contemplate making serious inroads into the agricultural economy that has been nurtured in the Cotton South during this last decade and a half under a truly sympathetic and understanding Democratic administration.

The markets of Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, New York, Detroit, Chicago, Kansas City, and all the great industrial trade areas comprehended within that territory had for years been the market of the Cotton South for its annual crops of early green garden vegetables, fruits, melons, and berries.

It is stated without fear of successful contradiction that if the program contemplated in the currently to-be-conducted trade-agreement negotiations is carried out that we in the great Southland will see our southern-grown early green vegetables—potatoes, tomatoes, turnips, eggplants, squash, carrots, cucumbers, celery, lettuce, cabbage, spinach, beans, peas, peppers, corn—rotting in our fields and on our land, while the Florida East Coast, the Seaboard, and the Southern Railways will haul trainload after trainload of identical vegetables—the product of foreign labor farms and gardens—across our fertile fields and through our Southern States to our own historic northern markets under the guise of a reciprocal trade-agreements pact.

Now, Mr. President, hear the southern commissioners well on this:

It may be true that in the realm of world trade northern industry can sell 100 automobiles or 100 tractors or 100 typewriters to the owners of the plantations in foreign countries whose peon labor produce their products. These foreign producers do not have to pay the minimum wage scales per hour imposed by the United States Federal Government. They do not have to pay Federal rates of workmen's compensation or social security taxes imposed upon the agricultural producers of our South. Unlike our producers, they are not faced with the payment of the income taxes cheerfully borne by our own southern truck farmers and workers. The foreigners are not afforded free schools, and old-age pensions, regardless of race, creed, or color, or other beneficences that flow out of the enlightening administration of local, State, and National Government in these United States of America.

It is axiomatic, Mr. President, that if the present rates of tariff now imposed upon these commodities were prohibitive and unduly destructive of all competition, how come the large imports of these articles which we have seen cross our frontiers and which are annually reflected in the foreign commerce report of agricultural imports?

Equally, let it be known to all men that if the present tariff rates do afford our southern producers some measure of protection necessary to retain home markets and maintain the American standards of living, then why reduce them?

If ever by the exercise of Presidential power the proposed trade agreements are effectuated, the truck farmers in Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, the Carolinas, yes, and the farmers in the Rio Grande Valley and those who cultivate the irrigated acreage in the Texas winter gardens, will some day find themselves dumping their spinach, their new potatoes, their tomatoes, their carrots, their snapbeans, their citrus fruits, and their melons into the irrigation ditches as a result of not finding markets that will so much as profit them to harvest, pack, and ship their stock—paying federally imposed wage scales—and all the while Illinois Central trains will speed across their acres burdened with the garden products of Mexican peon labor working at little or no wage on Mexican fields, while on this side of the border minimum-wage scales imposed by the Federal Government and organized labor rates are made effective against all labor used in harvesting and packing crops.

The southern textile industry itself is now threatened by the flood of cotton textiles soon to be loosed upon America in northern as well as southern cotton markets, once the proposal to slash the tariff rates on cotton manufactures and semimanufactures is made effective through the enactment of the proposed trade agreements.

We must be cognizant of the fact that the trade-agreements program in its entirety was an experimental program for the purpose recited in the act itself. Section 350 (a) of the act of June 12, 1934, as amended, provided in part, as follows:

"For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States and as a means of assisting in the present emergency, in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public and maintaining a better relationship among the various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce."

That was the declared purpose of the Trade Agreements Act, as expressed by the Congress of the United States at the time of its enactment.

Wherein, Mr. President, the Association Southern Commissioners of Agriculture respectfully ask of you, will the negotiation of the present trade agreements (to quote the language of the act itself, "assist in the present emergency, restore American standards of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public," and "establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce"?

The declared purpose of Congress as further recited in section 350 (a) of the act itself provides:

"Regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production."

Note well that the act specifically recites that it was "for the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production."

Mr. President, read this in the light of the letter the Secretary of Agriculture addressed to Hon. ELMER THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry, under date of November 26, 1946, wherein he recites the $80,000,000 loss to the Federal Government this very year on the potato crop alone; he tells of the inability of starch mills to absorb more potatoes and further points out that:

"Because the problems we are already facing with regard to potatoes may arise for other commodities in the not far distant future, it is obviously imperative that the whole question of price support policy, to accomplish the underlying objectives of the legislation, be given prompt and thorough consideration."

How then, in the light of this letter written by the United States Secretary of Agriculture, can the Committee on Reciprocity give any serious consideration whatever to reducing existing tariff rates on potatoes, potato starch, poultry, and hundreds of other agricultural items of which we have at the moment not only enough for domestic needs but of which we have exportable surpluses?

Who is there to say that the southern agriculturists will not in this crop year or in the crop years to come be able to raise enough string beans and peas and spinach and carrots and peppers and tomatoes to satisfy the needs of the American markets, and that therefore tariffs must now be reduced to supply whom: "various branches of American production," to wit, the producers themselves.

Argument is advanced that the principle of the reciprocal trade-agreement program, initiated more than a decade ago as an experiment in foreign trade relationship, was intended to cure an economic evil, maladjustment, and disease in our domestic and foreign trade relationship.

Argument is now also advanced that the cure has become a part of, if not worse than, the disease itself. The reciprocal trade-agreements program, now a more difficult problem to our national economy, is full of more potentially dire effects upon our people than was the maladjustment which gave birth to the act.

May we respectfully submit to your consideration that the so-called agreement nations with whom negotiations are currently to be conducted have many products which in the past have contributed much to our American standards of living and to our way of life. They include agricultural, mineral, semimanufactured and manufactured products and goods.

In the matter of effectuating hemispheric solidarity and world peace, no man questions the wisdom and the potency of trade, but let us have a truly reciprocal trade amongst the American farmers and the farmers and agriculturists of other nations.

Let us negotiate the free flow of crops of American cotton, wheat, and lard and other exportable surpluses for the agricultural and forest products of other nations, such as natural rubber, coffee, tea, bananas, silk, jute, sisal, and neither seek to penetrate their markets by dumping our goods on them nor, at the same time, permit them to dump into our already surfeited American markets their surplus of grains, beef, milk, poultry, eggs, vegetables, fruits, nuts, and berries—leaves, stems, stalks, or roots—to the continual and everlasting detriment of our own agricultural economy.

By the same token, Mr. President, let the heavy mass-production industries of America exchange the products of their techniques, their ponderous presses, skilled labor, technical equipments, and scientific instruments, for the industrial products of foreign industrial producers, but let us dispel all thought of selling American-manufactured goods in the markets of the world when we know at the outset that the foreigners can make no payment in kind and can only meet their obligations in the banking houses of the United States by shipping floods of agricultural products, drowning out the American markets, the American producers, and sorely distressing the domestic economy of the Nation as a whole by destroying in large part the purchasing power of the American farmers themselves.

Mr. President, let us in the Cotton South sell our farm products in American markets and with the proceeds thereof buy the products of our home industries; America will then have the products and also the industrial goods.

Buy your farm products abroad and 'tis true you will have the products but they, the foreigners, will have the tractors and automobiles, while our own agriculture goes back to a subsistence level of diet and of life.

Respectfully submitted.

ASSOCIATION SOUTHERN COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE,
C. C. HANSON, *Secretary.*

Congress Modernized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include herein a radio address I delivered over radio station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Thursday evening, January 2, 1947. The subject of the address was on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

CONGRESS MODERNIZED

You are a shareholder in the biggest business in the world, the Government of the United States.

As one of your duly elected representatives, I serve you in the Congress, which is the board of directors, as it were, entrusted with the task of establishing the policy line for this business. From time to time I report back to you, to tell you how the business is getting along.

Tonight I want to speak to you about something which has needed doing for too many years. It is about a law which has not received enough publicity. It is, I am proud to say, one of the most progressive steps taken by our Congress in this or any other generation. By name it is the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Why is it so important?

Because before the economic, political, and social pressures of our time, democracy is on trial. We've got to make it work or else.

We have just emerged from a war in which we defeated aggressive dictatorship. But another regimented way of life remains, and it is in competition with ours. Many nations which experimented with democracy after the First World War were unable to make it solve their problems. And so, they are listening to the siren call of communism.

They have seen the one remaining democracy—the United States—torn by many cross tensions during the past year. And they have jumped to the conclusion that if we, with all our wealth and power, cannot establish domestic order and tranquillity, then it is hopeless for them to attempt self-government.

They forget that we are an adaptable people, with a long experience in democracy which has enabled us to survive many crises. All we need is a little adjustment in the machinery of government to bring it up to date. And that is what we have started to do, effective this very day, through the modernization of our Congress.

The founding fathers intended that the Congress should be the heart of our representative form of government. In this century, however, the office of President has steadily acquired more power and prestige and the two branches have not always cooperated for the national interest. Herbert Hoover, a Republican President, had a Democratic Congress, and the two were at constant odds. As a result, nothing was accomplished to ward off the longest and severest depression that our country has experienced. In 1932, when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President, the Nation was paralyzed with fear. Millions of men were out of work, banks were failing, and, in desperation, the people cried out for direct action to save the Nation. The Congress, hidebound by old and slow procedures, was in no position to meet the emergency. It surrendered its law-making functions to the White House. There, the President with his advisers, made the laws which Congress approved, second-hand. The executive branch of the Government had become supreme.

So serious was the crisis for the Nation that there was no alternative. We were saved a domestic upheaval at the cost of learning that the stage-coach traditions of Congress could not cope with the problems of the machine age. Serious-minded men and women, knowing that the failure of the legislative function in other countries had been the first step toward dictatorship, feared that we were headed in the same direction.

As we weathered the storms of depression and war, Congress began to reassert itself. Instead of cooperation between the two branches of government, as hoped for, the old contest for power reappeared. In 1946, a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats voted down President Truman's recommendations. In this confusing situation, responsibility for failures could not be defined clearly. But the public, in its wrath, took it out on the party which by name, if not in fact, was in power.

Today we are confronted with a clearer division between the two. We have a Democratic President and a Republican Congress. If the two square off—as some people fear—we shall have a deadlock in government which would seriously imperil our whole way of life.

Frankly, I do not expect to see such a break-down in constitutional government. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is destined, among other things, to bring Congress and the Executive closer together—working as a team rather than as competitors in a struggle for power.

These reforms have come just in time.

Streamlined techniques are needed in government in order to make it work efficiently in this year of 1947.

Last year the total cost of the Congress, which is the voice of the people, amounted to little more than $50,000,000. By way of contrast, the little-known and minor agency called the Office of Indian Affairs spent $27,000,000.

Congress had not had a thorough reorganization since 1893. Its machinery of that day was designed to control only three one-hundredths of the task which confronts it today. A Congressman's job is to make laws, but through the years the people, in steadily increasing numbers, have called upon him to do all kinds of little errands. As a result, 80 percent of the average Senator's or Representative's time is taken up by work of a nonlegislative nature. Consequently, Members of Congress not only do not have time to study legislation but they do not even have time to vote. And day by day the measures coming up before Congress are more technical, involving not only the welfare of a district, a State, or the Nation but sometimes that of the world itself.

Worried, lest it lose its constitutional place in government, and impressed with the need

of self-improvement, the Seventy-eighth Congress authorized a joint committee of its own Members to make a thorough study of its organization and operation. It was my privilege to be one of the six Members from the House of Representatives who served on that committee. After a year of searching investigation and hearings, we reported a bill which, with some exceptions, was passed by Congress and became effective on January 2, 1947.

We had found, for instance, that Congress had more than 80 standing committees, many of which overlapped, making the machinery for legislating slow and defective. Six separate committees in the Senate deal with the rules and the administration of that body. In the House, six committees vie with one another for jurisdiction over legislation concerning public lands and three with veterans' affairs. Taxes are levied by some committees, and appropriations or expenditures by others. Oftentimes, the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. A Congressman may be a member of four committees, all of which are meeting on the same hour of the same day. This led to confusion and waste of valuable time. It is reported that Jesse Jones, a highly placed and responsible public servant, was called away from his work on 18 different occasions to appear before 18 separate committees to deliver the same 2-hour speech.

To correct this cumbersome set-up, we reduced the number of committees from 81 to 34. Many of these 15 committees in the House and 19 in the Senate are parallel in scope. Twin committees may hold joint hearings on the same bill, thus saving the time of busy administrators and legislators alike.

Furthermore, the Reorganization Act provides that each standing committee shall employ four staff experts (nonpartisan career men) to marshal the facts, plan the hearings, brief the committeemen, and prepare reports on pending measures. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress is to be expanded and legislative counsel provided to help Congressmen to properly evaluate the flood of complex problems which come before them.

The Reorganization Act will not only help Congress to pass legislation, but assist them in seeing to it that such legislation is carried out with congressional intent. With the increase of Federal functions during the twentieth century, Congress has created many commissions and agencies to perform them and has delegated its rule-making power to them. Too often, a decree issued by one bureaucrat in any one of the agencies has had the effect of law. To strengthen congressional oversight of administrative performance, standing committees of both Houses will keep watch over the execution of the laws in the public interest.

The bill raises the salaries of Members of Congress, and permits them to participate in the Federal retirement system now available to other Federal employees. It also relieves Congress from consideration of the many local and private claims which have heretofore diverted its attention from national policy making. Without impairing free speech, the Reorganization Act requires the registration of all lobbyists, with information concerning their membership and the source of their contributions, and their expenditures so that Congress may properly weigh the worth of the arguments presented by these pressure groups when it comes to enacting legislation.

By simplifying its operations, supervising the administration of the laws, controlling Federal expenditures, and becoming more responsive to the need for quick and expert action on postwar problems, this act will accomplish much.

By lifting the work-load and expediting the process of legislation, the Reorganization Act will strengthen our democratic form of government to meet the tests which lie ahead.

To safeguard the people's interest and to become more efficient in their behalf, the Congress needs your continuing interest and advice on matters of government.

Improvement of Congress, though imperative, is not an absolute guaranty of better government. We need good men and good will. But, above all, our greatest need is for an alert and well-informed public opinion which is the heart of democratic government.

We have done much to modernize Congress. With your help we shall do more.

When any legislative body becomes merely a debating society, playing with words when it should be passing constructive legislation to meet urgent problems, dictatorship is not far away.

A revitalized Congress is your concern as well as mine. It is useless to sit back and criticize government. We must do something positive to improve it.

At the beginning of this new year of 1947, let us resolve to devote more thought and effort toward the improvement of our Government so that democracy will survive, and go forward with confidence into the future.

Address by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York, Dedicating a Plaque in Memory of Joseph Medill Patterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of my address to the members of the New York Daily News Chapel, of Typographical Union No. 6, on September 9, 1946, in dedicating a plaque to the memory of the late Capt. Joseph Medill Patterson, one of the great figures of our time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, we have met here today in response to a single impulse: To draw inspiration once more from the memory of a great and valiant man whom we learned to love. Our purpose is to erect a perpetual testimonial of our admiration and affection for Capt. Joseph Medill Patterson.

You and I, who knew and worked with Captain Patterson, have no need for speeches to explain our presence here. Each of us could commune with himself and from his own association with this man of vigor and vision, readily call to mind the qualities which evoke our fond recollection and command our loyalty and homage. But we are not content with such silent communion. We want the whole community to hear our reflections, to learn and to know that a great-hearted giant had lived in our midst. We desire to communicate to future generations our response to his greatness, his simplicity, and his humanity.

Let us, therefore, record the noteworthy fact that we, who are here assembled, are the members of the Daily News Chapel of the Typographical Union No. 6. We are members of a labor union which chooses to commemorate in honor and affection the man who was our boss. This novel and arrested fact alone, this departure from the usual pattern, vividly demonstrates that Captain Patterson was an unusual man. The stereotyped cartoon of a publisher as a fat man, chewing a fat cigar, his vest besprinkled with dollar signs, was not conceived with Mr. Patterson as the model.

He was an extraordinary man, and he exhibited the rare man's paradoxes. He was born and bred to aristocracy, but none despised more vehemently the trappings of caste and class. He was accustomed to great wealth, but few had keener understanding of the problems of poverty. He had access to the high and mighty of the land; he preferred to know the aims, ambitions, and strivings of the little people. By natural aptitude he was a fighter and a man of action, but he selected the printed word as his sword and tool.

Already, even in his lifetime, his name was embroidered with legendary exploits. There is the story that he used to come to his editorial desk at the Chicago Tribune dressed in corduroys and a turtle-neck sweater. You have heard reports of his excursions among the derelicts, sampling their lonely and bitter existence. Numerous tales have circulated about his uncanny perception of the trend of public taste and mood. There are two stories that I like best, because they hold up a clear mirror to the man himself.

The first is the story of an argument between Patterson and one of his executives, which concluded with these words of the publisher: "The fact that I decide against you is no proof that I'm right and you're wrong. It may be that I'm wrong and you're right. It's purely because of an accident of birth that I happen to be in a position where I get my way." Few men of wealth and power see themselves with such candor and clarity.

The second incident I cherish as the symbol of his simplicity. It is the text of what he wrote when his circulation manager passed away: "Memo to Max Annenberg," he wrote, "Good-bye, I am going to miss you a lot. Hope to be seeing you some day." There were no flourishes, but all who read that unadorned memo knew that here was a man mourning the loss of his friend.

He was a playwright whose plays appeared on Broadway; he was a soldier so conspicuous that General MacArthur spoke of him as "The greatest natural-born soldier that ever served under my command." It was not in his make-up to seek an easy assignment or a safe berth. In five of the most violent engagements in World War I, he demonstrated the stuff he was made of. Before World War I, he had already served a term in the Illinois Legislature and in the office of commissioner of public works of the city of Chicago. Already he was giving conspicuous evidence of those qualities which ultimately produced his greatest enterprise—the New York Daily News. Each day during the past 28 years that paper has reflected his singular independence of mind, the vividness of his imagination, his genuine understanding of the great masses of his fellow citizens. That understanding never failed him because it was founded upon a true sympathy with the common people. With Patterson it was not a rhetorical flourish but the expression of his very being, when he carved upon the face of this building the closing phrase of Lincoln's immortal saying, "God must have loved the common people; he made so many of them."

When I consider the magnitude of his achievement in building this great institution, the News, I put in second place the fact that it is a stupendous business undertaking, outstripping all its competitors in a contest in which all the odds were against him, providing a livelihood for thousands of families and great wealth for its stockholders and managers. What I put in first place is that he succeeded in building a pipe line for the transmission of news, opinion, and intelligence into 4,000,000 homes—the largest channel of its kind in the United States.

He was its inventive genius, its architect, its designer. It is today a photographic image of his versatile personality. You, my friends, helped to maintain it, to sustain its pressure, and to carry its life-giving cargo to a vast population.

In many a cause in which I was privileged to carry the banner, he was a potent, resourceful, and trusted ally. There were times when we disagreed and then he was an equally potent, resourceful, and always chivalrous opponent. Even in the grimmest disagreements, no one could ever question the integrity of his motives, the purity of his patriotism, or his complete devotion to our country.

Men capable of wielding great power frequently become obsessed with a sense of their own wisdom and lose respect for the view of others. That sorry trait Mr. Patterson never exhibited. No one whose character is marred by such a flaw could have invented the idea of the annual battle page, where both sides in the campaign could equally and freely express their views regardless of the position taken on the editorial page. And there is not a newspaperman on the staff of the News who has not felt perfectly free to espouse any public cause without fear of reprisal.

Men who can command the fulfillment of their every wish sometimes become thoughtless of the fate and fortune of their struggling brethren. Not so Mr. Patterson. He said to me once, "I have to go slow. I have to consider so many people—the people who work with me. If I make a business mistake I am likely to penalize them without intending to do so. If I should wreck this business, thousands of people I have never seen would suffer; their children might go hungry. The responsibility frightens me sometimes. That is why I have to go slow."

And that is why we have come to lay a wreath of our tribute, our esteem, and affection at his feet. That is why, I am sure, in the Great Beyond, he is happy to witness these ceremonies, happy to win that which no one has ever amassed enough wealth to be able to buy—a little silver plaque bearing the evidence of the love of his coworkers. The price of that is a great human heart.

Captain Patterson, we salute you. Well have you earned the rest that Kipling spoke of:

"When earth's last picture is painted, and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and faith, we shall need it—lie down for an eon or two,
Till the Master of all good workmen shall set us to work anew!

"And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame;
But each for the joy of the working, and each, in his separate star,
Shall draw the thing as he sees it, for the God of things as they are!"

Reciprocal Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regard the speech made by Mr. Wheeler McMillen, editor-in-chief of the Farm Journal, before the New York Economic Club dinner, May 23, 1945, on the subject of reciprocal trade treaties a logical and unanswerable indictment of the low-tariff program of the trade-agreement advocates.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting Mr. McMillen's speech:

Since the reciprocal trade treaty program was instituted in 1934, the duties on 1,226 items have been reduced. A considerable number of items have been found on the free list. Not one single item has experienced an increase of duty.

Now demanded is not merely renewal of Executive authority to continue the program but the right to reduce duties by 50 percent below those reductions which already have been made.

No doubt can exist, therefore, about the intent of the proponents of these treaties. Their purpose is to reduce, to reduce again, and, if possible, to destroy whatever protection the tariff affords to the markets of American farmers, to the jobs of American workers, and to the ability of American business to serve the American people. On the evidence of their acts, and not merely of their words, their objective is that illusive international dreamland, the state of free trade among nations.

In behalf of these treaties more than one naive sophism has been advanced. Once they were earnestly recommended to the American people as a preventive of war. Now, with supreme contempt for the intervening history, they are soberly advocated as a preventive of future wars.

Among the other ills which the treaties promised to moderate was unemployment. Six years after the act was passed, and after a dozen other employment nostrums had been tried, until war made a temporary abundance of jobs, unemployment was as prevalent as before. Their contribution to the creation of new jobs during that period was imperceptible, if, indeed, they did not decrease employment.

The framing of the first legislation in authorization of the trade agreements was accompanied by a regrettable note of dishonesty. Although not distinguishable from commercial treaties among nations, they are called agreements. This term was written into the legislation for a single purpose, a purpose which I believe no defender of the treaties will attempt to deny. That purpose was to evade any review of their provisions by the congressional representatives of the people. It was to confine all authority with reference to them to the executive department of the Government. If the treaty procedure therefore smells a bit with the odor of totalitarianism, those who established the procedure chose the aroma.

PROPAGANDA BATHES TREATIES IN IDEALISM

A prodigality of propaganda has sought to blind the American people to any doubts about the immaculate virtue of the treaty program. So overwhelming has been this propaganda, so lovingly has every line and syllable been anointed with the functions of idealism, that whoever remains unconverted can expect to be regarded as one reeking with reaction, as the personification of sordid selfishness, unregenerate with isolationism and steeped in original sin.

The public funds of the Nation and the powerful propaganda machinery of Government have been enlisted to perfume the treaty program with this fragrant atmosphere of idealism. So effective has been the appeal to unselfishness that philanthropic generosity from many sources has surged forward to contribute money to further the propaganda. Among these sources are such pious idealists as the exporters and importers, the export manufacturers, the marine and shipping corporations, and international bankers. Remarkable as the fact may be, even certain of the foreign industrial and agricultural competitors of the United States have been induced to support the abolition of our tariff duties.

CHANGED CONDITIONS ARE NOW TO BE FACED

This is a timely moment to review a program for which so much factitious fervor has been aroused. The question comes up at an hour when we face a future filled with unknown and unpredictable quantities. For nearly 6 years the violent forces loosed in a devastating, consuming war have altered the economic conditions of the earth. Allusions to whatever effects may be alleged, pro or con, to have resulted from the trade treaties in the 1930's can have little weight in this discussion tonight. The world's face has changed. One could hardly say with accuracy that the world's face has been lifted; rather, it has been bashed in.

This is now a world that has spent most of its savings, destroyed large portions of its capital wealth, and which has profoundly distorted the former relationships among nations. This is now a world in which ancient hatreds have been intensified and new hatreds have flamed into evil existence. We shall hereafter be dealing with nations and peoples who will be striving desperately to recoup their damaged fortunes, to restore their former well-being, to assure their future safety from aggression, and to realize whatever they may of the shining hopes that have been held out to them as promises of the postwar era. Here in the United States we shall be obliged to repair the ravages wrought upon our own economy first by political recklessness and then by war.

Nevertheless, we are profoundly and sincerely anxious to help the less fortunate peoples of the earth. Genuine, effective help to others by the United States can be justified on the ground of enlightened selfishness no less than in the cause of humanitarian decency.

As Americans, we crave for every nation the highest possible standard of living that its people can earn. We oppose the exploitation of those who are economically or politically weak. The United States can derive no advantage, either in prosperity or security, because of poverty anywhere else in the world. Prosperity, anywhere in the world, is a buttress to prosperity and security everywhere in the world.

According to the precepts taught by the advocates of free trade and parroted by the proponents of the reciprocal-trade treaties, mutual international prosperity can be advanced by providing unobstructed access to world markets for those commodities which each nation most readily produces because of natural advantages or developed skills.

If this premise were true, and if it were supported by the evidence of fact, a simple and desirable formula for world welfare would be in our possession. Unfortunately it is not true; the fundamental error of their own basic theory deludes its advocates.

Building upon the sands of this false premise, the advocates of free trade are certain that the United States can strengthen other countries by constant reduction and eventual abolition of American tariffs and thereby admitting into this, the richest of all national markets, an unrestricted volume of competitive production from the rest of the world.

HOW FREE TRADE HAS PERPETUATED POVERTY

With no consideration for the moment as to the effect of such policies upon the fortunes of the American people, let us examine their actual effects upon those abroad whom we would like to help to achieve higher standards of living.

Under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, fully 65 percent of the imports of the United States entered on the free list, without payment of duty, and the free list has not been decreased since that time. It stood at about that figure, also, during the previous decade. Thus for a quarter of the century the United States has admitted approximately two-

thirds of its imports without duty. This record, certainly, affords a substantial basis of experience for estimating the effect of free trade upon the people in other lands who have produced those goods which we have bought freely and in abundance.

Among the products which we bought from abroad was rubber. We are the world's largest consumers. How much did free access to the American market improve the standard of living of the rubber producers in the East Indies? Their wages are variously reported at from 10 to 20 cents a day. Have they in return been able to buy automobiles or tires or even raincoats? Have they been able to exchange their labor for radios and refrigerators or even for the small comforts and conveniences such as abound in our stores? Has free access to the American market benefited the people of the East Indies, or has it exploited those people to provide Americans with cheap rubber? Has it, in fact, diverted them from developing production of other goods which they need for themselves?

From the same region the United States has imported annually from 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 pounds of tropical starches, mostly free of duty. Have those transactions enriched the farmers of the East Indies, or have they rather served to reduce the opportunities of American farmers?

Free of duty from South American countries we have imported large quantities of coffee. In addition we have imported, from there and other tropical areas, huge quantities of vegetable oils. Is there evidence that we have thereby built up the standards of living for the producers of those commodities? One answer may be found in the recent statement by a Brazilian economist. He speaks of a country vaster in extent than continental United States, older in discovery, and not inferior in natural resources. The average standard of living in Brazil, he declared, is below that of India and China, where the standard is so notoriously low that an increase of eighteenfold would hardly bring it to the American level.

Have the jute farmers of India overcome their poverty by access to world markets? Have the fellahin of Egypt reveled in prosperity from sending their cotton into the international channels of trade? What benefits are enjoyed by the laborers in the tin mines of Bolivia? Did free access to the American market create either prosperity or peace for the silk workers of Japan?

What is the matter with this picture? According to the principles of free trade advocates the producers of rubber, of tropical starches, of Torrid Zone vegetable oils, of coffee and tin and jute and silk ought to be prosperous. They ought not to labor for the world's lowest standards of living.

Before answering that question, it is pertinent to ask another. What are the two most constant problem crops in American agriculture? One is cotton, and the other is wheat. Both depend for a large part of their market upon world demand and foreign ability to buy. Farmers of the United States have relatively little difficulty in finding profitable markets for the poultry and dairy products, the meats and fruits and vegetables which they sell within the United States.

PRODUCTION HAS TWO JOBS TO DO

The fact is that the advocates of free trade overlook an important economic law to which the textbooks have given all too little attention. This is the law which seems to condemn to a condition of disadvantage nearly every large group of people who labor as original producers of an abundant raw material which must find its markets through world trade. The people who are forced to concentrate upon such production become the ready victim of exploitation by the ruthless forces of world competition. They are never far from the verge of an economic slavery which they can escape only by developing alternative products and new sources of earning power. The more they concentrate upon their specialty, the more narrow becomes their dependence and the more certain their poverty.

It must be emphasized that production has two functions. One is to create goods. The other is to create purchasing power. Production that does not earn buying power does not fulfill its human purpose.

Here in the United States the American people have built their unprecedentedly high standard of living over a century and a half by achieving a remarkable diversity of production. That diversity, promoted where desirable by a fairly continuous policy of protection from excessive foreign competition, has, under freedom, enabled Americans to develop an unequaled variety of sources of earning power. Our national prosperity is not dependent upon a few limited species of economic activity.

With so great a variety of means to earn, Americans are in consequence able to buy an overwhelming proportion of the goods produced within the United States. The fact that always more than nine-tenths and sometimes as much as 95 percent of our business is done among our own people, and that so little of it is subjected to the vagaries of world trade, has enabled our people to sustain and steadily to increase their high standard of living.

DOMESTIC PROSPERITY CREATES FOREIGN TRADE

The prosperity which has resulted from the long American protective policy has enabled Americans to become the world's largest consumers of imported materials and therefore the world's best customers for the products of other lands. Domestic prosperity is the most powerful stimulant of foreign trade. In periods of highest prosperity we import the largest volume of the raw materials which we do not produce, and import the largest quantities of the luxury goods which we can then afford to add to our standard of living. That higher volume of international trade is not the cause, but the product of prosperity at home.

A correct system of protective tariffs is a fertilizer for international trade and not, as the propagandists would force us to believe, a barrier. Such a system has enabled Americans to build up the production of the enormous variety of things Americans have wanted. That production has earned them the means to buy other commodities from elsewhere. That system has created diversification and abundance of earning power. We have not limited ourselves to a paucity of means to live, nor restricted ourselves to a few limited varieties of economic activity. Our farmers are not confined to the cotton and wheat and corn fields, but have a hundred other profitable activities. Our workers are not confined to the automotive, business machine, and other industries in which our efficiency may be exceptional. They have a tremendous choice of jobs. Does anyone really want to reduce that choice by limiting American production to a few specialties for world markets with less purchasing power than ours?

HELP OTHERS TO HELP THEMSELVES

The American people are quite generally agreed that their best service to the rest of the world may be to help other populations to help themselves.

That service will not be performed merely by opening our markets to the unrestricted delivery of their products. Such a course would only intensify the exploitation of other peoples to augment our supplies of cheap raw materials and cheap luxury goods. It would only narrow the fields of economic opportunity which they might create for themselves.

A far wiser and far more effective way to help less fortunate peoples to help themselves will be to aid them to produce for themselves the things they need for themselves. That course will be far more enlightened than to reduce their opportunities by exploiting their labor to produce for us the things that we have reasons to need to produce for ourselves.

Neither does it follow that a protective system which has yielded high returns for the United States can be exactly suited to the needs of any other country; nor, certainly, should a great Nation like ours, with a large natural capacity for self-containment, be influenced to imitate a policy developed for a small have-not nation such as England. Free trade, with all its accompaniment of exploitation, may be necessary for a country which can produce neither most of its food nor of its raw materials. In the United States we can produce most of both. We do not need to exploit the cheap human labor of distant lands. On the contrary, our most selfish interest, as well as our most generous good will, will be served if we aid such people to produce for themselves the goods they most need for themselves.

SHALL THE UNITED STATES UPSET FISCAL POLICIES OF OTHERS?

If trade treaties are to be reciprocal, and if they are to create this so-called free trade, the United States must demand that other countries reduce their duties in return for reductions by us. Most of the nations of the world depend upon customs duties for a far higher percentage of their national revenues than does the United States. Whereas the customs provide only about 9 percent of the income of our Government, Brazil, for instance, derives 48 percent of her revenue from customs. Every other Latin-American nation counts upon customs for more than 25 percent of national taxes, ranging up to 88 percent in Guatemala. Sweden and China look to customs for more than half their revenues, and India for nearly 70 percent. The United States may perform a doubtful kindness when it exerts its power of negotiation to upset the already delicate fiscal systems of less secure nations.

Thus far I have indicated that what is called freedom of trade tends to the exploitation of workers and producers in less diversified areas; that it restricts, rather than improves, the range of their economic opportunities; that it tends to bind them to enterprises of doubtful advantage; that it tends to deprive them of the power to develop diversified sources of earning power; that it puts them at the mercy of conditions beyond their control in world markets and keeps them in the power of their customers.

I do not believe that Americans wish to encourage the exploitation of any foreign people. I refuse to believe that Americans desire to become parties to an ill-conceived program which can only lead to the further pauperization of other nations. I do not believe that the genuine idealists of free trade themselves, if they truly understood the pernicious effects of their doctrine, would continue to be its advocates.

Never yet has it been possible to produce all the goods of all kinds for which human desires exist. There is no limit to the potentials of human consumption except purchasing power. In turn, the only limit upon purchasing power is earning power, the power to produce exchangeable goods.

The policy in every nation, therefore, ought to be to nurture and nourish, to stimulate and expand the capacity of the people to earn. How to maintain such a policy will shortly become the major concern here in our own country.

IF UNITED STATES BOUGHT EVERYTHING FROM ABROAD

Let us suppose, for one moment, that the United States succumbed after the war to the extremists in this passing frenzy of internationalism. Let us suppose that we decided to adopt this porous doctrine of free trade, and accepted the theory that we could prosper best by purchasing everything from wherever it might be obtainable most

cheaply. After the war nearly every product Americans use might conceivably be offered somewhere, by nations eager for exports, at a price below the level required for profitable production here. What, then, would be the consequence? What could it be except the rapid destruction of American earning power?

The illustration may be fantastic, but the principle is not. The preservation and increase of American economic strength is a first duty of Americans. The United States cannot hope to be a power for peace and stability in a turbulent world, and cannot expect to exert moral force for human good, and at the same time permit ourselves to abandon any kind of production that will improve our national strength. Only the United States will help the United States.

By 1940 our country had not yet emerged from the long depression. Since then the debt, destruction, and distortions of war have been superimposed upon the effects of the depression. We are in no position blithely to assume the costs of vast new theoretical experiments.

SHALL WE TRADE THREE-AND-ONE-HALF JOBS FOR ONE?

The motorcar industry is admired as a triumph of American efficiency. No other country makes so much car for so little money. The free-trade theorist therefore reasons that we should export more automobiles, and should reduce tariffs of some less efficient industry in order to import something to pay for the exported cars.

It so happens that in 1939 the automobile wage earners and the cotton textile industry's wage earners were approximately equal in number. The value of the output of the automobile worker was three and one-half times the value of the cotton mill worker's output. Therefore, it might seem logical to trade our efficiently made motorcars for cotton products from abroad, especially since several foreign countries have textiles to offer.

Simple arithmetic reveals what the effect would be. To create one job at making motorcars for export we should have to import enough textiles to displace three and one-half cotton workers. Is that the kind of business that will pay our public debt and maintain America strong?

Incidentally, a British mission this year reported to Lancashire that British spinners produce 18 to 49 percent less per man-hour than Americans, and British weavers 56 to 67 percent less. Our textile industry is not so inefficient.

WHICH MARKET BUYS MORE AUTOMOBILES?

The production of sugar beets in this country has long been scorned by the free traders as an uneconomic business. In any sugar-beet area of the United States an automobile will normally be found for every four or five persons. In Cuba there is one automobile for every 175 people. Which looks like the better way to build an automobile market, to buy some sugar from American beet farmers or to buy all of it from Cuban plantations where the actual workers buy no automobiles at all?

Moreover, when Detroit sells an automobile to an American citizen someone else sells a garage, a highway, a hot-dog stand, tire replacements, gasoline and oil, hotel rooms, and a whole train of goods and services. When an automobile is sold overseas only an automobile is sold.

Does some one complain that every American consumer has to help buy the sugar beet farmer's car? That could be. Assuming that the full amount of tariff is reflected in every pound of sugar, the duty adds up to about $1 per person. That kind of a dollar is job insurance for the automobile employee and for many other American workers. With the kind of employment problem that may roll up in a few years, the needless importation of goods America can produce will be recognized for what it is—the export of jobs. How many jobs can we afford to export?

NATIONAL DEFENSE DEMANDS PROTECTIVE MEASURES

Not for many years will the United States again dare to permit itself to be unprepared for war, for our preparedness will be assurance of peace. We know now that preparedness includes almost everything. Yet we see rising a new breed of isolationists who are willing to see their country isolated from sources of essential supplies. The short-sighted failure to encourage our synthetic rubber industry years ago left us in 1941 isolated from rubber. Thanks to a wise protective tariff enacted in the early twenties we were not also isolated from the indispensable chemicals from which we were cut off once before. The tariff-protected American chemical industry has performed an immeasurable share in the job of saving civilization.

The national defense demands that there shall be produced in some quantity and at some cost, somewhere within continental United States, every possible essential item for military needs and for maintenance of the civilian economy during the war.

A SMALL UMBRELLA OF APPEASEMENT

The appeal is raised that unless we are willing to cut another 50 percent from our present tariff rates we shall not be able to keep the friendship of other nations. When these reductions have been made, will our margin for the purchase of friendship be reduced to 25 percent of the 1930 rates? Shall we then be asked to surrender this last margin in the holy cause of purchased international good will? And when that is gone shall we be obliged to fight? Or shall we then begin to subsidize imports? One answer is as logical as the other. The appeal itself is absurd. A nation great as the United States cannot in fact be dependent upon so small an umbrella of appeasement.

The most immense of all the oversights of the free-traders is their failure to understand the new American philosophy. For centuries men assumed that the world had only so much wealth, and that if one man or one nation were to obtain more he must take it from others. That was the predatory philosophy.

Here under freedom we have developed something so great and so new that most of the statesmen and economists have not yet discovered its existence. Ours is no longer a predatory philosophy, but a philosophy of production. Through science we learn to obey the laws of nature and to create out of the materials of the earth vast arrays of goods such as never existed before. This is new wealth which we take from no one. We make it out of the soil, out of the air and sea, and even out of the waste heaps of a more ignorant past.

In less than three-fourths of a century we have created 15 new major industries which account for a tremendous share of our employment, of our wealth, and of our standard of living. The rest of the world is welcome to take our tools of production, to learn our skills, and to do the best it can to equal our standard of living. That, not our markets nor our jobs, is our best contribution to humanity.

The reciprocal trade-treaty program is a narrow, old-fashioned, one-way, down-grade alley that can only lead America and the other participating countries direct to the economic slums.

I have tried here to lay before you a concept of the true seeds of prosperity and the soil in which they will grow, whether that soil is in our part of the earth or far overseas. When we shall have helped the world's less fortunate peoples to produce for themselves the things they need for themselves, we shall then have helped them on the way to genuine and durable prosperity. Foreign trade is the fruit, not the seed, of prosperity. As others grow in welfare and well-being, as they build up their real earning powers, trade over the face of the earth will flourish as never before, discord will decline, and the productive ideals of American freedom will everywhere be called blessed.

Pearson Lists New Year Resolutions for Certain Needy Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an item from the Cleveland News of January 2, 1947:

PEARSON LISTS NEW YEAR RESOLUTIONS FOR CERTAIN NEEDY CITIZENS

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Today I suggest the following New Year resolutions for certain people—who could use them:

Harry Truman: I resolve to become President of all the people, not some of the people—from Missour and Arkansas.

John L. Lewis: I resolve to count to 3,500,000 before starting a strike.

Patrick J. Hurley: To post a "dead end" sign along the Santa Fe Trail.

Harold Stassen: To be comforted by the fact that the GOP didn't want Willkie, either.

Governor Dewey, of New York: 'Til '48, patience and fortitude.

Governor Warren, of California: Ditto.

Senator-elect BRICKER of Ohio: Ditto.

Senator TAFT, of Ohio: Likewise.

Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan: The same.

John Snyder: To pay more attention to running the Treasury Department and less attention to trying to run Harry Truman.

Brain-Truster Clark Clifford: To develop a passion for anonymity.

Senator MCKELLAR: To eat less and think more.

Senator TOM CONNALLY: To speak more cautiously to Mr. Molotov, and to fellow-Texan "PAPPY" O'DANIEL not at all.

REPUBLICANS MAY STEAL FOUR DEMOCRATIC PROBES

One backstage maneuver already has been pulled by the Republicans to steal four important reports by the House Merchant Marine Committee, in which the Democratic majority did some frank and unmerciful probing of fellow Democrats. Here are the facts as to what happened.

Last week Democratic Merchant Marine Chairman OTIS BLAND, of Virginia, called a meeting of his committee and placed before it four critical reports, as follows:

1. The antiquated accounting system of the Maritime Commission showed that over $1,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money cannot be accounted for.

2. Tax manipulations by large shipping companies, with Maritime Commission knowledge, would have robbed the Government of a huge tax bill but for the sharp eye of young Democratic Representative HENRY JACKSON, of Washington. As a result the Treasury will collect $40,000,000.

3. Excessive trade-ins allowed by the Commission to the United States and Grace Lines on the purchase of new vessels will cost the taxpayers many millions. Chairman BLAND has forced the Commission to take steps to recover overpayments.

4. An over-all report on the committee's work for the year.

OHIOAN WEICHEL TWICE STALLED OFF PUBLICATION

When the reports were presented, Judge BLAND moved for adoption, whereupon Representative AL WEICHEL, Ohio Republican, wanted to carry them over until 1947. He insisted they were "only interim reports."

However, two fair-minded GOP colleagues, CHRIS HERTER, of Massachusetts, and ROBERT HALE, of Maine, did not agree. When they seemed likely to side with Democrats for immediate acceptance of the reports, WEICHEL raised the point of "no quorum." This stymied the committee.

Two days later the group met again. Again WEICHEL opposed publication of the reports, and again he saw that he would not have the full backing of his Republican colleagues. Ten members were present—one short of a quorum—but the proxy of Representative ELLSWORTH BUCK, New York Republican, was reported in favor of immediate release of the reports. WEICHEL insisted that it not be honored.

Meanwhile Chairman BLAND was seeking to reach Representative DICK WELCH, San Francisco Republican, who will be committee chairman next year. Although the meeting date had been set to meet WELCH's convenience, he left word with his secretary that he was not to be disturbed—not even for a phone call from BLAND.

So, because WELCH refused to leave his office and walk a few steps to the meeting, WEICHEL was able to make his point of "no quorum" stick. Thus the four critical reports prepared by Democrats will be brought under the new Republican Congress.

Export of American Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the Lamborn sugar-market report, dated October 11, 1946, entitled "Are You Tired of the Sugar Shortage?" it was stated that—

Yugoslavia, whose belligerence toward Americans is all too well known, secured tens of thousands of tons of sugar through UNRRA this year with the approval and aid of our Government.

The accuracy of this statement published in the October 1946 Lamborn sugar-market report was challenged in an article published December 19, 1946, in PM, a New York newspaper.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the reply to the charge of PM, which appears in the Lamborn sugar-market report under date of December 24, 1946:

UNRRA SHIPPED 54,591,400 POUNDS OF SUGAR TO YUGOSLAVIA DURING THE FIRST 7 MONTHS OF THIS YEAR

(Authority: U. S. Department of Commerce)

Our many friends in the producing, processing, distributing, and sugar-consuming industries use, and depend upon, our facts and figures on sugar. In our pamphlet of October 11, 1946, entitled "Are You Tired of the Sugar Shortage?" we stated: "Yugoslavia, whose belligerence toward Americans is all too well known, secured tens of thousands of tons of sugar through the UNRRA this year—with the approval and aid of our Government."

A New York newspaper, PM, published an article on December 19 denying the accuracy of the above-quoted statement. They labeled our statement "bunk" and said that "Yugoslavia got no sugar from UNRRA this year." They based their statement on the authority of the Agriculture Department. Presumably they meant the United States Department of Agriculture.

Lest some of our readers might be confused as a result of the article in PM, we wish to point out (a) It is a matter of public record that on April 24, 1946, the United States Department of Agriculture announced "the Combined Food Board has reached an agreed recommendation for the allocation of sugar for the calendar year 1946." Yugoslavia was included in the countries to which an allocation was made to meet the allocation recommended for UNRRA; (b) The United States Department of Commerce wrote us on November 18 giving us a list of shipments of refined sugar from the United States to foreign destinations for the period January-July 1946. This record states that 54,591,400 pounds, valued at $2,601,733, were shipped to Yugoslavia by UNRRA. The number of pounds mentioned is the equivalent of 27,295 tons.

In view of the foregoing, it will be seen that our statement of October 11 is absolutely correct.

Many, many years ago we recognized that no sugar-brokerage organization could give a complete service without an adequately equipped statistical department. We take considerable pride in the fact that our statistical department has always gone to the greatest length to furnish our friends with accurate, unbiased, and complete data—on all sugar activities here and abroad. Needless to say we make no statements in our publications without carefully checking and double checking our facts and the sources.

California the Golden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following article by John Gunther, which appeared recently in the magazine, Holiday, gives some idea of the magnitude of California. Especially the last paragraph showing the tremendous increase in population, which has increased our social and economic problems. I trust the Members of the House will appreciate this when you hear appeals from the members of our delegation:

California, the thirty-first State to enter the Union, is the second American State in area (158,693 square miles) and the fifth in population (somewhere around 9,000,000). It contains the highest point in the United States (Mount Whitney, just under 15,000 feet) and not more than 60 miles away is the lowest point (Death Valley, 276 feet below sea level). California is the third State in the Nation in value of agricultural products, the first in airplane manufacture, the first in golding mining, the second in university graduates; it is second in oil, third in eggs and wool, and fourth in production of electricity. California has the highest living standard in the country, and the second highest per capita income of any State—$1,429 as against $1,031 for the Nation as a whole. It contains the richest American county (Los Angeles with its citrus crop), and the biggest, San Bernardino.

* * * * *

California is, it is often said, two States; the dividing line is the Tehachapi, one of the few east-west mountain ranges in the United States. But more than this spine of mountains divides northern California from southern. The chief criterion of demarcation is water. Above the Tehachapi, speakingly roughly, water is abundant; below, it is scant and precious. An interesting line is the right-of-way of the Los Angeles aqueduct; Los Angeles is below the Tehachapi, but part of the water supply of a community of 2,000,000 people is above. Water aside, the fact that the State is two States causes other problems. For instance, there is a State building in Los Angeles as well as Sacramento; there are two penitentiaries; the university is split in two, with separate campuses—virtually autonomous—at Los Angeles and Berkeley.

Northern California is itself so variegated that to describe it in a paragraph is neither possible nor necessary. Here is the Golden Gate and the wonderful complex of communities around San Francisco; here is Mount Shasta, Lake Tahoe, and the only active volcano in the United States (Mount Lassen); here is the upper Sonora, of which John Muir wrote, "For a distance of 400 miles your foot crushes a hundred flowers at every step"; here are those fascinating communities, Carmel, Monterey, and Salinas. The whole gamut of California history may be traversed in 20 miles in this region, from Monterey—which was the old Spanish capital—to Salinas, which is the scene of much of John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath.

Southern California, the third of the State below the Tehachapi, is something else again; it has a mood, an ethos, absolutely different from the California of the north, so much so that it is a different world. This is the California of petroleum, crazy religious cults, the citrus industry, towns based on the rich rentier like Santa Barbara and Pasadena, the movies, the sprawling giant of Los Angeles, the weirdest architecture in the United States, refugees from Iowa, a steeply growing Negro population, and devotees of funny-money. It is, above all, the California where climate is worshiped as a god. Yet all of it would shrivel and disappear—almost overnight—if it were not for imported water. Everything depends on irrigation, i. e., artificial rain comes by pipe and canal.

* * * * *

I began by saying that the population of California was about 9,000,000. In 1940 it was 6,907,387. But with the war—as we know—came a tremendous influx, not merely of military personnel but of defense workers and their families. By 1943 the population was estimated at 7,795,000 and by 1944 at 8,373,080; today the figure is probably about the same, though some estimates go as high as 9,250,000. Conservatively, it is agreed by all authorities that since 1940 the State has gained at least 1,500,000 people; this is an increase of 22.4 percent.

Some astonishing details were released if we break these figures down. For instance the city of San Diego jumped from a population of 289,300 in 1940 to an estimated 425,000 in 1944—a rise of 47 percent. The San Francisco area rose from 1,734,308 to 2,147,660 (24 percent), and Los Angeles County from 2,782,998 to 3,322,000 (16 percent). Los Angeles is today the third largest city in the country. Some single counties—particularly in the bay region—more than doubled their population in the war period; they rose 100 percent or more. This prodigious increase came, moreover, atop other increases. In 1900 the population of the whole State was only 1,485,000. In other words the war brought to California in 4 years more people

than its total population 40 years before. And there seems little doubt that, within the next few decades, California will surpass New York and Pennsylvania, Illinois and Ohio, to become the most populous State in the Union.

Modernizing Our Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein two editorials, one from the New York Times of December 30, 1946, entitled "Modernizing Our Diplomacy," and one from the Boston Herald of December 31, 1946, entitled "Streamlined State Department":

[From the New York Times of December 30, 1946]

MODERNIZING OUR DIPLOMACY

A certain looseness in the organization of our Department of State has been obvious for some time. It has become more apparent since the end of the war and the death of President Roosevelt, who to a large extent chose to act as his own Secretary of State and kept policy decisions in his own hands. The present condition of affairs, partly an inheritance and partly due to the clumsy functioning of an outmoded and rickety system, has resulted in international confusions and on occasion in considerable national obfuscation. It is therefore reassuring to learn that Secretary Byrnes is considering a basic reorganization of his Department and our Foreign Service.

The Secretary has been overburdened with a tremendous two-man job. For most of the year he has been away from Washington serving as our chief representative at the various international conferences trying to hew a pathway to peace. He has served the Nation brilliantly and well, bringing the United States from a position of cautious participation to one of world leadership. But his necessary absence abroad has left our State Department at home without his own leadership and without the immediate direction he might have exercised.

Sometimes it has seemed that the Department, with no available individual command and no sufficient authority, was simply not on the job. Outsiders have stepped into this vacuum and attempted to speak for it with most unfortunate consequences. Examples will readily come to mind. The Henry Wallace episode, which resulted in his retirement from the Cabinet, is one. Admiral Halsey's announcement that our fleet would go anywhere in the world "it damn well pleased" is another. Sometimes it has seemed that one section of our international service was deliberately pulling against another. The fundamentally opposed policies of Ambassador Messersmith and Assistant Secretary Spruille Braden regarding Argentina is a typical case. The Department's Office of Far Eastern Affairs has often seemed antagonistic to the program of our own representatives in China. The Department has also seemed at times to reach decisions on the spur of the moment without any reference whatever to long-term governmental policies and commitments. Thus we have been left facing in different directions in different parts of the world with no over-all chart to guide us.

All this adds up not only to poor administration but to general confusion. The public becomes bewildered. Rearranging the players on the old team has proved ineffective. Now it is proposed to create a kind of General Staff. This would remedy the apparent lack of liaison and cohesion between the various divisions. It would be extended to embrace our entire Foreign Service and bring our diplomats abroad into union and harmony with officials at home. Finally this departmental high command would explore the widening ground ahead, prepare a plan of operations and outline general policies for specific application. Extemporizing our strategy in so broad an effort as that for peace is outdated and dangerous.

Such a fundamental reorganization is overdue. Mr. Byrnes is said to be discussing it in detail with his most trusted advisers. If we are to maintain our position of world leadership we must forge new tools and modern machinery with which to do it.

[From the Boston Herald of December 31, 1946]

STREAMLINED STATE DEPARTMENT

If ever a theme has needed reiteration in these days when the United States is, for the first time in history, playing the leading role in world affairs, it is the demand for revitalizing the State Department which Mr. James Reston so effectively revived in the New York Times on Sunday.

However, word that Secretary Byrnes is considering a wholesale modernization of the State Department's antiquated administrative set-up comes as somewhat of a shock at this belated date in view of the fact that the Secretary has never made public, nor done anything perceivable, about the reorganization plans he demanded in a hurry from former Budget Director Harold D. Smith on the day he was sworn in as Secretary back in July 1945. Within the hearing of witnesses Mr. Byrnes asked Mr. Smith at the White House on that day to prepare as soon as possible a comprehensive plan for overhauling the Department. Mr. Smith set his experts to work and completed it with astonishing speed, largely because the Budget Bureau had been making continuing studies of the State Department upon which it could draw. Secretary Byrnes soon received the plan, but it has never been made public despite repeated requests for its release.

Even if the Secretary exercises his right to disapprove of all or parts of the Budget Bureau's recommendations, the least he can do is to make it public so that this expert document may provide a focal point for public, as well as official, discussions of a vitally important problem.

As Mr. Reston pointed out, the State Department has been subjected to at least two paper reorganizations in recent years. However, they made about as much difference in the effectiveness of the Department's policy-making and administrative procedures as did the pretty pastel paint which former Secretary Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., ordered on the Department's previously drab walls. What is needed is something fundamental, and it can be said from a most casual acquaintance with the contents of the Budget Bureau's report that it prescribed precisely such alterations.

What makes the reorganization doubly urgent, beyond the obvious fact that our Nation is playing a role in world affairs far beyond the capacity of the machinery which traditionally dealt with these matters in Washington, is the fact that events of the past 10 years have completely revolutionized the techniques of diplomacy. Foreign offices not many years ago practiced just diplomacy, and that was all. But the Nazis taught the rest of the world that propaganda and foreign economic policies were just as vitally parts of foreign policy administration as silk-hat diplomacy.

During the war we saw the physical evidence of these two new departments of foreign affairs in the colossal Foreign Economic Administration and the not so big, but big enough, Office of War Information. The remnants of these giants have been welded into the State Department without the kind of advance planning that one might expect to have preceded such an important amalgamation. True, the Secretary did create an Assistant Secretaryship for Foreign Economic Affairs, but it was soon evidenced that the job was even more important than that, and William L. Clayton, the original holder of this office, was elevated to be an under secretary. It all grew like Topsy, and perhaps not as well.

A great remaining need of the Department, as Mr. Reston pointed out, is better liaison in planning and policy-making with other Government agencies. What one so easily overlooks is that the vastness of our foreign interests and commitments now lends a foreign aspect to the operations of numerous departments which were always regarded as domestic. In his search for means to better coordinate the policies of these agencies with our over-all foreign policy, Mr. Byrnes could look for no better example than the little known National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, a statutory body presided over by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder. Its other members include the Secretaries of State and Commerce, the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. It has coordinated our foreign economic policies as Mr. Byrnes seeks to coordinate our over-all foreign policy.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that during the last session of the Congress I was one who was in favor of some form of universal military training, and I am of the same opinion at this time. As a matter of fact, developments since the close of hostilities of the last war convince me more than ever that this country should be prepared for the defense of our country, and I have advocated the retention of all of the islands and bases in the Pacific where our boys shed their blood, as well as the acquisition of all bases in the Atlantic and elsewhere required for our defense. I have also consistently advocated our retention of a strong air force, navy and army, and have pointed out my reasons for this position time and again.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this position, under unanimous consent, I include in these remarks a copy of part of a statement by Gen. Peyton C. March, World War I Chief of Staff, issued on his eighty-second birthday, and printed in the Washington Post of December 28, 1946, as follows:

GENERAL MARCH, 82, CALLS FOR TRAINING ALL

Gen. Peyton C. March, World War I Chief of Staff, yesterday marked his eighty-second birthday by urging universal military training as the surest protection against another war.

Reminding reporters assembled at his home, 1870 Wyoming Place NW., that he had proposed universal training as chief of staff 27 years ago, March said:

"It was talked to death in Congress. This time I hope it will have a better fate. The fact that we have more effective weapons now does not affect its validity at all.

"If we had had such a pool of trained manpower between the last two wars no nation would have dared stir us up and we probably would never have been involved in the recent war."

The aged general, alert and active despite his years, said he placed little faith in the ability of the United Nations or any other international body to avert war.

KEEP A-BOMB SECRET, HE SAYS

"You can't stop war by legislation or pacts," he declared. "The League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand treaty to outlaw war showed that."

March said emphatically that the United States should keep the secret of the atomic bomb from all other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I also include in these remarks a copy of the editorial entitled "Military Training" from the Washington Post of January 2, 1947, as follows:

MILITARY TRAINING

Those critics of universal military training who object to it on the ground that it would "prussianize" our youth would do well to review their history. The danger of "prussianization," as we recently witnessed only too graphically in Germany, arises primarily from the entrenchment of a professional military cult which wields power beyond its legitimate realm. The best antidote for a large American professional army is an adequate reserve of citizen-soldiers who have been grounded in the rudiments of military training. Indeed, the concept of a militia composed of all able-bodied men is an old one, still recognized in several States. It is based on the fundamental obligation of all citizens to safeguard the national defense. It is this democratic obligation, lying at the very roots of our society, which the proponents of universal military training are now seeking to embody.

Perhaps the most salient feature of the plan outlined in a War Department pamphlet distributed to Members of the new Congress is that the training would be under civilian direction. It has no connection with our commitments in Germany and Japan or with the draft in its present form. Rather, it is designed to provide a pool of manpower which could be retrained rapidly in the event of an emergency. Under this plan, men would be inducted at the age of 18 or when they finished high school. They would serve for 1 year or for 6 months with a like period in the active Reserves or National Guard. Those who showed an aptitude or signified a desire for additional training would be selected for officer training or for technical schools.

To be sure, the amount of strictly military training that could be assimilated in this period would be limited. In this respect the word "military" is a misnomer. The training would give the Army a chance to weed out misfits and to classify men according to their skills. It would give the trainees an invaluable democratic experience with their fellow men. It would provide the necessary adjustment which took time from the other aspects of military training during the war. There is no valid reason to believe this training would diminish the desire for education or deprive the Nation of young scientists. On the contrary, if experience during the war can be taken as indicative, interest in further education would be whetted. And the Nation would have, in return for the training, a physically healthier, more matured body of men, better equipped for the responsibilities of citizenship.

Nor is the idea of universal military training inconsistent with our hope in the United Nations. In this respect the argument advanced by the War Department pamphlet seems to us unimpeachable. "The very best guarantee of a successful United Nations," the pamphlet points out, "is a strong United States." In the event of a serious showdown while the United Nations is still in infancy, the strength of the United States would be the determining factor in preventing aggression. Our own security is inextricably bound up with the proposal. "Nations are seldom attacked by aggressors," the report asserts, "where there is substantial doubt in the mind of the aggressor that its victim would be quickly overcome." In an atomic attack we most certainly would not have the 2 years we required to mount our offensive after our actual involvement in World War II.

The annual cost of universal military training would be less than the cost of a mere 3 days of World War II. Most, if not all this expense, the War Department believes, could be absorbed by the savings resulting from unification of the armed forces. The issue of our future national defense is one with which the new Congress will surely have to grapple, and the age in which we live makes universal training a fundamental of that defense.

Speaking of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith a very timely editorial from the January 3 issue of Collier's magazine:

SPEAKING OF TAXES

The Republicans had hardly finished licking their chops over their 1946 congressional election landslide when their leaders began to talk tax reduction. A 20 percent personal income tax cut across the board was among the more delightful of the subjects brought up for discussion. We're as human as anybody else when it comes to paying taxes, so we naturally take to this talk like a cat to a crock of cream.

It is encouraging, too, to hear Messrs. KNUTSON, TAFT, TABER, BRIDGES & Co. assure us that big economies can be effected by bouncing hordes of Government pay rollers, cutting out unnecessary Government agencies and services, and so on.

We hope it works out that way. We're worried about only one thing; and that is the fact that in many an economy drive in times past the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces have been the first victims of the economizers.

There have been times when it wasn't especially dangerous to trim defense appropriations. But this is not one of those times.

A great deal of righteous talk about general disarmament is being heard, especially from the Russian Government; but no concrete moves toward general disarmament are being either made or promised at this writing.

Russia has anywhere from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 men under arms. The current Russian budget allotment for military purposes amounts to about $16,000,000,000 in United States money. Great Britain has some 2,000,000 men in its armed forces. Far from reducing its military potential, Britain is keeping on with conscription in peacetime.

Certainly we could disarm, as we did after World War I. In those naive times, we kidded ourselves that we were setting the rest of the world a noble example. What we were actually doing was extending to the rest of the world a handsomely engraved invitation to come and take us after a while, if it could.

Japan and Germany tried to accept that invitation, and it was only by dint of a colossal war that we kept them from doing so.

When and if we're assured that other nations will disarm in step with us, we can safely discharge some more soldiers, lay up some more battleships, and scrap some more warplanes.

Until then, let us make the armed forces not our first economy target, but our last. If this works out to prevent any drastic tax reductions for quite a while to come, O. K. It is some 9,999 percent better to pay high taxes than to pay tribute to a conqueror.

The House of Representatives and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an address which I delivered before the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, San Francisco, Calif., on December 10, 1946:

It is a pleasure and an inspiration to attend this great Farm Bureau convention and to have a part in your program.

I am glad to be here with Ed O'Neal, my dear friend and your great and distinguished president for so many years—years which have been of tremendous interest and importance to farmers.

I am happy, also, to be on the same platform with my friend Senator RUSSELL—DICK RUSSELL we call him in Washington. I am glad to say to this audience that the American farmer has no stronger or more effective champion in Congress than he.

I am glad to be here because I believe in organization. It is only by working together that people can accomplish things. I belong to the farm bureau in my home county because I believe in the work it is doing and because I know that it would be impossible to do that work without organization. I believe in the work which the American Farm Bureau Federation is doing. It has many functions—one of them is to represent farmers in Washington. More than any other group perhaps, farmers need someone to speak for them in a legislative way. Out of the 26,000,000 farm people scattered over the country, very few ever have an opportunity to come to Washington and discuss their problems before a congressional committee. It is true that all of them have the opportunity to take up matters with their own Representatives or Senators, and I know of no Member of Congress who does not welcome such activity on the part of his constituents. Individually, however, farmers can usually only present their own problems. They are not in a position to present the great common problems which are of such importance to agriculture.

I have been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture for 20 years. I know whereof I speak when I say that the American Farm Bureau Federation has well and effectively represented the farmers of this

country in Washington. It has gotten results—it commands respect and confidence. You should be proud to be represented by it.

I am happy tonight to address you as farmers—as producers—people who did a marvelous job of production during the war and who are still doing it. How refreshing it is that at this time, when strikes and threats of strikes and labor difficulties of all kinds are going on, farmers are going about their business producing the food and the fiber without which this Nation could not exist even for a day. We may be short of coal; we may not have farm machinery; we may not have new automobiles, but thanks to the farmers of this country, the people do have food—plenty of it—more than we have ever had in our history—yes, more than any people have ever had since civilization began.

This country did such a magnificent job in winning the war that the credit must be spread far and wide. We had the most magnificent Army and Navy and Air Corps ever gotten together in all the world's history. No soldiers ever fought more valiantly and heroically than American soldiers in the Second World War. I believe, however, that the future historian will say, as many observers have said during and since the war, that the great measure of our superiority over the enemy was our productive capacity.

Not only were we able to give our fighting men the most up-to-date and splendid equipment ever possessed by any army in history but we very largely equipped our allies. Not the least of our achievements in production was what we did on the farms of America. Churchill, speaking of the Royal Air Force, made the memorable statement that "never in all history have so many owed so much to so few." I think that could well be paraphrased and applied to the American farmer by saying that never in all history have so few produced so much. With less manpower, less equipment, less transportation—yes; with less of everything—farmers increased their production by more than one-third.

It was a striking example of what could be done by cooperation and hard work. It is impossible to picture the vast production which took place on American farms during the war years. A year or so ago, in speaking of this, I said that if all the cattle produced on American farms and ranges during the war could be rolled into one big steer, it would span the whole North American Continent. It could get a drink out of the Gulf of Mexico and wrap its tail around the Aurora Borealis; and if all the hogs which were produced on the farms of America during the war were rolled into one big hog, it could dig a ditch as big as the Panama Canal in two roots and a half. No one has ever contradicted that statement, so I guess it must be true.

I have been given the subject of the House of Representatives and the farmer. When he assigned me that subject, Mr. O'Neal said, "We farmers feel our best friend in government is the Congress." I appreciate this expression of confidence on the part of President O'Neal. The fact is, we Congressmen get kicked around so much that I am always mighty grateful for anything in the way of a kind word. But, seriously, I believe that the record will show that Ed O'Neal is right, and the Congress of the United States has stood by the American farmer and has shown its friendship for him on many occasions. That is natural, because Congress is the branch of our Government which is closest to the people. And because Members of the House of Representatives come directly from the people every 2 years, we Members of the House feel that we are very close to the public pulse. That is what the framers of our Government intended.

We hear a great deal of criticism of Congress these days. It used to worry me until I started going back through the pages of history; then I found that what people are saying about Congress these days doesn't even hold a candle to what they were saying about Congress 100 years ago. Yet Congress as an institution has gone on and on, and it will still be going strong long after its present detractors have passed away. Congress makes mistakes—plenty of them. It is made up of all kinds of people—because this country is made up of all kinds of people—good, bad, and indifferent. It makes me think of the old story about a colored man out in one of our Kansas towns. In spite of the fact that he had frequently done time in jail and had a generally bad reputation for fighting and gambling, he turned up one day as a deacon in the local colored church. One of his friends expressed some amazement about this turn of affairs but the new deacon explained by saying, "Well you see dey's a powerful roughneck element in our church and dey demanded representation." Maybe the same theory accounts for some people we get in Congress.

I have always said that I can tell pretty well just what kind of people live in a congressional district as soon as I get acquainted with the Congressman. By and large, Members of Congress are fine, upstanding representative American citizens. I will put my colleagues up any time against any group which might be selected on a Nation-wide basis—from the farm, from the factories, from business, and from the professions.

Members of Congress sincerely try to represent their people. If you want to know what people the country over are thinking about, read the debates in the House of Representatives. The President may be out of step; the Supreme Court may be out of step, but the House of Representatives is usually in accord with the thinking of the people.

As you of course know, the work of Congress is largely done in committee. In the House, the Committee on Agriculture consists of 27 members. They come from all parts of the country—just now there are members on the committee from New York and California, from Minnesota and Texas; in fact, Texas has two members. The other 22 members come from States everywhere in between. Every type of agricultural production and activity is represented. During the time I have been on the committee, I have served under four chairmen as follows: Gilbert N. Haugen, of Iowa, who served more than 30 years in Congress and was one of the authors of the famous McNary-Haugen bill; Marvin Jones of Texas, one of the authors of the Triple A Act of 1938 and much other farm legislation; Hampton P. Fulmer, of South Carolina; and the present able chairman, JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., of Virginia. Three of these men were Democrats, one was Republican. They came from different parts of the country but they were all alike in their devotion to agriculture and to the interests of the American farmer. That has been typical of the entire membership of the committee as I have known it. There are differences of opinion, of course, but partisanship has rarely entered into the consideration of matters by the committee. That has been the rule in the past and I am sure it will be the rule in the next Congress.

The Committee on Agriculture has always been one of the major committees. It has been a busy committee—so busy, in fact, that it has been considered as an exclusive committee, that is, members who serve on it are not permitted, with few exceptions, to serve on other committees. The smallest number of bills referred to the committee in recent Congresses was 200 in the Seventy-eighth Congress; and the largest number, 435, in the Seventy-sixth Congress. Of course, only a small proportion of the bills which are introduced in Congress finally become laws, but most of the important bills are brought up for consideration. In the Seventy-sixth Congress, when 435 bills were referred to the committee, 75 were reported to the House and 62 finally became laws. That is about the average percentage.

I know that some of you have been to Washington and have seen Congress in session. I hope that all of you will have such an opportunity sometime in your lives, and if you should happen to be in Washington during the next 2 years, I hope you will visit the Committee on Agriculture. Many people who visit Congress make the mistake of just attending the sessions of the House and Senate. In most cases, they would find committee sessions much more interesting. So I am taking this occasion to invite all of you to visit the House Committee on Agriculture when you get to Washington. On such a visit you will have a chance to see how thoroughly and carefully legislation is really considered in committee.

Many people are asking today what is ahead for agriculture. It is a natural question because without considering the changes made by the war we all realize that in recent years agricultural production in this country has been revolutionized through increased mechanization and the development of new and improved varieties of crops and breeds of livestock. The production of wheat has been almost entirely mechanized. The tractor, the corn picker, and the use of hybrid varieties of corn have completely changed the picture as far as corn production is concerned. New and improved methods of farming in the plains area have freed crop production from the weather hazards which formerly prevailed there. At present, mechanization is beginning to make great changes in the production of two important crops: cotton and sugar beets. The soybean has within a few years become one of the country's most important crops. These changes will go on, and they must be considered when agricultural legislation is framed.

With these thoughts in mind, I think that the next Congress should make a careful examination of our entire agricultural picture, with a view of determining what changes in legislation and in policy are necessary to meet the new problems which have arisen in recent years. The matter should, of course, be considered from an economic and social, rather than a political, standpoint. It should include a careful study and reexamination of the policies and programs now in effect. These programs should be considered on their merits. Those which can be justified as useful and helpful to agriculture should be retained. Those which cannot meet this test should be discarded. At that time we shall certainly want to hear from the farmers and the farm organizations of this country, and I take this opportunity to say that the views and suggestions of any of you on the question of a long-time agricultural program will be most welcome.

We are fortunate, I think, in the fact that there are no major emergencies threatening agriculture just now. All of you recall the disastrous slump in agricultural prices after the other war. That is not in the picture now because of the Steagall amendment and similar enactments which stabilize most agricultural prices at 90 percent of parity for two full years after the year in which the war is declared officially ended. There may be some difficulties in connection with the application of the price-support provision of the Steagall amendment. It is altogether possible that 90 percent of parity in the case of some commodities will stimulate overproduction. In the main, however, this amendment will give us a breathing spell during which we can give careful consideration to a permanent postwar agricultural policy.

I am sure the big question which is disturbing many farmers is whether they can continue to produce in abundance as they did during the war. I know that is what farmers want to do. They want to get away

from controls and regimentation. The question is, How can farmers produce in abundance without running the risk of price demoralization? All of us know from experience that even a small surplus frequently depresses prices materially. No one has yet come up with the exact answer as to how farmers can carry out a program of abundant production without the risk of ruinous prices. Since society as a whole gets the benefits of that production, there is general agreement, I think, that it is no more than fair and right that the farmer should be protected. In fact, I do not believe that there is any question more definitely settled in the minds of the American people at the present time than that something must be done to stabilize farm prices to the extent that farmers will never again suffer from severe deflations like those which took place in 1920 and 1929. That principle is as firmly embedded in our political thinking as is the principle of social security.

What kind of a program should we have? I am not trying to answer that question now. I want you to help answer it. We hope to get the answer to it as a result of our study and hearings in Congress. Certainly, the objective should be abundant production, but with safeguards to save the farmer from being drowned in the flood of his own abundance. Somewhere in the picture there should be price supports, but they should not be so rigid as to bring arbitrary controls and regimentation.

Certainly, a part of the program should be a positive, dynamic effort to expand markets.

The last Congress passed important legislation along this line. For the first time, it set up provisions for research in marketing comparable to research which the Department of Agriculture has been doing in the field of production. I do not have time this evening to discuss the recent research and marketing bill. Suffice to say, however, that it not only provides for research in marketing, but for research in new uses for agricultural products and for new crops and products to take the place of some of the things we have been producing in surplus. It is not a measure which will perform miracles or which will bring an expansion of markets or consumption overnight. But I believe that in the end and in the over-all picture it will substantially expand our consumption of agricultural commodities.

We all know the wonderful things which have been accomplished through research in the field of production. It hasn't been a case of making two blades of grass grow where one grew before. We've made a dozen blades of grass grow where one grew before. We've made grass grow where none grew before. It has been a marvelous thing for mankind. It has contributed as much as anything else to making us the great Nation which we are today. One hundred years ago approximately 70 percent of our workers were farmers. In other words, it took that large a proportion of our population to supply the rest of us with food and fiber. Today only 14 people out of each 100 workers are engaged in agriculture. Farming has become so efficient that only one-fifth as many workers are required as there were 100 years ago. It is this which has made our great industrial development possible. It has enabled us to raise our standard of living until it is by far the highest in the world.

It seems to me the time has now come when we should apply research in the field of marketing to the same extent that we apply it in the field of production. Although Congress has passed enabling legislation it must still be implemented by adequate appropriations and a sympathetic administration in the Department of Agriculture.

The measure to which I have referred also provides for expanded studies in the field of nutrition and there is great opportunity for expansion in that field, particularly along the lines of education. Howard Babcock's ever-normal refrigerator has become justly famous. Yet, it is well known that, if the people of this country should suddenly take a notion to expand their diet to the point urged by Mr. Babcock, we could not possibly produce in this country all the requirements for such a diet. No one expects that we will be able to adopt the diet contained in the ever-normal refrigerator—this year or next year or even in 10 years—but we are, I hope, going to be moving at a substantial rate in that direction. Any steps which can be taken to inform and educate people in the field of nutrition will help to expand farm markets and bring about a more prosperous agriculture. Of course, to do this, we'll need an expansion of buying power. The fact remains, however, that we are not at present exhausting all the buying power which could be used to purchase agricultural products. As long as the people of this country are spending $7,000,000,000 a year for alcoholic liquors and another $4,000,000,000 a year for tea, coffee, and soft drinks, as well as other billions for recreation and amusements, there is a field for expanding consumption of agricultural products.

I feel there are possibilities for increasing our foreign trade in agricultural commodities. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is a step in that direction. The fact that most of the nations of the world are getting together once a year to discuss food and agriculture with a view to translating surpluses in some countries into food for hungry people in others is bound to expand consumption. The more emphasis we can put upon food and other agricultural products, both nationally and internationally, the greater the market outlets we are going to have.

It goes without saying that continued and increased consideration must be given to the problem of soil conservation. Our fertile soil is our greatest national asset. It must not only be maintained but improved. It is not alone a farm problem. It is a national problem.

No farm program could be complete without study and action to bring about better rural housing conditions, better educational facilities in rural communities, and expansion of rural electrification and farm-to-market roads. Since mechanization will in all probability bring about further decreases in farm population, a sound farm program should include the encouragement of small industries in rural areas so that those farm boys and girls for whom there are no longer places in agriculture may remain in their home communities and still secure remunerative and pleasant employment.

The next Congress must consider many questions which will affect the lives and prosperity of all of us. It seems to me that the great problem which is confronting the world is: How can we all live together in peace and prosperity. Our greatest need is for leadership in that direction, and it seems to me that, more than any others, the farm people of the world are now furnishing that leadership. First, we have the great world Food and Agriculture Organization bringing together representatives of the world's farmers who comprise two-thirds of its population. Not only that, but bringing together representatives of all the world's people because of the fact that all are consumers of food and other agricultural products.

In the second place, here in this country farm organizations are setting a great example in the way that they are working together—not only on behalf of the farmers of this country but in making the Nation a better place in which to live. I was heartened and thrilled over the conference which the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the Cooperative Council recently held at Buffalo, N. Y., in which they got together upon a common program covering several agricultural questions. That is not the first time this has happened, nor will it be the last.

And, finally, farmers and farm organizations are making a great contribution to our ability to work and live together in that they are standing on the principle of parity. That's all that farmers have ever asked—parity with the other producing elements of our population. It is a fine principle. It denotes fairness and honesty and a desire to do right by the other fellow. If all of our people would get together upon this simple principle of fairness and economic equality, it would mark the beginning of the most glorious era ever enjoyed by any nation in the world's history.

Let's Look Into the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW has written an interesting article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for November 2, 1946, entitled "Let's Look Into the State Department."

Mr. MERROW, in the last session of the Congress, introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a select committee to conduct an investigation into the foreign policy of the United States. He believes that our foreign policy needs an overhauling, and I agree with his point of view. I have endorsed and supported the resolution which he has introduced, and I trust he will again introduce it into this session of Congress.

I am sure that the Members of this House will be interested in reading the very thought-provoking article referred to.

LET'S LOOK INTO THE STATE DEPARTMENT—LEGISLATOR BELIEVES CONGRESS AND PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE FACTS ON FOREIGN POLICY

(By CHESTER E. MERROW, Representative in Congress from New Hampshire)

A year after the end of the war in Europe and Asia, the Government and the people of the United States are engaged in another offensive. The objective is peace, not peace at any price, but peace based on mutual concession, mutual obligation, and mutual respect among nations great and small.

The general headquarters of this offensive is the antiquated building in Washington on the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Seventeenth Street, which houses the top officials of the Department of State. The general staff consists of these officials and hundreds of lesser ones scattered through some 30 other buildings in Washington. Their decisions are put into effect by line officers stationed in embassies, legations, and consulates in every corner of the world. Their weapon is the foreign policy of the United States.

At the moment, the people know almost nothing about these matters. Congress knows but little more. I propose that they be given all the facts. In the last weeks of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I offered resolutions in the House of Representatives calling for the creation of a select committee to conduct an investigation into the foreign policy of the United States and the manner in which it is formulated and carried out by the Department of State.

The primary purpose, however, and the only justifiable reason for making an investigation would be to provide Congress and the people with information needed to form sound judgments concerning the Department. How does the agency that is the first line of our peacetime national defense operate? What are its policies? How are they formulated and executed? What problems—of organization, of budget, or personnel, of administration—confront it? What measures can be taken by Congress and the people to overcome any difficulties that stand in the way of its efficient operation?

The objective, in short, is not to destroy public confidence in the State Department, but to build it up by getting at the facts on which effective action can be taken to make the Department what it must be at this moment in history—the best-staffed, the best-informed, the best-operated, the most efficient, the most resourceful, and the most respected foreign office in the world. With the responsibilities that it now carries, the United States can afford nothing less.

One significant result of such an investigation might well be an improvement in the quality and the quantity of information disseminated from within the Department to the people of the United States—and other nations. No comment is more frequently made in these days of rapid, bewildering developments in international relations than this one: "The United States has no foreign policy." That statement has been made by barbers, lawyers, filling station attendants, veterans, housewives, truck drivers, and professors. I have made it myself; so, doubtless, have you. Sometimes we may be right, for in a world such as we now live in, situations may easily arise for which the foreign policy of the United States provides no immediate coverage. That may be a reason why the lights in the State Department sometimes burn late at night.

Yet the probability is that most of the time the State Department only seems to have no policy. It may seem to have no policy because information concerning it has emerged from the Department in fragments, at long intervals, and without any apparent relationship to what has gone before.

The Department issues a good many press releases on a good many subjects during the course of a week. They range from the announcement of the transfer of a vice consul to a statement by the Secretary explaining involved negotiations concerning, say, international trade. The press and the radio get the most important information contained in these releases before the eyes and into the ears of the public, but the most painstaking commentator and the most careful editor is not always in a position to correlate this information with relevant information that has gone before. For lack of data as well as lack of time, they cannot always place it against its proper background, give it its correct perspective.

In consequence, major developments often break upon the ordinary citizen and the ordinary Member of Congress in such a way as to confuse rather than enlighten him. Unable to grasp all that is implied, he too often escapes from his bafflement by shifting the blame elsewhere: "The United States has no foreign policy." From perplexity and incomprehension it is but a short step to apathy, and a public apathetic to matters of foreign policy today is a danger not only to the security of the United States but to the cause of peace everywhere.

This situation can and should be remedied by the Department itself. With regard to the vast majority of problems and issues with which it deals, the State Department has, I am ready to believe, coherent, consistent, and cogent policies. If the relevant documents concerning a given issue were set forth consecutively and objectively explained, they would in most cases reveal a fixity of purpose and a continuity of method that would astonish many critics of the Department.

More than 3 years ago, the Department published an admirable volume entitled "Peace and War," which proved this to be the case. In addition to some 300 documents, the volume contained a concise but inclusive narrative of the development of foreign policy as it applied to the aggressor nations—Germany, Italy, and Japan—during the fateful decade between 1931 and 1941. Not only did it make clear that the United States had a foreign policy during that critical period. It also made plain that the execution of the policy was materially hampered because Congress and the public were not fully informed.

I do not see why more such information should not be published. It should be published, moreover, while public opinion can make itself felt. It should not come out long after the event, when only historical judgments can be rendered, but while events are in flux, so that they can be influenced by informed opinion.

The people of the United States are not the only ones who are interested in its foreign policy. As I discovered a year ago, when I visited 30 countries from the British Isles to the subcontinent of India, people in many lands are eager to know what the foreign policy of this country is. They realize that it will touch their lives at many points and in many ways. They are legitimately curious to know what its impact will be, what effect it will have on their security. If the United States does not give them the information they want, they will seek it from other and perhaps prejudiced sources. Other nations, much poorer than the United States, are spending far more, absolutely and relatively, than we are on foreign-information programs.

During the past year, the State Department has taken over from the wartime information agencies the responsibility for keeping other peoples informed about the United States. It is up to Congress and the people to see that that responsibility is carried out faithfully, efficiently, and comprehensively.

These are not the only matters that might be canvassed by a select committee of the House of Representatives concerned with the efficient functioning of the State Department. The adequacy of the personnel both of the State Department and of the Foreign Service is a question that must continually concern not only the recruiting staffs of the agencies, but every citizen who appreciates that his future and the future of his children may be determined by a foreign-policy decision made tomorrow morning. The question of salaries is deeply involved here, as it is in other branches of the Government. Members of Congress have a particular interest in the problem of liaison between the State Department and themselves. Although an Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations is provided for, the post has remained unfilled since Dean Acheson was promoted to be Under Secretary more than a year ago.

All these matters, however, resolve into one. It is this: No one here or abroad questions the position of the United States today. For better or for worse, it is the first nation of the world. It is also the nation that, by reason of its traditions, its resources, and its authority, is best fitted to make the idea of democracy the dynamic, constructive force for peace in the world that it is capable of being. The instrumentality for accomplishing this is the Department of State.

Is the Department up to its job? The sole purpose of the investigation that I propose would be, first, to discover the facts; second, on the basis of the facts, make recommendations for strengthening the Department at every point of weakness, for eliminating every shortcoming, for encouraging every creative possibility.

We must know before we build. We must investigate before we can know. The people of this country must have a full communiqué on the headquarters and the staff that is waging our offensive for peace.

Portal to Portal—A Drama in 10 Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker—

ACT I

The time: Summer of 1938.

The place: The Seventy-fifth Congress.

The action: Enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938—approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1062).

The time: June 30, 1943.

ACT II

The place: United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, Hon. Frank Picard, district judge.

The action: Anderson et al. against Mount Clemens Pottery Co. et al., No. 2582—An action by Steve Anderson and others against the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. et al. for an alleged violation of the wage-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act—a finding by the Court that certain extra time was not computed by the employer which in the judgment of the court constituted a violation of the Wage-Hour Act.

ACT III

The time: May 21, 1945.

The place: Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Judicial Circuit.

The action: An appeal for the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. et al. against Anderson et al. from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan. The judgment of the district court was reversed and the cause of action was ordered dismissed.

ACT IV

The time: October term, 1945—decided June 10, 1946.

The place: The United States Supreme Court, Washington, D. C.

The action: Steve Anderson et al., petitioners, against Mount Clemens Pottery Co. et al.—Writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to reverse a judgment reversing a judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, in favor of the plaintiffs in action for overtime compensation and liquidated damages under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act. Reversed and remanded. Mr. Justice Murphy delivered the opinion of the Court. Mr. Justice Jackson took no part in the case. Mr. Justice Burton dissented with the concurrence of Mr. Justice Frankfurter.

ACT V

The time: December 11, 1946.

The place: A certain industrial plant in the Middle West.

The action: A circular distributed to all employees of the plant which reads as follows:

FOUR MILLION DOLLARS WON IN "RECOVERY PAY" BY MOUNT CLEMENS POTTERY WORKERS

A recent decision of the United States Supreme Court has extended the "portal-to-portal" doctrine—the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. case. Under this decision, all time necessarily spent by the workers on the employer's premises is "working time" which must be paid for under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The decision applies to all employers covered by the law, and this means all employers within our jurisdiction.

In the Mount Clemens case the Court ruled that the employer violated the Fair Labor Standards Act because the employees had not received pay for the following kinds of time:

1. Time spent changing clothes, whether before starting work or after finishing, and during lunch period.
2. Time spent getting from the employer protective clothes, such as aprons, overalls, gloves, masks, etc., and in putting on and taking off these things, and returning them after work.
3. Time spent washing up or showering after work and during lunch hour.
4. Time spent taping or greasing arms or putting on and removing any oil, benzine, or other material for protection.
5. Time spent obtaining tools from employer, preparing, cleaning, repairing them, assembling and sharpening them and otherwise getting them ready, as well as time spent preparing them for storage by employer, as well as time spent to check them.
6. Time spent waiting in line for pay-roll.
7. Time spent in walking from gate to place where work is done in morning and in returning after the shift, and walking time so spent during lunch hour.
8. Time spent turning on switches for lights and machinery, opening windows, etc.
9. Working time for which worker was not paid because he was docked for lateness.
10. Time spent for roll calls or waiting for work assignments.
11. Time spent for medical examinations.
12. Time spent for preparing reports.
13. Time spent eating meals on duty.
14. Rest periods not exceeding twenty minutes.

All in all the Mount Clemens workers collected four million dollars in back pay for work done but not paid for in accordance with the Fair Labor Standards Act.

(Issued by Committee on Wage and Hours Claims.)

ACT VI

The time: December 13, 1946.

The place: Same industry.

The action: Distribution of a circular which read as follows:

TO ALL WORKERS

ALL OVER AMERICA WORKERS ARE TAKING FULL ADVANTAGE OF THEIR RIGHTS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT TO SECURE THEIR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY FROM THE EMPLOYERS

The Committee on Wage and Hours Claims is calling a meeting for all workers to explain in detail how each individual can take steps to secure their portal-to-portal pay.

ACT VII

The time: December 15, 1946.

The place: The union hall.

The action: The circulation and signing of an authorization which reads as follows:

AUTHORIZATION TO PROSECUTE WAGES AND HOURS CLAIM FOR OVERTIME

To ——— ———, *International President,*
——— ———, *International Vice President,*
——— ———, *President, Local No. —.*

DEAR SIRS AND BROTHERS: During my employment by my employer, named below, I did not receive pay for all time necessarily spent by me in my work as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I therefore designate and authorize you, or the survivors of you, to maintain an action under that act as my agents and representatives, for and in my behalf, and in behalf of other employees similarly situated, against my employer to recover the amount of the underpayments of overtime plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages.

I authorize you to retain counsel, to adjust or compromise my claim, and to receive payment in my behalf. My contribution to counsel fee shall not exceed 10 percent of my recovery, by settlement or suit.

With the signing of this authorization, I do hereby pay 50 cents on account as my share of the necessary disbursements for prosecution of the claim.

Name———————————————
(Please print)
Home address ———————————————
Company ———————————————
I began to work here ____ Month ____Year
My present job is ———————————————
Badge or clock No. ———————————————
Signed ———————————————
Date ———————————————
I served in the armed forces from ———— to ————

ACT VIII

The time: A few days later.

The place: United States District Court in Illinois.

The action: Filing a suit for $60,000,000.

ACT IX

The time: Any time.

The place: Anywhere.

The action: Preparation to defend portal-to-portal suits in all parts of the country. A single industry in the Middle West estimates that it will require the services of 200 people for a period of 2 years to carefully check and evaluate more than 70,000 plant records before a complete defense can be prepared for presentation to a Federal master in chancery on a single action for portal-to-portal demands. This means that the legal action involved will entail expenses in excess of $2,000,000 to defend such a suit in the case of a single plant.

ACT X

The time: Now.

The place: The Eightieth Congress.

The action: ?

Proposing an Inquiry Into and Study of Coal Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, twice within the past year Nation-wide coal strikes have hit the country. Another may come March 31.

Whenever such a strike comes we hear and read statements to the effect that conditions in the coal-mining industry are bad and that problems are different than in other fields of industry.

The strike threat is parried in some patchwork fashion and the Nation staggers on, hoping something will happen before next time.

I do not know that conditions in coal mining are different than in general industry but think Congress should find out in time to do something before the next deadline. Therefore I am introducing the following resolution today:

Whereas an uninterrupted flow of coal in adequate amounts is essential to the commerce of the United States and to the welfare of its citizens: Therefore

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (the Senate concurring therein), That the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate are authorized and directed to conduct an inquiry into and study of all factors affecting the mining and distribution of coal in the United States, with special reference to the conditions of the workers in the coal-mining industry, their safety, housing, wages, and comfort. Such study is to include the anthracite and subbituminous as well as bituminous fields.

The committees are empowered to operate jointly in this inquiry and to employ such investigators and clerical assistants as may be necessary and are requested to report their findings to their respective bodies with such recommendations as they deem desirable not later than March 1, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that such a resolution might be acted upon quickly and give the committees the maximum amount of time to make their study and yet leave time for Congress to act, if found desirable, before March 31.

Speaker Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an excellent editorial that appeared in the Sunday Star of January 5, 1947, on the subject of Speaker MARTIN. I am sure that the writer of this editorial has presented a true picture of our Speaker as we all know him. We know that JOE MARTIN is going to make a great record, for he is a great statesman and patriot.

SPEAKER MARTIN

In taking over the heavy responsibilities of Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has assumed a position ranking not far below the Presidency of the United States. As Mr. RAYBURN, his Democratic predecessor, declared in welcoming him to his new duties, he faces an arduous, onerous, and sometimes seemingly thankless task. But Mr. MARTIN, by virtue of his long experience in Congress, his physical ruggedness, his political know-how, and his attractive personal traits, is well equipped for the office, with all its high honors and its numerous headaches.

To begin with, as a Republican Member of Congress since 1924, he has long since won the affectionate esteem of virtually all his

colleagues in both major parties. He does not have flash; he is not brilliant in the usual sense of that word; he is a plain-spoken plodder, but he plods intelligently and well. Even those who have disagreed with him most in the past will freely acknowledge that he is what Mr. RAYBURN has called him—a man of great integrity, demonstrated ability, and good heart. These qualities—plus a taste for thrift and hard work—have been marked in him ever since his youth. His Massachusetts constituency was quick to recognize them. They were what carried him, in his early years, from newsboy to reporter and finally to owner of his successful Evening Chronicle in North Attleboro. Add to all this the fact that he is a nonstuffy, nonsmoking, nondrinking bachelor—a solid personality, but a very genial and informal one—and it is easy to understand why almost everybody who knows him respects him and feels impelled at the same time to call him "Joe." It is easy to understand, too, how his district always returned him to the House, even though it went for President Roosevelt in the Roosevelt landslides.

The excellent qualities that have thus served JOE MARTIN in his career to date will continue to serve him, and they will serve his country as well.

What About Those Citizens Against Whom OPA Enforcement Actions Are Still Pending in View of the Progressive Liquidation of OPA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is to be presumed that the transfer of functions of OPA to OTC—Office of Temporary Controls—is a forerunner of the ultimate termination and liquidation of the Office of Price Administration. Liquidation under existing law would still permit the Office of Temporary Controls or the Department of Justice to pursue all pending cases which have arisen out of price control enforcement.

Paragraph (b) of Section 1 of the original Act provides among other things that despite the termination of OPA the provisions of the act do not lapse "as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense."

This authority remains in effect under the terms of the joint resolution approved July 25, 1946, whereby the Price Control Act was amended and extended and it is, therefore, clear that the Enforcement Division of the Office of Temporary Control or the Department of Justice may still pursue those charged with offenses under OPA even in those cases where commodities have already been decontrolled.

I directed an inquiry to the Enforcement Division on December 2 and received a letter from Mr. William E. Remy, Deputy Administrator for Enforcement, dated December 30, 1946, in which he sets forth the policy which is being pursued and also a list of all pending cases as of October 31, 1946.

This is a matter which will require attention on the part of the Congress and I am sure that the House Committee on Banking and Currency will want to explore this matter at an early date. For general information, therefore, I am including in my remarks Mr. Remy's letter, together with a tabulation of pending cases:

OFFICE OF TEMPORARY CONTROLS,
OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 30, 1946.

The Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DIRKSEN: This refers to your letter of December 2, 1946, addressed to Mr. George Moncharsh. Mr. Moncharsh recently left the agency to return to private practice and I have succeeded him as Deputy Administrator for Enforcement. You will recall that I accompanied Ivan Carson to your office a few weeks ago in connection with a hotel rent case from Peoria.

At the time of the President's decontrol message we were in the process of enforcing the regulations covering commodities that were decontrolled as well as commodities that were not decontrolled. This meant that on the day of decontrol we had civil and criminal cases pending in court, suspension orders pending, completed cases ready for court action, cases substantially completed, and cases that had merely been assigned to investigators. It was our normal backlog of activity.

First, we had to separate those cases that involved decontrolled commodities from those that involved commodities that were still under control. This meant that we had to segregate the rent, sugar, and veterans' housing cases from all other cases. As you know, we have been handling certain phases of enforcement of the veterans emergency housing regulations.

The latest date for which we have accurate figures on our pending case load is October 31. I am attaching hereto two schedules which show our work load as of that day. Schedule A represents the commodities that are now decontrolled and Schedule B the commodities still under control.

We are now in the process of evaluating all pending cases involving decontrolled commodities to determine which cases should be dropped and which ones should be continued. This evaluating job will take about 2 months. During the course of evaluating the cases we are dismissing all those that involve less than $200 in actual overcharges. We are also dismissing those cases that involve infractions of our procedural pricing rules as distinguished from actual overcharges. An example of these cases is that we had two prices for used automobiles—a warranty price for a dealer who obtained the authority to sell at warranty prices and an as-is price for everyone who did not have such authorization. Some dealers failed to obtain this authorization, although they would have received such authorization by simply applying to the OPA. In a going price-control program it is important to bring these cases into court. However, since decontrol, there is no real reason to proceed with this character of cases. We are also dismissing all cases where there is serious question of the proof of violation. During this period of evaluating the cases we are disposing of a normal number of cases that are reached in court and also there are a number of cases that are being settled out of court. We are also dismissing all pending injunctions in these decontrolled cases where we are not also seeking treble damages. It is estimated that by the end of January we will have disposed of half of our enforcement backlog.

It is impossible to give an accurate estimate of the amount of money represented by treble-damage claims filed by us because in dismissing pricing-procedural violation cases, which I referred to above, we will dismiss some rather large suits. My best judgment at this time is that the treble-damage suits remaining on file after we have completed our evaluation of these cases will be close to $75,000,000 in overcharges. This amount cannot be accurately estimated until all pending investigations are completed. In some of the larger cases it takes several months to complete the auditing of the overcharges. In some of the cases pending in court the exact amount of the overcharges are not finally determined, and will not be finally determined, until the OPA investigators, as well as the defendants' auditors, have completed the necessary accounting.

It is impossible to estimate the amount of fines that will be imposed by the Federal judges in pending criminal cases.

After our evaluation of pending cases is completed it may be that we will be able to eliminate other categories of cases. Thus we will further reduce the number of pending cases. From time to time I am sure that you will want to use our latest figures on backlog. This information can be pulled together for you at any time on comparatively short notice. By the end of the year we will have a much better picture of our pending workload than we have today. I suggest that you check with us again later to get our latest reports.

Since November 9 we have reduced our enforcement staff by 5,000 positions. We have eliminated all of the district offices and have maintained only the 8 regional offices with 22 branch enforcement stations. We are of the opinion that it would be rather wasteful to turn over to the Department of Justice at this time all of the pending OPA civil cases. The attorneys who have been working on these cases are familiar with OPA regulations and the interpretations the courts have placed upon the Emergency Price Control Act. They are in a better position than anyone to finish preparing these cases and to screen out those cases that should be eliminated. Necessarily it will take a long time to dispose of all of the pending OPA cases. The Department of Justice should be prepared to take over these cases after the screening process is completed and the OPA has tried those cases that can be immediately tried. We have already had some conferences with the Department of Justice to determine when will be the best time for it to take over these cases.

I would appreciate very much the opportunity of discussing with you our plans for disposing of these cases and our policies pertaining to such cases. If there is any further information that you desire on this subject please let me know and I will endeavor to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. REMY,
Deputy Administrator for Enforcement, Office of Price Administration, Office of Temporary Controls.

SCHEDULE A.—*Review and Disposition Division—decontrolled commodities backlog as of Oct. 31, 1946*

	Total	Meat	Other foods	Apparel	Textiles, leather	Industrial materials	Lumber	Autos	Durables
Cases under investigation	4,184	439	322	602	171	850	398	968	434
Awaiting disposition	11,002	2,800	1,263	1,496	492	1,746	249	1,874	1,082
Cases pending in court	9,179	2,722	625	819	316	1,142	292	2,568	695
Federal criminal cases	771	250	58	20	32	44	6	340	21
Local criminal (New York)	139	90	23		1	1		22	2
License suspension	357	191	31	16	7	2	2	94	14
Administrator's own treble damage claims [1]	2,707	434	185	275	175	578	195	538	327
Administrator's consumer treble-damage claims [2]	2,211	335	162	179	5	174	20	1,147	189
Injunction	2,959	1,403	163	325	96	342	69	421	140
Contempt	35	19	3	4		1		6	2
Suspension order	331	331							
Determinations for subsidy withholding	8	8							
Number of cases expected to result in new treble-damage and criminal actions, total	5,624	1,576	761	675	215	824	187	898	488
From cases under investigation [3]	1,163	176	129	151	43	213	109	242	109
Pending disposition [4]	4,461	1,400	632	524	172	611	87	656	379

[1] On commodities sold for resale or for use in the course of trade or business.
[2] On commodities sold to consumers.
[3] 40 percent of meat and other food cases under investigation; 25 percent of all others.
[4] 50 percent of meat and other food cases pending disposition; 35 percent of all others.

SCHEDULE B.—*Program Division—on commodities still under control backlog as of Oct. 31, 1946*

	Total	Rent	Sugar	Housing [1]
Cases under investigation	1,858	843	965	[1] 50
Awaiting disposition	5,554	1,739	3,790	[1] 25
Cases pending in court	6,451	4,530	1,906	[1] 15
Federal criminal cases	238	58	175	[1] 5
Local criminal cases	132	63	69	
License suspension	93		93	
Administrator's own treble-damage claims [2]	554		554	
Administrator's consumer treble-damage claims [3]	3,912	3,426	486	
Injunction	1,498	969	519	[1] 10
Contempt	24	14	10	
Suspension order	1,310		1,310	

[1] Estimated.
[2] On commodities sold for resale or for use in the course of trade or business.
[3] On commodities sold to consumers.

Communism—Address by J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the address of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, delivered before the annual convention of the American Legion at San Francisco, Calif., on September 30, 1946, which I hope every Member of Congress will read, and reread.

The matter referred to follows:

REMARKS OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 30, 1946

I accept the distinguished service medal of the American Legion on behalf of my associates in the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have made its achievements possible. Bulwarking the men and women of the FBI are the high hopes and expectations of the loyal Americans whom we serve. The American Legion is a great force for good in this Nation. It exemplifies the traditions of our country and is living testimony to the spirit of America. I am happy to be here today to thank you of the American Legion for the great aid and assistance you have rendered the FBI over the years.

The record of your achievements is now history. Today, there is a greater need than ever before for the American Legion and its stabilizing force. We of the FBI need your help now even more than during the war years if the battle for a safe and secure America is to be won. Our enemies are massing their forces on two main fronts. One is the criminal front. Crime is increasing daily; juvenile delinquency is shocking; lawlessness is rampant. We are nearer to the days of gang control than we were a year after World War I. Add to the forces that account for a serious crime every 20 seconds, day and night, the other encroaching enemy of America and we have a formidable foe. I refer to the growing menace of communism in the United States.

During the past 5 years American Communists have made their deepest inroads upon our national life. In our vaunted tolerance for all peoples the Communist has found our "Achilles' heel." The American Legion represents a force which holds within its power the ability to expose the hypocrisy and ruthlessness of this foreign ism which has crept into our national life—an ism built and supported by dishonor, deceit, tyranny, and a deliberate policy of falsehood.

It is a matter of self-preservation. The veteran who fought for America will be among the first to suffer if the Communists succeed in carrying out their diabolical plots to wreck the American way of life. The "divide and conquer" tactics did not die with Hitler—they are being employed with greater skill today by American Communists with their "boring from within" strategy. Their propaganda, skillfully designed and adroitly executed, has been projected into practically every phase of our national life. The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims some 100,000 members has lulled many Americans into a feeling of false complacency. I would not be concerned if we were dealing with only 100,000 Communists. The Communists themselves boast that for every party member there are 10 others ready to do the party's work. These include their satellites, their fellow travelers, and their so-called progressive and phony liberal allies. They have maneuvered themselves into positions where a few Communists control the destinies of hundreds who are either willing to be led or have been duped into obeying the dictates of others.

The average American workingman is loyal, patriotic, and law abiding. He wants security for his family and himself. But in some unions the rank and file find themselves between a Communist pincers, manipulated by a few leaders who have hoodwinked and browbeaten them into a state of submission. Communists labor leaders have sparred for time in their labor deliberations to refer matters of policy to Communist Party headquarters for clearance. In fact, resolutions have been delayed pending such approval and contemplated strikes have been postponed until adequate Communist support and backing were available.

The Communist influence has projected itself into some newspapers, magazines, books, radio, and the screen. Some churches, schools, colleges, and even fraternal orders have been penetrated, not with the approval of the rank and file but in spite of them. I have been pleased to observe that the Communist attempts to penetrate the American Legion have met with failure. Eternal vigilance will continue to keep your ranks free of shifty, double-crossing Communist destructionists.

We are rapidly reaching the time when loyal Americans must be willing to stand up and be counted. The American Communist Party, despite its claims, is not truly a political party. The Communist Party in this countr" is not working for the general welfare of all our people—it is working against our people. It is not interested in providing for the common defense. It has for its purpose the shackling of America and its conversion to the godless, Communist way of lif.. If it were a political party, its adherents could be appealed to by reason. Instead, it is a system of intrigue, actuated by fanaticism. It knows no rules of decency. Its unprincipled converts would sell America short if it would help their cause of furthering an alien way of life conceived in darkness and motivated by greed for power whose ultimate aim is the destruction of our cherished freedom. Let us no longer be misled by their sly propaganda and false preachments on civil liberty. They want civil license to do as they please; and if they get control, liberty for Americans will be but a haunted memory. For those who seek to provoke prejudice

and stir up the public mind to angry resentment against our form of government are a menace to the very powers of law and order which guarantee and safeguard popular rights.

We of this generation have faced two great menaces in America—fascism and communism. Both are materialistic; both are totalitarian; both are antireligious; both are degrading and inhuman. In fact, they differ little except in name. Communism has bred fascism and fascism spawns communism. Both are the antithesis of American belief in liberty and freedom. If the peoples of other countries want communism, let them have it, but it has no place in America.

The Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini brands of fascism were met and defeated on the battlefield. All those who stand for the American way of life must arise and defeat Red fascism in America by focusing upon it the spotlight of public opinion and by building up barriers of common decency through which it cannot penetrate.

Such a crusade cannot be spearheaded by any force more potent than the American Legion, composed as it is of America's heroes who have proved their mettle in battle. The men and women who defeated the Nazi brand of fascism with bullets can defeat the Red brand of fascism by raising their voices in behalf of democracy and by exposure and denunciation of every force which weakens America.

The American Legion, ordained to bring together the veterans of World War I to perpetuate the associations made on foreign soil, is being expanded by the influx of veterans of World War II, who likewise fought that America might live. To allow America to become infected with the malignant growth of communism or to be infested by crime is a breach of our trust to those who gave their lives for American principles.

Let us gird ourselves with the determination that those basic freedoms and spiritual ideals for which so many have sacrificed so much shall not be destroyed from within.

Let us be steadfast for America, work and live for America, and eternally be on guard to defend our Constitution and our way of life against the virulent poison of communistic ideology.

Resolution of Ringgold County Carriers Association, Redding, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by the Ringgold County Carriers Association, Redding, Iowa, in the interest of a 25-year retirement law for postal clerks:

REDDING, IOWA, *October 2, 1946.*

To Whom It May Concern:

We, the rural carriers of the Ringgold County Carriers Association, assembled October 2, 1946, at the home of Carl Quick, Redding, Iowa, do hereby make the following resolution:

Be it resolved, That the Ringgold County carriers are unanimously in favor of a 25-year retirement law.

Very truly yours,

EARL W. KELLY,
President, Ringgold County Carriers Association, Redding, Iowa.

Second Bay Crossing From San Francisco to Bay Farm Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement made by me before a Joint Army-Navy Board created pursuant to House Resolution No. 529, Seventy-ninth Congress, of which I was the author, with reference to a second bay crossing from San Francisco to Bay Farm Island on the easterly side of San Francisco Bay; also a supplemental statement submitted by me to the same board:

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD J. WELCH, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE A JOINT ARMY-NAVY BOARD CREATED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 529, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, WITH REFERENCE TO A SECOND BAY CROSSING FROM SAN FRANCISCO TO BAY FARM ISLAND ON THE EASTERLY SIDE OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Board, I am happy to have this opportunity to appear before the Joint Army-Navy Board appointed pursuant to House Resolution No. 529, which was introduced by me for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon the need and feasibility, from the standpoint of both national defense and peace-time economy, of constructing a crossing from San Francisco to Bay Farm Island, or of a system of dams across San Francisco Bay as provided in the Reber plan.

It is regrettable that in the past, in connection with the construction of the two present bridges, the Army and Navy at first did not agree to their necessity. The tremendous importance of this great international seaport and the need for adequate communications between it and the mainland, which subsequent history has fully justified, resulted in long drawn-out controversy.

As a member of the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, I introduced all of the resolutions which resulted in securing the approval of the War Department to build the Golden Gate Bridge. Although proceeding under authority granted by the then Secretary of War, John W. Weeks, and the creation of the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district by an act of the California Legislature, as well as after the expenditure of upwards of one-half million dollars in preliminary work, the Board of Army Engineers, under General Brown, threatened to revoke the grant for no apparent reason. Despite the opposition, this magnificent structure was built during the depth of the depression without a single dollar of Government aid. It made a tremendous contribution to winning the war by reducing the time between Government military and naval establishments from a three-quarter-hour ferry trip to that of a few minutes' drive. The saving made to the Federal Government during the war and its value to our peacetime economy are beyond calculation.

Likewise, the War and Navy Departments both took a firm stand against the construction of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay bridge. I introduced the original bill in Congress authorizing the construction of that bridge. The men then guiding the destiny of the Army and Navy appeared before congressional committees in opposition to it. They contended that such a bridge would severely interfere with navigation and the operation of naval ships. They asserted that collisions would occur with the bridge piers if such a crossing were built.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, although this bridge has been in operation for nearly 10 years, I have yet to hear of any collisions, notwithstanding the fact that we have just completed a successful series of military and naval actions in the Pacific that made San Francisco the greatest port of embarkation in the world.

To overcome the opposition of the Army and Navy, it was necessary for me to make a personal appeal to the President of the United States, which resulted in his appointment of the Hoover-Young Commission, whose investigation and report led to the construction of this remarkable bridge. Contrary to their contentions, it has proven to be a greater asset to our national security and peacetime security than even the Golden Gate Bridge. It was also constructed without any Federal appropriation whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman and Board members, the time has come when we must look to our future needs. The responsibility resting upon you in this regard is heavy. The San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge had reached its capacity during peak hours even before the war broke out in Europe. It was this fact that led me to introduce in Congress, in the spring of 1941, H. R. 158. The passage of that resolution brought the appointment of a similar joint Army-Navy board to investigate and make recommendations concerning the need and feasibility of constructing a second bay crossing. Examination of the Board's report indicates that while such a bridge was considered feasible and practical, the urgency of war conditions and need for materials for war purposes were the principal factors which caused the Board to recommend against constructing a bridge at that time.

While a second crossing was needed then, the present great increase in traffic largely due to the great permanent expansion of both military and naval establishments on both sides of the bay with their attendant increase in population, makes the construction of a second bay crossing imperative now. It must be remembered, gentlemen, that were you to recommend favorably on this matter today, it would take at least 6 years before the bridge would be open to traffic.

In his letter of March 5, 1946, the Acting Secretary of the Navy, in recommending against the passage of my House resolution No. 529, advanced some of the strongest reasons why this second bay crossing should be constructed. In this recommendation he pointed out that: "Naval establishments and activities in San Francisco Bay area have been expanded tremendously since December 1941. The facilities of the Naval Drydock, Hunters Point, and the Naval Air Station, Alameda, have been increased to handle increased and increasing operations. The physical plant at the Naval Supply Depot, Oakland, has been extended." Gentlemen, these are potent reasons why another bay crossing should be constructed.

In his recommendation he further refers to the California State law requiring that no other bridge can be built as long as bonds for the construction of the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge are outstanding. An examination of the records of the operation of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge will show that at the present rate of income from that bridge these bonds will be paid off in full before the proposed crossing can be built.

Gentlemen, after many years of continuous local, State, and National public service, I believe I can speak as one who is thoroughly familiar with this problem. It is my considered opinion that a second bay crossing is absolutely essential for three basic reasons.

First. It will aid our future national security by tying more closely together all military and naval establishments throughout the area with a more direct traffic route and the elimination of traffic congestion.

Second. It will continue the progressive natural development of the peacetime economy of San Francisco and every community adjacent to San Francisco Bay.

Third. It will provide a direct route connecting the huge fertile Central Valley empire, which has an area as large as the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and one-half of New Jersey combined, with the great seaport city of San Francisco.

Transportation will never cease always to be both a wartime and a peacetime problem. The geographical location and strategic importance of San Francisco and the San Francisco Bay area make necessary the immediate expansion of our transportation facilities. A bridge is a highway whether it crosses a creek, a river, or San Francisco Bay.

Gentlemen of the Board, it is incredible to continue to limit the only means of transportation between this great international seaport city with a population of over 800,000 and the continental side of San Francisco Bay to a single overcrowded bridge

Another San Francisco Bay crossing when built should, by all means, provide for transcontinental passenger and freight service into the city and county of San Francisco.

I realize that this Board is not bound by Report No. 134 of the Joint Army and Navy Board appointed to report upon a Hunters Point-Bay Farm Island Bridge pursuant to House Resolution No. 158, dated July 23, 1941. I desire, however, to quote from that report with reference to railway service into San Francisco: "The Board recommends that if a bridge at that location be authorized it be a high-level, double-deck bridge, springing from Hunters Point west of Point Avisadero with four traffic lanes on the upper deck and two lanes for truck traffic and two railway tracks on the lower deck with suitable approaches at each end."

Thus it will be seen that while the board recommended against the construction of a bridge at that time, which was before Pearl Harbor; on the other hand, the Board unanimously concluded that a high-level bridge can be constructed at or near that point and at an estimated cost at that time of approximately $53,200,000. I respectfully request that pages 1905, 1906, and part of page 1907 of the report with reference to locations, types, characteristics, and dimensions of bridge be made a part of the record at this point:

"3. LOCATIONS, TYPES, CHARACTERISTICS, AND DIMENSIONS OF BRIDGE

"(a) General: The Board early in its deliberations decided that it would be inadvisable, for United States Navy considerations, to permit a bridge to spring from the easterly end of Hunters Point at or near Point Avisadero. This was due to the fact that a crossing at such location would be objectionably close to the existing Navy drydocks and interfere with anticipated expansion of the Naval Establishment. Following the above decision, the Board considered it advisable that two locations and types of bridges be investigated, one a high-level bridge located to spring from a point on the northerly side of Hunters Point near its base with the mainland and the other a low-level bridge to spring from a point on the southerly side of Hunters Point also near its base. It was further considered that both of the bridges should land at the same point on the east side of the bay, the approximate center of the southwesterly shore of Bay Farm Island; and that any crossing provided at Hunters Point should be a combined railroad and highway bridge, inasmuch as direct rail connection with San Francisco at the present time is from the south only, no other bridge north of the Dumbarton Point Bridge providing for mainline railway traffic. Pursuant to the above, both the high- and low-level bridges considered herein provide for an upper level carrying four passenger-car lanes, and a lower level carrying two main-line railroad tracks and two lanes for trucks. The eastern and western terminals of the two crossings investigated are located at or near present and/or prospective industrial areas. The locations, types, characteristics, and dimensions of the high- and low-level bridges are shown on the maps and charts accompanying this report.

"(b) High-level bridge.—The Board decided that any bridge crossing located north of Hunters Point should be of the high-level type in order to permit the unhindered passage of both Navy and commercial vessels of the largest type to the drydocks located at Point Avisadero and to the present and prospective Navy developments at this location. This required the high-level bridge to be provided with a major navigation opening, located about 2,200 feet easterly of Point Avisadero, having a vertical clearance of 214 feet above mean higher high water, which is equal to the maximum vertical clearance provided in the westerly channel span section of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. A horizontal clearance of 1,000 feet between fenders was deemed necessary for present and prospective navigation through the major opening. The bridge structure proposed comprises a number of navigation spans east and west of the major opening providing horizontal clearances of about 500 feet and vertical clearances gradually lessening from the major opening of 214-foot clearance.

"The high-level-bridge plan provides for connecting Third Street in San Francisco to the proposed East Shore Highway in Alameda County for vehicular traffic and railroad connection of the main-line Southern Pacific Railway in San Francisco to the mainline Southern Pacific and Western Pacific Railroads on the east bay shore. At the western terminal, the railroad tracks are separated from the vehicular lanes near the base of Hunters Point and reach the existing Southern Pacific Railroad main-line tracks in a separate alinement. As mentioned previously, the above railroad company alone possesses, at the present time, main-line trackage into San Francisco from the south, the trackage of the Western Pacific and Santa Fe Railroads in San Francisco being limited to freight-car trackage connected to ferryboat slips at the bay water front.

"At the eastern terminal the railroad tracks follow the vehicular with lane alinement until the proposed East Shore Highway is reached, whence they extend in the same alinement to connections with the existing main-line tracks of the Southern Pacific and the Western Pacific Railroads. The Santa Fe Railroad does not possess trackage at the present time in the vicinity of the eastern terminus of the proposed bridge, but it would be physically possible to make connection with the Western Pacific.

"The total length of the vehicular part of the crossing is approximately 10½ miles and the maximum grade is 3½ percent. The maximum length of the railroad part of the crossing is approximately 13 miles, and the maximum grade is 1.26 percent.

"The contemplated construction, commencing at the San Francisco terminus, includes the following items:

"1. One thousand three hundred and fourteen feet of six-lane vehicular approach roadway and 8,500 feet of two-track railroad approach, of which 3,000 feet is steel viaduct and 5,500 feet timber trestle.

"2. Two thousand seven hundred and thirty feet of two-railroad tracks and a transition vehicular viaduct raising the four-passenger vehicular lanes on the level structure to the upper level of a double-deck structure.

"3. Twenty-seven thousand four hundred and eighty-eight feet of double-deck structure, consisting of steel trusses on piers and providing for four-passenger vehicular lanes on the upper deck and two truck lanes and two railroad tracks on the lower deck.

"4. One thousand four hundred and ninety-three feet of transition, concrete-pile trestle structure (reverse of item 2 above) terminating in six vehicular lanes and two railroad tracks on a one-level mole.

"5. Nine thousand nine hundred and seventy-five feet of dredged earth and fill mole in San Francisco Bay, carrying six vehicular lanes and two railroad tracks on one level.

"6. Thirteen thousand feet of dredged fill causeway on Bay Farm Island and Alameda County, providing six vehicular lanes and two railroad tracks on one level and including a bascule bridge over the airport channel in San Leandro Bay to provide 100-foot horizontal clearance for navigation. In addition to the above, 5,200 feet of double railroad track either on fill or natural ground, located eastward of the proposed East Shore Highway, in prolongation of the causeway alinement.

"The bridge structure proposed in the deeper portions of the bay consists of trusses of 504-foot spans and in the shallower waters of spans of 288 feet, both of which correspond to span lengths selected for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge structure east of Yerba Buena Island.

"Examination of the meager available boring data at or near the proposed bridge alinement discloses that conditions pertaining to depth of water and length of piles would not be greatly different from those encountered on similar piers for the east bay approaches of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. The concrete pier foundation structures will be terminated at 15 feet above mean lower low water, and the bridge trusses will be supported by steel towers resting on the concrete piers. The proposed mole on the eastern side of the bay extends out from Bay Farm Island into the bay a distance of about 2 miles. This mole and the bridge piers will constrict the tidal flow of the bay waters, but it is estimated that the increase in maximum tidal velocity caused by obstructions will only amount to about .03 knot, which is considered negligible. Examinations of current data indicate that the maximum current velocities in the vicinity of Point Avisadero are now not over 2.2 knots.

"The bridge plan proposes connections with the railroads at grade level and overpasses or underpasses for the vehicular traffic, and also modern semicloverleaf connections to the streets and highways on both sides of the bay.

"The estimated cost of the high-level crossing is $53,200,000. This estimate was prepared on such data as were available, and is subject to verification if and when funds are provided for an adequate engineering investigation."

During the long uphill fight to connect this great international seaport city with its natural hinterland—the San Joaquin, Sacramento, Livermore, Napa, Sonoma, and Santa Clara Valleys, and the great redwood empire to the north—by a comprehensive system of bridges and highways, we have had the support of nearly every section of the State of California. In this just fight we should have and expect the unanimous support of all sections of the State of California and also of the Federal Government through a favorable report by your honorable Board.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT BY RICHARD J. WELCH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

A recognized fundamental principle of traffic planning is to alleviate, not to increase or intensify, congestion, such as exists in downtown San Francisco and in Oakland. Traffic on San Francisco streets adjacent to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge during peak hours has reached the saturation point. Twelfth Street, Oakland, is the principal traffic artery from Oakland to its hinterland. It carries the main load from the

bridge. Twelfth Street, Oakland, at Lake Merritt is also one of the most congested traffic arteries in the entire State of California.

The San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge springing from Rincon Hill was a matter of expediency 15 years ago. To parallel that bridge at this time, as proposed by the State of California director of public works is preposterous and an insult to the judgment of traffic experts as well as the people of this community who are unalterably opposed to creating another bottleneck at the northerly end of the San Francisco peninsula.

It should be known that State Director of Public Works Purcell, a State civil service employee, was offered the appointment of traffic manager for the city and county of San Francisco by former Mayor Rossi. Mr. Purcell I am informed, accepted the appointment, but subsequently declined to take over the responsibility of San Francisco's traffic problems. Had Mr. Purcell accepted the mayor's offer, would he now be advocating another serious bottleneck in the most congested traffic area in San Francisco?

This great international seaport city, built on the tip of a peninsula, cannot grow into the Golden Gate nor into the Pacific Ocean nor San Francisco Bay. Therefore, it must of necessity, and is, rapidly growing to the south. Following this growth, some of the largest distributing firms have moved from downtown congested areas. The Safeway Stores, Inc., has built its largest plant on Army Street; the Borden Dairy delivery's main plant is on Potrero Avenue at Army Street; Sears, Roebuck located its main store at Army and Mission Streets; at the present time there is under construction on Oakdale Avenue at Bayshore Boulevard—which is south of Army Street—what is known as "Apparel City," covering 30 acres of ground, where goods will be manufactured, displayed, sold, and delivered; other large business establishments and industries are following in this same direction.

I read with much care the opinions of the several senior Army and Navy commanders in the San Francisco Bay area on the need of an additional crossing from San Francisco to the east bay, from the standpoint of national defense. Commander J. W. Reeves, Jr., is of the firm opinion that any crossing north of Hunters Point would be objectionable unless built in the vicinity of the present San Francisco-Oakland Bridge.

Commander Reeves' recommendation should not be seriously considered for three basic reasons: First, a new bridge paralleling the present bridge would, as heretofore stated, further complicate the present bottleneck and add to the congestion at the northerly end of San Francisco peninsula; second, any new crossing should by all means provide for transcontinental train service into San Francisco—which would be impossible under Commander Reeves' recommendation; and, third, it is contrary to the advice of Vice Adm. William H. P. Blandy, who recently visited San Francisco upon his return from the Bikini atomic-bomb tests. While here, the admiral addressed the Army and Navy League and was quoted as stating that San Francisco Bay, by reason of its size, offers opportunity for decentralization of important military-defense establishments, of which roads and bridges are an integral part. On the other hand, Commander Reeves would create a veritable Pearl Harbor for seaplanes off Alameda Naval Air Base. Also in recommending against a bridge in the vicinity of Hunters Point, stating as a reason possible interference with the landing and taking-off of large seaplanes, Commander Reeves completely overlooked the fact that, from the beginning, seaplanes have been landing in the cove between Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, within close proximity to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

A bridge at Army Street or that vicinity would be approximately 5 miles from the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. The bay at that point is approximately 6 miles wide. May I call your attention to the fact that if a crossing were built at or near Army Street there would be a distance of over 11 miles between the new bridge and the San Mateo Bridge.

The type and location of a bridge across San Francisco Bay is the responsibility of the Federal Government and not that of the California State director of public works. It is unnecessary to state that a bridge cannot be built across San Francisco Bay until the Federal Government first gives its approval and issues a grant. It is also a fact that your Board has sufficient data to recommend or disapprove such a grant. Regardless of this fact, the State director of public works has asked the United States district engineer for a permit to make borings in San Francisco Bay between San Francisco and Alameda counties in connection with studies for a new bay bridge. Unless and until favorable recommendation is made by your Board and a grant made by the War Department for the construction of a crossing over San Francisco Bay, this is an unwarranted expenditure of public funds. The State director of public works appeared personally before the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco and asked for an appropriation of approximately $40 000 for this purpose. His request was rejected on the grounds that the Government already has sufficient data on which to grant or reject another bay crossing, thereby conserving the taxpayers' money.

Governor Warren stated to me personally that if the people of San Francisco want a bridge which would provide for railroads, they should have it. The people of San Francisco, as the record of the hearings before your Board will show, unitedly support such a bridge.

United States Senator KNOWLAND, who was born and reared in Oakland, Alameda County, stated before your Joint Army-Navy Board that a crossing should provide for railway service into San Francisco.

Congressman MILLER, whose congressional district includes Alameda, made a similar statement before your Board. When House Resolution 158 was under consideration by the Seventy-seventh Congress in 1941, and subsequently by the Joint Army-Navy Board appointed under it, 22 of the 23 members of the California delegation in Congress signed a petition requesting a crossing at or near Hunters Point.

I refer to these facts so that your Board may know that California State Director of Public Works Purcell does not represent the people of this community nor the people of the State of California in the position he has taken.

Hawaii Asks Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the information of the House the text of a statement released to the press on January 3 by the Citizens Committee for Statehood for Hawaii as follows:

The movement for statehood for Hawaii entered a new phase with the opening of the Eightieth Congress in the establishment of an office in Washington by the Citizens Committee for Statehood for Hawaii.

The office will open at 413 Bond Building on January 6, under the direction of George H. McLane. The purpose of this office is to advance legislation which is being presented to the Eightieth Congress by the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, and Representatives, both Republican and Democratic, from each of the principal sections of the country.

The bill being presented was drafted by the Citizens Committee for Statehood for Hawaii that was formed under the direction of Hon. Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii, and includes representatives of every phase of the political, economic, and social life of the Hawaiian Islands. The services are being financed by public funds of the Territory of Hawaii. This is the first time in the history of Hawaii that such an office has been opened in Washington.

People of Hawaii feel the time has arrived for admission of the Territory to statehood in the Union.

Hawaii's efforts for annexation to the Union as an integral part of the United States were consummated during the administration of President William H. McKinley. On June 15, 1897, he submitted to Congress a treaty for the annexation of the Territory of Hawaii. In his letter of transmittal, President McKinley said, "The incorporation of the Hawaiian Islands into the body politic of the United States is a necessary and fitting sequel to the chain of events which, from a very early period in our history, has controlled the intercourse and prescribed the association of the United States and the Hawaiian Islands."

A request for annexation had been previously rejected by President Grover Cleveland, who sought to restore the Hawaiian monarchy.

DEBATES ON ORGANIC ACT IMPLIED STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Hawaii became a Territory of the United States by the adoption by Congress of the organic act in 1900. An amendment providing that the adoption of the act should not be construed as a promise of statehood in the future was rejected during the debate on the organic act. This is one of many instances which have led the people of Hawaii to believe that they would some day achieve statehood.

STATEHOOD ASKED 14 TIMES

Fourteen times the petition of the people of the Territory has been presented to Congress through formal action by the legislature of the Territory.

Sixteen bills enabling Hawaii to become a State have been introduced in Congress since the adoption of the organic act in 1900 making Hawaii a Territory of the United States.

The aspirations and the progress of the people of the Territory have been subject to numerous investigations by Congress. Many of these have been conducted at the invitation of the people of the Territory, whose legislature has provided funds to defray the expenses of these inquiries.

CONGRESS HAS ACKNOWLEDGED HAWAII'S RIGHTS

In 1923 Congress acknowledged the right of the people to participation in Federal aid and similar legislation on the same basis as the States following receipt from the legislature of a petition described as Hawaii's bill of rights. The petition enumerated many instances when the people of the Territory were omitted from this legislation despite the fact that they bore virtually the same financial responsibilities as a State.

STATEHOOD HAS BEEN THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATED

Following extensive hearings in Hawaii in 1935, a subcommittee of the House Territories Committee recommended the appoint-

ment of a joint committee of the Senate and House to give further consideration to the study of statehood for Hawaii.

In consequence of this recommendation, a joint committee of 12 Senators and Representatives conducted an extensive investigation. It rendered a report on February 15, 1939, saying that Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of the Territories.

The committee recommended that unmistakable evidence that a substantial majority desire statehood should precede affirmative action by Congress.

In 1940 the Territory, in conformity with the recommendations of the aforesaid congressional committee, held a plebiscite resulting in a vote of 2 to 1 in favor of statehood.

The committee recommended also that on some appropriate occasion the question of statehood be again reexamined by the appropriate committee of Congress.

The legislature of the Territory renewed its petition for statehood in its session of 1945, asking that steps be taken for the immediate admission of Hawaii into the Union.

The subcommittee of the House Territories Committee that visited the Territory in consequence of this resolution, and under appropriate authority by Congress, held hearings in all parts of the Territory and heard more than 100 witnesses. The committee's report covered all aspects of the life and record of the Territory.

It recommended immediate consideration of legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood on the basis of testimony showing the high degree of local responsibility developed in the field of government, for the great advances made by the people of the Territory in their economic and social life, and the record made during the war—showing unmistakably the loyalty of all people in the population to this country.

The committee's report won widespread interest in the movement for statehood for Hawaii.

HAWAII'S WAR RECORD DEMONSTRATED LOYALTY OF PEOPLE

The report of the Subcommittee on Territories pointed out that the brilliant record of the people of all classes and races in the Territory during the war could leave no doubt as to the loyalty of the Territory's population. Experiences of the military command in Hawaii emphasize the excellent record of Hawaii's population during the war years. Any question of population loyalty was obliterated by an exemplary war-service record. The last remaining obstacle to statehood for the Territory was therefore removed. Hawaii's population now numbers more than 519,000. Nearly 90 percent of these people are American citizens.

SELF-DETERMINATION OF DEPENDENT PEOPLES

For the United States to refuse now to admit Hawaii to statehood would open the question of good faith of this country in dealing with people now in a dependent status, and in the application of the principle of self-determination. The tradition of local self-government extends back more than 100 years. The keen interest of these people in the management of their own affairs is evident from the fact that, in the last election, as in many previous elections, more than 85 percent of the people eligible to vote actually cast their ballots. The total number of registered voters in Hawaii exceeds 100,000.

STATEHOOD NOW WILL STRENGTHEN AMERICA'S POSITION IN THE PACIFIC

Adoption of legislation enabling Hawaii to form a State constitution by this Congress is opportune from the standpoint of international policy. The future pattern of Pacific relationships is now taking place. The promise to the Philippines of independence has been redeemed. The future of the Pacific islands is soon to be determined. The United States has achieved a position of leadership in the Pacific that should be asserted by positive action. With the problem of the future government of the Pacific islands and our relations to the people of the Orient still pressing for prompt solution, the granting to the people of Hawaii of statehood would unquestionably strengthen the place of this country in the Pacific.

VOTING REPRESENTATION WOULD ENHANCE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The important position of Hawaii to the defense of this country will be enhanced by giving Hawaii voting representation in Congress. Men of caliber who have a knowledge of the Pacific at their fingertips would be of manifest help to the program of national defense.

PURPOSES OF ECONOMY WOULD BE SERVED

It would save money for the Federal Government. The cost of salaries of executive, judicial, and legislative officials now paid by the Federal Government would be assumed by the government of the State of Hawaii. Over a period of years these savings would amount to several millions of dollars.

RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ON STATEHOOD

The record of the Republican Party reiterates the fact that the Territory of Hawaii has been represented by a Delegate in Congress for 46 years. For 38 of those 46 years, and for the next 2 years, the people of Hawaii have chosen a Republican to represent them in Congress.

In 1900 the first delegates from the Territory of Hawaii to a Republican National Convention were instructed to secure an expression from the convention favorable to early admission of the Territory of Hawaii to statehood.

UTTERANCES OF THE NATIONAL PARTY HAVE BEEN PROGRESSIVELY MORE FRIENDLY TO THE TERRITORY'S ASPIRATIONS

In 1908 the National Republican Party Platform declared territorial officials "should be bona fide residents of the Territory in which their duties are to be performed," and reiterated this stand in 1916.

In the party platform of 1920, the Republicans stated, "For Hawaii we recommend home rule." In 1932 they pledged, "We believe the customary status of self-government enjoyed by the Territory of Hawaii should be maintained."

The Republican Party platform of 1940 further endorsed self-government: "Hawaii, sharing the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule; and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and in the application of our national laws."

In 1944 the platform of the National Republican Party drew particular attention to the positive stand of the party regarding the Territory by restating the 1940 platform as follows: "Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule (looking toward statehood)[1] and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and the application of all our national laws."

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE ENDORSES IMMEDIATE STATEHOOD

In May 1946 the Republican National Committee adopted a resolution by unanimous vote endorsing the effort of the people of Hawaii to obtain immediate admission of the Territory of Hawaii to the Union as a State as follows:

"Whereas the Republican Party in its national platform has supported policies looking toward ultimate statehood for Hawaii;

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty, patriotism, and, by an overwhelming vote, their desire to assume the reponsibilities of statehood;

"Whereas the capacity of the people of this Territory to assume the responsibilities of State government has been fully demonstrated: and

"Whereas the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State would be in fulfillment of a promise long made, is in keeping with a policy of self-determination, and would strengthen the position of this country in the Pacific: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Republican National Committee endorses the effort of the people of Hawaii to obtain immediate statehood."

In January 1946 the Territorial Central Committee of the Republican party of Hawaii unanimously resolved and adopted the resolution "that it again endorse statehood for Hawaii, and that it earnestly and sincerely request Congress to pass an enabling act giving Hawaii statehood."

Bills introducing legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood have been presented to Congress sixteen times. On all but one of these occasions the bills have been introduced by Republicans.

NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION BACKS IMMEDIATE ACTION ON STATEHOOD

In his message to the Seventy-ninth Congress President Truman said: "I urge that the Congress promptly accede to the wishes of the people of Hawaii that the Territory be admitted to statehood in our Union."

The position of the Department of the Interior in support of statehood was outlined to the House Committee on Territories in the concise statements: "The Department is convinced that the people of Hawaii want statehood now and that they have demonstrated their ability and right to admission into the Union," Secretary Harold L. Ickes said. "Hawaii has been a territory for 40 years and it has proven itself worthy of statehood now," Secretary Julius A. Krug has stated.

THE MAJORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FAVOR STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII NOW

A Gallup poll, on March 14, 1946, showed the American people in favor of admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State by a majority of 3 to 1.

Resolutions favoring immediate statehood for Hawaii have, in the past year, been passed by many national groups and associations representing large cross-sections of the same American people who have just elected a Republican Congress. The National Education Association, at its annual convention in Buffalo, unanimously resolved for statehood, as did the 12,000 delegates to the Lions International Convention in Philadelphia. Dozens of other groups could be named.

Evidence of editorial support of statehood for Hawaii was made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 9, 1946, by the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii. Excerpts from editorial comment in 19 States indicated support for statehood for Hawaii in these States. Since that time literally hundreds of newspapers have editorialized favoring admission of Hawaii to statehood. The Kansas Salina Sun asked: "What more grounds does Congress need for admitting the Territory to the Union? After all, this is a Government by consent of the governed."

[1] Matter in parentheses indicates addition to platform of 1940 by 1944 convention.

Atlanta Ordnance Depot's Automotive School Trained 50,000 for Global "War on Wheels"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article, appearing in the winter issue of Dixie Business, by Lt. James A. Reilly entitled "Atlanta Ordnance Depot's Automotive School Trained 50,000 for Global 'War on Wheels' ":

ATLANTA ORDNANCE DEPOT'S AUTOMOTIVE SCHOOL TRAINED 50,000 FOR GLOBAL "WAR ON WHEELS"

(By Lt. James A. Reilly)

Atlanta might not be the place where one would look first for the largest technical trade school in the country, but the Gate City can make a justified boast of this distinction. The school is an Army establishment, and perhaps cannot be called a "trade school" with precise propriety, but for all practical purposes it is such by the nature of the instruction imparted in its courses.

The Ordnance Automotive School, located at Atlanta Ordnance Depot, graduated 50,000 highly trained automotive technicians during the war years. These graduates—many of them officers up to the rank of major general—played an indispensable part in the winning of the victory of World War II. And today most of them are back in private industry and making an important contribution to the Nation's motor transportation and to the safety of our streets and highways.

Much has been written about the famous Ordnance Automotive School at Atlanta, but not so well known is the story of its director, a familiar figure in Atlanta, who through more than 4 years of service at the school has made a major contribution to the success which the training establishment has attained. He is Maj. Eli E. White, an Atlanta high-school teacher with a penchant for military activity.

In his spare time between classes, lectures, and preparation of lessons while with the Atlanta public school system, he served in the Georgia National Guard for 13 years and became one of the most important figures in the State in rifle- and pistol-shooting circles. He has competed in innumerable matches, including the national matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, representing Georgia all over the country, and has won more medals, plaques, and other trophies than he can remember.

But when the shooting broke out all over the world, the future director of the Ordnance Automotive School laid aside his hobby weapons for more serious work. He had left his Georgia National Guard regiment before the outbreak of the war and thought that his military activities had been relegated to the realm of pleasant memories and reminiscent hours with former comrades. Engaged in teaching technical subjects specializing in automotive in the Atlanta public school system, he realized the potential value of his service in an era of war on wheels.

The Eighty-sixth Quartermaster Regiment, a motor-maintenance outfit, was at nearby Fort McPherson in 1941 and expanding to full strength to perform a portion of the enormous maintenance task of the swiftly growing new army. Lacking sufficient instructors and facilities to train its large numbers of recruits as qualified mechanics in a short time, the quartermaster regiment enlisted the assistance of the Atlanta public school system and an arrangement was worked out whereby the soldiers would take part of their instruction in the afternoons and evenings at Maddox Junior High School in Atlanta under the guidance of Instructor White.

Subsequent developments have a combination of O. Henry and Horatio Alger flavor. When the Eighty-sixth Quartermaster Regiment got rolling under its own steam, the Fourth Corps Area organized a small automotive mechanics school at Fort McPherson and attached it to Company A of that regiment.

The little mechanical school quickly outgrew Company A, outgrew the Eighty-sixth Regiment, and eventually outgrew Fort McPherson. It became—you guessed it—the Ordnance Automotive School of which Major White is now the director.

His steady climb to that post was through widely diversified jobs and special assignments for the school and the Ordnance Department. Getting back into uniform in September 1942 as a first lieutenant, he was assigned to the school and given duty in the student officer branch, which conducted several different courses for officers of all ranks and was attended by students from the grade of warrant officer to major general. One year after, he was chief of that branch and a captain.

Next he found himself in the motion picture business—for the Army, of course, but still it was completely new. The Ordnance Department wanted a technical training film produced on a phase of automotive operation and the orders came down to Atlanta that Captain White would report to the Signal Corps photographic center in New York to take charge of production of the film. Arriving there, he found that taking charge also included writing the scenario, making the detailed drawings of the models to be used, assisting in the construction of the models, being technical adviser for every shot in the film, and playing a leading part in the picture.

Upon return to his home station he was given command of troops as commanding officer of the First School Battalion, composed of soldier students of the school. He also fell heir to the unenviable job of chairman of the post rationing board, making this ticklish task run a little smoother with the lubricant of his broad understanding.

After the surrender of Germany the Army launched its gigantic, long-planned redeployment program to concentrate its military might against Japan as quickly and effectively as possible. Ordnance troops in training and the first units returned to Atlanta Ordnance Depot from Europe had to be retrained for the special conditions of the Pacific theater of operations. Among other things this involved more instruction and the experience of training in operating shops and other installations in woods and rough terrain, more decentralized operation, and living under cruder conditions. In Europe, ordnance shops and such operations, as well as the personnel, could usually be housed in buildings in liberated towns. Such situations were the exception rather than the rule in the Pacific.

A large tract of Government-owned land, the Waco rifle range near Bremen, Ga., 55 miles from Atlanta, was under the control of Atlanta Ordnance Depot and the special phases of redeployment training was set up there under Major White. Within 2 weeks, he had organized a cadre of training personnel, obtained equipment, and had 500 men working and living in the woods.

This training program, of course, ended with the collapse of Japan. However, after VJ-day to the present, the Ordnance Automotive School and its versatile director have been as busy during the war with the Army putting the maximum of postwar draftees and Regular Army veterans through the school before the inevitable governmental retrenchment reduces the facilities of the installation. During 1947 the school will give longer courses and the more thorough training of the peacetime Army, and the details of this program and the future of the school are its director's problems of the present.

The Portal Pay Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by David Lawrence which recently appeared in the New York Evening Sun.

In my opinion Mr. Lawrence "rings the bell" in the issue of portal-to-portal pay, and I hope the Congress will act quickly to settle the matter fairly and justly for all time.

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

EMPLOYER MAY ASK ABOUT COUNTERCLAIMS IN PORTAL-PAY ISSUE

WASHINGTON, December 31.—With all the exhortation from so-called liberal circles about how management and labor should get together—and how usually it's management's fault that they don't—there is no more conspicuous illustration of how to promote bad feeling and bitterness than in the action of the CIO in urging its unions to file portal-to-portal pay suits.

The theory that management must pay for time spent in walking from a time clock to a workbench or in washing up or changing clothes means that labor unions are introducing a new source of friction—just how many minutes of the day constitute a workday.

If attention be focused now on minutes consumed in walking, the employer may start asking about counterclaims for time spent in talking and for time not worked at the workbench.

Usually there is nothing in the collective-bargaining contracts which says that employees must do work for the 40 hours for which they are paid. But in the portal-to-portal suits, the courts now are about to figure out what constitutes an actual workweek. Employers will put in counterclaims so that courts may finally have to offset some of the union claims with an acceptance of employer claims with respect to minutes not worked.

Thus, is the workweek all the time spent on the premises or is it all the time spent in work? The famous Mount Clemens pottery case decided by the Supreme Court did not say explicitly that all time spent on the premises is working time but did allow for minutes not worked in going to and from a workbench. The courts in specific cases presumably are expected to figure out the exact facts and hence employers will be tempted to argue that employees in many instances were not docked for a few minutes of tardiness at the time clock or that they were not docked for coming back from rest periods or lunch a few minutes late.

If these matters are to be settled by Federal law—and an insistence on the letter of the portal-to-portal pay decision of the Su-

preme Court could compel it—then the whole subject of what constitutes work in the eyes of the law may have to be determined. Thus, in many instances there will be no portal-to-portal damages unless the total time exceeds 40 hours and runs into overtime. But in those instances where employers can put in counterclaims for 5 or 10 minutes per day, the courts will have to decide on the total time worked minus time not worked.

Labor unions have long insisted in some industries on payment for time not worked. Congress has been asked again and again to legislate on this point in what is known as feather-bedding rules. Now with the portal-to-portal pay suits, attention will be fixed on time not worked as a matter that needs remedy also.

Relations between management and unions need improvement and thoughtful students of the problem have come to the conclusion that what is needed is mutual trust and fair play. Seizing on the technicality in a vague decision by the Supreme Court as a means of extorting huge sums from employers or as a means of trading such claims for collective-bargaining concessions does not put labor-union leadership in a very good light in America at a time when labor unions need to win friends.

It is significant that the American Federation of Labor is not rushing in to urge the filing of portal-to-portal pay suits. Apparently this organization, which has had many years more of experience with trade-union practice than the CIO, knows that Congress will recognize the portal-to-portal controversy as a racket and will put a stop to it, leaving bad feeling between unions and management that could just as well have been avoided.

Collective-bargaining arrangements and custom in industry have long determined rates of pay. If the Federal Government now is to fix rates and the workweek in each factory through court decisions or administrative rulings, the courts and the governmental agencies will be piled higher than they were in the bootlegging days of the Volstead Act.

State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of today:

STATE OF THE UNION

Little attention will be paid in Congress or anywhere else to Mr. Truman's message on the state of the Union. For one thing, Mr. Roosevelt did so much to degrade the annual message into a partisan campaign speech in support of a platform composed by himself that the institution has fallen into disrepute. For another, since November 5 Mr. Truman no longer speaks for the majority in Congress.

There is, therefore, a good deal in the message that can be called impertinent in the precise sense of the word. What real difference does it make that he is now in favor of a balanced budget? The new Congress was elected on a pledge to reduce expenses and taxes and create a surplus for the retirement of the debt. Nothing that Mr. Truman can say will strengthen a purpose already formed. He has nothing to tell Congress about the means that may be adopted which the Members do not know as well or better than he does.

The same relationship holds with regard to labor legislation. The Republicans are going to write the amendments to be made to the laws governing unions. The new majority came into power among other reasons because the people were dissatisfied with the New Deal views on the subject and were determined on a change. Mr. Truman proposes some immediate labor legislation and the appointment of a commission to examine the question and report by March 15. He talks as if the revision of the law were not a Republican responsibility for which the party is going to be held accountable and as if the commission were capable of acquiring any knowledge of the subject that the appropriate committees of Congress cannot obtain. Neither assumption is sound; both assumptions run counter to the letter and spirit of our Constitution which places upon Congress the duty of writing the laws.

The section on foreign affairs was about as unsatisfactory as might have been expected. No one, bound as Mr. Truman is by New Deal dogma and tradition, can talk sensibly on the subject. What his foreign policy amounts to in substance is continuing support of rapacious allies without even the excuse of war to justify it.

The treaties with Germany and Austria which are about to be negotiated in Moscow will no doubt follow the pattern of the treaties with the minor powers already drafted. If so, peace, good order, and reconstruction in Europe will not be promoted. Meanwhile, though Mr. Truman professes the noblest ideals, his State Department is a party to gross and senseless brutalities in the treatment of the defeated. To expect a good peace in the face of this record is to expect larks to hatch from crows' eggs.

When, in a few days, Mr. Truman will have submitted his Budget message and his economic message, the Republicans can toss all three into the wastebasket and get to work on the job for which the majority was elected.

Fairness to All Is the Watchword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared an editorial in the Illinois State Journal, in Springfield, Ill.; the San Diego Union, of San Diego, Calif.; and other leading newspapers belonging to a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, Hon. Ira C. Copley, and because of its import, as well as its timeliness, I commend it to every Member of the House of Representatives and herewith insert it as part of my remarks:

FAIRNESS TO ALL IS THE WATCHWORD

The first great responsibility confronting the new Republican Congress, which convenes tomorrow, will be to see that this Nation is returned to a government by law rather than dictation by the whim of an individual.

This new Congress—the first under Republican control for 16 years—must restore to its full meaning the provision of the Declaration of Independence which says that "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

This does not mean that any special group—whether it be labor, employers, the Republican Party, or the Democratic Party—is entitled to special privileges.

It means that all men must be treated fairly, that the rights of all men must be protected, that there must be an end to class legislation, class hatred, and class bitterness if these United States are to survive.

No Congress ever was confronted with a greater responsibility because never before has the administration of government been allowed to depart so widely from the basic law of the land—the Constitution of the United States.

This Congress can get nowhere by applying a patch here and a patch there to the dizzy framework of political expediency that has served as a guide to the executive and judicial branches of government in the last dozen years.

It must begin with the basic principle that all men are entitled to justice, to freedom, to a fair administration of equitable laws.

If the new Congress does that, it will justify the faith the people displayed in the Republican Party last November 5.

It will signify a return of the Government to the people, by the people, and for the people. When that is done and the people remain alert, in the words of the immortal Lincoln, such a government "shall not perish from the earth."

But fairness to all men must be the watchword.

Our advice to the new Congress: Do it; don't merely promise.

FTC and the Advertiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am very glad to include an address made by the Honorable Robert E. Freer, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, before the Advertisers' Club of Cincinnati on November 6, 1946.

Mr. Freer is a man of great experience in the advertising problems of businessmen, and in his address he approaches this subject with the full knowledge of the facts.

The address follows:

At the outset may I explain that I do not propose to pass out cards on which to pledge your antipathy to untruthful advertising. Membership in the Advertisers' Club of Cincinnati, I have been pointedly informed, is incontrovertible evidence that each of you has long since hit the sawdust trail leading to truth in advertising. As all of you are "agin" sin in advertising, you may all settle back comfortably confident that my remarks will pertain to nonmember advertisers, agencies, and media.

Your kind invitation to me to come home to Cincinnati to participate in this meeting is appreciated. Your invitation evidences

your interest in advertising's program to achieve higher standards through continuous self-examination, self-correction, and self-discipline.

As early as 1905 many men were making their living creating advertising. One of their first acts of self-discipline was to set up an agency to check and confirm media circulation statements. This attested an increasing respect for facts. It also marked your profession as discerning buyers. Then followed various declarations of principles by groups associated with advertising; the voluntary adoption by some media of standards designed to serve as a guide to self-imposed censorship; and the establishment of better business bureaus—successive answers to the challenge of the ever-increasing social and economic responsibility imposed by advertising's growth.

It has been said that the genesis of industry's wide-scale adoption of advertising was when it simultaneously dawned on any number of established concerns that if the charlatan and the swindler could make advertising pay so well, why couldn't it be a profitable medium for businessmen who kept their promises? The chiselers, they felt, would always be with us but as subjects for control. The price of that control has been a measure of regulation of the whole advertising structure exemplified by better business bureaus, by State "printer's ink statutes," by the food and drug laws, and by the Wheeler-Lea amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act. Here is the picture today. Chiselers we shall have with us always, but they are easily recognized and appropriately restrained. So also with the frankly dishonest. There remain, however, for present and future consideration another minority—the unethical and the careless.

Many of the unethical are to be found in the ranks of those selling nostrums suggested as safeguards against nonexistent dangers. To them, in the language of the police court, unspent consumer dollars are vagrants, to be forthwith corralled from the prototypes of the terrified gentlemen and agonizing ladies whose innards may be depicted in the lurid copy. Part of, but not all, these cases are subjects for legal correction. As such copy disseminates, it represents just one more temptation put in the path of others of the border fringe. Through precept and example, and by instilling into the minds of the users and producers of advertising the hard fact that complete candor and good taste in advertising is good business, you are in a position to accomplish as much as, or more than, the government in discouraging the unethical.

The Commission and the advertising industry see eye to eye on the proposition that false or misleading advertisements are harmful both to the consumer and to business. Agreed as we are on the intellectual level of forthright condemnation of outright falsity, differences of opinion sometimes arise on the level of practical application to borderline situations. Words and sentences literally true, may be framed in a confusing setting capable of—if not artfully designed to be—misleading. It is just our hard luck—yours, the Commission's, and the courts'—that no magic formula can resolve the implications of such loosely written advertising copy. Whether calculated insertion of a restrictive weasel word here and a contradicting and subtractive phrase there are sufficient in a given case to remedy the deceptive ambiguity often presents a troublesome question. The test of unfairness is an elastic one and the Commission's duty is to keep pace with new promotional inventions. To evaluate, and to calibrate to the exact degree, the level of improvement to which business morals have evolved is not possible. The upward trend, though, is plain and the Commission sincerely hopes that its action in resolving such matters will never run counter thereto or drag your standards down.

Because no ingenious advertiser or Government expert as yet has invented the precise rule of thumb which will segregate the false from the true unvarnished variety of advertisement, the Commission has declined to issue advance opinions or to otherwise evaluate or criticize proposed advertising. Such a course, it is felt, would gradually evolve into some species of censorship, the attendant evils of which I need not discuss. On the basis of its experience and the scientific information to which it has access, the Commission has come to regard with suspicion advertising claims of any temporary relief preparation offered to cure the symptoms of or to stop or end any disease. The suspicion holds for the advertising of any simple emollient cosmetic offered as a rejuvenative or restorative of ladies' beauty. On the other hand, without comprehensive investigation the Commission cannot know if there is concealment of material facts or if a twist here and a turn there distorts the truth. These facts are or should be more readily available to the advertiser. What has been characterized as the addition of subjective values to selling by means of advertising cannot do away with the need for relevant truth as a competent guide to use.

The Commission's trade practice conference procedure gives valuable enlightenment on trends in business ethics and in some instances has brought cooperative and simultaneous discontinuance in whole industries of twilight zone practices. By this procedure entire industries meet together under Commission auspices, discuss frankly their trade practices, and undertake to clean up all deceptive advertising and other unfair practices. The Commission recognizes that the average American businessman is no petty pickpocket, to be haled into court at every opportunity. Giving him this chance to cooperate with his competitors and the Commission, with the objective of improving his business morality, is generally more effective than swinging the big stick. Many industries formerly numbered among the Better Business Bureaus' Augean stables stand witness to this method of house cleaning. Such conferences result not only in formal rules forbidding practices which are unfair under the law, but also in expressions of policy discouraging practices in the twilight zone, and encouraging in the interest of both industry and the consumer the voluntary adoption of ethical standards considerably above the legal minimum.

The Commission has found the trade-practice conference to be an unusually fine method of wholesale enforcement of the legal minima in many industries, obviating the necessity of countless formal enforcement proceedings against individual concerns, and the attendant temporary competitive advantage of the recalcitrant firm over those more high-minded or tractable. But principally the advantage lies in the fact that more real good can be accomplished on a voluntary basis than in an adversary proceeding, and much higher standards of ethical conduct adopted.

It is a hard and basic truth that a businessman wants his competitors to advertise truthfully. Upon information or belief that one or more of them is nibbling at truth's edges, he may adopt tomorrow at his office desk certain practical compromises with those concepts of truth in advertising which he today enthusiastically endorses when he hears them expressed at a luncheon of his advertising club. When he shares in making trade-practice conference rules for others he is more apt to see to it that his business lives up to them.

A recent issue of Printers' Ink refers to a poll of wage-earner husbands and wives in which three-fourths of the pollees said that advertisements help give better products for the money. At the same time over one-half expressed the opinion that advertisements add to the cost of things. Two-thirds expressed some specific criticism of advertising recently noted. The general tenor of some complaints coming in to the Commission indicates that at least a segment of the public holds either an emotional grudge or an intellectual spite against advertising as an institution. At times their observations border on the purple side, especially where the charge is lack of good taste, the regulation of which is certainly no function of the Commission or of any Government agency. Criticism may fairly be leveled at the taste of an advertisement dealing with various bodily functions, religious beliefs, loyalties, or prejudices in such manner as to offend a substantial part of the public. Some radio listeners have complained of bad taste appearing in the so-called entertainment part of a program, the commercial portions of which are above reproach.

Elaborate aids are now available to test the reactions of the public to copy suspected of transgressing on the side of bad taste or indelicacy. Every program or piece of copy which offends even a few people harms advertising as an institution. Questionable taste and lack of candor harm advertising before they begin to affect sales of the advertised product. It is such an elemental truth that I hesitate to express it, that however, fine and constructive advertising may be as a whole, if any considerable portion of the public loses confidence in it for any reason, whether justified or not, the efforts of the best elements in the business will be wasted.

Like other consumers I keep looking for signs that the trend observed today in many industries toward more informative advertising is a general one. Advertising cannot be considered as a substitute for honest market information. I imply no blanket condemnation of advertisements or commercials solely because they stress the subjective or emotional values; but as the scope of these values is enlarged in a particular advertisement, the greater becomes the need for relevant truth as a competent guide to use of the products. As packaging becomes more general, for example, consumers are less and less able to confirm their impressions by presale use of their senses of touch, taste, or sight.

The popularity of some private bureaus, institutes, and consumer reports suggests some public approval of proposals for an authoritative or official source of consumer information. Advertising should concern itself with supplying such information. If it turns a deaf ear who knows but that this polite consumer agitation may become a roar for establishment of machinery bypassing advertisers.

The Commission feels keenly its statutory responsibility to eliminate false and deceptive advertising. Not all of the matters considered by it originate from complaints by a competitor or consumer. The Commission's Radio and Periodical Division maintains a survey of advertisements appearing in magazines, newspapers, radio broadcasts, and mail-order catalogs. This prompts earlier investigation of advertisements questionable on their face. Secondly, representations previously the subject of Commission action are checked to ascertain whether the advertisers are living up to Commission orders to cease and desist therefrom or their own voluntary agreements to discontinue or modify them.

To do this, current magazines and newspapers are secured on a staggered monthly rate of three times yearly on the average, depending on the character of circulation and advertising. For the last fiscal year the representative newspapers scrutinized totaled 1,667 editions; magazines (including farm journals and trade journals) 1,033 editions; mail order catalogs, 82 (including those of five mail-order concerns with combined annual sales in excess of $1,750,000,000); and the commercial portions of 518,161 radio broadcast continuities.

For this job much credit is due the Nation-wide network chains, regional network

groups, transcription producers engaged in preparing commercial radio recordings, radio stations, and publishers who cooperated with the Commission.

In instances where advertising agencies or radio station personnel have prepared or participated in the preparation of advertisements subsequently found to be false and misleading, the agency or station is included with the advertiser as a party to any resulting corrective action. To date the Commission has not found it necessary in ending particular instances of false advertising to join agencies, radio stations, or publications which have done no more than serve as dissemination media. Pertinent to this policy is the fact that it is "unlawful" (Sec. 12 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended by the Wheeler-Lea Act) merely to "disseminate, or cause to be disseminated, any false advertisement" of a food, drug, curative device, or cosmetic. Under certain conditions (sec. 14) such mere disseminators are exempt from criminal liability, but not from civil proceedings.

The Commission recently reexamined its own procedures and the methods of handling its work. This resulted in a reorganization of personnel and functions, adoption of a program designed to expand the cooperative phases of our work, and revision of some of the rules of practice in formal cases. One criticism of the traditional case-by-case procedure, viz, investigation, complaint, hearing, and order, was that competitors of the party so proceeded against were left free to follow the identical illegal practice until such time as the Commission issued orders to cease and desist against each separate offender in turn. Where appropriate, simultaneous uniform corrective measures on an industry-wide basis are now proposed rather than directing action solely against the concern to which the complaining finger first pointed. I say where appropriate, because application of such simultaneous uniform corrective action must appear not only to be warranted in the public interest, but also to be practicable of execution.

Not only will the Commission expand its work in establishing trade practice conference rules but also will it give greater emphasis to the elimination of unfair trade practices through stipulations to cease and desist. To the greatest possible extent consistent with the public interest will the aim be to avoid the necessity of a multiplicity of full-dress formal proceedings. This cooperative method of handling the less important matters will implement a broader program of formal proceedings to prevent monopoly. We hope the results will inspire further confidence on the part of the public in the Commission's effectiveness in both fields.

I have no doubt that advertising standards will be raised in the future as they have been in the past. Only by digging back into media of 10, 20, and 30 and more years ago can the great strides of past advancement be fully appreciated. Of course, the most obvious improvement is the conspicuous decline of the fly-by-night, get-rich-quick type of ad. Some are still with us. Like the poor, they no doubt always will be with us. Certainly they will be so long as any media will disseminate them, since they have a one-crop harvest which can usually be gotten in the barn before the frost of a legal proceeding descends. And, like the modern farmer, this type of advertiser is a devotee of crop and field rotation. But to me the really impressive improvement is the rise of the informative and truthful type of advertising for established business—those of you who expect to be in the same business tomorrow, next year, and for years to come.

Such changes do not come easily, nor do they come chiefly as the result of Government regulation. As a matter of fact, if advertisers as a whole were no better than the Federal Trade Commission could order them to be, the situation would indeed be serious. The Commission and the Congress, of course, have participated in this change, and many practices which would have been ignored in the 1920's are now clearly within our jurisdiction, either by decision or by amendment of the law. But in this change there is a lag between the minimal legal requirements and the best standards of business itself. By continually raising your standards, you make it possible for our regulation to protect more fully the public and ethical business from the depredations of the unscrupulous.

Invoking Divine Guidance at the Convening of the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it was in the Constitutional Convention that Benjamin Franklin said, in substance, that if a sparrow could not fall to the ground without the notice of the Heavenly Father that surely an empire could not rise without His aid. That was true then and it is true now. Likewise the tremendous problems facing our Republic cannot be solved without His aid. It was in keeping with this thought that the Washington Federation of Churches conducted a special service for the Congress on Friday, January 3, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including therein a copy of the service used on that occasion:

AN OFFERING OF PRAYER INVOKING DIVINE GUIDANCE UPON THE NATION ON THE OCCASION OF THE CONVENING OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FRIDAY, JANUARY 3, 1947, 10:30 A. M., THE CHURCH OF THE REFORMATION, 212 EAST CAPITOL STREET, SPONSORED BY THE WASHINGTON FEDERATION OF CHURCHES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

PREPARATION AND PENITENCE

In the few moments of silence before we begin the spoken part of this service let us focus our thoughts first upon Him who governs the universe, and in whose name we are assembled, and then upon the special circumstances in the Nation and in the world which bring us to our knees in prayer.

The God of peace

O God of peace, who hast taught us that in returning and rest we shall be saved, in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength: By the might of Thy Spirit lift us, we pray Thee, to Thy presence, where we may be still and know that Thou art God.

The world of conflict

Behold, O Father, this Thy broken family, and help us to see ourselves as with Thine eyes: Nations eyeing each other with suspicion and dread; classes and parties and racial groups in the same Nation striving for supremacies not ordained by Thee, driven by panic fears and prideful ambitions unbecoming in followers of Thy Son, who took our nature upon Him to set us free. Give us, we pray Thee, such honesty that as we ponder these things we may feel in our hearts that contrition without which no man can enter the door that leads to new ways, higher loyalties, and finer endeavor. O Thou who has taught us that repentance must come before reformation, and sorrow before renewal, send, we pray Thee, the Spirit of Thy Son into our hearts that we may with sincerity pray together:

O God, we have offended against Thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and we have done those things which we ought not to have done. Have mercy upon us and forgive us our sins, both secret and open. Raise us to new life. Confirm and strengthen us in all goodness, and make us able and worthy to receive Thy promise of eternal life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Hymn: St. Anne..... William Croft

(Congregation standing)

O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home!

Under the shadow of Thy throne
Still may we dwell secure;
Sufficient is Thine arm alone,
And our defense is sure.

Before the hills in order stood,
Or earth received her frame,
From everlasting Thou art God,
To endless years the same.

A thousand ages, in Thy sight,
Are like an evening gone;
Short as the watch that ends the night,
Before the rising sun.

O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Be Thou our guide while life shall last,
And our eternal home.

—*Isaac Watts.*

INTERCESSION

And now let us lift up to God, and lay before Him, some of the sorrows and needs of the men and women and children who inhabit his earth, with special concern for our own Nation at this time when the legislative branch of our Federal Government is about to assemble in the Eightieth Congress; in the faith that God will hear our prayers if we offer them in the Spirit of His Son, not desiring better things for ourselves than for our neighbors, not wishing for our own Nation a security and a peace that would deny these benefits to other nations; but asking God's will be done in and through us, and in and through others. In humility, and in the spirit of brotherhood, seeking only the will of Him who made us, let us join in using the following litany:

We beseech Thee, O God, that by Thy Spirit the Eightieth Congress may discharge its responsibilities on the high plane where self-seeking gives place to self-discipline and ambition becomes that hunger and thirst after righteousness which has its reward in fullness of life; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That our legislature may write only such laws as reflect the divine law which governs all things in heaven and earth; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That Congress may interpret the mind of the people at its best, not catering to our greeds and hates and moral vulgarities, but giving sustenance to our loftiest visions and reality to our noblest dreams; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That sound guidance may be given to the youth of our land, and to those who influence them in their homes, their schools, and their recreation, to the end that our Nation may raise up public-spirited citizens, vigorous and modest and well-balanced, that so we may keep a place of honor among the nations of the world; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That Government and labor and management, in the mutual rivalry in which their fortunes are entangled, my learn through patience and through mutual respect to seek only those solutions which treat men as sons of God and therefore brothers one of another; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That we may see in every race and every minority group children of God, and whose

destinies are precious in Thy sight; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That those who control the Army and Navy may submit their courts and all their processes of judgment to the divine rule of justice; to the end that even the least popular offender may receive the most scrupulous fair play; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That our Nation may become a land of justice where none shall prey on others, where success shall be founded on service, and honor be given to integrity alone; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That our diplomacy, under Thy influence, may submit to the discipline of truth and may rise to the fearlessness which alone can accomplish Thy purpose for mankind; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That every question of foreign policy may be studied in the light of our deepest beliefs; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That we may check in ourselves and in others all ungenerous judgments and all presumptuous claims; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That Thou wilt inspire all who speak where many listen and write what many read, so that they will help to make the mind of this people wise, the heart sound, and the will righteous; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That Thou wilt give to the Supreme Court of our land a wise and understanding heart to judge Thy people, that they may discern between good and bad, and that this Nation may grow in obedience to Thy laws; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That Thou wilt grant to the President of the United States wisdom and strength to know and to do Thy will; and to the members of the Cabinet such insights and understanding that they, together with the President, may reach decisions in accordance with Thy holy will and way; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That every Member of Congress, aided by the prayers of the people, uncorrupted by power, neither blinded by prejudice nor hampered by pride, may serve this country with an eye single to the public welfare and a will dedicated to the all-embracing purposes of God; we beseech Thee to hear us.

That this Nation, bounteous in the fruits of the field, may by Thy spirit be led to share gladly and richly with Thy children across the seas in hunger and despair; we beseech Thee to hear us.

O God, by whose quickening grace we are made fellow citizens of the household of faith, grant that the good endeavors of Thy people in all nations, fitly framed together, may grow into a holy temple of righteousness and truth; through Him who is our peace, Thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

O Lord, we beseech Thee mercifully to receive the prayers of Thy people who call upon Thee; and grant that we may both perceive and know what things we ought to do, and also may have grace and power faithfully to fulfill the same; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Let us now join in saying the Lord's Prayer.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed by Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever and ever. Amen.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with us all evermore. Amen.

Hymn: Cwm Rhondda_____ John Hughes

(Congregation standing)

God of grace and God of glory,
On Thy people pour Thy power;
Crown Thine ancient church's story;
Bring her bud to glorious flower.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage
For the facing of this hour.

Lo! the hosts of evil round us
Scorn Thy Christ, assail His Ways.
Fears and doubts too long have bound us,
Free our hearts to work and praise.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
For the living of these days.

Cure Thy children's warring madness,
Bend our pride to Thy control;
Shame our wanton, selfish gladness,
Rich in things and poor in soul.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
Lest we miss Thy kingdom's goal.

Set our feet on lofty places;
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christ-like graces
In the fight to set men free.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee!

Save us from weak resignation
To the evils we deplore;
Let the search for Thy salvation
Be our glory evermore
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
Serving Thee whom we adore.

—*Harry Emerson Fosdick.*

DEDICATION

And now, brethren, while we remain standing, let us say together the following words of dedication:

Fill us, O Lord, with Thy light. Destroy in us the power of darkness, break into the innermost depth and change the whole of our being. Bless us with Thy grace. Bend us under Thy truth. We wait still upon Thee. We will obey Thee. Have mercy upon Thy children. Lord, we believe; help Thou our unbelief.

Then shall the minister bless the people.

Now our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and God, even our Father who hath loved us and given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, strengthen our hearts, and establish us in every good word and work. Amen.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE SERVICE

The Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., LL. D., Chaplain of the Senate; the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives; the Reverend Charles Enders, D. D., vice president, Washington Federation of Churches; the Very Reverend John W. Suter, D. D., dean, Washington Cathedral; the Reverend Frederick E. Reissig, D. D., executive secretary, Washington Federation of Churches; Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, LL. D., president, Washington Federation of Churches; the Reverend Oscar F. Blackwelder, D. D., LL. D., pastor, host church.

The Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUCENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a very timely editorial entitled "The Congress" from the Amarillo Daily News, under date of January 3, 1947:

THE CONGRESS

The Eightieth Congress of the United States convenes today.

Sometimes we Americans cuss our Congressmen and Senators; sometimes we make fun of them. Most of the time we work them to death, getting us hotel reservations and showing us around the Capitol and fronting for us at various Government agencies and bureaus. When they vote for bills that help our business or coincide with our prejudices, we vote for them for reelection. When they vote for bills and help the other fellow's business, or conflict with our prejudices, we damn them and vote for their opponents in the next election.

We take our Congressmen for granted. But if we would pause and analyze what this institution means to the American people and to the world, we would get down on our knees and thank God for Congress.

The Members of Congress are actual representatives of the people—of "the folks back home." The laws passed by Congress reflect, as directly as possible in a nation of 140,000,000 people, the wishes of the majority of those people. Russia's congress has no such power. True, its members are elected, although they all belong to one party. But it has no power to formulate and pass legislation and make it stick in the face of opposition by the executive branch. Russia's congress, in short, is a figurehead.

In our Congress there are two Houses. Both are necessary; but it is the lower House that is the more responsive to the popular will. Few Americans know that we came dangerously near not having a lower House.

The House of Representatives, in fact, was our forefathers' concession to democracy. The founders of our Republic—or at least a good many of them—weren't at all sure that the American people had the capacity for self-rule.

The Senate, an aristocratic body then elected by the State legislatures, was their idea of a governing body. But just to make sure that the Senate wouldn't throw monkey wrenches into the machinery of the Republic, they agreed to the creation of the House, its Members to be elected directly by the people.

Thus, the House always has been closer to the people than the Senate. Its elections are every 2 years instead of 6. And in its very operations it's the more democratic, the more colorful of the two legislative bodies.

There have been fist fights on the floor of the House. When a session of Congress ends the Senate just quits. The Members of the lower Chamber have been known to stage great sing-fests, with hundreds of voices joining in Auld Lang Syne or My Old Kentucky Home.

The most important man in the House is the Speaker, elected by Members of the majority party. Despite his importance, only one man in all our history has graduated from the Speakership to the Presidency. His name was James Polk. It was probably an accident, however, that Amarillo's main street bears the name of this Speaker-President.

So cuss your Congressman if you must; but remember that in this changing and restless old world the freedom of the individual American might evaporate pretty quickly were it not for the institution that holds forth in the big domed building on Capitol Hill.

Freedom and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Freedom and Security," which I wrote and which was published in the

Baltimore Sun of Sunday, January 5, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM AND SECURITY

(By Hon. JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator from Minnesota)

There are two deep emotional impulses within nearly all of us and at times they seem to be in conflict.

One is the desire to be free and independent, to work and live exactly as we please. The other is the equally deep need for security—the security of a comfortable home, a sure job, and congenial companions.

Most of us can remember when the urge to be free of parental control drove us as children to run away from home, trudging bravely along the railroad track that led out of our little town to the big world beyond, a few precious belongings and perhaps some bread and potatoes slung in a sack over our shoulder. And we can also remember how, as the afternoon shadows began to lengthen toward twilight, the deep need for the lighted and warm security of home slowed our steps and finally sent us hurrying back to arrive, breathless and a little shamefaced, in time for dinner.

SECURITY GAINED BY EFFORT

All through growing up, going to school, and working at one job after another we learn gradually how to be free, to stand on our own feet, to use wisely and well our own resources of brain and sinew, knowing both their extent and their limits. As we learn to be free, we also win security, the only security worth having, that which the individual builds for himself and which no outside power can take away from him.

Our lives as adults quite often appear to be a compromise between these two basic impulses toward freedom and security. Should we quit our humdrum job and risk our savings on that chicken ranch we've always dreamed of owning? Should we keep our little business going as an independent, competing concern, or sell out to the big outfit that threatens to smash us in a price war if we don't?

For most of us, the choice is usually a tough one with risks on both sides, and the decision is usually a compromise. But we can make the choice ourselves, with the knowledge that we have an equal opportunity with all others to succeed.

IN OLD DAYS NO CHOICE

There was a time when the individual had no choice. You worked at the job you were born into, or starved. Freedom of choice was a special privilege reserved for a few at the top of society, and even they did not have as much real freedom as all of us enjoy today.

A few centuries ago all of us had to devote all our energies to achieving the barest kind of security, enough food and shelter to stay alive. We had no time to think of freedom. We lived in small villages, producing ourselves nearly everything we consumed, and paying tribute and allegiance to some feudal lord in return for his protection.

The industrial revolution changed all that. Men found that by specializing in their labor and exchanging products they could produce far more than they had been able to produce before. Some farmed, some spun and wove cloth, others made shoes and plows and some devoted all their time to building homes or making furniture. Later on, the specialists invented machines which increased their productivity still more.

For the first time, society could see a chance of producing enough to banish forever the specter of starvation and want.

But to make the new system work, men had to be free to exchange the product of their labor for that of others. They had to be free to choose the kind of work they would do, to move from one place to another, to trade in markets where contracts were equally binding on all.

BY STRUGGLE AND SHEDDING BLOOD

It was natural that those at the top who had controlled the lives and labors of people and enjoyed many special privileges, thereby should resist the demands for freedom which the new method of production made imperative. It took centuries of struggle, some of it exceedingly bloody, to establish firmly in the organization of society the concept of individual freedom and equality under law.

Through that long struggle and the establishment of that liberal concept in society we discovered an amazing new resource and learned a startling fact.

The new resource was the creative energy which millions of just ordinary people display once it is released.

They say you can make a donkey go by dangling a carrot in front of him or by beating him with a stick. Men are somewhat alike. We work and strive under the whip of compulsion or in the hope of reward.

For many centuries we toiled under the whip of compulsion, sometimes real in the hands of the slavemaster, at other times merely the necessity of keeping body and soul together. We toiled from dawn to dusk, with no time for thinking or dreaming, and the creative energy within us remained locked up and untapped.

IDEAS COME FROM THE PEOPLE

But as we became free, as the division of labor gave us more time to think and dream, we found that the upper crust had no monopoly on ideas that could benefit society. And as opportunity opened up to all on more nearly equal terms, and the incentive of great rewards opened to anyone who could offer something society needed or could use, a veritable flood of new inventions, new ideas new processes and techniques poured out, not from any specially privileged group, but from the people.

This was the great new resource society discovered, the creative energy of individual men and women free to work and live as they pleased.

The startling fact we learned in this struggle was that our individual security increases in direct ratio as our individual freedom and opportunity increases.

Equal justice under law gave us security in our lives and property that the feudal lords had never afforded. And the flood of production released when individuals were freed and the incentive of reward for performance substituted for the whip of necessity provided even the least fortunate of us economic and material security undreamed of a few centuries ago.

Out of this struggle also grew the philosophy of political liberalism.

A political liberal today, as in the past, has two primary objectives.

One is to assure the greatest possible degree of freedom for all individuals consistent with enjoyment of the same degree of freedom by all other individuals.

In pursuit of that objective, liberals oppose and seek to root out of our system special privileges whenever they show up, whether they are enjoyed by great capitalists or by powerful labor leaders or by dictatorial bureaucrats.

The liberal's second objective is equality of opportunity and equality before the law for all individuals. A true liberal recognizes many problems in our domestic society today, in health, housing, education and labor relations. But he insists that the solutions to these problems must expand rather than contract the sum total of individual freedoms enjoyed by all of us and must not violate the principles of equal opportunity and equality under the law for all.

FREEDOM OFTEN MISUSED

We recognize that our present society is not perfect. Freedom carries with it risks and responsibilities, and sometimes individuals or groups mistake freedom for license to disregard completely the public interest.

The struggle to expand freedom, destroy special privileges, check license and broaden opportunities is a never-ending one. Mass-production factories have left jerry-built slums in their wake. Our labor-relations policy is a patchwork that is breaking down at a critical time. Too many people do not get a fair break on health or education. Business cycles sometimes spiral into depressions which weaken or destroy the security of many of us.

A group of politicians, taking advantage of our preoccupation during the 1930's with these weaknesses and defects in our free system, have launched what is today the most dangerous attack on freedom and security.

The basic thesis of these political leaders, all of them pseudo-liberals of the Laski-Wallace-Pepper-PAC stripe, is that Government's primary obligation must be to provide complete economic security for everyone, rather than to assure to all individuals equal justice, equal opportunity, and maximum freedom under law.

Their threat to both freedom and security is the more dangerous because it is insidious. They appeal to our basic need for security, they pay lip service to freedom while advocating programs which inevitably, whether they realize it or not, will liquidate both freedom and security. They have convinced many honest liberals that they are the true liberals of today.

PROPOSALS OF PSEUDO-LIBERALS

A few of the salient features of the domestic program advocated by these pseudo-liberal leaders in the Seventy-ninth Congress were the original version of the full employment bill, which sought to have Government guarantee a job to every individual who wanted one regardless of ability or willingness to work; the Wagner-Murray-Dingell compulsory health-insurance bill, which would have made every member of the medical, dental, and nursing profession a Federal employee subject to the control of a vast bureaucracy; increasing the minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents an hour, increasing unemployment compensation to $25 a week for 26 weeks, and raising all social-security benefits proportionately, and bitter opposition to every attempt to check the arrogant and arbitrary "public-be-damned" power which union leaders have gained as a result of legal immunities and special privileges and lopsided favoritism in public administration.

The real liberals recognized that if Government was to guarantee jobs to everyone, it inevitably would have to be given power to tell all individuals where, at what jobs, and for what wages they must work or starve. In other words, to make the promise good, Government inevitably would have to use the whip of compulsion, since it was taking away the carrot of incentive. And individual freedom, of course, would be liquidated.

Liberals insisted, and their counsel finally prevailed, that Government had an obligation to plan its fiscal and public-works policies so as to level out business cycles, but that for it to try to run the whole economy would mean the end of liberty.

CARRIED ODOR OF TOTALITARIANISM

The compulsory health insurance bill was so obviously headed in the direction of totalitarianism that it never got out of committee, and the new Congress will tackle the problem of meeting the admittedly real problem of making minimum health services available to all on a liberal and voluntary basis.

The attempt to make our minimum wage law, designed to eliminate sweatshops, over

into a statute requiring all employers to pay what some bureaucrat decides is a fair or living wage for a family of four has the same weakness as the original full employment bill. It sought to substitute Government edict for the free play of competition in a free market in fixing wages and hours.

A minimum wage is all right as long as we keep it a minimum. But the minute we begin to substitute arbitrary rules for the determinations of a free market, whether in prices or wages, we are gumming up the free exchange of goods and services which is a vital necessity to the economic system, and the result is a retrogression, not progress.

AIMING AT FREE SYSTEM'S HEART

Similarly, the continual drive of these pseudo-liberals to change the objective of our social-security system, which is the humane one of making sure no individual's living standards fall below a minimum standard, but leave the rest to individual initiative spurred on by incentive, to assuring everyone a high standard of living regardless of individual effort, is striking at the heart of a free system.

All of us know of individuals who now prefer to loaf on jobless benefits rather than work and produce. How many more such would there be if the benefits were increased as these leaders would have them increased? And how long would you and I keep on sweating and producing to earn our living standards, and see more and more of those earnings drained off in taxes to support the drones and loafers at standards we could not afford?

The incentive just wouldn't be there. Inevitably our whole economy would run downhill, or Government would have to step in and use the whip of compulsion to make individuals work, as it had to do in Italy, Germany, and Russia. And that again would mean the end of both freedom and security for the individual.

What the Wallace-Pepper-PAC crowd are doing is studying the defects of our free system through a magnifying glass and its accomplishments through the wrong end of a telescope. Naturally, the defects overshadow the achievements.

IT'S A PLEASANT PICTURE

But for those of us not afflicted with that kind of myopia the picture is very different. We see millions of Americans working shorter hours in pleasanter surroundings than any on earth, yet producing and enjoying better homes, more refrigerators and bathtubs and automobiles and fishing trips and summer resorts and all the other things that make life more comfortable and more fun than any other people on earth.

We can see the defects, too, but we see them in proportion, and we can see that we have achieved these things and this security because we have been free and had equal opportunity and equal justice under law.

Many businessmen, finding free competition tough and risky, have tried to organize monopolies, trusts, and cartels to eliminate the risk at the expense of society. In the United States we passed antitrust laws, breaking up these monopolies and restoring free competition. Europe let them grow until they developed such great economic power that the people demanded a remedy. Unfortunately, the remedy being adopted in Europe today, as it was under both Fascists and Communists, is not to break up the cartels, but simply to transfer the monopoly control to the Government.

WHERE CLOSE CONTROL FAILS

Some of our pseudo-liberals want us to adopt substantially the same answer through a "planned economy" even though it should be clear by now that a free economy will always outproduce a controlled economy. The reason is simple.

When an industry is controlled by a monopoly or by government, one man, or at the most a very small group of men, must make all decisions in that industry. If the top man is conservative he will be very slow about trying new equipment and techniques. And if control is political all kinds of considerations unrelated to business will enter into his decisions. If the controlling individual or group is of a radical turn it may wreck the whole industry by a series of ill-considered experiments.

MUST BE CHECKED, DIFFUSED

Under our competitive system the decisions on new techniques and equipment are made, not by any single individual or small group, but by hundreds, and in some industries, thousands of individual managers. No ill-considered experiment can wreck the whole industry, and progress does not depend on the judgment and initiative of one man, but of many hundreds or thousands.

Free competition has its problems, but it surely will outproduce any "planned economy."

Nowhere does the confused thinking and lack of real principles among this pseudo-liberal group show up more clearly than in consideration of the labor-relations problems we face today. Real liberals always have opposed great concentrations of irresponsible power, whether political or economic, as dangerous to freedom.

PUBLIC INTEREST PARAMOUNT

And it doesn't matter whether capitalists, labor leaders, or bureaucrats wield the power. It must be checked, diffused, and made responsible to the public interest.

We can imagine the screams that would come from the Wallace-Pepper crowd if 2,000 coal operators were forced to close all the mines because the leaders of their monopoly organization decided, in a period of critical shortage that the public must pay 50 percent more for coal or get none.

Yet when John L. Lewis uses exactly the same monopoly power to make exactly the same kind of demand on the people members of the Wallace-Pepper group are strangely silent. Their pseudo-liberalism gives out a very tinny sound when struck firmly by a principle.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chronicle of January 6 contains an editorial entitled "Statehood for Hawaii."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I have asked permission to insert this editorial in the RECORD. It reads as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Congress should authorize statehood for Hawaii, as Hawaii's Delegate JOSEPH FARRINGTON intends to ask at the current session.

Assuming that FARRINGTON represents majority sentiment among people of the islands, we can think of no grounds upon which refusal could rest.

Since acquisition in 1898, the islands have grown so in stature and importance, economically, industrially, and strategically that in those terms they represent an addition from which we draw strength and security.

It has been argued in the past that the islands' population was not homogeneous, and could not, therefore, be assimilated into the American culture. Certainly, Hawaii contains many and intermingled racial strains, and strains we are accustomed to thinking of as alien.

But the question of assimilable racial characteristics cannot be sanely considered except in fundamentals. In the things which really count are Hawaiians and mainland Americans incompatible?

The answer, as Farrington says, was furnished in the dark days between December 7, 1941, and the turn of the war tide. Presented with a unique opportunity to display alien and anti-American traits with disastrous effect, the populace of Hawaii closed ranks and conducted itself as the American unit that it is. Still further, the all-Japanese regiment from Hawaii, the Four Hundred and Forty-second, gave proof of loyalty which may be measured by its blind, armless and legless veterans as well as by the high contribution of life.

Indeed, just how American is the orientation of Hawaiians, is implicit in their appeal. They are not asking, as a truly alien people would, to be freed of American connection, but to be confirmed in it.

That the closest connection should be maintained, if for reasons of strategy alone, will be disputed by none. Since there is to be a close connection, two considerations argue for statehood. It is the course of enlightened self-interest, since we would have everything to lose by haughtiness, and it is only the recognition and Federal representation to which such an important national integer is entitled.

It is nineteenth-century nonsense to hold back on the score that the islands are not contiguous. The cable, wireless, telephone, and airplane have written new definitions of contiguity; Hawaii is closer to Washington today than Utah was a quarter century ago.

On all scores, it is a natural union, and we should end the anomaly which has kept Hawaii voteless.

Mr. Speaker, when Hawaii voluntarily became a part of the United States there was an implied promise, morally binding upon us, that when the people of those happy isles were morally and economically fitted for statehood they would be admitted to the Union as one of the sovereign States of the United States of America. Hawaii has met this test according to the severest standards for statehood that can be applied. Some people were fearful that the heterogeneous population of Hawaii under the stress of national emergency would not meet the high standard of patriotism of mainland Americans.

We have been through the crucible of war and the citizens of Hawaii, irrespective of their racial origin, have proven to be true and loyal Americans in the finest sense of that word.

Our Immigration Policy and Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the National Coordinating Committee for the Admis-

sion of 100,000 Homeless Jews, Sunday, January 5, 1947:

It is a sad commentary on our social fiber that a conference of this kind is necessary. True, we recoiled in horror when we read the stories of the Nazi brutalities and massacres. Most certainly, most certainly, we did not approve. But what did we do about it, we the generous, open-hearted, kind people of the United States? What are we doing about it? Isn't it time we asked, "Where is the conscience of America?"

The dispossessed Jews of Europe have become faceless people. We have fallen into a way of thinking about them in the mass and so have stopped realizing that each displaced Jew is an individual, a human being with blood, muscle, and sinew. Each day that is brought back to me anew. Into my office every hour in the day come letters of heart-rending appeal to help some loved ones to come to the United States. One is the only surviving member of his family; another has watched her husband and children go to their death in some inferno; still another pleads for the chance to live again in dignity, to earn his bread, to breathe freely again.

That is why I say this conference is a sad, no, rather a bitter commentary on our lack of conscience. No conference of this kind should have been necessary. Years ago we should have begun to open our doors to the desperate victims of the foul Nazi ideology. It is truly amazing how we talked around the problem, around and around it, and never talked about it straightforwardly. Yes, a trickle came through. And, yes, we admitted en masse a thousand persons and put them in a camp at Oswego as if they were of a strange, contaminating breed.

There exists a curious conflict in the American attitude toward the refugees, a conflict between generosity and fear. On the one hand, we pride ourselves on our tradition of being an asylum for the persecuted. On the other hand, we fear the alien, we fear competition for jobs, the aliens' impact upon our society. It is this conflict that has paralyzed us.

Between the years 1930 and 1946 approximately two and one-half million immigrants could have been admitted within the structure of our immigration laws. In the 17-year period, only a half million quota immigrants were admitted. You can, therefore, readily see that in asking for the admission of 100,000 Jews into the United States we are not being overbold, nor even ripping apart the intent of Congress when it framed the immigration laws, even those laws which have been characterized as "numerically restrictive as well as automatically selective."

Both congressional and Executive action are called for. In the past 12 months even with Executive action by President Truman only 6,213 refugees were admitted to these shores from central and eastern Europe. The annual immigration quotas set for these areas is 39,000. So, again, even within the frame of our immigration statutes, we have not taken the action that sheer humanity demands of us.

I have, therefore, on the opening of Congress introduced four bills dealing with the admission of displaced persons and refugees into the United States. One calls for the admission of 250,000 displaced persons and refugees who shall be admitted to the United States without regard to nationality. In the issuance of such visas, priority shall be granted in accordance with the length of time an applicant for a visa has been a displaced person or refugee. The second bill makes available to certain European nationalities having small quotas the unused parts of the annual quotas of European countries having larger quotas. For instance, Great Britain has an annual quota of 65,721, Germany has an annual quota of 27,370. In the year 1944, for example, only 2,303 of these allotted Great Britain quotas were used. Poland, on the other hand, has an annual quota of 6,524; Hungary, an annual quota of 869. These latter quotas are very many times oversubscribed. It is the purpose of my bill to allot the unused quotas not subscribed for by countries like Great Britain to the smaller quota countries. A third bill calls for the use of all unused quotas since the administration of the Immigration Act of 1924 by displaced persons and refugees. The fourth bill calls for permitting those refugees who did come here on temporary visas to remain permanently in this country. I have witnessed too many tragic and hardship cases of persons who are threatened with deportation proceedings to ignore that aspect of the problem.

The fact of your presence here today is proof positive that you are aware of the need to take action. Whether these bills become law or whether they will just lie gathering dust in the committee desk depends to a very significant extent upon you. By the very nature of its composition, our Congress must be responsive to public will and opinion. You must plan your campaign of education; you must make known articulately and vigorously your viewpoint to the Members of the House and Senate. You can induce newspapers to publish editorials thereon, magazines to feature articles, inspire broadcasts that will offset the antiquated, creaking notions of such organizations like the Daughters of the American Revolution and the vicious statements contained in the Meader report.

The report made by George Meader on the displaced Jews in the United States zone to the Senate War Investigating Committee is a distorted and ugly one. It has not been officially released or adopted by the committee, but it has already done incalculable harm. He seems to have taken his cue from General Morgan, whose unsavory viewpoint was exploded not so long ago in connection with UNRRA activities, and which ultimately led to the dismissal of General Morgan from that organization. After the sincere revelations in the Eisenhower, Harrison, Rifkind, and Pauley reports, it is not difficult to discern the chicanery in the Meader report for those of us who have studied the situation throughout these black years. The Meader report, however, is fashioned to inflame prejudice and place the picture out of focus. It is apparent that Mr. Meader is unfit to continue his post as counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee, and it is my guess that the committee itself will not countenance his kind of dishonest performance much longer.

Another detractor and defamer of these displaced persons is the distinguished Senator REVERCOMB, of West Virginia, who, in a report to the Republican Senatorial Steering Committee, opposed what he calls the upsetting of the present national origins quotas because many of those who seek entrance into this country have little concept of our form of government. Many come from lands where communism has had its first growth. He then said it would be a tragic blunder to bring into our midst those imbued with a communistic line of thought. This is contrary to the facts, as I have them. The displaced persons are fleeing from Communist lands. They dread communism. The Senator then suggested as an alternative that these people should be reestablished in Europe. He wants them to return to the graveyards of their loved ones who were slaughtered in cold blood by Hitler and his satellites. He wants them to go back to the pogrom atmosphere of Poland.

But it is the Meaders and the like who, unfortunately, may have the controlling word in the new Congress. It is these individuals who threaten not only to kill off liberal immigration measures but who seek to seal our shores to any immigration from any source.

The national commander of the American Legion, Paul H. Griffiths, is another person whose words of opposition to admission of displaced persons must be watched carefully. He objects to the admission of any displaced persons because they might take away jobs from veterans. I believe Colonel Griffiths is inventing a bogy. The admission of these refugees could not possibly hurt the veteran. He is himself in most cases a descendant of immigrant stock. We ask their admission on the grounds of humanity. Far from hurting the veteran, admission will help the veteran and all others because our years of greatest prosperity have been years when vast numbers of immigrants came to the United States. The admission of these unfortunate people, to my mind, would be an invaluable investment for the whole country.

We have waited 13 years for America to revive its tradition as a land of refuge, a haven for those fleeing political and religious persecution. Certainly, Thomas Jefferson would say now as he said in 1801, "Shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our forefathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe?"

I like the way the Washington Post in its editorial of New Year's Day put it, "Knowledge that the United States had forsworn its indifference would be the best New Year hope displaced persons could have. Aside from the appeal of humanitarianism there is a wealth of skills, culture, and potential good citizenship in these camps that on practical grounds ought to be considered."

That is a healthy sign. The CIO resolution which urges liberalization of our immigration policy is likewise a healthy sign. It does much to blast the notion that a more liberal immigration policy would injury our economic structure, deprive our citizens of jobs, and impoverish our opportunities. The soundness of our economy is much more dependent upon factors like international trade, high productivity, adequate purchasing power, on fewer monopolies than it is dependent upon a static, unchanging population.

But it is an old, old cry, raised in every generation, that American frontiers are gone. Such facile, unsound thinking on the part of the DAR and the like is quite discouraging, considering the influence on our immigration policies. The theory has been exploded time and again, but it keeps buzzing back like a mosquito behind the ear.

What is left out are the contributions of the refugees to America, the enrichment of the cultural and scientific life of the Nation, the formation of new enterprises employing American labor, the introduction of new skills to America and new processes and, of course, new customers to keep our productivity high.

Curiously enough, you will find that waves of immigration accompanied the economic expansion of the United States. The 1848 wave coincided with the westward movement of the Nation; the 1870 wave rose with the program of reconstruction and railroad growth, and the wave of immigration at the beginning of the century carried with it our corporate development and the expansion of our major industries.

I reemphasize that the demand for the admission of 100,000 Jews into the United States is not an excessive one. I pledge that I shall do everything in my power as a Member of Congress and as ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee; I shall use every means at my disposal to accomplish this resolve. In the knowledge of the preciousness of the gift of human life I can do no less.

The Need for Grain Cars in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this means of calling attention to the serious shortage of cars for shipping grain which now exists in Nebraska. This problem is of such magnitude that the Office of Defense Transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civilian Production Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and all other Federal agencies should join hands in seeking an immediate solution.

The Honorable Richard H. Larson, chairman of the Nebraska State Railway Commission, writes me as follows:

The situation is far more serious than it has ever been in my 6 years' experience on the commission.

Illustrative of the present state of affairs is the situation of one large country elevator, which would require over 4 years to empty its elevator of wheat if the cars were received as they have been over a 6-week period. Another typical situation in the wet-corn area is that of an elevator with a standing order for 10 cars during the month of December, and only receiving one.

The solution to this problem may lie in the aiding in the manufacture of new cars, the repairing of old cars, seeing that all cars manufactured are used in this country, more thought in the carrying out of the Government's grain-export problem, preventing loaded cars from remaining for long periods at seaboard points or elsewhere, sending empties to this area under emergency orders, or by returning to the railroads serving this area cars now in use elsewhere in the United States.

Farmers are finding it increasingly difficult, or impossible, to dispose of their corn. Interstate Commerce Commission car allocation orders are not functioning because elevator men cannot permit their elevators to become technically blocked.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Nebraska delegation is extremely anxious that this matter have immediate and thorough attention.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article which I contributed to the December 1946 issue of the magazine Baptist Leader, a magazine for church and church-school workers. The article is entitled "Building for Tomorrow," and it is on the subject of America's combating juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING FOR TOMORROW

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

The headlines today scream about the postwar crime wave. A continuous stream of stories and pictures on murder, rape, and robbery, fills the press. We read that almost 6,000,000 Americans—1 in every 23 of our inhabitants—have been arrested one or more times and fingerprinted. Every 20 seconds last year somebody in our country committed a crime.

Most disturbing of all are the statistics and stories of juvenile delinquency. J. Edgar Hoover, able Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, soberly tells us that more persons aged 17 are arrested than in any other age group. Next in order of most numerous delinquents are the 18-, 19-, 21-, and 22-year olds.

The chief investigator states that those under 21 represent 62 percent of all car thieves, 51 percent of all burglars, 30 percent of all rapists, 26 percent of all arsonists, 15 percent of all murderers. The arrest of girls under 18 years of age has increased 198 percent since the last peacetime year of 1939, while arrests of boys under 18 has increased 101 percent for drunkenness and driving while intoxicated, 72 percent for assault, 70 percent for rape, 48 percent for homicide, 39 percent for robbery. At age 15, 15 percent of boy and girl criminals had previous fingerprint records. And this figure rose steadily to 42 percent at age 20.

Mr. Hoover "debunks" the fear that returning servicemen will contribute to this crime wave. Rather he sees in them a potent, patriotic ally to save from a wayward life "the little tough guys" and girls who grew up while our men were overseas on military duty.

But what is wrong with America? Although we won the war abroad, we are losing the war for public safety and morality at home. We remember the stresses and strains of wartime living, the disorganization and break-down of the home—families uprooted by migration, fathers and brothers serving far away, mothers busily at work in war plants, youngsters earning and squandering easy money. We know that the aftermath of war has always brought a moral let-down and an increase in lawlessness. Now we are paying the tragic indirect price of war.

ALL IS NOT LOST

But neither increased adult nor juvenile delinquency are grounds for hysteria or defeatism. Twenty-two of every 23 of our people are still honest and law abiding. Many of the "twenty-threeards" have learned the error of their former ways.

Moreover, the counterattack on lawlessness has been launched by the United States Department of Justice and by localities, cities, and States working together. Public-spirited citizens, child- and social-welfare groups and enlightened officials in almost every American community are teaming up to lick the housing crisis (a major factor in fostering youthful offenses), to provide the most modern recreation facilities, to confiscate or neutralize dangerous weapons (many of which are war souvenirs, to eliminate harmful influences from the community—the bawdy entertainment places, the cesspool bar and grill, the salacious literature, the objectionable characters.

New preventive and corrective techniques and institutions are being devised, tested, weighed in the balance and judged accordingly. The juvenile court, specially devoted to handling young offenders, has long proved its worth as has the special juvenile detention facility.

Recently a Dearborn, Mich., judge instituted and proved the worth of a school for delinquent mothers and fathers. The judge established a parents' clinic as the answer to a particularly ugly case wherein a mother appeared before him, charged with having abandoned a year-old baby for 36 hours and having taken another child, aged 3, on a tour of taverns. The wayward mother became the first of a long series of parents who were placed on probation and educated in proper parenthood at the school. Under an old State law discovered by this judge, appropriate punishment was authorized against parents who have contributed to child delinquency. Attendance at school is the enlightened punishment.

Similar laws have been invoked in San Francisco and Omaha, to cite two instances, and have been successfully applied in parents' schools.

United States Attorney General Clark has outlined a new probation program for young first-offenders, too. Under this program, the offenders' criminal slate is wiped clean after 3 years of good behavior on probation, and these youngsters are thus spared the shame and guilt of a criminal record which frequently encourages a repetition of crime. It should be noted that 70 percent of adult criminals were juvenile criminals.

But it is you as an individual American mother or future mother, together with your mate or future mate, who must still bear the primary responsibility for curbing juvenile delinquency. So, too, must I, as a parent of four grown-up children and a grandparent of four young children. We can neither evade nor deny this great responsibility.

Your own son or daughter and mine may be as honest as the day is long, but there is always room for improvement in ourselves and them. There is a Chinese proverb which states that if each of us were to clean in front of our own doorsteps, the whole world would soon be clean. The idea is sound, for all too often delinquency begins in the home. Before we can criticize others let us look to our own homes.

There is always more work that you and I can do in cooperating with other parents and with church, school, and other authorities in checking lawlessness.

WHAT WE CAN DO

But our problem of juvenile delinquency cannot and must not be isolated from the problems of sound parenthood. There is only a thin line dividing the child who is arrested by the police, from the child who engages at home or elsewhere in minor thefts, lying, and malicious mischief. The needs of a delinquent child—for mastery, security, adventure—are the same as those of a righteous child, except that in the former, they have become so intensified as to burst out in transgression.

Juvenile delinquency then, is not a problem about "other people's children." It is a problem about your child and mine. It is completely apparent that even the so-called best of homes spawn delinquents.

I am interested in successful parenthood not only as a parent and grandparent, but as a former three-term district attorney of my county, as a citizen and as a United States Senator who is anxious to save for the community the precious young souls whose contribution might otherwise be lost because of their crimes. I am interested in helping to make the American home the bulwark of our society that it should be and still is.

I believe the key to successful parenthood, and indirectly to checking juvenile delinquency, is the attitude of the parent. If a mother regards the career of rearing a child as the most creative, the most spiritually rewarding, the most important career in the world, if she accepts its inspiring challenges for self-growth and for stimulating

the growth of the delicate being in her trust, she can hardly fail in her joyful endeavor.

If, on the other hand, she regards motherhood as an almost unmitigated drudgery, if she exaggerates its necessary burdens and minimizes its compensations, she will have set the stage for failure.

If we can see through the child's own inquiring eyes, if we can understand his tender receptiveness, we will not fail to provide him with the best within our power, we will not fail to fan its tiny flame of hope and legitimate desire. So, too, if we display in our personalities and in our deeds the ideals which we desire in our children, we will most assuredly implant them in young minds and hearts. The child's mind is like a sensitive sound camera; it registers almost everything around it and plays it back.

We must bear in mind the old truth that if we fill our homes with scenes of tenderness, affection, and teamwork, then the child will most invariably show these qualities. If the child's ears are filled with gracious words, constructive expressions, and noble thoughts, his lips will speak the same. To be sure, the outside environment—a neighborhood gang or faulty schooling—may tend to corrupt the child, but their influences can be counteracted, given favorable home conditions.

However, if a child sees family strife and hears profanity, gossip, and negative thoughts of fear, worry, and anxiety voiced throughout the home, he will probably tend to reproduce these miserable conditions in his own life.

Years ago when our own youngsters were very small, I hung up a sign in our front hall which read, "Little children are growing here." I wanted all who entered our home to contribute to the best possible environment for our dear little ones.

Perhaps you remember the beautiful verse:

"I took a piece of living clay
And touched it gently day by day
And molded with my power and art
A young child's soft and yielding heart."

A CHECKLIST FOR PARENTS

How can we be sure that we are molding well that soft and yielding heart? Here, as a sort of checklist, are four groups of questions whose answers may help us to evaluate ourselves as good parents. These questions involve the hallmarks of a straight-living child. If you can give affirmative answers to these questions, you may take much satisfaction. If, as is probable, you and I cannot answer them with unqualified "yeses," we must both spur ourselves on to greater achievement as parents. In doing so, we will help to keep our own and other youngsters on the straight and narrow path.

1. Is the child healthy? Has he received the love and care that make, for example, for good digestion and good nerves? Does the child have wholesome habits, a love of nature's great medicines of air, sun, and water, and a respect for his own pure body so that he will tend himself and feed himself with due care?

Consider how the delinquent child is so often the ill child—nervous, with poor posture, and poor digestion. The poisons of his body and mind conspire to rob him of the possibilities for good living. The indifference of parents, their neglect of the child's health thus reaps bitter fruit in more than the child's recurrent sickness. On the other hand, anxious parents may go to such an extreme of health mania that they make nervous wrecks of themselves and of their children.

If, however, your child has been enabled to enjoy the fullest blessings of radiant health, you have given him a priceless gift and have predisposed him to right thinking and acting.

2. Is the child happy? Do his countenance and his actions reflect natural good cheer? Does he realistically strive with faith and confidence to overcome his little defeats and misfortunes and any physical handicaps which he may have? Does he tend to see the bright side of things? Does he pursue his hobbies, his school work, his social play with zest, enthusiasm, and a singing heart?

Remember that the delinquent child is unhappy. His mind is a battleground of seething conflicts. He meets his day-to-day problems with defeatism and despair. He fails to find adventure in tracing ideas to their lair. He finds little that is constructive and stimulating in normal schooling and recreation.

If your child has a sense of humor, a spirit of honest fun, however sober he may be otherwise, if he enjoys the adventure of living, then you may indeed mark these to your credit.

3. Is the child filled with noble purpose? Does he have an attitude of service, of industry, of thrift? Does he seek beauty and charm and enlightenment in worship, in nature, in friends, in books, in magazines, on the radio, in the press, and in living not simply in the senses? Does he feel his responsibility to himself—to realize his fullest potentialities, to grow to his fullest dignity, to achieve? Does he recognize his obligations to his parents, to his community, to his Nation, to his Creator?

A delinquent child is selfish, a creature who has not learned the joy of giving. He is a child who has not felt the thrill of honest work. He is often the "underprivileged child" of the well-to-do, allowed to idle and waste, and denied his primary birthright to butter his own bread. He is a child whose development has been arrested. He has been stopped from acquiring and refining socially useful skills and information. The delinquent child has failed, too, to sense and respect his obligations to his mother and father, to his neighbors, to the land which has given him unparalleled freedom, and to his Maker. He may have the attitude that his parents, his community, and country owe him a living.

If you have instilled in your child the love of honest labor, of beauty, of service, you have enabled him to realize the divine meaning of our existence. Robert Browning once said, "Life has meaning, and to find its meaning is my meat and drink."

4. Does the child have self-discipline? Are honesty, integrity, reliability, truth, a part of his being? Does he know and live the virtue and rewards of self-moderation in all things? Does he feel a yearning for order and propriety?

A delinquent child is without inner checks and balances, a child which may have been taught the "thou shalt nots" but who never has known the true reasons for them. He is a child who has known only an outer discipline of father's strap, mother's slap, and teacher's punishment. He is a child whose senses, passions, and appetites run riot in excesses.

If you have encouraged self-discipline in your child without attempting to make him a little saint, you have given him the ultimate inner policeman which will insure righteousness all his days.

These questions, then, comprise a sort of report card which we as parents may mark for ourselves.

If our report cards are worthy, and if we seek ever to improve them, we will have helped to solve America's crime problem and, of greater importance, to insure the continued well-being of the Republic.

Carter Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a brilliant and eloquent address delivered by Representative J. LINDSAY ALMOND, Jr., at the Virginia State Democratic convention in Richmond on September 5, in which he paid tribute to the character and record of one of the greatest American statesmen, my late colleague, Senator Carter Glass.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, on the 28th day of May 1946, after a lingering illness, borne with characteristic patience and fortitude, the greatest Virginian of his day and generation answered the final mandatory summons of the only Commander in Chief his spirit and conscience ever knew. That dauntless son of Virginia, through his indomitable will, the sheer power of his intellect, his impeccable concept of honor and duty, and his uncanny and constructive mastery of the science of statecraft, had written his name and fame indelibly across the scroll of the affections, esteem, and respect of the American people.

Bowing to the acknowledged supremacy of divine omniscience, the democracy of Virginia today, in convention assembled, pays tribute to him whose life and achievements epitomize an immeasurable contribution to the efficacy of representative democracy and a priceless heritage to the posterity of liberty, justice, right, and freedom—the illustrious Carter Glass, of Lynchburg.

Stricken with grief because of his passing, Virginians—yea, Americans everywhere—with commendable humility and reverent pride, can point with unalloyed satisfaction to the rich and constructive contribution which he so unselfishly made, on the altar of public service, to his beloved State and country.

Many voices will be raised in the halls of this convention today, tomorrow, until the sound of the chairman's gavel announces adjournment sine die.

His voice will not be among them.

His was a familiar voice. It has been heard in every Virginia Democratic convention, save one, in almost half a century. Whether raised in debate or in exhortation, in denunciation, or in eulogy, whether cool in reasoned argument, or fiery with emotion, it was listened to. It might be heeded, or its advice might be rejected, but it was listened to. There was none who could ever ignore it, or be indifferent to it.

It will not be heard again. It is stilled forever.

But it will be remembered, and the memory of it can serve. To those who pause and listen to its loud silence, the courage in that voice will give courage, the wisdom of it will give wisdom, and the devotion of it to its party will engender devotion.

Physically diminutive, intellectually a colossus—Carter Glass in championing the cause of right and justice in the arena of democracy possessed a heart of adamant and a soul of fire. A master of sarcasm, irony, and invective, when aroused in battle against

wrong and oppression, yet his great heart pulsated with a genial warmth of friendship, compassion, sympathy, and understanding that exuded in the contagion of his personality and made him the idol of his fellowmen in all walks of life.

Carter Glass was a man of integrity and of courage. There was no inducement that could be offered, no pressure that could be applied, that could make him go against his conviction of right. He could accept the decision of his people at the polls with equanimity, but could not be swayed thereby from the course his mind and conscience had dictated. His own decision was for him to make and for him to follow. His own opinions were his to form, and by them he was guided. The few who attempted to influence him wrongly, to offer reward of any kind, got nothing for their temerity but his scorn and contempt, expressed as only he knew how to express them. Attempts to intimidate him were a call to battle. They succeeded only in arousing his spirit of contest to higher level.

His rapier thrusts in debate, the power of his reasoning, the clear logic and impelling force of his conclusions emanated from his masterful wielding of the flaming sword of truth which sought no quarter, gave none, and brooked no compromise with chicanery and deceit.

Carter Glass loved Virginia. Loving her, he served her. He did not serve intermittently; he did not serve perfunctorily. He did not serve for gain. He served all the days of his life, to the best of his ability, and for the sake of service.

He was born in Virginia. He was steeped in Virginia's history. He lived through more than half of her life as a member of this Union of States, and of some of the greatest events of her existence he could say, "A part of which I saw, a part of which I was." All his American ancestors were Virginians. In Virginia, they toiled and suffered and, in a measure, prospered. To Virginia, he owed much; to Virginia, he gave much.

Carter Glass loved the Democratic Party. Born as the Nation, Virginians had done so much to make great, free, and democratic, hurtled toward civil war and the arbitrament of differences by the sword, spending his childhood in the midst of a conflict in which Virginia gave her all, growing to manhood through the days of reconstruction, he gave his allegiance to the party that rid his beloved State of the carpetbagger and the scalawag, and set it on the course that led to restoration of liberty, renewed fertility of land and industrial progress. He saw the party beaten, he saw it resurgent, he saw it in defeat and in triumph. In the evil days he suffered; in the days of victory he gloried. In all that, too, he could have said he had a part. Why should he not give to that party his allegiance? Why should he not hold faithful to that allegiance to the day he passed into the dark shadow from which his emergence was through the doors of death into that bright land in which his faith was strong and abiding?

The independence of thought, of deed and of spirit, which ally and opponent agreed was one of his great virtues, could not break that loyalty, nor dim it. His independence was manifest within the party. Deeming it essential to the welfare of the State and Nation he loved so well, and to which were given his highest loyalty, he worked for it, fought for it, and sought to make it strong. When it seemed to him to stray from the path of principle and of honest conviction, he sought with others of like mind to lead it back into the true course, but assaults from without he repelled with all his glowing faith in its eventual redemption and with all his unwavering faith in its high mission. Foes within his party he could fight, but never the party.

For he was ever confident that that party would continue to give to the Nation the great service it had been privileged to give under the great Democratic leaders whose disciple he was, with whom he is worthy to be named.

The old adage that the office should seek the man voices an aspiration rather than a reality, but the aspiration came almost to fruition in the career of Carter Glass. He was drafted for a seat in the Virginia Senate. He was virtually pushed by his friends into a seat in the Constitutional Convention of 1901–02, in which he played an active, aggressive and effective part. He was first elected to the House of Representatives while sick in a hospital in a far-away State, and never thereafter had any real opposition. He sought a seat in the United States Senate, and, as if fate were determined that the record should be preserved, he was defeated. Appointed later to the Senate without any effort on his part, he was returned at every election without a contest within his party. He was tapped by President Woodrow Wilson for the post of Secretary of the Treasury while out of the country.

It is a fact not often emphasized that the greatest political fights of this great Virginian's career were for party, for principle, for candidates other than himself. The speeches made by him that will be remembered, some of them as a part of any history of the Nation, were of this kind. In the constitutional convention they were for reform of the suffrage laws. In the House of Representatives they were for the reform of the currency and banking laws. In the Senate they were for the integrity of the courts or for more vigorous prosecution of his country's wars. In party conventions they were for Democratic Party principles, for financial sanity, for the candidate of his heart and mind for the party nomination for President. On the rostrum they were for Woodrow Wilson, for Alfred E. Smith, for Franklin D. Roosevelt. Possibly the greatest speech of his life was that delivered for the first election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the great American President who preceded him to the grave by months. Or, paradox.cally, the speech he made in opposition to that President's pet project, the reorganization of the Supreme Court.

Member of the Virginia Assembly, member of the Virginia Constitutional Convention, Member of the National House of Representatives, Secretary of the Treasury, Member of the Senate of the United States, this man through 50 years of public service fought and worked and strived, sometimes to the point of physical exhaustion, with an unselfishness and a lack of personal ambition rare even in the best of public servants.

These are the things that easily come to mind when the public life of Carter Glass is reviewed. These are the events and the battles and the strivings. In these are included his constructive legislation in State and Nation, the suffrage clause of the Virginia Constitution, the value to the Nation in time of stress of the Federal Reserve Act, the speeches polemical and the speeches explanatory of abstruse financial theories, the floating of the Victory loan after the close of the First World War, when the Nation was weary and defeatists predicted failure.

But none of these constructive legislative and executive efforts and none of these platform triumphs, nor all of them, constitute his greatest contribution to his beloved Virginia and to his beloved country. That contribution was not of the material, but of the immaterial, not of the flesh but of the spirit. It was his moral courage, his intellectual integrity, his absolute disregard of and contempt for the political consequences of the course of action upon which conscience and conviction had impelled him to embark. It was these characteristics that gave him influence, more than any of his great qualities of mind. It was these things that gave him the respect of his colleagues, of opponent as well as of ally, of the people at home among whom he was reared and with whom he lived through the 88 years of his life.

Carter Glass stood firmly always for the things that are good in life. He stood for the eternal verities, the rock-ribbed concepts of Jeffersonian democracy, the underlying fundamental principles on which this great Nation of individual initiative and freedom of enterprise has grown to be the most potent factor in all of the world. His consuming ambition was to make his country bigger, better, and stronger—economically, politically, and morally. No man could be motivated by a purpose more noble or an ambition more lofty.

This man spoke out when there was something to be said. He acted forthrightly with promptness, unwavering purpose, and clear-cut decision when there was something to be done. Immovable before the surging torrent of criticism, unperturbed by the dissent of friendship, uninfluenced by the hope of political preferment, magnanimous in victory, devoid of recrimination in defeat, modest and humble under the avalanche of praise, laudation, and honor showered upon him, Carter Glass faced every issue throughout a long, eventful, and remarkable public career, and from his deathbed he handed back to the people of Virginia, whom he loved with zealous devotion and served with deep fidelity to trust, his warrior's helmet and shield without tarnish, without blemish, undefiled, without semblance of shame or taint of dishonor, but glistening, gleaming bright with the brilliance of the noonday sun. His place, forged by the dint of his own effort, is safe and secure in the annals of Virginia, to whose escutcheon he brings honor and credit and glory as he walks down the corridors of time to fame's eternal camping ground, there to answer the roll call of Virginia's and the Nation's great, with Washington, Madison, Jefferson, Lee, Wilson, and that innumerable caravan who have served faithfully, honorably, and well.

May his spirit brood over this convention and the memory of the qualities which made him great help to guide its deliberations.

Carter Glass would be the first to say that he owed much to the Democratic Party of Virginia, to the loyalty with which it supported him in his battles in national party conventions and in battles on the floor of the Congress of the United States, to the love which led it to present him to the Nation as one worthy of its highest honor. But we here who have followed his career know that the Democratic Party owes him much.

As a token payment of that debt, and as a reminder to future generations of the love and honor in which we, in company with Virginians of all parties, hold his memory, let it be hereby resolved:

First. That this convention voices its pride that the party it here represents can boast of such a man as Carter Glass as a member and leader; and

Second. That his strength of character, honesty of purpose, nobility of soul, courage of conviction, forensic power, sanity of judgment, tenacity of principle, depth of ethical concept, political and personal integrity, devotion to duty, loyalty to friendship, love for his country, and unwavering fealty to his God will ever stand as the bulwarks of his greatness, the vehicles of his accomplishment, and as a perpetual monument to his memory; and

Third. That it is the hope of this convention that whoever be its choice to succeed him in the Senate of the United States, Virginia will continue to be served with the same courage, the same ability, the same

devotion, and with as much honor to the States; and

Fourth. That Virginia Democrats here in convention assembled, pause for a moment in silent tribute to a great Democrat, a great Virginian, a great American—the inimitable, the indomitable, the invincible Carter Glass.

A New President's Unequaled Opportunity: America Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New President's Unequaled Opportunity: America Unlimited," written by John S. Knight, of the Knight newspapers, and published in the Detroit Free Press of November 24, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW PRESIDENT'S UNEQUALED OPPORTUNITY: AMERICA UNLIMITED

As President Truman sits in the sun at Key West, plaintively diagnosing the ailments of the Democratic Party and wondering what old "Jawn" L. Lewis will do next, the idea must have occurred to him that he is at least partially responsible for his amazing slide from the popularity peak he enjoyed shortly after taking office.

Harry Truman, good American and patriotic citizen, had an unparalleled opportunity to place country above politics, to lead rather than be pushed around, to carry over into the days of peace some of the unity of purpose that rewarded our supreme war effort.

Actually, the President has achieved few of these goals, not because he failed to recognize their worth, but simply for the reason that he is not a leader of men in the sense that Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and our late President have so been acclaimed by the historians.

There is a lesson in Mr. Truman's travails which the Republican Party, flushed with victory, should note well. The same lesson might have been learned in the middle of President Hoover's term, but neither the great engineer nor his supporters in Congress ever grasped even its fundamentals.

The lesson is that the people of America honor, respect, and follow their President in direct proportion to the quality of his leadership.

If he is a little man, they quickly sense it. If his course is wavering and indecisive, they soon lose faith.

In view of the recent election returns, all of this must now be quite clear to Harry Truman as he sits out his feud with John L. Lewis on the Keys of southern Florida. Let us hope that it is equally clear to the Republicans who have had 16 long years in which to reach a few conclusions of their own.

Unless the newly elected Republican Congress fails woefully in the next 2 years, either Dewey, Taft, Bricker, Stassen, Vandenberg, or Warren will be the next President of the United States. There are other possibilities including Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, but these six are currently leading the field.

Without expressing any personal preference, I would like to see a President elected who would do these things:

1. Issue a proclamation to this effect:

"As the newly elected President of the United States, I pledge you my word that each and every act of mine will be based upon one premise and one only: Is this good for my country?

"Whether or not I am reelected is of no great moment, but at this stage of our history it is all important that the country be given an administration free from the yoke of political expediency and the organized strength of powerful pressure groups. Every citizen will be guaranteed his full constitutional rights, regardless of position, wealth, or power.

"I shall yield to no man, group, element, or party in my zeal to place patriotism and love of country ahead of any other consideration."

2. Appoint Cabinet members who are eminently qualified to become the administrative heads of their departments. Give them full responsibility for the conduct of their departments but insist that the national welfare not be imperiled by factions within the Cabinet or individual loose talk.

In other words, demand that they function as a team in carrying out the policies laid down by the Congress and the Chief Executive.

3. Give the Vice President greater responsibilities than were originally contemplated in the Constitution, have him present at all Cabinet meetings, see that he is fully informed on every Presidential move, train him for Presidential succession in case the need may arise.

4. Take the lead in urging governmental economy. Have an adequate and conclusive study prepared showing just what useless functions of Government could be eliminated and then be ready to carry the fight to the people in case Congress should prove uncooperative.

5. Call management and labor together and tell them bluntly that the labor laws enacted by the Congress will be rigidly enforced and that there will be no appeasing of either side.

6. Insist upon a thorough-going reorganization of the State Department, which would develop men properly equipped for the position they hold either at home or abroad.

7. Draft first-rate men for important Government assignments and then support them up to the hilt.

8. Throw out the White House sycophants and build a small but loyal executive staff which would be completely in sympathy with the President's objectives and his "no politics" program.

9. Place White House press conferences on a dignified level and resolve to think twice before giving off-the-cuff opinions on questions that hadn't finally been determined.

10. Avoid silly junkets and political clambakes. Resolve to stay on the job and set an example for the rest of the country by giving a real sense of dignity to Government.

11. Restore the Supreme Court to its former high level by naming eminently well-qualified jurists, rather than politicians, to vacancies that may occur. Follow the same policy in appointments to the other Federal courts.

12. Work with congressional leaders of both parties and hold regular meetings for the furtherance of domestic and foreign policies required for the Nation's welfare.

13. Break up the quarreling between the Army and the Navy and demand an adequate program in which each branch of the service would play an important and honorable part.

Press for a single department of national defense in the interests of economy and the development of a real air force. Replace the boots-and-saddles generals and the battleship admirals with young, forward-looking officers who realize the world has shrunk.

14. Ban the practice of bureaucrats issuing rulings that properly should come from established courts of law.

15. See that all elements of society are treated equally but that all be compelled to obey the Federal statutes. Place no one class of society above another and avoid appeals to prejudice.

16. Endeavor to lead the country instead of following the election returns.

There are many other important resolutions that a President could make as he takes the oath of office but these points will convey the main idea.

A President who would approach his tasks with that sense of patriotism and humility might never be reelected but yet it is quite possible that he would prove to be the most popular and highly respected man of his time.

The people of America are not only willing but anxious to see the White House occupied by a man who, through his own actions, would help them regain their own sense of dignity and perspective.

The people, too, could help such a President by reorienting themselves. We hear too much griping about the future and too few expressions of faith in a country where industrial and social progress has gone hand in hand for the past 40 or 50 years.

Intolerance is once again on the march. The Jews are unjustly blamed for sins they never commit; Negroes as a group are condemned for the unsocial acts of a few and in some parts of the country even the Catholics come in for their share of abuse.

Since we possess every known blessing and advantage over other nations and an unlimited opportunity for world leadership, why can't these problems be solved if our hearts are right?

With the technological advances now in sight and a renewed faith in our democratic processes, there is no limit to America's future if we but have the will to work and the patience to understand the progressive steps by which a democratic form of capitalism evolves from one generation to another.

When we can raise our intellectual and tolerance levels above the chatter of the cocktail lounge and the gossip of the Tuesday Bridge Club, America Unlimited is ours for the asking.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

War Booms and Busts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, Judge Harold C. Kessinger, of Ridgewood, N. J., made an able and thought-provoking speech before the annual convention of the New Jersey Association of Schools of Business, on October 26, 1946, at the Military Park Hotel, Newark, N. J. His speech is worthy of reading and attention by every Member of Congress under the difficult conditions facing this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have Judge Kessinger's speech, under the title

"War Booms and Busts," inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Are we on the same old road?

Have we learned nothing, and will we repeat everything?

Will we continue on the tragic treadmill of war, boom, panic and war?

The American Republic was born in a panic.

American independence was declared July 4, 1776. Cornwallis surrendered October 19, 1781. When the couriers on lathered horses rode the Atlantic seaboard, proclaiming the good news of peace, it was the bad news for business.

The British Army had been here fighting us, but with gold to buy supplies; the French Army had been helping us, also with gold to buy supplies. Those outside the limited theater of hostilities had done a thriving business with all armies, including the Continental Army, named after the Continental Congress, a loose federation of Colony-States, and with no power either to raise troops or tax property.

In the chaos that followed the winning of the Revolution, creditors ran away and tried to hide from their debtors to avoid being paid off in wads of practically worthless paper money.

Farmers had livestock, but couldn't get enough money for it to pay their taxes to the various States of which they were citizens.

The farmers of western Massachusetts petitioned the legislature to create paper money based on horses and cattle. The petition was laughed down and voted down, and yet in our modern day we have had suggestions just as fantastic.

After being defeated by the law-makers, these Yankee farmers took matters in their own hands, just as Iowa farmers did over a century later, and started some "shotgun reforms." They raided the courts, broke them up, and drove them from their part of the state.

A Capt. Daniel Shays, veteran of the Revolutionary War, raised a band of 1,200 men, most of them former soldiers and attacked the arsenal at Springfield, Mass.

Thoughtful men in all the States were alarmed, aroused, and finally after the Shays Rebellion was put down, through a number of moves, not all of them too open and aboveboard, get enough delegates chosen to meet in Philadelphia, and after added effort got a majority of them to attend the meetings. Ultimately, after long debate, tense discussion, and many compromises, a constitution was agreed upon which, after more effort, far from unanimous, was adopted by enough of the States to become the Federal Charter.

Washington was elected President; Hamilton was appointed Secretary of the Treasury; and a solvent young nation was started on a very successful journey, in spite of wars, booms, panics, and wars.

Seven years after the War of 1812 we had a panic; nine years after the Mexican War; eight years after the Civil War; nine years after the Spanish-American War; eleven years after the First World War.

When you eat too much, you get a stomach ache; when you drink too much, you get a headache; when you go to any economic excess, you get an economic hang-over which we call a depression when it is little, and a panic when it is big.

When we have a war, the panic comes about 10 years after the war, preceded, of course, by a boom. Without a war to dislocate peacetime economy, it's about 20 years from one panic to another.

Before the panic of 1837, the people engaged in a feverish real-estate speculation. Wood lots in Maine jumped from $5 to $50 an acre. Three hundred and forty-seven new banks were started, most of them loaning money in ridiculous amounts upon real estate. When the panic broke, they all suspended specie payment.

North Carolina farms were sold for 2 percent of their supposed value; Mississippi repudiated its State debt; Pennsylvania suspended payment of interest; laws were passed in Western States to prevent property being sold for debt.

Early in 1837 great firms in New York and New Orleans failed; cotton fell from 20 cents to 10; poorhouses were crowded; a mob of 5,000 men attacked the city hall in Boston.

The panic reached its lowest ebb in 1841, and finally ran its course.

The Mexican War was followed by a great boom in slaves, and 9 years after the war, preceded by a slave boom, we had the panic of 1857, which was not as severe as the preceding panic, lasting only 2 years.

In 1860 we had the Civil War. In 1865 the war was over. Gloomy predictions were made that the soldiers would never settle down, but the restless days were soon over; a great postwar boom led by the railroads was soon under way.

Yet, in 1873—8 years after the close of the Civil War—there came a great panic which lasted 6 years.

Even the smartest men didn't see it coming; William H. Vanderbilt, considered very farsighted, was paying $120 a ton for steel rails just before the crash. Jay Cooke failed; also Fisk and Hatch, Henry Clews & Co., Union Trust Co., and the textile house of the Sprague, of Providence, for a greater amount than the total State and municipal debts of the entire State of Rhode Island.

Without a war in between, we jump 20 years to the next panic. We Republicans always call the panic of 1893 the Cleveland panic, just as you Democrats call the panic of 1929 the Hoover panic.

In the panic of 1893, 407 public and private banks failed. Wheat went to 49 cents a bushel. The Reading, Erie, Atchison, Union Pacific, Northern Pacific, and other railroads followed one another into receiverships. One hundred and sixty-nine roads, operating 37,855 miles of road, with stocks and bonds worth $2,400,000,000, went into bankrutpcy.

There was labor unrest all over the world, and fear that anarchy had arrived.

Finally things got better. The headache, the stomach ache, weren't quite so bad. We survived the economic hang-over and went into the election of 1896, McKinley and the full dinner pail versus Bryan and free silver.

In 1898 we had the Spanish-American War, not a big war, followed by a small boom, and yet, 9 years after this war, we had a depression under Theodore Roosevelt, when for 7 months many banks issued scrip.

We go along to 1912. The regular Republicans nominated William Howard Taft, father of the present Senator. The Bull Moosers, or Progressives, nominated Theodore Roosevelt, and the Democrats named the president of Princeton, who won easily over a divided opposition.

In 1914 three important things happened, and the third kept us from ever knowing how the first two would have turned out in any normal, peacetime economy. The first was Ford's 5-day week, the second was the Underwood tariff bill, and the third was the First World War.

Wages went higher than Ford's scale, and tariffs, high or low, were no issue when all of our competitors stopped producing and competing and started destroying and buying munitions from America with which to kill their enemies.

This country entered the war in April 1917, and the war was over in November 1918. Business boomed and prices zoomed in 1919 and 1920, took a serious drop in 1921 and 1922, and the real boom started in 1923, led this time, not by real estate, slave traffic, or railroads, but by King Auto.

In 1923 3,000,000 Americans bought the first car they ever owned—a good year for the dealers; no trade-ins.

Lumping trucks and cars together, the United States produced the following number of units in the following years:

	Units
1923	4,034,012
1924	3,602,540
1925	4,265,830
1926	4,300,934
1927	3,401,326
1928	4,358,759
1929	5,358,420

In 1929 we had the peak of the boom and the beginning of the panic. We had nearly everybody in debt for almost everything. We had the installment plan with a vengeance, most all income mortgaged, the market saturated.

By July 15, 1930, we had 2,000,000 people out of work in England, 3,000,000 in Germany, and by Christmas it was 5,000,000, half a million in Italy, and 300,000 in little Austria. Conditions in all other countries were comparable, except France, which had little mass production, and two-thirds of her people still in small towns and on the farms. Later, she, too, was swept into the world depression.

In 1932 we had in these United States of America 15,000,000 unemployed, and our total income for that year was $40,000,000,000, $3,000,000,000 less than we paid in Federal income taxes in 1944 in a war-spurred economy.

In 1933, under a new President, we devalued the dollar, started relief and deficit financing. In 1936 the soldiers of the First World War were paid their bonus, and this, added to everything else, was mildly inflationary, so that in the beginning of 1937 we had many amateur and professional economists predicting a new perpetual boom, only to have such a sudden drop that in 1938 the railroads hauled less tonnage than in the worst depression year of 1932, when only 1,370,678 automobiles were manufactured in America.

So we come to 1939, with nothing settled, everything postponed, a mounting debt which seemed in those days staggering, no added employment in private, profit-making enterprise. We drift along to September, when Germany marches into Poland, Britain declares war on Germany, and the world is in the Second World War.

Britain sold the American stocks of her citizens on the New York Stock Exchange—Atchison at $18 a share, and other equities at similar prices.

When English funds were exhausted, we had the lend-lease, then Pearl Harbor, and then two wars.

Now the wars are over, but not their results; not the physical destruction, not the moral degradation, not the spiritual scars, not the hunger and the hate; not even the seeds of the third world war.

Shall we walk down the same old road?

Shall we learn nothing and repeat everything?

Shall we continue in the war-boom-panic-war cycle?

Shall we have a 1947 and a 1948 something like 1921 and 1922, then the boom of 3, 5, or 7 years, and then the panic as deep as the boom was high, and then the third world war fought with atomic weapons?

American cities have not known the ruin and rubble, the mud and blood, the filth and disease of modern war.

Shall we risk knowing it in the next atomic conflict?

For 20 years after the First World War America acted as if she had no interest in, or responsibility for, world conditions, as if dictators and hate, and exploitation and aggression against weak peoples and small nations could never harm or touch smug,

prosperous, isolated, ocean-protected America.

In this radio-radar-electronic-auto-aero-atomic age, the oceans are not as much protection as was the moat around a medieval castle.

The airplane made isolationism impractical.

The atom bomb makes it impossible.

So I believe in the United Nations.

It is a start, and I am willing to make any start, no matter how little, and any compromise, save with liberty, conscience, the dignity of the individual, and the hard-won freedoms of worship, assembly, speech, and the press.

Let us take a new interest in politics on all levels.

I don't condemn the men who hold public office; I condemn those businessmen and civic leaders who refuse to serve in their towns, on their school boards, in their counties, their State, and the Nation.

We need public men who think of the next generation, not the next election—who represent the great public, not some private pressure group.

Let us protect the Nation and the way of life which has the greatest, longest record for giving every man a good job, every woman a good home, and every child a good education and equal opportunity.

And, in the name of the dead, the living, and the unborn, let us strive with every power at our command to win a durable peace.

Mayor O'Dwyer's Plan for Labor Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, much has been and, undoubtedly, more will be said with respect to proposals for effecting permanent and peaceful labor-management relations. It is, therefore, not surprising that the great city of New York under the able and inspiring leadership of the present mayor, William O'Dwyer, has taken the lead in this most important field. General O'Dwyer has taken the initiative in the establishment of a successful plan for adjusting labor disputes that menace vital services affecting the health and comfort of the citizens of New York City.

His plan is fully set forth in the following article and editorial which appeared in the New York Times of January 6, 1947, and which it is my pleasure to insert herewith:

LABOR PEACE HERE CREDITED TO PANEL—MAYOR'S EMERGENCY DIVISION HAILED FOR HELPING TO AVERT THREAT OF MAJOR TIE-UPS—COOPERATION ITS POLICY—BOARD OF BEST BRAINS IN CITY BUSY BEFORE CONTRACTS END, USES NO COMPULSION

(By A. H. Raskin)

The averting of the threatened tugboat strike focused new attention yesterday on the success of Mayor O'Dwyer's plan for coping with labor disputes that menace vital services.

Much has been written in recent weeks about the effectiveness of the Toledo plan and other programs for promoting industrial peace, but relatively little note has been taken of the techniques that New York City has been evolving to keep itself free of crippling strikes.

Since October 1, when the mayor established the city labor relations division under the direction of Edward C. Maguire there has been no major walk-out here. Disputes involving bus drivers, telegraph workers, school custodial employees, building-construction workers, funeral drivers, and many other groups have been settled without strikes.

START BEFORE CONTRACT ENDS

The division, with only four men on its regular staff, has confined itself to disputes in key industries. Its practice is to communicate with management and labor representatives in such industries a full month before their contracts expire and urge them to begin negotiations right away.

If little or no progress has been made within 2 weeks, the division notifies the State mediation board or the regional offices of the United States Conciliation Service. The division itself does not step in until it appears that the strike dead line will be reached without an agreement.

When it does intervene the city agency requests that the State or Federal mediator be assigned to cooperate in the city's efforts to effect a settlement. There is no rigid formula to which the division clings in its approach to critical situations, but one technique that it has employed with uniform success has been the appointment of three-man committees representing the public, employers, and labor.

"It has been our good fortune," Mr. Maguire said, "to obtain the services of really outstanding citizens on these tripartite committees. In all cases they have been men of great wisdom and they have given unsparingly of their time and experience.

"Their great contribution has been to make the parties in a dispute realize the public interest involved and the responsibility they bore to the public. They have represented the best brains of the community."

PERSONNEL CHANGES PLANNED

Mr. Maguire said the mayor had no intention of setting up a permanent panel of employer, labor, and public representatives because of the fear that the members might grow "stale or shopworn" through being called on too often. It was Mr Maguire's hope that no one would be asked to serve more than once in 6 months.

Thus far none of the committees appointed by the mayor has had to exert any compulsion to bring about a settlement, Mr. Maguire said. All agreements have been reached through voluntary discussion and mediation in the privacy of committee meetings with labor and management negotiators.

"The last thing we want to do," Mr. Maguire said, "is to have a committee impose a settlement, but if a situation were so vital to the public welfare and there was no apparent hope of reaching an agreement or of submitting the dispute to arbitration we might ask a committee to make a report to the mayor. If he approved, it would be made public as a means of exerting pressure on the parties."

One activity in which the city labor relations division has been heavily engaged has been the handling of labor problems affecting the city's own employees. Julius Kass, counsel of the division, served as a member of the mayor's committee on city salary increases. A comprehensive plan for labor relations and grievance machinery in all city departments, except the board of transportation, will be submitted to the mayor by Mr. Maguire later this month.

GROUP LEADERS COOPERATE

To help maintain the record of labor peace built up in the last 3 months, Mr. Maguire has conferred with leaders of many labor groups and boards of trade. They have promised their cooperation in making available to the division copies of contracts and contract termination dates in order that the city may become aware of threatening situations sufficiently far in advance to prevent strikes.

Mr. Maguire emphasized that additional data were still needed on expiration dates, even though the division's own activities will extend only to those industries it believes essential to the public welfare.

"We are a small organization, and we intend to stay so," Mr. Maguire said. "We do not want to grow. The job can be done by this small organization, or our theory is cockeyed.

"We are not in competition with the State mediation board or the United States Conciliation Service. All we want to do is supplement their work."

In addition to Mr. Maguire and Mr. Kass, the division's personnel includes Theodore W. Kheel, deputy director, and Henry Lyons, mediator.

PEACE IN THE HARBOR

The settlement at city hall Saturday night of issues between local tugboat operators and union employees did more than avert a repetition of last year's critical tie-up in this port. It illustrated clearly that timely action by Federal and municipal officials can, if reason prevails, provide an answer to such labor-management rifts as paralyzed the Nation's economy on so many occasions last year.

Negotiators for Local 333, United Marine Division, International Longshoremen's Association, AFL, and tugboat operators began their discussions 2 months ago. They made litle progress and there were indications that another strike of harbor craft workers would be called after the expiration of their contract on December 31. The 10-day walk-out by the local last February had threatened local fuel and food supplies and led to an unprecedented 36-hour shutdown of many of the city's public buildings. Another such strike would have been a catastrophe.

Early last month, however, the United States Conciliation Service entered the dispute. A week ago Mayor O'Dwyer appointed an emergency labor board in a further effort to bring about a settlement. Intensive work by members of both agencies contributed substantially to Saturday night's agreement, which came after nearly 10 hours of almost constant sessions at city hall. Under its terms the workers won a 40-hour week in place of the previous 48 hours, a general wage increase of 11 cents an hour, and time and a half for Saturday and Sunday work. Its approval by union membership is regarded as certain.

Reached after concessions by both sides, the settlement stands as a tribute to the foresight of the Conciliation Service and the city administration and the untiring efforts of their appointed arbiters.

How United States Food Saved World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How United States Food Saved World," written by Wallace R. Deuel and published in the Chicago Daily News of November 15, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW UNITED STATES FOOD SAVED WORLD—WHOLE NATIONS KEPT ALIVE—INCREDIBLE FLOOD OF SUPPLIES BLOCKS FAMINE, REVOLUTIONS

(By Wallace R. Deuel)

WASHINGTON.—This is the story of how the United States saved the world during the last 12 months.

The American people kept whole nations alive, and prevented civilization from collapsing in chaos and barbarism throughout most of the earth.

It was the greatest outpouring of help by one people to others that history has ever known.

This is the story of how America, in helping others, also helped itself.

People often say that one more war would destroy civilization, but World War II itself almost did that—and the danger is not over yet.

At least the modern world has a good chance to survive now, however, thanks to the United States.

The American people have been able to produce things on a staggering scale, and to get those things to the hundreds of millions of human beings who were dying for lack of them.

When World War II ended, 19 countries lay prostrate and dying.

The peoples of these countries numbered almost a billion—approximately half of the human race.

Europe was like a charnel house, and so was a large part of Asia.

MILLIONS HUNGRY

Tens of millions were gaunt with hunger and disease. They ached with cold, crawled with vermin and shook with fever.

The world had slaughtered almost 14,000,000 of its best men—and women—in uniform, and wounded almost 31,000,000 more.

Another 27,000,000 were missing or prisoners of war.

Total civilian casualties were probably at least as high as those in the armed forces. Six million civilians were killed in Poland alone.

The war had driven 77,000,000 human beings into alien areas.

Tens of thousands of children had been so completely lost that they did not even know who their parents were, or where their homes had been, or their own names or nationalities or the mother tongues they had spoken, and neither did anyone else know these things.

The war had destroyed 15,000,000 dwellings and seriously damaged 30,000,000 more.

Tens of millions of people had no place to live.

More than 25,000,000 human beings were living in caves, dugouts, ruined buildings and holes in the ground in White Russia alone when the war ended, and more than 800,000 in Poland.

Whole nations were wearing their last threadbare clothes. Whole nations had little or no fuel to keep them warm.

STARVATION

Starvation faced 800,000,000 human beings when the war ended—two fifths of the human race.

Without help, 300,000,000 of these people would have received 900 calories a day.

This is roughly what the Nazis fed the prisoners in the Buchenwald concentration camp.

The other 500,000,000 would have had approximately 1,500 calories a day.

This is roughly one half as much as the average American eats. It won't even keep people alive and well for long.

Large numbers of people in Holland were so far gone that they had to be given drugs so they could assimilate food.

In an inland village in Greece where relief deliveries fell 15 days behind schedule, one-fifth of the people were found to be living entirely on roots and weeds.

More than one-fourth of all new-born babies were dying in Poland.

More than one-half were dying in some other parts of Europe.

Twenty million children in Europe had tuberculosis, rickets, and anemia because they had been so hungry for so long.

Epidemics of typhus, typhoid, cholera, smallpox, bubonic plague, dysentery had broken out.

Tuberculosis, malaria, and venereal disease were out of hand.

Over this desolation of what had been the proudest, the most powerful, the richest, and the most civilized of peoples, there hung the stench of the unburied dead.

Over them hung moral collapse and despair.

Europe and Asia were dying. Other nations were bound to be soon stricken, too.

It was very near being the end of the modern world.

THE UNITED STATES STEPS IN

Only one country could give the hitherto undreamed-of help necessary to save the world—the United States.

It did give it.

America has contributed more than $3,342,000,000 to foreign relief.

This has been made up as follows:

Given to UNRRA	$2,700,000,000
Donated through American Red Cross	178,000,000
Raised and distributed by 93 other private relief organizations	464,000,000
Total	3,342,000,000

This contribution is almost two and three-quarters times as much as the United States public debt in 1916.

It is slightly more than the total United States individual income-tax collections in 1942.

It is not quite as much as the American people spent for recreation in 1939, and it is roughly twice the total they spent on toilet articles and preparations, barber- and beauty-shop services, and baths and massage.

CAN'T EAT MONEY

But money alone was useless. The world couldn't eat or wear dollar bills. Civilization was dying for the lack of goods and services.

Only the United States could provide these necessities.

A great flood-tide of supplies poured into Europe and Asia from the United States—supplies by the millions of tons;

Wheat, corn, rice, oats, and barley; dried beans and peas; fruit, eggs, and canned fish; sugar and soap and shirts and steel bridges and sawmills and signal equipment.

Milk and layettes and locomotives; coal; great road-building machines and tiny vitamin pills that were equally necessary to keep people alive.

Flame-throwers to fight a locust plague in Sardinia, airplanes to spread DDT on mosquito-breeding marshes in Greece, vaccine to stop cattle disease in China—all the things that might save the world.

America is sending more than 16,500,000 tons of food abroad this year.

UNRRA alone has shipped, among other things, 99,861 tons of meat and meat products, and 189,626 tons of soap, oils, fats, and waxes from the United States.

The American Red Cross has sent, among other things, 12,500,000 quarts of milk.

JOHN Q. SHELLS OUT

Americans privately contributed 21,759 cases of foodstuffs to a victory collection for foreign relief, and 689,448 cases to a later emergency collection.

Greek War Relief recently collected more than $314,000 worth of chocolate-milk drink.

The Maritime Catholic Committee for the Relief of Europe gave more than $136,000 worth of various foodstuffs for Italy.

A California rancher gave two carloads of wheat for Chinese relief. The Pueblo Indians of New Mexico sent UNRRA a gift of grain.

Some 234 inhabitants of the Eskimo village of Noorvik, Alaska, sent $42 they had raised to help war victims.

The total American contribution has been titanic.

There have been times this year when the United States shipped more wheat overseas in a month than it did in a whole year before the war. Every available port has been used.

Early this year, 19 Liberty ships were loaded with wheat in Albany, N. Y. An ice breaker had to be sent up the Hudson River to clear the way for them.

It was the first time that wheat had ever been shipped from Albany during the winter period of heavy ice, but port facilities have had to be used wherever and whenever they could be found.

FLOOD OF CLOTHING

Torrents of clothing have poured out of America, too.

UNRRA alone has shipped more than 279,000 tons of clothing, textiles, and footwear from the United States.

The American Red Cross has distributed more than 41,000,000 garments abroad.

More than 7,000,000 Red Cross garments have gone to France, 4,000,000 to Italy, 1,000,000 to Holland, and 1,000,000 to Poland.

The United States exported almost no coal to Europe before the war. This year, shipments have run between 1,400,000 and 2,000,000 tons monthly.

Some coal has even been shipped from Utah to Europe by way of Long Beach, Calif.

American medical and sanitation supplies have flooded into Europe and Asia, too.

The Red Cross has sent whole hospital units, bacteriologicals and drugs, X-ray supplies, bedding and rubber sheets, equipment for producing penicillin, blood plasma, decontamination units.

The Red Cross has just made 187,000,000 surgical dressings available for foreign relief.

It had previously sent 97,000,000 dressings to Poland, 25,000,000 to Italy, and 10,000,000 to Norway.

The Red Cross has also sent 9,000,000 vitamin tablets to Poland and 7,200,000 to Czechoslovakia and 1,000,000,000 units of penicillin to Holland.

It has shipped 2,000,000 pounds of soap overseas.

The United States Council for Relief Agencies has just sent 7,000,000 units of insulin to the United States zone in Germany and has arranged with Denmark to buy 5,000,000 units more a month.

FACILITIES TAXED

This torrent of goods has sometimes swamped transport facilities.

There were not enough ships to move the supplies until the war ended and the major redeployments ceased.

When ships became available, the flood-tide of goods they poured into Europe and Asia overwhelmed the transport facilities there.

America had to deliver the goods, as well as produce them.

So trucks and tires and parts and oil and gasoline are being sent overseas, too.

With them are going whole motor vehicle repair shops, road-building machinery, and locomotives and freight cars and track, spikes and ties and tugs with LST's and LSM's and LCM's.

UNRRA sent 18 fixed steel bridges to China this year.

The American Red Cross sent 500 bicycles to Finland so that nurses there could go on their rounds of mercy.

THE UNITED STATES SHARE

America has given more to foreign relief than the rest of the world put together.

The United States has contributed 73 percent of UNRRA funds.

It has provided 71.6 percent of the total tonnage of UNRRA supplies.

America has produced 73.1 percent of all UNRRA food shipments; 66 percent of all clothing, textiles, and footwear; 69.7 percent of all fuel, lubricants, petroleum and products, and 92.6 percent of all medical and sanitation supplies.

Besides its enormous outright contributions to relief, the United States has made available to the rest of the world since before Pearl Harbor, or committed itself to do so, the staggering total of more than $66,385,000,000 in various other forms.

America has done this under the following principal headings:

Lend-lease	$51,000,000,000
British credit	3,750,000,000
Total foreign credit authorizations by Export-Import Bank	3,458,771,000
United States quota in World Bank	3,175,000,000
United States quota in World Fund	2,750,000,000
Civilian supplies sent to liberated and occupied areas	1,400,000,000
Credits advanced to finance sales of United States surpluses abroad	851,486,000
Total	66,385,257,000

SEVENTY BILLION OUTLAY

Only a part of this total has been or will be available at any one time. Some of it will be paid back and with interest.

But all of these items represent in the last analysis American goods and services which nobody else could make available to the world, which America did make available and without which the world would have perished.

These outlays plus American contributions to foreign relief total almost $70,000,000,000.

The total United States national income reached this figure in only one prewar year—1937.

The United States public debt didn't total 70 billions until 1942.

Total wages and salaries paid in private American industry didn't reach that figure until 1943.

Seventy billion dollars is almost three and one-half times as much as the American people used to spend on food plus tobacco in a year in the period from 1929 to 1941.

It is almost eight times what they spent in a year on housing during that period.

COLOSSAL POWER

So colossal is America's power to produce that the country has been able to pour out its wealth on this gigantic scale without suffering hardship at home.

Foreign relief has operated on the principle, "From each according to his ability; to each according to his need."

America has been by far the best able to contribute, and it has contributed by far the most.

Countries which suffered the worst have received the most relief.

America's huge shipments have made hardly a dent in United States production.

The fats and vegetable oils which President Truman has promised we will send abroad this year, amount to only 5 percent of estimated United States production.

American shipments of coal are only 1 percent of national production.

The American people have eaten better since the war began than ever before.

Shortages have been due primarily to two causes:

1. The millions of men in the armed forces have used up more food and other commodities than they had used as civilians.

2. The civilians have made more money and bought more things with it than ever before.

The country has gone on wasting things on a vast scale, too.

Americans waste 125,000,000 pounds of food a day, according to one estimate, or enough to add 300 calories to the daily diet of 500,000,000 of the world's hungry human beings, according to another calculation.

UNITED STATES POLICY

United States outpourings of relief are serving America's own purposes, too, besides helping others.

Contributing to relief is not only a spontaneous act of humanitarian generosity. It is also a deliberate act of high policy.

The Government has attached the utmost importance to foreign relief.

It has devoted some of its best talents and energies to making relief available in the greatest possible volume.

"The compulsions of mere survival shape and guide much of our foreign policy today," Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, has said.

"These compulsions are so strong that nearly everything we do is directed to the preservation of life and the preservation of society."

There are three main reasons why the United States attaches such importance to foreign relief:

1. The simple humanitarian reason of keeping millions of people alive.

2. The feeling that the United States owes its allies a debt of honor to help them recover from the ravages which they suffered and which America was spared in the joint winning of the war.

Most particularly there is the feeling that the United States owes it to its allies to help them repair the damage caused by "scorched earth" tactics which America asked them to employ.

3. To make a decent world possible, and thereby serve America's own purposes.

WHAT UNITED STATES WANTS

The basic aim of American foreign policy is to create—or maintain—the kind of world society in which the United States can be safe, can remain at peace, can prosper and can preserve its free institutions and ways of life.

These things are possible only in a world in which there is a safe balance of power, a world which is peaceful and in which there is a reasonable degree of prosperity.

Without foreign relief on an enormous scale, the modern world had no chance to be prosperous.

It did not even have a chance to survive.

Nor could the world be peaceful. Nor could there be any safe balance of power.

Beggared, diseased, and bitter, hundreds of millions would have fallen prey to extremisms, most of them to the left.

Revolution would have swept a dozen countries, and Europe and Asia would have turned to Moscow for hope and direction.

Foreign relief—and America's other outlays—have prevented these things so far. They have made a decent world possible.

There is only a chance for America's kind of a world. But without American help there wouldn't even have been a chance.

A NEW PHASE

United States policy on foreign relief and lending now enters a new phase.

There will be no more huge outpourings of American treasure.

UNRRA goes out of business December 31 in Europe and March 31 in the Far East.

The world will need large-scale relief for another year. But the United States will no longer contribute three-fourths of it.

Also, America itself will distribute what it does contribute, instead of turning it over to others.

Washington thinks that the worst needs which UNRRA was created to meet will be met by early next year.

Washington also believes that further outpourings of United States purchasing power would create a dangerous inflationary pressure in this country.

The administration further thinks that internationally organized and administered relief work is inefficient.

Finally, some people here think that if the United States went on pouring out relief it might encourage a "mendicants' psychology" among the recipients which would harm the recipients themselves, the contributors, and the rest of the world as well.

UNITED STATES SAVES WORLD

Thus a great chapter in the history of United States foreign policy—and of civilization—ends. A new chapter begins.

But regardless of what the new chapter reveals, this remains true:

The modern world has come within a hair's breadth of destroying itself.

One people alone have been able and willing to produce the things that the world had to have, or perish—the American people.

The American people have thereby given the modern world—including themselves—a chance to survive.

Suppose that America had been unable or unwilling to do this?

Suppose that, in another war, America should suffer so horribly—along with the others—that the American people would not be able to save everyone else, even if they wanted to do so?

Outlook for the Durable Goods Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Hartley W. Barclay, and published in the New York Times of Thursday, January 2, with respect to the outlook for the durable goods industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG YEAR EXPECTED IN HEAVY INDUSTRY—HIGH, STABILIZED PRODUCTION INDICATED AS GROWING ORDERS ADD TO THE BACKLOG—DURABLE GOODS OUTLOOK—INCREASE IN ORDERS MATCHED BY DELIVERY RISE INDICATES BUYERS' MARKET IS FURTHER OFF

(By Hartley W. Barclay)

Record backlogs and firm orders for durable goods, equipment, tool and machinery lines now on hand point to 1947 prospects for stabilized production at a high level, with the major trend of increased productivity in evidence as assurance of a strong upward surge of this field of business.

Many manufacturers of durable goods, now quoting 8- to 12-month delivery, have reported that orders have tended to increase as deliveries have increased, indicating that the arrival of a "buyer's market" may occur later than was generally expected by forecasters.

The underlying post-war development which provides proof of the further bulwarking of the American economic scene, largely based upon capital goods investments, is the further increase in the investment of capital in heavy equipment to create both output and employment, as well as profits.

While new machines, methods, and processes installed and on order for early delivery, to accelerate this trend, are often unrecognized by the public, large-scale contracts setting record figures for construction of new plants indicate that the upward trend will continue through 1947 and probably far into 1948.

The year 1946 opened with a dismal outlook for the heavy manufacturing industries because of five depressing situations:

1. Shortages of materials.
2. Unexpectedly large requirements for engineering and scientific development.
3. Shortage of skilled labor and technical supervisory employees.
4. Dangers of industry-wide strikes in basic industries.
5. Economic hazards involved in war surplus disposal of equipment.

These aspects were further complicated by existing allocations and priorities on materials, indecision in official quarters in Washington, D. C., on important reconversion policies, and problems of price control adjustments. Acute stages of most of these problems have now been passed, spokesmen have reported.

Without exception, members of the heavy equipment industries reported during the year that the problem of bringing incoming parts and materials into balance with needs of production schedules was an acute bottleneck of their reconversion management experience.

However, many companies which had developed well-designed postwar plans, through adequate research into customer requirements and product development needs, survived the year in an excellent position. They said that this period compared to a trial run for their normal postwar output and that they expected to improve their methods further by standardization and streamlining in 1947.

Price movements within the heavy-equipment lines late in 1946 took a long-delayed and, in many cases, a very necessary upward adjustment ranging from 5 to 40 percent, providing adjustment for increased materials and labor costs and permitting in some cases improvement of the quality of products. Firm price policies are coming to the front, however, for the first quarter of 1947.

Inventories at the end of 1946 remained unbalanced, for the most part, with urgent needs for a few scarce materials essential to completion of production parts needed to round out final assembly schedules. A shortage of electric motors for machinery uses remained the most serious of the whole field.

Innovations in distribution of industrial supplies and equipment introduced long-delayed improvements in sales methods and distribution policies for some organizations. These steps were based, for the most part, upon a careful study of the advancing technical needs of industrial buyers and users of the products.

The result, greeted with enthusiasm by major distributors of tools, machinery, and metals everywhere, has been a substantial advance in the application of scientific management to the field of industrial sales.

Whereas the financial and inventory involvements of the distributing branches of the industry in the same period after World War I were extremely serious, Nation-wide reports show no current trend toward inventory speculation, excessive buying, and "shoestring" financing errors which brought about some large-scale failures after the First World War.

Spokesmen reported at the end of 1946 that technological advancements in many heavy-goods fields had not been completed as rapidly as had been scheduled, in some lines, but that substantial progress had been made. Many important new products have been delayed in final production by both shortages of component parts and by the extreme caution being exercised in testing and perfecting equipment.

Some of the important new products which will finally reach the mass-production stage in 1947 are reported to be the mechanical cotton picker, gas turbines for power-plant use, electronic inspection machinery, improved continuous-output package-manufacturing equipment, frozen-food-locker refrigeration, improved automatic painting and drying machinery, improved steel-mill rolling equipment, ultra-precision gages, higher-capacity machine tools using tungsten-carbide tool bits, and improved types of transportation and material-handling equipment, to mention only a few outstanding lines.

The geographical expansion of heavy-goods industrial plants continued during 1946 and is expected to develop further in 1947. Metalworking and machine shop activities on the west coast, in the Southwestern States, and the deep South are continuing to grow, although not at a rate that could challenge the leadership of the east and middle western regions.

Spokesmen for the heavy industries have reported excellent prospects for profitable operations during 1947, provided no upset occurs from an unexpected source. They revealed an expectation that the year would mark the introduction of an era of good times, with a widely distributed sharing in the progress of their industries.

"We Know That the Law Is Good, If a Man Use It Rightly"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the Very Reverend Dr. William J. Mahoney, C. M., president of St. John's University, at the Mass of the Holy Spirit, held in Brooklyn, N. Y., on September 26, 1946, commemorating the opening of the courts for the year 1946–47:

"WE KNOW THAT THE LAW IS GOOD, IF A MAN USE IT RIGHTLY"—1 TIMOTHY 1: 8

We would interpret this inspiring gathering here this morning as a public and sincere endorsement of these quoted sentiments of the apostle. "We know that the law is good, if a man use it rightly." The law is good in its nature and becomes good in its execution when used rightly.

The law is good. It must be good because it comes from God, Who is the essence of Goodness. So we can say not that the law is good, but rather that the law is God. It is what God would have men do. It is the will of the Creator imposed upon His creatures.

In the beginning God said, "Let there be light" (Gen. 1: 3), and history records that light was made. And in that light, creation first saw the beginning of an inexorable law—the will of the Creator stamped upon the work of His hands. From then and forever after there would be unquestionable evidence of a design of order and a changeless law. Night would follow day as summer would follow spring. There would be the ever enduring force of gravitation and the persistency of the mathematical formula that two and two make four. There would be the inevitable and uniform pattern of life, reproduction and death in the vegetable and animal kingdoms. The eternal will of God became the immutable law of animate and inanimate creatures alike. Fiat lux. Fiat lex.

Then on the sixth day of creation God created man, the most noble and beloved of His creatures. He would make man according to His own image and likeness. But was man who was created a little less than the angels to be and live without the law? Was he to be nature's solitary boast of defiant independence? No. The paragon of perfection still remained a creature of God. Man's own reason made known to him that despite his exceptional gift of free will he was also subject to a superior law. Fiat homo. Fiat lex.

The eternal law that governs all creatures, as it is applied to man is known specifically as the natural law. It was from the beginning decreed that man should do good and avoid evil. And this unwritten law received in time a more definite articulation when it was written by God upon the Mosaic tablets of stone. This law we know as the Ten Commandments. And within the sphere of this natural law must live man and move and have his being if the order of creation is to be completely maintained and mankind not to perish from the face of the earth. For God so wills it.

Law in its nature and origin, therefore, is sometning intrinsically good, something inherently holy. It comes from God. And consequently its human expression must stem from God. "For there exists no authority except from God" (Rom. 13:1). Civil legislation becomes sacred as it squares with divine legislation. The common law and court of equity are but detailed ramifications and specific applications of the Ten Commandments and must be revered as the Code of Sinai. As our late beloved holy father, Pope Pius XI, declared, the juridical order must be "an outward refraction of the social order willed by God, a luminous product of the spirit of man which is in turn the image of the spirit of God."

Human law, therefore, and we speak of a good law, because a bad law is no law, but rather a species of violence, reflects the will of God. And this divine reflection is found not only in him who makes the law as in him who enforces it, but in the highest to the lowliest agents of the law. Were the blessed sacrament of the altar to be carried in solemn procession by the Pope of Rome, all Catholics would bend their knees in devout adoration. This would also be true if the blessed sacrament was carried by a bishop or country parish priest, or even in time of emergency by a layman. It makes no difference who is the carrier, but it does make a difference what is carried. And so also in the exercise of the law, be he President or policeman, judge or attorney, he carries the same sacred thing—the law—the expressed and sacramentalized will of God. The court of law, therefore, must partake of the sanctity of the sanctuary We do speak of the minister of justice. And it is in this sense that the apostle speaks when he says, "We know that the law is good if a man uses it rightly."

They who handle the law handle the will of God. There are many people in this country who do not profess belief in God or who at least do not identify themselves with any public and organized worship of God. Yet they look above and beyond themselves for some ultimate source of personal safety, economic, social and international security, and the protection of their inalien-

able rights to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. And thank God the traditional democracy of America would not tolerate the enthroning of a false god, a self-appointed dictatorship or entertain a philosophy of law called juridical positivism which Pope Pius XI says "attributes a deceptive majesty to the setting up of purely human laws, and leaves the way open for a fatal divorce of law from morality." And hence our fellow citizens who do not accept God or church find their own hope of human security in our Government, courts, and lawyers. These agencies become the only sanctuaries whither such people can flee for protection against the criminal, the redress of wrongs, and reestablishment of the rights due them. These agencies, if they do not represent God to these people, at least should hold inviolate the imperishable sanctity of the law and be valiant custodians of the tabernacle of human rights.

With people who believe in God, the court of justice becomes even more holy ground where the will of God is reverentially and impartially dispensed to His obedient children.

We know the law is good if a man uses it rightly. And we know that those who deal with the law in any official or professional capacity will use it rightly if they are convinced they are interpreting and executing the will of God toward His people. They have been appointed human ministers of divine justice and charity. They have been ordained as legates to carry into effect what St. Paul calls the ordinance of the angels. (Acts 7: 53.)

With confidence that we have expressed your own thoughts and feelings this morning, we are happy to greet the members of the Catholic Lawyers Guild, their associates and friends at this opening of the New Court Year. The law is good and holy in its origin and nature. And we feel that in your hands it shall remain good and holy in its execution.

May the holy spirit of God prompt and guide you in your deliberations.

Resolutions of Poweshiek County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I desire to include a set of resolutions adopted by the Poweshiek County (Iowa) Farm Bureau at a special meeting held October 8, 1946. I feel that these resolutions are pertinent and will be of value to all Members of Congress who are interested in agricultural problems.

1. We reaffirm our allegiance to the United States, the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service, and the Iowa and American Farm Bureau Federations. We will cooperate with them to the fullest extent.

2. We pledge our wholehearted support to the churches, schools, and all other organizations in the county working for community betterment.

3. We recommend that every effort be made to make the United Nations Charter into a workable instrument for a lasting world-wide peace, and that the secrets of atomic energy be retained by the United States until such time as full peace is assured.

4. We feel that a revision should be made of the present parity formula, making it more equitable to the producers of all farm commodities.

5. We demand the fulfillment of the 90 percent parity price support program for 2 years after the official end of the war as provided for by the Steagall amendment.

6. Because of the break-down in the principles of OPA, resulting in inequitable conditions and ineffective control, we recommend the removal of all OPA regulations.

7. We believe that under present conditions the control of production of our agricultural commodities is necessary so that the supply will be in line with the demand. We recommend that this program be continued and administered by locally elected farmer committeemen up to and including the State levels. We further recommend the continuance of Federal commodity loans and purchases, when necessary to maintain the prices of farm products.

8. We favor the 100 percent collection of the State income tax rather than higher property taxes.

9. We recommend that all income producing property held by nonprofit organizations be taxed as other property.

10. Since two-thirds of Poweshiek County farmers are still living on mud roads, we recommend that a more intensive road improvement program be developed for the construction of all-weather secondary roads. We recommend that a more aggressive State all-weather secondary road program be adopted, including an additional 1-cent gas tax for secondary road building. We also believe that a higher percentage of Federal funds for road construction in Iowa should be used for all-weather secondary roads.

11. We recommend the establishing of a maximum speed limit on Iowa roads and a more adequate system of highway markings.

12. In face of increasing traffic accidents, we recommend that all automobile owners be required to carry liability insurance before an auto license be issued.

13. We favor legislation as outlined in the last school code commission report recommending $12,000,000 State aid annually for schools.

14. We urge the creation of a county board of public instruction.

15. Since a number of the counties of the State now receive $5,000 county appropriation annually for extension work, while others like Poweshiek County receive only $3,000 annually, we recommend that legislation be enacted so that all counties will receive $5,000 annually.

16. We recommend the employment of a full-time county nurse.

17. We ask for support in the 1947 session of the Iowa Legislature for an enabling act which legalizes the establishment of and provides for the maintenance of free public libraries for rural persons, and to educate toward the organization of efficient rural library units financed by local funds and supplemented by State and Federal funds.

18. We recognize the valuable assistance rendered to agriculture by the Agricultural Extension Service, the Experiment Station, Iowa State College, and the United States Department of Agriculture. However, we feel that the experiment station should devote more work and study to the control of livestock diseases and parasites.

19. The need of more soil conservation practices in Poweshiek County is becoming more evident each day. We recognize the value of the soil conservation work as carried on by the Poweshiek County Soil Conservation District and the Soil Conservation Service and pledge our support to this program.

20. We recognize the valuable training being given our rural youth through 4-H club work and vocational agriculture and homemaking schools. We feel that every rural boy and girl should have an opportunity for the training afforded by these programs.

21. We commend the farm service officers and manager and the general and special insurance agents for their work and the efficient operation of their groups.

22. The various cooperative associations in the county have made a successful and valuable contribution to agriculture. We pledge continued support and assistance to these organizations.

23. We recognize the value of the publicity and support which the papers of the county have given during the past year and express our appreciation to them for their fine cooperation.

What Goes On Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under extension of remarks, I wish to include herewith an item taken from the Arizona Farmer of December 28, 1946, entitled "Winter Seeds, New Yuma Industry." This is a very enlightening bit of information. It has a direct bearing on legislation now pending before Congress. It throws much light on the character of the soil, climate, and agricultural possibilities of land in Yuma County, Ariz., which is now being reclaimed by the Government.

This very area described in the included article is a part of the Gila project which the Bureau of Reclamation is preparing within a few weeks to have ready for veterans under legislation passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress. In view of the fact that the project is only partly completed, the amazing results portrayed in this accompanying article lend weight to the justification by the Bureau of Reclamation for the rapid completion of this reclamation work. The article is as follows:

WINTER SEEDS, NEW YUMA INDUSTRY—OATS, PEAS, WHEAT—AND WHAT'S TO COME NEXT?

On Yuma Mesa they're growing 800 acres of peas this winter—for seed! They're growing 40 acres of oats there and 10 more in Yuma Valley—for seed! Those peas will be planted next spring in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. The oats will be planted next spring in Minnesota.

These enterprises sound like interesting Arizona farm stories, and they are. But they are more. They are further proof that the Nation has discovered Yuma County as a winter seed-producing area.

If farmers elsewhere find themselves short of desirable seed, as the pea growers of the Northwest did last fall, they can send to Yuma and have seed grown in time for their next crop season.

Suppose that some seed house or experiment station develops a valuable new variety of vegetable or field crop, as the University of Minnesota has developed two varieties of 70-day oats. The seed can be increased in winter at Yuma, under the Arizona sun where there is never any shortage of irrigation water, and the variety can be in commercial production at least a year sooner than would otherwise be possible.

That has already been done in the case of Rescue wheat. In fact, the Rescue success was what brought to County Agent Bob Moody the inquiries which resulted in those plantings of peas and oats. He has answered still other inquiries which may lead to more and possibly bigger contracts next fall.

ALL-YEAR SEED COUNTRY

But wait a minute. Don't get the idea that raising winter seed for customers in a hurry is all that those Yuma folks have in mind. Once their county threshed a tenth of all the alfalfa seed produced in the whole United States, and they'll be back in that position again if market conditions are right. Maybe they'll get back there anyway, regardless of the market for old standard alfalfas such as Chilean and Hairy Peruvian. For they have the jump on the world in three important new varieties; they get 29 cents a pound premium for all the Ranger seed they can grow, 14 cents for their India and African seed. And it will be years, from all indications, before they can overtake demand.

Then there's Bermuda seed. The Roll-Mohawk district produced nearly all of America's Bermuda seed and can step up in its output any time more is needed.

On top of all this is a factor just as important as any already mentioned. They have seed know-how down there along the west end of the Gila and the south end of the Colorado. They're seed specialists whose experience will keep them ahead of all competitors. They know how to take full advantage of their climate. They know how to combat insects and are not afraid to pile on the fertilizer.

TIME THE ESSENCE

But since the peas are the most spectacular development of the current season, let's get back to Yuma Mesa and Ralph McGill.

Late last summer, Bob Moody had a letter from Gerald Whitney of the Whitney Pea Co., of Athena, Oreg. Whitney is a young go-getter whom many of the canners and freezers of the Pacific Northwest depend on for the seed they supply to their growers. All at once they had decided that they needed many tons more of Thomas Laxton, Alderman Improved Gradus, and Perfection seed than were available. Did Moody think there might be a chance to get a winter seed crop on Yuma Mesa?

Moody did think so. His reply was so favorable that Whitney flew to Yuma in his private plane. He signed a contract with McGill, a young veteran who had already made a name for himself farming on the mesa. McGill swiftly made a deal with the United States Bureau of Reclamation for 800 acres in forties and eighties, just leveled and ready for water. His proposition fitted right in with the Bureau's program for getting that land ready to be settled by GI's. Ian A. Briggs, who supervised the first plantings on the mesa division of the Gila project, had found that peas make an ideal nurse crop for alfalfa, protecting it from the winds which so often sweep across those treeless fields.

The Bureau furnished the alfalfa seed, which was drilled in with the peas between September 25 and October 5. The pea-seeding rate was 100 pounds to the acre, perhaps a trifle light. Nevertheless, there's a wonderful stand of both alfalfa and peas on every one of those blocks.

Whitney again flew to Yuma on December 8. This time he was accompanied by Francis Wade, who grows 1,000 acres of Oregon canning and freezing peas every summer. Both agreed that the prospects could hardly be any brighter. Two snappy nights immediately preceding had not even nipped the pea vines, some of which stood almost knee high. Wade predicted that the threshing could start in late February and that the yield of dried pea seed will be half a ton to the acre; it can be much more, with any sort of weather luck.

MAY NEED HELP AGAIN

But a wandering farm editor was skeptical that this one-season venture had any long-term significance. "You'll be growing plenty of pea seed at home this summer and probably won't be back," he said.

"We'll likely have plenty of seed of these varieties, but that doesn't mean we may not be short of something else," Whitney replied. "If this crop turns out all right, we may be looking to Yuma Mesa for help every time we get in a jam. And peas probably aren't the only vegetable that will yield winter seed in a district as warm as this."

McGill is also a figure in the seed-oat enterprise. In that, however, he's a partner of Alf Hess, who's giving him a lot of help with the peas.

TRIUMPH OF BREEDING

The Minnesota Seed Co., of Faribault, wrote to Moody about getting the seed of two new oats, Mindo and Bonda, increased. These are rapid-maturing varieties, strong-stemmed and rust-resistant, believed to be the best ever bred for the short summers of the Northern States and Canada. There was only a little seed. If the Minnesotans had to wait until 1947 to increase it, they would have to wait until 1948 for any extensive plantings. They hoped to save a year.

Yuma County was ready to oblige. On December 12 Hess and McGill began planting 15 acres of Mindo and 25 acres of Bonda on the mesa, 10 of Mindo at Hess's place in Yuma Valley. Again, alfalfa went in with the mesa oats, for oats also are a splendid nurse crop.

The Rescue wheat story has already been told in Arizona Farmer but will here be reviewed because of what that experiment led to. This is the sawfly-resistant, solid-stemmed wheat that originated in Canada just in time to give new hope to desperate farmers in Montana and elsewhere. Ralph Mercer, Montana's extension agronomist, sought aid from the Arizona Agricultural Experimental Station. A single bushel of seed was sent to the Mesa Farm, increased to 35 bushels in the winter of 1944–45. This was enough to seed 27 acres in Montana, which produced 877 bushels in the summer of 1945. The Montana Crop Improvement Association shipped 100 bushels back to Arizona and that was planted on 100 acres of John Bretz's farm in South Gila Valley, about 10 miles east of Yuma. Bretz's yield was 3,870 bushels, which got to Montana in time for June planting. Last fall Montana threshed 3,870 bushels, which is plenty to get commercial production of Rescue started in 1947.

No, it doesn't take any super-optimist nor any wizard with second sight to perceive that Yuma County has some wonderful opportunities in winter seeds. Those opportunities don't lie altogether on the mesa, either. Probably all the truck-crop seeds will have to be grown there; but when it comes to small grains, both Yuma Valley and South Gila Valley are warm enough.

To Reduce Taxes, Cut Public Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, much is being said these days about the reduction of taxes by the Federal Government. Everyone wants this to be done.

There are many ways to reduce taxes. But the surest way is to cut public expenditures.

A sharp reduction in the number of Federal Government employees, and the taking off of the pay roll of perhaps several hundred thousand Federal employees, will result in a great deal less spending of public funds. The saving will be made not only in the salaries now being paid these employees, but in ending the expenditures of vast sums of money by these employees and for housing and office equipment and other expenses necessarily incident to the retention of the vast army of civilians now on Uncle Sam's pay roll.

The public generally, and almost universally, is demanding that Congress delay no longer than necessary to take the proper steps to discharge hundreds of thousands of bureaucrats not needed in peacetime operations, who in many instances are retarding reconversion and stifling much needed production. The shifting of employees from one bureau or agency to another will not solve the problem. The taxpayers cannot be relieved of their present burdens until the bureaucrats are fired. Apparently they will not be discharged and their names stricken from the pay rolls until Congress refuses to appropriate the vast sums of money now being spent for their salaries and expenses.

The first and most important way to reduce taxes is to reduce public expenditures. Let us begin by eliminating unnecessary employees. The people demand that this be done, and I believe Congress will carry out such a program, and that the people will approve.

The following editorial appears in the Tulsa Daily World of Tulsa, Okla., of January 6, 1947, entitled:

THE FEDERAL PAY ROLL

Topping the agenda of the Eightieth Congress will be the Federal fiscal problems, never before so many, important, tremendous, and timely. Substantial tax and Budget cuts have been pledged from various quarters. Also to receive major attention will be the efforts to balance taxation with spending.

The machinery to help achieve this balance will be available to Congress when the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act are put into effect. This act calls for a more adequate review of spending proposals by means of a "legislative budget" to be submitted to Congress by February 15. For the first time Congress has provided itself with the tools with which to examine and bring needed efficiency to the largest governmental spending unit in the world.

A stronger fiscal control is not only necessary but imperative. The war-swollen total of Federal Government employment can well be the first target of economy advocates. The $7,500,000,000 peak was reached in 1944. At the end of 1945, after some cut-backs had been made, pay rolls were still 350 percent greater than in 1939. Today there are 2,299,000 civilian employees in the Federal Government. Congress should determine the number necessary for efficient operation of the Government and promptly put a stop to the habit of becoming wed to the public pay roll.

The Uncommon Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Members of Congress to an article which appeared in the Denver Post of September 19, 1946, written by L. Ward Bannister, a prominent and respected attorney of Denver, Colo., under the title "Here's a Cheer for the Uncommon Man."

We all recognize that the rights of the common man must be protected and that justice must be spread evenly for all. Nevertheless, we must make it possible for the uncommon man, who does the unusual thing for the benefit of all, to survive and be protected in the rewards he obtains from using his uncommon abilities, genius, and powers of leadership. The great difference between America and the rest of the world is that America makes it possible for the common man to become the uncommon man. It makes it possible for the laborer of today to become the capitalist of tomorrow. It recognizes the value, power, and necessity of leadership properly and honestly performed.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE'S A CHEER FOR THE UNCOMMON MAN—LET'S NOT FORGET REWARD FOR MAN WHO MAKES PROGRESS

(By L. Ward Bannister)

We hear much these days, and rightly, about the common man, but not nearly enough about the uncommon man. Let us beware that we do not let this man become the "forgotten man." We need him.

We, the people, are equal before the law, and want to stay so, for we will have no frozen classifications, but open ones, that we may strive and rise upon our merits. It is to be remembered however, that, in point of fact, we are not all equal in capacity and attainments. The great majority of the people are honest, industrious, and good citizens. As they strive, they progress, and the Nation progresses. They are the bone and sinew of our national life. They represent the common man. Below that majority is a small minority of the less competent, indeed, of many loafers, some of whom, it is to be regretfully said, are beyond redemption. Above that majority is another minority—men and women of greater natural ability, inventiveness, daring and achievement. They are found to some extent in all lines—management, labor, agriculture, the professions, the sciences, and the arts. Private capitalistic nations have them; so does public capitalistic Russia, although, because of greater individual liberty and responsibility, they are far more numerous in the former than in the latter.

It is the members of this superminority who represent the uncommon man; the man whom right now, even in our own America, there is a tendency to overlook and to forget. It is he, this uncommon man, who inspires and guides the rest of us into greater endeavor. It is he who makes the wheels go around into fields of greater accomplishment, indeed, into fields that often are new. What he does is for the benefit of us all in point of economic goods and of other values as well.

We need to keep this uncommon man with us. How are we to do it?

Let us not, through envy or economic error, shackle too much his greater abilities. Let us, in this connection, recall the story of Dean Swift's shipwrecked "Gulliver" who, landing alone on a strange island, lay down on the ground to sleep, only to find, on awakening, that a multitude of tiny dwarfs had swarmed over his body and had tied him to the earth. Yes, they tied him down, but they had to gang up on him to do it; not one of them could have done the job alone. No, "let not genius lay its head upon the block while towering mediocrity plays the king."

How are we to reward this uncommon man so that we may retain him in our service? There is, in the main, only one way. Russia tried another first, the formula of equality in economic reward, but in the end had to give it up and turn to that of inequality because the former rule proved inconsistent with human nature and social progress. Indeed, by way of illustration, wage differentials among the workers in Russia are greater today, in many instances, than in America.

What should the formula be? Here is one, although only symbolically expressed, that carries a rational appeal:

A quart of milk a day to the common man, and two quarts to the uncommon man, for the common man knows, if he but stops to think, that he is more likely to get his one quart if the uncommon man gets his two, and he wants his one quart.

Hail to the uncommon man!

Brooklyn's New Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 12, 1946:

BROOKLYN'S NEW LEADER

If we must have political bosses, John Cashmore, who succeeds the late Frank Kelly as Democratic leader of Kings County, seems a happy choice. He is not one of the back-room boys, but a civic-minded man of the people, whose career has been as open-faced as he is. Time will test his capacity in the new job, his pressure resistance, his progressiveness and his ability to pile up the impressive Democratic majorities that Kelly manipulated. But he is equipped for a good start.

He knows the ropes. He has been working his way up in politics for more than 20 years, from a youthful doorbell-ringer and handbill-passer to borough president of Brooklyn. For a political boss he is unusually experienced as an elected official, having served in the State legislature, the old board of aldermen and a vice chairman of the city council. His approach to his task is a complete contrast to that of his reserved and somewhat taciturn predecessor. He is affable, forthright, a good mixer, a ready debater, and an enthusiast for his favorite borough.

Mr. Cashmore may readily be graduated from a local to a national figure. Kings County is unique in a dominant State. It casts the second heaviest Democratic vote of any county in the country. Its majorities have repeatedly carried this State into the Democratic column and were considered phenomenal in the Roosevelt years. But Mr. Cashmore has won even larger majorities there than President Roosevelt or Mayor O'Dwyer. He is bound to have a potent voice in future Democratic conventions, both State and national.

Veterans' Hospital, Newington, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have just secured permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a resolution recently adopted unanimously by the rehabilitation commission of the American Legion for the Department of Connecticut.

This resolution asks for the immediate expansion of the United States Veterans' Hospital, at Newington, Conn. It is suggested that 128 additional beds be made available at this hospital. This is not intended to interfere in any way with the proposed construction of a new general and medical hospital in New Haven, Conn. Due to the fact that the Government already owns ample land and that the power plant and other utilities are now adequate to provide for an enlarged hospital, the additional beds can be provided for just about one-half the cost of providing the same number of beds at some new site.

I hope our Committee on Veterans' Affairs will very early in the session consider the advisability of expanding some of the existing smaller hospitals.

Resolution adopted unanimously by the rehabilitation commission of the American Legion for the Department of Connecticut

Voted, That without in any respect impairing its program for hospital construction in the vicinity of New Haven, we respectfully urge upon the Veterans' Administration the need of additional hospital beds at a point where they can be provided with maximum promptitude and minimum cost because of existing installations.

The record of the United States hospital at Newington is outstanding; and in our judgment it should be expanded by 128 beds to meet the constantly growing load of veteran surgical and medical needs before the situation becomes acute. We earnestly recommend this, as well as the prompt installation of long-awaited surgical facilities, and respectfully request that these urgent matters be given priority.

Further voted, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the chief medical director be requested to accord to our chairman an appointment to discuss this important subject as soon as practicable; and that copies of this resolution be transmitted for their information to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

The People's Plea to the New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1946, the people, by their ballots, made a strong appeal to the new Congress.

They said, by their votes, that they wanted to abolish regimentation. They said, in effect, that they wanted the new Congress to do everything necessary to relinquish the chains of the New Deal administration. The people undoubtedly said by their votes that they wanted us once more to be simply Americans. They told us, in no uncertain terms, that they wanted the new Congress to restore America to Americans for Americans.

The following article by Mr. E. F. Hutton, of Westbury, Long Island, appeared as a full-page presentation of these ideas in the New York Journal and American of December 13, 1946, which I am delighted to quote as a true expression of the people's plea to the new Congress:

If you are an American, read this. If you are too busy now, tear it out and read it later.

E. F. H.

ABOLISH REGIMENTATION

A PLEA TO THE NEW CONGRESS, FOR THE PEOPLE

GENTLEMEN: The vote which elected you was an insistent protest against interference with the lives and liberties of the people.

This interference came from two sources. One was by a vast bureaucracy asserting the power to rule and regulate our lives, often in disregard of statutes passed by the Congress of the United States of America.

The second was by the "invisible government" of irresponsible labor leaders who have been exempt from the law under which all others must live.

We want bureaucrats and labor leaders to be governed by law.

We want social security from strikes.

We want to be sure that we can get fuel to keep us warm and operate our vast industries.

We want to be sure that our cities shall not be plunged into darkness.

We want to be sure that our babies can have milk and our children can go to school.

We are tired of economic wars.

We want "domestic tranquillity" under which we can work, produce and prosper.

We want irresponsible power curbed.

We want to return to constitutional government—equal justice under law.

We want the Wagner Act reviewed in the light of the abuses which have grown up under it.

We want to know why there have been three times as many strikes since that act was passed.

We want all workers to prosper—because they are all customers. There are no labor gains when the loss in wages from strikes leaves the worker behind the eight-ball for months or years before he can catch up.

There are no labor gains when strikes force wage increases which do not result in increased production and must, therefore, be paid by all the people through higher prices.

Labor unions have exerted power over the lives of millions. More power than the Government can constitutionally assert. This must be stopped.

No man or group of men has the right to paralyze all business activities and throw millions out of work.

No American should be compelled to pay tribute to anyone for the right to a job. Slavery was supposed to have been abolished 81 years ago.

No American should be compelled to go on strike without a democratic opportunity to voice his opinion.

We want the working people of this Nation to have the freedom and the liberty promised under our Constitution.

We want waste in Government ended.

We want taxes reduced. Too much money is now being poured into Government bureaus and spent without thought or reason. We want this money made available to buy better tools and equipment and thus encourage increased production by human energy and skills. Only in this way will we enjoy lower costs as wages and standards rise.

We want you to encourage the enterprise system which built this country from 13 weak Colonies into the No. 1 world power.

We want you to say to every American: "Speak up. Express your opinion. Give your counsel freely on all public questions. Have no fear of retaliation."

We want more men who can create pay checks, more pay checks, bigger pay checks.

Gentlemen, you are the trustees of American liberty, the guardians of American prosperity.

As you face this trust, act upon what is right, not who is right; put aside political expediency. Legislate for America. Cooperate with the President of the United States and let him cooperate with you. Make some sacrifice of opinion for national unity.

You, gentlemen of the Congress, must reunite our people. You must reinstate the incentive to work, the incentive to risk capital in new ventures, free from crushing taxation and crippling red tape.

Your success in this effort will justify the faith of our founding fathers. Your failure may mark the collapse of the last citadel of a free people anywhere on this globe.

Respectfully yours,

E. F. HUTTON.

WESTBURY, LONG ISLAND

OPEN LETTER TO EVERY READER OF THIS ADVERTISEMENT

If you believe what is said here, it is your obligation to give this message the most widespread circulation possible. Endorse this page with your signature—send it to your Representatives in Congress and your Senator. Join with others in financing the reprinting of this advertisement in other cities and towns. As one individual, it is impossible for me to cover the country. If you are a man of American business, the reprinting of this message is an obligation of yours. Reprint it as a corporate or private effort, in as many papers as you can afford. If you are a leader of American labor, the same responsibility applies to you. We are now at the point where no one of us, interested in the welfare of our country, can any longer shirk his duty and responsibility.

E. F. H.

Address of Dr. Ruth Miller Steese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the radio address delivered December 30, 1946, over Station WKOK, Sunbury, Pa., by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese, of Mifflinburg, Pa., national executive committeewoman of the American Legion Auxiliary.

The address follows:

As we close the year of 1946 and look forward to the year of 1947, we do so with a song on our lips and a prayer in our hearts that the New Year will bring to every one in our radio audience the realization of the universal wish for the establishment of a true and lasting peace.

To America, the nations and the peoples of the world have always looked as the Utopia of their dreams, the land of wealth and opportunity, and the land and home of freedom and equality.

To America, the nations are again looking as the United Nations strive for the solution to the problems of war, for the answer to the possibility for the eradication of racial and class hatred and bitterness, and for the ultimate goal of world peace.

As we consider all the problems which face us, we realize that history will be in the making when the Eightieth Congress convenes in Washington this week.

To the new Congress will come many new faces and many individuals new to the science of national lawmaking. But in that group of new Congressmen will appear many who have served their Nation in other capacities, veterans in military science and service and veterans in governmental practice and procedure.

The Eightieth Congress will possibly be composed of the largest group of ex-servicemen ever to formulate our national laws. To the American Legion and its auxiliary, the calendar of events in Congress will be a constant study. With an actual membership of over 4,000,000, representing the interests of every veteran and his family in the United States, we shall seek to have made into laws those measures which will secure and maintain for us a sound America, freed from communism and all other foreign philosophies and ideologies—a safe America, whose every shore is protected by the strongest national defense program possible in a free country—a sane America, whose young men by a system of universal military training have learned the value of liberty and who prefer to serve her in time of peace in order to prevent the horrible holocaust of a third war of total destruction and annihilation. With such basic principles and ideas ever uppermost in our minds and hearts, we as the largest veterans' organization and its auxiliary, will present to this Eightieth Congress our major program on legislation. Our program will necessitate the drafting of approximately 250 bills, to be introduced into the Senate and House of Representatives early in the session, that the mandates of national conventions may be carried through to accomplishment. It is a huge program, varied in scope, gigantic in aim, and herculean efforts will be needed to make these 250 bills into laws within the one session, but with the strength and determination of organized veterandom we shall be successful. As we present our program to the public, we do so reminding them that it is not a selfish program and reminding them that the veteran population of the United States was their Maginot line, their Normandy beachhead, their southwestern Pacific defense between them and the powers of destruction of Germany, Italy, and Japan in 1941–45.

The veteran population is the personal representative of almost every family in the United States and as such, represents that for which all America and all Americans pledged an all-out effort for the perpetuation of the land of our fathers, the country of Washington and Lincoln and the land of promise of our children's children.

It was the blood of the veterans of 1917–18 and it is the blood of those of 1941–45 which keeps ever bright the red stripes in Old Glory, just as their courage and loyalty, their devotion and sacrifice keep the white stars and the blue field, true white and true blue.

The major legislative program which we shall present to Congress shall cover nine main objectives, which are—

1. Rehabilitation and readjustment.
2. Housing.
3. On-the-job training.
4. Terminal leave pay.
5. Reemployment of veterans.
6. Universal military training.
7. Education of orphans of veterans.
8. Aid to dependent children.
9. Veterans' preference.

The success of this program will mean the individual and collective success of everyone in terms of happiness and security to the America of the present. It will mean a partial fulfillment of the promises made when the men and women went forth to serve—that well-known promise of "nothing is too good for those who serve."

But the greatest security for the America of today and of tomorrow can be found only in the enactment of point 6—namely, universal military training.

The opponents of this measure have constantly deluded the public by confusing military training with military service. This has been done deliberately and with a purpose.

Because we of the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary believe so strongly that the American Legion plan for universal military training is a program of value to every young man, because we believe that it would raise the health and educational standards of the United States and because we are confident that it would promote lasting peace, we ask everyone, believers and nonbelievers alike, to study our plan.

With the military service of our country favoring it, with veterans' groups who know more than any other the exact meaning of war, promoting it, and with the National Education Association endorsing it, the public, who will be the most affected by it, should study it with an open mind, with an interest born of things American, with a love akin to their belief in and devotion to these, our United States of America.

It is with love for America and her traditions, with visions and dreams for her perpetuation as the worthy capital of the United Nations, that the membership of the American Legion and its Auxiliary asks you, the public, the individual citizen, to study our entire program on legislation that we may bring to realization the words of the immortal American, Abraham Lincoln, "To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan." But more important is his last admonition, "To do all which shall achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

This is the challenge which we of the American Legion and its Auxiliary offer to the American public as the old year of 1946 draws to a close and as we enter upon the new year of 1947 and as the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America goes into session.

May you each one measure your 1947 happiness and prosperity in terms of ease from suffering for those veterans hospitalized for you, in terms of security and protection for the widows and children whose veteran dead are scattered over the battlefields of the world, in terms of peace, enduring and everlasting peace, for all because we in the United States had the courage to be strong enough physically to command the respect of all the nations of the world, large as well as small.

And so with this program in mind, with a request for your support and cooperation, we of the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary wish you, each and all, a happy New Year.

Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the November 1946 issue of the Journal of the American Bar Association. This article was prepared by Hon. Aaron L. Ford, of the District of Columbia Bar and a former Member of this House. It deals with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and contains much helpful and timely information:

THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

(By Aaron L. Ford, of the District of Columbia Bar [1])

Article 1. Section 5, clause 2, of the Federal Constitution says that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." This provision of the Constitution being the supreme law of the land, the Senate or House of Representatives in the next or any succeeding session of Congress may by appropriate resolution adopt new rules relating to their proceedings or create new committees, notwithstanding the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.[2] But there are also many other things in the latter statute.

BACKGROUND

For many years the executive branch has requested, and the Congress has granted it, extraordinary powers to meet emergency needs. Complaint has arisen respecting the use of many of those grants. The situation became the target for criticism. Congress was strongly urged to reorganize and reassert itself as a coordinate branch of the Government.

On February 11, 1943, the House of Representatives created a special committee to investigate acts of executive agencies in excess of their statutory or constitutional authority.[3] The committee submitted seven reports,[4] of which the seventh pointed out that most important bills were drafted by the executive officials intended to be the recipients of the powers.

The committee recommended that Congress establish a permanent joint Senate and House legislative staff service, for the purpose of enabling the standing legislative committees of Congress to obtain expert, unbiased, and independent analysis of proposals. The committee also recommended the establishment of a permanent Joint Senate and House Committee on Appropriations, to investigate and study the manner in which the executive branch spends funds, the establishment of a permanent Joint Senate and House Committee on Executive Agencies and Procedures to investigate whether the laws are executed and administered according to the intent of Congress, and the creation of a joint committee of the House and Senate to study the organization and operation of Congress and recommend improvements to enable the Congress to meet its responsibilities.[5]

THE 1946 REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

Meanwhile, a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress was created for a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress.[6] On March 4, 1946, 157 years to a day after the convening of the first session of the First Congress, the committee submitted a report containing 37 specific recommendations for the modernization and improvement of the operations of Congress and stating in part that:[7]

---

[1] Member of Mississippi and District of Columbia bar; Representative in Congress from Mississippi in the 74th through the 77th Congresses, 1935–43; general counsel of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives To Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Exceeding Statutory or Constitutional Authority, 1943–45.

[2] Public Law No. 601, 79th Cong., 2d sess., approved August 2, 1946.

[3] H. Res. 102, 78th Cong., 1st sess. Howard W. Smith, of Virginia, chairman; John J. Delaney, of New York; Hugh Peterson, of Georgia; Jerry Voorhis, of California; Fred A. Hartley, Jr., of New Jersey; John Jennings, Jr., of Tennessee; and John B. Bennett, of Michigan. Representative BENNETT shortly resigned, and Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan, was appointed to fill the vacancy.

[4] H. Repts. 699, 862, and 898, 78th Cong., 1st sess.; H. Repts. 1024, 1366, 1797, and 1912, 78th Cong., 2d sess.

[5] A bill embodying these recommendations was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia on November 20, 1944. H. R. 5485, 78th Cong., 2d sess.

[6] S. Con. Res. 23, 78th Cong., 1st sess., introduced by the late Senator Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, and H. Con. Res. 54, 78th Cong., 1st sess., introduced by Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma. They were identical. The following were the members of the committee: Representatives Monroney, of Oklahoma; Cox, of Georgia; Lane, of Massachusetts; Michener, of Michigan; Dirksen, of Illinois; and Plumley, of Vermont. Senators Maloney, of Connecticut; Thomas, of Utah; Pepper, of Florida; White, of Maine; Brooks, of Illinois; and La Follette, of Wisconsin. Senator Russell, of Georgia, was appointed a member of the committee, on February 12, 1945, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Maloney. Senator Maloney passed away on January 16, 1945, and Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., was elected chairman of the committee on March 3, 1945. On January 11, 1945, early in the first session of the 79th Congress, Senator Maloney introduced a resolution to recreate or continue the committee (S. Con. Res. 7). This resolution was presented to the Senate by Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, for Senator Maloney during Senator Maloney's last illness. On January 11, 1945, Representative MONRONEY introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives to recreate or continue the committee (H. Con. Res. 18). This resolution passed the House on January 18, 1945, and was agreed to with amendments in the Senate on February 12, 1945. The House of Representatives concurred in the Senate amendments on February 19, 1945. The same Members were reappointed or continued to serve on the committee and the actual study and report was made pursuant to H. Con. Res. 18, 79th Cong., 1st sess.

[7] "The committee held 39 public hearings and 4 executive sessions between March 13 and June 29, 1945. The testimony of 102 witnesses was taken, 45 of whom were Members of Congress. In addition, 37 Members and many interested private citizens submitted written statements"; S. Rept. 1011, 79th Cong. 2d sess., p. 1; H. Rept. 1675, 79th Cong. 2d sess., p. 1.

"Our committee was created in response to a widespread congressional and public belief that a grave constitutional crisis exists in which the fate of representative government itself is at stake. Public affairs are now handled by a host of administrative agencies headed by nonelected officials with only casual oversight by Congress. The course of events has created a breach between Government and the people. Behind our inherited constitutional pattern a new political order has arisen which constitutes a basic change in the Federal design. Meanwhile, government by administration is the object of group pressures which weaken its protection of the public interest. Under these conditions, it was believed, the time is ripe for Congress to reconsider its role in the American scheme of government and to modernize its organization and procedures."

The bill containing the recommendations of the committee was introduced in the Senate by Senator La Follette on May 13, 1946, agreed to in the Senate on June 10, passed by the House of Representatives on July 25, and signed by the President on August 2, 1946.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION ACT

Titles I and II of the act relate directly to legislative operations. Titles III, IV, V and VI are related to that purpose but have additional direct effects.

Senate

Part I of title I substantially amends rules XVI and XXV of the standing rules of the Senate. Beginning with the convening of the Eightieth Congress in January of 1947, the present standing committees of the Senate are reduced in number from 33 to 15.[8] Heretofore Senators have been permitted to serve on an unlimited number of committees; but hereafter, under the amended rule, a Senator may not serve on more than two standing committees of the Senate, except that those of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees.

The amendment to rule XVI prohibits the Senate Committee on Appropriations from reporting an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation. It provides that the Senate shall not receive an amendment to an appropriation bill which proposes general legislation or is not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill. It also prohibits amendments to any item or clause of such bill which do not directly relate thereto and forbids the placing of any restriction on the expenditure of funds appropriated if the restriction is unauthorized by law and if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency.

House of Representatives

Part 2 of title I substantially amends rules X and XI of the standing rules of the House of Representatives. Beginning with the next Congress, the present standing committees of the House of Representatives are reduced in number from 48 to 19.[9] In the part, membership on one of the major committees in the House of Representatives was considered a full-time job for those members belonging to the majority party, but a member could serve on minor committees without limitation as to number.

Hereafter, under the amended rule, Members of the House may not serve on more than one standing committee, except that Members who are elected to serve on the District of Columbia Committee or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees. Rule XI has been broadened to permit the Committees on House Administration, Public Works, Public Lands and Veterans' Affairs to report at any time on certain matters; heretofore this privilege was pretty much limited to the Committees on Accounts, Appropriations, Rules, and Ways and Means when reporting revenue measures.

Subpena powers

Section 134 (a), part 3, title I, authorizes each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, to hold hearings and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses or the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents. With the exception of the Committee on Appropriations, which is authorized to conduct investigations under section 202 (b) of title II, no standing committee of the House of Representatives is authorized to subpena witnesses or conduct investigations.

Budget and revenue

The Government is the largest single spender of money. Raising revenue with which to finance its various departments and operations is a continuing as well as a tremendous problem. It has often been suggested that the members of the Appropriations and revenue-raising committees of the Congress should meet and give closer consideration to the relationship between income and expenditures. Section 138 (a), part 3, title I, provides for a joint meeting of the revenue-raising and appropriations committees of the two Houses at the beginning of each regular session of Congress, and contemplates joint action on the adoption of an over-all legislative budget.

LEGISLATIVE AID

While all of title I of the act deals with changes in Rules of the Senate and House of Representatives and is subject to the will and pleasure of the two Houses with reference to their own affairs, the other five titles of the act become a part of the substantive law.

Committee staffs

Subject to annual appropriations, the Committee on Appropriations of each House is authorized to appoint such staff by a majority vote as it shall determine to be necessary. Each of the other standing committees of the Senate and House of Representatives is authorized to appoint, by a majority vote of the committee, not more than four professional staff members in addition to the regular clerical staffs of such committees.

The professional staff members of the committees are to receive annual compensation fixed by the chairman and ranging from $5,000 to $8,000, and the clerical staff is to receive compensation ranging from $2,000 to $8,000. Section 202 (f), part 1, title II, provides that no committee shall appoint to its staff any experts or other personnel detailed or assigned from any department or agency of the Government, except with the written permission of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. Section 202 (g), part 1, title II, provides that no individual who is employed as a professional staff member of any committee shall be eligible for appointment to any office or position in the executive branch of the Government within a period of 1 year after he shall have ceased to be such a member.

Legislative Reference Service

The Legislative Reference Service began functioning as a division in the Library of Congress about 1914. It appears to have received its first appropriation $25,000, as such a division in the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1915. Its first work consisted of preparing indexes and digests of the laws but this was soon enlarged to permit it to supply information to committees and Members of Congress. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, the Legislative Reference Service received an appropriation of nearly $200,000.

Section 203 (a), part 1, title II, now establishes the Legislative Reference Service as a separate department in the Library of Congress. Its function is: (1) On request to assist any committee or joint committee of either House in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative proposals or recommendations submitted by the President or any executive agency, to assist otherwise in furnishing a basis for the proper determination of measures; (2) on request or upon its own initiative in anticipation of requests to gather, classify, analyze, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations, bulletins, and otherwise, data bearing upon legislation without partisan bias in selection or presentation; and (3) to prepare summaries and digests of hearings, bills, and resolutions.

Section 203 (b) (1) provides that a director, assistant director, and all other necessary personnel be appointed by the Librarian of Congress, without regard to the civil-service

[8] Sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States are not an unconstitutional invasion of the right of the Houses of Congress to make their own rules, inasmuch as those bodies may act by statutes as well as by rules. *Chapman* v. *U. S.* (1896), 6 App. D. C. 302; *In re Chapman* (Dist. Col. 1897), 166 U. S. 661, 17 S. Ct. 667, 41 L. Ed. 1154. This abolishes the Senate Committees on Audit and Control, Claims, Commerce, Enrolled Bills, Immigration, Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Interoceanic Canals, Library, Manufacture, Military Affairs, Mines and Mining, Naval Affairs, Patents, Pensions, Post Offices and Post Roads, Printing, Privileges and Elections, Public Buildings and Grounds, and Territories and Insular Affairs. At the same time the amendment to rule XXV creates new standing committees of the Senate on Armed Services and on Public Works; and it changes the names of the standing Committees on Education and Labor, Interstate Commerce, Public Lands and Surveys, and Rules to Labor and Public Welfare, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Public Lands, and Rules and Administration.

[9] This abolishes the House Committees on Accounts; Census; Claims; Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Disposition of Executive Papers; Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress; Elections No. 1; Elections No. 2; Elections No. 3; Enrolled Bills; Flood Control; Immigration and Naturalization; Indian Affairs; Insular Affairs; Invalid Pensions; Irrigation and Reclamation; Library; Memorials; Military Affairs; Mines and Mining; Naval Affairs; Patents; Pensions; Printing; Public Buildings and Grounds; Revision of the Laws; Rivers and Harbors; Roads; Territories; and War Claims. At the same time the amendment to Rule X creates new standing committees of the House of Representatives on Armed Services and on House Administration and Public Works, combines the Civil Service and Post Office and Post Roads Committees as well as the Education and Labor Committees into new Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Education and Labor, and has the effect of changing the name of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

laws, without reference to political affiliations, and solely on the ground of fitness.[10]

Legislative Counsel

On February 24, 1919, Congress established a legislative drafting service to afford to committees expert assistance in drafting public bills and resolutions.[11] The name was changed to Office of the Legislative Counsel on June 2, 1924, and placed under the direction of two legislative counsels, one to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the other to receive his appointment through the Speaker of the House of Representatives.[12] During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, $90,000 was appropriated to the Office of the Legislative Counsel.[13] Section 204, part 1, title II, now authorizes appropriations for the work of the Office of the Legislative Counsel in the following amounts for the fiscal years ending June 30: 1947, $150,000; 1948, $200,000; 1949, $250,000; 1950, $250,000; and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

COMPTROLLER'S AUDITS

Before the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it was the duty of the Comptroller General to conduct audits for the purpose of determining whether the departments and agencies of the Government were spending funds as authorized. Section 206, part 1, title II, now authorizes and directs the Comptroller General to make an expenditure analysis of each agency in the executive branch (including Government corporations), to enable Congress to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently expended.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING

Title III is often referred to as the Antilobbying Act. Such a reference is a misnomer, for there is nothing whatever in the act that prevents lobbying. The important part of this title is found in section 307. What the act really intends to accomplish is to bring about registration, and a statement of receipts and expenditures, on the part of any person who by himself or through another in any manner directly or indirectly solicits or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in securing or influencing the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Section 308 (a) provides that any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States shall, before doing anything in furtherance of such object, register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and furnish certain information; but persons who merely appear before committees of the Congress of the United States in support of, or in opposition to, legislation are expressly exempted from the requirements of section 308. Section 310 (a) provides criminal penalties for violations and section 310 (b) provides in addition that any person convicted is prohibited for 3 years from attempting to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any proposed legislation or from appearing before a committee of the Congress in support of or in opposition to proposed legislation.

TORT CLAIMS ACT

In considering the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Congress was faced with the question of how it could best handle the large number of tort claims. It could continue to handle them through private bills just as it had done in the past; it could give the heads of the Federal agencies power to make adjustments or settlements; or it could make the United States amenable to suit in the courts. It chose what might be termed a combination of the two latter courses.[14]

Small claims

Where the total amount of the claim does not exceed $1,000, under section 403 (a), authority is now conferred upon the head of each Federal agency to determine and settle any claim for money against the United States accruing on and after January 1, 1945, on account of damage to or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant for such damage, loss, injury, or death, in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred.[15] Larger claims are committed to the courts.

Suits

Subject to stated exceptions,[16] section 410 (a), part 3, provides that the United States district courts (for the district wherein the plaintiff is resident or wherein the act or omission complained of occurred), sitting without a jury, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine and enter judgment for money on any claim against the United States accruing on and after January 1, 1945, on account of damage to or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of an employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant for such damage, loss, injury, or death in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred. The section further provides that the United States shall be liable in respect of such claims to the same claimants, in the same manner, and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances except that the United States shall not be liable for interest prior to judgment or for punitive damages. It also provides that costs shall be allowed in all courts to the successful claimant to the same extent as if the United States were a private litigant, but not attorneys' fees.

Compromises, limitations

Section 413, part 3, authorizes the Attorney General to settle any claim after the institution of suit with the approval of the court in which such suit is pending. Section 420, part 4, provides that every claim against the United States cognizable under the title shall be barred unless within 1 year after such claim accrued or within 1 year after the date of enactment of the act, whichever is later, it is presented in writing to the Federal agency out of which activities it arises if such claim is for a sum not exceeding $1,000; or unless within 1 year after such claim accrued or within 1 year after the date of enactment of the act, whichever is later, an action is begun pursuant to part 3 of the title.

GENERAL BRIDGE ACT

In the past Congress has given its consent for the construction of bridges over navigable waters by the passage of individual bridge bills. By including title V in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 Congress gave its general consent for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges and approaches thereto over the navigable waters of the United States except where the construction of a bridge would connect the United States or any Territory or possession with a foreign country. The location and plans for such bridges must be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War before construction is commenced, and in approving the location and plans of any bridge they may impose any specific conditions relating to the maintenance and operation of the structure deemed necessary in the interest of public navigation.

Section 502 (c) makes it unlawful to construct or commence the construction of any privately owned highway toll bridge until the

---

[10] Section 203 (b) (2) authorizes the Librarian of Congress to appoint in the Legislative Reference Service senior specialists in the following broad fields: agriculture, American Government and public administration, American public law, conservation, education, engineering and public works, full employment, housing, industrial organization and corporation finance, international affairs, international trade and economic geography, labor, mineral economics, money and banking, price economics, social welfare, taxation and fiscal policy, transportation and communications, and veterans' affairs. For the work of the Legislative Reference Service (203) (c) authorizes the appropriation of $550,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947; $650,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; $750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; and such sums as may be necessary thereafter to carry on the work of the Service.

[11] 40 Stat. 1141.

[12] 43 Stat. 353; see also 55 Stat. 726.

[13] Public Law No. 85, 79th Cong. 1st sess.

[14] A somewhat similar bill passed both Houses but was given a "pocket veto" by President Coolidge. H. R. 9285, 70th Cong.

[15] Similar legislation has been in effect for some years.

[16] Sec. 421 exempts from the title: "(a) Any claim based upon an act or omission of an employee of the Government, exercising due care, in the execution of a statute or regulation, whether or not such statute or regulation be valid or based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a Federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused. (b) Any claim arising out of the loss, miscarriage, or negligent transmission of letters or postal matter. (c) Any claim arising in respect of the assessment or collection of any tax or customs duty, or the detention of any goods or merchandise by any officer of customs or excise or any other law-enforcement officer. (d) Any claim for which a remedy is provided by the act of March 9, 1920 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 741–752, inclusive), or the act of March 3, 1925 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 781–790, inclusive), relating to claims or suits in admiralty against the United States. (e) Any claim arising out of an act or omission of any employee of the Government in administering the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. (f) Any claim for damages caused by the imposition or establishment of a quarantine by the United States. (g) Any claim arising from injury to vessels, or to the cargo, crew, or passengers of vessels while passing through the locks of the Panama Canal or while in Canal Zone waters. (h) Any claim arising out of assault, battery, false imprisonment, false arrest, malicious prosecution, abuse of process, libel, slander, misrepresentation, deceit, or interference with contract rights. (i) Any claim for damages caused by the fiscal operations of the Treasury or by the regulation of the monetary system. (j) Any claim arising out of the combatant activities of the military or naval forces, or the Coast Guard, during time of war. (k) Any claim arising in a foreign country. (l) Any claim arising from the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

location and plans thereof shall have been submitted to and approved by the highway department or departments of the State or States in which the bridge and its approaches are situated. The right is given to enter upon lands and acquire or condemn real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of bridges and their approaches between two or more States.

SALARIES

Members of Congress now receive an annual salary of $10,000. The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of 1946 provided an additional expense allowance of $2,500 per year for Members of the House. The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of 1947 contained the same provision for Senators, effective after January 1, 1946. Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes, the salary of Members of Congress, by section 601 of title VI, is now increased to $12,500 per annum and the $2,500 annual expense allowance is made permanent. The annual compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States is increased from $15,000 to $20,000.

The provisions of the title also permit Members of Congress to come under the Civil Service Retirement Act, provided they contribute 6 percent of their annual salaries. No Member is entitled to receive an annuity until he shall have become separated from the service after having had at least 6 years of service as a Member of Congress and has attained the age of 62 years. The Government contributes to the retirement fund, and the annuity is an amount equal to 2½ percent of the Member's annual basic salary multiplied by his years of service, but not to exceed an amount equal to three-fourths of the compensation he is receiving at the time he becomes separated from the service.

CONCLUSION

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 does not appreciably change the rules of debate in the Senate nor lessen the prerogatives of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives, two things about which there was publicly expressed apprehension. Apart from the value of the reduction in the number of standing committees in the Senate and House of Representatives and the other changes made in the rules of the two Houses, definite forward steps are taken by the act in the provisions for professional staffs for committees, increased pay to clerical employees of committees, larger appropriations for the office of the legislative council, and the expenditure analysis of Federal agencies by the Comptroller General.

In this connection a most important part of the act is found in section 203, part 1, title II, wherein the Legislative Reference Service is established as a separate department in the Library of Congress with its duties broadened, its appropriation and personnel greatly enlarged, and the appointment of all its specialists and other employees lodged in the hands of the Librarian of Congress. For many years Congress has been greatly handicapped due to the lack of an adequate staff of expert analysts to assist it in the formulation and study of legislative proposals—lack of proper working tools. It has had to rely too much and too long on the analysis and advice of the executive branch. Congress now makes a significant start toward freeing itself from this condition in forbidding the employment by committees of persons detailed or assigned from any department or agency of the Government, without the written permission of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, and in making professional staff members of committees ineligible for appointment to any office or position in the executive branch for a period of a year after they shall have ceased to be such a member.

Yet Congress has inconsistently placed the hiring of all the personnel of the Legislative Reference Service in the hands of an officer of the executive branch, the Librarian of Congress who is appointed by the President (by and with the advice and consent of the Senate) and is charged with administering the copyright laws in addition to his duties as head of the Library of Congress.[17] In that situation lies danger to the success of what Congress has sought to achieve because, unless the Librarian of Congress is superhumanly careful, it will be only a short time before the executive branch dominates the Legislative Reference Service.

Other titles and provisions display, if not a complete solution of the problems with which they deal, a diligent and sincere attempt on the part of Congress to improve the operating methods and potentialities of the legislative branch. In so doing it has taken significant steps affecting the administration of justice as well, as for example in the matter of tort claims. While there are many difficulties to be seen ahead in launching the legislative reorganization program, everyone interested in good government will hope for its success and that it will prove to be a start upon which much may be built in the coming years.

[17] See 2 U. S. C. 136 and 17 U. S. C. A. 1–64. 1–64.

Army-Navy Moratorium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Fielding Eliot entitled "Army-Navy Moratorium":

ARMY-NAVY MORATORIUM

(By George Fielding Eliot)

Within the next 5 years, the ablest military minds of this country expect very great changes to be made in the weapons and equipment of our armed forces. These will involve changes in tactics and technique and changes, of course, in training. They may be such as to bring about changes in our national strategy—presuming, as we may well presume, that we shall not in 5 years' time have dispensed with the need for giving serious consideration to strategical matters.

This being the case, it seems a pity that we cannot lay aside, for the next 5 years, the furiously red-hot question of unification of the armed forces. Whatever we decide now, we may have to change as we go along, may have to alter out of all recognition within a few years. The existing War and Navy Departments are perfectly capable of taking care of our national security for the immediate future, and would be even more so if Congress would immediately enact those features of the proposed unification measure on which there is full agreement between the services.

These include (1) a national security council, to consist of the Secretary of State, the service secretaries, and the chairman of a new organization performing roughly the same function as the old War Production Board; (2) a central intelligence authority; (3) a central authority for scientific research and development along military lines; (4) statutory recognition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. One step more might be taken—the President might be authorized to appoint a chairman for the national security council with special powers as a Presidential deputy to resolve interservice differences. Particularly, this officer might be charged with bringing about interservice budgetary planning and coordination.

Admittedly, this would not be satisfactory to the Army proponents of unification now. My Army friends will, I am sure, regard this suggestion as Navy propaganda. But how can anyone who is sincerely devoted to the cause of national security really desire the continuance of the present condition of interservice controversy, which takes up so much of the time and thought of officers and officials at all levels of authority in both departments?

Consider what a 5-year moratorium on unification might accomplish:

First, we would have time to see what changes were brought about by new weapons and new methods, and also by international developments.

Second, during the 5-year period we would have five classes of high-ranking students passing through the National War College, studying together the broad aspects of war and of national security and passing out into their respective services again, to occupy positions of high authority.

Third, during the same period we would have in operation our seven joint overseas commands, in which joint staffs, under a single commander, would be working out the practical problems of joint command in peacetime.

Fourth, the national security council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff would have an opportunity, under statutory authority, to work on interservice coordination and to discover what could be done and in what respect improvement was required.

At the end of 5 years the whole matter could be reconsidered, in the light of the experience thus gained, and without the heat engendered by present urgent attempts to rush unification through Congress while the going is—or seems to be—good.

Meanwhile, the consolidated congressional committees on the armed forces will have a chance to shake down at their new jobs. A new President and new service Secretaries will have been 3 years in office and will have brought new points of view to the broad problems of administration which are involved. The question of universal training will have been settled. The shape and character of our commitments under the United Nations Charter will be far more sharply defined than they are at present.

One possible difficulty with the suggested 5-year moratorium is the unquestionable need for autonomy for the Air Forces. To establish a separate department of air at this time, however, should not be too much of a dislocation—or the Air Force could be set up as a separate military force under the temporary administration of the War Department for an interim period of 5 years.

This latter plan might, indeed, provide a most useful testing ground for some of the theories on which the idea of unification is based.

The Late Honorable W. B. Bowling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the Members of the House of the death of a distinguished former

Member, the Honorable W. B. Bowling, of Lafayette, Ala., on December 27, 1946.

Judge Bowling, as he is affectionately known to the thousands of Alabamians who knew and loved him, represented a part of my district in the House from 1920 until August 1928, when he resigned to accept the judgeship of the Fifth Judicial Circuit of Alabama.

Judge Bowling passed away suddenly. He was addressing a meeting of the Rotary Club in Lafayette, Ala., when he was stricken. His record as a Member of Congress and as a judge is one of excellence. He was a leader in the Baptist Church, of which he was a member, having served as the president of the Alabama Baptist Association for a number of years. Judge Bowling was 73 years of age at the time of his death. He had led a full life, filled with fine accomplishments. He died as he would have wanted to, "in the harness." His legion of friends mourn his passing, and bless his memory.

I include at this point a newspaper article from the Lafayette (Ala.) Sun, together with an editorial from the same paper:

JUDGE BOWLING PASSES SUDDENLY AT ROTARY CLUB—DEATH COMES UNEXPECTEDLY WHILE REVIEWING BOOK BEFORE THE GROUP

Judge William Bismarck Bowling, age 76, prominent jurist of this city, collapsed and died almost instantly while reviewing a book before the Lafayette Rotary Club, of which he was a member, last Friday at 1:20 in the Baptist Church annex.

Stunned members of the club and guests looked helplessly on while Doctors Wheeler, Riser, Frazer, and Moore administered artificial respiration and other first aid measures to no avail.

Judge Bowling was reviewing the Adventures of Captain Simeon Suggs, one of his favorite books, written by a former resident of this city, Johnson Jones Hooper. He had just read and commented on one of the book's outstanding chapters and had looked at his watch to see if he had time to review further. On finding that he had something like 10 minutes more, he put his watch back in his pocket and began talking. Suddenly he leaned forward against a nearby table and collapsed on the floor, where death came quickly.

Funeral services were held at Lafayette First Baptist Church, of which Judge Bowling was a member and deacon, Saturday afternoon at 3 o'clock, with Rev. C. C Sanders, pastor, conducting, assisted by Rev. O. R. Burns and Rev. V. M. Gardner. Burial was in the Lafayette Cemetery, with Johnson & Sanders in charge of arrangements.

Active pallbearers were John Williams, Joe Tyner, N. D. Denson, Judge Albert Hooten, Bismarck Evans, and Joe Jenkins.

Honorary pallbearers were Billy Hare, Holmes Powell, Dick Powell, Thomas Samford Mullins, Paul Hooten Sam H. Oliver, D. W. Jackson, W. O. Walton, R. C. Wallace, C. E. Fuller, C. S. Moon, James A. Hines, Bill Hines, Howell Morrow, B. B. McGinty, Dr. Gwaltney, Dr. L. N. Duncan, George Lanier, S. L. Toomer.

Surviving are the widow, Mrs. Frances Collins Bowling; one son, George R. Bowling, Lafayette; two daughters, Mrs. George L. Jenkins, Lafayette, and Mrs. John Thomas Frazer, Opelika; two grandsons, Ensign George Randolph Bowling, now stationed on Guam, and William Bismarck Bowling II, of Lafayette; two granddaughters, Miss Susan Bowling of Lafayette, and Miss Jane Frazer, Opelika.

Judge Bowling was born in Calhoun County, Ala., September 24, 1870, and was a graduate of State Teachers College, Jacksonville. He taught in the city schools of Montgomery, Ala., and Columbus, Ga., for 7 years and was admitted to the Alabama bar in 1900 when he began the practice of law. From 1904 to 1920 he was prosecuting attorney for the fifth judicial circuit of Alabama, resigning this office after he was elected a Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress. He served in this office until 1929, when he resigned to accept appointment to the office of judge of the fifth judicial circuit, in which capacity he was serving as senior judge at the time of his death. He did not seek reelection and would have retired on January 20, 1947.

Judge Bowling was active in church affairs, being an officer of the First Baptist Church of Lafayette and Bible class teacher for many years. He served as president of the Alabama State Baptist convention for 2 years and was moderator of the East Liberty Baptist Association for many years, holding this place at the time of death. He was a member of the Knights of Pythias, Masons, and a Shriner, and was a member of the board of trustees of Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn.

THE PASSING OF JUDGE BOWLING

The Sun this week chronicles the sudden passing of Judge W. B. Bowling, of Lafayette, one of our most esteemed citizens, whose contribution to the welfare and progress of our people has been outstanding.

Judge Bowling had a brilliant mind. He was one of the most learned men this section has ever produced. An outstanding jurist at the time of his death, his record of public service is seldom equaled. His knowledge of Biblical history was unsurpassed in Alabama, and to hear his discourses on this subject was, indeed, a rare privilege. His many other attainments, too numerous to mention, placed him at the top of the list in the field of public service. His passing was as we feel he would have wanted it, rendering a service to his fellow man while speaking to his fellow Rotarians. Judge Bowling loved Rotary and all it stood for, as he loved the Baptist Church, so the setting for his farewell to this earth was among friends he loved, in the church he worshiped and served so well in past years.

The suddenness with which death often comes is always shocking to loved ones, and while his legion of friends grieve with his family at his going, they can take consolation in knowing that he made a great contribution to his fellow man, and that the world was made a better place to live by his sojourn here.

Brooklyn Navy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program of the ceremonies held at Borough Hall on Monday, October 28, 1946, in observance of Brooklyn Navy Day, together with a letter from the chairman of the Brooklyn Navy Day Committee:

NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Brooklyn, N. Y., October 29, 1946.

Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is a pleasure to be able to report to you, a member of the citizens' committee, that the ceremonies held at Borough Hall on Monday, October 28, 1946, in observance of Brooklyn Navy Day, were an outstanding success.

For your information, there is enclosed herein a copy of the program.

With many thanks for your cooperation, I am,

Sincerely,

J. VINCENT KEOGH,
Chairman, Brooklyn Navy Day Committee.

BROOKLYN NAVY DAY, BOROUGH HALL, BROOKLYN, OCTOBER 28, 1946

PROGRAM

1. Musical selection: Navy Band of the New York Navy Yard, directed by Chief Musician Judson Hildebrandt.

2. National Anthem: Everett D. McCocey, soloist.

3. Navy Day proclamation: Borough President John Cashmore.

4. Message from Ralph A. Bard, president, Navy League of the United States.

5. Presentation of Navy League Charter to Brooklyn Council, Navy League of the United States, Commander Charles Hann, Jr., to Lt. William C. Mattison, secretary, Brooklyn Council.

6. Address: Rear Adm. Ralph S. Riggs, United States Navy.

7. Finale.

BROOKLYN NAVY DAY COMMITTEE

Honorary chairman: Hon. John Cashmore, president, Borough of Brooklyn.

Chairman: J. Vincent Keogh, United States attorney.

Col. J. H. Bigley, executive director, Brooklyn Chapter American Red Cross; James S. Brown, Jr., Esq.; Mrs. Mathilda Burling, national president, American Gold Star Mothers of the World Wars, Inc.; Mrs. Thomas F. Callahan, county commander, American Legion; Dr. J. Henry Carpenter, Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation; Hon. Emanuel Celler; Angelo Cincotte, Esq., county adjutant, American Legion; Lt. Comdr. Mary Clavin; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis P. Connelly; Mr. Milton Dammann, president, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce; Mr Henry J. Davenport, president, Downtown Brookyn Association, Inc.; Hon. John J. Delaney; Mr. James C. Diver, county commander, Catholic War Veterans; William T. Foley, Jr., Esq.; Mrs. Marion L. Foster, director, Home Service American Red Cross; Mrs. Katherine Goate, president, Women's Federal Jurors' Association; Mrs. William H. Good; Mr George H. Gray, president, Brooklyn Real Estate Board; Mr. Max Grossman, county commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Rear Adm. F. E. Haeberle, commander, Naval Shipyard; Hon. James J. Heffernan; Mr. Lloyd I. Herzka, secretary to the borough president; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward P. Hoar; Mr. Almeth W. Hoff, first vice-president, Brooklyn Civic Council; Mr. Nathaniel Kaplan, county commander, Jewish War Veterans; John H. Kearney, Esq., Knights of Columbus; Rear Adm. Monroe Kelly, U. S. N., commandant, Third Naval District; Hon. Eugene J. Keogh; Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, commander Eastern Sea Frontier; Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal, Brooklyn Jewish Center; William C. Mattison, Esq.; Lt. (jg) Andrew J. McCaddin, United States Coast Guard Reserve; Hon. Miles F. McDonald, district attorney, Kings County; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Richard B. McHugh; Mr. George V. McLaughlin, president, Brooklyn Trust Co; Rear Adm. R. R. McNulty, superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy; Mr Albert R. Menard, president, Rotary Club of Brooklyn; Hon. Donald L. O'Toole; Mr. C. E. Paige, Brooklyn Union Gas Co, president; Hon. Joseph L. Pfeifer; Mr. Joseph Pridday, president, Frederick Loeser & Co.; Hon. Edward J. Quigley; Hon. Leo F. Rayfiel; Mr. Branch Rickey, Sr., president, Brooklyn Baseball

Club; Miss Harriet T. Righter; John J. Robinson, Esq.; Hon. John J. Rooney; Mr. Leonard S. Ross, Namm's, president; Mr. Walter Rothschild, president, Abraham & Straus; John J. Ryan, Esq.; Mr. Frank D. Schroth, Brooklyn Eagle, publisher; Mr. James B. Schultz, commander, Old Glory Naval Post; Hon. Andrew L. Somers; Mr. Howard Swain, managing editor, Brooklyn Eagle; Mr. Frank J. Taylor, American Merchant Marine Institute; Dr. Sidney S. Tedesche, Union Temple of Brooklyn; Miss Mary Tuthill, president, Brooklyn Women's Club; Comdr. William T. Vrooman, Navy recruiting; Mr. Emile Z. Weinberg; Mr. Sidney Weinberg; Mr. Edwin B. Wilson, editor, Brooklyn Eagle; Rear Adm. Francis E. M. Whiting, commandant naval base.

Hon. James F. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, James F. Byrnes is more than Time's Man of the Year. He is America's man of these times, wholly devoted to the simple and fundamental truths of individual dignity and justice for individuals and nations, and always conscious of the realities of this new and dangerous, but challengingly hopeful, atomic age.

He has worked steadfastly for peace, believing always that a victory at arms is but the opportunity for the victor to lead in the fight for freedom, justice, and economic security for the conqueror as well as the conquered.

History will record few men who have given more for a better nation and a better world than our retiring Secretary of State.

I am honored today to join millions in an expression of heartfelt gratitude for his labor in behalf of the things for which so many have paid so dearly.

Eminent and worthy as his successor unquestionably is, he can but build upon the solid foundation Jimmy Byrnes has laid.

America and the world are better places in which to live because of the abilities and work of this fine statesman. We pray that he may regain his health and enjoy many years in this world he has helped to build.

On Federal Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 9, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be considerable controversy as to the wisdom of reducing personal income taxes at this time. I notice that those who decry a cut in personal income taxes are, in some instances, those who have been indoctrinated with the New Deal philosophy and practice of tax, spend, and tax. It is my opinion that there is no more reason for not reducing Government expenditures and cutting taxes now than there would have been in refusing to do so following World War I. The program of economy then adopted blazed the way for prompt and substantial reductions in individual income taxes. The rates were so high in 1918 that they had arrived at the point of diminishing returns.

In this connection it will be recalled that the Federal normal tax rate on individual incomes in 1918 was 12 percent—6 percent on the first $4,000—with a personal exemption for a single person of $1,000, a $2,000 exemption for a married person, and a credit for each dependent of $200. I repeat that this high rate of taxation, reduced exemption, and low credit for dependents had reached the point of diminishing returns. This situation, in the face of an unbalanced budget, a national debt in excess of $26,000,000,000, and 6,000,000 unemployed presented a serious problem that called for a courageous program of retrenchment and a realistic tax approach. The same arguments against tax reduction were made then that are heard now. I have referred to the high normal tax rate on individual incomes, the low exemptions, and low credit for dependents which existed in 1918.

The first step in cutting the Federal normal rate on individual incomes was taken under the Revenue Act of 1918 for the years 1919–20. The Federal personal normal income tax rate was reduced to 8 percent—4 percent on first $4,000. The personal exemption for a single person, a married person, and the credit for dependents remained the same. In addition to the normal tax the surtax rates ranged from 1 percent to a top rate of 65 percent on net income in excess of $1,000,000 with surtax exemption of $5,000.

The next revenue act was the 1921 act for the years 1921–23. The exemption for a married person was increased from $2,000 to $2,500 where the aggregate income of husband and wife did not exceed $5,000, and the credit for each dependent was increased from $200 to $400. In addition to the increased exemption for married persons and for dependents the surtax rates were amended applicable for 1922–23. A surtax exemption of $6,000 was provided and the surtax rates ranged from 1 percent on the first $2,000 to 50 percent on net incomes in excess of $200,000.

The second step in cutting the normal rate on individual incomes under the Revenue Act of 1924 was taken. Under this act the tax rate on the income of individuals was reduced to 6 percent—2 percent on first $4,000, 4 percent on second $4,000. The personal exemption for single persons and for married persons and the credit for each dependent remained the same. But the 1924 act increased the surtax exemption to $10,000 and the surtax rates ranged from 1 percent on the first $4,000 of net income to 40 percent on net incomes in excess of $500,000.

It should be mentioned, as well as stressed, that under the provisions of the Revenue Act of 1924 the tax for the year 1923 was reduced 25 percent.

The third step in cutting the normal rate on individual incomes was under the Revenue Act of 1926, covering the years 1925–27, which reduced the rate to 5 percent—1½ percent on first $4,000, 3 percent on second $4,000—while at the same time increasing the exemption for a single person to $1,500 and the personal exemption for a married person to $3,500; the credit for each dependent remained at $400. The 1926 act continued the surtax exemption of $10,000 and reduced the surtax rates. The top rate was reduced from 40 to 20 percent, and the top rate applied to net incomes in excess of $100,000.

The Revenue Act of 1928, while it did not change the rates or exemptions, increased the earned-income credit limit from $20,000 to $30,000.

The fourth reduction in the personal income-tax rate was under a House joint resolution enacted into law December 16, 1929, and taking effect as of January 1, 1930. The House joint resolution reduced the rate for 1929 on individual income to 4 percent—one-half of 1 percent on first $4,000, 2 percent on the second $4,000—the exemption for single persons, married persons, and the credit for dependents remained the same. Thus in four revenue acts following World War I there were four substantial reductions in the individual income-tax rates; also a 25-percent cut in the tax for 1923. In addition to all this tax relief there were two increases in personal exemptions for both single and married persons, and one increase in credits for each dependent.

It is noteworthy in the light of these reductions in individual income-tax rates, increased personal exemptions to both the single and married persons as well as the increased credit for dependents, that there were no Federal deficits in any year from 1921 to 1931.

But more extraordinary than all this, the record shows that notwithstanding all of this relief to individual income taxpayers, there was ample revenue to not only conduct the affairs of the Government in a high state of efficiency, but sufficient revenue to pay $1,000,000,000 each year for 10 years on the national debt.

The period of all this tax relief, to which I have referred, was one of full employment, large production, debt retirement, and Nation-wide prosperity.

During the 15 years of the New Deal, there have been adopted a great many tax proposals which have been inconsistent with our economic law. The country in the last election has repudiated these policies and expressed itself in favor of a return to a sound and constructive tax system. One of these theories is that a reduction of excessive and oppressive individual income tax rates will of itself

result in a heavy loss in revenue. The advocates of such a theory overlook the important fact that the yield from an income tax depends upon the amount of income which is subject to tax. If the individual rates are so high as to discourage production and expansion, interfere with business initiative, and deter venture capital, the tax yield on the income which could have been produced under fair and reasonable rates will be lost to the country. As will be shown, the tax on this increased income may go a long way toward offsetting any theoretical loss in revenue due to decreased rates. Excessive taxes dry up the source from which the revenue stems, encourage tax evasion, and make the tax less and less productive. The enemies of the income tax are not those seeking to reduce its oppressive and excessive rates, but those who insist that such rates remain on the statute books regardless of their effect on production, expansion, and initiative, in order to soak the rich. I believe that a reduction in the individual income tax will lend encouragement and stimulation to the production of income. This is illustrated by the experience in the twenties; when the war rates of the First World War were reduced. As has been pointed out, the first reduction occurred for the year 1921 under the Revenue Act of 1921.

In 1921, business and industry were faced with depressing influences arising as an aftermath of the First World War, and the country was passing through the trying period of liquidation and readjustment. Net income had declined from the all-time high of 23.7 billion to 19.5 billion for 1921. In the opinion of the Ways and Means Committee, the exacting of excessive taxes contributed in no small degree to the depression. For the year 1921, the reduction was limited to increasing the marital exemption from $2,000 to $2,500, where the aggregate income of husband and wife did not exceed $5,000, and increasing the credit for dependents. For the year 1922, there was a reduction in rates in all brackets, the top surtax being reduced from a top rate of 65 percent to a top rate of 50 percent. Other reductions followed in 1924, 1926, 1928, and 1929. The following table based upon Statistics of Income for 1941, published by the Treasury Department, shows what was accomplished through these tax reductions:

Net income:	*Billions*
1921	19.6
1922	21.3
1923	24.8
1924	25.6
1925	21.8
1926	21.9
1927	22.5
1928	25.2
1929	24.8
Tax:	*Millions*
1921	719
1922	861
1923	661
1924	704
1925	735
1926	732
1927	831
1928	1,164
1929	1,001

It will be noted that the net income increased through 1924 but decreased in 1925, although the tax yield for 1925 was greater than for 1924. The reason for this is explained by the following statement taken from the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927:

> The sources of the income returned for the calendar year 1925 as compared with 1924 clearly illustrate the effect of the new revenue act. The total national income was undoubtedly greater in 1925 than in 1924, due to increased prosperity, but the income actually returned for individual income-tax purposes was less, due to the entire exemption of over 40 percent of the 1924 income-tax payers. The income returned on account of wages and salaries was about $3,875,000,000 less; from individual businesses about $1,100,000,000 less; from rents and royalties about $538,000,000 less; and from interest and investments about $467,000,000 less. On the other hand, increased income was returned from dividends and from sale of property. Dividends increased about $214,000,000, while the gains from the sale of property, including that returned as capital net gains, increased about $1,418,500,000. The largest reductions in net income reported for tax purposes, in the income from wages and salaries and in the income returned on account of individual business, were in the lower tax brackets. The reductions in returns from rents and royalties and interest and investment income were almost entirely in the lower brackets. The greatest beneficiaries of the 1926 act were, therefore, people of small incomes, wage earners, salaried men, and men operating small individual business enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, it will also be noted from the table that the tax for 1923 was less than the tax for 1922. This was due to the 25-percent reduction in the income tax for 1923 provided in the Revenue Act of 1924. This loss in revenue was recouped by the increase in tax yield during later years.

Our capital gains also increased during this period. Prior to 1921, capital gains were subject to ordinary normal and surtax rates. Beginning with the Revenue Act of 1921, capital gains were subject to a flat rate of 12½ percent, where the asset sold had been held for more than 2 years.

The following table, taken from Statistics of Income for 1941, shows the increase in capital gains:

Capital net gains from sale of assets held more than 2 years:	
1922	$249,000,000
1923	305,000,000
1924	389,000,000
1925	940,000,000
1926	913,000,000
1927	1,081,000,000
1928	1,880,000,000
1929	2,347,000,000

A table is inserted in the appendix giving a break-down of the net income during the periods 1922 to 1929. As has already been pointed out, the drop in wages and salaries was due, not to the lack of income in national income but to the fact that a large part of such income was made exempt from the income tax due to raising the personal exemption and credit for dependents.

While there was substantial tax reduction during the period 1921 to 1929, inclusive, there was also a sufficient surplus to provide an annual reduction in national debt which, in 1920, stood at twenty-four billion. By 1930 the debt had been reduced to sixteen billion. This is shown by the following table, taken from the Secretary's report:

June 30—	*Total gross debt*
1919	$25,482,034,410
1920	24,297,918,412
1921	23,976,250,608
1922	22,964,079,190
1923	22,349,687,758
1924	21,251,120,427
1925	20,516,272,174
1926	19,643,183,079
1927	18,510,174,266
1928	17,604,290,563
1929	16,931,197,748
1930	16,185,308,299

There are some who advocate that any surplus which may arise should all be applied to the payment of the national debt. While I am a great believer in debt reduction, I feel that it is also important that the Government deal fairly with its taxpayers, who, in the second year after the war, are still burdened with heavy war taxes.

Any program which is adopted should, in my opinion, as in the twenties, provide a balance between debt reduction and tax reduction which is fair to all. Payments upon the public debt should not be so large as to require the continuation of oppressive war taxation upon our people in peacetime.

APPENDIX

EXHIBIT 1. STATISTICS OF INCOME FOR 1941, PT. 1, PP. 218–219

[Money figures in thousands of dollars]

Distribution	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
Income:						
Salaries, wages, commissions, etc.	13,693,953	14,195,356	13,617,663	9,742,160	9,994,315	10,218,450
Business profit	2,839,771	4,722,766	4,755,483	3,688,804	3,572,895	3,287,421
Partnership profit	1,427,127	1,676,409	1,810,014	1,827,025	1,732,581	1,755,145
Profit from sale of real estate, stocks, bonds, etc., other than taxed as capital net gain	742,104	863,107	1,124,566	1,991,659	1,465,625	1,813,396
Capital net gain from sales of assets held more than 2 years	249,248	305,394	389,148	940,569	912,917	1,081,186
Rents and royalties	1,224,929	1,814,126	2,009,716	1,471,332	1,490,760	1,302,276
Dividends received	2,664,219	3,119,829	3,250,514	3,464,625	4,011,590	4,254,829
Income from fiduciaries	257,928	329,124	310,144	305,806	333,265	421,481
Partially tax-exempt interest on Government obligations	33,989	43,711	29,645	25,651	36,782	47,479
Other taxable interest	1,738,601	2,177,771	2,281,703	1,814,402	1,936,604	1,675,916
Other income						350,981
Total income	24,871,908	29,247,593	29,578,997	25,272,035	25,447,436	26,208,561

EXHIBIT 1. STATISTICS OF INCOME FOR 1941, PT. 1, PP. 218–219—continued

[Money figures in thousands of dollars]

Distribution	1928		1929		1930	
	Individual returns and returns of fiduciaries, with net income	Individual returns with no net income	Individual returns and returns of fiduciaries, with net income	Individual returns with no net income	Individual returns and returns of fiduciaries, with net income	Individual returns with no net income
Income:						
Salaries, wages, commissions, etc	10,862,331	82,193	11,173,068	199,654	9,921,952	283,727
Business profit	3,243,955	32,811	3,327,989	58,413	2,628,057	69,697
Partnership profit	1,926,520	16,651	1,846,431	49,533	1,089,646	57,260
Profit from sales of real estate, stocks, bonds, etc., other than taxed as capital net gain	2,928,142	53,584	2,335,898	85,265	636,738	68,135
Capital net gain from sales of assets held more than 2 years	1,879,780	274	2,346,704	1,426	556,392	
Rents and royalties	1,164,518	67,071	1,278,757	79,984	974,325	103,460
Dividends received	4,350,979	88,984	4,783,240	297,726	4,197,304	434,988
Income from fiduciaries	443,998	17,577	508,221	12,209	429,459	19,843
Partially tax-exempt interest on Government obligations	40,553	1,763	40,184	2,864	38,134	5,738
Other taxable interest	1,841,818	59,760	1,908,030	115,177	1,608,434	161,536
Other income	302,040		296,235		239,004	
Total income	28,987,634	420,649	29,844,758	902,251	22,319,446	1,204,383

EXHIBIT 2. CAPITAL GAINS

The following data taken from the report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for 1927 show the following:

Profits and losses on sales of assets reported by 4,063 individuals with a net taxable income of $100,000 and over in 1916

Year	Profits on sale of assets	Percent profit to total income	Losses on sale of assets	Percent losses to total deductions
1917	$28,836,826	2.79	$19,150,961	13.40
1918	7,937,991	.92	65,072,240	32.44
1919	36,687,447	3.99	124,253,174	45.90
1920	10,910,541	1.33	216,116,946	56.75
1921	10,596,216	1.57	160,121,432	48.76
1922	95,245,772	12.06	87,032,461	33.97
1923	78,345,775	9.99	101,958,153	36.71
1924	101,089,611	12.34	53,784,450	33.99

The following table is prepared from the returns of 75 individuals who reported a net income in excess of $1,000,000 each for the year 1924. The table covers the years 1917 to 1925, both inclusive.

Year	Profits on sale of assets	Percent profit to total income	Losses on sale of assets	Percent losses to total deductions
1917	$2,803,233	2.58	$16,110,792	4.48
1918	1,723,990	1.87	23,955,447	22.47
1919	2,924,452	2.72	36,330,430	43.20
1920	1,243,069	1.22	42,964,016	58.00
1921	437,977	.44	41,459,237	49.54
1922	12,060,266	9.35	44,077,158	43.78
1923	14,732,561	11.27	40,761,119	32.39
1924	53,627,261	28.38	34,615,459	18.82
1925	62,822,952	31.07	45,230,895	19.05

The first table shows that from 1917 to 1920, both inclusive, 4,063 individuals reported gains in the aggregate amount of $84,772,805 and losses aggregating $424,593,321, the net result being approximately $340,000,000 more of losses than gains. In the same period of time the 75 individuals of great wealth reported $8,694,744 in gains and $119,361,285 in losses.

These were years of high values and great activity in the sale of property, yet in each year the losses were greatly in excess of the reported gains. Undoubtedly the very high surtax rates forbade the taking of profits and encouraged the taking of losses. Beginning in the year 1922 a large increase in reported profits is discernible, which amounts in both tables to a substantial excess over losses in 1924, the first year in which the present method of taxing capital gains and treating capital losses went into effect. While some allowance must be made for the great prosperity enjoyed in 1924 and 1925, the statistics support the conclusion that the capital gains tax has removed the restraint exercised by the surtax rate on profit-taking.

The same trend in the relation of gains to losses is indicated in the following table prepared for this committee covering the returns of all individual taxpayers. Statistics of losses are not available and the losses stated below are estimated from selected actual figures.

Actual profits and estimated losses on sale of assets regardless of time for which such assets were held

Year	Actual profits on sale of assets	Percent profit to total income	Estimated losses on sale of assets	Approximate percent loss to total deductions
1917	$318,170,617	2.63	$110,720,384	12.50
1918	291,185,704	1.64	571,468,120	31.38
1919	999,364,287	4.45	1,175,140,997	45.58
1920	1,020,542,719	3.82	1,680,304,149	56.87
1921	462,858,673	1.98	1,832,641,653	48.85
1922	991,351,580	3.99	1,251,989,891	35.41
1923	1,172,154,628	4.00	1,619,082,743	36.15
1924	1,513,714,092	5.12	896,906,462	22.45
1925	2,932,228,840	11.60	655,078,024	19.05
Total	9,701,571,140		9,739,332,423	

It is pointed out that in all three tables set forth in the preceding pages the ratio of gains to total income shows a marked increase in each case beginning with the year 1922, coinciding with the introduction of the capital gains rate of tax. Although the full effect of this rise may not be attributable entirely to the reduction of the rate, it is significant that the remarkable activity of the stock markets did not take place until some time later. A fair inference may be drawn that the lowering of the rate largely contributed to bring activity in the sale of property.

EXHIBIT 3. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1927, PAGES 10–11

Individual income tax: The Revenue Act of 1926 made sweeping changes affecting the taxation of individual incomes by increasing the personal credit exemption for single persons 50 percent and that for married persons and heads of families 40 percent, by increasing the earned income credit and by decreasing the normal and surtax rates. More than 44 percent of the individual taxpayers were relieved from income-tax payments. In 1924, 4,489,698 individuals returned taxable net income, whereas in 1925 the number fell to 2,501,166, a decrease of almost 2,000,000. Under the new law the rates of normal tax were reduced from 2 percent, 4 percent, and 6 percent to 1½ percent, 3 percent, and 5 percent, respectively. Surtax rates were cut from a maximum of 40 percent to a maximum of 20 percent. The earned-income provision was so extended as to apply to a maximum of $20,000 of such incomes as compared with the limit in the former act of $10,000.

It was very naturally anticipated that these changes would result in considerable loss of revenue. In fact, the report of the Ways and Means Committee submitted to the House estimated a reduction of $46,000,000 in normal tax paid and a reduction of $98,575,000 in returns from the surtax. As a matter of fact, however, the individual returns for the calendar year 1925 showed a larger tax than did those for 1924. The individual income tax returned for 1924 was $704,265,390, and for 1925 $734,555,183, an increase of $30,289,793. As estimated, there was a very large falling off in the normal-tax return. Before the deduction of earned-income and capital-loss credits, the normal-tax returns decreased $41,434,565. On the other hand, surtax returns decreased only $4,687,627, while the capital-gains tax increased $68,967,907. There was a net gain of $22,845,715, to which must be added $6,067,280, representing a decrease in the earned-income credit, and $1,376,798, representing a decrease in the capital-loss credit.

The results are attributable to several causes: First and most important was the increased prosperity of the country as exemplified by the increased income from certain sources, despite the reduction in number of returns. The income from dividends returned, which were $3,250,913,954 in 1924, rose to $3,464,624,648 in 1925 despite fewer returns and the reduction in total income returned. More important than any other changes was the enormous increase in the income reported from the sale of property, both under the capital-gains section and under the general provisions. Income from the sale of property under the general provision reported for 1924 amounted to $1,124,565,658, while in 1925 this figure had jumped to $1,991,659,499, an increase of $867,093,841, or 77 percent. In addition, income under the capital net-gains section increased from $389,148,434 to $940,569,341, an increase of $551,420,907, or 142 percent, and the tax from $48,603,064 in 1924 to $117,570,071 for 1925. In fact, the increased revenue from the capital-gains tax more than offset the loss of $46,122,192 in normal and surtax returns.

In the second place, the entire decrease in taxable incomes occurred in the classes not in excess of $5,000, while for those in excess of $5,000 it materially increased. The number of taxable returns with income of less than $5,000 decreased 55 percent, while the number in excess of $5,000 increased 18 percent; in excess of $25,000, 32 percent; in excess of $100,000, 67 percent; in excess of $300,000, 104 percent; and in excess of $1,000,000, 176 percent.

The Treasury Department has always contended that in the long run the taxation of income at moderate rates would be more productive than at very high rates. The soundness of this contention appears to have been amply borne out by the tax returns under the law of 1926, for both the calendar years 1925 and 1926.

The sources of the income returned for the calendar year 1925 as compared with 1924 clearly illustrate the effect of the new revenue act. The total national income was undoubtedly greater in 1925 than in 1924, due to increased prosperity, but the income actually returned for individual income-tax purposes was less, due to the entire exemption of over 40 percent of the 1924 income-tax payers. The income returned on account of wages and salaries was about $3,875,000,000 less; from individual businesses about $1,-

100,000,000 less; from rents and royalties about $538,000,000 less; and from interest and investments about $467,000,000 less. On the other hand, increased income was returned from dividends and from sale of property. Dividends increased about $214,000,000, while the gains from the sale of property, including that returned as capital net gains, increased about $1,418,500,000. The largest reductions in net income reported for tax purposes, in the income from wages and salaries and in the income returned on account of individual business, were in the lower tax brackets. The reductions in returns from rents and royalties and interest and investment income were almost entirely in the lower brackets. The greatest beneficiaries of the 1926 act were, therefore, people of small incomes, wage earners, salaried men, and men operating small individual business enterprises.

Higher Sights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include as a part thereof an address delivered at the annual convention of the Inland Empire Waterways Association at Portland, Oreg., last October by Dr. Wilson Compton, president of Washington State College. This address is a valuable contribution to the problems facing our Nation and the world. Following is a copy of the address:

It has been said that there is nothing so permanent as change. I can remember, and so can you, when the Columbia River was regarded as a picturesque, historic stream draining a lot of water from the mountains, full of salmon, and wonderful for sightseers.

I can remember, and so can you, when the Pacific Northwest was regarded as a good place to invest in timber and mines, a fine chance for wheat, cattle, and produce, and an excellent source of raw materials, with its future clouded only by high transportation costs to the East.

I can remember, and so can you, when the Pacific Northwest was regarded as the gateway to a fabulous Alaska, and some time perhaps to a greater trade with the Orient.

I can remember, and so can you, the phrase "going back East" still so commonly used in the West and the phrase "going out West" still so commonly used in the East—the former implying that one is returning home and the latter that the West is a frontier.

These were all true. To a large extent they are still true. But they are today only a small part of the truth.

The West is losing its inferiority complex. The phrase "back East" no longer implies an intention some day to return to the East to live. The phrase "out West" no longer implies a bold, uncertain, and risky adventure. The West is on the way to developing an economy and a culture of its own. You in the constructive activity you have undertaken can speed it on its way.

The Pacific Northwest is still the great natural gateway to the Orient, but the Orient itself is on the march and the prospect is that in the century ahead our trans-Pacific relations—financial, commercial, cultural, military, and political—will become as important in our national life as heretofore have been our trans-Atlantic relations—perhaps more important.

The Northwest is still an abundant source of industrial materials. But it no longer needs to be a raw-materials colony. Gradually it can finance its own enterprises, fabricate and process its own products, diversify its own agriculture, industry, and commerce. It can follow, or even lead, the wholesome trend toward decentralization of industry, and in no region is there more favorable chance for the development of small industry in conjunction with agricultural production and marketing.

The Columbia River system no longer is merely a picturesque waterway full of salmon. It is already the most important single economic factor in an already power-dominated region. The experts say it is only one-fifth power developed, and its diversified irrigation and inland-transport possibilities barely begun.

You have been studying the waterways possibilities of this region for a long time. I am only a newcomer, although an interested and frequent visitor in the Northwest for many years. Perhaps I have not lived here long enough to know the things which ought to be done which can't be done. Anyhow, I am not much interested in them, and I hope that I may never learn. But I am interested in what can be done, and what we who live here can do to bring it about through intelligent public and private cooperation.

But I don't want to talk in vague and ambiguous generalities. What are our principal resources, and what can we do with them in agriculture, industry, and commerce?

AGRICULTURE

I know agriculture pretty well, and I have seen farming at close range in nearly every State of the Union and in many foreign countries. The Northwest has much of the best and some of the worst agriculture I have ever seen. In variable climates, rainfall, topography, soils and production, and marketing conditions, the Northwest, as a whole, has the best opportunity for diversified agriculture of any region in this country.

Those of us who know the mixed history of agriculture well know the basic importance of diversification both of primary products and of processed and derived products; and the importance of a reasonable balance between our agricultural, industrial, and commercial economies. Carrying all his eggs in one basket is hazardous for an individual; for a community or a region it may be disastrous. The expanding facilities for food processing and refrigeration, for the utilization of byproducts, and for storage and orderly marketing are one of the greatest safety valves of Northwest agriculture. The trends in this direction should be encouraged, and that encouragement is closely related to power and water development.

FORESTS

Timber has been much of the backbone of industry heretofore in the Pacific Northwest, and millions of acres of its lands are apparently useful for no purpose except timber growing. The forest industries are today in transition from a depleting to a self-perpetuating basis. In no region is that transition more evident than in these Northwest States. Lumber dominance is gone in Washington, and gradually it is going in Oregon. But forest and forest-industry dominance is not gone—is not even going. Pulp and paper, plywood, plastics, and wood chemical derivatives are continuing to share the place in industry formerly occupied almost solely by the sawmills.

As an official of the State of Washington, I perhaps should not be boasting of the potential importance of an Oregon enterprise. But I would like to point your interest to a new type of industry in the Willamette Valley which, if it succeeds, as I think it will, may eventually revolutionize our forest industries. The Willamette Valley Wood Chemical Co. was formed about 4 years ago to operate a wood-sugar plant utilizing sawdust, planing-mill shavings, and sawmill wastes. It should have been in operation a year ago. I now understand it will be operating next month. It is equipped to make alcohol and will have a large tonnage byproduct of lignin.

The plant is owned by the United States. The operating company is owned by about 15 lumber and timber companies. There are about 50 other locations in the United States where enough sawmill wastes can be readily concentrated to provide raw material for a plant of this size, and hundreds of other locations where smaller units could be installed. Over half of these are in the West, and nearly a third are in the Pacific Northwest.

This process converts wood cellulose into readily recoverable carbohydrates, primarily sugars like the sugar we put into our coffee or would have put in if we had it. A measure of its potential ultimate significance is in the fact that there is annually in the forest-industry operations in the United States, including the logging and the mills, a quantity of waste wood sufficient, if converted into sugar, to supply annually a tonnage equal to the commercial production of all sugar from all sources the world over, or 33,000,000 tons.

I helped a few years ago to organize the Willamette Valley Wood Chemical Co. If I had been smart enough to have known that I would later be living on the north side of the river, maybe I could have had this pioneering company set up in Washington instead of Oregon. The fact that this project has been carried on to this point is due largely to the perseverance, zeal, and enthusiasm of the United States Forest Service. The timber and lumber companies of the Willamette Valley have evidently had enough sawmill troubles of their own

FORESTRY

Another significant recent forestry development is an agreement, called a cooperative sustained-yield agreement, between the Simpson industries on the Olympic Peninsula of Washington and the Forest Service, now pending final ratification, by which, with the combined use of private timber and national forest timber, a permanent operation is assured on a sustained-yield basis equivalent to between 90,000,000 and 100,000,000 feet annually. There should be a score or perhaps more of similar cooperative sustained-yield forestry agreements in the Pacific Northwest alone. Scores of tree farms on private forest lands are in operation and scores more are in the making. Meantime, Oregon and Washington have strengthened their forest laws including their wholesome regulations of timber cutting

All this holds important future promise for the Northwest and marks the trend of the transition under way in forest ownership and forest industry. It is the way to keep strength in the timber backbone of Northwest industry.

LIGHT METALS

Minnesota has its iron ore and Pennsylvania has its steel. There is no reason that Washington and Oregon should not similarly have their light metals industries or that these should not eventually occupy a place in the industrial economy of the Northwest comparable to steel in the East.

Here we are with billions of tons under our feet of magnesite and dolomite and of alumina-bearing clays; and with ample power to reduce, convert, and fabricate them. Washington State prides itself as the light-metals capital and Washington State College and the United States Bureau of Mines are engaged in important researches into the recovery and uses of aluminum and magnesium. Their future promise is dependent on the further diligent power and water development of the Columbia River system.

ATOMIC POWER

No one in the Northwest needs an introduction to the era of atomic power. Some of us regard it as a promise, others as a threat. To all of us it is a mystery, as indeed it still is to the very scientists who helped the most to harness the atom.

The Hanford enterprise is likewise a mystery. Those of us who have been shown the gigantic installations on that project and have something more than a superficial understanding of its significance are not competent to predict the course of development of atomic power. Neither, I think, is anyone else. There are, of course, some persons who speak pontifically on the subject and with an air of great self-assurance. Generally, however, these are not the men who know the most about it. They, on the contrary, are cautious and usually almost reverent in their forecasts and their opinions, for they know that they are dealing with the very mysteries of the universe and with forces in nature accumulating over billions of years.

When we as laymen reflect that the atomic bombs which destroyed great Japanese cities actually utilized only 1 percent of the energy hidden within the atom, we should be skeptical of the person who speaks with unrestrained assurance of the future of atomic energy.

I have heard it said, for example, and so have you, that the harnessing of the atom has made hydroelectric power and such dams as Grand Coulee and Bonneville obsolete. That is complete poppycock. Obviously, no one may say that atomic power will never supplant hydroelectric power. "Never" is a long time. But it may be said that there is no iota of present evidence to justify such a statement. That is not my opinion. That is the opinion of men who know as much as any men know of what is in an atom and what can be gotten out of an atom. I say it is their opinion, because I have asked them.

The Hanford enterprise is the present "plutonium capital" of the world. There is no known reason that it should not so remain; and it is at least not without significance that the principal reason that Hanford is the "plutonium capital" is that it has access to clean water and abundant low-cost power; in other words, it has access to the Columbia River.

The administration of the Hanford enterprise is now in the General Electric Co., under contract with the United States Army. Many of you know the phenomenal record of General Electric in research and development, not only in electrical manufactures, but in the ramifications and uses of electric power. Many of you know also of the inspiring and ingenious mind of Dr. W. D. Coolidge, for so many years at the General Electric research laboratory in Schenectady, N. Y., and in recent weeks sent to the Hanford engineering works to head its research work, presumably in the production and uses of plutonium and in related researches.

The Pacific Northwest is not accustomed to leadership in research either fundamental or industrial. In fact, as many of you know, out of nearly 2,500 industrial research laboratories in the United States in 1940, the entire five States of the Pacific Northwest had only 50, one-half of the number at that time in the single little State of New Jersey.

Of course for the present at least, the light of Hanford is hid under a bushel. The veil of secrecy is bound to be continued as long as the interest of national security demands it. In time an international policy for atomic power control will be developed through the United Nations. In time the Atomic Energy Commission will be appointed. In time it will determine policies. In time the veil of secrecy will be lifted.

The Hanford enterprise should be regarded not as just another industry, but rather as potentially marking a new era in the march of science into the Pacific Northwest. The Hanford enterprise, with all of its significance for the present and all its implications for the future, is itself a strong reason for accelerating, not retarding, the power and irrigation development of the entire Columbia River system.

OTHER INDUSTRIES

You know better even than I do the development opportunities in minerals, clays, and coals and in phosphates and chemicals.

COMMERCE ACROSS THE PACIFIC

There is one future prospect which I think warrants more public interest than it is now getting—the development of finance, communication, trade, and commerce across the Pacific. There lies a great chance for the Pacific Northwest. Japan is not much in the news nowadays because Japan is not much of an issue nowadays, as is Europe. Japan is not an issue because MacArthur has mastered it in peacetime as he helped to master it in wartime.

I spent several weeks in the Orient this spring on a special Army mission. No one can do that with his eyes open without getting an impression of great populations in ferment, almost a billion people. I happened to be a guest in General MacArthur's home the afternoon that a proposed new constitution for Japan was announced by the Japanese Government—a constitution for the permanent government of 88,000,000 people. It proposed three major changes:

1. Abolition of the so-called Emperor system and continuance of an Emperor merely as a symbol of national unity but with no governmental functions.

2. A democratic form of government based on a free electorate, universal suffrage, and general free public education.

3. Renunciation of war and abolition of the means of making war.

The cynics may say, and some do say, that this is the handiwork merely of General MacArthur and does not represent the views of the Japanese. That is not true. Obviously, no constitution for Japan can be adopted which General MacArthur disapproves. But he knows, and we should know, that eventually the Japanese must shoulder and will shoulder the responsibilities of their own government and that no useful purpose would be served by now imposing on Japan a framework of government and a political system which have no roots in the convictions and determinations of the Japanese themselves.

That constitution initiated in March was vigorously debated for months in the new Japanese Diet and the Japanese press. A few weeks ago it was finally voted upon by the national legislature of 466 members with only 4 dissenting votes. That action may turn out to have been a turning point in the history of the Pacific; and in our daily press it received about 10 lines of inconspicuous notice.

China is different. There is no present prospect of national unification through diplomatic means. China is trying in one or two generations to solve many of the problems, political, economic, industrial, and social, which we and our Anglo-Saxon forebears took four centuries to solve—that is, insofar as we have in fact solved them. Then we wonder sometimes why China has so many political troubles. China needs and wants our help and our patience—and it certainly needs both.

The Orient needs help in education, finance, industry, and trade. I think it welcomes and will continue to welcome American cooperation in its affairs if we try to help exploit its resources and do not try to exploit its people. Many of you will live to see our trans-Pacific relations as important to our Nation as its trans-Atlantic relations have been; and there is no reason that the Pacific Northwest may not continue to be the natural, convenient, and preferred gateway to the Orient. Whether the principal access is through Seattle or Portland is not so important as that the Northwest explore its opportunities across the Pacific, develop them, and rise to them.

What bearing you may ask has all this upon the development of the great inland water system which more and more dominates the Pacific Northwest. This much as I see it: The dream of the future of the Northwest will never be realized without the complete development of the Columbia River system. By complete development I mean, of course; Power. But just as much I mean: Irrigation; and the low-cost navigation and inland transportation byproducts of an orderly river development. The people of the Northwest are alive to the importance of low-cost power. They are not yet equally alive to the importance of low-cast water on millions of acres of fertile lands which without water will continue as they now are: as arid wastes; and they are not yet equally alert to the present possibilities and future significance of low-cost inland transportation.

Many people fear that development of extensive new areas of agriculture will lead to overproduction. Certain it is that overproduction may result if along with our agriculture and forestry we do not develop diversified industries, improved means of transportation, better storage and marketing, and larger and more dependable markets nearer to sources of production. If the Northwest can foster a balanced economy of that kind and can gradually develop what I have called an economy and a culture of its own, the last thing it needs to fear is general agricultural overproduction—especially in the light of the world-wide production deficiencies accentuated by the vast destructions of a prolonged war.

I wish that through public and private cooperation the Northwest States would unite in support of a long-range program for the long-range development of the entire Columbia River system and seek its enactment by Congress as a fundamental legislative charter and as a continuing statutory authorization for specific developments year by year and step by step. That, after all, is not much different in the basic objectives from those of the Bonneville Power Administration or the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Commission, whose chairman is an associate of General Wheeler, the distinguished principal speaker at your convention, who has given you such radiant assurances of cooperation in the multiple-use development of the Columbia River. There should be a firm comprehensive Federal legislative authorization, not merely a House report such as Document 308 of the Sixty-ninth Congress—useful as that is and will continue to be. Such a charter would help to avoid the perennial sparring bout over which Columbia River projects come first, which should be pushed the hardest and which Federal agency does what. Such authorization has been helpful in other like circumstances. I know of no reason to think that it would not be helpful in these.

If the Columbia River development can go forward on such an orderly basis, if diversified agricultural, industrial, and commercial development is thus enabled to go hand in hand, and if we are wise enough, resourceful enough, and diligent enough ultimately to convert the great trans-Pacific potential into a human reality, the Pacific Northwest within the lifetime of some of you who are here today will see and will well support a population of 15,000,000 and will have come close to realizing the dream which has attached so many of you for so many years to the objectives which have brought you here today.

I hope, too, that you will encourage larger public interest in and greater public support

for the scientific services of your State institutions. They are the principal leaders of the march of science in the Pacific Northwest. They can greatly help you to help yourselves.

I am well aware that progress is made not by grandiose generalizations or by big words about the grandeurs of the Pacific Northwest, or by speeches by college presidents, but by the day-by-day effort of men and women who make things, who buy and sell things, and who perform useful services, and by enterprises which take good new ideas and convert them into a reality. Production of goods and trade in goods and services have been the foundation of our progress, and they will continue to be. Without them our educational and cultural opportunities and our chances for lasting peace are the form without the substance, for if anything is certain, it is that if trade and commerce do not cross national boundaries, armies will.

And yet the Pacific Northwest will never be bigger than its own ideas. Invention, it is said, is 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration. A good idea without courageous and diligent effort to put it to work is nothing more. Many people nowadays want jobs. Not so many want work. The national production and employment averages show that our collective productivity per man per hour of work is still 20 percent less than it was before the war.

We can do better than that. We can, that is, if we will. It is still true, unfortunately, that some individuals gain from war. But no nation and no community gains. War is destruction, not construction, and no one can gain wealth by destroying it. We can postpone our day of reckoning, and we are doing just that right now in this country, blunderingly, to be sure, rather too blunderingly, I think, but postponing it, nevertheless. But we won't avoid it. Some day we will face it; and if we face it successfully, it will be with more production, not less production; more trade, not less trade; more transport and more power, not less.

Fortunately, the war also has brought many new products, new methods, new techniques. These will greatly increase the productivity of our effort. More and more heavy labor is for machines, not men. Nowhere is that more true than in the Pacific Northwest, where the giant power of a Grand Coulee or a Bonneville can be captured in any factory or household or on any farm by the simple device of sticking a plug into the wall.

But that does not alter the fact that eventually we will make a choice—either to work harder to produce more to make up for the world-wide war destruction in which all nations will share or to adapt ourselves to a lower standard of living than the standard which we are capable of achieving.

No nation can permanently live off of the interest on its debts.

Let us keep our eyes on the stars, but our feet on the ground, and in blueprinting a future development for the Pacific Northwest, let us not be nearsighted or provincial and let us not waste our time on any small plans.

Sugar Decontrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 9, 1947

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a memorandum regarding sugar control, which I have received from the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp., Ltd., as follows:

MEMORANDUM REGARDING SUGAR DECONTROL

CALIFORNIA & HAWAIIAN SUGAR REFINING CORP., LTD.,
San Francisco, January 3, 1947.

It has been our privilege and responsibility for many years to supply the trade in the western and midwestern States with a substantial part of its sugar requirements. We have always operated under the theory that whatever happens in the sugar business that is detrimental to the best interests of our customers is likewise not good for ourselves. For this reason we are very much concerned about the campaign now being sponsored by certain interests to bring about an early ending of sugar controls.

Many of you are familiar with what happened following the quick lifting of sugar controls after World War I. For the information of those not so familiar, we would like to point out that at the time of decontrol, December 5, 1919, refined sugar was quoted at seaboard refineries at 9 cents per pound. On May 29, refined sugar at seaboard refinery touched 26 cents with re-sales being quoted substantially higher and retail sales being made at from 30 to 40 cents a pound. From this date the price began to decline and by the end of the year, December 31, 1920, refined sugar was selling at around 8 cents per pound. Sugar buyers large and small suffered severe financial reverses and many were actually forced into bankruptcy by the extent and abruptness of the decline.

We feel that the situation facing us in 1947 is even more critical than was the case in 1920. After years of high employment, with increased purchasing power coupled with the long pent-up demand for more sugar, it would be difficult to estimate what quantity of sugar would be required to satisfy the demand in this country in the first year of free trading. It is quite obvious that with the most favorable division of the Cuban crop among world claimants, even if based on prewar purchases, United States supplies for 1947 will fall far short of satisfying this demand. The early lifting of controls could only mean widely fluctuating markets with the logical sequence of economic disaster to jobbers and manufacturers. In a free market, when supplies are short, sugar would probably go to aggressive speculative interests, with the result that the housewife and the small manufacturer might receive less than they did in 1946 and certainly less than their proportionate shares of the supplies.

We are anxious for the return of the sugar business to a free-market status, but we want it accomplished in such a manner as to assure reasonable stability of prices and equitable distribution during the decontrol period, and not a repetition of the disastrous experience of 1920.

The Department of Agriculture is consulting with the various branches of the sugar industry as to recommendations for gradual decontrol with the idea of having the Government entirely out of its wartime sugar program just as quickly as conditions warrant. The Department of Agriculture should be allowed to carry out this program in conjunction with the industry, and such necessary legislation to authorize the Department to do this should be passed by the Congress.

If you are in agreement with this, we would suggest that you get in touch with your Senators and Congressmen, who are always anxious to obtain accurate information and suggestions from constituents who are familiar with a subject about which legislation is being considered. Such action should be taken at once as pressure on the Congress from the uninformed calling for immediate and complete decontrol is growing.

Sincerely yours,

EARL B. WILSON,
President.

Flaxseed and Linseed Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 9, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am daily in receipt of correspondence from manufacturers who use flaxseed and linseed oil in the manufacture of their products. Particularly is this true with the manufacture of linoleums.

It is evident that a situation has developed in the national picture that gives cause for alarm, sufficiently so that the Congress can well give consideration to this important subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a weekly letter published by the Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., vegetable-oil manufacturers and refiners, Minneapolis, Minn., which tells the story in a very concise manner:

ARCHER-DANIELS-MIDLAND CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., December 27, 1946.

GENTLEMEN: As the new year begins, we should like to comment on prospects for supplies of flaxseed and linseed oil for United States requirements during the next 12 months. We do not recall ever having to face a gloomier situation on the 1st of January than we do this year. After a very careful analysis of the supply and disappearance figures, we have come to the conclusion that on January 1 there will remain a linseed oil supply, over and above minimum stock requirements, of about 160,000,000 pounds. At the 1945–46 restricted disappearance rate of 62,725,000 pounds per month, these supplies should last until about the middle of March. In arriving at these figures, we have taken the latest Government estimate for the domestic 1946 crop and have added all supplies of flaxseed and linseed oil, either received since July 1, 1946, or promised from Argentina, Canada, Mexico, and Uruguay.

When the last supplies of linseed oil run out in the middle of March, the industries that utilize drying oils will have to get relief either from new crop Argentine flaxseed or from substitute oils. In regard to the first alternative, we are somewhat skeptical as to the ability of our Government to make arrangements for any substantial shipments of Argentine flaxseed or linseed oil to reach this country much before April or May. In the first place, Great Britain has made an initial purchase of 100,000 tons of linseed oil in Argentina, and our Government has as yet concluded no such purchase. In the second place, Argentine flaxseed is moving very slowly to the Argentine processors because farmers are dissatisfied with the present price of flaxseed (reduced by 40 cents a bushel from last year) and because of labor difficulties on the farms and a shortage of harvesting equipment. We believe, therefore, that there will be some delay in getting the Argentine processing mills into full production and consequently in getting any substantial supply of linseed oil from that source.

Turning to the substitute oils, we notice that the Government has estimated that out of the total of 1,150,000,000 pounds of drying

oils to be used in 1947, only 700,000,000 pounds will be linseed oil and 450,000,000 pounds will consist of other oils. We are extremely doubtful whether even such a supply of drying oils other than linseed will be available for 1947. In the first place, the fish-oil crop has been much smaller this season than for some time past. Soybean oil is badly needed for edible requirements; tung-oil exports from China have been disappointingly small; and the beans from which castor oil is made are eagerly sought at high prices by Europe so that the amount available for this country may be reduced.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that the United States of America will be comparatively bare of drying oils from April to June, when the first of the Texas and California flaxseed is marketed.

We consider that this country is entering a new era in drying oils in which we must place less dependence upon supplies from abroad and more on our own flaxseed and soybean crops. The United States Government's goal of 5,000,000 acres of flaxseed for 1947 is not large enough to make up the deficit caused by a shrinkage in supplies from Argentina. We seriously doubt whether even the 5,000,000 acres indicated as a goal will be achieved unless the Department of Agriculture will pay heed to the advice of State PMA committees, seed men, and farmers that the support price on flax be raised from $4 a bushel, f. o. b. Minneapolis, to at least $5.50 a bushel. According to the above-mentioned authorities, farmers, especially in the Northwest, where the bulk of flaxseed is grown, do not believe that the present market price of $7.25 a bushel in Minneapolis will hold when flaxseed comes to market in volume next August. On the other hand, they realize that if they are to raise flax, they must pay from $8 to $10 a bushel for seed flax. That expenditure, added to increased labor costs on the farm, makes the flax crop look like a pretty expensive affair. Farmers, therefore, feel that the Government should assure them a support price which will give them from two and one-half to three times the price of wheat, four times the price of corn, and twice the price of soybeans. If we are to avoid a major catastrophe in the protective-coating industry in this country, we cannot emphasize too strongly the need for prompt Government action to assure at least 5,000,000 acres of flaxseed for the United States for 1947.

Very truly yours,

T. L. DANIELS.

Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a statement on the situation in regard to the rice industry in the United States, which statement has been prepared by Hon. Homer L. Brinkley, general manager of the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association, and Hon. W. M. Reid, executive vice president of the Rice Millers' Association.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that rice is one of the principal industries of my district, and as rice is produced in only four States—Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and California—and as matters affecting our industry will be considered by this Congress, I am submitting this statement in regard to our industry for the benefit of the membership in order that they may be informed in respect to this very important industry in our country, especially in view of the fact that consideration of rice in trade-agreement negotiations with foreign countries must be taken up in the near future.

The statement is as follows:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *December 16, 1946.*

CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION,

Tariff Commission Building,

Washington, D. C.

Subject: Consideration of rice in trade-agreement negotiations with Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Union of South Africa, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

SIR: This statement is comprised of two parts—the first component states reasons why export markets must be provided for United States rice, and the second component states reasons why no reductions should be made in tariff rates on rice imports.

PART I

The production of rice in the United States in 1946 is officially estimated at approximately 70,000,000 bushels of rough rice, which will produce approximately 2,000,000,000 pounds of milled rice. Production of rough rice in the last 5 years has averaged 67,500,000 bushels, which when processed has averaged 1,900,000,000 pounds.

The domestic utilization of rice in the United States during the last 5 years averaged approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds, only slightly more than 50 percent of the total quantity produced. Shipments to territories average approximately 280,000,000 pounds, or 15 percent of the total quantity produced. Exports account for the remainder, or approximately 35 percent of the total production. Inasmuch as more than one-third of the total production must be exported, foreign markets are of vital importance to the United States rice industry.

The countries with which trade negotiations are contemplated which are the most likely potential markets for United States rice are: Belgium, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Luxemburg, Norway, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Cuba is the principal foreign market for United States rice. Shipments to that country during the past 5 years have averaged about 305,000,000 pounds. Cuba would have taken considerably more rice from the United States if it had been permitted to do so. United States exports went to Allied countries during the war, and since have gone to areas in the Far East having critical rice shortages. To accomplish this, the Government has restricted the quantity of rice which might be shipped to Cuba and other normal markets. Cuba utilizes about 500,000,000 pounds of rice annually, approximately 10 percent of which is supplied by domestic production, and 90 percent by imports.

For a long period of years prior to 1937, importers in Cuba who maintained a monopoly of the rice trade with the Orient asserted that the Cuban trade did not like American rice. Some United States Government officials, being informed of those statements, and without making any effort to ascertain the reason for such statements, assumed them to be true. Since 1937 the United States has supplied Cuba with 60 percent or more of its total requirements for rice. The consumer of rice in Cuba definitely prefers rice from the United States to rice of any other origin. This may be accounted for in large part by the fact that the United States is constantly developing new and improving its older varieties of rice. At the present time the United States produces the finest quality of rice produced anywhere in the world.

Another reason which contributes to Cuba's preference for United States rice is that rice mills in the United States are the most modern of any in the world, and are capable of processing rice in a manner most desired by the market in which it is to be consumed.

In negotiating a trade agreement with Cuba, arrangements could and should be made by which that country will agree to make it possible to import not less than 400,000,000 pounds of rice from the United States annually.

Before the war, about 75 percent of Canadian imports, which averaged 28,000 tons of rough rice and 8,000 tons of milled rice, came from the Far East, principally from Burma. In the war years Canada obtained all of its rice imports from the United States. Because of the proximity of Canada to the United States, because of its friendly trade relations with the United States, and lastly—and of prime importance—because of the dependence of Canada upon the United States in time of war and economic crisis, arrangements should be made with Canada by which that country will agree to obtain its requirements of rice regularly from the United States.

The per capita consumption of rice of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Luxemburg, and Norway is small, therefore these countries are not important markets for rice; however, inasmuch as they do not produce any rice and as their trade with the United States is extensive, it should not be difficult to induce these countries to give preference to rice from the United States.

PART II

Inasmuch as the production of rice in the United States is on an export basis, tariff duties have been provided to protect the industry against importations of rice from foreign countries whose living standards are so low that rice is produced and sold at prices with which the United States rice industry is unable to compete. It is essential that the full measure of tariff duties provided by the Congress be maintained.

A trade agreement, dated February 1, 1936, was entered into between the United States and the Netherlands, by the terms of which the rate of duty on broken rice which will pass readily through a metal sieve perforated with round holes five sixty-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, was reduced from five-eighths to one-sixteenth of 1 cent per pound (Customs TD 48075). In making that reduction, Government experts stated that broken rice is an insignificant byproduct obtained in the milling of rice. That is not a fact. Broken rice is an important product of rice. United States Standards for Milled Rice classify broken rice as Second Heads, Screenings, and Brewers' Rice. They differ in size only. They are almost identical in food value and have approximately the same end use. Broken rice is used in the brewing industry, in the manufacture of starch, and for human consumption. Over the past 10 years the brewing industry alone by average has used approximately 210,000,000 pounds of broken rice annually. Every pound of broken rice, irrespective of class of broken rice, which is imported, replaces a comparable quantity of domestic rice.

In 1935, the last year before the Netherlands trade agreement became effective, importations into the United States of broken rice amounted to 27,614,000 pounds. In the first year after the import duty was reduced on broken rice pursuant to the trade agreement with the Netherlands, importations of broken rice amounted to 92,771,000 pounds,

an increase of 236 percent. Of the total quantity imported approximately 60 percent was shipped from the Netherlands, the other 40 percent was shipped from countries receiving most-favored-nation treatment.

Rice is not a product of the soil of the Netherlands. Practically all of the rice which is processed in the Netherlands is produced in the Orient, where wages and living standards are very much lower than those in the United States.

Inasmuch as the United States produces a far greater quantity of rice than it utilizes, concessions which may be made to the Netherlands or to any other foreign country on rice are for the most part illusory, for although importations of broken rice increased appreciably in the first year under the trade agreement with the Netherlands, imports in subsequent years were practically nil. The domestic industry, recognizing that it must maintain the domestic market, simply reduced its prices to a level of values that made importations unprofitable. Any concessions in import duties on rice which the United States Government may hereafter make would have the same effect. Therefore, concessions made to foreign countries would not benefit them at all but merely tend to decrease the domestic price for rice. Any reduction in tariff duties on rice would be most inconsistent with legislation enacted by the Congress which provides price support for United States rice and would tend to increase unduly the cost of maintaining such price support.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN RICE GROWERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
HOMER L. BRINKLEY,
General Manager.
THE RICE MILLERS' ASSOCIATION,
W. M. REID,
Executive Vice President.

Relief From War Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 9, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there is a popular demand that the people be relieved from war laws. War emergency acts should be repealed as rapidly as possible, and Congress should take the necessary steps to declare the hostilities terminated. I introduced such a measure on the date Congress convened, January 3.

It is true that the President has eased the situation somewhat by Executive order, but the people are demanding that Congress go further than the President has gone. It is my opinion that we can safely go much further. We can go far enough to get rid of a lot of bureaus. Hostilities can be terminated either by proclamation of the President or by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

The people want relief from war laws. They want us to get back on a peacetime basis. We cannot stimulate and encourage reconversion and production until we can rid ourselves of these war laws. These emergency acts and Executive orders must be repealed. The abolition of one bureau and setting up one or more to take its place under a different alphabetical designation will not satisfy the people and will not solve the problem. It is high time that we relieve the people from the necessity of obtaining permits from some bureau, or bureaucrat, every time they want to engage in a new business or expand their present activities. Therefore, the emergency war acts should be repealed, and the hostilities officially terminated.

The following editorial on the subject is taken from the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World of January 6, 1947:

RELIEF FROM WAR LAWS

Numerous repressions and services by the Federal Government ended with the President's announcement of the end of hostilities. The action greatly increases the responsibilities and opportunities of the new Congress. A great many affairs will have to be reshaped. It remains for the Congress to make a formal declaration of the ending of the war emergencies established by proclamations in 1939 and 1941. That formal action will set aside possibly 500 statutes; hence congressional leaders are not disposed to hurry procedure.

There was a long and weary period of wartime restrictions. The people practically revolted against many of them last year, and the remaining restrictions as well as the policies themselves had dynamic effects in the last election. The President suggests that some of the controls seem proper for reenactment. The big feature for the public, however, is relief in several directions. A principal direction is taxation, for Congress is expected to follow up by the demobilization of war practices and implement the savings made possible. There are reductions in taxes in certain luxury goods; immigration restrictions are restored in some instances. Outlays for stabilizing farm prices and regulating production are out unless Congress restores them.

The tremendous flood-control program is not greatly affected by the order of President Truman. Many of these projects are reinstated by the order but work will not go on until appropriations are made. The emergency construction system of getting power from flood-control dams may be ended. The general hope is that hereafter these big projects for dams will be clearly defined at the outset and be confined to the expressed purpose—flood control. The abuses under the war system were strong.

The end of the war laws, coming with the end of the old year, should add to the composure of the country. There remains the caution given out by the President recently—that it all depends upon all of us going to work. Some of the alibis have been removed.

Terminal-Leave Bonds Should Be Paid in Cash Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 9, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the law authorizing terminal-leave bonds for enlisted men was passed during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] was author of the bill. It merely gives enlisted men of World War II the same benefits, privileges, and rights that had been given to officers serving in World War II.

DEBT CONFESSED BUT PAYMENT WITHHELD

At the time of passage of the bill in the House, the author and most of the Members of the House insisted that the former enlisted men should be paid in cash in the same way and manner that the former officers had been paid in cash. However, the Senate adopted the bond method, which confesses a debt to the former enlisted personnel in the armed services during World War II, but withholds payment. In the conference between the two Houses, near the end of the session, the House was forced to yield to the bond method or permit the bill to fail. Certainly it was preferable that the bill pass in the bond form rather than not pass at all, so the House yielded. After all, the bond method caused much progress to be made in the direction of final settlement because it enabled the veterans to obtain a certificate from the Government showing that they were entitled to a certain amount. In other words, the debt was transformed from an unliquidated debt to a liquidated debt.

AVERAGE BOND $208.60

The average size of bonds issued up to date is $208.60. The bonds were issued only in multiples of $25. If a veteran is entitled to less than $50 he is paid in cash. If he is entitled to $199 he is given a bond for $175 and is paid $24 in cash. The number of bonds audited to date is 2,915,000 and the amount of bonds issued is $627,800,825. The data on the average size and total number of bonds issued refers to bonds, the stubs for which have been received from finance officers by the Federal Reserve banks and audited by them. An unknown additional amount have been issued and received but not audited by the banks. The average size bond has been somewhat larger than that anticipated in preparing estimates of the total amount expected to be paid. It is possible that larger claims have been processed with more uniform speed than other claims and that the average size may drop from its present level. The total amount of terminal leave expected to be paid in cash and by the issuance of bonds was $2,700,000,000, at the time of the passage of the act. It is possible that the actual amount will exceed this sum.

INTEREST NOT INCLUDED IN BONDS

The interest on the armed forces leave bonds is not included in the face value of the bonds. Each bond contains this statement on its face:

> The United States of America, 5 years from the issue date hereof, will pay ---------- (amount, to veteran named) with interest thereon from the issue date at the rate of 2½ percent per annum, payable with the principal.

On the reverse of the bond it is stated that—

> Interest ceases upon maturity or on the last day of the month in which payment of the bond is made, whichever may be earlier.

I introduced, the first day the Congress was in session, a bill providing for cash payment of these bonds at the option of

the holder. The bill was actually filed with the Clerk for introduction last August. In other words, this bill if enacted into law, will make the bonds liquid in the hands of the veterans and they may cash them immediately.

Many veterans prefer holding the bonds and receiving the 2½ percent interest. Other veterans are desperately in need of money and can use it to better advantage now than they can at any other time of their lives.

TEXT OF H. R. 6

If the House had gone Democratic this time, my bill to pay these bonds would have been H. R. 1. The Republicans, exercising their rights, preferred not to permit me to use this number by electing, instead, to use H. R. 1 for a bill to reduce income-tax payments to individuals up to the amount of 20 percent on incomes of $300,000 a year and less and a reduction up to 10 percent on incomes in excess of $300,000 per annum. I am not criticizing the Republican majority for using H. R. 1 in any way the party in power desires; it is their privilege and right. However, I do feel like the payment of these bonds is more important to the veterans of World War II and to the country generally, than the reduction of income taxes at this time.

It occurs to me that we should pay our debts while we have the money to pay on them. We should first eliminate all unnecessary expenses, reduce the expenditures of government to the lowest possible level, and then pay as much as possible on our huge national debt. This would give us a balanced budget and a substantial payment on the debt. Both are greatly needed.

The text of H. R. 6 follows:

A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 6 (a) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 as reads as follows: "Each such bond shall mature 5 years from the date thereof." is amended to read as follows: "Each such bond shall mature 5 years from the date thereof, but shall be redeemable at any time prior to maturity at the option of the holder thereof."

SEC. 2. Section 6 (d) (1) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to accept an assignment of a bond issued to the insured under this section, the proceeds of which shall be used in payment of premiums or in payment of the difference in reserve in case of conversion to insurance on another plan or in payment of a policy loan on a United States Government life-insurance policy or a national service life-insurance policy."

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of section 1 of H. R. 6 would turn the bonds into liquid assets by providing that they may be redeemed at any time at the option of the holder, whereas they must now be held until maturity or be used only in payment for insurance controlled by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 2 of H. R. 6 would eliminate from the law, regarding use of the bonds, the restriction that a policy loan, for payment of which the bonds were assigned, must have been made prior to July 1, 1946; and in conformity with the new redeemability of the bonds, eliminate the requirement that the assignment not be a means to cash the bonds.

COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

This bill has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. I have addressed a letter to the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the committee, asking that this bill be reported out for House action at an early date.

It occurs to me that hearings will be unnecessary, but if hearings are necessary, I hope they will be granted before hearings are held on the tax-reduction bill.

INTEREST SAVING

The United States Treasury can borrow money to pay these bonds for an interest rate less than 50 percent of what the veterans will receive.

A Bill To Create an Alaskan International Highway Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced again a bill to create an Alaskan International Highway Commission. This bill, which passed the House unanimously last year but died in the Senate, is, in my opinion, one of the most important measures that has been presented for this Congress' consideration. My interest in this bill lies in the fact that I consider our national future, both economically and stragically, lies to the north over the polar icecap and the Territory of Alaska.

The recent flight of a group of B–29's from the Alaskan Wing of the Air Command into the polar regions; the Operation Musk Ox carried on jointly by the United States and Canada, and the recently completed Operation Frostbite, all indicate the importance of the northern areas of this continent. The Army and Navy during the summer past and this winter have carried on Arctic operations in the Bering Sea, in the Aleutians, in Alaska, and in Colorado and Wisconsin. There is a distinct connection between my proposal for the creation of an Alaskan International Highway Commission and the operations which have been and are being carried on in the subpolar and polar regions of this continent. It is necessary that an international commission be created to investigate the building of necessary roads to connect this country with Alaska. It is, in my opinion, one of the most important questions facing the welfare and security of our country today. I am certain that the Canadian Government will be tremendously interested in this matter and would be more than happy to cooperate with us.

It is no mere coincidence that the various operations have been and are being carried on at this moment in the northern regions of this continent. All these movements indicate to me the inexorable march of events in this day and age and should bring home to us quite clearly the importance—from all points of views—of Alaska and the Arctic areas. This measure, which I am today introducing, is only the proposed foundation of the building which must and will take place both on the ground and in the air in the future. Our destiny lies in that direction, and we would do well to remember it always.

United States Supreme Court Tenure Should Be Limited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has become quite obvious to the people of this country that the tenure of the Supreme Court Justices should be on a limited basis. At the present time the Court is lopsided from the political angle, and the people are demanding that our judiciary be strictly nonpartisan in character. It should not represent a majority of either party. Its present complexion is strictly New Dealish, and the time has come for the Congress to propose a constitutional amendment which would provide fixed terms for the high Court so that the people in a measure could have some control over this important department of government.

Mr. David Lawrence, outstanding political writer and editor of the United States News, has a most interesting editorial in the January 10 issue of his valuable magazine. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the editorial in question. It should be of considerable interest to the Members of this House:

THE NEW DEAL LIVES ON—POWER OF NEW DEAL CONTINUES IN DOMINATION OF SUPREME COURT—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROVIDING FIXED TERMS FOR JUDICIARY WOULD GIVE PEOPLE PERIODIC CHECK—JUDICIAL POWER MISUSED IN INTERPRETING LAWS OF CONGRESS

(By David Lawrence)

The American people may think that, because they have taken control of both Houses of Congress from the Democrats, the Republican Party has been put into control of the Government.

But this is largely an illusion. For the truth is the New Deal lives on in the Supreme Court of the United States, where the Justices are appointed for life.

Justices Murphy, Rutledge, Black, Reed, Douglas—all ardent New Dealers—comprise the majority.

This is the Court which insists on writing legislation by employing the fiction that it is merely interpreting legislation.

This is the Court which has brought upon the Nation an economic crisis by an ambiguously worded and irresponsible decision in the portal-to-portal case.

This is the Court whose majority is so imbued with class partisanship that one of its fair-minded members, Justice Jackson, called in effect for an investigation of the Court by Congress when he filed last summer with the judiciary committees of both Houses a formal letter setting forth a set of circumstances of which the Democrats failed to take cognizance.

The Republicans have the power to look into the goings-on inside the Supreme Court.

A STARTLING CASE

Justice Jackson in his letter referred to the portal-to-portal Jewell Ridge Coal decision—the forerunner of the much-publicized Mount Clemens Pottery case. He said:

"The Jewell Ridge Coal decision in itself was a somewhat startling one. The United Mine Workers reversed the position it had previously taken about the Fair Labor Standards Act superseding the coal miners' collectively bargained contracts. It employed as counsel Mr. Justice Black's former law partner to argue its new contention to the Supreme Court and he too took a position as to coal miners not consistent with his argument used the previous term to win a case for the iron miners. Mr. Justice Black reversed the position he had taken in managing the bill as Senator. The Court by a bare majority of 5 to 4 supported the change of front by the United Mine Workers. * * *

"On the Court, Mr. Justice Black controlled assignment of the case because the Chief Justice was in dissent. Mr. Justice Black chose Mr. Justice Murphy to write the majority opinion. While Mr. Justice Murphy was preparing his opinion, a strike of the mine workers and negotiations with the operators were proceeding. It was proposed to hand down the decision in favor of the miners, without waiting for the opinion and dissent. The only apparent reason behind this proposal was to announce the decision in time to influence the contract negotiations during the coal strike. Chief Justice Stone protested such proposed irregular treatment vigorously.

"I do not believe Mr. Justice Murphy favored it. In all events it was abandoned. * * *

"The defeated parties in the Jewell Ridge case applied to the Court for a rehearing and asked that Justice Black be excluded from participation because of his past relations to the attorney for the successful parties. As there is no power in the Court to disqualify a duly commissioned Justice, all members were agreed that the petition for rehearing must be denied."

CONGRESS SHOULD SEEK FACTS

Why doesn't Congress prescribe a rule permitting the Court itself to disqualify a member in particular cases? Why doesn't Congress seek now the facts as to how the vexatious portal-to-portal decision came to be handed down and why a rehearing was denied?

To fail to look into charges made by a member of the Supreme Court is for Congress to fail in the duty given it by the Constitution to watch over the behavior of the judiciary.

The Constitution does not use the phrase "life tenure," but states that judges may hold office "during good behavior."

This does not mean that a partisan Congress shall examine the opinions of the judges as a pretext for impeachment. The phrase means ethical behavior.

The answer to the problem is not to impeach Justices on technicalities or to punish them for their opinions. That was New Deal unmorality. The answer lies in legislating against abuses in the proper way—by amendment to the Constitution. Had Mr. Roosevelt chosen that course, there could have been no valid criticism of his plan to enlarge the Court.

An amendment to the Constitution should be adopted by Congress and submitted to the States for ratification which will provide that Justices shall serve a term no longer than 10 years, but that they shall be eligible for reappointment by the President for subsequent 10-year terms. The present members of the Court should have the opportunity to be reappointed—their terms of 10 years to begin from the day of their original appointment. The United States Senate, however, would have the opportunity to say each time whether it wished to confirm those renominated.

This would mean that the people, through their Senate, would declare whether the Justices should be continued in power. On matters of this kind in the Senate, it is unlikely that partisan majorities would be mustered, but, in any event, the people would have a voice. No political philosophy imposed by one President would then endure for life in the Supreme Court.

"PACKING" ENDED 60–40 PRECEDENT

As for the Federal judges on the courts below the Supreme Court, there are many able men among them, including many who were appointed by the Democratic administration who have made good judges. But here, too, the "packing" went on. Out of the men appointed to the bench from 1933 to 1945, about 95 percent were Democrats. Such an abuse of the traditional principle of a 60-to-40 ratio between the major parties, upheld by Republican as well as Democratic Presidents prior to the Roosevelt regime, calls for an investigation.

Certainly the same constitutional amendment which governs the tenure of Supreme Court Justices can be made to apply to the judges of all the Federal courts. They, too, should be appointed for 10-year terms and eligible for reappointment.

It will be argued that life tenure insures an independent judiciary. But a fixed tenure in the highest courts in the various States has proved effective in that direction, too. Judges in the highest court in the most populous State of the Union—New York—are elected for fixed terms and nominated by both parties through bipartisan agreement. The people thus retain a check against bad judges.

PEOPLE WANT THEIR JUDICIARY

The American people today do not favor the New Deal. Nor do they favor the misuse of the judicial power to get across collectivism or revolutionary doctrines which are aimed at the confiscation of private property by judicial fiat. The portal-to-portal decision is typical of many cases in which the New Deal Court has disregarded custom and practice and set about to confiscate private property on the pretext of interpreting a law of Congress.

The "workweek" is and should be what the employer and the employees agree it is, and when Congress limited the maximum hours to 40, beyond which overtime should be paid, there never was the slightest intent to rule on what constituted the first 40-hour schedule—whether payment should be made for changing clothes, walking from a time clock to a work bench or any of the other absurdities which the Supreme Court now has introduced in its misguided effort to write a definition of the workweek. Congress did not wish to make such a definition because custom already had provided a practical definition.

The portal-to-portal decision not only has brought confusion but it may bring financial ruin to some companies. It will delay expansion. For who wants to lend money to a company with lawsuits involving millions of dollars hanging over that company?

The way of reform lies in getting rid of life tenure, which has proved dangerous, and to substitute a system of appointment for 10-year terms. Justices failing of reappointment can be given the opportunity to accept retired pay and be called on to serve as special masters or referees in judicial proceedings.

The American people want a fair judiciary and they are entitled to it. It never was intended that any party should control the judicial branch of the Government completely for generations of time. Not only Republicans but a substantial number of Democrats will support proposals to create a fair judiciary. For therein lies the safeguard of a government that really rests upon the consent of the governed.

The Late Dave E. Satterfield, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of deep sadness that I learned of the death of Hon. Dave E. Satterfield, Jr., on December 27, 1946.

I became acquainted with Mr. Satterfield at the beginning of my service in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and from that early acquaintanceship developed a strong and abiding friendship for him.

He was a distinguished lawyer and served with great ability upon the Judiciary Committee and as a Representative in Congress. His sincerity won the confidence and respect of all those who were associated with him. He was at all times a gentleman. It was with genuine regret that his colleagues learned that he had decided, early in 1945, to leave Congress to become general counsel of the Life Insurance Association of America.

He was truly a great American patriot. In World War I he served as a naval aviator, and with the outbreak of World War II he immediately offered his services and was sent to England on a special mission by the Navy.

I shall always prize the friendship and loyalty of Dave Satterfield. I know my colleagues share with me the deep sorrow of his untimely death and join with me in extending to his wife and sons our sympathy in the loss of husband and father.

May his soul rest in peace.

A Suggested Remedy for the Portal-to-Portal Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following letter from the Curtis Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, Mo., enclosing an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 29, 1946.

I think the letter and the editorial are worthy of our most serious consideration in connection with the unprecedented

conflicts that confronts industries which were engaged in manufacturing during the war:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 6, 1947.*

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The scandalous situation that has developed as a result of the Supreme Court's decision with respect to portal-to-portal pay demands prompt action by Congress.

Our company, whose combined capital and surplus totals $2,323,000, has been sued for $2,000,000 portal-to-portal back pay. Bankruptcy would result if the company had to pay any such fantastic sum.

There is universal agreement that maximum production is needed in 1947 to restore the shortages caused by the war and to bring prosperity to the country. But it would be silly for our company, or any other company faced with similar suits, to expand facilities and operations when faced with possible insolvency.

Many recommendations have been proposed to correct the situation. The one suggested by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in an editorial published December 29, 1946, appears to be so simple, and so easy to accomplish, that we are taking the liberty of sending a copy of the editorial to you. Won't you read it?

The matter is so important and needs such prompt action that Congress, when it convenes, should not delay in considering appropriate relief. We urge that legislation along the lines indicated in the above editorial be promptly enacted.

Yours very truly,

CURTIS MANUFACTURING CO.,
C. W. FREES,
Secretary and Treasurer.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 29, 1946]

REMEDY FOR THE PORTAL-TO-PORTAL MESS

Here is a solution for the fantastic epidemic of lawsuits against employers to recover portal-to-portal pay, with heavy penalty, as a result of the Supreme Court decision in the now celebrated Mount Clemens Pottery case. It is estimated that these suits seek sums ranging from five to six billion dollars. If they are successful, many industries face financial ruin. Members of Congress, according to Representative WOLCOTT, of Michigan, are being flooded with appeals for action.

The line of attack against the portal-to-portal cases most frequently mentioned is a limitation on the collection of pay to 1 year. A bill to this effect was introduced in the last session by Representative GWYNNE of Iowa and passed by the House. In the Senate, the limit was increased to 3 years, but Congress adjourned before a compromise could be reached. It is doubtful, however, under the ex post facto principle, whether such action by Congress would provide a real remedy.

The Mount Clemens Pottery case was based upon the Fair Labor Standards Act, better known as the Wages and Hours Act. This law was passed by Congress in 1938 to set minimum wages and an eventual 40-hour week. It provided for time-and-one-half pay whenever the maximum hour specification was exceeded. Nothing was said about portal-to-portal pay in so many words, but judicial construction of the law by the Supreme Court held the Mount Clemens Co. liable for such pay.

In drawing up the Wage-Hour Act, Congress spent considerable time in preparing definitions for the various terms used in the act. It defined "person," "commerce," "State," "employer," "employee," "industry," "goods," and other words. It did not, however, define what it meant by the word "workweek." This, it turns out, was an all-important omission. For want of a clear definition of "workweek" in the law, the task fell upon the courts to decide just what this means.

Last Friday we described the tangled procedure preceding the Supreme Court decision. When the case came to the highest court, Justice Murphy, on behalf of the majority, undertook to define what constitutes the workweek. He found that employees in the Mount Clemens plant were compelled "to spend an estimated 2 to 12 minutes daily, if not more, in walking on the premises." He added:

"It follows that the time spent in walking to work on the employer's premises, after the time clocks were punched, involved 'physical or mental exertion (whether burdensome or not) controlled or required by the employer and pursued necessarily and primarily for the benefit of the employer and his business.' Work of that character must be included in the statutory workweek and compensated accordingly, regardless of contrary custom or contract."

But when Justice Murphy used the phrase "statutory workweek," he did so in a sense that caused Justices Burton and Frankfurter to dissent. In his dissenting opinion, Justice Burton said:

"To sustain the position of the court in requiring these additional moments to be recorded and computed as overtime, it is necessary to hold that Congress, in using the word 'workweek' meant to give that word a statutory meaning different from its commonly understood reference to the working hours between starting and quitting time—or from whistle to whistle."

Justice Burton added:

"There is no evidence that Congress meant to redefine this common term and to set aside long-established contracts or customs which had absorbed in the rate of pay of the respective jobs recognition of whatever preliminary activities might be required of the worker by that particular job."

Later, in his opinion, Justice Burton continued this line of reasoning by saying:

"'Workweek' is a simple term used by Congress in accordance with the common understanding of it. For this Court to include in it items that have been customarily and generally absorbed in the rate of pay but excluded from measured working time is not justified in the absence of affirmative legislative action."

So, in a very real sense, the judicial conflict in the Mount Clemens case revolved around two different conceptions of what "workweek" means. This is confirmed by Edward Lamb, of Toledo, the lawyer who originated the portal-to-portal legislation. He said yesterday that the Supreme Court decision did nothing more than "define a workweek."

There's the rub. Congress, while defining every other important word and phrase in the Wage-Hour Act, did not define "workweek" and therefore forced the courts to try to determine what Congress meant. They were faced with a hiatus in the law and, as we pointed out Friday, legislated from the bench, with Justice Murphy's interpretation prevailing over Justice Burton's.

The solution is for Congress to relieve the courts of guessing what it meant by the term "workweek" and to define this term itself. It can do so by a simple amendment to the Wage-Hour Act, adding the definition of workweek to the other words and phrases which are defined.

This amendment might well be based on the reasoning of Justice Burton when he said that it was improper for the court to include in the word "workweek" items that "have been customarily and generally absorbed in the rate of pay but excluded from measured working time." The purpose, of course, would be to bar portal-to-portal claims except where either custom or contract recognizes the additional time as compensable.

If Congress should pass such an amendment, it would clarify and simplify the task of the courts and, we make bold to say, it would blast to kingdom come most of the suits that are now plaguing the Nation. As to meritorious portal-to-portal claims, compensation can be determined by contract between the parties.

Such claims, for example, are fair when, say, a coal miner has to walk or ride a mile or more underground to reach the coal face to be mined. It is fair, too, as the railroads recognize, when they compensate an engineer for the time he must spend oiling up his engine before starting on a run. Such unusual situations are already covered in collective-bargaining agreements and other justifiable portal-to-portal claims can be covered in future collective-bargaining agreements.

The need for the present is a remedy for an intolerable mass of windfall lawsuits, many of them instigated by opportunistic lawyers, which take advantage of a flaw in a statute. We urge Congress to apply the remedy by defining the term "workweek."

Role of the Senate in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Senate's Role in Foreign Policy," delivered by me before the Institute of World Affairs at Riverside, Calif., December 9, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE'S ROLE IN FOREIGN POLICY

Under the American constitutional system the Congress is the policy-forming branch of government. That, of course, is theory. In foreign relations, the Senate has the last word. That, too, is theory. If our Constitution worked as the schoolboy assumes it does, on first reading, it would be as simple to understand as Caesar's opening statement about Gaul, which, if I remember rightly, was that Gaul was divided into three parts. The American Constitution assumes that the powers of Government are divided into three parts. No government is static and despite the fact that constitutional government is described as rigid, American Government has never been either static or rigid. That which is done today may not be done tomorrow, and that which was done yesterday may never be done again. The notion of popular sovereignty with the people's representatives responding to the people's wishes, in the long run and over a long time, apparently works as the founding fathers thought that it would work. But at particular times and under varying degrees of party, presidential, or public-opinion pressure those who have the last say at any given time may be quite different from those who have had the last say the last time the Senate spoke. Sovereignty in the sense of the last word is still not easy to discover in the American governmental system. Therefore, despite the glib pronouncements of those writers who placed responsibility for all things in the American Government upon the person or

institution nearest at hand or those easiest to criticize or praise, an accurate evaluation of responsibility is difficult at all times. The American Government is exceedingly complex. That is both prologue and general.

There is no doubt in my mind but that the twenty-third session of the Institute of World Affairs is interested in the Senate's role in our foreign policy as of 1946 and 1947. The Senate's strength comes as a result of the two-thirds requirement for the ratification of treaties. But even this requirement has been tempered lately by a use of the resolution technique which requires only a majority vote and becomes effective after passage in both Houses in Congress and the President's signature.

Also, due to a number of factors, the treaty technique instead of initiating an era of peace or setting up machinery for international relations is now not as readily used as it has been. For example, not one single peace treaty has yet been ratified. Still, in Japan a new constitution based entirely upon a peace status has already become effective under military-occupation auspices. No peace treaty will affect that.

Even if a treaty had been ratified, international relations today are on such a day-to-day scale due to rapid communication and transportation that administration of a treaty has become the big factor just as the administration of a law is the big factor rather than the treaty or the law itself. Thus, that statement which I made before that the Congress of the United States, and, in regard to treaties, the Senate, while being a policy-forming instrument under the Constitution, are today tempered by both time and circumstance.

Despite the fact that we have won a great war for democracy and despite the fact that we have crushed dictators, the executive branch of our Government looms stronger, more important, and more active than ever. After the Civil War the Supreme Court put a constitutional curb upon the powers of the President, but during this war the Supreme Court sustained and made the Presidency more powerful than ever. The pen may still be mightier than the sword, but the doer has definitely the inside track over the theorizer, the deliberator, and the policy former. The President is the doer in our Government.

Am I, a United States Senator, attempting to make my job seem less important? Definitely not! I do think, though, that if we are to understand how the wheels go around in our great Government we must appreciate comparative values of those agencies which in theory and in practice had divided among them powers of government in these United States.

Now, for a bit of history, which to date has not been recorded and hardly noticed. There has been in the United States Senate at least one Senator very conscious of the fact that the Senate of the United States upset a constructive program of a farsighted President at the end of the last war. That Senator deemed that the Senate acted unwisely and not for the country's nor the world's best interest. He, of course, may have been wrong. But still those were his sentiments. President Wilson stressed the writing of peace treaties that were never ratified and to a great extent never became operative. He stressed the ideal dreams of a League of Nations and a World Court which failed to come true because of the lack of cooperation of the most important sponsoring Nation. The world watched, despite the lack of American membership, the growth and development of the International Labor Organization and the acceptance of its basic ideals by nearly three scores of nations. Early in his first term, the Senator, mentioned above, aided materially in bringing the United States into the International Labor Organization and was one of those who fought for but failed to get American adherence to the World Court protocol. When World War II broke out in Europe, this Senator remembered well the actions of his country after the last world war and believed that world organization was not only practical but necessary and consistently worked for placing America in the position of being prepared for peace when the war should be won. That single thought never left the mind of the Senator. Consistent with it, as time went on, the following things were done:

First, in order that the Senate of the United States might function properly in planning for the peace it was necessary to bring about a changed attitude on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee. This could only be done by changing the committee's membership. That most difficult task was inaugurated and consummated. This is that story.

It should be remembered that the Mandatory Neutrality Act which was the law of the land demanded that the United States should treat equally both the aggressor and his victim. I had introduced a resolution providing that the act be changed so that it would act against only the wrongdoing aggressor and not the victim of the aggressor. We were unsuccessful in having this neutrality amendment accepted. In the summer of 1939 when it appeared to many persons that war in Europe was certain the President of the United States himself asked for a change in our Mandatory Neutrality Act. This the Foreign Relations Committee denied. The reason given by the majority of the committee was that war would not come. When the new Congress organized in January 1941 this action on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee was pointed out. Lend-lease was in the offing and I mentioned the fact that the administration could not afford to take a chance with that. As a member of the Committee on Committees of the Democratic Steering Committee, I was asked what might be done. I pointed out that first of all no new Senator should ever be put on the Foreign Relations Committee and that Senators representing strong committees should be there so that if the President wished to use the Foreign Relations Committee as a council of state he would have such an organization. The council of state idea is very old constitutional theory. George Washington himself assumed that the Senate as a whole, when it consisted of merely 26 Members, might act as such a council. It should be pointed out here that the Foreign Relations Committee in 1941 consisted of 23 Members.

I was also asked what Senators I would suggest going on the committee since I had mentioned new Senators should not be placed there. Immediately I suggested Senator Glass, of Virginia, and Senator Byrnes, of South Carolina. These Senators both had great seniority and were administration supporters. It was thought by some that Senators of long standing would not give up their seniority on other committees to serve on this committee, but both Senator Glass and Senator Byrnes accepted. Senator Glass told me personally how grateful he was for the opportunity it gave him to serve his country. There were two Democratic vacancies and these two great Senators were named. The Republicans accepted the theory and Senator Austin gave up his ascendant position on the Judiciary Committee and accepted the position on the Foreign Relations Committee. Those three leading Senators, two Democrats and one Republican, gave up strong positions on other committees to serve in the most junior positions on the Foreign Relations Committee.

With the reorganization of the Foreign Relations Committee, the President now had a council of state if he wished to use it, for the committee now consisted of both the majority and minority leaders and the chairmen of the following committees: Foreign Relations, Finance, Banking and Currency, Military Affairs, Education and Labor, Interoceanic Canals, Appropriations, Audit and Control, Pensions, and Public Lands, and in the course of time the majority party whip. Was this change necessary? Of course, no one can say for sure. Probably lend-lease was not important, but without it, I, for one, believe that we would still be fighting Hitler and the Japanese. Was the reorganization important for lend-lease? Even after the reorganization lend-lease was reported out of committee by just one vote. If the President of the United States had failed in having accepted his lend-lease recommendation no one can say today what might have happened to the President's whole war program.

No sooner were we in the war than the Senator mentioned above took the stand that the plans for peace must run along simultaneously with the development of the war. To this proposition there was great opposition. "Let's win the war," shouted many, "and leave the peace until the war is won." Thus assuming that that for which we were fighting as not important.

In rapid succession Mr. Hull, of the State Department, appointed a committee of experts to study for the peace. A small group of Senators and Representatives were invited to meet with Mr. Hull and Mr. Welles with these experts. Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, appointed a subcommittee of eight Senators to consider any propositions for peace which might be referred to the committee. This committee of eight met regularly. At the time of its first meeting seven of the eight were opposed to doing anything. At the time of the reporting out of the Connally resolution seven of the eight favored that resolution. This changed attitude, I am sure, came primarily because these men were almost daily struggling with a great problem and became convinced that a constructive start was necessary. Thus, through the Connally resolution Congress spoke in favor of world organization to prevent war. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference was called. The Hot Springs Conference on Food and Agriculture was called. The International Labor Organization came to America in 1941 and then again in 1944 for the great session where it adopted the Declaration of Philadelphia. The San Francisco Conference was called and the United Nations Charter was worked out providing for various branches of international activities under the Charter. The Senate ratified the Charter. The Senate ratified the constitution of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. These were all done while we were still at war. And before the world was legally at peace, the Senate of the United States acted upon the compulsory jurisdiction provision for the International Court of Justice. Thus, today, before the ratification of a single peace treaty, America stands legally and already in international organization.

Without constructive leadership in the Senate of the United States this could not have been. I emphasize the Senate's part in this program because it has all too soon been forgotten. Had we neglected to act during the war the United Nations Charter, like the Covenant of the League, would have been made part of the treaties and it might have suffered the same fate.

One other aspect of the Senate's activity in international organization; as early as 1935 in a conference made up of the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Welles, and the president of the Foreign Policy Association, Mr. Raymond Leslie Buell, I advocated a closer relationship between the Senate and the State Department and the Executive. I even suggested the use of Senators as negotiators of treaties and conventions. That our Government had turned its back definitely upon

this idea, adhering strictly to President Wilson's theory of a harsh division between negotiators and ratifiers of treaties, was apparent from the reception my idea got. Still, in time it prevailed. Senator WHITE was sent to Cairo. I was appointed to the Philadelphia Conference. Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG were appointed to the San Francisco Conference. Senators MURRAY, CHAVEZ, AUSTIN, WAGNER, TOBEY, and BREWSTER were appointed to other conferences, and much good has been accomplished.

This practice provides for a better understanding, on the part of the Senate, of treaties that are to be ratified and helps in their ratification. The practice also has contributed greatly to what of late has become an accepted idea of both major political parties—that foreign relations should be carried on as bipartisan or nonpartisan activities. Surely in our conduct in relationships with other nations we should present this united front. The nonpartisan idea has become reflected also in those other committees which represent a united Nation such as the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs. That which has been done is all to the good for America of 1946 stands vastly different from what she did a generation ago.

All of these things have not been accomplished just as a result of growth. They have been planned for and they have been fought for, and sometimes the going was not easy. There is no doubt in my mind, at least, that future generations will know that what has been done is good. Has the power of the President been made less effective because of his partnership in action with Congress? Has the power of the Congress been affected adversely because of its close connection with the Executive in our foreign policy? Not even the old-fashioned stickler for the absolute separation of powers in our constitutional theory can point out any evil result coming from this close relationship. International relations are not relations which are aloof and far off. They are relations which affect the homes, the firesides, and the people quite as much as any wholly domestic question. The bringing of the people closer to these problems through the action of the people's representatives in no sense does violence to our constitutional scheme or its theory.

Now, what of the Senate's role for tomorrow. I repeat again, not a single treaty has been ratified. But the Senate has already had a part in framing the ideals and the ideas which will go into many treaties which will be presented to us. Last fall there were three great international meetings being carried on at the same time; the Treaty Conference in Paris, the United Nations meeting in New York, and the International Labor Organization in Montreal. These three were all accomplishing great things. As time goes on we shall be able to evaluate and compare that which was done, but at present all were tending toward a single great objective. A common desire of nations seemed to be for the first time in history a predominating motive, and that desire was world unity. By this I do not mean that nationalistic tendencies are dead. Nationalistic advantage-taking and selfishness will no more become dead issues than will state and sectional tendencies and selfishness in our own country. Advantage-taking on the part of persons, groups, and nations cannot be overcome by mere organization. The processes of education, the reevaluation of aims, the changing of ideals, and the conscious development of new outlooks are all essential to bringing about this change. Age-old tendencies only give way as a result of the substitution of other tendencies. Growth and development should be our aim, not fiat or decree.

Let me illustrate my point about all of the international meetings tending toward world unity. Senator Austin in making a speech before the United Nations pointed out that if, and when, the United Nations set up trusteeships those trusteeships would be administered for the benefit of the people within the trusteeships. Almost at the same time he made his remarks I was presiding in Montreal over the Committee on Dependent Territories of the International Labor Organization Conference. One of the basic theories this Committee worked out in Philadelphia in 1944, made tangible in Paris in 1945, and gotten ready for a draft convention in 1946 in Montreal was the idea that the peoples in dependent territories should be governed in such a way that they should not be exploited, but that they themselves should receive the benefits of good government in their behalf. In other words, when Senator Austin made his pronouncement to the United Nations, already the representatives of 50 nations in the International Labor Organization had agreed that dependencies should be administered for the benefit of the people in those dependencies. Could Senator Austin have said anything else?

I bring out this incident to illustrate an old point which has always been overlooked in the Senate's role in foreign relations. That point is the point of interdependency. The President, of course, is important in all matters connected with the American Government and especially in foreign relations. The State Department, too, is important, but as long as our Constitution gives the Senate the last word regarding the making of treaties it is just childish not to let the Senate have one or two first words also.

May I make another point? Under the Constitution, treaties ratified become the supreme law of the land. Since the Supreme Court's decision in regard to the Migratory Bird case, there is no doubt in anyone's mind that a treaty, because it is the supreme law of the land, can supplant legislation both of the State and the Nation. Thus it is a tremendously great legislative principle at stake, and, therefore, it must be assumed that the Senate and the Congress will always be most jealous of its prerogatives. It is right that this should be. The people's representatives should have a voice in the law which governs the people.

Let me moralize a moment. From time to time, since Theodore Roosevelt told the world after the election of 1918 that Woodrow Wilson was a repudiated leader and that if parliamentary government prevailed in America, as it did in most of the European states at that time, Wilson could no longer logically be the spokesman for America, persons have suggested that we change our form of government and make it parliamentary rather than presidential. And lately again it has been suggested that President Truman resign as a result of the last election. This much should be said if we are to contrast our American system of the separation of powers with the British parliamentary system. The British Government always knows that it is responsible, that if it does not meet the will of the people it will be brought down. The American Government does afford the opportunity for putting the blame for actions on someone else's shoulders. Our Government, therefore, affords a constant invitation to alibi. Skillful politicians, when they have been in the White House or in Congress, take advantage of this situation and blame either Congress or the President for inaction or improper leadership. The more separated our powers become the more alibiing, the more shifting of responsibility, and the more placing of the blame on someone else's shoulders will prevail. If we can unite the Executive and the Congress in foreign relations we at least confine the alibiing, the blame shifting, and the refusing to take responsibility to domestic issues. Thus America, among the nations of the earth, stands stronger today as a result of the new partnership between Congress and the Executive than it has ever before in our history. I count that good.

In the light of what has taken place in the last 6 or 7 years that which we did in 1919, '20, and '21 seems anything but statesmanlike. Think of a great government, such as the United States, making formal peace with Germany after the last war by providing Germany with a treaty which in effect said, "We, America, will take all of the rights and you will assume all of the obligations of the treaties so far negotiated, but we will accept none of the responsibilities." Could there have been a stronger invitation to aggressor men or nations than that?

Who can blame an opportunist Mussolini, an ambitious Hitler, or imitators of perversion, such as a Matsuoka or a Tojo, from assuming that there is no such thing as a national morality and anything a state may do must be deemed good if it is successful. If men and nations forget duties, obligations, and responsibilities, morality ceases to exist. It is these three: Duty, obligation, and responsibility, that make right, not might. Germany, Italy, and Japan were not wrong in the last war because they lost. They were wrong because they assumed that nations had rights only. But no nation has any right which refuses to accept its obligations, duties, and responsibilities in the sisterhood of nations.

History is not just lived, it is made. Peace will never come by fiat. It has got to be planned for. World organization cannot grow, it must be set up. All facts of political governmental development in the world tell us that. Still, men today assume that there is nothing that can be done to better conditions. Still, we are discouraged. Yet in the face of those things accomplished in the last 6 or 7 years where is there room for discouragement? By that statement, please do not assume that I have an idea that nothing more need be done. Quite the contrary. We have only made a beginning. World organization does not mean that men will live in a condition of bliss. There will be strife, there will be deliberation, there will be debate, and there will be talk, but out of it all will come the strengthening of political techniques which will lead onward and upward and man will find himself in a better world as far as war is concerned. International war can be overcome by international organization if there is a will for such an objective. It cannot be brought about if we shirk because many of the things presented to us are hard and difficult. The Senate's role must still be that of having the last word, but with the last word should come a sense of the heavy responsibility which it must maintain. That there is a will to do this among the Senators today is one of the bright promises of the immediate future.

Attitude of National Grange on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the action taken by the National Grange at its eightieth annual session at Portland, Oreg., last November. This statement contains the Grange platform for agriculture and expresses their views on current issues. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Go ahead sanely and promptly on reconversion problems of both industry and agriculture was the keynote of the eightieth annual session of the National Grange just concluded at Portland, Oreg., and its pronouncements will strike a responsive chord among thinking people across the Nation. The session sternly faced the reconversion problem, urged proper consideration for the needs of agriculture, and emphasized the necessity for mobilizing all national forces for an energetic program of self-help, best expressed by cooperative effort—aided by sound Government agencies, but never dependent upon them.

The principle of individual initiative and effort was stressed in nearly every committee report at Portland, supplemented by a positive command to cut Government expenses, abolish all unnecessary bureaus and other spending agencies, and accomplish a balanced budget at the earliest possible moment.

Community service work by local granges was especially emphasized, seeking not only maximum direct benefits to members of the organization but overflowing into the life of the community; with the Grange hall made a genuine social, educational, and planning center, thus proving the Grange to be the effective spokesman of the rural people of America.

Thousands of Pacific coast patrons came to the Portland convention, with groups from a score of more distant States; and a class of nearly 5,800 candidates received the seventh degree, highest in Grange ritualism. The 1947 convention of the National Grange was unanimously voted to the State of Ohio, the city to be later designated, while Maine made a strong bid for the 1948 session.

Below in concise form appears the Grange platform for agriculture, unanimously adopted by the Portland convention after thorough study and extended discussion. Following it is a condensed itemized summary of the principal declarations, both favored and opposed, made by the Portland gathering.

GRANGE PLATFORM FOR AGRICULTURE

It is the conviction of the National Grange that a sound farm program to be used as a guide during the strenuous period of readjustment which our Nation faces is more essential than ever before. The stability of agriculture, as well as of the Nation as a whole, rests upon the following basic principles promulgated by the National Grange:

1. Conservation of our basic natural wealth of soil and timber must be promoted through sound soil-building, water-conservation, and fire-prevention programs on a self-sustaining basis.

2. Farmers' equitable share of the national income must be secured through a modernized parity and obtained through fair market prices rather than by subsidies. Support prices are justified where necessary to assure consumers adequate supplies and producers a fair price.

3. We shall continue, as in the past, to encourage both marketing and purchasing cooperative farmer organizations as the first reliance for adjusting and stabilizing markets in the interest of both producers and consumers.

4. The Grange supports efforts of the Council of Economic Advisers created by Congress for development of a "stock of remedies" for emergency actions in meeting economic dislocations-and restoring an economy of balanced abundance.

5. We urge extension of the Marketing Agreements Act to include producers of commodities which can use it to an advantage in securing for consumers adequate supplies at reasonable prices while at the same time protecting producers against seasonal market dislocations.

6. We favor use of marketing quotas, when approved by two-thirds of the growers voting in a referendum, for preventing surpluses from creating market gluts, supported by a multiple-price system domestically for utilization of surpluses.

7. We favor expansion of international trade through commodity-agreement programs and the use of such devices as the export-debenture plan and equalization fee, for assuring American farmers a fair share of world markets, and the adoption of safeguards which will protect domestic producers from imports in such volume as to destroy the American market for American producers.

8. We favor establishment of a health program which would include preventive medicines, make adequate hospital and medical facilities available to all areas through cooperative efforts, and the establishment of a Federal office of nutrition to cooperate with State, local, and private agencies in promoting improved diets.

9. We favor Federal and State guidance and assistance in the development of sound, long-range readjustment programs for areas where changes in agricultural production had created serious social or economic problems.

10. We urge consolidation and coordination of Federal agencies participating in the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act, in order to centralize authority, eliminate duplication, and obtain maximum efficiency. We recommend that each cooperating State appoint advisory committees patterned after the National Advisory Committee to work with State agencies in developing sound research programs.

The National Grange favors:

A sound farm-credit system under an independent bipartisan farm credit board.

Congressional action to promote and encourage increased housing construction.

Strict enforcement of liquor laws.

Inclusion of farm-to-market roads in principal secondary highways classification.

Removal of Federal taxes on motor fuels.

Increased activity to promote highway safety.

More economical and equitable distribution of surplus war materials.

Increased activity in promoting rural health programs.

Increased allotments of sugar for home canning.

Standard rims for farm wagons and machinery.

Adequate rural electrification financing on a self-liquidating area-coverage basis.

Extension of old-age and retirement social security to farmers and farm workers.

Strengthening and extension of farmer cooperatives.

Extension of rural free delivery to serve all citizens on public highways.

Increased conservation of natural resources.

Continuation of United States Department of Agriculture administration of the farm-labor-placement program.

A transportation policy which will best serve users and give a reasonable return to investors.

Amendment of labor laws to establish equity and fix equal responsibility on contracting parties.

More vocational agriculture teaching in high schools.

Establishment of national fund for research in the major diseases.

More and improved public radio service programs for agriculture and civic institutions.

Legislation to make the Extension Service financially and politically independent of any farm organization.

Local and State control of public schools.

A national fertilizer policy which would assure farmers ample supplies at reasonable costs.

Rapid expansion of rural telephone service.

A modernized parity formula, including labor costs.

Protection of American producers from a flood of cheap agricultural imports.

Reduction of Federal expenditures and a balancing of the budget.

Unqualified support of the United Nations.

Retention of the Soil Conservation Service as an independent agency in the United States Department of Agriculture.

A minimum wage, related to the cost of living, by areas.

Deferring public works construction unless it provides urgently needed health or other essential services.

A policy encouraging production sufficient to meet demand.

End of all consumer subsidies.

Extension of social security to employees of publicly owned utilities.

Continued charitable contributions to displaced people of war-torn areas.

Creation of labor courts to promote industrial peace.

The National Grange opposes—

Legislation making uniform insurance rates compulsory.

Admission of Hawaii into statehood.

Exportation of farm machinery and household articles until domestic needs are met.

Restriction on the production of sugar beets.

Repeal of the acreage limitation in the reclamation law.

Restriction of markets for perishable farm products to a 5-day week.

Publication of salacious, obscene, and objectionable literature.

Socialized medicine.

Peacetime military conscription.

Lowering of national park standards.

Establishment of acreage allotments as a prerequisite for receiving price supports.

Increased taxation of cooperatives.

Sharing the atomic bomb secret with anyone.

THE GRANGE SETS UP GUIDE POSTS

Several years ago the Grange set up three basic guide posts and has repeatedly reaffirmed them. They have attracted widespread approval and were given new endorsement by the Portland session, which declared them fundamental in assuring permanent prosperity. Here they are:

1. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth; or anything which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

2. The compensation of each should be based on what he contributes to the general welfare.

3. The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression—both physical and economic.

Applied to every-day problems, this means this Nation must continue to produce a balanced abundance; must prevent monopolies in agriculture, industry, or labor, which restrict production in order to enhance prices; must see that reasonable compensation is made possible for those who earn it; and must do this under the private enterprise system, which provides an opportunity for everyone to develop his own talents as he may desire.

Promotion of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject What We Must Do

To Promote World Peace delivered by me in the Salt Lake Tabernacle at the Armistice Day celebration November 11, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE MUST DO TO PROMOTE WORLD PEACE

In a letter sent to me by General Eisenhower, dated June 20, 1946, he wrote: "I am of the considered opinion that progress toward universal and enduring peace lies along three roads—organized international cooperation, mutual international understanding, and progressive international disarmament. All must be traveled simultaneously. Progress along any one of these roads will engender mutual confidence and so stimulate progress along others."

The outstanding characteristic of American generals and admirals in the second World War is that they were basically great statesmen along with their military genius. Thus we have seen the fruits of American democracy proved. Citizens trained in the theory of government who can take lead of armies and navies and defeat the greatest aggressors in all world history should be a sign to the world of the strength of the American system. A trained citizenry for America is our firm belief.

In our meeting this afternoon we have come together to honor those of our citizens who have proved their worth and their belief in American culture and American life. We bow our heads in honor and in gratitude for those who can be present with us only in spirit. We raise our heads and we salute as man to man those to whom we are eternally grateful. But with it all we dedicate our lives and our national entity to the ideals, the hopes, and the aspirations stated so strongly, so well, and so statesmanlike by our great Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower.

Can we as individuals put our faith in the future as our great military leader has done? How can we who have only shared in a small way the concern of our great leader fail to have faith in his description of the purposes for which we fought? It is now for us to win the peace. It can be done. History proves that it can be done. Our own hearts tell us first that nothing good in this world is accomplished without planning, without organization, and without understanding what our ultimate aims are to be. American leadership, honored as it has never been honored before in the world—and, incidentally, worthy of honor—bids well to guarantee that the dream of the ages and the desire of the nations will become a realization.

Those of us who have been privileged to be close to our great generals and admirals, not only in this war but also in the last, have learned to honor their simplicity of life, their devotion to duty, their love of country and its ideals. Marshall, King, Eisenhower, Nimitz, MacArthur, Halsey, and Clark, all knew what they were fighting for. Americans all. But everyone a citizen of the world, and so honored. It is in the statesmanship and the ideals of these great military leaders that I put my greatest faith in future peace. Most of these men and some I have not named I have been privileged to honor by sponsoring a bill which provided permanent rank for our five-star generals and admirals. They have been honored by the Amercan people. America thus does not fear her military.

How has this faith in our own principles been evolved? First, because of a sublime belief in the inspired principles that underlie our form of government. Second, because all of these generals and admirals were trained in American public institutions. They know their history. They understand the worth of the philosophy of the founding fathers. In honoring them I honor all who followed them. There is poetry but there is also sadness in the fact that today two great groups of American soldiers, with a scattering of veterans of former wars, and separated only by a generation, are greeting each other as brothers in arms. World War I and World War II each fought for the same cause. Each in theory accomplishing the same purpose. But the Second Great War was made necessary by the failure of the peace of the first. This picture, poetic as it may seem, is too sad to be repeated. Surely our great Government has purposes other than those of merely creating veterans to be honored once every generation. If we have fought for a cause it is time for us to see that that cause is accomplished now that victory has come. It is to the accomplishment and the realization of that cause—the peace—that our lives here are dedicated. Is it a dream which baffles our endeavors? Is it an ideal which cannot be attained? I say not. World organization is now in the making. Respect for it will bring results. Is world organization for peace impossible? Definitely yes, if we think only of the perils and the hardships to overcome, both of which may lead to such utter discouragement that the will to try will be lost. I take encouragement for the possibility of a united world with a common objective of peace from what has occurred in our own culture, and in the history of Europe and America during the last 200 years. Man, his ideals, his aspirations, and his purposes have greatly changed in those 200 years. I cite but one incident of that history.

Two hundred years ago men thought that it pleased God to burn at the stake those whom they called heretic. Persecution in its vilest form was rampant in the earth, and mankind called it good. Then came over the earth a changed attitude. Men ceased to say: "Let us kill those with whom we disagree." They said: "It is better to put up with them than to murder them." And a spirit of forbearance took the place of persecution. Then about the time that our Constitution came into existence men said to each other: "It is better to tolerate those with whom we disagree than to either persecute them or to forbear with them." And thus a bit of religious tolerance came into existence. America has thrived under this spirit and we found it good. Yet it is not the ideal even in the field of religion. There is one step further we must go. And that step, I suggest, is appreciation. If we are to have world peace, if we are to have world unity, if we are to have world organization, we must substitute and replace persecution of all men and all ideas with forbearance, and then move into the field of toleration. But before world unity can be attained we must learn to appreciate one another. Through appreciation the world will gain the good and temper the evil which its diverse civilizations and cultures have to offer. This can be done. It should be done. And if I may judge from the spirit of this occasion, all present agree with me that the time has come to attempt the making of a new world along the lines of appreciation of the culture, the habits, and the ideals of all civilized parts of the world. That is the dream of a United Nations organization came true. That is a dream of a Bolivar brought to its fulfillment. That is the dream of a Washington who hoped to see the day come when men dwelt with one another throughout the whole world as brothers. Those are the ideals which this meeting represents today.

Will they be attained?

I will cite but one promise of their ultimate fulfillment under American leadership. The soldiers' education bill which I had the honor to author was written not primarily for the benefit of the soldier boys and girls but it was written because America realized that she could not afford to risk the leadership of an untrained generation. France and England both failed to replace by training the losses they suffered in the last war. That we were determined we should not do. As a result there are now in our universities and colleges and other institutions 1,300,000 soldier boys and girls studying under the guidance of teachers and institutions who know the worth of America, the ideals which have made us great. Never in the history of education in the world has anything like it ever happened before. From this army of one million and a half of trained leaders what is there this Nation cannot accomplish? Will the world follow? It is following. It is for us to remain worthy of the position of leadership God and circumstances have placed us in. It is to that task that we dedicate the hopes, the aspirations, and the prayers of this great meeting and of all our countrymen throughout the land.

The Sugar Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the Washington Post this morning appears an editorial on the sugar problem. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW IT'S SUGAR

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee sharply criticizes the administration for holding down sugar prices during the war years and failing to stimulate production in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the continental United States. The committee concedes that immediate decontrol of sugar would result in a free-for-all scramble for available supplies and lead to speculative hoarding. But it says there is every prospect that controls may safely be removed gradually during the present year and abandoned entirely late in 1947. For the present it recommends increases in 1947 sugar rations twice as large as the increases recently proposed by the Department of Agriculture.

In our opinion, the administration deserves to be applauded rather than blamed for not unduly encouraging sugar production. So far as the continental United States is concerned, the decline in beet production was brought about by the Government's efforts to increase the output of more necessary crops during the war period. And it certainly would not have been desirable either from the viewpoint of Cuba or that of the United States to encourage an excessive expansion of sugar production in Cuba. The result would have been serious world overproduction when supplies of cane sugar from the Far East again became available and European beet production approached normal.

Agitation is not confined to demands for more liberal sugar allotments for our people. Immediate decontrol of sugar is being urged by certain interests that, Secretary Anderson declares, hope to reap speculative gains from a rise in prices. Possibly Government estimates of the size of the coming Cuban and European crops err on the side of conservatism, warranting a somewhat larger allotment of Cuban sugar to the United States. That is a matter on which expert opinions differ. However, Secretary Anderson rightly views with alarm any proposal that might result in giving our people a larger share of world sugar supplies at the expense of

other nations. He explains that the Cuban crop represents the major portion of world export sugar. The United States as a member of the International Food Council has been buying the whole of that crop and allocating it to various countries. Most of these countries have a great deal less sugar per capita than we have, and they also have less of other foodstuffs. Hence the burden of proof rests upon those urging an increase in our share of the Cuban crop.

To abandon sugar controls any time in the near future would create great hardship to needy European countries forced to compete for scarce supplies with sugar-hungry American consumers able to outbid them. In short, early decontrol of sugar would not only impose fresh burdens on American consumers; it would be a betrayal of the countries that have trusted us to act for them in buying and distributing Cuban sugar. They have a right to expect that we will not let them down. As Secretary Anderson puts it, "Our integrity is at stake."

God's Law in Modern Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], on Laymen's Sunday, October 20, 1946, broadcast on the Church of the Air radio hour, and reprinted in the November 1946 issue of Christian Laymen.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOD'S LAW IN MODERN LIFE

(By RALPH E. FLANDERS, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and recently elected Senator from Vermont, made this address on Laymen's Sunday, October 20, 1946)

When we look back over the last 200 years, we realize that human life in this world has changed beyond all recognition so far as its material aspects are concerned. This has resulted from a series of discoveries made by the natural sciences and all the related subjects on which the greatest intellects of our race have focussed their attention in this marvelous period.

The laws, the physical phenomena, have always existed. In a real sense we have not invented these great developments. We have discovered them. They were always there. These great discoveries have other results. The wonders of transportation and of communication have expanded our interests to cover the whole world. What we do affects the whole world. What the whole world does affects us. This has great potentialities for good and for evil.

They have enormously multiplied material goods. The automobile, for example, as a useful device for the ordinary man, became possible as a result of a complex sum total of these discoveries derived from all the branches of science and engineering.

Again, we must see that this process may be used for good or evil, for the same complex web of discoveries and inventions makes either possible. It has made possible bigger and more destructive wars. Indeed, we have brought this development to the point where it threatens the destruction of our material civilization; and, being brought to that point, it threatens the same fate for intellectual and spiritual values as well.

It does this because we are leaving the moral problems unsolved. We are evading the question as to what we shall do with this great mass of discovery and invention. What they will do for us is of small importance as compared with the great question of what we will do with them.

This morning, let us narrow down our discussion to one of the problems that affect us as a nation and view it in the light of the passage which was just read from St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians.[1] This problem arises from the fact that science and engineering have tied many millions into one great community.

We have had a year in which the Nation has suffered from widespread and long-continued industrial strife. Industrial strife is not new. It has always broken out here and there in local disturbances for generations past. What is new is the greatly enlarged scale of its operations and effects. When great national unions come to a deadlock in their negotiations with great national industries, we have a condition which is no longer local. It affects us all. It works great harm to the people of the whole Nation. Some of this harm is immediate and direct, while other results extend over long periods of time indirectly, but nonetheless seriously, and over great areas of the population. These great deadlocks between management and labor can no longer be directed solely against the parties to the dispute. They are directed against the well-being of the whole body of our citizens. Rebellion of the members, whose function St. Paul so vividly described, hurts the whole body. The health of the members is only to be found in the health of the whole body.

One of the things St. Paul was writing about is the value and worth of every individual soul in the total mass of a great population like ours. The individual soul of the humblest citizen is the concern of the whole Nation. The individual likewise, and in reverse, has a contribution which she or he can make to the well-being of the whole. This is Christian doctrine. It is not Nazi or Fascist doctrine, in which the interests of an imaginary body called the state is the ultimate object of human endeavor. Christian doctrine is that the state is charged with the welfare of the men, women, and children which compose it. The body's concern is with the health of its members; and the members, in turn, contribute to their own individual welfare and that of their fellows by doing their part to maintain the health of the body as a whole. How can we make this doctrine effective?

I venture to suggest that it will help us if we take a new view of our reasons for accepting Christian doctrine. We can accept it because it comes by revelation, but that may not be all there is in the matter that makes it demand our acceptance. Christian doctrine is not true solely because it has been revealed. It has been revealed because it is true.

We must be willing to see that throughout the history of mankind it has been found by those who observe life intently and clearly that if men acted in certain ways, human relations were rich and satisfying. If they acted in other ways, man was set against man, the tremendous advantages of cooperation were lost and valuable social institutions disintegrated.

The laws of the spiritual life which produced these results are universal laws applying to all mankind; and in studying them and discovering them, gleams of truth shone through the darkness in widely scattered corners of the earth and over millenniums of time.

This was a slow and painful process. What revelation has done is to present these laws simply and as a whole so that each civilization, each generation, and each person does not have to go himself through arduous trial and painful error to discover these things for himself. They have always been there, but by taking advantage of revelation, each person and the world can escape a mass of misery.

By thinking of these laws of life exclusively in terms of Christian revelation, we have done our society great harm. By considering them as laws of life existing eternally which revelation has made available to us, even as scientific discovery has made the ether waves available, we can perhaps make them more readily understood and more diligently followed. The damage that has been done is that in considering them as the exclusive doctrine of a particular religion, we have eliminated them from the education of the young on the theory of the separation of the church and the state. So long as they are considered to be the exclusive property of religious sects, rather than as being great universals whose rewards and penalties we can by no means escape, so long we may suffer the major part of our children to go out into life untaught, and unprepared to face the most important facts of life.

The laws of Christian ethics are universally true. We must find means of reinstating their instruction into the training of the young. They must become the rules of living for their elders. To bring this about is the great task of the church and this task must not be approached on the basis of sectarianism or from the standpoint of revelation alone. It must be approached as a task of instruction and practice in the fundamental laws of life.

St. Augustine's great pronouncement holds true—"Thou hast made us for Thyself and our lives are restless till they rest in Thee." This truth comes to us with far more serious implications than in St. Augustine's simpler world. We live in a world far more dangerous, far more filled with possible material blessings, than his generation could possibly conceive. Let us begin now to teach and to live.

[1] 1 Corinthians xii: 12–26.

Bilbo's Drumhead Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a very well-considered editorial entitled "Bilbo's Drumhead Trial," from the Boston Herald, together with an article by Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of the Harvard Law School, in which he gives a clear discussion of the constitutional question involved. Certainly, neither the Boston Herald nor Mr. Chafee can be charged with southern prejudice.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of January 6, 1947]

BILBO'S DRUMHEAD TRIAL

You can hate "The Man" with all the righteous hatred of demagogy, bigotry, and cheap

ignorance, but you cannot summarily deprive him of his rights without also doing grave violence to the very decencies he has himself attempted to tear down. The Senate's exhibition over THEODORE G. BILBO does no credit to it, nor does it promote the principle of government by laws and not by men.

Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of the Harvard Law School, in a thoughtful letter in the Mail Bag, deplores the move to refuse BILBO a seat as a dangerous practice against which Senator Hoar once warned. The more emotional haters of BILBO will regard this as legalistic hair-splitting, and much too good for the Mississippian. But in the careful observance of our democratic guarantees for even the most unworthy lies the freedom of all of us.

The Senate undertook its action Friday on the basis of the reports of two committees—Campaign Expenditures and War Investigating. The first concerned his intimidation of Negro voters and the other his use of his high office "for his personal gain in his dealings with war contractors." Under the constitutional provision that the Senate "shall be the judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own Members," the intimidation charge, if formally confirmed, could be a basis for the exclusion of BILBO on a mere majority vote. But on this matter the majority report of the committee found no basis for the charges. Only the minority held him guilty.

This was, of course, a whitewash by Chairman ELLENDER, of Louisiana, one of the pro-Bilbo leaders. The Senate would most certainly reverse it in any formal consideration. But there had been none, and the BILBO exclusion move came on a committee election report finding him guiltless.

As for the bribery findings, these do not concern "election returns and qualifications" under the clear meaning of the Constitution. They are properly matters for expulsion by a two-thirds vote after a free opportunity for debate, not for peremptory exclusion at the door on a majority vote.

This does not mean that the filibustering Southerners were exactly on the side of the angels. In their battle to get 1 Senator seated they prevented 35 other Senators from being sworn in, not to mention tying up Congress and presenting a sorry picture of democracy in action to the rest of the world.

The departure of BILBO to the hospital has temporarily suspended the issue. He is technically neither excluded nor admitted. But in effect he has been deprived for the time being of his seat by a process of summary justice that is, as Professor Chafee says, unpleasantly like lynch law, and Mississippi has lost half of its senatorial representation.

Attempts by the North at compulsory reformation of the South are likely to have the reverse effect. BILBO was the worst possible symbol of State's rights for his fellow Southerners to champion, but most of them rallied to his side. This revival of the Civil War might have been avoided by a more considered attack.

THE MAIL BAG

A PLEA AGAINST LYNCHING BILBO

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

Little as I like Mr. BILBO, of Mississippi, I believe that the Senate Republicans are doing him a grave injustice in trying to stop him at the door. Assume that the charges against him, if properly proved, are a sufficient ground for disqualifying him by a majority vote—this is certain as to the charges of intimidating Negroes, although there is considerable doubt whether the better-supported charge of receiving money from war contractors does not have to be established by the two-thirds vote required by the Constitution for expulsion (art. I, sec. 5). My only point now is that the effort to disqualify BILBO before he takes the oath violates well-considered precedents of the Senate.

When the eligibility of Senator Smoot, of Utah, was contested on March 5, 1903, on a charge of polygamy, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, said:

"The orderly and constitutional method of procedure in regard to administering the oath to newly elected Senators [is] that when any gentleman * * * presents * * * a certificate of his due election from the executive of his State"—which BILBO has done—"he is entitled to be sworn in, and all questions relating to his qualification shall be postponed and acted upon by the Senate afterward. * * * [Otherwise] a third of the Senate might be kept out of their seats for an indefinite time on the presenting of objection, without responsibility. * * * [Consequently] a change in the political power of this Government which the people desired to accomplish would be indefinitely postponed."

No Senator questioned this statement. The same day Mr. Smoot took the oath of office. The committee investigating his election reported in June 1906 that Smoot was not entitled to a seat, but this report was rejected by the Senate on February 20, 1907. During the intervening 4 years, Smoot voted with the other Senators, except that he did not vote on questions concerning his own eligibility. (Webb and Pierce, "Senate election case" (1913), at pp. 929, 930; see also 1227.)

Senator TAFT claims that there are precedents the other way, but they are not supported by thoughtful reasons like Senator Hoar's. The Smoot case has governed most subsequent cases of contested Senators, including the famous case of Newberry, who was elected from Michigan in 1918.

The present disregard of this practice of letting the contested Senator take his seat provisionally comes with very bad grace from the Republican Party, which took full advantage of it in the case of Newberry, a Republican. He was allowed to sit, although his election was immediately contested by Henry Ford (the opposing Democratic candidate); Newberry's vote for the Republicans helped greatly in keeping the United States out of the League of Nations; subsequently, after several years of usefulness to the Republicans in a closely divided Senate, he was disqualified for enormous expenditures in the primary.

The Massachusetts legislative practice conforms to Senate practice in the cases of Smoot, Newberry, and others. (Cushing, "Reports on Contested Elections to Massachusetts House" (1853), pp. 474, 153 note; compare p. 439.) The strongest precedent known to me for the present contrary position of the Republican Senators was furnished by Rhode Island Democrats. On January 1, 1935, they barred two duly certified Republican State Senators at the door (like BILBO), thus getting a bare Democratic majority of the Senate, which was immediately used to throw almost everybody in reach out of office, including the whole Supreme Court of Rhode Island. This striking illustration of the validity of Senator Hoar's reasoning against "stopping at the door" is hardly a precedent for Senator TAFT to cite with enthusiasm.

A decision on BILBO need not be delayed for years, like the decisions about Smoot and Newberry. After BILBO has been allowed to take the oath and has been provisionally seated in accordance with the well-considered practice of the Senate, there is no reason why the question of unseating him should not be brought before the Senate as soon as the orderly conduct of business permits and the disposition of more pressing matters, such as legislation on portal-to-portal claims. Whatever charges are now prematurely urged to bar BILBO at the door will be just as persuasive to bar him later, after he has had the usual trial before the Senate.

The Bilbo case touches a sensitive spot in several States in the South, and it is very important that it should be handled with scrupulous respect for established precedents. Every effort should be made not to offer BILBO's supporters any excuse for hailing him as a martyr to injustice.

Give BILBO a fair and regular trial, and then deal with him as he deserves. The opponents of BILBO and lynching ought not to lynch BILBO.

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, Jr.

CAMBRIDGE.

Congress Comes Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Comes Back," written by Fred Brenckman, Washington correspondent for the National Grange Monthly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS COMES BACK—THE PEOPLE OF THE NATION SEEM TO BE IN GENERAL AGREEMENT THAT LABOR AND INDUSTRY MUST SOMEHOW OR OTHER LEARN TO WORK TOGETHER, AND CONGRESS HAS ORDERS TO WORK EARNESTLY TO BRING THIS ABOUT

(By Fred Brenckman)

There is a general agreement that the first and most important duty confronting the Eightieth Congress, which convenes on January 3, is to revise existing legislation with reference to labor and industrial relations.

On several occasions during recent years the House of Representatives has courageously grappled with this problem, but its efforts were nullified by inaction in the Senate. At the last session of Congress the Case bill was passed by both Houses, but the measure was vetoed by President Truman.

A great deal of water has passed beneath the bridges since that time. We have had a national election, and the outcome is regarded as a mandate to the incoming Congress to do something really effective in stabilizing conditions on the industrial front. While the CIO-PAC made a blacklist upon which were inscribed the names of those who voted for the Case bill and boastingly proclaimed that these Members of Congress would be retired to private life, nothing of the kind happened. On the contrary, with scarcely any exceptions, those Members of Congress who voted for the Case bill and who were candidates for reelection won handily, while many of the most subservient followers of the CIO-PAC line were buried under an avalanche of votes.

This was true not only in the rural sections of the country but in many urban districts as well. This makes it plain that millions of union members and their families cast their ballots in favor of needed changes in existing laws.

The fact is that the people of the country are fed up with the strikes, work stoppages, and everlasting bickering that have prevailed since VJ-day, halting our reconversion program and engulfing the Nation in the rising tide of disastrous inflation. The feeling is general that if this condition of affairs is allowed to continue, it will wreck our economy and destroy our system of private enterprise.

No segment of the population is immune to the ill-effects of the industrial warfare that

has been in progress for many months, with no present signs that the scourge has run its course.

We fought and won two wars of gigantic proportions at the same time through team play and united action, and common sense dictates that that is the way to win the peace, which is so mockingly elusive.

WAGNER ACT IS RESPONSIBLE

The exact nature of the remedial legislation which Congress may enact at the coming session is still a matter of conjecture. However, it is widely recognized that the glaring inequities inherent in the National Labor Relations Act, commonly known as the Wagner Act, are at the root of our troubles. Passed in 1935 to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, it is manifest that it is not working as its proponents claimed that it would at the time of its enactment.

As has frequently been said, it is a one-way act, when what is needed is a two-way act. Reading this act from top to bottom, one finds little but an enumeration of the duties, responsibilities, and obligations of the employer, with nothing to correspond on the side of the employee. To make this or any similar legislation fair and workable, there must be mutuality of responsibility. There is a legal maxim to the effect that a contract without equity is void. A legislative enactment without equity should be void, too, or, better yet, it should never have been passed.

The agency established to administer the act under consideration is known as the National Labor Relations Board, which acts as prosecutor, judge, and jury in all cases instituted by it or coming before it. This is in violation of the fundamental principle that any person who brings a dispute to a tribunal for judgment is entitled to have the controversy determined by a fair and impartial judge. Many people are of the opinion that the National Labor Relations Act should be repealed and that a more fair and workble law should be enacted to take its place.

SOUTHERN FARM LEADER SPEAKS

How large numbers of farmers feel about the situation was indicated in the recent annual report of W. G. Wysor, general manager of the Southern States Cooperative, with headquarters at Richmond, Va. In outlining what he termed the minimum reforms necessary to correct the inequities and defects of the Wagner Act, Mr. Wysor said:

"1. Make labor unions responsible for compliance with their contracts and agreements. They now can and do violate their contracts with impunity.

"2. Subject unions and union members to antiracketeering laws, as are other citizens.

"3. Restrict collective bargaining to the plant or company level, rather than the industry-wide level. The latter system, now in effect, can be and has been employed to deprive the people of essentials such as steel, coal, and transportation.

"4. Unions as well as employers must be compelled to bargain collectively. Union czars are slapping down contracts and saying, 'You sign it or we walk out.'

"5. Subject labor unions to anti-monopoly laws, as are corporations and individuals.

"6. Prohibit jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts.

"7. Prohibit the closed shop, which is the mechanism by which labor monopoly is achieved. Does not an individual have the right to work, which is the right to earn a living, without being forced to pay tribute to a union to which he may not want to belong?

"8. Prohibit royalties or any other taxing power by labor unions. The power to tax should be vested only in the Government.

"9. The right of free speech must be restored to employers. The Wagner Act deprived the employer of that fundamental right."

In concluding his discussion of the subject, Mr. Wysor declared:

"Farmers recognize the right to organize labor unions and the right to bargain collectively or individually. Our objection is to the abuses, the irresponsibility, the racketeering, the domination of the Government itself by labor unions and labor union leaders."

LEWIS SUPPLIES FINAL TOUCH

If anything more was needed to convince the people of the United States that Congress must act to bring order out of chaos on the industrial front, the final touch was supplied when John L. Lewis blandly announced that the contract which the Government made with the United Mine Workers was terminated, and the 400,000 bituminous-coal miners walked out, creating a situation that threatened to paralyze our entire economy on the very verge of winter.

Then followed the dramatic proceedings before Justice T. Alan Goldsborough, of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, with President Truman, Secretary of the Interior Krug, and Attorney General Clark refusing to back down.

Whether or not the sentence of Justice Goldsborough, imposing a fine of $3,500,000 on the United Mine Workers, together with a fine of $10,000 which was meted out to Mr. Lewis, for contempt of court, will be sustained will be decided by the Supreme Court. Argument in the case will be heard on January 14. The truce announced by Lewis when he ordered the miners back to work, after the production of coal had been stopped for 17 days, is scheduled to end on March 31.

NEW CIO CAMPAIGN

Meanwhile, the CIO has announced that it intends to open a campaign for another increase in pay, amounting to 25 percent. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, declares that a survey made by his organization's economist, Robert R. Nathan, former Deputy Director of Reconversion, indicates that such a wage increase is possible without raising prices or reducing the prewar profit of industry.

It will be recalled that similar reckless and irresponsible statements were made by so-called economists in the Department of Commerce a year ago. These economists and their statements were utterly discredited by the events that transpired almost immediately after a wage increase of 18 percent was granted in most of the key industries of the country.

Report on Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment of the House I wrote the chairman of the House Small Business Committee on the subject of the committee's report on cooperatives. Following is a copy of my letter:

CLAYTON, MO., *October 2, 1946.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,

Chairman, House Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will remember my original objections to the publication of the House Small Business Committee's Report on Cooperatives. At the time the committee's Report on Cooperatives was published I gave my assent to its publication because I understood from you that the report was to be purely factual and but a tentative exploration into the subject matter of the tax-exemption privileges enjoyed by cooperatives in the United States. Immediately after the publication of this report my office was deluged with mail from small businessmen who protested that the report was a vigorous defense of the tax-exemption privileges enjoyed by the cooperatives and that it was seriously defective from the standpoint of making unwarranted conclusions with respect to the evidence presented and a general failure to give proper weight to the evidence introduced by private business. During the weeks that have elapsed since the publication of the report I have also heard another comment which has greatly distressed me. The story is being circulated that this report was intended to capture the votes of cooperative members for the Democratic Party in the coming election.

I think that the position taken by the report does lend color to this kind of political gossip. The report, far from being tentative, is, in my opinion, extremely conclusive, and my assent to its publication was based entirely on my understanding with you that the report would be careful to refrain from coming to any definite conclusions. The report was to be entirely tentative and the matter was to be pursued further by the committee when Congress reconvened. Instead of that, the report definitely and positively defends the tax-exemption privileges enjoyed by cooperatives and comes to the unfair conclusion that such privileges are not discriminatory against private business.

With one phase of the report I concur. The staff has done an excellent job of showing that the tax-exemption privileges enjoyed by cooperatives are entirely legal and constitutional. The report thus sets forth very clearly and instructively the legal and constitutional basis of the tax-exemption privileges enjoyed by cooperatives. If the report had stopped here, I would have no complaint to make. What I do object to is the fact that the report then proceeds to justify the privileged tax position of cooperatives with arguments which are not based upon supporting facts, or which are open to serious challenge. Let me give you a few examples:

1. The report says that a cooperative "apparently has no unfair tax advantage over any other type of firm or corporation which may elect to operate on the same basis." Anyone knows that there are many corporations and firms in the United States which could not operate on the basis of a cooperative without abandoning the profit motive which has been such an important factor in the amazing material progress of our Nation. Cooperative theory attacks the whole system of profit in our capitalistic economic system and boldly declares that it seeks its elimination. Private business, on the other hand, believes in the advantages of profits and in fact the profit motive and profits are an indispensable part of free capitalistic enterprise. To say that cooperatives have no tax advantages over private business, provided private business will abandon the profit motive, is to tell private business that if it does not like such advantages enjoyed by cooperatives, it must withdraw from capitalistic enterprise. Such an argument is thoroughly revolutionary in its implications and extremely unfair to private business.

2. The report states that the tax advantages of cooperatives are relatively small and that they in no way give cooperatives an undue advantage over private business. How can this statement be supported? Did the committee attempt to examine certain cooperatives to determine whether their ability to accumulate tax-free capital has been a major factor in their rapid growth? Within my own

knowledge, I know of at least two cooperative corporations which have enjoyed an amazing growth due almost entirely to the fact that they have been able, year after year, to reinvest their actual net earnings without taxation. The argument advanced, therefore, seems to me to be entirely unsupported by any factual evidence.

In view of the foregoing, I have made up my mind that the report, as it now stands, is completely misleading and deceptive and has done great damage to the interests of private business. It constitutes, in effect, a complete whitewash of cooperatives from the standpoint of tax exemption. The committee did not have sufficient evidence to come to such conclusion, and, in default of such evidence, it was very unfair for the report to come to such conclusion. Personally, I do not think that the tax-exemption privileges of cooperatives can be justified, but I am perfectly willing that the whole matter should be tested by a fair and impartial analysis of the issue rather than determined by conclusions which lack supporting data.

I understand, furthermore, Mr. Chairman, that you have written a letter to cooperatives urging them to get behind this report and to defend it to the death because you warned them that a hornet's nest has been stirred up and that private business is going to do its best to overthrow the report. Such a letter seems to me to be utterly uncalled for and certainly should have been submitted to the full committee before being transmitted.

I see no other alternative, Mr. Chairman, except to inform you that I must make public my opposition to this report as it now stands. I intend to release this letter to the press and to inform the small businessmen of this country that that report does not express my sentiments. I shall also move quickly, when Congress reconvenes, to have that report completely reexamined. In the meantime, I hope that the small businessmen of this country will understand that several of the members of the committee sympathize with their just complaints against it.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER C. PLOESER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I also include with this letter the following editorial on the subject from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, printed on January 7, 1947:

THE PRICE OF BUTTER

The Department of Justice, with very good reason, has launched an investigation of market rigging on butter in New York. The Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, representing 60 percent of the producers in the New York milkshed, has admitted buying upward of 500,000 pounds of butter to sustain the price past the deadline for setting milk and butter prices in New York for the month of January.

Farmers' cooperatives have been treated very generously by the Government. They have been exempted from business taxes levied on private companies and given the aid and sanction of the Department of Agriculture.

It is open to question whether they can be reached by an antitrust prosecution, but it is time to find out. If cooperatives try to rig the market against the consumer, and to sustain artificial prices by artificial scarcity, they should be subject to the same penalties—and the same taxes—as other predatory enterprises.

A move to lift tax exemptions now enjoyed by cooperatives has been kicking around Congress for some time, and the policy of the Dairymen's League is a sure way to guarantee its success.

Meanwhile, it is worth noting that butter prices in St. Louis, in the center of an area naturally adapted to dairying, are higher than they are in New York City. The retail and wholesale price of butter has fallen here recently, but the wholesale price in St. Louis is still several cents higher than the price of 69 cents at which Swift & Co. is contracting to sell butter to State institutions in the Midwest.

We are moved to inquire, in the plaintive vernacular, How come? It might be worth while for the antitrust division to take a look at the underpinning of dairy prices in the Midwest as well as in the East.

A Real Tax-Reduction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 6 I introduced H. R. 480, which has for its purpose the amendment of section 25 of the Internal Revenue Code. Under the provisions of this bill, the normal and surtax exemption for an individual would be $1,000 and where a joint return is filed by a husband and wife the exemption would be $2,000. The exemption for each dependent would remain at $500. To the low bracket taxpayer this would mean a tax saving of approximately $100 per $500 of increased tax exemption.

It seems to me that if there can be a tax reduction program at this time it should take the form of increasing the tax exemption, rather than an across-the-board reduction of 20 percent as has been so loudly proclaimed by the Republican majority through the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. As a matter of fact, H. R. 1, which was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota on the opening day of the Eightieth Congress, does not live up to advance notices, much, I assume, to the disappointment of those Republicans in the top bracket, who would get only a 10 percent reduction on their top bracket income, while other taxpayers receive 20 percent. As the number in the top bracket with an income over $300,000 number approximately only 600 to 1,000 persons, I assume it was felt that they are not politically numerous enough to cause any great disturbance.

Under the bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota, the married man with two children and an income of $3,000 would benefit by approximately $27.50. A taxpayer with similar exemptions but with an income of $15,000 per year would benefit to the extent of approximately $690, while if his income were $50,000 a year, he would benefit to the extent of approximately $5,650. However, the real joker in H. R. 1 is the fact that age becomes the standard for tax exemption, rather than ability to pay. If an old dowager with an income of $300,000, who has never done a day's work in her life, reaches the age of 65, she is entitled, under the Republican bill, H. R. 1, to an additional exemption from tax liability of $500, or $1,000 total. If an oldster of 64 years is still on the job and has an income of $1,000 or $1,500, he gets no additional exemption above the $500 which is presently provided in the current law. Evidently, the Republicans forget that the price of a quart of milk, a dozen of eggs, or a can of tomatoes is the same on Willis Avenue in the Bronx as it is on Park Avenue in Manhattan, and that other items of daily food and daily use are equally costly.

Contrast the Republican bill, H. R. 1, with H. R. 480, which I have introduced, and you will find that the latter is based on the sound economic principle that taxes should be levied against those who are best able to pay. To me, only the emergency of a global war could justify the levying of taxes on pittances of income, scarcely sufficient to keep body and soul together. The sooner we free those in the lower brackets from the shackles of taxation, the longer deferred will be the day when the Government may be obligated to contribute to their maintenance.

Ever since VJ-day, almost a year and a half ago, the economy of the country has been torn asunder by the fierce struggle between labor and management. The effects of this struggle have been deplorable, yet its fury has not subsided. To my mind, a partial cure lies within the power of the Government itself. Raise the tax exemption and thus increase the take-home pay of the worker, and I am convinced that you will find, in large part, the road to industrial peace.

The Revenue Code and Its Administration—Gem No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following statement made by a leading tax accountant of Los Angeles showing a case of some of the absurd rulings of the Department of Internal Revenue:

A revenue agent examines the returns of a large taxpayer for the war years and decides that the invested capital is overstated. As a result he reduces the excess-profits tax credit, thereby showing more income subject to excess-profits tax and a greater tax. Purely as a result of this action he must, and does, reduce the net income on which he computes income tax and the result is as follows:

Additional income subject to excess-profits tax	$150,000	
Additional excess-profits tax thereon at 90 percent		$135,000
Reduced income subject to income tax	$150,000	
Reduction of income tax—40 percent on $150,000		60,000
Additional excess-profits tax, less reduction in income tax		75,000

The taxpayer, more or less voluntarily, consents to this adjustment and sends its check to the collector of internal revenue in the amount of $75,000, asking him to figure the amount of interest payable, and says "That's that."

He was never more mistaken, because the collector will demand that the taxpayer send him an additional $60,000, and wait for the return of this money, euphemistically described as an overassessment, until Washington, and perhaps the congressional joint committee, approves the payment.

All this because of a purely mathematical adjustment. In the meantime the collector is demanding interest and, on failure to pay same, is charging interest on interest.

A comparable case would be if I went to the men's furnishing counter of a store and purchased $25 of ties and $25 of socks, paying therefor. Upon my return home the salesman calls me to say that the ties should have been $30 and the socks $20 so I owe him $5 more on the ties. I suggest that he apply one against the other but he says he can't do that because the overpayment on the socks has to be passed upon by the board of directors. How long would that store stay in business?

Finally Washington approves the overassessment and orders a refund of $60,000. This action is given publicity in the newspapers in the taxpayer's home town and the man in the street says "Ha, ha! They're at it again. It beats all how these big fellows wangle large sums from the Government and leave me to pay the taxes."

Subsistence Allowances for Veterans Attending Schools and Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to a great number of petitions I have received from veterans who are attending schools and colleges under the provisions of the so-called GI bill of rights and who are experiencing difficulties due to the ceilings on subsistence allowances.

To date petitions containing about 16,000 names have been received. Many of these petitions are accompanied by personal letters detailing the difficulties under which the writer is laboring in his effort to complete his education. Following is the preamble to the petition:

The program of federally sponsored veteran education and rehabilitation (Public Laws 16 and 346)) was undertaken in the best and most generous spirit by our National Government. The thousands of veterans now attending colleges and universities throughout the Nation are deeply appreciative of this opportunity to bring themselves back into civilian America on a par with their fellows. The veteran knows he has earned this reward and is working hard and well at his studies. His worries have been relieved somewhat by the section of both laws which provide that he be paid a monthly subsistence allowance of $65 if he is single and $90 if he is married. When the laws were originally passed the figure was lower. The Seventy-ninth Congress noting the rising cost of living, increased the subsistence allowance to $65 and $90. But the rising cost of living has overtaken this relief until the situation leaves the collegiate veteran with no alternative but to turn again to Congress for help. We, the undersigned, veterans of World War II, respectfully ask the Eightieth Congress and the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to do all in their power to raise our monthly subsistence allowances. We recommend that the amount be raised from $65 for single men to $90, and from $90 to $125 for married men. We must remain in the colleges. Our education is an important part of the future of our great Nation. The danger is not small that if no relief is forthcoming from the Congress many of us will be forced to leave our education behind and seek jobs. We must not disarm educationally. The decision rests with Congress and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Address of Hon. E. Barrett Prettyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable E. Barrett Prettyman, associate justice, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, at the Welcome to Washington Dinner for newly elected Members of the Eightieth Congress, Hotel Mayflower, Saturday, January 4, 1947:

Mr. Toastmaster, Members of the Congress, ladies and gentlemen, it is my very pleasant privilege to welcome to Washington those of you who are newly come to the Congress. You have entered upon a great adventure, and this city is to be the scene of it. You are to be participants in the moving drama of world affairs. You are to be the living part of the machinery of democratic government, conductors of a great experiment, craftsmen responsible for the design of a great project in human history. And so we congratulate you every one, and welcome you to the scene of the great experience. We also welcome back those of you who are returned to Washington. For you, too, it is a great event, and we congratulate you upon it. This dinner has no purpose but that of welcome, and has no other program. It seems strange that a mere welcome should supply a subject for discussion. But the fact is that in this case it does. Because I am no longer active in affairs, the sponsors of the dinner tonight thought that I could talk about it with complete objectivity. Hence I am here.

As Members of the Congress, of course your chief concern is with matters of national importance. You are the lawmakers of the Nation in matters committed by the Constitution to the Federal Government. And so it is right and proper that your chief concern and interest should be directed to those great measures which affect all the people. Your next interest lies, of course, in matters which affect the State or district which you represent. Their residents are your constituents, and you are their representative in the legislative branch of the Government. It is proper that this be your next concern. But you have another function less emphasized than the others, and it is about this that we want to talk. It is a function of which you may be scarcely aware.

You are the town council of the city of Washington. You are the legislature of the Federal territory known as the District of Columbia. We are the people who live or work in that city and that District. Mutual problems arise from those two facts.

Those problems are rarely faced in their entirety, in full perspective. They are generally approached from the limited standpoint of some particular matter which is acute at the moment. We would like to take a quick look at the whole of the situation.

First, may we note the history and nature of this place we call the District of Columbia. In the second report of the Committee of Eleven in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, it was proposed that the Congress should have the power "to exercise exclusive jurisdiction, in all cases whatsoever, over such District—not exceeding 10 miles square—as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of the legislature, become the seat of the Government of the United States." This clause remained in the Constitution and is the seventeenth clause of section 8 of article I of that document. Pursuant to that provision, a site was selected astride the Potomac River. Maryland ceded half of it and Virginia half of it, and the boundaries were fixed in 1791 by declaration of President Washington. In 1800 Congress passed an organic act for that District and in 1802 incorporated the city of Washington. Since then, the Virginia half of the District has been receded and the whole of the remaining part has become one body politic known as the District of Columbia.

We shall not venture further into the complicated history of the place. The point of interest to us tonight is that in the Constitution there was created a District which was to be the "seat of the Government of the United States." It was to be separate and apart from all the States and subject to the exclusive legislative control of the Federal Congress.

The step was a natural and wise one. The members of the Constitutional Convention were well aware that in Europe, where the national governments attempted to function in established cities, there were constant difficulties between the local and national authorities. The national governments were exposed to harassment by local people and by parties in the cities in which they operated. They were not in command of the locations of their own operation. Moreover, our founding fathers had had experience of their own in New York and Philadelphia. So the basic concept was that the Federal Government should have a place of its own in which to operate, subject to its control, apart from the turmoil of local disturbances, and at all times subject to its own needs and uses. The District of Columbia, therefore, is the seat of the Government of the United States. That is an easy phrase and a wise concept. But it has many practical aspects.

The Government of the United States is not composed of inanimate bits of machinery. It is composed of human beings. The Congress of the United States is not an incorporeal theory. It is a congregation of men and women. The executive departments are not abstract unrealities. They are composites of living people. The work of all these people constitutes the operation of the Government. Those people have families. When you establish a place in which the Government is to be, you thereby assemble in that place many people, all the people whose daily work is the Government, and all the families of those people. Moreover, those people have needs. They must have food to eat, education for their children, shops to buy in, streets to travel on, sanitary facilities, churches, libraries, courts, hospitals, doctors and dentists, and so on. They must have places in which to live. When it requires a

hundred thousand or so of officials and employees to operate the Federal Government, the seat of that Government necessarily becomes a great city composed of those people and their families, and all the other people and their families who are necessary to supply the needs of the Government people. The fact is that the efficient day-by-day operation of the Government depends in large part upon the health and happiness of the people who compose it, and this in turn depends upon the nature of the place where they live, its facilities, its arrangement, and its efficient operation. So, by virtue of the Constitution, you are the exclusive legislative authority of a great city of about a million population. Under present arrangements, you control the utmost detail of that operation. You are the body which says how high the buildings shall be, what bridges there shall be across the river, what diseases shall be quarantined, what courts there shall be here and their respective jurisdictions, how estates shall be probated, what acts shall constitute crimes, how negotiable instruments shall be enforced, what schools there shall be, and all the ten thousand more details which make up the operation of a fairly good-sized municipality, which is also a separate Federal territory. You dictate by items how the city finances shall be raised and disbursed. You say how much shall be spent for streets, and each street, how much for hospitals and how many employees there shall be in each, how much for each and every minute item in the city budget. You even say that there shall not be meters on the taxicabs here.

Thus we have a peculiar combination of facts. On the one hand is a city council composed of 531 members from every place in the whole United States except from the District of Columbia. On the other hand is a great mass of citizens, living and working here, in part employed by the Federal Government, in part their families, and in part the people, and their families, who conduct the activities necessary to supply the needs and wants of the others.

The problems are mutual ones. You have a deep responsibility for the operation of the seat of the Government of the United States. You want that operation to be efficient and effective. You want the Nation's Capital to be the most beautiful city in the world. You want the city under your management to be decent and progressive. On the other hand, the people who comprise the city are the living material with which you must deal. You are directing the actualities of their daily lives. Their homes, their children's education, their fire protection, their police, their law enforcement, their health measures, their social programs are the material of which you must fashion the city which you are building and managing.

Many of these problems are big and complicated, such, for example, as the financial relationship between the Federal Government as a whole and the local treasury which is composed of local revenues. Some others are more or less trivial. There are frequently a hundred or two hundred bills pending before the Congress affecting only the District of Columbia. But in the aggregate these matters make up, on the one hand, the creation and operation of the seat of the Government of the United States, and on the other hand the municipal government of a million people.

The mutuality of the problems seems to call for a cooperative approach. Should not the Members of Congress and the people resident in the city be friendly? This group here tonight thinks that they should be, and they are pretty certain that they can speak for the vast majority of the inhabitants in the city.

We fully realize that from your point of view Washington is in some respects a problem child, and at times a disagreeable one at that. When you get here you have a hard time finding a place to live. You have no friends here. Your wife has trouble making arrangements for her marketing and shopping and her social life. Your children have to go to strange schools. All in all, you may not like it. Moreover, there is no obvious political recompense in service for the District. The people in your home districts may not applaud your acts in providing good government for the District. In some cases, fortunately rare and eccentric, they even resent the time thus spent. We fully realize your hindrances. But you do have direct interests here. Aside from your official responsibilities for local government, you also have personal interests. You have a home back home, but you also now have a home here. You are part of the people for whom this District was created. And the difficulties are not all one way. From the point of view of Washington, Congressmen are sometimes somewhat of a problem too. You do not let these people vote, not even in a Presidential election. You do not let them have a voice in the selection of even one administrative official in the local government. You won't let them do lots of things they would like to do. You frequently dislike them and say so publicly and in vigorous language.

An illustration of the respective difficulties has appeared in the papers in the last week or two. All of you need places in which to live. Naturally you resent the fact that you can't get them. You don't like it. We thoroughly understand that. If we were in your position we would feel as you feel. But, on the other side, Washington is some 30,000 housing units short and 9,000 of those are reported to be acute requirements of veterans and their families. The point of the matter tonight is not what should be done about this or any other particular problem. The point is: Instead of treating each other as bothersome, troublesome, unreasonable so-and-so's why not sit down together and together work out a solution to the problems which affect and irritate both? Much greater headway can be made together than can be made separately.

As you come to deal with District affairs, you will find city administrative officials equal to any in devotion and ability. You will find neighbors just like the folks back home. You will find civic organizations aggressive in community affairs. You will note a striking peculiarity, and this we emphasize as of great importance. Although, in national and international affairs, Washington is the most political of all places, in local affairs there are not any politics of a party nature. In all my years of experience, I have yet to see a local matter either presented to, considered by, or decided by Congress on a partisan party basis. The chairman of the respective committees are, of course, of the dominant party but the custom is invariable that the committee members who take an interest approach these matters on a cooperative, nonpolitical basis. It would be an oddity of first impression if they should divide on a local issue on party lines.

You will find a great many friends of the District and its people in the Congress. I need not call the roll. Senator MCCARRAN, Senator CAPPER, Senator O'MAHONEY, Senator BUCK, Senator BALL, Senator HOEY, Congressmen EVERETT DIRKSEN, GEORGE BATES, KARL STEFAN, ED HÉBERT, VAUGHAN GARY, MARY NORTON, JOHN MCMILLAN, are among the many who have devoted much of their time to District affairs. The great city which you find here, its arrangement, its beauty, its operation are due in no small measure to the unselfish contributions of these men, their fellow workers and their predecessors. I believe that if you were to listen to them, you would find that this service and this attitude are not without satisfaction as major items in their country's business upon which they are engaged.

And so it is that we extend to you tonight a hearty welcome to the great city of which you are among your many duties, the city council. And with that welcome is urged mutual friendliness in mutual local problems. This dinner, as I said in the beginning, has no other purposes or program. This group of people wants you to like Washington. They want you and your families to be happy here. They want you to take an interest in the affairs of the city. They know you have difficulties. They believe that joint efforts on a friendly basis will achieve the best results—better government, and greater happiness for all. They wish that you may come to see in them, not a distasteful necessary chore, but a friendly congregation of people whose daily lives and living are so much in your power.

And now all of us wish for each of you a career of great success in the momentous world of affairs in which you have become an important working part.

Truth in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of November 30, 1946:

TRUTH IN POLITICS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Business appears at last to be coming out of its corner swinging in an aggressive way at the bureaucrats who have for nearly a generation been beating it over the head with malicious accusation and intimidation. And none too soon.

Maybe it is going too far to say that business, meaning all business, has got up that much steam. But, at any rate, at least one tough customer by the name of Young performs in a way that is old-fashioned and refreshing.

He is no small-fry businessman, either. He is a multimillionaire railroad president, and his name is Robert R. Young. In the railroad business Mr. Young is no small-timer, nor is he quiet.

Now he has moved on in his bear hunt and, in the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly, takes off against not only his business competitors but the biggest of all monopolies, the Government.

As to the rights and wrongs of Mr. Young's railroad battles, you'll have to go to a judge and expert superior to this writer for an opinion.

But when he gets around to discussing the Government, that's territory in which we feel at home.

Never mind all his detailed fussing about what has happened to him in his dealings with Government and competitors—but just concentrate your mind on the logic of this:

"Our country was started by placing limitations, regulations, and restrictions—not on the people but on the Government; that is what the Constitution is, a comprehensive plan for regulation of the Government.

"But for 175 years now the politicians have been reversing this wholesome initial process by taking the limitations off the politicians and putting them on the people.

"What we need today is a truth-in-politics act to match the truth-in-securities act, clause for clause.

"If my annual reports and proxies were filled with broken promises and half-truths, the truth-in-securities act would have got me if the common law had not.

"The sources of income of every public servant would make as interesting reading as do those of officers and directors."

That's a devastating novelty in thinking. Ever since the New Deal Securities and Exchange Control Acts were put in force the inside dope of corporation affairs has been public record. Businessmen have no secrets any more from anybody. Why should politicians?

"Is it any less a crime for a public bureau or commission to divert the substance of Peter to buy the vote of Paul than it is for some Kreuger to convert the assets of a publicly held corporation to personal use?

"To pretend to seek price stability while quietly encouraging wage increases is, to say the least, not being frank."

Remember the OPA scandal that has put us where we are today—with high prices, no production, and business in a tailspin?

"Taxation should be direct where the underprivileged can have a look at it. To cause them to believe that only the rich bear these price-spiraling burdens is to deceive them.

"A truth-in-politics act to impose penalties upon such abuses would give us better government just as certainly as the Securities Act has given us better business.

"The standards for measuring the honesty of our public servants who ask us to trust them with our liberties and our life certainly cannot be lower than those they themselves have laid down for the custodians of merely our money."

Well, what do you know? Imagine anybody rising up to let the politicians have one like that! Imagine a businessman, imagine a railroad man, whose every move is under the thumb of the Government, doing it!

Mr. Young has certainly got hold of an idea there.

Imagine the effect if a truth-in-politics act had been in force these 16 years past while the Government was extending its power over the people at a rate unprecedented in our history!

Imagine the effect if the truth about taxes were brought home to the people deceived by the late Harry Hopkins' formula of "spend and spend and spend, and tax and tax and tax, and elect and elect and elect!"

Imagine the effect of the truth about our foreign policy had it ever been discovered!

Well, now is a good time to begin, even if late. The oncoming Eightieth Congress can do the job. The way to begin it is, of course, by the formula already announced.

The Nation is going to get mighty sick of hearing what the New Deal has done to it before that process is exhausted, but the facts have to come out.

Maybe when they have, the country will be ready for something approaching truth in politics for a while.

Community Property and Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article written by Mr. J. B. Scholefield, one of the leading tax accountants of Los Angeles, Calif., on the subject of community property and income tax. It is well worth reading, and definitely shows the inconsistency of the Treasury Department in their attempt to defeat community-property laws.

There is evidently a widespread belief that residents in so-called community-property States, with a prescience which even they would not claim, foreseeing the burdens of income tax centuries before they were imposed, protected themselves in a way which was not quite "cricket." Anticipating the heavy taxation which is the inevitable result of excessive activities of the Federal Government, they devised and enacted the community-property laws under which all or part of the income of married persons resident in those States must be divided for taxation, thus loading an unfair portion of the income tax on residents of other States.

This has been a pet peeve of the Treasury Department in recent years, but, beyond slipping over an amendment to the code relating to estate taxes when the representatives from the community-property States were looking the other way in 1942, the Department has been able to do little about it; however, if we can believe what we read, it now proposes that Congress should permit the married residents of all States to divide their taxable incomes in two returns, thus, presumably, reducing the taxes payable by each.

Lest the prospective beneficiaries of this unwonted generosity of the Treasury Department become unduly elated, forgetful of the fact that the only way to reduce taxes is to clip the wings of Government and to reduce expenditures, I venture to point out certain disadvantages attendant upon residence in a community-property State, or, to cover less territory, in the State of California. This, you will agree, is a tremendous admission by a southern Californian, but it must be made if I am to make my point.

Whether or not the Treasury Department is seriously considering such a course, and waiving the question of how the Federal Government can make income the property of those who do not own it under State law, there may be some value in pointing out some of the disadvantages suffered by community-property taxpayers.

They do not always pay lower taxes. There are cases of wealthy wives with working husbands who have substantial earned income. In such cases the wife must pile half of the husband's earned income on top of her large income and pay tax thereon at the highest rates. On the other hand, if the wife's income is all from separate property, she cannot include any of it in the husband's return, and thus lower her taxes. The result is taxation much greater than would be paid in similar cases by residents of other States.

A husband must be very careful to keep on the right side of his wife. If she brings action for divorce, especially if based on some extramarital activity of his, she will claim, and may possibly be awarded, the whole of the community property. This might be all the husband's property. Or, again, if the wife dies before the husband, and they are not on good terms, she might will away her full half of the community property (which she has a right to do) and seriously embarrass him or ruin him in his business if all the community property is invested therein.

If the Supreme Court decision on the 1942 code amendment, as reported in the press, means what it says, all the community property pays estate tax on the death of the party first dying. If this is the wife, the husband pays on property which is his. In any event, and irrespective of the amendment, he has to pay on one-half of the community property when the wife dies, although he earned it all. She may leave no estate from which the tax can be paid.

The husband has the management of the community property but he cannot give it away without the consent of the wife, even though he earned it. In California the wife has, under State law, a present vested interest in the community property, but, nevertheless, the husband cannot give her any substantial amount therefrom without paying Federal gift tax.

If by some weird construction of property rights it is ever provided that, for income-tax purposes, all the income of husband and wife shall be equally reported in separate returns in all States, the result will be that tax rates must be increased to raise the required revenue; so, although some residents of community-property States will pay more tax, so will many residents (especially unmarried persons) of other States.

If uniformity is to be the rule in everything, then we in southern California should be required to carry umbrellas and wear rubbers when it rains in New York or snows in Boston, and we should be forbidden to breathe the ocean air because residents of inland States are deprived of that privilege. What we should do when they have a tornado in Florida beggars the imagination.

J. B. SCHOLEFIELD.

The Late Dr. Leo S. Rowe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 6, 1947

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star on the passing of Dr. Leo S. Rowe, late director general of the Pan American Union:

DR. LEO S. ROWE

It is not an exaggeration to say that Dr. Leo S. Rowe will be mourned throughout the Western Hemisphere. He was indeed a citizen of half the world, if not the whole of it. His services as Director General of the Pan American Union during the most important quarter century in modern times were widely useful. He lived for his task, was dedicated to it with all his soul. News of his sudden and tragic death will come as a shock to great numbers of people who never personally met him.

Dr. Rowe's intellectual powers were of a very high order. He was a scholar of distinction before he began his public career. Skilled in the philosophy of the common law, he brought to his endeavors in Washington a competency for equitable judgment which made his knowledge of the past a dynamic force of compelling value. He knew thoroughly the essential doctrines of international comity. It was part of his equipment, too, that he understood financial, industrial, and commercial problems in their larger and more inclusive aspects. He proved his talent notably in the Treasury and State Departments before he was chosen, in 1920, to carry on the work developed by John Barrett.

But Dr. Rowe's major achievements were not mere negotiations between governments. He was a man of a wonderful heart, a simple and kindly man who cared deeply about humanity without regard to condition or creed or class or any other limitation. If

the good-neighbor ideal was symbolized by any individual, he was that one. His chivalry is a legend that surely will endure.

More important, however, is the survival and progress of the cause to which he gave his efforts. The 21 republics of the newer half of the globe, with Canada not overlooked, were to him a single society, varying only in minor respects, sharing an identic destiny, advancing cooperatively toward a mutual prosperity as well as peace and freedom. All the monument that he would wish is that of the continuance of the movement to which he belonged. The best tribute possible to pay to him is practical support of the pan-American program.

World Bank Outlook Causing Congressional Dissatisfaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of January 2, 1947:

WORLD BANK OUTLOOK CAUSING CONGRESSIONAL DISSATISFACTION—REPRESENTATIVE CRAWFORD, OF HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, CALLS FOR MEETING OF BIG POWERS TO ELIMINATE THE "BUGS" SO THAT INSTITUTION CAN GET UNDER WAY—CHAIRMAN SPENCE INDICATES ASSENT TO REVIEWING ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT—CLAYTON AND OTHER AMERICANS INSISTING THAT NEW PRESIDENT BE FROM UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 31.—Commenting December 30 on the status of the World Bank as seen by a high-ranking member of the House Banking and Currency Committee which last year held lengthy hearings on the Bretton Woods program before approving it, Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD (Republican, Michigan) stated to this writer:

"There is obviously something wrong with the blueprint of the World Bank as drafted at Bretton Woods. This has been apparent to many of us all along, but Congress passed the program intact, partly because it was then seeking international cooperation on all fronts and partly because the administration insisted that even the change of a comma in the Bretton Woods Agreements would require another international conference and that the articles of agreement were beyond criticism.

"But it is now apparent that there are 'bugs' in the shiny new machine which must be eliminated by the only ones who have the power to do so—those who created it. This may require a calling together of the powers so that they may consider the defects of the original agreement, and remove them, in order that capable men from the president down will come to the bank and get it under way.

"Lately great difficulty has been experienced in obtaining and holding a president of real capacity. Upon further understanding of the Bank agreement, capable men have been running away from what should seem a tempting offer. They don't want to become a mere figurehead under the directors who hold the Bank's actual power. This set-up is all out of harmony with the way in which great corporations function in the United States of America. Recent World Bank developments are stigmatizing the efforts of the United States of America in matters of international cooperation."

CHAIRMAN SPENCE'S COMMENT

Asked for his opinion on the World Bank, Representative BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee of the expiring Congress, stated to the writer, "I am unfamiliar with what is behind the resignation of Eugene Meyer or with the inner workings of the Bank, but if something is wrong I have no objection to reviewing the articles of agreement in the light of experience."

WILL INSIST ON AN AMERICAN PRESIDENT

Among non-Americans discussed in World Bank circles for president, the British wanted to advance the name of a Canadian other than Graham Towers. However, they were deterred by the fact that very soon after the official announcement that Eugene Meyer would resign shortly, Under Secretary of State William Clayton appeared personally before the Bank's executive directors to say that the United States of America felt the post should go to an American. Mr. Clayton argued that at the Savannah Governors' meeting last March an understanding was reached that a European would head the Fund and that therefore an American should head the Bank. Mr. Clayton further said that the United States Government feels that the executive directors should elect an American nominee

Some executive directors, reportedly including the British and also Mr. Machado, who represents various Latin-American countries, are said to have reacted unfavorably, although not necessarily vocally, to this direct intervention in the Bank's affairs—for which Clayton conceivably may not be personally responsible.

Many here are still expressing mystification concerning the resignations of Mr. Meyer and Mr. Harold Smith. If Mr. Meyer at the beginning really intended to stay only 6 months, they are asking why Mr. Smith accepted the vice presidency at all.

If the next World Bank president should lack Meyer's banking experience, he will need a vice president who has such background, and this Smith does not have. In any case, Smith's resignation means what it says, and he is not expected to remain long after Mr. Meyer's successor takes over.

Meyer took the post in the spirit of public service. It is reliably reported that he had not carefully read the Bank's articles of agreement before taking the job, perhaps assuming that the president of the World Bank was comparable to the president of a commercial American bank. To say the least, this is not exactly the case.

Trial of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I extend herewith as a part of my remarks the following resolution:

Whereas the trial of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, of Zagreb, was nothing more than a judicial farce, and an attempt by Tito to stifle the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia; and

Whereas the complainants acted, not as prosecutors, as we in America understand the term, but as persecutors, not only of the archbishop; but also of the Holy Mother Church: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, parishioners and friends of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, Brayton Avenue, Providence, R. I., duly assembled at the Narragansett Hotel, Providence, on December 8, 1946, upon the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the parish, do hereby protest the proceedings whereby the archbishop received a sentence of 16 years imprisonment, and we demand the immediate release of Archbishop Stepinac, and also for the cessation of persecutions of Catholics in Yugoslavia; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Truman, to our Department of State, and to our Representatives in the United States Congress.

DECEMBER 8, 1946.

Elections in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have received from Mr. Carlton F. Wells, of the University of Michigan, and a memorandum from Mr. Wells, as the chairman, Michigan Committee of Americans for Poland, in the matter of the coming elections in Poland:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE,
Ann Arbor, January 8, 1947.

The Honorable T. S. GORDON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear MR. GORDON: As one of the most outspoken advocates of a free and independent Poland, you will be interested in the two statements enclosed relating to the forthcoming elections in Poland. They will tell you little that you do not already know of the mockery of "free and unfettered elections" that Poland is now having imposed on it by the U. S. S. R.-puppet regime. Sydney Gruson, in the New York Times for January 3, had an even more up-to-date account of the grim, ruthless, totalitarian tyranny that the U. S. A. at Yalta helped to fasten on 25,000,000 Poles.

No doubt you have seen W. L. White's article in the January Reader's Digest—an honest, dispassionate, informing report on the Poles.

I don't know—who does?—the United States' next move after January 19. The cruel dilemma confronting Britain and the United States is terribly calculated to make the Polish people suffer—not the unspeakable Bierut regime. Hence, the inadequacy of any rule-of-thumb principle such as our apparent State Department's view that a badly behaved government cannot expect aid from America. Alas, the penalty for such punitive action toward Poland would be to starve the Poles for the misbehaviors of a government not of their choosing but of Moscow's and—to a degree—Britain's and America's.

Yours sincerely,

CARLTON F. WELLS.

MICHIGAN COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS FOR POLAND,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

MEMORANDUM

Two timely articles on the coming Polish elections of January 19, 1947: Poland Pre-

pares for the Elections, by Zygmunt Zaremba; Is Democracy Too Good for Poland? by Feliks Gross.

Questions of far-reaching import must be frankly faced by Americans in the weeks immediately ahead. The above articles from the liberal New Leader provide authoritative, factual answers to these two questions:

1. Is there even an outside chance that the free and unfettered elections promised Poland 2 years ago at Yalta will be realized?

2. Or is the pattern of totalitarian, terrorist elections—already imposed on Bulgaria (October 27) and Rumania (November 19)—to be imposed on 25,000,000 Poles?

The New York Times editorial of the other day also relates to the coming Polish elections on January 19:

"Under the Yalta agreement, both the United States and Great Britain, together with Russia, assumed definite obligations to see to it that the peoples of liberated Europe have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, in conformity with the Atlantic Charter. This pledge has been redeemed everywhere except in eastern Europe, where it has become a mockery. * * * Marshal Tito continues to rule Yugoslavia with an iron hand; Georgi Dimitrov, former head of the Comintern and inventer of its Trojan Horse tactics, has taken over Bulgaria; and Rumania faces a like development."

The Michigan Committee of Americans for Poland believes that it is in our own country's long-term interests that America face up to the U. S. S. R.'s record in eastern Europe. And it further believes that leaders of American public opinion can best serve those long-term interests by assessing that record honestly and fearlessly, particularly as it emerges in connection with the January 19 elections.

Yours sincerely,

CARLTON F. WELLS,
Chairman, Michigan Committee of Americans for Poland.

The Founding Fathers Said, "For Ourselves and Our Posterity, We Do Ordain and Establish"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the long budget message of the President today, I kept remembering the phrase so often used by the men who founded this Republic as expressed in the Constitution itself and in many early state papers. They were wont to say, "For ourselves and our posterity, we do ordain and establish." I am inclined to think that they were quite sincere in this explanation of motive for their policy. However, I have sometimes sadly smiled at the sarcastic wit of the fellow who said, "What has posterity done for me that I should do anything for him?" While this may have been said jokingly, it too often indicates the attitude of the present generation in most of our personal attitudes and actions.

At this moment, at the close of the most terrible war in human history, when the young men who are our posterity saved this Nation from destruction, only a nitwit could have the audacity to ask, "What has posterity done for me?" Reversed as it may seem, our posterity has done more for us in these recent terrible years than we can ever do for our posterity. However, that does not excuse us from the obligation to think of and act toward benefiting posterity.

The President's Budget message today was certainly not devoid of thought and consideration for posterity. In the broad outline of suggested national policy which we have just heard from him, the long future of our country came in for as much consideration as did its immediate future. When the President recommends, as he did today, Federal aid for education, he was certainly thinking both of the immediate and of the long future, and naturally of posterity as well as of ourselves. I approve and applaud the President's recommendation for generous financial aid to the American public schools.

I note with satisfaction what the President's message said about a wise policy toward our national resources. Undoubtedly the message in its entirety will elaborate on the treatment of all of the natural resources which our Nation should husband and develop. The text of the message refers to our natural resources, of mines, forests, soils, and rivers with a recommendation that they be conserved and engineered for the present and future benefit of the country. This is a matter very dear to my heart.

Great statesmen—many of them from Missouri—have looked upon the West during the last century or so and have seen the possibilities of exploiting or developing it to add to our national wealth. It is significant that President Truman's home town, Independence, Mo., historically was the jumping-off place for Americans entering the far West, for it was the eastern terminus of the Santa Fe Trail, and through Independence, Mo., those influences operated, by which a large part of the West was acquired and came under the American flag.

Even before the Santa Fe traffic enriched America, the great fur traffic, centering in St. Louis, passed through Independence, Mo., as a focal point from the mountains and rivers of the Rocky Mountain West. Small wonder that this present-day Missourian in the White House, coming from the great bend of the Missouri River, should recognize the possibility of enriching the Nation through a proper development of the West. As surely as the mining industry, the cattle industry, and the lumber industry, have added to national wealth in other days, so will reclamation, hydroelectric-power production, and similar western developments now add to our wealth, stabilize our economy, furnish continued employment to all of our people and create new tax-paying wealth to service the national debt at this critical juncture.

Therefore, I am delighted to hear the President in this message today speak of such expenditures for developing our national resources as national investments, for such they really are. This is one part of the President's policy message which I trust Congress will consider in a broad light and approve by proper legislative action.

Hydroelectric Power Development on the Columbia River by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of James H. Polhemus, president, Portland General Electric Co., before the annual meeting of the Inland Waterways Association, Multnomah Hotel, Portland, Oreg., Friday, October 25, 1946:

I am much pleased to appear before this organization, which has as its prime purpose the furthering of navigational development on the Columbia and Snake Rivers, because for many years I was closely identified with the harbor and channel improvements on the lower Columbia which established this locality as a deep-water port of major importance. I have also had much more than a speaking acquaintance with the development program on the upper river. From 1911 to 1914, I was an engineer and superintendent of construction of The Dalles-Celilo Canal, which, together with the Cascade locks project, was the first effort of the Federal Government to develop greater navigational use of the Columbia waterways system. My conviction that these and later projects have proved of immeasurable value to the Columbia basin certainly is as deep as that of any of you now in this room.

However, navigation as such is not my subject today, except as it is related to the incidental development of hydroelectric power from the multipurpose dams now built or projected. Perhaps I should not say "incidental development" because I firmly believe—and I may add that my belief is one shared unanimously by the management of the company I now represent—that the generation of power from the Federal dams inspired primarily as navigation and reclamation projects in many respects transcends these latter two objectives in importance. Especially is this true right now when the region is faced with a critical power shortage at the very time when its development is expanding at a rate probably not surpassed during any previous period in our history.

I should like to commence by quoting a recent statement of Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville project, one of your speakers today. It was one he made before congressional hearings while seeking additional appropriations for the Bonneville project. He said:

"The Bonneville Power Administration as I see it today is a public utility. It has all of the obligations of a public-utility status, and when a public utility enters on the responsibility of serving the people of a given area with an essential service it undertakes large responsibilities. One of them is to see that that service is adequate, from the time it starts, as long as that utility is in existence.

"We are now in that position for the large part of the Northwest. The Government, as I see it, is now in the position of having undertaken a responsibility of supplying the distributing agencies in the Northwest and therefore the people of the Northwest, through those distributing agencies, whether they are public or private, with an essential service, and we can't withdraw. We can't

be too handicapped in the rendering of that service by appropriations."

I want to say that I agree unqualifiedly with that statement, and I want to add something of my own to it.

It appears to me that the obligation and the responsibility referred to by Dr. Raver—to serve the people of the Northwest with an adequate supply of federally generated electric power on a continuing and expanding basis—is one which does not end with generation alone. The construction of an economically feasible and soundly engineered transmission network to carry the power to those distribution-load centers where demand exists, and the provisions of adequate interconnection facilities with the distributing systems which achieve final delivery to the homes, farms, and industries which consume the power is equally as important as the construction of dams and powerhouses. We can't use the one without the other.

Ever since the inception of Bonneville, Portland General Electric Co. has been, and now is, the medium through which more than half the people of the State of Oregon can receive this power and put it to work.

Portland General Electric Co., too, has obligations and responsibilities to the people it serves, and I want it understood that I speak in their behalf when I say that irreparable injury will be done them and to all the people of this region if those of us in the electric industry, whether we represent privately owned companies or the agencies of Government, fail in our duty and our obligation to anticipate the full needs of the people at the very time when it appears that we have the opportunity to make our longest strides toward achieving the destiny of the Northwest as a great industrial, agricultural, and trading region.

We need more dams, more powerhouses, more transmission lines, and more interconnections, and we need them quickly. We believe we can squeeze by the forthcoming peak season, which normally occurs in December, although not without running our steam-generation plants at or near their capacities. It will take all our energies and a united front of all other agencies involved to secure the necessary appropriations and to do the necessary construction of extra facilities needed to meet the 1947 peak a year from now.

Another word in behalf of the people my company serves. Since the inception of the Bonneville project, Portland General Electric Co. has believed that its job was to get this power to the people as quickly and in as large amounts as possible, in order that the advantage of its low-cost generation would be immediately enjoyed. We have added to our transmission and distribution facilities to the extent of millions of dollars but have refrained from building generating plants of our own ever since construction of the Bonneville project was commenced.

It should be clear in everyone's mind that the decision of Portland General Electric Co., and some other distributing agencies as well, not to proceed with the expansion of their own generation facilities was motivated by a sincere desire to cooperate in the program for Columbia River development in a way that would best serve the public interest.

When the Bonneville was completed, a large power surplus was immediately created. It was waiting to be used. Its advantage of low cost could not benefit anyone unless it was used.

We believed then, and we believe now, that it was our duty to the people we serve to bring them the benefits of such Federal projects as Bonneville just as rapidly as it was in our power to do so, and up to the full limit of the region to absorb any surplus. Obviously such an objective cannot be served by refusing to distribute the low-cost energy from Federal projects. Not only would it have been unpatriotic to our region, but economically unsound, to build additional generating plants to compete with Federal projects. We were Bonneville's first customer, and have always been its largest distributor. Bonneville and Coulee power now supplies more than two-thirds of the kilowatt-hours used by our customers and, as this amount has grown, repeated rate reductions have been made.

The result has been that our present rate structure is built upon the continuing availability of federally generated power in amounts adequate to meet not only the present but the future demands of our people. If these needs are not fulfilled, it is these people who will be hurt.

We are providing ample transmission and distribution capacity for the rapidly increasing loads on our system. Our plans are being made in detail for 5 years in the future and call for yearly expenditures of around $3,000,000. We have over $4,000,000 worth of equipment now in order.

In closing I want to say merely that, serious as is the present problem of power supply and interconnection bottlenecks for this region, it is not so serious that we can't lick it if we all go to work in harmony and with the same common purpose that we had in the recent war. Together we met the full demand for power then. Together we can do it now.

Address by Hon. B. B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa, at Opening of Iowa Centennial Exhibition in the Congressional Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on December 28 last, the State of Iowa observed the one hundredth anniversary of its admission into the Union. In that connection I made some remarks at the Library of Congress, at the time of the opening of the Iowa Centennial Exhibition there and the ceremony in connection with it. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"IOWAY" AND IOWA IN HISTORY

In May 1673 a party of French voyageurs left Green Bay in Wisconsin bound for the West. Far behind them lay a maze of lakes and rivers, the rock of Quebec, and the Court of France. Ahead lay the wilderness. Through the forests the canoes glided, by the Fox River, then over the portage worn by countless Indian feet, and down the Ouisconsin River. Heading the company were Father Jacques Marquette and Louis Jolliet. One represented Father Claude Dablon, Superior of the Society of Jesus in New France, eager to gain a new empire for the faith. The other traveled with orders from Count Frontenac and Jean Baptiste Talon, the Governor and Intendant, to follow the great river of the West to the sea and secure its banks for France.

Day after day the paddles dipped and rose, and on June 17 the canoes cut into the Mississippi, "this so renowned river," as Marquette called it. Ahead, on the sunset shore, rose the bluffs and wooded hills of "Ioway." The great river was delightful, not a thick muddy flood coiling through malarial flats, but a mesh of clear channels and woodsy islands. They glided for a while, and trekked inland from the west bank to pass a pipe with the Illinois, who had fled to "Ioway" from the wrath of the dreaded Iroquois.

There were rivers flowing from a westward country full of grasses, flowers, deer, bison, and wild birds that change their season in the night. They saw the prairies, some day to be described by an American poet in another tongue—

"The unshorn fields, boundless and beautiful,
For which the speech of England has no name."

—*William Cullen Bryant.*

Other Frenchmen came. Pierre Charles Le Sueur, ascending the Mississippi about 1700 to find the lead mines of Perrot, saw the open prairie above the Des Moines River. His talented young companion, Jean Penicaud, later described familiar features of eastern Iowa in his record of the journey. And the Jesuit Father Charlevoix in 1721 reported that "the River Moingona (i. e., the Des Moines) issues from the midst of an immense meadow, which swarms with Buffaloes and other wild beasts." But that time the French were mining lead on the upper Mississippi, and for many years their maps of the Great Valley had shown the bluffs, mines, and rivers of Iowa, the distant lodges of the Ioways and Otoes, and mysterious lakes far in the Northwest, now recognized as those of the Okoboji region.

Iowa had emerged into mapped and written history, but for many years to come, only as an undefined vastness where French, Britons, and Spaniards fought and schemed for lead and furs, and intrigued for the friendship of Indian tribes, who never dreamed that those adventurers were—

"Among the skirmishers that teased the future,
Precursors of the grave slow-moving millions
Already destined to the westward-faring."

—*Willa Cather,* Macon Prairie.

It was a battleground also of two Indian cultures, Siouan and Algonkian, for it lay between the eastern woods and the high plains where the bison was lord.

In the shifts of war and diplomacy "Ioway" was shuffled from one empire to another: From France to Spain in 1762, and back again briefly to France under Napoleon, who tossed it into the lap of the United States. Then it became successively a part of the Territories of Louisiana, Missouri, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

Lead and furs made Iowa's history for more than a century after Le Sueur. They brought the miners, hunters, and traders, who controlled and often intermarried with the Indian. Across those years pass the picturesque figures of Julien Dubuque with his "Mines of Spain" confirmed to him by the Spanish Governor Carondelet in 1796; the Yankee explorers Jonathan Carver and Peter Pond; Jean Baptiste Faribault; and the trader, Thomas G. Anderson, who had an artist's eye for "the little islands of wood scattered over the boundless plains." And there was Jean Baptiste Trudeau, who represented Spain, traded on the Des Moines, and in 1794 intended to reach the Rockies by way of the Missouri. There were the settlers, like Basil Giard and Louis Honore Tesson, who got titles from Spain, built low, comfortable houses and planted gardens. And many others enter the crowded pageant: Manuel Lisa, John Colter, Wilson Price Hunt, Pierre Dorion, Antoine Le Claire, Russel Farnham, Maurice Blondeau, and the tragic George Davenport, whose name is proudly borne by a city.

Always there was the Indian, and always the increasing pressure of the white man, from the defeat of the Sacs and Foxes by the French in 1734–35 to the showman's visit of the Ioways to Europe in 1845, led by young Mahaska or White Cloud. The traces of the

hunter and the trader were gossamer threads through the wilderness, but after Jefferson's bold purchase of Louisiana in 1803 the explorations of the white man closed around the Indians' "Ioway" in an ever-tightening mesh. First Lewis and Clark built their fires along the tawny Missouri, and buried Sergeant Floyd on the bluff by the present Sioux City. Then Pike ascended the Mississippi, and after him came the Oregon-Astoria party on the Missouri, Stephen H. Long, Governor Lewis Cass and Henry R. Schoolcraft, and Gen. Henry Atkinson. In 1820 Kearney's party struck boldly across the emptiness from Council Bluffs to the St. Peter or Minnesota River, giving Iowa a claim to a far northern boundary. In 1816 the southern limit was defined, and 20 years later another explorer, Albert M. Lea, published a little book that gave Iowa a definite place and name. So claims the State historical society.

With the explorers came forts, beginning with Madison in 1808–09, and then agents, and treaties, and the Indian was doomed: Keokuk, Wapello, Poweshiek, Appanoose, Black Hawk, in treaty after treaty, from 1824 to 1842, signed away the heritage of the race. Black Hawk fought in Illinois, retreated, pined in captivity, visited that other warrior Andrew Jackson, dictated his story to Antoine LeClaire, and then died in Iowa. The Black Hawk Purchase Treaty alone surrendered 6,000,000 acres in eastern Iowa. The red man faded to the Western reservations; only the crafty Inkpadutah made a last gesture of savage resentment in the Spirit Lake Massacre of 1857—the year of Iowa's second constitution, that permitted banks and corporations. The Indian was not of that world. With him faded also the buffalo:

"But the flower-fed buffaloes of the spring
Left us long ago.
They trundle around the hills no more
With the Pawnees lying low."
—*Vachel Lindsay.*

Already "Ioway" had become Iowa and had lived a rich and exciting history. It had been a vast organized territory stretching from Missouri to Canada, a bright newspaper editor had called its people "Hawkeyes," and Robert Lucas had come to govern them and to be agreeably disappointed at finding them not crude and bumptious, as he had feared. The people had scarcely had time to get used to being a territory, when a vigorous agitation for statehood began to seethe. It gathered speed slowly until 1844, when a popularly elected convention drafted a constitution, then it lagged for 2 years while the Hawkeyes insisted upon their natural western limit—the Missouri. Then Congress yielded to them, accepted their constitution, and passed the bill which President Polk signed 100 years ago today, creating the twenty-ninth State—Iowa.

Who were those Iowans, who made the two constitutions of 1846 and 1857? And why were there two?

The answer to these questions lies in the fact that there were two Iowas. The first was the child of the Great River, the Iowa of the miner, the trader and trapper, the Indian agent and interpreter, the soldier, and the hill farmer of the old eastern counties. That early Iowa derived mainly from the Upper South and the Ohio Valley, and had a southern and democratic flavor. Burlington, Fort Madison, and Keokuk were steamboat towns with fine spacious homes, and looked to St. Louis, while Dubuque became a lumber town and faced north. The people came largely by the rivers and tended to stay near them. They were Mississippi French, Irish, and Scotch, and their homes and manners reflected those of the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, and the Missouri. They were Jacksonian—the Whigs called them "Locofocos"—and they sent a Missourian, Augustus Caesar Dodge, to Congress as Territorial Delegate and later as Senator. They were anything but submissive, but they respected law, held trials to suppress the lawless, and formed claim associations to protect their rights to the land.

The second Iowa, as one is tempted to call it, was something different. It came less by the rivers, more and more by land as the turnpikes and then the railroads thrust across the Mississippi and into the rolling prairies of the interior. In 1854 Iowa had not a mile of railroad track, but by 1866 the bigstacked locomotives puffed to the Missouri. This was the Iowa of the homesteader, drawn by the glowing immigrant guides and land advertisements, and coming increasingly from the Northeast and from Europe. In 1840 Iowa was almost purely native American and rather southern, but by 1856 it was 11 percent foreign-born, and 4 years later contained 25,000 New Englanders. The Yankees came in groups, bringing their love of the village, the Congregational Church, and the college—as at Grinnell. The change was reflected in the election of 1856, when Iowa turned Republican, and elected a New Englander, James W. Grimes, as Governor, and an Illinoisan, James Harlan, as United States Senator.

The newcomers descended upon Iowa like a landslide, pushing the population from 192,000 in 1850 to 674,000 in 1860, and to 1,600,000 in 1880. They were attracted by reports of the rich prairies, farm lands, for Iowa is over 90 percent tillable, a proportion no other State can rival. The earliest settlers tended to cling to the streams and groves, but as the leafy places filled up and the railroads struck out for the faraway Missouri, the pioneers ventured out into boundless light and space, and became a really new people, whatever their origins.

"It is strange to live on the high world in the stare
Of the naked sun and the stars.
Men in the old lands housed by their rivers.
They built their towns in the vales in the earth's shelter.
We first inhabit the world. We dwell
On the half earth, on the open curve of a continent.
It is strange to sleep in the bare stars and to die
On an open land where few bury before us."
—*MacLeish*, American Letter.

They brought flocks, herds, droves, wives, and broods of children, the family Bible, and the schoolteacher, and oxen to pull the great plows for breaking the hard prairie sod. So the life of our inland Iowa grew westward by rivers with strange names like Nishnabotna and Wapsipinicon. The prairie world was new and wonderful with its warm winds from the southwest, its bright high stars, driving storms and steely cold, long lines of fire, trips to town and to the inevitable mill. How beautiful the prairie looked to a newcomer in spring is vividly told in the journal of an Englishwoman, Jean Rio Pearce, a Mormon pilgrim of 1851:

"The weather is now fine and the flowers are lifting their heads and looking more beautiful than ever. There are a great variety of flowers growing on the prairie, such as are cultivated in our gardens at home. We are constantly walking over violets, primroses, daisies, bluebells, the lily of the valley, columbines of every shade, from white to the deepest purple, Virginia stocks in large patches. The wild rose, too, is plentiful, perfuming the air for miles."

The human flood washed over Iowa as the railroads spread their net, eventually leaving no place more than 12 miles from the locomotive's whistle. The counties advanced, tier after tier, until they checkerboarded the State to the Missouri. The old river towns of the East began to look rather uneasily at new cities rising in the interior, as the capital moved to Des Moines. And the steamboat interests recognized the enemy, and fought rails and bridges. And when a steamboat rammed the Rock Island bridge, Iowa first heard of Abraham Lincoln, the railroad lawyer.

The mixed blood and the strangers came. Hollanders fleeing from a frigid state church, Hungarians from Austrian rule, Norwegians from the cold hillside farms, Swedes and Danes from their landlords, Germans from the Prussian military caste, Bohemians from foreign oppression. Collectivist Christians like the Amana people, Socialist idealists like the Icarians, and Mormons on their way to their garden in the desert. All found a welcome and homes in liberal and democratic Iowa. Even Abner Kneeland and his Freethinkers, who settled near Farmington in 1839 were not cast out.

Iowans were a mixed breed, but they were generally of one mind, respecting the then deep cleavage in the American people: slavery against freedom. They supported the doctrine of Chief Justice Charles Mason of their own supreme court, in the case of Ralph, that when a slave lived on their soil with the consent of his master, he became a free man. They elected a Unionist for Governor, Samuel J. Kirkwood, and when the storm broke, sent about 80,000 men to war. Iowans fought to hold Missouri in the Union, an Iowa regiment led the furious assault on Fort Donelson, Tenn., and Iowans were in Sherman's march to the sea. In 1864 Iowa helped to reelect Lincoln to complete the unfinished work which they who fought * * * have thus far so nobly advanced. The State earned its inscription on the Washington Monument: "Iowa: the affections of her people, like the rivers of her borders, flow to an inseparable Union." Following the war, an Iowa justice of the United States Supreme Court, Samuel F. Miller (the first appointed from beyond the Mississippi), checked the trend to national absolutism by deciding that our people are citizens of States as well as of the Nation. Another Iowan, George W. McCrary, proposed the tribunal that possibly averted more civil strife by deciding the bitterly contested Presidential election of 1876.

Iowa has done more than her share in every war since the Mexican and the one to save the Union, and in peacetime has preserved a loyal and conservative character. The people, to preserve their economic independence, have sometimes supported seemingly radical but really conservative movements like the Greenback campaign against monopoly. But in the 1890's, when their neighbors went overboard for populism and free silver, Iowans shunned economic heresy. Their tradition of stability has been one of their many gifts to the Nation.

Yet they have not been stay-at-homes. Since the gold rushes of the 1850's they have played an eminent part in conquering the far West. Twelve hundred Iowans pioneered in Utah, and in Oregon, where the provisional government adopted Iowa's laws. Council Bluffs for many years was the gate to the far West, where Buffalo Bill, born and raised in the State, was an express rider. Three Iowans—Grenville M. Dodge, Samuel R. Curtis, and Peter A. Dey—promoted the Union Pacific Railroad that linked the oceans in 1869, fulfilling the dream of an earlier Iowan, John Plumbe, of Dubuque, and of Hartwell Carver, grandson of Jonathan, the explorer.

At an early date Iowa began to rival far wealthier and more populous States, in furnishing statesmen who influenced the development of our national administration and the course of our history. The first President born west of the Mississippi, Herbert Hoover, is an Iowan. The roll of Cabinet members, 16 in all, and famous Members of Congress is a long one, including Senators James W. Grimes, James Harlan, William B. Allison, Jonathan P. Dolliver, Albert

B. Cummins; George W. McCrary, Secretary of War; Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior and President of Leland Stanford University; and four Secretaries of Agriculture—Henry A. and Henry C. Wallace, Edwin T. Meredith, and "Tama Jim" Wilson, who practically created the department. We could name many more, if time permitted.

Even before Governor Lucas noted their intelligence, Iowans began to give their State the highest rank in literacy. They had schools, printing presses, and newspapers before they had a territorial government. One of the first acts of the State legislature provided for the security of the common-school fund, and a country school was set up at the center of each four sections of land. Today, Iowa is a land of colleges and universities, boasts one of the Nation's finest State universities, and Iowa State College at Ames has always been preeminent in agriculture and engineering. Iowa claims better local provision for higher education than any other State. A wise observer, the statesman, James Bryce thought that the numerous small colleges probably were more efficient agents of culture than a single public university would have been. In the middle of the last century nearly every town had a lyceum, and most of the famous lecturers visited Iowa and were astonished at the high level of culture they found. For these advantages Iowans owe a great debt to the pioneers who established the private and denominational colleges, and to the statesmen and educators who fought the battle for endowed and tax-supported public instruction, from the one-room schoolhouse to the higher State institutions. The results of their idealism appear in many beautiful campuses with modern buildings. The memorials of the struggle are hidden away in petitions signed by thousands of Iowans, for land in aid of schools, and in the catalogs and lectures that streamed from the early printing presses to advertise the advantages of popular education.

Religion has been in Iowa since the Catholic missionaries came in canoes to offer the Sacraments to explorers, traders, and miners and Indians. Before the region was a Territory, came the Methodist circuit rider and the Baptist exhorter to preach anywhere and everywhere and build log meeting houses. The flood of immigration made liberal Iowa the city of refuge of many denominations—Quakers of antislavery faith, orthodox Lutherans, German Catholics, Spiritualists, Anglicans, Disciples. Their faith left its landmarks in the many simple white churches that ride on the long swells of the prairie. They seem more typical of the simple and abiding faith of the people than the city churches of massive stone built almost in the urban East.

As Iowans emerged from the pioneer era and considered their past, they began to write their recollections, the beginnings of a native literature. A tiny volume of poetry by an Iowan appeared at Davenport as early as 1856. In the 1890's indigenous literature produced the Stories of a Western Town (1893) by Alice French, better known as Octave Thanet. Since then a band of Iowa novelists and poets have created a literature of their society. It is not the facile product of the temporary investigator but the mature work of men and women like Ruth Suckow, Josephine Donovan, Herbert Quick, and Phil Stong, who have grown up in the river town and on the prairie farm, and know the rural school and church and the State fair. The literary influence of Iowa has been borne far and wide also by several magazines, founded and ably edited by Iowans. They have answered the complaint of Walt Whitman, 80 years ago, that Americans had no really American literature.

Iowa can claim also some native composers, who have written modern interpretations of Indian melodies and popular ballads that swept the country, like In the Shade of the Old Apple Tree. The church music of Sumner Salter reflects the plain religious faith of the masses, while the scientific appreciation and popular teaching of music are represented in the research and writing of Carl Seashore and the school work of C. A. Fullerton. One of the most beloved of symphonies, to Americans, the New World Symphony, is believed to have been written in part while Antonin Dvorak enjoyed the Iowa summer at a little Bohemian town of Spillville, where he composed, loafed, strolled, and played the church organ.

Art in Iowa has made the headlines through the paintings of Grant Wood, who established a new and vigorous school of American painting, and other modern artists, but its roots lie deep in the character and experience of the people. National groups brought to Iowa their traditional arts and handicrafts and a genuine thirst for culture, and their household arts have been preserved for posterity in local collections like the Norwegian museum at Decorah, and in delicate watercolors for the American Academy of Design. These and the older pioneer American stocks have founded collections and fostered new art. One of the Nation's earliest municipal art galleries was established at Davenport through the generosity of C. A. Ficke, father of the Iowa poet, Arthur Davison Ficke. The State and the people have promoted art in the public schools, colleges, and universities; and by bringing to the public prominent American artists and their work, have fostered the general understanding and interest that has played a vital role in the growth of American contemporary art.

This is but a cursory review of Iowa's gifts to American life, which have been carried to the remotest verges of the "open curve of a continent" by her children. In 1930 more than a million of them—not the least of the gifts—were living beyond her bounds. Their reunions, societies and meetings testify to their pride in the State that has given these things to our native American culture.

"This is our land, this is our ancient ground—
The raw earth, the mixed bloods and the strangers.
The different eyes, the wind, and the heart's change.
These we will not leave, though the old call us.
This is our country-earth, our blood, our kind."

—*MacLeish*, American Letter.

Six Weeks in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report entitled "Six Weeks in Europe," made by me to Oklahomans over a radio hook-up on October 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have just returned from Europe where I visited Denmark, Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, France, Ireland, and England.

My mission was twofold—one, to attend a world agriculture meeting in Denmark, and the other to make a survey of conditions in that part of Germany now under our control and supervision.

President Truman appointed me a delegate to the Food and Agriculture Conference held in September at Copenhagen.

This appointment came to me because of the fact that I am chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

The Conference was attended by representatives of 47 nations.

The purpose of the Conference was to promote the organization of the farmers of the world for their own benefit, profit, and security.

This organization of farmers has the following present objectives:

First, to gather, analyze, and exchange statistics on farm crops, surplus products on hand, and on crop production from year to year.

Second, to develop a world-wide agriculture organization for the specific purpose of assisting farmers in the production and marketing of their products.

This will require a plan for the financing, storing, preserving, and distributing of farm commodities so that a safe surplus of food products may be on hand at all times to tide the peoples through periods of drought and other impediments to the production of food.

The detailed plans remain to be worked out by the organization known as the FAO.

The over-all hope of those interested in this organization is to increase food production and thereby raise the level of nutrition of the peoples of the world.

In Oklahoma, and in the other States, farmers have had a fair year.

The wheat and corn crops have been the largest ever.

The prices now current are the best in decades.

To farmers the question naturally arises, Can present prices be maintained?

No one can answer this question positively.

The peoples of the world are hungry and ragged, so it would seem that there will be a substantial demand for food such as wheat, corn, and livestock, and for cotton and wool for clothing for the next several years to come.

The conclusion just stated is based on the following statement of conditions throughout the world.

At the present time our government is assisting in feeding and clothing the peoples in the war-torn areas of both Europe and Asia.

Already we have helped feed peoples of over 20 countries.

However, great as is America, our resources are limited.

Heretofore each country has managed to get along but times are different today.

A world-wide war has just been terminated.

Millions of peoples have been displaced.

Denmark has over 200,000 Germans in concentration camps and the Government wants to send them home, but they have no homes to which to return.

England has 158,000 German war prisoners to return to their fatherland, but the German fatherland is not an inviting place just now.

When Poland was attacked vast numbers of Poles were taken prisoner and transported to Germany to work as slaves.

Now they have been liberated and are free to go home, but their country was destroyed and they have no homes to which to return.

Today, a half million Poles are still in western Germany living on the meager rations dealt out by the American, British, and French armies of occupation.

Yugoslavia wants to send back to Germany hundreds of thousands of Germans who have been unwelcome "squatters" for generations.

Czechoslovakia wishes to return many thousands of German children who were made orphans by the war.

In brief, it is estimated that the several nations hold well over 1,000,000 old men, women, and children awaiting transportation back to Germany.

In sections of Germany the people will certainly starve this winter unless food is provided.

Japan presents a similar problem.

India, with its 500,000,000 people, faces a grave food shortage.

It is estimated that 20,000,000 people will die as the result of the present famine in China.

All this means a serious drain on the world's food supply.

Despite wars, famine and pestilence, the population of the world is increasing.

It is estimated by experts that world food production must be increased by 163 percent by 1960—only 15 years hence—in order to meet the minimum requirements.

These are a few of the problems now confronting the World Food and Agriculture Organization.

This organization, associated with and a part of the United Nations, must be considered as an experiment.

So was our Constitution an experiment, but the constitutional experiment has been a success.

Today the United States, developed under our Constitution, is the richest, the strongest, and the most influential nation of the earth.

The United States delegation to Copenhagen, consisting of some 30 members, flew to Denmark.

Each member had a return air-line ticket but when the conference was over we were advised that all plane space was sold and reserved until November.

Further, we learned that multiplied thousands of Americans were in Paris, London, and other European cities awaiting transportation home.

Facing this transportation problem I contacted our Embassy in London and was advised that the earliest means of getting home was on the steamship *Washington*, which was then scheduled to sail from Le Havre about September 20.

I requested and was accorded space for return to New York.

Then the maritime strike occurred.

The sailing date was postponed from day to day and we did not start home until Sunday, October 6.

However the deferred sailing gave me two more weeks in Europe.

In addition to the Committee of Agriculture, I am chairman of the Committee on War Department Appropriations.

This position rates me a plane and crew to take me wherever I wish to go on business connected with War Department expenditures.

At my request an Army plane was flown to Copenhagen to take me to Frankfort, Germany, the seat of the Army headquarters having jurisdiction over the American zone of occupied Germany.

By plane I saw Germany from the air, and I saw Frankfurt, Weisbaden, Heidelberg, Mannheim, Hamburg, Nurenberg, and Berlin from both the air and on the ground.

My time will not permit a detailed report on conditions in Germany.

However, a few observations:

The business sections of the towns and cities were destroyed.

Wharves, bridges, airfields, and roads were damaged if not destroyed entirely.

Residential sections were not intentionally attacked.

Churches, hospitals, and schools were protected as far as possible.

Many cities with famous names will never be rebuilt.

Berlin, the capital of Germany, was the central target of the Allied attack.

At a low altitude I looked down on Berlin, once the most substantial and beautiful of the world's capitals.

Now, from the air, it resembles a vast honeycomb with the honey gone.

From the ground it resembles ancient Athens and Rome—only walls and columns still standing.

The once beautiful wooded park, almost in the center of the city, is now devoid of trees and looks like a clearing in a wilderness.

On my tour of Germany I conferred with the military and civil heads of our forces in the American zone and sector of that devastated country.

My report on military affairs was made direct to the War Department.

My report on civil affairs was made to the Secretary of State and copies of both reports, secret and confidential, were sent to the President of the United States.

Our ship, the *Washington*, owned and operated by the United States Lines, as stated, was delayed by strikes.

This gave me the opportunity of attending the closing sessions of the war prisoners' trial at Nuremberg.

Nuremberg, the place of the trial, is located in the American zone; hence, our khaki-clad soldiers were on duty and in evidence in all parts of the city and in the surrounding country.

Nuremberg was selected for the place of trial for the following reasons:

The city, formerly containing half a million inhabitants, was chosen by Hitler as nazism's cultural center.

The city was the capital of the Nazi Party Congress.

While the city was some 75 percent destroyed, the courthouse called the Palace of Justice, was not greatly damaged.

Immediately adjacent to the courthouse is a modern jail, or prison, with cells for 400 prisoners.

Hence, Nuremberg was a natural for the most celebrated trial of all history.

At Paris I took off late in the afternoon to attend the final sessions of the trial.

There were no lighting facilities at the airport in Nuremberg, so I had to land at Frankfurt and drive the almost 200 miles in order to attend the last sessions of the international military tribunal.

After an all-night drive I arrived at Nuremberg at 5 o'clock in the morning.

Our three-star automobile, the property of General Clay, was stopped and inspected at almost every turn.

The members of my party had special cards of identification but the American military authorities were taking no chances of permitting unauthorized persons reaching the closing sessions of the world-famous trial.

Here is the picture of the last day of the famous trial as I saw it.

The courtroom was about the same size and resembled the courtrooms in our Oklahoma courthouses.

On the last day the court convened at 9 o'clock a. m.

The prisoners, pale and emaciated and in various forms of dress, were in the dock surrounded by the smartly clad soldiers of the United States.

The soldiers at every door were giants in size and were ready for any emergency.

Their suits of army woolen were perfectly tailored and fit like gloves.

They wore steel helmets, enameled white.

Broad white web belts encircled their waists.

Each wore white gloves and carried a sturdy police club also enameled white.

To complete their glamorous outfit each wore red cords around his shoulders and their black shoes were topped with white leggings or spats.

The soldiers of no other country could present a comparable picture.

Only a few military uniforms were worn by the German prisoners.

Goering, the first deputy under Hitler and No. 1 Nazi leader, was dressed in conventional gray, but the suit had been made when he was a much heavier man.

Now he was only a shadow of his former self.

Presently the judges, in flowing black gowns, solemnly filed in and took their seats at the elevated table.

The attorneys for the prosecution, as well as for the defense, occupied the space between the four-nation court, on the one side, and the dejected war prisoners on the other.

Behind the judges stood the standards containing the victorious flags of Russia, Britain, France, and the United States.

The presiding judge was Lord Chief Justice Lawrence of Britain.

When the court was called to order every seat on the floor and in the galleries was occupied.

Each seat in the room was numbered and each had attached thereto a head phone set.

The court, the prisoners, the attorneys, and the spectators all had their head-phone sets in place.

The proceedings were conducted in Russian, French, English, and German.

The judges took turns in reviewing the charges and the evidence against each prisoner.

It made no difference what language was used; the interpretation was instantaneous into the language understood by the listener hence there was no delay for interpretations.

Each one of the prisoners heard a summary of the evidence against him and the verdict of the court as to his guilt or innocence.

The prisoners were indicted on four counts.

Each prisoner was charged with having conspired to commit crimes against peace by planning, preparing, and initiating a war of aggression.

They were charged with war crimes by violating the laws, treaties, and customs of war.

They were charged with crimes against humanity—namely, enslavement, extermination, and murder.

It took 80,000 words to catalog the crimes charged in the indictments and it required a day and a half for the court to present the reviews, summaries, and findings.

During one session of the court, and while the prisoners were in the dock, I was shown through the prison.

My guide was the prison superintendent, Colonel Little, formerly of Fort Sill, and who married a Lawton girl.

I visited every cell occupied by the once proud and haughty German leaders.

Each had an individual cell.

The rooms were small—save the ceilings were high.

On one wall there was a small opening for light and ventilation.

The opening was protected by heavy iron bars.

Instead of glass the light came through a clear plastic, something that will not break and afford a sharp cutting edge.

Each cell contained a heavy iron cot, a dirty mattress, and two blankets.

A small, flimsy table was provided.

One plain wooden chair and a specially devised open toilet made up the furnishings.

All hooks, nails, and electric wires had been removed.

There was nothing that could be used in a suicide attempt.

The mess provided consisted of porridge—a kind of hash—three slices of dark bread and coffee.

No metal knife or fork or spoon was provided.

A frail wooden spoon was permitted.

When the meal was over all vessels were removed.

At night the reading glasses and spectacles were removed from each cell.

In the door was an opening just large enough to permit of the passing in of food, books, and articles of clothing.

The opening was heavily barred and was kept locked from the outside.

Night and day—during every hour and every minute—a strong, alert American soldier stood before the door of each cell and constantly observed the movements of his prisoner.

Near the row of cells containing the 21 prisoners was a small chapel, and such as requested were permitted to attend the services provided.

Such was the life they lived during the 10 months of the trial.

How different from the scenes of pomp and splendor which they enjoyed prior to the fall of their projected empire.

In my tour of the prison I entered the dingy cell of Goering, the No. 1 German war prisoner.

Who was this terrible man Goering?

The answer:

Goering was Hitler's crown prince—the great Reichsmarshal, Chief of the Luftwaffe, President of the Reichstag, architect of the Gestapo, dictator of German economy, the man who ordered Allied airmen in prison war cages murdered, and the man of whom the high court said: "His guilt is unique in its enormity."

The noon hour was over and the sentencing of the prisoners was set for 3 p m

Again the courtroom was filled.

Only those having special permits were in their seats.

The dock was vacant.

The chairs had been removed.

Immediately behind the dock was a narrow sliding door—just wide enough for one person at a time to enter or retire.

Promptly at the appointed hour the high court marshal cried out:

"Attention! Attention! Take your seats."

The judges, again in sombre black, entered and the court sat.

Such was the picture when the sentences were pronounced.

Amid a deathly silence the sliding door, operated by electricity, clicked and moved aside and one after the other, two strong American military police, dressed for the occasion, quickly stepped inside the room and took their places, one on each side of the door.

They were quickly followed by Goering, prisoner No. 1, and he was followed by a third strong American M. P.

A headphone set was handed the prisoner and he made his own adjustments.

Without delay Lord Chief Justice Lawrence, in measured words, pronounced the sentence, as follows:

"Herman Wilhelm Goering, on the counts on which you have been found guilty, the International Military Tribunal sentences you to death by hanging."

For a brief moment the condemned prisoner gazed at the judges.

Then, realizing that this was all, he whisked off his headgear, wheeled quickly about, returned through the narrow sliding door, and disappeared forever.

It took about a minute and a half to return the first condemned man to his cell and to produce in court the second—Von Ribbentrop.

Then followed the same procedure and the same sentence.

One by one the prisoners were produced, sentenced, and returned to their solitary cells to await the execution.

On Wednesday, October 16, in the high walled prison yard adjacent to the Palace of Justice, the sentences were carried out.

Nine of the war prisoners were hanged—not executed honorably as soldiers die, but disgracefully like common criminals.

Goering, the tenth, too cowardly to face the gallows, deserted his comrades in crime and committed suicide a few minutes before he was to be hanged.

This kind of a trial the world never witnessed before and it is the hope of mankind that such a trial will never again be necessary.

Let me here digress to remind you of the fate of some other historic war criminals.

If time permitted it would be interesting to comment on the last days and untimely deaths of such dictators and tyrants as Caesar, Frederick the Great, Hannibal, and Napoleon.

The world knows the fate of Mussolini, and a few days ago I saw the dismal chamber, some fifty feet underground, where Hitler is supposed to have met his death.

The recent war has developed and is bringing forth a new world program and a new era in international and world affairs.

Nations will either conform to the new concept of national morality or they will surely perish and disappear from the earth.

At Paris I looked in on a session of the United Nations organization. James F. Byrnes, the American Secretary of State, was presiding.

This organization has for its purposes: First, to reestablish peace, and, second, to develop a plan for the prevention of wars.

Our people should be—and I believe they are—supporting the foreign policy of our Government.

Upon the success of this policy the future of civilization depends.

If Germany had won the war, what would certainly have happened to our public men—the President, members of his Cabinet, Army and Navy officials, and even Members of Congress, who declared war, enacted the necessary legislation, and provided the funds for carrying on the successful contest?

Certainly they would not have been given a 10-month trial and every opportunity to develop and present their several defenses.

No doubt but that they would have been executed without even the formality of a trial.

If either Germany or Japan had won the war, what would have happened to our National Government, to our State governments, and to the governments of our cities?

Obviously, they would now be only fading memories.

Some may yet believe that we should not have entered the war.

But, remember, we were attacked without warning at Pearl Harbor.

The unholy alliance of Germany, Italy, and Japan had designs on the United States.

Let me also remind you that the United States is the "prize of prizes."

We own and hold two-thirds of the world's gold.

We own and hold one-third of the world's silver.

We have almost unlimited supplies of raw materials.

We have the best money and the best financial system in the world.

We have the best utilities, the best railroads, the best factories, and the best workers, and all would have been taken over by the conquerors.

Our money, our banks, our factories, and our utilities would have been confiscated.

Our workers would have faced the draft, and many would have been sent to foreign lands as slave laborers, and our farmers would have lost their farms and become plodding peasants in an effort to feed and clothe the world.

Why do I make such statements?

My answer—I have just seen what the Allies have done to Germans and Germany.

Does anyone dare think that Germans, dominated by ruthless leaders—who luckily are now no more—would have been more lenient to us than we are being to them?

Berlin, the German capital, is destroyed.

Nuremberg, the Nazi center, is annihilated.

The German Government is no more.

German money is almost worthless.

Already we have installed a new financial system, with a new form of money, for the American German zone of occupation.

German prisoners of war, under heavy guard, are forced to work as directed by the military authorities.

German citizens have had their homes and their usable property taken over by the Allies.

The great Farben office building in Frankfurt was confiscated and is now the headquarters of the United States Army of Occupation.

Uninjured residences were commandeered for the use of our military and civil personnel.

The famous Kronberg Castle, the hiding place for the crown jewels, is now being used as an officers' club.

German citizens are homeless, hungry, and ragged.

For the want of food they are not strong enough to perform hard labor.

They have neither milk, butter, sugar, soap, nor starch.

For 6 weeks I had to live on European food, and as the result I lost 16 pounds.

There are no fat people today in either Germany, England, or France.

Linen sent to the laundry looks worse when returned than when sent out to be washed.

I was cautioned about the scarcity of soap in Europe, so I took along what I considered an ample supply.

Because of strikes my return was delayed.

My soap supply began to fade, and when I reached our returning ship my last portion had dwindled to about the size of a thin half dollar

There is practically no fuel in American-occupied Germany.

The winters are long and cold.

I saw whole families gathering in their winter supply of fuel.

Anything that will burn, including green twigs and limbs of trees no larger than one's finger, are collected in bundles and either carried on tired backs, pushed in wheelbarrows, or hauled in clumsy carts to their humble homes.

There is little transportation in Germany.

German men and women pulling and pushing small carts and wagons clutter the roads and highways as they wend their weary ways to either the fields or back to their dreary homes.

Such are Germans and the Germany of today.

Germany lost the war and lost all.

Had we lost the war we likewise would have lost all.

Yet I realize fully that many of our own people have suffered greatly and have lost heavily because of the conflict.

If there be such of you now listening to me let me remind you that what you have left is just that much saved.

If each of you could see what I saw in seven countries of Europe you would, I think, bow your heads and thank God that you live in Oklahoma and that you are a citizen of the United States of America.

Hawaii, the Forty-ninth State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, under date of December 21, 1946, relative to the admission of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State, as follows:

HAWAII, THE FORTY-NINTH STATE

The Eightieth Congress will again be confronted by Hawaii's ardent request for inclusion in the Union. The last Congress dallied on this issue. There is no good reason why the coming session should not grant the request promptly.

The people of Hawaii have long sought statehood. In 1940, 67 percent of the voters favored it. President Truman has given his endorsement. A subcommittee of the last House urged statehood unanimously.

Hawaii fulfills the traditional requisites for statehood. In area, it exceeds any of these States—Delaware, Connecticut, Rhode Island. In population, it exceeds Nevada or Wyoming or Delaware or Vermont. It is wealthier than many States; in 1945 its citizens paid $174,000,000 to the Federal Treasury—more than was paid in any of 14 States.

Hawaii is modern. It maintains a high standard in public works and government services. Its standing in education, health, and law enforcement is better than that of some States. In recent years, it has passed progressive labor legislation. Financially, its government is in sound condition.

Hawaii wants statehood because its people feel they have ended the period of pupilage. They point out that they are now Americans without representation and that they may suffer discrimination as a result. Hawaii's sons were drafted in the recent war, yet its people had no voice on the draft law or the declaration of war. Its people pay Federal taxes but have no voice in levying or disbursing them. Laws are constantly being passed in Washington that vitally affect Hawaiian industry and agriculture, the Hawaiians have no vote on these laws.

The Hawaiians proved during the war that they are as good and as patriotic Americans as any of us on the mainland. They want this recognized in fact. As their territory possesses all the other qualifications, we owe them this recognition.

Special Committee Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Special Committee Issue," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 13, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ISSUE

Those who thought the Congressional Reorganization Act meant the doom of special investigating committees will be surprised to learn that the question is still a very live one. In fact, resolutions already have been introduced in the Senate to authorize two special inquiries—one of them an extension of the War Investigating Committee's powers.

As the preliminary debate on the two resolutions brought out last week, the intent of the committee which recommended the reorganization legislation was to do away with the practice of appointing special committees independent of the standing committee set-up. The Senate committee in its report advocated giving "regular standing committees" supervision of all "special" inquiries and recommended special committees be abolished. The Senate approved this recommendation, but when the bill came up in the House the provision against special committees was eliminated. As finally adopted, the act left the way open for any special investigations which Congress might authorize.

While the suggestion was injected into the recent debate that political motives might animate opponents of a continuation of the deep-probing Senate war investigating group, there is considerable to be said on the side of those who object to a return to the special committee system of the past. One of the prime purposes of congressional reorganization was to so overhaul and simplify the committee structure as to eliminate the exasperating conflict and confusion resulting from overlapping or outright duplication of committee work.

It is conceivable that situations may arise in which a special committee, authorized to cut across committee lines, could cover ground ordinarily within the scope of several regular committees and thus do the job more efficiently and more thoroughly than any of the standing committees could do it. The majority of inquiries fall within the province of regular committees, however, and good business practice would require that they conduct them, through their own subcommittees. Unless some reasonable curb is placed on the practice of appointing special investigating groups, the good start made toward streamlining the committee organization of Congress will be completely nullified.

British Compel Jews To Run Gantlet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the news story as told in the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1947:

BRITISH COMPEL TEL AVIV JEWS TO RUN GANTLET—SOLDIERS BEAT THEM, 29 ARE HURT; ANTI-SEMITISM AND HATRED OF BRITISH GROW

(By Homer Bigart)

TEL AVIV, PALESTINE, January 7.—Two obvious facts—a growing anti-Semitism among British troops and a rising anti-British feeling among all classes of Palestine Jews—dominate all other considerations in the Palestine crisis.

The anti-Semitism has been the inevitable product of terrorist acts, just as terrorism appears to be the inevitable recourse of a people who feel that all legal pressure for achieving security and freedom have failed.

The British troops now in Palestine are certainly no worse than American troops now in Germany. Both forces are composed largely of young recruits who, under strain, are liable to lose their heads. No one could deny that troops here have suffered nagging provocations. But the Sarona incident in Tel Aviv Thursday night was a particularly nasty display of anti-Semitism, and the tragic prospect of further excesses must receive urgent consideration in London.

Shortly after a terrorist attack on the district military headquarters in a citrus house in the heart of Tel Aviv, soldiers and police entered the Montefiore district, on the northeast of the city, rounded up the male population, and marched them into Sarona police compound. Some 60 to 70 men were forced to run the gantlet between rows of soldiers and police, who struck them with rifle butts and batons. Twenty-nine were injured, 7 seriously enough to require hospitalization.

A brigade commander of the Sixth Airborne Division, whose troops were involved, told this correspondent tonight that a closed inquiry would start Wednesday. As a result of allegations made by certain civilians regarding incidents at Sarona, the whole matter is sub judice, he said. "No officer or other rank is empowered to give any further information, by virtue of this fact."

The inquiry had been demanded by Mayor Israel Rokach. The mayor was ill Tuesday, but Town Clerk Yehudah Nedivi, who served 4 years as a captain in the British Army, said the city administration was convinced the allegations were correct.

I drove to the Montefiore district and talked with several men who had been beaten.

Abraham Klajman, owner of a textile mill, said that police entered the factory after 9 p. m. and ordered Klajman and 12 men of the night shift out into the yard. "I asked them whether I should halt the machines, and they replied, 'You'd better—you won't be back very soon.'

"I told the girl employees they'd better stay inside the factory. We were lined up in the yard. Some of the workers started smoking, but the cigarettes were struck from their hands by the police.

"Suddenly a policeman fired in the air, and I heard a command, 'Run.' We ran to the main road, where we mixed with a crowd of men whom the police and soldiers had removed from a bus. We stood there a few minutes, and then the command 'Run' came again. At Sarona, the main gate was open. Soldiers and police were lined up on both sides of a lane leading to the center of the compound—a distance of one-sixth of a mile. I heard the cries of men being beaten in the darkness ahead, and then I realized that the shots fired by the police had been a signal to the soldiers to prepare the gantlet.

"I was a prisoner of the Germans at Radom, back in Poland, and I have learned a few things. I kept in the center of the mass of running men and suffered fewer blows than those on the outside. I was clipped once on the head and twice on the arm, but did not fall. Some of the older men fell. I saw a man clubbed with the butt of a rifle as he lay on the ground.

"In the center of the compound we were ordered to sit in a circle on the ground. The soldiers continued to beat those they could reach at the edge of the perimeter. Some of the men became nauseated, others fainted. I heard one soldier cry, 'Give me a machine gun and I'll kill the whole bloody lot.'

"Then we were put into trucks and taken to the British counterintelligence at Jaffa. There was a stretcher case unconscious in my truck, and another man with a broken leg and one with a badly injured arm.

"At Jaffa they simply took our names and ordered us to go home. I overheard an officer saying, 'Who gave orders to arrest these people? Take them back.'"

Similar stories were obtained from Benny Brabda, who had fought with the Jewish Brigade in Belgium and Holland; Joram Danieli, a textile worker; and Joseph Dula, a laborer whose right arm was still in a sling. Dula had fallen during the gantlet run and lost consciousness.

Military Contribution Made by Iowa During World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by

Gen. Charles H. Grahl, adjutant general of the State of Iowa, given at the Register and Tribune public affairs meeting at Des Moines, Iowa, on December 14, 1946:

Obviously to tell of the military contribution made by the State of Iowa during World War II cannot be covered in the short time available. Volumes could be, and should be written on this subject. Therefore I can only touch on the high lights of the glorious contribution made by our State.

Iowa furnished upward to 275,000 men and women to the armed forces. This includes those who were in the regular service prior to December 7, 1941, together with those inducted through selective service and those who entered Federal service as members of the Iowa National Guard.

The State and the Nation owe a deep debt of gratitude to the more than 7,000 uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System of this State who through their efforts, sacrifices, and devotion made possible the successful operation of the Selective Service System. They served as local board members, members of Government appeal boards, as well as physicians and dentists and registrants' advisory boards.

To the everlasting credit of the citizens of the State of Iowa, they accepted the Selective Service System in a most loyal and patriotic manner. Iowa has an enviable record of having fewer delinquents (people who attempted to evade selective-service law), both in percentage and in actual numbers, than any of the 48 States.

Men inducted through Selective Service in Iowa served in all theaters and on all battle fronts of the world.

During the period enlistments were being accepted by the armed forces, volunteers from Iowa always kept our State near the top of the list of States furnishing men from this source. Frequently Iowa led the States in the number of men volunteering for the Navy.

The strength of the Iowa National Guard upon its induction into Federal service was 6,643 officers and enlisted men. The record of Iowa National Guard troops in the Thirty-fourth Division, the One Hundred and Thirteenth Cavalry, and the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Observation Squadron in World War II cannot be surpassed.

The Thirty-fourth was the first American division to be sent to the European theater of war after Pearl Harbor. You are all familiar with the glorious record of the Thirty-fourth in north Africa, Salerno, the crossing of the Volturno, and the terrific fighting in which they engaged at Cassino, where some of our men had stuck it out so long and had suffered so much that they had to be lifted out of their fox holes. It is history that when the Allied attack finally achieved its goal at Cassino, no less than five divisions were required to finish the task which the Thirty-fourth had so gallantly begun and so nearly completed.

This division took much of the pounding on the beach head at Anzio. At the war's end the division could take credit for having taken part in liberating thousands of square miles in Italy. Up to May 1, 1945, men of the division had won 15,000 Purple Hearts, 9 Medals of Honor, 98 Distinguished Service Crosses, 116 Legion of Merits, 1,072 Silver Stars, 1,954 Bronze Star Medals, 7 British awards, 7 French awards, 6 Italian awards, 1 Distinguished Flying Cross, 34 Air Medals, with 52 Oak Leaf Clusters.

The One Hundred and Thirteenth Cavalry group, known as the Red Horsemen, was made up primarily of Iowa men, and they also made a tremendous contribution to America's war record in World War II. Primarily inducted and trained for long-distance mechanized reconnaissance, the Red Horse Cavalry saw all kinds of action in Normandy, northern France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany, usually in the forefront of the battle. In its first engagement in Normandy, the Red Horse Cavalry put aside its mechanized reconnaissance tactics and cut its teeth on one of Hitler's best SS Panzer Grenadier divisions, the Seventeenth. For 4 days it fought in the treacherous hedgerows against what turned out to be the spearhead of a German counterattack. They served with the Thirty-fifth, Twenty-eighth, and Thirtieth Infantry Divisions, and cooperated with the Eighty-second Armored Reconnaissance Battalion. At one time the Red Horse group spread out to fill a 35-mile gap between the Nineteenth Corps and the Fifth Corps. Their fighting was so effective that during a 3-day period of this operation the group captured 1,000 prisoners of war and inflicted an estimated 400 enemy casualties while clearing an area of more than 430 square miles. I could go on and on, telling of the exploits of the Thirty-fourth Division and the One Hundred and Thirteenth Cavalry in World War II.

During World War II, the Secretary of War, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, made this statement, "National Guard units have played a vital role in the mobilization of our present army and they have made a brilliant record on every fighting front. We are counting on them as a bulwark of our future national security."

Secretary of War Patterson, in appearing before the Conference of Adjutants General in Washington, D. C., May 2, 1946, said, "We have won the war but until we shall attain international security through the United Nations, the National Guard, as an essential part of our defense establishment, must be ready to do its part in warding off any threat against the peace of our Nation. On its record, for generations, it has been our first source of trained civilian manpower in every emergency.

"In the war just ended, the National Guard splendidly justified itself. When hostilities ended, the National Guard was on every battle front.

"National Guard men were the first Army troops to engage the Japs at Guadalcanal, New Guinea, Morotai, the Gilberts, Marshalls, and Marianas. They took part in every major operation in the Pacific, from Bataan to Okinawa. In the European theater, National Guard men were in the forefront of the African campaign, spearheaded the attacks on Sicily, Italy, and in southern France, were among the assault forces in the landing and invasion of Normandy and stormed through the German homeland.

"It is of prime importance that the National Guard be reorganized as expeditiously as sound procedures will permit, strong in well-trained personnel, fully equipped and ready for an emergency.

"After victory there comes a great feeling of well-being—the job is done—it is the time to turn to different fields of endeavor—a false sense of security is furthered by the thought that there is no more need for an army. Among the unscathed there is little thought given to the casualty lists—to the enormous debts mounting ever higher as the result of a costly war. Human memory falls short of the grim panic of predawn attacks and drowning desperate men on a foreign beachhead, clawing their way through the crimson surf to strike a blow against the terror of an inhuman, fanatical enemy. Memory is dimmed to the point where the exploits of our Armies are cheapened and ridiculed. Individual emotions tend to balance from reason to selfishness.

"There is an obligation on the part of all citizens to see that America is never again caught unprepared, never again will we have months to train and prepare in case of an emergency.

"I sincerely believe if we fail to maintain an adequate national defense in the future as a means of maintaining peace, the price we have paid in human lives and in material wealth during World War II will have been in vain."

Report by the American Veterans' Committee on Studies Made of the Cost of Living of Veterans Attending Colleges and Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am having printed in the RECORD a study by the American Veterans' Committee—AVC—of the need for an increase in the subsistence allotments of student veterans.

The American Veterans' Committee has the largest campus membership of any veterans' organization and for the past year has devoted considerable attention to the problems of the student veterans. Reports from its 148 college chapters as well as studies made by the American Council on Education indicate that the major complaint of GI's in college is that they just cannot make ends meet on their present subsistence allowances. The statistical information given in the following report is in most cases based directly on statements of administrative officers of colleges and universities and, I think, presents a startling picture. As chairman of the World War Veterans' Committee, I am deeply interested in the report which presents in straightforward language a problem which that committee must face.

At the end of the report I am including a bill introduced by myself at the request of the AVC that would not only raise the subsistence allowance for veterans receiving educational benefits, but also raises the on-the-job training ceilings which have limited the amount of money which veterans at colleges could earn in attempting to supplement their income.

The report and bill follow:

REPORT BY THE AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE ON STUDIES MADE OF THE COST OF LIVING OF VETERANS ATTENDING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Veterans receiving education and on-the-job training under the GI bill of rights (Public Law 346) are entitled to subsistence benefits designed to aid them in supporting themselves while obtaining an education. Under the original GI bill, which became law on June 22, 1944, the veterans were entitled to subsistence payments of $50 per month for single veterans and $75 for married veterans. In view of the inadequacy of these original provisions in the face of increases in the cost of living, the GI bill was amended on December 28, 1945, raising subsistence benefits to their present level: $65 for single veterans and $90 for married veterans.

Toward the end of the last session of Congress there were increasing complaints from student veterans that they were being forced to drop their hopes of obtaining a college

education since they could not meet even the basic living costs of board and room under their present allowances. In an effort to get the facts on the cost of living on the campus, the American Veterans' Committee has made a continuing study through its college chapters of the living expenses of the average veteran attending college. In brief, this study indicates that costs of food, clothing, and rent alone exceed the average veteran's income. The budget of a single veteran for these major items looks something like this: Food, between $40 and $45 per month; clothing, about $10 per month; rent, $15 per month. This amounts to an average of $70 per month before cigarette money and miscellaneous expenditures are added in, which generally take about 30 percent of the average student's expenditures.

For a married veteran the situation is even more serious. Average expenses are: Food, between $70 and $75 per month; rent, $40 to $50 per month; and clothing, $20 per month. This totals $145 per month before miscellaneous expenditures are added. For married veterans with children these figures run about 10 to 20 percent higher.

These figures are borne out by a recent survey of the American Council on Education, which, in a preliminary report from 132 educational institutions having 272,149 veterans enrolled, indicated that the median costs of board and room alone exceed the present allowances.

The ACE study is broken down according to privately controlled universities, publicly controlled universities, and privately controlled junior colleges. The cost of living is highest in the privately controlled universities, where the single veteran is paying between $46 and $87 a month for board and room if he lives on the campus, and between $60 and $100 per month if he lives off the campus. The married veteran without children is paying between $75 and $165 for board and room on the campus and $110 to $304 per month off the campus. When the married veteran with children is considered, the situation is so critical that one wonders how this individual is able to support his family even with a considerable amount of part-time work. The ACE report shows that married veterans with one child pay between $100 and $205 for board and room on the campus, and $120 and $307 off the campus. The married veteran with two or more children pays between $110 and $235 on the campus and $140 and $250 off the campus.

The corresponding figures for publicly controlled universities are approximately $10 lower for single and married veterans without children and about $30 lower for married veterans with children.

Another survey of the problem has been made by the Army Times, a nationally circulated independent veterans' weekly, which included reports from presidents, deans, and veterans' advisers at leading educational institutions in 26 States and the District of Columbia. The Army Times concludes from its survey: "There is practically unanimous agreement among these school authorities that the allowances—whether the $65 for those without dependents or the $90 for those with dependents—are not now adequate to cover reasonable and necessary living costs. In addition, the opinion is overwhelming that this is particularly true of married veterans, while the financial situation of those with children is, in most cases, desperate."

A few of the specific comments made by the universities queried are worth noting. The University of Michigan stated: "The GI students, married and single, at the University of Michigan, are encountering great difficulties in their attempt to live on the present subsistence allowances. Careful estimates indicate that there should be made immediately a 25-percent increase in subsistence allowances for veterans attending the University of Michigan."

Temple University states: "Many of our students have had to withdraw because they were unable to support their wives and/or children and themselves."

The University of Tampa comments: "A lot of the boys would have no Christmas unless we provided for them. I am afraid that some of them are going to become discouraged and drop out. The subsistence should be $25 per month more for married veterans."

Marquette University states specifically: "The average cost for a single veteran for shelter, food, and clothing runs to $79 monthly. The same items for married veterans without a child amount to $162."

We know that student-veterans are clamoring for increases in subsistence allowances. In a recent conference of student war veterans representing some 84,000 ex-GI's in 26 colleges and universities throughout New York State a resolution was adopted providing for a $35 increase in GI subsistence for college students. Almost all of AVC's college chapters have petitioned the national office at one time or another for vigorous action working towards an increase in the allotment.

The data which is presently available clearly indicates that veterans in colleges in order to exist must: (1) Work to make up deficits; (2) use up their savings if they have them; (3) borrow funds from colleges or other sources. Many have not been able to continue at all. The American Council on Education reports that the 132 institutions they queried stated that almost 2,000 students have left college for financial reasons.

The various studies which have been made are unanimous in pointing to the married veteran as the individual facing the most acute problem. We cannot view the plight of the married veteran as one of short-term duration. In May 1946, 30 percent of the veterans attending college were married and 10 percent had children, while in November 1946, 6 months later, 48 percent of the veterans were married and 17 percent had children. The student-veteran is older than the average college student and is within the age range when most young men are anxious to get married. We can reasonably expect that the percentage of married veterans will continue to increase.

Likewise, we cannot dismiss the problem of the GI in college as one which will evaporate in the next year or so. There are now slightly over a million ex-GI's in colleges and universities, and colleges report that on the basis of enrollment requests this figure will be maintained and exceeded for at least the next 5 years.

Veteran students, of course, have been among the hardest hit by the present price inflation. The $65 allowance for single veterans will buy only $45.50 worth of food, clothing, and shelter today. A married veteran's $90 is worth only $60. Since December 1945, when the present allotments went into effect, food prices alone have gone up 46.3 percent. The over-all cost of living has gone up 21.6 percent.

What can be done?

The American Veterans' Committee supported at the last session of Congress a bill which would increase subsistence benefits for students under the GI bill to $100 for single veterans and $125 for married veterans, plus $10 additional for each child. We shall continue to support this proposal in the Eightieth Congress. We believe it is a reasonable and fair adjustment. The veteran, far from expecting to live in luxury on his subsistence allotment, is in most cases prepared to carry on outside work to aid in meeting his expenses. The proposed increase of $35 per month would provide a bare minimum under which veterans can attend school. They will still be forced to supplement their allotment from outside sources, principally by working at part-time jobs. But unless the benefits are raised in the very near future thousands of veterans will be forced to abandon all effort to take advantage of the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights.

A bill to amend certain provisions of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $100 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $125 per month, if with one dependent, plus an additional $10 per month for each additional dependent, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding 30 days in a calendar year. Such person attending a course on a part-time basis, and such person receiving compensation for productive labor whether performed as part of their apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business or other establishments, or otherwise, shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependency allowances, as may be determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $300 per month for a veteran without a dependent or $325 per month for a veteran with one dependent plus an additional $10 per month for each additional dependent."

SEC. 2. Paragraph 11 (b) 1e of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended, to read as follows:

"(e) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than 3 months."

Why Sugar Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I called the attention of the country in 1942 to the stupidity of paying large concerns for not producing sugar. The people were taxed to pay the subsidies for not producing sugar, and now if the people get sugar it is largely through a Government-created black market. Not being satisfied with this method of creating a shortage of sugar, the bureaucrats pushed exports to the limit from 1942 to 1946, inclusive. The number of pounds of sugar exported from the United States during this period totals more than 3,066,774,000 pounds. Moreover, 329,463 short tons and 658,926,000 tons of sugar were exported to foreign countries in the first 10 months of the year 1946 at a time when the fruit on American farms was rotting on the ground because sugar was not available for canning it.

The bureaucrats insist that the American people must learn to consume less sugar, say about 72 pounds per capita annually instead of 98 pounds per capita annually.

The bureaucrats believe that by teaching the American people to use less sugar per capita and the people of foreign countries to use more sugar per capita such a formula will sweeten our international relations.

I am informed by an official source that the export statistics, which I am inserting as a part of my remarks, include both lend-lease and UNRRA shipments:

Sugar exports from the United States, 1942–45 and first 10 months of 1946

[Short tons, refined]

Country of destination	1942	1943	1944	1945	January to October 1946
Greenland	1,554	1,050	698	479	0
Iceland	4,995	3,774	6,082	3,221	3,471
Canada	265	32	97	199	76
Newfoundland and Labrador	10,513	7,138	9,531	8,852	9,254
Miquelon and St. Pierre	155	245	54	153	75
British Honduras	(1)	0	0	314	224
Honduras	649	(1)	(1)	(1)	0
Panama Canal Zone	4,959	0	0	1,451	3,126
Bermuda	274	650	988	850	483
Curaçao (Netherlands West Indies)	515	4	28	196	15
Norway	0	0	0	0	9,346
United Kingdom	14,256	218,805	188	5	10
France	0	0	0	26,776	22,516
Austria	0	0	0	0	2,366
Czechoslovakia	0	0	0	1,018	2
Hungary	0	0	0	0	514
Switzerland	12,756	(1)	0	0	36,759
Finland	0	0	0	0	20,712
Poland	0	0	0	1,055	11
U. S. S. R. (Russia)	[2] 86,106	[2] 204,053	166,242	60,095	5
Azores	0	0	560	0	0
Italy	0	1,025	524	39,532	46,115
Aegean Islands	0	0	0	0	306
Yugoslavia	0	0	0	3,024	29,244
Albania	0	0	0	1	4,744
Greece	0	0	3,997	11,439	29,522
Iraq	4,105	335	(1)	0	0
Iran	728	116	28	8	0
Saudi Arabia	0	2	156	839	119
Philippines	0	0	0	1,257	6,346
French Pacific Islands	294	15	8	112	6
French Morocco	6,763	64,166	27,184	9,959	13,765
Tangier	221	0	0	0	499
Algeria	0	73,115	38,685	13,124	56,530
Tunisia	0	[2] 2,132	10,678	4,599	20,112
French Equatorial Africa	(1)	45	0	0	390
French West Africa	0	[2] 14,521	3,600	3,715	12,468
British West Africa	0	683	359	0	0
Liberia	49	91	81	176	127
Other countries	529	255	115	144	205
Total	[2] 149,686	[2] 592,242	269,323	192,673	329,463
Thousands of dollars	13,762	[2] 52,404	30,714	23,655	34,779

[1] Less than 0.5 ton.
[2] Revised.

Source: Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Astronomic Arithmetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a statement by Mark Merit, entitled "Astronomic Arithmetic":

ASTRONOMIC ARITHMETIC
(By Mark Merit)

Were it not for the fact that the human mind has developed a tolerance for figures, it could not accommodate itself to comprehension of the vast arithmetic it has had to digest since the beginning of the war. This was our reaction to a sheaf of figures which tells the story of tax collection by the Alcoholic Beverage Industry since the beginning of repeal—13 years ago. We think you, too, will be interested in the story because it actually concerns every man, woman, and child in the United States.

So we'll begin by informing you that the amount of Federal, State, and local taxes collected from the sale of all alcoholic beverages for the past 13 years (since repeal) was equal to an amount sufficient to defray the entire cost of the Federal Government for the first 120 years of its existence, or to be more exact, from 1789 to 1909. The amount: $21,000,000,000!

Now let's look at 1946 alone—and another comparison. The Federal taxes collected in 1946 (State, county, and municipal taxes not included) from the sale of alcoholic beverages amounted to over $2,500,000,000—more than enough to pay for the atomic bomb project.

And please remember that of the total of $21,000,000,000 in taxes collected since repeal, about six and one-half billion went to the various States, counties, and municipalities. The Federal revenues go to defray the expenses of our National Government. The States' and other taxes go into the general States' funds and the money is variously earmarked to defray the cost of education, public welfare, old age pensions, aid to crippled children, and in some instances it results in the reduction of property taxes.

The amount of taxes, then, collected from the sale of alcoholic beverages such as distilled spirits, beer, wine, etc., is the largest with the exception of the Federal income tax: more than twice as much as is collected from the sale of any other industry's products.

It is not difficult to realize the inescapably heavier income tax we would all have to pay, whether we partake of alcoholic beverages or not, if the equivalent of the huge revenue now going to the Government went into the long pockets of the bootlegger, as it did in that late lamentable period, carelessly termed "prohibition."

Watch That Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and cogent editorial from the Amarillo Daily News of January 4:

WATCH THAT AX

The first Republican tax-reduction bill has been dumped into the House of Representatives' mill.

This bill, fathered by Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, proposes a 20-percent cut in income taxes across the board until the $300,000-a-year bracket is reached, where the reduction is pared to 10½ percent.

There are only 600 people in the United States whose income is in excess of $300,000; so for all practical purposes, the reduction is a flat 20 percent.

The final tax program that will come out of Congress likely will be a modification of the Knutson plan. There will have to be hearings and debates, and changes are inevitable. But the Republicans are committed to tax reduction, and tax reduction there will be.

Most Members of Congress agree that drastic Government economies will be necessary in order to reduce taxes. There are, of course, many financial corners that can be cut. Several departments can be considerably improved by the application of the economy ax.

We trust, however, that Congress will not run hog wild in its economy roll to the extent that the American people will wake up some morning without an adequate Army and Navy. In the past, the armed forces have been the first target of economy-minded Congresses. Never before, however, has an efficient and up-to-date defense force been as necessary as now.

It is true that we face no immediate threat of war. It is true, further, that the great powers are talking disarmament. But realism dictates that we not be as naive as we were immediately following the First World War.

The entire western world is looking to the United States for leadership. And today, regardless of our eventual goal of universal peace and one world, leadership means power. We have learned in the months since hostilities ended that power still rules; that prestige and leadership are based on power. That's the way things are, whether we like it or not.

We are committed to a bipartisan foreign policy through which we intend to make our influence felt wherever it is necessary for the furtherance of world peace and order. We are in Europe; we are in the Orient. Since war anywhere will, eventually, involve this Nation, we are going to have something to say about what goes on the world over.

Already Russia has halted the extension of her influence in Europe, principally because Moscow is convinced that we mean what we say. Our display of naval strength in the Mediterranean did more than all the notes that could have been written to support Turkey and Greece against Russian demands. Our exaction of high reparations from Yugoslavia for the shooting down of American fliers was a display of power that added to our prestige everywhere.

We must, for a while at least, remain powerful. A progressive and strong Army and Navy are the instruments of power.

We believe that Congress understands this. Just the other day, the House Naval Affairs Committee issued a report which contained this statement.

"The most expensive thing in the world is a cheap Army and Navy."

One more point:

The current Russian allotment for military purposes amounts to around $16,000,000,000 in American money. That should give Congress a slight pause in its headlong drive toward economy.

Hello There! Meet the Eightieth Congress!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me by the House, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, herewith, the transcript of a broadcast made by an old friend of mine and one of America's sane and sound newscasters, who hails originally from the Midwest and has never found it necessary or desirable to apologize for things American. This able commentator, Ted Malone of the American Broadcasting Co., includes

some good advice for all of us in his newscast of January 3 greeting the arrival of the Eightieth Congress:

Hello there, it's a cold, wet, mushy, snow-slushy day in New York. But in spite of this, today is a big day in America, a big day. In fact, just 15 minutes from now an event is going to take place which the American newspaper editors describe as the most important, the most significant event in the world this year.

All this is going to happen just 14½ minutes from now. Play, Rosa, as we open the door to a great adventure.

In just above 12 minutes from now something is going to happen that is of tremendous importance to your home here and to the whole world.

Strangely enough, there is none of the dramatic suspense today there was in the spring of 1944 when a dozen countries and a million soldiers waited breathlessly for D–day. Never in all history was a secret involving so many people and so many preparations so well kept. In contrast, today's momentous occasion is no secret at all. Today's event has been published to the world for weeks. It will take place at 12 noon in Washington, D. C., when the Eightieth Congress of these United States will be called to order 11 minutes from now. Now, wait a minute, if you were expecting an atom bomb or some history-making event don't be too sure this isn't it. The lives and homes and happiness of more people depend on this Congress then on any atom bomb ever produced. And sink or swim, survive or perish, this Eightieth Congress due to be called to order just 10½ minutes from now is going to make history of one kind or another.

The election last November was a bold announcement to the world that an aroused American people believed in the institution of democracy, that we were neither impressed nor intimidated by the scorn shown by some countries toward our way of life.

As Congress meets today the world will see democracy at work. If it fulfills the mandate we have given it, it will be a lesson to the world. If it fails, this will be a turning point in history. Just about 9 minutes from now this great adventure will begin.

One of the traditions and customs at these opening sessions is the presentation of the message of the President on the state of the Nation. President Truman, we understand, will make his report on Monday. So, today, in these last moments before the new Congress is called into session, I think it would be very interesting if you and I—the voters, the taxpayers—just ordinary folks, maybe living in average towns along familiar streets but the sovereign people Congress represents, I think it would be altogether fitting and proper if we gave our own version on the state of the Nation, because we are the Nation, the people, the blood and bone and sinew of democracy. And whether or not we have thought about it as much as we should we are the ones whose comfort and security, whose peace and happiness, whose very way of life depends on what this Congress does. So I offer for your approval our message to Congress on the state of the Nation.

Gentlemen of the Congress, old and new Members of both the House and Senate, these are pretty critical times. Not all the people in our town do much talking about them, but they do a lot of thinking, and sometimes a lot of worrying, and probably more praying than most of them have done in a long, long while. To be blunt, we're not particularly happy. We know we are all a lot better off than most of the rest of the world, and we're not supposed to complain about meat shortages and the scarcity of soap and the rationing of sugar and the high prices of things in general, and we have tried to be patient about all these things, but when we stop to realize that most of our shortages today are simply the result of blundering and fumbling in the past, then we come to the end of our patience and we want something done about it.

And, gentlemen of the Congress, we are expecting you to do it. And I might add, we're expecting it soon.

Another thing we are expecting is some quick action on this business of housing. There hasn't been much of any building in our town for too many years. Families have doubled up and repairs have been delayed, and even so the prices of houses and property have gone up and up until they're ridiculous. There isn't any excuse for all this any more. We have plenty of raw materials and plenty of men who can build, and we want everybody to quit blaming everybody else, and start building houses. We don't want any more delays and bottlenecks and buck passing and blaming. We want homes. And we expect this Congress to provide ways and means to build them. This is one reason we elected you.

And, by the way, let's get one thing straight right here. We read in the papers and hear over the radio that a lot of folks are mighty worried over the fact that in the new Congress both the Senate and House have Republican majorities while the President and executive branch are still Democratic. Well, gentleman of the Congress, this is one thing that the folks along our street aren't worried a bit about. It sounds to us like some of the confused thinking we have had too much of. The way we figure in our town is that both Congress and the President represent all the people.

Some folks in our town are Democrats and some Republicans but we all want pretty much the same things, and we're all Americans. And, as we see it, the Government is American, too. And that's what we want it to be. We don't like the confusion of recent years—in Government or business. Even in our town we have been confused sometimes by the irresponsible talk about labor and management, that they are out to destroy each other. Like in most towns, some of us are part of one group and some another. In the winter we shovel snow off our sidewalks together, in summer mow our lawns. Our kids go to the same schools, and on Sundays we go to the same churches. We know that if either one of us destroyed the other we would destroy our town. We have learned a sad lesson this past year. When differences have arisen, we haven't had a fair set of rules to settle them, and, no matter who was to blame, everything has stopped, then nobody has won, everybody has lost. This doesn't make sense and everybody along our street knows it. And, gentlemen of the Congress, you know it, too. This is no time to play politics with our American system of free enterprise.

You might not expect ordinary folks in our town to say much about international affairs. But there were a good many blue stars in the windows along our street—some gold stars now—so international affairs hit pretty close to home to some of us. Everybody in our town wants peace, and we think America has worked pretty hard for it, too; almost too hard sometimes. We resent the pushing and shoving we've been given sometimes. It reminds us of Munich and "peace in our time," which wasn't peace at all. So most of the folks along our street have decided that the best guaranty of peace in the world is a strong, free America. This means that when you cut taxes, gentlemen of the Congress, we expect you to do it without weakening our American defenses. There are plenty of other costs to be cut without destroying our Army and Navy. And these useless costs must be cut.

In our town we don't believe in spending money we don't have. We like to meet our own bills and we expect our Government to do the same. Members of the Eightieth Congress—House and Senate—barely 4 minutes from now the gavel will fall and your work will begin. These are critical times in America and all across the world. Never in history has any Congress ever met with so many people depending on it for so much. We elected you because we believed in you. Now it is your solemn duty to keep the promises you made to us and vindicate our faith. But you have a duty and responsibility above and beyond all this which mark today as one of the most important days in modern history. With dictatorships and puppet governments flourishing in the wake of war, democracy is being scorned today as a decaying institution. Freedom of speech and enterprise and religion, the freedoms of the individual on which we base our way of life, are being wiped out slowly but surely in many countries of the world. You today are a symbol to all men everywhere of democracy at work. It is now your great privilege to reawaken the world to the blessings of freedom and liberty for all mankind that the whole idea of the government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth.

Budget Balancing, Debt Retirement, and Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by a constituent:

JANUARY 10, 1947.

The Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KNUTSON: Out of all the fog of talk about Budget balancing, debt retirement, and tax reduction, some fundamental truths seem gradually to be receiving better attention. The first of these is the relative order of importance Unquestionably this is:

First. Reduction in Government expenses.
Second. Substantial debt retirement.
Third. Reduction in taxes.

It would be much more agreeable and much easier on Congress if the third item could become the first, but I think we shall have to depend upon the Republicans in Congress for sufficient courage to handle these matters in the order they are stated above.

The real subject of this letter, however, relates to item 3. If the first two steps can be accomplished then, and only then, should taxes be reduced; and if they are reduced, is it more important to cut income taxes or excise taxes?

The heavy dependence of the Treasury in the past upon income taxes, which fluctuate widely from good times to bad, has been a serious weakness in our fiscal policy. Consumption does not vary widely between good and poor times. Taxes on consumption can, therefore, reasonably be depended upon and we should go slow in reducing excise taxes on this account alone.

The present high income-tax rates are choking off one of the main sources of new capital. Careful study as to what makes our economic machine go shows plainly that it is the constant accumulation of new capital throughout the years that has so greatly increased the standard of living in the United States. The twins of saving and investment, which must go together, are the thyroid gland of our commercial and industrial system.

We know that practically all the capital accumulated from savings is accumulated by people with incomes of $10,000 to $200,000 per annum. People with incomes below $5,000 accumulated practically no capital at all although there are a great many of them.

People with incomes above $200,000 are capable of accumulating a great deal of capital if permitted by taxes to do so, but there are so few of them that the total capital accumulated scarcely counts.

In reducing income taxes, therefore, it is most important for the continuing well-being of the economy, including the wage earners whose interest is in continuous employment no less than in wages, that we reduce income taxes in the brackets between $200,000 and $10,000.

Your proposal of a uniform 20-percent cut meets my test of suitability, but I wonder if there is not another way which might meet your approval.

The reason that incomes of five thousand to fifty thousand dollars are hit so hard is because we start right off with a 20-percent bracket. In the old days income taxes were more gradual. Why not start off with 6 or 8 percent on the first $2,000 and step it up from there, perhaps to a level almost the same as exists on present highest incomes? This will result, I think, in the most benefit to those groups of taxpayers who can be expected to accumulate capital, thereby supplying the lifeblood of our economic system.

I devoutly hope that you and your associates in Congress will recognize that reduction in income taxes will be far more beneficial to the economy than reduction in excise taxes. Furthermore, if you do reduce excise taxes, the relief should come on those items of which the purchase is most easily postponed and which can scarcely be classed as necessities. It seems to me that taxes on transportation, telephone service, light bulbs, jewelry, furs, and luggage could well have first claim on your attention; the first three because of the necessitous character, the last three because purchases are easily postponed and people engaged in these lines will be badly hurt by an announcement of a reduction in future taxes.

Very sincerely yours.

Advice to the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, because of its great public interest, and its interest to all Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Advice to the Republicans," written by the minority leader of the Senate [Mr. BARKLEY] and published in the New York Times magazine for January 12, 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the minority leader's advice to the majority party will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

"ADVICE TO THE REPUBLICANS"—FROM BARKLEY

THE FORMER SENATE MAJORITY LEADER WARNS HIS COLLEAGUES AGAINST MISUSE OF A VICTORY

(By ALBEN W. BARKLEY)

WASHINGTON.—I may be rushing in where angels fear to tread in offering advice to the party which won the congressional elections in November. But I am not doing so on my own initiative, but at the request of the New York Times; and I trust that the suggestions I shall offer will be accepted as sincere and not in any sense presumptuous.

Except to avoid the mistakes which produced it, or to evaluate the mandate which it may have implied, no purpose can be served by attempting to draw deductions concerning all the reasons which induced the American people to return a Republican instead of a Democratic majority in both houses of Congress on November 5.

Democrats may say it was due to war weariness, or controls, or shortages, or adherence or deviations from Roosevelt policies or programs, or the increase in the cost of living, or the impatience of the people over labor disputes, or any one of a dozen other circumstances which may have caused dissatisfaction among large numbers of people.

The Republicans may assert that their victory was due to the repudiation of the New Deal, or to the general desire for a change, or to the high cost of government, or to the desire to reduce taxes, or to the superior program they offered to the people, or any one of a dozen other causes.

There is a certain amount of speculation in all these claims, because it is impossible for any of us to read the minds of thirty-five or forty million people and know why they voted as they did.

I shall not attempt such a futility. The inescapable fact is that the Republican Party will have a working majority in both houses of Congress, which carries with it the full party responsibility for the legislation that Congress will enact during the next 2 years.

It has been asserted in many quarters that the Republicans did not want control of both branches of Congress; that they wanted only to establish a trend by controlling the House as a basis for possible victory in 1948 without at the same time being saddled with full legislative responsibility in the meantime.

I discount this theory completely. I have never known any political party that did not want all it could get out of any election. The Republican Party wanted to obtain control of both Houses, and it campaigned for such control.

It was not necessary for it to be very specific as to any program, and it was not. It was only necessary for it to be the willing and eager beneficiary of such discontent or dissatisfaction as existed. It may have been good campaign strategy not to risk the loss of votes by laying out too clear a blueprint of what they would do in the event of victory.

But the day of campaign strategy is now past and the day of full responsibility is at hand.

What sort of mandate with certainty can be said to have been conveyed by the people when they elected a Republican Congress?

It was not, in my opinion, a mandate to repeal the whole or any substantial part of the legislative program enacted under the Roosevelt administrations.

I know with what contempt many Republicans—and some Democrats—refer to the New Deal. But this program included many reforms and legislative acts which the American people did not vote to abandon.

They did not vote, for instance, to abandon the agricultural program encompassed in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Soil Conservation Act, the Farm Security Act, crop insurance, support prices, the parity principle, rural electrification, or other phases of the agricultural set-up of the past 14 years. They may want them strengthened and improved and their administration simplified. But they do not want and did not vote for the program's abandonment.

In my opinion, the people did not issue a mandate to the Republican Party to abolish or weaken the law regulating the issue or sale of securities, the social-security legislation for old-age benefits or unemployment insurance. It is my belief that the people want this progressive measure broadened and made more secure. This is an established part of our social responsibility and I cannot imagine the people as having voted to retrace their steps in this field.

I cannot believe that the people voted to cripple the regulation of communications under the Communications Commission or aviation under the Civil Aeronautics Board, or the extension of the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Trade Commission in the fields wherein they operate. Neither did they issue any mandate to repeal the Labor Relations Act or the wages and hours law. These enactments may need modification in the light of experience, and consideration should and no doubt will be given to this subject by the new Congress.

But to assume that the November Republican victory indicated that the people expect that these measures be wiped from the statutes altogether would be a gross misinterpretation of the election returns.

In the field of international relations it may be equally easy to misread the meaning of the election. The Republican Party was in control of the Government from the retirement of Grover Cleveland in 1897 to the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson in 1913.

During this period the Spanish-American War was fought and we acquired Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines.

Republican leaders and the people finally acknowledged that we had as a result become a world power and would be henceforward guided by "manifest destiny."

Hence it has seemed strange in recent years to note so large a proportion of Republican Members of Congress assuming an attitude of isolation in regard to our foreign policy and our foreign relations.

During and following the recent war it has been gratifying to have the wholehearted cooperation of leading Republicans in and out of office in the conduct of the war and in the formulation of our foreign policy. I have no doubt this nonpartisan or bipartisan cooperation will continue in the coming 2 years. This working together in the international field has been more manifest in the political than in the economic phase of international policy.

In my opinion the two can no more be separated in the international than in the domestic field. Politics is defined as the science of government. Economics is the science of producing, distributing, and using the means of enhancing human welfare. Politics and economics are therefore intimately related, each partaking of some of the attributes of the other.

It is therefore impossible to be a political internationalist and an economic isolationist at one and the same time.

This fact was recognized when the Social and Economic Council was established under the United Nations.

The same is true of the labor, educational, and agricultural subsidiaries of the United Nations and the international trade conferences provided for.

It was in pursuance of this dual phase of international affairs that the Bretton Woods agreements were ratified and became an integral part of our foreign policy. The same is true of the British and other loans to foreign countries. Whether we wanted to become the world's banker, we have become just that; and the statesmen of all countries are coming more and more to realize that economic stabilization is essential to political stability and that both are essential to world peace and security.

Therefore, it is my firm conviction that the Republican victory in November gave no mandate to retrace our political or eco-

nomic steps in attempting to guide the nations and their peoples toward the goal of greater security, happiness, and prosperity.

There is another question which has in the past assumed more political and less economic importance than it deserved. That is the question of trade barriers.

Tariffs and tariff laws have been too long regarded merely as political issues between partisan debaters. But the economic consequences which flowed from an excess of economic nationalism after the First World War ought to warn us against a repetition of such a mistake.

I am in no position to predict what the Republican majority in Congress will do with the Trade Agreements Act which expires in 1948. A majority of Republican Members voted against the last extension of this act. But whatever their attitude may be, it is obvious that we cannot go back to the old unscientific, back-scratching, log-rolling, methods of tariff legislation.

I was a member of the Democratic minority during the consideration of the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930. Congress began the consideration of this measure in December 1928, and finally passed it 18 months later in June 1930. I recall the methods used in the process, the horse-swapping that could be observed almost before one's eyes in the Senate, and the business suspense and uncertainty during more than a year and a half and finally the world-wide disaster which flowed from world-wide methods of similar import.

Whatever else may be deduced from the recent elections, surely nobody will contend that the people expect the coming congressional majority to return to the outworn and outmoded crudities which have accompanied tariff legislation when only politics has been considered.

On the question of labor legislation there will be sporadic and ill-advised efforts to enact some sort of punitive measures because of impatience with recent labor disputes and strikes. Such proposals as compulsory arbitration, the drafting of striking workers into the Army, the outlawing of the closed shop, the infliction of prison sentences on employees who strike and other punitive proposals will be brought forward.

I would not attempt to predict what will finally come out of all this in the way of labor laws. I would caution the new majority against hasty or angry legislative explosions in this field. The subject cannot escape the serious research and earnest consideration which Congress should give it. I was a participant in important labor legislation two decades ago affecting railroad labor. After various efforts in one session of Congress we were able to bring railroad executives and railroad labor organizations together in long conferences that resulted in the passage of a law which both helped to write and which both respected. For more than 20 years it preserved peace between the railroads and their employees.

While I recognize that this field was simpler than the entire field of labor and industrial relations, I think that an effort to bring labor and industry generally together to consider and recommend to Congress legislation which would be fair to both and to the people and would be respected and observed by both would be well worth trying.

In the absence of this, Congress should approach the problem without fear, without rancor, without prejudice, and without trying to tear down the whole house in order to eradicate such evils as there may be found in it.

Another problem which will demand immediate attention by the new Congress is that of taxation, the balancing of the budget, and the reduction of public expenditures. About 1 year ago I delivered an address in which I predicted that when we had been able to eliminate war and immediate postwar expenditures, we ought to be able to reduce the annual Federal Budget to about $25,000,000,000, which would at our present rate of national income permit a considerable tax reduction.

If the world settles down to the peace which we all desire, I still think this is possible; but I fear that a hasty reduction of taxes before searching the possibilities of stabilizing our future expenditures would be unsound. Under the new act governing congressional procedure there is a mandate that Congress coordinate revenues and expenditures and that if the contemplated expenditures exceed contemplated revenues, provision must be made for raising the difference by providing new revenues.

This was intended as a means for safeguarding a balanced Budget. The Budget of the United States Government has not been balanced since 1929. I think the people would like to see what a balanced Budget would look like or sound like. Therefore, while we are all in favor of the greatest possible tax reduction, I cannot escape the feeling that it would be unwise to separate the question of income from that of necessary outgo, before determining definitely the amount of tax reduction that will be possible.

There is one other subject upon which I would offer a suggestion or two. That is the subject of investigations.

A prominent Republican Member of the House of Representatives was recently quoted as saying they would open every day's session with a prayer and end it with a probe.

This may have been an enthusiastic outburst of specious alliteration; but if literally adopted, it might cheapen both the prayer and the probe.

There are beyond question some things connected with the war and the expenditure of public funds which are legitimate subjects of investigation, including the misconduct of public officers, legislative or executive. But there are too many vital problems on the congressional doorstep to justify the consumption of the entire time of Congress for the next 2 years in conducting inquisitions only, especially if inspired by partisanship or by a desire to make hay for the next Presidential election.

I believe that the public interest frequently requires the most searching and pitiless inquiries into wrongdoing wherever it may be found. This is necessary to punish criminal guilt and to warn others of the fate which awaits faithless public servants. Such investigations should have the support of the minority and will have it.

What should be avoided is any tinge of witch-hunting obsession looking to some political advantage for a party or a candidate. I have observed and participated in a number of investigations in the last 30 years. I have never seen one that either elected or defeated a political party or a candidate for President, including the Teapot Dome investigation in the Harding and Coolidge administrations.

As I suggested at the outset, I hope I will not be deemed presumptuous in making these suggestions to the incoming majority of Congress.

They are made in the utmost good faith. During the nearly 10 years of my incumbency as majority leader of the Senate, I have enjoyed the friendship and I trust the confidence of the minority which has now become the majority in both houses of the Congress.

I desire to make any contribution within my power to the welfare of our common country and of the world. I am not so naive as to believe that these next 2 years can be kept free from political differences in Congress or among the people.

I feel very strongly, however, that there is a wide and ample field for understanding and cooperation between the two parties in fostering the best interests of our own people while at the same time accepting the leadership which has been thrust into our hands in rebuilding the structure of mankind for the goal of a better world.

In these days of national and international anxiety, the fact that the legislative branch of our Government is to be Republican and the executive is to be Democratic offers no legitimate excuse for either to play the ordinary game of politics looking to the next Presidential election. This last statement applies as well to the minority as to the majority in both houses of Congress.

The American people will demand courageous and constructive grappling by their Congress with the tragic problems that beset them in this period of economic and social reconstruction, and in my opinion will not tolerate mere political maneuvers for political advantage. Any political party in these days which devotes itself too strenuously to these political maneuvers will lose, and ought to lose, the confidence of the American people.

Wages and Price Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by one of my constituents:

JANUARY 7, 1947.

Mr. PHILIP MURRAY,

President, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MURRAY: Being neither an employer nor an employee but much affected by the general well-being of the United States, I have been disturbed by the possibility of another general fund round of wage increases in industry. I am confident that further wage increases will be followed by price increases. I realize that some of your economic advisers take the view that this need not be the case but, without debating the question of need, I am sure that it will occur. If prices are pushed up further by wage demands, I fear that it will mean a quick end to the present era of full employment and relative prosperity for the wage earners.

Increases in wages of certain groups may benefit them temporarily but as fast as those increases become generalized all advantage to the wage earner is lost. You will recall that the wage increases of the fall of 1945 and the winter of 1946 became generalized with great speed.

You are also aware of the risk that those groups in the community who do not share in wage increases, and there are a great many of them, will be priced out of the market and their resistance to high prices will bring about a collapse of industrial activity and employment. This happened in 1920 and there are distinct signs of considerable risk of its happening now. Further wage increases would, I fear, be the last straw.

There is, fortunately, an alternative policy which gives great promise, not only to the wage earner but to all of us: To hold wages where they are for a year at least, to have no strike during this period, in order to give competition and production an opportunity to bring prices down, and increase the real earnings of everybody. The most authoritative opinion holds that prices in 1947 will normally trend considerably lower. The wage earner will benefit from a lower cost of living and this is a real and permanent

benefit as contrasted with the temporary and illusory benefit of a rise in wage rates.

We must remember also that income taxes are going to be cut to some extent in 1947; a step which will improve the disposable income of wage earners.

A final advantage of the course here advocated is that the benefits of lower living costs will be generalized and will hence tend to propel the economic machine. In fact, this has been one of the principal factors in the rise of the American standard of living over the whole history of this country.

It seems so plain to me that the course which is advocated in this letter is the only course which will benefit the wage earners of the country as well as all the groups not affiliated with organized labor, while the policy of raising wages further is calculated to take away, in the form of higher cost of living and unemployment, the very advantage which it pretends to confer.

I devoutly hope that before it is too late your organization will swing over to the idea of a considerable moratorium on wage increases in order to give the economic machine a chance to perform the cost-lowering process which we confidently expect of it.

In conclusion, I wish there might be a greater recognition by organized labor of the fact that if we are to continue to raise the standard of living of the country, gains in productivity per man-hour must be made and that these gains must not be seized in toto by labor; part can go to labor, part must be passed on to the public in the form of lower prices, and part must be added to profits in order to acquire the new capital which our system requires in large amounts from year to year, and which must come principally from undistributed profits.

The immensely greater size of the American industrial plant, as compared with 1936–39, makes the use of any 1936–39 standard of industrial profits completely inappropriate. To keep the industrial machine running, to keep employment at a favorable level, the constant investment of new capital is required. I estimate that the minimum tolerable level for profits is at least twice the 1936–39 average and probably even more than this.

Your organization would render a wonderful service to the country by swinging over to the side of economic truth and abandoning the view that the persistent rise in wages without regard to these other factors is beneficial to labor or to anyone else.

Very sincerely yours.

A Plan for National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Plan for National Security," delivered by Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, of the United States Army, before the Georgia Farm Bureau in its State convention held at Macon, Ga., on November 14.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a normal American method, as soon as a war is over, for our people to dust their hands, turn with relief away from war with all its burdens, restrictions, heavy expenditures, and the reading of the long lists of dead and wounded, and to get back with all haste to the more cheerful scenes of peacetime living and the brighter prospects of civil occupations and professions.

I am not suggesting any radical change in the American way. It has been adequate for the winning of two great wars in my lifetime and yours. I am suggesting, however, before we close the books of the late war and start the grim business of paying for it, that we have a last look—rake a few dead leaves, if you will—at least let us determine the reasons why we won and the enemy lost.

Here is my list of lessons from the war, for whatever it is worth. If it is thought-provoking, I have accomplished my purpose in compiling it.

One great reason for our victory lay in the fact that we had more and better manpower.

In the course of the last war, half a million American airmen served under my command. Nearly 100,000 of those men were listed as missing in action; fully half of them will never return to their homes. Having seen their conduct in battle, I think the least I can do is to tell their mothers and fathers the kind of fighting men their boys made.

In the early days in England, when we started the building of the Eighth Air Force with 5 men and when we began our invasion of Hitler's fortress of Europe with 10 airplanes, one of my worries was as to how our American youth would react to the cruel tests of modern war. I received my answer in those days when the Eighth Air Force was sometimes losing 10 percent of its strength on a single mission, in the days when it looked like we would all be used up and lost in 10 days. Here, briefly, are two typical stories which gave me my answer:

1. In the early days of the Eighth Air Force there was a young bombardier who, because of the skill he had exhibited, was detailed to be the master bombardier on a mission against German targets. As his plane approached the target, a German fighter attacked head-on and fired a 20-millimeter shell into the nose of the airplane. It blew the bombardier to the back of his compartment and tore a big hole in his body. Instinctively he crawled forward to his bombsight and got off an excellent bombing run, hit the target squarely, as photographs later showed, then fell dead over his bombsight.

This bombardier had a twin brother who was in the same organization. We told his brother that we would like to have him stand down for a few days since we felt the loss of his brother would affect his work. He said: "No. I want to carry on as my brother would have me do." The next day he climbed into the bloody cockpit from which his brother was lifted the day before and took off on a mission from which he never returned.

2. I remember well another instance when, on one of our tough missions, a squadron lost all of its planes but one. We told the squadron commander that afternoon that it would be some days before we could send up new crews and new planes and that his squadron would necessarily be out of the fight during that time. This squadron commander said: "No, sir. We have one airplane left. It came back with 400 bullet holes in it but I have every man in the squadron working on it tonight and it will be ready to go in the morning. We are not out of the fight." We admired the spirit of that squadron commander so greatly that we borrowed planes and crews from other squadrons and he was back in the fight when a mission was launched the following day.

Since my return from the war theaters, I have noticed the impression in some quarters that the Air Forces had an easy ride in this war. Our Air Forces in Europe lost more than 90,000 men. The Fifteenth Air Force, under my command in Italy, had a combat strength of 20,000. In 1 year it lost 22,500 men. How many units in this war lost 114 percent of their combat strength in a single year?

Other primary reasons for our victory:

Because we had more industrial capacity to produce more and better weapons of war.

Because we had time in which to gear these tremendous establishments to full-scale stature and production.

Because we had space—two great oceans on either side of us, which served as protective barriers and prevented our manpower and our industrial capacity from receiving blows from the enemy while it was being mobilized.

Let us now see whether these factors will be sufficient to place us on the winning side should a war come again. Let me say first, with all the emphasis at my command, that nobody hopes more fervently than we in the Army that the United Nations organization may be so perfected as to prevent any further wars. But until that time comes, we must provide armies, navies, and air forces in sufficient force to insure that our country will be protected while we are developing the peace machinery.

I suggest to you that the nature of warfare and its weapons has changed to such an extent that time and space factors have been materially reduced, in fact largely eliminated. If the Germans could in 1944, as they did, produce a rocket which could travel 70,000 feet above the earth for a distance of 280 miles at 700 miles per hour and deliver a ton of explosives with considerable accuracy, it is absolutely certain that any of the principal industrial nations of the earth can, by 1950, develop a superrocket with a range of from 3,000 to 5,000 miles which can travel at a speed of 1,000 to 3,000 miles an hour, sufficiently high to overcome the earth's curvature, and deliver 10 to 20 tons of explosives with great accuracy. When that weapon is developed, you can well see that the time and space factors which have stood us in such good stead will largely disappear.

Much has been said in recent times about the effect of the atomic bomb on warfare in the future. We in the Army Air Forces have thought a great deal about it, too, and we now have developed a Deputy Chief of Staff for Air whose sole mission is the study of the effect of atomic energy and weapons on warfare and the development of new weapons through the most advanced experimentation and research. We acknowledge the shattering and cataclysmic implications introduced by atomic fission, and we have marshaled our best brains and our whole scientific and experimental organization to think through every possible implication and mold our air establishment accordingly.

In my studies of this problem, I have asked this question: If I had been the head of the Japanese General Staff, how could I have prevented the atomic bombs from being delivered on Japanese targets? This is my conclusion: There are three ways in which this might have been done had the Japanese possessed the necessary military force. The first would have been to destroy the production capacity of atomic bombs at its source in the factories and laboratories of the United States. This would have been the most decisive and effective way. The second method would have been to destroy the bombs, and the planes which were to deliver them, on their bases in the Marshall Islands, before they were launched. The third possible but doubtful method would have been to have had a fighter defense and an antiaircraft defense of sufficient efficiency and intensity all over Japan to have destroyed the planes carrying the bombs as they approached their target. This would have required a larger fighter force and a better antiaircraft defense than any nation in the world has even approached to date. It would have been the most inefficient of the three methods and least likely to succeed.

Now, what sort of force would Japan have needed to accomplish the first two of these methods? The only weapon known to warfare today which could have accomplished these purposes—the destruction of bomb-making capacity in the United States or of the planes carrying the bombs—the long-range bombers on bases in the Marshall Islands—would have been a long-range bomber force such as we alone of all the nations of the earth had in this war. The most powerful army in the world and the most powerful navy afloat would have been impotent to stop these bombers with their death-dealing atomic bombs. Only a long-range bomber force of sufficient power to fight its way through to its targets could have saved Japan from the bombs.

We must revamp our war plans; we must reorganize our military power for a new type of war. If all of us will fully realize these facts and prepare our military machine for the future in accordance with them, our country will still be secure. If we do not, if we insist upon building a military machine with which to win the last war, then we shall have no real security and the tremendous cost will have been an idle expenditure.

You hear the argument that we should not alter an organization which has won two wars. Sitting Bull won the Battle of the Little Big Horn with bows and arrows. Dewey won the Battle of Manila Bay with 6-inch guns. Could anyone suggest that, because two great victories were won with antique weapons, we should hold fast to old means and modes and methods?

There is every indication that we must reorganize our national defensive structure for the new type of warfare I have indicated where time and space are practically eliminated. We will need more speed of decision than we were able to get in the last war. It is enough to say for the proposed unification of the armed forces, with Army, Navy, and Air Forces on coequal status, that economy in peace and efficiency in war demand it.

A system of national security for the United States in the future must have these ingredients:

First of all, our State Department must be an organization which will entice and offer an ample career to the best brains we can produce in this country. We must always remember that where the diplomat leaves off, the soldier must take up the burden.

Secondly, we must have a central intelligence agency which will tell us what is brewing in every corner of the earth.

Thirdly, we must have a force in being ready to move on a moment's notice to destroy the discovered war chest of the enemy before it is launched.

Fourthly, we must keep our weapons modern. This requires great emphasis on scientific development—research and experimentation. It has been said that every war begins with the weapons of the last war. It may well be that we were given a preview of the weapons which will dominate the next war in the robot bomb, German rocket V-2, or our atomic bomb. It may well be, too, that some of the technique which appeared experimentally in the last war may be commonplace and routine in the next—such things as radar, blind bombing.

While there is grave danger that the war of the future will be a short war of unparalleled destruction, the first blows of which will come through the air, nevertheless, if we are wise, we will maintain naval and land forces, modern and mobile, the whole to be supported by a National Guard and Organized Reserves and Reserve Officers Training Corps prepared to mobilize and lead the manpower of the Nation. Then, too, we must have better plans for the conversion of industry to warfare than we have had in the past for the simple reason that there will be less time, plus the great probability that it will have to be done while the destructive blows of the enemy are raining upon us.

This much is certain. There is the greatest probability that the first battlefields of the next war will be the industrial cities of the United States. No aggressor nation of the future can miss the point that the last two wars were lost by the aggressor because he neglected to depreciate the manpower or destroy the material resources of the United States.

Finally, over all this business of sound organization, modern weapons, and mobilized industry and manpower, rides this dominant fact—no nation is secure unless the citizen places the welfare of his country above his personal self-interest. During the war the national interest was dominant. Now there are many signs and there is grave danger that personal interest and selfish welfare of highly organized minorities are being placed above the national interest, the welfare of all the people.

As the first plank in our platform for national security, let us make certain that the future generation is educated to put national interest first.

Report of Special Committee of City Airport Commission of St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 10, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend into the RECORD the report of the Special Committee of the City Airport Commission, of St. Louis. This report was made prior to the report which I included with my speech on the subject yesterday, Thursday, January 9. It is important to a full information on the subject:

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF CITY AIRPORT COMMISSION

To the City Airport Commission:

The following is a report of the special committee appointed on November 29, 1946, for the purpose of investigating certain airport matters and making recommendations thereon:

The committee consisted of: Messrs. John J. Church; Russell E. Gardner, Jr.; George C. Smith; C. W. Gaylord, chairman. Alfred Fleishman was subsequently appointed secretary of the executive committee of the airport commission and so served for this special investigation.

MATTERS CONSIDERED

The committee was charged with specifically considering the following:

1. The remarks contained in the letter of resignation by Col. James H. Howard, former chief of aeronautics for the city of St. Louis;

2. The remarks in the letter of the late Maj. Albert Bond Lambert submitted during the latter part of October and which contained a discussion of aviation and airport development.

Subsequently, the mayor suggested to this committee that the report of the aviation council be studied in order that the committee have before it this additional information. The committee felt that in view of the aviation council's report, the city should be asked to submit its own response in answer to many of the council's statements. The committee itself called upon the city for a response.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

In the course of its investigation, the committee consulted both formally and informally with members of the aviation council, Colonel Howard, city officials, newspaper reporters and editors, air-line officials, and others. Matters brought before it were weighed and considered in terms of ultimate benefit to all of the citizens of St. Louis. The committee was particularly concerned that no special group interests be allowed to take precedence over the interests of the citizens of St. Louis.

Careful consideration was given to the mass of material and statements submitted. It soon became apparent to the committee that, if the report was to serve any immediate purpose and to be of readable length, it could cover only the broad, general, underlying matters involved. It was felt that the conclusions should point a general course rather than the exact details thereof.

Thus, the committee has not undertaken to report a paragraph-by-paragraph analysis of the Howard, Lambert, aviation council, and city's statements. It has tried to reduce them to their essential basic contentions which seem to the committee of greater concern to the citizens of St. Louis as a whole.

For those who wish to make a more detailed study, however, the committee has attached the several statements mentioned above, together with such other information as is herein referred to as being germane to this report.

OBJECTIVES

Its chief objective, the committee felt, was—

To find under the circumstances and conditions presently existing a basic and underlying approach and to recommend a method of procedure and a type of organization most usable and practicable to obtain rapid and continuing growth and successful operation of the air facilities of St. Louis.

To this end, it addressed itself to the past constructively, rather than in an attempt to liquidate all differences, especially those which are relatively no longer pertinent.

The four statements, primarily the occasion of this investigation, were placed before the committee in the order hereinafter discussed. Some were presented personally with oral comments, others were supported by various data and written information.

COL. JAMES H. HOWARD

With reference to Colonel Howard's letter of resignation and his subsequent appearance before this committee, the following comment is made by the committee:

1. Colonel Howard stressed as his principal difficulty in organizational matters the lack of any delegation of authority to a city chief of aeronautics which would permit that office to command cooperation from the department heads involved in deciding what and when action would be taken.

2. He said he had no new organizational set-up in mind or new department because it would fail, due to the noncooperation of the other department heads.

3. The only concrete suggestion which Colonel Howard offered was that someone directly under the mayor and authorized to give orders in the mayor's name ought to be an excellent expediter of individual projects.

4. In the scope of activities he seemed most concerned over the city airport commission's selection of the Ross Airport as against the Grand Avenue site on which he had put in considerable work.

He stated that the commission had not been properly sold on information as to the Grand Avenue site or had a lack of understanding of such information as was before it.

He could offer, however, no additional data to that already submitted in Horner & Shifrin's report and supplemented by the city

officials concerned and duly weighed by the commission. In fact, he took no part in bringing out the similarity of favorable possibilities at the Ross Airport without some of the serious disadvantages of the Grand Avenue site with the excessive prohibitive cost of remedy. These factors which determined the commission's action were submitted by Horner & Shifrin and other city officials—none of whom appeared to the committee to have any particular brief for either site except that it was necessary for the city to have a decision made promptly. The commission's action was taken after the due consideration as requested in Mr. Horner's report on the Grand Avenue site. The action was unanimously passed.

5. Colonel Howard's statements have generally been used in public discussion as characterizing a complete condemnation of the city's aviation supervision both as to personnel and activities.

6. In the record, however, there is a statement from Colonel Howard dated August 29, 1946, in which he says: "that at no similar interval of time in the past has so much been accomplished in advancing aviation in St. Louis as has been done during this period of time. The forecast indicates that the next 9 months will far exceed the 9 months previous and so on into the future."

7. If this statement is true and, with some minor qualifications, the committee believes it is, then everything could not always have been wrong with the city's aviation effort during the past year, when there has been made the best showing yet to be recorded in spite of endless obstacles of this post-war period.

MAJOR LAMBERT'S SUMMARY

Repeated reference has been made in public discussion to the summary of Maj. Albert Bond Lambert, as a blast condemning delays by the city in airport development. The committee does not believe this was the prime purpose of the Lambert document. It feels, however, that the constructive suggestions and even the indirect inferences in the summary should be taken to heart and given careful consideration by the city

The real purpose of the Lambert report, the committee feels, was to inform the public as to the present status of St. Louis' aviation in general and airport development at Lambert Field in particular. It also projected the future progress to be expected under present conditions and pointed out where the emphasis should be placed.

Granting that Major Lambert's summary may permit various interpretations, depending upon his purpose in preparing it, a key to its motivation is found in an explanatory letter which he subsequently wrote to Mr. Russell E. Gardner, Jr., on November 7, 1946.

While the letter is attached to this report, the committee feels that the following important excerpts from this letter are pertinent to better public understanding.

"In the first place, I presented only the bare facts as they actually exist and without criticism on my part. The general theme throughout the summary relates to the all important time factor. * * *

"The tentative timetable set up on page 3 is subject to revision by the proper authorities, either on the step-by-step basis or on the concurrent development of two or more items—and therein, after careful study, lies the answer. In this connection I pointed out that if there is a valid reason for delay, the public can more readily understand and accept the situation.

* * * * *

"In my opinion, the press and the expectant public have not been sufficiently advised from time to time as to the progress made on any one item and also on the status of the entire program. Consequently, there appears to be a rather prevalent and persistent impression that our local airport program has been unnecessarily delayed. Right or wrong, this subject has been in the open for some time through the press, editorially and otherwise, over the radio, at public functions, and by individual citizens.

* * * * *

"In submitting a summary of the airport situation, I feel I have acted in the best interests of aviation; the public, the city administration, and, I am sure, Mayor Kaufmann in the end will agree with me. I gave full credit to the administration for what has been accomplished. If the facts are correct, and I think they are, then it points to a more concerted action by all concerned in reducing the time factor now facing us."

Major Lambert's verbal statements to city officials were in the same tenor as his letter of explanation to Gardner. On that basis, all city officials interviewed expressed hearty accord and acceptance. The members of this committee who had opportunity to contact Major Lambert before his death also subscribed to the position taken in his summary.

AVIATION COUNCIL—CITY STATEMENTS

The published program of the Aviation Council of Metropolitan St. Louis, Inc., with a preface by its president, Mr. George B. Logan, speaks for itself and is attached for the purpose. The program is apparently intended to be all inclusive of aviation activities and objectives.

The city has made its comment on aviation progress as requested by this committee. This covers much the same material as the program of the aviation council, at least to the extent of those activities in which the city participates. The city's statement is attached and should be read with the aviation council report.

Since much of the subject matter is common to both of these statements, the committee makes the following observations in commenting on them together:

1. The principal criticism in the aviation council's program seems to be regarding delay in designing plans for objectives already accepted as the city's responsibility and in the execution of such plans when finally agreed on.

2. The comments of city officials would indicate that there are certainly two sides to the question of delays. Deferment for good and sufficient reasons may be wise and prudent. They should not be confused with delays which are due to ineptitude and procrastination.

3. For the latter there is little excuse, and certainly the committee holds no brief for them. The committee can find no major delay as above distinguished which has seriously affected the aviation development in St. Louis.

4. There have been many minor delays. Some were unavoidable due to conditions both during the war and thereafter which were entirely outside the control of those concerned.

5. Regardless of the explanation, these delays have been most trying and, in many instances, explanations have either not been considered necessary by the city officials or have been so handled as to receive all too narrow publicity. The committee found that the latter criticism of the city's publicity methods is particularly prevelant among the people commenting.

6. The aviation council's report contains many excellent and worth-while recommendations. The city's statement indicates clearly, however, that wide differences may exist in the ways and means and timing of these objectives, even differences in the very acceptance of the objective itself, as being the particular responsibility of the city.

7. As a body of air-minded citizens representing diversified interests and widespread areas, the aviation council has established as its purpose the function of advancing and promoting ideas and objectives of aviation.

8. It remains, however, for the city officials to assume the final responsibility of wisely and legally expending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Here is a case in point. If the selection by the aviation council of the east side for the next major airport was unanimous, many influential members of the aviation council must have second-guessed on this question. A large number of them enthusiastically supported the Columbia Bottoms site. The city officials cannot with equal freedom so change their minds when the city already has expended in excess of one-half of a million dollars on land acquisitions. The property was acquired as a result of a decision made after long and laborious ponderings with the help and advice of all interested parties, including all available aviation experts.

9. The committee holds no brief for minds that cannot be changed if another day is at hand or when conditions warrant that major change will be the best course for all concerned. Certainly, however, changes under such conditions require very fundamental supporting data, real reasons, and serious deliberation, including adequate arrangement for acceptable liquidation of abandoned plans, both physically and financially.

Except as they influence the committee's recommendations hereinafter given, the committee will rest its comments for the moment as to both the council's program and the city's statement, but not before urging on those concerned that both these documents be given the study which they deserve.

The committee has tried to avoid the position of placing the contributor of constructive criticism in the pillory frame through the device of possible but misleading interpretations. The committee must, in justice to those critics of the city aviation herein mentioned, call attention to its own vulnerableness to the charge of partiality due to membership on the city airport commission.

PREMISES FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Certain considerations in the committee's premise seem worthy of recording before recommendations are stated. This recording is in the character of informal and nontechnical discussion. It attempts to briefly high light:

1. The nature of the city's decisions as to the part the city can plan in the aviation business to the advantage of St. Louisians and the scope of the city's responsibilities thereunder.

2. The nature of aviation business itself and the forces influencing its development.

3. The "how" of the city's present procedure set up to do the job and "who" now acts for the city.

4. An entirely new proposal, in line with the latest and best thinking as to good administration for city government when engaged in business, to solve, for the long term, the city's aviation problem.

Obviously this committee does not set itself up to analyze in one final judgment all aviation matters concerning St. Louis. On the contrary, the committee believes such considerations are ever continuing from day to day and must receive the routine vigilant attention of a going city organization acting as the city business agency for aviation. To arrive at what the nature of such an agency should be and how it could best be organized to supervise in the interest of the city's aviation requires some general observations as to the nature and scope of the city's aviation responsibilities. Again the committee hastens to explain that it does not attempt to fix these city responsibilities and anchor them for all time; it only accepts them as it presently finds them, having very general, though possibly somewhat hazy, public acceptance. The responsibilities are bound to change from time to time in the future, even the near future, as aviation developments force attention to the necessities of the ever-changing circumstances.

The committee finds every evidence of general public acceptance that the city's role in aviation must always be that of filling the holes in the picture which an informed public believes to be in its best interest. This is an important point to be thoroughly digested. The city is not in the aviation business as such solely for the profit made therein. As quickly as it can pass any phase of its business operations over to private enterprise for a reasonable consideration, and with the assurance of protection of public interest in their future development, the city is expected to do so. Thus, great care must be constantly exercised that group enthusiasm be tempered with public knowledge of the predictable probabilities as to city responsibilities and the cost thereof in deciding what share of the various aviation loads the city should assume. Every one of these decisions involves risk of loss and again the city's position is different from the private enterpriser. The air lines must take risks, some even greater than the city's, but with this great difference—the air lines, barring most exceptional circumstances, can always second guess with the receipts it receives for its services and correct even major errors of judgment. But the city cannot always be going back to the citizens for more bond money, unless it has been recognized that prior funds have been reasonably and successfully used.

DEVELOPMENT OF AIR FACILITIES—A BUSINESS

Putting Missouri in the air may be an entirely different matter than "lifting Missouri out of the mud." Although probably of equal importance to the public interest, the two problems must employ entirely different techniques in their solution. Putting Missouri in the air simply cannot be accomplished if air objectives continue to be considered in the same category as constructing sewers, repairing streets, or the laying of pavements, State-wide or local. All of these latter operations are based on known factors that can largely be predetermined. There are many years of experience behind them. The pattern of public conduct toward the acceptance of them is set by long and accustomed usage.

Aviation, however, is a new industry. It still has to be based on predictions. Sometimes these predictions, made only 12 months previously, have seriously missed their mark. Numbers, tonnage, and equipment itself are in a state of flux. Ground facilities needed to handle them are in the same category.

Already jet propulsion and reversible propellers are changing predictions as to the necessary size of runways. Other improvements too numerous to mention are forcing a daily reappraisal of aviation thinking.

Despite this, the development of St. Louis' air facilities and their operations is a business. Efficient and modern business methods must be applied to them. The city must deal on a day-in-day-out basis with many air lines, air schools, commercial aviation, private flying and related organizations, the Civil Aeronautics Authority and Board, and other Federal and State aviation authorities. In its association with them, it must have full, up-to-date knowledge and understanding of their problems, present and future, not only as related to St. Louis but, also, as to the regional and national situations. It must approach them with enlightened vision.

PRESENT CITY AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Presently aviation matters are conducted in practically the same manner as other city affairs and this has been the practice of prior administrations ever since aviation became part of the city's responsibilities with only minor divergences in details and no real difference in theory or law. The city's charter sets up the manner or procedure and the departments to be concerned. An aviation matter or project, once accepted as city business, is divided into its several functional components necessary for its achievement. Each such function or duty is then turned over to the respective department charged by the city's charter with performing such function. This is the same procedure as is followed in all other city business. Briefly, for example, a new airport facility would be public work and thus its construction is required to be instituted by and carried out under the supervision of the board of public service. Then there would be the financing through the board of estimate and apportionment and the ordinance authorizing the project by the board of aldermen, and so forth; also the law work of the city counselor on the ordinance or condemnation proceeding if such is involved. If the facility is to be leased out, the comptroller is vested with exclusive authority, with approval of the board of estimate and apportionment, to rent city property for periods not exceeding 5 years, and so forth (over 5 years takes an ordinance passed by the aldermen). If the facility is to be operated outside the personnel already established by ordinance, the department of personnel would be concerned since the control of the system of personnel administration is vested there. If the facility is operated by the present airport personnel, it would come wholly within the department of public utilities. In any case, the supervision of its operation, control, management, and regulations would come under the department of public utilities. If purchase of supplies is involved, the supply division would handle it, since it holds exclusive control over the purchase of supplies for all departments, boards, or offices, exclusive of material for public work or improvement.

In addition to the other city boards and departments which are vested by law to perform, among many others, the functions set out above, there is a city airport commission created by ordnance. It is not charged with responsibilities or vested with authority to act or perform managerial supervision. It can only act in advisory capacity in, and through recommendation concerning design, construction, control, operation, and management. As presently created it has eight lay-citizen members appointed by the mayor and seven ex officio members from among the city officials and department heads who discharge or control the major functions mentioned above. Also the board of aldermen have, by ordnance, assigned to, and under the direct and exclusive jurisdiction of, the director of public utilities, the design, development, management, control, operation, supervision, and regulation of the city airport or airports, etc. This includes an airport manager and his staff of employees to operate the airport.

This briefly portrays, for a relatively simple airport matter, the nature of the internal procedure necessarily followed by the city and the type of organization which the city charter provides to be relied on to execute the various proceedings required. The committee has no intention of trying to make a case against the city's government being run along functional lines. The members of this committee in this and other capacities have had exceptional opportunities to see too much successful city performance to challenge this political philosophy in city affairs in general. When city activities have been in long standing and become largely routine or at least predictable as to the time and personnel needed to discharge each function, then the functionalized department offers specialized efficiency and great operating economy. But this has reference to the operation and management of the older facilities offered by city government which have taken on a pattern long since familiar and acceptable to our citizens and requiring only the specialized knowledge peculiar to such facilities.

Actually the whole set-up sounds much more complicated than it turns out to be in practice. It is only different from business management's practice of departmentalizing for successful control and efficient performance, in that the city's departmentalizing is fixed by law and may not vary one iota as to responsibility and authority and hence prerogative and attitude; whereas in business departmental lines are ever changing to meet new needs and conditions.

But in business—and here comes the rub—certainly no prudent business executive would ever try to combine two entirely dissimilar businesses by eliminating the entire personnel of the second enterprise in toto and shoving every department of the second enterprise together with its relative counterpart in the first enterprise, theoretical function by theoretical function, and, expect the members of the first organization to carry on successfully with practically no additional help or expert "know how."

But the city is forced by charter and ordinance to do just this and to try to perform under the acquisition of a new turbulent air partner, an airport, requiring entirely new techniques and functions though called by old names and classified by law into city boards and departments which make strange bedfellows, indeed.

Aviation problems have to compete for attention with all the other city affairs in each department and with each official concerned. It is the old established interest of well recognized and publicly accepted authenticity versus the new aviation matter of unestablished priority, and surrounded with plenty of uncertainty as to the correct course, the selection of which called for long study and much research. It is natural, since choice as to priority often has to be made, that old, familiar activities receive the first attention. Doubtless, this may be the correct course, as disposing of matters generally affecting more citizens who, by custom, are expectant of the usual treatment within an acceptable period of time. The city's governmental set-up is not equipped to do the complete job by its own initiation. Its system is not self-energizing for aviation. It was the flesh and blood operating the city's government, led by the mayor, which had to take hold and function, often in spite of the set-up.

The very nature of this treatment, so forced on the responsible city officials, was bound to beget hurdles and crises which required long hours of negotiation and much discussion and planning. Often these crises came at just the time when other necessary and important activities jammed the city departments concerned. Aviation had to wait its turn or pinch hitting had to be resorted to. The committee finds at the city hall, among those in position to observe, that at least a quarter and often over half the time of the mayor and of the other officials concerned was engaged solely in aviation matters. This does not include the night work at studying aviation development as reported elsewhere. This latter, the committee can vouch for of its own knowledge.

The members of this committee who are new lay members of the city airport commission and therefore not personally responsible for action prior to their appointment, are nonetheless impressed with the fact that the city airport commission has helped with its advice and far-sighted recommendations, especially those of its members like Major Lambert, who had large experience, outstanding knowledge, and the will to make the personal sacrifice necessary to put this experience and knowledge in places where they did real good. The city owes a great debt, already of long standing, to Major Lambert and his like.

The city has been most fortunate in having available in its midst technical experts for analysis, counsel, and engineering participation. The report on terminal airport facilities for this region, on which Horner

and Shifrin and Harland Bartholomew collaborated, is one of aviation's outstanding documents.

This briefly, but it is hoped essentially, covers the "situation aviation" in St. Louis to date, except for one major circumstance which is stated at the conclusion of this report.

A NEW PROPOSAL AS TO FUTURE PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

The committee has now highlighted the nature of the city's probable part in aviation, what the city may expect to find in the aviation business, and how and through whom the city has been acting on aviation matters. It now remains to offer an approach holding reasonable hope for a permanent, long-term solution to the difficulties and dangers in procedure and organization as presently practiced in compliance with the city charter requirements.

Even though open to the charge of being repetitious, the committee wishes to again point out a probable forecast for aviation and the city's future efforts therein. It is to be recalled that, with the close of the fighting war in 1945, aviation sprang out of its Pandora box and all the prior planning in the air world did not remotely forecast its accelerated pace or the speed of its changing developments. And it may well be that, after some reactionary lull now appearing on the horizon, aviation will take on another and even bigger spurt. This may require reappraisal and much investigation and reorganization of the city air facilities—in other words, much of the planning to date may be revised at far greater effort than the original attempt, because aviation is bound to get more technical and complicated in its internal affairs even though the service which it renders our people is, in outward aspects, ever being streamlined and simplified.

The probability in the public mind of this future situation is why the committee has felt its real job was to suggest a program to meet it. We cannot always hope to be fortunate or lucky or have our leaders pinch hit aviation rabbits out of our hats. This aviation of the future will require good men to handle it, adequately reinforced by the best of organizational advantages with complete freedom in procedural matters. If the major jobs were already done, the house of aviation all built and satisfactorily occupied and its functions and duties had joined all the other city functions and duties harmoniously, then perchance, the present set-up could be expected to carry on with only a reasonable share of extra worries. But with a practical certainty that such cannot in all probability be the case, it seems imperative to the committee to take every precaution to reduce the city risk by securing the best tools available to do the job.

The committee studied the problem in its theoretical aspect as well as the practical application. Theoretically it first tried to solve "How can city government best deal with its aviation problems?" But this question was soon changed to "How can the citizens best deal with the aviation problems through their city government?" This brought prompt results. Students of government explain that, with the city in the aviation business, there is present all the normal problems of obtaining good governmental administration raised to double or triple intensity. This is because of the great technical knowledge required and the big risks involved due to the tremendous velocity of changes and development in air transportation, requiring the shrewdest of business talents and rarest of foresight. Both of these prerequisites of extraordinary technical and business acumen are in substantial addition to the normal requirements needed for good governmental administration of the services customarily furnished by cities. Further, it is harder to execute the task of keeping the citizens satisfied as to the city's performance in its aviation business.

In the broadest terms, there are three steps open:

1. Elimination of the business of city aviation—the city to get out of so risky a commercial enterprise of such highly technical requirements as to never permit of ready public appraisal;

2. Turn it over, in toto fully financed, to a technical and business management to handle, ad lib, within a rigid framework set up to protect the citizens' financial and civic interests;

3. To form an airport agency responsible to the people, tied into the city government by mayoralty appointment and by financial accountability, authorized to hire the business and technical director with staff, to manage the business largely as would directors of a private business, and to be accountable to the citizens as the stockholders.

THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

The committee favors the third alternative, either in the form of a city authority under State sanction or as a city-owned corporation. The latter would probably be preferable. Thus, or only from something very similar, can city aviation be assured of the attention over the long term that it so urgently needs with single straight-line responsibility and authority and all the other advantages which come from the special designing of the best possible vehicle for streamlined use.

REGIONAL SCOPE OF PROBLEM

The committee recognizes that aviation is a regional problem. The city of St. Louis is only one factor in the over-all scheme. While the duties of the committee are, of necessity, limited to a discussion only of St. Louis' part of the problem, it feels it is not out of order to call attention that its conclusion suggests a ways and means which would permit the city's participation, simply and effectively, in regional activities and facilities.

INFORMED PUBLIC NECESSARY

In all of these operations it is absolutely essential to have the support of an informed public. The press of St. Louis, through its wide news coverage and editorial comment, have done much to create the necessary public awareness of the importance of aviation to the growth and future of St. Louis.

I

THE COMMITTEE FINDINGS

(a) Much has already been accomplished toward aviation progress in St. Louis. Consideration has been given to the chaotic conditions of the aviation enterprise itself. Handicaps and restrictions which have beset businesses and municipal activities during the war and postwar activities have also been factors affecting the results. This situation which faces St. Louis is no different from that which affects all other major American cities. The condition is universal.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

(b) It should be noted, that at the beginning of the war, the total investment in airport facilities by the city was $3,073,500. During the war, little construction was possible; at the same time, between 1943 and 1945, a half million dollars was expended for land acquisition and construction. In the past 12 months more progress has been made than in the 26-year, 1919–45, era. In the past year alone, according to the city's records, $3,500,000 has been allocated for land acquisition and construction, which sum more than doubles the previous airport investment by the city.

TO BE DONE

(c) A tremendous amount still remains to be done. There must be no complacency or satisfaction with past accomplishments. The important thing now is the speed and manner in which present and future objectives are to be achieved.

II

SCHEDULES AND PUBLICITY

(a) For projects already accepted as city responsibility definite plans and work schedules should be established. Insofar as the course has been plotted, policy made and announced, work must proceed as expeditiously as possible.

(b) These work schedules should be published so that all the citizens may know what to expect. The committee is in full accord with Major Lambert's recommendations with respect to this point.

(c) Work schedules should be adhered to as closely as possible. When such schedules are changed or retarded for any reason, the explanations for the delays should be fully and frankly published.

III

SELF-SUPPORT

Aviation facilities should be self-supporting. Commercial airports, supplemented by the income from their auxiliary facilities which serve the public, can and should be made to pay their own way. In fact, all airports should be made as self-sustaining as possible.

IV

A NEW PUBLIC AGENCY

(a) A city airport authority should be established to fix the nature of the city's responsibility for aviation objectives. This public body should be a new one and be brought into being as soon as possible.

(b) It should have:

1. Definite responsibility and centralized authority to develop and operate the city's air facilities in a businesslike and expeditious manner.

2. Sufficient qualified personnel to carry out the policies and objectives chosen by the citizens.

3. Power and responsibility of coordinating and furthering the area aviation plan.

(c) The committee recommends that the Governmental Research Institute of St. Louis, which enjoys the confidence of the citizens of St. Louis, be asked to study and recommend the exact nature of such a public agency or body, whether it be public, corporate, or private, and to outline the steps necessary to insure its legal competency.

(d) Our citizens have selected certain aviation objectives. They have voted considerable sums of money for their attainment. The recommended city authority must be given the responsibility for carrying out these objectives and square that responsibility with the proper ways and means of pursuing them, including the allocation, with fairness to all of the funds available to finance them.

(e) The committee invites attention to section 15126, Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1939, which states in brief that local legislative bodies may vest jurisdiction "for the construction, improvement, equipment, and maintenance and operation of airport facilities in any suitable officer, board, or body of such city." The statute also provided that legislative bodies may, by franchise or contract, authorize others to perform the above.

Since this statute may be subject to various legal interpretations, it is recommended, as a first step, that the Governmental Research Institute outline the procedure necessary to resolve any legal complications, if such are found to exist.

IN CONCLUSION

The committee has previously stated that the many contentions and countercontentions herein considered are too lengthy and numerous to be adjudicated by it if this report is to be timely and of value. When the premises are more clearly defined, the committee is convinced, many of these differences will be automatically resolved.

It should be made clear, however, that the committee is not evading the charges made and answered. It strongly feels that it is more important to address itself to the major issues, namely, what can be done constructively to accomplish the city's aviation objectives, in the best possible manner, and which will avoid a recurrence of these differences.

Even if solutions to each and every contention were advanced, if there is to be no basic change in the approach to the city's aviation problems, as many or more new contentions, arguments, and differences would arise requiring constant liquidation. It would be a never-ending process.

The occasion and nature of these conflicting contentions have been taken into consideration, however, and whenever applicable, used as the basis for the committee's recommendations.

If the committee has made helpful, fundamental suggestions and recommendations as to the practical steps to be taken to achieve rapid and successful growth of the air facilities of St. Louis under the circumstances now existing, it will have achieved its purpose to that extent.

FEDERAL USURPATION CAUSES A CRISIS

Grave and fundamental, however, as are the considerations herein discussed, there is another matter so desperately urgent that, although not definitely charged with its consideration, the committee has felt compelled to take it into account. Before a week is out, the committee will submit a detailed report which is now nearing completion. This is the story of the usurpation by Federal agencies using war powers to project their war control of Lambert-St. Louis Airport into permanent peacetime control. Without satisfactory sclution of this complete debacle to all the St. Louis aviation hopes and plans, nothing else can be relatively of much importance.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN J. CHURCH,
RUSSELL E. GARDNER, Jr.,
GEORGE C. SMITH,
CLIFFORD W. GAYLORD,
Investigating Committee.

St. LOUIS, Mo., *December 30, 1946.*

Signed by the committee December 31, 1946.

NOVEMBER 23, 1946.

A. P. KAUFMANN,
City Hall, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MAYOR KAUFMANN: A year ago, after my release from active duty with the Army Air Forces, I accepted your invitation to become associated with your administration as chief of aeronautics for the city of St. Louis.

The job as you outlined it to me, was one of considerable responsibility, and one which would utilize my 8 years' experience in aeronautics. You told me of your desires and hopes of accomplishment. And I felt, in accepting your offer I might be of assistance in advancing St. Louis' position in aviation. I can assure you I entered into my work with great hope and enthusiasm.

During the year I have found aviation matters in the city administration to be the concern of many departments and the responsibility of none. In spite of this handicap I made every effort to fit myself into the conglomerate picture. I was satisfied to work for the time being within the narrow limitations of one department in the hope that decisions could be reached for a consolidation and a coordination of aviation effort without interminable delay and fruitless discussions.

But, after a year, I have determined that under the present conditions the city of St. Louis has no function for a chief of aeronautics, since he can be nothing more than an adviser on minor aviation problems.

In view of this conviction on my part, I feel that I must submit my resignation to you. My further association with the city in my present position will place a burden upon the taxpayers for a service which cannot be rendered. I assure you, however, that I shall be happy to serve the city voluntarily in an advisory capacity should such service be requested.

With many thanks for your many courtesies, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

JAMES H. HOWARD,
Chief of Aeronautics.

SUMMARY OF STATUS OF THE AIRPORT SITUATION IN THE ST. LOUIS AREA OCTORER 1946

For the purpose to be defined herein, and in a broad sense, aviation can be divided into two phases:

First. Aircraft operations.

Second. Ground and terminal facilities.

One is measured by the scope of the other.

Aircraft operations have developed in greater volume than provisions made for ground and terminal facilities. In this respect most communities, or responsible authorities, have followed the path of least resistence in emphasizing the more glamorous development of aircraft operations without equivalent attention to the needs for adequate grounds areas that must necessarily and concurrently be provided.

The Aviation Council of Metropolitan St. Louis was organized and incorporated in June 1946, primarily to promote St. Louis as a national air center. They have announced a year-round program to stimulate local aircraft flying by different monthly events and features. In a factual statement covering the future of St. Louis in aviation, they present comparative figures showing the increase in aircraft operations, passengers, air mail, air express and freight—and with predictions for the future. The council states that St. Louis, for lack of airport facilities, finds itself utterly unprepared to meet present or anticipated air traffic. However, they say the problem is capable of solution. Organization and leadership are required.

Although the aviation council can of its own initiative promote and stimulate aircraft flying, they are rather dependent upon the city airport commission and the authorities of adjacent political subdivisions to concurrently provide adequate landing fields and airport terminals sufficient to meet the situation as it develops. The aviation council rightly asserts that it is the only organization in this metropolitan area capable of doing the broad and detailed job of chartering the course, and of exerting the pressure necessary to bring to this entire area the full advantages of the air age.

Under date of June 5, 1944, Horner and Shifrin submitted to the airport commission a report and survey specifically covering the expansion of the Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport to its fullest extent. Said report outlined in detail the progressive stages of development in the order of their importance. On July 10, 1944, Horner and Shifrin submitted a revised plan of the field and runways with recommendations that the final study and recomputation of the over-all grading be made in order to secure a more economical balance of cut and fill. All of which was approved by the airport commission and endorsed by the chamber of commerce air board.

Under date of August 20, 1945, the chamber of commerce air board addressed a communication to Mayor Kaufmann presenting therein a series of questions incident to the progressive development of Lambert Field, and requested a review of the essential items in the order of their importance, and stressed the fact that the time factor was all-important in the final accomplishment of the project.

In this respect, a primary purpose of the aviation council will be to follow up the initial effort of the air board. However, the council cannot comprehensively carry out this purpose without a definite knowledge of the situation as it has developed since 1944, and likewise an established program for the future.

At a recent meeting of the airport commission, and in a declaration of policy, the following paragraph, among others, was approved:

"Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport is the only site presently available in the timing necessary to hold St. Louis' present position and to permit improvements necessary to keep pace with airflight progress thereby avoiding a gap in St. Louis air development." On this assumption and in view of the past, present and future situations, the time factor becomes all-important to any ultimate accomplishments.

As Lambert Field in its expansion will be the sustaining feature around which a regional-airport system will be created, it would be expedient at this time to ascertain and set up in detail the exact status of its present development, and of extreme importance, an estimated timetable covering each of the following items listed in the order of their procedure. In their sequence one cannot be undertaken until the other is practically completed.

No. 1. Over-all design and plans and specifications.

No. 2. Additional land.

No. 3. Field drainage.

No. 4. Removal and relocation of Airport Road.

No. 5. Grading.

No. 6. Construction of single system runways, taxi strips and terminal ramp.

No. 7. Terminal building, water supply, sanitary sewers.

No. 8. Location of parking areas and highways in relation to the terminal building.

No. 9. Field lighting.

THE TIME FACTOR

A timetable, as may be assigned to each item of improvement, or concurrently to more than one item, can only be estimated upon present conditions and the uncertain conditions of the future. Nevertheless, it will prove an incentive and a guide to proceed in a methodical manner and with the least delay. If there is a valid reason for delay the public will more readily understand and accept the situation.

All conditions considered, and without concurrent contracts on two or more items, it has been unofficially estimated that the following items will not be completed within the dates indicated:

No. 3. Drainage, June 1947.

No. 5. Grading, June 1948.

No. 6. Runways, etc., May 1949.

No. 7. Terminal building, August 1950.

No. 9. Lighting, February 1951.

These estimates are not based altogether upon the actual periods of construction. Consideration has been given to the intervening periods of delay generally incurred by a slow process of municipal administration here and elsewhere. A revision by competent authorities may change these figures slightly more or less depending upon how much of the master plan, beyond stage three, will be carried out.

Much has already been accomplished toward the materialization of this project. Nearly all of the land has been acquired by the city; the covering of Cold Water Creek proper is 90 percent finished. Through bond issues and city ordinances funds are available for the initial items of construction. An appropriation of approximately $1,250,000 was approved by ordinance for the construction of a 9,000-foot east and west runway, and awards made for a design of the new terminal building. Plans and specifications are ready for the further draining and grading of the field.

In the meantime the city administration has done everything possible to maintain the present field at its maximum capacity in resurfacing the runways; extension of the administration building and receiving ramp; added facilities for the air lines, mail and express; removal of the grain elevator and many other items incident to airport operations. Of major importance will be the immediate construction of a 4,100-foot runway that will comprise the western end of the 9,000-foot runway ultimately to extend into the expanded area. Bids will be received October 29.

AIRPORT PROGRAM—CITY OF ST. LOUIS

The immediate program provides for the expansion of Lambert Field; the acquisition of Columbia Bottoms as a second major airport site and the further development, if possible, of the Ross Field, North Broadway. At least these three projects are in sight and under way. We must not continue under a misconception that St. Louis will in the near future construct two small airports within the city limits. The Columbia-Hampton site was ruled out some time ago. The Morganford-Weber site is a component and vital part of the St. Louis program. After 2 years of search and study and by elimination it is the only remaining site capable of development as an urban airport. It is, first, subject to an ordinance in order to institute condemnation proceedings. In view of organized protests in the vicinity the passage of such an ordinance is problematical. Federal participation is also a necessary factor. One thing is certain, the project will not materialize of its own accord.

REGIONAL AIRPORT PROGRAM

In 1944, the Metropolitan Plan Association agreed to create a metropolitan-airport program based on the Horner and Shifrin Regional Airport Survey of 1944, and to bring into accord as much as possible the respective programs of the city of St. Louis, St. Louis County, and the adjacent areas in Illinois. This authority and procedure were approved by the city airport commission and the chamber of commerce air board. However, very little progress was made along these lines. It would be advisable at this time for the Aviation Council of Metropolitan St. Louis to ascertain if such a thing exists as a coordinated regional-airport program sufficient in scope, provisions, and purpose to justify Federal recognition.

The above data is presented unofficially in the interest of local aviation, and the fact that our aircraft operations will be limited to the ground space provided for the purpose. The Aviation Council of Metropolitan St. Louis is community-wide in its function and purpose. The airport commission in its authority is practically confined to the airport program for the city of St. Louis. In coordination much can be accomplished.

A. B. LAMBERT.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *November 7, 1946.*

Mr. RUSSELL E. GARDNER, Jr.,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR RUSSELL: I appreciate your letter of November 4, and also the opportunity it gives me to reply in detail relative to the airport summary, and your inquiry.

In the first place, I presented only the bare facts as they actually exist and without criticism on my part. The general theme throughout the summary relates to the all-important time factor. As quoted on page 2, the airport commission in a declaration of policy declared that Lambert Field "is the only site presently available in the timing necessary to hold St. Louis' present position and to permit improvements necessary to keep pace with air-flighted progress."

The tentative time table set up on page 3, is subject to revision by the proper authorities, either on the step-by-step basis or on the concurrent development of two or more items—and therein, after careful study, lies the answer. In this connection I pointed out that if there is a valid reason for delay the public can more readily understand and accept the situation.

I had in mind the airport-bond-issue campaign of 1942, of which I served as chairman. Conducted on a broad scale, the citizens of St. Louis were educated to the vital needs of aviation and the results that could be accomplished. The $4,500,000 proposition was approved 5 to 1. In the more recent general bond-issue campaign the airport item was dramatized in tense promises.

In February 1945, the airport commission and the chamber of commerce air board approved a definite airport program for the city of St. Louis as follows: The expansion of Lambert Field, the acquisition of Columbia Bottoms, and the construction of two or three smaller airports within the city limits (copy enclosed). Since that time the city has been confronted with many perplexing problems in the culmination of each and every feature of said program.

In my opinion, the press and the expectant public have not been sufficiently advised from time to time as to the progress made on any one item, and also on the status of the entire program. Consequently, there appears to be a rather prevalent and persistent impression that our local airport program has been unnecessarily delayed. Right or wrong, this subject has been in the open for some time through the press, editorially and otherwise, over the radio, at public functions, and by individual citizens. It all reveals a keen proprietary interest in the entire proposition. For instance, the real-estate exchange in January 1946 addressed a communication to the city officials urging that prompt steps be taken to acquire land for several small urban airports.

Occasionally statements are made about authorized improvements that are too far ahead of immediate accomplishment. In one instance it was announced through the press, April 12, 1946, that the citizens' bond issue advisory committee had approved the airport grading of approximately 3,500,000 cubic yards and that the project is expected to start this summer. The public absorbs these things without a knowledge of the intricate proceedings the city must follow. Nevertheless, for lack of evidence it serves to create a feeling of delayed action that must be broken down or accepted as inevitable.

The citizens of St. Louis have been extremely generous in their support of aviation and, judging from the past, they will not question any increased costs over the original estimates in developing Lambert Field to its maximum capacity in the least length of time. The stake is a big one and of vital consequence in sustaining our air-line operations. Lambert Field has been instrumental in bringing over $90,000,000 to the St. Louis area since 1936. It is now the nucleus of a rapidly growing industrial district and subdivision. If the field could be concurrently developed to include the fourth and fifth stages of the master plan, it would bring in lucrative returns—moreover, it would discount the need of Columbia Bottoms for many years to come. However, this is not the point of this communication but only a thought for consideration.

In submitting a summary of the airport situation I feel I have acted in the best interests of aviation; the public, the city administration, and, I am sure, Mayor Kaufmann in the end will agree with me. I gave full credit to the administration for what has been accomplished. If the facts are correct, and I think they are, then it points to a more concerted action by all concerned in reducing the time factor now facing us.

A detailed study and break-down of each item in the order listed on page 2 may assist you in determining the possibilities of advancing the indicated timetable on page 3. If a timetable is not considered expedient, then to refine the procedure in order to accomplish the same results. I have exhibits of each statement made in the summary and these I would be pleased to review with you at your convenience.

I personally appreciate the interest both you and Clif have displayed in aviation and the time both of you are willing to devote in its advancement, and I am sure the community at large reflects the same sentiment.

Sincerely yours,

A. B. LAMBERT.

STATEMENT OF CITY OFFICIALS WITH RESPECT TO PROGRESS OF AVIATION PROGRAM WITHIN PAST 3 YEARS

GENERAL COMMENTS

The runway facilities at Lambert Field were capable of, and do accommodate, any and all types of airplanes now being used. A check of the operating manuals issued by the various air lines discloses that there is no restriction or limitation or penalty on Lambert Field with respect to any aircraft now being operated or now proposed to be operated by any air line, nor is there any lack of facilities which causes the field to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of airplane traffic now using the airport. No airplane desirous of coming into St. Louis has ever been unable to do so either because of insufficient length or number of runways. No lack or inadequacy of facilities at Lambert Field has ever caused one single plane to bypass St. Louis.

This is not to say that the city should be complacent with a status quo; in fact, it is positive that better facilities are needed and it is known that in the near future more extensive and more numerous runways will be necessary to handle the increased business. The speed with which construction at Lambert Field is now being carried out guarantees that the development will stay in advance of the needs.

Nevertheless, the above comments with respect to present conditions are made to disprove irresponsible criticism of those who claim that St. Louis is losing aviation service for lack of facilities. Anyone who has made the comparison will admit that the facilities at Lambert Field are equal to, or better than, those now available in any other large city in the United States, with the possible exception of Washington, D. C.

METROPOLITAN AIRPORT-DEVELOPMENT PLAN

In the early part of 1944, city officials became convinced that the over-all master airport-development plan, covering the entire metropolitan area, was essential. The value of such a study and plan was discussed with the CAA who agreed that such a study was required in order to secure orderly development.

Since this time various regional offices of the CAA have adopted this principle and incorporated it in their regulations covering metropolitan areas. Mr. Harland Bartholomew, in collaboration with Horner and Shifrin, were employed to prepare this study. Their report was completed in November 1944 and later published as a 75-page printed report. It contains estimates of future air traffic which may be expected in the St. Louis area and interprets the needs which may result from that traffic in terms of numbers and sizes of airports. In addition, the entire area was studied as to availability of sites and general areas selected within which the needed facilities might be provided.

This report, which was one of the first of its kind published in the United States, has received not only national, but international, recognition. The CAA has adopted it as a model for other cities and copies have been disseminated for great distances, requests having been received from many foreign countries. It should be noted that all plan-

ning and construction work which the city of St. Louis has undertaken has been in conformity with the recommendations contained in this report.

SUMMARY OF OVER-ALL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

As a measure of the over-all accomplishments, and in an attempt to fix the time interval during which rapid progress has been made, the following analysis of records in the comptroller's office has been prepared:

Investment in airport facilities by city of St. Louis

A. Investment as of Jan. 1, 1942:	
Bond fund	$2,000,000.00
Special funds (WPA, special appropriations, CAA)	1,073,500.00
Total	3,073,500.00
B. Investment during war period, Jan. 1, 1942, to Sept. 1, 1945:	
Lambert Field:	
Land	406,996.85
Runways, aprons, etc.	70,239.40
Buildings	82,817.26
Columbia Bottoms:	
Land	105,800.89
Total	665,854.40
C. Investment during postwar period, Sept. 1, 1945, to Dec. 31, 1946:	
Lambert Field:	
Land	647,564.44
Runways, aprons, etc.	833,725.59
Buildings	86,176.04
Drainage	1,224,431.28
Columbia Bottoms:	
Land	523,004.99
Total	3,519,902.34
Grand total	7,259,256.74

NOTE.—The figures used in the items listed above include that amount which has already been spent, together with that which is actually under contract with work in progress.

A glance at this tabulation reveals some startling and significant facts. It will be noted that the entire investment of the city of St. Louis in airport facilities at the beginning of the recent war was slightly over $3,000,000. During the war period only little construction was possible, but between 1943 and 1945 some $500,000 of land was acquired. The interval since VJ-day has been one of intense activity and it will be noted that within the past year alone in excess of $3,500,000 has been expended for land acquisition and construction work. Thus it will be seen that in the past 12 months more progress has been made than in the entire history from 1919 to 1945. In fact, the total investment in airport facilities has been more than doubled within the past 12 months.

Careful inquiry and analysis of accomplishments in other cities discloses that no other city can approach this record. While many cities have announced rather grandiose plans, only one or two have provided any funds for carrying out those plans, and no city in America can point to any actual accomplishments which are even nearly comparable.

LAMBERT FIELD

Inasmuch as it was impossible for the city to carry out actual construction during the war years, this period was devoted to an intensive study and preparation of engineering plans.

With respect to Lambert Field, a complete analysis of possibilities for expansion was undertaken by the city's consultants, Horner and Shifrin, who filed their report in June 1944 recommending a master plan of ultimate development. After this plan was adopted by the airport commission, work was started on preparation of detailed engineering design, plans, and specifications. Today all such plans and specifications covering the entire future development of the field, and including those for grading, drainage, and runways, are complete and ready for the taking of bids, so that there will be no delay in passing from one construction phase to another.

The city also commenced acquisition of land by the passage of the necessary ordinance and the filing of condemnation suits in the St. Louis County circuit courts. With but few minor exceptions, none of which interfere with the first construction stage, all needed land has now been acquired. This process involved negotiations with more than 200 individual property owners, and included appearances at hearings before various groups of appraisers appointed by the courts. At the start of this task, about 2 years ago, Lambert Field consisted of approximately 400 acres of usable land, and this has now been expanded to 1,400 acres, or more than three times its former size. In acquiring this land the city has expended in excess of $1,055,000.

Wishing to have an official expression with respect to the attitude of the Federal Government concerning airport construction, the city did, on three occasions during the war, file requests for permission to construct such work. These requests were denied until June 1945, when permission to start enclosure of Cold Water Creek was granted. However, this permission was without priority assistance. In spite of these difficulties the enclosure of the main branch of Cold Water Creek is now an actual accomplishment, the work having been completed within the past few weeks at a total cost of $712,000.

With the arrival of VJ-day the major construction work has been rapidly accelerated, and there is now in actual progress two large contracts, one totaling $512,000 and embracing two main trunk sewers, which are to be the backbone of the new drainage system, and another estimated to cost $753,000 for the construction of a portion of the main new east and west runway. These latter two construction jobs, together with others which will be mentioned later, bring the total of work now actually under construction to a figure in excess of $1,600,000, and Lambert Field is now a beehive of activity.

Pending completion of the above projects, which are a portion of a long-range program, and in order immediately to provide facilities for handling the ever-increasing business at Lambert Field, the city has also undertaken a number of other improvements, both to the field and to the administration building. Principal among these is the erection of an addition to the terminal building itself, which is designed to provide additional ticket-counter space and approximately four times the present waiting-room area. Associated with this project is the remodeling of one of the hangars to take care of the Post Office Department and to provide offices for the operations divisions of the various air lines.

To permit airplanes to park in closer proximity to the terminal building, thus reducing walking distance for passengers and speeding the handling of traffic, a long concrete finger, flanked on either side by concrete loading platforms, has been constructed out into the field, and fencing has been rearranged to provide easy access for passengers and to exclude the public from the area in front of the administration building. Included in this program, also, is the provision for loading and unloading limousines under covered areas at a point adjacent to the field proper and new baggage-handling facilities. All of this work in the terminal area is practically complete, some of it actually being in service at the present time and the remainder will be finished within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

Another phase of the Lambert Field expansion which has received considerable attention is that of the new terminal facilities and administration building. Architects have been employed to design these features, and preliminary plans are already complete and are under submission to the air lines for suggestions and comments. Work is progressing rapidly.

The acquisition of adequate road access to Lambert Field has not been overlooked, and some time ago, at the instance of the city, the Missouri State Highway Department was encouraged to inaugurate a program for the widening of Natural Bridge Road. Plans for this project contemplate a two-lane highway in each direction, with an intervening parkway, and the city has been successful in having this project adopted by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, thus making Federal funds available. Construction plans for the widened road are complete, but the work cannot be started, pending acquisition of the right-of-way.

The city has agreed with the State highway department that it will furnish that portion of the right-of-way adjacent to the property which the city has acquired in the expansion of Lambert Field, and in addition the city secured the cooperation of the St. Louis Public Service Co. in filing an application before the Missouri State Public Service Commission for the abandonment of approximately one-half mile of streetcar tracks, which lie along the side of, and adjacent to, the present road. This case was heard by the commission many months ago, and is still pending and undecided. In the interim, the State highway department has also filed condemnation suits against various property owners and is busily engaged in securing easements and rights-of-way from a large number of others involved. We understand that actual construction work will be started in the early spring.

The city for some time has been dissatisfied with the Bridgeton Station Road approach to Lambert Field, and has been negotiating with the St. Louis County Court for the widening and improvement of that stretch of Bridgeton Station Road leading between Natural Bridge Road and the terminal building. Although the city has agreed to furnish the needed right-of-way and to contribute to the cost of that improvement; nevertheless, the county authorities have so far refused to inaugurate this project.

By comparing the above recital of actual accomplishments with the so-called program of the aviation council it will be immediately apparent that the council has, for the most part, merely presented a relisting of projects which the city has already under construction, and further it is apparent that the council has offered no original ideas or suggestions with respect to the St. Louis airport program.

COLUMBIA BOTTOMS

Few appreciate the enormous total of work and effort which has been necessary to bring the Columbia Bottoms project to its present status. About 3 years ago and prior to adopting the Columbia Bottoms location the city airport commission had selected and officially approved the so-called Tesson Ferry site in southern St. Louis County. Much time and money was spent in making surveys of the Tesson Ferry area and in the preparation of preliminary plans and cost estimates. At the instance of the city this site was also studied in great technical detail by the air lines and by the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Its merits and demerits were compared from an engineering and aeronautical point of view with some six or eight other locations. The CAA as well as the five air lines serving St. Louis unanimously agreed with the city in the conclusion that the Tesson Ferry site was, from all viewpoints the most desirable site available in the entire metropolitan area.

Following this investigation the city officially filed an application requesting the County Planning Commission to approve the site and designate it as available for airport purposes. After considerable delay the city was finally granted a hearing on its application at which time Mayor Kaufmann, accompanied by Milton M. Kinsey, then director of public utilities, and the late Maj. Albert Bond Lambert personally appeared and spoke in behalf of the city petition. Among other things the city agreed to make available to county residents an area greater in extent than Forest Park, which area was to be fully improved with lakes, golf courses, swimming pools, and other recreational features.

The city's application was denied.

Subsequently the city was notified that the only site in St. Louis County which would be approved by the planning commission for use as a major airport was one in the Columbia Bottoms area at the confluence of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers.

A considerable volume of Missouri River water passes over the Columbia Bottoms at high or flood stages of the river, and for this reason, together with the necessity of carrying out extensive grading operations of a nature which might affect navigation, it was incumbent upon the city to secure a permit from the United States Army Engineers before assurance could be had that a major airport could be constructed at this location.

Quite properly the United States engineers required that a great mass of technical information be submitted including the proposed alignment and design of levees; a grading program together with a statement of final elevation desired for the completed airport; information concerning subsurface conditions, and so forth. This data was secured and compiled at great cost by the city staff in conjunction with outside engineering consultants.

Later hearings were held on this application and the permit was granted.

City officials immediately began to prepare an ordinance calling for the condemnation of the area, but in doing so were amazed to discover that the records of St. Louis County with respect to property ownership were inaccurate, and inadequate in some instances, and wholly nonexistent in others. This unusual situation necessitated complete field surveys, not only of the out boundaries of the area but also of each of the more than 75 individual property ownerships involved—a task requiring several months time for all the surveying forces which could be employed.

In due course the ordinance authorizing the condemnation was passed by the board of aldermen and the actual condemnation suits were filed in the St. Louis County circuit courts.

These suits are still pending in the courts although filed on September 21, 1945, more than 1 year ago.

In the meantime, however, the city has energetically followed the policy of continuing to negotiate with individual property owners and to date has actually acquired possession of 35 parcels totaling 2,546.05 acres at a cost of $628,800. Thus the city already owns more than one-half of the 4,000 acres required.

In the interim also studies for the development of a satisfactory runway pattern have continued.

Under the circumstances and conditions briefly recited above, it is evident that the city authorities are deserving of the highest commendation for actual accomplishments in the acquisition of the Columbia Bottoms site.

SMALL AIRPORTS

In conformity with the recommendations contained in the metropolitan area airport development plan, the city has officially approved the development of the three small airports which that report recommends within the city limits.

By a contractual arrangement made with a private operator, the city contributed the free use of land which it owned in north St. Louis and constructed thereon a concrete apron, and this property, together with adjoining leased property has been placed in actual operation. This site, known as the Ross Airport, has proved very popular and considerable aviation activity is now in evidence with many airplane owners having established it as their home base. Plans are under way for the enlargement of this field and applications for Federal assistance in connection with the construction work are now on file with the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

With respect to the field in South St. Louis, the city airport commission has approved an ordinance for the condemnation of needed land, which ordinance was introduced in the board of aldermen on June 28, 1946, where it has been pending ever since. In this instance also, applications have been filed with, and are pending before, the Civil Aeronautics Administration for Federal assistance in connection with construction work.

Considerable study has also been given to the proposed development on Hampton Avenue just south of Manchester. While there are certain problems with reference to land acquisition, which have not as yet been solved, this site was also submitted to the CAA for their approval and there are pending applications for development funds.

In this respect it is to be noted that a vast majority of the small airports recommended in the airport-development plan fall within the confines of St. Louis County, and it is expected that those communities will wish to take the leading role in the development of this type of airport, although so far as it is now known, no steps in this direction have been taken by any county community.

SECURING OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Officials of the city have been extremely active in securing satisfactory Federal legislation for assistance in airport programs. These gentlemen, acting on behalf of the city, as well as representatives of the United States Conference of Mayors, appeared before both Senate committees and joint House and Senate committees, where Federal legislation was pending and were successful in having certain proposed features modified to the satisfaction of municipal corporations.

Later, when CAA issued a proposed set of regulations under which the Federal act was to be administered, the city officials again took an active part in protesting many features which would have made the proposed regulations unworkable, as well as illegal in the State of Missouri. As a result of their activity at the hearings concerning these regulations, the CAA has announced that many changes will be made. All of this activity, which has been confined to the last 6 or 8 months, has brought great credit to the city of St. Louis and has resulted in expressions of appreciation from officials of many other cities.

Pending the adoption of final CAA regulations, the city of St. Louis has filed tentative requests for Federal funds, a summary of requests being as follows:

City of St. Louis summary of applications to CAA for Federal airport aid

	City	Government	Total
Lambert Field:			
Land	$352,688	$117,562	$470,250
Construction	6,359,237	6,035,013	12,394,250
Total	6,711,925	6,152,575	12,864,500
Columbia Bottoms:			
Land	1,076,798	358,932	1,435,730
Construction	9,984,409	6,870,091	16,854,500
Total	11,061,207	7,229,023	18,290,230

City of St. Louis summary of applications to CAA for Federal airport aid—Continued

	City	Government	Total
Morganford Rd.:			
Land	$318,750	$106,250	$425,000
Construction	431,190	431,190	862,380
Total	749,940	537,440	1,287,380
Hampton Ave.:			
Land	337,500	112,500	450,000
Construction	488,438	488,439	976,877
Total	825,938	600,939	1,426,877
Ross Field:			
Land	248,062	82,688	330,750
Construction	606,694	606,693	1,213,387
Total	854,756	689,381	1,544,137
Grand total (5 projects)	20,203,766	15,209,358	35,413,124

NOTE 1.—As requested by CAA the above figures contemplate the maximum possible future development at each site.

NOTE 2.—Due to certain retroactive provisions of Federal Airport Act, the figures include certain rather large amounts already spent by city.

Department of the President, Board of Public Service, Nov. 24, 1946.

While it is realized that unless additional Federal appropriations are passed, the city will be unable actually to receive the sums requested; nevertheless, the applications were prepared to cover such sums at the request of Federal officials who wished to use them not only as an actual application, but as an indication of the total funds which might be needed for necessary future aviation development.

EFFORTS TO SECURE NEW AIR-LINE SERVICE

The city of St. Louis has formally interviewed and actively participated in every hearing held by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the past 3 years, when those hearings involved new commercial air-line service into St. Louis.

Through its law department and the presentation of expert witnesses the city has filed with the board data and exhibits concerning the commerce, industry and business of St. Louis, together with studies disclosing its community of interest with other cities and similar pertinent information. City officials have stressed the airport program and have pointed out the need for added service.

Among others, the city has appeared in cases wherein Braniff Airways, United Airlines, and Continental Airlines have proposed to bring entirely new air service into St. Louis, and in cases wherein American, Eastern, Chicago Southern and Transcontinental Western Airlines have proposed to augment existing service.

In all these instances the city has encouraged and supported the air lines in their attempts to secure the necessary permission, and while no decisions have as yet been finally handed down, nevertheless, it appears certain that these efforts will be fruitful.

BASIC PROGRAM OF AIR PROGRESS FOR THE METROPOLITAN ST. LOUIS AREA

(Presented by the Aviation Council of Metropolitan St. Louis, Inc., 2181 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.)

PREFACE

The Aviation Council of Metropolitan St. Louis, Inc., is a nonprofit organization composed of some 38 civic, service, and business groups in the metropolitan area. Each constituent group designates one individual who serves as its representative on the council. In addition to these members, there is a group of advisory members, including such men as Gen. Clifford M. Gaylord, Oliver M. Parks, Edgar M. Queeny, Sidney Maestre, John Longmire, Col. James H. Howard, and

Col. Richard T. Carter. The late Major Lambert was a member of this advisory group.

The council was incorporated so as to provide continuity of effort for the period of years it will take to accomplish the air-progress program presented in this brochure. Voluntary subscriptions of business firms have made possible the establishment of the office, full-time executive manager, public-relations staff, and office staff necessary to begin the essential activities to carry out the program.

To avoid annual solicitation of funds the council plans to hold an annual metropolitan St. Louis air fair, an industrial exhibit with an aviation theme. The first air fair is scheduled from May 9 to 18, inclusive, at the arena. Through this exposition the council desires to show the aviation industry and the visiting public what St. Louis industries produce, thereby opening new markets for St. Louis manufacturers. At the same time, exhibits of the aviation and allied industries will bring to the attention of the people of this region the uses of aviation which will aid our industry.

The council feels confident that its program, its management policies, and the leadership which it offers in bringing to the St. Louis area all possible benefits of aviation will merit support and cooperation.

Sincerely,

GEORGE B. LOGAN,
President.

MARVIN E. HOLDERNESS,
Executive Manager.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Aviation Council of Metropolitan St. Louis, Inc., having been organized in the summer of 1946 for the purpose of "bringing to metropolitan St. Louis every possible benefit from aviation," presents herewith the basic program which it has approved, and which it will support with the united effort of its constituent member organizations.

In the achievement of this program the aviation council will cooperate with the officials of the city of St. Louis, of St. Louis County, and of other cities, counties, agencies, and individuals in the metropolitan area, so that this area may become the air center which it is entitled to be by virtue of its geographic location, its population, and its diversified industry.

To realize the benefits of aviation, and to become an air center, it is necessary that the over-all picture be reduced to its component elements, and that efforts be directed toward the coordinated and simultaneous accomplishment of the many interrelated projects.

The support already given by the citizens of the metropolitan area to the aviation council, and by the voting of public moneys by the citizens of this city, is clear proof that the entire area wants, and will not be satisfied until it obtains, all the benefits which will accrue from aviation.

The council recognizes that wartime handicaps have delayed our program, but feels that these handicaps in production and materials must be rapidly overcome if this area is to meet competition of other areas in aviation development. Some strides have been made, but the council is convinced that much more could have been done and knows that much remains to be done.

The aviation council will strive to speed up all agencies presently involved in this program, and offers these officials all possible cooperation and assistance within its power.

THE PROGRAM OUTLINE

There are eight basic elements involved in the aviation council's program. Necessarily, as to all of these, the program is area-wide. The elements and the council's objectives are summarized in the chart below.

Basic elements and Aviation Council objectives

I. Adequate airport facilities: Immediate completion of temporary facilities at Lambert Field; development of basic Lambert Field expansion plan; plans for other major airports; development of small airports, airstrips, and airparks.

II. More frequent and more convenient scheduled flights: Obtain more flights originating in St. Louis, convenient arrival and departure times; daily round trips to trade area cities; facilities for housing and servicing planes at Lambert Field; greater patronage for scheduled flights.

III. Efficient ground transportation to and from air fields: Completion of Natural Bridge highway widening program; Bridgeton Road; downtown and outlying passenger terminals; adequate, direct, and low-cost transportation; plans for helicopter taxi service.

IV. Sound financial planning: Protection of public funds through wise expenditure; development of program to meet fixed charges; reduction of burden on taxpayers.

V. Facilities for military aviation-defense training: Provision of space and facilities for military air-defense training.

VI. Educational program on multiple advantages of air use: Assist in development of aviation courses in schools; acquaint businessmen with the benefits of air transportation; keep the area informed regarding developments and benefits of aviation.

VII. Promotion of safety facilities: Support safety measures; assist in providing air marking, safety devices, and equipment.

VIII. Development of various types of air industry: Support present air industry; bring in new essential air industry, and build area as an aviation industrial center.

THE PROGRAM DETAIL

I. Adequate airport facilities

A. Lambert Field: The aviation council is in full accord with the statement of the St. Louis Airport Commission that Lambert Field is the only site "presently available in the timing necessary to hold St. Louis' present position and to permit improvements necessary to keep pace wth air-flight progress, thereby avoiding a gap in St. Louis' air development." With this thesis in mind, the council's program with regard to Lambert Field is as follows:

(1) Temporary expedients: There is a universal feeling in this community that emergency facilities should have been planned, begun, and finished sooner. Immediate completion of these facilities is of paramount importance. In particular it is necessary that the following items be completed and in operation before the Christmas holiday traffic rush begins:

Additional waiting-room space.
Better restaurant facilities and food.
Less complicated baggage procedure.
New and enlarged ticket-counter space.
Adequate and sanitary rest rooms.
Sufficient telephone and telegraph service.

The key to each of the above is the completion of the one-floor annex building, which, as a temporary structure, could have been finished 8 months ago, but which is not yet completed. By the coordinated efforts of the city, the air lines, and the services involved, the whole job can be finished promptly and some of the stigma presently attached to the passenger service at Lambert Field can thereby be temporarily eliminated.

It might be stated in general, since most of the permanent improvements necessarily require long-time elements, that the council will continually push for making the best use of what we have, and improving it on a temporary basis. Only in this fashion can we speedily answer the charges of tardiness which are daily launched against the city.

(2) General expansion program:

(a) The pattern for expansion of Lambert Field as set forth in the Horner and Shifrin report, approved by the municipal airport commission, included new and extended runways, relocating and building a new administration building, and all necessary grading, drainage, and lighting. While the council admits the existence of handicaps in the completion of this program, it feels that planning could have been done during the war, and that some grading and other similar work could have progressed during this period.

(b) Delay in making plans and specifications has delayed contract letting. Delay in the condemnation proceedings has delayed the availability of necessary land. Further delay in detailed planning of the administration building could easily delay the completion of that building when materials are available. The estimate of the late Major Lambert that the complete work would not be finished until 1951 may be pessimistic but has not been denied.

(c) We recognize that the city of St. Louis under its laws and charter was designed as a governmental body, not a business institution, and we recognize that not being a business institution some of the delays have been inevitable. In fact, the city officials have cited the charter and the ordinances as the chief cause of delays.

(d) The city charter is 32 years old. If the charter interferes with our aviation progress and the city officials will point out where and why, the council will help to take that problem to the people. In the meantime more cooperation between city officials, and more prompt decisions, will help to realize quickly the objectives for which the citizens have voted money.

(e) Decision is needed as to the sum total of buildings to be erected and service to be offered on Lambert Field. Provision must be made for air freight, including a warehouse for receiving outgoing and incoming shipments. There is need for this sort of building at the field, and need for mechanical loading equipment.

(f) The city has announced a policy of desiring to control all structures at the field. The aviation council does not disagree with this policy, provided it does not interfere with the main and inescapable purpose of providing facilities for all aviation uses. Whether these facilities be provided by the city or by private industry, by ground leases, or by building leasees, is immaterial.

(3) Other major airports:

(a) If it to take 5 years to finish Lambert Field (as the late Major Lambert estimated) and an approximately equal length of time thereafter to build a new airport, the planning for a second major airport must be begun now. The council feels that such second airport, when needed, should be built on the east side of the Mississippi River. The legal objections which controlled the decision of the Doolittle committee in 1940 and which limited the decision of Horner and Shifrin in 1943, were removed by the Missouri Constitution of 1945.

(b) Whether political and governmental objections will prevent building on the east side is not known. There is no fundamental reason why they should.

On the east side are two great industrial counties and many major cities. These communities we are sure are desirous of being included in the area aviation picture, and we are equally sure that they will contribute ratably to the cost of providing needed facilities. An airport on the east side will cost infinitely less of the area taxpayers' money and will deliver a greater portion of benefits to the aviation-using population.

Indeed two airports could probably be built on the east side for less than would be required at Columbia Bottoms. What has already been spent on Columbia Bottoms is not lost. The purchase of such land is doubtless a good investment and even a limited view of the future of air traffic makes several major airports a necessity.

(4) Small airports: A crying need for the immediate present as well as an absolute necessity for future development of this area, is the building of air strips and air parks for privately operated planes. These fields will be to the airplane what concrete roads were to the automobile. Without

close-in fields available for the private user of airplanes, the St. Louis area will be forever locking out the choicest business customers of its surrounding trade area. Not only must close-in airports be built so that airplane owners may come into the city and trade with us, but many landing fields must be built by the smaller cities in this area to provide convenient centers for their own citizens and their own respective trade areas, and also that we may fly out in our own planes.

The council proposes to urge not only the city of St. Louis toward this improvement, but also the counties and the other municipalities of the area. The council believes the proposal for a temporary landing strip on the river-front site of the Jefferson Memorial is a subject that should first of all receive consideration by the city administration and the Jefferson Memorial Commission.

II. More frequent and more convenient scheduled flights

It is not sufficient for a metropolitan community as large and as important as St. Louis to simply have airplanes flying over it or through it, and stopping only at such times as are convenient to New York and San Francisco or to Chicago and New Orleans.

St. Louis should have the benefits of air transportation to and from the communities with which it does business. It should be possible to fly at a convenient hour in the morning to Chicago, or Kansas City, or Tulsa, or Memphis, or Louisville, or Indianapolis, or any city within a radius of 400 miles, transact a day's business, and return conveniently the same evening. Our airplanes offer that, but many of our schedules do not.

The aviation council realizes that to get this service there are required three important and pressing undertakings.

First, action by the city to furnish, or to aid the air lines, or private contractors to furnish, ground facilities to house and care for the planes which should originate their schedules in St. Louis and in which planes could, if necessary, be kept overnight, checked, inspected, and serviced. There are no such facilities at Lambert Field at the present time.

Second, there is required the cooperation and action of the air lines themselves to give to St. Louis a greater proportion of their flying equipment.

Third, there is needed the cooperation of the aviation council to educate the public so that more people make use of flying advantages, and make the schedules profitable.

The aviation council pledges itself to sponsor and provide this educational program and it will continue to urge the city and the air lines to cooperate in the manner suggested above.

III. Efficient ground transportation to and from airfields

One of the common complaints of air-line customers (and of those who have never tried the air lines) is the excessive time and cost of getting to and from airports. In fairness to aviation, it must be said that most of these time delays are exaggerated. Comparison is seldom made in those calculations with the time required to get to and from railroad stations. But even with this factor allowed for, there is too much lost time going to and from airports, and it costs too much.

The first thing to be done to cure this situation in St. Louis is to widen the narrow portion of Natural Bridge Road, give that road an express highway status.

There has been unnecessary delay in the action of the highway commission on this work, and a speedy decision should be urged by the city of St. Louis, or even by the governor, to get this work actually under way.

Another thing which is a crying need and can be easily and cheaply done is to cure the "bottleneck" of the small section of Bridgeton Road from Natural Bridge to the administration building. The city has offered to donate the ground necessary to widen this road. The highway commission and the St. Louis County authorities should see to it that this road is immediately widened. It will probably be 5 years before the new administration building can be used and this improved section is needed now.

Another method is to persuade the air lines to facilitate passenger handling by having a joint terminal downtown and one or more in suburban areas.

The air lines should facilitate the checking in of passengers, and the checking in and checking out of luggage, to eliminate the unnecessarily long time of loading and unloading.

The aviation council poses the question as to whether the transportation of passengers to and from the airport should not be a function of the Public Service Co. under rates approved by the Public Service Commission.

There seems to be no real reason, with a continuous flow of traffic to and from Lambert Field why passengers should be required to pay $1.15 for the trip each way. A much smaller cash fare would still permit profitable operation of scheduled busses. It is true that competitive conditions will probably force these changes, but it is the desire of the aviation council not to wait on the slow process of competition to achieve them.

Our metropolitan area must also necessarily look forward to the day of air-taxi service, particularly between major airports and downtown. While not yet perfected, the helicopter must be importantly regarded in any long-range plans. The council will watch development closely and encourage the use of helicopters when appropriate.

IV. Sound financial planning

The aviation council recognizes the financial burdens undertaken by cities, counties, and other subdivisions to supply air facilities. As a civic group, the council will attempt in every way possible to prevent unwise and extravagant expenditure. In addition, it will be the purpose of the council, insofar as possible, to have these public expenditures self-supporting.

Sound financial planning, contemplates confidence and courage in making an investment now in the future of aviation, and a certain common sense and wisdom in so investing that there will be no unnecessary burden on the taxpayers.

V. Facilities for military-aviation defense training

The aviation council believes it can render no greater service to this Nation than to see to it, as a matter of national defense, that our air forces are kept at the highest point of efficiency.

To do this our World War II aviators should have facilities for maintaining their skill and experience. There should be provision for the recruits to our National Guard, and Army and Naval Reserve organizations to learn to fly, and especially to learn to maintain and service flying equipment. This can be done only at airports.

It is presently the announced policy of the city of St. Louis to eventually remove from Lambert Field the National Guard, the naval air station, and the privately owned companies now teaching flying and aviation mechanics. With the ultimate carrying out of this decision, the council has no quarrel, but before that is done and before one of these institutions is disturbed, in the slightest, there must be a place for them at other fields in this area.

Naturally it is the primary duty of the armed forces, whether it be Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or National Guard, operated with Federal funds, to provide the final and permanent facilities, including flying fields and housing for personnel and equipment. These are national problems, maintained by national taxes, and an undue portion cannot fall on any State, municipality, or area. The State government, however, and the city government and the county governments can and should spearhead a movement to provide these facilities in their area, and in this improvement the council will lend complete assistance.

VI. Educational program on multiple advantages of air use

The aviation council intends to persuade and to convince the residents of this area of the advantages of air transportation—as a corollary to securing more and better services. But the need of education, aviation-wise, goes beyond that. The lessons of World War II should be remembered so that our population is thoroughly aware of what aviation means, not only to our business life but to our existence as a Nation.

The council will enlist the aid of the schools in developing air-age educational courses, and in presenting the possibilities of the aviation industry as an economic career.

It is the intention of the council to continually demonstrate to the businessman of St. Louis how they can expand their markets both within this country, and internationally, by the intelligent use of air-freight, air-passenger, air-mail, and air-express service, in both buying and selling. Every city is now a world center. Cities located on ocean harbors will gradually lose much of the prestige they now enjoy air-wise, because of their location. Every city which will provide adequate airport facilities has the possibility of being an international port.

Indeed, St. Louis in the center of the Mississippi Valley has more natural advantages than any of the water ports when it comes to air navigation. It is surrounded on all sides—not only on one—with producing and consuming areas. It is far enough from all great waters to escape their natural fog and storm hazards. It has the natural advantages of a great air harbor surrounded by customers. Its citizens must seize this opportunity.

VII. Promotion of safety facilities

To achieve universal acceptance of the use of the air in all its phases, we must achieve universal confidence in all phases of air transportation. The aviation council pledges itself to support such safety measures as are within its power to influence.

The problems of engines, planes, and radio must be left to others, but the council will support a program of air markings so as to aid private flyers not only in locating themselves, but in locating the nearest landing fields. The council will help the civil aeronautical authorities to enforce their regulations against reckless, low flying, and stunt flying in congested areas, and will urge the equipping of Lambert Field and other landing fields with the always up-to-date weather service, radio communication, and "blind landing" radar equipment, field lighting, and modern control-tower devices. It will urge reasonable zoning ordinances to definitely locate proper air-park possibilities and to eliminate approach hazards.

VIII. Development of various types of aviation industry

There are presently employed in the metropolitan area directly engaged in aviation over 8,000 persons. These people are engaged in manufacturing planes, providing the services of the air lines, teaching flying, teaching aviation mechanics, repairing airplanes, selling airplanes, and providing a host of air services such as vacation trips, emergency trips, aerial photography, surveying, and so forth. The future of such an industry, to provide a livelihood and an income for the citizens of this area, is unlimited.

For one reason or another, this area has lost aviation industries which, if they had been retained in St. Louis, would have by now furnished 25,000 jobs.

This problem goes back to 'adequate airport facilities," for all of these industries must live at and upon airports.

The airport program, therefore, which the council proposes to support necessarily includes the retention of these industries.

Economic history reveals the fact that some old industries are always passing out, and new industries coming in to fill up the gaps. A community which is alive to economic progress cannot afford to shut its eyes to the possibility of any such new industry.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is the firm conviction of the aviation council, supported by daily evidence in overwhelming quantities, that aviation is the new industry which offers the greatest opportunity in our economic and social welfare. It is not only an industry in itself; like all transportation, it is the handmaiden to all other industries. Air power is peace power; the national safeguard of our homes, cities, and our American way of life. The aviation council is determined to see that this great metropolitan St. Louis area benefits from aviation industry, obtains the many advantages of air transportation, and regains its position in development of air power as peace power.

Article by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an article which I contributed to the magazine Future, which is published by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. This piece appeared in the December 1946 issue and is entitled "The World's Most Important Publication." It is on the subject of the very publication in which our words here are printed, namely, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I feel that it will be of interest to all of the readers of this renowned periodical.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD'S MOST IMPORTANT PUBLICATION

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"Mr. President, I rise to address the Senate on what I humbly believe to be most vital topic today in America."

"Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present."

"Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?"

"I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute."

These are the parliamentary echoes of the United States Congress, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the world's most important publication.

Probably not one in every hundred of our citizens has ever seen a copy of the RECORD, yet this magazine's contents affect their lives and destinies more than those of any other periodical on earth. Since the RECORD carries each previous day's verbatim proceedings of the United States Senate and House of Representatives when either or both of the two Chambers was in session, the paragraphs of the RECORD affect every businessman, farmer, housewife, veteran, wage earner—as regards their taxes, their income, their health, their well-being, and that of their country. Moreover, in the contracted world of the atomic age, the contents of the RECORD are of first-rank importance throughout the globe.

What comprises those contents? Speeches, debate, articles, press releases, statistical tables, texts of bills, committee reports and amendments, messages from one House to another House, messages from the President, lists of persons nominated to positions ranging from postmasters to ambassadors.

The publication that carries this varied assortment of public items is adless, pictureless, and profitless. It mirrors rhetoric, wit, humor, pathos, strategy, and, yes, boredom now and then as Congress wades long and deep through complicated issues.

When Members of either Chamber pass away, the following session is usually devoted to tributes to the departed colleague. (That prompted one lady to write her Congressman: "Please send me some more RECORDS containing memorial tributes for some of your dead Congressmen. I enjoy reading them so much!")

Actually, when the average citizen picks up a copy of the RECORD, like as not he is not particularly attracted by the comparatively dull typography and format of its three-column pages. His imagination is probably not very thrilled by the somewhat stilted but very functional language of Congress chronicled in the RECORD; for example:

"Much as I love and admire my distinguished and affable colleague from Illinois, I must take exception to his recent colloquy on the subject of mules."

But buried within that typography and woven into the subtleties of parliamentary debate are words and deeds of which your grandchildren and mine may read with excited awe.

Tops, therefore, in world and historical significance, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has many other unique distinctions. It is tops among the world's reading matter in flexibility of size, ranging from 2 to 300 pages or more per issue. This broad size range makes for an unusual pricing system: single copies of the RECORD can be bought by the public from the Government Printing Office (or from a special booth in Statuary Hall in the Capitol) at the rate of 3 cents for a RECORD of 24 pages and a penny extra for each additional eight pages in the particular issue of the RECORD.

The RECORD is also exceptional in speed of publication. Congressman Jones and his colleagues may, for example, deliver speeches in the House of Representatives at 4:30 in the afternoon on Tuesday. By the time they have arrived at their offices early Wednesday morning, their complete speeches, possibly full of elaborate statistical tables which they did not bother to deliver orally, are accurately set up in the freshly printed RECORDS awaiting them on their desks.

Another singular feature is that the RECORD is tops in complete freedom and variety of contents. Unrestrained and uncensored by any editor, it ranges in mild or fiery language over every conceivable subject, just as the Congressmen want it, from alpaca wool to zinc, from Asia to Zanzibar, with content and style restrictions dictated only by obvious rules of propriety.

Last, but far from least in its special features, the RECORD is unfortunately not tops, but relatively at the bottom in size of circulation (reaching a mere 43,000 subscribers or purchasers daily).

Just how the RECORD takes on its qualities is this.

THE RECORD'S SCHEDULE

From the opening of the legislative session, usually at 12 noon, several times a week, when the Presiding Officer's gavel falls and the Ministers of the Senate and House open proceedings with prayers for Divine aid and guidance, crack shorthand reporters take down the verbatim record of whatever transpires in both Houses. Everything is faithfully recorded by the reporters—the great oratory, the brief remarks, the attendance called, the roll-call votes, the committee notices, the questions, the answers, the debate cross-fire, the occasional laughter.

If Congressmen desire, they may edit the rough version of their own remarks on the official transcript within a matter of an hour or so after they have spoken and the "hot copy" is turned over to them.

Congressmen may also ask (and just about always get) "unanimous consent" to "extend their remarks," that is, to have inserted in the body of the Appendix of the RECORD, remarks, statistics, letters, articles, speeches, which they themselves may not actually have read or delivered on the floor of the Senate or the House. This is a particularly important practice in the House of Representatives. Since time for speaking on the House floor is at such a premium among 435 Representatives, they use the "extension of remarks" in the Appendix to present statements which they could not otherwise place in the RECORD.

In this way, too, the Appendix of the RECORD gets to be quite a bulky affair in its own right. By virtue of its ability to reprint outside material, it comes to contain much of the cream of the Nation's speeches, newspaper articles, magazine pieces, and radio talks which strike particular Congressmen's fancies as being worthy of permanent note and which they, therefore, ask to have inserted.

By late afternoon, Congress' proceedings have usually come to an end, those Congressmen who cared to edit their remarks have done so and the reams of transcribed reporters' copy are sped on their way to the Composing Division of the Government Printing Office.

From there on (usually beginning at about 6:30) the publication procedure followed is similar to that pursued at break-neck pace in a modern newspaper plant. The copy is set in type; stereotypes are made; printed on 3 huge 64-page presses with a speed of 12,000 impressions an hour each; bound; wrapped; and delivered to the Washington post office in mail sacks by an underground conveyor belt and to Congressmen's offices by special messenger.

Legislative history is thus recorded for all who would read it. But just who does read it?

THE RECORD'S DISTRIBUTION

The figures of the RECORD's circulation and revenue appear like so many peanuts in comparison to those involved in any large sized modern magazine.

Only about 39,500 copies of the daily edition are printed and distributed to officials as provided by Federal law. Each Senator is allowed up to 100 complimentary copies of the daily edition and 5 copies of the thick, handsome bound edition. Representatives are allowed 68 copies of the daily edition and 3 copies of the bound edition. A mere 2,900 copies of the bound edition are printed. A biweekly index to the RECORD is printed in a total of about 11,500 copies.

Free copies of the RECORD are supplied to the officers and committees of Congress, to certain officials and libraries of the United States and the States, and to designated depository libraries, foreign legations, and certain newspaper correspondents. The cost of printing these copies is paid from the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress. In recent years, since Congress has been in almost continuous session, the charge to the appropriation for this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has averaged about $900,000 per year for an average of about 16,000 type pages.

In addition to the copies provided by law, about 3,000 copies of the daily edition are published. These copies serve to fill requisitions from the Government Printing Office's Superintendent of Documents who supplies subscribers to the RECORD. These subscribers pay for the RECORD at the rate of $1.50 per month. Requisitions from various Government departments for additional copies are also filled from the afore-mentioned supply of 3,000.

The amount received from subscribers varies from $20,000 to $23,000 per year, and $7,000 to $8,000 per year is received from departments for additional copies. The Superintendent of Documents also orders for sale each session 50 copies of the Bound Edition, from which is realized from $1,500 to $2,000, depending on the number of volumes.

RECORD REPRINTS

Yet, there is a sizable byproduct of the RECORD and this consists of the reprints which are made from it. Under the law, Congressmen are allowed to order reprints in leaflet or booklet form from the RECORD at cost price in order that the Congressmen might, without undue expense to themselves, keep constituents informed of legislators' positions on current affairs.

Thus, the Congressmen order reprints from the RECORD in a total of millions of pages per year. The envelopes in which the reprints are inserted are supplied free by the Government to the Congressmen as is the printing of the title and the speaker's name on the envelope, unless the title of the reprint as carried on the envelope exceeds 12 words in length. The envelope with enclosed reprints is, of course, mailed postage free under the Congressman's frank.

This system has resulted in rare, but oftimes overexaggerated abuses. Such abuses occur when a Congressman orders reprinted from the RECORD at Government cost-price, of course, a speech or article written or delivered by some outsider which is then mailed postage-free in very large quantities. Were the speech printed and mailed privately, the cost would, of course, be tremendous in comparison to the Government cost-prices.

The above abuse occurs far more infrequently than is indicated by the professional breast-beaters who often denounce this admittedly undesirable practice. The check of a potentially aroused public opinion is more than sufficient to prevent any but rare abuse of the Congressman's franking privilege.

Ofttimes public criticism is also leveled against Congressmen for the particular materials which they have inserted in the RECORD, whether or not they reprint it in leaflet form. It should be noted here that, with certain qualifications, if the inserts are over two pages in length the Senator or Representative must announce at the time of his proposed insertion the cost to the Government of printing it (at the rate of about $52 per RECORD page). In any case, the Senator or Congressman must get unanimous consent from his colleagues for any insertion whatsoever.

Although Congressmen may at times err all too humanly in judgment by asking that trivial or overlengthy materials be inserted in the RECORD, there will be few to deny that almost universally this insertion practice is honored faithfully with the public interest in mind. More often than not, the criticism directed against Congressmen on this score is more narrow-minded and carping than it is public-spirited in origin.

Some years ago I remember being criticized for inserting an article in the Appendix of the RECORD by the late Dr. Alexis Carrel on the power and technique of prayer. I doubt now if there will be many of my readers who would gainsay that such an insertion on this subject was potentially quite helpful in solving legislative problems and the crucial issues of that day and this.

In a different vein, there comes to mind a recent incident, faithfully chronicled in the RECORD, which proves that this worthy publication can be other than dry as dust. It can frequently be touched with humor and spirited exchanges between Congressmen. The former quality may be illustrated in this colloquy which occurred during the Bretton Woods Agreement debate and which involved my colleague the Senator from New Hampshire, the Honorable CHARLES TOBEY, and myself:

"Mr. TOBEY. The correct pronounciation is 'Bretton'—with a short 'e.' Will the Senator please pronounce it correctly? It jangles my nerves to hear it called 'Bray-ton' Woods.

"Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator, but I am not so sure he is correct. It depends upon whether one is in Wisconsin, New Hampshire, on the high seas, or in Britain, Brittany, or elsewhere. I am sorry the Senator's nerves are so tender.

"Mr. TOBEY. If the Senator were to call it 'Bray-ton' Woods in New Hampshire, he might not come out alive."

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is, of course, composed on the whole of more substantial stuff than the above quotation would indicate.

THE RECORD AND YOU

The RECORD is beyond question worthy of reading, if only on occasion, by every young and old citizen of the Republic. In that way, you can come to understand at almost first hand the workings of your Congress and the thinking and acting of your own 531 legislators. Your understanding is particularly important in view of the imminence of the 1946 elections.

You can get in the RECORD habit by consulting the RECORD in your library or by writing your Senator or Congressman for a free sample copy. (His regular subscription allotment is usually exhausted among the libraries in his State or district, so that he will probably only have individual copies available to send out.)

If there are particular issues of the RECORD you wish, in order to look up the debate on some particular subject, write to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Specify the dates and ask for their price which you later remit. The prices will, as previously indicated, depend upon the length of time in which one or both Houses WAS or were in session on the particular days and upon the amount of insertions in the body and the Appendix of the RECORD in those issues.

IMPROVING THE RECORD

For its own part, Congress can do much to make the RECORD a more interesting and valuable medium. Already, in the legislative reorganization bill, passed in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress, it directed that each day's RECORD be henceforth indexed as the previous day's subject matter, carrying a résumé of the program of that day, together with a list of congressional meetings and hearings on the succeeding day. But Congress can do more on behalf of a better RECORD. Through its Joint Committee on Printing, it should modernize the style and format of the RECORD, extend its distribution and make its price more uniform. Why, for example, could not the RECORD be made more appealing to the reader's eye and at the same time be placed on sale on principal newsstands throughout the country? The possible competition with private magazines would be negligible; in fact, a relatively mass circulation of the RECORD would probably stimulate other magazines' circulation. And, too, such a move might have vast beneficial effects in stimulating public interest and information on Congress, both of which could at present stand much improvement.

The world's most important publication deserves a better break at the hands of Congress and the people.

Reclamation Realities in the Missouri Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered before the North Dakota Reclamation Association at Williston, N. Dak., on November 8, 1946, by Goodrich W. Lineweaver, Director, Branch of Operation and Maintenance, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C. The subject of the address was Reclamation Realities in the Missouri Basin, and it deals frankly with problems that confront the people of the Missouri Basin as well as the executive departments and the Congress in connection with the reclamation phases of the Missouri Basin project.

The recognition by Congress of the Missouri Basin project through its authorization in the Flood Control Act of 1944 and subsequent appropriations has given this vast project an excellent start. There are, however, many hurdles yet to be taken that will require the utmost cooperation on the part of the people of the Missouri Basin States with the Bureau of Reclamation. As a Senator from a State that is vitally interested in the progress of the Missouri Basin project, I am deeply concerned that all agencies responsible for advancing this development shall cooperate, and that obstacles shall be smoothed out promptly so that construction can go ahead without delay.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Bureau of Reclamation has scheduled a 6-year construction program on the multiple-purpose Missouri Basin project. More than half a billion dollars is required to carry out that construction schedule for authorized irrigation works, power plants, and transmission lines.

I am here today to talk to you about what is necessary on your part and our part to translate this schedule into realities. These realities in the Missouri Basin fall naturally in two classes. The first class is the achievements; the second is the hurdles still ahead.

Heading the list of achievements is the extension to the entire Missouri Basin of a comprehensive reclamation development through approval by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944 of the coordinated plan of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. The Congress also authorized the appropriation of $350,000,000 toward the construction of the reclamation features of the plan, and efforts are being concentrated on the 29 units in the initial stage.

The Congress has already appropriated $31,480,300 for actual work. Construction contracts already awarded total $11,090,000 on units that will cost about $41,000,000 to complete at current prices. Field engineering is being pressed. Designs and specifications and other preconstruction activities are going forward for units to cost up to the $350,000,000 authorized for expenditure by the Congress. Factual surveys are progressing to provide detailed economic information to aid

in final designs of the project and to furnish specific information supporting appropriation requests.

The second phase of these realities recognizes the hurdles that must be overcome. In order to get the first 29 units constructed a prime requirement is repayment arrangements for the reimbursable irrigation share of the costs. Demonstrating to the Congress that construction appropriations should be made to maintain the reclamation schedule is an immediate task you must recognize, and regular appropriations will be of concern annually until the entire project is completed.

Modernizing the reclamation law is another of the Missouri Basin realities. Urgent consideration is needed to retain the basic principles of the law while adapting its provisions to present-day conditions as they exist in this basin and elsewhere west of the ninety-seventh meridian. The aims and objectives of the Missouri Basin project must be brought home to the people of the area it will serve. Then there is the necessity of informing the rest of the country what the Missouri River at work will do in enlarging the local, State, and National tax base, and the new purchasing power to be created. Major attention must be focused on the human values—the people, the homes, and the communities that must be protected from repetition of the disastrous consequences of the drought of the thirties.

With this preview, let's take a more detailed look at these achievements and problems. The Bureau of Reclamation, together with the people of the Missouri Basin, has come a long way with this project since November 1943, when Assistant Commissioner William E. Warne, speaking before your association at Valley City, outlined the plan which later was embodied in Senate Document 191 of May 1944. The pioneer work by W. G. Sloan in formulating a basin-wide approach to the development of western water resources is universally acclaimed. In Washington, Harry W. Bashore, then Commissioner of Reclamation, took the leadership in effecting the reconciliation of the program of the Bureau of Reclamation with that of the Corps of Engineers initiated by Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick.

This reconciliation led to the most constructive piece of legislation for the conservation and use of western water and land resources since the passage of the reclamation law of 1902. The Flood Control Act of 1944, to which I refer, did even more than set in motion the Missouri Basin program. It is a milestone in the recognition of the superior rights of water for irrigation in the arid and semiarid West and in assuring participation by the States in shaping their destinies which are bound up with the economic use of the water on the land.

Such organizations as the North Dakota Reclamation Association, through your representatives in Congress, were effective in securing enactment of that magna carta of western irrigation. Your eternal vigilance is necessary to insure protection of this legislative recognition of the priority of water for irrigation.

Today, under the leadership of Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug and Commissioner Michael W. Straus, the Bureau of Reclamation has started the transformation of the Missouri Basin project into reality. In this field we have the full cooperation of every agency of the Department of the Interior. Through the Federal Inter-Agency Committee we are working with the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, and the seven States of the basin.

Construction forces are at work on the Missouri Basin project. On the Bureau's units, the dirt has begun to fly at Kortes Dam in southern Wyoming, at the Boysen Dam near the Wyoming-Montana line, and at the Angostura Dam in southwestern South Dakota. Bids have been received from contractors for the construction of the first feature of another irrigation unit—the Frenchman-Cambridge—in Nebraska.

The Heart Butte Dam of the Heart River unit in west central North Dakota is scheduled as the next construction job the Bureau is to start in this section of the Missouri Basin. The Heart River unit is described as your guinea pig of irrigation in North Dakota. This isn't an experiment for the Bureau of Reclamation, for we will make sure that it is more than an engineering achievement. The realities for making the Heart River unit a success require programming of the project development as to insure throughout the area the fullest beneficial use of the crops produced in the irrigated valley. Through this integrated land use, stockmen and dry-land ranchers will be protected from the disastrous shock of drought, and at the same time there will be maximum benefits to the commercial interests of your cities and towns.

Dickinson Dam, a feature of the Heart River unit, will be primarily devoted to the municipal water supply for the city whose name it bears. Provision in the project plan for municipal water evidences the confidence of the city of Dickinson and the Bureau of Reclamation that west central North Dakota can be a community of permanent prosperous homes. That confidence rests on the security that irrigation of the Heart River Valley will bring to the whole trade area.

That confidence cannot rest on continuation of the present system of dry-land farming and ranching. The bountiful harvests of the past few years, when happily a wet cycle coincided with high prices, should not obscure your recollection of the devastating drought of the thirties. You can recall when crops were withered if they grew at all, when your livestock was slaughtered to prevent death from thirst and starvation, and your people fled the farms and the cities and towns in search of security in the irrigated areas to the westward. In the Midwest and East, the loss of markets in the Great Plains for the products of factories and farms added to unemployment and swelled relief rolls. The Federal Treasury turned into the Plains States more than a billion and a quarter dollars in relief and other aid in a well-nigh futile effort to combat human suffering that followed in the wake of the drought. It is worthy of note that the cost to the Federal Treasury of those critical years in the Missouri Basin alone was nearly twice as much as the estimated cost of the projects in the initial stage of the reclamation program even at the currently rising prices of construction.

Under exclusive dry-land agriculture, North Dakota is losing population. From 1930 to 1940, while the national population increased 7.2 percent, North Dakota's population decreased 6 percent, 43 of your 53 counties had a net decrease of more than 40,000 people. Since 1940, in spite of prosperity, the civilian population of North Dakota has continued to decrease, not considering men in the military service.

Creation of these irrigated family-size farms will provide unequalled settlement opportunities for the 470,000 young men and women from the Missouri Basin put into uniform during the war. You can extend a welcoming hand to the people who entered war work in other States.

The initial stage of the Bureau's basin plan includes a Knife River unit and five irrigation pumping systems on the main stem of the Missouri, as well as the Missouri-Souris development. The great Missouri-Souris area in North Dakota and Montana embraces the largest acreage of any single irrigation development in the United States. It will also supply municipal water to cities and towns in the James River and Red River Valleys which, together with the restoration of Devil's Lake, makes it truly of State-wide significance. At the same time, the Bureau of Reclamation is looking into every possibility of using to the full the potential irrigation and power opportunities of the Garrison Reservoir being constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

At this very time, the Bureau is forging the first link of its power transmission network of the basin project. The transmission line being constructed to carry power from Fort Peck Dam for construction purposes at Garrison Dam will have permanent use as the backbone of the transmission grid to carry Missouri River power to the rural areas of western North Dakota.

Fort Peck power plant, together with those on Bureau projects in Wyoming, Colorado, and Nebraska, forms the nucleus of the future reclamation power program in the Missouri Basin.

As the major dams in the coordinated plan are completed and linked by a transmission grid, there will be large blocks of low-cost power to illuminate the ranches and homes, lighten the burdens on the farms, for industrial purposes, and to serve cities and towns. Generators of nearly 2,000,000 kilowatts capacity are included in the projects being readied for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. This capacity will ultimately produce about 5,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy that will be transmitted by the reclamation grid being readied for early construction.

Other benefits from this multiple-purpose project must be recognized. The Missouri River Basin has areas of outstanding importance in the conservation of fish and wildlife and recreation, and the Bureau proposes to protect and develop these areas with local and national agencies involved.

Silt control, irrigation of Indian lands, further development of mineral resources, and numerous other advantages must also be taken into consideration. Each is a contributing factor to the amazing total of benefits which will be made possible by construction of the project.

North Dakota, as well as each of the other Missouri Basin States, must be solidly behind the Missouri Basin program to assure that it will move ahead on schedule. First, it is essential that all of the people of your State recognize the value of having the program moving ahead on full scale and at a scheduled rate that will bring the initial stage engineering features and project developments into effective operation before another great drought devastates the Plains. All of the people of your State must have the solid conviction that the irrigation and multiple-purpose features are needed for full operation year in and year out regardless of whether it is the wet cycle or the dry cycle. To have an effective Missouri Basin project, you cannot permit construction activities to move on an intermittent stop-and-go basis. Orderly construction schedules are essential to bring in the irrigation water supply before the inevitable drought returns. In the same way, irrigation areas must be fully farmed year in and year out, and an orderly marketing pattern must be established for irrigated crops so that there will be irrigated islands of safety in the drought years when they are desperately needed. Securing solid and wholehearted State-wide understanding of those realities must be the first task of your educational program.

Determination of a proper share of the construction costs which must be repaid by water users is a critical problem on which the Bureau of Reclamation needs your participation, in working out a solution. Under the reclamation laws since 1902, there has been established the principle of reimbursability of reclamation projects. I am confident that all of you here support that principle as a sound and wise basis for federally financed irrigation developments. Your support is particularly justified in view of the statutory

provision that the annual payments by water users shall not exceed their repayment ability and the total obligation they are required to assume shall be a fair share of the construction costs.

Since publication of Senate Document 191 construction estimates have risen greatly. On certain units, due to rise in prices and completion of engineering plans, the cost estimates at current prices are from 50 to 300 percent greater than the estimates at 1940 levels. Inevitably, consideration must be given to the fair share of the increased construction cost that is to be repaid by irrigation water users over a period of time consistent with their repayment ability.

Before leaving that subject, I must remind you that continuation of construction appropriations by the Congress can be expected only if there is clear-cut evidence to satisfy the Appropriation Committee members and the Congress as a whole that the project landowners are ready to assume their fair share of the construction costs. The Reclamation law requires a repayment contract before irrigation water is delivered to the land and for some years it was the policy of the Bureau and the Department of the Interior to require a duly executed contract before construction began as evidence of the good faith and willingness of the water users to become partners in the enterprise. The policy has been modified to recognize, in lieu of a duly executed repayment contract other satisfactory evidence of the willingness of a water user's organization to assume a realistic repayment obligation. That modification permits a call for bids or even start of actual work on a major facility such as a storage dam on any Missouri Basin irrigation unit. However, the negotiation of repayment contracts must be prosecuted diligently because the Congress requires tangible evidence of good faith on the part of the water users before it will appropriate funds to meet the Bureau's construction schedules.

Final execution of the repayment contracts involves many time-consuming legal formalities, and I trust that no construction appropriations will be withheld until all these final steps are completed. Nevertheless, I feel sure that the amounts of construction funds appropriated will, in large measure, be gaged by the rapidity with which the project landowners represented through the irrigation districts execute contracts for repayment of a suitable proportion of the construction costs.

I will touch again on a point I mentioned earlier—namely, modernization of the reclamation law. In the 44-year period following enactment of the basic Reclamation Act there have been recurring modifications of the original authorities, such as extension of the repayment period from 10 years to 20 years to 40 years. Just as the horse is giving way to the tractor, so must the old reclamation single-purpose project vehicle be supplemented by a new legislative conveyance equipped to deal with coordinated multiple-purpose basin development.

Some of you heard Commissioner Straus, speaking before the recent Omaha convention of the National Reclamation Association, outline a new approach to western reclamation. I am going to take the liberty of quoting some of his remarks because they are particularly applicable to the realities of reclamation in the Missouri Valley.

"Reclamation here today," the Commissioner said, "is an institution that also does not advocate abandoning any of the time-tested and sound fundamentals of reclamation law, including the tenet that those benefited should contribute to the expense in accordance with their rewards and their ability to pay. But we have a strong case to present to the Congress next year for a change with the times.

"Today, as our country fills up, there is increasing and undeniable interest in the development of our recreation and fish and wildlife resources. This growing demand should not be contested but should be well served at future multiple-purpose reclamation reservoirs. They offer this opportunity without detriment to irrigation. So, during the last days of the Seventy-ninth Congress, we obtained a new law (Public Law 732), worthy of your attention, which authorized allocations on a basis that the irrigator need not repay that part of the cost of our reclamation projects that can properly be allocated to benefits to fish and wildlife. Why, now, should the reclamation laws not be amended in the same way with respect to purely recreational features of a reservoir so that these benefits are achieved without saddling the expense of the vacationist or the nature lover at reclamation reservoirs on the local water users, as required by present law? The answer, of course, is that such action is due. The Bureau of the Budget and the President have already approved a proposal by Reclamation to have recreation benefits allocated as nonreimbursable national benefits, thus lifting this fiscal burden from the backs of the irrigationists. With proper attention of the Western States, this proposal, already approved as to language, will pass Congress and become law."

Then the Commissioner went on to say that the modernization of the reclamation laws should not stop there.

"Why, for an example of inconsistency," he asked, "should the United States charge western power users 3 percent interest for investments in developing the power of rivers right in our country here while the same United States lends billions of dollars at less than 2 percent interest to countries all over the world for the same and other purposes thousands of miles from our homes? I am satisfied that our reclamation power interest rate should be lowered to at least 2 percent. We are discriminating against ourselves and must continue to do so under the present laws until you change them."

The Commissioner then asked a very pertinent question. "Why, when we study the place of Federal irrigation in our economic picture, do we look through the wrong end of the spyglass? Legislativewise we keep our books on the basis that any balances due on a project—on Boulder Dam or Coulee Dam—are debts. But in balancing the books we seem to be blind to the fact that these and similar capital investments on the other side of the ledger become credits ranking, without challenge, among our most productive national assets.

"We have drifted into some sort of corkscrew thinking whereby, after we proved it sound to first develop our national strength and wealth by granting some 130,000,000 acres of our Federal treasure to the railroads which opened the West, now we act as if it is unsound to secure our national strength and wealth in the West with our Federal treasure, even when Uncle Sam keeps title to the works built, unless under an advance contract it be paid back in 40 years by water and power users. When irrigation creates from the desert or sagebrush a Phoenix, a Boise, a Scotts Bluff, or specifically, a Yakima—on which an investment of $37,000,000 over a period of years brought back in the single year of 1945 crops worth $78,000,000—are we or are we not broadening the tax base? Is the wealth created at a Yakima taxable or not—and is it taxed?

"For a number of years now, the United States has considered expenditures to control floods—expenditures in the national interest to be paid from the National Treasury and not by the local beneficiaries. Of course, this has naturally lured many localities to disguise irrigation developments as flood control proposals with frequently sad results. But what no one can explain is why in the name of logic, consistency, or wisdom, it is a local reimbursable benefit for which the farmer should pay to aid agriculture by putting water on acres, and at the same time it is not a local but a national and nonreimbursable benefit for which the farmer should not pay to aid agriculture by holding water off acres—frequently the same acres at different seasons.

"The last Congress started a reexamination of the reclamation laws. The undertaking will be resumed by the next Congress. Now is the time to liberalize the reclamation laws. Our ability to discharge the tasks we have undertaken in great measure rests on further development of the ever-evolving reclamation laws that are both our legal foundation and our actual ceiling. Give this matter your full attention and wisdom in the coming months so that we may be enabled to go forward undeterred to our mutual goal of putting all the available water in the arid West to useful work."

Gentlemen, this is the expressed policy of Mr. Straus concerning the future of reclamation. Again, let me say to you that his ideas apply with particular reality to the Missouri Basin. We have a great water resource development authorized by law, but there is much to be done before the Missouri River and its tributaries are really put to work for the people of the basin and of the Nation.

Administrative Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the most important subjects facing the Eightieth Congress is the straightening out of the relationships between Federal agencies and our citizenry in order to make certain that the hirelings of the Federal Government work in the capacity of servants rather than masters of our people. The relationship between the agencies and the courts will also merit much attention by us in the future as it has in the past. A noteworthy step along this line was the passage by the Seventy-ninth Congress of the Administrative Procedure Act, with which my colleagues are familiar. Nevertheless, many questions are arising from day to day over the operation of that act; questions such as relate to the evidence receivable at agency hearings, the lawful bases of agency decision, the limitations on agency discretion, the plenary scope of judicial review of "legal wrongs" through agency action or inaction, the powers and duties of the courts to review agency decisions and grant relief, and so forth.

It is essential to the correct functioning of this act that our citizenry have a clear idea about these and other questions. Therefore, all the light that can be thrown on the picture will be of service. Along this line I ask that there be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD, following these brief remarks, the text of an address which our colleague, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], delivered before the assembly of the American Bar Association at its last annual meeting, and

which was subsequently printed in the December 1946 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. In it the Senator from Nevada makes many interesting observations regarding the application of the Administrative Procedure Act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVING ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE: HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE; SCOPE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW

(By PAT MCCARRAN)

It is a great source of gratification to me to have this opportunity to speak to the legal profession of the United States of America, here gathered in annual assembly. To improve and perfect the administration of justice is the aim of all of us, and certainly this is the time and the place to talk about it.

It is often assumed that there are many kinds of justice. There is said to be arbitrary justice, which has always seemed to me to be a conflict of words. Then there is justice according to law, which it is the purpose of the Constitution of the United States to establish. There is the justice of legislatures, of courts, and of administrators or executives. It is primarily of the latter instrumentalities of justice that I speak today; but of course—so long as our Constitution survives—they do not and cannot operate independently of Congress and the judiciary.

There are four things that I want to say about administrative justice: First, because we are an imaginative people and because we regard principle highly, justice with us is something different than mere official fiat. Second, because from the time of the settlement of this land we have been devoted to the tenets of representative government, legislation does and must play a major part in all matters of justice. Third, because after a century and a half of national history we have just now adopted an Administrative Procedure Act, it is important to examine its broader aspects. And fourth, because only a beginning has as yet been made, a word should be said respecting the tasks that remain to be done in the immediate future.

I. JUSTICE IS DIFFERENT FROM OFFICIAL FIAT

The Constitution of the United States opens with the declaration of purpose of the American people to establish justice. Such a purpose requires that government regulation be pursued, and that controversies be settled, upon an ethical and rational basis. The means to that end are the laws of the land. The vehicles by which they are applied are the courts and, of late years, the administrative agencies of the United States. Both courts and agencies, it should go without saying, must operate not only within the laws but within the purpose of the laws and the Constitution.

However, two contrary points of emphasis have gained considerable currency in the last decade or so. The first might almost be called the cult of discretion. The other is the assumption that whatever is official, or officially done, is necessary and therefore lawful. While discretion has its place and government must operate, it should require no argument to demonstrate that constant emphasis on these two themes will inevitably destroy government according to law and substitute mere fiat in the place of justice.

Law versus arbitrary power

Where law ends, arbitrary power begins. If the laws may be bent to the preferences of any official agent or tribunal, they cease to be laws, and become merely advisory declarations of the legislature. But this Nation was founded upon the premise, enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, that all arbitrary executive power is to be avoided. It is therefore unsound and unwise to divide government into matters of law and matters of discretion, because such a division implies that the one is as proper as the other. Although we may never wholly achieve it in all details, the whole theory and cast of our Government is that it is a government of law, rather than a government of men. Discretion is merely the inescapable or unintentional residue.

Nor is it any more valid to divide the field into matters of law and matters of government. While it is often convenient to refer to the mixed field of law and government, we do not mean thereby that matters of government are beyond the law. Under our constitutional system, governmental powers must be exercised within the law.

The aim of all law must be justice

In connection with either discretion or government, it is important also to bear in mind that law means not merely the letter of the statutes. The aim of all law is justice. Justice is the aim of statutory law. It is the aim of judge-made law. It must also be the aim of administrative law. We will do well, therefore, to emphasize both law and justice in considering administrative powers and processes. Otherwise the law and the methods of applying it become nothing more than a false front behind which arbitrary, unethical, and irrational operations proceed unrestrained.

My point here is that we must begin with a firm basis—that we seek justice according to law, that discretion must play a subordinate part, and that governmental processes derive no validity from the mere fact that they are official. We may at times fancy that, as a practical people, we can safely deviate a bit here and there; but we do so at our peril and, after each such indulgence, the task of bringing our Government again into line with our ideal must be given a high priority.

II. LEGISLATION MUST SET THE STANDARDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

As a regular matter, how are we to achieve justice according to law? I have said that the means and the vehicles to that end are the laws and the tribunals of the land. Here the laws have a dual function. Statutes create and fashion the tribunals, and they state the "law" in its usual sense of substance and procedure.

It is at this point, however, that we reach a crossroads in the field of administrative justice. Those who lean toward administrative absolutism maintain that statutes should create and empower agencies—but should go no further. Yet if we are to achieve a regime of law, there are several obvious answers to that new political creed.

If there is no statutory law respecting procedure, administrative processes are left to be regulated solely under the broad phrases of the Constitution. But the Constitution does not mention administrative agencies or functions. In fact, it contains the barest passing reference to executive departments of government. Its framers assumed that laws would be made by Congress and applied by the courts. They assumed that trial by jury would supply additional popular safeguards. They assumed that limitations on criminal law processes would preserve civil liberties. Yet administrative justice is subject to none of these limitations.

Law must regulate and control the agencies

Even more important is the fact that the Constitution is not, and was not intended to be, a code of law. It sets up a form of government. Administrative justice has been engrafted upon that form. It remains for us to provide a realm of law within which administrative agencies are to operate, just as law has been provided for courts to administer and a judicial code has been developed. Both substantive and procedural law have been provided for courts.

There is more reason to do both for administrative agencies, because courts may draw upon the principles of the common law and long tradition has given them a mode of procedure—whereas agencies do not profess to be bound by tradition and claim no descent from the common law.

Piecemeal regulation will not do

It is sometimes said that, although these things may be true, the substantive and procedural law applicable to an administrative agency should be prescribed piecemeal, for that agency alone.[1] In other fields, however, we instinctively and diligently seek uniformity and conformity in matters of procedure. Diversity merely feeds confusion, which is a great vice in any form of government and operates to defeat the very purposes of good government. Moreover, when administrative agencies are created or when additional powers are given to them, it is because there is some immediate and important public issue to be settled. The question is whether to regulate or not to regulate, and if so to what extent, rather than how to regulate. It is utterly impractical to expect Congress, at such a time, to enact a complete procedural law for one agency or one function. Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that procedural provisions respecting particular administrative agencies are often fragmentary, usually hastily improvised, and sometimes unwisely imitative.

These answers will not satisfy those who are distrustful of written law and who therefore seek to reduce legal processes to nothing more than individual judgments or orders in particular cases. Nor will they satisfy those who are distrustful of legislation by the elected representatives of the people and who advocate instead the delegation of legislative and judicial powers to bodies of appointed specialists.

The necessity for law making by Congress

But if we are to have law in this field, we must have legislation. If our legislation is to be sound and wise, it must be grounded upon an understanding of the whole field of administrative justice. If it is to regularize, simplify, and make workable that field, then it must apply to all agencies and all functions. The need has been recognized by most of those whose duty it is to oversee the administration of the laws.[2]

On June 11, 1946, the Administrative Procedure Act became a part of the law of the land.[3] It was the culmination of many years of official studies, legislative hearings, and cooperative discussions.[4] It is drawn on a functional basis, and hence applies to all agencies or operations within its terms. The Gordian knot has thus been cut. We have made a beginning. Let us examine what it is and what it means.

---

[1] "Until now it has been the policy of the Congress to set up in the organic act creating a new agency at least a rough outline of procedures suitable to its distinctive functions." Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, memorandum accompanying veto message relating to the Walter-Logan bill (H. Doc. 986, 76th Cong., p. 8).

[2] In 1938 the Attorney General advised the President that "there is a need for procedural reform in the wide and growing field of administrative law" (S. Doc. 8, 77th Cong.). In 1945 the Attorney General stated: "The time is ripe for some measure of control and prescription by legislation. I cannot agree that there is anything inherent in the subject of administrative procedure, however complex it may be, which defies workable codification" (S. Rept. 752, 79th Cong., p. 38).

[3] Public, No. 404, 79th Cong., ch. 324, entitled "An act to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure." For the collected legislative documents, see S. Doc. 248, 79th Cong.

[4] See H. Rept. 1980, 79th Cong., p. 7 et seq.; and S. Rept. 752, 79th Cong., p. 1 et seq.; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, pt. 2, p. 2148 et seq.

III. SCOPE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The Administrative Procedure Act covers many subjects, which combine into an indispensable whole. It recognizes that administrative agencies both make and apply law, exercising legislative as well as judicial functions,[5] and that they operate through both informal and formal (or hearing) procedures.[6] Agencies are defined and functional exceptions have been drawn.[7]

The approach is summarized in the following words of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the United States: [8]

"The principal problems of the committee have been: First, to distinguish between different types of administrative operations. Second, to frame general requirements applicable to each type of operation. Third, to set forth those requirements in clear and simple terms. Fourth, to make sure that the bill is complete enough to cover the whole field.

"The committee feels that it has avoided the mistake of attempting to oversimply the measure. It has, therefore, not hesitated to state functional classifications and exceptions where those could be rested upon firm grounds. In so doing, it has been the undeviating policy to deal with types of functions as such and in no case with administrative agencies by name. * * *

"The committee feels that administrative operations should be treated as a whole lest the neglect of some link defeat the purposes of the bill. * * *

"The bill * * * is not a specification of the details of administrative procedure, nor is it a codification of administrative law. Instead, out of long consideration and in the light of the studies heretofore mentioned, there has been framed an outline of minimum basic essentials. * * *

"The bill is designed to afford parties affected by administrative powers a means of knowing what their rights are and how they may be protected. By the same token, administrators are provided with a simple course to follow in making administrative determinations. The jurisdiction of the courts is clearly stated. The bill thus provides for public information, administrative operation, and judicial review."

We may, therefore, safely assume that the statute is, as its framers intended it to be, complete and plenary.

Nine basic premises of the act

The terms of the statute are, of course, technical. The legislative documents which accompany it tend to explain the meaning of particular words and phrases. This is not the place to enter upon a discussion of the minute applications of its several provisions. However, it will fittingly supplement the general description, which I have just read, to enumerate some of the basic premises of the legislation. There are nine that will illustrate the purpose and the coverage of this statute:

1. The first of these basic premises has already been indicated. The field of administrative justice can and must be made subject to democratic legislative processes. Administrative agencies can and must be bound by the statutory law of the land. Therein they have duties as well as powers. They are not ambassadors plenipotentiary, circumscribed by no rules save what they choose to call the good of the state. They are merely agents, bound by the scope of their authority and commanded to do justice in the execution of the laws.[9]

Eliminating mystery and confusion

2. Administrative agencies have an affirmative duty to make known to the public their organization, methods, and procedures as a prerequisite to the exercise of administrative functions.[10] This may be something new, but it is indispensable if the mystery and confusion is to be taken out of the administrative process. Courts operate in the narrow territorial confines of judicial districts, but agencies have a country-wide jurisdiction. Court organization is minutely prescribed by statute, while agencies are left to devise their own set-ups. Court procedure has been standardized by the centuries in its essentials, while administrative methods are new. For these reasons, informational rulemaking by administrative agencies is necessary.

3. In the matter of the exercise of legislative powers the fundamental premise of the new statute is that—even where statutes do not require a hearing—the public has a right to notice and an opportunity to participate in rule making and official action therein must be expressly taken upon a rational basis and for a legitimate purpose.[11]

The separation of judicial functions

4. In the field of adjudication the act requires an amplitude of notice, availability of settlement opportunities, and the separation of functions. In other words, the premise is that the exercise of judicial functions by administrative agencies must be truly judicial in essential form and actual substance.[12]

5. Star-chamber proceedings are outlawed. No one may be denied the right to be accompanied, represented, and advised by counsel, at all times and in all places.[13]

Limitations on investigations

6. Investigatory processes are limited to those required for the purpose of securing the just administration of the laws. In this connection the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has put the matter very well in the following words: [14]

"This section is designed to preclude 'fishing expeditions' and investigations beyond jurisdiction or authority. It applies to any demand, whether or not a formal subpena is actually issued. It includes demands or requests to inspect or for the submission of reports. An investigation must be substantially and demonstrably necessary to agency operations, conducted through authorized and official representatives, and confined to the legal and factual sphere of the agency as provided by law. Investigations may not disturb or disrupt personal privacy, or unreasonably interfere with private occupation or enterprise. They should be conducted so as to interfere in the least degree compatible with adequate law enforcement."

Similarly, the issuance of actual subpenas must be equal, rational, and authorized; and any subpena is contestable prior to or upon enforcement.[15]

Requirements as to hearings

7. Statutory hearings, whether in the field of rule making or adjudication, must generally conform to the accepted modes of receiving proof in nonjury cases and of testing proof.[16] It would be possible to expand on this subject at some length, but the real significance of these provisions will become more apparent in connection with the matter of administrative decisions, which are the crux of administrative justice.

Where statutes require a hearing, the act requires that the exclusive record for decision be made in open hearing,[17] that decisions be made by, or with the recommendations of, hearing officers,[18] and that the private parties concerned be given full opportunity to participate in the decision process.[19] In short, the administrative decision is made part and parcel of the hearing in order to assure that the hearing performs the function for which it is intended and to prevent the decision from departing from the evidence and the issues.

The fundamental requirement respecting statutory hearings and decisions is that administrative action must be taken "upon consideration of the whole record * * * and as supported by and in accordance with the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence." [20] The agency must show upon the record its "ruling upon each" finding or conclusion proposed or exception presented and agency decisions must include not merely findings and conclusions but "the reasons or basis therefor, upon all the material issues of fact, or discretion presented".[21]

Tests as to the evidence

The act is therefore plain—if not indeed redundant—to the effect that evidence, issues, and decisions are a single whole, that the decision may not be made except upon and in accordance with the evidence, and that the evidence must—as the Senate Judiciary Committee report states—meet the tests of reliability and probity "prevailing in courts of law or equity in non-administrative cases." [22]

The same premise is no less plain where no administrative hearing is required or where subjects are excepted from the hearing requirements of secs. 4, 5, 7, and 8.[23] Section 6 (d) requires every agency to state its procedural or other grounds for the denial of any request in rule making or adjudication. If there is no statutory administrative record upon which such a denial is tested, then the act provides for judicial inquiry into the facts, "to the extent that the facts [are] relevant to any pertinent

---

[5] See The Architecture of the Administrative Procedure Act (32 A. B. A. J. 550).

[6] See Informal Dispositions Under the Administrative Procedure Act (32 A. B. A. J. 646).

[7] See Exceptions as to the Administrative Procedure Act (32 A. B. A. J. 749).

[8] S. Rept. 752, 79th Cong., pp. 5–7.

[9] See sec. 9 (a) and the definitions in sec. 2 (f).

[10] See sec. 3. Some of the effects of the public information requirements of sec. 3 are illustrated by the Federal Register of September 11, in which Federal agencies were required to publish their organization and procedure not theretofore made available to the public.

[11] See sec. 4, particularly subsecs. (a) and (b). The remaining subsections further the objective stated in the text.

[12] See sec. 5 as supplemented by secs. 7 (a), 8 (a), and 11. Subsec. (d) of sec. 5 adds an administrative duty to issue declaratory orders in proper cases. Subsecs. (a) and (d) of sec. 6 supplement sec. 5 by providing for informal (that is, nonhearing) procedures. Sec. 9 (b) adds special requirements respecting licensing procedures.

[13] Sec. 6 (a). See also sec. 6 (b).

[14] Sec. 6 (b) and H. Rept. 1980, 79th Cong., p. 32.

[15] Sec. 6 (c); Senate committee report, p. 20; House committee report, p. 33.

[16] Sec. 7 (c). See the extensive legislative history respecting this provision, for which purpose S. Doc. 248, 79th Cong., provides a convenient collection and index.

[17] Sec. 7 (d).

[18] Sec. 8 (a). See also sec. 5 (c).

[19] Sec. 8 (b).

[20] Sec. 7 (c). See also Senate committee report, p. 22; House committee report, pp. 36–37.

[21] Sec. 8 (b).

[22] Senate committee report, p. 22.

[23] In the comparatively unusual case where there is statutory provision for a hearing and consequently for decision upon the record thereof but the subject is exempt from secs. 4, 5, 7, or 8, sec. 10 (e) (B) (5) nevertheless requires substantial evidence which, as the committee reports point out, must meet the tests of sec. 7 (c). See Senate committee report, p. 28; House committee report, p. 45.

issue of law presented."[24] Whether or not there is a statutory administrative hearing, it is therefore undeniably a major premise of the statute that administrative action of any sort must be tested by facts, that the facts must be proved upon a record, and that the proof must meet the tests familiar in traditional Anglo-American judicature.

Questions of law are for the courts

8. So much for questions of fact. But what of questions of law? The act simply and expressly provides that courts "shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of any agency action.[25] Its further premise, moreover, is that discretion must be exercised in a sound and rational manner, and within the objectives permissible under the law. Not only is that the whole tenor of the statute, but the act expressly provides both for the things which are necessary to test the exercise of discretion and for judicial review of matters of discretion.

Thus, statements of grounds are required where denials occur in informal or nonhearing cases of rule making or adjudication.[26] Investigative powers may be exercised only "as authorized" and "in accordance with" the law and the facts.[27] In statutory hearing cases subject to section 8 the agency must make findings and conclusions, and state the reasons and basis therefor, "upon all the material issues of * * * discretion presented on the record."[28] A declaratory order may be issued or refused only in the exercise of "sound discretion."[29]

Judicial review of agency discretion

Judicial review is suspended only "so far as" agency action is "by law" committed to agency discretions.[30] Committed "by law" means, of course, that claimed discretion must have been intentionally given to the agency by the Congress, rather than assumed by it in the absence of express statement of law to the contrary. "Abuse of discretion" is expressly made reviewable.[31]

It should come to no one as a surprise, therefore, that the measure was explained on the floor of the Senate as providing for judicial review of the arbitrary exercise of discretion or of the exercise of discretion based on unsound reasoning[32]—or that on the floor of the House of Representatives it was explained in the following words: [33]

"There are exempted [from judicial review] matters to the extent that they are by law committed to the absolute discretion of administrative agencies. There has been much misunderstanding and confusion of terms respecting the discretion of agencies. They do not have authority in any case to act blindly or arbitrarily. They may not willfully act or refuse to act. Although like trial courts they may determine facts in the first instance and determine conflicting evidence, they cannot act in disregard of or contrary to the evidence or without evidence. They may not take affirmative or negative action without the factual basis required by the laws under which they are proceeding. Of course, they may not proceed in disregard of the Constitution, statutes, or other limitations recognized by law."

It would be hard, therefore, for anyone to argue that this act did anything other than cut down the "cult of discretion" so far as Federal law is concerned.

Plenary review of "legal wrong" by action or inaction

9. Finally, the act expressly provides not only that every instance of "legal wrong" shall be subject to judicial review [34] but that adequate intermediate judicial relief shall be provided,[35] that inaction shall be as much subject to review as excessive action,[36] and that every recognized type of question of law—including supporting evidence for findings upon which agency action rests [37]—shall be subject to judicial review.[38] It is, therefore, a major premise of the statute that judicial review is not merely available but is plenary in every proper sense of the word. No administrative agency need fear it so long as administrative operations accord with law, but no citizen need complain that he is without it if he has been subjected to injury beyond the law.

None of these premises of the Administrative Procedure Act will bear attack, unless the concept of justice according to law is to be abandoned. There is no half-measure or middle road. However, the statute need not be viewed as a strait-jacket for administrative agencies. Except so far as there may be other or "outside" requirements of law,[39] it simplifies as well as directs administrative processes. Official compliance will set at rest endless bickering and discussions as to what is proper procedure. Under the act, agency action may be attacked—but it can be as simply defended. If indeed there is any danger to good and efficient government in the act, that danger lies in its becoming merely a form through indifferent administration, reluctant interpretation, or insufficient public understanding.

IV. CONTINUING VIGILANCE AND FURTHER LEGISLATION ARE ESSENTIAL

What of the future? Government is always restless. Apart from the fact that we live in an era of governmental violence in many parts of the globe and that we have just completed the shooting phase of the greatest war of our history in order to put down such violence, we would be foolhardy to assume that government can stand still at home in the Western Hemisphere. Those who would change our form of government may for the moment at least be reduced to a remnant, but nevertheless government will continue to do things, to undertake new programs, and to devise new measures to alleviate the evils of the day.

In the field of administrative justice we as a nation, seeking either to maintain or perfect our domestic institutions, should forge ahead along two main lines: First, we should enforce and expand what we have done in the field of justice. Democracy must not merely work, but must function, to accord with our ideals, of which justice according to law stands high on the list but requires constant effort and vigilance. Specifically, we must first be assured that existing legislation to this end is made fully effective. Then we must add to it, lest for want of diligence we retrogress.

Indeed, we must not assume that what we have done so far is either the end or necessarily the best course. Carefully studied and measured experience may indicate that we should revise the present administrative system entirely. For example, there may be room for the return of certain functions to the ordinary courts of the land, or it may be wise to create new courts to exercise functions now casually committed—or assumed to be properly committed—to executive agencies.

That is a line of progress which has been made from time to time in the past. Congress itself has recently surrendered the legislative prerogative respecting tort claims and committed the function to the regular courts.[40]

Courts should not surrender their functions

Secondly, we must give more attention to the substantive phases of legislation where administrative justice is involved. That is a duty which not only Congress but every affected interest must face. Heretofore, with some notable exceptions, the trend of government has been for legislatures to shed their responsibilities for the making of law. There has been a much too ready acceptance of the idea that the real work of governance must be left to the experts. The courts, too, seem to have become imbued with the idea that the judicial duty and function is theirs to surrender. In fact, however, it may be doubted that either the Congress, the courts, the experts, or the public gain by such unrestrained methods. Such a trend will ultimately leave Congress and the courts with little vital work to perform. At the same time the administrative arm finds itself directed to proceed with fragmentary powers and vaguely stated authority.

It would therefore be a great advance if we could tear from our minds the concept that legislatures are delegating powers, for delegation implies surrender and abdication. Instead we should proceed upon the proper theory that—through our legislatures—we are stating law as fulsomely and as accurately as possible, leaving the necessary execution to courts or administrative agencies, as the case may be. By abdication, legislatures and courts avoid many problems, rather than solve them. If we would proceed on the premise that we are stating law, we would in part at least narrow the area of doubt and discretion.

Here indeed is a field of statesmanship, good government, and democracy, in which all can share—legislators, administrators, educators, the public, those who are regulated, and the legal profession. It is understandable that lawyers traditionally consider judge-made law to be the highest form of jurisprudence. As a profession you are also much concerned with questions of the forms of government, the separation of powers, and the development of constitutional law. Yet each of you knows that, in your daily work, statutes and regulations constitute the bulk of the living law.

Our fundamental concept of government and law

I commend to you, therefore, the proposition that the proper framing of legislation should command some of your best talents and attention. Give your best efforts to such matters, for they are important if the idea of justice according to law is to survive and flourish.

Our new administrative-law statute reflects in letter and in spirit our conception

---

[24] Sec. 10 (e) (B) (6); House committee report, p. 45; and see, to the same effect, Senate committee report, p. 28.

[25] Sec. 10 (e).

[26] Sec. 6 (d). It applies to formal or statutory-hearing cases as well, although sec. 8 (b) makes that unnecessary in most such instances.

[27] Secs. 6 (b) and 6 (c). See also point (6) in the text, supra.

[28] Sec. 8 (b). See Senate committee report, pp. 24–25; House committee report, p. 39.

[29] Sec. 5 (d). See Senate committee report, p. 18; House committee report, p. 31.

[30] See introductory clause to sec. 10.

[31] Sec. 10 (e) (B)*(1). See the House committee report, p. 55, n. 22.

[32] CONGESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, pt. 2, p. 2153.

[33] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol 92, pt. 5, p. 5653.

[34] Sec. 10 (a). A right of review is thus granted, whether or not particular statutes make similar provision. In view of some recent theories, this in itself is a most significant contribution of the act.

[35] Sec. 10 (d).

[36] Sec. 10 (e) (A). See also the definitions in subsecs. (d), (e), (f), and (g) of sec. 2; and see secs. 6 (a) and 8 (b).

[37] Sec. 10 (e) (b) (5) and (6). See, in this connection the Senate committee report, pp. 28, 30–31; House committee report, p. 45; and item (7) in the text, supra.

[38] Sec. 10 (e) generally.

[39] See sec. 12.

[40] Public Law No. 601, 79th Cong., ch. 753, title IV; Federal Tort Claims Act, approved August 2, 1946.

of the fundamental principles underlying the American Government. I would express our views on that subject thus:

The law is not the people; the people are not the law. The law is the spirit of justice governing the people. If this spirit of justice, impinging as it should upon every individual, fails to reflect full faith, fails to inspire full credit and confidence, in the hearts and minds of the people, then there prevails a threat of no mean magnitude to the future strength and the future continuation of this form of government.

If, on the other hand, this spirit of justice, prevailing in law and in administration, finds a resting place of confidence and contentment in the hearts and the minds of the citizenry, if each individual is brought to believe that he receives the same measure of the spirit of justice that his brother receives, this Nation and this form of government, of which we are so proud, will, under God, find a course of continuation for the welfare of civilization in the centuries to come.

Veterans' Bonus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to me by a World War II veteran.

Mr. Speaker, in this letter the veteran, Mr. Seabury D. Stoneburner, has made some timely remarks on two important subjects. I hope every Member of this House will read this letter. It follows:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *January 9, 1947.*

Representative EMORY H. PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Most veterans, if polled on the bonus question, I believe, would be in favor of a cash payment.

I am not in favor of a bonus for these two reasons: First, no one in this country owes us a thing. We fought for our country—not for someone else's. And second, even if a case could be made that servicemen's salaries were low in comparison with industrial wages, where would the money come from to pay the bonus? In the final analysis, it would have to be paid by future generations because my generation cannot completely pay off the New Deal and war debts. As for me, I do not want my children to have to carry an added debt load just to give me some extra cash.

Congress should set up a schedule and aim to pay off five billion of the debt each year. President Roosevelt used to say, "Debt doesn't matter. We owe it to ourselves." Why not let our party now adopt the slogan, "Debt payments don't hurt. We are paying them to ourselves."

The proposed five billion annual debt retirement would guarantee a minimum of that amount for business expansion and capital improvements. Let's stop thinking up new ways to spend money and start reducing the debt in order to make a better Nation for the future.

A little publicity by our party along these lines would probably get the veterans and the whole country behind it.

Yours very truly,

SEABURY D. STONEBURNER,

Age 28; Navy service, 3½ years in PT boats; now employed in white-collar job.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on January 11, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, thanks for all your wonderful letters expressing approval of the return of this program to the air. I am glad you like it and will keep on making its contents to suit your taste.

To you veterans listening in, I want to issue this warning: January 31 is the last day you can reinstate your war-service insurance if you did not keep it in force after you left the service.

After January 31, in order to be a policy holder, you will require a physical examination. My suggestion to you, in case you intend to get reinstated but have neglected to do so, is to see the Veterans' Administration before that date. If I can help you, let me know.

Remember, it may not be as easy a few months or years from now to pass a physical examination if you do not attend to the matter now. Your insurance is worth something to you. Hang on to it if you can and, if you are planning to, reinstate yourself now.

A while ago, the Marine Corps made available to me several thousand flag books. These I distributed to you people pretty thoroughly but I suppose there were some who did not receive them.

If you want me to send you one of the few I have left, write me. This flag book gives a complete history of our flag, and our Constitution. It is beautifully colored and has the pictures of many types of American flags in bright colors. I have some here in my Washington office and they are yours for the asking.

President Truman's speech before the joint session of Congress met with considerable praise from persons I came in contact with. One point he stressed, however, which might be taken with a grain of salt was his remark that the veterans' program is now complete.

I suppose the way you look at that one is from your own personal standpoint. Some veterans are satisfied with what Congress has done, but a lot of others aren't.

Mr. Truman's premise that our veterans' program is complete might be accurate if the GI bill of rights were being administered properly. I am not criticizing General Bradley, but I say now as I said a year ago—the Veterans' Administration still has a long way to go before perfection in dealing with our veterans is realized.

When I voted for the GI bill and Congress passed it, we were in the midst of World War II. Nobody could do enough for the soldier. The sky was the limit, they said.

But lately, a lot of people have changed their tune. The veteran is lazy, indolent, unwilling to shoulder his burden in society, they maintain. They talk somewhat differently.

With that element I cannot agree. Mr. Truman may be right when he says we have completed our veterans' program. Perhaps he means plans. Well, I always believed the program was completed when the GI bill was passed.

That bill was the veterans' dream come true. No government ever proposed so much for the men who fought for it. In this bill, the soldier could hope for free education, job priority, decent medical and hospital treatment for the rest of his days.

Many people have criticized me because I proposed a bonus for our veterans. Really, I have proposed nothing that is not included in the GI bill. The $4,000-loan guarantee in the GI bill is a bonus whatever way you want to look at it. If you don't believe me read the bill.

Someday, the veteran will insist the GI bill be carried out. He can count on me to see him through.

Farmers Guild Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, at the request of R. V. Garrod, chairman of California Farmers, Inc., I include herewith the following resolutions adopted by the Farmers Guild at their annual convention at Monticello, Ind., on December 4, 1946:

COST OF PRODUCTION

Whereas the acceptance of the principles upon which America was founded are freedom and responsibility; and

Whereas this can only stem from maximum agricultural production which in turn can only be achieved by the farmers receiving cost of production plus a reasonable profit for his products; and

Whereas any cost-of-production formula should give a wage for the farmers, his employees and members of his family equivalent to that received by those possessing similar skill employed in industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are on record as reiterating our stand for legislated minimum prices of not less than cost of production.

REPEAL OF PMA

Whereas regimentation is inconsistent with the concepts of a free people and dangerous to their well-being: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend the immediate abolition of the AAA and PMA and all similar regulatory agencies.

STATE BARRIERS

Be it resolved, That we oppose trade barriers between States and other political divisions and we urge the abolition of highway barriers in the form of discriminatory taxes and unscientific size and weight regulations on trucks.

FUTURES TRADING

Whereas it is a requisite of legitimate marketing of farm products that these

markets should be free from all forms of racketeering; and

Whereas the futures markets constitute a growing threat to the farm-price problem by gambling on the price of farm products, beating down the price thereof below cost of production, as witness the October futures market crash in cotton and grain; and

Whereas the practice of commodity gambling and its attendant evils is the main cause of much agricultural instability: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we demand of Congress immediate steps to stabilize farm prices and eliminate the futures markets.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Be it resolved, That we recommend that Congress continue investigating un-American activities.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE TREATIES

Be it resolved, That we demand of Congress to repeal the authority granted the President to approve reciprocal-trade agreements without the advice or consent of the United States Senate.

TAXING COOPERATIVES

Whereas there is being conducted a strenuous campaign to press laws through Congress and State legislatures which will have the effect of doubling taxation on returns received by producers from the sale of such products as are marketed by the farmer-owned cooperative selling agencies; and

Whereas in this modern age these cooperatives are just as much a part of the farmers necessary equipment as his planting and harvesting machinery; and

Whereas these co-ops are on all assessment rolls, pay property and franchise taxes on all real estate, buildings, equipment, necessary to perform their operations, sales commissions, and stock on hand; and

Whereas farmers receiving money from the sale of their products through their farmer-owned, membership-controlled selling cooperatives pay both Federal and State income taxes on such excess income as their produce returns them; and

Whereas it is very evident that such taxation would in every sense of the word be double taxation and eliminate the agencies performing this useful and necessary work for the producers, thereby automatically increasing the cost of living for consumers. However, this does not mean we are in favor of exempting capital-stock companies masquerading as cooperatives from proper or adequate taxation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do hereby place ourselves on record as vigorously opposing such proposed taxation; and be it further

Resolved, That we instruct our proper State officials to so inform all Members of Congress and State legislatures of this action and respectfully request them to strenuously oppose the passage of such legislation when and if presented for enactment into law.

LABOR

Whereas labor has inalienable rights, among which are the right to work, to quit work, or to strike: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in the public interest we ask labor to consider that this freedom does not contain the right to compel others to quit work by force or pressure, nor the right to commit violence or violate a contract, therefore the maintenance of membership or the closed-shop clauses should not be in any labor laws.

WARTIME CONTRACTS

Whereas reports are widely current of corruption in connection with the letting of war contracts, and the conduct of those responsible for such corruption goes to the very foundation of a free government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to thoroughly investigate such reports and fix the responsibility for such acts regardless of who may be involved and take all possible steps to punish those responsible for same.

ARMED FORCES INDOCTRINATION

Whereas reports are current that members of the armed forces of the United States have been given courses of study or lectures the effect of which has been to accomplish their orientation in leftist ideologies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to investigate such reports and, if true, to fix the responsibility therefor and take steps to insure a cessation of the same.

Relief of the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to include eight points formulated by the National Federation of the Blind in its convention held in St. Louis in June of 1946. These resolutions were submitted to me by Mr. Tom Jantzen, president of the Iowa Association for the Blind, and they are as follows:

1. The retention of title X of the Social Security Act as a separate title dealing exclusively with the blind.

Comment: It is felt that to deal effectively with the economic problems of blindness, aid to the blind should not be lumped, confused or "scrambled" with all other forms of public assistance.

2. More adequate relief of the distress of poverty among the blind.

Comment: The present national average granted in aid to the blind is $33 per month. It is felt that this average should be raised to $75.

3. The requirement that the State exempt at least a minimum of earnings and other income, thus permitting and encouraging the blind, and which forbids the pauper theory of aid to the blind.

Comment: Under the present arrangement the blind are penalized for any display of initiative or effort to earn their own way to economic independence and self-respect.

4. A system which strikes down the abuses of the "means" test, budgeting, social-worker control of the lives of the blind, and which forbids the pauper theory of aid to the blind.

Comment: Under the present system the social workers apparently have unlimited power to investigate every intimate aspect of the private life of the blind person to determine his budget of necessities, and to deduct all his meager earnings from his aid. This approach to aid has the earmarks of the pauper theory of aid.

5. A safeguard permitting the States to adopt their own interpretation of need, eligibility for assistance, and the establishment of a flat grant system.

Comment: It is felt that the Federal Government should lay down minimum requirements upon the States—not maximum requirements. The aim of Congress should be to establish a floor of security for the blind which preserves self-respect and dignity without placing a ceiling on opportunity to achieve independence and self-respect.

6. A system which removes the limit of the Federal Government's contribution to the States, increases the Federal percentage payable to the poorer States, and insures that these increases will be passed on to the blind rather than merely enriching the States' treasuries.

Comment: Adequate relief from the distress of poverty among the blind can be attained only when the Federal Government assumes its fair share of aid expenditures by removing the present limitation on matching funds of $20 per person and by proportionately increasing Federal grants to poorer States.

7. The erasure of responsibility of relatives from all aid to the blind laws.

Comment: To insist upon the responsibility of relatives for the care of a needy blind person is to close one's eyes to the public responsibility of providing a basic security and reasonable opportunity for self-support to the blind.

8. A prohibition of any State requirement that the recipient of aid to the blind transfer his property to the State.

Comment: In the event that a blind person's property is capable of producing income, to deny him its use is to deny him a means and opportunity of achieving independence and self-support.

Communism in Textbooks Used and Paid for by Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been aroused by publication of reports that the Army, the Veterans' Administration, the Library of Congress, and certain schools and colleges have used or are using, at public expense, textbooks advocating communism or other alien political ideologies. I have made some investigation of the matter and here will lift the brass curtain and present the facts so far as I have been able to secure them. I commend this information to attention of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and will raise a few unanswered questions to which perhaps the committee can secure answers.

Specifically, most of the charges in question pertain to two volumes entitled "Economics: Principles and Problems," by Paul F. Gemmill and Ralph H. Blodgett. These two textbooks are identified by the armed forces as Educational Manual EM-763, prepared and selected by the editorial staff of the United States Armed Forces Institute for Use by the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard. They are copyrighted by the authors and published by Harpers Bros. which in its sales promotional literature on the texts lists 195 colleges and universities in 43 States, the District of Columbia, and Canada as using or having used the books.

These books are not good objective works in economics but rather they

cleverly plead the case for the following propositions, among others:

First. Abolition of inheritances.

Second. Federal ownership of all land.

Third. Sterilization of certain "social undesirables."

Fourth. Increased income taxes.

Fifth. Equalization of all incomes.

Sixth. Abandonment of the price system.

Seventh. Government ownership and control of all business.

Eighth. Socialized medicine.

Needless to say, these ideas are in harmony with the Communist party-line and have no rightful place in any activity sponsored by the United States Government. Yet, 46,472 sets of the two-volume work were purchased by the Government for use of the armed forces at a cost of $40,224.81 and were used for over 2 years. Royalties paid the authors by the Government total $2,362.49. Of this amount, Gemmill received 71 percent and Blodgett received 29 percent.

Who is Mr. Paul F. Gemmill and who is Mr. Ralph H. Blodgett? Considerable information about them is available in Who's Who in America. For instance, we find that Blodgett is a professor of economics at the University of Illinois, the author of various articles, and likes to play golf and bridge. The same source tells us that Mr. Gemmill is a professor at the University of Pennsylvania. He, too, is an author of more works than those under question here at the moment. His alias is Paul Fleming, the magician. He made his living for a time as a magician and perhaps he thinks that some of his remedies for the economic ills of America will produce magical results. I do not doubt but that they would be different results but there is nothing very magical about Red fascism.

Professor Gemmill, alias Fleming, has quite a record of association with left-wing groups and activities. For instance, the Communist Daily Worker, March 5, 1941, page 2, reveals he signed a statement to the President defending the Communist Party. He is reported in the Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, page 4, as a signer of an open letter denouncing the United States Attorney General, at that time Hon. Francis Biddle, for his charges against Harry Bridges and the Communist Party. He is quoted or referred to a number of other times by the Daily Worker and, of course, is one of those who has been active, signing petitions and agitating, for abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. But, enough of Gemmill and Blodgett.

How does it happen that the Government of the United States, specifically the Army, has purchased books written by these radicals? Not many Army men studied the books. Only 959 Army personnel enrolled in the course in which the books were used from May 1944 to September 1946. Only 26 actually completed the course. It would appear, therefore, that a Government supply of 46,472 sets was more than sufficient. But, why were any bought?

The Army's Information and Education Division, since its inception early in the war, has been in charge of the indoctrination, orientation, and education of our soldiers. It conducts the troop information program, helps run the Armed Forces Institute, a correspondence school for the services, makes motion pictures dealing with specific aspects and problems of the services' jobs and operates the Army's radio broadcasting stations. It entertains, instructs, and trains. This is the branch of the Army which bought the books for said purposes. Brig. Gen. C. T. Lanham is presently the head of this operation. He is a very courteous and cooperative gentleman and in no way responsible for the purchase or distribution of the texts in question which were, I am informed, adopted under the reign of his predecessor, Fred Osborne, a New Deal civilian President Roosevelt brought down from New York, put in a general's uniform and who has now returned to civilian life. I do not know whether this gentleman and his subordinates ever read the texts before they were adopted by the Army for use. But, the system they evolved for their selection was, briefly, as follows:

The United States Armed Forces Institute adopted texts selected by its editorial staff, a project of the American Council of Education. Selection was based upon a comprehensive survey of allegedly outstanding educators at a number of educational institutions chosen on the basis of size, geographical distribution, and academic standing. A press release of the War Department, October 4, 1946, states:

> As the result of a survey made in 1944 by the editorial staff, the textbooks in question, having received the highest number of points were selected in May of that year as the text in economics for USAFI.

The War Department advises me that the following individuals representing the following institutions, listed the texts in question as first, second, or third choice and it was thereby selected:

Prof. Harvey A. Wooster, Oberlin College, Ohio; Pauline Woodard, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.; Dean R. E. Glos, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; Prof. Dudley F. Pegrum, University of California, at Los Angeles; Prof. Shorey Peterson, acting chairman, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Dean Calvin B. Hoover, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Prof. Howard M. Teaf, Jr., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.; Prof. T. H. Boggs, Stanford University, California; Dean D. D. Carroll, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Prof. C. W. Hasek, Pennsylvania State College; Prof. Donald English, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.; Prof. Jesse S. Robinson, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.; Prof. F. H. Elwell, the University of Wisconsin at Madison; Dean Elmore Peterson, University of Colorado at Boulder; Prof. Clair Wilcox, Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania; and Prof. Lloyd P. Rice, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. This makes one wonder just how far the Communists have infiltrated the American educational system, when books recommended by such people representing the American Council on Education, can turn up to be Communist to the core. I have the names of others involved which I will make available to the committee.

Before turning to the final disposition of these texts for use by other branches of government, let us examine some of the exact language used in them. My interest in these books was immediately aroused when I read on page 17 the analogy classifying Hon. Bruce Barton, a former distinguished Member of this House, as a tramp and elsewhere holding Hon. Harold Laski, British Labor Party radical, up to highest esteem. But, on page 18, we find a plea for objectivity. The authors state by way of caution to the reader:

> He should be from Missouri, maintaining a receptive but skeptical attitude, weighing critically every scrap of evidence as it makes its appearance and finally rendering a judicial decision that is free from preconceptions and personal bias.

I am from Missouri. Let us proceed. On pages 315–316 we find some advice to the armed forces which is designed to help avoid the pitfalls of half-hearted planning:

> It would seem that a choice must be made between a capitalistic economy and a planned economy, for extensive economic planning could scarcely be carried on under capitalism. In a planned economy a governmental board or commission, appointed or elected, would direct the economic activities of the country. With assistance of local agencies throughout the country, and aided by a great mass of statistical data, the central board would decide what goods to produce and in what quantities. Most economists agree that such economic planning is impossible unless society as a whole, through the government, owns all the nonhuman resources of production. That is, land and capital must be socialized if national economic planning is to be effective.

Shades of the OPA and CPA. This is the last chance for free enterprise. Next time the planners will socialize the land and capital. They are doing it in England today. They have already done it in Russia.

On page 521, of volume 1, the authors have a statement they entitled "Abolition of Inheritance." It reads as follows:

> Our goal then, is equality of opportunity. * * * The first move in this direction, we believe, should be the adoption of a thoroughgoing Federal estate tax which will prevent the piling up of wealth for the use of individuals and will insure its expenditure in the interests of all. If this tax is to do its full share in reducing inequalities, it must take a very large proportion of a man's estate upon his death, leaving for the heirs (apart from a modest provision for direct dependents) little more than mere keepsakes which are valued chiefly for sentimental reasons.

Shades of the Kremlin and Karl Marx! The authors, in their so-called objective analysis, continue in this vein:

> It is scarcely necessary to add that an estate tax, if it was not to be evaded, would have to be accompanied by a gift tax which would prevent the transfer of property in anticipation of death, or would at least tax such transfers at a high rate. * * * To prevent evasion of income taxes (which the authors suggest be made confiscatory along the lines of certain 1941 war taxes) there would be need, of course, to eliminate tax-exempt securities (Government bonds).

On page 523 Gemmill and Blodgett state:

> The abolition of most inheritance and an increase in the taxes on large incomes would do much to reduce economic inequality, and at the same time would produce an enormous amount of revenue. To mention specifically but one important item, we may note the fact that the estate tax that we

have proposed would, within a century at the most, bring all land (or at least all land used for business purposes) into the hands of the Government. This land would doubtless then, as now, be rented out to the highest bidders and would produce a large and steady income year by year. We believe that estate and income taxation should be made to promote equality not only by relieving the rich of their surpluses, but by bestowing upon the poor the revenue collected in this way. It would doubtless be a mistake to make the distribution on a per capita basis, and in the form of cash. Hence, we propose that it be done in a way that is both simple and sane, through extension of social services.

We have already advocated the adoption of various forms of social insurance and the provision of free medical and hospital service for all who need it. * * * Lack of educational opportunity should be removed. * * * This educational program, of course, would involve not only free tuition in elementary and secondary schools and higher institutions but also such allowances for living expenses as would make it unnecessary for the members of working class families to quit school for lack of funds. * * * We believe that our program would establish a substantial degree of equality of opportunity, so that such inequalities as continued would be the result of differences in native endowments and not differences in environmental conditions.

Then comes a significant footnote on pages 524–525 by way of amplification of the foregoing:

The adoption of this program would not, of course, make up for such serious physical deficiencies as physical invalidism or feeblemindedness. Hence, to repeat a statement made in chapter 26, it is probable that there will always be some members of society who, because of physical or mental defects, cannot be expected to support themselves. Unfortunates of these kinds will have to be cared for at the public expense, unless they have friends or relatives who are able to look after them adequately. We believe that such persons should be provided with a standard of living that will enable them to live in health and decency, but that they should be prevented from propagating their kind. It is often suggested that, if their defects are of a transmissible type, these public charges should be required (in return for their maintenance) to submit to segregation or sterilization.

Mr. Speaker, other quotations could be given if time and space permitted. The foregoing are typical. They have not been lifted from the text in such a fashion as to distort their meaning or to fail to give the full meaning of the authors.

These textbooks were withdrawn from the curriculum of the United States Armed Forces Institute on September 11, 1946, by order of the Information and Education Division, after contents of the books were exposed. On November 9, 1946, the War Department issued a press release stating in part:

This action will mean that additional thousands of college textbooks stocked by the USAFI can be made available to veterans in colleges and universities through the Library of Congress.

It has been the policy of the Department to declare surplus to the War Assets Administration text materials which are no longer required or wanted by the armed forces. Then, WAA transfers them to the Veterans' Administration which in turn has the assistance of the Library of Congress, through its Surplus Books Section, in distributing these surplus books to veterans enrolled in civilian schools. There is some conflict about what has happened to the thousands of copies of EM–763. The Army stated in a letter to me December 23, 1946:

Stocks of these books are frozen in depots overseas and in the United States pending determination of final disposition.

The Director of the Legislative Reference Service, of the Library of Congress, assured me in a letter December 18, 1946, that while certain surplus books used in the educational programs of the armed forces are being distributed free of charge for the use of veterans taking educational training at public expense under the GI bill, the Gemmill and Blodgett volumes are not among them. Yet, a brochure of the Library under date of June 1, 1946, listing the books so made available, does include the Gemmill-Blodgett text. Also, a correspondent for the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News was advised by the Library and so stated in the press December 30 that "the Library has exhausted its supply of these books." The full truth of this matter needs to be gone into. It would be interesting to know just how strong the Communist influence is in the Library of Congress. It would be interesting to know which schools snapped these volumes up when offered by the Library and how many veterans today are studying these books at expense of the taxpayers and in what schools and colleges. It would be interesting to know whether or not the sales propaganda of Harper Bros. is truthful in contending this is a standard college text used or having been used in 195 schools which they list, including, I am sorry to say, the University of Missouri. It would be interesting to know if, printed and distributed to veterans by the Government, the veterans have gained the idea that this rubbish has the approval and blessing of the Veterans' Administration. It would be interesting to know if anyone in the armed forces responsible for selection of these books is still serving in a capacity in which such an error could be repeated and just to what extent the Communists have infiltrated the armed services. Boards of education and those supporting educational institutions using these texts might well inquire into what is going on in their schools in the classes on economics.

Use of Franked Envelopes for Private Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Office of Temporary Controls, Office of Price Administration has been writing letters apparently to everyone listed in the Washington telephone directory, recommending former employees for employment in private industries.

These letters are signed by Mario P. Canaipi, Chairman, Employment Service. Of course, we have no objection to Mr. Canaipi recommending anyone he may choose for a position but we do object to his using a franked envelope in making his recommendation.

It certainly seems to me that if this individual desires to recommend anyone he should use, as any business concern or any private individual would be required to use, a 3-cent stamp on the envelope.

Apparently these form letters of recommendation are sent out in wholesale lots and must be costing the United States Government many thousands of dollars. It is for that reason that I make this objection.

Two Budgets Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress starts off committed to a program of economy and the balancing of the national budget. Both are commendable things to do. There are many places in the national picture where the previous Congress committed us to a policy of internal development. This is particularly true in the great Missouri development program, which by the way is a far-reaching project of deep interest to several States in the western section of the country.

While we must set about the task of balancing the budget and reducing expenses, it would seem wise to me at least that we should give due consideration to permanent long-lived investments which will have for their purpose the development of great sections of the country. This is particularly true of the Missouri Valley area.

The accomplished editor, Mr. Kenneth Simons, of the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, proposes a very unique plan for meeting this situation in an editorial published in the Bismarck Tribune under date of December 31. Here he proposes that we deal with one phase of this situation as a permanent long-time investment and regard it from this angle as we think in terms of balancing the budget.

I include herewith the editorial written by Mr. Simons:

TWO BUDGETS NEEDED

How can businessmen who favor Government economy reconcile that attitude with their demands for the expenditure of huge sums of public money?

The question is a fair one and demands a legitimate answer if a large and important part of our population is to avoid convicting itself of hypocrisy.

The issue is particularly pertinent here in the Missouri Valley, almost solidly Republican in politics, where all of us are asking the expenditure of huge sums on development work. How can we support economy and at the same time demand continued investment of Government funds in this region?

The answer lies in that word "investment." We are not asking the Government to spend

but to invest. There is a vast difference in the meaning of the two words and it is the key to our seemingly contradictory position. For it is one thing to spend money in order to maintain routine operations of the Government, another to invest it in the hope of receiving a long-time and continuing benefit. The latter is what we are asking Uncle Sam to do when we plead for the development of the Missouri Basin.

No one can successfully deny that the program for the over-all development of the Missouri Basin insures the creation here of thousands of new farms, thousands of new businesses, thousands of new industrial enterprises. Neither can there be any doubt that these will pay taxes to the Federal Government, offer jobs for millions of persons and thus strengthen the economy of the Nation. These benefits will not be temporary in their nature but will continue to shower blessings upon this Nation and its Government far beyond the time of any person now living.

For this reason it is clear that the Congress should set up two different kinds of budget. One should be an operating budget for the maintenance of the routine functions of Government. This should be held to the lowest practical minimum.

A second should be the Federal investment budget, which could properly be divided into two parts. Such investments as new Federal post offices and other buildings which may result in improved service or convenience but which cannot possibly add to the productivity of the Nation should go into one part of the investment budget.

Projects which create permanent jobs, farms, and businesses should be included in another and separate part. Quite obviously, too, the latter should have preference. To spend $100,000 in building a new post office is one thing; to spend $100,000 in creating new farms and in providing new opportunities for jobs and business is another and far better thing. The two should not even be mentioned in the same breath so far as value to the country is concerned.

It is for this reason that we in the Missouri Basin can consistently ask for substantial appropriations for valley development and, at the same time, support the demand for economy.

The Republicans have long contended that they, if returned to power, would reestablish business principles in the Government. They can find no better place to begin than in their management of budgetary problems. If they mean what they say, they will begin by revamping the entire governmental system of spending tax money so the people will be able to clearly understand what they are getting for it.

Meanwhile, this is a good place to suggest that the Republican Senators and Congressmen from this Basin are well established, since the Great Plains returned to the Republican Party long before the rest of the country. We have a right to hope and expect that they will see to it that the Government continues to invest in the development of this region.

Senator Wallace H. White, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, a man of great current interest is the majority leader of the Senate, Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine. Because I know many Members of both the Senate and the House, and the public as well, are interested in this outstanding statesman, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial taken from the Lewiston Evening Journal of December 27, 1946; also a biographical article appearing in the Portland Sunday Telegram, January 5, 1947, on the senior Senator from Maine:

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Evening Journal of December 27, 1946]

WHITE AND THE COMMITTEES

There's no row like a family row. The Republicans in the House are roaming around Washington with tempers at the kindling temperature. Now dignified Senators are having their inning.

Senator REED, of Kansas, is hollering "oligarchy," charging that Senators WHITE, of Maine; TAFT, of Ohio; and VANDENBERG, of Michigan, are running the show. Several Senators have objected to one having more than one important job.

WHITE has been practically agreed upon for floor leader. He also wants to be chairman of the Commerce Committee. He says today that he will not withdraw but will be a candidate for Commerce chairman when the GOP conference meets December 30 to make final assignments.

WHITE is the best qualified of the upper Chamber to head the Commerce Committee. He is the outstanding authority in Congress on communications. He is coauthor of the present radio law. At the personal insistence of President Roosevelt early in his first term, WHITE accepted chairmanship of the American delegation to the International Communications Conference at Cairo. This was at the time that the Democrats had swept into Washington. This was a good assignment, but F. D. R. realized WHITE'S especial fitness to head the delegation. WHITE demurred, but the President made it a question of duty and WHITE went.

Radio people would like WHITE to have the Commerce chairmanship. The current edition of Broadcasting magazine, a weekly publication, editorially calls for WHITE to be "drafted."

Says the magazine, "WHITE knows more about communications and radio than any man in Congress. WALLACE WHITE, by all standards, is the best qualified legislator in the Nation to chart the course for new radio legislation. Irrespective of all other considerations, he should be drafted by his party to head this important committee, even though the dual-leadership burden will be heavy. There should be a new Communications Act and it should be the Wallace White Act. The Congress and the Nation owe it to him."

This kind of talk is business, not political.

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram and Sunday Press Herald of January 5, 1947]

PARALLEL IN MAINE POLITICS—SENATOR WHITE FOLLOWS GRANDFATHER'S FOOTSTEPS

(By M. E. Learn)

Thirty years ago WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., was elected to Congress from the Second Maine District and his Democratic opponents decried the move as "a boy being sent out to run a man's errand."

It turned out to be a long errand.

This week, 30 years later, WHITE is still running that errand, and running it so well that he is now majority leader in the Republican-dominated Senate, and chairman of the all-important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

When WHITE was assigned as chairman of the committee, in the face of bitter opposition by Senator CLYDE M. REED (Republican, Kansas), he completed a parallel in family history that matches the political parallels of the Cabot Lodges of Massachusetts and the Hales of Maine—for his grandfather, Senator William Pierce Frye, held that chairmanship, as well as the presidency of the Senate, when he died in 1911 after 50 years of public service, 40 years of it in Washington.

In a certain sense he also is right back where he started 45 years ago, when, as a raw recruit on the political scene, he left Bowdoin College to become a junior clerk for that same committee, and secretary to the President of the Senate, his grandfather.

Ever since the early days of that clerkship WHITE'S fervent wish was to duplicate the distinguished career of the grandfather he admired so well, and every step he has taken since has been with that end in mind.

Senator Frye, for 40 years a powerful figure in Congress, both in the House and the Senate, and thrice President pro tempore of the Senate, was an impressive deity to look up to and emulate—but step by step, practically in Frye's very footprints, WHITE has made his way, and the "boy's errand" today is well-nigh accomplished.

WON EARLY PRAISE

Early in his career Republican friends and Democratic foes started comparing him with the "old Senator," as Frye was fondly termed. His first speech in the campaign of 1916, when he ran for Congress in the Second Maine District, resulted in a close friend of Frye's saying:

"The young man is fine. He is better than the old Senator was at the same age."

This coming in a day when austere elders frowned on the younger generation, and when compliments to their ability came as hard as conceding defeat to the Democrats, was a forewarning of WHITE'S coming political success.

Like the old Senator, he was graduated from Bowdoin, and Frye, even then recognizing the potentialities of his gifted grandson, gave him an early "in" with national politics by immediately fostering him as his secretary while he was acting Vice President of the United States.

STUDIED LAW IN LEWISTON

In that capacity, handling all the correspondence of the office, WHITE familiarized himself with the workings of Congress, and early equipped himself with a background of legislative training and diplomatic experience unmatched on Capitol Hill.

So that he "wouldn't get the habit of being a Government clerk all his life," the old Senator persuaded WHITE to return to Lewiston, where they both were born, to study law. The rugged legislator had also studied law in the Spindle City, and was anxious for his charge to acquire a legal background for a future that was already beckoning.

Senator Frye, for 10 years active in Maine political circles prior to his tenure in Washington, had twice been elected mayor of Lewiston; and WHITE, for the first and only time in his career, failed to match his grandfather's steps. But, it cannot be said he didn't try, for thrice he was defeated in the preponderantly Democratic city.

He did, however, brighten the sad hearts of the minority Republicans at the time, for his second failure resulted in his reducing the Democratic plurality to such an extent that he convinced everyone he was the man to be their congressional candidate.

Oddly enough, WHITE, in sharp contrast to his grandfather, had little or no hand in State politics. Senator Frye had been elected to the State legislature three terms, and was attorney general for the State from 1863 to 1870.

ELECTED TO WAR CONGRESS

It was the only time in their political parallels, however, that they varied. Frye was elected to Congress from the Second Maine District in 1871, and served 10 years before being elected to the Senate. WHITE, going out on that "boy's errand," was elected to Congress from the Second Maine District in 1916 to serve in the war Congress, and

served 14 years before being elected to the Senate in 1931.

The venerable old Senator was elected President pro tempore of the Senate three times, in 1896, 1901, and 1908, and was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when he died in 1911. WHITE'S latest conquest, as majority leader of the Republican-controlled Senate, moves him a step nearer to his grandfather's highest point of attainment, while the coveted chairmanship of the Commerce Committee tied another knot in the paralleled careers.

Both were extremely active committee members, Frye having served on many boards, including the important Coast and Insular Survey, Foreign Relations, and Pacific Railroads. WHITE, active during more hectic eras when committees in Congress were as thick as Missouri cousins, is one of the few men in Congress today who served through both World Wars I and II.

Like his grandfather, he has been assigned to powerful Senate committees, which guide the legislative program from day to day. He has examined charges of extravagance and waste as a member of the Appropriations Committee; maintained close touch with diplomatic developments the world around on the Foreign Relations Committee; has guided and tempered Federal policies touching railroads, telegraph, trucking, and a host of other problems as a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee; and has served on a few others, including the Merchant Marine, Monopoly, Civil Service, Education and Labor, Claims, Patents, and Wildlife Conservation.

He sponsored the White-Jones Merchant Marine Act, the White bill for regulation and development of Alaska fisheries, and the Radio Act of 1927.

PROTECTED MAINE'S WELFARE

An ardent champion of his own State of Maine, WHITE fought against the Canadian reciprocal trade agreement, importation of Russian and Swedish pulpwood, coastwise trading by foreign vessels, and rallied to the cause of the Quoddy project. He fought for the protection and care of inland fisheries and protested the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

His time and energies have been called upon by five Presidents of the United States, from Woodrow Wilson down through Franklin Roosevelt, and now a sixth, President Truman.

The Honorable O. Gardner, of Maine, in making his memorial address to Senator William P. Frye, said of WHITE'S grandfather:

"He was an idealist. He was that kind of a man who would always make his politics express his honest opinion. Senator Frye is a partisan, who said, 'I have little faith in a man connected with a political party and who really and honestly believes in its principles, who is not ready at all times to defend and maintain them'."

TAKES BROADER VIEW

There the two differ slightly. WHITE is an idealist, but not so avidly partisan that he does not recognize some worth in the opposing party's creed. One of his biographers has said:

"With some people, patriotism is a holiday garb to be taken out of the moth balls on Washington's birthday and the Fourth of July. With WHITE, patriotism is an attitude of mind and being which applies 365 days a year—a profound faith in the destiny of America—plus a quiet devotion to those everyday, humdrum chores which Kipling once described as 'the meaner damnabilities of life.'"

Some patriots join the chorus of God Bless America and call it a day. Others sit up until midnight to get the committee report into the Government Printing Office in time for the next day's debate. Every country, of course, needs both types—but, when the going gets tough, the warbling patriots always find a narrowing market for their wares, and the burners of midnight oil grow to their full stature of responsibility and service.

WHITE is an idealist, but a burner of midnight oil as well. He has closely paralleled his illustrious grandfather's career, but his full stature has not yet been attained, he is still building unmeasured authority and influence as a spokesman for Maine in the highest councils of the Nation.

The old Senator can rest assured that the "boy" is doing a man's errand, and doing it well.

Wool Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a statement I made today before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, State Department, and other Departments:

Wyoming ranks second in wool production among the States. The records disclose that about 30,000,000 head of sheep, which represents 72 percent of all the stock sheep of the country, are owned by ranchers in the Western States. The sheep, lamb, and wool industry is sixth in importance in the entire area, with an annual income of over $270,000,000. Over 100,000 people are employed to run sheep in the West. Livestock is the basic industry in the 200 counties in the range States. About 96 percent of the range of nearly 800,000,000 acres in these States is usable only for grazing purposes. Any action which will reduce the numbers of livestock running on these lands, which are worthless except for grazing purposes, and thereby reducing the return which our economy receives from these lands is detrimental to the economy of the whole country. Grass is the chief crop to be harvested from this immense area. The 30,000,000 head of sheep we run on the western ranges are daily gathering the products of the soil and processing them for utilization in our economy. The livestock industry is Nature's free contribution to society. Our livestock is a free labor force whose value is inestimable, and anything that hampers our livestock production and prevents the complete use of Nature's free labor and processing plant affects the welfare of our entire economy. Raw material income, particularly from agriculture, including livestock, represents new wealth annually created by production. Over a 20-year period before the war the national income averaged $7 for each dollar of total farm income. This average held in good times and in bad times. Over the same period our factory pay rolls total the same amount as our total farm income. Our livestock industry is the greatest source of new income in the Nation. The investment in livestock is equal to the combined investment in the steel and automobile industries. Any action that will promote greater use of our grazing lands and the enlargement of our livestock industry will help every segment of our economy and every dollar of income thus created will turn into $7 of national income for use in trade. It follows therefore that any reduction in livestock income will be followed in a few months by a corresponding reduction in factory pay rolls and in our national income.

As I have said, we in Wyoming are deeply interested in the tariff on wool and wool textiles. Now, what are we here for? It seems absurd to us that this great department of Government would give serious consideration to a reduction in the world tariff at this time. As I have pointed out, any action that will impair the situation of that industry will be reflected shortly in reduced factory pay rolls and national income. It is unbelievable that any action will be taken that will weaken a great industry which produces an essential commodity for our national economy, and one which so vitally affects the welfare of all the people in the Western States. It is unthinkable that any action will be taken that will destroy the utilization of the grass, the chief if not sole crop of the western range. No one can deny that such action would seriously affect the economy of the West and consequently the economy of the Nation.

During the war the wool industry has been kicked around from pillar to post. Let me briefly call to your attention some salient facts:

1. The stock-sheep population on the farms and ranches of the United States has declined from 49,000,000 in 1942 to 37,000,000 in 1946.

2. The number of lambs saved has dropped from 32,000,000 in 1942 to 26,000,000 in 1946. This indicates a further reduction in our stock-sheep population in the next year or two.

3. During the 5-year period from 1936 to 1940, inclusive, our domestic wool supplied on the average over 82 percent of the wool consumed in this country, whereas last year our domestic wool supplied less than 20 percent of the wool consumption of the United States.

4. In the 5-year period from 1942 to 1946, inclusive, this country consumed 5,159,000,000 pounds of wool. During the same period our domestic production amounted to 2,071,000,000 pounds of wool. On November 9 last the Commodity Credit Corporation reported it had a stock pile of 517,000,000 pounds of unsold wool from the domestic production for the year 1943 to 1946, inclusive. We were able to sell only a billion and a half pounds of our domestic wool during that period, when our consumption during each year of that period was over 1,000,000,000 pounds annually, and it must be noted that practically the entire market for domestic wools in those years was in supplying military requirements. Congress required the use of domestic wool for that purpose, otherwise we would have been unable to have sold any of our domestic wool in the American market.

5. During the 5-year period from September 15, 1941, to September 15, 1946, the wool growers of this country received an average price increase of only 13 percent for their wool. During the same period, the average price increase for 23 other farm commodities was 94 percent. A few of the increases are: Corn, 144 percent; hay, 94 percent; cotton, 101 percent; peanuts, 100 percent; tobacco, 84 percent. Wool received the lowest price increase and the next lowest was an increase of 37 percent.

6. United States Tariff Commission shows by its report that in 1944 the wool growers of the United States lost 10.8 cents on each pound of wool produced or a loss of 60 cents on the wool produced from each head of sheep. They further show that during the same year the loss on sheep and lambs amounted to 42 cents per head or a total loss of $1.22 per head on wool and meat production.

7. The apparel wool imports to the United States less reexports for the 5-year period of 1936 to 1940, inclusive, total 612,861,000 pounds. For every year from 1941 to 1946, inclusive, the imports exceeded the total imports for the preceding 5-year period.

8. England and her dominions shipped 600,000,000 pounds of apparel wool to the

United States for the year ending last July, and Argentina shipped 347,000,000 pounds for the year ending last September.

9. World stock piles of wool amounted to over 5,000,000 pounds at the close of the war. England and her dominions control over 85 percent of the fine wool of the world under what is known as the joint organization (J. O.), which gives it a virtual monopoly on fine wool.

10. The United Kingdom has provided 80 percent of the woolen and worsted textiles imported into this country and it is anticipated that under the 41-percent reduction in ad valorem rates on woolen and worsted textiles under the trade agreement of 1939 that imports will be increased sixfold in the years that lie ahead. Without question the British Government is presently engaged in an expanding program of its textile industry for the purpose of increasing its exportation of worsted and woolen textiles to this country. Delivery by air of these textiles from England makes their plants as close to the American trade as the manufacturing plants of our mills.

11. The average hourly earnings in the wool-textile mills in England as of last November was 35 cents, whereas in the United States it was $1.05. Labor costs therefore are three times as high in the United States as in the United Kingdom.

12. The woolen and worsted manufacturing industry employs 150,000 persons and is seventh in point of employment in this country. The clothing industry employs over 500,000 persons. A reduction in our tariff means the exportation of jobs, make no mistake about that.

From these facts, it seems to me that the conclusion is irresistible that a reduction in the tariff on wool and woolen textiles would be disastrous to our industry and to the Nation. Tariffs are merely an equalizer between our price levels and the rest of the world. The American market should be open to the domestic wool growers and our wool textiles manufacturers and in order to do that the tariff should equalize the difference in costs at home and abroad. A reduction in the tariff now would be the knockout blow for the wool industry of the United States. If the tariff on fine wool was increased from 34 to 51 cents foreign wool could still be brought into this country at less than the cost of production of our domestic wool.

It seems to me, therefore, that the best interests of the United States demand that our first concern be the welfare of the people of the United States and that common sense dictates that our course of action should be either to increase the tariff in order to adequately protect this great industry, or to provide an import quota which would insure proper protection for both the wool growers and the manufacturers of wool and worsted textiles.

The American people are unwilling to sacrifice the American market to foreign producers and manufacturers who can produce cheaper by reason of low wages, long hours, and lower living standards.

How To Solve the Potato-Surplus Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to give the Congress a few facts on a matter which is of the utmost importance to the American farmer—the American public—yes, and to the people of the world.

It relates to the surplus crop of potatoes. In 1946, the potato surplus was one of the largest on record.

H. C. Moore, head of the potato section of the Michigan State College, reports that the latest statistics show the potato output in this country will total 477,000,000 bushels. This indicates a surplus of approximately 105,000,000 bushels and, in the so-called late States alone, the surplus will run upward of 65,000,000 bushels.

Certain phases of this problem were discussed on the floor of the Senate last July. At that time, it was proposed that potatoes be dehydrated and shipped abroad for relief purposes. It was pointed out that the Government was committed to buy the surplus potatoes anyway as part of the price stabilization policy, and, therefore, the only added cost to the taxpayer would be that of dehydration and shipping.

As I recall, the Department of Agriculture maintained at that time that the only alternative was to leave the potatoes rot in the ground or above the ground.

I did some checking in Michigan on the situation and I have found another alternative—one that is not only practical but also points the way toward a major contribution to the long-range stability and prosperity of the American farmer.

Then I found that potatoes cannot be stored like wheat or other grains, that the only method of saving parts of the crop was either to dehydrate the potatoes or—and this is most important—convert them into potato flour.

The dehydration of potatoes, according to the testimony last July in the Senate, is a fairly expensive proposition. However, dehydrating plants were set up during the war and subsidized by the Government. The price of finished dehydrated potatoes runs around 35 or 40 cents a pound. Processing and packaging alone runs from 8 to 10 cents a pound. Despite the fact that dehydrated potatoes have all the nourishment and good that whole potatoes—or, for that matter, wheat—have, it was a very costly method of saving millions of bushels of potatoes.

Not much, if anything, has been said about potato flour, despite its great importance in the ultimate solution of the problem. Potato flour is selling in a competitive market at only 8 cents a pound. That is less than 2 cents a pound more than wheat flour. Potato flour is produced only in comparatively small quantities. Therefore, it is logical to believe that if production of potato flour climbed to large proportions the price could be reduced much more.

The commercial price of potato flour includes the open-market cost of raw potatoes used. Obviously, then, the cost of processing a pound of potato flour is far below the cost of processing a pound of dehydrated potatoes. It is also a fact that potato flour retains all the essential minerals and vitamins and is more nutritious than wheat flour.

William Stuart, senior horticulturist for the Department of Agriculture, wrote a book called The Potato. In it he stated, and I quote:

> Potato flour contains all the chemical constituents of the potato tuber, retains all the minerals and salts which dietitians say are vital to the human body.

It is also a matter of record that potato flour, if properly stored, will keep indefinitely—and that is most important in this program. Some of my colleagues will recall that as early as World War I we shipped potato flour to France.

But the big problem is that there are comparatively few flour-processing plants in this country.

However, I submit that making potatoes into flour is a far more logical and economic method of utilizing surplus potatoes than is dehydration. Now the question is, should the use of this method, and any plants which might be created to do the job, be confined to the current emergency when much of the flour would be shipped to Europe and Asia for relief purposes? Admittedly, that might be wasteful, although in view of the lower processing costs, I am not so sure. But that brings me to the second and even more important phase of this program.

There is a man from my State who runs five bakeries in which he features potato bread. What he had to tell me was a revelation. He indicated that this program could provide one of the greatest single contributions to long-term farm prosperity in this Nation.

We know that 71 percent of our potato crops are produced in 12 States—and that makes this program mighty important to a large segment of this Congress.

Well, this man, Jack Schafer—incidentally, he is no relation of mine, although he is a good friend—started some 15 years ago with a single small bakery. The expansion and growth of his business has been fantastic, and he tells me that most of it is due to the popularity of potato bread.

He makes it from a potato culture, which in turn is made from potato flour.

He uses a ratio of about 4 pounds of potato culture to every 100 pounds of wheat flour. The result is a bread which has the old-fashioned potato taste, or flavor, keeps longer, and is generally said to be a better loaf.

The increase in his sales bears this out, but he also had tests made by the famous Siebel Institute of Technology in Chicago. I want to quote from the official Siebel report:

> Two-day-old Schafer's bread containing potato culture scored higher than any of the other bread tested. It rated 96.5 percent as against 83.4 to 84.2 for the three competitive makes. It was also higher than the Schafer's bread without potato culture.
>
> Furthermore, in comparison, the superiority of the culturized bread became more pronounced when it was 6 days old. External appearance was excellent and texture, flavor, and eating qualities were such as to produce an unusually flavorful and satisfying piece of bread.

That was at the end of 6 days, a time when ordinary bread is already moldy and discarded. The Siebel report showed that loaves of culturized bread did not show mold until the seventh day,

although they were kept in incubators at an average of 90° to 95° heat and 80 to 85 percent humidity, thus approximating poorest summer conditions. Even then the mold could only be found under a microscope.

As the result of these tests the potato bread received the Siebel certificate of merit.

But most of us here would not have needed chemical tests to show the logic of adding potatoes to bread. We could just recall when we were young and mother baked her own bread. Remember how she used to add mashed potatoes or potato water? Do you know why? Because, in addition to the better potato flavor, the bread stayed fresh longer and, because she only baked once a week, that was mighty important to her.

Schafer gets that same old-fashioned flavor and keeping quality by using potato culture. It proved so sensational that he bought the company which manufactured the culture and now nearly 300 bakeries around the country are adding this potato culture to all their white and dark bread, buns, rolls, doughnuts—and in fact, just about all of their yeast-raised baked goods.

I have a number of testimonial letters here which bear out the contention that potato bread has universal popularity. They come from top bakers the country over.

One Wisconsin baker says: "I could sell more if I could get the wrappers," and another in California says: "We have used a number of carloads and find that culturized potato flour is beneficial to flavor and keeping qualities and all-around uniformity."

A Mount Vernon, N. Y., baker says that he believes potato culture has a definite part in the baking industry and a Boston bread maker says that the culture adds that "particular something" which people want in bread.

The question now comes up: What to do about this?

I anticipate, naturally, that some of my colleagues from the Wheat Belt may be a bit apprehensive over what they might feel to be an effort to sell potato flour as at least a partial substitute for wheat flour.

Nothing could be farther from the truth.

This program actually will benefit their constituents both directly and indirectly. It will bring an over-all improvement of the farm picture and the elimination of the need for broad potato subsidies year after year, which, incidentally, this year consist of a $1.75- to $2-a-bushel support price.

Also, it is a known fact that the trend over a period of the last two decades has been toward eating less and less bread. A temporary halt in the trend resulted from the bread-enrichment program, but bakers fear that the down trend will be resumed.

That means less bread bought and less wheat used.

Now, per capita consumption of bread climbs where potato flour and culture are used in bread.

This Michigan baker, Jack Schafer, president of Peter Pan Bakeries, tells me that bread should be neutral and have the old-fashioned neutral flavor which potatoes impart. Bread should be the foundation for sandwiches made with butter, jelly, cheese, or a hundred other ways of using bread.

Surveys show that people actually eat more bread when it is neutral in flavor. It is something like water. People normally drink a lot of water; but if all they get is pop or something like that, their normal intake of liquids declines.

It is contended that addition of potato culture to bread actually will boost the over-all consumption to such an extent that wheat growers would benefit to a great degree.

And this really is just another step forward in the bread enrichment program which has helped so much and enabled bakers to bring to the American public a white bread that is both nourishing and palatable. Addition of potato culture further enriches bread.

Let me summarize the benefits which could be derived from the universal adoption of about a 4 percent potato flour or culture content in all white bread, dark bread, rolls, buns, doughnuts, and so forth.

It would mean that the bakers of this country would be using 4 pounds of potato flour to every 100 pounds of wheat flour they now use. It takes 5 pounds of raw potatoes to make a pound of flour, so that would result in an annual consumption of upwards of 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes. That would wipe out the surplus.

It would be even more beneficial to farmers than appears on the surface, because the commercial grades of potatoes used to make the flour are the hardest grades for him to market. In fact, the demand is so poor that millions of bushels are used each year as cattle feed and additional millions are never even taken from the ground.

This would be a new and most stable source of income for every farmer growing potatoes.

It would mean new millions of dollars in extra income for America's farmers and coming in at the very time when the effects of inflated wartime demand for foodstuffs can be expected to be on the wane.

I believe that this potato program could prove a source of income for the farmer which could well be a major factor in keeping his earnings stable over the coming years and help prevent another depression.

This could not be accomplished in time to solve the immediate problem but steps could be taken and the program started. And if flour-processing plants were put up they could process surplus potatoes for shipment abroad for relief during the twilight period in which a widespread program of encouraging the use of potato flour in bread was being made effective.

This is a common sense approach which would benefit every American by eliminating a problem which has long contributed to higher taxes—as every subsidy must.

It means a better bread for the American public.

It means more money and stable markets for the farmer.

If the bakers of this country were to adopt this program of including that small portion of potato flour in their products, it would solve the surplus potato problem immediately. However, we must realize that there is not enough potato flour processing capacity in existence at this time to handle the job and an educational program is desirable and necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend these facts to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture, who, I know, wants to help solve the potato surplus problem. I am calling on the Department of Agriculture to gather all available data—and to give the Congress soon a tangible recommendation of a plan of action to make the program effective.

The Late Honorable Lynn J. Frazier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague the Honorable WILLIAM LEMKE announced to the Congress yesterday the death of Lynn J. Frazier, former Senator, of North Dakota.

I, too, share with my colleague and the people of North Dakota in the loss sustained by the State of North Dakota in the passing of Lynn J. Frazier. It has never been my pleasure to become intimately associated with the Senator, nor to have known him well. It was in the early years of his governorship that I entered the State. I recall that those were stormy days in North Dakota.

It was under his regime that the Republican Party was split into two factions. He became the Governor of the State and the leader of the faction that is known to this day as the Non-Partisan League. But throughout these many years the league has remained Republican at election time. At no time have they ever sought a separate ballot or a third column.

For many years prior to the arrival of Lynn J. Frazier on the scene, there had been great dissension within the State over the prices of grain and the control of funds. The leaders of the Non-Partisan League charged the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and the business interests, including banks and railroads, of exercising dominant power over the economic life of the people of the State. It was under his leadership as Governor that the State constitution was changed permitting the bonding of the State to engage in an industrial program.

Lynn J. Frazier, then the Governor, entered upon his duties in the year 1916. He served two full terms and part of the third term. Under his direction many changes were wrought in the State's government and many bitter political battles took place. As a result of these battles the Governor was recalled in his third term. He was, however, after his

recall, elected by the people of the State of North Dakota United States Senator in the year 1922, and he served in this capacity for 18 years.

Despite the many who disagreed with Senator Frazier as Governor, it must be remembered in fairness to him that he administered well the affairs of the State, and he was confronted with difficult problems in putting into effect the new laws and the industrial program. At no time was there any charge against his character or his record.

His record as a United States Senator was one that highly commends him among the Members of that distinguished body. He has ever sought the welfare of the less fortunate people in the country and moved in the direction of legislation in their behalf on all occasions.

Senator Frazier leaves his wife and five children: two boys, Willis and Vernon; twin daughters, Uni and Versa; and a third daughter born during the second year of his term as Governor, named Lucille.

I extend to all the members of the family and those closely associated with him my profound sympathy in the loss of this distinguished citizen, husband, and father.

The Teachers' Pay Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune of January 9, 1947:

THE TEACHERS' PAY PROBLEM

The National Education Association, the national professional organization of educators, with a membership of more than 775,000, has come forth with a challenging declaration of policy calling for improved schools, higher professional standards for teachers, more adequate salaries for teachers, and more State and Federal aid for education.

The story of the shortage of teachers has been told so frequently in recent months that there seems no good reason for repeating it here. Most potent reason for the shortage, of course, is the low salary and other unattractive factors which go along with teaching school. That story is well known, too, and the present salary levels are a far cry from what the NEA describes as an essential minimum—$2,400 for a qualified beginner who is a college graduate, with increments beginning the second year of teaching and leading to a professional salary level of $4,000 to $6,000 for experienced teachers.

Even granting that the $2,400 is the "asking price," and that teachers would be willing to settle for less, especially since comparatively few college graduates in other fields make $2,400 during the first year they sport a college degree, it is going to take a lot of money to put teachers' salaries on a plane that will attract—and keep—the right kind of talent. The teachers have looked around and called upon Uncle Sam as the only man with enough money to do the job.

They must realize that Federal financing will mean, to a greater or lesser degree, Federal control. Governor Donnelly and his squabble with the Labor Department over the State employment service is the most recent, but not the only, example of what happens when the school district or the city or the State goes to Uncle Sam for help.

And, of course, Uncle Sam has only one place to get the money he so generously doles out to the school district, the city, or the State. It comes from the pockets of the taxpayers in the school district, the city, and the State. He can, of course, even up the benefits as between the rich areas and the poor areas—the haves and the have nots—and that is what the school teachers are seeking. At the same time he creates a lot of administrative jobs that send the cost to the taxpayers kiting.

Even considering the need for equalization of educational opportunity, we wonder whether the teaching profession is providing a very constructive sort of leadership for the Nation; whether it has considered the pitfalls of plunging the schools into Federal control; and whether it has explored other means of providing adequate and economical education for the Nation's youth, with teachers who are reasonably paid. It is, of course, an accepted fact that there must be State aid to insure proper school facilities in some poorer districts, but it also is pretty obvious that somewhere there is a backbreaking point in taxation. Somehow we are going to have to cut our pattern in education and other governmental functions to fit the cloth of our resources.

We wonder if our educators ever have considered the possibility that our public schools may be spending money on too many things; that the cost of the frills of education has made it impossible to raise salaries for those who are teaching the basic subjects which will prepare the pupil for college or a job. That, of course, may be a narrow view of the matter. There will be many educators who will say it is. On the other hand, the schools cannot do everything. And perhaps rushing to the Federal Government for money is one of the things they ought not be doing.

Significance of the Recent Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address by the Honorable John Q. Tilson, of New Haven, a distinguished Member of this House for 22 years and for 6 years the majority floor leader of the House, speaking before the Graduates Club of New Haven, Conn., on December 4, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and fellow club members, had I anticipated that my drawing power was such as to bring out a crowd like this, I might have struck John Plant for a larger honorarium. At any rate, I appreciate the fine audience.

Remembering the precept that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country, I had not expected to see so many.

I should be less than candid if I failed to say that an audience made up of men with whom I associate daily, lunch together, talk together, and discuss public questions together, is not an easy one for me to address somewhat formally. Somehow I feel that you know pretty well my "down sittings and uprisings, and understandest my thoughts from afar off."

When your chairman first suggested that I talk on the recent election and the significance of the result, he appeared really solicitous that so far as humanly possible my remarks on the subject should be unbiased. What a suggestion to a rock-ribbed, dyed-in-the-wool Republican. It reminded me of the good lady down in Charleston, S. C., who wished some one would write a really unbiased history of our Civil War—from a southern point of view. Perhaps the best way to leave it is that what I shall say will be unbiased—from a Republican viewpoint.

When I was in politics and we tried in advance to figure out the probable result, we usually made a certain percentage discount for damned liars. So if there are any New Dealers left and they are here tonight, they are free to make such discount as they deem proper for Republican bias. At least I do not wish to be a hypocrite, so what I say will be from the heart as well as from the shoulder.

The outcome of the recent election was what would be called in countries with a parliamentary form of government a vote by the people of lack of confidence in their government. It was a complete turn-over of the majority in both Houses of Congress. It was a mid-term reversal, that is, it occurred in the middle of a Presidential term. What does it mean? Broadly, what does it signify? Such mid-term reversals have been of very frequent occurrence in our national history and for all sorts of reasons, good, bad, and trivial. There were at least five such reversals between 1865 and 1895. It would serve no present purpose to refer to any of these, except perhaps, a brief reference to 1866.

In the election of 1864, Lincoln, a Republican, and Johnson, a Democrat, were elected on a Union ticket. Saving the Union was the issue, that is, winning the war. Lincoln had repeatedly made evident his policy for restoring the Union. When Johnson became President, the war being over and Lincoln dead, he tried his best to pursue this Lincoln program for reconstruction, but without success.

In the congressional election of 1866 an overwhelming majority of Republicans was elected. They were called Black Republicans then, and thoroughly deserved the name, for they proceeded to write one of the blackest chapters in all our American political history, from which the whole country still suffers. All of the cherished plans of Mr. Lincoln for restoration of the Union were ruthlessly scrapped for what was called reconstruction. It had in it a much larger element of destruction. I speak feelingly on the subject for I was born and brought up in a part of the country that had suffered greatly from the so-called reconstruction.

All the other midterm reversals may be skipped over till we come to 1910 when I myself was a Member of Congress. I was unable then and still am not able to figure out any substantial basis for the 1910 turnover. Perhaps Mr. Taft's ineptitude as a politician was as much responsible as any other cause. At any rate, the Democrats took control of Congress, and, as usually happens after a midterm reversal, the incumbent President was not reelected.

Almost the same can be said of the 1918 reversal when the Republicans resumed control of Congress. At the time of the congressional elections in 1918 the end of the war was in sight. By all the ordinary rules, Mr. Wilson's party should have been continued in power. There had been no issue between the parties during the war. Both had supported it loyally, and, as I well recall, most of the Republican candidates for reelection would have been glad to settle on a basis of status quo. If Mr. Wilson had asked his party to support at the election all Members of the war Congress who

had loyally supported the war, regardless of party label, few changes would have been made. To the contrary, he appealed to the voters to elect a Democratic Congress which they indignantly refused to do.

In the 1930 congressional elections, at the middle of Mr. Hoover's term, the result was very close but the Republicans had a majority of two in the House. Before the old Congress expired in March, the Republicans-elect held their caucus as usual, nominated Mr. Longworth for Speaker and unanimously reelected me as the majority floor leader for the new Congress.

As was then the practice, Congress was to meet in the December following, but before that date arrived, one Republican had resigned and five had died, Mr. Longworth being one of them. Of the six vacancies, five of them had been filled by Democrats, so that when Congress convened Texas' Jack Garner filled Speaker Longworth's place, and I had no majority to lead.

In the two earlier instances, under both Taft and Wilson, the change of parties probably made little difference in the legislation, though as usual it indicated a complete change of administration at the next Presidential election, which took place as expected.

In Mr. Hoover's case it probably did make a difference. A depression had descended upon the country and as usual the party in power was being held responsible for it. Mr. Hoover struggled manfully trying to do something about it, but proposals coming from him were coolly received by a hostile Congress and usually got nowhere. In fact, the real spirit of the triumphant majority, looking forward to a complete change, in 1932, was well expressed by one of the leaders when he said: "We'll do just enough to save the country, but not enough to save Hoover."

Now coming to the revolution of 1946, was it nothing more than the preliminary skirmish in the real battle to come off in 1948? Was it nothing more than the time-worn battle cry of "turn the rascals out," which usually means turn in another crew of rascals, or at least as near to that description as those turned out? As a confirmed optimist, I refuse to believe it. I believe that it meant a great deal more than this and that the next 2 years will so prove. To my mind the sobered attitude of mind shown by Republicans all over the country in the first blush of a victory, far more sweeping than had been expected, was a good omen. There were no victory parades, no red fire, no brass bands. No singing "Happy Days Are Here Again." One could feel it in the air that a sobering sense of responsibility held sway over thoughtful minds. All of which tends to give hope to those who look for something constructive to replace some of the legislation and activities under such legislation that have proved unwise and destructive of our domestic economy and our American way of life.

A few words as to the causes that brought about the revolution of 1946 may help to throw light upon its meaning and what may be expected to result from it. There are almost as many explanations as there are explainers, but there are a few things among the many that practically all analysts agree upon as having had an important influence in making the mandate given at the polls so emphatic.

Fortunately, we can at once eliminate all international issues. Such foreign policy as we have has been loyally supported by Republicans as well as Democrats. Republican VANDENBERG worked loyally and unselfishly shoulder to shoulder alongside of Democrat TOM CONNALLY to hold up the hands of Democrat Secretary Byrnes, while New Dealers Wallace and PEPPER were trying to undermine him. So there was no mention of foreign issues in the campaign and it could be truly said that beyond the water's edge we were a united country. However, of domestic issues there were plenty. Just a glance at some of the more important ones.

One of the two most important causes of the decisive turn-over, as agreed upon by analysts, was the attempt to fix prices and all the countless restrictions affecting the daily life of almost everyone. And it was not simply the inconvenience and sometimes distress caused by the restrictions and controls. These were borne with varying degrees of patience especially while the war lasted. What finally caused the worm to turn was that at last it became evident, even to the masses of the people, that the whole scheme was not only negatively futile but positively harmful, in the final result accomplishing exactly the opposite of what it had been supposed to do.

Patient in wartime, housewives got tired of waiting for meat, soap, and other necessities, while OPA controls snagged the supply lines. Consumers joined producers in protest. Millions of losers in the race between wages and prices joined the ranks of the dissatisfied. Honest dealers kept prices down, but their customers soon found that they had little or nothing to sell. The reversal at the polls was especially noticeable in the industrial areas, showing loss of faith in the promises that prices of necessities would be kept down.

Then people got mad and began to say things, yes, and got ready to do things, which purpose they proceeded to carry out on November 5th.

In addition to the inconvenience of so many controls steadily increasing, a number of people were beginning to fear that our Government had inclined toward the adoption of the kind of controls used under totalitarian forms of government and that these controls in the hands of a bureaucracy might become permanent. There were numerous statements to this effect made public. Max Lerner's book It Is Later Than You Think says: "It is neither accident nor whim that the New Deal is studded with 'alphabetical' agencies. Each of them occupies a salient on the advancing front of the transition to a socialized state." He speaks of them as essentially an executive government and the spear point of social advance, Mr. Roosevelt being described as the ideal leader for such an advance. To many such notions were cause for alarm.

Any administration ought to have known better than to have attempted to put into force and carry out such a colossal scheme of price fixing and controls. An early demonstration of the folly of such a scheme is interestingly referred to in an old letter written by Tom Paine to Danton in the time of the French Revolution, May 6, 1793. It reads as follows:

"I see also another embarrassing circumstance arising in Paris of which we had full experience in America. I mean that of fixing the price of provisions. * * * The Convention has nothing to do with regulations of this kind; neither can they be carried into practice. The people of Paris may say they will not give more than a certain price for provisions, but as they cannot compel the country people to bring provisions to market the consequence will be directly contrary to their expectations, and they will find dearness and famine instead of plenty and cheapness. They may force the price down upon the stock in hand, but after that the market will be empty. In Philadelphia we undertook, among other regulations of this kind, to regulate the price of salt; the consequence was that no salt was brought to market, and the price rose to 36 shillings sterling per bushel; and we regulated the price of flour till there was none in the market, and the people were glad to procure it at any price."

Referring to this letter and recalling the meat famine of last October, we can only say "History repeats itself."

Next to the disillusions and irritations connected with price controls and other exasperating restrictions, the unhappy labor situation doubtless influenced the election result more than anything else. The urgent need for production and more production was obvious while unprecedented strikes paralyzed vital major industries. There were strikes against public utilities on which millions depend for the means, comforts, and necessities of their daily lives. Even strikes against agencies of government itself. The voters decided that something must be wrong somewhere and clearly manifested their belief—that something should be done about it.

Following the election, editors, columnists, analysts, and a lot of plain ordinary people began figuring on what had happened and what might be anticipated in the near and more distant future. It was quite generally agreed that the CIO and the PAC, having stuck their necks out the farthest, had been the hardest hit. Lumping the two together as a single entity, Mark Sullivan says it "saw defeat of candidates it supported, victory for candidates it opposed. It saw an election outcome which means, more than any other one thing, a mandate by the country to the new Congress to write new labor legislation. It sees a change of mood on the part of the President, who now is undoubtedly willing to sign labor legislation which before the election he vetoed."

Certainly, the result makes it clear that the country is not ready to go along with the extremists. At least a halt has been called so that people may take time to consider the direction in which we are heading. It is my belief that President Truman will welcome the opportunity to change his attitude toward labor legislation. I believe that he will sign any reasonable bill to improve the present impossible situation in regard to labor relations. As a real friend of labor, he can justify his act. In my judgment it will be good party politics to do so besides being the best thing for this country, including labor, of course. Even if he felt that it would not be wise politically to actually sign such a bill, he could, and, I believe, would, exercise the constitutional privilege of holding it 10 days and permitting it to become a law without his approval.

I may be far too much a confirmed optimist, but I really believe that Truman as a patriot and a good American will strive during the coming 2 years to adjust himself to the situation confronting him by cooperating with Congress as far as possible, and that we shall see some good legislation instead of the deadlock and do-nothing feared by many. His greatest handicap will be his political advisers and the millions of officeholders who quite naturally wish to hold on to their jobs. In spite of this, I shall continue to hope that Mr. Truman will so meet the difficult task confronting him as to grow in the confidence of the people rather than lose further ground.

Let me close by giving you part of an editorial from an Ohio county newspaper because it covers much of the ground I have tried to cover and closes on the same optimistic note:

"Where do we go from here? It is obvious that New Deal nostrums and quack governmental remedies, with every man a king and everyone made happy by Government planning his life and fortune, is out the window. The people have turned thumbs down on the planners. But Republican strategists now in the saddle will do well not to seek to hoodwink the public by telling them 'happy days are here again.'

"The people should be told the truth. After being made to believe for 14 years that black is white and two and two makes five, this novel approach to public questions might be good politics as well as good ethics. A campaign of education should emphasize the truism that no government on earth can create wealth or is gifted with black art which will produce wealth without work or creative industry; the people should be told that for the first time since Alexander Hamilton the credit of the Federal Government has been impaired by vast New Deal expenditures before the war and by incomprehensible sums expended in prosecuting the greatest war of all time; they should be told that economy is not optional, it is imperative; and that ambitious programs of public works and social legislation must await a clearing of the financial skies; labor should be told that wages come out of profits and the only way to maintain the high standard of American living is by creating wealth by capital and labor working in unison.

"Everyone should be told the blunt and unpleasant truth that we cannot juggle ourselves out of the mess we are in through political hocus-pocus or demagogic promises or legerdemain. We have all got to get down to work and produce something beside monkey wrenches to throw into the political machinery.

"The road ahead is long and hard, but it is not a hopeless task with which we are confronted. May the Republicans, now in the driver's seat in Congress, with a reasonable assurance of being in power in the executive branch of government 2 years hence, lead us with wisdom and courage through the troubled postwar waters which lie ahead. We must not fail. This blessed land, this lighthouse of liberty to millions of enslaved human beings throughout the world, must and shall be preserved."

Why Government Labor Courts Must Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by R. C. Hoiles, of Santa Ana, Calif., and published in the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum on January 11, 1947, entitled "Why Government Labor Courts Must Fail." This is a lucid explanation and goes right to the heart of the matter. It follows:

WHY GOVERNMENT LABOR COURTS MUST FAIL

(By R. C. Hoiles)

Many people think that the labor problem can be solved by government labor courts. If the word "compulsory" were used in discussing these labor courts, most people would not believe in them. But government labor courts would either have to have authority to enforce their decisions, and thus be compulsory, or else be only advisory. In either case, that is not the solution.

If a labor court is to be simply advisory it invariably will side with the party that has the most votes in order to keep its job as adviser. The consumer is the best voluntary counsel for labor disputes.

But let's consider what it would be if it were compulsory. Because we have courts to settle disagreement, many people think we can have courts to settle labor disputes. But the case is not at all parallel. At present courts attempt only to interpret agreements that have already been made. They never attempt to tell two people they must make an agreement.

Let us suppose that an individual has a written agreement with his automobile dealer. He deems that the dealer has transgressed the agreement and takes it to court. The court interprets the agreement and tells what each party must do to comply with the agreement.

But the judge does not and would not attempt to say, in the absence of any prior commitment, what the automobile dealer should do in the absence of any agreement. The judge would not say that the individual must continue to patronize the automobile dealer or that the dealer must continue to do business with the individual, if there had been no agreement.

But compulsory arbitration on labor matters would do exactly that. It would attempt to force two parties to continue a relationship which they might not want to continue. If there is a labor dispute the labor court would come in. It hands down its decision, and the workers, although dissatisfied, must keep on working. They very likely would not keep on working, but we will assume they did. They probably would come to work but lay down on the job, so that the employer would not even want them there.

But suppose that the employees do continue their services under a decision unsatisfactory to them. After a year the arbitrators would call again. This time suppose the award is more satisfactory to the workers but the employer says he cannot abide it and still continue in business. Would he be privileged to close down his shop? Or would the workers have a right to say that since they were forced to accept a distasteful situation a year before, it is poor justice that does not also compel the employer to accept a decision unsatisfactory to him?

Hardly any contract is completely satisfactory to both sides. Both would like to have a better contract but it is the best they both can get. So instead of either one quitting or striking, both of them agree. Then we have no strikes. Then we have continued production. Then everybody, including the customers, workers, and employers, benefits more than if there were no agreement, even if not completely satisfactory to each side.

The Government has no magical way of making agreements satisfactory to both sides. The Government is only force. Compulsion or force is always distasteful or obnoxious to those on whom it is used.

The only way strikes can be avoided is by agreement. The only way we can have voluntary agreements, and all real agreements are voluntary, is to have each party realize that he never can get all he wants and that all he is entitled to is the right to make a bargain with anyone in the world who will give him the best bargain. That is all either the employer or worker is entitled to. Anything else takes away from some person his God-given right to exchange his services with the person who will give him the most.

If the Government interferes with free exchanges it is not an impartial government; it is a government of men rather than a government of law. Unless we can get people to believe that no man, no matter how poor, and no firm, no matter how rich, has a right to have protection from competition, we will continue to have labor troubles. Our production will be restricted, friction will grow, and our standard of living will be less than it would be, and unless we are careful, we will wind up with a dictator who will tell us all how we shall trade.

Resolution of Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD A. COFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

To the Congress of the United States:

At a meeting of the board of governors of the Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee held November 14, 1946, in Washington, D. C., it was unanimously resolved that the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to investigate by an appropriate committee the adequacy and results of existing labor laws and regulations, to determine among other basic requisites of sound labor relations the following:

A. If the said laws and regulations do give protection to the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively.

B. If the equality of bargaining power has been restored between employers and employees.

C. If fundamental practices have been encouraged to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions.

D. If business has been safeguarded from injury, impairment or interruption.

Respectfully submitted.

NONBASIC STEEL COORDINATING COMMITTEE,
By E. S. EVANS, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Governors.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 4, 1947.*

Year of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, during the annual convention of the Speech Association of America, which was held this year in the Sherman Hotel, of Chicago, Dr. W. Norwood Brigance, chairman of the speech department of Wabash College and president of the Speech Association of America, delivered one of the most stimulating and thought-provoking addresses it has been my pleasure to hear in many years.

It is a challenge to Congress as well as to American citizens generally as this Republic surveys its educational problems which include not only the need for the more adequate financing of schools and more respectable salaries for teachers but which also emphatically include the need for a careful scrutiny and reevaluation of the curricula of our schools and colleges to determine how much of the course of study is adapted and adaptable to the world of today and how much simply remains in the curriculum because of tradition, inertia, or indifference.

Mr. Speaker, Congress will have before it many suggestions for strengthening the educational program of America. The following address by Dr. Brigance should be "must" reading for us all before we make final decisions on legislative proposals involving the great cause of education.

It is not enough that we promote education; we should do what we can to improve the types of education to be promoted.

SPEECH OF W. NORWOOD BRIGANCE, "YEAR OF DECISION"

That iconoclastic historian, Bernard DeVoto, wrote a significant book 3 years ago entitled "The Year of Decision: 1846." It was a history of America in that one year, 1846, and it was DeVoto's contention that the course of American history and the pattern of American life for the half century following were determined by events and decisions that took place in the year 1846.

It is a paradox that the year 1946, even more than 1846, is likely to be significant as a year of decision: 1946 is year one of the atomic bomb; 1946 is year one of the United Nations organization; 1946 is year one of a power struggle between two political philosophies, communism and democracy—or what passes for communism and democracy—that is likely to test both our ability to handle atomic weapons without explosion and to live under a United Nations organization. As a discerning wit remarked, "From now on, we know it is one world, all right; but we don't know yet whether it is to be this world or the next world."

Robert M. Hutchins said last May to the American Council on Education: "The great problems before us are first, can we survive? and second, what kind of life are we going to lead if we do?" Then he added that the world must try to arrive at a destination where survival is possible within not more than 5 years.

If Hutchins is right, then 1946 is year one of our 5 years of grace. If he is right, it is still a year of decision, because what we have done in this year, and shall do during the first half of 1947, is likely to determine for a long time to come the course of history, not for America alone but for the world.

II

Now this year of decision in international affairs is also a year of decision in American education, for the obvious reason that the repercussions in the political and military world have set off seismic tremors in the academic world: 1946 is year one of the Harvard report on general education in a free society; 1946 is the year of the Columbia University report on a college plan in action; 1946 is a year in which more than 100 colleges and universities, including what we may call the eminent institutions, have either announced or instituted a revised curriculum; 1946 is a year in which Mr. Hutchins' pronunciamentos on the fall of man have been accelerated in tempo.

In brief, 1946 is a year in which American education is attempting to fix a new pattern of education. It is the most widespread curriculum revision since the day of Charles W. Eliot, and it is likely to determine the direction of education for at least the next generation.

Therefore, I want to look at two of these recommendations for curriculum change—two that are widely known and that reflect the thinking of a large area of traditionism in education—and I want to estimate their implications.

III

The first is that proposed by Mr. Hutchins. Mr. Hutchins, of course, is a curious cross between "Peck's bad boy" in education and a lonely, austere Savonarola who thunders, "Repent ye, or be doomed!" His tenets are these:

1. The human race is either about to destroy itself, or to survive under a "peace more horrible than war"—unless we change our present system of education, drastically and at once.

2. To save the human race from this ill-fated alternative, we must abandon vocational education in the schools, and make all education a liberal education "for the common vocation of citizenship."

3. The core of this liberal education is not to be found in a study of modern science or social science, or in focussing on the contemporary problems that beset man. It is to be had in the study of great books of the past—let us say, Homer and Thucydides, Virgil and Augustine. Somewhere along the line I either read or heard a speech of Mr. Hutchins' in which he said that the curriculum he proposed would not be essentially altered over the period of 100 years, or even 1,000 years. Pure knowledge, because it was pure, was not defiled by time. I believe I am not doing Mr. Hutchins an injustice by saying that this is an inherent part of his plan of education.

Now, Mr. Hutchins' faith is appealing. He is so earnest and so unashamed that you cannot help but admire him. In the midst of a modern world, created for the most part by the educators who rebeled against the ascetic pattern of education—I assume it is understood by persons in this room that the scientific and economic foundations of modern society were laid by educators who broke away from the classical tradition—Mr. Hutchins repeats without apology an old refrain:

"Faith of our fathers, living still,
In spite of dungeon, fire, and sword,
We will be true to thee 'til death!"

He stirs in us old memories. We want to believe him. Perhaps we want to believe him because he calls to us with a childlike faith. Perhaps also we want to believe him because his is a simple faith, and we are hungry for simplicity. So many of our problems are complex. We want to get back to the days when life was simple, or we thought it was simple.

But we cannot quite give our intellectual assent to Mr. Hutchins. If it were wholly an act of faith, we might go along; but reason compels us to pause. Perhaps, too, we remember that warning spoken by Dr. Donald B. Tresidder, once an eminent physician and now president of Stanford University. Said Dr. Tresidder to a group of educators last May at which Mr. Hutchins was present: "I have long been interested in Robert Hutchins—from a medical point of view!"

Essentially, Mr. Hutchins' grand scheme of education breaks down at that point which Ortega y Gassett calls "historic reason." Gassett has pointed out that when a people think effectively they think in terms of their historic past, and they use "historic reason." Mr. Hutchins, in calling upon the faith of his fathers, denies historic reason.

He would take us back to the educational concept of the early Middle Ages, to a pattern of education that closed the Platonic schools, and rested its learning on the Sacred Books of the Past—with the result that the intellectual world was frozen for 1,000 years. It was not inevitable that we have the Middle Ages. Part of the responsibility for it rests on those educators who closed the Platonic schools and anticipated Mr. Hutchins by 1,500 years. They were the original worshipers of great books.

Mr. Hutchins is seemingly unaware that the educational gospel he preaches was also the dominant theme of education in the oldest of all civilizations—that of China—and that its effect was to still the spirit of inquiry in the Chinese mind, or at least to prevent its ever arising, and that this pattern of education was perhaps the single most influential factor in the slow withering of what otherwise might have become a great civilization. Again, it was not inevitable that China should be as it is today. Part of that responsibility rests on those educators of China 2,500 years ago who fixed on China the pattern of education that Mr. Hutchins would fix on us.

Thomas Jefferson warned us against Mr. Hutchins' doctrine a century and a quarter ago. At the age of 73, when many minds look backward instead of forward, Jefferson wrote urgently that "* * * institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. * * * as new discoveries are made * * * institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times," and he warned against any society remaining "ever under the regimen of their ancestors" (Writings, Ford, ed. X, 42-43).

Ralph Waldo Emerson repeated that warning 109 years ago. Speaking before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Harvard, he said bluntly:

"Each age, it is found, must write its own books. * * * Meek young men grow up in libraries, believing it their duty to accept the views which Cicero, which Locke, which Bacon, have given; forgetful that Cicero, Locke, and Bacon were only young men in libraries when they wrote these books."

Hence, instead of Man Thinking, we have the bookworm.

Mr. Hutchins' plan of bookworm education fails in the test of historic reason.

IV

Next, I would like to look at the Harvard report on General Education in a Free Society. I began reading that report before the printer's ink on it was decently dry. I had been waiting for its appearance for almost a year. I think I can truthfully say I started reading it with excitement. I expected something of the institution that had produced Charles W. Eliot, who touched off the educational changes of the late nineteenth century.

Well, one is not wholly disappointed in the Harvard report. In many respects it is what one would expect from Harvard: scholarly, thorough, and at times brilliant. But it is characterized by the limitations of the Harvard institutional mind, limitations from which Charles Eliot had been wholly free (and from which the Harvard scientists are free today). I do not mean to imply that the institutional mind of Harvard is a separate and distinct species. It is rather a particularized pattern of the academic institutional mind, but it is characterized by its own particular limitations. These limitations, for example, are seen in the historical writings of those Harvard historians, Albert Bushnell Hart and Edward Channing, as contrasted with their Harvard successor, A. M. Schlesinger, who was educated at Ohio State and Columbia. It was the pattern of mind dealt with by Vernon L. Parrington, himself a Harvard man, in his Main Currents in American Thought.

But if you want to meet the Harvard institutional mind at its best, you will find it in John P. Marquand's delightful satire, the Pulitzer prize-winning novel of 1938, The Late George Apley. Marquand understood the type of mind that produced the Harvard report, and he satirized it in a wicked and delightful manner. To anyone who plans to read that report, I recommend first reading The Late George Apley. Having done that, you can read more discerningly between the lines of the report:

"DEAR JOHN: [wrote the late George Apley to his son] When I come I want you to take me to some of the new plays, and please don't feel that I shall be shocked by them. Your father can stand a good deal."

And again:

"DEAR JOHN: * * * Yesterday I found that your mother had actually taken this [Sigmund] Freud book out of the Athenaeum. She was embarrassed when I found her reading it * * *, and gave as her reason that she wished to know what [your sister] Eleanor was doing. I am now reading it for the same reason."

Throughout the Harvard report there is this shocked acceptance of the present, a resentment that we are living today instead of yesterday. In the allied Harvard report made in 1942 on the training of secondary school teachers, especially with reference to English, this resentment against having to live today produces the following incredibly delightful statement.

"Unfortunately, however, there is another element * * * and this is the mass-communication of the newspapers, magazines, movies, and (especially) the radio. The tendency of all of them * * * is to cajole and lull readers, onlookers, or listeners into a permanent state of unquestioning receptivity; to prevent their becoming reasoning, critical beings" (p. 4).

The late George Apley said exactly the same thing in the same overtones:

"DEAR JOHN: I wish there weren't quite so many new ideas. Where do they come from? * * * I try to think what is in back of them and speculation often disturbs my sleep."

This attempt to deny the existence of the present, or at least a resentment against having to deal with it, is the underlying philosophy of the latter half of the Harvard report. It states and adheres to the premise that one of the purposes of education is to free the student from the tyranny of the present. We all agree with that, of course. I want to make that very clear. There is no understanding the present without knowing a significant part of the past. That is precisely what I had in mind in quoting Ortega y Gassett, that we think effectively only when we think in terms of the historic past and use historic reason. I believe that. But the effect of the Harvard report is to free the student from the tyranny of the present by fixing on him the tyranny of the past. To some of us, tyranny in any form is bad.

It was against this tyranny of the past in education that Thomas Jefferson struck when he turned his back on his own alma mater, William and Mary, and established the new University of Virginia—to break the grip of the dead hand of the past that smothered living learning.

It was against this tyranny of the past that Charles Francis Adams II protested to Harvard University itself, in a year when he was a member of the Harvard Board of Overseers. Of the education he had received at Harvard he said:

"No matter how long I may live, I shall never be able * * * to overcome some of the great disadvantages which the * * * wrong theories and worse practices of my alma mater inflicted upon me. And not on me alone. * * * We were all college graduates, and yet how many of us could follow out a line of sustained, close thought, expressing ourselves in clear concise terms?"

It is one thing to study the past. It is another to be smothered by it.

I want to make it clear that much of the Harvard report is good, is in fact very good. Especially, it seems to me, that its statement of the traits of mind that constitute education are the best I have ever read.

These abilities are, the report states, "to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, to discriminate among values. They are not, in practice, separable and are not to be developed in isolation" (p. 65).

Its exposition of these abilities is profound and penetrating. For example, it recognizes three aspects of effective thinking: (1) Logical thinking, or "the capacity to extract universal truths from particular cases and, in turn, to infer particulars from general laws"; (2) relational thinking, or the "understanding of complex and fluid situations, in dealing with which logical methods are not adequate * * * thinking in a context"; (3) the element of imagination in thinking, which is "distinctive in the thinking of the poet" and may be described as neither straight thinking, nor crooked thinking, but as "curved thinking" (pp. 65–67).

This part of the report states explicitly that "education is not merely the imparting of knowledge, but the cultivation of certain aptitudes and attitudes" (p. 64).

If the report adhered to this throughout, it would be the greatest document on education of the twentieth century. Its failure is that it does not. Having set this as the qualities of mind to be developed by education, the report then—curiously and without explanation—settles back on the orthodox curriculum divisions of the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. From that point it ceases to offer any further original or profound contribution.

One is at loss to explain the inconsistency, or shall we say the failure to follow through. Was it because the two parts of the report were developed by two subcommittees which, being unable to reconcile their differences, simply let them stand unreconciled? Or was the committee a victim of structural monism, seeking for a unified simplicity? At any rate, it settled back on a structural unity, simple but adequate, of natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

V

Basically the weakness of Mr. Hutchins' grand scheme and of the latter part of Harvard report is that they rest tacitly on the assumption that knowledge is power. "Give students knowledge," they say in effect, "and they will be able to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, and to discriminate among values." No one questions this need for knowledge, not in the least, but knowledge alone does not enable people to think effectively, to communicate thought, or make relevant judgments, or discriminate among values. Having the knowledge is not enough. There must be added ability to use that knowledge.

In every crisis of the twentieth century there has existed enough knowledge in the world to solve it. But it was not in the right place at the right time. That is another way of saying that it could not be communicated to the point needed, at the time needed.

Twice before I have referred to Ortega y Gassett's insistence on the importance of historic reason. Let me use it now in specific instance. Ramsey Muir, one of the most competent of English historians, at the close of his discussion of the English Civil War, set forth one of the issues of modern education. He had just finished the account of this conflict which rent the English people 300 years ago. It was a conflict between two political forces that rejected compromise. The Royalists had lost, their King had been executed, their leaders had been proscribed, and Cromwell had been made dictator. The Puritans had won a victory as complete as any victory by force can ever be won. Yet at Cromwell's death 5 years later, the fruits of victory were lost and the Stuart Kings were restored to the throne. It was a conflict in which the Puritans lost in the end because they had won the war. After describing this, Muir came to his momentous statement:

"The war had taught the English people 'that even the noblest and the most enlightened aims are vitiated and will eventually be frustrated if those who advocate them try to secure their victory by force, and not by discussion and persuasion. These [discussion and persuasion] were to be henceforth the characteristic notes of the growth of free institutions in the British Commonwealth.'" (A Short History of the British Commonwealth, II, 487.)

The British people learned that in the seventeenth century, not through their educational system, but through war and dictatorship. What it thus learned is what every democracy must teach to every successive generation: That democracy rests on discussion and persuasion, that its people shall discuss their problems and reach an intelligent consensus, that they shall not goosestep to military commands, nor yield to mob law.

There are two kinds of nations in the world today, only two: Those who in crises want to shoot it out, and those who have learned how to talk it out. There are these two kinds, no more. They are the democratic nations, and the totalitarian nations. That is the essence of what Macaulay meant when he made the famous statement that, "Parliamentary government is government by speaking."

Now the education of each successive generation in this process, always essential to democracy, has now become essential to the survival in its present form of what we choose to call civilization. Uranium 235—and its derivative, plutonium—have brought us exactly to that point. Either we accept it, or accept the alternative given by Reuben Gustavson: "I believe in one uranium atom, divisible, with oblivion for all."

The England described by Muir could develop this by methods not to be relied on today. To paraphrase Disraeli, it was a government, "by the few, and the very few." Only one man in ten had the right to vote, and none of the women. But the gentlemen of England who ran that Government had been trained in the home, trained also by tutors, and trained, finally, in college—not only to communicate their ideas effectively, but also to settle their differences by talk. That was the core of their democracy.

Today, in contrast, we have universal suffrage. This is simply another way of saying that the 9 men in 10 who did not vote 300 years ago now control the government. Yet we have not developed any system comparable to the home-tutor-college training among the gentlemen of England for educating the whole electorate of today in the use of discussion as an instrument for making group decisions. The Hutchins scheme and the Harvard report fail entirely to provide in any way for this inherent feature on which democracy now rests and has always rested.

These educators are irked by the present. They want to escape from it by living in the past. But the relentless pressure of the present cannot be escaped by ignoring it. Consider one aspect of this pressure of the present. The radio and talking picture now carry the human voice around the world. They have become the most powerful instruments in existence for mass education and mass thought-stimulation, for people today hear and are influenced by the voices from Hollywood, Washington, London, Rome, and Moscow. The sheer existence of the radio determines to a large degree our choice of national rulers. It exerts a constant influence on the operation of democratic government. Is it asking too much that educators in this year of decision face the fact frankly that these inventions compel a reappraisal of some of the older methods of education that were based on the primacy of the printed page?

What do Hutchins and the Harvard committee say should be done about these forces of mass education and mass through-stimulation? Nothing. Nothing at all. They not only fail to recognize the new form of an old force. They failed to recognize the old force itself. The only reference I can find to the radio or moving pictures appears in the 1942 Harvard report on the training of English teachers. I quote: "The recom-

mended program contains no element of special training * * * in such instruments of education as the radio and the moving picture" (p. 139).

I don't want to be facetious, but the general impression I get from the Harvard report is that the teaching, let us say, of Beowulf is highly acceptable in a modern curriculum, and that one may devote a substantial part of time in college to pursuing the pronunciation of the phoneme [i] in Wessex during the twelfth century—or indeed anything that comes out of the past, just so long as it can be examined in terms of course-content. The fact that "much of yesterday's wisdom is today's banality and tomorrow's baloney" does not trouble the framers of this report.

But I submit that an inherent part of education is to be able to do something, as well as to know something. I submit further that every educated person ought to know when a thing is proved and when it is not proved, should know how to investigate and to analyze a proposition that confronts him, and how to search for a solution, how to talk about it effectively before others, and how to contribute to a discussion on problems of joint interest.

Above all, I submit that any educational system should produce an understanding in the next generation—and here I am quoting Eric Hodgins, vice president of Time, Inc.:

"That clear and understandable communication between man and man is the most important necessity in the material world; that wars, plagues, pestilences, and famines are eventually to be done away with only through this means. Here indeed is a proposition on which free and Christian mankind can unite as upon almost nothing else."

Mr. Hutchins' grand scheme and the Harvard report stop short of this vital aspect of education. They fall short, therefore, of offering a full philosophy of general education in a free society.

It is our duty in this year of decision to see that this omission shall not go unnoticed and unchallenged.

VI

Here perhaps I ought to stop. But there is one thing more I want to say, a reference to a fact that ought to make every educator uneasy in conscience, namely, the grave indictment against education that those great political and social upheavals which have marked the history of man, have been too largely caused by men of education. The French Revolution, the American Revolution, the Jeffersonian revolution, the Jacksonian revolution—and I forbear to mention political disturbances the past 20 years—represent upheavals in which the underprivileged and undereducated were compelled to overthrow the dominion of the privileged and educated. I grant that leadership in these movements came from a few, a very few, of the educated class. I remind you that the majority of the so-called educated people stood against change, until much of the violence of these upheavals came from delayed pressure which the educated people had helped to create.

To what extent was this due to the kind of education given them in school—that study of the dead past as a dead past, the curriculum criticized by Jefferson as "the regimen of their ancestors," the educational practices branded by Charles Francis Adams as the "wrong theories and worse practices * * * inflicted upon me. And not on me alone."?

The concept of Greek education was, "Know thyself." The concept of some of the educational planners today is, "Know the Greeks," or "Know the novelists of the nineteenth century, including the obscure ones."

I heard a man who calls himself an educator say the other day, "All right, we can make an atomic bomb. So what? That has nothing to do with the college curriculum." That our educational system could produce such a man is an indictment of that system.

Ogden Reid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of January 5, 1947:

OGDEN REID

For a third of a century Ogden Reid was editor of this newspaper. It is not too much to say that it was the one great concern of his living, night and day, throughout that long term of years. He lived to see it reach new heights of power and prestige; and now that he is gone, perspective emphasizes that his character, his leadership, was the central fact in this achievement.

Reserve was instinctive to him. He liked understatement in the written word, and his own speech, for all its straightforward strength, was courtesy itself. The domineering executive was utterly alien to his nature. It was through suggestion and restraint, rather than direct command, that he influenced the growth of his paper. Many others contributed to the flowering of the Herald Tribune under his regime. He welcomed skills of every type, knew how to encourage them by a discerning word and stood by his staff with a loyalty that made the paper the best of workshops.

His loyalty bears defining. It was part and parcel of his devotion to the newspaper, his love for it, his interest in it. That loyalty ran first of all to the paper as an institution. His thought and desire were that the Herald Tribune should live on regardless of the life span of any one individual. His goal was to surround himsef with the best minds he could discover, to consult his advisers on every major problem and intrust to his heads of departments a maximum of freedom.

As a matter of course, such loyalty included the members of his staff. He knew them as friends. He cared deeply about their personal problems, and if ever in their outside labors they ran afoul of arrogance in public officials there was no question where their chief stood. Ogden Reid took his stand first and investigated later; his man was right until proved wrong. Mayors, governors, presidents could come and go; the Tribune lived on. Such backing brought its reward in a staff unique in its loyalty and affection.

A word belongs to his courage. It could be said of him that he did not know what fear was. Whenever an institution has survived the gales and rides the seas securely it is easy to forget the narrow escapes and the critical hours. The years of Ogden Reid's captaincy included some of the hardest weather in newspaper history. The mortality in newspaper life was high everywhere. In New York City some of the strongest foundered. It was one of Ogden Reid's greatest qualities as a leader that nothing could shake his confidence, his faith. However grave the threats, he set an example of calm steadiness that served the ship well.

If this paper has sought and preserved a distinction in style that was part of its long tradition, there again the taste of its editor gave the tone. Its critics, in art, in music, in literature, or in the theater and the motion pictures, a long and notable line, were a chief interest for Mr. Reid. In their selection as in their encouragement he was deeply concerned. In the style of its writing, as in its typography, he sought to make the paper worthy of its highly intelligent reading public.

The 33 years have been not less a period of grave problems with respect to the character and the presentation of news of national and international thinking. No one could have been a more staunch Republican; but it was equally his conviction that a good Republican must be an independent one and that party allegiance must never be permitted to outweigh considerations of the national welfare. Whenever times compelled, his editorial page opposed his party and followed the line of patriotism as he saw it.

There was a quality of straightforwardness in his speech as there was of thoroughness in his thinking which gave at once strength and simplicity to his actions. What he knew, he knew. His memory was extraordinary, as accurate as it was retentive. A basic sense of justice underlay his whole approach to life. He had great patience with individuals, as with problems. He refused to jump to conclusions or heed public clamor. The same quality of mind which made him believe in fair play for every human being—in the ballot for women, in equality for Negroes, for example—gave balance to his thinking which made his decisions, when reached, almost invariably sound. Yet if any member of his staff could master a novel proposal it received a ready welcome on its merits; the fact that it was different from an accepted pattern was a spur rather than a check to its acceptance. In a period of mighty changes he had the ability alike to hold fast to what was right and to accept open-mindedly what was demonstrably in the line of progress.

He was, beyond question, a leader. His were the virtues to hold a staff true to its best. There could be no doubting his courage, his loyalty, his strength, his sense of justice. He lived as he died, beloved and unafraid.

Twilight Christians of the Western World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the text of a powerful and splendid sermon delivered by the Most Reverend Bryan J. McEntegart, D. D., bishop of Ogdensburg, N. Y., at the annual red Mass sponsored by the New York Guild of Catholic Lawyers at St. Andrew's Church, New York, N. Y., Friday, September 27, 1946:

TWILIGHT CHRISTIANS OF THE WESTERN WORLD

"Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy, and vain deceit; according to the traditions of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ." (Colossians 2: 8.)

Recently a correspondent in Japan wrote for us the tragic story of the twilight Christians who live in the Gotos Islands, about 60 miles out from Nagasaki.

Three hundred years ago when persecution was raging in Japan, their Catholic ancestors fled to these islands and established there a Christian underground. Their priests were murdered or exiled, and they became a flock without a shepherd. In the second half of the nineteenth century, priests were allowed to return. They were recognized and welcomed by about half of the hidden Christians; but thousands of others failed to come forward.

Today, some 30,000 of these unrecovered Christians are groping in the twilight of their half-forgotten and half-distorted traditions.

Their form of baptism is a corruption of the Latin used by the early missionaries. At least 11 of their prayers seem to be derived from Catholic prayers. In their "Our Father" there are a few intelligible old Japanese words. Their "Hail Mary" contains the words "Ave Maria" and "Sancta Maria" but the remainder does not make sense. The remnants of the old Christian traditions are now encrusted with pagan ideas and pagan practices.

For these people the thread of history snapped about 1640. Yet they still look for the day when priests will come from overseas to reestablish their religion. Though they have eyes to see and ears to hear, they do not realize that in their midst are the saving doctrines they long for. Such is the history of the Twilight Christians of the Far East—a people whose lips speak the time-honored words of Christianity while their minds think the thoughts of a decadent, futile paganism.

I. THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

Like the early Christians of the Gotos Islands, our forefathers enjoyed the fullness of the Christian heritage. From the days when St. Paul first set foot in imperial Rome, Christian missionaries flooded over Europe, driving back the curtain of paganism and setting up great Christian centers. Through many centuries the teachings of Christ inspired the growth of social and political institutions and formed the basis for a sound juridical order.

Following the discovery of the New World, the intrepid colonists brought to the Western Hemisphere the culture of their homelands. The roots of American institutions, therefore, reach back to the soil of Christian culture and civilization. For the religion of our pioneers was not just a ritual of worship; it was a philosophy of life, permeating man's daily actions.

Let us examine that philosophy of life. In it, as in every philosophy of life, the key is to be found in man's ultimate values. It recognized, as the supreme possession of man, immortal life; as his final goal, union with God. All else in life had value only in relation to that end. "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?" Man's material welfare was the means of promoting his higher activities. His use of this world's goods was to achieve the ultimate goal of union with God.

Man's relationships with other men were based on a more fundamental relationship, that between himself and a personal God. Justice was a virtue that had as its motive obedience to the will of an infinitely just God. The rights of others were their sacred possessions, inviolable because of the dignity of human nature and the inescapable authority of God. Liberty and freedom were not the irresponsible yearnings of an unbridled heart, but a God-given faculty to dispose at will of this world's goods within the limits of the supernatural purpose of life.

The eternal happiness to be found in the unending embrace of God was the center of the Christian philosophy of life, the key to its meaning, the inherent principle of its unity. As all came from God, all tended to God. Man derived his dignity from the image of God impressed on his immortal soul. Mankind was one under the fatherhood of God. And all men were subject to one universal norm of morality—the will of God, our sanctification.

This, in brief, is the Christian philosophy of life, the wellspring of the most cherished ideals of that spiritual order which we know as western civilization.

II. MATERIALIST PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

Today, however, western civilization faces the challenge of a radically different philosophy of life, Marxian materialism. The key to that philosophy, as to all others, lies in its ultimate values. The horizon of Marxian materialism is drawn in to the ponderable things of life. Its ultimate goal is the unrestrained exploitation of material wealth. Its standard of human conduct is whether an action promotes or retards world domination by the proletariat.

Truth, then, in this philosophy, is not the measure of words by reality but the clever use of words to advance political or social aims. Justice means not to "render to each his due" but to seize, to exploit, to gain by whatever means expedient. Right does not depend on a moral obligation and an external inviolability of the moral law, but rather upon the force which stands behind it.

When matter and might are supreme, individuals lose their identity in the masses; human nature loses its dignity. When men are motivated by material values alone, then force becomes their only principle of action. Freedom and liberty cannot exist where force is supreme. Hence, the inevitable result of a materialistic world order is either slavery for the masses in a totalitarian regime, or the utter annihilation of the human race in the ultimate clash of force upon force. Such, even now, is the verdict of history.

III. THE MODERN CONFUSION

This materialistic philosophy of life, full blown in the communistic state, is drawn up in deadly array against what we call the Christian way of life, our civilization. Its objectives are clear—world domination and the ruthless exploitation of the goods and peoples of all nations. Its forces are marshaled under an iron discipline.

Against it, the leaders of western civilization present a scattered array, wavering in indecision and uncertainty. Our objectives are obscured, our ideas befuddled, and our position confused. One thing alone is certain, we are conscious of a crisis in the western world today.

Many solutions are being offered by diplomats and government officials, by educators, economists, lawyers, and scientists. Time and again, they appeal in all sincerity for justice and human rights, for freedom and human dignity, for democracy and international unity. Yet, strange to say, their arguments carry little conviction and men continue to wrangle about the meaning of these key words taken from the Christian philosophy of life. While we grope in the darkness, time is running out. The forces against us gather momentum.

What is the source of our confusion? Simply this. The words, which our leaders use, are full of life and meaning and force when they are set in the philosophy of life according to Christ, and only then. They lose that life and meaning and force when men wrench them from a spiritual way of life and try to set them in a pagan philosophy according to the traditions of men or according to the elements of the world.

Hence it is that the present widespread confusion of Christian language and pagan purpose may well be regarded as the sorry plight of the Twilight Christians of the Western World.

Naturally, the question arises: How did our concepts of the Christian philosophy of life come to be so encrusted with the paganism of our own days?

Almost a century ago, Pope Pius IX, like a watchman in the tower, saw the clouds coming on the horizon. In unequivocal terms he warned men of the dangers hidden in the so-called liberalism of his day. That danger lay in trying to isolate the economic and political order from all influence of religion and morality.

Forty years later, Leo XIII in his series of great encyclicals pleaded with the nations not to attempt to build the structure of society on the shifting sands of utility and selfish interest. That structure, he declared, can withstand the battering and turmoil of life only when it is built on the solid rock of God-given moral law.

Yet the process was not halted. Men still spoke in familiar terms of sacred rights and justice under the law, but gradually the true meaning behind those words was slipping out of their minds.

Then came the wave of secularism. We were told openly that religion was purely an inner and private affair. It was void of any sanctions to guide man's organized social relationships. The existence of God was not explicitly denied, but His influence and His moral law were banished from the organized life of society. By degrees this secularism spread far and wide.

In our schools and universities millions learned all about the earth and how to acquire its riches, but were left ignorant of their duties to the Creator of the earth and their own true dignity and destiny. Economic life became a hard, cruel, and relentless pursuit of gain by employers and by workers. Finally, many of our jurists, repudiating reason as a basis for law, substituted other norms, all reducible in the last analysis to the will or force of the dominant group. In their thinking there is no place for God's law or man's inalienable rights.

IV. CHRISTIAN RESURGENCE NEEDED

Thus it is that the remnants of our Christian inheritance have become saturated with a decadent materialism. While lips speak the familiar words of a Christian philosophy of life, hearts seek the baser goals of greed and gain. One is reminded of the words of Christ: "These people honor me with their lips but their hearts are far from me." While our representatives strive to stay the juggernaut of materialism abroad, many have yielded to materialism at home. Like fifth columnists, the principles of Mammon have stealthily wormed their way into our Christian pattern of life and have robbed it of much of its virility, its force, its singleness of purpose, and its unity.

Last June, on the eve of the elections in France and Italy, our Holy Father pointed out the fundamental issue. It was whether these nations would "continue to rest on the firm rock of Christianity, on the acknowledgment of a personal God, on belief in the spiritual dignity and the eternal destiny of man," or whether they would entrust themselves "to the unfeeling omnipotence of a materialistic state without any ideal beyond this world, without religion, without God." His words spoken to France and Italy have equal significance for the other nations of the earth.

We cannot serve two masters. We must either purge ourselves of the poison of materialism and restore to our institutions and social order the completeness of the Christian, the spiritual way of life—or we must accept the materialistic way of life with its rule by force, its slavery of the masses, its tyranny, and its subjection.

The situation can be set right only by radical changes nationally as well as internationally. Fifteen years ago, Pius XI described the injustices prevailing in the social and economic order and called for a thorough going social reconstruction, but he also warned us that such reconstruction must be preceded "by a profound renewal of the Christian spirit from which multitudes engaged in industry in every country have unhappily departed."

On the international level, few have so well diagnosed the crisis of our times as has General MacArthur. Speaking from the battleship *Missouri* on the day of the Japanese surrender, he said: "The problem basically is theological and involves spiritual recrudescence and improvement in human character that will synchronize with our matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all the material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit, if it is to save the flesh."

Most certainly a profound renewal of the Christian spirit is needed to impel men to seek before all else the kingdom of God and

His justice. To effect such a change in a world that seems governed only by material forces and distracted by hatred and greed, may appear to be a fantastic dream, but is it any more hopeless than the enterprise of that handful of unknown and uneducated men from a remote oriental province, who set out to conquer the imperial power of Rome and the intellectual culture of Hellenism?

The process of regeneration will be on its way in the very hour when we Catholics or a considerable portion of us unite in a serious reform of ourselves. In God's own providence, it may be given to those who are gathered here to start the dawn of the new age. Sooner or later it is inevitable that men's minds should turn once more to search for spiritual reality, and when once the tide begins to flow, all the sand castles that have been built during the ebb will disappear.

It is not given to me to read the inscrutable secrets of divine providence, but this I do know: In the present crisis there rests on every man and woman here today a threefold duty: First, we have a duty to study seriously the principles of the Christian philosophy of life. Great moral and religious truths are deep. They cannot be fully absorbed by school children or inculcated in the ordinary Sunday sermon. The professional man should have an inquiring mind on moral and religious issues. He has a duty to study and to know well the reasons for what he believes.

Second. We have a duty to exemplify the principles of Christ in every action of our public and private life. Ours it is, like St. Thomas More to be at all times the champions of God's law as given to us by reason and revelation.

And third. We have another duty. More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of. You have come here today to pay the solemn tribute of your great profession to the Supreme Lawgiver of the universe. You have gathered about the altar of God to beseech His divine blessing on our country and its institutions. But above all, you are about to join in offering the sublime sacrifice of the cross that men may everywhere renounce the weapons of violence, and peacefully submit their affairs to the administration of justice under God and the law. May that continue to be your prayer by day and your prayer by night.

And now I leave you in benediction the words of our Holy Father addressed to all men of good will:

"Do not become disheartened. You are many, many more than appearances seem to indicate, even though others by their bravado and arrogance aim to create a false impression of the strength of their ranks. You are strong, and stronger than your adversaries, because your intimate convictions are true, sincere, substantial, founded on eternal principles. God is with you."

Subsistence Pay Allowances of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an article taken from the Daily Illini of January 12, 1947, a newspaper of the University of Illinois, containing the result of a survey taken at the University of Illinois with regard to present subsistence pay allowances of veterans who are attending school under the GI bill of rights:

SURVEY SHOWS VETS' CHECKS DON'T COVER LIVING COSTS

This isn't news to the veteran, but the ex-serviceman on the campus spends more money on his basic subsistence while in college than his $65 or $90 check covers.

A survey on the cost of subsistence released yesterday by the American Veterans Committee discloses that the average single veteran who does not eat in an organized house spends $96 per month on food, rent, cleaning, laundry, toiletries, and miscellaneous items. The single vet who pays a house bill shells out $82.50 per month.

The married veteran who eats out and who has no children spends $141.75 per month, while husband and wife with cooking privileges get along on $115.25 every month.

More than 190 veterans were interviewed in the 2-week survey, which will be sent by the AVC to all Senators and Representatives from Illinois in Washington, D. C., and to the Veterans' Administration, in an attempt to increase the subsistence allotment of veterans attending colleges and universities.

New York University has recently completed a similar study and the national planning committee of the AVC is carrying on a campaign at present to increase the subsistence of student veterans.

A break-down of the figures for the single veteran who eats out discloses that on the average he spends $67.50 for food, $17.50 for rent, $4.50 for cleaning, $2 for laundry, $1.50 for toiletries, and $3 for unclassified items. The laundry figure is based on sending clothes home for washing. The miscellaneous figure covers haircuts, shoe repairs, etc.

The single veteran who takes his meals in an organized house spends $71.50 per month for his house bill. His other expenses are the same as his buddy who eats out.

Being married while a veteran at the university costs $92.50 per month if you eat out and you have no children to feed. Rent costs $32.50; cleaning, $5.50; laundry, $2.25; toiletries, $4; and miscellaneous, $6. The laundry figure is based upon the little woman doing the cleaning at home.

If the veteran and his bride have cooking privileges, their food bill amounts to $65 per month, while the other expenditures remain the same as for the vet and his wife who eat out.

If the single veteran sends his laundry to be washed in the Twin Cities, the average monthly bill runs to $9. The married veteran eating at home with his children is in a separate category, the AVC states, but the added expenditure for children was not large enough to cause an appreciable difference in the survey.

But if you ask the man who owns one, the kids cost a lot of money in addition to that $90 a month.

General Bradley Receives Philip Murray Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last night at the Statler Hotel Gen. Omar N. Bradley received the Philip Murray award for the most outstanding service to our veterans during 1946. This award was given by the national CIO community services committee.

In accepting the same, General Bradley delivered a remarkable tribute to the veterans and labor's great contribution to victory. He also outlined a future program for postwar industrial peace.

Every Member of Congress should read the general's speech. It follows:

If someone here were to ask how it was that our wartime generals in the field could have won so many medals, I would point to their troops in making my answer. Generals were awarded medals because they had in their commands the privates, corporals, and sergeants who truthfully won those medals for them.

The decorations worn today by field commanders of troops are not rewards for tactical skill, or even for the leadership they brought to the front.

Instead, they are worn and valued as symbols of the courage of their troops. They belong to the privates, the corporals, and sergeants; to the lieutenants and captains who made—and who often paid for—the victories they represent.

And so, Mr. Carey, when I come here to thank you for this award which bears the name of your president, Philip Murray—and which has been generously given me by your community services committee of the CIO—I would like to feel that it is not simply a personal tribute. But rather that it is one which extends itself to the whole vast organization of the Veterans' Administration and considerably beyond—to the American people themselves.

For it is the American people who have opened their hearts and their pockets to make possible the vast economic and social undertaking of the Veterans' Administration.

In their wartime creation of the GI bill, the American people have not only sought to repair the damage caused by war to the lives, careers and the job security of numberless veterans. But they have also prescribed a new and daring charter for human welfare that cannot only repair but enrich beyond measure the lives of these young men.

By establishing opportunities for education and the restoration of useful job skills, the American people have granted the veteran his right to share fairly in the wealth of this Nation by honest reward for productive labor.

I believe veterans have rejected the doctrine that they can gain long-term benefit in the guise of special privilege. In this, they have reaffirmed the judgment of our American people that whenever they—or any other group—pursue special interest at the cost of national welfare, they shall inevitably penalize themselves as well as all others.

The GI bill has opened the doors for millions of veterans to opportunities for greater economic security and more abundant happiness. These are guarantees we must have for freedom. As long as freedom remains a force for human welfare, men will cherish freedom in their hearts and defend it with their lives.

In this recognition of me for the work of our Veterans' Administration, you have restated your faith in the objectives of our program.

These objectives have basic political as well as economic implications. If we are to nourish the faith of veterans in the vigor and permanence of democracy, we must offer them sound economic security. We must show these young men that in a democracy men have achieved more personal liberty and greater economic opportunity than has ever been possible in any other nation.

Without firm faith in the opportunity democracy offers them, men become susceptible to the influences of deceptive political doctrines. I do not believe for one moment that American veterans will ever consciously betray the country to which they have given their loyalty. But we must remember that

empty stomachs, cold-water flats, and joblessness can so agonize the minds of men that liberty becomes cheap by contrast to the security for which they hunger.

During the decades of our industrial development, organized labor captured and sustained the faith of millions of American wage earnefs. In its ability to guide workers toward happier lives through the benefits of collective bargaining, labor has not only contributed to our national economic well-being but it has also championed human rights. And while labor has worked as an instrument of democracy helping to build a more productive industrial machine, the tragic events of history have shown us—it is only in a democracy where business can profit, that labor can also bargain.

I shall not devote my time to extolling the achievements of labor in this last World War. Any veteran of the battle front knew that neither industry nor labor let us down. With huge resources of men and machines we could use freely the trucks, tanks, and guns you delivered—to save the lives of soldiers.

This is no time to reminisce; it is a time to look ahead.

If we are to move forward, we must put the war, and production records, behind us. It is time to measure our problems today, to adjudge our peacetime need for production, and to ask ourselves how well we are doing.

These are the answers that veterans want; the 11,000,000 veterans with jobs, and the 2,500,000 veterans in training.

It is not only essential that we give the eleven million an assurance of continuing employment. But it is also critically important that we look ahead and ask ourselves: What are the prospects for those 2,500,000 veterans in training?

For unless we can offer them jobs to match their skills we are throwing our billions away. And, in the hearts of these young men, we are building fuzes of despair and frustration.

We cannot permit the veteran to fall victim to economic disaster without risking the terrible results of his let-down.

If we risk large-scale business default and unemployment through ignorance or greed, through ineptness or lack of economy controls, through failure of management and labor to reconcile their differences—the veteran might suffer a body blow which could forever impair his adjustment. How well and how quickly the veteran shall be integrated into our national life is an economic question the American people must answer.

In forecasts for 1947, the Veterans' Administration must predicate its costs and prospects of success on the business health of the Nation. Recessional unemployment would mean increasing expenditures in readjustment allowances and render precarious the position of veterans who have exhausted their entitlements. It would excite a retreat of veterans to schools, aggravating their crowded conditions.

On the other hand, full production and abundant employment would lessen the cost of readjustment allowances. It would stimulate the economic and intelligent use of educational opportunities. It would enable hundreds of thousands of veterans to purchase homes of their own.

The intricate task of reorganizing and decentralizing the Veterans' Administration is nearing completion. Even so we are not yet satisfied with performance in all the States. For although we have tripled the number of employees, although we have acquired an additional 9,000,000 square feet of office space, and although skilled management engineers have worked to simplify procedures and unravel red tape—bottlenecks and delays occasionally develop. I do believe that our speed is vastly improved, that our performance is better, and that we are giving veterans Nation-wide service which 1 year ago was not obtainable anywhere in the United States.

In the entire program only insurance is limping behind. Tens of thousands of veterans have suffered irritating delays as conditions became successively worse before they could be improved. In varying parts of the country, the situation is still an unhealthy one.

For almost a year, we have struggled with increasing business while working to retool. Today that retooling process is on the doorstep of completion. However, it will take additional months before day-to-day production can wipe out our accumulation of delinquent accounts.

I frankly know of no other way in which this serious condition could have been remedied more promptly and still provide a permanent solution. We hope that we shall reach satisfactory Nation-wide performance by the middle of this year.

The budget proposed by the Veterans' Administration for the next fiscal year amounts to almost one-fifth of the President's total Federal Budget. The overwhelming bulk of this huge sum will go directly to financial benefits to veterans and their dependents.

Despite these vast dollar resources, the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration program is dependent upon the interplay of those economic, social, and political forces which together guide and direct the Nation's life. The veteran with his billion-dollar benefits shall recover no more quickly and progress no farther than this Nation of which he is part.

For all their bonds of comradeship, American veterans have no economic identity of their own. They have no political identity of their own. Their prosperity, their happiness, will come from the prosperity and happiness of the Nation at large.

If we are to sustain the veterans' faith in the political future of democracy and in the economic future of America, we must demonstrate that the unity which forced unconditional surrender upon our enemies during the war can provide unconditional opportunity for Americans in peace.

The ability of organized labor and management to get together, to work together will provide the barometer of our success.

As partners in prosperity or depression, labor and management must learn how to arbitrate the differences that halt production. They must learn to find agreement on fair wages and job security, and they must learn to respect economic rights of each other in this democracy of ours.

These are real and meaningful issues that confront the veteran in the coming year.

I hope that next year I can make an award of my own, with a medal for Philip Murray of the CIO, a medal for William Green of the A. F. of L., a medal for William Jackson of the Chamber of Commerce and a medal for Robert Wason of the NAM—each of them inscribed, like this award, to read: For distinguished service together; for their outstanding and mutual contributions to the welfare of the veteran.

The Saintly Scientist, George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Clare Boothe Luce at the memorial services commemorating George Washington Carver Week, Trinity Cathedral, Pittsburgh, Pa., Sunday, January 5, 1947:

In the year 1855 a German immigrant called Moses Carver, who owned a pioneer farm in Diamond Grove, Mo., bought a slave for $700. She was a 13-year-old Negro girl called Mary. One day in 1860 a son was born to Mary. She named him George. Soon after George's father, a slave on a neighboring farm, was killed in some field-hand accident.

These were the bloody border years. Outlaw bands of Kansas jayhawkers and redleggers, Missouri guerrillas and bushwhackers, roamed like maddened beasts. They looted, burned, and raided. A raid struck Moses Carver's farm on a bitter cold night in January 1861. When the raiders left they had Mary and her babe.

Moses' wife, Susan, was very fond of Mary. So Moses sent a friend as a scout to steal her back. He offered him 40 acres of fine timberland and a $300 race horse for the return of Mary and the baby. The friend came back to report that Mary had disappeared. Her fate was never known. It must have been cruel. But he handed a tattered bundle of sick baby, dying of croup and exposure, to Moses, and took his $300 worth of horseflesh.

This was the child who became one of America's greatest scientists. This was the child who became the man that the Seventy-ninth Congress, without a dissenting vote, passed a bill to honor on this day every year.

The elderly German farmer was stern and taciturn, but just. And his good wife was kind. They brought little George up in their rough pioneer home to be a useful, prudent, and resourceful little chap. They taught him to read out of Webster's old Blue Back spelling book. But there was no place in Diamond Grove, Mo., where a little black boy could go to school. Not even Abe Lincoln had freed the slaves. Not even though Missouri law had proclaimed in 1865 that thereafter "no Negro should know any master but God."

Now Moses Carver didn't hold much with God. He was never known to have gone to church. But little George began to obey his new Master early. When he was 10 years old he made up his mind that God wanted him to have an education. With the good wishes of the Carvers following him, he left home to get one. He packed all his belongings into one bandana handkerchief and set off down the road for a neighboring town, where there was a school of sorts for colored children.

In the years that followed, young George slowly but surely worked his way through grade schools in a half dozen towns of the Middle West. At odd hours, or in odd months, he earned his school money at odd jobs. He was a laundryman, a cook, a houseman, a carpenter, a farm hand, a rug cleaner, and gardener. He grew into a very tall, thin, gangling, stooped young man, who stammered and seemed very shy. For some inexplicable reason, he began to develop very extraordinary talents. He sang, particularly spirituals, well. He played the piano, accordion, and organ with some virtuosity, although he had never had the price of a lesson. He made beautiful laces with his long, clever, fingers. He painted charming pictures of native flowers, uncannily accurate in their botanical detail. And with all growing things he had a "green thumb." He seemed to know more about the common wayside plants than anyone in any town where he worked. Maybe because he rose before the dawn every morning, and roamed the fields and woods, collecting and classifying plant life, although he had no books to tell him what he was looking for, or how to do it.

Wherever he went he made friends among colored and white folks. They helped him a lot. But he was always most careful to give service for every penny. He saved little, because he always gave his services more generously than he was paid for them.

In the year 1890 he entered Simpson College at Indianola, Iowa. This was a white Methodist college which had Christian faith and democratic vision enough to take a few colored men. After he had paid his entrance fees, he had 10 cents left in his pocket. He bought 5 cents worth of corn meal and 5 cents worth of suet. He lived on that for a week. He then worked his way for a year as college laundryman and janitor. There he started and taught Bible classes, which became immensely popular with the white students. A year later he went to Iowa State Agricultural College. He worked his way there, too, as a waiter, and a masseur for the football team. There seemed to be a healing power in his fingers when they touched torn muscles. At Iowa State he began to show a totally inexplicable genius for agricultural chemistry. He got his bachelor of arts degree in 1894 and his master of arts degree in 1896. When he graduated he was invited to remain as a member of the faculty. But shortly after, the call came from Booker T. Washington to join the staff of the struggling Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. He was offered its department of agriculture and chemistry. He accepted at once. What Negro could refuse Booker T. Washington, that young courageous leader of his people?

Washington was among the first colored leaders to see that the Negro problem had not been solved by emancipation. The children of the beaten backs, and branded breasts had been released from physical slavery only to face economic and political slavery. They had been tossed into liberty without homes, fields, food, clothes, jobs, votes, or education. Never having owned property, they knew neither how to protect it, nor to acquire it. Their families had been torn apart by slave sales. Their women, who had never been allowed legally to marry their mates, had often been used by white masters. Their morals and ethics were unstable. Except as faith itself had given them instructions, except as they could "steal away to Jesus," they had no teacher of any kind. Mentally and spiritually crippled by white men, now they were free. Free to enter in fierce economic competition with these same white men. The men who believed that because of the Negroes' false pretentions to humanity and liberty the South had been economically ruined and physically devastated.

This was the cruel situation that faced Booker T. Washington. In the beginning he began almost single-handed to lick it. By teaching his bewildered and suffering people to help themselves. By teaching them how to work, how to save, how to fit themselves by manual training first and formal education second, to be responsible citizens of a free country.

When Carver came to Tuskegee, it was a pitiful little collection of collapsing old farm buildings, built mostly by the Negroes themselves. Forty years later it was a well-endowed splendid university. Its crowning glory was its greatest educator, Carver, who never left it all the days of his life.

When Carver died in 1943, at the age of 83, he was known, not only throughout the South, but throughout the world. His scientific achievements had been great. For 40 years he had urged upon the boll-weevil, cotton-ridden South the diversification of crops, soil conservation, increase of live stock, native industrialization, and the dissemination of all related information to the southern farmer, black and white. He lived to see much of his program brought to the South. After the disaster of the depression had left vast areas a Tobacco Road, with the Negro at the bottom of the heap, it took the whole Federal administration of Roosevelt to do what this one colored man had long foreseen must be done if the South was ever to be saved.

For 40 years, Carver had urged upon American scientists the need for developing ersatz, synthetic, or substitute products from animal, mineral, and vegetable matter, and waste. He lived to see many of his ideas such as dehydrated foods, plastics, and so on, adopted in industry. It took two World Wars to convince America of what this one colored man had long foreseen must be done if America was not to waste its raw materials.

His greatest scientific claim to fame rests on what he accomplished with the so-called "lowly" peanut, and the "humble" sweet potato.

When Carver came to Tuskegee, the peanut was an American crop not worth mentioning. Peanuts were just hog food, or a clutter to be found at circuses and ball parks. Today, the peanut is among the six largest American crops. It involves a two hundred million dollar business.

Carver found over 300 uses for that funny little "goober-nut." In his laboratory, he made from it milk, butter, flour, soap, shaving lotion, breakfast foods, a variety of oils, and paints, coffee, shampoo, building boards, axle grease, ink, and a treatment for dandruff.

He found over a hundred uses for the sweetpotato. He made flour from that, too. And molasses, candy, starch, vinegar, library paste, tapioca, dyes, and shoe-black.

From cornstalks he made building boards and painting canvasses. From cotton-waste, he made road-blocks. From sawdust, synthetic marble. From clays and loamy soil, many dyes and paints. From Alabama red clay, by a process of sixtuple oxidization, he made the fabulous blue paint once known to King Tut Ank Kamen's artists. The secret of this pigment had been lost to the world since Moses' people were in bondage down in Egyptland. He even made dyes from cowdung.

Who said you can't make a silk purse from a sow's ear? Not Carver. He could have, if he had been interested in purses. He wasn't. Least of all was he interested in his own purse. He could have been a millionnaire. But when he died, he was drawing the same salary as when he came to Tuskegee. And most of that he had saved, to leave in his will to Tuskegee's Research Foundation.

A great mycologist, a student of fungus growths, he found many cures for crop-blights and diseases. The only thing he never licked was the boll-weevil. One suspects that's because he didn't want to. The South had been suffering for a century from its one-crop system. It needed diversification if it was ever to prosper. No doubt Carver thought God had sent the boll-weevil to teach it this lesson.

He fathered a whole new science, chemurgy, which is the study of soil constituents, and what is needed to make the soil produce more, so men could eat and sell more, and dress and live better. Carver understood well that wonderful earthly trinity of the soil, its fruits, and man.

Many honors came to him at the end. He received degrees from famous northern universities. He was made a director of the Department of Agricultural Research; collaborator in the division of plant industry in the United States Department of Agriculture, a member of the Royal Society of Arts in London. He was awarded the Spingarn Medal; and, in 1939, the Roosevelt Medal for achievement in science.

He had the friendship of three Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, and Franklin Roosevelt. Henry Ford and Thomas Edison sought his counsel, and both offered him vast sums to join their laboratory staffs.

His fame was world-wide. He corresponded with Mahatma Ghandi, with whom he has sometimes been compared.

That is the brief biography of George Washington Carver.

But now we must ask ourselves, for what shall we honor him most today.

Shall we honor him because he was a Negro? Yes, of course. This record of a man born a slave, who wrested an education from an inimical white society, and with it achieved so greatly, is a spectacular and heartening triumph for all Negroes, and for all white people who wish to see them fulfill their American destiny. But to honor Carver primarily as a Negro, is somehow to patronize him. It is to say, in effect, that what he accomplished is notable chiefly because he was a Negro. It is to deny him something by according him praise for the one thing over which he had no control—the color of his skin. Thus in honoring him primarily as a Negro, we would subtly belittle him as a scientist.

Then shall we honor him primarily as a scientist regardless—as the expression goes—of color or birth? Yes, of course. How shall mankind ever honor enough a man whose discoveries made life richer and easier for hundreds of thousands of southerners, both black and white? And yet to honor him primarily as a scientist is somehow to ignore that very mysterious quality of his success, the thing in him, the force in him, the strength in him, which brought him from the lowest economic depths of American life to the pinnacle of world fame. It is this something in him that we should honor. It is this something which makes him stand on a high and singular ground above all other men, black or white, and scientists less famous or more famous.

I think we should honor George Washington Carver here today more as a saint than as a Negro or a scientist. For only the saints and the heroes ever have or ever can save the world. The heroes cut our losses. But the saints increase our gains.

What do we mean by the word "saint"? We mean more than a man who is generous, kind, patient, and unselfish. We mean by "saint," a man who consciously tries to live by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God. We mean a man who abundantly possesses those three theological virtues—faith, hope, and charity. A man who hopes in God, when every man's hand is turned against him; who trusts in God when there seem no grounds for trust; who loves in God when his fellow men hate him. Such a man Carver tried to be, and was.

His great and abiding significance for America lies in his saintliness. He was born into slavery and ignorance. He was emancipated into poverty and prejudice. And yet he proved to black and white alike that a man's will and intellect come to him from God. And that when a man knows this central fact of the universe, he cannot fail to accomplish what other men call miracles. Carver did know this fact. He also knew that virtue and knowledge are not assets to be used for the profit of the one to whom they have been given by God. They are burdens, liabilities, obligations, ordained for the use of others.

No scientist, or psychoanalyst can explain the genius of Carver in today's fashionable terms of biological or sociological determinism. By every biological and sociological count, this man should have been warped, twisted, or crippled in his will and intellect.

If there had been any birth control or planned parenthood practitioners around in the year of his birth they would have settled for him as the one child who should never have been conceived. Born in slavery, puny and ailing, orphaned at infancy, he was doomed to failure.

He was cradled in an atmosphere of hatred and contempt for the Negro, that often burst into violence. His people were told that they were little better than animals. They were often treated worse. Carver did not make the tragic error so many of his race have made: he did not believe the white racists. So he was never crippled in his opinion of his own human nature. Nor did he make the mistake latter-day Negroes are making in taking the opinion of some of their own leaders, who tell them that while the Negro

is the equal of the white man, he is nevertheless different in his nature. For things which are different in nature are not equal. A feeling of difference is bound to resolve itself into a feeling of either superiority or inferiority. In any case, it also cripples a man in his opinion of his human nature, by setting him apart from other men. Carver knew precisely what he was—a child of God's. That meant that in his essential human nature, with its will and its intellect, he was exactly like all God's children. No real quantitative difference could exist between him and other men. Only a qualitative difference in virtue and knowledge. And these came from God. Therefore, he knew only God's grace could elevate him above others, or if he refused to accept grace, set him below them. And Carver "lifted up his eyes to the hills", whence came his strength. And God's grace illuminated his human intellect, and steeled his human will. So that while he was in no sense different from any other son of Adam, he became better, and stronger and wiser.

The truth of God had made him free. The truth of God struck off his chains. And it alone will strike off the chains of his people, and of all people.

Carver was simple, with the simplicity of saints, about this real source of his strength and wisdom. He said, "I go into my laboratory with God."

Carver probably never heard of St. Ignatius of Loyola. When he spoke, he spoke almost in the same words of that medieval saint who said, "Receive, O, Lord, my entire liberty—my understanding, my memory, my will. From Thee have I received all things, to Thee do I return all things. Give me but Thy grace, and Thy love. I ask nothing else of Thee."

In Rachkam Holt's fine biography of Carver, there is a very interesting story told which illustrates his saintly faith.

Some years ago, Carver was addressing a religious group. He began at once to preach his constant theme of God's great bounty in the fruits of the earth to man, and man's great indifference to it. And how, because man would not consult God, he had not even scraped the fringes of the earth's possibilities. Instead, he was laying waste to the Eden that lay beneath his hand, his plow, his test tubes.

"Thou madest man to have dominion over the works of Thy hands. Thou hast put all things under his feet," Carver quoted. Then he said what he had done with the no-account peanut and sweetpotato, man could do with everything else that grew because God had said that everything could be made of use to man. "God is going to reveal things to us that He never revealed before we put our hand in His," he said. "No books ever go into my laboratory * * * I never have to grope for methods; the method is revealed at the moment I am inspired to create something new. Without God to draw aside the curtain, I would be helpless."

Several days later the New York Times published an editorial about Carver's talk.

Said the editor, "It is * * * to be regretted that (Carver) should use language that reveals a complete lack of the scientific spirit. Real chemists do not scorn books, and they do not describe their success, when they have any, to 'inspiration.' Talk of that sort will bring ridicule on an admirable institution (Tuskegee), and on the (colored) race."

To which we are tempted to say to that unhappy editor that talk of his sort has already brought much disaster on the whole human race, for it was a flat denial of the power of God to aid his own creatures.

But let us quote Carver's reply. It ranks, perhaps, as the noblest and most sensible statement made in a century by an American scientist.

"Inspiration," Carver wrote, "is not at variance with information; in fact, the more information one has, the greater will be the inspiration. In evolving new creations, I am wondering what value a book would be to the creator, if he is not a master of analytical work, both qualitative and quantitative." He went on to say how he had seen taro roots in the Tuskegee markets, and how he had begun to explore the possibilities of developing useful byproducts from them. He said, "I know of no one who has ever worked with these roots in this way. I know of no book from which I can get this information. Yet I will have no trouble doing it. Proverbs 3: 6: 'In all thy ways, acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths.' Intelligent people now believe in God. I am not alone in this. May God deepen and strengthen our religion as a race, rather than destroy it."

Now that particular editor probably did not reflect the religious views of the Times staff as a whole. Nevertheless, the Times did not publish Carver's reply. Who knows? Perhaps they refrained from doing so for fear of disillusioning Carver about his belief that he, as a scientist, was not alone in believing in God. The fact is, that science in our age has become increasingly identified with atheism. Many and sometimes famous are the scientists who do not believe in God. Some of the most famous lived and prospered in prewar Nazi Germany. There they did much about making V-1's and V-2's, and for example, soap, not out of peanut oil, but out of human bodies. Perhaps our greatest fear of Russia's atomic scientists is the knowledge that they believe officially in Godlessness. But even in the so-called Christian west, the scientific interpretation of man is all too likely to be that he is either a mere animal, a chemical or electrical set of reactions, or a machine which secretes thought as a dog secretes saliva. And whether they admit it honestly in their columns or not, many a modern editor agrees with them.

Yet these are the very same editors who plead for the advancement of the colored people, on the grounds that they are not animals. How incredibly contradictory is their position. How silly is the position of the Godless scientists. Their task, they say, is to discover the laws of nature and the universe. And yet they deny that there is a lawgiver and a governor of the order they discover. Carver's mind was too intelligent to be caught in such childish contradictions.

Carver, of course, might also have told that Times editor that Archimedes was not reading any book in the bathtub the day he sprang forth, not only bookless, but towelless, shouting, "Eureka" seeing, as it were, in a divine flash, the law of the displacement of matter. How many times before Archimedes had taken a bath, we do not know, but certainly this was not his first one. And yet, in that particular tub, he had his greatest scientific inspiration.

What book was Newton consulting under the tree the day that apple plopped on his head, and knocked, so to speak, the idea of the law of gravity into him? That could not have been the first time that Newton ever sat under an apple tree. Nor, if he was a normal man, the first time he had been accidentally beaned by some external object. It was not necessary for God to hit Carver over the head with a peck of peanuts to set his mind to work. He had never so far lost contact with his Creator.

The above are only two examples of pure scientific inspiration. Indeed, the annals of science are full of inspirational and accidental discoveries of major importance.

What irritated that Times editor, and what irritates many people today about Carver, was that instead of muttering something about how his ideas "just naturally came to him," or even shouting an occasional Hallelujah, he always said, with devastating simplicity and honesty, "I am just an interpreter. I have only to listen to God's voice and He tells me what to do."

Carver's favorite poem was The Flower by Alfred Lord Tennyson:

"Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies,
I hold you here, root and all, in my hand.
Little flower, but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what man and God is."

And Carver always wore a little flower in the buttonhole of his old, clean, shabby suit. A reminder to him, no doubt, that it was enough for him, as for any man, to try to understand a simple field flower to understand all. He never succeeded. No man ever will, this side of the grave. But Carver understood better than most, because he let the God who had made the flower help him.

Carver never erred, as so many scientists and laymen do who claim to believe in "something" in identifying the Creator with the things He created. God was not in the flower, or in the earth, or in the elements, or in man, as some "life force," or "energy," developing and perfecting itself along with animal, mineral, and vegetable matter. Carver knew that God was already perfect, and that He stood outside His created universe. God, although everywhere, was no more to be confused with that flower than Tennyson was to be confused with his poem, or Carver with what he made in his test tubes. No one would hold, in short, that Tennyson was his poem, that Carver was his peanuts, or even that Einstein is his theory of relativity. Tennyson, Carver, Einstein were the creators of the things they created. Their spirits and minds had informed and inspired their creations and they bore, so to speak, their imprint, but they stood wholly outside of them. The simple logical fact of the perfect existence of a perfect Creator, whose imprint was on everything, Carver held as naturally as he held the heart in his breast. And, therefore, in trying to find out about what a peanut was made for, he asked quite logically the One who had made it, and who knew all the answers. He got plenty.

Because Carver acknowledged God in all his ways he let God direct his paths. God directed him in the path of humility. Humility is not to be confused with servility. Carver faced all men with that dignity, courage, and self-confidence which came naturally to the man who knows he has been created lord of all the earth, and knows no master but God. "Christ is my strength," he said over and over. He tried to behave as a follower of Christ ought to behave. He never took refuge in tragic clowning and dumb-nigger fooling. The men of his race have often been pitifully forced to assume this attitude as protective coloration, to conceal their breaking hearts, and to avoid a broken hand. In the words of the great Negro poet, Countee Cullen, the average Negro was—

"Born of the sorrowful of heart
Mirth was a crown upon his head,
Pride kept his twisted lips apart
In jest, to hide a heart that bled."

Carver was never melancholy or bitter. How could he be? He had that peace that passeth all understanding, in the joy of the Lord.

And because he knew how lavishly God gives, he gave likewise. He tried to return good for evil whenever he had the chance. As a Negro that was daily, sometimes hourly.

Our Blessed Lord was crucified for claiming to be Divine. The Negro is often crucified for claiming to be human.

It would take a long time to tell all the insults and degradations, the large and small indignities visited on Carver, even after he became a well-known scientist, just because he was colored. Jim Crowism followed him all the days of his life. When he was invited to a hotel by a big group of businessmen, to explain his discoveries to them—in order that they might make money, he was forced to go

up in the freight elevator. When he traveled to lecture at great white universities, he could not eat in the dining car. Once he addressed a number of divinity students. They applauded his address loudly. But afterward, some of those young men who were going forth to preach about the Christ who had died to save all men, refused to shake hands with him. In whose hands were the crucifixion nails plunged afresh on that dark evening?

Once, under the auspices of the YMCA, he did a lecture tour of a dozen colleges in Mississippi. In some of these towns during the night, the citizens had put up strange signs to welcome the South's greatest scientist: "Nigger, don't let the sun set on you in this town."

He spoke at the University of Oxford. Later Senator BILBO demanded to know "what the proud University of Mississippi was comin' to enyhow," to let "that peanut nigger from Tuskegee" talk to them. What, he fiercely asked, could a dirty coon have to say that would interest fine Southern boys, no less girls?

Carver's subject had been how the whole South could grow prosperous by crop rotation.

Once Carver was called before a congressional committee to testify on his chemical discoveries with the goober. It was the tag-end of a weary legislative day. Carver's time was gruffly limited by the chairman to 10 minutes. At the end of the 10 minutes, even the southern Democrats were enthralled. They extended his time to an hour and a half. When he finished they rose in a body and applauded. As a former Member of Congress, who has seen many a busy and bored Congressman cut short the testimony of Cabinet members, or sneak out in the middle of it, I can tell you that this was indeed an astonishing triumph. It gives me some idea of the tremendous power he must have held over even unfriendly and superior audiences.

Well, one prediction is safe. No American Congress will ever pass legislation to honor the name of BILBO. And today that prince of calumny, whose mouth spews forth the toads of prejudice, and the asps of hate, could do with only a little of the honor the world is now according that "peanut nigger."

And in having said so much against another of God's creatures, I have spoken more harshly than George Washington Carver ever was heard to do of any man in all his life.

"They crucified my Lord
And He never said a mumblin' word.
Not a word, not a word, not a word!"

The Lord had set a watch before his mouth, and kept the door of his lips. And when he could not speak well of a man, he remained silent.

His ascetism, his celibacy, and his poverty, were all marks of his deep piety. He sparingly ate only the simplest foods. Often his own herb and wild field flower dishes. He neither smoke nor drank. When someone asked him why he did not smoke, he replied, "If God had intended the human nose to be used for a chimney, He would have turned the nostrils up." And when a Time reporter once wrote him up "as a shabby, toothless, old man," he simply smiled and said, "The reporter did not really seek information. If he had asked me I would have told him I was not toothless. I had my teeth the whole time in my pocket."

He might have made millions, but whatever God revealed to him, he shared fully and freely with all who would accept it. It astonished others that he refused all profit from his knowledge. It astonished him that they ever expected him to claim personal rewards for the information God had given him. He would permit no patents to be taken out on his discoveries, allow no commercialization of his name. When some members of Tuskegee urged him to do so, in order to enrich his own people, his answer was that the white men had too long exploited the black man. And black men would not make this process just by turning the tables.

Although he was always something of a recluse, like all saints, when he went forth it was to help his fellow men who were most in need. The poorest Negro got as much of his time as the richest and most important visitor to his laboratory. Did some Negro or po'ah white down the road need a cheap bright paint for his pitiful shack, setting eggs, information on how to can tomatoes, fill an eroded ditch, cook cowpeas, pickle meat in hot weather, make draperies out of burlap bags? Carver told him, and if he still didn't understand went and showed him. He prescribed good food—to be found in the fields for diet deficiency, and medicaments made from forest herbs for his neighbors' ills. He helped them grow their crops. He vetted their animals.

Rich men who wrote offering thousands for a cure for a crop blight received the answer free by return mail. Free to the asker. The stamp had cost Carver 3 cents.

One day it will be clearly seen that in addition to his scientific achievements, Carver did more than any man ever born to improve racial relations in America.

But over and above all else, his significance for our time is that in his person he showed that a man of science functions best for the good of the world when he is a man of God.

When American scientists begin to follow with humility in his footsteps, and to consult God in their laboratories, that day—and that day only—will they stop making atomic bombs, chemical gases to wipe out all life, and all the other frightful weapons, which they are everywhere projecting in the laboratories of white civilization.

They won't stop, of course. Our age is far gone down the road to materialism.

In 1943 a reporter asked Carver what he thought of world events. He replied, "We are on the verge of a great purification." And would say no more.

Did he mean that men in vast numbers must yet be stricken to their knees, and enslaved by their brothers? That all the world must be tortured and crucified in a third world war before mankind will come to its senses and see that man can never be free, and stay free, until we admit that the God of Love is our true Master?

But if we will not listen now to God, then let us all listen to this saintly American, George Carver.

"I indulge in very little lip service," he said. "But I ask the Great Creator silently, and often many times a day, to permit me to speak to Him through the three kingdoms He has created—the animal, mineral, and vegetable kingdoms—to understand their relations to each other, and to the great God who made all of us. I ask Him daily and sometimes momentarily to give me wisdom and understanding and bodily strength. Hence I am asking and receiving all the time."

As twilight fell over Tuskegee on the night of January 5, 1943, George Washington Carver died peacefully. It is that day we are here to memorialize. And that we honor his death-day, instead of his birthday, as is the world-wide custom with all great men, is also strangely significant. Perhaps that, too, is a sign from God, who in his Providence concealed Carver's birthday on earth in the mists of chance and time. With the exception of our blessed Lord's birthday, and His Mother's, the Christian church celebrates the anniversaries of all saints on their death-days. For that is the day when they are really born: born into the full sight of their Creator.

His life story might be told in the titles of the spirituals he loved so well:

"Oh, Mary, don't you weep, don't you moan. You toiled in slavery down in the South's land. Your son was young when he began. But the trumpet sounded in his soul. And the walls came tumblin' down. His knees got acquainted with the hillsides, too. And down came heavenly manna. There was a balm in Gilead. Go, telling doubting Thomas. He climbed the highest rung of Jacob's ladder. And the sweet chariot swung low to carry him home. To see how the end would be. His people are shouting all over God's heaven."

Oh, yes, do believe without a doubt—we Christians got a right to shout, as well as the angels. For his saintly life, a gospel of self-forgetful service, sowed in us the seeds of a richer faith in God, and a greater love of our brother. How God blessed America, when he blessed George Washington Carver.

Views of Country Editors on Our Nation's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the American Press for January 1947:

MR. CONGRESSMAN—HERE'S WHAT AMERICA'S COUNTRY EDITORS WANT DONE ABOUT OUR NATION'S PROBLEMS

"Do something immediately to prevent crippling strikes!

"Slash Government costs and balance the budget!"

Those are the two issues which the Eightieth Congress should act upon first in the opinion of the majority of the weekly newspaper editors of America—the editors whose news and views are read by an audience of nearly 70,000,000 Americans.

Following the election, in which it was apparent that the country wanted a change, the American Press determined to find out what changes the editors of the Nation wanted most. In a three-page poll, this magazine enumerated all of the most publicized proposals offered by leaders of the incoming Congress; asked the editors to check those they favored. The questionnaire was sent to one outstanding editor in each of 1,000 rural counties. Over 20 percent sent in complete replies.

At the conclusion of the poll, this $64 question was put to weekly editors: "What two subjects do you consider of first importance to the Nation and therefore warranting the most prompt attention of the new Congress?"

LABOR COMES FIRST

Answers to this question showed an overwhelming demand that labor legislation be taken up first.

Other vital issues, in order of the number of times they were mentioned, were: Cut Government costs; find the right answer for guaranteeing a lasting peace; cut taxes if the Budget can be balanced; slash Federal bureaus and the number of employees; abolish wartime controls.

Also of primary importance to editors are: Housing, reconversion, a hands-off policy toward business by Government, giving the States more governmental authority and working out atom-bomb control.

On the A No. 1 question of labor, Aaron Fischer, of the Woods County Enterprise and Waynoka News, Waynoka, Okla., says: "Labor must be brought back into line to where one man or one small group of men cannot tie up the Nation's entire production."

And most editors go along with Editor Fischer. In fact, they are so convinced that

something must be done about the strike situation that only 2 percent indicated that they completely reject any labor-curb legislation.

As for the types of labor-curb legislation which editors believed would be most beneficial, revision of the Wagner Act was advocated by 92 percent, including 2 percent who would like to see the act repealed entirely.

A total of 82 percent advocate legislation to force unions to publish financial statements.

Eighty percent favor legislation to require compulsory arbitration in disputes affecting the national economy if labor and management cannot come to an agreement.

Seventy-seven percent want legislation to force settlement of jurisdictional strikes caused by rivalry between unions.

Seventy-seven percent think legislation is needed to curb feather-bedding or make-work practices by unions.

Seventy-two percent approve legislation to outlaw the closed shop.

Seventy-two percent favor repeal of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act.

Sixty-four percent would like a provision for a 60-day waiting period after notice of strike.

Forty-one percent favor legislation to make strikes illegal for a year.

Approximately one-fifth of the editors indicated a desire to give labor "the works" by voting in favor of all nine of the above proposals.

Several editors pointed out that in line with outlawing the closed shop would be abolishment of the check-off system whereby employers deduct union dues and turn them over to union officials.

Editor Franz W. Zeiske, of the Bellville (Tex.) Times, thinks a congressional committee to investigate strikes and then publicize the real facts in the situation could be a great aid in settling disputes.

"With the cold and simple presentation of the true facts, impartially arrived at by a disinterested authority or committee, reprehensible practices by employers would bring about the deserved opprobrium of the public, and, similarly, the unreasonable and often destructive, silly, and unfair demands of unscrupulous labor leeches would be exposed to the violet ray of public opinion."

Editor Zeiske emphasized that too often the public doesn't know the real issues involved in a strike.

One weekly publisher believes that unions should be controlled as is big business with antitrust and monopoly laws, publication of its finances, open records, and elections of officials. The same laws that apply to large interstate corporations should apply to labor, he says.

Walter B. Sanders, publisher of the Nunda (N. Y.) News, says: "What is needed is legislation that will treat labor organizations on the same basis as business is treated, according labor leaders and labor organizations the same rights as business, no more, and ending the present state of affairs which if allowed to continue can only end in revolution."

In the realm of Government finance, weekly editors are not so much concerned with getting a tax cut—they demand a tax cut only if the Budget can be balanced and some of the national debt retired.

VIEWS ON TAXES

Editors were asked:

"Which comes closest to your view:

"1. Reduce income taxes immediately by 20 percent regardless of whether the Budget can be balanced and the national debt reduced?

"2. Reduce taxes only if the Budget can be balanced?

"3. Reduce taxes only if the Budget can be balanced and if our national debt can be reduced?"

Replies showed:

Only 12 percent of the editors want an immediate 20-percent tax cut regardless.

A total of 58 percent say reduce taxes only if the Budget can be balanced and if our national debt can be reduced.

Another 22 percent said reduce taxes only if the Budget can be balanced.

A total of 4 percent desire to maintain taxes at the present rates or raise them to pay off the national debt, while 1 percent was for limiting any tax cut to certain income-tax brackets or for providing different exemptions from those now in effect. A total of 3 percent failed to answer the question.

Editor Ralph Van Keuren, of the Troy (Pa.) Gazette-Register, is probably typical of the majority of editors on the tax question when he says, "Reduce taxes only if the Budget may be balanced. Do with Government expenditure as you would do with your own business."

BALANCED BUDGET

Other editors, however, fear that Government will not reduce expenses substantially until taxes are reduced and its income is slashed.

Says R. A. Brodhecker, of the Brownstown (Ind.) Banner: "As long as Government has money it will spend. Budget could be balanced and debt reduced even with 20-percent cut."

Says Publisher Peter A. Dragon, of the Albion (N. Y.) Advertiser, who is for immediate tax reduction: "Give labor more money and thereby help reduce the number of strikes."

Several editors were explicit about the type of tax cut that might be put into effect.

L. B. Boorman, of the Lemmon (S. Dak.) Leader, asks this of Congress: "Enact an equitable tax law that will adjust the burden on the middle class."

Matt Sheley, of the Pinckneyville (Ill.) Democrat, thinks the 20-percent tax-cut proposal smacks of the days of Mellon and Hoover. Says he: "The 20-percent plan would help the man earning less than $10,000 yearly very little. Under the plan * * * (the higher income group) would save hundreds of thousands and even millions of dollars. * * * (Any) income-tax cut should be patterned after the fashion of the income-tax assessment practiced these past several years."

While weekly editors believe the Government can tighten its purse strings considerably on many expenditures, the majority do not favor cutting the appropriation for the Army and Navy by up to $5,000,000,000 as suggested by several Senate leaders. They look with even greater disfavor at cutting American occupation forces in Germany and Japan.

EXPENSE-CUTTING

The following suggested methods of expense-cutting received votes of confidence from weekly editors in these percentages:

Elimination of Government bureaus set up to take care of wartime emergencies, 95 percent.

Making a large slash in the number of Federal employees, 84 percent.

Cutting amounts of loans to foreign countries, 58 percent.

Eliminate farm subsidies, 57 percent.

Cut Federal expenditures for social services, 45 percent.

Across-the-board cut in funds provided for all Government departments, 43 percent.

Cut appropriation for Army and Navy by up to $5,000,000,000 as suggested by several Senate leaders, 23 percent.

Cut American occupation forces in Germany and Japan, 17 percent.

Comments on cutting Government expenses included that of Franklin Yates, of the Bedford County Times, Shelbyville, Tenn., who said farm subsidies should be eliminated now when they are not needed. He added that in 1933 they were justified.

T. Ballard Watters, of the Marshfield (Mo.) Mail, gave this opinion: "The Government should quit building dams and quit all competition with private business."

Numerous comments from editors revealed a fear of cutting Army and Navy appropriations due to the fact that world peace is still only in the formative stages.

Said G. Marshall Townsend, of the Milford (Del.) Chronicle: "Let these fellows alone. We may need them badly."

FOREIGN POLICY

As for foreign policy, the questions and answers follow:

Question. Do you think Congress should encourage a tougher policy with Russia?

Answers. Yes, 54 percent; no, 23 percent; no answer, 21 percent. Two percent took the attitude, "not tougher, but tough."

Question. Do you think Congress should continue to support the United Nations?

Answers. Yes, 89 percent; no, 3 percent; no answer, 6 percent. Two percent were for limited support.

Question. Do you think Congress should, in general, support the present foreign policy of the administration?

Answers. Yes, 74 percent; no, 6 percent; no answer, or undecided, 20 percent. In answer to this question several asked "What is that policy?" indicating an underlying disapproval of foreign policy which is not clearly defined.

Question. Are you in favor of the Baruch plan for control of the atom bomb?

Answers. Yes, 50 percent; no, 12 percent; no answer, 38 percent. Most of the "No" answers opposed it on the grounds, "We should hang on to the bomb ourselves." The extremely high number who did not answer this question indicates a good deal of indecision on the part of the editors—they want to know more about it.

Question. Would you favor a return to the high-tariff policy once practiced by the Republicans?

Answers. Yes, 9 percent; no, 69 percent; no answer, 18 percent. Four percent want high protective tariffs but don't want them high enough to "fence America in." Of those answering "No", a number underlined their answer or added an exclamation point to emphasize their opposition.

Question. Do you favor removing our troops from China?

Answers. Yes, 32 percent; no, 43 percent; no answer, 25 percent.

RENT CONTROL

Opinion among editors varied on what course of action should be pursued in respect to rent controls.

Question. Which most nearly expresses your views on rent control?

1. Keep rent control but allow a blanket 10 to 15 percent rise in rents.

2. Keep rent control at present levels on old housing, but lift controls from new dwellings.

3. Keep rent control for the immediate future but lay plans immediately for gradual decontrol of properties.

4. Lift all rent controls immediately.

Answers. Favorite plan of those suggested was No. 3, to keep rent control for the immediate future but lay plans immediately for the gradual decontrol of properties, with 38 percent finding this most desirable; 21 percent think all rent controls should be lifted immediately, 11 percent urge a 10 to 15 percent increase in rentals, 5 percent favored a 10 to 15 percent increase coupled with laying immediate plans for gradually decontrolling properties, 4 percent said, "Keep rent controls," 4 percent voted for two of the proposals, 3 percent favor keeping rent control at present levels on old housing, but lifting controls from new dwellings.

Several of those wanting to keep rent control thought there were inequalities in the system which should be remedied.

As for other wartime controls, the majority of editors favor getting rid of them. Specific questions and answers were:

Question. Do you think Congress should immediately end price control over sugar and rice?

Answers. Yes, 58 percent; no, 26 percent; no answer, 16 percent. One publisher com-

mented, "Why not stop controlling United States sugar production in peacetime?"

Question. Do you think Congress should end the Housing Administration's priority control over building materials?

Answers: (Answers sent in before President Truman relaxed these controls.) Yes, 67 percent; no, 18 percent; no answer, 16 percent.

Question. Should the act giving the President wartime emergency powers be revoked at once?

Answers. Yes, 50 percent; no, 33 percent; no answer, 17 percent. The fact that a smaller percentage of editors favor revoking these powers than favor getting rid of other controls seems to be directly traceable to the strike situation. Typical of the negative vote was Harold H. Smith, of the North Side News, Jerome, Idaho, who said: "No, Lewis was stopped by this power alone." Several indicated that the act should be retained until the new Congress demonstrates whether or not it can adequately deal with the labor problem.

Other general questions and the answers of editors follow:

Question. Do you think Congress should pass a law requiring every physically fit young man who has not served in the armed forces to take military or naval training for 1 year?

Answers. Yes, 51 percent; no, 38 percent; no answer, 11 percent.

Question. Do you think Congress should pass a law raising minimum wages throughout the country from 40 to 65 cents an hour?

Answers. Yes, 16 percent; no, 76 percent; no answer, 7 percent. One percent said there should be a 50- to 55-cent minimum.

Question. Do you favor extending Social Security to those groups not now covered by the Social Security Act, such as farmers, professional people, domestics, and Government workers?

Answers. Yes, 47 percent; no, 44 percent; no answer, 9 percent.

Question. Do you think Congress should enact legislation for Government-sponsored medical insurance?

Answers. Yes, 12 percent; no, 80 percent; no answer, 8 percent. (The "no" vote was exactly the same as the vote in a poll conducted by the American Press on this subject in September 1945.)

Question. Do you think a firmer policy toward Communists and fifth-column activity in this country is needed?

Answers. Yes, 85 percent; no, 9 percent; no answer, 6 percent.

Question. Do you think Congress should carry out the Congressional reorganization bill cutting the number of committees as passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress?

Answers. Yes, 79 percent; no, 3 percent; no answer, 18 percent.

Question. Should more governmental authority be returned to the States by the Federal Government now that the war is over?

Answers: Yes, 86 percent; no, 3 percent; no answer, 11 percent.

Question. Do you want Congress to pass the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill to have the Government participate in large-scale financing of low-cost housing, slum clearance, and building research?

Answers. Yes, 30 percent; no, 51 percent; no answer, 19 percent.

Carl B. Miller, of the Putnam Democrat, Winfield, W. Va., we think, summed up the opinions of the majority of country editors when he commented:

"What people want here is a 'damn good letting alone.' Reduce services of government; eliminate a number of so-called social services; repeal 'closed shop' as un-American; abolish 'check-off' as an imposition upon employers and un-American. Keep taxes at the present level until the Budget can be balanced. Stop playing Santa Claus to every nation in the world. Stay out of private business—and individuals' personal business."

The Future of University Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Edmund Ezra Day, of Cornell University, at the University of Buffalo Centennial on October 4, 1946:

We are gathered here to consider the future of university education. We might do this in terms of any one or more of a wide variety of subjects, such as curriculum construction, instructional methods, teaching aids, structural alterations, the interdependence of education and research, the means of adequate financing, the interrelationships of public and private agencies. Attention to any or all these aspects of higher education, not to mention others of similar character, is quite in order on this occasion. Perhaps the other speakers will deal with at least some of these matters. I hope they will. As for myself, I feel drawn to a phase of higher education which lies in a somewhat different realm. What I have in mind is a clear identification of the basic responsibilities with which higher education is charged in a free society such as ours.

To deal with higher education in these terms is a difficult undertaking at any time. For education at all levels is essentially a means of social adaptation and social progress. In other words, educational policy is but a special phase of social policy. Hence it is impossible to plan educational innovations intelligently without making basic assumptions with respect to social organization, social purpose, and the nature of social progress. Inevitably the future of higher education will involve responses to the social changes that are in prospect.

Currently the social outlook is both obscure and uncertain. However, it is highly probable that social changes of great moment lie ahead. More and more it becomes evident that we live in revolutionary times. Two world wars within a single generation have released tremendous unsettling forces. Some of these have taken the form of scientific and technological advances. Others have appeared as national and racial uprisings. Already these great forces have broken the established moorings of civilization. At least temporarily we are adrift. We have no sure sense of direction; we lack the means with which to steer a charted course even if we knew where that course lay.

Amid this confusion two facts stand out: (1) If international war comes again, it will exhibit means and degrees of destructiveness never before witnessed by mankind; (2) the conflict of ideologies which characterized World War II was not ended by the defeat of the enemy dictatorships but remains unabated in our postwar world.

These two momentous facts are slowly sinking into the mind of the American people. With the first we are endeavoring to deal with specific proposals—proposals for the international control of atomic power and for the better establishment of collective security. With the other fact—the continuing conflict of ideologies—we have not yet come to grips.

If, as seems perfectly evident, we face a growing conflict of fundamental ideologies, it is high time we acquired a full understanding of the ideology we ourselves profess. Upon what set of beliefs and ideals have we been depending? We speak glibly of American democracy. Of what does it consist? By what means have we striven to establish and maintain it?

In answering questions of this sort reference is invariably made to our respect for the dignity and worth of the individual. We ultimately appraise all our social arrangements and procedures in terms of the benefits they bestow upon the people, not in terms of the advantages they yield to the state. We think of the state as an instrument for the service of the people, not of the people as slaves in the service of the state. All this is sound as far as it goes, but the basic question remains, How have we undertaken to implement by specific measures or policies this concept of the ordering of our social and political life in the service of the ultimate interests of the common man?

Any full answer to this question entails a much more extended analysis than can be undertaken on this occasion. However, it is quite possible to expose here in outline at least four of the fundamental components of the national policy through which we have striven to enrich our common life.

In the first place, we have insisted upon an extraordinary amount of individual liberty. Much of the early settlement of the continent was in search of freedom. The American Revolution was successfully fought to establish it. It became the very soul of our Federal and State constitutions. No ideals have played quite so important a part in our national life as those of freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, and of worship, freedom of the press and of inquiry, freedom of enterprise and of economic venture, freedom of assembly and of group organization. We have been truly the land of liberty.

In the second place, we have confirmed our faith in the rule of the people by sweeping extensions of the suffrage. We have eliminated all property qualifications from the right to ballot, and given to women the same voting power enjoyed by men. The fact that in some sections of the country certain elements of the population are in practice disenfranchised impairs but does not destroy the ideal we have set for ourselves. Government in America is by consent of the governed. We have endeavored to establish a rule which is by, for, and of the people.

In the third place, we have sought from the outset to extend the range of individual opportunity through free public education. We have exhibited a confidence in education matched nowhere else in the world. We have poured money in unparalleled amounts into the support of education. We have steadily expanded the scope of the school systems of the country and have developed an amazing array of tax-supported institutions of higher education. Doubtless we shall go further in this same direction. Educational opportunity is nowhere in the world as great as it is in America, and as a people we propose to keep it that way. We believe that only as people are educated can they expect to govern themselves wisely.

Finally, our national life has been characterized by phenomenal achievements in the field of science and technology. In part these achievements have been due to the freedom we have enjoyed and to the provisions we have made for popular education. In part, however, they appear to spring from a special genius of the American people. We have a flair for the mechanical and technological and as a people have won great material advantages from the assiduous cultivation of science in both its pure and applied forms. All this has proven enormously profitable. Our victories in the two world wars are a case in point. It may fairly be said that the victories in both instances were due in no small part to the almost incredible scientific and technological resources we were able to bring to bear.

These four great elements are not by any means all that lie in the American way of life, but they surely compose a substantial part of it. It is fair to say that we have depended primarily on these four to assure

our national progress and prosperity. Viewing the record in retrospect, we can see clearly enough that this dependence has not been misplaced. We have enjoyed a measure of well-being unmatched in any other country of comparable size and power. The record to date is one of which we can all be tremendously proud, and one for which we should surely all be profoundly grateful.

The fact remains that the current situation is not reassuring. Without question not a few of the present trends are ominous. More and more it becomes clear that the policies upon which we have relied so fully have a fundamental limitation in common: They supply no clear moral or spiritual imperative. Liberty is not invariably disciplined, and when it is not, becomes license. The exercise of the ballot is not uniformly either enlightened or public spirited, and may relapse into corruption. Free education may be selfishly exploited and effect no social gains whatever. Science and technology respect no system of social and moral values and are quite as capable of destroying civilization as of building it.

Given liberty and educational opportunity, the right to vote and all the powers that science and technology can convey, we still face the problem of what we choose to make of life. What we cannot get along without is a fundamental faith by which to order and direct our strivings. This is true of each one of us individually; it is true of us all as a great self-governing people. For the concentrations of power we have developed, economically, politically, and socially, make it quite apparent that we can no longer assume that the interplay of selfish interests will automatically fuse in a serving of the public good. Power politics can wreck us domestically as well as internationally. More and more we are driven to this conclusion: We cannot hope to survive as a free people except as we develop a pervasive sense of social responsibility with all that this entails in individual morality.

It is with this idea fast in mind that we must, with others, plan the future of university education in America. If we are to move forward successfully we must first agree on fundamental objectives, set in the light of the social outlook of our times; then we must work imaginatively and assiduously to devise the specific means by which these fundamental objectives are to be attained.

As we do this at the level of higher education, we shall be dealing with both general and vocational education. There is an inclination in some quarters to rule that universities should not concern themselves with instruction looking toward the mastery of any of the practical arts. This is an altogether unrealistic attitude. Higher education in this country has always been in part vocational in ultimate purpose. It will continue to be so. But, in seeking vocational ends, it must not be allowed to become purely technical. Vocational education at the level of the university should be professional in character. This is tantamount to saying that it should respect three governing principles: (1) an emphasis upon fundamental disciplines as distinguished from immediately applicable, narrowly conceived practical techniques; (2) a sustained pursuit, through scholarly and scientific research, of new knowledge bearing significantly upon the vocational arts; and (3) a steadfast devotion to the broader implications and social obligations of the vocation for which the training is provided. Vocational education at the university level should, in other words, have a substantial cultural content and bearing.

That professional education has not always met these requirements has to be frankly admitted. It is part of the responsibility of our universities to see that it does so. There is no other way in which to make sure that our professions are alerted to their public responsibilities. It is in this area that we should recognize one of the most important challenges with which higher education in America is now faced.

In general, the future of higher education is bound fast to the future of all education. Higher education will progress satisfactorily only as all education effects certain important advances. The goals toward which these advances have to be made are multiple. There are at least five I feel impelled to specify.

We must make education connect more directly and explicitly with the forthright pursuit of truth. This is true of education at all levels and of all types. Too many students move through our schools and colleges without ever acquiring a first-hand acquaintance with what it means to seek truth honestly and faithfully. The experience is one which can be given within widely varying levels of intellectual capacity and educational endowment. The love of truth and the disinterested pursuit of it lie at the very heart of freedom. They should be cultivated assiduously through the work of our schools and colleges.

We must do better than we have in imparting through formal education a widespread social understanding. We have been too easily satisfied with evidences of information on the part of our students. Information is not enough. We must build information into knowledge, and knowledge into understanding. The common man must know where he is, and where he is going; the character of the leadership he is offered and the requisites of the followership he must exhibit. Formal education must contribute more than it has to social wisdom.

We must make education minister more effectively than it has to an expanding social sympathy. Mankind is being knit more and more closely together. We must all come to see more clearly the nature and force of the common bonds of humankind the world over. The schools and colleges, especially as they learn to use some of the new devices, such as the teaching film, can make highly important contributions to this end.

We must, through education, give work an improved status. There are few things in life so rewarding as a satisfactory job, and few things as unprofitable as sheer idleness. Leisure there should be when we have learned how to use it to advantage, but work itself should give its enduring satisfactions. The idea that we seek education in part to lighten our work load is basically fallacious. The more education we get, the greater are our obligations to serve. We must develop through popular education a philosophy of work in which productive labor becomes both a duty and a privilege. It is a responsibility of the schools and colleges to see that satisfaction is taken by students in work well done. It is equally important that young people get a clear conception of the rewards that lie in honest and sustained industry, be the occupation high or low.

Finally, we must in education in America come to grips with the everlasting moral imperatives of a free society. Our public schools and colleges have avoided this assignment all too long. Whatever may be the necessary consequences of the complete separation of church and state, they surely do not entail avoidance of all moral responsibilities. Formal education cannot possibly be regarded as an amoral social function. It is high time that our schools and colleges dealt more explicitly and responsibly with their obligations to the moral order in American democracy.

Not long ago we were given a profound and moving statement of the sort of faith that I believe higher education in America must proclaim if it is to win its way through the confusion, disorder, and dismay with which the world of free men is now beset. This statement comes from one of the wisest proponents of democracy this country has yet seen. It is from the pen of the distinguished historian, who was until recently my colleague, the late Carl Becker. I quote:

"To have faith in the dignity and worth of the individual man as an end in himself; to believe that it is better to be governed by persuasion than by coercion; to believe that fraternal good will is more worthy than a selfish and contentious spirit; to believe that in the long run all values are inseparable from the love of truth and the disinterested search for it; to believe that knowledge and the power it confers should be used to promote the welfare and happiness of all men rather than to serve the interests of those individuals and classes whom fortune and intelligence endow with temporary advantage: these are the values which are affirmed by the traditional democratic ideology. They are the values which, since the time of Buddha and Confucius, Solomon and Zoroaster, Plato and Aristotle, Socrates and Jesus, men have commonly employed to measure the advance or the decline of civilization the values they have celebrated in the saints and sages."

It is in this sort of faith that the future of higher education in America rests. Our planning and our hopes must be framed in our fundamental belief in the role that our universities and colleges will play in shaping all aspects of society. We stand looking at the results of a war that has changed the face and the customs of the world as we knew it. The growth of new technologies, a phenomenon of war, has this time been crowned with the emergency of a force which, in a blinding instant above Hiroshima, has called a dramatic turn in human affairs. In atomic energy we have a force with which the world must reckon from this time forward, yet which the world seems altogether unprepared to accept.

We have no option but to reappraise our attitudes, our habits of thought, our fundamental convictions, and our interests, both material and spiritual, as the new age opens before us. We cannot escape the fact that higher education has a special relevance to the social and political aspects of our existence as a people, and that it must be effectively brought to bear upon the challenging problems which now confront us. May we with all the resources at our command, strive to make human endeavor in every walk of life, work more and more surely for righteousness and truth, for justice and mercy, for peace and good will among men.

Limitation of Presidential Tenure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to your attention and that of the entire Nation a profound editorial which appeared in the June 1946 issue of the Republican, the national magazine of the Republican Party. This editorial clearly sets forth the thinking in connection with the proposition of limiting the terms of the Presidency of the United States. This editorial is entitled "A Job for Republicans" and it might have been called a job for Americans. Now is the time for us to take up this important job and complete it. To the

editor of the Republican I feel we owe a debt of gratitude for his determined stand on this issue which expresses, I believe, the sentiments of this House.

The editorial follows:

A JOB FOR REPUBLICANS

Now that the tradition which formerly limited Presidential tenure to two terms has been shattered, most Republicans agree that a constitutional amendment restricting the length of time one man may occupy the White House is urgently desirable.

Mere agreement among Republicans is useless. It is time for aggressive action if the principle of free government which the tradition upheld is to remain alive.

The only major argument ever raised against limitation of tenure is based on the notion that America's survival might some day depend on retention of a particular individual as President.

That presumptuous argument was used in 1940. It was then believed by many who now may be willing to recognize that the Nation owes its survival from 1940 to 1944 to its millions of armed young men and skilled industrial workers, its production wizards, and its scientific geniuses, and that these saviors of the Nation would have performed their functions no matter who was in the White House.

The argument was used again in 1944. That time its fundamental fallacy was tragically and conclusively exposed within a very few months.

Some of the 27,000,000 citizens who voted in 1940 to wipe out the traditions that no President should be permitted more than two terms pretended the tradition did not matter.

"After all," said Harold Ickes, "what is a sacred tradition among friends?"

The answer to Ickes' question is that the "sacred tradition" provided one of our major guaranties that our Government would remain forever the servant of the people and never become their master. The "sacred tradition" was a safeguard that would, by itself, have kept America from slipping into the abyss of one-man, one-party, totalitarian government.

This is not retrospective political bellyaching. It is a statement of simple fact.

The "sacred tradition" at which Ickes sneered was established by George Washington and articulated by Thomas Jefferson as an outgrowth of the fine contempt in which American revolutionists held the decrepit and fraudulent doctrine of the "divine right of kings."

And in a land where men seemed endowed with a rugged instinct for keeping their "big shots" trimmed down to a reasonable and controllable size, it served for 152 years to prevent the self-perpetuation of any ruling clique in the land. It made it impossible for any man to hold the vast powers of the Presidency long enough to destroy effectively the American form of a government of checks and balances. It was a basic part of our fabric of free government.

But 6 years ago boss Frank Hague, Jersey City, declared himself "absolutely 100 percent for a third term." Mayor Edward Kelly, Chicago, said, "I suppose I was one of the very first to go on record for a third term." Earl Browder, Communist candidate, proclaimed, "The tradition against a third term in the Presidency must be set aside."

And so the tradition was set aside.

Most of the 27,000,000 who followed the lead of Hague, Ickes, Kelly, and Browder probably were not voting to undermine the principle of free government in America; they were merely voting for a man.

But now the man for whom they voted is gone and so is the tradition that upheld the principle. With the tradition gone, the principle can no longer depend upon good faith and general acceptance for its survival, as it formerly did. It must be made a part of the law of the land.

It is not important whether an amendment be adopted limiting Presidential tenure to one 6-year term or two 4-year terms. But it is important that quibbling over details be halted and an amendment be adopted.

Getting a constitutional amendment through Congress and the requisite number of State legislatures equires an aggressive campaign.

Such a campaign is necessarily up to all the Republicans.

When the voting starts, many Democratic legislators will be found to be fully aware of the danger that arose when the "sacred tradition" was broken. But the Democrats cannot be expected to take the initiative. To do so would be to confess the errors of 1940 and 1944, and in the realm of practical politics that is unthinkable.

Yes, this is clearly a job for the Republicans.

Every day of delay, whether due to lethargy or to squabbling over the exact terms of the limitation, is a day in which the principle of free government in America is in peril.

The Federal Budget Is Still Too High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared January 11, 1947, in the Sun, published in New York City, entitled "The Federal Budget Is Still Too High":

THE FEDERAL BUDGET IS STILL TOO HIGH

The President's Budget message pours a deluge of cold water upon the Nation's hopes for genuine economy at Washington. It predicts a decline in Federal spending in the coming fiscal year of $6,000,000,000, or about 14 percent down from the current fiscal year. If the President's estimates of receipts are accurate, if Congress reenacts the emergency excise taxes which would otherwise expire on June 30, if Congress increases postal rates, if nothing is added to the expenditures now budgeted, then on June 30, 1948, there will be a surplus of about $1,800,000,000. If this surplus should then be applied to reduction of the public debt, about two-thirds of 1 percent of the principal could be retired. Such is the measly objective provided by the 1948 Budget and even this goal cannot be reached unless taxes are held at present levels.

During the war a number of economists attempted to forecast the postwar Budget. Their estimates ranged from a low of $18,000,000,000 to a high of $25,000,000,000. The proposed level of 1948 expenditures is 50 percent above that highest estimate.

But there is another and more direct way of showing the magnitude of the Budget. In his message Mr. Truman says that it will cost less than 3 percent of the national income to pay interest on the public debt. On this basis the Federal Government proposes to take for its own purposes in the coming fiscal year about 21 or 22 percent of national income, to use about one-seventh of that amount to pay the interest on its indebtedness and to use less than one-twentieth of what it receives to reduce its indebtedness.

For the ordinary person judgment of the Budget message is made more difficult by changes in names and classifications, but he will recognize one of the old landmarks of all Budget messages. Category by category, Mr. Truman goes through the list, mentions a lump sum and then, in effect, asks how it could possibly be reduced. He is not always on solid ground. It will be the duty of Congress, in the interest of more than a pittance payment to reduce the public debt, to examine with skeptical eye virtually every classification. It is irrefutable that payment of interest on the national debt, in the amount budgeted, is an obligation of the Government which cannot be reduced. The same thing is true of some other categories. But the administration has sought to mark each and every category with the warning, "Do not touch," and that is plain and unadulterated nonsense. The heavy hand of ruthless economy should and will fall upon many a category. This Budget is a challenge to the Republican majority in Congress and it will not go unanswered.

That Balanced Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to every Member of Congress a timely and excellent discussion of President Truman's Budget by Tom Munger, able news commentator and analyst, whose column, Capitol Watchtower, appears in many of the leading newspapers in Michigan. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Munger's analysis of Mr. Truman's Budget message, as follows:

CAPITAL WATCHTOWER

(By Tom Munger)

The Federal Budget presented to Congress last Friday by President Harry S. Truman was widely characterized in the press over the week end as a balanced Budget. This was largely because the President said it is a balanced Budget, the first in 18 years by his own admission.

Furthermore, he called it a realistic, tight, complete Budget, justified in every detail. He challenged Congress to pare anything further off it. Thus the President indicated his belief that the Budget contains only those items in the amounts absolutely necessary to the operation of the Government, and the safety and welfare of the people.

All of this sounded like something the GOP doctor ordered, until it was revealed that the Budget total is $37,528,000,000 for the 1947–48 fiscal year, which begins next July 1. This is only $4,995,000,000 less than the 1946–47 Budget of $42,523,000,000, which was the highest peacetime Budget in the history of this or any other nation.

As a matter of fact, the 1946–47 Budget was more than three times any previous peacetime Budget, even under the New Deal, and the 1947–48 Budget is only slightly less than three times the largest previous peacetime total.

It took about 24 hours for the more Budget-minded of the national legislators to digest the huge volume, larger than a telephone book and devoted largely to figures, and statistical tables, and diagrams. They were caught unawares by reason of the fact President Truman recently closed all the "pipe lines" from the White House, and nobody knew authoritatively in advance just what the Budget would be like.

Meanwhile various estimates of the amounts that Republicans would be able to pare off the Budget emanated from the marble halls of Capitol Hill. Senator TAFT, of Ohio, thought possibly $3,000,000,000 might be the figure. Others of lesser caliber foresaw reductions running as high as $17,000,000,000. All of them thought these reductions possible, without reducing appropriations for the armed forces, at the same time making a large payment upon the national debt.

Finally it dawned upon the more realistic of legislators that quite possibly the President had been somewhat disingenuous, to say the least, in calling it a balanced Budget.

This week some bewildered Members of Congress, and some even more bewildered political observers, still are asking whether it is a balanced Budget on the basis of assured income and outgo of Government funds or is balanced merely on the basis of several easy assumptions made for political purposes.

There are many reasons for thinking that the latter is the case.

The Government estimates that its 1947–48 fiscal year income will be $37,730,000,000, down $2,500,000,000 from this year, but in view of the Budget total, leaving a surplus of $202,000,000, exclusive of excise tax receipts. This would be the first surplus since 1930.

In his Budget message, President Truman asked for continuance of the wartime excise taxes, which cease automatically on June 30 because of his action in declaring hostilities at an end, which came just before New Year's. He asked also for postal-rate increases, close upon the action of the Seventy-ninth Congress decreasing airmail rates from 8 to 5 cents. Moreover, he warned emphatically against income-tax reductions, for another year at least.

By this means, he hopes to get the 1947–48 surplus up to $1,800,000,000, all of which would be paid on the national debt, reducing it by June 30, 1948, to a total of $260,200,000,000.

Now it is implicit in the administration figures that a comparatively large increase in national income was set down as the basis of a balanced Budget. President Truman said the Government estimates that the increase in national income will approximate $1,000,000,000, to a peak of $166,000,000,000.

Thus Government income estimates for the 1947–48 fiscal year carry personal income-tax returns at an all-time high of $19,120,000,000, and corporate income-tax returns at $8,270,000,000.

What reason exists for thinking these figures even remotely realistic? There are reasons, indeed, for thinking them nothing of the kind, but instead a kind of politico-statistical pipe dream.

If the so-called portal-to-portal retroactive-pay suits, which now demand sums in excess of $4,000,000,000, are not outlawed by Congress and are pressed to a conclusion, hundreds of industrial companies may go out of business this year and next. One rather large company already has done so.

Those industries strong enough to meet the back-pay demands will of course charge off the payments against taxes for the years covered by the court awards. Notably, one great company already has done this—the Dow Chemical Co., of Midland, Mich.

On this basis, the estimated corporate income tax returns of about $8,270,000,000 would largely, if not entirely, evaporate.

At the same time closing of industrial plants would greatly reduce employment and personal income tax returns would decrease accordingly.

Then what would become of the projected surplus of $202,000,000, or even of the balanced Budget? What would become of the projected $1,800,000,000 surplus on the basis of continued excise taxes and higher postal rates?

This gives rise to an interesting question.

The Budget estimates show a prospective surplus of $202,000,000, without the excise taxes on luxuries. When the excise taxes, and even the higher postal rates, are included, they show a possible surplus of only $1,800,000,000. Yet they carry excise tax returns alone, should Congress reinstate the taxes, at $6,118,000,000. How is that?

Do $6,118,000,000 and $202,000,000 add up to only $1,800,000,000, or is there a colored gentleman in the woodpile? One would be tempted, almost, to believe that the famous team of Amos and Andy had dreamed up such a financial absurdity.

It can be argued logically that Congress never will permit the portal-to-portal pay suits to be tried. But what then?

Many observers feel certain that organized labor, balked on the back-pay suits, will turn again to strikes as a means of attempting to correct the quite real and distressing dislocation between prices and wage rates, instead of going all out to increase production for the same purpose.

This, too, would lead directly to reduced corporate income taxes, reduced employment and hence reduced personal income-tax payments.

Either way, the country faces the prospect of deflation and a sharp recession of business activity. When it will happen is anybody's guess, but many signs indicate its approach. National income is not likely to increase.

But supposing that neither strikes nor back-pay suits bring on a depression; supposing that no depression arrives this year or next. Nevertheless, on the basis of figures presented along with the Budget, a balanced Budget remains a pipe dream.

The President has recommended universal military training, although he left out the word "military." Yet the Budget contains no request for funds to defray the cost of such training, which certainly would run into the billions each year. He included only $3,510,000,000 for so-called global finance, involving final payments to Britain on the British loan, famine relief around the world, and the near certainty of at least one additional large foreign loan.

In his Budget message, President Truman asked for almost no reduction of the top-heavy Government pay rolls. Indeed, he asked for removal of the ceilings on Government personnel, imposed by Congress when it passed the 1945 Federal pay-raise legislation.

Everything considered, the Budget message and the Budget itself, together with accompanying estimates, add up to just one more example of the loose thinking, the willingness to employ easy assumptions, and resultant doubtful statistics to gain a political advantage, which marked the New Deal from start to finish.

America Rises to a New Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address on the subject America Rises to a New Destiny, delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon before the junior chamber of commerce at Minneapolis, Minn., on the evening of January 14.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I greatly appreciate the privilege of talking to you tonight. For four long years I have wanted to make a speech on a subject about which I feel deeply. For nearly three of those years, I held my tongue because we were at war. With the triumph of VJ-day, I said: "Now the time has come." But the utter confusion, both economic and political, which followed that day of victory convinced me that the timing was wrong. Tonight as I stand here before a group of men not only young in years, but fresh in viewpoint, I am certain that no better moment could be found for me to speak out.

I want to talk to you about "America, Rediscovered." I hope to show you that not only the future of our country but the future peace of the world depends on Americans rediscovering America.

The origins of my message date back to midway in the war when we were being assured by press, radio and magazine, by speech, song and ode, that mighty Russia was winning the war singlehandedly. Unless you sang the praises of the Red Army, unless you memorialized the heroes of Stalingrad, you were not in step. I kept thinking that this was Russia's portion of glory in the war and that ours would be next. I did not then, and I do not now, want to detract one iota from the part that the Soviet Union played. But I began listening then and I am still listening now for those same organ peans of praise for the gigantic part that our beloved Nation played.

Let's take a look at the record. The fact is that the United States waged a war so colossal, so stupendously greater than that by any other nation that it is beyond our comprehension.

Where Russia fought on a 2,000-mile front and a mere pond called the Baltic Sea—where Britain guarded a coast of 800 miles and a life line through the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean 10,000 miles long—the United States waged war on seven oceans, every sea, and on scores of fronts that totaled not two, but tens of thousands of miles. Our invasions of Jap-held islands alone were military feats heretofore never dreamed of. The invasion of Europe by British and American forces combined was a titanic operation which even the military mind still has difficulty grasping. The world has never seen the equal of the military achievements and military resources of our great and glorious Republic.

From a production standpoint the job done by American industry singlehandedly, almost defies the imagination. Consider:

Between 1940 and 1945, this country produced 294,000 fighting planes, including approximately 100,000 bombers—a plane production that far outstripped the production of all other nations of the world combined, enemy or Allied. In approximately the same period this Nation, which had only 7,695 ships in its Navy in 1941, had 100,000 fighting and auxiliary ships when the war ended in 1945. In fact, by the time the war was over, we actually had more ships in the United States Navy than we had men in its personnel in 1939. Today we have a Navy that far outstrips the dream of any admiral in history, and dwarfs all other navies of the world combined.

Our construction of merchant ships was actually hair raising. In approximately 5 years, we built 7,100 sea-going ships in the merchant class with the result that when the war ended, America—not Britannia—ruled the waves, with the American flag flying on twice as many ships as all the other merchant fleets of the world combined. In 5 years, American industry produced 6,000,000 rifles, 5,000,000 carbines, 2,500,000 machine guns, and 2,000,000 submachine guns. In the same period our factories turned out 37,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition to supply those same guns with fire power. We produced 85,000 tank guns, 55,000 units of field artillery, 71,000 mortars, 770,000 trucks, 2,000,000 tons of high-explosive TNT, and 2,000,000 tons of smokeless powder.

Those are figures that not even the mathematical mind can cope with, but I am not through. I want to offer you some figures

which will give you a better perspective on the might of the Soviet Union's Red Army.

In a little over 3 years—during the very time when we were hearing how Russia was winning the war almost unaided—we sent the Soviet Union by air or in our own ships and under our own escort through the treacherous Arctic and Persian Gulf routes, 14,450 fighting planes, including 9,700 pursuit ships and 3,800 bombers; 7,000 tanks, 3,200 armored scout cars, 2,200 ordnance service vehicles, 52,000 jeeps, 363,000 trucks, 35,000 motorcycles, 8,200 antiaircraft guns, 135,000 submachine guns, 343,000 tons of explosives, 105 submarine chasers, 195 torpedo boats, 7,600 marine Diesel engines, $320,000,000 worth of machine tools, $35,000,000 worth of metal-cutting tools, $43,000,000 worth of petroleum-refining equipment, $171,000,000 worth of electric generators, 810,000 tons of nonferrous metals, 17,600 tons of ferro-alloys, 2,688,000 tons of steel, entire railroads, not to mention tons of food, including butter, which you did without. And if that is not enough to impress you, let me add that what we sent Russia was only two-thirds of what we sent Britain.

And if you are still unimpressed, let me further add that the above list is not complete by several railroad systems, several hundred ships, and hundreds of millions of good old American dollars.

Now I am prepared to stand up with any man and give Russia credit for its part in the war, but at the same time I want to stand and pay the fullest tribute to the gallantry of our own armed forces, and these herculean accomplishments which our capitalistic system made possible.

When you consider that in addition to all this, we put 12,000,000 persons into the armed services and raised approximately $400,000,000,000 in taxes and loans from our people, I can scarcely be accused of flag waving when I cry, "Wake up, America; you don't know your own strength."

Now, I purposely omitted the mention of one weapon which we produced that literally overshadows every other single effort of the war—the atom bomb. No words of mine can begin to describe its horrifying potentialities. At the moment it is an American possession. How long it will remain our secret no one knows. But as Winston Churchill says, "It is the new balance of power in the world today." It makes the United States, already armed with the greatest Navy, the greatest air force, and the greatest Army, the most awe-inspiring military power the world has ever seen.

So here stands America, a stupendous nation—strong like no other before it—unaware of the vastness of its muscle, unsure in its leadership without which world solutions are impossible.

What are you and I as Americans going to do about it?

We have a role and it is a simple one. It is the task of impressing on Americans the plain fact that with our strength goes responsibility.

First, let us make every American sure in the knowledge that our strength derives not from communism, not from fascism, not from nazism, not from socialism, not from any totalitarian system, but from a mighty, free, competitive system, a republicanism which we have chosen to call democracy. It is a system which needs no borrowings from the isms of the Old World, the teachings of Marx, nor the decadence of the Orient. It is the greatest dynamic force in the world today and only by preserving it intact can America realize its full role in human affairs.

Second, let us ourselves realize and impress on our fellow Americans that with oceans reduced to mere rivers, and with weeks reduced to mere minutes by the advent of jet propulsion and the harnessing of atomic energy, no minor disturbance of the peace, be it in the Himalayas of Tibet or on the veldt of Africa, is beyond our concern. No longer can America close its eyes to the fact that, as a street fight may turn into a riot, so may a minor border dispute flare into the next world war.

Finally, let us grasp and fully comprehend the terrible strength that is ours and realize unless it is put to wise and just use, it will be turned against us, just as surely as the peoples turned against arbitrary power of their protectors and rulers of other centuries.

Wisdom, not passion nor prejudice, must be the keystone of the conduct of our foreign affairs.

On the domestic scene we are emerging from an era of confusion partly caused by totalitarian liberals attempting to drag us into the abyss that has engulfed every republic that abandoned its ideals for human liberty in exchange for a totalitarianism masquerading under the guise of emergency and equality.

On top of that basic conflict we are now wallowing in postwar adjustment.

We hear men speak of recession, depression, inflation, and deflation. We hear outcries that labor is throttling the country, we hear screams that the robber barons are returning, now that the Republicans are on their way back to power. I think labor in many instances has abused the power it has gained. I believe that greed has not been erased from the heart of every financier. Of course I see the threat of inflation on one hand and a recession on the other.

Fundamentally, we are in a period of transition, a period of readjustment of economic values, a period of restoration in the balance of political power. So long as Americans like you here tonight grasp the implications of what is happening, and seek to steer a safe and sound course, then so long will America be spared the burden of unsold inventories and unemployed labor on one hand, of inflation and a panicked people on the other hand.

Depressions and inflations alike are primarily a state of mind. Only ignorance and distortion of values breeds either form of calamity. One only has to know America to realize its untold potentialities, to understand that only lack of our own wisdom can keep us from cashing in on tomorrow.

On the international scene, as on the domestic front, we are also in a transitory stage. From some quarters come forecasts that Russian expansionism is going to throttle the world; that British imperialism and the pound sterling are once again spreading their tentacles; that fascism is not dead; that the United Nations is already a failure.

Here again I must say that the actions of the Soviet Union leave much to be desired. Nor does the difficulty of Great Britain in India or her policies in Palestine add to the peace of my mind. Other disturbing factors are Peron in the Argentine and Tito in Yugoslavia. To me the Trieste treaty creates another Danzig. I read daily of new ineffectualities performed in the name of the United Nations.

Yet I know that all these threats to the peace of the world can be diminished in direct ratio to the wisdom of the role played by the United States of America.

At the moment we are possessors of the big stick, but I sometimes feel we speak too softly. Only if we encourage the American people to awaken to their full strength can we expect our statesmen to speak with full voice.

The United States of America today represents the greatest concentration of technical skill and industrial power essential to modern warfare. I do not speak in prideful exaggeration of our power, but of its place in people's struggle for peace.

Our goal is a lasting peace in the interest of all humanity. That lofty objective is aided by tranquillity and stability at home. Our prosperity contributes to the welfare and order of the world. The well-being of America is essential to the safety of mankind everywhere. And America is sustained and made great by the energies and the endeavors of all her citizens. Frequently, our purposes cross each other. But our ability to work together is the heart of the life of our Republic and of a durable world peace.

America's material production and unselfish spiritual ideas are a master force radiating throughout the world to the inestimable blessing of mankind.

We must realize that tremendous affairs throughout civilization rest on affairs here at home—in America—the center of the world's gravity.

So in the final analysis the conclusion cannot be escaped that in the hands and hearts of Americans rests the spiritual force and the instruments of power to bring about world tranquillity and lasting peace. Therefore, the task of rediscovering America is the task of each of us.

Senator Taylor, of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles by three of our most distinguished columnists commenting upon the courage, the idealism, the sincerity, and the parliamentary ability of the brilliant and able gentleman from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who has taken so commendable a position on the question of the honor of the Senate and of civil rights at elections. The Senator from Idaho was the first to call our attention, last June, to reports of illegalities which it was alleged were committed in the Mississippi primaries. His forthright action on the opening day of this Congress served effectively to raise the issue above the level of partisan politics, and to frame it in bold and fearless terms.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 15, 1947]

MAN TO MAN—GLEN TAYLOR'S SENATE SPEECH ON BILBOISM LONG WILL REVEREERATE OVER UNITED STATES

(By Harold L. Ickes)

GLEN TAYLOR, Democratic Senator from Idaho, on the floor of the United States Senate on June 26, 1946:

"A United Press report which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, June 23, accuses * * * a Member of this body * * * of inciting people in his State to use 'any means' to prevent qualified voters of his State from exercising their right to vote for candidates for the United States Senate. The matter should be quickly and fully investigated by the Committee on Privileges and Elections * * * ours is the duty, as well as the privilege, of passing on the credentials of our Members, and we cannot disregard charges such as these without a serious loss of prestige."

The same Senator TAYLOR before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, July 1, 1946: "This issue (Bilboism) is one which * * * tests the sincerity of our

Senate. It was put before us, if the newspaper reports are correct, by one of our own Members, who saw fit to give us advance notice of a widespread plan to break Federal laws. He has allegedly named the time and place and pretty well described the details of the crimes to be committed. The threats are worthy of special credence because they were made in the context of a long history of similar crime. The election is tomorrow. If you act, you must act fast."

CITES COLUMN STATEMENTS

From the Harold L. Ickes column of July 17, 1946: "The Senate of the United States can hardly expect the people to have more respect for it than it has for itself. And the Senate's respect for itself, if its attitude toward THEODORE G. BILBO be any yardstick, can be measured in fractions of inches. I wonder if the Senate will ignore its obligation to the people * * * the constitutional power to purge its own membership was given deliberately and for a purpose. If the United States Senate is willing to accept and fraternize with a man of Bilbo's character, I cannot conceive of anyone to whom it could possibly take exception."

From the Harold L. Ickes column of October 16, 1946: "If, as alleged, this product from the canebrakes of Mississippi (BILBO) was elected Senator by 'fraud and violence' and other unconstitutional methods, he can simply be denied the right to take the oath of office."

From the Harold L. Ickes column of December 30, 1946: "It would be difficult to respect a Senate that would admit BILBO on the record that he himself has tailored. And, so, I say that it is the Senate that is on trial. It has the power and the constitutional right, it may even be suggested that it has the moral obligation, to bar the doors of the Senate to a political pariah. As a Senator, BILBO would only degrade the Senate as he has disgraced his party, by flaunting his contempt for the Constitution that he has sworn, over and over again, to uphold and defend. The United States Senate cannot afford to become an accessory after the fact in political high crimes and misdemeanors that would make a mockery of public morality and strike at the heart of our institutions."

A GREAT SPEECH, THIS

Senator GLEN TAYLOR on the floor of the Senate, January 3, 1947: "It is not only Mr. BILBO who is on trial. Today it is the Senate itself which is on trial. We, the Members of the Senate, are not only on trial collectively, we are on trial individually. * * * Mr. BILBO * * * has toured the length and breadth of his State stirring up racial hatred, inciting white to hate black and causing black to hate white. To whites, who are themselves poor, ill-nourished, ill-clothed, and ill-educated, he does not offer prosperity, nourishment, clothing, food, and education. No, he offers to them the delicious sense of feeling superior to someone else, the cheap thrill of membership in a master race, the joy of kicking someone else around. To those on the lowest rung of the ladder, he does not offer a lift, he merely offers to create another rung still lower, so that the progress of man will be a series of descending steps. This is the same sort of cheap thrill that was peddled in Germany by an ambitious house painter some 10 years ago. We know that his doctrines and his methods brought no good to his people or the people of the world."

A great speech, this—one that will reverberate throughout the country for a long time to come. The 20 Democratic Senators who defended BILBO, the indefensible, have this upstanding young Senator from Idaho to thank that the excision of Bilboism was not entirely a Republican operation; Senator TAYLOR started the fight against BILBO on June 26, 1946. And he finished it, with the help of some other Democrats and of the Republicans whose appreciation of public morals was superior to that of those Democratic Senators who started a filibuster for BILBO.

[From the Washington Post of January 6, 1947]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

DRAMA IN THE SENATE

If Hollywood had written the script, the drama on the first day the Senate met could not have been sharper. It was a situation made for a movie producer.

The triumphant Republicans were gathering. Handshakes and back slapping were the order of the day. This was the beginning of the new dispensation.

The atmosphere on the Democratic side of the aisle was subdued. The losing team was taking defeat with dignified good humor. They were waiting for the Republicans to make their move to deny Senator THEODORE G. BILBO a seat.

Then, from the back row on the Democratic side, the young hero sprang up. It was perfect type casting. GLEN TAYLOR, Senator from Idaho, could be played by James Stewart or Gary Cooper. As it was, TAYLOR did very well by the part.

In the first place, he had to be clever and quick to beat the opposition to the draw. On the other side of the aisle, Michigan's Senator HOMER FERGUSON was waiting for the moment. FERGUSON had brought the Bilbo issue through the Republican conference. He had won approval to bar the Senator-elect from Mississippi at the door of the Senate.

But TAYLOR was in there first. He put in his resolution, and therefore it had precedence. What is more, he was prepared with a speech, and a good speech. On top of that, he could read his speech in a voice that had some dramatic quality. It could be heard even above the disorderly buzz of the Senate. Perhaps more politicians should try the radio before they come to the Senate.

The young Senator from Idaho had gone back into the record of previous instances when Senators-elect were met with charges disqualifying them from membership. In one such case he found that Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, had made a most significant speech.

In the move to oust Frank Smith, of Illinois, a Republican, the Democrats had taken the initiative. They were then the party of opposition. Republican leaders suggested that the day would come when the southern Democrats would have cause to regret that action. They would be faced with charges against one of their own number for violating the election laws. How would they like it then?

Senator GEORGE solemnly rejected this suggestion. He said that if it was established that a Senator-elect had violated the Constitution—no matter what provision—then the southerners would vote to deny him a place in the Senate.

Having established this background, TAYLOR went on to show how BILBO had violated the Constitution. He quoted the vicious, shocking language that BILBO had repeated on platform after platform during his campaign for reelection. It had been a deliberate invitation to violate the amendments to the Constitution that guarantee to all citizens, regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, the right to vote.

In basing his case against BILBO on the race issue, TAYLOR was on sound ground. It is infinitely more important than the charges growing out of the war contracts. The latter are bad. But they are nothing like as bad as the crude incitation to riot and violence implied in the demagogic raving that BILBO did in Mississippi last June.

As though any further drama were needed, at the peroration of TAYLOR's speech, BILBO came over and sat down a few feet from the speaker. He sat there glowering up with an arrogance rarely equaled in Senate history.

From the beginning of his term 2 years ago, TAYLOR has been regarded as a maverick. He has not played by any of the Senate rules, whether printed or unprinted. Often he has gone off the deep end when his more cautious colleagues, even those who agreed with him, were for discretion. Again and again he has violated the first of the unprinted rules, which is, "Do not stick your neck out." Occasionally he has looked foolish, and his cautious colleagues have snickered.

But boldness and courage are now and then rewarded, even in politics. TAYLOR showed on the very first day of the new session that it is not essential for the Democratic Party to collapse like a worn-out accordion. This is a lesson which should be taken to heart by Democrats, not only in Congress but everywhere. Two living parties are essential to a two-party system.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 4, 1947]

ECONOMICS OF BILBOISM

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

There is a related and underlying economic issue in the Bilbo case in the Senate which should not be lost sight of, because it involves the typical southern demagog and the purpose he serves.

This purpose is contrary to the best interests of the South in its attempt to improve its economic conditions.

It was brought out clearly by Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR, Democrat, of Idaho, in the speech on his resolution to prevent BILBO, Democrat, of Mississippi, from taking the oath and to refer the charges against him to the Senate Rules Committee for further investigation.

There was a spirit of tolerance in the Idaho Senator's speech. He led up to his penetrating analysis of the southern demagog type by explaining that the problem of race relations in the South is a highly complex one requiring patience and good will. He was willing, he said, "to move as slowly as necessary. I ask only one thing: that we do move forward, that we do not turn back the clock. And I will vigorously resist any attempt to move in the opposite direction, the direction of ill will."

Then he put his finger on the economic issue:

"Mr. BILBO has moved in that backward direction. He has toured the length and breadth of his State stirring up racial hatred, inciting white to hate black and causing black to hate white.

"To whites, who are themselves poor, ill-nourished, ill-clothed, and ill-educated, he does not offer prosperity, nourishment, clothing, food, and education. No, he offers to them the delicious sense of feeling superior to someone else, the cheap thrill of membership in a master race, the joy of kicking someone else around."

None has ever put more accurately the basic motivation of southern demagogs who exploit the racial issue. And, sad to state, that also is the motivation of other interests in the South which want to keep the poor whites and Negroes on a low economic level for their own selfish purposes. They use such demagogs as Senator BILBO for their purpose.

That was a clear influence in the campaign of the late Gene Talmadge in Georgia.

A native who returned to watch that election was amazed at the support of the Georgia demagog by powerful economic interests that knew how Mr. Talmadge, when governor previously, had harassed labor union activities.

It is well to remember this background. Though it has no direct bearing on the basic issue in this case, which is the Senator's attempt to prevent Negroes from exercising their constitutional right to vote in primary

elections, it does have its meaning in the battle for democracy in the South.

The BILBO case presents a great national issue. The Senator has become the symbol of the forces of intolerance, bigotry, and racial prejudice by his inflammatory speeches and by his blatant and open efforts to intimidate Negro voters.

The issue is simple. It cannot be obscured by tortuous arguments about State rights, by legalistic maneuvers over whether the Senator should be prevented from taking the oath first, pending further debate and investigation, or whether he should be admitted and then expelled, or by filibustering by southern Senators.

One thing to remember is that our democracy is on test before the world today. Less than a year and a half ago it finally came, victoriously, through its greatest struggle for preservation, only to find that keeping it is a daily struggle in peacetime, too.

It was therefore most fitting that our first postwar Congress should open with a great battle for the extension of our freedom here at home, a battle to strengthen our democratic processes on the issue of constitutional rights and civil liberties.

For that is exactly what it is.

Red Cross Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, there appeared in last night's Evening Star a splendid editorial in praise of the wonderful work done by the American National Red Cross during World War II. Since I have a high regard for the American Red Cross, as well as Basil O'Connor, national chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED CROSS RECORD

Every man, woman, or child who assisted the American National Red Cross between July 1939 and July 1946 has reason to be proud of the record of those years, now disclosed by Basil O'Connor, national chairman. It is a report of an achievement probably unequaled in the history of philanthropic endeavor. The program represented in it extended to the ends of the earth, embraced all nations and all classes of people, served on every fighting front and carried on in the battle areas in aid of civilians after hostilities ceased. It still continues to alleviate hardships caused by every sort of disaster—and is expanding into additional fields of safety, health, and general welfare effort.

The number of individuals who supported the Red Cross with gifts of money was 56,550,733. Literally millions volunteered their labor through a total of 3,755 chapters. Members of the organized special corps of canteen, hospital, and recreation helpers were 3,838,000 in 1942–43. The list of paid employees included 2,098 persons in 1941 and 24,378 persons in 1945. Contributions for the period indicated reached $784,151,800. Expenditures during the 7 years were $730,749,169, of which $365,816,818 went exclusively for services to the armed forces and veterans. The roster of volunteer blood donors, Mr. O'Connor said, shows 6,663,121 names. Altogether, 13,326,242 pints of blood were given between February 1941 and September 1945.

Such figures are too vast to be comprehended easily. To illustrate their astronomical character, it is suggested that the average individual life in the United States in the twentieth century runs about 64 years and the labor given the Red Cross from 1939 to 1946, without consideration of wages of any kind, approximated 24,453,100 weeks—or, roughly, 382,078 ordinary lifetimes. What matters most, however, is the fact that the whole tremendous globe-encircling enterprise was and is free of even the slightest shadow of compulsion. It is a cooperative fellowship into which nobody is pushed or driven. The quality of its ministrations is even more noteworthy than their variety and extent. Henri Dunant at Geneva in 1862 and Clara Barton right here in Washington in 1881 builded better than they knew. Those who have followed them have been worthy of their example. No wonder the solemn and cautious Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences declares of the modern Red Cross: "To its founders its present scope would have seemed an impossible ideal."

The Job Ahead in the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of an address on the subject, The Job Ahead in the Missouri River Basin, delivered at Bismarck, N. Dak., on November 21, by Assistant Commissioner William E. Warne, of the Bureau of Reclamation. North Dakota is vitally concerned with the progress being made and planned by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers in the development of the Missouri Basin program authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The task ahead of us should be understood both in the Halls of Congress and in the executive departments, and Mr. Warne has brought forcibly to the attention of the people of the United States the magnitude of the job ahead.

I commend to the attention of the Congress and the people of the Missouri Basin, as well as of the entire West, the very able presentation of this subject which Mr. Warne made in the capital city of my State.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1943, about this time of the year, I had the opportunity in speaking before the North Dakota Reclamation Association at Valley City to outline what has now become the famous Basin-wide plan for the conservation and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin.

Since that time Mr. W. G. Sloan and General Pick have each set down in detail their programs, one for the tributaries and the other for the main stem of the Missouri River, and these plans have been reconciled into a single comprehensive basin-wide plan. The Basin plan has been approved by the Congress, authorized for construction in the Flood Control Act of 1944, and the construction has actually been begun. The work that has been placed under way includes Boysen Dam on the Big Horn River in Wyoming, Kortes Dam on the North Platte River in Wyoming, the Angostura project on the Cheyenne River in South Dakota, and the Frenchman-Cambridge project on the Republican River in Nebraska, which have been started by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Fort Randall and Garrison Dams on the main stem of the Missouri River, the Hardin County Dam, and other flood-control works on the lower tributaries which have been started by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. A dozen or more additional units have been brought forward to the point at which work can begin on them in the near future provided that the necessary preliminaries are completed and that release of funds for their construction is found to be consistent with the national program to combat inflation. One of the projects in the forefront of this group is the Hart River project at the very door of Bismarck. I shall discuss some of these projects in more detail later.

I told a group in Omaha last spring that we were 57 years late in getting around to the task of doing something about putting the Missouri River to work. I measured the time from Maj. Arthur Powell's great speech on water conservation before the North Dakota Constitutional Convention in 1889. His words demonstrate clearly that the problem was fully recognized then, although it has taken us more than half a century to prepare to meet it squarely.

Let me repeat again some of the things that Major Powell, that doughty war veteran who, as head of the United States Geological Survey, did so much to kindle the fires of conservation in this country, said when your State was being organized:

"The State of North Dakota has a curious position geographically in relation to agriculture. The eastern portion of the State has sufficient rainfall for agricultural purposes, the western part has insufficient rainfall, and the western portion is practically wholly dependent on irrigation.

"In the western portion all dependence on rains will ultimately bring disaster to the people. They are unwilling yet, a good many of them, to admit it, but the study of the physical conditions which prevail in this country and the application of the knowledge which has been given to mankind through the study of these same problems in Europe and Asia and Africa all prove this one fact—that in the western portion of this State they will have to forever depend on artificial irrigation for all agriculture."

Major Powell's prophecy has come through. In the western portion of North Dakota, they have now learned to irrigate, the lower Yellowstone project, for example, and at Williston and elsewhere. The pioneer conservationist went on:

"In the eastern portion they may depend upon the storms that come from the heavens and there is a middle belt between the two regions which is of very great interest. They will soon learn in the western portion to depend upon irrigation and provide themselves with agencies for the artificial fructifying of the soil with water.

"In the eastern part they will depend on the rainfall and in the middle portion they will have a series of years when they will have abundant crops; then for 2 or 3 years they will have less rainfall and there will be failure of crops and disaster will come on thousands of people who will become discouraged and will leave."

Again, Major Powell's words were prophetic. The droughts of the 1930's started jalopy caravans carrying westward the people of North Dakota and other Plains States—westward to no more fertile land but to land that was dependably watered by irrigation.

Thirty thousand farm families, it is recorded, moved out of your State during those

terrible years. I do not need to tell you that their leaving almost wrecked some of your communities. It caused a heavy drain on the financial coffers of the Nation. During the 6 years of the drought, more than $600,000,000 flowed from the National Treasury to combat its effects in the six semiarid States in the Missouri River Basin. Of that sum, $92,000,000 was spent for Federal relief in North Dakota alone. I need not point out to you that this money would have gone a long way toward completing the developments that we are now beginning for the permanent use of the waters of the Missouri River. The drought of the 1930's and the Missouri River itself may seem remote to some living in the eastern tier of counties in North Dakota, and to many who live in the humid States of the East, but the problems of the recurring droughts of the high plains are not remote from any part of North Dakota and I have just given you figures which clearly show that they affect the pocketbooks of all citizens of the United States.

But it took the people of the Nation more than 50 years to make up their minds to follow Major Powell's advice. He said:

"Years will come of abundance and years will come of disaster, and between the two the people will be prosperous and unprosperous, and the thing to do is to look the question squarely in the face and provide for this and for all years.

"There's almost enough rainfall for your purposes, but one year with another you need a little more than you get. It is flowing past you in the rivers. Storms come and spread over the land and the water runs off into the rivers and is carried into the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. There are waters rolling by you which are quite ample to redeem your land and you must save these waters."

Major Powell asked the people to conserve their streams; told them that the water was to be preserved and stored during the seasons of nonirrigation. He said:

"All other wealth falls into insignificance compared with that which is to come from these lands from the pouring on them of the running streams of this country."

In some respects, perhaps half a century is not too long a time for a great people to spend in mastering a new problem. Certainly there were mitigating circumstances here. The pioneers who came upon the high plains in the dramatic trek that rolled our civilization westward to the Pacific had little experience, personal or racial, that would prepare them for the conditions they encountered. Irrigation, the management of arid and semiarid lands, is much older than recorded history. In early Biblical times, the great Queen of Babylon caused ditches to be built, the land to be watered, and her people to prosper. But the words of these hidden passages in the Old Testament meant little to the sons of the frontiersmen who had been transplanted from the humid and well-watered sections of Europe to the humid and well-watered section of the North American continent. Unlike the Spanish who brought a Mediterranean understanding of the irrigation of arid lands into the deserts of Mexico, Peru, New Mexico, Arizona, and southern California, the sons of the colonists were not well prepared to meet the conditions they encountered beyond the 20-inch rainfall line.

Perhaps the best illustration of their lack of preparation to meet the problems which drought and aridity have fastened permanently to nearly one-half of the land area of the United States was the fact that our pioneers brought with them from the humid lands of England the law of riparian rights. Under the original riparian doctrine, a man downstream who may have used the flowing water to turn a mill wheel could, within minor limitations, enforce his right to have that water continue to flow past his property, even though it could be much more beneficially employed for irrigation higher up on the stream. The contrasting doctrine of prior appropriation, on the other hand, was brought into our Southwest by the Spanish who knew the requirements of a dry land. This doctrine recognizes the right to appropriate the water for beneficial uses and when so appropriated for irrigation the use of the water becomes generally a right attached to the land. It has been a long struggle between these two doctrines in our West, but now generally the doctrine of prior appropriation is recognized in the arid and semiarid States. You will recall, however, that express recognition of the superior right of making beneficial consumptive use of water in relation to some other uses was not written into our national law until the Flood Control Act of 1944 which approved the Missouri Basin plan.

This endorsement of the paramount right of those who make beneficial use of water was a signal victory for western irrigationists and an omen, I trust, of more good laws to follow in the completion of a sound statement of a national water policy.

In the coming months, there will be much discussion, I expect, as there has been in the months just past, of new legislation to implement the Missouri River and other basin plans. I do not know whether you people of North Dakota fully realize the extent of the good fortune that has been yours in the enactment of the comprehensive plan for the development of the Missouri River. The reclamation law of 1902, under which great strides have been made in the irrigation of western lands, has served well the primary single-purpose project. But it needs to be revised to fit our new river-basin concept. The basic authorization for the Missouri Basin development went a long way toward correcting the weaknesses of the older and more fundamental law that governs exclusively elsewhere, but much still needs to be done. I urge you, as men who are concerned with the needs of your State, to give the revision of the reclamation laws your attention and best judgment.

But let us return to the major point of this discussion—the problem of the Plains, the climate which causes optimistic folk during rainy years to forget the need for irrigation until, too late for them to do anything about it, the drought descends again upon them. Our task is to teach the value of conservation of water so as to reduce the leanness of the lean years that are sandwiched in between the fat years. You will note that I say reduce the leanness of the lean years. Neither the Missouri River Basin plan nor anything else that we can do today will eliminate droughts. Droughts will come again and again down through the years. The best that we can hope to do is to mitigate their effects. Properly used, the waters of this region can be made to eliminate the adverse effects on your economy of droughts, even severe and protracted ones. But the droughts will come again, and each time some adjustment will have to be made. There is no excuse, however, ever again to permit this region to be caught in the trap of the 1930's. We have the skills, we have the knowledge, we have the plan to store, conserve, divert, and use the waters to make it unnecessary ever again to slaughter breeding stock to keep them from starving to death in the High Plains.

We are a great and compassionate people, but it takes a dramatic event to seize our imagination. The creeping paralysis of the drought in the High Plains that wore down, defeated, and drove away tens of thousands of families did not stir us to the immediate action with which we as a Nation usually respond to such catastrophes. The reason was that it was slow in its processes. I recall that at the same time, in 1936, there was a great earthquake in some remote region of Turkey, and some 50,000 people were rendered homeless. Here was sudden catastrophe—awful and easily pictured. As a result, within a week, children were saving their pennies to take to Sunday school for the relief of the displaced and stricken people.

But we have here a problem that is always with us, even though it reaches acute form only during certain years and at intervals. I believe now that nearly everyone understands what that problem is. We have even drawn up and adopted a plan and commenced work on the first small section of it.

This is no time to relax. The big job remains ahead. Only the barest start has been made on the construction of the works that are required to control and use the waters of the Missouri River. Much, much more must be done. It will take the aid, the understanding, the constant vigilance and cooperation of the people of North Dakota and the other Missouri River Basin States through many years to come to complete the Missouri River development.

Here are a few facts that will show that where the water supply is controlled and the waters are used by man it is possible to strengthen agriculture. In 1945 some 4,000,000 acres of land, served by the Bureau of Reclamation in 17 Western States, produced 12,000,000 tons of widely diversified crops that were valued at more than $435,000,000. Predictions are that the 1946 crop will equal this record.

Irrigated acres in North Dakota contributed their share to these food and money gains. Let us glance for a moment at reports from McKenzie County, in which part of the lower Yellowstone irrigation project in the Missouri Basin is located. Fifteen thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven acres of irrigated land in McKenzie County produced crops that were valued at $79,425 in 1945. This is almost 10 times the general average per acre of the crop value in the State.

The report from this irrigated acreage in North Dakota is proof that diversified agriculture made possible by irrigation is the best kind of security.

As you well know, under continued dependence on dry-land agriculture, North Dakota is losing population. While the national population during the 1930's increased by 7.2 percent, the population of North Dakota decreased by 6 percent. Forty-three of your fifty-three counties had a net decrease of more than 40,000 people. There are those who will say, "Oh, you are talking about the drought years." But since 1940, in spite of prosperity, the population of North Dakota has continued to decline.

Now, let me repeat that the Missouri River Basin plan is not a panacea for all ills in North Dakota and the Plains States. The worth of this development depends on how soon its dams, power plants, and transmission lines are built and how well they are maintained.

A few wet years and there might be a repetition of what happened during the early days of the Williston and Buford-Trenton projects. These projects were constructed in western North Dakota shortly after the passage of the National Reclamation Act of 1902. When the wet cycle came, some of the local farmers and the people of the State lost interest in irrigation and abandoned the facilities that had been constructed.

When the drought struck in 1934, if the old Williston and Buford-Trenton projects had been in working order they would have paid for themselves in a single year. The Bureau of Reclamation was asked to reconstruct these projects and to build others in North Dakota. The Buford-Trenton has been reconstructed and it produced $177,783 on 8,776 irrigated acres in 1945.

As for "the other projects," the Missouri River Basin plan is the answer to that request. It will bring under irrigation 1,266,440 acres of land in North Dakota and provide power from three hydroelectric plants with an installed capacity of 458,267 kilowatts.

The Heart Butte Dam of the Heart River unit in west central North Dakota is sched-

uled as the next construction job of the Bureau in this section of the basin. This will be the fifth unit in the Missouri River Basin plan to be placed under construction by the Bureau.

The Heart River drains an area of 3,390 square miles in west central North Dakota and is a tributary of the Missouri River, joining that stream from the west, near Mandan and Bismarck.

The proposed plan of basin development includes two units—the Heart Butte unit serving these lands lying along the lower 60 miles of the Heart River and the Dickinson unit near the headwaters.

The Heart Butte unit includes 13,538 acres of irrigable land served by one gravity diversion and 37 individual pumping plants.

The pumping units will serve 9,638 acres, in tracts ranging from 62 to 3,402 acres in size, with a total installed pumping capacity of 566 kilowatts. Distribution can be made by the simplest of laterals excepting the 3,420-acre tract near Mandan where a more elaborate canal system is necessary.

Pumping lifts will vary from 15 to 32 feet. The one gravity diversion will serve 3,900 acres.

The proposed Heart Butte Dam will impound 50,000 acre-feet for irrigation storage plus additional storage for silt detention and flood control. The dam site is about 60 miles above the mouth of the Heart River where the valley is constricted by sandstone cliffs. An earthfill structure approximately 123 feet high and 1,250 feet long on the crest is proposed.

The Dickinson unit, in the immediate vicinity of the city of Dickinson, provides storage for municipal use and irrigation use. The proposed dam is an earth-fill structure with a maximum height of 45 feet and a concrete-lined spillway at the right abutment. The total storage capacity is 16,500 acre-feet, of which 3,000 acre-feet are reserved for silt detention, and 9,500 acre-feet is flood-control superstorage, above the spillway crest. The city of Dickinson will provide the necessary facilities for treatment and delivery of the water to existing water mains.

The irrigable lands to be supplied by the proposed Dickinson Reservoir consist of six separate pumping units, ranging in size from 50 to 264 acres, and totaling 780 acres.

The city of Mandan suffered heavy flood damage during the flood of 1943. With the flood storage provided in the proposed Heart Butte Reservoir, the city will be well protected against future floods.

The largest portion of the area drained by the Heart River is made up of dry-land farms devoted primarily to the production of wheat, and relying on the production of other grains and livestock production for supplementary income. Irrigation development has been slight, and the agricultural economy has met with catastrophic reverses since 1930 due to drought and to the absence of irrigation as a stabilizing influence. The salvation of the area can be attained in the largest measure by the development of irrigation to supplement dry-land farming and livestock operations. That is what the project is designed to do for the people of the immediate area.

The 29 initial units of the Missouri Basin plan include in addition to the Heart River project, the following projects for North Dakota: the Missouri-Souris development, Knife River unit, and five irrigation pumping systems on the main stem of the Missouri.

The Missouri-Souris area in North Dakota and Montana totals 1,311,800 acres, of which 1,108,500 acres are in North Dakota. It is important to note that during the thirties, farmers living within the boundaries of the Crosby-Mohall area of the Missouri-Souris unit in the northwestern part of North Dakota harvested nothing on 50 acres out of every 160 acres which they seeded, as an average, for ten successive years.

In addition to the benefit from irrigation, the Missouri-Souris will supply municipal water to cities and towns in the James River and Red River Valleys which, together with the restoration of Devil's Lake, makes it truly of State-wide significance.

The Bureau is also looking into every possibility of using the irrigation and power potentialities of Garrison Reservoir, being constructed by the Corps of Engineers in this area.

The power-transmission line now being built by the Bureau to carry power from Fort Peck Dam for construction purposes at Garrison Dam will have permanent use in the transmission grid that will transport Missouri River power to rural areas of western North Dakota.

Power is an important part of the Missouri River Basin development, for it will help return to the Government a major part of the construction costs as well as supply energy for lighting your homes and developing new industries within the basin. The Missouri River plan calls for the production annually of 5,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power. The return from the sale of this energy is expected to average $21,800,000 per year.

The Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior is planning to market this power wholesale off a transmission grid that will serve the entire area and interconnect all major power plants constructed by either the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers. This power will be made available at consistently low rates to municipalities, rural electrification cooperatives, other public agencies, to industries, and to others as broadly as possible. In its way as significant as irrigation, this hydroelectric energy will spread the benefits of the great undertaking for the development of the Missouri River to rural areas, and to isolated towns throughout the great expanse of the Missouri River Basin.

This energy will be taken from the waters stored by the 100 dams on the Missouri and its tributaries—flood waters that can be used to irrigate about 5,000,000 acres of new lands, thereby creating 53,000 new farms. Supplemental water supplies will also be provided for another half million acres in the basin.

The people of North Dakota and other States in the Missouri River Basin with a stabilized agriculture based on irrigation and industrial development made possible by low-cost power will offer new markets for the products of the other parts of the country. Thus, the whole Nation will benefit from the prosperity of people who in times of flood and drought were not able to eke out an existence from the land.

In the 3 years since the Missouri Basin plan was first discussed at Valley City more progress has been made toward controlling and using the Missouri River than during the 50 years that had elapsed since Major Powell so clearly set forth the problem. The big job of building the structures, diverting the water, generating and transmitting the power, controlling the floods, establishing navigation on the main river, still lies ahead. But our feet are firmly planted on the road. If we go forward together we shall control the Missouri River and make it bring a new prosperity and security to the entire basin.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald and another from the Washington Post, on the subject of labor legislation.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald]

ACT, BUT STUDY, TOO

We have no doubt that the new Republican Congress will move swiftly to enact what it regards as corrective labor legislation, while brushing aside President Truman's request for a commission to study the labor situation in advance of legislative action. In doing so it will be short on memory. One of the major GOP criticisms of the New Deal was its angry race, in punitive mood, to slap all manner of regulations upon the financial and business communities. New Deal critics laughed when President Roosevelt recommended in 1938 a Temporary National Economic Committee to study the national economy which the New Deal had already subjected to major surgery in the absence of a factual study. It acted first, studied afterward.

Now a distinguished professor, Dr. Jacob Viner, of Princeton University, recommends a Temporary National Economic Commission to investigate the monopolistic practices of organized labor to fill out the picture developed by the original TNEC, which confined itself almost entirely to studying monopoly in industry and finance. We think the subject is one of sufficient importance to the national future that a thorough study should be made by competent experts, not in 2 or 3 months, but in whatever time it takes to achieve competent investigation of the whole subject of labor monopoly and management-labor relations.

Congress will probably feel it necessary to take early legislative action in this field. But if it would learn a lesson from the New Deal, which its majority upbraided so long and so lustily, it will regard its initial actions as neither final nor punitive. It will admit the improbability of doing a thoroughly good job so fast, regarding its first labor legislation as of an interim nature subject to the findings of a commission, such as Professor Viner proposes. We agree with the Republican leaders in Congress that early action is necessary to eliminate the more obvious faults in existing labor legislation, but we hope the Congress will also find ways of getting the whole picture before it so that any faults of haste may later be corrected. After all, we can hardly stand another New Deal so soon.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

APPROACH TO LABOR LEGISLATION

It may be assumed that there will be strikes in 1947. There always will be strikes so long as we live in a democratic society that permits men to lay down their tools to enforce a demand or voice a grievance. The objective of the legislation that Congress is seeking to write cannot be to outlaw strikes, but to discourage them and to minimize their effect. We cannot stop men from disagreeing, nor should we seek to resolve every disagreement by Government fiat. But we can, and must, strive to protect national interests against the consequences of major disagreements.

Government therefore should rarely, if ever, try to tell labor and management what the terms of their bargains should be. Instead, it should make peaceful machinery available to either party whenever there is danger that collective bargaining may break down. Any other course would lead us back to the situation that existed from 1942 to 1945, when both employers and labor unions lost the habit of bargaining with one another because it was always possible to run to the National War Labor Board for a decision. This was understandable, and perhaps inevitable, during a war, but a democratic government cannot afford to play a similar

role in peacetime. The Government must never again be put in the position of rendering a decision which it is not able and willing to enforce. Nor should it be required, except in the most extreme situations, to make and then enforce decisions that are bound to be resented by large segments of society. The only way to avoid these dangers is for Government to eschew the role of referee wherever possible. Then, when the exceptional case comes along, its power and prestige will operate unimpaired.

There are, of course, some situations in which Government can take the lead without endangering the self-reliance of management or labor. For example, the fixing of minimum wages and maximum hours is now generally accepted as a proper field for government intervention. Of course, there may be differences of opinion as to how wise a particular minimum or maximum may be. But the fixing of such standards is not likely to discourage the practice of collective bargaining, for their imposition is normally important only in situations in which individual, rather than collective, bargaining is still the practice.

The Wagner Act provides another example of Government participation that is consistent with a policy of nurturing the practice of collective bargaining. Indeed, the very objective of that statute was to enable employees to organize free from employer interference. The result is that in recent years organizational strikes, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have dropped to about 20 percent of the total. It is, therefore, accurate to say, although it is too rarely said, that the Wagner Act, by providing an administrative remedy, has diminished strikes from those particular causes which it was intended to remove.

It is also accurate to say, however, that the Wagner Act has not had the effect of reducing all types of industrial strife. The membership and power of labor organizations have grown greatly during the past decade partly as a result of the protection which the act has afforded employees. Since VJ-day many of these labor organizations have been engaged in a running battle with employers for the purpose of securing wage increases. These struggles, and therefore today's problems, do not flow from the denial of the right to organize. They flow from vigorous differences of opinion between equally powerful interests as to the division of the fruits of industry. It would not prevent the struggles or solve the problems to repeal or seriously eviscerate the Wagner Act. Such a remedy would not be appropriate to the disease in our present industrial relations.

Some extremists will say, to be sure, that if Government had not encouraged collective bargaining, unions would not be strong enough today to call effective strikes. Those who take that position, however, must be prepared to go back to the days of the individual bargain, when American working people had to battle for the mere right to pool their strength. Such a solution is defeatist. It looks backward. We must, rather, evolve techniques, voluntary wherever possible and compulsory only where essential, by which labor assumes responsibility commensurate with its power. If a boy whose muscles have only recently developed to the point where he can hope to box successfully with his classmates occasionally abuses his newly won strength, we do not try to solve the problem by deliberately weakening those muscles again, for that would only restore a preexisting inequality. We seek, instead, to teach him the rules of fair play, to impress upon him that he must be as wise and considerate as he is strong.

Government can, and should, encourage a similar development in labor organizations. There are indications, in Gallup polls and elsewhere, that the members of labor unions would welcome that course almost as much as their fellow citizens. They, too, believe in the observance of contracts, in the elimination of jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts, in the wider dissemination of information concerning union finances, and in greater democracy within labor organizations. They—and most of their leaders—do not like to use the strike weapon. According to a recent survey by the magazine Factory, a majority of union members doubt whether the benefits they gained from recent strikes were worth the sacrifices made. Their leaders should heed that fact. Still more believe, however—and this should open the eyes of management—that they would not have been accorded these benefits if they had not struck.

It thus appears that the working people of the country are as anxious as the rest of us to reduce the incidence of industrial warfare. We must cultivate this desire for peace, not stimulate the desire for war, as we would by a program of strongly antilabor legislation. Specifically, we have in mind as "reforms" to reject the abolition of the hard-won fundamental guaranties contained in the Norris-LaGuardia and National Labor Relations Acts. This does not mean that some amendments of these statutes are not now desirable. They are. Certainly we must increase union responsibility and give to employers the feeling that they have equal recourse to the agencies of Government. America cannot afford to have either management or labor believe that it is not receiving fair treatment at the hands of the representatives of the people.

Legislation, to repeat, is necessary. But it would compound an ancient fallacy to assume that labor problems, which are problems of human relations, can all be solved by passing laws or creating new Government instrumentalities. There are other methods, effective although admittedly not infallible. Stronger mediation machinery is the first requirement. That is the gravamen of the unanimous report issued on December 15 by the prominent representatives of industry and labor who comprise the United States Conciliation Service's labor-management advisory committee. Public utility strikes cannot be tolerated, and more than mediation may be required to prevent them. A conference just held under the auspices of the Secretary of Labor gives promise of bearing fruit in the form of an over-all management-labor agreement to bar utility strikes. If this project succeeds, it should provide a foundation of practical experience for later legislation in this field.

The success of local industry-labor panels in Toledo and Louisville suggests that similar agencies could operate effectively on a national scale. Their good offices should only be invoked by the President, and then on those rare occasions when there is a threat of a break-down in collective bargaining in an industry so basic that a work stoppage would affect the economy of the entire country. Too frequent use of such panels would weaken their prestige and dilute the quality of the personnel available to serve on them. Moreover, it would interfere with the success of those long and often painful bargaining negotiations that should always precede the appointment of any such panel.

The task ahead promises to be unusually difficult. We must design methods that will prevent a future John L. Lewis from attacking the Nation's jugular vein, without at the same time endangering those freedoms that are every bit as essential to the life of America as the coal that Lewis sought to withhold. There can be no perfect solution, no infallible cure-all. But this must not discourage us from seeking early improvement. While much depends upon a change in the hearts of men, there are places at which a change in social controls will also tend to ease our present discontents. The task of finding those places and making those changes will call for ingenuity, for patience, and for rare disinterestedness.

If the approach is sound, the measures ultimately adopted will be equally so. In view of the results of the congressional elections, it is essential that Republicans and Democrats join hands in a bipartisan approach to the formulation of a national labor policy. What has worked in dealing with foreign relations could work no less well in coping with our most important domestic problems. The Truman administration and the Republican leadership in Congress can serve their country best if they will put partisan considerations aside in attacking labor relation problems in the weeks ahead.

It can be done. It has been done in the State of New York, where the wholly bipartisan Ives joint legislative committee succeeded, throughout an 8-year period, in studying, rejecting, and recommending legislation without internal dissent, and did so with the acclaim of both industry and labor. Some of the committee's most effective work was done during a period when the Republican Party controlled both houses of the legislature and the governor was a Democrat. To cite one example, the chairman of the committee, a Republican, experienced no difficulty in discussing, and later devising, a legislative program in collaboration with the Democratic chairman of the State's labor board. It would not be as easy to do the same thing successfully in the Washington spotlight. But that is no reason for avoiding the attempt. A coincidence should encourage the attempt. Two of the men who worked together in the Empire State are now in Washington, one as that State's new Republican Senator and the other as chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. What they and others did once, they—and others—can try to do again.

But the effort, if it is to be made, cannot be long delayed. The patience of the public is growing short. It will disappear altogether if a new wave of strikes descends upon the country. Careful, objective study will be needed before wise legislation can be passed, but that study must end before the trees are green. While we cannot afford to legislate as soon as January, we cannot afford to wait until July.

Farm Practices Influencing the Incidence of Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Farm Practices Influencing the Incidence of Multiple Sclerosis," by Dr. James Asa Shield, who is assistant professor of neuropsychiatry at the Medical College of Virginia. The address was delivered on November 7, 1946, at the convention of the Southern Medical Association, at Miami, Fla., and is a discussion of degenerative diseases resulting from the continued use of chemical fertilizers on the soil.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Man's kinship with and dependence upon the soil are expressed by Dr. V. G. Simko-

vitch.[1] "Go to the ruins of ancient and rich civilization in Asia Minor, Northern Africa, or elsewhere. Look at the unpeopled valleys, at the dead and buried cities, and you can decipher there the promise and the prophecy that the law of soil exhaustion holds in store for all of us * * * depleted of humus by constant cropping, land could no longer reward labor and support life, so the people abandoned it. Deserted, it became a desert; the light soil was washed by the rain, and blown around by the shifting winds."

In the occurrence of multiple sclerosis in Germany, England, Northern Europe in general, and the United States, where large amounts of inorganic, incomplete chemical fertilizers are used by farmers, in contrast to the absence of multiple sclerosis in China, Japan, and India where natural fertilizers or manures are used, nature presents us with a challenging fact.

Farm practices which influence the total quality of the crop and, in turn, the quality of man's food are the concern of this paper. Thus, the soil as a source of man's food, especially the trace elements, becomes the physician's problem. The doctor must demand that the agriculturist produce a food that will meet the multiple protoplasmic needs for optimal growth, development, and function. Prescribing a good diet is not enough. There is a very wide variation in the composition of fruits, vegetables, grains and meat, milk and eggs, when produced on different soils, in different sections of the country, on different farms, or even on different fields of the same farm. The Peckham Pioneer Health Service Centre in England discovered that feeding families in the center with ordinary, so-called balanced food diet brought from a shop was not enough. They were forced to grow the food themselves and to use not new methods, but the ancient method of returning waste to the soil. Man's interference with the perfect balance between the natural processes of growth and decay may be largely responsible for the predicament of our malnutrition, in spite of adequate diet by the present standards.

A fertility that is optimal for the production of nutritional foods depends not only upon various elements, humus, physical structure, tillage, moisture, sunlight, but also upon the fauna and flora of the soil. Microorganisms play an important part in making air nitrogen available to plants and in the decomposition of humus. Mycoorhizal fungi surround rootlets and stimulate metabolism as a living fungus bridge which connects soil and sap.[2]

In this discussion our interest centers in deficiency in the trace elements (iron, cobalt, copper, zinc, chlorine, sodium, magnesium, manganese, sulphur, silver, boron, nickel, aluminum, arsenic, fluorine, iodine)—all protoplasmic needs known and unknown that are influenced by farm practices. The soil is being depleted of its fertility by large urban populations and industries. The maintenance of fertility is a farmer's problem, but the food that the American people consume is everyone's problem. Farm practices must protect and maintain this fertility in order that we may be able to buy foods that have the capacity to give optimal nutriment to our bodies.

The soil of England was being depleted in 1836 when Carswell[3] first noted a multiple sclerotic pons and cord, as an interesting neurological specimen. The soils of France were being depleted in 1839 when Creveilhier[4] described the neuropathology of multiple sclerosis and gave two case histories. A few years later in France, Charcot[5] gave us a description of the clinical and pathological pictures of multiple sclerosis. The soil of Germany was being depleted in 1840 when a chemist roughly "analyzed a human body."[6] He found calcium, nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium in addition to water. His crude methods showed the same elements were present qualitatively in plants and animals, and he concluded that as long as these elements were replaced in the soil in generous quantities, neither plants nor people would suffer from malnutrition.

Thus, we see that multiple sclerosis, depletion of soil, and the introduction of inorganic chemicals as a treatment for the soil were all introduced to man between the years of 1836 and 1840.

A century ago the prevailing practice in agriculture was to take from the soil without adequate replacement of its store of minerals and humus. Cropping had become so intense in Germany, France, and England that nature could not replenish the soil. The natural process of laying down top soil was too slow. The introduction of inorganic chemicals resulted in quantity production of food. The incompleteness of the chemicals used, and their tendency to accentuate incipient deficiencies of certain other elements in the soil, is now being recognized by agricultural research.[7]

There have been many suggested causes for multiple sclerosis, but there has been no proven etiological factor to explain its incidence. Pathologically, it is a demyelinating disease, and there is some agreement that the acute lesions are characterized by perivascular infiltration, edema, and local glial proliferation,[8] producing the coming and going of symptoms, exacerbation of the old and appearance of the new, resulting in a chronic degeneration of the nerve parenchyma.

My observation has been in agreement with other neurologists in regard to the conditions that precipitate and influence exacerbation of this illness, namely, pregnancy, infections, inorganic chemicals, trauma, strains and stresses, exposure, vaccines, marriage, emotional upsets, lumbar punctures, and gross dietary restrictions. There is one common feature in all of the various things which precipitate the attack, increased demand on the human body. It follows that these factors can only precipitate the illness in individuals who are vulnerable. The geographic distribution of the incidence points out those who are relatively protected and those who are candidates for multiple sclerosis when hit with sufficient force by a precipitating factor.

WHO ARE THE VULNERABLE?

Multiple sclerosis, though thought by many doctors to be rare, and almost unheard of by the public, caused 1,301 deaths in the United States in 1944 as compared with 1,361 deaths from infantile paralysis and 2,045 deaths from pernicious anemia.[9] Multiple sclerosis is both less recognized by the physician and more crippling to the patient than infantile paralysis. In the New York City area in the first 46,875 selectees examined, 29 were found to have multiple sclerosis, while 734 had tuberculosis, 170 had diabetes, and 8 had pernicious anemia. During 1933 a study of chronic illnesses in 113 New York hospitals revealed 1,050 cases of multiple sclerosis and 551 cases of pernicious anemia among a total of 573,623 cases. A survey in Switzerland disclosed 36 multiple sclerosis cases per 100,000. In one locality there were 70 per 100,000. A survey in England and Wales showed 16 per 100,000.[10]

In order that we might have a better concept of the incidence of multiple sclerosis in the United States, I obtained, through the courtesy of the United States Department of Public Health, the statistics on the number of deaths that occurred in each State during the year of 1944. I also obtained this data on infantile paralysis and pernicious anemia during the same year for comparison.

There is the high urban and low rural incidence of the disease. Contrary to the general impression, it is shown that multiple sclerosis is not rare in the Southern States. I believe there is a tendency for the prevalence of multiple sclerosis to be in direct ratio with the number of neurologists in the respective States. I have seen patients from every Southern State east of the Mississippi. There figures are on the low side due to diagnostic error and intercurrent infections being recorded as cause of death in patients with multiple sclerosis.

Multiple sclerosis could not well be a deficiency disease in the usual concept. The Chinese caloric intake is from 2,000 to 2,500 per day. The Chinese diet is deficient in calcium, in vitamins, proteins, and fats. Yet the Chinese do not have sclerosis of their nerves, their blood vessels, blockage of their veins, or hypertension. They do not have kidney or gall stones. They have limited food supply, but this food is better suited to meet man's body needs as evidenced by the absence of degenerative diseases, in spite of the high incidence of infectious diseases. Their limited supply of food is grown by farmers who do not use inorganic chemicals which, in the light of present knowledge, tend to disturb the chemical balance of the soil and, in turn, to disturb the mineral and chemical content of the crops and, thus, affect the health of the animals that feed on the crops. The Chinese do not have multiple sclerosis.

What evidence is there that the absence or insufficiency of trace elements affects plants and animals? Beeson[11] writes, "The recent increase of interest in the distribution of nutritional trouble in plants and animals is a natural sequence to the earlier work of diagnosing and classifying these troubles and their symptoms." He gives three United States maps; first, of the occurrence of boron and manganese deficiencies in plants; second, of the occurrence of copper, iron, magnesium, and zinc deficiencies in plants; and third, of the occurrence of mineral nutritional diseases in animals, namely, cobalt, copper, and iron causing nutritional anemias, calcium and phosphorus causing bone diseases, selenium toxicity and grass tetany.

The 1943 report of the Administrator of Agricultural Research[7] discussed the soil-plant nutritional relationship. "Cattle in areas where cobalt is deficient in native

---

[1] Simkovitch, Vladimir A.: Hay and History, Rome's Fall, Reconsidered from an Understanding of Jesus and Other Historical Studies, p. 161. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921.

[2] Howard, Sir Albert: An Agricultural Testament. Oxford University Press, 1940.

[3] Carswell, Robert: Pathological Anatomy. Illustrations of the Elementary Forms of Disease. London: Longman (et al.), 1838.

[4] Cruveilhier, J.: Anatomie Pathologique du Corps Humain, ou Descriptions avec Figures Lithographiées et Coloriées des Diverses Alterations Morbides dont le Corps, Humain est Susceptible, v. 2. Paris: J. B. Bailliere, 1942.

[5] Charcot, J. M.: Histologie de la Sclérose en Plaques. Gaz. d. Hôp., v. 41, pp. 554, 557, 556. 1868.

[6] Yerkes, A. P.: Soil—A Foundation of Health. International Harvester Co., Chicago, 1946.

[7] Auchter, E. C.: Report of the Administrator of Agricultural Research, 1943, pp. 2–3. United States Department of Agriculture.

[8] Putnam, Tracy J.: A Multiple Sclerosis and Encephalomyelitis. Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, v. 19, p. 310, (May) 1943.

[9] Statistics obtained through courtesy of the U. S. Department of Public Health.

[10] Statistics obtained from the Association for Advancement of Research of Multiple Sclerosis.

[11] Beeson, Kenneth C.: The Occurrence of Mineral Nutritional Disease of Plants and Animals in the United States. Soil Science, v. 60, No. 1, (July) 1945.

plants become gaunt owing to loss of appetite, become listless and anemic; the hair coat becomes rough and the skin is scaly. After extended exposure to the deficiency muscular atrophy develops and death occurs. In North Carolina cobalt deficiency is accompanied by a low manganese content for the forage; while in Massachusetts the iron content is low. These multiple deficiencies have prevented a normal development of dairy and beef cattle. Trouble with sheep and dogs also occurs in North Carolina in those areas where the soil is depleted of certain trace elements."

A survey was made of pastures and hay lands in the Northeast where an ailment in cattle, called grass tetany, has been reported to be associated with intensive fertilization with nitrogen, potash, and phosphate.

What is the relationship of mineral imbalance in soil, plants, and animals to multiple sclerosis? Ferraro [12] with repeated administration of potassium cyanide rather regularly produced pathologic changes characteristic of multiple sclerosis. Other chemicals, such as injection of sulfanilamide, have been followed by encephalomyelitis.[13] Carbon monoxide poisoning has precipitated a progressive multiple sclerosis.[14]

The chemical substances such as sulfanilamide, potassium cyanide, lead, arsenic, arsphenamine, carbon monoxide, and nitrous oxide have been found to disturb the structure of the central nervous system and produce pathology closely resembling postinfectious encephalomyelitis. In animals that live on food from soils depleted of some elements such as cobalt, manganese, iron, et cetera, or from soil overfertilized with nitrates, potassium, and phosphates evidence of central nervous disease is found.

"The fertilization may possibly have accentuated incipient deficiencies of certain other elements in the soil. Preliminary results with new techniques developed by the laboratory to study the effects of fertilizer and soil treatments on the mineral content of food and forage plants indicated that the amounts present in minute quantities in both hay and green vegetable crops are affected by liming and fertilization practices. On the basis of these results, it seems possible that modifications of liming and fertilization practices may result in an increased content of some of the essential elements in soils" [7] and in foods.

Thus, circumstantial evidence points to the fact that unbalanced chemical fertilizers, either too much or too little, or in the wrong combination of minerals, interfere with the soil's ability to supply the necessary chemical elements for healthy plants and animals.

"The plant needs varying amounts of different elements, much of one, little of another; for example, cotton as a general rule needs at least 36 pounds of nitrogen, equivalent to 225 pounds of natural nitrate per acre. Natural nitrate contains a large amount of nitrogen, 16 pounds per 100, but application of 100 pounds per acre would not be adequate to correct the nitrogen deficiency of the soil as measured by the requirements of the cotton plant. On the other hand, "saltsick" (an anemia) of cattle feeding on certain pasture land in Florida is prevented by addition of a trace of cobalt to the fertilizer treatment. Application of a little zinc oxide per tree, or driving one small zinc-covered nail in the orange tree, controls the mottle-leaf disease for a period of several years." [15]

Composts of vegetable matters and animal manure contain all of the known elements contained in the human cell and likely many other factors needed by the human cell that are as yet unknown to the biochemist. Thus, natural manures have the potential capacity to give to the depleting soils a complete fertilizer, while the chemical fertilizer is an incomplete food supply for the plant and will continue to be until we perfect and advance our knowledge of microbiochemistry. Therefore, full quality food can only be raised on virgin soil and on soil that has been replenished by the refuse from all of its produce, both plant refuse and animal refuse.

The natural phenomenon that nature has presented for us of multiple sclerosis' occurring here and not there, of its occurrence only in places where incomplete, commercial fertilizers are used in farm practices, presents for our consideration an experiment that has been carried on for over a hundred years. The subjects and potential subjects run into the millions. In order that we may have a limit to our geographic research, let us again take China, which has an estimated population of 450,000,000 people and is 90-percent rural, and Germany, which, as greater Germany, had an estimated population of 79,000,000 people, with a rural percentage much smaller than China but which cannot be ascertained exactly. The time element in this experiment goes back a century. I do not think statisticians could question the number nor the time of this experiment. The Chinese farmer uses natural manure to produce his food; the German farmer uses inorganic chemical fertilizer to produce his food.

In 1840, von Liebig introduced the practice of applying inorganic material to the lands as fertilizer to replenish the depleted soils of Germany. This practice spread rapidly, and it became customary to apply mainly nitrates, potassium, phosphorus, and lime. This incomplete fertilizer provided the major needs of the soil but overlooked the minor needs, minor though equally vital to the soil. On the other hand, in China the agricultural practice of intensified farming demanded that the depletion of these soils be prevented. For centuries the Chinese have returned to the land the refuse of the products of the soil and the manures of animals including man. In Germany before the war, multiple sclercsis was second only to syphilis in causing pathology of the nervous system. In China multiple sclerosis is such a rarity that authorities, such as Snapper and others, state that it is nonexistent.

Where soils are depleted of certain minerals, biologists tell us of deficiency disease in plants, and they have found that very small amounts of the proper minerals added to the soil will eliminate the deficiency disease. For instance, in New Zealand there was a soil deficiency of cobalt in the grasses that made the pasture, which in turn caused the sheep to become paralyzed. The application of 3 or 4 pounds of cobalt per acre prevented the deficiency of the grass and eliminated the bush paralysis in the sheep.

In spite of our present knowledge of chemistry and of chemical fertilizer, we have not developed a technique to determine the minute traces of iron, cobalt, copper, boron, zinc, chlorine, sodium, magnesium, manganese, sulfur, and perhaps many other chemical substances, that are needed by plants. It is true that plants can grow without these trace elements, but in order for them to give a complete optimal diet to the animals that feed on them, they must be grown on a soil that is a completely fertile soil. Until we develop further knowledge of soil and plant chemistry, reliance can be placed only in the natural manures that give a more complete and balanced fertilization.

IN SUMMARY

We have a story of depleted soil, soil that man in the western world has attempted to correct by the use of a few chemicals. These chemicals are inadequate to meet the full needs of plants and animals as they represent only a few of the protoplasm's mineral needs. These chemicals have the capacity to disturb the mineral balance and the natural fauna and flora of the soil. People whose food comes from soils fertilized with chemicals appear to have more degenerative diseases, more vascular diseases. Multiple sclerosis is a degenerative disease. Its clinical characteristic of acute or subacute onset, with symptoms that improve or disappear, points to involvement of the circulation.

People who are fed on food produced by incomplete, inorganic fertilizers appear to be more liable to circulatory disease, more liable to central nervous system circulatory disease, more liable to vascular constrictions and dilatations, more liable to perivascular infiltration and to edema in their nervous systems and local glial proliferation, due to disturbed mineral balance in their bodies and their blood streams. Therefore, when greater demands (the precipitating factors of multiple sclerosis) are put on their vulnerable bodies, these people develop the syndrome of multiple sclerosis.

The conclusion, thus, is indicated that the incomplete fertilization program carried on in Germany, England, Europe, and the United States is contributing largely to the inadequacy of the quality of the diet, with deficiency of trace elements and unknown factors, contributing to and being largely responsible for the presence of multiple sclerosis in what appears to be ever-increasing incidence in the occidental world. It is also indicated that the use of complete and natural manures in the oriental world may be the factor in producing a more adequate diet, thus, explaining the orient's freedom from multiple sclerosis and some of the other degenerative diseases.

[12] Ferraro, A.: Experimental Toxic Encephalomyelopathy. Psychiat. Quart., v. 7: 267, 1943.

[13] Fisher, J. H.: Encephalomyelitis Following Administration of Sulphanilamide. Lancet, 2: 301, 1939.

[14] Hilpert, P.: Kohlenoxydvergiftung und Multiple Sklerose. Arch. f. Psychiat., 89: 117, 1929–30.

[15] If They Could Speak. Chilean Nitrate Educational Bureau, Inc., pp. 6–7, New York, 1941.

International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by A. L. Hager, Chairman, International Salmon Fisheries Commission, at a meeting of the Pacific Northwest Trade Association held in Vancouver, British Columbia, on November 25, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission has just completed its field season for 1946. This year has been an important one for the Commission. It is the year in which the very serious obstruction at Hell's Gate has been permanently removed. The stretch of difficult water found at Bridge

River Rapids has been similarly eliminated and now, for the first time in history, we are assured that the runs of sockeye salmon are able to pass up the main Fraser River without delay.

The year 1946 has further significance to the salmon industry for it marks the beginning of regulation of the sockeye fishery of Puget Sound and the Fraser River by an International Commission. The terms of the treaty required 8 years of investigation preliminary to the actual regulation of the fishery. During those 8 years much was accomplished in gaining a fundamental concept of the problem with which we are dealing. Fish were tagged at various places along the route of migration and times of passage of the various runs through the fishery were established. As a result of extensive tagging operations at Hell's Gate the disastrous blockade was brought to light. Other work has covered the spawning grounds, the Indian fishery, the commercial industry and its history; all of which are building toward a real understanding of our problem of rehabilitating the sockeye salmon fishery.

The sockeye salmon of the Fraser River pass through the waters of Juan de Fuca Strait, Puget Sound and the Gulf of Georgia, and many are taken by the very intensive United States and Canadian fishery. In 1913 these waters produced over 2,000,000 cases of sockeye salmon of the highest quality. This was one of the largest runs of salmon ever to enter any river, and its failure to return in its cycle year of 1917 and its continued small yield have literally meant disaster to the salmon industry of this area. It was to restore this valuable fishery to its former greatness that spurred both Canada and the United States toward international cooperation.

The sockeye treaty was finally ratified in 1937 and the Commission was created to rebuild this lost resource. The very essence of the treaty is to restore this fishery to its former level of production in as short a time as possible and that, gentlemen, is the real purpose around which the activities and policies of the Commission are centered.

The Fraser River watershed covers some 91,000 square miles. The sockeye spawning areas located throughout this system are invariably tributaries of lakes, for peculiar to the life history of the sockeye salmon, the young must spend at least 1 year in a lake before going to sea. Most of these spawning areas are in the most primitive regions; in the tributaries of Stuart Lake and lakes beyond, some 800 miles from salt water; in the Bowron area, where observers are constantly harassed by grizzly bears; in the Chilko area, over 50 miles by rough wagon road to the nearest telephone or post office. The observers make long, tedious trips to cover the spawning grounds to obtain the information so necessary to gage the success of regulation.

These same men have to make frequent contacts with the Indians to keep a close watch over the places of fishing and the numbers of sockeye each family takes. I mention this so that you can visualize conditions which we are up against in order to collect the information for each season's work.

I have pointed out that the primary duty of the Commission is to rebuild the fishery; but before this could be done, it was first necessary to determine the real cause for the failure of the runs of sockeye salmon to maintain themselves. Through extensive tagging programs, one of the principal sources of trouble was found to be at Hell's Gate. It was conclusively shown that a most serious blockade existed there between the water levels of 25 and 40 feet; that frequently huge losses occurred there; and that the conditions for passage were unusually such as to kill off the valuable up-river races. Huge runs, like that to the Quesnel area, have been virtually exterminated by this and other blockades upstream. To proceed with rehabilitation without first correcting the causes for the decline would have been folly.

It became apparent that the elimination of the Hell's Gate blockade was an essential step toward rehabilitation of the runs.

Hell's Gate is located in the very heart of the Fraser Canyon, about 130 miles from the mouth of the river. At this point railroads pass on either side as well as communication lines with the East. The canyon at this point is only 190 feet across, with sheer rock walls on either side. To remove rock or blast channels blindly would only have made conditions worse for the fish.

Before any plans could be formulated, a detailed engineering study was made of this stretch of water. After months of experimenting with a scale model constructed at the University of Washington, fishways of an entirely new design were tested and found to meet our requirements. Vertical baffles, instead of the common horizontal steps, reduced the current from the 25 feet per second found in the river to 1½ feet per second in the fishways.

At the same time that structures were being designed for Hell's Gate, studies were made at Bridge River Rapids, Farwell Canyon, and at other suspected obstructions to salmon. In 1944, $2,000,000 was made available by the United States and Canada to eliminate all known areas of difficult passage. At the end of the 5-year program that has been outlined by the Commission, sockeye will be able to ascend to spawn without danger of delay or loss.

After studying the operation of the nearly completed fishways at Hell's Gate and at Bridge River Rapids, I am very pleased to tell you that research conducted this year shows without doubt that the fish have been able to ascend easily and without delay during the levels at which fish were formerly blocked.

I want to make it clear to all of you that the fishways at Hell's Gate functioned perfectly at the water stages for which they were designed. They have eliminated the very serious obstruction at the 25- to 40-foot levels which we knew conclusively to be one of the principal causes for the present depleted condition of the fishery. The Commission was fully aware that a few fish might be temporarily delayed at certain levels below 25 feet. We know that there are stages above 40 feet that cause difficulty. Steps are now being taken to clear the canyon at these other levels.

We are carefully watching for other stretches of water which might delay the migration of sockeye salmon to their spawning grounds. This year one such area was found at China Bar—about a mile above the gate. Here the fish were experiencing real difficulty in ascending the rapids during the height of the South Thompson run and the Commission took immediate steps to blast out a temporary channel so that the fish were able to continue their journey upstream.

We were not so fortunate in clearing an obstruction in the South Thompson River which, because of the extremely low water, affected the latter part of the South Thompson run. A work crew was rushed into this area and a temporary channel cut, as soon as the block was discovered, but it is known that a few of the weaker fish failed to get through. A detailed study of this area will be made and measures taken to prevent further loss of fish.

I believe this is a good time to review the regulations which were prescribed by the Commission in 1946. It should be kept in mind that the members of the Commission are striving toward a single aim; to restore the sockeye salmon fishery of the Fraser River and adjacent waters to its former size as soon as possible. Therefore, when regulations for the 1946 season were first considered, the problem was not "How many fish could be taken from this year's run," but rather, "What are the sizes of the depleted upriver races and how best can they be protected while going through the commercial fishing areas?" This follows closely the intent of the treaty to rebuild the fishery.

The staff of the Commission has made a detailed study of the cycle runs of 1938 and 1942 and complete records of the catches and spawning for these years are available. When the time came to consider the 1946 regulations this information was carefully weighed and regulations were drawn up which would allow the early up-river runs—those which had been hardest hit by conditions at the Gate—complete protection, while the great run to the South Thompson could be heavily and profitably fished. Therefore, after considerable discussion with the advisory board and the staff, July 25 was set as the opening date for the fishery in the United States and Sooke waters and August 8 (2 weeks later) for the Fraser River area.

The extent and the progress of the run is still fresh in the minds of many of you. True to prediction of the Commission, there was no evidence of any great runs passing through before the fishery opened. It was found that the first 3 weeks of fishing were mediocre and it was not until August 26 to 30 for the United States and after September 4 in Canada that the expected South Thompson River run hit. The run was large and concentrated and the industry on the whole did very well.

Now came a most difficult problem for the Commission—adequate escapement had to be assured and sometime during the season the fishery had to be closed to allow sufficient fish to ascend the river. This was the first time that guides to measure the relative size of the run were put to practical use in regulation, and frankly many sleepless nights were spent pondering the decisions which had to be made.

The progress of the fishery from Cape Flattery to Mission on the Fraser River was followed by the staff which collected records of the total catch and the catch of each boat in each area. The Commission knew at all times during the season the total number of sockeye that had been taken within less than 24 hours after the fish were landed. The volume of the escapement to the spawning grounds was closely watched through the daily catches of the Commission's biologists at Hell's Gate. Comparison of these measures of the 1946 run with similar records from 1942 enabled us to maintain a constant watch of the relative sizes of the 1946 and 1942 runs.

As the fishing season unfolded these measures of abundance were closely watched by members of the Commission. On September 2 and September 7 the Commission met at Bellingham to review the most significant aspects of the run. Later, on September 21, the Commission met and learned that, first, the Canadian catch had exceeded the United States catch and to carry out provisions of article VII of the treaty, fishing must be closed immediately: Secondly, few fish had yet arrived at Hell's Gate; and finally, the catch indicated that the run this year to the South Thompson was slightly smaller than that of 1942. It was imperative that the fisheries of both Canada and the United States be closed immediately.

Terms of the treaty do not permit the Commission to open or close the fishery. The Commission must recommend to the State of Washington and to the Dominion of Canada its desires; and it takes time to put a closure into effect—4 hours usually.

When the closure became effective, the Canadian catch exceeded the American catch by 626,475 sockeye.

The latest figures on the 1946 catch show that the United States took 3,573,804, Canada 4,200,279, making a total of 7,774,083 sockeye. We find that in 1946 Canada took 54 percent of the total catch while in 1942 it caught 63 percent. Further, in 1946 the total United States catch was 651,999 fish more than in 1942. The total for Canada was 842,320 fish less than for 1942. I want to point out that actually in 1946 the combined effort of the two countries took 976,951, nearly one million more fish, between July 25 and September 25 than in the same period of time in 1942. It has been a most successful season for the industry.

Now comes the most important phase of the year's activities—the results from the July closure to protect the early portion of depleted runs of fish. From counts of the numbers of spawners found in the various areas the protected races have shown increases far beyond anticipation. It was a pleasant surprise when our preliminary estimates showed that the 1946 escapement to the up-river spawning areas was two to five times greater than that found in 1942. Here are some typical examples: compared with 1942, Bowron River increased from 1,800 to 7,300; Raft River from 450 to 2,200; Seymour River from 1,950 to 3,500; Chilko River from 33,000 to 70,000; Stellako River from 48,000 to 250,000; even the Quesnel River, where no fish were found in 1942, had at least 50 fish in 1946.

Only the runs to the Stuart Lake area failed to show an increase. The reason is now known. This run passes through Hell's Gate between June 15 and July 15—this year at a time of exceptionally high water. We have found in our studies evidence of a blockade at these high levels, but it was not until this year that the water remained at such a high stage long encugh so that significant damage was actually found. The fish which finally arrived at Stuart Lake were scarred and battered and showed the effects of difficulty at Hell's Gate.

The Commission will install auxiliary high-level fishways this winter to eliminate this difficulty for all time.

In order to measure the success of the regulations, it was necessary to know how many fish escaped the fishery this year to ascend to the South Thompson area to spawn. Although it is still too early to know just how many fish were in this area (our men are still in the field), the number of sockeye present was large, and we feel confident that it has been sufficient to allow the return of a run comparable to that of 1946. When I was on the grounds in October, I saw thousands of fish spawning in the Little and Adams Rivers, and in the Shuswap Lakes. Most of the fish that reached the area came through the fishery during the closed period of September 25 to October 14. It was gratifying to find that our judgment in regulation has allowed sufficient fish to get through the fishery and that good fishing is assured for 1950.

Before closing, I would like to say a few words about the prospects for the next year, 1947. After examining the spawning and catch records for the cycle years of 1943 and 1939, we find ourselves confronted with a very serious situation. The total pack for 1943 was only about 49,000 cases, less than one-thirteenth the pack for the past season. Our major producing areas had almost a negligible spawning stock; the South Thompson with 10,000; the Chilko, 13,000; the Stellake, 9,000—all extremely poor. The Birkenhead River, with its 50,000 spawners, practically supported the entire fishery. To restore these runs to a profitable size will require that sockeye fishing be reduced to the minimum in 1947.

I believe that the year 1946 marks the start toward real success for rehabilitation of the sockeye fisheries of the Puget Sound-Fraser River area. The patient work of rebuilding the depleted runs has begun with increases in the up-river spawning of from two to five times the numbers found in 1942; and further continued good yield from the South Thompson run is assured for 1950. This year the water levels at Hell's Gate remained in the former blocked stage throughout part of July, August, and to September 10. If the fishways had not been operating probably every fish would have been lost and the increases received from the early closed period would not have materialized. I repeat—the fishways at Hell's Gate and at Bridge River Rapids functioned perfectly for what they were built and designed to accomplish.

The problem of an equal division of the sockeye catch each year deserves full consideration, but the time and space at my disposal are inadequate for coverage of the subject.

The story of the natural predators of the sockeye—and of the "human predators"—is also of vital interest.

I want to assure all that my fellow Commissioners are a capable and conscientious group of men, devoting a generous share of their time without recompense to the great work before us.

All concerned are confirmed optimists in the belief that the project will in time measure up to our highest hopes.

The United States Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a little current paper on the Senate of the United States, prepared by a young student, Miss Polly Kurtz, of Clearfield, Pa., publication of which I think will be of encouragement to this young student in her study of civic affairs, and may provide interesting reading to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REQUIREMENTS OF A SENATOR AND GENERAL INFORMATION CONCERNING HIM

A Senator must:

Have been a citizen of the United States for 9 years before he may serve.

Be a resident of the State from which he is elected.

Be at least 30 years of age.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Two Senators are elected from each State by the direct vote of the people for a term of 6 years. (One-third of the Senate is elected every 2 years.)

The salary of a Senator is $10,000 per year with allowances to cover traveling, stationery, and other such expenses. The allowances are based upon the population of the State which the Senator represents.

The offices of the Senators are in the Senate Office Building.

In case of the death or resignation of a United States Senator the vacancy is usually filled by a temporary appointment by the Governor of that particular State, which continues until the next general election, at which time a Senator is elected to fill the remainder of the term.

DUTIES OF A SENATOR

He should attend the meetings of the Senate.

He should attend as many of the committee meetings to which he belongs as he is able to without being absent from the Senate sessions too long.

His mail requires answering and this takes up a great deal of his time.

He should have a good idea of what his people want and try to serve them well—to the best of his ability.

It is up to the Senator himself to find a home in Washington.

THE SENATOR'S OATH

(Also taken by the Representatives)

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I will take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

OFFICIALS AND THEIR FUNCTIONS

Job and person performing such

Vice President (usual Presiding Officer): None (was President Truman).

President pro tempore: KENNETH MCKELLAR.

Secretary: Leslie L. Biffle.

Sergeant at Arms: Wall Doxey.

Chief Clerk: John C. Crockett.

Parliamentarian: Charles L. Watkins.

Secretary—majority: None (was Leslie L. Biffle).

Secretary—minority: Carl A. Loeffler.

Chaplain: Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

Legislative clerk: Emery L. Frazier.

Journal clerk: Edward J. Hickey.

Official reporter.

Page boys.

The Vice President: Presides over the Senate and signs the enrolled bills.

The President pro tempore: Performs in the absence of the Vice President the duties of that office.

The Secretary: Presides over the Senate when the Vice President is absent. When the President pro tempore is elected he is the custodian of the seal. He demands the money used for the expenses of the Senate; administers oaths, attests (to bear witness to) bills and joint, concurrent, and Senate resolutions. In impeachment trials he may issue, under the authority of the Presiding Officer, of course, all orders, mandates, writs, and precepts that are authorized by the Senate. He also certifies to the President of the United States the ratification of treaties and the names of the people confirmed or rejected upon the nomination of the President.

The Sergeant at Arms: Keeps order in the Chamber. In case of a violent argument between two Senators the Sergeant at Arms takes the mace in his hand and carries it toward the quarrelers. The mace is a bundle of rods with an eagle on the top. It is a symbol of authority and it reminds Members that they can be expelled if they do not behave.

The Chief Clerk: Has general supervision over all the clerks under the authority of the Secretary and is the reading clerk.

The Parliamentarian: Must know down to the finest detail all the rules by which meetings are run. If an argument comes up pertaining to the rules, he looks up the past records and tells the Presiding Officer how similar meetings in the past have been run.

He also indicates the references of bills and executive communications to different committees.

Secretary of the majority and minority: I am not writing on political parties so I am leaving references to these jobs out.

Chaplain: Offers a prayer at the beginning of the daily sessions of the Senate.

Legislative clerk: Endorses action on bills and any other papers presented to the Senate. He prepares the legislative calendar and is the assistant reading clerk.

Journal clerk: Keeps the Journal of the legislative and impeachment proceedings.

The official reporters: Report stenographically the proceedings of the Senate.

The page boys: Run errands for the Senators (and Representatives). They also answer telephones in the lobbies, carry messages, get books that Members want, and keep papers in order. Twenty-one pages work in the Senate. They are appointed to their jobs usually by the Members who have been in the Senate for the longest time. If a Senator wants a page he snaps his fingers. Pages earn $4 a day every day that the Senate is in session.

THE WORK OF THE SENATE

A. The Senate elects a President of the Senate (President pro tempore) to preside in the absence of the Vice President.

B. The Senate approves or rejects the nominations to Federal offices made by the President.

C. The Senate tries, as in a court, all the persons who have been impeached. A two-thirds vote is needed to convict them.

D. The Senate, by a two-thirds vote, may ratify, amend, or reject all proposed treaties between the United States and foreign countries.

E. The Senate meets on the second Wednesday in February, after the Presidential election, with the House to count the electoral vote. If an election results, the President pro tempore of the Senate announces the election successful, and announces, also, the winners. If no election results, the Senate elects the Vice President.

F. The Senate, in joint action with the House, makes new Federal laws and changes old ones. They also declare war; order the mint to coin money; provide for the Army and Navy; and propose amendments to the Constitution.

DID YOU KNOW?

Senators cannot be arrested when Congress is in session, or while going to or from a session. Also, at these times they cannot be forced to testify in court or serve on a jury. Of course, they should avoid committing a criminal offense as they can be arrested and tried anytime Congress isn't in session.

A Senator is not called by his own name in the sessions. He is referred to as "the Senator from Iowa," or whatever his State may be.

Senators should be addressed by "My Dear Senator So and So or My Dear Senator."

Senators need not pay postage. Their mail is carried free. In place of a stamp is printed the Senator's printed signature and underneath that "United States Senator." This is called the franking privilege. Below is an example:

"United States Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, free. CLAUDE PEPPER, U. S. S.

"Miss Polly Kurtz, care of John Kurtz, Clearfield, Pa."

Demonstrations of approval or of disapproval by the people in the gallery are strictly forbidden by one of the rules of the Senate. The rule is enforced very rigidly.

The Senate's title was originally derived from the Roman Senate.

When the Senate is in session three white lights burn outside the door of the Senate Chamber—that is, at the main entrance.

United States Senators were originally elected by the State legislatures until the seventeenth amendment was passed stating them to be elected by direct vote, effective to Senators elected after May 31, 1913.

Eating places are provided in the Capitol for Senators and their guests. The restaurant is in the Senate wing and is accessible to the Senate Chamber.

Members of the Senate are not permitted to smoke while on the floor.

The Senators are provided with a one-rail electric train in a subway for quick transportation from their offices to the floor of the Senate Chamber.

ITEMS OF IMPORTANCE

I have not put these items in order or in any sequence as they are general items which would not fit in any other part.

Senatorial courtesy

Senatorial courtesy is a custom where the President, in making nominations to Federal offices, is expected to consult the United States Senators from the State in which the vacancies exist, before giving the nominations to the Senate to approve. If the Senators are of a different political party, other than that of the President, the custom is not applicable.

When a Senator desires to speak, he rises and addresses the Presiding Officer and does not proceed until he is recognized. Also the Presiding Officer recognizes the Senators who first address him.

Members of the Senate are not subjected to impeachment, but the Senate can with the concurrence of two-thirds expel a Member. Members are subject to prosecution for treason, felony, or breaking the peace, the same as a private citizen.

How long may a Senator speak?

The only limitation on debate in the Senate, except such as may be imposed by unanimous consent, is that provided by the cloture rule. (Provides Senators may end a debate by a two-thirds vote.)

The first woman elected to the Senate was Mrs. Hattie Caraway in 1932. The first woman to serve in the Senate was Rebecca Felton in 1922.

The term of the Senate is 2 years, beginning January 3, of the odd years.

Senators may be called to a special session by the President.

Filibusters

Filibustering is the practice of deliberately taking advantage of freedom of debate—in the Senate—to delay action on a bill, and so forth. In 1917 the cloture rule was adopted by the Senate providing the Senate may end a debate by a two-thirds vote. Then no Senator may talk longer than an hour on one bill.

Lobbying

Lobbying means to discuss a subject with a Senator and try to get him to vote on it the way you think he should vote.

The Senate meets in the Capitol.

The Senate meets every year not long after January 1 and continues in session until the business for the year is finished. This is usually some time in the summer.

REFERENCE

1. We Are the Government.
2. Congressional Directory, January 1944.
3. Lincoln Library.
4. World Almanac, 1946.
5. Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?
6. Growing in Citizenship.
7. United States Government Manual, summer, 1944.
8. New Century Book of Facts.
9. Library of Congress, Reference Department.

I really enjoyed working on the Senate as my term paper. It was an absorbing as well as educational project. I learned many things which I did not know about the way my Government functions. I also uncovered some very interesting bits of information on the United States Senate. I know more of my duties as a citizen to help keep the wheels of my Government turning. Now that I have learned as much as I have about the Senate, I would like very much to attend a session of the Senate some time in the future.

POLLY KURTZ.

Thoughts for Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, these times call for clear and dynamic thinking as few previous occasions in man's history have. I ask unanimous consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article on the subject of thoughts for our times, which I wrote for the magazine Think in its issue of October 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS FOR OUR TIMES

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

(The irresistible power of an idea ripe for development and translated into brilliant action. Thoughts as powers for good or evil in the lives of nations and of individuals.)

All history is full of the illustrious names of great men and women who reversed seemingly irresistible tides of human affairs. These leaders emblazoned new chapters of man's progress in the chronicles of time. These pioneers in thinking and action, such as the men of 1776, seized upon an idea, an idea ripe for development and translated it into brilliant action. "There is nothing more powerful in this world than an idea whose time has come," said Victor Hugo.

As a legislator who has served in the United States Senate during the trying years of the Second World War and the challenging first postwar year, I have seen how thoughts are weapons. They are powers for good and evil both in the life of a nation and in the life of an individual. Your thoughts and mine can make of your life and mine a thing of radiant beauty, of majestic growth, of fascinating interest, of eternal inspiration for those who are to follow after us.

These are not just words; they are proved truths. No man is so humble that his thought cannot make for good in his own life, in that of his family, and in that of his neighbor. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," is proved every day—in your office and mine, in our home, and in our house of God.

Thoughts that are dynamic, that are alive and keen, enable you and me to seek life's meaning. "Life has meaning," said Browning, "and to find its meaning is my meat and drink." It is this spiritual food which nourishes the humblest soul and the greatest soul. It is this incentive which enables us to meet our proudest obligations to others, to our Nation, to our God, to ourselves.

Creative thoughts, constructive thoughts, aspiring thoughts, liberate each of us from

whatever chains may bind us in our particular circumstances. Man was not meant to be bound. "I was born free," said St. Paul, "free of man-made limitations."

The thirst for new thoughts enables us to reap the legacy of man's recorded history, the wonders of science and the arts, of religion, philosophy, which are available to each of us in our personal libraries, in the libraries of our schools and our offices and in our public libraries. Each of these institutions is crowded full of stimulating ideas waiting for you and me to grasp. Knute Rockne was right. He said, "The idea's the thing." And with his new ideas, he fashioned the greatest football teams in United States gridiron history. But whatever our field of endeavor—sports, commerce, manufacturing, retailing, education, homemaking—the idea's the thing.

So what? What if all this be true, then what? If all this be true, and I am certain that it is, it behooves each of us—you and me—to make himself the master of his thinking. It behooves us in our own way to smash the shackles that may bind us—the shackles of apathy, the chains of fear, anxiety, and worry.

It behooves us to awake and sing of our freedom by cleansing our minds of man-made doubts. We know that fear paralyzes growth; that it can poison the mind as it can poison the body. We know that ridding ourselves of fear does not mean throwing sensible caution to the winds but rather purging our minds of senseless worry about all those things which will probably never come to pass anyway. It was a wise man indeed who said on this subject, "I have more trouble with myself than with anyone else."

Part of that trouble is our apathy—yours and mine—our tendency to get mired in outworn habits and practices, to use not the best approach, the most streamlined approach, the most effective approach to our objectives, but rather the old moth-eaten approach to which we may have grown accustomed. Apathy drugs thinking. "There is no expedient in this world to which a man will not go in order not to think."

Do you remember the story of the chained eagle? When it was young, it was free to fly as it would. Later, it was caught and chained. Always, thereafter, it would walk only to the end of the chain and no further. One day, the chain was released. But the eagle did not fly away. It walked only to the same length and then stopped. We must not allow ourselves to be chained that way by our own rut-bound thinking.

Each of us, then, is called upon by his own higher self and his own higher destiny to rise and explore new interests, new vocations, new avocations, to seek new beauties, to educate his mind with new truths. The mind rusts with excessive rest. We must keep it active.

By doing so, we will slash the bonds of fear and apathy which muddle our thinking, becloud our intellect, give us synthetic thoughts rather than real, creative thoughts. We must keep moving forward or we shall find ourselves slipping backward. "Hitch your wagon to a star," said Emerson. This doesn't mean having a wild grandiose notion about our own potentialities and becoming overaggressive in our ambitions. It does mean soundly and realistically appraising our possibilities in a free America that awaits with warm and open arms new thinkers who will help it to achieve greater progress—spiritual progress, material progress.

What the individual can do, the Nation can do—think more clearly, more constructively than ever before on the economic issues, the political issues, the social issues at home and abroad. We can rid our national thinking of fear and apathy. By doing so, we will help to realize a still better and fuller life for our own people and help set a standard for the world.

These then are the thoughts for our times. They, too, can turn the flank of history and of your history and mine.

American Dollars Fight for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by me and appearing in the November issue of the American Magazine, on the subject of dollar democracy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN DOLLARS FIGHT FOR PEACE

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah)

(What's really behind our $15,000,000,000 of aid to foreign countries, revealed here for the first time by a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. An over-all national policy designed to keep democracy alive in a chaotic world.)

At London, Paris, Moscow, or wherever representatives of the American Government go to carry out our foreign policy, they carry the world's biggest bank roll with them.

That bank roll has been a potent factor in many of the victories we have won for our point of view. Every nation is acutely aware of America's wealth. And it is no accident that American dollars frequently implement our foreign policy.

Everybody wants our dollars because they represent a claim upon American production. America, you see, is still the only major industrial nation of the world whose productive plant is intact, in good working order, and capable of turning out vastly more than its own citizens require.

Since everybody around the world seems to want dollars, our foreign-policy directors have tried to see that they go where they will do democracy—and America—the most good. Already our Government has apportioned out some $15,000,000,000 in 1½ years to help create an economic atmosphere abroad in which democracy can thrive.

Democracy always thrives best—you will note if you look around the world—where people have a fairly high standard of living. Totalitarianism thrives on poverty.

Right now the world is gripped in a worldwide war of ideas. The contest is between the democratic way of life and the way of life that prevails in the totalitarian state, such as Russia or Spain.

America has no quarrel with Russia as a nation. In fact, Russia can contribute enormously to our well-being because she wants to buy our goods. But America does want to discourage the appearance of totalitarian states wherever it can. In this sense, our new policy of dollar democracy occasionally does conflict with Russian policy, because Russia is encouraging the formation of totalitarian states wherever she can in Europe.

While our policy of dollar democracy aids our foreign policy, it is not a bald business of buying friends. It represents a valiant effort by America to assist allies badly hit by the war back to their feet, so that they can prosper, enjoy democracy—and buy our products. The large-scale export of our dollars will not only help revive prostrate nations, but will help maintain the value of our dollar. Our dollars represent America's standard of living built upon our savings accounts, insurance policies, and dollar investments. During the war I sought, unsuccessfully, to pay off every American GI serving overseas in dollars instead of in foreign currencies. The plan, if it had been followed, would have made the dollar the world currency, because everybody wants the dollar.

If there was any doubt that America is using dollars to combat totalitarianism it should have been dispelled by the debate in the House of Representatives on the $3,750,000,000 credit to Great Britain. One of the leading congressional advocates of the loan put the matter bluntly when he said:

"It is in my heart and I am going to say it: I do not want Western Europe, England, and all the rest pushed farther toward an ideology which I despise."

As I will show, the loan to France last spring just before her elections was also influenced by political considerations.

There is absolutely no question that the factor which tipped the scales to assure congressional approval of so big a loan to Britain was the fact that it would strengthen the democratic cause in the world. This consideration was so powerfully persuasive that it dwarfed such opposition arguments as the popular one that we had already sent too much money overseas to help our friends. The opponents could add the loans and gifts up to about $15,000,000,000, not including our $2,700,000,000 commitment to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In round numbers, the amounts involved were these:

Six billion dollars—Total commitment to the Bretton Woods fund and bank.

Three billion dollars—Loans by our Export-Import Bank.

Two billion five hundred million dollars—Credits financing the sale of overseas war surpluses and lend-lease leftovers to foreign governments.

Three billion seven hundred and fifty million dollars—The British credit.

That, admittedly, was a lot of money by any kind of measurement. But our top officials felt it was the only way to keep the rest of the world from the economic chaos that breeds totalitarianism.

It was obvious that if we did not make loans and contribute generously to relief, there was nobody else who could. The alternative, unmistakably, would have been panic, poverty, disease, and despair, the four horsemen of totalitarianism.

While the United States uses the promotion of economic health and stability as a weapon in its fight for democracy, it is alleged that the U. S. S. R., for example, uses the promotion of poverty and despair for the advancement of totalitarian regimes in eastern Europe.

I personally doubt that Russia is following such an avowed policy, but our State Department seems to think so. In its note to the Kremlin on July 28, it specifically accused Russia of promoting the economic disintegration of Hungary.

In our fight to prevent people from getting into the desperate frame of mind where a dictator seems appealing to them, we have already made loans to Great Britain, France, Finland, Belgium, the Netherlands, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Saudi-Arabia, and Poland.

The State Department came nearest to being frank about its use of dollars for political objectives in the case of credits to Poland. It said, without qualification, that we would lend $90,000,000 to the Poles if they held free

elections and let our foreign correspondents report what was going on there.

The biggest remaining prospect for our loan program (aside from Russia, which at the moment is hardly a promising prospect) is China. General of the Army George C. Marshall, special Presidential envoy, went to China several months ago with authority to grant a $500,000,000 credit at such time as it would be useful to his mission of trying to get the Chinese to stop fighting among themselves.

Other possible Export-Import Bank loans regarded as serious possibilities at this writing are additional advances to Czechoslovakia and new credits to Turkey and Italy. All of these countries are in or near the Soviet orbit.

The British credit, largest ever made in history by one government to another, was not an Export-Import Bank loan like the others, but was approved directly by Congress. It was more generous in its terms than any other credit because of Great Britain's unusual importance to world trade. No other nation was in a position to give us so much in return by helping to promote freedom on the avenues of world commerce.

Britain's exports had been cut to a third by the war, her dollars and gold reserves were down to about half of what they had been before the war. The nation's economy was in very serious trouble. Without the credit, the British could not have gone along with the Bretton Woods Fund and Bank, or other parts of the broad program of freer, nondiscriminatory trade to which our foreign economic policy was dedicated. In exchange for the credit, Britain agreed to break down her Empire barriers and preferences.

Without the loan, the two great western democracies undoubtedly would have been crossing swords in the most vicious trade war in history. Nothing, probably, would have pleased the Russians more. The Soviet press and American fellow travelers made this plain by attacking the British loan as just another example of a Western conspiracy against the Soviet.

Our campaign to distribute American dollars to needy nations may look haphazard in the pages of your home-town newspaper. And it has looked haphazard to a good many uninformed lawmakers on Capitol Hill. Actually, it has been a well-planned program, though the administration has not been hanging out signs advertising this fact.

Certain Congressmen apparently don't remember it, but about a year ago Congress established the National Advisory Council on International Financial and Monetary Problems to coordinate these loans for their greatest effectiveness. The NAC was to see that our foreign loans made sense.

With the wealth of the richest country in the world at its disposal, the NAC became the most powerful financial group in the world. Meeting at least weekly for the past year, it has been as busy as it has been powerful. It is a truly representative body, containing persons with such diverse political and economic views as the extremely liberal Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce; the strong anti-inflationist Marriner S. Eccles, who is Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Export-Import Bank; Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder; and William L. Clayton, representing the State Department. Mr. Clayton, who is Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, is one of the administration's foremost philosophers of free world trade.

Secretary Wallace is by far the most generously inclined regarding foreign loans. Some of his NAC colleagues figure he regards this lending as just another form of deficit spending or "pump-priming" to help keep national employment up to the 60,000,000-job level which he has so widely advocated.

You can call this spending pump-priming if you wish, but I would call it plain common sense. Long before the NAC was created I had introduced into the Senate a resolution calling for international economic cooperation and pointing out that in the new world organization there should be an economic as well as a political division. It is my contention that poverty anywhere tends to make poverty everywhere, and general prosperity anywhere helps bring prosperity everywhere. The world is interdependent when it comes to economic well-being.

At any rate, the NAC now coordinates our efforts to raise living standards in other parts of the world. It never puts its approval on a loan, however, without shrewd regard for the political considerations raised by the United States Department of State. And in a number of instances the State Department has even initiated loans which it thought should be made for political reasons.

When Congress began consideration of the British loan last spring it soon became evident that the loan wouldn't have a chance unless the administration made it clear that (1) somebody at the top level was coordinating foreign loans with our foreign policy, and (2) that this lending would stop pretty soon. Consequently, the NAC made its first and only report to Congress on March 1.

The report pointed out that loans were being coordinated, and further stated there would be no more requests to Congress for loans for specific countries, as in the case of the British credit. All other loans would have to come out of the Export-Import Bank fund, which was already running low. The NAC proposed an additional $1,250,000,000 for the fund, and that would be all.

It was at this time also that Leon Blum, French Socialist leader, was scheduled to arrive in Washington to start negotiations for a loan to France. So there seems to have been further curious timing to the report. Paris dispatches had been carrying all sorts of astronomical figures as suggestions of what the French Financial Mission would want by way of credits from the United States.

The NAC report, therefore, served notice on the French that any loan comparable in size to the British credit, or one which would require special congressional action, was out of the question. A few hours after the report was announced the French sent word that sudden illness had required the postponement of M. Blum's trip. Whether or not he was actually ill, the 2 weeks' delay in departure gave the French experts time to realine their figures.

I talked with M. Blum soon after his arrival, and felt (both before and after the talk) that France should be granted a generous credit. It was another case of helping an old friend back on her feet so that she could again become one of our leading customers.

But it soon developed that the French, even after the NAC report, had a misleading impression of the money available in the Export-Import Bank fund. Actually the bank's free balance was getting perilously below $1,500,000,000. And the French kept talking of a loan from the bank running into 10 figures, which was clearly out of the question.

Then, in the midst of the French negotiations, diplomatic correspondence was renewed with the Russians over a Russian application for a $1,000,000,000 loan that had been made months before, but which administration leaders professed to know nothing about. It seems that the $1,000,000,000 had been more or less promised to the Russians in the spring of 1945 (while the war was still on) by Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, provided that the Russians met our terms.

When this Russian application was found in the midst of the French negotiations, the Export-Import Bank felt it necessary to earmark $1,000,000,000 of the bank's $1,500,000,000 remaining funds for the Russians, even though few officials felt the Russians would meet our terms.

This meant that the French could have no more than the remaining $500,000,000. That was the figure generally assumed in the NAC to be the top amount the French could get, until word came from Paris that Secretary Byrnes had been saying "yea"' to even larger sums in his informal conversations with the French. Rather than "let Jimmy down" the NAC agreed to $650,000,000 for France. But to do that it had to first remove the earmarking of the $1,000,000,000 for Russia. Thus the phantom "loan to Russia" became the substance of the credit to France.

And, to the great relief of our officials, the French deal was closed in time to have whatever effect it could have on the lection in France on June 2. There is no question that the loan played a considerable role in causing the French people to reject the bid of their Communist Party for power.

United States press reports continue to breathe life into the Russian loan, much to the embarrassment of the officials concerned. With the Export-Import Bank's funds down to around $300,000,000 by the time Congress went home, there was not the faintest likelihood of such a credit until some time next year, if ever.

A most miraculous change in Soviet willingness to cooperate in international affairs would have to come about before Congress would give the Export-Import Bank enough money to grant such a loan. President Truman showed his awareness of this situation when he failed to ask Congress for the additional $1,250,000,000 for the bank recommended by the NAC, even though he had said in March he would ask for it.

By holding up the request for expanding the bank's lending power, the President thus blocked the Russian loan, because, as things stand now, the bank does not have enough money to make such a loan. It is apparent the President will ask for the money out of which a loan could be made to Russia only if the U. S. S. R. indicates a change of heart with regard to cooperation.

I think it is only fair to look a borrower in the eye—as any banker does—and ask how the money will be used. In the case of Russia we should make the loan only if Russia cooperates in helping to raise the world's standard of living and in helping to raise barriers to free world trade. If Russia would join the Bretton Woods bank and fund and abandon its policy of making economic vassals of foreign countries by all-encompassing agreements with them we would be favorably disposed, I am sure, to make a loan.

Which brings us down to the gist of this whole loan program. Either we do things like lending money, providing relief, and setting a good example as becomes our new position of leadership in the world—or we let the outside world, still largely prostrate from the war, fall into the hands of dictatorial regimes. such regimes thrive on poverty and are incapable of trading and dealing with other nations on a friendly basis.

Hungary, our recent enemy, offers a striking illustration of the contrasting methods of totalitarian states, such as Russia, and ourselves. While Russia was bleeding the Hungarian economy to such an extent that we protested to the Kremlin, we showed the Hungarians how we felt about their welfare by returning to them their entire $35,000,000 gold reserve which the Nazis had stolen. We tried to promote sound currency and economic stability, while the Russians fostered inflation.

Our policy is not anti-Russian, but it is, rather, an effort to build up conditions of prosperity and free trade throughout the world. It is only under such conditions that we, ourselves, can prosper, for long.

Dollar democracy represents the American Government lending money on generous terms to other friendly governments to help them preserve their economic structures so that they can remain democratic and prosperous. When they are democratic and prosperous they are good customers for us.

Low Power Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Region Is Entitled to Its Low Power Rates," published in the Seattle Star, under date of Wednesday, December 18, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS REGION IS ENTITLED TO ITS LOW POWER RATES

Midwestern Congressmen who are threatening to block all appropriations for the expansion of Columbia River power developments—unless power rates in this area are increased—may think they are battling for private enterprise as against public ownership in the power field.

But the response from the Pacific Northwest must tell them the facts. If the power rates in this region are increased the Grand Coulee-Bonneville Administration and the public power movement generally will not be the only or even the chief sufferers.

The economy of the whole region will be dealt a devastating blow and an entirely unjustifiable one.

The Pacific Northwest is handicapped in some topographical respects. The Columbia River and other streams have carved deep canyons. It is, for this reason, more difficult and costly to develop large reclamation projects than in more favorably situated States. A smaller proportion of land is available for cultivation than in the Mississippi River Valley.

But the heavy run-off and the deep canyons are ideal for hydroelectric-power development. It is for this reason that the Pacific Northwest can offer industry lower power rates than any other section of this country.

There is ample justification for the $17.50 kilowatt year rate offered by the Bonneville Administration. Its operations have been audited by an independent firm which finds that under present rates the Administration should be able to return to the Federal Government all sums advanced for power development, meet a considerable share of the irrigation costs associated with the Columbia Basin project, and still show a surplus.

It is natural, perhaps, that less favorably situated sections of the country should look covetously upon this region's power resources. But that fact neither excuses nor condones an attempt to stifle the development of the Pacific Northwest.

It is right that cheap hydro-electric power from this region should be distributed as widely as possible. It is not feasible, however, to transmit power from Grand Coulee to the Middle West.

If Congressmen JENSEN, of Iowa, and JONES of Ohio, who have launched the attack on further development of Columbia River power, are merely peeved because their States cannot benefit from the cheap electricity of the Pacific Northwest they are putting on a dog-in-the-manger act that may have serious consequences, not merely for this region but also for the Nation. For sound economy demands that industry establish itself where conditions are most favorable. If industry is denied the right to use cheap power and if the Columbia and other rivers remain only partially harnessed while industry is required to buy coal and other fuels, the whole national economy suffers.

Congressmen JENSEN and JONES happen to be Republicans. This is not to say that the movement against public power has a Republican tinge. In the last Congress two Oklahoma Congressmen, both Democrats, spearheaded the fight against public-power development. Both were retired by voters in the Oklahoma primary.

Governor Earl Snell, of Oregon, himself a Republican, has done good service to the Pacific Northwest, and incidentally to the Republican Party, by calling for an all-western battle against any attempt to stifle Columbia River development.

This region's interest in power is not a partisan interest. The late Senator Charles McNary, of Oregon, fought for the building of Bonneville Dam. His name will be given to the dam at Umatilla, provided for by congressional action.

President Roosevelt, of course, is entitled to primary credit for ordering both Grand Coulee and Bonneville development but long before 1932 Republicans and Democrats of this region were voicing their demands that the National Government put the Columbia to work, instead of allowing its water to waste its energy in falls and rapids.

Cheap and abundant power is the right of this region. Cheap power has been attained and present rates can stand any unbiased examination. To deny the Pacific Northwest the right to offer its power in abundance would be a calamity for the region, an injury to the Nation.

Sectional prejudice can go further than follow a dog-in-the-manger policy. It can develop into a case of cutting off the nose to spite the face. That is what these midwestern Congressmen appear to be attempting in this case.

Looking Ahead in Food and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an address which I delivered before the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, Topeka, Kans., on January 9, 1947:

Two years ago I had the pleasure of speaking before this group. I enjoyed it then and am happy to be back again. At that time we were in the midst of the war. In Europe the Battle of the Belgian Bulge was still on. In the Pacific the end still seemed far away. Many are the changes which have taken place during these 2 years. Yet, from an agricultural standpoint, conditions are not greatly different from what they appeared to be when I spoke at your meeting in 1945. In fact, in looking over a copy of my remarks at that time, I find that much of what I said then is applicable today.

This is largely because of the fact that the end of the war did not mean the end of war conditions. The last shot was fired almost 17 months ago, but it has been only a little over a week since the President proclaimed that hostilities were at an end. During most of the intervening period our business economy, including agriculture, operated under wartime controls, almost to the same extent as during the war.

Furthermore, the need for food and other agricultural products in the war-torn countries has made it necessary for American farmers to continue production at wartime levels. Without that production and its distribution, through UNRRA, the United States Army, and commercial channels, misery, starvation, and death would have encompassed the globe.

But world agriculture is slowly being restored. By another year it is likely that demands from the war-torn countries will shrink materially and American farmers will no longer have that outlet for their products—at least, not in the tremendous volume of the past 2 years.

But the shift from war to peace is only one of the conditions which make a reconsideration of our agricultural program necessary. In recent years we have seen a revolution in agricultural production through increased mechanization and the development of new and improved varieties of crops and breeds of livestock. The production of wheat has been almost entirely mechanized. The corn picker and the use of hybrid varieties have completely changed the picture so far as corn production is concerned. New and improved methods of farming in the plains area have freed crop production from the weather hazards which formerly prevailed there. At present, mechanization is beginning to make great changes in the production of two important crops: cotton and sugar beets. The soybean has within a few years become one of our most important crops. These changes will go on. Agriculture must keep up with them and they must be considered when agricultural legislation is framed.

This makes it important for all of us to do some straight thinking and talking, as to what lies ahead in the field of food and agriculture, and that is what I want to discuss with you today.

I am not here with the idea of proposing a program, but rather to talk about some of the questions of an agricultural nature which are likely to come before Congress, and to urge that you help me and my colleagues to find the correct answers.

We are fortunate at this time in the respect that there is no immediate price emergency confronting agriculture. All of you who were farming then recall the disastrous slump which took place in agricultural prices following the other war. That is not in the picture now, because of the legislation passed by the Congress during the war, which will support most agricultural prices at 90 percent of parity during the next two crop-years. It is true there may be some difficulty in applying these price supports. There is trouble already as to potatoes, and eggs are beginning to look like a problem. The question involved is whether the price guaranties imply the authority to impose a limit upon the quantity of the commodity eligible to price support, or whether it applies to all of the commodities which farmers may desire to produce. This question, however, is not applicable to the basic commodities—wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—inasmuch as other legislation provides for the imposition of marketing quotas when supplies reach a certain point.

In the case of some commodities, prices at 90 percent of parity are a positive stimulus to overproduction. As to others, such prices are less than present costs of production. This indicates that parity at the present time does not represent a normal relationship between the prices of the various agricultural commodities. No doubt, it did represent such a relationship during the 1909–14 period, but mechanization, the development of new varieties of crops, greater general efficiency, and differences in the amount and cost of labor used, have greatly changed the situation. In my opinion, most of the difficulties in price stabilization which we are likely to have during the Steagall period will arise out of the fact that the parity relationship has not been brought up to date.

Some have raised the question as to whether the commitments under the Steagall amendment will be kept now that the political control of Congress has changed. To me that is no question at all. The Steagall amendment is a solemn pledge on the part of Congress that farmers who, at the request of the War Food Administration, expanded their operations, made new investments in land and equipment, and undertook the production of new and unfamiliar crops, will be given an opportunity to adjust their operations to peacetime conditions. Farmers have done their part magnificently, and Congress will do its part and keep its pledge as to prices. Both Republicans and Democrats made the pledge and Republicans and Democrats will keep it.

But when we speak of what's ahead for agriculture, most of us are not thinking about the next 2 years. We are thinking what is going to happen after that time. Before we try to answer that question, let's take a look at the present situation. In brief, it is this: During the war, American farmers increased their production approximately one-third. They did it under the most adverse conditions as to labor, machinery, and transportation. They did, on the whole, have the benefit of moderately good weather. What they accomplished clearly indicates that with increased mechanization now or soon to be available, with better methods and practices in common use, and with better varieties of crops, postwar productive capacity will equal or exceed what it was during the war.

We consumed this production during the war and since. The hard, cold question is: Can we continue to do it? While the war was on, our domestic-food consumption increased substantially. Everybody was working. They had plenty of money to spend. Things for which they could spend it were limited. Food prices were held down by ceilings and by vast subsidy programs. As a result, Americans generally spent a smaller proportion of their incomes for food than in any recent period, and still ate better than any people ever ate in the world's history. Great quantities of food were taken by the Army where consumption was high, not only because of good appetites but because of waste. At the same time, our allies took every pound of food which we could spare and transport to them.

Consumption has continued high domestically. Buying power is still high and most goods, except food, are still scarce. Foreign nations are still taking a great deal of the food although, directly or indirectly, we are paying for most of it. But wartime conditions are gradually giving way. Perhaps we will have another year of substantial exports to war-torn countries. We do not know what exports will be after that. In another year or two the American people will be able to purchase many things they have been wanting since the war began. Some money which has been going for food will be spent for refrigerators, cars, and radios. Ceilings and subsidies are out and consumers are now paying more for most agricultural products. This may reduce consumption. What will these changes mean to an agriculture which has the capacity and desire to produce at wartime schedules or better?

Can farmers continue to produce in abundance? A lot of people seem to be taking it for granted that they can, and, of course, farmers want to do it. The question is: Can they do so without producing surpluses, which in the past have meant price demoralization? All of us know how even small surpluses frequently result in drastic price cuts, which are more severe in the case of perishable commodities but are not limited to them. This is a phenomenon which is peculiar to agriculture, and stems from the fact that ordinarily the individual farmer has nothing to say about the price of what he produces and sells. He likewise has nothing to say about the prices of the things he buys, which are fixed by those who manufacture and distribute them.

The general recognition of this dilemma has resulted in governmental policies which undertake to stabilize agricultural prices. While the temporary Steagall legislation goes farther than any other, in one form or another, we have had attempts at price stabilization ever since the creation of the Federal Farm Board in 1929. In my judgment, there is now general acceptance by the American people of the principle that the Federal Government must tabilize farm prices to the extent that farmers will never again suffer from severe deflations like those which followed 1920 and 1929. That principle is as firmly embedded in our governmental policies as is the principle of social security. Not settled as yet are the questions as to (1) the level upon which prices should be stabilized and (2) the methods and procedure which should be used in bringing about such stabilization.

Experience has taught us a great deal about such operations. One thing we have learned is that it is impossible over any considerable period to support prices above prevailing free markets without controls over production or marketing, or both. Another is that the higher the support price, the greater the control that is necessary. We have learned also that you can't support prices on just a few commodities without causing serious shifts and dislocations in production. I think the most important question confronting agriculture today is that of deciding how much price support and how much control there is to be in our postwar agricultural program, keeping in mind that the two inevitably go together, and that the higher the price supports the more rigid the controls.

I do not believe there are very many, either in Congress or out, who would want to say that they have the complete answer as to what is the best postwar program for agriculture. That is something upon which all of us are going to have to work—and work hard.

With that thought in mind, I am going to ask the House Committee on Agriculture to hold extended hearings on the whole problem of postwar agriculture, with a view of determining what changes in legislation and in policies are necessary to meet the problems which have arisen in recent years. The matter should, of course, be considered from an economic, rather than a political, standpoint. It should include a careful study and reexamination of the policies and programs now in effect. These programs should be considered on their merits. Those which can be justified as useful and helpful to agriculture should be retained. Those which cannot meet this test should be discarded. At these hearings, we shall certainly want to hear from farmers and farm organizations, and I take this opportunity to say that the views and suggestions of any of you on the question of a long-time agricultural program will be welcome.

While I do not at this time feel that I can say what our future agricultural policy should be as to programs and details, I do want to make some suggestions as to the direction which I think it should go. My answer on that is that our objective, as far as possible, should be abundant production rather than a policy of scarcity and controls.

That, however, is a question which cannot be decided independently for agriculture. Farmers can't follow a program of abundant production if industry and labor are going to follow monopoly practices, or scarcity economics, whatever you want to call it. We have had plenty of experience with industrial monopolies in the past and we still have them, in spite of the antitrust laws. In recent years we have seen monopoly practices increase in labor until we have Nation-wide labor monopolies exercising almost absolute control over vital industries. These monopolies have been fostered and perpetuated by governmental policy.

The first step we ought to take to assure abundant production in agriculture is to get rid of monopoly in whatever fields it now exists. We have got to insist that other groups besides agriculture enter the field of free competition and abundant production. I don't think it is necessary to elaborate on this. Sufficient to say, if we are going to make any headway in that direction it will require an entire change of thinking on the part of many leaders in labor and industry, as well as the application of antitrust legislation, or its equivalent, to labor monopoly.

What further moves can we make in the direction of making abundant production possible? For one thing, we can take some definite steps in the field of expanding markets. First of all, I think we should go into the field of research in the marketing and utilization of agricultural products—something which has been almost entirely neglected up to now as far as governmental policies are concerned. It is natural that when research activities were first undertaken by the Department of Agriculture many years ago, they should be in the field of production. At that time most of our production was for use at home or in nearby communities. Marketing had not become the problem that it is today. Marvels have been accomplished in the field of production. Without adequate marketing machinery to handle this production, neither the farmer nor society as a whole is in a position to get the real benefits which come from more efficient production. The war brought about many changes in the transportation, preservation, and processing of agricultural products, as witness the developments in the fields of dehydration, compression, and freezing. Except for that, however, progress in the transportation, distribution, utilization, and marketing of agricultural products has fallen far behind production. The time has now come when the Department of Agriculture, the various State agencies dealing with agriculture, transportation agencies, processors, distributors, and farmers themselves, must work together in bringing about an expansion of agricultural marketing and consumption.

Authority for such a program is contained in bipartisan legislation passed by the last Congress. That authority must still be implemented through adequate appropriations by Congress and by a sympathetic administration in the Department of Agriculture.

Along with better marketing, we need research in the field of new uses and in the development of new crops, which are needed here and which we can produce efficiently. This also is covered by the legislation to which I have just referred.

There should be many things ahead of us in the field of nutrition. Not only do we need more research and information on this

question, but we need to make that knowledge available to the public. The school-lunch program established by the last Congress means more than nourishing meals and improved health to school children. If properly carried out, it means the dissemination of practical and helpful information on food, not only to school children but to parents as well. That in turn means more food consumption.

In a very practical sense, improvements in marketing and distribution, and wider information on nutrition, will eventually mean more dollars in the farmer's pocket. This is because food is in competition with many other articles for the consumer's dollar.

It is foolish to say there are no chances to expand farm markets here at home when only a comparatively small part of our national income is spent for food, and when we are currently spending about $7,000,000,000 annually for alcoholic liquors and four billion more for tea, coffee, and soft drinks, as well as other billions for amusement and recreation.

What about foreign markets for agriculture in the years ahead? That, like some other things, depends on our general policies as well as on our agricultural program. Certainly we should do everything possible to build up our exports of such agricultural commodities as the world needs and which we can produce efficiently. Of course, we can't export without importing and, for that reason, our general tariff and trade policies will largely determine what we can do on agricultural exports.

I think we should try to see what can be worked out in the way of international commodity agreements. The preliminary meeting of the World Trade Organization which has recently been held in London has been giving consideration to this matter. I believe that in the case of commodities which enter into world trade on a large scale, like wheat, cotton, wool, sugar, and rubber, commodity agreements embracing the leading consumer as well as the important producing nations, offer a sound approach to the problem of expanding international trade and stabilizing prices.

This brings up the program of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the FAO. I have attended the two annual meetings of this organization, one at Quebec, the other at Copenhagen. To me the organization represents a significant step in bringing about better international relations and understanding. There is no subject as universal as food and agriculture. Everybody consumes food, and two-thirds of the world's people are farmers. In much of the world, just getting enough to eat still occupies most of an individual's time and efforts. If the nations of the world, through their representatives, can get together just once a year to talk over the engrossing, important, and universal subject of food, it may mean much in bringing about world understanding.

Of course, the FAO has broader and more definite aims than that. It seems to me that the objectives most likely of early realization are those which would make scientific knowledge in agriculture available to the countries which have been backward in their agricultural progress I know that at the two meetings which I have attended, this possibility has been at the forefront of the discussion as far as these countries are concerned. The matter which seemed to excite the most interest among representatives of the countries in which agriculture was highly developed was that of surpluses and international trade. This year Sir John Boyd Orr, the Director General of the organization, proposed his world food board plan. This program, which calls for setting up a world food board, would convert surpluses in countries in which they exist into food for hungry people in others, and makes a great appeal to the imagination. It appeals to common sense as well. Certainly, anything which can be done to translate burdensome surpluses into life-saving food for the hungry should be carried out.

All of these proposals, abundant production, by labor and industry, expansion of farm markets, new uses for agricultural products, wider education on the subject of nutrition, export markets, move in the right direction. They are in harmony with a program of abundant production. Their immediate effect may not be so great, but it will be cumulative and should make price supports and strict controls less and less necessary.

This does not mean, however, that I think we can do away altogether with price supports and controls in the near future. I think we may need them at some levels for some time—perhaps always, in order to prevent price debacles like we had in 1920 and 1929. That is far different, however, from attempting to continuously support all farm prices at above market levels which must inevitably mean stringent controls.

The more we can expand markets along the lines I have indicated, and the greater the degree of real, free enterprise we have in industry and labor, the more we can get away from support prices and Government controls.

There are many matters which I have not had time to mention because they are not concerned directly with prices and marketing. They are, however, of the greatest importance and I must not conclude without mentioning them.

Perhaps the greatest of all of our farm problems, from the standpoint of national interest, is soil conservation. Our fertile soil is our greatest asset. It must not only be maintained, but improved. In the larger sense, it is not a farm problem, but a problem directly affecting the very future existence of the country.

May I refer also to the necessity for study and action for the purpose of bringing about better rural health conditions, better educational facilities in rural communities, and expansion of rural electrification and farm-to-market roads. Today farmers and farm workers are deprived of the benefits of social security Our laws should be amended so as to permit them to participate.

These are some of the things ahead of us, as I seem them. They are matters which I hope will be studied and discussed in every farm home in America, as well as on street corners and in community meetings. Yes, they should be discussed in the cities as well, because there is nothing so vital to the welfare of our cities and the Nation as a whole, as a sound agricultural and rural life. History is filled with examples of the decline and fall of great nations when they neglected the land and the people who occupied and tilled it. This Nation, great and powerful as it is, must not fail to heed these clear warnings of the past. The farm home must remain as it always has been, the cornerstone of American life and progress.

Truman-Dewey Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., on Thursday, January 9, 1947, titled "Truman-Dewey Economics":

TRUMAN-DEWEY ECONOMICS

There was political significance that the two men who may grapple for the Presidency in 1948, Harry S. Truman and Thomas E. Dewey, spoke simultaneously yesterday to their respective legislative bodies on what should be done for the best interests of the people along economic lines. And, as likely 1948 opponents, a comparison of their views is pertinent.

Governor Dewey recommends maintenance of six so-called emergency taxes but also retention of the 50-percent cut in the State income taxes; President Truman says Federal taxes should be kept at the present level and that it would be "unsound fiscal policy" to reduce wartime income taxes. On this point, Mr. Truman will find opposition from a GOP Congress pledged to cut income taxes as a measure to build up the take-home pay of the worker.

Governor Dewey talks of a $400,000,000 State veterans' bonus, which if approved may raise the State debt to almost a billion; on Monday President Truman said that with the exception of minor adjustments, Federal aid to veterans has been completed.

Governor Dewey advocates extension of the State labor-mediation service and establishment of a research agency to study labor-management relations; President Truman wants minimum wages raised, social-security benefits increased, a broader coverage of the wage-hour law. It is significant that nowhere did the President express sympathy or support of the Nathan philosophy that industry's profits can permit a 25-percent rise in wages without endangering economic stability.

Governor Dewey wants private housing construction encouraged for use by families with middle-class incomes, and also a $25,000,000 appropriation to supplement the $35,000,000 emergency housing program for veterans begun last year; President Truman urges a long-range housing program which will start 1,000,000 new dwellings this year and which will in time reduce housing costs.

Governor Dewey urges utilization of the St. Lawrence water-power resources; President Truman wants industry to build up undeveloped areas and depressed regions.

While the economic theses of the two Executives do not conflict sharply at any one point, there is a marked difference in the degree with which the two stress important basic philosophies. Governor Dewey is definitely for lower income taxes, while President Truman is not. Dewey warns sharply against new demands of pressure groups, pointing to a recent group of proposals which would cost the State more than one and a quarter billions. Truman is not nearly so emphatic in denunciation of new spending.

Particularly interesting is the President's belief that taxes can be maintained at present levels and at the same time prices can be lowered by expanding production and the "initiative and inventiveness" of our industrialists. That is, we submit, a debatable point. If the cost of living is to be reduced, where better to begin than on taxes? And since taxes enter into the cost of every commodity, especially where wages play a large part in the cost, how better can prices of such commodities be lowered than through reduction of processing taxes? And how better can wages be stabilized than through reduction of the Federal income tax, allowing larger take-home pay and by that degree at least lessening the threat of strikes?

In general, to summarize, President Truman is perceptibly less anxious to reduce taxes, especially income taxes, than is Governor Dewey. Truman is obviously more anxious to appease organized labor than is Dewey. And, most important of all, Truman

faces a deficit and unbalanced Budget, while Dewey has a large surplus. It remains to be developed which is the better equipped to avoid a boom-and-bust era—but to date the odds are with the Governor.

Air Accidents

REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] brought up the subject of an air-accident investigation. This is a very important matter indeed, and I trust that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce through a subcommittee or acting as a whole will be prepared to conduct such investigation as may be necessary to determine what relationship any action or any inaction on the part of a governmental agency, including the House of Representatives and the Senate, may have to these accidents. I include the legislative body because, of course, there is the matter of adequate appropriations for the operation of airways and airway facilities. As soon as the committee can get organized, I hope we will be able to proceed to learn something of the facts in order to be able to make an early report.

I have submitted this matter to the chairman of the committee and I trust and hope that his concurrence and approval will be had. If it is necessary to introduce a resolution to give special authorization to the committee, he will do so.

The Select Committee of the House of Representatives To Investigate Air Accidents, appointed pursuant to House Resolution 125 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, of which I had the honor to be a member, conducted 28 such investigations and made certain recommendations. A number of those recommendations were made effective. But since those days, 1940–42, there has been a great expansion in air traffic and many new problems are presented. These problems demand our attention, and our action where congressional action is indicated, as the airways of this country are constructed, operated, controlled, and maintained by the Federal Government.

Bureaucrat Creates Bilbos in Iowa County With Taxpayers' Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following Department of Agriculture letter:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Bedford, Iowa, January 7, 1947.

Dear Friends, after reading this don't say, "I didn't know it."

First, the war is over and millions of our boys have returned overjoyed to be home alive, many crippled for life, others that have not, and will not return, died for their loved ones at home and for buddies that they might return to a free world. Yes, they died for the slackers too. Who is responsible for the slacker? Is it not you and I? Second, 1946 brought a record harvest of all crops. Has there ever been a year in history when a bumper crop was needed more than the past year? The farmers' cribs and bins, our elevators and our Government steel bins (ever-normal granary) all empty and the world starving with but one source to look to for food. The Year 1946, Mother Earth, Nature, and the Supreme Power that watches over us.

Yes, 1946 was a wonderful year for which we truly are thankful. Do we appreciate our position and enjoy the material things of life so much we forget who brought all these things about? Yes, many of us do. Let's not forget our Senator BILBOS. Did we not have our BILBOS in Taylor County during the war? Yes. Let's watch their every move though camouflaged as our friends. All is not gold that glitters.

Opportunities of 1947 confront us: Triple A's job is one of soil conservation. A great deal of the top soil on our rolling land has washed away. The past year a great deal has been done to hold as much as possible of what good soil remains on thousands of acres, but this work has only started.

This work must be speeded up. More land owners and tenants must be convinced of the need of conserving our soil if future generations are to live on this same land. I am convinced if our hillsides are to be farmed they must be terraced. Many of our hillsides have washed away until what remains is worthless from a standpoint of production. It is not too late to save what is left if we act now.

The sign up for 1947 is expected to be carried out in February. Landowners and tenants must plan together the practices you expect to carry out at the time of signing your intentions for there will be no shifting from one practice to another. Neither will you be permitted to add another practice. The practices on which payments will be made are the ones shown when giving your intentions. You should give your plans serious thought. Just what should I do? Should I build terraces instead of liming and fertilizing? Perhaps both, but your allowance may not go as far as you had hoped. A great deal of serious thinking will help you and your township committeemen solve your problem.

In order to keep the record straight and to correct the belief of at least a few, we are offering the following explanation. A few farmers in our county have come into our office thinking it was the Farm Bureau Office and wanted to leave us $10 as membership dues. Naturally, we informed them they were in the AAA Office, after which they inquired if it was true that they must belong to that organization to be eligible for soil conserving technical help such as laying out terraces, dams, etc., from our office and that of the Soil Conservation Service, also to be able to get lime and phosphate deliveries. We informed them, it was not true, and that AAA is a Federal agency; it is our duty to help everyone alike. It is also the duty of every State and Federal agency, which is tax-supported to serve all the people and not just a few. As far as AAA and Soil Conservation Service is concerned in Taylor County, everyone will be given the same consideration whether or not you belong to a farm organization, church club, or any secret orders. Under our Constitution anyone desiring to join any organization is strictly their own business so long as it does not interfere with the rights of others. A special privileged few is "Hitlerism."

Yours truly,

FRED O. HUNTER,
Chairman, Taylor County A. C. A.

Jefferson National Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 24, 1946, the High Knob Development Association staged a five-State picnic party on High Knob, Wise County, Va. The association was organized for the purpose of developing the Jefferson National Forest as a vacation and recreation spot and has made wonderful progress in its undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herein the address I delivered on the occasion:

The American people live too fast to see and enjoy the beauties and opportunities of nature. We would be repaid a thousandfold if we only took time to take advantage of the opportunities nature affords for pleasure, for recreation, for meditation.

We have gathered here this afternoon upon one of God's watchtowers, situated in the midst of one of the great playgrounds the All-Wise Architect included in His plan of creation for the enjoyment of His people, from which vantage point we can behold one of the loveliest scenes in nature's gallery of art. Most of us only live a few miles away, and yet how many of the people are here for the first time this afternoon? How many of you present here this afternoon ever took time before to come up here and enjoy this great playground, which is a part of your inheritance, by just playing around, beholding the beauties that greet you on every side, and communing with nature and nature's God?

We all need to "pack up our troubles" now and then, forget the cares of the day, repair to some choice spot such as this, and bask in the sunshine or sit beneath the shade of some verdant tree, breathe good wholesome air, and just meditate on the goodness, the beauties of nature and nature's God; or, if we are not in a meditative mood, take a plunge in the lake, row and fish around, play golf or tennis, throw horseshoes, walk down some bow-covered path, climb some rugged steep; and, if we do, we will find that "the cares that infest the day will fold their tents like the Arabs and as silently steal away."

As I visit other sections of the world, the thought keeps coming back to me that in the creative period, God, after creating the earth and pronouncing it good, came back to this section, seated Himself on Holston's White Top, Cumberland's Pinnacle, the Towers of the Breaks, or here on High Knob, surveyed the surrounding territory with the purpose in mind of making it the loveliest spot of all His creation, and when He got through leveling down a peak over here, raising a peak over yonder, putting a little more curvature in a ridge over here, a little more symmetry in a ridge over yonder, pushing the mountains back to widen a valley over here, pulling them closer together to narrow a valley

over yonder, putting in an extra river over here, a sparkling branch over yonder, and then clothing it in blue grass, giant oaks, and stately poplar, and bedecking it with the dogwood, the redbud, and the rhododendron, He was greatly pleased because there lay before Him, in all its loveliness, His greatest handiwork—your land and my land—southwest Virginia.

Ah, my friends, the Great Architect in shaping and forming Southwest Virginia brought into play all of his unlimited talents. His practicability is reflected in our fertile valleys and long, sloping blue-grass hillsides where the good earth responds to man's every demand; in our wonderful forests, abounding in hard and soft woods of the finest texture; in our inexhaustible limestone deposits; and in our excellent coal seams that produce the finest black diamonds nature has bestowed upon man. His artistic, picturesque imagination is here reflected in a veritable fairyland of streams, all crystal clear, some playing hide and seek as they wend their way through blue-grass pastures and rugged defiles in the mountain ranges, where the mountain bass, the king among the finny tribe, basks in sun-kissed pools or battles the current in rapid shoals; other, high up on the mountains, sparkling and cool, where the speckled trout, shy and elusive, brings into play every strategy known to the angler; of stubbled fields and unkept fence rows, where man's heart gets an extra beat and his being responds to every call of nature as he watches the pointer and setter range in quest of quail; of valleys, narrows, long and winding, furroughed by age, where babbling streams and sweet-throated songbirds compose the orchestra by which the elves at twilight dance and sing; and of peaks, rugged and nature-worn, that rise in majesty and grandeur to within speaking distance of the heavenly throng, and where the angels steal on moonlit nights to get a glimpse of what God can do at His best.

Such, my friends, is our inheritance. Why not enjoy it to the fullest by making its choice spots accessible, not only to our people but to the people of our whole country?

The development of High Knob, which is one of our choicest spots, is an undertaking that, if successfully carried forward to completion, will now and in the future years bring joy and happiness to untold millions.

God has done His part; it is up to us to do ours.

Complete Repeal of Regulation W Is Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading an article which appeared in the business section of the New York Times yesterday, January 15. It was written by Charles Hurd, an able Times correspondent.

The basis for Mr. Hurd's article was a letter addressed to Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, by the Federal Reserve Board, outlining their intentions relative to the continuing of controls on the use of credit by consumers.

I have taken an active interest in the repeal of regulation W because I believe that this regulation and control is detrimental to farmers, veterans, and low-income consumers who must depend on credit to secure many of the necessary good things of life.

The Federal Reserve Board now has advised Congress, through their letter to Representative PHILBIN, that it was planning to manage and control consumer demand through juggling the permissible terms of credit on durable goods.

The Board said it expects to adjust credit terms from time to time under its regulation W—to lessen the influence of credit on business cycles. It further said it realized the principal effect of its present credit terms has been to restrain consumer demand for automobiles, washing machines, and other household accessories.

This is one of the most outrageous pronouncements ever to come from an agency of this Government. The Board confesses it is deliberately attempting to reserve the market in autos and other durables for the rich—for the families with sufficient wealth to make large cash payments. It wants to cut off from the good things of postwar industry, now coming through in ever-increasing quantities, the wage earners, the average veteran, and others who do not have big cash accumulations. These people have good jobs and the capacity to pay out of their earnings, on reasonable installments, for the items they need, just as badly as do the well-to-do group, who have most of the ready cash savings.

The installment buyer, who bought 70 percent of all autos manufactured in recent prewar years, has as much right to a car today as does the cash buyer, whether supplies of autos are limited or not. However, the Board's credit terms, requiring one-third down and payment of the balance in 15 months, act to set the amount of installments at a prohibitively high figure for the average family.

This power of the Board, in effect, predetermines the standard of living of millions of American families.

Moreover, we want no more self-appointed supermen to try to manage and control important phases of our economy from a Washington office. The Board mentions more than six important economic factors which it plans to weigh—including such ponderous intangibles as "the general level of economic activity," "the price level and its movement," and "public holdings of liquid assets," as it omnipotently juggles credit terms, imposes its will and judgment on hundreds of thousands of businessmen, manufacturers, and bankers throughout the country and forces them to exact unreasonable and repressive credit terms from their customers.

The American people voted last November to get the Government out of business, wherever possible, and to terminate restrictive wartime emergency controls at once, because the war is over. Now we see the Federal Reserve Board is planning to hang on stubbornly to consumer-credit controls, hampering industry and using war powers to manipulate normal business in peacetime.

It is high time this interference was ended, and I prophesy and hope that Congress will strip these powers from the Board promptly and completely.

National Industrial Traffic League Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a circular gotten out by the National Industrial Traffic League, Mr. Alonzo Bennett, Memphis, Tenn., president, relative to the coal strike last fall; also a resolution adopted at the thirty-ninth annual meeting of this association, regarding the coal strike. It is as follows:

THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL
TRAFFIC LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C., November 25, 1946.

To Members:

Attached is a copy of the resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the National Industrial Traffic League at New York City, last week, Thursday, November 21, regarding the coal strike which threatens national economic strangulation and the extension of a precedent already set, of usurpation by selfish organized minorities of the power to tax which is the power to destroy. Copy of the resolution was sent immediately to the President of the United States over the signature of President Bennett, with a letter of transmittal reading as follows:

"The Nation is deeply concerned with the problems confronting you by reason of the coal strike. While we hope you can find a solution, the event is but symptomatic of fundamental defects in Federal statutes governing labor organizations and the responsibility for their actions.

"At the thirty-ninth annual meeting of the National Industrial Traffic League, the attached resolution was adopted, with the hope that Congress can be prevailed upon to correct the disease while you are dealing with the symptoms.

"The National Industrial Traffic League is an organization of individuals, firms, and corporations actually engaged in the shipment and receipt of commodities; also commercial, trade, and traffic organizations, dealing with traffic or transportation matters, located in the United States.

"The vast preponderance of our citizenry are hopefully behind you."

Copies of the resolution also have been sent to Members of Congress.

Particular attention is invited to the suggestion in the last paragraph of the resolution that regional and local organizations take similar action.

In response to many inquiries regarding the possibility of a general freight embargo, the latest advice is that there is a possibility none will be issued this week. The railroads, of course, must conserve their available supply of coal, and are hopeful that a freight embargo will not be necessary (should the strike continue) until their supply of coal is down to a 30-day basis.

Passenger-train mileage on coal-burning railroads has been curtailed by 25 percent. General Order ODT 68, effective 11:59 p. m., November 24, prevents rail carriers from operating a total daily coal-burning passenger service locomotive mileage in excess of 75 percent of the total coal-burning passenger service locomotive mileage operated by them on November 1, 1946. The order further prevents the operation of special passenger trains requiring the use of coal-burning loco-

motive power, except by special permit. The order also prohibits the movement of carnival and circus trains.

Respectfully submitted.

E. F. LACEY,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THIRTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRAFFIC LEAGUE, NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 21, 1946, REGARDING THE COAL STRIKE

Whereas the Nation's transportation facilities already are alarmingly curtailed and face complete paralysis in the near future, due to the unprecedented national coal strike; and

Whereas it is our duty and obligation, through the National Industrial Traffic League and other channels of constructive effort, to see that adequate, economical, safe, and efficient transportation by common carrier be made continuously available to the shippers of the Nation; and

Whereas the issues involved in this strike in defiance of our Federal Government would place a single individual and one segment of an organized minority, over and above constitutional and constituted government; would threaten national economic strangulation and the extension of a precedent already set, of usurpation by selfish organized minorities of the power to tax which is the power to destroy; and

Whereas the impact of this strike has directly or indirectly affected the constitutional rights and privileges of all the people of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Industrial Traffic League in general membership meeting here assembled, That as protectors of shippers' interests in adequate, economical, safe, and efficient transportation services by the Nation's common carriers, and, as American citizens who individually are injuriously affected by such strikes of national scope and effect, we do officially and in our individual rights call upon the Congress of the United States at once so to curb the power of any organized selfish minority, that they shall not commit acts which would tend to paralyze the Nation's arteries of commerce, to strangle its national economy, to substitute its prerogatives for those of constitutional and constituted government authorities, to usurp the power to tax which the people have delegated solely to local, State, and Federal Governments, or to vitiate the constitutional rights of the citizenry at large; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded at once to members of both Houses of Congress; to the President of the United States, and to members of the league with suggestion for similar action by their local and regional organizations; and to the press.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp. at the dawn-patrol breakfast sponsored by the Boy Scouts of America, over radio station WJZ, Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York, Wednesday morning, January 8, 1947:

INTRODUCTION BY HON. HARRY J. DELANEY, CHAIRMAN, BUSINESSMEN'S COMMITTEE

Mr. DELANEY. Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, we all know Jim Farley—if I may be permitted to address him publicly in the way that we all affectionately refer to him in our private conversations—as one of the Nation's stalwarts who has valiantly fought to keep America in the path that has made her great.

Likewise, we know that he never loses an opportunity to speak up for those causes which join with the church, the school and the home to work for the protection and betterment of youth. It is for these reasons that we thought he was the very best person whom we could ask to help us launch this million-dollar drive for the expansion of the Boy Scouts of America in Greater New York.

It is with the greatest of personal pleasure, and with keen appreciation of his coming here this morning to address our dawn patrol breakfast, that I present to you the former Postmaster General of the United States—and a friend of youth—the Honorable James A. Farley.

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

I needed a Boy Scout bugler to rouse me out of bed so that I'd be here on time for this dawn patrol breakfast. It is a great tribute to Scouting, and to your interest, that so many of you have come here this morning at this early hour.

There is nothing more worthy of your losing sleep over than a concern for youth, especially for those thousands of New York City boys who should be, but are not, getting the worth-while training and enjoying wholesome activities provided by the Boy Scouts of America.

Raising a million dollars for the furtherance and expansion of Scouting in Greater New York should be relatively easy if you will just pass on to other civic-minded New Yorkers word of the splendid work the Boy Scout movement is doing for the boys of this city, and let them know how imperative it is that adequate funds be provided to enable you to carry on and to reach more boys.

Last Saturday morning, I read in my newspaper where three 16-year-old youths had been surprised while committing a holdup. One of the youthful bandits was killed in the desperate gun battle which ensued, and a detective was wounded. The frequency with which such acts of criminal violence are happening is merely one more evidence of the increasing prevalence of juvenile delinquency which is attributable, in part, to the era of bloodshed from which the world is only now beginning to emerge.

Following every major war, the civilized world has seen such periods, when moral values fall, affecting all, especially children—those innocent victims of the curse of conflict.

In these troubled postwar days, when nations are merely beginning to learn that there is a way and a will to work together for world order and international cooperation, we must intelligently and aggressively combat the effects of the war upon today's youngsters.

To do so will cost only a fraction of the billions which we so willingly poured out of our collective pockets to prosecute the war. But we will not truly win the war and achieve those purposes for which it was fought, unless we treat with and heal those moral and social festerings which had their origins in the conflict.

What a small matter it is then, to ask the good people of this city to reach down into their pockets and give generously so that you who are charged with the moral and character training of thousands and thousands of New York City youngsters outside of their school hours, may do so adequately and successfully.

The Boy Scouts of America is doing a significant job for the youth of our land. Theirs is a great responsibility in these postwar days. The citizens of New York, I am convinced, will rise to the challenge if they are made aware of the need and are given an opportunity to contribute to the correction of the problems.

Recently, I returned from a 3 months trip around this shrinking globe. The plane on which I embarked rose into the skies, and without any effort on my part, I was transported on my modern magic carpet to Portugal, Spain, France, Germany, and Italy. From there I was whisked off to Cairo and the Holy Land, to fabulous but troubled India, and then in turn to Singapore and Shanghai, each with its poverty stricken millions.

I saw devastated Tokyo, learning its A B C's of democracy at the feet of its revered schoolmaster, General MacArthur; shook hands with our Australian friends in Sydney; rejoiced with the men of Manila over their recent liberation; and then home at last after a brief but pleasant stay in Honolulu.

Throughout this globe-encircling flight, I sat physically and mentally at ease, confident that the young men who piloted and navigated these planes were endowed with the knowledge and skill to take me where I wanted to go—swiftly and in safety.

As I observed them, I was convinced that beyond their technical preparation, they were equipped with another more significant training to prepare them to assume the grave responsibility for the lives entrusted to their care, which often required split-second decisions in moments of crisis.

I am certain that most of these top-flight young Americans who navigate the airlanes of the world, in their youth had the benefits of good home guidance; had the spiritual and moral influences of their churches; and had the inspiration of the character-building and citizenship-training program of the Boy Scouts of America.

I wish that every boy had the qualifications that these young men have. And I know one element of their training which is available to every boy where a Scout troop exists. That is the opportunity to be a member of the Boy Scouts of America, and to receive the training given in Scouting.

Unfortunately, not every boy has the opportunity to be a Boy Scout, a Cub Scout, or a Senior Scout. Recent Gallup surveys showed that three out of four New York City boys want to be Scouts, but that only one out of every four is actually getting that coveted opportunity.

The reason for this inability of Scouting to serve all the boys who desire to be Scouts may be very simply stated. It is our failure, yours and mine, as interested citizens to furnish sufficient funds to create and maintain a Scout organization here in New York City which is adequate in personnel and able to provide camps usable the year round, and other facilities in order to serve the hundreds of thousands of boys crowded together in these comparatively few metropolitan miles.

Let us consider for a moment these disturbing facts. Nearly half of the 100,000 persons arrested for serious criminal offenses in New York City this past year were youngsters under 20 years of age, and 75 percent of these youngsters were mere boys.

Visualize, if you will, what those startling statistics mean in misspent young human lives and personalities, and then link to them this significant situation—52 percent of New

York City's teen-agers have no continuing relationship to any leisure-time program.

Scouting, with its activities so appealing to youth, may mean the difference between a boy ending his brief career in a bandit gun battle, or sitting as the confident master of himself and of the destinies of others, at the controls of one of man's most complicated inventions—a globe-circling plane.

Our failure to provide this boy with the training of Scouting may mean for him a life of delinquency and crime, instead of a career that will bring success to him, satisfaction to his family, and progress to the community at large.

Let me call your attention to an even larger aspect of the work in which we are engaged in Scouting. I was handed a letter sent to Richard Ford, one of the Scouts here with us this morning at this dawn-patrol breakfast, and which he recently received from a boy in Germany. I quote from it:

"You will wonder that you get suddenly and unknown a letter from Germany. I got your address by a Scout brother.

"I am a boy of 15 years. My father is a legal adviser and we have lived in a little town in Uecklenbourg. Now we are homeless and we attempt to build us up a new existence. Therefore I am willing gladly in communication to come with a comrade and friend.

"I am here patrol leader and we have just come home from a fine trip with my boys. We was in Vogelsbert—an old volcanic mountain. We have pass the night in a shaky hut. It was a icy cold fog. We have not tents.

"Excuse me, my English language bad is and I have not found the right expressions.

"Your comrade,

"KNUD."

That letter, written by a 15-year-old German youngster, expresses the hunger of boys in that misguided land for the free expression of their youthful desires to practice the skills of Scouting as well as to participate in Scouting's world brotherhood of boys.

Let me read you another letter, addressed to members of Boy Scout Troop 218, of New York City, which recently had sent camping equipment to a Scout troop in Arnheim, Holland, where, you will remember, our Allied air-borne troops battled so magnificently after they had been cut off inside the German lines. This letter acknowledges the gift of the American troop's equipment, and was addressed to their meeting place in the Synagogue Community Center, in Manhattan, which sponsors the troop. I quote:

"As we got the case last week, we were gladly surprised to find all those beautiful equipments we need so bitterly.

"You know how the situation was as we returned to our city. Not only all houses were looted, but we found our Scout homes heavily damaged. Now we are building a new headquarters—an old garage or stable—badly damaged, too. Has now got a new roof and glass windows * * * the only thing we can say now is that it is rainproof. With your nice new axes we can build furniture, as soon as we get some trees.

"But we should not speak about our difficulties; we should say how happy we are with the presents you make us. We are proud of our American tents. As soon as the case was opened we admired the contents and immediately built up the tent.

"I am sorry that I cannot say in English, as I should like to do, how the boys are looking forward with glittering eyes at the new tent standing behind our house.

"We shall never forget the New Yorker Brother Scouts."

What more can I say, or need I say, as to the importance of scouting's international brotherhood of boys—to help bring about friendship and understanding among the youth of the world.

With such friendship and understanding, beginning in childhood and continuing into adult relationships, we can hope for a better world.

My recent globe-girdling trip has brought home forcibly to me that the world has grown closer together geographically, so that one segment of it could reach out with ease and destroy another with the aid of that new-found instrument of destruction, the atom bomb. One sure way to prevent such a catastrophe is to teach brotherhood to our children.

As we launch this drive here this morning to raise a million dollars for Scouting's needs of 1947 in Greater New York, I see the task ahead as of such vital importance to our national and international well-being, that I believe every thoughtful citizen of this community will want to give financial support or personal leadership, or both, to the Boy Scouts of America.

Committee Assignments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

TO THE DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, committee assignments of all parties other than the controlling party are charged to the minority—see volume 8, Cannon's Precedents, section 2184, page 9:

On April 11, 1911, Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama, offered a motion naming the members of the standing committees, when Mr. N. E. Kendall, of Iowa, rising to a parliamentary inquiry, asked if the committee appointment of Mr. Victor L. Berger, of Wisconsin, elected as a member of the Socialist Party, had been charged to the minority, and if his assignment was to be deducted from the minority quota.

Mr. Underwood replied:

"He is charged to the minority. It has always been that way.

"Mr. Berger is not a member of the majority party. He belongs to a party that is not in control in this House, and all parties that are not in control in this House belong to the minority."

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, when our former colleague, Hon. F. H. LaGuardia, of New York, invited me to discuss with him the 20-percent tax-reduction proposal over the Mutual network, I immediately accepted the invitation because it would afford a splendid opportunity to present the plan to the American people in an intimate and informative manner. Then, too, Mr. LaGuardia and I have been personal friends for a matter of 30 years, having come to Congress together back in 1917. While we seldom see eye to eye, that has in no manner interfered with our long-standing friendship.

Under leave so kindly granted me by the House, it is desired at this point to insert in the RECORD what was said by both Mr. LaGuardia and myself upon the occasion of our discussion:

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Good evening! This is the unauthorized spokesman of unorganized Americans again on a Conference of the Air.

I have been opposing the proposed 20-percent across-the-board reduction in Federal personal income tax. I am still strongly opposed to it. But in keeping with my policy of having all the facts presented, so that everyone will get a complete picture and then be able to make an intelligent decision, I will seek to bring to you, as often as I can, the best authority on the opposition.

Tonight we have with us the original sponsor of the 20-percent across-the-board reduction in Federal income tax, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, chairman of the important Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. Mr. KNUTSON and I came to Congress at the same time just 30 years ago. He has served uninterruptedly since that time, and today is the chairman of the most powerful committee of the House of Representatives. I have asked him to explain to you his proposed income-tax reduction and to give you his reasons for it.

Harold, it's nice to have you with us tonight. May I ask, do you consider the present plan of 20-percent income-tax reduction up to $300,000-a-year income, and 10½ percent reduction from $300,000-a-year-up income, fair? And how do you justify it at this time?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am happy to have an opportunity to discuss with my friend and former colleague, the bill (H. R. 1), which I introduced in the present Congress, providing for a reduction in individual income taxes. I recall with pleasure the fact that my friend, Mr. LaGuardia, and myself came to Congress at the same time, just 30 years ago. My bill provides for a 20-percent reduction in the tax on incomes up to and slightly in excess of $300,000. If the taxpayer's income exceeds that amount, the reduction in tax attributable to the part in excess of $300,000 is 10½ percent.

Another feature of the bill is that it gives an added advantage to taxpayers over 65 years of age, in that it allows to each person in that group an additional exemption of $500, making a total exemption of $1,000.

I have been particularly concerned about the plight of many of our citizens over 65 years of age. A great many of them, including retired teachers, municipal workers, and many others, have as their sole source of livelihood the small pension which they receive on retirement, and are unable to engage further in a gainful occupation. Under my bill, with the increased $500 personal exemption, almost 2,000,000 taxpayers in this group will be removed from the tax rolls.

The bill, in granting a 20-percent reduction in tax on incomes up to and slightly in excess of $300,000, recognizes the need for granting the greatest relief to those who furnish risk or venture capital for new enterprises, to the worker, to the earner, and to those who utilize their income in creating production, the development of new enterprises, and the creation of employment. In general, incomes above $300,000 are unearned. Our present individual war income taxes are so oppressive and burdensome at this time, that they are stifling and retarding incentive, production, and employment. During the war period there was ample justification for these high rates but, now that the war is over, it is essential that these tax obstacles be immediately removed, so that we may

have full production and employment in our peacetime economy.

My bill does not go as far as I would like in accomplishing these objectives, and further reductions will have to be made in later years. However, in view of the high governmental expenditures and magnitude of the public debt, I believe that the reductions provided for in H. R. 1 are as great as we can justify at this time. My friend must realize that so long as Government revenues continue at the present high level, it will be difficult to reduce governmental expenditures below governmental receipts. One way to reduce governmental expenditures is to give the people relief from the excessive tax burden, so that there will not be as much revenue left for wasteful and extravagant spending.

I recall that when my colleague was in Congress, back in 1924, there was considerable debate about the Mellon plan, with a top surtax rate around 25 percent. The Congress, in the Revenue Act of 1924, finally adopted a top rate of 40 percent. I believe that my former colleague favored the 40 percent rate in preference to the 25 percent rate. Under my bill, the top surtax rate is 74.8 percent. I do not see how those who supported a 40 percent top surtax rate in 1924, because they believed in high surtaxes, can complain about the top rate of 74.8 percent under my bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That's right, I don't. But, as a matter of fact, HAROLD, a family of four—man, wife, and two children—with an income of $3,000, would get but one-point tax rate reduction, while a like family, with an income of $90,000 a year, would get a twelve-point tax rate reduction under your plan. Do you think that's fair?

Mr. KNUTSON. My good friend states that under my bill, a family with four dependents, with an income of $3,000, would get but one-point tax reduction, while a like family, with an income of $90,000, would get a twelve-point tax reduction. He inquires whether I think that is fair? I believe that Mr. LaGuardia is a litle confused about the Federal income tax, which has been drastically revised since he was in Congress. When my former colleague was in the House, we allowed a credit for each dependent of $400. At the present time the credit for dependents has been increased to $500. Therefore, a family with four dependents would have total credits amounting to $2,000—$500 for the husband, $500 for the wife, and $500 for each dependent. It is true that the tax reduction, which my bill provides, depends upon the amount of the tax paid by the taxpayer. My plan is not a novel or new one. It has been employed many times in the past, both by the Federal Government and the States. In the Revenue Act of 1924, Congress reduced individual income taxes for the year 1923 by a flat reduction of 25 percent.

In the First Revenue Act of 1940, when the Government was in need of immediate revenue for defense purposes, individual income taxes were increased by a flat 10 percent of the individual tax payable under the existing law. Many of the States have reduced income taxes by straight across-the-board methods, and I've heard no complaints from the taxpayers getting such relief. In fact, the gentleman's own State of New York cut individual income taxes for 1941, '42, '43, and '44 by a flat 25 percent and for 1945 by a flat 50 percent. Surely, my friend does not wish to deny to the whole country the benefits which his own State has granted to the citizens of New York. If our Federal revenues would permit, I would be only too glad to follow the great State of New York ih proposing a reduction as large as 50 percent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Now, what would be the objection, Harold, instead of providing a reduction of taxes across the board, as you state, to lifting the exemptions? The present exemptions now are $500 for the taxpayer and each dependent. How about making it $2,000 for a man and wife and $600 for each child? That would bring an equal relief to all. You know the cost of living is pretty high now, and it's very difficult for the lower-income groups to get along. Even Senator TAFT admits that. A $3,000 family now pays $137 income tax under the present law, and would pay $169 a year income tax under your plan. By lifting the exemptions it would not pay any income tax.

Mr. KNUTSON. My friend offers as a substitute proposal for my bill a plan to increase the exemptions so that the new law would provide a $2,000 exemption for a man and wife and $600 for each child. I do not believe that he realizes the result of such a proposal. At the present time it is estimated there are approximately 45,000,000 taxpayers on the tax rolls. This is in addition to the 12,000,000 taxpayers who were removed from the tax rolls by the Revenue Act of 1945.

Mr. LaGuardia's proposal would remove an additional 20,000,000 taxpayers from our tax rolls, and would almost double the loss in revenue over that provided for under my bill. The mayor's plan would result in a revenue loss of approximately $6,000,000,000. It would leave us little, if any, surplus to apply toward a reduction in the national debt or relief from war-excise-tax burdens.

I believe it is essential, in order to secure a permanent check on the wasteful and extravagant governmental expenditures, to have the taxpayer realize that he is actually paying for such expenditures out of his own pocket, in the form of the direct tax, like income tax. It seems important, therefore, that we should keep as many taxpayers as possible on the tax roll during their production period, in order that they may realize that they are the people who must pay the Government's bills. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish. Let us provide for a tax reduction bill which will stimulate the whole country to full production and employment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Thank you, HAROLD.

I know we are all grateful to Representative HAROLD KNUTSON for being with us, and stating his case so well and frankly. Now, this is in keeping with my policy in giving both sides of every question. I will continue to explain to you my opposition to the 20-percent across-the-board income-tax reduction. And at every opportunity, when I take a decisive stand on any important issue, I will try to get before you the very best authority on the opposition. Giving both sides, that's the American way. Then we can make our decision intelligently and on the merits.

Limiting Federal Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we often hear that there is some danger of a recession within the next few months. On every hand we are told that only increased production and sustained buying will prevent this predicated recession.

Congress can take action to eliminate some of the credit regulations which prevent millions of people in low-income groups from buying the refrigerators, stoves, cars and other items and goods for which they cannot pay cash on the line. Regulation W, which was issued by and is administered by the Federal Reserve Board, discriminates against the lower-income groups in favor of the more fortunate individuals who can pay cash for everything they buy.

I expect to introduce a bill which will provide for the full elimination of regulation W. In order to more fully explain my position on this measure, I am including in my remarks a résumé of a speech which I made in New York City on October 18 before a large group interested in consumer credit:

The subject I am going to talk about, Federal controls, is so important and the situation so critical that I felt it my personal duty to fly to New York to talk to you, in a serious manner, concerning the imminent dangers to our American democracy, brought on by the present and threatened unnecessary Government controls, regulations, and regimentation.

What I will have to say here today needs repeating over and over again until our American Government has reassumed its traditional and constitutional place in our society and complicated economic life.

These days I would feel that I had been negligent in my duty as an American citizen and as a Member of Congress if I did not devote most of my speaking time to the discussion of the threat of bureaucracy and Government controls to our constitutional method of government.

VIEWS CHANGED

As a young secretary to a new Member of Congress 12 years ago, I had somewhat different views. I thought that there was a need for Government control and direction. At that time I thought that the Government should step in to help solve our economic and business problems. There were many in the Government who were thinking the same as I. Furthermore, this line of reasoning continued, and through the years down to the present, increasing numbers of men and women in Government service became more and more saturated with the philosophy that the Government should get more and more into business; should more and more regulate and control the daily life of men and women in this big and great country of ours.

If I had been asked to speak to you 12 years ago my remarks would have been quite different. But time and experience have done their work, and so I am here to talk to you in support of the view that we must have less Government control.

As a Member of Congress for the last 4 years, I receive letters almost every day from businessmen and farmers who complain that they are being threatened and coerced by petty governmental officials for unintentional violations of foolish, and many times unnecessary, and often detrimental, rules and regulations.

My own experience in handling thousands of problems for the 300,000 people of my congressional district of northwestern Minnesota has convinced me that we have had far too much unnecessary meddling, interference, and regulation on American business, large and small, and on our average citizen as well.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL

I just want to give you a few examples of the unreasonable, wild, senseless regulation of small business as practiced by the present-day crop of planners, dreamers, and good-doers, whom we know as bureaucrats.

However, first let me give you a general example. You have often wondered why Alaska, a Territory of vast resources and wealth, hasn't developed.

Alaska's resources are almost limitless. It has large coal deposits. It has immense timber and mineral resources, but Government regulations hold back their development.

A more specific example concerns the American motorcar industry. Last November the Ford Motor Co. was authorized by OPA to sell for $728—a car which cost Ford, without profit or "anything to go on," as Henry Ford II put it, $1,041. The OPA never denied the cost figures, yet they were willing to destroy the Ford Motor Co. by their actions. Public pressure and higher administration officials finally, and much later, brought out a readjustment in OPA prices.

That is an example of a Government control agency ready, able, and willing to destroy a great American business corporation.

Now I want to give you the details of how a class B bureaucrat is all set to destroy a small business in northwestern Minnesota. Here are the facts:

Just last week I received a letter from a businessman in northwestern Minnesota who owns two small stores and also a locker plant in the country just a few miles from one of his stores. He was fined by the Office of Price Administration because he did his book work for both establishments at his main office contrary to a regulation set up by the OPA. This rule required that his books be kept at each place of business. An injunction was served on him, a small-business owner, and he was threatened with aditional costs if he did not pay his fine, without protest. And this in America.

You may say, why that's just an isolated case. Oh, no, it isn't. I know, from my talks with other Members of Congress, that similar unjustified threats to small business have been made by OPA and other agencies of our Government.

But here is another case: A meat market owner in a small town in my district received the following letter from the enforcement officer of the district office of Price Administration of Fargo, N. Dak.:

"During the month of May your cattle quota was 5,530 pounds but you slaughtered 5,540 pounds, thereby exceeding your quota in the amount of 10 pounds. This excess slaughter must be deducted from your next month's quota.

"Therefore, I must admonish you that you must adhere to strict compliance to this order and any order or regulation as issued by the Office of Price Administration for failure to do so will subject you to any of several penalties available to this Office and it could be that your slaughter permit would be revoked."

So aroused was this local businessman that he showed the letter to the newspaper editor of his community. The editor wrote a front page editorial of two columns pointing out that the case was a typical example of the Gestapo tactics of the so-called legal brains of the OPA.

American business, large and small, is being strangled, harassed, and smothered by the thousands of inexperienced emergency Government workers trying to administer the millions of rules and regulations set forth by the class A group of dreamers, planners, and good-doers; those big shots of each department, division, commission, or bureau, who work out the fantastic "patterns" to control our daily lives.

The threat of the destruction of private enterprise, both large and small, in this country, is increasingly real and serious.

We are happy today to know that leaders of business, agriculture, consumer, and labor groups now recognize it and are beginning to warn you and the American people of the danger.

WARNING SIGNALS

Please allow me to quote to you just a few of these warning signals of recent weeks. Just last Monday, October 14, you perhaps read this in your daily newspaper:

"Warning that our whole American system is in danger, the National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades declared Sunday that officials seek to subject the Nation's food distribution to a worldwide totalitarian system.

"The association released a letter to Chairman FLANNAGAN (Democrat, Virginia), of the House Agriculture Committee, urging his group to study what it called this grave threat aimed at collectivization of agriculture on the Soviet model."

Only yesterday an important voice of education, Dr. Donald J. Cowling, of the Mayo Foundation of the University of Minnesota, was quoted in the Nation's newspapers as saying, "Too much government, regardless of the theory on which it is based, is mankind's worst foe."

Just last Tuesday, October 15, I read the following news report in a Minnesota daily:

"Government ownership of the transportation industry would open the door for the socialization of our entire economy, Donald D. Conn, executive vice president of the Transportation Association of America, said Monday.

"Addressing more than 1,000 business leaders at the eighteenth annual Boston conference on distribution, Conn said, 'Present policies and principles of regulation will inevitably lead to Government ownership of this industry'."

On October 9, Minnesota newspaper readers saw this in a Minneapolis newspaper: "Management landed a series of damaging body punches in its fight against bureaucratic controls at the Minnesota industrial conference at the Radisson Hotel, Tuesday.

"Robert R. Wason, New York, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, charged that controls, which he said have made industry impotent, are charting the course for the country's next depression.

"'Left alone,' he asserted, 'free enterprise could lift the American standard of living to its highest level in history'."

LABOR'S VIEWS

I just quoted a representative of big business. So I want to report to you now the thoughts of a labor leader, William Green, and his great union organization, the American Federation of Labor. I will read from my home town daily on October 15: "The American Federation of Labor today called on the administration to remove immediately all wage and price controls except on rents. The convention gave its formal approval to an earlier recommendation from A. F. of L. President William Green."

Only last week at Chicago another labor group, the A. F. of L. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen's Union, charged that Government controls caused unemployment and black markets. They closed with this stinging statement:

"We doubt seriously whether the dictatorship that exists in Russia can interfere with the rights of its people to a greater extent than do these would-be dictators who head the OPA."

So we see that labor and management alike and other groups as well, and also millions of Americans, demand a limiting of Government controls.

HOUSING

Almost everyone is aware of the dismal and tragic failure of the Federal Housing Administration's attempt to build houses and homes for veterans. Late in August a gloomy picture of the present and future housing situation was painted as a result of the survey made by the National Association of Real Estate Boards among American builders.

Almost half of the 700 builders reporting declared that Government red tape was a major bottleneck, and many blamed this for material shortages. I want to give you some examples of the comments:

"We represent five builders who are ready, willing and able to produce 500 housing units within the next 12 months. However, Government red tape is responsible for their failure to produce. Home building is at a standstill in this area."

"Too many forms that mean nothing—no head, no tail. Changing of procedure, inability of Government agencies to interpret their own directives."

"Government controls, restrictions and changing policies have completely discouraged us from building more homes for sale or rent. If Government would stop regulations and restrictions on home construction, we feel that marked improvements would result in both quality and quantity."

The Government has in recent years developed controls in the field of labor relations and all phases of industry and business.

REGULATION W

As you all know here, it even started to tell the merchant that he couldn't give credit to his old customers, friends, or neighbors.

The notorious regulation W was issued by the Federal Reserve Board. You are familiar with it.

However, I want to point out again how this Federal interference with trade and business brings great harm and hardship to millions of low-income Americans.

Regulation W unfairly restricts the needs of veterans. On the one hand, the Federal Government expands credit facilities and credit terms for the purchase of houses (as well as businesses and farms); and, on the other, restricts the veteran in acquiring the appliances and furnishings to make the house a home.

Regulation W is discriminatory in that it favors the cash purchaser over the less wealthy buyer who must pay out of income.

The study of incomes recently released by the Federal Reserve Board shows that 70 percent of all Americans have little or no savings.

The important lesson to be learned from this comprehensive survey is that all our social experiments have not greatly changed the pattern in which national income is distributed.

The alarming part of the picture, shown by the report, is that, with 70 percent of all families having little or no liquid savings, we are as vulnerable to depression as we were in 1929. A short set-back in employment would eat up the small savings of most of these families in a week or less. The inflationary dangers of worker incomes has been dissipated the first year since VJ-day. We must now guard against deflation and depression.

After World War I, when radios sold for $300 to $400, refrigerators for $500, and automobiles for $2,000, manufacturers said, "The only way we can get the selling price down is mass distribution." Distributors said, "The only way we can sell in mass volume is by giving buyers long-term installment credit."

They didn't prove to be wrong, did they? The history of what happened is as plain as the A B C's.

Today, in 1946, with a far bigger problem of employment and prosperity, we must sell half again as much in unit volume of consumers' durable goods as in the prewar days, or live through another great depression.

We are now running into a situation where we are going to have enormous production, with a possible cut in domestic markets as the result of Government controls on consumer credit. There is no point in mass production unless these things can be put into the hands of the people and it is simply impossible to have mass purchases when the law or regulation W requires stiff down payments with quick and full payment of the balance. Unless regulation W is permanently abolished we face trouble ahead. If regulation W is terminated we can be headed for a tremendous period of credit and of general prosperity, for the two go hand in hand.

Incidentally, I might say that if I am reelected, I am going to introduce a bill which will prevent the Federal Reserve Board from continuing regulation W. In that connection I ask your cooperation and your help in your home areas throughout the country. Contact your own Congressmen, your own Senators, for their interest and support for such a measure.

WRONG PHILOSOPHY

I could go on and offer much more evidence against the philosophy of Government controls. Giving Government bureaus or departments power to unnecessarily regulate the lives of our citizens gives only temporary advantages to the people of the country, but this eventually will be more than offset by the damage done to our free and constitutional system of representative government. It is time for all of the businessmen, workers, and farmers of this country to reassert themselves and to exhibit again the same spirit of independence which has made the United States the greatest country on earth.

I went to Europe last fall for 2 months. I spent some time in beautiful Norway. I receive letters from Norway every week, and the big trouble they write about is that they are worried about government control and government regulations. If anything is going to keep Norway back, it will be government interference and government controls.

After going through all of Europe, I find that we have the greatest country in the world and that is the way we want to keep it.

PROPER CONTROL

When I speak of freedom from Government regulation, I do not mean that we should return to the days when big business was running wild and exploiting the natural resources and the common people of this country. Neither does the enlightened businessman of today want this. I believe that Government should assume the responsibility of protecting legitimate business and the people against unfair business practices and unscrupulous individuals. We welcome this type of Government control, just as we welcome community police protection. However, there is a difference between a police department and a politically inspired gestapo.

We rightfully resent Government action based on the assumption that the average businessman and farmer is dishonest and has to be watched.

If some of the "brain trusters" in a few of our alphabetical agencies and other departments have their way, our Government will soon be completely socialized from within, and the people will have had no chance to vote on it one way or another.

DANGER AHEAD

I am not an alarmist; nor do I exaggerate when I warn you of the dangers confronting our democracy. The piecemeal evidence is before you every day when you read your daily papers or your news magazines. As good Americans, it is your duty to stand ever vigilant and alert to the danger.

Federal agencies die slowly. They grow quickly. There is a traditionally stubborn resistance to the business of dismantling them. Emergency departments born of war have a way of perpetuating themselves in peace far beyond the point of need or reason.

While few persons believe that we shall ever squeeze our Federal bureaucracy back into its prewar mold, it is obvious that a tremendous job of reorganization and retrenchment remains to be done. Duplicating functions need to be eliminated, consolidations made, emergency agencies trimmed away, and surplus manpower eased firmly off the pay rolls, and unnecessary control agencies discontinued.

Yes; America is in danger. We have come to the crossroads and we must make our choice. Time is so important. Do we prefer to solve our national and international problems under a free society or in a society where a man is merely the creature of the state?

So I hear you say, "Yes; we now know about the situation. What can we do about it?"

ACTION NECESSARY

Just this, my friends: many millions of Americans are not awake. They are not as yet aware of the danger. That is where you come into the picture.

Each and every one of us, no matter what station in life we may hold, must tell our friends and neighbors time and time again that to want true democracy is not enough. We must do something about it before the wave of Federal controls and bureaucracy engulfs us all.

Let us gird ourselves with the determination that those basic freedoms and spiritual ideals for which so many have sacrificed so much shall not be destroyed from within.

We must all be crusaders in the great cause of liberty so that our children and our coming generation will be able to hold their heads high and breathe the clean air of a true democracy.

I thank you and your splendid organization for the opportunity to come to New York to help you in the crusade and battle to save America. What are you going to do about it?

Problems and Possibilities of Domestic Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of domestic shipping problems and possibilities, I include therein abstracts from a series of articles appearing in the October, November, and December, 1946, issues of the Log of America's Maritime Industries, which are as follows:

DOMESTIC SHIPPING PROBLEMS AND POSSIBILITIES: AN ANALYSIS OF THE COASTWISE AND INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING INDUSTRY, PRESENTING ITS PREWAR PLIGHT, ITS PRESENT PROBLEMS, AND THE OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

In order to compete in the postwar world, the water carrier must turn its attention toward speed—speed of the vessel and speed of loading and discharging operations. The tremendous increase in labor costs is one of the things which makes this necessary. The narrowing differential between water and rail rates, and the widening differential between water and rail speed, is another. And thirdly, the vital necessity which is intertwined throughout any consideration of water-borne commerce—the interests of national defense which require fast ships fitted with the most efficient mechanical equipment.

If the domestic ship lines are forced to accept unsuitable war-built tonnage because the cost is made low enough for them to be able to purchase the needed vessels, much harm will be done to the industry and the national interests. What the industry needs most desperately is new ships, designed and constructed specifically for the trade in which they are to engage and having the most profitable tonnage capacity, new and efficient cargo-handling equipment, and propulsion machinery which will provide the necessary speed. With vessels of this type the industry can successfully compete against the other forms of transportation, provide the Nation with fast vessels of varying types which will be able to perform the manifold functions required of ships in time of war, serve the economy of the Nation by keeping our shipyards alive with the all-important "know how," and provide an incentive to discovery and employment of new designs and methods.

CURRENT CARGO-HANDLING EXPENSES

The current expenses of cargo handling are staggering and prohibitive to any successful intercoastal and coastwise ship operation until labor becomes productive. At the present time labor is continually slowing down operations as well as calling costly strikes. Cargo which normally should move at the rate of 14 tons per hour is often deliberately slowed to 3 or 4 tons per hour, despite substantial wage increases having already been granted. Before any solution to the problem of ship operation can be worked out, labor must recognize its responsibilities and do the work for which it is being paid—and paid well. No one is denying labor the right to strike, but it should be denied the right to slow down deliberately from 14 to 4 tons per hour while it is supposedly working. The success or failure of our entire national shipping program can easily rise or fall according to the attitude of the labor which is loading our ships.

With the cooperation of labor the industry can settle down to the business of improving cargo-handling methods and load more ships in less time, at less cost and greater revenue, and thus be in a position not only to operate, but to improve the conditions of labor.

To increase the efficiency of cargo handling will, in some cases, require new ships embodying construction features adapted to the particular trade in which the vessel is to be engaged. There is, however, much room for improvement in the loading of conventional types of ships which are now sailing. Some of these new methods are in actual use and are proving very successful. More effort must be spent by industry and Government to find short cuts in loading which will speed operations.

These necessary changes will have to be made largely by the individual companies with an eye to their particular types of trade, distances, etc.—but they must be made. There will be many objections from labor and from other sources, but if ships are to compete with rails in the postwar era they must face the facts. One company which experimented with the container system of moving cargo prior to the war discovered that it reduced the cost of loading by more than half. It is just such drastic reductions through improvement of methods which are needed if domestic shipping is to succeed.

PRESENT RATE STRUCTURE

All domestic transportation by water has to compete with rail transportation, but not all rail transportation has to compete with water transportation. It is this fact which has enabled the railroads to depress rates wherever they meet water competition, without the necessity of depleting their total revenues. In many instances, particularly in competition with the coastwise trades, the railroads have established substantially lower rates for long haul in competition with water carriers, while maintaining much higher rates for the shorter haul over a part of the same route where no water competition exists.

During the past year substantial increases have been authorized for rail rates in the proceedings *Ex parte No. 162*, following hearings held in Washington, scarcely a month after the railroads first filed their petitions, and probably additional increases will soon be forthcoming as a result of more extensive hearings held in various parts of the country. Meantime, proceedings to aid the water carriers, requested in *Ex parte No. 164* before the railroads filed their request, have encountered protracted delays and little relief is in prospect for the immediate future while the greatest transportation volume in the Nation's peacetime history results in critical shortages of railroad equipment and threatens to disrupt orderly reconversion programs.

RAILROADS FIGHT WATER CARRIERS

The railroads make no secret of the fact that they have made rates against the water carriers. In their recent proceeding before the ICC for a 25-percent increase in rates, they have specifically asked for much smaller increases on the particular commodities which form the bulk of the intercoastal trade, west-bound iron and steel and east-bound lumber. Witnesses in that proceeding, including high officials of the railroads, have testified that it is their purpose in making these exceptions to deprive water carriers of the business.

The policies of other governmental departments have afforded little prospect for cooperative efforts for the water carriers' restoration. The attitude of the Department of Agriculture has seemed unreasonable when it opposes drastically needed rate increases and goes so far as to state, as it did in the citrus fruit rates from Florida to north Atlantic points, that it objects to any rail increases necessary to permit restoration of coastwise water service.

Such an attitude on the part of a major agency of the Federal Government is certainly ill-advised and short-sighted for, if rates should be kept so low as to preclude profitable operation by the water carriers, the consequent loss of water service would surely result in ultimate increases in rail rates and a disadvantage to the public.

Further obstacles to recovery are APA pricing methods developed during the war when there was no domestic water transportation industry off-shore. Examples are price ceilings which are based on f. o. b. plant prices, plus the cost of transportation, which offer the shippers no incentive to employ cheap transportation methods and ceilings which allow sellers to compute percentage of mark-ups on factory cost plus transportation charges to delivery points. Such ceilings actually put a premium upon high-cost means of transportation.

VOLUME OF TRAFFIC

The indicated volume of traffic in the postwar era is heartening for the industry. However, any determination of the amount of goods which will be transported by ship necessarily depends upon many of the other factors which have already been mentioned.

The Port of New York Authority in its survey discovered, through a sample check of shippers known to have used coastwise services in 1939, that almost all who expressed their views were interested in the early resumption of the service. Those able to give quantitative comparisons between actual tonnage shipped in 1939 and estimated tonnage to be shipped in 1946 anticipated an increase of 30 percent.

It seems reasonable that in the next few years there will be a considerable amount of freight moving by water because of the war depletion of goods throughout the country. That is, this freight will move by water if a sensible rate structure is established which will permit the water carriers to compete, if labor cooperates, and if the operators succeed in putting new methods of cargo handling into service. There will be goods to move, but upon these factors depends the all important question of who will move them.

In the past the volume of ship traffic in the domestic trades has very closely followed the index of industrial production. What improvement in ships and facilities will largely accomplish is to prevent declines in shipping when such declines occur in the industrial production. When production falls off, industries are naturally seeking to economize, and if ships can offer them good service at low cost much of the freight may be diverted from the railroads. This will permit the water carriers to keep all of their ships in operation rather than lay them up during temporary slumps in industrial production.

WHAT MUST BE DONE TO REESTABLISH DOMESTIC SHIPPING

The necessity for reestablishing our domestic shipping system and improving it has been evidenced. But how can this be accomplished and still keep the operation within the classification of private industry? Many solutions to the problem have been offered—some of them good, some of them bad, none of them perfect. Yet somewhere there does lie a solution and it should be one of the primary aims of the industry, Government, and the people of the United States to discover the working formula which will produce and maintain a strong domestic merchant marine.

There must be some Government program to replace vessels which it commandeered in the interest of national defense—nearly all of which have been sunk or so radically altered for military purposes that it is impractical to reconvert them. The Government paid for these vessels, but they were paid for on the basis of their depreciated value, which was approximately 25 to 50 percent of their original cost. As has been pointed out in this article, the original cost of most of these ships was $40.18 per deadweight ton, and to replace them today would cost well over $250 per deadweight ton. The cash settlement made by the Government is wholly inadequate. Yet if the shipping companies had those vessels today, regardless of their age, they would have ships to put into service and they would have ships designed for the trade.

It has not been the policy of the United States to burden any one group of people with the cost of the war. In every industry affected by the demands of war there has been ample compensation. Then why should not the Government make just settlement with the shipping companies by replacing ships with ships?

It is not considered desirable to have the Government operate our domestic merchant marine. Nor would it be wise to risk Government capital without an equal risk of private capital. Private capital is ready to assume the risks, but it must have fair payment for losses in physical assets and such payments should be based upon the cost of replacing those assets today. In a fair settlement, payment should be made on the basis of present cost per dead-weight ton minus the depreciation for age. This would result in only fair payment but would be appreciably greater than settlements made on the basis of original cost minus depreciation. After all, it is through no fault of the ship operators that the cost of shipbuilding has risen from $40.18 per ton to over $250 per ton.

GOVERNMENT KILLED DOMESTIC SHIPPING

This one fact stands out—the Government completely annihilated the domestic shipping industry in the interests of national defense. What happened to its competitors? The railroads and trucking companies, rather than being destroyed or even curtailed, were swollen with Government business as well as the traffic diverted from the absent water carriers. Therefore, in fair treatment, the shipping industry deserves Government aid in reestablishing itself.

Just how this Government aid should be administered is a matter for experts. It should not result in Government participation in the operation of vessels or great risk of Government capital. Adequate payment for vessels requisitioned would be one step toward establishing the service. A construction differential based upon the difference between what it would have cost the companies to replace the vessels at the prewar costs prevailing at the time they were requisitioned and the present construction costs would be a practical method of aid. Financial help through interest-free loans would be worthy of consideration in light of the fact that each ship is equally important as a national defense unit as it is for commercial purposes.

There are many ways in which the Government can help the industry reestablish itself without great risk of public funds. One plan which merited much discussion was the income-debenture plan, but this resulted in Government participation and a risk of capital which was not desirable. As an alternative to this plan, it was argued that the Government should lower the prices on its war-built ships to such an extent that it would be feasible for an operator to run them on a sound financial basis. This seems a sensible plan—basing the cost of the ship on its earning power rather than its prewar cost—and would make ships available to those who could utilize the types to be had from the surplus fleet.

However, in the case of coastwise companies which could never operate the available vessels economically and efficiently, the Government should not force them to buy these unsuitable ships because of their low price but should evolve a plan to construct new ships designed for the special needs of the trade. Otherwise the industry will be back in its hopeless plight of prewar days.

REVISION OF RATE STRUCTURE

Any program to replace ships will be worthless unless those vessels have some reasonable assurance of earning a profit. Government regulation of transportation has been here for a long time and is here to stay. The need for this regulation is readily evident for the protection of the public interest. But a program of Government regulation which favors one system of transportation to the exclusion of another cannot be construed as being in the best interests of the public.

To cite the need for an upward revision in the steamship rate structure, here are some facts and figures presented by John E. Cushing, president, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., in an address given before the San Francisco Foreign Trade Association.

Mr. Cushing said: "In 1939 the ship wage and overtime bill for an intercoastal round trip was about $14,000. Today it is $27,000. Prewar the ship's complement fed for 80 cents per man per day. Now the figure is $1.37. On the cargo side for almost identical commodity make-ups a ton of cargo handled in and out in 1939 for an average of $3.12. In 1946 the same operation is costing about $6.03. Thanks to the skill of the Maritime Commission designers, the fuel bill is proportionately less in percentage increase despite the much higher speed. It has risen only 50 percent with oil prices some 70 percent higher than prewar.

"Over-all, excluding repairs, insurance, and overhead, on which conditions do not now permit a fair comparison, a normal round voyage would run in 1939 at about $85,000. Today it involves the expenditure of $150,000 plus, and sometimes a pretty big plus. Neither figure carries any allowance for capi-

tal charges and both are based on the same totals for cargo tonnage handled."

The Interstate Commerce Commission is the body established by the Congress to exercise control over transportation. It was created especially to see that the people of the United States were offered a means of travel and shipment at reasonable rates and were assured of efficient services. As there is no doubt as to the vital necessity to the people of an active and profitable merchant marine, the burden is incumbent upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to see that an adequate rate structure is evolved which will allow maximum development of both rail and water carriers. This can be done and the ICC has the power to do it.

If the ICC, keeping in mind that since the passage of the Transportation Act of 1940 it is bound to give impartial treatment to both water and rail carriers, overhauls the rate structure and eliminates everything that discriminates against one in favor of the other—which means almost entirely the railroad rates discriminating against the water carriers—our ships can be run at a reasonable profit which will allow systematic replacement of vessels. Such a revision of rate structure will directly benefit the people. The Nation can maintain a strong merchant marine to serve both its transportation and defense needs without the burden of taxes.

The ICC has instituted hearings and studies on this situation and if it acts promptly and fairly the entire Nation will be benefited. If it does not, there will exist a deplorable situation brought about through the actions of a body created expressly to serve the public.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF INDUSTRY

No action or policy of Government alone is going to solve all of the problems of the merchant marine. Industry must take the lead with initiative and foresight. It must make every effort to operate efficiently, discover new methods of reducing costs and time, redouble its efforts to secure cargoes, stand up and fight as a unit for its rights, and invest its own capital in improvements.

There is nothing inherent in shipping which prevents making a profit. Profit does depend upon a normal rate of production throughout the country, and like any other industry, it prospers in good times and suffers in poor. But efficient management can make a profit if the Government plays the role to which it is committed.

Experimentation will uncover new economies in time and expense. Some companies are already using new methods of handling cargo which are proving successful. Completely new types of carriers such as the trailer-ships are being put into operation. Studies are being made to develop new types of shipboard cranes for loading holds. If these attempts to improve the efficiency of loading operations are not immediately successful, the industry should be patient and come forth with its own ideas of how the expensive job of loading and discharging cargo at less cost and greater efficiency can be accomplished.

Postwar ships are fast and economical to operate. If the industry can put such ships into operation, keep them loaded and on the move, and provide regularly for their replacement, it will be making its contribution to the national welfare, defense, and transportation economy.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF LABOR

There is little that can be said here about labor which has not already been said. However, we can reiterate the obvious fact—which seemingly at present is ignored—that labor has a tremendous stake in industry. Labor alone cannot make the domestic shipping industry, but it can break it. Nor can management or Government alone succeed. There must be cooperation among management, Government and labor before we can hope to see our merchant marine prosper.

If labor can see the light—realize that unless it produces more profits through efficient employment of its own power and talents it can not expect to gain in the long run—we have the foundation for a prosperity which the shipping industry has not known for a long time. On the other hand, if labor continues its disruptive tactics, insists on delaying ships over petty squabbles, deliberately slows down the work, and makes impossible demands for wages and working conditions, management will not be able to succeed and consequently there will be no outlet for labor's resources. Labor has a right to share in the profits, but it also has the responsibility of helping to establish those profits. Once this fact has become a part of labor's basic philosophy the industry will proceed on a sound basis.

CONCLUSIONS

In this article we have outlined the condition of the domestic shipping industry prior to the war, sought to establish the causes of its tottering financial position, analyzed the problems now facing the industry, and projected some ideas on how to rectify bad conditions, solve some of the problems, and establish a prosperous postwar domestic merchant marine. In summation, then, we list some of the basic things which must be done to achieve this end:

1. Government must evolve a program of aid to ship operators to replace requisitioned vessels and reestablish the services disrupted by the war.

2. The Interstate Commerce Commission must overhaul the transportation rate structure to eliminate discrimination and allow water carriers to participate on an equal basis with other systems of transportation.

3. Industry must take the lead in initiating new methods which will improve efficiency and must employ private capital to a maximum.

4. Labor must recognize its responsibilities and cooperate with management and Government to establish an adequate and efficient domestic merchant marine. Noncooperation will eliminate the demands for its own services.

If all of these things are done with sincere effort, everyone is not automatically assured of a profit, but everyone is assured of the opportunity to compete for profits which are there for the taker. Although attainment of these objectives does not assure success, failure to attain them does assure defeat.

Portal-to-Portal Suits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement on portal-to-portal pay made by Mr. John P. Frey, president of the metal trades department of the A. F. of L. The statement is as follows:

SUITS FOR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY VIOLATE A BASIC PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(By John P. Frey, president, metal trades department, A. F. of L.)

In reaching a decision on the question of suing employers for so-called portal-to-portal back wages, the executive council of the metal trades department, A. F. of L., has been governed by one basic consideration—its faith and loyalty to collective bargaining with employers.

It is through collective bargaining that our trade unions, in negotiations with employers around the conference table, are able to reach acceptable agreements covering the terms of employment and the conditions of labor.

Without such mutual agreements there could be no satisfactory or stabilizing industrial relations, chaos would exist. The value of collective industrial agreements to both labor and management is similar to government by law through the peoples' duly elected representatives; in fact, and not in theory, it is self-government by labor and management.

When labor and management enter into negotiated agreements, the integrity of both are involved. Unless such agreements can be depended upon by both parties, collective bargaining cannot be successfully continued.

The international unions who comprise the metal trades department, A. F. of L., have practiced collective bargaining with employers from the beginning. It has been their definite policy to strengthen collective bargaining in every way possible, to benefit their membership, and to retain the employers' confidence in this method of regulating industrial relationships.

Throughout the Nation, the international unions have negotiated many thousands of these agreements with employers in the metal-working industries, which are now in effect. When these agreements were negotiated there was a free, open and aboveboard presentation of all the conditions which the unions desired to have incorporated, including the wage rates, overtime rates, classifications, and all other items affecting wages. When these agreements had been negotiated and signed, they specifically expressed what the employers were willing to pay in the field of wages, and what trade unionists were willing to accept for the period covered by these agreements.

In the application of all terms and provisions of agreements during their life, the question of each party's good faith and integrity is involved. Without this good faith and integrity, collective bargaining would be of little, if any, value to either labor or management.

When an agreement is entered into, the employer knows what his labor costs will be, so far as wages are involved, for the period of the agreement. Trade unionists under the agreement pledge themselves not to introduce new questions of wages during the life of the agreement, unless the agreement specifically contains a provision for the reopening of the agreement for this purpose during the period of its existence.

To now inject the question of back pay, for portal-to-portal time, would be an admission that when wage agreements were signed by trade-union representatives, they had been insincere during the negotiations, and had held mental reservations which they were unwilling to discuss with employers while seated at the conference table.

Our trade-union movement has no assets more valuable than its agreements with employers, and the integrity which is involved.

There is nothing to prevent the discussion of portal-to-portal pay when existing agreements with employers are negotiated, and the inclusion of this form of payment in the new agreements. But as to existing agreements with employers, many of them entered into with the same corporation for a generation or more, the executive council definitely recommends that existing collective-bargaining agreements must not be dishonored by now entering into legal suits to secure a form of wages which were not provided for when the existing agreements were negotiated.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 13, 1947.*

Portal-to-Portal Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL—FINANCIAL AVALANCHE LET LOOSE BY SUPREME COURT MAY CHILL HOPES FOR EXPANSION OF BUSINESS AND STEADY EMPLOYMENT—A CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS

(By Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Congressman from Indiana)

I am going to discuss these portal-to-portal cases now being filed as a result of recent Supreme Court decisions. I am going to suggest what might be done about them.

The portal-to-portal or travel-time cases mean, in simple words, that the Supreme Court has decreed a new meaning to the word "workweek." It has decided that pay begins at the gate rather than at the workbench.

Acting as a superlegislature, the Court has overridden long-established customs and practices in industry; it has declared collective-bargaining contracts null and void; it has changed the meaning of an act of Congress. I was in Congress at the time and I know that portal-to-portal pay was not even thought of when the bill was before Congress. A Senator, who was one of the authors of the bill, agrees that this is so.

A FINANCIAL AVALANCHE

The consequences of the Court's arbitrary and reckless action are beyond computation. It has already resulted in damage suits totaling over $3,000,000,000. Other suits will probably be filed in hundreds, if not thousands, of cases, to an estimated total of five or six billion dollars.

Many businesses are now faced with the threat of bankruptcy. The suits, if successful, will result in claims against the United States Government for tax credits amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, thus increasing the tax burden on you and all other taxpayers in the United States.

And, as the arbitrary back payment of more dollars for no more goods will force costs and prices still higher, millions of consumers must pay the bill.

The court has let loose a financial avalanche. No business, however small, that produces goods for sale in interstate commerce in which men have worked more than 40 hours is now free from its threat. The claims range from $270,000,000 against Ford, $200,000,000 against Bethlehem Steel, $100,000,000 against International Harvester, down to claims of a few thousands against companies employing but a dozen or so men. One of the smaller companies has already paid over $4,000,000 to get its claim settled.

TWICE THE VALUE

It has been estimated that claims against the automobile industry alone may aggregate twice the value of the factory buildings. Allowance must, of course, be made for the exaggeration of damages which all plaintiffs make when they go to court. Undoubtedly, many of these huge claims will be whittled down to much smaller amounts.

But, if you had just been sued for $20,000 damages on account of an automobile accident, not covered by insurance, would you feel like going ahead with a plan to build a house until you knew what a court or jury would do to you in the damage suit? Or, even if you would take that risk, would a bank lend you money to build your house until the law suit had been settled?

The same situation confronts every business which has been or may be used. Nothing could be better designed to chill the hopes of the New Year for a steady expansion of business and jobs, or to make investors cautious in risking new money to buy the tools for business to expand. Even as big a company as General Motors has had to ask for more funds as a result of its strike losses this past year.

CLAIMS AFFECT EVERYONE

The men rushing to court may sue themselves out of jobs. It can be seen, therefore, that either as worker, stockholder, consumer, or taxpayer, these portal-to-portal claims affect every one of you. The attorney in one of the cases says it "is the biggest and most important decision the Supreme Court ever made." This stretches it a bit. The Dred Scott case which helped to bring on the Civil War, and some others, were more important. But it is doubtful if the Supreme Court ever did anything so destructive to the business and jobs of the Nation.

Some of the more fortunate companies may be able to pay these claims, or get tax credits from the United States Treasury as a result of paying them, and keep running. But the damage to business and jobs from this judge-made definition of "workweek," with Nation-wide application, in good times and bad, may be measured by the fact that in the years from 1936 to 1939, 60 percent of all companies, doing a quarter of all corporate business, operated at a loss.

From what fund are these companies to pay huge claims for travel time, running back for years? It is too bad that none of Mr. Roosevelt's appointees to the Supreme Court ever ran a business, and that few, if any, were ever even the legal advisers of business.

To the extent that the Supreme Court bankrupts the smaller and weaker companies or checks their growth, it further concentrates economic power in the hands of the few that may be able to survive.

THE THREE CASES

Let us review what the court has done. There are three cases in all: One, involving underground iron mining; the second, coal mining; and the third, ordinary factory operations. In all three, from two to four judges of the court disagreed with the decision. In the iron and coal mining cases the plaintiffs were represented by the former law partner of Justice Black, whose participation and deciding vote in one of the cases was so sharply rebuked by Mr. Justice Jackson last June. And, as pointed out by Mr. Jackson, Justice Black, in voting for portal-to-portal, reversed the stand he had taken as a Senator and legislator when he was managing wage-and-hour legislation through Congress.

The wage-and-hour bill provides that work over 40 hours a week must be paid for at the rate of time and one-half. It also provides that if this overtime is not paid, the employer is liable not only for time and a half, but also for a 100-percent penalty as liquidated damages, together with attorney's fees and costs.

This means that these portal-to-portal lawsuits call for $3 for time spent getting ready to work, as against $1 for actually working. That is why these claims run into such staggering sums. Thousands of companies are now at the hazard of huge claims never contemplated by either Congress, the companies, or by the wage earners themselves.

WHAT IS WORKWEEK?

That the labor unions accepted the long-established meaning of workweek, is conclusively shown by the fact that they never once questioned it until just lately in all the 8 years since the law was passed. Now, in passing the bill in 1938, Congress did not define what constituted a workweek of 40 hours or more. It was wise not to do so. It left the meaning of that word as it was then commonly understood by management and men alike according to custom and practices prevailing, often for generations, in the different industries of the country.

When the bill was passed a workweek or workday meant from whistle to whistle in the factories, or face to face in the mines. In short, the time a workingman is actually doing productive work for his employer. Not only was it a matter of custom, but in many cases it was a matter of contract.

For example, the United Mine Workers agreed in their collective-bargaining contract that "7 hours of labor shall constitute a day's work and this means 7 hours work at the usual working places for all classes of labor." Did this contract mean anything to the New Deal majority in the Court? Not a thing.

UMW ON RECORD

The United Mine workers had in fact protested against portal-to-portal as a basis of computing time. The UMW wrote the Wage and Hour Administrator in 1940—after the law had gone into effect—as follows: "The uniform high rates of pay that have always been included in the wage agreement of the mining industry contemplate the employee's working day beginning when he arrives at his usual working place. Hence, travel time was never considered as a part of the agreement or obligation of the employer to pay for in this industry, nor as hours worked by the employees, and this has been the case since the 8-hour day was established in the industry—in 1898"—49 years ago.

Later, in order to skate around wage ceilings imposed by law in time of war, the miners reversed their position and asked for portal-to-portal in order to get more pay. The Supreme Court obliged them by a 5 to 4 vote.

The Court has now applied the rule to factories as well as mines. The Court holds that a man must be paid from the time he enters the company's premises until he leaves—gate-to-gate. But is there a word in the law about being on the permises? Not a syllable. It will be exactly as logical for the Court to say at some later time that a man must be paid travel time from the time he leaves his home in the morning until he gets back at night, and thus start a new round of damage suits.

PAY WHILE SLEEPING

It is certainly just as important to the company that a worker travel from home to gate, as from gate to workbench. As Justice Roberts, of the Supreme Court, said, "It would be no less a judicial fiat" if miners were required to be paid for time spent in their homes. And, with the Supreme Court acting as a wage-raising organization, you may, in fact, no longer be surprised if I tell you that a claim has actually been filed for pay while sleeping.

If this keeps on, American industry will be like liver pills; "they work while you sleep."

Mr. Roosevelt complained that the old Supreme Court was a superlegislature passing upon the wisdom of legislation on the basis of their own personal, political, and economic philosophy. But do you know of any decision by the old Supreme Court that let loose damage suits of $3,000,000,000, and more? As Chief Justice Stone and Justice Roberts said in the first of these cases, "If we are to have a government of laws" we must ascertain what Congress has enacted rather than what we wish it had enacted. * * *

WHAT CAN CONGRESS DO?

"There is nothing in the words of the statute or its history to suggest that Congress intended, without mentioning it, to confer on the Administrator or the courts so vast a power over the industry of the Nation. * * * The act was not intended by Congress to turn into work that which was not work, or not so understood to be, at the time of its passage. * * * It was not intended to permit courts to designate as work some activity of an employee, which neither employer nor employee had ever regarded as work. * * * They are to get three times as much per hour for riding and walking to and from the work they were hired to do, as they get from doing the work itself. The injustice of it to me is shocking."

There is no social injustice in the customary definition of workweek, because as was said by Justices Burton and Frankfurter, "The obvious, long-established, and simple way to compensate an employee for such activities (as walking time) is to recognize those activities in the rate of pay for the particular job."

Now, can Congress do anything? That is the big question. I do not think Congress is helpless. As all of the lower Federal courts have only such jurisdiction as Congress confers upon them, Congress, in my judgment, could withdraw the jurisdiction of the courts to try these cases. There is a clear precedent for its doing so.

SEVERAL PRECEDENTS

When the contract to pay Government bonds in gold coin was repudiated in 1933, Congress, at Mr. Roosevelt's insistence, passed an act forbidding the courts to try suits for damages filed by Government bondholders.

Next, Congress could levy a special windfall tax on the amounts recovered in portal-to-portal suits. This would make it unprofitable to try the cases. Again, there is a precedent for doing so. When the first triple-A farm bill was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, Congress taxed, at the rate of 80 percent, the windfall money which remained in the hands of food processors as a result of that decision. Again, as proposed by Congressman GWYNNE of Iowa, Congress could probably shorten the back period from which travel time could be collected, thus reducing the amount of damages. Again, as proposed by Congressman HOFFMAN, of Michigan, the provision for 100-percent liquidated damages might be repealed, thus cutting the loss in half.

There is court authority that "rights of action based upon purely statutory grounds may be abolished by the legislature even after they have accrued" (*National Carloading Corp.* v. *Phoenix-El Paso Express*, 176 S. W. 564).

A SUPERLEGISLATURE

There is a still broader ground for congressional action. The Constitution says: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress." None is vested in the courts, and as the "intent of the lawmaker is the law," it must follow that when a court in effect amends a statute by giving it a meaning never dreamed of by Congress, Congress can more specifically tell the courts what its intent originally was. It cannot be that acts of Congress can be amended by the Supreme Court as a superlegislature, and thus transfer legislative power from Congress to the courts by what is, in effect, an usurpation of power.

The Constitution never intended that anyone could cut its heart out in this manner. It is too fantastic for belief even for this present age. This litigation is a good object lesson of the evil flowing from concentrating in the Federal Government power over millions of different businesses operating under widely different conditions. It is too much like Hitler's Germany.

These suits start the New Year under stormy economic weather. Until settled, many ships will keep near shore. The Court presents a challenge to Congress that Congress must meet.

Crash Landings or GCA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the number of airplane crashes in which passengers have lost life or limb is a subject of great concern to everyone, most particularly those of us who want to see aviation flourish in our country as a means of progress and to assure our national defense.

In connection with the airplane crashes, there has been carried in the January 13, 1947, issue of Aviation News a very interesting editorial by Robert H. Wood, the editor.

This editorial, entitled "Crash Landings or GCA?" discusses very intelligently the new techniques for landing in fogs and stormy weather developed by the Army and Navy during the late war. Army and Navy planes are using these ground-control approach techniques, made possible principally because of developments in radar, and are finding it relatively easy to land in fogs or stormy weather.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial in the RECORD, and I commend the words of this editorial to my colleagues, to the CAB, and to the airline officials who are so greatly concerned with aviation's future:

CRASH LANDINGS OR GCA?

Few public-relations problems of the air lines this winter deserve more attention than the necessity for satisfying the persistent query of the layman: Why don't air liners use operating Army and Navy radar systems to land in emergencies?

The public fully realizes that adoption of so-called blind-landing equipment by the Nation's entire air-line system on a 24-hours-a-day basis at all major cities is a complex and expensive project which cannot be achieved overnight. There are apparently valid reasons why day-to-day use cannot be made immediately of certain outmoded GCA equipment in Army and Navy possession.

But why are air liners in distress permitted to wander over the country within range of up-to-date GCA operating units until fuel exhaustion brings a crash?

On the same stormy night of January 6 two DC-3's made crash landings after they were unable to find an open airport before their fuel disappeared. Fortunately, there were only two deaths. As a story in this issue of the News points out, both ships were within range of three GCA systems. During their entire distress periods, all three sets were definitely in operation, their crews standing by awaiting any emergency call. These stations are located at Patuxent, Md.; Andrews Field, Md.; and Floyd Bennet Field, N. Y. Investigation discloses that CAA's Airways Traffic Control at no time alerted these stations, which did not know of the planes' difficulties, nor is there any evidence that pilots were informed of the emergency facilities available to them. Instead, both passenger-laden transports crashed.

It is quite true that neither CAA nor the air lines permit any regularly scheduled commercial air liner to make a landing which depends on the ground-control-approach system. Regardless of the soundness of this policy, it is based on a conscientious effort to safeguard public safety.

But any air-line pilot can declare an emergency and violate any regulations at the risk of punishment later, if he lives. Some pilots prefer to follow the rules, even in emergencies. Others apparently are not even informed of the possibility of using properly functioning GCA units at nearby military and naval bases.

All three GCA stations mentioned above are building up enviable safety records for the services. Andrews Field recently landed a C-82 with 24 military passengers under almost impossible night weather conditions. The plane did not have enough gasoline to taxi off the runway after its landing. All other airports in the vicinity were closed. On January 2, under similar conditions, a C-54 landed at Andrews in fog so thick the tower personnel did not see the aircraft until after it was on the ground.

One anecdote worth repeating: Admiral Nimitz, proceeding from Columbia, S. C., to Washington in a Lockheed transport, was informed by Washington National Airport—operating on instruments—of a 4-hour landing delay. He reserved a place in the stack, then landed at Patuxent, using GCA, with a 75-foot ceiling. The admiral and his crew had lunch, later joined his place in the stack over Washington, and had only 30 minutes' circling before landing.

The number of such instances increases daily. Both Army and Navy have maintained almost perfect operational records in experimental all-weather air transport services, by using GCA.

We hope the Air Transport Association will explain to the public why air liners are not using GCA equipment within range when there appears every likelihood that a crash landing will be only a matter of time. If there are sound reasons why the industry prefers to risk a crash landing over a GCA landing, they should be aired. If there are no such reasons, why cannot GCA emergency service be authorized? If mechanical problems must first be overcome before military GCA can be received, what are they, and how much longer will commercial transports be denied the safety advantages enjoyed by every Army and Navy aircraft?

If the industry itself does not begin to answer these questions soon we may expect the steamships, railroads, and others to take the fullest advantage of an opportunity to arouse public sympathy in their campaign to open up air transportation to the surface carriers.

ROBERT H. WOOD.

The Future of Reclamation and Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I

include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech prepared for the annual meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association held in Lincoln, Nebr., on January 13, 1947, on the subject entitled "The Future of Reclamation and Irrigation."

Because of pressing legislative work in Washington, I was unable to attend the meeting, and the speech was read by Mr. E. P. Ryan, of Grand Island, Nebr., secretary of the Nebraska Midstate Association. It follows:

Mr. President and members of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity of speaking before your annual meeting and to discuss with you some of the present problems and future plans of reclamation. The Reclamation Bureau, which is a division of the Interior Department of the Government, is about 47 years old. Their main purpose is to develop irrigation and reclamation in the 17 Western States. In doing this they naturally had to build tremendous dams which furnish power to help pay for some of the irrigation developments. In building the dams they conserve soil, control floods, and develop electrical energy.

At the height of our war activities we were spending about $7,000,000,000 a month to keep the instruments of war in operation. If this amount of money had been made available for the development of the natural resources of our country, including irrigation, conservation of soil, power, and flood control, we would find that 1 month's money spent for war would be sufficient for a 7-year program, which would bring new lands under irrigation, develop power, and conserve our soil. In addition, it would bring tremendous wealth to the United States.

It has always been necessary to work hard and use tactful diplomacy to sell the reclamation program to the eastern section of the country. It should be remembered that there are 45 Representatives from the State of New York and 33 from Pennsylvania. This means that there are more Representatives in the House of Representatives from these 2 States than we have from the 17 Midwestern States combined. Missionary work is always in order.

The 17 Western States concerned with reclamation make up more than half of the geographical area of the United States. These States, with their irrigation and farming activities, supply, in rough figures, 47 percent of the Nation's beef; 78 percent of its wool; 77 percent of its wheat; 30 percent of its canning crops; 76 percent of its sugar beets; 31 percent of its cotton; 42 percent of its potatoes; 79 percent of the alfalfa seed; and major quantities of flax, beans, peas, hogs, fruits, and other crops. If this area was a separate nation, I am certain that the eastern section of the United States would go to great limits to establish favorable trade relations with it.

It should be stated, in all fairness, that the entire tremendous wealth in these 17 Western States is not directly dependent upon agriculture, but directly and indirectly irrigation is the most important single factor in the life, progress, and development of all of these States. It has been shown, in the last 40 years, that irrigation is certainly an important factor in the life, progress, and development of this area. It has been the great stabilizer. Irrigation provides that confidence and security which makes possible an expanding economy.

Irrigation brings greatly increased incomes to a community. It brings enormous gains in purchasing power and increasing living standards not only to the farm families but to the professional and business men living in these irrigation areas. Nor should one overlook the assets to the Federal Government through the payment of income taxes. I am convinced that if a careful study were made, it would be disclosed that the new wealth and taxes paid thereon would far exceed the original cost of irrigated projects several times during the 40-year period allotted for the payment of these developments.

Eastern interests would do well to realize that development of dams and everything pertaining to irrigation means the underwriting of their own prosperity. It does mean a tremendous increase of purchasing power from the West, much of which goes into the industrial sections of the East.

The vast production and the accompanying assurance that comes from a confidence that water brings to the land is a continuing heritage of immeasurable value to our Nation. Irrigation brings an assurance to any community. Because much of our land is gradually wearing out, it is necessary to develop a wise policy for the proper extension, maintenance, and repair of our present lands.

In the arid States the spring planting of crops is always accompanied with a certain apprehension as to how great a crop may be harvested.

Water, with all of its accompanying benefits, helps to bring on an expanding economy in this country. It helps to make life richer and happier. If this country is to continue to grow and prosper, we must have a continued expanding economy in America. This means a strong government and a free growing society.

An expanding economy, reduced to market-basket language, is an economy in which more and more goods and services to make life richer and happier are produced at constantly lowered prices and costs without reducing the wages or incomes which are the laborer's incentive to work, the farmer's and management's incentive to produce, and the business' incentive to expand. Certainly irrigation provides a backlog of safety, security, and stability to a community. The farmer who has the experience and the energy, plus the necessary water, with all of its benefits, cannot help but prosper and have a high degree of security.

It is interesting to take a look at the agricultural lands in the United States. Indeed, the entire world is short of good agricultural land. The new land to be developed is limited. The Nation should use its entire energy in the development of new lands, new natural resources, because this is real wealth. The new wealth created by irrigation through increased production, increased population, and expanded property values does represent a new purchasing power with growing consumer markets for industrial products.

The story can be told time and again and proven by experience that new lands brought into production means new wealth, new sources of taxes, and better standards of living.

American agriculture, with its production of new wealth, has created a nation which grew from a population of 3,000,000 in 1775 to 140,000,000 in 1946. The new wealth from agriculture and from our natural resources created the capital to build the industrial plants of this country which are unequaled in any other nation. Our industrial plants during the war outproduced all the other nations put together. We produced, not from our trade, but from the resources of this country and from its tremendous production. Agriculture supplied 65 percent of the needed raw materials. Without American agriculture, industry and the Nation would have been helpless.

It is interesting to note that agriculture and the great industrial age grew together. The records show that between 1850 and 1920 there was about the same ratio of growth between industry and agriculture. Our farms had to create the capital and the material to make our industries possible.

During this period of 70 years agriculture expanded at the rate of about 5,000,000 new acres of improved farm lands each year. At the end of World War I, we had about 355,000,000 acres of land under cultivation. The amount of land brought in through irrigation has about offset the land retired.

Since 1910, we have increased our harvested areas about 10 percent while our population has increased from 92,000,000 to 140,000,000 or more than 50 percent. If we are to continue to meet the needs of our expanding population, it will be necessary to produce more crops, either through developing new irrigation areas or through the use of proper seed, cultivation, and fertilizer.

If we look at the expanding population, and the birth rate has gone up from 18 per thousand in 1920 to 29 per thousand at the present time, we will need 10,000,000 new acres of land or we will not be able to meet our expanding needs.

Coming nearer home, it is estimated that Nebraska has nearly one million additional acres of land which can be irrigated. Nebraska has lagged behind in the development of its irrigation. This has been partly due to the fact that there has been a continued controversy in Nebraska relative to the use of its waters. It is my opinion that if the Nebraska Legislature is thrown into a bitter controversy relative to the use of water within the Nebraska borders, that the Reclamation Bureau will not be in a position to lend assistance to this State. Nebraska has a tremendous amount of water in the Niobrara, the Loups, the Plattes, and the Republican Rivers that should be utilized for domestic purposes first, and then the development of power by REA districts to help pay for irrigation. It naturally falls that soil conservation, flood control, recreational facilities, and navigation will be benefited by the steps taken to use the water for domestic purposes and for irrigation. Nebraska should put its house in order if they desire to be in a position to expect or accept assistance from the Bureau of Reclamation in developing irrigation within the State.

Under resolutions which I introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Reclamation Bureau and the Army engineers have nearly completed preliminary surveys for the use of water on the Niobrara River, the Loup Rivers, and on the North Platte River. Additional surveys will be made and additional plans will be formulated, but final work will be held in abeyance until all controversy within the State relative to the use of water has been settled.

There is no question but what the helpful development of agriculture, and this includes irrigation, is necessary for a prosperous United States.

When one analyzes the agriculture products, both imported and exported, since 1922, we find, with the exception of 1 year, we have had to import more farm products than we actually exported From 1934–41 we imported annually on the average of 50,000,000 acres in excess of our exports. There were some interesting charts released by Congressman MURRAY, of Wisconsin, that were taken from the records of the Agriculture Department, and tell a revealing story about our production, our exports, and our imports.

It is interesting to note that during the years of 1925–29, the imports forced down the price of our farm products and brought on a depression. During this time we presented to the world the spectacle of a nation trying to go in two different directions at one and the same time. This Nation was promising the farmer a price for his products on one hand and on the other hand we were importing farm products at less than

our American parity level to keep the farmer from obtaining that price. Yes, we even plowed under our crops and killed the pigs and paid the farmers not to produce and turned over the market for 50,000,000 acres to foreign production. There never was an overproduction. It was an underconsumption and inability of the laboring men and the public to buy.

This Nation has about 550,000,000 acres classed as agricultural lands. We have been actually farming about 355,000,000 acres. Much of this agricultural land is submarginal and should not be farmed. The only opportunity for increasing production in this country is better scientific farming and bringing in an additional 20,000,000 acres of land which can be irrigated.

It is true that we can buy Argentine meat and other agricultural products from foreign countries cheaper than we can produce them here in the United States. This theory to me is a malicious mirage. I have always maintained that cheap raw materials are costly and cheap labor means a cheaper product, a cheaper nation, and lower living standards. If we adopt the theory that we can get better and cheaper products by imports from countries where the products are produced by cheap-labor standards, we then shut off the source of our own income at home.

In developing irrigated areas there must be proper engineering, with canals, laterals, and ditches for the turning of water onto the land. When irrigation projects are considered we must be sure that there are enough acres of the right kind of land to grow the right crops and when this is coupled with a sound diversification scheme and the building up of the fertility of the soil, then the project can be justified. In the early days of irrigation development in Nebraska, some lands were brought under irrigation which never should have been bonded for that purpose. The farmer who accepts irrigation must be certain of a sure and certain water supply and at a cost which he can afford to pay. He must have enough water when he needs it. He must have the right amount of water at the right time if he is to produce the right kind of crops. He must know the business of irrigation. He must have the knowledge and skill and experience, as well as energy to carry out these farming operations. Irrigation projects must be properly laid out, surveyed, and analyzed in order that they can justify their existence.

According to the 1940 census, more than 85 percent of the irrigated land in these 17 Western States is irrigated primarily from individual, partnership, or cooperative irrigation organizations. About 15 percent of our irrigated land is classified by the census as included in the Bureau of Reclamation projects. It must be remembered that the early irrigation was done by the easy method. Future developments will require extensive constructions, going to land not so easily reached by ordinary methods. This land cannot be developed by private initiative entirely. It is estimated that there are some 20,000,000 acres of land that can yet be irrigated or benefited by water. Most of this construction will be costly and it follows that a careful planning and help from the Federal Government will be needed to get the work started.

In my humble opinion, the over-all picture of reclamation and irrigation is bright. No one will or can stop the hands of progress. Developing our natural resources is progress. I hope Nebraska will be prepared to take its rightful place in this parade of progress. The prime objective of the Nebraska Reclamation is to bring to use all the water within the State for the benefit of the citizens. When this is done some 1,000,000 new acres of land will be irrigated. Power sufficient to supply every farm and home in Nebraska will be produced. Let's move forward with that objective in mind.

Nineteen Hundred and Forty-seven for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Nineteen Hundred and Forty-seven for Conservation" from the November issue of the Country Gentleman magazine:

We respectfully renew a suggestion that President Harry S. Truman proclaim 1947 soil-conservation year. Country Gentleman originally proposed this action several months ago, before the need to maintain maximum food production for famine relief took precedence over everything else.

That need is now lessening while the reasons which prompted the suggestion are still more urgent. The deterioration of our soil resources has increased and a return of crop surpluses appears nearer.

Our soil has been an "expendable" during the war and the famine period following it. Six years of intensive cropping has speeded up the rate of depletion and resulted in damage that needs to be remedied at the earliest opportunity. We have been growing three acres of row crops where our land can stand only two in such sustained production. Recent surveys, based on measured soil losses, indicate that the potential productive capacity of about one third of the land in the Corn Belt, our richest farm area, will be permanently lowered in the next decade if present cropping systems are continued.

Dr. M. A. McCall, our leading agronomist, says: "Certainly to maintain continued profitable agriculture in the United States more attention must be directed toward an increase in the acreage of grasses and legumes as a part of the regular farming practice." This shift would have the further value of promoting the production of livestock and livestock products, making for a more permanent farming system and a better national diet.

Such a readjustment in our land use, along with other needed conservation practices, cannot safely be delayed. If action is put off and surpluses develop the damage can be irreparable.

Higher farm production was not a passing war phase. A recent excellent Department of Agriculture study, Changes in Farming in War and Peace, states that "Agriculture has experienced a production revolution during the war years. A large part of the change is irrevocable. It will persist under peacetime conditions." Increased mechanization, use of higher-yielding varieties, and better farm practices insure ample production. The imminent danger is that we shall have too much production soon of some crops at the expense of the longer future. The Department of Agriculture is now having to plan how to support crops for which a 90 percent parity price is guaranteed. There is worry about how to keep the cost within bearable limits.

The provident way of doing this is by a national soil restoring and conserving program. It is better to store up productive capacity in the soil than to store surplus commodities in the granaries and warehouses under Government loans. The basic capital stock of the Nation would thereby be safeguarded for future requirements, which a growing population or new emergencies will impose upon it.

Only a proclamation by the President could focus the attention of the country upon what needs to be done. As nothing else, it would give an impetus to an eventually necessary movement toward soil conservation and proper land use, assuring the permanence of the Nation's primary source of security and well-being. It is with these considerations in mind that we respectfully suggest that the President proclaim 1947 "soil-conservation year."

Air Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 16, 1947, entitled "Air Accidents":

AIR ACCIDENTS

Congressional concern over the current rash of air-line accidents may serve a valuable purpose. Properly directed, an investigation such as proposed by several Senators and Representatives could bring to light the root of the trouble. That, in our opinion, is money, or the lack of it. Neither the air lines nor the Government is putting into air safety research—and practical adaptation of already proved devices—more than a fraction of what is needed. Since the financial condition of the air lines is not bright, the problem harks back to the support the Government is willing to give through the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the agency responsible for operating the airways. So far the CAA's funds for research and development have been deplorably low.

There is some validity, we think, to the contention of Senator BREWSTER that public confidence in air travel has been sapped by recent crashes. That confidence will not be restored by mere publication of figures indicating that the air-line safety record has consistently improved and was better in 1946 than in 1945. For most people, the passenger fatality rate of 1.6 per 100,000,000 passenger-miles in 1946 as opposed to 2.31 in 1945 is an irrelevant statistic. Air lines suffer in this respect because most of their accidents are spectacular and because the probability of death in such accidents is great. Nor is public confidence likely to be encouraged by the knowledge that several important safety aids already proved workable by the Army and Navy have not yet been put into use at civilian airports. The problem of lost planes and blind landings, for instance, has definitely been licked by wartime electronic developments. If money for installation were available, a combination of such facilities both on the ground and in planes would be a guaranty against failure of any one safety device.

Possibly there is something to be said for a probe of the Civil Aeronautics Board's position as both the instigator of safety rules and the agency charged with investigating accidents. The primary value in a congressional inquiry, however, would be in exposing the extremely limited scope with which the safety problem has been approached. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has a budget of only $875,000 for research and development in the fiscal year 1947, and only $180,000 of this is devoted to radio and radar. The $1,600,000 asked for 1948 is not much

better. Nor can the $1,000,000 program announced by the air lines be considered adequate. The fact is that we are still playing with pennies on a problem that requires a concerted, all-out attack if it is to be solved in time to aid 1947's pressing needs. If a congressional investigation can focus attention on the paucity of our efforts, and galvanize a concentrated drive into action, it will help materially in bringing about the sort of air safety facilities to which the public is entitled.

Wisconsin Labor Leader Favors Changes in Wagner Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, George A. Haberman, president of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, is one of those farsighted labor leaders who can appreciate the equities existing in a given situation. He has had the courage to make a public statement to the effect that certain inequities exist in the Wagner Labor Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a news release by the Associated Press, bearing a Milwaukee date line, wherein this labor leader has courageously stated his views so that the workingmen of Wisconsin and the Nation might have the benefit of his views:

WAGNER ACT CHANGE FAVORED BY HABERMAN

MILWAUKEE.—George A. Haberman, president of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor (AFL), said last night the federation believes the Wagner Act should be amended "to make it more equitable."

However, he said any amendment to the act should follow recommendations of a top-level labor-management conference held "without Government interference."

Haberman's statements were made in comment on a declaration at Chicago by Maurice R. Franks, editor of the Journal of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America (Ind.), that the Wagner Act was "lopsided" in favor of labor unions. Franks, also business agent for the union, which claims 2,500 members, advocated that most of the act be tossed "straight out the window."

FEELS AMENDMENT NEEDED

The Wisconsin labor leader said, "We have long felt an amendment is needed. You can't make one-way contracts. But we also feel that the changes should be worked out by a conference, set up as a legislative steering committee, including spokesmen of the AFL, CIO, railroad brotherhoods, and the independent unions on one hand, and representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce on the other, without Government interference.

"It is our conviction that the Congress would attach great weight to suggestions from such a meeting. There is, after all, no bar to an amiable understanding between labor and management. They have the same common objective of production, management being the financial means and labor the menial.

"There is no reason why a labor-management meeting cannot eliminate costly industrial strife without the drastic legislation which is certain to come unless reason and common sense are brought to bear on the problem by both parties."

Vatican Contact Force for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission already obtained by me in the House, I offer for printing in the RECORD the following article by Sumner Welles, which appeared in the Washington Post of January 15, 1947:

TAYLOR MISSION

(By Sumner Welles)

VATICAN CONTACT FORCE FOR PEACE

It is unfortunate that the controversy over Myron Taylor's mission as the President's personal representative at the Vatican should have recently flared up again, and this time in what appears to be an acute and even virulent form. The world is already so torn by intolerance, by prejudice, and by antagonisms of one kind or another that it is deplorable that the existing bitterness should now be accentuated here in the United States.

The decision of the President to continue Mr. Taylor's mission, at least, until peace has been restored, has been violently assailed and as vigorously defended. There is no need to question the motives nor the good faith of either side in the present dispute. But the form which the controversy has taken tends to obscure a number of simple facts.

Demands for the termination of Mr. Taylor's mission have been based upon the following charges:

It is alleged that President Roosevelt's decision to send a personal representative to the Vatican violated the principle of the separation of church and state. It is further asserted that the step taken circumvents constitutional requirements. Finally, in the words of a recent protest, the Taylor mission is said to represent one of the most dangerous chapters in modern secret diplomacy.

It is hard to understand the reasoning behind the charge that the policy inaugurated by President Roosevelt, and continued by President Truman, runs counter to the principle of the separation of church and state. The appointment of a Presidential representative at the Vatican cannot affect the provisions of our Constitution, nor shape our own internal policies.

From the purely juridicial standpoint the territory known as the Vatican City constitutes a sovereign state. It is so recognized by the majority of nations.

At the outbreak of the war, almost every country except the Soviet Union and the United States, whether constitutionally Protestant, as in the case of Great Britain, whether officially non-Christian as in the case of Japan, or whether anti-Christian as in the case of Nazi Germany, had accredited diplomatic representatives to the Holy See. Those diplomatic missions had obviously not been appointed in order to further any extension of the influence of the church over state. They were appointed because the powerful influence exercised by the Vatican throughout a great part of the world was recognized, and because the governments so represented knew that the Vatican had available to it sources of information possessed by very few, if any, other governments.

The President is entrusted by the Constitution with the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. If he is to carry out these responsibilities successfully he must be free to utilize the services of such agents as he may consider necessary in order to obtain the information he may require whenever that is not available through normal channels. The history of the foreign relations of the United States contains innumerable instances of the exercise of this right by American Presidents. Personal representatives of the President have often been appointed where official diplomatic relations have not existed.

One of the reasons why President Roosevelt sent his personal representative to the Vatican was his realization that the United States Government must have available to it every possible shred of intelligence which might assist it in prosecuting the war or in laying the foundations for a just and lasting peace.

But I believe that an even more compelling motive was the President's conviction that the Vatican represented a great moral force, and that it was to the advantage of the American people that their Government should be in a position where it could cooperate effectively with every world agency which was striving for the creation of a peace based upon principles of better international order and for justice and of morality.

No unprejudiced American citizen, whatever his creed may be, can deny that the Vatican constitutes one of the most powerful moral forces in the world of today, and that Pope Pius XII has been an outstanding leader in the battle for the abandonment of policies of cruelty and of aggression, and for the adoption of such standards in the relations between nations as can make for enduring peace.

It is impossible to deal seriously with the charge that Mr. Taylor's mission constitutes a dangerous "chapter in modern secret diplomacy." The foreign relations of the United States could not be carried on if every report rendered to the President by one of his agents abroad had immediately to be made public. Under any such requirement as that, the sources of American information would dry up within 5 minutes.

No American diplomatic agent in recent years has carried out his duties with greater discretion, with greater success, and with a greater regard for his country's interests than Myron Taylor. When the full story of his mission is finally recorded, it will be recognized that it has been of great service to the United States. It will also be seen, as the Reverend Dr. Everett Clinchy said a few months ago, that there has been nothing in this mission which "need alarm" any sincere Protestant.

At least until peace has been restored to the world, the means of cooperation between the Vatican and the President of the United States afforded by Mr. Taylor's mission should continue. The termination of his mission as a result of the present agitation would not only renew religious rivalries which most Americans had hoped were permanently stilled, but it would also hinder this Government in its efforts to bring about the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation the Kansas City Star is known for the quality of its editorials, many of which cause a great deal of discussion.

One of the editorials the folks at home have urged me to read appeared in the Kansas City Times—the morning edition of the Star—on Friday, January 10, 1947, and reads as follows:

MEET THE BIG BAD LANDLORD

Still there is nothing for the hundreds of thousands of owners of small apartments and rental houses who have been systematically ruined by this inflation to the great pride of the OPA, Rent Control Division, and, we must assume, to the pride of the national administration.

Still there is nothing for millions of other small property owners who have barely managed to survive while a large share of the population has had money to spend as never before on trinkets, bad whisky, and entertainment.

All controls have gone off hotel rooms. Big hotels, which are big business, managed to fare better under the OPA than the small property owners, as any traveler can report from his own experience with room prices. At least increasing costs entitled them to the right to increase their rates, and complete decontrol may turn out to be the best answer.

Now turn to owners of rental property who haven't received even a smile from the OPA rent division to this day. There are 4,000,000 of them, the great majority obviously made up of small owners.

You have heard the big, wicked grasping landlord described by OPA officials. Here is one example in Kansas City:

She is an elderly widow living on relief in a dilapidated three-room shack. She owns (with mortgage) an old but substantial brick apartment building on the east side of Kansas City—16 units each with 3 rooms and bath. The occupants are employed, most of them at good wages, and the rents are $12.50 a month.

The widow is responsible only for poor management that had failed to set adequate rents before the war. When the OPA came along she was hooked and hasn't been able to get a rent increase to this day.

As costs increased it was necessary to turn over all the income to carry the mortgage. For years the widow hasn't received a dime for her equity of more than half the prewar value of the building. Given a fair rent of $20 a month, she could have lived and whittled down the mortgage.

A more common type of case is another woman who owns outright a good 20-unit apartment building on Admiral Boulevard. She received the building at a prewar bargain price of $25,000. The kitchenette apartments (even linens furnished) are held to $22.50 a month, a rent that was low in 1941. With inflated costs her income on the building is less than $1,000 a year, less than 4 percent to cover interest and depreciation on her investment.

Not even a 15-percent rent increase would be enough for the real hardship cases. In the last rent control law Congress provided for increasing rents in hardship cases. The OPA has generally ignored this authority. Real estate men believe that in Kansas City the OPA administration of James M. Robertson has been more vindictive toward the small property owners than most offices. It has been comparatively generous to a few large operators.

It is this kind of OPA administration that is making a case for a complete blow-up in Congress, just as other OPA policies precipitated the end of other price controls. We realize that four million is only a voting minority. But defense of minorities is an American tradition.

One of the many letters I received, in part, is as follows:

I am sending you a clipping that was in the Kansas City Times this morning that fits my case to a T.

My husband was stricken with a stroke over 3 years ago and has not been able to walk, let alone work.

I petitioned the OPA, this same James M. Robertson, for an increase in my rent, and he said he didn't think I was entitled to an increase.

I have a lovely apartment, three rooms, furnished, with sleeping porch, private bath, running hot water, and garage, for which I am getting $30. I asked for $40, and he turned me down flat. Please try to kill this OPA.

Mr. Speaker, although Congress directed OPA—now OTC—to give relief in distress cases, it is quite evident that many of its offices, the Kansas City office in particular, has not done so and that its staff continues to act in the arbitrary, dictatorial, unreasoning, and unsympathetic manner which has brought this agency of the Government into such general disrepute.

A request has been made for a sweeping investigation of the Kansas City office and the removal of Mr. Robertson.

Poland Abuses UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, 1945, before casting my vote against UNRRA I outlined my reasons for doing so. I closed that speech with this prophecy:

Let us not by this unwise, un-American legislation arm the international political manipulators with an instrumentality of power with which they can exercise control of life and death over the starving victims of war.

The proof of the accuracy of my statement has from time to time been revealed by those who have seen the ghastly results of the fraudulent handling of the funds and materials furnished by our more than generous taxpayers.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD a recent disclosure of the maladministration published in Life magazine in the issue of December 16, 1946:

POLAND ABUSES UNRRA—OFFICIALS AND MOST-FAVORED CITIZENS ARE GETTING THE LION'S SHARE OF FOOD SHIPPED FROM THE UNITED STATES

(For many months the Polish Government has distributed UNRRA supplies on a political rather than on a humanitarian basis. This practice has received little publicity in the United States, despite the fact that it is in direct violation of the no-politics principle underlying all UNRRA relief agreements. The facts on which the following report is based have been gathered by Life from a number of sources within Poland itself.)

At Warsaw's Hotel Polonia, if you are willing to pay the price, you can drink vodka cocktails made with UNRRA grapefruit juice intended for Poland's undernourished children. On the main street—the Marszalkowska—peddlers clamor to sell you UNRRA cigarettes, chocolate bars, sardines, and even soap, which is one of disease-ridden Poland's greatest needs. By shopping around a little you can buy UNRRA coffee, UNRRA flour, UNRRA children's shoes—indeed, almost any of the long list of food and clothing items shipped into Poland by the international relief agency with the highest of charitable motives.

UNRRA, operating on the theory that supplies can best be channeled through the normal pipe lines of rationing and trade, simply turns its goods over to the Polish Government. The Government, busy nationalizing Poland along Russian lines, has used the supplies to subsidize itself and reward its friends. The result is a grim travesty of the charitable impulse. In the midst of Poland's dire poverty thrive restaurants which serve the finest steaks and pastries in Europe. True, they observe three meatless days a week. But on these days their customers are subject only to the hardship of selecting among goose, turkey, duck, chicken, partridge, guinea hen, hare, fresh salmon, or whitefish. The clientele, of course, is strictly limited. For even a simple restaurant meal, in dingy surroundings, a Warsaw typist would have to spend half a week's salary. In fact, lunch hour in Warsaw finds many workers just killing time because they have nothing to eat at all.

In return for its shipments, UNRRA has exacted a promise from the Polish Government to distribute supplies without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief. Ironically, this very promise is used by the Government as justification for favoring its own employees. The promise, say officials, means that the Government must help the most deserving. Obviously, the most deserving are those who work productively for their country, i. e., civil servants and workers in nationalized industries. Thus class I ration cards, calling for highest allowances, go to officials of the Communist-Socialistic bloc parties, bureaucrats, Government employees, the militia, and the security police. Others who get class I cards are journalists, artists, clergymen, and employees of private industries which sell at least 75 percent of their output to the Government at the Government's artificially low-price level. Class II cards go to housekeepers, public pensioners, and employees of private industries which sell 50 percent of their product to the Government. Class III cards go to people over 60, unemployables and workers in private industries which sell 25 percent of their goods to the state. Some 3,000,000 Poles who run their own businesses or work in private industries which do not sell to the Government have to get along as best they can without any kind of ration card. So do 12,000,000 Poles who live on farms and therefore are considered self-sufficient.

Possession of a class I card is a great privilege. In October for example, a cardholder was entitled to buy, among other things, 4½

pounds of UNRRA flour for less than 1 cent a pound (in United States money) and 2 pounds of UNRRA canned meat at 6 cents a pound. If he so desired, he could then sell these goods on the free market or legalized black market, for 30 cents a pound for the flour and anywhere from 90 cents to $1.15 a pound for the meat.

Besides food, clothing is also distributed by ration card and much of it eventually finds its way into the free market. In early fall one government official bought one pair of men's shoes and two pairs of children's shoes at a total of 2,000 Polish zlotys, which are worth about 1 cent each in United States money at the official exchange rate and actually worth about one-tenth of a cent each. He sold the children's shoes for 7,000 zlotys, which meant that he got his own shoes free and made a profit of 5,000 zlotys in addition. After fur-lined lumber jackets from Canada were recently sold to lucky cardholders at 600 zlotys, many of them soon showed up on the free market at prices ranging from 5,000 to 6,000 zlotys. Much of UNRRA's cloth for suits, which is distributed to class I cardholders at the rate of 3½ yards each 6 months, also is resold on the free market at about 10 times the ration price.

Over and above their extra rations, the bureaucrats also get frequent allotments of food free out of UNRRA supplies. In the Ministry of Reconstruction, workers with a family of three, recently received as 1 month's free allotment—13 pounds of sugar, 13 pounds of flour, 4½ pounds of jam and 6½ pounds of fats, plus some tea, salt, macaroni, canned foods, and evaporated milk.

Government employees have been able to buy all the American cigarettes they want at 116 zlotys a package. They can sell them at 200 zlotys, the standard free-market price, buy a package of Polish cigarettes for 80 zlotys and thus make a profit of 4 zlotys while smoking a package of Polish cigarettes free. The effect of such dealings is to increase greatly the incomes of Government workers or, in another sense, to make UNRRA pay a good part of their salaries. In cash pay they receive from the government only 3,000 to 10,000 zlotys a month. Their special UNRRA rations and allotments make up the difference between their low pay and relative prosperity, either in the form of higher living standards or in cash made in the free market. The government is already planning widespread pay raises to make up the difference after UNRRA expires the first of the year.

Although some members of the UNRRA mission here are outraged at this sort of favoritism, most of them seem to view it with a resigned acceptance. During the summer-school vacation, UNRRA discovered that Polish children were getting only four or five quarts of milk a month and pressured the government into raising this quota to 20 quarts by cutting off supplies from adult cardholders. UNRRA has also persuaded the government to set aside 10 percent of its cloth for children and institutions for the sick and aged. But the biggest share of UNRRA supplies still goes to those at the head of the line, and nobody does anything about it.

Why RFC Any Longer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, December 30, 1946, entitled "Why RFC Any Longer?" While the banks are full of money I do not understand why the Government should be in the lending business, especially when we have banks with footings of better than $4,000,000,000, and are making loans to foreign nations.

WHY RFC ANY LONGER?

Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have recommended to President Truman that the lending powers of that agency be indefinitely extended beyond June 30 next, the date now fixed by law for their expiration. They also urge extensive revision of the law under which the RFC exists and codification of the several acts pertaining to its activities.

But why revise a law which fairly cries out for repeal? The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was born of the depression of the 1930's and was elaborated to meet some of the emergencies of the war effort, when the Government had pretty nearly taken over the capital and credit markets. In both capacities it was designed to deal with conditions which no longer exist. It should pass out along with the reasons for its being.

To be sure, the RFC has a lot of unfinished business on its hands, loans made hither and yon which will be more or less fully repaid. It can be liquidated only over a run of years to come. But we see no reason why its liquidation should not be turned over to a bureau of the Treasury.

Perhaps Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, has provided a clue to the RFC Board's reasons for thinking the Corporation's lending life should be extended. He thinks Congress should force some Government agency to lend money freely to small business. He is quoted as saying that small businessmen need help and are as much entitled to borrow from the RFC as are the big corporations.

Quite so. They have as much right to borrow from the Government as have the big fellows, which is to say no right whatever. We do not know whether the Corporation is now making loans to corporations of any size. If it is still presuming to exercise its emergency powers Congress should crack down upon it.

Many small business enterprises need help. Loans are an appropriate form for their assistance only if they are actually credit worthy in the strict banking sense and where they are they can obtain loans from their banks. For a great many of them, loans would be a dangerous kind of help. Indebtedness out of proportion to the equity or ownership capital engaged is no real help to a business of any size.

Banking is not a legitimate part of the activities of a government such as ours. Government is necessarily political. Banking cannot be political if it is to be banking and not patronage.

Why a Training Program?—An Address by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have attended and taken part in a national defense program under the sponsorship of the national defense committee of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of the District of Columbia, on January 10, 1947, a meeting which convened under the very competent chairmanship of Mrs. Della E. Luther. At this meeting, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, delivered an unusually important address on the very timely subject Why a Training Program?

Because of the significance of his pronouncements and the timeliness of the subject he discussed, General Hershey deserved and should have had a very much wider audience than the one which crowded into the Department of Commerce Auditorium on that epic occasion. In order that the widest possible circulation may be given to the facts and figures which he has collected and that his comments and suggestions may be the better understood, it is essential that the text of his address be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And I ask that that be done.

Mr. Speaker, General Hershey's address, to which I have just referred, is the following:

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Legion Auxiliary, fellow Legionnaires, it is always an honor and a privilege for me to appear before an American Legion audience. The consideration, the cooperation, and the support I have received through the years from this great veterans' organization has been one of the most pleasant and reassuring experiences that I have ever had. The American Legion in the District of Columbia especially has always been available through the years to perform a great variety of tasks for the Selective Service System. Your kindness and your hospitality to me on numberless occasions will always remain among my most treasured memories.

It is my privilege to discuss with you tonight the subject of training. I want to be very certain that there is no misunderstanding as to the authorship of the views I may express. I do not reflect the views of either of the armed services. I have no official responsibility for the training of our citizenry. Hence, I shall offer no opinion as to the length of training or the kind of training that should be given. The facts and figures that I shall use are matters of common knowledge. I have no inside information of any description. In fact, I am quite certain that a better subject for my discussion would be the training that is not being done.

I have been interested in universal military training since the first decade of this century. I have believed it to be the only effective method for a nation to prepare for war and the only fair method of distributing the responsibilities for national security in a democracy. It has seemed the only way to train a fighting man so that he may have a reasonable chance to survive if and when war comes. In addition, it has seemed to be a method by which a nation could be strong and by its strength discourage aggression. In common with all World War I soldiers, I saw the war come to find us unprepared. The cost in lives and money was increased materially because we were not ready. We won after we had time to prepare. We learned nothing from our experience. We demobilized in haste and confusion, yielding the advantages thousands had died to gain. Soon we were doing our best to become richer and boasting that we were helpless so far as military strength was concerned.

Then came the late thirties and warnings of impending war were not lacking. It broke out in Europe, but to us the danger seemed distant. In 1940 the phoney war turned real and almost daily a nation disappeared. There was enough anxiety here—in fact

barely enough—to pass a Selective Training and Service Act. The word "service" was tempered by the word "training."

I saw the making of this act in some detail and I shall never cease to wonder how it was possible to pass the act at that time. The influence of this act on the war that was to come has never been evaluated. To have a million men in the armed forces when war came was an experience that had never happened before in American history. The presence of the machinery to induct any required number and a machinery which had already been accepted by our people as a fair and equitable system for procuring men was an asset that has been taken for granted rather than fully appreciated.

The war was won. Our prior sins in demobilization were repeated. There was a general desire on the part of many of our people to be relieved of individual responsibility for the future security of America. There were many reasons for this, some good. The war had lasted a long time. Many of our young men had served years in the armed forces, much of it in distant places and under unpleasant as well as dangerous conditions. They were entitled to come home as soon as they could be reasonably spared. There were many in the armed forces who had served neither long nor dangerously. Probably their clamor to come home was the loudest. It is always easy to know in retrospect, but perhaps some of you may remember that the dangers of rapid demobilization were the topics of some conversations in 1944. Expediency governed reason. We forgot our mission, the objective for which the war was fought was crowded into the background.

National security is a continuous process. It is always a dangerous time for a command when one unit relieves another in the line. It is always a dangerous time for a nation when the war is won and the winners drop their weapons and start home. It is more dangerous that no definite or permanent plans are made for the peacetime establishment whose responsibility it will be to keep the peace the war won.

America has been celebrating the victory for nearly a year and a half. It has not yet settled itself down to the business of determining how we shall maintain the peace almost 300,000 died to gain. To complicate the matter even further, the war left us with material enough to equip an Army of eight millions and a Navy of about four. Too much equipment is almost as much burden as too little. With too little fighting ability is reduced materially, but with too much there can be little time for training after caretaking duties are done.

In addition, the Army has a large occupational job on its hands in two continents. The President stated in his message that one-half of our one million seventy thousand to be under arms on July 1 will be on occupational duty. No inconsiderable number of the remainder who are in the United States are engaged in the necessary administrative duties to maintain a force of that size abroad.

The importance of occupation is in no fashion belittled. The point to be understood is that occupational duties are of a particular type of service and are in no sense training for combat under conditions that would apply in a war tomorrow.

Another fact we must face is that these occupational troops are not troops available for the security of the United States except to a very limited degree. We need but recall our forces in the Philippines at the opening of World War II to determine how inflexible troops are whose duties place them well beyond supporting distance of the homeland in the early phases of conflict.

America in planning her postwar forces has reasserted her historical objection to large professional forces. To provide adequate security she has planned large increases in her National Guard and other reserve forces. To provide a method which would insure trained, rather than untrained, men for these reserve forces a universal training plan has been projected. It seems to be fairly clear that a large proportion of our regular forces are guards of excess equipment, caretakers on ships, and policemen and regulators in several occupied countries, leaving few to engage in the profession of preparing to defend America. If the situation in our regular forces gives cause for concern, then the situation in the reserve forces should bring on nothing less than extreme anxiety.

Our National Guard has a dual purpose. These purposes are to buttress domestic tranquillity as a State force at the same time being prepared to supplement immediately the regular forces in any emergency. The National Guard between World Wars I and II never reached much above 200,000. The contributions of this component have been written on battlefields all over the world. The plans upon which our national security depend provide for a National Guard of 681,000—a sizable force, more than three times prewar strength. Here is a component where we should find at least one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand engaged in a weekly training. Even such a figure would not bring it to the allotted strength for 2 or 3 years. I have not seen the strength quoted in the papers lately, but when last I read it it numbered some 10,000. One more component in which no training is now being done.

The organized Reserves of the Army are projected in the thousands, both officers and men, but they are, so far as I know, individuals with paper organization at best and certainly no training worthy of the name.

The plans call for 200,000 (198,352 for those who prefer exactness) in the active Naval Reserves. These are in the process of being recruited—some beginning in training has been made. The active Marine Corps is set at 60,000 The inactive reservists of both Navy and Marine are not included in these totals. Their numbers as projected are three or four times those in the active units.

Figures are tiresome, but let us make a tabulation of our manpower needs as projected for the Regular forces, the National Guard, and the active Reserves of the Navy and Marine Corps:

Army	1,070,000
Navy (as of 1947), including Marine Corps	571,000
National Guard	681,000
Naval Reserves (active)	200,000
Marine Corps Reserves (active)	60,000
Total	2,582,000

Roughly 2,600,000.

I repeat this does not include the millions that have been projected in the inactive reserves.

As has been indicated, the training these forces are receiving leaves very much to be desired. The problem, always the first in training a force, is to have some effective method of getting men. World War I and World War II were different from any other large wars in which this Nation has been engaged in that sufficient and suitable men were provided at the time they were required. The weakness of our numbers position now is that a very large fraction of this 2,600,000 men are not in the forces. A further weakness is that about 50 percent of the men in the Army have a year or less to serve on their present contract. This is further complicated by the fact that in the great recruiting campaign which has been under way for nearly a year and a half—even though aided by a pay scale for privates equal to former wage scales of higher non-commissioned ranks and with the most liberal provisions of the GI bill of rights—yet more than 60 percent of the recruits came from men liable for the draft.

It may be well to look at our normal supply of young men. There are about 1,200,000 that reach the age of 18 or 19 each year. Between 800,000 and 900,000 of these are suitable for military training or service under standards a little less rigid than those presently in force. There are men of all ages in the forces, but for the purposes of comparison let us consider all physically fit young men 18–25 inclusive. These number about 6,600,000. In other words, we have allotted to our forces a number which is about 40 percent of all the young men between 18–25, inclusive, and we must remember that practically all the physically fit young men 19½ to 25 inclusive are or have been in the armed forces.

There are hardly enough young men physically fit in the ages 18 and 19 who have had no service to fill the vacancies now existing or due to occur during the next 12 months. The size of the problem can be quickly measured by the fact that it would require all physically fit young men 18, 19, and 20 to build our Regular forces, National Guard, and active Naval and Marine Corps Reserves to allotted strength even if no men of any other ages were included.

I have difficulty in understanding how there can be any possible optimism as to the possibility of building this force on a voluntary basis. To maintain 1,000,000 men, even if every man was enlisted for 3 years and no one was discharged or died before he completed his enlistment, requires 30,000 men every month. But one-half of this million enlisted for 1 year or 18 months brings the requirement above 50,000 per month.

November recruiting totals were less than 20,000. And in October, with Selective Service operating for the first 15 days and the GI bill of rights privileges wholly available for 7 days, the total was 43,769. However, 39,307 were without prior service and were enlisted during the first 2 weeks.

The National Guard must enlist 40,000 men per month if it is to reach allotted strength in 2 years. At least 75 percent of these must come from men who have had no service. The needs of the Naval and Marine Corps Active Reserves can be added to this total.

Here is the situation: How can we build and maintain these forces? The first requirement is that the obligation to serve in our armed forces must be left upon all, especially in the lower military ages. This obligation should be waived for those who have served, unless we have a national emergency; then it should exercise selectively upon all as men are needed.

Second, all liable men should be permitted to enlist for at least 3 years in any of the services, Regular, National Guard, or Active Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.

Third, the vacancies in the Regular forces should be filled by selection to serve for a period of 18 months as at present prescribed. These men could be used to man our home defenses with the hope that they would be trained for their possible duties in case of war.

Fourth, we should train all personnel not in the forces under a universal training plan. Excellent authority to the contrary notwithstanding, a selective draft for service as required can operate concurrently with a universal training plan. To implement this plan requires—

1. An extension of the liability for service for use when and if required.

2. A universal training plan which, when in full operation, may provide a feeder to our other forces.

In this connection a word of caution. The experience of this Nation indicates that when relatively large numbers are needed in the armed forces some form of compulsion must be provided.

The Right To Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, of January 14 had a very challenging editorial on the subject The Right to Strike. The writer clearly indicates that the right to strike is limited by the public interest. It is not conceivable that the individual has a right to strike with others where service to the public is involved. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in question:

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

The American people are going to limit the right to strike in essential industries. The Supreme Court may start the process in its decision on the injunction against John L. Lewis. Congress may do it with new laws. Whether it is well or badly done will depend on how clearly the public understands the situation and on how closely the law follows justice and common sense.

The public has been confused by talk about "the right of a man to quit work" and about the thirteenth amendment's prohibition of "involuntary servitude." In human society there are no absolute rights. The right to free speech confers no freedom to commit libel. The right to bear arms gives no man a license to duel. Taxation, eminent domain, conscription—all limit private rights in the name of public welfare.

The right of an individual to quit work is not a right to conspire with others to paralyze an essential public service. It is not, for instance, a right conferred on a union to cut off a city's light and power supply, as was done at Pittsburgh a few months ago. It is not a right to deprive a city of police protection, as was proved in Boston 28 years ago. It is not a right to halt the railroads, as was demonstrated in the United States last spring. It is not a right to shut off food supplies, as is being shown in England today.

Freedom from involuntary servitude is precious. It was won through centuries of struggle. It must be guarded with our lives. But it will not be cherished or protected by using the words to cloak an abuse, an actual destruction of freedom. The individual's freedom from involuntary servitude furnishes no license for a union—or a company—to hold a city or nation for ransom. And if there is justice in recognizing that a worker has some interest in his job so that we tolerate his efforts to keep a strikebreaker from taking it, there is justice also in requiring men not to strike when their doing so robs thousands of others of the right to work.

Modern industrial society has developed new conditions which give small groups—unions or companies—tremendous power. Open warfare in essential public services means anarchy. It exercises a coercion on the community which must be answered by coercion. Actually, common sense is already limiting the right to strike or to lock out. But we have not yet legally provided for the situation.

Compulsory arbitration is widely denounced, both by unions and industrialists. But in some way the public is going to protect itself. It can rightly demand that those engaged in essential services agree to arbitrate their differences—and accept the result—or get out of those industries. In return, it should provide special safeguards—such as the guaranty of wages and working conditions at least equal to the average in the same community. The alternative is a law permitting the declaration of an emergency and the taking over of plants by the Government—with powers to deny bargaining and picketing privileges.

Groceries—$1,000,000,000 Worth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1944, I stated on the floor of the House of Representatives my views on UNRRA. Subsequent events have proved the prediction then made by me.

UNRRA has proved to be a cold-blooded inhuman scandal. Now that another barrage of emotional propaganda is soon to be let down upon the American taxpayers to induce them to make a contribution of 73 percent of a billion-dollar relief fund for the starving men and women and children in the war-torn countries, I want again to urge that the funds for the foreign foodless victims of the war be administered by reliable relief agencies, completely divorced from all politics, and from the grafting, intriguing black-market operators heretofore entrusted with the distribution of the taxpayers' relief funds.

What I said on January 24, 1944, was this:

Is it necessary to set up this UNRRA machinery for becoming entangled in a new world order of power politics to effectively distribute $1,350,000,000 to starving men, women, and children throughout Europe and Asia? Are there no existing Christian organizations with long and honorable records of humanitarian achievement, fully equipped in every way to administer the desired relief? Of course there are such organizations, ready and prepared to act. They are now operating in the field. What is wrong with the National Red Cross, the Society of Friends, and others? Who objects to utilizing the facilities and personnel of these great agencies of mercy?

I will tell you who they are: They are the alien-minded power politicians who seek to build a new world order who see in this fund of $1,300,000,000 and other billions to follow the very elements of political domination of starving populations. No tears will be shed over the ghastly victims of starvation by those who will control the organization set up by this legislation. The alien-minded manipulators of our declarations of policy do not favor, but instead desperately fear, the adoption of a plan by which distribution of food and clothing will be made by Christian agencies. What has been the excuse given by some of our allies in justification of letting little innocent, starving, pot-bellied, moaning babies starve? Why, they say: "What if the Nazis should steal it and thus prolong the war?" But does the evidence show that this danger exists? Dr. Howard E. Kershner, director of relief in Europe from 1939 to 1942 for the American Friends Service Committee, stated that not a mouthful of food sent to the people in other occupied countries ever reached the mouths of the enemy. Does not our State Department bear witness to the fact that the enemy forces or populations have never had access to the 19,000 tons of food going to Greece each month?

This piece of legislation, like so many New Deal proposals, has set forth in it a worthy objective but concealed within its provisions are commitments to further alien intrigues in the field of world-power politics.

The printed pages of the hearings on this resolution (H. J Res. 192) are as barren of facts pertinent to the real issues involved as the Sahara Desert is destitute of fertile soil and moisture to produce food.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point, under unanimous consent, an editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald, Washington's independent newspaper, under date of Wednesday, January 15, 1947:

GROCERIES—$1,000,000,000 WORTH

The United Nations promises a report today on the 1947 food needs of the world. Twelve war-wrecked countries have already presented their estimated grocery bills to a UN special committee.

These bills, according to preliminary reports, add up to approximately $1,000,000,000. What the United Nations will try to decide, beginning today, is who grows all this food, who gets it, and who pays.

The United States, with the assistance of Canada, Australia, and Argentina, will do most of the food exporting. The countries which need food, and have to get it or starve, are Poland, China, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, Italy, Finland, Austria, Korea, Ethiopia, and the Philippines.

WE SHOULDERED THE UNRRA BILL

As we understand it, one of the first things which United Nations intends to discuss today is the who-pays-and-how-much problem. Under UNRRA—currently being wound up—Uncle Sap was handed the bill for 73 percent of the world's relief expenditures.

The rest of the world managed to ante up the remaining 27 percent.

The United Nations Committee on relief needs has promised, or almost promised, that world relief, now under new management, will be divvied up a little more evenly. Rumors have it that, in 1947, we may have to pay only half, or maybe a third, of the tab. Whatever the reduction, we American taxpayers will be grateful, and will thank everybody concerned.

We find ourselves hoping, though, that the UN, quickly and at long last, will set up a good tough, top-priority committee to check on just who gets this $1,000,000,000 worth of food.

POLITICIANS DID THE DISTRIBUTING

Under UNRRA, as nearly as we can find out, nobody at all really knew who was getting the groceries, and what was happening to them. Some of our investigators, nosing around Yugoslavia, Poland, and China did discover that a lot, maybe most, of our relief supplies had been grabbed and distributed by the local politicians to their favorite citizens, or voters. This situation seemed to be particularly true in Yugoslavia, where our American diplomats were not even allowed to enter the textile mills where UNRRA yarns were being converted into clothes for freezing army peasants, or maybe uniforms for Tito's expanding army.

One of our State Department experts, however, did some personal checking into this particular situation. He, Eric L. Pridonoff, former State Department economic analyst, is now back in this country, and has told his story in the current American Mercury.

Altogether, he devotes 6½ pages to what really happened to our UNRRA supplies in this particular part of Europe. We recommend his story as good embarrassing reading for us open-hearted Americans. And we think that UN's special committee might do

worse than give it careful study before it makes a final decision about the need for checking up on just where our relief groceries are to go.

LOTS OF FOOD WAS SHIPPED

Among other things, Mr. Pridonoff lists the actual help which UNRRA shipped to Yugoslavia. Altogether, we and other Samaritan nations did an impressive enough job.

We shipped in enough, for instance, to give every man, woman, and child in Yugoslavia some 150 pounds of food per year. Grains, meat, sugar, milk, pork fats, and oils were included. By April 15 of last year UNRRA had given Tito enough cotton and wool to supply every little and big Yugoslav with two pair of pants, two shirts, three union suits, six pairs of sox, one sweater, one overcoat, and six handkerchiefs.

In addition to this, UNRRA's ships sent in over 8,518 metric tons of medical supplies, 26,000,000 gallons of gasoline, more than 12,000 trucks, 7,500 tons of coal, and some odds and ends like tractors, plows, sawmills, trains, mining equipment, and locomotives.

Altogether, as of December 31, 1946, Yugoslavia had received some $400,000,000 worth of UNRRA goods, of which we Americans contributed 73 percent, about $300,000,000 worth.

There was, of course, no doubt about the need of the unhappy Yugoslavs in this case. But, as far as many Yugoslav peasants know, UNRRA sent them neither food nor clothing. Such supplies as did reach right-thinking and right-voting Yugoslavs came from Tito and his assistant Santa Clauses, period.

So, as we have mentioned, 1947's $1,000,000,000 bill is coming up, and a substantial part of it will probably be ours. Under the circumstances, we hope our UN representatives will demand a tough investigating committee, with full authority to see that our groceries actually get to the world's starving people, without political finagling.

"Know-How" at Holtville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring examples of the glory of democracy is Holtville, Ala. That community, centering in its high school, has demonstrated how superb local leadership develops, challenges, spreads, permeates, cooperates and builds, taking advantage of every opportunity offered by God, His friendly human creatures, their schools, and their government, local, State, and National.

A story by Blake Clark in the Rotarian, later condensed and carried in the Reader's Digest, gives many of the facts.

It is my great pleasure to give my fellow Members most of that excellent article. I am sure that you will find it both interesting and helpful. It is rare, in that it deals with the "how" of the achievements noted.

"KNOW-HOW" AT HOLTVILLE—YOUNGSTERS IN THIS ALABAMA VILLAGE HAVE FUN AND LEARN GOOD CITIZENSHIP BY OPERATING BUSINESSES, ADULT STYLE

(By Blake Clark)

"Boys and girls can work miracles under their own power. They may need help in shaping their first plans—but, after that, you'd better watch out or you'll get run over!"

This is the credo of Principal James Chrietzberg, whose Holtville High School is one of the busiest places in Alabama. Holtville High hums with student-run enterprises which do almost anything for the local farmer from slaughtering his meat to giving his wife a shampoo and finger wave.

By introducing up-to-date agriculture methods, redecorating homes, improving habits of health, and providing a variety of recreation, these boys and girls have breathed a new spirit of initiative into the whole community. At the same time they are learning to be responsible citizens and not forgetting to pile up plenty of scholastic credits.

* * * * *

Every Holtville student just naturally took his worries to strong-jawed, soft-spoken Principal Chrietzberg. One spring morning in 1938 six boys and girls showed up at once. Gropingly they expressed their troubled thoughts. "Ten years from now," asked one boy, "are we going to be share croppers winding up the year with nothing to show for our work?" A girl said, "I want to go places besides the wood pile and the well."

"Do you want to leave Elmore County?" Mr. Chrietzberg pushed back the brush of black hair that was always falling over his forehead. They did not, but they wanted to know why Elmore County couldn't be a better, more up-to-date place to live in.

Chrietzberg understood, for he had been a local farm boy himself. With rare insight, he avoided giving those youngsters any specific advice about how they might make their dreams come true; instead, he spoke feelingly about what could be accomplished through individual determination and resourcefulness. The students went back to their desks with a glowing conviction that it was up to them to decide exactly what would improve their lot—then go for it.

A few mornings later Chrietzberg arranged for the school's vocational agriculture expert, J. R. Formby, to discuss in assembly the 25- to 50-percent spoilage of meat slaughtered each fall by local farmers. Money was lost, Formby said, and families failed to get fresh red meat so essential in a winter diet. Then he casually mentioned a new means to preserve meat—frozen-food lockers—and explained what a boon they were to any community.

Five minutes after assembly, Rudy Johnson, Jeffie Parker, Carl Russell, and four other boys sought Chrietzberg out in his office. Gangling, 6-foot Jeffie was their spokesman.

"Why can't we slaughter hogs here—have our own refrigerating plant and food lockers right on the campus?" he asked eagerly.

"Do any of you know how to butcher?"

"We'd like to learn. Mr. Formby will teach us."

"It would mean a lot of work—even assuming that the school could raise the money," Chrietzberg objected.

"If you'll get the cash, we'll do the work."

This was just what Chrietzberg wanted to hear. He took the matter up with 12 local farmers, members of a night class given by Formby. They agreed to underwrite a loan. Then he obtained from the Federal Security Administration $13,500, to be repaid in 5 years at 3 percent interest. In 2 weeks, Jeffie and the other boys were breaking ground for the new slaughterhouse.

Engineer Harry Derring came from Auburn College to help install the refrigeration plant. Formby, jack-of-all-farming-trades for 15 years, made such a good instructor that student butchers were soon expertly salting down hams, shoulders, and sides; making sausage; and rendering lard. One of them, Kenneth Jones, set a county record for portioning a beef. For $1 a month the students rented to farmers lockers kept at 6 degrees below zero, where they stored fine bacon, pork chops, spareribs, beef, chicken, and turkey, as well as vitamin-rich snap beans and peas, peaches, and strawberries. In 1944 alone they took in $3,880, and by that time the FSA loan had been paid off.

Not forgetting his girls, Chrietzberg invited Mrs. Margaret Holt to tell an assembly about work being done by school canneries which she had visited in Georgia. She described the benefits to rural communities and concluded with: "Proper canning can increase a farm family's income by $300 a year."

Again Chrietzberg was waited upon by a committee. Helen and Betty Shields, Marzell Carroll, and Elizabeth Fuller said that the girls of the home-economics department wanted to know why they couldn't start a cannery. Chrietzberg lost no time telling them about an idle State-owned cannery at Tuskegee, 60 miles away. In return for another pledge of hard work, he arranged to borrow the coveted equipment.

The girls published a canner's cookbook, urging women to bring their best freshly picked vegetables to the school cannery. "Two hours from garden to can" was the girls' slogan. The only charge was the net cost of the containers and a 3-cent canning fee. In one year the home-economics class lined the kitchen shelves of 125 housewives with 8,000 cans of corn, okra, tomatoes, peaches, plums, and pears.

At still another meeting, County Agricultural Agent J. E. Morris convinced students that all too many people in Elmore County were undernourished. Explaining the necessity of at least four eggs a week for every man, woman, and child in the community, he pointed out that the few scraggly chickens in farmers' back yards were not supplying half that amount.

Boys in the vocational agriculture class attacked the problem forthwith by starting a hatchery. Ordering a plentiful supply of New Hampshire Reds, they resold them to farmers with an agreement that the school hatchery would buy eggs from these special flocks at 15 cents a dozen above the market price. In 1944 the students hatched 80,000 chicks which they sold locally, clearing $2,295.56. As tow-headed hatcheryman, "D. C." Mercer, put it, "We buy eggs for 5 cents each and sell them at 12 cents, as chicks."

The pattern once set, fresh projects came tumbling on one another's heels. Young plumbers harnessed the water from seven springs, built an 18,000-gallon reservoir, and piped water to the school. They helped home owners install pumps, bringing running water and modern bathrooms to scores of houses. School electricians, largely self-trained, wired many local homes, as well as the Church of Christ at Lightwood.

They set up a complete system of theatrical floodlights for the school stage, including a switchboard and overhead banks of four colors. Sophomores with a flair for decoration brightened up the dull interiors of Holtville homes by painting furniture, rebottoming chairs to make colorful dining-room sets, building cardboard screens to hide gaping fireplaces in summer and ingeniously transforming discarded feed sacks into tufted bedspreads. Student dietitians took charge of their family's meals for 2 months, introducing salads and substituting a variety of whole-grain breads for the inevitable corn pone. Last year Frances Gibbon won a State-wide contest for planning and preparing in her own home the most nutritious meals served in any Alabama family.

The biggest difficulty was in getting trained people to direct the numerous projects. Harassed teachers found themselves chosen as supervisors of from 8 to 12 activities, to some of which they admitted almost total ignorance. In such cases, either the teachers quickly remedied their own lack of information or the students went ahead on their own. When, for instance, the earnest query of would-be electricians drew a complete faculty blank in this field, they started

their own electrical education by studying the operations of an electric generator which one of their number, Edwin Dennis, had in his home. Then they accumulated wire and testing devices from shops in Montgomery and, learning from Edwin and each other, in a few months had sufficient mastery of the subject to be doing all the maintenance work of the school.

And there was difficulty from outside the school, too, chiefly from critics who looked skeptically at the rash of community activities and made meaningful remarks about the importance of the three R's. Their objections usually subsided, irrationally enough, with their first sale of eggs to the school hatchery or with the rental of a food locker.

When Holtville High students undertook the revitalization of a large part of Elmore County, one of the most critical needs was for farm machinery. Farmers wanted to cooperate with the Government's plea for an increased supply of valuable peanut oils, but no one could afford $650 for a peanut picker. With profits from the hatchery, the school bought a picker and rented it out. Nearly every farmer then planted from 4 to 20 acres of the new crop, not only helping Uncle Sam, but helping himself to a profit of $70 an acre.

With the profits from the peanut picker, the boys bought other machines to rent. Soon they were doing a booming business—and so were the farmers. Men unable to afford mowing machines gladly paid $2 an acre for a machine and a student operator to cut oats, and immediately sowed more grain than before. Holtville farmers used to grow only enough hay for their own use because they had no way to bale it for sale. When Chrietzberg bought a power press and schoolboys Ernie Richardson and John Sears Waldrop offered to bale for $3 a ton, farmers increased their acreage. After storing all they needed for winter feed, many sold over $300 worth "—and that ain't hay," said Ernie. Soon Holtville's farmers were plowing their land with student-manned tractors, threshing and binding their wheat with a student-run combine, and grinding their feed in a student-operated grist mill.

With two of the first tractors in that part of the country, Doug Brown and Melvin Curlee terraced 5,000 acres of land to save it from erosion and helped the country terrace many thousands more. Gripping this soil are the roots of 65,000 trees donated by the Alabama Power Co. and planted by students.

Thanks to Holtville High boys and the school's power sprayer, Elmore County, 6 years ago a one-crop county, now has orchards that would delight the eye of Johnny Appleseed. Convinced by the agriculture agent that peaches could be more profitable than cotton, agricultural students helped farmers set out more than 50,000 peach trees, which the boys keep sprayed and treated for borers. Last year Farmer Ernest Wilson banked $1,000 in peach money, and Sam McGlancy cleared $3,500 from an 11-acre orchard.

Modern methods and machines make farm life a more pleasing prospect. As freckle-faced, football-playing John Sears, "If I have a tractor, I'll farm, but I'll be darned if I'll follow a mule down a cotton row all my life." Fewer Elmore County boys are leaving home than formerly.

But the Holtville High boys aren't all headed for farming. School woodwork and machine shops are turning out small businessmen as well. With the help of Instructor D. E. Blackwell and less than $5 spent for two fan belts and a saw, students recently set up an assembly line turning out clothespins from discarded lumber. This home-made unit in one corner of the shop was the joke of the other students until a group of them, in a Montgomery department store one Saturday, saw women pushing into a line to buy Holtville-made clothespins at 10 cents a bag. The venture has already cleared more than $500, and the unit is 400 gross behind in filling orders from stores as far away as Birmingham.

Projects big and little roll from the same lathes and drills. Besides making wooden beds, metal scooters, swings, jungle gyms, and fence posts, the boys turn out a fertilizer distributor that takes a swath as broad as a highway, laying lime slag and phosphorus four times as fast as a farmer can do it by hand. By a 10-second adjustment these machines are converted into speedy sowers of grain. Farmers are buying them at $100 each.

Under the trade name New System, which might well be the title of their whole school course, Sherwood McCord, Bill Myrick, and other practical-minded young chemists have made and sold cold cream, tooth powder, hand lotion, nail-polish remover, liquid soap, even a corn cure.

Neatly manicured and cleanly shampooed, Mary Jane Jackson, Lorene Gray, and a dozen other girls seriously interested in beauty culture, work hard to improve their own and others' appearance. In a spotless parlor, well equipped with a professional chair, drier, and a hot-oil steamer bought second-hand for $190, they beautify the complexion, hair, and nails of some 50 customers. Students pay 15 cents for a shampoo, outsiders 25 cents. Each week the parlor averages about $10 in fees, which buys new equipment. A permanent-wave machine is next on the list.

Not so successful were the eight boys who wanted to learn barbering. Obtaining a professional chair and a porcelain basin from a defunct shop in nearby Wetumpka, they started work on grammar-school kids at 10 cents a head. But they made discouragingly little progress without a trained instructor. Finally, by giving dances and selling candy, they raised $65, with which they sent their most promising craftsman, Hubert Kingsley, for a 6-week course in a barber college in Florida. Hubert returned, but was offered too good a job in a Montgomery shop to turn down. He repaid the loan, but the barber shop failed.

Keeping tab on all organizations handling money are pretty Betty Waites and her corps of efficient young bankers—girls and boys taking the commercial course—who, in their cubbyhole bank, keep accounts, accept deposits, make loans, figure interest, and collect payments. Averaging $300 a day in cash transactions, the bankers work in pairs and are personally responsible for exactly balancing their books before turning them over to the next force. Six hundred and twenty-five dollars are out on loan at present. A recent transaction was a loan of $18 to the Science Club to buy a stereopticon. The club gave a dance and paid off the note, including 6-percent interest, in 3 months. The largest loan to an individual was $75 to a lad who had forgot to bring the money he wanted to contribute to a war-bond drive being held that day. Next day he repaid the money, with interest—1 cent.

To a community starved for recreation, Holtville High students have brought a variety of entertainment. Every Saturday night in the school auditorium from 200 to 500 persons enjoy a full-length movie, together with short subjects and news reel, for 10 cents. On Wednesday evenings shirt-sleeved farmers and their wives throng the school bowling alley or play ping-pong, ring tennis, or volleyball. Also they are avid borrowers of books, magazines, and home games, such as badminton, checkers, and parchesi, of which the school keeps a plentiful supply.

In order to shelter all its activities, Holtville High has had to expand. Using its own money when county funds were not forthcoming, the school bought deserted shacks and woodsheds, and students built their own cabins, until today they attend class in some 25 different frame buildings spread over a 54-acre campus.

The Holtville High system has bred self-reliance. Now when a boy begins the new school year, he tells his teacher what he wants to learn—American history, biology, business arithmetic, and veterinary work—and is assigned courses accordingly. Daily class schedules are flexible. If a student wants to go with his veterinary group to dehorn a farmer's cattle, he hands in his day's assignments to his teachers and takes off. By keeping up in his academic classes, he earns freedom to work on his treasured project.

The myriad activities of Holtville High students stimulate rather than interfere with their scholastic performances. The number who leave school before graduating has decreased from 45 to 25 percent since the present flexible school system was inaugurated 8 years ago. One graduate in four goes to college—the usual percentage from Alabama schools. For some years the State supervisor has kept a comparative record of Alabama high-school graduates in various colleges. Holtville High boys and girls were first one year, and always rank in the top quarter. Not one of them has ever flunked a single college subject, even for a semester.

Today there's a new spirit in Holtville. Farmers like to ride past the terraced land, the fields of wheat and oats as well as cotton, the peach orchards, and the barnyards alive with fat hogs, purebred cattle, and fine chickens. Their wives take pride in clean painted homes set in green landscaped lawns and furnished with radios, magazines, and modern plumbing. Families are healthier because they eat better and more varied meals, and they are happier because they spend their leisure more intelligently. At the same time the boys and girls are solidly sold on Holtville. They know it's a prosperous, upstanding community because they've made it that way themselves.

Resolution of General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following house resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island on January 9, 1947:

Resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States of America, and the Italian Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary with relation to the arrival of the Honorable Alcide de Gasperi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, in this country and the need of financial and economic help for Italy from the Government of the United States of America

Whereas the Honorable Alcide de Gasperi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, has arrived in this country as a guest of our Government to discuss financial and economic help from the Government of the United

States of America, necessary for the rebirth of his country and to alleviate the bitter suffering of his people; and

Whereas the people of Italy are united to us by long-standing ties of friendship and Italy was our cobelligerent in the war and is endeavoring to rehabilitate itself in a new regime of democracy; and

Whereas our country has fought a victorious war to establish a rule of justice and freedom among the peoples of the world and in order to win the peace we have to assist those countries which are suffering the ravages of the war, and which, like Italy, are anxious to join with us in the maintenance and defense of western civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States of America are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to extend to Italy all possible help; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the recording clerk of the house from Rhode Island to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, to the President of the United States of America and to the Secretary of State of the United States to be transmitted by him to the Italian Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Merger Plan Is Called Top Issue in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence entitled "Merger Plan Is Called Top Issue in Congress":

MERGER PLAN IS CALLED TOP ISSUE IN CONGRESS—NAVY WOULD FAVOR CONSOLIDATION IF DETAILS WERE MADE CLEAR

(By David Lawrence)

The most difficult problem to come before the new Congress is the "merger" of the armed services.

Members of Congress would prefer that the Army, Navy, and Air Forces get together on a plan and save the legislators much perplexity.

Some efforts to obtain an agreement have been made informally between the War and Navy Departments. Progress has been made, but ill feeling has been fostered by the unwillingness of Army and Army Air Forces officers to obey the request of President Truman that the subject be not aired in public.

Navy officers are represented as feeling that they are "gagged" while the spokesmen of the other services are not restricted. Only last week a prominent air officer made a speech criticising by innuendo another branch of the service and arguing in favor of the "merger" plan from the War Department viewpoint.

No "merger" plan adopted by Congress is going to be effective, and the national defense of the United States is going to suffer if representatives of one armed service seek to take advantage of another. The spirit will not be one of cooperation, but constant friction.

With the public demand for tax reduction and the cutting of Government expenses, it is natural that men in the armed services should be apprehensive about what will be done to the national-defense budget. But it is more than ever necessary that interservice conflicts should not govern the settling of the budget.

ALL SERVICES FAVOR MERGER

The present situation about the whole problem is that the Navy, Army, and Air Forces all favor a merger. The Navy has been reluctant to agree to any plan that did not delineate functions clearly, but the Navy does favor a merger plan and has offered several.

While the Navy favors the merger idea in principle, it has wanted to know how the principle would be applied in a concrete way. Last June President Truman made about the best outline of a merger plan that has been suggested, but with two major mistakes in it.

One related to the consolidating of all services in a single department. This has been more or less superseded by a trend toward three separate departments for Army, Air Forces, and Navy, respectively, but with an Office of Secretary of Defense, which it is hoped would never reach the proportions of a big department.

There is a vast difference between an office or bureau and an over-all department. The President didn't go into detail, but if he meant that the Secretary of Defense would be in the Cabinet and would coordinate the three departments the idea would fall on receptive ground generally.

Another mistake related to the question of airplanes for use of the Navy in connection with antisubmarine warfare and reconnaissance generally. The President's letter was not clear. The Army Air Forces have been seeking to get control of all airplanes, but the Navy folks feel that the lessons of the last war taught conclusively that air pilots trained to work with and under the jurisdiction of ship commanders in a fleet operation are better than those who work independently from land bases under Army auspices.

UNITED STATES RELIES ON SEA POWER

The point is vital to the future defense of a nation like the United States, which has to depend on sea power, and it is surprising that the Army Air Forces have not conceded this.

Under most of the merger plans proposed the Army Air Forces would have a coordinate part with the other services and would, of course, be preponderantly concerned with air operations. Ground armies and amphibious operations would have their own tactical air forces, as was so effectively demonstrated in the Pacific war.

The Army Air Forces made a wonderful record in strategic bombing and in air operations generally and have earned their right to be considered a coordinate department. But to demolish the Navy's own trained air force or to try to abolish the Marine Corps by merging it with the Army would weaken the defense of the United States by depriving this country of certain specialized operations that should remain under the Navy because they are primarily connected with ship tactics.

It would seem that the controversy over the merger has hurt the prestige of all the armed services somewhat because the truth is the Army, Navy, and Air Forces did a better job of coordinating and unification in the war than would be suspected from the many extreme comments to the contrary being made in an effort to get approval for particular plans of consolidation.

Editorial Tributes to Secretary of State James F. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials appearing in newspapers from all over the United States concerning the resignation as Secretary of State, of a distinguished South Carolinian, Hon. James F. Byrnes.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of January 9, 1947]

GOOD-BY, JIMMY BYRNES; HOWDY, GEORGE MARSHALL

Of all the American statesmen who have served their country as Secretary of State, from Washington's day to Truman's, not one has ever been faced with so many pressing problems in foreign relations as has James F. Byrnes.

He has served only a trifle more than a year and a half. Yet William H. Seward, in his eight turbulent years under Lincoln and Johnson, never had so many troubled spots in the world to watch as has Byrnes in less than a fourth of Seward's tenure.

History has placed Seward high among our great foreign ministers. He ranks with Jefferson, Jay, Webster, Calhoun, Blaine, Root, and Hughes.

We believe that if historians are left to write of the atomic age, the name of Jimmy Byrnes will be in the same category with his illustrious predecessors.

It is a source of regret that Jimmy Byrnes had to resign at this critical moment. Somehow, all Americans, from the taxi driver and the factory worker to the President himself, had a calm confidence that with Jimmy Byrnes sitting across the table from Molotov and Bevin that American interests would be meshed into the larger world interests in such a way as to preserve international peace as well as to maintain American honor.

Not that Byrnes is a cautious man. He is often a bold man. Never an isolationist, he has understood that cooperation of the United States with all the rest of the nations is the first essential to saving civilization from another world holocaust.

But that was just a beginning. He had to try to extract something that would pass, at least, for cooperation from some of the toughest diplomats who ever sat in a conference room.

He has done so much better than any other recent diplomat who has been assigned such a difficult role that there is no comparison.

He steps out during a lull in the treaty making. The minor treaties have practically been drawn. The major treaties—with Germany and Austria—are yet to come. Would that Jimmy Byrnes might feel that his health could permit him to go on to the greater tests ahead.

President Truman has made a good choice to fill Secretary Byrnes' shoes. Gen. George C. Marshall has a far greater experience in foreign relations than Byrnes had when he became the country's first minister.

His policies, without a doubt, will be the Truman-Byrnes policies.

Throughout all the war years it was General Marshall who made American military policy fit into the complicated picture of a war that was fought on three continents and on the islands of the seven seas. He and the United States Army were dominant among the forces of all the Allied Powers in wartime.

Since the war he has taken the China assignment, a much tougher job in a smaller sphere than Byrnes had. No, George Marshall didn't bring Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists together. Is there a human being on earth who could?

Just as Jimmy Byrnes refused to let the career men of the State Department live his life for him, so we believe will George Mashall quickly teach the traditional spats-and-striped-pants boys that he is going to run the State Department, with their help and not on their sufferance.

Nearly every time the chips have been down, the United States has come up with a leadership that sometimes seemed to materialize out of nowhere. We had a Washington in our Revolution, a Jackson when the first industrial economic pains hit us, a Lincoln for the Civil War, a Roosevelt to end our great depression and win World War II.

We seem to have been a fortunate Nation as well as a great one. We were lucky to find a Byrnes when our State Department was saturated with second-raters at Franklin Roosevelt's death and he was no longer here to run it.

We're fortunate now to have a George Marshall.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of January 8, 1947]

A GREAT SECRETARY GOES

It is on the record in correspondence disclosed at the White House that Secretary Byrnes had since last April been doing his exacting work at Washington, Paris, and New York in flat disregard of medical counsel. It adds to the American people's appreciation of the great services Mr. Byrnes has rendered to know that it was at the risk of a physical break-down that he labored day and night to perform his exacting task.

Senator VANDENBERG's tribute to the retiring head of the State Department, testifying that he has been an able, courageous, effective Secretary in the best American tradition, well expresses what the country feels. Our relations with Russia today show, despite remaining stresses and tensions, an improvement, compared with conditions last winter that would have seemed almost incredible at many times in the intervening months.

Mr. Byrnes' policy of mixing friendliness with firmness, of making no concessions on essential principles, has amply vindicated itself.

The country has assurance that the President intends that the same policy shall be adhered to throughout the coming months. Of the ability, courage, and sound Americanism of General Marshall, who will take over, there can be no question. In the selection of a head of the State Department at this time the fact that the man chosen would stand first in line of succession to the Presidency could not be ignored. There need be no fear that General Marshall will not measure up to any responsibilities the future holds in store for him.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun of January 8, 1947]

MARSHALL SUCCEEDS BYRNES

Secretary Byrnes' decision to retire brings the third change in the leadership of the State Department since the 1944 elections. First, Mr. Hull stepped out because of his health. His successor, Mr. Stettinius, resigned in July 1945. And now Mr. Byrnes, who succeeded Mr. Stettinius, himself gives way on the advice of his physicians to General Marshall.

The retiring Secretary leaves behind him a record of growth and achievement. President Truman had given him a wider discretion than President Roosevelt had allowed to either Mr. Hull or Mr. Stettinius. Coming to the office without experience in international negotiation and with no great background in world affairs, Mr. Byrnes has developed in the way an able man conscious of great responsibilities might be expected to develop. He has shown great patience and tact as a negotiator and has acquired an extensive knowledge of the field in which he operated.

He has not always carried his point. What negotiator could expect to do that? But he has managed to round out the work of peacemaking with the German satellite states, and has at the same time laid the groundwork for the larger settlement with Germany. It is unfortunate that his resignation deprives us of the experience he has gained in a year and a half of almost continuous negotiation. Any successor must of necessity spend a great deal of time in acquiring what Mr. Byrnes has acquired. But if Mr. Byrnes had to resign, General Marshall is, of all possible successors, the one likely to suffer least from this handicap.

As chief of staff during the war, General Marshall was in on all the conferences of the Big Three. He has been in the field as an executant of foreign policy for more than a year in China. His work in China has not been crowned with the success he sought, but who can doubt its competence? Certainly he had unusual opportunities for observing Russian policy while he was in the Far East, and it will be with Russia that he will have to conduct most of the negotiations concerning the German and Austrian treaties, which will constitute his first assignment as Secretary of State. As for the British, he was in intimate touch with them throughout his tenure as chief of staff.

There is one further point at which General Marshall promises to measure up to the standard set by his predecessor. Because of his long service in the House and Senate, Mr. Byrnes was as well equipped as Secretary Hull had been to deal with congressional committees on foreign policy. His ability to work with Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG was one of the elements in the success of the bipartisan approach to foreign policy. General Marshall also enjoys the confidence of congressional leaders. This was demonstrated repeatedly during the war. Now, as he takes over at the State Department, his congressional support will lend great promise to his work as a negotiator and as a prime figure in the bipartisan policy, the continuance of which is essential.

General Marshall is, to be sure, an Army man, and Army men are not always acceptable in civilian offices. This reservation is less important in his case, however, than it would be with most generals. He has always been the military statesman rather than the glamorous man in uniform. He has commanded confidence not because he was a romantic figure, but because of his solid abilities. It is these solid abilities which have brought about his appointment to succeed Mr. Byrnes, just as they occasioned his appointment to the China mission.

In a word, the departure of Mr. Byrnes is regrettable, but there is every reason to believe that one good man has been replaced by another.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of January 8, 1947]

BYRNES OUT, MARSHALL IN

Although Secretary of State James F. Byrnes' successor is one of the most distinguished of Americans, the resignation of the man who with patience and firmness stopped the expansion of Russia will cause regret, even dismay, in the United States and in those parts of Europe which are freer and easier because of his labors.

When Mr. Byrnes, a United States Senator from South Carolina, a Supreme Court Justice, an "assistant President," and then a Secretary of State, took the last office, there were some misgivings. It was recalled that when he was in the Senate his eminence was attributed to his flair for compromise; he was called a fixer. After he returned from Moscow in December 1945, the misgivings grew. He had talked to Stalin, but it seemed that his talent as a senatorial compromiser failed him at the Kremlin. The Russians were unlike United States Senators; they thought a concession was a sign of weakness. But Mr. Byrnes learned quickly.

At the first United Nations meeting in London in January 1946, he was bewildered by the Russian double cross. Molotov was very rough. Conciliation and appeasement did not work with the Russians any better than they had worked with the Nazis. So Mr. Byrnes and Senator VANDENBERG got together and wedded patience with firmness. Assured of bipartisan support through the prestige of Senator VANDENBERG, Mr. Byrnes started to get things done.

He engineered the 21-nation peace conference in Paris and skillfully used it as a sounding board to answer the Russian propaganda. And he gained great prestige by insisting, over the objections of Molotov and his entourage, that the smaller nations be heard. He could be as sharp as Molotov and as stubborn. His stock began to climb. When he wrote the note to Tito after the Yugoslavs shot down the American flyers, the opposition knew that the United States was not in a dilettante mood on European affairs.

Then Mr. Byrnes made his great speech at Stuttgart on the unification of Germany, and that is likely to become known as the most notable document of the reconstruction era.

By this time Mr. Byrnes had thoroughly convinced the men of the Kremlin that an American concession had not been a sign of weakness. The Russians backed down. As Mr. Byrnes finished his year of 1946 he could take satisfaction in his accomplishments: he had saved Trieste from Tito's Reds and kept a Russian squadron out of the Adriatic Sea; he had reduced the pressure on the Dardanelles; he had aborted the Russian attempt to set up a satelite state in Azerbaijan; he had won a Russian agreement to discuss peace treaties with Germany and Austria; he had wangled the American disarmament resolution through the UN Assembly in New York. As he resigned he left the peace treaties with the five German satellites ready for signature by his successor.

The United States had never had a Secretary of State who did so much for his country in so little time when time was short. And the world had rarely seen a man who in a year raised a reputation from so low a point to one so high. The hopes of all freedom-loving Europeans resided in him as they did for a little while in Woodrow Wilson 27 years ago. And the regenerated German Nation of the future may bless him.

His defect as a Secretary of State was that he was really not the Secretary of State at all. While he was holding the Russians at bay in person—enough of a task for any man—he could not guide his Department in addressing the affairs of the rest of the world. This can be inferred from President Truman's statement on foreign affairs in his message on the state of the Union. Mr. Truman reviewed those things that had been done vis-à-vis the Russians, but made no mention of what should be done, or might be done, in the Near East, the Middle East, the Far East, or Latin America.

It is possible that the new Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall, will mend these gaps in our foreign policy. His experience in China, whence he is now returning, surely has made him aware of the shortcomings of our policy in that quarter. His valedictory statement on Chinese affairs, calling down a plague on the House of Kuomintang and the House of Yenan, also, indicates that he knows what is needed.

General Marshall failed in his mission to China, but his was an honorable failure which redounded to his credit. The Chinese factions which he could not reconcile recognized that he was a great man while they rebuffed him.

As the wartime Chief of Staff he earned a world-wide reputation. President Truman called him the greatest military man this country has ever produced, and a great many of Mr. Truman's fellow Americans may agree with him. His labors as Chief of Staff fit him admirably for the task of pulling the State Department together, for he has a preeminent gift for organization. It is not likely that he will spend as much time in the field as Mr. Byrnes did, although he certainly will go to Moscow in March in Mr. Byrnes' place. That will be a meeting of foreign ministers, and it would be taken ill, especially in the Kremlin, if the American Foreign Minister sent a deputy.

It would be enlightening to know the thoughts in Moscow as the news is received of the American change. The Russians know the temper of General Marshall after watching near at hand his adventure in China. They may wonder if there is any significance in the appointment of the greatest military man this country has ever produced as the Secretary of State.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News of January 9, 1947]

WELL DONE, MR. BYRNES!

James F. Byrnes retires from office assured of the gratitude and affection of his fellow citizens.

He has been a great Secretary of State, as history unquestionably will record. He won that distinction in a service of only 18 months, but these were 18 difficult months in which a great war ended and an American foreign policy had to be devised and oriented to the developing, and in large measure unexpected, conditions of the peace.

The chief new condition he had to face was the revelation by events of an unexpected ambition and aggressiveness in the postwar diplomacy of Russia.

The policy of firmness and patience, with which he met that problem, is itself hardly more than a year old. The Stuttgart speech, in which Byrnes told the world that this country was in Germany for as long as the necessities of achieving peace and democracy in Europe might require, was delivered last September.

But in the intervening period the policy thus launched had achieved a diplomatic equilibrium with Russia, which, at this writing, appears to hold more promise of lasting world peace than had been visible at any time since the war ended.

This policy was largely the personal work of the Secretary of State. The President, of course, was ultimately responsible, but wisely conceded the initiative to Byrnes, who, in turn, had the wisdom to welcome gratefully the able collaboration of Senator VANDENBERG.

No small part, indeed, of Byrnes' service to the Nation has been his contribution, with VANDENBERG, to the achievement of an unprecedented bipartisanship in the originating and carrying out of foreign policy.

The country has been fortunate to have had available to head the Department of State during these crucial 18 months a man of Byrnes' special qualifications. He was new to diplomacy, as most Americans must be who assume this post, but he learned fast and proved to have the qualities of statesmanship. He has been both an able negotiator and a leader, able to mobilize popular support behind his policies.

He matched ability with devotion. During the past 6 months he has continued with his arduous duties under his doctor's warning that only rest might save his life. He persisted until, with the stage set for the German treaty negotiations, he felt he might turn over the responsibility to a successor.

Well done, Jimmy Byrnes.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News of January 8, 1947]

ONE GREAT MAN FOLLOWS ANOTHER AS SECETARY OF STATE

One great American succeeds another as Secretary of State.

James F. Byrnes, who resigned, has earned his title to greatness in that office. Under most difficult circumstances, after an uncertain beginning, he finally hammered out an American foreign policy that the world recognizes and respects. His own people support this policy almost unanimously.

This achievement overshadows all of Byrnes' previous career as Senator, Supreme Court Justice, and "war mobilizer."

President Roosevelt had made Byrnes' task extremely difficult, almost impossible. Roosevelt had been his own State Department. He had run the war with little thought as to the diplomatic problems that would follow victory. He shaped our fighting strategy with no consideration as to its effect on the bases of power and influence in the postwar world.

Believing it would hasten victory, he allowed Stalin to dictate where we should fight and where we should not. Stalin, however, considered every move in relation to the aggrandizement of the Soviet Empire and the extension of its influence.

Though this policy had been intended to speed the end of fighting, at the end in Europe it delayed peace. We halted our advance and sat on our weapons while we waited for Stalin to complete his promised conquests.

When Byrnes became Secretary of State, he confronted the physical results of this policy. Neither he nor any other living man knew all that had gone on in Roosevelt's mind. He could not know for certain what had transpired in Roosevelt's conversations with Churchill, Stalin, and lesser heads of states, including the Arabian. The Department did not have the records. Perhaps Roosevelt believed the United Nations could rectify all frontiers, including the Russian; could safeguard democracy even on the soil occupied by the Red dictator's armies.

Byrnes confronted the fact of a vast increase in the territory, power, and influence of the Communist dictatorship both in Europe and Asia, threatening the vestiges of democracy, capitalism, and liberty on both continents.

It was not possible for peaceful diplomacy to roll back the Communist conquests. But when the Russians resumed the march, pressing forward on many fronts, Byrnes determined to bring them to a halt. He made a stand on the goal line of western civilization and the line held.

In the midst of this effort, he was cruelly betrayed by treachery in the Cabinet, treachery that President Truman appeared momentarily to approve. When Truman recanted his approval of Henry Wallace's stab in the back, Byrnes loyally continued his labors for the President who had been disloyal to him.

Byrnes was already tired from the struggle, and the manifest ingratitude and stupidity of his Chief must have made the burden heavier than ever.

Though his resignation had been the subject of much speculation, it came finally as a surprise.

General Marshall has won acclaim as one of the great men of his age through his conduct of the war. As United States Chief of Staff, he really exercised the chief influence on both American and British strategy. There is an element of irony in the fact that he must now assume responsibility for the diplomatic problems that resulted in part from the plans he fostered and approved.

While Roosevelt was acting as his own foreign minister, high military commanders had more to do with the foreign relations that really counted than did the civilians in the State Department. Men like Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Walter Bedell Smith learned the business of diplomacy through practice.

The State Department, none too rich in talent, did not have the opportunity to develop leadership from its own ranks. The morale of subordinates has been undermined by rapid changes in the leadership of the Department. Marshall will be the fourth Secretary to serve in a little more than 2 years.

Recently he has been struggling with the most difficult task of all—the attempt to reconcile the Chinese nationalists with the Communist revolutionaries. He has not succeeded, for reasons he stated yesterday with eloquent candor. Yet this lack of success—under the circumstances it does not deserve the name of failure—has not diminished his prestige.

Bernard Baruch has just resigned the post from which he directed the Nation's policy regarding control of atomic weapons. There is risk that his resignation, coupled with Byrnes', may be interpreted abroad as a weakening of American support for the American policy. If so, we believe the interpretation will prove false.

We regret the departure of both men. But we rejoice that so wise, unselfish, and patriotic a man as General Marshall is available to head the State Department.

In one respect his recent experience may strengthen our position. He will certainly give to Asiatic affairs their due share of importance. Byrnes had been deeply, and necessarily, involved almost entirely in European problems. This may account in part for the flabbiness of our behavior over the incident at Dairen.

With no Vice President in office, Marshall would succeed to the Presidency if the President died. He is big enough for the job. Politicians will begin to think of him as an elective successor to the Presidency if Truman decides not to run again.

We do not believe political ambition prompted him to accept the post. He is 66 years old. He, too, is a man tired from heroic labors for his country.

The Nation is grateful to him for the services he already has performed and equally grateful to him for accepting the new call to duty.

Displaced Jews in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 15, 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD a very informative address delivered by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, adviser to Gens. Joseph T. McNarney and Mark Clark, in New York City on October 1, 1946.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer which indicates that the cost of printing the address will be $270. Notwithstanding the estimated cost, I regard the address to be so worth while as to justify the expense, and I make the request for its printing.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outset, I wish to express appreciation to my predecessor, Judge Simon H. Rifkind, who left a heritage of respect and sound policies which have made my task much less difficult than it might have been. In some ways, the problems have changed since his departure. In his final report, he stated that there were a hundred thousand Jewish displaced persons in Europe. Tonight I report that there are over 200,000. He was dealing largely with the men and women recently liberated from German concentration camps. Today the majority consists of recent infiltrees from eastern Europe. However, although the basic problems are in some respects different and greater, the basic policies which Judge Rifkind helped to establish should be and are the same.

The solid foundation laid by him has made it easier to build the subsequent superstructure of care.

I take this occasion also to express public appreciation to my own congregation, Temple B'rith Kodesh, Rochester, N. Y., for its understanding cooperation and generosity. For 4 years now I have been its absentee rabbi, most of that time directing the Jewish religious program for the armed forces and more recently as adviser of the United States commanders in Germany and Austria. And now again at the request of the Secretary of War they have granted me a further leave of absence to carry on this important undertaking. I cannot find words adequate to express my gratitude for their loyalty and on-going helpfulness.

I wish to pay public tribute to the high-level United States governmental authorities who have had some direct association with my responsibilities in Europe. The President of the United States, the Department of State, and the Department of War, have steadily maintained a sympathetic, humanitarian attitude toward the Jewish displaced persons. Under their direct responsibility, the borders of the United States zone in Germany and the United States in Austria have remained open to those of our people fleeing from persecution in eastern Europe. Their policies have been humanely and effectively implemented by the commanding generals of Germany and Austria, Gen. Joseph T. McNarney and Gen. Mark Clark. They have done more than implement policies from Washington. They have helped to fashion such policies as would give the maximum help and impose the minimum hardship. The United States governmental authorities, civilian and military together, have in my opinion, given the world the outstanding example of practical humanitarianism in this sorry postwar period.

And now I offer both an expression of appreciation and a report to the five major Jewish organizations who were originally consulted about my appointment and who are recognized as having the principal responsibility in matters affecting the Jewish displaced persons in Europe. I refer to the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Conference, the American Joint Distribution Committee, the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and the World Jewish Congress. Before I left for Europe, I called together the heads of these organizations and said, "There will be occasions when I will need the help and guidance of the organized Jewish community. There may be times when I will have to convey information and counsel to the Jewish community. I cannot and will not deal with disparate and perhaps conflicting groups on such delicate and urgent matters. In this, at least, there must be unity." It is gratifying to report that so far as my responsibilities are concerned, there has been unbroken working unity ever since. I informed the Secretaries of State and War as well as the theater commanders in Europe of my working relationship with these organizations. They agreed that full consultation and cooperation were necessary to sustain the morale and the physical well-being of the Jewish displaced persons. They appreciate the understanding, the assistance, and the functioning unity of these Jewish organizations and trust that it will continue at least as long as the need exists. My hope goes beyond that point. I trust that this unified effort is the promise, the symbol, and the pattern of a united Jewry in the years to come.

I wish to report also an increasing understanding in the relations between the United States Army and the Jewish community with reference to the displaced persons in Europe. For various reasons, for which it would serve no good purpose to recapitulate at this time, there was a period of criticism, irritation, and tension. The great disappointment of the Jews that displaced persons were still in camps in Europe somehow seemed to channel itself against those who were taking care of them and who also, I must add were equally disappointed that their charges had not been resettled elsewhere. In any event, that period has passed. Responsible Jewry knows now how indebted Jews are to the United States Army. On the other hand, the promotion of contracts between high military authorities and responsible Jewish leadership has increased the understanding, the appreciation and the dependence of the military in relation to these Jewish groups.

Let us look now at the relations between the military and the Jewish displaced persons themselves. I wish to state, in the first place, that the basic policies of USFET and USFA are excellent. Generals McNarney and Clark continue to grant haven to Jewish persecutees. They continue to maintain a differential in food, housing, and care favorable to the victims of Nazi persecution. They grant exemption to Jews from the pressure applied to other displaced persons to return to their countries of origin, fully recognizing the inhumanity of such a program for our people. They exclude Jews from all "no work, no eat" proposals. They give every possible assistance to the establishment of an adequate religious life among the displaced persons. Despite acute food shortages and the special problems of supply caused by the shipping strike, they granted extra rations to the Jews for the high holidays. In a communication which has just come to me from Frankfort, it is stated that the Army will not permit the Jews to pay for the publication of the talmud in Germany, which has recently been approved. We felt that it would be an appropriate historic gesture and an eternal answer to Nazi book-burning to have the schass published by the displaced persons in Germany and were ready to arrange for its financing out of Jewish funds. USFET headquarters, I now learn, is ready to make the paper and printing available out of its resources, consistent with its program of providing religious materials for displaced persons.

The top policies are excellent. The problems arise in the field. The displaced persons are not accustomed to American military procedures and disciplines. The young American GI finds it difficult to understand the displaced person. His way of thinking, his behavior patterns are foreign to him. As time passes, the displaced persons become increasingly burdensome to those who are responsible for their care. There is undoubtedly a subtle, unhealthy German influence which is probably growing.

To counteract the effects of these factors and to reduce undesirable tension to a minimum, we have undertaken a program of education and interpretation. I prepared an article on the Jewish displaced persons which appeared in three issues of the Stars and Stripes, the Army publication read by the military in Germany and Austria. It was also published in all of the unit newspapers and magazines and was distributed by the Information and Education Branch of USFET. In actual effect, therefore, this interpretation of the Jewish displaced persons was brought directly to the attention of the officers and enlisted men who are likely to have contact with them. There has been a similar effort to interpret American military policies and procedures through the Jewish chaplains, the central committee of liberated Jews, and the Jewish voluntary agencies. For example, when we found that incidents were developing on trains carrying large numbers of displaced persons from Austria to Germany because there was no adequate liaison between American personnel who issued orders in English and the displaced persons who failed to obey them in Yiddish, we arranged for Jewish chaplains to accompany these trains. At the point of origin they explained American military policies and procedures. They related the contribution the Army is making toward the saving of Polish Jewry. They shared the hardships and privations of the people on journeys of 2 or 3 days in boxcars, and then stayed in new camps for a day or two to help in the process of orientation.

Our staff has made an analysis of the incidents that have occurred since January 1, 1946, and on the basis thereof has prepared a list of "do's and don'ts" for the Army and for the displaced persons, pointing out concretely the things to avoid in order to reduce and perhaps eliminate unpleasant incidents.

One cannot generalize about the total relationship of GI and DP. In some places the Jews pay the highest tribute to the understanding and helpfulness of the American military in their area. In other places there is much criticism. We are doing what we can to obviate the difficulties and are receiving the fullest cooperation from the high-level military authorities.

The relationship between the Jews and the Germans is paradoxical. The studies made of German attitudes indicate no basic changes. I have seen nothing to prove that the Germans regret their anti-Semitism. They may regret the effects of it on world opinion. They may think that the Nazis were too crude in their techniques of persecution and extermination, just as most of them seem to regret only that Hitler lost the war, not that he started it. But they remain anti-Semitic.

The Jews likewise regard the Germans, who despoiled them and murdered their families, with an unforgiving hatred.

One might expect this combination of unforgiving hatred and unregenerate anti-Semitism to lead to grave friction. Actually, it does not. In many camps and centers the Jews live peaceably side by side with the Germans. Outbreaks of antagonism between them are rare, marginal rather than general. They may seem more general because it is the sensational isolated incident which is featured by the press, whereas the daily, quiet living together never makes the headlines. However, they do live together for the most part in an unbroken though uneasy peace. Some Germans are employed in Jewish camps even as vocational instructors. In a recent

incident in a camp near Munich the Jews actually took under their wing the German employees of the camp, not as hostages, as was erroneously reported in the newspapers, but for their protection until the excitement was calmed down.

Such incidents as have occurred were due for the most part to the use of German police in or near Jewish camps. Before his departure, Judge Rifkind asked for discontinuance of such practices in the camps. His recommendation at the time was not approved because of the reduction of American military personnel. However, subsequent incidents and continued interpretation have brought about the elimination of German police from Jewish camps. They have not as yet, however, brought about the exclusion of German police from the neighboring areas of Jewish camps. I must state in explanation of the Army's reluctance to take this step that:

(a) There are not enough American troops in United States Zone in Germany for policing purposes.

(b) Under the circumstances and because of larger policy, the Army finds it desirable to utilize Germans for German police purposes.

(c) If German police are pursuing actual or alleged law-breakers on a German road, their task would be made difficult, if not impossible, by the establishment, let us say, of a three-mile limit around Jewish camps.

Nevertheless, we have recommended that German police be excluded from the contiguous area and this is receiving consideration from the appropriate authorities.

Much could be said about the internal conditions among the displaced Jews. However, for the purpose of this report, let the following brief summary suffice.

In the first place, we sought to build up a sense of responsibility, dignity and status among the DP's. This took shape in the official recognition by General McNarney of the Central Committee of Liberated Jews. Hitler had outlawed Jewish communities from Europe and announced that he had forever destroyed them. The American Commander gave historic answer by granting legal recognition to a Jewish community within Germany itself. Even though, as we hope, this community will not long endure in Germany, as a gesture and as a symbol it is of profound significance. I wish you could have been present with me at the luncheon that General McNarney tendered in the Yankee Doodle Room of the Casino in Frankfort to the officers of the central committee. These Jews, so recently freed from concentration camps, still bearing upon their arms and upon their souls the marks of their persecutors, still having some excuse because of their experience with Nazis in uniform to question the intentions of anyone in uniform, conducting themselves as equals, with dignity, with propriety and with self-respect.

The Army is now preparing to give them a larger measure of responsibility in the administration of their own affairs. It calls on them to give orientation to the newcomers. It relies on them to help maintain law and order. On the other hand it is anticipated that the military authorities will not obstruct them but will assist them in keeping constantly before the world the simple fact that their basic problem of resettlement has not been solved.

I am pleased to report that on the occasion of its formal recognition, the committee brought to General McNarney the organized will of the Jewish displaced persons to work. This has been a difficult and complicated problem. The survivors of the concentration camps had neither the strength nor the will to work. Certainly they would not work for the German economy. Through the months this unreadiness to work became almost a fixation, a kind of group psychosis. It exercised a profound demoralizing influence. Steadily there has developed a healthy change. At present a substantial percentage of the employable Jews actually do some work in the administration of their own camps. The time has now come, they reported to General McNarney, when they are ready to go further. They are prepared now to do any work for the needs of displaced persons, non-Jewish as well as Jewish, for the Army and for its dependents, and for UNRRA, but not for the German economy. We are engaged now in planning for a realistic work program, which is extremely difficult because of problems of materials, machinery, financing, and so forth. With the approval of the Secretary of War, I am at this time engaged in securing experts to come to Germany to set up such a program.

In this connection, I wish to state that the recent infiltrees have contributed something new to the total picture. Unlike the earlier displaced persons directly liberated from concentration camps, most of the newcomers are from Russia, whither they fled before the advancing Nazi armies. They are not the products of the abnormalities of the concentration camps. They are accustomed to hard work. It would be a great pity if their capacity and will to work were to be dissipated. We shall do everything possible to prevent this.

It became clear early in our experience that the problems of Jewish property restitution were too complex for a rabbi. We recommended to General McNarney and General Clay that a recognized Jewish expert be attached to the military government staff to handle it. The recommendation was accepted, the Jewish organizations were consulted, and a distinguished attorney with long legislative and governmental experience was appointed. Mr. Max Lowenthal is now engaged in this difficult and complex undertaking.

The largest single problem that confronted us was the infiltration from Poland, which in a short time doubled the Jewish displaced persons population in Germany and Austria. Even before the Kielce pogrom, the robbing, beating and killing of Jews in Poland had increased the flow of those seeking safety in our zone. On the 4th of July a maddened mob of Poles gathered outside the Jewish Community House in Kielce and demanded the blood of the Jews. No one protected the Jews. No one helped them. The church authorities refused to lift a finger. The police either turned their backs or participated with the mob. The local government was either helpless or indifferent, and it was only after 42 of these people, many of them the fine, young comrades of the Kibbitz, had been beaten to death, and many more severely, some fatally, wounded, that the national government effectively intervened and put a stop to the pogrom.

The Polish Jews who were coming back from Russia hoping to get back some of their families' possessions or property, had immediately learned that even when the law granted them restitution it was nullified by a letter from the Polish Fascist forces threatening their lives if they attempted to claim their rights.

Polish anti-Semitism was as old as Polish history. At regular intervals, it erupted into pogroms. The Easter season left no Jews free from a sense of fear. The old lies of Christ-killing and blood-letting were inculcated in the churches and disseminated therefrom. Then the Poles learned some new things from the Nazis. They were given instructions and authorization to exterminate Jews. The more than 90 percent of Polish Jewry who were murdered during the Nazi regime actually perished, for the most part, at the hands of Poles working under German orders rather than at the hands of the Nazis themselves. The disturbed postwar conditions in Poland produced tensions and frictions of which the Jews were made the scapegoat. The Communist-dominated government is unpopular with the majority of the Polish people and in particular with the articulate, well-organized Polish groups which are also anti-Semitic. The Jews were ground between the upper and lower millstones. The Kielce pogrom was the logical outcome of these conditions.

Not long thereafter, I managed to get into Poland. I wanted to see with my own eyes the conditions which the refugees were reporting to me. I desired to exercise, if possible, some restraining influence on Polish anti-Semitism. And officially I was interested in bringing back to General McNarney a realistic analysis of the problems and needs that were likely to confront him as Commander of the United States Forces in Europe.

I visited the larger centers of Jewish life in that country, including Warsaw and Lodz. I went then to lower Silesia where the government had undertaken an interesting experiment in repatriating Jews, giving them the housing, farm lands, heavy industry jobs, and some of the businesses that had been formerly the possession of the Germans who had been expelled. I visited the repatriation centers into which flowed the tens of thousands of Jews coming back out of Russia whither the German armies had driven them. They returned to Poland with high hopes of finding some of their loved ones, of recovering some of their possessions, of reestablishing their lives in their former homeland. But on all counts they found themselves doomed to frustration and despair. Most of them decided to leave Poland, and no one was able to convince a single Jew to wait or remain in Poland who had reached the conclusion that his life was no longer safe there; that neither he nor his family had any future there.

I could understand their feelings. I was drawn to the Polish ghetto as with a dark fascination. It is the last word in desolation and sorrow. Except for an empty, unused church on the very edge of it, an apt symbol I thought of the ineffectuality of Christianity in preventing or mitigating the most un-Christian barbarism of all time, the ghetto is a vast sea of rubble. Every house, every building was systematically destroyed. There is a strange, weird, deathly silence about the area. Nothing living stirs in it. No traffic passes through it. The only people you see are the human vultures, the poor Poles who dig about in the ruins searching for money and valuables which Jews buried, hoping vainly to return from the camps where they were exterminated. I stood at the quiet, unused railroad siding at which each day Jews were loaded into locked box cars, and carried to the extermination chambers at Auschwitz and Treblinka.

There is a memorial to the ghetto resistance. But, much more poignant were the unmeant memorials. The little heaps of bone fragments, the belt buckles, the utensils which the victims wore or used before they were killed. The stench of death was still in the air.

I could easily see why the Jews would want to leave Poland. Every stone cried aloud of the blood of their loved ones. The very people with whom they were now being asked to help rebuild Poland were those who had helped to destroy their families. A rabbi in the Polish Army said to me, "I loathe this uniform. These Poles killed my wife and two children. I will stay here only long enough to help the survivors to escape."

In the hospital in Lodz I called upon those who had lived through the Kielce pogrom. For some it was only a temporary respite from death. One man, Sokolowsky, was dying before my eyes from a crushed spine.

Another, dreadfully wounded, kept asking for his wife. Because his own life hung in the balance, they told him she was in another hospital, but they told me she was dead, murdered by the pogromists. One woman, whose body had been pounded out of human shape, told me how miraculously she and her husband had survived the war and the Nazi concentration camps. They had been separated by a thousand miles but managed, as if drawn by a magnet of love, to find each other when the holocaust had passed and now with a new-born child had settled in Kielce when the pogrom struck and her husband was slain.

There was a certain almost objective bewilderment and horror with which these people described what had happened to them. They just could not understand how other human beings could hate them so. There had never been any personal difficulties between these Jews and their attackers. Most of them in fact had but recently come to Kielce and were known to be on their way to other places. They described how their attackers, including women and children, had used bricks and rocks, clubs, pieces of iron and steel, and had concentrated particularly in attacks upon their heads and genital organs, so that most of the dead were beaten into unrecognizability. Only the concentration camp numbers on their arms testified to their identity.

Yes; I could understand why the Kielce pogrom deprived the Jews of Poland of whatever sense of security they had formerly possessed.

And then I saw them on the move. Perhaps in some ways, this was worst of all. Together with the Christian Poles they had been persecuted and despoiled by the Nazis and their families had been murdered. Together with the Poles they had yearned, lived, and fought for the liberation of their country and of all Europe, and now they had to run away from Poland. Tragedy compounded, disillusion without end! On the way to the points in lower Silesia from which the movement started which brought them eventually to the United States Zone, Germany, they were again beaten, robbed and some of them were killed. They were gathered in shelters near the border where they lay on the floors, no beds, no pillows to rest their heads on; and in some cases, no food, for everything was taken from them. Like criminals, they had to steal out at night. As one of them said to me, "Apparently we are criminals. Our crime is that we are Jews." I saw them crowded into trucks, 58 by actual count in one truck, men, women, and children, the old, the infirm, and the sick, the pregnant women and little babies, each allowed space only for such possessions as could be carried in a small bag or a briefcase, and again on the way to the borders their last possessions were stolen from them. If they couldn't pay the bribes demanded by the petty Polish officials, sometimes they would be thrown into jail. The crowning indignity was their inability to be transported across the border by vehicle. They were dumped unceremoniously some distance east of the border and then had to walk with their possessions and children and ailments over the frontier to Czechoslovakia where they received more humane care but were expeditiously moved on their way out of the country.

Before I left Poland, I was able to do two things for these people. For the survivors of the Kielce pogrom, I was able to secure from the Jewish agency a commitment for the earliest possible shipment to Palestine of these survivors, when they could move. I met with the Prime Minister of Poland who quite genuinely, in my opinion, proclaimed his Government's good will toward the Jews and its opposition to anti-Semitism. However, particularly since the Kielce pogrom, they felt they had no right to insist that the Jews remain in Poland. I asked him then why, if his government permitted the Jews to depart, they were also allowing the soldiers and petty officials to rob, beat, and extort bribes from them as they were leaving. He promised to try to correct this, and subsequent reports indicated that he kept his promise—that the outward movements thereafter were protected by the government, that they took place in daylight, not at night, and that the people, apart from the dangers they were fleeing and the uncertainties to which they were going, at least were reasonably safe in the process of moving.

But these were minor matters compared with the great tasks confronting us. For it was perfectly plain to me that most of the 160,000 Jews in Poland were on the move and that their immediate destination was the United States Zone in Germany. Yes, they were on the move. On one night alone, according to a telephone message from Prague, 3,900 people crossed the border. Can you begin to visualize the problems of reception, housing, feeding, care, medical attention, clothing, as well as the longer range needs of education, work, religious life? Until the middle of September there was no day when fewer than 1,000 came our way.

At this point, I say, "Thank God for the United States Army." The United States Army alone has given shelter and care to the great numbers of our people fleeing from eastern Europe out of fear and desperation.

I flew back from Poland to my headquarters in Frankfort and reported to General McNarney. I told him that 60,000 Jews would be fleeing Poland between August 1 and October 31, and most of them in the first 6 weeks, and that another 40,000 would probably come out over the winter, leaving perhaps 60,000 who were planning to remain in Poland. I recommended to him the continuation of traditional American policy of haven for the persecuted. Similar recommendations were conveyed to the President of the United States. Despite pressures to the contrary, despite the critical housing and food shortages of Germany, despite the lack of any clear outlet for these people, the borders were kept open.

However, appreciating the problems of the Army, recognizing the fact that, although more than half of the housing in the United States Zone in Germany had been destroyed by bombing, the total population was already 3,000,000 above the prewar level, and hundreds of thousands of expelled Germans were yet to be returned to Germany by countries such as Czechoslovakia, which was forcing them out. I took it on myself to attempt to arrange for some dispersal of the flow from Poland. This was something which General McNarney, as United States military commander, could not undertake, but which I, with the cooperation of the major Jewish agencies, could properly do. I met first with the leaders of the major Jewish groups who were at that time gathered in Paris for the Peace Conference. We agreed on a program and swung into action.

First, Gen. Mark Clark, commander of the United States Forces, Austria, whose adviser I had also become, agreed to raise the level of his settled Jewish displaced persons population from 5,000 to 30,000. In this, as in all other matters on which we have dealt, he was willingly cooperative. He orders his staff to take the "can-do" attitude on these matters and gives them the example himself.

Next, we sought to set up camps for 25,000 Jewish displaced persons in Italy. At first, Mr. LaGuardia, the Director General of UNRRA, declined to assume such responsibility because of UNRRA's intention to liquidate its affairs. Subsequently, in the company of some of the Jewish leaders, I called on Mr. LaGuardia, and he agreed to UNRRA's assuming responsibility for such camps, providing:

1. The United States State Department would get the consent of the Italian Government.

2. That the War Department would provide the food for the camps.

These were difficult conditions to meet, and even today the program has not been accepted. However, I flew to Italy with General McNarney, and with him discussed the project with the American and Allied military commanders. I presented it as effectively as I could to the head of the UNRRA mission in Italy and to the Italian Cabinet member responsible for such matters. Finally, I was granted a 45-minute interview with Pope Pius XII at his summer residence at Gastel Gandolfo. It was a satisfying talk. He sat behind a desk and I sat by its side, and we proceeded from the realms of generalities to the specific matters which were my responsibility. I requested certain specific action. He agreed to take it. I now await results.

In France we secured temporary visas for a large number of Jews from Poland. They are to be supported by JDC until they can be moved to their ultimate destination. Similar arrangements are now in process for Belgium, Holland, and Sweden.

I met with the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia and urged on him the establishment of camps for 10,000 in his country. He asked if I could get him some guaranty that these Polish Jews would not remain in Czechoslovakia. Alas, even in Czechoslovakia, Jews were fearful lest this project jeopardize their security. They, too, did not want Polish Jews to remain in their country. Once again the United States Army came through. General McNarney authorized me to give his personal guaranty to the Czechoslovakian Government that on July 1, 1947, if so requested and with 30 days' notice, he would take these Jews from Czechoslovakia to the United States Zone in Germany. When I left, we were awaiting a definite answer from Czechoslovakian Government. Before my departure from Europe we were setting up a plan to settle 2,000 children in a well-equipped, former German camp in Norway where a number of groups, the Norwegian Government, the United States Army, UNRRA, JDC, were assuming combined responsibility.

My heart is heavy as I report that not a single government in Europe has been prepared to offer more than temporary shelter to these people. In spite of all that these Jews and the others have suffered together at the hands of the Nazis, these Jews are still unwanted, still stigmatized, still excluded from the normalities of life.

It has been my difficult task as well as great opportunity and privilege to arrange at least for the physical safety of these people and for their shelter and care. In spite of all that we are doing for their dispersal, most of them still come to territory controlled by the United States. Coming in such vast numbers before adequate accommodations can be secured or gotten ready, there are many difficult problems. The life for the new people is not pleasant. The conditions which confront them at the beginning are cheerless and discouraging. Their basic problems are still unsolved; but they are safe. When my predecessor laid down his responsibilities, he said that there were 100,000 displaced Jews in the occupied countries. Today there are 200,000. In these few months we have saved more Jews from death and despair than perhaps has ever been accomplished in so short a time in all our tragic history.

Let us look ahead at some of the impending problems and difficulties.

The steady reduction of United States military personnel carries with it some potential dangers to the Jews. For, with the reduction

of American personnel, it follows that more responsibility in Germany must be borne by German personnel, and the Jews do not trust the Germans, for good reason.

The drastic reduction of appropriations to the United States forces in Europe creates some grave problems in the care of the displaced persons, for the displaced persons budget comes out of Army appropriations. If there is not enough money to go around, the displaced persons will feel the shortage as the GI's will, but since they live much closer to the edge, they will feel and suffer the results more keenly. It is not enough for the United States Government to establish and maintain a policy of haven and care to persecutees, but must also provide the Army with necessary funds. All men of good will should do everything in their power to induce the Congress of the United States to give the Army of the United States the funds with which to carry out its responsibilities.

If this is not done, there will be increased pressure to lower standards which are already at the minimum. There have been proposals already to eliminate the differential for persecutees. There have been proposals to cut their rations below 2,200 calories, which allows them little more than coffee and bread and margarine for breakfast; a stew for dinner; coffee, cheese, and crackers for supper.

There have been some proposals to place Jewish infiltrees under the administration of German welfare agencies. This would be hateful to Jews. It could not be administered smoothly or effectively. It would be offensive to the World Jewish Community. It would be in violation of basic policies established by the President of the United States, the State and War Departments, and the Theater Commanders.

Thus far, these proposals have been rejected by the responsible military authorities, but they continue to hover about the margins of the situation. So long as the Army does not have enough money to fulfill its responsibilities, we will not be free of the threat of it. It is imperative, I repeat, that every effort be made to induce Congress to give the Army the means with which to do its job.

There is another grave danger which is the product of the total situation. It is not only because of reduced personnel and appropriations that more responsibility and autonomy are being granted to the Germans but also because of the desire to reestablish the German economy and to reduce the cost of the occupation to the American taxpayer.

For the Jews, the implications are not good. It becomes just that much more difficult to take a German house or German farm for displaced persons despite the fact that the Germans robbed the Jews of infinitely more than could ever be taken away from them for this purpose, despite the fact that the Germans are still the beneficiaries of the Jewish property that they confiscated; despite the fact that the Jews are still homeless in camps while the Germans are reestablishing their national life in their own homes and on their own soil.

It is not my province to discuss American foreign policy in the current delicate international situation, but it is my duty to indicate the need for the greatest vigilance to protect the elementary rights of the people whom the Germans slew and despoiled.

The final danger of which I wish to speak is the threat of demoralization to the displaced persons themselves. It is in the nature of almost of a miracle that they maintained their sanity and balance and hope so long and in the face of such obstacles. But how much longer can this go on? And, remember that we are speaking now of the second largest concentration of Jews on the European continent. These displaced persons are now exceeded in numbers only by the Jewish population of Rumania. Let me give you the statistics:

Jewish displaced persons in United States Zone, Germany	130,300
Jewish displaced persons in United States Zone, Austria	33,901
Jewish displaced persons in British Zone, Germany (approximately)	23,000
Jewish displaced persons in French Zone, Germany (aprpoximately)	2,000
Jewish displaced persons in British, French Zones in Austria (approximately)	3,000
Jewish displaced persons under UNRRA in Italy (approximately)	9,000
Jewish displaced persons in France (approximately)	7,000
Jewish displaced persons temporarily in European continental countries (approximately)	10,000
Total	218,201

What needs yet to be done? In the first place, we must give material help on a scale never before required. There are about 1,250,000 Jewish survivors on the European continent, apart from those in the Soviet Union. Nearly a million of them are in need of help. Hundreds of thousands are completely dependent for food, clothing, and shelter on Jewish voluntary relief agencies. The balance get some indispensable, supplementary help from them.

The Nazis systematically and completely despoiled the Jews. With rare exceptions, they are utterly destitute. There are no indigenous Jewish communities to carry these burdens. Even the elementary program of rescuing Jewish children must be financed entirely by American funds. Because so many children were exterminated each child has a thousandfold worth. Most of them have to be ransomed; substantial sums are paid to the non-Jews who kept them in their homes during the Nazi regime.

The movement of the refugees up to this point has had to be financed by Jewish funds. There are way stations where shelter is provided, hot meals are served, clothing is distributed, medical care is available. When you remember that in one night alone 3,900 people crossed the border from Poland to Czechoslovakia, that the average in the past 2 months has exceeded a thousand a day, you will have some idea of the cost.

Even in Germany and Austria where the United States Army has assumed the principal burden of care, life would be intolerable for these poor people without the supplementary help of the joint distribution committee. In Germany, for example, these displaced persons receive 2,200 calories per day. In Austria the Army is able to provide out of its reduced appropriations only 1,200 calories a day. The diet is not only inadequate but monotonous and dreary. JDC supplements it in both countries so as to maintain health and morale. Our Jewish agencies provide teachers and materials for the education of the surviving children and practical programs for vocational training. They have reestablished a religious life among these people so that they have something to cling to.

Material help is therefore a prime necessity. The second concerns the United States and has to do with the early resettlement of these people. As I will indicate later, most of them want to go to Palestine. But there are considerable numbers who desire to migrate to the United States. For most of them, the prospects are almost hopeless. Even under the existing quota arrangement, very little has been done to expedite immigration. A maximum of 3,900 people a month is possible under the reestablished quota laws. In actual fact, I have been informed that fewer than 3,900 have entered the United States not in the last month, but in the last 6 months. The whole program is cluttered with red tape. It has never been galvanized into dynamic action. When I was in Poland I learned that despite the Polish quota, not a single visa had yet been issued in Poland. They had not even opened the Consular Office to do this.

However, we should go beyond existing immigration policies. We are the richest country in the world. Our economy has expanded beyond our fondest hopes. There is a grave labor shortage. The acceptance of another 50 or even 100,000 displaced persons into the United States would not adversely affect our social order. Many of these people bring needed skills with them, as for example, tailoring, which is very much in demand at the present time. Others can create new products.

The organized Jewish community through the National Refugee Service provides transportation for these people, gives them care on their arrival and offers assurances to our American communities that they will not become a burden.

Palestine is the major hope. Over 90 percent of these Jewish displaced persons insist on going to Palestine. They don't want to be pushed around any more. They want to start life on their own land and on their own terms—they don't want to be tolerated somewhere else. They don't want to live in the graveyard of both memory and of hope which Europe has become for them. I can assure you that they will brave every hardship and every danger to settle in Palestine. They will not be daunted by Arab terrorism or British obstructionism. For them it is literally Palestine or death.

Palestine has had a wonderful effect upon those who have already found a home there. It heals them of their wounds, straightens out their complexes, washes them clean of the scars of the ghetto. They are entitled to this new, free, clean life and they are going to get it.

It is my opinion that the United States Government will find it far less costly in money, irritation, and even life to take the positive steps now to resettle these people in Palestine than to temporize.

Finally, I wish to say that the treatment of these Jews is the ultimate test of our war and peace aims. It has been the crucial but tragic role of our people to reflect the health of world society. When the body politic was sick, Jews were persecuted; when men lived in peace and freedom, Jews shared the common blessings.

So in our time the Nazi assault upon the Jews, as some of us vainly tried to tell the world 15 years ago, was the prelude that contained the pattern for the attacks upon and for the catastrophe that would yet befall the entire family of nations. It was all there in what happened in the early 1930's to the Jews of Germany. So will it be again today if the surviving Jews of Europe will be betrayed or abused or neglected; that will be the pattern, the shape of things to come. But if these, the first and worst victims of the Nazi enemy, who fought hardest and suffered the greatest losses, will be cherished as comrades in a common struggle for human rights and human emancipation, if we will together bind their wounds and heal their sorrows, if we will stand by their side in their reestablishment as normal, self-respecting human beings, it will be the promise and ultimately the fulfillment of a better day to come for all mankind.

Necessity for Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "There's a Four-Letter Word for It," written by Mr. W. E. Zipp, vice president of the Ceco Steel Products Corp.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE'S A FOUR-LETTER WORD FOR IT

(By W. E. Zipp, vice president, Ceco Steel Products Corp., Chicago, Ill.)

America has the highest standard of living in the world, but something is happening to it. There is talk of a recession—even a depression. We at Ceco do not believe a depression has to come in the building industry.

We know nothing about nylons, breakfast foods, or radios. But 35 years in the construction industry have taught us something about building and its problems. We believe the construction industry can and should lead the way back to an even higher standard of living.

We admit the complexities of today's situation. But we feel that these complexities can be circumvented. So why think a depression? Why not do in peace as we did in war, expect prosperity, plan prosperity, work for prosperity?

Let's look at the facts a minute. Today our needs for everything are the greatest in our history. There is accumulated purchasing power to keep industry humming for years to satisfy those needs, particularly the building industry. Then what is the fly in the ointment; why the fear that we are headed for collapse?

We at Ceco believe it's something the economists haven't analyzed. We believe that prosperity depends on a different kind of straight thinking—on whether we, as individual Americans, are willing to work to make prosperity work. It's as simple as that.

It won't be easy. We said "work!" and we mean "work!" We of management must really work at managing. We must junk the too-frequent wait-it-out idea.

And labor must work—produce more instead of less—reduce over-all costs per unit—justify high wages. Wages must not spiral after prices and prices after wages. Labor and management both must have something left after they've made their investment of time and capital.

It can be done if we're intelligent enough, willing enough, fair and square enough.

Of course, we can't do it overnight. We can't provide a new home or plan for everyone who wants one next week, or next month, or even next year. But we can start—and keep on * * * and once the ball is rolling the results can astound even ourselves. When Roosevelt announced our production goals for the first year of the war, the world laughed. It was a different story when we exceeded them. Then, we were unprepared. Today, we have everything to work with if we're permitted to use it—and will use it.

Sure, during the war, costs were a secondary consideration. But today, in a freer economy, the same will-to-work can drive down costs and prices, and drive up the production which labor needs to stay prosperous.

We eased up after the shooting stopped—all of us. That's understandable. We needed to. But we've had our breathing spell. Now let's face the fact that there is no magic road to prosperity—that we cannot get something for nothing indefinitely. Always, eternally and inevitably, we of management and labor are going to have to work for prosperity.

Here at Ceco we have faith—faith that horse sense is finally taking hold. The productivity of labor is increasing. Absenteeism and turnover are decreasing. Output per man-hour is on the upgrade. Controls are no longer the bug-a-boo they were. Many critical material shortages are leveling off. Some cities have modernized their building codes, and a general revision is in progress.

In the past year unfavorable factors plagued us and at times we were not pleased with the service we gave. Shortages of steel and manpower, coupled with many delays, held down our production levels. We are apologetic to all of our good customers, who for the most part have been understanding and tolerant.

Yet as we look back over 1946 we're really surprised to see how much we did accomplish. We performed the following things in preparation for greater prosperity:

1. We doubled manufacturing capacity in our plant No. 1. Also, expansion plans went forward in our 14 other plants and warehouses, coast to coast.

2. We facilitated management operations by centering our general offices at plant No. 1.

3. Company-wide, we increased our plant and erection organization by 40 percent, our office personnel by 30 percent.

4. With additions to our research facilities and personnel, we developed 16 new major products. More than 100 others still are under study. War experience is reflected in expanded use of diversified metals.

5. We—management and labor—increased production. Shipments of several principal lines, including screens and windows, were and now are greater than ever before.

6. We—management and labor—reduced absenteeism in our plants by 50 percent.

7. We consistently modernized our equipment and machinery for maximum production.

8. We improved our agent-dealer structure and our service to agents-dealers.

What we did, many others did. In the days ahead we all can do even better.

Just a few fundamental virtues are necessary. Hard work, intelligence, and sympathetic understanding of labor's problems upon the part of management. Hard work—ever-increasing production—understanding of management's problems upon the part of labor.

We can say that here at Ceco we have the finest working conditions, the finest safety record, and the greatest opportunity in the history of our company.

We believe that production will maintain these high standards and even better them; production that justifies high wages; production sufficiently great for the costs involved, to make the selling price within the reach of the widest possible markets.

America has never yet admitted defeat. Why start now? High living standards can be cushioned against depression. Let's all quit doodling and get to doing. Yes, there's a four-letter word for it—w-o-r-k.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements and Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Reciprocal Trade Agreements and Tariffs, delivered by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] before the Mining and Metallurgical Society Mining Club, at the annual dinner meeting in New York on January 14, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the subject on which I was asked to address you, but I propose that we shorten that title and talk only about tariffs and tariff policy. Personally, I dislike double talk and certainly the name "reciprocal trade agreements" would fall in the general category. The word "reciprocal" was used as bait in the desire to have people think in terms of an exchange with some element of equality. The word "agreement" was used only as a device to avoid the constitutional requirement for Senate approval of treaties. These agreements are treaties, of course, and in the negotiation of them we departed far enough from the idea of reciprocity to comply with the scriptural admonition that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

What I have to say to you about tariff policy will come under three headings, namely, some elementary facts; what is currently transpiring; and what our attitude or program should be. Now for a few elementary facts.

All nations regulate their foreign trade. This is not a new development; they have always done so. Many devices are used to accomplish this, of which tariffs are the least objectionable. Obviously, all these regulatory devices are restrictive in one way or another, so it is important to know what they restrict.

The reason, I say that tariffs are least objectionable is because you know in advance what duty you must pay in order to enter a given market. You can enter the market at a price and you know what that price is. Naturally, the amount of the duty must be calculated in order to determine your ability to compete. Also, it is true that there are tariffs so high as to be prohibitive. The truth is that there are few such rates remaining in the United States tariff. If it were not so, we would hardly be the world's largest importer.

On the other hand, many nations maintain tariffs higher than those of the United States, but where they are really bent on restricting trade, tariffs are ineffective. That is why most nations use quotas, import permits, exchange restrictions, and other devices that really restrict or stop the movement of goods. You can readily see the difference, for whereas these devices restrict the movement of goods and in many cases completely stop such movement, tariffs permit the movement but impose a tax on it. This also is restrictive. But what does it restrict? Well, it tries to prevent the lower standards of other countries from undermining our higher ones. It does this by

making an approximate equalization of the differences in the cost of competitive goods as such differences reflect lower standards of wage and living. Please note that I said competitive goods. Contrary to popular belief, the United States has for many years followed the policy of admitting noncompetitive goods free of all duty. Few nations have such an extensive free list as the United States and that is why over a period of many years, more than two-thirds of all our imports pay no duty at all. So, when we talk of United States tariffs, we mean the tariffs that provide this equalization on those things that we can produce in the United States just as efficiently as they can be produced anywhere else. And may I remind you at this point that efficiency and cheapness are not synonymous terms. Cheapness may result from efficiency. Unfortunately, it may also result from low wage and living standards.

Before going on to matters of immediate interest, may I recommend to those of you who are interested, a study of tariffs made several years ago, in which the relative heights of tariffs in the United States and other nations were compared. It is rather amazing to find that, contrary to the propaganda of more than a decade, our tariffs are lower than most nations—not higher. If I remember rightly, this study was published by the American Tariff League in New York under the title of How High Are American Tariffs? and I suppose you could get a copy from them if it is still in existence.

Let's review a little history: The Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934 ceded to the executive branch of the Government certain powers Congress possesses constitutionally under the commerce clause. However well intended this move may have been, merits which its supporters claimed for the theory of reciprocal trade agreements could not be proved at that time, for World War II was coming on, and by the time any substantial number of reciprocal trade agreements were made and ready to operate, the economy of the world was badly out of balance because of the war.

Now for current happenings: The State Department is proceeding to commit us internationally to a system we haven't ourselves had sufficient experience with to properly evaluate. A conference took place in London beginning October 15, 1946. It was attended by representatives of 17 or 18 nations. They considered proposals made by the State Department of the United States for a world charter for an International Trade Organization. These charter proposals are an elaboration of proposals made by the State Department in December 1945, under the title: "Proposals for the Expansion of World Trade and Employment."

The latest published document is a State Department publication No. 2598 which is entitled "A Suggested Charter for an International Trade Organization of the United Nations." Since this booklet was published in September, the London Conference I mentioned above has been concluded and publication No. 2598 has been superseded by a new draft which has not yet been generally released to the public by the State Department. Further, a subcommittee of the United Nations is scheduled to do more redrafting at Lake Success, N. Y., from January 20 to February 28.

I hope that the results of the redrafting will be promptly thereafter published by the State Department and made available to the general public, because the plans and potential commitments contained therein will be of great importance to all Americans. However, I fear that there will be little opportunity for the public at large to become very well acquainted with these proposals inasmuch as hearings have already been scheduled to begin early in March in several different cities in the United States. Presumably, every interested American citizen will have an opportunity to express his opinion at these hearings, but I ask you how can we expect our citizens to familiarize themselves with a complicated document which in its form today contains 89 articles and which is to undergo further redrafting, if the redrafting is completed on February 28 and hearings begin on March 3? Aside from the grave danger that there will be complacency on the part of most people, actually, I believe that it will be next to impossible for anyone to completely familiarize himself with what the proposals contain, much less make his wishes known in respect to them and their implications and effect.

My own impression is that these proposals embody a strange and unfortunate mixture of good and bad. Everyone of us who has ever had any contact with international trade is aware of the fact that a tremendous amount of constructive work can be done by some international organization created for the purpose. General agreement as to rules of the game, collection and dissemination of accurate statistics, general agreement on administrative practices, and other such matters which I need not mention, can be extremely constructive.

The preliminary charter contains proposals for doing these very things. Unfortunately, it also contains other matter to which many of us are or should be unalterably opposed.

One such is the very considerable discussion of cartels, private and intergovernmental. The underlying theory seems to be that all of the former are bad but that just as soon as the same practices, except on a more grandiose and complete scale are done by government, they become positively angelic. I repudiate that assumption as wholly fallacious. In either case the agreements, whatever their nature, must be made and administered by human beings. If such humans are disposed to practices that are reprehensible, it should be obvious to everyone that their powers for evil are increased when they have behind them the authority of government. Then, too, I do not like the trend toward the creation of a world trade bureaucracy with authority to carry out their edicts. I think we have seen quite enough of that here in the United States to have warranted the repudiation the idea received at the polls some weeks ago.

It is true that we are hopeful for maximum progress in setting up a world in which there shall be peace and amity among all people. That is a goal that will require hard work and great patience to achieve. Not losing sight of our goal, we should nevertheless realize the great danger of assuming that we have already achieved it and that we can act accordingly. It seems to me there is just such an assumption involved in these proposals under which world commissions and world agencies are created in which we have but one vote against their many, and yet these agencies and commissions would be given considerable power to make decisions in the economic sphere that could require revolutionary changes in our domestic economy. Someone might say such changes should be made. I can only answer that I have no objection to change, provided always that it is a change for the better and also that I prefer evolution rather than revolution. Our power for good leadership is almost wholly dependent upon our keeping ourselves strong enough to be leaders.

I want to refer only very briefly to the question of the authority under which the Department of State makes its proposals. Presumably it does so under the authority of the President to conduct foreign relations.

It may also be argued that it does so under authority which came to it upon the ratification of the Bretton Woods agreement, for resolution VII, contained in the final act of the Bretton Woods Conference, in part states: "The United States Monetary and Financial Conference recommends:

"(1) reduce obstacles to international trade and in other ways promote mutually advantageous international commercial relations;

"(2) bring about the orderly marketing of staple commodities at prices fair to the producer and consumer alike;

"(3) deal with the special problems of international concern which will arise from the cessation of production for war purposes; and

"(4) facilitate by cooperative effort the harmonization of national policies of member states designed to promote and maintain high levels of employment and progressively rising standards of living."

But the regulation of commerce is specifically assigned by the Constitution to the Congress of the United States. That is to say, to the legislative branch of Government. The Congress, it is true, has in the so-called Trade Agreements Act delegated to the executive department the authority to make certain changes in tariffs. It seems to me that this limited authority to change tariffs hardly covers some of the proposals to which I have already briefly referred.

At this point also I want to point out to you the progressive deterioration in our former American practice of government of laws contrasted with a government of men. First was the usurpation of legislative functions by the Executive under the Trade Agreements Act. Now the next step proposed is that tariff rates for the United States be arrived at by bargaining with 17 other nations, almost all of whom have interests quite different in many respects from our own. Bargaining is hardly the word, for we are one in a total of 18.

You can't give the United States away and have it too, neither can you get it back easily if you blunder too far.

I am informed that a poll issued in the last Fortune magazine shows that 68 percent of our people say we must protect ourselves first and help the world after. This might be misconstrued, but to me it means we must preserve this Nation if we wish it to be strong enough to help the world and lead it to peace.

Immediately following the November elections, the Department of State announced its intention to proceed in a further reduction of tariffs. I hope you have examined the list of several thousand commodities on which the State Department professes willingness to negotiate. Hearings on these commodities began yesterday, January 13, in Washington. A number of realists in the United States have suggested that in negotiating these trade agreements, we must not give away all of our trading stock before we get the things that really bring reciprocity. Reciprocity consists in giving something in return for something which we get. If we make all of our valuable concessions with too free a hand, we may find ourselves out of trading stock at a time when we need something to trade for something we need.

What should our programs be? I think that the current emphasis on foreign trade and the part that it is represented to play in the prosperity of the United States, completely obscures the fundamentals of the situation. Much of the current propaganda implants the idea that an increased exchange of goods in world trade will create prosperity. Of course, we all want to see a mutually profitable and expanding world trade but we know that the fundamental fact is that prosperity does not come from the exchange of goods but from their production.

You and I know that present-day demands for goods are terrific. Not only have all regions of the world been starved for goods during the war years but tremendous areas have also been laid waste by the devastation of war, so that besides the pent-up but more

normal demand, there is also superimposed the tremendous abnormal demand for reconstruction of these devastated areas. These facts create a great problem for us here in the United States. We have tremendous capacities to produce and to export. It should be clear to everyone that these fantastic demands of all the rest of the world are far in excess of any demands that we have for things that we need to import. Yet the only real way of getting paid for our exports is through the imports of other things that we need, so that if these two do not eventually balance, we are in a bad way indeed.

This question of dollars is assuming rather huge proportions. Of course, other nations do not want our dollars really. What they do want is our goods and the dollars are the means of acquiring those goods.

A scheme has been evolved that seems very attractive while it lasts. We presently are making huge exports and those who make them are being paid in American dollars. We are preserving the illusion of a great export business by making loans of more and more dollars abroad.

I hope you all remember our unsatisfactory experience with foreign loans and investments after the last war.

But realizing that goods eventually must be paid for in other goods and that the dollars loaned only can be repaid if we import increasingly larger amounts of foreign goods, it is proposed that we greatly reduce tariffs so that any nation that can produce cheaper than we can will have free access to our markets. As we buy these goods we again provide a steady stream of dollars for the foreign seller. Getting these foreign foodstuffs and manufactured goods so cheaply will just be wonderful. The people who now produce cattle and cotton or textile goods, or who are engaged in mining or forestry, can quit their arduous toil. We can buy these things cheaper. And think how much additional employment we will be providing for people in other parts of the world. Things like textiles, watches, chinaware, all can be bought much cheaper. Can't you picture the benefits? We get the goods cheaply and we provide the foreign nations with the dollars. But one thing may bother us a bit. What employment will our own people have? They must have jobs in order to get dollars to loan the Government so the whole scheme will work. Further, let us remember that 85 percent of all costs of the normal things of life comes from wages, and if we make unfair tariff provisions, which destroy our selling prices and do not protect our established costs, then we have injured the workers of America in their wage program and standard of living.

Now, seriously, no such foolishness will last for very long without the dissipation of everything we have built up since this country was founded. Remember that it is the same administration who misled labor with the mistaken assurance that wages could be increased without affecting prices, that now says that we can import the things we now produce without disturbing jobs.

I ask if any among you thinks he knows what our costs of production are to be in this country to the point where he is willing to use his judgment in figuring out now a tariff on a basis that will properly protect us in innumerable industries and products upon which our workers and our people rely for a living. I confess that the unsettled conditions of the world are too great for me to make any forecasts in this direction at the moment.

What then should be our tariff policy?

I believe the legitimate purpose of tariffs is to adequately protect our national wage and living standards. This does not mean either high or low tariffs. It does mean rates sufficient to provide protection to the degree and at the time it is needed. It should not protect operations which continue to be inefficient. The rates should be such, however, as to make it possible for domestic products to compete on at least equal terms with similar commodities produced abroad under lower standards than are tolerated here in the United States. Many agricultural and industrial products can be produced cheaper somewhere else. These lower foreign costs may be the result of one or the other of two broad basic factors. First, are more efficient operations or natural advantages, such as climate. As I have said earlier, most of the things having natural advantages are already on our free list, and, in my opinion, they should stay there. But the second reason for lower foreign costs is the existence of much lower wage and living standards. Wherever these are reflected in the unit costs of production we need an equalizing device, if we expect to permit those goods to come into our market without upsetting our higher living and wage standards.

As you know, the tariff-making function has been transferred from the legislative branch of the Government to the Executive by the passage of the so-called Trade Agreements Act. I do not believe that it should continue as an Executive function. Whatever advantages of technique may have been developed in the conduct of this program can be preserved and continued just as well, and even better, as a legislative function. I am not advocating the making of actual rates by the Congress as a whole. However, such criticisms as there have been in the past about political logrolling in Congress are dwarfed into insignificance by the possibility of much greater logrolling on an international scale, if rates are to be made through international conferences at which the United States will be consistently in the minority.

Tariff rates cannot be static in a changing world and for this reason it is not practicable for the Congress itself constantly to consider alterations in the tariff. I believe that the Congress should formulate a tariff policy which will provide for true flexibility, making it possible to change rates up or down with the minimum of delay when and as the need for such changes becomes apparent.

My thought is this: If, by legislation, we could revamp the method of studying and preparing for the trade agreements so that industry would have a voice in the preparation of the plan before it is ready to be consummated, and that voice might be an independent voice not tied in with any of the present committees, it might help us in reducing trade barriers where such reduction is justifiable and safe, and it might keep us from making agreements from which we would have to withdraw, thereby making enemies rather than friends.

If we could devise a way to have the great business organizations, farming organizations, and labor organizations recommend a group of men to serve on an advisory committee for the purpose of checking and assisting in the formulation of reciprocal trade agreements and tariff reductions, we might avoid doing some things which we will regret, and from which we must withdraw if we are to protect the American economy and the welfare of the workers in this Nation.

My thought at the moment is that such committee should consist of 16 of the ablest men in the country, all of whom are recognized as believing in the American system and wishing to preserve it, so as to keep America strong for the welfare of our own people and to enable us to render a decent and fair service in leadership toward proper international relations and peace.

Those 16 men could be composed of 8 from business and industry, 4 from agricultural organizations, and 4 from labor organizations. They would be appointed for a period of 5 years each with proper arrangements for the first appointees, so that all would not retire from the advisory committee in the same year.

Of the eight appointed from business and industrial organizations, two should be appointed to represent those who are chiefly interested in foreign trade; two should be appointed from those who are interested in domestic trade; four should be appointed from those who are chiefly interested in domestic trade but who, nevertheless, are engaged in foreign trade. This may not be the final way the appointments should be made, but it gives you the thought I have in mind.

The purpose of this advisory committee would be to know promptly when any foreign nation requests a reciprocal trade agreement or the reduction in our tariffs, and the people of the United States should be apprised of such a request in its beginning. This committee should be informed immediately of the findings of any committees studying the proposed trade agreement.

This advisory committee should give to the people of the United States their well-considered opinion of the propriety and safety of making any agreement which involves the manufacturers and businessmen and the labor of the United States.

You might well say that this would slow up the process of making these agreements. My reply is that the importance of protecting business, industry, labor, and the farmer in this country justifies any such delay, because their whole future economic welfare depends upon the wisdom of these agreements.

Perhaps you will wonder whether in outlining my plan for a permanent policy I am indirectly suggesting that international cooperation in economic matters be scrapped. Not at all. If it is to be cooperation, nothing in my plan would interfere. If, on the other hand, it is to be more of coercion than cooperation, then my plan would quite properly apply the brakes.

The representatives of the nations who conferred in London in October-November, are to meet again as an interim tariff committee. This next conference is scheduled to meet on the 8th day of April in Geneva, Switzerland, at which time it is planned that they shall make mutual reductions in trade barriers. Among these, tariffs are prominently and constantly mentioned, even though they are the least restrictive. This is not accidental. Foreign nations would find it easier if they could take over our existing markets rather than painfully build up the markets in dominions and colonies in the same manner we built up ours here.

The fact seems to be overlooked that the announced object of the first conference and the State Department proposals was the expansion of trade, not its redistribution. A tariff advisory committee such as I have described could prepare the information as to the amount of further reductions we can make in United States tariffs without injury to our domestic economy. It should be done, however, by an independent determination of facts, free from any directive from the executive department, based on predetermined conclusions. Moreover, what reductions we offer should be substantially matched by each other nation in the concessions it will make. This is a more important point than most people realize. Let me give you an illustration.

When most British traders speak or write in their own trade journals they indicate that the success of the international effort at economic cooperation will depend on the willingness of the United States to drastically reduce its tariffs. When they mention the preferential treatment they give others, it is usually to declare their unwillingness to give up this form of discrimination against us. They have followed the same line of argument since the early thirties.

But what are the facts?

Whereas since then they have kept most of their tariffs, preferences, import licensing, etc., the United States has reduced over 1,200

of its tariff rates. Almost half of these have been by 50 percent. And every one of these reductions has been immediately made available to Britain. In exchange she made about one hundred and fifty reductions in her tariff rates in the United Kingdom-United States trade agreement. Most of these, however, were only reductions in the amount of preference she granted others.

The "most favored nation" clause has serious implications and great dangers. We may have sound reason for granting a special consideration to some country in return for what they do for us. I ask you, if another nation does not qualify and give us the equivalent in return, why should it be favored with special consideration? It does not make good sense to me.

I have no fault to find with the British when they seek their own advantage, but I would like to see Americans show as much concern for our best interests as the British do for theirs.

As you doubtless know, the briefs of Americans who are vitally affected by the negotiations I have mentioned had to be filed by December 21 last. Oral hearings are now in progress in Washington. These began on January 13.

We can increase our mutually profitable foreign trade but we should do it through measures consistent with the preservation of employment, the protection of our living standards and the wages of our workers, and the income of our farmers. The important point I would like to leave with you is that we should strive for a truly constructive tariff policy, that rates should be neither higher nor lower than are actually needed, and there should be no tariffs at all if we don't actually have a need for them. Whatever modifications are made from time to time should be through research and expert study rather than through processes of logrolling, whether it be national or international logrolling.

Let those who crave an increase in foreign business carefully meditate upon a decrease in domestic business if we, through hurried and ill-advised action at a time when relative cost of production is unknown due to disturbed world conditions, do things which seriously disturb a fair balance of trade and thus produce unemployment at home.

Protection of Public in Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the biggest problems before Congress is obviously the need for equitable reforms in the Wagner Act which will protect the interests of the public. One of the proposed reforms that must be given due consideration is the matter of compulsory arbitration of labor disputes in key industries. Last year, when the Senate considered the Case bill, it voted down my compulsory arbitration amendment in the mistaken belief that the President would sign the Case bill if the arbitration feature were omitted. That belief was mistaken, because the President vetoed the Case bill anyway. But this issue will not down, and must be met squarely in order that we may be adequate.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that an article which I wrote on this subject for the October 1946 issue of Kiwanis magazine be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED A PRO-PUBLIC LABOR LAW, SAYS HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR; MEMBER, KIWANIS CLUB OF CHIPPEWA FALLS, WIS.

One of the many outstanding contributions to public service of the 1946 victory convention of Kiwanis International was its labor resolution. Unanimously adopted, the resolution petitioned Congress to enact laws clearly defining the respective duties and responsibilities, rights, and privileges of management and labor, with adequate provision for enforcement of the duties and responsibilities. The resolution further asked the national legislature to control industrial disputes and "provide for compulsory arbitration of all disputes prior to the calling of a strike which might endanger the national welfare or impinge upon the constitutional rights of the citizen."

The passage of this pro-American resolution clearly showed that Kiwanians know our country is faced with the choice of either compulsory arbitration of disputes in key industries as a last resort to prevent strikes or what amounts to compulsory chaos. The one-sided Wagner Act, as it now stands, legislates compulsory chaos because it forces a strait-jacket upon management while encouraging irresponsible labor leaders to the wildest excesses in violation of the public interest. Under the Wagner Act, management, for example, must bargain collectively while the unions can blithely walk away and stay away from the conference table.

The assembled Kiwanians clearly showed further that they want the rule of law and the rule of equality in industry and commerce rather than such anarchy as we experienced in the disastrous railroad strike of May 1946 when two irresponsible men paralyzed the Nation's transportation, and in the similarly disastrous Nation-wide shipping strike of September 1946.

Particularly in this atomic age, when our national security could be breached by a split-second attack by atom-carrying rockets launched thousands of miles away, it is essential that we prepare against all emergencies by setting up compulsory arbitration machinery in public utilities and key Nation-wide industries. Let us never forget that even during World War II, while our men were dying overseas, 14,000 strikes occurred, costing us 24,000,000 man-days. Dare we risk such an eventuality in the future when a war will be settled not in years or months or days but in the first seconds and minutes while some vital industry may be on strike and the enemy sees a fine opportunity for attack?

Compulsory arbitration machinery is required not only because we are living in an atomic age but because:

We are living in an economically complex age, when, even in peacetime, all parts of the economic order—agriculture, industry, mining, forestry, trade, utilities—are interdependent with every other part; a break-down in any one part cripples all other parts.

We are living in a revolutionary age in which we are faced by a tremendous vitalized power. Russia, with whom we are rightfully trying to establish a realistic basis for cooperation for a just and lasting peace, but which we nevertheless recognize is actively promoting world communism through planned chaos in every country.

We are living in an inflationary age in which prices are constantly rising because full production, the greatest obstacle to inflation, has not been achieved on account of strike after strike and because of OPA maladministration—the hindering of business through regimentation.

We have seen that voluntary mediation and arbitration simply have not been adequate enough to prevent strikes and increase the supply of goods so as to balance demand and hold back inflation.

THE COST OF STRIKES

Merely since the end of the war, strikes have cost us 113,000,000 man-days directly and untold millions of man-days more indirectly because of employees thrown out of work due, for example, to the absence of parts supplied by strike-bound feeder plants. We have lost a billion dollars in striking workers' wages and untold billions more in indirect wage losses and in lost employer profits and investor dividends. We have lost 3,000,000 autos and trucks, 1,000,000 mechanical refrigerators, 415,000 washing machines, 3,000,000,000 board feet of lumber, including enough construction lumber for 100,000 desperately needed houses. We have lost vital farm implements and vital fruit crops, the latter particularly through jurisdictional strikes.

What is more, we have lost, if only temporarily, American cooperation, good will between citizens, and community spirit.

Well, what are we going to do about it? Let us enact a compulsory arbitration law as a part of a pro-American labor law—a law with guts in its vitals and teeth in its jaws in order to insure industrial peace. This law need not be antilabor nor antimanagement, but propublic for the welfare of all of us.

Such a general law would provide for:

(a) A Federal mediation board with powers of conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration in all industries during a 60-day prestrike truce in which all strikes, lock-outs, and walk-outs would be banned.

(b) Special emergency fact-finding commissions to look into disputes involving utilities and key industries and to make recommendations on wages, hours, and working conditions.

(c) Prohibition of royalty payments to unions except for specified purposes such as health and welfare funds, which must, however, be administered jointly by labor and management.

(d) Union liability before the law in the event it breaks contracts.

(e) Outlawing of secondary boycotts.

(All the above are general provisions of the Case bill which Congress passed but which the President vetoed.)

(f) A requirement that labor as well as management bargain collectively in good faith.

(g) Banning of jurisdictional strikes.

(h) Democratic and secret union elections and strike votes.

(i) Publicity on union finances.

A final element in this law would be compulsory arbitration. It would be a logical extension of provision (b). After all efforts at voluntary conciliation, mediation, or arbitration fail, after the report of the Emergency Fact Finding Commission in a utility or Nation-wide industry proves of no avail, then the compulsory arbitration machinery would go into operation.

The exact details of such operation were incorporated in an amendment to the Case labor bill which I introduced but which the Senate voted down in the hope, as many of my colleagues told me, that President Truman would sign the Case bill if compulsory arbitration were omitted. That hope was mistaken. The President vetoed the Case bill anyway.

However, I believe the Case bill should be enacted by the Eightieth Congress, over the President's veto if necessary, and compulsory arbitration should be provided as follows:

1. In the event a strike threatened in a Nation-wide or key industry, such as fuel, transportation, communication, or steel, the President of the United States would be empowered to require labor and management to submit to arbitration. The parties would

have 20 days to draw up an agreement to arbitrate, covering all issues, such as wages, hours, and working conditions.

The arbitration board would consist of three or seven members, as determined by the President, with an equal number of members chosen by labor and by management and another member chosen by both labor and management.

In the event the parties failed or refused to prepare an arbitration agreement or appoint arbitrators, the Federal Mediation Board would do so for them.

STRIKES PROHIBITED

2. From the day the President required the parties to arbitrate to the entry of final judgment upon an award, strikes, lock-outs, and slow-downs would be prohibited. If management violated this prohibition, its action would be deemed an unfair labor practice under the National Labor Relations Act. If the employees violated this requirement, they would be deprived of certain of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

3. Both parties would be free to settle their dispute during the arbitration proceedings. Such settlements would be effective for 6 months. Thus collusive settlements to defeat the arbitration and resume industrial warfare would be prevented.

4. The arbitrators would hand down an award which would be enforcible by the courts like any other contract.

No one regrets more than I do the necessity for compulsion. I would infinitely prefer that reason would prevail and that both labor and management would be free to engage in voluntary mediation and arbitration. But reason does not always prevail as has been proven so many times in the past when labor leaders and men of management have forgotten their obligations to the public interest.

The issue is drawn for us. We may wait and see; we may ignore the lessons of recent industrial history. Or we may embark on the new, legal course of compulsory arbitration as proposed by Kiwanis. We may insure industrial peace or we may doom our Nation to perpetual industrial chaos.

The New Research Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial entitled "The New Research Law," appearing in the Farmers Build News under date of November 1946, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW RESEARCH LAW

While the principal objective of the new research law is to assure agriculture an equality in research equal to industry, it could be more clearly defined if it were that of improving the economic position of farmers. Existing facilities are adequate to meet the production problems of cotton, wheat, corn, mung beans, and everbearing raspberries. The farm problem is not production. The farm problem is that of price.

Prices of not less than cost of production should be the first objective of research in marketing. Farmers cannot stay in business on any other basis. If agriculture accepted war-price ceilings as its share of preventing inflation, then it is entitled to a cost-plus floor to prevent deflation.

A fundamental of marketing is a legitimate market free from racketeering. Too long have farm prices been determined by "futures" gamblers. No other business would tolerate such an outrage. Witness the October crash in the cotton-futures market where the manipulations of one man caught "long" cost our cotton growers over $200,000,000 through no fault of their own. The South is not in a position to absorb these losses.

It is surprising that economists, land-grant colleges, old-line farm organizations, and the United States Department of Agriculture have never studied the devastation in agriculture resulting from futures trading. A cursory examination of the evil would enable anyone to see eye to eye with one of America's truly great economists, Ernest D. MacDougall, when he so aptly wrote, "the practice of gambling under the forms of trade can hardly be considered as an economically productive occupation."

The average economist deals in facts, but often he is tempted in his conclusions to accept unproven theories as facts on the authority of other economists who have copied from other equally uninformed economists. In the field of futures trading these same economists publish as factual findings information which has been released by the propaganda press bureaus of the commodity gamblers. It should be a signal that all is not well when the volume of futures trading always exceeds by many times the production of a commodity. Can it be that some economists are under the same pressure as the honest college professor whose conscience balked at giving good grades to the athletic ignoramus?

In view of the huge appropriations and the trust given by farmers on the goals of the new law, it is hoped that its administrators will start from scratch and take nothing for granted. With such procedure there should come recommendations for a workable plan for Congress to stabilize agricultural prices. On these premises conclusions are bound to follow that farming cannot be done for less than cost and that much agricultural instability can be averted by eliminating futures trading.

Investigation of commodity gambling will reveal the following facts: That the futures contract is not a warehouse receipt for the commodity but only a lottery ticket with no assets back of it; that those who buy or sell a cotton, corn, wheat, egg, butter, lard, etc., futures contract deal only in price differences; that a futures contract does not permit the naming of grades; that the buyer of a futures contract, when delivery is made, has nothing to say about the kind or grade he shall receive; that the determination of kind or grade to be delivered under a futures contract is at the option of the seller, usually resulting in the delivery of dog-tail cotton or skin-grade wheat; that, for example, deliveries of wheat under a futures contract are negligible—not more than one-third of 1 percent of the total volume of futures trading; that those who buy specified grades of a commodity for spot delivery to arrive do so in the cash markets and not in the futures markets. The investigators probably would also find that propaganda press releases have duped our educators and economists into thinking that the price problem is insoluble except for the Government to give subsidies to farmers.

It should not strain the courage of the investigators to uncover these truths, and it should be less a strain to recommend the remedy. Though they will encounter the resistance of a few gamblers, they will win the gratitude of 6,000,000 farm families.

What Makes CAB Tick?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include as a part thereof an editorial which appeared in the January 13 issue of the Oregonian, a daily newspaper published in Portland, Oreg. Following is the editorial:

WHAT MAKES CAB TICK?

This page confesses inability to explain the actions of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which has rejected the application of an American line for commercial air service from Seattle and Portland to Honolulu, but has authorized an Australian firm to enter Honolulu from Vancouver, B. C., via Seattle and Oakland. Matson Navigation Co. has been seeking a certificate since 1942, without success, but the CAB granted the Australian permit after a 1-day hearing.

The CAB consistently has refused to authorize an American steamship line to start air service, though the advantages of ship-plane tie-up to the traveling public are obvious. But the certificate just granted is to an air line wholly owned by foreign steamship companies. The CAB not only refuses to permit American business to compete with foreign business on equal terms but actually discriminates against an American applicant by turning over its potential territory to a foreign line.

The Matson Co.'s withdrawal of its application for the Northwest-Hawaii service coincided with the Board's decision to reopen the field to other applicants, which was tantamount to another rejection of the Matson request. There were no other applicants at the moment. Additionally, opening the territory to a foreign air line reduces the amount of business available.

The Aeronautics Board's new Chairman, James Landis, has hinted that if the Board grants a certificate for direct Vancouver-Honolulu service to Trans-Canada Air Lines, a firm controlled by the Canadian Government and also with shipping connections, it will be more disposed to favor a Portland-Seattle-Honolulu line. This page is not opposed to reciprocity, but why should it be necessary for American business to wait until our own Government installs a foreign rival before authorizing a competitive American line?

Northwesterners, who want direct service to Honolulu and are told that they must travel via Oakland, demand a clearer explanation than any yet given by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Matson's latest decision to renew its application, and a revival of interest by Northwest Airlines, calls for a public definition of CAB policy.

Sugar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of sugar is creating a desperate situation in the family life of this Nation. I am flooded with propaganda

from my district and I assume that each Member of the House is likewise receiving mail urging that Congress take action with reference to the shortage of sugar. I have devoted many hours of time, as I know each Member of the House has done, in an effort to ascertain from what source the black market procures the sugar which it offers all the way from 30 to 45 cents a pound.

I want to urge upon the Congress that some action be taken to protect the people of this country from being gouged by any action which may be taken by the International Emergency Food Council, successor to the Combined Food Board, with reference to the allocation of sugar to foreign countries during this year.

I am sure that you all realize that allocations of 1947 are about to be made by the International Emergency Food Council and the Secretary of Agriculture, the United States representative in the sugar section of the Council.

I believe it the duty of every member of Congress to see to it that this International Emergency Food Council does not permit large allocations of United States supplies of sugar to foreign countries and thereby reduce for this year the amount of sugar to our own consumers.

I believe that fair treatment should be accorded to the American consumers and Congress should insist upon this.

I understand that there is an effort being made by our foreign neighbors to get large allocations of sugar for their nationals and that such allocations be made upon the basis of the entire year of 1947.

To allocate sugar for a whole year on a basis unfair to the United States would be a dangerous move not only for the supply of sugar for our own people but as an international commitment. If too large a commitment for a whole year is made under an international agreement, we as a nation would be morally bound to observe the terms of that agreement inasmuch as our agency of government is a party to the allocation agreement.

The least that should be permitted by Congress is an allocation on a quarterly basis with an opportunity for Congress to see that the consumers of our own country are protected.

The fact that the 1947 crop, so the experts inform us, is likely to be a possible one and a half million tons more of sugar than 1946 for home consumption and export may tempt the International Emergency Food Council to urge this as a basis for a larger allocation to foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that Members of the House who are interested in obtaining additional supplies of sugar for their constituents should know that today here in Washington a meeting of the Sugar Section of the International Emergency Food Council may reach an agreement which will result in curtailing supplies of sugar available for use in this country. For years now the United States has allocated to Britain and Canada large quantities of sugar and it may be that we should continue some allocation. However, in view of charges that have been made that excessive quantities of sugar have been allocated abroad, I think that the Members of Congress should have an opportunity to examine this question and if necessary establish a new policy for this country to assure fair treatment to our citizens.

I dislike to be in the position of being accused of desiring to violate international commitments because I want this country to live up to its obligations. The point is that we do not want an obligation which unfairly deprives our citizens of needed sugar, and unless the Members of Congress act promptly in this matter the meeting today of the International Emergency Food Council may well result in an obligation binding this country for all the rest of this year. I think that if it is necessary to make an allocation it should certainly be for not longer than the first quarter of this year.

Bills have already been introduced to embargo exports of sugar. This may seem a drastic step but unless the bureaucrats downtown are willing to pay better attention to the problems of our citizens we may need to take drastic steps and take them promptly.

Since the Second War Powers Act expires on March 31, 1947, I wonder if the administration has any statutory authority to effectuate an allocation of sugar to foreign countries after that date. I, for one, would not be well disposed toward being confronted with an agreement covering the whole year and being requested simply because of that agreement, concerning which the Members of Congress have not been consulted, to enact legislation carrying it out, unless at that time I should be entirely convinced that the American people had been given fair treatment in the agreement.

I may add that the United States will have available from its own crops possibly 600,000 tons more sugar in 1947 than it had in 1946, and in addition to this we will likely obtain from Cuba nearly a million tons more this year than last year in our purchase of the large current crop. Thus, the United States in 1947 should have possibly 1,500,000 tons more of sugar than in 1946 for home consumption and for export. It is recognized, of course, that the United States, in contracting to buy virtually the whole Cuban crop, had committed itself to share part of the Cuban supply with the United Kingdom and Canada, as these countries had normally been markets for part of the Cuban crops and these countries had not bid against the United States for the Cuban crop.

In sharing United States supplies of sugar, it should be explained that during the war the Combined Food Board, made up of representatives of the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States, allocated food supplies, including sugar, on an international basis. These three countries had experienced about the same per capita consumption of sugar before the war. Thus, under the allocations of the Combined Food Board, the aggregate supplies of the three countries were allocated to each country, roughly, on its population basis, sugar now being rationed to consumers in each country on about the same per capita basis. Any allocations of this aggregate supply to countries other than these three thereby reduces the quantity available to each of the three countries, including the United States.

I propose, with the help of my colleagues, to bring all possible pressure, legislative or otherwise, to the end that our people get a fair deal on this international sugar agreement, even going to the extent of preparing a bill to prohibit the export of sugar, unless some relief can be procured for our own consuming public.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the need is greater than ever before for enactment of legislation that would assist our old folks. This group has been neglected too long and should be granted a liberal Federal pension. I have brought this issue to the House floor, to the press, and over the radio many times and it is my conviction that everyone over the age of 60 who is not required to pay a Federal income tax should be provided an adequate old-age pension.

We have seen the costs of living soar to a point where the pitiful allowances in the form of old-age pensions for our elders have become a disgrace to the world's richest Nation. The executive agencies of our Government continue to come to Congress with requests for more and more money to spend in foreign lands and to loan foreign governments to improve living conditions abroad, but they have consistently failed to bring in proposals for extending old-age assistance to the many who are now ineligible to receive it or for liberalizing old-age pensions so that those who are eligible for assistance can maintain themselves in conformity with the American standards of living. The United States has loaned billions to foreign nations but the loans have never been repaid. We must call a halt on these foreign hand-outs until our old folks are provided an adequate assistance.

For years we have been conserving forests, lands, wild game, and oil. We guard the flying geese and ducks and we protect the mineral wealth under the ground. I believe it is time to conserve human beings and make life comfortable for our elders. This country has the natural wealth, the resources, the raw materials, the manpower, the mills, factories, and industrial machinery to give every American family all it needs in the way of food, clothing, education, luxuries, and pleasures. There is enough food to feed every hungry person; there is enough wool and cotton to clothe every man, woman, and child in the country; there are materials in mines and forests, mills, factories, and warehouses to house every family if restrictions are removed; there are raw

materials and modern machines sufficient to equip these homes with both necessities and luxuries; there are enough railroad engines and freight cars to transport these needs of men to every nook and corner of the country.

When a wage earner has toiled for 40 years or more, he should be retired with a pension that will enable him to live in comfort and dignity the rest of his days.

Under present legislation, there is a great and unjust discrepancy in the payments received by old people in our various States. Average monthly allowances for the aged range all the way from as low as $12 to as high as $53. It is urgent that action be taken to correct these injustices and establish a program equally fair to all concerned.

We need a social-security system based upon need which will eliminate thousands of investigators and supervisors. Our elders want security and peace. They do not want to be upset every 6 months by a Federal reinvestigation to see whether or not they have gotten rich from their meager allowance during the preceding period they have been receiving welfare assistance.

On January 10, I introduced H. R. 781 which provides a direct Federal old-age pension of $60 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over. The text of H. R. 781 follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Social Security Board (hereinafter called the Board) shall pay, out of any funds hereafter appropriated for such purpose, old-age assistance to qualified individuals at the rate of $60 per month.

(b) For the purposes of this act an individual shall be deemed to be a qualified individual—

(1) who is 60 years of age or over on the first day of the payment year;

(2) who has been a citizen and resident of the United States for not less than 10 years;

(3) whose gross income, or whose gross income combined with the gross income of a spouse, as the case may be, for the tax year preceding the year in which the payment year begins is less than the minimum amount with respect to which a Federal income tax return is required to be filed; and

(4) who makes timely application for the benefits of this act.

(c) Payments to qualified individuals shall be made monthly for each month during a payment year. A "payment year" shall begin April 1 and end March 31. Application for the benefits of this act during any payment year shall be made on or before March 15 of the calendar year in which the payment year begins.

SEC. 2. Any individual making application for the benefits of this act shall furnish such evidence of age and citizenship as the Board may by regulation prescribe. The gross income of any individual for the purposes of this act shall be established from records and data in the possession of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall upon request furnish to the Board any documents, records, or information which he may have relating to the gross income of any applicant for the benefits of this act.

SEC. 3. The first payment year under this act shall begin April 1, 1947. No payment to any State under title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be made for any quarter beginning on or after such date.

SEC. 4. The Board shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. As used in this act the term "United States" shall include the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the matter of liberalizing and extending old-age assistance is one of the outstanding domestic problems that confronts us today. I request all of the Members of the House of Representatives who are interested in an adequate legislative program for the care of our senior citizens, join me in urging that this matter be brought to the House floor for consideration at the earliest possible date.

Government and a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able speech delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] at the annual banquet of the Virginia Press Association of Richmond, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this critical period of our history, when institutions deemed by us to be fundamental are being challenged both here and abroad, I welcome this opportunity to reaffirm my belief that without a free press our democracy would soon perish because, as Jefferson said: "The liberty of speaking and writing guards our other liberties." I likewise believe that any plan for a lasting peace which does not include our conception of a free press will rest upon a precarious basis.

No one in public life in Virginia has greater cause than I to be grateful for a free press. During my 30 years of public service I served in the State senate both before and after World War I and in the house of representatives both before and after World War II, and in such service was called upon to take a stand on many controversial issues. Never was my desire to do my duty as I saw it challenged by any paper in the State, and often the course I pursued was commended. In assuming this month my duties in the highest legislative body in the world, it is my hope and my prayer that I can justify the confidence expressed in me last summer and last fall by the press of the State.

When the distinguished president of your association extended to me the much-appreciated invitation to address you tonight on the subject of Government and a free press, he, of course, knew that on the basis of personal experience I favored a free press. I am happy to be able to assure you that by inheritance and training, as well as by experience, belief in the principles of a free press is fundamental with me. In my classes in history and government at Richmond College under that brilliant teacher, Dr. S. C. Mitchell, we were taught that freedom of speech and freedom of the press were of the essence of our democracy, and I entered public life as a member of the Virginia State Senate in 1916 fully conscious of the fact that freedom of the press was a principle for which my colonial ancestors had stood. Two of my direct ancestors, James Gordon, of Lancaster, and James Gordon, of Orange, were members of the Virginia Convention which ratified the Philadelphia Constitution in 1787. Another member, Benjamin Harrison, was a close relative of my ancestor, Nathaniel Harrison. Those three members of the Virginia Convention not only voted to ratify the Federal Constitution but they supported the proposal of Patrick Henry to have expressly reserved in the greatest instrument ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man certain fundamental human rights, including the freedom of the press, which the framers of the Constitution had evidently taken for granted.

In urging upon the Convention expressed declarations in the Constitution similar to the Virginia Bill of Rights, Patrick Henry said:

"The necessity of a bill of rights appears to me to be greater in this Government than it ever was in any government before. I have observed already, that the sense of the European nations, and particularly Great Britain, is against the construction of rights being retained which are not expressly relinquished. * * * If you intend to reserve your unalienable rights, you must have the most express stipulation; for, if implication is allowed, you are ousted of those rights. * * *

"With respect to the freedom of the press, I need say nothing; for it is hoped that the gentlemen who shall compose Congress will take care to infringe as little as possible the rights of human nature. This will result from their integrity. They should, from prudence, abstain from violating the rights of their constituents. They are not, however, expressly restrained. But whether they will intermeddle with that palladium of our liberties or not," said he, "I leave you to determine."

I have frequently expressed the belief that Thomas Jefferson was our greatest political philosopher. His principles of democracy have been the North Star by which I have steered my political course, believing that truth is eternal and that the problem of succeeding generations is to perceive it and to apply it to existing conditions.

Thomas Jefferson said in one of his letters:

"Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

In that statement Jefferson, no doubt, was using the familiar device of exaggeration for the sake of emphasis. Jefferson knew, as we all do, that while a free press is essential to a democratic form of government, no press could survive where some orderly form of government did not exist.

As a matter of fact, the functions of Government and the press are as closely intertwined as the expression describing the press as "the fourth estate" would suggest.

Government without the voice of the people, as expressed through their media of communication, to guide it becomes autocracy. The press and its younger sister, the radio, would be voices crying in the wilderness without a government able to give substance to the expressed desires of the people.

As a result of the efforts of Henry, Jefferson, and Madison, the bill of rights which became part of our basic law in 1791 contained a clause forbidding Congress to make any law "abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press."

But, as I suggested at the outset, the chain of responsibility which attaches Government and the press has links that are binding at both ends.

The English jurist, Blackstone, warned that liberty of the press meant "laying no previous restraint upon publications, and not in freedom from censure for criminal matter when published."

He said: "Every freeman has an undoubted right to lay what sentiments he pleased before the public * * * but if he publishes what is improper, mischievous, or illegal, he must take the consequences of his own temerity."

In our own Government's early days, when there was fear that the United States would be destroyed by the type of anarchy that came to France in its revolution, there were doubts as to how far a free press could be trusted.

George Washington was one of the advocates of the sedition law of 1798, which forbade publication of matter intended to defame the Government or bring its officers into disrepute.

Jefferson opposed that law, which expired by limitation in 1801—the year he became President, but his own experience with the press while he was in office was trying enough to have discouraged a less firm believer in individual liberties.

It is natural, I think, that each war and its aftermath should bring a new test of the theory that a democratic government and a completely free press can coexist.

During World War I we passed an espionage law which forbade anyone to wilfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces. It was tested by those who claimed that a prohibition against writing or speaking against our participation in the war violated the right of free speech.

In upholding that law in 1921, the Supreme Court of the United States held that freedom of the press may protect criticism and agitation for modification or repeal of laws, but it does not extend to protection of him who counsels and encourages the violation of the law as it exists.

Our press has had no difficulty surviving under that interpretation and successfully passed its greatest test during the last war when it proved that a system of voluntary censorship would work.

It would be hard to find a stronger bulwark for a free press of the future than the record which shows that the American press, through self-discipline, kept out of print matter that would give aid and comfort to the enemy and which might have cost American lives while it still retained the privilege of printing what it chose without anyone to say in advance, "you must print this" or "you cannot print that."

There did come out of this war, however, a new realization that a free press, like many other things which once were matters only of national concern, now has become an international problem.

Sumner Welles, telling of his 1940 mission to Germany, said he never before had realized so vividly the tremendous power which authority to dictate to the press gave to a government.

"From that moment I have been convinced," Welles said, "that when this war is over the peoples of the earth must never again permit a situation to arise where any people shall be deprived of their inherent right to know the truth."

The Congress has been on record since September 1944 with a resolution expressing its belief in the world-wide right of interchange of news by newsgathering and distributing agencies, without discrimination as to sources, distribution, rates, or charges, and that this right should be protected by international compact.

I am happy that in the program for world-wide freedom of information, sponsored by the American Society of Newspaper Editors and by such individuals as Kent Cooper of the Associated Press and Hugh Baillie of the United Press, the Virginia Press Association has played an active and effective part. Last October the issue reached the Assembly of United Nations in a stirring speech by Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines, in which he said: "A free press is essential to peace."

The framers of the United Nations Charter, like the framers of the Federal Constitution, included no specific provision on the subject of human rights, although the phrase "human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, or religion," occurs no less than five times in the final draft of the Charter. Referring to that fact, Sigrid Arne, writing last spring for the Associated Press, said:

"One human right—freedom of the press—is so important that at London the Philippines proposed a special conference to adopt it."

Writing in a recent issue of Newsweek concerning the Russian censorship of the press during the war and increased restraints since the war, a foreign correspondent gave it as his opinion that the chief stumbling block to friendship, understanding, and mutually helpful cooperation between the United States and Russia was the Russian censorship which completely controlled all news sent out from Russia and all foreign news published in Russia. We all know that there can be no satisfactory solution of peacetime control of the atomic bomb without the right of inspection upon which the American representatives have insisted. We all know that if we are denied information concerning what the Soviet Union is doing it is a breeding ground for suspicion that what is being done is not for the best interests of the democracies of the world.

It is well for us to remember the importance placed by the founding fathers, whose wisdom in government has never been excelled, upon the freedom of the press as an instrumentality for the preservation of democratic institutions.

In this country that fact has become so firmly established that I do not expect to see it challenged. But since, in the words of Wendell Willkie, we are now living in "one world" in which what is done abroad vitally affects us, our program of government and a free press must of necessity embrace a world-wide program.

In advocating such a world-wide program, I was interested in this comment by General Romulo, with whom I served for a number of years in the House and for whose ability and integrity I have a high regard:

"The press, the radio and the movies, to be free, must not only be able to operate without fetters; they must be inwardly free of corrupting motives and self-limiting prejudices."

That statement, of course, posed the basic problem of difference of opinion between Russia and affiliated countries and the Anglo-American countries on what constitutes freedom of the press. The problem will continue to be studied and it is our hope that in the interests of a lasting peace a solution can be found, notwithstanding the fact that so far the Soviet Union has not accepted the invitation to become a member of the international commission which is studying it.

The Romulo statement which I have quoted likewise poses for us the issue of the responsibilities of freedom. In no State in the Union has the press been freer from 'corrupting motives and self-limiting prejudices" than in Virginia. That, however, might be termed the negative phase of the responsibilities of freedom. I desire to close this discussion of the freedom of the press with an appeal to the members of the Virginia Press to take the fullest advantage of their great opportunity for positive responsibilities of freedom.

Shortly before Christmas we had a heavy sleet storm. As I walked down an avenue in Lexington named for the immortal Stonewall Jackson, a large and old apple tree in the backyard of a fraternity house toppled to the ground. The load that had been imposed upon its branches was more than its roots could sustain. If a democracy is to survive, the roots of Christian living, of self-discipline, of unselfishness, and of equal rights for all, special privileges for none, must be deep and strong to support the privileges of freedom which are demanded in an age of unparalleled scientific development and creation of wealth. In a word, the rights and privileges of democracy must be properly balanced by duties and obligations if our cherished institutions are to endure. In such a program there is a part to be played by every paper in the Old Dominion. Not every paper will win an award at one of these annual dinners for its contribution to an America in which every man shall have an equal opportunity with every other man to be the master of his own fortune, but in every great undertaking the sum total of the effort is what counts most.

May the words of Patrick Henry at the opening session of the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia in 1774 be our motto:

"I now speak no longer as a Virginian. I speak now and henceforth as an American."

Presidential Succession—Necessity of Providing for Someone To Act as President in Event President-Elect and Vice-President-Elect Fail To Qualify

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill designating a person who shall act as President, if a President shall not have been chosen before a time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified.

The present tragic situation in Georgia is certainly evidence of the urgent necessity of getting our own Federal laws in order so as not to be confronted with the confusion and chaos which would come to the Nation and to the world if we should reach an inauguration day without anyone qualified to act as President or named to act until a President shall have qualified.

It is not necessary that I discuss the confusion and havoc that would result from our failure to have a President, even for a very short time. The difficulties that would arise are obvious to everyone. There would be no head of the executive department. The members of the Cabinet and the chiefs of the departments could not be appointed. No vacancies in the executive department could be filled. The Army and Navy would be without a Commander in Chief. All laws would have to be passed by a two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress, and it is doubtful if any valid

law could be enacted by even a two-thirds majority, as under the Constitution a law must be presented to the President before it can be passed by a two-thirds majority.

Feeling that this legislation should be given immediate attention, and for the purpose of calling it to the attention of the Members of Congress, I have secured unanimous consent that the bill be here inserted. The bill is as follows:

A bill to provide for the selection of an acting President in the case of failure to qualify of both President-elect and Vice-President-elect

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Presidential Succession Act of 1945."

SEC. 2. (a) If neither the President-elect nor the Vice-President-elect has qualified at the time fixed for the beginning of his term, the House of Representatives shall proceed under its rules, but not before noon of the January 3 preceding the time fixed for the beginning of the term, to the selection of an individual to act as President.

(b) The same action by the House shall be taken in the case of the death, resignation, removal from office, or inability of an individual acting as President under this section, and in the case of the disqualification or failure to qualify of an individual selected under this section.

(c) An individual acting as President under this section shall continue to act until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, except that—

(1) if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the failure of both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect to qualify, then he shall act only until one of them qualifies;

(2) if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the disability of an individual acting under this section, then he shall act only until the removal of such disability.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever, under section 2 (a) or (b), the House of Representatives is to select an individual to act as President, and the House has not made the selection, or the individual so selected is disqualified or has failed to qualify, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall act as President: *Provided*, That if the House of Representatives shall not have elected a Speaker, the President of the Senate pro tempore shall then act as President.

(b) An individual acting as President under this section shall continue to act until either the President-elect or the Vice-President-elect qualifies, or until a qualified individual selected by the House under section 2 (a) or (b) is able to act, but in no event beyond the expiration of the then current Presidential term.

(c) If, at the time when an individual enters upon the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President under subsection (a) of this section, the House of Representatives is not in session, or would not meet in accordance with law within 20 days thereafter, he shall issue a proclamation convening the House in extraordinary session, giving 20 days' notice of the time of meeting.

SEC. 4. No individual shall act as President under this act if he is ineligible to the office of President under the Constitution or if he is under impeachment by the House of Representatives at the time the powers and duties of the office of President devolve upon him.

SEC. 5. The taking of the oath of office by an individual who is to act as President under this act shall be held to constitute his resignation from any office held by him in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 6. During the period that any individual acts as President under this act, his compensation shall be at the rate provided by law in the case of the President.

SEC. 7. Sections 1 and 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President," approved January 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 1; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 3, secs. 21 and 22), shall apply only in the case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability of the President and Vice President elected by the electors provided for in section 1 of article II of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1940, I introduced substantially the same bill in the House of Representatives. Thereafter it was unanimously approved by the Committee on the Judiciary and passed the House of Representatives without a dissenting vote on April 23, 1941. No action was taken on the bill by the Senate. In the succeeding Congresses I have introduced and tried to secure passage of this measure. You will notice that the bill names the Speaker of the House as the first in line to act as President in the event no one has qualified to act. The Speaker pro tempore of the Senate is named as the second in line to act. I felt that perhaps favorable action was not forthcoming in the Senate because the Senate felt that the President pro tempore of the Senate should be the first in line to act. Accordingly, in the Seventy-ninth Congress I introduced H. R. 4263, which would have the old Secretary of State and the others on down through the Cabinet act as President if the contingencies set forth in the bill arose.

I think the Speaker of the House or the President pro tempore of the Senate are the proper ones to act because the members of the Cabinet might represent an administration going out of power. But even more important than the person who is going to act is to make sure that there is some person who can carry on in this hiatus.

PROTECT THE UNITED STATES AGAINST TROUBLES LIKE GEORGIA'S

Many leading newspapers of the Nation have editorialized recently upon the necessity of avoiding in the Federal Government a situation like that in which the State of Georgia now finds herself. Typical of the editorial comment is an editorial of the Washington Post of Friday, January 17, 1947, which is as follows:

GEORGIA'S MISFORTUNE

For the Talmadge legacy of which the people of Georgia are now the unhappy inheritors, they must blame the myopia which bedeviled the framers of their own constitution. There is undoubtedly a great deal of ambiguity in the constitution respecting the succession to the governorship of the State in the situation that developed with the death of Governor-elect Eugene Talmadge. His son, Herman Talmadge, was able to claim the governorship with some show, or at least some pretext, of legitimacy on the basis of his election to the office by the legislature. And perhaps the claim has as much legality as Ellis Arnall's attempt to retain a position in which the constitution specifically forbids him to succeed himself. It may be set down as one of the minor ironies of history that the Georgia constitution, written by friends of Governor Arnall, provided altogether needlessly that the Lieutenant Governor-elect could not be sworn in until after the Governor-elect had taken the oath.

Out of the internal contradictions of the Georgia constitution there developed a situation as ludicrous as it was tragic. It was not surprising, of course, that the son of Eugene Talmadge should have grasped power by whatever pretext lay at hand. Eugene Talmadge himself was elected to the governorship by a kind of political chicanery that thwarted the will of a majority of the State's voters. The State legislature, rigged in accordance with the same unbalanced county unit system, naturally supported his son, Herman.

In the circumstances, Governor Arnall's effort to hold the fort seems somewhat quixotic. It is difficult to see how he can succeed in view of the legislature's hostility. Nor in the showdown is Lieutenant Governor-elect Thompson likely to be recognized as Chief Executive by the legislature. Let us hope that the courts of the State will resolve the dilemma in their favor and that there will be enough respect for law and order left in Georgia to give effect to the decision. If the courts decide otherwise, however, the people of Georgia probably will be no worse off under Herman—the son being so much like the father—than they would have been had Gene survived.

But there is a moral to this case which ought to be observed. So far as the good people of Georgia are concerned, it behooves them, if they ever get another Governor as good as Ellis Arnall, to draft a constitution sound enough to withstand the challenge of a pretender. So far as the Nation is concerned, it behooves us to plug the loophole that still remains in our provision for the Presidential succession. The twentieth amendment to the Constitution says that in the event that neither the President-elect nor the Vice-President-elect shall have qualified, "the Congress may by law provide for the case." The Congress has never so provided. Remote as the contingency may seem, it would be well to be forearmed against it.

I also include a well-considered editorial of the Baltimore Sun of Friday, January 17, 1947, which is as follows:

PROTECT THE UNITED STATES AGAINST SUCCESSION TROUBLES LIKE GEORGIA'S

Faced with a surplusage of governors, the State of Georgia resounds with turbulence. As everybody knows, Gene Talmadge died in the gap between his election and his inauguration. It says in Georgia's brand-new constitution (1945) that the General Assembly can elect a governor in certain contingencies. Ol' Gene's boy Herman claims the assembly has validly elected him in line with this provision. But the constitution also says that the sitting Governor shall continue until his successor qualifies. The anti-Talmadge crowd questions the assembly election. So the sitting Governor, Ellis Arnall, looks on young Talmadge the way Henry VII looked on Perkin Warbeck—as a "pretender."

The spectacle may seem humorous at a distance and to outsiders, though it is no fun in Georgia. But it wouldn't even be funny to outsiders if a similar situation grew up in Washington affecting the Presidential succession. In these days of desperate gravity in the international field and of grave Presidential responsibility in the domestic field, a break-down of the succession machinery might be serious indeed. Yet the fact is perfectly obvious that the succession machinery already creaks badly and is wholly unprepared to cope with wholly possible contingencies.

For instance, what would happen if the President-elect and Vice President-elect should die between the time of their election and their inauguration? There is literally no provision in the present law covering such a happening. When President Roosevelt died, in April of 1945, it is true that President Truman succeeded without any fuss under the Succession Act now on the

books. But the act takes hold only after the President to be succeeded has taken office, as Mr. Roosevelt had earlier that year.

This is one of the constitutional loopholes which Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, has long had in mind. Under the twentieth amendment to the Constitution, a clear invitation is given Congress to legislate for this and all other conceivable contingencies in the Presidential succession. Mr. KEFAUVER has pressed in successive Congresses for some kind of action under this amendment. But he has steadily failed to rouse the congressional interest to the point required for legislation. So far this session the judiciary committee of neither House has given the matter any consideration whatever.

It is time the thing was attended to. This is preeminently the kind of question which should be settled before it actually arises.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to meet the contingency, remote, but nevertheless possible under certain circumstances, namely: First, if a President has not been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term; and, second, if a President-elect or a Vice-President-elect shall not have qualified.

The first contingency may arise through failure, first, of the electoral college to elect a President and, second, through failure of the House of Representatives to choose a President before the beginning of his term. The second contingency would arise by reason of the death or disqualification of both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect, or through failure of the Senate to elect a Vice President when the right to choose one when that duty shall devolve upon them. Should the election of a President devolve upon the House and the election of a Vice President devolve upon the Senate, and a person for neither office be chosen before the beginning of the term, this bill designates the Speaker of the House of Representatives as acting President until a President shall have qualified. If the House of Representatives has not chosen a Speaker, then, and then only, the bill designates the President of the Senate pro tempore to act as President.

It is more likely when the election is thrown into Congress that the Senate would elect a Vice President than that the House would elect a President before the beginning of his term, in which event the Vice President would become acting President until the House should elect a President. The Senate is a continuing body, and a majority of Senators would elect a Vice President from the two highest on the list of those voted for in the electoral college. But the method of choosing a President by the House is more involved.

It would be a new House, one elected at the previous election. It would meet on January 3. It would have to organize. It could not organize until it elected a Speaker. This may not be possible for days, or weeks, or even months. Deadlocks have occurred in the past over the election of a Speaker, one lasting several months. And it is reasonable to suppose that the strength of a third-party candidate which should cause a stalemate in the electoral college would be reflected in the composition of the House where the vote for President from among the three highest on the list would be by States and not by individual Members as in the Senate. The vote of each State would be determined by a majority of its delegation, and in case a State delegation is equally divided that State would lose its vote. The electoral vote is required by law to be counted on January 6, only 3 days after the first meeting of a new Congress. Obviously, if a deadlock over the speakership should ensue and not be broken by January 6, the two Houses of Congress could not even meet in joint session on that date to count the electoral vote, much less proceed to the election of a President or Vice President. Assuming, however, that a Speaker of the House were to be elected promptly, and the count of the electoral vote disclosed a stalemate, the House would proceed to ballot for President. No other business would be in order from day to day. The date for the inauguration of a President is January 20, as fixed by the Constitution, allowing but 12 weekdays in which to make a choice, and if no one is chosen by that time the Vice President, if the Senate meanwhile has elected one, would become Acting President, otherwise, under this bill, the Speaker of the House would become Acting President, and the House and Senate would continue to ballot for President and Vice President, respectively. In the election of a Vice President by the Senate two-thirds of the Senators shall constitute a quorum, and a majority of the whole number is necessary to elect. It might be an easy matter to prevent an election by the absence of a constitutional quorum. In the extremely remote possibility of the death of both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect or of some disqualification of each, then the Speaker of the House would become Acting President until a President should qualify.

The bill designates the Speaker as acting President for the twofold reason that he is first elected by the people as a Representative and, second, he is elected by a majority of the House of Representatives as its Speaker. In other words, it might be said that he derives his power direct from the people as the result of a recent election. In lesser degree the same could be said of the President of the Senate pro tempore.

This bill is in pursuance of the provisions of section 3 of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution and is made necessary by that amendment, section 3 of which is as follows:

SEC. 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President-elect shall have died, the Vice-President-elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President-elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice-President-elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

Under this provision it will be seen that Congress derives authority to designate any person whomsoever it desires to act as President under the circumstances indicated. Hence, by designating the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Congress, by the enactment of this bill, would be designating a compatible officer just as it did some time ago when an Assistant Secretary of the Navy was designated as Acting Secretary. Also, an analogy is furnished in the temporary function exercised by the Chief Justice of the United States when presiding over the Senate in a trial of an impeached President. His authority so to act is in the Constitution. Likewise, the authority of Congress to designate a person, any person to act as President is derived from the same source, the Constitution.

Tribute to the Late Judge John D. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the farmers of America in general, and the farmer cooperatives more particularly, lost a dear and valued friend on November 26, 1946, when Judge John D. Miller passed away. The Dairymen's League News in a front-page streamer headline properly described Judge Miller, "storekeeper, lawyer, farmer, Dairymen's League crusader and leader, trail-blazing champion of farmer cooperatives in America."

It was my pleasure and privilege to be closely associated with Judge Miller 25 years ago when legislation which eventually was enacted into the Capper-Volstead Act was being presented to the Congress. No man in this country has rendered more valuable service to the cooperative movement than Judge Miller. He was one of the pioneer advocates of the cooperative movement. His plan for the organization was sound and helpful. The cooperatives of this country are under great obligation to him, particularly for his services in the early days of the development of this movement.

Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial tribute to the late Judge John D. Miller as it appeared in the December 17, 1946, issue of the Dairymen's League News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN D. MILLER

The passing of John D. Miller marks the end of an era in the history of the Dairymen's League. His leadership always constructive, at critical times rose to the heights of fearless crusading. It has been the one great continuing influence in the building of the league's cooperative structure.

He, more than any other one individual, designed and guided the league organization from the beginning. In later years it was his wise counsel and abiding faith in farm people and their cooperatives that helped most in establishing the policies of the association along sound and progressive lines.

The imprint of his foresight, his legal knowledge, and his broad understanding of cooperative business is permanently upon every part of the league organization. That imprint is the record of 30 years of devoted and brilliant service.

Yet through all the years of a busy life, even when responsibility weighed heaviest upon him, he kept the spirit of youth alive in his heart. He was never too busy to be kind and helpful. He never lost his love for baseball, a lively game of cards, bowling, or a thrilling detective story. He enjoyed good literature, too, especially the classics. Forced to support himself from the age of 12, self-educated and disciplined in the hard school of experience, he knew the real values in life and had a natural understanding of farm people—their problems and aspirations.

To no one man will league farmers ever owe so much. He gave the best years of his life to the cooperative cause, and like so many other stalwart league leaders, fell on the field of battle. Only 2 weeks before his death, and on the eve of his ninetieth birthday, he was not only carrying on the duties of general counsel, but also working hard to complete two major projects—a history of the Dairymen's League and a commentary on cooperative law. Both of these projects were practically finished.

It might well be said of him, too, that he was the "happy warrior" of the Dairymen's League, for he never was happier than when he was in the midst of action, spending himself in the service of farmers. Never did he waver in his conviction that only through cooperative enterprise could farm people ever hope to acquire economic independence and maintain the great institution of agriculture on an equal footing with other industries.

More than this, he believed that farmers' cooperatives might well prove to be the great bulwark of national democracy and freedom in the present world struggle between democracy and radicalism of all kinds.

League farmers will always be proud of the services rendered by their own "Judge" Miller to their hundreds of thousands of fellow farmers in other cooperatives throughout the Nation.

An outstanding authority on cooperative law, he helped frame much Federal and State cooperative legislation. As president of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation and later the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, he built those two national organizations up to new high peaks of service and influence. Of his outstanding service in these broader fields, let his fellow leaders speak. Their tributes are printed on other pages in this issue.

As for league farmers, the bright light of his leadership will shine on like a beacon through all the years.

And in the farmers' hall of fame, with such other league immortals as Albert Manning and Chester Young, the glowing record of his service to agriculture will be forever enshrined.

Attitude of Secretary Forrestal Toward Unification of Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Forrestal for Unification," published in the Boston Herald of January 18, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORRESTAL FOR UNIFICATION

The "unification" plan for the armed services announced on Thursday by President Truman is a feather in the cap of Secretary of the Navy Forrestal. It was the stiff-neck admirals and the "school tie" Annapolis boys who offered the greatest resistance to this obvious step toward defense economy and efficiency. It was Forrestal with the aid of his friend, Ferdinand Eberstadt, who broke down this opposition and made possible such "unification" as now seems probable. It is by no means complete or ideal unification, but it is an important step forward, breaking with powerful traditions of the past. In view of the consolidation of the military and naval committees of Congress in accordance with the Congressional Reorganization Act, we now have reason to believe this first token "unification" will soon be a reality, and that more complete unification will follow later on. To have expected much more at first would have been to fight windmills with lances.

We nominate James Forrestal to be the first Secretary of National Defense for the following reasons:

1. It was largely through his efforts that the hidebound Navy opposition to merger was broken down.

2. Mr. Forrestal, a public servant of unusually high character and ability, has talked of leaving the Cabinet. He should be induced to stay.

3. The "unification" plan is popularly believed to be a War Department stunt to gain control of the whole military establishment. A civilian and not a "Navy man," Mr. Forrestal's connection with the Navy would, nonetheless, introduce equilibrium into a new structure which many citizens believe to be too heavily weighted on the Army side. He would be counted on to run the new organization in the interest of the country without regard to the special interests of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Forces.

4. In view of his record in bringing about the present compromise on unification, we believe that he could be counted on the Army side. He could be counted on to perfect unification in the position of first Secretary of National Defense.

We hope that President Truman will see these advantages in our proposal and that Mr. Forrestal can be induced to accept.

The National Wool Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech prepared for the annual convention of the Montana Wool Growers Association at Billings, Mont., on January 16, 1947, on the subject entitled "The National Wool Picture."

Bad weather forced cancellation of airplane flights from Washington and prevented my attendance at the convention. The address was sent to Carl O. Hansen, secretary of the association. It follows:

Members of the Montana Wool Growers Association, I am glad to be with you this morning and have an opportunity to sketch in some of the details of the wool picture as it appears in Washington at the present time. I do not come before you as a wool expert, but rather as one who, perhaps, has access to some information that will be helpful in considering the difficult wool-market situation in which you find yourselves at the present time.

I do not want to bore you with statistics, but a few are necessary if we are to have an understanding of the wool-marketing situation. I should state that accurate figures as to the wool situation are hard to get. Different sources do not always agree. The figures that I present come from the United States Tariff Commission and from the Wool Division of the Department of Agriculture, and were obtained last week.

The total domestic production of shorn and pulled wool from 1933 to 1944 averaged 434,800,000 pounds; in 1945 it was 387,000,000 pounds; in 1946 it dropped to 358,000,000 pounds. I have seen one estimate that the 1947 clip would be only 250,000,000 pounds, although this would appear to be low.

It is estimated that the decline in sheep population in 1946 will be about 10 percent.

The total stocks of wool, domestic and foreign, in this country on July 1, 1946, are estimated to have been 1,000,000,000 pounds. This includes all wool in the possession of wool dealers, the CCC and on farms and ranches. The total world wool stock pile on July 1 was 4,958,000,000 pounds, which can be broken down as of that date (latest accurate figures) as follows:

[In million pounds]

	Wool stock
Exporting countries:	
Australia	1,690
New Zealand	450
South Africa	310
Total, British Dominion	2,450
Argentina	240
Uruguay	5
Grand total	2,695
Importing countries:	
United States	931
United Kingdom	832
Others	560
Total	2,263
Total world supply	4,958

or almost 5,000,000,000 pounds.

Since this date the countries of the Southern Hemisphere have harvested a wool crop. However, it is probable that about as much wool has been used as has been added to the world supply.

You have read reports of tremendous sales of the British stockpile at auctions conducted by the Joint Organization in London and at other Empire markets. It has been said that these sales improve the picture greatly and are an index to the rate of wool consumption by countries in Europe recovering from the war. Actually, you should not be too optimistic about these sales. I am reliably informed that European mills devastated by war are not getting into operation much faster than was expected 2 years ago, and that the large sales are partly due to buying by continental governments as a hedge against inflation. Therefore, much of this wool is still, as a matter of fact, in stock pile and a part of the world supply which must be disposed of.

Of the Empire stocks held on October 1, 1946, at least 75 percent are probably inferior, heavy, burry, and carbonizing types;

suited only or almost entirely for Continental consumption. Not more than 10 percent of the Empire stocks of 3,400,000,000 pounds on hand October 1, 1946, are of the desirable "American types."

The British Empire Joint Organization has estimated that it will take 13 years to liquidate its stock pile. Our Tariff Commission expert estimates between 8 and 16 years, or an average of 12 years, depending on world conditions.

While this Empire wool is not strictly competitive with our finer American wools, its price has a definite relationship to the price at which we can sell our wool. It is thought likely that the Empire will try to stabilize the price of its wool at a reasonably high level for at least several years, and this will, of course, be helpful to American wool marketing, other things remaining equal. If duties are cut, or there is a depression, it would adversely affect marketing operations.

Imports of South American wool are more than twice the pre-war imports and from Argentina there are at the present time three times the pre-war quantities. This is, of course, of great concern to the domestic producers. The reason for the increase is that duties on South American wool are now about half what they were before the war, having been reduced by Executive orders issued under the reciprocal trade agreement program. This is at least an indication of what can be expected from future lowering of tariffs. Even though the South American wool is generally coarser than ours, it is competitive because the mills can regulate fashion and if they want to use this wool, they can decide that sports clothes and tweeds are fashionable rather than fabrics made of finer wools.

Our textile and wool growers' costs are considerably above those of the Empire. In textile production the wage ratio here is three times higher than in the United Kingdom. Labor costs in the United States are 2.3 times higher. The average production ratio in the United States is 1.3 times higher. In addition, our ranching costs, including herding, are 4 to 5 times higher than Australia.

Turning now from the foreign to the domestic picture, the production of domestic wool has dropped from a 1935–44 average of 434,800,000 pounds to 358,000,000 pounds in 1946.

[In million pounds]

Shorn wool:	
Year:	
1935–44 average	369
1945	321
1946	299
Pulled wool:	
Year:	
1935–44 average	65.8
1945	66
1946	59
Total production:	
Year:	
1935–44 average	434.8
1945	387
1946	358

It is interesting to note that from 1936–40 our growers supplied 76.4 percent of the wool that was consumed in this country, 43 percent in 1941–42, 34 percent in 1943, and that in 1946 only 23 percent. Our domestic consumption for 1946 is in excess of 1,060,000,000 pounds, of which 240,000,000 pounds was domestic and 820,000,000 pounds foreign.

In brief, while our domestic consumption is over 1,000,000,000 pounds, our domestic production has dropped to 358,000,000 pounds, and we are now furnishing only 23 percent of the wool consumed in this country.

The CCC has on hand, as of December 31, 1946, 461,600,000 pounds, and the stock pile in this country is around 1,000,000,000 pounds, a year's supply. In addition, hanging over the market is the increased production from South America of wools that are more or less competitive, and at least 10 percent of the huge world wool stock pile of about 4,000,000,000 pounds.

Since 1943 CCC has purchased 1,273,200,000 pounds of wool. Of this amount, 461,600,000 pounds remains unsold as of December 31, 1946. This reserve stock includes 163,700,000 pounds of the 1946 clip, 163,000,000 pounds of the 1945 clip, 87,000,000 pounds of the 1944 clip, and 47,600,000 pounds of the 1943 production.

Dr. Louis G. Connor, of the Tariff Commission, says that even the higher prices paid in recent auctions in Australia for fine wools would not make it possible for the CCC to avoid a loss in disposing of its wool. Parity prices have gone up at least as much as the estimated 10-percent increases in prices paid at these auctions. The result is that the CCC price has risen, too. Australian wool would come into this country at about $1.11 with the duty paid. If the CCC sold any wool at the present time, it's price would be around $1.15, and there is a 10-percent differential against United States wool which would result in a loss to the CCC of some 15 cents per pound if it tried to meet the price of Australian wool.

Before completing this part of the picture, I should add one more factor—that is, that 18 foreign countries have been invited to meet in Washington this month to consider reductions in tariffs and eliminations of quotas. In the public notice of this meeting, wool is listed among the items to be considered.

You know that the world is now greatly in our debt. It will be further in our debt if it now accepts our exports freely, but how is it going to pay? Is it going to be in the form of an I O U in the till of the Export-Import Bank, largely supplied with capital from the United States Treasury? If these countries pay at all it must be in commodities and products which they produce. That is obvious. It would appear to be clear that our normal consumption of tea, coffee, spices, linen, bananas, and scotch whisky imports will not serve to balance the books.

Could it be possible that countries producing huge surpluses of wool, beef, mutton, flax, wheat, and sugar would insist upon our acceptance of even larger supplies of such commodities? In fact, realizing the low cost of production in countries burdened with a large exportable surplus of these commodities, and the artificial high-price levels in this country, it requires no proof to envision what will be done. No doubt, a cotton grower of the South and the eastern industrialist manufacturing complicated machinery protected by patents can view lowering of tariffs and doing away with quotas with complacency. But can the people of a land-bound agricultural State such as Montana? If such competition is to be met, it can be overcome only at the expense of longer hours at lower pay under a greatly reduced standard of living, not only for the farm people but also for those who supply their needs.

I should mention one more factor—that is the adverse publicity that has been appearing in the national magazines regarding the wool industry. I would like to call your especial attention to the article in the January 1947 issue of Fortune magazine, entitled "The Trouble With United States Wool Is That It Is Uneconomic. The Industry Subsists on the Excessive Tariffs, Wartime Subsidies, and Political Shenanigans." I believe this article should be "must" reading for every sheepman attending this convention.

The present purchase program that has been carried on by the CCC since 1943 will expire in April of this year unless extended by Presidential order or some action is taken by Congress. Therefore, you have facing your industry at the present time a large carry-over of wool, possible reduction in tariff rates and a possible end of the present purchase program in April.

A reduction under the reciprocal-trade agreements acts, combined with a termination of the commodity credit wool purchase program in 1947, would certainly leave the domestic wool industry in a bad situation. It is something that should give great concern to this convention. An agreement should be reached between the State associations and your national associations as to steps to be taken to protect your industry in this emergency.

You will remember at the last session of Congress Senator O'MAHONEY in the Senate and Congressman GRANGER in the House introduced legislation on which long hearings were held. Sheepmen from 11 Western States appeared at these hearings. Representatives of the State Department, Agriculture Department, and Tariff Commission all added their testimony. The President of the United States was prevailed upon to write a letter to Senator O'MAHONEY promoting wool legislation. Various members of the wool trade presented their views on the legislation. The wool producers were unanimous in their desire for legislation to protect the wool industry. The legislation was finally reported out of the House Agriculture Committee on July 25 in a considerably amended version.

It contained three important provisions. Wool would have been designated by law as a Steagall commodity receiving a price support of not less than 90 percent of the adjusted comparable price for 2 years after the 1st day of January following the official declaration of the end of the war. A comparable price would have been determined under the bill for wool and lambs which would have placed them in an equitable relationship with the basic agricultural commodities. In other words, at that time wool would have been priced at about 42 cents a grease pound. The bill would have provided for the sale of domestic wool in competition with foreign wool, thus permitting a reduction of the domestic stock pile. This legislation failed of passage, but I describe it in some detail, as it is very similar to the legislation that has been introduced in the present Congress, again by Congressman GRANGER in the House and Senator O'MAHONEY in the Senate. This legislation was opposed by most wool trade members who appeared before the House committee. To quote from the testimony of Mr. Harold Lindsay, president of the National Wool Trade Association and director of the Boston Wool Trade Association. "(our) members (are) opposed to any legislation which seeks to perpetuate the present system of Government purchase and sale of our domestic clip."

Mr. GRANGER's bill in the present Congress is H. R. 63; Senator O'MAHONEY's bill in the Senate is S. 103. These two bills should be given careful consideration by your convention. Are they what you want at this time? The fight to get them through the Congress is going to be a difficult one, and favorable action will be taken only because the wool industry is in agreement on what it desires and is willing to support the program.

Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming has a proposal to establish a quota system for imports or to increase the tariff to protect domestic production. This would be the simple way to give the wool industry the protection it must have to survive, but either of these proposals would run into formidable objections from the executive branch of our Government. Your industry should decide definitely and unequivocally where it stands with regard to lowering of tariff barriers and placing of quota restrictions, and as regards the O'Mahoney and Granger bills.

Wool and lamb production is one of the principal industries of Montana as well as of the 11 Western States. That fact is entitled to recognition, by the whole country. The industry must have such legislation as is

necessary to place it on a long-time, sound basis.

Possibly I have given you a picture of the wool-marketing situation that is too dark. There are many things which should encourage the sheepman, and they have been well expressed in Dr. M. M. Kelso's article in the January issue of the Montana Woolgrowers entitled "Prospects in Sheep." I would like to recommend it for your reading.

In conclusion, let me summarize the situation:

1. There is a stock pile of 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool in this country which is enough to supply our domestic consumption for 1 year.

2. Outside the United States there is a stockpile of about 4 billion pounds, not to exceed 10 percent of which is a type and quality which is competitive with our wool.

3. In 1946 only 23 percent of the wool consumed in this country was domestically produced. We actually produced only a little over a third of our needs.

4. CCC purchase program ends in April unless extended by Presidential or congressional action.

5. Eighteen countries are now meeting in Washington with our State Department for the purpose of lowering tariffs or quota barriers.

There are five possible courses of action:

1. Let the CCC purchase program end, accept lower tariffs and let wool be sold in competition with world supplies.

2. Raise the tariff to cover the difference in cost of production between this and foreign countries.

3. Establish a quota that will permit the entry of only such wool as is needed to add to our domestic production to meet domestic consumption needs.

4. Enact legislation that will guarantee a comparable price as provided in the Granger and O'Mahoney bills.

5. A combination of these measures.

Each has its faults and advantages. It is for this association, together with other State associations and the National Wool Growers, to determine the course they want to pursue.

Your national legislative committee did a splendid job in presenting your case before the committee of Congress during the last session. Such men as Byron Wilson, Casey Jones, and your own secretary, Kelly Hansen, did outstanding work.

I have not discussed the matter of competition with other products, nor studies and experiments that are being carried on looking to a more efficient marketing and handling of your wool. Neither have I concerned myself with meat. I have limited these remarks to presenting briefly the world-marketing situation as it appears at the present moment.

Your Members of Congress have served, and will continue to serve, your great industry. Let us agree on the essentials of a sound, long-time, legislative program and then go to Washington and see that it becomes the law of the land. The wool industry is of great importance to the West, but it is also economically important to the Nation, and it is entitled to legislation that will put it on a sound basis.

The Late Mark Thistlethwaite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a friend whose untimely death brings sorrow and a deep sense of loss to most of us in this Congress and to a host of others with whom he lived and worked.

Mark Thistlethwaite was truly a part of the Washington scene. I believe only three Members of this Eightieth Congress were serving here when Mark came to Capitol Hill as secretary to Vice President Thomas R. Marshall in 1913. After 8 years in the office of the Vice President, Mark rejoined the staff of the Indianapolis News, which he served as Washington correspondent continuously to the time of his death.

Mark Thistlethwaite was a gentleman in the finest sense of the word, a great reporter in the finest tradition of his profession. His was a rich and productive life. Kindly, tolerant, and helpful, Mark made life richer and better for all who had the good fortune to know him.

His death is a heavy loss to his profession, to his State, and to his country.

No Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. On the day Congress convened, January 3, I introduced a bill to repeal the OPA in its entirety, including rent control.

Since I introduced this bill, H. R. 299, I have received letters from all over the country, and particularly from my district, declaring that there is no real housing shortage. The housing shortage, they say, is only apparent, and not genuine. They say that the arbitrary and unreasonable enforcement of present rent control laws and regulations has developed a situation which has been considered a housing shortage, but which, in reality, is only an impediment put in the way of those who want to occupy premises which stand vacant or are only partially occupied.

An excellent illustration of the thinking of some of the people on this subject is set forth in the following letter which I have just received from Mr. Oscar Bieser, of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA, *January 13, 1947.*

Mr. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,

New House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: I have spent most of my life in the rental business here. I started in 1924, about 22 years ago, and have managed or owned an average of 600 to 1,000 units all of those years, and during those 22 years have seen five recessions or depressions as we called them and of course the same number of highs. I have of course studied the so-called housing shortage from every angle as it applies to Oklahoma City housing. I have also talked with many property managers and owners from Tulsa, Dallas, Cleveland, New York City, Seattle, Los Angeles, and other places, and I find the same condition exists in those places, so it is not only here that these same conditions hold true.

There is no real housing shortage here or anywhere that I can find. Sounds crazy, doesn't it? When there was no meat in the butcher shops, it sounded crazy to say there was no meat shortage too, didn't it, but price control was lifted and there is no meat shortage and meat is not $1 per pound either, is it? I can tell you why if you will listen.

I like to give examples to illustrate. I bought two apartment buildings on West Thirty-first in 1938. The rent on each apartment then was $40 per month on the average. They are efficiency apartments, and all of them were occupied either by couples or by two single girls living together. These people all worked, in most cases both the man and wife worked. You will recall the good stenographers then made $25 to $35 per week, now they make $45 to $60. Now 9 of those 15 units are occupied by single girls or single men. The rent is frozen at $30 per month. Why should these people be bothered by having to live with someone. The OPA will not allow the owner any more rent for more tenants so why should owners try to get two or more persons. One tenant will do less damage than two or more, and repairs will some day have to be made so when vacancies do come up the owners try to get only one person. Furniture is much higher now than in 1942, and these are furnished apartments.

I believe there are at least 10,000 such units here at this time. Of course, not all of these people would double if rent was increased but most of them would. Add to these maybe 2,000 units that are vacant because the rent is frozen at, say, $15 per month with bills paid and the gas and light bills will run $12 to $15 per month. There is no reason for the owner to rent them. Would you, if you owned them? Now add to those the 600 to 1,000 houses and duplexes that are vacant because the owners want to sell them, and a vacant house or duplex will sell for at least $1,000 more vacant than it will rented because it takes 6 months to get possession, unless the rent director does not like the color of your hair or the way you wear your hat, in which case he can refuse to issue the certificate and then you cannot get possession at all and there is nothing you can do about it.

If rent control was lifted tomorrow, in 60 days or less there would be no housing shortage here. There is no meat shortage and meat is not $1 per pound, and so it would be with rent. You are not interested, or at least you should not be if you represent all of the people, in the welfare of any group but only as it applies to the average; that is, the over-all average of tenants. Let me tell you about that. I believe that 30 to 40 percent of the rent property here is rented at over the ceiling rents now, and if an owner is going to rent over the ceiling he will, of course, get all he can, which, in most cases, is $75 to $80 for a place that is only worth $40, while the units that are rented at ceiling rents are held to $20 to $25. In placing the worth of the units I am taking the rent as it was in 1942 and comparing it with the prices of all the things property owners have to buy now. They have to eat the same as other people. Now look at the unfairness of this. The larger property owners are not the ones that are renting over the ceiling; it is the owner with only two or three units that will take the chance. These account for the 30 to 40 percent I set out. With larger property owners, if the rent is too low on some of his units, he just locks them up and lets them stand; he is not hurt too bad, or maybe he might pay off to someone to get an increase, either of which is bad, don't you think?

And it is costing us about $2,500,000,000, or maybe more this year, to maintain this gestapo control. The war has been over nearly 2 years. Of course, France and England kept rent control after World War I, and still have it, but this is the United States, remember? Think about this. If what I say

is true, the GI's are paying $6,000 now for houses that will not bring $3,000 in 2 or 3 years because they cannot rent places. So, after all, who is paying the bill? The answer is with you.

Yours truly,

OSCAR BIESER.

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in Thursday night's announcement on unification of the armed services.

As far back as 1941 I proposed a basic change which was fundamentally the same as that now agreed upon by the President and the Secretaries of War and Navy.

A year ago in April 1946 I proposed a plan of unification which is practically identical with the plan now agreed upon. In a public statement at that time, I said:

The most important aspect of the controversial issue of unification is that it must be acted upon, either rejected or adopted, as soon as possible because the formation and organization of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps cannot be made until we decide whether we are going to merge the armed services or not.

There are certain fields in which there can be no question of the necessity of merger. They are (1) procurement; (2) services, such as medical, financial, and so forth; and (3) intelligence. These activities of the armed services should be merged without delay.

But I share the doubts of the opponents of the proposed merger as to the practicality and advantage of merger in the field of operation. To put it more bluntly, I oppose the submerging of one service to another service rather than the merging.

There can be no question that the Air Forces should be raised to an equal level of authority and autonomy with the land forces and the sea forces. This should be done whether by merger or by a separate Department of Air.

The greatest need for merger is the merging of military policy with foreign policy. In other words, get the State Department and the armed services together, through a National Security Council

Bearing in mind that there are certain fields in which merger is most necessary but other fields in which it is most questionable, I believe that we should adopt the following organization for unification:

1. Create a Secretary of Common Defense, who shall have (a) executive or line authority for unifying and merging (i) procurement, (ii) services, such as medical, financial, etc., and (iii) intelligence; and (b) advisory or staff duties to the President in coordination of the services on all other matters.

2. Create a Secretary of Air in addition to the existing Secretaries of War and Navy, retaining in these three full executive authority under the President, independent of the Secretary of Common Defense, over everything except procurement, services, and intelligence.

3. Appoint a Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, but who shall act only in an advisory capacity to the President, and having no authority over the chiefs of the separate services.

4. Retain the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the executive group on military policy and strategy.

5. Merge military policy and foreign policy with the creation of a National Security Council, composed of Secretaries of State, Common Defense, War, Navy, and Air, with the Secretary of Common Defense being the chairman of the council.

Income-Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I insert in the RECORD for the information of the membership a letter addressed by Robert B. Dresser, an outstanding attorney, of Providence, R. I., to the President of the United States and Members of Congress which contains arguments in favor of the measure that are, to say the least, thought-provoking. The letter follows:

JANUARY 14, 1947.

Re Knutson tax bill.

The President and Members of the Congress, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: On January 3 Congressman KNUTSON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, introduced in the House of Representatives a bill (H. R. 1) providing for an across-the-board cut in the individual income taxes of 20 percent on incomes up to $302,000, and of about 10½ percent on incomes over that amount. You, Mr. President, and certain Members of Congress, have expressed opposition to the proposal, principally on the ground that a reduction in tax rates without a corresponding reduction in expenditures would prevent the balancing of the budget.

This conclusion is based apparently upon the assumption that "rate" and "revenue" are synonymous, that the higher the rate the higher the revenue. This, however, is not the fact. The revenue from an income tax is dependent not only on the rate of the tax but also on the size of the income on which the tax is imposed.

Both reason and experience demonstrate that in peacetime a moderate rate of tax on income will, in the long run, produce more revenue than a high rate. The explanation is (1) that the lower rate leaves in the hands of the taxpayers more income, which, when invested and put to work, produces more wealth, and (2) that the lower rate encourages investment and the production of wealth. This increase in wealth when invested produces additional income, which in turn when invested produces still more income, and so on. By thus increasing the national income, which is the base on which the tax is levied, more revenue is obtained and the wealth of the Nation is increased to the benefit of the people as a whole.

Our own Government's experience supports this view. For examples, we must look to the period prior to the starting of the national-defense program in the spring of 1940, for since then our economy has been subject to the artificial stimulus created by war, a stimulus which is rapidly disappearing.

Secretary of the Treasury Andrew W. Mellon put this principle to the test after World War I and, by getting Congress to reduce drastically the income-tax rates, obtained larger revenue and incidentally paid off over $9,000,000,000 of the country's World War I debt.

Another example is furnished by a comparison of the 6-year period from 1926 to 1931, inclusive, with the six succeeding years, 1932 to 1937, inclusive. During the first period the maximum individual income-tax rate was 24 percent in 1 year and 25 percent in the remaining 5 years. In the second period the rate was 63 percent in the first 4 years, and 79 percent in the last 2. Despite the much lower rates and the substantially smaller population during the earlier period the national income and the revenue, as shown by the individual income-tax returns, were higher than in the later 6-year period with the higher rates and increased population.

The present tax rates on individual incomes, running to a high of 86.45 percent, are confiscatory and if continued will inevitably destroy our system of private enterprise and our American form of government and force us into some form of national socialism.

The process by which this is accomplished is simple.

1. By increasing the taxes on industry and on those who invest capital in industry to an excessively high rate and maintaining them there, the supply of capital for industry is reduced.

2. Less capital for industry means less business, lower wages, and fewer jobs. If the capital supply is greatly reduced, business stagnation and large-scale unemployment follow; and if the reduction is large enough, the Government must step in and supply the capital, or chaos will ensue.

3. If the Government supplies the capital, it eventually becomes the owner and we have socialism or communism.

The effectiveness of taxation as a means of establishing communism has long been known to the Communists. In the Communist platform of Karl Marx, 2 of the 10 planks are—

1. "A heavy progressive or graduated income tax."

2. "Abolition of all right of inheritance," in other words, a 100-percent-inheritance tax.

By this means Marx knew that he could dry up the sources of capital and ultimately abolish private property, which he declared to be the objective of the Communists.

Accordingly, if communism or socialism is to be avoided, it should be our objective to increase rather than decrease the capital supply.

Without a constantly increasing supply of capital for investment in productive enterprise no nation can be prosperous. For example, in normal times about $4,000,000,000 of new capital is needed each year merely to give employment to the new crop of young people seeking employment, to say nothing of other needs. Largely because of excessive and unsound taxation, this capital was not forthcoming during the years between 1932 and the beginning of the defense program in 1940, and hence during that period there was large-scale unemployment, averaging as much as 10,000,000.

Capital put to work provides jobs and higher wages. The automobile industry furnishes an excellent illustration. Based upon 1939 reports, the number of jobs created directly and indirectly by the automobile industry, which is less than 50 years old, was at that time 6,105,000. This is over 10 percent of the total number of persons now employed in all classes of employment, including those in the armed forces.

The average American produces more and earns more than the citizen of any other nation *because he is assisted by a large investment in plant, equipment, and working capital.* For example, aided by an investment of $25,000 per employee in railroad plant and equipment, an American railroad worker earns and is paid wages 100 times those paid a Chinese coolie who performs the same service without the aid of any equipment. Take from the American worker the railroad equipment and give him nothing but his bare hands, and his high wages would disappear.

Likewise, a primitive Hindu textile worker earns a few pennies a day with her cheap, inefficient hand loom, on which she can make but a few yards of cloth in a day. Aided by an investment per employee of $6,000 in modern machinery and equipment, the American textile worker produces hundreds of yards of cloth daily and earns over $7 a day.

These, of course, are but a few of the many examples.

The capital required to provide the machinery and equipment that have so greatly improved the lot of the American worker comes solely from the savings of corporations and individuals. Only a small percentage of the people, however, save money for investment in productive enterprise. Studies by Dr. Carl Snyder and by Dr. Willford I. King, of New York University, indicate that the great bulk of the capital supplied by individuals comes from those having the larger incomes. If these savings are taken in taxes, the capital is not available and business stagnation and depression with large scale unemployment follow.

Those who criticize the Knutson bill because its rate of reduction is not graduated in favor of the smaller incomes are advocating the course proposed by Karl Marx—a course which if continued will inevitably destroy private enterprise and our American system of government. In fact, it is to be regretted that the bill does not apply the same cut to incomes above the $302,000 level, as that applied to incomes below.

It is not surprising, therefore, that people are expressing alarm at the opposition to the proposed reduction in income-tax rates. For example, in the Whaley-Eaton letter of December 28, 1946, it is said (p. 3):

"Men talk of whether or not it is advisable to reduce taxation. The fact is, that unless it is reduced, communism or some other ism is inevitable for the simple reason that existing taxation is confiscatory. It is liquidating not only the 'kulaks,' but also the white-collar classes and even the wage earners on whom the levies likewise fall. Taxation is consuming capitalism; it is nationalizing the *income* of industry, which may be quite as bad as direct nationalization of plant."

As for expenditures, the budget of $37,500,000,000 proposed by you, Mr. President, is four times the highest peacetime budget in the country's history prior to the starting of the defense program in 1940, and is a matter of grave concern. It should be greatly reduced, and to this end every unnecessary expenditure should be eliminated.

The cry of "communism" and "socialism" is not the product of a distorted imagination. If anyone thinks "it can't happen here," let him take a look at England, long the victim of a heavy graduated income tax on individuals, where socialism is about to become an accomplished fact, and let him at the same time read the following statement made by Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons in 1876:

"Of all the taxes on the statute book, the income tax is the only tax through which it is possible that socialism or communism, or anything like them, can in the nature of things find an entrance into our system. It cannot be done by indirect taxation. * * * I do not believe it unjust that the rich man should pay more liberally than the man of lower position; but the unlimited adoption of the doctrine is full of danger to the state, and I ask whether it is wise for us to give the smallest scintilla of countenance to that doctrine, by adopting any proposal such as that now before us. * * * In the income tax we have a law admitting of being dealt with in a manner which would have given satisfaction to the Commune of Paris."

A cut of 20 percent in individual rates, I submit, is none too great, and should be put into effect as soon as possible and made applicable to the year 1947, as proposed in the Knutson bill.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

P. S.—In an address delivered in New York on December 16, 1940, on the subject, "The Tax Problem and Future Prosperity," Dr. Carl Snyder, for many years statistician of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and the author of "Capitalism the Creator," said:

"Deep and wide have been the discussions as to why this country should have had in the last 11 years no increase in product or in income over the levels reached in the late twenties. Eleven years without a parallel in the long history of this country! Careful compilations show that every 10 years since the founding of the Republic have shown an average rate of growth not greatly differing from one decennium to the next. In the last 50 years, up to 1930, this average rate of growth per annum has been about 4 percent. Since 1930 a complete arrest of this astonishing growth. * * *

"But the primal cause? As I see it: the drastic reduction in business profits, due in large part to the tremendous rise in taxation."

After pointing out that the "net *increase* in capital invested over the last 100 years or more" had been at approximately the rate of 5 percent, Dr. Snyder continues:

"I suppose this net annual increase in capital investment seems so small that the star-eyed gods of reform—and the prophets of the millennium which they would introduce—cannot believe that such extraordinary results can derive from so slender a source. Forgetful of the acorn and the towering oak! * * *

"Their (our industries') fabulous increase in product is due to one thing and one thing alone; that is to machinery, new and ingenious chemical processes and all the like—not remotely to any of the fabled skill of the workman. That skill and energy were there, and it had been there, we have now evidence to show, for at least 5,000 years before this great outburst of industry in recent times began. * * *

"But all this forty or fifty billion dollars' worth of machinery and means of transport and the like has required a steady and definite increase in the capital supply year by year. What our 'statesmen'—so-called—apparently cannot understand, is that to stop this capital supply—to tax it out of existence—is simply to bring the progress of the Nation to a standstill. This is exactly what it has done in the last 10 years of futile and fantastic 'social experimentation' and bungling and equally futile efforts to improve the lot of the common man. As if human nature could be changed by fiat or decree! As if by laws and commissions or endless bureaus for this and that, human intelligence or skill could be increased by a hair's breadth! An utterly infantile belief that has already cost this country the incredible sums which I have mentioned and now threatens to continue this enormous loss. For it now seems clear enough that it is only the burden of unsound taxation and of restrictive laws and meddlesome bureaus that is holding back this country from the continuation of the great industrial and social advancement through five or six generations. Simply this and nothing else. As I see it, the greatest economic tragedy in our history. The price of ignorance, fatuity, and folly. No reason in the world why our national annual income should not today be one hundred and twenty or one hundred and thirty billion dollars, instead of seventy or seventy-five.

"And consider what this vast sum, with its normal rate of increase, would amount to in another 10 years: a national income then of perhaps, $200,000,000,000. In no wise an idle fantasy. * * *

"In the face of such a prospect, does it not seem incredible that we should have lawgivers and lawmakers so blind to reality, so lacking in understanding, as to believe that the pathway to prosperity and national well-being is through the restriction of profits and the taxation of large corporations and large fortunes, when it would seem that even the blind could understand that it is high profits and chiefly large profits which have provided the capital funds for our wondrous industrial advancement and present-day wealth and well-being?"

(NOTE.—This letter states my own views and is not intended as an expression of the views of the law firm of which I am a member.)

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

The big issue in Washington this week is how much money the Government should take from your pockets.

For the third year after the end of the war in Europe, President Truman proposes to spend an average of $1,000 per family. He says we should not reduce taxes. Republican leaders, together with many Democrats, say we should. Let me begin this discussion by telling a story.

A prize was offered for the strongest man at a county fair. Instead of tossing an anvil the greatest distance, the contest was to see who could squeeze the last drop out of a lemon.

So a lemon was produced—whether from Florida or California I don't know—a juicy lemon, anyway. All the blacksmiths and mighty men squeezed it one after the other until no one could get another drop. Then a little shrimp of a man stepped up. He had legs and arms like pipe stems and weighed about 110 pounds. He took the lemon in one hand and squeezed out another teaspoonful of juice.

The judges were amazed. They asked, "How do you do it?" He said, "That's easy—I'm the tax collector."

SOME PERTINENT COMPARISONS

Now that we know who squeezes the lemon the hardest, let's measure the juice. Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine was the top year in national income until war-buying abroad and national defense at home finally gave us the "fools' gold" which President Roosevelt once called war prosperity.

Until then the depression had lasted 10 years, and 8,000,000 still out of work in 1940 showed that the reformers had reformed, but the Nation had not recovered.

Now, let's make some comparisons. National income today, in this post-war boom, has doubled since 1929, but Federal taxes have increased 13 times.

Nearly one-third of all your total income last year was eaten up by the tax locusts of Federal, State, and local governments. On

the average, out of each dollar you earned, you had left about 70 cents to spend.

It is of course impossible to abolish all taxes, but if they were, the "take-home" of the average American family would increase 50 percent! That shows how to increase wages without raising prices. Reduce taxes and you increase wages. Keep the lemon from being squeezed and you have more juice left.

CUT MEANS PAY BOOST

A 20-percent tax cut this year, added to the tiny relief already graciously granted us since VJ-day, would amount to a 6-percent pay boost for those earning around $3,000 a year.

And, as it would not increase prices but reduce them, it would stimulate consumption, production, and jobs. It would help to solve the housing problem.

A married man with $5,000 income now pays 173 times as much Federal income tax as he paid in 1929. But that is income taxes alone

In addition, there are scores of excise taxes—electric light bulbs, cigarettes, etc.—hundreds of items. Many of these taxes were imposed for the express purpose to discourage buying the articles during the war. Excise taxes have grown up twelve times.

Now watch that little guy squeezing the lemon a while longer. State and local taxes are also going up. All kinds of taxes. In some cities a man pays three income taxes, to the city, the State, and the Leviathan on the Potomac.

And here let me say a good word for the Tax Foundation and all similar organizations fighting this engulfing flood of taxation. You should give them your support.

MORE TAXES, MORE RENT

Gasoline is taxed two or three times. Real estate taxes are going up. As they go up landlords have to ask for more rent. Taxes account for about one-fourth of all rent.

Nearly every tax increase is a forced mark-up of the cost of living, ordered by the Government. So you see that this matter of big government and big taxes is at the heart of a lot of our problems.

But let's take another look at the little guy squeezing the lemon. What effect have taxes and Government debt on security for old age? That is certainly worth your looking into.

Well, to begin with, we have a borrowing Government—one that pays its bills, in part, only by going into debt, as we have done now for 16 straight years. It forces interest rates down, so as to borrow as cheaply as possible so as not to make the voters mad by taxing them too much to pay the interest on the debt. You may say, fine, reduce the interest rate.

WHAT LOW INTEREST ENTAILS

But there is another side to that also. Everything has two sides. Government can give to nobody without taking from somebody. So let's look at the other side of low interest rates, from the somebody standpoint.

In 1939, only 8 years ago, you might buy for old age and the security of your family, when you can no longer work, a couple of bonds yielding 3 percent before taxes, or $6 income a year.

Today those bonds, on the average, earn you only $5. But the purchasing power of the $5, due to the rise in prices, is only 68 percent of what it was in 1939.

But that was before taxes. So watch the lemon squeezer again. Today you pay a higher tax out of the lower income.

Putting these things all together, you must now save $2.50 to have it earn you the same net income to buy groceries as $1 bought 8 years ago.

In 1930 money in the savings bank earned 4 percent. It now earns 1 percent or 1½ percent. That means that a school teacher or anyone else has to work longer in order to save two or three times as much in order to have the same income.

The same thing is happening to life insurance. Because the Government has forced down the income from investments of the insurance companies, you now have to pay a higher premium for the same protection.

Investment income of churches, colleges, annuity funds for retired clergymen, etc., is melting away. All this is done under the beautiful slogan of "social security." You hear that word "social" and don't see what is happening to "security," a man's own security and his family's.

The result is, unless we change things, a man has to earn more dollars to make his old age secure. He has to keep on working when he would otherwise retire, thus shutting out job opportunities for young men and women. And that is important.

There is still another way to look at this lemon squeezer. Suppose in January 1937, you sold a small house for $3,750 and bought Government bonds. Well, the 10 years have rolled around. You cash your bonds for $5,000. Can you buy back the house you sold with the $5,000 you now have? No, you cannot. The gain in interest has not offset the shrinking value of the dollar.

In addition, you owe your share of the national debt, an invisible but first mortgage, amounting to nearly $8,000 for the average family.

Why do dollars shrink in value and prices rise accordingly? Is it your fault or the fault of industry? No, you don't issue dollars—unless you are a counterfeiter.

ALL SAVINGS WORTH LESS

What then is responsible for the fact that your savings in Government bonds, insurance, bank deposits, pensions, social security cards, etc., won't buy today what they bought 10 years ago?

It is the war; of course, and—and—Government policies in Washington. The people are responsible only because they supported these policies under the cock-eyed notion that money is wealth, and that we could borrow ourselves rich.

We are still pouring billions overseas under the "one world" notion that we have no right to be better off in America than other people. I say, why not, if we earn it, as we have done.

Now, with the war over, we find that our money supply—currency and checks—has increased three times since 1939 and six times since 1933 And there is where your inflation comes from. That is why you can't buy back that house you sold 10 years ago.

As President Parkinson, of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, says, high prices are not inflation—money is inflation.

Yet the lobbies are still pressuring Congress for Federal aid to schools, highways, airports, and everything we haven't the courage to tax ourselves to buy right where we live.

Social reform? Yes. Economic reform? Yes. But I say no reform is worth the candle unless it rests on a completely solvent government.

I know a man who has a social-security card issued by Bismarck's Germany 50 years ago. How much would it be worth to him now, even if he had not come to America? Think it over.

LET'S INFORM THE REFORMERS

Before we go in for more social reform in Washington, we had better reform our thinking about taxes and debt, and pieces of paper called money, as being wealth. If we do that, we could put social reform on a sound basis.

Those who make their living spending other people's money brand everybody who has old-fashioned ideas about paying our bills as we go as a reactionary, a Troy, or a Fascist.

But I'm leaving it to you whether they or the folks who think as I do have the real interests at their heart of our old people, the disabled veterans who have nothing but a pension to live on, and our young people starting on life's journey, looking for jobs.

But perhaps the worst effect of high taxes is its deadening blight on new business getting started, or established business expanding.

Profits, or the hope of profits, determine the birth rate of new business, which is another name for opportunities for jobs. Taxes, on the other hand, increase the death rate of business.

Even under former tax rates, the average business lived only 5 years. Believing, as I do, that prosperity is the greatest of all reforms, and makes all others possible; and believing, too, that the best security a wage earner has is a successful employer, I hope you will look at the lemon squeezer from this angle.

Today we are busy repairing the destruction of war. But take thought for tomorrow.

Some day the other nations will recover and compete with us for the world's trade and our own trade with the price of their goods free from the cost of our social-security taxes and minimum-wage rates. We had better begin now to shingle the roof of American business.

All taxes and government debt raise prices. And inflation is taxation, the cruelest of all taxes, because it hits the poorest the hardest.

Whenever government borrows money from a commercial bank, it, in effect, creates money out of thin air. It is next door to greenbacks. It is like pouring water into milk.

And if we have another war before we get this debt down where we can handle it, we will have to go as totalitarian as Hitler or Stalin, confiscate all private property and conscript everybody into government work camps. Then our social-security cards will be like those issued by Bismarck 50 years ago. And keep this in mind The revolutionists in our midst would like nothing better than a collapse of government caused by unbearable debt and unpayable taxes.

MAKE OUR GOVERNMENT SOLVENT

Now the optimistic side of this picture is our enormous capacity to create the new wealth to carry the debt and gradually pay it off. If we stop all the rackets in Government, business, and labor that cause more dollars to be paid out for no more goods, and go to work, we can pull through; if we back up men in Congress like Senators BYRD and TAFT in cutting Government spending.

Work is the chief answer. That little word with four letters answers more problems than a library of lawbooks.

Government bonds are no doubt still the safest investment in the world. I advise everyone to hold his bonds, if at all possible, and to reinvest them when they fall due.

But this is a very unsafe world. Let us go to the heart of the problem. It is that government costs too much, spends too much, taxes too much, goes into debt too deep.

Let us make our Government absolutely solvent. Then the Government bonds and all savings will follow along. The tail goes with the hide.

Vandenberg's Proposal for China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the

following editorial from the Evening Outlook, of Santa Monica, Calif.:

VANDENBERG'S PROPOSAL FOR CHINA

The first evidence that this country may be ready to adopt a realistic policy toward China has come from Senator VANDENBERG. In his address to the Council of World Affairs at Cleveland he urged that the United States abandon its present policy of treating the Chinese Communists on a basis of equality with the National Government and throw its support to the non-Communist coalition which is trying to put China's new constitution into effect.

This is the first time anyone has dared to suggest that we should take sides in China against the Chinese Reds. The plain fact is that we have not been neutral and cannot be. We helped the Chinese Nationalist Government during the war and since. It has represented whatever nation there is in China. It gallantly resisted Japan through years of one-sided war, without any support from the Chinese Communists. In the final phase of the war, when Japan was already hopelessly beaten by our own forces, we made the capital mistake of inviting Russia to come in for the final kill.

If that action was not the only cause of the present Chinese civil war, it did have the effect of confusing the issue in China and blinding many Americans to the underlying realities of the situation. Having urged Russia to become a leading party to an oriental settlement, we felt obliged to consider the Chinese Communists on a footing of equality with the Nationalist Government. The folly of our action is shown by the fact that in 1945 Russia had recognized the Nationalist Government as speaking for China and had reached a complete agreement with it. But once Russian armies were in Manchuria, at our invitation, Moscow naturally began to back the Chinese Reds and to press a propaganda campaign for the United States to withdraw from China entirely.

The mission of General Marshall failed because it was dedicated to the impossible goal of reconciling the two Chinese parties, on the false assumption that the Chinese Communists would support a genuine democratic regime. Meanwhile, the Nationalist Government had done two things which should have led General Marshall to revise his policy. It had staked its future on smashing the Communist power and on giving China a truly democratic constitution, somewhat on the American model.

Senator VANDENBERG wants the United States to throw its influence on the side of this new Chinese Constitution. It alone offers hope that China may become a democratic nation, able to accomplish her own regeneration and recovery. The goal of the Chinese Communists, as General Marshall has made clear, is nothing less than a completely communized China, which can only mean prolonged civil war.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek may be less "liberal" than our State Department would like, but he is right in believing that the power of the Chinese Reds must be smashed before China can develop as a great nation.

That is the reality, and unless our State Department recognizes it and shapes our policy accordingly, there will be no peace in China and no recovery in our time.

Senator VANDENBERG'S proposal will, of course, be furiously denounced by our Reds and fellow travelers. Henry Wallace and his kind will argue that it would array us against Russia in the Orient, ruin Big Three harmony, and lead us down the road to war. But it need do nothing of the kind if we pursue it with the same firmness and patience which we have used in opposing Russian aggression in Europe. Russia is not going to fight us if we back the new Chinese Constitution and the Generalissimo. Russia will only scream—while we continue to hold the trump cards.

Senator VANDENBERG'S suggested policy is the only one which makes any sense in China. If we do not apply it, we risk the complete collapse of that country and its ultimate domination by Chinese Communists under Moscow.

Reciprocal Trade Agreement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement I made this morning before the Committee of Reciprocity Information pertinent to proposed further tariff rate cuts under the reciprocal trade agreements program:

Members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, gentlemen, you will no doubt agree that any inquiry into the merits of the reciprocal trade agreements program may well be prefaced with a brief inquiry as to its purpose.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is a very clever piece of legislation enacted as section 350 of the United States Tariff Act of 1930, thereby obviating the rewriting of the Tariff Act, a tremendous undertaking in itself, by delegating to the executive department of the Government the power to adjust tariff rates either upward or downward in the discretion of the Chief Executive, under advisement of the State Department.

Note that rates may thereby be revised upward for the protection of any branch of our American industry which may warrant it. Evidently this is contrary to the leanings of the State Department inasmuch as never once in the past 12 years since the inception of the Trade Agreements Act has even one single rate been increased.

The Trade Agreements Act was introduced as a temporary piece of legislation to relieve unemployment in this country and to alleviate economic distress in other countries by affording them greater dollar exchanges through a concession to them of a larger share of our domestic market, which might logically be expected to result from lowered tariff rates. That it did not alleviate unemployment in this country between 1934 and 1941 and that it did not serve to prevent wars is quite obvious from the record.

It is, furthermore, apparent that the tariff rate cuts conceded to other nations just prior to the war have not at this time had an opportunity to demonstrate just how effective they can be in favor of the foreign producer and how detrimental to the domesic manufacturer.

We do know that they stimulated imports; and only the preparation for the recent conflict interrupted the upward trend in volume of imports, which started as succeeding agreements were written just prior to the war. We have every reason to believe that those same reduced rates within the next few years will clearly demonstrate that they are only adequate to afford foreign producers a liberal share of our domestic market.

I cannot therefore understand just how anyone can propose cutting these rates further at this time without first establishing a waiting period until we shall have a clearer picture of just what imports we may expect in the postwar period.

Today American producers are deeply concerned with the State Department's policy of going ahead now with further tariff cuts, as is quite evident from the printed records of the congressional committee hearings of 1945 on this subject. More industries than ever before filed briefs and made appearances at the hearings conducted by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in that year. Today more industries than ever before have gone into exhaustive detail in preparing their statements submitted to your committee in opposition to further tariff cuts.

We read statements in the daily press that this program of tariff reduction is being pursued for the best interests of our people and in conformity with a mandate from our people, as expressed by their congressional representatives when the act was renewed in June 1945. This however is not truly the case. Both congressional committees, after hearing the evidence presented, recommended passage of the Act, but with severe limitations. It was passed in Congress after unprecedented delay and by only a slight majority, and then perhaps at the urging of our new President, who asked that it be passed as "the first business of importance" of his Administration.

A survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in 1945 disclosed the thinking of the American people. In answer to the question, "Would you be in favor of or would you be against letting goods come into this country which would sell for less than our goods?" 78.7 percent of the 94 percent who expressed an opinion answered that they would "be against letting goods come into this country which would sell for less than our goods." Only 21.3 percent favored the free flow of lower-priced, competitive foreign goods.

Naturally we are all in favor of the free flow of non-competitive foreign goods such as tea, coffee, cocoa, or any other products which do not directly displace the products of our own farms.

The NORC commented: "A majority of every population group studied favored keeping out competitive foreign goods. It is significant that both Republicans and Democrats questioned were in close agreement on this issue."

This harmonizes with recent press reports on the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture of the 13 Southern States (proverbially overwhelmingly Democratic in national elections), which filed briefs insisting that southern agriculture shall not be exposed to imports which could wreck the domestic market, but favoring imports of a noncompetitive nature from other parts of the world which, in turn, would make it possible for us to export an equal volume of our surplus products.

After reading news reports and digests of many of the briefs filed by opponents of the Trade Agreements Program, as now administered, I am personally convinced and can only draw the conclusion that the program's opponents do not fear fair or reasonable competition with foreign goods. They do, however, see the need for a differential—in terms of a tariff or excise tax on imports or quantitive control—to measure the difference between domestic and foreign living standards due to lower foreign wage rates, or longer hours, or other comparable factors, where machines and man-labor are otherwise equal in productive efficiency.

When speaking of productive efficiency it has been seriously contended by proponents of the program that perhaps our American handicraft industries are inefficient because they must depend upon a protective tariff for their existence; and that, consequently, as "weak sisters" in our economic set-up, they do not deserve such assistance, but should be made to sink or swim on their own merits.

On the surface this may sound like a forthright argument in favor of clean and decent

competition between the domestic producer and the foreign manufacturer. Actually it is a slur on American handicraft industries. It is furthermore based on a fallacy. If there were such a thing as international laissez faire, this might hold true, but we have seen the devious means resorted to by our foreign competitors who wish to move their goods on the American market at any cost in order to establish dollar credits.

It is toward the elimination of such practices that the trade-agreements program is aimed, but certainly to effect our purpose we need not resort to the lowering of rates, for such a procedure is wholly unwarranted.

If an American glove manufacturer, for example, must buy his raw material at a higher cost to him than his foreign competitor and must then convert his raw skins into finished gloves at labor rates which rank with the highest of any industry in this country, he certainly cannot compete pricewise with his foreign competitor who purchases raw skins at a lower cost and converts them into finished gloves through operation of a cottage industry with little or no overhead, and where there is no semblance of a true factory other than a distributing point for raw materials and a collection point for finished gloves; whose labor rates at the very highest are but one-third of ours; and who is not in the least concerned with factory overhead, paid vacations, social security, unemployment insurance, employee health and hospitalization insurance; and whose people are free to work any number of hours their physical endurance will permit. If that may be called fair competition, then I don't know what reasoning to expect from the proponents of a general downward tariff revision.

Taking the glove industry again as an example, we find that it is a healthy industry in the American economic set-up, having amicable labor relations, clean factories, practically no homework, a voluntary health insurance plan for employees, paid vacations, and one of the highest hourly wage rates of any industry in this country. It is situated in small communities, in line with our national policy of decentralization of industry, highly competitive within itself, being composed of a number of small companies with no monopolies; thereby assuring the American consumer a fair competitive price for its product.

And yet that same glove industry, the knit glove and fabric industry, is one of the handicraft groups that necessarily depend upon tariff protection and that have been vilified by proponents of the trade-agreements program as inefficient industries, not directly, but by inference. These enthusiasts who speak so forcefully of increased foreign trade have never had the courage to specify even one industry which they might consider inefficient.

It is with this type of smear technique that we are forced to contend; and I would therefore like to point out today that as far as the handicraft industries with which I have been associated intimately all my life are concerned, I can assure you that the competition that our American manufacturers in the leather and knit-wool glove industries have met with, both among themselves and with importers, is such that over a long period of years it has been proven they must be efficient or they never would have survived.

Handicraft work necessarily implies a high labor content in the direct cost of production; and it is this item of cost which cannot be further reduced, and which has been the target of the program's proponents. Wherever possible in the industrial history of the United States this item has been shrunken by American manufacturers through technological improvements in the form of new machinery, improved machinery, and mass production; but how can an American manufacturer be indicted for inefficiency on his failure to reduce this item of cost any more than his foreign competitor may be credited with efficency because his item of labor cost is lower as a result of a lower foreign standard of living, longer hours of work, and an almost complete lack of costly social benefits?

Since this item of cost cannot be reduced and since it is one which reflects payment of wages to workers, we must, as we have done historically, establish or maintain some equalizing device which will offset the difference between our higher American labor costs and the lower cost of foreign labor in identical competing products. This country has only used one method in doing this and that has been the protective tariff. We have no other method by and large to keep our American manufacturers on an equal basis in marketing their products in their own country in competition with imports.

It is now proposed that we shrink this measure of equalization today in a period when our labor rates are several times higher than they were back in 1930, when our present Tariff Act was passed.

We have been assured that in the coming negotiations every possible precaution will be taken to avert injury to American industry. I am certain that it can be proved beyond a reasonable doubt that further tariff cuts, especially in this era of international chaos, will do irreparable harm to our domestic glove-manufacturing industry, which proved itself so vital a part of our national defense program during the recent war.

The fine leather dress glove industry and the knit wool glove industry and fabric industry are located in small communities throughout more than 18 States, and when the day comes, as it surely will under the encouragement of further lowered tariff rates, that imports increase, you may be certain these small communities dependent upon this one industry will be wiped out.

An outstanding example is Fulton County, N. Y. It presents a picture on a large scale of what we find in a lesser degree through the country, in smaller communities. Just prior to the war instead of being the center of fine dress-glove manufacture for the United States, it might probably more aptly have been called "the center of glove labor employment in the United States," directly through the vicious competition, pricewise, of other countries, such as Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, and Italy.

In 1938 glove labor took a 10 percent cut in wages as a solution to one problem: How to manufacture a dozen gloves at $15.75, when the competing price was that of the Czechoslovakian glove which sold for $14.50. It was simply a question of our labor absorbing a loss in order to allow the manufacturer to compete with that country in our own home market.

That same country, under a nationalized economy, with controlled costs of production which will be entirely unascertainable by our Government, is now back making gloves, with a volume that increases every month.

Added to all the historical foreign countries of origin are Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico in the fine dress-glove field, and Canada, Mexico, and Cuba in the work-glove division.

If past tariff rates, established to enable this industry to compete with foreign sources, are to be again lowered, in the face of industry's crucial tariff history, then certainly some other device must be drafted to enable it to survive pricewise in competition with foreign sources in the days ahead.

I have read the very thorough briefs presented jointly by labor and management in the knitted- and leather-glove industries, which have been filed with you; and it would only be redundancy on my part to go into further detail on the grave problems which the members of these industries realize must be faced if they are to remain in the field of American business life.

I do wish to emphasize, however, that these industries have certainly merited the most sincere consideration on the part of our Government when it meets with the 18 other leading trading nations of the world to negotiate the new reciprocal trade agreements, which we all so earnestly hope will fulfill the purpose of the program and stimulate a better social and economic relationship among the peoples of this earth.

Second Bridge Across San Francisco Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a joint Army-Navy board is in the process of making studies for the location of a second bridge across San Francisco Bay.

I have urged that this crossing be located southerly of the present bridge, and preferably from the vicinity of Hunters Point to the vicinity of Bay Farm Island in the city of Alameda, Alameda County, Calif.

One of the most rapidly developing sections of California is the southern Alameda County section. It has all of the natural facilities that go to make a great industrial district, and its climate makes it one of the most desirable residential districts in California.

A bridge at this location would not only break the bottleneck of traffic that now exists and would be materially aggravated if a new structure is built within a few hundred feet of the existing structure, one of the suggested locations being examined by the joint Army-Navy board.

The city of Alameda, through its city council, has unanimously adopted a resolution asking the Army-Navy board to take into consideration and to give weight to certain pertinent factors pertaining to the location of this bridge, and that this resolution may become of such record, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

"Resolution 3448

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America in the matter of the construction of a second traffic crossing between San Francisco and the area commonly known as the East Bay

"Whereas the joint Army and Navy board is now making studies for the location of a proposed new bridge across San Francisco Bay, pursuant to House Resolution No. 529, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session; and

"Whereas the Toll Bridge Authority of the State of California is making a similar study under authorization of its resolution; and

"Whereas these reports will be submitted to the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Council of the City of Alameda*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is, hereby memorialized on this subject and respectfully requested in its study of the aforementioned reports, to give due weight to the following considerations, to wit:

"1. That the volume of traffic over the present bay bridge is such as to make plainly evident the immediate need for a new structure.

"2. That the location of the present bay bridge does not adequately serve the larger portion of the population of Alameda County. Out of a total county population of 743,000, the areas east of Lake Merritt and to the southern county line, including East Oakland and the cities of Alameda, San Leandro, and Hayward, have a population of 391,271. To the traffic emanating from this area must be added that which originates in the cities and towns along highway 50 and that part of highway 99 from Stockton to Bakersfield.

"3. That the approaches to the presently existing structure are not adequate to properly care for the traffic of the bridge.

"4. That the location of the proposed bridge should be to the south of the present structure and so situated that it might adequately serve the areas hereinbefore described.

"5. That the construction of a new bridge in close proximity to the present bridge would add greatly to the existing confusion in, and difficulties of, handling traffic in these areas.

"6. That of all the bridge plans submitted for study, the Walsh plan, providing for a bridgehead at the foot of Army Street in San Francisco and a double bridgehead in Alameda—one to serve West Oakland and points north, and one to serve Southern Alameda County—would most adequately serve this area.

"7. That the cost of construction of the bridge proposed under the Walsh plan, or some other similar plan, would be much more economical than any other proposed location because of the fact that the lands are now available and open for the proposed construction work.

"8. That a recent study of the diversion of traffic from the present bridge discloses that approximately 25 percent of the present bridge traffic would be diverted to the proposed bridge if built between Army Street and Bay Farm Island, and that the volume of 'peak' traffic diverted would represent approximately 50 percent of such traffic.

"9. That the greatest industrial and residential expansion and development in Alameda County has been, and will continue to be, in the area that would be most adequately served by a bridge from the foot of Army Street in San Francisco to Bay Farm Island in Alameda.

"10. That a crossing on the location herein proposed would bring the San Francisco municipal airport and the Oakland airport many miles nearer each other than another crossing in the vicinity of the present bridge which would be of first importance in case of war.

"11. That the rich San Joaquin Valley with all its products which are shipped to the San Francisco market would have a direct freeway into the city with a minimum of traffic stops and with the practical elimination of traffic congestion areas.

"12. That a second crossing at the location herein suggested would give a wide distribution of traffic and tend to eliminate congestion rather than to concentrate traffic with increased confusion as would be the case with a second crossing in close proximity to the present bridge.

"*And be it further resolved*, That in consideration of these factors, the Congress of the United States, and all other bodies vested with authority to deal with this subject, be, and they are, hereby respectfully urged and requested to find and determine that the proposed bridge should have its westerly terminus at Army Street in San Francisco and its easterly terminus on Bay Farm Island in Alameda and to authorize and direct its construction accordingly."

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly and regularly introduced and adopted by the council of the city of Alameda in regular meeting assembled on the 7th day of January, 1947, by the following vote, to wit:

Ayes: Councilmen Howe, Jones, Osborn, Sweeney, and President Branscheid, (5).

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of said city this 8th day of January 1947.

J. P. CLARK,
City Clerk of the City of Alameda.

Another Truman Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I include as a part of my remarks a very interesting article written by Gould Lincoln which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., on January 18, 1947. The article follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL
(By Gould Lincoln)

Chalk up another success for President Truman—an amicable settlement of the controversy between the Army and Navy, the War and Navy Departments, over the proposal to merge the Departments, creating a single Department of National Defense.

The final settlement, it is true, retains so-called Secretaries of War, Navy, and Air Forces, to head each a department. But over them is the Secretary of National Defense, with Cabinet rank, to coordinate them all. The Secretaries of War, Navy, and Air Forces will not have Cabinet rank—but they are to retain the right to talk direct to the President. Time alone will disclose whether this right to go over the head of the Secretary of National Defense to the President is a good thing. It, however, was probably the price of agreement.

The country is being treated to a phenomenon—a recrudescence of popularity of a President who was on the down grade during the first 2 years he was in office—or nearly 2 years. If it continues, the Republicans will have to watch their step in Congress and out or they may miss the big prize—the Presidency in 1949—to which they have so confidently looked forward since the elections of 1946.

For if 1946 was a bad year for Mr. Truman, 1947 is taking on another hue. On the international side, relations with Soviet Russia appear to be on the up-and-up largely due to the firm policy advanced by Secretary of State Byrnes, with the backing of President Truman, and, equally important from the point of view of national unity, with the backing of Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, now chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and of Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, former chairman. Further, the appointment of Gen. George C. Marshall, who as Chief of Staff played a major part in winning the Second World War, to succeed Mr. Byrnes as Secretary of State has met with wide approval.

On the domestic side, where the President sustained his severest loss in prestige and popular favor last year, there has been a distinct improvement. It has stemmed first from the President's fiat refusal to bow the knee to John L. Lewis and his striking coal miners and, second, from his belated, though necessary, removal of many of the wartime controls over production and prices. Further, there has been a lull, at least in the battle between organized labor and management on many fronts, a battle which lost the country untold billions since the close of the war and retarded reconversion to peacetime economy. In addition, the President has taken the bull by the borns and recommended some amendment of the Federal labor laws—not enough by any means—but some, which marks a distinct withdrawal from the adamant position of the Roosevelt New Deal administration.

His labor legislation recommendations have been hailed in some organized labor circles as fair and moderate. There are indications labor will rally back of his program—as the best line of defense against the more drastic proposals advanced by the Republicans in Congress. If labor follows such a course, and at the same time uses enough common sense to abandon demands for large increases in wages at a time when prices of commodities have started to fall, Mr. Truman may emerge as the real friend of labor—which certainly will not hurt him in a contest to succeed himself in the 1948 national election.

The best way to play politics, sometimes, is not to play them at all. The moves Mr. Truman has been making, on the surface, have not been good politics in that they did not appear to be calculated to appease the radicals who stuck to the late President Roosevelt like a leech. When Mr. Truman kicked Henry A. Wallace out of the Cabinet, the radicals let out a wail and threatened reprisals. The removal of Mr. Wallace, however, made a hit with a lot of people—and this country, at bottom, is not radical.

Mr. Wallace was the last of the Roosevelt Cabinet remaining on the pay roll, except Secretary of the Navy Forrestal. The fumbling which took place at the White House over Mr. Wallace's New York speech, attacking the foreign policy which Secretary of State Byrnes was pursuing, injured Mr. Truman's prestige. The result—the elimination of Mr. Wallace—did not hurt at all. Face to face with a Republican-controlled Congress, Mr. Truman is at last himself, apparently, without seeking to play the Roosevelt role or listening to those who insisted they spoke the thoughts and policies of the late President.

Few people in this country, if any, hate Mr. Truman. Many have been sorry for him because of the heavy burdens he has had to bear in the immediate postwar period. A good many have admired the courage with which he faced the railroad strike and the coal strike—either of which might have brought disaster to the entire country. His expressed willingness to cooperate with Congress, if it works out, will do him no harm. If the Republicans, for their part, try to play too much politics—merely to hamstring Mr. Truman—so much the worse for them in 1948.

Third District of California, a Mighty Agricultural District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Third District of California comprises five counties, namely, San Joaquin, Sacramento, Yolo, Solano, and Napa. Each of them has some excellent

agricultural areas. This district is in the center of the great interior valley of California and straddles the delta of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin Rivers. Among the crops raised in this area are almonds, walnuts, grapes of all kinds including table grapes and wine grapes, celery, asparagus, sugar beets, potatoes, tomatoes, beans, lima beans, corn, alfalfa, beets, peas, onions, carrots, spinach, peaches, apricots, prunes, pears, plums, cherries, strawberries, and other crops. Most of the farming is done by means of irrigation. In other words, it is intensive farming where water is applied to the land during the hot summer season when California has no rainfall.

The value of the crops for 1946, by counties, is as follows:

San Joaquin County	$129,000,000
Sacramento County	35,000,000
Solano County	22,000,000
Napa County	16,202,000
Yolo County	45,264,711
Total	247,486,711

San Joaquin County leads all of the counties in the Third District in the annual value of its agricultural crops, and for 10 years has been in the first 10 counties of the United States as one of the highest annual producers, when measured in dollars, of agricultural products.

I take pride in and it is a pleasure to represent a district that is as fertile and productive as this is. Many of these crops are processed, and the district is filled with canneries, sugar-beet refineries, and other plants having for their purpose the preparation of these foods, in various forms, for the people of the United States.

Our people are not only great producers, but they are very generous. Scarcely a week goes by but what someone sends something to our office produced on the farms, canneries, and wineries of the Third Congressional District. These shipments we shared with my colleagues and others.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley, Chairman of the Board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley at the testimonial dinner honoring Prime Minister Constantin Tsaldaris, of Greece, sponsored by the Justice for Greece Committee at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on Monday evening, December 16, 1946:

I account it a pleasure and a privilege to be invited to speak to you tonight. This is a time in the affairs of the world when honest men everywhere want to stand up and be counted. I esteem it an honor to be accounted among those who have espoused the cause of Greece.

To you, Mr. Prime Minister, I should like to make a word of explanation.

During the last war a phrase developed in our own American speech that I have always liked. When someone undertook to speak on behalf of the American soldier, the plain simple man in the ranks, the man who did not sit behind a desk, the man who was a thousand miles from the "big brass," the man who did the job of working and fighting and sometimes dying for our common cause, when I say someone took the rostrum or the field on his behalf, he very often remarked: "I am speaking for a million good guys named Joe." Mr Toastmaster and Mr. Prime Minister, that is my place and my function tonight. I am not representing any particular political party, any specialized subdivision of this Commonwealth any race, any creed, any sect. I want to speak to you, rather, on behalf of several million very good persons named Joe and John and Jack and Bill and Mary and Louise and Elizabeth

These persons for whom I speak are the good, common folk of these United States. They are friends of mine. I know a lot of them. They are the common folk who work hard for a living They read the newspapers and they listen to the radio, but they are also very busy in the important occupation of making both ends meet. They gather in their small clubs and discussion groups and a great many of them don't even follow that formality. But they have ideas and ideals. They form opinions and judgments. They supply the lifeblood of this political society.

I think I may say with some candor that I know something of how these millions of good persons think and feel. I have never been very far away from them all of my life. In fact, sir, I may say that I am proud to be one of them.

Surely it is no secret and surely it treads upon no official toes to declare that those common folk are not entirely satisfied with what has happened and has been happening in the case of Greece. The newspaper comment you have seen reflects a genuine American attitude and that attitude has been made manifest in many other forms as well.

The American is traditionally devoted to fair play. He is proud of the fact that he does not take a mean advantage. He is sensitive about his straightforwardness, his basic honesty, and his courage.

He is not at all sure now that those attributes have been reflected in the course of action that has been taken in respect to Greece.

Perhaps this simple and straightforward American, this one of several million good guys named Joe or Mary, is not completely informed on all the finer points of negotiation respecting Greece. He probably hasn't had time to read the text on various debates and discussions at Flushing Meadows or Lake Success or here in the Waldorf Towers. But he has some very solid convictions about right and wrong and one of those convictions is that he doesn't go back on his friends.

The American knows that Greece, as a nation, is a friend of the United States, as a nation. He knows that the individual Greek, and he's met a lot of them, is a friend of the individual American.

He has not forgotten moreover what happened in the early days of the war. He has not forgotten that the Axis military machine was repeatedly pictured to him, by a design, of course, as completely invincible. The Facist legions and the German hordes would, of course, he was told, sweep everything before them. The news that he received was a bleak record of disaster upon defeat.

It was at that time that the men in the mountains of Greece punctured the Axis superstition of invincibility. The Greeks stood their ground. They were outnumbered, they were outgunned, but they were never outfought. The American cannot and will not forget that the Greeks stood fast and showed that free men could remain free, that brave men could fight against the odds and could still win.

If he thought at all about what would happen to Greece after the war, he took it for granted that she would enjoy the same treatment, the same privileges, the same opportunities, the same concern, as that which would be accorded to any victorious ally. This is only natural. Such an attitude would be the logical reflection of the sense of just obligation of the sense of fair play.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the American is chagrined by some of the things that have taken place. He suddenly discovers that Greece, instead of being the tried and trusted friend, has become a "problem". He finds that the Greek cause, instead of being the most logical and natural thing in the world, has become the subject for confusing debate and for uneasy compromise.

It is, therefore, small wonder that he has expressed his dissatisfaction. It is not in the American way to forsake a friend in need. It is not in our tradition to retreat in the face of threats, to lie down before obstacles.

There is perhaps, however, some basis for the confusion that has existed in many minds. What would have appeared from the beginning as a very simple case of doing justice to and for an honorable ally has been complicated by the intrusion of many other issues that are not at all germane to the major facts in the case. There have been political differences in Greece, for example. That is hardly astonishing since there have also been some profound political differences in France, in Belgium, in Britain, and even I suspect in these United States. There has been a difficult problem of rehabilitation and recovery in Greece. That also certainly is not surprising since the degree of devastation wrought in Greece by the Axis invasion has been tremendous. There has been quite naturally some degree of unrest, of insecurity. Nothing could have been more logical.

But what has happened is this. By accident or by design, and I think the latter would be correct, this division of opinion has been developed into a political issue that clouds the basic facts in the case.

Subtly the whole good cause of Greece has been made an ideological battleground for two great conflicting theories of government. The Greeks chose to remain where they had been from the beginning; in our camp and on our side.

As a result they have been subjected to pressure from within, to forays from without, and to a campaign of almost unparalleled vilification. The precise mold and form that the Greek political state takes at the present time is after all primarily the concern of Greeks. We are committed to the right of people to live under governments of their own choosing. The Greeks have made their choice. The fact that another body of organized political thought finds that choice disadvantageous to its own aims does not modify in any degree the right of the Greeks to do as they have done or the justice of the claims that Greece may make upon her friends and allies.

I submit, sir, that a certain amount of political dust has been thrown in the eyes of right-thinking and well-meaning persons in a desperate attempt to blind them to the issues.

On the other hand, the very fact that such a situation has come about should make it plainer than ever that if there is to be a division along the lines of ideologies and institutions, Greece should be allowed to choose freely into which category she will fall.

Manifestly Greece cannot take this course of action unaided. For these are perilous times for defenseless small states on the borders of some great powers. Greece needs friends as she has never before in recent times needed them. Friendship can be extended to Greece in a number of ways. First of all, it is the obligation of Greece's allies to give the fullest possible attention to Greece's justifiable claims for her own security. In a number of instances since the end of the war we have advanced, as the basis for decisions that have been made and steps that have been taken, our own inalienable right to see to it that we are not again placed in jeopardy. We have claimed that repeatedly as a natural function of a sovereign state. If that be true, how then, can we deny to a friend and ally the inalienable right to the same safety and security? The danger to Greece is real, and it affects us. The mode of meeting that danger is much more apparent than any plans that we ourselves are making for our own future security. Greece has asked for modification of frontier areas to her own military advantage. In the light of the fact that those frontier areas have been in the past made the path of invasion and are being now made the ground from which constant pressure is being put upon the Greek state, this claim seems just.

The Greeks are not asking for some type of specialized advantage at this point or at that. They are not demanding some curious sum in reparation based on a bill of hypothetical losses. They are only asking for elementary security. They are asking for a physical adjustment that will give to them the sense of safety and thus the peace of mind that makes recovery possible. Naturally we have a stake in that recovery.

There will be no free world, sir, if Greece is in chains. There will be no democratic world if Greece is high-pressured into a political organization that the Greeks themselves have long since discarded.

In this international trial of opposing political ideas, Greece needs friends in court. A few million good people, for whom I speak, want to be those friends. They recognize that the enduring stability of our own institutions is part and parcel of our relationship to the whole world. What happens to Greece is part of that relationship. It is, therefore, part of our own instant and vital concern.

Americans will not be content to see this stronghold of freedom forsaken. They will not be content with an inglorious retreat, with weasel words to define some new and treacherous appeasement.

We hope, Mr. Prime Minister, that your visit here will be the occasion of once more bringing before all the people the just claims of the nation you represent. We hope, sir, that you will find now and in the future, as others have found in the past, that Americans are neither recreant to their responsibilities nor unmindful of their obligations. We hope that you will be able to return to your own people and tell them that in the people of these United States you found stanch advocates and true friends of justice for Greece.

Present-Day Four "R's" in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, for many years we have conveniently—if not grammatically—listed the three "r's" of public education as "readin', 'ritin', and 'rithmetic." But I notice that editors and publicists are adding a fourth "r" to the list, meaning "raise in teachers' salaries." Volumes have been written and spoken on the educational need of today, and most of it calls for Federal aid for our public schools. The demand is growing in these days because the need is becoming more apparent and the educational crisis greater.

I have favored widening the financial support of the American public-school system. I have long seen the need of equalizing educational opportunities for all the children of our Nation. I recognize the inequality of wealth in various sections of our great country, resulting in educational "low grounds" in certain areas. These educational "low grounds" can be leveled up only through Federal aid, properly applied. Even in areas where the wealth is moderate, or adequate to sustain a good school system under normal conditions, the present-day shifting in population and the building and faculty problems which have grown out of the war years make Federal aid for education, in some form or other, most essential if we are to continue our great system of free—and efficient—public schools.

The control and direction of education is a local matter. I would not favor control from Washington. I believe it is possible, however, for financial support to be given out of the Federal Treasury where it is so imperatively needed without dictatorial control—or any other control other than a minimum of financial accounting—from the Nation's Capital. Somewhat the same views, and the reasons therefor, appear in the following letter from Supt. Harvey L. Taylor, of the Mesa Public Schools, in Mesa, Ariz.:

MESA PUBLIC-SCHOOLS,
Mesa, Ariz., December 20, 1946.
Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURDOCK: Because I know of your keen interest in education and because you are well acquainted with the situation in Arizona and particularly in Mesa, I am taking this opportunity to tell you about the school situation in Mesa.

We now have 5,000 school children enrolled. A recent survey shows that we have in school this year, students from 185 different cities in the United States, which represents 35 different States. Most of the people coming into Mesa bring no wealth. Therefore, we have a large number of children to educate for the amount of taxable property back of each child.

As you know the State of Arizona gives us $95 for each high-school child and $65 for each elementary child in average daily attendance. The balance of the budget has to be raised by district levy. This works out so that 47 percent of the money comes from the State and 53 percent from the district. To raise our district levy this year, our tax rate is $5.06. Next year, if we put our teachers' salaries where they must be, our rate will be at least $1.40 higher which will give us a total school levy of $6.46.

Every building we have is crowded to capacity. We are using halls, basement rooms, auditoriums, cafeterias, etc. to take care of the overflow and in some instances it has been necessary to have children meet only half day in order to stagger classroom use and take care of our increasing enrollment.

We now are planning a building program, which to meet our immediate needs will require a million dollars. This will increase the tax rate another $2 which will give us a school tax rate of $8.46. This will practically bankrupt the farmers in this community because, as you know, most of this money has to be paid by the farming population, since we have little or no industry.

The only relief that we have at the present time is for additional State help. Right now we are proposing that the average daily attendance allotment be raised from $95 for high school to $115 and from $65 to $95 for elementary students. If this law passes it will relieve the situation some. It would seem, due to the shifting of population in the last few years, that we should have some Federal aid for buildings, perhaps similar to that given us during the depression under the PWA (not WPA). It would also seem that there must be some kind of a plan whereby the wealth of the United States, regardless of where it is, can be used for the education of the children in the United States regardless of where they are, which, of course, would imply Federal support of education on somewhat the same plan that we now have Federal support of roads.

We have always been very proud of our schools in Arizona but we have a new condition with this influx of population which creates a real problem for us, especially in Mesa.

We deeply appreciate what you are doing to help get some of the buildings from the Japanese Relocation Center at Rivers, Ariz. This camp is only 25 miles from Mesa and it would be inexpensive to move the buildings in to help relieve our situation next year. The present high cost of building and the shortage of materials will keep us from building for at least 2 or 3 years. We must have these buildings in order to keep school until we can provide permanent structures.

We know there are many problems facing our national leaders but we can think of nothing that is more important than the adequate education of American youth because in such education must lie the safety of our glorious American way.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

HARVEY L. TAYLOR.

Army-Navy Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following exchange of correspondence between President Truman, Secretaries Forrestal and Patterson re Army-Navy unification:

EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PRESIDENT TRUMAN, SECRETARIES FORRESTAL AND PATTERSON RE ARMY-NAVY UNIFICATION

Following is the text of the joint letter on Army and Navy unification sent to the President by Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal:

MAY 31, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to your instructions, we have reviewed the major elements involved in establishing a greater measure of unification among our national

security organizations, with a view to defining those matters upon which we agree and those upon which we differ. While we regret our inability to bridge completely the gap between us, we are pleased to be able to report a considerable area of agreement. Sincere efforts to expand it were made by both of us.

For your convenience, we outline below those matters upon which agreement exists and those upon which we are unable to agree. The order of presentation is not intended to indicate the relative importance of the various items.

I. Agreement exists on the following matters:

1. Council of Common Defense: To integrate our foreign and military policies and to enable the military services and other agencies of government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving our national security. The membership of this council should consist of the Secretary of State, the civilian head of the Military Establishment (if there be a single military department), the civilian heads of the military services, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, referred to below.

2. National Security Resources Board: To establish, and keep up to date, policies and programs for the maximum use of the Nation's resources in support of our national security. It should operate under the Council and be composed of representatives of the military services and of other appropriate agencies.

3. The Joint Chiefs of Staff: To formulate strategic plans, to assign logistic responsibilities to the services in support thereof, to integrate the military programs to make recommendations for integration of the military budget, and to provide for the strategic direction of the United States military forces.

4. No single military Chief of Staff: In the opinion of the War Department, the Military Establishment should contain a single military Chief of Staff, who would serve as principal military adviser, available to offer advice when differences of opinion arise among the military heads of the several services. The Navy feels that the Joint Chief of Staff should be the highest source of military advice. The War Department is willing to omit the feature of a single Chief of Staff.

5 Central Intelligence Agency: To compile, analyze, and evaluate information gathered by various Government agencies, including the military, and to furnish such information to the National Security Council and to other Government agencies entitled thereto. It should operate under the Council. An organization along these lines, established by Executive order, already exists.

6. Procurement and supply: There should be an agency to prevent wasteful competition in the field of military supply and procurement through joint planning and coordination of procurement, production, and distribution. If there should be a single military department, this agency should be within the department.

7. Research agencies: There should be an agency to coordinate the scientific research and development of the military services. If there should be a single military department, this agency should be within the department. The existence of such an agency would not remove the need for an over-all Central Research Agency.

8. Military education and training: There should be an agency to review periodically the several systems of education and training of personnel of the military services and to adjust them into an integrated program. If there should be a single military department, this agency should be within the department.

As to the agencies mentioned in 6, 7, and 8 above, the War Department believes that these agencies will not be fully effective except as agencies within a single department. The Navy, on the other hand, believes that they will be more fully effective under a coordinated organization than under a single military department.

II. We are unable to agree on the following matters:

1. Single military department:

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW

The Military Establishment should be set up as a single entity, headed by a civilian of Cabinet rank with authority and responsibility for the several services. The administration and supervision of the services should, however, so far as possible, be delegated to their respective heads, in order that each service may have as much freedom of development as possible and in order that the traditions and prestige of each be not impaired.

(Only if there is this unity of structure, headed by an individual with power of decision, can we achieve action where there is now inaction, concerted policy where there is now disjointed policy, and economy of manpower, resources, and money where there is now waste of them all. Any organization which does not facilitate prompt decision and prompt action thereon, totally ignores scientific development and the nature of modern war. The military security of the United States is a single objective. Accomplishment of this single objective with the greatest economy and efficiency demands unity of direction.)

NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW

The Navy favors unification but in a less drastic and extreme form. It believes that serious disadvantages will result from combining the military services into one department. It would involve sacrifices of sound administrative autonomy and essential service morale.

The Navy recognizes the need for a greater measure of integration than now exists, not only between the military departments but among all agencies of government responsible for our national security. A single military department falls short of meeting these objectives.

While the Navy feels that the measures upon which agreement exists, as set forth above, would fully meet the needs of present conditions, it sees certain advantages in placing a Presidential Deputy with clearly defined powers of decision over specified matters at the head of the Council of Common Defense. From this as a starting point, it should be possible to move forward such further measures of unification as become advisable, based on further experience.

The Secretary of the Navy recommends to the President, in view of the wide area of agreement which presently exists, that legislation be enacted at once giving statutory effect to those matters on which there is agreement. These steps will of themselves constitute a very substantial advance over our prewar, and even our present, organization for national security. If they are put into effect it will be possible, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, to meet the nine specific objectives set forth in the President's message to the Congress on December 19, 1945. Further consideration and study can then be given to the remaining questions on which there is wide and general divergence of view between, and outside of, the military departments.

2. Three coordinate branches:

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW

The Military Establishment should contain three coordinate branches—naval, ground, and air. Each should have a civilian head and a military commander. These officials should have access to the President, but not Cabinet rank, since this would be in derogation of the position of the civilian head of the Military Establishment. As was stated above, the three branches should be given as much autonomy as possible. (Our experience in the last war clearly indicates that parity for the Air Force and the operation of all three services as a team are essential to our national security. Everything that we know of the future points to an increase rather than a decrease in the decisive role of air power.)

NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW

The Navy feels that our national security requires maintenance of the integrity of the Navy Department, headed by a civilian Secretary of Cabinet rank. Naval aviation, together with surface and subsurface components, have been soundly integrated within the Navy. The Navy feels that similar integration by the Army of its air and ground forces would be in the best interest of our national security.

However, if the alternatives were three military departments or one, the Navy would prefer three departments.

3. Aviation:

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW

Responsibility for the development, procurement, maintenance and operations of the military air resources of the United States should be a function of the Air Forces with the following exceptions, in which cases these responsibilities should be vested in the United States Navy: (a) Ship, carrier, and water-based aircraft essential to naval operations including those of the United States Marine Corps. (b) Land-type aircraft necessary for essential internal administration and for air transport over routes of sole interest to naval forces, and where the requirements cannot

NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW

The Navy has no desire either to compete with, or to dictate to, the Army Air Forces. On the other hand, the Navy feels that its experience qualifies it to judge its own aviation needs.

One reason for the Navy's strong conviction against a single department is the continued efforts of the Army Air Forces to restrict and limit naval aviation. The Navy knows that these efforts, if successful, would seriously impair our sea power and jeopardize our national security.

To accomplish its fundamental purpose, the Navy needs a certain number of landplanes for naval

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW	NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW
be met by normal air transport facilities. (c) Land-type aircraft necessary for the training of personnel for (a) and (b) above. (The Nation cannot afford the luxury of several completely self-sufficient services. The war demonstrated that they must be complementary—mutually supporting. With respect to landplanes, there are no purely naval functions which justify uneconomical duplication of equipment and installations. For example, the Air Force already performs long-range reconnaissance for the ground forces and itself. The Navy's recognized requirement for the products of long-range reconnaissance can be effectively filled by the Air Force. As regards antisubmarine warfare, it is the view of the War Department that the experience of the Army Air Forces in the last war adequately justifies the belief that land-based planes operated by the Air Forces can meet this requirement).	reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping. Experience indicates that such landplanes to be effective, must be manned by naval personnel trained in naval warfare. Lack of such aircraft under complete naval control as to design, procurement, operations, personnel, training, and administration might be disastrous to our national security. Similarly the Navy must have air transport essential to its needs.

4. United States Marine Corps:

The Navy and the Army differ on the functions of the United States Marine Corps as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW	NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW
There shall be maintained as a constituent part of the naval service a balanced Fleet Marine Force, including its supporting air component for (1) service with the fleet in the seizure of enemy positions not involving sustained land fighting and (2) to continue the development of tactics, techniques, and equipment relating to those phases of amphibious warfare which pertain to waterborne aspects of landing operations.	There shall be maintained as a constituent part of the naval service a balanced Fleet Marine Force, including its supporting air component for (1) service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advance naval bases or for the conduct of such limited land operations as are essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign and (2) to continue the development of those aspects of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, techniques, and equipment employed by landing forces.

There is agreement upon the other primary duties of the Marine Corps, viz:

(1) To provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, and

(2) To provide security detachments for protection of naval property at naval stations and bases.

These matters have been explored by us with a sincere desire to comply with your wishes that the military services reach complete mutual agreement. Our failure to achieve complete unanimity is due to no reason other than that our respective views on the points of difference are as sincere as they are divergent.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.
JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

The text of the letter from the President to Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal follows:

JUNE 15, 1946.

GENTLEMEN: I have read with care your joint report of May 31, 1946. It was also helpful to me to have the full oral presentation of the points involved, which you and the members of your Departments made to me on June 4.

I am pleased and gratified at the progress you have made. I feel that we have come a long way in narrowing the zone of disagreement which had previously existed between the services. The full understanding reached on eight vital aspects of unification is a significant accomplishment. These eight elements are Council of Common Defense, National Security Resources Board, Joint Chiefs of Staff, omission of single military Chief of Staff, Central Intelligence Agency, Procurement and Supply, Research Agencies, and Military Education and Training.

In addition to these eight points of agreement, I am advised also by representatives of both services that they are in accord in their attitude toward the provision in the Thomas bill, S. 2044, which provides for four assistant secretaries in charge of Research, Intelligence, Procurement, and Training, respectively. They believe that such assistant secretaries are unnecessary. I agree with their position that the presence of these four assistant secretaries is undesirable because they would greatly complicate the internal administration of the services and that such a plan would deprive the secretaries of the respective services of functions which are properly theirs.

Your report of May 31 listed four items upon which you were unable to agree. An analysis of your comments contained in your report, and in the lengthy discussion which we had, discloses that the services are not nearly so far apart in their attitude toward these points as had been reported. It is my firm conviction that the determination of these questions in the manner which I present herein will result in a plan which incorporates the best features offered by the respective services.

With reference to the points upon which full agreement was not reached my position is as follows:

1. Single military department: There should be one Department of National Defense. It would be under the control of a civilian who would be a member of the Cabinet. Each of the services would be headed by a civilian with the title of Secretary. These Secretaries would be charged with the internal administration within their own services. They would not be members of the Cabinet. Each service would retain its autonomy, subject of course to the authority and over-all control by the Secretary of National Defense. It is recognized that the services have different functions and different organizations and for these reasons the integrity of each service should be retained. The civilian Secretaries of the services would be members of the Council of Common Defense and in this capacity they would have the further opportunity to represent their respective services to the fullest extent.

2. Three coordinated services: There should be three coordinate services—the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The three services should be on a parity and should operate in a common purpose toward over-all efficiency of the national defense under the control and supervision of the Secretary of National Defense. The Secretaries of the three services should be known as Secretary for the Army, Secretary for the Navy, and Secretary for the Air Force.

3. Aviation: The Air Force shall have the responsibility for the development, procurement, maintenance, and operation of the military air resources of the United States with the following exceptions, in which responsibility must be vested in the Navy:

(1) Ship, carrier, and water-based aircraft essential to naval operations, and aircraft of the United States Marine Corps.

(2) Land-type aircraft necessary for essential internal administration and for air transport over routes of sole interest to naval forces and where the requirements cannot be met by normal air-transport facilities.

(3) Land-type aircraft necessary for the training of personnel for the afore-mentioned purposes.

Land-based planes for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping can and should be manned by Air Force personnel. If the three services are to work as a team there must be close cooperation, with interchange of personnel and special training for specific duties.

Within its proper sphere of operation, naval aviation must not be restricted but must be given every opportunity to develop its maximum usefulness.

4. United States Marine Corps: There shall be maintained as a constituent part of the naval service a balanced Fleet Marine Force, including its supporting air component, to perform the following functions:

(1) Service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases or for the conduct of such limited land operations as are essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign.

(2) To continue the development of those aspects of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by the landing forces.

(3) To provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy.

(4) To provide security detachments for protection of naval property at naval stations and bases.

It is important that the basic elements of the plan of unification be stated clearly. The eight fundamental points agreed upon and the four points which are herewith decided constitute a total of 12 basic principles that should form the framework of the program for integration.

There is no desire or intention to affect adversely the integrity of any of the services. They should perform their separate functions under the unifying direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of National Defense The internal administration of the three services should be preserved in order that the high morale and esprit de corps of each service can be retained.

It was gratifying to have both of you and General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz assure me that you would all give your wholehearted support to a plan of unification, no matter what the decision would be on those points upon which you did not fully agree. I know that I can count upon all of you for full assistance in obtaining passage in the Congress of a bill containing the 12 basic elements set forth above.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The Honorable ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
The Secretary of War.
The Honorable JAMES FORRESTAL,
The Secretary of the Navy.

The President today sent identical letters as follows to Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of

Utah, chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs; Senator David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs; Representative Andrew J. May, of Kentucky, chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs; and Representative Carl Vinson, of Georgia, chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs:

JUNE 15, 1946.

MY DEAR ———: One of the most important problems confronting our country today is the establishment of a definite military policy.

In the solution of this problem, I consider it vital that we have a unified armed force for our national defense.

At my request the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have made a sincere effort to settle the differences existing between the services on this question. They have made splendid progress.

They have reached an agreement on eight important elements of unification, and with reference to the four upon which there was not full agreement, their differences are not irreconcilable.

On May 31, 1946, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy delivered a report to me of the results of their efforts. I have replied to them stating my position of those points submitted to me for decision.

I enclose herewith a copy of the report of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, together with a copy of my reply to them.

You will note that there are now presented 12 basic principles upon which the unification of the services can be based. They are as follows:

1. Single military department: There should be one Department of National Defense. It would be under the control of a civilian who would be a member of the Cabinet. Each of the services would be headed by a civilian with the title of Secretary. These Secretaries would be charged with the internal administration within their own services. They would not be members of the Cabinet. Each service would retain its autonomy, subject of course to the authority and over-all control by the Secretary of National Defense. It is recognized that the services have different functions and different organizations and for these reasons the integrity of each service should be retained. The civilian Secretaries of the services would be members of the Council of Common Defense and in this capacity they would have the further opportunity to represent their respective services to the fullest extent.

2. Three coordinated services: There should be three coordinate services—the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The three services should be on a parity and should operate in a common purpose toward over-all efficiency of the national defense under the control and supervision of the Secretary of National Defense. The Secretaries of the three services should be known as Secretary for the Army, Secretary for the Navy, and Secretary for the Air Force.

3. Aviation: The Air Force shall have the responsibility for the development, procurement, maintenance, and operation of the military air resources of the United States with the following exceptions, in which responsibility must be vested in the Navy:

(1) Ship-, carrier-, and water-based aircraft essential to naval operations, and aircraft of the United States Marine Corps.

(2) Land-type aircraft necessary for essential internal administration and for air transport over routes of sole interest to naval forces and where the requirements cannot be met by normal air transport facilities.

(3) Land-type aircraft necessary for the training of personnel for the afore-mentioned purposes.

Land-based planes for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping can and should be manned by Air Force personnel. If the three services are to work as a team there must be close cooperation, with interchange of personnel and special training for specific duties.

Within its proper sphere of operation, naval aviation must not be restricted but must be given every opportunity to develop its maximum usefulness.

4. United States Marine Corps: There shall be maintained as a constituent part of the naval service a balanced fleet marine force including its supporting air component to perform the following functions:

(1) Service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases or for the conduct of such limited land operations as are essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign.

(2) To continue the development of those aspects of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by the landing forces.

(3) To provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy.

(4) To provide security detachments for protection of naval property at naval stations and bases.

5. Council of National Defense: To integrate our foreign and military policies and to enable the military services and other agencies of government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving our national security. The membership of this Council should consist of the Secretary of State, the civilian head of the Military Establishment, the civilian heads of the military services, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, referred to below.

6. National Security Resources Board: To establish and keep up to date policies and programs for the maximum use of the Nation's resources in support of our national security. It should operate under the Council and be composed of representatives of the military services and of other appropriate agencies.

7. The Joint Chiefs of Staff: To formulate strategic plans, to assign logistic responsibilities to the services in support thereof, to integrate the military programs, to make recommendations for integration of the military budget, and to provide for the strategic direction of the United States military forces.

8. No single military Chief of Staff: In the opinion of the War Department, the Military Establishment should contain a single military Chief of Staff, who would serve as principal military adviser, available to offer advice when differences of opinion arise among the military heads of the several services. The Navy feels that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be the highest source of military advice. The War Department is willing to omit the feature of a single Chief of Staff.

9. Central Intelligence Agency: To compile, analyze, and evaluate information gathered by various Government agencies, including the military, and to furnish such information to the National Defense Council and to other Government agencies entitled thereto. It should operate under the Council. An organization along these lines, established by Executive order, already exists.

10. Procurement and Supply: There should be an agency to prevent wasteful competition in the field of military supply and procurement through joint planning and coordination of procurement, production, and distribution.

11. Research agencies: There should be an agency to coordinate the scientific research and development of the military services.

12. Military education and training: There should be an agency to review periodically the several systems of education and training of personnel of the military services and to adjust them into an integrated program.

A plan of unification containing these 12 elements has my unqualified endorsement. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Chief of Naval Operations have assured me that they will support such a plan.

It is my hope that the Congress will pass legislation as soon as possible effecting a unification based upon these 12 principles.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The President has received the following letter from the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received your joint letter of June 15, 1946, addressed to me and to the Secretary of the Navy.

I believe the changes you outlined will provide an economical and effective organization for the military services and again pledge my wholehearted support, and that of the War Department, to carrying out its provisions. You can count upon us to furnish any assistance in any way that you may deem advisable.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON

The President has received the following letter from the Secretary of the Navy:

JUNE 24, 1946.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to acknowledge your letter of June 15, 1946, addressed to the Secretary of War and to me, and to refer to my conversation with you of June 19 on the general subject of the reorganization of the War and Navy Departments.

It is my understanding from your letter and our subsequent conversation that your principal objectives are:

(a) The creation of a single department of national defense under a civilian head, with broad powers of over-all supervision and control, while leaving full administration of their respective services to the Secretaries for War, Navy, and Air.

(b) With particular regard to the Navy—the preservation of its integrity and autonomy so as to insure the retention of those imponderables of spirit and morale so essential to a military service, and to insure also that the ability of the future Navy to discharge its responsibility for the security of the Nation is not impaired.

I consider the foregoing objectives attainable, and the recognized difficulties in drafting legislation which will insure their success, surmountable.

One of the other points in your letter of June 15 relates to the subject of land-based planes for naval reconnaissance, anti-submarine warfare, and protection of shipping. I am glad to note that the Navy is to have a continuing part in the future development of these operations, so that full advantage may be taken of its experience in this field and of the lessons learned in the late war. Admiral Nimitz joins me in this expression.

I wish to thank you for the patience with which you have listened to the Navy's views on the reorganization of our national defense and for the time which you have devoted to the subject. You may be assured of my desire and that of Admiral Nimitz to cooperate with you fully in the effort to achieve the objectives of your program.

Respectfully,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

The President today sent the following letter to Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson and Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal:

JANUARY 16, 1947.

GENTLEMEN: I am exceedingly pleased to receive your joint letter of January 16 in which you advise that you have reached full and complete agreement on a plan for the unification of the armed services.

I recognize that each of the services had made concessions in the effort to reach this

agreement, and I feel that it constitutes an admirable compromise between the various views that were originally held.

The agreement provides a thoroughly practical and workable plan of unification and I heartily approve it.

You have both worked ably and effectively, with your respective staffs, in bringing about this result. I appreciate your fine efforts and I congratulate you upon an accomplishment which, I am sure, will contribute greatly to the efficiency of our national defense.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The President has received the following letter from Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson and Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On May 31, 1943, we jointly submitted to you a letter which gave our respective views on the major elements involved in establishing a greater measure of unification of our armed forces.

In your letter of June 15, 1946, you expressed gratification at the progress made in narrowing the zone of disagreement which had previously existed between the services and stated your position with reference to the essential points on which disagreement still existed.

In our opinion the necessity for agreement between the military services is now even greater than at the time of our earlier letter. We and our representatives have been meeting in an effort to secure further resolution, within the scope and the spirit of the statement of your position, of the views of the two departments. We are pleased to report success in this undertaking.

We agree to support legislation in which the following points are incorporated:

(a) There shall be a Council of National Defense, a National Security Resources Board, and a Central Intelligence Agency (which already exists) as agreed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in their letter to the President of May 31, 1946.

(b) The armed forces shall be organized under a Secretary of National Defense so as to place the Army, the Navy (to include the Marine Corps and Naval Aviation), and the Air Forces, each with a military chief, under the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force respectively. Each shall be under a Secretary and, under the over-all direction of the Secretary of National Defense, shall be administered as an individual unit. The Secretary of any of the three departments may, at any time, present to the President, after first informing the Secretary of National Defense, any report or recommendation relating to his department which he may deem necessary or desirable.

(c) A War Council shall be created consisting of the Secretary of National Defense as Chairman and with power of decision, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, and the military heads of the three services. The War Council will concern itself with matters of broad policy relating to the armed forces.

(d) There shall be a Joint Chiefs of Staff consisting of the military heads of the three services, and also the Chief of Staff to the President if that office exists. Subject to the authority and direction of the Secretary of National Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will provide for the strategic direction of the military forces of the United States, will formulate strategic plans, assign logistic responsibilities to the services in support thereof, integrate the military requirements, and, as directed, advise in the integration of the military budget.

(e) There shall be a full-time joint staff to consist initially of not over 100 officers to be provided in approximately equal numbers by the three services. The joint staff, operating under a director thereof, shall carry out policies and directives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(f) The Secretary of National Defense shall head the Armed Forces Establishment, shall be vested with authority, under the President, to establish common policies and common programs for the integrated operation of the three departments, and shall exercise control over and direct their common efforts to discharge their responsibility for national security.

We are agreed that the proper method of setting forth the functions (so-called roles and missions) of the armed forces is by the issuance of an Executive order concurrently with your approval of the appropriate legislation. We attach for your consideration a mutually agreed draft of such an order.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.
JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

EXECUTIVE ORDER

FUNCTIONS OF THE ARMED FORCES

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, I hereby prescribe the following assignment of primary functions and responsibilities to the three armed services.

Section I. The common missions of the armed forces of the United States are:

1. To support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

2. To maintain, by timely and effective military action, the security of the United States, its possessions and areas vital to its interest.

3. To uphold and advance the national policies and interests of the United States.

4. To safeguard the internal security of the United States as directed by higher authority.

5. To conduct integrated operations on the land, on the sea, and in the air necessary for these purposes.

In order to facilitate the accomplishment of the foregoing missions, the armed forces shall formulate integrated plans and make coordinated preparations. Each service shall observe the general principles and fulfill the specific functions outlined below, and shall make use of the personnel, equipment, and facilities of the other services in all cases where economy and effectiveness will thereby be increased.

Section II. Functions of the United States Army:

General:

The United States Army includes land combat and service forces and such aviation and water transport as may be organic therein. It is organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. The Army is responsible for the preparation of land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Army to meet the needs of war.

The specific functions of the United States Army are:

1. To organize, train, and equip land forces for:

(a) Operations on land, including joint operations.

(b) The seizure or defense of land areas, including airborne and joint amphibious operations.

(c) The occupation of land areas.

2. To develop weapons, tactics, technique, organization, and equipment of Army combat and service elements, coordinating with the Navy and the Air Force in all aspects of joint concern, including those which pertain to amphibious and airborne operations.

3. To provide, as directed by proper authority, such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States.

4. To assist the Navy and Air Forces in the accomplishment of their missions, including the provision of common services and supplies as determined by proper authority.

Section III. Functions of the United States Navy:

General:

The United States Navy includes naval combat and service forces, naval aviation, and the United States Marine Corps. It is organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat at sea. The Navy is responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war, and in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war.

The specific functions of the United States Navy are:

1. To organize, train, and equip naval forces for:

(a) Operations at sea, including joint operations.

(b) The control of vital sea areas, the protection of vital sea lanes, and the suppression of enemy sea commerce.

(c) The support of occupation forces as required.

(d) The seizure of minor enemy shore positions capable of reduction by such landing forces as may be comprised within the fleet organization.

(e) Naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping. The air aspects of those functions shall be coordinated with the Air Force, including the development and procurement of aircraft, and air installations located on shore, and use shall be made of Air Force personnel, equipment, and facilities in all cases where economy and effectiveness will thereby be increased. Subject to the above provision, the Navy will not be restricted as to types of aircraft maintained and operated for these purposes.

(f) The air transport necessary for essential internal administration and for air transport over routes of sole interest to naval forces where the requirements cannot be met by normal air transport facilities.

2. To develop weapons, tactics, technique, organization and equipment of naval combat and service elements, coordinating with the Army and the Air Force in all aspects of joint concern, including those which pertain to amphibious operations.

3. To provide, as directed by proper authority, such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States.

4. To maintain the United States Marine Corps whose specific functions are:

(a) To provide Marine Forces together with supporting air components, for service with the Fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of limited land operations in connection therewith.

(b) To develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces.

(c) To provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy.

(d) To provide security detachments for protection of naval property at naval stations and bases.

(e) To provide, as directed by proper authority, such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States.

5. To assist the Army and the Air Force in the accomplishment of their missions, including the provision of common services and supplies as determined by proper authority.

Section IV. Functions of the United States Air Force:

General:

The United States Air Force includes all military aviation forces, both combat and service, not otherwise specifically assigned. It is organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained air-offensive and defensive operations. The Air Force is responsible for the preparation of the air forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war, except as otherwise assigned and in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Air Force to meet the needs of war.

The specific functions of the United States Air Force are:

1. To organize, train, and equip air forces for:

(a) Air operations, including joint operations.

(b) Gaining and maintaining general air supremacy.

(c) Establishing local air superiority, where and as required.

(d) The strategic air force of the United States and strategic air reconnaissance.

(e) Air lift and support for air-borne operations.

(f) Air support to land forces and naval forces, including support of occupation forces.

(g) Air transport for the armed forces, except as provided by the Navy in accordance with paragraph 1f, of section III.

2. To develop weapons, tactics, technique, organization and equipment of Air Force combat and service elements, coordinating with the Army and Navy on all aspects of joint concern, including those which pertain to amphibious and airborne operations.

3. To provide, as directed by proper authority, such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States.

4. To provide the means for coordination of air defense among all services.

5. To assist the Army and Navy in accomplishment of their missions, including the provision of common services and supplies as determined by proper authority.

The Pipe Lines—What Shall We Do With Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Disposition of Surplus Property well qualified to speak, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], came the statement in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments this morning that the Big Inch and Little Big Inch Pipe Lines were one item of surplus property which the Government at this time might sell and realize at least more than the original cost.

As bearing upon the present situation, the attached letter and statement received this morning are given to the committee:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 17, 1947.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Charles H. Smith, Mr. E. McK. Hunt, and I, who called on you last Thursday afternoon on behalf of Big Inch Gas & Oil Corp., are very appreciative of the time and attention which you gave us.

As you suggested, we have prepared, and now enclose, memoranda setting forth the considerations which in our view bear on both sides of the question of extending the period for consideration of the supplementary report establishing a new policy for disposal of Government-owned pipe lines.

As we said, it is our view that on balance the interests of the country would be best served by permitting disposal of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch Pipe Lines pursuant to the supplementary report without further delay. If you should desire, we stand ready to confer with you again or to appear before your committee at any time to furnish any additional information at our disposal.

Very sincerely yours,

MALCOLM S. LANGFORD.

HISTORY

September and October 1945: Government operation of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch Pipe Lines in petroleum service was terminated.

November 1945: Hearings before the Surplus Property Subcommittee, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate (Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman).

January 4, 1946: Date of report to the Congress by the Surplus Property Administrator on disposal of Government-owned pipelines (sometimes referred to as the Symington Report or the Blue Book). A copy of such report is attached hereto. This report favored disposition of the pipe lines in petroleum service.

June 1946: War Assets Administration advertised for bids on the pipe lines under the policy established in the Symington Report.

July 30, 1946: Closing date for bids on lines.

July 31, 1946: Sixteen bids publicly opened and read.

September 16, 1946: Last date for submission of more detailed information by the bidders pursuant to invitation by War Assets Administration.

November 19, 1946: War Assets Administrator Littlejohn announced rejection of all bids.

November 19, 1946–December 9, 1946: Hearings before the House Select Committee on Surplus Property Disposal (Representative SLAUGHTER, chairman).

December 30, 1946: War Assets Administration advertised for new bids to be submitted before noon on February 8, 1937, and to be opened and read on February 10, 1947.

January 3, 1947: Eightieth Congress convened, having before it supplemental report of Robert M. Littlejohn, War Assets Administrator, on Government-owned pipe lines, dated December 18, 1946 (sometimes referred to as the Littlejohn Report or the Yellow Book). A copy of such report is attached hereto. Its principal recommendation is that the lines be sold "to the purchaser offering the greatest net return in dollars to the United States Government."

January 3, 1947: Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, introduced House Joint Resolution 2 proposing that the War Assets Administrator be prohibited from disposing of the lines until 6 months after submission to the Congress of the Federal Power Commission's report on its investigation of the natural-gas industry, Docket No. G-580.

January 10, 1947: Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator REVERCOMB introduced Senate Joint Resolution 20, proposing that section 19 of the Surplus Property Act be amended to provide that in the case of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch Pipe Lines 90 days shall elapse following the submission of the supplementary report before the War Assets Administrator may sell the lines, instead of the 30-day period now provided.

January 15, 1947: Senator MYERS, of Pennsylvania, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 34 proposing the same postponement as Congressman WALTER's House Joint Resolution 2.

CONSIDERATIONS IN FAVOR OF EXTENSION OF THE PERIOD FOR CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED PIPE LINES

1. Members of the Congress not already familiar with the problems incident to disposal of the lines would have a longer period within which to consider whether or not they are in favor of the disposal policy set forth in the supplementary report of General Littlejohn, dated December 18, 1946.

2. The Congress after further study might establish a policy which would avoid certain inequities which are possible results of the policy set forth in the supplementary report. The policy of disposing of the lines to the highest cash bidder is likely to result in higher prices to the consumers of gas (if the lines are to be used for gas). For each cent per thousand cubic feet increase in the price at which the owner of the lines sells gas, he can afford to pay roughly $20,000,000 more for the lines. This, of course, must be paid for by the consuming public in the long run. Any difference between the price paid for the lines and the cost of constructing new equivalent facilities is an unreasonable burden on the consuming public.

3. The Congress would have the opportunity of deciding once and for all whether it regards the creation of a common carrier system for petroleum and petroleum products as necessary and desirable as a part of the regulation of the oil industry.

4. It would give the Congress the opportunity to reiterate specifically with respect to the pipe lines that, as stated in section 2 of the Surplus Property Act, the dollar return to the Government is deemed to be of lesser importance than the other objectives there stated.

5. It has never been fully developed what the consequences would be to industry and the public if, after conversion of the lines to gas, the armed services should require their use for oil in an emergency. Testifying before the House Surplus Property Committee, Edwin Hill, vice president of Ford-Bacon-Davis, stated that in his opinion the lines, if once converted to gas, would never be reconverted to oil, even in an emergency. The reason, briefly, is that purchasers of the gas, whether for industrial use or home use, would become dependent upon a continued supply of natural gas through the lines. A cutting off of their supply would cause great hardship and economic chaos. Some persons believe this factor would outweigh military requirements for oil use.

CONSIDERATIONS AGAINST EXTENSION OF THE PERIOD FOR CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED PIPE LINES

1. Changing of the period specified in section 19 of the Surplus Property Act from 30 days to 90 days would of itself probably not be particularly harmful. However, the delay would almost inevitably be very much longer and under Congressman WALTER's resolution, disposal of the pipe lines would be indefinitely postponed, since it is not known when the Federal Power Commission will submit its report on its investigation of the natural-gas industry, Docket No. G-580.

2. Delay alone would serve no purpose. Delay merely gives the opportunity for such action as the Congress might wish to take during the longer period.

3. If the Congress desires to enter upon a thorough exploration of the disposal of the pipe lines, even after the already over-long delay in their disposal, this could be done only by full-dress hearings and a complete investigation. If such hearings were to serve their purpose, it would be necessary to have them conducted by a competent and unbiased staff with able counsel of the caliber which served the Senate Subcommittee on Surplus Property Disposal. Otherwise the committee would hear only witnesses representing vested interests opposed to the utilization of the lines for one purpose or another, or opposed to their use at all, whose views are already well known. Only with a skillful staff to conduct the investigation would all of the pros and cons be brought forward fully and independently for the benefit of the committee.

4. After the hearings, which would undoubtedly consume weeks of time, the committee would have to digest a voluminous record and formulate its conclusions as to the policy for disposal of the lines which it would recommend. The committee's report and any legislation which it desired to recommend would then go to the floor of the House of Representatives where it would unquestionably be debated at great length, considering the various conflicting interests which are involved.

5. After adoption of a policy by the House of Representatives, the proposed policy would go to the Senate where it would be reviewed in committee. The Senate committee might or might not choose to hold hearings of its own. The recommendations of the Senate committee would then go to the floor of the Senate where extensive debate would again be inevitable.

6. The possible further delays incident to conference between the two Houses and the subsequent procedures before final adoption of the policy are obvious.

7. If that extensive procedure should result in a policy differing from that set forth in the supplementary report of the War Assets Administrator, it would be necessary for still another set of bids to be invited.

8. If Congressman WALTER'S resolution should be adopted, the delay would be an absolute minimum of 6 months following submission of the Federal Power Commission's report, which has not yet been filed. No matter what the cause of the delay, it is entirely possible that the result of further substantial postponement of disposal of the lines would be that they will never be sold at all. This is a result which appears to be desired by certain elements in the oil, coal, and railroad industries.

9. It is already established that there is a need for these facilities for the transportation of both oil and gas. Both industries have projected facilities to serve the same need that the Big Inch lines would meet. They cannot be expected further to delay indefinitely the execution of their plans. The result of further delay in disposal of these lines will be the construction of facilities by both the oil and the gas industries to serve precisely the same purposes which these lines could serve. The demand for the use of these facilities would be drastically reduced by the construction of such competing facilities.

10. All of the bidders have been faced with the necessity of keeping financial underwriting and backing intact for an unusually long period of time. It is well known that the financial commitments behind certain of the bids which were opened July 31, 1946, expired upon the rejection of all of those bids. Bidders cannot reasonably be expected to maintain their own interest and that of their financial backers for further indefinite periods of time.

11. Every time the disposal of the lines is again considered publicly, those who desire to use them for gas disparage their usefulness for oil; those who desire to purchase the lines for oil are inclined to disparage their usefulness for gas; and those who do not want to use the lines at all disparage their usefulness generally. The inevitable result of this repeated casting of doubt on the practicability of operating the lines for either gas or oil would be, cumulatively, to destroy the confidence of banks, underwriters, and the investing public generally in the soundness of securities issued to finance the purchase of the lines.

12. During the period of delay the Government will continue to bear depreciation on the lines at the rate of over $10,000 per day.

13. War Assets Administration states that it proposes to go ahead with the present schedule of receiving bids on or before February 8 and opening and reading them publicly on February 10, 1947, even if the Congress should adopt a resolution postponing the Administrator's power to dispose of the lines. Upon the reading of the bids it will be plain who are the leading bidders for the lines. It would be very unfair to them to have them set up as targets for all unsuccessful or disgruntled bidders at hearings conducted thereafter. Should it be decided in spite of the inherent dangers further to delay disposal of the lines, it would be for the benefit of all bidders to require postponement of the submission and reading of the bids until hearings have been concluded.

14. Despite the wording of the conclusions and recommendations of the supplementary report of Administrator Littlejohn, his disposal of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch Pipe Lines is still controlled by the Surplus Property Act of 1944. The Administrator must dispose of the lines in accordance with the objectives of that act. The purposes which might be served by further congressional action with all the possible delays incident to hearings would be equally well served by making it clear to the War Assets Administrator that failure of the Congress to reject his supplementary report does not authorize him to ignore the objectives of that act. His disposal of the lines under the act must also be reviewed by the Attorney General. Unconscionable returns will not be allowed by the Federal Power Commission or the State public utilities bodies, in the case of gas, nor by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the case of oil.

Testing American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article which I wrote for the October 1946 issue of the magazine Public Service. The article is entitled "Testing Our American Citizenship."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTING OUR AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"God, give us men!
"The time demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands."

Never was this cry of Josiah Gilbert Holland for inspired leadership and followership more urgent than today in America in the atomic age. With crisis both at home and abroad, American-thinking Americans are called upon to preserve our way of life from the insidious wiles of alien influence.

We are called upon to preserve our constitutional Republic of checks and balances—the way of individualism against the way of collectivism—of private ownership against public ownership—of spiritual truth against base materialism.

How can we succeed in maintaining Columbia as the true gem of the ocean, the home of the brave and the free? The answer is: By better citizenship in every American home, in every American office, in every American school. We need, indeed, more little red schoolhouses and fewer little Red school teachers. We need to combat the propaganda from poison factories in government and outside government that would set class against class, race against race, creed against creed, that would ruin our system of free, competitive, private enterprise.

To be adequate to our responsibility, each of us ought to be able to test our citizenship, just as an immigrant is tested in order to be naturalized as an American citizen.

Here, then, are a few standards which I believe may be appropriate. They represent what I humbly believe to be ideal standards of citizenship. Probably no single one of us will fulfill all of these ideals, but it is up to each of us to approximate them more and more.

"STANDARDS OF CITIZENSHIP

"1. We should know and love the American Charter.

"What is the American Charter? It consists in part of the United States Constitution, including, of course, the great Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

"The American Charter consists in part of the Declaration of Independence, sealed by the blood of the martyrs of the American Revolution. It consists in part of the Farewell Address of the Father of Our Country, George Washington, and of the Gettysburg Address delivered by that epic figure, Abraham Lincoln.

"It consists of American history, the great deeds and words and thoughts of every generation of America since 1776, in time of war and peace. All these we should read and reread, learn and relearn, and love sincerely from the very depth of our being.

"2. We should know and love the American cultural heritage.

"America, the Beautiful is more than a song. Ours is more than a great and beautiful geographic expanse. We have American poetry, literature, music, art, which can hold their heads high amidst the other towering cultures of the world. We have thrilling customs, traditions, flowering in every one of our regions, in every one of our local communities, all constituting a part of our cultural heritage—yours and mine and the possession of those who are yet to come.

"3. We should know and respect the symbols of America.

"Every good citizen knows and respects the great symbols of our land. He has a deep and abiding respect for the Stars and Stripes. He knows our great songs—The Star-Spangled Banner, Columbia, the Gem of the Ocean, and many others. He observes our national holidays—Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Independence Day, Memorial Day, Thanksgiving, Christmas.

"He loves these symbols of our country, not blindly, but with his eyes clear and filled with the beauty of them. He respects all these symbols in the very depths of his heart and soul and relives each holiday in the very fiber of his being.

"4. We should know and love and see the shrines of America.

"In order to become fully infused with the spirit of America, we should be acquainted with 'the shrines of each patriot's devotion'—

with Independence Hall, Concord, Lexington, Mount Vernon, Springfield, and, in our Nation's Capital, the United States Capitol, the United States Supreme Court, the White House, the Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln Memorials.

"If it is at all possible, we should try to see these unforgettable landmarks in person, but at any rate, whether we see them in picture, in drawing, or in real life, we should see them in our mind's eye with love and devotion.

"5. We should develop the personal qualities of an American.

"We have great traditions for the ideal individual American. He is a man of health and vitality, of thrift and diligence, industry and humor, and love. His mind is unclouded by distrust or fear. He has perspective. He has faith in himself, in his loved ones, in his constitutional government, in his fellow man. He has no time for the pessimist, the defeatist, the divisionist. He owes allegiance to his God, to his country, and to his fellow man. He holds his head high because his conscience is clear. He is a growing man. He is not guilty of arrested development. He knows that life is an unfolding process in which more and more of his potentialities can be developed with each passing day.

"He believes in and practices above all the Golden Rule.

" 'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.'

"6. We should know and contribute to American leadership.

"It is up to each of us to become acquainted with the workings of our Government—local, State, and national. We should make certain that the men whom we elect and support in public office respect public office as a public trust. They must be men devoted to the American way of life.

"Thus, we must exercise our ballot choice wisely and carefully. We must not allow ourselves to be mentally stampeded by false slogans and synthetic thinking—by glittering generalities and promises of security in return for liberty. We must remember the words of Benjamin Franklin, 'He who would give up liberty for security deserves neither.' (And he usually gets neither.)

"7. We should know and contribute to our community.

"We have obligations not only to the land in which we live, but to the local community in which we reside and work. We must do our part in helping to make it a clean, happy, thriving community. We must fulfill our neighborly obligations to those who dwell in our vicinity. The strength of the Nation is founded on the strength of its smallest unit—in the family and in those who are close to the family.

"8. We should contribute to the economic well-being of our country.

"If we are good citizens, we must become an ever more important sustainer to the economic life of our country. We must contribute to the economic blood stream of our land. We must do our part, however humble, in helping to make new jobs, higher wages, and more quality goods. America needs job makers and job builders."

It needs men of vision and enterprise, willing to invest their time and money and energy into opening up new industries, new vistas of opportunity for all. It needs men who will tap our genius of mass-production economy to produce goods that will give us a still higher standard of living.

It needs men who will work for harmony and cooperation between labor and management in order to be of greater public service to all of us—the farmer, the housewife, the merchant, and others.

CONCLUSIONS

These are our ideals. Applying them presents the real rub. But it can be done, it is being done, it will be done. There are more and more Americans, in Holland's words, who are:

"Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

They will enable our ship of state to proceed in spite of all perils to the calm seas of prosperity, freedom, and peace. It is up to you and to me to be among those valiant men.

The Good Samaritan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include with pleasure a splendid and powerful message of tolerance and decency expressed in the words of the poem by James Patrick McGovern, of Washington, D.C., entitled "The Good Samaritan."

THE GOOD SAMARITAN

Christ was born a Jew, yet many gentiles scorn
The race from which their own religion's born;
Charity in thought, alive with deed,
Their Saviour taught to be the soul's prime seed;
Still charity seems more of hand than heart;
A gesture rather than of them a part.
While Jews once more are homeless on the earth—
No Palestine, no Promised Land, no hearth.

The Hebrews bravely fought for every land
Where freedom marched for footholds in the strand;
Now freedom won, where is their sacred sod
On which they may like others worship God?
Once more they wander, flying refugees,
Persecuted, across the seven seas;
And sometimes hearts turned bitter in dire stress
Rise to violent passions of lawlessness.

What tragedy of suffering compares
In years and poignancy to turn gray hairs,
With that which trial has graven on this race?
The gentile's scorn has marked the Jewish face
With thought-worn brow, grave eye, and mystic fire,
Brands of survival and the heart's desire.
And so the Jew by long tradition tried
By grace as well as strength is fortified.

Do gentiles in their proud majority
Fear to set this dwindled people free
That they may grow in all their scope and power?
Was not an Einstein born in happy hour?
Did not a Heine in his suffering
Voice lyrics which with deathless beauty sing?
Has a Baruch accumulated gold
Save that he might serve mankind growing old?

The Jew is man, no ism mars his name;
Just human nature, as you and me the same;
Scion of Moses and of Solomon,
With good and evil of the father's son;
A small minority, which seared by time,
Scales the ridiculous to the sublime.
Should gentiles, then ignore their fellow man.
Forget Christ and the Good Samaritan?

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Let There Be Light—It Is Gradually Dawning on the Country That a 20-Percent Tax Reduction Would Benefit All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, when Republicans in Congress first proposed a drastic reduction in Government spending, to be followed by substantial reduction in personal income taxes, the do-gooders and spenders joined in an anvil chorus to denounce the program as purely political. Some even went so far as to say that it was designed to help the rich at the expense of the poor. Columnists, commentators, and Communists took up the cry, and some have persisted in their tactics down to this very day.

Mr. Speaker, the American people were not deceived. They know that the way to cut taxes is to cut taxes; that the way to reduce spending is to reduce appropriations. The Republican Party is pledged to this program, and with the help of forward-looking Democrats who place country above party we hope to succeed.

Recently two very able editorials on the subject have come to my attention; one, from the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, the other from the Tampa (Fla.) Times. It is because these two editorials are unusually factual and discerning that I ask to have them inserted in the RECORD. The editorials follow:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press]

TAX'NG AND SPENDING

Last session Congress adopted a reorganization bill intended to modernize its own procedure and bring back into legislative hands control over Federal taxing and spending. The first budget under the new system provides a test of the taxing and spending reform. Republican leaders of Congress are now taking steps to get this machinery into motion.

The idea is to adopt a definite plan and then stick to it, instead of treating spending and taxing as though they had no relation to each other. Minnesota legislators, faced with serious financial problems, should watch this experiment and adopt whatever seems applicable to this State's situation, as Representative Claude Allen has been urging.

The plan calls for joint sessions of the taxing and spending committees of both branches of Congress. These committees will decide how much they want to tax, how much they want to reduce the national debt. This will determine how much they can properly appropriate. If they also decide that the impelling needs of the government are higher than they first assume, they will have to change their ideas on the other two points.

In other words, Congress is supposed to then see that the spending and taxing bills it passes carry out the policy. What it spends will determine what it taxes and the other way around. No doubt there will still be some politicians in Congress who make a career out of favoring all appropriations

and voting against all taxes. But the majority leaders will have to assume responsibility for a more sensible handling of the public's money.

The Federal Government has been spending more than it taxed since 1930, living on borrowed money. During much of the New Deal this was a deliberate pump-priming policy and during the war a necessity. The idea now is that the time has come to start paying off the debt and reducing taxes. President Truman's Budget shows that this makes necessary even more cutting down of wartime spending than he has proposed, for his Budget left room neither for tax reduction nor debt reduction. It is up to Congress to say by how much this can be done.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Times]

THE PRESIDENT STICKS TO THE NEW DEAL PLUS

To anyone who looked to President Truman's economic report for further signs of an administrative trend away from bureaucratic meddling, his report yesterday was a disappointment.

The President's call for maintenance of wartime tax levels, extended rent controls, increased social-security benefits, higher minimum wages, wage-and-hour regulations covering wider fields and new groups, and long-range housing is the New Deal plus.

If enacted, the program would reopen the way for more governmental interference, controls and regimentation. That is completely and diametrically opposed to the very clear mandate of the American people expressed at the polls in November.

The very name—wartime income tax—is reason enough to show that the high tax level should be sharply lowered. It is easy enough to talk of taking advantage of the high level of prosperity to build up revenue surpluses to be applied on the national debt, but how long does Mr. Truman think the high level of peacetime production can be maintained saddled with excessive wartime tax rates?

The wartime taxes are already a drag on business enterprise and individuals and certainly do not square with the frequent predictions of recession and depression emanating from the inner sanctums of many administration bureaus and departments. Fortunately the Cassandras among the New Dealers and the professed liberals of the Henry Wallace stripe have had an extremely low batting average. Had their worst fears been realized, recession and unemployment would already be harassing the country.

The move for a 20-percent tax reduction under the leadership of Representative KNUTSON is the right course toward equitable tax adjustment and, in effect, increased real wages.

The President's talk of reduced prices, while at the same time encouraging wage increases and a higher minimum wage standard is cock-eyed economics. It is just as fallacious as his bitterly recalled go-ahead signal to labor in August 1945, to seek higher wages, while prices were frozen by the OPA ceilings. The most disastrous effect of that untimely move by Mr. Truman was to set in motion a chain of reactions that has not stopped exploding since. The strikes throughout 1946 were directly attributable to such a hastily announced policy. Their continuance would precipitate more of the same in 1947, if recognized by Congress.

If Mr. Truman and his staff of economic advisers seriously comtemplate stimulating greater production and resultant expanded employment in 1947, they would do far better to recommend an end to the siphoning into governmental extravagance of the earnings of the American people. There lies the greatest danger to the economic prosperity of this Nation, waste and inefficiency demanding a Federal Budget at an excessive peacetime scale of close to $40,000,000,000.

Along with the price and tax proposals which reflect the influence of too many years of New Deal thinking, the economic report's housing, social security, and fair employment practices recommendations are equally unacceptable for the well-being of the American people.

The long-range housing program sounds attractive enough, but Mr. Truman was supposed to have started a housing program under Wilson Wyatt and everyone knows the mess of that. It did not work before because it was impossible to control even with the liberal wartime powers the President possessed. It will not work if tried again.

As for introduction of the fair employment practices issue into the months ahead by including it in the report when harmony is the most desirable condition, Mr. Truman could not have selected a more highly controversial problem. The doctrines of the FEPC go straight back to the New Deal and that means plenty of political trouble for any economic program.

In his bid for public support, Mr. Truman talked generously of doing something to aid small business—incentive aids to encourage their prosperity. That is the usual fine talk, but his suggestions for making it easier for small businesses to get credit assistance do not make sense. Mr Truman need only study the stringent supervision of banks and bank loans conducted by the Federal Comptroller of the Currency to know how difficult the Government makes it for small business to negotiate private loans. Of course, if he proposes to let the bars down and use the taxpayers' money freely to underwrite obviously speculative loans without regard to the borrowers' responsibility, a flurry of small businesses can be launched, but the days of their success would be numbered at the start.

The patronage of government cannot defeat the ancient economic laws governing prosperity. Word juggling, couched in the most optimistic language, is no substitute for economic stability founded on tried and true experience. The President's economic report is high sounding, but after all is said and done, it is only a promise of his willingness to foster more economic experimentation of which the country has already had too much.

Reciprocal Trade-Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement made by me on January 16 at hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information regarding the reciprocal trade-agreements program, as follows:

Gentlemen, you have a full program, and I realize that many others desire to present testimony to you on the reciprocal trade negotiations. For that reason I will be as brief as possible.

Fulton County, New York State, is the center of tanning in that State as well as being the heart of the dress-glove industry of the United States. Leather-industry employment in Fulton County amounts to about 5,000 workers. These workers are dependent entirely upon the prosperity of the leather industry, and I am concerned with the future of the Fulton County leather industry, should the already extremely low tariffs on leather be further reduced.

In offering this statement in protest against the lowering of present rates or the binding of these rates at current levels, I am not unaware of the need for foreign trade and the need for the stimulation of such trade. I believe with you that the prosperity of the community, whether it be local, national or international, is dependent upon the flow of trade and that unwarranted obstruction to such a flow should be removed. Gentlemen, I believe in reciprocity but it has never been my understanding of that term that it should be unilateral.

True reciprocity involves more than concession in tariff rates by the United States. It should mean the abandonment by other countries of those political and economic restrictions on trade which relegate tariff rates to minor significance. It should mean the reduction of foreign tariff rates to levels consistent with those in this country.

The United States has already reduced its tariff rates on leather by from ⅛ to ½, and today has lower rates on leather than any other country in the world. Its average rates on leather, in fact, are less than the average ad valorem rate imposed upon imports in general.

The next step, gentlemen, in my opinion, lies not with us but with foreign countries before this country gives any consideration to tariff concessions.

The leather industry is particularly concerned in these negotiations with the artificial restraints to trade which have been imposed by foreign countries. These restraints are, briefly:

1. Subsidization or nationalization of foreign leather industries with the result that they can compete with the United States on a level where competition costs can be ignored.

2. Bilateral trade agreements for the securing of essential raw material to the exclusion of the United States.

3. Export embargoes on essential raw materials for the development of home industries or to support war-born industries which could not survive in a free international economy.

4. Currency and exchange restrictions which make export of raw materials to the United States impossible; this also for the purpose of supporting war-born industries which could not otherwise be maintained.

5. Imposition of special luxury and sales taxes on United States leather, thereby nullifying tariff agreements, in order to protect their home industries by shutting out American goods.

6. Empire preference in tariff rates whereby the United Kingdom and its Dominions enjoy preferential treatment with each other at the expense of United States exports.

In presenting the above points I have deliberately been terse. These points could be expanded upon at greater length but I know how jammed your schedule is. The points I have made will, I believe, be discussed in more detail by representatives of the leather industry on Thursday. Nevertheless, I feel that I could not sit by while these discussions were in progress without stressing the importance of the subject to Fulton County, N. Y. The leather industry there is vitally concerned by the threat to its existence in the unfair competition now being practiced by foreign governments against American tanners. On their behalf, I submit that further reductions in the already too low tariffs on leather should not even be considered and that the prime question should be the securing of some reciprocity from foreign governments to meet the already generous concessions made by the United States.

Investigation of Excessive Expenditures of Public Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions during the reign of Roosevelt, we frequently heard about the mandate of the people. I think we can well continue this line of reasoning today when we think about the November 5 elections. Certainly the people of the Nation expressed a mandate for a change in the methods and practices of this National Government. And it becomes the duty of the Republican majority in both Houses of Congress to carry out that mandate.

One phase of that mandate which was clear-cut is that they want the national budget balanced, and the public at large have a right to know why the excessive expenditures that have gone on year after year even preceding the war under the direction of Mr. Roosevelt. It seems to me that it is the responsibility that rests upon the Republicans in Congress to make the necessary investigations of these excessive expenditures and to go to the very bottom of each instance.

This can only be done by intelligent, well-timed, and carefully arranged investigations. The November 5 election was won by the Republican Party because the American people finally saw through the propaganda that is put out by the New Deal to justify their excessive expenditures which have brought the Nation to the brink of disaster.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a syndicated article written by the accomplished writer, David Lawrence, dealing with the question of investigations:

CONGRESS MOVE SEEN TO BAR INVESTIGATIONS—NEW DEALERS LOOK FOR WAY OUT UNDER ORGANIZATION ACT

(By David Lawrence)

It begins to look as if the New Dealers who spent billions of dollars of public money without an audit of their expenditures and as if the bureaucrats who abused public power are about to escape scrutiny, and perhaps punishment altogether, by the device of banning special congressional investigating committees

The Republicans will prove themselves poor politicians and will virtually hand over the 1948 election to the Democrats if they go along with the let-bygones-be-bygones spirit which is behind the effort to kill off investigating committees.

The Republican Party won in 1946 because the public at last saw through a decade of New Deal propaganda and finally got the impact of governmental controls operating at their worst. But the true extent of governmental mismanagement has never been disclosed to the public. It had been believed that in the next 2 years there would be an opportunity to turn the searchlight of publicity on the misdeeds of the past decade.

Now, however, the Democrats see a chance to squelch investigating committees by arguing that the Congressional Organization Act was designed to do away with special committees. It is being contended that the regular committees of the Senate, for instance, can do the investigating. This is a fallacy. For the regular committees are much too busy with their regular assignments to do all the investigating necessary to penetrate a complicated field of inquiry, which is usually the reason for a special Senate resolution ordering a special committee to take testimony.

PRECEDENT IS SOUGHT

The issue arises, to be sure, over the continuance of the Truman-Mead committee, but it goes far deeper. For the Senate is being asked to establish a precedent and let all committee investigating be done by regular committees.

The Congressional Organization Act will become a mockery if it is constantly interpreted as a device to curtail the rights of the Congress itself. There is nothing sacrosanct about an organization bill which is invoked every day as a reason for not doing what the Congress is supposed to do—namely, to protect the people's interests against abuse.

The same persons in Congress—with an exception here and there on both sides of the aisle—who are inveighing against special committees took a sadistic delight in using committee investigation powers to harass their political opponents. Even the income-tax returns of citizens which were supposed to be secret were tossed before investigating committees by the New Deal administration in its ideological combat that precipitated the present wave of class warfare in America.

WAY TO BLOCK ABUSES

It is true that some investigating committees go too far but on the whole they do more good than harm. It is true also that some of the regular committees have succeeded in squelching inquiries and that the only way the House of Representatives, for example, got a chance to investigate the labor situation under the watchful eye of Representative HOWARD SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, a few years ago was to appoint a special committee. The regular labor committee of the House was stacked by the pro-labor elements in this country against an inquiry.

It will be easy for the lobbyists to get to some of the regular committee and stack the membership in the future, as in the past, by concentrating against the one or two members who hold the balance of power. When Congress, however, is free to look into any subject at any time with a special committee, the lobbyists have everything to fear and so have the individuals who abuse the power of Government.

While the Congressional Organization Act is a good thing, it was intended to assist routine procedures and not to rule in advance on substantive matters of legislative interest. If the barrier of the law is to be brought forward every time some of the Members of Congress want to make an inquiry, it will gradually weaken the act itself and bring about repeal. Certainly, as between a curtailment of the power of Congress to investigate and the so-called streamlining of routine procedures, it would be better to give the benefit of the doubt to the investigating process, which is the sole instrument that really scares many bureaucrats from committing abuses.

Our Atom Bomb Monopoly Will End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a very well written editorial from the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph. I feel that the significance of this piece is felt by all thinking Americans who seriously consider the atom bomb in all of its horrible phases. Were more people to read and feel like this editorial we might proceed to control this new energy. It follows:

WITH EACH DAY—

The Rebekah Lodge is conducting an apron sale today and tomorrow at the Peerless Cleaners on Belle Street.

Miss Betty Ann Bohart has become engaged to Paul E. Todd, of Wood River. Judge Boynton granted two divorces Wednesday in city court. Six babies were born Tuesday and Wednesday at St. Joseph's and Memorial Hospitals.

The fire department made three minor runs Wednesday, one to put out a fire started by a small boy playing with matches.

People are talking about the coal strike, the high cost of living, and what the Republicans will do when they take over in Congress next year. It's still big news when one of the stores gets a shipment of nylons or white shirts.

It looks like the same old world, with people dying, getting married, having babies, and conducting apron sales.

But it isn't the same old world.

More than a year has gone by since, with a silent flash far brighter than the sun, an insignificant amount of uranium yielded up its atomic energy over Hiroshima, erasing a major city eight times as large as Alton.

At a lake bearing the odd and ironic name of Success, in New York, the diplomats are wrangling over what shall be done with this weapon of Armageddon. So far, in measurable action, they have achieved exactly nothing.

The debate gives the appearance of a stalemate, and so we go about our daily lives as if everything were the same.

But it is only the debate that is stalemated, not the race for the atom bomb itself. While the diplomats argue, Russia is feverishly at work at solving the riddle whose answer flashed over Hiroshima. We have the bomb now, but each day that passes whittles away our monopoly. It may end tomorrow or next week, but end it surely will.

What then?

Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from home, E. C. Gregersen—better known as Slim—composed the following poem about beautiful Hawaii, which is further proof that everything our good colleague JOSEPH FARRINGTON tells us about his Hawaii is true:

HAWAII

(Dedicated to all lovers of the islands)

When hill and dale is cloaked in snow and glaring ice,
Then let the helmsman take me back to Paradise,
That icy breath I'll leave behind, and fear it nevermore;
Oh, speed the day when I may see the beauties of Hawaii's shore.

With lazy swells and gentle tides the kindly seas caress us,
Then in the purple haze of dawn the island shores address us;
Volcanic peaks, white crowned with snow, look down on verdant
Valleys far below, and royal palms with stately grace
Sway gently in the trade winds light embrace.

The thunderous roar of surf is heard on coral strand,
The tumbling waves race up to kiss the gleaming sand,
There are singing strings and swaying hips of maidens fair
Bedecked with leis, and orchids in their raven hair;
The while, with graceful hula hands sweet tales unfold
Of pagan love and princely deeds and warriors bold.

Terrestrial wonders by the score, greet ear and eye along the shore
And from the Pali's dizzy height, unfold the beauties of the night.
The friendly moon swings low o'er youthful lovers passing by,
The Southern Cross stands guard in brilliant starlit sky.
A lunar rainbow spans the gulch, from canyon walls
A silvery veil adorns the glistening water falls.

At the crater's brim there's a fiery glow, and ships in the harbor far below
At Waikiki on a flowing tide the surfboard riders gracefully glide;
Then a welcome hand, an open door in a quiet nook on the Kona shore,
In this Paradise I'll dream and rest, 'mid friendly smiles and life at its best.

—*E. C. Gregersen.*

EXIRA, IOWA, *December 1946.*

Statements by Under Secretaries of State Clayton and Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 16, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] made certain remarks concerning Under Secretaries of State Dean Acheson and William L. Clayton, which were given considerable publicity in the public press.

In fairness to these gentlemen and to their untiring efforts on behalf of the welfare of the people and Government of this country, I would like to insert in the RECORD the public statements they issued on this subject on Friday, January 17.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to recall to the Members of this House the President's constant reiteration of the difficulties he encounters in persuading men of integrity and proven ability to make the personal sacrifices that Government service entails. And I am sure that any Member of Congress on either side of the aisle who is familiar with the work Mr. Acheson and Mr Clayton have performed, at great personal sacrifices to themselves, will deplore this type of attack. Such attacks only go to make it that much more difficult to obtain or retain the best men available for the tremendous tasks that face this Nation and the world in restoring conditions of lasting peace.

The statements follow:

STATEMENT BY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE WILLIAM L. CLAYTON

When asked for his comment regarding the speech of Representative SHAFER in the House on January 16, 1947, W. L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, made the following statement:

"Whatever his intention Mr. SHAFER's statement is clearly wrong on its facts.

"The British loan was approved on July 13, 1946, by the House.

"The fiscal year of Anderson, Clayton & Co. ended July 31, 1946, so that obviously the loan could not affect the profits to which Mr. SHAFER refers. I have no connection with Anderson, Clayton & Co. except as a stockholder, but I have ascertained that during that year Anderson, Clayton & Co. sold only 3,500 bales of American cotton to Great Britain. This was less than one-quarter of 1 percent of its total sales of 1,979,023 of American cotton for the season, which sales were very largely to domestic mills.

"Of total exports of 3,600,000 bales of American cotton, during the cotton season of 1945-46 (which corresponds to the fiscal year of Anderson, Clayton & Co.), the Commodity Credit Corporation shipped directly 2,060,000 under lend-lease, UNRRA and arrangements with the Army in occupied territories. No cotton merchant profited from these governmental transactions, but quite the contrary. The remaining private exports of some 1,540,000 bales were made under the Commodity Credit Corporation surplus-sales program and directly reduced Government-owned stocks to the substantial benefit of the Government and the American cotton farmer.

"It is, of course, quite obvious that the exportation of cotton and other American products has been assisted by Export-Import Bank credits. In the case of cotton, the principal beneficiaries have been the Commodity Credit Corporation and the American cotton farmer.

"In the case of the cotton credits, moreover, the loans have been uniformly short-term, interest-bearing and virtually self-liquidating. Thus, they cost the American taxpayer nothing unless there are unexpected defaults.

"Anderson, Clayton & Co. are not only cotton merchants, but are engaged in cottonseed oil milling, cotton ginning, and other local industrial activities in this country and abroad and not much affected by foreign trade and these activities contribute substantially to its profits."

STATEMENT BY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON

Mr. SHAFER has seen fit to make derogatory remarks about me on the floor of the House of Representatives. Only one of these is worthy of comment. He implies that since I have held public office I have profited from the business of the law firm in which I was formerly a partner. I resigned from membership in that firm on February 1, 1941, the day on which I took office in the Department of State. My interest in the then existing business was valued and thereafter paid to me by the remaining partners. I have had no connection with or financial interest in the business of the firm since that time.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on January 18, 1947.

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, when Adolf Hitler climbed to power in Germany one of his favorite methods of getting rid of men selected by the people was to lie about them and repeat that lie so many times that he finally made people believe it.

This devilish method is often put into effect by enemies of the people against their chosen representatives in our country. This method has been used right here against your own Congressman.

For instance, the poison-pen letter was developed by ingenious enemies some years ago in this district to smear me and to create the impression that John Q. Public was incensed over the man they had so recently elected their Congressman.

Actually, the writers of these poison-pen letters were phonies, or else stooges of the small and select fraternity of pet-hate boys whose chief pleasure is derived from mouthing invectives at yours truly.

Last week their strategy was to try to give the people the idea that I am getting more publicity than anybody else in Congress and that my unimportant chatter, as they called it, didn't deserve space anyway.

Triple Cities readers know, of course, that while some newspapers have been mighty kind to me, others haven't. They know that they can always read a lot more about certain other public officers, about their activities and personal references, than they can about me.

So the new strategy of making me look ungrateful for favors not received won't work. I will continue to resist that kind of hypocrisy just as I have the other kinds.

I realize that in fighting the smear-peddlers, I am tackling a job as difficult as David faced when he fought Goliath. They always come back with more. But my duty is to place you people on guard against such tactics and make them recognizable.

The particular smear letter, entitled "Too Much Hall," attempted to draw into the picture a distinguished Washington newswriter, Mr Cecil Dickson, of the Gannett newspapers, and use his column as a source of the contention that I am a great publicity getter.

Mr. Dickson was talking about State-wide publicity through Gannett newspapers generally and he was absolutely right. I keep close check on State news and I am well aware of the marvelous treatment given me by the Gannett News Service here in Washington. This State-wide publicity they have given me could not be bought for any price.

However, the Gannett News Service would be the first to say that I had merited the publicity or they would never have given it to me.

Today, I kept a promise I made during the recent election campaign by introducing a bill designed to help veterans.

Last fall and since then, many boys just out of service complained to me that Congress had placed a limit on their abilities

and opportunities when the ceilings were put on their earnings in connection with on-the-job training.

The Government adopted the policy of affording veterans a chance to make up for their lost time during the war by paying them extra for understudying the man on the job higher up. This is the American way. Instead of finding himself in a groove, the veteran immediately looked about him and saw the chance to get ahead by training for a better position, at the same time receiving compensation for his efforts.

This was judged as fitting and fair to our veterans who had given up so much during the war years while others more fortunate forged ahead of them.

Of course, there were some abuses. For instance, it was found in the War Department that colonels were training to be generals and getting general's salaries at Government expense. Other flagrant violations were discovered, so Congress last year was called upon to place an earning limit of $175 for single men, $200 for married men.

I agree that some limit hould have been placed on this job-training program in order to stop the abuses. But I think Congress went too far with the limit. Such action bears out the complaints I have received and therefore I am proposing to remedy this iniquity.

The bill I have introduced does not raise the allowance each veteran receives, but it gives more veterans a chance at on-the-job training. It reads as follows:

"A bill to increase the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education

"Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: '*Provided,* That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $350 per month for a veteran without a dependent or $400 per month if he has a dependent or dependents.' "

An Answer to Denials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a transcript of remarks made by me over Ed Hart's forum, Is Congress Doing Its Job, over Station WINX, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, January 19, 1947:

Mr. HART. Congressman, recently you have leveled some pretty serious charges against some high officials of the State Department. Just what do you think that the Congress of the United States should do about these men that you accuse of high crimes and misdemeanors?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Hart, the charges that I leveled against those men, principally, Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, and Will Clayton, largest single stockholder of the cotton firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co., are backed up by cold, hard, unfortunate facts. But I have only begun to tell the public and the Congress the tie-up between these men, and America's State Department policies and their own pocketbooks.

I stated, and I want to repeat, that Will Clayton, the largest stockholder of the largest cotton company on the face of the globe probably made, or will make, more money out of the British loan through sale of cotton to Great Britain, paid for by American taxpayers, than any other single individual made, or will make out of that loan.

Mr. Clayton denies this, saying that he has no connection with Anderson, Clayton & Co. except as a stockholder. But, Mr. Clayton, isn't it a fact that you own 40 percent of the stock of the largest cotton company of the world? And isn't it a fact, too, that you were one of the prime leaders negotiating the loan to Great Britain? And isn't it a fact, too, that Great Britain is our largest cotton buyer?

The fact that the British loan was authorized only a few days before the closing of the fiscal year of the books of your company means nothing. You know, Mr. Clayton, that credits are anticipated. You know that governments lend money by various means, through their banking institutions to private corporations, which purchased large quantities of American cotton. You know that commitments of the operations of companies such as Anderson, Clayton & Co. are not limited by a matter of a few days.

And here is something I would like to ask you, Mr. Clayton, if you are listening. Is it just a coincidence that the firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co. was able to buy nine cargo ships from the War Shipping Administration at knock-down prices and that these ships are being used to take cotton from Brazil to China? And is it only coincidence, Mr. Clayton, that you have worked long and hard, not only for loans to Great Britain, but to China, to Poland, to Yugoslavia, to Italy, and to every other country on earth that wants an American hand-out?

Now, Mr. Clayton, I want to ask you another question, if you are listening. Isn't it a fact that you, a prime mover in negotiating the Mexican Waterway Treaty, are profiting through that treaty by means of the development of some 200,000 acres of the richest cotton land in the Western Hemisphere located in northern Mexico? That treaty allows Mexico to get more water from the Colorado River watershed than Mexico had any idea of getting, and Mexico got this water at the expense of our western cities and our western cattle industry. Under that treaty Mexico can take up to 1,500,000 acre-feet of fresh water per year even if it dries up cattle waterholes or curtails water supplies for the cities of Los Angeles, San Diego and other cities in the West.

One other charge I want to make has to do with dealing with the enemy. Mr. Clayton, did your company deal with Brazilian and Argentine cotton firms that were on our State Department blacklist, as charged by Drew Pearson several months ago? And since there has been no denial of this charge how does it happen that your firm was not placed on that same State Department blacklist?

Mr. Clayton, why don't you resign from the State Department? Even though you were to resign, you may be sure that the Republican-controlled Congress will look into all of these dealings that I have mentioned. If the Congress were to fail to do this, the Congress would not be serving the people of the United States.

Mr. HART. Congressman SHAFER, you mentioned Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson in your opening remarks, but you have spent most of the time presenting charges against Mr. Clayton. What do you think the Congress should do about Mr. Acheson?

Mr. SHAFER. Congress should make sure he is separated from any position where he can influence American commitments to foreign nations.

In his denial of my charge that his law firm will make a million dollars if the Polish loan goes through, Mr. Acheson states that he is no longer a member of the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb; that he resigned from the firm in 1941 when he entered the State Department.

By the way, Mr. Hart, the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb is trying like the very mischief to get the Polish loan through the Senate. Naturally, the firm sees a very considerable fee in closing a deal whereby half a billion American tax-paid dollars would go to the Soviet-controlled government of Poland. Now, just how much that fee would amount to we cannot be sure because there are a lot of expenses involved, but it should run in the neighborhood of a million dollars—a million American taxpayers' dollars.

Now, Mr. Acheson says he has nothing to do with the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, but why it is, Mr. Acheson, that in the Washington telephone directory of current issue, on page 162, column 4, there appears the name of the law firm, Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb.

Now, Mr. Acheson has denied that he has any connection with this law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb since he entered the State Department, but Mr. Acheson has not denied that his former economic adviser, Mr. Donald Hiss, left the State Department to become affiliated with the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb. Mr. Acheson has not denied that Mr. Donald Hiss is a brother of Mr. Alger Hiss who resigned from Government service because his affiliations with certain one-world do-gooder, communistic, starry-eyed, crackpot left-wing groups.

Now, isn't it customary, Mr. Acheson, that when a man resigns as a member of a law firm, that the resigning member has his name taken from the telephone directory, the door of the law office and the building directory? It is only in the case of a deceased member that the name is retained in the directory for good-will purposes. And isn't it a fact that when a man permits his name to be used by a law firm that he is considered under the law as a member of that firm and is responsible as a partner in that firm?

But, Mr. Acheson, when you became Under Secretary of State should you not have made absolutely certain that your name was expunged completely from the law firm, so that the public, and those who would seek favors for foreign governments, might not be misled? But Mr. Acheson, it wasn't eliminated, any more than it was eliminated before you were fired from the Treasury Department. So, why don't you resign at once? You, too, were mixed up in that Mexican Waterway Treaty that means so much to Will Clayton.

Congress should investigate these men thoroughly so that the American taxpayer, the American businessman and the American public be no longer kept in ignorance of what these men may be doing behind the scenes.

American Business Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article entitled "American Business Opportunity," by Oscar Vogl, appearing in the December 1946 issue of Future magazine, together with a short comment by the editor:

AMERICAN BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY

(By Oscar Vogl)

(The author of this article is exceptionally well qualified to discuss the topic of export and import, as well as the establishment of an international trade fair in the United States of America. He was born abroad as the son of an American newspaperman (New York Herald) and an English lady related to royalty. Educated abroad and in the United States of America, he is free from prejudice or political bias. He has made a study of this subject for many years. During World War I he was one of the first to volunteer his services to the American Relief Committee in London. Later on he was one of the minutemen lecturers for Herbert Hoover's food conservation plan. In World War II he was a consultant on the War Production Board. He also donated his services as public relations counselor to appreciate America, speeding up war production through morale building among the workers. The late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, commented highly upor this work, as did J. Edgar Hoover and the most prominent industrialists and labor leaders. He is a prominent and well-known merchandising and public relations counselor, serving some organizations now continuously for over 15 years. We believe the subject of this article is of sufficient importance at this time for us to invite interested readers, associations, and chambers to express their views. Address all communications care of this magazine, attention the editor.—EDITOR.)

This is not written in reference to or in support of any existing political organization. It is an appeal to the business interests of the United States to expand in the direction of world trade, to take advantage of the golden opportunities that World War II has thrown into our laps, and be farsighted, efficient, and vigilant at all times.

American businessmen with foreign connections in World War I will no doubt recall many lost opportunities due to nothing else but negligence on the part of our traders and the laissez faire attitude of our State and Commerce Departments.

To take just one example—at the close of World War I warehouses in neutral ports were loaded to the gills with United States-made goods for which there was a crying need on the European continent. Yet many of these products came back to our shores merely because traders of other countries had the advantages. In Danzig, just to mention one, the commanding general appointed through our aid was a Britisher. Naturally he favored British traders. In other ports Britishers secured the orders in competition with our salesmen simply because they had the know-how, the finesse, and either lower prices or better terms.

In other markets outside of Europe we experienced similar setbacks because our traders mistook wartime demand for permanent business. It did not take Germany very long to regain her dominant position in such foreign markets as Central and South America after our bankers underwrote her enterprises and sold us many securities at high rates, which eventually tumbled to nothing.

Today we are again faced with similar obstacles and opportunities.

Before the last shot was fired, the world's traveling salesmen were on the ground with sample cases and concessions. The need to export is important in Great Britain and many other countries besides our own. It is a life-and-death struggle. We cannot expect preferential concessions or any favoritism even in view of previously granted allowances or loans. This world trade is a ruthless, cold-blooded, selfish, give and take undertaking. There is no quarter given. The foreign buyer demands the best advantages and he who can supply them, be he yellow, black, white, or blended, gets the orders.

Political compatibilities or racial relationships are all forgotten when world trade is entered into. Of course, one need not discount old-established connections, reputations for square dealing and so forth, but these generally only come into the picture when everything else is equal.

The new competition now entering the world trade arena should be of considerable concern to us, possibly the only large, free enterprise operating country left in the world.

With the made-in-Germany cartels being condemned and put out of the running, the socialized, collectivized, and government-controlled industries and agricultural production in many countries can become for us unsurmountable competitors in world markets.

Before World War II it was reported that John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers was greatly perturbed over the large purchases of United States of America made mining machinery made by the Soviet Union. He could easily visualize the lower cost production of the Russians with their dictator-controlled, underpaid, unorganized labor. Export trade removed, the United Mine Workers would be faced with a terrific unemployment situation. Other United States of America industries could easily be placed in a similar position. It so happened that World War II saved us from such a catastrophy, however, it may not be so long before a similar situation will arise again; therefore eternal vigilance and proper planning is our best protection.

When, in World War I, Lord Kitchener was made the Supreme Commander of the United Kingdom's armed forces, someone asked him what he would do. His reply was: "Only three things, organize, organize, organize!"

The best protection to retain and expand our world-wide trade connections is to organize now. Organize in such a thorough, efficient, and sound manner that we not only will hold our present world trade volume, but expand it to give us many years of prosperity and employment at a scale that will permit the continuance of the highest standard of living in the world. That, after all, is the alpha and omega of our hard-earned mass-production supremacy and the private enterprise system we, as freedom-loving people, cherish and wish to perpetuate.

The socialistic-, communistic-, and fascistic-governed countries of the world are looking upon us with jealous eyes, suspicion and fear. We are, so to say, the testing ground for the liberally inclined thinkers in all parts of this planet.

To organize now, properly for world trade supremacy, the United States can take a good lesson from the now defunct German world-trade organizations.

There is no better system that we could follow as a Nation to build up the greatest foreign trade in the world than the German plan. While the British retained their foreign trade on the old-established, know-how reputation for square dealing and quality production, the French depended on tradition, fashion, and good manners, the Germans had to go at it the hard way. They organized, organized, and organized.

That meant every German commercial attaché, every consul and consular officer, every German steamship agent, and every bank and insurance company with foreign branches and connections pooled their knowledge and information to make Germany a great world trading nation.

Promising young men, professors and technicians and military leaders were sent to the outposts after thorough training, to establish contacts. Many of these married into prominent foreign families, while others became instructors, supervisors, or military guides; thus building up a tie that brought volume trade to the Vaterland. Even Kaiser Wilhelm II, like the Prince of Wales, did not consider it undignified to promote foreign trade for his country and people. The glamour of royalty has more than once secured a favorable trade treaty. It is all in the game of power politics and world-trade domination.

In our position, we have the advantage for the present, yet we lack the moral support of our Government. Only a typical American world-trade-minded State Department supplemented by a Department of Commerce and an Agricultural Department of the highest efficiency and free from partisan political bureaucrats and directors, can be useful in such an undertaking The operations must start with the right set-up and viewpoint from the top down, and not from the bottom up.

Un-American worshipers of the totalitarian, fascistic, communistic, or even royal regimes, should not be tolerated in any branch of these services. Everyone connected with our Foreign Service should be checked and tested first for his loyalty and his belief in the American way of life, and, last, but not least, his ability. The admonition of our fighting President, Theodore Roosevelt, should be remembered and considered. "We have room in this country for but one flag—the Stars and Stripes. We have room for but one loyalty—loyalty to the United States of America. There can be no 50–50 Americanism. There is room here for only 100 percent Americanism—only those who are Americans and nothing else."

The set-up must be free from politics, nepotism, social butterflies, and striped trousers brigadiers.

The staff, from Ambassador down to the doorman at the consulate, should be imbued with the thought that only what is good for the United States of America and its people is of interest and consideration. Commercial attachés as well as consular officers and staffs should know their business and be helpful in building trade for the United States of America, manufacturers and producers. This is contrary to a report from an American exporter and importer in Central America who stated that he gets speedier, more accurate and efficient information from the British Consul than from his own.

Another ex- and importer recently advised that the American consul in an important South American port told him he had no information nor knew anything about the United States pure food laws. Still, a shipment of several tons, pertinent for the production of edible foods in the United States of America depended on this information.

In spite of our handicaps, we, of course, have among us outstanding successes in world trade. These are large, well-organized, thoroughly efficient, and merchandising-minded corporations whose reputation and success abroad would be of inestimable value to develop a bigger and better foreign trade for all manufacturers and producers in our country.

It is only fair to call attention to the exceptionally fine service, trade, and reputation built up by our leading oil men, automotive manufacturers, meat and food packers and producers, motion-picture people, agricultural implement makers, pharmaceutical firms, and many, many others. For example, in some sections of the world, one of our men's hat manufacturers and one shoe manufacturer have a reputation that cannot be equaled. These companies have pioneered for years, researched and carefully built up

market after market in spite of keen foreign competition and lack of proper support from our Government agencies. With the long-range viewpoint in mind, these people feel the need of greater cooperation to retain and expand these markets not only for themselves but others as well.

Since every change presents a new opportunity, the collapse of Germany has thrown one such chance into our very lap.

The Leipzig International Trade Fair has been established through the ages as the greatest marketing place in the world. Before Herr Hitler upset all the apple carts in Germany and eventually in all of central Europe, there gathered in the city of Leipzig in Germany each spring and each fall the prominent buyers of merchandise from all over the world. At these meetings, lasting about 2 weeks each, orders for from two hundred and fifty million to often over three hundred million dollars used to be placed with German manufacturers Many commodities such as furs, just to mention one, had established Leipzig as their marketing center for the world. Indeed, not only fur buyers, but buyers of thousands of items in all parts of the world had an annual visit to the Leipzig Trade Fair on their must list. The well-informed merchandiser had no alternative. He had to be at the fair or be considered passé.

Today there is no Leipzig trade fair worth mentioning The last one, held under Russian supervision, was a sad parody to the glorious affairs that filled a city of 500,000 population to 650,000 or over for a few days of grand parades, expositions, concerts, and international good-will building.

When all is said and done, world trade builds unity, and unity makes for better understanding of all people, races, and nationalities. Here we have it at our doorsteps—the greatest opportunity—and no action, vision, organization, or even preparation. Yes; there have been wildcat promotion attempts in various parts of the country to establish such a fair. They all fell by the wayside because the promoters lacked knowledge and only had greed in their prospectus while some chambers of commerce, minus vision and an oversupply of jealousy in their directors' meetings, could not pass a resolution.

A United States international trade fair cannot be established successfully unless it follows the pattern outlined herewith for the formation of an all-American, efficient State, Commerce, and Agricultural Department. It must have these three Government agencies as supporters, but not as guides or managers. The United States international trade fair should be organized, financed, and managed by big business and small business along sound business principles. It is a big undertaking and will take time to set up properly and will succeed only if unselfish, clear-thinking, broad-minded, highly ethical, truly American men of vision will underwrite it and help organize it now, before some other country finds it opportune to steal the show away from us.

Limitation and Control of Opium and Coca Leaves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two resolutions dealing, respectively, with measures to limit and control the world's production of opium and coca leaves from which cocaine is manufactured, and to abolish opium smoking in the Far East.

Each of these resolutions was unanimously adopted recently by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

To one who has worked before, during, and since the war, at the difficult task of trying to eliminate one of humanity's greatest curses, it is gratifying that the Social and Economic Council has established a special commission to deal with the problem and apparently intends to continue the efforts which, since 1912, had finally achieved considerable progress, though against formidable opposition.

The resolutions follow:

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL—COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS—LIMITATION OF THE PRODUCTION OF RAW MATERIALS—RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION ON DECEMBER 3, 1946

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs—

Recognizing the importance of bringing as speedy a solution as possible to the problem of limitation of production of raw materials from which narcotic drugs are manufactured;

Noting the preparatory work previously accomplished in this field;

Expressing its appreciation of the efforts of both the executive and legislative branches of the United States Government during the war to insure the continuity of this work with the object of arriving at a solution of this problem; and

Realizing on the other hand that changed circumstances rendered it necessary to collect further information in order to continue the preparatory work preliminary to an international conference on the limitation of such raw materials;

Decides—

Subject to the approval of the Economic and Social Council, to issue to governments concerned a questionnaire calling for such information, this questionnaire now to be prepared by the Secretariat in the light of the views expressed during the present session of the Commission and after the approval by the President, Vice President, and Rapporteur

To instruct the Secretariat to draw up a questionnaire on coca leaves for consideration by the Commission at its next session.

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL—COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS—ABOLITION OF OPIUM SMOKING IN THE FAR EAST—DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs—

To fulfill the stipulation embodied in article 6 of the international opium convention signed at The Hague on January 23, 1912, concerning the supression of the manufacture, internal traffic in, and use of prepared opium;

Considering that the Governments of the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, and Portugal had decided to adopt the policy of complete prohibition of opium smoking in all their territories in the Far East and had taken measures to give effect to this policy;

Recommends that the Economic and Social Council urge all countries which still legalize the use of opium for smoking to take immediate steps to prohibit the manufacture, internal traffic in, and use of such opium.

A Man Who Wants To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the far West comes the following letter from a studio worker.

The Congress still hesitates to give the Nation legislation which will permit a man, unhampered, to earn his daily bread.

A STUDIO WORKER WHO WANTS TO WORK

According to the Times, the Interfaith Council of Churches wants to see the strike in the motion picture studios settled. And our mayor, too, has come out for such a proposal. Very, very noble though a little too late, it seems to me.

During the last 24 months, I have been forced to go "on strike" and been off pay roll almost 12 months. Why? Bloodshed, intimidation, anonymous phone calls, threats.

I have no quarrel with the men and women I used to work with. We enjoyed fine conditions, swell pay, good treatment • • • and we had to go out on the picket line time after time, on some pretext or other.

Were we given the right of a secret ballot? No! If we wanted to stay in this business and remain healthy, we had to do as we were told.

Now if the churches and the mayor really want to do something for us, how about giving us the right of a secret ballot? How about letting the rank and file, rather than a bunch of Commies, decide our fate?

Where were the churches and the mayor when we had to pound the pavement for 8 months last year? And now we've been out over 3 months again.

I have never written a letter to a newspaper before. If I want to stay healthy I can't let you sign my name to it. So I am asking the Times to tell the churches and the mayor to let us, the poor suckers who have to pay the price, say that we want to go back to work. We want the right to work. We want to run our own unions not by fear, or threats, but in an American, democratic fashion.

I have been a union member for over 20 years. I hope the new Congress outlaws jurisdictional strikes, and makes suffering such as I had to endure impossible for the future. Yes, the churches and the mayor can help. Give us a secret ballot and help us get rid of our so-called leaders.

A STUDIO WORKER.

LOS ANGELES.

The Road to Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of January 20, 1947:

THE ROAD TO PEARL HARBOR

Published today is a book which we think had better be bought, read, inwardly digested, and carefully kept for future reference by all Americans who hope to see the mystery of Pearl Harbor some day fully and finally solved.

The book is Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War, by George Morgenstern; Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1947; 425 pages, 4 maps, exhaustive index and appendix; $3.

It has to do, of course, with the most disastrous and disgraceful defeat ever yet inflicted on American armed forces by land, sea, or air—the Japanese body blow that might have been a death blow, dealt us at Pearl Harbor, T. H., on Sunday morning, December 7, 1941.

The book's author—a long-time newspaperman, who during the late war was a Marine Corps Reserve captain directing the marine combat correspondents—has summed up in this volume all the facts which have become public to date with reference to the historic calamity.

Mr. Morgenstern has done the job, too, in a hard-hitting and hard-boiled style which makes the book as interesting as some of the better current murder stories.

And the book is a sort of murder story, since it concerns the slaughter of 2,326 American fighting men in a raid of which they had no warning.

Why weren't they warned? The Roosevelt administration had been inviting a Japanese attack for months. Matters had reached the ultimatum and deadlock stage between Washington and Tokyo by November 26.

It is the thesis of this book that Roosevelt wanted war—with Japan or Germany, or preferably both; that he knew some 80 percent of the American people wanted to stay out of the war; and that he refrained from alerting our Pacific outposts, though knowing Japan would soon attack, so that our men would be caught asleep and Roosevelt could quickly fan up a war fever and smother all his critics with a howl that this Nation had been treacherously assaulted.

Though Roosevelt is not blamed exclusively for the Pearl Harbor massacre, this book lays a large part of the blame at his door—and nails it down with hundreds of citations of recorded testimony.

It seems to us that publication of Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War should be a signal for yet another Pearl Harbor investigation—this time by a Congress controlled by Republicans and therefore in a position to dig out most, if not all, of the facts which the New Dealers up to now have been able to keep concealed.

Ogden Mills Reid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Ogden Mills Reid," which appeared in the Daily Times, published at Mamaroneck, N. Y., on Wednesday, January 8, 1947:

OGDEN MILLS REID

Westchester especially mourns the passing of Ogden Mills Reid, president, publisher, and editor of the New York Herald Tribune, because not only the life of this outstanding journalist but the careers of his forebears were intertwined with the country's development.

It was at Ophir Hall in Purchase, family homestead, that Whitelaw Reid, father, received official notification in 1892 of his nomination for the Vice Presidency, with Benjamin Harrison heading the ticket. It was there that Ogden Reid spent many happy days of his youth, a period wherein he learned to love Westchester, an affection which never died. And it was, therefore, most fitting that when he was laid away to rest yesterday afternoon, this, too, should be in Westchester, amidst the peaceful hills sloping gently to the Hudson, in the quietude of Sleepy Hollow Cemetery, above the Tarrytowns.

Ogden Reid was a man who accomplished much with little noise. His famed father bequeathed to him the New York Tribune, one of many struggling periodicals in a period of bitter economic rivalry. By persistence, vision, and courage he built this publication, through a fortuitous merger with the equally celebrated New York Herald, into a newspaper of international significance and respect.

Yet during those long years of effort, and later when success had crowned the venture, Mr. Reid never sought personal honors, never asked political preferment, and never forgot that his service to the public came first.

Always there was sincere effort to make honest presentment of the news the scale upon which the newspaper was to rise or fall. In time there was added the courageous policy of flat refusal of advertising which did not conform to the same standard, a field wherein the Tribune once led the entire journalistic profession. And these sound standards, faithfully followed, resulted in the existence today of a living memorial to the man who inspired the ideals.

This newspaper, in company with a host of others throughout the Nation, extends to Mrs. Reid and the children its deepest sympathy.

We have lost a good neighbor.

Amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, from March 1933 through the Seventy-eighth Congress most of the so-called social legislation enacted was written and sponsored by the executive branch of the Government. Some of these laws, and particularly the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act, have been administered and interpreted in so partisan a manner that their pronounced objectives have been seriously impaired. Little or no effort has been made to safeguard the public interest or to give equal protection under the law to employers as well as employees. Those entrusted with the administration of these laws in many instances have wantonly disregarded the plain intent of the Congress to correct existing evils and have encouraged unscrupulous people to commit acts of lawlessness against the persons and property of thousands of law-abiding employees as well as employers, to threaten the health and economic well-being of millions of citizens, to challenge our American way of life, and to jeopardize the security of our country.

In November 1946 the American people revolted against this impossible situation and elected a Republican Congress. There is no doubt that they have given a mandate to the Republican Party to correct the shortcomings of New Deal labor legislation.

As chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor I shall try to carry out what I conceive to be the express will of our citizens. My primary purpose will be to see that all labor legislation enacted by the Congress will consider, first, the public welfare, and, secondly, equal justice and protection under the law to employees and employers. It will be my earnest endeavor to establish the relationship between labor and management on an even keel. An earnest effort will be made to amend all labor laws which violate these principles.

In furtherance of this program I have prepared and introduced a bill to amend and clarify the Fair Labor Standards Act. In this bill I have attempted to solve a problem and clear inequalities created by the Supreme Court in its recent decision on the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. case. This decision by the Court has established a precedent which threatens the financial structure of our free-enterprise system and the integrity of collective bargaining. By straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, the Supreme Court has violated its own established rules and misinterpreted the plain intent of Congress in authorizing the award of overtime pay and compensatory damages for such activities as walking from the time clock to one's post of duty, changing clothes, and so forth.

The bill which I have introduced speaks for itself. It is not punitive. On the contrary it is designed to thwart a punitive action. The bill does not deprive labor of any moral or legal right under the Fair Labor Standards Act, but it does prohibit legalized grand larceny.

On Monday, January 20, Mr. Pressman, counsel of the CIO, testified before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. He is reported to have recommended that the billions of dollars in portal-to-portal claims already filed and to be filed by the unions should be settled through collective bargaining. This, of course, is unthinkable. The Government must cease to compromise principles for votes. Administrative agencies and the courts must cease encroaching upon the lawmaking powers of the Congress, and the Congress must restore public confidence in our Constitution and in government by law. While I am chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor that will be my objective.

[From the Washington Post]

PORTAL DEFENSE

Lee Pressman, CIO general counsel, told a Senate subcommittee that the future operation of the Fair Labor Standards Act would be threatened if pending Senate measures to disallow portal-to-portal pay claims were enacted. In our opinion the greatest threat to the Fair Labor Standards Act stems from the distorted interpretation of the purpose and meaning of the law which led the Su-

preme Court to validate exorbitant claims for back pay.

If Mr. Pressman is really anxious to retain for labor the benefits of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the wise procedure, it seems to us, would be to support efforts to clarify the law and bring it into conformity with the plain intention of Congress. Otherwise, opposition to the act growing out of the Supreme Court's loose definition of what constitutes working time for which employees must be paid may result in much more drastic revisions of the present law than are now contemplated.

As a matter of fact, labor stands to gain a great deal more than it will lose by the legal outlawing of suits for back pay under portal-to-portal rulings. For if such claims are relentlessly prosecuted, many firms faced with huge claims for back pay and damages will offer strong resistance to demands for further wage increases, while others would be forced into bankruptcy. So far as we can see, about the only people who stand to gain in the long run by prosecuting these back-pay claims are the lawyers who, according to Senator CAPEHART, expect to get a large slice of the amounts recovered in the form of fees.

In the past, payment for time spent on employers' premises has, as a rule, been indirectly allowed for in fixing the terms of an agreement. Moreover, as President Green of the AFL pointed out in a recent letter to member unions, "What constitutes time worked for the purpose of figuring straight-time and overtime compensation can best be determined by labor and management over the bargaining table." Even Mr. Pressman, while opposing individual settlements, advocates legislation authorizing employers and unions to settle outstanding portal-pay claims through collective bargaining. The constitutional objections that can be raised in connection with all pending bills relating to retroactive claims apply likewise to Mr. Pressman's proposal, which would have the further disadvantage of leaving industry still saddled with billions of dollars of claims for back pay without any assurance that reasonable settlements of such claims could be negotiated.

Summary of Federal Tort Claims Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the following summary of the recently enacted Federal Tort Claims Act, which was prepared under the direction of and made the subject of an address delivered by J. Vincent Keogh, United States attorney for the eastern district of New York, at a regular meeting of the Brooklyn Bar Association.

It is hoped that the summary will be of assistance to those who might possibly have rights under the act. It follows:

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

(Enacted August 2, 1946—Public Law 601, ch. 753, secs. 401–424)

This statute permits tort actions against the United States on claims growing out of negligence committed by employees of the Government on and after January 1, 1945. Whether an act is negligent and whether recovery lies is determined by the law of the place the act was committed.

The statute generally is divided into two categories:

1. Where the claim is $1,000 or less.
2. Where the claim is in any amount.

DEFINITIONS

"Federal Agency":

Includes: Executive departments; independent establishments of the United States; corporations whose primary function is to act as, and while acting as, instrumentalities of the United States whether or not authorized to sue and be sued in their own name.

Excludes: Any contractor with the United States.

"Employee of the Government":

Officers or employees of any Federal agency.

Members of the military or naval forces of the United States.

Persons acting on behalf of a Federal agency in any official capacity temporarily in the service of the United States whether with or without compensation.

"Acting within the scope of his office or employment":

With respect to the military, means acting in the line of duty.

1. Where claim is $1,000 or less:

(a) Claim in the above amount can be submitted to the head of each Federal agency, and he has the right to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and settle such claim.

(b) Any such award or determination is final and conclusive on all officers of the Government (except when procured by fraud).

(c) Any award made shall be paid by the head of the Federal agency out of appropriations hereby authorized.

(d) Acceptance of the award by the claimant is final and constitutes bar to further action either against the United States or against the employee committing the act.

(e) The head of the agency shall annually make a report to Congress of all claims paid by the agency. The report shall include the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claim.

2. Where claim is in any amount:

(a) Suit may be started against the United States under the following conditions:

(1) Exclusive jurisdiction is in Federal district court.

(2) Must be brought in court where plaintiff is resident or where act was committed.

(3) No jury trial.

(4) United States is not liable for interest prior to judgment.

(5) United States is not liable for punitive damages.

(6) Successful claimant is entitled to costs which shall not include attorney's fees.

(b) (1) Judgment in a suit is a complete bar against further action by the claimant as against the employee committing the act.

(2) Where a claimant has submitted his claim to the head of an agency for settlement ($1,000 or less) he cannot bring suit unless final disposition has been made of his claim, provided—

(A) The claimant may withdraw his claim from consideration upon 15 days written notice and then start an action; provided further that:

(B) Where his claim is disposed of or he withdraws it, he cannot sue for a sum larger than the amount he presented to the Federal agency unless he shows that the increased amount is based on newly discovered evidence not reasonably discoverable at the time he present the claim to the agency.

(C) Where the head of an agency disposes of a claim, such disposition shall not be competent evidence of liability or amount in proceedings where suit is brought.

REVIEW

(a) Final judgments of the district court are reviewable by appeal in the CCA in the same manner as other judgments of the district court or

(b) In the Court of Claims of the United States provided that the notice of appeal filed in the district court under rule 73 shall have the written consent of all the appellees that the appeal be taken to such court. Appeals to the Court of Claims must be taken within 3 months after entry of judgment in the district court.

COMPROMISE

The Attorney General is authorized to compromise or settle any claim after suit is instituted with the approval of the court in which the suit is pending.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

(a) Claims of $1,000 or less are barred unless presented in writing to the agency out of whose activities it arises within 1 year of the enactment of the statute or 1 year after claim is accrued, whichever is later.

(b) Suits are barred unless begun within the 1-year period as above described.

(c) Where a claim not exceeding $1,000 is presented to an agency the time to institute a suit therein is extended for a period of 6 months after the date of mailing notice to the claimant of final disposition; or from the date of withdrawal of the claim, if it would otherwise expire before the end of such period.

EXCEPTIONS

The statute lists 12 exceptions under which no action or claim lies.

ATTORNEYS' FEES

(a) Where head of agency makes an award in claim not exceeding $1,000; where the recovery is $500 or more the attorney may be allowed up to 10 percent of the amount recovered.

(b) If suit is brought, the attorney may be allowed up to 20 percent of amount recovered.

(c) The attorney's fees are to be paid out of, but not in addition to, the amount of judgment or award.

(d) Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects more than the statutory allowances shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both.

EXCLUSIVE OF REMEDY

From the date of enactment of this act, any claims cognizable under this state, shall be brought against the United States regardless of the authority of any Federal agency to sue and be sued in its own name.

EXCEPTIONS

SEC. 421. The provisions of this title shall not apply to:

(a) Any claim based upon an act or omission of an employee of the Government, exercising due care, in the execution of a statute or regulation, whether or not such statute or regulation be valid, or based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a Federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused.

(b) Any claim arising out of the loss, miscarriage, or negligent transmission of letters or postal matter.

(c) Any claim arising in respect of the assessment or collection of any tax or customs duty, or the detention of any goods or merchandise by an officer of customs or excise or any other law-enforcement officer.

(d) Any claim for which a remedy is provided by the act of March 9, 1920 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 741–752, inclusive) or the act of March 3, 1925 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 781–790, inclusive), relating to claims or suits in admiralty against the United States.

(e) Any claim arising out of an act or omission of any employee of the Government in administering the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended

(f) Any claim for damages caused by the imposition or establishment of a quarantine by the United States.

(g) Any claim arising from injury to vessels, or the cargo, crew or passengers of vessels, while passing through the locks of the Panama Canal or while in Canal Zone waters.

(h) Any claim arising out of assault, battery, false imprisonment, false arrest, malicious prosecution, abuse of process, libel, slander, misrepresentation, deceit, or interference with contract rights.

(i) Any claim for damages caused by the fiscal operations of the Treasury or by the regulation of the monetary system.

(j) Any claim arising out of the combatant activities of the military or naval forces, or the Coast Guard, during time of war.

(k) Any claim arising in a foreign country.

(l) Any claim arising from the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Late Gen. Dan I. Sultan

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I call the attention of the House to the death of one of the distinguished citizens of my State, a native son, born and reared in Oxford, Miss., Gen. Dan I. Sultan, a member of a distinguished family of Lafayette County. General Sultan died here in the last week. The House was not in session at that time, which is the reason comment is made today. Gen. Sultan was well known in Washington, where he served as resident Commissioner during the 1930's. He was equally as well known throughout the military establishment, and to the people of the United States. Three times he received the Distinguished Service Medal for his work with the military department of our Government. He succeeded General Stilwell in the Chinese-Burma theater of the war, where he rendered outstanding service. Upon his return to the United States General Sultan became Inspector General. We are extremely regretful to know of his untimely passing. The State of Mississippi has lost a splendid citizen, a citizen of national stature, and a great soldier. We shall miss him in the years to come.

Mark Thistlethwaite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial concerning the death of Mark Thistlethwaite, taken from the Fort Wayne, Ind., Journal-Gazette of Friday, January 17:

MARK THISTLETHWAITE

When Mark Thistlethwaite, the Journal-Gazette's Washington correspondent for more than a quarter of a century, died suddenly Tuesday afternoon, top Government officials from the White House down paid tribute to his worth as a journalist and a man.

These tributes were well deserved, for Mr. Thistlethwaite embodied the highest capabilities and ideals of his profession. His knowledge of the Washington scene was intimate. He possessed a sound sense of news, judgment, accuracy, integrity, industry, and a clear style.

That he was held in the highest regard by his fellow correspondents is attested by the fact that he had served as secretary of the National Press Club, as president and acting secretary of the famous Gridiron Club, and as chairman of the standing committee of the Capitol Press Gallery.

Mr. Thistlethwaite was born in Richmond, Ind. He was graduated from the Richmond High School and Swarthmore College, and then entered the newspaper field, working in Philadelphia and Indianapolis

He became secretary to Gov. Thomas R. Marshall in 1909 and continued to serve as secretary to Marshall during his two terms as Vice President of the United States from 1913 to 1921. Since the latter year he had been a Washington correspondent until the time of his death. He was regarded as the dean of the capital correspondents' corps.

Of the 530 Members of Congress today, only 3 were in Washington when Mr. Thistlethwaite arrived there with Vice President Marshall in 1913.

Indiana has produced many outstanding newspapermen, but none of them was more widely known or more esteemed than Mark Thistlethwaite, whose by-line was so familiar to Journal-Gazette readers. He was for all his experience a kindly, lovable gentleman.

To his widow and other surviving members of his family we extend sincere sympathy.

Who Pays for the Smears?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, many now in the House will recall how over the years Members of this House, and I was among the ones elected and reelected by our people who know us and our records, were characterized as being seditious, nonpatriotic, unfit to sit in Congress by anyone like Winchell, a notorious liar, scandalmonger, a disgrace to the Navy uniform which he once wore, an example of almost everything which an American should not be; by Carlson, contemptible, lying pup; by Birkhead, the renegade minister, and others of their ilk. Yes, the American people would like to know who pays these preachers of class hatred, these creators and disseminators of falsehoods.

John T. Flynn has rendered a distinctive service to the public by telling us of some of them. From the Chicago Tribune, which in the eyes of the internationalistic world wreckers should be blacklisted because it is pro-American, comes the following editorial:

WHO PAYS FOR THE SMEARS?

John T. Flynn has just finished in the columns of the Tribune a definitive account of the filthy brigade of liars for hire, who, for a fee, will organize a campaign to blacken the reputation of any decent American citizen who has enemies willing to pay for the smear job. They are, taken as a group, as insignificant as they are unsavory.

Among them is Rex Stout, the organizer of hate societies, and his comrade in infamy, Birkhead, a discredited preacher who used to be a hack writer for Haldeman-Julius, the publisher of atheist books. There is Leslie, another preacher without a pulpit, who specializes in the anti-Catholic propaganda that is part of the Communist Party line. There is Gailmor, the convicted thief, and Plotkin, the drunken psychopath, who writes obscenity to order. There is Derounian, the writer of anti-Semitic pamphlets, who turned from that occupation to the composition of a book of libels which, with the aid of the New Deal, made some hundreds of thousands of dollars for him and his money-hungry publishers, Dutton & Co.

These people have been astonishingly successful in some of their campaigns of vilification. Because Charles A. Lindbergh opposed the war, Stout, Birkhead, and others organized a campaign of vituperation that convinced an astonishing number of unthinking people that he was friendly to the Nazis. Actually, as Mr. Flynn showed, Lindbergh's contacts with the Nazis were made at the request of the American Government, for the purpose of obtaining information about Hitler's aviation that our State Department and military attachés had been unable to get. The New Deal administration, having received Lindbergh's patriotic services, permitted him to be smeared without saying a single word to refute the libels that it knew were libelous.

Plotkin, with money furnished in New York, wrote as election propaganda a book attacking Senator Burton Wheeler that is so filthy that it cannot even be quoted. Senator JOHNSON, of Colorado, a member of the committee that investigated the smear plot against Wheeler, declared on reading the book that the only method of dealing with a person like Plotkin was with a horsewhip. The New Dealers, however, snuffed out the investigation before the trail reached the higher-ups in the plot.

These smear artists have been exposed. Some of their libels have been proved in court and damages have been assessed. Publicity has destroyed the smearers' reputations, or such as they had to lose, and any lies that they may invent in the future have thereby been discredited. They, however, are of secondary importance.

The greater offenders are the people of pretended respectability who have provided the money to finance these vicious activities. Under the New Deal control of Congress these slanderers and libelers were largely successful in keeping secret their own financial records and those of the paper organizations that they operate. Under the new Republican Congress they must not be permitted to operate any longer in the dark. Congress, in investigating these organizations, must throw the light of publicity on the purchasers of vilification.

California Veteran Population Still Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

in the Appendix of the RECORD the following facts concerning the increase in veteran population in California:

As new figures on veteran populations and veteran migration trends are released it becomes more and more evident that California will continue to be the leading center of veteran population and of need for service to veterans, especially in the field of employment.

A united effort on the part of every community through veterans' organizations, employers, labor organizations, service centers, and business groups is necessary to assure proper readjustment of these veterans to the economic life of the Nation. The Veterans' Employment Service and the California State Employment Service are ready and equipped to do their part in the development of jobs and the placement of veterans, but they cannot be successful without the help and cooperation of the community groups.

The Selective Service figures as of early December show 1,089,052 were inducted through California draft boards. Of these 1,072,030 are listed as returned and 17,000 as casualties. These figures do not include the militia, veterans of other wars and immigrant veterans, estimated at about 800,000.

National figures as of October 31, 1946, set the veteran population of the country at 17,900,000, with California estimated as having 10 percent of the total. It is estimated that veterans and their families now constitute 60 percent of the national population.

An idea of the migration trend is indicated by a snap check on December 15 of 100 separation notices of all services from widely separated centers. Out of the 100, thirty-one stated they expected to seek work in California, although enlisting from another State. The Veterans' Administration conducted a survey in San Francisco, October 26 to November 4, of 2,700 veterans. Of these 1,254 hailed from every State in the Union except Vermont and planned to make their home in California.

Labor-Management Argument—Minnesota Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, beginning last September two of the Nation's greatest newspapers, the Minneapolis Star and the Minneapolis Tribune, have been running in Time magazine a series of advertisements on the advantages of Minnesota as a place in which to live and work.

At a time when labor-management problems are on every thoughtful person's mind, it is worth calling to the country's attention the extraordinary record of not a day lost by strike in any of Minnesota's many war industries from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day. I am only sorry it is not possible to reproduce here the tantalizing picture of employer and employee fishing in one of Minnesota's thousands of beautiful lakes.

The matter referred to follows:

LABOR-MANAGEMENT ARGUMENT—MINNESOTA STYLE

During one of the country's worst strike crises, a Minnesota labor organization bought newspaper space to announce cheerfully to a troubled nation that, in Minnesota, workers would rather fish with the boss than fight with him. It's better for both labor and management to reach a sportsmanlike agreement by themselves, said the ad, because "you can't go fishin' with a Government bureau."

Influenced by a way of life unusual in America, Minnesotans have a common-sense approach to such problems that reflects the self-reliant, satisfying outdoor life they live. For this is the State of good neighbors; of hunters and fishermen; of golden prairies, blue lakes, green forests; the State of beautiful cities and small towns where industry and culture thrive with the unspoiled wilderness only a few hours away.

This Minnesota way of life—how does it concern you? In this logical way: It has attracted and held a people of exceptional intelligence and literacy, a people of skill and stability. If you are a producer of articles of high value and small bulk, like the automatic-control equipment of Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., or the abrasives and Scotch-brand tapes of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., St. Paul, perhaps you, too, will find that these Minnesotans are good workers to know. An internationally known engineering firm says, "The great asset of Minnesota is the unique skill and intelligence of its people."

A million of these able, industrious Minnesotans live in and around Minneapolis and St. Paul. A hundred thousand more live in An erica's second-busiest port, Duluth, on Lake Superior. Others live in the many attractive small cities of Minnesota. If human skill and dependability are important in your business, look for them here.

Why not get personally acquainted with Minnesotans and the Minnesota way of life?

The Salvation Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, under the auspices of the Salvation Army, over radio station WJZ, New York City, Sunday evening, January 5, 1947:

As you know, I have but recently returned from a world-wide business trip which took me to many countries in Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific area. During this trip I talked with many persons—statesmen, businessmen, scientists, soldiers—indeed to men and women in all conditions and walks of life.

The future held many uncertainties for them and they were obviously confused by the condition in which they found themselves. Among the uncertainties which I found disturbing them was the prospect of a third world war. On all sides they saw, as I saw as my trip progressed, huge standing armies, young and healthy men in uniform who could better have been tilling the soil, or doing the most necessary work of reconstruction.

They wanted to see those men out of uniform and they wanted the bulk of the armies demobilized because they felt that this would be a step toward world disarmament and eventually to permanent peace. I need not argue the soundness of this idea. I know that disarmament is what the people of the world want. I believe that we Americans want the reduction of armies, but in full cooperation with the other nations of the earth, to the end that the great burden of armaments may be lifted from the people and shall cease to menace their peace.

But there is one army, a true international army, which must never be demobilized. It should, indeed, increase. It has been in the battle for years, but the only blood upon its banner is that of its own martyrs. It has unceasingly carried forward the word of God and the message of human compassion since the day of its founding.

It has always pursued a steady campaign of assistance and encouragement to all who needed it, no matter what their politics, their nationality, their church, or their religious belief or their lack of it.

It is the one standing army the world really needs—the Salvation Army.

I don't propose to make a detailed speech here about the many and obvious virtues of the Salvation Army. No words of mine could brighten its record of service in the two great wars of our time. The men who fought those wars will always remember the Salvation lassie with tender affection.

And just as the blue and red uniform was a familiar sight to our soldiers, so it is to us at home. I wonder if perhaps it is not a too-familiar sight—if by casual acceptance of the ever-present Salvation Army uniform we do not forget the things it represents.

Most of us know of the religious side of the Salvation Army. We accept the zeal of its soldiers and officers. We know of its constant service to God through help to the helpless, but I am not sure that all of us know how extensive is the Salvation Army's work behind the scenes.

How many know that the Salvation Army operates hospitals, or that it gave assistance to 11,000 prisoners and parolees last year? How many know that more than 30,000 days of care were given to children in the army's day nurseries and shelter homes?

These things go on all the time. Character-building youth clubs, vocational-guidance centers, summer camps for young and old alike, homes for the unfortunate, inexpensive and respectable lodging for working girls. It seems to me that the list is endless, but I am assured that the Salvation Army operates only 60 religious and welfare institutions here.

Sixty institutions—each one developed to meet a human need; each one operated solely on the basis of that need without regard for color, creed, or politics. Truly this is the army that the world really needs. This is the army of which the city, Nation, and the world can well be proud.

Insofar as possible, the Salvation Army pays its own way. In its rehabilitation of the fallen it stresses the dignity and self-respect of honest work, and, as a byproduct of this policy, gains some revenue from the paid work of the men themselves. Some, but not all, of the lodging houses break even.

But there are many, many vital services of the Salvation Army from which there can be no cash return. Almost every service to the needy, to mothers, to children, to the aged, and to the prisoners and parolees must necessarily operate at an economic loss since these are people who cannot pay.

Nevertheless, by its extreme efficiency and the devotion of its workers, the Salvation

Army manages to so conserve its resources as to enable it to provide $2.50 in service for every $1 it must ask from the public.

And now it must ask $1,000,000 to enable it to continue at full strength through the next year and to meet the unexpected crises of this peaceful postwar life. For that million, remember, it will provide two and one-half in service.

Two and a half for one, my friends, is a bargain at any time. When paid in the humanitarian currency of the Salvation Army it grows tenfold in value.

Now I'm not going to exhort you to get out and work for this cause. I'm not going to plead with you to contribute. I think it would be presumptuous because I am convinced that all who hear me now and millions of others will agree that the Salvation Army must not be allowed to fail. I am convinced that you and they will work and will contribute out of your own generous hearts without prompting from me.

I want only to remind you that the need is great and the time is now. Thank you.

Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, January 19 was the birthday of one of the greatest Americans who ever lived, Gen. Robert E. Lee. Magnanimous in victory, devoid of bitterness in defeat, he transmitted to posterity a name unsullied, a record untarnished, and a character symbolic of every virtue worthy of emulation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include as a tribute to his grandeur the following editorial from the Lynchburg News of January 20, 1947:

A SUCCESSFUL MAN

Eighty-two years have elapsed since Robert E. Lee ended a military career that had defeat for its climax and eternal fame as its reward, and began a brief career as educator and leader and guide of youth. Seventy-seven years have passed since death ended his activities in every field of physical endeavor and gave him to posterity as an example to all men living and yet to live.

That is a period but little more than an average life time, but a period long enough for a name to become established as a star in the firmament, a spiritual guide to innumerable generations of his own country and the countries of the world.

Innumerable lessons have been drawn from the life of this remarkable man, whose greatness was matched by his nobility, but surely not the least of them is one the world needs today, needs always. It is that there is something greater than success if success is measured by material accomplishment. There is no law on the statute books of any nation bearing the name of Lee. There is no great industrial enterprise that owes its greatness to him. There is no territory in all the wide expanse of a gigantic Nation that was acquired by him or through any effort of his. He founded no great university and to the university that glories in possession of his name he contributed no money, no fine buildings, no life time of guidance. His greatest military venture ended in the collapse of the cause for which he fought. The college over which he presided was a struggling institution at the time of his death. Yet the man does not live, though he be steeped in cynicism and wrestle with a sense of frustration, who would call his life a failure, call it anything but a glorious success. There's hardly a man, though his egotism be gigantic, his appetite for fame gargantuan, who would not trade every success he has achieved, or surrender prospect of every success of which he dreams, for the failure of Robert E. Lee.

Materialism is no more the curse of today than of any other day and idealism is no more scorned or wrongly defined. Yesterday, today, tomorrow—all are the moments for contemplation of Lee's life and character, for attempts at full realization of the truth that success is not necessary to man's growth and fruition, that what a man is takes precedence over what a man does, that while achievement is the goal the pathway chosen to its attainment and the integrity of his soul as he pushes on are the things that make for the only real greatness. Material success is to be sought, but greater is that spiritual success which is all a man can leave as heritage to his people and without which nothing is worth while. By that test Robert E. Lee was the world's most successful man.

Infant Mortality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant on Monday, January 20, 1947:

INFANT MORTALITY

A baby born in Connecticut is a mighty lucky little person, for the simple reason that his chance for surviving the dangerous period of infancy is greater than almost anywhere else in the world. This fact was revealed in the recently published report of the United States Public Health Service. It showed that infant mortality in the United States had declined to 38.3, the lowest in history, and was bettered only by Australia with 29.4 and Sweden 29.6. Connecticut's record was far superior to most sections of the country with an infant mortality rate of 29.9.

One of the principal factors in this declining death rate, according to the Public Health Service, is the higher proportion of births occurring in hospitals. In 1945, the latest year for which complete statistics were available, 78.8 percent of all births registered occurred in hospitals and other institutions.

Here in Hartford this greatly increased use of hospitals for maternity cases is reflected in figures that have been mounting steadily. For example, in one recent 24-hour period 29 babies, 17 boys and 12 girls, were delivered at the Hartford Hospital, equaling the all-time record for that institution. Similar acceleration of activity is reported by other hospitals. These splendid services, unfortunately, are too often taken for granted. But they constitute only one of many reasons why these hospitals have a real claim on both the affections and the pocketbooks of those who benefit from them.

The splendid record established by Connecticut should be no cause for smugness. Rather it should inspire a feeling of thankfulness that we are so well served, and hopefulness that even this good record will be bettered, not only in Connecticut, but in the rest of the world.

The Failure of Repeal; the Return of Prohibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following speech delivered by Rev. Sam Morris, of San Antonio, Tex., on January 17, 1947:

National prohibition went into effect on January 16, 1920, and was repealed on December 5, 1933. We had 13 years of national prohibition; we have now had 13 years of repeal and much of the Nation is going back to prohibition.

PROHIBITION BY LOCAL OPTION

Massachusetts has 65 towns and townships with populations ranging from 40,000 down that prohibit the sale of all beer, wine, and whisky. New Hampshire has about a hundred such dry towns and townships; Vermont has 120; Maine over 300; Wisconsin, 350; Ohio, 450; Pennsylvania, 650; and the State of Illinois over a thousand with nearly 2,000,000 people living in them.

The State of Virginia has several whole counties that are dry. Louisiana has 16 dry parishes, Minnesota 20 dry counties; the drys have won 32 of the last 37 county-wide liquor elections in Arkansas; Georgia has 67 counties that are dry; Alabama 47 dry counties and only 20 that permit the legal sale of beverage alcohol; Mississippi has 53 of her 82 counties that prohibit the sale of all beer, wine, or whisky; and the State of Kentucky, known around the world for its famous brands of liquor, has 92 wholly dry counties, 14 others that are partially dry, and only 14 left that are wholly wet. The State of Texas has 139 dry counties, and a recent newspaper survey revealed that 53 percent of the people 21 years of age or above would vote for State-wide prohibition if faced with the opportunity. The latest Gallup poll showed 33 percent of the American voters across the Nation as a whole favoring national prohibition.

REPEAL HAS FAILED

Advocates of repeal said there would be less drinking and it would promote temperance. Let the records speak. Ink on the repeal amendment was hardly dry before the commercial liquor interests launched a multi-million-dollar sales campaign employing all the modern devices and technique of present-day advertising and designed to make housewives, young women, and mothers regular drinkers, as well as the men and boys. Big blazing billboards, flaming neon signs, popular home magazines, national newsweek publications, metropolitan dailies, and country newspapers flaunt this brazen prodrinking propaganda before the eyes of the American public at every turn. Movies are filled with drinking scenes of beautiful stage and screen stars drinking beer, wine, cocktails, and highballs. National radio networks, regional networks, special networks, and most of the individual radio stations carry regularly scheduled and widely adver-

tised beer- and wine-sponsored broadcasts that pour a steady stream of glamorized, fun-seasoned, music-flavored, prodrinking propaganda appeals into the American home by the family firesides among the tender young children just the same as adults.

INCREASED CONSUMPTION

The pay-off has been an ever-rising tide of liquor-drinking. In 1934—the first full year of repeal—the per capita consumption of beverage alcohol was approximately 10 gallons; by 1941 it had increased to 15 gallons; it climbed to 18 gallons in 1943; and by 1945 it was over 20 gallons for every man, woman, and little child in the Nation.

In 1945, part of the year during a bloody global war and the rest of the year while millions starved for bread in foreign lands, the American people drank the stupendous sum of 110,000,000 gallons of wine, 190,000,000 gallons of distilled spirits, and 2,527,000,000 gallons of beer, for which they paid the mammoth amount of nearly $8,000,000,000.

That's how repeal has promoted temperance.

No wonder our court dockets are crowded and our penal institutions are packed and jammed with cases involving liquor.

No wonder 17-year-old boys lead our $16,000,000,000-a-year crime parade in this country.

No wonder wrecked homes and divorce proceedings have multiplied and grown with every passing year of repeal.

No wonder city jails are full of drunks; drunken women stagger on our streets, and drunken drivers race our highways, turning them into bloody slaughter lanes.

BOOTLEGGERS FLOURISH

Advocates of repeal said it would lawfully regulate the liquor industry and stop bootlegging. The traffic is as lawless as ever. You had as well talk about regulating thunder and lightning by law: you had as well talk about regulating rattlesnakes or hornets by law. Last year with over 400,000 legal outlets operating full blast the Federal agents broke up 1,645 moonshine stills and caught 1,666 bootleggers in the wet State of Georgia; they broke up 1,385 moonshine stills and caught 1,450 bootleggers in the wet State of North Carolina; they broke up 1,158 moonshine stills and caught 550 bootleggers in South Carolina—that State doesn't permit local option and doesn't have a foot of prohibition territory in it; they broke up 847 moonshine stills and caught 1,255 bootleggers in wet Alabama; they broke up 492 moonshine stills and caught 650 bootleggers in wet Virginia; they broke up 485 moonshine stills and caught 685 bootleggers in wet Florida; and in Kentucky, with 73 legal distilleries and 6 legal breweries running full blast day and night, they broke up 302 moonshine stills and caught 522 bootleggers. In all across the Nation last year the Federal agents broke up more than 8,000 moonshine stills and caught over 11,000 bootleggers.

NEW DEAL SALOONS WORSE

Advocates of repeal said the old saloon would not come back. Prohibition closed 177,000 old saloons. Repeal opened some 400,000 New Deal, raw deal, repeal drink shops. But, of course, they are not called saloons. They are called cafes, filling stations, drug stores, package stores, night clubs, cocktail lounges, Dine and Dance, First Chance, Last Chance, Bloody Bucket, Brown Derby, Tip Top, Pea Patch, Blue Moon, Pale Moon, Quarter Moon, Full Moon, Silver Spoon, Silver Slipper, etc.—a thousand and one names but you never see the word saloon.

We changed the name on the front of the building, but we didn't change the stuff in the bottle.

The old saloon is not back.

But the old drink is back.

You may paint a pump handle until you are black in the face but that won't change the water in the well. You may call saloons night clubs, package stores, cocktail lounges, inns, taverns, any name you care to choose but that won't change the booze.

ALCOHOL A HARMFUL DRUG

Alcohol in beer, wine, or whisky is a habit-forming, narcotic, poisonous drug that befuddles the brain, depresses the nerves, retards muscular reaction, and releases inhibitions. Changing the name on the front of the building where it is sold, legalizing the sale of it, giving Uncle Sam revenue from its sale, hiring a pretty girl to serve it, and using revenues from it to build schools and pay old-age pensions won't keep it from making people drunk and causing them to kill and murder, to steal and rob, beat their wives, starve their babies, curse God, and go to the devil.

THE REAL ISSUE

This fight is over what booze is and what it does, not over who makes it, who sells it, or who gets the money out of it. And a bottle of legally made, legally sold, and legally drunk beer, wine, or whisky will cause just as much drunkenness, sin, sorrow, shame and grief as will a bottle of bootleg hootch sold in a fruit jar under prohibition.

More booze, more drunkenness, more crime, more staggering women, more delinquent youth, more drunken drivers, more wrecked homes, and more ruined lives have followed in the wake of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. And just as Gen. Douglas MacArthur and his fighting Yanks island-hopped back across the Pacific to recapture the Philippines and conquer Japan, the Bible-believing, Christ-honoring, humanity-loving, sin-hating, high-souled, high-minded, sober-hearted Christian men and women of this Nation that love the Lord and the church and their little boys and girls are driving this relegalized liquor out of State after State, county by county, and precinct by precinct.

PROHIBITION CAN BE ENFORCED

Some of you are probably saying to yourself: "Yeah, but you can't enforce prohibition; you can't make independent freedom-loving people obey a law they don't like." Did you ever hear that argument?

How about your income-tax law?

How many of you like that law?

A government that can make 60,000,000 people obey an income-tax law can make them obey a prohibition law.

A government that can make 130,000,000 people stop buying meat, lard, flour, sugar, coffee, and shoes can make them stop buying booze.

A government that can draft 20,000,000 young men to be soldiers and send them across the seven seas should not have too much trouble in making a few thousand bootleggers stop poking fruit jars through knotholes after dark under prohibition.

ABOLITION OF LIQUOR WORTH FIGHTING FOR

"But," somebody else says, "we tried prohibition once, and it didn't work." We tried world peace once, too, and it didn't work. We drafted our boys, spent billions, and whipped old Kaiser Bill in World War I for the sake of world peace—a war to end war; a war to make the world safe for democracy.

Remember it?

But when old Adolf Hitler arose in Germany, Mussolini in Italy, and Japan stabbed us in the back at Pearl Harbor we didn't whimper and whine and say, "Well, there's no use fighting. We fought for world peace once, and it didn't work." No, my friends, we drafted our boys, mustered our resources, built our plants, and fought for world peace all over again on a bigger and bloodier scale than before.

Why?

Because freedom from oppression, the protection of little helpless nations against the ruthless tread of heartless dictators, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is worth fighting for over and over, again and again.

And ladies and gentlemen, freedom from the political corruption, the social debauchery, the economic waste, the domestic strife fostered by a ruthless liquor traffic; and the protection of helpless wives, inexperienced youth, and innocent little children is worth working, talking, voting, fighting, and praying for over and over, again and again.

That's why abstinence and prohibition forces never give up.

Come in, join our ranks; help us win this battle.

Letter of Rt. Rev. George P. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ST. JOSEPH'S RECTORY,
Portland, Maine, January 12, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT HALE,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Kindly permit the undersigned officers of St. Joseph's Men's League, representing more than 3,000 men and women of this parish, to appeal to you as our official representative in Washington, to employ every legitimate effort to have our State Department and Government take cognizance of the flagrant violations of sacred pledges made by our Nation and our war allies in the Atlantic Charter, at Yalta, and at Potsdam guaranteeing freedom and personal security in life and property to all peoples in all lands.

You must be well aware that these pledges are being openly violated in such acts as the murder of priests in Poland and in Lithuania and the recent farcical trial and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac in Yugoslavia, concerning which our State Department makes little or no protest, to the degree that we as a Nation cannot escape the accusation of violating our pledged word and condoning evident crimes against humanity.

You must also be aware that the blood of thousands of our American boys was spilled to secure for all, without distinction of race or religion, all God-given rights in their persons, and in their homes, and now in direct violation of sacred agreements, murder, deportation, imprisonment, and deprivation of the consolations of home and religion are being inflicted upon innocent people. Can it be possible that we as a people have broken faith with those brave men, living and dead, who believed our word that crimes against civilization would never again be perpetrated among the liberated nations after victory over a cruel enemy?

May we not hope that you will use your influence in the proper channels that these wrongs may not be continued with apathy on the part of our Government, which must champion the cause of justice and humanity before the world?

Very sincerely yours,

RT. REV. GEO. P. JOHNSON,
Vicar General Pastor.
JOSEPH CARLETON, *President.*
JAMES B. FOX, *Vice President.*
J. GEORGE REARDON, *Treasurer.*
GEO. A. YOUNG, Jr., *Secretary.*

White Population Shows Hawaii Gain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 19, 1947:

WHITE POPULATION SHOWS HAWAII GAIN—GOVERNOR'S REPORT REVEALS JAPANESE ARE ON DECLINE, NATIVES ON INCREASE

WASHINGTON, January 18.—Territorial Governor Ingram M. Stainback says Hawaii's white population has increased, the ratio of Japanese has decreased, and the happy-go-lucky native Hawaiian population is growing fast.

In his annual report to the Secretary of the Interior, he estimated Hawaii's population at 519,503, and adds:

"The Caucasian element of Hawaii's population has more than doubled since 1940.

"At that time it numbered 74,542, or 18.92 percent of the total. It now numbers 173,533, or 33.43 percent of the total. This represents the outstanding shift in Hawaii's civilian population in the past decade."

Mr. Stainback says the ratio of Hawaiian residents of Japanese ancestry declined from 40.1 percent in 1940 to 32.2 in 1946—168,463 persons.

"The Hawaiian and part Hawaiian group numbered 75,048, or 14.5 percent—of whom 10,887 were pure Hawaiians.

"The Hawaiians and part Hawaiians of all the ethnic groups in Hawaii are increasing the most rapidly through an excess of births over deaths.

"Their ratio of births minus deaths, of 35.3 a thousand, compared with 17.5 for the total population and 22.6 for the Puerto Rican group, is second in order of biological vitality. The proportion of persons with Hawaiian blood has not changed greatly during 20 years."

Mr. Stainback said smaller ethnic groups—Filipinos, Chinese, Koreans, Puerto Ricans, and Negroes—make up slightly more than one-fifth of the population. Filipinos, bolstered by admission of 6,000 sugar and pineapple workers, compose one-tenth of the population.

Although Hawaii's population increased 3.46 percent by the addition of 17,381 persons during the year ended June 30, 1946—compared with an annual rate of growth of 5.09 percent during the war years—Oahu was the only island with a significant increase.

Oahu has 358,911 inhabitants—69.1 percent of the Hawaiian total compared with 58 percent in 1940.

Oahu's population has increased 57.2 percent since 1940, while that of all the other Hawaiian islands has declined during that period an average of 5.8 percent.

Other Hawaiian facts as reported by Governor Stainback:

There were more job opportunities in Hawaii than there were takers among the 14,000 World War II veterans.

Less than 1 percent of the Hawaiian veterans filed unemployment-compensation claims compared to 15 to 25 percent on the mainland and 50 percent in Puerto Rico.

Hawaii's schools attained their most favorable pupil-teacher ratio in history—one classroom teacher for each 30 pupils.

Tax collections indicated that Hawaii's commerce in the first year of peace exceeded the wartime level by almost $3,000,000.

Of $42,473,900.63 collected in taxes by the Territory, 26 percent was gross income and consumption taxes.

Hawaii's crime rate was low, 1,204 major crimes per 100,000 population and juvenile delinquency increased slightly.

Veterans' Temporary Emergency Housing Program in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the housing shortage in California and other parts of the Nation continues in the critical state, and thousands of veterans and their families still seek adequate housing facilities. It is estimated that 10 percent of the veteran population of the Nation is living in California. Temporary housing units to provide homes for these veterans have been under construction. State and local governments have joined with the Federal Government in providing funds for the projects. Now the Federal Government has informed the State of California that no further funds are available to meet its share of the cost of these housing units, and work must cease. If funds are not provided by appropriation to meet the obligation of the Federal Government for these projects, thousands of veterans will be homeless.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 adopted by the Legislature of the State of California on January 15, 1947:

Senate Joint Resolution 1

Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to providing funds to complete the Veterans Temporary Emergency Housing Program

Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States appropriated $445,000,000 for the construction of 200,000 units of temporary housing to house veterans of World War II; and

Whereas the National Housing Agency and its constituent unit, the Federal Public Housing Authority, because of increasing material and labor costs, now estimate that only 150,000 units can be completed within the limitations of existing funds; and that only approximately 10,000 of the 18,000 units scheduled for California can be completed; and

Whereas the Government of the United States through its agencies and departments aforesaid has entered into contracts with the State of California and with California communities and educational institutions to provide such temporary housing; and

Whereas, the State of California and California communities and educational institutions on the basis of such contracts have appropriated and expended more than $11,000,000 in reliance upon the good faith of the Government of the United States acting through its departments and agencies aforesaid; and

Whereas California veterans and their families desperately need all such promised temporary housing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to provide sufficient funds to complete all temporary housing units for veterans for which the State of California has appropriated funds to match contributions of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California.

Sidney J. Weinberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under date of July 18, 1946, President Truman awarded to Sidney J. Weinberg the Medal for Merit for extraordinary fidelity and exceptionally meritorious conduct. The citation to accompany the award read as follows:

Sidney J. Weinberg, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States. Mr. Weinberg, as Chief of the Bureau of Industry Advisory Committees of the Office of Production Management and its successor, the War Production Board, and Assistant to the Chairman of the War Production Board, and Vice Chairman of the War Production Board during the period from May 1941 to September 1944, was charged with organizing the industry divisions, with enlisting the services of business and industry leaders of the United States, and of coordinating administratively the functions of the Office of Production Management and the War Production Board. In all of his duties he displayed initiative, a broad understanding of industry, production and procurement problems, and management and employee relations. By his tact, sound judgment, forcefulness, and unlimited energy, he rendered invaluable services to the Government which were of great benefit in the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. Weinberg is a distinguished New York investment banker and industrialist who has had a brilliant, colorful, and interesting career which began with Goldman, Sachs & Co. in 1907, and of which company he has been a partner since 1927 and is presently the senior partner. He is a director of the following companies, among others; Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc.; Continental Can Co., Inc.; General Cigar Co., Inc.; General Electric Co.; International General Electric Co., Inc.; General Foods Corp.; the B. F. Goodrich C .; the Lambert Co.; Madison Square Garden Corp.; McKesson & Robbins, Inc.; National Dairy Products Corp.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Van Raalte Co., Inc.

He enlisted as a seaman in the United States Navy in 1917 and later became a special agent of naval intelligence; special agent of the War Trade Board;

and deputy collector of customs at Norfolk, Va.; and was demobilized from the United States Navy in December of 1918 and received his honorable discharge on June 5, 1921. He has been a member of the Business Advisory Council for the United States Department of Commerce since June of 1933 and a member of the executive committee since 1935 and a graduate member since 1944; member of the Industrial Advisory Board of the NRA, 1934; formerly member Investment Bankers code committee and the government committee of the Investment Bankers Conference, Inc.; member, New York Stock Exchange, board of governors, 1938–40; New York Curb Exchange and Investment Bankers Association of America, board of governors, 1934–37; vice president 1937–38.

In May of 1941 he was appointed Assistant Director of Purchases of the Office of Production Management, and in June of that year was appointed Chief, Bureau of Industry Advisory Committee; appointed assistant to the Chairman, War Production Board, in January of 1942, and resigned in August of 1943; June of 1944 was recalled by his Government and appointed Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, in which capacity he served until August of 1944. He is a director of the American Arbitration Association; member of the board of managers of the New York Botanical Gardens; member New York State Chamber of Commerce, American Legion, and is a Mason. He is also a member of the visiting committee of the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University. His clubs are Bond, Recess, Madison Square Garden of New York.

The text of the citation awarded to Mr. Weinberg is as follows:

The United States of America to all who shall see these presents, greeting:

This is to certify that the President of the United States of America, in accordance with the order issued by Gen. George Washington at Headquarters, Newburgh, N. Y., on August 7, 1782, and pursuant to act of Congress, has awarded the Medal for Merit to Sidney J. Weinberg for extraordinary fidelity and exceptionally meritorious conduct.

Given under my hand in the city of Washington this 18th day of July 1946.

HARRY TRUMAN,
Commander in Chief.
DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary of State.

He is typical of that large group of fine, patriotic Americans who gave so unstintingly of their time and effort to their country during the critical years preceding and during the last war. He has earned the gratitude of all.

The Late Honorable Andrew J. Volstead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address over Station WOL by the distinguished commentator, George E. Reedy:

A gaunt man with a bushy mustache died last night, and with his passing closed the most fevered chapter in American history. He was Andrew J. Volstead, author of the Prohibition Act and the storm center of the roaring twenties.

To the modern generation, reared in the glare of the flashing neon light outside the corner cocktail lounge, the name Volstead can mean very little. At best it can only recall a few vague, childhood recollections of a thin and mean-faced cartoon character with a battered top hat and an old-fashioned umbrella.

But to those of us who met the springtime of life in what has been called the era of wonderful nonsense, his was a name that can never die. It was constantly on our tongues—sometimes accompanied by a look of rapture, sometimes with a loud guffaw, sometimes with a knowing wink, and—regrettably—sometimes with a resounding curse.

It was impossible to avoid the name, and it was even more impossible to avoid his law. I do not mean by that that no one was able to buy anything stronger than coffee during the period of the great drought. Far from it. In fact, according to some reports, only desert explorers found their thirst unslaked for any considerable amount of time.

But with his law came a whole new way of life—a change in customs and habits and manners that had been with us for generations. Whether they were good or bad is something that can be answered only by the Highest Court on the day of the Last Judgment. But even a blind man must admit that they took place.

American citizens who had never even thought of robbing a child's bank suddenly found it desirable to know other American citizens who had teethed on brass knuckles and lived by nimble wits. Women who had always retired discreetly to another room when the men brought out the brandy suddenly thrilled to the taste of bathtub gin cocked in a tightly sealed room on the second floor of a slum tenement.

Of course, it was all against the law but in that frenzied age breaking the law seemed to be fun. In fact, it was a confession of social ostracism to be unable to supply the name of a good, local bootlegger to an out-of-town friend.

With the concerted drive against the law came the rule of cynicism and crime. Our cynicism showed up in famous wisecracks. One of the best known of the day centered around the bootlegger's standard boast that his panther milk was "just off the boat." The victim of this sales talk soon learned to mutter under his breath: 'Yeh; it was scraped off—the varnish."

But other more sinister remarks crept into our language and have stayed there up to this day. Who can forget that a "typewriter" was a machine gun and a "rod" a pistol and that a man "taken for a ride" would probably fail to enjoy it? These were the passwords of the strangely assorted group—including Al Capone, Dion O'Banion, Hymie Weiss, and Schemer Drucci—who took over such cities as Chicago.

For the first time in the history of the newspaper game, the police reporter became a person of the first importance. His stories filled the front pages of every newspaper and usually were the explanation for a screaming headline. Many of us owe our first job to the expanded activity that followed Mr. Volstead's law.

What Andrew J. Volstead thought of all this is problematical. He was defeated in 1922 and went back to his Minnesota home to practice law. That he remained a lifelong dry is well known. But after his one great effort he refused to lead any more crusades.

He died last night at Granite Falls, Minn., at the age of 87. The problems that he tried to solve are still with us. But of him this can be said. He stamped his personality upon the United States more vividly and more lastingly than any other figure in the memory of living man.

And now, here is Stuart Grey with a message from my sponsor and that old, old story—the weather.

Second San Francisco Bay Crossing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with House Resolution 529 which was introduced by me and unanimously passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, a joint Army-Navy Board has been making its investigation and study of the necessity for a second San Francisco Bay crossing from the city of San Francisco.

The importance of such a second crossing, not alone to our peacetime economy but also to any possible future requirement of national defense, cannot be overemphasized.

Under the permission granted me, I include herewith three editorials recently appearing in San Francisco daily newspapers.

Editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call Bulletin:

BEST BRIDGE SITE—ANOTHER BAY SPAN BADLY NEEDED FOR TRAFFIC, BUT IT ALSO SHOULD AID SAN FRANCISCO DEVELOPMENT

All you have to do to know and realize sharply that we need another crossing from San Francisco to the East Bay is to drive over the present bay bridge.

Try that, during a peak traffic period, and you'll have a fender bender for your book of memories you'll never forget.

Agreement on the desirability of another bridge is pretty general, locally, anyway.

This local feeling has been expressed to a joint Army-Navy Board, which conducted hearings here preparatory to making a report.

Meanwhile, however, controversy has arisen.

For some reason, the State department of public works has chosen to suggest another, high-level crossing more or less parallel to the present one.

This stand, premature to say the least, has been condemned, rightfully, by the board of supervisors.

The board offered its support to San Francisco's Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH, a valiant leader in the fight to cut through Federal Government lethargy and red tape and get some action on another bridge.

Mr. WELCH has announced his opposition to a mere duplication of the present span and has cited two important points:

1. The proposal would not allow full development of San Francisco southward, which is the only direction in which the city can develop industrially and, for the most part, residentially.

2. A twin of the present crossing, as proposed, makes no provision for bringing the trains to San Francisco.

The Congressman has in mind a large view of the growth and development of this port,

and his ideas of another bridge are fitted to this picture.

The State officials ought to take a similar approach.

Granted, we need more traveling room for vehicles crossing the bay.

That does not mean, however, that a mere duplication of the present bridge is the best or the only solution to the problem.

Far from it. The best solution is one which looks to San Francisco's development, and is designed to help and to fit into that development.

This is what Congressman WELCH has in mind. His efforts should not be prejudiced by anyone's prematurely nursing and ballyhooing some pet project which falls short of the goal.

Editorial from the San Francisco News:

HIGH BRIDGE FOE

The outburst in Washington of Representative RICHARD J. WELCH against a second high-level bridge based upon Yerba Buena Island is the tip-off of what may become a first-class fight in Congress. If the structure crosses the island it is likely a special act of Congress will be required, in addition to formal consent of the Secretary of War.

Mr. WELCH favors a trans-bay crossing further south. Moreover, he believes any crossing should contemplate bringing transcontinental rail lines into San Francisco. The News agrees with him in both respects. We believe no studies thus far made have given sufficient weight to the population drift southward from San Francisco down the peninsula. Although the present San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge is running close to capacity it is handling much through traffic that would better be accommodated by a crossing far enough south to avoid the traffic-congested center of San Francisco. In spite of the fact that railroad managements have declared they do not want to bring transcontinental trains into San Francisco, we believe the time may come when their patrons will insist upon it, or competitive conditions will force it. Hence, a low-level crossing that will accommodate rail lines seems to us the course of wisdom.

The population center of the peninsula will shift continuously southward. Ultimately there will be one great urban area from San Francisco to San Jose. Any bridge plans that fail to consider the future convenience of this peninsula community will not be realistic.

Apparently Representative WELCH is prepared to fight against another high bridge adjacent to the present one. He doubtless can marshal strong support in Congress. So it would be well for the State department of public works and the governments of both San Francisco and Oakland to pay some attention to his attitude.

Editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle:

THE SECOND BAY CROSSING

Representative RICHARD J. WELCH'S analysis of the folly of a second bay bridge built close to the present one is altogether sound. As he says, considerations of public defense, of the avoidance of traffic congestion, and of San Francisco's need for transcontinental rail service call for a second crossing as far distant as possible from the first.

It is well that WELCH has taken the offensive in attacking the school of thought which holds that we can solve our bay-traffic dilemma by simply twinning the existing bridge. That concept lacks imagination and foresight.

It is entirely understandable why such responsibile public bodies as the police and fire commissions oppose any bridge close to the existing bridge—their 24-hour-a-day congestion headache would be increased beyond the powers of aspirin to relieve.

What the interests of San Francisco, Oakland, and all the rest of the region on both sides of the bay require is, not a high-level bridge to the north of the present one, or to the south of the present one, in fact not a high-level bridge at all. The only feasible solution for the problem of this second link is a causeway. It may well prove necessary, out of consideration for navigation and defense, to make it part causeway and part tunnel. It will be more expensive than a bridge. But rightly placed, accommodating trains, busses, trolleys, trucks, and automobiles, it will bear what the traffic will be, and no conventional bridge would be equal to that for long.

Senator Bridges and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of January 20, 1947:

SENATOR BRIDGES AND RUSSIA

When the history of these days is finally written, the wise men of another day will see that the voice of at least one leader in American life warned this Nation against the terrible peril which it faces because it stands in the way of world conquest by the most ruthless of all conquerors, the rulers of the Kremlin.

Senator BRIDGES' voice has been raised more often, and with more effect, than any other public figure in the United States, warning us against those dangers that are in store for the United States from adopting a policy of appeasement with Russia. Senator Bridges deserves great praise for his courage in adopting a policy which is not at the moment always popular.

Many Americans, weary after the greatest of all wars, and justifiably expecting a period of peace, are not yet awake to the fact that only half the job was done in the last war.

Americans, with all their faults, ask only for peace and a chance to prosper.

They can never understand, because of their own peaceful way of life, the will to world conquest of a Japan or a Germany. It is even harder for them to understand the Russians' desire for world conquest, since Russia already has so much territory and so much wealth.

Then, too, Americans have been lulled by the fact that they have won two great world wars within a quarter of a century. They do not realize that, for the first time, they are faced by an opponent whose resources, both in the form of raw materials and in manpower, are greater than those of the United States.

When mighty Rome ruled the world in its day, there were probably a few voices in the Roman Senate who warned against the barbarians in northern Europe. But probably the majority of Romans went on scoffing that those barbarians could be any threat to mighty Rome. Yet, one day, those hungry, ruthless, and rugged barbarians swept into the sunny plains of Italy, and the Roman empire was no more, and the world entered the Dark Ages.

History can repeat itself, and the only way we can survive and the world can be saved from the tragedy of a thousand years' decline into an age of murder and terror, is if the United States will listen to the warnings against Russia of Senator BRIDGES and those who feel as he does.

W. L.

Rent Controls Cause Housing Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Detroiter, a weekly magazine published by the Detroit Board of Commerce, Detroit, Mich., which gives some revealing facts in regard to rent controls and the housing shortage. This statement appeared in its issue of January 13, 1947.

RENT CONTROLS CAUSE HOUSING SHORTAGE

OPA says rent controls are necessary because there is a housing shortage. But rent controls are prime cause of our so-called housing shortage. Shortage of dwellings will be endured as long as rent controls last.

Actually there are more dwelling units per capita here now than ever before in Detroit's history. In 1940 there were 441,486 units or 272 per thousand population, a peak up to that time. Since then dwellings have jumped 15 percent against increase of only 8.8 percent in civilian population. Today there are 288 residences per thousand population in Detroit.

Why then are accommodations difficult to find today? The answer—rent controls. People still can afford to spend 20 percent of their income for rent. With incomes up 50 percent or more and rents virtually stationary, this 20 percent buys about half again as much space as in 1940. During the war thousands of Detroit families moved to larger quarters, or, if living with another family moved to separate units. Low rents enable many single persons to rent entire dwelling units which normally they would share.

Proof of the above trend is furnished by Government census reports on residential occupancy. These show that in 1942 only 4.7 percent of Detroit's dwelling units were occupied by one person. By 1945, like figure was 6.8 percent. In earlier years, 14.3 percent of residences with 4 to 10 rooms each were occupied by 2 persons; by 1945, proportion of these large units held by 2 occupants rose to 17.7 percent.

Large households decreased considerably in number during war years. In Detroit, Government surveys show 3.2 percent of all residences occupied by 8 or more persons in 1942; by 1945 only 1.7 percent held families of that size.

Rent controls and high income enabled workers who stayed at home during the war to obtain larger living quarters. These lucky families expanded at expense of thousands of veterans and their families, who now find it impossible to rent homes in Detroit.

Chief fallacy of rent control lies in assumption that there is a fixed (subject to slow increase) supply of housing facilities. Actually, in a free market, rentals are determined by supply of units available for rent or purchase, a flexible quantity dependent upon rent cost in relation to income.

Remove rent controls and initial result would undoubtedly be a jump in rentals. But this rise would be short-lived. Higher rentals would speedily convert Detroit's hous-

ing shortage to a temporary housing surplus. This would bring rents down to their normal economic relationship to incomes. Keep rent controls or refuse to permit landlords to increase rentals sufficiently to cover their higher operating costs and Detroit's deplorable housing shortage may continue for years.

JOHN R. STEWART.

Public Education in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, while extending my remarks in the RECORD and including therein an article taken from a Greenville, S. C., newspaper, regarding South Carolina schools, I call attention to the great progress our State has made in the field of public education.

My own children, of necessity, must change schools in midterm. To our great delight we have found that South Carolina schools are on a parity with Washington schools. Our children have experienced no difficulty in changing schools by reason of the fact that our South Carolina schools are equally as far advanced as schools in the District. This fact should be enlightening to the many who believe that the schools in the South are not as good as those elsewhere.

SOUTH CAROLINA DOES MORE FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN, IN PROPORTION TO WEALTH, THAN OTHER STATES—STATE EFFORT IN PROGRAM IS TWICE ABILITY TO SUPPORT SUCH FACILITIES

(By Cheves Ligon)

South Carolina's public schools may not be all that is desirable, but the people of the State do not have to be ashamed of them.

Dr. James H. Hope, retiring State superintendent of education, recently pointed out that this State is doing more for its school children, in proportion to its wealth than the Nation as a whole; and "South Carolina's effort, what she really puts into her educational program is exactly twice her ability to support such a program."

FACTS, FIGURES GIVEN

This statement, in his final annual report as State superintendent, is "sewed up and hammered down" with a series of facts and figures which may be surprising to anyone who has not inquired into details of the school program.

In 1923, when Dr. Hope took office, the average teacher load, based on enrollment, was 32 white pupils and 64 Negro pupils per teacher. In 1946, the average was 29 white and 32 Negro pupils per teacher in elementary schools, and 23 and 28, respectively, in high schools. When based on average attendance, these figures are even lower.

SALARIES INCREASE

In 1923, the average salary paid white men teachers was $1,210.16 per year and the average for white women was $767.63. The average for Negro men was $271.81 and the average for Negro women was $228.48. The average for all teachers of both races was $641.90.

In 1946, the average for white teachers was $1,351 and the average for Negro teachers was $1,141.

In 1923, the State spent $7,062,824.40 in salaries for teachers of both races. In 1946, the State spent $14,367,401.25 for teachers' salaries and the districts added $4,127,879.75 more in supplemental pay and for administrators.

SPEND MUCH MORE

In 1923, $1,929,674.50 was expended on schools. The total for the school year ending in 1946, including transportation, was $20,039,359.90.

In 1923 the State spent $88,956.94 on transportation of pupils and in 1946 it spent $1,933,807 for this purpose.

In 1923, there were 1,733 white and 2,343 Negro schools having one, two, or three teachers. In 1946 there were only 838 of these small schools for whites and 1,730 for Negroes. The total number of schools was reduced from 4,690 to 3,955 in the same period.

ENROLLMENT DECLINES

And total enrollment declined. In 1923 there were 236,613 white and 226,267 Negro students, a total of 462,880. In 1946 there were 247,224 white and 201,020 Negro students, a total of 448,244. However, average attendance improved from 70.27 percent for both races to 80.11 percent.

Length of white school sessions increased from 144 to 178 days and Negro school sessions from 80 to 163 days.

Per capita expenditures, based on average attendance, increased from $34.29 to $72.

Expenditures for libraries increased from $1,395.62 to $139,313.

The grand total of all expenditures for all school purposes leaped from $11,153,192.58 to $28,071,731.

PROGRESS COMPARED

Dr. Hope's last annual report contains 20 pages of these comparisons.

"A favorite pastime of the educational reactionaries is that of pointing with alarm to the unfavorable comparisons which may be made between the educational picture in South Carolina and other States more favored financially," Dr. Hope said.

"But I submit that the only evaluation of progress is in comparison between actual situations as they exist within the State at any given times, rather than emphasizing our relative position in regard to other States where conditions may be wholly unrelated."

Finland's Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the proposed treaty of peace for Finland is a typical example of the manner in which the iron heel of Russian communism will subjugate free people in the postwar world. It is fortunate that the United States does not have to sign or ratify this treaty because were it necessary, such action would doubtlessly be regretted for generations to come.

The Finns sought nothing in the war except to preserve the integrity of their Republic and the individual liberty and freedom of their people. They were subjected to a brutal and unprovoked attack by Communist Russia and for daring to defend themselves they have had forced upon them a treaty of peace as cruel and brutal as the war itself. By the terms of this treaty, they have lost their government and become slaves of Soviet Russia.

It is disheartening indeed to see an honest nation of honest people who loved their republican form of government and their individual freedom as much as any American loves his government and his freedom, be liquidated and enslaved for the sake of international politics and big-time diplomacy.

It is no wonder then that this peace conference will be a much bigger fiasco than the one of 1919.

In this connection, I am including in my remarks a statement sent me by the Finnish-American Democratic League of Duluth concerning the tragedy of Finland:

THE TRAGEDY OF FINLAND

A democratic republic of 4,000,000 people will be reduced to abject slavery if the proposed Russian reparations are finally ratified. The amount demanded is nominally $300,000,000. In fact, the full payments will approximate $1,000,000,000, which sum is so outrageously large as to be impossible of fulfillment. The present economic and political conditions in Finland, which is now under the dominion of Russian totalitarian dictatorship, beggar description. Why should Finland be obliged to pay reparations to Russia, which was the aggressor in the war? In fact, Russia was expelled from the League of Nations because it was the aggressor.

He who says that life is worth living in Finland knows not whereof he speaks. The people of Finland have been robbed of a considerable portion of their most valuable land. Finland is no longer an independent nation. The liberties of the people have been extorted from them. The freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, and the freedom of assemblage are no more.

For Finland, American hearts have only sympathy, but in the present terrible crisis in which Finland now is, something more than sympathy is needed. Finland needs the friendly action and protection from the United States. As our late President has so well said: "The people of Finland, by their unexcelled resistance in the face of overwhelming armed force, have won the moral right to live in everlasting peace and independence in the land they have so bravely defended."

What America's great Secretary of State, Elihu Root, said as to Belgium aptly applies to Finland:

"What we have to do is not merely to protest in the name of humanity—it is to assert a right, it is to call upon the world to assert a right, a right under the law of nations for the protection of humanity and of civilization. This is our concern."

THE FINNISH AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC LEAGUE.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of labor legislation, which I delivered on the night of January 21 at a meeting of the Minnesota Employers' Association in Hotel St. Paul, St. Paul,

Minn., and which was broadcast over WCCO, Minneapolis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Eightieth Congress faces two major tasks in the field of labor legislation. The first is to achieve a just balance between legal rights and responsibilities of employers, employees, and unions in their relations with one another and by other sound, liberal means to try to lessen the number of strikes that interfere with commerce. The second is to enact into law a sound and liberal solution for the industry-wide shutdowns and other monopolistic practices in labor relations which can paralyze our economy.

The legal rights and obligations of two groups of individuals, employees and employers and their representatives, are involved in this issue along with the rights of the general public, which in a democratic society become paramount to any individual rights in certain situations. It is because the general public has become one of the major victims of recent industrial strife that the need for legislation is so acute today. We have had serious waves of strikes many times before, and an increase in their volume after the end of war controls was inevitable.

But the strikes in 1946 were different from anything before. It was not a case of more strikes at individual plants, but rather a series of industry-wide or regional shutdowns in coal, steel, railroads, oil, shipping, and trucking. The secondary effects of such strikes were tremendous. Not only were millions of workers not directly involved made idle, but our whole economy began to slow down and all of us were affected.

In addition to this radically different situation, there are today upwards of 15,000,000 workers organized into unions, as compared to a maximum of three or four millions prior to the last decade. Unions are no longer weak, poverty-striken organizations struggling for recognition in American industry. They are tremendously wealthy and powerful organizations whose policies and actions have terrific repercussions on our whole economy. A national policy adopted to encourage weak and struggling unions hardly fits our labor-relations picture today.

Opponents of any legislation in this field often argue from the assumption that the welfare of unions and the welfare of individual workers are identical. That is not true. There are many unions which perform excellent service for their worker members. There are also unions which serve their members very badly. Union leaders are no different from other human beings. They tend to be corrupted when they gain too much power over other human beings. The prestige, power, and funds of the union out of which they make their living often tend to become far more important to them than the real interests of the employees the union is supposed to serve. In other words, the union becomes an end in itself instead of an instrument to serve employees. And as happens in all organizations, control of unions tends to be concentrated in the hands of a militant and well-organized minority, sometimes, as in the United Mine Workers, in a single individual.

In seeking solutions to the two major problems in labor legislation, I have tried to apply four principles which are fundamental to our free society in America. The first is the principle of equal justice under law, which is graven over the entrance to the Supreme Court Building in Washington. That principle is not applied in labor relations today. We have one set of rules which apply to the employer, and an entirely different set, almost amounting to no rules at all, which apply to unions representing employees.

There are some who think this situation is all right, that equal justice under law should not apply in labor relations. They believe that simply because of the advantage which the employer-employee relationship gives to the employer, government should be a partisan of employees and unions. That has been the policy of the New Deal, in practice if not in stated theory.

The fallacy of this position is that it overlooks the fundamental nature of government in a free society. In order to function, government power must always be superior to the power of any private interest in a free society. To aline that tremendous power of government on the side of one party to the collective bargaining process makes a complete mockery of free collective bargaining, because the other party simply has no chance. More important, when any democratic government forgets its liberal function of adjudicating the rights and interests of private parties and groups on the basis of equal justice under law and becomes a partisan of a particular group or groups in society, it is headed inevitably toward dictatorship and the liquidation of all individual rights and freedoms.

The second principle to apply in this field is that any concentration of power which approaches monopoly proportions is detrimental to the public interest and dangerous to freedom. The liberal solution to such concentrations of power is the same one we applied in the antitrust laws; to break them up and diffuse the power. There is only one other alternative, and that is for government to try to regulate and control such monopolies in the public interest. That alternative heads inevitably toward more and more government controls and eventually would mean the end of a free economy.

The third principle is that free collective bargaining should be our primary method of settling disputes between individual employers and their employees, with the rights and responsibilities of the two parties roughly equivalent. Here, again, there are many who disagree, who regard strikes as barbaric and uncivilized and insist that labor disputes should be settled by the courts like any other disputes. At one time, I proposed such a procedure in critical cases myself. But more thought has convinced me that any sort of compulsory settlement of labor disputes in private industry is incompatible with a free economy. Most major disputes are over wages, which are the price of labor services in a reasonably free market. I do not see how it would be possible to fix wages, whether by executive or judicial decree, and avoid also fixing prices. If Government does that, our free, competitive economy is finished.

The fourth and final principle I have tried to apply is that Government intervention in labor disputes should be kept to the absolute minimum consistent with a proper concern for the public interest in avoiding major shut-downs and protecting the legal rights of citizens. If free collective bargaining is to be our policy, as I believe it should, then the great bulk of disputes should be settled by bargaining, with both parties free to strike if they cannot agree. If Government is too ready to intervene in disputes, as it has been for some years now, then one party or the other, believing he can gain something by such intervention, will be sure to insist on it, and the whole collective bargaining process is weakened and tends to break down. That is what happened under the War Labor Board.

With these principles in mind, let's now discuss the bills on this subject which I have sponsored or joined in introducing. Hearings on these measures are scheduled to begin Thursday before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We have consolidated the hearings on all labor bills because it is almost impossible to consider one phase of this subject without getting into all others. It is likely that before we are through we will combine in one bill all the legislation we propose, even though there are now a number of separate bills.

Senate 133, which I introduced January 10, deals with the problem of industry-wide bargaining and does it drastically, by prohibiting such bargaining when two or more competing employers are involved.

The purpose and effect of the bill would be to place the bargaining power, of both unions and employers, at the local community level, instead of permitting it to be concentrated in international unions controlling the total labor supply of an entire industry, or in employer associations bargaining for a whole industry.

The bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for a union to represent as bargaining representative the employees of two or more competing employers in the same industry unless the competing concerns are situated in the same labor market area. It would also be an unfair labor practice for an employer to bargain with a union representing employees of a competing employer under the same circumstances. A labor market area is defined as a metropolitan or other geographical area within which a majority of the employees regularly employed by the employers in that area reside, with a maximum diameter of 100 miles.

Another section of the bill would make it unlawful for any international union, either by coercion or agreement, to attempt to dictate the terms of a collective bargaining agreement being negotiated by one of its locals, and unlawful for any employer to delegate his bargaining power to any employer association outside his own labor market area. This section would be enforced by injunction, on the petition of the Federal Government or of an injured party, and is necessary because not all of the situations would be cured by the unfair labor practices.

My purpose was to avoid disturbing the present practice in the printing, laundry, trucking, and many other industries of negotiating contracts on a city-wide basis. While the wisdom of such joint negotiations might be questioned from an economic standpoint, city-wide shut-downs resulting from them very rarely have any serious repercussions on the national economy, whereas industry-wide shut-downs in steel or coal production, or transportation, do affect vitally the whole Nation.

I believe this solution to the industry-wide bargaining problem is absolutely sound in principle and will have two beneficent results. First, it will return the power to bargain over the terms and conditions of employment to the local union, where the individual employee can participate much more directly and certainly will have a stronger voice in the decisions which affect him so closely. Second, it will eliminate, instead of trying to regulate, the monopoly situation where one individual or a small handful of union leaders can arbitrarily shut off the Nation's total supply of any product. It applies to monopoly control of labor supply exactly the same principle which we applied in the antitrust laws to monopoly control of commodity supplies. That is sound liberalism.

I have been asked: "What will happen if a union defies the law and calls an industry-wide strike?" The answer is very simple. If monopoly has gone so far in unions that our Government is powerless to enforce its laws, then we are headed for chaos and dictatorship. That is a challenge which no government that hopes to govern can evade or fail to meet. Union leaders and sympathizers who, even by implication, make such threats, need to relearn what freedom and free government mean.

One of the most important problems in this field is that of preserving the essential freedom of the individual worker, as against coercion or intimidation from any source. The so-called closed-shop contract, which makes union membership compulsory, is peculiar to America. It has never been sought until very recently by labor movements in other countries. Here, it grew out of the fanatic opposition to unions which prevailed among most employers, whose "open shop" was usually closed against any union member. The closed-shop contract became a symbol of union security against employer opposition and sabotage. However, when the National Labor Relations Act became law, it eliminated that valid reason for this type of contract. Employers are now compelled by law to bargain with unions which enroll a majority of their employees, and are prohibited from discriminating in any way against union employees.

With the present strength of unions the closed shop, union shop, and maintenance of membership clauses have become more and more a device to consolidate the power of unions—not so much their power to deal with employers as their power over employees. The abuses of this power by unions during the war are notorious. I know there are many unions, notably in the printing industry, where there is very little if any abuse of this power. But the fact that here and there we find benevolent despots is no valid argument for the institution of tyranny.

There is no question but that the closed shop is a deeply illiberal device. It turns over to an outside agency, the union, absolute control over the individual's right and opportunity to work and earn a livelihood. The temptation to abuse that kind of power is too great to place before any human beings, even union leaders. It violates two fundamental American principles: one, that all individuals should enjoy the maximum freedom consistent with enjoyment of the same degree of freedom by all others, and, two, that any monopoly in private control is wrong and dangerous in a free society. Actually the closed shop is just as wrong in principle as the hated "yellow-dog" contract by which employers sought to make nonmembership in a union a condition of employment. In fact, when we were drafting Senate 105, the bill which I introduced to outlaw closed-shop contracts, we found that to make good sense we had to outlaw "yellow-dog" contracts along with the closed shop, even though the former have been illegal since 1932. The principle involved is identical.

That bill, Senate 105, is very simple. It makes unlawful any contract or agreement making either membership or nonmembership in a union a condition of employment. Another section repeals the proviso in section 8 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act which legalizes closed-shop contracts, and such agreements then become unfair labor practices under the Act. The closed shop, of course, is wholly inconsistent with the major purpose of that Act, which is to assure to individual employees full freedom to join or not to join any labor organization.

While I have never had any doubts about the illiberal nature of the closed shop, at one time I did question whether it could be eliminated without too severe disruption of labor relations in America. Senators Burton, Hatch, and myself tried to propose limitations and regulations to curb the worst abuses. That mild proposal, incidentally, provoked just as violent antagonism from union leaders as the present ones. The more I studied the problem, however, the more I became convinced that regulation of this evil was fundamentally the wrong answer. It not only tolerated an intolerable infringement of freedom, but it led inevitably to more and more interference in labor relations by some Federal bureaucracy, and we have too much of that as it is. And I doubt whether the disruption of labor relations will be as great as is feared. It seems to me that unions now having closed-shop contracts and doing a good job for their members will continue to be about 100 percent organized as the railroad brotherhoods are today without a closed shop. Those unions whose members belong only because of compulsion are the ones likely to have trouble, and they should have it.

Since this bill was introduced, I have listened to and read a great many union arguments against it. One of these is the "free rider" argument, that all employees benefiting from a union contract should help pay the cost of the union. In effect, those who make this argument assume that unions, like Government, should have the power to tax and that American workers generally are chiselers unwilling voluntarily to pay for benefits actually received. I will not accept either assumption as valid.

But the main thesis of those who favor compulsory union membership today is that without it, individual employees will either drop out of a particular union or join a rival, raiding union and that thereby in the long run unions will be hurt and the employees themselves injured. That line of reasoning must assume that individual workers in America are too stupid to make proper decisions for themselves even in their own interest, and that union leaders must make the decisions for them. That, I submit, is completely totalitarian thinking, typical of that which prevailed in Nazi Germany and prevails today in Soviet Russia; namely, that the people are too stupid to know and decide what is good for them and that some particular group must have dictatorial power to make their decisions for them and compel them to go along.

Senate 55, which Senators TAFT, of Ohio, SMITH, of New Jersey, and I introduced on January 6, is a considerably revised version of the so-called Case bill which Congress passed in 1946 and the President vetoed. Its major purposes are to improve Federal mediation machinery and to more nearly equalize legal responsibilities of unions and employers.

It would establish a new Federal Mediation Board, independent of the Department of Labor, to try by purely voluntary mediation to bring about peaceful settlements of disputes which threaten a serious interruption of interstate commerce. Both unions and employers, when the Board intervened in a dispute, would be required to withhold strike or lock-out action for not to exceed 60 days in order to give mediation a chance to function.

Another section deals with so-called welfare funds, simply requiring that such funds be jointly administered and be in the nature of a trust so that the funds cannot be misspent. Foremen would be eliminated from the definition of employees covered by the National Labor Relations Act so that employers would not be placed in the impossible position of being compelled to bargain over the status of these key supervisors with unions representing the employees they are supposed to supervise. Other sections would make both unions and employers suable as legal entities in Federal court for breach of contract and would require all unions to file with the Secretary of Labor and furnish annually to their members understandable financial reports.

The most important section of Senate 55 would make unlawful secondary boycotts which are in restraint of trade and organizational or jurisdictional strikes. The secondary boycott is a device denied to all other citizens, which unions have used to create and maintain monopolies as vicious and harmful to the public as any ever attempted by the late and unlamented trusts. As for organizational and jurisdictional strikes, the National Labor Relations Act affords fair and democratic procedures by which both of these questions can be settled by a majority vote of the employees involved. I can see no reason why employees should be denied that right simply because some unions would rather settle such questions by economic force.

One more bill will be introduced soon, proposing a number of amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. The amendments will strengthen, not weaken, the rights of employees under that act. The bill will propose amendments limiting the Board's right to determine appropriate bargaining units so as to protect craft and other minorities, clarifying election procedures and protecting independent unions against the Board's prejudice in favor of affiliated organizations, and requiring that the Board's findings of fact be supported by the weight of evidence instead of just "any" evidence. Other amendments will seek to assure free speech to employers, to define collective bargaining and require unions as well as employers to bargain, and, finally, to separate the prosecution from the judicial functions of the Board. It is hardly in accord with our concept of justice to have the same agency which files and prosecutes a complaint also sit in judgment on the accused.

Some day I would like to see the National Labor Relations Act rewritten completely, but I doubt whether there is time to do that in this Congress. The purpose of the act, to guarantee to employees full freedom of association for collective bargaining, is absolutely sound, but it is not a well-drafted statute. No employee can get into court to protect his rights unless the National Labor Relations Board says he can. It would be entirely possible, by appointment of a hostile Board, to make a complete dead letter of the guaranties of the act. That is neither sound nor liberal law, and I look forward to the day when we can abolish the Board's judicial functions and permit any individual to go directly into court for protection of his rights.

These in brief are the changes in national labor relations policy which I believe essential to continued progress in a free America. Some of these proposals are radical, in that they would require drastic changes in present policy. But we must remember that we are dealing with some 20 years of accumulated problems, and applying poultices to the body politic when the diagnosis demands surgery is apt to multiply instead of solve problems. In the Smith-Connally and other emergency measures hurriedly rushed through Congress in recent years we have tried to treat symptoms of basic maladjustments in our labor relations policy instead of attacking causes. I think such efforts do more harm than good.

It is to be expected that union leaders will oppose such a program. They would be superhuman if they did not. Never in history have the holders of power and special privilege given them up without a struggle. Many public leaders who believe quite sincerely that it would be better to regulate these evils which have developed in our economic life rather than root them out have labeled my proposals as too drastic and myself as antilabor or reactionary. If being in favor of assuring to individual workers in America the maximum degree of individual economic freedom and being against monopoly whenever and wherever it appears is being antilabor or reactionary, then I guess I'll just have to accept the labels. I have always considered such attitudes as being the very heart of political liberalism.

The legislation I have discussed will bear down most heavily on unions. I see no point in trying to dodge that fact, because it is also a fact that it is unions and their leaders who have in the past 10 years shown a growing disregard of their obligations both to the public and to the individual workers whom they are supposed to serve. Any time that such abuses of power are shown on the

employer side, I will be the first to insist on their correction. Employers are no more to be trusted with irresponsible power than union leaders. They are very much the same kind of people, and our present lop-sided national policy is a direct result of the power-drunk arrogance and stupidity with which employers dealt with unionization a few decades ago. The John L. Lewises in the labor movement learned their lesson well—from employers.

I receive a great many letters on the subject of labor legislation, including quite a few from employers who want to see the whole National Labor Relations Act junked, who demand that all strikes be outlawed. Congress is not going to do anything of that kind, and such demands only prejudice our chances of doing a fair and sound job of overhauling national labor policy. It is apparent that in laws, judicial decisions, and administrative practices, Government has gone much too far in increasing the power of unions and relieving them of legal responsibilities and duties. We want to correct that situation and do it on a fair, liberal basis, achieving a reasonable equality of power and a sound balancing of legal rights and responsibilities. We want no loopholes for any employers so inclined to go on the kind of union-busting campaigns we had after the first war.

If any substantial number of employers do interpret the changes we make in laws as a signal to embark on a drive to destroy unions, then I can assure you that the changes will be repealed soon, and we will likely have an even more lop-sided and partisan policy than we have now.

That would be tragic for all of us, because, whenever Government departs too far and for too long a time from its liberal function of dispensing equal justice under law to all individuals and groups, and becomes a partisan of particular groups, whether employers, employees, farmers, or any others, it inevitably tends to degenerate into dictatorship. Both free enterprise and free labor unions would be liquidated if that happens.

It is the obligation of all of us who believe in a free society to make sure that does not happen; that this time our labor relations policy stops somewhere near the center and then is made to work on a just and sound basis.

Boise Still Radiates Pioneer Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, there appeared in the January 18 issue of the Saturday Evening Post an accurate, informative article on the city of Boise. Its author is Beirne Lay, Jr., a former Army Air Forces colonel who became enamored of Idaho's capital city while stationed at nearby Mountain Home air base. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. An estimate from the Public Printer indicates that printing the article in the RECORD will require two and one-half pages, or one-half page more than is allowed under the rule without an estimate, and that the cost will be $150.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITIES OF AMERICA—BOISE

(By Beirne Lay, Jr.)

(Remember tranquillity? They have it in Idaho's relaxed capital, a city basking in Luck's smile. The earth provides volcanic heat, the mountains send ice water, and even prunes are fair to look upon.)

Capital and largest city of Idaho, called Boise for short and pronounced to rhyme with "noisy," which it isn't, Boise City will give you a jolt, because it ought to be a remote, northwestern hellhole—and it isn't.

It faces a desert as forbidding as the griddle on which Las Vegas sizzles and yet its residential streets pass through lofty tunnels of cool shade. It was born of the same western tradition as Reno, but it has passed up it birthright of whisky, women, and gambling, and has turned its back on homicides and malodorous politics.

It is sedate as Concord, N. H., modern as the East Fifties in New York, and level-headed as Idaho's dry farmers, sheepherders, miners, and lumberjacks, who dot a State of only a half million population, but larger in area than all New England.

From the standpoint of terrain, Idaho just isn't the kind of country in which you'd expect to find a modern metropolis like Boise City, made up of 47,000 homemakers. Nature has beaten the living daylights out of Idaho. It has punched its nose until the molten lava has spilled all over its shirt front. It has whacked its skull with a billy until one of the bumps, now called Borah Peak, has risen to 12,655 feet. There are bare patches of scar tissue on Idaho's torso that are as lifeless and ghastly as the Sahara's wastes. The Snake River has cut Idaho's throat from ear to ear with a gash that is deeper in one spot than the Grand Canyon. And finally, the Boise Valley is doled out a miserable 13-inch ration of spring rainfall that barely sustains the sagebrush and fails, as someone has put it, to cool the "naked lava, too tough for a rattlesnake's belly."

Yet Boise is today the headquarters of everything worth while in the State except the university, which is at Moscow—a devilishly inappropriate name for any town in Idaho. Its past is the tumultuous story of the raw frontier. Its veins run with melted mountain snow, without which Boise would surely die. And its future as the seat of an agricultural inland empire shines brightly over the irrigated front yard which Washington Irving once aptly termed "the ruins of a world."

Boise is a government and residential town, like Washington, D. C., and its existence does not depend upon its factories, which are few and small. But to compare the two on equal terms, you'd have to jack Washington up to 2,700 feet above sea level, give it the kind of climate that Californians lie about and eliminate Washington's sprawling and nauseating slums. And where the District of Columbia's citizens glower in voteless impotence, you'd substitute a contented electorate that has returned its nonpartisan city council to office without opposition and without epithets in the last two elections. When Mayor Westerman Whillock returned from the war, his old job of running this slumless, racket-free town was handed right back to him.

All this civic rectitude doesn't make Boise dull any more than Will Rogers was dull because he wasn't a lecherous rake. There just aren't enough jangled nerves and satiated appetites in Boise to make big-city vices pay off. Boiseans don't catch the point of gasping for air in night clubs when outdoor life is in their blood, and they prefer the entertainment of dropping in on the neighbors the way people do in small towns, or meeting strangers. Boise still radiates the personality of pioneer America, with a go-to-hell glint in one eye and a howdy-pardner gleam in the other. She is such a natural and friendly place that you can't help liking her right back.

The first thing that strikes the visitor from his street-corner vantage point is informality. He will see farmers and businessmen, mostly coatless; girls who run instead of walk, sweatered high-school athletes, a few cowboys, and maybe some nuns from St. Teresa Academy. He will see beautifully clean streets without beggars or bums, and he will sense a general air of leisure and all's-well.

Boise is the richest city of its size in the United States; the buying power in local pocketbooks is twice that of the $1,160 national average. But Boiseans are not caste-conscious. The well-being is evenly spread and the people don't care a hang how much dough you've got or who your old man was. If you look O. K., you're in—until you deal one off the bottom.

The secret of Boise's prosperity is locked in snowdrifts, part of them visible up on near-by Shafer Butte, but most of them cached hundreds of miles away in the Rockies, at the headwaters of the Snake, in Yellowstone National Park, Wyo. Spring floods cascade down the Snake's channel and fill an enormous reservoir behind the dam at American Falls, Idaho, where they are stored for the irrigation of the Snake Valley—a scimitar curving west and northward past Boise. Boise's immediate supply is locked behind 354-foot-high Arrowrock Dam, 22 miles east, up the Boise River, a bonanza which slakes the thirst of a quarter of a million acres in the Boise Valley.

Thus Boise has become the heart of a 400-mile-long green desert, whose ditches and laterals flow with enough water from 8 rivers, 31 creeks, 3 lakes, and 25 dams to flood a canal from New York to San Francisco 100 feet wide and 100 feet deep.

When the water mixes with the desert's volcanic-ash soil, which is rich in phosphorus and potash and short on injurious alkali content, the result is an annual jack pot of $40,000,000 worth of Idaho potatoes, corn, and grain; $30,000,000 worth of dairy products; $60,000,000 worth of livestock from herds of 2,000,000 sheep and 400,000 beef cattle; and $10,000,000 in vegetables and seeds.

Those are the stand-bys, but from land that once cost from nothing to 50 cents an acre and now brings up to $500, the farmer's horn of plenty tumbles out giant Hale peaches, prunes, strawberries, grapes, apples, deep-breasted turkeys, chickens, peanuts, hogs, tobacco, chinchilla, 80 percent of the country's hybrid sweet-corn seed, sugar beets, hops, bees, and big, dark-red Bing cherries.

One crop which does not thrive in Boise is the skunkweed of racial and religious friction. The foreign population includes about 4,000 Basques, who are exceptionally popular and well integrated in all enterprises; a couple of hundred Chinese; a few Japs, whose sons' names were inscribed without local protest on honor rolls for war service; and 51 Negroes, who somehow manage to support two churches. One-sixth of the inhabitants are Mormons by religion. The last Boisean to serve as Governor was a Jewish merchant.

Politically, Boiseans are not interested in startling the world. No Boisean since William E. Borah has attained national prominence; none sits today in Congress; and none has been Governor since 1919. But as party headquarters for State and national politics, Boise enjoys watching the political medicine that bubbles out of two of its leading hotels, the Owyhee and the Boise.

Although traditionally Republican, the State was represented until the recent elections by a Democratic Governor, two Democratic Senators, and a Democratic Representative arrayed against a lone Republican Representative in Congress. Now the State is again purebred Republican except for New Dealing "Singing Cowboy" GLEN H. TAYLOR, who was not up for reelection, but whose

candidates for Democratic Senator and Congressman bared their backs to an unmerciful flogging from the voters for their advocacy of a Columbia Valley Authority. Idaho farmers want less, not more, Government interference.

But the State's return to the GOP is less a manifestation of political orthodoxy than a current barometer of sentiment within its large and unfathomable independent vote, which knuckles under to no machine of either party and has swung away from McKinley Republicanism and Borah isolationism. The year 1948 may reaffirm that Idaho is a Republican oyster on a Democratic half-shell.

In Boise and throughout the State, saloons are illegal, but in effect the people vote dry and drink wet. Three dry amendments placed on the November ballot by civic-virtue forces were badly beaten. You're supposed to consume the hard stuff publicly only in licensed bottle clubs, yet promoting the purchase of a drink over the bar is no herculean task. Gambling, though popular in the back rooms of locker clubs, is illegal, too, and this is one reason Boise doesn't compete with Reno for the lucrative divorce trade, although its legal-resident law matches Nevada's 6 weeks. The other reason? Boise doesn't want it.

The city has no red-light district and police blotters seldom record darker deeds than loitering or overtime parking. For 2 years no killing has marred the peace—a far cry from conditions in the valley in the eighties, of which G. A. McLeod relates: "Sheriff Charles Furey put the desperado in a hole in the ground where from 10 to 15 prisoners a day are kept. The only locks about the structure are on the Winchester rifles of the guards, and their orders are that any man seen sticking his head out of the hole, intending to escape, is to be made an object of target practice."

Boise is proof that a fair-sized city can have a good time minus vice and corruption, without the needling of reformers, a civic factor which might be expected in a thoroughly religious town where there are 23 denominations and 47 churches. Instead of prudery, you find a spirit of live and let live and a lack of pretense that is as refreshing as the flavor of Boise's prunes. Unlike the standard dish which disgraces eastern breakfast tables, restaurant prunes actually taste delicious; their flavor startles you as much as the 1-day laundry and drycleaning service which you get in the leading hotels without extra charge.

What makes Boise the way it is comes into better focus after you have looked at its geography and poked around in its history. Boiseans, isolated 400 miles from the Pacific Coast, in what was still referred to in the nineties as the Great American Desert, and living against a backdrop of stupendous mountains which shut out winter storms and the outside world, still nourish a spirit of fierce independence. It was this spirit which enabled them to survive the rude reception they got from the red man and to wrest, one day, a $200,000,000 annual harvest from the land that pioneers feared would defy cultivation.

The hellish task of blazing the old Oregon Trail from Missouri to the Pacific, via the Snake River Valley and Boise, fell to the William P. Hunt expedition of 1811. Hunt's visit alerted the hostility of nomadic bands of Snake and Crow Indians, described by Capt. B. L. E. Bonneville, who camped on Boise's site in 1834, as "filthier than Hottentots, eating vermin from each other's heads." Bonneville's voyageurs gave the green oasis its future name when they sighted it, with cries of "Les Bois!" (the woods).

From the thirties until 1862, the Boise Valley was a parched wasteland, inhabited by British traders, beaver, Indians, and sage hens. Travelers bound for the Pacific crossed it with one eye cocked over their shoulders and with no conceivable inducement to plant the seed of a community where Boise now stands. Then rich claims of gold were staked on the gravel bars in Boise Basin, just over the mountains to the north, but the stage was set for the birth of a new city when boomers found that they couldn't digest gold dust.

Sick of a diet of wild game and sourdough, miners up in the basin gladly turned for food to the planters around Boise's present site. Thus the city violates western tradition by never having been a miner's boom town. It began, instead, as a bloom town. And while Idaho City, in the basin, collapsed from 30,000 to less than 1,000 inhabitants in a few years, Boise held its own and grew.

In 1863 Maj. Pinckney Lugenbeel was sent by the Union Army to establish Boise Barracks and thereby impress not only hostile Indians but unfriendly miners. Partly because of the value of the new source of gold to President Lincoln's hard-pressed domestic and foreign credit, Idaho Territory was admitted to the Union, and in 1866 Boise was incorporated as a city.

Of greater importance to modern Boise and to Idaho than mining—although gold, silver, and lead ores have yielded the State $1,000,000,000—were the pioneer efforts of William A. Morris to irrigate with crude equipment, after Government permission was granted for the diversion of water from the Boise River in 1864. Dry farming was successful from the start. One converted miner named Davis bought seed at 25 cents a pound and marketed a crop of onions, cabbages, and potatoes worth $50,000.

The word spread. A permanent back wave of emigrants continued settling on farms, until today, their sons have made Idaho fourth among all the States in the shipping of foodstuffs. Idaho potatoes are a national institution, and exuberant Californians cannot blink the fact that they are among southern Idaho's best agricultural customers.

Except for a successful feud in 1864 with the first Territorial capital of Lewiston, Boise might never have become Idaho's first city. The legislature passed an act in that year transferring the capital to Boise, but angry Lewiston citizens came back with an injunction against the removal of the seal and archives, forcing an acting secretary of state to escape under armed guard to Boise.

The new capital acquired an allergy to remote control from Washington which survives vigorously today. Until 1890, when Idaho became the Union's forty-third State, the White House sent an almost uninterrupted succession of sad sacks to occupy the Territorial Governor's chair. Of the 16 political appointees, several never showed up, some remained but a few days, and only 8 served a term of a year or more.

In addition to the confusion created by no-show governors, Boise was faced with a difficult problem of communications with the State's more distant counties. Not until 1887 did it have a branch line to the Union Pacific at Nampa. It lacked, and still lacks, a railroad to northern Idaho. Trains must go through Oregon and Washington to reach Lewiston, because you might as well try to lay track through the Grand Canyon as through Idaho's rougher and deeper Seven Devils Canyon.

The branch line gave the farmers an outside market, and a Senate committee gave them water. The visiting lawmakers were sold on irrigating Idaho when they were shown a 2-foot peach-tree branch clustered with 29 peaches. Their enthusiasm led to passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, which put Uncle Sam into the irrigation business in a big way, with the States, private enterprise, and industrious farmers as partners. The combination has worked well enough to develop the Snake Valley into the third largest irrigation project in the country.

At the turn of the century, with a population of only 6,000, Boise held titular leadership of Idaho on the strength of little more than its central location, its splendid climate and long-growing season, and the civic pride of its citizens. The latter capitalized on their hot artesian wells, whose water bubbles up from volcanic springs at 176 degrees, to fill a large indoor natatorium, which was hailed by one appraiser as the Taj Mahal of the Pacific Northwest.

Although it is Boise's boast that tornadoes and severe storms are unknown in the valley, the record shows that a lively zephyr once scalped the roof off the Taj Mahal, which is now popular as a warm outdoor swimming pool. Two hundred and fifty homes in the Warm Springs Avenue district are still heated all winter from the same source through pipes which simultaneously melt snow and ice from many streets.

In 1907 the voters sent to the United States Senate a young Boise lawyer named Borah, who had earned prominence in the early 1900's when he won the conviction of one Harry Orchard for the bomb assassination of former Gov. Frank Steunenberg. GLEN TAYLOR'S election to the Senate in 1944 showed how much the State-wide electorate has swung away from Borah's intense nationalism, but in Boise the man they followed for 33 years is a fresh and reverent memory still. As for Harry Orchard, he has turned the tables on Borah, the judge, and every member of the jury by surviving all of them. Today, a trusted prisoner, Idaho's most famous criminal lives peacefully in a cabin near the penitentiary, minding poultry and visiting Boise unaccompanied, save by his sheep dog.

While Borah's star rose in the twenties and waned in the thirties, Boise grew steadily to a population of 26,130 in 1940, exclusive of the Bench community, an outgrowth of Boise beyond its city limits on high ground south of Boise River. A faithful chronicler, since 1864, of this rise from a clump of cottonwood trees to current opulence is the city's only morning, afternoon, and Sunday newspaper, the Idaho Statesman. Bitterly anti-New Deal, the Statesman is owned by a gray-haired, charming woman named Margaret Cobb Ailshie. She is the daughter of the Statesman's long-time owner, Calvin Cobb, who died in 1928, and from whom she inherited lively ability and a gift for retaining friendships that are Nation-wide.

The Statesman compensates for conservative political views by a progressive approach to transportation. It owns two airplanes. Their operation presents no problem to the staff, which includes Coeditor Thomas G. Lanphier, who won renown for shooting down Admiral Yamamoto, and wishes people would quit reminding him of it; Dave Johnson, a crack aviation editor who flew B-29's; two former B-26 pilots; and an ex-Marine Corps fighter pilot.

Margaret Ailshie's weakness for fliers stationed at Gowen Field and neighboring Mountain Home during the war was shared by all Boiseans. They made the boys so welcome that hordes of them have settled permanently, accentuating a housing shortage which never eased off even when the two air bases closed down.

The Statesman's flying editors foresee a bright aviation future for Boise. Its municipally owned airport at Gowen Field, under lease to the Army, has mile-and-a-half-long runways and is a regular stop for United Air Lines. Besides the postwar fighter squadron which the National Guard will station there, two free-lance air-freight carriers have applied to the city for hangar facilities. Empire Air Lines will probably base at Gowen, too, when red tape permits.

Private fliers are so active that they keep the sky above four smaller fields, located practically inside the city, swarming with light planes. High freight rates by rail suggest that airfreight carriers should have

their planes full relieving the Boise Valley of surplus strawberries, cherries, peaches, early lettuce, and other perishable fruits and vegetables. Airplanes have long been the best means of seeding grazing uplands and of reaching stranded hunters, foresters, and ranchers in the primitive areas, which are still inaccessible except by pack train and are largely unexplored. Parachute drops are made to fight fires among the yellow and white pine stands which help to cover half of Idaho with forests. There are communities only 60 miles from Boise that stay snowbound 6 months of the year and welcome the roaring motor of a plane equipped with skis.

Aviation, however, does not monopolize the pages of the Statesman, which does a big-time job of acquainting its 40,000 State-wide readers with all the news, from world events to sheep ranching. One issue, reporting on an annual convention of flock masters, carried the inspired headline: "Sheepherders peer ahead." Actually, no forelocks of wool have obscured the vision of Idaho's sheep or cattle men, who long ago settled their bloody differences over grazing lands and struck a mutually profitable deal with the farmers. The latter were persuaded to grow large crops of winter feed, unprofitable for shipment to other regions, to save the herds which had formerly starved wholesale on snow-covered mountainsides. Similarly, astute farmers ran the dairy herds up to 200,000 purebred cows after they had figured it out that a like quantity of feed would produce a $19,000 carload of butter as against $16,000 for 40 carloads of hay and a whopping freight bill.

The backbone of the sheep industry is the largest Basque colony outside the Spanish Pyrenees; it totals about 10,000, in all Idaho. No longer differing noticeably from other Boiseans, the Basquos, as they are called, are descended from seamen who jumped ship off California and took refuge in the mountains as shepherds.

The thrifty Basque colony is a credit to Boise, and it can show many native Americans something about patriotism. Its leaders raised a disproportionately large sum for War bonds. Half the male Basque population of Boise's enclave rushed into uniform.

J. Lynn Driscoll, a Boise banker who has lent money to Basques all his life, calls them excellent risks, points to the significant absence from their language of any word for adultery, and accuses them of only two faults, bootlegging and stealing grass.

More colorful than its annual State fair and rodeo is Boise's nearest approach to a Mardi Gras—the Basque Ball. Likewise, Basque food is the chief note of color in Boise's cuisine, which is abundant but unimaginative. Gourmets and lovers of cafe society will find no rival of 21 or Ciro's in Boise's conglomeration of downtown bottle clubs. Highwater marks in local excitement run to dancing and the eating of steaks at the walk-up Boise Club, and tippling at the Gremlin's Roost. The best times are enjoyed where Boiseans really prefer them—in the home.

Both men and women spend a lot of time away from Boise in their mountain playgrounds. Fishermen go after brook trout, black bass, and salmon, or try their luck with the 25-pound Kamloop trout to be found in the Payette Lake country, a mile-high summer resort at which Boiseans escape the heat after a short automobile drive. Hunters can draw a bead on mule and white-tail deer, elk, mountain goat, bear, and antelope, or take a lead on Chinese pheasant, Hungarian partridge, valley quail, ducks, and geese. There is no open season on sage hens, which are so dumb that they have enough trouble just surviving.

Ski runs are close by at Bogus Basin and McCall, or you can take your Norwegian tumbles at recently reopened Sun Valley, which is 100 miles east by air. Baseball fans can go out to Airway Park and cheer the Boise Pilots up the ladder of their six-team class C league, which includes a Yankee farm at Twin Falls. Boise's polo team, outstanding in the Pacific Northwest before the war, is riding again.

A soothing experience awaits you if you drop in at the office of Mayor Whillock, an industrious, popular businessman who has to bolster his $3,000 salary with the proceeds from a shoe store he owns. His situation is hardly less remunerative than that of the Governor, up at the capitol, who has been raised from $5,000 to $7,500, but still has to live in a hotel or with friends, for lack of a governor's mansion.

Whillock's office reflects the peace of a town so hard up for knotty problems that the mayor is given to glancing out the window into Boise's clear, sparkling atmosphere and worrying about the smoke menace or a scrap of paper the street cleaners missed. Housing is tough, he says, as it is everywhere else, and more cash will have to be raised next year to meet the $1,000,000 city budget, but times are pretty good.

Before you leave, he may hand you a publicity sheet which discloses that Boise has 15 parks, 8 hotels, 16 elementary schools, a junior college, 8 Masonic lodges—plus every other club a joiner could want—3 hospitals, 6 theaters, and a streamlined police force of 39 coppers, who maintain the peace with the aid of 9 radio police cars and a solid front against the fixing of tickets.

Culture is nurtured by the Boise Gallery of Art, by the music lovers who originated what has since become National Music Week and by the 250 ladies of the Columbian Club, which has been full of good works since 1892.

Should your curiosity lead you into the shop of Goon Hoy, Chinese herbs and tea, Mr. Hoy will open a drawer full of dead leaves and bark, and assure you with a straight face that a brew from these materials will cure backache, hangover, or lack of pep. Behind Goon Hoy's deceptively bland countenance lurks the impulsive spirit which prompted him, on VJ-night, to detonate a hoard of 10,000 firecrackers on the capitol steps.

Boise has many able businessmen, including a former partner of Henry J. Kaiser, 61-year-old Harry Morrison, whose Morrison-Knudsen firm of general contractors directs its national and international enterprises from Boise. Morrison is credited with bringing together six building and earth-moving magnates, including Kaiser, to form the famous Six Companies, Inc., which built Boulder Dam on the Colorado and Bonneville Dam on the Columbia, and also took over and finished Grand Coulee; sank the enormous piers for the great bay bridge from Oakland to San Francisco; and poured out Liberty ships during the war.

Another industrial prodigy, who sits on the State planning board in Boise, is a self-made multimillionaire in his midthirties named Jack Simplot. He is a resident of neighboring Caldwell. Starting out as a potato dealer at Burley, Idaho, Simplot prospered phenomenally. He now has a phosphate plant at Pocatello, is president of an insurance company, and owns the country's largest potato-dehydrating plant at Caldwell. The plant produced prodigious quantities of concentrated spuds and onions for troops overseas, and a like output of gripes from the soldiers. Simplot, who has been voted one of the 10 outstanding young businessmen in America by the junior chamber of commerce, is said now to be staking out some of his profits in quick-freezing and prefabricated housing.

Far from being alarmed at the growing prominence of its smaller neighbors a few miles down the Boise Valley—such as Nampa and Caldwell, with their large processing and meat-packing plants, co-ops and the world's largest creamery—Boise has appeared to resist industrialization deliberately. She prefers to be the brains rather than the brawn of Idaho's economy.

Dearer to her than factory chimneys are her avenues of towering shade trees. Sweeter to her than coal smoke is the scent of her State flower, the white syringa. Better than freight sheds are the flower beds that surround the Union Pacific depot, which resembles an Italian-Spanish villa with a medieval tower. And she is proud of the unobstructed view from the depot north to the capitol, which is like the vista in Washington, from the Lincoln Memorial to the Capitol.

From their gardens and tidy green lawns, Boiseans can look out over the desert in the long cool evenings and find peace in the stable future which stares back at them from the fertile valley, whose irrigated acres will soon be increased to half a million. They see no reason to alter their sane pace of living to conform to a world that seems to be in danger of losing its mind. For the healthy environment in which their children grow, for their esteem of just plain good citizenship and for their belief in the decency of human beings they have no apologies.

Men must have food, and Boise can feed many men and thereby prosper. But Boise believes that man cannot live by bread alone, that the spirit must find sustenance, not in the complexities, but in the simplicities of life, and must frequently ask itself: What shall it profit a city if it gain the whole world and lose its own soul?

Report on UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, before the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, at Chicago, Ill., on January 9, 1947. The speech is in the nature of a report on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The last time I attended a meeting of the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations I witnessed a most dramatic ovation to one of Chicago's most distinguished citizens. The closing line of the speech at that luncheon was Stephen Decatur's famous cry, "My country, may it always be in the right, but my country, right or wrong!" The audience rose to its feet and applauded. It applauded at length, and with unrestrained admiration for the character of the speaker. The speaker was Gen. Robert E. Wood. The time was 1941.

Does anyone doubt that the tradition of the United States still stands behind that quotation? Does anyone doubt that it applies with equal force in the traditions of England, of France, and indeed of all the countries of the world: "My country, may it always be in the right, but my country, right or wrong"?

We have none of us learned to say, with a fraction of the same fervor, "my world." Nor have we tried. Can we so learn, or can our children, or theirs? Do we want to try to learn? UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, about which I am going to speak to you

today—is dedicated to fostering the idea of "my world, my human race" in the minds and hearts of men everywhere. If this idea is to take root and grow, UNESCO is the one political organization that is most likely to help it grow.

I shall have to begin by conceding that, at the first general conference of UNESCO in Paris last month, from which I have just returned, the American delegation did not find a conference dedicated wholeheartedly to education, science, and culture. The conference was in part a political conference. That fact is of great important to the American people. By political conference I do not mean merely that the delegates played politics as they would on a university campus, or at the Christmas meeting of a learned society. I mean that, behind many of the assembled scholars, scientists, educators, and administrators of cultural agencies, stood their governments seeking to advance and protect specific national interests.

There was, however, far less jockeying for national advantage than you would find at most intergovernmental conferences. In part, the jockeying merely took the mild form of competition for prestige. But, in the larger view, we of the American delegation learned once more that power in today's world is not merely economic power and military might. Power also lies in the field of ideas. As older empires lose economic and military power, and as new ones emerge, they are eager to gain strength on this new frontier—the frontier of the mind.

We learned in Paris the great importance that the statesmen and politicians of many countries attach to the proposed activities of UNESCO. The problem within the United States is to see to it that we Americans now understand how vital these are to us as well.

Potentially, UNESCO is a force of the first magnitude. It can contribute mightily to a world will toward peace. It can thus be a major force in the security program of the United States through the furtherance of the broad objectives of American foreign policy—peace and prosperity among all peoples of the world.

Did the fact that this first conference was also a political conference mean that it failed? Not at all. Anne O'Hare McCormick, of the New York Times, one of the American delegates, described it as a most successful political conference. The politics of national interest merely show that the idea of one world, of "my world," is still a long way off; that the task of UNESCO is indeed a very great task, for the long pull and not for the short.

UNESCO obviously is not going to bring about, in a few years, the moral and intellectual revolution that is required by the age ahead of us. But it is equally clear that it can now move confidently toward a more modest goal—to help dispel, in some degree, the unwarranted fears, suspicions, and hatreds that hang like a fog over the world today.

No unresolved disagreements bedeviled the sessions. The closest approach to one was raised by the representative of Yugoslavia, Mr. Ribnikar. Mr. Ribnikar inquired whether UNESCO proposed to develop a philosophy of its own, which would exclude or even combat the philosophy of dialectical materialism and which it would seek to impose on all peoples.

In my opening speech to the conference, the day after Mr. Ribnikar first spoke, I said, "UNESCO does not believe and cannot believe that peace is to be obtained through the intellectual and cultural subjugation of the world by any single political philosophy or through the conversion of the world to any single religious faith. UNESCO is founded on the belief that neither the forced unification of the world of the spirit, nor the forced standardization of the world of the mind can give men peace, but only a world democracy of mind as well as spirit. Cultural democracy implies cultural integrity, as true political democracy implies the freedom of the person and his personal integrity and self-respect. The cultural democracy which UNESCO proposes is a democracy of mind and spirit in which every culture shall be free to live and develop in itself and in the great community of common culture. Freemen do not fear ideas; freemen are not afraid of thought; freemen are eager to confront the differences and rich varieties that life presents, and to determine for themselves the things they take as true. This, from the beginning, has been the path of freedom."

Mr. Ribnikar's question may have a bearing upon the decision of the Soviet Union to join UNESCO. Russia was the only major power which was not officially represented at the conference. While there is great and useful work for UNESCO to do through its present roster of members, it cannot realize its full potentialities unless and until the Soviet Union constructively joins in the work. The fact that the Communist press throughout the world absolutely ignored UNESCO—even the Communist press of Paris—is interpreted by many to mean that the Soviet Union is taking no steps to prejudice its later joining in UNESCO.

Can UNESCO succeed? I want to contrast several remarks I heard in the first days. One was by J. B. Priestley, the novelist, who was a British delegate. "This conference," he said, "which is trying to lay the foundations of international understanding, is the most underrated conference in all history." Another was a remark that circulated among the French journalists covering the conference: "L'UNESCO c'est du fromage, qui s'est monte sur un nuage"—which, literally translated, means "UNESCO is a cheese riding on a cloud." In French political slang, I'm told, the cheese means something like our phrase, "pork barrel"—a pork barrel riding on a cloud. Another French commentary, similar in its cynicism, was "UNESCO is a band of little valiant men, and so much music lover."

My own view, of course, is that of Mr. Priestley. Otherwise I would not be here talking about UNESCO. I amend Priestley's comment in one way: UNESCO, in its potentialities, is the most underrated organization in history.

I have never heard anyone question the importance of UNESCO's goal. The obvious question—the recurrent, pervasive and latently demoralizing question is—can UNESCO actually make any significant progress, within the significant future, toward its goal: Is it, in fact, now riding on a cloud?

The skeptics can truthfully say, UNESCO has no real power. It has no authority to intervene in the cultural or educational life of any Nation. Its budget is a pittance compared with its task. It must do most of its work through other organizations. Its responsibilities are as wide and intangible as the human mind and spirit. It cannot measure or prove its results.

But there are compelling reasons for believing that UNESCO can succeed. To me these reasons are cogent enough to make UNESCO a good gamble—something of a long shot, perhaps, but good enough to warrant playing the gamble to the absolute limit. By "succeed" I do not mean that UNESCO may hang on as a worthy, rather useful and certainly harmless refuge for intellectuals and artists—as indeed it may. By succeed I mean that, in the issue between war and peace, it can weight the balance for peace.

The first of my reasons is that, like the other parts of the United Nations, it must succeed or we are all of us in dire straits indeed. Hard-headed men everywhere know this. The 43 governments that sent representatives to Paris are most of them fairly hard-boiled. Many of them can ill afford to spend money for luxuries. They came to Paris to work out a program that a decade ago would have indeed seemed, in the politician's view, a ride on a cloud. Today it may be a matter of life or death.

Second, there is abroad in the world, among ordinary people, a deep if vague yearning for the ends UNESCO is designed to serve. The ordinary people of the earth want to understand each other, and to understand the best of each other. They know that such understanding will minimize the risks of war. The unspoken hopes of millions are thus centered on UNESCO's goals, even though today UNESCO is virtually unknown. But it is dedicated to the service of ordinary people everywhere and, as it secures leaders that understand this, UNESCO will derive vitality from the people.

Third, the world now has at its disposal, for the first time in history, instruments of communication, and of education, that make possible the development of what Archibald MacLeish calls a planetary culture. It is no longer unrealistic to talk about eradicating illiteracy everywhere, or about raising the educational level of all. It is no longer visionary to establish the goal for most of the world's population of a full, prompt, and continuous account of world developments. The newest and most spectacular of these instruments are radio, motion pictures, and fast transportation. These are the tools UNESCO can work with—tools potentially as promising for good as the new weapons of war are potent for destruction, if we have but the sense to use them.

Fourth, and to this point I shall address the last half of this talk. A good start—a sound start—was made by UNESCO at Paris. After the opening plenary sessions the Conference was divided into three major commissions. One was on administrative and legal questions, with which I shall not belabor you though they were constructively resolved and are crucial for the long pull. A second was devoted to the problem of relief and rehabilitation of the educational, scientific, and cultural facilities of war-devastated areas. Of this I shall say only that the plight of these areas is a matter of deep concern to UNESCO. Although UNESCO itself cannot become an operating relief agency, $400,000 was voted to prepare a report on the needs and how they can be met, and to stimulate public and private agencies to help meet them.

The third commission, of greatest interest to such an audience as this, was that which dealt with the long-range program of UNESCO. This was further divided into six subcommissions—one for education; one for libraries, and museums; one for social sciences, philosophy, and humanistic studies; one for the natural sciences; one for the creative arts; and one for the mass media of communication.

There never had been any shortage of ideas for UNESCO. Proposals had come in by the bagful for a year—many of them excellent proposals. We heard from the proponents of a world language, a world university, a new calendar. The proposals ranged all the way from the establishment of a bird sanctuary on Heligoland to a frontal attack on rebuilding both the educational and communications facilities of the world.

So the first task of the conference was to agree upon a principle of priorities. The decision taken helped to bring UNESCO down out of the cloud. It was this: that projects should be few in number; that every project must be tested by its feasibility; that every proposal must further be tested by the question, Will this contribute directly and significantly to the cause of peace through understanding?

Out of the six subcommissions on program came recommendations, later adopted by the general conference, in support of over one hundred projects. The number was in my

opinion far too large. I shall be happily surprised if really substantial progress is made on 10 percent of them during 1947.

Certain recommendations were common to all the subcommission reports. For example, each developed plans for the exchange of students and specialists, for the convening of international meetings, and for the creation, as needed, of new international associations of specialists. Such exchanges, if they are undertaken on a really large scale, can clearly contribute to peace through understanding.

A second general type of recommendation was directed toward increasing the freedom and the volume of international communication. These recommendations took many forms, and dealt with studies of censorship, customs and postal and freight rates on books and scientific materials, copyrights, new methods of reproduction, standardization of library cataloging, international lending of books, etc.

Perhaps the most ambitious single project was one that came out of the education subcommission—a world-wide attack on the problem of illiteracy, and the establishment of minimum standards of education everywhere. This is a revolutionary undertaking, but it lies at the heart of UNESCO's long-range effort. If UNESCO can contribute substantially to its solution, it will have justified its existence through this effort alone. Well over half the world's population is illiterate. Can the world achieve peace through understanding in the absence of the simplest tools of understanding, the ability to read and write? Illiterate men are pawns in a power struggle. They are also victims of an inequality so grave as to constitute a threat to peace. UNESCO will create a staff of its own, supplemented by experts from many nations, to recommend programs for combatting illiteracy; to develop educational materials; and to determine how best to use books, pictures, films, and radio. Dr. George Stoddard, President of the University of Illinois, took leadership in the development of this major proposal, as he did in so many ways in Paris.

Further, Mrs. Louise Wright, Dean Richard McKeon, Dr. Carl Milam, and other Chicagoans made notable contributions to the development of UNESCO's program.

A recommendation made by Dr. Charles Johnson, President of Fisk University, became the top priority project of the social scientists. Under it UNESCO will undertake a study of the psychological and social tensions that lead to war. When the tensions that produce unrest, suspicion, and hatred among classes, races, and peoples have been identified and diagnosed we shall know better how to attack UNESCO's central problem of promoting peace through understanding.

An example from the subcommission on the natural sciences is the proposed International Institute of the Amazon. This proposes to bring together scientists from many nations, and from many fields of science, to study the problems of food, disease, and natural resources of a tropical area. The tropical areas of the world have been characterized by malnutrition and backwardness. An international attack upon this problem may open up new possibilities for the development of the tropics in such a way as to reduce future international tensions.

The mass media proposals were of especial interest. Before the Paris meeting we had heard that some of the other nations—particularly the smaller nations—feared what they called American cultural imperialism. It was charged that, by a combination of our financial strength, our highly developed communications industry—and our policy of opposing all barriers throughout the world to the free flow of ideas and information—we aimed to flood the world with American ideas, American standards of taste, and—to use an ugly word—American propaganda. We were told that, for this reason, America's proposals for the use of the mass media would find a cool reception.

We discovered that this fear of American cultural imperialism is not a fear of American books. Our book exports are, unfortunately, negligible. It is not a fear of American art or music. Neither is it a fear of the American press associations, which get plenty of competition, or of American radio, which can be heard in most countries only by short wave. What it boils down to is largely the fear of Hollywood. The very technical genius of Hollywood, which makes its pictures sought after and beloved by the masses of the people of the world, terrifies the scholars and intellectuals and politicians in these countries when they hear their children speaking English with an American accent, using American slang, and discussing love, divorce, and murder in Hollywood epigrams. The great world-wide impact of Hollywood is but little understood here in the United States, and it is greatly feared abroad.

The American delegation arrived in Paris determined to press for maximum use of the mass media of communication—motion pictures, radio, and the press—not as instruments of entertainment, but in their potential role as magnificent and unprecedented new instruments for the pursuit of peace. We were delighted to find that, far from being cool to the development of the mass media in this role, other nations began to take the lead on proposals which we had been prepared to advance.

In the subcommission on mass media, under the chairmanship of a Belgian and the vice chairmanship of a Dane, the British, the French, the Canadians, and others came forward vigorously with proposals that coincided closely with our own.

The small nations found us gladly acknowledging that other peoples have ideas, and cultural achievements, that deserve mass dissemination, even in America. The ancient Greeks couldn't film or broadcast their plays, we conceded; but they could write them. The other nations found us eager to cooperate in a scheme by which mass communications techniques might be broadened by inviting technicians of backward countries to work and study in the more advanced countries.

UNESCO will undertake a major effort to reduce the barriers that now obstruct the free flow of communications among peoples. We know from bitter experience that even highly literate peoples, when they are cut off from a full, honest, and continuous account of developments among other peoples, can be propagandized and bullied into aggressive belligerency. UNESCO is to survey the restrictions on the flow of information and ideas across international boundaries, and the suppression and distortion of information and ideas by any influence.

In cooperation with the United Nations, UNESCO will explore the possibility of creating a world-wide broadcasting network, under international auspices. Such a network might bring to ordinary people everywhere, and in many languages, an account of the history, the achievements, the problems, the hopes and the aspirations, the music, and the literature of other peoples.

I shall conclude my comments on UNESCO's program with a special word about the natural sciences. It is clear that science, and scientific ways of thinking, have a major, a crucial, role in education for international understanding. Cooperative projects, involving the collaboration of scientists of many nations, are helpful by the very fact of collaboration, even though the projects may have no direct bearing on peace or on the will to peace among people generally. But at some point the yardstick must be invoked. Does UNESCO, for example, have any direct concern with research on cancer? I fear that many of the scientists at Paris, who hoped that UNESCO might immediately emerge as the chief agency for coordinating international scientific activities, including scientific research as such, came away feeling that the budget allotted for science was inadequate for such a purpose; and that another organization, specifically designed to the end of advancing international scientific research as such, might be needed. If there is a single field of UNESCO in which the world is turning to the United States for leadership, it is science and technology. UNESCO should increasingly stress this field with the passage of the years.

UNESCO's operating budget for the first year—$6,000,000—is minuscule compared with the task and the opportunity. That is about the cost of two submarines. It is about half the budget of the University of Chicago in a normal year. The American delegation opposed a somewhat larger budget, not because of any lack of faith in UNESCO, or failure to understand the magnitude of its task. We opposed a larger budget because the cost of the various international organizations that have come into being during the last 2 years has mounted to the point where many of the smaller nations—particularly those impoverished and devastated by the war—simply cannot afford to pay their share. It would be a disaster if they were forced to withdraw. Further, it will take time properly to organize UNESCO's staff and coordinate its program.

The American delegation at Paris insisted that the 1947 budget must not be taken as a standard for future years. When the nations have passed through what Senator VANDENBERG calls "the present subsistence period"; when UNESCO has built its staff and discovered by experience what it can and what it cannot do, I see no limit, except the clear-cut promise of results, upon either its efforts or its budget.

I shall close on a note of hope and caution. The conference that took place may well have been, in Mr. Priestley's words, the most underrated conference in all history. For UNESCO can become one of the most useful instruments ever devised by man.

But it can fulfill its potentialities only under favorable conditions. It cannot succeed unless the pressing political and economic problems that now beset the world are resolved in such a way as to give UNESCO time to grow. It cannot succeed in the absence of outstanding leadership, adequate funds and public support. It cannot succeed if the expectation of quick results brings disillusionment.

Yet, no experiment in international cooperation ever held less danger or more promise for the future peace and well-being of mankind. UNESCO is like a break in an overcast sky. It is a patch of light—if I may reverse a familiar expression—now no bigger than a man's hand. We must all unite in the hope that it is destined to grow—to grow until the clear light of truth and understanding breaks through to all peoples.

Reduction of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "They're All for Lower Taxes,

But—", published in the magazine section of the New York Times for January 19, 1947. The article is written in a more or less humorous vein, but I think by reason of that it all the more clearly depicts the conflict in emotions which we experience as we go about the all-important task of balancing the Budget and making some retirement of the public debt. I think the article might be read with profit by all Members of the Congress, as well as by citizens who are interested in this matter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY'RE ALL FOR LOWER TAXES, BUT AT THE SAME TIME EVERYONE WANTS GOVERNMENT TO KEEP UP ITS BENEFITS AND EVEN ADD TO THEM

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

PORTLAND, OREG.—Folks out this way quarrel and bicker about a lot of things, but you can bet your warmest suit of winter woolens that they all want that 20-percent reduction in personal income taxes. You can't start any rumpus on that. It's as popular as a nice rich elk stew around the campfire.

When Representative KNUTSON, of Minnesota, the ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, first announced that everyone's taxes might be sliced a fifth, you would have thought he had offered to divvy up the Comstock Lode. The populace got so jubiliant that cowpunchers who never returned a tax form in their lives celebrated by shooting the light bulbs out of hotel signs in five or six cattle towns.

Even Dad Wingate is for Mr. KNUTSON's proposal, and Dad is a crotchety old trapper on Granite Mountain who generally is opposed to everything. He has the reputation of being the most "agin" man in the whole State. "'Deed I am for that 20-percent tax reduction," said Dad. "It'd give me a real nice piece o' change. Why, with that reduction I'd be headed straight for Easy Street if the doggone Guv-ment would only boost the bounty on coyotes. The Guv'ment has got so consarned stingy. Wouldn't hurt 'em a bit to pay me $5 apiece for killing them critters."

That's a sample of the way people feel.

And there's Colonel Sloan. We call him colonel because he's always marching and trudging in the National Guard parades. The colonel had just come from a red-hot meeting to protest the War Department order closing the Sixth Army area office in our home town. He was still reciting parts of his speech when we bumped into him.

"Silly, dastardly, dangerous outrage," harrumped the colonel. "A school child knows that whole office here didn't cost more than $35,000 a year to maintain, and now they've gone and left our fair city defenseless."

We asked the colonel about the 20-percent tax reduction.

"Bully!" he shouted. (The colonel was in the Spanish-American War.) "Those taxeaters in Washington keep me impoverished. They're the people who insidiously closed the Army area office while I was bedridden with influenza. Cut taxes immediately, I say. Should have been done long ago. Harrumph!"

Of course, our Congressman has the right idea on the whole situation. He's as strong as mustard for cutting taxes. Didn't we just reelect him by a whopping vote when he promised to keep the tax collector out of our cash drawers and to give us all Townsend plan pensions when we get to be 60? We've got a mighty good Congressman. He's working hard to pass the Williamette Valley project to irrigate farms, and he assures us it's going to help business, too, when the Government spends $180,000,000 right at our back door. What with all that money pouring in and then the tax reduction our Congressman has promised, we're going to have prosperity that will have us all in clover.

But don't get the notion that our Congressman isn't for economy. He's a real economy man; none of that crazy spending for him. He watches the Treasury with an eagle eye.

Only last week our Congressman came out against the dams that the bureaucrats proposed to build 3,000 miles away in New England. "A ridiculous waste of money. None of the advantages of the great Williamette Valley project." Those are the very words our Congressman used. And then he said, speaking out clear and bold, "If we are going to lighten the insufferable tax burden the people are carrying, we must cleanse the public pay roll of bureaucratic meddlers."

Just to show how folks' words are often misunderstood, the President up and closed the Reclamation headquarters downtown. Of course, our Congressman didn't stand for that. He sent the President a sizzling telegram telling him how he hadn't meant the local Reclamation people at all when he talked about bureaucrats. Funny how a man as smart as the President of the United States is supposed to be can get things wrong. Our Congressman told the President to economize by closing the Reclamation office in Amarillo instead. After all, why should the taxpayers support a Reclamation office 'way down there in Texas?

Politics always starts everyone to arguing, I guess, but the 20-percent tax reduction must be an exception. I've traveled from the Continental Divide to the Pacific's shores, and I can't find a soul against it. Sentiment must be just about unanimous, I imagine.

A few blocks from my mother's house lives a big banker. He's a Republican. You should hear him talk for tax reduction. He practically gives his college cheer. He came by the other evening on his way home from a banker's meeting that demanded a return of the tariff on lumber. Over one of my father's old-fashioned's the banker said, "If the new Congress only gives us genuine tax relief, stops loaning money to foreign countries, and affords us effective protection from competition by foreign products, we are in for a period of undiluted prosperity in this country." The banker always talks in big words like that: he must read a lot.

It's queer, but we have a friend in the CIO Political Action Committee who won't even stop in when he sees the banker's sedan in front of the house, yet our CIO friend is for tax reduction, too. We heard him on the radio the other night. He was making a speech in favor of higher unemployment insurance payments and increased expenditures for public housing. Near the end of the speech he came out for tax reduction. Naturally, he asked for tax reduction in the lower brackets. So our CIO friend and our banker neighbor are both for tax reduction, although we aren't quite sure in just what bracket the banker thinks the reduction ought to be.

Living here on the rim of the country's western frontier, we frequently see farm and city people wide apart on political questions. It's not like that on this tax reduction business.

My wife's folks run a dairy and grain farm along the Columbia River. Every single one of them hopes Congress puts through the 20-percent-tax reduction. My mother-in-law even thinks the reduction ought to be 40 or 50 percent. "Look what a fix we farmers would be in if they shut off the parity payments," she told me during the holidays. "Our tires are all shot to pieces because the Government doesn't spend enough money on the roads. The REA should string more wires to get us cheap electricity. The only way we farmers can lay by a little is to get out from under some of the taxes."

Everywhere I go people are for tax reduction, yet some of them are frightfully provincial about it. I was over in Idaho a week or so ago. When people there talk about tax reduction, they think the Government should economize on its hydroelectric power expenditures in the State of Oregon. That's a fine attitude! We all know that Oregon needs more power if it is to attract new industries. Thank goodness we in Oregon haven't such a provincial outlook.

A narrow person could criticize us, I suppose, for urging that Treasury money be saved by not building that proposed railroad to Alaska, but that's a good deal different because Alaska isn't even part of the United States. And if the railroad were built, what might happen to our steamship companies in Portland? You can't blame us for thinking of that.

Our town has a larger proportion of its inhabitants over 60 than any other city in America, so plenty of Townsend Clubs still meet in the auditoriums of local schoolhouses. Even our Congressman, the one working with all his might and main for tax reduction, is a loyal Townsend Club member. The old folks are anxious to get those $200-a-month pensions, but until the Townsend plan comes through they have to count every cent. That 20-percent-tax reduction looks mighty inviting to them. The president of our biggest Townsend Club told me the tax reduction would so encourage general prosperity that the country could easily pay all the old people Townsend pensions.

"Then," he added, "each of us Townsendites will spend the $200 every month, and thus keep the prosperity going."

I suppose Government expenditures must be cut somewhere along the line if we are to get the tax reduction we all want, and our State has a United States Senator who knows how to cut them. He tells us that the Army and Navy spend more of our money than almost all the rest of the Government put together. He is making it tough for those generals and admirals to throw our hard-earned dollars around.

The Senator knows a lot about foreign affairs, too. He wants us to stop appeasing Stalin. "The Russians will respect us," he said recently, "only if we show them a mailed fist."

Once in a while I worry about how we are going to stand up to the Russians if we get the 20-percent tax reduction by saving money on the Army and Navy, but I'm sure our Senator knows what he is talking about. After all, he's been in politics a long time.

One would think that if you talked to enough people, you would finally bump into someone who didn't want taxes cut. I even tried talking to an Indian with braids on the Oregon seacoast. He was very happy. His tribe had just won a $20,000,000 judgment against the Government in the United States Supreme Court. This Indian didn't speak like the Indians in the story books. He had been to the State university, and he said, "The Bureau of Internal Revenue has ruled that our $20,000,000 from the Government is income. I hope that Representative KNUTSON puts through his 20-percent tax reduction in time to enable our tribe to keep a greater share of the money."

I like this tax reduction talk for an extra reason. You have a chance to find out things you never knew before. Captain Homer Goodsell runs a tugboat service on the upper Columbia River. Whenever anyone solicits him on a charity drive, he always starts complaining about the money he loses. We all felt sorry for Captain Homer's financial plight, but the other day he blurted out, "Darn those Congressmen if they don't pass that 20-percent cut. It'd save me a cool $2,500 in taxes every year."

We must have stared at Captain Homer sort of steady, for he looked sheepish and said, "Well, my business has been a whole lot better since the Government put in that big lift-lock at Bonneville."

Captain Homer stared back at us and added defensively, "That lock cost $11,000,000. It oughta have helped some."

I am a Grange member in good standing, and all the Grangers are for tax reduction. I thought a lot of them were 'way in the hole on their farms, but when I heard them totaling up what the 20-percent cut would mean to their bank accounts, I decided they were doing all right. In fact, my fellow Grangers seem about as strong for tax reduction as they are for parity payments, soil-conservation benefits, and rural electrification lines.

I guess this sounds like my Grange is pretty reckless about spending Government money, but that isn't so. You should have heard our Grange Master talk against wasteful spending on unemployment insurance and similar ways of mollycoddling labor. Our Grange Master was pretty mad, too, when he said that. Hadn't the State federation of labor just come out for saving money by eliminating all subsidies for agriculture?

Taxes ought to come down any time now. Isn't approval of the 20-percent reduction practically unanimous? Even folks in Alaska are all out for it. On the streets of Seattle last week we hailed an old friend from Fairbanks. Over coffee and pound cake he told us that he was on his way to Washington, D. C., to lobby for two things—tax reduction and the price of gold pegged at a higher level. "More people in Alaska are for that 20-percent tax reduction than for statehood," said my friend, banging the table with a fist, horny from many hours gripping the controls of a gold dredge.

We parted, but not before he had admonished me to "work for Federal funds to keep up the Alcan Highway where it stretches through Canada."

I have traveled all over the West in the past few weeks, and I don't see how tax reduction can miss. Everyone is for it—cowpunchers, locomotive engineers, tugboat captains, waitresses, Indians, artists' models, prospectors from Alaska, housewives, grocers, butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers. I've already figured out how to spend the 20 percent I'm going to save on my personal income tax.

I'm going to buy a new rod and reel to use fishing for Rainbow trout in Tombstone Lake up on top of the Wallowa National Forest. I understand the fish there are 22 inches long, and I can get to Tombstone Lake with a pack outfit just as soon as the Government appropriates money to swamp out that old trail across the pass.

Patrick Henry, Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Patrick Henry, Lawyer," delivered by Michael Francis Doyle, of Philadelphia, before the Virginia Bar Association, at Virginia Beach, September 18, 1946, at which the Lord Chief Justice of England and the president of the American Bar Association were present.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman:

These remarks should be commenced by addressing this distinguished audience as, "fellow-citizens," the first usage of which expression has been accredited to Patrick Henry himself in his address to the people of Virginia.

Indeed, it might be regarded as presumptuous for a citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—even a Philadelphia lawyer—to come to your State and before such a learned body as I am now addressing to discuss the qualities of this great Virginian whom all revere and whose name is an inspiration to the children of the schools of all our country as well as this Commonwealth.

If that thought should be in the mind of any of my listeners, may I not suggest that until he left his home in Virginia—in 1774—to attend the sessions of the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia, Patrick Henry always and solely classified himself as a Virginian. In this very month, 172 years ago—in fact it might be said on September 18, 1774—this great statesman arose in Carpenter's Hall, in the city of Philadelphia, and expressed for the first time in one of his eloquent addresses, "I now speak no longer as a Virginian. I speak now and henceforth as an American." It is from that city as an American, therefore, that I come to this State which he loved so well with renewed admiration of his qualities as a man, and a statesman, and to reaffirm my allegiance to his patriotic ideals. Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Declaration of Independence, salutes Virginia the home of the father of independence.

Indeed, Philadelphia has its claim in other ways to his name and fame. His portrait by Thomas Sully, of Philadelphia, has been regarded as the best likeness of him which has come down to us. The famous painting of the Speech in the House of Burgesses Against the Stamp Act was by P. F. Rothermel, a Philadelphian. Carpenter's Hall, Philadelphia, has on one of its walls the painting of DeLand of Patrick Henry Addressing the First Continental Congress." Many offices in our Quaker City are graced by copies of these great works. Not far from the site of Benjamin Franklin's printing shop in Philadelphia the first biography of Patrick Henry, by William Wirt, was printed and first saw the light of day. I trust, therefore, that if any evidence is needed of Philadelphia's connection with Virginia's great son these facts will suffice.

Patrick Henry was a man of great attainments, both domestic and public. He was the father of 17 children. He had responsibilities far beyond the heads of most families these modern days. While the date of his admission to the bar has never been in controversy, yet there has been contention over the length of time which he studied to become a lawyer. Thomas Jefferson and Judge Winston state that 6 weeks' preparation enabled him to pass the required tests. Other authorities, such as Colonel Meredith and Captain Dabney, contend that he studied law from 6 to 8 months, while Judge John Tyler, another of his contemporaries, insists that he finished his studies in 1 month, during which time he read Coke Upon Littleton and the Virginia Laws. At all events, he successfully secured the approval of two of his examiners without much examination, they hoping, no doubt, that his defects would be quickly discovered by their own colleagues. The third examiner, having learned that two had already signed his application, put him to a test and was convinced that, although he knew very little law, he knew many other things which were important for lawyers to know, and dubiously signed his license. He thus secured the necessary assent of the required number of the board of examiners. One, however, George Wythe, refused to sign. Patrick Henry was neither a graduate of a college nor a student in a law office. He had neither a preceptor nor a diploma to attest his proficiency. He had neither an office nor a clerk. Indeed, at this time he had no visible means of support. Having failed as a storekeeper, and without employment, he sought the law for his field of endeavor. It is possible that these elements may have even aided him in securing his license to practice law. At all events, his examiners showed excellent judgment and never regretted their action.

Some scholar, through research, found that Demosthenes, the noted Greek orator, was 27 years of age when he attained his greatest fame, and Cicero, the great Roman, also reached his fame at the same age. It might also be remarked that Patrick Henry was this same age when he first began his fame in the celebrated lawsuit, known as the Parsons case. What he early lacked in legal knowledge, he quickly absorbed with his keen powers of observation and impressed the courts wheneve. he appeared on behalf of clients. There was no Colonial Bar Association in Virginia in those days—nor elsewhere for that matter. Patrick Henry, however, soon made himself the leader not only in litigation before the courts, but in all public matters, small and great, affecting the community.

He kept a record of his fees in his own handwriting which still exists. It showed that in less than 6 months of 1760, the year of his admission to the bar, he had 60 clients. By the end of 1763, in 3 years' practice, he had 1,185 lawsuits in which fees were paid. These did not include many where his advice and services were rendered without charge. This pictured him as a busy, active young lawyer. I doubt if any of his profession in this State, of his age at this time, can show a record superior to this Such was the beginning of his career at the Virginia bar. It is not my intention in my allotted time to continue an analysis of his professional services in the courts in detail during the succeeding years. It must be observed, however, that the law aided him to become an orator and that he was a lawyer before he was a statesman. The field of the law still offers the greatest path, even in these days, to statesmanship and world leadership. His election to the Colonial Legislature opened his career of public service to his countrymen. His appearance in Philadelphia marked him as a statesman and as a great Virginian. Patrick Henry, the Virginia lawyer, now develops into Patrick Henry, the founder of independence, and Patrick Henry, the statesman.

He discontinued his profession of the law for 13 years to serve his State in public office. At the end of this period he again reentered the law and commenced one of the most brilliant careers ever experienced by an advocate. His wonderful powers as they developed showed his leadership in nisi prius practice, as well as many of the great chancery cases of his time. It was as a defender of the rights of the common man and as a criminal lawyer that his eloquence had the widest scope. He had no equal among the great leaders of his profession in his State. It must also be acknowledged that Virginia had many of the great lawyers of this period. This admission by a Philadelphia lawyer surely will not lessen even the luster of the Philadelphia bar. The distinguished names comprising the list of officers and members of the Virginia Bar Association still attest that the qualities and splendid talents of their ancestors—famous names honored in those days—and these days as well—have not disappeared from this historic State.

As an orator, Patrick Henry was the foremost of his day. Judge Carrington, one of the leading men of Virginia at this period, who knew him well, stated his eloquence was beyond all power of description. He has been acknowledged as one of the greatest orators of all time.

William Pitt, afterward Lord Chatham, one of the most noted of English statesmen and orators, has often been compared with Patrick Henry. One, however, was primitive, plain, and a man of the provinces; the other was a complex development living in the center of English civilization. One was simple and sincere; the other was imbued by the power of his public office. They both, however, held lofty views, were farseeing, patriotic, and born to enthrall mankind with masterful language.

McDowall wrote, "The most remarkable characteristic of Henry's speaking was its union of dramatic power with a striking moral ascendancy. This was the salient characteristic of his life as well as of his oratory."

Grattan stated: "He lightened upon his subject and reached the point by the flashings of his mind which were felt but could not be followed." Another contemporary affirmed "He swayed every assembly he addressed apparently at his pleasure. When fully aroused he overthrew all opposition and forced all to accept his views as the only true ones. His wonderful oratory made him a thousand times the superior of his opponents. By common consent of all his contemporaries, his eloquence was indescribable."

Gen. Andrew Jackson, while passing through Virginia and hearing him in a criminal case, said of him: "No description which I have ever heard, no conception I have ever formed gave me any just idea of his powers of eloquence."

Thomas Jefferson, at one time his colleague and admirer, and at another time his critic, stated in his autobiography that he appeared to speak as Homer wrote; again he said: "He was the greatest orator that ever lived."

Beyond all doubt his eloquence was one of the chief forces of the American Revolution. It was as necessary to that great cause, said Henry Armitt Brown, noted Philadelphia lawyer and orator, as the intelligence of Benjamin Franklin, the will of Samuel Adams, the pen of Thomas Jefferson, or the sword of George Washington. There is such a time in a nation's trial that one voice speaks for all. It echoes the spirit of the age. The voice of Patrick Henry was the voice of America struggling for freedom. He must be regarded as the first and greatest leader of American independence.

When Patrick Henry and the other delegates came to Philadelphia in September 1774 for the first meeting of the Continental Congress, few knew each other. They were acquainted only through their correspondence and from the pamphlets which had been published from time to time in the various Colonies.

Patrick Henry had as his colleagues from Virginia, George Washington, Richard Henry Lee, Peyton Randolph, Richard Bland, Benjamin Harrison, and Edmund Pendleton. These were the leaders of the colonial cause. It is remarkable, however, that of this number only two were Members of the Continental Congress who signed the Declaration of Independence—Richard Henry Lee and Benjamin Harrison. Of this first Congress, John Adams wrote, "This Assembly is like no other that ever existed. Every man in it is a great man and orator, a critic, and statesman, and, therefore, every man upon every question must show his oratory, his criticism, and his political abilities."

Charles Thompson, a son of Ireland, was confidential secretary of this Congress. At the first meeting the Members, "conscious of the impending perils of the movement," resolved "that all their deliberations should be kept inviolably secret." His records were thus regretfully destroyed. Had his notes been preserved, they would show that it was Patrick Henry, the leader for independence, was also the one who kept the Congress from approving the plan of an English colony along the lines proposed by Joseph Galloway, of Pennsylvania. It took all the eloquence of Patrick Henry to prevent the adoption of Galloway's motion on that September day, 1774, when it proposed a plan for a colonial union formed with a council to be chosen from the 13 assemblies, and a President to be appointed by the King. This plan was defeated by only one vote. It was Patrick Henry's eloquence that secured the necessary votes to defeat it. It was a most narrow escape. Had it been adopted, there probably would have been no Declaration of Independence and no free government by the people of the United States. We would have been a colony under the crown of Great Britain. The history of the world would have been changed. Patrick Henry destroyed the carefully planned plot for a British colonial government in our States, and by his leadership directed the plans for our independence and our new Government. He is the father of American independence.

The stirring history of the Revolutionary period cannot be detailed here because of the brevity of these remarks. It is enough to say, however, that Patrick Henry had made such an impression on the First Continental Congress and so shaped the course of American history that his presence at the Second Congress was not essential. He then set out to show that a sovereign government could exist solely by the power of people expressed in laws of their own making without direction of the British Crown and the power of its military and naval strength. He gave the example of a public officer who could be the servant of the people, instead of their master. As the first elected Governor of Virginia he demonstrated how a Crown colony could organize into a State and carry on as an independent government. His devotion to the Revolutionary cause and his appreciation of the military genius and leadership of Washington have never been questioned. His example became an inspiration for other Colonies and to other patriots. He did a service in this regard which has not been fully recognized, even to this day.

Patrick Henry wisely indicated the responsibility which independence would bring to the people of the Colonies, when he expressed himself in a letter to one of his sons, as follows: "Whether this independence will bring a blessing or a curse will depend upon the use our people make of the blessing which a gracious God hath bestowed on us. If they be wise, they will be great and happy. If they are of a contrary character, they will be miserable. Righteousness alone can exalt them as a nation."

He challenged the new Federal Constitution, because, while it was republican in form, it gave too much power to the office of President and failed in its protection of the liberty of the individual citizen. His fight against the Constitution as it was drawn successfully resulted in the adoption by the First Congress, under the Constitution, of the 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights. It was his stand, as well as Jefferson's leadership and Madison's pen, that helped to make these amendments a part of the Constitution. His warning of the extensive power of the President has been fully justified by the exercise of authority of this office during the past century and especially in recent years.

Patrick Henry was called upon to serve in more high offices than possibly any other American since the adoption of the Federal Constitution. He did not hesitate, however, to decline public office when he felt he should not accept.

This is his record in that regard:

In 1794 he was tendered a United States Senatorship by Gen. Henry Lee, then Governor of Virginia.

In the same year President Washington proposed to send him as a Minister to Spain.

In 1795 President Washington offered him the post of Secretary of State.

In 1795 he offered him the position of Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

In the same year Washington designated him as Minister to France.

He was suggested as a candidate for the Vice Presidency. He declined votes offered in the Electoral College for the Presidency itself.

For the sixth time he was elected Governor of Virginia, which he refused to accept.

In 1799 President Adams named him as Envoy to France, and the Senate confirmed the nomination.

All these places and honors were declined by Patrick Henry.

Patrick Henry died on June 6, 1799, in the 63d year of his age, at Red Hill, Charlotte County, Va., and was buried in the ground adjoining his home. Washington followed him before the end of the same year. Neither were permitted to see the beginning of the new century. Like Moses of old, they could view the promised future from the heights of another Mount Nebo without fully comprehending the magnificent vision of the results of their labors.

Has our country performed its full duty to the memory of Patrick Henry? I fear not. Our national development is largely due to his ideals of government, to his character, and to his labors. His conception of independence, born of Virginia soil, quickly grew in all the American Colonies. Our Nation is the leader in democracy and civilization because he lived. Today, however, we find new seeds of government being implanted in our beloved country, foreign to the homes of Virginia and contaminating to American soil. Communism is the antithesis of independence. The fruit of the efforts of Patrick Henry and those patriots who founded our Nation is now in danger of being destroyed. We must meet the challenge. We call upon the spirit of Patrick Henry by its eloquence to arouse the deadened attitude of our people to valiantly meet this issue. We call upon our fellow-citizens to follow the spirit of George Washington, whose leadership created our Nation. We call upon them to protect the ideals of Thomas Jefferson that we may continue to be free. What these men built let no man put asunder. False doctrines must not be implanted in our schools, nor un-American laws be enacted for special privilege by our legislatures. Equality and equal rights shall be shared by all under the law, but no man or combination of men—no matter under what guise—shall have transcendent rights. The spiritual guidance which blessed the eloquent tongue of Patrick Henry in St. John's Church, Richmond, became a benediction to the world. The voluntary expression of labor exemplified by the invitation to Carpenter's Hall, Philadelphia, to chart a new course of liberty was based on the conception of equal rights of all men and for all mankind.

Let us not permit this conception of our liberties or these blessings now possessed by the American people to be destroyed.

It is right and proper that we should honor the signers of the Declaration of Independence and those who drew the Constitution of the United States and presented these charts of liberties to the world, and who for them were willing to sacrifice their lives and fortunes.

The grave of every signer of the Declaration of Independence which has been located is

marked by a tribute of our Federal Government; the last resting place of each of the signers of the Constitution is marked by a national emblem of honor—but the grave of Patrick Henry—even to this day—is unhonored. It has been forgotten by the Federal Government; it has been overlooked by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Only a few months ago his home and his land at Red Hill were offered for public sale to settle the estate of the last owner. Were it not for a few patriotic men and women, the property might have fallen into hands of speculators and to possible desecration. The foundations of his home were he spent his last days still remain. His law office nearby still stands. His body lies in the ground which he marked for his resting place. It is one of the hallowed spots of America.

My friends of Virginia, will you not join with those valiant ones who have become guardians of this shrine and help preserve it for our Nation? Lawyers from Pennsylvania and other States are willing to join with lawyers from Virginia in sponsoring this movement and becoming its protectors.

As we joined together in 1776, when the blood of your fathers was offered to be shed with that of the patriots from the other Colonies, should we not now join together to continue to redeem our obligations to the founders of our Republic?

May our devotion to the past and the knowledge of the dangers which confront us today create strengthened bonds of brotherhood which will, with God's blessing, protect us and our Nation now and forever.

Essays on Benjamin Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two essays on Benjamin Franklin which were adjudged the best in a competition sponsored by the Poor Richard Club, of Philadelphia, and radio station WPEN in conjunction with the two hundred and forty-first anniversary of Franklin's birth.

The prize essays were written by Betty Lou Martin, of the Prospect Park High School, Prospect Park, Philadelphia, and Warren R. Bisbing, of the Lincoln Prep School, Philadelphia, Pa.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN SPEAKS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ON HOW TO LIVE TOGETHER IN WORLD PEACE

(First prize winner in girls' division, WPEN Benjamin Franklin essay contest, Betty Lou Martin, Prospect Park High School, Prospect Park, Pa.)

I am deeply honored and more than obliged to speak to you who represent all nations at this time and present for your arbitration my humble opinions which are for you to take for what they are worth.

During my lifetime, world peace was probably unthought of. As most Americans and very likely others of you no doubt know, I am a moralist and on such an occasion as this I could not leave my morals behind. I believe that this one suits the occasion best: "Wrong none by doing injuries or omitting the benefits that are your duty." This is my idea of justice, and I believe most of you will agree that if this could be followed to perfection, peace would be one direct result; but since there are nations who give nothing and take all they possibly can, I, myself, would deem such a thing impossible and more or less as wishful thinking. Yet, if each nation would be more broad-minded and tolerant, you would be on the road to peace without so much blundering and idiotic groping around for the illusive key to peace. Be not disturbed at trifles, or at accidents common or unavoidable, and remember, lost time is never found again. Do not hesitate to do what you believe is right, but think in terms of the world, not your nation.

Experience keeps a dear school, but fools will learn in no other, and scarce in that; and to conclude, God helps them that help themselves. I am, as ever, thine to serve thee, Benjamin Franklin.

POOR RICHARD WRITES AGAIN

(First prize winner in boys' division, WPEN Benjamin Franklin essay contest, Warren R. Bisbing, Lincoln Prep School, Philadelphia, Pa.)

Many years ago I was happy in life to work with my fellow countrymen in forming the United States of America and in establishing the place of the Union among the nations of Europe. Back in those days, I wrote upon my return to Philadelphia: "I had not the firmness to resist the unanimous desire of my country folk, and now I find myself harnessed again in their service for another year. They engrossed the prime of my life. They have eaten my flesh, and seem resolved now to pick my bones." Here, once more it appears that the public would have even my bones and dust served them. It is my duty.

The efforts of my fellow Americans in building a United Nations is but the continuation of my efforts in the eighteenth century. I have passed my wand on to men like Byrnes and Vandenberg, Marshall and Taft.

Let me say that the motive force for a United Nations must spring from the good will of the peoples, the plain peoples of all nations. The diplomats and political leaders must foster this good will and honestly represent it in their council chambers. The diplomacy of the future must be established upon the recognition of basic human rights.

All nations desire permanent peace. That peace can be threatened only by differences among nations. Therefore, people must develop a proper respect for other peoples who may have philosophical, economic, political, racial, and cultural differences. Such variations among peoples must be recognized as natural. Guard against the development of bad will and prejudice upon the perception of such differences.

Then again, a United Nations must be a strong union. Membership must be serious and not whimsical. United power and arms should be organized for the preservation of a permanent peace and of the United Nations. Only in strength can ideals be realized.

It follows that the government of the United Nations must be conducted upon a sound financial structure. Proper arrangements should be set forth for the growth of resources to back the decisions of the massed peoples of the earth.

Naturally, the peoples who so contribute to the government of the earth demand their proper influence and representation. The legislative bodies should make laws to achieve justice and universal support. The people will constantly desire to know about the regulations enacted. Hence the channels of information must be kept open to all peoples.

Disputes which formerly caused wars will be settled by the judicial system of the United Nations. Such a court must develop a respect for its opinions by the wisdom and understanding reflected. Appeals must be possible, but final decisions must be handed down. Reason requires that such decisions must be upheld by force, if necessary. Thus, international government will develop legislative, executive, and judicial departments.

Rights must be set forth and duties must be prescribed. Under such plans, mankind will witness the growth of a new and better social order, a universal society, a United Nations. May all blessings go with it.

The State of the Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "The State of the Unions," written by Maurice R. Franks, editor of the Railroad Workers Journal, the official organ of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America.

I feel that this editorial has many very valuable suggestions at this crucial time, when we are trying to solve amicably the question of relationship between employer and employee.

I understand from the writer, Mr. Franks, that his suggestion with reference to the creation of an industrial relations court is contemplated only as a court which can deal with the controversies which arise over the meaning and interpretation of a contract voluntarily entered into between management and labor. It is not intended otherwise to solve the issues of employment or collective bargaining. Its purpose is to keep a dispute over the meaning of a contract voluntarily entered into from shutting down production while the equities of the parties under the contract are determined.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF THE UNIONS

It has long been the custom for the President of the United States to deliver an address to the incoming Congress. This so-called report on the state of the Union is, in effect, a formal report on his stewardship. The purpose is to outline the activities of his office which naturally affect the state of the Union, and invariably suggestions considered by the President to be important to the national welfare are made to the Congress.

DEMOCRACY IN UNIONS

This report of our Nation's President immediately suggests to my mind another kind of Presidential report, one also affecting the national welfare. It would be extremely interesting today to hear a number of these. I refer, of course, to possible reports by all our union presidents on the state of the unions.

Not being a wishful thinker, I have no hope of seeing any such reports forthcoming at this moment. The reason for my lack of hope is simple: it is because the "stewards" of many of our unions find themselves, through poor stewardship, in no position to render a full and accurate report on the state of their unions.

I am, nevertheless, of the belief that such reports should be now obligatory. It is the Nation's due that the state of the unions should be clarified. Also that this inner economic government shall be put to functioning along far more democratic lines.

NO ROOM FOR HATE

Through present-day manipulations of union bossism, in many cases a far cry from unionism as faithfully conceived, this country has been thrown into a state of economic chaos, if not actual economic revolution, from which there is small chance for escape unless remedial measures are immediately found and applied.

In searching for a remedy one consideration is of utmost importance; we shall first have to purge all hatred from our hearts and place the welfare of our country above every selfish inclination, whether we be worker or employer, politician or private citizen. Minus such a general attitude, we cannot hope to make order out of chaos.

THE NECESSITY OF UNIONISM

Although I lay no claim to being an economic doctor armed with a cure-all, I nevertheless believe myself to be in a position to offer a number of suggestions which, if accepted and acted upon, would play their part in bringing about a more harmonious relationship and a better understanding between the workers, their employers, and the general public.

My 27 years in the labor movement fully convinces me that unions—and I mean only good unions—are an integral part of our American way of life. Without good unions many workers would be sent reeling back into the days of the Simon Legrees of industry, when the individual worker was in all ways bound to do the bidding of a ruthless industrial master. Times when 16 hours of sweaty toil per day for a livelihood, utterly mean in itself, was the rule, and when even little children, by a cruel extension of this same despicable practice, were compelled to work from dawn to dusk with never an opportunity to enjoy the inherent rights of every American.

Indeed, without unionism it would not be long before the sweatshop, with all of its dastardly and inhumane conditions, would be back in our midst; and it would not be long either before wages would be back down to a starvation level. Proof of this deduction may be found in the files of newspapers bearing the dates of 1933–34–35, during the true depth of the depression. In the columns of those newspapers are plenty of items—many of these illustrated by photographs from various parts of the country—which bear telling witness to the fact of anxious workers being auctioned off like slaves at the high bid of 20 cents an hour. And there are other items on file to record the miserable fact that men were discharged through the front door only to be rehired at the back door of the same shop at half the usual wage. These conditions no decent American desires to see return.

The spirit of Simon Legree was not altogether dead in the thirties. Nor is there reason to suppose that his spirit is any more dead today.

This being true, it is obvious that good unions are very much needed to protect not only the workingman but also the honest employer against his chiseling racketeer competitor.

It is no longer a question of "unions to be or not to be." That matter has been definitely settled. It is now simply a question of "unions, good or bad."

Well, I, for one, see no reason why we cannot insist upon good unions—particularly since these are possible, provided only we think clearly and act with wisdom and common sense.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN

Every thinking person is deeply concerned about the present labor-management conflict. Numerous cure-all suggestions are constantly being offered. Outstanding among these is: "Outlaw all strikes, and you have the answer!"

Such a glib suggestion, when offered as a cure-all, is fantastic—outrageous, even, in this Republic which was itself first cast in the American mind in the form of a strike against oppression. Consider the rebellion against acts of the British Crown which led to the Boston Tea Party. No, never popular will be laws which force free men into slavery!

There is, in fact, no single answer to the labor problem, and for the very simple reason that there is no single cause. The causes of present friction are numerous. Looming large among these is man's inhumanity to man, man's departure from the teachings of Christ. When the industrial Simon Legree held the whip, he lashed the worker in a manner most ungodly; and now that the whip has changed hands, and it is the labor leader—in many cases, as unscrupulous as Legree—who wields the lash, the blows which fall are still no less ungodly. Never shall we find peace among ourselves until workers and their employers stumble upon the obvious fact that they are not natural enemies but are, instead, full partners in a common cause: production.

THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS DILEMMA

One of the chief causes of labor trouble may be charged directly to the method employed in our industrial relations system—our procedure in the handling of labor disputes. Unless and until we face the fact that changes must be made in keeping with the times, we are bound to have labor trouble and all of its repercussions. In other words, our industrial relations procedure is mainly responsible for the present state of the unions—in truth, a hell of a state!—and simply because this system was put into effect during a period of blind hatred.

The system I refer to originated through the National Labor Relations Act, more commonly known as the Wagner Act, and to some idealistic nitwits as the Magna Carta of labor.

This law was enacted during the worst of the depression—a period of great confusion. Examination of this law reveals that the authors themselves were confused. The language of the labor act is so muddled that the clearest thinkers cannot interpret it. There is the preamble, stating that here is a law designed to diminish causes of labor disputes such as burden or obstruct interstate or foreign commerce—and yet nowhere does this law set up provisions to protect two-thirds of the integral participants in commerce: namely, the employer and the public. No wonder the present labor act promotes disharmony! For, in effect, it protects only the unions and their leaders.

STREAMLINE SLAVERY—1947 MODEL

In some sections—particularly in 7 and 8—no real thought is given to the welfare of even the workers. Only the leaders are considered here, since in these sections it is found that compulsory unionism is condoned, compulsory unionism being but another term for streamline slavery, 1947 model.

In section 7 the worker is told that, through the passage of this law, he has a right to join a union of his own choosing—which, to my way of thinking, means that he has the right to join or refuse to join a particular union. And yet, almost immediately following, in paragraph 3 of section 8, he is told that nothing shall preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization whereby one of the conditions of employment shall be membership in that union. In short, the worker is free in section 7, only to become a slave in section 8; since, unless he does join the union in possession of the contract with the employer, he is deprived of the very job which yields him a living. Upon being deprived of his right to earn a living through the instrumentality of a legalized closed shop, what becomes of a man's stated right to join a union of his own choosing?

Other sections of this labor act make of the employer a criminal in the simple exercise of his natural prerogative of free speech, since there are specific stipulations which subject to fine and imprisonment any employer who so much as speaks to an employee on the subject of unionism.

CHISELERS WILL ALWAYS CHISEL

If you believe these statements of mine to be exaggerated, it might be a good idea for you to read the actual text of the National Labor Relations Act. Once through with the job you will, I am certain, agree that it is the most lopsided piece of legislation ever put over on the American worker, the employer, and the public. This labor act, you will find, fails to establish standards as to what constitutes legitimate unions or legitimate employers. It will also be clear to you that, under this law, chiselers are favored above ethical men—since chiselers have always been able to chop legalistic language to fit their chiseling intentions.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

In the light of the foregoing, I do not hesitate in saying that, when the doors of the new Congress are opened, it would be a job well done were most of this act to be tossed straight through the window, and were a number of thoroughgoing amendments to be made in the interest of common equity and sound Americanism. If we are to have equity in the matter of industrial relations, the law must give full consideration to the three integral elements of industry: The workers, the employers, and the general public.

It must, however, be borne in mind that such consideration cannot be realized in an atmosphere of mob hysteria or promoted by hearts of vengeance influenced by the haters of either side of industry. The matter must be calmly and fairly approached. Were I to be offered my say on this most important issue, I should, with full deliberation, make the following recommendations to the new Congress:

1. That the name of the Labor Act be changed from the National Labor Relations Act to the Industrial Relations Act. This title, unlike the present one, is unbiased in its address. It indicates that the law is not set up to favor labor alone, but that it is prepared to recognize, with fairness to all, the three vital components of industry: Workers, employers, public.

2. That this Industrial Relations Act create an Industrial Relations Department of Government, one which would be unbiased in its outlook, and whose function it would be to coordinate the services of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Commerce; this new Department to be headed by a Director of Industrial Relations, an official under no special allegiance to any of the groups otherwise already fully represented.

3. That this Industrial Relations Act create an Industrial Relations Court. It would be the duty of this court to try all contractual dispute cases that come before it that could not be settled through conciliation, mediation, or arbitration—the decision of this court to be prompt and binding. There would be no allowance for a strike for the duration of any labor-management contract since this court would have full power to act on all side issues, including jurisdictional disputes, and thus avoid unnecessary cessation of production.

4. That this Industrial Relations Act stipulate that only citizens of the United States or its possessions would be eligible to negotiate any matter pertaining to industrial relations.

5. That labor unions, as well as employers, be required to render financial statements at yearly intervals at least, such statements to be attested to by certified public accountants.

6. That labor unions be required to observe the rules of strict parliamentary law at all meetings, and that they be also required to elect officers and conduct strike votes by secret ballot.

THERE IS HOPE

To hear some people talk, one is led to believe that the union situation is hopeless. Well, with these people I simply cannot agree, convinced as I am that, if proper steps are taken, we can and will find the answer to the present vicious problem. Some people are saying that the entire labor movement has gone Communist, or that it is headed by a bunch of racketeers. Fortunately, however, these are not the facts. The truth of the matter is that the rank and file of workers, whether belonging to the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the railroad brotherhoods, the independent labor unions—or to no union at all—are, by virtue of the very fact that they have chosen to work for a living, good honest people, able and willing to do the honorable thing when they know it to be the honorable thing to do.

And, by this same token, the leaders, by and large, are likewise honest men, since it must be remembered too that the vast majority of them have come up from the ranks of the workers. This being the case, their misdoings can be charged to the head more than to the heart. It can never, therefore, be a simple matter of "knock 'em down and drag 'em out!" Nor should legislation be enacted which will penalize the majority for the acts of a very, very small minority.

GIVE THE UNIONS BACK TO THE WORKERS

No doubt, we do need corrective legislation designed to drive the racketeers and radicals from our unions, but there is no need to pile good unionism on the same wagon with the bad. The type of legislation needed is that which will give the unions back to the workers and which will enable them to operate in accordance with the true principles of unionism—which, of necessity, must be in complete harmony with the true principles of Americanism. When suggestions such as have been outlined in this article are placed squarely before the rank and file for consideration, so that they may analyze them according to parliamentary procedure and vote upon them by means of the secret ballot, it will, I am confident, be proven beyond all shadow of doubt that the vast majority of all union members detest the actions of the racketeers and radicals as intensely as do all other decent citizens. Also that labor will be the first to approve such corrective legislation as will make for better times all around.

When this point is reached, no one will have need to fear unionism, because everyone will then be proud of the actual state of the unions.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor, the Railroad Workers Journal.

Commercial Radio Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "America Likes Its Commercials," written by Carroll Carroll and published in the January 8, 1947, issue of Variety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA LIKES ITS COMMERCIALS—REFLECTIONS ON A MEDIUM CATERING TO THE MASSES AND AN ANSWER TO THE CRITICS OF NATIONAL TASTE

(By Carroll Carroll)

HOLLYWOOD.—The steady flow of criticism leveled at commercial radio is not insidious because it's consistently carping, but because it's almost exclusively in media that feel radio's advertising competition and offer no opportunity for rebuttal. Radio's so-called public service or noncommercial moments are sometimes praised, though generally ignored by the public, while its most popular stuff is systematically panned. The fact that the sock advertising programs are barbecued almost exclusively puts the sincerity of the criticism in jeopardy and opens to the suspicion of venality the entire editorial policy of the publication that carries it.

The sincerity of each individual critic of radio, his right to criticize and the validity of his writing is not questioned. The trouble, in most cases, is that the critic, clothed in a knight-in-armor complex, approaches his task as a defender of the people. He defends them by whacking away at radio commercials and the way they're handled, yet there is no definite indication that most radio commercials are truly resented by any great number of people. The few cranks write letters and can always get them published. But a hundred or a thousand or even ten thousand letters can't represent 20,000,000 listeners. The average radio critic says radio is in a rut. He wants things changed. Yet there is every proof that change for the sake of change is the last thing the radio audience will accept. And so it goes.

The truth is this: Almost anyone who cares to knock radio can find editorial sanctuary somewhere. Congressmen who need a little publicity pick on Hollywood or radio or both. Reformers who would like to be quoted take a poke at radio. Radio has been accused of causing everything from juvenile delinquency to bad crops. Anybody who can write convincingly can take a jab at radio and get it published in some magazine or newspaper. Why? The magazines don't sock the press and the press rarely criticizes the magazines. But they'll all pile onto this Johnny-come-lately of advertising that has made itself felt.

Even this would be O. K. if there were any forum in which to answer detractors who publish letters and write articles beginning—"Whenever I hear a commercial announcement I turn off the radio?" There is no available space in which to reply to those who curiously qualify their right to criticize by saying, "Of course, I never listen to radio but * * *." Then follows a blast against material the writer presumably absorbed by osmosis. Where can FCC's frequent complaints that commercial radio is not in the public interest be answered?

A medium of radio's size and dignity deserves a defense area in which to point out to a lot of people that all this criticism consistently ignores the primary purpose of commercial radio. That purpose is to interest a huge audience. Each program seeks the largest it can get. None hopes to please only a certain few. There are some who could prove that this is the essence of democracy. But its critics contend that commercial radio is something between intellectual suicide and moral share cropping.

The Federal Communications Commission, for instance, is constantly objecting to the quality of commercial radio. But no Government commission exists to police other forms of intelligence. No Government agency objects because all books published are not of the highest type and the ones that sell fastest are generally the hottest or the funniest. Nor does the Government tell newspapers to play down sensational stories and stuff that gets circulation.

BUT WHAT ABOUT THE MASSES?

Only the intellectual element of the lunatic fringe wants to censor books, all of which are commercial projects—even the Bible—but everyone feels free to demand that something be done about radio. Everyone ignores the fact that he has the power to make the most devastating attack in the world on commercial radio—the power to turn it off.

The fact is always ignored that commercial radio's catering to the masses has resulted in the most constant flow of high grade entertainment in the world, which boils down to the greatest good to the greatest number. That commercial radio makes people happy by giving them a lot of entertainment, and makes advertisers happy by giving them a lot of business, would seem to be sufficient grounds on which to rest any defense of it. But no! Commercial radio is forced to make an effort to confound its critics by trying hopelessly to prove that it's something it never set out to be—art.

In countries where radio attracts no very great or faithful audiences, because no program is forced to compete with another in catering to the national tastes, radio is dull as entertainment and ineffective culturally for the simple reason that it does not reach the people. Symphonic music played all day offers little to listeners who don't like, nor understand, this music—and what's more don't want to. Lectures, even the best, are wonderful only to those who listen to them. And such listening can't be forced.

Ignoring this completely, critics of commercial radio lash out at the shows and stars this Nation loves and deplore the fact that radio doesn't do more to educate and uplift. They prefer to scream at what the people quite obviously prefer. Thus the critics of commercial radio are critics not of art, nor of intrinsic goodness, but of the national taste. As such, they are naturally entitled to criticize until their lifetime pens expire. But why blame radio? Why blame advertisers? Advertisers have actually improved the national taste in many ways both in print and on the air.

There is no purpose in trying to defend commercial radio as art. But it can be defended as the greatest and most loved form of entertainment in the world; great because it's highly competitive and loved because it is carefully planned to give people exactly what they long for, quick, easy, free, entertainment.

It's axiomatic that commercial radio in order to merit the word commercial must present what vast throngs of people like to hear most. Because when people don't listen in large numbers to a commercial program, it cannot sell enough product to pay for itself. It immediately ceases to be commercial and very soon ceases to be. The public, therefore, is the critic, judge, and jury on every sponsored radio show. A very large segment of the public—one or two million people at the very least—must like a commercial program or it cannot afford to remain on any network.

Rarely, if ever, does the public dislike a radio show because it carries advertising, in spite of the fact that many of radio's critics live by fostering this belief. Actually I have never seen anyone get up to turn off a commercial announcement. This is not because many commercials don't deserve turning-off but because people are educated to accept them. People know they'll end in a minute and people are lazy. I have, however, seen

many a person turn off the entertainment portion of a radio show because he knew it would not end in a minute and he couldn't stand it. When enough people do this the commercial announcements are automatically turned off at the source.

JINGLES: THE VOICE OF A PEOPLE

For this reason, and for no other, commercial radio in the United States is most truly the voice of the whole population. The people ask for what they want by rejecting what they do not want. Radio entertainment speaks the thoughts of the Nation insofar as it reflects its taste. The voice of a people can't be the cultured tones of its intellectuals any more than it can be the babbling of its illiterates. It does not pay commercial radio to cater to either of these peripheral groups. The mighty middle class is the big buying public and the man who guesses best what that class wants to hear is radio's number one genius for the semester.

In those parts of the world where radio is not in the hands of the much maligned advertisers, anxious to please large groups, there is very little incentive to give people really high-caliber entertainment of a diversified nature. Nobody cares who listens when nobody benefits by increasing an audience.

Perhaps it is culturally deplorable that more people in the United States want to listen to Abbott and Costello than to Toscanini and 100 men, although analogous tastes are undoubtedly international. Nevertheless, much maligned radio offers both Mr. Toscanini and the Messrs. Abbott and Costello. While the critics snarl at the time Abbott and Costello waste, and much of the public snarls at the time Toscanini wastes.

The truth is that radio's critics have adopted a set of false values and refuse to associate cause and effect. They stand aghast at the size of the audience that listens every Tuesday at 10 p. m., eastern standard time, and wring their hands because so many people can't be mentally improved at that time instead of just amused by Bob Hope. But put in the mental improvement show, take out Hope, and try and find that huge audience.

Among the things that the war proved was the social and educational value of commercial radio with its gigantic audiences absolutely absorbent to the ideas of their weekly heard friends. Bing Crosby in a few casually read words could instill more patriotism and fire in more people for getting on with the war than all the best poetry of Stephen Vincent Benét, Archibald MacLeish, and Norman Corwin set to kettledrums and broadcast nightly over four joined networks. During the war commercial radio, with its selling know-how, packed the big propaganda punch. Cultural and intellectual radio sounded more inspiring sometimes to the cultured and intellectual few who listened. But the technique of the commercial announcement was the hard-slogging doughfoot the propagandists turned to when there was a huge job that had to be done. And it proved these hard-slogging commercials were listened to on large audience commercial shows.

FIBBER'S CULTURE VERSUS ALLEGORIES

Jack Benny, Fred Allen, and Fibber McGee, through their immense audience, are potentially greater sources of culture to the masses than all the allegories, wonderful as they may be, that Arch Oboler ever wrote. The fact that these commanders of public opinion don't exercise their power doesn't lessen it. Though they hold their power casually, sometimes even unconsciously, any three top network comics working solidly together could swing the country any way they wished. People even elect hillbilly singers to high political office.

When Jack Benny has Joseph Szigeti as a guest he's doing more for music in a half hour than many a whole season of relatively unheard symphonic broadcasts, because men are judged by the company they keep. And if Szigeti pleases Jack Benny and Jack Benny pleases Joe Public, Joe Public is going to like and listen to Szigeti. It's another proof that things equal to the same thing are equal to each other.

No rush of critical torment is brought on because there are only a few concert halls in New York City and over threescore theaters. (All commercial projects.) No one wails because most of the best-remembered stage successes are musical comedies and operettas. Yet, because radio consciously caters to this same general taste, radio is excoriated.

Nobody balks at buying a magazine for from 10 to 50 cents, knowing it's perhaps 50 percent or more paid advertising. Yet critics insist these same people have cause to scream when a $15,000 radio program, which they get for nothing, is interrupted for 2½ minutes of advertising during 29½ minutes. Make it 3 minutes out of 30, and it's only 10 percent advertising for radio as against 50 percent, and over, for periodicals. And it's for free versus for cash.

There is no way to deny that radio advertising, far from impeccable, sometimes tramples taste. But there is also no denying that publication copy is frequently just as "peccable." Each medium does its best to police its advertisers, but "natures" spelled backwards is no different in print than on the air. Radio critics say commercials come into your home, your living and dining rooms. So do magazines. Radio is turned on with the knowledge that advertising makes it possible. And a 10-cent magazine buyer is aware that so much desirable reading could not be delivered as cheaply without advertising.

True, children can hear radio and perhaps not read publication advertising. But most children who listen consciously to the radio can read. And only the fewest of radio's most violent critics complain for the sake of children. Furthermore most of the people who worry about children's tender ears either ignore or don't know how hardy young minds can be.

For every critic of commercial radio there must be a minimum of 5,000,000 radio fans. If they do not all actually benefit culturally when they turn on heir radios they benefit to the degree they expected to benefit. If they don't, they turn it off.

The FCC not long ago gave out a snort against soap operas emphasizing all their weak points and adding the charge that they contribute to imbalance on a station's program. Imbalance, a beautiful word, is apparently exactly what radio listeners want most. At the times when station and network programs are in most marked imbalance they enjoy the largest audiences. There is Tuesday with the imbalance of four big consecutive comedy shows: Amos 'n' Andy, Fibber McGee and Molly, Bob Hope, and Red Skelton.

A similar imbalance is found in the Sunday comedy series. Jack Benny, Phil Harris, Charlie McCarthy, and Fred Allen have a tremendous audience.

It is impossible to put anything important in competition with one of these top programs because then the criticism comes from quarters crying to know, for example, why an outstanding show like Frank Sinatra is put in direct competition with Ed Gardner of Duffy's Tavern. People who want to hear one probably want to hear both. Whenever a network or station has tried to combat or break up the imbalance of big shows or soap operas following one upon the other the effort has been unsuccessful.

The FCC claims soap operas please advertisers because they're cheap. If they were only cheap, advertisers would not care for them. The fact that they're also effective proves people listen to them. The fact that they've defied competition proves people prefer to listen to them.

To argue against imbalance on the air and urge that educational material be sandwiched in with other stuff has as much logic as to demand that newspaper editorials be slapped between comic strips. Or comics put on the editorial page. There is every good reason of logic and balance in favor of such a move. But the people have proved their preference for imbalance. It's more convenient for them. If you want to make them go out of their way you can make them turn to the editorial page to read a comic. But you'll never make them read an editorial that way.

PUBLIC SETS THE PATTERN

Another claim of the FCC is that radio favors the sponsor before it favors the public. To fix this, FCC suggests more nonsponsored programs and fewer shows built to a standard pattern. This frames a nice question: Shall the public have what sponsors have discovered the public likes or what the FCC thinks it should have?

An examination of available surveys indicates that the type of shows FCC suggests meet with considerable apathy. The standard patterns FCC wants to eliminate are only offered by sponsors, not dictated by them. The patterns used are used because they are the ones the public chooses to listen to. And experiment on the part of sponsors has proved it's useless to try to change these patterns to any great extent.

Explanation of H. R. 665, Requiring Private Participation in Export-Import Bank Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 665 would require the Export-Import Bank to secure on all loans over $5,000,000 full-risk private participation for an amount equal to 25 percent of the total loan.

The primary objective of this bill is to encourage and require the operating policy of the bank to conform with section (c) of its statement of basic principles, which reads in part:

> As a matter of prudent management and as required by law, the bank makes only loans which offer reasonable assurance of repayment.

If the loans of the bank meet this standard, it is likewise reasonable to expect that Export-Import Bank officials would easily find private banks to supply 25 percent of future loans.

Moreover, this bill would protect the bank from being constrained to make partial or outright political loans. Fortified by the requirement of private participation in its risks, the bank would not be embarrassed by requests for outright or quasi-political loans.

This safeguard would eliminate the charge either at home or abroad that the bank is being used as an instrument for political and economic warfare.

The smaller credits of the bank are exempted from the proposal in order that this smaller business would not be unduly impeded by participation requirements. Probably the danger of political loans is not as important in credits under the $5,000,000 mark.

Up to this time the bank has made some loans in which politics were involved. Foreign countries and well-informed people in America are not being fooled by this practice. The victim of this official deception is the ordinary American taxpayer, who desperately clings to the belief that those in high places in his Government speak only the truth.

If the officials of the bank mean what they say when they solemnly assert that the bank makes only loans which offer reasonable assurance of repayment, this bill should be of real assistance to them.

However, if the bank is to function as a combination politico-economic international weapon, then obviously the safeguards of H. R. 665 are unwanted. If the bank is a political instrument, any pretense otherwise should end.

Enactment of this plan into law would also encourage the return of international lending to private channels. It would provide a partnership outlet for the gigantic loanable balances of the big banks of the Nation.

While this goal is meritorious, it is of minor importance compared to the need for establishing the operations of the bank on a forthright basis.

The proposal follows the pattern used successfully by the RFC in making small loans, with local banks required to take a part of the risk.

We have seen the boomeranging results of lend-lease and UNRRA in several instances. It should be apparent now to the most foolhardy zealot of foreign hand-outs that international friendships based on economic paternalism are counterfeit.

Years ago I got my first lesson on human relations in finance from a sign on a cigar store cash register. It read:

I loaned money to three friends;
I lost the three friends; also the money;
I have decided to lose no more friends.

In case administration officials do not agree with the moral of this verse, a case study of international loaning by a government may be enlightening.

After World War I, France carried on an ambitious program of direct Government loans to European nations. Aside from participation in the two American-sponsored German credits, the objective was to strengthen her military position and have strong allies in case of war.

How did this scheme work out? Read the following complete list of French Government post-World War I loans and recall what each country did for or against France when World War II arrived.

When the time came for the borrowing nations to help France, those receiving almost half of the loans fought France. One nation, Turkey, stayed on the sidelines. The quick collapse of resistance of the other loan recipients is a matter of record.

French loans to European countries between World War I and World War II

Country	Date	Amount	United States currency
Rumania	1923	£16, 500, 600	$75, 471, 000
Belgium	1923	[1] 400, 000, 000	24, 320, 000
Austria	1923	[1] 170, 000, 000	10, 336, 000
Bulgaria	1923	[1] 40, 000, 000	2, 432, 000
Germany (Dawes loan)	1924	£3, 000, 000	13, 251, 000
Hungary	1924	[1] 96, 000, 000	5, 026, 560
Poland	1927	$2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000
Bulgaria	1928	[1] 130, 000, 000	5, 096, 000
Rumania	1929	[1] 561, 000, 000	21, 968, 760
Germany (Young loan)	1930	[1] 2, 156, 000	84, 601
Finland	1930	[1] 300, 000, 000	11, 772, 000
Poland	1930	[1] 25, 000, 000	981, 000
Rumania	1931 (spring)	[1] 575, 000, 000	22, 540, 000
Yugoslavia	1931 (spring)	[1] 675, 000, 000	26, 460, 000
Poland	1931 (spring)	[1] 400, 000, 000	15, 680, 000
Do	1931 (fall)	$8, 400, 000	8, 400, 000
Yugoslavia	1931 (October)	$10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000
Hungary	1931 (fall)	$14, 160, 000	14, 160, 000
Austria	1932 (December)	$13, 650, 000	13, 650, 000
Monaco	1932 (November)	[1] 13, 000, 000	509, 600
Belgium	1933 (February)	[1] 300, 000, 000	11, 760, 000
Poland	1936 (December)	[1] 405, 000, 000	18, 901, 350
Do	1939 (October)	$13, 680, 000	13, 680, 000
Turkey	1939 (October)	[2] £5, 000, 000	19, 445, 000

[1] Francs.
[2] Gold.

Source: Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

In connection with the foregoing factual record from France, the following comment from Nicholas J. Spykman, of Yale University, in America's Strategy in World Politics, is worth considering:

Loans create neither gratitude nor dependence, and they can be repudiated with the greatest of ease. Not favors already received, but favors still to be received create for the donor a position of influence and power.

The ability to grant or withhold access to a market, the opportunity to veto ever anew the outflow of the mines, or the export of a yearly crop creates a position of power which no creditor can match.

In the political struggle for the Danubian region, rich France extended loans and poor Germany offered markets. It was the natural exchange of trade between agrarian Danubia and industrial Germany that proved to be an unbreakable bond and an opportunity for Germany to create an instrument of power which French high finance was unable to defeat.

The Principle at Stake in Continuing RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, within the coming weeks Congress will be called upon to furnish new breath of life for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the situation confronting us as we consider renewal legislation is ably outlined by Mr. U. V. Wilcox, well known writer for financial journals and publisher of a weekly bank news service, in the current edition of his Washington Backgrounds.

The article entitled "The Principle at Stake in Continuing the RFC" is submitted for consideration of Members of Congress under the unanimous consent which the House has granted:

THE PRINCIPLE AT STAKE IN CONTINUING THE RFC

(By U. V. Wilcox)

WASHINGTON.—The chairmen of the Senate and House Banking Committees have before them a bill to continue the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. President Truman has recommended that the giant all-purpose lending agency be extended. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder would use it as a "stand-by credit agency," noncompetitive with private agencies—if they fulfill their purpose.

The life of the RFC legally expires June 30, this year. Congressional action must come during the next few months with public hearings and extensive testimony.

The continuance of the life of the RFC involves the taxpayer, business, banking. It means more. The functioning of the capitalistic system is also involved.

If it is determined that the Nation must still support the giant bureaucracy known as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the implication is plain that the capitalistic system cannot be wholly trusted. There is doubt implied that it will work and that it will take credit risks as needed.

Basically, the RFC exists to make loans. It lends money. It is a bank—a Government bank. When, because of a world-wide depression, it was established for this purpose, there was the promise that when Government financial aid was no longer needed, it would end. It would cease to exist, its purpose in pouring out Government funds having been achieved; namely, to save the capitalistic system.

Now, all the official indexes, the forecasts of the Council of Economic Advisers and private agencies, see good times ahead. Blue skies and all the business traffic lights set for full speed.

If it is determined that the RFC must be continued as a stand-by credit agency, then there must be some doubt about these forecasts. If it is declared that the RFC will not lend in conflict with private finance, then why should it continue? As a threat? Its very existence, with its powers and authority to act, constitute a menace and an intimidation.

If the RFC continues with what amounts to promises to be good, then what of the hazards if some administration or some set of officials come into power, unwilling to be bound by the original promise?

If it is argued that the RFC is needed, just in case, the inference is plain that Congress can hardly be trusted to re-create another

RFC when conditions demand again the outpouring of Government credit. The same argument could be made on behalf of all the emergency powers which President Truman is now so properly turning back.

Let Congress consider well the implications to the American system of free enterprise when it decides the future of the RFC.

Save America's New Competitive Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address entitled "Save America's New Competitive Power Policy," delivered by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and a former Member of the House from the district which I am honored to represent, at the Arkansas Rural Electric Cooperative Association banquet, Little Rock, Ark., January 16, 1947:

Mr. Toastmaster and fellow Arkansans, the power battle of 1947 is already on in Washington. The enemy's objective this year is to cut us in two, divide our forces, and conquer us. The tactic is not new, but it promises to typify the opposition's present campaign against us.

It is taking on ominous proportions. Power company presidents are pouring into Washington like bees swarming in the spring. The two busiest bees in the swarm are the presidents of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. and Southwestern Gas & Electric Co. Incidentally, one of these bees has a rare and peculiar stinger—made of nylon—nylon hose.

I appreciate your invitation to come here, as your employee, and talk with you candidly about the grave and momentous problems that face us today.

This is, indeed, a crucial hour for Arkansas. The fate of the Nation's power program hangs in the balance tonight. The course Arkansas takes may determine the course of the Nation. You and the rest of our people may hold in your hands the destiny of this State and of this Nation insofar as this power issue is concerned.

You are well aware of the long, hard fight we made, beginning in 1939, to get power authorized for Norfork Dam. At the same time SAM RAYBURN was making a similar fight in Congress for power in Denison Dam, on the Red River between Oklahoma and Texas. Without realizing it then, with these two dams we were laying the foundation for America's first Nation-wide generating and transmission policy. With Norfork and Denison we were cutting the pattern for competitive sources of wholesale power for most of the rest of the country.

By the spring of 1944, it was apparent that Norfork and Denison would soon be generating current. They would be the first flood-control dams in the country to generate power without special authority for its sale.

Congress was faced with the necessity of determining, even in the midst of the war, how Norfork and Denison power should be marketed. Some wanted an all-inclusive authority such as TVA. The power companies wanted all the power for themselves. These were the two extremes.

Congress took the middle course for this area and for the country. In the Flood Control Act of 1944 it delegated the Department of Interior to build the lines and market all power produced under the control of the War Department wherever generated in the United States. This included, of course, Norfork and Denison power.

Congress directed the Secretary of Interior to sell the surplus power and energy from all such projects "in such a manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. * * * Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized * * * to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies."

This new policy was enacted after a hard fight with the power companies. Both Arkansas Senators supported it. It was hailed as a bold step forward for the people—the dawn of a better day in the electrical age.

Southwestern Power Administration was created by the Department of Interior in September 1943. Under war powers of the President, it operated the Grand River Dam Authority in Oklahoma.

After the Flood Control Act of 1944 was passed, the Secretary of the Interior designated Southwestern Power Administration to build the lines and market the power from Norfork and Denison Dams, and from the many others to be constructed in the Southwest.

Thus was the Arkansas-Oklahoma-Texas region honored by being the first to benefit by America's first national power policy, a policy of favoring the people with active power competition. This region gave birth under the act to a baby giant that would bring to us a whole new frontier for development—that would serve as a model for all America.

(Incidentally, I want to pause to congratulate the Arkansas Gazette on its splendid editorials of late, advocating the complete harnessing of all these rivers.)

Southwestern Power Administration spent 2 years making exhaustive engineering studies and last year requested of Congress $23,000,000 to begin the system. Part of this was to be used to tie Norfork and Denison together with high-voltage transmission lines.

Part of the $23,000,000 was to be used for a firming-up steam plant at Lake Catherine. The Federal Government had spent $1,800,000 to partially construct that plant during the war. It is now idle and A. P. & L. is trying to get it. The balance of the $23,000,000 was to be used to build lines to cities and towns and electric cooperatives in Arkansas and the other States which needed and desired the power. A substantial part of the $23,000,000 was to be spent in Arkansas, and this was just the beginning.

The rural electric cooperatives of Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, and Missouri went to SPA's support, unanimously. Delegations of co-op leaders rushed to the Capitol and testified before congressional committees. The day we appeared before the House committee, the bees swarmed outside the committee door while we were in there, and we had to walk through them on our way out. Of course, they testified, too.

We got the worst of it. The House Committee cut SPA's request from $23,000,000 to less than three and one-half million. The House raised the figure to $7,500,000.

Our Senators and Congressmen are all my personal friends, as you know. I am not criticizing any of them for not supporting SPA, but criticizing ourselves for doing such a poor job of letting the people know the facts, for the people generally remained silent except for those whom the power companies pressured into writing and sending telegrams.

When the bill went over to the Senate the bees went over there too. Our co-op leaders, with no honey to operate on, couldn't stay in Washington, but they did return there and testify before the Senate committee.

The Senate committee knocked the baby out completely. But the Senate revived it with the help of Senators MCCLELLAN and FULBRIGHT, and passed the measure with the $7,500,000 the House had enacted.

Unfortunately, for Arkansas, the foreign-owned power companies succeeded in killing the steam plant and all lines in our State except the big connecting link. Wall Street won; our people lost.

Today SPA's giant transmission line from Norfork to Denison, down through Arkansas—all that was left for us—is in the initial stages of construction. Even this line will yet be the nucleus of a great power system for a greater Southwest if we give it our wholehearted support.

Tonight, however, the Government of the United States is on the verge of junking, at least for the present, the major part of its power-program plans for this area, so nobly launched only 12 short months ago. The President's budget message last Friday called for less than $3,000,000 to proceed with the southwestern power lines during the next fiscal year—and the bees will no doubt try to sting that to death. In the face of last year's opposition or lack of support from a majority of Arkansas' Congressmen, the President did not again ask for funds to begin the $11,000,000 Lake Catherine steam plant, so badly needed, or for the much-needed transmission lines necessary to permit our cities and cooperatives to purchase Norfork power. Don't blame the Government; blame ourselves for not supporting the Government in its stand last year. If the people don't act now, there will be little further progress for us soon.

Let's take a look at this power program as it would affect the people of Arkansas. Norfork and Denison each has a 35,000-kilowatt generator in operation. By the summer of 1948 each will have two 35,000-kilowatt units installed—a total of 140,000 kilowatts. This will exceed the present installed capacity of the Arkansas Power & Light system. Fort Gibson, in Oklahoma, is under construction. Bull Shoals, Blakeley Mountain, and Narrows should be under contract shortly. Soon to follow will be Table Rock, Markham Ferry, Dardenelle, Gilbert, Greers Ferry, Ozark, Wolf Bayou, Webber Falls, Short Mountain, Tenkiller, Eufaula, Antlers, Pine Creek, and others. There will be at least 23 of these dams in Arkansas, southern Missouri, and eastern Oklahoma, forming the great lakes of the Southwest. One may take one look at Norfork Dam and realize that this is no idle dream. These things are at hand.

President Truman in his state-of-the-Union message to Congress last week said:

"In the development of the great river systems of America there is the major opportunity of our generation to contribute to the increase of the national wealth. This program is already well along; it should be pushed with full vigor."

At our regional meeting in Baton Rouge in November many of us here heard Assistant Secretary of the Interior Gerard Davidson say that power in this area can be produced at less than in TVA, at less than anywhere else in the United States with the possible

exception of the Pacific Northwest. First, because of the several good rivers involved; secondly, because we have on-the-spot, low-cost gas and coal to firm up the hydro. In other words, because Mother Nature made us potentially power rich.

Night before last I had the honor of addressing the rural electric cooperatives and municipalities of the Tennessee Valley—from Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama, and Mississippi—at a banquet in Nashville. In the 2 days I was in the valley I saw first-hand for the third time in 12 months the almost unbelievable development and progress going on there. It made me happy indeed. But as I flew on here my heart grew heavy as I realized that Arkansas is missing what Tennessee has accomplished.

Arkansas is the least industrial of all the States save one. Arkansas' per capita income is the lowest of all the States save one. There is a direct relationship between the two. And President Truman told the Congress last week:

"We should also give special attention to the decentralization of industry and the development of areas that are now underindustrialized.

"Wide regions of this country still hold the promise of tremendous economic development. The Government should examine particularly the contribution it can make toward this development by stimulating production and distribution of low-cost hydroelectric energy."

He was surely talking about Arkansas. And the best route known to us for accomplishing that in this power-monopoly area is via an SPA or TVA, and SPA happens to be our only choice.

TVA, as you know, only generates and transmits power as would SPA. It does not distribute it, except in rare instances, to big industries. It delivers its power to cities and towns and electric co-ops for distribution. There are 138 such distributors in the Tennessee Valley: 4 large cities, 80 smaller cities and towns, and 46 co-ops. In the fiscal year 1946 these 138 distributors of TVA's wholesale power sold almost 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours to 669,000 customers for $42,774,000. After paying all operating expenses, including $2,224,000 taxes, they had $11,986,000 net left. Out of the $11,000,000, they paid $3,707,000 debt retirement and interest, and still had $8,280,000 left.

Add this $8,000,000 to their $28,130,000 net earnings of previous years and you have a total net earnings of $36,410,000. This is approximately one-half their combined long-term debt. These 138 distributors now own properties worth over $100,000,000 with a net equity of over $60,000,000. Those are people like you and me who live in that poorer country just across the river—poor rich folks.

This record is truly outstanding. Many of these distributors have owned their properties for only a few years. Last year they reduced their rates—already the second lowest in the country—by $850,000. Their combined rate reductions now amount to $12,000,000 annually. As their financial position improves, their rates will come down still more.

It will interest you to know that if the 669,000 customers of these distributors of TVA power had been served at Arkansas Power & Light rates, their power would have cost them $34,000,000 more last year. If the customers of A. P. & L. had been served at the rates paid by the people in Tennessee, they would have saved almost $7,000,000 last year.

And the greatest loss to Arkansas was not this overcharge of nearly $7,000,000, but the denial of adequate use of electricity caused by high rates. Residences and farms in Tennessee used an average of 1,902 kilowatt-hours last year, compared with only 959 kilowatt-hours used by residences and farms on the A. P. & L. system. Tennessee residences and farms averaged more than twice as much last year as did Arkansas residences and farms—and paid smaller monthly bills. The average annual bill of customers in Tennessee was $34.05, compared with $39.14 on the A. P. & L. system. The cost per kilowatt-hour to residences in Tennessee was 1¾ cents, compared with 4 cents in Arkansas.

Small business establishments in Tennessee saved 1 cent on every kilowatt-hour purchased, by comparison with A. P. & L. rates. This was a saving of $4,500,000 for small business in Tennessee last year. Small businesses served by the A. P. & L. Co. would have saved nearly $3,000,000 last year if they had been served at Tennessee rates.

Large industrial plants in Tennessee are served directly by TVA at very low rates. Smaller industries are served by the 138 distributors. The average industrial rate of the A. P. & L. Co. includes both large and small industries. The average industrial rate of the distributors in Tennessee was, nevertheless, 3½ mills lower than the industrial rate of the A. P. & L. Co. Tennessee's small industry saved $6,000,000 last year by comparison with A. P. & L. rates. Small industries served by the A. P. & L. Co. would have saved approximately $1,500,000 last year if they had been served at the Tennessee rate.

If the families, farms, businesses, and industries served by A. P. & L. alone would have saved $7,000,000 last year at TVA rates, you can appreciate that the savings of all of the people of Arkansas would run several millions more when we add the customers of Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Arkansas-Missouri Power, O. G. & E., and others.

It is sometimes erroneously said that if private utilities here reduced their rates to the same level as TVA that we in Arkansas would be as well off as the people in Tennessee. This is not true. The people in Tennessee have these low rates and a $60,000,000 equity in their properties. In another 10 years they will own, debt free, all their properties worth several hundred millions, and then they can reduce rates still further.

I can illustrate this principle in another way: Two men with families occupy similar houses for 20 years. One buys his house on 20-year terms; the other rents. The monthly payment of the buyer and the monthly rental of the renter are the same. At the end of 20 years, one owns his house; the other owns nothing. Furthermore, the owner managed and operated his property to suit himself during the 20 years, whereas the renter enjoyed no such freedom. The difference here is that in the power field in Arkansas it would cost half as much to own as to rent.

Competition—free competitive enterprise—has made America great. David Lilienthal, in his book, TVA—Democracy on the March, says:

"A short time after TVA announced these low rates the neighboring private utilities of the Southeast followed suit by making large reductions in their own rates. The immediate result was a spectacular increase in the use of electricity in the homes they served. The year after the private companies adopted the principle of the TVA yardstick, though not the rates, for theirs did not decline so far, five of the six companies in the entire United States with the greatest increase in electric growth were here in the Southeast."

Even Thomas Jefferson listed freedom from monopoly as one of the basic civil liberties. In his famous letter to Donald he wrote:

"By a declaration of rights, I mean one which will stipulate freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of commerce against monopolies. * * * These are fetters against doing evil which no honest Government should decline."

The President in his same speech last week outlined five major economic policies which he said he believed the Government should pursue during 1947. The second one he mentioned was, and I quote again, "restriction of monopoly and unfair business practices, assistance to small business; and the promotion of the free competitive system of private enterprise."

We all know how the attempts at public regulation of utility monopolies generally have failed. Only competition supplied by SPA—or outright public ownership—can offer any substantial hope to our people. If the power companies succeed in killing off SPA, I predict that even the power companies will regret it not many years hence.

Everywhere in the United States that there is a competitive source of power, wholesale costs to the co-ops have gone down in the last 5 years; everywhere else they have gone up.

Let us not overlook what a little competition has already meant to the rural electric cooperatives of Arkansas. Having introduced the model REA Act in the State senate in 1937, I was naturally interested in seeing the co-ops get a decent rate for wholesale power. I recall A. P. & L. refusing to give co-ops in Arkansas any rate for more than a year prior to that time and then not until they were ordered to do so by a fair-minded State utility commission in 1937. The rate A. P. & L. filed as a result of this order was 17½ mills per kilowatt-hour. The commission refused to approve the rate on the grounds that it was too high. After much negotiation A. P. & L. filed an 11-mill rate under protest, stating at the same time in its letter to the commission that any rate under 17 mills was noncompensatory. In other words, that at 11 mills it would be serving the co-ops at less than cost.

Later, in 1939, to defeat efforts to bring TVA power into Arkansas, A. P. & L. lowered its rate to the larger co-ops to approximately 8 mills. It was not until SPA in 1945 developed to the point where it was able to offer power to co-ops in Arkansas at a rate which would average 5 to 5½ mills that A. P. & L. offered some of you a 6-mill rate. And this A. P. & L. rate, as you know, had terrific restrictions in it. In spite of these A. P. & L. offers the Arkansas co-ops continued their enthusiastic support of the SPA budget request last year. Now, in a further effort to wean you away from SPA support A. P. & L. has recently offered you a rate as low as SPA and with some of A. P. & L.'s objectionable restrictions removed.

Only the fact of SPA competition has brought this situation about. Only the co-ops have supported SPA vigorously so far. Only they have sought to benefit immediately by it. Consequently, only they have benefited. Where would we be without SPA? Isn't it a case of Little Red Riding Hood and the wolf?

I understand that the A. P. & L. president has stated in the record before the Arkansas commission that he offered you that rate only to kill SPA. I understand he has openly stated that A. P. & L.'s low rate to you is a subsidy, which the people of Little Rock and all the other cities, served by A. P. & L. must pay. Why doesn't A. P. & L. make similar reductions to all the people? SPA would save every man, woman, and child living in the cities and towns of Arkansas—if we average their industrial, commercial, and residential savings—well over a dollar each per month. And SPA would be self-liquidating. It would cost the people nothing. Even the power companies would benefit, for they would purchase large blocks of the low-cost power.

I know you of the co-ops are not going to be gullible enough to believe for 1 minute that if all competition is killed A. P. & L. would continue to serve you at the present rate.

The president of Southwestern Gas & Electric Co. had the distinction of opening the campaign against the rural electrification program in Washington last year. Never before had the power companies appeared against us before congressional committees.

It was in the Poage bill hearings, a little over a year ago, that he told the committee that the job of rural electrification in America was practically done and that REA needed no more loan funds. At page 262 of the hearings, Congressman HARRIS, of Arkansas, asked him: "Do you feel that REA needs an additional appropriation to do the job ahead?"

The S. G. & E. president answered, "I don't think so; no, sir. * * * I think the money they have got, Mr. Chairman, is enough to do the job."

For the record, let it be said at this point that as of that time less than half the farmers in the United States had electricity. Only 53 percent have today. At that time less than 30 percent of the farmers in Arkansas had electricity and only 31 percent have today. We stand forty-third among our sister States in the percentage of farms electrified. We, here in the power oasis, starve for energy.

He was careful not to criticize Mr. Wickard, saying:

"Mr. Wickard is a dirt farmer himself and we feel that he has the best interest of the American farmer close to his mind and heart."

But we got $350,000,000 in loans after the Southwestern Gas & Electric president told Congress we needed no more funds. So he has now changed his tune about REA. Today he has set out to discredit REA, your national association—everybody—in a divide-and-conquer campaign, and, of course, still claiming that REA needs no more loans.

According to the press, he made a speech to his employees recently. It got a lot of publicity, and the press quotes him as saying:

"REA is the worst enemy the farmers have."

He even told them that the co-ops "are business-managed and free enterprise," and that they "are capable of running their own affairs and should be allowed to do so."

Do you see his strategy?

Then he wrote the managers of the co-ops to which he furnishes power—in Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas—a two-page letter, dated December 12, 1946, and attached a newspaper clipping about his speech. I hold in my hand one of those letters. In it he said to the managers:

"You are a business-managed operation, just as we are."

And—

"As long as you meet your fixed charges there should be no interference by Federal bureaus with your operation."

I want to read you another paragraph from the Southwestern Gas & Electric president's letter to the co-ops:

"It is going to be necessary very soon for you gentlemen to choose whether you are going to continue to be business-managed organizations, buying your power and energy from existing free enterprise, at rates which you can enforce in courts, or whether you want to become, like the cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley, completely dominated by the public Power Trusts through the bureaus in Washington."

I read this statement to the Tennessee Valley co-ops and they got a big kick out of it—for it just so happens that they are the freest and most independent co-ops in the United States. Some of them have paid off their loans completely.

It was the last paragraph of his letter to the co-op managers that I enjoyed most. Let me read it to you:

"We will be glad to meet with you and your boards, at your convenience, to give you our understanding of this entire picture, which, we believe, you will find is considerably different than that given you by the propaganda of the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington and by Mr. Clyde Ellis of NRECA."

Now, my friends, it is up to you to decide what course you shall take. You have spearheaded the campaign for Southwestern Power Administration. The people generally have said little either way. The unorganized municipalities in Arkansas which could save millions of dollars a year, if SPA lives, have done little so far to support it. I speak not only of the municipalities whose power systems are municipally owned, but also of those which would benefit, nevertheless, either through competition or by owning their own systems.

The day is at hand when we in this part of the world must decide whether we are to be free or subservient economically. We are competing with every other section. It is a highly competitive world. Shall we choose, then, to live out the electrical age under monopoly or under the benefits of a competitive system?

I appeal to you and to every man and woman in the Wonder State to write your Senators and Congressmen now and let them know how you feel. Let them know whether you, the people, want for yourselves and your children the comparative poverty of a permanent power monopoly or the prosperity of SPA competition. Let's act now to save America's new competitive power policy.

National Income and Federal Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply interested in the proper approach to the income-tax situation, especially as it may relate to the creation of more property to tax, a larger revenue to the Government as a result of it, and an ever-expanding pay roll for the workers of this country. Not only this, I believe that with the proper approach to the tax problem, especially in the light of past experience, taxes can be substantially reduced and at the same time more revenue collected and a substantial reduction in the national debt can be made each year. This, of course, is based upon the assumption of retrenchment in governmental expenditures and elimination of waste. All this can be achieved including, of course, a balanced budget.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the information to substantiate my statement:

National income and Federal income taxes on individuals, estates, and trusts reflecting reductions in tax rates, 1921–29, inclusive

Year	National income payments to individuals [1]	Total annual income tax liabilities of individuals reported in tax returns filed with U. S. Treasury [2]	Principal changes in income taxes by Congress	
			In act of—	Principal provisions
1921	$57,700,000,000	$719,000,000	----------	
1922	59,600,000,000	861,000,000	Nov. 23, 1921	Surtax rates were reduced from those applying to 1921 income; including reduction of top rate to 50 percent; personal exemptions for married persons were increased from $2,000 to $2,500 (except for those with net incomes of over $5,000) and for dependents from $200 to $400; and taxpayers were permitted to be taxed at 12½ percent on net capital gains if total tax on total net income was not less than 12½ percent. Total income tax revenue increased.
1923	69,000,000,000	662,000,000	June 2, 1924	Provided for a 25 percent credit or refund on all income taxes paid on 1923 income.
1924	70,000,000,000	704,000,000	-----do-----	Normal tax rates sharply reduced; surtax rates cut in all income brackets; top rate lowered to 40 percent; tax credit allowed on earned income; and a moderate liberalization with respect to capital net gains and net losses. Income-tax revenue increased.
1925	73,600,000,000	735,000,000	Feb. 26, 1926	Increased personal exemptions for married persons from $2,500 to $3,500 and for single persons from $1,000 to $1,500; reduced normal tax rate; reduced surtax rates on incomes above $26,000 to a maximum of 20 percent; and liberalized the amount of earned income for purposes of earned income-tax credits. Income-tax revenue increased.
1926	77,100,000,000	732,000,000	-----do-----	Do.
1927	77,200,000,000	831,000,000	-----do-----	Do.
1928	78,900,000,000	1,164,000,000	May 29, 1928	Further liberalized the amount of income on which earned income-tax credit could be claimed.
1929	83,500,000,000	1,002,000,000	Dec. 16, 1929	Normal-tax rates applicable to the year 1929 reduced by joint resolution of Congress.

[1] National Income and Its Composition, vol. I, p. 137 (by National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, N. Y.).
[2] Statistics of Income, pt. I, Historical Summaries, 1938 (U. S. Bureau of Internal Revenue).

Notwithstanding these successive and sharp reductions in individual income tax rates from 1921 through 1929, Federal tax collections on individual incomes were substantially maintained—actually increasing in the latter part—due to the stimulation and incentives they gave to producing a larger national income, which steadily expanded throughout the period. A similar but more striking effect of the reduced tax rates on individuals having annual net incomes of $25,000

and over is shown by the following figures:

Annual income tax liabilities of individuals reporting net incomes of $25,000 a year and over in tax returns filed with U. S. Treasury [1]

Year:	*Millions*
1922	$572
1923	423
1924	550
1925	627
1926	626
1927	724
1928	1,045
1929	928

[1] Statistics of Income, pt. I, Historical Summaries, 1938 (U. S. Bureau of Internal Revenue).

Edwards Perpetual Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article appearing in Collier's magazine for September 21, 1946, concerning the Edwards perpetual calendar, which is as follows:

GOOD-BY FRIDAY THE 13TH—THE CALENDAR BY WHICH WE LIVE IS FAR FROM PERFECT. WHY NOT HAVE ONE BASED ON COMMON SENSE?

(By Kyle Crichton)

If there was anything that one might think could be counted on in this stormy world it would surely be the calendar—the ordinary, day-by-day calendar. Of course it changes by the year and you're invariably looking at 1943 instead of 1946, but the thing has been in use for centuries and has rather a right to be considered sacrosanct.

However, we find to our amazement that there are people who are very much irritated by the calendar. Having arranged trips and discovered that the train had gone the day before, they are inclined to be petulant. They maintain flatly that just because somebody was a fathead away back in the ages we don't have to put up with the nonsense.

Among these people is Lt. Comdr. Willard E. Edwards, electronics officer at the Ford Island Base, Honolulu. In fact, he started being annoyed as far back as 1919 in Quincy, Mass., when he spoke up in Latin class and said the calendar gave him a pain. The teacher looked at him with a baleful eye and said, "I suppose you can do better?" Teachers have got away with this sophistry for years, and it is to the credit of Willard that he was not daunted. He set to work and at the age of 15 turned up with the new calendar you see herewith.

Not only has Commander Edwards rearranged things in a mathematical way but, if his plan is accepted, he may have wrought a vital social change. Consider New Year's Day, that awful period when you're trying to recover from what happened the night before—well, under the Edwards plan there is no New Year's Day. Or rather, there is a New Year's Day but it isn't January 1. It's a holiday, it's always a holiday, and it's not counted. By eliminating that sad occasion, he is able to set up a perpetual calendar that never varies an inch from year to year. If your birthday is on a Tuesday, it will continue to be on a Tuesday right down to the time when you don't care.

Here are some of the features of the Edwards revised new civil calendar:

1. There would never again be a Friday the 13th.

2. In leap years a second day apart, called, amazingly enough, Leap Year Day, is observed between June 31 and July 1. This could be an international summer holiday.

3. Monday would be the first day in every week instead of Sunday. Saturday and Sunday would be the week end, as we always knew they were.

4. The last business day of each quarter, the ninetieth day, falls on a Saturday. That makes it swell for bookkeeping, tax reports, and inventory. The year has equal quarters of 91 days.

5. The 1st, 15th, and 30th, common payroll, bill-paying, and accounting days, all fall on weekdays.

6. Easter Sunday would be fixed at April 14, which is close to the original historic date and agrees with a provisional bill enacted by the British Parliament in 1928. With a fixed Easter there would be six 3-day United States holidays every year. Anybody who objects to this is a lousy employer.

7. There are 26 weekdays in every month, 91 days in any 3-month period, and 65 school days in each quarter.

Commander Edwards feels that he is getting closer to action all the time. In the last few years his calendar has been endorsed by business groups, educators, and newspapers. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, has introduced a House resolution which requests the President to urge international adoption of the calendar.

If New Year's Eve in other climes compares even remotely with our reverent celebration, Commander Edwards' calendar will be adopted and some of us will get ourselves straightened out for the first time in years. Write somebody about this immediately.

THE EDWARDS PERPETUAL CALENDAR

This calendar has two international holidays—New Year's Day, before Jan. 1, leap year day before July 1

January							February							March						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
[1]	2	3	4	5	6	7														
8	9	10	11	12	13	14														
15	16	17	18	19	20	21														
22	23	24	25	26	27	28														
29	30																			

April							May							June						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S

July							August							September						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S

October							November							December						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S

[1] New Year's Day.

Writer Finds Rightist Greece Has Greater Freedom Than Leftist Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in the body of today's RECORD there will be found some highly interesting and remarkably informative statements about the true nature of communism and the actual objectives of those who espouse it, either wittingly or unwittingly, at home or abroad. Americans eager to know the truth are urged to read, in full, the addresses of Congressman EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, found in the House section of the proceedings of Congress as they transpired today. I also recommend that students of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD take careful note of the definition of communism which I read into the RECORD when Congressman RANKIN yielded to me during the speech he made following the remarks of Congressmen DIRKSEN and MCCORMACK. That definition came from the usually reliable New York Times and conforms so precisely with that which our House Committee on Un-American Activities has been utilizing for the past 2 years that it appears the editorial writer gained his information from that source. In all events, it is a definition which every patriotic and well-informed American citizen should know and understand.

I now call attention, Mr. Speaker, to an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald, the largest daily newspaper published in our Capital City. It makes some factual and illuminating observations on conditions as they exist today in the war-torn countries of Poland and Greece, both of which suffered seriously during the Nazi invasion. Freedom and democracy, as we understand the terms, function in neither of these countries today, but the following article does point up some of the excessive oppressions which communism imposes upon its victims. The comparisons in this article are substantiated by observations and inspections made by Congressmen who visited in these war-weary lands last fall.

The article follows:

WRITER FINDS RIGHTIST GREECE FREER THAN LEFTIST POLAND

(By Robert Conway)

WARSAW, January 14.—A comparison of political conditions in rightist Greece and leftist Poland definitely favors the monarchist goverment on the perimeter of Soviet Russia in eastern Europe.

This is the considered opinion of this correspondent after spending last summer in Greece and on the eve of leaving Poland for another trip to the Hellenic Peninsula.

This does not mean that conditions in Greece are good. But in Communist-dominated Poland there is more interference with civil liberties, more persecution than took place in Greece.

BRITISH REPORTER AGREES

For the sake of the record, this is not my opinion alone. Christopher Buckley, of the London Daily Telegraph, who also reported on Greece, agrees with me on all points.

On numerous occasions I have had opportunity to stress these points to various Communist leaders of the Polish provisional government, including Gen. Wiktor Grosz, spokesman for the foreign ministry. I told him in detail how Polish political evils exceeded those in Greece.

Grosz replied:

"I regard as odious any comparison between Poland and Greece, or Poland and Spain. A comparison between things which are not similar is not a comparison. There are abuses here, that I cannot deny, but one must always keep in mind that such abuses

are incidental to the achievement of a worthy object."

DETAILED COMPARISON

This accurately reflects the Communist and pseudo-Communist argument.

Here is the detailed comparison of Greece and Poland:

1. Freedom of speech: The Greeks, despite unquestionable intimidations, enjoy greater freedom of speech. Even Greek Communists express their opinions—in restaurants, sidewalk cafes, and private homes—with some degree of assurance.

2. Freedom of assemblage: Prior to, during, and after the Greek elections and referendum on the return of the King all parties were permitted to hold political meetings. In Poland the Peasant Party has been unable to obtain permission to hold a meeting even inside a hall in Warsaw.

3. Freedom of the domestic press: Greek Communists were allowed to publish their papers without prior censorship, although such publications were monitored and the editors held responsible for their contents. In Poland, however, the opposition press is strictly censored and forbidden even to report the killings of Stanislaw Mikolajczyk's followers.

On the other hand, the Polish Government press, day after day, publishes reports of outrages against law and order. In Greece the Communist press was actually allowed to print what most people considered vastly exaggerated reports of police murders of Democrats, and to issue flat denials of government statistics on civil war casualties in Greece. Such freedom is not conceivable in Poland, where even the fact that the United States and Britain have protested against election conditions has not been made known to the Polish public.

CORRESPONDENTS FREE IN GREECE

4. Freedom of the foreign press: Foreign correspondents have been arrested on several occasions in Poland and have been warned to accept government guidance in the search for truth. This has not occurred in Greece, where, for example, this correspondent visited jails and traveled wherever he wanted to and contacted political bandits without once being taken into custody. In Poland, although I was specifically promised similar freedom, I was arrested and held for 30 hours, and since then have been unable to enter jails to investigate conditions.

5. Political persecutions by the gendarmerie: Poland's security police under a Communist minister of security is more efficient than the Greek police. However, both are cruel according to the testimony of victims.

6. Rights of trial and habeas corpus: These fundamental rights under the American conception of justice have been scrapped in both countries.

7. The right to vote: This is interfered with to a certain extent in both Greece and Poland, but the wholesale elimination of names from registration lists which occurred in Poland never took place in Greece.

8. The right of all parties to enter candidates: The wholesale elimination of candidates which occurs in Poland never took place in Greece.

High Import Levy Favored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of January 21, 1947, reporting the results of its poll on the subject of importation of products of other countries which can be sold at prices lower than our cost of production. This poll of a cross section of the city's adults reveals a strong sentiment for the protection of American industry and employment opportunities for labor.

The news item follows:

THE BULLETIN POLL—HIGH IMPORT LEVY FAVORED 7 TO 3—DUTY TO PROTECT UNITED STATES LABOR MOST STRONGLY BACKED BY UNION MEMBERS

(By Paul Trescott)

Philadelphians are still wedded firmly to the idea of the protective tariff.

Seven out of ten adults in the city oppose the idea of bringing in goods which can be made and sold at a lower price than they can be manufactured in this country.

This is a margin of better than 3 to 1 of those with opinions, for 22 percent oppose the idea, and 8 percent have no opinion.

When interviewers for the Bulletin poll talked to a cross section of the city's adults they did not mention the word "tariff," which it was felt would not be universally understood. Instead, the question was worded this way: "Some countries can sell certain products more cheaply than we can. Would you favor a policy of letting these products come into this country and be sold here at a price which is lower than we can make and sell them for?"

The answers:

	Men	Women	All
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes	19	24	22
No	73	67	70
No opinion	8	9	8

Members of labor unions feel much more strongly about keeping out the products of other countries that might undersell us than do nonunion members. Here is the break-down of answers by union membership:

	Union	Nonunion
	Percent	*Percent*
Yes	15	23
No	73	69
No opinion	12	8

Hearings on the continuance of reciprocal trade treaties, under which we exchange goods with other countries, were begun in Congress last week.

Despite the strength of local opinion on the question of bringing in goods, the fact remains that many countries can buy our products only if we take theirs in return.

Political and Economic Encirclement of Greece Grows Tighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by Mr. Sotarios Nicholson, of Washington, D. C. The article follows:

Capital authorities observe that the conclusion of an economic pact between Soviet-dominated Yugoslavia and her similarly controlled neighbor, Albania, marks one more step toward the political and economic encirclement of Greece. This tactic, an additional element in the gigantic pincers movement directed by Russia against the ravaged Hellenic monarchy since the end of the war, further marks a move toward the ultimate Soviet aim of a South Slavic Federation of States.

With Greece beset by cabinet difficulties and with her western allies having lost the initiative, the Soviet strategy has taken the offensive both in the above manner and in the base implication made by Albania that Greece, rather than Albania, was responsible for the mining of the Corfu Channel. This mining led to the loss last October of two British destroyers, *Saumarez* and *Volage*, which went down carrying 44 men, and to the charge placed before the United Nations by Britain that Albania laid the mines, which were of a type left behind by the Germans during the retreat from the Balkans.

Diplomatic observers note that the economic anschluss between Albania and Yugoslavia is of far-reaching proportions, and will make Albania virtually a puppet province of the biggest of Russia's three Red proteges, Yugoslavia. This newest treaty between Tito and Albania's Premier Hoxha makes Yugoslavia a partner in every important branch of the latter's economy by, first, establishing a customs union of the two countries, and, secondly, equalizing their currencies. The customs union maneuver abolishes the economic frontier between the two countries, setting up an Albania-Yugoslavia commission in the former country to administer the customs jointly. American economists interpret the monetary system move as just falling short of establishing a single monetary system for the two countries.

Other less sweeping but nevertheless important factors in the Hoxha-Tito merger which now threatens Greek political and economic freedom are:

1. Yugoslavia will furnish technicians to help further Albanian agriculture.

2. Yugoslavia will also furnish technical aid to help Albania produce textiles, metals, and reconstruction materials.

3. Tito will extend credit to Albania for the purpose of creating consumer goods industries.

4. Tito will strengthen Albanian economy by establishing companies backed by a combination of Albanian and Yugoslavian capital.

5. Not to be overlooked in this Russian-abetted anschluss between Tito and Hoxha is the fact that it tightens Tito's hold on Albania's oil fields, which produced 1,500,000 barrels of oil in 1940, and are estimated to have a reserve of 25,000,000 additional barrels.

In the eyes of Washington officials, the political significance of this Slavic pact is interpreted as a Stalin take-off on Hitler's policy, "in unity there is strength." By uniting Albania with Yugoslavia, he joins two relatively small countries into a powerful lever that can be used against democratically minded Greece, and against the whole of southern Europe.

Albanian implications that Greeks might have laid the mines that struck British ships in Corfu Channel are but a part of the systematic and intense application by the Reds of a smear campaign against the non-Slavic Hellenes. The attack made by the Albanian newspaper, Besketari, are said by some to be similar to the smear technique used by Yugoslavian and Bulgarian newspapers, and to be a planned attempt to reverse Greece's position from an accusing nation to an accused one.

Protection Against Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if your next door neighbor's home is on fire, of course, you help him to put it out. If the wind is blowing toward your home you keep your eye out for flying sparks. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the position of the American livestock industry today. Mexico is on fire with foot-and-mouth disease. It has broken out over a broad area from Veracruz to Mexico City. Over a million head of cattle have been exposed.

In order to meet the situation, perhaps, every single head of cattle in that infected area should be killed and buried. Certainly a strict quarantine should be imposed on that immense area, and Uncle Sam will have to foot the bill, or at least, a great deal of it. We must do it to protect ourselves and I will tell you why.

The investment in livestock in this country is equal to the combined investment in the steel and automobile industries. With an investment of that character we simply cannot take the chance of foot-and-mouth disease spreading like wild fire over this country.

Mr. Speaker, over the years, radio commentators, writers, and others have led the American people to believe that the sanitary embargo which prevented beef and lamb exports from South America to this country was a subterfuge and, in fact, an economic barrier.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, the American people will have to unlearn everything these propaganda artists have told them. But we will be forced to pay through the nose for the concrete proof.

Foot-and-mouth disease exists all over the world wherever cattle and sheep are produced, with the exception of the North American Continent, West Indies, Cuba, Australia, and New Zealand. On eight occasions since the turn of the twentieth century, we have had outbreaks in this country of foot-and-mouth disease. Each time, by prompt work of our Bureau of Animal Industry, it has been stamped out as quickly as possible. Dr. John R. Mohler, for many years Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, has estimated that the entire cost to the livestock industry and to the State and Federal Governments cooperating in stamping out the disease in these eight outbreaks, exceeds $200,000,000. The 1914 outbreak was the most serious and widespread and it was necessary to kill 172,222 head of cattle, hogs, and sheep in 22 States, at a cost of nearly $6,000,000. The livestock killed in that outbreak in the 10 larger States was as follows: Illinois, 78,566; Pennsylvania, 26,306; Ohio, 12,142; Massachusetts, 8,238; Michigan, 7,877; Indiana, 7,050; New York, 6,545; Wisconsin, 4,703; Kentucky, 4,025; Iowa, 3,914. Foot-and-mouth disease attacks cattle, hogs, sheep, and goats. The disease is highly infectious and when once started spreads with great rapidity. The nature of the disease is such that every object with which the diseased animal comes in contact becomes a possible source of infection from which other animals or humans may spread the disease. Infected animals coming into a clean herd, of course, are main carriers of the disease but it is generally believed that next in importance to the infected animal and product therefrom, that man can carry the germ and spread the disease on his shoes or clothing. The California outbreak in 1929 was directly traced to garbage brought ashore from a ship just returned from Argentina and, it should be noted here, that this was in violation of the existing Bureau of Animal Industry orders.

With the exception of the instances noted above, we have always had an ocean between us and countries where foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent. Now, suddenly, we find an outbreak in our next-door neighbor, the Republic of Mexico. The origin of the infection is of particular interest in view of the repeated charges that the sanitary embargo against South American meat was a mere pretext used by the livestock interests to prevent competition from those countries that made no effort to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease. The disease came to Mexico through the importation of Brahma bulls from Brazil. A relatively small shipment, about 140 head, was received in October 1945. Our Bureau of Animal Industry immediately protested the acceptance of this shipment as being in violation of the sanitary treaty between this country and Mexico. The protests were ignored, and after a brief quarantine period in the harbor of Veracruz, the bulls were allowed to land, and of these 18 head were moved into the southern part of Texas. There is no record that this first shipment of bulls brought foot-and-mouth disease with them, and the few head now in Texas are under close quarantine and supervision.

On April 10, 1946, a much larger shipment, 327 head, left Brazil for Mexico, and despite strenuous protests of our Bureau of Animal Industry, were allowed to unload on the same island near Veracruz. The commercial cattle breeders in northern Mexico joined in the protest. At a conference in Los Angeles late in July between representatives of our Department of Agriculture and of the Mexican Department of Agriculture, it was agreed that these bulls would either be returned to Brazil or shipped to Europe for relief purposes. However, the Mexican authorities permitted these bulls to move from the quarantined island to the mainland, and they were placed on a ranch in the State of Veracruz. In about 3 weeks' time after the bulls were moved to this ranch, foot-and-mouth disease broke out among them and among other cattle on this ranch. Unfortunately, the Mexican Government did not let us know of this outbreak for about 2 months, and it was not until December 18 that our Bureau of Animal Industry learned of the situation, and not until December 26 last that the disease was positively diagnosed by experts of our Bureau of Animal Industry as foot-and-mouth disease.

Since that time several officials of our Bureau of Animal Industry have spent 2 weeks or more in Mexico surveying the situation in order to help the Mexican Government eradicate or check the spread of the disease. That survey is now completed, and I am advised that Dr. Fladness, the Assistant Chief of th Bu eau, left for Mexico City last night for a final conference with Mexican officials. Upon his return to Washington, the Department of Agriculture will make its recommendations to the Congress. I was pleased to know that our Committee on Agriculture had appointed a subcommittee, with the Honorable GEORGE W. GILLIE as chairman, to make a thorough study of this entire matter. I am confident that under Dr. GILLIE's able leadership the problem will be handled expeditiously. Unfortunately, much time has been lost, and it is now understood that the infection has spread to at least eight States in the vicinity of Mexico City and Veracruz.

I want to emphasize first that this is not a human-health problem. While foot-and-mouth disease is transmissible to humans, it is only on rare occasions that this is observed. Secondly, that the livestock industry of this country simply cannot exist with foot-and-mouth disease. In Argentina, where it has long been prevalent, they have large alfalfa fields on which the cattle run during many months of the year. On soft feed of this kind, the effect of the disease is far less serious than it would be under other conditions. In the northern and western part of this country, where cattle are on dry feed for 6 to 8 months of the year, the situation would be entirely different, and under the range conditions of the West, where cattle must travel long distances for feed and water, the situation would be such that the cattle industry could not operate profitably.

We must keep this country free of foot-and-mouth disease whatever the cost. I do not know what the program of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Committee on Agriculture will recommend, but it is absolutely imperative that we do everything possible to protect against this alarming situation. We must help Mexico to keep the disease from spreading into the northern Mexico States, for the very simple reason that if it ever gets up to our borders it will be practically impossible to prevent the disease from spreading to our country, no matter how tightly the borders may be closed. The disease can be carried by birds or by wild animals, as well as on clothing of human beings or packing materials, and in many other different ways. If it ever invades northern Mexico and is allowed to become established there, then we will have a constant battle to keep it out of our own country. It is a distinct threat, even though now it is a distance of several hundred miles from the nearest infected territory to our own borders. Let us keep it at that distance and render every aid in our power to our sister Republic to eventually stamp it out.

The Bronx—A Seaport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the people not only of Bronx County but of all the people of our country that Bronx County has every facility needed for a major seaport. Situated, as Bronx County is, along the East River and Long Island Sound, it is readily and easily accessible to the lanes uniting our country and Europe by water transport.

All during the war, large convoys of ocean-going vessels were made up in Long Island Sound and Bronx County docks were used by large ocean-going vessels.

In immediate proximity to those docks are great railroad yards, which could facilitate the movement of freight to and from those docks with ease.

We in Bronx County feel that the Nation as a whole would benefit by the economies which would be realized by utilizing the facilities of Bronx County as a major seaport.

In compliance with the admonition in the Bronx Home News to keep everlastingly at it, I submit, herewith, that newspaper's editorial appearing in its edition of January 15, 1947, which sets forth very well the position which the people of Bronx County take concerning their seaport:

FOR A BETTER BRONX—REPRESENTATIVE POTTS JOINS THE FIGHT FOR A BRONX SEAPORT

The drive for a Bronx seaport has been under way for a quarter of a century.

The aim is to spur Federal, State, and municipal governments and private enterprise toward every possible degree and manner of participation in upbuilding of the borough's East River-Long Island Sound water front.

WE'RE ENTITLED TO IT

Deep-water channels and other natural advantages, as well as easy proximity to the Atlantic and coastal lanes, entitle our water front to a major role within the port of New York.

Nevertheless, the role remains minor and the Bronx maritime vision remains unrealized because through the years borough civic and political effort have managed to win but a fraction of the development sought. Some notable advances have occurred, but the biggest and hardest part of the task lies ahead.

We are therefore happy to note that the borough's only Republican Congressman, Representative POTTS, is moving to renew the drive. First of his party to be elected from the borough in decades, he announces determination to pitch in for an objective in which he can count on solid nonpartisan cooperation from his three Bronx Democratic colleagues, an objective for which Bronx Democrats themselves have campaigned.

A VANTAGE POINT

Named to a post on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Representative POTTS hails this as providing a point of vantage for the fight. We look to him, therefore, to make his views heard and felt.

As a member of the new Public Works Committee, whose purview includes river and harbor improvements, Democratic Representative BUCKLEY will also be expected to put in a good word at all opportunities.

The Republican majority's budget-cutting intentions may put formidable obstacles in the way—and Representative POTTS, as a freshman Congressman, will scarcely be in a position to wield strong influence. Nevertheless, by asserting and reasserting Bronx claims, he can keep the project constantly alive.

POTTS points out that "the future of Bronx industry and employment" would surely be enhanced by local port development sufficient to bring ocean vessels here and to make the Bronx a cargo-receiving and transshipping center. More docks, warehouses, and industrial plants along the borough's easterly water front would be a positive contribution toward borough-wide prosperity. Some benefit must also accrue toward the country as a whole, he maintains.

Federal aid can play a prime part in realization of Bronx seaport aspirations. Whenever it comes, it will be welcome. Representative POTTS can be certain that his efforts in that direction will have all Bronx support and appreciation.

St. Croix & Bayfield Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. J. Proctor Knott, of Kentucky, delivered in the House on June 27, 1871:

Mr. KNOTT. Mr. Speaker, if I could be actuated by any conceivable inducement to betray the sacred trust reposed in me by those to whose generous confidence I am indebted for the honor of a seat on this floor; if I could be influenced by any possible consideration to become instrumental in giving away, in violation of their known wishes, any portion of their interest in the public domain for the mere promotion of any railroad enterprise whatever, I should certainly feel a strong inclination to give this measure my most earnest and hearty support; for I am assured that its success would materially enhance the pecuniary prosperity of some of the most valued friends I have on earth; friends for whose accommodation I would be willing to make almost any sacrifice not involving my personal honor or my fidelity as the trustee of an express trust. And that fact of itself would be sufficient to countervail almost any objection I might entertain to the passage of this bill not inspired by an imperative and inexorable sense of public duty.

But, independent of the seducive influences of private friendship, to which I admit I am, perhaps, as susceptible as any of the gentlemen I see around me, the intrinsic merits of the measure itself are of such an extraordinary character as to commend it most strongly to the favorable consideration of every Member of this House, myself not excepted, notwithstanding my constituents, in whose behalf alone I am acting here, would not be benefited by its passage one particle more than they would be by a project to cultivate an orange grove on the bleakest summit of Greenland's icy mountains. [Laughter.]

Now, sir, as to those great trunk lines of railway, spanning the continent from ocean to ocean, I confess my mind has never been fully made up. It is true they may afford some trifling advantages to local traffic, and they may even in time become the channels of a more extended commerce. Yet, I have never been thoroughly satisfied either of the necessity or expediency of projects promising such meager results to the great body of our people. But with regard to the transcendent merits of the gigantic enterprise contemplated in this bill I never entertained the shadow of a doubt. [Laughter.]

Years ago, when I first heard that there was somewhere in the vast terra incognita, somewhere in the bleak regions of the great Northwest, a stream of water known to the nomadic inhabitants of the neighborhood as the river St. Croix, I became satisfied that the construction of a railroad from that raging torrent to some point in the civilized world was essential to the happiness and prosperity of the American people, if not absolutely indispensable to the perpetuity of republican institutions on this continent. [Great laughter.] I felt instinctively that the boundless resources of that prolific region of sand and pine shrubbery would never be fully developed without a railroad constructed and equipped at the expense of the Government, and perhaps not then. [Laughter.] I had an abiding presentment that, some day or other, the people of this whole country, irrespective of party affiliations, regardless of sectional prejudices, and without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, would rise in their majesty and demand an outlet for the enormous agricultural productions of those vast and fertile pine barrens, drained in the rainy season by the surging waters of the turbid St. Croix. [Great laughter.]

These impressions, derived simply and solely from the eternal fitness of things, were not only strengthened by the interesting and eloquent debate on this bill, to which I listened with so much pleasure the other day, but intensified, if possible, as I read over this morning the lively colloquy which took place on that occasion, as I find it reported in last Friday's Globe. I will ask the indulgence of the House while I read a few short passages, which are sufficient, in my judgment, to place the merits of the great enterprise contemplated in the measure now under discussion beyond all possible controversy.

The honorable gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Wilson], who I believe is managing this bill, in speaking of the character of the country through which this railroad is to pass, says this:

"We want to have the timber brought to us as cheaply as possible. Now, if you tie up the lands in this way, so that no title can be obtained to them—for no settler will go on these lands, for he cannot make a living—you deprive us of the benefit of that timber."

Now, sir, I would not have it by any means inferred from this that the gentleman from Minnesota would insinuate that the people out in his section desire this timber merely for the purpose of fencing up their farms so that their stock may not wander off and die of starvation among the bleak hills of the St. Croix. [Laughter.] I read it for no such purpose, sir, and make no such comment on it myself. In corroboration of this statement of the gentleman from Minnesota, I find this testimony given by the honorable gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Washburn]. Speaking of these same lands, he says:

"Under the bill, as amended by my friend from Minnesota, nine-tenths of the land is open to actual settlers at $250 per acre; the

remaining one-tenth is pine-timbered land, that is not fit for settlement, and never will be settled upon; but the timber will be cut off. I admit that it is the most valuable portion of the grant, for more of the grant is not valuable. It is quite valueless; and if you put in this amendment of the gentleman from Indiana you may as well just kill the bill, for no man and no company will take the grant and build the road."

I simply pause here to ask some gentleman better versed in the science of mathematics than I am to tell me if the timbered lands are in fact the most valuable portion of that section of country, and they would be entirely valueless without the timber that is on them, what the remainder of the land is worth which has no timber on it at all. [Laughter.]

But further on I find a most entertaining and instructive interchange of views between the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Rogers; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Washburn; and the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Peters, upon the subject of pine lands generally, which I will tax the patience of the House to read:

"Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

"Mr. WASHBURN of Wisconsin. Certainly.

"Mr. ROGERS. Are these pine lands entirely worthless except for timber?

"Mr. WASHBURN of Wisconsin. They are generally worthless for any other purpose. I am perfectly familiar with that subject. These lands are not valuable for purposes of settlement.

"Mr FARNSWORTH. They will be after the timber is taken off.

"Mr. WASHBURN of Wisconsin. No, sir.

"Mr. ROGERS. I want to know the character of these pine lands.

"Mr. WASHBURN of Wisconsin. They are generally sandy, barren lands. My friend from the Green Bay district, Mr. Sawyer, is himself perfectly familiar with this question, and he will bear me out in what I say, that these pine timberlands are not adapted to settlement.

"Mr. ROGERS. The pine lands to which I am accustomed are generally very good. What I want to know is what is the difference between our pine lands and your pine lands.

"Mr. WASHBURN of Wisconsin. The pine timber of Wisconsin generally grows upon barren, sandy land. The gentleman from Maine, Mr. Peters, who is familiar with pine lands, will, I have no doubt, say that pine timber grows generally upon the most barren lands.

"Mr PETERS. As a general thing pine lands are not worth much for cultivation."

And further on I find this pregnant question, the joint production of the two gentlemen from Wisconsin:

"Mr. PAINE. Does my friend from Indiana suppose that in any event settlers will occupy and cultivate these pine lands?

"Mr. WASHBURN of Wisconsin. Particularly without a railroad?"

Yes, sir; "particularly without a railroad." It will be asked after a while, I am afraid, if settlers will go anywhere unless the Government builds a railroad for them to go on. [Laughter.]

I desire to call attention to only one more statement, which I think sufficient to settle the question. It is one made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PAINE], who says:

"These lands will be abandoned for the present. It may be that at some remote period there will spring up in that region a new kind of agriculture which will cause a demand for these particular lands; and they may then come into use and be valuable for agricultural purposes. But I know, and I cannot help thinking that my friend from Indiana understands, that for the present and for many years to come, these pine lands can have no possible value other than that arising from the pine timber which stands on them."

Now, sir, who, after listening to this emphatic and unequivocal testimony of these intelligent, competent, and able-bodied witnesses [laughter]; who, that is not as incredulous as St. Thomas himself, will doubt for a moment that the Goshen of America is to be found in the sandy valleys and upon the pine-clad hills of the St. Croix? [Laughter.] Who will have the hardihood to rise in his seat on this floor and assert that, excepting the pine bushes, the entire region would not produce vegetation enough in 10 years to fatten a grasshopper? [Great laughter.] Where is the patriot who is willing that his country shall incur the peril of remaining another day without the amplest railroad connection with such an inexhaustible mine of agricultural wealth? [Laughter.] Who will answer for the consequences of abandoning a great and warlike people, in possession of a country like that, to brood over the indifference and neglect of their Government? [Laughter.] How long would it be before they would take to studying the Declaration of Independence and hatching out the damnable heresy of secession? How long before the grim demon of civil discord would rear again his horrid head in our midst, "gnash loud his iron fangs and shake his crest of bristling bayonets?" [Laughter.]

Then, sir, think of the long and painful process of reconstruction that must follow with its concomitant amendments to the Constitution: The seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth articles. The sixteenth, it is of course understood, is to be appropriated to those blushing damsels who are, day after day, beseeching us to let them vote, hold office, drink cocktails, ride astraddle, and do anything else the men do. [Roars of laughter.] But above all, sir, let me implore you to reflect for a single moment on the deplorable condition of our country in case of a foreign war, with all our ports blockaded, all our cities in a state of siege, the gaunt specter of famine brooding like a hungry vulture over our starving land; our commissary stores all exhausted, and our famishing armies withering away in the field, a helpless prey to the insatiate demon of hunger; our Navy rotting in the docks for want of provisions for our gallant seamen, and we without any railroad communication whatever with the prolific pine thickets of the St. Croix. [Great laughter.]

Ah, sir, I could very well understand why my amiable friends from Pennsylvania [Mr. Myers, Mr. Kelley, and Mr. O'Neill] should be so earnest in their support of this bill the other day, and if their honorable colleague, my friend, Mr. Randall, will pardon the remark, I will say I considered his criticism of their action on that occasion as not only unjust but ungenerous. I knew they were looking forward with the far-reaching ken of enlightened statesmanship to the pitiable condition in which Philadelphia will be left unless speedily supplied with railroad connection in some way or other with this garden spot of the universe. [Laughter.] And besides, sir, this discussion has relieved my mind of a mystery that has weighed upon it like an incubus for years. I could never understand before why there was so much excitement during the last Congress over the acquisition of Alta Vela. I could never understand why it was that some of our ablest statesmen and most disinterested patriots should entertain such dark forebodings of the untold calamities that were to befall our beloved country unless we should take immediate possession of that desirable island. But I see now that they were laboring under the mistaken impression that the Government would need the guano to manure the public lands on the St. Croix. [Great laughter.]

Now, sir, I repeat I have been satisfied for years that if there was any portion of the inhabited globe absolutely in a suffering condition for want of a railroad it was these teeming pine barrens of the St. Croix. [Laughter.] At what particular point on that noble stream such a road should be commenced I knew was immaterial, and so it seems to have been considered by the draftsman of this bill. It might be up at the spring or down at the foot log, or the water gate, or the fish dam, or anywhere along the bank, no matter where. [Laughter.] But in what direction should it run, or where it should terminate, were always to my mind questions of the most painful perplexity. I could conceive of no place on God's green earth in such straitened circumstances for railroad facilities as to be likely to desire or willing to accept such a connection. [Laughter.] I knew that neither Bayfield nor Superior City would have it, for they both indignantly spurned the munificence of the Government when coupled with such ignominious conditions, and let this very same land grant die on their hands years and years ago rather than submit to the degradation of a direct communication by railroad with the piny woods of the St. Croix; and I knew that what the enterprising inhabitants of those giant young cities would refuse to take would have few charms for others, whatever their necessities or cupidity might be. [Laughter.]

Hence, as I have said, sir, I was utterly at a loss to determine where the terminus of this great and indispensable road should be, until I accidentally overheard some gentleman the other day mention the name of "Duluth." [Great laughter.] Duluth! The word fell upon my ear with peculiar and indescribable charm, like the gentle murmur of a low fountain stealing forth in the midst of roses, or the soft, sweet accents of an angel's whisper in the bright, joyous dream of sleeping innocence. Duluth! 'Twas the name for which my soul had panted for years, as the hart panteth for the water brooks. [Renewed laughter.] But where was Duluth? Never, in all my limited reading, had my vision been gladdened by seeing the celestial word in print. [Laughter.] And I felt a profounder humiliation in my ignorance that its dulcet syllables had never before ravished my delighted ear. [Roars of laughter.] I was certain the draftsman of this bill had never heard of it, or it would have been designated as one of the termini of this road. I asked my friends about it, but they knew nothing of it. I rushed to the library and examined all the maps I could find. [Laughter.] I discovered in one of them a delicate, hairlike line, diverging from the Mississippi near a place marked Prescott, which I supposed was intended to represent the river St. Croix, but I could nowhere find Duluth.

Nevertheless, I was confident it existed somewhere, and that its discovery would constitute the crowning glory of the present century, if not of all modern times. [Laughter.] I knew it was bound to exist in the very nature of things; that the symmetry and perfection of our planetary system would be incomplete without it [renewed laughter]; that the elements of material nature would long since have resolved themselves back into original chaos if there had been such a hiatus in creation as would have resulted from leaving our Duluth. [Roars of laughter.] In fact, sir, I was overwhelmed with the conviction that Duluth not only existed somewhere, but that wherever it was it was a great and glorious place. I was convinced that the greatest calamity that ever befell the benighted nations of the ancient world was in their having passed away without a knowledge of the actual existence of Duluth; that their fabled Atlantis, never seen save by the

hallowed vision of inspired poesy, was, in fact, but another name for Duluth; that the golden orchard of the Hesperides was but a poetical synonym for the beer gardens in the vicinity of Duluth. [Great laughter.] I was certain that Herodotus had died a miserable death because in all his travels and with all his geographical research he had never heard of Duluth. [Laughter.] I knew that if the immortal spirit of Homer could look down from another heaven than that created by his own celestial genius upon the long lines of pilgrims from every nation of the earth to the gushing fountain of poesy opened by the touch of his magic wand, if he could be permitted to behold the vast assemblage of grand and glorious productions of the lyric art called into being by his own inspired strains, he would weep tears of bitter anguish that instead of lavishing all the stores of his mighty genius upon the fall of Ilion it had not been his more blessed lot to crystallize in deathless song the rising glories of Duluth. [Great and continued laughter.] Yet, sir, had it not been for this map, kindly furnished me by the Legislature of Minnesota, I might have gone down to my obscure and humble grave in an agony of despair, because I could nowhere find Duluth. [Renewed laughter.] Had such been my melancholy fate, I have no doubt that with the last feeble pulsation of my breaking heart, with the last faint exhalation of my fleeting breath, I should have whispered, "Where is Duluth?" [Roars of laughter.]

But, thanks to the beneficence of that band of ministering angels who have their bright abodes in the far-off capital of Minnesota, just as the agony of my anxiety was about to culminate in the frenzy of despair, this blessed map was placed in my hands; and as I unfolded it a resplendent scene of ineffable glory opened before me, such as I imagine burst upon the enraptured vision of the wandering peri through the opening gates of paradise. [Renewed laughter.] There, there for the first time, my enchanted eye rested upon the ravishing word "Duluth."

This map, sir, is intended, as it appears from its title, to illustrate the position of Duluth in the United States; but if gentlemen will examine it, I think they will concur with me in the opinion that it is far too modest in its pretensions. It not only illustrates the position of Duluth in the United States, but exhibits its relations with all created things. It even goes further than this: It lifts the shadowy veil of futurity and affords us a view of the golden prospects of Duluth far along the dim vista of ages yet to come.

If gentlemen will examine it they will find Duluth not only in the center of the map, but represented in the center of a series of concentric circles 100 miles apart, and some of them as much as 4,000 miles in diameter, embracing alike in their tremendous sweep the fragrant savannas of the sunlit South and the eternal solitudes of snow that mantle the ice-bound North. [Laughter.] How these circles were produced is perhaps one of those primordial mysteries that the most skillful paleologist will never be able to explain. [Renewed laughter.] But the fact is, sir, Duluth is preeminently a central place for I am told by gentlemen who have been so reckless of their own personal safety as to venture away into those awful regions where Duluth is supposed to be that it is so exactly in the center of the visible universe that the sky comes down at precisely the same distance all around it. [Roars of laughter.]

I find by reference to this map that Duluth is situated somewhere near the western end of Lake Superior, but as there is no dot or other mark indicating its exact location I am unable to say whether it is actually confined to any particular spot, or whether "it is just lying around there loose." [Renewed laughter.] I really cannot tell whether it is one of those ethereal creations of intellectual frostwork, more intangible than the rose-tinted clouds of a summer sunset; one of those airy exhalations of the speculator's brain, which I am told are ever flitting in the form of towns and cities along those lines of railroad, built with Government subsidies, luring the unwary settler as the mirage of the desert lures the famishing traveler on, and ever on, until it fades away in the darkening horizon, or whether it is a real, bona fide, substantial city, all staked off, with the lots marked with their owners' names, like that proud commercial metropolis recently discovered on the desirable shores of San Domingo. [Laughter.] But, however that may be, I am satisfied Duluth is there, or thereabout, for I see it stated here on this map that it is exactly 3,990 miles from Liverpool [laughter], though I have no doubt, for the sake of convenience, it will be moved back 10 miles so as to make the distance an even 4,000. [Renewed laughter.]

Then, sir, there is the climate of Duluth, unquestionably the most salubrious and delightful to be found anywhere on the Lord's earth. Now, I have always been under the impression, as I presume other gentlemen have, that in the region around Lake Superior it was cold enough for at least 9 months in the year to freeze the smokestack off a locomotive. [Great laughter.] But I see it represented on this map that Duluth is situated exactly halfway between the latitudes of Paris and Venice, so that gentlemen who have inhaled the exhilarating airs of the one or basked in the golden sunlight of the other may see at a glance that Duluth must be a place of untold delights [laughter], a terrestrial paradise, fanned by the balmy zephyrs of an eternal spring, clothed in the gorgeous sheen of ever-blooming flowers, and vocal with the silvery melody of nature's choicest songsters. [Laughter.] In fact, sir, since I have seen this map I have no doubt that Byron was vainly endeavoring to convey some faint conception of the delicious charms of Duluth when his poetic soul gushed forth in the rippling strains of that beautiful rhapsody—

"Know ye the land of the cedar and vine,
Where the flowers ever blossom, the beams ever shine;
Where the light wings of Zephyr, oppressed with perfume,
Wax faint o'er the gardens of Gul in her bloom;
Where the citron and olive are fairest of fruit,
And the voice of the nightingale never is mute;
Where the tints of the earth and the hues of the sky,
In color though varied, in beauty may vie?"

[Laughter.]

As to the commercial resources of Duluth, sir, they are simply illimitable and inexhaustible, as is shown by this map. I see it stated here that there is a vast scope of territory, embracing an area of over 2,000,000 square miles, rich in every element of material wealth and commercial prosperity, all tributary to Duluth. Look at it, sir, [pointing to the map.] Here are inexhaustible mines of gold, immeasurable veins of silver, impenetrable depths of boundless forests, vast coal measures, wide, extended plains of richest pasturage, all, all embraced in this vast territory, which must, in the very nature of things, empty the untold treasures of its commerce into the lap of Duluth. [Laughter.]

Look at it sir [pointing to the map], do not you see from these broad, brown lines drawn around this immense territory that the enterprising inhabitants of Duluth intend some day to enclose it all in one vast corral, so that its commerce will be bound to go there whether it would or not? [Great laughter.] And here, sir [still pointing to the map], I find within a convenient distance the Piegan Indians, which, of all the many accessories to the glory of Duluth, I consider by far the most inestimable. For, sir, I have been told that when the smallpox break out among the women and children of that famous tribe, as it sometimes does, they afford the finest subjects in the world for the strategical experiments of any enterprising military hero who desires to improve himself in the noble art of war [laughter] especially for any valiant lieutenant general whose

"Trenchant blade, Toledo trusty,
For want of fighting has grown rusty,
And eats into itself for lack
Of somebody to hew and hack."

[Great laughter.]

Sir, the great conflict now raging in the Old World has presented a phenomenon in military science unprecedented in the annals of mankind, a phenomenon that has reversed all the traditions of the past as it has disappointed all the expectations of the present. A great and warlike people, renowned alike for their skill and valor, have been swept away before the triumphant advance of an inferior foe, like autumn stubble before a hurricane of fire. For aught I know the next flash of electric fire that shimmers along the ocean cable may tell us that Paris, with every fiber quivering with the agony of impotent despair, writhes beneath the conquering heel of her loathed invader. Ere another moon shall wax and wane the brightest star in the galaxy of nations may fall from the zenith of her glory never to rise again. Ere the modest violets of early spring shall ope their beauteous eyes the genius of civilization may chant the wailing requiem of the proudest nationality the world has ever seen, as she scatters her withered and tear-moistened lilies o'er the bloody tomb of butchered France. But, sir, I wish to ask if you honestly and candidly believe that the Dutch would have ever overrun the French in that kind of style if General Sheridan had not gone over there and told King William and Von Moltke how he had managed to whip the Piegan Indians. [Great laughter.]

And here, sir, recurring to this map, I find in the immediate vicinity of the Piegans "vast herds of buffalo" and "immense fields of rich wheat lands."

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Many cries: "Go on!" "Go on!"]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Kentucky continuing his remarks? The Chair hears none. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. KNOTT. I was remarking, sir, upon these vast wheat fields represented on this map in the immediate neighborhood of the buffaloes and the Piegans, and was about to say that the idea of there being these immense wheat fields in the very heart of a wilderness, hundreds and hundreds of miles beyond the utmost verge of civilization, may appear to some gentlemen as rather incongruous, as rather too great a strain on the blankets of veracity. But to my mind there is no difficulty in the matter whatever. The phenomenon is very easily accounted for. It is evident, sir, that the Piegans sowed that wheat there and plowed it in with buffalo bulls. [Great laughter.] Now, sir, this fortunate combination of buffaloes and Piegans, considering their relative positions to each other and to Duluth, as they are arranged on this map, satisfies me that Duluth is destined to be the beef market of the world.

Here, you will observe [pointing to the map], are the buffaloes, directly between the Piegans and Duluth, and here, right on the road to Duluth, are the Creeks. Now, sir,

when the buffaloes are sufficiently fat from grazing on those immense wheat fields you see it will be the easiest thing in the world for the Piegans to drive them on down, stay all night with their friends, the Creeks, and go into Duluth in the morning. [Great laughter.] I think I see them now, sir, a vast herd of buffaloes, with their heads down, their eyes glaring, their nostrils dialated, their tongues out, and their tails curled over their backs, tearing along toward Duluth, with about a thousand Piegans on their grass-bellied ponies, yelling at their heels. [Great laughter.] On they come. And as they sweep past the Creeks they join in the chase, and away they all go, yelling, bellowing, ripping, and tearing along, amid clouds of dust, until the last buffalo is safely penned in the stockyards of Duluth. [Shouts of laughter.]

Sir, I might stand here for hours and hours, and expatiate with rapture upon the gorgeous prospects of Duluth, as depicted upon this map. But human life is too short and the time of this House far too valuable to allow me to linger longer upon the delightful theme. [Laughter.] I think every gentleman on this floor is as well satisfied as I am that Duluth is destined to become the commercial metropolis of the universe, and that this road should be built at once. I am fully persuaded that no patriotic Representative of the American people, who has a proper appreciation of the associated glories of Duluth and the St. Croix, will hesitate a moment to say that every able-bodied female in the land between the ages of 18 and 45 who is in favor of women's rights should be drafted and set to work upon this great work without delay. [Roars of laughter.] Nevertheless, sir, it grieves my very soul to be compelled to say that I cannot vote for the grant of lands provided for in this bill.

Ah, sir, you can have no conception of the poignancy of my anguish that I am deprived of that blessed privilege. [Laughter.] There are two insuperable obstacles in the way. In the first place my constituents, for whom I am acting here, have no more interest in this road than they have in the great question of culinary taste now perhaps agitating the public mind of Dominica, as to whether the illustrious commissioners who recently left this capital for that free and enlightened republic would be better fricasseed, boiled, or roasted [great laughter]; and in the second place these lands, which I am asked to give away, alas, are not mine to bestow. My relation to them is simply that of trustee to an express trust. And shall I ever betray that trust? Never, sir. Rather perish Duluth. [Shouts of laughter.] Perish the paragon of cities. Rather let the freezing cyclones of the bleak Northwest bury it forever beneath the eddying sands of the raging St. Croix. [Great laughter.]

Repeal Silver Purchase Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have offered this day two bills to repeal the nonsensical Silver Purchase Acts.

Recent developments have clearly indicated that the greed of a few mine owners, abetted by a powerful lobby, have sown seeds of their own destruction. Not satisfied with the exorbitant price of 71.11 cents per fine ounce as fixed by Federal statute, the silverites demanded and received 90.50 cents per fine ounce. The new law requires the Treasury to buy silver mined by American companies at 90.50 cents and permits it to sell its surplus silver at the same price.

This was practically a hold-up. Certain gentlemen in high places successfully urged holding up every piece of legislation until they got this increase. While the contest was on in the Senate, producers of silver held up their supplies. They were awaiting the extra gravy spelled out by the new law. Industrial users of silver went without. They had to resort to melting down silver dollars to get the much needed metal.

Then came the boomerang. Countries like China, New Mexico, and India found the new prices too attractive. India replaced its silver coins with nickel and sent the silver to the United States market. Britain followed suit, substituting copper-nickel tokens for silver coins and also dumped its silver in the American market, tons of which are now begging for buyers. Silver came pouring in from Spain, China, Russia, the Near East, Mexico, from the four corners of the earth. The price dropped. The market price today fixed by the silver brokers is 78¾ cents. This is almost 12 cents below the price fixed by law.

The end is not yet in sight. The price will go lower. Meanwhile, Uncle Sam must pay 90.5 cents per ounce.

Silver needs no props like the Silver Purchase Acts. Uncle Sam has over 3,000,000,000 ounces stored away at West Point. Uncle Sam digs it out of the ground with one hand and puts it back with the other.

Silver must take its place unafraid and must compete on its own with other metals. We must no longer worship silver as a fetish. The Silver Purchase Acts must be repealed.

Electricity for Farmers—The Threat to Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at Tennessee Rural Electric Cooperative Association banquet, Nashville, January 14, 1947:

Mr. Toastmaster and fellow cooperators, the enemy's battle of the bulge is on. He is striving with all his might to cut us in two, to divide and conquer us.

The tactic is not new, but it promises to typify the opposition's '47 campaign against us and is taking on ominous proportions.

The battle of '46 was a new maneuver, in that never before had the enemy met us head-on in congressional committees. Beginning with the Poage bill hearings in October 1945, the power companies have appeared against us at every opportunity.

Farmers are the most peaceable people on earth. That's one reason they are farmers; they like the freedom of country life. They never want a fight—which is one reason only half of them have electricity today. They didn't want all the power fights that were thrust upon them last year, and they don't want more this year. They have never attacked, nor instigated trouble with, the commercial power companies.

But neither will they run from a fight. They didn't run last year—and they won most of the engagements—although we must admit that a few times we got as jittery as an expectant father.

To be able to properly defend ourselves—and I am talking about REA, the co-ops, TVA and every other phase of the power program, for we are all one in a given area, whether we like it or not—it is necessary that we keep our eyes on the broad objectives, the great and everlasting good to be achieved.

To be able to better comprehend these objectives and the complexities of our daily problems at all times, it is well to keep ever before us the background out of which they grew, and continue to grow. To review them here this evening would be impossible, but I do want to recall a few facts of local interest from America's power program history.

The Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration both were conceived, in no small part, out of two notable accidents. Both might have come into existence in some form at some time, but they well might not have come in our time. The first of those accidents is related by the "Father of REA and TVA," the late Senator Norris, in his autobiography, The Fighting Liberal. There he says, and I quote, "My association with TVA was purely accidental and, at the start, very much against my personal wishes."

He goes on to record how, shortly after World War I, the question of completing Wilson Dam was referred, over his protests, to the Committee on Agriculture, of which he was chairman. He continues, "I found myself confronted with a responsibility which I did not want," but "I went to work." Thus by the accident or coincidence of a committee assignment he became the victim and ultimately the champion of the complete development of the mighty Tennessee.

Twice Senator Norris got TVA bills passed through both Houses of Congress only to see them vetoed, first by Coolidge and then by Hoover.

The White House was the barrier, and there is where the second accident comes in. We may call it the accident or coincidence of Franklin Roosevelt's affliction with infantile paralysis; or of his seeking treatment at Warm Springs; or even more simply, of his having so much time on his hands that he noticed even the minutest things about him—and enjoyed them all, save one. I quote from a speech he made at Barnesville, Ga.:

"There was only one discordant note in that first stay of mine at Warm Springs. When the first-of-the-month bill came in for electric light for my little cottage I found that the charge was 18 cents a kilowatt hour—about four times as much as I paid in Hyde Park, N. Y. That started my long study of proper public utility charges for electric current and the whole subject of getting electricity into farm homes."

Thus we have it in their own words that both Norris and Roosevelt—the two great leaders most responsible for TVA and REA—each became interested quite by accident.

This is important because in each case it was a discovery that any intelligent and unprejudiced person might have made; a dis-

covery of a dire need and the possible satisfaction of that need through a vast and novel program. Not by any stretch of the imagination were TVA and REA designed as steps toward some ism, as some of our dearly beloved self-interest leaders in the divide-and-conquer campaign would have the world believe. Rather they were separate and independent discoveries of the same ways and means of removing the barrier of bigness, that the people might be free to do for themselves what no corporation was willing or able to do. They were discoveries of ways and means of stimulating and expanding our free competitive enterprise system, injecting into a naturally monopolistic, major American industry an element of competition. Free competitive enterprise—not merely free enterprise, for free enterprise without competition is monopoly—free competitive enterprise is what has made America great.

You know the story they tell on Ben Franklin, how in his youth, he was stalking down that narrow street in Philadelphia—if he was stalking down any Philadelphia street it was a narrow one—with a long loaf of bread under his arm, and a beautiful lady poked her head out of a window—I don't know whether she smelled the bread or heard his hobnails on the cobblestones—and she made a sarcastic remark about how comical he looked. Well, it struck his fancy—or at least helped him get acquainted—so he got even with her. He married her and discovered electricity.

Benjamin Franklin may have discovered simple electricity, but it took Franklin Roosevelt and George Norris and John Rankin to discover competitive electricity.

REA followed TVA as logically as night follows day. Any government interested in capturing for its people vast resources of low-cost hydropower wasting itself away to the sea—nonprofit wholesale power—would also be interested in seeing it reach those people through nonprofit distribution systems, at least to the extent of providing competition.

Had there not been a TVA there might never have been an REA. Senator Norris, in what some regard as perhaps his greatest speech, because, in a sort of farewell and good-by to man, it records for posterity jewels of his intellect and eloquence which would otherwise have been lost—and I refer to his address on his way home at the end of his long career in the Senate, delivered at the first annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis, January 19, 1943 extemporaneously and without notes, in his 82d year—Senator Norris in that masterful address said:

"And I would like to remind you, my friends, we never would have had a Rural Electrification Administration if we hadn't first had a Tennessee Valley Authority, and we never would have had either one of them if it had not been for our President Roosevelt."

Why wouldn't we have had an REA without TVA? What the Senator probably meant was that except for the TVA experiment in farm distribution of electricity cooperatively beginning with, to quote Dave Lilienthal's TVA—Democracy on the March, "a particular kind of TVA-inspired cooperative born in 1934 in the back of a furniture store in Corinth, Miss.," Roosevelt would not have created REA by the Executive order of March 11, 1935, and without the TVA experiment and the REA experiment with cooperatives under the Executive order the REA Act of May 20, 1936, could not have been passed.

Particularly because we are assembled tonight in the heart of the great crescent of the Tennessee Valley and in the birthplace of REA, both of which have captured the imagination and inspired the hopes of mankind throughout the civilized world, it is interesting to observe the separate courses that TVA-financed and REA-financed co-ops have taken. These courses have been largely parallel, but a brief comparative analysis of a few points in contrast will best serve our purpose here.

First, I want to list six advantages which TVA-financed co-ops—in and out of Tennessee—have enjoyed over the others. Perhaps there are more, as well as disadvantages.

1. Generally, those that were TVA financed got an earlier start, thus avoiding some of the higher wartime and postwar construction costs and thus being able to cash in on more of the accelerated wartime farm revenues.

2. They enjoyed more adequate financing, for the TVA revolving fund kept them well supplied until they began borrowing from REA.

3. They were able to do a better planning and system-designing job, because of this more dependable financing.

(The last three advantages apply not only to TVA-financed projects, but to all co-ops which purchase power from TVA; to those in the old Tennessee Electric Power Co.—and other acquisition—areas. For handy reference hereafter, let us call them all "TVA co-ops.")

4. TVA co-ops have enjoyed from the beginning an exceptionally favorable wholesale power source: adequate TVA power at cost without restrictions as to its use.

5. TVA co-ops have been less subject to the economic hazards of commercial company spite-lining and cream-skimming of their projected territories, especially after the TVA purchase of TEP Co.

6. TVA co-ops got a head start with a much higher percentage of good load centers around which to build rural lines—especially after the acquisition and division of TEP Co. and other companies.

REA co-ops generally, by contrast with the TVA's, have had a terrific struggle in most of the country, beginning long before the all-out opposition and divide-and-conquer campaigns of last year and this.

1. REA co-ops got less construction completed, if, indeed, they got started at all, before the war; they lost valuable wartime revenue, and many of them, less able to absorb the burden, paid interest for years on partially completed, non-revenue-producing construction.

2. Their growth has been retarded because as a whole they have never had adequate loan funds in a single year.

3. Because of inadequate and uncertain financing they have never been able to plan scientifically. This has retarded construction and is resulting in more expensive redesigning and rebuilding.

4. With the exception of Bonneville and a few smaller areas, REA co-ops have never had an adequate source of unrestricted, low-cost wholesale power.

5. In practically every other State, except Nebraska, REA co-ops have been forced into expensive, time-consuming local battles by their neighboring power companies, constantly harassed by foreboding threats of spite-line destruction, threats of disastrous State legislation, threats of inadequate power supply except with unmerciful restrictions—these and many others that in far too many instances have been carried out.

6. On the national front the struggle of the REA's has been even more titanic: for loan funds, for administrative funds, for an even break in war-construction regulations, for reasonable power sources, and to stave off restrictive legislation.

The inevitable result on both State and national levels was organization, primarily for purposes of defense at first.

NRECA began to take form during the copper hearings in 1941. Co-op leaders had gathered in Washington from several States to deny the charge of Congressman Winter and others that the co-ops were hoarding precious copper. I met them there when, as a Member of Congress from Arkansas, I appeared before the same committee to deny Winter's charges, but I knew nothing then of their discussion to form a "national."

The first I knew of NRECA was the day it was incorporated in Washington, March 20, 1942, under the Cooperative Act of Congress. I was honored to be one of a dozen or so invited to meet the incorporators at a little reception that evening. George Norris, John Rankin, and Bob Poage were there.

Norris, RANKIN, and others had long urged such an association to organize and give concerted voice to the people back home in the ever-increasing battles.

I remember the beam of happiness that radiated from Mr. Norris' face when he inquired how they had organized and was told that they had incorporated in exactly the same manner as REA co-ops do, by a few individuals becoming the incorporators and the first board—as required by law—but providing for the democratic election of their successors at the first meeting of members and for complete, autonomous, and democratic control thereafter.

NRECA is even more democratic now, for today it has a director from each State, elected annually by the members. It is the most democratic national organization of any kind that I know of.

NRECA's accomplishments have exceeded our fondest hopes. Many of them are intangible and cannot be listed, as, for instance, the good derived from day-to-day contacts with official Washington.

You who attended the first annual meeting at St. Louis in 1943 will recall that a strong resolution was passed asking permission to resume construction. A committee was appointed to follow through, and, in cooperation with REA, we got results—then and several times thereafter. All co-ops, including TVA's, benefited.

In 1943, when the national board became convinced that the co-ops were being penalized on certain types of insurance and that there would be advantages in pooling it, they employed an insurance executive and got results. Co-ops benefited to the tune of at least $150,000 a year.

In 1943, NRECA determined that the Government was making more than $2,000,000 a year clear profit on REA loans; that the amortization period of 25 years was too short; and that REA should be extended beyond 1946. So it set out to get the law changed. We initiated and led the fight, and, with the help of REA and our friends in Congress, we got the interest rate reduced from an average of more than 2.6 percent to a flat 2 percent. We got the amortization period extended to 35 years and the act made permanent. All co-ops benefited—to the extent of more than $2,400,000 a year as of their September 1944 advances—and, of course, the annual saving far exceeds that today.

Here is where the separate paths of TVA and REA co-ops come together. TVA co-ops had been paying a flat 3½ percent on their TVA loans. Their paths had come close previously when TVA co-ops started obtaining their new loans from REA. Now there was no good reason why they should go on paying 3½ percent on the TVA loans when they could borrow from REA at 2 percent under the McCord Act and the NRECA 2 percent amendment and pay off the TVA loans.

TVA made loans to seven Tennessee cooperatives. Six of them have paid off those loans with funds borrowed from REA.

We have computed the resulting annual savings of all Tennessee cooperatives on both old and new loans. Incidentally, we have also listed the one county public-utility district and the several valley towns which enjoy corresponding savings. Yes, they could join the National, too. On the TVA loans the savings are 1½ percent a year. On all REA advances in Tennessee, as of September 21, 1944—the effective date of the

NRECA amendment—the savings average above six-tenths of 1 percent a year; on all later advances we have estimated the savings at a flat six-tenths of 1 percent a year, although we know they are in excess of that.

We have listed here all Tennessee projects and their approximate total annual savings resulting from the NRECA 2-percent amendment, partially in conjunction with the McCord Act, based on their unpaid balances of September 1, 1944, and subsequent advances through September 30, 1946:

Name of project	Annual savings on TVA loans (refunded)	Approximate annual savings on REA loans, exclusive of TVA loans refunded	Approximate total annual savings of Tennessee co-ops
Volunteer electric		$7,774.23	$7,774.23
Tricounty electric		11,029.10	11,029.10
Southwest Tennessee electric	$3,600.00	4,848.74	8,448.74
Bolivar public (city)		232.60	232.60
Middle Tennessee electric		8,304.66	8,304.66
Gibson County electric	6,000.00	7,455.93	13,455.93
Duck River electric	2,480.60	11,568.49	14,049.09
Dickson public (city)		1,027.24	1,027.24
Cumberland electric		7,415.25	7,415.25
Upper Cumberland electric		4,885.94	4,885.94
Fort Loudon electric		2,406.86	2,406.86
Carroll public (county)		441.60	441.60
Paris public (city)		848.72	848.72
Weakley public (city) (paid REA in full)		289.80	289.80
Pickwick electric	1,470.00	833.93	2,303.93
Meriwether-Lewis electric		1,511.37	1,511.37
Tennessee Valley electric		2,619.65	2,619.65
Sequachee Valley electric	7,100.00	3,531.12	11,331.12
Plateau electric (no REA loan).			
Holston electric		1,694.47	1,694.47
Appalachian electric		1,558.84	1,558.84
Lincoln County electric	4,500.00	2,134.26	6,634.26
Newport public (city)		637.40	637.40
Lafollette public (city)		547.40	547.40
Caney Fork electric		2,769.63	2,769.63
Forked Deer electric		2,855.95	2,855.95
Chickasaw electric		1,088.23	1,088.23
Mountain electric		2,435.50	2,435.50
Grand total	25,850.60	92,616.91	118,467.51

These savings are permanent; you'll save these amounts annually—proportionately—on your unpaid balances of present and future loans. You in Tennessee alone saved more last year as a result of the National's efforts in this one instance than the National's total income last year. It is interesting that your savings exceed $1 a member per year, whereas your annual dues in the National are or would be only 10 cents a member per year. Ten hundred percent per year is not a bad investment, is it?

I am confident that any of our friends on Capitol Hill would tell you that the National has been effective several times in obtaining more adequate loan authorizations. All co-ops benefited, members and nonmembers alike.

On three different occasions the co-ops coordinated their efforts through organization to defeat well-organized campaigns to place restrictions on the REA program. Twice restrictive amendments got out of committees, and one passed the House. We won every final skirmish—and all co-ops benefited.

Last summer when President Truman included the REA loan program among public works in the general stop order, your National got busy fast. The order was rescinded in almost a matter of hours. All co-ops benefited, members and nonmembers.

NRECA has a voluntary group-insurance program for project employees, such as you have through your State association, and it is working on an employee-retirement plan, comparable with that of the industry generally. These by their very nature have to be for members only.

We feel that NRECA has done an effective job of staving off the power company-National Tax Equality Association drive to impose income taxes or income-tax equivalents on us. If so, all co-ops have benefited.

NRECA's regional and national meetings surely contribute something to better understanding, education, and organization. If so, all co-ops benefit.

NRECA publishes a national magazine, Rural Electrification. We feel it has great value in keeping our people informed. Member co-ops have always sent it to the directors and managers of nonmembers gratis. Surely all co-ops benefit from the magazine.

These things have been accomplished for all of you, members and nonmembers, by an organization whose members generally have had more difficult struggles, less advantages, and less ability to pay dues than the nonmembers in Tennessee.

All the reasons I have mentioned for belonging to the National Association are, in my opinion, as nothing by comparison with the need of your membership now for the battles immediately ahead.

NRECA's membership and its financial stability have climbed steadily this past year; 637 projects in 38 States and Alaska are members today, a 40 percent increase in '46, but only 8 of them are in Tennessee—and that doesn't look good when we must appear before Senator MCKELLAR'S Appropriations Committee. Members of NRECA member projects number over a million farm families, but only 40,773 are in Tennessee.

Our bank account is bigger than it has ever been before, but we should have, we think, substantial reserves for any emergency. A single telegram to the nearly one thousand projects can cost several thousand dollars. Several telegrams might be necessary in a single crisis—and we had several crises last year. We do no high-pressure lobbying. Our biggest expense is in keeping you advised so you can let your Senators and Congressmen know your needs and desires on matters before them.

We need more personnel in the office—there are only eight of us including the magazine and all other employees—but we have about all the budget can stand, based on present membership, if we are to continue the accumulation plan.

We are carefully audited semiannually; we work hard and we make every farmer's 10-cents-a-year go as far as it will.

We are the only national organization of any kind that is doing a continental thing about power on the side of the people.

You've read the statements of Congressman TABER, of New York, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, that in his opinion we have been getting several times too much in loans. The country as well as the Congress has moved far to the right—which historically tends to slow down all Government lending. We have compiled extensive documentary evidence that the power companies are taking advantage of the situation and are moving in for the kill.

The Power Trust's president, Grover Neff, of Edison Electric Institute, who told a congressional committee last year that we needed no more funds, now says not only that REA needs no more, but also that no more transmission lines are necessary anywhere except as the power companies build them—and we need lines from power dams in many States. The National Tax Equality Association freely predicts our demise with taxes it says will be levied against us. Others predict trouble for TVA. All signs point to the battle of the ages for us—and it is at hand.

Barely over a year ago two enemy generals opened the offensive against us. They were Grover Cleveland Neff and Frank Wilkes, president of the Southwestern Gas & Electric Co.

Their strategy then was to praise REA and make light of the farmers, and to insist that REA needed no more money. Today their strategy has changed; they are condemning REA viciously and praising the farmers—but insisting that nobody needs any more money, including REA.

For instance, at page 209 in the Poage bill hearings last year, Mr. Wilkes said, "Mr. Wickard is a dirt farmer himself, and we feel that he has the best interest of the American farmer close to his mind and heart." At page 262 Congressman HARRIS asked him, "Do you feel that REA needs an additional appropriation to do the job ahead?" Mr. Wilkes answered, "I don't think so; no, sir. * * * I think the money they have got, Mr. Chairman, is enough to do the job." He then went on to make light of the farmers' judgment in pleading for restrictive safeguards around their loans.

Wilkes, Neff & Co. killed the Poage bill dead as heck—but we got $350,000,000 in loans after that; so they are trying a new line now.

Wilkes addressed his own employees recently. He told them, according to the press—and it got wide publicity—(1) that, and note the change, "REA is the worst enemy the farmers have * * *;" (2) that the co-ops "are business-managed and free enterprise"; that they "are capable of running their own affairs and should be allowed to do so."

Do you see his strategy?—drive a wedge between the co-ops and REA, and unpopularize REA with Congress. Doesn't sound like him last year, does it?

Then Mr. Wilkes wrote the managers of the co-ops to which he furnishes power—in Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas—a two-page letter dated December 12, 1946, and attached the newspaper clipping about his speech.

In a single paragraph he made these two statements: "Yours is a business-managed operation just as we are," and "as long as you meet your fixed charges there should be no interference by Federal bureaus with your operation."

Let me read you another paragraph from his letter:

"It is going to be necessary very soon for you gentlemen to choose whether you are going to continue to be business-managed organizations, buying your power and energy from existing free enterprise, at rates which you can enforce in courts, or whether you want to become, like the cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley, completely dominated by the Public Power Trust through the bureaus in Washington."

His next paragraph is the one I like:

"We will be glad to meet with you and your boards, at your convenience to give you our understanding of this entire picture, which, we believe, you will find is considerably different than that given you by the propaganda of the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington and by Mr. Clyde Ellis, of NRECA."

A year ago Grover Neff, then president of Wisconsin Power & Light Co., speaking for EEI, told the same committee (1) he didn't want to criticize REA and (2) that some farmers are superstitious and afraid of electricity (page 181). Later he repeated his reference to farmers' superstitions (page 182), and I quote him, "But I have talked with farmers that are afraid of it; they are afraid they are going to burn themselves down—farmers that are rich and can afford it."

God pity the stupidity of some power company presidents.

At page 191, Neff told the committee: "It looks to me like the REA has the necessary funds now allotted to complete their part of this program."

Since the time he was so careful not to criticize REA last year, Neff, still proclaiming the job "is nearing an end," has become

very critical of both REA and Mr. Wickard. We can supply a number of his quotations to that effect. At the same time he is publicly advocating that the utility industry ignore REA and put on a "friendly" campaign with co-op directors. I suppose he thinks they are as ignorant now as he thought they were superstitious last year.

The outright purchases in recent months of two co-ops in Oregon and Idaho by power companies are merely instances of the divide and conquer strategy.

These examples are but a small part of the evidence we have gathered, but I am sure they are all you need or want to hear tonight.

In a few weeks we'll be asking for $250,000,000 in loans for the ensuing fiscal year; we'll be asking for adequate REA administrative funds; we'll be asking for dams, generators, and transmission lines in many sections; and we'll be seeking funds for adequate farm electrification research. We may even be defending the basic REA and TVA Acts. We'll be asking these things and defending the program for years to come. The over-all job is not even half done.

We need your help in this fight. You need us to help hold the fort against the divide and conquer onslaught. You are writing one of the most glorious chapters in American history, and we feel that by cooperating nationally you could make valuable leadership, monetary, and membership contributions.

May I ask you whose projects are not members a question? When you return home won't you act at once to have your cooperative become a member of the national association?

I should like to close with a quotation from Senator Norris' St. Louis speech. Said he:

"But, friends, don't forget, your enemies are the same fellows who are enemies of TVA. You ought to know that your enemies, if they could destroy you, would do it. They may destroy you indirectly. * * *

"You cannot separate these things (REA and TVA). They belong together. God put them together. And every stream that rolls down the mountainside through the meadows into the sea ought to be made to bring its blessings, its comforts, its joys, to the farm home as well as to the city home."

Johnny McCabe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hammond (Ind.) Daily Times of January 28, 1947:

JOHNNY M'CABE

Many Lake County visitors to Washington have returned praising Johnny McCabe, of Whiting, an employee of the House of Representatives who, while 4 feet 10 inches in height, has considerable stature when it comes to doing things for people and in a most gracious manner.

For years, when the Republicans were in power, McCabe was superintendent of pages on the majority side of the House and then held the same position with respect to the minority pages. He personally knows every one of the 535 Senators, Congressmen, and Territorial Delegates, who represent us in the Senate and lower House. In fact, being a walking encylopedia on congressional procedure Johnny is often consulted by statesmen of both Chambers.

When the Republicans returned to power, Johnny was a candidate for Doorkeeper of the House, an $8,000 post, but someone else got that position. So he was transferred to other duties. Now we understand that Republicans and Democrats in the House are agreeable to passing a special act whereby Johnny will be assigned a new post at an appropriate salary so the Congress may get the benefit of his 28 years of experience and service on Capitol Hill.

When next you go to Washington be sure to look up Johnny McCabe.

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1947, Attorney General Tom Clark announced that an 11-count indictment had been made against Carl Aldo Marzani, 35, of 508 North Fillmore Street, Arlington, Va. The basic counts of the indictment charged that he had concealed his allegiance to the Communist Party while employed in strategic positions in the Federal Government. He was dismissed from the State Department December 20, 1946. His Federal-employment history is as follows:

He received a temporary appointment in the Office of the Coordinator of Information on March 7, 1942, and remained with that agency when it became the Office of Strategic Services, where, as a master sergeant in the Army assigned to the OSS, he was responsible for producing motion-picture films which were sent to the higher echelon showing the strength and location of all American forces throughout the world. He was discharged from the Army September 20, 1945, and continued with the OSS in a civilian capacity as Deputy Chief of the Division of Presentation of the Office of Intelligence, Collection, and Dissemination. When the OSS was merged into the State Department he was transferred to that agency September 20, 1945. He was removed, as previously stated, January 20, 1946.

His original appointment to the Office of Coordinator of Information in March 1942, as economic editor in the Division of Research and Analysis, was conditioned upon a satisfactory character and fitness report. According to the announcement made by the Attorney General, he alleged that after an investigation by the FBI and the Civil Service Commission, and on the strength of his own statements, he was ruled eligible for employment July 29, 1943.

The files of the Committee on Un-American Activities have for the past 6 years carried the Communist record of this individual. He is listed on page 429 of the Communist compilation of Communist Party election petitions for the year 1939 of the State of New York, as a signer. Also there is a special folder in the files on Marzani which states:

CARLO ALDO MARZANI

Chief of Editorial Section, Presentation Division, Research and Analysis Branch of the Office of Strategic Services.

New York section organizer of the Communist Party under the name of Tony Whales (New York police files). Wife is Edith Charles, who, together with her husband, signed election petitions for Earl Browder. Both were fired from the WPA writers' project for Communist activity.

In February 1944 the Special Committee on Un-American Activities served a subpena upon Harry B. Mitchell, President of the United States Civil Service Commission, calling upon him to produce all the records from the files of the Civil Service Commission concerning an attached list of 128 Government employees whom the committee had reason to believe were Communists, or who were engaged in Communist activities. Mr. Mitchell refused to supply these files. Carl Marzani was one of the 128 names listed on the subpena.

Since the files and records of the Committee on Un-American Activities were available to the agents of the Civil Service Commission, the FBI, the State Department, and the OSS, the question arises as to how this individual could have obtained and retained his employment in a strategic position during wartime.

Why Federal Taxes Are High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United States News of January 24, 1947:

WHY FEDERAL TAXES ARE HIGH: POSTWAR COSTS OF GOVERNMENT

In the third year after the end of the fighting war, President Truman insists that the Federal Government must go on spending at the rate of at least $37,500,000,000 a year. That is more than four times the highest spending rate of prewar New Deal years and causes anguish among income taxpayers, who are asked to pay wartime tax rates for years after the war is over.

The President's budget is a challenge to a Congress that has promised tax relief. The implication is that everything is trimmed to the bone, but Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican, of Colorado, and Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota, must force their colleagues to take another look at the Budget Bureau's estimates. These men head the tax committees of Congress, whose problem is outlined on page 49. But, if they are to deliver the promised lower rates, others must first find out how to pare expenses. A way to save $1,500,000,000 out of the $37,500,000,000 budget would provide a base for a 10-percent tax cut on individual incomes. A 10-percent cut in the budget as a whole would allow more than a 20-percent cut in income taxes.

A look beneath the surface of the President's budget discloses a number of interesting plans and developments of the administration.

Little things show up first. Before the war, for example, it cost $160,000 to run the White House. Mr. Truman now asks $501,900 for operation and maintenance in the year that begins next July 1. The Executive Offices cost $196,000 to operate in prewar years. They are down for $1,417,000 in the next fiscal year. The Government Printing Office is to get $7,156,000, twice as much as in a prewar year. The Budget Bureau itself, which cost $396,000 before the war, will now cost $3,506,000.

Those are just little items in a big budget. A step up in the scale shows the same trend. Congress cost $22,000,000 before the war and is scheduled for $51,809,000 in the next fiscal year. The judiciary cost $9,500,000 before Pearl Harbor, but is to cost $19,000,000 next year. The Department of Commerce struggled along on $20,000,000 in prewar years. It wants $260,814,000 now.

Where the Department of Labor managed to operate for $24,000,000 in 1939, it finds that it cannot manage for less than $106,242,000 next year. Diplomats of the Foreign Service after seeing to this country's foreign relations at a cost of $14,000,000 a year before Pearl Harbor, want $117,000,000 to do the job.

Big money begins to be involved at the next level.

It is to cost $350,000,000 to make up an expected deficit in revenues of the Postal Service. Taxpayers contributed only $40,000,000 to users of the mails before the war. The Navy wants to spend $344,000,000 on new ships in the third year after end of the war, or about half as much as the whole Navy cost before the war. The Interior Department, after getting along on $150,000,000 in prewar years, now asks for $363,000,000. Its reclamation projects alone are down for $178,000,000, that cost $96,000,000 before.

Times are very good. Almost anyone who wants to work can have a job. National income is almost twice as high as it ever has been in a peacetime year.

Federal relief, nevertheless, is to cost $720,000,000. That's the Federal Government's contribution to States for aid to the aged, to dependent mothers and children, and to the blind. During the last period of comparable prosperity, relief costs were negligible, with individual families meeting most of the burden. It is to cost $182,000,000 next year to promote public health, where it cost $48,000,000 in 1940. Crime control is down for $85,000,000. It had cost $33,000,000 before.

Rivers, harbors and flood control are down for $689,000,000 next year. This item cost $210,000,000 in prewar budgets. Public roads are scheduled to get $435,000,000 in the year ahead. Road construction cost the Federal Government $169,000,000 back in 1940.

It's pretty much the same story all along the line.

Public housing cost $19,000,000 in 1940. Next year it is to cost $173,000,000, if Congress goes along with Mr. Truman. Mortgages of $443,000,000 are to be bought by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to underwrite veterans' homes.

Farmers, although never so prosperous, still are recognized as an expense to the Treasury. They stand to get $330,000,000 next year for price supports. They got approximately the same amount before the war, when prices were much lower. Mr. Truman also proposes to spend $66,000,000 as an export subsidy for farm products, and he wants $154,000,000 for the new Farm Home Administration to help tenant farmers become homeowners. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics plans to spend $4,850,000 to study farm problems, which cost $1,000,000 in prewar.

Really big money begins to show up in plans for veterans and in money earmarked for the Army and Navy.

Veterans' pensions are to cost $2,492,000,000. The prewar cost of pensions was $417,000,000. Then, businessmen are to get $1,000,000,000 as a subsidy for employing veterans in the on-job training program. Another $1,000,000,000 is allotted for educating veterans in schools and colleges. The sum of $980,000,000 is put down for benefits to jobless veterans, members of the "52-20 club." These are all new postwar costs. To administer the program the Veterans' Administration proposes to pay $870,000,000. That's nearly as much as the whole Army and Navy spent before the war. In 1940 salaries and administrative costs amount to $101,000,000.

The Army's program is reflected in an $804,000,000 item for supplies such as food, clothing, and medicines. That is more than the entire prewar Army budget. New weapons for a year of peace are to cost $338,000,000. The Signal Corps got along on $6,455,479 in prewar years and now is down for $100,000,000. The Panama Canal gets a budget allowance of $25,526,338. The Canal had $9,000,000 before the war. The Military Academy at West Point is estimated to need $6,378,000 in the budget year ahead. Before the war the Academy operated on $3,000,000.

The Navy shows the same trend as the Army. The naval air arm is down for $815,000,000. That's more than the Navy Department got altogether before the war. To train naval reservists in the year ahead, the Department wants $110,000,000. Before the war reserve training cost $8,500,000. The total Navy budget amounts to about half the total prewar expenses of the entire Government establishment.

War agencies are scheduled to keep operating in the third year of peace. Mr. Truman's budget provides for 1,271,976 civilian employees of war agencies. That includes civilians in the Army and Navy, as well as civilians in war agencies that cannot seem to be liquidated. Before the war only 229,917 persons had similar jobs.

Former enemies are turning out to be a peacetime drain on United States taxpayers. The War Department proposes to spend $645,000,000 for the relief of occupied countries. The State Department is down for another $387,000,000 to be spent for foreign relief. And $76,000,000 is budgeted to aid foreign refugees. The cost of defeating Germany and Japan did not end when the shooting stopped. Next year, destitute and defeated foreigners are scheduled to receive almost as much relief as the Federal Government extended to the jobless Americans during the depression years.

The Philippine Army, although now independent, also is a cost to the United States. This force is down for $100,000,000 in the United States defense budget.

Atomic research is to cost twice as much next year as this year. The budget calls for an outlay of $443,244,000 to be spent on the atom.

Research, in fact, is budgeted as a major operation in a number of fields. The Bureau of Standards is down for $11,500,000. Before the war this Bureau received around $2,000,000. The Navy earmarks $27,000,000 for research. Previous peacetime naval research amounted to $6,000,000. And the Department of Agriculture asks $3,375,000 for white pine blister-rust control. Before the war, this tree disease cost the Government $1,767,930.

Tax relief? These items are typical in a budget that the President describes as tight. They reveal that Big Government tends to stay big. They also demonstrate what Senator MILLIKIN is to be up against when he attempts to write a tax bill that will meet all these expenses, allow some margin for reducing the public debt, and, in the bargain, give a substantial measure of relief to income-tax payers.

English as the World Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the Members to the excellent article in the National Education Association magazine of January 1947 regarding English as a world language. The article is by Frank C. Laubach, special counselor and representative, Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, Foreign Missions Conference of North America. Mr. Laubach is an authority on the teaching of English and foreign languages through phonetic alphabets throughout the world.

His comments regarding the great work done by former Senator Robert L. Owen, who has pioneered much of the work of a global alphabet, is interesting. Senator Owen explains, however, a slight misconception regarding the supplanting of the Roman alphabet as asserted in the article. Senator Owen's letter follows the article.

GLOBAL ALPHABET IN SEVEN LANGUAGES

"English should be made a world language, and I invented the global alphabet for that purpose," says Robert L. Owen, president of the World Language Foundation, 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Bilingual books, using global, are now available in seven languages. "With these books, the Chinese or Russians, for example, can learn within 4 or 5 months to read, write, and speak English. Only 1,200 words are required and the form and pronunciation both of the Chinese and English appear side by side, enabling the student to read with his eye not only the form of English words but the sound of English words as well."

WANTED, A GLOBAL LANGUAGE—THIS IS A PLEA FOR A FIFTH FREEDOM—THE FREEDOM TO SPELL WORDS THE WAY THEY SOUND

(By Frank C. Laubach)

Mark Twain said he felt sorry for the man without enough imagination to spell a word two ways. We ought to feel sorry for an age so tied to the apron strings of the last century that we can't change wrong to right, just because our ancestors went wrong. On this spelling matter we are more mossback than the Hottentots; they have a perfect alphabet.

Now that we are resolved to be "one world" we need a language of interchange so we shall not be in everlasting need of interpreters, well named "interrupters." The San Francisco conference was handicapped because the delegates did not all know a common language.

Where shall we get this global language? Several artificial languages have been devised. Esperanto claims to be known by a million and a half highbrows—but did you ever meet anybody who could speak it?

The most perfect language now in use, in my opinion, would be Creole, as spoken and spelled in Haiti. The phonetics are perfect, and it has practically no grammar. How easy it is grammatically may be seen from

the following sentences literally translated into English:

The man did go.
A man go now.
A man wil go.
Several man go now.
Several man wil go.
Several man did go.
A man hav go already.

But to advocate Creole is purely wishful thinking, for only 3,000,000 people speak it. What languages are in the running?

At the top is English, spoken by over 200,000,000 as a first language and 200,000,000 as a second language.

Next is Chinese Mandarin, spoken by 100,000,000 as a first language and 100,000,000 as a second language; ninety-nine-hundredths of these live in China.

Arabic, 100,000,000 as a first language, 50,000,000 as a second.

Spanish, 100,000,000 as a first language, 25,000,000 as a second.

Russian official, 50,000,000 as a first language, 50,000,000 as a second language.

French, 50,000,000 as a first language, 50,000,000 as a second.

Hindi spoken by 50,000,000 in India as a first language, 50,000,000 as a second.

Of all the widely spoken languages, Russian has the most perfect spelling and by many people is considered the richest in expressing shades of thought. Its alphabet was made perfect by Lenin in 1920. With the zealous and efficient Communist organizations all over the world, Russian is bound to run a neck-and-neck race with English as the world language, even though English is now numerically in the lead.

Mandarin will be in the race when China begins to assume her destiny as the world's largest nation. But Mandarin has two handicaps: First, it uses characters which are rough pictures of ideas instead of sounds. These are difficult for foreigners to learn to write and nearly hopeless for printers. Second, it must be spoken in four tones, which foreigners find exceedingly difficult.

Spanish is beautiful and its spelling is nearly perfect, but its irregular verbs are harder to master than those of English. Nevertheless it is high up in the race.

So is Arabic. The Mohammedans are making more converts than are the Christians. And nearly every convert learns to read the Arabic alphabet. But Arabic is confined to the Moslem world.

It has several phonetic difficulties. The vowel sounds are usually omitted, so a reader must know whether "bt" is "bit," "bat," or "boot." The deep gutturals are next to impossible for most foreigners to pronounce perfectly.

This is how English would look if spelled like Arabic: "Mch hs bn wrttn abt rfrmed spling as a savr of spc. Possbly ths wld b a gd pln. Bt it wld b a bttr pln if it wer carrd frthr. If a systm of abbrvtns wr adptd, as mch as 40 pct of spc cld b savd. It wldn't b so hrd as u mght thnk. U cn read ths, cn't u?"

So in the front of the race for a global language are English and Russian. General de Gaulle would demur at leaving French out, but French is spelled almost as badly as English. If the French really want to be in the race any longer, they will have to reform their spelling. They could adopt the Haitian Creole spelling and all the world would bless them. But my guess is they would perish first.

English will also have to reform its spelling, unless we are content to end up a bad second. Of all the great languages, English ranks next to Chinese and Thai as the world's worst in orthography. We had better do for English what the Soviets did for Russian in 1918, agree to reform our spelling.

Half America and four-fifths of the youth of America will accept a reformed spelling with a whoop and a hurrah, if it isn't too drastic. If you don't believe that, ask people through the schools, newspapers, and churches. I have asked several hundred audiences how many favor reformed spelling and three-fourths of them raised their hands for it. Often it was unanimous.

But how shall we reform our spelling? There have been at least 200 suggestions. The most radical is that of Robert Owen, the blind ex-Senator who wrote most of the Federal Reserve bank law. He wants to assassinate the entire Roman alphabet. He is promoting his global alphabet that looks a little like Gregg shorthand, and he has many of America's great interested. If Senator Owen can wield enough influence to get his alphabet started, it has a chance of winning by sheer merit. It is the simplest, best alphabet I have ever seen. But it labors under the same handicap as the Esperanto language, that so far nobody has used it much.

The proposal with the greatest weight of scholarship back of it is the international alphabet. Now taught in many schools and colleges, this may ultimately be adopted. But it compels you to unlearn nearly every vowel sound in the English language. I learn it one day and forget it the next.

Another approach was begun in 1943 by a group of us working at Teachers College, Columbia University. We tried to find a spelling which would really be everyday English, yet absolutely regular in true democratic style.

1. We held an election of words, giving 7,000 words each a vote to discover how the syllables in English words are usually spelled. This syllable count gave us a basic spelling for each English sound. The vowels and diphthongs in this basic spelling are as in the following words:

big	beg	bag	hot	bug	hurt
aim	*bee*	*die*	*boat*	*few*	
boot	*cow*	*law*	*oil*	*twist*	(*tw*k=took)
				quit=kwit	
				cook=kwk	

With this spelling we are able to use the English alphabet without any diacritical marks. The printers do not need new type. This basic English spelling does for letters what basic English does for words—it provides the one commonest way to spell every word in the English language.

Basic spelling of consonants follows five simple rules:

(1) no letter "c."
(2) "ch" always soft like "chin."
(3) "g" always hard like "get."
(4) "dhis" for "*th*is" to distinguish it from "*th*ink."
(5) "pigs" iz pigz.

Whenever it is necessary to respell an English word we do it this basic way.

2. But most English words do not need to be respelled because they can be pronounced just as they are by any student who learns that there are two or three regular ways of spelling these sounds. The table shows the alternative regular ways.

Basic spelling	cot	gait	bee	hurt	boat	few
Alternative	*ah*	gate	here	her	fore	cure
	car	gay	heat	bird	for	*argue*
Basic spelling	*cow*	*law*	die	big	oil	
Alternative	loud	*auto*	bite	*very*	boy	
Basic spelling	*dull*	*kick*	kw	shun	with double rr	
					arrive	
Alternative	ank*le*	cat	*queer*	*action*	*error*	
				session	*irrigate*	

Those are all the ways of spelling that are important enough and simple enough to retain. They cover 80 percent of our words. We scrap all the rest and spell the other 20 percent of our words the basic way. "Conscious" is spelled "conshus." "Eight" turns to "ait." "Light" turns to "lite." "Though a tough cough plough me through" turns to "thoa u tuf kawf plow mee throo," which iz eezee enuf for enibodi.

We are now using basic spelling in streamlined lessons to teach foreigners how to read English, and its success exceeds our wildest hopes. In a week or two a foreigner who reads his own language can read every English word spelled the basic way, even tho he never saw the word before.

After that a second book teaches him the meaning of 850 words in basic English and the 1,000 words in the Thorndike-Lorge list. They overlap, making 1,371 words in all. Every badly spelled word is respelled the basic way once, for example:

Whot
What is this?
taibul
This is the table.
What is this?
ewr
This is your hand.
What is that?
mie hed
This is my head.

When the student finishes the second book he will then know the meaning and pronunciation of 90 percent of the words he encounters on the average page. He can look up the other 10 percent in a dictionary, and so is henceforth independent.

This method shortens the teaching of English by years, but it isn't heaven, for it leaves 20 percent of the English words as badly spelled as ever. This 20 percent will be the foreigner's nightmare the rest of his life, unless he can respell them.

Our only hope is that we can silence the selfish old fogies who would rather send the world to perdition than bother to learn a new way themselves. We don't ask them to change. We only ask them to show tolerance toward the rest of us who want to spell according to the dictates of our consciences. If educated English-speaking people will agree that there are two ways to spell, the old way and the right way, then most of the difficulty the foreign world dreads will be hurdled.

Perhaps the foreign world will gradually force us all to stop spelling badly. Once this regular way of spelling has become respectable, educated people of every other tongue will write the regular way to America and England, and the progressive English-speaking businessmen will learn to write back to the outside world in the same way. The volume of this phonetic correspondence is going to be enormous. Writers will begin to use the "fonetik" spelling—some of them perhaps apologetically at first with quotation marks. But the quotation marks will disappear soon.

The movement will gather momentum, first, because there will be immense public opinion for it; second, because we are in this race with the Russian language; and, third, because it always was the rite way to spell. In these days when we streamline everything else, science will gradually conquer chaos even in spelling.

Spain, Russia, Haiti, and China have reformed their spelling. So will we, for it is being forced on us. Which reform? This moderate one of 20 percent or the international alphabet? We may even be forced to accept Owen's perfect global alphabet. That would be the real metric system of orthography—the speller's heaven.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1947.*

Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MONRONEY: Enclosed find the Laubach article referred to in the January issue of the National Education Association Journal, in which Dr. Laubach so warmly commends the global alphabet as perfect.

I do not propose to change the spelling of English words as currently printed, much less to assassinate the Roman alphabet, which has been enormously useful in the world's history and especially in Laubach's work, where he has used the Roman letters to teach 65 different nationalities how to write and read their own language within a day or two.

I use the global alphabet as a means of teaching English-speaking people and people of other languages to quickly learn to read American-English newspapers, magazines, and books. This can be done with the global alphabet within a comparatively few weeks, as Prof. Mario A. Pei has so well said.

The approval of Dr. Laubach is deeply appreciated by me, as I regard him as the grand marshal of the forces now waging war on illiteracy and ignorance.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

If We Really Want To Cut Taxes, Here's the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Dodge (Iowa) Messenger:

IF WE REALLY WANT TO CUT TAXES, HERE'S THE WAY

In a discussion on how to reduce the Federal Budget, Henry Hazlitt, writing in the current issue of Newsweek, proposes an old-fashioned method, so old and forgotten, in fact, that it seems startlingly new.

In brief, Mr. Hazlitt urges a careful scrutiny of every item in the Budget and the cutting out of any expenditures not necessary. It's as simple as that.

We suspect that many grandfathers of present-day citizens employed just such a procedure in handling their personal finances or businesses. That was in a day when thrift was regarded as a virtue. Nowadays, as Mr. Hazlitt suggests, fancy rhetoric is used as a substitute for the good common sense of our forefathers.

Of course, there's nothing fancy or even modern about carefully scrutinizing every item of expense with an idea to reduction. But it's practical and it's workable, and if done honestly would result in immense savings to the taxpayers.

We read, for instance, in Mr. Hazlitt's article that the budget proposed for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next, contemplates the expenditure of more than was spent in four whole years just before the war or in 12 whole years around the twenties. Note particularly that this is a comparison with recent years. It is not going back to George Washington's time or even the gay nineties. And granted that in the last few years there has been a big expansion in Government needs, both domestic and foreign, nevertheless there is nothing to warrant an increase in spending of such fantastic proportions. We clearly are way out of line. If we want to get back to where we should be, the first essential thing is a firm determination. The way is open if we choose to use it.

Mr. Hazlitt makes the further sensible suggestion that the budget examination be conducted by expert investigators. And also—and this is most important—he would place the burden of proof on those who wish to make the expenditures. That's turning the tables in the right way. Those who seek to save the taxpayers' money should not be required to justify their reductions. Quite the contrary, the spenders should be forced to carry the burden of proof, should be made to justify every dollar they propose to spend, and do so in the face of cross-examination by trained and capable experts.

Because of the present inflated state of Federal spending, such a plan as above proposed, if properly carried out, could not result in anything less than savings of vast proportions to the taxpayers. The plan, in fact, is so feasible that it could well be adapted to other taxing bodies, such as the State, county, city, schools, etc. And, with possible modifications, it would work splendidly with private business and individual budgets.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit an editorial taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in which it outlines what I consider to be a very sound approach to this subject of tax reduction. From my practical experience as a certified public accountant, I concur with the writer of this editorial and all of his deductions.

The editorial follows:

A TAX-REDUCTION FORMULA

Congress seems determined to reduce income taxes in spite of the great need and golden chance to reduce the national debt instead. Hence it is time to find a better formula than the two undesirable ones that are now contesting for favor.

1. Representative KNUTSON contends that his uniform 20-percent reduction would probably produce more revenue than the existing rates because the lower tax would act as a production and investment incentive. However, business is already running near the peak, so the bill would inevitably curtail revenues sharply.

His formula would leave the family with $5,000 gross income paying 9.81 times its 1939 tax and the $100,000 family paying only 1.56 times its 1939 tax. Thus, it would shift burdens from larger to smaller taxpayers.

2. There are also flaws in the counterproposal to help the little fellow by increasing personal exemptions sharply—such as Representative ENGEL's plan to double them. Doing so would take great numbers of taxpayers off the rolls. It is much better to leave them on and let them feel the direct stake they have in their Government and its policies.

Exemptions could be increased very little without cutting even deeper than the Knutson formula into Government revenue. Incomes are concentrated toward the lower end of the scale. No matter how hard the rich are soaked, the greater part of the total levy must come from the lower parts of the income pyramid.

3. If Congress insists on reducing taxes, it can be done simply, fairly, and without eliminating taxpayers. It can be done by reducing the rate a uniform number of percentage points in each bracket. If the rate were lowered four points, for example, the first $2,000 of taxable income would pay 16 percent instead of the present 20, and the over $200,000 bracket 87 instead of 91.

Tax reductions for 1947, first under the Knutson flat 20-percent bill and second under the four-points-per-bracket formula, would be as follows:

Taxable income	Flat 20 percent	Four points
$2,000	$76.00	$76 or 20.0 percent.
$4,000	159.60	$152 or 19.0 percent.
$8,000	372.40	$304 or 16.3 percent.
$20,000	1,379.40	$760 or 11.0 percent.
$50,000	5,095.80	$1,900 or 7.5 percent.
$200,000	29,795.80	$7,600 or 5.1 percent.

Under the Knutson bill the $200,000 man would get 392 times as much reduction in dollars as the $2,000 man—which is unfair to the smaller taxpayer. But under the Engel formula or any other uniform rule to increase personal exemptions, the $200,000 man would receive only four and one-half times as much reduction as the $2,000 man—which is unfair to the larger taxpayer.

In contrast with both inequitable schemes, reducing the bracket rates by any uniform number of points would give the $200,000 man precisely 100 times as much reduction as the $2,000 man. That is in exact proportion to their incomes. It is fair to both. It is the surest way to reduce without shifting taxes either from larger to smaller taxpayers or from smaller to larger—that is, without wrecking the carefully balanced existing distribution of the burden.

The Knutson bill swings far to the right, favoring large incomes and breaching the ability-to-pay principle. The Engel plan swings far to the left, unduly favoring small taxpayers and penalizing large ones. Congress, we trust, will shun both extremes and follow the straight, fair, and safe road which lies between them.

Reenlistment of Partially Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1946, I introduced H. R. 6090, a bill to permit partially disabled veterans to reenlist in the armed forces for limited duty. On the one hand it is evident that a large number of war veterans, who suffered permanent physical disabilities could and would find a happy and honorable career by remaining in the service of their country. On the other hand, it is equally evident that they could not only be useful in the armed service, but there is a positive need for them.

It is well known to everyone that a comparatively small percentage of soldiers and sailors are used for combat troops, even in wartime. For every man who is potentially a front-line soldier, there are a number in supporting positions, many of which can adequately be

filled by those suffering some physical handicap. Mechanics, clerks, laboratory technicians, stenographers, tailors, telephone operators, and many other such classifications are required by military organizations, and there is nothing but tradition which keeps such jobs occupied by men in the pink of physical condition. The physically handicapped can perform these services adequately, and release for more strenuous duty those who are more fortunate.

This bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and a number of the members of that committee were persuaded of the merits of the bill, but the committee itself did not find the opportunity to report the bill before the adjournment in August.

In the meantime, the War Department, on October 16, 1946, virtually adopted my proposal and announced that it would recruit up to 5,000 disabled veterans for such positions.

Naturally, I welcome the adoption of the principle of my bill by the War Department, but I am so convinced of its propriety and need that I would like to see this made a permanent, legally established policy. And, further, I would like to see the same policy established in the Navy and Coast Guard.

Accordingly, I have reintroduced the bill, which is now H. R. 73, and which has been referred to the Committee on Armed Services. I urge the committee to favorably report this bill, and the Congress to adopt it, because it seems to me that it would be quite useful and important, both to a large group of veterans who deserve our consideration and also to the armed forces themselves.

I am appending below the text of the bill, as well as a part of the text of the War Department release dated October 16, 1946:

A bill to permit partially disabled World War II veterans to reenlist in the armed forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, for limited duty.

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who (a) served in the active military or naval service of the United States, including the Coast Guard, a part of such service having been after December 6, 1941, and before September 3, 1945, and was discharged from such service under conditions other than dishonorable, and (b) incurred a partial physical disability in line of duty in such service, or as a result of such service, shall be eligible for reenlistment in the armed forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, for such limited duty as he is physically capable of performing, if he is otherwise qualified to perform such duty. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively, shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

ARMY WILL RECRUIT 5,000 PARTIALLY DISABLED VETERANS

In another move to bring skilled personnel into the United States Army and also to offer the Army as a career to many men heretofore barred from such an opportunity because of disability caused by honorable service, the War Department announced today that certain categories of disabled veterans would be accepted for enlistment in the Regular Army.

Recognizing that many men disabled in service are desirous of an Army career and that many of these men have proven themselves able and skilled by winning over their handicaps, the War Department has directed that an initial 5,000 partially disabled veterans will be accepted for service in the Regular Army.

This action comes as an official recognition of the fine character and strength exhibited by the majority of our disabled men, and provides the Army the opportunity of action in helping to place our disabled men in normal and happy positions. However, the Army does not consider the move as helping the handicapped, but, rather, desires to utilize the services of the handicapped in preserving its fighting strength. Careful study of the accomplishments and the development of special skills by partially disabled men has proven to the Army that these disabled men have shown themselves of equal value in many occupations to many other men unhindered by any handicap. The War Department feels that those individuals with nonorganic disabilities can be utilized in technical type positions in such a manner as to be a great asset to the Army.

In planning the action the War Department assembled a partial list of the "overhead type" positions that can be filled by these individuals. The positions are as follows: Diesel and automobile mechanic, clerk, postal clerk, dental laboratory technician, draftsmen, electricians, machinist, moving-picture projectionist, sign painter, shoe repairmen, stenographer, tailor, teletype operator, toolroom keeper, X-ray technician, key punch operator, classification specialist, office machine servicemen, telephone operator, tabulating machine operator, clerk-typist, medical technician, tabulating machine repairman, shop clerk, etc.

Thanks to the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent editorial appearing in the Boston Traveler entitled "Thanks to the Army," as follows:

THANKS TO THE ARMY

The Boston airport is potentially a safer place today than it ever has been in the past. Thanks are due to the Army which made possible the loan of a radar ground control approach system. Thanks is due to Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN who acted as intermediary between the airport and the Army. There is no evidence that thanks is due anyone else.

It is time that this problem of making airplane landings safer be tackled directly. Ground control approach is no untested novelty. It proved its worth throughout the war. No one seems inclined to deny its practicality. The real argument—to dignify what is not properly an argument at all—is its cost.

The cost of installation is great. So is the cost of installing protective devices on the railroads of America, but they are installed. The obvious answer to the argument of cost is to ignore it.

Safety is an essential factor for any stable transportation system and the cost of providing safety is a normal operating cost. It is merely added to the price of tickets on most transportation enterprises.

Of course that will make flying more expensive, with adverse economic effects to the industry if the industry bears it, to the taxpayer's pocket if he bears it. Is that an argument for leaving out a tested and practical means of safety?

There are two questions to be answered. How can we get the best in radar protection in the quickest way? Who should pay for its installation and maintenance?

What? The FEPC Again!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most honest, patriotic Americans, whether Democrats or Republicans, are looking to the Eightieth Congress with high hopes of a constructive and sound program of accomplishment, free of sectional bickering and political maneuvering. Certainly they have a right to expect that. So far the session has been a harmonious one. All good Democrats in the Congress have demonstrated a willingness to go along with their Republican colleagues to that end.

In the Seventy-eighth and particularly in the Seventy-ninth Congresses southern Democrats on many occasions alined themselves with their Republican colleagues to prevent some of the left-wing legislation sponsored by certain high-ranking Democrats from being enacted into law. Some of this, such as the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act, sponsored by so-called progressive Democrats, was in reality part of a program which had its origin under the leadership of the Soviet-dominated Communist Party.

This proposed iniquitous legislation, although regarded by some as aimed at the South, is in fact nothing but an objective of the Communist Party. And as such it was in reality aimed at our republican form of government. For surely no national legislation ever proposed could be as far-reaching in its regimentation of the people. For it must be admitted by all that it is as assuredly regimentation for a northern manufacturer to be told that he must employ people upon a basis of race rather than merit or ability as it is to make it mandatory for a southern employer to do the same. Such vicious legislation would prove to be the last word in regimentation.

This most un-American proposal has now been made again by an outstanding member of the Republican Party in the form of a bill recently introduced. And in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind our Republican friends that they did not come into power because of their advocacy of such left-wing proposals, but rather on the contrary. We will now find out whether in stopping cockeyed and screwy legislation by coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats in the last Congress the Republicans were playing politics, or whether they were really interested in the welfare of the country and the maintenance of the American way.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I submit herewith, in part, a most timely article by that able writer, Mr. George Rothwell Brown, which appeared in the January 13 issue of the Baltimore News-Post and other publications:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

WASHINGTON, January 13.—How long solidarity or Republican opinion in Congress can be maintained, to the advantage of the country as a whole, is a question that has risen already on Capitol Hill.

* * * * *

A very great factor in the Republican landslide, which gave that party control of both Senate and House of Representatives, was the increasing awareness by the people, and a growing fear on their part, of the plots and conspiracies against this Republic by the Soviet-dominated Communist Party.

WRATH OF PEOPLE

The people rose in their wrath, and since then all but the extreme Roosevelt left wing has been disclaiming all connection with or sympathy for communism.

The American people now know that the major design of the Communists in the United States is to destroy the American form of government.

They know that the method pursued by the Red Fascists is the sowing of dissension among the people, the creation of alleged racial and class distinctions, and the constant irritation of sore spots that might be expected to heal of themselves if left alone.

One of the must demands of the Communists was the enactment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee, to replace the temporary committee set up as a war measure.

TRUMAN BLESSING

When Truman inherited the left-over left-wing legislative nostrums which he found on Roosevelt's desk, he bundled them up in a single package and sent them to Congress with his blessing.

The rupture that had occurred between Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress was intensified, the New Deal coalition fell apart, the Communists were repudiated and today even their former New Deal buddies are running from them as from the bubonic plague.

In his annual message Mr. Truman made no mention of the FEPC bill. But in his economic report, sent to Congress last week, he returned to the subject evasively and indirectly.

Those old-fashioned, conservative Americans, who thought that in November the people had given to a Republican Congress a mandate to go right and stay right, will be shocked, no doubt, to learn that a Republican Congressman, Mr. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has introduced a bill to carry out one of the major Communist demands, providing for the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

VOTE PREVENTED

Republican and Democratic conservatives, in their celebrated coalition in the last Congress, prevented such a measure from coming to a vote in the House.

The voters at the polls in November overwhelmingly sustained their position.

Almost to a man the left-wing Democrats, who had fought for the FEPC bill, which epitomized the whole Communist drive against American solidarity, were defeated and driven from Congress.

The Republican Party in Congress can cause a lot of trouble for itself, as well as for the country, by espousing this piece of red nazism.

It can break up the working understanding in Congress between conservatives of both parties at a time when the United States stands virtually alone in the world as the guardian of free and unlimited enterprise and the exponent of the independence of the individual citizen.

But the Republican Party probably cannot win another election by going left and embracing the repudiated doctrines of discredited communism.

Strike at West Allis Works of Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no subject more widely discussed in the United States today than the question of labor-management relations. Every newspaper and every radio commentator has discussed it, often with more heat than light. And much legislation has been drafted, most of which, incidentally, proposes drastic and unjustified restrictions on the legitimate rights of unions.

In the light of this situation, I should like to call your attention to the fact that perhaps the most important single strike now in effect in this country is the direct responsibility, not of the union involved, but of the company. I refer to the strike now in progress at the West Allis Works of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. in West Allis, Wis.

The Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Mr. Speaker, has a long and sordid record of antilabor activities. For years it has been a leading member of the National Metal Trades Association. The pages of the La Follette committee reports are filled with instances of the use by Allis-Chalmers of the strike-breaking, espionage, and antilabor services of the National Metal Trades Association.

A former president of this company, Mr. Speaker, was a leading contributor to and official of the isolationist, nationalist America First Committee. It is not without significance, I think, that the arrogance, stubbornness, and refusal to bargain in good faith of this company resulted in 1941 in a long strike which materially impeded this country's armament program. It was then, you remember, that the America First Committee was at the height of its campaign to sabotage this country's defense plans. Nor is it without significance that the terms proposed by the National Defense Mediation Board, which were finally accepted by the company as the basis for settlement, were substantially the same as those offered weeks earlier by the union.

The current strike at Allis-Chalmers contains all of the factors inherent in a situation in which an antilabor management, determined above all else to smash the union of its employees, has forced its workers to go on strike, has whipped up an unprecedented campaign of antiunion hysteria, and has consistently refused to negotiate in good faith for the equitable settlement of the strike.

More than 8 months ago, the workers at the Allis-Chalmers plant, in West Allis, Wis., voted 8,091 to 251 to go out on strike to win the same contract and wage adjustments which had been granted months earlier by the vast majority of companies in this country. Their demands were for an 18½-cent wage increase, a workable grievance procedure, and union-security provisions.

But let me say that long before it voted to strike Local 248, United Automobile Workers, CIO, which has been certified by the National Labor Relations Board as bargaining agent for the Allis-Chalmers workers, attempted for months to get some kind of settlement which would have made a strike unnecessary. To all the union's proposals, the company's answer was "No." Not only did the company refuse even to consider the union's proposals, Mr. Speaker, but it refused even to agree to certain adjustments which had been ordered by the National War Labor Board.

The National War Labor Board had, on the basis of Local 248's perfect record of no work stoppages during the war, recommended that the company agree to a standard maintenance-of-membership clause. This the company refused to do.

The National War Labor Board, after extensive surveys, had established the fact that wages at Allis-Chalmers are considerably below those paid elsewhere in the Milwaukee area, and had recommended a 19½-cent wage increase for certain classifications of workers. This recommendation was made, Mr. Speaker, in December 1945, over a year ago, but the company has stubbornly and defiantly refused to put it into effect.

Still, in an effort to settle the dispute without the necessity of striking, Local 248 proposed in negotiations that the issues of wages, union security, and grievance procedure be submitted to arbitration for a final and binding decision.

But this proposal, too, was rejected by the company. How can we speak seriously of preventing strikes by imposing restrictions on unions, Mr. Speaker, when the most devastating strike in the United States has resulted from a company's refusal to accept the union's offer of arbitration? This offer, I might add, has been renewed repeatedly by the union, and it has been supplemented by the union's proposal to refer the dispute to a Presidential fact-finding board. But every single union proposal has been rejected by the Allis-Chalmers Co., and this despite the fact that the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors overwhelmingly voted in favor of the union's suggestion for arbitration.

It is perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, and the conclusion is inescapable, that the Allis-Chalmers Co. deliberately created this strike and has deliberately refused to settle it.

Allis-Chalmers has refused to accept the union's offers.

Allis-Chalmers has refused to accept Presidential fact-finding.

Allis-Chalmers has refused to accept arbitration.

Fattened with high wartime profits and subsidized by Federal carry-back tax

rebates, Allis-Chalmers has embarked upon a program of unconcealed union-busting. It has hired strikebreakers, it has had the police plant labor spies in union meetings, and it has had many of its striking employees beaten by police within its own plants.

Its most recent maneuver has been the organization of an ill-disguised company union; and the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board has granted that union's petition for an election to determine the bargaining representatives for the Allis-Chalmers workers. I must remind you that the legally constituted representative for the Allis-Chalmers workers is Local 248, UAW-CIO, which has been certified by the National Labor Relations Board. The decision to order a new election—a decision which is in violation of Federal law—was made not by any impartial Federal agency, but by the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board.

If this precedent in Wisconsin is not stopped it will be carried into all other States and seriously disrupt industrial relations.

In an effort to stop this obviously illegal act, Local 248 applied to the Federal courts for a temporary injunction restraining the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board from holding the election. The hearing on the union's petition was held before Judge F. Ryan Duffy of the Federal district court in Milwaukee on January 9, 1947. On that same day Judge Duffy handed down his decision denying the union's request for an injunction. It was handed down Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that briefs filed by the National Labor Relations Board and the Department of Justice in a similar case pending in the United States Supreme Court, dealing with the question of the constitutionality and scope of authority of State labor relations boards, and supporting the position taken by Local 248, were still in the mail and had not yet arrived in Milwaukee. Judge Duffy's decision was made with a haste which was injudicious. Judge Duffy who handed down the decision against the Allis-Chalmers workers' union is a close relative—a brother-in-law—of Mr. Harold W. Story, vice president and general attorney of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. and chief architect of its antilabor policy. Under the circumstances, the impartiality of Judge Duffy's decision could be subject to grave doubt. But Judge Duffy apparently did not for a moment entertain the thought of disqualifying himself.

The conclusion seems clear, Mr. Speaker, not only that responsibility for the Allis-Chalmers strike rests solely with the company, but that the company has apparently benefited by an unusual judicial decision, which upsets the original election held by the NLRB and thereby abrogates the legal rights of the bargaining employees.

Could the brother-in-law relation between the vice president of Allis-Chalmers, Mr. H. W. Storey, and the judge of the Federal court, Judge Duffy, have been an influence in the judge's decision?

I submit that no legislative program concerned with labor-management relations can be just or equitable which concerns itself only with punitive measures against labor and which ignores the existence of a conspiracy hatched by the powerful and influential captains of American industry to destroy the bargaining power of their employees by smashing unions.

Reorganization of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland Oregonian of January 18, 1947:

NOT MERGER

Whatever one may term the President's plan to reorganize the armed services—integration or unification, perhaps—it certainly is not merger. The Secretaries of the Army and Navy are not giving up much autonomy and power, except in that the Army loses its Air Forces (but logically will expect to retain influence since Army officers will become Air Force officers).

This page favors unification of the armed services to the point of merger, as necessary to guarantee cohesive action—which we did not have at the beginning of the war—and a maximum of defense in an era when attack will come by atomic or other scientific weapons with such paralyzing swiftness that offense must be geared to the same pace. We are not sure that President Truman's Missouri compromise will accomplish this unity.

The plan given to Congress, with approval of Secretary Forrestal of the Navy and Secretary Patterson of the Army, would increase the President's secretaries from 10 to 12, of whom 4 would represent the military (an influential minority). Secretaries for War, Navy, and Air Forces might or might not have Cabinet status but would have access to the President's ear. There may be pressure to have Congress assign them to the Cabinet, along with the Secretary of National Defense.

It is probable that most Americans, after the example of disunity at Pearl Harbor, have thought of merger of the armed forces under terms of a single civilian secretary (not four), possibly with a single chief of staff and certainly with single authority over the military heads of Army, Navy, and Air Forces. This has not been accomplished in this program, nor is it likely that it could be accomplished with approval of the Army and Navy brass and Cabinet heads. The proposal, instead, is for a Secretary of National Defense who shall lay down policies and programs for the three branches which, however, will operate as separate and independent units.

Nothing in this plan assures that there will not be a continuation of the rivalries, jealousies, and political maneuverings of the separate forces, each having a military chief and a civilian secretary who can go around the Secretary of National Defense to the President and to Congress. It may lead to economy in buying and lessen duplication, but these gains will be wiped out if there is continual struggle for prestige and power. It seems likely that the Secretary of National Defense may be so harassed that he will degenerate into a purchasing agent and expediter of home-front production for the military.

The plan does not even unify the Air Forces as an equal and separate arm, since the Navy would retain its naval and marine land-based planes, even for transport, and will guard jealously against any invasion of its sphere by the new, growing, and ambitious Air Forces. Congress may consider the plan as a first step toward the goal of merger, long fought by Army and Navy brass, and as the accomplishment of a separate air arm which is the first front in national defense, yet it must view with misgivings the separate status of command in each department.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bills introduced by me at the request of the American Legion:

A bill to define loss of use of an eye for the purposes of granting the statutory award of $35 per month under the provisions of subparagraph (k), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), promulgated under Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a sentence at the end thereof to read as follows: "For the purposes of this subparagraph the use of an eye shall be considered lost when visual acuity is 5/200 or less."

A bill to provide compensation or pension for the widows and children of deceased veterans of World War I or World War II who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment

Be it enacted, etc., That the widow, child, or children of any deceased veteran of World War I or World War II who at the time of his death was entitled to or in receipt of monetary benefits for disability resulting from an injury or an aggravation of any existing injury under the provisions of section 213 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 1308; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 501), section 31 of Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress (48 Stat. 526; U. S. C., title 38, sec 501a), or section 12 of Public Law No. 866, Seventy-sixth Congress (54 Stat. 1197; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 501a–1), shall be entitled to the benefits of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1281, 1282; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 503 to 507, inclusive), as amended, provided that the other requirements thereof are met.

A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That part of the second proviso of section 28, Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 524; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 722), which limits payment of compensation thereunder

to 75 percent of the payments otherwise authorized, is hereby repealed, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to pay 100 percent of the compensation otherwise authorized under Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress.

A bill to amend subparagraphs (a) and (d) of paragraph 1 of part III of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That the words "90 days" where used in subparagraphs (a) and (d) of paragraph 1 of part III of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, shall read "70 days" wherever they appear.

Allocation of Type C–4 Ship to Great Lakes Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a resolution I have received from the city clerk of the city of Chicago that was adopted by the city council, requesting the allocation of type C–4 ship to Great Lakes area:

"Whereas for many years there has been a lack of adequate local steamboat passenger service in Chicago, and especially in recent years due to the fact that the recreational opportunities for the public have been seriously curtailed as result of the war effort; and

"Whereas for this and many other reasons, the citizens of Chicago have been denied the privilege and advantages offered in low-cost water transportation and have not had an opportunity to take advantage of the natural benefits of being the largest port city on the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas the civic and business leaders of the city of Chicago, a maritime city, have noted with a great deal of apprehension, the decline of the passenger steamboat traffic in and out of the port of Chicago, and have come to the conclusion that drastic steps must be undertaken in order to reestablish the interest and the imagination of its people and the reestablishment of an awareness to the desirability of steamship traffic on the Great Lakes, and particularly on Lake Michigan; and

"Whereas as the result of the depression, the unusual economic conditions resulted in the bankruptcy of steamship lines which have for many years served the public; and

"Whereas under the shipbuilding program of the United States Maritime Commission there were constructed some 5,000 ocean-going ships which, since the cessation of hostilities are necessary to be transferred from Government ownership to operation by private interests; and

"Whereas it would be a distinct advantage to the Great Lakes area if some means could be found whereby one of these ships could be diverted for use on the Great Lakes in an effort to reestablish local steamship passenger service and automobile ferry service on a modern and enlarged scale; and

"Whereas it has come to our attention that the Wisconsin and Michigan Steamship Co. has made application to the United States Maritime Commission for the purchase of one of the type C–4 ships to be known as the steamship *Chicago Clipper*, for use on the Great Lakes with the specific intent to use the port of Chicago as an operating base: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this city council that the acquisition of such a ship for the Great Lakes trade and especially for the building up of the potential steamship passenger and tourist traffic to and from the port of Chicago, is a most desirable adjunct to the commercial facilities and that great public benefit will accrue from such venture; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this city council hereby places itself on record as urging the allocation of at least one of the type C–4 ships to the Great Lakes area, as above stated and that all other Federal agencies having jurisdiction on the Illinois waterway, be enlisted to authorize the passage of said ship from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Maritime Commission, United States Senators from Illinois, and United States Representatives from districts within the city of Chicago."

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago, at a regular meeting held Friday, the 10th day of January A. D. 1947.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 22d day of January A. D. 1947.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

The Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend subsection (e) of section 1 of the Civil Service Act of May 29, 1930, as amended by the enactment of my bill H. R. 4718, which is now Public Law 688, Seventy-ninth Congress.

When H. R. 4718 was enacted into law it contained a provision limiting the benefits of the bill to Federal employees who were involuntarily separated from the service after 25 years of service, but limited to those who had reached their fifty-fifth year. The bill also was applicable only to those employees who were involuntarily separated between the dates of July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947.

My new bill strikes out the 25-year clause and also the restrictive date of June 30, 1947, and provides that any officer or employee involuntarily separated from the service, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency after July 1, 1945, and who has served the Federal Government for 25 years, would be eligible for the retirement benefits outlined in the present subsection (e) of section I of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

If one may judge from the present drive to reduce the number of Federal employees now on the pay roll, it can be readily seen that many of the regular civil-service employees are to be involuntarily separated from the service before and after the termination date of the present act; namely, June 30, 1947, and I believe it would be unfair if we should fail to provide for them in view of the fact that their separation from the Government will be involuntary.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will see the justice of this matter and will give prompt and favorable consideration to my bill.

Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate of January 4, 1947:

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The Territory of Hawaii has for some time been desirous of entering the Union. Prior to the war, congressional debate consistently raised the barriers of a large and unreliable Japanese population, the tremendous distance between the islands and the mainland, the inability of them to become self-supporting, and the enormous Federal expense necessary to maintain them as a bastion of national defense, let alone give them any of the economic advantages of Washington's largess.

Most of these arguments have long since become outmoded. The 155,000 people of Japanese descent unquestionably proved their loyalty to the United States during the war; the relative distance of the islands from the west coast has been greatly diminished by increased air transportation and faster ship service; Hawaii has proved that she need not be financially dependent on the United States; and any Federal expenditures involved in maintaining Hawaii as a State would be no more than in keeping her as a Territory.

Unlike her fellow Union aspirant, Alaska, Hawaii has the necessary population to warrant representation in Congress, and a more permanent and at present stable financial background for the satisfactory upkeep of her own government and people.

In any future congressional discussion on the advisability of admitting Hawaii as the forty-ninth State, perhaps the more-than-map knowledge of the Territory acquired by several Congressmen on their tour of the area during their Pearl Harbor inquiry should be of great value to their colleagues in making a decision.

There are those who feel that Hawaii should be granted statehood as a just repayment for her gallantry during the war. And there are others who, for sentimental reasons, would like to see the beach of Waikiki and sunsets over Diamond Head incorporated into the Union.

But what seems the best reason of all is that the Territory of Hawaii, its people, its produce, and its capabilities warrant inclusion in the Union as the forty-ninth State. There is everything to show that it would make a healthy and welcome addition to the other 48 States.

Spending Psychology Still Clings in Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence which gives a very clear analysis relating to the expenditures by the administration:

SPENDING PSYCHOLOGY STILL CLINGS IN CAPITAL—CONGRESS MUST BECOME REALISTIC OR HARDSHIP WILL ENSUE

(By David Lawrence)

Almost every day since the Republicans have come into power in Congress dispatches have gone forth saying at first that there would be a tax reduction and then saying that the prospect was fading. It is but another way of saying that the Budget cannot be cut and implying that the Republicans should have known better than to have even suggested such a thing.

This is the result of a strange psychology of spending which has prevailed in the National Capital for nearly 15 years.

So accustomed is official Washington to the idea of spending the people's money that anyone who suggests reversing the tide seems like an intruder in a game reserved wholly for those who have confused liberalism with liberality.

The war will have been over nearly 2 years by July 1 next, when the new fiscal year starts, and yet the Democratic administration is determined to spend $37,500,000,000 a year.

NINE BILLION PREWAR TOP

The largest prewar budget was $9,000,000,000, and this was considered tremendous, so, allowing for the fact that prices have risen and costs have soared, a Federal budget of even $18,000,000,000 would seem to be out of line for peacetime.

Yet when it is suggested that the Republicans might reduce the budget to about $30,000,000,000, the cry goes up that the Government is about to be "wrecked" and that the task is impossible.

No budget-cutting, public or private, was ever accomplished without repercussions of protest and dissent. But the cutting of the Federal budget is attended also with cries of pain because vested interests have grown up in bureaucracy which insist on spending certain sums long after the public need for such expenditures has passed.

The Republican Congress Members who first started the movement for a 20 percent reduction in taxes ought to be given the thanks of their countrymen and encouraged to continue to press for that objective. For even if it were decided not to return a single dime of that sum eventually to the taxpayers and all of it were given over to retirement of public debt, it would be a worth-while achievement to have been instrumental in some way in reversing the spending psychology and introducing a saving psychology at last.

EASE OF COLLECTION

There is more public pressure, of course, behind tax reduction than behind debt retirement. So for all practical purposes it is well that there is some pressure, because unless a start is made now toward eliminating waste and useless expenditures, the Nation's credit standing will be impaired and a long-range inflation set up that will bring severe hardship to all the people.

One reason for the spending is the ease with which taxes are collected. The deduction of taxes on pay rolls is a relatively inexpensive way of collecting billions. But, as this correspondent said when the pay-roll tax was adopted, it is perhaps the most expensive in the long run to the Nation's economy. For what has happened is that the worker has looked only at his take-home pay and has insisted on getting a higher and higher sum from the employer in the hope of getting the latter really to absorb the tax. Despite the fact that employers indicate on the pay envelope the amount deducted for taxes, the employee has been restless to recover the lost earnings. The rise in wage costs which the Nation's economy is today compelled to endure and the drop in purchasing power of the dollar, which means a reduction in real incomes to workers, are largely due to the imposition of the pay-roll tax.

PAY-ROLL TAX CUT URGED

The most helpful step to America's economic structure would be to cut the Federal Budget sufficiently so as to eliminate a substantial part of the pay-roll tax altogether. If the withholding tax could be reduced to 5 or even 10 percent of the worker's income, it would not be such a steep cut into his pay envelope as today when about 20 percent is lopped off before he takes his pay home. But as long as the Democratic administration and a substantial number of Democrats in Congress resist the cutting of Federal expenses and insist that Federal Budgets around $37,000,000,000 are sacrosanct and can't be touched there will be little relief for the worker.

What the Nation needs is to remove the governmental temptation to extravagant spending. This can be done if the legislators begin thinking in terms of a $25,000,000,000 budget for the next couple years and begin to aim at a $20,000,000,000 maximum thereafter.

This would, to be sure, cut off some veterans' benefits, but the Public Treasury cannot stand handouts to able-bodied men indefinitely. The sooner Congress gets realistic on the matter of veterans' benefits, the sooner the Nation will begin to sleep comfortably at night without a thought of recessions and job insecurity which the present condition of the Federal Budget invites.

Return for Burial of Members of Armed Forces Killed in Foreign Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the late war there were instances where young men about to go across were married to young girls whom they had known only a matter of days. Some of these members of our armed forces were killed in battle, or died in line of duty, and are buried in foreign lands, and left surviving widows who are not interested in having the remains evacuated and returned to America for burial.

The present law requires that the application for evacuation and return of the remains of deceased soldiers shall be made by the next of kin, and the widow is regarded as the next of kin. I have received a letter from a grief-stricken father and mother who are friends of mine that their son is buried on Iwo Jima, and that his widow whom he knew only 2 weeks prior to the marriage is not sufficiently interested to make application for the return to America of his remains. This father and mother want their boy back in America in their family cemetery. I am informed that there are thousands of other fathers and mothers who are in this situation. I have today introduced a bill amending Public Law 383 of the Seventy-ninth Congress to provide that in cases of this kind where the widow is not sufficiently interested to make application for the return of the soldier, the parents or other member of the deceased's immediate family may make such application. This bill will work no injury or disadvantage to any person and will make it possible for a grief-stricken father, mother, brother, or sister to have the opportunity to visit and care for the last resting place of a loved one who gave his life for his country.

Hoover Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the following editorials from the Los Angeles Times and the San Jose Mercury-Herald:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times]

CONGRESS SHOULD RIGHT THE WRONG DONE BY ICKES

Bills to make the name Hoover Dam official for the great structure in Black Canyon of the Colorado River have been introduced in Congress and should pass. Hoover Dam was so named by Interior Secretary Ray Lyman Wilbur in honor of the man who as Commerce Secretary helped so much to bring the Colorado River compact into being and who as President signed the bill under which the dam was constructed.

Wilbur's successor, Harold S. Ickes, disliked Hoover for various reasons, mostly connected with politics, and under the pretext that Wilbur's action was technically invalid—though the Attorney General advised him to the contrary, and Congress had adopted the name "Hoover Dam" in legislation—attempted to change it, selecting the popular though geographically inappropriate name of Boulder Dam. Whatever technical steps were taken by Ickes to make the renaming stick—they have not been passed on by any court—it is obvious that Congress has the right to return to the original name given by Wilbur and should do so. The authority of Congress is paramount.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury-Herald]

RETURN TO REASON

Congressman JACK ANDERSON of this district has introduced a bill in Congress to change the name of what is now known as Boulder Dam back to its original designation as Hoover Dam.

The bill should, and no doubt will, be passed with little argument. The dam project was conceived and launched under the Hoover administration. The Roosevelt administration had little to do with it except carry out the plans and specifications. Changing the name was part and parcel of a "smear Hoover" campaign. All of the original documents, maps, specifications, legislation pertaining to the project refer to it as the Hoover Dam—and Hoover Dam it should be and should remain.

Housing: 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I believe every member of the Congress realizes the need of sound and equitable labor legislation, and from the great number of bills already offered, it is hoped that the committees in charge of these bills will produce for our membership legislation that will accomplish prosperity for both labor and management and protection for all American citizens.

To bring these desired results the membership most certainly must consider the outlawing of jurisdictional strikes, in order to prevent work stoppages. We need to impose upon unions the same requirements for moral and financial responsibility and the adherence to contracts in the same degree as is now required of the employer, and we must consider the elimination of the closed shop so that every United States citizen can exercise his own judgment as to whether or not he wishes to belong to a union. This free choice is not enjoyed now and deprives the citizen of one of his fundamental rights.

I do not oppose the general purposes of unions. I believe they have served a good purpose when properly regulated and in the hands of good leaders. I further believe the rank and file of union members will benefit by the enactment of laws that will accomplish the ends mentioned above.

LOWER PRICES, NOT HIGHER WAGES, CALLED COUNTRY'S PRIMARY NEED—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS DECISION, NOW WHOLLY IN HANDS OF INDUSTRY HEADS, DEMANDS STATESMANSHIP PUTTING INTERESTS OF THE PUBLIC FIRST

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, January 21.—The most pregnant decision now pending in the United States is whether the Congress of Industrial Organizations wins its round of wage demands, beginning this week with the demand on steel. The outcome lies wholly with the heads of industry. The demands will be granted or not granted, or granted in part by decisions of the industry heads. On them is responsibility for the economic policy which is involved and the economic statesmanship that is called for.

A year ago this was not so. In that first round of demands the administration took over. President Truman personally took over the steel demand and strikes: He, with administration agencies, took over the coal one, the railroad one, several minor ones. In the General Motors strike the administration intervened in the form of pressure in favor of the union and its demands. That was administration policy. It had an economic theory (with a political motive running parallel) that higher wages were desirable, and when wage demands were resisted by industry the administration took over.

DISCREDITED THEORIES

All that is now over. The administration's theory that higher wage rates were desirable, as an offset to postwar unemployment which it predicted, was discredited when the unemployment did not take place. A twin theory, that the wage rises could take place without price increases, was likewise discredited. The administration itself was obliged to decree price increases to pay the wage rises it had brought about. The whole administration economic theory went very sour. As to the politics involved, deference to the CIO and its Political Action Committee ceased to be a motive when, in the November election, the country rebuked that organization's attempt at political power.

Today, the administration is out of the present round of wage demands. It is officially and formally, through President Truman's voluntary termination of the war powers which enabled the administration to take over struck industries. It is out also in mood and attitude, it is glad to be out. The administration has a manner of pleased relief as it refrains from taking a hand in the present wage demands.

An additional reason contributes to put power of decision in the hands of the industry heads. The union leaders, it is true, have nominally all the power they had a year ago. But they know that the laws which gave them that power are about to be changed. And they know that if they now make strident use of their power, the new laws will be more severe. They know too that public opinion is against them. Knowing all this, the union leaders refrain from the raucous belligerency they practiced a year ago. Though they go through the formalities preliminary to a strike, their manner says they will refrain from striking.

The power of decision thus put in the hands of industry heads calls on them for an economic statesmanship as vital, in the present condition, as any act of Congress. What is involved is not a mere conflict of interest between two groups; it is the interest of all groups and every citizen, the economic fate of the country. For the industry heads to consider only their own interest would be an economic crime and almost a moral one. To consider only their own interest and that of the unions would be almost as bad. The breadth and depth of what is called for can be suggested by stating the core of the problem before the industry heads.

NEED FOR LOWER PRICES

An industry has in its treasury certain money. It has sold its output, received its pay, and paid its expense. Certain money remains. It is this money the problem deals with.

This money can go to any of three destinations, or be allocated among them: (1) to owners of the industry in the form of increased dividends; (2) to workers in the form of higher wages; (3) to the public in the form of reduced prices.

Of the three, reduced prices has by far the compelling priority.

Young Henry Ford has seen the wisdom and led the way. In the 1920's he was a child, but he knows the lesson. Failure to give enough of the fruits of the 1920's prosperity to the public in the form of reduced prices was the principal cause of the collapse that followed.

Plan To Encourage New Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced a measure, H. R. 1038, entitled "A bill to provide incentive and encouragement for the formation of independent small businesses."

Both political parties and both the executive and legislative branches of the Government have long affirmed their interest in small business. Many ideas for halting the concentration of economic power in big business have been proposed or experimented with.

No satisfactory degree of success has attended these efforts.

The power and size of big business were increased by the war. The march of bigness was proceeding steadily before the war.

SALES OF GIANT FIRMS HAVE MULTIPLIED

This monopolistic trend is sharply illustrated by sales of a Nation-wide retail organization. In 1929 its gross volume was $403,000,000. By 1946 its volume had increased to an estimated total of $1,700,000,000 in sales.

In a food chain, against a 1929 volume of $213,000,000, 1946 recorded a 300-percent increase to $844,000,000. But retail trade itself has increased less than 100 percent since 1929.

The problem of finding a way to restore opportunity and equality for small business is not easy. Most suggestions and proposals attempt to aid small business by the neosocialistic devices of Government loans, bureaucratic assistance agencies, or other crutch devices.

These methods would make new small business, like the American Indian, dependent on Government aid. Small business would be born and operate generally by the Government acting as a combination midwife and wet nurse.

The last thing an ambitious American who has the initiative and the courage to be determined to create his own business wants is Government intervention or assistance. The individualist who wants a business of his own is most allergic to governmental paternalism under any guise.

So a successful method of reviving the formation of small businesses is not found via the route of financial subsidies or supervisory crutches.

NEWBORN FIRMS NEED FREEDOM FROM ENCUMBRANCE

What the ambitious prospective small businessman or group wants is a fair opportunity to start a business and get it on a paying basis. What the business project needs is a chance to learn to walk before it must carry the Federal burdens imposed on a fully established enterprise.

At present, a new small business is burdened with about the same tax problems and Government regulations as a billion-dollar corporation. Yet, the industrial giant established its strength

over a long period, when present Federal burdens were nonexistent.

The present difficulty is comparable to putting a 50-pound pack on the back of a child who has not yet learned to walk. The normal course for a child is to let it learn to walk by itself. A similar approach to the difficulties of a new business may offer the best possibilities of success.

Legislation designed to promote small-business opportunity should make allowance for a period of profitable operation before the business must meet the overhead of tax burdens and expensive governmental red tape.

Accordingly, H. R. 1038 provides that new small business will not be subject to Federal tax laws, including unemployment and social security taxes, during its first 3 years. This would give a new enterprise a genuine opportunity to get under way and get its operations "in the black" before the burden of Government taxes and bureaucratic red tape became part of the overhead.

PLAN IS NO CURE-ALL

This plan is no cure-all for the low birth rate and high mortality rate of small business. But it might stimulate a real expansion of new small business. It provides genuine encouragement to venture capital to enter modest enterprises. It would be a constructive incentive toward the formation of neighborhood and community enterprises, with all the social advantages of home-owned business.

This proposal seeks to promote the decentralization of economic power, and to reverse the economic collectivism represented by giant corporate enterprises.

Likewise, this plan should help new small operators to secure a larger proportion of the retail business, which could again become a major field of opportunity for individual economic independence.

Obviously, this plan would require careful safeguards to prevent its abuse by unscrupulous operators, who would seek in it loopholes for evasion of established tax responsibilities.

Accordingly, I have attempted to limit the benefits of this measure to enterprises that would genuinely qualify. It is possible that committee hearings will develop the need and the means to further tighten up the limiting provisions.

Aside from this difficulty, this plan has other lesser disadvantages. One is that the individual or group who desired to operate under this plan would have to incorporate in order to qualify.

Secondly, and perhaps more important, is the fact that this proposal might give a temporary advantage to new enterprises competing with existing small businesses.

However, as one long engaged in small business, I can speak with some assurance on this seeming disadvantage. Most small businessmen would welcome legislation that created an atmosphere favorable to the formation and successful establishment of new small independent enterprises. The business worry that perplexes me and small businessmen generally is the ever-present fear of a cutthroat squeeze-out by giant concerns.

One problem facing small business is the semimonopoly that large enterprises already hold in various lines of business. This bill does not cope directly with that concentration of economic power.

Offhand it might appear that this measure would deprive the Treasury of tax income. Actually, however, there can be no tax loss on enterprises that do not exist. Likewise, new firms do not provide important income to the Treasury. And, more important, if the measure encouraged the successful formation of new businesses, eventually the Treasury would benefit very substantially from the founding and permanent establishment of new enterprises.

In introducing this measure, I am conscious of the fact that it may, in this original form, have serious defects. However, I believe that such shortcomings can be ironed out in committee hearings if the basic idea is sound.

BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS MAY FIND PLAN DESERVING OF VIGOROUS SUPPORT

From a legislative standpoint, this proposal faces a serious barrier. It does not contain the driving force that would be automatic if it promised direct returns to some existing segment of American business. Those who would benefit by it have no organized voice and are scattered and unorganized. Accordingly, it may be difficult to secure for this proposal a fair appraisal of its merits.

However, I am hopeful that veterans' organizations and other groups dedicated to the preservation of free enterprise will carefully study the merits of this plan. If they agree with the basic idea of the proposal, I solicit their cooperation and assistance in perfecting the plan and securing congressional action.

In the larger sense, if America is to avoid the political centralization of power that in other countries has finally resulted in totalitarianism, we must now move rapidly to stop centralizing and monopolistic trends. If the road of economic opportunity is to be reopened for veterans and others, these prospective entrepreneurs must be given the incentive of a full-fledged opportunity for success.

In nature, the new-born plant or animal is usually provided with some original protection from the hazards that affect maturity. To maintain free enterprise, established enterprises should welcome conditions under which their unborn competitors would have an equitable opportunity to achieve success.

Accordingly, to avoid more Government control, existing business might well encourage, through their established trade organizations, legislation of this nature.

All those who see the dangers of unlimited Government experimentation and costly subsidy ideas in the small-business field might find in this plan the constructive solution for the present paucity of successful business births.

Mr. Speaker, most students of this problem recognize the danger and fatality of bureaucratic intervention and costly subsidies as a solution to the decline of opportunity for small business. My proposal attempts to encourage small business and at the same time avoid these evils. I am hopeful that the possibilities of this plan will be carefully considered and fairly appraised.

H. R. 1038

A bill to provide incentive and encouragement for the formation of independent small businesses

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 421 the following new supplement:

"SUPPLEMENT V—NEW CORPORATE ENTERPRISES

"SEC. 430. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises

"(a) In general: The tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply to that portion of the 'normal tax net income' and to that portion of the 'surtax net income' not in excess of $20,000 with respect to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in subsection (b)) for any taxable year beginning not later than 3 years after the organization of such enterprise if—

"(1) Limitation on amount of capital: The invested capital of such enterprise for such taxable year does not exceed $100,000.

"(2) Limitation on character of income: 90 percent or more of the gross income (as defined in section 22) of such enterprise for such taxable year consists of income other than dividends, interest, rents, royalties, gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets, or income which constitutes personal holding company income under section 502 (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f).

"(3) Limitation on dividends: The dividends paid or declared during such taxable year do not exceed in the aggregate 6 percent of the invested capital of the enterprise for such year.

"(4) Limitation on interest paid on borrowed funds: The interest paid, either directly or indirectly, to any shareholder, is not at a rate greater than 6 percent per annum.

"(5) Limitation to individual shareholders: At all times during the taxable year not less than 80 percent of the voting stock of the enterprise, and not less than 80 percent of the stock of all other classes, is bona fide owned by individuals, or by estates or trusts by reason of the death of former shareholders.

"(6) Limitation on salaries paid: There is no portion of the compensation paid to any employee during such taxable year which would not be allowable as a deduction under section 23 (a) (1) (A).

"(7) Limitation on character of assets: At no time prior to the close of such taxable year has the enterprise acquired, directly or indirectly, either the name, going-concern value, or physical assets of another corporation or of a partnership or trust, or the assets which were used in a trade or business carried on by an individual.

"(8) Limitation of leases, etc.: At no time during the taxable year has the enterprise paid, or been required to pay, to any other person, pursuant to a lease, contract, or other arrangement, any amount which is determined with reference to the profits, income, or receipts of the enterprise and which constitutes gross income in the hands of such other person.

"(b) Definition of 'New corporate enterprise': As used in this section, the term 'new corporate enterprise' means a domestic corporation which is organized, and actually embarks upon the active conduct of a trade or business, at any time after the date upon which this supplement becomes effective."

SEC. 2. Part II of subchapter A of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (employers' tax under Federal Insurance Contributions

Act) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 1412. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"The tax imposed by section 1410 shall not apply to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in section 430) for any tax year for which the enterprise is exempt under section 430 from the tax imposed by chapter 1."

SEC. 3. Subchapter C of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 1612. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"The tax imposed by section 1600 shall not apply to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in section 430) for any tax year for which such enterprise is exempt under section 430 from the tax imposed by chapter 1."

Elections in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a letter that has been sent to Hon. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, which denounces the fraudulent elections that took place in Poland on January 19, 1947:

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.:

The Moscow-engineered Polish elections, held under complete Communist control and characterized by arrests, intimidations, deportations, and murder, mark a turn for the worse in international affairs.

The fraudulent Polish elections are a warning of destiny that annexation of all Europe, Asia, and eventually of America will take place by similar methods as in Poland unless stern and effective measures are adopted by the United States, the only country capable of stopping Russia's drive for world domination.

The flagrant violation of even the meager obligation of holding free elections in Poland, as guaranteed by Yalta, should definitely shatter any illusions that the United States may have concerning the sanctity of Russian pledges. Mikolajczyk's forlorn effort, under pressure of the United States and England to cooperate with Russia, should by now thoroughly convince our statesmen that it is impossible to do any legitimate business with Soviet Russia.

The Polish-American Congress, the authentic voice of 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, vigorously protests against the crime of dishonest elections aimed at the complete enslavement of the Polish Nation. At the same time it calls upon the United States Government to repudiate the fake elections, to withhold recognition of the counterfeit government imposed upon the Polish Nation by a foreign power and to demand, above all, an immediate United Nations investigation concerning the elections in Poland and the presence of Russian troops in that country.

However it is done, Soviet domination in Europe must be curbed and Soviet troops and agents must be sent home where they belong if world democracy is to survive.

Stalin has willfully broken his pledges. His Polish puppets have deliberately ignored all American notes of protest with reference to the elections. The next move is now up to our Government. What does the United States, a signatory to the Yalta pact, propose to do about the intolerable situation?

The time has come for America, the leading military and economic power on earth, to speak courageously and act fearlessly.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish-American Congress.

Report on Program of Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include, at the request of Herbert G. West, executive vice president of the Inland Waterways Association, an address delivered by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the annual meeting of the association in Portland, Oreg., October 24, 1946. His address gives a report on the program followed by the Army engineers.

General Wheeler's address is as follows:

It is a distinct privilege to be with you today, to renew and strengthen the friendly relations between members of your association and the Corps of Engineers. It is now 12 years since the Inland Empire Waterways Association was founded in 1934, when General Robins was your division engineer. It is far more than a coincidence that the same 12 years have witnessed greater strides in developing the water resources of the Columbia Basin than any corresponding period in history. Truly your work has given a richer and deeper meaning to the words "Inland Empire."

Many of you remember a far different era of waterways development. It was not long ago that a steamboat with more than 100 passengers aboard had to be piloted over the swollen waters of Cascade Rapids in the Columbia River, because the flow became so great that the locks could not be operated. That particular kind of daring exploit is no longer required of the navigators whose boats in 1945 carried 803,000 tons of freight through the Bonneville locks and the commodious pool above. An equal boldness and enterprise is needed now, however, to achieve the full use of your tremendous water resources.

As Chief of Engineers, I am happy to meet with the Inland Empire Waterways Association in discussing the future systematic development of this vast potential wealth. The Corps of Engineers takes pride in being among the earliest advocates of progressive development of this great river basin.

The activities of Army engineers in this region began with the first dredging of the Columbia River in 1866 and the development of the magnificent inland channel between Portland and the sea. Our work was significantly extended when the United States Congress adopted the concept of multiple-purpose development of river-basin resources. In the River and Harbor Acts of 1925 and 1927, Congress directed the Army engineers to make a comprehensive investigation of all important American rivers. The engineers were directed to study and review not only navigation and flood-control possibilities, but all of the manifold potentialities of power development, irrigation, stream purification, and recreation. The famed House Document No. 308 of the Sixty-ninth Congress and the series of "308" Survey Reports which followed continued the first fruits of this important advance in Nation-wide planning. These "308" reports are the foundation and framework of the Federal Government's planning of basin-wide, multiple-purpose development programs. In the first of these reports—House Document 103, Seventy-third Congress—the engineers presented a general plan for developing the main stem of the Columbia River from the head of tidewater to the Canadian border. At the same time, we set up a related plan for the Snake River, outlining an orderly development between its mouth and Lewiston, Idaho, 140 miles upstream. The Corps of Engineers' "308" reports, proposing power, navigation, and multiple-purpose dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers, were ready for congressional and executive action when President Roosevelt assumed office in 1933.

It was on the basis of these investigations and "308" reports that, in 1933, Congress authorized construction of the Bonneville Dam as a navigation and power project located at the head of the tidewater. This dam became the first of the series of dams planned by the Corps of Engineers for the full development of the Columbia River. Shortly after construction on Bonneville Dam began, the Bureau of Reclamation followed with construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, the farthest upstream dam on the United States portion of the Columbia.

Today, Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams on the main stream are in operation. The need for these projects has been fully demonstrated. During the war the development of the aluminum industry and electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries resulted in enormously accelerated demands for power. Power available at Bonneville and Grand Coulee also made possible the Hanford Engineering Works for atomic-bomb development. In addition, this power was used to weld together a substantial part of our maritime and navy construction. It is estimated that the demand for power in this region will soon exceed even these great wartime demands. The original "308" report plans are constantly being adjusted and revised to keep pace with rapidly expanding requirements of industry and agriculture. We are on the threshold of a program more vast and far-reaching than any yet undertaken. A comprehensive resurvey of the Columbia River Basin is now well advanced. Ultimately, we will harness the entire river system and achieve complete beneficial water control throughout the basin.

Definite project plans have been completed for a great dam near Umatilla, Oreg., to be named in memory of the late Senator McNary. This multiple-purpose project will constitute an additional unit in the comprehensive development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers in the interest of navigation, power, irrigation, and other water uses. It will be a high concrete dam with a maximum pool elevation of 340 feet. Fourteen electric generating units, having a total capacity of 960,000 kilowatts, will be installed ultimately at this project. The McNary Dam and Reservoir will create about 60 miles of slack water for through barge traffic on a 9-foot channel to Pasco, Wash., and into the Snake River. The total cost of the dam and related structures, including the full power installation, is currently estimated at $180,000,000. Of this amount, the War Department Civil Appropriations Act for the present fiscal year has provided $2,600,000 for preliminary work. Preparation of construction plans and specifications is now well under way. We will

start excavation for the locks as soon as budgetary limitations permit.

Another authorized project for which planning is already well advanced is a series of dams to provide slack water navigation from the McNary Pool up the Snake River to Lewiston, Idaho, 140 miles. This project—which includes benefits other than navigation—typifies the great significance of water resources development in the future of your inland empire. It will open up a development of the immense agricultural, mining, and lumbering resources of the Snake River Basin. At the same time these Snake River dams will provide a substantial block of power—in excess of a million kilowatts ultimately—to meet the requirements for industry, agriculture, and general economic betterment. In addition, the new Snake River dams will materially raise the natural water surface. This, in turn, will permit the development of more than 200,000 tributary acres of irrigable land.

Construction of the Foster Creek project has also been authorized by Congress. It will be located on the upper part of the Columbia River, 50 miles below Grand Coulee. It is designed primarily for production of hydroelectric power and will be a straight concrete, gravity-type dam. The Foster Creek power house will be designed to permit installation up to a million kilowatts of capacity, as required. Cost of the project is currently estimated at $140,000,000. Funds have been made available to our district engineer for advance planning and initiation of the definite project report. As you know, however, the River and Harbor Act of this year did not provide funds for construction of this project. But since market estimates show that the region needs additional power at an early date, we hope that Congress and the President will soon make construction funds available.

In the Willamette Valley program, two dams of the proposed seven have been completed: Cottage Grove on the Coast Fork, and Fern Ridge on the Long Tom River. A third dam—Dorena on the Row River—was started before the war, and work on it has since been resumed. We hope that it soon will be feasible to start construction of the Detroit Dam on the North Santiam River and Meridian Dam on the Middle Fork. We are currently working on plans for the McKenzie and South Santiam Rivers. We expect to develop projects which will safeguard fishing interests and assure community preservation.

Looking further into the future, as viewed by the Army engineers in their comprehensive planning, a proposed dam at The Dalles will fit into the broad program for improvement of the Columbia, by extending slack water 31 miles above the head of the Bonneville pool, and by providing for further substantial power production and other valuable benefits. Just as the Bonneville Dam inundated the Cascade Canal and thereby removed a bottleneck, the Dalles Dam, which has yet to be approved by Congress, is designed to submerge the Dalles-Celilo Canal and lock system and thus eliminate another obstruction to free-moving, modern river traffic.

The Army engineers have made extensive studies of the prospective traffic that will develop on the Columbia River above Bonneville when adequate navigation facilities are provided on both the Columbia and Snake Rivers. It is conservatively estimated that the barge traffic on these rivers will reach at least 3,000,000 tons annually. This figure can be more than doubled by probable future industrial, mineral, and agricultural developments. These developments are dependent only upon the aggressiveness and foresight of the people of the Columbia Basin.

The Columbia River's original natural resource, fish life, which has brought so much fame to the Northwest, is being fully taken care of in the construction of all new dams, as it was in the construction of Bonneville Dam. As you know, fish ladders, elevators, and other facilities for the passage of fish over Bonneville Dam were provided at a cost of over $7,000,000. Even though our funds have been reduced, we are devoting substantial amounts to fish-conservation projects. In addition, the War Department has transferred funds to the Fish and Wildlife Service for continued studies of fish life. You may be sure that we will make adequate provisions for protection of fish life in all future engineering plans.

In the present construction program which I have outlined, the first logical step is promptly to initiate construction of the McNary Dam. It not only is the key project, as far as navigation is concerned, but is also of great importance in meeting the rapidly mounting demands for power. The Snake River improvements, which will soon make slack-water barge transportation on the lower Snake a reality, should follow as rapidly as possible. Construction of Foster Creek project should go forward promptly, simultaneously with the Snake River project. It is obvious that there is also an urgent need for completing the remaining five of the seven dams planned for the Willamette Basin development to prevent any recurrence of disastrous damages from the floods which are so frequent in that area.

We are now engaged in a comprehensive resurvey of the entire Columbia River Basin.

Working out these great developments as an orderly progression is an undertaking of tremendous proportions. Although it would be possible for a small group working independently to evolve a feasible plan of development, their answer would not necessarily reflect the people's desires. This region does not consist merely of water, land, minerals, lumber, and agricultural products. The people of seven States and a Province of Canada are the region itself.

As you know, the Corps of Engineers is neither an initiating agency nor a sales agency. On Corps of Engineers projects, Congress has established and has consistently maintained the wise policy of letting each program begin at the grass roots. It has always left the primary responsibility for implementing each major development to the people of the river basin. By our own preference, as well as by congressional directive, our procedure of public hearings on proposed improvements invites full public participation. We encourage the critical scrutiny of all interested citizens and groups of citizens, for we are well aware of the direct effect of waterway improvements on the lives and welfare of many people.

The Corps of Engineers and the other Federal agencies concerned with development of river basins are, in fact, obliged to keep State agencies and local interests informed as to the scope and progress of their work, and as to the plans of development that are being considered. Prior to submission of any report to Congress by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Interior, the report must be referred to the governors of the affected States—in order that their views and recommendations may accompany the reports when sent to Congress. Thus the people, through their State officials and their representatives in Congress, may appeal from any decision of the Federal agencies involved in water conservation.

To further insure participation of States and local interests in planning, a Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee was formed early this year.

The governors of the States which lie wholly or partly in the Columbia River drainage area were invited to designate five representatives to meet, once each month, with representatives of the five Federal agencies concerned in the development of this region. These agencies are the Federal Power Commission, the Agriculture and Interior Departments, and Bonneville Administration, and the Corps of Engineers.

Monthly meetings of this Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee provide a regional forum for continuing review of Federal and State activities. It is important that these meetings take place on the ground where the people, whose welfare is affected, live.

We are doing our utmost to insure that the local viewpoint on all problems is fully represented at these meetings. To provide representation for all the interests concerned, the representatives of the States may take with them, to committee meetings, as many advisers or consultants as they think necessary to discuss fully any particular plan or proposal.

The activities of the Inter-Agency Committee provide adequately for coordinating the development within the United States portion of the basin. Further coordination, to cover the international aspects of the development, is provided through the work of the International Columbia River Engineering Board, on which the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior are directly represented.

This board, which reports to the International Joint Commission, is now investigating potentialities of interest jointly to the United States and Canada. The importance of these plans, mainly concerned with water storage, is evident from the fact that the Canadian portion of the Columbia Basin contributes 30 percent of the total annual run-off of the watershed.

There is nothing in our experience of many years of planning and developing to indicate that organizations such as you now have actively at work in the interchange and coordination of planning information—or that the democratic procedure and wisely established restrictions which safeguard the rights of States and the opportunity for private enterprise—are in any way an obstacle to the development of land and water resources.

On the contrary, we who are responsible to the American people through Congress have been impressed again and again with the need for the fullest participation of all responsible citizens in determining what projects are required. Regional development of our water and land resources must represent, in the first place, the sum total of our engineering knowledge and experience, based upon years of exhaustive investigation and intensive study, which in turn are based upon years of careful and accurate observation. Even then, no amount of engineering knowledge can itself arrive at an ultimate program without the support of an informed public opinion and the fullest cooperation of all interested Federal and State agencies and the citizens.

This is a major reason why, under our constitutional form of government and democratic process, the role of the Inland Empire Waterways Association, chambers of commerce, and other civil and professional groups which take the lead in forming public opinion in this region is so important a factor for the future. Within the framework of the general plan and program already completed for the Columbia River Basin, we can select projects for orderly, progressive development well in advance of the foreseeable needs of the region. These needs have been and will continue to be successfully anticipated and provided for—through constant cooperation of the residents of the area who know their requirements, and the established agencies who take action, under democratic procedures, when the requirements are made known to them.

These goals for the ultimate development of the region must remain flexible enough to permit modification as new technologies and requirements arise. Each step in the

measured progression toward these goals must be backed up by the proof of accumulated experience. Each project must be considered in relation to future improvement and fitted into its proper position in the basin-wide development program. The economic soundness of the expenditures required must be well established before far-reaching commitments are made.

We believe—I'll make that stronger; we know—that it is possible to develop without dominating the economy of an area. It is our constant aim to render a Federal service without encroachment on the functions and services properly belonging to the States or to the private institutions of the localities we serve. With this objective before us, we will continue to do our full part in assuring the maximum economic development of the Columbia River Valley.

INLAND EMPIRE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION,
Walla Walla, Wash., January 16, 1947.

Hon. HAL HOLMES,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAL: Enclosed you will find a copy of the address given by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the Inland Empire Waterways Association annual meeting held in Portland October 24, 1946.

We would appreciate very much your having this printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

HERBERT G. WEST,
Executive Vice President.

Bad Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, there appears on January 18, 1947, in one of the New Mexico daily newspapers, the Las Vegas Optic, of Las Vegas, N. Mex., an editorial on socialized medicine entitled "Bad Medicine." Because it expresses my own thinking on the matter better than I could, I desire to read it into the RECORD for the consideration of other Members of the House. The editorial reads as follows:

BAD MEDICINE!

"Socialized Medicine—Bad Medicine for You!" That is the title of an extremely effective article by Michael Wright appearing in Better Homes and Gardens.

Mr. Wright describes how socialized medicine works in Britain, where a single, disinterested doctor will dispose of as many as 40 patients in 2 hours. He points out that in most communities there are agencies, clinics, and hospitals that provide free or low-cost care for the needy. He observes that under socialized medicine, where there is no direct cost to the patient involved, hypochondriacs will swamp the doctors whether there is anything wrong with them or not, thus depriving people who really need treatment of the proper attention and discouraging the physician. Then, in conclusion, he lays down in words a philosophy that should be the solid foundation for medical-care legislation and policy.

"A person who needs help should have it," he writes. "But not in a manner that will tear down the quality of medical care to the rest of us.

"Not in a manner that will destroy private practice.

"Not in a manner that will destroy the voluntary hospital system.

"Not in a manner that will give one man control over medical research and education.

"Not in a manner that will bind the physician to political slavery."

There can be no more effective argument against socialized, regimented, or bureaucratized medicine than that. Let the Nation remember it.

Dr. Edward R. Johnstone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an excerpt from a recent editorial of the Vineland Times-Journal, which speaks eloquently and sincerely of late Dr. Edward R. Johnstone, a distinguished citizen of my district, whose service to humanity will long be remembered:

DR. EDWARD R. JOHNSTONE

It is bewildering, as one thinks on the more than half century of Dr. Edward R. Johnstone's service to his fellow man, to approach the subject. His services were so many and so varied, and his contributions to the public welfare so vital, as to challenge the imagination. In thinking on these accomplishments, crowding a span of 57 years in public work, one immediately recalls the famous phrase of Winston Churchill, spoken for the British airmen who saved Britain in its most grave hour. Paraphrasing Churchill's words, they apply with full meaning to Dr. Johnstone's accomplishments:

"Rarely have so many owed so much to the compassion of one man."

In seeking the touchstone to his career, one must conclude that it was the compassion in his heart for those who were handicapped or who had faltered along the road that impelled him to offer a strong hand which never grew weary, never was withdrawn, until at last he left us.

Our beloved friend was a knight in shining armor to children. He made the cause of children with retarded mental development his own. Working unceasingly in their behalf for over a half century, Dr. Johnstone rallied the best minds of the country to their cause. The fame of the training school at Vineland is world-wide, but its great leader was not interested in fame or fortune. He was interested primarily in the least of these children entrusted to his care and the care of his devoted associates.

The same gentle spirit that blessed the children, also blessed those who have been associated with him for many years. They were encouraged to continue their most difficult tasks when he walked among them, and now that he has passed on, Dr. Johnstone has left for them an example of devotion and a tradition of service to the cause of handicapped children which will serve to inspire them in all the years to come.

—*Max Leuchter.*

Petition From Citizens of California Endorsing Investigation of Communist Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition from citizens of California endorsing the investigation of Communist activities:

To Congress:

(Attention Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN, Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities.)

We, the undersigned American citizens of the State of California, congratulate you on your plan to investigate the Communist plot now centering in Hollywood and the west coast area. We realize that because of this investigation you and your committee will be subjected to much persecution, ridicule, and attack. We are, therefore, signing this petition to give you encouragement and support of your defense of Christian America.

Katherine Luederes, Miss Anna Glaus, Mrs. Julia E. Hofmann, Miss Stella Lauban, Helen R. Schaefer, Mrs. Anna Klinger, F. Binzigne, Mrs. Barbara Hoffler, Miss Hilda Goetz, Mrs. L. Tell, Mrs. M. Ermel, Mrs. Carl Schumaker, Mrs. Louise Lueders, Mrs. Martha Flury, Los Angeles; Rev. Paul Branke, Hollywood, Calif.; Max A. Mueller, Margaret Mueller, Washington Park; Gertrude Harvey, Mrs. Georgia Harvey, Marie Pritchard, Ann Dyster, Margaret Cole, Charley Cole, Los Angeles; Harriet E. Loew, Downey; Fermor M. Tweedy, Bell; F. N. Everett, United States Navy; Mrs. Eleanor Lisk, Mrs. H. D. Davis, Los Angeles; Mrs. Elvira Speyer, Pasadena; Mrs. R. James, Herman L. Miller, Mrs. Alice D. Meesaugh, Mrs. John Overholser, Santa Monica; M. Windant, Compton; O. A. Windsor, Santa Monica; Mrs. Mary J. Doty, V. G. Bervais, Ray R. Shoemaker, Iola E. Beagle, Gola Beagle, W. R. Burus, Santa Monica; Florence Wiseman, Henry Kravanger, Jas. G. Harris, Mrs. Chas. Carr, Mr. Chas. Middleton, Mrs. Emily M. Finley, Mary K. McGlassen, Mrs. Margaret Maxey, Mrs. Nanie Alva Culler, Mrs. Daisy Watson, Mrs. Maul Heywood, Mrs. M. Beam, Luella Wilde, Caroline Nylander, Mrs. Bessie Morris, Los Angeles.

Mrs. Lila Sprague, Della M. Brooks, Pearl W. Bruck, Rose Graves, Mrs. Cynthia B. Camp, Frank J. Messmer, Catherine Adams, Oscar Bush, Mrs. Susan B. Stokely, Clarence H. Jackson, Mrs. Maude C. Sweeney, Wm. J. Ollrich, Mrs. Marie Strube, Lottie Point, Mrs. Laura Johnson, Gertrude G. Zanzat, Mrs. Alma H. Brown, Mrs. Kathryn Corbitt, Los Angeles; Alice C. Bussell, Beverley Hills; Martha S. Burns, Mrs. Ralph Moreman, Mrs. B. M. Humphrey, James B. Meeds, Mrs. William A. Weiss, Mrs. J. V. Bangous, Mrs. Elizabeth Preece, Geo. W. Preece, Mrs. Opal M. Peterson, J. W. Peterson, T. J. Dessert, Joe F. Doerine, W. J. Heuly, Mrs. F. Franklin, Mary I. Mercer, Los Angeles; Mr. and Mrs. John Swanson, Long Beach; Elsie Freese, Emily Wilson, Edyth Scribner, Mrs. Wm. Apel, Chas. McVean, Mrs. Charles McVean, Mrs. Elizabeth G. Behrens, Los Angeles; Elbert E. Chenoweth, El Monty; Mrs. Emma M. Willing, Mrs. Erma G. Rhoades, Miss Marjorie Ames, L. V. Patterson, Mrs. George I. Brownson, Mrs. E. L. Harrington, Mrs. Iva R. Harrington, Mrs. Cora H. Ebry, Los An-

geles; Mrs. Mary E. Patterson, Hollywood; Mrs. M. E. Harbison, Mrs. C. R. Walker, Edna Vaught, Rev. Arthur Torre, Ivy M. Caneday, Mrs. J. E. Carter, Mrs. Zenith W. Thatcher, Caroline J. Rankin, Clara Wilson, Mrs. Flora Barnes, Eliz Clare Roberts, Lillian Wilson, Elmer W. Sulbinder, E. Claire John Sulbinder, A. E. McCard, Los Angeles.

Mr. and Mrs. C. L. Benson, Mrs. D. Galloway, Mrs. Geo. McCullock, Mrs. Mary E. Lewis, C. A. Lewis, Mrs. Luca J. Allen, Wanda Rey, Mrs. Katherine Wilde, Alma Adams, Herman F. Lee, Elizabeth Spicker, Mrs. Hattie Holsenbach, Mrs. Norma Howard, Rhoda E. Green, Mrs. Bertie Glassman, Mrs. M. J. McIntosh, William D. Evans, W. B. Buckey, Mrs. Anna M. Reinoehl, Miss Irene O. Reinoehl, Los Angeles; Mrs. Helen Pruett, R. L. Pruett, Glendale; Mary Smith, Mary A. Lyons, S. A. Ruddy, Henry E. Holtkamp, Lois M. Wallace, T. O. Page, Rae Page, Mrs. Mary E. Horn, Walter C. Marsk, Ralph H. Danham, Martin C. Staley, Clarence M. Wugel, Robert R. Wallace, Ralph W. Stevens, W. W. Johnson, S. M. Matthews, J. Gravok, Mrs. F. E. Jerou, Eloy E. Welker, Miss Daisy Highley, E. Hamlin, Dr. A. L. Hunt, Clara E. Burg, C. L. Crosswhite, Mrs. L. M. Hurt, H. C. Beresford, Los Angeles; Marie H. Simmons, Eugene H. Beresford, Jim Arnold, Hollywood; Anna Faith, John F. Faith, George Krug, Maude T. Krug, Harry L. Woodward, Mrs. Olive Woodward, Mrs. F. M. Van Deventer, Elizabeth K. Evans, Los Angeles.

Mrs. J. W. McCarver, Mary K. Peden, Edna M. Gufillan, June Simo, Dr. Anita H. Curtiss, Mary K. Burk, C. H. Calvin, Mrs. A. C. Platte, Mrs. H. Sutherland, Mrs. G. E. Trowbridge, Mrs. Christopher Palzell, David O. Kiebler, Nellie M. Kiebler, Edward W. Kiebler, H. Hungstler, Mrs. Mary Kay Thomas, Los Angeles; Sarah E. Downing, Hollywood; G. H. Taylor, Rev. Mae M. Taylor, George S. Ralsky, Mrs. Agnes M. Little, Mrs. Louise Schaffer, Los Angeles; Ann Boddy, Hollywood; M. Pauline Stuart, Patricia Burke, Mrs. Christina M. Tomson, Mrs. M. B. Denning, Eugene K. Mangum, Maybelle J. Mangum, Bertha Schurr, John W. Walling, Clara Koppe, Rosa Maag, Mrs. Susan Balka, J. W. Herring, Gladys Herring, Mrs. J. W. Herring, Mrs. Allie McKee, Miss Goldye M. Brierton, Mrs. Cloe Lynes, Mrs. E. H. Suratt, Los Angeles; E. H. Suratt, Hollywood; Mrs. Elsie Allen Fox, Mrs. Carrie E. Douglas, Mrs. Lena C. Thorpe, Mrs. Georgia L. Deeker, Mrs. Louise Sanford, Eliza S. Lee, Mae G. Wick, Mrs. E. F. Teeters, Frank H. Rogers, Della Davis, Dora Hazlett, E. Goerlitz, Catherine Marinos, Elise Thieman, Mrs. Bertha Slade, Mrs. Hill, Octave Frankum, Marie Elisa Browser, Mrs. Olga Olren, Fred O. Hand, Los Angeles.

Miss Anna C. Clauson, Mrs. Jennie M. Hitchcock, Sarah L. Evans, Maude Stoneman, Mrs. Castilla A. Christian, Mrs. Lizzie P. Oden, Mrs. Alice Hallenbeck, Charlott Hams, Miss Mamie Smith, Miss Kate M. Scagell, Fred Gibson, Linda E. Lewis, Pearl M. McClure, Etta Hamlin, Miss Marie LaSpelle, Mrs. Clara A. Lucas, A. Lawrence, William C. Jensen, Janis J. Moore, Mabel P. Bartlett, Mary Kay Thoms, Julia H. King, Hattie A. Lenser, Merton T. Daniels, Chas. E. Patsfaugh, F. E. Simons, John A. Spencer, L. D. Walter, Los Angeles; Josephus S. Carr, North Hollywood; Geo. O. McMaster, Russ Black, Salvator Covatois, Geo. Walsh, Los Angeles; O. R. McLain, Van Nuys; Harold Garcia, M. C. Totspough, Mrs. James H. Berry, J. I. Cuttler, James J. Carney, J. A. Bitterlin, W. W. Decker, Mrs. M. Loraine Decker, R. D. Cornell, Reetha E. Cornell, Eve L. Carney, Elsie Sutter, Dana Waynick, M. B. Savage, E. R. Savage, R. A. Savage, J. L. Case, Edith E. Case, Wm. R. A. Van Ness, A. Blanchard, O. Blanchard, V. Pedersen, Jack Monte, Elenore Monte, L. Burch (native miss), Maywood; Miss May E. Reed, Mrs. Lora C. Lamont, Agnes Flynn, Mrs. A. Harmon, Mrs. Gertrude Carns, Thomas W. Conyers, Los Angeles.

T. O. Laird, Mrs. T. O. Laird, Mrs. Freda J. George, Miss Ruby A. Halley, Mr. George Carus, Mr. Herman, Los Angeles; Mrs. Roy H. Ziem, Alhambra; Mrs. H. L. Ziem, H. L. Ziem, Wilmington; Mrs. O. P. Major, E. B. Brewster, S. J. Pohl, H. E. Myren, Alhambra; A. C. Hachter, San Gabriel; C. L. Stock, Arcadia; Geo. W. Koehler, Los Angeles; R. W. Mays, El Monte; A. Saynham, Arcadia; Eva Thornton, Ella B. White, Pearl E. Vorhees, Wray Haymond, Mary Cornell, Nellie Scott, Allie Hall, Adeline Linhoff, Alice Wood, Amanda Spurgeon, Myrle Binkley, Alice Jones, Miss Ida Larson, Mrs. Elizabeth B. Cook, Mrs. Alice M. Winkler, Emil Winkler, Los Angeles; Mrs. Evelyn Hald, South Pasadena; Mrs. Y. Anderson, H. M. Anderson, Mrs. Mae Bonhage, Mrs. Lusina A. Chapman, W. H. Thomsen, Stella B. Thomsen, Mrs. Ada L. Reif, Paul G. Biorklund, Arthur W. Lowe, Mrs. R. P. Caton, Los Angeles; Pvt. John Kautter, Fort Lewis, Wash.; Llewellyn H. Davis, Los Angeles; Charles E. Molineaux, Pasadena; Marshall Bailey, W. H. Bruce, Caroline Simpson, Capt. J. O. Grant, U. S. A., John O. Foss, E. Blackweir, Ada Hienstea Gates, Matilda Koch, Joseph F. Frisinga, Los Angeles; Alma Johnson, David Johnson, North Hollywood; Merlin A. Workman, Gustave Holmes, Mrs. Grace McLeod, Luke Kikkert, Abigail Kickkert, Pasadena; Daniel Handcock, Los Angeles.

Marie Merchant, L. Stephens, Elmer H. Smith, Mrs. E. H. Smith, Charles E. Warner, Rose M. Warner, Florence M. Stantz, Maude M. Harris, Rev. Geo. W. Smith, Thomas R. Artigo, Nettie L. Bristol, Fred Langston, Mrs. P. R. McGilton, Edwin B. Magonigle, Mrs. Roy Mitchell, Roy Mitchell, E. H. Macpherson, Mrs. A. Marion Wassam, E. Hombly, Jennie M. Metcalf, Mrs. Emily W. Criter, J. J. Kelly, Mrs. Esther L. Kelly, P. A. Kelly, Los Angeles; Emma Hilgenfeld, Fred Hilgenfeld, Anna Barfkin, Elizabeth R. Stratten, Paul T. Miner, T. J. Ruslie, Josiah Swafford, Fred L. Etnier, O. P. Ellis, Wallace B. Harrison, A. H. Hughes, Harlow D. Dean, Pasadena; Mrs. Nelle G. Long, Mrs. Jo B. Miller, Mrs. Betty V. Seeley, Mrs. Peggy Siebert, Los Angeles; Mrs. Josephine McDonald, Hollywood; Mrs. Ora E. Conn, Mrs. Rose Robinson, Mrs. Alice Yates, Mrs. Ruby Parsons, Mrs. Marella Hood, Mrs. Lavina Murphy, Los Angeles; Mrs. Renna C. Peirson, Glendale; Nellie A. Dysinger, S. P. Dysinger, Mary T. Callahan, John Kessick, Ella Maude Milton, Elmore Y. Milton, Mary Davidson, Elsa Paeper, Charles J. Castera, Emily Riley, Lizzi Sattler, Lawrence J. Riley, Margaret Hayes, Myrtle M. Church, Esther M. Waltz, Aldin D. Walt, Elizabeth B. Church, Los Angeles.

Mrs. Jennie F. Dick Mrs. M. V. Finn, M. F. Church, Mr. C. Peacock, Mrs. R. Peacock, Myrtle A. Dorries, Ida B. Treon, W. C. Dorries, Mrs. C. J. Peltier, Mrs. Eliza Tibbens, Mrs. Zella Gould, Arthur Gould, Edith Curry, Anna Eliassen, Mrs. Ray Hunt, Chas. D. Hardcastle, Flora E. Hardcastle, Laura E. Oliver, Marion Neulander, Fred E. Reiff, Edith L. Newton, Nancy Lee Stucky, Thomas M. Irvine, Alice Beck, Hazel A. Johnke, I. S. Berman, Bertie Mae Rice, Everett Wright, Paul Hill, Anna B. Chambers, Margaret A. Bingham, Florence F. Paradis, Florence M. Poppaw, James H. Poppaw, Mrs. Fern Bryant, Nina M. Dodsworth, Mrs. Etta L. Reichard, H. Reichard, Angiolina Romersa, Margaret C. Madden, Charles W. Madden, Laura La Creauex, Armand Foster, Samuel E. Howard, Bethel R. Howard, Marie Bewel, Fred J. McMahon, Edward Feagardine, Belle Strasberger, Julia Grady, Raymond W. Knittle, Amelia Meller, Mary J. Ward, Los Angeles; Conrad Sandeen, Oakland; Mrs. Hellen F. Read, Mrs. A. O. Taylor, Mrs. John Pritchard, Mrs. Annie M. Ambler, Craven Ambler, Mrs. Josephine B. Shaffer, Laura Francis, Mrs. Rose E. Le Dreux, Charles J. Kroening, Los Angeles; W. Shirk, Gertrude Shirk, Culver City.

Mary I. Mercer, Mae Clara Ellerhoff, Harriet A. Smiley, Lillie Hamman, M. W. Barnes, Mrs. C. Beaman, Edith Wassman, Myrtle M. Winter, Clara B. Tomlin, Lucille Tomlin, Bessie E. Bower, Bertha M. Unis, Bessie Grace Beam, Violette Wendroff, Helen B. Hoagen, Los Angeles; Rosa Gehington, Hollywood; Frances V. Clark, Harry M. Baker, Glen Author, David H. Barr, Los Angeles; Clara E. Thomson, Hollywood; Hazel Rush Peck, Emilie J. Beem, C. F. Gogohin, George E. Livingston, Los Angeles; Mrs. A. Ketman, Glendale; Mrs. Charles Hunter, Mrs. F. S. Weakley, Francis S. Weakley, Robert E. Jones, Janie A. Payne, Mrs. Arobelle Stewart, T. B. Busby, J. C. Rayburn, M. B. Hines, Los Angeles; Elmer J. Hinze, Compton; Al Foster, Mrs. Bea McClure, Mrs. Emma A. McClure, Charles J. McElroy, Mrs. Amelia Doyle, Mrs. Viola Duddy, Mrs. Klara Swarthout, E. O. Smith, Mrs. Bertha B. Smith, Mrs. Margie Delmar, Miss Nora Foley, J. H. Balchen, J. F. Delmar, Ruby Barrett, Bertha Forbes, Thomas Earl Kenway, Oscar Thompson, Lillian G. Brand, John S. Dudley, Henry E. Leimback, Iva M. Judge, Mrs. Vera Brooks, Dorothy Runner, Lamar J. Freeman, J. Levett, Hattie Sappington, Beryl Downing, Mrs. M. Alexander, Mrs. Virginia Cruson, Los Angeles.

Mrs. C. L. Jantz, Nellie B. Foster, Emma Halslutzel, Mrs. M. L. Taylor, G. A. Harrington, Harold Ewing, Nathan Edgar Magee, George Hansen, Mrs. Jeannette Guthrie, Vernon F. Vance, Ernest A. Henry, Jr., Los Angeles; Mrs. D. M. Flaherty, Ontario; Mrs. Laura M. Beck, Mrs. Sue N. Smith, Charlotte Ann Lowe, Miss Mary F. Jopling, Mrs. H. L. Thompson, Miss Alyce J. Cummelin, Mrs. Jane Titus, Margaret Mitchell, J. T. Raftery, C. C. O'Neil, Los Angeles; Antonici M. Baur, Anton Baur, Inglewood; L. F. Meyer, J. P. Pinger, Clay Devine, Chas. Douglas, Mrs. Bee Baily, Mrs. Bessie Cook, Mrs. Camilla Strauslin, Carl Mueller, Edwin A. Elliott, Los Angeles; Jean Parker, Long Beach; Nancy Weakley, Orange; Andy Brown, Mrs. Elsie Long, Mrs. Lydia Jensen, Peter Jensen, Edith P. Brookhouser, Caroline Heft, M. G. Barlow, Los Angeles; W. R. Coombs, Culver City; Mrs. Cornelia L. West, Lyle D. Holland, Los Angeles; Stanley J. Gregory, Bell; A. Kammer, Martha Palwatory, Helen Northwood, Dr. Louis C. Childwachter, Mrs. Mary Zervas, Nancy Griffith, Bert C. Shank, Mrs. Bert C. Shank, Mrs. Anastasia Fisher, Cora J. Shank, Mrs. M. Lewis, Mrs. Wm. H. Tanner, Los Angeles; Mrs. Anna M. Howe, Hollywood; Augusta Perkins, J. Olivepop, Los Angeles; G. L. Kanzelmeyer, Mrs. G. L. Kanzelmeyer, Midway City; Miss Clare H. Martin, Miss Eva E. Steele, Los Angeles.

Wm. E. Johnson, Maywood; D. A. Ball, Los Angeles; C. B. Blackwelder, Pomona; Ed Norton, J. W. Aldridge, Los Angeles; Herman Klinnert, Downey; H. R. Davis, North Inglewood; C. De Barth, Downey; R. L. Moore, Maderia; A. F. Nichols, Bell Gardens; H. G. Stoddard, H. B. Noble, Maywood; Henry W. Brarens, Mrs. Alma Jones, William J. Hubbard, James A. Jolly, Marshall R. Harrison, Los Angeles; Albion H. Ricker, Hollywood; Joseph W. Klinger, Los Angeles; Thomas W. Garcia, Hollywood; Mrs. Lena Caldwell, Martha Leedy, Robert Livingston, John Versin, Mrs. John Versin, E. B. Craton, Mrs. E. C. Marsh, Laura Alford, Z. I. Fortner, Laura J. Morie, May Guillaurine, Los Angeles; Jessie B. Walkup, William F. Wendlandt, South Pasadena; Jane Taylor, Julia Rasmussen, Catherine J. Moore, Edgar Foreman, Cecil G. Sheppard, Mr. and Mrs. M. M. Daily, Mr. and Mrs. E. F. Ludington, Helen Piersol, Mr. F. H. Barnes, Mrs. E. Barber, Hugh Glass, R. F. Blanchfield, Lelah F. Jones, R. M. Blanchfield, Mrs. Nona E. Davis, Mrs. I. E. Anderson, Alice P. Collins, Mrs. F. E. Juou, Mrs. L. Risdon, A. H. Bushman, Eddie King, W. J. Mead, Los Angeles; Mrs. Bertha Thorson, Tom Bjorka, Bell; Carl Bjorka, H. Engelbretson, G. Anderson, Mrs. Hilda Gore, Mrs. Bertha Grezzell, Los Angeles; Mrs. Etta J. Williams, Culver City; Mrs. Edith Lyon, Edward A. Lyon, Los Angeles.

Miss Mabel Lewis, Los Angeles; Mrs. Anna O. Weisel, Oliver E. Weisel, Monterey Park; Mrs. L. B. Harvey, Los Angeles; Mrs. Dorothy M. Williams, Fontana; Mrs. Ruth E. Erickson, Mr. J. W. Erickson, Mrs. Dale Streck, Mrs. George Spyier, Culver City; L. Ellen Mitchell, Mary E. Wenger, Mabel Schulz, Carene P. Gaines, Thomas Gaines, Pearl E. Krug, Los Angeles; Mrs. Charles Nicol, Mr. C. A. Nicol, Rev. John B. Kenyon, Culver City; R. J. Hannah, Venice; Gail O. Meeke, Culver City; Mrs. George A. Woods, Mrs. Lillian Prouty, Venice; Mrs. Virginia Hagar, Mr. C. M. Beard, Mrs. C. M. Beard, Los Angeles; Mrs. Ethel B. Day, Mrs. Almeda V. Brook, Venice; Mrs. Grace Cleland, Los Angeles; Mrs. George J. Motter, Venice; Mrs. S. L. Dunn, Marian Apsahl, Irene Olson, Audrey M. Hughes, Mrs. V. E. Layton, Mrs. R. Morrow, Mrs. Maud Harper, Mrs. Lila Hamilton, Los Angeles; Mrs. Bell Englehart, Monterey Park; Mrs. Mary Morrow, Topango; Mrs. Florence Johnson, Los Angeles; Mrs. Charles Wentzel, San Fernando; Mrs. Laura C. Ray, Mrs. Myrtle G. Ruckor, Mrs. Anna K. Forsberg, Mrs. Nell Jones, Mrs. N. F. Whitman, W. R. Dolbier, Bessie Dolbier, Eliza M. Alexander, Clara A. Stedee, A. E. Wheeler, Helen Schultz, Mrs. Pearl G. Wines, Roy C. Wines, Mrs. Bjorklund, Bonnie L. Finley, Mrs. Margaret Thompson, George P. Thompson, Mary Brent, J. B. Spellman, Mrs. M. Burger, Los Angeles; Mrs. Vern E. Hamilton, Inglewood; Mrs. Kathrine Johnson, Los Angeles.

Charles W. Bonhill, Clarence T. Walsh, Mrs. Lucille B. Walsh, Frank S. Ruland, P. V. Watts, Zabiah Bonhill, Frederick Walkden, Caroline Walkden, Mrs. W. F. Ferguson, J. O. Carmichael, Emma G. Force, Emma Parks Cole, Los Angeles; Pearl V. Puccinelli, O. I. DoAne, F. E. Aflot, Fred I. Lewis, Carl Olson, L. Giller, George Welch, Peter Rossini, Carl Bennicchi, William Loftus, Patrick Hanifin, Louis Graggon, San Francisco; Lula Wamock, Anne Stanek, Los Angeles; Melton E. Rounds, Huntington Park; Fannie Gilliam, Kasper C. Kirby, Warren G. Harter, Willis M. Allen, Mrs. Emelie Coon, Mrs. Rose Vidal, Mrs. Gertrude Yargley, Mrs. P. C. Underwood, Mrs. Robert Underwood, R. S. Penrose, Wm. D. Albertsmeyer, Los Angeles; W. L. Whitman, M. C. Hanson, Hollywood; John P. Daly, A. Puccinelli, San Francisco; Rudolph Joseph Ghianda, Richmond; Anthony Oliva, Mary J. Tresten, Matt Kessery, San Francisco; Lenore Puccinelli, Los Angeles; Harry A. Scott, Eileen M. Stewart, Ona L. Stewart, Lancaster; Merl E. Ricks, Los Angeles; Dorothy M. Tids, Sara A. E. Wurm, Royal Henry Wurm, Nellie Longuelan, Lancaster; S. J. Hopson, Eva Hopson, Los Angeles; Mrs. B. F. Kirby, Mrs. Alice Keller, Long Beach; Mrs. D. A. Wright, Palmdale; Elnor Gilbert, O. Benjamin Gilbert, Lura E. Colborn, J. O. Tarsell, Alhambra.

Luna M. Spangenberg, Geo. L. Spangenberg, Alhambra; Mrs. Bertha E. Schilling, San Gabriel; Theodore W. Walter, Baldwin Park; F. B. Lewis, Monterey Park; Mrs. Lottie B. Senter, Alhambra; Mrs. Mattie B. Carr, W. O. Clark, Baldwin Park; Mrs. Elda R. Troth, Los Angeles; K. H. Cameron, Flagstaff, Ariz.; Mrs. H. C. Dunn, Hollywood; Mrs. Emily M. Bartels, Chas. Bartels, Miss Joyce Yates, Miss A. D. Cragin, Thelma A. Cragin, J. H. Butler, Charles A. Matsin, A. R. Doctor, Mrs. Alice Herman, Los Angeles; Mrs. E. Lucille Sanford, Lancaster; Mrs. Lucy Talamentes, Palmdale; Paul J. Clapp, Rena E. Clapp, Cornelia P. Weeks, Frank C. Van Brocklin, Lettie E. Van Brocklin, Earl E. Clapp, Vivian E. Clapp, Glendale; Florence Redner, Alhambra; Mrs. Jessie C. Knox, Katherine MacPherson, El Monte; James R. Knox, Laura Crouse, Elsie J. King, Virgil R. King, Mrs. Marietta Niles, Mrs. Esther Yager, Los Angeles; Mrs. Alina Person, Highland; Mrs. Ruth Johnson, Mrs. Claudia M. Berry, Cora M. Binks, Olive M. Ponleur, Clara H. Dove, Mrs. Grace M. Webster, Louis Wilde, Los Angeles; Joseph A. Casey, Burbank; James M. Murphy, Los Angeles; M. Sampling, Wilmington; Mrs. A. C. King, Emmett R. Holman, Mrs. Gertrude Lord, H. M. Peak, Mrs. Emma March, Mrs. Alice Ashton, Mrs. Arvila Bewley, A. F. Mitchell, T. J. Camp, Mrs. Anna M. Hauptly, Mrs. Daisy D. Farmer, Los Angeles; J. G. Scott, Maywood; Mrs. Alice M. Kauffman, George M. Taylor, H. C. Kauffman, Los Angeles.

Eline N. Olson, Christine C. Olson, Mrs. R. A. Hylton, Mrs. L. O. Sangster, Grace Tice, Charles S. Bitner, Lenore Puccinelli, Los Angeles; P. Roshetnek, Albert Puccinelli, Irene Cashman, Jas. F. Fink, N. W. Cox, Ernest Sevenaw, W. G. Sullaway, James McNamara, M. J. Flaherty, Anna D. Cain, Hobart Hicks, San Francisco; Mrs. Bettie Keadle, Los Angeles; James E. Barrett, Mrs. Mary L. Barrett, Long Beach; Mrs. Walter Russell, W. A. Russell, Edith Whitwell, Los Angeles; Mrs. Margaret Wyatt, Ontario; Mrs. Billie Etzenhouser, Nancy Etzenhouser, Della Flemming, P. T. Hoy, Mrs. Alice Engel, Helen Long, Angela A. Mele, Mrs. A. Jannett, Mr. A. Jannett, Miss Mazy Long, Donna Leonardi, Antonio Mele, Nicholas Long, John Massillo, R. Prinze, Juliet Rich, Joseph Argie, Michael La Torre, John Sanjo, Mrs. Leo Padesta, Mr. Leo Padesta, Catoldo Pouch, James R. Compton, Josephine Fabrizio, Theresa Janiro, Pearl M. Mallich, Fanny Pesoli, Beth Martin, H. I. Martin, Ambrose Piroli, Jane Noggle, Mrs. Mignona, Miss A. Mignona, Giuseppe Mignogno, Oscar D. Noggle, Lawrence S. Long, Clifford C. Colton, Marv Lou Balch, Los Angeles.

G. E. French, Los Angeles; Joe T. Kals, North Hollywood; Maeui A. Bean, J. Thomas, J. K. Westerfeld, C. H. Creveling, Mabel G. Creveling, John B. Boone, C. W. Tyree, F. R. Bertin, Eppa J. Hypes, Frank King, Lois King, Los Angeles; Nellie Robertson, Beverley Hills; H. V. Reed, Hazle Vanderworth, Inez Allen, Los Angeles; Ferd Brombacker, Mrs. Ferd Brombacker, North Hollywood; P. D. Lansdown, Mrs. Stewart, Los Angeles; Mrs. F. J. Lavan, Culver City; Hattie Holsenback, Los Angeles; Margaret McCall, Pasadena; Wayne L. Westberg, Mary M. Westberg, Lynwood; Hortense Grausman, Mrs. Esther Burns, Nels E. Ogran, Mrs. Lula Thomas, Mrs. Bertha Johnson, Mrs. Ida Menges, Mrs. Maggie M. Twitty, Mrs. Lou Gillette, Mr. Cozad, Mrs. W. S. Hilts, Mrs. Maud Carnahan, Mrs. Helen Becker, Mrs. Lucille Horsley, May Watson, Mrs. F. C. Winters, Mrs. G. W. Moses, Mrs. N. W. Lane, Miss H. Lovelace, Emma W. Abnid, Elsie Washburn Thomas, C. Harper, William C. Colwell, Carie Lovelace, Los Angeles; Mary McWilliam, Pasadena; Mrs. Reuben Van Bebber, Goldie M. Swartzendruber, Mrs. Bertha Burnham, Henry Peterson, Mary Davis, Esther Mitchell, Dr. E. D. Sager, H. R. Sprague, Bertie Ireland, Los Angeles; Guy P. Prothero, Bell; Leslie O. Wheeler, Los Angeles; Ruth V. Prothero, Lew H. Woodring, Bell; Albert R. Taylor, Huntington Park; H. L. Shires, Bell.

Harrison Bailey, John H. Ream, Mrs. Willie A. Beadles, Mrs. Emmett Clary, Miss Wallie H. Harms, Anna Edwards, I. M. Sage, Mrs. I. M. Sage, Mrs. H. T. Van Auken, Mrs. Vena Huffman, Mrs. Maud M. Oehring, A. L. Oehring, Mrs. Olive Leonard, H. W. Thomas, Madeline Monder, Hortense Mondor, Los Angeles; Clara M. McMaster, Glendale; C. F. Davis, Pearl Davis, Arch N. Latham; C. J. McPherson, J. R. Hibdon, Mrs. Betty Blaney, Laura Gordon, Los Angeles; Thomas H. Hoban, Monterey Park; S. S. Wauchop, Santa Monica; Emma I. Krueger, Los Angeles; J. M. Chadwick, Inglewood; E. E. Bofier, Culver City; L. R. Lanhart, Inglewood; W. G. Logan, Mr. and Mrs. C. H. Clark, A. L. Whitlow, Mrs. Ann Stofer, Mrs. Florence M. Johnson, Frank Wolfe, Henry A. Johnson, Norma Coleman, Marie A. Fair, Ida Shulz, Dolly A. Knight, Lelia Clarke, Jane Malchenson, H. Seidler, John H. Dixon, L. A. Wittliff, Ralph Warnock, Los Angeles; Mrs. Henry Wittpen, Oakland; Ethel Strong, Mrs. L. Savage, Mrs. E. Van Ness, Mrs. P. E. Sherman, Mrs. Leatha E. Corbin, Wesley W. Corbin, Lewis Morris, Mr. and Mrs. J. G. Moore, Edgar Savage, Mrs. Geo. T. Savage, Edgar C. Savage, E. W. Savage, Robert H. Dunlap, H. C. Shwenk, E. M. Smith, G. O. Reavis, Los Angeles.

Edith R. Thomas, Ransom M. Callarhops, James L. Olsen, John P. Carter, Ransom T. Hood, R. E. Brown, Mrs. Bessie B. Bean, Charles F. Bean, Fred Palmer, Alice S. Olson, Mrs. Ida Palmer, Los Angeles; Gertrude Fuhrman, Ingelwood; Lois Tignor, Los Angeles; Mr. Pearl P. Bush, Raymond F. Sturges, Long Beach; H. P. Bouma, Bellflower; E. C. Sipes, Mrs. Frances E. Cook, Mrs. Edward C. Sipes, J. B. Duncan, Elsie Ormsby, Long Beach; A. B. McLashton, M. McLashton, Los Angeles; Paul G. Hunter, Bertha C. Hunter, Long Beach; Anton Rieder, Los Angeles; Richard H. Callahan, Long Beach; Neal Macpherson, Leo Fistbruch, A. C. Grundmann, A. C. McNair, Los Angeles; Edwin L. Hazlett, Whittier; E. H. Caress, Ben Gorelick, Los Angeles; Kay Arnold, Lynwood; L. J. Carrall, Puente; Ezra Neff, Mabel E. McKean, Elizabeth I. Hatch, Virginia T. Crocker, Clara A. Goode, R. E. Goode, Chloe A. Sellers, Martha M. Morris, Mrs. A. H. Hormel, Mrs. Ann E. Spameare, Irene Gleason Mrs. Nellie Botts, John Eric Anderson, Mrs. Myrtle McCrillis, Mrs. E. Caldwell, G. E. Nettleton, Katherine Osborn, Mr. and Mrs. B. A. Mays, T. W. Douglas, Los Angeles; A. U. Jadwin, Mrs. Aril C. Jadwin, Bell; Mrs. J. E. Chenoweth, Hollywood; Mrs. Ina L. Keeney, Mrs. Florence Bank, Mrs. Mattie Y. Amerman, Myrtle Clegg, Los Angeles.

H. T. Smith, Los Angeles; A. J. Latson, Whitten; Mrs. Edward Call, Agnes Thompson, Mrs. Blanche Rife, Mrs. D. A. Brown, Los Angeles; David A. Braun, Glendale; Mrs. Alsada V. Barley, Mrs. Blanche Webb, Anna Deshane, Thomas Deshane, Mrs. Minnie Yentsch, Mrs. Grace Wadleigh, Grace May Wolf, Los Angeles; Mrs. Charlotte C. Rastalt, La Canada; Luther B. Pell, Mrs. Jane Pell, Mary E. Timmons, James R. Wood, H. S. Anderson, Mrs. Marie L. F. Brocar, Mrs. Elenor G. Harkinson, Mrs. Louna Colvin, Laura A. Knipper, Florence A. Sopp, Evelyn A. Sopp, Cora B. Haston, Harry A. Dildine, William Holsebo, Mrs. Rhoda M. Turney, Mrs. C. B. Homan, Wilber S. Lewis, Mrs. Jennie D. Lewis, Wilfrid Wright, Elizabeth Wright, Mildred Stone, Mollie E. Kohl, Mrs. J. Smith, Mrs. Mary Brogan, Los Angeles; R. E. Wallace, Glendale; Mrs. Helen E. Preston, Mrs. Hilda Ness, Los Angeles; Mrs. Anna McDonald, Pasadena; Vindora Coughlin, Monrovia; Chr Wacek, Hollywood; J. H. Cummings, Mrs. J. H. Cummings, Los Angeles; Charles E. Michal, North Hollywood; L. F. Beayk, Montebello; George Wharan, J. A. Wucks, R. M. Chappell, South Gate; A. Barber, Al Bebean, G. J. Griffo, Monrovia, Arthur W. Marrin, Hollydale; C. F. Monson, Mrs. Jean Berry, Jewell Atteberry, Los Angeles; Charlie A. Elliott, Maywood; Mrs. Mary Mae Donald, Ella I. Calder, Los Angeles; Ann Adams, Montebello; W. W. Foster, Wichita Falls, Tex.; H. B. Hamhn, Glendale.

R. H. Bower, Sammy F. Shay, Mrs. Louise G. Orr, R. Lee Wilson, Oscar M. Hayward, Hannah Hayward, Frances C. Adams, Mrs. E. P. Walley, Los Angeles; L. E. Strobel, Pasadena; N. E. Whitman, Dorothy Smith, Mary J. Hendrie, Matilda J. Paxton, Los Angeles; Marie P. Beaty, Leota Griffin, Hollywood; Frank Struhs, Jr., Julia J. Resto, G. E. Breli, George W. Mann, Marie Mozrio, Fred B. Lonas, C. L. Thom, Betty Thom, D. M. Gamble, M. Catherine Weigman, Mrs. R. Roehr, S. M. Miller, E. R. Smith, A. C. Brooks, Mrs. Lula Walker, C. W. Wright, Mary Wright, Georgia H. Wright, Frances C. Hoffman, Wm. Frank, Sarah Emma Frank, R. Lentz, E. A. Lentz, George Lentz, Marguerite C. Borries, Jessie Scott, Wilma Bouer, Mrs. Lillian Wallis, Mrs. Kezia Graham, Charles D. Mcul-

ton, Mrs. Mary R. Hoskyu, Mrs. Nettie W. Ives, Addie M. Kirkpatrick, Mrs. Elizabeth B. Hufton, Mrs. Hattie Roundy, Florence Lucas, Myra A. Smith, Olive Lewis, Celia Smith, Joe E. Reyes, J. C. Davis, P. E. Morrison, J. W. Stratton, J. P. Mullarkey, Los Angeles; C. Chick, Lynwood; P. F. Fabrick, Pasadena; A. Canon, Lynwood; N. C. Cortinez, A. E. Schwartz, E. C. Huffman, H. Clark, Los Angeles.

Frances L. Daugherty, Bertha H. Caukins, Col. Jim Renfro, Steven Tatlian, Dorothy E. MacGregor, Antoinette A. Small, Elizabeth Brennan, Mildren Newman, May O. Barney, Mrs. W. J. Turner, Anna K. Chustie, Bertha K. Dixon, Harry K. Buckley, Myrtle Scott, Mrs. G. L. Sebus, Miss Clara E. Buckland, Helen M. Alexander Mrs. Mary K. Frost, Grace E. Poundstone, Miss Esther Williams, Mrs. Mabel T. Hawkins, Josephine M. Welch, Rose Long, Miss Emma I. Paulk, Mrs. Alice M. Cummins, Walter W. Schwidde, William H. Bluder, John Wolff, C. W. Thaxten, Charles Peters, Clyde C. Boatright, Floyd Hawley, J. A. Watkins, Lewis Y. Brown, H. K. Edwards, Bertha J. Hanseny, John L. Smith, Rose Behrendt, Thomas B. Thompson, Gus A. Chemnitz, G. F. Hauser, Chas. Gaston, R. T. Thaxten, Selena M. Stabler, Ray Miller, J. A. Whitted, J. S. Pope, Mrs. H. Johnson, P. B. Savers, Mr. Estel Paty, Clara R. Paty, Florence Peddiend, George W. Gambrill, Ernest Seigel, George Gelpi, Mrs. George W. Adams, Mr. Francis B. Petry, Olivia Lewis Conger, Harry M. Taylor, Joseph A. Ballerino, Mrs. George Gambrill, Victoria Pfaender, Arthur Planche, Christ Pfaender, Nancy Bell, Los Angeles.

Virginia Morris, Huntington Park; Virginia Wright, O. F. Chew, Amy C. Dickson, Sam Castro, Mrs. Bennie Castro, J. T. Bennett, Ruth Bennett, F. S. Fountain, Val. J. Smyth, Joseph Odantz, George A. DuHarme, Patrick R. McGovom, Gus Gaisser Joseph Hall, Ray Burnett, Anthony Streeb, Henry G. Pleiss, J. W. Wheeler, Fred Wessel, Peter J. Roach, Mrs. Zeria Powers, Mrs. Elizabeth Winker, Julia Cummings, Christene Hoernle, Agnes E. Maesel, Louis E. Maesel, Carl M. Winker, Mrs. Aldes Turpin, Clifford G. Fisher, Grady D. Patterson, Los Angeles; Eugene C. Martin, Inglewood; Mrs. Anna K Lang, Ada F. Brown, George W. Kendall, Kathryn Traynor, Geo. M. Snyder, Helen J. Cackley, Catherine R. Cackley, Grace E. Elwell, Ethel C. Winston, Dee J. Brown, Helen Selberg, Los Angeles; Esther Schen, Warren, Pa.; W. W. Brown, Los Angeles; George A. Welzenbach, Anne M. Welzenbach, George Matrango, William F. Kenny, E. E. Eberly, William F. Kenny, Jr., T. G. Chambers, Kathryn H. Chambers, Helen Gillis McDermott, Hollywood; F. L. Mellody, Los Angeles; Clara S. Welzenbach, Ernest V. Johnson, Hollywood; Mabel DeMoss, Nora L. Elliott, Janet Ann Lassell, Myrtle Kay, Alice R. Bennett, J. M. Kelley, Agnes O. Kelley, Alice E. Dinger, Jr., Blanche Kancky, Los Angeles.

Mr. and Mrs. Al Gerdes, E. Wasserthurn, Mrs. Berniece Cook, Los Angeles; H. B. Devin, Huntington Park; W. F. Montgomery, Mrs. Agnes Montgomery Elbert W. Morrison, Mrs. Rose Morrison, Edward Deskin, Mrs. Edward Deskin, Marie Allison, H. O. Reinhart, Mrs. A. Arizmendiz, Mrs. M. Chance, Emily Koller, James G. Koller, E. E. Fredeen, Erick Hendrickson, Ewald R. Anderson, Ray O. Anderson, Carl R. Carlson, Erick W. Len, Chas. V. Shelstron, Los Angeles; Lewis C. Duncan, Cathedral City; Arthur Marcusson, Glendale; Andrew B. Olson, San Gabriel; Anderson Gust, Tuyungo; Ruth F. Fredeen, A. D. Greenleaf, Los Angeles; George C. Miller, C. H. Rogers, Roy E. Land, Ruth E. Land, G. L. Newton, Joseph C. Reed, Warren A. Robert, Jos. Steele, V. E. Schneider, R. I. Simkin, Eugene L. Hill, Bell; Thomas C. Finley, Edward C. Hengst, George Steinkamp, Los Angeles; H. J. Anderson, Inglewood; Robert R. Martinez, Los Angeles; O. N. Brown, Santa Barbara; Mrs. Troutman, Elmer D. Simcox, Fred H. Fowler, Mrs. F. H. Fowler, Inglewood; Louis Range, Los Angeles; Robert Henderson, Gardena; Jesse Earl Brown, James H. Garrett, J. V. Maile, Mrs. Harriett Johnson, Mrs. Mary Cook, Fred Hefty, Hugh P. Andrews, Geo. W. Finley, Los Angeles; John H. Baker, Leona; Cora E. Marett, Isabel R. Smith, Helen Rittenhouse, Los Angeles; Leopold P. Meyer, Hollywood.

J. E. Bauman, Eugene C. Baldwin, San Marino; Aleksander Mauer, Joseph Nejman, George Durand, Felix Urban, Frank Klukowski, Stanislaw Becker, Mike Dragulo, Jozef Sochacki, Adelbert Stryjcack, Los Angeles; Ella M. Baker, Henry H. Baker, Mrs. Nell Woodccck, Mrs. Margarete Wagley, Hampton E. Wagley, Mrs. Edna L. Montoyer, Ruth E. Smith, Charles R. Barker, Mrs. Helen T. Chambers, Bell; Mrs. Mary J. Smalley, Mrs. Florence Farnsworth, Roy V. Farnsworth, Mrs. Zella Sherrill, Miss Betty Sherrill, Ben H. Miner, Tula K. Miner, Frances S. Miner, Etta Minor, Mildred Cameron, Mrs. Dora A. Claypool, Mrs. Flora O'Donnell, W. A. Jackson, Ralph McDonald, Katherine L. Jackson, Ruth Welsh, Wilma McDonald, W. C. Hines, Grace J. Correll, W. H. McFarland, Donna W. Eid, Mrs. J. W. Colbert, David H. Sisson, Lillian S. Gilmore, Mrs. K. Sturdevant, Los Angeles; Carrie B. Loomis, Janet A. Norton, Long Beach; Ralph C. Loomis, Compton; Enid Shepardson, W. A. Hildreth, Aureeta Wilsey, Long Beach; Dan Ettleman, Pearl M. Ettleman, Los Angeles; Fred P. Akins, F. A. Jenner, Walter Teter, Long Beach; Mrs. Marian E. Everhart, Compton; Mary N. George, Lizzie D. Riley, Hollywood; Margaret L. Patchin, Philip L. Fowler, Charles F. Herzog, Mrs. Ethel M. Herzog, Lotta Eva Lehigh, Los Angeles.

Atalanta M. Kerrigan, Helen M. Day, Cecelia Bart, Jeannette Herzog, Los Angeles; Rose V. Coyne, Hollywood; John R. Olmstead, Martin A. Borcheiding, Emily Dietz, H. W. Woolmen, Anna Allgood, Mary E. Olmstead, Los Angeles; Miss Nellie Barker, Wilmar, Mrs. P. D. Rush, Mr. P. D. Rush, Erastus F. Basham, Mrs. Essie M. Basham, Garvey; Mrs. M. Wilcox, Elijah Broadbent, Clara Hovell, Mrs. Opal Gamble, Anna Betts, Wilmar; Verna Engart, Monterey Park; Mrs. M. W. Ward, Wilmar; Emma Johnson, Nora S. McCullough, Alhambra; Chris L. Franco, Minnie Franco, Frances R. Franco, San Gabriel; J. H. Hoagland, Sarah Hoagland, Alhambra; M. J. Kennedy, H. E. Kennedy, Monterey Park; Roy Leonard, Kitty Ann Brown, Alhambra; A. F. Gotchell, Wilmar; Gladys Richardson, Los Angeles; Marette Rogers, Downey; Mrs. Betty Anthony, Bakersfield; Mrs. A. R. Woods, Bell Gardens; Mrs. Cecile F. Richardson, Inglewood; Mrs. Mary G. Tully, Mrs. Rosie C. Hooper, Los Angeles; Mrs. Norma Heller, Glendora; Mrs. Florence Frullani, Mrs. Naeline H. Osborn, Thos. E. Kuvell, J. R. Richardson, Dolly Thompson, Birtha Smith, Helen Moore, Bessie N. Nichols, Phillip J. Loesen, Los Angeles; Harry Samuelson, Garvey; James Larons, El Monte; Rev. J. Richards; Edwin Rilly, W. E. Noble, Mrs. W. E. Noble, Mrs. Leita Flint, Walter F. Peterson, Ernest E. Gollins, J. Smith, Los Angeles.

Ruby C. Paul, Jack C. Hileman, V. E. Anderson, C. Amsler, J. H. McKinsler, Elsie Cinnamon, Marjorie Ashmore, W. J. Vanandel, Herschell R. Scott, Los Angeles; Mrs. Alice M. Beebe, Mrs. Evelyn E. Mangan, Hollywood; Mrs. Loma R. Gump, Mrs. Jeanette C. Pervell, Mrs. Frances A. Emig, Dorothy Arnold, Los Angeles; Margaret E. Sutton, E. Lenive, Mrs. Marvin W. Murray, Hollywood; Mrs. Ida B. Baker, Mrs. Vera Madaris, McKinley Madavo, Myrtle Reymam, Freda Koester, Louise H. Williams, Charles H. Williams, Loy F. Ragan, Albert E. Lehman, H. R. Morse, John C. Koester, Frank B. Cummings, Julia L. Cummings, W. E. Edgerton, Dorothy Edgerton, Cora Burow, Mrs. E. G. Barry, Mrs. E. H. Clark, Mrs. McCarty, Edgar V. McCarty, Frances Smith, Mr. Marvin Smith, Miss Wanda Fisher Viola Fisher, Mrs. George Shnurle, Mrs. James Deason, Mrs. Alice Deason, Anna Ayres, A. L. Scheffler, Max Jonas, Augusta M. Judd, Lt. Mitchell G Dwyer, Mrs. Edwin Fougeron, Mrs. Marie Fikstad, Maulyn Anderson, Mrs. C. K. Hines, Walter Thomas Rentschler, Los Angeles; J. W. Bain, Pasadena; F. E. Joquel, Laura Buchen, Lorine Cox, J. L. Siefer, Christine M. Siefer, Mrs. Nellie C. Hipsley, Mrs. Edna Binney, Mrs. Margaret Patterson, C. C. Stony, Los Angeles.

R. C. Sarlat, Muriel B. Sarlat, Lovie Traver, Birdie B. Floyd, Evelyn Reps, H. F. Hathaway, Mrs. Catherine Moen, Mrs. Hope U. Marvin, Mabel P. Bartlett, Anna A. Bruce, Mrs. Maala Brittan, Beatrice G. Anderson, Helen LeRoy, Mary J. Ball, J. J. Simons, M. Paul, Linda E. Lesser, Emeli E. Meissner, Maude I. Petersen, M. K. Thomas, J. L. DeRenzy, Mrs. Glenn C. DeRenzy, Los Angeles; Pat Parker, Hollywood; Mabel I. Gardner, Virginia Gardner, Sigrid Mikkelson, Glenn C. DeRenzy, Mrs. Marie Gies, Mrs. Harry Medlicott, Mrs. John DeRenzy, Mrs. Joseph Zimmer, Mrs. Estelle R. Bird, George W. Bird, Mrs. W. A. Rice, W. A. Rice, Martin Winkler, John P. Lankow, Fred Bohnert, Martin Estell, Chas. W. Farren, J. C. Reedy, L. B. Crain, Elsie M. Crain, Los Angeles; Margaret E. Brinkley, Albert Bussick, Emilie Traber, Cecil S. Blinn, Los Angeles; Mrs. E. Cooper, Mrs. Dorothy Newman, Mrs. R. Otter, Mrs. O. O. Leek, Glendale; Pearl M. Cromwell, Barbara Skeen, Burbank; Martha Ricker, Viola Miller, Glendale; Thelma Brown, South Gate; Mrs. Grace I. Sprague, Rose J. Smith, Los Angeles; N. B. Steinig, Duane Steinig, Whittier; Mrs. Gussie James, H. W. Laffee, Los Angeles; Joan F. Moyette, Glendale; Mrs. John Nail, Mr. John Nail, Los Angeles.

Mary P. Johnson, Pearl D. Tussel, Edward P. Tussel, Josephine Van Sickle, Arthur J. Johnson, Mabel M. Johnson, Mrs. Medora R. Swinnerton, Kenneth T. Swinnerton, Eagle Rock; Mrs. Heler F. Officer, Hollywood; Richard A. Walter, Mrs. Otelia E. Walter, Mrs. Bradie Going, Katheryn Ware, Mary V. Cowrey, Ed Jacobson, Mabel S. Hayne, Mrs. Carrie F. Dixon, Mrs. Joseph School, Edna Walters, E. W. Church, Los Angeles; Mrs. E. C. Kennedy, Mrs. R. A. Hamlin, Mrs. E. Jones, Mrs. Ben Tompkins, Mrs. D. Bundy, Mrs W. J. Jones, Anna Meyer, Culver City; Mrs. W. R. Wood, W. D. Wood, Florence Buyer, Mrs. Agnes Nolen, Mary Louisa Brill, Harry Brill, Virginia McMillan, E. J. McMillan, Mrs. Irvin Macbeth, Bertha Miles, Edwin Wayman, Clara Johnson, Mrs. Lola Taylor, John L. Buckingham, Sylvester C. Boarman, Caroline E. Boarman, William J. Fram, Lenore Hall, Clayton Straub, Ethyl K. Wardall, Caryl B. Weissan, Dorothy A. Calloley, Fred C. Krueger, Eleanor G. Kreuger, Herbert Charles, Myrtle Charles, Minnie J. Helmus, Cash Helmus, B. W. Hudson, Agnes Ann Hudson, Sumner A. Hamilton, J. L. Chilson, Flossie F. Gunther, Fred A. Gunther, Marie W. Chilson, Ruby V. Brown, Cleone Gregory, Los Angeles; Evelyn McMillen, Glendale.

Emma Johnson, Walter Wochinsky, Mrs. Alice H. Ewing, Alhambra; Mrs. Grace A. McClain, Garvey; Mrs. W. C. Gibbs, Margaret Allen, Lillian K. McCoy, Nora R. Snyder, Alhambra; Virginia H. DeVoe, Los Angeles; Sarah V. Butler, Gertrude B. McDole, George O. McDole, Alhambra; Lissa I. Flom, Marie Fox-Decker, Maude D. Benton, Caroline H. Anderson, Laura S. Bentley, Olga C. Bentley, Mary E. Butler, Florence D. Dorseth, Marie C. Nelson, Mary Robinson, Mrs. V. W. Davis, Mrs. A. Conley, Carl W. Carlson, Mrs. Doris Ward, Mrs. Jean S. Challenger, Nora T. Humphreys, Miss Rosalie Hidalgo, Mrs. J. Sardano, Los Angeles; Mrs. Gertrude MacDonald, Venice; Mrs. Dorothy M. Carlson, Los Angeles; Hope H. Rodriguez, Alhambra; Mrs. Rose Odle, Geo. G. Knepper, Louise Paglieise, Los Angeles; Frank S. McAfee, Maywood; Herman C. Moore, Alhambra; John A. Bromley, L. A. Nyberg, George T. McSalmon, E. W. Burleson, O. A. Homan, Wm. P. Baker, Elma P. Baker, Margaret Baker, Irene Warren, Maria Elisa Browser, Frank A.

Mattrice, Winnifred Nehring, H. F. Parkerton, O. W. Anderson, Leonard Smith, Lon Irene Layton, Mrs. James D. Moone, Raclusio J. Olwa, Los Angeles; Louis Olwa, San Marino; Leonard A. Cannorozzi, Mrs. Emma N. Cochrane, Mrs. Katherina Bukowski, Mrs. G. C. Beard, Los Angeles; Capt. and Mrs. L. V. Heft, San Bernardino; Mr. Carroll Heft, Mrs. Anne Heft, Long Beach; Isabel Duncan, Miss Thera Gathings, San Francisco; Mrs. Maurine Middlebrook, Long Beach.

Robert Middlebrook, Long Beach; Rita Piper, Dr. G. F. Reeder, Los Angeles; Leon Nadeau, La Roy L. Lewis, Eva A. Lewis, Nick Tempers, Tom Leinos, Santa Monica; Milford M. Scott, W. F. More, Los Angeles; Horace N. Gooding, Harry W. Gunsted, Ralph P. Stratton, Thomas G. Scott, Genevieve Lore, Fred V. Schoolman, Dolores C. Culp, Santa Monica; D. K. Cummings, Los Angeles; A. Mann, Jr., William Bailey, John F. Kennedy, Mrs. Carrie L. Balleu, Mrs. Isabelle Shugrue, Santa Monica; Mrs. Nellie A. Jacobs, Venice; Ray Egglesby, Santa Monica; J. G. Scott, Maywood; Marion Talbert, Santa Monica; Mrs. Lula Boyd, George H. Boyd, Lucille E. Dowell, Mrs. Peggy Tierney, C. H. Wand, Mrs. Martha F. Wand, Norman Olson, J. Arthur Kain, Los Angeles; D. H. Sealt, Pasadena; T. W. Parkhouse, Los Angeles; Mrs. Lena Taylor, Pacoima; Mrs. Laura Ruth, Pasadena; Mrs. Rose C. Sharpe, Mrs. Bertha Evens, Mrs. C. A. Boeck, Los Angeles; Mrs. Fannie M. Retts, Glendale; Eula M. Black, P. P. Shule, C. H. Hamilton, R. L. Wall, C. A. Masters, Esther Winters, Benjamin K. Gold, R. J. Petty, R. J. Evans, Salome C. Gross, Miss Alice D. DuBose, Mrs. Effa G. Scott, J. M. Alexander, E. P. McCarthy, Nick F. Ryan, J. Ernest Chappell, Mrs. C. B. Chase, Marie C. Septer, J. Dunkellecker, Mary Louise Roberts, Los Angeles; A. E. Ritter, El Monte; Irene Wolverton, Katherine Ryan, Los Angeles.

William W. Seedmore, Glenn T. McClure, Mrs. Amy Bagley, Harry P. Merrick, Mrs. Evelyn Bay, Fred Bastron, Mrs. Bertha Bastron, Joseph Keeler, Marilyn Wilson, Los Angeles; Edna Sussex, Norma Jean Wall, Temple, Ariz.; Mrs. Ethel M. Gruber, F. A. Gruber, Mrs. C. Donlin, Mrs. Elda R. Troth, Dr. A. L. Hunt, Miss Sophia Pilley, Mrs. Frances Newton, Mrs. Lizzie P. Oden, Lydia J. Bolton, Mrs. Florence Murphy, Mrs. Bennett Stefflin, Etta Stefflin, Mrs. Eva C. Arnett, Los Angeles; Fred W. Born, Inglewood; Beverley Jones, Los Angeles; Mrs. Ellen Born, Inglewood; Chas. Deschamps, Lancaster; G. E. Waggener, W. E. Sorenson, Acton; W. R. Duncan, Lancaster; Henry Oswold, Mojave; D. L. Mitchelton, Glendale; H. L. Parry, Ignacio C. Arellano, Los Angeles; H. S. Shureman, Glendale; F. Callan, El Monte; Wm. A. Morse, Los Angeles; T. J. Turner, H. P. Johnson, Mrs. H. Johnson, Mrs. Rose Howard, Margaret Wauk, Helen M. Soggan, L. T. Berry, S. A. Yarniff, Paul R. Nelligan, Geo. F. Staub, Glendale; Mrs. Anna Humphrey, Mrs. Angelina Hamilton, North Hollywood; Mrs. Mamie Bowman, Los Angeles; Mrs. Rose Hoffbauer, Mrs. Helen Boyce, Mrs. Laura Hanks, Lee Hanks, Edward C. Newton, Mrs. M. Katie Lang, Edmund B. Lang, Mrs. Mary G. Swartz, Mrs. Emilie Cross, North Hollywood.

W. Clay Wilson (pastor, Seminary Baptist Church), Mrs. Constance E. Eaton, Mrs. Lillian J. Randolph, Mrs. A. H. Gautschi, Ettore Teddy Falconer, Consuela S. Falconer, Mrs. Elizabeth Toth, Anna Treisuer, Los Angeles; Lula Platt, Ontario; Bessie Bell, Upland; Joseph Elon Kemp, South Gate; Dervia Hegwer-DeMay, Los Angeles; Louis H. Smith, Mable R. Smith, La Crescento; Ruth M. Smith, Glendale; Mahala McPeak, Gertrude Trullinger, La Crescento; I. Wells Spencer, Mary J. Spencer, Stella Parsons, Mrs. Arthur E. Ball, Mrs. Walter N. Crouling, Tryinga; Arthur W. Carter, B. R. Tomberlin, E. A. Walton, Donald R. Crouch, Glendale; Hempel M. Gellan, Monterey Park; D. Tantaglia, Glendale; J. Guy White, Burbank; Walter J. Boldrini, Jack M. Petersen, Glendale; R. J. Shugert, Los Angeles; Edward A. Carey, D. G. Malisch, G. F. Holcomb, Glendale; Mildred Walker, Mary Lois Hamilton, Los Angeles; Leroy A. Phelam, Glendale; J. H. Clessif, Los Angeles; Eva Martin, Opal G. Smith, Thomas H. Nelson, Wallace Brewer, W. O. Meckle, Glendale; Olive B. Scott, Arthur R. Scott, La Crescenta; Edith C. Gillaspie, Glendale; Ina McPeak, M. E. T. Long, La Crescento; Dorothy G. Watson, Thelma Brown, Saverio S. Schiro, Leon Moore, Louise H. Brooks, Los Angeles; Fred E. Thursland, Glendale; Edward T. McGovern, Los Angeles; Tully Pontecorvo, Alhambra.

Mrs. Mildred Owens, Miss Clara Chittenden, Mrs. Ida Pickering, Mrs. Jennie Bucholtz, Mrs. Eleanor L. Glenn, Mrs. Elsie Scoules, Mrs. Vina Weeks, Mabel E. Hollingsworth, Florence V. McClane, Mrs. Ruth M. Williams, Mrs. Etta O. Schaffner, Mrs. Anna J. Fleming, Cornell Wingfield, Mildred Stoughton, Mrs. Diane Irwin, Mrs. J. Herbert, Noble J. Johnson, Agnes D. Johnson, Arthur W. Cooper, May Gray, Chester B. Gray, James H. Hammack, H. A. Modesitt, Katherine Waterman, James E. Hewitt, Mrs. Loula F. Dustin, Virginia Drummond, Los Angeles; Ida L. Harlin, Maywood; C. H. Clark, Marcella Tracy, Carrie Brown, Mrs. J. Tucker, H. Bushong, Mrs. Lila Tannor, Helen Pirkins, Los Angeles; Mrs. Ona E. Haire, Alhambra, Frank Schroeder, Los Angeles; Mrs. June M. Devine, Mrs. Annie B. Atwater, William W. Perrine, Mrs. M. Jeruard, O. L. Jones, R. H. Ziem, Pearl Kerkendall, Lydia M. Crackler, Helen L. Moorhead, Samuel H. Atwater, L. F. Stewart, G. E. Chapple, P. K. Chapple, Harry I. Cranston, Pearl D. Cranston, Ulysses L. Cranston, Mary A. Cranston, Irene M. Bibbins, Eleanor L. Cranston, Lester Stewart, Willard B. Fernald, Florence Stewart, Mrs. Laura Stewart, Mrs. E. J. Hansmann, Alhambra; Mrs. Charlotte M. Larimer, William G. Larimer, Los Angeles; Martin C. Peters, Alhambra.

Mrs. E. J. Pinkowski, San Gabriel; Lana F. Steadman, Joseph Maus, Alhambra; Mrs. B. G. Bliss, Littlerock; Mary Maus, Barbara J. Maus, Anna C. Hirschinger, Alhambra; Lewis H. Mintman, Littlerock; Mrs. Bertie Hughes Barnett, Funk E. Meserve, Mrs. Mary H. Smith, C. H. Smith, Mrs. B. Williamson, Los Angeles; Mrs. A. H. Gilbertson, Mrs. E. Hunt, Pasadena; Mrs. Rosemary Nunamaker, Los Angeles; Roy Wolford, Axel R. Hoflund, Inglewood; Catherine T Rooney, Mary Rooney, Nell B. Kiser, Fred H. Kiser, Wassa J. Stoddard, Robert Freeberg, Los Angeles; Wallace E. Reynolds, Bell; Thomas F. Kelly, Thomas L. Poulson, Arthur V. Link, John A. Gibson, Ernest M. Klassen, J. Schow, Frank Scapacaza, Nell B. Kiser, Gerald DeLong, L. N. Angell, Mrs. Jeanette N. Mann. Charles H. Mann, Mrs. Cecil A. Freeberg, P. M. Blevins, Mrs. Jewel Wilkerson, Gudry Allen, Elwood F. Brunn, Harry C. Black, Mr. and Mrs. Chas. E. Landmesser, Mrs. Charlotte Thurber, Mrs. Ellen J. Hjarth, Elizabeth Stolpe, Los Angeles; Mrs. M. A. Ransome, Burbank; M. R. L. Baxter, South Gate; Harry T. McGovern, Mrs. Doyle Purcell, Mrs. Gertrude Turner, Mrs. Susan H. Edwards, Mrs. Lena James, Nina F. Walker, Adam Schmidt, Andosehas Pedroseton, Roy W. Campbell, Bob Inbrecht, Los Angeles; Chas. Rowe, Burbank; Marie M. Uebersox, Hollywood; M. W. Corkran, Jr., United States Marine Corps; C. M. Baker, Pacoima; Dave Anten, B. B. Carter, Los Angeles.

Audley Summerville, El Monte; Frank J. Lang, Los Angeles; Joe Gruhiman, Glendale; W. S. Dewey, La Crescenta; W. E. March, T. B. Kostenlander, J. C. Stump, Glendale; Marjorie McDonald, Hollywood; G. Mulson, Los Angeles; K. Wilds, Alhambra; W. Andrews, La Crescenta; L. D. Meredith, Glendale; M. C. Carter, Los Angeles; Fred J. Keller, Glendale; G. Englund, M. Davis, Burbank; C. L. Reams, Glendale; E. C. Mitchell, North Hollywood; M. J. Logan, Glendale; V. W. Johnson, Los Angeles; J. S. Slade, Glendale; Iner C. Ellis, Los Angeles; William A Cross, Glendale; L. Brake, Burbank; Manuel Aclia, Glendale; Roy E. Gillaspie, Glendale; N. Earl Summers, Burbank; Jesus T. Mendoza, San Fernando; Joseph De Soto, Los Angeles; Clarence E. Griene, Tia Juana; Leo T. Baker, Burbank; Carl J. Kerr, Pasadena; J. A. Nowline, Glendale; Howard P. Naper, La Crescenta; G. L. Fogy, Highway Highlands; Frank A. Reddall, Glendale; May Belle Gaigano, Los Angeles; John Coverton, Glendale; Mrs. F. Maude Landwehr, H. F. Scheel, Mrs. Odelle R. Ertz, Mrs. Lydia Witt, Mrs. Madalena Michela, Mrs. Lillian Castetter, Miss Mary L. Michela, William H. Becker, Mary L. Becker, Harriet L. Garfield, Mrs. Alice Baker, Mrs. Carrie Baxter, O. O. Baker, Los Angeles; Miss Kate Gunnell, L. A. White, S. A. Lapp, D. R. Wells, H. E. Matzick, M. Babcock, Bell.

Mrs. Lucile B. Caspers, H. C. Cornaford, L. A. Guiton, H. G. Martin, Mrs. Edna M. Porter, Mrs. Elizabeth Linsley, Bell; Mrs. Lydia Roehrig, Pasadena; Miriam Johnston, Alta; Elizabeth S. Briggs, Mrs. Ethel Treser, Pasadena; Miss Dorothy Hartwell, Highland Park; Mrs. June Wilbrandt, Pasadena; Mrs Stella M. Smith, Altadena; Miss Doris E. Smith, Charles W. Unfried, Riley O. Welch, Pasadena; Jean Wilson, Los Angeles; Betty Collins, South Pasadena; Charles Douglas, Mrs. Mabel Douglas, Mrs. Ascension Martha Bristol, Anna Nearing, Margaret Moulton, G. E. Graham, Mrs. Nerine Sharp, Mrs. Mae Humphrey, Lavita Graham, Mrs. W. C. Holland, Mrs. Jessie Roberts, Mrs. Margaret Beyer, Felix J. Shisler, Martha Nichol, Mrs. Isabel Moore, Mrs. Inez E. Duncan, Albert Y. Moore, Gertrude D. Lloyd, Alice V. Lloyd, Fay D. Lloyd, T. W. Pinkerton, Jr., Los Angeles; R. O. Hutchinson, Virginia Hutchinson, Van Nuys; Eugene S. Mikkelson, Montebello; Helen A. Boos, S. G. Bateman, Mrs. Elba J. Little, Ernest Nelson, H. D. Kirk, Mrs. S. G. Bateman, Minnie Anna Bray, John W. Hassey, Carrie H. French, Marion Savage, Mary Coleman, George S. Coleman, Annie M. Ambler, J. M. Alford, E. Van Valin, Mrs. Josephine Blanchard, Los Angeles; Miss Anna Moe, Monterey Park; William Barker, Los Angeles.

L. Hulbert, Los Angeles; Franz Schneider, Mrs. Edna K. Edinger, G. H. Edinger, A. Abrahamsen, Santa Monica; E. Y. Boyd, Lela Boyd, Mrs. Bertha McGray, Betty Overton, Mary Koral, Pansy Rounds, Los Angeles; Lula B. Hutchinson, Mrs. M. J. File, Van Nuys; Mr. and Mrs. Pritchard, Los Angeles; Mr. and Mrs. Riley, Mrs. Mamie Fleshman, Long Beach; Mr. and Mrs. P. W. Murphy, Mr. and Mrs. S. Lesko, Miss Dora Pritchard, Mr. Elmer Inman, Mrs. Gertrud Mutens, George D. Clark, D. E. Link, Freeda E. Edson-Norton, Ada B. Boyce, Ida E. Williams, Los Angeles; David Wallace, Pasadena; Mrs. Helen V. Neuman, Ruth A. Sands, Helen E. Payne, A. S. Payne, Effie E. Horn, Almeda L. Mix, Mrs. Lucille Omar, Mrs. Mary J. Shupe, James Richardson, Marion Richardson, Los Angeles; Mrs. Ida Hushman, George A. Meissenburg, Mrs. Iva M. Meissenburg, Arthur Gulezian, Jennie Gulezian, Alice Gulezian, Rub Gulezian, Rosemead; Mary C. Biciche, Cristosero Bichiche, Wilmar; D. T. DeGameo, William B. Buckley, H. F. Hall, Rosemead; Mrs. Eleanor Ketchum, William DeF. Ross, Los Angeles; Sam Hushman, Harold Smith, Rosemead; R. L. Schadel, Adah E. Schadel, Arcadia; Frank E. English, Rosemead; M. J. Reed, San Gabriel; J. Paris, Odile Paris, R. W. Frankfurt, G. J. Thompson, F. E Quirk, Fred W. Sandquist, Rosemead.

Fred W. Sandquist, Rosemead; Georgia Stromberg, C. L. Winders, Los Angeles; Vernon Cole, San Diego; Marjorie Boone, Los Angeles; Robert Stromberg, Glendale; Mr. and Mrs. Imogene, Carlsbad; Anna Reinhold, Mr. and Mrs. Bert Thomas, San Diego; Helen Markham, Pasadena; Lillian Bowlsby, Emily Neslund, Mary Norton, Henry W. Barens, G. D. McDonald, Leonard C. Berryman, John

Marned, R. Byrne, V. Nugent, Jas. J. Dee, John Downing, Wm. Langan, Ralph Gebring, John Gallagher, Henry W. Hentze, Mrs. Inez C. Foster, Los Angeles; Mrs. Emily Lyman, Hollywood; Carl Carlson, O. B. Brewster, Mrs. Rose E. Gore, Mrs. Clara P. Harris, Mrs. Marie A. Cowan, Jay Elmont, E. G. McGlauflin, Los Angeles; Robert C. Petty, Mrs. Minnie Lee Petty, Ocean Park; Miss Rose C. Smith, John J. Wilkie, LeEtta Jewell, Annie J. Potter, Mary C. Hill, V. Fae Wahman, Mrs. R. W. Ainsh, Laura Holmes, Geo. J. Van Loon, Lydia Milligan, Irma Kramer, Omerea B. Taber, William Mead, Miss Ella Day, Ida Frances Underhill, Clara V. Underhill, Mrs. Margaret M. Calhoun, Mrs. Gladys H. Peabody, Alma Smith, Margarette M. Steeb, W. Howard, Alta J. Bryan, James P. Case, Maola B. Case, J. Winterbottom, Joseph S. Zerega, Rev. Ernest W. and Mrs. Lavvorn, Herman C. Lewis, W. E. Foland, Joe J. Bolton, Los Angeles.

Carelia Cole, E. G. Zeliff, Will L. Land, M. Johnson, James W. DeLaney, Jay G. Holland, William Lambert, Ora West, C. W. Koegle, Cavin W. Craig, Berdena Craig, Martha Hengel, N. W. Corrington, Anna L. Harpper, Mildred R. Obert, Jenny M. Johnson, John L. Erenard, Louis C. Dodelar, Floyd G. Fife, George Hixon, John B. Pauly, Charles E. Porter, John C. Searfoss, Peter Castovena, Frank Post, B. F. Bollar, August F. Richard, Los Angeles; Fred C. Ries, Compton; G. Hoppel, Louis Wideman, M. Morris, L. Schram, Lloyd E. Blumfield, Mrs. Maybell Rankin, Mrs. Jessie Boals, Nannie Griffin, Harriet Carter, Miss Fern Standeford, Etta Lipe, Mrs. Melvin Higginson, Los Angeles; Rev. F. Du Pee, Lina Scott Du Pee, Tujunga; Arlene Honn, James L. Verity, Stella Verity, Bessie Bowman, Carlos H. Bowmar, Mrs. M. More, Mrs. Lavinia C. Hedges, Richard Hotchkiss, Valerie Hotchkiss, Winifred C. Ott, Rollo A. Ott, Francis J. Gotcher, Mrs. F. J. Gotcher, Lois W. Seldon, Oscar M. Johnsen, Willard Andrews, Zella R. Mussen, Mrs. L. H. Williams, Los Angeles.

Leary E. Graham, Alhambra; A. J. Millican, Mrs. A. J. Millican, Araminta McElroy, Fred W. Meadows, Lucille Bramham, Mr. W. C. Bramham, Los Angeles; Edward L. Fountain, Edna B. Fountain, Huntington Park; Gladys L. Ruxton, Los Angeles; Nellie R. Chalfant, Louis Budway, Louis M. Brown, Dorothy P. Brown, Earl R. Chalfant, Mr. and Mrs. Ungibauer, Mrs. John Bruno, Edward L. Dickenson, Ida M. Dickenson, Huntington Park; Mrs. H. Burlie, Miss Hardman, Lois Burlie, Mrs. Laura E. Uline Margaret Townsend, Elizabeth McFarlane, Marie L. Ferrero, Anna Rea, Mrs. Anna Mary Regua, Mary Garnett, William F. Feely, George J. Ferrero, M. A. Refrodi, Margaret D. Baier, Mrs. Susie West, Mrs. Nora Robinson, Joseph Josupait, Miss Maude Shaw, Ernest Whitman, Carrie C. Juntman, Angelina Marino, Catherine Marino, Ernest Groves, Los Angeles.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky from the New York Sun:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

DISPLACED PERSONS

A new category of human beings has been produced by the peace. What it amounts to is that there are a large number of men, women, and children who belong to no country, who have no homes, who have no present and no future and no idea where they are to go. For them, time has stopped.

It is estimated that there are still more than 800,000 displaced persons, about one-third of them women. About 150,000 are children under 19. These figures may have changed somewhat since they were gathered by births, deaths, and enforced return to the countries of nativity—which in many instances means death.

I have some earlier figures which show that in March 1946 the estimates showed that there were more than 6,500,000 displaced persons, of whom 5,500,000 have been repatriated. The discrepancy between these figures is that both are estimates, that some have been replaced (not repatriated) and that many have died.

It is an error to think of displaced persons as Jews. They are of all faiths. Only one-quarter of them are Jews; the largest number are Roman Catholics. Although they come from all countries, the largest groups are Poles, Balts, and Yugoslavs who dare not return to the lands of their nativity because there they will without doubt be killed. The Jews dare not return to Poland because Communist Poland is the scene of the most intense anti-Semitism ever witnessed in Europe. The general feeling is that to become a replaced person, that is, for a Jew to be sent back to Poland or a Catholic to Yugoslavia, is the same as demanding that a person commit suicide. It is a death sentence.

These are marginal human beings—a product of the war. For them there are three solutions:

1 To leave them where they are in displaced persons' camps, idle, useless, producing nothing, achieving nothing, shattered in mind and body;

2. To find some country where they can begin life anew;

3. To kill them off as a nuisance.

Perhaps solutions 1 and 3 are the same, although the first is more costly while the third is more immoral and brutal. But the effect upon the individual is about the same.

But when the second, the only rational solution, is proposed, the resistance to immigration appears everywhere. The world is familiar with what a tragedy the mere proposal of bringing 100,000 Jews into Palestine has produced. That has practically led to civil war in that country. Few countries welcome displaced persons in any important numbers. Under the American immigration laws, 154,000 persons may enter the United States annually. More than half of the quotas are assigned to Great Britain, Scandinavia and other western European countries which are not involved in the problem of the displaced persons. Apart from these figures, numerous devices have been employed to make immigration difficult.

In the 10-year period between 1931 and 1940, immigration amounted to 528,000 persons, but there was an emigration of 459,000, leaving a net increase of 69,000. During the next 3 years the immigration totaled 103,000, of which 75,000 remained in this country. It is difficult to reconcile these figures with the apparently large number of refugees in our larger cities, but in the period 1933–45 the total number of quota immigrants admitted was 375,000.

It is true that a small number of special immigrants, visitors and students were admitted during the war years, but some of them—how many I do not know—have been ordered to return to their own country. In dealing with permanent immigration we have to limit ourselves to those who are admitted for permanent residence to this country. The number, in any one year, is obviously not large.

Several proposals have been made to increase the number to be admitted to this country and to Canada. But nothing of a positive and constructive nature has been done here, there or anywhere. And no one can say what will be done. Meanwhile these displaced persons are going mad, are dying, are being replaced to the torture of the countries of their origin. It is a horribly inhuman picture for which there seems to be a need for immediate solution.

Peace Is Geared to Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we seek in vain for a just and lasting peace unless we realize that it is geared to the principle of justice. In the flush of a military victory, which claimed as its objective freedom for the individual, we are surprised to know that there is less, not more, of it. Europe today is the living example. Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania lie prostrate under the heel of the Russian dictators. We must have no part in this tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday morning I listened to Mr. Lothrop Stoddard, outstanding commentator for the Evening and Sunday Star, and I was impressed by the logic and timeliness of his remarks. Every Member of the House should read what he has to say with reference to Russia's treatment of Poland. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the complete address of Mr. Stoddard, as follows:

For all believers in and workers for international peace and security, this should be a day alike of humiliation and resolution. The reason is not hard to seek. On this Sunday, so mild and tranquil here in Washington, there is taking place in distant Poland an outrage on international morality and decency for which we Americans are largely responsible through our supine neglect or refusal to face up to the commitments we formally assumed regarding that unfortunate country and people. The so-called elections going on in Poland at this very hour are at once the climax of a whole series of betrayals by us and our western associates, and the prelude to still worse iniquities, unless we do something effective to avert them.

It is a curious yet indubitable historical fact that the status of Poland has, for the better part of two centuries, furnished an accurate gage of the world's moral climate. The cynical erasure of Poland from the map through total partition between the predatory states of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, approximately 150 years ago, set the pattern of that ruthless imperialism with its attendant break-down of moral principles in the conduct of international relations which eventually brought on two world wars and the totalitarian wave that today threatens utterly to destroy our civilization.

Some years before World War I, a prominent Roman Catholic historian wrote that, so long as the suppression of the Polish nation persisted, Europe was living in a state of mortal sin which would entail a proportionate retribution. Today, the condition of the Polish people is so much worse than it was in 1914, and is so clearly due to the actions of all the great powers, that it is foolish to delude ourselves into thinking that enduring world peace and security can be built on foundations which condone or perpetuate such

flagrant violations of elementary right and justice. The sooner we get that stern truth through our heads in an atomic age, the better for us and our children.

Poland is thus once more the outstanding acid test of our real intentions. Again I say that unless we do something effective about this imperative challenge to our professed principles and policies, we shall be found wanting, will show ourselves to be time-servers and hypocrites, and may expect to reap most unpleasant consequences.

The diplomatic Rake's Progress of Poland's betrayal, worthy of the pen of a modern Hogarth, is a tale so long and intricate that I can only summarize it in the brief time at my disposal. It begins with Poland's determination to resist Nazi aggression in 1939, on the faith of treaty pledges by Britain and France guaranteeing Polish sovereignty and integrity. Then came the Russian stab in the back and Poland's partition between the totalitarian giants, Hitler and Stalin. Yet, when those arch-despoilers fell out, Poland did not profit; basically because London and Washington did not hold Moscow to the pledges it had categorically made. Those pledges are first found in the Atlantic Charter, to which Soviet Russia subscribed in 1942. They were reiterated in the agreements concluded between Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, first at Tehran and again at Yalta. The Yalta Declaration of February 11, 1945, not only reiterates the adherence of the signatories to the Atlantic Charter and the embryonic United Nations but specifically provides for an independent Poland and a provisional Polish Government pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot.

How those promises have been kept is shown by our recent note to the Soviet Government, after our repeated protests to the Moscow-dominated puppet regime at Warsaw had been contemptuously flouted. Going over the heads of those Warsaw stooges to the source of real authority, our State Department complained to the Kremlin: The methods used by the (Polish) Government in its efforts to eliminate the participation of the Polish Peasant Party in the elections include political arrests and murders, compulsory enrollment of Polish Peasant Party members in the bloc political parties, dismissal of Polish Peasant Party members from their employment, searches of homes, attacks by secret police and members of the Communist Party on Polish Peasant Party premises and party congresses, suspension and restriction by Government authorities on Polish Peasant Party meetings, suspension of party activities, suppression of the party press, etc.

The long catalog of offenses cited in our note, of which merely part is here quoted, only faintly portrays the bloody reign of terror vividly described by foreign news correspondents and in official dispatches by our and other diplomatic representatives, some of which have been made public. Yet, in face of all this, the Soviet Government has had the effrontery to reject our note and blandly asserts that no interference in Poland is needed by the Yalta signatories, since all goes well there.

Thus backed up to the hilt by Moscow, the Warsaw puppet regime is not only carrying out its farcical elections according to specifications but is obviously planning to visit dire retribution on all opponents to its ruthless will. The terror seems thus slated to go on to the bitter end.

Our rebuff by Moscow is thus complete. And it should be understood that the parallel protests of the British Government have been similarly defied. What should Washington and London do about it? The best program I have seen advocated comes from the pen of William Henry Chamberlin, one of our outstanding authorities on world affairs, with special knowledge of Soviet Russia and its aims. Writing in the current issue of the New Leader, Chamberlin says:

"It seems to me that there is only one logical, honorable, straightforward thing for the United States Government to do. This is to declare, on the basis of the overwhelming evidence, that the forthcoming election is a fraudulent sham; that we can no longer recognize the usurping, carpet-bagging group of Comintern agents that is so obviously unable to face the chances of a free election as having any legitimate claim to be considered the Government of Poland.

"We should break off diplomatic relations or, if the argument is raised that we need a source of information, we should withdraw our ambassador. We should make it clear that no loans or credits involving American participation will be granted to any Polish regime that does not derive its authority from a genuinely free and unfettered election. And we should publicly and officially express the hope that the Polish people will succeed in overthrowing by force a regime which has given them no opportunity to repudiate it by peaceful and legal means.

"An American diplomatic offensive of this kind [continues Chamberlin] would have the effect of a thunderclap throughout eastern Europe. It would shake every Red Quisling regime from the Baltic to the Adriatic. It would be a tremendous impulse to the morale of the gallant Polish Maquis, who have already reduced the authority of the puppet government to a nullity in large areas of the country.

"Such action would be fully justified by the express wording of the compact into which we entered at Yalta. And we would really lose nothing by taking a vigorous stand. Is anyone, inside or outside the State Department, still so naive as to believe that any Communist-dominated regime anywhere can be anything but an enemy of our country?

"The idea that we can peacefully divide up the world with Russia and buy security in this hemisphere by acquiescing in the stamping out of the last sparks of liberty in eastern Europe is not only immoral, but stupidly mistaken. The Communist fifth-column offensive against America is world-wide in scope. William Lawrence, on the basis of a recent trip in South America, reports in the New York Times that Communist parties are a main channel for the dissemination of anti-American propaganda. General Marshall, just before he left China, declared that Chinese Communist propaganda (dutifully re-echoed by a corps of far-eastern fellow-travelers in this country, as the new Secretary of State might have added), 'has given plain evidence of a determined purpose to mislead the Chinese people and the world and to arouse a bitter hatred of Americans.' The more aid and comfort we can give to the forces of freedom behind the iron curtain, the less resources Moscow will possess for its propaganda offensive in other parts of the world."

Thus speaks William Henry Chamberlin out of his wealth of knowledge and personal experience. Regular listeners to these broadcasts will not be surprised when I say that I endorse every word of his proposal, because it represents the standpoint I have taken for years. Such a program officially announced and unflinchingly pursued by the American Government, in close association with what would almost certainly be parallel action on the part of the British Government, would give a world sick of totalitarian aggression and longing for truly liberal, enlightened leadership, the cue it has long awaited and which countless millions today almost agonizingly crave.

The moral imponderables would swing unerringly to our side when we at last came out unequivocally for the redemption of commitments which we have distressingly ignored or nullified in our vain quest for appeasement—vain, because the object of that false policy cannot, basically, be appeased.

Certainly, to acquiesce in or overlook the insolent challenge flung us by Warsaw and Moscow over the fake elections and attendant reign of terror in Poland would spell a diplomatic surrender of the first magnitude. After such a capitulation we should go into the negotiations over the settlement of Germany with two strikes against us.

There is only one way to insure a new and better world. That is along the path of righteousness and justice. If that path be temporarily obscured by an overgrowth of noxious obstructionism, the overgrowth must be cut away. The path itself cannot be abandoned, because there is no detour.

Squeeze in Cocoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 19, 1947:

SQUEEZE IN COCOA

The British Government Control Board, which is operating a cartel in West African cocoa beans, comprising about half of the normal world supply, has offered American cocoa dealers 20,000 tons at 25 cents a pound, plus freight. This is an advance of 6 cents a pound within a month and contrasts with a price of 15 cents a pound commanded by Brazilian cocoa last October, and an average price of slightly less than 5 cents a pound from all sources in the nine prewar years 1932–40.

Not unnaturally, American dealers feel that the British cartel is trying to gouge them and have refused to buy. One consequence is a shortage of chocolate bars.

The British Government, arguing that because of shipping difficulties private trade channels could not handle the cocoa crop, moved in and assumed control in the war year 1939–40. It bought the entire West African crop and marketed it at a fixed price of 4.4 cents a pound. In November 1944 the Government issued a white paper announcing its intention to continue wartime purchase and price controls over the West African crop after the war. The extension of controls was justified for an entirely different reason from the original plea of a shipping shortage. The Government said that control was to be maintained in order to avoid "vagaries of speculation" in world markets.

The cocoa cartel is manifesting the usual British predilection for trying to wring extortionate profits out of those who must deal with British-controlled monopoly markets. The same sort of thing that is happening now in cocoa happened in rubber in 1925, when the British and Dutch international combine put the price up to well above a dollar, trebling it from the previous profitable base price within a very short time.

America, as the principal rubber consumer, was the designated victim of this gouge, but the users here, under the leadership of Mr. Hoover, resisted the cartel by withholding orders and engaging in wide-scale reclamation of used rubber. This eventually brought the price down within reason. The cocoa and chocolate industry can expect no help from the administration, and particularly the State Department, which goes on burbling that foreign loans and tariff concessions are all that are necessary to stimulate manufactures and trade in raw commodities.

The Development of the Colorado River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, one of the major problems before the West today is that of the use of the waters of the Colorado River. Everyone of the seven States of the river basin—Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, and California—is vitally concerned with the use of these waters. To a greater degree than in any other major river basin in the United States, the lands of the Colorado River Basin are arid.

The Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior has prepared a great report on the Colorado River Basin. This report should be on the must-read list of all students of the West.

An able discussion of the situation presently confronting the Colorado River Basin was made by the Honorable William E. Warne, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the National Reclamation Association at Omaha, Nebr., last October 11.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Mr. Warne be printed in the RECORD.

I am informed by the Government Printing Office that the manuscript of the address will, it is estimated, make about three and one-quarter printed pages of the RECORD, and will cost $195.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I have never had an assignment that I appreciated more than this one to discuss with the National Reclamation Association a plan for the development of the Colorado River Basin. If you will pardon a brief personal reference, I shall tell you why.

Almost since I can remember, the great, arid basin of the Colorado has been home to me. I was reared on an irrigated farm in the Imperial Valley of California.

I recall dog days when the ditches were empty and we, long past worrying about the dried-up alfalfa, anxiously hoarded water for the cows lest the ponds themselves go dry. And I remember springs when the water ran thick with red mud and we were afraid that the river again would turn in upon us as it did in 1905.

As a young man, I learned more of these droughts and floods. I saw the great river so low because of drought that I could have waded across it near Yuma almost without wetting my knees. Another year I stood on the levees in Mexico with dirty flood waters lapping almost at my feet. One hundred thousand people in the towns and on the farms stretching to the Salton Sea had only those few inches between them and disaster.

The history made by the explorers, the irrigationists, and the engineers who tried to conquer the Colorado has interested me ever since the night I attended my first public meeting at the Alamo country schoolhouse. There I heard the late Mark Rose of Holtville, Calif., explain to my father and other men of the farm bureau how the construction of a great dam in Boulder Canyon would remove our danger. More than 20 years later, I joined the staff of the Bureau of Reclamation in time to take a small part in the completion of Boulder Dam, so long the hope, and now the salvation of my old neighbors.

The people of the Imperial Valley and those of other areas along the lower river no longer are terrorized by the Colorado. Floods are caught in Lake Mead and the effects of droughts are eliminated by releases through Boulder Dam. The lower Colorado is in harness. The main stem, itself, is under complete control, and plans are under consideration for dams to control the two bad-acting downstream tributaries, the Gila and Bill Williams Rivers.

This life-long connection with the Colorado River Basin makes me proud now to have a part in preparing a plan for the second stage of the development of the river.

History tells us that in 1539 and 1540 Francisco de Ulloa and Hernando de Alarcon sailed up the Gulf of California and proved that California was not an island. They found a great river where a strait was expected.

This river was not friendly as were so many other American rivers. Instead of providing a highway for explorers, trappers, and emigrants to use in entering the country, the Colorado at many places proved an impassable barrier. Its canyons were the high-water mark of the northward march of the Spanish Dons and Padres. None knew where the river went after it entered the upper canyons. None knew whence the river came as it reached the delta. Some old maps show two or more rivers in its place.

For many decades the river was named and renamed. Various sections of it were given different names. For a while, it was called the Firebrand River, and over another stretch of years it was the River of the Martyrs. Not until our generation did it become known as the Colorado River from its source at Grand Lake all the way down to the sea.

Since the Colorado was so difficult, it does not surprise us to find that the explorers, trappers and early emigrants took a dim view of this river. Lt. J. C. Ives in 1857, three centuries after discovery of the river, in summing up for them, said:

"The region last explored is, of course, altogether valueless. It can be approached only from the south, and after entering it, there is nothing to do but leave. Ours was the first, and doubtless will be the last, party of whites to visit this profitless locality. It seems intended by nature that the Colorado River along the greater portion of its lone and majestic way shall be forever unvisited and unmolested."

Yes, less than 100 years ago Lieutenant Ives, the head of an expedition sent by our Government, rendered that verdict on the first 300 years of acquaintance with the Colorado River. He wrote the paragraphs as he turned back in his steel, paddle-wheel boat, *The Explorer*, having reached almost the exact spot where Boulder Dam today stands. One of Lieutenant Ives' sketches of the profitless locality in his report looks very much like the actual site of the dam.

The captain of *The Explorer* could not foresee that in less than 100 years the hydroelectric energy that could be taken from the river at the rapids that turned back his boat would make the building of Boulder Dam profitable. I want to remind you of Lieutenant Ives' verdict, a little later, as we attempt to look ahead for another century or so in the Colorado River Basin.

The Mormons in the upper tributaries and Dr. Oliver M. Wozencraft on the lower river found in irrigation the key to unlock the wealth of the basin. The Mormons in 1847 had to use the waters of Utah in order to exist in their newly chosen homeland. They were soon establishing irrigation colonies along many of the streams that joined to make up the Colorado.

Dr. Wozencraft reached Fort Yuma on his way to California during the gold rush. He heard talk of a plan to cut the west bank of the Colorado River to fill up the Salton sink. The object of this plan was to make it possible to travel by boat across the terrible desert of this below-sea-level valley.

Dr. Wozencraft saw, however, that if the river could be diverted simply to inundate a great valley it could be diverted to irrigate the dry alluvial soil that formed the wide floor of that valley. Several decades later, Charles R. Rockwood and others developed the Imperial Valley by carrying out the Wozencraft plan.

Men, since these beginnings, have worked diligently to devise and promote plans to use the Colorado River.

There is no area in the United States where the use of the waters of a river is more important. The Colorado River drains 242,000 square miles in the United States. Its basin makes up one-twelfth of the land area of continental United States. The basin is arid or semiarid throughout except at very high altitudes. I have traveled from the tundra where the Colorado rises at the tops of the Rockies 1,400 miles to the sandy waste where the tidal bore enters the delta, and each of the areas of the basin is short of rainfall. Some are dry all the year, as is the case of the Imperial Valley where my teacher once dismissed the class so that we could go out and run in the rain. It was the only storm we had that year. Other areas of the basin are dry only during certain seasons. But this basin is and for ages has been dry. The magnificent canyons that set the Colorado River apart from among all of the rivers of the world were carved by a great river that ran through the land. That is why the canyon walls rises spectacularly to 6,000 feet. If the Colorado River had been made great by waters that ran off the land, the walls probably would have been shaped by the falling and flowing water into smooth, round hills long before this.

From the time of the cliff dwellers right on down to today, men who have chosen to live in the Colorado River Basin have had to irrigate land to provide food for themselves. Our irrigation methods have improved over those of the prehistoric Indian who carried the water to his corn hills in an ollas on his head, but in the Colorado River Basin men have irrigated the land or moved on. Red men or white men, pagan or Christian, Mormon or Catholic, Spanish, Mexican, or American, irrigated the land or got out.

In the future, also, we will find that the number of Americans who can live in the Colorado River Basin will have a direct relationship with the amount of water used there for irrigation.

In 1869, the new attitude that the Colorado River must be used was held by Maj. John Wesley Powell, when he headed the first successful exploration of the canyon sections of the river. The names of others who made important studies of the river, C. H. Birdseye, A. P. Davis, F. E. Weymouth, Walker E. Young, E. C. LaRue, come to mind, but there was none more colorful than the one-armed Civil War veteran who sat in a chair bolted to the deck of a boat as he ran the rapids of the river. Major Powell lived to preach water conservation and to influence the making of the reclamation law that has been so beneficial in the development of the Colorado River.

The Colorado River was too big a problem for one man, or agency, or State to handle alone. Cooperation was required among all interests to achieve the results these studies foretold.

By 1920 the governors of the seven States of the basin were organizing meetings to plan joint action. In that year, at one of the meetings, Delph E. Carpenter, of Colorado, made the novel proposal that Wyoming,

Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, California, and Arizona, all being sovereign States, exercise the treaty-making powers reserved in the Federal Constitution as a means of cementing an agreement on the interstate division of the waters of the Colorado River.

Carpenter's key of complete cooperation unlocked the puzzle that the interstate character of the river presented. In Santa Fe on November 24, 1922, the Colorado River compact was completed. This then unique interstate treaty divided the waters of the Colorado River system between the upper and the lower basins at Lee Ferry by providing that each basin could have the beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually, that the lower basin could increase its beneficial consumptive use of such water by 1,000,000 acre-feet of water annually, and that the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming will not deplete the flow of the river at Lee Ferry below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet during any period of 10 consecutive years. This compact has been scrutinized microscopically and there are many opinions concerning some of its provisions. But the compact has borne as fruit the Boulder Canyon project and the entire first stage of development of the Colorado River. I am sure that its makers consider themselves more than amply rewarded by these results.

Made possible by the compact was the construction of Boulder, Davis, Parker, and Imperial Dams, of the All-American Canal, the Colorado River aqueduct serving southern California cities, and of new irrigation projects such as the Gila and the Colorado-Big Thompson.

Among other results of the compact was legislation authorizing and directing the Bureau of Reclamation to make studies and prepare a comprehensive plan for further development of the Colorado River Basin. A few months ago, after years of work in close cooperation with the States and other agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation presented to Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug a comprehensive report on the development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin for irrigation, power production, and other beneficial uses. This is the book. Those of you who want copies may obtain them on the table outside the door after the meeting this morning.

Take stock with me for a moment of what this report discloses, for we are now at the point of considering the plan for devising the second stage of development of the basin. The report shows that not quite half of the water of the Colorado River is used now. It shows that there are 134 potential projects within the basin that are worthy of consideration at this time in connection with the second stage of development. Of these projects 100 are in the upper basin, where the lesser development occurred during the first stage. The 134 projects would irrigate 2,656,230 acres of land that are now dry or inadequately watered, 1,734,980 above Lee Ferry and 921,250 below. Of this total 1,533,960 acres would be lands not heretofore cultivated at all. The report further shows that, in addition, 500,000 acre-feet of water have been allowed for irrigation of upland pastures for use in connection with grazing, both in national forests and on other public lands. The report shows that 38 hydroelectric power plants with a total installed capacity of more than 3,500,000 kilowatts are possible as a part of the development program. The report notes opportunities usefully to divert water for use in other adjacent basins. The report reemphasizes the fact, however, that there are more opportunities to use waters of the great Colorado Basin than can be supplied by the reliable annual water yield of the Colorado River.

This again brings the entire basin squarely face to face with the problem that confronted the seven States back in 1920. Further cooperation is required or development is likely to be suspended for 10 or 20 years if it is not permanently stopped at this point. The question is: What water will be used where in the further development of the Colorado River Basin? This time, however, there are guideposts to aid in the working out of a mutual program, and the task should be easier. As guides there are the Colorado River compact and the Mexican Water Treaty that was ratified in 1945. These set the amounts of water required for delivery at two critical points, Lee Ferry, the dividing point of the upper and the lower basins and the Mexican border, below which the river is out of the reach and jurisdiction of the United States. This treaty, which provides that Mexico shall acquire no right to the waters of the river in excess of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water a year, serves to remove a major uncertainty that previously had faced those who were at work developing the basin; namely, the limit of Mexico's right. This had to be done before the division and use of waters on the United States' side safely could be carried much further. Another advantage we have today is that we have a tried and proven method of negotiating and confirming interstate water agreements.

The Secretary of the Interior, acting through Reclamation Commissioner Michael W. Straus and in accordance with the recommendation of Regional Directors E. O. Larson and E. A. Moritz, joint authors of the comprehensive report, has asked the basin States to determine their respective rights to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact. He has asked also for the recommendations of the seven States for construction of projects in the next stage of development, the stream-flow depletions of which will assuredly fall within the ultimate allocations of the water which may be made to the individual States. Secretary Krug had thus to turn to the States. The reclamation law now provides and always has provided that we shall proceed in conformity with State laws regarding water rights. Thus, when we are faced with potential demand in the Colorado River Basin exceeding the water supply, we must turn to the States for the exercise of their responsibilities to tell us what their water rights consist of. The Flood Control Act of 1944 requires that reclamation plans be laid before the affected States in order that they may comment to us and through us to the Congress on the soundness and desirability of the works and schemes proposed.

The challenge to cooperate and to proceed with the development of the Colorado Basin was quickly accepted.

Governors Hunt, of Wyoming, Vivian, of Colorado, Maw, of Utah, and Dempsey, of New Mexico, met in Cheyenne July 22 with Federal Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, representing President Truman, to organize for negotiation of a compact regarding the waters of the upper basin. Arizona, which has some interests in the upper basin, was represented. Several meetings have since been held of the Compact Commission and its engineering committee. Conscientious men are earnestly at work and I have every confidence they will be able to eliminate perhaps the biggest uncertainty in the basin today, namely, the question as to how the upper-basin waters are to be divided.

The old Committee of Sixteen, having two representatives from each basin State and two of the power allottees at Boulder Dam, has been succeeded by the Colorado River Basin States Committee. This group, or at least a large part of it, has met and will continue to meet, I understand, in the interests of promoting a mutual plan for the development of the entire Colorado River Basin. Other groups are similarly engaged. The Bureau of Reclamation is working with all of these groups with the avowed purpose of aiding and assisting in the development of the specifics of a plan for the second stage of development of the basin.

The governor of each of the seven States has assigned to responsible men of his staff, in addition, the task of reviewing and commenting on the comprehensive report. Because of the size and scope of the report, we will withhold it from submission to the Congress 90 days longer than we are required to withhold it under the law so that the States will have more time for review and comment.

The stakes for which all are playing in this game of get-together are extremely high. If there is developed a mutually agreeable plan as a result of the work now under way in the States, a plan that might well involve the construction of a billion dollars or more of projects for irrigation, power, river regulation, and related purposes, I believe that the plan can be justified before the American people, authorized for construction as the second stage, and financed by the Congress. In this event the projects could be constructed in the near future and put to use. This second stage that I visualize will occupy the construction forces for perhaps another 15 years, as the first stage has occupied the construction forces for the past 15 years, but it will not exhaust either the water or the possibilities of the Colorado River Basin.

No, the development of the Colorado River Basin to the point at which the last drop of water that can be provided will be put to beneficial use is 100 years away and perhaps much farther. Please keep that firmly in mind. There will be unused water in the Colorado River to waste into the sea for perhaps another century, long after any sensible and justifiable second stage of development is completed and put to use.

At this moment the principal danger in the Colorado River situation is that the fine tradition of agreement and mutual effort that has served the seven basin States so well in the past may be abandoned because of fear. Some who are interested in developments that have already been made fear that water they hope to use may be committed elsewhere in the second stage of development. I consider this fear wholly groundless. The second stage of development cannot and, in my opinion, should not be a 100-year plan, as it would have to be to necessitate a decision now on the question of where to use the last drop of water that can be made available in the Colorado Basin to its seven States. We should not create obstacles to our present progress by borrowing troubles from the future, troubles that I believe will prove to have been imaginary. The second stage should be a 10- or a 15- or at most a 20-year program that can be completed with comfortable water margins around all edges.

There are no seers who can peer 100 years into the future. Therefore, none can lay out a plan today that would be considered satisfactory in the year 2046. Our long-range plans are not strait-jackets. They are useful in providing general guides and limits when they reach beyond one or at most two decades. The best we can hope to do today is to lay out a line of action in connection with the development of a great river basin that will hold for 10, 15, or 20 years, and to revise our long-range plans at 10-year intervals to meet ever-changing conditions.

Suppose, for example, we successors of Lieutenant Ives in the Colorado River Basin had found ourselves bound for 100 years by his plan for the Colorado River. Remember, he said in 1857 that no one would ever visit the canyon section of the river again. But 73 years later we were constructing the world's greatest dam at the spot on which he made his dismal and myopic forecast. If we had not reserved and exercised the right to revise Lieutenant Ives' long-range plan for the Colorado River, we would still have 11 years

to sit out to complete a century of inactivity.

Instead, the pioneers introduced and expanded irrigation—were beginning to, in fact, when Lieutenant Ives made his voyage. This development and improved techniques in transmitting electric energy made Boulder and other great dams in the river both necessary and practical.

Every State and every locality of the Colorado River Basin will reap rich rewards and the entire Nation will benefit from a sound second stage of development. Los Angeles and southern California generally need power that the second stage will make available in the lower river. Southern Nevada and Arizona need part of the power, as well. The Imperial, Yuma, Coachella and Palo Verde Valleys need the long-range protection that the great main stream regulating reservoirs will provide. This regulation will be helpful also in meeting national responsibilities assumed in connection with the administration of the Mexican Water Treaty. Developed areas in Arizona require supplemental water to stave off sharp curtailment of growth and production. The metropolitan areas of Salt Lake City and Denver need plentiful low-cost hydroelectric power, and they, too, must have the support of supplemental water diversions from the Colorado River. New Mexico and Wyoming and the other upper basin States are critically in need of further irrigation development within the basin. To demonstrate how acute this requirement for new irrigation and industrial development is, let me cite the fact that in 1940 the density of population within the Colorado River Basin was but 3.6 per square mile, less than one-tenth of the national average of 44.2.

New wealth and activity of extreme importance is possible through the application of a part of the great reservoir of hydroelectric energy to the development of the latent mineral resources of the basin. Utah and Colorado are the leading domestic sources of vanadium, uranium, radium, and molybdenum. Precious metals, copper, natural gas and oil, and one-fourth of the Nation's bituminous and sub-bituminous-coal reserves are found in the basin. Great beds of thinly covered phosphate rock center around the corner common to Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado; the foundation of a future fertilizer industry of mammoth size. Take a look at southern Nevada. It will be instructive. Because Boulder Dam provided a source of plentiful, cheap power, a great electrometallurgical industry grew up near Las Vegas during the war. It was a war baby, but while the magnesium plant is not making magnesium now, there are half a dozen smaller, new industries occupying the buildings and there is a great scramble for a power supply to make possible the entrance of more into the field. Parenthetically, let me say that this is not an isolated instance, for nearly 100 percent of the power that we installed for war has been picked up already by industry. However, if sufficient low-cost power can be made available soon enough, the transition from war activity to a wholly new postwar economy will be made comparatively painlessly and southern Nevada will be permanently benefited. Let other areas take heed. Let the Nation take heed, too, of its need to prosecute plans for the orderly development of these latent resources for future prosperity and security.

The Colorado River is but half utilized. Therefore, it makes no sense to say, whether you are a Californian, as I am, or a resident of any other of the seven States, that we must stop building in order to protect what has been done in the first stage. The people of the lower basin were the first to reject completely the philosophy of Lieutenant Ives. They believed that something constructive should be done with the Colorado River. By their demonstrated need and their dogged perseverance they won the support of nearly the whole basin for Boulder Dam. They obtained, in consequence, the immense first-stage benefits for the basin as a whole. The second stage of development, I feel sure, will merit the support of all of those who fought the good fight for the control and use of the first half of the waters of the river.

The second stage will place other great dams in the main stem, stretch high-voltage lines over other deserts to additional cities, bring water through diversion tunnels, aqueducts, and through canals to found and support cities, and to create and sustain great new farming areas.

Yes, there is mutual need for further development of the Colorado River from one end of the basin to the other, and therefore, logically there should be a mutual purpose among the seven States. All the residents of every section of the seven States will be benefited. Whether or not they realize it, they have a personal interest and stake in the success of the cooperative efforts now under way. Those who lived in fear of drought and flood and won their long fight for security with the aid of their basin neighbors, must now come to the assistance of their earlier benefactors and help the second stage to materialize.

Some who agree that a logical second stage could hold no dangers for any water user who has benefited from the first stage, say in sincere perplexity:

"Yes; but what will be the solutions of these problems that are 100 years or so in the future? May not suffering be introduced when the time comes to divide the last drop of water in the river?"

At the very outset of the atomic age, who knows what wholly unbelievable answers to these problems may be possible 100 years hence? The electric age, in which we all live so familiarly today, answered Lieutenant Ives' problem of the "profitless locality" completely in much less than 100 years.

However, the answer to the 100-year problem does not have to be left to atomic energy. It is perfectly possible to bring new water into southern California and the Colorado River Basin from the surpluses of other and more distant streams. Yes; it would be costly by present standards. But it may become entirely practicable by future standards. And some other basins within reach will have surplus waters in the future, as now.

Is it fantastic to think of such an answer to the 100-year problem of the Colorado River? I do not think so. Already surplus waters from the Sacramento are being transferred by the Central Valley project of California to the San Joaquin Basin, which will effect a shift, when the project is completed, of 500 miles southward of a water supply from Mount Shasta to below Bakersfield. Feasible means of bringing surplus water from the Trinity or the Klamath Rivers into the Sacramento Valley could now be devised, if it were warranted. And since the Colorado River aqueduct was completed and is now being extended to San Diego, nearly 300 miles from the Colorado River over deserts and high rugged mountains, who will say that an aqueduct from the San Joaquin Valley through the Tehachapis to southern California is impossible if and when surplus waters are brought that far south? By exchange among power plants it is possible to operate great power systems much more extensive than it would be practical to operate by transmitting power from a single source. What thinking man can say the eventual transportation, by exchange or otherwise, of surplus waters great distances is impossible and may not become practical and within the range of financial feasibility in much less than 100 years?

I believe it is not too early to begin the long preliminaries that must precede the completion of any such magnificent plan. The Congress would do well to authorize and direct the Bureau of Reclamation to start the preliminary engineering work in a small way without delay.

For fear of misinterpretation, however, let me state perfectly plainly that the second stage of development of the Colorado River Basin need not be tied to the importation of water to the Colorado River Basin from any outside stream. So long as in excess of half of the flow of the Colorado River is unused, the straits are certainly not that dire. No State at the present is utilizing the minimum firm allocation of water that was made by or to it. No State or locality is hurt by projects that are built now. And no State is about to be hurt by any pending specific proposal. California, the largest water user among the seven States, last year diverted only about 3,500,000 acre-feet, materially less than the 4,400,000 acre-feet of firm (III-A) water to which she has limited herself.

I have a recollection that the Supreme Court said in the Boulder Dam case something like this, if I may be permitted a nonlegal paraphrase of its opinion: "A vague fear that eventually there may be a shortage of water in the river does not provide cause for legal action which might halt development now."

The Colorado River already has been placed in harness by the process of the States of the basin and the Federal Government cooperating to eliminate the hazards of flood and drought along the lower river and to bring the positive benefits of irrigation and cheap power over wider areas. We have the plan and the skill to carry that development a long and profitable second step forward. Cooperation and the dedication of all interests to the mutual purpose are required to get it done. There is no real danger in letting the distant future contend with some of the ultimate problems, especially since we have begun to see practical solutions for them today.

The Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation stand ready to assist any and all interests in the Colorado River Basin to compose differences and arrive at a mutual plan for the second stage of development. We think that this second stage of the development of the Colorado River Basin should start from the year 1946.

Jewry's Role in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Truman Shares Pride in United States Jewry's Role in World War II"; an address entitled "Our War Record," delivered by Louis I. Dublin; and an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, at a dinner given by the National Jewish Welfare Board at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on January 9, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement and addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN SHARES PRIDE IN UNITED STATES JEWRY'S ROLE IN WORLD WAR II

President Harry S. Truman sent his greetings and best wishes to the dinner audience

at the National Jewish Welfare Board's war records meeting at the Waldorf Astoria last night, through Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey, principal speaker at the event.

"The President is deeply aware of the contributions made by the National Jewish Welfare Board," General Hershey said. "I know that he shares the pride of all Americans in the history of the American Jewish community's achievement—a history now made available by the Bureau of War Records to us and to posterity."

OUR WAR RECORD

(By Louis I. Dublin, Ph. D.)

I share with all of you here tonight great pride in the service to our country of more than half a million Jewish men and women in the fight for human liberty and decency. The quality of this service has been high and some of the best examples of it are here tonight in the persons of the ex-service men who are our honored guests. Tonight we also celebrate the successful completion of a major undertaking in connection with the service of our half million men and women. Like every other group in the country, we are greatly interested in our achievement. We want the cold, hard facts of our participation in the war. Now we have them and we have a glorious story to tell.

A great deal of effort—of time and money—went into this undertaking. If ours were a well-ordered world, it would hardly have been necessary to have put so much effort into it. But, as you will remember, the circumstances of the war period and of the events leading up to it were anything but the orderly circumstances of an orderly world. This period was characterized by vicious and venomous attacks against minority groups. It was the day of the colossal lie; the bigger, the better. The chief victims of this type of attack were the Jews. Worst of all, some American citizens engaged in this dirty work. We, therefore, were compelled to do this job of completing our record as it never was done before. We knew we had to put our heart into it and to produce a record that would convince through its reliability and completeness even those who would malign us.

The credit goes to Frank Weil, who even before we entered into the war, had the foresight to arrange to meet the inevitable charges regarding the military service of Jews. In the early fall of 1941 he asked me if I would direct a committee to compile the facts on Jewish participation in the forthcoming military effort. He made only one condition, and that was that the work be done with the greatest accuracy and with the best technical skill. I would not have taken the assignment on any other basis. Mr. Weil and others will tell you later the developments of this war-records project. I do want, however, at this point to thank Mr. Weil for the opportunity he gave me and my colleagues to serve the Jewish Welfare Board in this important task, and also to thank his fellow officers and the executives of the Jewish Welfare Board for their unflagging and wholehearted interest and support of our project.

The assembling and analysis of the great mass of war records was a long and hard job. In the nature of the case, the whole effort had to be decentralized. But we had to keep in touch with virtually every Jewish community in the country and help them organize their record system. Think of the accomplishment. We have in the files at the board not only a huge number of service records, but also the records of nearly 40,000 casualties, including 11,000 of our honored dead. We have the facts on the 27,000 men and women whose deeds of valor and merit were so outstanding as to receive recognition—and their awards total 50,000. And remember—these are all carefully authenticated records. We did not accept rumor or hearsay. We have spared no pains to make sure that everything that went into the files was accurate. We have leaned over backward in order that no one could say, at any time, that we were making wild guesses or inflating figures to make them appear that Jews were doing more than their share of the fighting and dying. We resisted efforts from some quarters, even friendly ones, to issue figures that would give this appearance. The same thoroughness and care was applied to every aspect of our work, including the many surveys and sampling studies on the number of Jews in service in various communities. We have tried our utmost, and I am sure we have succeeded in giving to the American people as a whole and to American Jews an honest and reliable record of the military services of Americans of Jewish faith during World War II.

The planning and the work of assembling the records was anything but a one-man job. Many distinguished and able statisticians and social scientists served on our technical committees. So that you may know the high caliber of the group, let me read their names to you: Harry L. Lurie, vice chairman; Prof. Salo W. Baron, Elisha M. Friedman, William B. Herlands, Dr. Maurice B. Hexter, Leffert Holz, Prof. Daniel Katz, Dr. Isador Lubin, Dr. Julius B. Maller, Herbert H. Marks, Prof. Otto Nathan, Dr. Morton Seidenfeld, Dr. Maurice Taylor, Dr. Joseph Zubin.

These men have given generously of their time and skill to help plan and guide this great work. There were many technical problems to solve and they helped. We profited from their resourcefulness and from their good judgment. I take this opportunity to thank them all.

But the ultimate success of the job depended very largely on professional leadership and guidance. At the beginning, Mr. Samuel Leff was extremely useful in getting us organized. Later, when we could gage the situation better, we recognized the need to put the responsibility for the work in the hands of a person who had not only thorough training and large experience in statistical studies but also in community organization among American Jews. This is a rare combination indeed. There was one man for the job and that was Sam Kohs. It was our good fortune that we got him.

Mr. Kohs' background and qualifications made him the ideal person for our difficult task. Early in his professional career Dr. Kohs was a psychologist, and as an essential part of his preparation he had a thorough grounding in statistics and statistical methods. From a teaching career in psychology, Kohs was called into Jewish community work and served in many phases of that work. He was, for a long time, director of the Department of Social Technology in the Graduate School of Jewish Social Work in New York City. He next developed and directed the resettlement program of the National Refugee Service. In 1941, just before taking over the directorship of the Bureau of War Records, he was engaged by the Jewish Welfare Board as its field secretary for the western States. Thus, Kohs knew Jewish communities all over the country, to what extent they were organized and who were their leaders, both lay and professional. He knew to whom he should go in any particular place and what he could expect. He had administrative experience and capacity and technical knowledge as well. He saw the importance of the war records in all its implications. He tackled it with enthusiasm, energy, and resourcefulness. He assembled an efficient and loyal staff. He has never spared himself in his desire to bring this work to a successful conclusion. To him, above all, belongs the credit for what we have accomplished. He deserves the everlasting gratitude of our country and our people for the success of this historic undertaking.

Time permits me to mention only a few of the many individuals who have given vital assistance to us. I must, however, mention the splendid work of Mr. Leffert Holz, who traveled up and down the land doing missionary work for war records and helped to organize many of our regional, State, and local units. Gathering war records was not the most glamorous job of all the wartime activities of the Jewish Welfare Board, but, as a layman talking to lay leaders, Mr. Holz was able to carry his conviction to responsible community leaders to get the necessary local backing for the work.

New York City was, of course, our major problem. This city has never really been well organized for any single Jewish cause let alone for a task of this kind, which was without glory to anyone and yet required long and sustained effort. Fortunately, we are not lacking in courageous and self-sacrificing citizens. Jacob Bleibtreu is one of them. He knew the difficulties of tackling the job of New York, and he was not frightened by them. He has carried the responsibility for getting a war records program into operation in New York City, and I take this opportunity to express our thanks for his efforts and accomplishment.

With the enormous mass of records that we accumulated, the board was faced with the problem of how these records, which were in constant use, could be tapped as needed to provide current reports on the numbers of casualties and awards as well as listings of the names of casualties. To those of us who are used to these problems, the answer is simple. It is a job for tabulation by modern mechanical methods. Everyone has heard of modern tabulating machinery. For the occasional needs of the bureau of war records, it was inadvisable to install the expensive machinery and the personnel required to run it. We knew that the International Business Machines Co. had a service to do such jobs for outside organizations, and we went there with our problem. What we did not know was that that great organization was willing and anxious to help us out without any cost whatsoever to the board. For the committee and the board, I want to thank Mr. Thomas J. Watson, who comes pretty near being New York's best citizen, and Mr. Jarvis Bell, of the International Business Machines Co., for giving us this vital help not only freely but with the utmost promptness and courtesy. Thanks to them, the efficiency of our operations was increased and valuable information was available for use in short order.

Thus, in celebrating the completion of our project, we pay our tribute to the many people who made it possible. To you and to them, I would emphasize again and again that what we have produced is not a thing for the moment but something of permanent value to the country and to the Jewish people. As so often happens also, the by-products of this work should prove as valuable as the product itself. For in gathering this information, we have had to organize all over the country for a common purpose. We have discovered leaders and abilities all over the country. We have learned how to work together on the national as well as on the local level. I hope that this has created bonds and disclosed skilled resources for other efforts within Jewish communities that will work to their benefit and that of our fellow citizens.

Tonight I am proud of our people—proud of their war service, proud of their proven leaders to whom we can look to help meet the problems that are ahead!

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. LEWIS B. HERSHEY, DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

We meet tonight to note the successful completion of a most worthwhile task by

the bureau of war records of the National Jewish Welfare Board. We were at war when this task was begun. America was putting forth every ounce of her energy to prevent defeat until she could mobilize her men and her resources so that she might win. There was no complacency then. There was no certainty of victory. The road ahead was difficult, uphill, and uncertain. The National Jewish Welfare Board found their program of service to Jewish men and women in the armed forces increasing hourly. There had been few in the forces in 1940, but war had brought thousands of inductions; eventually the number was to reach 600,000.

It was fortunate indeed that this great organization had the habit of successful achievement. The National Jewish Welfare Board had experienced more than 30 years in programs for the welfare of Jewish men and women. We who are ancient enough to have been in World War I remembered this organization in that war. We saw its work at home, we saw it in France.

In the days when the bureau of war records was preparing the ground work for its great task the program of the parent organization was following the American forces in their global deployment.

In every branch of our armed forces and in every theater of our world-wide battlefields there were Jewish men and women meeting their responsibilities as American citizens. These men and women, as they served, as they fought, as they bled, and as they died, made the records that it has been the high privilege of this bureau to record with such accuracy and thoroughness. These records are typical of America's participation in World War II, and the JWB is publishing a two-volume set of books based on the bureau's material, to be called: "American Jews in World War II." The bureau's files offer a very large sample study, for there is one from each group of 25 members of our armed forces. Some of these men fought above the clouds, others fought beneath the seas. Some waded ashore in Normandy in the Army Ground Forces, others as marines fought for coral beaches on faraway islands in the Pacific. In these lists are the names of doctors, dentists, scientists, and technicians. On these rolls is the name of a man who died leading the division he commanded; above and below his name on the list are privates first class who gave their lives fighting for America. In these records are the names of many who served their country well and have returned to carry on the less glorious but no less necessary responsibilities of American citizenship. Among these names are others whose bodies must ever bear the scars of battle. Battles waged that the most of us in America might be spared the terrifying experiences that have come to so many on this earth during the last decade.

In this list are those who gave their lives in the services of their country. These contributions should never be forgotten by a grateful America. I wonder, have they? When our existence hung in balance and we were afraid, we saw no other alternative but that our young men must serve, must fight, must die if necessary, to save us all. Those were dangerous times. We saw our young men go, to be gone we know not how long, to face hardship, privation, perhaps death. We said then we would never forget the part they played. The fighting war has been over for more than a year. How much are we willing to sacrifice now—today to hold the peace they gave so much to win? Is it America or only scattered unrepresentative voices that cry today that we must not interfere with home, education, or an easy life, even for a few months, in order that another young America might be prepared to prevent World War III?

We are proud when we read the record of achievement of these men and women. We are proud that in her hour of trial our Nation had young men and young women of the ability, fortitude, and loyalty that these records display. Our pride is not primarily in the fact that these men and women who played so well their part were Jewish. Our pride lies primarily in the fact that they were a typical cross-section of the men and women of America in a national emergency. Our pride is in the fact that in the days of war they played their part not as Jewish men and women but as Americans. The crisis which brought them into the armed forces was a danger to America. They fought to save America for no particular kind of Americans but for all Americans. That was the spirit in war. That must be the spirit in peace.

In victory there is great satisfaction. When we win, we are so relieved that complacency comes easily. When success comes, we forget how near we came to failure. Unless we are wise we shall fail to learn as much from success as many have learned from defeat. It is so easy, so pleasant, to breathe more freely once the danger seems to be passed. It takes energy, will power, perseverance, to work to keep the peace, even as it took all of these to gain the peace. I should be the last to deny any American the right to feel the greatest pride in the accomplishments of his Nation during the past 6 years. The achievements of the combined efforts of all of its people were little short of miraculous. The strength she was able to build after war was upon her proved the power of a free people once they are aroused. The unity that danger engendered indicates what a people can do when they have a common objective to which they are all irrevocably committed. We proved in war that as a people we know how to win wars once we are committed to battle and provided we have allies who can help us avoid defeat until we are prepared to gain victory. It required 2 or 3 years, but eventually we developed our resources of manpower and materials until they were trained fighting men, equipped with a wealth of munitions unlike any that our enemies or allies could provide. We became strong enough to make our enemies sue for peace after several years of war. No one can say but it is very doubtful that we should have been forced into the war if our enemies had known first that we would fight and secondly that we could fight with the effectiveness that we did. Our problem is to find a way to let the world know for what we will fight and to take such measures as will insure a reasonable chance that all can understand our capacity to fight when and if we must.

Certainly every nation and every citizen of every nation should desire peace. The test comes when we decide what we value more than we value peace. In the past 30 years in the United States the citizens have not been clear in their minds for what they would fight and for what they would not fight.

If the citizens of America were uncertain as to the things for which they would fight if the necessity arose, should we have been surprised that nations came to believe that we would not and could not fight? Yes, America has always prided herself on the fact that she is peace loving. Is she willing to give up her political freedom to maintain the peace? Is she willing to give up her religious freedom to maintain the peace? Is she willing to give up her economic freedom to maintain the peace? If the answer to these questions is no, and from her history I must assume that it is no, then what do we mean when we claim to be peace loving?

May I assume that we want peace if we can have it and retain our individual right to participate in our Government. We want the right to vote. The right to debate. The right to disagree, generally, when our party is out of power and often when it is in power.

May I assume that we want peace if we may have it and with it the right to worship as we please or not to worship if we choose. The right to preach. The right not to listen. The right to attend church and the right to stay away.

May I assume that we want peace if we may have it and still retain our standard of living. We want the right to belong to a labor union or the National Association of Manufacturers and that the members of each shall determine the policies of each and that you and I as citizens of these United States can disagree wholeheartedly with the policies of both.

So as we pause tonight to commemorate the contributions of the Jewish men and women in accepting their individual responsibilities and liabilities as American citizens in our armed forces during World War II, let us pledge ourselves to maintain the Nation for whose safety they offered their lives. By strength they won the war and saved the Nation. Without strength we shall not keep the peace they won.

President Truman voiced his concern for the future on December 20, 1946, in his informal remarks to his Advisory Commission on Universal Training when he said:

"I have been somewhat of a student of history, and I have discovered that great republics of the past always passed out when their peoples became prosperous and fat and lazy, and were not willing to assume their responsibilities.

"In other words, when the Romans and the Greeks and some of the ancient Mesopotamian countries turned to mercenary defense forces, they ended. That is, when the people of a nation would not do the necessary service to continue their government, it ended eventually in one way or another. That has been true of modern nations also."

If our Nation is to be strong, then each citizen must be willing and able to take his full share in the liabilities as well as the privileges of citizenship. This means that he works at the duties of citizenship and is ready and trained to fight to maintain his Nation if the necessity arises. The citizen's responsibilities in a democracy are great; unless he accepts them democracy cannot live. His primary interest must ever be in the United States of America. His interest or his sympathies in other nations or peoples must be secondary and operative only when they do not interfere with his obligations as an American citizen.

In conclusion, the significance that must not be lost is that it was as American citizens that the Jewish men and women in these records served, fought, and died that this Nation might live.

Industrial Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Dr. Thomas H. Howells and appearing in the Daily Camera, of Boulder, Colo., Saturday, December 14, 1946, dealing with industry-labor relations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PERMANENT REMEDY FOR STRIKES?

(By Thomas H. Howells)

A stand-by rationing system for every person in the country, roughly, similar to the one used during the war, should be provided by legislative action. Its purpose would be to punish strikers, however, rather than to save food; therefore, the old plan should be modified for the sake of simplicity and workability.

Books of coupons should be issued to each person, bearing ration points in the same denomination as money. On governmental order, buyers would be required to furnish the same value in ration points as money, whenever goods (i. e., food, electricity, gasoline) are purchased. A sufficient number of points should be given each person to provide adequately for (but not in excess of) his needs. Ration points would, of course, not be required for purchases until an emergency arose and an Executive proclamation was issued. Everyone would be required, however, to keep his coupons on hand, available for use when necessary. It might be desirable also to issue special types of easily distinguishable coupons to employees in the principal industries; i. e., red coupons to the miners, blue coupons to railway workers, yellow coupons to railway management group, etc.

If a national strike were called, and the situation demanded prompt action to control it, this latent rationing system could be immediately activated by joint action of the Congress and the President, with the provision that the coupons of the strikers, and their dependents, should be invalidated. By this means society would simply stop serving those who have refused to serve it.

Necessary special provisions in case of such rationing would be: (1) Local boards to adjust individual inequities; (2) an early test vote of confidence by the general electorate, perhaps using electrical voting machines.

If the privileges of striking to obtain their rights is thus denied certain groups of workers, it is only fair that an effective alternative force should be provided for use in bargaining with their employers. Otherwise the workers might be exploited unmercifully. In this reference, attention should be called to the fact that, under the present system of striking in order to enforce demands, employees penalize themselves in order to penalize their employers. They voluntarily suffer the entire loss of their wages in order to compel their employer to suffer similar losses. In other words they cut off their noses in order to spite their employers' faces. This is an uneconomic method for all concerned, especially the innocent public; it would be much better if a less disastrous way could be devised.

It is therefore proposed that, if workers are obliged to continue work under penalty of a rationing system, they should be allowed to initiate, as an alternative of striking, the following program, which must of course be provided for beforehand by legislative action: An agency of the Government should take over the industry, and during the period of its control it should:

1. Pay the workers one-half of their previous wages.

2. Maintain the plant and pay all operating and developmental expense.

3. Sell the product of the industry and collect payment.

4. Confiscate to the Government all the profits of operation; therefore, no payment would be made to the company.

The advantages of this arrangement would be:

1. No loss to the public of the services of the industry.

2. The workers would not need to penalize themselves as much as they do now in order to penalize their employers.

3. The owners should be gratified that their business would not be destroyed; their only loss would be profits.

4. An additional source of public revenue would be provided.

In justification, if the strikers, as a body, can refuse to sell their services to the community, then the community, as a body, has a right to refuse to sell its services to the strikers.

Yet the workers should be able to sell their services effectively without pauperizing their families.

Asia and the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, Asia and the State Department, written by Owen Lattimore, director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIA AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

(By Owen Lattimore)

WASHINGTON. — The appointment and speedy confirmation of Gen. George C. Marshall as Secretary of State have drawn a flood of comment. Most of it is interesting. Great men are not always interesting men, but General Marshall is one of the great men of our time who, in spite of his modest avoidance of publicity, has always had, without asking for it, the interest of the people.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., in a book review in the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly, says acidly that "small men have now succeeded great men in the United States, but small problems have not succeeded great problems."

General Marshall stands apart from this sweeping condemnation. He is a great man who can cope with the greatest problems; and it is not only America that knows it. The world knows it.

Yet in all the comment about General Marshall, and about the problems that will now come to his desk, one most important combination of circumstances has been overlooked, and that is the significance, in the bureaucracy of the State Department, of General Marshall's exceptional experience in Asia and knowledge of Asiatic affairs. He is the first Secretary of State in our history whose knowledge of Asiatic affairs is greater than his knowledge of any other sector of our foreign relations, and the first Secretary of State to step into office directly from an assignment of topmost policy-making importance in Asia.

Only people who have been dealing with the Far Eastern Division of the Department of State over a period of years can fully appreciate the significance of its state. It is the literal truth that the upper crust of the State Department bureaucracy has always tended to reduce policy in Asia to a second or third priority, as compared to policy in Europe. Men in the Far Eastern Division and its subdivision have had to waste hours of ingenuity in wriggling through channels to get far-eastern questions taken up—and taken up in time—by Secretaries preoccupied with European and Latin-American decisions, controversies, pressures, and counterpressures.

Particularly damaging to the development of a well-rounded national policy has been the practice—not dead yet—of subordinating the recommendations of various far-eastern desks to review by the desks dealing with European powers which have possessions and interests in Asia. These things are important in a bureaucracy, and the State Department is one of the most bureaucratic bureaucracies in Washington. The bureaucrats whose vested interests are in European policy have almost always been able to block, or at least to narrow, the channels by which the far easterners had to approach the Secretary.

It is true that Dean Acheson, as Under Secretary, has done a great deal to improve the working of a poor organizational system, by sacrificing an enormous amount of time to conferences at which all division chiefs have their say in the presence of other division chiefs. It is true also that the Far Eastern Division is at present exceptionally strong because its Chief, John Carter Vincent, in addition to his thorough grasp of far-eastern policy, has had a good deal of European experience and has a knowledge of European politics which puts him on a level footing with the European experts.

Vincent had the confidence of Byrnes, and he will certainly have the continuing confidence of Marshall; but had the successor of Byrnes been almost anyone but Marshall, Acheson and Vincent and the Far Eastern Division would have had to start once more on the old weary treadmill of "briefing" and educating a Secretary who, through no fault of his own, would instinctively have called the European expert in and kept the far-eastern specialist waiting in the corridor whenever he had to make a choice in the allocation of urgent demands on his time.

While people naturally think of Marshall very largely in terms of his recent China experience, it is important to recall that this is not his only far-eastern experience. He had an earlier spell of service in China with the Fifteenth Infantry, the American regiment which used to garrison Tientsin, and in that assignment he had a ringside view of China in the war-lord period. As a younger man, moreover, he had a brilliant record in the Philippines. Finally, as Chief of Staff in the war years, he had China within his field of view as well as Europe and Russia. It should not be forgotten that "Uncle Joe" Stillwell, that great man whose greatness has not yet been adequately recognized either in China or in America, was a "Marshall man."

Because of all this, the Marshall appointment has almost as important a bearing on policy in Japan as on policy in China. The spectacular MacArthur shadow has fallen across the policy-making functions of Washington from the moment that General MacArthur set foot in Japan as conqueror, as the symbol of American policy, and as the exponent of American policy whenever criticized or even questioned by the Russians, the British, and sometimes the Chinese. It is not an exaggeration to say that General of the Army Marshall will be the first and only American since the death of President Roosevelt to approach problems of policy in Japan without the political and psychological handicap of being dwarfed by the giant stature of General of the Army MacArthur.

The relationship between the two will not work out in any vulgar controversy. Both men are too big for that. But Marshall is the Democratic Secretary of State in an administration which the Republicans can outvote at any time; and MacArthur, in the

hero-worship of some of the Republicans, is a strange heraldic figure, both a Wild Bull of the Pampas and a Sacred Cow.

Although under Marshall Asiatic policy will take its proper and proportional place in American world policy without tedious bureaucratic lobbying and maneuvering, the other components of our world policy will not be distorted. Marshall has a full grasp of the transition from war policy to postwar policy. He has never succumbed to either the tradition of contempt for the British or the tradition of implacable hate for the Russians which are characteristic of many of our professional Army and Navy men, but there is not the slightest danger that he will be taken into camp by either the Russians or the British.

We may fairly expect from General Marshall an integration of the policy of safeguarding and advancing the American interest with a policy of retaining what needs to be retained from the grand alliance which won the war.

Development of the United Nations Toward World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech made by Mr. Henry Usborne, a leading new member of the British Parliament on November 12, 1946, on the subject of the development of the United Nations toward the great goal of world government.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. HENRY USBORNE (Birmingham, Acock's Green). I beg to move that an humble address be presented to His Majesty as follows:

"Most Gracious Sovereign, we, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."

It is with much apprehension and anxiety that I have gathered up my courage to move this address, for I am well aware of my shortcomings and of my inexperience. In the 16 months during which it has been my privilege to represent the people of Acock's Green I have learned that sympathy here is always given in full measure to any member who endeavors to do his duty, is true to his conscience, and is honest and outspoken. It is on this basis, and in all humility, that I wish to address, through you, Mr. Speaker, my remarks to the House this afternoon.

I am not really a politician but an engineer. I am much more at home examining a blueprint than I am when I have to examine a Government white paper. I have spent all the years of my working life in Birmingham, that city of a thousand industries, peopled for the most part by technicians and engineers life myself. In Hall Green and Acock's Green, the constituency I have the honor to represent, live the people who knew how to make it, who in their thousands filled the factories of Birmingham, where, at the time of Dunkerque and in the subsequent years of the war, the miracle of production took place. They, my people, suffered, and many died, under the fury of the nightly attacks on Birmingham in the dreadful winter of 1940. But they did not flinch, and production soared in mounting curves till finally the ghastly struggle was over, and the opportunity was won—the opportunity to secure a dynamic, lasting peace for all mankind, so that never again would this senseless slaughter have to be repeated.

In July 1945, when our victory was certain though the last stages of the fighting still continued, the people of Acock's Green sent me here to represent them, because I believe they knew then the nature of peace and the conditions which we must create if it is to be made secure and permanent for all time. It was for this reason, I believe, that they chose me. I used these words in my election address:

"Peace, and with it happiness, justice, and freedom for all men—these are ideals impossible of attainment unless we are willing to work and to suffer for them. There can be no new order in Europe or anywhere else without a change of outlook and of renunciation on our part. We must discard all our old ideas about nationalism and class and wealth, and learn to regard ourselves as units of humanity, sharers of the world's wealth and the world's problems in common. In the future which I hope to see we will have to create a United States of Europe as an integral part of the Federation of the World. This is possible even in our lifetime if we start working for it now. No peace will be permanent until we achieve it."

That was part of the platform on which I stood. For the fulfillment of that pledge my constituents sent me here to Westminster. I am well aware of the tribute which is being paid to my people by the choice of myself to move this address this afternoon.

I have also been for 8 years an elected member of the Council of Federal Union, that society of idealists—and we do not mind being called idealists—who work together to study the problems and conditions of peace. Today that organization has grown to world stature, and only recently at a conference in Luxemburg was incorporated under a new name, the Movement for World Federal Government. More than 40 members of this Parliament are members of it; in almost every country of the world you will come across our people, speaking different languages, holding different ideologies, and surmounting the barriers of nationalism, of class and creed, by their determination to work together for one single goal; namely, the creation of an effective world parliament which may save us from atomic destruction, and, by the only method known to man, secure world order with freedom based on law and justice. Only ultimately by government, we believe, can one hope to abolish the international anarchy out of which the world's difficulties now so largely arise. We believe that there is no short cut to peace; there is no alternative to government.

In the speech with which the honorable gentleman, the member for Watford (Mr. J. Freeman), so ably moved the address this time last year, referring to the San Francisco Charter, he used these words:

"It must be the concern of His Majesty's Government to breathe life into these blueprints and to make a living organism of peace and plenty * * * but it will not be done * * * by the stereotyped methods of old-fashioned diplomacy. Something new is needed." (Official report, 16th August, 1945; vol. 413, ch. 73.)

Today, I think all of us in this House share those views. Indeed, we know that what is needed is effective world government, as the Foreign Secretary and the leaders of all parties have so frequently stated. In this connection might I make one plea to His Majesty's ministers. It would be this: That they should continue ceaselessly to stress on every possible occasion that it is their desire to see effective world government, elected by the people, ultimately created. For we know that that task is so great and so urgent we cannot hope to carry it through unless we have the driving power of world public opinion behind us; and it will make it so much easier for us, the common people in every land, to canalize this overwhelming desire for a just and lasting peace if the ministers who speak for Britain leave no doubt that they too believe that world government can be and is being achieved, and if in their pronouncements and their policies they indicate the need for its success. In this way, with Britain's lead, I believe we can perform that miracle, and provide a world of permanent peace for future generations to enjoy, a world in which the abundant resources which now lie latent will be fully developed for the good of all mankind.

Unfortunately, today, as is so tragically apparent from the meetings now taking place in New York, there is an underlying fear that each big power, in the genuine interests of its own security, is looking to military strategy for its defense. Yet, we, the common people of Britain, know the absurdity of that thesis, and recognize that in this atomic age there is only one form of security for any of us; that is, the security, not of force but of effective international law, and the order which can be based upon it. Until we have that law, which only world government can make, every nation must, of course, provide its own armed forces for its own protection, in conformity with article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations. The United Nations organization is the overriding factor, as indeed it must be, in British foreign policy. Nevertheless, immediately the United Nations organization can be developed into, or be replaced by, a real and effective world government elected by the people, with a police force of its own to enforce its law, my constituents will ask me, or whoever then represents them, to propose on their behalf that Britain shall demobilize its armed forces and merge its defense and sovereignty in the greater sovereignty of all mankind.

I am well aware that this goal of which I speak is some way off. But surely nothing worthwhile was ever achieved without great effort and a supreme single-mindedness of purpose. My constituents and I knew the difficulties that lay ahead when our troops were beaten back from the shores of Dunkerque, and we knew the long odds against our ultimate success. Yet, in five short years we had succeeded. We are now prepared to repeat that all-out effort, and to keep it up indefinitely till permanent peace for all time is ultimately secured; for that is the end for which we fought the war, that was the purpose of our victory. We know what is involved, we are prepared to work for it, and to spend and to be spent in that endeavor. With God's help, and with high courage, I believe we shall succeed.

Number of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 15), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a debate on the size of the

Government's establishment, recently conducted by the magazine Pic in its issue of October 1946. Participating in the debate were the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], Mr. Norman M. Littell, Mr. John W. Hanes, and myself.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD WE HAVE FEWER GOVERNMENT WORKERS?

(Compiled by Jack H. Pollack)

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

Yes

Absolutely, yes! The Federal Government has much too many employees. Too many for good government. Too many for efficiency. Too many for American taxpayers with a $275,000,000,000 national debt over their head to support. Too many menacing your liberty and freedom, and mine, just as top-heavy European bureaucracies have always menaced freedom abroad.

How can we be sure of this? Here's how. Committees and individuals investigating the sprawling Government have again and again reported incredible duplication of effort in Federal agencies, terrible overlapping of function, mountains of useless paper work, disgracefully slow work habits in bureaucrats who have a master complex, look down their noses at the public.

Why does Uncle Sam today have three times as many job holders hanging on to his coat tails as he had in prewar years? Why is there today the fantastically large ratio of approximately one Government job holder for every 18 individuals engaged in private enterprise? Why does the Baghdad of Bloated Bureaucracy, Washington, D. C., talk about more and more Government jobs instead of less and less, more and more Federal red tape to strangle business and agriculture instead of less and less? Why does the Government waste its personnel in overstaffed offices, so that constituents have told me: "I came down here to work for Uncle Sam, hoping that I would be of service. But my office is full of people sitting around and doing nothing. I'm just twiddling my thumbs, and I don't intend to continue to draw down a salary from the taxpayers' hard-earned funds. So I'm quitting."

Why does the Federal Government have so many employees? To call a spade a spade, here are a few reasons why:

Because bureaucratic officials who have once felt the power of having a horde of underlings serve them never want to give up that power and disband the horde.

Because power begets more power and bureaucracy begets more bureaucracy.

Because Uncle Sam pays salaries partly on the basis of the number of subordinates which a given bureaucrat has, and thus serves to encourage the bureaucrat to get more subordinates whether he needs them or not, and thereby increase his salary.

Because there are government theorists and schemers who want to centralize more power in the Federal Government and reduce the State and local authorities to nonentities.

So what? So this. If you and I would save our liberty, we must do everything possible to have the swollen Federal pay roll deflated to prewar size and, in particular, to have dictator-minded bureaucrats dismissed. We must demand of our Government that it use scientific management to save men, money, materials, and time. We must decentralize Federal power to the grassroots of the country. We must get rid of the concept that the Government should know all, should control and do all.

SENATOR SHERIDAN DOWNEY

No

We can cut the number of Federal employees in half only by cutting their work in half. But first we must decide what work to stop. For example, we could drop half of the employees of the Veterans' Administration by deciding that we will give our veterans about half the hospital and medical care they now get, and ask them to wait twice as long to receive compensation for wounds and injuries suffered in battle, or any other benefits a grateful public wants them to have. Likewise we could drop half of our postal employees by deciding that we did not particularly care how fast our mail is collected, sorted, transported, and delivered, and that we would good-naturedly put up with the resulting delays and the eventual break-down of our most efficient postal system.

The number of civilian employees working for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps is somewhat over a million—about the same number now employed in all other agencies of the Government combined. We could, then, cut the entire Federal personnel in half with one fell stroke by simply deciding that we will have no Army, no Navy, and no Marine Corps.

A 50 percent cut would mean eliminating 1,200,000 employees and the work which they now do throughout the 48 States. Outside of the Army, Navy, Veterans' Administration, and postal service there are about 580,000 Federal employees in the continental United States. If all services of the Federal Government except these four were abandoned, there still would not be a 50-percent reduction. Even if, in addition, half the civilian employees of the Army and Navy were dropped, the cut would not total 50 percent. Another 50,000 would have to be dropped from the Veterans' Administration and the postal service.

Extreme as they are, these examples illustrate the nature of the problem. While no one disagrees that the present size of the Federal service should be reduced, there is little sense in an approach which sets a goal in terms of a fixed percentage. The problem is not one of arithmetic. It is one of national policy and program, based on what the people of the country, acting through their representatives in Washington, want the Federal Government to do. It is a problem involving questions like these: What current services to the public should be stopped? Which ones curtailed or expanded? What new ones, important to national welfare during the present period, undertaken?

It is impossible to give the public all the different kinds of services now available through the Government, or maintain our world position of security as a Nation, and still arbitrarily reduce Federal workers 50 percent.

I have heard a good deal of irresponsible criticism lately of the Federal worker. Most of it is unfounded. The vast majority of Government employees are conscientious, hard-working citizens who are in no sense of the word squandering the taxpayers' money.

LAWYER NORMAN M. LITTELL

No

From years of contact with the Government agencies and thousands of Government employees, I believe that the proposal to cut Federal employment in half is crude, blind, unintelligent, and uninformed. To blame high taxes on Federal employment, as is now being done, is sheer demagoguery. Every informed citizen ought to know that over 95 cents out of every taxpayer's dollar goes for wars—past, present, or future.

But suppose we do try to cut Federal employment in half—where does that half come off? No sane citizen would advocate abolishing the War and Navy Departments or even cutting them arbitrarily in half. Nor reducing the Post Office staff by one-half and risk the delaying and paralyzing effects upon American industry and the vast confusion in human relationships. Would anyone curtail the safety of life at sea by cutting through the far-flung lighthouse service, the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Coast Guard and life-saving services? Would anyone cut in two the United States Forest Service, whose limited personnel can barely keep under control the ever-present forest fire menace which annually destroys millions of dollars of national timber resources? Would anyone cut in half the grazing service, which saves from complete destruction, through overgrazing and other abuses, the vast areas of grazing land in the public domain? Should we give up protection of the great national parks by the Park Service which we city folks visit during vacation?

Along with other false charges about the superfluity of Government employees, it is believed in some unthinking quarters that these jobs are sinecures for people who do not wish to work. This is a gross libel on Government employees. Of course there are lazy people in Government. There are lazy people everywhere. From many contacts with private industry either as a director or as legal counsel for private corporations before serving in Government and after returning to private practice, I can assure you that the number of lazy people is about equally distributed in both private and public industry. Human nature is the same wherever you find it, but I have never seen harder work, more efficiently done, than in the Government.

The most universal of all rules is that men wish to do something constructive and creative. The instinct to build and achieve is deep in all of us, and nowhere is it more evident than in public service. So great is the appeal that innumerable men and women take much of their compensation in the satisfaction of serving their country, declining higher salaries and other opportunities outside of Government because they have found a way of life in public service which offers enduring satisfaction.

I say more power to them, more pay to them, more credit and public recognition to them, and a lot less talk about cutting them in two.

CORPORATION EXECUTIVE JOHN W. HANES

Yes

The Federal Government has far too many employees. I know it. You know it. Many Government employees and officials know it too. New Federal activities were added during the war. Old activities, in some instances, were expanded under the guise of war necessity. All required additional employees.

But now that the war is over, the time has come to demobilize Government operations, increase efficiency, and reduce expenses to levels that will make possible debt retirement and lowered taxes. A congressional committee reveals that this year there were 2,505,482 civilian Government employees (excluding those outside continental United States) contrasted with 928,836 civilian employees in December 1939.

Since VJ-day, there have been substantial reductions in war-agency employment. But this trend has been negated in part by rapidly expanding non-war-agency employment.

There are, of course, good reasons for some of these increases. Part is due to the aftermath of the war. For example, the Veterans' Administration has increased by 67,000. Part is explained by changes in the methods of reporting the number of employees, as in

the Post Office Department, which now counts as full-time several thousand employees not previously so reported. There are other explanations. But these do not explain the increases in ordinary old-line agencies, where war-agency employees have been brought into the regular service.

Many agencies used the war as an excuse to take on new activities. In this group as a whole, employees increased by almost 385,000—from 678,494 in 1939 to 1,063,213 in December 1945—a rise of 56.7 percent. Further increases in these agencies at a time when we should be demobilizing our war activities doesn't make sense.

Yet further increases are in prospect. The 1947 budget, for instance, contemplated 35,000 man-years of employment for the Department of Commerce, as contrasted with 21,000 in 1945; 1947 personnel expenditures were estimated at $115,000,000 as compared with $77,000,000 for 1945. And increases were proposed for other departments.

We may be demobilizing our Army and Navy. We may be cutting down the pay roll of some of the war agencies. But we are not demobilizing Government as a whole.

What is the solution? To my mind, four steps are necessary if individual and local government rights are to be preserved.

1. Return to State and local jurisdictions those functions assumed by the Federal Government.

2. Eliminate overlapping and duplicating agency and bureau effort in similar fields.

3. Improve Federal personnel administration.

4. Stop filling vacancies created by retirements until the Federal pay roll is back to its prewar level.

America, Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which I made to the fortieth annual meeting of the Life Insurance Association of America, on December 13, 1946, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

I am delighted to have this opportunity today to come to speak to this very splendid gathering. I am highly indebted to your president for the gracious presentation. He was so much kinder to me than a friend of the late Senator James of Kentucky was in presenting him to a Kentucky audience that I am all the more grateful. This friend of Senator James was a very plain, blunt man, and in presenting him to a Kentucky audience, he said, "Now, ladies and gentlemen, I am not going to bore you with a speech today, but I will introduce to you a man who will." I am deeply indebted to my friend for saving me from that.

It is good to be here. I have always been an ardent believer in life insurance. My first policy was taken out when I was 17 years of age, after I had bought a country newspaper on credit and the policy was secured on my own motion for the benefit of my creditors.

I have been taking out policies ever since for the benefit of my creditors, and incidentally for the protection of my family. Life insurance is one of the greatest stabilizers in our American economy.

I have great admiration for your association, and especially since I observed that Grover Cleveland was your first general counsel. Any organization that had a man of his judgment and wisdom to start it along the line of public service ought to have succeeded even as your organization has done.

I believe that insurance people generally are rather optimistic, hopeful. I like that. You know, I think we can learn a great deal from our Negro citizens. I come from the South, as you observe. I know about the character of the Negroes, and I think we can learn a great deal from their philosophy.

I read Hambone in the papers. You know, Hambone is a character who represents the Negro race. Not long ago, he came in on Monday morning, and he had a particularly radiant expression on his face. His landlord, his boss, seemed to have admiration for anybody who could feel good Monday morning. He said, "Hambone, you look like you are feeling good this morning."

He said, "Yes, sir, boss, I am feeling good."

"What did you do over the week end that you feel so good this morning?"

"Boss, I can't tell you that, but I will tell you this, if you would just go with me one Saturday night you wouldn't be a white man again for anything in the world."

Your distinguished president indicated that I had held a great many political offices, and I have. When I was 17 years of age, along about the same time I was running this newspaper, I went as a delegate to a congressional convention that met over the mountains in my State. In those days, you know, we nominated the Members of Congress in conventions, and at this convention the delegates were filled up with things, a good many of them, other than enthusiasm.

We stayed in session all night, trying to nominate a candidate. Early morning came, sunrise, and we adjourned for breakfast. In that town close by was living a distinguished educator, Dr. R. L. Abernethy, who was then president of Rutherford College, a tall, handsome man who wore a Prince Albert coat and silk hat and presented a very impressive appearance. One delegate, half intoxicated, didn't know who he was and clapped him on the shoulder and said, "What office are you running for?"

"I am a candidate for the kingdom of heaven," said Dr. Abernethy.

"Brother," said the inebriated one, "you will be elected. There is not another man in this town running against you."

I think you might be interested, as all good Americans are wherever they assemble, in taking a little inventory of our situation. We had a great many interesting things to deal with in the last Congress. We shall have a great many more interesting ones to deal with in the forthcoming Congress. I think the last Congress deserves a good deal of credit for the bills which it killed as well as for those which it passed. You know, a very important public service sometimes is to stop legislation rather than to make it. Upon the whole, I think we can complain of the fact that too many laws are adopted without giving thorough and full consideration to the effect they would have upon our time and upon the future, and I believe that we are getting down in our reorganization method so that more time shall be given.

In the last Congress we passed a great many measures, some of which I think will be really beneficial to the country and others which will not—at least it is questionable whether they will—and those that were killed in the light of the reason and common sense and the judgment of Congress will redound to the public good.

One of the measures presented to that Congress was the Fair Employment Practice Act which was defeated. There was a great deal of criticism about that measure, about its defeat. People talked about a filibuster as if it was a very adverse thing. Filibusters are not good things always, but sometimes they are very helpful. Thomas Jefferson believed in them. He provided in his Manual of Laws for filibusters. It is the only way by which a minority can stop venal legislation if the majority have not awakened to the dangers incident to its passage.

This measure when it was presented to the Congress, by the way, had a very fine name—Fair Employment Practice Act; nobody could be opposed to that name, but it was very much of a misnomer, and those of us who opposed it sought to portray its real significance to the people of the Congress and of the United States.

I made the first long speech that I had made in the Congress on that bill. I set forth 12 reasons why I thought it was inimical to the interests of America. I approached it as an American citizen rather than a southerner, although I am an intense southerner and yet a still more intense American.

Incidentally, after having discussed all of these views from the American standpoint, I discussed the racial features involved in it because, of course, support stemmed from a racial base. In discussing that, I sought to disabuse the minds of the Senate as well as of the country of the idea and the thought that the South discriminates against Negroes. You know that is the general opinion. I can well understand how that opinion prevails, and yet I do not think that there is the basis for it that so many people imagine.

For instance, I pointed out that the great State of New York and the great States of Pennsylvania and of Ohio and of Michigan permit all children, Negroes and white, to go to the same schools, but that they do not permit the Negroes to teach in any very large numbers in those schools.

I contrasted North Carolina as an example. For instance, I said that the State of Pennsylvania has two-fifths as many Negro citizens as North Carolina has, and yet there are only 400 Negro school teachers in the State of Pennsylvania. If Pennsylvania had as many Negroes as North Carolina has and gave the same proportion of teachers, they would have 900 Negro school teachers, whereas North Carolina has 7,435 Negro school teachers.

Then I mentioned the further fact that in North Carolina we maintain five colleges solely for the Negroes, and that every professor in those colleges and every president is a Negro. I took the figures with reference to the other States and made a comparison in the same sort of fashion and emphasized this idea, that in North Carolina we provide that every Negro child from the day it first enters school until it graduates from the university is taught by a member of his own race, and that we emphasize race pride instead of race prejudice, race integrity instead of race amalgamation and equality of opportunity instead of social equality.

After discussing those things, I elaborated a little more to show about the lack of discrimination, giving the number of Negro doctors we had in North Carolina and the number of Negro lawyers and the number of Negro bankers. I mentioned the further fact that we have more Negro banks in North Carolina than in all of the Nation north of the Mason and Dixon's line, and that is a fact. Then I mentioned that we had the largest Negro insurance company in the world in North Carolina, and several other things.

I was very much gratified that the Senators gave me good attention, a thing that they do not always do when a Senator speaks. You are doing a very good job if you get a

small proportion of the number to remain and listen. Anyway, one of my distinguished Republican friends came up to me afterwards and said, "Senator, I have listened to your speech with a great deal of interest. There is just one thing that worries me about this whole situation."

I said, "What is that?"

He said, "After hearing your speech, I am just sorry that I am not a Negro and live in North Carolina."

There were two great problems confronting this country after the surrender of our enemies in the recent World War. One was, of course, a reconversion from a wartime basis to peacetime, and the other was the adjustment of our international affairs. We had had an amazing record of production. The farmers and the manufacturers and all of those who were producing in this country had surpassed even their own highest expectation of what they might do during this period of the war. The whole Nation had been converted to a war basis, and now when the war suddenly terminates, the opportunity comes for us to be converted to a peacetime basis.

I was struck with the desire in this country to change over, the purpose to do so, but we had a great many people who were predicting and prophesying evil, as we always have. There were those who started out with the theory that now we must have full employment in this country and predicting that we are going to have vast unemployment and therefore we must pass a bill to provide for full employment. They advocated passing a bill to provide for $25 a week pay for 26 weeks to every person who was out of a job and applied for one and didn't get it. The Congress killed that measure, which I thought was very wise. I think it would have protracted unemployment. We have no real unemployment. Industry and business provided work for everybody, and the only difficulty was getting people to work. There was a job for everybody who wanted to work in some field of activity, and so we went through this period of reconversion, as the distinguished Ambassador, Hon. Ray Atherton, has said, with very great credit to this country and probably with less halting and with less slowing down of the processes than any other country could have dared to have hoped for.

As we pass over this period, we have other things that the economists, the planners and the researchers and newspaper columnists and radio commentators are holding out before the country to increase the fear and distrust of this Nation. They started out first to talk about inflation. They said, "We are going to be engulfed in such inflation as will literally destroy our economy," and they said that there was just one way to prevent that and that was to retain OPA with all of its full controls and powers. There were those among them who would have liked to have fastened upon this Nation a permanent regimentation and would have liked to have had a planned economy adopted for America.

The people of this country were not in favor of that. They wanted to revert to the normal standards as rapidly as possible. They wanted to be relieved of regimentation which they had gladly accepted during the period of the war, but they wanted to be relieved of it just as early as possible, and business wanted to be free. We cherish freedom in America. We like the idea of a man being able to direct his own affairs and to proceed with his own policy and to procure what he desires so long as he does not take away from somebody else his rights and his privileges or invade their sacred precincts. So the OPA in a large measure passed out in response to the wishes of the people of America, and we have not had drastic inflation. We have higher prices, but we do not have the sort of inflation that was prophesied.

Now the economists and the researchers and the planners are all busy working up a depression and in everything you read they are telling about how bad it is going to be in this country, what a great depression we are going to have, and the danger about that sort of thing is that almost anything that you assert plausibly or forcibly or continuously enough, no matter how illogical it may be—if you continue to repeat it over all the means of communication at hand, you make an impression upon the public mind, and after a while you create fear and distrust, and that, I think, is responsible for the very great decline that occurred on the stock market both as to cotton and especially as to stocks generally when billions were lost without any appreciable reason or without any firm foundation for it.

Those who spread the word about this country that we are bound to have a depression follow this sort of reasoning: They say that historically we have had depressions following war, and since we have had the greatest war of all time, then necessarily we must have the greatest depression.

That is a fallacious argument, and I do not believe that it is justified.

Your great insurance companies are interested in maintaining the stability of this country and maintaining prosperous conditions and maintaining the sort of economy that shall endure, and I think you realize that America has the basis upon which to go forward in building a firm, stable economy even in this period of reaction from the war, without the disastrous effects of a general depression.

What are the facts about it? Is there any special reason to feel that we should have a depression? What is it that causes a depression?

Of course the first thing is loss of confidence, and then the next thing is the failing purchasing power of the people of a nation which results in unemployment and in taking away the markets for the goods which are produced on the farms and in the factories.

What are the facts about our situation today? The earning power of the people of America today will approximate in the year 1946, $170,000,000,000. It will require about $40,000,000,000 of that to pay the taxes to the United States Government. That will leave $130,000,000,000 to buy goods with, to purchase the things which we have not been able to get and which we desire and to make investments and to build homes. That certainly should strengthen and sustain our economy.

What is the money situation? There never has been an hour in all human history when the financial structures of this Nation were in such fine condition as they are today. We have gone for 3 years now, or practically 3 years, without a bank failure in the whole United States. In the single period of 4 years we had more than 5,000 bank failures in the midst of the depression. Today, for more than 3 years, or nearly 3 years, not a single bank failure in the whole United States. And we have on deposit in the banks of this country $166,000,000,000, in round figures, representing the current savings and the cash of the citizens of the United States.

Is there any reason why that money is not available to develop new enterprises and to advance the interests of business in every line and to make for the development and progress of this Nation?

In addition to that, we have in America $274,000,000,000 of outstanding Government bonds owned by the people of the United States. With these bonds being liquidated over a period of years, there will be a continual payment to the citizens of the United States of billions of dollars as each year passes which will furnish a great reservoir of funds for the purpose of purchasing the things which they desire and for investing in whatever enterprises may attract them or appeal to their judgment and wisdom.

In addition to that, heretofore we have had panics or depressions when we had no means for providing for unemployment. Today every single State in the Union has a vast, huge unemployment fund in its treasury. Every State has millions of dollars for that purpose. So when there is a slowness of work or when there is a stoppage of industry of any kind not occasioned by strikes, instead of people having to go on relief or having to appeal to charity, they will be receiving the compensation from the fund which has been created by their contribution and by the contribution of the employers of the Nation. This vast sum is available to tide over these periods when people are unemployed or when there is a scarcity of work or slackening of demand for products in any particular line of industry.

Therefore, with these things and with the further fact that in the United States today we need the things that industry can produce and that the farmer can grow, and we need them in increasing volume both for the satisfaction of our home markets and for satisfying our export trade, which is increasing and which can be, and shall be, very properly directed along the line of taking up the surplus from the farm and factory in this land, I think we can take great encouragement and hope.

Another thing which I think those who are predicting depressions and who are working overtime in trying to create fear and distrust in the public mind fail to note, is that conditions have changed in America. In 1932 only 50 percent of the people of the United States could buy the necessities of life. They didn't have the money. Today 98 percent, according to statistics, of the people of the United States have the money to buy the necessities of life.

With that vast extent of purchasing power residuary in the people of this Nation, there isn't any reason to talk about a depression and certainly not to undertake to bring it on by artificial means. I think this Nation should take account of its strength and of its power and of its resources and with that should bear up with the sort of confidence that shall look unafraid toward tomorrow.

There is one thing that gives some pause, and that is our labor situation. However, I think that we might remember this, and that was referred to by the Ambassador in his magnificent address, that even this year we are producing higher than we produced during the period of the last 5 years, even with all the strikes we have had and with all the hold-ups and with all the interferences. We are still producing, and I believe that the new Congress is going to have to deal in a very sensible sort of way with this question of labor relations.

I think we have some very unwise and very unfair labor laws now in force. I have been in favor of modifying the Wagner Act. I think it ought to be. I do not believe in any sort of law that works unfairly upon any segment of our population. I do not believe in any law that requires the making of contracts and then only binds one party to the contract. I do not believe that you can make any law that will be satisfactory to the people of America when it binds the employer and the management and lets the labor union go scot free. In that sort of fashion, you know, you make a contract for a year and in a month's time or 6 weeks' time, one party can violate with impunity whereas the other must be held to strict accountability. There are so many things in connection with this that I think ought to be changed, not with the idea of pursuing any antilabor policy but with the idea of taking away from labor the exemptions which have been improperly granted to labor in the time of its weakness. Now that it has grown strong and mighty in its organization, it ought to be subjected to the same laws that govern other organizations.

We have in this country about 12,000,000 people who belong to labor unions, approximately that number. We have 58,000,000 who

are holding jobs and drawing either wages or salaries from them, and we have 140,000,000 people as our total population. I do not think in America we can afford to let any group or any segment of our population take charge of the country, and I do not think that we can afford to let them dominate the situation and tell the balance of the world and America what we are going to do.

I believe in being absolutely fair to labor in all relationships and safeguarding all of their rights, but I do not think that the right to strike is an absolute right. I agree with President Woodrow Wilson when he said that the right to strike is not absolute, but only a relative right, and that no union has a right to strike against the public interest. I think in America we are going to have to make some sort of provision by which the great industries which furnish the very lifeblood of the Nation cannot be paralyzed by the dictations of one man or of a group of people. I think that in the public utilities and in the coal mines and in the transportation facilities there must be some sort of method provided by which America cannot be suddenly halted in its economy and have the whole Nation standing on tiptoe waiting to see whether or not some man, in utter disregard of the rights of the people of this Nation, shall cause suffering and, sometimes, even starvation of the people of the land. I think that America is too great for that. I think it is too powerful.

I think that as we approach the discussion of this matter, we must do so in justice and in fairness to everybody concerned, but with a high sense of obligation to the people of this whole Nation, and I believe that America is set to perform its duty in that respect in providing laws that shall safeguard the rights of every man who toils and labors, to guarantee to him reasonable return for his labor and reasonable working conditions and all of the things that go with it, but that likewise shall insure to the public the fact that these agencies shall continue and go forward and that they shall not be halted and stopped and paralyzed.

Over in one of the northern cities there was a strike in an electric-power plant, and the power was off and the lights were off, and it was necessary in the hospitals that emergency operations be performed by candlelight. That sort of thing ought not to be permitted to occur, and I think that our economy can be so ordered, and I believe the common sense of the American people will sustain it, and even the men who compose the labor unions of this Nation will recognize its justice when proper provision is made to prevent strikes in essential industries. I think that any organization that has grown as great as the labor unions ought to be regulated and ought to be required to report with reference to their expenditures just like other organizations. It ought also be required to report to the men who have contributed this fund—all of its members.

You know we have exempted the labor unions from practically all the laws. That has been the trouble. The unions received, this year, dues in America amounting to $418,000,000. Of course, they don't pay a cent of tax on that. I am not so concerned about that, but I am concerned that the men who pay in all of this money shall know what becomes of it and likewise that the Government should have some sort of reports, regulation, and control as it does of other organizations.

A corporation cannot make contributions to elect Senators and Representatives, but the unions can contribute all they want to for that purpose, and spend all they please.

We in America need to realize that there is just as much danger in a monopoly of labor as there is in a monopoly of money or anything else. When we have the antitrust law we ought not to exempt, as we have done, the labor unions from the operation of a measure like that. I think the great forces of the law must work equitably and reasonably upon all the people of the United States if we are to maintain our freedom.

America is a great country. I was so interested in the Ambassador's statement about the influence of America, about how the people in Canada think about it. Today, notwithstanding all the untoward things that are occurring in this country, I am prouder of America than at any time in all the past. I believe this is about the highest hour in human history. I think, as I look over the world and see the position which America has taken both in the conduct of the war and in its aftermath, that we are entitled to be regarded as an unselfish nation. I do not think the charge is true that we are a people who deal solely in material things, that we are shylocks. You cannot believe that applies to America when you stop to realize that of all the funds contributed last year and this year to UNRRA for the relief of the suffering and starving and the naked of this world, America has donated 71 percent and the balance of the world contributed 29 percent. We have cast out upon the waters this bread for the relief of humankind over the earth, and I believe that it shall come back to us manyfold in time to come.

Another thing we have had a great deal of discussion about is the conduct of the war and the use of the atomic bomb. I think you might be interested in a conversation that I had with President Truman just 4 weeks after the atomic bomb was used. I notice that Albert Einstein, the scientist, said in a recent speech that if President Roosevelt had lived, the atomic bomb would not have been dropped. I think he is wrong about that. President Roosevelt authorized the expenditure of more than $2,000,000,000 for the perfecting and developing of the bomb, and there wasn't but one purpose in his doing that and that was to use it to shorten the war and to save American lives and to save the lives of the people of the world.

There is one thing I think would interest you that the President said in the White House conversation after the bomb was dropped. Of course, before the bomb could be dropped, the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, had to give the order. The Chief of Staff reported to him, saying, "Mr. President, we have perfected this bomb and tried it out in New Mexico. We want to use it. We have selected Hiroshima as the place to use it in Japan. If we drop the bomb, we will kill a hundred thousand, perhaps 200,000 people, at one time. We will devastate that country in that immediate vicinity, but we will end the war and we will save American lives." Then it was recounted to the President how we went from island to island in the Pacific, and everywhere we went, as we landed on the beachheads, we had to drive the Japs back, that they continued to shoot from pockets all about, and the casualties were very heavy. We had literally to exterminate every Japanese soldier on the island. The President was told that if we continued in that way we were going to pay a heavy tribute in lives before the war was won.

We were already killing a lot of women and children dropping bombs over Japan. The President was told that if we used the atomic bomb we could accomplish our purpose speedily.

After hearing all the reasoning, President Truman stated that this was the most tremendous decision he had ever been called upon to make, but he decided to have the bomb dropped, and I think properly so.

But there is one thing which I think you should remember and every American should remember with pride. Notwithstanding that Japan attacked us treacherously and infamously as a thief in the night and even while her ministers were still in conference with ours in Washington, yet we did not drop the bomb on Japan without giving them notice. We notified the Emperor and legislative body of Japan and we set the hour and told them that unless Japan surrendered before that time we were going to visit unprecedented destruction upon their land and people. Instead of surrendering, Japan sent back a very discourteous and defiant note. She thought, of course, that we were bluffing, that we had nothing new, and then the bomb was dropped. The world knows the result.

I think it should always be remembered that even in the high crisis of war, America had the humaneness and the conception of fairness and justice to other nations even at war to give them notice in advance of devastation like that.

Then I am proud of America because of the position which she is taking now. You know, I think the adoption of the United Nations Charter was a marvelous achievement. I know it is discredited in some respects by some people because they are constantly referring to it in the same sort of way that these others talk about depressions and about inflation and everything else. They are all the time magnifying war and voicing the opinion that we have got to have another war, and they are depreciating the effect of the labors of the United Nations.

I do not think that is justified. I think the meeting in San Francisco last year did a wonderful job. After 10 weeks of deliberation and of discussion and disagreement, finally we unanimously adopted the United Nations Charter by the 50 nations participating, and that was a great achievement. Every single representative, every nation there represented signed this United Nations Charter.

This document ranks second to the Constitution of the United States. Our Constitution represents a Magna Carta for the people of the United States. The United Nations Charter is the Magna Carta of the world, and as we think in terms of what has been accomplished already, we can say that it has not been a failure.

Have you noticed all the sensational reports every time a conference is held, saying, well, it is about to break up, they have so many disagreements, can't agree about anything, and it is all going to be a failure, and yet the fact is that every single conference that has been held has agreed about something, and something very material. Every time a conference has adjourned, we have adjourned upon higher ground than when we met.

That will be true of this conference now completing its labor in New York City as it was of the one in Paris. We are approaching the consideration of the final things about the planning for peace and the United Nations, so that we will bring to pass the long drawn out hopes and aspirations of mankind as we look for a peaceful world.

America must be patient. You know, our people are rather emotional. They want a thing done right now, and they want it done in just exactly the way they wish it to be. They are rather intolerant of anybody who differs with them about it. America is a strong nation. A strong man, conscious of his own power and his own resources, can afford to be patient even while he is firm. America is a mighty and a strong nation and America can afford to be patient even as she is firm. Because she is conscious of her own power, her own prestige, her own resources, her own ability, she can afford to deal patiently with other nations.

We are getting to a better understanding with other nations. Take the case of Russia. There are two things that Russia needs to know, and she is learning those rapidly. One is that Russia ought to understand that America is not trying to tell her what kind of government she shall have, and we do not propose to dictate to her how she shall manage her internal affairs, and by the same reasoning we do not propose that Russia shall dictate to us the kind of government

we shall have or how we shall manage the internal affairs of the United States. We do not propose for Russia or any other nation to impose their will and dominating purpose upon any of the small nations. We covet only for other nations somewhat of the privileges which we ourselves enjoy, the privilege of liberty, of freedom, of justice, and standing as a rather unselfish nation. We want to see if we cannot aid in leading the nations of this world along the dimly lighted pathway to the exalted purposes of free government among peoples, to the determination by them of their own great purposes, and as we go along this way, I think we shall assume to ourselves, as we associate with other nations, somewhat of the strength and the virtue and the power of the united public thought of the world.

Have you read this United Nations Charter? Of course you haven't read all of it, it is too long, but you should read the preamble. I shall not quote it in detail but merely the substance. I like the way it begins. It says something like this: We, the peoples of the United Nations of the earth, do hereby solemnly covenant and agree with each other that we will not go to war, that we will settle matters by arbitration, by discussion, by agreement—and all through it runs the thought that this great dreamed-for peace for mankind must be realized in the days and years and even centuries ahead, to the end that we shall not with each recurring quarter of a century have to sacrifice upon the altar of war, the finest and the best youth of our land.

I do not believe that the United Nations is a failure. I do not believe that this organization shall fail. I think it is just as possible to preserve peace in the world as it is to have orderly government in the United States. We have 48 States. Each State is independent, autonomous and maintains its own sovereignty, and yet one State does not go to war with another when controversies arise. We submit it to the United States Supreme Court, and the determination of that court is final and we accept it. If it wasn't accepted, they could requisition all of the power of the United States to enforce that decree.

In similar fashion, there is no reason why the member states of the United Nations should have to go to war to settle controversies that arise.

I do not believe that this idea and concept of universal peace is a utopian dream. I do not think it is merely an idealistic conception. I believe it is possible in our day and in our generation. I am looking forward toward that. I am thinking and hoping that America shall remain strong and mighty and powerful at home and that she shall exercise a dominating influence with the other nations of the world in the interest of preserving peace.

I believe in the America of yesterday, the America that you know and that I know and that we love, the America that we have lived for, the America that many have died for, and that many more have been willing to die for in order to preserve the heritage, the marvelous heritage, of liberty and freedom and of justice which has been ours through the years. I think the future lends much reassurance to us, both at home and abroad.

I like the spirit of a great English poet, Sir Owen Seaman, who wrote, in the very dark hours of the war, these few lines which I should like to read to you. They epitomize to my mind the spirit of Great Britain and the spirit of America and of the world, of those who hope and strive for that day to dawn which will bring forth the peaceful tomorrows.

You that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And trust that out of night and death shall rise
The dawn of ampler life;
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given you, for a priceless dower,
To live in these great times and have your part
In Freedom's crowning hour;
That you may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heaven, their heritage to take:
"I saw the powers of darkness put to flight!
I saw the morning break!"

Today I believe that the morning is about to break upon God's world, and as the sun shall course across this earth and come to the western horizon, flooding the world with soft, mellow light of eventide—the calmness and the serenity of that hour shall be emblematic of the calmness and serenity and the peace of God's whole world—

Our fathers' God, to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King!

Reduction of Tariff on Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 24, I appeared before the United States Tariff Commission relative to the reduction of the tariff on sugar. Supporting me in my position on this matter were the following organizations: The American Sugar Cane League, Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association, and United States Beet Sugar Association.

Domestic sugar, we believe, presents a special problem in the consideration of the proposed trade-agreements program, because the industry operates under a system of Government supervision unique in American agriculture. It is probably a fact that no other food industry has been under such complete Government control during the war period as has the domestic sugar industry. Production and sales controls are still in effect, and sugar, which continues in short supply, is the only commodity still being rationed to all classes of trade and consumers. We are, however, approaching a time when supply will again equal or exceed the consumptive demand. The problem of making an orderly transition from these extensive controls to a more normal status of sugar-trade operation is at the present time giving men of the industry deep concern.

The normal pattern of the world's sugar economy has been greatly changed through the influence of war. The total effect upon our continental and insular economy is yet unknown. In these circumstances of disruption and uncertainty it would seem highly inadvisable to add further confusion and uncertainty by reducing the rate of tariff which now remains after four successive reductions between the years 1934 and 1942. The present rate would be wholly inadequate protection for the domestic industry should the quota system be abandoned. These four reductions have aggregated 62½ percent of the rates that prevailed prior to June 8, 1934. Should the President exercise to the full extent the authority granted under the provisions of the new Trade Agreements Act and again reduce the tariff rate 50 percent, the aggregate reduction would be 81½ percent.

In 1934 Congress first enacted sugar-quota legislation which placed controls on the supplies of sugar and since that time there have been four reductions in the rates of duty on sugar. The rates now in effect represent a reduction of 50 percent from the rates prevailing at the time of the approval of the Foreign Trade Agreements Act, and a reduction of 62½ percent from those specified in the Tariff Act of 1930.

The first of the four reductions, effective June 8, 1934, was made by the President under the flexible provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930. By that action the rate of duty on 96-degree raw sugar imported from foreign countries other than Cuba was reduced from $2.50 to $1.87½ a hundred pounds, and the duty on Cuban 96-degree raw sugar was cut from $2 to $1.50 a hundred. Domestic producers of sugar beets and sugarcane were not, however, left without compensation against the impact of the lower rate of duty. On the same day the President signed the Executive order reducing the rate of duty he also approved the so-called Jones-Costigan amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, which established a system of quotas and specified that a processing tax should be imposed on sugar at a rate not greater than the reduction of the duty. Proceeds of the tax were used to make benefit payments to growers of sugar beets and sugarcane so that the protection afforded domestic sugar producers might be maintained and, to quote the President, they might obtain "a fairer return for their product." Except for a brief interval in 1939, quotas remained in effect from 1934 until shortly before the attack which brought the United States into the war, and they have been the principal stabilizing influence in the sugar industry.

The second reduction in duty became effective September 3, 1934, in the reciprocal-trade agreement between the United States and the Republic of Cuba. Under that agreement the rate of duty on Cuban raw sugar was reduced from $1.50 to 90 cents a hundred pounds. However, the agreement also contained a certain measure of protection for the domestic producer since it provided that the duty would revert to $1.50 a hundred pounds whenever sugar quotas became inoperative. The value of that provision was demonstrated in September of 1939, when, with the outbreak of the war in Europe, it was deemed advisable to suspend quotas temporarily. The duty reverted to $1.50 and continued at that level until the quotas were reinstated on December 26, 1939.

The third reduction in duty came with the proclamation of a supplemental trade agreement with the Republic of Cuba, effective January 5, 1942. In that

agreement the rate of duty was reduced from 90 to 75 cents a hundred pounds, and the requirement that a higher rate of duty must prevail when quotas became inoperative was completely eliminated.

The fourth reduction in the duty was written into the reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Peru, effective July 29, 1942, which reduced the rate of duty on 96-degree raw sugar imported from foreign countries other than Cuba from $1.87½ to 93¾ cents a hundred pounds. The rates of duty in the Peruvian agreement were applicable to all most-favored nations.

The current rates of duty on sugar, considered alone, as previously stated, are wholly inadequate to maintain domestic production.

In recent years differences in costs of production, once a yardstick for measuring tariffs, have been completely ignored. Nevertheless, it seems worth while to point out that the last investigation by the United States Tariff Commission, completed in 1934, indicated that the difference in costs of production between the United States and Cuba was $1.50 a hundred pounds. In view of higher wage rates, higher taxes, and higher costs of all kinds in all domestic sugar-producing areas, it is a fair assumption that the differences in costs today are as great as they were at the time of the Tariff Commission's study. Yet the present trade agreement would permit a reduction in the rate of duty on Cuban sugar from 75 to 37½ cents a hundred pounds which would equal only 25 percent of the difference in costs of production, as determined by the Commission, and only 18.375 percent of the rate established by the Tariff Act of 1930.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM S. HILL, OF COLORADO, BEFORE THE UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION, FRIDAY, JANUARY 24, 1947

Gentlemen, it is a great honor, indeed, to be granted the privilege of appearing before this body, and I sincerely appreciate it. Representing the legislative branch of our Government, in general the West and specifically the Second Congressional District of the State of Colorado, I appear before you in the interest of western agriculture and mining production. But particularly I wish to call your attention to the general situation of the sugar-beet industry. In the district I have the honor to represent, sugar-beet production and the processing of that farm product is the most important agricultural activity.

The sugar-beet industry has been protected by the Federal Government through various types of programs. This protection is absolutely essential if this industry is to grow and develop. Foreign areas producing sugar have, generally speaking, cheap labor, cheap land, and in many cases a lower tax rate, but in the end-result the production of sugar itself in these foreign areas fall far below the man-hour production of the continental beet- or cane-producing areas.

The average acre of beet or sugarcane in the United States produces more sugar per acre than is produced in Cuba or offshore areas, and is produced more efficiently and the laborers are paid a higher wage.

We believe that domestic sugar production, both beet and cane, presents to this group a problem of serious import; and we who represent the industry, both the grower and processor, hope you will give the proper consideration necessary and examine the issue thoroughly enough that your decision will in no way curtail or hinder the expansion of the continental sugar program.

The Second World War and the postwar period will definitely change our approach to the entire sugar economy. What the final result will be on our continental and insular sugar production cannot possibly be known or understood at this time. Under these circumstances and facing these uncertainties, it does seem proper and fitting that we should not add to the confusion and the disruption of our sugar program by reducing the rate of tariff on sugar at the present moment.

Understanding as we do that the wartime authority to allocate sugar expires March 31, 1947, and the wartime authority to control the price of sugar June 30, 1947, and the Sugar Act December 31, 1947, it would seem advisable that the entire sugar producing and processing problems should be considered in its entirety. A reexamination and careful consideration of the entire issue might be made at this time and the details of the program worked out with the support and the assistance of the Congress. If we are to deal comprehensively and thoroughly with this most complicated world food problem, it does seem that action at the present moment in the light of world conditions would be highly inadvisable.

Functions of Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not the Major Aim," published in the New York Herald Tribune, dealing with what would seem to have been the functions of the Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, which appeals to me as being so splendid an exposition thereof that I think it might well be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT THE MAJOR AIM

Former Representative Andrew J. May and three members of the Garsson munitions combine have been indicted as a result of the study of the combine made by the Senate special war-investigating committee. It is a logical result and the courts can now determine whether it was a justifiable result in the legal sense. But it is to be hoped that it will not be the only result.

It is always in the public interest to expose and to punish fraud. That, inevitably, will be one of the functions of the war-investigating committee, which has just taken a new lease on life. But the search for individual malefactors will not be the primary purpose of the committee. Congress is not (except in cases involving impeachment) a judicial body, nor is it a police force. The detection of criminals is incidental to its major task of legislating wisely in the national interest, which, of course, involves the study of law enforcement and law evasion. From the standpoint of Congress the discovery of frauds in war contracts should mean active research into the things which made such frauds possible, and a study of the best methods of dealing with any future emergency which might again open the doors to similar crimes against the Government.

This does not mean that guilty individuals should be permitted to escape censure, or any other punishment which the law and public opinion may mete out against them for their derelictions. It does mean that the congressional investigators should endeavor to fit each case into a general pattern and make this pattern as clear as possible to the public. Is the Garsson case typical? If so, to what extent does it represent criminality, punishable by law, and how much of it springs from the abuse of congressional influence or general administrative laxity? Some of these questions must be answered by the courts, the others can be developed by the committee. But the committee will have the primary responsibility of seeing to it that the over-all picture becomes plain to Congress—which must do its best to close any loopholes in the law—and to the public. It must never allow either the excitement of pursuing wrongdoers or the prospect of partisan advantage to obscure its major aim. The Garsson case has never been clarified insofar as its relationship to public policy is concerned—perhaps it cannot be until a study of contract apportionment over the whole area of war industry has been completed. But such clarification is the real goal of the war-investigating committee.

We the People and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by the Most Reverend Lawrence J. Shehan, D. D. V. G., auxiliary bishop of Baltimore and Washington at the annual red mass at Catholic University on January 26, signalizing the opening of the courts and Congress:

The juridical system of any nation may be said to be one of the most trustworthy measures of its enlightenment. Surely no one would seriously maintain that wealth is any such measure. Until recently many moderns would have claimed this role for science, but the history of the last generation has shown the weakness of any such pretension. In a certain sense art, and in a truer sense literature, may be regarded as a valid gage; but great art and great literature are often produced by a small group of geniuses who may not be truly representative of the people. Sometimes great literature actually has its origin in a reaction against a base or unenlightened culture. But the system of laws which a people develops, by which it chooses to live, which it uses as the framework of its civilization, by which it passes on all its legacy of material wealth, cultural achievement, and social gains, expresses as nothing else can the enlightenment of the people itself. Further than this it manifests in a most practical way the concept which a nation has formed of itself, of its individual citizens, of its family life and all its social relationships. And these are undoubted tests of a nation's enlightenment. Certainly our own country might well be content to have the mental and moral stature of its people judged by the system of laws which had its birth with the adoption of our Constitution.

In the course of time it is almost inevitable that any juridical system should grow in size and complexity. It could not be otherwise in our own country, with its great expansion of territory, with the rapid multiplication of its citizens, with its unprecedented increase in wealth, in industry, and in commerce. But if any system of law is to retain its vitality, its meaning, and its usefulness, it must, in at least a general way, remain within the comprehension of the common people. It may become complex, as our great modern buildings have become complex, but if it is to fulfill its function it must be grounded on a firm foundation and its general plan must remain intelligible to the ordinary man. It may seem presumptuous for one who is unlearned in this subject to speak to those who are deeply learned. But, on the other hand, the law is meant primarily, or at least mainly, for the common people, and as one of them it may not be inappropriate for me to attempt to state what we, the common people, look for in the law.

First of all, we look to the law of our country to express and preserve our single most sacred civic heritage—the dignity, the freedom, and the equality of the individual. These things come to us, not as gifts of the state, but as natural and unalienable rights. We know, of course, that in our history, under the freedom guaranteed by our Constitution, some have abused liberty to reduce great numbers of their fellow citizens to virtual economic slavery, robbing them at the same time of both their dignity and their equality. But, happily, those abuses have been largely eliminated, and those which may remain will, with proper vigilance, be corrected. The danger now is that in our zeal to curb the lawless liberty of some we shall slay the legitimate freedom and dignity of all.

The dignity, freedom, and happiness of the individual is inseparably bound up with the family, for it is only within and through the family that these objectives can be achieved by the masses of men. The family, moreover, is the basic unit of society and the foundation of our whole social structure. Our national welfare, therefore, depends upon the welfare of the family. We have a right then to look to the law to uphold and preserve the sanctity and stability of family life. Unfortunately, in many jurisdictions there has been a tendency to enact and to favor legislation calculated to weaken the family and to further its disintegration. The alarming rapidity with which the divorce rate has risen and continues to rise makes all too evident the harmful effects of such legislation, and the abuses which have occurred in so many parts of this country have given rise to discussion about the desirability of uniform legislation. In whatever may be done we have a right to expect from our law and our legislators a genuine concern for the welfare of family life as the single most important element in our general social welfare. What we should expect is a recognition of the fact that in the very nature of things the family must be regarded as a stable and permanent unit, and that in such a unit the child in particular has the right to be reared and to find his happiness and security. The law then should so safeguard the permanence and stability of the family that those who enter into the state of marriage would be forced to realize that they are entering into a lifelong contract involving sacred obligations which cannot be lightly tossed aside.

But it is not only the preservation of the family that we expect from the law. We look to it for the proper maintenance and ordering of all those vital relationships which constitute our social life. The relationship most in the public consciousness at the present time is that between employer and employee. As in the case of the family, so also in this and in all other important relationships, we look to the law to give expression, not to what any particular group feels it has the strength to demand, but to those principles of right reason and common sense from which alone justice can eventuate. This, of course, is but another way of saying that the civil law governing the family and all other relationships must be founded on the natural moral law.

This brings me to the further consideration that our whole juridical system should be regarded as founded on, as giving expression or development to, and as buttressing, the natural law. That law, eternal and unchangeable, has received clear expression in the Ten Commandments which we derive from the Old Testament. But for the knowledge of that law we are not dependent on divine revelation. It can be known by human reason as the law imposed by the Creator on all men alike, although experience has shown that revelation was needed to emphasize the eternal and unchangeable character of that law. Unless civil law retains its roots in the natural law, it can have no stability and no real binding force in conscience; and unless it remains within the framework of the natural law, there is no telling to what extravagances men will go in their ideas of what may be made legal.

In our own times there has been a tendency to disregard this connection of the civil with the natural law and the restrictions placed by the latter on the former. The two most obvious recent examples are of course the movements to legalize euthanasia, or so-called mercy killing, and sterilization. In our own country these two movements have their roots in a false sentimentalism. But we must remember that in Nazi Germany these same practices, seeking their justification in a blind sentimental attachment to the superior race, led to the horrible atrocities of Dachau, Buchenwald, and Belsen. Here, of course, it is assumed that practice would always be guided by a spirit of benevolence. But let us not assume that, once we have departed from the sanity of the natural law, we shall be superior to any other people in either wisdom or virtue. The horrors which marked almost every phase of the late war, even up to its last days, indicate all too clearly that, given sufficient incitement, any nation can be guilty of almost any atrocity, once it has lost sight of those clear and safe concepts which have been given to us as the most fundamental guide of our conduct.

A further characteristic which we have a right to find in our juridical system is that application of the law should be made justly and impartially to all. Our main traditional method of insuring such application has been an independent judiciary, which has been required by an enlightened public opinion to maintain itself free from corrupting influence of private interests and political partisanship. In the whole sphere of our political and social institutions there is nothing more important to each of us than that the judiciary should remain independent and should retain the highest ideals of personal integrity, legal knowledge, and practical wisdom. We of this country have a tradition of reverence for the judiciary; and no greater calamity could befall us than that the judiciary should not continue to merit that reverence.

If, however, justice is to eventuate from even the most impeccable judiciary, it would seem that the laws themselves should not only be clearly expressed in terms comprehensible to the layman, but that they should also continue to be interpreted according to the clear and certain meaning of the terms used. Considerable comment has arisen over the opinion expressed by an eminent jurist that: "The notion that because the words of a statute are plain its meaning is also plain is merely pernicious oversimplification," and over the use made of those words by a member of the legal profession in the Government service. All of us realize that even a clearly worded law, when applied to a situation not fully envisioned when the law was enacted, may need light over and above that derived from the bare meaning of the words. But it has been contended that the words used hold a meaning much more startling than this. In any event, it would seem to the ordinary layman that nothing is better calculated to bring the law, the legal profession, and our whole juridical system into public odium than the idea on the part of the average citizen that the law does not or may not mean what it says, together with the inference, which some have not failed to make, that the law is regarded as a sort of trap to the well-intentioned but unwary layman or as a device whereby those able to purchase the best legal service can obtain an unfair advantage over their neighbors and competitors.

It is indeed understandable that in our complex world the application of the law to new and involved situations should not always be immediately clear. In such circumstances, it seems to the thoughtful and interested citizen that it is essential that the law should be interpreted and applied according to recognized principles and that there should be definite continuity in interpretation. Justice demands that the citizens should be able to know how existing law affects what they do or what they contemplate doing. But this is possible only if the interpretation of the law is made in the light of precedent and according to rule and principle.

Perhaps such an interpretation of law will not always meet adequately new conditions which arise. In that case, in a democracy, we look for relief from the proper lawmaking body. We do not expect to see existing law twisted out of its obvious meaning to meet conditions which are entirely new, or to fit into the latest concepts of social theory. If laws do not mean what they say, if there is no order in their interpretation, if their application is not made in the light of history and experience, if they are interpreted solely in the light of present facts as seen by individual authorities from the point of view of newly arising political theory, then we can only say we are headed for legal chaos.

Again, if justice to all is to be the outcome of our juridical system, the law must be regarded as supreme and equally binding upon all who come within its purview. This means that not only must there be no privileged class beyond the reach of the law's arm; it means also that the Government itself must operate within the framework of the law. Only through true sovereignty of the law can the individual be protected from the arbitrary action of government, or, rather, of those who for the time being hold the reins of government. This, on occasions, may seem to hamper the effectiveness of the Government. But in times of emergency, provision for prompt action on the part of the Government is made within our law; and it is better that a sound system of government under law be provided and maintained than that the Government itself should never be inconvenienced or delayed by the operation of the law. The supremacy of the law means that the liberty of all is to some degree restricted, the Government included; but only through the supremacy of law can our legitimate liberty be preserved.

These are a few of the considerations which occur to one who, while not immediately involved in the complexities of the law and in the political and economic forces which are at work, yet thoughtfully ponders the system of law within whose framework his life must be lived and his work carried out. In view of these considerations certain modern trends which are manifesting themselves seem to give grounds for grave concern.

I believe I cannot better describe those trends than by quoting words used recently by Dean Roscoe Pound. "We cannot," he said, "be blind to the attacks upon our law * * * which are going on aggressively and persistently in the United States but are only a phase of the general attack throughout the world. * * * In the United States the realists, and on the continent a type of nationalist and believer in a totalitarian policy, consider the idea of a state ruling according to law and not according to will as superstitious and decadent. They scoff at the idea of a people solemnly convenanting by constitution or bill of rights to keep to announced principles of right and justice and to reason, and striving by continued adherence to judicial construction of the covenant to make it real in their political behavior. * * *

"Our American fundamental doctrine of the separation of powers," he continues, "is under attack from those who urge that law is to be whatever is done officially. But the world has had not a little experience of late as to what rejection of that doctrine leads to. We were told under the Nazi regime that the separation of powers had disappeared from German public law. Russian writers tell us that the Soviet Constitution 'ignores the separation of powers.' They tell us that rights are not protected by law when they run counter to official policy. They tell us that law has an absolutely new meaning. It has no juristic rules but only technical social rules. There is no question of right and wrong, but only techniques of ordering behavior. Law is not to be a guide to government, but an instrument of government. Reason gives way to force.

"Some of them give up the very name of law, with its connotations of justice and rights and reason. One says, 'Every conscious workman is aware that religion is the opiate of the people; but I believe that only a few realize also that law is an even more poisonous and disturbing opiate.' "

I would call special attention to this quotation which links religion and the law together in condemnation. For the truth is that the traditional concept of law is fundamentally a religious concept. We might go further and say that the concept of law in western civilization, and particularly in this country, has been a Christian concept. To begin with, it is based on that concept of man which was the product of Christian teaching and Christian belief—the concept of man as free and equal, with essential rights springing from the fact that he has been endowed by his Creator with rational nature. It had its origin in the idea of man created by God as a social being, destined to live in society, and bound therefore by the natural law to reverence for and obedience to the legitimate government of the polity in which he lives, which in turn is equally bound by the natural law. The very opening sentence of the legal document which gave birth to this country as an independent Nation shows that our founding fathers based the whole legal structure of this country on the religious concept of the moral law. It is not strange then that recent attacks made on our traditional legal concepts should be intimately connected with the rejection of religious concepts. It is certainly questionable whether our traditional legal concepts can continue as vital realities apart from their religious foundation.

We who retain religious faith should be particularly concerned to preserve the traditional concepts and system of law which we have inherited in this country. By that I do not mean that we should remain stationary or become reactionary in our thinking, or that we should refuse to move with the times. Law must change to meet the new needs and problems which arise. But we have a special stake in preserving the fundamental concepts and the system itself which have come down to us; first, because they correspond to the most fundamental truths of human nature; second, because our most cherished institutions are inseparably entwined with them; and, finally, because only under such concepts and such a system can religion continue to flourish.

Since the modern trends threatening our legal heritage have their origin in a nonreligious or an antireligious spirit, it is not surprising that, once these trends have reached the fullness of their development, the destruction of religion should become for those who have gone along with these trends a sort of primary obsession. The reason is obvious. Religion in the nature of things stands for law. It places over all men, over all institutions, over the state itself, God's eternal law, especially as expressed in the law of our nature. It denies the validity of law or ordinance or dictate which is in contradiction to divine law. By its very nature then, religion finds itself in opposition to the personal rule of dictatorship, particularly if the dictator claims absolute power in the name of the state. It has been no mere accident that religion in general and the church in particular have found themselves the object of attack in each of the countries where totalitarian influences have gained full sway.

But it is not only religion that needs to fear modern movements opposed to our legal traditions. In their own way all personal liberty and every kind of free enterprise have quite as much to fear, for they too can flourish only under a rule of law. Shortsighted indeed is any individual, no matter what his economic status or his personal grievances, who would trade freedom under the law for the bondage of personal rule.

Well may we in this country be proud of the juridical system and legal tradition which our forefathers have developed and bequeathed to us. Under them our Nation has been able to grow to be the strongest on earth; yet all the while the individual has enjoyed the solid meat of true liberty—a liberty which has permitted him on the one hand to worship his God, to live his own life, and rear his family according to the dictates of conscience, and on the other hand has enabled him to produce and enjoy a material prosperity known to no other people under the sun. Under a system of law, preserving its continuity with the past and adapting itself to new problems, there is no question but that this country, which performed such miracles of production in the late war, can go on to produce in peace enough and to spare for all the citizens of this land.

At the present time a special significance attaches to the maintenance and development of the tradition of freedom under the law sacred to this country. The nations of the world are in the slow and painful process of bringing into being an international organization. It seems certain that our own country is destined to be the seat of that organization. Here will be gathered at frequent intervals, perhaps almost continuously, official representatives of nations from all over the world. If this country gives an outstanding demonstration of what can be accomplished by freedom within a great stable juridical system; if within the framework of the law we meet the problems of modern times and stand as a living example of the good life of freedom under the law, and as a contradiction of all that is claimed for the newer trends toward state absolutism with its concomitant slavery, then there can be no doubt that we shall exert a telling influence on the political and social thinking of the rest of the world.

At present our world stands poised between a free society governed by laws and a slave society of dictatorial rule; but it cannot long maintain its precarious balance. Can any one of us doubt that the side of freedom is the side of law? It is the present opportunity of our country to draw the world in the direction of law and freedom. From the depths of our hearts we pray God that our country may not let this great opportunity slip from its grasp.

The Capital Goes to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Franklin L. Burdette:

[From the National Municipal Review of September 1946]

THE CAPITAL GOES TO THE PEOPLE—INDIANA OFFICIALS GO BACK TO HOME TOWNS TO TALK THINGS OVER WITH THE FOLKS, TEACH GOVERNMENT, LEARN OF NEEDS

(By Franklin L. Burdette)

"Bringing the capital of Indiana to the people" is the theme of a novel, State-wide program of civic education under the personal leadership of Gov. Ralph F. Gates. In carefully organized community conferences, attended by the Governor, department heads, and other public officials, the work of the Indiana State government is discussed with high-school seniors, college students, civic groups, and the general public.

The first purpose of the conferences, the governor has said, is "to give the opportunity to the people of each community to see and talk with the heads of the various departments of State government and to have questions answered without the necessity of traveling to the capital of the State." The second purposes "is that the heads of State departments may understand more thoroughly the problems of the local communities." Good government, Governor Gates believes, must be close to the people; for effectiveness it must meet their needs, and for improvement it must depend on their support and understanding.

Beginning in December 1945, five regional conferences have been conducted, each for one day, at East Chicago, South Bend, Evansville, Terre Haute, and New Albany. Not less than 8,000 high-school seniors or college students have attended the conferences, participating in study classes. High school or college buildings have been use as centers, particularly to emphasize among young citizens the responsibilities which confront them. All meetings and classes have been open to the public.

In each community nonpolitical sponsorship has been arranged for the conference. Schools and colleges, chambers of commerce, and service clubs have appointed committees for local arrangements. Plans for each conference are made by the State department of commerce and public relations, headed by Lt. Gov. Richard T. James. Paul M. Ross, executive director of the department, is in charge of detailed arrangements. Costs of the programs are absorbed without specific budgetary allocations by participating State departments and by cooperating local organizations.

Morning sessions of conferences have been devoted to a preliminary convocation and to three class periods attended by high-school seniors. Virtually all seniors from public and parochial schools have attended, transportation being provided when necessary by

school busses. Depending upon the population of the region selected, seniors have represented schools in a single county or in as many as seven counties.

CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION GIVEN

Typically, officials from 18 State agencies which provide extensive public services are prepared to offer classroom instruction. Large attendance has at times required multiple sections in each subject, and additional sections have occasionally been organized in the afternoon. State officials are encouraged to present basic information and to afford time for full discussion and for questions. Visual aids, including motion pictures, slides, and charts, are used in several classes, and literature is distributed freely.

It is understood, upon the insistence of the Governor, that instruction must be nonpartisan but that discussion may range fully over the services and problems of State departments. The State Department of Public Instruction has cooperated in making advance arrangements with schools to facilitate selection of the three class sessions which each student will attend, to encourage notetaking and participation in discussion, and to plan oral reports by students when they return to their schools.

The Governor has whenever possible visited various classes during the morning sessions and has held a press conference with student reporters from all school newspapers of the region. A civic luncheon program is usually arranged by one of the sponsoring organizations.

GROUP CONFERENCES HELD

Afternoon sessions are devoted to individual or group conferences. The widest advance publicity is given to the availability of State officials for conferences with local officials, citizens, or citizen groups. State departments have sent hundreds of letters of open invitation to organizations, to officers of counties, cities, towns, and townships, and to State officers and agents working in the area. Newspapers and radio stations have announced conference hours. Each State department represented at the afternoon sessions has maintained a separate temporary headquarters. State officials have been especially prepared to discuss cooperation or specific services in the communities of the region. Attendance at the afternoon conferences has been both representative and large.

No attempt has been made to reach final decisions at these afternoon conferences—sometimes called clinics by the newspapers. But State officials and many local groups have expressed enthusiastic appreciation for the contacts and frank discussions of problems. Delegations have from time to time presented conflicts of opinion about local or regional needs, and such occasions have become informal public hearings. Newspaper coverage has been extensive; in Terre Haute even questions and answers were printed.

Experimentation has revealed that, measured by attendance, the conference day is more effectively closed with a dinner meeting than with a program in an auditorium. As the principal speaker, the Governor has presented department heads with brief, nonpartisan explanations of their functions in the State service. Questions are invited from the floor and the Governor assigns them to appropriate officials for answers. In practice, questions have been less readily volunteered by the adult audiences than by students meeting in the morning sessions. To avoid preparation of questions at the State capital, however, committees on local arrangements have been asked to suggest problems of significance and interest.

MORE CONFERENCES PLANNED

Because of the early closing of rural schools, governmental service conferences have not been scheduled from the middle of April until early fall. The 5 conferences already held will be augmented by at least 12 more in order to reach every section of the State. Favorable local reaction has resulted in many requests for annual conferences. The Governor expects to meet the requests, perhaps selecting a new center for each region when conferences are repeated.

The Indiana program of conferences is an outgrowth of Governor Gates' conviction that public officers, whether elected or appointed, should maintain the closest possible contacts with the people. In the broadest sense, the processes of civic education must flow in two directions. Officials and citizens are mutually teachers and pupils. Both have governmental responsibilities and, by a method of sharing, problems may be halved and accomplishments doubled.

The Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress has an especial interest in, and is indeed proud of, the Library of Congress. The Nation takes pride in the greatest library perhaps in the world. It is an inspiration to those who walk within its walls and observe not only one of the most beautiful and lustrous works of architecture but the compilation of the richest bureau of information ever assembled.

It would be presumptuous of me to adequately describe this work of art and knowledge. However, Mr. Horace C. Carlisle has described it beautifully and majestically in poetry in The Library of Congress, Treasure House of Beauty and Truth, The Library Is Not by Tourists Forgot, The Lovely Library of Congress, and The Librarian.

Knowing that the Members would be interested in these beautiful and appropriate descriptions, under unanimous consent, I include them in my remarks:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

(By Horace C. Carlisle)

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

T-he Library of Congress, earth's climax in art,
H-armonizing in every effective design,
E-ver widening in wonders—surprising the heart—
L-ifts a life into visions—that never depart—
I-n which wisdom and beauty and fitness combine.
B-oth tradition's and history's palmiest past,
R-evelations, with priceless philosophies fraught,
A-re enshrined here forever, to live and to last,
R-etrospective reminders that hold, and hold fast,
Y-esterday's and today's and tomorrow's best thought.
O-ft, when thrilled with a rapture, too full to define,
F-raught with high aspirations—enriched by a prayer—
C-onsecration slips into the heart, to entwine
O-ptimistic persuasions and feelings divine,
N-ever felt in such perfect profusion elsewhere.
G-od, Himself, seems to speak from these welcoming walls,
R-ecognizing that all things, predestined to last,
E-nshrined herein as if in response to His calls,
S-hould be, down through the ages, till time's curtain falls,
S-afely guarded, as treasures, vouchsafed from the past.

TREASURE HOUSE OF BEAUTY AND TRUTH

When we sit, and watch the people,
In the wide Library halls,
Saunter thru it, seeking wisdom
From its ceiling and its walls,
Painted there in rich profusion,
We in wonder meditate
On the past, and ask the question,
Will the future be as great?

People, living in the present,
Have the wisdom of the past
To help them to build the future
Still more beautiful and vast—
But, by work, and not by conquest,
Work of heart and mind and hand,
Are all lasting works accomplished,
After being wisely planned.

Many of the finest people,
From the corners of the earth,
Come to this superb Library—
For to scholars it is worth
More than all the hoarded millions
Of the Nation's millionaires—
This Library is the answer
To today's historians' prayers.

THE LIBRARY IS NOT BY TOURISTS FORGOT

The Library of Congress is the recognized
Masterpiece of all structural art—
By the masters of learning it's oft eulogized
For the magical, logical part
That it's played in preserving the wisdom of men,
Which enriched the historical past,
By the products of chisel, of brush, and of pen,
That should be kept intact till the last.

Its rich, picturesque grandeur is nowhere excelled,
Its rare sculptury can't be surpassed,
Its historic importance can't be paralleled,
For herein has been wisely amassed
The best thought of the ages that has been enshrined
In the languages of many lands,
And these transcendent treasures recall to the mind
The great work of antiquity's hands.

The Library of Congress is earth's beauty spot;
It's the Mecca to which tourists come,
And secure, for their hearts, a rare forget-me-not,
To take with them, when they return home.
As the Wise Men looked forward to Bethlehem's Star,
They look backward with pleasure upon
The Library of Congress, wherever they are,
For what it for their own hearts has done.

THE LOVELY LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

In the matchless Library of Congress, enshrined
In America's national heart,
Are preserved the historical works of mankind,
Done in lit'rature, sculpture, and art,
That the people, as time toward eternity moves,
While their int'rests in men and things last,
May enjoy these creations, which Heaven approves,
As they silently speak from the past.

From these volumes the tales of antiquity's past
Are retold to the truth-seeking mind—
Here the progress of man, from the first to the last,
Has been, by those before us, enshrined—
The Library of Congress is everywhere known
As the mecca for lovers of art,
And for lovers of lit'rature—it stands alone,
Beauty spot in America's heart.

For humanity's sake, from the press of the past
The great works, in all languages, rest
In the Library's care, where they stand, justly classed
By the scholars of earth as the best.
When the ending of time bids farewell to the years,
And they sleep in oblivion's tomb,
The Library of Congress, as now it appears,
Methinks, may up in Heaven find room.

THE LIBRARIAN

L-uther H. Evans, the Library's Chief,
U-nder whose management it is maintained,
T-akes special pride that it is the belief,
H-eld by his force, that the Library's gained
E-ver since he has been given control—
R-ight is his guide, and success is his goal.

H-e, with the courge to keep keeping on,

E-very night, in his dreams, happily sees
V-isions of days better than those now gone;
A-nd, as the future unfolds, by degrees,
N-obly, expectantly, he's hoping to
S-ee, later on, all his best dreams come true.

T-rue to the trust that's committed to him,
H-e by his conscience alone is controlled.
E-very new task he performs with a vim—

L-ooking ahead, as the hours unfold,
I-n swift succession, new duties that must
B-e done in ways, both impartial and just.
R-endering service to his fellow men,
A-lways alert to the present-day needs,
R-eady always with his voice and his pen,
I-n his own manner and style he proceeds.
A-ctions speak louder than words, yea, is true—
N-ot what we say, so much, but what we do.

Reduction of Income-Tax Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, there is herewith submitted for the RECORD a letter from Mr. Courtland Kelsey, of New York City, a recognized expert on Federal taxation, which, in my opinion, utterly demolishes the criticism that H. R. 1 would unfairly benefit high-income groups at the expense of those in the lower brackets.

In a subsequent letter, Mr. Kelsey pointed out the inequities of the present income-tax rates. For example, an individual with a $10,000 income pays more than 11 times as much taxes as a man with a $2,000 income, while a man with a $50,000 income pays more than 125 times as much.

NEW YORK, *January 10, 1947.*

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In a letter appearing in the New York Times of January 8, Mr. Hyman H. Bookbinder, assistant director of research, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, takes the position that the uniform reduction in income-tax rates provided in H. R. 1 would unfairly benefit the higher income-tax groups, and offers the following table purporting to demonstrate it:

Total net income	Spendable income		Percent increase
	Present law	H. R. 1	
$1,200	$1,162	$1,170	0.7
$2,000	1,810	1,848	2.1
$3,000	2,620	2,696	2.9
$5,000	4,202	4,362	3.8
$10,000	7,815	8,252	5.6
$50,000	25,205	30,164	19.7
$100,000	36,873	49,498	34.3
$300,000	65,436	112,349	71.7
$500,000	92,536	157,927	70.6
$1,000,000	160,286	271,177	69.4

Mathematically the figures are approximately correct and no doubt the same argument will be made and the same or similar figures presented at the hearings before your committee. Like many other statistics, however, those presented by Mr. Bookbinder should not be accepted at face value since they are confined to showing the increase in "spendable income" that would result from H. R. 1 and ignore the actual relation between the spendable income and the total income of the two groups under the present law and as proposed by H. R. 1.

It is quite obvious that if A now pays only 2 percent of his total income for taxes no possible reduction in taxes could increase his spendable income by more than 2 percent of the total income, while if B now pays 70 percent of his total income for taxes his spendable income could be increased by as much as 70 percent of his total income. It is equally obvious, however, that the reason for this is that 98 percent of A's total income is already spendable, while only 30 percent of B's total income is spendable. As a first step in determining whether the uniform 20 percent reduction in tax rates is "fair," therefore, the percentages of spendable income to total income should be substituted for the amounts of spendable income shown in Mr. Bookbinder's table. The table would then be as follows:

Net income	Spendable income	
	Present law	H. R. 1
	Percent	*Percent*
$1,200	96.8	97.5
$2,000	90.5	92.4
$3,000	87.3	89.9
$5,000	84.0	87.2
$10,000	78.1	82.5
$50,000	50.4	60.3
$100,000	36.9	49.5
$300,000	21.8	37.4
$500,000	18.5	31.6
$1,000,000	16.0	27.1

Because the higher income groups started with so much smaller percentages of spendable income, the increases resulting from the reduction in rates are necessarily greater, but unless the percentages after the increases are themselves unfair, there is nothing unfair about the increases.

Mr. Bookbinder favors, as an alternative to uniform reduction of rates, an increase in the personal exemptions from $500 to $1,000 each. He says that this would increase the spendable income of a $2,000-a-year family man by 10 percent, a $10,000-a-year man by 3 percent, and a $100,000-a-year man by 1 percent, which he considers to be fairer. Since the $2,000-a-year man's spendable income is now more than 90 percent of his total income, because of the present exemptions and the relatively low rate of tax, it is obvious that doubling the exemptions could not possibly increase it by more than 10 percent. Doubling the exemptions, however, does increase the portion of the total income on which no tax whatever is paid and, on that basis, the percentages of increase are not 10 percent for the $2,000-a-year man, 3 percent for the $10,000-a-year man, and 1 percent for the $100,000-a-year man, but 50 percent, 10 percent, and 1 percent, respectively. Furthermore, even if Mr. Bookbinder's own method of determining the percentages of increase is adopted, the man whose spendable income is already 90.5 percent of his total income would have this increased by 10 percent; the man whose spendable income is already 78.1 percent would have this increased by 3 percent; while the man whose spendable income is now only 16 percent would have this increased by 1 percent.

Payment of income tax has been truly likened to working a portion of the year for the Government without compensation. Apparently Mr. Bookbinder takes the position that if A now works 2 days and B works 20, when any change is made A's work should be reduced from 2 days to 1 day, or 50 percent, but B's work should not be reduced from 20 days to 10 days, but only to 19 days, or 5 percent. As a result, B would then be required to work 19 times as long as A instead of 10 times. If B's time were reduced by 10 days, he would necessarily have a greater reduction than A, since A's reduction cannot exceed the 2 days which he now works. But if B thereafter continues to work 10 days to A's one, wherein is B's reduction unfair to A?

I am enclosing a clipping from the Times and trust that you will not be swayed from your present position.

Very truly yours,

COURTLAND KELSEY.

Rural Electrification Program Great Asset to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by me at the Tennessee Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Nashville, Tenn., on January 15, 1947. The address is as follows:

The Federal rural electrification program constitutes one of the greatest benefits that has ever come to the farmers of America. It has done much to modernize the farming industry. It has brought to the farm the advantages of city life. It has made farming interesting and attractive to young people so that in increasing numbers they are remaining on the farms of the country. This is of value not only to farms but to the Nation as a whole. Every citizen ought to understand the benefits coming from this program so we can meet the attacks which will be made upon it.

Of the approximatel; 6,000,000 farms in this country, only 3 percent had power line electric service in 1925 and only a little more than 10 percent in 1935. Commercial power companies had not found a way to operate profitably in rural areas that were outside the immediate vicinity of cities and towns. In thinly settled rural areas, farmers seeking electric service were thwarted by high connection charges and expensive long-term contracts.

The Nation's answer to this problem was Federal credit for rural electrification, with farmers operating their own power systems. Congress made the first move by including funds for promotion of rural electrification in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. The late President Roosevelt, on May 11, 1935, established the Rural Electrification Administration by Executive order. REA became a continuing agency of the Federal Government when Congress on May 20, 1936, passed the Rural Electrification Act.

At the start of the program, it was believed that commercial power companies would take the lead in the rural electrification program. However, utility firms borrowed less than $1,000,000 of $100,000,000 in emergency relief funds made available for the program in 1935, and it soon became apparent that a truly national program was possible only if farmers themselves became active. In 1935, rural electric cooperatives began to spring up throughout the country. Their accomplishments soon established the fact that the nonprofit farmer cooperative was a highly effective instrument for rural electrification.

The effectiveness of the Federal rural electrification program is shown by the latest official reports of progress. A few months before REA was established, fewer than 750,000 American farms had central station electric service. As of July 1, 1946, this number had grown to more than 3,000,000 or nearly 53 percent of all the farms in the Nation. Approximately half of the farms electrified since 1935 are served by REA-financed lines. The rest are on lines of commercial power companies whose activity in rural areas has been stimulated by the REA program.

More than 900 REA borrowers, financed by loans exceeding $900,000,000, are today operating nearly a half-million miles of lines serving more than 1,600,000 farms and other rural consumers in 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands. More than 75 percent of the consumers on REA-financed lines are farms. The rest are nonfarm rural homes, churches, schools, community halls, stores, and a variety of rural industries such as creameries, grain elevators, woodworking plants, machinery repair shops, and quarries.

Farmers are managing their own cooperative electric systems so well that in many cases they are repaying their Government loans more rapidly than their loan contracts require. REA latest reports show that borrowers have paid nearly $100,000,000 of principal and interest on their loans, of which almost $20,000,000 represents payments on principal in advance of due dates. Payments overdue more than 30 days totaled only about $700,000 or less than eight-tenths of 1 percent of the amount due.

In the State of Tennessee, before the rural electrification program began, only 9,727 farms, or 3.6 percent of all the farms in the State, had central station electric service. Latest estimates based on the 1940 census show that 25.6 percent of all 247,617 farms now are electrified. There are 30 REA borrowers in the State, operating nearly 15,000 miles of power lines and serving more than 102,000 rural consumers.

One of the factors that has enabled REA borrowers to carry out electrification in sparsely settled rural areas that commercial power companies found uninviting is the principle of area coverage. REA believes that in any rural community every farmer who wants electric service is as much entitled to it as another. In carrying out this policy of area coverage, REA borrowers group farms in thinly settled territory on lines with those in more populous areas. In this way, they are able to serve entire rural communities at uniformly low rates.

A great deal remains to be accomplished in Tennessee in carrying out this area-coverage program. Tennessee contains some of the Nation's largest co-ops and ranks second only to Texas in number of consumers served by REA-financed lines. However, the latest operating reports of the Tennessee co-ops indicate that only 49 percent of the consumers they serve are farms. This is among the lowest percentages in the country. The rest are nonfarm establishments, such as homes, business stores, and industries in small towns and villages. The REA-financed lines in Tennessee serve an average of more than 7 consumers to the mile, the highest of any State, indicating grounds for suspecting that the co-ops here have not yet gone so far back into the hills and remote valleys as those elsewhere.

In 1945, Congress approved the McCord amendment to the Rural Electrification Act, under which REA was authorized to make loans to finance the Tennessee co-ops to refinance their indebtedness to TVA. This action enabled the co-ops to qualify for the 2 percent, 35-year financing available through REA. All of the TVA co-ops in Tennessee have now taken advantage of the more favorable financing made available to them under this amendment, have refinanced their TVA loans, and are fully financed by REA.

One effect of this change in financing is expected to be increased emphasis by the Tennessee co-ops on service to farms. This tendency can be seen already in the expansion plans the Tennessee co-ops have submitted to REA for approval.

Of the $550,000,000 in REA loan funds available during the 2-year period of fiscal 1946 and fiscal 1947, REA has already allocated more than $18,000,000 in loan funds to Tennessee borrowers. These loans will finance the additional REA-financed power systems in the State of 12,500 miles of rural power lines serving 63,000 new consumers. These new lines are being built as rapidly as line-construction materials can be obtained. The Tennessee co-ops are continuing to prepare plans for additional expansion. As of the end of 1946, loan applications totaling almost $9,000,000 from Tennessee borrowers were being processed in REA headquarters or were in preparation in the field.

REA loans approved in Tennessee since the program began amount to more than $30,000,000. Of the total amount approved, almost $18,000,000 has been advanced to the borrowers to finance paying for completed construction. The Tennessee borrowers have paid nearly $5,000,000 of principal and interest on their Government loans. Nearly one-fourth of this amount represents payments on principal in advance of due dates.

Rural electrification has greatly stimulated city and small-town employment and trade in Tennessee. Experience has shown that for every dollar spent in building rural power lines, farmers spent $2 for wiring, plumbing, equipment, and appliances. Added to these direct business benefits is the effect of rural electrification in increasing farm efficiency and income and thus contributing to community morale and prosperity.

Farmers served by REA-financed lines in Tennessee are making ever wider use of electric power. Scores have taken up dairying as an added farm enterprise, using electricity to do most of the work: pump water, milk the cows, and cool the milk for the grade A market. Electric haydriers no longer are a novelty in the State. One farmer last year was paid a premium of $5 to $10 a ton for his barn-cured hay.

Some farmers have turned from cotton to livestock farming, relying on the electric pump to supply water; others have turned to truck farming, using electricity to irrigate; still others have gone into the poultry business, using lights to provide longer days for the laying hens, electric heat for chick brooders, and electric power for the water pump.

In many sections of the country, the increased use being made of electricity by farmers has produced a shortage of power in rural areas. The co-ops of Tennessee, supplied abundantly with TVA power at reasonable wholesale rates, are fortunate that this problem does not bother them. This power situation, plus the relatively high consumer density of the co-op systems, places the Tennessee co-ops in unusually favorable position to carry out farm electrification on a wide scale.

The Rural Electrification Administration was established because of the needs of rural people for electric service. Electricity on the farm may once have been a luxury, but developments of the last 11 years have made it plain that it is now an essential service. Without electric power, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the farmer who lacks electric power to make his full contribution to our agricultural economy. Extension of that service to every Tennessee farmer will require enlightened membership and continuance of wise and unselfish local leadership.

A few days ago I received a letter from Mr. W. S. Bates, manager of the Volunteer Electric Cooperative. I want to quote three paragraphs from this letter. I am certain Mr. Bates expresses the sentiments and experience of rural electric cooperatives throughout the country.

"It has been reported that Congressman TABER, who, we understand, is slated to become chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has stated that the Rural Electrification Administration has been receiving three or four times too much money, that it ought to be put on a business basis, and that he intends to see that this is done.

"Our project is providing electric service for approximately 7,700 members and has on hand applications from approximately 3,500 others who have been waiting from 1 to 5 years. With just a little encouragement, we believe another thousand applications would be made immediately. The last request we had with REA for funds was in the amount of $860,000, but, due to limitations of funds, our application was cut $335,000.

"Through the years our cooperative has been operating, many applicants have had to wait and wait, because we were advised REA did not have adequate funds to lend to build all the lines for which we had requests."

We cannot avoid the fact that the private power trust and lobby is going to try to do all the damage possible to the TVA and to its rural electrification program. They feel encouraged by the recent change in control of Congress. Both the TVA and REA are bipartisan programs. Neither has ever participated in politics, and they do not rest on a political basis. Both programs have the support of both parties in Congress. I do not think the change in political control of the Federal Legislature is going to greatly affect the REA program. It will not if you see to it that the people are well informed as to the benefits of the program and that they make their position known to their Senators and Congressmen. But we must be on the outlook for crippling amendments. They will be offered. Some of them look reasonable until they are fully analyzed.

Undoubtedly the amendment prohibiting the building of generating plants, unless the Federal Power Commission finds that rates are unreasonable, will be presented again in this Congress. Well, in the Tennessee Valley we do not have to worry so much about generating plants, but this amendment is intended to sabotage the whole REA program, and if it is applied to generating plants sooner or later it will also be applied to transmission and distribution lines. It is an effort to make the farmers of America operating their co-ops come to Washington, go through the expense of litigation before the Federal Power Commission and in courts. It would result in such prolonged delays as to effectively prohibit co-ops from building needed generating

plants. And mark you, the same thing would follow as to co-op lines. The amendment must be defeated.

Another amendment that will undoubtedly be offered is to prohibit co-ops from buying existing plants or distribution lines. The big part of the success of the REA program has been in the acquisition of existing facilities. The co-ops in the Tennessee Valley would never have been able to operate successfully if they had not been able to purchase facilities of the private electric companies. Throughout the Nation farmers have built electric lines. These later have been purchased by the electrical co-ops and services have been improved. The REA program would be sabotaged if this amendment should be adopted.

An amendment offered last year to the House appropriation bill requiring REA to contract all of its construction will no doubt be offered again this year. This is an unreasonable proposal. It would result in paying on occasions an unreasonable amount for construction. It is an impediment which no private utility has to operate under. Most contracts should and ordinarily would be let by contract. But to provide by law that this must be done would take away the bargaining position of electrical cooperatives.

I hope that throughout the United States you will get the message to your Representatives in Washington as to what the REA program means to you—or what it means to the farmers of America. If you do this, we need not fear repressive legislation.

Good Advice to Genuine Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial:

FATE OF THE TIMID

It was along in the middle of the 1940 Presidential campaign that an observing citizen whom we know made this comment:

"I wish I could escape the impression that the Democrats had named the Republican candidate."

The man who said that was a friend of Mr. Willkie, a rather close friend in fact. Perhaps he contributed sizably to Mr. Willkie's campaign, although that would be his business. Certainly he had Mr. Willkie's confidence; did all he could for his election and was distressed at his defeat.

What this citizen had observed was that the speakers, writers, and commentators who had appeared enthusiastic for Mr. Willkie's nomination and who in great degree were responsible for the creation of public sentiment that influenced the Republican convention to choose Mr. Willkie, had, in many cases turned out to be strong partisans of Mr. Roosevelt. Once the Republican nomination was made, they turned against Mr. Willkie.

Well, perhaps that particular suspicion was born from clear intimations of Mr. Willkie's defeat, but it is also a fact that it would conform to pattern. The Republican Party has indeed been influenced by the propaganda outcries from sources which mean no good to the Republican Party.

In the campaign of 1944, Governor Dewey certainly made some concessions to New Dealism, notably when he endorsed the Wagner Act. It is certainly questionable whether any of the so-called liberal sentiment which had been so vocal on the subject was thereby converted to Mr. Dewey. It is equally questionable whether very many independent voters were impressed.

In the battle over the continuance of price fixing a great many of the Republican leaders of Congress thought it best to pay lip service to OPA. It is hard to believe that they were not greatly influenced by the propaganda blasts in behalf of OPA. It soon developed that the country was very tired of OPA. Either the Republicans were influenced by the propaganda or else they sadly misjudged public sentiment. Finally, the Republicans saw that the country was tired of controls and Washington meddling. When they acted on that theory they began to gain the votes that won the 1946 elections.

Having gained that success, one might think that the Republican majority would cease to pay attention to a lot of people who right up to the day of election insisted that American sentiment wanted none of the Republicans. However, such judgment would be lacking a full appreciation of the timidity of politicians.

The same old tune is being sung. The Republicans are in the hands of the "old guard"; what is the "old guard" is not specified. The progressives are frozen out; they are, but it was the voters who did the freezing. The Republicans just think the people gave a mandate against New Dealism, and they had better be careful what they do.

Now the new Republican Congress is not very old. It is too early to judge what it will do. But at this stage of the proceedings there are certainly grounds for the unpleasant impression that some of the leaders have been listening to the liberal fairy tales.

There was the campaign promise to demobilize war controls. That has been considerably modified by some Members of Congress who now think that most of these controls still are necessary. How the Government functioned for one-hundred-and-fifty-odd years without them is not adequately explained.

There was the promise of economy. Now we hear that a budget of $37,500,000,000 cannot be reduced very much. It certainly can't if the Republicans are to accept the idea that the elimination or curtailment of any current Government activity would be a calamity.

And then they must be careful not to do anything drastic in labor-relations legislation. Very well, let's don't do anything drastic. But to make unions equal—and no more—before law is hardly in the category of drastic.

Every one of these modifications of position exactly corresponds with the line put forward by that group of publicists which never meant the Republican Party any good.

All over this world political parties which do not know what they think or have not the courage to say and act on what they think are disappearing. They are no loss.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who represents a congressional district rich in agriculture, and representing a State which is second in the production of hard wheat, and a great cattle-producing area as well as large numbers of sheep, my farmer constituents are quite apprehensive about the proposed further reduction of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The Congress, by adopting the Steagall amendment, established an agricultural policy for this country for a period of 2 years after the war had been officially declared over. A further reduction of duty on basic agricultural commodities will in effect nullify the Steagall amendment and consequently the fixed policy of Congress.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill suspending temporarily the authority of the President of the United States from entering into any foreign-trade agreements that would decrease any existing rate of duty without the advice, consent, and approval of the Congress.

Concurrently with introducing this bill, I have today directed a letter to the Honorable George Marshall, the Secretary of State, suggesting and requesting that he halt further hearings in the State Department having to do with the proposed reduction of the present rates.

As a part of my remarks I include copy of my letter to Secretary Marshall:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE MARSHALL,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I say in the beginning, that I offer my sincere congratulations and best wishes to you in the tremendous task you have undertaken. I know of no appointment that has been made in a decade that has been more popular or meets with the universal approbation of the American people.

I represent one of the great agricultural congressional districts in the United States. For 6 years I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture in the House, and only left the committee this year because I was named to a position on the Rules Committee.

Because of what I sincerely believe to be one of the most serious economic problems facing the American people is now being considered by the State Department, I am prompted to write you this letter. Apparently it is proposed to lower duties still more at this time, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; and I sincerely hope that you will terminate at once the hearings now being held before the Committee on Reciprocal Information.

The question of import duties has been a controversial issue ever since the Boston Tea Party. In fact, this has been the main issue in many, many Presidential campaigns. It is of course high-sounding, and theoretically a beautiful case could be made to the effect that duty fixing or rate making should be entirely eliminated from politics. I say, Amen! so far as partisan politics is concerned; but as I view the situation, if politics means "Science of Government," then the question of reducing or increasing duties is most assuredly a political question—not a partisan political question, but nevertheless a political question.

Mr. Secretary, I should like your indulgence, and submit herewith a few of the many reasons which, to my way of thinking, make it necessary that these hearings should be terminated at once.

(a) The problem is political. If it is said that it should not be a domestic political problem, then I submit that further lowering these duties at the present time is power politics.

(b) The problem is highly controversial.

(c) Further reduction in duties at this time will unduly disturb our domestic economy.

(d) The domestic and foreign commerce situation is much different today than it was when the reciprocal-trade program was inaugurated.

(e) Many excise taxes have been imposed and increased on American goods. Many foreign goods are now wholly in the hands of foreign monopolies.

(f) The Congress by legislation, with the full approval of the President of the United States, adopted the Steagall amendment, under which guaranties of not less than 90 percent of parity as a floor price for most agricultural products is effective for the next 2 years.

(g) According to official reports from the Department of Agriculture, the world price of many agricultural products, plus the proposed duty, is much less than the lawful floor price guaranteed by Congress. For example: If the world price of wheat is $1 and the proposed duty is 21 cents per bushel, we have a total wheat world price, plus duty, of $1.21 per bushel. The 90 percent parity floor price guaranteed by law to the wheat farmers in this country is approximately $1.69 per bushel. You can thus readily see the difficulty that would confront us in respect to the wheat situation.

(h) Our Government has a huge financial task to provide the funds to support agricultural prices in conformity with the provisions of the Steagall amendment, without taking upon itself the responsibility of supporting the agricultural prices of the whole world.

(i) If we are to provide the funds necessary to support the expense of Government, and certainly if we are to pay anything on the national debt, we must maintain a national income that will make this possible. This we cannot do if the Office of the Secretary of State permits any group within the State Department to wreck our domestic economy.

(j) Some agricultural products are not at this hour bringing the guaranteed price, and since the futures market indicates that perhaps many domestically produced agricultural products are, and will be, below the legal support price guaranteed by the Steagall amendment, you can readily understand the extreme seriousness of the situation; and certainly this is no time to further "tinker" with duties. If we are to back you up in the huge undertaking you now have, in establishing a permanent peace, certainly we must keep our country strong at home, not only from a military standpoint, but from the standpoint of our own domestic economy.

We are facing a very serious fiscal situation. You have tremendous responsibility, but I can think of none more serious than your responsibility of preventing the people in your Department from jeopardizing the economic welfare of our people in this country. You and I both know that it is much easier to keep men employed than it is to find them jobs after they have lost them. By the same token, it is much easier to maintain a price structure for commodities than it is to try to adjust them after the prices have taken a downward spiral.

It is worthy of note that this is the first postwar period in history where there has not up to this time been a downward spiral of agricultural prices. I believe the Steagall amendment is largely responsible for this situation. As I see it, you cannot at this time lower these duties on agricultural products without nullifying the benefits of the Steagall amendment, which is the law of the land. I, therefore, respectfully submit that the hearings which are now being conducted and which are within themselves causing much apprehension in the country, be terminated and this whole matter of further "tinkering" with the lowering of duties, be suspended for a period of a year, until we can have a better opportunity to take stock of ourselves. By that time the peace treaty will have been written and we will have a much better picture of the whole situation than we could possibly have at the present.

Very sincerely yours,

ROSS RIZLEY,
Member of Congress.

The Important Decision Awaited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the question of equalization of freight rates has been under consideration for many years. Much progress has been made in the last few years toward equalizing rates between the official zone in the north and the southern and southwestern zones. In carrying out the policies established under the Transportation Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission held hearings in various places throughout the Nation over a period of many months. As a result, an order was issued by the Commission that would reduce class rates 10 percent in the South and increase them 10 percent in the East and North. The order was contested in a Federal court in New York and upheld. It was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and a decision will mean much toward resolving this issue.

Recently the Louisville Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky., had an editorial, which I think is significant. The El Dorado Daily News, of El Dorado, Ark., commented on this editorial in one of its recent issues and under unanimous consent I include it in my remarks:

THE IMPORTANT DECISION AWAITED

This indeed is a momentous year for the South, when it is remembered that we can expect a decision from the Supreme Court on the all-important freight-rate issue. The battle was joined in the high tribunal when the Court agreed to hear the protest of nine Northern and Eastern States against an Interstate Commerce Commission order reducing class freight rates 10 percent in the South and increasing them 10 percent in the East and North. This order was upheld by a United States district court.

Also pending is the suit brought by Governor Arnall, of Georgia, with that State itself as the petitioner, to force equal rates and to penalize railroads and having imposed historic differentials.

The Louisville Courier-Journal said in a recent editorial that the South might well be grateful to its rival region for having brought its suit.

"Never was the point of dispute more clearly revealed than in the petition of the nine Northern States, and never was greater support given to the southern cause," the Kentucky newspaper points out. "For what the suit says, in so many words, is that the North will lose some of its traditional advantage in industrial competition if the ICC is permitted to reduce class freight rates 10 percent in the South while raising them 10 percent in the North."

The Courier-Journal goes on to declare that the South certainly will agree that this will be the result of the order. But it will disagree stoutly with the North's argument that the result will be improper and confiscatory.

"Look," the South might well say—"look who's talking now about confiscation and discrimination. After generations of competitive advantage, the North is talking about unfairness when the advantage shifts."

Portal-to-Portal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I commend to you and to the membership of this body a most-learned brief on the situation created by the decision in the Mount Clemens pottery case. The author is the Honorable Joe C. Barrett, an outstanding member of the Jonesboro, Ark., bar. I believe that members of the House of Representatives Judiciary Committee and the House Committee on Education and Labor will find this brief of especial interest in their endeavors to solve the problems arising under this decision of the court. Attorney Barrett has studied this matter most earnestly, and he has, in this brief, submitted much information which will be of real value to the considerations of the Congress.

MEMORANDUM BRIEF ON CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO OUTLAW PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY SUITS

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States (opinion by Justice Murphy) in the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. case has resulted in the filing of suits seeking to recover overtime, liquidated damages and attorneys' fees by employees against employers totaling an enormous sum. While the decision does not definitely settle anything in that particular case, the clear import of the decision is that, regardless of prior custom or contract, recovery can be had for all time in excess of 40 hours per week spent by an employee as "walking time" and "preliminary preparations" prior to and after the usual customary beginning and stopping time. Of course, the opinion indicates that if the time spent in these activities is insignificant, the de minimis non curat lex rule applies. We recall no instances, however, where the de minimis rule has heretofore been applied in suits for the recovery of money and, to this extent, we believe it is a new application of that rule. What is de minimis must still be settled by an authoritative opinion of the court of last resort.

The impact of this decision upon industry is so great that the Attorney General asked leave to intervene in the Mount Clemens case upon its remand, apparently in the hope of minimizing the ultimate effect upon the public Treasury because of the fact that a very large portion of any ultimate recovery will fall upon the United States by reason of the cost-plus war contracts. The very existence of small industries is threatened by this decision.

It is hardly to be hoped that there will be such complete reversal by the courts as to afford corrective relief. Any relief that can be effective must, therefore, come from Congress. If we view the trend of public think-

ing correctly, the Congress is ready and willing to act. It becomes important, therefore, to analyze the legal basis for action by Congress.

CONGRESS HAS THE RIGHT TO FORBID THE ENFORCEMENT OF CLAIMS NOW PENDING FOR THE COLLECTION OF BACK PAY UNDER SECTIONS 6, 7, AND 16 (B) OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Apparently, many believe that there is something inherently unconstitutional in retroactive legislation. This belief is not justified. Of course, ex post facto criminal legislation is prohibited by the Constitution, but retroactive civil legislation is not. It is only when the validity of such legislation is attacked on the ground that some vested right is taken away without due process of law under the fifth amendment that there is any constitutional limitation upon Congress to enact retroactive civil legislation.

Furthermore, even a vested property right which would otherwise be protected by the fifth amendment may be abolished retroactively by Congress when Congress is exercising a power specifically conferred upon Congress by the Constitution. An example of such power vested in Congress is the power to regulate interstate commerce. An example of the power of a State is the police power.

It will be pointed out hereinafter that it seems reasonably clear that the rights of an employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act are not such as would survive a repeal of the act. Since this is a question, however, to be interpreted by the courts and may vary with such interpretation, it would appear advisable to couple with a repeal of the act of affirmative abrogation of those rights, in the lawful exercise of the congressional power to remove present burdens placed upon commerce by the enforcement of the act as construed in the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. case. If this be done, it would be desirable for Congress to make certain findings of fact.

In adopting the Fair Labor Standards Act, Congress declared public policy and found as a fact that the existence of substandard living conditions and excessive working hours (1) caused the channels of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such conditions; (2) burdened the free flow of commerce; (3) constituted unfair competition; (4) led to labor disputes obstructing commerce; (5) interfered with the orderly marketing of goods. (See section 2 of the act.) It is also found to be the purpose of the act to relieve unemployment by shortening the workweek and spreading the work. It was to relieve these burdens that the act was adopted providing for minimum wages and maximum hours and overtime pay.

Congress could now find that (at least, prior to the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. case) in applying sections 6 and 7, both employers and employees followed a substantially uniform practice of interpreting "workweek" as being either period upon which pay was customarily based at the time of the act's adoption either (1) by custom or usage; or (2) as a result of collective-bargaining contracts; or (3) upon some other accepted understanding of the period during which the employee was actually engaged in productive labor. Congress could now find that agreement had been entered into and carried out on that basis; that rates of pay had been calculated on that basis and had been paid and received without protest.

It would seem proper for Congress to then find that, as a result of the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. case, suits seeking recovery of vast sums for overtime had been instituted under the provisions of section 16 (b); that such suits seek to recover pay for time beyond that which, by the practice of the parties, had been thought of as constituting a legitimate workweek; that enforcement of such claims threatens the solvency of the employers, particularly those who had prepared their financial budgets according to the past practice which they and their employees had consistently followed. It would seem proper also for Congress to find that the present enforcement of such claims could not serve retroactively to alleviate the conditions which the act found to exist, particularly those relating to burdens on commerce; that such enforcement could result only in the imposition of additional burdens and in unexpected and unanticipated recovery by employees.

It would seem proper for Congress also to find affirmatively that instead of aiding commerce, the enforcement of such claims threatens the credit of employers who have in good faith relied upon the construction heretofore placed upon the act and the acquiescence of the employees thereunder; that the enforcement of such claims at this time would create hardship, financial embarrassment, and, in many cases, financial disaster; that the threatened enforcement would create ill feeling between management and labor, confusion and uncertainty as to what pay labor is entitled to receive and the employer obligated to pay, and interferes with collective bargaining; that for these and other reasons the present interpretation constitutes a burden on interstate commerce and free flow of goods in commerce, leads to labor disputes, burdening and obstructing commerce, and thus enhances the very burdens upon commerce which it was the purpose of the act to remove.

Upon such findings Congress could then well declare that it is contrary to public policy to permit the enforcement of such claims. Perhaps it would be desirable to include one exception in favor of employees who actually perform services in reliance upon the provisions of the act as interpreted by the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. case.

Basing its action upon such findings of fact, Congress could first repeal sections 6, 7, and 16 (b) of the act retroactively; then it could reenact sections 6 and 7, including definitions of hour and workweek in such way as to exclude walking time and such other unanticipated items as now constitute the basis of the actions now pending. Congress could then reenact section 16 (b) so as to prohibit the maintenance of suits under that section for overtime based on claims alleged to have accrued prior to effective date of the new act, except in cases where the employee can affirmatively show that he performed portal-to-portal services prior thereto in reliance upon an interpretation of the original act entitling him to pay for such services, and providing also that in any such action acceptance by the employee without protest of pay tendered for services performed during any workweek constitutes conclusive evidence that no such reliance was in fact placed by the employee upon his right to portal-to-portal pay. With reference to future suits, the new section 16 (b) should contain a short period of limitations.

The following reasons support the power of Congress to adopt such an act:

I. A right created by statute falls with the repeal of the statute, even as to rights in litigation actually pending in the courts at the time of repeal, provided it has not been reduced to judgment, and provided a contractual or vested property right has not been created by action of the parties under the statute.

II. The power of Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional duty to regulate interstate commerce, is not limited by private contractual or vested property rights, which may be taken away without compensation in a proper exercise of that power.

III. The rights of employees under sections 6, 7, and 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act are not private property rights, but are rather in the nature of public rights granted to effectuate a declared legislative policy and, therefore, a fortiori can be taken away retroactively to effectuate in legislative policy.

These points are briefed in consecutive order:

I

Under this heading we will discuss cases dealing with the effect of the repeal of a statutory right, where there is neither a saving clause protecting rights accrued thereunder, nor an indication that the legislature affirmatively intended to strike down the right in order to effectuate a legitimate legislative policy. The general rule in these cases is that a right created by statute, having no separate existence apart from the statute, falls with its repeal even when litigation to enforce the right is actually pending in the courts. It is only when the court finds that by reason of action by the parties under the statute, a vested right protected by the fifth amendment, or in the case of a right created by a State legislature, a contract right protected by the Constitution from abrogation by the State, has been created, that such a right is held to survive. It is not believed that such a right exists here. But even if it be thought that the rights of employees became vested or contractual, as we shall see in point II, infra, they may be abrogated by a proper exercise of a legislative power created by the Constitution.

A. Cases where the right fell with the statute

The principle that a statutory right falls with the statute, even as to cases pending in the courts, has its origin in the English law. Leading English cases on the subject arose under a statute of insolvency which authorized a debtor who had delivered all his property to his creditors to obtain a discharge of all his debts. While a motion for discharge by a debtor who had turned over his property was pending, the statute was repealed. A number of cases arose under it. In *Surtees* v. *Ellison* (9 Barnwall & Cresswell, 750), Lord Tenterton declared that, notwithstanding the disastrous effect of the repeal on proceedings then in progress under the act, the right to a discharge fell with the act. In a later case dealing with the same subject (*Key* v. *Goodwin*, 4 Moore & Payne, 341), Tindal, C. J., said:

"I take the effect of the repealing statute to be to obliterate the repealed statute as completely from the records of Parliament as if it had never passed, and that it must be considered as a law that never existed, except for the purpose of those actions or suits which were commenced, prosecuted, and concluded while it was an existing law."

English cases, of course, are distinguishable because of the absence of constitutional limitations. But they illustrate the effect of a repeal when no such limitation exists.

This principle has found extensive application in a large variety of decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

The American rule is well stated in *Western Union Telegraph Co.* v. *L. & N. Railroad Co.* (258 U. S. 13). The telegraph company under an existing statutory power, had condemned an easement for its telegraph lines along a railroad right-of-way. While the judgment of condemnation was on appeal, but after the telegraph company had paid the amount of the condemnation award into court, the statute authorizing such condemnation was repealed. The Court, in holding that the rights of the telegraph company fell with the repeal of the statute, after pointing out that the rights were more of a public than a private character, said at page 22:

"Our conclusion, therefore, is that as the State could have withheld the power from telegraph companies to condemn the right-of-way of railroad companies, the State could withdraw the power before its exercise, and it could not be exercised before the conditions of condemnation were established

and adjudicated, and this not preliminarily or dependently, but in final and unreviewable determination. To this situation the condemnation in the present case had not attained. The grant of power to the telegraph company, therefore, was subject to legislative control, and the act of March 14, 1916, was not an 'interference by the legislature with judicial proceedings in court' and does not offend the fifth or fourteenth amendments."

In *Norris* v. *Crocker* (13 How. 429), a Federal statutory right of action in favor of slave owners against persons aiding fugitive slaves was held to fall with the repeal of the statute even though such an action was pending at the time of the appeal.

In *Maryland* v. *Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.* (3 How. 534), a condition placed upon a railroad franchise that unless it passed through certain villages it should pay $1,000,000 to the State for the benefit of the county in which the villages were located, was held to fall on the subsequent repeal of the condition by the State legislature. As the Court said in that case at page 549:

"* * * if the policy which at that time induced it to prescribe a particular course for the road, and, in case it was not followed, to exact from the company $1,000,000 and devote it to the use of Washington County, was afterward discovered to be a mistaken one, and likely to prove highly injurious to the rest of the State, it had unquestionably the power to change its policy."

Other examples of cases holding that statutory rights which are found by the courts to be in the nature of remedies, procedural rights, penalties, or public rather than vested private rights, fall within the statute, follows: *Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co.* v. *Goldsboro* (232 U. S. 548); *South Carolina* v. *Gaillard* (101 U. S. 433 (1879)); *Pearsall* v. *Great Northern Railway* (161 U. S. 646 (1896)); *Gibbes* v *Zimmerman* (290 U. S. 326 (1933)); *Ogden* v. *Blackledge* (2 Cranch 272 (1804)); *Eell* v. *Daggs* (108 U. S. 143 (1883)); *Morley* v. *Lake Shore Railroad Company* (146 U. S. 162 (1892)); *Oshkosh Water Works Company* v. *Oshkosh* (187 U. S. 437 (1903)); *Union Dry Goods* v. *Georgia P. S. Corp.* (248 U. S. 372 (1919)).

B. Cases where a right was held to survive repeal

But where the courts have found that, as a result of action taken by the parties pursuant to a statutory right, vested or contract rights have been created and there is no indication of an affirmative intent by t' legislature to abrogate such rights retroactively in the exercise of an undoubted legislative power, the courts have held that the right survives the repeal of the statute. *Steamship Company* v. *Joliffe* (69 U. S. 450 (1864)); *Ettor* v. *Tacoma* (228 U. S. 148); *Coombs* v. *Getz* (285 U. S. 434 (1932)).

In *Ettor* v. *Tacoma*, supra, a State statute authorizing a municipality to change the grade of streets, and imposing a liability in favor of abutting owners against the municipality for damages arising out of any such grading, was repealed after grading operations had been completed, but before the damages had been determined. The Court held that the right of action had become a vested right which survived the repeal of the statute. It is distinguishable because the right was one created by the Government against an agency of the Government itself, as a condition to the exercises of a power conferred upon the agency. The theory of the case appears to be that the municipality, as an agency of the Government, could not avail itself of the benefits of the act to the detriment of private property for whose sole benefit the right was created, and then seek to avoid its obligations. Here, the right was a "public private right" granted to private parties for a public purpose.

In *Steamship Co.* v. *Joliffe* and *Coombes* v. *Getz*, supra, a divided Court in each case held that a statutory right created by State legislation had ripened into a contractual right because the parties had acted in reliance upon the statute prior to its repeal, and that this right survived the repeal of the statute. These cases illustrate the strictness with which the Court compels adherence to the contract clause by State legislatures. The contract clause, of course, is clear and explicit, and where the Court finds an obligation of contract to exist, it will not permit that obligation to be abrogated by a State except in the exercise of the police power (see point II, infra). We have found no cases where a contract right has been held to arise under a Federal statute as a result of mere action by the parties.

In the Joliffe case a pilot had tendered his services to a vessel under a statute allowing him half fees upon such tender. The statute was subsequently repealed, but simultaneously a new statute providing generally for similar services and fees was reenacted. The Court, in a 4-to-3 decision, held that the repeal was not intended to impair rights accrued under it as similar rights were created by the new act, and that the pilot having tendered his services as required by the act, had obtained a quasi-contractual right to his fee, which "has become a vested right which stands independent of the statute" (ibid, p. 458).

The dissenting justices, per Miller, J., citing many authorities, took the position that in any event the right fell with the statute.

The most interesting of these cases, perhaps, is *Coombes* v. *Getz*, supra. A State constitutional provision rendering corporate directors jointly and severally liable to creditors for embezzlement or misappropriation by corporate officers was held by the majority of a divided Court to create a quasi-contractual right in favor of creditors who had relied upon the statute in extending credit to the corporation which survived repeal of the constitutional provision creating the right. There was a strong dissent by Cardozo, J., writing for himself, Brandeis and Stone, JJ., who held that the contract provision of the Federal Constitution was intended to protect only express contracts and not quasi-contractual rights, and that in any event the right was not contractual but remedial.

These cases are of importance for two reasons. First, it is apparent that in each all members of the Court were in agreement that the right would have fallen with the statute if no quasi-contractual right had been found to exist. There was no suggestion that the right in either case would survive as a vested right under the due-process clause of the fourteenth amendment. If the cases had arisen as the result of Federal legislation, therefore, it would seem that the views of the dissent would have prevailed. Secondly, it is to be noted that the quasi-contractual right found by the majority in each case was based upon the fact of action taken pursuant to the statute. It would seem, therefore, that the rights of employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act who could not show that they had performed the services for which they are now suing in reliance upon any particular interpretation of sections 6, 7, and 16 (b) would fall with the repeal of those provisions. For presumably a contractual right cannot be predicated upon work which both parties believed was part of the work for which payment had been made and accepted. There would be no change of position in reliance upon the act, whereas in each of the cases cited there had been such a change of position. Whether the rights of employees who can affirmatively show that they did rely upon these provisions would be held to survive repeal if the Fair Labor Standards Act were a State statute by a State legislature may be open to question under the above decisions, though they appear to be contrary to the weight of authority, which is in accord with the dissenting opinions. But we have found no authority for suggesting that any contractual or other rights can arise under a Federal statute such as the Fair Labor Standards Act.

It would seem, therefore, that the rights of employees under sections 6, 7, and 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, being of a public rather than a private character, granted to effectuate a legislative policy, would have no separate existence apart from the statute and would fall by its mere repeal. However, it is not necessary to rely upon any such analogy to support the retroactive legislation here contemplated. For, as will be seen in the next point, even express contract rights do not restrict a proper exercise of the State's police power by a State legislature, and a fortiori, the due process clause does not restrict Congress in the proper exercise of a legislative power conferred upon it by the Constitution.

II

Under point I we saw that a statutory right automatically fell with the repeal of the statute creating it, except in a few cases where the Court held that a contractual or vested right had been created by the acts of the parties in reliance upon the statute, which had an existence apart from the statute and therefore survived its repeal. Those cases did not deal with the power of the legislature to abrogate a right, whether vested or not, if it affirmatively intended to do so in the public interest, but rather with the question whether the right fell as an incidental result of the repeal of the statute. So far as appears from the opinion in the cases there cited, there was no indication of a legislative intent to abrogate the right retroactively.

In addition to raising the question whether the rights of employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act fall automatically with its repeal, the purpose of the discussion under point I, was to demonstrate the result flowing from the repeal of a statutory right, whether automatic or intentional, when no constitutional provision requires that the right be protected.

Under the present point we shall show no constitutional provision save the rights here in issue, because there is no constitutional limitation upon the plenary power of Congress to abrogate a property right affirmatively in pursuance of a legislative policy under a constitutional legislative power. It is believed that an examination of the cases will show beyond any doubt that even if employees who worked overtime under the Supreme Court's interpretation of the wages-and-hours law could be said to have obtained quasi-contractual or otherwise vested rights to be paid for such overtime, those rights may now be abrogated retroactively by Congress if it be found that their present enforcement would constitute an interference with or place a burden upon interstate commerce, or would otherwise be contrary to a present legislative policy.

For purposes of convenience we shall discuss under subheading A what appear to be the leading cases sustaining the right of Congress to override private rights in the exercise of a constitutional legislative power; under B we will consider cases establishing the related proposition that one Congress may not, by creating private vested rights, restrict the constitutional legislative power of a successor. In the event that any further authority is needed, we have added under C cases indicating that the rights of Congress under the commerce clause are as broad as the rights of a State legislature under the police power, and have collected a few cases indicating how far the Supreme Court has gone in sustaining the power of

States to override private rights in a proper exercise of that power.

A. Private rights cannot fetter the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce

Perhaps the leading case on this subject is *Norman* v. *B. & O. R. Co.* (294 U. S. 240 (1935)) where the Court, by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, held that gold clauses in private contracts were subject to the superior power of Congress under the Constitution "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin," article I, section 8, paragraph 5. The Court, in rejecting the argument that the fifth amendment protected the rights of holders of "gold clause" contracts, said at page 307 et seq.:

"This argument is in the teeth of another established principle. Contracts, however express, cannot fetter the constitutional authority of the Congress. Contracts may create rights of property, but when contracts deal with a subject matter which lies within the control of the Congress, they have a congenital infirmity. Parties cannot remove their transactions from the reach of dominant constitutional power by making contracts about them." (See *Hudson Water Co.* v. *McCarter*, 209 U. S. 349, 357.)

"This principle has familiar illustration in the exercise of the power to regulate commerce. If shippers and carriers stipulate for specified rates, although the rates may be lawful when the contracts are made, if Congress through the Interstate Commerce Commission exercises its authority and prescribes different rates, the latter control and override inconsistent stipulations in contracts previously made. This is so, even if the contract be a charter granted by a State and limiting rates, or a contract between municipalities and carriers." (*New York* v. *United States* (257 U. S. 591, 600, 601); *United States* v. *Village of Hubbard* (266 U. S. 474, 477, note); see, also, *Armour Packing Co.* v. *United States* (209 U. S. 56, 80–82); *Union Dry Goods Co.* v. *Georgia Public Service Corp.* (248 U. S. 372, 375).)

A case almost indistinguishable from the situation under consideration, and upon which great reliance was placed by the Chief Justice in the Norman case is *Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co.* v. *Mottley* (219 U. S. 467 (1911)). In 1871 a claimant for damages against the railroad had released all claims against the railroad in consideration of a lifelong free pass. Thereafter in 1906 Congress limited the right of railroads to give free passes. It was held that the private right was subordinate to the commerce power of Congress. In discussing this case, the Chief Justice said in the Norman case at 309:

"Quoting the statement of the general principle in the *Legal Tender* cases, the Court decided that the agreement must necessarily be regarded as having been made subject to the possibility that, at some future time, the Congress 'might so exert its whole constitutional power in regulating interstate commerce as to render that agreement unenforceable or to impair its value.' The Court considered it inconceivable that the exercise of such power 'may be hampered or restricted to any extent by contracts previously made between individuals or corporation.' 'The framers of the Constitution never intended any such state of things to exist.' *Id.*, p. 482. Accordingly, it has been 'authoritatively settled' by decisions of this Court that no previous contracts or combinations can prevent the application of the Antitrust Acts to compel the discontinuance of combinations declared to be illegal." (*Addyston Pipe & Steel Co.* v. *United States*, supra; *United States* v. *Southern Pacific Co.* (259 U. S. 214, 234, 235); see, also, *Calhoun* v. *Massie* (253 U. S. 170, 176); *Omnia Commercial Co.* v. *United States* (261 U. S. 502, 509); *Stephenson* v. *Binford*, (287 U. S. 251, 276).)

The Chief Justice continued, at page 309:

"The principle is not limited to the incidental effect of the exercise by the Congress of its constitutional authority. There is no constitutional ground for denying to the Congress the power expressly to prohibit and invalidate contracts although previously made, and valid when made, when they interfere with the carrying out of the policy it is free to adopt."

It is important to note that in both the Norman and Mottley cases the taking was in every sense retroactive. For in each case the party asserting the right which was abrogated had performed his part of the contract and was prevented by the legislation from collecting his pay.

In discussing cases dealing with retroactive application of the Employers' Liability Act, *Second Employers' Liability cases* (223 U. S. 1, 52), *Philadelphia, V. & W. R. Co.* v. *Schubert* (224 U. S. 603), the Chief Justice said, at page 310:

"The power of the Congress in regulating interstate commerce was not fettered by the necessity of maintaining existing arrangements and stipulations which would conflict with the execution of its policy. The reason is manifest. To subordinate the exercise of the Federal authority to the continuing operation of previous contracts would be to place to this extent the regulation of interstate commerce in the hands of private individuals and to withdraw from the control of the Congress so much of the field as they might choose by 'prophetic discernment' to bring within the range of their agreements. The Constitution recognizes no such limitation." (Id., pp. 613, 614). See also *United States* v. *Southern Pacific Co.*, supra; *Sproles* v. *Binford* (286 U. S. 374, 390, 391); *Radio Commission* v. *Nelson Bros. Co.* (289 U. S. 266, 282).

It is interesting to note that the Supreme Court relied upon this case in holding that private contract rights are subject to the very provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act here under consideration (*Overnight Motor Company* v. *Missel* (316 U. S. 572 (1942)). In that case the employee was concededly being paid at a rate in excess of the minimum required by the act, but he was being paid under an employment contract calling for a weekly rate which allowed for no differentiation between the rate of pay for work done in excess of a 40-hour week. The employer relied upon the fifth amendment as protecting his contract right. In disposing of this contention, the Court said, at page 577: "If overtime pay may have this effect (of removing burdens) upon commerce, private contracts made before or after the passage of legislation regulating overtime cannot take the overtime transactions 'from the reach of dominant constitutional power'" (citing *Norman* v. *B. & O. R. Co.*, supra).

Congress, having the undoubted power under the commerce clause to abrogate the private rights of employers in establishing hours of work and minimum wages for the benefit of employees in interstate commerce, must have the corollary power to take away rights thereby granted to the employees at any time that it finds their further enforcement will create a burden upon interstate commerce, and especially, as here, that such enforcement will defeat the very purposes for which the rights were originally granted.

B. Congress may not, by creating private vested rights, restrict or bargain away its constitutional legislative power

To hold that Congress in 1938 by enacting the Fair Labor Standards Act may create private rights which would prevent Congress in 1947 from removing what at such later time is found by Congress to be a serious burden upon interstate commerce, is to run afoul of another established principle; that Congress may not bargain away its power to regulate a subject over which it has undoubted legislative power. Only an amendment of the Constitution may limit the power of Congress to legislate in a field as to which the Constitution directs and empowers it to legislate.

As was held by the Supreme Court in *Boyd* v. *Alabama* (94 U. S. 645 (1876)), in sustaining an Alabama statute repealing an earlier statute creating a private lottery for a period of 25 years, the Court said, at page 650:

"We are not prepared to admit that it is competent for one legislature, by any contract with an individual, to restrain the power of a subsequent legislature to legislate for the public welfare, and to that end to suppress any and all practices tending to corrupt the public morals." (See *Moore* v. *The State* (48 Miss. 147); *Metropolitan Board of Excise* v. *Barrie*, (34 N. Y. 663).)

And in *Manigault* v. *Springs*, (199 U. S. 473 (1905)), the Court in holding that a statutory prerequisite to the enactment of certain laws passed by one legislature though not repealed, could be disregarded by a successor legislature, said at page 487:

"As this is not a constitutional provision, but a general law enacted by the legislature, it may be repealed, amended, or disregarded by the legislature which enacted it * * * but it is not binding upon any subsequent legislature, nor does a noncompliance with it impair or nullify the provisions of an act passed without the requirement of such notice."

In Stone v. *Mississippi* (101 U. S. 814, (1879)), the Court upheld a State statute repealing a prior statute granting a 25-year charter to a lottery company in consideration of a stipulated cash payment and further annual payments. In answer to the claim that the right of the lottery company was a vested private right protected by the contract and due-process clauses the Court said, at page 819:

"The question is therefore directly presented, whether in view of these facts, the legislature of a State can, by the charter of a lottery company, defeat the will of the people, authoritatively expressed, in relation to the further continuance of such business in their midst. We think it cannot. No legislature can bargain away the public health or the public morals. The people themselves cannot do it, much less their servants. The supervision of both these subjects of governmental power is continuing in its nature, and they are to be dealt with as the special exigencies of the moment may require."

And again at page 817:

"All agree that the legislature cannot bargain away the police power of a State. 'Irrevocable grants of property and franchises may be made if they do not impair the supreme authority to make laws for the right government of the State; but no legislature can curtail the power of its successors to make such laws as they may deem proper in matters of police.'" (*Metropolitan Board of Excise* v. *Barrie* (34 N. Y. 657); *Boyd* v. *Alabama* (94 U. S. 645).)

To permit Congress in 1938, by creating vested rights, to prevent Congress from exercising its power and duty to regulate interstate commerce in accordance with the facts as it may find them in 1947 would be to fly in the teeth of this principle. Only the people by amending the commerce clause contained in the Constitution of the United States can limit the power of Congress in a proper case to regulate interstate commerce.

C. The power of Congress to regulate commerce is as broad as the power of State legislatures under the police power. A proper exercise of that power is not limited either by the due-process or contract clauses

A power conferred upon Congress to legislate in a particular field by the Constitution

has been held to be as broad, and as free from limitation arising out of private property rights, as the rights of States to legislate under the police power. Indeed, the constitutionality of the very provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act now under consideration was sustained by the Supreme Court on the basis of the "plenary power conferred on Congress by the commerce clause" in *U. S.* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100 (1941)). As the Court in that case said at page 114:

"It is no objection to the assertion of the power to regulate interstate commerce that its exercise is attended by the same incidents which attend the exercise of the police power of the States." (*Seven Cases* v. *United States* (239 U. S. 510, 514); *Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries & Warehouse Co.* (251 U. S. 146, 156); *United States* v. *Carolene Products Co.* (304 U. S. 144, 147); *United States* v. *Appalachian Electric Power Co.* (311 U. S. 377).)

And again:

"The power of Congress over interstate commerce 'is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the Constitution.'" (*Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, supra, 196.)

"* * * 'The judicial cannot prescribe to the legislative department of the government limitations upon the exercise of its acknowledged power.'" (*Veazie Bank* v. *Fenno*, 8 Wall. 533 (ibid., p. 115).)

In *Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries Co.* (251 U. S. 146 (1919)), the Court, in upholding the power of Congress under the War-time Prohibition Act to deprive private owners of their right to sell bonded liquor legally acquired and owned by them, said, at page 156:

"That the United States lacks the police power, and that this was reserved to the States by the tenth amendment, is true. But it is nonetheless true that when the United States exerts any of the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution, no valid objection can be based upon the fact that such exercise may be attended by the same incidents which attend the exercise by a State of its police power, or that it may tend to accomplish a similar purpose." (*Lottery Case*, 189 U. S. 321, 357; *McCray* v. *United States*, 195 U. S. 27; *Hipolite Egg Co.* v. *United States*, 220 U. S. 45, 58; *Hoke* v. *United States*, 227 U. S. 308, 323; *Seven Cases* v. *United States*, 239 U. S. 510, 515; *United States* v. *Doremus*, 249 U. S. 86, 93–94.)

And again, at page 156 et seq.:

"If the nature and conditions of a restriction upon the use or disposition of property is such that a State could, under the police power, impose it consistently with the fourteenth amendment without making compensation, then the United States may for a permitted purpose impose a like restriction consistently with the fifth amendment without making compensation; for prohibition of the liquor traffic is conceded to be an appropriate means of increasing our war efficiency."

That the police power of the States is not overridden either by the "contract clause" or the "due process clause" has been established beyond question and by innumerable decisions of the Supreme Court since the case of *Munn* v. *Illinois* (94 U. S. 113).

As was said in the case of *Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co.* v. *Goldsboro* (232 U. S. 548, 558):

"For it is settled that neither the 'contract' clause nor the 'due process' clause has the effect of overriding the power of the State to establish all regulations that are reasonably necessary to secure the health, safety, good order, comfort, or general welfare of the community; that this power can neither be abdicated nor bargained away, and is inalienable even by express grant; and that all contract and property rights are held subject to its fair exercise."

A useful cross-section of the cases in support of this proposition will be found in *Union Dry Goods Co.* v. *Georgia* (248 U. S. 372, at pp. 375–376). In that case the Court in upholding the power of the State by fixing rates for supplying electricity to supersede lower rates agreed upon in an existing contract between the company and the consumer said:

"That private contract rights must yield to the public welfare, where the latter is appropriately declared and defined and the two conflict, has been often decided by this Court. Thus in *Manigault* v. *Springs* (199 U. S. 473, 480) it was declared that:

"'It is the settled law of this Court that the interdiction of statutes impairing the obligation of contracts does not prevent the State from properly exercising such powers as are vested in it for the promotion of the common weal, or are necessary for the general good of the public, though contracts previously entered into between individuals may thereby be affected.'

"This is on authority of many cases which are cited.

"In *Hudson County Water Co.* v. *McCarter* (209 U. S. 349, 357) it is said that:

"'One whose rights, such as they are, are subject to State restriction, cannot remove them from the power of the State by making a contract about them. The contract will carry with it the infirmity of the subject matter.'

"In *Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co.* v. *Mottley* (219 U. S. 467, 482) this is quoted with approval from *Knox* v. *Lee* (12 Wall. 457, 550, 551), viz:

"'Contracts must be understood as made in reference to the possible exercise of the rightful authority of the Government, and no obligation of a contract can extend to defeat the legitimate Government authority.'"

After citing and quoting excerpts to the same effect from *Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.* v. *McGuire* (219 U. S. 549); *Rail & River Coal Co.* v. *Ohio Industrial Commission* (236 U. S. 338, 349); *Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co.* v. *Goldsboro, supra*, and similar cases, the Court concluded:

"These decisions, a few from many to like effect, should suffice to satisfy the most skeptical or belated investigator that the right of private contract must yield to the exigencies of the public welfare when determined in an appropriate manner by the authority of the State, and the judgment of the Supreme Court of Georgia must be affirmed."

It is to be noted that the cases last above cited all deal with State legislation and turn primarily upon the contract clause. But it is obvious that even if the specific constitutional prohibition against the abrogation of contract rights may be overridden in the exercise of the police power by a State, the fifth amendment does not restrict a proper exercise by Congress of a legislative power conferred upon it by the Constitution.

III

We have seen that a proper exercise of the power conferred upon Congress by the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce cannot be limited even by private property rights which would otherwise be protected by the fifth amendment. That the proposed legislation is a proper regulation of commerce can hardly be questioned. As a result of the situation created by the bringing of innumerable suits retroactively under the original act, the very physical and economic structure of interstate commerce is threatened. Can it be doubted that if Congress found that as a result of an act passed by its predecessor 8 years previously the wheels of commerce were about to be brought to a standstill—let us assume, for example, that the inevitable result of such legislation was to bankrupt most interstate carriers in the country—that private rights created by Congress under such earlier legislation could bar a later Congress faced with such a national catastrophe from relieving commerce from the burden of such enactment

But in the present instance we are not confronted with any such private property rights as those stricken down by the courts in the gold-clause cases, the wartime-prohibition cases, the commerce-clause cases, or the State police-power cases cited under the previous point. The rights which the courts in those cases held could be stricken down were generally private property rights in the purest sense: Property legally acquired and held by private individuals or contract rights based upon contracts legally entered into between private individuals. Here we are not confronted with private rights created either by private contract or by private initiative and industry. On the contrary, as the Supreme Court has repeatedly said, we are confronted here only with rights of a "private-public character * * *. Although this right to sue is compensatory, it is nevertheless an enforcement provision." (*Brooklyn Bank* v. *O'Neil*, 324 U. S. 697 (1945) at p. 709.)

This right to overtime pay forming the basis of the rights of the employees is described in the Fair Labor Standards Act itself as a civil penalty, and in the O'Neil case, supra, at page 711 as "statutory wages and liquidated damages. One section, 16 (b), creates the obligation for the entire remedy." It is further described in the same case at 704 as a "statutory right conferred on a private party, but affecting the public interest" which "may not be waived or released if such waiver or release contravenes the statutory policy," and again: "Where a private right is granted in the public interest to effectuate a legislative policy, waiver of a right so charged or colored with the public interest will not be allowed where it would thwart the legislative policy which it was designed to effectuate."

The fifth amendment forbids only the taking of private property without due process of law. Private rights created by statute "in the public interest to effectuate a legislative policy," and which cannot be waived or compromised, are not such property rights as it was the intent of the Constitution to protect. On the contrary it would seem that such a right was one created purely by statute and must fall if the statute is repealed for the express purpose of abrogating such rights in order to effectuate a legislative policy, if indeed, it does not fall by a simple repeal of the statute creating it.

JOE C. BARRETT,
Attorney, Jonesboro, Ark.

Nebraska Fertilizer Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Nebraska farmers are in dire need of fertilizer. Recently, Mr. Charles Marshall, president of Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, wrote a letter to me giving full information regarding this problem. In order that the membership of the House

may have this information, I quote from his letter:

Congressman KARL STEFAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEFAN: I am writing you in regard to the fertilizer problem in the State of Nebraska and the seriousness of the situation.

I am enclosing, for your consideration, a table showing the estimated consumption of fertilizer by crops and by groups of crops, as prepared by the College of Agriculture and the Production and Marketing Administration of Nebraska in conjunction with other interested groups. You will note at the foot of the page that there is indicated a possible consumption in 1947 of 5,100 tons of ammonium nitrate, with that consumption increasing to an estimated 14,800 tons by 1950. It is the feeling of our organization that, if the materials were available, that these figures are likely below the actual amount which would be used. However, these are the figures which were arrived at by these reliable and conservative organizations. They also indicate total use of 1,800 tons of P_2O_5 for 1945 and an increase to 4,200 tons in 1950. On the second page of this summary of needs, you will see the break-down as to crops and groups of crops for 1951 and the estimated uses of the two principal fertilizers used in Nebraska now—ammonium nitrate and superphosphate (P_2O_5).

In order to substantiate our statement as to the immediate and urgent need for ammonium nitrate, we have orders for 300 carloads of 32½ percent ammonium nitrate upon which deposits have been made by various dealers and members. These deposits are covering the entire purchase price of the fertilizer with a portion of the deposits in our office and the balance in the hands of the county offices and dealers. One carload of fertilizer is usually 40 tons. If we get a 32-percent product, then we have about 13 tons of nitrogen per car.

We have orders for a great many carloads of fertilizer in the immediate neighborhood of the plants at Grand Island and Mead, which are manufacturing 32½ percent ammonium nitrate, and if we could receive permission to take delivery in truck lots, we could move many carloads of the product from these plants direct to the farms which are needing these materials and have advanced money to pay for them.

There are a great many trucks which have delivered livestock to the Omaha market that return by way of Mead and Grand Island and a great many times these trucks are empty. By having permission to handle ammonium nitrate in truck lots, it would serve to alleviate a serious condition in regard to boxcars which is facing the grain producers and livestock men in Nebraska. These boxcars are so very urgently needed to transport grain which is now in the farmers' hands and which they are unable to move because of the boxcar shortage. The use of trucks would serve the dual purpose of getting the fertilizer materials in the hands of the farmers for the production of crops for the coming year and, to our way of thinking, would provide a logical answer to a critical condition in both the delivery of fertilizer and the release of boxcars for grain shipment.

From this time on during the production season when this fertilizer can be used in Nebraska to such advantage it is our feeling that by the time it could be shipped to the seaboard and there loaded into boats and transported to foreign lands, it would have perhaps largely missed the growing seasons in those particular areas, to which we are now shipping fertilizer and, consequently, would serve the needs of all mankind to far greater advantage by using it in the immediate proximity of its manufacture—right on Nebraska farms and in the adjacent territory.

With the present arrangements under which we are operating, we are receiving only approximately 5 percent of our total needs and are paying the high freight rates necessary to transport this small amount of fertilizer that we are receiving from Sheffield, Ala. The freight adds materially to the cost of production to those people using the fertilizer and further complicates the question of transportation and most assuredly provides a situation extremely difficult for the average farmer and user of the product to understand.

Approximately one-half of our total needs should be delivered in Nebraska in April for use on bromegrass, small grains, potatoes, etc. Inasmuch as the demand for fertilizer for the production of bromegrass is very high and Nebraska is listed in our department of rural economics as the highest producer of certified bromegrass seed in the United States, this need should most assuredly be recognized as a problem affecting a much wider region than just the individual farmer producing the seed. This certified bromegrass seed has been extremely scarce and orders for this seed come to Nebraska producers from all over the United States. Viewing this need in connection with a few carloads of fertilizer—being manufactured within a few miles of these production fields—would be of assistance to thousands of farmers in their farming program in all parts of the country.

The Nebraska Non-Stock Cooperative Association is the service organization of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation. We have 10,000 farm families who are members of our organization and approximately 300 dealers and distributors in various parts of the State. Many of them are located in the irrigated areas where the over-all production can be materially increased to the benefit of local farmers and the Nation as a whole by the use of commercial fertilizer.

These lands will be farmed regardless of whether commercial fertilizer is available or not. The lack of fertilizer will contribute to the serious depletion of soil fertility brought about by all-out production upon these Nebraska farms—which continues even now as it has during the war years—and the effect of this depletion of fertility will be felt by generations yet to come if we are not in a position to meet the problem now when it can be met much easier than it can after further depletion has taken place and a rebuilding process is necessary. The orders for fertilizer in Nebraska, at the present time, in our opinion, are barely that necessary to maintain fertility and will do nothing toward rebuilding some areas in which serious depletion has already taken place. Consequently, Nebraska farmers are desperate in their effort to preserve the fertility of their farms for the benefit of all people and any assistance that you may be able to give us in providing fertilizer by way of elimination of regulations which, at the present time, are the apparent handicap in our being able to get nitrate from the plants located in Nebraska, would certainly be appreciated by every farmer in the State.

The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation and the Nebraska Non-Stock Cooperative Association are not interested in this problem from a profit angle but entirely from a service to Nebraska agriculture and the maintenance of a sound, stabilized farming industry. If we can provide any further information which would be of assistance to you in your efforts to help Nebraska farmers in this particular problem, we are at your service.

Sincerely yours,
NEBRASKA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
CHARLES MARSHALL, *President.*

National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1947.
Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is enclosed herewith draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended," with the request that it be introduced and considered for enactment.

The purpose of section 1 of the proposed bill and conforming amendments contained in section 2 thereof is to authorize the Veterans' Administration to issue originally national service life insurance on any of the permanent plans of insurance authorized by the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. Under existing law, national service life insurance may be originally issued on the 5-year level premium term plan only, and such insurance must be carried for 1 year before it may be converted to insurance on a permanent plan. The need of these restrictions in existing law has passed and there is no reason why insurance on any plan should not be initially issued.

The further purpose of section 2 of the proposed bill is to provide that in any case in which an insured is shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be totally disabled at the expiration of the level premium term period of his national service life insurance under conditions which would entitle him to continued insurance protection but for such expiration, such insurance shall be automatically converted to insurance on the ordinary life plan unless the insured has elected some other available plan.

It is anticipated that some policyholders of national service life insurance will be totally disabled at the expiration of the level premium term period of their insurance. Such individuals who will have been totally disabled for 6 or more consecutive months will be entitled to waiver of premiums until the expiration of the term, but insurance protection will cease at that time unless the level premium term insurance is converted to insurance on some other plan before the end of the term. Upon conversion of insurance to a permanent plan, the right of waiver of premiums which exists at the time of conversion will continue. Many such totally disabled persons, either because of incompetency or other circumstances beyond their control, may be unable to make application for conversion of insurance within the level premium term period. To guard against the hardship which would otherwise result under such circumstances, automatic conversion of insurance to a permanent plan must be provided. Under the provisions of section 2 of the proposed bill the insurance protection and right to waiver of premiums of such individuals will be continued.

The purpose of section 3 of the proposed bill is to repeal subsections (y) (1) and (y)

(2) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. Subsection (y) (1) authorizes reinstatement of level premium term insurance upon written application, payment of two monthly premiums, and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator that the applicant, subject to the provisions of the second sentence of section 602 (c) (2), is in good health. The part of section 602 (c) (2) which is referred to contains independent provisions relating to the exclusion of service-connected disability, less than total in degree, in determining good health for reinstatement purposes. These general provisions would continue to be applicable to reinstatement as provided for by regulations upon the repeal of subsection (y) (1).

Reinstatement within the term, upon the payment of two monthly premiums and a showing of good health is now authorized under Veterans' Administration regulations and, to meet existing conditions, was so authorized for several years prior to the enactment of subsection (y) (1). Although no change in such regulations is presently contemplated, it is believed that the matter of reinstatement generally is so affected by changing conditions involving the interests of policyholders as a group that considerable flexibility should be permitted in determining when and upon what conditions reinstatement may be accomplished. In keeping with this general principle, the provisions of subsection (y) (1) should be repealed in order that regulations with respect to the subject matter thereof shall be susceptible of such periodic changes as may be warranted.

Subsection (y) (2) authorizes reinstatement of level premium term insurance within 6 months after lapse or within 6 months after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1946, approved August 1, 1946, (February 1, 1947) whichever is the later, upon payment of two monthly premiums, provided the applicant is in as good health on the date of application and tender of premiums as he was on the date of lapse. Under the provisions of this subsection, insurance which has lapsed more than 6 months may not be reinstated on a comparative health basis after February 1, 1947, and the Veterans' Administration will be without authority to provide by regulation for reinstatement on a comparative health basis in such cases on or after February 1, 1947.

If subsection (y) (2) is repealed, the Veterans' Administration contemplates the issuance of regulations which will allow reinstatement on a comparative health basis up to August 1, 1947, without regard to the date the insurance lapsed. Subsequent to August 1, 1947, regulations will authorize reinstatement of National Service Life Insurance on a comparative health basis within 3 months after lapse upon application and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator that the applicant is in as good health at the time of application and payment of premiums as he was on the date of lapse. Such privilege of reinstatement will be similar to the reinstatement provisions now applicable to converted National Service Life Insurance policies. This right is more liberal than the reinstatement privileges generally provided under policies issued by commercial insurers and affords reasonable protection for policyholders. In regard to permitting reinstatement to be accomplished for an indefinite period in the future on the basis of comparative health within 6 months from date of lapse, there is grave doubt that such practice would be equitable to those policyholders who continually retain their contracts in force. This conclusion is based to some extent upon the reinstatement requirements as published by other mutual insurers. It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine comparative conditions of health at two periods more than 3 months apart.

A great majority of the veterans who have been discharged from World War II have allowed their National Service Life Insurance to lapse. It will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration, on a national scale, to carry on an informative campaign so that veterans may be fully enlightened relative to their rights and privileges regarding National Service Life Insurance. This program will comprehend the solicitation of assistance from all organizations interested in veterans' welfare. It is planned to utilize all recognized media, such as the mail, newspapers, magazines, radio, moving pictures, etc., for carrying information to the veterans. This program will have been completed before August 1, 1947. It is obvious that the proposed plan will be ineffective unless and until subsection (y) (2) is repealed.

The proviso of subsection (y) (2) authorizes the granting of an additional period not exceeding 60 days for the payment of premiums by an insured who makes inquiry prior to expiration of the grace period disclosing a clear intent to continue insurance protection. Similar provisions were contained in Veterans' Administration regulations prior to the enactment of subsection (y) (2). For the reasons heretofore stated in support of the repeal of subsection (y) (1), it is believed that this proviso, which also was intended to meet an existing situation, concerns a matter which is more properly one for regulation.

The proposed bill, if enacted, will not involve any cost in addition to that contemplated under existing law.

Because the right of reinstatement on a comparative health basis will expire February 1, 1947, in those cases where insurance has lapsed more than 6 months many veterans will be unable to reinstate lapsed insurance after that date under existing law. It is therefore respectfully urged that the proposed measure be specially considered for enactment at the earliest possible date.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that Office to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army, Administrator.

A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every person who is commissioned and hereafter ordered into, or who is hereafter examined, accepted, and enrolled in, the active service and while in such active service shall, upon application in writing (made within 120 days after entrance into such active service) and payment of premiums as hereinafter provided and without further medical examination, be granted insurance by the United States against the death of such person occurring while such insurance is in force."

SEC. 2. Subsection (f) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Such insurance may be issued on the following plans: Five-year level premium term, ordinary life, 20-payment life, 30-payment life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, and endowment at age 65. Level premium term insurance may be converted as of the date when any premium becomes or has become due, or exchanged as of the date of the original policy, upon payment of the difference in reserve, at any time while such insurance is in force and within the term period to any of the foregoing permanent plans of insurance: *Provided*, That conversion to an endowment plan may not be made while the insured is totally disabled. In any case in which the insured is shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to be totally disabled at the expiration of the level premium term period of his insurance under conditions which would entitle him to continued insurance protection but for such expiration, such insurance shall be automatically converted to insurance on the ordinary life plan unless the insured has elected insurance on some other available plan. All level premium term policies shall cease and terminate at the expiration of the term period. Provisions for cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, refund of unearned premiums, and such other provisions as may be found to be reasonable and practicable may be provided for in the policy of insurance or from time to time by regulations promulgated by the Administrator."

SEC. 3. Subsections (y) (1) and (y) (2) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, are hereby repealed.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1947.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I enclose herewith the proposed drafts of three additional bills and I would appreciate it very much if you would introduce them for us.

One would provide Government protection for widows and orphans of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II; the second would renew expiring 5-year level premium-term policies for another 5 years; the third would amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act.

We certainly appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6, Public Law No. 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The surviving widow, child, or children of a veteran who served in World War II whose death is not due to service therein, but who was discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable after having served 90 days or more or for disability incurred in wartime service in line of duty, or who at time of death was receiving or entitled to receive compensation or retirement pay for wartime service-connected disability, shall be entitled to pension in the amounts and otherwise subject to the conditions of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section the definition of the terms 'veteran,' 'widow,' 'child,' or 'children' shall be those applicable to World War II as provided in Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as now or hereafter amended."

SEC. 2. The surviving widow, child, or children of any person who has died, or dies, in active service in World War I or World War II after having served 90 days or more and whose death is held not due to service therein, shall be entitled to pension in the amounts and otherwise subject to the conditions of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section the definition of the terms "veteran," "widow," "child," or "children" shall be those applicable to World War I and World War II as provided in Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as now or hereafter amended.

SEC. 3. Section 1 (c), Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Payment of pension under the provisions of this act shall not be made to any widow without child, or a child, whose annual income exceeds $1,800, or to a widow with a child or children whose annual income exceeds $3,000. In determining annual income any payments made by widow, child, or children, for expense of last sickness and burial of the veteran shall be excluded and any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered nor shall life-insurance payments from any source be considered: *Provided*, That where payments to a widow are disallowed or discontinued hereunder, payment to a child or children of the deceased veteran may be made as though there is no widow."

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or veterans' regulation, for the purpose of payment of compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, one parent whose annual income does not exceed $1,800, or two parents whose annual income does not exceed $3,000, shall be deemed to be dependent. In determining annual income any payments made by a parent for expense of last illness or burial of the veteran shall be excluded and any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered nor shall life-insurance payments from any source be considered.

SEC. 5. Paragraph II (a), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"II. (a) Payment of pension provided by part III, except as provided in paragraph I (g) shall not be made to any unmarried person whose annual income exceeds $1,800, or to any married person or any person with minor children whose annual income exceeds $3,000."

SEC. 6. This act shall be effective from the date of its approval: *Provided*, That claims otherwise payable for a period prior to the effective date of this act may be adjudicated and placed on the roll and the benefits of this act shall be applicable to such claims and those claims now on the rolls.

SEC. 7. Except to the extent they may conflict with the provisions of this act, the provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, the Veterans Regulations promulgated thereunder, and of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, as now or hereafter amended, shall be applicable to this act: *Provided*, That no compensation or pension shall be reduced or discontinued by the enactment of this act.

A bill to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year-level-premium-term policies for another 5-year period

(Introduced by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts by request)

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of the first paragraph of section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (47 Stat. 234; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 512), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That at the expiration of any 5-year period a 5-year-level-premium-term policy may be renewed for a second, third, fourth, or fifth 5-year period at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination; and in case the 5-year period of any such policy shall have expired between January 24, 1947, and the expiration of 5 months after the date of the enactment of this amendment to this amendatory proviso and the policy has not been continued in another form of Government insurance such policy may be renewed as of the date of its expiration on the same conditions upon payment of the back premiums within 5 months after such date of enactment; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall cause notice to be mailed to the holder of any such policy of the provisions of this amendment to this amendatory proviso."

A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

(Introduced by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts by request)

Be it enacted, etc., That section 602 (d) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended effective as of October 8, 1940, to read as follows:

"(2) Any person in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, who, while in such service and before April 20, 1942, or within 120 days after entrance into active service and prior to September 3, 1945, dies or has died, in line of duty (including death resulting from disease or injury incurred in line of duty), without having in force at the time of such death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, in the aggregate amount of at least $10,000, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance as of the date of entry into active service or October 8, 1940, whichever is later, in the sum of $10,000 payable as provided in section 602 (h), except that payments hereunder shall be made only to the following beneficiaries and in the order named—

"(A) to the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unremarried;

"(B) if no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares;

"(C) if no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares: *Provided*, That if such person serving as a flying cadet or aviation student, Navy or Army, between October 8, 1940, and June 3, 1941, the date of approval of Public Law No. 97 and Public Law No. 99, Seventy-ninth Congress, died as the result of an aviation accident incurred in line of duty while in such active service, such person shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted an aggregate amount of insurance of not less than $10,000. Any additional insurance granted by virtue of this proviso shall be payable in the manner provided by this section."

SEC. 2. Section 602 (d) (3) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended effective as of October 8, 1940, to read as follows:

"(3) (A) Any person in the active service who on or after October 8, 1940, and prior to April 20, 1942, or within 120 days after entrance into active service, and prior to September 3, 1945, becomes or has become totally disabled as a result of injury or disease incurred in line of duty and such disability continues without interruption for a period of 6 months or until death intervening prior to the end of such 6 months' period, without having in force at time of incurrence of such disability at least $10,000 insurance issued under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted, effective as of the commencement of such total disability national service life insurance in an amount which, together with any such insurance then in force, shall aggregate $10,000 and such gratuitous insurance shall continue in force without payment of premiums until 6 months after the insured ceases to be totally disabled or until 1 year after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, whichever is the earlier date: *Provided*, That such protection shall cease and terminate unless within such period such disabled person shall make application in writing for continuance of all or any part of such insurance and shall submit evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of entitlement to waiver of premiums under section 602 (n) of this act or tender the premiums thereafter becoming due: *Provided further*, That waiver of premiums under section 602 (n) shall not be denied under this subsection on the ground that total disability commenced prior to the effective date of such insurance: *And provided further*, That anyone who applied for and was issued insurance after becoming totally disabled, and but for such application would be entitled to insurance hereunder, shall have the right, upon application within the time and in the manner as above limited, to elect to surrender insurance applied for and to be issued insurance hereunder, or if such insurance shall have lapsed without election, such person shall be considered subject in all respects to the provisions of this subsection, as hereby amended, but policies issued hereunder shall be effective from date of surrender or lapse of policy previously issued.

"(B) Any person in the active service who on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to April 20, 1942, has been or shall be captured, besieged, or otherwise isolated by the forces of any enemy of the United States for a period of at least 30 consecutive days and extending beyond April 19, 1942, and at the time of such capture, siege, or isolation by the enemy did not have in force insurance in the aggregate amount of at least $10,000 under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, as amended, or this act, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted, effective as of the date of such capture, siege, or isolation, national service life insurance in an amount which together with any insurance then in force shall aggregate $10,000 of insurance, and such insurance shall remain in force and premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the period while such person remains so captured, besieged, or isolated, and for 6 months thereafter: *Provided*, That such protection shall cease and terminate at the end of such period of 6 months unless within such period such person shall make application in writing for the continuance of all or any part of such insurance and shall submit evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of entitlement to waiver of premiums under section 602 (n) of this act, or tender the premiums thereafter becoming due."

SEC. 3. Section 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended effective as of October 8, 1940, to read as follows:

"(5) If any person deemed to have been issued insurance under subsection (3) (A) or (B) hereof die without filing application and within the time limit therefor, death-insurance benefits shall be payable in the manner and to the persons as stated in subsection (2): *Provided*, That no application for insurance payments under subsection (2) or (3), as hereby amended, shall be valid unless filed in the Veterans' Administration within 3 years after the date of death of the insured and the relationship of the applicant, where required as a basis for such claim, shall be proved as of date of death of insured: *And provided further*, That persons shown to have been mentally or legally incompetent at the time the right to apply for continuation of insurance or for death benefits expires may make such application at any time within 1 year after the removal of such disability."

"The International Conference on Trade and Employment Is But an Impudent Attempt To Set Up an International New Deal in Utter Defiance of the Plain Meaning of the November Election"—George Rothwell Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, from day to day the hidden meanings, the sinister purposes, and the cunningly concealed objectives which are involved in the craftily contrived promotion of the International Conference on Trade and Employment, scheduled to convene in Geneva on April 8 next, become increasingly clear. The extremist left-winger, the ultra-radical one-worlder, the inveterate international New Dealer, is up to his old tricks again.

As this mad maneuver of those who have lost faith in all that has made America great bodes no good for the country we have known and loved, it is reassuring, indeed, to note that that able and ever alert student of public affairs, Mr. George Rothwell Brown, widely known publicist and newspaper columnist, has delved deeply into these mysterious machinations to expose with his analytical pen, and in no uncertain terms, all the plans of these artful architects of this thoroughly un-American scheme to control and regulate the foreign trade of the United States through an international organization in which America will be accorded but one vote.

Because of the timely importance of that which he has written on this momentous subject, I ask the unanimous consent of the membership that a series of articles which were printed in the Los Angeles Examiner and numerous other metropolitan dailies during the month of December 1946, under his byline signature, may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the George Rothwell Brown articles, to which I have just referred, are the following:

PART 1

NEW YORK, December 2, 1946.—It is a fortunate thing for the United States that in January the control of Congress will be taken over by a political party which, presumably, still believes in the economic policies which made this country so rich and strong that it was able twice in a quarter of a century to fight, feed, and finanace most of the whole world.

The keystone of this policy for many years, until the Roosevelt New Deal, was a protective—but not a monopolistic tariff—which developed American industry to the highest plane ever attained, and made American labor the best paid on earth.

The stage has now been set at London for the final destruction of this keystone of the economic American arch, to be consummated at the International Conference on Trade and Employment, to be held at Geneva beginning next April 8.

All is now in readiness for one of the most deadly blows ever struck at the American free enterprise system and the American standard of living, at Geneva, unless the new Republican majorities of Senate and House in the Eightieth Congress step in and stop the outrageous scheme before it has been permitted to be put so far into effect that subsequent withdrawal by the United States might bring down upon us a world-wide boycott.

The present American high wage level is already tops for anywhere on earth, but organized labor is voicing demands for further wage increases in many basic industries.

If labor can be made to realize that what the administration has in mind is a proposal, cleverly concealed in the intricate double-talk of economic sharpers, the effect of which would be to reduce the American high-wage standard to the mean average low world standard, labor will demand—and obtain—the abandonment of this scheme.

At a time when the voters of the United States have overwhelmingly repudiated the Roosevelt New Deal on the domestic front, the American State Department, totally and impudently ignoring the plain meaning of the November election, is preparing, behind the backs of the American people, to set up an international new deal to which, once we shall have ratified it, the whole American domestic economy will be compelled to conform.

It is a vicious and underhand plot, the most unbelievable part of which is that it was not devised by the foreigner, but by alleged experts in our own State Department in Washington, which is permeated with pinks and fellow travelers.

The whole plan is tied in with the British loan and the International Bank, and is essentially a scheme for American financing of the whole world, the reduction of American tariffs, the curtailment of American exports to permit foreign competition in a world-controlled market, the regulation of employment by Government, and the lowering of the American wage scale.

Congress ought to get after this monstrosity in a hurry.

PART 2

NEW YORK, December 3, 1946.—The deadlock imposed upon the world by Russia to give her time by delaying the making of peace, to consolidate her gains of geography and populations in Europe and fasten the communistic system on her satellites, including eastern Germany, has distracted attention from the graver economic disaster threatening the United States through the United Nations.

This threatened economic menace is inherent in the terms of the American proposals, prepared by the State Department technicians, to form the basis for a plan of world control of trade and labor, to be adopted by the International Conference on Trade and Employment, called to assemble at Geneva in April of next year.

Under this plan the control of American production, both of manufactured goods and agricultural surpluses, would pass from the hands of the American people into the hands of an international superstate.

This superstate would say what American surpluses might be exported and how much of foreign goods must be imported by the United States, to bring about a utopian equality of living to the underprivileged peoples of the world.

What the State Department has kept carefully concealed is the fact that this proposed international new deal, this world-wide dream-state, would be established at the expense of the American standard of living and the American wage scale, the highest any country in the world has ever known.

The three greatest nations in the world today are the British Empire, which is socialistic; Soviet Russia, which is communistic; and the United States, which is the last bulwark anywhere of free enterprise.

How the proposed grandiose system could be made to work with a country like Russia, with a completely controlled economy, was the question which suddenly preplexed the preparatory committee, which has made the plans for the Geneva Conference, just before it adjourned its sessions in London last week.

A special addition was made to the proposed charter as bait to gain the adhesion of Russia to the world-trade plan, to provide for meeting those objections to free trade growing out of the fact that the totalitarian Russian Government is the sole importer and the sole exporter of goods at prices fixed arbitrarily by itself.

A London dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune of November 27 discloses that except for this additional provision the peculiar problem presented by Russia has been passed over until the full United Nations meeting.

The contemplated world-trade scheme to be adopted at Geneva is the lungs, if not the heart, of the whole United Nations superstate.

No such plan as this, which must be embodied in an international agreement, can be approved and put into effect by the Truman administration without action by and the consent of Congress.

PART 3

NEW YORK, December 4, 1946.—Members of two very tough committees of the House of Representatives—to be taken over in January by some very tough Republicans—are watching the slowed-down construction of the United Nations edifice with impatience.

These are the Committees on Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs. Both are heavily endowed with prerogatives over issues that are building up here in the General Assembly and the Conference of Foreign Ministers.

President Truman will encounter a good deal of Republican stubbornness in both of these committees, not on domestic questions, such as taxation, although there may be plenty there, too, but on the many international questions, growing out of the sessions of world statesmen now in progress in New York.

Some of the more pessimistic members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee expect that the contemplated honeymoon between the President and the new Republican Congress will go on the rocks early in January.

One of the principal causes of friction, calculated to prevent a full measure of that cooperation which Truman invited when he had studied the meaning of last month's election returns, will be the attitude of the Republican House toward the trade and employment agreements to be reached, if State Department hopes are realized, at the Geneva Conference, in April of next year.

The "American proposals," as they are called, which will form the basis of the contemplated international new deal for the regulation of American foreign markets and the wage scales of American labor, aim a deadly blow at what is left of the American protective system.

This brings them squarely into the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, in which body, under the Constitution, all matters affecting the tariff must originate.

Any expectation in United Nations circles in New York that the agreements affecting American foreign markets, enforced import quotas, and reduction in American production at the order of an international organization will be regarded as agreements having the character of treaties must speedily be abandoned.

There is evidence here that the new Republican House will be exceedingly jealous of its own prerogatives.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, much more internationally minded than its House opposite number, will have no monopoly in considering issues growing out of the peace settlements if and when any such are finally agreed upon.

At the close of the First World War a Republican Foreign Affairs Committee took the play away from the Senate and reported, and the House adopted, its own resolution declaring the war with Germany to be at an end. History may repeat.

It is understood here that both Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs are considering sending Republican Members to Geneva as observers at the Trade and Employment Conference April 8.

The Republican House will insist upon taking the cover off the package which the State Department has wrapped up in so much secrecy.

PART 4

NEW YORK, December 7, 1946.—"There was probably never a stranger political fact than this—that the one nation in which free enterprise is still a fighting term should lead the movement to create a planned world economy; nor a more ironical fact than this—that what strongly recommends its proposals to other nations is their fear of American competition if free enterprise survives in this country."

The above is one of the striking conclusions reached by Mr. Garet Garrett, editor of American Affairs, in an article he has written for the January number of that quarterly, analyzing the "American proposals" of our State Department, which form the basis of the agenda which will be considered at Geneva, on April 8, by the International Conference on Trade and Employment.

In this article, from the proof sheets of which I am permitted to use the following quotations, Mr. Garrett makes the first technical exposure of the secret scheme prepared by this Government, for setting up a world superstate at the expense of the American economy, American tariffs, and American labor.

Referring to the State Department's "American proposals," Mr. Garrett sounds this note of solemn warning against them:

"Every conscious citizen ought to know what they are and understand them. Not for the reason only that the twenty billion will be in jeopardy if they fail, but for such other reasons as:

"(1) That they call for a transfer of governmental powers to a world economic authority, and

"(2) That if they are adopted and take effect as the law of the world we shall be deeply touched in our daily lives, even to the point of being no longer free to do as we would with our own things, no longer free to act upon our own problems in our own way."

Mr. Garrett then goes on to ask whether, under this proposed scheme, American free enterprise could survive. He answers it by saying:

"That question is in heavy labor of debate and yet the planners already know the answer. Their answer is logical, not speculative.

"If the world economy is planned by an international authority invested with governmental powers, so also national economies will have to be planned.

"It cannot work any other way, and that is why all the ideology of planning has been transferred from the national to the international plane.

"The experts now writing the book for a planned world economy are those who a little while ago were planning on a national scale. National planning does not force world planning, but world planning does entail national planning.

"The answer, therefore, is that in a planned world, covered by such a thing as the international-trade organization, acting as an agency of the United Nations, free American enterprise as we knew it, would belong to history."

PART 5

NEW YORK, December 9, 1946.—While East and West were sparring for strategic advantage in the location of the political capital of the United Nations in New York last week, the economic capital of the new world government was being quietly established in Geneva.

The fate of the American economy, and the ability of American industry to maintain the high American wage level through unrestrained production and unrestricted foreign markets will be settled according to State Department plan, not in an American, but in a foreign atmosphere.

This will be accomplished by the International Conference on Trade and Employment, under the United Nations.

Congress, and the country, with few exceptions, have not yet awakened to the menace in the bold scheme for an international New Deal that will set the pattern for the American domestic economy, embodied in the American proposals of the State Department.

Garet Garrett, editor of American Affairs, who has taken this plan apart and examined it with microscopic eye in an analysis he has written to be published in the January number of that quarterly, has this to say of the scheme devised in secret by the State Department experts:

"They had to achieve a feat of concealment. The thing to be concealed, from the American public, at least, was that a fair statement of the meaning of the American proposals would read: 'A plan developed by a technical staff within the Government of the United States to impose upon the trade of the world a collectivist system.'"

The charter of this international world authority which it is proposed to set up at Geneva under the United Nations was approved last week by the preparatory committee sitting in London.

Of this subtle plan Mr. Garrett writes, and has given me permission to make these quotations:

"No member nation shall conduct its foreign trade in a way to injure another or to put another at a disadvantage. No member nation, the United States, for example, shall, as we now say, export unemployment.

"A nation will be supposed to be exporting unemployment when it forces its goods upon the markets of the world merely in order to keep its own labor busy.

"On the contrary, if there is unemployment in the world as a serious economic evil, member nations shall share it with one another instead of trying to unload it; and from this it follows that they shall in fact share employment. * * *

"Two of its implications are revolutionary. The first one is that a nation may no longer do what it likes with its own market, not even to protect its own people. * * *

"The second implication is that as the trade of the world is planned and controlled by an international authority, so the American economy must be planned and controlled, for, unless the Government did plan and control production in this country, it could not fulfill its obligations under the charter."

To state it bluntly, in the language of the street, here is a plot by the Democratic Department of State to outlaw the American standard of living, heretofore maintained by the highest wage scale ever attained by any people, and to share equally the poverty of the world through curtailment of American production and trade at the order of an international superstate.

Can they get away with it?

Illegal Entries of Aliens Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I find that bureaucratic government has become so securely entrenched and consequently so arrogant that requests for information by citizens or Members of Congress are ignored. It is most important that any department of the Government having information upon which to enable Congress to legislate for our national security, such information should be promptly made available to the Congress. I believe it is highly important that the Congress know how many persons are entering this country illegally.

The shortage of houses, the high cost of living, and other factors may be presented as reasons for not flooding our country with illegal alien entries. Important as these reasons may be, the most compelling objection is that a person who enters our country illegally, flouts our laws to get here, will disregard our laws while he is here. We have enough lawbreakers now without importing them.

I have tried to assemble facts on this vital problem of illegal alien entries into the United States but the press seems to be the only reliable source from which to draw a conclusion as to what is taking place in the field of immigration.

I am inserting such material as I have been able to gather, which may be useful to the Judiciary Committee. Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting quotations and photostatic copies of tables:

ADMISSIONS AND ENTRIES OF ALIENS TO THE UNITED STATES AND THEIR IMPACT ON OUR HOUSING SHORTAGE AND OTHER PROBLEMS

December 20, 1946: The Washington Post contained a story that President Truman had assigned four ships to a special refugee run to ferry European immigrants to the United States. The article quotes the President:

"During the Christmas season a year ago, on December 22, 1945, I issued a directive to a number of executive agencies designed to facilitate the immigration of refugees and displaced persons up to the full limit provided by the immigration law.

"Up to October 21, 1946, only 4,767 persons were provided for under these arrangements. At the present time, foreseeable sailings in 1946 will provide for only 683 more persons."

After quoting Truman as to delays in shipping for displaced persons who hold immigration visas for the United States, the article further quoted him:

"Mindful of the bleak Christmas ahead for these people who have already suffered so much, I have taken up this matter with the Maritime Commission and can hold out hope of early improvement."

The article concludes:

"The President did not say how many more refugees are scheduled to enter this country, but the presence of 2,100 at Bremerhaven alone indicated the total number would be large."

November 26, 1943: On this date Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, testifying in executive session before the House

Foreign Affairs Committee, said that President Roosevelt some years previously had set up an agency to rescue people from Europe, and implied there was no need for the adoption of H. Res. 350 and H. Res. 352 "providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe." Mr. Long said that, under the machinery theretofore established by the President, over 307,000 visas of all kinds were granted to persons from enemy or enemy-occupied territory; and most of them came here on visitors' visas.

Long's testimony, suppressed for an extended period, was finally issued as a "(Confidential print) extracts from hearings" before the committee mentioned.

NOTE.—About a year ago, the writer asked the Department of Justice's Immigration and Naturalization Service concerning aliens in this country, and was told that "between 1940 and 1945, both years inclusive, there had been 241,708 immigrants admitted to the United States, i. e., immigrants admitted as entitled to ultimate citizenship."

The same source informed that, at December 26, 1940, the estimated number of aliens registered here was 4,889,770; and that, due to deaths, departures, etc., the estimated number of registered aliens at July 1, 1945, was 3,350,000.

March 16, 1946: The Washington Post, under the byline of Dillard Stokes, reported that, under Justice Department Order 3229, issued by Attorney General Frank Murphy, the matter of "what aliens are getting into your country" is "run in totalitarian secrecy," since that order prevents the disclosure of that information.

April 25, 1946: The Washington Times-Herald reported that immigration authorities at New Orleans had reported that "enemy aliens arrested during the war were being returned to South America by plane at a cost of $195 to $266 each."

June 3, 1946: The Baltimore Sun reported that the Immigration Service had informed Attorney General Clark that an estimated "60,000 aliens have illegally slipped into the United States this year," and that "the border patrol arrested 30,000 aliens who had illegally crossed the Mexican border during January, February, and March of this year, the official, who cannot be quoted, said: 'The number of persons gaining illegal entry in addition to those apprehended is variously estimated up to the number caught.'"

June 3, 1946: The Evening Star carried substantially the same report as did the Baltimore Sun.

July 19, 1946: The Baltimore Sun reported: "Since the end of World War II, millions of aliens have turned their eyes and hearts toward America and are now pouring into this country—illegally—at the rate of 2,000 a day.

"That is the estimate of Tom Clark, United States Attorney General, who said that of the 60,000 who entered this country unlawfully in a month, 30,000 were arrested by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, perhaps better known as the border patrol."

NOTE.—Two thousand a day is 60,000 a month, 720,000 a year. House appropriation hearings show that the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization advised Mrs. Earl Browder to go to Canada, get a visa, and then apply for her citizenship; and that this is a frequent procedure for aliens who originally entered the United States, or were here, illegally. In 1937, letters from Sumner Welles told aliens how to go to other Latin-American countries, get visas, and then return for admission to citizenship.

September 26, 1946: The Times-Herald reported that: "1,075 alien stowaways seized as flight to United States continues."

October 26, 1946: The Hearst papers reviewed the entry of 2,000 aliens a day, illegally, and quoted Congressman NOAH MASON as severely criticizing the gag order of the Department of Justice preventing giving of information on aliens, and as saying an investigation of immigration is in order and will be made.

November 2, 1946: The Evening Star, under a Miami date line reported: "48 Estonians rejoice as President permits them to stay in the United States." The story quoted the White House (Mr. Truman) as saying: "In due course they would be given immigration visas which will enable them to remain in this country." (They had arrived and entered illegally after an ocean crossing in a small open vessel.)

It is known that aliens are being flown in in droves from Tel Aviv by Skyways; and the same is doubtless true as to other international air lines.

DEAR SIR: As per your request, we are listing below the names of passengers carried on our recent flight from Tel Aviv, Palestine, to Miami, Fla., as reported by cable by Captain Granere, pilot of the flight:

Miami to New York: Abraham Goldberg, Mindla Szostak, Nili Szostak, Szoszana Szostak, Asyr Rajcjes, Riuilia Tisch, Alfred Frenkel, Khaim Chmouter, Edith Schuster, Eva Schuster, Riva Kawa, Anna Neumann, Markus Juwiler, Elhanan Cohen, Walter Berman, Adele Bermann, Swi Swet, Alfred Rosenfeld, Salamson Simche, Golde De Mayer, Elara Schalit, Fande Rich, Joseph Zarecki.

Miami to Los Angeles: Fred H. Hilton.

Miami to Venezuela: Lee Robitschek, Henia Robitschek, Daniel Robitschek.

We have been advised that a Mr. Fred Hilton was picked up in Cairo, Egypt, rather than at Tel Aviv, and proceeded to Los Angeles, Calif., instead of New York.

We trust that this is the information you desire; if not, please feel free to call upon us at any time we can be of further service to you.

Very truly yours.

Skyways International passenger manifest

Part of weight and balance manifest for trip No. ———, plane No. 53472 (flight No. ———)
Originated at: Cairo, Egypt. Destined to: Miami, Fla. Date: October 10, 1946

Passengers embarking at: Cairo, Egypt. Date: October 10, 1946
Passengers destined to: Miami, Fla.

	Name	Ticket No.	Age	Sex	Nationality	Passport No.	M S	Occupation	Pers. wt.	No. bags	Bag wt.	Wt. ovnt.
1	Souren Aghazadian		45	M	Iranian		M	Manufacturer	160			
2	Chouchanik Aghazadian		29	F	do		M	Housewife	160			
3	Roubik Aghazadian		12	M	do		S	Student	160			
4	Albert Aghazadian		7	M	do		S	do	160			
5	Zola Sharmini		26	F	do		S	do	160			
6	Eli Tour		18	M	do		S	do	160			
7	Dorine S. Issaq		19	F	Iraqian		S	do	160			
8	Salmon Y. Sheeri		52	M	do		M	Business	160			
9	Violet Sheeri		29	F	do		M	Housewife	160			
10	Iraj S. Fard		20	M	Iranian		S	Student	160			
11	Kassan Shahminzady		21	M	do		S	do	160			
12	Olga Vostrakova		37	F	Tchecoslo		M	Housewife	160			
13	Eddy Vostrakova		2	M	do		S	Infant	160			
14	Kouros Satrap		22	M	Iranian		S	Student	160			
15	Naim Bahery		20	M	Iraqian		S	do	160			
16	Margareta Amisian		42	F	Iranian		M	Housewife	160			
17	David Michel		25	M	U. S. A		S	Mechanic (New York)	160			
18	Albert Waby		49	M	do		M	Phonographs operation (New York).	160			

Skyways International crew manifest

Part of weight and balance manifest for trip No. ———, plane No. 53472 (flight No. ———)
Originated at: Cairo, Egypt. Destined to: Miami, Fla. Date: 10 October 1946

Crew embarked at: Cairo, Egypt. Date: 10 October 1946
Crew destined to: Miami, Fla.

Position	Name	Nationality—Passport No.	Age	Sex	M S	Birthplace	Pers. wt.	No. bags	Wt. bags
Captain	Granere, James, U. S. A	U. S. A	28	M	M	U. S. A	160		
Copilot	Middleston, Henry J., U. S. A	do	27	M	M	do	160		
Flt/eng	Garvey, James P., U. S. A	do	36	M	S	do	160		
Nav	Calkins, Leonard, U. S. A	do	48	M	M	do	160		
Hostess	Mansour, Cecilia, U. S. A	do	32	F	S	do	130		

Totals: Number of crew, 5; bags, weight, 770 pounds. Revised totals: Number of crew, 5; bags, weight, 770 pounds.
Prepared by: Antoine G. Menassa.

Skyways International pilot's declaration

Plane: 53470. Nationality: U. S. A. Trip No. 306. Date: 2d October 1946
From: Lydda. Bound for: New York. Skyways International Ltd., Miami, Fla.

CREW

	Name and surname	Denomination	Nationality	Age	Sanitary conditions
1	Granere, J. A	Pilot	U. S. A	28	
2	MacDonald, F. J	Copilot	do	26	
3	Van Bergen, C. J	Mechanic	do	26	
4	Calkins, L. A	Navigator	do	43	
5	Goodson, E	l'Camareio	do	22	

	Name and surname	Passengers							Baggage (pieces)
		Nationality	Age	Sex	Civil status	Profession	Origin	Destination	
1	Ameen, Albert K	U. S. A	53	M	Married	Retired	Lydda	New York	2
2	Baadarani, Adel	Brazilian	15	M	Single	Student	do	Belem	Nil
3	Baadarani, Fatma	do	22	F	do	Housewife	do	do	2
4	Bajner, Marjem Dvojra	Polish	48	F	Married	do	do	New York	3
5	Chinicz, Mordekhai	Palestinian	38	M	do	Agent	do	do	3
6	Daoud, Tewfik Eff	Trans-Jordan	48	M	Single	Merchant	do	Miami	3
7	Ezrovits, Morie	Stateless	34	M	Married	Barber	do	New York	4
8	Ezrovits, Helena	do	33	F	do	Housewife	do	do	1
9	Garfinkle, Bouena	Canadian	28	F	do	Welfare worker	do	do	4
10	Garfinkle, Max	do	33	M	do	do	do	do	4
11	Gyulai, Lenka	Palestinian	38	F	Widow	Dressmaker	do	do	4
12	Gyulai, Suzanne Mirjam	do	13	F	Single	Student	do	do	1
13	Haouache, Khalid Ahmed	Syrian	16	M	do	Merchant apprentice	do	Belem	2
14	Hicherman, Sara	Palestinian	44	F	do	Secretary	do	New York	3
15	Katter, Edmund Nafe	U. S. A	20	M	do	Student	do	do	2
16	Lubliner, Hans Immanuel	Undefined	23	M	do	Laborer	do	do	2
17	Makari, Laroud de, Linda	Lebanese	27	F	Married	Housewife	do	do	4
18	Makari, Katia	do	5	F	Single	N/A	do	do	Nil
19	Makari, Wilma	do	3	F	do	do	do	do	Nil
20	Nassar, Shafiq Nejib	Palestinian	39	M	Married	Merchant	do	do	2
21	Rehfisch, Dr. Hans	Undefined	55	M	do	Author	do	do	4
22	Rehfisch, Antonia	do	41	F	do	Housewife	do	do	Nil
23	Vainbren, Mordekhai	Palestinian	44	M	do	Contractor	do	do	2
24	Weihl, Klara	do	50	F	Widow	Housewife	do	do	1
25	Weihl, Oskar	do	25	M	Single	Accountant	do	do	3
26	Weihl, Rudolf	do	21	M	do	Cook	do	do	2

Origin of the Truman Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week the upper Chamber of Congress debated at great length the question of whether or not the famous Senate War Investigating Committee should be continued. After the debate came to a close, the Senate deemed it advisable to grant this committee an additional year in order to complete its investigation of the war period.

This committee has been in the public eye for several years, yet very few people know of the incidents that occurred behind the scene to inspire its creation.

It was this committee, originally headed by Harry S. Truman, that sent him skyrocketing into the Vice Presidency of the United States and then into the White House itself.

In this connection, it would seem apropos to state for the first time the genesis of this committee.

The story dates back to late in December 1940, when sensational information concerning a highly placed defense-contract profiteer, came to the attention of Joseph Leib, free-lance writer of Washington, D. C.

Leib took this matter up with Sam O'Neal, who was at that time Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Star-Times—now publicity director of the Democratic National Committee—and they decided to bring the information to the attention of the Department of Justice. On January 4, 1941, they made their first call upon the then Attorney General Robert Jackson, Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General, and other officials. They made other calls on January 9, 14, 15, 16, and 23, 1941. However, the Justice Department refused to take action on this case.

Nevertheless, Leib sent the following letter to every Member of the Senate in the hope of bringing the case out into the open. The message read:

JANUARY 6, 1941.

MY DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Several days ago I conferred with Department of Justice officials relative to profiteering and fraud in defense and war contracts. The Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Star-Times assisted me in presenting amazing evidence in connection with this matter.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the Congress should set up an investigating committee to watch over possible frauds against the Government and I trust that you will give this suggestion your careful consideration and attention.

Should you care for further information, please advise. With many thanks.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH LEIB.

This letter was followed up with personal calls upon a number of Senators, including Mr. Truman.

Then, on February 13, 1941, Senator Truman introduced his resolution calling for the creation of a defense investigating committee, and the measure was officially approved on April 1, 1941. Senator Truman immediately became chairman of the committee.

Part of this story was told in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (vol. 89, pt. 10, p. A2280) by Senator STYLES BRIDGES.

Fearing that the statute of limitations would run on the above-mentioned case, Leib got a bill introduced, H. R. 4916, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which demanded the suspending during time of war or national emergency the running of any statute of limitations on prosecutions for Federal offenses. This measure was introduced on May 29, 1941.

Finally on November 26, 1941, a long-delayed hearing was held by the House Judiciary Subcommittee and the only witnesses were Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin, who introduced the bill, Mr. Leib, and Mr. Alexander Holtzoff, Special Assistant Attorney General. The Justice Department opposed this piece of legislation because it was too broad, but on January 28, 1942, after much agitation they sent to the Congress H. R. 6484, a bill to suspend during the present war the running of statutes of limitations applicable to certain offenses. This became law on August 24, 1942, and it was during this period that the Justice Department set up a war-fraud unit. From the exposure of a number of war contracts came the demand for the Renegotiation Act and the subsequent saving of untold billions of dollars.

Unfortunately, all the details surrounding this matter cannot be made public at this time. Who the defense contract profiteer was, why the Justice Department refused to take action and other incidents that took place will be revealed at a later date. When it does break, one thing is sure, it certainly will make interesting reading.

Our War Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following article by Mrs. George S. Patton, Jr.:

LET WAR DEAD REST

(By Mrs. George S. Patton, Jr.)

Wherever our soldiers are buried overseas, there is America, and American cemeteries mark the triumphal march of our armies through the islands of the Pacific and from Africa, Sicily, and Italy through France to the borders of Germany. No Americans are buried in any enemy soil.

The crosses, each with its identification tag, stand in long rows guarding the dead, and on my journey overseas last June I saw local people everywhere, both grown-ups and children, putting flowers on the graves of the men they call "our liberators."

I have seen this picture repeated three times, in 1921, 1938, and 1946, and I believe every American who some day visits a grave in one of these cemeteries will come away feeling it is completely right that he should lie there.

This is the judgment of many of the bereaved of World War I who have talked with me after the first poignancy of their grief subsided.

After the last war I saw the dead brought back. I watched them being put into graves on funeral day at a national cemetery, week after week. Each of those coffins had meant the bereavement of some family when the word of death was received, and in that time of great emotion the relatives had asked to have the bodies returned.

But on the day of burial it was rare to see a family present. Many of them did not come, I think, because the wound of sorrow had begun to heal, the meaning of the burial ceremony had changed for them, and they had begun to realize that the broken bodies brought back in sealed caskets bore no relation to the men they had known and loved.

Our Army graves-registration units under the Quartermaster General are making incredible efforts in all parts of the world to identify the bodies of lost Americans, thus ending the strain of uncertainty in many homes. Our Government will either bury their bodies in national cemeteries overseas or send them home, according to the decision of their next of kin.

As a specious comfort to the bereaved relatives, sending them home is called repatriation. The word is a misnomer, for every American cemetery, wherever it is, is already American soil, owned and cared for by the United States Government.

My husband felt this deeply, and in 1919 he wrote the poem in which he said:

"Our free souls will be far,
Holding the line in sunny France
Where we died to win the war."

Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair, killed in Normandy, held the same belief, Mrs. McNair wrote:

"Lesley was a soldier and wanted to die a soldier's death. I know he would want to stay where he is, surrounded by the men he trained and with whom he died. He would not want his body moved."

What do most of those graves overseas hold? Parts of men wrapped in blankets or mattress covers, without coffins—gone back to earth because they could no longer serve their purpose.

Will it comfort you to hear that your soldier is being shipped home in a box or an urn to be reburied? What will come home to you isn't what you remember and love.

Will it ease your grief, or make you happier to know that some young soldier, drafted to serve our country overseas, is digging up these poor bones?

If the family of the fallen soldier would find comfort in a permanent, tangible record near at hand, let them erect a simple monument in the family cemetery plot, inscribed with the man's name and record and the place of his burial overseas. Or this could be added to the list on a family monument already established.

Thus there would be a lasting memorial at home where it could be seen, without the gruesome performance of moving the remains.

And what would your man himself say if he could speak?

Every good soldier I have ever known wanted to be buried where he fell.

Mine did.

Our dead have earned the right to rest in peace.

Amendment of Civil Service Retirement Act—Bills To Aid Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in the House three bills, one to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, for the purpose of increasing the annuities of those who have retired, or are about to retire, under the Retirement Act, by 50 percent of the annuities they are now receiving, or will receive, or by $600 per annum, whichever amount is lesser.

I believe this to be a very just and worth-while measure, for it will afford employees who are eligible to retire an opportunity to do so with a livable annuity which will offer them security for the future. It will also encourage older employees to take advantage of the retirement system, and thus make openings available for employees to move up, and thereby create new positions to be filled. This action will help materially to solve some of our unemployment. Heretofore, employees have hesitated to retire due to the low retirement rate they would receive as they felt the annuity would be inadequate to meet the needs of present-day living, and they continued on in their positions even after reaching the retirement age. This bill, I feel sure, will help to remedy the situation and will aid in bringing about a proper solution to the problem.

The other two bills are to aid the postal employees. One measure provides for a working schedule with 8 hours' service not to extend over a longer period than 9 consecutive hours; that is, to get 8 hours' work in on a 9-hour period. Many times postal employees report to work and then have to wait around several hours before going back on duty. This seems to me to be a great waste of time, and I am sure that a working schedule can be arranged which will correct this situation.

Also, I have a bill to grant to postal employees the same leave privileges which are enjoyed by regular civil-service employees. This bill provides that postmasters and employees shall be granted 26 days' leave of absence with pay each year, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, and also 15 days' sick leave with pay, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, and to be cumulative. This also provides for certain leave privileges for classified substitute employees.

I firmly believe that the postal employees are entitled to the same leave benefits as are granted to other civil-service employees.

Canol, the Major Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World of January 20, 1947:

CANOL, THE MAJOR SCANDAL

When the history of World War II scandal, inefficiency, and horrible waste is written, Canol will be a big item. That was the oil project some United States military officials dreamed up. They were partially aided by Canadians. The scheme was to furnish oil for war by a long pipe line. It turned out the project was impractical in the first place. The oil supply was tenuous. The capacity of the plant and line was not enough to be of any help in the war, even if careful operation had been possible.

Now we are told that the $100,000,000 project is a ruin; that only the $25,000,000 refinery remains, and it is worse than useless. The story, among the most disagreeable of the war, is that the junk dealers have taken everything they found loose. It is likely the refinery has been cleaned out of all the relatively small or detachable equipment. The great scarcities of metals and other things in the United States furnished first-class incentive for looting. The equipment scattered about the place—bulldozers, tanks, trucks, and heavy materials—would deteriorate, anyway, regardless of the looting. The whole affair seems to have been left to the guardianship of the highly touted and much-pictured Canadian Royal Police. In other words, the United States promoters and managers and even the Government, appeared to abandon the whole business right after it was ostensibly completed. Whatever the circumstances under which decay took place, the United States suffered a tremendous loss. The expenditure was never justified and it was poorly handled.

Just who was responsible for this miserable but very costly farce should be put on record. Our recollection is that a military man was the mainspring. The Government and war authorities generally must have acquiesced. The whole matter should be

looked over and assorted and cataloged. The size, in the first place, was forbidding, and the calculations were incorrect. The plan had no chance to succeed. Now, to add to the injury, comes the mysterious removal, the busy capitalization by industrial scavengers. The whole thing, even at this late date, has a ghastly look, an evil sound, a mighty bad smell.

Portal-to-Portal Pay Suits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as part of this extension of remarks, I include a statement of Alva W. Phelps, president of the Oliver Corp., well-known makers of farm machinery. In this statement to all members of the Oliver Corp., Mr. Phelps discusses the so-called portal-to-portal pay suits as they may affect the Oliver Corp.

The statement is as follows:

To All Members of the Oliver Organization:

You are all aware of the tidal wave of so-called portal-to-portal back pay and damage suits recently instituted against American industry. Most of these suits, the total amount of which now exceeds $4,000,000,000, were suggested by the recent court decision in what is known as the Mount Clemens Pottery case—a decision involving a new and entirely unforeseen interpretation of the Wage and Hour Act, and contrary to traditional and well-known practices and customs.

Most of you also know that suits have been filed against Oliver for tremendous sums totaling $11,000,000. It is claimed that half of this total represents a recovery of wages, although such additional compensation was never anticipated by our employees or by union officials during regular contract negotiations. The other half, in the amount of $5,500,000, has been asked for damages.

We believe that it is best for all of us to make it clear to you that at present the suits are no more than a gamble. Jurists and legislators have indicated that they are aware of the crippling effect on industrial progress and job security that such a terrific and unearned body blow would have on industry.

As a responsible member of American industry, Oliver has attempted at all times to meet its obligations to employees, customers, dealers, and the general public interest. In meeting these obligations, Oliver has, desires to, and will, as must any other business, move within the framework of the law. Now a surprising interpretation of one law has led certain labor leaders to believe that they have grounds to impose a heavy penalty upon industry—the same industry on whose orderly expansion and success the jobs and prosperity of all productive workers depend.

All Oliver employees have received full and fair compensation according to the terms of contracts made in good faith between their representatives and the company under the lawful process of collective bargaining. The company, therefore, advises you that it must defend these suits vigorously in order to protect its dealers, customers, stockholders, and, ultimately, its own employees. Balanced protection of the best interests of all those concerned with a business as well as the general public is an important function of honest management. In this case, as in any other where one group might seek temporary benefit at damaging expense to the others, we will make every effort to carry out this function.

Yours very truly,

ALVA A. PHELPS,
President.

Farewell Message of the Late Gen. Joseph Stilwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the farewell message of the late Gen. Joseph Stilwell to the Tenth Army as he took leave of them.

The message follows:

Now that you are on the way back to the farm, the shop, the desk, or the mine, or soon will be, listen to a few words from an old brass hat who has watched the generations pass by. You are not required to listen any more; nobody can call you to attention; you are free from red tape, discipline, censorship, and restrictions; the wraps are off you at last. But give me a chance to speak to you briefly with the wraps off me, too. Even brass hats are tied up in red tape, and sometimes they don't like it any better than you do.

My great regret is that I can't expect to go along with your generation very much longer. I have seen how you respond in a crisis, and it is okay. I have heard you cuss and gripe, and that's normal and proper. You can take it on the nose, and you can dish it out, with interest. You have made the grade, as soldiers, sailors, and marines, and you can have my shirt any time you need it.

When you get home, they will make a fuss over you. They will be shouting, "Welcome home, heroes," "The thanks of America," etc. How you will squirm and wish you could get down to Clancy's with the boys! All you can do is sweat it out, make your speech, and be thankful that it doesn't last very long.

The home folks think a lot of you and they will only be trying to show their appreciation. You want your own people and your own community to feel that you made good, anyway. They never doubted that you would; it was only you who had any qualms about it. And here is where you cash in; you have been through the mill, you have stood the gaff, and you have the satisfaction of accomplishment that nothing can buy. That is the real reward of your service. From now on you can live with yourself, without regrets.

But unless I read you wrong, you will not think your work as Americans is all done because the war is over. In the face of aggression, we got together and submerged all our little differences. In the big issues, everybody came through. You did not hesitate to go forward and pull a buddy out of machine-gun fire at the risk of your own neck. And it didn't count that you were maybe a college graduate and he never got beyond the eighth grade, because you know he'd have done as much for you. You wouldn't know, except incidentally, who were Protestants, Catholics, or Jews in your company, who were union men and who nonunion. It wouldn't have made any difference anyway.

The war has proved the essential cohesion of America. If the Germans and the Japs had looked us over carefully, and had had the brains to evaluate what they saw, they would never have been crazy enough to try to pull us down. If we can lick a problem such as this war has been, are we going to let the comparatively minor problems of peace bother us? Why, if we put the same effort on solving our domestic problems that we have put on licking the Germans and the Japs, we could make over the United States of America the way we'd like to have it.

It is too much to expect that we should continue the same pace when the urge is gone, but 11,000,000 ex-servicemen can have a lot to say about what we will do. I am sure of one thing—you like the way America is headed, or you wouldn't have put up such a fight for it.

Maybe in the near future your machine gunner will make a million dollars and you will run a filling station. What the hell! It may be that you will make the million and the gunner will run the filling station. That's America—everybody on his feet, and nobody on his knees.

One more thing before I stop talking. You have left your outfit and exchanged the bugle for the alarm clock, but you will never be alone again. There are 11,000,000 men now who belong to the same club you do, who have had similar experiences. You have, all of you, seen a lot of the world and can better appreciate what we've got in the United States of America. Because I have faith in the outlook and ideals of your generation, I should like to live long enough to see what you do with your opportunities. But though it is a fine day in the morning for you, it is getting late in the afternoon for me.

Good luck, soldier. I am proud to have known you.

Second Bay Bridge Crossing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, San Francisco has four outstanding daily papers each of which is of national and international prominence.

A few days ago in the extension of my remarks I included editorials from three of these papers which dealt with the fact that a second San Francisco Bay bridge is imperatively needed of a type and location that will meet the future requirements of our peacetime economy and national defense. Such a crossing must not only provide for vehicular traffic, but also adequate facilities for transcontinental railroad service. The complete unanimity of opinion in San Francisco and in many other communities in that area is demonstrated by a further editorial in the fourth newspaper—the San Francisco Examiner. That editorial is as follows:

HASTEN THE NEXT BRIDGE

Ten years ago, in November 1936, the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge was open for automobile traffic, and even at the time of the opening there were persons who insisted it was not needed.

Now, a decade later, it is found that the great bridge is insufficient to handle the traffic, and construction of another structure is urgent.

Hearings have been held and the matter will soon be considered in Washington, with Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH, of San Francisco, endeavoring vigorously to haster the final decision.

The necessity is apparent. The site or route of the new bridge has yet to be determined.

That is the problem which must be solved by engineers, traffic experts and the advisors of the cities which the bridge will serve.

The new bridge should relieve, rather than further confuse, the traffic problems of its terminal cities, in particular San Francisco, which owing to its downtown congestion is a traffic problem child among municipalities.

The new bridge must not dump further traffic into already congested areas.

That aspect of bridge planning was discussed when the bridge commissioners met here. It must not be neglected in the Washington decision.

But that decision should not be delayed. The bridge is needed now.

Dr. Conant on 2-Year Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, January 26, 1947.

This editorial discusses the annual report of President James B. Conant, of Harvard University, in which President Conant expresses his approval of junior colleges. By implication he also approves Federal aid for education.

The editorial follows:

DR. CONANT ON 2-YEAR COLLEGES

Those who believe that the 2-year period following graduation from high school offers a promising educational level will find unexpected support in the annual report of Dr. James B. Conant, of Harvard. Looking ahead to the time when the GI boom will have spent its force, Dr. Conant anticipates a steadily growing demand for advanced education. "For many types of students," he suggests, "a terminal 2-year education beyond the high school, provided locally, seems better adapted to their needs than that offered by a traditional 4-year residential college."

In recommending "the rapid expansion and development of such terminal 2-year colleges," the governing factor in Dr. Conant's mind is one of cost. His argument is that local provision for students would be far less expensive than equivalent provision at residential colleges. Moreover, if Federal aid for public education is made available, without Federal control of education, he sees no reason why some of the money flowing to the States should not be used in supporting the local 2-year colleges. For many students, two or more academic years would prove a fitting climax to their formal education. For others, particularly for those qualified for the professions, there would still be the opportunity to go on.

There is nothing novel in the idea of a 2-year level beyond the high school. For decades it has been the concept on which the flourishing development of junior colleges has been based. Here in the East, these institutions are financed privately as a rule; in California, the additional 2 years are usually provided at public expense. In California, also, a variation on the pattern has been evolved, known as the New American College, in which the last 2 years of high school and the first 2 years of college are combined in a single 4-year unit. In New York State, the most recent application of the idea has been the far-sighted program of 2-year institutes, recommended by the board of regents and just now getting under way. If Dr. Conant's discussion serves no other purpose than to further this program, it will have been a useful contribution.

New England Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry—a vital part of the business life of New England—soon will be nonexistent unless steps are taken to remedy the ills that now beset it.

In an effort to call public attention to this important matter and in the hope of helping to solve the problems now facing this multi-million-dollar industry the Providence (R. I.) Journal recently assigned one of its reporters, Leonard O. Warner, to study the industry and the problems now facing it and to write a series of five articles on the subject.

So that every Member of the House and Senate may have the benefit of these articles, I propose to offer these articles for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and under permission already granted me I include herewith the first article, as it appeared in the Journal of January 12, 1947. It follows:

NEW ENGLAND'S FISHERIES VIEWED AS DYING INDUSTRY — MULTI-MILLION-DOLLAR BUSINESS FISHING ITSELF OUT OF EXISTENCE THROUGH MACHINE METHODS, COLOSSAL WASTE, AND LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE FUTURE

(By Leonard O. Warner)

Austin Powers, one-time fisherman turned labor executive, looked out from his second-story office window onto teeming Northern Avenue, off the Boston Fish Pier, and observed:

"If this keeps up, Boston will be the home of the bean and not the cod. This is a dying industry, but it doesn't know it. The pity of it all."

With deep feeling that brought out his slight Irish brogue, Powers was talking about the depletion of the great fishing grounds which fan out from the New England coast. From these vast ocean bottom plains, hills and valleys, New England has built an industry that now earns, according to the best estimates, an income of about $50,000,000 each year.

The industry itself and its allied businesses—boatbuilders, net makers, ships outfitters, filleting plants, etc.—probably represent an investment of $500,000,000, stretching from Connecticut north and eastward to the tip of Maine.

Haddock and redfish are the largest items in the New England catch, each totaling about 114,000,000 pounds a year. About 100,000,000 pounds of cod are caught annually. Flounders, herring, whiting, pollock, and mackerel are the only other species taken in quantity, but there are at least 63 other minor species landed.

From the large New England ports of Boston, Gloucester, and New Bedford, Mass., Portland and Rockland, Maine, and scores of small water-front villages in Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine, come between 40 and 50 percent of the Nation's fish.

Much of all this is threatened now by an industry that has become so efficient it is cleaning out the nearby Georges and South Channel banks, and forcing its small draggers and large otter trawlers to push further eastward into the North Atlantic in the search of haddock, cod, redfish and other species.

"Pretty soon we'll be going to the Flemish Cape east of Newfoundland, halfway to Europe, and then there won't be any fishing because it won't be worth it," said Powers. As the fishery moves eastward and northward farther away from shore, bank after bank is depleted. And still the trend is eastward, ever eastward, leaving poor grounds behind near home.

Several years ago a fisherman, a little more than 6 hours out of Boston, could drop his nets on the Georges bank or in South Channel and come up with a load of haddock, New England's favorite fish. Today, he is sailing to far off Emerald bank, Sable Island, and even Banquereau (Quereau to fishermen).

SEVEN HUNDRED MILES FROM BOSTON

Quereau is from 700 to 800 miles east by north of Boston—and east of Halifax—and to reach it the Boston and Gloucester men must sail from 55 to 65 hours.

The gulf of Maine, skirting the Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine shores, was always good for a pen full of redfish—the favorite in midwestern fish and chip places. But today, the horny-handed men of Gloucester, specialists in the art of catching and marketing redfish, are sailing far out onto the Nova Scotian shelf to get their fill. And even there, redfish aren't so abundant as they used to be. The drive must be to the east, ever eastward, farther from home.

A trip for fish now in many cases means 10 or 11 days out on the far-away banks in dirty weather and rough North Atlantic seas. In one year alone, according to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior, trips to the Nova Scotian banks increased the aggregate running time of the New England otter trawler fleet by more than 2,600 days.

Thus, if the trawlers had been able to find good fishing in Georges, the fleet could have spent 2,600 fewer days running between port and fishing ground. Since a trawler's time is worth something like $250 or more a day, the increased running time cost the owners, crews—and consumers—around $650,000 in a year.

Causes for the decline in the Georges bank and South Channel fishery are several, but all are interrelated.

William C. Herrington, aquatic biologist of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Cambridge, across the Charles River from Boston, pointed out that right now the unexplained failure of young haddock to survive is one of the reasons for scarcity of the fish.

His office has several theories concerning the reason for death of many young fish, but none has yet been proven, and so, nothing is being said yet.

CAUSES OF DEPLETION

But, the causes for depletion during the intensive fishing just before World War II and in the early months of the war go like this, as given by Herrington:

1. Destruction of unnumbered millions of baby haddock too small for market. Official observers indicate in some years between two-fifths and four-fifths of the total number of haddock caught by otter trawlers were below commercial size.

2. Development of a trend to market small haddock—fish below 1½ pounds. The practice results in the capture of most of the young haddock before they have completed more than a fraction of their normal growth. A 2-year-old haddock, left on the banks another year, would double in weight, and similarly a 3-year-old haddock will increase its weight by 30 to 40 percent more.

3. Lack of regulations protecting small fish. The Pacific Coast halibut industry, faced with extinction because of overfishing, submitted to an international commission an agreement limiting catches and protecting small fish. Similarly, the English fishermen in the North Sea, confronted with the fact they were fishing themselves out of business, are now controlled by regulations protecting baby fish. Results in both cases: increased catches.

The constantly dropping catches brought into port by New England fishermen are reflected in figures kept at the Boston fish pier office of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

1941 LOAD AT BOSTON

Take Boston, for instance. In 1941, while the Boston fleet was operating at high level, the boats brought in 300,000,000 pounds of fish.

During the war, the Boston fleet lost many boats to the Navy, but by 1946 the dragger and otter trawler numbers were at their all-time high. Old boats had been returned and veterans had entered the business with new vessels.

But the 1946 catch was only 155,000,000 pounds, slightly more than half the 1941 total. Opponents of conservation will point out that during 1946 the Boston fleet was tied up by strike for 5 months, but B. E. Lindgren, fish and wildlife marketing specialist in Boston, estimated that the 5 months would probably have not yielded more than an additional 50,000,000 pounds.

In any event, operating last year at full steam with more boats than ever, Boston could have landed about only 200,000,000 pounds, or 100,000,000 pounds less than in 1941.

To the consumer, whether he lives in sight of the sea on the rugged New England coast or in the Corn Belt of the Midwest, the depletion of the nearby North Atlantic fishing grounds and the longer runs out to sea add up to higher prices for fish and poorer quality.

SQUEEZE TOO GREAT

When the day comes—and some on the Boston fish pier believe it not far off—that the consumer refuses to pay high prices for fish, many boats in the fleet will be forced to tie up. It is impossible to go far out to sea to fish and then sell it at a low price. The squeeze is too great.

With the increased cost, ironically enough, comes poor quality. Although gutted and iced as it is taken aboard, fish that is 5 days in the hold will not be so fresh as fish 1 to 1½ days from the water into the freezers or on store counters.

When Austin Powers, business agent for the Atlantic Fishermen's Union, was decrying the industry's blindness to its troubles, he used cod to illustrate his point. No Bostonian would do differently.

But to Powers, to the fishermen, and the researchers of the Fish and Wildlife Service, haddock is probably the most rapidly disappearing fish.

FISH BECOMING SCARCE

The redfish is becoming scarce; so is the cod. The yellowtail flounder, found off southern New England to the southward of Block Island, is becoming harder to find and on the Massachusetts north shore other specialists of the Fish and Wildlife Service are trying to determine the cause for the scarcity of clams.

Rhode Island clams are not so plentiful as they used to be, and while pollution is to some extent responsible, overfishing must also bear the brunt of the responsibility.

Maine is concerned because its 1946 catch of lobsters was 1,000,000 pounds under that of 1945. There, also, fishermen are pleading for legislation to protect egg-bearing crabs.

And so it goes.

If you confine the problem, for the moment, to the deep-sea fishing ground in the North Atlantic, it's just like Capt. Elroy Coffin, of South Portland, Maine, skipper of the dragger *Nautilus*, says:

"Too many and too much—too many draggers and they take too much."

Rome Wasn't Built in a Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Brighton-Pittsford Post, Pittsford, N. Y., of January 9, 1947:

ROME WASN'T BUILT IN A DAY

From some of the most casual situations come some of the most obvious lessons.

Watch a small child patiently building up a set of blocks, one at a time, one on top of another, steadily wider and then higher; over a long period of time the construction process continues. The plan, the creative work and its projected result, take time, patience, care, and study. But it only takes 1 second for another child to make a sweep of his hand and knock the entire labor to pieces.

The damage has been done. The destruction wrought. And now it becomes the necessary objective of the new Congress to bring back some order out of the chaos. The low condition in which it finds the ship of state is one which cannot be built in a day, a year or 2 years, or even 4 years. The bungling, the graft, the infiltration of foreign ideologies, the sovereign bureaus, are but titles to endless chapters of waste and mockery of this Republic, the correction of which was mandated to this and succeeding Congresses.

Despite the initial headlines which have appeared, on a set of bills to be pushed immediately into the hopper of legislation, no one should be stupid enough to think that the boys in Washington are going to succeed in doing a housecleaning job overnight or in any very short time. The period of reconstruction is a slow, tedious, somber, studious operation. In the conditions inherited by the Republicans, dissatisfaction with so many things is so intense that a few unthinkingly, may wonder why they see no sudden sunburst pattern of a new millenium. First things must come first; a sound program must be planned; foundations must be laid again; the structure of a sound economy must be built; harmony, happiness, security and a hopeful future must be fabricated into the design for living; and with all these combined as a goal, nothing can be undertaken loosely and disjointedly. It must be workable.

For those entrusted with the future of the United States, there is today the biggest order ever confronting a Congress. Not only are our domestic problems of tremendous weight, but also we are now committed to an assembly of nations to still further complicate our future. Still heavy with moisture behind the ears, we are feeling our way in the dark, among friendly and unfriendly peoples, not yet aware of which are which.

The new Congress will do well to make progress at all, it will do well to produce some sort of a record this year, which will achieve something to point at with pride. Some glaring troubles will necessitate immediate action to offset the unbalanced position in which the Congress finds the ship of state. Some people will consider that only what affects them personally is of paramount importance.

Everyone should be considerately intelligent, patient and cooperative. Don't expect Rome to be built in a day, and give the new Congress a little time to get organized and under way. You can expect great things from it, but not always will the things you think are great, necessarily be so.

Summary of Antelope County Triple A Activities for 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of Congress, it was my privilege to travel into every one of the 24 counties in the Third Nebraska Congressional District which I have the honor of representing in Congress. One of the great counties of this district is Antelope County, where unusual progress has been made in the planting of trees under the program once known as the "shelter belt." This tree-planting program in Antelope County has been outstanding. It is of great pride to the farmers on whose farms these trees were planted.

The soil-conservation practices in Antelope County have been unusually good. I have received a report on this program in Antelope County. I include it as a part of my remarks for the information of the House. It follows:

The close of the first postwar year finds triple A playing a major part in the reconversion of agriculture to peacetime production, with most emphasis on soil conservation. Many wartime activities have been discontinued, and we will try to summarize some of them for you.

During the past year Antelope County farmers continued to carry out soil-conservation practices approved for the county, and they will receive approximately $156,333.41 for these practices. In order to bring our soil back to a high level of fertility, which has been greatly exhausted during the past few years of intensive production, Antelope County farmers during 1946 farmed approximately 7,842 acres on the contour; strip-cropped 58,840 acres; constructed 45,000 linear feet of new terraces; established 3,921,000 square feet of sod waterways; seeded 25,361 pounds of grass seed in native pasture; moved 35,000 cubic yards of dirt in constructing dams; harvested 6,380 acres of alfalfa for seed; applied several tons of chlorate on bindweed; clean-tilled 175 acres; plowed under 33,452 acres of green manure crops; moved 32,836 cubic yards of dirt in constructing drainage ditches; tilled 32,836 acres of stubble; planted 76,500 new trees; maintained 360 acres of established trees; and seeded 4,779 acres of land back to native pasture.

All of the above practices were inspected by community or county committeemen and received their approval before any payment was made for the practice.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six saw the terminating of various wartime activities. These included subsidy payments on dairy products, beef, and sheep and lamb sales; $76,594.72 was paid Antelope County farmers to help increase beef production badly needed here and abroad. In addition, $15,577.89 was paid to producers of fat sheep and lambs. Emergency corn and wheat purchase programs were started in early summer to purchase grains for shipment to foreign countries where famine threatened. Antelope County farmers were paid $112,682.74 for 86,713 bushels of corn and $7,564.56 for 3,694 bushels of wheat, payments being handled through the local AAA office. Farmers redeemed 33,526 bushels of corn valued at $30,173.40 which was under seal from previous commodity-loan programs. To date 43 loans have been completed on 1946 corn and 65 applications for loans have been received, indicating that a great amount of the 1946 corn crop will be placed under seal, thereby keeping the corn where it will be readily available to the producer, or other Antelope County farmers instead of the corn moving out of the country.

Handling of rationed items such as building materials and farm machinery has ended with the exception of extensions to February 8, 1947, only on farm machinery. Records indicate that 371 veterans applied for rationed items in 1946; 371 permits were issued and 334 permits were extended on these applications.

Although this is a minor wheat county, there are 259 Federal crop-insurance contracts in effect for which $11,091.92 was paid in premiums. A number of producers suffered wheat losses and were paid a total of $1,975.73 for such losses.

Office activities continued with over 8,900 callers during the year; telephone calls amounting to 2,812 on record; 18,670 personal letters were written; 8,653 mimeographed letters were mailed; 5,918 received; 77 county or precinct meetings held at which 2,031 persons attended; made 1,338 contacts by county and community committeemen; held 22 meetings with other agencies; and published 52 articles of interest to farmers.

Local, State, and national interest seems to be increasing in a farm program. The last few years did not necessarily require as strong an organization of farmers as we are certain to need once we are in the middle of overproduction, loss of heavy shipments of agricultural commodities abroad, and the general slump that is certain to come within the near future. Triple A is looking to intensive soil-conservation practices and continuation of a price-support program to see the American farmer through.

Good News From Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of January 26, 1947, entitled "Good News From Pittsburgh," as follows:

GOOD NEWS FROM PITTSBURGH

The year's best news on the industrial front so far was the announcement on Friday that the United States Steel Corp. and the United Steelworkers of America had agreed, in the public interest, to extend their existing wage contract from February 15 to April 30, followed by the simultaneous statement of both parties that agreements had been reached on substantial and basic parts of a program for equalizing wage rates for comparable jobs within plants, between plants, and between companies. The continued production of steel is assured until at least May 1. The sense of public responsibility which both sides show encourages hope that there will be no strike after May 1.

CIO President Philip Murray's steel union is asking concessions which, it is estimated, will add $300,000,000 to the industry's existing $1,500,000,000 wage bill. Among these is the issue of portal-to-portal pay. If this were written into a new contract the employers would at least know where they stood. Pending legislative, judicial, or collective-bargaining action, they do not know where they stand on back pay based on the portal-to-portal theory. The present extension of the contract may give time for this question to be threshed out. Meanwhile the adjustments announced this morning provide for retroactive payments of more than $30,000,000 to iron out what both parties have agreed were inequities in previous wage rates.

The wisdom of the steelworkers' demands has been and will be questioned. Their realization in full would be felt in increased prices for a thousand commodities and services. But the wisdom of corporation and union in recognizing, as they did in an agreed statement, "their joint interest in maintaining peaceful industrial relations" will be applauded by all except those who believe in industrial warfare as a political weapon.

The general principles of wage increases can be debated on an intellectually respectable plane. Many of us hold that excessive wage costs do not in the end even benefit the wage-earner. Others seem to regard any increase in the money wage rate as a positive good. But there can be no intellectually respectable argument about stoppages in basic industries. Such stoppages hurt everybody—employer, employee, and consumer. Last year there were enough of them and enough threats of them to shake the foundations of our economic and political life. Perhaps we have just seen at Pittsburgh the beginnings of an industrial statesmanship that will avoid them. One cannot predict, but one can hope.

Peace in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 29 (legislative day of Monday, January 27), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in my State there is a very distinguished and capable labor leader who often delivers statesmanlike and intelligent speeches, and makes analyses of our great domestic labor problems. I refer to Dave Beck, the international vice president of the teamsters' union. About a week ago he delivered an important address before his own organization. I think it is one of the finest analyses of labor-management problems ever given, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are entering a new year. If history repeats itself, as it has done since the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, before another year rolls around we will have developed a finer America. But not without sacrifice. To use the words of Winston Churchill, this will require "blood, sweat and tears."

We are emerging from a terrible war. We are still trying to readjust our people and our industries from war to peace, and we are meeting some difficulties in so doing. Already we have experienced serious strains on our economic life. Capital and labor have had bitter disagreements and the public has been seriously disturbed. Many feel that a better job could have been done, but we must not forget that a lessened efficiency is the price we sometimes must pay for democracy, though democracy is worth far more to us than this small sacrifice.

I am sure that we would not trade places with the people of any other nation. Those who advocate private enterprise, as I do, surely would not prefer a situation similar to that in Britain, where the nationalization of industry is going forward today. Not even those who most dislike John L. Lewis want us to follow the footsteps of the British. Surely the problems of Asia and Palestine and India are far more serious than any we have to face, either foreign or domestic. I am certain that at least 99 percent of our people—labor, capital and the public—do not look upon the situation in Russia as an improvement over our own.

We can find no solace for our ills in China, or Japan, or France, or in any other country in the world. No, we are still in the number one position. Our people are enjoying the finest of living standards, our hopes are the highest for the future.

Yes, we have our serious problems. It will require time and effort to solve them—but solve them we will. Some politicians think they have the answer, but they have not. Some say labor is entirely at fault. It isn't. Others blame capital entirely, and they, too, are wrong.

We have in America the finest leadership of capital and labor to be found in the entire world. It is overwhelmingly against the socialization of industry and opposed to communism. Some of the leaders in industry oppose any form of recognition for organized labor, but a great many other men in influential business positions have grown practical. They have advanced with the times. They have learned that new techniques are necessary in this modern world.

Some men in labor have felt that when Franklin D. Roosevelt passed on to his reward, everything he fought for would go to wreck and ruin, but that, of course, is foolishness. No such thing will happen. Perhaps it is true that labor enjoyed an edge, even a considerable advantage under Roosevelt, but labor was a long way behind when he was first elected. Perhaps in some instances labor moved a little too fast for industry. The profit picture during the war eased that strain, however.

When the war ended, and when we began to get back to competitive operations, we discovered that the restraints of wartime controls prevented the easy meshing of the gears of our economic machine. We are now working out our problems through the process so common to democracy.

Our last national election came as a surprise to many of our people, but there were those of us in labor who anticipated the results. We are now watching the changing picture. We face a new Congress; we see politicians attempting to understand the meaning of the election, and hold-overs trying to discover exactly what happened.

We can be sure of this, however: If unwise legislation is enacted it will have a depressing, disturbing effect upon our economy and the welfare of the American people.

In my opinion, there are no short cuts to the solution of our industrial and economic problems; absolutely no cure-alls. We cannot bring industrial peace by legislation. Such peace can come only when industry, public, and labor recognize character and ability, wherever it is found in the leadership of unions and management, and when public support is given such leadership in attacking the economic problem intelligently and courageously.

Punitive legislation, in the guise of laws to regulate labor and to promote industrial peace, now being discussed by Congressmen, is a far more serious threat to our American system of free enterprise than all the Communists and crackpots combined—and they are a real menace. Whatever undermines the faith of the American worker in the honesty and the fairness of his Congress and his Government cannot help but shake the foundations of our economic system and provide fertile ground for the propagation of alien philosophies hostile to our way of life.

The cure for industrial disturbance is not to be found in semislave laws intended to take away the hard-earned rights of the working people and chain toilers to jobs against their will. It is to be found only in understanding and cooperation between men of good will in industry and labor and public support of honest men who represent them.

If those who cry loudest for laws to curb labor were sincerely desirous of industrial peace, rather than selfish and unwarranted advantage, they would explore the tried and proven ways. They would tackle the problem by the use of the only successful formula: better, closer relationships, confidence, and mutual understanding between those who speak for labor and capital.

A few States already have passed laws, and Congress is now being importuned to pass further laws, to outlaw the union shop and the closed shop. Union people, however, are not being fooled by this campaign. They know, as do those who promote such legislation, that its purpose is to destroy the strength of labor. Yet, without semislave legislation to force working people to remain at the machine against their will, such laws must fail. They will be as futile as the late, but unlamented, dry law.

Such legislation certainly will not increase production or efficiency, both of which are essential to the welfare of capital as well as to the welfare of labor and the public. It is one thing to encourage an unfriendly employer to hire individuals who will refuse to join unions but who will accept all the benefits that have been won through union activity.

It is quite another thing to force union members to work side by side with such people. The doctors will not work with those who do not belong to their medical association, lawyers will not cooperate in their work with those who are not paid-up members of the bar association.

I believe in free labor and in free industry. Unless both are free, we will lose our political liberties. Laws which take away the rights of labor also strike at political freedom. To protect free labor, the working people will be driven into political action to a greater extent than heretofore witnessed if unfair legislation is enacted.

It is unfortunate that there should ever be strikes, yet the right to strike is so basic that any law which attempts to take it away, or to limit it, must necessarily and inevitably change the fundamentals of American liberty and, in so doing, alter our form of government. Laws which strike at liberty are dangerous; they should never be passed. They cannot be enforced except by unacceptable, dictatorial methods. Surely we have not forgotten the lessons of our tragic era of prohibition. In the end, such punitive laws create pressures which burst their bounds, often with painful consequences. They also encourage methods far more crippling to industry than the strike.

Honest Americans today want industrial peace; they do not want strife and disorder. Honest men also know that such industrial peace cannot be established by law or by edict. Men, not laws, make peace—and war. Industrial peace must come through the process of equitable dealing by honorable men in both capital and labor.

The charge that labor constitutes a "monopoly" is ridiculous. In fact, the very accusation comes from corporation chiefs who actually head giant business and industrial monopolies. It is as silly to accuse labor of being a monopoly as it would be to accuse the American people of being a monopoly.

There is no doubt, nor do we deny, that labor has at times had an occasional leader who proved to be without vision, or who was incompetent and arrogantly selfish, and even dishonest. Business and industry, even the honored professions, have had similar men. There have always been men, in every type of endeavor—even in the church—who proved disloyal and unworthy of their trust. Labor has no more time for such individuals than has the public.

One group of Congressmen proposes publicity for labor's finances, as if labor had something to hide. The plain fact is that unions today furnish frequent financial statements to their members and often publish them in printed form, for all who may be interested. Labor's financial statements are easy to understand; they are not like the complicated compilations of figures issued by corporations.

I am not afraid of publicity of labor's finances. I believe, however, that if labor should be required to publish its financial matters, capital should be required to do likewise. That is only being fair and honest about it. Whatever information may be required of unions should also be required of employers. I am not averse to making public all the incomes of both labor and capital, their employees, and administrators.

I would go further than mere financial statements. If industry will agree, I will be willing to have both sides submit all of the facts about earnings, wages, expenses of all kinds, as well as profits, upon entering into collective-bargaining conferences. Let us also require the corporations to furnish sworn statements of their capital structures, showing actual, honest investment.

I would agree that if either the union or the employer failed, or refused to submit all financial facts, then a Government regulatory agency should step in, examine the books and records, and furnish the data. And make it all public. Perhaps it is time to end the long day of secrecy in corporate dealings; perhaps it is time to turn on the light, to give the public all of the facts, let everybody, including investors, know the truth about the giant business concerns as well as the small operators, including the salaries paid to the representatives of both capital and labor.

In the end, we come right back to the fundamental principle that peace in industry, like peace between nations, is based on good will, understanding, and mutual respect. Peace can be maintained in industry only if labor and capital, each respecting the rights of the other, are willing to cooperate to find peaceful means for the settlement of differences. If joint publication of financial statements and salaries will help, I am for it.

Democracy is often cumbersome and inefficient but its final benefits justify its progress by trial and error. I do not say, nor do I believe, that all strikes will be, or can be prevented. I merely say that to prevent strikes should be our goal, that we should strive to reach this goal intelligently. There will be strikes, from time to time, for there will be instances where nothing but strikes can bring labor and management together and clear the air so understandings can be reached.

This is true because we, of labor, are as human and as prone to misjudgment, as are the humans who comprise management, and who own capital.

Labor must ever keep in mind that power brings responsibility and that we must measure up to that responsibility.

Labor must not retard, rather labor should encourage the introduction of labor-saving machinery and processes. We must not interfere with the mechanization of industry. We must encourage greater production and resultant lower consumer costs. We will create jobs in the delivery-service industry as we create added pay load and lower consumer costs. Thus may we increase jobs and shorten the hours of employment.

The 40-hour week must not be used as a means of promoting overtime work at premium pay. That is contrary to the interest of labor.

Labor must hold its agreements sacred. Once we have signed with an employer, live up to every provision of the contract, no matter how unfavorable or unpleasant.

Industry, on the other hand, must not be permitted to hold inventions off the market and thus retard industrial progress, even though capital investment may be temporarily impaired by changes wrought by the inventor.

Strikes must not occur in public utilities or against the Government, but this implies that the utilities and the Government must not act to prevent collective bargaining. They must meet the going wage scales of private industry.

Government-operated utilities and monopolies should pay wages and salaries equal to the prevailing scales in similar private business for similar work, and grant equal standards of hours and working conditions. This should also be the practice of all subdivisions of Government, such as PUD's, the Bonneville Authority, the TVA, and city light. Monopoly, owned by Government, which increases consumer cost, is just as vicious as private monopoly that operates in like manner.

Utilities and businesses, such as the city water department, should not be permitted to earn excessive profits from the consumer for the benefit of the general tax fund. That is a direct move in the direction of socialism and, eventually, communism. It is but a short step from a state monopoly of one business to a state monopoly of other businesses. Such monopolies are dangerous to our system of free enterprise, for they promote socialism.

Publicly owned monopolies must be required to so operate that their rates will provide no more than a just, a fair return on actual investment.

Artificial barriers to commerce, which have been set up by law for the protection of invested capital—the certificate of public convenience and necessity and other similar regulatory machinery—should be scrutinized by our lawmakers, for they deny the very principle of free enterprise and prevent open competition.

In our own State of Washington we have seen the Civil Aeronautics Board award monopolistic rights by means of the certificate of convenience and necessity to one commercial air line to operate between Seattle and San Francisco, and thus prohibit the competition of other lines, to the great disadvantage of the entire Pacific Northwest area. Is this free enterprise? Is this competitive industry?

The other day a Seattle motorbus company which is in process of selling out to the Greyhound Lines showed a profit of approximately 20 percent for the year 1946. Yet this company refused a wage increase

to its employees and closed down its operations for several weeks. Did this action of this company show a decent respect for the public welfare? During the entire period of the shut-down the public was denied service; no other bus company was permitted to operate because this corporation held a certificate of convenience and necessity which banned competition.

Labor will not progress through the public operation of industry; labor can only progress under free enterprise and competitive business, through collective bargaining.

In the field of education, labor also has a great responsibility, for the children of labor, in almost all instances, attend the public schools, both primary, secondary, as well as the higher institutions of learning. It is distinctly to labor's interest that the best teachers be obtained, and, under our enterprise system, we can only attract the finest educators, and retain them in their profession, if we reward them with salaries, and conditions of employment and retirement, commensurate with their contribution to the public welfare. Salaries must be high enough to reward educators for the years of study and preparation required of them. Any other policy will prevent the proper development of our school system, make us dependent upon inferior instructors, to the great detriment not only of the schools but of our own children.

The children of working people will suffer far more than the teachers, if we fail in our duty.

Our public schools are the cornerstone of our democracy; our teachers are, to a great degree, entrusted with the development of young America.

We cannot spend too much money for fine buildings, playgrounds, gymnasiums, athletic programs, debating teams, and clean competition. We must have adequate stadiums and fields and competent instructors, well compensated, to guide our children during their formative years.

We, of labor, believe that our judges should also be compensated adequately. We have not paid our judiciary well enough in the past. We should now recommend to our State legislature that the salaries of judges be raised.

Unnecessary and incompetent personnel should be eliminated from the public pay roll, but ability and industrious energy and accomplishment in public service should be as well rewarded as it is in private business.

Let us conduct our union organizations for the public welfare. Let us travel every avenue open to us to avoid strikes. Let us give an honest day's work for an honest day's wages. By percept and example, do everything within our power to preserve industrial peace. Let us study our industries and do what we can to make them prosperous, for we cannot obtain good wages and good conditions from unprofitable industry.

We cannot by our efforts make industry profitable in all instances, because management also has a tremendously important part to play, but we can do our share. We can do this by aiding management in every possible way to reduce costs and to increase efficiency. Let us operate our equipment as economically as possible. Let us maintain maximum pay loads, wherever possible, because we will create more and better jobs when the efficiency of our industry results in lower costs to the consumer and increased demand for our services.

Let us not forget that we are the best paid workers in the world. We enjoy finer living standards than workers of any other land.

We built this country to these high standards through our system of private enterprise. The schemes of the Communists and the crackpots offer us nothing but the ruin of our hopes and the destruction of all our gains. We shall not tolerate within our membership any individuals who advocate the alien philosophy of defeatism. Remember, we have never known of a disciple of communism to ask for a passport to settle in Russia!

If Russia likes communism and a communistic dictatorship, that is her own business. But we insist that Russia shall not send her propagandists to interfere in our domestic affairs and to promote the overthrow of our system and our way of life.

We have had our disagreements with our employers and, perhaps, we will have more disagreements in the future. But we have made progress far greater than have the workers of any other country.

We are hopeful that the year 1947 will reward our organizations with progress and that we will be able to contribute something worth while to a better and happier industrial America.

Rural Mail Routes

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing at this time a bill for the purpose of providing for the improvement of unimproved rural mail routes throughout the United States. This bill supersedes House bill 5957, which I introduced in the last Congress, with one principal exception that the new bill is to be operative until July 1, 1952.

This bill seeks to remedy the present situation in the United States which prevails in our rural sections. According to the reports of the Bureau of the Census, as of 1940, 53.8 percent of all farms in America are located on roads that are unimproved. Of the remainder, 27.4 percent were located on gravel or topsoil roads, and 18.8 percent were on hard surfaced or paved roads. Over half, Mr. Speaker, were on roads which were unimproved and which prevented all-weather travel. Those figures are for 1940, before the outbreak of the war. During the war, of course, lack of labor and shortages in materials and road machinery further deteriorated rural roads.

It is apparent that such conditions affect our agricultural economy. Farmers deserve to have, and should have, all-weather roads. They should have farm-to-market roads that will aid them in transporting their products to markets and provide them with highways to get into town for their shopping. This bill will aid them in securing these farm-to-market roads.

It is apparent that this lack of roads penalizes our systems of rural education. Today throughout America we have seen schools in the country consolidated, and the school children are gathered in school busses and carried several miles from their farm homes to modern schools. We feel that this practice will likely continue and that greater benefits accrue to these students through such a system. Certainly, economy is practiced in such a program, but such benefits to the students and to the economy of the rural school districts are lost if bad roads hinder the regular transportation of the farm children to and from these schools. Such a program, as outlined in the bill which I am introducing, would insure the greatest value from our rural-school programs in that these roads would be built.

One of the greatest services to rural families is the rural-mail delivery. Eight million families in America are dependent on the rural-mail carrier for the delivery of their mail. The approximate number of rural-mail patrons is 29,200,000. In rendering full service to these millions of American citizens, the rural carriers travel daily 1,420,970 miles. Certainly this great service, giving delivery to 29,000,000 Americans daily, calls for all-weather roads. But the figures indicate that 53.8 percent of the farms are located on roads that are unimproved. Over half of the farms served by the rural mail delivery are handicapped by the lack of adequate roads.

Under the bill which I have drawn these roads would be based on these rural-mail routes; for over a long period of years the rural-mail service has worked out routes to most economically serve the greatest number of patrons. It has been general practice for the school-bus routes to parallel these rural-route roads. Farm-to-market roads would be provided best through use of these rural-route roads. Thus, in serving the farm citizenship best, we would be increasing the efficiency of his mail service, bettering the benefits of the educational program for his children, and providing him with farm-to-market roads.

The bill provides that this program shall be handled through grants of funds to the local county agency, which would mean either the county judge or the commissioners court or the equivalent agency in each county. The character of such improvements by the county agency, however, will be subject to the approval of the Postmaster General of the United States and the Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration.

The grants under this bill to any county shall not exceed $5,000 per mile of such routes. It is estimated that the average cost shall amount to about $3,000, and I know of nothing that will give the farmer greater benefit for his money.

Such a program will link the farm and the town with all-weather highways which would increase the economy of both the farm and the city. It would be most beneficial to our educational program, and it would insure proper service to the patrons of the rural routes. It would mean equitable treatment of some 29,000,000 citizens who reside on farms in the United States. It would be reflected in better farm operations that would be reflected in better agricultural price levels and would increase the real wealth of the Nation.

This program, under my bill, is to be in operation for a period of 5 years. It will supplement the peacetime road program to endeavor to regain and make better the roads system prior to the outbreak of the war. Any Member of Con-

gress who has served as county judge or as county commissioner realizes the attention that is required to keep in operation a good-roads system. Any of the Members of Congress who are farmers know just how necessary such roads are to the farmer. Any Member of Congress who has been a teacher or an educator will readily understand how valuable such a program will be to our rural-school systems. Members of Congress who are merchants will appreciate how much such a roads program will aid our business economy.

The rural-mail carriers who daily travel 1,420,970 miles will tell you how necessary such a program is at this time; and those 29,000,000 Americans who are served by our rural-mail delivery will feel that you want to serve them well. It will aid our Nation in overcoming the serious handicap created by lack of road work during the war and in the increased traffic as a result of the war.

Such a program is vital to the welfare of our Nation.

New England Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry—a vital part of the business life of New England—soon will be nonexistent unless steps are taken to remedy the ills that now beset it.

In an effort to call public attention to this important matter and in the hope of helping to solve the problems now facing this multi-million-dollar industry the Providence (R. I.) Journal recently assigned one of its reporters, Leonard O. Warner, to study the industry and the problems now facing it and to write a series of five articles on the subject.

So that every Member of the House and Senate may have the benefit of these articles, I propose to offer these articles for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and under permission already granted me, I include herewith the second article, as it appeared in the Providence Journal of January 13, 1947. It follows:

NEARBY FISHING BANKS DEPLETED; NEW ENGLAND DRAGGERS MUST GO FAR AFIELD—SOUTH CHANNEL, GEORGES BANK CATCHES HAVE DROPPED FROM 25,000 TO 500 POUNDS; PUBLIC APATHY TOWARD PERIL TO INDUSTRY ALARMS FISHERMEN

(By Leonard O. Warner)

Capt. Bert Hemeon, short, blond skipper of Ben Pine's trim *Columbia*, is one of those who understand the ills that beset the New England fishing industry.

But he isn't quite sure what, as an individual, he can do about it.

"We keep going and we scrape up what fish we can," he said as he sat on a plushy red hassock in Ben Pine's cluttered loft overlooking Gloucester Harbor. It was a cold, wet day, and the *Columbia* rode uneasily at her moorings at the end of the dock. Ben Pine, owner of the *Columbia* and once skipper of the famous *Gertrude L. Thebaud*, was out of town, and so it was all right for Captain Bert to occupy the boss' corner of the loft.

Captain Bert went on:

"Other years we've been fishing pretty handy right around home," he said, pointing southeast in the general direction of Georges Bank and South Channel, where haddock and cod once abounded.

"Now, we're off Quereau and Sable, off Halifax, and that's a long way from home. Do you know, I started out from Quereau on a Friday and when do you suppose I got home with my load? Tuesday. That's quite a spell.

"If a dragger wants to stay around home and fish Georges and South Channel, well maybe he'll get 500 pounds to a drag. Remember, we used to get as high as 25,000 pounds to a drag.

"This is the worst I have ever seen it. I've tried to get haddock for a couple of days—got only 9,000 pounds in 2 days when I should have gotten more than 200,000 pounds. I gave up and went for redfish somewhere else.

"Why, the same boat is catching 5,000 pounds where it once caught 160,000 pounds. It's bad, real bad."

Captain Bert sat quietly for a few moments looking out onto the harbor and at two men at a nearby dock who were repairing their dragger.

In a few minutes he had completely and simply summarized the problem of the North Atlantic fisheries—depletion and over-exploitation of haddock and cod with the result that New England boats are being forced farther to the east and away from home to fill their pens.

A little later, Capt. John "Oscar" Ribiero, skipper of Ben Pine's *Puritan*, came in and sat down. He wasn't at home in the loft. He threw his hat from hand to hand and looked out longingly at the *Puritan*.

PUBLIC INTEREST LAGS

"Fish is scarce all right," he said. "We fish where we never have before." And then he left. It was growing dark and he wanted a last look around the *Puritan*.

In Boston the next day, Austin Powers, the Atlantic Fishermen's Union business agent, was more eloquent in his description of the ills of the New England fisheries.

"It's a terrible thing to sit around and watch an industry go to hell," he shouted. "Some of the boys out there," he said, pointing to the adjacent union hall, "think this scarcity of fish is so obvious that anybody should be able to see it. But we've got to do some shouting. People don't seem to realize what's happening.

"My God, can't Congress see what's happening?"

Powers, together with Patrick J. McHugh, secretary-treasurer of the Atlantic Fishermen's Union (AFL), has been active for years in attempting to bring the problem of depletion to the public eye.

"We're just running out of fish, that's all," said Powers, gesticulating wildly as he talked.

"Why 9 or 10 years ago, we used to go off Cape Cod and in 6 or 7 hours catch all the redfish we wanted. It's not only haddock that's scarce; it's cod, redfish, and yellowtails, too.

"Now, if we want redfish we go off Nova Scotia—650 miles, and that takes better than 2 days and 2 nights, one way. We're scraping them up where we can. Look at the board outside in the hall; that'll tell you."

SMALL CATCHES PREDOMINATE

Powers got up from his desk and walked out from his office into the union hall. Fishermen were sitting around a small table on a low stage at the front of the large, cold room. The catches listed on the blackboard averaged about 50,000 pounds to the boat—and these were boats that should be bringing in 150,000 to 200,000 pounds each.

"But selfish people, people who don't care," Powers added, "tell you it's the weather, or there's no fish because it's winter, or the practice bombs of the Navy killed all the fish. That's a lot of mularky."

He went on to explain his belief that the high costs of operating boats to far-off fishing grounds will place fishermen in a vise which will force many boats out of business. Fish prices have already started to tumble under the impact of a plentiful meat supply.

"You're not going to buy a pound of fillet for 53 cents if you can get a steak for 59 cents," said Peters. "And then what happens to the fishermen?" He threw up his hands and shook his head.

The high-powered Diesel draggers and trawlers lying along the smelly Boston fish pier, the largest such pier in the world, are mute evidence in this tale of depletion.

These are the vessels which drag large otter trawls along the sea bottom, gathering everything in their path that is not too firmly attached to the bottom or fast enough to get out of the way. Because the mesh of the net is only 2¼ inches, the small fish cannot escape, and they are injured or crushed to death as the net fills. When the catch is hauled onto the deck and dumped, the young fish, then dead or dying, are culled and thrown overboard.

Millions of these baby haddock (under 1½ pounds) are "railroaded" overboard in a year. Sometimes the water is literally covered with dead baby haddock cast aside by scores of fishing boats operating in the same general area. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that in 1 year the draggers and trawlers destroyed 63,000,000 baby haddock—63,000,000 potential main courses of a fish dinner.

In the late winter and early spring, fishermen grab shovels to dump overboard the jelly-like spawn that oozes from mature fish which were about to lay their eggs. That spawn, left in the hands of nature, would have developed into millions of fish.

Things were different, prior to the introduction of the otter trawl from Europe in 1905. Those were the days of the dory trawler when haddock and cod were caught on long lines, laden with hundreds of baited hooks, suspended between buoys. The mother vessel, usually a schooner, waited for the dorymen to return with their catches.

ADVANTAGES OF DORY FISHING

The fish caught by the dory trawlers were mature and big. They had spawned and laid millions of eggs. Fish about to spawn did not bite; nature took care of that. Young fish would not bite on a hook, preferring daintier morsels during their formative years. Nature was given a chance by the dory trawlers.

However many small fish the otter trawler destroyed, it alone was not responsible for the present severe over-fishing.

Along about 1925 the development of filleted and quick-frozen fish rapidly expanded the market for fish. Fishermen raced to meet this new demand. New trawlers were built, more men went to sea, and the Georges Bank and South Channel were generously spotted with vessels, all raiding the bottom with power.

For several years, those who saw the sea as an unlimited source of fish were right. There was fish everywhere, or so it seemed.

But the ocean has given up.

Some fishermen like to compare their business with farming. A rancher, they pointed out, would be hard put to market steers if he had killed off all his calves the year before.

Reciprocal-Trade Agreements

REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, Webster defines reciprocate as follows: "To give and take mutually; interchange; to give something in return for."

What I would like to know is what we get in return for these reciprocal-trade agreements. All I can see in these agreements is that Uncle Sam takes another beating and it is about time to curb the authority of the State Department to enter into these agreements without giving the Congress a careful look-in.

I want to call the attention of the House to House Resolution 52, introduced by Representative JENKINS of Ohio, which requests the postponement of any action seeking the further adjustment of duties under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as amended, until sufficient time has elapsed to permit further study of the necessity for further action under the reciprocal-trade-agreements policy. This resolution should receive the immediate consideration of the Ways and Means Committee.

Pennsylvania is one of the greatest industrial States in the Union. A State that, along with other industrial States, should be the first consideration of the State Department as to whether or not these agreements are going to upset the equilibrium of our economic life and throw thousands of Pennsylvania's people out of employment. Pennsylvania is rightfully concerned, as are other States, about these agreements, because of its 10,000,000 people who are dependent upon it. It is a State which produced approximately 30 percent of all war materials, and a State that sent 1,400,000 men and women into the armed forces. A State that must be given consideration when reciprocal-trade agreements are being discussed.

I understand that the commercial policy division of the State Department is now holding hearings with certain branches of industry as to the possibility of granting further tariff reductions as concessions to other countries. We have made enough concessions to other countries thus far and it is about time to take inventory and look after our own backyard.

I am particularly concerned about the glass-container industry, which has 76 plants scattered throughout the Nation—19 of these plants are in Pennsylvania, which produce 25 percent of all glass containers; and 8 of these plants are in my district, employing several thousand people.

In a recent letter to the Honorable William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, I called his attention to the fact that already substantial reductions have been made on these items running up to 50 percent through trade agreements made by our country with France, the United Kingdom, and Mexico. Because of disruptions in world trade during the war years, it is impossible to determine at this time the effect of these concessions on the glass-container industry.

Therefore, I protest vigorously against any action being taken at this time or any trade agreements entered into which would affect or disturb the glass-container industry and the people it employs. The glass-container industry has enough problems now without putting any further barriers in its path. We are deeply sympathetic to the problems of other countries, and we are, and should do, everything we can to be helpful; however, any agreements that would disrupt our economy and create difficulties for our people should not be considered. Recovery in war-torn countries should not be at the expense of American labor. It must be recognized that we cannot compete with low-paid European labor unless we are satisfied to reduce American labor's standards of living. I know the Congress will agree with me that we must maintain a high standard of wages and living conditions for our people, therefore, we cannot afford to jeopardize the progress and prosperity of the glass-container industry, as well as many others upon which thousands of our people are dependent for their livelihood by making further reductions in tariff that will bring the glass-container industry down on its knees.

It is about time we take away from the gentlemen in the State Department the authority previously granted them by which they may wreck important industries. This Congress is the body to explore the whole tariff matter and write the answers, not the Department of State.

I sincerely hope the Ways and Means Committee will bring out this resolution at an early date so the Members of Congress will have an opportunity to be recorded on this very important matter which will greatly affect the economic life of the Nation.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 24, 1947]

WORLD'S BEST HOPE

Americans, more than any other people, should have an instinctive sympathy with the empire conception. Senator VANDENBERG says that, if 5 percent of the world's population (meaning the Americans) enjoy 50 percent of the world's income, it is high time everybody adopted the American system. But what is the American system? It is adventurous free enterprise plus a large free-trade area protected by high tariffs. It is our view that the American system has been of benefit to the world. Imperial preference is a step in the same direction. Britain can perform the greatest service to human welfare that lies within her power by developing and strengthening that system.—From the London Daily Express.

Government and Medicine Don't Mix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Dr. Everett P. Coleman, of Canton, Ill., who is one of the outstanding physicians and surgeons of this country and president of the Illinois State Medical Society, which I have entitled "Government and Medicine Don't Mix":

We are living in a changing world. Progress in scientific medicine has advanced so rapidly in the past few years that it taxes the ingenuity of the trained scientific mind to keep abreast of it. In the same manner legislative and other affairs are also changing so that the medical profession is having to protect itself on so many fronts that again the scientific doctor, accustomed to thinking only in terms of treating his patient, hardly knows which way to turn to defend himself.

A presidential address at this type of meeting, is, in a sense, an accounting of stewardship, a report to you of ideas formulated during the past 2 years. A very few years ago your former presidents have given scientific papers on this occasion, containing their ideas along lines of scientific medicine which were instructive and which many times marked important advances in the science of medicine. Of more recent years these addresses have been based on legislative problems with which we were faced, and suggestions with reference to what might be done to overcome threats to the practice of medicine. All these have had an optimistic viewpoint.

On this occasion, were we living in normal times, we too should have an optimistic outlook and there are many reasons why this should be. Our country has just won the greatest war in the history of mankind. Our victorious armies are rapidly being disbanded. The country should, under normal circumstances, be returning to a period of postwar prosperity and the inhabitants should be in a position to enjoy more comforts and more happiness than they have had heretofore. Our returning medical veterans are coming back to their practices with their knowledge enhanced by great scientific advances in the past 2 years, especially along the line of chemical and biologic medicine. For example, there is the selective study of physiology. It is now known that radioactive iodine can be introduced into the circulation and will lodge in the thyroid gland, permitting a better and more thorough study of the function of that organ. This same method of studying physiology shows the possibility of adding to our information in reference to all the other organs of the body. Corresponding medical and surgical advances have been obtained, and there are prospects of more. Infections are being overcome.

The recent advances of surgery in radical resections of stomach and pancreas for cancer, opens a new prospect for those interested in that type of work. Penetrating wounds of the eye are said to no longer require a loss of vision of that eye, or the loss of the eye itself, which I am told has been a routine procedure up until the last 2 or 3 years. With these, and many other examples in mind, a summation of the last 2 years of progress and the anticipation of things to come should bring an outlook of optimism. It should be based on the prospect of increasing length of life and health for the citizens of this country and of decreasing their illness, and an outlook of added happiness, which we know the medical profession alone is able to give the public. Instead of these things an attitude of caution seems indicated, based on the fact that civilization which has been built up by the efforts of comparatively few, who then carried the masses to vistas beyond their capacity to imagine or appreciate, may be voted down; it may even be lost by the ballot, which was originally used to free mankind.

Europe for generations has developed a spirit of aggressiveness and fostered the development of armies and national hatred.

The result has been wars which now have practically wrecked civilization as it existed there. In the United States a spirit of internationalism has appeared with a tendency to foster class hatred until, with an impending return to the draft and to rationing, we well may be on the road to a governmental controlled economy, in which the individual may lose his identity until step by step we return to a life of regimentation which we have seen in Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and Soviet Russia. To a condition which, while necessary in the Army and Navy, has brought about so much resentment of that type of life among our returning veterans, that the system of voluntary enlistment seems to have fallen down almost entirely.

This is due to the fact that our young men are only too anxious to get away from the regimentation which our present bureaucratic politicians are attempting to force upon the entire Nation. Races which have lived in serfdom and semislavery for years may find that for themselves regimentation is a step forward; for the citizens of this country, however, it is a long journey backward and what will be lost under these conditions may well require generations to regain. The medical advances of this country have practically overcome and almost wiped out a great number of the major infections: tuberculosis, lues, typhoid fever, and many others. More recently traumatic surgery has taken a tremendous step forward as is shown by its remarkable effectiveness in the hands of our military surgeons in the war. The treatment of peritonitis, hemorrhage, and shock has improved, and many surgical conditions which until recently caused death or permanent disability have responded to newer surgical methods. Such conditions as appendicitis, diseases of the thyroid gland, of the stomach, the gallbladder, the genitourinary organs, have been managed so well that persons suffering from these dread ailments are relatively safe when treated in the hands of the skilled American doctor of medicine.

Increased length of life brings the penalty of added afflictions and of these old-age has been termed the most dreadful disease of all, but even the afflictions due to advancing years have been lightened by medical science. For example, great progress has been made in recent years in the treatment of fracture of the hip, and in prostatic disease, two of the commoner disabling conditions of the aged.

With all our accomplishments, we still have much to gain, new worlds to conquer. Although heart disease leads all others as the cause of death, perhaps a very potent factor in the production of the sclerotic arteries which tend to produce much of it, is that other prevalent disorder, chronic arthritis. These conditions, added to cancer, are now our major medical problems. The task is not simple and its solution needs the minds of the best medical men we can obtain. If we are to solve these problems we must as a profession be free to study, to learn, and to accomplish gains such as those which solved the problems of diphtheria, smallpox, and tuberculosis.

When we consider the troubles of the business or economic world and see how it is threatened by ill-advised attacks from politicians and ambitious agitators, and when we see the same agitators looking upon medicine with an envious eye, we must give thought as to what might occur if their plans should succeed. We must think of what medicine is now doing, and what it will be able to accomplish in the next decade if allowed to carry on at its normal rate of progress, and then consider what medical stagnation would mean instead.

We have as a profession several objectives. One is the care of the sick and here we have seen medical care develop until it is so complete and so readily available in this country that the public takes it for granted. The public here expects and receives a grade of medical care and a type of personal attention not available elsewhere in the world. Throughout this country any citizen is able to consult a doctor of medicine, is able to be hospitalized, and to receive scientific care from medical men who are interested in his welfare. He has a better chance of being restored to health than in any other country. All this at a price which compared to autos, furnaces, and house repairs, is comparatively cheap. In our care of the sick we have done a marvelous job. We have also developed along economic lines. In any form of society there are those who through inability to plan ahead or make provision for their future care, need in times of distress, help from the more prosperous members of their communities. Regardless of their financial status those who are unable to care for themselves in the State of Illinois are assured of good medical care as is shown by the amount spent for this purpose, by the supervisors in their care of the indigent, by the old-age pension system as applied under the control of the Illinois Public Aid Commission with the assistance and advice of the Illinois State Medical Society, and those who receive blind and widow's pensions, and aid to dependent children. In addition we have some very excellent laws which take care of industrial injuries and unemployment. Many of these are efficient and satisfactory in relieving the needs of the indigent or the substandard groups in every community. They are well worth-while projects, and they are doing a great deal of good. Because these are serving a useful purpose, and because they are subject to some interesting political complications we now have Government bureaus in Washington showing a desire to pension everyone, at least from a medical angle.

The medical profession is not reactionary. To anyone who has given thought to the rapidly changing pace of advancing medical knowledge it is evident that the modern doctor has to be progressive, for otherwise he would not survive in this competitive field. From the economic angle he is interested in voluntary prepayment insurance plans as advocated by the American Medical Association, and as now being introduced by your State society. He is interested in furthering needed and proper health legislation, which will secure more hospital beds, and legislation which is intended to protect the workman against lost time due to sickness, as well as unemployment. He is interested in any measure which protects the individual against truly catastrophic illness. We as medical men feel that we are competent to care for the sick, and that our methods of insurance for medical care will be managed far better and more in the public interest than anything managed politically from Washington. The repeated and flagrant examples of bureaucratic inefficiency with which we are familiar gives us confidence that we surely can do a better job.

We are interested in a constant sponsoring of scientific medical progress, in the correlation of accumulated experiences as demonstrated in medical journals, and in such meetings as this. We are interested in giving the younger men an opportunity for increased scientific progress so as to increase their ability to serve the public. We are interested in having time and opportunity for study so as to crystallize our ideas when we review the results of the past day's work. By this means we hope to overcome the diseases just mentioned, which are the greatest menace to the health of our citizens at the present time.

If the Washington plan for the regimentation of our profession should succeed, it may start out conservatively to gain as many supporters as possible, but in a short time will inevitably lead to the following objectionable features: First, domination by lay people, such as social-service workers who have enthusiasm and energy but with little medical knowledge. For example, in the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, where regulations were made permitting the doctors to make only one or two visits to patients with scarlet fever; where it was ruled that no obstetrical cases should be taken to the hospital on Government funds, and no permission given to treat the unfortunate on relief if the local officer did not happen to believe that there was such a thing as illness. As you know, there are some who question that. Second, there will be a free dispensary type of service to the public, such as in Germany, where prior to the war the ear, nose, and throat man was expected to treat 100 patients a day, in addition to his private patients; pediatricians 60 to 80 a day, and a general practitioner 75 to 80, in addition to private patients. There will be no chance to progress professionally or financially. In addition to the horde of neurotics who will try to monopolize our time, which should be given to those who are really sick, there will be endless governmental reports to be filed, no time for constructive thought or study, and no time to organize mentally and to assimilate the results of the day's work. And, as you all know, these last factors are of vital importance. If we cannot give thought to what we have done during the day, do not have time to analyze our problems, we will tend to deteriorate and the public will receive a much poorer grade of medical care.

Since we are confronted by these problems let us give thought as to how these plans to regulate medicine, and ultimately the entire public, are introduced. They are put over by a long and devious method of propaganda, of quoting false statistics, in which the Department of Social Security has specialized in recent years. Statistics which are falsified. For instance, it is possible in considering the infant mortality in some European city to take a comfortably situated section of that city with a good mortality rate, and in order to compare it with a city in the United States with a slum population, pick out the worst ward in that latter city and use its figures as being typical of the entire city or even that State and then compare the two. Or to take a substandard Negro community, one of the few remaining black marks in our health record, quote its figures on infant mortality as being typical of the entire United States, and then to compare those figures unfavorably with some European country. Then to use that statement to the effect that we as a Nation are far down the list in infant mortality. This statement is also applied to maternal mortality and the mortality of adolescents and adults, but those of you who have been in Europe and have seen the conditions of poverty and squalor under which a great many of these inhabitants live, you who have seen the slum districts in London, in Naples, in Alexandria, and have seen the moral degradation and filthy living conditions of Paris, you know that while in our country many things are not ideal they are still so far in advance of anything European that figures tending to prove those individuals are healthier, and have less sickness than we, are definitely based on erroneous statements. Furthermore, in these alleged statistics no comparison is made between cities of comparative population and climate.

Another propaganda point is the statement that the draft with 40 percent rejections of our young men is a reflection on our medical care. It is more of a reflection on the qualifications which our Army enforced rather than the condition of the people who were examined. In addition to illiteracy, there are several reasons for that 40 percent rejection. First of all, the high physical standards of the United States Army, higher by far than those of any foreign country. The fact that many were rejected because of nonpreventable diseases such as myopia and psychoneurosis, which are hereditary. Unless we are permitted to go into

the field of eugenics and have a governmental enforced system of birth control we will never be able to overcome this hereditary angle.

We now have figures available here which show the real facts, which indicate beyond doubt that our country is by far the healthiest and has the best mortality and morbidity record of any country in the world. Our traducers in Washington speak gloatingly of the fact that other countries, in Europe particularly, have a lower maternal mortality rate than we have here. They fail to state that the pregnant woman in this country dying of heart disease or automobile accident is listed as a maternal death here, but not in the other countries which they seem to admire so much. They also fail to call attention to the fact that while the Swedes in Sweden have a very good maternal mortality rate, the Swedes in Minnesota have a still better one. Facts of this type are not called to the public attention.

What can we as a profession do to counteract this propaganda? How can we protect our own interests and particularly those of the otherwise defenseless public? I think there are several satisfactory answers to this question. First of all, we can continue the good work that we are doing as a medical organization. This is our present bulwark against attack, the work at home by State societies. For example, in the past 20 years our State society has been contacting the public through meeting with the various service organizations and clubs, through the press, and sometimes by radio, telling the public of the accomplishments of scientific medicine, telling them of the things that organized medicine has been doing for their welfare. This has been a real accomplishment and on the basis of it we have made many friends throughout the State, we have many friends in legislative fields, and we have more in the grass roots of the country. We must continue this method of making friends and letting the public know what we are aiming to do, how our intentions are based on aiding their welfare. We must do it by contacting various organizations that represent the public. We can do it in a very efficient and thorough way throughout State and county medical societies. The major national problems perhaps can be attacked by the American Medical Association and the national physician's committee but the real ground-work done at home must be through our State and county societies. Through them we must have closer contact and cooperation with druggist and dentist, with the lawyers who in many respects have as many troubles and as many threats as we have, and particularly in the Middle West section we must have closer and better contact with farmers and farm organizations. It is highly important that we realize their problems and that we get together with them so that they will also realize ours. By such contacts we can gradually and successfully overcome any shortage of physicians in rural areas, for we have a mutual interest with the farmers as they have with us.

In addition we must continue our Public Relations Department, both in the State Society and in the National organizations, and our representatives in the Public Relations Department must be used to sell organized medicine to the general public by all means available. This has been done in the past as I have just stated. We have taken an active part and accomplished much and we must now extend our efforts further by contacts through the press, radio, and by public addresses. Our new plan in the Public Relations Committee of the State Society holds great promise of making more direct and worth-while contacts in the future.

Furthermore, we must aid the economic side of medicine by cooperation with one or more types of prepayment insurance, and perhaps a choice of two or three types may be advisable. We must have closer cooperation among ourselves. We cannot afford to let personalities interfere with the needs of the profession. A united sentiment among the medical profession is essential. We must continue to improve medical science and practice, for by best serving the public interests we best serve ourselves. Our problems are many and our responsibilities are great but despite the threatening clouds of stifling bureaucratic oppression I feel that the profession which in a few short years produced a Lister, an Osler, a Crile, and a Mayo, a profession which has taken the plagues of yesterday and turned them into memories, will also be able to overcome its problems of misguided bureaucratic legislation as well as to advance further against the ramparts of cancer, heart disease, and the other perils of mankind. With a united medical profession we can accomplish in the coming generation, as we have in the past, things that make miracles seem commonplace. Our hope is that with a free and untrammeled profession we can raise the health and happiness of our American citizens to a level once thought to exist only in the dreams of the poets.

Our Responsibility for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 29 (legislative day of Monday, January 27), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our Responsibility for World Peace," delivered by my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on the Methodist Hour, January 12, 1947, and also the prayer delivered at the same time by Hubert Quillian, president, La Grange College, and lay leader, North Georgia Conference.

There being no objection, the address and prayer were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORLD PEACE

(By Senator JOHN SPARKMAN)

I

Let us discuss for a few minutes a subject of great concern to us all—of great concern to our children, and to generations yet unborn—our responsibility for world peace. During the little more than a century and a half that we have been a nation we have engaged in some of the greatest and deadliest wars of all time. Some of those wars presented almost impossible tasks for us to perform in order to win. Yet we have won every war. The secret of our success has been in the fact that in those great and deadly wars we had a united nation. Our people were united in the great effort. They were working as one. They were all-out for war and were doing their best to win.

Never was there a better example of this united and untiring effort to win a war than in the great World War just ended. Any impartial appraisal of the winning of that war will certainly give a large part of the credit to the all-out effort on the part of America. Almost without exception, every man, woman, and child was working with a will to win. The heart of America was in the fight.

This has been true in war. Why should it not also be true in peace? It should be! We must back up our lip service for peace with the same fervent desire and with the same determined effort that we have manifested in time of war. As we work to win a war so must we work to win the peace.

Much of the trouble, I believe, springs from our thinking. Wars are fought over principles. In every war that we have fought there has been involved (we felt) a principle worth fighting for. We have gone to war to stop aggression or to prevent the invasion of human rights. We have developed a feeling that winning the war corrects the conditions and that nothing further remains to be done. That is far from true. War corrects nothing—it does not build; it destroys. War beats down the opposition and makes it possible to proceed, to build, to correct. We have formed the habit of simply quitting when the war is won. That is the time which calls for the greatest effort—the united effort—of our people. As organized might can win a war, so organized effort can win the peace. The heart of America must be in the fight for peace.

Much time has been used in trying to get the nations together. Practically a whole year now has been used and even yet we are far from the position where we can confidently say that everlasting peace is assured on earth. But how far from final victory were we 1 year after Pearl Harbor!

Perhaps a better comparison is with the formation of our own Government. The Constitution under which we live was presented to the Thirteen Original States more than a year before it became effective through ratification by the States which only a few years before won an impossible war of freedom by their united effort. They surely felt the need of sticking together. Yet they were slow to accept this new plan and did so only after promise of considerable amendment. During the century and a half since that time more than a score of amendments have been adopted. It has taken us 150 years to get our own Government going just the way we want it and people still clamor for changes. Should we grow impatient if it takes us a year, or 2 years, or even 10 years, to build up an organization of nations to work mutually to prevent war?

Today the largest single item in our national budget is for our national defense. The nearly $15,000,000,000 we are called upon to spend this year for this one item alone is twice as much as our entire national budget a decade ago. The next fiscal year the figure is set at eleven and one-half billion. We dare not reduce our defenses below such a figure despite the crushing load of the enormous national debt. The world is loaded down with a tremendous burden—expense for national defense. It is an expense that cannot be endured forever.

There is hope for a reduction of armaments. This time, however, it may be stated as a certainty that such reductions will not be made unilaterally. Reduction must come, if at all, through united action in the organization of nations.

Cannot the millions of members of the Methodist Church make this fight for peace a real fight, and make it a part of the program of the year of stewardship?

In the Crusade for Christ, 1947 is the year of stewardship. The laymen and laywomen in the Methodist Church are responsible for the promotion of this cause and program.

If ever there was a responsibility for stewardship it is in this matter of world peace. The fight for peace is perhaps not so glamorous as is that for war. It is not so apparent—but it is just as real and just as important.

As I understand the real meaning of stewardship, it is that we are entrusted with something of value and of great worth. God Himself has placed the responsibility for the peace of the world on the shoulders of the citizens of the United States. We must accept this responsibility, take it into our

hearts, and make it a part of our stewardship to God for life, liberty, and the future welfare of all mankind.

Let us take just a minute to see how the spotlight of the world's interest is playing upon the United States. Before the war ended, plans were well under way to form an organization of the nations of the world to prevent war in the future. This first meeting of the representatives of the world was held in the United States. Since that time there has been a cessation of hostilities on all battle fronts; and where once there was war there is now starvation, distress, and pain. The United States has sent millions of dollars worth of food, clothing, and relief supplies to her allies and her former enemies. We are one of the few nations of the world not disturbed by want, hunger, cold, and fear.

This has put us in the position where we can either be the big bully or the big brother. There may be some citizens in the United States who would prefer that we be a big bully among the nations of the world. But it is the responsibility of the church people of this Nation to play the part of a big brother to the starving and weary men, women, and children of other lands.

Our lands have not been laid waste by the ravages of war. Our beautiful cities have not been blasted into rubble. Our ships still roam the seven seas—the greatest Navy in the world today. Our planes and rockets and airships of destruction are still able to fly the lanes of the stratosphere. Somewhere in some secret storage place remains at least one atomic bomb, and in the files of the War Department and in the minds of the scientists remain the secrets for the manufacture of atomic bombs far more destructive than those that dropped on the cities of Japan.

Can we not see how other nations envy us? How perhaps they look with fear, and not favor, on what our representatives say and do? They are wondering whether we are not speaking softly and carrying a big stick.

More than ever before the responsibility for world peace rests upon the people of the United States. We must recognize this. We must understand it. We must reverence our responsibility and make it a stewardship for God and His children around the world.

II

This Methodist Church, of which you and I are a part, is not a denomination centered in one small part of the country. It is a world-wide church. It has members, in as good standing as you or I, in almost every land under the sun. It is trite to say that the sun never sets on the altars of the open Bible of our church.

Thus we can see that our own church has a great interest in this matter of world peace. Wars where brothers—even brothers in Christ—go to war against brothers must forever be no more. And if they are to be a thing of the past, brotherhood based on Christian love must take the place of anger, fear, and envy.

Thus the congregation to which you belong must recognize its possibility of fostering friendship and understanding among our brother congregations in other lands. What an excellent example of this was shown this past fall when hundreds of local Methodist churches sent packages of clothing to the ministers of Methodist churches in western and central Europe. I am told that city, town, and country churches all united in this endeavor to share with fellow Christians in an hour of tragic need. This is one way we recognize our responsibility for world peace, and seek to promote good will among all people.

III

In the final analysis, keeping peace, like making war, comes back to the individual. The terms of peace will be fixed by the agreements of a few responsible men as they meet around the conference table. But the kind of peace they make will be determined by the desires of the individuals back home.

What, then, can you as an individual church member, or as a friend of the church interested in living in a world of peace, do to further the cause of world peace? What is your responsibility?

First, you must be informed about the conditions that exist at the present time. You must realize that each of us is a part of everything that happens and that we cannot live isolated and selfish lives. We cannot live in a world where part of the people are half-starved and the other part are half-stuffed.

You must let your representatives in your local community know how you feel about this. For they too help make public opinion. You must let your representatives in Congress know what your idea of stewardship for world peace means to you, and how they should vote and speak. You must let us who are your Senators know what you think, believe, and feel. We are there to serve you and we cannot serve you unless we know your desires.

Then you must pray to God for guidance—that you at home and all those in positions of authority may be guided by God and that God's will may be done. We firmly believe it is God's will that all of his children shall live in a world of peace and plenty. But we must be guided by Him if we are to bring in an era of universal peace and good will.

So this is your part. To work and pray and fight for peace.

From pulpits and platforms all over this Nation there should come the messages needed to kindle in the hearts of men an understanding and a spirit of tolerance that make for peace.

Ask your pastor to preach a sermon on world peace. Ask your Sunday school teacher to discuss it as part of your Bible lessons. During the war you held special prayer meetings for victory and for the safety of your sons. Now, give over your prayer meeting some Wednesday night to a discussion of the meaning of stewardship and its relationship to world peace.

You laymen are doing a splendid job in leading the members of this great church to a consideration of the place that stewardship plays in our total Christian life. Will you let me, as a Methodist layman, ask you laymen to make our responsibility for world peace a large part of our stewardship program and let us bring to the mind and heart of every American his responsibility—his stewardship—for this great cause. If peace is to come to our world the consecrated Christian leadership of America must lead the way. Please God, we must not fail.

A PRAYER

(By Hubert Quillian, president, La Grange College, and lay leader, North Georgia Conference)

O God, our help in ages past
Our hope for years to come
Be Thou our guide while life shall last
And our eternal home!
Our times are in Thy hand and our faith is in Thee.
Our souls are restless until they find rest in Thee.
We lift our hearts in prayer this morning,
Sustained by the promise of Thy presence and
Inspired by the communion and fellowship of
Our common worship and devotion to Thee.
We come this morning in meekness and humility
As laymen of Thy Church, conscious of our
Great need. Endue us, we beseech Thee with
Courage and vision to attempt great things
And to expect great things in Thy name.
Give us, we pray, powers equal to our tasks,
Rather than tasks equal to our powers.
Consecrate us anew to a sense of stewardship
Of our time, talent, thought, and treasure, that
We may best serve Thee and man and so fulfill
The law of Christ. In Thy name, we pray.
Amen.

Marcus Allen Coolidge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the late Senator Marcus Allen Coolidge, industrialist, Democrat, and public servant:

We of Massachusetts, irrespective of political faith, regret the passing of one of our most distinguished citizens.

It is customary at a time like this to pay honor to one we have regarded with respect and affection. Oftentime, this acknowledgment of our true thoughts and feelings comes too late. The alternating current of mutual help and sacrifice and appreciation, upon which all human understanding depends, never comes to spiritual life between man and man.

The life of Marcus Coolidge was an exception to this human failing.

During his time with us he lived a full and useful life which we were privileged to recognize and reward.

A brief biography of this typical American deserves to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Marcus Coolidge was born in Westminster, October 6, 1865. He was educated in Westminster schools and attended a business college. He began in the chair and rattan business with his father, Frederick Spaulding Coolidge, who, himself, had a long and praiseworthy political career. His father was a Representative and was an elector for Grover Cleveland in the 1888 election.

Marcus Coolidge became well known for financing construction of railroad and street-railway projects in the early 1900's.

He began this line of activity in Chattanooga, Tenn., in 1902, and within a few years had engineered the building of similar projects in several Massachusetts and Vermont communities.

In 1905 he went into manufacturing metal and wood-working machines and all during his political career, held a close interest in the firm.

He was elected mayor of Fitchburg in 1916, and in 1920 became chairman of the Democratic State Convention.

He had previously worked as a member of the campaign committee in the reelection of President Woodrow Wilson.

After serving as a special envoy to Poland, he returned to Fitchburg and won the Democratic nomination for lieutenant governor in 1920. He was defeated by Republican Alvan T. Fuller in the election.

From then until 1930 Coolidge devoted most of his time to his work as president and treasurer of the Fitchburg Machine Works.

In 1930 he was nominated for the United States Senate and won the election by a flattering majority.

His campaign for the Senate was chiefly marked by his frank antiprohibition stand. In the upper Chamber, he concentrated his efforts on the solution of economic problems and unemployment issues.

Mr. Coolidge was a trustee and vice president of Cushing Academy, Ashburnham, Mass.

He married Ethel Louise Warren at Springfield, Vt., in 1893. Besides his wife, he is survived by three daughters, Mrs. Donald F. Carpenter, of Southport, Conn., Mrs. Gordon Hughes, of South Dartmouth, Mass., and Mrs. Harry H. Woodring, of Topeka, Kans., wife of the former Assistant Secretary of War and former Kansas Governor.

From 1931 until 1937, he was a leader of the Democratic Party in Massachusetts. A man of proven business capacity, his wise counsel and temperate advice are surely missed. Quiet, sincere and self-effacing, Marcus Coolidge, was a man to inspire the broad tolerance and constructive teamwork which our age demands.

Let those who read, be moved to emulate the accomplishments of this fine American citizen.

Reports That Show Drop in Flying Hazard Despite More Deaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United States News of January 31, 1947:

Air travel, on the basis of miles flown by established lines, is safer now than at any time in the history of commercial flying. Recent accidents have given the public an impression that flying hazards are rising, but the official figures disclose a trend the other way.

The number of persons killed on scheduled flights set a new high in 1946. The number killed, however, in relation to miles flown and to passengers carried set a new low. As a result, airplane travel remained safer than travel in automobiles but less safe than travel either on trains or on busses.

Air travel now is under investigation by Congress due to public reaction to recent accidents. Safety regulations are being tightened by the Civil Aeronautics Board, under Chairman James M. Landis. New equipment is beginning to be installed that will reduce accidents at airports. Airports themselves are to be improved gradually so that they will be safer.

The facts show, however, that even with present rules and present equipment the accident trend is downward in relation to volume of traffic.

Miles traveled reached 7,204,000 passenger miles in 1946. That is 79 percent over the 1945 traffic and more than four times the 1941 traffic.

Lives lost totaled 149 in scheduled air-line accidents during 1946. Thus, 1946 traffic was 79 percent above 1945; fatalities, 29.5 percent higher.

Ratio of lives lost to miles flown on scheduled air lines gradually has been brought down since 1940 from 3.56 deaths per 100,000,000 passenger miles to 2.07 in 1946. The 1930's saw a spectacular drop, with introduction of modern planes.

This trend toward greater safety has been held, despite more planes in the air and greater plane capacity, resulting in more deaths and injuries per accident. Air-accident deaths are high in relation to injuries compared with accidents in trains, busses, and autos, where injuries dominate the accident tolls.

The record of plane operations, despite a headline-catching series of crashes that gave the public a confused impression of safety on the air lines, is this:

Scheduled air lines operate only 826 of the 85,000 civil planes in this country today. Out of an estimated 7,562 civil air accidents last year, scheduled air liners had 31, including 11 involving fatalities to passengers, compared with 10 fatal accidents in 1945. The air-line record is given in detail in the table.

Nonscheduled services operate between 10,000 and 20,000 aircraft for charter and other uses. There are no exact figures because Civil Aeronautics Administration is just starting to get data on this type of air carrier. So a general safety record cannot be computed for nonscheduled carriers. It is known that noncertificated passenger carriers had 31 accidents resulting in 77 deaths last year.

Personal aircraft encountered about 7,500 accidents last year, resulting in 667 deaths, according to preliminary estimates.

Military-aircraft accident totals for 1946 are not fully known. Army Air Forces planes had 1,334 major accidents, causing 359 deaths in the United States. Accident figures of the Navy air arm are not available.

Relative safety of air lines compared with autos, busses, and trains is shown for the last 6 years in the chart. Accidents and resulting deaths in autos and busses increased in 1946, as compared with 1945, just as did air-line accidents. The 1946 death rate for autos and busses on a mileage basis is not yet available. The train death rate for the first 6 months of 1946 went up slightly, as compared with 1945.

Causes of accidents: Pilot errors still account for about half the accidents. Very few crashes are traced to poor maintenance work on planes, and CAA finds no reason to think that overeconomy by air lines is a contributory factor. Findings in 11 fatal accidents on scheduled air lines in 1946 show pilot errors to be the primary cause in seven cases. Lax administration of the company and errors by ground personnel were partly responsible in two crashes. Engine failures caused two others.

Analysis of 1945 accidents in unscheduled flying shows that pilot mistakes caused 73.9 percent of the total of all accidents; material failures caused 18.3 percent; weather and other causes accounted for the remainder.

Remedies for accidents depend, in the opinion of CAA and the industry, upon better pilot training, tighter enforcement of safety rules, and better flight aids. Weather still is the No. 1 enemy of the air lines, increasing the opportunities for pilot errors. In 1946 the 11 fatal accidents on scheduled lines all occurred in the first and last 3 months of the year. Spring and summer months, with better weather, showed no fatal accidents.

Pilot training and selection is given much attention by the CAA and air lines. But so far they can report little definite progress in developing new safeguards against human errors. Use of more automatic controls gradually will cut down the area in which human errors are possible.

Flight aids in use today still are not much more numerous than in prewar days, though improvements are expected soon. The major new flight aids:

Instrument landing system—ILS—gives the pilot two radio beams to follow into an airport in fog or darkness. But no air line is using ILS in operations today, although pilots are being trained for it and early use is expected.

The system is installed at only 31 airports. By April 1, about 70 airports will be equipped with ILS and 55 more will be equipped in the year starting June 1. That will cover major airports, but only a small percentage of the 1,331 airports big enough to handle transport planes.

Ground-controlled approach — GCA — enables radar operators on the ground to see planes on a radar screen and talk them down to a landing. Army and Navy fliers have made a nearly perfect safety record where they use GCA. But only recently has CAA been able to get three sets, borrowed from the Army, installed for civilian use. The Army has agreed to lend CAA 20 more GCA sets. The three sets installed now will be operated on an experimental basis until adapted for commercial use.

Omni-directional range: This gives pilots radio beams to follow from any place on the compass. Present airways provide four beams, and if a pilot strays he may be lost for good. Omni-range is installed now between New York and Chicago. Next year it will be installed on new airways only. Present plans provide for no replacements of existing four-beam types.

Radar sets: Radar gives ground personnel a picture of air traffic up to 100 miles from a control point. CAA is asking for money to buy 25 sets next year for airports, and two more sets for air-traffic control centers. A similar radar aid known as microwave-early-warning is being installed at the Washington, D. C., airport for experimental use. The Air Transport Association is financing another MEW set at New York City. Radar inside planes so far has not been used by air lines, on the ground that present equipment is not reliable enough.

Delays in installing these flight aids for commercial use are acknowledged by CAA. The instrument-landing system was ready to be used in 1941, but for 5 war years the Army took over all such equipment. In the 16 months since the war ended CAA and the air lines have been trying to adopt the devices for commercial use, but the program has been delayed. Also, CAA points out that since 1941, the Budget Bureau and Congress have allowed CAA about 59 percent of the money it requested. For the coming fiscal year, the Budget Bureau has approved funds 20 percent below CAA requests.

Aviation's troubles have been made more difficult by widespread publicity given to safety problems. The industry recognizes that, for sound future growth, flying must be made safer and more regular. Congress now is investigating the present system of Government aviation aid. That system has been little changed to meet the needs of a postwar air fleet almost four times the size of the prewar fleet.

AIR LINES' SAFETY RECORD

Here is the story of air-line safety over the last 17 years. The number of deaths resulting from air-line accidents is going upward, but the rate of deaths per miles traveled is going down. Figures shown cover scheduled air-line operations of American companies here and abroad, as reported by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Deaths include both passengers and crew

members; a passenger-mile (1 passenger being carried 1 mile) is the basic unit in figuring miles flown:

Year	Miles flown	Persons killed	Deaths per 100,000,000 miles
1930	103, 747, 249	33	31.8
1931	121, 122, 777	39	32.2
1932	148, 186, 337	45	30.4
1933	199, 776, 034	28	14.0
1934	226, 650, 857	38	16.8
1935	262, 570, 920	20	8.0
1936	480, 818, 839	67	13.9
1937	534, 888, 662	66	12.3
1938	617, 829, 923	64	9.9
1939	851, 818, 242	26	3.13
1940	1, 205, 104, 025	45	3.50
1941	1, 476, 949, 226	46	2.74
1942	1, 750, 228, 685	71	4.06
1943	1, 926, 005, 555	44	2.28
1944	2, 616, 488, 815	75	2.87
1945	4, 021, 779, 965	115	2.86
1946	7, 204, 000 000	149	2.07

Source: National Safety Council.

New England Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry a vital part of the business life of New England, soon will be nonexistent unless steps are taken to remedy the ills that now beset it.

In an effort to call public attention to this important matter and in the hope of helping to solve the problems now facing this multi-million-dollar industry the Providence (R. I.) Journal recently assigned one of its reporters, Leonard O. Warner, to study the industry and the problems now facing it and to write a series of five articles on the subject.

So that every Member of the House and Senate may have the benefit of these articles, I propose to offer these articles for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and under permission already granted me, I include herewith the third article as it appeared in the Providence Journal of January 14, 1947. It follows:

MANY LEADERS IN INDUSTRY SEE NEED TO CONSERVE NORTHEASTERN FISHERIES—OTHERS QUALIFY THEIR ADMISSION THAT DEPLETION IS REAL THREAT; DUMPING OF LOW-PRICED CATCHES AMONG PRACTICES INCREASING WANTON WASTE

(By Leonard O. Warner)

Many men on the wind-swept Boston pier who both own boats and deal in fish are openly scornful of anyone who lays stress upon the depletion of the nearby New England fishing banks.

Cigar-smoking Bart Whalen, of R. O'Brien & Co., put it this way:

"You're talking to the wrong guy, Buddy. They always talk about depletion in the winter, but hell, in the spring the fish will be jumping aboard. They want us to worry about 200 years from now. I've got enough to do to worry about right now. There's plenty of fish."

He went on with his paper work. Whalen was one of the few dealer-boat owners who could be found working on the same floor with the noisy unloading and fish-packing operations. The long, wide pier is constructed so that boats are unloaded on one side, the fish are handled and packed as they come off, and then loaded onto trucks on the street side.

Most of the operators are ensconced on the second floor of the pier building, in other words, encased by knotty pine and insulation which bars the blare and the smell of downstairs.

Some owners apparently realize, along with the fishermen, that they have wrested millions of dollars from the sea without heed for even the most elementary conservation practices. The few who endorse conservation do so qualifiedly.

Edward H. Cooley, diplomatic president of the large Atlantic Coast Fisheries Co., is one of those on the Boston pier who gives double-edged answers to queries concerning his attitude on this problem of depletion.

"There is depletion, sure," he says, "but it is not serious enough. There are areas (where fish are) which haven't been touched."

Cooley added his belief that the economics of the situation will take care of it, meaning, he said, that as fish become scarce or the price drops boats will be forced to tie up and during the ensuing period of relatively slight activity, the fish numbers will naturally increase.

FORESEES GOOD FISHING

He looked out of his large office onto a neat trawler, the *Red Jacket*, lying alongside the pier. It was owned by his company. "I'll make you a sporting bet that next April that boat will bring in 250,000 pounds in one trip," he said with a smile.

The Atlantic Fishermen's Union men who see smaller and smaller catches—50,000 to 70,000 pounds a trip being landed—would probably have taken Cooley's wager.

Cooley, however, said he would favor the appointment of an international commission to rule the fishing banks. He explained that the regulations would have to be international in scope because the Canadians, Nova Scotians, Newfoundlanders, French, Portuguese, and Spanish, as well as Americans, fish off the banks near New England and near Nova Scotia.

"It wouldn't do us here any good to tie up if those other fellows were to be allowed to get what we were leaving," said Cooley.

CLOSED FOR SPAWNING

It is his belief the fishing grounds should be closed during the spawning season to allow the mature fish to lay their eggs. During the spawning time, he said, fish are thin and flabby, and the New England fleets would be missing very little by lying in during that period.

Frank discussion of the problem comes from Thomas D. Rice, executive secretary of the Massachusetts Fisheries Association and of the Federated Fishing Boats of New England and New York. From his office in the Fish Exchange Building at the end of the Boston pier, Rice can see thousands of pounds of fish being sold every weekday morning.

"It's touch-and-go to keep the boats operating today," said Rice, pointing out that the problem was about to be tackled in 1941 when the war broke out and canceled all plans for a conservation program.

Rice expressed the belief the Massachusetts association and the fishing-boat owners would be active to prevent disaster. He added, "Any conservation move would be uniformly accepted."

ONE CONSERVATION ATTEMPT

An attempt at conservation was made by the Fishermen's Union early in the war.

Under the terms of an agreement between owners and the unions, money received for baby haddock would be donated to the USO if the small fish (under 1½ pounds) brought in by a boat was more than 10 percent of the catch. The USO received several large checks as a result, and the donations were given wide publicity.

The effect was that boats stopped taking baby haddock. There was no profit in it.

But gradually the compact was allowed to slip by, and in not too many months the boats were bringing in baby haddock again.

The short supply of fish on the nearby banks is responsible, too, for a wanton destruction that is apparently inexcusable. According to the stories heard around the pier, and in Gloucester, skippers are often radioed by the owners to throw a poor catch overboard rather than go through the expense of bringing it in. There is no money in landing a small load.

It is also an open secret along the pier that skippers—both on their own initiative and on orders from shore—dump their loads because the price is low at the moment.

There are some who defend both practices as economically sound, with no regard for the waste of natural resources.

In some circles the recent restatement by the Atlantic Fishermen's Union of a restriction on the size of cod catches also is described as wasteful. Because the price of cod dropped from about 10 cents to about 4 cents a pound, the union in December prohibited boats from catching more than 5,000 pounds of cod for each man aboard. Most otter trawlers carry a 17-man crew and so their restriction would limit them to 85,000 pounds to the trip.

The union points to that as conservation of a sort, saying that a boat won't take more than it can sell, but others emphasize that a boat can't always hit 85,000 pounds on the nose. As a result, many thousands of pounds of cod are tossed overboard.

NO CHANCE OF DEPLETION

Owners in Gloucester, the redfish center, apparently view the threat of depletion of the Georges Bank and South Channel with no great alarm. Everett R. Jodrey, Gloucester net dealer and operator of two small draggers, voiced the opinion that "there's not a chance of depletion."

He went on: 'I've been hearing this talk along Duncan Street (road leading to Gloucester docks) for 50 years. The fish get scarce now and then, but they always come back. I don't think a larger mesh in the net would save many fish, because once the fish are in the net, they are injured and if they escape they become prey for other fish."

Despite the skepticism, the trade publications read by the fishermen and boat owners do carry items to keep the danger of depletion before their readers.

The much respected New England Trawler Equipment Co. of Chelsea, Mass., not long ago published a slick-paper book explaining the various trawling operations. In mentioning the construction of smaller trawlers, the company had this to say:

"They (smaller trawlers) are not a replacement * * * for the large trawlers if fish become scarce on the nearer banks. For trips to Emerald or western banks, the larger boats, able to fish under any conditions, are necessary."

This from a company whose business it is to foresee trends in fishing.

Truman the True Friend of Labor and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 29 (legislative day of Monday, January 27), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article

entitled "Truman the True Friend of Labor and Industry," written by Charles T. McPherson and published in the Oregon Democrat, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN THE TRUE FRIEND OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY

(By Charles T. McPherson)

I have known President Harry S. Truman for several years, and entertain for him the highest personal regard. In respect to abilities, nature has by no means been unfriendly to him; and he has neither despised nor slighted her gifts. A severe course of mental training, combined with the mental practice obtained by presiding over the United States Senate has fully developed his natural endowments.

Above all these considerations, everyone respects President Truman for his stern, unyielding, uncompromising patriotism. The permanent good of his country, the restoration of its unity, and the perpetuation of the national power and glory through all coming time, are the objectives he keeps constantly in view

For almost 2 years after his assuming the Presidency, President Truman has without flinching endured the severest tests which come to the President of the United States. He has lost no time and shirked no hardships. In regard to President Truman's soldierly qualities, we are especially indebted for the clear and ready manner in which he seized the points of action and movement, and expressed in orders the ideas of the Commander in Chief, commanding, giving universal satisfaction—to the surprise of military experts.

President Truman is possessed of an intellect of remarkable clearness and force. With keen analysis, he finds the core of a question, and works from the center outward. He cares little for the mere graces of speech; but few men are so greatly endowed with the power of clear statement and unassailable argument. The path of his thought is straight—

"Like that of the swift cannon ball,
Shattering that it may reach, and
Shattering what it reaches."

When President Truman has hit the mark, he uses no additional words, and seeks no decoration. These qualities, joined to his power of thinking quickly, places him in the front rank—high above his enemies, who seek to supplant him—and every year increases his power.

It has been said by some that President Truman is a partisan, a strong partisan, and that is true. In the estimation of some this detracts from his fame. That evils arise from extreme partisanship, there can be no doubt. But it should not be forgotten that all free governments are party governments. Our great Americans have been great partisans. President Truman is not more partisan than were Adams, Jefferson, Jackson, Clay, Calhoun, Benton, Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Strong men must have strong convictions, and "one man with a belief is a greater power than a thousand that have only interests" Partisanship is opinion crystallized, and party organizations are the scaffolding whereon citizens stand while they build the walls of their national temple. Organizations may change or dissolve, but when parties cease to exist liberty will perish.

President Truman's position is that of a liberal, a careful protector of American industry, a true friend of labor—avoiding the extremes of either free trade or wholesale protection. By all means he should be reelected in 1948.

Charles J. Sharkey, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Boston Daily Record, Thursday, January 9, 1947, by Bob Considine. Mr. Sharkey, who was from Lawrence, Mass., was the pilot of the Chinese air liner which crashed near Tsintao, killing 42 persons. The article follows:

ON THE LINE

(By Bob Considine)

NEW YORK.—I knew that boy Charlie Sharkey, the American pilot who was killed with 41 others when his Chinese air liner crashed near Tsintao the other day. He was a handsome, devil-may-care lad who differed from the pattern of most romantic adventure strip heroes only in one respect. He got killed.

Yet, if such things are possible, he must have gone to his death with his flying hat cocked at the old rakish angle and a measure of contempt in his sturdy heart. For certainly he had been familiar enough with death during his short, crammed life of high adventure.

Sharkey was a kid out of a Lawrence, Mass., shoe factory. But he was born to grip a pilot's stick, for he had the eye, the muscular niceties, and the cascades of spirit that are needed. He haunted the little sightseeing airfields near his home, jumped into the RCAF as soon as the Canadians began accepting American boys, and he was on his way.

For a time after Pearl Harbor he ferried all types of ships across the South Atlantic for Pan America. But when the Army's Air Transport Command took over that contract he moved on across the world to China to fly the hump of the Himalayas for what remains the world's most mysterious air line, the Chinese National Aviation Co.

CNAC is owned partly by Pan American, but its inscrutable control is in the hands of Chiang Kai-shek, Madame Chiang, and her brother, T. V. Soong. General Chennault, our one-time Flying Tiger man, also is interested in it.

In the summer of 1945, while in China and India—where I last saw Sharkey—I tried for weeks to get a comprehensive story about CNAC, but no one who knew its workings cared to lift the shroud. No ledgers or manifests could be seen. Indeed, the Army Air Force men who shared some fields with CNAC and sometimes bunked with its employees were as much in the dark as anyone else.

"It's the Generalissimo's private air line," this reporter would be told

LINK WITH OUTER WORLD

Rumors about it were a dime a dozen: That its Chinese copilots and radio navigators had amassed fortunes running luxury items into luxury-starved China, where a carton of American cigarettes might bring $100, a fountain pen $200, and a case of whisky $1,000.

Occasionally the Chinese Government would shoot a smuggler; indeed, while I was there a major general was shot for making too much money. But the traffic continued. Ten-cent sulpha pills brought $5 in the Chinese black market, where the chief buyers were the Japanese conquerors.

Sharkey and a few other Americans, some of whom lived like princes, were China's only link with the outer world from late 1941 until our own air force, truck convoys, and gas-pipe wizards backed open a tortuous back-door service entrance into China from India's upper Assam Valley.

Flying stripped-down DC-3's that had seen better years, these CNAC pilots carried the first lend-lease stuff into China over thin-aired, jagged mountain spires where only a James Hilton could imagine the existence of life. They flew by the seat of their pants, for there were no radio beams to guide them. And the prowling Jap fighters from Myitkyina shot them down like fat ducks.

A Zero nailed Sharkey once and the boy put his creaking, unarmed DC-3 into a steep dive for a canyon formed by towering cliffs. There he zigzagged back and forth across the canyon, almost scraping its walls. After a terrible 20 minutes he lured the Jap into a wall and escaped.

LIKE MODERN SLAVE SHIP

Sharkey's winged crate sometimes was little more than a modern slave ship. Tough Chinese sergeants, invoking China's selective-service rules, would chase and catch screaming coolies who might range from 12 to 60. Tied hand to hand, they would be carried in cattle cars or trucks to Kunming and loaded into a CNAC plane for the trip to India, where they were outfitted, given a little training, and sent into Burma to fight for Stilwell or the British.

They flew in lots of 50, shoeless and in rags. Most of them had never seen a plane, close-up. At 5,000 feet, Sharkey told me, they'd all be air sick. At 15,000 they'd huddle together for warmth, like freezing puppies. At 20,000 they'd begin passing out, for only the pilot, co-pilot, and radio-man had oxygen masks. They'd roll around dangerously in the plane when it was sucked down or flung upward in the incredible air currents of the region.

As the plane nosed down into India they'd revive, get sick again, and then be kicked out. Many would try to walk home, unable to believe they were hundreds of miles from their rice paddy and that a frozen world of Everest-like peaks intervened.

Sharkey carried thousands of them, but never could harden himself to their plight. Once he flattened a Chinese lieutenant for kicking a recruit. Without fail he'd give out cigarettes and chocolates to the human fodder he flew. They'd eat both.

The pilot lost his life and the lives of his passengers in a reconverted C-46, a big clumsy heap already weary from hauling freight before it was given to CNAC. The surprising thing is that Chinese authorities have ordered other liners grounded until an investigation can be made. Human life there, perhaps, begins to assume a value.

The Economist and the State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include full text of the address of the retiring president of the American Economic Association, delivered Saturday, January 25, 1947, at the annual meeting held in Atlantic City, N. J. It follows:

In the charter of incorporation of the American Economic Association its pur-

poses are stated as follows: "(1) The encouragement of economic research, (2) the issue of publications on economic subjects, and (3) the encouragement of perfect freedom of economic discussion. The association as such will take no partisan attitude, nor will it commit its members to any position on practical economic questions."

Admirable purposes and principles. In pursuing them the association, over the 60 years of its life, has rendered invaluable service to the profession. It has offered an opportunity for economists to present their ideas to colleagues and to have these ideas discussed at the meetings. It has enabled members through the Proceedings and the Review, to keep in touch with the work and thinking of fellow members. It has also—and this perhaps has been its greatest service—offered an opportunity for many members to get together once a year and to become acquainted with each other. It has created a degree of esprit de corps among economists.

But it has remained aloof from practical affairs. It has been academic, though in the fine, not the derogatory, sense of the word. In the meantime profound changes have occurred in the life of the country. Not only has the elimination of time and space from travel and communications made all decisions necessarily more urgent and decisive, but the growth of economic units and the concentration of economic power have imparted to a vastly larger proportion of public and private actions a nation-wide, nay, a world-wide significance. The United States can no longer remain complacently aloof behind the oceans, nor the economist behind the book stacks. An economist's study can no longer be his world; the entire world must be his study.

To an ever-growing extent public authorities and national and international business enterprises turn to economists for advice and guidance; and economists in increasing numbers seek partial or total employment outside of academic halls. There are many economists who, like other thinkers, remain aloof and follow their own thoughts in an arduous effort to discover the eternal verities. The world needs these men and the profession is proud of them. For every important practical forward step in the progress of humanity has had its origin in the abstract, supposedly impractical thinking and dreaming of the scholar; the physicist, biologist, philosopher, and student of social problems.

The closet thinker may be compared to the scientist who invents and perfects means of achieving military and industrial objectives; other economists may be likened to the military or industrial army who must utilize the results of the thinking of the scientist in helping to solve the problems of the day. Both phases of the economists' work are necessary to society; the profession has a responsibility for developing both kinds of economists—the thinker and the doer. But while it may be feasible for the thinker not to be a doer, it would be fatal for the doer to refrain from thinking.

It should be recognized that for many, if not for most, economists the quiet and peace of the ivory tower has been lost. The confusion and struggle of the market place is upon them. Many have gone to work there and have rendered yeoman service to the economy and the state.

But they have done so as individuals, for they have had little, if any, organized support from their colleagues in the association, little facility for sounding the trends of thought among their fellow workers. Some method should be devised by which the public, and more particularly members of this association, could find out how the economists of the country stood on important issues. One way to promote this would be to create a small committee on public issues. Such a committee could select issues on which the views of members would be sought. It could take responsibility for wording the questions, calling for assistance on persons best qualified to give it. The entire association, or the portion of it which might be expected to know most about the subject, would then be circularized. After the replies had been received the secretary of the association would issue a statement to the effect that the 4,000 members of the American Economic Association have been asked a certain question; of this number—so many replied; of the replies—so many took one view, and so many another. This could be refined by classifying the replies geographically, by field of interest, and in other ways. Such a statement would not commit the association as such to any viewpoint, and therefore would not violate the letter or the spirit of its charter. But it would enable the public to know currently how the profession stood on an issue and would give economists themselves a way of knowing better what other members of their craft were thinking.

An incidental, but not unimportant, advantage of such a procedure would be that it would counteract the effect of pronouncements on controversial questions, appearing from time to time, attributed to a stated number of economists. For many reasons such statements are not the best way for economists to voice their views. There is no way of judging whether those who are quoted represent a prevailing or a minority opinion. The questions on which the views are expressed are not selected by a representative group, but are usually propounded by an energetic individual who wants to gather support for his position. Not infrequently the issues presented are minor from the viewpoint of the public interest. Also, because of their unidentified origin and the unsystematic selection of signers (at least, as far as the public knows), such pronouncements are likely to be taken as propaganda efforts by an interested group. Finally, in practice the questions are often ambiguously worded and do not offer a good opportunity of indicating clear-cut views on well-defined issues. Experience shows that occasional pronouncements of this sort, well-intentioned and public-spirited as their objectives may be, have done nothing in most cases to enhance the prestige of the profession; but, on the contrary, have tended to bring it under suspicion of being either unrealistic or influenced by some pressure group.

From the point of view of the association, this is important, because statements by a substantial number of its members are likely to be interpreted by some as expressing the views of the profession as a whole, or of the association itself. This is prejudicial to its interests and to those of the vast majority of its less-vocal members. Clearly, the association would not wish and is not in a position to do anything to interfere with the freedom of its members to express themselves publicly in any way they choose. That is their privilege, and one consistent with the texture of democratic ideas. But while nothing can be done to prevent such statements or to discourage them, the establishment of official polls would go a long way toward counteracting their harmful effect on the standing of the profession.

There are many issues on which there is practical unanimity among economists, while public opinion is widely divided. There are others, it is rumored, on which agreement has not been reached even among members of the profession. Clarification of the issues and focusing attention of the members on them would result in making many members feel a greater sense of their urgency and to induce them to review and organize their thinking in relation to the realities of the day in fields not confined to their immediate specialty.

At no time has it been more important for economists to have the respect and confidence of the public, or more necessary for the country to make the best possible use of the specialized training, knowledge, and vision of economists. For society today is confronted with a vital issue. What must be decided in the immediate future is whether an answer to pressing economic problems can be found within the framework of capitalism and free enterprise or whether economic organization must move in the direction of socialism or communism, or whether a combination of the two systems offers the best solution. These alternatives involve political, moral, and spiritual dilemmas, but the fundamental question is economic: Shall enterprise continue largely under private ownership, or shall it be increasingly or wholly turned over to the State? From the Socialist or Communist point of view, the important questions appear to have been solved—many decades ago, while for protagonists of private enterprise answers to the question are still to be developed. Communism places a period after its dogmas, in fact, an exclamation point, while a question mark is still discernible at the end of deliberations on economic dilemmas by proponents of individual enterprise. This appears to give the Communist approach the advantage of certainty, and leaves capitalism under the apparent handicap of indecision. But in the long term, free enterprise may gain the more important advantage of greater flexibility, which makes it more adaptable to changing economic forces. Its opportunities are many, the challenge of events is vibrant, and all intellectual resources must be directed toward meeting it.

In this critical hour the economist and his association have a great opportunity and a corresponding responsibility. On the discharge of this responsibility depends not merely the standing and future of the profession—but a vastly more important issue as well—the form of future economic life. For if economists cannot devise a way of making a system of free enterprise produce results satisfactory to the mass of the people, it is certain that the trend will be away from free enterprise and toward some form of Socialist state; and while experience has not shown conclusively that a Socialist state can tolerate spiritual freedom, which democracies value above all, neither has it been demonstrated that socialism must necessarily be totalitarian and is irreconcilable with freedom.

In the critical period ahead, when these questions must be answered by events, economists and their association are under obligation more than ever to help in the development of correct solutions to pressing problems that confront the economy.

The suggested method of testing the views of economists might be one helpful step. Other ways of strengthening the profession's grip on reality need to be developed. Most of the members of this association are not only economic thinkers but teachers as well. Promotion of better understanding of economic problems by future men of affairs and statesmen is not the least of the economists' obligations. But the economics they teach must reflect understanding of the forces that shape the changing economic world.

Economists, therefore, are under double obligation—for themselves and for their disciples—to perfect their implements and processes of thinking. They must beware of dogmas; avoid blind faith in free enterprise, in the all-curing beneficence of the entrepreneur's profit dollar without reference to the source whence it is drawn or the use to which it is put; as well as refrain from sole reliance on the hydraulic strength of the income stream, or the salutary nature of the dollar spent by the consumer, regardless of who he may be or the rationality or wastefulness of his expenditure. They must subject to searching analysis the effects of outlays by the state, the investor, the producer, and the consumer. They must be conscious of the importance of all four phases of national income: its source, its magnitude, its

distribution, and its use. Likewise, they must not fall into the error of depending on the quantity of money alone as an adequate regulator of economic developments, or adopt the reverse doctrine that the amount of money is an unimportant and irrelevant condition with little or no bearing on prices or the course of events.

No set of statistical series, to say nothing of any single series, is a sufficient basis for determining causal relationships on which economic policy can be predicated with safety. They are only indications of where one should look for the causes and interrelationships that determine economic events. When it is said that statistics are the economist's conscience, what is meant is that they indicate the limits of the territory in which the economist may tread with assurance on the hard surface of fact. They do not restrict his freedom of exploration in the less easily traveled lanes of intelligent surmise and imaginative understanding. A good economist need not be a seer, but he must not wear blinders, and he must have the seeing eye.

In order to perform their function adequately, economists must adhere rigidly to the discipline of through analysis of conditions as they are and not permit themselves to be blinded by preconceived theories or by transitory considerations of expediency. Lasting economic health would not be achieved by sole dependence on the encouragement or limitation of savings or on the promotion of adequate investment or consumption; or on the expansion and contraction of the supply of money. Great leaders who, under the stress of current conditions, have evolved systems of economic concepts modify, expand, or alter these concepts under different circumstances and as their own thinking progresses. Followers must be on the alert not to become more royalist than the King.

If economics is the study of man in the process of producing and consuming what he needs and what he wants, then it is apparent that the subject matter of his inquiry is constantly shifting. Not so many years ago no one needed or wanted gasoline because the motor car had not been invented, and no one wanted moving pictures or radios because they nad not yet been imagined. A "horse and buggy" economist in a motor age is of no greater use than an isolationist in the atomic era. An economist, in order to merit this designation, must keep his mind open to the realities of the ever-changing pattern of economic life. When his thinking becomes rigidly confined by a set of unchanging dogmas, his usefulness rapidly declines while the amount of mischief he may do becomes formidable.

The success of the economists' efforts, however, even if they do their best, will depend on the behavior of the different economic groups which make up society and on effective organization of the state. But, while progress in the rationality of the behavior of economic units is necessarily a slow process to which understanding of economic forces can contribute a great deal but only gradually in the course of time, better adaptation of the machinery of Government to the tasks it must perform in modern society is an essential preliminary step long overdue in the upward climb toward a smoothly functioning economy.

For progress on this road better organization of the Government, more direct and effective ways of translating programs into action must be devised and instituted. Democracy, it has been said, is the rule of mediocrity. There is an element of truth in the allegation. For mediocrity represents the average, and a rule of the majority cannot be too far removed from the understanding of the average. While leadership in a democracy must remain in touch with the average, it should strive to be ahead. It should lead—not follow. Leadership that is below the average is disastrous; leadership that is on the level of the average holds little promise of advancement. Leadership that is ahead of the average results in progress. It may make all the difference between a rise and a decline in the tide of a nation's life.

Consequently, Government must be so organized as to encourage better-than-average leadership and assure it of the country's support. This is the opposite of what actually prevails. It is regrettably true that existing governmental organization is such as to make it well-nigh impossible even for brilliant leadership to achieve progress, except at times of crisis and then only at great hazard and with much delay.

We have a Congress which has great powers and is controlled by one of the two leading political parties. The position of Congressmen on vital issues, however, is not determined by their party allegiance. The economic views of progressive Democrats, for example, are much further removed from those of conservative Democrats than those of individual progressives or conservatives of either party are from each other. This is so well known that it is almost a platitude. And yet, at the risk of platitudinousness, it needs to be restated because of less obvious implications. For this means that in choosing a Member of Congress the voter has no assurance that the party designation of his candidate insures his taking certain positions, even on vital issues. Unless the voter knows the views of a candidate on a variety of problems, he votes in the dark. Some system under which the platform on which a party is elected to office will indicate the line of policy that its individual members are pledged to carry out is an essential part of a rational and effective democracy. We have no such system. It is imperative that one be established. With such a system in effect, pressure groups representing special interests would have considerably less opportunity to influence legislative action.

In the course of time terms of office of Congressmen should be so modified as to make impossible the frustration and stalling of government that occurs when the majority of Congress belongs to a different party from that of the Executive. This, however, would require an amendment to the Constitution and would be a slow process. The urgency of such an improvement in legislative machinery is obscured by the lack of likemindedness within the parties. It is significant and hopeful, on the other hand, that many of the other changes most urgently required for rationalizing government can be accomplished not only within the existing terms of the Constitution but for the most part even without legislation—by the adoption of effective practices and the establishment of a tradition of responsibility in government.

Recent improvements in the internal organization of Congress under the La Follette-Monroney bill are important steps in the right direction and hold a promise of better functioning of the Legislature. But in order to serve the purposes of democracy, adequate means must be devised to make Congress a more effective instrument for carrying out the will of the electorate. A machinery of Government under which the President and Members of Congress, who were elected at the same time on the same platform and have the same party allegiance and the same mandate from the people, cannot cooperate on major issues is one that frustrates the democratic process.

Coordinate with Congress stands the Executive, with powers derived in part from Congress and in part directly from the Constitution. To function effectively it must have organized machinery for cooperation with Congress. Experience has demonstrated that voluntary, irregular contacts are not enough. A regular statutory line of authority between the executive and the legislative arms of the Government is needed.

The executive itself should be so organized as to be in a position to initiate programs expressive of broad national policy, and when approved by Congress, to carry them out as a coordinated undertaking—through the different parts into which the executive branch of the Government is subdivided. As the Government is constituted, there was until recently no agency for formulating national policies, no provision for regular consultation with the legislative power, and no machinery for coordinating the activities of the 10 regular departments and the numerous independent agencies, boards, and commissions. The only place where the power of coordination is lodged under the existing system is the White House. And as a consequence, too much responsibility, too much detailed work, and too much omniscience is expected of one man—the President, who, in order to discharge the superhuman duties piled upon him, needs to be a paragon of physical endurance, of wisdom, energy, tact, and showmanship, as well as of political strategy. The result is that Presidents are killed by overwork and yet can rarely achieve a complete and continuous program of national policy.

For the President does not have the support of a Cabinet with joint responsibility for national policy. Such a Cabinet does not exist in this country. There is only a group of men, charged with specific duties in separate fields, with the President alone as a unifying and reconciling factor. The extent to which problems of national policy are discussed at Cabinet meetings is not generally known. But that there is no recognition of joint responsibility for adopting policy is clear. It is also apparent that there are jealousies and a constant jockeying for power. Furthermore, many of the most important functions of the Executive are entrusted to agencies not represented in the Cabinet table at all—and subject to no control except by remote direction of Congress and infrequent contacts with the overworked and necessarily inaccessible Chief Executive. The course of government may be pictured as an obstacle race—beset by many hurdles and run simultaneously on many courses, with but one judge who is under pressure to look in all directions at once and to make prompt decisions of vital importance, without opportunity in many instances to consider comprehensively all the elements involved.

This system is a heritage of a past era, when the duties of Federal Government were infinitely simpler. It needs to be remodeled in order to be equipped to handle effectively the numerous pressing problems of a modern state. It has been well said that every human institution must change if it is to last. It would be tragic if at this critical time the country's efforts to achieve domestic and world reconstruction were frustrated by worship at the shrine of vested error.

This country abandoned traditional laissez-faire largely because recurrent booms and depressions had demonstrated the inefficiency of unregulated private enterprise, its inability to cope with the problems of a complex society. If government in turn shows itself incapable of dealing effectively with these problems, then in what direction will the country move? Will it be toward communism, fascism, or anarchy? There is little solace for America in any of these alternatives. Preservation of democracy is the country's wish, but if democracy is to be preserved, it must function efficiently. Its ideals must be implemented and made secure by governmental machinery capable of carrying out the people's will effectively and without undue delay.

The need for better organization of policy formation has been recognized for a long time and its urgency has become more apparent during the great depression of the thirties and during and after the Second World War.

Its acuteness has not abated, but increased, during the present period of reconstruction.

One important move toward better coordination of Government activities was taken when the act putting into effect the Bretton Woods agreements provided for a National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems to consist of the Secretaries of the Treasury, State, and Commerce, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank. This Council has the function of considering with the American representatives on the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development the general policies to be pursued by the United States in the field of international finance, and particularly in which decisions of these two institutions are subject to approval by the United States. The Council is directed to coordinate, so far as practicable, the policies and operations of the representatives of the United States on the fund, the bank, the Export-Import Bank, and all other agencies of the Government engaging in foreign financial transactions. It is required to make periodic reports to the President and to the Congress. Since its organization the Council has been extremely active and has represented the United States in negotiations in connection with the British credit and the loans to France. Formal organization of interdepartmental cooperation in international finance through this Council is a constructive development of a high order to importance and promise.

A potentially more important step was the adoption, after much discussion and debate, of a law known as the Employment Act of 1946, approved by the President on February 20, 1946. This date may mark the first step in the process of rationalizing the Government on an over-all basis and organizing American democracy to fit modern conditions. The act, in effect, declares it to be the continuing policy of the Federal Government to encourage opportunities of employment for all who are willing and able to work, and to promote employment, production, and purchasing power. In form, the law deals primarily with one aspect of economic life, employment, but the different facets of economic activity are so interrelated that a successful policy assuring continuous employment would require and assure stability of production, prices, and other phases of life as well. The statute is couched in negotiated language, representing compromises between different points of view. Perhaps this should make it easier for its administrators to command broad support. It is beyond doubt that the act provides a foundation for coordinated national economic policy.

It requires the President to transmit to Congress every year at the opening of the session, an economic report covering in substance all important phases of the Nation's economic life, together with a program of action. In addition, the President may from time to time transmit supplementary reports.

The act sets up a Council of Economic Advisers to assist the President in the formulation of his economic reports. It also creates a joint committee of Congress to receive these reports and to make studies of its own, and on this basis to transmit to the Senate and House of Representatives its own reports containing its findings and recommendations.

This act contains, in embryo, what is necessary to start the Government on a road to more effective action. It recognizes the unity of the problems handled by the different departments and agencies, it gives the President the kind of help and support that he requires and is entitled to in the discharge of his great responsibilities, and it improves the procedure for cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of Government. A stronger and more formal link must be forged in the near future, but the present law represents a step in the right direction.

This statute has been enacted so recently and the Economic Council has been constituted for so short a time that it is too early to judge of its effectiveness in actual operation. Its possibilities, however are far reaching, it needs the support of all citizens, and more particularly of this association, whose former president has been appointed as chairman of the council. The country cannot afford to have this promising start become lost in the mazes of official red tape, or in conflicts for power among agencies. It must become the beacon light leading toward a new and more adequate machinery of government in a democracy.

The Council is at present in the experimental stage. On how it is developed and how much importance it gains in shaping the country's economic policy will depend whether it will signalize a momentous step forward in the democratic process or merely the emergence of another in a long series of agencies issuing reports.

Programs worked out by the Council must be so realistic and convincing, so well thought out and adapted to the country's needs, so thorough and so practical as to win acceptance, in whole or in large part, by the President. His report to Congress, prepared in the light of the Council's recommendations, would then be such as to enlist the support of public opinion. Congress and the Executive should then stand together for the enactment and administration of such laws and policies as the country's needs demand.

There is in this possibilities of gradual but vital improvement in our economic life. If the reports become established as the recognized authoritative basis of action, the recommendations would become binding on all heads of Government departments and agencies. There would be less bickering, misunderstanding, and cross-purposes between branches of the Government. A Cabinet member or the head of an agency would have the sole choice between supporting the program adopted by the Government or resigning.

The sound view that for an official on the Cabinet level the only alternative as a matter both of effective public policy and of personal self-respect is to cooperate or to resign has never been established in this country. There is instead a dangerous practice of remaining in office against one's convictions in order not to split the party, and an inclination to refuse to quit under fire. These may be good rules of conduct when party loyalty or personal integrity is in question, but not when the issue is one of national policy.

The ideal attitude of a Cabinet minister toward the Cabinet is described by Viscount Grey in these significant words:

"To put his mind into the common stock; to work sincerely in matters of difference of opinion and difficulty for a Cabinet decision. This does not mean that what is regarded by a minister as vital to the public interest should be compromised. A minister should resign rather than agree to that. It means that a minister should not press his personal views unduly about what is not essential, that he should contend for substance not for form, that he should consider without amour-propre how his own opinion can be reconciled with that of others. Subject to the one qualification of not sacrificing what he regards as vital to the public interest, he should not contend for victory, but for agreement in the Cabinet.

"The other qualification is that of accepting full personal responsibility for Cabinet decisions, when once agreed to."

This is a statement about a responsible Cabinet of the British type—by a distinguished member. Adoption of similar principles in an American setting appears to be the only alternative to governmental fumbling.

A clear-cut administrative policy, with all the heads of government departments committed to its support, would carry great weight with the public, which placed it in power. It would also impress Congress. Adoption in some form of the proposal for Cabinet members to appear before Congress in person and answering questions in open meeting would contribute further to cooperation between branches of the Government and to recognition of complete accord on policy by the administration. It may be feasible for candidates for the Presidency to name their Cabinets before election, so as to make the ministers more conscious of their responsibility to the people, the ultimate source of their authority.

An American form of responsible government could develop out of the beginning made by the Full Employment Act if it is supported by the adoption of practices that would increase its effectiveness. The organization and principles laid down by the Constitution and sanctioned by American tradition would be preserved, and at the same time the Government would become more purposeful and more responsive to the demands of changing conditions.

To economists and to this association, the recent step toward a better formulated and better implemented public policy is not merely a matter of general interest. It is a Council of Economic Advisers that has been established and it is the Council's economic reports that are expected to constitute the heart of public policy. This new instrument of Government gives the profession of economists a broad opportunity of rendering greater service to the Nation and places on them and on this association a correspondingly grave responsibility.

What Congress has said to the economist is in the language of the gaming table: "Put up or shut up."

That's the economist's dilemma. Since economists by occupational selection and by training are not able to shut up—the only alternative is to put up, that is, to produce the men, the data, and the understanding, and to promote the public support essential to the execution of effective economic policy. To this purpose the efforts of economists and of their association must be rededicated. The ivory tower has been conquered by events and razed to the ground. The economist is out in the open and must come to grips with problems of state.

Give Tax Relief First to Low-Income Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote the pertinent part of a letter I have received from the Treasury Department written January 13 signed by Mr. Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr.:

From the date in table 1, page A-15, of the enclosed extract from the Treasury Bulletin, together with an estimated 1944 total tax liability of $18,300,000,000, a rough approximation may be obtained of the proportions of the total liability attributable to individuals with adjusted gross incomes of less than $2,500, $3,000, and $3,500. The percentages computed on this basis are as follows: For individuals with less than

$2,500 adjusted gross income 16.1 percent, with less than $3,000, 23.9 percent, and with less than $3,500, 31.6 percent.

Everyone is aware that low-income citizens of our Nation are facing tremendous difficulties financially. Many families are not in a position to pay, as they are obligated to pay, the income tax sums they are assessed.

The Republicans have talked much about reducing income taxes. Before they and the Congress proceed to reduce income taxes in the higher brackets, by all means they should reduce materially taxes in the lower brackets. Another approach to the problem which would be especially helpful to low-income families particularly where these families have several children would be to increase appreciably exemption amounts. I sincerely feel our economy will be strengthened at this time if we make appropriate studies and work out a solution to the income-tax problems of low-income families whereby their purchasing power will be considerably increased.

There is no group with whose incomes I am more familiar than teachers; I taught in rural school 3 years. My mother and twin sister taught school. My father, the principal of a four-teacher school, along with his wife, yet teaches. I know teachers and people with similar incomes need income-tax reductions badly. I favor raising immediately and materially the salaries of our school teachers; this must be done. To this end I have worked and expect to work in the future. On the other hand the type of tax legislation to which I have referred will aid teachers materially.

How Many Soldiers Convicted of Military Crimes Are Taught and Educated To Make Good Citizens While Serving Their Sentences?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of the program for rehabilitation of our prisoners at one of our United States disciplinary barracks, namely, Camp Gordon, Ga. The summary of this program was prepared by Lt. Col. Hugh D. Adair, commandant, who is doing very excellent work in the rehabilitation of these men whose foot slipped while in service at some time in the past.

One of the most serious things confronting the American people today is the rehabilitation of these boys, many of whom participated in the very midst of battle in the war.

While it is true few know and realize what is going on in these camps, this program while not as colorful or dramatic as some, of aiding and restoring these boys, is of tremendous importance to the Nation.

Many a youth who through indiscretion while in service will be so trained and restored in mind and spirit that they will become good citizens and thus thousands of lives saved from destruction and further criminal tendencies.

I have visited Camp Gordon and have seen the camp in operation under its most able commandant, Lt. Col. Hugh D. Adair, and I offer praise most highly to him for his excellent administrative ability.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM CONDUCTED AT BRANCH UNITED STATES DISCIPLINARY BARRACKS, CAMP GORDON, GA.

1. HISTORY OF INSTALLATION

The Southeastern Branch of the United States Disciplinary Barracks, Camp Gordon, Ga., was activated as a disciplinary barracks by authority of section III, War Department Circular 406, October 16, 1944, being activated at Fort Bragg, N. C., on October 20, 1944, as a class I installation under the commanding general, Fourth Service Command. The installation was moved from Fort Bragg to Camp Gordon, Ga., on December 19, 1944, to occupy the area and facilities formerly utilized by the Camp Gordon prisoner-of-war camp.

Col. J. E. Ardrey was commandant from the date of activation until May 28, 1945, when Lt. Col. Leroy Weaver was made commandant. Lieutenant Colonel Weaver was succeeded as commandant on November 19, 1945, by the present commandant, Col. Hugh D. Adair, under whose command and leadership, with the assistance and cooperation of higher headquarters, the institution has grown and developed to its present state of efficiency and good organization.

2. DESCRIPTION OF INSTALLATION

The barracks proper is composed of the entire area at the western extremity of Camp Gordon formerly occupied by the large prisoner-of-war camp, with housing, messing, and other facilities for 2,000 prisoners, and with adequate housing, recreational and general facilities, and administrative offices for the operating personnel. Adjacent to the compound is a large vocational shop compound area, embracing eight large modern shop buildings, splendidly equipped for a varied vocational-training program. All buildings are of mobilization-type construction with standard two-story barracks. The barracks is served by adequate paved roads, with good water and electrical service provided by the post.

3. THE CHAPLAIN

(a) The ecclesiastical duties of a chaplain in a disciplinary barracks are not particularly different from such activities in any Army organization. The same religious services are held and the same religious sacraments are administered. Because the men are in confinement, it is always possible to insure their availability for attendance at such services. However, as the percentage of inmates who were deeply religious prior to their confinement is very small, attendance at religious services is not ordinarily very large.

In most Army organizations, the chaplain is concerned with providing religious activities for those who are already religious, while in a disciplinary barracks a chaplain's major problem centers in creating a religious interest among those who have not previously been church conscious. In fact, a chaplain's work at a disciplinary barracks is very largely an attempt to salvage the possibilities that still remain among the prisoners. One need not expect such an effort to be popular among the inmates, or to result in large attendance, for such an effort appeals only to those who are sincerely concerned in finding a finer way of living.

The essential value of the work of the chaplain of a disciplinary barracks is in direct proportion to the number of individuals who are able to ultimately achieve religious personal and social integration. Although the work of a chaplain in such a situation is admittedly difficult, it is at the same time highly satisfactory.

While, at present, much of the chaplain's work centers in the rehabilitation of the inmates of this institution, the work is nevertheless on a religious basis rather than on a purely psychological and sociological foundation. Because the religio-group-therapy program is somewhat different from the work ordinarily done by a chaplain, it is outlined in detail.

The chaplain is a regular member of one of the classification boards which meets twice each week and consumes a half day at each sitting. Periodic visits to the isolation building, interviews with members of the families of prisoners, writing letters for prisoners, holding consultations with prisoners on personal problems, acting as liaison between inmates and the Red Cross field directors, delivering sex-morality and orientation lectures to the USDB detachment are some of the not strictly religious activities which occupy the time of the USDB chaplain.

(b) Religio-group-therapy program: For the religio-group-therapy classes conducted by the chaplain, a series of eight meetings is planned and scheduled. One meeting per week is held, each meeting lasting from 1300 to 1615.

No coercion or overpersuasion is used to get men into the classes, and in the classes themselves men are encouraged to ask questions and express their own opinions.

The use of elaborate and technical terms is studiously avoided.

The primary purpose of these classes is to help the men toward better and more coherent thinking, a more realistic attitude toward their own strong and weak points in character, and better adjustments to life here in the compound, during and after restoration to duty in the Army, or to civilian life with its duties and obligations.

In many instances those improvement become apparent even before the end of the series of meetings.

Note is made of the fact that in these classes chief stress is put upon the over-all improvement of the man himself and not upon the idea that it is a restoration class. A very real endeavor is made to help men toward restoration, but this is an expected result, more than a goal. The goal is to help the men to help themselves, in the compound, in the Army (if restored), or in civilian life if they return there.

A report is made after a complete study of each man's 201 file, his attitude and adjustment in the class, and an unhurried personal conference with the man in the chaplain's office.

Copies of reports are placed in the 201 files of those men attending these classes.

Following is the outline of lectures used in the religio-group-therapy classes:

1. Orientation.
2. Personality development.
3. Motivation—basic drives.
4. Maturity or immaturity—adjustment or maladjustment.
5. Conflicts and personality difficulties as a cause for anxiety. What to do?
6. Means of self-discipline.
7. Alcohol and sex.
8. Popularity. Getting along with people.

The professions of faith among the present group of inmates is as follows, approximately: 25 percent Catholic, 62 percent Protestant, 12 percent none, 1 percent Jewish and other.

4. SUPPLY SECTION

(a) The supply office is responsible for the procurement and distribution of all quartermaster, signal, ordnance, and engineer supplies to all departments of this institution, including the vocational shops.

(b) Prison supply: This section supplies all inmates with wearing apparel, toilet articles, tobacco, and all items required during their period of confinement. Class X clothing is furnished whenever it is available, and all clothing is imprinted with distinctive markings and colors, depending upon the grade of the prisoner to whom furnished. In addition, all prisoners, upon discharge or restoration, are furnished by this section with the necessary clothing and articles in accordance with current regulations.

(c) Maintenance and utilities: This section makes necessary alterations and repairs to physical property of this institution. The firing of boilers and water heaters outside of the compound is done under the supervision of this section and all prisoners assigned to this duty are given instructions as to the proper method to use in their work. These instructions are as prescribed by the post engineers and are for the purpose of stopping fuel wastage and possible damage to the equipment. In addition, minor repairs are made to buildings, plumbing, and electrical appliances.

(d) Subsistence: The ration break-down for all messes is operated by this section. All messes are inspected periodically by the food supervisor and any deficiencies or irregularities noted are directed to responsible officers for corrective action. An inspection of messes is also made by the post sanitary inspector and many favorable reports have been received from this source.

(e) Commissary section: Toilet articles, such as razor blades, tooth brushes, etc., as may be necessary, not to exceed in value $1 per month for each general prisoner confined, are issued by the supply section semimonthly.

Tobacco and matches not to exceed 50 cents in value per month is issued to prisoners of this institution.

Tobacco purchased for prisoners from their personal funds and tobacco issued gratis under provisions of AR 600–375, change 7, is done in strict compliance with provisions of War Department Circular 135, dated May 5, 1945.

A tobacco ration card is maintained for each inmate.

An individual record is maintained for each prisoner indicating articles drawn and the value of same.

Through strict control of distribution of free toilet articles authorized under AR 66–375, it was possible to furnish needs of general prisoners confined to this institution for about 25 percent less than the amount authorized, i. e., $1 per month for each prisoner for toilet articles.

(f) Articles furnished prisoner by quartermaster: The following articles are provided for issue to inmates by the Government at no expense to the inmate. Issues will be made periodically at such times as the items are available through normal supply channels: Safety razors; shaving brushes; tooth brushes; combs; towels, hand or bath; shoe dubbin; double-edge safety-razor blades; shaving soap; tooth paste or powder; toilet soap; shoe laces; smoking tobacco.

5. INFORMATION AND EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING

(a) *Information*

1. The information and education branch is responsible for the arrangement of lectures, the outfitting of troop information centers, and exhibiting of films for all inmates and military personnel. There are six troop information centers located at the following points:

(a) Block C, for the use of inmates.
(b) Disciplinary company.
(c) Headquarters company.
(d) Company E.
(e) Company I.
(f) Officers' center.

2. Weekly lectures are presented to the officers and military personnel. News maps are displayed in all troop information centers. This branch also aids the enlisted personnel in their selection of U. S. A. F. I. textbooks. Approximately 24 courses have been secured.

(b) *Education*

1. The educational branch of this institution is consolidated under the academic training branch. Under this heading, there are three distinct schools—literacy school, upper grades, and commercial school. Each potential student is carefully tested and assigned to the school that more closely fits his need. During the past year, a revised system of testing has been instigated and consequently the inmate's intellectual level is ascertained more readily.

2. During the past year, the school has been renovated, materially and academically. A civilian training program was inaugurated which was resultant in a better brand of instruction for all phases of the institution. All in all, the accomplishments of this branch during the year have been very noteworthy.

(a) Literacy school: The literacy school caters to those inmates who are functionally illiterate. The aim of this school is basic, to teach the student to read, write, and comprehend fundamental everyday problems. The potential student is given standard United States Army D. S. T. tests and is placed in his appropriate level. There have been 635 such tests administered. The instruction of the student is complete when he is declared literate. Motivation is the foremost consideration of the instructors. If the student is receptive, then he is placed into prep level, which prepares him for entrance into the upper grades.

During the year, 215 men were enrolled in literacy school. The number that graduated from this school was 150, therefore, 57 men are still attending. The remainder were dropped due to various reasons, such as inability to learn, psychological or psychiatric reasons, to be discharged, or to be restored to duty.

(b) Upper grades: Upper grades school was inaugurated the 14th of November of the past year. The purpose and aims of this school are to continue on where literacy school left off, and to furnish an education to those men who have been deprived the privilege through adverse circumstances. The courses offered here were designed to cover in 8 weeks material generally requiring a school semester. To accomplish this aim unimportant material has been eliminated and stress placed on essential materials.

The over-all aim of the upper-grades school is to prepare the student to meet existing standards of the modern world and to assist him in restoration to military service or adjustment as the case may be.

Courses offered in upper grades include English, composition, history, social studies, and current events.

A total of 186 inmates have attended the school out of which 44 have graduated. The remainder are still in school, or due to discharge, change of assignment, etc., no longer attend.

(c) Commercial school: Commercial school enables the men to get a concrete idea of the modern American business world. Classes in typing, secretarial practice, business law, business management, salesmanship, economics, English, and bookkeeping are offered.

Upon graduation of the students from typing school, many are placed in responsible positions within the institution. At the end of a 12-week term the average speed of the students is approximately 25 words per minute. To increase accuracy and speed in typing and shorthand, an advanced course is now being offered.

During the year, 181 men were enrolled in business school; of this group, 72 were graduated, 51 are now attending. The remainder were dropped due to various reasons.

Inmate instructors are carefully selected for their educational background, previous experience, and background in teaching. Their efforts are coordinated and supervised by trained civilian personnel under the direct supervision of the supervisor of education and the educational officer. A teachers' training program is conducted weekly, and the individual needs and weaknesses of the inmate instructors are discussed.

A revised system of testing has been improvised by the upper grades and commercial school through which a potential student is placed into the level that more closely fits his educational background. In this way the school constantly undergoes improvement that benefits all concerned.

(d) Dee Bee News: The Dee Bee News is a mimeographed paper published for and by the personnel of this institution under the direct supervision of this branch. The primary function of this weekly paper is to serve as the voice of the institution and as a register of the events that concern the inmates. The weekly distribution as of June 30, 1946, was 2,000.

(e) Visual aids: The visual-aids department is responsible for charts, maps, diagrams, etc., which are used as training aids in the school. Visual education plays an important part in daily instruction within the classroom.

6. VOCATIONAL-TRAINING SHOPS

The vocational-training shops in connection with the vocational-guidance section permit the utilization of prison labor on useful work projects and, in addition, inmates receive vocational training as part of the rehabilitation program. Much success has been obtained in this direction, which is best exemplified by the volume of work projects accomplished and the number of prisoners who have become proficient in their trades.

All assignments for work in the shops are made by the employment control officer upon the recommendation of the classification board. The basis for prisoner assignments are civilian occupation, aptitudes, individual desires, and custody classification. Military personnel instruct and supervise the prisoners assigned to the various shops.

(a) Auto mechanic shop: Major and minor repairs on automobiles and other engines and motors are made in this shop. Disassembly and reconstruction are taught to all of the students in this department.

(b) Body and fender shop: This shop does very important work. Fenders are rolled out, bodies and doors are straightened, sanded, compounded, primer coat applied and painted. There is an average-size class of men who are always in the shop to learn the body and fender trade. Work performed is for the Disciplinary Barracks, Oliver General Hospital, Camp Gordon Exchange and the Augusta Arsenal.

(c) Typewriter repair shop: All sizes and types of typewriters, adding machines and calculators are repaired, cleaned and oiled in the typewriter repair shop. Many parts are replaced which are won beyond use.

(d) Blacksmith shop: General blacksmithing is done in this shop. Parts are repaired and manufactured for rakes, lawn mowers, barber chairs, meat slicers, tool dressing and many other items.

(e) Print shop: The work in the print shop consists mainly of printing forms and other necessary items which are used in the administration of the disciplinary barracks.

Inmate rule books, note pads, ration reports, letterheads, file cards, PX order forms, time cards, job order forms, personal property sheets, ration break-down forms, conduct and efficiency forms, prisoners stationery, home parole forms and many other items are printed in this shop.

(f) Radio shop: Major and minor repairs are made on radios, amplifiers, public address system, and other electrical appliances which are used in the administration of the disciplinary barracks.

(g) Welding shop: All types of welding are employed in this shop. Work is performed for the disciplinary barracks, Oliver General Hospital, and Augusta Arsenal. Work ranges from welding of tools to automobile repair work.

(h) Carpenter shop: All carpenter work for the disciplinary barracks is done in the carpenter shop. Bulletin boards, bread boxes, bookcases, file cabinets, tables, signboards, pallets, packing boxes, window frames, blackboards, and other items large and small. Large numbers of rifle and packing boxes have been made in this shop for the storage of guns and other military equipment for the Ordnance Department.

(i) Cabinet and upholstery shop: Chairs, settees, divans, and many other items are made and repaired in this shop. Radio cabinets, speaker boxes, meat blocks, brushing machine spindles, and other items for the Red Cross, post exchanges, and athletic and recreation section are made and repaired in this shop.

(j) Clothing repair shop: Seat covers, coveralls, curtains, caps, handbags, brief cases, arm bands, and many other articles are made and repaired in this department. Clothing is altered and chevrons and patches are sewn on for personnel attached to the disciplinary barracks.

(k) Sign shop: All necessary signs for the disciplinary barracks are painted and handlettered in this department. Many signs and posters were made for the recruiting service. Furniture and fixtures, bulletin boards, broom racks, bookcases, and many other items are painted and refinished in the sign shop. Vehicles for the disciplinary barracks, Oliver General Hospital, Camp Gordon Exchange, and the recruiting service and the Augusta Arsenal are stenciled and handlettered.

(l) Machine shop: The machine shop has a wide variety of work to do. Work is accomplished for different organizations on the post which ranges from making nuts and bolts to highly specialized and intricate parts for the repair and upkeep of the many machines in the disciplinary barracks.

(m) Shoe repair shop: Shoes, sandals, gloves, pistol holsters, and other items of leather goods are manufactured and repaired in this shop.

7. MEDICAL SECTION

(a) Organization: The medical section of the SE Branch USDB, Camp Gordon, Ga., is located in area C and consists of two medical officers, nine enlisted men, and four inmates. Its chief function is to safeguard the health of officers, enlisted men, and inmates of the branch USDB, Camp Gordon, Ga.

(b) Infirmary: The infirmary, an annex to the dispensary, is also maintained by this section and consists of 17 beds for treatment and observation of inmates with minimized ailments. This facility permits the hospitalization of inmates without the necessity of transporting them to the hospital, with the exception of surgical cases requiring special treatment, thereby effecting a reduction in personnel and transportation. In addition the security problem and the guard personnel assigned to the hospital ward has been minimized considerably.

(c) Equipment: (1) X-ray (field model) is utilized in the dispensary for minor fractures and confirmation of diagnosis. (2) Infrared lamp is available for dry heat therapy. (3) Pharmacy with limited and restricted medicants which is adequate for the dispensary.

(d) Functions: (1) Complete physical examination is given each inmate on arrival by medical officer for restoration and clemency. (2) Complete physical examination given each inmate on termination of sentence and release. The report is submitted on WD AGO Form No. 38. (3) Daily sick calls and treatments are given all personnel. (4) Immunizations are given to newly arrived inmates and on occasions when necessary. During the period June 30, 1945, to June 30, 1946, the following immunizations have been administered: (a) tetanus, 1,240; (b) tetanus (stimulating dose), 2,050; (c) smallpox, 1,260; (d) typhoid, 1,070; (e) typhoid (stimulating dose) 1,840. (5) Physical examination of EM and inmates assigned to mess halls are given monthly and their total numbers 105 per month. (6) A medical officer makes daily visits to the isolation cells for care of inmates confined thereat. (7) The surgeon is also a member of the classification board and medical advisor to the supervisor of prisoners.

(e) Summary: There is maintained a ward at the station hospital, Camp Gordon, Ga., for hospitalization of inmates with communicable and infectious diseases and for major surgical cases. In cases where facilities are inadequate at the station hospital they are transferred to Oliver General Hospital, Augusta, Ga., for final disposition.

8. DENTAL CLINIC SECTION

The dental clinic is a recently built air-conditioned establishment located within the compound, with all modern equipment sufficient to furnish adequate dental care for all inmates and military personnel except those special cases requiring hospitalization.

The clinic consists of four chairs and units, fully equipped X-ray room with facilities to handle all operative procedures, surgery, periodontia, prosthodontia, and all oral and extra oral X-rays. A complete dental laboratory is maintained to carry out and finish construction of full and partial dentures.

The clinic personnel consists of 3 assigned dental officers, 1 enlisted man, and 10 general prisoners. The chair assistants, lab and X-ray technicians are general prisoners, who have been taught their work since being assigned to the clinic and are under constant supervision of the dental officers.

During the fiscal year, the clinic totaled 9,369 sittings with 235 dentures being made, 3,465 fillings and 760 extractions along with other types of operative and surgical procedures.

9. PSYCHIATRY AND SOCIOLOGY SECTION

Personnel of this department consists of three psychiatrists, two psychologists, two social interviewers, and includes a staff of clerks and stenographer.

During the past year over 4,420 cases have been processed in this department. This section is responsible for the preparation of histories and classification summaries, required for study by the various boards. This includes a complete social, educational, occupational, civil, and military history as well as evaluations and predictions by the psychologist and psychiatrist as to the future prognosis of each individual case. When completely processed, the cases are then ready for the classification board to consider the man for restoration, clemency, job assignment, and security.

Additional duties of this division include individual counseling (individual psychotherapy) especially of problem cases in order to aid them in their adjustment while in confinement. There are also group psychotherapy classes conducted in the military training company, premilitary training company, and development platoon. The primary aim of the group therapy lectures is to aid in group adjustment and to prepare and teach these men to make a satisfactory adjustment when they are restored to duty.

A special company has been in operation throughout most of the year, which includes mental defectives, psychopaths, and prepsychotic individuals who by reason of their instability are not amenable to treatment and care in the general prisoner population. The psychiatry and sociology division acts in a supervisory capacity over the handling of these men.

There are from time to time, scheduled discussion groups for all psychiatry and sociology personnel for consideration of pertinent problems, illustrative cases, particularly to thoroughly acquaint and maintain the interests of the staff in the work they are performing. Such an understanding of the general problems inevitably improves the caliber of the work performed.

The psychological section, in addition to its other duties, administers the Army general-classification test to both prison population and enlisted personnel when necessary, and conducts the Wechsler-Bellevue intelligence examination, as well as other psychometric and personality tests where indicated. This aids in a better evaluation of the capabilities of the prisoners and serves as an adjunct in determining job assignment.

There is maintained a psychiatric and psychological library consisting of books, journals, and pamphlets. These books are available to all officers and enlisted men of the unit.

10. ATHLETIC AND RECREATION

(a) Motion pictures: Current releases, 16-millimeter, are shown in two theaters. One is in the Outdoor Theater, located inside the compound; the other is a regular theater, adjacent to the compound, to be used by selected prisoners. In addition to showing current releases of commercial productions, sport news, current events, travelog, orchestrations, and special features are shown according to the attached schedule. It is to be noted that we have increased the film schedule to six showings weekly. Double projectors are used in the showing, giving the effect of continuity without change of reel. The projection staff includes a noncommissioned officer and two parolees, all of whom are extremely efficient in the operation and projection of the film.

(b) Boxing bouts and tournaments: These are a series of boxing engagements with contests ranging from two rounds to eight rounds on a professionally mounted ring, spotlighted and announced. The fights are scheduled on Friday evenings, twice a month. The present attendance represents an increase of 50 percent over past activities, and is now being shared by an increased number of officers and enlisted personnel. Signal Corps photographers are present to photograph some of the action movements, and audience participants. The participants and handlers receive cigarettes and other items as prizes, which this section has been able to obtain either by contribution, or by purchase through the prisoners' welfare fund or central post fund. Comedy relief, slapstick, and records are furnished in connection with the contests, and receive great ovations, and stimulate interest during the intermission periods.

(c) Inmate personnel variety shows: A new series of shows under the direction of a parolee has been presented in the outdoor compound theater once a week barring unfavorable weather conditions. These shows have been exceptionally well received by the enlisted personnel and inmate population, and follow the pattern of a night club presentation, including the following: A full dance-band orchestra, master of ceremonies, eight specialty numbers, including dancing, singing, duet, and trio work. The program ranges from classical interpretation through hillbilly and low-down swing. The personnel directing the shows are extremely capable and

have contributed much enthusiasm and ability toward the success of the performances. Stage and electrical maintenance and public-address men are cooperating with the directors of these performances to the greatest of their ability. Talent scouts are constantly on the lookout for new performers and the prisoner morale, I am informed, has been built up through those efforts, both by this section and the prisoners themselves.

(d) Recorded musical programs: These programs are presented as per attached schedule. Improvements have been made both in equipment and technique, and in the addition of hundreds of new records, ranging from top classical to low-down rhythm. Special radio programs, news events, and sports digests are presented by two parolees, who also present regular information of interest to the inmates. A broadcasting studio has been completely rebuilt and is located in the A & R building proper. Next to this is a completely equipped radio and repair shop, ready for use.

(e) Publications: Constant use by the compound, enlisted men's day rooms and officers' quarters, is made of the current weekly and monthly digests and newspapers.

(f) Library: A library of 17,000 volumes is maintained in C Block under the direction of A & R officer and a civilian, assisted by three (3) general prisoners. The library has been enlarged, refurnished, relighted, redecorated, and is operating at peak efficiency. An increase of 75 percent in personnel borrowing has been noted in the past two (2) months.

(g) Athletic program:

1. Inmate personnel: Softball, hardball, basketball, volley ball, ping pong, badminton, horse shoes, weight lifting, general gymnasium training, and boxing, are offered to inmates. In this connection, the boxing contests are supervised, graded and scored by a general prisoner, a past professional prizefighter, whose aptitude in this connection makes him a valuable asset in this activity. Tournament teams and selected participants are given equipment recently modernized and cleaned. The main athletic supply room is located in the indoor theater.

2. Officers and enlisted men: Golfing, tennis, badminton sets are furnished in addition to those mentioned in 7a above. Any special activity is scheduled, provided the necessary participants have joined.

(h) Miscellaneous: This section furnishes two orchestras for the entertainment of personnel in the Cadre Club, and officer personnel in the Officers' Club, USDB, the Service Club, Officers' Club, and Red Cross (prior to closing) of the post. These engagements run between four and seven a week, to an audience personnel of between 200 and 2,000.

(i) Legal aid: This section provides a legal-aid officer, who assists inmates in the handling of various legal matters that involve personal decisions, signatures, certificates, and the like. Approximately 30 cases per week are usually handled.

11. CLOTHING AND EQUIPMENT REPAIR SHOPS

On March 25, 1946, the combined clothing and equipment shops started setting up for the operations of repairing clothing and equipage, which the Army shipped to this station for processing. Due to a change of orders the clothing shop never started production, the shop being converted into a field-desk repair shop.

The task was to arrange the shops in the best way possible for the performance of the many operations which the equipage had to undergo before completion. For this two buildings were necessary to house all the shops for the repairing of cots and bedsteads. The operations used in the repairing of cots and bedsteads are as follows: The cot or bed is first classified, to determine its condition; those found to be beyond repair are salvaged, others which are suitable for repair are sent to the bed-repair shop. The repairs here consist of replacing worn-out or missing springs or parts and welding of any part in need of same. They are then sent to the paint shop for spray painting, inspection, and banding, making them ready for shipment.

In the repairing of the desks, field, fiber, company, and headquarters, the operations consist of classifying, repairing, and replacing of broken or missing parts, painting, inspection, and wrapping for shipment. These operations are done in one building, on a belt system, which has proven highly effective.

The bed-repair shop started production during the middle of the month of April, setting an average of 1,000 cots repaired per week for the month; production not having reached its expectation due to the lack of personnel and equipment; personnel at the time consisting of an average of 115 general prisoners, 10 enlisted men supervisors, 3 civilian supervisors, and 1 superintendent. Incoming shipments of cots totaled 100,193 at the end of the month. The desk-repair shop still was in the process of being set up.

The following month production of cots raised to an average of 1,500 repaired per week, a slight increase in personnel accounting for this. No production was recorded this month in the desk repair shop as it was still being prepared for operation. Shipments of desks had started to arrive, and at the end of the month we had received 10,361. Cots and bedsteads had reached the total of 212,086 cots and 5,229 bedsteads.

At the end of the month of June production was under way in all of the combined clothing and equipment shops. This month the output for cots was an average of 2,500 repaired per week, and 100 per week for desks, repair shop lacking proper equipment, and personnel still limited. The June goal for the production of cots had been set for 1,000 repaired per day, falling short due to lack of material during the month, although towards the end of the month it was reached. The shipment of the repaired cots was begun, and shipments totaled 14,628 for the month. These shipments being made to the Montgomery ASF depot, Montgomery, Ala. The total incoming shipments of cots, bedsteads, and desks, respectively, were 281,850, 7,351, 10,945. Personnel now averaged 140 general prisoners, 10 enlisted men supervisors, 6 civilian supervisors, and 1 superintendent.

12. SUPERVISOR OF PRISONERS

The supervisor of prisoners is responsible for the discipline, housing, messing, clothing, and job assignment of all prisoners. In order to accomplish these functions efficiently, the department is divided into five sections: (a) Administrative section, (b) operating section, (c) work assignment section, (d) personal property section, (e) mail inspection section.

(a) Administrative section: This section is composed of the supervisor of prisoners, the assistant supervisor of prisoners, and such enlisted personnel as is necessary to maintain proper records, publish memorandums and directives pertaining to the general activities and conduct of the prison population, maintain court records, and receive and complete initial processing of prisoners upon arrival at this institution.

(b) Reception company: The reception company processes all newly arrived prisoners. They furnish the initial issue of clothing, commissary items, arrange for processing and medical and dental examinations. The normal period of a prisoner's assignment for this company is 30 days, and within this period all necessary interviews and board hearings are given by the various sections. Upon completion of the reception period, the prisoner is assigned to a regular company, in accordance with the recommendations made by the various boards.

(c) Discipline: Punishment for infractions of the rules and regulations is imposed by a disciplinary board composed of the supervisor of prisoners, the psychiatrist, and a line officer with practical military experience, and operating under the provisions of ASF Circular No. 382, dated October 10, 1945.

(d) Operating section: All personnel assigned to duty within the compound come under the supervision of the supervisor of prisoners. For administrative, supply, and security purposes the compound is subdivided into three areas or blocks, namely, blocks A, B, and C, and the cell-block section. Each block is divided up into companies of 160 to 240 prisoners each, with separate messes, supply and orderly rooms for each company. The barracks are of the army two-story type and equipped with double-decker beds. The operating personnel of each block consists of the following: Block commander, executive officer, and supply-mess officer; block sergeant major, assistant sergeant major, supply sergeant, mail sergeant, and two block gate guards (0600 to 2200). Each company during the day has a first sergeant, executive noncommissioned officer, supply sergeant, and mess sergeant. From 1630 to 0730 there are two shifts of guard supervisors with a noncommissioned officer in charge of each shift, who are distributed throughout the block for guard and supervisory purposes. Qualified prisoners are used as clerks in block and company headquarters, as well as cooks and KP's in the mess halls.

(e) Assignment section: The assignment section is under the immediate supervision of the supervisor of prisoners, and is responsible for the segregation of prisoners into the various custody classes. In addition to the above, it is the responsibility of this officer to assign prisoners to the job most suited for them, taking into consideration the recommendation of the Classification Board and various officers of this institution.

Card files are prepared listing Classification Board recommendations, and in addition they list the block and company to which each prisoner is assigned.

(f) Property and accounts: Upon arrival at this institution, all prisoners are required to deposit with the property and accounts officer all funds, postage stamps, and property in their possession that they are not permitted to retain while in confinement.

Additional funds are credited to the accounts of inmates on receipt of cash, money orders, or checks received through the mail or from other sources, such as visitors.

The average amount on deposit in this office is $10 per prisoner. About 20 percent of the inmates have less than $1 or no money credited to them.

All inmates may make withdrawals of funds for the purpose of transmittal to a dependent or authorized correspondent, payment of telegrams, subscriptions to magazines, correspondence courses, periodicals or newspapers, postage stamps, and the purchase of tobacco or similar articles in accordance with conduct grade of prisoner.

The cash balance of this fund as of June 30, 1946, is as follows:

Total receipts	$81,748.07
Total disbursements	66,573.94
Cash balance	15,174.13

Prisoners are interviewed upon arrival to determine the disposition of personal property they have in their possession.

All articles in the possession of a prisoner, upon arrival at this institution, not listed

above, may be stored with the Property and Accounts Office. In the event property is stored at this office, the prisoner is given a receipt listing all property held for him.

To date approximately 3,000 parcels have been sent home at the request of prisoners.

Prisoners are given opportunity bimonthly to submit a request for tobacco, stamps, and other authorized items to be purchased from funds on deposit, prior to June 15, 1946.

(g) Prisoner mail and inspection section: This section handles the checking of the mail, keeping records of all prisoners and other authorized correspondents, stamps and the prisoner's stamp account, recording all outgoing mail, inspecting of all mail, both incoming and outgoing, directing the mail through the proper channels for expeditious delivery, transmission of contraband to the proper authority and the inspections of all books, magazines, newspapers, etc., entering the compound. The following is a breakdown of all prisoner mail processed by this section:

Month	Incoming	Outgoing	Total
July	18,500	14,000	32,500
August	20,300	15,500	35,800
September	21,000	14,700	35,700
October	22,500	16,000	38,500
November	27,800	16,300	44,100
December	36,500	15,800	52,300
January	33,000	15,500	48,500
February	32,500	14,600	47,100
March	31,800	14,200	46,000
April	29,700	13,400	43,100
May	27,400	12,800	40,200
June	24,600	10,700	35,300

Inmates are authorized to correspond with four persons of their own choice, providing these correspondents are not inmates or former inmates of this or other institutions and providing that they are otherwise reputable and are of good character. All requests for authorized correspondents are accepted and approved at once, subject to a later investigation. Prisoners in the first conduct grade may write four letters per week, one of which may be at Government expense, and may receive as many as desired. Men in the second conduct grade are allowed to write only two letters per week but may receive all of their incoming mail. Men of the third conduct grade are restricted to sending and receiving one letter per week.

Gen. Mark Clark, Soldier and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, 1946, Gen. Mark W. Clark, whom history will record as one of America's greatest generals, was feted at Pittsburgh by Americans of Italian descent. Among those who spoke at the testimonial dinner was the Honorable Judge Michael A. Musmanno, of my city, now president judge of the current Nuremberg trial, who had served with the glorious Fifth Army in the various capacities of military governor, naval liaison officer with combat troops, and naval aide to General Clark. This speech is worthy of being made a permanent record in its tribute to an outstanding American, who at the present time is representing our Republic at London in the formation of a peace treaty with Austria. The speech follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, my friends, ladies and gentlemen, I will leave the more formal welcome to our guest of honor this evening, to the governor of the State, the Honorable Edward Martin, while I proceed to recall a few of the events which have made the name of Gen. Mark Clark one forever to conjure with when the valorous deeds of American heroes are recounted. We must at once go back to the summer of 1943, when the entire European continent was under the shadow of the greatest evil force that ever darkened human civilization. You will remember the war charts of the time, which displayed Axis territory in black ink, and that blackness blotted the entire map from the tip of Norway to the Black Sea—Germany, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece, Albania, Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland, Poland. And all within one fort, the German festung, one solid wall of armament defended by the mightiest war machine in recorded times. Ten million troops with the very latest model equipment in tanks, planes, artillery, rocket guns, mines, torpedoes. For three years the Allies had suffered one defeat after another, the British Army had been driven from the Continent. There was one master, and that was the maniacal Adolf Hitler.

On September 9, 1943, a day that shall be forever memorable, the United States challenged that mastery. In the dawn of that day the American Fifth Army landed on the fiery beaches of Salerno and attacked the Hitler wall. The Fifth Army attacked from the flat sandy shores against an enemy lodged in the mountains, it attacked an enemy that could count on vast reserves and did so; it attacked against an enemy that, flushed with victory, did not know defeat. And that attack was led by one of the greatest soldiers America has produced, and the very man we honor ourselves by honoring this evening, Gen. Mark Wayne Clark.

The Allies at last were on the Continent. Hitler's boast that not an American or British soldier could remain 24 hours in Europe was set at defiance.

In a fire and brimstone order of the day, Hitler fulminated that at all costs the Fifth Army must be thrown back from the beaches and destroyed as the men might try to reembark in the landing craft they had so rashly brought to these shores. This American general who dares so much must be taught to appreciate with whom he is dealing.

After preliminary attacks on September 12 against our Sixth Corps, the main enemy strength unleashes itself on the 13th in a drive through the Forty-fifth Division and down the corridor formed by the Sele and Calore Rivers. He has advantage in position and mobility. Tanks followed by infantry carried in half tracks concentrate quickly and break through our line at Altavilla, they drive the British out of Battipaglia. Our left flank is exposed. The enemy drive us from the tobacco factory at Eboli, which commands the principal enemy supply routes. We are pushed back at this point 1½ miles. The enemy can now put his main forces across the Sele River.

He rolls on relentlessly down the lower corridor, pushing on toward the sea. The situation is critical, our line has been dented, even pierced. In his jeep the Army commander speeds from sector to sector. He dismounts, enters the front lines, confers with unit commanders, he gets down into the foxholes with the men. He talks to them, tells them what this means. To give way now is to lose all that has been already gained.

The general's appearance encourages, comforts, and emboldens. News of his presence spreads like wildfire. The enemy attacks. They meet a wall of fire. Units which spearhead the advance are cut to pieces by the defending forces.

General Clark has now climbed to the summit of Mount Chirico. Standing on the exposed knoll he sees a column of 18 enemy tanks less than 1,000 yards away. Once they pass through the gateway of the hill mass they will meet only flat, treeless country. If they are not stopped they can carry everything before them to the very water's edge. There is no defense artillery in the area. Clark knows of a tank destroyer at a turn in the road 3 kilometers to the rear. With his aide, he tears down the hill, leaps into his jeep, and starts for the weapon. He finds the tank destroyer and orders the operator to follow him.

He places the tank destroyer and it goes into action, and the first German tank is ablaze as it rolls over on its side. Six more tanks quickly receive the same treatment. The enemy believes it has run into a concentrated defense position, and withdraws.

Dusk is falling, the line is safe for the day, but reinforcements are imperatively needed. At the bottom of the hill the Army commander stops before a portable wireless outfit and sends a message crackling.

That evening he stands beside his jeep studying the sky filled with a thousand Mediterranean stars. But he looks for something not so stationary, nor so distant. The orchestra of the guns rumbles a bass accompaniment to his troubled thoughts.

Suddenly he fixes his gaze on something moving in the heavens. The object silhouetted against the silver canopy above grows larger, from it something now falls—a tiny black dot which suddenly spreads white wings. Slowly and gracefully it descends. Then another drops from the same plane and still another. More planes are presently overhead, hundreds of them, and thousands of white umbrellas are gracefully nearing the earth. The Airborne Infantry that he called for has arrived. His lines will be reinforced for the morrow, and he will attack at dawn. For this extraordinary exploit in courage, resourcefulness, and determination, General Clark was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

On September 15, General Clark declared: "We have arrived at our initial objective. Our beachhead is secure, and we are here to stay. Not one foot of ground will be given up."

Since that time, the Fifth Army never relinquished a foot of ground. It suffered some temporary dislocation but never was ground taken from it by the enemy held by the enemy for more than 48 hours.

Driving irresistibly through the mountains, the Fifth Army liberated Italy October 1 and gave a shattered but still usable seaport to the Allies. General Clark now lifted his strategic binoculars on Rome. We crossed the Volturno but at Cassino, bloody Cassino, we were stopped. This mountain village, which later featured so largely in the world press, stood astride Highway 6 like an armored giant, and absolutely barred passage to the north.

In the mightiest aerial bombardment yet felt by a single town, Cassino was levelled until now one walks through it as through a graveyard after an earthquake, but the mountainous bastion still held. General Clark was compelled to read in the rock summits before him the story that Rome had never fallen from a southern attack.

The three stars on the young general's shoulder straps carried a firmament of responsibility. Peoples in all parts of the globe looked to him for the liberation of the Eternal City, for as Rome belongs to all nations, its enslavement meant holding all peoples in a measure of bondage to the foe. Up to this time, not an Axis capital had been reached. Germany held all of continental Europe save a small portion of Italy. An advance was imperative. Yet there stood the flinty barriers, each rocky crag mounted with a light weapon the equivalent in strength of an infantry battalion.

The fact that Hannibal had failed in a similar venture, as had other supergenerals, did not comfort General Clark. The way

must be found. Reverting to the good old American game of football, he made an end run. He landed at Anzio, and by securing this beachhead, Clark in effect held a dagger ever threatening the German right flank and causing the enemy to divert his forces in an attempt to ward off the stab.

The Anzio landing was a success. For the second time our guest of honor had successfully broken into Hitler's fortress Europe. Putting the enemy in the position of having constantly to look over his shoulder, General Clark now prepared for the final operation, the breakthrough to Rome.

On May 11, at 11 o'clock at night, the German forward wall burst into flame, and the offensive was on. We were on our way to Rome. Time will not permit the relating of that brilliant Rome campaign, when we destroyed four German divisions and seriously mauled five more. The Fourteenth German Army became an army in name only.

On June 4, Mark Wayne Clark entered the outer zone of his long-dreamed-of objective. From housetops and street corners snipers fired at the oncoming Yanks. The tall, angular Army commander was a conspicuous target. Bullets whizzed over his head. The General, without insignia, and wearing his customary paratrooper's tan boots and his shirt open at the collar, strode forward.

At last. Rome is Clark's, and being Clark's is the world's. The first Axis capital is freed, now there is certainty that Nazi domination will be destroyed everywhere. It can be done. Here is proof. Hitler wished more than anything else to hold Rome. But with the Stars and Stripes now fluttering proudly from the Campidoglio, Hitler and Hitlerism are doomed.

Though Rome is now liberated and safe, the main object of the Army commander has not yet been fulfilled. He has set out to destroy the enemy armed forces in Italy. He has dealt them a crippling blow, but they still live. Kesselring's army, staggering from the punches of the 24-day offensive, has reeled across the Tiber and is madly racing for the next natural defense barrier.

Up the entire Italian Peninsula are mountains, mountains, mountains. As soon as one towering hill mass is achieved, another looms immediately behind it. And on the summit of each flinty peak a German artillery or machine-gun unit is waiting for the Yanks. It is enough to discourage any soldier. It is almost like trying to level the waves of the sea.

Farmhouses, villages, and towns, as if they had climbed to escape some rising flood, are almost without exception situated atop hills. And practically every habitation, every type of building is constructed of stone, all of which the foe uses as natural fortifications against us.

It takes an army with a set purpose, a high resolve, and a good-natured disposition too, to operate under such discouraging conditions. And this army has the right kind of a commander, one who is constantly concerned about their welfare, one who sees to it that they have the right kind of clothing, the best food obtainable under the circumstances, and the highest quality of equipment and guns.

The German Army re-forms, reorganizes. It fights desperately and loses at Viterbo, it disputes bitterly the ground at Pisa, it battles tenaciously at Leghorn, but it is compelled to relinquish even that important port. Supplies can now be landed in this large harbor, as badly smashed as it is from our bombing and from German demolitions.

Kesselring now withdraws to the Gibraltar of his defenses, the famous Gothic line. One hundred and ten miles in length, it built man-made obstacles into natural mountain barriers until it seemed that at last Hitler could save his armies in Italy and continue to keep them supplied from the rich Po Valley to the north.

September 9, 1944, was the first anniversary of Salerno day. At the celebration which marked the anniversary, I saw General Clark and there was nothing in his manner to suggest that he had any apprehensions about the attack which was to begin the next day. With thousands of GI's, he applauded the boxing of Joe Louis, international heavyweight champion, who had been brought in to entertain the boys. The next morning at 3 o'clock, the Fifth Army jumped off, and in a punch reminiscent of Joe Louis, sent Kesselring staggering away from his immediate front line.

It had been with some accuracy stated that the whole bottom of the German position in Europe reposed on the German Army in northern Italy. Clark prepared to knock out that bottom.

He smashed through the Gothic line and faced his antagonist at Bologna. During the winter of 1944–45, the Italian theater became known as the Forgotten Front. Men fought and froze in the mountains, but the tactical situation was described elsewhere as a stalemate. During that period, I saw front-line service with the Eighty-fifth Infantry Division, the Legnano Combat Group, and the Nine Hundred and Eighty-fifth Field Artillery, and I was not aware of any stalemate. The air was constantly vocal with artillery projectiles going and coming, fire fights were ever continuing, patrols went out every night, and prisoners came back from the enemy with valuable information.

From the Adriatic to the Tyrrhenian Sea, the soldiers of the American Fifth and British Eighth Armies prepared for the day when General Clark, now commander in chief of all Allied troops in Italy, should give the word which would send the mighty host northward to smash and destroy for all time the German Armies on Italian soil.

The first blow of the campaign was struck on April 2. Nineteen days later we entered Bologna. The city was hysterical in greeting. The city which the Germans for 6 months held against our every effort to enter was now ours. But there is no time for rejoicing. The enemy must be completely destroyed. He is now fleeing northward, but from time to time he stops and viciously counterattacks. Our many columns, however, press on.

At last we are on the banks of the Po, the mighty Po, the so-distant Po, the river which had seemed so unattainable, the river which was to be the Nazis' defiant stand, and across which we were never to pass. The enemy demolishes the bridges and expects to make a defense line of the river, but our engineers throw a pontoon span across the tawny flood. General Clark is happy. As he crosses the stream on the low-hung bridge, he stops to bathe his hands in the water, a little ceremony of sentiment. His fondest desire is crystalizing into reality. The enemy is being driven out of Italy, and more than that, his armies are being annihilated. Hordes of the green-gray figures, they who were to dominate the world, are moving southward, their original direction, but this time not as conquerors, but as prisoners. A German major comes up to me and asks to surrender. I ask him, "Where's your battalion?" He replies that he has no battalion, and I tell him, "Well, a Navy commander will not accept the surrender of a major without his battalion. You had better report to a corporal." And so I turn him over to a two-striper, who takes him in tow.

The German generals still order their troops to fight on. Frantically they are trying to get through to the Austrian Alps, there to resist in the stronghold which Hitler is to maintain against the world for decades, if necessary, he says.

One by one those cities rich in story, romance, and beauty are liberated. Mantua, Genoa, Padua, Cremona, La Spezia, Parma, Como, Verona, Pavia, Milan, Turin, Venice. The Italian partisans are out in full number. They who had been fighting for so long in the mountains are now out in the open, fighting the enemy forward lines. Clark has been encouraging them, for a long time supplying them with ammunition and equipment.

On April 30, General Clark announces that the German forces in Italy are no longer an organized army. The country is entirely in our hands, from Sicily to Brenner, from the French border to Trieste. There is nothing more for the proud German generals to do but surrender, and they do this completely and unconditionally.

It is my privilege and pride to be present when General von Senger enters General Clark's field headquarters to surrender all the German land forces. General Clark, in shirt sleeves and green neck scarf, receives the surrender.

La Guerra in Italia e' finita!

General Clark, there is nothing we can say which can add to the pride which must be yours in having liberated Italy, the land of the Caesars, the Michelangelos, the Garibaldis, the land of the forefathers of ten millions of us Americans. Yours was the most difficult of all operations in the entire war, and the greatness of your achievements in Italy have caused us to overlook somewhat the great work performed by you prior to the Italian campaign. We may overlook, but we cannot forget that you were deputy commander to General Eisenhower in planning the whole North African campaign. We cannot forget that it was you who went by submarine through enemy controlled waters to land on enemy patrolled shores to deal with the French, so as to save the lives of tens of thousands of American lads then on the ocean. Who can forget that dramatic exploit which had all the aspects of a detective mystery thriller; how, while you were dealing with the French, the Vichy police arrived and you had to hide in the cellar, how one of your party coughed and you stopped up his mouth with chewing gum. Every schoolboy knows that tale, which for melodrama surpasses anything that fiction has to offer.

His men have faith in him because they know he takes his chances with them and always looks after their welfare and comfort. To Clark, men are never expendable. Those who accompanied him on the submarine venture to north Africa said that Clark had two principal preoccupations throughout that entire exploit: First, the success of the mission, and, second, the safety of his men. His own security was a later consideration.

At Anzio, when an ammunition truck exploded during an air raid, General Clark ran to the aid of the wounded British driver who had crawled from the truck and lay beside the flaming vehicle.

During the fighting Mrs. Clark naturally worried about her husband and his narrow escapes, so she wrote him like a good wife, expressing the wish that he not visit the front every day. In characteristic humorous fashion, he wrote back, "You fry the pork chops and I'll run the Army." Clark never complained that the people back home were not doing enough. As a matter of fact, he was always grateful for their sacrifices.

We may talk about General Clark, fete him, and honor him, but no tribute can surpass that which I saw in Sorrento. While Military Governor of the Sorrentine Peninsula, I was visiting one day the various charitable institutions. At Capo di Sorrento is located the home for the aged. In time of peace the aged draw aid from the community, but in time of war they are at the mercy of fate. I stopped at this ospizio. A crippled, withered old man of about 90 hobbled up to me and inquired, "Are you an American?" When I replied in the affirmative, he asked if I knew General Clark. I

replied that I did, that I was attached to the Fifth Army. He said, "Come with me."

In a moment the tree-shaded yard was filled with several score of as old and forgotten a group of human nondescripts as you can imagine, all chattering and inquiring in quavering, nonmusical tones. But through all that trembling cacophony, one heard, "Il Generale Clark, il Generale Clark." The little leader led me to a little chapel of wood and stone. We stooped to enter the interior, dark but for the light produced by two or three candles flickering at a shrine on the wall. Within the shrine appeared a faded newspaper picture of General Clark. "Eccolo!" exclaimed the old man. "Il nostro benedetto benefatore, il Generale Clark." At that moment a nun came in, her wide, white bonnet enclosing an open, intelligent, and kindly face. I bowed to her and she said, "Commander, 2 months ago this place was to have closed its doors. In the war we were completely forgotten. There was absolutely no food, not a crumb of bread. The inmates were ready to throw themselves from the cliffs because they could not return to the city, where starvation was inevitable. One of our sisters saw your great General Clark at Sorrento and told him the story, and the next day a truckload of food arrived. He saved the lives of these poor people, and now the Commune has taken up our support again. But had it not been for General Clark, this haven of refuge for the homeless and forgotten would have ceased to exist. He must be a great and kind man and we shall never forget what he is doing for our poor mutilated Italy."

General Clark, the gratitude of that nameless and humble little community is only a symbol of the admiration and veneration with which you are regarded throughout Italy. We Americans of Italian descent here join with that group and, in the chapel of our memories we also have fashioned a little shrine of admiration, and if you will permit, of affection too, for:

The noblest soldier of the day,
The greatest Roman of them all,
The man we in Pittsburgh are privileged to call our friend, Gen. Mark Wayne Clark.

Army Court-Martial System Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a statement I made on January 17, 1947, with reference to court-martial trial of a constituent of mine, Pvt. Joseph A. Marques, of Lynn, Mass.:

The Army identifies him by the number on his "dog tags."

I prefer to call this American by his name—Joseph A. Marques, of Lynn, Mass.

This young man never had a police record in civilian life. In fact, he had just turned 18 years of age, when he entered the service. When his "hitch" was up, he was honorably discharged and given a good-conduct medal. He reenlisted and was sent to Austria as a member of the Nine Hundred and Forty-sixth Military Police.

While engaged in an altercation and defending himself against an armed Russian, his gun was accidentally discharged, killing an Austrian civilian.

He was accused of murder.

He was tried, not by a jury of his peers, for no men in the ranks are permitted to serve on a military court martial. Officers alone qualify as prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, judge, and jury.

In this star chamber type of proceedings, the scales of justice are tipped against any enlisted man.

Joseph A. Marques, American, is a victim of this antiquated and unjust system.

He has been convicted, given a dishonorable discharge, and sentenced to be confined at hard labor for the rest of his natural life.

And who were the witnesses against this soldier of ours? An Austrian civilian, an Austrian doctor, and other Austrian officials so recently enemies of everything American.

It would appear that our officers, trying to impress the Austrians with their fairness, leaned too far backward, seeing only the Austrian side of the case, and ignoring the rights of a mere enlisted man.

The unfortunate incident took place on December 11, 1946, long after the war had ended and long after the time when an arbitrary military trial could be justified. The officer class, however, is reluctant to surrender its special powers and privileges. In their eyes, the men in the ranks who must forever "sir" them, command less respect than civilians of another nation who are beyond their authority. Americans will endure this onerous system in time of war but not in time of peace.

In justice to Joseph A. Marques, I am asking the War Department to review his case and grant a new trial; this time an open one, where the American people will have a chance to know all the facts.

Furthermore, I believe that the Congress should ask for a thorough airing of the Army's court-martial set-up. Enlisted men must be permitted to sit on juries which try enlisted men, so that the men in the ranks will get a fair break.

Ask any one of the millions of veterans about this, and you will get the very definite opinion that reform is needed.

Cuban Sugar Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Independent Retail Food Dealers Association of Western Maryland:

Whereas for the past several years a very large part of the Cuban sugar crop has been allocated and shipped to foreign countries, such shipments amounting, in 1946, to 1,600,000 tons of the total 3,800,000 available for allocation by the Combined Food Board; and

Whereas Cuba is not only the major foreign source of sugar supply for the United States, but this country has, since 1902, acted to advance and maintain the economic stability of Cuba, which stability largely depended upon her sugar exports to the United States; and

Whereas, as a result of such allocations, it has been necessary to require heavy sacrifices on the part of American consumers and to impose a rigid system of rationing, which control is still in effect more than 18 months after VJ-day; and

Whereas, prior to the inauguration of such arrangements, these countries were accustomed to paying prices for sugar which, in the typical case of Yugoslavia, were more than three times (13.86 cents per pound) the prices of Cuban sugar (3.84 cents per pound), which premium encouraged maximum production on the part of such countries; and

Whereas the socialist and communist states of Europe are not likely to decree or plan for increased domestic production of sugar so long as Cuban sugar is available to them at prices far below what they are accustomed to paying and far below the minimum necessary to bring about increased production; and

Whereas for the reasons stated the allocation of nearly one-half the Cuban crop for export amounts to an unnecessary subsidy to the recipients of such relief at the expense of American consumers: Be it

Resolved, That the appropriate authorities in Washington be urged to notify the various countries to which Cuban sugar has been allocated in the past that no allocation will be made at this time, and that if and when additional allocation is made, same will be drastically reduced; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be requested to interest itself in this situation to the end that more Cuban sugar may be made available to American consumers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman J. GLENN BEALL, Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, and Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR.

H. R. 1000 Recognizes the Right of Each American Prisoner of War To Obtain Justice on His Individual Claim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in response to a resolution adopted by the Forty-seventh National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I introduced H. R. 1000, providing for the establishment of a claims commission to examine and render final decisions on all claims by American nationals who were members of the armed forces of the United States and who were prisoners of war of Germany, Italy, or Japan.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert at this time an article by Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which clearly describes the basis for this proposed legislation and also discusses the salient features in the bill. Mr. Ketchum's article is as follows:

INHUMANE TREATMENT OF POW'S—DOES IT GIVE RISE TO INTERNATIONAL CIVIL LIABILITY?

(By Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States)

The veterans of Foreign Wars has asked the Congress to enact legislation which would set up a claims commission to examine and render decisions on claims of former prisoners of war against Germany, Italy, and Japan based on violations of the Geneva Prisoners-of-War Convention.

The VFW bill, H. R. 1000, introduced by Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT (Republican, Pennsylvania) on January 13, 1946, represents months of research and study

on the part of its National Rehabilitation Service and National Legislative Service. More than anything it was without precedent because it represents a changing concept in international civil law, based on the violation of a treaty between nations then at peace. The treaty in question is the Geneva Convention—an international agreement, the original purpose of which was to improve the condition of wounded soldiers of armies in the field. The agreement was originally drafted at Geneva in 1864 but was later replaced by the Convention of July 6, 1906, which was also adopted at Geneva. The latter is the one known as the Geneva Convention and was accepted by 35 nations, only Turkey, Salvador, Bolivia, Venezuela, Nicaragua and Colombia abstaining. The Geneva Convention was confirmed in the Hague Convention of 1907 with the avowed intention of the signatory powers that the regulations dealing with treatment of prisoners were no longer in the discretion of such powers, but were binding on them.

Briefly then, here are the articles which Germany and Japan, particularly the latter, both signatories of the convention, are guilty o. violating. The considered opinion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the violations of these articles gives rise to international civil liability, is the basis for this bill.

"ART. 4. They (prisoners of war) must be humanely treated * * * personal belongings * * * remain their property.

"ART. 7. Prisoners of war shall be treated as regards food, clothing, and quarters on the same footing as the troops of the government which has captured them."

In addition the following prohibitions were also placed by the Hague regulations on the means of injuring the enemy:

"To kill or wound treacherously individuals belonging to the hostile nation or army.

"To kill or wound an enemy who, having laid down arms or having no longer means of defense, has surrendered at discretion.

"To declare that no quarter will be given.

"To make improper use of a flag of truce."

The repeated violations of the above articles and regulations by responsible functionaries of the Imperial Japanese Government and the German Wehrmacht have been recounted so often as not to bear repetition here. The victorious powers seized upon these violations as the basis for criminal indictments. Hundreds of Nazi and Japanese officers, noncommissioned officers, prison and concentration camp officials have already been convicted and executed pursuant to the judgment of international tribunals and army-of-occupation courts; many more are awaiting indictment and trial.

The international world-state is thus exacting the debt owed it by those who flaunted the laws which bound nations to the perpetuation of a peaceful world society. What then of the rights of the individual? Is the exacting of a debt for a crime against the state ipso facto a settlement of the debt owed the individual whose injury represented the crime? No system of jurisprudence of civilized nations recognizes such debt identity as between civil and criminal liability. When A assaults B, the state punishes A for a crime against the people. However, B has a cause of action arising out of the assault based upon a denial of a basic right in B of security of his person. What, then, of the right of Corporal A, who was permanently maimed by Captain B, a sadistic prison commandant? Captain B has been imprisoned by an international war tribunal. Does it follow then that Corporal A's injury is without remedy as against Captain B and/or the state he served? As the legal classicists so aptly put it—is it a case of damnum absque injuria (an injury without damages)?

Take the case of X Corporation, an American concern doing a thriving business in Manila on December 7, 1941. The initial Japanese aerial attack destroyed the property of X Corporation with damages estimated at $200,000. Y Corporation was an American concern doing business in Tokyo. Y Corporation was seized by Japanese authorities. Estimated loss to stockholders residing in the United States is approximately $100,000. The termination of hostilities finds millions of dollars of Japanese property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian. Who has the first claim against this property? The stockholders of X and Y Corporation, who seek to recoup their property loss, or Corporal A, who will never walk again because of brutal treatment at the hands of his captors and Private M, who will never see again because of a starvation diet in Camp O'Donnel?

The question is a timely one because the Mixed Claims Commission set up after World War I recognized the recoupment of losses arising out of property damage. Also late in the Seventy-ninth Congress several bills were introduced which sought damages for American nationals and corporate interests based on property damage.

At first glance this concept represents a callous indifference to American prisoners of war whose bodies were brutally maimed and broken in defense of the Nation and, incidentally, the property of American nationals. Actually, the glaring disparity in value appreciation goes much deeper. International agreement with respect to prisoner-of-war treatment is relatively new in the history of warring nations. However, the pattern of exacting tribute and reparations from defeated countries has existed since that time "when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary." No thought has been given then by enlightened nations to the consideration of reparations or confiscated enemy property as the means whereby these former prisoners of war might satisfy a claim for damages based on the violation of an agreement solemnly entered into by the nations concerned. The failure to heretofore appreciate this new concept of civil liability—as well as criminal liability—must be attributed to the mass thinking of enlightened nations which submerges the individual in the world-state though tending to dignify him in the national state.

The forty-seventh national encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in September 1946 sought for the first time to attach the right of the individual, as well as nations, in the enforcement of international treaties. This, then, is the basis for the VFW's bill relating to prisoner-of-war claims, which without precedent, yet supported by the fundamental precepts of Anglo-Saxon and Roman law, seeks to create a right for individual damages arising out of treaty violations. The exacting of a penalty in criminis from individuals has materially strengthened the position of exacting a penalty in civilis from the States as principals to the agent individual violators.

The June 30, 1944, annual report of the Alien Property Custodian reveals that the total value of enemy property in the United States is $567,000,000 and the value of property vested in the Alien Property Custodian is approximately $200,000,000. The VFW bill would set up a claims commission to which this property would be transferred and deposited in German or Japanese special deposit accounts. The commission would adjudicate and render final decisions on claims of former prisoners of war based on violations of the Geneva Convention respecting prisoner-of-war treatment.

The figures of the War and Navy Departments reveal that a total of approximately 32,000 prisoners were in the hands of the Japanese, about 12,000 of whom died in captivity; and approximately 100,000 prisoners in the hands of the Germans, about 1,000 of whom died in captivity. Many of the deaths resulted from wounds received previously in action while on the other hand many deaths resulted from brutal and inhumane treatment at the hands of the captors. Certain limited survivors of those dying as a result of inhumane treatment would be permitted to file a claim before the Commission in behalf of the deceased. This distinction is necessary because the damages sought rest on treaty violations; which would not serve the cases of the survivors of those who died as the result of action against the enemy. The latter's remedy must continue to rest with the nation the deceased served.

An agent would be appointed by the President through whom all claims would be processed. The evidence already on file in the War and Navy Departments which was used as the basis for criminal indictments against the war criminals would be available to the Commission in adjudicating the claims. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, should this bill be enacted, proposes setting up a special bureau in its national rehabilitation service under Director George E. Ijams to handle claims on behalf of all former prisoners of war who institute claims for damages against the offending nations.

The administrative costs, as well as the awards approved by the Commission, would be borne by the special deposit accounts established with enemy property in possession of the United States. The bill provides that damages awarded by the Commission would have preference over the claims of nationals and corporate interests for damages due to property damage. Should these special deposit accounts be insufficient to pay these claims, then the bill provides that the deficit shall constitute a lien on reparations from the nation concerned.

Should the Congress enact this legislation a great and notable step will have been made in the recognition of the dignity of the individual in the world state. Such a law would strengthen the foundation of international common law—a corpus juris for the individual in our "one world," the cornerstone of which foundation was so dramatically laid at Nuremburg in October 1946.

Speech of Hon. Katharine St. George, of New York, at a Dinner Given by the Washington Editors in Honor of General Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech I made January 27, 1947, before a meeting of trade journal editors held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

When I first ran for public office, I wanted to state as simply and clearly as possible my thoughts and convictions on the vital questions of the day.

With the help of some trusted advisers, we drew up a 12-plank platform, so that I could clearly define my position. And so that everyone would know, if they cared to, how I stood on vital issues.

The sixth and seventh planks in this platform referred to labor and management and I would like to talk a little about them:

6. I favor all of labor's hard-won gains, and hope and believe that labor will go even further in its march forward. The ultimate goal is to have every union member a capitalist.

7. I believe management and labor have an equal responsibility to the consuming public, and that it is the Government's responsibility to prevent development of disputes that jeopardize public rights and services.

We know and must acknowledge that labor unions are responsible for the greatly improved living and working conditions under which their members live and work today. My industry is the coal industry, and I am therefore going to take it as my example. Anyone who went through the anthracite region in Pennsylvania 30 years ago and revisits it today must admit that it is like comparing daylight to darkness, and the union can rightly take credit for this improvement in living conditions today.

It may sound farfetched to say that you want to see every union member a capitalist, but it is happening under our very eyes.

Why cringe at the mention of capitalism? I venture to say that every one of us in this room is a capitalist.

The United States is the greatest and best example of capitalism in the world today. No one need be ashamed of the name. On the contrary, we should go out and convert the whole world to capitalism, just as the Communists go out and try to convert the world to communism, and for that they deserve our admiration. They have the crusading spirit which we unfortunately have lost. We must regain it if we are to survive. We must recruit more adherents to our cause.

We can well point to our achievements. The highest standard of living in the world. The greatest per capita wealth. The greatest program of free, higher education in the world. And finally that this Nation has never lost a war, and that in the last 35 years it has twice saved its allies in two world wars, turning defeat into victory.

All this has been achieved under the American capitalist system. The only system under which free enterprise, and free labor can exist. And for these reasons we want all our people, union and nonunion, to become capitalists.

The second thought is that now that labor has come of age, now that it has its full strength, certain restrictions must be enforced, and certain self-discipline must be practiced. This lesson had to be taught to management and they learned it the hard way.

You all know of the gentleman who said publicly, "The public be damned." We all know that today no one, however brash, would dare make such a remark.

Labor leaders today, in some instances, have acted as though they felt that the public could be kicked around with impunity.

Who, and what is the public? The public is the majority of the workers in the United States, and they are not members of unions.

There are about 15,000,000 people belonging to labor unions, if we accept the CIO's reputed 6,000,000 members. Many experts consider this figure too high.

There are outside of union members and agricultural laborers 32,820,000 workers in the country today. These independent workers are the public, and they have their rights and under our system our Government must see and must insist that their rights are safeguarded and that they, too, shall have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

For that reason our Government has a solemn duty to prevent the lives, livelihoods, and existence of the public from being jeopardized.

We have now developed two strong giants that owe their existence to capitalism and nothing else. They are management, representing free enterprise, and the union, representing free labor. Now, our task is to coordinate them, and here Government must play its part with justice and impartiality, so that it can function as the arbiter trusted by both management and labor to such an extent that they will submit to arbitration.

Thus we will perfect and strengthen what we have built. Thus we can and we must take another step forward in the epic of America.

New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Walter H. Van Hoesen, president of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, Inc., at the annual dinner of the association held at the Roosevelt Hotel on Tuesday evening, January 14, 1947:

Members of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, Inc., have honored me with election as their president for the coming year. Needless to say I will make every effort to justify their confidence and it shall be my purpose to try to increase the cooperative effort which has always marked our relation with every other group in the field of transportation.

It seems most appropriate at this gathering of more than 1,000 men representing every branch of foreign trade to dwell for a moment on a few of the problems which confront us today.

The year just ended has seen a tremendous upturn in world commerce. Exports from the United States reached a total of nearly $8,800,000,000 and imports were more than $4,000,000,000. In 1947, a further increase which may reach $11,000,000,000 for exports and $6,000,000,000 for imports, is predicted. When you stop to think that almost half the Nation's foreign trade passes through the port of New York, it will be understood why we should give thought to properly guarding and caring for what is really the very lifeblood of this great city.

Foreign trade has been carried on during the last year under very great difficulty. We, freight forwarders and brokers, have been aware of the problems perhaps more than any others, because it is our job to arrange and see to the execution of all details incidental to transportation of goods from supplier to consumer. Steamship operators, railroads, truckmen, and other groups have each had their own particular headaches, but forwarders and brokers have been confronted with an accumulation of all the ills attacking foreign trade.

If New York is to retain its position as the leading port of the world, steps must be taken to prevent recurrence of the paralyzing succession of strikes which hampered activities in 1946. Steps must be taken without delay to relieve the congestion on piers and at rail terminals. Docking facilities and the handling of cargoes must be modernized. The constant increase of shipping expenses must be halted.

The problems faced by all of us engaged in foreign trade are related and we shall all lose if there is a bottleneck anywhere along the line. It has been the practice in the past, for each group, to seek solution of its problems without particular thought or regard to the over-all picture. The time has come when we must join forces for the common good and act through a central council or committee, if you will, to strive for better conditions.

The services performed by the freight forwarders and brokers are essential if our foreign trade is to prosper. In the past we have been blamed by the shipper whose goods could not be transported and even in Washington there has been a disposition to make our lot more difficult by seeking to regulate our activities. What we need and plead for is cooperation.

There is a tendency on the part of the Government, shippers and others to demand more and more in the way of services from freight forwarders, and at the same time to seek means of reducing our financial returns from such services.

I do not like to think what would happen to American goods abroad without the foreign freight forwarder. He maintains direct contacts in every part of the globe, and is constantly called on to advise on problems confronting shippers and transportation interests alike. In short, he helps to carry the flag and through his efforts American goods are known in all nations and to all people. I am happy to refer to the excellent patriotic services given by foreign freight forwarders in helping to transport essential materials and supplies through the recent war.

United States Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Army and Navy Journal, Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, United States Army, commanding general, United States forces, European theater, prepared the following article on the record of the United States Military Government in Germany. General McNarney has been in command of the United States Army forces over there since the appointment of General of the Army Eisenhower to be Chief of Staff of the Army. General McNarney soon will be relieved in Europe by Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, United States Army, and will take over his new duties as Army Air Force representative on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations.

General McNarney's authoritative report on the record and accomplishments of the United States Military Government in Germany is particularly valuable in light of the recent discussions and criticisms. It follows:

[From the Army and Navy Journal of January 18, 1947]

THE MISSION OF UNITED STATES MILITARY GOVERNMENT IN GERMANY

(By Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, commanding general, United States forces, European theater)

As we cross the threshold of a New Year, some 20 months after VE-day, it is time to take stock of the responsibilities, difficulties, and accomplishments of United States Military Government in Germany and to assess the progress that has been made toward the attainment of our objectives. The negative aspects of our occupational policies—demilitarization, denazification, decartelization,

and decentralization—are well on the way toward accomplishment. The second part of the task, now under way, is the long-term job of guidance of the German people in their economic, political, and social rehabilitation according to democratic principles.

Great strides have been made since May 1945, when once powerful Germany, now devastated, disorganized, and demoralized, became the charge of Military Government. Even before the guns had stopped firing, the Allies had set up local governmental machinery on a provisional basis. Shortly after VE-day each of the four occupying powers was assigned a zone of occupation and the Allied Control Authority was established in Berlin to deal with matters affecting all of Germany. The headquarters of United States Military Government was first located in Frankfurt and later moved to Berlin, while the headquarters of United States Army occupational forces was placed in Frankfurt.

Reconstruction in the United States zone began immediately. Lines of communication and transportation were gradually restored, and a limited industrial production was achieved. However, the German people were engaged primarily with the problems of obtaining food, fuel, and adequate housing. They were too apathetic and bewildered to be much concerned with more than their own personal security.

Food, which was the immediate problem in the early days, has remained of paramount concern. At the beginning of the occupation the official daily ration for adults was only 900 calories, palpably a starvation diet. The prescribed ration scale has been increased steadily for the past year and a half, until the present basic ration provides 1,550 calories for normal adult consumers and substantially more for heavy laborers and expectant and nursing mothers.

Even in the past, Germany had never been able to grow enough food for its people and with battle-torn fields and destroyed farm machinery is less able than ever to do so. In order to maintain the present ration standard, the United States has had to supply more than 1,000,000 metric tons of food to the United States occupied areas of Germany up to the end of 1946. To pay for these imports, Germany will necessarily have to build up exports of items which she can, and which we will allow her to produce. Only by such permissible exports can she obtain dollar credits with which to pay for her imports. Ultimately it is expected that the German Nation will achieve a level of economy which will make her independent of our support. Definite and measurable progress has been made in this direction with plans to export more than $100,000,000 worth of manufactured goods from the United States zone in 1947, representing an increase of more than 400 percent over the 1946 export level. These exports will consist primarily of toys, chinaware, light vehicles, musical instruments, cameras, and other goods of purely peaceful use, and dollar proceeds from them will be applied against the cost of bringing food and other vitally needed supplies into Germany. In keeping with the Potsdam Declaration, the control of German economy by military government will continue to the extent necessary to assure the production and maintenance of goods and services required to meet the needs of the occupying forces and displaced persons in Germany and essential to maintain in Germany average living standards not exceeding the average of standards of living of European countries.

At the beginning of our occupation German industry was throttled by a number of strictures, including shortages of coal, electric power, and raw materials and a lack of skilled laborers and adequate transportation. These deficiencies are gradually being overcome. The over-all industrial production in the United States zone, which was only about 26 percent of the 1936 level in January 1946, had risen to 44 percent of 1936 by the end of October. This progress represents, however, gains in heavy industries and not in lighter manufacturing. Increasing production in lighter manufacturing—the source of permitted exports—still remains of utmost importance.

Maximum possible industrial progress in the United States zone alone would not mean the revival of the German economy to the level envisaged by the signatories of the Potsdam Declaration to be the lowest on which Germany could survive peaceably. That level will be achieved only when Germany is treated as a single economic unit. An important effort toward making Germany self-supporting was made in July 1946, when the United States invited the other three occupying powers to join her in the economic unification of Germany. Great Britain responded to this invitation, and an agreement for economic unity of the United Kingdom and United States zones was signed in New York in early December by American Secretary of State Byrnes and British Foreign Secretary Bevin. Joint Anglo-American financing is to be made available over a 3-year period, with the expectation that at the end of this time the economy of the combined zones will have been sufficiently rehabilitated so as to make unnecessary further imports of food and supplies at the expense of American and British taxpayers. Bizonal administrations in economics, food and agriculture, communications, transportation, and trade and commerce are being conducted by German specialists under Anglo-American supervision.

Two-power cooperation is an auspicious beginning; four-power cooperation is our ultimate desire. The invitation to France and the Soviet Union remains open, and they are cordially welcome to participate with Anglo-Americans in abolishing the economic barriers still cutting Germany into three parts.

It has been constantly pointed out to the German people that the basic cause of their suffering and distress was the war which German militarism and nazism brought upon the world. It is crystal clear that Germany will have to do her part to repair the devastation wrought by her upon her neighbors. Germany's natural reconstruction has, therefore, been complicated by the need for reparations.

With respect to industrial plants allocated or designated for destruction in the United States zone prior to May 1946, 85 had been dismantled or destroyed by mid-November and 35,000 metric tons of equipment had been shipped to Allied Nations. Progress in delivery of reparations from the United States zone has not proceeded as was originally planned, owing to lack of quadripartite agreement on measures to effect economic unity. The levels of industry agreed upon by the Allies were based upon the assumption of economic unity and would have to be revised if one or more of the zones is forced to try to become self-sustaining without the mutual benefit of free economic interplay between all parts of Germany. Until it is clear that Germany is to be treated as an economic whole, all plants scheduled for reparations cannot be dismantled or destroyed. Some may have to be retained to supplement zonal capacity for self-existence.

The lack of four-power agreement on basic financial reforms has also impeded the economic recovery of Germany. There has been no common financial policy to control inflation, to revise the debt structure, and to place the nation on a sound fiscal footing.

We have taken every action possible to rehabilitate German finance in the United States zone. The Germans themselves, under our supervision, are undertaking a long-needed reform of their banking structure. Their guiding aim is to establish financial control in such a fashion as to make impossible the manipulation of public funds for the creation of a dictatorial and militaristic regime. External assets, carefully hidden throughout the world, have been sought out and blocked. The reckless Nazi fiat financing has been replaced by a conservative and realistic policy of heavy taxation and carefully controlled expenditures. The Nazi practices of barter and clearing and the system of blocked marks have been eliminated, and a beginning has been made toward the establishment of an acceptable system of foreign exchange. We have gone far beyond economic and fiscal reforms in Germany.

We have introduced democratic processes into the civil service, and have widened its basis to include all full-time government employees. We have encouraged the free and extensive growth of trade and labor unions. We have restored to the Germans the basic freedoms which have long been lost to them—freedom of thought and the freedoms of discussion and expression. Military government first purged the German press and radio of Nazi and antidemocratic forces and influence, and a rigid system of licensing was established. By the end of 1946, 44 newspapers, with a combined circulation of over 4,000,000, were licensed for printing in the United States areas of occupation. This number does not include Die Neue Zeitung with a circulation of over a million, which is the only overt American newspaper published in Germany. The German press is not subject to prepublication censorship and is free to publish any material "except Nazi and militarist propaganda and material constituting a malicious attack on military government or aiming to disrupt unity among the occupying powers." The German radio stations have been reestablished on a similar basis, with balanced educational and recreational programs.

The German school system has been partially reestablished; by the end of 1946 nearly all children of compulsory school age were again enrolled, despite lamentable overcrowding of classrooms. Serious difficulties with regard to classrooms, fuel, trained and acceptable teachers, and suitable textbooks still remain as some of our most difficult problems. Shortages in paper supply and inadequate printing facilities tend to aggravate the condition. Supplementing the formal education of German youth, personnel of both military government and the United States Army of Occupation, and their dependents, are participating in a broad-scale program of German youth activities.

One of the most important milestones in the rehabilitation of Germany was reached in January 1946, when the German people were permitted for the first time in many years to participate in free elections. Since that time every village, city, county, and state in the United States zone has elected its own governmental administrators, and German representatives of all three states meet together regularly in a zone-wide body, the council of states (Laenderrat), to discuss common problems. This organization constitutes the link between military government and the German states, and through this body proposals and recommendations are submitted to military government for consideration and approval. United States policy to decentralize German government has been carried out to the extent that each state has, for all practical purposes, autonomy within its own boundaries. During 1946, military government fulfilled its policy of turning back to the Germans themselves responsibilities for self-rule, until now only minimum supervision and control is exercised. Military government acts primarily in an advisory capacity. Direct administration of the United States zone by military government can be and, of course, will be reestablished at any time should the Germans stray from the path of democratic procedures on which they have been started. Constabulary

units of the United States Armed Forces are located at strategic points throughout the United States zone for the purpose of enforcing military government decisions and cooperating with the German civil police in preventing the rise and spread of lawless elements.

Four major political parties, representing degrees of political adherence from Communistic to conservative, are functioning freely in each state of the United States zone. It is encouraging, in this respect, to note that so far little tendency has arisen on the part of Germans to return to the conglomeration of minor, or "splinter," parties through which Germany's political strength was dissipated in the latter years of the Weimar Republic.

In July 1946 military government approved a recommendation from the Denazification Committee of the German Council of States to make discretionary the application of sanctions against youthful offenders (those born after January 1, 1919) except for those classified in either class I (war criminals) or class II (active Nazis) under the law fof liberation from national socialism and militarism. This general amnesty for the youths who were swayed by the insidious Nazi doctrine and ideology in their most impressionable years was based upon the knowledge that it was exactly this younger generation upon whom we and the Germans would have to depend for leadership in Germany in the future. By providing them with full opportunity for rehabilitation, military government was able to give heart to those forces which were anxious to get on with the job of instituting democracy in Germany. In this response of military government to the proposals of the German Council of States the give-and-take policy of our occupation has again been demonstrated, a policy which, in this instance and in many others, has redounded to the benefit of all concerned and has further promoted the inculcation of democratic procedures.

On Christmas Eve the amnesty was extended to other persons charged as followers whose income showed no evidence of profit from membership in the Nazi Party. To these nominal adherents to the Nazi Party we have given an opportunity to take an active, constructive role in rebuilding a peaceful Germany. The amnesty did not apply to members against whom specific evidence could be found to warrant their trial for war crimes, crimes against peace, and crimes against humanity.

It should not be assumed that this amnesty indicates any softening in our original determination to eradicate Nazi influence from the German Nation. Millions of personal and Nazi Party records have been examined, and countless numbers of Nazi adherents have been delivered to justice. The task has been difficult, and it is not yet completed. Except for major offenses against the statutes of the Geneva Convention, which fall within the jurisdiction of the theater judge advocate, and other major crimes, which come within the purvey of the Office of Military Government for Germany (United States), the denazification of the United States zone of Germany is now administered by special German courts (Spruchkammern) in each German state under the supervision of military government.

It may be a long time before Germany has been rehabilitated into a democratic state with a central government subject to the will of the people. We will not tire. We will work ceaselessly for quadripartite agreement on all issues which will contribute toward the creation of a German Nation who will never again threaten her neighbors and the peace of the world and who will take her place among the honorable and peace-loving nations of the world. The road back for the German people will be hard, but it is not the intention of the United States occupational policy to make it harder. As Secretary Byrnes stated in his Stuttgart speech of September 6, 1946: "The American people want peace. They have long since ceased to talk of a hard or soft peace for Germany. This has never been the real issue, what we want is a lasting peace. We will oppose harsh and vengeful measures which obstruct an effective peace. We will oppose soft measures which invite the breaking of the peace." The United States must honor her sacrifice in the winning of the war by staying in Germany until the job is done.

[From the Army and Navy Journal of January 18, 1947]

One has only to read the article by General McNarney in this issue of the Army and Navy Journal to realize the tremendous and far flung responsibilities which he has discharged so successfully in Europe. A number of the "visiting firemen" who made hurried trips to Germany came home with distorted notions of the conditions they found and it was the comments they made upon their return that brought forth the suggestion that a congressional investigation should be instituted. As time passed the responsible Members of Congress began to realize that our forces in Germany under command of General McNarney were doing an admirable job and that to emphasize the relatively few blunders, shortcomings, and crimes, which were being corrected as soon as discovered, would create an impression in Europe which would damage the prestige of our troops and even the dignity of the United States in the eyes of Europe. To go into a defeated country to change not only its mode of life but its mode of thought, to eradicate from its mind the idea of being the superrace, to destroy Hitlerism and to substitute democracy therefor, to provide for and get millions of hungry people back to work, to reorganize the businesses of the country and to place its finances upon a comparatively sound basis—these were only some of the problems which pressed for solution. No one can read General McNarney's article without a better understanding of what has been accomplished and to give him and those who served with him credit for the welldoing of the task laid upon them. It may be that the Senate will institute an inquiry into the conduct of the occupation and the incidents which have occurred during its course. If so there will have to be exposed the intrigues which involve the other occupying powers. Such exposure would not improve the relations of the occupying powers. The Army has nothing to conceal and would be perfectly willing for the Senate to have all the facts, which we are certain would demonstrate the care and wisdom displayed. We commend to Congress the article by General McNarney since it will give it light that will cause pride in the performance the Army has given.

Peacetime Military Training—Its Benefits and Dangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing this Congress will be the determination whether peacetime universal military training is essential to the adequate defense of the country.

There is no doubt that many persons, who a few years ago believed that a year of military training in normal peacetime should be given to the youth of our country, have radically changed their views. It is now admitted that thousands of our young men found themselves either in the front lines or within easy reach of the front lines after less than 4 months of basic training.

It is my opinion that most parents, although hoping for peace, realize the possibility that their sons might be called upon to defend their country, and that they probably would not object to peacetime military training under reasonable safeguards and conditions. In other words, if we are to have military training, then it should be with the least possible dislocation to the lives of the youth of our Nation. The period should be as short as possible, the timing should be such that it would least interfere with the education of our youth, and, lastly, the training should be purely military with emphasis on the prevention of a military caste, and a jealous guarding of the bounds within which military training must be confined. If the youth of the country are in peacetime to be committed to the care of the armed forces for even so short a period as 4 months, then the armed forces must also assume reponsibility for the protection of their morals, and that protection must be based upon something more than physical health.

I believe that Hon. John M. Lewis, one of the justices of the municipal court of the city of New York, stated the case in an address to the Delta Theta Phi law fraternity on January 10, 1947, in New York City. Judge Lewis served with the Seventy-seventh Division in World War I and received the Purple Heart. He is a past commander of the Three Hundred and Fifth Machine Gun Post, American Legion, which is composed of the outfit with which he fought through the war. He has also served as advocate of the New York City Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars. His son, John M. Lewis, Jr., lies in St. Avold's Cemetery in France, a casualty of World War II.

The address of Judge Lewis follows:

My brothers in Delta Theta Phi, it is quite some time since last I spoke that greeting, yet the words came easily in the presence of so many old friends with whom I have been in touch since the good old days in Fuller Senate. A true friend, it has been well said, is one with whom you can be yourself. And these older brothers here have been true friends indeed, to meet with whom meant parting with soul uplifted and a lighter heart. Would that I could entertain you now with tales of how they so often added to our common store of good humor, but I promised the members of the active senate a talk on constitutional limitations in universal military training of youth. The training must be military, I maintain—free from the youth-control features which mark the training in dictatorships—and, after some background, I have the cases.

War veterans' organizations have advocated universal military training since 1919, and there are many who now believe that such preparedness might have prevented World War II. The advantages of such training, to the Nation and to the youngsters themselves, are now conceded by a majority of our adult population, according to polls taken on the subject. The statement that we may not be given time to prepare for our next war cannot be challenged. Congress has power, delegated by the Constitution, to raise armies and to provide and maintain a

navy, and the implied power to train the youth in military science and in the numerous skills used by the armed forces. Morale talks have always been considered part of military training and the three Rs would seem to be a modern military necessity.

There is little opposition to the physical or technical training in the use of arms, given in the school of the soldier, or to its extension to the limit of the implied powers. Rather widespread, however, has become the fear that, once the youngsters are assembled in camp, they will be given nonmilitary courses of study they would not have been given in schools or colleges selected by their parents. It does little toward combatting this fear for us, who are advocates of the training, to point out: (1) That, under articles V and IX of the Bill of Rights, the natural rights of parents cannot be abridged by the Federal Government; (2) that, under article X, power over education is reserved to the States or to the people (in this case, the parents); and, therefore, we will never have youth control here in any counterpart of the Hitler or Russian method. There have been made public too many complaints about the orientation lectures given to servicemen overseas; and, last November, much publicity was given to a GI university (The U. S. Armed Forces Institute), which supplies servicemen with courses in nonmilitary subjects. At a meeting of its directors, whose appointment seems as unauthorized as the setting up of the institute as I read the Constitution, it was decided to discontinue a book on economics against which the charge of communism had been made.

The complaints, of course, point up the dangerous possibilities contained in this precedent being set for the armed forces. But the merits or demerits of any book on economics, or of any fact sheet or informational talk, are all beside the point I now make. The all-important question in this controversy is: Can the War and Navy Departments, existing through the power in Congress to raise armies and to provide and maintain a navy, go in for nonmilitary education, the supervision of which was, until this war, reserved to the States and strenuously denied to any Federal agency? And I say it is important to have that question determined before the idea of an Armed Forces Institute is carried over into the long-range legislation for universal military training of youngsters in their 'teens.

It must be well known in official Washington that nothing short of an amendment to the Constitution would give the Federal Government power over education. It was charged on the floor of the Senate that the amendment proposed in 1924, to give Congress power to regulate the labor of persons under 18, was an attempt by Washington bureaus to get power over education as well. Recognized authorities on constitutional law, including the great William D. Guthrie, had not the slightest doubt that the word "labor" as used in the proposal would include mental as well as physical exertion, and that if the amendment were adopted as part of the Constitution, it would be a grant of Federal power over education.

During the unsuccessful campaigns for ratification, the women in the bureaus who had lobbied for the amendment denied any ambition to regulate education. Come 1939, however, when they conceded the disappearance of the child-labor problem, Miss Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, began talking about the need of a common goal in education. Under the guise of preventing child labor, then, the bureaus had sought to control education; and now, I say, under the guise of a year of military training, they seek Federal education of youths 17 and 18 years of age, for in 1944 the same Miss Lenroot was quoted by a writer for the New York Times as authority for the proposition that a military training year should be used to its fullest educational advantage.

In connection with the age provision, an interesting observation was contained in the script of a popular motion picture. Bing Crosby listened patiently to the complaint of an 18-year-old that her father was unreasonably restricting her freedom. Then said Bing: "When I was 18, I thought my father was pretty dumb too. But, when I became 21, I was surprised at how much the old man had learned in three short years."

What instructors or writers chosen by Federal bureaus could do with 17- and 18-year-olds in a course on new concepts of citizenship (to mention one suggested by a columnist friendly to the cause) is a possibility of alarming proportions. Hitler did just that—took the youth off to camp and gave them new concepts of citizenship. The Russians did it before Hitler, and they do it yet. But, as pointed out by the Supreme Court in a case to follow, such ideas touching the relation between individual and state are wholly different from those upon which our institutions rest.

Our Congressmen know all that. There is no peril more clearly understood, no opposition more appreciated by Congressmen than that to Federal invasion of education. In several Presidential campaigns, the platforms of both major political parties contained planks for Federal aid to the educational systems of the States, to be administered by the States, without Federal interference. That was to reassure the voters that the funds allotted by the Federal Government would not bring Federal supervision, and to meet the charge that such was the aim of the Washington Office of Education.

If anybody misunderstands the opposition to the attempts of the bureaus to get a foothold on education, that misunderstanding cannot be laid at the door of Congress. There it is clearly understood that the parents back home don't want their children standardized, and that the Federal Government cannot invade the natural right of parents to select the place where their children shall go for education. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that State governments cannot restrict that right, under amendment XIV to the Constitution, and amendment V places the same restriction on the Federal Government.

In *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, and *Pierce* v. *Hill Military Academy* (decided together and reported in 268 U. S. at p. 508), the court held unconstitutional an Oregon statute which required every parent or guardian of a child between 8 and 16 years of age to send him to a public school, and declaring failure to do so a misdemeanor. It was contended by the schools that the enactment conflicted with the right of parents to choose schools where their children shall be educated, the right of the child to influence the parents' choice of schools, and the right of schools and teachers therein to engage in a useful business or profession, and was therefore repugnant to the Constitution and void. The court said:

"Under the doctrine of *Meyer* v. *Nebraska* (268 U. S. 390), we think it entirely plain that the act of 1922 unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control. As often heretofore pointed out, rights guaranteed by the Constitution may not be abridged by legislation which has no reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the State. The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the state; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

In the *Meyer* v. *Nebraska* case, cited above, the State law forbade, under penalty, the teaching in any school of any modern language, other than English, to any child who had not passed the eighth grade. The court said:

"The problem for our determination is whether the statute as construed and applied unreasonably infringes the liberty guaranteed to the plaintiff by the fourteenth amendment: 'No State shall * * * deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.'

"While this court has not attempted to define with exactness the liberty thus guaranteed, the term has received much consideration and some of the included things have been definitely stated. Without doubt, it denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint, but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and generally to enjoy those privileges long recognized at common law as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by freemen."

I pause here to ask: Isn't that an echo of the declaration that men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Plaintiff taught a modern foreign language. The court said further: "His right thus to teach and the right of parents to engage him so to instruct their children, we think, are within the liberty of the amendment." And further: "Perhaps it would be highly advantageous if all had ready understanding of our ordinary speech, but this cannot be coerced by methods which conflict with the Constitution—a desirable end cannot be promoted by prohibited means."

The court then pointed out that Plato, for the welfare of his ideal commonwealth, suggested a law which should take children away from their parents. And that, in order to submerge the individual and develop better citizens, Sparta assembled the males at seven into barracks and entrusted their subsequent education and training to official guardians. And said the court:

"Although such measures have been deliberately approved by men of great genius, their ideas touching the relation between individual and state were wholly different from those upon which our institutions rest; and it hardly will be affirmed that any legislature could compose such restrictions upon the people of a State without doing violence to both letter and spirit of the Constitution."

As I indicated above, amendment V to the Constitution restrains the Federal Government in almost identical language: "No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law."

In *North Carolina* v. *Vanderford* (35 Fed. 282), it was held that the fifth amendment only announces and reaffirms the ancient principles of the common law, and prevents them from being unjustly invaded by the power of the Federal Government.

Another annotation has it that this clause is a restraint on the legislative, as well as on the executive and judicial powers of government and cannot be construed as to leave Congress free to make and process due process of law by its mere will.

On the point that Congress cannot legislate on a matter over which the Constitution has given it no power, it has been held that every exercise of power must find its justification in some authority delegated by the Constitution (in re American States Public Service Co., 12 Fed. Supp. 667). This case is also authority for the rule that what cannot be done directly because of constitutional restrictions, may not be accomplished

indirectly by legislation which accomplishes the same result, since constitutional provisions, whether operating by way of grant or limitation, are not to be evaded by legislation, which although not in terms trespassing upon letter and spirit, yet in substance or effect destroys the grant or limitation.

And on the same point, you will find that those who have written on amendment IX construe it to bar legislation in the absence of specific power, although it reads like a catch-all for the protection of nonenumerated rights.

Amendment X reads: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. In *State ex rel Steinle* v. *Faust* (9 N. E. (2) 912), as though it were axiomatic, the Court said, "Education is purely a matter of State concern and no rights, powers, or duties concerning it have been either expressly or impliedly granted to the Federal Government, within the limitations of the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

The Congress will consider the subject of universal military training in the light of all that has been developed in the debate to date. Both Senator GURNEY and Representative WADSWORTH have stated that the training should be military and the constitutional limitations observed. They should have the support of all who want America strong enough to win the peace, without risking youth-control.

In the words of the address of Junius to the people of England: "Let me exhort you never to suffer an invasion of your political constitution, however minute the instance may appear, to pass by without a determined persevering resistance. One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact, today is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures, and where they do not suit exactly the defect is supplied by analogy. Be assured that the laws, which protect us in our civil rights, grow out of the constitution, and that they must fall or flourish with it. This is not the cause of faction or of party, or of any individual, but the common interest of every man."

Congress Should Cooperate, Not Criticize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jerry Greene from the Washington Times-Herald:

Unless Congress is willing to spend a lot of money, the chances are better than bright that the two impending investigations into the safety of air travel and the causes of recent plane crashes won't be worth the time and money they will entail.

The money is needed for men and equipment necessary to operate the Nation's airways. There is nothing in the history of recent congressional sessions to indicate that the legislators will put up the dough this time.

There have been, and will be, flamboyant charges made from Capitol Hill about "outrageous" and "misleading" statements made to Congress by representatives of executive agencies about air safety. You can kiss these cracks off in a hurry.

The simple truth is that not until Congress is able to pass a law which will eliminate the human element in flying can legislation put a stop to air accidents.

A check of the leading air-lines reveals that they will welcome any congressional investigation, insofar as safety regulations and crashes go. They say they have nothing to hide and they think they are doing a good job.

They know their crack-ups are spectacular and attract a lot of attention but one of the executives was wondering why the Senate didn't probe the causes of split rails and human errors in judgment which have killed off quite a few in train accidents in the last year or so.

But the probes, one definitely set in the Senate by Senator OWEN BREWSTER (Republican), of Maine, chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee, and another coming up in the House, won't prove anything from digging in the wreckage of past crashes. That is what the experts say, and with emphasis.

These air executives, civil, Army, and Navy, will tell you that a major percentage of the country's plane crashes result from a mistake in judgment on the part of the pilot—and he, like anybody else, wants to live.

And most of the crashes result from the pilot getting lost in lousy weather or from his efforts to land the plane somewhere under hazardous weather conditions.

That means the United States has to keep up the latest navigation aids, has to improve its weather forecasting and has to pour men and money into the ground facilities if air accidents are to be kept to the human minimum. Either the Government or the private companies, or both, will have to pay for these services.

Both the Army and Navy believe they know how to stop a majority of crashes but their system is costly—and still debatable. The services have established what they call "ground controlled approach" systems, through which, roughly, a man sitting before a radar screen on the ground gives the pilot minute instructions when a plane is coming in during bad weather.

The Army has recently given three of the GCA sets to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, for installation in Washington, New York, and Chicago. Operation takes highly skilled ground personnel and the sets cost about $170,000 each. These will be used on an experimental basis.

Neither the Army nor the Navy regards GCA as experimental. The Army now has 21 overseas airfields equipped with the sets, has 8 bases in the United States in operation, and has recorded 35,000 GCA landings.

The Navy has 19 operating GCA units in the United States, has pulled off 18,863 operational airplane approaches in which the safety of the plane and crew was at stake 1,071 times.

As a convincer, the Navy points to the record of "the hotshot," a four-engined standard Douglas transport, or rather two of them.

Each day for the last year and a half, regardless of weather, one "hotshot" has taken off from San Francisco direct for Patuxent, Md., near Washington, and at the same time, the sister "hotshot" has departed Patuxent for California.

There have been many times during the last 18 months when the aircraft on both coasts were weathered in. But not the "hotshot." Old "hotshot" rolled on, brought safely to earth by GCA.

Just one "hotshot" flight has been canceled. About 2 weeks ago the roads were so icy around Washington that passengers couldn't drive to Patuxent, and they held up the plane.

Most of the experts think it will be 3 to 5 years before commercial aviation really becomes an all-weather service.

It will take close work between the Government and private industry to bring this about.

There is room, they say, for investigation by Congress, but the investigators, while picking up fewer headlines, will find a richer field for probing in a study of what can be done to help than in prowling around the twisted bits of old metal on a mountain hillside where a guy got lost in the fog.

Temperance and Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, yesterday, Tuesday, January 28, 1947, I had the privilege of speaking before the annual State convention of the South Carolina Federated Forces for Temperance and Law Enforcement at Columbia, S. C.

His Excellency, Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, spoke to the convention, as did Dr. Paul Wheeler, Dr. Edward B. Dunford, Hon. J. Hertz Brown, Rev. F. Clyde Helms, Rev. Albert D. Betts, and others. Under unanimous consent, I include my speech in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the South Carolina Federated Forces for Temperance and Law Enforcement, ladies and gentlemen, I am especially grateful to you of my home State for the high privilege you have accorded me. While I have been honored by invitations to many States to speak before temperance groups and have pending now invitations to several States, I prize this opportunity above all others because it is at least, in a sense, a contradiction to that Biblical statement "a prophet is not without honour, save in his own country."

Coming as I do from our Nation's Capital, the wettest political subdivision in the world, I am glad to be among so many of you whose views coincide with mine on the liquor question. I, myself, am externally, internally, and eternally against intoxicating beverages in all forms.

It is good that we crusaders for temperance have united our efforts and now work toward the same objective. Most of the Christian denominations are united in their opposition to the use of beverage alcohol and they urge their members to abstain from its use. I am happy to cast my influence with the good Christian people of this Nation and to "stand up and be counted" among the drys.

LIQUOR IS A BAD BUSINESS

Liquor is a bad business. One of the first questions that insurance companies ask when you apply for a policy is, "Do you drink beverage alcohol?" With them it is not a moral question or a spiritual question, it is just a plain business question. They realize that drinkers are poor insurance risks. As a matter of fact, bartenders and people who own liquor establishments have to pay higher rates of insurance.

Liquor cannot be sent lawfully through the United States mails. The Supreme Court is on record as having declared that no man has an inherent right to make and sell alcoholic beverages. The liquor business is not like the mercantile business, the manufacturing business, farming, public utilities, or other agencies for the manufacturing of necessities of life. Ordinarily an agency is

created and permitted to exist for the good of mankind. They fill a public need. The world is better and happier because of their existence. This is not the case with the beverage alcohol business. The world would be better off if it did not exist. It corrupts politics, it pollutes society, it wrecks homes, it blights lives, it debauches character.

ALCOHOL A HARMFUL DRUG

Alcohol in beer, wine or whiskey—legal or bootleg—is a habit forming narcotic poison that befuddles the brain and depresses the nerve. Many people who, when sober, are kind, tender and dependable will often when under the influence of alcohol become overbearing, brutal, dishonest and commit crime.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION

For 13 years America had national prohibition. The law was not perfect, but it was the best method the American people have found to deal with the liquor traffic. It was never given a fair chance. Instead of giving it the proper enforcement and correcting any defects in it, we repealed it and there have followed disastrous results in this Nation.

PLENTY OF BOOTLEGGERS

Advocates of repeal complained about bootlegging under prohibition and said to relegalize the liquor traffic would end bootlegging. But the Federal Government in 1945 broke up over 8,000 bootlegging stills and caught over 11,000 bootleggers. Here are the figures from some of our neighboring States:

State	Moonshine stills destroyed	Bootleggers caught
Wet Florida	485	885
Wet Virginia	492	650
Wet Alabama	847	1,250
Wet South Carolina	1,158	599
Wet North Carolina	1,385	1,450
Wet Georgia	1,645	1,666

With this record before us for various wet States in the Nation we can understand the truth of the statement of our retiring Governor when he recently declared: "That 'as many liquor stills as during prohibition days' were in operation in South Carolina last year."

It was contended that with repeal only good and Government-inspected liquor would be drunk. Such contention is not borne out in fact. People are drinking poisonous alcohol concoctions as heretofore. One night last week in the city of Washington, D. C., six people died as a result of drinking poison liquor.

INCREASED LIQUOR CONSUMPTION

Advocates of repeal said it would reduce drinking. This, like the promise of no bootlegging, has proven to be a joke. According to the records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington in 1934, the first full year of repeal, the per capita consumption of beverage alcohol was approximately 10 gallons; by 1941 it had increased to 15 gallons; it climbed to 18 gallons in 1943; and by 1945 it was over 20 gallons for every man, woman, and little child in the Nation.

In 1945, part of the year during a bloody global war and the rest of the year while millions starved for bread in foreign lands, the American people drank the staggering amount of 110,000,000 gallons of wine; 190,000,000 gallons of distilled spirits; and 2,527,000,000 gallons of beer, for which they paid the mammoth amount of nearly $8,000,000,000.

INCREASED DRUNKENNESS

Advocates of repeal said it would promote temperance and reduce drunkenness. The records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington show that each year of repeal the ratio of drunkenness per 100,000 of the population has increased by an average of 96 percent over 1932, the last full year of prohibition. Last year over a million people were arrested for offenses connected with liquor. It is estimated by some very reliable sources that it cost this Nation $5,000,000,000 a year to care for her drunks alone. We have never received more than $2,500,000,000 in revenue. That means while the Government got $1 in revenue it had to spend $2 to take care of the drunks produced by that liquor. How long would you operate a grocery store, a filling station, a hotel, or any other business that costs you $2 for every $1 that you took in?

DRINKING DRIVERS

The repeal of the eighteenth amendment has been followed by an increase in the number of drunken drivers that race our streets and highways. Some 35,000 people were killed in traffic fatalities last year. The National Safety Council informs us that 1 out of every 5 persons killed in traffic accidents is due to a drinking driver or a drinking pedestrian, which means of course that last year some 7,000 people lost their lives as a result of mixing alcohol and gasoline.

At Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Japan stabbed us in the back, killing somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,000 American citizens. For that infamous act we called some 20,000,000 of our finest boys and girls from their firesides, sent them across the seven seas and spent billions of dollars to fight a global war. Yet right here in our own Nation last year on the highways and streets of this country the liquor traffic killed twice as many people as Japan killed at Pearl Harbor. I believe in defeating and outlawing the internal enemy of strong drink at home just as our fighting forces conquered the external enemy around this troubled world.

RUINED WOMANHOOD

Perhaps the most tragic result of repeal is the way it has put the women of this country to drinking. The old saloon debauched the men and boys. This new repeal saloon is debauching the womanhood of this Nation worse than the old saloon debauched the manhood of the Nation.

The relegalized liquor interest makes special efforts to get women drinkers. If you notice the blazing billboards they nearly always show beautiful women holding beer glasses. The big magazines and daily newspapers carry alluring pictures of beautiful women drinking cocktails and highballs. The screens invariably have the heroines drinking the hellish fluid. Young women are used as cashiers, barmaids, hostesses, car hops, waitresses, and dispensers of this beverage alcohol with the result that it is as common to see drinking and drunken women as it is to see drinking and drunken men.

About a year ago the American Medical Journal carried the astonishing report that in 1932, which was the last full year of prohibition, 1 out of every 5 persons arrested for drunkenness in Chicago was a woman; but in 1944 1 out of every 2, that is, every other person arrested for drunkenness in Chicago was a woman.

America's greatest possession is not her wooded forests, her fertile fields, her vast prairies, her great railroads, her manufacturing and industrial plants, her extensive communication systems, or her immense wealth. Her greatest possession is her womanhood. Here the liquor interest is striking a devastating blow at the greatest influence for good in our national life, for as someone has said, "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world."

ABSTINENCE NOT ENOUGH

How shall we deal with this problem of strong drink? Very frequently you hear people say, "Well, the booze business does not bother me. I never touch a drop. I am a teetotaler." The woods are full of bootleggers that never touch a drop of the stuff they sell. Many saloons will not employ a bartender that drinks. Some of the largest distillers in the Nation will not permit drinking on the part of their employees. And yet these forces traffic in the beverage-alcohol business. So personal abstinence is not enough that only solves the problem for one individual. We must do something to stop the traffic. We must prohibit others from making and selling it and ruining other people.

EDUCATION NOT ENOUGH

You very frequently hear people say the way to solve this problem is by education. But the liquor industry with $100,000,000 a year to spend on billboards, in newspapers and magazines, over the radio, advertising, and glamorizing the drinking of liquor can educate the American people to drink so much faster than the abstinence forces can educate the people not to drink that the liquor traffic hardly knows it has any competition in the educational field.

Thousands of dollars are spent daily to perpetrate the lie that beer is real food, while hardly a penny is given to publicize the truth that milk is nutritious.

PROHIBITION NEEDED

We have laws to prohibit stealing, cursing, gambling, and vice. Just personal abstinence from these sins and education against them are not enough. And that is the way it is with this liquor business. Not only must we personally abstain and teach our loved ones to abstain, and not only should we teach and educate the public on the evils of alcohol, but we must have laws for the protection of the public against those who would traffic in beverage alcohol and victimize the public.

THREE KINDS OF PROHIBITION

There are three kinds of prohibition. National prohibition like we had under the eighteenth amendment and which was repealed 13 years ago.

State-wide prohibition as they now have in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Mississippi. Some States permit the sale of beer but do not allow the sale of hard liquors. That is the kind of prohibition the people of South Carolina voted for in an advisory referendum in 1940 but which the general assembly has failed to ratify.

In the third place there is local option prohibition. By local option prohibition we mean that a precinct, a town, a township, a county, or a subdivision as an independent political unit may call an election on the sale of alcoholic beverages. Many States make provision for local option elections and they have proved a very helpful method for dealing with the liquor traffic if we are to judge by the way the country is going dry under local option. I am happy to know that our new Governor in his inaugural address came out strongly for local option.

LOCAL OPTION AREAS

Massachusetts has 65 towns and townships with populations ranging from 40,000 down that prohibit the sale of all beer, wine, and whisky. New Hampshire has about a hundred such dry towns and townships, Vermont has 120, Maine over 300, Wisconsin 350, Ohio 450, Pennsylvania 650, and the State of Illinois over 1,000 with nearly 2,000,000 people living in them.

The State of Virginia has several whole counties that are dry. Louisiana has 16 dry parishes. Minnesota 20 dry counties; the drys have won 32 of the last 37 county-wide liquor elections in Arkansas; Georgia has 67 counties that are dry; Alabama 47 dry counties and only 20 that permit the legal sale of beverage alcohol; Mississippi has 53 of her 82 counties that prohibit the sale of all beer, wine, or whisky; and the State of Kentucky, known around the world for its famous brands of liquor, has 92 wholly dry counties, 14 others that are partially dry, and only 14 left that are wholly wet. In North Carolina 75 of her 100 counties prohibit the legal sale

of hard liquor, but beer is sold in every county but 2. The State of Texas has 139 dry counties, and a recent newspaper survey revealed that 53 percent of the people 21 years of age or above would vote for State-wide prohibition if faced with the opportunity. The latest Gallup poll showed 33 percent of the American voters across the Nation as a whole favoring national prohibition.

At present South Carolina laws do not permit local option elections. That is a big issue before the general assembly. I personally hope the legislature will give the good people of our State a law providing for a local option prohibition election. It is nothing but right, fair and democratic. If the people in a local community or county want to hold an election and ban the sale of beverage alcohol they ought to be permitted to hold such an election. Why send our boys and girls around this troubled world to bleed and die in order that the people of Italy, Germany, Japan, and other countries may exercise the democratic privileges of holding free elections and casting their votes on public issues and then deny the people of our own State of South Carolina the privilege of holding an election on the issue of local option? I, myself, am for prohibition but join others in the advocacy of local option as a means to the end.

Congress Needs Bolstering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon City Banner Courier:

CONGRESS NEEDS BOLSTERING

The time has come for Congress to get some support from the tax-paying folks back home. If we don't let our Senators and Representatives know that we expect cuts in both taxes and governmental spending, how are they to combat the pressure of government lobbies which pound away at the same old story of "some cuts are necessary, but not in my department"?

Take this proposed Army-Navy merger as a case in point.

Old Army and old Navy men just cannot conceive the loss of their traditional interests through consolidation. The two services have been so long independently operated that the top brass just cannot see how it can compromise or sacrifice in order to effect a merger in which both branches would be regarded as tops, as they look upon themselves at present.

But, Mr. Congress, this matter is not a question of preserving the rights and privileges of top brass in either or both services. It is a two-horned question of saving the taxpayers' money and improving national defense.

Army and Navy departments duplicate facilities, installations, and agencies which, if combined, could give the Nation better defense for less money.

We are completely disgusted with the archaic two-arm national defense set-up. It is ridiculous in these modern times. Both Army and Navy are maintained for national defense—that is their main reason for existence. Impartial Navy and Army men admit national defense would be stronger and would cost far less if the services were unified.

Well, what are we waiting for?

We Should Have Fewer Government Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, while there has been a general widespread discussion upon the subject of tax reductions, and so many of the people have joined in the discussion of economy in government, we have now reached the point at which action must be taken in order to accomplish these worth-while objectives. We cannot continue to go forward with a loadstone about our necks. This leads me to a discussion of the problem to which I desire to address myself in this statement and in these remarks.

Our Nation and the common people of our country have had the very great burden of very heavy taxes upon their shoulders for a long period of time. It is true that we have passed through the most devastating war of all times, and during this great emergency all of the people have toiled and struggled, they have saved, they have paid very high and unusual taxes, they have contributed to every fund for the benefit of the boys in the service, they have bought bonds until it hurt—they were the great army behind the lines who contributed so much to the end that victory might be ours—and this great contribution consisted in giving their boys to our Army, Navy, and Air Corps for active duty and service in this awful conflict.

Mr. Speaker, when we view our present situation, following World War II, we find we are facing a staggering national debt of approximately $275,000,000,000. We must support and pay that debt. We must pay the interest upon that debt. This is not an easy or trifling commitment on our part. It is the largest debt faced by any nation at any time. But, whatever that debt may be, and whatever staggering sum the principal and interest thereon may attain, I am confident the American people want to pay and discharge it. We will pay our war debt—but we do not want more of cruel war foisted upon us. We want peace in the future and we want peace treaties consummated with other nations which will assure a lasting and a permanent peace to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that there are too many Federal employees in our Government. There are too many of such employees for efficiency, and there are too many of such employees now sapping away the taxpayer's money—taking that money away from the channels into which it should be allocated. Why does Uncle Sam have about three times as many job holders hanging on as he had during the prewar days? And, at this point, may I ask why is there today the unthinkable high ratio of almost one Government job holder for every 18 individual Americans engaged in private business and industry? These are pertinent questions, and these are questions that the people are asking of the President and his many and various agencies and departments of Government.

And, may I suggest, that I have often wondered why the bureaucrats in Washington usually talk about more Government jobs instead of less and less employees; why they usually involve the people in more and more Federal red tape, which has ever tended to strangle and stymie business, industry, and agriculture, instead of less and less of those obstructions? And, all of us have wondered why our Government, and those in charge of practically every agency and department, wastes its personnel in overstaffed offices and unnecessary employees? This latter statement is the usual condition found by those who come here to work, upon the request of their Government, because they find, in many instances, they "have nothing to do" and they frequently resign and return home disgusted and dismayed. Many people come to Washington on business missions, but upon arriving they find the agency of Government, with which they desire to transact business, so completely overstaffed and so crowded with personnel that they are unable to find any person with whom to take up their particular problem—and they, too, usually "beat a hasty retreat back home." Then why, Mr. Speaker, does the Federal Government have so many unnecessary employees, and why does it retain this oversupply of needless workers on the pay rolls? That is the question the American people are asking, and that is the question they desire answered by the department heads and those in charge of the many and various agencies of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I venture some reasons for this condition, which I desire to appear before the people for their consideration.

When these bureaucratic officials have once experienced the power of having many people under their command, all serving them, they never want to surrender that power. They do not desire to reach the time when their hordes of employees are dissolved or disbanded. They want to continue throughout the future with all the power their position warrants. They like it—and they want to keep it.

We know, from experience, that power and great authority begets more power and greater authority, and that a bureaucracy begets more bureaucracy. We have witnessed that great growth and expansion throughout the past 14 years in our own country.

Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam pays salaries to department heads, and others in the top positions, which are based in part upon the number of people and subordinates which the director or supervisor has under him, and, thus, a large personnel in any department is highly essential to him, and this fact alone encourages him to get more people on the pay roll in his particular agency and department whether he needs them or not. A large personnel tends to increase the prestige and the compensation of the bureau-

cratic head of that agency or department.

And, may I add, there are many government theorists, planners, designers, and schemers whose sole desire appears to be to centralize and consolidate more power in our Federal Government, and to reduce the power of the several States and of our local authorities into mere nonentities. What we need is more power in our several States and local communities and much less power centralized in Washington. Our Federal Government is now top-heavy with inflated power and authority—and this must end, with its controls, with its orders, and with its dominating grasp upon the throats of the people.

So, Mr. Speaker, whatever our obligations are, at the moment, let us face the facts and solve the problem of reducing our Government workers to a mere necessity, and thereby reducing our pay rolls accordingly; let us remove the necessity of the vast burden of taxes which now exists because of the unnecessary and nonessential employees on the Federal pay roll. We have the job of getting down to business, in a businesslike manner, by deflating the Federal pay roll to a prewar size, or even smaller, and let us demand of our Government, our President, and every department and agency of Government that scientific management be exercised, all to the end that men, money, materials, and time may be saved. We must demand that our Federal Government be decentralized and returned to the several States, and to the very grass roots of our Nation, where, I am convinced, it can and will be handled better and more economically than under this centralized system in Washington. Our Federal Government certainly cannot know all, control all, and do all in this great Nation.

Why Income-Tax Exemptions of Low-Income Groups Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced a bill recently providing for what he calls a 20-percent reduction of income taxes "straight across the board" for incomes of $302,000 or under and about 10.5 percent reduction on incomes over $302,000.

On January 9, 1947, my good friend, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED of New York, inserted into the RECORD a statement which gave his views, apparently supporting Mr. KNUTSON's proposal on the ground that such a tax reduction would be needed to bring about a continued prosperity. Mr. REED makes a very interesting statement, contending that the law of diminishing returns has been operating and that the Knutson bill would increase the revenues rather than diminish them. Mr. KNUTSON states his bill would cut the revenue $3,500,000,000.

On the 19th day of March 1945, I introduced a bill increasing the tax exemptions of a single person from $500 to $800 a year and of the head of a family from $1,000 to $2,000 a year. On January 3, 1947, I reintroduced this bill increasing the tax exemption of a single person to $1,000, the head of a family to $2,000, reinstating the householder clause which recognized the fact that if a father or mother died the remaining parent should continue to have the full exemption of the head of a family because the burden to continue the home and to keep that little family together is even greater than before the death of the other parent.

Let me state my position clearly. First, and above all, we have to balance the budget. We cannot continue to borrow; we cannot continue to go in debt for operating expenses of this Government. When I say "balance the budget" I want it distinctly understood that I want included in that budget not only the interest on the national debt but inclusion in each annual budget of an amount which will liquidate that debt upon a sound plan of amortization. If there is anything left after we have balanced the budget, including an amount for amortized debt, the great masses of people in the low-income group who require that money to live should be given the maximum benefit of that reduction. In the event that an increase in tax exemption as outlined by my bill cannot be made with a balanced budget, then I would increase the exemption of a single or married person only where the income of the single person or combined income of the husband and wife did not exceed $5,000. This would be reinstating the clause that was enacted in the Revenue Act of 1921 and would give the benefit of that increase only to the low-income group provided it can be done with a balanced budget.

According to many published stories the Knutson bill represents the tax policy of the Republican Party which now has control of both Houses of Congress. This viewpoint finds some basis in the fact that both Mr. KNUTSON and Mr. REED, the two ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee, are supporting the Knutson bill and the further fact that I seem to receive no appreciable support from other Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee nor from the Republican leadership for my bill.

I like to think of the Republican Party as the party of Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln once said, "God must have loved the poor because he made so many of them." I am afraid the present leadership of the Republican Party does not agree with Abraham Lincoln in this view.

Let us see just what the Knutson bill does. Let us break it down. According to a newspaper report it provides for a cut of 20 percent straight across the board for every taxpayer with an annual income up to about $302,000 and about a 10.5 percent cut for the taxpayer with an income above $302,000. The heading of this article states "Knutson contends reductions in income tax raise revenue." The article quotes Mr. KNUTSON as calling attention to the fact that the Federal debt was reduced by $8,000,000,000 from 1920 to 1930, and then quotes him specifically as saying, "Despite these reductions, tax revenues continued to rise so that there was ample surplus to provide for sizable reductions in the national debt."

This article also gives a table of deductions which would be made under the Knutson bill. For instance this table shows that a single worker with a weekly wage of from $11 to $12 a week would pay 10 cents a week or $5.20 a year taxes. According to economists and cost-of-living experts it took $1.55 in 1946 to buy what $1 bought in 1939. Under the Knutson bill this man, unless he is over 65 years old, still has only a $500 tax exemption. On this basis $323 would have bought the same living items in 1939 when his tax exemption was $1,000 a year that the $500 bought in 1946. This worker would receive 2 cents a week or $1.04 a year reduction in taxes or tax relief while the financier who had a $100,000 annual income would receive $12,790 a year reduction in taxes. The same table shows that a man and wife with an income from $22 to $23 a week would pay 20 cents a week or $10.40 a year in taxes. They would have saved under the 20-percent clause 4 cents a week or $2.08 a year while the financier who had a $200,000-a-year income would save $29,795 a year.

Let us take a man and wife with an income of $2,500 a year or approximately $48 a week. In 1939 he paid no taxes. Under the Knutson bill he would pay $3.60 a week or $187.20 a year. He would save 72 cents a week or $37.44 a year, while the financier with an income of $300,000 would save $48,985 a year. The average weekly wage in manufacturing, according to the Labor Department, is approximately $48 a week. This man and wife with a 1947 income of $2,500 would have $2,313 left after the payment of taxes. On the basis that it took $1.55 in 1946 to buy what $1 bought in 1939, this taxpayer could have bought the same living in 1939 with a net income of $1,613 that he bought in 1946 with his $2,500 income after taxes, and conversely it would take $3,875 today to buy in living what his $2,500 bought in 1939 when that $2,500 was exempt. The single man with $1,000 a year income would have required $1,550 in 1946 to buy what his $1,000 bought in 1939 and conversely $645 would have bought the same living in 1939 that his $1,000 buys today. That $1,000 was exempt in 1939. I am assuming that these workers are under 65 years of age.

HOW MANY PEOPLE CONSTITUTE THE LOW-INCOME GROUP?

Let us examine the record and see just how many people we have in this low-income group that I am speaking about. Let us use $2,500 as the top figure for the sake of illustration. I addressed the House on this subject in 1945 and again in 1946. I had obtained from the Treasury Department tables showing the income of the various groups in 1944, one

of our largest national-income years. I found that in 1944 there were:

First. Twenty-one million six hundred thousand individuals with annual incomes of $1,000 or less, 12,250,000 of whom were single persons and 9,010,000 were heads of families.

Second. There were 12,430,000 individuals, 7,450,000 of whom were married or heads of families with incomes from $1,000 to $1,500.

Third. There were 11,990,000 individuals with incomes of from $1,500 to $2,000, 9,580,000 of whom were married persons or heads of families.

Fourth. There were still another 7,550,000 with incomes of $2,000 to $2,500, 6,590,000 of whom were married persons or heads of families.

This was according to the Treasury report furnished me taken from the income tax records. Summarizing we find we had in 1944, 53,230,000 individuals with incomes of $2,500 or under. If we assume that each head of a family in this group had at least one dependent, we find that we have 85,860,000 people in this country or 61 percent of the population who are dependent on individual or family incomes of $2,500 a year or under.

MUST WE LEVY AN INCOME TAX ON THE LOW-INCOME GROUP TO MAKE THEM TAX CONSCIOUS?

The argument has been advanced that we have to levy an income tax, no matter how small, to make the low-income taxpayer tax conscious. On February 6, 1946, I made the following statement on the floor of this House:

> Taking money we call taxes from the low-income groups, which should be spent for bread, butter, milk and food to fill the stomachs of hungry children will not avert inflation. Such a policy can only bring about suffering, crime, immorality and poor citizenship. No policy of making everyone pay a tax to make people tax conscious can be justified when the tax dollar collected forces the living standards of the taxpayer below a decent level.

Taking 10 cents a week tax from a $12-a-week worker which he must take from his bread, milk or other food bill and then hiring thousands of clerks to handle these accounts at a cost of many times the amount collected to make that taxpayer tax conscious just does not make sense to me. In many States he pays a sales tax on everything he buys. Everytime he pays rent, he is paying the taxes on the house or room he rents. Every time he goes to the theater, if he ever has enough left to go there, he pays a tax. In fact, every time he turns around he pays some kind of a tax. If he is not tax conscious now, a withholding tax of 10 cents or 20 cents a week will not make him so.

INCREASE IN TAXES MEANS INCREASED DEMANDS IN WAGES

I have always felt that labor was on sound footing when it based its demand for increased wages on the increased cost of living. In bargaining between management and labor it is the amount of take-home pay which is used in determining whether or not the worker is being paid a fair wage. Take-home pay is, of course, the pay after the various deductions including income taxes. Take, for example, the worker with a wife who had a $2,500-a-year income. Let us assume that he lives in some city where it would require $2,800 a year for him to support himself and wife under a decent standard of living. The difference demanded would not be the difference between $2,500 and $2,800, or a demand for an increase of $300 a year. It would be a demand for an increase in wages between $2,000 and his take-home pay after deductions of $187 income taxes. The demand would be for the difference between $2,800 and $2,317 a year, or a demand for $483-a-year increase. I have not included any social-security and other deductions.

This income tax paid by the low-income worker helps to bring about labor strife in that worker's effort to obtain a living or better wage. In this way the tax is passed by the worker to the employer, who in turn adds it to his cost of production. The consuming public in the end pays the bill in increased prices.

The unorganized worker, the government worker, the farmer, and the other low-income groups find it difficult to pass that tax levy back to someone else. They have no alternative but to pay it and reduce their standard of living accordingly.

HOW DOES REDUCTION OF TAXES AFFECT THE TOTAL TAX COLLECTION AND WHY?

There are many people in both the Republican and Democratic Parties, in fact I believe they constitute a majority of those parties, who believe that if you will only give tax relief to the man on top the benefits will trickle or percolate down to the little fellow below. This is based upon the theory that by creating new investment capital the workers will obtain jobs. I cannot agree fully with this theory of government. I agree that under a capitalistic form of government or under a profit system, we must permit the retention of enough profit so that industry can expand. However all the capital in the world will not create jobs except insofar as it creates purchasing power in the erection of new factories, and so forth.

The depression of 1929 to 1940 should satisfy the most skeptical that those benefits do not adequately trickle or percolate down to the little fellow below. My theory is that in order to have permanent prosperity one has to begin by increasing the purchasing power of that great mass of people—86,000,000—in the low-income group. It is only by increasing the purchasing power and raising the standard of living of this great mass of people that we can have real and permanent prosperity. By increasing mass purchasing power I do not mean taking the tax dollar from one taxpayer and giving it to another. I mean increasing the farmer's and worker's productive capacity and giving them a greater share of the selling price of the thing they produce on the farm, in the factory, mine, or whatever it may be. If you will do this the man above is bound to obtain his share of the profit.

Let me illustrate what I mean. If the wife of that low-income worker from whom we are taking 10 cents a week income tax should take the 10 cents a week and buy a spool of thread from the corner dry goods store to patch her husband's pants, everyone from that corner store up through to the manufacturer of the thread and back to the farmer who grew the cotton that went into the thread would get part of the 10 cents. If that $2,500 a year worker could take a part of the $187 you are going to tax him under the Knutson bill to buy a suit of clothes for himself, or a dress for his wife, everyone from the store which sold him the suit or dress through to the manufacturer and back down to the farmer who grew the cotton or wool that went into the suit or dress is bound to benefit. But if that worker is not left enough to buy a suit or dress, everyone from the store where he would buy the suit or dress or whatever it may be, up to the textile mill and manufacturer who would make that dress and suit of clothes and back down to the farmer who raises the cotton or wool, will be the loser.

It was for this reason and not because the tax relief was given to the higher bracket taxpayer that the revenue in the treasury for a time increased in the past, despite the reduction made in income-tax rates. I recognize the fact and I have said so repeatedly that we have passed that critical point in the rate of taxation, where the law of diminishing returns is now operating. Under a capitalistic or profit system you must leave enough profit to the businessman so he can have capital to expand his plant to take care of increased business. On the other hand no business can expand and no profit system can survive without profits and there is no profit on a pair of overalls, a suit or dress that the low-income group does not buy. Mr. Henry Ford, Sr., undoubtedly had this very policy in mind when for the first time he established what was then considered extremely high a "$5-a-day minimum wage" in his factory.

Let me repeat that a sound peacetime prosperity can only be built upon that basis. It is only by building up the income and productive capacity of the low-income group that you can have a national income large enough to pay our minimum current operating expenses, pay our national debt, and not have further inflation.

WHAT HAS BEEN THE REPUBLICAN TAX POLICY IN THE PAST?

What has been the policy of the Republican Party with regard to tax reduction in the past? Has the Republican Party during the years they were in power followed the policy as outlined by the Knutson bill, and which it now proposes to adopt as the Republican policy? Let us examine the record. Let us go back to the first revenue act that was passed after the Republican Party came back into power in 1921. This act increased the exemption of a married person from $2,000 to $2,500 where the aggregate income of the husband and wife did not exceed $5,000. It further increased the credit for each dependent from $200 to $400.

Next came the Revenue Act of 1924. Under this act the tax rate on the income of the individual was reduced from 6 to 2 percent on the first $4,000 and to 4 percent on the second $4,000.

Next came the Revenue Act of 1926. This act reduced the tax rate from 2 to 1½ percent on the first $4,000 and from 4 to 3 percent on the second $4,000, while at the same time increasing the exemption of single persons to $1,500 and of married persons to $3,500. It left the credit for each dependent at $400.

Then came the Revenue Act of 1928 which did not change the rates or exemptions but increased the earned income credit limit from $20,000 to $30,000.

The fourth reduction in personal income taxes was under a House resolution which was enacted into law December 16, 1929. The House joint resolution reduced the rate for 1929 on all individual incomes from 1½ percent to one-half of 1 percent on the first $4,000 and from 4 percent to 2 percent on the second $4,000, leaving the exemptions and credit for dependents the same.

Summarizing, the Republican Party passed five tax bills from 1921 to 1929 and in four out of the five the tax rate of the low-income group was given first consideration. The tax exemptions were increased from $1,000 to $1,500 for a single person and from $2,000 to $3,500 for a married person, and the exemption for dependents was increased from $200 to $400. In addition to these exemptions, of course, business and the man on top got a substantial reduction in his surtax and the tax rates. These bills decreased tax rates on incomes below $4,000 from 6 percent to 4 percent to 2 percent to 1½ percent to one-half of 1 percent successively. This was the Republican tax policy from 1920 to 1932. I believe this policy was right then. I believe it is right now.

CONCLUSION

It is my contention that the Knutson bill is a radical departure from what has been the Republican tax policy in the past. If the Knutson bill is passed it will place into the hands of the Democratic Party the most effective campaign argument any party can have; an argument which will appeal to 86,000,000 people in the low-income group. It may spell defeat for the Republican Party in 1948. To pass the Knutson bill in its present form constitutes not only a total lack of political foresight but a complete lack of political "hindsight" as well.

British Violations of Debt Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal and American of January 19, 1947:

BRITISH VIOLATIONS OF DEBT AGREEMENTS

The urgent warning was given Congress at the time of the British loan negotiations that the huge sum of money very easily could be used to the injury of the United States and very likely would be so used.

There is now a dramatic, but hardly astonishing, fulfillment of this warning, which was, of course, ignored when Congress approved the loan.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has confirmed that the American Government is gravely concerned over the recent trade pact concluded between Great Britain and Argentina, which is clearly in violation of the loan agreement.

The Anglo-Argentine trade pact provides for payments to Argentina under the "blocked" British sterling system, and limits Argentina's use of that money to "the British sphere of influence."

This means that money received by Argentina in trade with Britain must be spent with Britain, thus excluding the United States and all other countries from any commercial dealings with Argentina based upon the improved Argentine financial position.

Since the British Government had agreed, as a condition of obtaining the American loan to abstain from the use of blocked currencies in international trade made possible by the loan, the fact and extent of violation are apparent.

Secretary Snyder attempts no concealment of the essential facts in this matter, or of his own displeasure.

"We feel that we must live up to our agreement," he comments.

"Those are reached after careful deliberation and we expect both parties to live up to the agreements.

"We signed the loan agreements with them (the British) some time ago, and we just want them to live up to the agreements."

But the Secretary is vague about what the American Government will do in the situation.

All that the American Government seems to have done is to ask an interpretation by Great Britain of the effect of the Anglo-Argentine pact upon the Anglo-American loan agreement.

What the American Government could and should do in the situation is to refuse further American participation in the loan agreement, since British violation constitutes both a legal and a moral nullification of the entire agreement.

The British have already drawn $800,000,000 against the total approved loan of $3,750,000,000.

Why should they have further access to this gigantic fund, since they have failed to abide by the conditions under which it was set up for their use?

Why, indeed, does not the American Government now do what it should have done in the first place—make American interests the first and sole consideration?

The British loan was not made in the American interest, and it was not made with the consent or approval of the American people—and in fact, the administration which made the loan has since been repudiated by the people, and one of the foremost factors which contributed to this repudiation was the British loan.

Amateur Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended to me by the House, and due to the aroused public interest in good and clean sports, I am inserting in the RECORD an address delivered by Francis T. Murray, executive director of Philadelphia Inquirer Charities, Inc., at the fortieth anniversary dinner of the Middle Atlantic Amateur Athletic Union held at the Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, on January 16, 1947:

Precedent dictates that on an occasion of this sort the members of the organization celebrating its fortieth anniversary are to be congratulated and lauded, each one, for the individual contribution made, which added much to the strength of the present-day society. Time has relegated many of you who once worked hard to more or less advisory assignments, but while the years may have slowed physical capacities, they have only served to sharpen your interest in the Middle Atlantic Amateur Athletic Union, which for the last 40 years has served our community so well.

The younger members of your union should be congratulated also, for recognizing in the work of the charter members the lofty ideals of amateur sportsmanship, which are just as true and practical today as they were when first conceived and codified back in the year 1888, and for their efforts toward furthering this work.

Usually when an association has been successfully in operation for a span of four decades it becomes difficult to imagine new challenges to be faced, fought out, and conquered. Yet tonight each and every one of us interested in amateur sport is facing one of the most crucial challenges of all times, not only in regard to the interpretation of amateurism, which some people are twisting to suit their own conveniences for various reasons, but also the equally vital interpretation of what constitutes an honest competitive effort.

Fortunately the original constitution of your union clearly and unmistakably defines and interprets both issues. Unfortunately, however, customs and times on occasion make it fashionable and more expedient to apply to both issues an interpretation falsely considered more practical.

The exponents of this latter school of thought, I am happy to say, represent an infinitesimal portion of those competing in and those interested in amateur athletics. The vast majority, which includes men such as yourselves, find the precepts of this small minority group shocking, sickening, revolting, yet undeniably they are present, gnawing away like termites at the very foundation of our amateur society.

Like a foreign enemy who might invade our shores, the adherents of the school of thought, of which I speak, are out to destroy our system of sports for sports' sake, sports for the betterment of the community and country, sports for the physical, mental, and moral improvement of the athlete.

Because of its nature, rather than any serious inroads it is making, the time to act is now, and the thing to guard against is fatal mental apathy.

Our program calls for toughening up morally, along with physical and mental exercising. It is difficult to conceive of an athlete who has spent untold years of hard work developing an athletic skill lending an ear to some unscrupulous person suggesting that he debase his art for material gain. Yet, oddly enough, the very idea, at least commercially speaking, has a certain inherent lure. Therefore, it calls for mental adjustment, at least to the point of determining in what spheres of endeavors the material profit motif applies and in what activities, such as amateur sports, it has no place whatsoever.

Municipally supervised and institutionally administered sports point up for those who perform in the brilliant spotlight of sports for sports' sake, the control of inherent, animal behavior. Championship performances in the past placed great accent on the physical and mental side of the picture; however, because of this new challenge we are facing,

the moral integrity of the champion of the future, as well as of those encouraging participation in sport, looms more important than ever.

Lion-hearted, intellectual courage and solid moral integrity must be stressed by our coaches as strongly as the track instructor stresses the importance of a fast start. Moral reflexes must be exercised and toughened to respond just as quickly to unscrupulous advances as our muscular systems compensate and shift to guard against unexpected offensive flashes and take advantage of openings, which disappear just as suddenly as they come about.

Local, State, and Federal legislation will help make it more difficult for those identified with the shabby side of sport to operate, but the operation will never come to a standstill until everyone connected with sports lashes out at the invaders with a vigor, which is instinctive and individual, but which is still common to all athletes.

The pursuit of sports has always been soul-satisfying and materially productive. In this era, the thrill of competing will be even more intensified and the material results more productive because the physical competition will be stiffer than ever before, and coupled with the incentive of battling for a principle. Moral ruggedness will be playing a major role.

If sporting figures are idols to youngsters and, I believe they are, then present- and future-day athletes have a tremendous obligation to those who will follow to see to it by their behavior that the shadows of doubt which have crept into the athletic picture are eliminated in their entirety.

Few are the organizations that can boast of a record of service and accomplishments, such as yours. The purposeful thinking which you advocate and the lofty goals and standards of amateurism which you have set are ideal.

The doctrines which you preach become more true with each passing day, and because of your efforts, untold thousands of athletes have found it possible to experience the thrill that comes only from an honest sweat, worked up in honest competition.

We at the Philadelphia Inquirer wish to congratulate you on the excellent work you have done, are doing, and will continue to perform. We stand ready to assist in anyway possible, and come the 1948 Olympics, the whole world will become aware of what we in Philadelphia and the surrounding communities know so well. That is, the American amateur athlete is second to none and the Philadelphia product at least the equal of any in this great country of ours.

Where Does It Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article written by Mr. M. O. Cox, editor of the Farm Weekly agriculture supplement of the Sioux City Journal. I am sure it will be of interest to those who do not have an intimate knowledge of agriculture:

Many an easterner, upon driving through the great Midwest for the first time, asks: "What in the world do you do with all that corn? Who eats it anyway?" Through Illinois, Iowa, southern Minnesota and eastern South Dakota he travels mile after mile bordered by masses of corn. He sees, too, field after field of small grains. Then he wonders what happens to this gigantic Midwest production.

CORN

First in importance, of course, is corn, of which over 3,200,000,000 bushels were harvested last fall.

Only a small percentage of the corn crop goes for industrial purposes and human consumption. The bulk of it goes into the production of steaks, chops, milk, and eggs. The net movement of corn from farms is only about 10 percent. Nearly 20 percent is sold off the farm but 10 percent is bought back as commercial feeds, leaving only about two hundred and fifty to three hundred million bushels for industry, exports, and other uses off the farm.

Livestock consumes 80 percent or more of the corn crop. USDA figures show that about 0.71 percent of the total crop goes for seed; 2.03 percent for export; and around 8 percent for industrial uses.

Food processors and industry use corn for dry process products, alcoholic beverages, wet process products, breakfast foods, and flour.

OATS

As a feed crop oats ranks second in importance, topped only by corn. The bulk of the 1,500,000,000-bushel 1946 crop will be utilized as a livestock feed. In general, in the United States, the oat harvest never leaves the farm. In a few areas such as Iowa, the No. 1 oat State, oats move through trade channels for industrial uses.

Some oats go into commercial mashes and feeds which in turn are brought back by the farmer. Another small percentage of the total United States crop goes to make various oat cereals. One of the world's largest oat cereal mills is located in Iowa. If you eat 6.9 pounds of oats each year you are getting your average share of prepared oats.

SOYBEANS

The Midwest soybean crop is sold off the farm and goes to feed mills and processing plants. A large amount of the industrial by-product, soybean-oil meal, is bought back by farmers for livestock feed.

The 200,000,000 bushels of soybeans produced in 1946 will be turned into valuable oil, livestock feed, glue, plastics, rubber substitutes, ink, enamels, linoleum, soap, and a hundred other items.

WHEAT

Wheat is another crop that stays in the United States. The 1,100,000,000-bushel crop harvested in 1946 will go for three principal purposes: Human food, livestock feed, and seed. The price of corn and oats largely determines whether or not the farmer will use wheat as a livestock feed.

During the war years, when wheat was more valuable as a human food, the bulk of it went for flour and other food products. The percentage used as livestock feed is small.

United States exports of wheat have dropped off, too. In the last 10 years net exports have averaged less than one-half of 1 percent of the total wheat produced.

FLAX

Flax is another crop that moves from the farm as it has limited use as a livestock feed before being processed. The bulk of the flax crop is marketed soon after harvest, August to October, inclusive. The farmer buys back, in turn, linseed-oil meal, a valuable, high-protein feed necessary for feeding livestock. From the oil the manufacturers are able to make dozens of products including such things as linoleum, oilcloth, patent leather, and oils for paints.

International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I reported to the House last August that from October 21 to 26, 1946, there would take place in the Library of Congress a meeting of the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers. It is my purpose now to report to you on the work of that distinguished body during a week of manifold activities. Daily sessions of the main body and of the several federations that make up the International Confederation took place throughout the week. The Librarian of Congress, Dr. Luther H. Evans, cooperated enthusiastically with these men and women of letters who came from many countries to be present at the first session of this body to be held in the United States.

I may point out that this Washington meeting was an extraordinary congress arranged at the annual meeting in Paris in March 1946, for the purpose of making plans for the international congress already scheduled for London this year.

At the Paris meeting, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, through its general manager, Mr. John G. Paine, invited the congress to meet in Washington so that the American society might be in close touch with the confederation's activities in returning to normal prewar operation.

The chief purpose of this international confederation is to maintain the integrity of intellectual property throughout the world. For 20 years now this confederation has been functioning. Its work is largely the work theretofore undertaken by smaller and more limited groups.

Within the confederation are four federations, concerned respectively with dramatic rights, music-performing rights, recording rights, and the rights of persons active in the field of letters. Our own national stake in this confederation is the membership in the second federation of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers—more familiarly known to most of us under its alphabetical designation, ASCAP. It is my belief and earnest hope that other movements in this country soon will avail themselves of the machinery of this confederation. I am convinced that the creators of intellectual property can find no more adequate means of protecting their rights than through such machinery as this.

In its last plenary session before the World War, at Stockholm, in 1938, delegates attended from 46 European societies, and from 8 societies of the Western Hemisphere. The confederation's first postwar congress was in Paris in March 1946, where steps were taken to restore prewar operations, and where the delegates gladly availed themselves of an

invitation to sit in extraordinary session in Washington in October 1946. It is of the Washington session that I report.

I am happy that this confederation was received most courteously, not only by its affiliated members in ASCAP but also by the representatives of our own Government. The visitors overwhelmed me with expressions of praise and gratitude for their kindly reception by the Department of State, the Library of Congress, and other governmental agencies that had opportunity to facilitate the work of their congress.

I believe I speak with a certain degree of authority on international relations. It has been my privilege to serve for many years on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and for a long time as its chairman. I have participated in the United Nations organization from its beginnings in San Francisco to my attendance at the latest session of the General Assembly in New York. I have taken an active part in the efforts of representatives of many countries to reach amicable solutions of a multitude of problems.

I have long been aware—and it is with sincere gratitude that I note the State Department has become aware—of the incalculable value of promoting international understanding through the cultural intercourse of the different peoples involved. Intellectual property knows no geographical limits. We who are trying to compose differences in our thinking on international problems know that if there were a political language as universal as the language of the arts our difficulties soon would disappear. As we try to build a structure of international amity, the confusion of tongues often frustrates our efforts.

As art knows no national barriers, artists may be our most potent ambassadors of good will. Paderewski as a statesman was limited by national boundaries and policies, but as a pianist he spoke a language that the whole world heard with delight, and the whole world respected his statesmanship because it understood his art. Paderewski's international language is typical of the cultural forces which we must invoke as our greatest diplomatic asset.

These thoughts with me are not of recent origin, but they have taken new significance following my close relation with the work of the confederation.

It is from the standpoint of international relations that the Congress of Authors and Composers was superlatively important. The men and women who came here as delegates from their respective societies are the people who, in their own countries, write the newspaper articles, the magazine articles, the novels, the dramas, the musical compositions that mold the public opinion of those countries and stir the emotions of their compatriots.

We here, as a nation, are committed to the broad principle of international cooperation for the sake of good will and peace. In furtherance of that principle we must cultivate friendly relations and a better understanding among all nations. Peace flows from friendship, and friendship flows from acquaintance. The knowledge of America abroad, strange as it may seem, is very meager. Misinformation is almost universal. Foreign peoples do not know us as we really are. Only within recent years have we had the perspicacity to attempt to spread through the world a knowledge of ourselves, so that foreign peoples, knowing us better, would understand better our way of life and our system of individual and collective liberty.

The results of our efforts to become better understood have been good thus far, but the work of securing a thorough knowledge of foreign peoples and imparting to them a true knowledge of ourselves is a task that will consume many years—indeed, it is a continuous task in which all men of good will throughout the world should eagerly enlist themselves.

How long will it take, for example, to rub out the false picture of American life that prevails in both Europe and Latin America? That picture is a composite, formed of impressions gathered from our movies, from the eccentricities of American tourists abroad, from highly imaginative press reports of happenings here, and from miscellaneous exaggerations of American wealth, emotionalism, nervous tension, intense productivity, boundless resources, daring experiments, and so on. This false picture has given to foreign peoples the idea that we are a race apart from all the rest of the world, that our life is complicated, grandiose, artificial, and subject to one controlling factor that regulates our thinking, our being, our relationships with one another—that factor being money.

What a travesty upon the truth. The simple truth is that Americans are moved by the same emotion as other peoples. We are not a race apart. We are not consumed by lust of money; we are not a nation of gamblers, cutthroats, and drunkards. We live simple lives in the main, and have the same esthetic and spiritual impulses that other peoples have.

This Congress of Societies of Authors and Composers, having been held in the United States, gave to the delegates an opportunity to see us as we are; to become acquainted with our daily routine; to meet the representatives of our Government intimately and socially; to become friends with our playwrights, novelists, and composers; and to see our movies, plays, and real life in their true perspective, either as satires or as true interpretations; and thus to form an accurate idea of what Americans are and how they live.

Among the delegates who gave us a delightful glimpse into their changed conceptions of American life as a result of their visit among us were two distinguished friends of humanity who were destined never to return to their respective native lands. I refer to Dr. Eduardo Marquina, foremost poet and playwright of Spain, president of the Performing Right Society of his country; and to Mr. Fred Markush, gifted composer and general manager of the Performing Right Society of Hungary. Both of these gentlemen were fatally stricken in New York City within a few days of the close of the congress.

The comments of Dr. Eduardo Marquina just before his untimely death were particularly interesting to all who favor intimate interchange of cultures among nations:

> Why, this is a new and magnificent America—
>
> He exclaimed.
>
> Like so many of the peoples of Europe, I had a totally different and erroneous opinion of America before I came here—
>
> He said—
>
> I thought the people here were overemotional, living a grandiose life of strain and pretense, amidst an atmosphere of crime, artificiality, and greed. I obtained my views from your motion pictures and from the grotesque caricatures of Americans who sometimes strut through Europe, bragging and spending money in foolish fashion.
>
> Now I find that Americans live simple lives, home-loving lives. They are fond of music and the theater, and are insatiable readers. The legitimate stage gives a much better picture of the United States than do the movies. In my opinion every effort should be made to have American dramas presented in all countries in the world. Nothing would more promptly destroy the injurious prejudice that obstructs good understanding between this great country and other nations. The Glass Menagerie, The Voice of the Turtle, and State of the Union are admirable American plays that should be seen throughout Europe. Your musical offerings, also, are extremely valuable as showing American culture and folkways. I mention Carousel as an example. The fiesta or merrymaking in the opening of the second act, which you call the clambake, is a splendid scene, very significant of American life, and calculated to warm the heart of every beholder.
>
> Long live the true America that I have found here! It is the most wholesome of nations, quite different from the caricatures shown on the screen. I shall forever cherish the memory of my visit.

The opinions expressed by Dr. Marquina were voiced also in his own way by Mr. Fred Markush, who expected to do his share in representing to his countrymen the true America. He was especially interested in American music. As a composer of remarkable versatility, no better judge of our musical culture could have come to this country. The peoples of Hungary and the United States are the losers by the death of Fred Markush; but his sympathetic message has gone forth and will do much to bring the two nations closer together.

Both of these eminent men expressed astonishment over the neglect by America of the moral and legal rights of our gifted sons who produce our literature, our music, and our scientific triumphs. I regret to say that the United States is backward in this respect and that the protection afforded to the creative artists in Europe is much more effective than that which we give under our copyright law.

Because the confederation came to the United States to find here fresh blood for the life stream of their seasoned experience in the field of authors' rights, they studied carefully our own country's approach to the matters concerning them. During the course of their discussions, these delegates stressed the principle of the author's inherent rights as distinguished from the limited rights,

broad though they may be, that are secured to the author by American copyright law. Therefore, in meeting after meeting of the various groups of the four allied federations, and of the parent body, there was stressed the urgent need for revision of our present copyright law. As it now reads our copyright law belongs in some aspects to the horse-and-buggy era. It came into being before radio, before television, before the vast mechanization of music in motion pictures, wired music, phonograph records and coin boxes. It has required a host of legal tests to blueprint its application to modern times. In my opinion, the law needs a thorough revamping, first, to give adequate consideration to the rights of the creator in his work, and second, for an orderly legal interpretation of those rights.

As a result of the work of this meeting, the world of creative artists looks to the United States to bring its copyright practices up to date. Delegates to this congress, many of them in this country for the first time, found here a development of the arts beyond their expectations. At the same time they found inconsistencies. To the European way of thinking the right of the creator is paramount. The author's intellectual property is his by right of creation. Nothing may invade the sanctity of his ownership. To strip the author of rights in any particular is to them unthinkable. Yet what do these delegates find in our copyright law? They find one provision that exempts from its application a vast industry that fattens on the musical works of authors who are estopped from invoking protection of the copyright law—and I think I need not tell you I refer to the coin-operated machines—"juke boxes," so-called. They find another provision they cannot understand—one that makes for compulsory licensing of the recording of copyright works. In passing may I observe that in our whole organic law this is the sole example of congressional price-fixing.

Our visitors came with an inquiring and open mind. They were happy when we told them that the recognition of the principle of copyright in the United States antedated the Constitution, that at least 12 and perhaps all 13 of the original Colonies enacted copyright laws. All the Colonial Congresses were in sympathy with the principle that "no property is more peculiarly a man's own than that which results from the labor of his mind." They were told that the Constitution itself included a provision that Congress should have power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." This factual history of the development of copyright law pleased them immensely. Yet I must tell you in all honesty that they found it difficult to reconcile our copyright law with our acceptance of the principle. You may understand their concern in this respect when I tell you that the single matter upon which this session saw fit to take definite action was that of the coin-operated machines.

I quote from the minutes of the congress their resolution unanimously adopted:

The International Confederation of Authors' and Composers' Societies, assembled in special congress at Washington in October 1946, deplores the provision of the United States Copyright Act which exempts from payment of fees any public performances taking place by means of coin-operated mechanical instruments (juke boxes), and wishes to draw the attention of the United States Government to this provision, and recommends the abolition of such exemption which grants a privilege to users to the serious detriment of legitimate rights of authors and composers throughout the world.

Similarly the congress went on record with regard to the copyright regulations in Canada where the protection provided for creators whose works are used in mechanical production is very inadequate.

We have long been aware of the importance of redrafting our copyright law. Numerous efforts have been made to effect changes. Unfortunately, many of these have originated from selfish interests, and their enactment would weaken rather than strengthen the position of the creative artist. The most intelligent approach to solution of this problem was the so-called Shotwell bill. You will recall that Prof. James T. Shotwell, United States Chairman of the League of Nations Committee for International Intellectual Cooperation, led a movement before the war to redraft the copyright law, and that after exhaustive study and protracted hearings attended by representatives of all the parties in interest his committee drafted a bill which found its way into the Congress. Unfortunately, it went the way of a vast amount of proposed legislation—forgotten in the stress of war.

I know that in this session of Congress we shall have a vast amount of important legislative work. Domestic problems are multiplying. The international scene is clouded with much misunderstanding. We must face our duties with renewed devotion to basic principles, seeking the leadership of an all-wise Providence.

In my opinion a new copyright law, based in all respects upon full recognition of authors' rights, should be among our first enactments. Such a law will be a powerful tool to implement the State Department's efforts to stimulate the international flow of national cultures. If we have the vision to proceed promptly to the enactment of this law, we will protect our own creative artist and we will announce to the world that we in America guarantee the integrity of work of creative artists of other nations.

I, for one, should be happy to be numbered among the lawmakers of the Nation to participate in bringing this about. I believe, in all sincerity, that no single movement can more effectively convince our brothers in art in other countries that Americans, like themselves, are truly concerned with the things of the spirit, that we do not live by bread alone. Such a movement transcends party lines. It is American in the truest sense. To the enactment of such a law I pledge my best efforts. To its enactment I rally every one of you.

The Budget Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks before the Citizens National Committee, Inc., at the Hotel Statler in Washington, on Monday, January 27, 1947:

Mr. President and members of the Citizens National Committee, I am happy to be able to be with you this morning. I am particularly happy because, if I understand the objectives of this organization clearly, I believe it has a great opportunity to be of help to the Congress in dealing with the most important problem confronting us, in my opinion, at this time.

I refer to the problem of putting our financial house in order. I say it is the most important problem confronting us at this time because unless order is restored national solvency is impossible, widespread suffering is inevitable.

Too many governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy. The rocks are visible in many directions at this time.

The President's Budget message was, I am confident, a tremendous disappointment to millions of Americans, to all those who believed that the President would respond to the clear mandate from the people to slash expenditures, to eliminate waste and extravagance, and to limit Federal activities to those which are essential in the light of the conditions confronting the country at this time.

It was particularly disappointing in view of his message to the Congress only 4 days before in which he indicated that expenditures would be cut to the bone and in which he expressed the hope that Congress would cooperate in what he termed with a smile his "economy program"—an economy program which turned out to call for an over-all expenditure of $37,500,000,000 in a fiscal year commencing almost 2 years after VJ-day.

The national welfare demands reduction in expenditure, reduction in the national debt, and reduction in taxation, with a view to assuring essential production and to avoiding Nation-wide suffering for all.

During the past 14 years we have seen unprecedented waste and extravagance; we have seen deficit piled upon deficit; we have seen the national debt mount to unheard-of proportions; we have seen bureaucratic government encroaching on the liberties of the people, assuming more and more power, and usurping functions belonging more properly to States, local governments, and private business. We have seen ever mounting taxation to be paid for in the sweat of everyone who labors, whether by brawn or by brain.

As a result of war and the spending philosophy of the administration, we are today confronted in the fiscal field by unparalleled conditions.

We talk of a national debt of $260,000,000,000. That is an enormous figure. It is 10 times the maximum national debt during World War I. It is far above the figure which competent persons have thought the Nation could carry, but it doesn't tell the whole story. It makes no mention of contingent liabilities.

In response to inquiries which I propounded about a year ago, the Bureau of the Budget testified on the record that the gross public debt, plus contingent liabilities, amounted to the astounding figure of over $663,000,000,000.

That is approximately two-thirds of a trillion dollars. It includes in addition to the gross public debt, which we normally consider, obligations guaranteed by the United States of $27,000,000,000, unliquidated obligations against appropriations and authorizations of $43,000,000,000, agency loans guaranteed by the United States of $6,000,000,000, and insurance by Government agencies of $309,000,000,000.

The gross public debt alone is equivalent to over $1,850 for every man, woman, and child in this country. The equivalent on the same basis for gross public debt plus contingent liabilities is over $4,700.

We have an enormous number of Federal agencies, many of them engaged in functions not properly functions of the Federal Government, particularly under present conditions. According to Senator BYRD, of Virginia, those agencies number 1,150 as compared to 190 in 1935.

There has been great duplication and overlapping of functions in many of these agencies. The Comptroller General has stated not so long ago that there were no less than 29 agencies lending Government funds, 3 insuring deposits, 34 in the acquisition of land, 16 in wildlife preservation, 10 in Government construction, 9 in credit and finance, 12 in home and community planning, 10 in materials and construction, 28 in welfare matters, 14 in forestry matters, 4 in bank examinations, and 65 in gathering statistics.

We have an enormous Federal pay roll with apparently little or no desire on the part of the President for its proper reduction. The most recent figure that I have seen showed over 2,300,000 persons on the Federal pay roll today as compared with about 900,000 in 1939 and about 720,000 in 1935. In other words, there has been an increase of 1,400,000 since 1939, probably representing an increase in expenditure in the neighborhood of $5,000,000. There are in many States more Federal employees than there are State employees. Excluding the Army and Navy, there are more Federal employees on the pay rolls today than there were on VJ-day.

A year ago the Bureau of the Budget testified that a majority, if not all, agencies of Government, except strictly national defense and war agencies, would with the approval of the President, request appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 in excess of those for 1946. It would appear that it is proposed to accord many of those agencies further increases for the fiscal year 1948 as compared with those for 1947.

There has been gross waste of the people's money in many fields. May I give you one example which, while not one of the major examples in terms of dollars and cents, is, nevertheless, in my judgment, of the greatest importance in terms of the proper functioning of our form of government.

In response to further inquiries which I propounded a year ago, the Bureau of the Budget reported on the record that there were no less than 46,000 (part or full time) employees engaged in publicity or propaganda work of every kind and description on the Federal pay rolls at the people's expense. Without burdening you with detail which can be found in the hearings on the subject, I may state that the work included publications, press service, radio broadcasting, group contacts with attendance at meetings, paid advertisements, exhibits, motion pictures, lantern slides and lecture material, photography, correspondence, individual contacts, educational cooperation with schools and civic or special-interest organizations, posters, and other miscellaneous items.

This enormous governmental publicity set-up, in my opinion, is not only a gross waste of the people's money but over and beyond that makes for the destruction of the proper exercise of the legislative functions of the Government.

Title 5, section 54, of the United States Code specifically provides that "No money appropriated by any act shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose." Departure from the philosophy underlying that law, coupled with the surrender in large measure of control of the purse-strings by the Congress leads inevitably to the domination of Congress and the people by the executive branch of the Government.

Lack of proper control and worse in the handling of funds made available to departments and agencies has resulted in the loss of many billions of dollars to the people of this country.

The Comptroller General of the United States has recently reported the loss of many billions, particularly in connection with cost-plus contracts, renegotiation, and contract termination. He has castigated the procurement agencies of the Government for laxity and lack of ethical standards. He has reported in one instance that the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration have failed to account properly for over $8,000,000,000.

Referring to abuse of authority and degeneration of moral standards, as late as July 29, last, he said, "We cannot overstate the seriousness of the situation. Nothing less than the faith of our people in the integrity of their Government is at stake."

Further examples of the shortcomings of the spending era in which we have been living are unnecessary.

Waste and corruption must be eliminated. Federal expenditure must be limited to expenditure which is essential in the light of present-day conditions; the national debt must be reduced; taxation must be reduced; efficient government must be assured at the least possible cost.

The legislative budget in the sense in which the term is used today is a new feature in the control by Congress over appropriations. It is provided for in section 138–A of the reorganization law approved on August 2 last.

In that law it is provided that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, shall meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and, after study and consultations, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, shall report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. The report must contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year, including an amount to be reserved for unforeseen requirements. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditure, the report must contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. If the estimated expenditure exceeds the estimated receipts, the resolution approving the report must state that it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased by the amount of the excess. The report must be made on or before February 15.

The purpose of the provision is to compel consideration of receipts and expenditures as a whole in advance of the beginning of each fiscal year and the adoption of a ceiling which will at least serve as a rough yardstick for the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and for the Congress as a whole.

With the purpose sought I am in accord. Whether the specific mechanics provided will achieve the underlying objective remains to be seen. I hope that the proposal will contribute to sound economy. Obviously, however, no accurate conclusions can be reached by the Congress until after the several subcommittees on appropriations have completed their work. From this standpoint, the new law puts the cart before the horse.

What the Congress has vitally needed for many years, in my opinion, is a competent staff of investigators and auditors.

In no other way can proper retrenchment be assured unless the President himself is determined to effect that retrenchment. The Bureau of the Budget under present conditions is just a part of the White House organization.

The President's budget message is lacking in clarity and gives evidence of lack of careful consideration. It contemplates an over-all expenditure in respect to the fiscal year 1948 commencing July 1 next, of $37,500,000,000. This proposed expenditure is in respect to a fiscal year starting almost 2 years after VJ-day. It represents an expenditure of more than four times our largest prewar budget, a budget which was considered enormous at the time. It represents the equivalent of $55 a month on the back of every gainfully employed person in this country.

The President asks for $5,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt; for $2,100,000,000 for refunds under present tax laws; for $7,300,000,000 for veteran services. These are tremendous figures. They aggregate $14,400,000,000. They leave a balance of $23,100,000,000 for the other expenses of the Government.

Our over-all expenditure in 1939 was about $9,000,000,000, in 1914 it was about $1,000,000,000.

A detailed analysis of the Budget has not yet been possible. This must be made by the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget insofar as limited time permits and by the several subcommittees on appropriations in the House and in the Senate.

The Budget, would appear, however, to indicate little or no effort to respond to the people's demand for real retrenchment. On the contrary, it would appear to contemplate the carrying on of unjustified activities—activities which are not primarily Federal activities—activities which the Federal Government cannot afford to support under present conditions.

Eleven billion two hundred million dollars is requested for the Army and Navy. I should be the last to take any step that would cripple our armed forces at this critical time in world affairs. I am inclined to believe, however, in the light of such study as I have been able to give the matter, that substantial reductions may well be effected in this enormous item of expenditure without in any way affecting the fighting efficiency of the armed forces.

Seven billion three hundred million dollars is proposed for veterans' services. Again I would not reduce in any way the benefits provided for our veterans. I am not convinced, however, that this tremendous item of expenditure has been carefully computed or that substantial savings cannot be effected in reference to administrative personnel now numbering over 220,000 and other administrative costs.

The discontinuance of unnecessary governmental functions and the elimination of unnecessary personnel offer a major route to retrenchment. It is noteworthy in this connection, in how many instances it is proposed by the President to give substantial increases in appropriations to departments and agencies.

For example: It is proposed to appropriate $947,000,000 as compared with an actual appropriation this year of $723,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture; it is proposed to appropriate $264,000,000 as compared with $194,000,000 this year for the Department of Commerce; it is proposed to appropriate $313,000,000 as compared with $272,000,000 this year for the Department of the Interior; it is

proposed to appropriate $111,000,000 as compared with $99,000,000 this year for the Department of Justice; it is proposed to appropriate $356,000,000 as compared with $178,000,000 for this year for the State Department; and it is proposed to appropriate $352,000,000 as compared with $295,000,000 this year for the Post Office Department.

A similar comparison for some of the independent agencies of the Government shows an increase from $12,000,000 to $12,700,000 for the Civil Service Commission, from $5,500,000 to $7,300,000 for the Federal Communications Commission, from $3,300,000 to $4,200,000 for the Federal Power Commission, from $2,500,000 to $3,900,000 for the Federal Trade Commission, from $9,600,000 to $11,900,000 for the Interstate Commerce Commission, from $1,000,000 to $1,700,000 for the National Archives, from $4,000,000 to $7,900,000 for the National Labor Relations Board, from $4,900,000 to $6,500,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission. These are but examples.

All items of the proposed over-all expenditures must be thoroughly examined by the committees referred to. Particularly such items as those classified by the President under the heading "International affairs and finance," $3,500,000,000; programs for improvement of transportation and communication systems, for public works and development of natural resources, $2,600,000,000; for our agricultural program, $1,400,000,000; for social welfare and general research, $1,700,000,000; for war liquidation, various services to business and other miscellaneous items, $2,100,000,000.

It is not a question of spending what we might like to spend. It is a question of eliminating every cent of expenditure that is unjustified under present conditions.

The essential needs of efficient governmental operation should govern appropriations—in turn appropriations should guide the Ways and Means Committee in determining the amount of revenue to be raised by taxation.

We need to get away from the spending psychology of the past 14 years. We need to get back to an appreciation of the fact that whenever any agency of the Government wastes $3,000 it has wasted the entire year's work of some citizen. When it wastes $100,000 it has wasted a year's work of 33,000 American citizens, or all the inhabitants of a good-sized middle western city.

Every dollar of Federal expenditures comes out of the toil of those who produce. Every worker on the Federal pay roll means one less worker to help produce for all.

The expenditure proposed in the President's budget message can and must be slashed. All unjustified expenditure must be eliminated. Let us hope that the legislative budget will contribute to this end.

It Profits Uncle Sam "To Cast Bread Upon the Waters"—Western Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago when our colleague, Congressman Charles Leavy, was with us from the State of Washington, he used to badger me about the respective potentialities of our States in the West. Said Charlie one day, "John, the Columbia River is the greatest potential power-producing river in the West. Did you know that the Columbia River has five times the volume of your Colorado River?" I made quick and mathematical reply, saying, "Charlie, do you know that we can build in numerous places on the Colorado River dams five times as high as any you can possibly have on the Columbia River? Now since total power output is the product of volume times fall, I don't see that you have much to brag about in comparison between your Columbia and my Colorado." I think our respective statements comparing the greatest river of the Pacific Northwest and the greatest river of the Pacific Southwest sums up a proper comparison of them with regard to hydroelectric power production.

Let me hasten to say that the foregoing is simply a convenient illustration, and I use hydroelectric power production merely because it is most easily and mathematically stated, and not because it is the most important in western economy. In fact, utilization of water for power production is entirely secondary to certain life-giving uses for which it is needed in the West.

Previously, I have stated to the Congress that, although 20,000,000 acres of land have been reclaimed from the desert in the West, which is about 50 percent of the total possible development in irrigation, even so, not to exceed 20 percent of the wealth-producing possibility of our maximum reclamation program has thus far been realized in completed projects. That is to say that further moves toward completion of this reclamation program will create wealth, not in direct proportion to total increases, but rather according to the squares of the capital investments made. I do not want to seem too mathematical, and I realize that it might be difficult to prove with a Q. E. D. that such is a mathematical fact, but I am convinced that the increase of new wealth out of increased investments in reclamation runs more nearly in a geometric ratio. The history of a few typical reclamation projects furnishes ample evidence of such economic expansion.

I know the argument will be raised at once by those indifferent to such reclamation developments and also by those poorly informed, and especially those who are hostile to it, that it is not wise policy to bring in new land now. They will say that American agriculture is apt to be troubled with surpluses as has been the case prior to the recent war. However, if the true facts are made known, reclamation projects do not compete with the major crops produced by American agriculture, and, therefore, have no appreciable effect in bringing about troublesome surpluses of those major crops. The great wealth produced by reclamation consists of specialty crops harvested at unusual seasons and thereby, instead of competing with the major farm crops, supplements them in giving our consuming public the variety which it wants.

Thousands of carloads of lettuce are shipped out of the warm valleys in the Pacific Southwest when most of our country is blanketed in snow, and even in the Pacific Northwest fresh food, as well as fruit, is produced under irrigation at a time when most of the East is suffering a climate in which nothing will grow. Quick-frozen peas and other table crops are readied for the market and flown by air to bring these top prices, which makes their total production so astronomical in volume and value.

Perhaps the French gardeners in Paris growing truck under glass could be cited as carrying on the most intensive kind of agriculture known, but the irrigated West can show an equally intensive agriculture, not of a hothouse variety. No, we have the sun out there, and it works overtime, and we do not have to glass-in our irrigated acres. The all-important thing to remember is that we are not growing corn, nor wheat, nor rice, nor tobacco in the West, and that there is no competition with the other farming sections of the Nation. In the far West we farm intensively but not competitively.

My stock illustration to show the productivity of irrigated lands is a report on one main project around Phoenix, Ariz., which 2 years ago produced $30,000,000 worth of food and fiber on 225,000 acres of irrigated land in 12 months. However, I found that during the following 12 months that same land averaged $165 per acre in the cash value of its crops. There are several other projects in Arizona which are about equally productive and still other projects in adjoining States in the Pacific Southwest where the annual production is comparable in value.

Astonishing as the above appears to be, it is surpassed by certain projects in the Pacific Northwest where the crop production in 1943 on one project averaged $245 per acre. Other projects up there exceeded even that figure. In fact, I am told that during the last few years the United States Treasury collected in income taxes from some of these projects annually more than the original total governmental investment in the projects. That would certainly seem a good investment for Uncle Samuel as well as for his enterprising nieces and nephews.

Although the recent war years have been unusual years, the Reclamation Service shows that the total agricultural production in food and fiber during the war years averaged approximately 50 percent annually of the total Government outlay through the United States Bureau of Reclamation for all these Federal projects. Hold in mind that the reclamation law provides for the ultimate repayment of every dollar of capital investment which Uncle Sam makes, which makes the United States Treasury safe and whole on all such Federal expenditures. Yet, meanwhile, the Government is pulling into the Treasury, through taxation from this wealth-producing investment, many times over the Government money spent to help create them. This is private enterprise in high gear, yielding rich profits from wise Government encouragement.

The Right To Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, much is being written and said on the all-important labor-management question. I am not opposed to organized labor, and as a businessman, feel I am somewhat qualified to understand both sides. An editorial appearing in the January 14 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "The Right To Strike," sums up the situation in a clear and concise manner. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial mentioned:

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

The American people are going to limit the right to strike in essential industries. The Supreme Court may start the process in its decision on the injunction against John L. Lewis. Congress may do it with new laws. Whether it is well or badly done will depend on how clearly the public understands the situation and on how closely the law follows justice and common sense.

The public has been confused by talk about the right of a man to quit work and about the thirteenth amendment's prohibition of involuntary servitude. In human society there are no absolute rights. The right to free speech confers no freedom to commit libel. The right to bear arms gives no man a license to duel. Taxation, eminent domain, conscription—all limit private rights in the name of public welfare.

The right of an individual to quit work is not a right to conspire with others to paralyze an essential public service. It is not, for instance, a right conferred on a union to cut off a city's light and power supply, as was done at Pittsburgh a few months ago. It is not a right to deprive a city of police protection, as was proved in Boston 28 years ago. It is not a right to halt the railroads, as was demonstrated in the United States last spring. It is not a right to shut off food supplies, as is being shown in England today.

Freedom from involuntary servitude is precious. It was won through centuries of struggle. It must be guarded with our lives. But it will not be cherished or protected by using the words to cloak an abuse, an actual destruction of freedom. The individual's freedom from involuntary servitude furnishes no license for a union—or a company—to hold a city or nation for ransom. And if there is justice in recognizing that a worker has some interest in his job so that we tolerate his efforts to keep a strikebreaker from taking it there is justice also in requiring men not to strike when their doing so robs thousands of others of the right to work.

Modern industrial society has developed new conditions which give small groups—unions or companies—tremendous power. Open warfare in essential public services means anarchy. It exercises a coercion on the community which must be answered by coercion. Actually, common sense is already limiting the right to strike or to lock out. But we have not yet legally provided for the situation.

Compulsory arbitration is widely denounced, both by unions and industrialists. But in some way the public is going to protect itself. It can rightly demand that those engaged in essential services agree to arbitrate their differences—and accept the result—or get out of those industries. In return, it should provide special safeguards—such as the guaranty of wages and working conditions at least equal to the average in the same community. The alternative is a law permitting the declaration of an emergency and the taking over of plants by the Government—with powers to deny bargaining and picketing privileges.

Polish Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles from today's Washington Post:

POLISH ELECTIONS

(By Sumner Welles)

FUTURE UNITED STATES POLICY

The results of the Polish parliamentary elections were even more fantastic than had been expected. The Polish Peasant Party was allowed to poll only one-tenth of the total vote cast and the Socialist-Communist bloc, supported by the Bierut-Osubka-Morawski provisional regime, was made to triumph all along the line.

The Moscow-dominated parties will, consequently, hold nearly 400 out of 444 seats in the Polish Parliament. The Peasant Party leader, Mikolajczyk, will have to abandon his persistent and courageous efforts to maintain some semblance of real democracy in Poland, and the last vestiges of the liberal policies which General Sikorski had hoped to establish will, at least temporarily, disappear.

The reports of the American correspondents who covered the Polish elections have made it unmistakably clear, if proof were needed, that the coercion and fraud, the proscription of opposition candidates, and the open violence practiced by the provisional government resulted in elections which were the reverse of free and unfettered. It is not without significance that the heaviest majorities for the Soviet-favored candidates were rolled up in the former German districts transferred to Poland after their occupation by the Russian armies.

The official protests earlier made by the British and American Governments in view of the accumulating evidence that a shameless rigging of the elections was about to take place were, naturally, fruitless.

It is frequently said in extenuation of what has been taking place in Poland since the establishment of the Lublin government, that, if the Soviet Union is to become a cooperative and peaceful power, it must obtain the assurance of security, and that the only guaranty of Russian security lies in the establishment of "friendly governments" in all of the states adjacent to the Soviet Union.

But there is no justification for the implication that "friendly governments" would not be established as a result of free and fair elections or for the argument that Russia has a right to impose minority governments upon independent peoples until their majorities have either been cowed into submission or obliterated. If that were to become the official view of the United States, the normal influence of this Government would sink to an all-time low.

The need for the American Government to make a basic decision can no longer be evaded. The good faith of the United States is directly involved. For it is a matter of official record that, in addition to the pledges set forth in the Yalta Agreement, the United States during the war years repeatedly and officially assured the Polish people through their representatives that it would never recognize a government "unrepresentative of Poland." Can the United States hope to retain the confidence of the smaller countries and to exercise a constructive influence in world affairs if it disregards pledges of so solemn a character?

The decision which must be made will in a very real sense determine the nature of the European peace to come and the extent to which the American people are going to be able to insure their own future security.

The question now is whether the Government of the United States and the governments of the other western democracies will adopt a positive policy in the light of what has taken place in Poland or whether they will continue to limit themselves to pro forma expressions of deprecation.

The Yalta agreement, to which the Soviet Union as well as the United States and Great Britain officially subscribed, guaranteed the Polish people an opportunity to obtain representative government through fair elections. That pledge has now been flagrantly ignored. The Polish elections afford a further example of how the system which the Communist Party calls "democracy" works in practice.

At this moment when the long-postponed discussion of the German treaty is finally at hand and the attention of the American people is at length concentrated upon the pressing need for the prompt negotiation of an over-all European settlement, it is vitally important that the Government of the United States decide whether any peaceful and lasting European order can be created if some of the component peoples are deprived of their rights to self-determination and to sovereign liberty and when such international commitments as those incorporated in the Atlantic Charter and in the Yalta agreement are cynically violated.

There is nothing to be gained by any present severance of relations with the existing Government in Warsaw. A rupture at this moment would merely serve the interests of the Bierut-Osubka-Morawski regime. Nor can any final settlement of the Polish question be anticipated until the key to the whole problem of European reconstruction—the German treaty—has been found. The very frontiers of Poland must be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the future German treaty.

But the United States can now make it clear that in its considered judgment what has occurred in Poland constitutes a violation of the third article of the Atlantic Charter, to which every member of the United Nations is committed under the United Nations Declaration, as well as a violation of article I of the United Nations Charter, and that this Government will consequently submit the issues thereby raised to the United Nations at the next meeting of its General Assembly.

The questions presented involve the good faith of the United States, the nature of the foundations required upon which to construct a peaceful world order, and the establishment of a precedent which may well determine whether the smaller nations of the earth are to be able to maintain their freedom and independence in the years to come.

Powers and Duties of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, at the organization meeting of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I have the honor to be chairman, the committee unanimously adopted a resolution relative to its powers and duties and scope of its work under the rules of the House and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. In the consideration of this resolution the committee heard the report of a preorganization subcommittee consisting of Mr. VORYS, of Ohio; Mr. JONKMAN, of Michigan; and Mr. JAVITS, of New York. In view of the interest expressed in the action of our committee, I am extending in the RECORD the full text of this committee resolution and the report of the subcommittee, which was received and filed:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE AND THE SCOPE OF ITS WORK

Whereas the Committee on Foreign Affairs was established in 1822, and by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (1) has been given jurisdiction as a standing committee over relations of the United States with foreign nations generally, and (2) shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the Department of State and the agencies of the United States Government of the laws relating to the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally; and

Whereas the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 gives apparently conflicting jurisdiction to other House committees, and the possible overlapping jurisdiction of committees may result in duplication of committee activities and unnecessary demands upon the time of departmental officers in appearing before committees; and

Whereas by tradition and precedent peculiarly close relations have grown up between the Foreign Affairs Committee and the executive departments with reference to foreign affairs; and

Whereas it is the desire and purpose of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to aid in the formulation and execution of a bipartisan foreign policy and to cooperate to the fullest extent with the President and the new Secretary of State in the discharge of their grave responsibilities, while at the same time discharging its obligations to the people and to the House of Representatives, of recommending legislative action only after full knowledge of the facts and policies involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, (1) That the Committee on Foreign Affairs make a detailed study of the laws affecting the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally, and that a study be made of the international organizations of which the United States is a member;

(2) that the Committee on Foreign Affairs invite the Secretary of State to cooperate with the committee in such study and to furnish all necessary information as to the organization, the personnel, and the policies of the Department of State and international agreements to which the United States is a party, and that the committee agree to safeguard such information against any disclosure which is incompatible with the public interest; and

(3) that, upon the acceptance by the Secretary of State of this invitation and agreement, the Committee on Foreign Affairs recommend to the Speaker and to the other committees of the House of Representatives that no other committee make any unnecessary duplicating studies of the organization, personnel, and policies of the Department of State; that the Committee on Foreign Affairs invite duly appointed subcommittees from other committees to participate in hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on subject matter which is within the jurisdiction of such other committees, and that the Committee on Foreign Affairs request the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the other committees whose powers and duties may involve foreign affairs to permit subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to participate in hearings by such committees which involve the organization, personnel, or policies of the Department of State and matters relating to the relations of the United States with foreign affairs generally; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, and the chairmen of the standing committees of the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON POWERS, DUTIES, AND SCOPE OF WORK OF COMMITTEES

The reorganization of the House committees caused by the change in personnel and in party control, together with the changes required by the Reorganization Act of 1946, involve a careful analysis of the powers and duties of the various committees and a planning of their work, so as to avoid duplication and confusion. While the House has over-all control of the functioning of its committees, their jurisdiction and their activities, each committee can contribute to the over-all plan by making an analysis of its own functions and a plan for its own activities as part of the over-all work of the House. Conflicts between committee activities are subject to the decision of the House, but, by study and planning and cooperation, conflicts can be avoided. It is in this spirit that the subcommittee presents the accompanying resolution.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs was established in 1822 and has had "a broad jurisdiction over foreign relations" (sec. 689, Jefferson's Manual), and has by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 been given its prior jurisdiction as a standing committee and also jurisdiction over (sec. 121, rule XI) "all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to * * * relations of the United States with foreign nations generally" including "international conferences and congresses." * * * "Measures to foster commercial intercourse with nations * * * the United Nations organization and international financial and monetary organizations" and "foreign loans" and (sec. 136) "shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned," thus giving the Foreign Affairs Committee special powers and duties with respect to the Department of State and the international organizations of which the United States is a member.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 gives apparently conflicting jurisdiction to other House committees, to wit (sec. 121, rule XI):

"Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department:

"(B) Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels * * *

"(D) Studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States * * * and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

"Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

"2. Regulation of interstate and foreign transportation.

"3. Regulation of interstate and foreign communication.

"Committee on Un-American Activities: The diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries * * * and all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation."

Committee on Appropriations: The work of the Appropriations Committee requires detailed study of the organizations and activities of the Department of State.

Committee on Armed Services: This committee has announced a study of the entire international situation under its jurisdiction, "common defense generally."

The possible overlapping jurisdiction of these six committees may cause, on the one hand, duplication of committee activities, and unnecessary demands upon the time of departmental officers in appearing before committees and, on the other hand, the possibility that studies necessary for legislation may be omitted entirely because of misunderstanding or confusion. There have been many instances where executive agencies asked for blanket authorizations from legislative committees, saying that justification of the details would be presented when appropriations are sought under the authorization, and then when the same agency appears before the Appropriations Committee it states that this subject has been explained in great detail to the legislative committee. The result is that neither the legislative nor the Appropriations Committee makes the proper examination of the project because each thinks the other is doing it.

On questions involving foreign policy the relations between the Executive and the Congress are fundamentally different from the relations in domestic affairs. In the first place, in the disturbed and tense international situation, both Republicans and Democrats on Capitol Hill are determined that Congress and the Executive shall present a united front to the rest of the world as we formulate and carry out a bi-partisan American foreign policy. Wide-open congressional investigations, public arguments and debates between Congress and the Departments have an important place in the settlement of domestic issues, but would be out of place in many aspects of our foreign affairs at this time.

In the second place, under our Constitution and traditions the Executive has powers and responsibilities in international affairs in his relations with Congress which do not apply at all in domestic affairs. In 1796 President George Washington refused a request of the House of Representatives for information in connection with the Jay Treaty saying: "The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution and its success must often depend upon secrecy; and even when brought to a conclusion a full disclosure * * * would be extremely impolitic. To admit, then, the right of the House of Representatives to demand and have as a matter of course all the papers respecting a negotiation with a foreign power would be to establish a dangerous precedent."

In the case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright* (299 U. S. 304), it was held that the powers of the Presidency in foreign affairs came before and beside the Constitution. The Court said: "In this vast external realm with its important complicated, delicate, and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation. * * * Into the field of

negotiations the Senate cannot intrude and Congress itself is powerless to invade it." House resolutions of inquiry, although highly privileged, when addressed to the President or the State Department on subjects of diplomatic interests contain the clause "if not incompatible with the public interest." (See Cannon's Precedents, vol. III, sec. 1896; id., vol. VI, sec. 436.) Many times information requested of the State Department is denied as "incompatible with the public interest."

The power of subpena certainly stands no higher than a privileged resolution of inquiry. The House rules and precedents show that there is no constitutional way for Congress to force information from the Executive except in impeachment proceedings.

This Congress desires to cooperate to the fullest extent with the President and the new Secretary of State in the discharge of their grave responsibilities; on the other hand, we believe this Congress is determined to have at least part of its membership fully informed as to the facts and the policies involved. We do not believe this Congress would be willing to legislate if pertinent and relevant information were denied the proper committees of Congress.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has by tradition and precedent peculiarly close relations with the State Department and the Executive with reference to foreign affairs. We believe that it is the committee to make inquiries concerning personnel, policies, and organizations of the State Department and our international activities. We believe that the Department will make full disclosures to this committee of all necessary information with proper safeguards for secrecy if publication is "incompatible with the public interest." We received much of such information during the war. Subcommittees of the Military Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee received information of the most secret kind, including A bomb development during the war, and preserved this secrecy inviolate. The House, in acting upon conclusions and recommendations furnished by committees which are enjoined to secrecy, has at least the assurance that trusted Members of the House are fully informed, and believe that secrecy is in the public interest. Such committees have a grave responsibility. Secrecy should not extend beyond vital military and diplomatic matters, but in such matters it is imperative that (1) the proper committee be fully informed, and that (2) this information be not made public.

We believe that the resolution, with reference to our work, placing upon the Foreign Affairs Committee the responsibility of checking the organization, personnel, and policies of the State Department, providing liaison with other committees which are necessarily involved, and preventing duplicating activities of other committees, will be the best way to carry out necessary functions of the House of Representatives at this session.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has precisely the same jurisdiction under the Reorganization Act as the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, except for treaties. The House, however, with its constitutional power of the purse, initiates all appropriations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has the primary duty of authorizing all appropriations affecting relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

Cooperation in the formulation and execution of a bipartisan policy involves more than cooperation between the Senate and the Executive; it involves more than cooperation between the House and the Executive; it involves more than cooperation between the parties in each body of Congress; it involves cooperation between the Senate and the House, as well as between Congress and the Executive. The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House is obviously the appropriate committee to cooperate with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

Tariff Pirates Are Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an interesting and well-timed editorial from the Belleville, Il., News-Democrat, Friday, January 24, 1947.

I have been disturbed recently by the tendency of some persons to start a movement toward high tariff barriers to commerce, but I am confident that the majority in this Congress have confidence in the policy of tariff reciprocity as the best path toward an expanding world economy. The United States has much to gain by the continuation of the reciprocity policy—much to lose by a relapse into economic isolation.

The editorial which follows briefly explains the meaning of a high tariff wall which would be thrown up after the scrapping of the policy of reciprocity to the average American, the consumer and the business man. The editorial:

TARIFF PIRATES ARE BACK

A few months back, when OPA still was in force, many manufacturers and producers screamed loudly that Uncle Sam was lousing up their business by meddling in something which was none of his concern. They griped continuously about various injustices and discriminations; said they just couldn't bear up under the burden.

OPA got the blame for everything—from stifling industrial reconversion to trampling on grandma's bunion. From the housetops they shouted "Down with price controls," and they raved and ranted about a return to the "solid principles of free trade."

Some of them even stooped to connivance against the Government—which is to say the people of the United States—by maliciously withholding desperately needed items. And finally they put the screws on and brought the country to its knees by a fiendishly engineered artificial meat famine.

Their zealous fight for "free trade" was won, and the OPA was killed.

But now the shoe is on the other foot. It develops that all their loud mouthings about the restoration of "free trade" was insincere hokum, dished up purely to make a point. These opportunists never wanted "free trade," and even now are unwilling to submit to the law of supply and demand.

Instead, the hoodwinkers want to turn the tables on the people again. They are currently bellyaching for greatly strengthened protective tariffs, which naturally are imposed and enforced by the Government and are paid for by all domestic consumers. They don't want price ceilings, but they do want price floors.

More than a thousand briefs have been filed in Washington by United States industries and trade associations, and within the next 3 weeks spokesmen will vocally go to bat to win congressional approval to gouge the man on the street.

American sheepmen, for example, whose lamb and mutton were conspicuously absent during the artificial meat famine, are in the swim. They want a substantial increase in the wool tariff, which, of course, will be reflected in the price of your next suit of clothing.

The Cotton Textile Institute not only wants to keep the high tariff on imported cotton fabrics, but it also wants quotas which would flatly restrict imports. That, too, shows up in the price you pay for clothing and whatever else is made of cotton.

Fabulous byproduct of the cattle industry—which led the OPA-killing meat strike—is hides. And the leather people are going to town to boost the tariff on Argentina-produced hides. If they win out, you may be sure that the price of leather shoes will never be lower.

The shortage of paper, even at the enormous current prices, won't be alleviated either if domestic paper manufacturers, who can't even approach fulfillment of a colossal backlog of orders, have their way. They also want the sky-high tariff on paper retained. And that, ladies and gentlemen, affects your pocketbook all the way from building paper to toilet paper.

We could go on reciting these outrageous proposals until both you and we got blue in the face, but not once would there be one of them free of the taint of selfishness, and proposed in the public interest and for the common good of all American mankind.

Free trade is impossible wherever the supply is controlled. Yet that is exactly what these free trade champions of a few months ago now are seeking.

The thing about it that we don't like is that the public will be made to hold the bag—and pay the bill.

The Job Training Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Arkansas City Traveler:

THE JOB TRAINING CEILINGS

The stand of H. A. MEYER, new Third District Representative, in favor of lifting the $200-a-month ceiling on combined wages and subsistence allowance for war veterans taking on-the-job training should meet with general public approval.

The on-the-job training program was set up to compensate veterans for the occupational advantages lost by their being called into service during the period in their lives when most young men are learning a business or trade and qualifying themselves for full-fledged participation in their chosen careers. The subsistence allowance offered by the Government enables them to cross the financial hurdle imposed by the low wage scales inherent in apprenticeships and "learner" type jobs.

In anything as large, as involved, and as hurriedly set up as the veterans' training program, there were certain to be loopholes by which individuals and companies could take unfair advantage. The Veterans' Administration sought to close these gaps by imposing the $200 top monthly ceiling on veterans' income from both employers and the Government.

To men with families and other obligations, the reduction in income which followed the imposition of this ceiling came as a definite hardship in the face of rising living costs. The pinch has been felt particularly in the large cities, where almost everything comes with higher price tags. Especially hurt have been the older men who had acquired some experience before entering service and who wanted to start at a higher level in the training scale and qualify for a better type job.

Under the circumstances, it would appear sound policy for Congress to lift the ceilings by a reasonable amount while laying down more definite regulations for the entire program. This combination would work to restrict chiseling while discounting the penalty on the great majority of veterans acting in good faith.

What Government Agency Can Make a Better Showing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss briefly one of the important activities which is carried on by the Federal Government in my State, and the rest of the Western States where rainfall is insufficient to grow crops without man-made water storage and distribution systems. I refer to the work of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior, which for almost 45 years has been constructing dams, building irrigation canals, hydroelectric projects, and developing prosperous irrigated farming areas and communities.

The total contribution of this work, in terms of wealth and human welfare, is perhaps immeasurable, but some indication of its extent can be gathered from the records of the Bureau of Reclamation. A factual report of achievements, prepared by the Bureau, has just reached me. It is entitled "Project Repayment Histories and Payout Schedules" and contains a detailed account of the financial status of each project, year by year. This report should be studied by every Member of Congress.

I am particularly impressed with the completeness of this record and the businesslike repayment procedure in effect. This procedure is based on a series of repayment plans which have been authorized by the Congresses and enacted into laws from 1902 forward. The project water users have agreed, in 295 contracts, to repay $352,400,000. Amounts due under 80 of these contracts, principally for the sale of surplus waters in reservoirs, have been fully paid. There are now 177 contracts on which payments are being made each year. An additional 38 contracts have been executed covering repayment for projects now under construction or just being completed.

Of the amount that had become due in these contracts to June 30, 1946, 97.6 percent, or $74,838,673, has been paid. That is an excellent record of repayment, it seems to me, and proof of the soundness of the Government's investment in the projects.

Let us look for a moment at that investment. After 44 years of operations approximately $1,000,000,000 has been spent. When these projects for which repayment contracts have been executed are completed, the investment in them will be more than $1,800,000,000. As I stated before, $352,400,000 will be repaid by water users. An additional $473,315,000 which will have been expended for irrigation facilities will be repaid from revenues to be obtained from the sale of power. Over half a billion dollars invested in power facilities will be repaid from power earnings.

This reimbursability characteristic is basic in the structure of the reclamation program, making it somewhat unique in this era of large outlays of Federal moneys. It was provided for in the original Reclamation Act passed in 1902 and the requirement has been adhered to throughout the intervening years.

But do not think that the monetary return to the Federal Treasury is the only measurement we have of the value of these western reclamation projects. Speaking cumulatively, for the years 1906 through 1946, nearly $5,000,000,000 worth of crops has been produced in these areas. In 1946 alone, a banner year as to yields and farm prices, the gross crop value totaled over $500,000,000.

You can see from this record why I am interested in the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation as they relate to my section of the country and as they relate to the total national wealth.

Killing the Goose That Lays the Golden Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, regarding H. R. 1030, we all realize the necessity for maintaining certain excise taxes in view of our large national debt and the necessity of balancing the budget. It appears to me, however, that in our desire to secure a high volume of taxes there is an inherent danger of overtaxation. When the President announced that he would permit certain excise taxes, levied as an emergency war measure, to lapse in June of this year, he created a situation which was highly damaging to the fur producers of this country. The State of Wisconsin is producing 60 percent of all domestic fur, and, at the time of the announcement, was having great difficulty in keeping its house in order because of the sag in market conditions. The message added fuel to the fire in this industry.

The passage of H. R. 1030, now before the House, would reimpose or continue in effect these war-excise-tax rates for an indefinite period. I am satisfied that the House Committee on Ways and Means will very soon conduct a thorough study of this whole excise-tax problem and will bring to the House a bill which we can consider as permanent legislation and which will reestablish the old tax rate on luxury items which existed prior to the war.

The fur producers in my district and State have paid large sums in the form of excise taxes under the war program. They do not now object to paying taxes if the business warrants, but, Mr. Speaker, under present conditions, the industry cannot meet these war-excise-tax rates. This means that there will be very little in the way of tax dollars, which the Government needs so badly, from this industry. Congress cannot afford to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. If business is poor in this industry, then it cannot meet its tax liability and the Government will not profit. Removal of these taxes, however, just as early as possible, will permit the industry to rehabilitate itself and taxes will flow into the Treasury when this period has been overcome and the industry is prosperous again.

Mr. Speaker, let us not make the mistake of seeking tax dollars under this program when, as a matter of fact, they will not be paid by an industry which has no immediate prospects for a profitable season. I am opposed to the passage of this bill insofar as it continues the excise tax upon the fur producers of this country, and especially upon those of my district and State.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert some pertinent observations with regard to the reciprocal trade agreements:

The so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program is a legal monster that ultimately will destroy the American worker, farmer, and businessman. This Frankenstein piece of legislation was conceived in hysteria and nurtured behind closed doors of the State Department.

This program placed in the hands of the State Department an instrument that has been used for the economic death or serious injury of the farmer, worker, and businessman.

The Congress should take steps immediately to wrest from the State Department the power to make these agreements.

The agreements actually are give-away agreements. To call them reciprocal agreements is a misnomer and a piece of propaganda concocted by New Deal thinkers to hoodwink the man on the street. It was a term employed by the New Dealers to enable them to put across the idea that such a program eventually would mean the economic salvation of the world.

Reciprocity should be a two-way street. Actually, the whole program has been a one-way street ever since it was first inaugurated in 1934. In all those years there has never been a tariff increase. On the contrary there

have been hundreds and hundreds of tariff reductions so that we have been granting concessions all along the line and receiving nothing in return.

Despite these reductions we have not yet felt the full effects of the program. That is explained by the war years which prevented imports on the things on which the tariffs had been reduced.

But we are beginning to feel the results of these give-away agreements today. Hundreds of our industries are threatened with extinction and thousands of jobs are at stake not to mention the injury to hundreds of our agricultural products.

It will not be long before the disastrous results of this wicked program are felt. I am fearful that we will wake up too late. Hundreds of representatives of labor, agriculture, and business have the same feeling. Currently, hearings are being held before a committee downtown which is called the Committee for Reciprocity Information. This is an interdepartmental committee set up to hear the story of American labor, agriculture, and business. These hearings are being conducted in preparation for the Geneva tariff conference which will be held this spring. There 18 nations will sit down and draft a world-trade program.

Members of our State Department who will represent the United States at this important conference have full authority to cut tariffs up to 50 percent of the existing schedules.

They have the power utterly to ignore the appeals for protection which are now being made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

They should not have that power. When I say that I am merely reflecting the position of spokesmen for a large part of the American economy. These spokesmen are fearful lest State Department officials, often with no practical experience, will barter away the American's high standard of living.

I believe in competition and world trade. But I do not believe that the American worker with his high standard of living can compete with the low standard of living found in most countries today.

There are those in the State Department who believe that some American industries are inefficient and therefore unworthy of tariff protection. They are of the opinion that these "weak sister" industries should be wiped out. The opinion is that unless such industries can stand on their own and compete with foreign-made goods they should be allowed to die.

This is utter nonsense. It is dangerous and fallacious thinking. And yet this is the position of many high-ranking officials of the State Department who now have the power to reduce tariffs by 50 percent.

If an American glove manufacturer, for instance, must buy his raw material at a higher cost to him than his foreign competitor and must then convert his raw skins into finished gloves at labor rates which rank with the highest of any industry in this country, he certainly cannot compete price-wise with his foreign competitor.

The labor costs of the European glove manufacturer are only one-third of the American manufacturer. As a result, the European manufacturer can make and send into this country, including the duty, a dozen pairs of gloves for less than we can make them.

In this connection, I wish to point out the utterly nonsensical provision in the so-called reciprocal trade agreements which is known as the most-favored-nation clause. As a result of this clause, the minimum tariff rate governs the tariff rate for all nations wishing to import the same commodity into the United States. If, for example, we set a duty schedule on the imports of Belgian pottery, that rate applies to all nations wishing to import pottery into this country. This is a matter of grave concern to thousands of American workers, farmers, and businessmen. It is an integral part of the program which mystifies most people.

Members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information were exceedingly courteous to representatives who have been appearing before them during the past 2 weeks. They were patient and gave witnesses ample time to express their viewpoints.

What disturbs me, however, and hundreds of American businessmen is what effect these hearings will have when State Department officials sit down at Geneva with representatives of the 18 nations. There is the fear among labor, farm, and business groups that the State Department representatives at Geneva will ignore these appeals for tariff protection. They have the power to do so. The hearings now being conducted could well be mere window dressing. Our State Department is not bound by these appeals.

If it is the aim of State Department officials to destroy the American standard of living they should come out in the open and say so. The American worker might then have an answer to that attitude.

The trouble is, of course, that these agreements are drawn up in such secrecy that nobody knows exactly what is being done until after the negotiations are completed. That certainly is not the democratic way of doing business.

We have only ourselves to blame. Only the Congress should have the power to draw up trade agreements. We have placed this power in the hands of the political untouchables in the State Department. They are not responsive to the wishes of the people. The voters cannot touch the State Department.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on radio program New England in Congress, Yankee network, Station WEAN, Providence, R. I., Saturday, January 25, 1947:

Question. Since the last congressional elections there has been a great deal of discussion on the subject of labor. All kinds of ideas have been advanced for handling the problems which are grouped under the head of labor. Numerous bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate, and I wonder if you would tell me just what is your attitude toward the proposed legislation on this subject?

Answer. Some Members of Congress have never been sympathetic toward labor's position. It's fair to say some of these men are motivated by a firm purpose to cut down labor unions in any manner they can. Others, apparently well-meaning Members of Congress, are of the opinion that union members, or at least union officials, should be punished in some way or other. These Members interpret the results of the last election as a rebuke to labor unions—I have heard that opinion expressed. Now, I don't think that is the sensible attitude to take. Aside from any statistical interpretation of the results of the last election, what the average person wants—and this includes members of trade-unions as well as nonunion people—what he wants is not an end to unions but an end to industrial disorder, or strife, or whatever name one sees fit to give it. What he wants is production with fair prices and decent jobs at fair wages. As I see it, the job is to find a way to promote that desire of all Americans.

Question. Do you mean that no legislation at all is needed—whether new laws or amendments of old ones?

Answer. I would never make a flat statement that no legislation should be enacted. Laws are constantly being reconsidered in the light of new developments. But I do think those who have rushed forth with the present crop of so-called labor legislation are going at this thing in the wrong way.

Question. Why do you say that?

Answer. Well, these same men who are advocating new control agencies—or new functions for old Federal agencies—to control, interfere with, or dominate labor unions—are the same men who decry the fact that there is already too much Government interference with our daily lives.

Question. Then would you say industry—both from the standpoint of management and labor—would be better off if there were less Government interest in industrial relations?

Answer. I would, absolutely. I think our efforts should be directed toward removing the Government from business, at least in this connection; to get back to genuine collective bargaining for the settlement of industrial disputes.

Question. How do you propose such a "return to collective bargaining," as you phrase it, could be brought about?

Answer. I think it could come about very easily, if management, or business, would take up willingly the opportunity for leadership which is now in its hands.

Question. Do I understand you to infer that management in the past has failed to exercise leadership in the field of industrial relations?

Answer. That's correct. I believe, in all sincerity, that it was the failure of business to show some genuine leadership that resulted in the growth of unions and in the enactment of the labor legislation which is presently on the Federal statute books.

Question. Do I understand from that, that you feel labor has been exercising whatever leadership there has been?

Answer. Not exactly that—the fact is that in years past the working men and women looked to management for leadership in their constant struggle for economic security. Management failed miserably. The result was that employees were forced, whether they would or not, to form unions—labor organizations—in order, through the strength of numbers, to force management into making some long overdue concessions.

Question. Did that provide at that time, what we hear referred to now as a balance between labor and management?

Answer. It should have, and had management recognized that unions were here to stay, labor could have been admitted as a partner in the industrial function, and then labor and management could have worked out its problems in a spirit of cooperation.

Question. But isn't it a fact, Congressman, that management did try to bargain with the unions?

Answer. It is a fact that there were meetings in some industries. Some business leaders actually welcomed the union representatives as spokesmen for their hundreds of employees and with them worked out plans for betterment. Most, however, refused to recognize the unions and were determined to break them. Prior to the 1930's, business generally, rejected its opportunity for leadership and embarked upon a program of union busting. They did not lead—they fought the unions. That is a historical fact.

Question. It is your opinion that this attitude was responsible for the industrial discord we have had in recent years?

Answer. Well—it's been a progressive thing. The employees had turned to their unions for leadership when management failed to provide it. When the unions failed to find a spirit of cooperation in business leaders, they turned, of necessity, to some outside agency. Their aims were honest and legitimate, so where else could they turn but to the state. They looked to the Federal Government for assistance in their efforts to achieve a better life for their people. And the state provided the assistance and the leadership which they sought. You must remember that Government, being a political body, is always attentive to the cries of great numbers of its people. That is borne out by the present statements of many Republicans—they plead that the GOP should not go too far with antilabor legislation. They want to get the labor vote in 1948.

Question. Will you explain what you mean by your statement that the Federal Government provided the "assistance and leadership which the unions looked for?"

Answer. It's not always easy, you understand, to put an attitude, or a state of mind, into concrete, definite words and phrases. But, let me put it this way. Many big industrialists—those who dominated the field, generally—refused to accept the idea of sitting down and bargaining with union representatives as freemen—so the Federal Government provided the Wagner Act, that's the act which set up the National Labor Relations Board and made collective bargaining a protected right of the labor unions.

Labor unions strived for an intelligent attitude toward the men and women who operate the machinery of business. Industry provides for the retirement of machinery and capital assets—but it gave no thought to the human element in the plant—here the Federal Government provided social security.

Industry provided insurance against the times when machinery was down and not producing income—but gave no thought to the men who were also down and producing no income. The Federal Government provided unemployment compensation.

Industry believed wages should be governed by the number of employables in the general labor pool. Available labor competed one with another for the available jobs. Wages were kept at a low level. The Federal Government stepped in and provided the Fair Labor Standards Act, setting a minimum on wages and a maximum on hours at straight time.

Question. Isn't it fair to say that this was a good development in industrial relations?

Answer. Yes; it is in the sense that it marks progress. But it is not so good when you consider that this marks the entrance of the state as a dominant element in industrial relations.

Question. I don't follow your idea, Congressman. How can this helping hand of the Federal Government be considered a harmful influence?

Answer. It is my belief that this "helping hand," as you call it, interfered with the proper effectiveness of genuine collective bargaining, as it should be conducted by freemen in a free society. You see we had, along with the benefits obtained from all this legislation, the active interest of an all-powerful authority—the state. Labor had no choice in the matter.

Labor was driven into the arms of government in order to win a square deal from employers. It naturally looked in that direction for protection of the rights which the state recognized. It received that protection but with it came additional administrative orders, executive direction, court decrees, and a general manifestation of the authority of the state.

Since this was so, it might be said that labor leaned on the Government. Management, as a result, looks to the state for clarification of its position. The net result is the present situation in industrial relations. Instead of having management and labor bargaining as free people—we have management, labor, and government involved in a never-ending bickering that threatens to wipe out every vestige of free collective bargaining.

Question. That brings us to just about the point where we started, Congressman. I can appreciate your attitude on the labor situation, but isn't it a fact that we have to have action of some kind? The question, it appears, is what kind of action we should have.

Answer. That's exactly the position we are in as I see it. I don't like the insistence on more governmental authority. With that authority will come more control, and it is foolish for labor unions or business to think they can have one controlled and not the other. Labor will be insisting on government control of industry, and industry wants government control of unions. The achievement of both goals would be the end of our "free enterprise system" and the beginning of a socialist state. Some men insist that is the only way out. I insist our system can function, and solve all our problems, if freemen will act like intelligent men and get on with the job.

Question. What steps do you suggest toward this end?

Answer. Let's have an end to the attitude that labor is the enemy of industry. Labor is just as essential to industry as industry is to labor. One complements the other. Industry had a chance, years ago, to provide the essential leadership which would have produced a better and more well-ordered life for all of us. It muffed that opportunity and the state had to step in.

Let industry now demonstrate intelligent leadership. Industry makes use of every possible facet of scientific knowledge to develop its operations. Let it also make use of every possible facet of social and political knowledge to cultivate the human beings who make its operations possible. The leaders of industry in many places have shown that leadership. There are many instances of industries where a strike is unheard of, where employees have intimate, personal relations with their employers, and where employees enjoy better conditions than are provided by all the Federal and State legislation on social security, etc.

Industry knows that the workingman's chief concern is a decent wage that will enable him to enjoy the benefits of our industrial output. If industry is equal to the opportunity which is afforded it at this juncture in our national development, then we can ease the state out of the picture altogether and all of us can enjoy industrial peace and progress. Industrial peace, and the real progress we all work and hope for, cannot be obtained, and will not be promoted, by writing into the law of the land the punitive measures which are advocated in the current crop of so-called labor legislation.

Fatal Atom Rays Still Being Cast by Bikini Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 20, 1947:

FATAL ATOM RAYS STILL BEING CAST BY BIKINI VESSELS

(By John M. McCullough)

WASHINGTON, January 19.—The persistence of dangerous radioactivity aboard ships which served as targets for the two atom bomb tests at Bikini last summer almost certainly means that the vessels never will be permitted to escape rigid Navy Department control, it was learned today.

When their usefulness for study has ended, it is probable that they either will be scuttled at sea or employed for fleet gunnery and air attack practice.

At the moment, no final decision has been made, principally because of their almost priceless value as laboratories for continuing study of biological effects of radioactivity and as training schools for Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Public Health Service radiological safety officers.

CITY MAY GET SCHOOL

It also was authoritatively learned that Philadelphia has a "good chance" of becoming the home in the near future for the Navy's permanent Radiological Safety School—a school whose civilian and military graduates ultimately may be numbered in the scores of thousands.

The present schedule for disposition of the target ships, the bulk of which are at Kwajalein, calls for a certain number to be transferred to Pearl Harbor, others to the Pacific coast, and the balance—including those unseaworthy for either journey—retained at anchor in Kwajalein's great lagoon.

Thus far the real hazard due to their radioactivity has not prompted any change in the schedule.

DEADLY FUMES FEARED

Working parties and detachments of graduates from the Radiological Safety School established by Operations Crossroads and continued until a few weeks ago have been working aboard the ships for months without suffering the slightest injury, due to the extraordinary safety precautions.

A definite Navy decision not to sell the ships for commercial scrap arises from the fact that, when vaporized—as it would be in the process of being cut up—the contaminated steel gives off poisonously radioactive fumes. Furthermore, working with the steel results in a skin contamination of measurable radioactive intensity.

It is feared that, no matter how low the radioactivity ultimately might become, uncontrolled disposition of the ships in the commercial scrap market might lay the foundation for excessive suits for damages against the Federal Government on the part of persons complaining of injury, due to radiological poisoning.

RATS PLACED ON SHIPS

Thus, the question really is reduced to one of scrap value versus law suits—and the Navy, facing sharp budget restrictions, is in no position to invite costly litigation.

The hitherto undisclosed fact was learned that experimental rats from the Navy's Medical Research Center at Bethesda, Md., are living under control conditions aboard some of the target vessels at Kwajalein, under careful study by medical technicians.

The importance of precise measurement of the biological effects of alpha and beta emanation is just as vital to future national security, naval spokesmen asserted, as the study of the primary effects of gamma and high-speed neutron radiation during and immediately following the "Able" and "Baker" tests of last July 1 and July 25 at Bikini.

WOULD AFFECT ALL OBJECTS

The radioactivity remaining is precisely the type which would most seriously affect not only naval craft but all other installations, afloat and ashore, following an atom bomb raid, particularly if it took place under conditions approximating the "Baker" (underwater) detonation.

Although every ship at Kwajalein was stricken from the list of commissioned naval vessels and was heading for the scrap heap, Bikini or no Bikini, naval officers are keenly sensible of the implications of persistent residual contamination of ships of the active fleet in the event of atom bomb attack.

"America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Bill Collins, Jr., which appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., January 12, 1947:

NATIONAL HYMN, "AMERICA," WAS WRITTEN ON SCRAP OF WASTE PAPER BY ANDOVER STUDENT IN HALF HOUR—DR. SAMUEL FRANCIS SMITH, A YOUNG THEOLOGICAL STUDENT AT THE TIME, FENNED THE IMMORTAL VERSES OF MY COUNTRY, 'TIS OF THEE, IN HOUSE ON MAIN STREET, ANDOVER, A HALF HOUR BEFORE SUNSET ON A FEBRUARY DAY IN 1832

(By Bill Collins, Jr.)

You would not have known, had you looked up at the sullen, slate-gray sky on that afternoon in February, in the year 1832, that something historically important to a nation was about to happen. The ponderous, frowning clouds rolled up over the horizon like fat men in a parade, pouting angrily, threatening a storm. The wind woke itself up from a breeze to a rushing, howling wind, forcing the trees to tip their hats as it raced headlong through the streets of the growing little village of Andover.

You would not have known, had you followed the course of the young man carrying an armful of songbooks as he made his way slowly along Main Street, his head bent forward as he buffeted the storm winds. He could not have told you, had you asked him—because he did not know himself.

Yet that young man was walking along the pathway to eternal fame. He was climbing the stairway to the creation of a hymn that has become the inspiration of a nation. It is a hymn that is a national tradition, sung by millions of school children in millions of schoolhouses throughout the United States. It is "America."

Breathing heavily from his battle with the wind, his spirits darkened by the dismal day, the young man wearily climbed the stairs to the front porch of 147 Main Street. His armload of songbooks weighed heavily upon his muscles. His hands were cold as he reached for the latch and let himself into the house.

The warmth of the house was a welcome thing as it rushed to him and embraced him. He smiled in relief as he placed the songbooks upon his study table and shed his coat and hat. Mr. Mason would be waiting for him to get these translations done, for him to change the German words into English verse. He was anxious to begin his work.

Quickly the young theological student from Boston, in Andover to attend classes at the Andover Theological Seminary after graduating from Harvard College, prepared his desk for labor. Freshly sharpened pencils, pen and ink, a light—the tools of his work were readied. Then he sat down at the table in the center of the north parlor of the house at 147 Main Street and began to read through the songbooks.

It was one-half hour before sunset, and at that moment a young man, requested to translate some German songs into English because he was a talented linguist, made inken marks with a scratching quill and the marks wrote his name and fame across the face of a nation.

America will always remember Dr. Samuel Francis Smith. He was the author of its greatest hymn.

As the young student thumbed the pages of the songbooks, humming the tunes, allowing himself to be caught up in the martial, patriotic air of them, he felt a strong surge of love of country swelling his heart. Suddenly the pages, flicking, one after the other, stopped. The young man's hands were still. The melody of a song in the German book—a song later claimed by some to have been penned in France—caught his fancy, held his mind. He hummed it to himself, again, and again.

"It is a wonderful melody," he said to himself. "It is a surging, swelling, inspirational tune." As he hummed the tune over and over to himself, it seemed as though the rhythm pulsed with his pulse, beat with his heart's beats. If only it had English words!

Then it was that history happened. The suggestion of a thought, the ready ambition and eagerness of a young man's mind, the taking up of a pen—words scrawled upon a piece of waste paper (some say it was the wrapping of a bundle of meat) and history had been made.

In one-half hour's time Dr. Samuel Francis Smith wrote the verses of the song that was destined to become America itself. "My Country, 'tis of thee" were words that were to be sung by millions and millions of Americans throughout the world—and they were written on a piece of waste paper in Andover, Mass.

When the young theological student had completed his poem, fitted to the music of a song he had found in a German songbook, he was pleased. He sang it to himself again and again. The words were like the wind that rushed through the treetops outside, free and strong and great and clean.

Yet he was not aware of what he had done. He was not aware that he had written his name across the face of a nation, that his simple poem, penned in such a hurry as the words rushed out of his heart onto paper, was to become beloved by all his countrymen. He told no one in particular of his triumph, of his creation.

Even his landlady, a Mrs. Hitchings, who ran the boarding house in which he lived, who made and sold paper dolls to the children of the village, was unaware of what her young roomer had accomplished, of what fame was due to be his.

The young man worked diligently and swiftly translating the other songs the music teacher, Mr. Lowell Mason, had requested. As he worked he heard his friend's voice requesting that he do this work. "I received these German songbooks from a friend who recently returned from Europe," he had said, "but they are not of much use to me because I cannot read German. You, Samuel, understand so many foreign tongues—would you translate some of them for me? Will you translate them into hymns, songs, or poetry—or, if you prefer, compose hymns or songs of your own of the same meter so that I can use them?"

When he had finished his work for his friend, the music teacher, the young student quietly placed them all together in a sheaf—including his immortal song dedicated to the meaning of America—and took them to the man who was to become the father of church music in America. He did not, even then, point out his best work as he placed the finished hymns and songs in the professor's hands.

The fame and glory that was to be his as creator of the hymn "America" was slow in arriving—in making itself known to the young man. He returned to his rooms and worked on his studies, feeling pleased that he had been of help to a fine friend. There in the boarding house, which is said to have once been a tavern, young Dr. Smith had written a poem that shall never perish from the minds of Americans, but he did not realize the greatness of his deed.

Mr. Mason, pioneer of music in public schools, took the sheaf of music thankfully, handling it tenderly and with the great respect all lovers of music afford all melodies. He took the hymns and songs with him for use in his classes.

Among his many fine and wonderful traits, Mr. Mason had a deep love of children. Important as he was in the music world of young America, he devoted much of his time to directing a juvenile choir for the Boston Sabbath School Union. The union included approximately 3,000 children, of which about 500 were members of Mr. Mason's juvenile choir. These 500 children of Boston were the first Americans to ever sing the national hymn "America" at a public gathering.

Thus it was that while strolling past the historic Park Street Church in Boston the following Fourth of July young Dr. Smith heard his song being sung at a public celebration, its tender and meaningful words being given full glory by the clear, melodious voices of 500 children, led by Lowell Mason.

He was both surprised and thrilled. The people in attendance applauded. They stamped their feet and they whistled. They began to sing the song themselves, then with other Americans, until gradually "America" was being sung by all Americans. From a little red schoolhouse in South Dakota to a high school in New York City, "America" was sung in the same reverence as the national anthem.

People all over the country were singing the words written by a young student upon a piece of waste paper—and they were realizing all that their magnificent country means to them.

"America" has been sung by Americans on all the far-flung battlefronts of the world. It has brought a sense of home-being to soldiers stranded in frontline trenches and to sailors being rocked savagely by wild seas. It has brought security and peace and contentment and the gratefulness of a thankful people—"I am an American," they told themselves as they sang Dr. Smith's hymn, and they were proud.

In 1932 the one hundredth anniversary of the public acclaiming of "America" on that eventful Fourth of July in Boston was nationally celebrated by congressional resolution. The young Dr. Smith, who was born near the Old North Church in Boston, was toasted by his appreciative countrymen although he was not alive at the time.

However he did not have to be present to realize how his song had been taken to the heart of America itself. His realization of how his hymn had traversed the Nation came before the hundredth year of its being sung by Americans. In tribute to his Harvard classmate, Oliver Wendell Holmes, in speaking of "America," wrote:

"Time wrecks the proudest piles we raise,
The towers, the domes, the temples fall,
The fortress crumbles and decays,
One breath of song outlasts them all."

Born in Boston in October 1808, Rev. Samuel Smith died in November, 1895, after living a full life that carried him through

Harvard College, Andover Theological Seminary, ordination, various pastorates, college professorship, editorialship, and missionary work in Europe. He wrote many publications and other hymns, one of which was "The Morning Light Is Breaking," which was penned about the same time that "America" was written.

Some controversy has arisen since his death as to the actual date upon which the national hymn was written, with one contention being that it was written in 1831 and contained five verses in place of the four now so well known. Another controversy arose over whether the song was written in Andover or Newton, where Reverend Smith later lived and held a pastorate. Dr. Smith was alive at the time of this controversy and, to settle the issue, penned the following note to the Andover Historical Society:

"'America' was written in my room at the house of Mrs. Hitchings while standing before the front window nearest the front door of the house in the north parlor. If I remember rightly, I always had my study table in the middle of the room to guard against being diverted by any objects in the street, as I might have been if the table had stood near a window."

The original draft of the young 24-year-old student's hymn is now owned by Harvard College. Written on an old subscription blank, it was presented to President Lawrence Lowell in 1914 by Dr. D. A. W. Smith, eldest living son of Rev. Samuel Smith, the author.

Dr. Smith married Mary White Smith September 16, 1834. Mrs. Smith was the daughter of Jonathan Kimball Smith and Ann White, of Haverhill, Mass., and granddaughter of Rev. Hezekiah Smith, a chaplain in Washington's army.

The America House, as the dwelling at 147 Main Street, Andover, is now called, is now owned by Phillips Academy. Still standing, it bears a simple sign describing its significance.

Last week, on the same sort of a dismal day on which the young Dr. Smith wrote his immortal hymn, I passed by that house on my way to the Andover Historical Society for a visit with Miss C. M. Underhill, the pleasant and charming resident-director of the society, who gave me permission to go through the files pertaining to Rev. Smith's creation "America."

The sky was sullen and slate-gray and ponderous frowning clouds lumbered heavily over the horizon as I sat there in the hundred-year-old house of the society, gathering my notes to the stately rhythm of a dignified, aged gradfather's clock, and, somehow, as I read and learned so much of the life of the young man and the creation of his wonderful hymn, I felt it was the year 1832 and I wondered if I could hear him singing the words he wrote so hurriedly on a piece of waste paper, before it began to snow.

Majority Whip Organization

REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including information which I trust will be of value to the Members of the majority party in the House of Representatives. You will find here a complete outline of the various regional whips and assistant regional whips whom I have appointed to make up the majority whip organization for the Eightieth Congress:

Majority whip: LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois.

Deputy whip: RALPH A. GAMBLE, of New York.

Eastern regional whip: W. STERLING COLE, of New York. Eight States, 62 Members—Maine (3), New Hampshire (2), Vermont (1), Connecticut (6), Delaware (1), WILLIAM J. MILLER, of Connecticut; Massachusetts (9), R. B. WIGGLESWORTH; New York (28), W. STERLING COLE; New Jersey (12), CLIFFORD P. CASE.

East central regional whip: HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio. Seven States, 72 Members—Pennsylvania (28), LEON H. GAVIN; Michigan (14), JOHN B. BENNETT; Ohio (19), J. HARRY MCGREGOR; Maryland (2), West Virginia (4), Tennessee (2), Kentucky (3), J. GLENN BEALL.

Midwest regional whip: ROBERT A. GRANT, of Indiana. Eight States, 67 Members—Indiana (9), ROBERT A. GRANT, of Indiana; Illinois (20), EVAN HOWELL; Wisconsin (9), Minnesota (8), North Dakota (2), South Dakota (2), 1 vacancy, LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin.

Western regional whip: HAL HOLMES, of Washington. Twelve States, 44 Members—Kansas (6), Colorado (3), Nebraska (4), Oklahoma (2), A. M. COLE, of Kansas; Washington (5), Oregon (4), Montana (1), Idaho (2), Wyoming (1), Nevada (1), Utah (1), HAL HOLMES; California (14), GORDON L. MCDONOUGH.

Membership	245
One vacancy	1
Total	246

Alaska and Hawaii Make New Statehood Bids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Butte (Mont.) Post of January 11, 1947:

ALASKA AND HAWAII MAKE NEW STATEHOOD BIDS

Two of the early measures in the new Congress propose admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood. Introduced by their respective Delegates, they renew a race between the Territories to become the forty-ninth State.

Admission of both has been widely urged as a defense measure to strengthen the ties of the territorial inhabitants with the rest of the Nation. Both are recognized as vital outposts in whose destiny all United States citizens are concerned. They proved their value as such in the recent war, when they were key points in defense of the continent.

In the case of Alaska, statehood would help inhabitants to overcome present disadvantages of isolation and undersettlement. Long-distance supervision from Washington and a resultant lack of sympathy with the problems of Alaska is one of the reasons why its commercial development and settlement have lagged. These conditions would be remedied by increased control by Alaskans over their industries and natural resources which would follow admission to statehood.

Although both territories have voted in favor of statehood, their admission necessitates passage by Congress of enabling legislation and adoption by the new States of constitutions. The final step is proclamation of their new status by the President.

Their admission proposals are not new. Similar legislation was before the last Congress but never was acted upon. However, their chances are better now, since the war has given the Nation a new realization of their importance to the Union.

Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing some talk of hedging on tax reductions and much talk of paying off the national debt. Liquidation of the national debt is a problem of the next hundred years.

The Nation wants tax relief now.

Business needs tax relief now.

The citizens want to keep more of their earnings to spend for themselves.

The Republican Party promised tax relief. After study committees had surveyed governmental waste, bureaucratic irresponsibility, war extravagances like the Canol project and others of similar character, these study committees found that there are many—very many—ways in which multiplied millions can be saved by reducing appropriations, compelling greater governmental economy, with a real and actual increase in governmental efficiency.

The Republicans must not break their campaign promises to the people.

If the Republicans disappoint the Nation after the gross betrayal of the people's trust and confidence by the New Deal Administration, communism might well make long strides toward the violent overthrow of our American system.

It is unthinkable that we—a people who accomplished the miracle of war efforts which we did—should be defeated by taxation and labor-industrial disputes. There is no need for it.

Those who now argue that our plain, unequivocal promises of tax reduction and governmental economy made to the people before the elections should now be repudiated, do a great disservice to the Nation, the Congress, and the Republican Party.

Of course, the executive bureaus and departments argue vehemently that they must have more money instead of less. Of course, they are attempting to shift their activities to pretended and simulated peacetime necessities. Of course, they will try to hold onto their powers and their spending, their extravagances, and their claims of public requirements. When did bureaus and bureaucrats ever do otherwise?

It is the job of the Republican Congress intelligently to cut appropriations, compel economies and increased efficiency in the executive branch of the Government, and to translate those economies and that increased efficiency

into a balanced budget, debt retirement, and tax reductions for our people.

Our American Government is the biggest business on earth, and it should be the most efficiently operated. It has been said that "Everybody's business is nobody's business, and everybody's money is nobody's money." That is the psychology of bureaucracy, of course, but the fact is everybody's business and everybody's money as expressed in Government and public funds are distinctly and emphatically the concern of the Congress.

The Republican Party and the Republican Congress must keep the campaign pledges to the people for the sake of the common welfare and the confidence of the people in our American system of government, economy, and society. That confidence must never be jeopardized again as it was under the broken promises of the New Deal. To preserve public confidence in our American system, our pledges to the people must be fulfilled.

Defensio Pro Populo Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, the current attempt to heap infamy and ridicule upon the State of Georgia by those ignorant of her history and institutions cannot go unchallenged. The time has come for men of good will to plead for sanity and truth. A page of history is worth more than volumes of hypothetical abstractions to one seeking enlightenment over the present controversy for the office of Governor.

Georgia was one of the Thirteen Original States of the Union. Her early constitutions, like others of the Revolutionary period, placed the election of the Governor and many other officials in the hands of the legislature. The era of Jacksonian democracy witnessed a series of amendments to Georgia's Constitution of 1798 showing a definite trend away from legislative dominance toward a better balance of power between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government. Among these was the amendment of 1823–24 providing for popular election of the Governor. The provision of this amendment for the returns of elections was as follows:

> The returns of every election for governor shall be sealed up by the presiding justices, separately from other returns, and directed to the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives, and transmitted to his excellency the governor, or the person exercising the duties of the governor for the time being who shall without opening said returns cause the same to be laid before the senate on the day after the two houses have been organized, and they shall be transmitted by the senate to the house of representatives. The members of each branch of the general assembly shall convene in the representative chamber, and the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives shall open and publish the returns in presence of the general assembly, and the person having the majority of the whole number of votes given in shall be declared duly elected governor of this State; but if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the two highest number of votes who shall be in life, and shall not decline an election at the time appointed for the legislature to elect, the general assembly shall elect immediately a governor by joint ballot; and in all cases of election of a governor by the general assembly, a majority of the votes of the members present shall be necessary for a choice. Contested elections shall be determined by both houses of the general assembly in such manner as shall be prescribed by law.

As a result of these amendments of the early nineteenth century, Georgia emerged with an excellent constitutional system and came to be known as the Empire State of the South. American history could not be written without the names of William H. Crawford, John McPherson Berrien, John Forsyth, Howell Cobb, James M. Wayne, Herschel V. Johnson, Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, and Thomas E. Watson. Frederick L. Olmsted, the Yankee peripatetic, declared:

> It is obvious to the traveler and notorious in the stock market that there is more life, enterprise, skill, and industry in Georgia than in any other of the southern commonwealths. It is the Yankee land of the South.

Numerous changes were made in the Constitution of Georgia in 1877, designed primarily to prevent a recurrence of the abuse of finances that had occurred during the Reconstruction Era, but the provision for the returns of election of the governor quoted above were carried forward without material change. In 1943 the legislature authorized a commission of 23 members to revise the constitution. This commission's work was submitted to the general assembly for further revision and approval, and on August 7, 1945, the people ratified a new constitution. No change was made in the method of electing the governor, but provision was made for a lieutenant governor, as follows:

> There shall be a lieutenant governor, who shall be elected at the same time, for the same term, and in the same manner as the governor. He shall be president of the senate, and shall receive the sum of $2,000 per annum. In case of the death, resignation, or disability of the governor, the lieutenant governor shall exercise the executive power and receive the compensation of the governor until the next general election for members of the general assembly, at which a successor to the governor shall be elected for the unexpired term; but if such death, resignation, or disability shall occur within 30 days of the next general election, or if the term will expire within 90 days after the next general election, the lieutenant governor shall exercise the executive power and receive the compensation of the governor for the unexpired term.

The failure to make specific constitutional provision for succession to the office of chief executive in case of the death of the chief-executive-elect is not a mystery too deep to be fathomed by men of intelligence. The Constitution of the United States had no specific provision on this matter before the adoption of the twentieth amendment in 1933, and while the National Constitution now provides for succession of the Vice President-elect, much doubt remains as to who would be President if both the President-elect and Vice-President-elect should die before inauguration.

That rival claims should be advanced in Georgia in a case where the constitution is not specific is but natural. Supporters of Herman Talmadge controlled the general assembly and elected him governor by a vote of 161 to 96. Melvin E. Thompson—elected lieutenant governor—and his supporters contended that the general assembly was without authority in this matter; that the lieutenant governor legally became the acting governor upon the expiration of the term of Gov. Ellis Arnall. The attorney general of Georgia and retiring Governor Arnall supported Thompson's claim. Governor Talmadge, who was supported by the adjutant general, gained control of the executive offices in the capitol. A suit has been entered in the courts to test the legality of the election of the governor by the general assembly. Talmadge asserts that the courts have no jurisdiction in the matter, but, nonetheless, he has publicly announced that, should he be mistaken in this position, he will abide by the decision of the Supreme Court of Georgia. Moreover, in his first appearance before a joint session of the general assembly he stated that at the end of the present session—limited to 70 days—he would be willing to resign if Thompson would also resign and permit the speaker of the house of representatives to serve until an election by the people could be held. Thompson, insisting that he has the only legal claim to the position of governor, will not agree to this procedure; hence all parties await a decision by the supreme court.

The educational and charitable institutions, and most agencies of the State government are functioning normally in the meantime. There has been no violence or bloodshed. A perfectly natural solution is being made of the situation that could have arisen in many States.

The ridicule of Georgia during the past year has had no justification. Reference to any standard encyclopedia will show that Georgia still remains the largest State east of the Mississippi, that her population is above 3,000,000, and her birth rate—Rousseau's criterion of a healthy state—one of the nine highest in the United States; that in 1946, the year she received so much abuse from the press, Georgia produced 555,000 bales of cotton, 730,300,000 pounds of peanuts—highest in the Nation, 44,145,000 bushels of corn, 114,747,000 pounds of tobacco, 6,204,000 bushels of peaches, 7,020,000 bushels of sweetpotatoes, 4,025,000 gallons of sugarcane sirup, and other agricultural products, of a total value of approximately $500,000,000; that since 1940 Georgia has produced 60 percent of the Nation's naval stores; that taking advantage of the recent discovery of her distinguished scientist, Dr. Charles Herty, Georgia is forging ahead in the manufacture of newsprint from slash pine; that her textile industries are rapidly expanding; that her 4,000 manufacturing establishments employed 255,900

persons in 1946, as compared with 170,000 in 1939; that the annual value of her 27 mineral products—including 80 percent of the Nation's supply of kaolin during the war years—is above $20,000,000.

Those who criticize Georgia's educational institutions should remember that at the University of Georgia, the oldest chartered State university in America, increased emphasis is being given to research and publication, and that the recently established University Press is already making a distinct contribution to American culture. Newspapers that heralded the fact that approximately 100 students out of an enrollment of 6,314 at the university made an orderly march to the capitol to present their views in the controversy over the governorship gave little or no notice to the fact that on the same day the regents of the university system of Georgia voted $1,250,000 for a new library building. The State of Georgia has increased her annual appropriation for educational purposes threefold in the past 15 years. For the school year ending in June 1946, Georgia had 4,745 elementary schools—1,776 for white children and 2,969 for Negroes—with an enrollment of 601,170 pupils—372,667 white and 228,503 Negroes—and a teaching staff of 15,864—9,962 whites and 5,902 Negroes. High schools numbered 1,333—793 white and 540 Negro—with a student enrollment of 144,722—114,114 white and 30,608 Negro—with a teaching staff of 6,314—5,033 white and 1,281 Negro. In the fall quarter, 1946, there were 22,651 students enrolled in the 18 divisions of the university system of Georgia—including 1,718 in 3 Negro colleges—to say nothing of private educational institutions such as Emory, Mercer, and Agnes Scott. The State of Georgia now ranks first in the Nation in the percentage of total State income devoted to education. Is adverse criticism justified?

The signatures of Lyman Hall, Button Gwinnett, and George Walton remain on the Declaration of Independence. The statues of Alexander Hamilton and Crawford W. Long remain in the Nation's Hall of Fame. The poems of Sidney Lanier are still admired by all Americans. The golden isles of the Georgia coast and the lakes of the Georgia mountains remain favorite resorts. The people of Georgia still employ the hospitality for which they are renowned. The Cherokee rose will blossom again in the springtime. The year 1947 is likely to see Georgia continue her rapid strides in industrial and agricultural progress. The momentary controversy over the office of chief executive will merit only a small footnote in the history of a great State.

The Rural Electrification Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the program of the Rural Electrification Administration is one that is welcomed by rural America. I am for that program and I wish to see it carried on and expanded.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein Legislative Resolution No. 1, passed by the Legislature of Nebraska. The resolution is as follows:

Legislative Resolution 1

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase allotments for rural electrification program in Nebraska

Whereas the rural electrification program is of great importance to Nebraska; and

Whereas electricity should be brought to every possible Nebraska farm home; and

Whereas the allotments for rural electrification should be increased to further this program and make it possible for every person desiring electricity for their farm: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixtieth session assembled:

1. That the Rural Electrification Administration allotments be increased in order to assure every possible Nebraska farm home benefits of electricity.

2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Director of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Nineteen Hundred and Forty-seven Is Bicentennial Year of Great Hero, John Paul Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Arizona Daily Sun of January 22, 1947, entitled "1947 Is Bicentennial Year of Great Hero, John Paul Jones," which was written by James Patrick McGovern, Washington correspondent of that newspaper:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVEN IS BICENTENNIAL YEAR OF GREAT HERO, JOHN PAUL JONES

(By James Patrick McGovern)

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 22.—A joint resolution of the Seventy-ninth Congress introduced July 19, 1946, "Providing for the comprehensive observance of the bicentennial of John Paul Jones," passed the Senate by unanimous vote on July 17, 1946, and was reported favorably by the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, to which it had been referred. The pressure of business in Congress, however, prevented final action before the adjournment of that session. It now remains for the Eightieth Congress to take proper measures to bring the name of John Paul Jones suitably before the people of the United States in the bicentennial year of 1947.

As a genius, patriot, and man, John Paul Jones ranks among the most outstanding of the American Revolution. In action and in theory he demonstrated the soundness and scope of his professional training. His deeds reflected an ardent love of his adopted country. In private life he had an extraordinary magnetism for men and women alike.

John Paul Jones first saw America at the age of 12 as a shipboy on a merchant vessel which sailed to Virginia. He continued his service at sea for some years, rising rapidly to the position of master of a trader, but he left this employment and settled in America, at first incognito, pending an admiralty trial in Tobago, of the Bahamas, for the death of a mutineer whom he killed in self-defense. When the ports were closed and the Revolution ensued, he accepted a commission in the Continental Navy as the first lieutenant of the *Alfred* in Hopkins' fleet.

Soon, as captain of the *Providence* and of the *Providence* and *Alfred* combined, he evinced his originality in strategy, his skill in tactics, and his brave and also generous spirit in enterprises against the enemy. With the independent command of the *Ranger* in European waters, his ability and boldness became even more pronounced. His plan to burn the shipping at Whitehaven, which failed only because of insubordinate officers and crew, was typical of his large, surprising designs. At St. Mary's Isle his purpose to take the Earl of Selkirk as a hostage for the exchange of prisoners was perhaps ill-conceived, yet it revealed at the same time the humanity and gentlemanly traits of the supposedly rude, unscrupulous sailor. And the victory of the *Ranger* over the *Drake* speaks for itself as unique in a long history of English naval warfare unmarred by any defeat until this exploit even in the home waters of the British.

The cruise of the *Ranger* was only the prelude to the still more brilliant deeds with the *Bonhomme Richard* and the accompanying ships. Despite the inferior frigate, the insubordination of captains of the other vessels, notably that of Landais in the *Alliance*, the mercenary purposes of the crews with the exception of officers and men of the *Richard* herself; despite such drawbacks, Jones won one of the most notable victories in history in taking the *Serapis*. In what other instance in warfare was the sinking frigate the conqueror and the still seaworthy frigate the conquered, even to the extent that the victorious captain and his officers and crew had to transfer finally from the former to the latter? And when, at the climax, Pearson called to Jones to surrender, in the conviction that the *Richard* was in desperate straits, the reply of the American will always be cherished as historic: "I have not yet begun to fight."

The later record of Jones is scarcely less notable. After the battle, he made a skillful and daring escape from the pursuing British to the port of Texel in Holland and an even more striking dash from that port despite the blockade of the enemy. It was during his stay at the Texel that he honored the flag of the United States in a new, significant form by refusing, for his protection, to adopt the subterfuge of a French commission as captain of a privateer in substitution for his commission as captain in the Navy of America.

Unfortunately, neither America nor France offered him a suitable squadron during the remainder of the Revolution. He did, however, bring to completion the building of the ship of the line *America* by his characteristic energy and resourcefulness in the face of obstacles, and it was only the presentation of this ship to France as a mark of appreciation that prevented him from commanding her as rear admiral. After the war, Louis XVI of France presented him with a gold sword in recognition of his victory in the *Bonhomme Richard* over the *Serapis*. America gave him a gold medal such as no other naval officer of the Revolution won.

Although America was at peace, Jones thirsted for new action, further training, greater honors. Jefferson, then the American Minister in Paris as the successor to Franklin, was an intermediary and adviser when Jones

received and accepted an offer as rear admiral from Catherine II of Russia to fight in her second war against Turkey. He served in the Black Sea with his usual canniness and bravery, but while he won the victories, the favorites and courtiers of the Empress took the honors. In fact, they not only arrogated to themselves the glory that was his but also calumniated his name as a naval officer and as a man.

The tense strain of his life, physical and mental, contributed toward his early death at the age of 45. His end came at Paris in 1792, during the turmoil of the French Revolution, so that his grave long remained there in obscurity. In 1905, however, his identified coffin and body were brought to America with signal naval and military honors. He now has a magnificent resting place in a sarcophagus in the crypt of the chapel of the United States Naval Academy.

The setting of the sarcophagus well conveys the spirit of the life of John Paul Jones. In front of it is the inscription: "He gave our Navy its earliest traditions of heroism and victory"; and nearby are the names of the ships which he commanded. The words of John Paul Jones, crystallized into deeds, still live. It was Jones the patriot who said: "I can in no situation, however remote I am, be easy while the liberties of America seem to me to be in danger." It was Jones the strategist who advised: "Who can surprise well must conquer." It was Jones the warrior who declared: "I have not yet begun to fight."

Stick to the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of January 28, 1947:

STICK TO THE FACTS

People who know their way around usually learn early in life not to pay much attention to the arguments of those who are careless of their facts.

In political matters, however, the most obvious misstatements are apt to do harm, because they are accepted as true by many who do not have the background and opportunity to disprove them.

This is particularly true where the falsities appear in print. The world is full of credulous souls who simply can't bring themselves to disbelieve anything they read in black and white.

Most newspapers are especially vigilant to try to keep their facts straight. Errors usually are corrected on the first opportunity. But even the best of newspapers can't do much about special writers who attempt to sell a line of reasoning by means of garbled facts.

A classic example of disregard of facts appeared in a recent article by Columnist Ralph W. Page, printed in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of Friday, January 24.

This article was an ardent defense of the Roosevelt-Hull program of reciprocal trade agreements, by means of which the tariff protections of the Smoot-Hawley Act have been largely swept away.

Consider the following paragraph:

"The worst depression on record immediately followed the attempt to boost the American standard of living by enacting the highest tariff schedules on record (the Smoot-Hawley bill). Since then under the Trade Agreements Act these subsidies and barriers have been reduced 30 percent—and (1) no industry can show that it has been damaged and (2) the standard of living, and our export trade, have increased prodigiously."

The amazing collection of misstatements must have been hard for the author himself to swallow, since he followed it immediately with the words "on this undisputed premise, etc.," in an apparent attempt to bolster it up by boldness, since it was unsupported by facts.

To show the startling mishandling of truth in the paragraph, it is necessary to take it phrase by phrase:

"The worst depression * * * followed * * * the Smoot-Hawley bill."

The mere dates disprove this. The American end of the depression started, as almost everyone knows, in October of 1929. That was the month the stock market crashed and business started going to pieces. As a world proposition, the depression already had been going on for several years. Germany had inflated and collapsed; England and France were in trouble.

At any event, the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, officially known as the Tariff Act of 1930, was not signed until 8 months after the United States depression began. It was signed June 17, 1930.

"Subsidies and barriers have been reduced 30 percent."

This is so inaccurate and misleading that it is almost unbelievable it should be seriously stated. A word of explanation may make the point clear. Under the Smoot-Hawley Act, approximately 60 percent of imports were not charged a tariff at all; they were on the free list as being noncompetitive.

Of the others, virtually all which have any industrial importance have been reduced by the trade agreements. On considerably more than 1,000 basic items, involving the production, in one way or another, of the great bulk of American manufactures, the rates have been cut a full 50 percent.

In 1945 the President demanded and was given the right to cut any existing tariff another 50 percent.

To try to sum all this up under the harmless-looking pretended average of 30 percent is ridiculous.

"No industry can show that it has been damaged."

Again, this is a ridiculous statement. At the tariff hearings in 1945 industry after industry showed specific losses. So serious was the situation that in some lines the labor unions, alarmed for the future of their employment, were the ones foremost in going to bat for protection.

A single example will prove the point. In the watchmaking industry it was the union which protested loudest that the reciprocal trade agreements were permitting the sale of literally millions of Swiss-works watches which, under a protective tariff, would be manufactured by American labor.

"The standard of living" has "increased prodigiously."

Tell that to the marines. Are houses necessities—part of our standard of living? Try to buy or rent one. What about automobiles? Or electric refrigerators? Or any of a thousand prized items with long waiting lines? Food? We are doing without a great many staples, and still more luxuries. Lack of sugar, cooking fats, etc., have put diet in a strait-jacket.

Meanwhile prices on such items as can be found have been soaring because of inflation. The whole plea of the labor unions for higher wages has been based on the answerable argument that New Deal inflation has undermined the American standard of living.

"Our export trade" has "increased prodigiously."

As has been brought out a thousand times, there is only one way by which the New Dealers can support this well-known statement; and that is to count in the shipments we made before Pearl Harbor to the nations then preparing to fight us.

The statement is true if we count all the scrap iron shipped to Japan before the war, all the gasoline and other war munitions sent to Germany and Italy. These items would have been bought whatever the price. The purchasers needed them—and one of the worst mistakes in all American history was for our Government to allow them to be sent out of this Nation and turned over to the Axis Powers at that very time plotting against us.

What the trade agreements did was to expedite this export of war materials which might easily have lost the war for us. Under these agreements millions of dollars' worth of Japanese trinkets, or east-European glassware and other products, were traded for the necessities of modern warfare.

If war materials are omitted from the export lists, as they certainly ought to be, it is impossible to prove any increase in our export trade as a result of the trade agreements. Moreover, it is a sad fact that much of what exports we have made have been paid for, not by the foreign recipients but by the American taxpayers, as witness the entire lend-lease enterprise.

Mr. Page is, of course, entitled to whatever opinion he likes on the subject of tariffs.

But in fairness to the several million Americans who are trying seriously to understand this vexing problem, he certainly ought to stick to the facts in presenting his case.

A Lesson in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times, Wednesday, January 1, 1947:

WASHINGTON, December 31.—When the President, by proclaiming today the official end of World War II hostilities at noon, automatically terminated or specifically limited the lives of 51 statutes and restored to Congress the powers in them that were on indefinite loan to the Executive, he was following the precepts of his own political philosophy and also giving the Republicans a lesson in practical politics.

The personal philosophy implicit in Mr. Truman's act was stated by Thomas Jefferson in a letter to James Madison in January 1797:

"The principle of the Constitution is that of a separation of legislative, executive, and judicial functions except in cases specified. If this principle be not expressed in direct terms, it is clearly the spirit of the Constitution, and it ought to be so commented and acted on by any friend of free government."

LESSON TO REPUBLICANS

The lesson in politics he gave to the Republicans can be summed up as follows:

In the recent campaign you talked and acted as if it would be necessary to compel me to give up any war and emergency power after the need for it was obviously ended. You promised the people that you would

quickly cut down the Executive to constitutional size. That was never necessary so far as this Executive is concerned, and here is proof.

The President did not say this. And in his press conference there was no reference to political considerations.

But if he had made the statement above, or thought these things, it would have been a just comment on the speeches made by some Republican spokesmen and candidates for Congress this autumn.

Not until recently did the Republicans seem to realize that "stop-look-and-listen" should be their guiding slogan in the reconversion of the executive branch of the Government to coordinate, peacetime status; that this must be attained gradually in concert with the President rather than by their majorities in Congress acting alone.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, warned the Senate Republican conference yesterday that precipitate action must be avoided in the national interest. Prior to that, Representative EARL R. LEWIS, of Ohio, after a study of the war and emergency statutes, issued a similar warning to his colleagues in the new House majority, many of whom had pledged themselves to headlong repeals.

ACT CALLED PROGRESSION

But, while various committees of Congress were preparing to follow Mr. WILEY's recommendation that they study the situation and report by February 15 to the Judiciary Committees of both branches what the first steps toward reducing abnormal and wartime executive powers should be, the President took these himself, and voluntarily. Like his moves to abolish the various controls and other regimentations of wartime, his act today was a progression toward the coordinate, constitutional form of government in which he is the firmest of believers.

If some other man had been sitting in Mr. Truman's chair, it might have been necessary for the Republicans to use the pressure they promised in the campaign to get back the congressional powers which have been delegated to the Executive in recent years.

HISTORY'S EXAMPLES CITED

There are examples in American history of Presidents whose appetite for special authority grew with every new supply of it. But Mr. Truman's disposition is exactly to the contrary, and this is merely the latest illustration he has provided of that fact.

His timing of the proclamation of the end of hostilities gave it in part the appearance of a stroke of political strategy, because a Congress is about to assemble which is controlled by the party whose campaign spokesmen talked as if governmental reconversion would have to be forced on the President.

Doubtless he was pleased to use the time factor to such advantage.

But the chief reasons for choosing the last day of the year for his action were legal and constructive. By officially ending the World War II hostilities before the advent of the year 1947, Mr. Truman saved the American taxpayers from $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 which ultimately they would have had to pay in farm subsidies and excise levies if the proclamation had been delayed into the year that begins at midnight.

A Religion of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, recently on the occasion of the Round-Table Interfaith Broadcast, which took place in Jersey City, N. J., the radio listeners heard a convincing and stirring statement on the moral value and religious nature of good will. The speaker was Rev. August F. Bender, pastor emeritus of the Second Reformed Church, who recently celebrated his fiftieth anniversary as a minister of religion.

Dr. Bender is noted for his scholarship, eloquence, and his unobtrusive piety. He is not only an eminent citizen of his city, but by virtue of his kindly nature, his genuine humility, and his undaunted courage, one of its most beloved.

I append herewith his brief, reflective discourse as it appeared in the Jersey Journal:

It is with profound pleasure that I salute Mayor Hague, his fellow commissioners, the religious leaders, and all people of Jersey City, regardless of sect, color, and social status, for all are children of the God and Father of all mankind. I congratulate them upon their past achievements in the civic, social, industrial, and religious activities, and for their endeavors toward the permanent good of our city. I wish them abundant honor and prosperity in the years to come.

As no city lives unto itself in these days of world-wide commercialism and every life is somehow dependent upon and linked with some other life, there is only one way to be useful citizens, and that is to have part in a service well grounded in good will toward mankind.

"Here goes in the name of God and humanity"—that was the motto of our heroic service men and women, white and colored, of Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faiths, in both World Wars. The Lord of Hosts ever went forward with our valiant beloved because they had committed their righteous cause into His hands and because they trusted in Him implicitly while they suffered, bled, and died for Old Glory.

"Here goes for God and humanity"—may that be the slogan of all citizens of Jersey City! With such a spirit, there is no failure.

Let that be the spirit in which we seek to make the Golden Rule operative in industrial affairs and with which we seek to make this a warless world.

With all the religion that we profess to have and boast of, yet there is such a thing as not having enough religion. I mean the religion of good will that expresses itself in life, and not in forms; that seeks to glorify God, and not itself; that has for its purpose the saving of the lost, not the righteous.

I am thinking of real religion, the religion of good will; the religion of love which loves God with all its heart and soul and one's neighbor, irrespective of religious belief or color. The religion of good will that moves us to go out of our homes and offices and factories into the streets and byways, seeking the social outcasts, prodigals, and underprivileged, in order to bring about their eventual reformation and reestablishment among respectable men and women.

I have in mind the religion of power—a power far greater than that of the atom bomb. The power of Almighty God—that makes us new creatures. The religion of good will that closes the lips of the blasphemer; that kills the thirst of the drunkard; that lifts men and women from degradation and despair to plains and plans of honor and integrity.

Whether your skin be white or colored—whether you be a Jew, Protestant, or Catholic—you cannot have too much of this religion of power and good will. It is the religion of Jesus Christ.

After a Christian ministry of 30 years in Jersey City I am happy to state that Catholics and Jews have been and still are numbered among my dearest friends. During the past 50 years in the ministry of the Reformed Church in America they have ever helped me most generously in my labors of charity. Honor to whom honor is due.

I salute them most cordially. We go to church in Jersey City to learn to love and help one another. There is no racial prejudice among the people of Jersey City.

"O brother-man! Fold to thy heart thy brother!
Where pity dwells, the love of God is there!
To worship rightly is to love each other—
Each smile a hymn, each kindly deed a prayer."

New England Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry—a vital part of the business life of New England—soon will be nonexistent unless steps are taken to remedy the ills that now beset it.

In an effort to call public attention to this important matter and in the hope of helping to solve the problems now facing this multi-million-dollar industry the Providence (R. I.) Journal recently assigned one of its reporters, Leonard O. Warner, to study the industry and the problems now facing it and to write a series of five articles on the subject.

So that every Member of the House and Senate may have the benefit of these articles, I propose to offer these articles for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, under permission already granted me, I include herewith the fourth article, as it appeared in the Journal of January 15, 1947. It follows:

AQUATIC BIOLOGIST SUGGESTS PLAN TO PROTECT NORTHEAST FISHING GROUNDS—FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE OFFICIAL HAS THREE-POINT PROGRAM FOR SOLVING ACUTE HADDOCK SHORTAGE—REGULATIONS USED IN PACIFIC SUGGESTED

(By Leonard O. Warner)

During the war years fishermen and fishing boats from the ports of Boston, Gloucester, and New Bedford were recruited by the Navy, leaving only a comparatively small fleet of draggers and trawlers.

Depletion was relegated to the background, both because of the need for food and the fact that a small fleet couldn't deplete the 20,000-square-mile undersea farm that is the Georges Bank and South Channel, off Cape Cod.

But William C. Herrington, aquatic biologist for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, kept his eye on depletion, knowing that with the war's end the problem again would become serious.

Herrington has been studying the situation for 12 years, first at sea aboard draggers and trawlers, and then in his Manter Hall office off Harvard Square in Cambridge.

And now, with the fleet at its peak strength, Herrington has reached the conclusion that three things must be done if New England boats are to stay in business close to home, rather than be forced far out to sea, and perhaps out of business.

Because the haddock presents the most pressing problem, Herrington, called "Doc"

by fishermen, has confined his recommendations to the species.

These are his suggestions:

1. Require all boats fishing for haddock to use a net mesh of 4 inches, inside of the knots, rather than the present 2¾-inch mesh, so that nearly all fish under 2 pounds may escape.

2. Establish closed areas to protect principal nursery grounds.

3. Prohibit the sale of haddock under 2 pounds. This recommendation would implement the first, since fishermen would not catch what they couldn't sell.

Herrington added his belief that the recommended regulations must be backed by Federal legislation or international treaty. For Georges Bank and South Channel, Federal legislation only would be sufficient, but for the Nova Scotian banks—also important to the United States—international action would be a prerequisite to successful control.

The pattern might be the International Fishery Commission set up by treaty between the United States and Canada in 1930 to control the halibut catches in the northern Pacific Ocean. The Pacific halibut is a classic example of a resource which, after undergoing extreme depletion, has been restored through careful regulation.

HALIBUT GROUNDS DIVIDED

Under authority of the treaty, an international commission divided the halibut grounds into four areas, and thereafter annually set a quota on the number of pounds of halibut that could be taken. When the quota is reached, the season is closed.

As a supplementary measure, two areas where small fish predominate are entirely closed to fishing.

As a result, the abundance of halibut in the Pacific has increased tremendously. The catch per unit of gear has risen as much as 112 percent since 1930, and halibut production has jumped 10,000,000 pounds.

New Englanders also might have developed halibut catches, but lack of action—such as that which now threatens the haddock and other species—has virtually choked off the halibut in the North Atlantic. Many years ago New England caught about 14,000,000 pounds of halibut annually; now the catch is 1,000,000 pounds.

But in the Pacific the fishermen, the boat owners, the dealers—in fact, everybody—were in agreement that action must be taken. Selfish interests were laid aside.

FIRST STEP FAILED

The first formal step toward control of the North Atlantic fishing grounds was taken in 1940, but it failed miserably. In that year the Atlantic Fishermen's Union drafted a bill for introduction into Congress embodying the same recommendations as made here by Herrington.

"We couldn't even get it introduced, say nothing of passage," said Austin Powers, union business agent. "Is Congress blind? Shouldn't it be interested in saving an industry worth millions of dollars?"

Herrington explained he fully realizes his recommendations may appear drastic to those accustomed to thinking of the Northwest Atlantic as their own private fishing pond rather than as a great natural resource owned by all of the people of the United States.

"When the alternatives to regulation are considered, however," he added, "it should be obvious that some definite action of the kind suggested must be taken.

"If the fishery continues its present course without hindrance, and the taking of small haddock continues and increases, the tremendous production of the haddock fishery in the South Channel-Georges Bank area will decrease both in quantity and quality until the annual catch is reduced to less than 50 to 60 million pounds, and is made up principally of baby haddock."

DECLINE OF REDFISH

While haddock has been the primary concern of the researchers, the popular redfish and yellowtail are also declining. Figures show that the rapid expansion of the redfish fleet has resulted in a considerable decline in yield from the Gulf of Maine, and that to supply the market—the great Midwestern market for redfish—the boats are being forced to progressively more distant grounds.

Cod catches also have been fluctuating widely for the past 10 years and only now is the problem being examined.

It has been the experience of all interested in solving the problem of depletion that dealers are much less concerned than fishermen. Said one official: "The closer you get to the men who have to get the fish out of the water, the better understanding you get."

Officials of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, unselfish in their motives, feel that agitation for remedial action must come from the industry itself and from the public, rather than from the Government. When it comes, the next request for congressional action will probably be made by the Atlantic Fishermen's Union.

The men of the Fish and Wildlife Service feel they have accumulated sufficient data to warrant action. The only accurate figures showing the decline of the haddock fishery, for instance, are those of the Service.

ANNUAL CATCH FIGURES

Long ago, these men determined that annual catch figures were not accurate barometers. When the annual figures increased, the industry pointed to them as proof that nothing was wrong, that there wasn't overfishing.

But the only method of accurately keeping count was to compile the figures on the basis of "catch per day per boat." That would tell the real story.

The Service has been keeping its figures in that manner, always being careful to make adjustments for improved gear, more efficient boats, and so forth.

Their charts show that the peak year for abundance of haddock was in 1927. In that year the average catch per boat was 44,000 pounds. By 1931 that had slipped to 9,100 pounds, but those were depression years and demand was slow.

In 1942 the figure was 16,600 pounds per day per boat.

In 1946 it was 14,500—a long way from the 44,000 pounds of 1927. And it can be said that 1927 and 1946 were comparable years so far as demand is concerned.

The Fish and Wildlife Service charts prove one major point, Herrington said. "In the long run, the catch can be no larger than the fish growing up to commercial size."

Growth of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of our people are greatly disturbed over the apparent growth of communism in our country. May I say that I am unalterably opposed to any philosophy which would, to any degree, either lessen our ardor and faith in our form of government or which would either tend or point to the destruction of our form of government. We, as Americans, believe in our form of government—and that form of government must maintain throughout the future years.

Any group or any organization which becomes infested with communism, or communistic policies, must clean out its own back yard and rid itself of those who believe in those un-American policies. I am very happy to find an article upon this very subject, which appears in The Stars and Stripes of date January 30, 1947, which, under unanimous consent, I incorporate herein as a part of my remarks. This article follows:

CLEAN OUT YOUR NEST

A week or so ago Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., son of the late President, let it be known that he and some of his associates in the American Veterans Committee had reached a startling conclusion. Communists within the self-styled veterans' group have torn it asunder and factionalized it, he said. We are now bewildered and confused by their lies; the Reds are advising those who follow the Moscow trail to tie in with the AVC; the people have lost faith in us because we are Commie-infiltrated; and an up-and-coming organization of inspired young Americans is now tattered and torn, Roosevelt said, and, he added, "We must decide—what now?"

The veterans of America—not quasi-veterans who never wore the uniform of their country and who make up one of the most vocal factions of the AVC, which is not a veterans' organization at all—echo the query, What now? Much as they believe that all bona fide veterans would best serve their own interests by alining in membership with existing major veterans' societies, neither the well-organized ex-service men and women nor this veterans' spokesman are insistent upon their doing this. If any group of men, or women, who saw war service in their country's armed forces, wish to form their own select groups, that is their business. But, however pleasing it might be to float along on a tide of veteran popularity by finding it possible to join a so-called veterans' association without actually being a veteran, the two, like oil and water, cannot possibly have anything in common. We said that many, many months ago. We also said that no philosophy espoused by Communists could be tolerated in the same clubroom or meeting place of any group that believes in unadulterated Americanism. The two ideologies will not mix, and the mixers can only ride to a fall. Like some others who choose to mistakenly term themselves "liberals," young Roosevelt and a few of his friends are only now beginning to find out what we have tried all along to tell them.

Lest it be reasoned that the Roosevelt decision is an entirely new slant, let us disabuse the thoughtless. Four months ago Charles G. Bolte, "Chuck" to his pals, and the AVC national chairman, lambasted all recognized major veterans' organizations who do not subscribe to his "liberal" sophisms. In a weasel-worded radio address, he stated that his outfit "did not welcome Communists," but he made no effort to kick them out. In a foredoomed campaign to sign up a million members, he accepted donations from veteran and nonveteran alike, and cared not about their source. He signed up nonveteran as well as veteran, American and alien, patriot and opportunist foreigner, all under a banner claiming America as its origin and veteran as its purpose. By word and by pen, he and his associates, including young F. D., through argument and expression, have sown the sort of discord that attracts Communists and alienates red-blooded Americans. He has not had the will to do what other organizations have done—refuse the Reds membership—because he needed numbers he could not otherwise obtain.

The National Tribune–The Stars and Stripes discussed this issue as far back as the fall of 1945. In June, October, and twice in November 1946 we attempted to point out to the real veterans in AVC the error of their ways and the pitfalls that must come. At innumerable times we have discussed here the Communist philosophy, all without avail, and we say once more that when one sleeps with strange and diseased bedfellows the taint is infectious; when termites once get into a house, that house will be destroyed unless preventive measures are adopted.

A prominent Washington newspaper printed last week 21 inches of paid display advertising by admitted Communists of Maryland and the District of Columbia. In a play on words, they attempted to lead the unwary to believe that they were loyal Americans; that they supported American democracy and the Constitution; that they condemned the use of force and violence; that they accept in good faith the principles of organizations, including those of veterans, and do not wish to capture them; that they do not want to stir up trouble; that they bid only for improved living and working conditions and a better life for the common man. They lie. The newspaper that printed the advertisement accompanied it with an explanatory editorial, admitting it has been amply demonstrated by official records, both here and in Moscow, that every paid-for word was a printed equivocation. The Reds have been proved to be disloyal to this Nation and all of its institutions; they believe in revolution by force and violence; they are attempting to gain control of every type of organization in which they have membership; they thrive on discord, unhappiness, unemployment, lack of housing, hatred, it said. We add that "liberalism" is but counterfeit communism, and we are now engaged in a war against that ideology.

Now comes F. D. R., Jr., and his friends asking, What now? It may be they have just awakened to the fact that the people are fast revising their estimates of how far one can go in tolerating Communist-inspired Leftist movements, whether they be termed "liberal," "progressive," "radical," or "red." But if the question be real or feigned, the genuine veterans of this country can supply the answer. They have been trying to do it for, lo, these many years. Do not encourage Red demonstrations such as we have witnessed so many times under AVC banners. Become imbued more with an old-fashioned and undiluted Americanism and less attracted to false prophets who would save the world at the expense of their own beloved country. Learn the difference between truth and propaganda, and find a means to absorb and believe in the fundamental rights that have made this country the greatest on earth. Devote less time to curing the fancied ills of all the peoples of the world, and move to correct the maladies that our sworn enemies are stealthily injecting into the veins of your own kind. Be kind, be generous, veer a little to the left or the right, if you will, but keep a firm eye on and help to preserve the liberties that have been handed to you at such bloody cost and that you yourselves in your own time helped to preserve. Recognize them for what they are. Do not throw them foolishly away. That is what to do.

Help us to weed out of the armed forces confessed Communists who seek only to destroy. Give aid to those who would remove them from places in government, both high and low. Add some impetus to the effort to kick the vermin out of any organization where it associates with you and sullies and compromises your own patriotism. And, if you would have the AVC enjoy the company of groups of veterans that struggle ever to make of this America what it was intended to be, if you would gain their respect and march side by side with them in a wholesome belief in militant Americanism, revise your standards and rewrite your bylaws to make of the AVC an honest organization with the right to use the words "American" and "veteran."

Clean out your own nest.

Resolution of Steuben Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following resolution:

The Steuben Society of America, an American patriotic organization, interested in the educational, civic, and political problems affecting the American people, and being firmly convinced that there must be no repetition of the failure of 1918 and subsequent years to properly provide for the returning veterans, do submit to the Veterans' Administration of the United States of America the following brief of those subjects which it believes should be sponsored so as to generally provide for the welfare, comfort, and future of the returning veterans of World War II:

EMPLOYMENT

We believe that the rights as given to the veteran respecting his job, both private and governmental, should be protected by the United States Government by creating a special court of jurisdiction within the Veterans' Administration to which the veteran may apply in the event of necessity to seek reinstatement to his position or any other action to assure his benefits hereunder.

We do not believe that the veteran should be submitted to the necessity of pursuing his legal remedies in the Federal and other courts, but rather that such a particular subject should be considered by a court duly created and acquainted with veterans' problems.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

We advocate a greater application of the privileges of educational, vocational, trades, agricultural, and technical programs under the supervision and planning of the United States Government through its duly created Veterans' Administration, under a bureau of education which shall have the authority and power to direct and control in the several States, municipalities, and communities the educational and training programs for the benefit of the veteran wishing to acquaint or adapt himself to the program.

United States assistance should be given when found necessary and warranted to each locality to permit the building of such schools and institutions as may be deemed essential for the proper administration of such educational and training programs, and for the proper dormitory accommodations to those accepting the rights under said program.

DISABLED VETERANS

We advocate appropriation of reasonable compensation to disabled veterans of World War II. We further believe that our Government should provide the means for such disabled veterans to obtain vocational rehabilitation through the service of a duly constituted Federal division of social welfare under the auspices and pursuant to the rules and regulations prescribed by the Veterans' Administration, which in turn may assist veterans in their home States, municipalities, and communities.

HOSPITALIZATION

We believe that one of the first responsibilities which we have is to provide adequate facilities for the hospitalization, treatment, and medication of those wounded, maimed, sick of mind, and sick of body veterans, and we therefore advocate the creation of a division of mental hygiene within the Veterans' Administration which shall arrange for the acquisition or erection of buildings and institutions, and for the equipment thereof, so as to provide for hospitalization, treatand medication of those wounded, maimed, sick of mind, and sick of body veterans, and World War II.

HOUSING

We advocate a greater activity by the Veterans' Administration in urging the enactment of legislation to alleviate the dangerous and alarming housing conditions, particularly as they affect the veteran. We do not believe that quonset huts as a temporary housing measure are practical, sanitary, comfortable, or business-wise projects.

We urge the Veterans' Admin.stration to use its efforts to obtain the lifting of restrictions on those vital materials and supplies used in the erection and completion of housing accommodations. We believe that the Veterans' Administration should use its efforts in obtaining legislation in the several States, communities, and municipalities permitting old and boarded-up buildings to be rehabilitated so as to be available for occupancy by veterans and their families.

Finally, we advocate the planning within the several States, municipalities, and communities of certain housing developments for veterans' occupancy exclusively.

RELIEF

We are fundamentally opposed to the granting of relief on the ground that it tends to discourage the individual. We are, however, mindful that certain conditions and circumstances, particularly as affecting a sick and disabled veteran, may arise which would necessitate assistance. We, therefore, advocate the creation within the Veterans' Administration of a bureau for the relief of sick and disabled veterans.

TAXES

We urge upon the Veterans' Administration support of legislation granting to all veterans of World War II an exemption from income-tax payments for a period of 1 year.

PENSION

We urge upon the Veterans' Administration support of legislation which would assure reasonable pensions for the widows and orphans of veterans who sacrificed their lives for their country in World War II.

Respectfully submitted.

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA.

Veterans' Social-Security Credits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to point out a real injustice which is being done to veterans with respect to social security.

As the law now stands, workers who have earned at least $50 in half the quarter-year periods since 1936, or since they reached the age of 21 years, are fully insured, permanently.

Military service is not insurable employment, so that many veterans, through no fault of their own, have been prevented from continuing this status which their brethren who did not enter military service were able to maintain. Consequently, inequity has been created to the detriment of the veteran.

The law also provides for a "currently insured" status under which, in cases where deceased workers paid pay-roll taxes in at least half the quarters in the 3 years preceding death, death benefits are paid to certain of their dependents. Few are the veterans who are covered.

It is my opinion that the veteran's prewar social-security credits should be protected by crediting his account with an amount equal to that which he would have earned at $160 a month if he had spent the period of his military service in an insurable employment.

A bill to correct this injustice has been introduced, and I trust it will receive the favorable consideration of this Congress.

Cooperation and Coordination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, as a small tribute to an efficient branch of the national defense, I take pleasure of presenting here a part of an article written by me and published in the February issue of the Sojourner, official publication of National Sojourners, Inc., descriptive of conditions in the U. S. S. *Leyte*, then under the command of Capt. Henry F. MacComsey, United States Navy, and also some remarks about the relation of adequate funds to efficient scientific research:

COOPERATION AND COORDINATION

In December, I made a trip to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as the guest of the Secretary of the Navy. The passage down was by air, the return in the U. S. S. *Leyte*—one of the new aircraft carriers of the Navy. As a part of the instructive purposes of this trip, the guests witnessed a battle problem conducted by this great ship. The smoothness of handling aircraft—both in launching and in recovery—the fine coordination of every part of this sea-air combination, the loyal cooperation of every one on the team from captain to seaman, told the story of why and how the United States was victorious in this greatest-of-all-wars just concluded. I do not say this with any thought that the Navy won the war. Far from it! I use it merely as an example of the handling of equipment and the efficiency of all forces under the Stars and Stripes. I use it to invite your attention to what we now have toward maintaining the national defense. I trust that Sojourners will exert their every effort, both collectively and individually, in trying to preserve the various components of the armed forces in adequate numbers and outstanding efficiency.

Also, while on this subject, may I invite your attention to the urgency of continuing scientific research in matters of national defense and in the education of young men and women to undertake such research. Always remember that scientists are of little use without adequate funds and equipment; that these material components are worthless unless handled by intelligent personnel. Scientific personnel, equipment, and adequate funds go hand in hand in research and accomplishment. Let us be sure the team does not lack any part essential for success.

Federal Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY THE AMERICAN LABOR PARTY ON A FEDERAL TAX PROGRAM

Unless the American people vigorously take up the fight at once, the Republicans are determined to put over a Federal tax program which will provide relief for the greedy at the expense of the needy, and which will help plunge our country into a depression. The greatest need of this country is to increase the purchasing power of the mass of our people, which is being threatened by high prices. Taxes on the average American decrease mass purchasing power. Taxes on the comfortable and the rich have little or no effect on purchases; they largely reduce already heavy savings.

Nevertheless, the Republicans have set their sights for big tax cuts to the higher bracket taxpayers, with only crumbs thrown to the average American. Their major goal is a flat 20-percent reduction in personal income tax rates. This scheme is both undemocratic and dangerous to the economic health of the Nation.

A 20 percent cut for everybody sounds fair. Actually, it is highly unfair because it would give the greatest relief to those who need it least. A married man with 2 dependents and an income of $500 a week would save $1,816 in taxes. If he had an income of $5,000 a week, he would save $39,824. But a worker with a wife and 2 children earning $30 a week and struggling hard to provide food and rent and clothing for his family would save only $13.40.

The Republican 20 percent across-the-board cut is dangerous to the Nation because it will do little or nothing to increase the purchasing power of the masses of the people, upon which our economy depends. At the same time it will provide additional millions to the higher bracket taxpayers whose unspent savings are the country's real inflationary menace, and may plunge us into depression. This is shown by the startling facts as to the savings of the American people recently reported by the Federal Reserve System. At the end of the war, after years of scarcity of consumers goods, 50 percent of the families in the United States had only 3 percent of the total individual liquid assets. It is clear that the Republicans' income tax proposal will serve mainly to increase the savings of the upper income groups, savings which, if not reinvested, will stall our economic machine. Such tax cuts are reminiscent of those put into effect during the Mellon regime, and will reverse the whole course of progressive tax legislation during the Roosevelt era.

When President Truman declared the war emergency at an end, the Republicans were faced with a dilemma. That meant the end of wartime excise taxes on June 30, 1947, accounting for about $1,250,000,000. They were fearful that the end of these taxes might endanger their plan to cut huge slices off the personal income taxes of wealthy Americans. They have, therefore, now urged that these taxes be continued.

The proposal to continue the wartime excise taxes after June 30 is sound as applied to the luxury items. It is unsound and should be rejected as applied to necessities, such as taxes on admissions to movies or theaters, cosmetics, luggage, handbags, etc., except in the higher-priced luxury items.

The American Labor Party calls for a tax bill based on the democratic principle of ability to pay, a tax bill which will strengthen the purchasing power of the masses of the people, a tax bill which will recapture some of the swollen profits being reaped by industry as a result of the postwar inflation. We urge Congress to reject the 20-percent-across-the-board cut and instead:

1. Raise personal income-tax exemptions from the present level of $500 per person to $1,500 for a single person and $2,500 for a married couple. In this way with the retention of the $500 credit for each dependent a married couple with two children would thus have $3,500 free of income tax. The authoritative budget studies of the Heller committee, adjusted for recent price rises, show that at least $3,500 is required to keep a family of four at a minimum standard of decent living.

2. Repeal all Federal excise taxes, whether enacted during the war or before the war, on necessities. Sales taxes hit the neediest the hardest. We have Federal excises on sugar, electrical appliances, films, beer, cosmetics, handbags, and other commodities, all of which should be repealed. There is no place in a democratic fiscal system for regressive taxes on necessities.

3. Restore for the year 1947 the excess-profits tax on corporations, without any carry-back. Events have made it perfectly clear that the repeal of the corporate excess-profits tax as of the beginning of 1946 was a colossal fiscal blunder. Corporate profits have skyrocketed to their highest peak; unprecedented billions are being made by big business out of the postwar inflation. As an anti-inflationary measure, as a means of siphoning off huge savings of a small group of corporations and individuals which may plunge us headlong into depression, as a source of billions badly needed for housing, education, public works, and tax reductions in the lower brackets, the excess-profits tax should be restored for the year 1947 at wartime rates, without a carry-back provision.

Such an immediate tax program will contribute to the economic health of the Nation and will help achieve the proper standard of living of millions of Americans.

We protest the undemocratic procedure adopted in the House of Representatives of rushing the excise tax continuation bill to the floor without hearings. We also protest the gag-rule procedure sanctioned by the House Rules Committee under which only the Ways and Means Committee will be permitted to offer floor amendments to the bill. Such a procedure is designed to prevent the American people from having their day in court on the bill and their elected representatives from being free to urge amendments. It is not in keeping with the American tradition.

New England Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry—a vital part of the business life of New England—soon will be nonexistent unless steps are taken to remedy the ills that now beset it.

In an effort to call public attention to this important matter and in the hope of helping to solve the problems now facing this multimillion-dollar industry, the Providence (R. I.) Journal recently assigned one of its reporters, Leonard O. Warner, to study the industry and the problems now facing it and to write a series of five articles on the subject.

So that every Member of the House and Senate may have the benefit of these articles, I propose to offer these articles for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, under permission already granted me, I include herewith the fifth article, as it appeared in the Journal of January 16, 1947. It follows:

BOSTON, GLOUCESTER FLEETS INVADE FISHING WATERS OFF BLOCK ISLAND—DEPLETION AT GEORGES BANK, SOUTH CHANNEL DRIVES BIG BAY STATE TRAWLERS TO YELLOWTAIL GROUNDS; CATCHES THERE DROP DRASTICALLY AS RESULT

(By Leonard O. Warner)

Depletion of the Georges Bank and South Channel fisheries has done more than drive the large boats of the Boston and Gloucester fleets further to the east in the North Atlantic.

Scarcity of haddock and other species is forcing the draggers and trawlers to an invasion of southern New England waters, off Block Island, fishing for yellowtail flounder, a popular fillet in the New York market.

The inevitable result is a dearth of yellowtails, one of the chief mainstays of the Rhode Island and New Bedford fleets of smaller fishing craft.

The decline of the lobster, clam, and quahaug populations should be of no less concern to New England and other parts of the Nation.

Up to 1935, yellowtails were considered a scrap fish. The big fellows from Boston and Gloucester wouldn't have bothered to stop if they had known there were a million pounds under their bottoms.

But times have changed. The yellowtail has become increasingly popular as a fine food fish and haddock aren't too plentiful on Georges.

Now, the small Rhode Island and New Bedford boats find themselves surrounded by those Boston fellows whenever they go out on that more than 100-mile line between Montauk Point and Nantucket Shoals, where yellowtails are found.

Linus Dodge, young Block Island fisherman, counted 35 boats in a small area, many of them the large Georges Bank trawlers, one day not long ago. It is more than likely the Boston and Gloucester trawlers had been out to Georges and South Channel, found lean pickings and decided to drop in for a yellowtail catch to salvage something out of the expensive trip.

"There's just too many boats fishing for yellowtails," said young Dodge.

Other Block Island fishermen expressed the opinion that conservation measures will have to be taken soon if the yellowtail industry is not to disappear. New Bedford fishermen, hauling in about 15,000,000 pounds of yellowtails a year, can remember when whaling was that city's biggest industry.

And look at what overfishing did to whaling, they say.

One Point Judith fisherman, famous several years ago for his large catches of yellowtails, declined to be quoted by name on the problem, but gave this view of the situation:

"There aren't as many fish because more boats are dragging and because some of the larger boats are going far off shore to break up the schools before the fish get inshore."

Fishermen at both Block Island and Point Judith, centers of the Rhode Island yellowtail industry, told how in the spring they have to shovel spawn off the decks. "It's a shame,"—that's the universal opinion. "But, we have to keep getting 'em—if we don't somebody else will. This needs a law, a Federal law."

According to estimates, Rhode Island fishermen land between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000 pounds of yellowtails each year, most of that for the New York market.

William F. Royce, in charge of the North Atlantic fishery investigations for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service at New Bedford, supports with figures the statements by fishermen that yellowtails are becoming scarce.

The yellowtail population declined abruptly in 1943, he said, and has been at a low figure ever since.

In 1942, Royce explained, the average yellowtail catch per day per boat was 12,000 pounds. It dropped to an average of 5,000 pounds in 1944 and has remained there.

SERVICE STUDIES PROBLEM

The Fish and Wildlife Service is continuing to study the problem, attempting to nail down a specific cause, or set of causes.

"We don't know definitely that intensive fishing is the whole cause," he said. "It may well be an important factor."

Some fishermen on the New Bedford docks like to believe that Navy practice bombing on the yellowtail grounds was responsible for the decline of the fish population. Studies conducted by the State of Louisiana show, however, that fish within 150 feet of the explosion of an 800-pound bomb are not affected. Bombing is probably a negligible factor in the population decline of yellowtails, said Royce.

Lobster, once a penny apiece, now a luxury, is another classic example of bad fishery management.

In 1889, the Nation took more than 30,000,000 pounds of succulent lobster—an average per trap of 173 pounds.

Today, with all the advantages of power-driven boats, the take is 21,000,000 pounds.

"Moreover," said a conservation bulletin of the Fish and Wildlife Service, "present-day catches contain a larger percentage of small lobsters, which in itself is a dangerous sign."

REGULATION BY STATE

The lobster fishery is regulated by individual States, but the Fish and Wildlife Service has been working diligently to bring about acceptance of the uniform minimum size limit for lobster of 3⅛ inches. As a result Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and Georgia have adopted this minimum size.

Only Rhode Island and Connecticut still adhere to the 3 1/16-inch limit. Rhode Island legislators were given a bill last year to raise the limit to 3⅛ inches, but it was lost in the shuffle. It apparently wasn't important.

The difference of one-sixteenth inch in the body shell of a lobster may seem trifling, but it means a difference of about a quarter of an inch in the over-all length of the lobster, and changes the minimum legal size from about three-quarters of a pound to a pound.

"Protection of under-sized lobsters appears to be essential if the productivity of this important fishery resource is to be maintained," said the Wildlife Service.

MANY CLAM GROUNDS BARREN

The Atlantic clam and quahaug resources have likewise been badly managed, according to the Wildlife Service. For want of scientific cultivation and conservation management, many clam grounds are now barren or depleted beyond value.

"Furthermore," said the Fish and Wildlife Service, "some large areas where clams are abundant are heavily polluted with domestic sewage and consequently closed to clammers. So long as the public fails to cultivate its clam grounds, discourages private cultivation, and pours its domestic sewage and industrial wastes over its good clam-growing areas, it can get only a fraction of the potential yield of this resource."

Edward C. Hayes, acting administrator of the Rhode Island Division of Fish and Game, agrees fully with the Wildlife Service. "Some of our best clam flats are in polluted areas," he said.

Albert M. Day, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, expressed the additional belief that the clam industry is now suffering from a situation brought about by excessive digging over a period of years.

MASSACHUSETTS SURVEY

Very recently Dr. Paul S. Galtsoff, shellfish biologist of the Wildlife Service, began a survey on the Massachusetts north shore to attempt to obtain basic information on the scarcity of clams.

Dr. Galtsoff is now preparing recommendations for a detailed study which the Wildlife Service will probably conduct to reveal the important factors adversely affecting the clam population.

But the public and the commercial fisheries are slow to accept recommendations—whether it be for clams, lobster, haddock, yellowtails, redfish, cod, or what have you. From a conservation point of view, the fisheries are perhaps the most poorly managed of our natural resources.

The Department of Interior, of which the Fish and Wildlife Service is a branch, recently summed it up this way:

"The commercial fisheries, taken as a whole, are among the least progressive industries in the United States.

"They are generally slow to improve their products, to develop new ones, to exploit virgin resources, to correct wasteful fishing methods, or to utilize the whole of their raw material."

The Chaplain and the Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I wrote to a clergyman friend of mine in St. Louis, Rev. Lawrence Kearney, S. J., of the faculty of St.

Louis University, advising him that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be mailed to him daily. I received a letter from him in which he commends our Chaplain, as well as his predecessor. His letter also expressed a profound thought in such an exquisite manner, that I shall ask your indulgence while I read it:

I've grown with the years to appreciate the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more and more. If they carried nothing but prayers, each issue would be a joy to me. The last and the present Chaplain unlock the doors of heaven by their reliance on that sacred name which the builders had rejected but which was made head of the corner. I have no hope of UN until it is requisitioned as the foundation. Then there will be peace on earth and not until then. Your Chaplains are great legislators.

LAWRENCE KEARNEY, S. J.

A Fraud on American People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Salt Lake Telegram under date of January 22, 1947, relating to misuse of clothing donated by Americans in last year's victory clothing drive:

A FRAUD ON AMERICAN PEOPLE?

Two instances of the misuse of clothing donated by Americans in last year's victory clothing drive to help European war victims have recently come to public attention.

A woman in Fairdale, N. Dak., gave a dress to the drive. She pinned a note high inside the sleeve wishing "lots of good luck" to the needy European woman who might receive it. The other day she received a reply to her note. It didn't come from Europe. It came from a woman who lived about 200 miles away in another Dakota town. She said she bought the dress, along with 99 others, sight unseen, for $18—or 18 cents a dress—from a Chicago mail-order house.

A few weeks before, a Muskegon, Mich., boy, aged 11, also received a letter in the mail. He had donated a pair of almost new galoshes in the victory clothing drive. He put a note in the boots and he received this reply from a Mississippi man:

"I am writing you this and attaching your letter so you may not be disappointed in your letter to a little foreign friend. I am a used-clothing dealer in this city (Greenwood, Miss.) and unfortunately—and as I fear, in other cases—your boots were sold to me in New York, instead of going where they were intended."

Frankly, this just makes your blood boil.

The two cases have been turned over to Congressmen. One Senator has suggested a congressional investigation. We certainly think there should be an investigation, and a thorough one. There should be a full report on what happened and a full exposé if someone played fast and loose with the American people on this purported campaign to help the unfortunate, destitute people overseas.

Somebody ought to go to jail for a colossal fraud on the American people.

Decontrol of Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the fifty-second general assembly in the State of Iowa is now in session, and the senate, with the house concurring, recently adopted a resolution urging immediate decontrol of sugar for home consumption and industrial use, calling attention in the resolution to the difficulty housewives have in preparing satisfactory meals with the present sugar ration, the lack of sugar for canning, and the fact that in Iowa great quantities of fruits, berries, and so forth, are produced which cannot be preserved because of the lack of sugar.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include Concurrent Resolution 6 of the Iowa General Assembly, which reads as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Whereas the housewives of America have patiently and patriotically exercised during the period of hostilities and for more than a year since the cessation of hostilities, the strictest economy in the use and consumption of sugar as a part of their contribution to the war effort; and

Whereas sugar is indispensable for a well balanced American diet, and housewives cannot prepare satisfactory meals without an adequate supply of sugar; and

Whereas the waste resulting from the lack of sufficient means of preserving foodstuffs through the scarcity of canning sugar can no longer be justified, since this Nation has not been at war for the past 18 months; and

Whereas Iowa, in common with other great agricultural States, produces many crops which require sugar for preservation, such as fruits, berries and vegetables and in the past year losses in these products, because of the limited sugar available have been estimated at several millions of dollars; and

Whereas the absence of sugar for canning purposes has caused thousands of tons of fruit to spoil, thereby depriving American families of a much needed food, and has caused hardships and financial losses in many farming and canning communities; and

Whereas labor in the food-processing industry has been without work because of the sugar shortage; and

Whereas in 1946 the sugar under the direct control of the United States increased by more than one-half million tons and no portion of this increase was made available to the American people; Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to provide by law for an immediate decontrol of sugar for home consumption, and for industrial use; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress is respectfully requested to remove all controls from the production, processing, distribution, rationing, sale, and importation of sugar without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress.

A National Public Housing Program From the Standpoint of the Needs of the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I am including herein an address on housing by the Honorable William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, which was read at the annual meeting of the United States conference of mayors in Washington, D. C., on January 20 last. As Mayor O'Dwyer was detained in New York by reason of most pressing city business, his address was read by Hon Edmond B. Butler, chairman of the New York City Housing Authority. I might add that Mr. Butler is one of the outstanding experts in the country on public housing.

The address of Mayor O'Dwyer follows:

Every city in this country is confronted with a housing shortage so serious that it jeopardizes the health and family life of our citizens. Those hardest hit are veterans and their families. In such a situation it becomes our duty as chief executives of cities to plan a course of action and take the steps necessary to solve the problem.

You will agree with me, I am sure, that we have had enough explanations, excuses, and historical reasons for the crisis which confronts us. It avails us little to blame the war, the low rate of construction before the war, the lack of proper planning to avoid deterioration and decay of entire neighborhoods, the low incomes of families which fail to attract profitable building enterprises, the difficulties in the building industry, or a dozen other things. What matters is that there is a job to be done now.

In December 1945, before I took office, I appointed an emergency committee on housing, representative of all interests in the city, to survey the entire situation and to recommend a course of action. At the same time, the New York City Housing Authority, which has to do with the public housing program and is also necessarily concerned with the over-all housing picture, made a study of total housing needs from the point of view of both the actual shortage and what rentals families could afford to pay.

A few figures for New York City will be interesting because they probably illustrate the situation in all cities. We have an absolute shortage of at least 150,000 apartments. This means that 150,000 families, or about 500,000 persons, are living under the crudest and most difficult conditions—with children in boarding houses without cooking facilities, doubled up and crowded in with other families, and even scattered so that the mother and children reside in one place and the father in another. While this is a staggering figure, it does not reflect the total needs of the community. In addition to the 150,000 families, almost all of whom are those of veterans who can find no homes of their own, there are about 600,000 families, many of whom are also those of veterans, now living in slums and obsolete buildings.

In New York City, therefore, we have a total need for 750,000 new apartments if we are to satisfy the existing absolute shortage and meet our replacement problem. Our

first concern, of course, is to provide decent homes for veterans and other families who are now living under makeshift arrangements. But in considering the housing needs of our cities, we cannot ignore the terrible problem of replacement and rehabilitation of our deteriorated areas which affect the general welfare of our citizens and the financial stability of our governments.

A program of this extent requires the utilization of all our resources, private and public. Private enterprise can and must be permitted to do the major portion of this job. In New York City we have given and will continue to give private enterprise every inducement and encouragement to build. We have assisted insurance companies and banks to undertake large-scale housing developments, now in the course of construction, by condemnation proceedings, closing of streets, replanning the neighborhoods of the projects, and by some tax exemption. It is evident, however, that private enterprise has not in the past been able to provide for the entire range of housing needs in the community, nor is there any reasonable prospect of its being able to do so. Only that portion of the job which cannot be done privately must be undertaken directly by government. This portion will vary in different cities. Even if we assume that private enterprise can and will undertake to build for three-fourths of the total need, in New York City there would still remain a governmental responsibility for about 200,000 apartments. This portion of the job alone is of such magnitude that it requires an active partnership of the Federal, State, and local governments. In New York we have such a partnership, which has produced significant results over the years. I hope this partnership will continue on an expanded scale because the greater portion of the task by far is still ahead of us.

In the first decade of public housing in New York City we have provided apartments for more than 17,000 families or for approximately 60,000 people. This was achieved mainly with the aid of the Federal Government under the United States Housing Act of 1937. Unfortunately, for all practical purposes, our cities can no longer look to this act for further assistance because funds have been exhausted.

In 1939 the people of the State of New York authorized $300,000,000 for loans to municipalities for public housing. Of this amount, the sum of $240,000,000 was allocated to New York City. The war stopped construction of most of this program. The New York City Housing Authority, however, continued with preparation of architectural plans and specifications, the acquisition and clearance of sites, and, in other respects, put itself in a position to commence construction as soon as conditions would permit. As a result, one project is fully occupied with 3,500 families; five additional projects for 6,735 families are actually under construction; and of the eight remaining projects for 11,660 families, four are about to go into construction and four are in the site-clearance stage. Unfortunately, our second partner, the State, has also run out of housing funds appropriated to date. Of the $240,000,000 allocated to the city, $125,000,000 have actually been spent or obligated to contractors. The remaining $115,000,000 is barely sufficient to complete these projects for which plans have been drawn and sites acquired.

I said before that the city government should be a partner in this undertaking. In contributing tax exemption and other forms of assistance to public housing, cities have assumed financial obligations. Whenever possible, cities should go beyond that and actually finance public housing independently of Federal and State aid. In New York City we have done just that. By guaranteeing bonds of the Housing Authority and by agreeing to pay annual cash subsidies, New York City has made possible five projects for 2,633 families.

It is a sad commentary on this Nation's ability to overcome great obstacles that we have been able barely to scratch the surface in housing. In New York City, where more permanent public housing has been undertaken than in any other community in the country, only 38,000 apartments have been provided over the years with 200,000 apartments still remaining to be provided in low-rent public housing. And the housing appropriations of all the partners in the enterprise are exhausted. A similar unfilled need for public housing and lack of funds to meet that need must exist in all cities.

In plain language, to solve this housing crisis within the reasonably near future, our cities need substantial sums of money now. The public housing requirements are of such magnitude that the Federal Government must continue as a major partner in this enterprise. To make this possible, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was introduced in the last Congress. I gave it my full support, and I hope all of you did, even though the measure provided for only a small portion of the need. For example, with the appropriation contained in that bill, New York City would, at the present time, be able to build a total of 20,000 apartments over a 4-year period. At this rate, if the Federal Government were the only source of funds, it would take 40 years to fill the present minimum needs for low-rent subsidized public housing in New York City. When the Federal housing bill is reintroduced, we must all support it energetically. We must convince Congress that it is essential for the welfare of our country. Some may consider it more expedient to divide the bill into several measures for the purpose of gaining speedier consideration for public housing. Whatever the form, if the bill permits a resumption of the public housing program, we must press for speedy enactment. There are other important elements in the general housing bill, particularly those which would encourage the construction of rental housing by private enterprise, which should receive serious consideration by Congress. These, too, must receive our full support.

As mayors, we should also look to our States as full partners in this program to the extent that financial resources of the States permit. In New York I am urging a continuation of State aid by means of an additional $300,000,000 for loans to the municipalities, together with the corresponding subsidies to make low rents possible.

As mayors, we do not have to be reminded of the financial plight of our cities and of the strict limitations upon our powers. Municipalities are in the least favorable position to assume added obligations for public housing. Nevertheless, it is our duty to continue to explore every means by which cities may contribute toward the solution of the overall problem.

This threefold plan of action which I have discussed relates to the immediate urgent need for low-rent public housing. There are, in addition, a few pieces of unfinished business which are of an emergency nature and which should receive the prompt attention of Congress. There are many permanent low-rent projects in the Federal program throughout the country, the construction of which was interrupted by the war. In the meantime, costs have risen to a point which makes it impossible to complete these projects under the limitations of the United States Housing Act of 1937. Under no circumstances should the development of this group of projects be further impeded. It may be necessary to ask Congress to enact a special measure quickly to permit their completion. In any event, the new public housing bill should be sufficiently flexible with regard to cost-limit formulas so as to avoid the same difficulties in the new program.

The other piece of unfinished business relates to the temporary housing program for veterans which Congress authorized last year. No doubt many of you have had the same experience as we in New York have had when the Federal Government found itself short of funds to complete the program which had been started. As a result, we found ourselves in a very awkward situation, since a definite number of homes was promised to veterans. In many cases, as in New York City, sites had already been acquired and improved with the necessary utilities. Temporary housing is admittedly a makeshift and falls short of the type of housing which the veteran deserves. Nevertheless, the job which has been started must be finished. There is dire need for these emergency quarters. Our cities cannot afford to assume the contractual commitments of the Federal Government in order to complete the temporary housing program. Nevertheless, New York City is advancing $3,600,000 to the Federal Government to prevent a stoppage or a reduction in the temporary housing program in New York. Congress should give immediate consideration to a deficiency appropriation for temporary housing, and those cities which have advanced the funds necessary to avoid a stoppage or curtailment of the program should be reimbursed.

The temporary housing program is evidence of our failure to meet the needs of our communities, and particularly of our veterans, for permanent housing. Using the same ingenuity which enabled us to win the war will enable us to solve the housing problem, the number 1 problem of our Nation. The joint efforts of private enterprise and Government in the execution of a well-thought-out program will provide all our citizens with decent homes.

Rev. Daniel W. Driscoll, O. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following special article published in the Pilot, official news organ of the archdiocese of Boston, under date of Saturday, January 11, 1947.

It pays deserved tribute to the Rev. Daniel W. Driscoll, O. S. A., pastor of St. Mary's Church, Lawrence, Mass., which is the largest church in New England. This beloved shepherd, who was business manager of Villanova College for 13 years, has brought to his present responsible assignment a keen interest in the mental as well as spiritual development of his parishioners. As a builder of character, he is making a noteworthy contribution to the life of his community. He is helping to make better men and women who will enrich our American way of life. I believe that we owe to this modest spiritual leader, and to all men of God, some appreciation of the fine work they are doing.

As the Pilot expresses it:

MEET YOUR PASTOR

(By Bill McMorrow)

From the pages of Archbishop Cushing's "Vocation Guide to Religious life—Archdiocese of Boston," we learn that the Augustine Fathers are today serving as parish priests, as teachers, preachers, missionaries, research men in the field of letters and science, scholars, and writers, and today's presentation might very well be captioned "Welcome," for in telling the brief story of Rev. Daniel W. Driscoll, O. S. A., pastor of St. Mary's, in Lawrence, we introduce for the first time in this section of the Pilot a member of the Augustinian Order. Of far greater importance to Father Driscoll, however, is the fact that St. Mary's is an Augustinian parish, located in the great manufacturing city of Lawrence, which down through the years has always been served by this order, and as he himself puts it "* * * its pastor is just another Augustinian."

Born in Lawrence, November 18, 1886, Father Driscoll moved to North Andover at an early age, and was educated in the public schools there and Johnson High School. A graduate of Villanova College, class of 1906, he was ordained to the priesthood in 1915, and served as business manager of Villanova for some 13 years. Later he served as curate in St. Rita's parish, Chicago, and St. Matthew's in Flint, Mich., and in 1937 he went to St. Augustine's in Philadelphia, one of the four oldest churches in America, the one burned during the "Know Nothing" uprising, and oddly enough, a church to which George Washington had contributed a sum of money when it was erected. Following his stay in Philadelphia, he came to Lawrence and St. Augustine's on Tower Hill, known to residents of the district as "the chapel on the hill," following which he came to St. Mary's as pastor in 1941. In tracing the assignments of Father Driscoll it is noteworthy that he has served in the oldest (St. Augustine's, Philadelphia), the newest (St. Augustine's on Tower Hill, Lawrence), and the largest (St. Mary's) churches in the province.

UNIQUE HISTORY

"St. Mary's Church, founded in the year 1849 by Rev. James O'Donnell, has many unusual highlights attached to its history," Father Driscoll pointed out. It is such a large parish, with three other mission churches, one of which, the Immaculate Conception, seats in the upper church alone over 1,200, that the assistants are appointed by the pastor to the different missions and districts, and each assistant is, as it were, another pastor in his own district. They are also given charge of the different societies, which gives the pastor more time to look after the many details pertaining to the school system, repairs, construction, and the cemeteries.

LARGE AUDITORIUM

The first church was built in 1849 on the north side of Haverhill Street and is used today for a grade school. It has the largest auditorium in the city and is often rented for the outstanding large city social functions. Many notable church dignitaries and Government officials have been seen there, including President Truman in November 1944. The present church was built in 1870 by Father Edge, O. S. A. It is of beautiful stone construction, which never seems to lose its light color or grow old. It is the largest church in New England and may well be called a cathedral, comparing favorably with the Holy Cross Cathedral in Boston. With no lower church, it seats about 2,200 comfortably and is 80 feet from ceiling to floor. Its gothic architectural lines are so perfect that its enormous size is not perceptible; yet a stranger in Lawrence, viewing the skyline for the first time, couldn't miss its towering spire, a landmark for many miles.

Assisting Father Driscoll in the work of this busy parish are Rev. Charles F. Hart, O. S. A., subprior; Rev. Daniel J. O'Mahoney, O. S. A., Father Driscoll's former pastor, and at 91 years of age perhaps the oldest priest in our diocese today; Rev. William P. Kelly, O. S. A.; Rev. Hugh P. O'Neill, O. S. A.; Rev. William Donovan, O. S. A.; Rev. John R. Brennan, O. S. A.; Rev. John V. Keegan, O. S. A.; Rev. Joseph T. Conroy, O. S. A.; Rev. Edward J. Carney, O. S. A.; Rev. Thomas Rogers, O. S. A.; Rev. John J. Lamond, O. S. A.; and Rev. James J. McCusker, O. S. A. A recent census revealed 2,341 families and 7,745 souls in the parish, and, as one would imagine, activities of a spiritual and social nature are many and varied. The St. Mary's Holy Name Society, Holy Family Sodality, Sacred Heart Sodality, Legion of Mary, Blessed Virgin Sodality, St. Vincent de Paul Society, Alumnae Association, CYO, and Boy Scouts, Troop No. 21, as well as St. Rita's Junior Guild and St. Rita's Senior Guild are but a few of the leaders, each a firm booster of the parish and a source of considerable satisfaction to both Father Driscoll and his assistants.

Four parish schools comprise the educational system here—St. Mary's Grammar School, for boys and, for girls St. Rita's Grammar School, and St. Mary's High School for girls. With 674 boys and 697 girls in the grammar schools and 298 high-school girls enrolled, totaling 1,669 pupils served here, it's small wonder St. Mary's school system is looked upon as "tops" in this section of New England, and, of course, the records of the graduates more than attest the value of the personal attention given the pupils by the 36 Sisters of Notre Dame, 4 Sisters of St. Dominic, 9 Xaverian Brothers, and 2 lay teachers who handle this large assignment for Father Driscoll.

PARISH CALENDAR

For the past 50 years Our Parish Calendar, a monthly publication, has been issued at St. Mary's and is currently edited by Father O'Neill, in tiptop style, with a multitude of interesting articles, pictures, and data important to every parishioner.

St. Mary's Cemetery and Immaculate Conception Cemetery both come under the direction of Father Driscoll and his assistants, and represent just one more interesting assignment taken in stride at busy St. Mary's Rectory.

In addition to Immaculate Conception parish, other missions of St. Mary's in Lawrence are Saints Peter and Paul Church and Assumption B. V. M. Church. Located within the parish lines are the national Churches of St. Joseph's, St. Anthony's, St. Anne's, and St. Francis', a truly Catholic community in every sense of the meaning. At the moment Father Driscoll is completely wrapped up in the renovations of St. Mary's, and the beautiful stained-glass windows are most certainly outstanding. The work of Terrace O'Duggan, of Boston, they represent simplicity and beauty rolled into one—and little doubt exists that they have no peer elsewhere in our great diocese. The renovation and construction work is something of a hobby with Father Driscoll, for his dad was a well-known contractor in Lawrence, and the building game is nothing new to the pastor, who learned it as a youngster, the hard way.

Soft spoken and mild mannered, Father Driscoll is a man's man—every bit, loved by all in the community, and his soft spot seems to be in his fondness for the children. As your reporter took leave of his visit with Father Driscoll, he was given one of the beautiful spiritual bouquet cards distributed to the children for Mother's Day, each year. And the last verse of the beautiful poem seems to express the thoughts of Father Driscoll to perfection:

"And so on earth on this her day,
Close by sweet Mary's shrine
Where mother taught us first to pray,
Mary—we link her name with thine."

Statement of Policy Adopted by the Meeting of Midwest Chairmen of 12 States Held at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Ill., January 18, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the Midwest Republican chairmen held in Chicago on January 18 a set of resolutions was adopted which is worthy of consideration by the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the statement of policy adopted by the meeting and the resolution also adopted at that time.

We recognize the fact that the people have entrusted to the Republican Party the responsibility for sound legislation.

Therefore we recommend the following as some of the important objectives:

Any labor legislation passed by Congress must be based on the fundamental principle that it will protect the rights of labor—meaning by labor—the men and women who work. If new legislation is fair, industry will again operate freely to the benefit of all.

Drastic reduction of governmental expenses must be made now. This will include the abolition of all unnecessary bureaus and personnel.

Income taxes must be cut, and these cuts must be applicable on the incomes of all citizens.

Governmental legislation must be passed which will reverse the present trend of forcing small businesses into mergers. A broad base of small business is fundamental to healthy commerce.

The country must go back to operation under specific laws instead of the present control by Federal commission ground rules and interpretation of laws. Every citizen of this country is now regulated by what bureaucrats and courts choose to designate as their interpretation of congressional acts.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MEETING OF REPUBLICAN MIDWEST CHAIRMEN, STEVENS HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 18, 1947

Resolved, That inasmuch as the birth and the rebirth of the Republican Party came from the great Midwest, we believe that the welfare of this Nation can well be entrusted to a Republican President who is symbolic of the ideals and heritage of the Middle West.

Address by Hon. Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma, at Senator Overton Appreciation Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 31, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me delivered at the Senator Overton appreciation dinner, held at the Roosevelt Hotel, New Orleans, November 14, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator OVERTON, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen of New Orleans and the State of Louisiana, a most pleasant task has been assigned to me tonight.

It is not often that we have the opportunity of saying just what we think of a fellow Senator.

I am glad to be in this great international city of New Orleans.

I am glad to be in this great Democratic State of Louisiana.

Democratic States are not as plentiful now as they were a few days ago; however, I am glad to report that my State of Oklahoma is still in that select group known as the solid South.

Again I am especially delighted to attend this appreciation dinner in honor of my friend and your distinguished senior Senator, the Honorable JOHN H. OVERTON.

Tonight I am doing for him what I am sure he would do for me if a like occasion presented itself.

There is this difference between Senator OVERTON and myself: In undertaking to pay him a well-deserved tribute I am able to rely on positive facts and his record of accomplishments, while if he were in my State, under similar circumstances, he would have to draw rather heavily upon his imagination.

In passing, let me say that Louisiana is well and ably represented in the Senate of the United States.

Your junior Senator, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, is an able, hard-working, and an outstanding Member of the upper House of the American Congress.

Here in the South you have learned something that has not yet dawned upon some States in the North.

You select able, energetic, and patriotic men and send them to Congress and then you keep them there until they know their way around.

It is due to this policy that the South wields such a dominant influence in the lawmaking branch of our National Government.

When the new Senate convenes in January I will note only three Senators who were there when I moved over from the House on March 4, 1927.

Those Senators are KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee; ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas; and WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia.

Senator OVERTON arrived in the Senate on March 4, 1933, and when he returns on January 3 he will find only 13 Members older in the service than himself.

In my time I have seen many Senators come and many Senators go, but no Senator has come to Washington during the past quarter of a century who has made good to a greater degree than has your own distinguished Senator JOHN H. OVERTON.

For one reason or another, some 22 Senators will have successors in the new Congress soon to convene.

Of these 22 new faces only 5 will be Democrats; hence the balance of power, from a voting standpoint, will shift from the South to the North.

This change in the political line-up—serious as it may be to some sections and to some groups of our people—will not greatly affect Louisiana and the South.

The reasons for this statement are obvious:

The long tenure of membership, the high-ranking places on important committees and the ability and energy of your Senators and Congressmen, are positive guaranties that in the future, as in the past, the interests of New Orleans, Louisiana, and the South will neither be overlooked nor neglected.

After a distinguished and successful career at the bar, Senator OVERTON first came to the National Capital as a Congressman from the Eighth Louisiana District.

In 1932 he was elected to the United States Senate, where he is now an outstanding Member.

As an evidence of fidelity and loyalty to his State and to the South, Senator OVERTON selected committee assignments where he could render the greatest possible degree of service to his people, to his State, and to the Nation.

Louisiana and the South, among other things, are interested in navigation, river-and-harbor improvement, and flood control.

Senator OVERTON secured assignments to the Committee on Commerce, where, as ranking member, he has been able to shape and control the policy for such improvements and developments.

However, policies alone will not make rivers navigable, will not improve harbors, and will not either curb or control floods.

Planning, even with congressional approval, will not by itself secure the ends desired.

It takes money—appropriations—to pay for straightening the rivers, deepening the channels, building the harbors, and constructing the levees, dams, and reservoirs to control the floodwaters that habitually fall upon the North and descend upon the South.

In order to protect his State and the South, Senator OVERTON secured assignment to the Committee on Appropriations, where the money is allocated and appropriated.

Money for river and harbor improvement and flood control is handled by the Senate Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations and Senator OVERTON is a high-ranking member of this committee.

The only limit to the amount of money appropriated for the development and improvement of Louisiana has been the timid conscience of your senior Senator, JOHN H. OVERTON.

Your senior Senator is chairman of the subcommittee handling money for the Navy Department and, being a member of this committee myself, I have personal knowledge of the painstaking interest which he took in seeing that the Navy was not neglected during the recent war.

The success of our Navy in World War II was made possible, first, by the plans made by your junior Senator, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, as a member of the Naval Affairs Legislative Committee and, second, by your senior Senator, JOHN H. OVERTON, as chairman of the Navy Appropriations Committee.

In addition to these all-important committee assignments, Senator OVERTON is a high-ranking member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and is chairman of the Committee on Manufactures.

On each committee he wields a dominating influence.

Like your State of Louisiana, my State of Oklahoma has to deal with the floodwaters coming down from western Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, and Kansas.

The Arkansas River and it tributaries cover Oklahoma and the adjacent States like a gigantic fan.

The recent Congress approved an ambitious plan for the control of floods, the development of hydroelectric power, and even navigation on this turbulent Arkansas River and now, here in his presence, in his home State, I give full credit to your distinguished senior Senator for making this proposed development possible.

To the extent that we can control floods on the Arkansas River, your damage will be less, and to the extent that we develop navigation, your trade and commerce will be increased and expanded.

Because of our success in World War I, because of our accomplishments in World War II, and as the result of our energy, ability, and leadership, the United States is today the strongest, the richest, and the most influential Nation of the earth.

The present status of our country has not come about by chance.

The phenomenal program of preparedness in the recent war, while too long delayed, was not just a "happen so."

The success of our Army and Navy upon the land, upon water, and in the air was the result, first, of careful planning; second, of ample legislation and appropriations; third of the will to win of the people on the farms and in the factories and, last but not least, the ability, courage, and heroism of the millions of our brave boys fighting to protect our homes, our institutions, and the democratic principles upon which this Republic was founded.

During his service in the Congress, Senator OVERTON has played his full part in solving the domestic, national, and world problems which came before our people and the Congress for consideration and adjustment.

Our national flood-control program is a monument to the foresight and statesmanship of Senator OVERTON.

His great experience, his great ability, his unbounded energy, and his unlimited enthusiasm have been in no sense limited to the problems of either his State or the South.

The proper place of the United States among the nations of the world has had his serious consideration and action.

His wise decisions and his eloquent voice have helped to save the United States and to place our country upon the lofty plane of unselfish leadership where we find ourselves today.

The recent war has developed and is bringing forth a new world program and a new era in international and world affairs.

Nations will either conform to the new concept of national morality or they will surely perish and disappear from the earth.

Your senior Senator, JOHN H. OVERTON, played his full part in preparing for that war, in conducting the conflict, and in the program of reconversion back to peace that is in process of accomplishment tonight.

Senators are elected by the States, but when elected, in addition to representing their States, they become Senators of the entire United States.

In conclusion, from what I know of your fine citizenship, your many and diversified interests, your cities and towns, and your vast agricultural areas, I am glad to testify that JOHN H. OVERTON is what I consider a perfect representative of your people, your State, and of our beloved Nation in the Senate of the United States.

The Closed Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 31, 1947

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a newspaper debate on the subject of the closed shop between our colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and Mr. Frank P. Fenton, of the American Federation of Labor.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

SHOULD THE CLOSED SHOP BE OUTLAWED?

(As debated by Frank P. Fenton, director of organization, American Federation of Labor, and Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin, chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary)

Mr. Fenton opens: "The terminology 'closed shop' was coined by antiunion employers because of antipathy American people have for anything closed and with the specious plea that the 'open shop' affords opportunity for freedom. The open shop is a closed shop to union men. The proper designation of the closed shop should be the union shop open to all qualified workmen. Propagandized individuals might conclude that the closed shop invades individual rights. Groups leading the clamor to destroy the union shop aren't affected. Hidden advocates are antiunion employers, or agents acting for them in Congress and through State legislatures, Associated Farmers, Christian American Association, and other propaganda channels to deprive labor of benefits won after 100 years of struggle. We employ no underhanded methods in furthering the union-shop principle. We offer these reasons: (1) It affords job security and protection against employers' arbitrary discrimination in discharging, promoting or demoting, or favoring the nonunion worker over the union worker. (2) Equality of contract begins where there is equality of bargaining power. (3) Protection of working standards by preventing cutthroat wage competition by nonunion employees or employers. (4) Equality of sacrifice by assuring to all good wages and working conditions. (5) How can we exercise discipline to assure fulfillment of contractual relationship without union discipline? Labor's contribution to social and economic welfare represents a forward stride in human relationships, compensating for its faults."

Senator WILEY challenges: "The reasons for support of the closed shop fade before these facts: (1) Countless rank-and-file union members themselves have written to Congressmen, including myself, opposing the closed shop because it is an instrument of labor-boss dictatorship; why, then, smear all opponents of the closed shop as antilabor? (2) The law prohibits employer discrimination against union members whether or not a closed shop prevails; why, then, is it necessary? (3) Closed shops have not prevented wildcat strikes by some undisciplined contract-breaking workers. (4) Labor can make still greater contributions to the public welfare if it is freed from the monopolistic shackles of the closed shop."

Mr. Fenton replies: "(1) In an attempt to refute the record of votes cast by a majority of workers, Senator WILEY relies on 'countless' letters of union men. The union shop can only be established by choice of a majority of workers. (2) The Wagner Act contains special provision to legalize the union shop by collective bargaining. (3) The record shows fewest strikes where the union shop exists. Would the Senator destroy an institution that has materially reduced strikes? (4) Labor can only fulfill its responsibilities to the public where it has commensurate authority. What will protect the individual worker in collective bargaining and social legislation except the union shop?"

Senator WILEY opens: "The most recent Nation-wide public opinion poll shows that 73 percent of nonunion workers believe the closed union shop is an example of bad Americanism. Fifty-five percent of union members also believe the closed union shop is bad Americanism. I share their convictions because: (1) The closed shop is a violation of the individual freedom of the American worker. It works this way. A closed shop contract is signed, requiring an employer to consider union membership as a condition of employment. This employer will thereafter be required to fire a man simply because the man does not maintain his membership in a union or is expelled from the union. Thus, the employee can lose his very livelihood because of the contract provision. (2) The closed shop is undemocratic. Why cannot employees be democratically persuaded to join or not to join unions rather than be compelled to do so? (3) It gives a handful of union leaders the right to monopolize the supply of labor in a given industry, since they can refuse membership to workers who want to get into the industry. (4) The closed shop is no longer required as an element of protection of unions as in the days when unions were just getting on their feet. (5) It gives labor leaders a virtual dictatorship over employees because the leaders' ability to expel them means their automatic loss of employment."

Mr. Fenton challenges: "Few persons seek public opinion polls as a basis for important policies. They seek facts in historical records. Union shop agreements will increase due to 43,000 unfair labor practice charges brought before the National Labor Relations Board. Vocational organizations fix qualifications for members to maintain discipline and standards of service in fulfilling contracts. Does Senator WILEY believe those who don't qualify lose their freedom or livelihood? The individual has his choice (1) as a union member to participate in an agreement protecting his social and economic interests; (2) as a nonunion worker to work under arbitrary rules dominated by the employer. This is answered by 8,000,000 workers who voted for industrial freedom under the Wagner Act."

Senator WILEY replies: "As one who has been a laboring man himself, as well as a businessman and farmer, I believe in every American's constitutional right to freedom of work. The standards set by purely voluntary professional organizations cannot be compared to those established by monopolistic unions with a closed shop agreement wherein membership is compulsory and men can lose their livelihoods because of their independence. I believe in unions and in collective bargaining. But I am opposed to labor dictatorship as much as I am opposed to any other type of dictatorship, and so are the American people."

National Representation for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 31, 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able statement in support of national representation for the District of Columbia, written by Jesse C. Suter, of the Evening Star editorial staff, and printed in that newspaper on January 26.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—OUR PENDING CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

(By Jesse C. Suter)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL REPRESENTATION—WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT IS NOT

Senate Joint Resolution 6, introduced on January 6 by Senator CAPPER, proposes an amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and electoral college to the people of the District of Columbia. The resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, of which Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, is chairman, and was considered informally in an executive session of that committee last Monday.

Because of the importance of this matter, the fact that the question of national representation has been before Congress for so many years and the voluminous records of hearings available, further consideration of the matter was deferred so as to give new members of the committee an opportunity to become familiar with the record.

There appears to be confusion in the minds of some Senators as to this movement for national representation being in some way involved with efforts for local self-government and the idea that the measure has only local significance. Some also believe that there exist numerous factions representing widely divergent views on the question.

For many years there has been a far greater unanimity of organization support of national representation than of any other legislation affecting the District. This has been shown by petitions to Congress and also by vote in the unofficial plebiscites of 1938 and 1946. In the first of these, 92 percent of the vote cast favored and 8 percent opposed granting the right of representation in the Congress and in the electoral college. The recent plebiscite held on election day 1946 showed 85 percent voted for and 15 percent against such representation.

The movement for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia is not now, and never has been, a movement for local self-government. The local issue is in no way involved, either directly or indirectly.

Any local aspect is a mere and somewhat remote incident in the long struggle of these voteless and unrepresented people for representation. When granted that right, they would then have only the same fractional participation in the control of the seat of Government by the Congress, through their elected Senators and Representatives in that body, as possessed by the people of the 48 States.

What these District people are after is their fundamental right as American citizens to have a potent participation in the Government of their country. They have the same interests at stake in the legislation and administration of the Government of the United States as every citizen of the 48 States. They are all subject to the same laws, pay the same taxes, and serve the country in every way precisely as if they were the citizens of a State. District people are required to fight, bleed, and die just the same as if they were the residents of a State.

Among the 48 States, the District of Columbia is on a basis of equality when it comes to obeying the Nation's laws and bearing its burdens, but is not on an equal footing, or really on any footing at all, when it comes to possession of those basic principles of participation which express and vitalize American citizenship.

This American Government of ours is reputed to be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people—but, as a matter of fact, it is a government of a part of the people, by a part of the people, and for all of the people.

To deprive a large group of intelligent and in every way worthy Americans of a right to participate in the Government of their country is indefensible. When it is noted that this group exceeds in number the population of 14 States, such denial just does not make sense.

Under the Constitution, which gives the Congress the power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the seat of the Government, there is no provision whatever for representation in the Congress for other than States.

For this reason, as advised by able constitutional lawyers, an amendment to the Constitution is required to empower the Congress to provide these Americans of the National Capital community with the privilege of electing one or two Senators, a proper proportion of Representatives, and electors of President and Vice President equal to the aggregate representation in the Senate and House of Representatives.

There is nothing unreasonable in such a demand on an American Congress by a large group of fellow Americans who by every calculation of measurement are the peers of the Members of Congress and the constituents who sent them to Washington.

As a matter of fact, just between us fellow Americans, it is not a presumption for these voteless and unrepresented Americans to ask the Congress (which is their sole legislature) to provide for their effective participation in the Government of their country. On the other hand, it would appear to be the grossest presumption on the part of the Congress to deny vital citizenship rights to fellow Americans of the District, whose only fault, if any, is that they are residents of the seat of Government.

The pending Senate Joint Resolution 6 is an enabling provision conferring on the Congress a new power regarding the people of the seat of the Government, over which it already possesses the power of "exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever." The amendment has been drawn very briefly and broadly; so as to give to the Congress considerable latitude in the exercise of its power.

The proposed amendment does not attempt to clutter up the Constitution with detail legislation, but simply grants a required power which the Congress now lacks.

Earlier forms of proposed amendments for the purpose went into considerable detail as to what representation should be given to these people whose permanent residence is at the Nation's Capital. It developed that there was wide divergence of opinion both in and out of Congress as to what the representation should be and other details which clearly should be left to the best judgment of the Congress in harmony with its present constitutional power over the seat of the Government.

The proponents of the proposed amendment believe that the extent of representation to be granted and other incidental questions can be safely left to the judgment of the Eightieth and subsequent Congresses.

For instance, some in both houses of Congress have raised objection to the representation of District people in the Senate, and some have questioned whether such representation in the Senate should be by one or by two Senators. Now, if the constitutional amendment should restrict representation to the House of Representatives these people who believe that they are entitled to representation in the Congress, which is composed of both the Senate and the House of Representatives, would be put to the necessity of waging another campaign for further amendment to remove such restriction against representation in the Senate.

It is the Congress, and not just the House of Representatives, in which these people need representation, for it is the Congress which governs them, taxes them, and sends them to war, and not just the House of Representatives.

While these District people have great respect for the ability of the Eightieth Congress, they are such optimists as to believe that future Congresses will possess the same high qualities and good judgment.

The Eightieth Congress might be unwilling, by subsequent legislation under the amendment, to provide representation in the Senate. But they should not, by mutilation of the proposed amendment, shut the door to future Congresses' providing for such representation if in their judgment it is required by justice.

The closing sentence of the proposed amendment, as pending, provides: "All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal." The Congress under the authority of this closing sentence surely is taking no chances whatever of making a mistake which it would have difficulty in correcting. Even though at first the District people might be given a minimum of representation in the Congress, it could be later expanded, modified, and safeguarded in any way which the judgment of Congress might determine.

But what is needed now is an opportunity to answer any specific objections and early favorable report by the committee and favorable action by the Senate.

The identical joint resolution will shortly be introduced in the House of Representatives, but it is expected that some favorable action by the Senate will precede consideration by the House committee.

Two Vice Presidents—Don't Let It Happen Elsewhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to ask unanimous consent to reprint two excellent editorials from the Washington Post and the Washington News concerning my proposed constitutional amendment providing for the election of two Vice Presidents in order to eliminate possible confusion in the line of Presidential succession.

[From the Washington Post]

TWO V. P.'S

When President Truman took a stand against an appointive official succeeding him in case of death or disability, he pointed to the Speaker of the House as the logical heir apparent. The House eagerly took up that view and passed a bill substituting the Speaker for the Secretary of State as No. 1 on the Presidential succession list. In the Senate the bill hit a snag, chiefly because Mr. Truman had put the Speaker above the Senate's President pro tempore. This deadlock between the two Houses gives special point to Representative MONRONEY's plan to leave both the Speaker and President pro tempore undisturbed and provide for two Vice Presidents.

What gave the Speaker the inside track in the search for a new heir apparent was the fact that he is a doubly elected official—elected a Representative by his constituents and Speaker by a majority of the House. That is a real advantage. But there are other factors which make the Speaker an unsatisfactory choice for acting President. Being leader of the House, he may have power enough to bring about the impeachment of a President to further his own ambition. In case of disability on the part of the President his potential successor should be free to serve temporarily in the White House, and the Speaker could scarcely do that without giving up a position attained through many years of public service in Congress.

These difficulties over using the Speaker as heir apparent and the dislike for moving any appointed official into this powerful executive role focus strong attention on the constitutional amendment that Congressman MONRONEY is drafting. His plan calls for a First Vice President who would function as a sort of administrative assistant to the Chief Executive and a Second Vice President who would preside over the Senate. In case of the death of the President or the First Vice President, the Second Vice President would succeed to the administrative role so as to become familiar with the duties and policies of the President whom he might succeed.

We think the Monroney plan has notable possibilities. At one stroke it would eliminate nearly all danger of having a President not elected by the people and insure the succession of an experienced official within the executive branch in case of an unexpected White House vacancy. Some fears have been expressed that the President and the proposed First Vice President might not work together harmoniously. But this difficulty could be overcome in some measure at least in the nominating conventions by choosing compatible personalities for the top positions on the ticket. The present tendency to let geographical considerations dictate the selection of Vice Presidential candidates would be minimized in some degree by the choice of three candidates instead of two.

One difficulty arises from the fact that a constitutional amendment is a slow method of eliminating the uncertainty that would envelop the White House in the event of President Truman's death. But we are quite convinced that the defects in the present system cannot be fully overcome without a constitutional amendment. Fortunately, Mr. MONRONEY intends to deal in his proposal with other contingencies that might leave us without a President. Realization that we are only one heartbeat away from an appointed President and that emergency legislation on the subject seems to have little chance of enactment should spur Congress into hasty consideration of this new approach.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 21, 1947]

DON'T LET IT HAPPEN ELSEWHERE

Georgia didn't necessarily get into this mess just because of the general cussedness of Georgians.

Framers of the State constitution—and it was rewritten in the Arnall administration—made no clear provision for the death of a governor-elect before he was sworn in. And they used such cloudy language in other sections as to make possible conflicting interpretation that (1) the legislature could elect a governor or (2) the lieutenant governor-elect could succeed.

As a result, Georgia has two governors, both solemnly sworn in, each eager to serve, but neither quite sure that he's the McCoy.

Eventually, it is assumed, the courts of Georgia will decide. Whether Herman Talmadge, if he is loser, will submit, remains to be seen. One day he says he will abide by a court decision; next day he says the courts have no jurisdiction. And Herman has the militia.

While Georgia struggles to restore constitutional government, it might be a good time for people in other States to examine their own constitutions to see if all contingencies are clearly provided for.

The Federal Constitution, itself, is far from foolproof on succession to the Presidency. One hundred and forty-three years ago, after the Thomas Jefferson-Aaron Burr mix-up, an oversight of the founding fathers was corrected, to provide separate balloting in the electoral college for President and Vice President. Again, in the so-called "lame duck" amendment of 14 years ago, another omission was corrected by stipulating that if the President-elect should die before being sworn the Vice-President-elect should become President. But there's considerable doubt about what would happen if both should die, and if the new Congress should fail to organize itself and take action before the Presidential term began.

Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, coauthor of the act to reorganize Congress and a lawmaker who tries to look ahead, has proposed a constitutional amendment to provide the election of two Vice Presidents and clear up some of the confusing procedure on Presidential succession. What's happening in Georgia is more than a gentle hint that the Monroney plan and similar proposals had better be trotted out for debate and action.

Smearing by Inaccurate Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert herewith an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune, Saturday, January 11, 1947:

WHO CHAMPIONS HOPE AND FREEDOM?

Henry Robinson Luce, the publisher of Time magazine, opened an internationalist forum, which his magazine and the Cleveland Council on World Affairs are sponsoring in that city, with some remarks about the Tribune. He said that we favor prosperity for the United States, that we are not in favor of poverty and disease, that we are against strikes and the loss of production, and that we favor freedom. In these observations, Mr. Luce was correct.

He was incorrect, and, we believe knowingly so, when he went on to say that, so far as we are concerned, the rest of the world outside the United States can sink into poverty and despair.

Mr. Luce and others like him talk a lot of love for humanity. They hold meetings, make speeches, and pass resolutions. Anything that is international seems to them good. They were in favor of cooperating with the British, the Russians, or the Chinese to the point where America cooperated its pockets inside out. They are not very particular about the causes in which we are to cooperate or whom we cooperate with.

The loose-thinking Luces are seldom critical of the foreign governments which they think should be America's constant and principal concern. They are not skeptical of the United Nations. It's international and that's enough for them. Nor are they properly critical of a foreign policy subservient in turn to Britain and Russia, which the State Department pursues in implementation of the immoral, infamous, and unconstitutional private deals of Roosevelt and Truman at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

That there is poverty and despair in the world is, unfortunately, all too true. The Tribune's is one of very few voices raised in this country in indignant protest against the root causes of these conditions. The Tribune has steadily demanded positive action to rectify these abominations.

Instead of fronting for British colonial exploitation and Communist tyranny, as the internationalists do when they talk their jargon and open their dinner jackets to display bleeding hearts, the Tribune has uttered condemnation of nations, institutions, policies, and back-room deals which have fostered and maintained the poverty and despair which are rampant throughout the world. Unlike the internationalists in their hypocrisy, we refuse to be an accomplice in the degradation and enslavement of humankind.

Thus we have bluntly asserted that the United Nations is a betrayal of American ideals of freedom and of America's hopes for peace, because it is nothing but a conservator for British imperialism and Russian enslavement. The British and Russian regimes together are responsible for more poverty, despair, and ill will among the world's millions than any other agency. The United Nations has been converted into an instrument for protecting their tyranny and perpetuating it.

The way to remove poverty and despair among colonial peoples is to give them political liberty and to prevent the white proprietors from continuing to sweat them for a bowl of rice or a few pence a day. The way to give hope and a decent life to the millions of victims of communism in Russia and in its hostage states is to liberate these multitudes from terror, enslavement, and enforced political nullity. As every reader knows, the Tribune has said these things repeatedly in unmistakable language.

The way to lift Europe from the slough of despair and the morass of poverty is not to impose chaos upon defenseless people by the methods of Yalta and Potsdam, which are those of the iron curtain, rule at pistol point, enforced mass migrations, exaction of slave labor from war prisoners and political dissidents, and destruction of Germany as the core of the European economy. These things, too, the Tribune has repeatedly said.

The idea of the internationalists is that cooperation should manifest itself through maintenance of an ill-fed slave world outside of the United States, with America keeping the victims on a dole. This is the foreign policy as it has been under Truman and Byrnes, Connally and Vandenberg—a policy which is represented as bipartisan, but against which all decent Americans will most certainly rebel.

The Luces can talk internationalism until they are blue in the face. It will only encourage Russia in its grab of bases from Norway. It will fail to give a single Hindu, Moslem, Indonesian, or Annamite the hope of freedom. It will fail to hearten a single Pole from among the millions the Communist puppet government has disfranchised in order to hold them in bondage. It will withhold hope from all of the 15,000,000 Russians penned up in slave camps—an authentic estimate from Maj. Victor Cazelet, former British political liaison officer with the Polish Government in exile. It will merely confirm prisoners of war in the belief that there is no hope beyond reconciling themselves to their fate as slave laborers.

We had denounced Mr. Luce's fake forum as an attempt to represent the Middle West as sympathetic to eastern seaboard internationalism in all its brutality. Having no honest answer, Mr. Luce turned to falsehood and misrepresentation. If he wants to learn something about championing the causes of downtrodden and oppressed peoples, we recommend a reading of our files. It is not the Tribune but the internationalists who have failed to recognize infamy when they saw it; it is not the Tribune but the internationalists who have promoted starvation and oppression.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call this situation to the attention of the House.

Some of us were somewhat disturbed 2 years ago when UNRRA, with relief funds, purchased five transport planes for Yugoslavia. Two of them they delivered, but the other three they have been maintaining at Love Field, in Dallas, Tex. We had hoped that such a performance would not occur again, but I find that on January 3 of this year UNRRA bought 17 C–46's, at $17,500 apiece, and 5 C–47's, at the same price, some of which have already been delivered to China. That is 22 C–46's and C–47's that UNRRA has purchased this month with relief funds. It may be necessary—I do not know—to use this type of plane to distribute relief supplies, but it is a very expensive operation, and it is very questionable, I understand, whether the planes are actually to be used for that purpose. There is some indication that perhaps some syndicate in China is putting in a commercial air line with these planes that have been purchased with UNRRA funds. Somebody ought to put a stop to this.

I am sure the taxpayers of this country, who are putting up more than three-fourths of the funds for UNRRA to feed and clothe the hungry and naked peoples in the other parts of the world, did not expect the money to be expended in the purchase of transport planes.

Potash Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of fertilizer, and the need for an

increased supply to meet the ever-increasing use and demand for fertilizer, is one of great concern to every Member of Congress. This shortage, despite the increased production, is the result of a growing appreciation on the part of agriculture for the benefits to be derived from the extensive and systematic use of commercial fertilizers. The potash industry is one of the principal industries in my State, and this increase in the use of fertilizer is one which augurs well for agriculture, for the potash industry, and for the Nation.

By unanimous consent heretofore obtained, I insert in the RECORD a very informative statement on the subject by Mr. Horace M. Albright, president of the United States Potash Co., Inc., presented by him before the Subcommittee on Agriculture last Friday, January 31, 1947:

STATEMENT OF MR. HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES POTASH CO., INC.

As a representative of one of the potash producers, I am fully aware that there is not as much potash as the fertilizer and chemical industries would like to have at this time. However, I wish to emphasize that domestic production is at an all-time high. Reliable estimates indicate a total supply of 750,000 tons of K_2O for American agriculture for the fertilizer year ending June 30, 1947. This year's supply, therefore, is estimated to be slightly above the all-time high reached last year and greatly exceeds the average 1935–39 prewar consumption of 375,076 tons K_2O.

The potash producers have been continually operating their plants at the maximum capacity available under the prevailing conditions. In 1946 drought seriously depleted water resources and heated available water to high temperatures which curtailed production. My company's refinery output was down perhaps 10,000 tons of high-grade muriate of potash due to those abnormal drought conditions, and that potash which was not made was lost for this season.

In order that you may realize how widely potash was distributed and how great was the growth of demand for fertilizers, especially in the Middle West, I will quote some significant figures. In the southeastern States, North Carolina used an average of 46,730 tons K_2O during the prewar period 1935–39, and this increased to 87,226 tons for the fertilizer year ending June 30, 1946. In the similar periods, consumption in Mississippi increased from 8,876 tons K_2O to 14,993 tons in 1945. In the Middle Atlantic States, of which New Jersey is typical, consumption increased from an average of 12,241 tons to 20,792 tons K_2O. In Pennsylvania the increase was from 16,749 tons K_2O to 30,625 tons K_2O. Turning to the Midwest where the use of fertilizers really got under way during the war period, we find that Illinois averaged only 2,659 tons K_2O during the prewar period 1935–39, but this was increased to 18,038 tons for the year ending June 30, 1945. During the same period consumption in Wisconsin increased from 3,435 tons K_2O to 21,981 tons, and in Iowa the increase was from 600 to 7,517 tons K_2O.

In measuring the advances made in the production and consumption of potash during and after the recent war, we must remember that in the prewar years the United States imported one-half of its potash from Europe. These imports stopped during the war and have not yet reappeared. This placed full demand upon our domestic production, and in addition we should remember that our domestic production had to supply not only the United States but all of North America.

The farmer has been taught the higher economic value of potash use which, combined with increased income, has resulted in greater demand, and although domestic production has increased about three times its prewar level, the demand is in excess of the greatly increased American production.

It is important for the committee to realize that the boxcar shortage has materially affected deliveries of potash, which must be hauled across the continent from the mines and refineries, all of which are located in California, Utah, and New Mexico.

This boxcar shortage is still a hazard. Our company is today 400 cars in arrears in shipping orders. Thus, even if more output of potash could be achieved, even if more run-of-mine salts should be ordered for fertilizer use, there is no reason to believe that the extra supply of boxcars could be had.

I call the attention of the committee to a chart (which I shall pass to each member) titled "Potash Deliveries: Agricultural and Chemical, North America." It shows the amount of potash delivered and presumably consumed in North America in the calendar years 1938–46, principally of course in the United States.

In reading this chart you will note that deliveries in the calendar year 1946 amounted to 915,000 tons K_2O as compared to 870,000 tons the preceding year.

Thus you will get a clear picture of the amount of potash used in the manufacture of fertilizers by noting that everything under the crosshatch for chemicals indicates what potash was used in agriculture.

Unfortunately there is a widespread impression that the American potash industry is not producing as much potash in the current year as it did last. The data clearly show that this is not the case. Never since the beginning of World War II has there been in any year a decrease in the output of potash by the American industry. There will be no decrease this year. The erroneous idea is derived from the fact that there will be less potash distributed in April–May 1947 than in the same period in 1946 because tonnages canceled early last year by chemical manufacturers on account of the closing down of certain war plants made a temporary surplus available which was allocated in April–May 1946. During the period beginning June 1, 1946, and running through May 31, 1947, that tonnage so released to agriculture has been spread over the entire period.

As you have been informed, the entire output of potash during the war period and currently has been distributed in accordance with allocations prescribed by the War Production Board its predecessors and successors, and in line with a system and policy based on the historical background of prior purchases of potash. Under this policy, which so far as we know was regarded as fair by potash producers, fertilizer and chemical manufacturers and consumers, the chemical industry had first call on supplies because of their manufacture of chemicals important to military operations, the balance being allocated to the fertilizer industry.

The members of the committee may be interested to know how this allocation system has served the agriculture of the various sections of the country. Here I am talking about deliveries of potash to fertilizer manufacturers by potash producers, whereas I have already discussed consumption figures. These delivery items are for the same States as those already mentioned in connection with the consumption story. To illustrate, among the Southeastern States I mention North Carolina where deliveries in 1946 amounted to 52,271 tons K_2O as compared to 30,882 tons in 1938. In New Jersey typical of the Northeastern States, 1946 deliveries amounted to 31,744 tons K_2O as compared to 19,000 tons in 1938; in Pennsylvania 16,031 in 1946 as compared to 11,765 tons for 1938; in Mississippi 12,379 and 10,175 tons K_2O.

Turning to States where the use of fertilizers represents a relatively new expansion, in Wisconsin 1946 deliveries amounted to 8,629 tons as compared to 1,161 in 1938; in Illinois the corresponding figures are 61,789 and 9,620 tons and in Iowa 1,850 tons in 1946 as compared to 134 tons in 1938.

With the permission of the gentlemen of the committee, I should like to insert here for the record a brief statement outlining the history of this American potash industry in which we profess great pride. Prior to the First World War you will recall there was no American potash industry. Through the expenditure of huge sums of money and great effort on the part of both Government and industry, emergency plants were built during that war, which had raised their production to a maximum of 55,000 tons in 1918. High costs made the price of this potash as high as $500 or more per ton K_2O. Only one of these plants survived the liquidation of high-cost operations when imports of German-French material were resumed in 1920. I refer to the property of the American Potash & Chemical Corp. at Searles Lake, Calif. Persistent search for additional sources of water-soluble potash by both Government and private enterprise resulted in the discovery of the present New Mexico potash field in 1925 by an oil company which accidentally encountered a bed of sylvite, which is the ore from which 85 percent of our American potash is made. The first mine was opened in January 1931. The refinery in connection with that mine was opened in September 1932. Two other large mining and refining companies were developed in the next few years. By 1938, the last peacetime year prior to the opening of the Second World War, there was 475,000 tons of K_2O used in North America. Of that tonnage, approximately one-half was imported from Europe.

Throughout the period of World War II emergency, the American potash industry supplied Canada and Cuba with their potash requirements on the same basis as that of the United States. In addition, substantial quantities were allocated for export under lend-lease. In other words, the American potash industry became the principal source for potash supplies for the Allies and friendly nations to the southwest during World War II.

Pearl Harbor—Plotting or Bungling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an appraisal of the book, Pearl Harbor: the Story of the Secret War. This review of George Morgenstern's Pearl Harbor is by William H. Grimes, editor of the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Grimes ends his review by this warning to the Republican Party:

There should be a thorough inquiry and if the first Republican administration at Washington fails to make it the party will be in position of accessory after the fact.

Morgenstern's book, bristling with facts and documentary evidence, is "must" reading for all patriots who want the truth about how this country was maneuvered into World War II.

The complete review follows:

PLOTTING OR BUNGLING

In this book, Pearl Harbor, Mr. Morgenstern builds up to the conclusion that the

naval disaster of December 7, 1941, resulted from the anxiety of Mr. Roosevelt and his advisers for an incident that would force this reluctant country into World War II.

Some people, perhaps a growing number, have accepted or are willing to accept that conclusion. A great many people reject it and do so with some heat.

Isolating emotional factors for the moment, Mr. Morgenstern has done a competent and thorough job of reviewing information from the various official inquiries as well as from other sources. He brings loose threads together, collating revelations separated by time and source. More than half a dozen inquiries extended over four years and unless one made a business of following them, which most people had not the time to do, the whole thing is confused. For these people much of the book will be in the category of new information. For those who have given the whole subject closer attention, the book is a good refresher course. That would be so even for those who will denounce the book before they read it.

There were three opportunities to avoid, or at least postpone, Pearl Harbor.

Months before December 1941, a chance for diplomatic discussion was allowed to slip away. On the very eve of Pearl Harbor, Secretary of State Hull was on the point of proposing a temporary arrangement to continue diplomatic relations with Japan. He dropped the plan, even though the military leaders warned they were not prepared for war.

If Pearl Harbor had been better equipped with patrol planes and radar detection, the Japs would have been discouraged from attacking, because surprise was essential to their plan. Much of the material was available but it was sent elsewhere.

If after war became almost a certainty, Pearl Harbor had been properly alerted to use the defenses that it had, the Japs, whose spies were everywhere in Hawaii, might not have taken the chance an attack involved. The Army and fleet commanders were not given proper orders.

If in the hours before the attack, there had been proper evaluation of the information at hand, Pearl Harbor could still have been alerted to minimize the damage from the attack.

None of these things was done. They were not done despite the fact that Washington—the Jap code having been cracked—had almost as much warning of impending war as though American officials had been sitting in meetings of the Jap cabinet.

For Pearl Harbor to happen it was necessary for a number of people in various places to be asleep at the switch, all at one and the same time. And subsequently many of these same people showed themselves very alert and competent planners and administrators. That this is due to mere coincidence is a colossal incredibility. There must be some other explanation. Mr. Morgenstern says an incident in which the Japs would appear the aggressors was wanted.

One weakness is that Mr. Morgenstern gives the Pearl Harbor commanders almost a clean bill of health and sees the exclusive blame in Washington. One can believe that the bulk of the blame was at Washington and still think that the commanders at Pearl Harbor could have been more alert.

Another weakness is that Mr. Morgenstern almost assumes that the Japs loathed the thought of war and that in the diplomatic negotiations their representatives were not dissembling. After all, the Japs had built a huge war machine, made a threatening alliance with Hitler and were not at all incapable of double dealing.

But with all due allowance, there was still something wrong at Washington. Mr. Morgenstern says it was a well-planned plot. His evidence might just as well point to planless bungling.

Mr. Roosevelt was a man given to impulsive action. He possessed a sublime self-confidence that he could ride any situation, compensating for errors by a subsequent bold stroke.

When Mr. Roosevelt committed this country to help England, he was staking so much on a British and Russian victory over Hitler that the country could not afford to stand by and see any other result. He found himself committed to Britain not only in Europe but over the whole world and committed as well to British dominions and British allies, including the Dutch with dependencies in the Pacific. He may have fully realized what he was doing. The chances are that he did not. At any rate he did not inform the American people candidly. On the contrary he kept telling them he meant to engage in no foreign war while he was becoming more and more committed in a situation pushing him to war. At the very moment he was giving a most positive assurance Americans were undertaking a military base in Ireland.

That was Mr. Roosevelt's dilemma at the time of Pearl Harbor. There are signs that he had begun to lose his self-confidence; that his conflicting commitments, one set to foreign powers and another set to the country, concerned him very much; that he was hesitant and did not know what to do.

But meanwhile Mr. Roosevelt had taken personal command of the diplomatic moves and military preparations. All his subordinates moved only on his orders.

Thus at the time of Pearl Harbor the situation was that the source of all directions was in a state that was the opposite of conducive to decisive action. So no action was taken. A great many people could see what was coming, but the nerve center was paralyzed and unable to react.

If Mr. Roosevelt and his advisers did not want war, there is evidence that they had come to regard war as inevitable. But they were looking to Europe. There is not preponderant evidence that they particularly wanted to fight Japan and a two-front war would reduce the strength this country could bring against Hitler, which was the last thing they wanted. The picture of bungling is clearer than the picture of plotting.

Either way the thing is bad enough and the country is entitled to the full story, which it certainly has not had. One reason is that inquiries have been centered on Pearl Harbor. Separated from its background, Pearl Harbor is not all-revealing. The background is the diplomatic conduct preceding the war and much of that has been successfully hidden so far. There should be a thorough inquiry and if the first Republican administration at Washington fails to make it, the party will be in position of accessory after the fact.

George Morgenstern's Book on Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "But Never Surrenders," from the Chicago Times of January 26, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUT NEVER SURRENDERS

The ghost of Pearl Harbor still gets kicked around. The die-hard isolationists who seek to salve their own consciences by blaming the disaster of December 7, 1941, on Franklin Delano Roosevelt at least have the virtue of never knowing when they are licked.

Latest entrant in the ranks of the hindsight experts who know all the answers to Pearl Harbor is George Morgenstern, author of Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War, published last week by Devin-Adair.

Mr. Morgenstern happens to be an editorial writer on the Chicago Tribune.

A couple of weeks ago the Tribune permitted Mr. Morgenstern, in its Sunday book section, to review his own book.

First, he quotes certain "authorities"—one of them being Norman Thomas, the perennial Socialist candidate for President—who expect his book to be "vehemently denounced." Then he proceeds to take himself seriously enough to say, "Critics had better be scholars before they get too vehement about that promised denunciation."

The writer of this editorial lays no claim to scholarship. But he did sit in Washington through three dreary months of the congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor, which Mr. Morgenstern did not.

Therein lies the source of the greatest factual weakness in the Morgenstern book. Its author has had to rely exclusively on a cold transcript of some 10,000,000 words which would take a lifetime to digest.

Mr. Morgenstern did not see the witnesses on the stand or their examiners. He had no gage as to their credibility evidenced by expression, hesitation, or inflection of voice. He did not see the actions of Senators FERGUSON and BREWSTER as they posed their tricky questions designed to crucify the memory of Roosevelt.

Particularly in point is the great weight assigned by Morgenstern to the testimony of Capt. L. F. Safford, United States Navy, regarding the so-called winds message by which the Japanese were supposed to have notified all their agents that hostilities were commencing.

Of all the 50 or so witnesses appearing before the investigators, Captain Safford was the only one alleging that the "execute" message had ever been sent and intercepted by our intelligence service. Even all high Japanese officers interrogated after Japan's surrender testified that the "execute" message was never sent.

Yet one of the strongest pillars in Mr. Morgenstern's structure of evidence that President Roosevelt and his aides knew when and where the war was due to break out was Captain Safford's evidence. Had Morgenstern witnessed Captain Safford's peculiar behavior and obvious confusion when testifying—or even if he had carefully read and weighed Safford's testimony—he would have discounted it completely.

So far as Mr. Morgenstern's expectation of vehement denunciation of his book is concerned, the gentleman flatters himself. It simply isn't worth it. About all it amounts to is a wordy apologia for, and repetition of, the minority report of the congressional Pearl Harbor investigating committee.

Mr. Morgenstern does not even have the grace to point out, or even mention, what a weak minority wrote the minority Pearl Harbor committee report. He makes much of the "New Deal" majority of the committee and emphasizes that "naturally" the majority wrote the majority report.

What Morgenstern didn't mention was that two of the four Republican members of the committee—Representatives BERTRAND GEARHART, Republican, California, and FRANK B. KEEFE, Republican, Wisconsin—signed the majority report. Nor did he recognize that Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, and Representative J. BAYARD CLARK, of North Carolina, could not by any stretch of imagination be called New Dealers.

The anti-New Dealers by a vote of 4 to 2 rejected the idea that Franklin D. Roosevelt provoked the war with Japan simply because

the evidence showed that it wasn't so. No "loaded" jury was needed.

Senator FERGUSON is still preening his political ambitions by bellowing that "the truth" about Pearl Harbor eventually will out. The public will be waiting for anything new that Mr. FERGUSON may produce. There is nothing new in the Morgenstern book.

What Is a Press Monopoly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Is a Press Monopoly?" from the New York Times of February 2, 1947.

In these times, when most Americans seem to be agreed that monopoly must be suppressed if the rights of American citizens are to be preserved, it would seem to me that the importance of avoiding monopoly which interferes with freedom of the press is quite as vital as the control of any other form of monopoly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS A PRESS MONOPOLY?

The sale of the Stern newspapers in Philadelphia and Camden would threaten grave hardship to hundreds of the employees were it not for the action and encouraging words of Robert McLean, publisher of the Bulletin, who bought the properties. Mr. McLean made it clear that he agreed to purchase only after the suspension of the newspapers had been determined upon. He promises for the time being to continue the salaries and regular wages of those now at work and expresses the hope that "the Record and Courier Post of Camden * * * will be resumed under independent ownership."

Milton Murray, president of the American Newspaper Guild, sees in this generous action another step in what he calls "the increasing trend of American newspaper monopoly." If Mr. Murray does not state all the facts it is possibly because he has a lot on his conscience. The final push which sent the Stern newspapers over the brink was the strike of Mr. Murray's union for terms Mr. Stern could apparently not meet and remain solvent. But for the action of the Bulletin there would be only rock at the bottom of the precipice for more than 1,600 persons involved.

There is an element of Greek tragedy in the situation. In 1935 it was David Stern, then publisher of the Post in New York City, who gave the Newspaper Guild one of its first closed shop—or so-called guild shop—agreements and started it on its way. The Guild at that time sought to represent only news department employees. But many newspaper publishers and executives who were used to dealing with unions and had done so amicably for years were shocked at this willingness to place in the hands of a single group, which was already taking positions in public affairs, the sole opportunity to write and edit the news.

Liberal publishers conceded the rights of a union devoted as a bargaining agent to the best interests of its members. Such has always been the policy of this newspaper. But a social pressure group was quite another matter. As such the political leaders of the guild, and their aim to dominate the jobs of writing and editing of news were regarded with grave suspicion by sound newspapermen, those of the public who understood the trend and by the rival unions of the AFL.

If a charge of monopoly is now to be made it must be directed against this aspiration of some of the guild's leaders. Fortunately, and in the main, they have not succeeded. We believe that the many good newspapermen in the guild's ranks would oppose their drive for a monopoly in the expression of political opinion if they realized where it is leading. The Stern newspapers, indeed, were not crippled or destroyed by the guild leaders' desire to control their news policies. They were hammered down by economic blows, the last and most crushing directed by the guild. But the moral stands. The guild leaders who did this thing had further and more dangerous ambitions. We hope and believe that this catastrophe will be a beacon of warning to all members of a profession which, though it must live by profits, salaries, and wages, is, and ought to be, dedicated to the public service.

The Fertilizer Supply Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the production of agricultural commodities plays a vital part in the welfare of our Nation and the supply of commercial fertilizer is closely related to our agricultural production.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which was made by Mr. Ralph B. Douglass, vice president of the Smith-Douglass Co., Norfolk, Va., before the fertilizer subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture at its hearing January 31, 1947:

I thank the committee for the privilege of appearing before you and telling you what little I may know about the present fertilizer supply situation. My work and activities cause me to have frequent and close contacts with the farmers in the areas where my company operates, and I am naturally very much interested in seeing them get full and adequate supplies of fertilizers. It hurts the soul of a fertilizer man not to be able to fill all of the demand because all of his training and experience before 1941 was in trying to find a market for his fertilizers and ways to get business—to promote it by endeavoring to get farmers to use greater quantities and in any other legitimate way he could—so it is an entirely new experience for him to be called upon for more fertilizer than he can supply.

I understand you are interested in the immediate short supply situation and will therefore attempt to confine my remarks accordingly. Then if there are any questions, I will be glad to try to answer them.

Fertilizer materials such as superphosphate, potash, and the solid nitrogen materials, are often used by the farmers of this country for straight application to their soils. These same materials along with nitrogen solutions and other plant food elements are combined together to make what is commonly known as complete commercial fertilizer or mixed fertilizers.

Notwithstanding the fact that the anticipated supply is at an all-time high, there is not enough to satisfy the farmers' current needs either for straight application or in the form of complete fertilizers. Records show that when farm income is up in a given year, the demand for fertilizer will increase correspondingly the following year. If farm income is down, then the demand for fertilizer falls off in the succeeding year. Since the farm income in the year 1946 was at an all-time high and since farmers have learned that commercial fertilizers contribute so much to economical farm production, the current demand is at an all-time high. I estimate farmers over the country as a whole would buy 15 to 20 percent more plant foods in the spring of 1947 than they bought in the previous spring season. That quantity is just not available for use within the time needed and I see no practical way it can be provided. Strikes and labor troubles have contributed toward limiting production. It is hard to calculate accurately, but I believe we would have had 10 to 15 percent more of fertilizer and materials except for the labor difficulties which have been encountered.

Except for some priority assistance given the potash industry and except for the building of some nitrogen plants for military needs, the fertilizer industry was not permitted to build new plants during the war. Steels for building and machinery and other necessary things were put to more direct military purposes. With substantially the same productive capacity for superphosphate and complete fertilizers, the industry, through these facilities, was able to supply American agriculture more than 14,000,000 tons of fertilizer in 1946 as compared with an average of 7,300,000 tons in the 1935–39 period. If fertilizers of the same plant-food content had been produced in 1946 as in the 1935–39 period, it would have resulted in a production of 15,500,000 tons in 1946 as compared with the 7,300,000 tons in the 1935–39 period for the reason that the plant-food content had been increased about 15 percent.

These figures I have quoted are for the entire United States, but the geographical pattern of use has changed tremendously. In the older consuming areas where for many years the farmer has known the value of fertilizer in economical and efficient agricultural production, the demand has increased but not to the same extent as it has in other sections of the country. During the war period when all of our farmers were being urged to produce more fibers and foodstuffs, those situated in areas where fertilizers had never before been used learned of the value of commercial plant food.

In North Carolina, which is one of the older consuming areas, the consumption of fertilizer increased from about 1,100,000 tons in the 1939 period to about 1,500,000 tons in 1946. Likewise, in Pennsylvania, another older consuming area, where the average consumption in the prewar period was about 350,000 tons, it increased in 1946 to about 500,000 tons. Roughly, both States increased consumption about 40 percent. However, let us go to the State of Illinois. In 1939, Illinois used about 40,000 tons of fertilizer, excluding raw phosphate rock. In 1945 Illinois used about 210,000 tons, still excluding raw rock. Exact figures are not available for 1946, but my guess is they will show a consumption of about 250,000 tons. Think just a moment about this increase from 40,000 to 250,000 tons.

May I mention here that my company since VJ-day has completed a modern up-to-date and efficient plant at Streator, Ill., at a cost of close to a half million dollars. It is now producing superphosphate and mixed fertilizers at full capacity. Other plants are under construction to serve that State.

In Wisconsin the story is of even greater increased consumption. In 1939 Wisconsin used about 42,000 tons. In 1945 about 265,000 tons, and in 1946 an estimated 300,000 tons. Iowa is an even more accentuated example. In 1939 that State used only 13,000 tons of fertilizer and in 1946 used about 175,000 tons. A generally corresponding increase as that in the States I have cited has taken place in the entire Midwest area. Several new modern plants have been or are being built in most of those States by companies other than my own.

The demand in California and other west coast States has increased tremendously. Due to economic conditions and because Government priorities are not now in effect, it is believed the west coast area will receive a larger portion of the total United States supply of nitrogen as well as some other fertilizer materials and fertilizers than they have ever had before.

All of this will show a changing pattern of use. The increased consumption in those new areas is naturally taking away some supplies which would otherwise be available to the older consuming areas, but even in these older areas there is a much greater supply than in the prewar period.

The CPA recently found that 65 new fertilizer plants are being built in the United States. Also, major additions have been made to 44 existing plants. These expanded facilities are going up in many sections of the country, but to a great extent they are concentrated in those areas which have begun to use fertilizers only in the last few years.

I have given you approximate consumption figures for 1946 and my estimate of demand in the immediate future. I would like now to add the observation and opinion that over-all supplies during the current year will be equal to and probably slightly in excess of those in 1946. The over-all demand, I have said, however, is for 15 percent or 20 percent more fertilizers than will be available. The shortage will be much worse in some areas than in others.

What type of fertilizer or material will be in shortest supply? I think it will be the solid nitrogen materials of the kind generally used for straight application, and I think the shortage of this will be more acute in the South Atlantic States than elsewhere because of smaller imports of Chilean nitrate of soda and smaller production of domestic nitrate at Hopewell, Va., due to shortage of soda ash. There is a substantial new production of ammonium nitrate at Government-built plants now being operated by private industry in Kansas and Arkansas, but this material does not move economically or logically to the East to replace the short supply of nitrate of soda. It more logically is consumed in areas nearer where it is being produced and west of the production points. Mixed fertilizers and other materials will be short in other areas. The new practice of using fertilizer in the Midwest, in the Rocky Mountain area, and on the Pacific coast would create a hope for much more volume than can be supplied in the spring months of 1947.

I now come to the matter of what can be done about this immediate shortage. It can be alleviated by completely shutting off exports of superphosphate and nitrogen materials. However, this matter of exports and the wisdom of furnishing fertilizers to occupied countries and to our former allies to whom commitments have been made by our country is a broad subject with which I would not attempt to deal It should be borne in mind, however, that we are importing more than we are exporting. Except for shutting off these exports and providing needed transportation facilities for some materials, I can see no remedy for the immediate future. Productive facilities cannot be built and brought into production overnight, but with the vast number and large capacity of new facilities now being constructed and with our industry now operating under a free economy, it seems reasonable to assume that by the summer or fall of 1947 practically all shortages will disappear.

About That House of Mr. Straus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "About That House of Mr. Straus," which was published in the Washington Daily News of January 29, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABOUT THAT HOUSE OF MR. STRAUS

Michael Straus, Interior Department official, today is ducking brickbats from the Senate Civil Service Committee for occupying a house on Department-managed property, although the evidence indicates that nobody before considered his tenancy irregular.

The house is the old Linnean House, at Porter Street and Klingle Road in Rock Creek Park—a landmark of Pennsylvania Dutch stonework, whose charms are about outweighed by its draftiness and the cost of fuel.

The News last October mentioned his tenancy in a story about 99 park-land houses for which Uncle Sam is landlord. Also mentioned was the rent, $185 a month.

Now comes the Senate committee with a "disclosure" that Mr. Straus is occupying the mansion, and that, moreover, the Government keeps up the surrounding park grounds without cost to Mr. Straus. The whole business is saturated with secrecy and intrigue.

Back in 1939, the News' own files reveal, the Interior Department was pretty desperate for a tenant for the old rock pile. An item in the News for December 22 reported the building, unoccupied, had besought a tenant under the headline "Uncle Sam has a house to rent."

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of people in my district are worrying about labor-management legislation. They feel that labor leaders, realizing the change of attitude by the great majority of American citizens, are bringing terrific pressure on our legislative bodies and that new legislation is now necessary. This is true to a certain extent, but I firmly believe that the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are proceeding on this very important subject exactly as they should. Hearings have started in the Senate committee and they will start with the House committee this week. Certainly these hearings are necessary.

To write good, sound legislation on any important subject calls for thorough hearings, so that every angle of the subject can be thoroughly discussed. In order not to repeat a situation like we faced during the last coal strike, I firmly believe much thought must be given to the antitrust laws. The people never before suffered so much or were threatened so much by the country's powerful industrial leaders as they have been by the powerful labor leaders in the past few years, especially the past few months. Our antitrust laws must be reconsidered and amended so as to have the same application to organized labor. No; I do not believe in doing anything drastic, but to make unions equally responsible with management certainly is only fair and cannot be considered drastic by labor leaders.

The article follows:

CONGRESS SEEN CERTAIN TO PASS LEGISLATION TO RESTRICT LABOR—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS THREATS BY UNION LEADERS WILL NOT DETER REPUBLICANS, SURE OF SUPPORT OF NATION AND OF OPPOSITION PARTY

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—Hearings on labor legislation by the House Labor Committee will begin the coming week. The Senate committee began last week. Both expect to conclude hearings and report to their respective branches by March 15. There is a vague intention that the new legislation be passed by April 1. But this is much more a hope than a confident expectation—fulfillment would be rather a surprise.

Actually, legislation by April 1 would be likely only if urgency is created by some new development. Just because strikes or other provocative developments would create in Congress a spirit of urgency, and also severity, such developments are not likely. Labor leaders are on guard against them; have a spirit of conciliation. They are desperately anxious that Congress go easy and to that end are willing to go easy themselves.

The spirit of the House is more urgent than that of the Senate and aims toward the more drastic forms of proposed legislation. That, however, is a characteristic difference between the two branches at all times. The expectation of Republican leaders is that the House will write strong legislation, that the Senate version will be somewhat milder, and that the final version will be hammered out in the stage of conference between the two. The House is in a determined mood; it will hold out for strong legislation.

WILLINGNESS TO LISTEN

What may be called the official Republican attitude on labor legislation is strongly apparent in the hearings conducted by the Senate Labor Committee. Three Republicans on the committee—Chairman TAFT, of Ohio; BALL, of Minnesota; and SMITH, of New Jersey—are for various reasons leaders in Republican policy about labor. Their attitude throughout—and especially toward the most conspicuous witness from the labor side, Secretary of Labor Schweilenbach—is one of quiet determination accompanied by open-minded willingness to listen to whatever labor representatives have to say. Both the determination and the tolerance are a

fruit of the November election. They know the country earnestly wants labor legislation.

Of the country's wish there is strong evidence in the experience of Senator ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, in the November election. He was already in the Senate and his position about labor was well known. Although labor has much strength in the State, including powerful Congress of Industrial Organizations unions, Senator SMITH won a victory that made history. He got the largest plurality ever received by any candidate of either party for either Senator or Governor, the two high offices filled by State-wide election. The inference is that many of the rank and file of labor and of labor's womenfolk are tired of what labor leaders and unions have been doing, and want corrective legislation. The inference is borne out by the experience of other successful candidates for Congress in States and districts having large numbers of workers in the electorate.

BACKED BY OPPOSITION

For the combined resoluteness and tolerance of the Republican leaders there is an additional reason. They know they are backed up not only by the country but by the opposition party. The condition is very unusual. Here is legislation of the highest importance, which in the ordinary sense is extremely controversial, but which in Congress is not controversial at all. It is not a party issue. Far from separating the two parties, the labor issue binds them together. The leaders of the Republican majority, as they formulate legislation, do not need to feel they must battle for it on the floor. So far as battle arises it will not be about whether legislation should be passed, but on details of it and on whether it is strong enough. When leaders of a majority party are thus buttressed they can afford to be open-minded toward the only real opponents of the legislation, the labor leaders and spokesmen.

The attitude of labor spokesmen has three main characteristics. Partly impeding and partly in threat, they call on Congress to go easy. So far as that is a threat and an appeal to political considerations it has no weight whatever, for the very reason that both parties favor the legislation.

The labor leaders say of certain proposals that they won't work. This the Republican leaders take seriously. It is for light on this that they listen carefully to labor arguments.

The labor leaders say legislation is not necessary, that there will be no repetition of last year's strikes. The weight this assurance has with Congress is zero. There will be legislation, and it will be more on the strong side than otherwise.

Outlaw the Collective Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able article entitled "Outlaw the Collective Strike," written by Mr. Charles Hall Davis, of Petersburg, Va.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The issues confronting the American people today must be solved quickly, if our structure of ordered liberty is to be preserved. Ordered liberty means liberty under law. There can be no ordered liberty under lawlessness.

The time for appeasement and political pussyfooting is past. The American people must either reassert their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; or else recognize that they will, in the future, enjoy only such concessions or temporary privileges as an organized minority pressure group may permit. We might well recall the experience of Germany, Italy, and Russia along these lines.

What is the issue today?

When the camouflage is torn away, the issue is clearly revealed. It is this:

Shall the labor unions, or any other organized minority pressure group, be permitted to formulate any demand that they please, without previous ascertainment of their justice or injustice by an impartial tribunal, and then compel compliance with those demands through the use of their own collective powers and resources; with accompanying threats, terrorism, force, and violence; with disregard and impairment of the similar and equal rights of others; with resultant danger to our entire economic life; with deliberate challenge and flouting of Government; and with suspension of law and order?

Or shall the labor unions, like all other citizens, be required to submit their claims to an impartial judicial tribunal; where the rights of both parties to the controversy can be heard and determined under due process of law, through the peaceful processes of orderly judicial procedure; where the public can be represented and protected; and where the judgment of the court will be enforced by the commonwealth, and not by mob violence?

Under the American theory, all controversies are justiciable; and today we are attempting to have this theory adopted by all nations. At the same time, we permit labor unions to enjoy special privileges and immunities not accorded to other citizens; and to act as a law unto themselves.

The unions can enforce their demands through the use of their collective force and resources; they are exempted from the injunctive processes of the courts, through which injustice and violence can be restrained at the start; they are exempted from collective liability for collective action; they have been placed outside the law, and above the law. They have become a superstate. Either Government must control them, or else they will control Government.

The great weapon of the labor unions is the collective strike with its accompanying picket lines, threats, terrorism, force, and violence. That weapon has been made more effective through the closed shop, and other similar practices. Today it is a sword of Damocles, suspended by a hair, and threatening the welfare and even the existence of the United States.

The unions must be disarmed. The weapon of the collective strike must be removed from the Nation.

Seemingly, the people and their leaders have been deceived and misled by the vociferous and repeated claims of the unions, so that they have lost the ability to think clearly. Practically every public speaker, even though he advocates some control of union excesses, opens his remarks with a statement that he is a friend of labor, that he wants to preserve the gains of labor, and that he advocates collective bargaining.

Substantially every right-thinking American citizen wants to safeguard the rights of the laborers; and also to safeguard the similar and equal rights of the employer, of nonmembers of the union, of the general public, and to prevent any interference with, or defeat of, the administration by Government of its entrusted authority and of its duty to secure and safeguard the equality of rights of all citizens.

But the gains of labor, as asserted by the unions, means the special privileges and immunities now enjoyed by the unions which impair and defeat the similar and equal rights of others. Government was established to prevent just such impairment and defeat of the equality of human rights.

Similarly everyone believes in the wisdom and desirability of collective bargaining. The representatives of the employees should confer and bargain with the employer as to wages, hours of work, working conditions, safety and health provisions, social-security arrangements, etc.

But collective bargaining does not mean that, in case of disagreement, the union as one of the parties shall be empowered to compel compliance with its demands through the exercise of its own collective powers and resources; while the employer, all nonmembers of the union, the public, and even government itself, are helpless; because the unions have been exempted from the equitable control of the courts and from collective liability for their collective acts.

In case of disagreement between the union and the employer in their efforts to arbitrate and settle a dispute, then all arbitration should cease; for arbitration is essentially compromise and appeasement. The unsettled issues should then be submitted to a court, which will be able to bring out all the facts and evidence, to administer justice (not compromise or appeasement), and to protect equally the rights of all laborers, employers, and of the public.

But unions apparently do not seek justice—rather they seek favoritism.

There is no more justification for a labor union to enforce compliance with its arbitrary demands through the use of its collective powers and resources, with its accompanying threats, terrorism, force, and violence, than for the Ku Klux Klan to follow a similar procedure.

Labor unions, as such, have no collective inherent rights. All inherent rights are individual, and there is no such thing as a collective inherent right. The Creator endowed each human being with an equality of such rights, but with a disparity of powers or talents. No human being or institution can change or alter that equality of endowment of inherent rights.

The members of a labor union, acting collectively, have no greater or different rights from those held by every nonmember individual. The mere fact of acting collectively does not change the character or volume of rights held by each member. Through collective organization and action, the union members can command greater collective powers and resources. But they are not justified in using their collective powers and resources to defeat the equality of inherent rights, which American government was established to secure.

Every human being has an equal inherent right to work, to quit work in the absence of a binding contract, to contract to work for another, and to contract with others to work for him. The right to work is of no more dignity than is the right to contract. And each of these is an individual right.

A man has a right to quit work, when he chooses, in the absence of a binding contract. But when he exercises this right to quit, he quits; and thereafter he has no conceivable right to prevent others from accepting the job which he has voluntarily abandoned; nor has he any conceivable right to limit or control the employer's right to contract with others to take that job. Nor has he any right, in connection with others, to use the collective powers and resources of a labor union to impair the equal rights of nonmembers to take the job, or the right of the employer to employ them. The American people could well reread the parable of the vineyard, related in Matthew 20, verses 1–15, as showing our Lord's conception of the

sacredness of the rights of property and of contract, of the rights of employer and of employees.

The collective strike, as exercised today by the unions, is neither more nor less than a conspiracy by an organized group to destroy that equality of inherent rights which American Government was established to secure; and to enforce compliance with its demands by unlawful means, through the use of its own force and resources in defiance of government and in violation of public order, safety and welfare.

A conspiracy has been defined by the courts as—

"A combination formed by two or more persons, by concerted action, to accomplish a criminal or unlawful purpose, or some purpose not in itself criminal or unlawful, by criminal or unlawful means."

Measured by this test, the labor unions, as operated today, are unlawful conspiracies on both counts. They seek to accomplish unlawful purposes through the use of unlawful means.

The collective strike is the chief unlawful means now used by labor to accomplish its unlawful purposes. Whatever may be hereafter done to prevent any group being organized for unlawful purposes, we should now take away from the unions the chief weapon (or unlawful means) which they arbitrarily use to accomplish their unlawful purposes. This would effectually and promptly end the present wave of strikes. It would reestablish our economy and enable us to resume production and avoid a destructive economic collapse. It would largely restore law and order, and end national economic unrest.

The collective strike should be immediately outlawed.

Hawaiian Territory's Claim to Statehood Entitled to Favorable Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Oakland Tribune of January 20, 1947, touching on the ambitions of the Territory of Hawaii to become a State.

The Oakland Tribune is the largest newspaper on the east side of San Francisco Bay and is a dominant force for thought in an area containing over a million people.

The owner and publisher of this paper is the father of the junior Senator from California, the Honorable WILLIAM KNOWLAND.

The position that the Oakland Tribune has taken is in consonance with that of other newspapers on the Pacific coast when it urges statehood for Hawaii.

Chambers of commerce and other quasi-public bodies in California and her sister States of the Pacific reflect the attitude of the people of the Pacific slope toward this subject.

Measured by any standard by which other Territories have been admitted to statehood, Hawaii rates high. The people of this happy land have proven their loyalty to the United States the hard way in the crucible of war. The editorial reads as follows:

HAWAIIAN TERRITORY'S CLAIM TO STATEHOOD ENTITLED TO FAVORABLE CONGRESS ACTION

Hawaii, as one of the most beautiful and valuable possessions of the United States, is asking for statehood and there is a bill in the United States Senate and the House authorizing this status. Those who have studied conditions in these vital and strategic islands, which are essential to the defense of the Pacific coast, are convinced that the racial and economic situations justify statehood. Some others are doubtful on these points, but their misgivings are not supported by the facts.

Alaska also wants to become a State. A referendum held in October went 2 to 1 for statehood, which is the same as the last vote in Hawaii. There also is some sentiment in Congress in favor of Alaskan aspirations.

It seems possible then that this year may be the first in 35 years in which a new State comes into the Union.

Never before has so long a period as 35 years elapsed between the admission of States. The longest previous hiatus was 15 years, between the entrance of Missouri in 1821 and that of Arkansas in 1836. Between 1816 and 1821 a new State was admitted every year. Only three Members of the present Congress—Senator MCKELLAR and Representatives SABATH and DOUGHTON—were Members when Arizona became the forty-eighth State 35 years ago this coming February 14. Arizona and New Mexico were to have come in together, but in 1911 President Taft vetoed the resolution for joint admission because the constitution submitted by Arizona provided for recall of judges.

The only requirements in the Constitution covering statehood are that the Federal Government guarantee each State a republican form of government, and that no State's territory may be divided into new States without its consent. Otherwise Congress is free to set the terms for admitting a new State.

The usual requirements are that its inhabitants have shown desire for statehood, that it have enough population to support a State government, that its people have shown capacity for self-rule. Usually Congress authorizes a convention to draft a constitution, which is then to be approved by popular referendum. It is usual also for the new State to have had the previous status of a Territory.

However, this procedure has had its exceptions. Six States were admitted without congressional authorization of a constitutional convention. Texas was admitted without having been a Territory; it was authorized, if it chose, to divide its territory into five States. West Virginia was carved out of Virginia during the Civil War without the consent of Virginia, and Nevada was admitted in 1864 with a population of only about 7,000.

There has been hesitation about admitting Hawaii and Alaska because they do not adjoin any present State. But Louisiana was not contiguous to any other State when admitted in 1812, and when California was admitted in 1850 the nearest other State was Texas.

The population of Hawaii, over half a million, is larger than that of any State at the time of admission except Oklahoma. Alaska has a population of about 75,000, with whites slightly predominating in numbers over Eskimos and Indians.

The claim of Hawaii to statehood is especially strong and should be given the fullest consideration in the Congress.

Don't Kid Us, Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial from the La Crosse Tribune of La Crosse, Wis.:

DON'T KID US, JOE

Josef Stalin is quoted by a none too reliable correspondent in a recent magazine article as believing there is no need to fear another war because there is no reason for it, and the peoples do not want to fight.

He also is quoted as saying that the U. S. S. R. can live peaceably in the same world with capitalism, "with no attempt on the part of either to interfere with the internal political affairs of the other."

That's fine. We hope he means it. In the meantime, however, it would help if Uncle Joe would tell the boys on Pravda and Izvestia about his new point of view, and forbid—as he can do with a flip of the wrist—the daily dose of anti-American propaganda which is dished out by his obedient press.

Until the Russian press and radio ceases to distort facts and call names, until it stops seeing imperialists hiding behind every bush in the United States thirsting for Russian gore, we will listen to Stalin's sweet talk with reservations.

It was Stalin himself who said that it is sometimes necessary for the revolution to take a step back in order later to take two steps forward.

Are you just taking a step back, Joe?

Wholesalers and the Robinson-Patman Act—Are They In Because They Are Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert F. Klepinger, a very distinguished young lawyer from Washington and Ohio, from Law Notes, volume L, No. 2, of May 1946:

WHOLESALERS AND THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT—ARE THEY IN BECAUSE THEY ARE OUT? [1]

(By Robert F. Klepinger, of the Washington (D. C.) and Ohio bars)

One of the mysteries of distribution under our economic system is the wholesaler's discount. No one appears to have successfully challenged or to have justified denial of it

[1] This is the second article discussing the Robinson-Patman Act. The first appeared in Law Notes, February 1946, vol. L, No. 1, p. 11.

to those who perform the function of distributing and selling directly to the consumer.

On March 13, 1923, the law was settled in the Mennen case [2] that a manufacturer could classify customers as wholesalers and retailers; that it could allow one discount to a wholesaler and deny the same discount to a retailer under the Clayton Act. The court held that mutual or cooperative corporations could be denied those discounts because such organizations were retailers.

On June 19, 1936, Congress amended the Clayton Act by enacting the Robinson-Patman Price Discrimination Act.[3] Bearing in mind that Congress was aware of the Mennen rule, the mystery deepens when one studies the legislative history of the Robinson-Patman law. The bill, as reported in the House, contained a provision for just such a classification of purchasers. The report explains it sufficiently.[4] But it was eliminated.[5] The explanation given was:

"The Senate amendment also contained a provision of classification of buyers on which they receded." [6]

That was all. The only other reference seems to have been in the Senate during a discussion of the conference report which was the final action taken: "* * * the classification section of purchasers, we entirely eliminated from that part of the Senate bill." [7]

But the real reason must be based upon inference. It is that farmer cooperative associations were contending that they would have been deprived of wholesalers' and jobbers' discounts unless the classification provision was stricken.[8]

Now, the Act's legislative background means simply this: Congress rejected the proposal that a manufacturer could refuse a retailer the wholesale discount. That conclusion seems inescapable. As we have seen, cooperatives are retailers. There is no question about that classification. We then proceed one step further.

IS PROPOSED LEGISLATION IN A LAW BECAUSE IT IS OUT?

The elimination of proposed provisions in a bill establishes the congressional intent to withhold and deny the proposal. It cannot be read into the law, under those circumstances, by implication. That proposition was upheld in the Cudahy case [9] in which the sole question was whether Congress had authorized the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, under the Fair Labor Standards Act [10] to delegate his statutory power (to regional directors) to issue subpenas. The Court reviewed the legislative history of the act which, it stated, significantly shows that the authority to delegate the subpena power was eliminated by the conference committee from the bills which each House had adopted. Such authority, expressly granted in the bill which passed the Senate, was rejected by the conference committee.

The Court had previously observed that the Federal Trade Commission Act [11] as well as other acts, did not grant authority to delegate the issuance of subpoenas. In the Cudahy case an express power had been kept in a Senate bill as passed by that body. But the classification section in the Robinson-Patman bill never received even that sanction because it was killed before House passage by the very committee which had first espoused it.

Surely, Congress never intended that cooperative associations should have the sole right to wholesale discounts while denying it to other retailers such as chain stores. In the light of this legislative history, who would contend seriously to the contrary, especially when it is recognized that thousands of druggists in Buffalo, Philadelphia, and Minneapolis, for example, all buy as wholesalers in the role of cooperative wholesale drug houses? All return from 8 percent to 10 percent of the wholesale purchase price to their individual retailer-owners. If chains were not given the wholesale discount this would mean that they were discriminated against to the extent of 15 percent or 20 percent because chains perform their own warehousing at an average cost of approximately 8 percent.

The coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act, in his book by that name, admits that wholesalers are not directly mentioned in the law. He enunciates the principle that if a manufacturer elects to distribute merchandise both through an independent wholesaler and a chain store all of the provisions of the Act must apply in the treatment of the wholesaler in the same manner as in the case of any other purchaser. This is true, he says, because that principle is "implied" in this language of the law: "or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefits of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them."

He repeats that the principle is again specifically implied in the preamble to the bill when it was introduced in Congress. But the preamble to the bill was stricken on passage by the House and the title amended to read as it appears in the Act. The quoted language immediately precedes the first proviso in the first section.

It is not at all clear why specific language in recognition of the wholesaler's discount is not used in the law and the problem does not seem to have been directly passed upon by the courts. Apparently wholesalers thus far are only under the law upon the assumption that, right or wrong, their function is so vital that without it, generally speaking, the distributive process would be impaired if not rendered impossible. The proponents of the act repeatedly declared that its purpose was to protect the independent merchant, the public served by him, and the manufacturer; that the principal method to accomplish that purpose was to regulate and control mass-buying power. Although the bill was said to have been drafted by a wholesale association,[12] it contains no declaration-of-policy section such as has been included in many acts of Congress enacted in the past decade to control and regulate business in interstate commerce.

A member of the conference committee stated, when the conference report was debated, that the bill which was finally passed contained many inconsistencies. He also said:

"In one breath you can give any discount or allowance. In the next breath you say, 'No; you cannot give any discount. The Federal Trade Commission can prevent it.'"

Referring specifically to sections 1, 2, and 3 of the bill as they became the law, he added:

"* * * I have read this bill backward and forward in an endeavor to get the inconsistencies removed therefrom, but I cannot do it. * * * For example, under the general House bill (secs. 1, 2) there is a ceiling set upon the amount of discount that may be given. There is a limitation, under certain conditions, to be fixed by the Federal Trade Commission. Under * * * (sec. 3) any quantity discount can be given, any amount, provided it is given or is available to everyone who obtains or buys the same quantity. There is no limitation as to the amount of discount obtainable or to be given under * * * (sec. 3) provided that amount is available to everybody. How under the sun you are going to reconcile that provision with the other sections of the House bill is beyond me." [13]

Those views do not represent an isolated example of careless lawmaking. As recently as May 31, 1946, an eminent Senator challenged any lawyer in the Senate "to say that he has ever seen so poor a piece of legislation and one so awkwardly drafted as is this provision * * *. The language itself shows how loosely and carelessly the legislation has been drawn by whoever drafted it. But whoever drafted it did one of the poorest jobs, in my judgment, that has ever been done on any bill I have seen presented to the Senate of the United States."

If the rule of statutory construction in the Cudahy case, supra, is controlling, then it may well be urged that when Congress refused to enact the classification-of-purchasers section, it did not intend to "safeguard differentials between different classes of purchasers" which, as we have seen,[14] was the avowed reason for sponsoring it. Are, therefore, those differentials between classes (wholesalers, jobbers, retailers) safeguarded by the act? In an approach to that question, it is interesting to contemplate the conference report language [15] as it might have been written explaining the discarded classification proposal. An excerpt will suffice:

"A separate clause safeguarding differentials between different classes of purchasers becomes unnecessary. Such differentials, so long as equal treatment is required within the class, do give rise to the competitive evils to which the bill is aimed."

The question of whether the Robinson-Patman Act upholds and justifies the wholesaler's discount is also troublesome to Federal Trade Commission counsel. This is seen at once in their observations:

---

[2] *Mennen Co.* v. *F. T. C.* (288 F. 774).

[3] 15 U. S. C. A., secs. 13, 13a, 13b, 21a.

[4] "Since added restrictions are here imposed in these respects, a separate clause safeguarding differentials between different classes of purchasers becomes necessary. Such differentials, so long as equal treatment is required within the class, do not give rise to the competitive evils to which the bill is aimed; while to suppress such differentials would produce an unwarranted disturbance of existing habits of trade.

"It should be noted that there is nothing in this exemption to prevent consumers when buying cooperatively or otherwise in quantities characteristic of retailers or retailers when buying in quantities characteristic of wholesalers from being accorded the same prices as those dealers respectively so long as their prices are respectively justified within their own class on the basis of differences in cost required by subparagraph (2) noted below.

* * * * *

"Differentials between purchasers in each classification as set forth in the above exemption must, of course, be justified by differences in cost as provided by subparagraph (2) below." (H. Rept. 2287, 74th Cong.)

[5] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 7760, 8139, 8223.

[6] House Conference Report, 2951, 74th Cong.; see, also, discussion by Judge Major in his separate opinion in *Staley Mfg. Co.* v. *F. T. C.* (144 F. 2d 221, at p. 229). It contains the following statement: "The committee report (H. Rept. 2287, 74th Cong.) accompanying the bill expressly stated that the object of this definition was to eliminate the basing point or delivered price method of selling, and that the definition would require the use of the f. o. b. method of sale. This definition was stricken by an amendment unanimously agreed to by the House."

[7] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9903.

[8] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 8118.

[9] *Cudahy Packing Co., Etc.* v. *Holland* (62 S. Ct. 651, 656; 315 U. S. 357, 366).

[10] 29 U. S. C. A., sec. 201 et seq.

[11] 15 U. S. C. A., sec. 19.

[12] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 8137.

[13] 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9419.

[14] Footnote 4.

[15] Footnote 4.

"It is not surprising that inquiry has been made * * * concerning the application of the Robinson-Patman Act regarding prices and discounts quoted different classes of trade. There is ground for differences of opinion, and in many cases only litigation and the resolution thereof by the courts will settle the issues involved. Any reliable opinion upon the situation would require consideration of the facts relating to justification of the differences in discounts based on differences in cost and upon the actual effects upon competition and competitors resulting from the differences in discounts."

The inquiry made to counsel for the Commission was how a wholesaler's discount is justified and recognized, regardless of the amount he may buy; whether the language of the Act definitely provides for a wholesaler's discount—or, if the language of the Act is not specific, whether the legislative debate or reports establish such intent, if any.

In January 1946[16] a member of the Commission stated that the interpretation (of sec. 2 of the Clayton Act) in the Mennen case, supra, was discarded by the Supreme Court in *Van Camp & Sons* v. *American Can Co.*;[17] that that decision also in effect overruled the National Biscuit Co. case.[18] The latter had upheld graduated quantity discounts based on total purchases of stores of a chain and the denial to individual owners who sought to pool their purchases so as to qualify for such discounts.

Whether the Mennen rule, summarized briefly at the beginning of this article, was "discarded" in the Van Camp decision, is open to argument as will be seen in the Supreme Court's reference to the Mennen case:

"We have not failed carefully to consider *Mennen Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* ((C. C. A.) 288 F. 774) (followed in *National Biscuit Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* ((C. C. A.) 299 F. 733), cited as contrary to the conclusion we have reached. The decision in that case was based upon the premise that the statute was ambiguous and required the aid of committee reports, etc., to determine its meaning, a premise which we have rejected as unsound."

The Court had stated the facts briefly:

"George Van Camp & Sons Co., the complainant, and the Van Camp Packing Co., are both engaged in the business of packing and selling food products in tin cans in interstate commerce. The American Can Co. manufactures tin cans used in the food-packing industry and sells such cans to the other two companies and leases to them machines for sealing the cans. It sells to the packing company at a discount of 20 percent below the announced standard prices at which it sells cans of the same kind to the complainant; it charges complainant a fixed rental for the sealing machines, but furnishes them to the packing company free of charge; and it discriminates in other respects. The effect of the discrimination is to substantially lessen competition, and its tendency is to create a monopoly, in the line of interstate commerce in which complainant and the packing company are competitively engaged."

CONCLUSION

On October 15, 1945, President Truman made a salutary plea for the consumer to the Seventeenth Boston Conference on Distribution.[19]

He urged that "intensive market exploitation must now replace wartime allocation of goods; the consumer must be reached and sold at the lowest possible cost."

He continued:

"Circumstances this year clearly point to the need for a critical reexamination of the ways and means, and the cost of distributing goods and services from producer to consumer."

If the proposed reexamination is undertaken, it is to be hoped it will be searching and include not only related Federal and State laws and their judicial construction, but "existing habits of trade."

The need is imperative. The economic problems confronting the American public demand it.

[16] See Robinson-Patman Act Symposium, January 23, 1946 (C. C. H.), cited in Law Notes, February 1946, vol. L, No. 1, p. 14.

[17] (1929), 49 S. Ct. 112; 278 U. S. 245, 73 L. Ed. 31.

[18] 299 F. 733.

[19] New York Times, October 16, 1945.

Gentlemen, the Hour Is Yours—To the Eightieth Congress Without Regard to Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Staple Cotton Review, January 1947, official organ of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, the oldest and most successful cotton cooperative association in the Cotton Belt, of which my valued and devoted personal friend, Hon. A. H. Stone, chairman of the Mississippi Tax Commission for many years, one of the leading statesmen and most accomplished economists of the United States, is the editor, to wit:

GENTLEMEN, THE HOUR IS YOURS

To the Eightieth Congress Without Regard to Party:

In addressing the following observations to the Eightieth Congress without regard to party we do so advisedly. Seldom in the history of political parties in the English-speaking world has so great an opportunity been presented as was given the Republicans by the American people at the elections of November 1946. With this opportunity goes also an almost staggering duty and responsibility. But neither the opportunity nor the duty is confined to Americans of any one political persuasion. These are the heritage and the birthright of every man and woman living under our system of government. One of the strongest injunctions laid down in Washington's Farewell Address, a document which stands next only to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and is of almost equal fundamental importance, is that against overemphasis on party. So we would avoid that here. (By the way, you can find no truer governmental chart, none more certain to bring us safely back to the security of our ancient moorings, than the letter and the spirit of that immortal message from the Father of His Country. Think over this when you read it on the occasion of his birthday next month.) Members of Congress, Senators and Representatives alike, are Americans first, and last, and in this crisis their first duty is to America and the American people rather than to any political party. The situation internally in which this country finds itself is the result of a combination of circumstances for which no one party is solely responsible. It is much more nearly the work of one man, who, in defiance of one of our most sacred traditions, was kept in power overlong by the people themselves, chiefly as a reward for the bestowal of bounty from the Federal Treasury, and in order to continue it, on a scale more vast than was ever known in the world's history.

During 14 years of so-called Democratic control, and we repeat, almost entirely under the overpowering dominance of a single personality, this country came dangerously near the parting of the ways in the matter of its fundamental structure. The war cannot be used as an excuse for the most radical departures made under Mr. Roosevelt's control and at his instigation and insistence. There is good authority for the statement that during his first term, 1933 to 1936, Federal expenditures exceeded those of all his predecessors combined, from George Washington on. And none of it was for war purposes nor in anticipation of war. He was President for 9 years before Pearl Harbor. But the significance and the hurtful consequences of the Roosevelt expenditures are not to be found in their volume, appalling as that was. In an address which this writer made as president of the National Tax Association, in San Francisco, in 1939, he made the statement that regardless of the enormous volume of Federal expenditures under Roosevelt, it was only through an analysis of their application and purpose that the real significance of the figures could be determined. Keeping the date, 1939, in mind, we quote from that address:

"When we thus bring into view the picture of the uses of the vast sums which have been and are being expended, their application to purposes not heretofore dreamed of as governmental functions, we realize that we are dealing with something fundamentally much more serious than a mere statistical exhibit, no matter how staggering its size. We are concerned here with a philosophy of government, rather than with the implements of governmental operation. We are witnessing the process of a gradual but sure decadence, if we may so express it, a certain lowering of the standards, of a liberty-loving, individually independent, self-reliant people, into dependent masses and groups, bringing upon the Nation and the State every conceivable form of pressure for securing for themselves every conceivable form of governmental service or benefit. We are seeing enacted before our eyes the tragedy of a bloodless revolution, through which all units and levels of government, even sovereign States themselves, apparently have come to be willing to sacrifice their pride, and all but literally subscribe to pauper's oaths, in order to obtain what they call 'our share' of public bounty. We are undergoing a test of our capacity for self-government under the forms of a representative democracy."

These statements were not in any sense exaggerations. If you will turn back to another election, 10 years ago, that of November 1936 and read Mr. Roosevelt's Madison Square Garden speech, in which he announced the personal platform upon which he proposed to continue in office, you will find ample warrant for much more than we think it is worth while to say here and now. In that speech, he took the American people up on a high mountain and promised them the earth and the fullness thereof, if they would only continue him in office and would follow where he proposed to lead. He promised every element of the population everything which human ingenuity could devise in the way of personal benefactions through governmental largess. His promises were the full bloom of all that men may hope, seek, and desire upon this earth for their wives and children and themselves. His language was so plain, so simple, and so direct as to need neither explanation nor comment. His appeal to the frailties of human nature, its instinctive selfishness, self-interest, and greed, was irresistible. He wasted no time in discussing such abstractions as whether the objectives so declared, the hopes so expressed, fitted in with the scheme of government under which we live, or ran counter to the organic law which supports the framework of the established order under which these things were to be made to

come to pass. That was in 1936. If we turn the clock still further back, to 1887, keeping Mr. Roosevelt's speech in mind, we may see exemplified one of the greatest contrasts ever offered in the pages of the history of governmental policies, purposes, and functions. In the year 1887, on February 16, Grover Cleveland sent a brief veto message to Congress, in which he disapproved an appropriation of $10,000 for relief in certain drought-stricken counties of Texas. Mr. Cleveland wrote:

"I can find no warrant for such an appropriation in the Constitution, and I do not believe that the power and duty of the General Government ought to be extended to the relief of individual suffering which is in no manner properly related to the public service or benefit. A prevalent tendency to disregard the limited mission of this power and duty should, I think, be steadfastly resisted, to the end that the lesson should be constantly enforced that though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people. * * * Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character."

Mr. Cleveland was a Democrat. Those of us who are old enough to have voted for him have reason to feel that down to this time he was the last one to fill the office of President. He ranks easily, by common consent, among the five or six really great Presidents which this country has had in all its history. He had profound convictions as to the functions and duties of the National Government. But it is not claimed that he was more honest, more patriotic, or of finer character than was Mr. Roosevelt. The difference between the two, which it is our purpose here to emphasize, is not to be found in the personal qualities and attributes of the two men. It is a difference which transcends all personal considerations and goes to the very bedrock, the foundation stones laid by our forefathers for the superstructure which they bequeathed to us and which it should be our sacred duty to perpetuate unimpaired.

In commenting at the time upon the election of 1936, we made the following observation:

"Apparently, we have now reached the point of another revolution in governmental substance and theory, which is nonetheless real because it is being accomplished without war or bloodshed and without a change of outward, visible governmental form."

Revolutions do not go backward, but when they are in the wrong direction, their effects may be mitigated, if not entirely overcome. As a practical proposition, we, of course, know that we have gone too far to permit an orderly return to the ultraconservative position held by Grover Cleveland. We had gone too far 10 years ago. On the other hand, we had even then gone far enough in the opposite direction, far beyond the limits of emergency excuse, to realize the dangers involved in attempting to give effect to new and novel theories of service through their incorporation into permanent policies of government. It is not yet too late to find some sane and substantial ground between the two extremes; not necessarily precisely a middle ground, but somewhere between the two. To discover and determine the location of this zone of safety, to fix its reasonable boundaries and by fair trial prove it, this is the duty, as it should be the privilege, of all patriotic Americans, regardless of political affiliation.

It is a fair question to ask what we mean by the fundamentals of our governmental structure. Fifteen years ago the answer might have been self-evident to the mind of the average American of voting age, with as much as a high-school education. But as we have several times pointed out in these comments, we have undergone a revolution during the past decade and a half. We would answer now that one of these fundamentals is that of the difference between the duty of the Government to the citizen and that of the citizen to the Government. Another one of preeminent importance is that of restoring in the estimation of the American people the dignity and standing of the Supreme Court of the United States. Another is the division and separation of the functions of government between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. Another is the rights of the States, including their freedom from Federal and other artificial interference, regimentation, and control. The right to work is a fundamental, God-given, essential human right, one which should not be hampered or restricted by any requirement of membership in or affiliation with any man-made organization of any kind whatsoever. The right of individual bargaining transcends the right to bargain collectively. One of the most important, one which is in fact absolutely essential to the perpetuation of the Government itself, is the right of the Government to protect itself in the exercise of its governmental functions. One of the chief of these functions is that of protecting its citizens in the orderly processes of their lives against the selfish machinations of either capital or labor or against any other form of attack. This right was conclusively upheld by the Supreme Court in the Debs case, growing out of the Pullman strikes, during Cleveland's first administration. It is today again on trial. There are other fundamentals, but this enumeration is sufficient for our purposes here.

As to one of the most important of these—that of the constitutional division of Federal authority—we shall call George Washington to witness. One of the wisest of the injunctions in his Farewell Address was in these words: "It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

It should be profitable to recall the fact that during the 4 years beginning with 1933, we witnessed the most glaring example of the effects of the spirit of encroachment, against which Washington so solemnly warned. We had then the spectacle of a President of the United States, to a large extent practically absorbing the legislative branch of the Government, while at the same time brazenly attempting to control the highest branch of the Federal judiciary. Washington rightly characterizes this as creating a real despotism, regardless of governmental form.

As to another, the necessity for the preservation of the independence of the States from Federal encroachment, we may go from Virginia to Massachusetts and put another President on the stand. This time it is Calvin Coolidge, speaking at the College of William and Mary, at Williamsburg, Va., on May 15, 1926:

"No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced form local self-government. No plan of centralization has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction, and decline. Of all forms of government, those administered by bureaus are about the least satisfactory to an enlightened and progressive people. Being irresponsible, they become autocratic, and being autocratic they resist all development. Unless bureaucracy is constantly resisted it breaks down representative government and overwhelms democracy. It is the one element in our institutions that sets up the pretense of having authority over everybody and being responsible to nobody.

"While we ought to glory in the Union and remember that it is the source from which the States derive their chief title to fame, we must also recognize that the national administration is not and cannot be adjusted to the needs of local government. It is too far away to be informed of local needs, too inaccessible to be responsive to local conditions. The States should not be induced by coercion or by favor to surrender the management of their own affairs."

As to the freedom, dignity, and independence of the individual citizen, which Thomas Jefferson sought to protect through the Bill of Rights, we may quote the language of a great American and a great editor, Henry W. Grady:

"Exalt the citizen. As the State is the unit of government, he is the unit of the State. Teach him that his home is his castle, and his sovereignty rests beneath his hat. Make him self-respecting, self-reliant, and responsible. Let him lean on the State for nothing that his own arm can do, and on the Government for nothing that his State can do. Let him cultivate independence to the point of sacrifice, and learn that humble things with unbartered liberty are better than splendors bought with its price."

We have said that it is the duty and should be the privilege of every patriotic American to defend these fundamentals. This is incontestably true. But at this juncture in the Nation's affairs, it is in a peculiar sense the obligation of the Congress to set the course and to lead the way. It is not too late, but there is no time for delay. Both duty and opportunity are knocking at your door. Gentlemen, the hour is yours.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the Prospect Park Jewish Center, Brooklyn, N. Y., January 31, 1947:

Yesterday we hailed the natal day of a great American. To live in the hearts of those you leave behind is not to die. Frank-

lin Delano Roosevelt will live forever in the hearts of the people of America and the world. We recall how shocked and stunned we were at his sudden passing. The stirring words of Whitman reechoed in our minds. Yet, "nothing in life became him quite like leaving it." He died as he had lived—as a warrior on the battlefield—for he was, indeed, a soldier who fought for many causes.

In retrospect, we are better able to contemplate the many conflicts that distressed and disturbed the Nation for a long period prior to our entrance into the war. We now realize how effectively Roosevelt applied his personality, his indomitable spirit, his visionary statesmanship, to the resolution of such cleavages. It is then, and then only, that we achieve a full and lasting appreciation of the stature of our beloved President.

God gave him as servant the understanding heart—for which Solomon prayed—to judge his people and enable him to discern between good and evil, between right and wrong. If there ever was a man who, in the words of the prophet Micah, "did justice, loved mercy, and walked humbly," it was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His heart was ever attuned to the needs of the common man and he struggled with might and main to find the answer—the true answer—to those needs. It is said that Heaven gives its favorites early death. Roosevelt died with much of his work unfinished, but he had laid the foundations and he had charted the blueprints for a better world. These will be his testament—his legacy—to the American people as well as to the peoples of the world. It is for each one of us to strive to carry on the building and completion of the peace and the establishment of a lasting world security for which he so arduously labored. The task may seem supercolossal at times, but he never faltered—and we cannot afford to do so.

Never in recorded history have we had a man, stricken down in the prime of life as he was, who exemplified such fortitude in overcoming the handicaps of paralysis and thereby inspiring thousands of others so afflicted to make a similar effort toward the establishment of useful and satisfactory lives. As Emerson so truly said, "For everything you have missed, you have gained something also." Fate dealt Roosevelt a cruel blow, but the law of compensation that is invariably operative increased Roosevelt's mental and spiritual life a thousandfold as his physical capacities were weakened. His determination to conquer the ravages of the disease with which he was afflicted will spur and encourage many others.

It was my proud distinction to know him intimately well. I frequently visited with him at the White House and elsewhere. He rarely appeared depressed, on the contrary, he always seemed to be buoyant, sparkling with infectious humor, trading quips and puns, indulging in that pastime as frequently as he would flick the ashes from the cigarette in the perennial long holder.

The dramatic scene of his last inauguration will be, for me, unforgettable. He was wheeled out on the south portico and lifted to the lectern by his son, James, and a secret-service man. It was a cold day, with a drab, dreary sky yet, at that very moment, the sun came from behind the clouds and shone upon him, as though divine providence had sought him out to give him guidance. There this man stood, crippled in body, yet firm and vigorous of mind, mastering the destiny of his own country as well as that of the world. Tears welled in the eyes of many present. The Marine Band played Hail to the Chief and the Star-Spangled Banner, and then the President repeated the oath of office from memory, administered by Chief Justice Stone, with his hand resting on the family Bible. He spoke briefly, fervently, and promised he would carry on the fight to victory. At that time the flame of democracy seemed to burn more brightly as his words echoed to the far corners of the earth over the air waves. Tumultuous applause greeted the end of his address, and as he turned to retire to the White House he waved a hand in jaunty greeting to the crowd, giving us a broad and comforting smile. No one there realized that we could count the days he would be with us.

It is easy to be brave from a safe distance. Roosevelt was brave at any distance. He never shunned the fray. He may have taken comfort in the thought that to be great is to be misunderstood. He set the course for the ship of state and held the wheel firmly. He steered our vessel past the shoals of intolerance and the reefs of swollen privilege. He knew there would be villifiers and detractors and isolationists and American Firsters, and other rabble rousers but all they won was his contempt. We loved him for the enemies he made. He seemed possessed of prophetic vision. He saw clearly and felt deeply, long before the dangers actually touched our shores. He properly judged and appraised the wily techniques of the Axis diplomats. They pursued a sort of artichoke method, a method which resulted in the disintegration of an agreed settlement, or an agreed peace, by surreptitiously, and sometimes openly, detaching leaf after leaf. As each leaf disappears, there doesn't seem to be sufficient justification for strained relations. The process is stealthy, and vigilance is relaxed until finally the dire moment arrives when only the choke remains.

As Hitler and his hoodlums sat plucking at the international artichoke, picking leaf by leaf, justice, tolerance, humanity, life itself, Roosevelt tried to warn the American people and the world. He knew Hitler and his studied cruelties and machinations against the Jews. He clearly saw that soon other minorities—Catholics, laborites, and other dissidents—would be drawn into his insatiable maw. His famous "quarantine the aggressor" speech clearly indicated his perspicacity. He knew that we could not remain aloof from the coming struggle or successfully insulate ourselves from participation; that even as formidable a barrier as the Atlantic could not protect us from such predatory beasts.

How well he knew for whom the bell tolled. He recognized, too, the intent of the perverted forces within our borders that deliberately aided the Axis and sought to throw about their activities the all-embracing cloak of extreme patriotism. He had the onerous task of fighting not only an enemy from without but a virulent one from within. But he skillfully led public opinion and prepared it for the shocks to come. After Dunkirk, he sagaciously suggested lend-lease; in exchange for 50 over-age destroyers, he secured from the English a group of strategic island bases; then came the peaceful occupation by American forces of Iceland and Greenland; the convoying of ships and the arming of merchant marine; then, in a burst of glory, the resounding principles of the Atlantic Charter, stimulating and encouraging the downtrodden throughout the world. Every effort was to be made to guarantee personal safety and to establish freedom from want and fear for all peoples. Here was no "riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." The language of the Atlantic Charter is clear and simple, so that he who reads may understand. Here is a document that will live in the hearts and minds of men forever and a day. The four freedoms were promulgated to maintain and sustain the fighting strength of the democratic peoples of the world.

His own personal experience endowed him with a tremendous sensitiveness to the tribulations of humanity. He set up the War Refugee Board, an independent agency, with no authorization from Congress. This entity rendered great service and it was hoped that it would continue to render assistance to persecuted minority groups in Festung Europa. Despite caustic opposition, he set up the free port at Oswego, N. Y., and there over a thousand refugees who managed to escape the Hitler purge lived comfortably housed and protected. The need was great then. But, strangely enough, victory and time have magnified this problem.

The late President was largely responsible for the now-famous Palestine plank incorporated in the Democratic platform of 1944, and, in a way, I like to think I, too, can lay claim to a bit of the responsibility for the inclusion of that historic plank, as I was a member of the committee on platform and resolutions during that convention. That plank demanded unlimited immigration into Palestine and the destruction of the nefarious Malcolm MacDonald white paper of 1939. In addition, that plank advocated the establishment of a Jewish national state in Palestine. In my numerous contacts with the President he always indicated a fervent desire to carry out the terms thereof. I do believe that if he were living the white paper would be no more, and there would be more than a trickle of refugees going into Palestine. The Jews would not be forced to enter their own homeland as "thieves in the night."

The late President outlined the basic philosophy for the making of a new world order—the world of today—the world of tomorrow. He sought to convey to us that the world was one whole and that its problems could only be settled by solutions that were best for the good of the whole world, and not just a few; that society is really one unit; that the total resources of our whole society should be administered to serve the needs of all individuals. To many this would be not only distasteful but completely repugnant, as they have been conditioned to thinking in terms of national divisions and the acceptance of strife between nations. Roosevelt emphasized the reality of such divisions and that the values they represented must be preserved, but he also warned us that the only way to preserve them would be through international cooperation assuring security to the whole world. The nations of the world, he felt, had to be brought together in a cohesive program of mutual aid, securing to each the long-sought chance to develop its own culture and political forms. He believed it to be the only method whereby the perpetuation of nations might be remotely guaranteed.

Roosevelt pointed out that all of us have one basic economic enemy—fear—fear of want, fear of old age, fear of unemployment, fear of illness—and that such fear is an immutable threat against the stability of our cherished institutions. He related to us that in a highly organized industrial society, with the many so dependent upon the few—the dignity of the individual demands that the political bill of rights be reinforced by an economic bill of rights. He saw and understood the underlying struggle of our times as the struggle of man against the machine and fully realized that if it were permitted to be perverted it would but lead to the degradation of human beings.

Roosevelt was our most eloquent spokesman for a society that would serve—rather than exploit—the human beings who composed it.

The late President, in no uncertain terms, outlined this economic bill of rights for a postwar society. He included the right to a job and an adequate wage, medical care, business freed from monopolistic control, a home for every family, social security against unemployment, against old age, against sickness, education for every child.

For such suggestions he was branded a revolutionist. Daily he was described as a dictator. No; my reply could be summed up in two words—great statesmanship. Would that he were with us today.

Government Officials Give Ship Profits to Foreigners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there was recently introduced a concurrent resolution by the Honorable FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine, a resolution demanding the immediate return of more than 200 American merchant ships chartered to Great Britain and now in operation in competition with the American merchant marine. The resolution says these vessels are being chartered to Great Britain on terms more favorable than those of charter to American citizens, and these so-called loaned ships for the purposes of war are being diverted in direct competition with the American merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, as to the use of such ships supposedly loaned for the purposes of war, it recently has become known that the United States-owned freighter *Samboston* and loaned to the British especially for war, brought to Boston, Mass., 72,000 bales of rubber from the Malay Peninsula. This shipment was worth more than $3,000,000 in addition to other cargo. Under current rates the voyage would give gross revenue of more than $300,000 to the British.

During the latter part of 1945, the British assured the Maritime Commission that steps would be taken to stop this kind of competition and confine the war-loaned ships to essential British commerce. It is suggested that the *Samboston* voyage might have been arranged just prior to the British assurance, for otherwise it would have been in violation of the oral assurance. As it takes only 40 days from Malaya to Boston, yet the assurance was given more than 75 days previous to the arrival of this ship. Of course, it might be said that the assurance given to this country trickled out very slowly to the Empire.

Further, leaving out the matter of competition there is actual stupid official conduct toward our own American merchant marine. The charter rate to the English for the *Samboston* is the same as required of American citizens, but the foreign lend-lease users of our ships, including the British, are not required by the State Department to pay our Government part of their voyage profits, which are required from American citizens by the Maritime Commission. The State Department and the Maritime Commission are chartering these ships to foreigners in disregard of the Ship Sales Act passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, the foreign nations thereby paying less for the use of United States-owned ships, than do citizens of the United States. During the hearings on the ship sales bill, the Congress refused to favor foreigners over citizens of the United States. Yet the State Department and Maritime Commission are carrying on the charter and use of United States-owned ships with special favor to foreigners and against the best interests of our American merchant marine. And also at the cost of the American taxpayer who has paid for these ships out of the twenty-one billions spent by the Maritime Commission for the building and operation of merchant ships during the war.

By the disregard of the Ship Sales Act in not making foreigners pay part of their voyage profits to our Government on the United States-owned ships, the same as paid by American citizens, it is estimated that a loss of nearly $100,000 has been incurred on this single voyage. With such general conduct on the part of the State Department and the Maritime Commission, we can only speculate as to the millions of dollars that are being given to foreigners while at the same time we are penalizing the American merchant marine. In addition, there are further losses to the Treasury of the United States, for there is no income-tax payment on the profits made by these foreign nations out of the United States-owned ships. The resolution of my distinguished colleague deals only with the British operation but I am introducing a resolution covering the loan, use, and operation of all United States-owned ships now in possession of foreign countries competing with the American merchant marine, and asking for the immediate recovery and return to the Government of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, these are hazardous times for our American merchant marine and it should not be further hurt by the Government officials of the United States with the use of the taxpayers' money. The matter is being examined in preparation for the beginning of early hearings on the matter.

Problems of Central and Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me before the returned service men and women of the First Magyar Reformed Church at Rakoczi Hall, Bostwick Avenue, Bridgeport, Conn., January 26, 1947:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure for me to be back in Fairfield County for the first time since the Eightieth Congress convened. It is good to be with my many friends of Hungarian descent here in the fine city of Bridgeport.

I am happy to report to you, as your Representative in Washington, that the Eightieth Congress is well under way, that the period of organization and reorganization has passed, and that we are now prepared to consider the many perplexing problems of the day.

I am pleased to report also that, as a new Member, I have been fortunate enough to be appointed to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. Although this committee does not, like the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have the power to pass on treaties, it will, I think, have a great deal to say about the conduct of our foreign affairs; it will keep an ever-watchful eye over the intricate machinery of international relations.

Not the least of the problems which confront us in connection with our relations abroad is the question of Hungary. This question in turn is intimately related to the whole problem of central and western Europe, which remains the cockpit of the world at this difficult time.

I believe that it is vital that we consider these problems with relation to each other and not as questions to be decided separately. I believe that the principles enunciated by Senator VANDENBERG, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in his Cleveland address, and by the eminent John Foster Dulles in his New York speech must weigh very heavily with us at this time. In brief, what these two authorities on foreign relations call for is a positive American foreign policy based on realities and animated by American leadership. America played a vital part in the winning of World War II. America must now exercise the leadership to which her military and industrial predominance entitle her. We are faced with very much the same challenge as that which confronted the British at the Treaty of Vienna in 1815. The challenge to Britain then was to abandon isolationism and make full use of her leadership to promote peace. We in America are faced with the same challenge today. Future generations will judge us by our ability to meet it. The extent of our failure will be commensurate with the magnitude of our opportunity.

But it is not enough to make note of our obligations. This is no time for lip service to ideals so recently drenched in blood. It is essential that we act, and that we act now. Many precious months have been frittered away since VJ-day because of our inability to understand what is in fact the great challenge of the hour. We have lost much of our prestige and power throughout the world because of our hesitation to lead the world in peace as we led it in war. This is no time for pious platitudes and windy protests. It is the time rather for effective and energetic action based on a dynamic concept of our mission in the world.

For although the war is over, it is abundantly clear that we are still living in a period of conflict. It must be our earnest endeavor to resolve these conflicts by peaceful means. We must be determined, however, not to surrender those very things for which millions of men and women recently laid down their lives. Although peace is most devoutly to be sought it is not to be bought at any price. We could have had peace in 1941 had we been willing to surrender our independence and freedom. We can be sure of peace now if we decide to renounce our faith.

The peace which we desire is not a peace based on abject surrender, it is a peace founded upon those principles which we have always regarded as vital. We must use every means at our disposal to achieve this great purpose.

We must give firm and patient support to the United Nations organization. But that is not enough. We must also evolve a definite diplomatic program buttressed by economic action which will spread the doctrine of freedom into those far corners of the world where the sinister forces of darkness and reaction are still rampant. This is not only a matter of common humanity, it is in our self-interest. We must, in this fashion, bring hope into the hearts of men and women everywhere who are standing steadfast against the forces of tyranny which, in spite of our victory, are still on the march. We must so live our lives here in America that these forces will know that, although we

want peace, we are determined that it will be a peace with freedom and justice. Having fought for these principles we must not now resort to a policy of appeasement. We must not stand idly by watching the frontiers of freedom shrink. We must not go from one Munich to another until at the last, confused and alone, we are routed and overwhelmed within our own borders. We must mobilize public opinion throughout the world to the end that people everywhere can take heart in the knowledge that the great America of today is truly the heir of those who, with their blood, forged for us our independence.

Now, all this cannot be done at once. It will take the united effort of all and it will take time. Since time is short, however, we cannot wait. We must start now to implement a policy for central and western Europe. As this policy gathers strength, it will roll back those people who, through their cynicism and despair, have lost faith in freedom.

There is not time to discuss in one brief speech the entire question of defeated Germany. Suffice it to note here that it should be our every effort to carry through Mr. Byrnes' policy of decentralization. Unity should be sought in Europe as a whole rather than in Germany as a nation. Unity in Europe should eventually be predicated on the concept of Winston Churchill—a concept which looks to a gradual federalization of Europe. We must endeavor to bestow upon Germany a government which, in the words of Walter Lippmann, will set in motion centrifugal rather than centripetal forces. By this I mean that Germany must be rather like a starfish spreading the fruits of its industry throughout Europe than like a doughnut containing its power within itself. This, as you know, is now the great bone of contention between us and Soviet Russia.

This is vital also in order to counteract any possibility of another partition of Poland. It is vital because, in spite of her defeat, Germany remains the most powerful industrial center in Europe. It is vital also in order to protect the Germans from the virus with which they were infected during the Nazi regime. Fascism—red or black—is still tyranny.

If we are able to achieve this, if we can halt the onward sweep of despotism and terror, then men may at last turn their thoughts and their whole hearts to peacetime pursuits.

As I have already indicated, the problem of Hungary is inextricably linked with the problem of Germany. Until we have solved this central dilemma, we cannot solve the problems which arise on the periphery.

As you all know, the long history of the American and Hungarian peoples is fraught with common interests and aspirations. The traditions of freedom run deep both in Hungary and the United States. In many American cities, statues of Louis Kossuth stand proudly and defiantly, a challenge for Fascist or Communist tyrants, who would deprive the Hungarian people of their liberties. In Budapest the great statue of George Washington stood until the Nazis entered the Hungarian capitol.

How did it happen then that with these ideas of freedom so deeply rooted in Magyar tradition, many Hungarians became Nazis. It happened, ladies and gentlemen, because the Treaty of Trianon visited such hardships upon the Hungarian people that they were fair game for unscrupulous tyrants. First came Bela Kun, the Communist despot and latterly came Adolf Hitler with promises of great rewards on his lips. The Hungarian people so sorely tried by the burden of the Treaty of Trianon could not resist the overwhelming military and economic pressure of the Nazi empire. Finally, however, oppressed by the Nazi and smarting under the stark terrorism of the German regime, Hungary stirred toward freedom in the last days of the war only to be oppressed and conquered again by her Communist "liberators." She is now occupied by at least 300,000 Red Army troops and under the recent treaty negotiated but not yet signed, she must pay reparations of $300,000,000, of which $200,000,000 are to go to Soviet Russia. In addition to these crushing measures, the persecuted Hungarian people have also for almost 2 years been saddled with the expense of supporting hundreds of thousands of Red Army troops. This enormous financial drain upon an impoverished country of 10,000,000 people has precipitated a runaway inflation, the effects of which are not confined to Hungary but on the contrary are felt up and down the length and breadth of the Danubian Basin. Over and beyond that, as you know, thousands of Hungarians are being deported from Czechoslovakia and Hungary into slave-labor camps, mostly in Russia.

When Father Chernitzky telegraphed me last week further informing me of the plight of many Hungarians now being deported as slaves to other countries, I immediately communicated with the Under Secretary of State, the then Acting Secretary Dean Acheson. In my letter, I protested vehemently against this inhuman treatment and requested him to investigate these tragic circumstances and give me a full report at his early convenience.

Hungary is being treated in the traditional manner in which a defeated enemy is treated by the victor. This method has not worked well up to now and there is nothing in recorded history to indicate that it will work well in the future. The entire business of making a peace should be conducted without animosity on the one hand or sentiment on the other. By sentiment I do not mean a due regard for humanity. This must, of course, receive paramount consideration. The underlying principle for peace negotiations must, however, be to prevent World War III rather than to punish our enemies in World War II. This is a luxury which we can ill afford at this time when the atom bomb and other lethal weapons of unimaginable horror hang like the sword of Damocles over our heads. This is the sort of irresponsible behavior which will lead only to further unrest and not to a solution of any of our problems.

Hungary, steeped as it is in early traditions of freedom, had no place culturally in the German sphere of influence. Hungary must be so treated that she can take her place in the family of freedom-loving nations. Hungary must be allowed to redeem the position which she lost through her association with Hitler's Germany. I am convinced that this is what the people of Hungary desire. I know that we in America look with an anxious eye at the crucifixion of Hungary. I feel sure that just as Col. Michael Kovats gave his life fighting in the American Revolution, so will the people of America give their sympathy and support to the people of Hungary. America, ever the champion of liberty, cannot be indifferent to the cruel nightmare in which they are engulfed. We must not sit quietly on the side lines and lose by apathy and default what we gave our blood and our treasure to preserve.

Dr. Herbert Lincoln Clarke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 30, 1947, the ashes of one of the most beloved figures of my home city of Long Beach, Calif., the late Dr. Herbert Lincoln Clarke, together with the ashes of Mrs. Clarke, were interred in their final resting place, the Congressional Cemetery in Washington, D. C. It is peculiarly fitting that these ashes should come to rest in the Congressional Cemetery for there they are in close proximity to the grave of John Philip Sousa with whom Dr. Clarke was associated as cornet soloist and assistant conductor for many years.

As a tribute from the world of music—especially of that band music which Dr. Clarke loved and advanced so materially—a massed band consisting of equal numbers of the United States Navy Band, United States Marine Corps Band, and United States Army Air Corps Band, organized by Captain Santelman, played at the grave under the baton of Mr. Simone Mantia, the oldest living member of John Philip Sousa's world-renowned musical organization.

Mrs. Bradley and I had the distinct honor of representing the city of Long Beach at this memorial service, which was arranged by a lifelong friend of Dr. Clarke, Mr. Frank McGrann, of the Conservatory of Music, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mrs. Ruby B. Henderson, foster daughter of Dr. Clarke, of Garden Grove, Calif., and Mrs. Harold Hagen, wife of Congressman HAROLD HAGEN, of Minnesota, attended the memorial service, the latter in the capacity of a personal friend of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert L. Clarke, Jr., Dr. Clarke's son and daughter-in-law, both now in California.

I quote here an article written by Mr. McGrann and published in the Pennsylvania Band Master's Association news letter of April 1945, as follows:

DR. HERBERT LINCOLN CLARKE

With the passing of Dr. Herbert L. Clarke at the Harriman-Jones Clinic Hospital in Long Beach, Calif., on the night of January 30, a dear friend I have known for the past 40 years, the career of the world's most famous cornetist, was brought to a close.

Dr. Clarke was born at Woburn, Mass., on September 12, 1867, the son of William Horatio and Eliza Tusts Clarke—his father being a prominent composer and organist.

As Herbert often told me, he first played in a family orchestra of which his father was the conductor, with the brothers William, Edwin, Ernest, and Herbert all playing violins.

It was the desire of Herbert's father that he should continue to play the violin; however, his brother, Edwin, finally changed to a cornet and that instrument immediately took young Herbert's fancy. His father forbade his playing on Edwin's new type of instrument and therefore it was only when his father was absent and with his mother's permission, Herbert would play Edwin's cornet whenever he had an opportunity to do so. The first band that Herbert ever played in was the Queen's Own Rifle's Band, of Toronto, Canada, of which John Bailey was the leader. During Herbert's career as a cornetist he studied under many celebrated instructors.

One of Herbert's most outstanding characteristics was his willingness to assist young musicians. He told me when he first joined a band, the older musicians would avoid helping the younger ones and that when he noticed this, he decided if he ever amounted to anything as a cornetist, he would gladly assist young musicians whenever possible. Through that decision, thousands of young musicians have profited by assistance rendered them on a free gratis basis by Dr. Clarke.

Dr. Clarke, at the age of 24, became cornet soloist with the famous Gilmore Band, and after the death of Mr. Gilmore he joined John Philip Sousa's famous band, with which he was connected for many years as cornet soloist and assistant conductor. He was also cornet soloist in the bands conducted by F. N. Innes, Victor Herbert, and Ellis Brooks. He was conductor of the Seventh Regiment Band of New York, the Reeves American Band of Providence, R. I., the Naval Brigade Band of Massachusetts, and the Anglo-Canadian Leather Co. Band of Huntsville, Ontario, Canada.

From November 30, 1923, to February 1, 1943, Dr. Clarke served as director of the Long Beach Municipal Band of Long Beach, Calif., from which position he resigned on orders of his physician.

In 1934 the Phillips University, of Enid, Okla., conferred on Dr. Clarke the degree of doctor of music. He was past president of the American Bandmaster's Association, a member of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, and an honorary member of the Pennsylvania Bandmaster's Association.

Dr. Clarke was a pioneer in the recording of phonograph records, having recorded for Berliner, Brunswick, Columbia, and Victor. He was credited with having recorded more cornet solos than any other cornetist. The last time Dr. Clarke took part in recording was at my recording studio on May 7, 1944, when he conducted the band in three numbers, two of these being compositions of his own, Sounds from the Hudson, played by Leonard B. Smith, cornet soloist of the United States Navy Band: The Debutante, played by Edward L. Masters, cornet soloist of the United States Marine Band; and Willow Echos, played by his old friend and side partner in Sousa's Band, Dr. Frank Simon, this being the last time Dr. Clarke ever conducted a band in solo accompaniments. Dr. Clarke conducted a band for the last time in New York, at a rehearsal of the New York City Police Band of which Capt. Eugene LaBarre is the director.

The funeral services were held on the afternoon of February 2 at Mottel's Mortuary and Chapel in Long Beach. The Long Beach Municipal Band, under the direction of B. A. Rolfe, who succeeded Dr. Clarke, played two numbers, Past Glad Hours and a cornet solo Twilight Dreams, one of Dr. Clarke's own compositions, played by Forest L. Ray, cornet soloist. The final resting place for the remains of Dr. Clarke and his wife, who passed away in 1930, has not yet been determined.

Dr. Clarke is survived by a son, Capt. Herbert L. Clarke, Jr., of Van Nuys, Calif., a stepson, Ralph Clarke, of Beverly Hills, Calif., a stepdaughter, Mrs. Ruby B. Henderson, of Garden Grove, Calif., with whom he resided, a grandson, Stephen Clarke, of Long Beach, Calif., and two brothers, William of Santa Monica, Calif., and Ernest of New York City.

FRANK MCGRANN.

Reserve Officers of the Naval Services Oppose Recent Compromise for Merger of Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, commonly known as the RONS, an organization with a membership of over 34,000 Naval Reserve officers who served in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, believe that the recent compromise proposal for the merger of the armed forces as proposed to Congress by the President is not in accord with the best interests of national security.

In a letter received by me over the signature of Eugene C. Carusi, president of the RONS, it is pointed out that the proposed merger program is a step away from unification and can only result in confounded confusion, continued duplication, increased expenses, and less efficiency.

President Carusi's letter is as follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS OF
THE NAVAL SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1947.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, an organization of 34,000 reserve officers who have served in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard is keenly interested in the subject of merger or integration of the armed forces. It is our belief that our national security is best served under a system which provides the most efficient Army, Navy, and Air Force at the lowest cost to the taxpayer.

It is our further belief that the recent compromise proposal for merger of the armed services as proposed to Congress by the President neither unifies nor integrates the War and Navy Departments but instead actually adds two additional departments, the Department of Air, and the Department of National defense, and, if enacted, will result in a further division of our armed forces with further duplication of effort as well as increased military administrative costs. We feel that this latest plan is a step backward instead of forward, a divorce instead of a merger, and that the main purpose of unification—to strengthen our national security—is defeated. This is definitely not a move toward unification even though it may so appear on paper. In fact, it is a step away from unification and can only result in confounded confusion, continued duplication, increased expense, and less efficiency.

If the primary purpose of the proposed change is to give the Army Air Forces independent status under a new cabinet head rather than achieve unification and economy such action should be taken directly. We fail to see how any degree of unification, harmony and economy will be obtained by inserting in the top echelon chain of command one more official—with the inevitable staff of aides—between the President and the chiefs of the three military departments; particularly, when each of these three chiefs is to be accorded the right to go "over the head" of this new official direct to the President.

In view of the above, RONS earnestly suggests the appointment of an independent and nonpartisan commission composed of outstanding civilians who have served in all branches of the armed services in the recent war to thoroughly study all aspects of the unification problem and to report its findings to Congress before final legislative action is taken on the merger. We feel that such a commission can approach the problem from an independent civilian standpoint and yet have full knowledge of the wartime requirements for coordination and cooperation between all branches. We feel that the commission must be composed largely of persons who served in the Reserve components of the armed forces in view of the fact that professional officers' thinking is necessarily colored by their career in and devotion to their particular branch of the service. Though the integrity of these officers certainly cannot be doubted we feel it is vitally necessary that the viewpoint of the members of the commission be detached and objective.

Reserve officers are vitally affected by the proposed reorganization of the armed forces. They have a vital stake because they supplied 19 out of every 20 officers in World War II, many of whom will be subject to recall to combat duty in event of any future threat to our national security. Therefore, they feel they have a right to insist upon a plan of integration which will provide the most efficient Army, Navy, and Air Force at the lowest cost to the taxpayer consistent with protection of our national security.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE C. CARUSI,
President.

Polish Provisional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release, No. 69, of the State Department, issued on January 28, 1947, concerning the Polish Provisional Government:

On January 19 a general election was held in Poland, the results of which are expected to be announced shortly. The United States Government has followed closely the developments leading up to this event in accordance with the commitments it accepted at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences. On numerous occasions it has expressed its concern over the course of events in Poland which increasingly indicated that the election would not be conducted in such manner as to allow a free expression of the will of the Polish people. On August 19 and November 22, 1946, formal notes were addressed to the Polish Provisional Government on this subject. On January 5 this Government brought the situation in Poland to the attention of the British and Soviet Governments and expressed the hope that those Governments would associate themselves with the Government of the United States in an approach to the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity. This proposal was rejected by the Soviet Government. On January 9 this Government delivered a further note to the Polish Provisional Government which stated, among other things, that if the repressive activities on the part of the Provisional Government did not cease immediately there was little likelihood that elections could be held in accordance with the terms of the Potsdam Agreement. The British Government has also protested to the Polish Provisional Government the violation of its election pledges.

The reports received from the United States Embassy in Poland in the period immediately prior to the elections as well as its subsequent reports based upon the observations of American officials who visited a number of Polish voting centers confirmed the fears which this Government had expressed that the election would not be free. These reports were corroborated by the general tenor of the despatches from foreign correspondents in Poland. It is clear that the Provisional Government did not confine itself to the suppression of the so-called underground but employed widespread measures of coercion and intimidation against democratic elements which were loyal to Poland although not partisans of the government bloc. In these circumstances the United States Government cannot consider

that the provisions of the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements have been fulfilled.

The United States Government has made it clear that it has no desire to intervene in the internal affairs of Poland. By virtue of the responsibility which devolved upon it as one of the principal powers engaged in liberating the countries of Europe from Nazi occupation it undertook, together with the British and Soviet Governments, to secure for the long-suffering Polish people the opportunity to select a government of their own choosing. It was in connection with this undertaking that this Government agreed to the decisions respecting Poland that were taken at the Yalta Conference, including the decision to recognize the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity. These decisions with respect to Poland, which were accepted by the Polish Provisional Government in their entirety, formed part of a series of agreements between the United States, British, and Soviet Governments. The United States Government considers that the Polish Provisional Government has failed to carry out its solemn pledges.

The United States Government intends to maintain its interest in the welfare of the Polish people. While retaining full liberty of action to determine its future attitude toward the Government of Poland, this Government will continue to keep itself informed of developments in Poland through its diplomatic mission in Warsaw.

Transfer of Jurisdiction Over Territories of Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there has been advanced again the proposal that jurisdiction over the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii ought to be vested in the Navy Department. The people of the two Territories oppose any such move. They oppose it because they know that under the American system civilian government is the only proper government; and they oppose it because they know from their experience during the war that local and national defense, far from being impeded by orderly and democratic government, is, in fact, immeasurably strengthened thereby. There is, indeed, a real need to change the governmental structure both in Alaska and Hawaii. But that need does not lie in the direction of substituting military control for civilian control. Instead it calls for immediate granting of statehood to these two Territories. In that way and only in that way will there be positive assurance that Alaska and Hawaii will be great and strong both in war and peace, and in the best possible position to contribute to the prosperity of our Nation and to its protection in time of emergency.

The case against the proposal to transfer jurisdiction to the Navy Department has been compellingly set forth in an editorial which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of January 16. That editorial is quoted here:

THE COLE BILL AGAIN

Representative W. STERLING COLE, of New York State, has reintroduced in Congress his bill to put the United States Navy in control of all the Territories and island possessions.

His measure, put into the lower House on Tuesday, would transfer jurisdiction over Territorial administration from the War and Interior Departments to a proposed new branch of the Navy Department. It would be called the office of external possessions.

Mr. COLE's basic argument on behalf of the bill is, in his own words:

"The Territories are of basic importance to national defense.

"The maintenance of naval bases and installations in such Territories and security measures for defense of such areas are the primary responsibility of the Navy Department."

The bill introduced by Mr. COLE would put the functionr of civil government now exercised by the United States Army in the Panama Canal Zone under the Navy.

This is not the first appearance of this proposal.

Mr. COLE introduced a similar bill on January 6, 1945. It was referred to the House Committee on Territories and brought immediate protest from the Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska. Thereafter Mr. COLE introduced a revised bill. It excluded Hawaii and Alaska from the Navy-control plan. It was sent to the House Naval Affairs Committee.

Neither bill was acted on by the Seventy-ninth Congress. They died in committees.

The new measure should, and no doubt will, draw another sharp protest from the Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska. And it should be protested likewise by the official civil organizations and by individuals in the Territories. For it strikes at the very heart of local self-government, a basic principle of American citizenship and American freedom of political action.

At the outset let us emphasize that we do not question the sincerity of Mr. COLE's motives or his belief that his measure would provide an essential factor in national defense.

Mr. COLE represents the Thirty-ninth District of western New York. His home is in Bath, N. Y. He is a lawyer by profession, a graduate of Colgate University and Albany law school with a Phi Beta Kappa high scholarship award. He is a member of the United States Naval Reserve, and has long been a member of the House Committees on Naval Affairs and Insular Affairs. He is also a member of the newer Special Committee on Postwar Military Policy.

His associations, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, are obviously with Navy officers. And it is natural that he should gain from at least some of them the conviction that to fulfill its role in national defense the Navy should have control of the land territories in what might be described as the outlying areas of the United States.

But the plan of the Cole bill is against the whole course of development of self-government for American communities.

It is directly counter to the statehood proposals before Congress for both Hawaii and Alaska.

It represents a type of thinking which regards outlying areas not as communities with membership in the rights and privileges of the American democracy; but as colonies to be administered by official fiat from above, and subject to the military command instead of to the obligation of citizenship.

There is nothing in the history of any of the Territories or insular areas to justify the Cole bill.

In war as in peace the people of these areas have manifested no less regard for their obligations and duties to the United States than the people of Mr. COLE's home State and home district.

Indeed, the immediate response of the people of Hawaii and of Alaska to the stern call to arms on December 7, 1941, was exceeded in no State in the Union. And, we say with pride, no State in the Union had a better war record than had Hawaii.

This record was founded not alone on the imminent danger to Hawaii and to Alaska. The response was not solely the response of fear for our own safety in these islands, or on the Alaskan Peninsula.

It was founded also on certain knowledge that should the defenses for Hawaii and Alaska break down, the whole west coast of the United States, and the Panama Canal Zone, would be laid open to enemy attack.

The people of Hawaii and Alaska knew that on them, as well as on the Navy and the Army, and on that gallant, outnumbered, ill-equipped little force in the Philippines, rested the responsibility for holding the Pacific line until the immense American war machine could get rolling.

Yes, the record of Hawaii and Alaska in wartime is secure for history.

It offers no excuse for taking from either Territory the self-government it already has and depriving it of the deeply, proudly cherished ambition to march on to full statehood.

Nor do we believe that from the standpoint of long-range strategy the Navy can justify taking control of the Territorial and insular areas.

In Hawaii and in Alaska the Navy has great bases. No reasonable plan for the establishment of such bases has been refused.

In the areas farther west and southwest in the Pacific, there are similar bases. Most of these areas are already under Navy control.

There never has been presented to Congress or the people a valid case for permanent naval occupancy and naval government of the Territories and insular areas.

The new Cole bill will be opposed even more emphatically than those the New York Member introduced in 1945.

The protests will come from the earlier sources of opposition, and from new sources.

Since the first legislation went in, President Truman has declared himself strongly in favor of immediate action on statehood for Hawaii.

A subcommittee of Congress has made a report to the main House committee cordially favoring statehood for Hawaii.

The new Secretary of the Interior, J. A. Krug, has reiterated the previous hearty support of statehood as voiced by his predecessor, Harold L. Ickes.

In the country at large, statehood for Hawaii is much better understood than it was 2 years ago. The support for statehood is correspondingly widespread.

But it would be foolish to permit the Cole bill to ride without new protest. The chances are greatly against its passage or even a favorable report from a House committee. But so long as Hawaii remains a Territory, we are open to such attacks on our political status and our citizenship rights.

The way to end those attacks, the way to assure forever that the lowly status of a colony is not imposed on us, is to get statehood.

Not till then will the menaces to local self-government be removed.

Conflict by Congress Committees Is Likely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article

by David Lawrence entitled "Conflict by Congress Committees Is Likely":

CONFLICT BY CONGRESS COMMITTEES IS LIKELY—DUPLICATED EFFORTS OR RIVALRY SEEN UNDER REORGANIZATION

(By David Lawrence)

Congress hasn't quite cleared up in its own mind just what the various committees are to do. The streamlining Reorganization Act achieved a good many reforms, but theory and actual working conditions are likely to conflict and only experience and evolution will furnish the right answer.

Thus, in the House of Representatives, the Foreign Affairs Committee has just voted to make a study of State Department matters and so has the Committee on Expenditures in Governmental Agencies.

On the surface it would appear that this is a duplication of effort or perhaps a rivalry of interest between the two committees. Also the House Armed Services Committee now is asking the Secretary of State to testify as to the nature of foreign policies so that commitments can be examined in relation to the military side and appropriations needed.

Strictly speaking, the same reasoning that led to the merging of the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs in both Houses would seem to argue in favor of a consolidation of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

ARGUMENT IS LOGICAL

It could be argued quite logically that these subjects belong together and that one is dependent on the other. For, after all, armies and navies and air forces are not needed to preserve domestic tranquillity and have their uses only in foreign affairs when wars are threatened or break out.

So far as the House or Senate Foreign Affairs Committee is concerned, these units have no business except to help shape national policy in relation to other nations. What is done there has a bearing on the size of the armed services and the nature of the defense program that is to be established, but it is not up to the Senate or House committees to formulate a defense plan.

Congress made a serious mistake when it merged the Army and Navy committees because each branch of the armed services is important enough to have its own affairs watched by a committee of each House. But now that the Armed Services Committee has been set up, it is natural that the cry for merger in other directions should be taken up.

Actually the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has a duty to survey State Department policies and personnel and to give its judgment to the Appropriations Committee. As for the Committee on Expenditures, it has a right to inquire into methods of spending and handling of purchases, rentals of property, and management of personnel matters abroad, and auditing of accounts, but not to examine the broad policies of the Secretary of State or his assistants in what is known as international relations or foreign policy.

THIN REED FOR DEFENSE

As for the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, they may inquire concerning the nature of foreign policy and commitments, but this is a thin reed on which to base a defense plan. What is said by the present Secretary of State may or may not be pertinent in a year or so. The only way the armed services should function is to assume every hypothesis of war is plausible and to develop defense plans accordingly.

It would be tragic, indeed, if the Armed Services Committees after hearing Secretary Marshall in executive session, were to launch a program of expansion or reduction of the defense establishment. Undue significance internationally would be attached to such a session.

Conversely, the Armed Services Committees would be better off if they formulated a defense plan on the broad assumption that the United States, as a member of the UN, must be prepared, for instance, to fight a war against Russia irrespective of what soothing words may come from Moscow or any other capital of the world. It is the business of military men to draw up hypothetical plans all the time and to prepare for any serious contingency. With a totalitarian government in power in Moscow, the peace of the world will be continuously unstable and the words of no foreign secretary of state should be taken in place of the advice of military and naval and aerial experts as to what the United States needs to ward off attack, especially in this atomic age.

The United States has been caught napping before by ignoring this sort of thing. Whenever anybody in Congress or in the armed services mentioned the need for fortifying Guam, for example, prior to 1941, there was a hue and cry about disturbing relations with Japan. If the Armed Services Committees are going to get tangled up in diplomacy once more, instead of sticking to strictly military preparations, the defense of the United States may suffer accordingly and the United States may be caught with another Pearl Harbor attack some day.

Free Enterprise and Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of January 25, 1947:

ON FREE ENTERPRISE AND TAX POLICY

Most persons develop deep-rooted prejudices about tax rates because of their individual economic positions. Nobody really enjoys paying taxes, of course, and we can always find plenty of reasons why some other segment of society than our own ought to pay a larger share of the necessary Government revenue, so that our segment can pay less. At the State and local levels, we also debate vigorously about how the necessary revenues should be collected.

But when we consider Federal policies about this, it becomes more than just an economic group-interest debate or an academic exercise. For it has a very important bearing nowadays on what political philosophy we, as a Nation, are to pursue. National government is inevitably so complex and powerful, in a modern industrial society, that it can—if we wish it to—completely dominate the economy. It can easily control the whole character and behavior of private enterprise, through a thousand arms of regulation and taxation and policy, unless we consciously limit it.

One of the important questions of our time is whether it is necessary and, if not, whether it is socially wise for us to permit government to assume a virtual veto power over our economic system. For if we agree that it is necessary, this means that we have repudiated the free-enterprise system. And if we agree even that, though not essential, it is nevertheless wise, this means that we do not value the free-enterprise system highly enough any more to struggle for its perpetuation.

The Register doubts that very many Americans, faced with the choice in this form, would take so defeatist a view. Most of us recognize as socially sound the intervention of government at specific and well-defined points, to restrain excesses or abuses by private enterprise. But most of us expect government to exercise self-restraint in all areas except these carefully reasoned and described ones.

For if such intervention respects no limits, it automatically encroaches everywhere for the sake of mere power—and we get a condition of state capitalism in one form or another. This is pretty near what happens, even to a democracy, in modern war; we excuse it then because of the threat to our national existence, but the abandonment by government of these extraordinary powers when peace returns is always implicit in our acquiescence.

Now the philosophy of taxation is a part of this delicate balance between governmental economic control and private enterprise, and affects that balance rather directly. In a dynamic or growing industrial society, there must be a constant flow of new capital into production resources; otherwise the system stagnates.

Tax policies determine, to a large degree, where this flow of capital is to come from, whether the new resources are to be Government-controlled or privately controlled—and in fact whether new capital is going to flow into production at all!

If the tax rates are such that private enterprise can accumulate very little for new investment, then naturally the new resources are not going to be created by private capital. In that event, Government may go about creating and retaining ownership of a larger and larger proportion of our productive resources, by using its tax revenues for this purpose. Or it may disperse these revenues so thinly, into consumption channels or for nonproductive enterprises, that the necessary new productive plant never comes into being.

Right now the United States is at a high level of employment, with a high national income. Almost everybody agrees that our tax revenues must take a substantial bite out of the Federal debt first. Almost everybody agrees that the budget can now stand some slicing—it might even stand considerably more than anyone has proposed, if real unification of the armed services took place. It could certainly stand more, all along the line, if the reasons for reducing it seemed imperative enough.

The issue is, Ought not the Budget be deliberately cut hard enough so that, in addition to the debt payment, personal income taxes can be reduced—leaving that surplus in private hands for new capital investment, and thus stimulating expansion of our productive resources?

Nobody is proposing that the average personal income-tax rates be cut back to anywhere near the 1929 level. Nobody is proposing even that they be cut back to the 1939 level. The most radical proposal (for 20-percent reduction) represents no more than a compromise between the 1939 rate and the stiffest (1945) wartime rate.

This policy requires, to be sure, both a basic faith in the free-enterprise system and an understanding that new capital investment means still higher production, more national income, and, therefore, more tax revenue ultimately. That sequence is the very essence of a dynamic free-enterprise system.

That system, meanwhile, has suffered some mortal blows in the last generation because of blind nationalism throughout the world which pitched us first into depression and then war. Many areas have already turned away from the system in despair. We in the United States still have the opportunity, if we use it wisely, to prove anew the long-

term social values of a vigorous private-enterprise economy.

This may, indeed, be the last opportunity of our epoch in history to give the incentive system an even chance to produce. Is it not a chance worth taking?

Senator Pepper's Views on Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel-Star, on December 29, 1946, and another article published in the Orlando Morning Sentinel, on December 30, 1946, being an interview between Mr. Walter Duranty and myself, respecting relations between this country and the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel-Star of December 29, 1946]

WALTER DURANTY SIZES UP CLAUDE PEPPER—SINCERITY SENATOR'S TOP HOPE FOR PEACE, NOTED REPORTER FINDS

(By Walter Duranty)

"If more politicians in this country were thinking about the next generation instead of the next election it might be better for the United States and the world," said Senator PEPPER (Democrat, Florida).

The Senator was talking to me in Brooksville, on his way to St. Petersburg, and I had journeyed there to interview him for the Sunday Sentinel-Star.

The Senator can afford to say that because he's all set for 4 years. Yet some people might think he is kind of in the doghouse. Not that it worries him, and he told me why.

He said, "Not long ago I was going to talk at one of our universities. Many of the boys were veterans. One of my friends said to me:

"'Listen, CLAUDE, do you have to be controversial?

"'Can't you leave Russia alone? I know you went there and had a talk with Stalin * * * but can't you leave Russia alone?'"

The Senator looked at me, smiling in a rather quizzical way, and went on, "I'll tell you, Mr. Duranty, I just couldn't do it, because Russia is important.

"If somehow or other we can't make a deal with them * * * a friendly deal * * * for their benefit and ours * * * then it is just too bad. That's what I mean by talking about the next generation.

"Either we're moving toward a bigger and bloodier war, or to peace and friendship. In my opinion, this can be achieved, but we haven't much time to waste. In the next year or two we are sowing the seeds of the future. Will they be seeds of friendship, or will they be seeds of war?

"As I was saying," he continued, "I did talk about Russia at this university, much along the lines that I'm talking to you now. I don't suppose they all agreed with me, and I doubt whether I changed their minds. But they listened with attention. You've talked in public yourself; and you can tell when an audience listens.

"And afterward one of the boys came up to me and said:

"'Would you know it, Senator, that I and some of my friends didn't think much of you. We thought you were a radical or a Communist, or tied up somehow with Moscow * * * and we didn't think much of you. In fact, we came here to make a sort of booing clique to interrupt your speech. But you notice we didn't boo.'"

The Senator didn't say this in a boastful way, as if to imply that he had spellbound this potentially hostile group. He just stated it as a fact—direct and sincere—as I am sure that the boy and his friends who came there to boo, but didn't, also were sincere; and sincerity counts, and integrity counts, and if a man will stand up and face his opposition to say what he believes * * * that may count much more.

I asked the Senator if he could tell me quickly, in general terms, what are the obstacles to friendship between this country and Russia.

Mr. PEPPER rubbed his chin and then said firmly, "There are very powerful interests in this country which don't like the Soviet Union or anything it stands for, and probably never will. Then, there is a big mass of public opinion which has been influenced unfavorably against the Soviet Union.

"I wouldn't call this mass of public opinion ignorant or misled because I think that it, or they, honestly want to know about Russia and are willing to hear and eager to learn.

"But for the most part, at this moment, they are not friendly toward Russia and are suspicious of Russia's aims and actions."

"Yes," I said, "and then?"

"Then," said Mr. PEPPER, "there are people like myself, or yourself, who want to find out the facts, who know that this country has no aggressive or hostile aims against any other country, and are willing to believe the same about the Russians * * * for similar reasons.

"No great, big country like the United States or the Soviet Union wants to go grabbing territory. We have enough of our own. I admit there is a danger in both these countries that rash and greedy men may cause trouble by what might be called imperialistic expansion.

"Many people think today that Stalin entertains such dangerous ideas. I don't believe it, just as I well know that the United States wants nothing of the kind.

"Therefore, we should be friends with Russia and can be friends with Russia, and must be friends with Russia. You lived there a long time, Mr. Duranty, and I was there a short time, but I think you will agree with me when I say that the Russian people as a nation admire and respect America and have no ill feeling toward us.

"Some of them, perhaps, and some of their rulers are suspicious about us, as many people here are suspicious about them. But I feel confident that a way of friendship can be found."

This time I rubbed my chin. "And what do you think about Stalin?" I asked.

"Quite a lot," said the Senator. "But let's leave that for tomorrow's story."

So I left it like that, and on the way, riding home, I wondered to myself what I thought about CLAUDE PEPPER on the basis of our conversation. And I thought he added up to two things that matter most to me * * * and I could add a third thing. I thought, first, that he is sincere and good, and has brave ideas. Some folks may think that he is in the dog-house at present (as I said before), even in his home State, but so what?

Second, I feel that his line with which I began this piece that politicians ought to think more about the next generation and less about the next election is one of the best lines I have ever heard.

Third, he is a happy man. He is young and strong and a magnificent speaker—or did you happen to hear about him at the last Democratic convention. Last, but very far from least, he has the most charming and beautiful wife any man could want.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Morning Sentinel of December 30, 1946]

WALTER DURANTY SIZES UP CLAUDE PEPPER—NOTED REPORTER FINDS PEPPER SEES PEACE AS STALIN'S CHIEF AIM

(By Walter Duranty)

"Stalin's two outstanding qualities," said Senator PEPPER (Democrat), of Florida, "are in my opinion common sense and/or perseverance. He follows his thoughts through with the intentness and determination of a dog on a trail. I imagine that he is the same in action; a man who sees his objective clearly and goes after it at all costs."

"What," I asked, "do you think is Stalin's chief objective?"

"Peace," said the Senator firmly. "First, perhaps selfishly, for the sake of his own country and its reconstruction. Russia has suffered far greater losses of human life and materials than is generally realized here.

"The devastation of war ruined the richest industrial and agricultural areas in the Ukraine and the North Caucasus—not to mention Stalingrad, of course, and in White Russia and along the Baltic coast up to and including Leningrad, where nearly half the population died in one of the most terrible sieges that history has ever recorded.

"To repair those dreadful wounds Russia must have peace, and Stalin knows it. But over and above that, and beyond it, I believe, is Stalin's second objective: to develop the natural resources of his gigantic country and improve the living standards of its people.

"As you well know, Mr. Duranty, those standards are still deplorably low, if judged by an American yardstick. To raise them to anywhere near our level will take time and prodigious effort. For that peace is a necessity."

He paused and looked at me, "Yes, and not only peace, but if possible the assistance of the United States, so that our example and our technical skill can be used to help Russia progress."

"You don't think, then," I said "that Russia is a menace, or that Stalin himself is a man so greedy for power that he might have dreams of conquest as wild and dangerous as those of Hitler."

"No," said the Senator, "I do not believe that, because it does not correspond with my estimate of Stalin's character. As I said at the beginning he is a man of great common sense, and, frankly, there is no sense at all in the idea that Russia should wish to challenge the United States of America and/or the British Commonwealth for the domination of the world.

"I don't believe Stalin thinks along those lines. He does, I am convinced, wish to see the system of socialism succeed in Russia. To that wish or hope or goal he has devoted his life.

"It is a system most different from our own. In this country private enterprise, individualism, capitalism if you like, has been successful. Despite certain imperfections, abuses even, which I do not need to discuss, the American system of private enterprise—capitalism—has produced greater wealth, happiness, comfort, culture, all that is meant by civilization, for more people over a greater area than any other system in the history of the world.

"We may wish to remove the imperfections and correct the abuses, but we don't want to change our system.

"Stalin, on the other hand, is convinced that for Russia a socialist system is preferable. He and Lenin before him gave their lives to that cause, yet I do not see where or why this difference of systems should involve any conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. That, I believe, is the view of Stalin also."

This was very interesting to me because we were talking in the house of Col. Raymond Robbins, of Brooksville, and Colonel Robbins was Red Cross representative in Petrograd during World War I; and later, as unofficial ambassador for some months after the Bolshevik Revolution, knew Lenin well and was liked and trusted by him, and knew Trotsky, too, and Stalin, who at that time was less prominent than he is today.

The colonel went back to Russia in 1933 and was received by Stalin who said to him:

"I am a Leninist and try to make socialism work in Russia because that is what Lenin wanted."

I remembered something Stalin had said to me—or rather written—when I first interviewed him in 1929. I had put in my report that Stalin was "the inheritor of Lenin's mantle." When he returned my copy, which he had read and approved, for me to cable it to the New York Times, I found that the phrase about Lenin's mantle had been scratched out and that instead Stalin had written "Lenin's faithful disciple and the prolonger of his work."

So it was interesting to me to find that Senator PEPPER and Colonel Robbins were saying almost the same thing about today's Lord of the Kremlin.

The Senator told me another interesting thing—that in his interview with Stalin he had asked the Russian Communist leader whether he truly believed that world-wide peace could be attained and maintained. To which Stalin replied, "Yes, in time, but remember that Christ said, 'Seek and ye shall find.'"

I straightened up in my chair. "Are you sure, Senator, that Stalin said that?"

"Sure. You see George Kennan, who was then our Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, and speaks Russian perfectly, was kind enough to act as my interpreter. Stalin had his own interpreter. After the interview Kennan and I compared notes carefully, and we both are certain that Stalin used those words."

"Don't forget," he added, smiling, "that Stalin was raised for the Church and got his early education in a theological seminary of the Greek Othodox faith."

In conclusion, I asked the Senator:

"You were speaking yesterday of the obstacles to Russian-American friendship in this country. What about the obstacles in Russia?"

He replied:

"Well, I suppose that in a way it is much the same thing. There, too, is a great deal of ignorance and lack of mutual knowledge and understanding. There, too, are certain forces whose interest and purpose it is to set the United States and the Soviet Union at loggerheads, to provoke hostility between them, because only by this means can these forces recover from their defeat.

"I refer, of course, to Germany, which is a beaten country but not, I think, wholly chastened in spirit. I know that the Kremlin's control of press and propaganda and public opinion is very great. I feel that there is a danger that Germany's desire for revenge can have a certain influence in Russia—and perhaps in this country, too. It must be Germany's hope to inflame and play upon ill-will between the United States and Russia, just as Hitler manipulated and profited by discord and divergence between France and Britain in the period between World War I and World War II."

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on February 1, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, 24 hours after I introduced the Hall plan for veterans' housing, I was challenged and attacked and called the most atrocious names. HALL wants to bankrupt the country, they shouted.

It will interest you folks who didn't listen to my plan last week that I simply stated that I believed every veteran, regardless of the color of his skin or what church he attends or how small his pocketbook is, should be afforded the chance to own his own home and have a new one, if necessary.

It will also interest you to know that the handful of vociferous persons attacking me are all making big salaries, live in nice, comfortable homes, and are not worrying where their next meal and their families' meals are coming from.

But they smear me to you and try to block the only proposal yet made in connection with veterans' housing that puts a nickel in anybody's hands so he can do something about getting a roof over his head.

Personally I think they ought to be ashamed. A few years back, don't I recall these same people were beating their breasts and waving the flag and demanding that every boy climb into a uniform and march off to fight for his country.

These people who smear me now because I want to follow through and carry out a fair program are the same ones who promised our boys the world if they would go forth and do battle for them.

Well, all I have to say to them is, you may have the power of high position right now to misrepresent me and attempt to question my motives when I try to help the veteran. But don't think for a minute, boys, you can push aside the hopes and desires of 14,000,000 veterans by ridiculing my suggestion. Don't think they will retreat one inch. Your frowns will not scare them any more than you scare me. Whether you like it or not, I'm going to use the job the folks back home gave me to the very best advantage I can to help our veterans. Whether you like it or not, you can't stop me.

As to the abuse you are handing out, of course, there are ways and means of overcoming that. I've survived nearly a decade now in spite of your abuse, your intolerance, and your determination to rub me out. It won't be my fault if I don't survive for a while to come.

Naturally, I've had to work overtime to find the ways and means. You don't like it because I take good care of thousands of requests folks make of me.

You don't like it because I fight back when you heap your coals of fire on my head. You like to dish it out but you can't take it. You won't like it when I flood this district with letters which I will send to every voter exposing the men by name who are in this plot to get me. I don't want to do this but I will have no other choice if they keep persecuting me. But you've got to take it if you keep smearing me because this program is dedicated to the protection of the people of this district. This program is dedicated to the defense of a free, unfettered Representative, elected by a free people.

But to get back to the veteran. You high-salaried critics who are making fun of my efforts to help veterans' housing ought to read this story by Columnist S. W. Matthews, Miami Daily News staff writer. The headline reads, "Family hungry in one room." "Vet wants to sell eye to buy a house trailer." "For sale: One eye."

Proceeds from the sale of this eye will be used to buy a trailer. With the trailer the young veteran wanting to sell the eye believes he will be able to buy food for his wife and three children, for right now $22 of his $36 weekly wage must go for rent.

Also, he will be able to do some cooking in the trailer, whereas at present his family can only sleep in the room. There are no cooking privileges. By cooking at home, he figures the grocery money will go farther. Far enough, possibly, to permit him to start paying on doctor's bills.

On his own since he was 12, this veteran has been used to making a living, but since he got out of the Army he's found the going tough. He's not skilled at any rate, his wife is in poor health, and wages haven't soared like rents and grocery prices.

He tried, he says, holding down two jobs at once, but there is a physical limit to what one person can do, even when spurred by the sight of his wife and children going without food.

There were two conditions he set when the Miami Daily News classified department brought him into the city room. He didn't want his name used because he was afraid his wife might see it. He also doesn't want charity.

He just wants to sell an eye to someone who needs a transplanted cornea, figuring if he can lick the rent problem he can make a living. He will take any kind of a job he can get that will pay enough to buy the groceries, and $36 won't do that with $22 going out for rent.

It's Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of February 2, 1947:

IT'S YOUR MONEY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

In 1913, the average American citizen worked for himself first and for the government second. Today, he works for the government first and for himself second.

In 1913, the American people paid $2,176,000,000 in taxes to local, State, and Federal governments.

This was divided between the governments as follows: $657,000,000 to the Federal tax collector, $300,000,000 to the States, and $1,219,000,000 to local outfits.

In those days, people didn't look to Washington for the solution of all their problems. They spent the most of their tax money building up cities and municipal services—parks, lighting systems, sewers, streets, etc., items they could use and realize on day by day.

In 1946, the American people paid $46,104,000,000 in taxes.

Of this, local government got $5,055,000,000 or roughly four and one-half times as much as in 1913. States got $4,529,000,000, which is slightly more than 15 times as much as they got in 1913.

The Federal Government's take in 1946 was $36,520,000,000.

That is more than 55 times as much money as the Federal Government took in taxes back in 1913.

It is your money the various governments across the Nation are collecting in taxes—$2,176,000,000 in 1913 and $46,104,000,000 in 1946. Our tax bill in full has gone up by that $2,176,000,000 figure about once every year and a half for 33 years, and the Federal Government has been the biggest hog at the trough all the way.

No wonder private property is fading from the American scene. No wonder a working man's goal is—not a home, not a bank account, not things to buy his wife and children—but freedom from debt to the Government.

The tax collector is the first man at the cash window in every American's business today.

Do you want it to go on that way? Do you think it should? Do you think it can be stopped? And do you realize what is going to happen unless it is stopped?

Of course, we will all be stripped of our last property, and that means our last shreds of independence, if the tax bill of the United States continues to go up for this next 33 years as it has so far in this twentieth century.

People are not free who work for the Government.

The Germans and the Japanese and the Russians have shown us that. The French and the British are now discovering it for us and for themselves, all over again.

The only reason the tax bill goes up, naturally, is that the governments we tolerate here spend our money faster and faster and faster.

We have just come through a world war in which our Federal Government alone spent $400,000,000,000—dollars belonging to the American people, wealth of the American people.

Common sense would say that after such a maniacal spending spree as that, even the Federal Government would be willing to taper off for a while.

But last month President Truman asked Congress to appropriate $37,500,000,000 for Federal spending in the next fiscal year—or nearly $2,000,000,000 more than he asked for the 1947 fiscal year.

Instead of down, he wants to spend up.

There is only one way to look at such a proposition: the Federal budget will have to be knocked to pieces by Congress if the people of this country are ever going to be allowed again to build their ownership of private property which means to build their independence again.

No man is independent when he is in debt to the Government. Nobody today is out of debt to the Government. We never will be until the tax collector's hot breath is off our necks. And that can't happen until spending slows.

It is the nature of government never to give up a power freely. Can you think of a case? Can you recall a single time any government ever declared of its own free will and without public pressure that it was doing unessential and unnecessary work?

That just doesn't happen.

Everything every one of our governments does, local, State, and Federal, will be defended as absolutely essential to public welfare, until the taxpaying public simply and flatly says "We won't pay for it."

The money involved is your money. Do you want to spend it your way or have the governments take it away from you and spend it their way?

That's the question right before us. Congress is working on just one side of it. The same principle applies to government wherever found, local, State, or Federal.

The taxpayer can decide for himself.

He can start now to recover his liberty to work for himself and his family, or in 10 more wild spending years of government we'll all be working for government not just most of the time, but all of the time. This is our last chance.

Are Federal Corporations a Threat to Free Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following debate on the Wake Up, America program between Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Congressman from Indiana, and myself:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

ARE FEDERAL CORPORATIONS A THREAT TO FREE ENTERPRISE?

(As debated by Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, Congressman, Fifteenth Congressional District New York; member of Committee on the Judiciary, and Samuel B. Pettengill, former Congressman from Indiana)

Mr. CELLER opens: "Federal corporations generally are a threat to free enterprise. However, there are Federal corporations which don't constitute a threat and which in the public interest should exist; for example, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That was inaugurated during the Republican Hoover administration. It supplemented the activities of the ordinary commercial bank. Banks will only grudgingly make loans on fixed or capital assets. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is geared, however, to make such loans over a long period. The RFC has made many constructive loans for the purpose of building and erecting railroads, buildings, etc. The Tennessee Valley Authority is another Federal corporation which has been a boon to farmers and other inhabitants of the Tennessee Valley. It has made possible cheaper electric power. To the farmers it has often made the difference between failure and success in their crops. During the war emergency it was necessary to set up the Metals Reserve Corporation and the Rubber Reserve Corporation, which should be liquidated. Sometimes emergencies arise during peacetime. We had such a situation which gave rise to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. During that time it was impossible to get mortgages on homes and foreclosures mounted rapidly. As soon as the emergency was over, it went out of business and went out with a profit, too. Subject to the limitations I have stated above, I would depreciate any growth of Federal corporations."

Mr. Pettengill challenges: "The RFC was conservatively run. Nevertheless, Congress wiped off a billion or two of its bad debts. This loss was, of course, saddled on privately owned enterprise. The TVA has made a good showing on paper only because it pays less in interest and taxes than private enterprise. The HOLC has gone out of business only because its functions were transferred to another alphabet agency. In 1945, it still showed $1,009,982,000 and was still collecting on 532,495 accounts. That it has or will make a profit is very doubtful."

Mr. CELLER replies: "Mr. Pettengill is rather isolated in his animadversions against the RFC. Perhaps his new Republican and big-business associates make him that way. Big business wants the RFC scrapped. That is understandable because the RFC primarily helps the little fellow. As for the TVA, I know of no Member of the House who would demand its termination. In fact, there is a great onrush on both sides of the aisle of the House to establish a Missouri Valley Authority. Big power companies continue high rates and extract high profits with little regard for the farmer needing cheap hydroelectricity for the economical running of his farm. The Government must step in where private power interests fail."

Mr. Pettengil opens: "Federal corporations are the first wave of socialization of business. They compete with business privately owned; they tax that business to make up their deficits; they discourage that business. With Federal corporations it is possible to socialize business as completely as in Russia. The proponents say, 'But we don't intend to go that far. We only intend to go so far.' When they say this, they admit such corporations are a threat to private business, a threat limited only by self-restraint of Government officials. Federal corporations have been organized to do what the Federal Government itself cannot do constitutionally. Promoters of socialization by deceit have gotten around the Constitution in some cases by organizing Federal corporations under State law—Delaware law—to engage in any business a private corporation may engage in. They avoid congressional scrutiny by getting authority to issue their own debentures and obtain funds on United States Government credit to finance their operations without asking Congress for annual appropriations. This gets around the control of the purse, one of the last weapons of free people to defend themselves from kings or bureaucrats. They fight to prevent their operations from being audited and exposed by the Comptroller General's office, which is an arm of Congress. The Tennessee Valley Authority is an example. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was organized in 1932 to operate in a limited field for 2 years only. Look at it now—the biggest bank in the world."

Mr. CELLER challenges: "To say Federal corporations are the first wave of socialization of business is to advance the age-old cry advanced when municipalities undertook operations of private water companies in the public interest. Mr. Pettengill complains that Federal corporations avoid congressional scrutiny. Congress receives reports from all Federal corporations any time it wishes. Mr. Pettengill should consider the effectiveness of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. John Q. Public is insured with saving deposits to $5,000. Banks formerly opposing the corporation idea now actively support it. Federal corporations should be the exception, not the rule. They should only be established when private industry cannot meet a public crisis or serve best public interest."

Mr. Pettengill replies: "I note Mr. CELLER's statement that Congress receives reports from all Federal corporations any time it wishes. This does not square with Comptroller Lindsay Warren, who has told Congress repeatedly of his difficulties with these agencies. It is one thing to get a report, often self-serving, and an independently certified audit. Warren says our Government has become bigger than its creator (Congress) and arrogantly snaps its fingers in its face. It was only after Mr. Truman became President that Senator BYRD's bill to stop some of this finger snapping became law."

The Two-State Oyster War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the observations made this morning over radio station WOL of Washington, by George F. Reedy, veteran newspaper reporter and widely known radio commentator. Mr. Reedy is known far and wide as a meticulous fact-getting veteran reporter and news commentator and his observations on the alarming situation between two of the Nation's States should be known to all of the citizens of the Nation.

All is quiet along the Potomac this morning. But behind the curtain of law and order, the forces of Virginia and Maryland are gathering for a final show-down. The climax may come this week.

The "two-State oyster war" has passed the stage of comic opera. It is a crucial issue, which already has been stamped in the minds of the local citizenry, by the rattle of gunfire—along the river.

The Virginia oyster fleet, which touched off the conflict by dredging for the bivalves, was kept in port over the week end by vigilant Maryland patrol boats mounting machine guns. So far, no one has been hurt but the omens for the future betoken no good.

The dangers inherent in the situation have been recognized by Charles M. Lankford, chairman of the Virginia Fisheries Commission. In a warning directed to the oystermen of his own State, he said flatly "that all Virginia fishing laws, would be enforced to the hilt."

His meaning was clear and simple. The Virginians must stop the dredging that has brought Maryland legislators to the boiling point.

But it is doubtful that his action will placate the house of delegates at Annapolis. That body shows no signs of backing down from its intention to pass a law, authorizing Maryland courts to try Virginians for breaking Free State fishing rules.

It seems strange that such a conflict can arise in the twentieth century. War between the States is somehow as outdated as the bustle.

Such battles were supposedly settled more than 150 years ago, when the founding fathers convened to write the United States Constitution. Could they return today and watch the two States fight, they would believe that their efforts had failed.

The Constitution was written to solve the same type of issue that has divided Virginia and Maryland. It was a document that supposedly ended for all time to come the battle of State against State.

Possibly the warring oystermen of Virginia and Maryland could profit by a study of the period prior to the Constitution.

At that time this country was governed by the Articles of Confederation—a loose agreement that gave almost absolute sovereignty to each of the 13 States.

While the rest of the world looked on in amazement, State fought State by every possible method. Open warfare was waged with tariffs, taxes, and guns.

The results were disastrous to the position of the United States in world affairs. England sarcastically asked whether it was supposed to send 1 ambassador or 13 ambassadors to this country. And all European nations openly ignored our rights in any question that arose anywhere.

An American of that period never referred to himself as an American. If he were questioned as to his homeland, he would say that he was a Virginian, or a Georgian, or a New Yorker.

Within a few short years our country had become an international laughing-stock. We were unable to pay our debts, either domestic or foreign, and our prestige had shrunk to an absolute low.

Only the enactment of the Constitution saved us from again becoming the colonies of an Old World power.

Of course, no one seriously expects the oyster war to bring this country to any such position again. It will be settled—and settled peaceably. But before the two States go too far it would be well for their leaders to remember that we went through this kind of a spree before.

It gained us nothing but a hangover that took some pretty drastic doctoring to cure.

The New Year and the Shipping Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, an important editorial by Mr. Stanley Ferguson, marine editor of the New York Journal of Commerce, appeared in that paper January 7, 1947. It is entitled "The New Year and the Shipping Industry." It is such a compact and constructive presentation of the principal problems facing the merchant marine as it enters the New Year that I felt all interested in our merchant marine should read it. Mr. Ferguson's broad knowledge of shipping, his earnest desire to be helpful to the industry, and his ability to write clearly and forcefully, make him one of the most influential friends the industry has. Therefore anything coming from him is worth serious consideration. The article follows:

THE NEW YEAR AND THE SHIPPING INDUSTRY

(By Stanley Ferguson)

Few years in the present century have confronted the American maritime industry with so many conflicting elements of promise and frustration as that we are now entering. For some sections of the industry it promises to be one of the best years within living memory, but for others the outlook is less rosy and for shipbuilders generally—as Gerrish Smith pointed out so graphically last week—it is bleaker than at any time since the depression and worse by far at the close of the First World War.

As in most industries, wage demands, strikes and the threat of strikes are forcing up costs to constitute the most worrisome problems at hand. With these the industry itself must deal as best it can, but where the outlook is worse, other factors weigh heavily and their resolution is beyond the power of the industry itself to achieve. With the domestic shipping lines the chief problem is rates. With the shipyards it is the painful lack of orders for new tonnage. Both of these problems are insoluble without Government aid.

A TEST IN STATESMANSHIP

One must acknowledge that the Nation's present shipping position presents the Eightieth Congress with a severe test in statesmanship, particularly with respect to policy on new construction. With such a vast surplus of ships on hand, and the urge for economy in Federal spending so general, the temptation will be strong indeed to cut very sharply any further Federal aid to new construction, if not indeed to end it altogether. The administration, itself, has already set a precedent in this respect by its cancellation last August of plans to build nine large passenger liners for the merchant marine.

Members of the Eightieth Congress will doubtless be greatly swayed by this temptation. But the question remains nevertheless—will the interests of economy actually be served if the Nation does abandon its long-range (50-ships-a-year) program to save money now? Any long-range view returns a negative answer. We tried it before with results now well known. By the late thirties our merchant fleet had grown obsolete as a unit.

However, this is far from the whole story. It is true that cancellation of the liner program and other merchant shipbuilding plans threatens to deprive our out-of-balance merchant marine of special types of vessels it needs. But the real threat is to the maintenance of an American shipbuilding industry. This vital industry, although moderately busy today, is facing virtual disintegration within a few months for lack of new orders. Its facilities are being dismantled, its staffs are being scattered, and its whole future obscured.

To permit an industry as vital as this to wither on the root, while shipyards abroad are booming, should be as unthinkable as to permit the aircraft or electrical industry to suffer the same fate. Yet, it no longer lies with this industry to save itself. Building costs here are so high that, left to itself, this industry would merely enter new fields of endeavor. Only direct Government orders, or orders sponsored by the Government through construction subsidies can prevent this deterioration, and only with the consent of Congress will it be possible to do it.

It is not necessary to embark upon a giant building program to prevent this dangerous relapse. What is required is a small building program, sufficient only to maintain a nucleus of know-how and experience and to keep shipyards here constantly abreast of all technological improvements. It might involve 50 ships a year and it might involve less. It is up to Congress to decide this, but decided it should be. Such a program would be economical, it would prevent obsolescence of the fleet as a unit, it would be prudent and it would be safe.

SUBSIDIES AND ECONOMY

Another field in which the temptation to cut expenses will doubtless prove strong is that of operating subsidies, which are being resumed this month by the Maritime Commission.

Even those Congressmen who may be sobered by the difficulties of the shipyards and domestic lines may wonder why the relatively successful offshore lines should receive subsidy aid at a time when they are doing so well financially, and here again it is essential that careful thought be given to the reasons why these payments are being made and why they should be continued without legislative impairment.

Operating subsidies are being paid out now not because they are needed today, but because they almost certainly will be required before many years have elapsed. These funds are disbursed by the Government under 10-year contracts—in good years as well as in bad. In busy times like these they constitute a reserve upon which the industry may draw when cargo and freight rates decline. If it should turn out at the expiration of these contracts that the subsidy aid was not needed, the funds will be recaptured by the Government. If, on the other hand, subsidy aid should be withdrawn or cut down now in the interest of economy, the

whole meaning of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act will be defeated and the loss of 10 years of hard-won gains will result.

A FIELD FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT

To an industry as individually minded as that of shipping, it is frustrating indeed to accept the obvious fact that so much of the future will be determined by the Government. But this is far from being a reason for passivity. On the contrary, it means the industry must show all the more vigor, imagination, and leadership in grappling with those problems it actually is able to solve by itself.

One task to which shipping could set itself with profit is that of improving its position in the estimation of the American public. That this position is not all it should be today is doubtless due to the defensive attitude the industry has been obliged to take on such matters as subsidies, surplus ship sales, wage demands, rates, and so on. Its needs and problems have been such that it has tended in self-justification to dwell more on its losses than on its gains and more on its difficulties than on its achievements.

Without depreciating in any way the extent of the problems with which the shipping industry must grapple, it may be questioned whether the net effect of this defensive attitude is precisely that intended. From the outside it does not seem to be. Too many complaints are more likely to produce impatience than sympathy in a country where "nothing succeeds like success" and one must inquire whether there have not indeed been too many. Nobody loves a poor relation and still less does anyone want to be treated as one. But the way to avoid such treatment is by not acting like one.

Some organizations—the American Merchant Marine Institute in particular—have striven nobly to counter this trend by highlighting the achievements of the American merchant marine in war and in peace, and it seems a propitious time to push this further. In the many fields where American shipping is today operating successfully, where it is competitively strong and prosperous, where it is developing new avenues of commerce and introducing new methods, its achievements should not be hidden on the theory that they will weaken the industry's position on subsidies and wages. These achievements and successes should, in fact, justify the Nation's confidence as expressed in the 1936 act. They indicate that 10 years of intelligent Government aid and private initiative have resulted in something a good deal more deserving of future support than failure.

Resurgence of the Old High Tariff Gang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very analytical article written by Robert L. Norton, entitled "On the Resurgence of the Old High Tariff Gang," appearing in the Boston Post of January 29, 1945.

ROBERT L. NORTON COMMENTS ON THE RESURGENCE OF THE GLD HIGH TARIFF GANG

WASHINGTON, January 28.—It is perfectly clear that a powerful movement is on foot in Congress to kill off the reciprocal-trade agreements and return to the old high protective tariff system which brought about such lamentable results with the Smoot-Hawley bill of evil memory.

HULL'S PROGRAM

While basically this campaign is fortified with Republican support, it does not lack Democratic proponents in the South. It is little concerned with partisanship or party principles since as far back as McKinley and Taft, the Republican Party initiated the idea that reciprocal trade would be a good thing for expanding American industry.

And, even then, there was a dim recognition of the fact that it would be a contributory factor to world peace, since most wars were started by the determination of nations, backed by superior military force, to grab economic power and trade advantage through territorial acquisition.

Now the fight is to ditch the great program built up mainly by former Secretary of State Hull, negate or cancel altogether the trade treaties, most of which do not expire until 1948, and restore the fixing of tariffs to Congress. Presently, there is pending negotiations with 18 countries under the terms of the reciprocal-trade pacts which will expire in June of next year, unless extended.

OLD ARGUMENT

The attempt now being made to sink the world-trade policy of the Government may be briefly summarized without entering into the complexities of the question. Primarily, it's a step backward toward what used to be called stand-pattism and economic isolation. All of the old-time arguments are advanced, the principal one being that with infinitely higher wage scales and cost of production, this country cannot compete with goods manufactured by other countries, thus holding the domestic market and maintaining the American standards of living.

The argument is entirely fallacious since this country is facing an entirely different situation with a world in economic chaos, and ruined industry in other countries struggling desperately to get on its feet, trying to feed and employ its peoples and restore some measure of stability after the frightful catastrophe of the war. In the circumstances the iron curtain set up by the Soviets is merely incidental to what would be involved should America once again return to iron tariff barriers.

It would be entirely inconsistent and destructive of our participation in the United Nations and would be the sure road to another world war which in this atomic age might result in extermination, if we are to take the word of cold-blooded scientists. The dire consequences, of which every thinking person is aware, and which at least excites an uneasy apprehension and fear in the consciousness of those who don't engage in deliberate reasoning, are too apparent to risk.

NOT ENTIRELY SELFISH

The reciprocal-trade treaties are no more perfect than any other human instrument devised by a government of men, yet beyond peradventure of contradiction they do represent a purpose to bring about some measure of economic stability in a distraught world, and restore world peace, if that be possible.

At the same time this philosophy, or policy, is not entirely unselfish so far as this country is concerned. It has in the background the sense that our own security is at stake. Also, it is demonstrable that the expansion of reciprocal-trade relations, rather than lowering our living standards and destroying industry would, in the long run, have just the opposite effect.

In practice, these agreements are entirely flexible to meet any situation which may develop in unfair competition with other countries, that is, unfair to the American worker, consumer, or any given industry. This has already been proven in the operation of agreements with South American countries and it is being worked out with Great Britain, which has been, and may still be, our chief competitor for world trade. There could be no worse buncombe than the Soviet propaganda decrying the joint imperialism of the western democracies, more particularly in the case of Britain and the United States.

SHAKY FOUNDATION

Whatever hope there may be of reconciling the democracies with Soviet Russia, aside from the great political problems which we are now encountering and which offer the main threat to world peace, lies in the establishment of friendly trade relations. It is only within the framework of these treaties that a free economy, such as we support and adhere to, can get along with totalitarian governments where all production, conditions of labor and basis of exchange of products is controlled by the state. If we can't do business with Russia on a reciprocal basis, as we now propose, then the prospect for agreement in the political field, for tolerance of our conflicting ideologies, for making the structure of the United Nations a potent force for world peace, rests on a shaky foundation.

It is to be noted that the assault on the reciprocal-trade treaties comes from the leftists in this country, as well as from what we used to refer to as reactionaries. Soviet propaganda in this country has the support of its fellow travelers and the organized Communists who are mainly interested in isolating capitalism in America by choking off a revival of international trade.

PERSONAL INTERESTS

On the other hand, Washington today is full of the agents of various high pressure and sectional groups, which in their attempts to break down the reciprocal-trade program, are interested in lower tariffs simply because they figure their own immediate profits are involved and without the slightest concern for the far-reaching consequences of a return to the old high protective system, a system which has become entirely obsolete under present world conditions.

It's a revival of sectionalism which is represented by Members of Congress of both parties, who are attempting to restore old time logrolling, and who are motivated entirely by the demands of industry and agricultural groups in their own districts.

It would seem to us that the opponents of the reciprocal-trade treaties are biting off their noses to spite their faces.

Surplus Property and Local Governmental Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I set forth below a statement on surplus property by the National Institute of Governmental Purchasing:

The NIGP, an organization representing State and local governmental purchasing agencies from coast to coast, is greatly disturbed by the continuing inaction of the War Assets Administration in making surplus property available to local governments, as required by the surplus-property law. Ever since the first Surplus Property Administrator took office, we have regularly appealed to the disposal agency for consideration of the needs and the rights of tax-supported units of government.

Despite one appeal after another, State and local governments are today as they have been for two long years thrust aside and held at arm's length, as though their needs were not worthy of attention by WAA. Yet State and local governments should stand in the forefront as logical outlets for the people's surplus property.

Recently General Littlejohn revealed some isolated abuses on the part of a few local governmental agencies. We join with him in condemning violations of the law. We believe that any persons who engage in such practices should be prosecuted. But the fact that out of 175,000 governmental agencies eligible to buy surplus some 38 to 50 have violated the law should not in any way affect the rights of the remaining 174,960 units.

The decontrol of prices places State and local governments at even a greater disadvantage than they were during the war. Governmental agencies are controlled by statutes. They spend the people's money. They cannot compete in a chaotic market for needed supplies for essential services, because they are bound by legal procedures, competitive bidding practices, and safeguards which, in normal times, protect the people's dollars. In times like these, buying competitors can take away goods from State and local governments simply by paying more. This situation reemphasizes the absolute necessity for the WAA to do everything in its power to enable tax-supported agencies to acquire those items of surplus that can be used in maintaining vital community services.

It is a national disgrace that publicly operated hospitals are without adequate bedding, linen, medical and surgical supplies while numerous quantities either remain in Federal warehouses or are being disposed of in such a manner as to make it impossible for the taxpayers' own governments to acquire them.

The maintenance of sanitary facilities is one of the most important of local governmental functions. Motor vehicles are used to do this job. But motor vehicle parts and equipment, urgently needed to replace worn-out units, are rusting away in stock piles, or unavailable to us.

There has been a steady increase in the national crime rate, but electronic equipment that would be of invaluable aid to police departments across the country cannot be acquired for the war against crime.

We have read stories of the fantastic sale of a huge quantity of machine-shop equipment as junk. From one end of the country to the other governmental agencies and school systems urgently need machine-tool equipment to modernize their facilities in order that they may do a more economical job for the taxpayers.

Now we witness a bland proposal that all priorities be scrapped. Such abandonment of priorities is pictured as a kind of decontrol, but it is nothing of the kind. Whatever its intent, its effect will be to sink the people's local governments beneath a mad scramble for surplus materials. It will give free reign to unscrupulous speculators and deprive local governments of supplies urgently needed for essential services. In September of 1944, at a hearing before the Senate War Investigating Committee, there was disclosed a sordid story of what happened when there were no priorities. We refer to the investigation of two companies, Worldwide Merchantile Corporation and Consolidated Industries; both agencies of one Irving Wexler, better known as Waxey Gordon.

We urge that General Littlejohn immediately appoint an advisory committee consisting of outstanding purchasing officials from State, city, and other local governmental agencies for the purpose of planning an intelligent, constructive program for making surplus available to tax-supported agencies performing public services, whose supporters are the taxpayers who bought them in the first place.

The time is passed for the WAA to give lip service to section 13 of the surplus-property law while bending all of its efforts toward disposal of war surplus through nongovernmental channels. Numerous hearings before committees of the Congress have shown repeated violations of the letter and spirit of section 13.

We believe that no greater benefit to the national economy can be derived from the war surplus accumulations than to make them available for the maintenance and improvement of essential public services in every State, county, and community in the United States.

An opinion of the Attorney General holds that it is legally proper for disposal authorities to distribute surplus real estate to local governments without charge. Congress clearly intended, when it enacted the surplus-property law, that the people's governments be given preference in the disposition of the people's property.

For 2 years now, the NIGP has earnestly sought only the obvious rights of the people's local governments, not special preferences. The reward for this conscientious approach to Washington authorities has been a ride on the Washington merry-go-round—the well-known Washington run-around. We have warned repeatedly of the potentials of national scandal. We believe that congressional investigating committees will ultimately show that there has been one.

There is still time, because there is still surplus, for State and local governments to procure materials for their people. The disposal authority must now awaken to the inescapable fact that State and local governments exist and will be vocal from this point on. We will no longer accept gobbledygook in place of surplus property. We rely upon the people's Congress to see to that.

(NOTE.—The term "local governments" as used herein includes State governments and all political subdivisions thereof.)

(The National Institute of Governmental Purchasing, Inc., is a nonprofit organization whose membership consists of public buying agencies of various levels of government in the United States and Canada, and is dedicated to improving governmental buying.)

Should We Reduce Taxes 20 Percent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article on taxes by one of the outstanding students of our economy, Chester D. Tripp, editor of the weekly Economic Trend Line Studies:

TAXES

Since the election, several Members of the Congress have asked me the questions: How does Economic Trend Line Studies view the tax adjustment proposed by some of the leaders of the Republican Party? Did we feel that an arbitrary 20 percent reduction should be made now, or should a program of reduced expenditures be worked out first and the tax reduction afterward?

Speaking for Economic Trend Line Studies, I replied that in my opinion the problem was too involved for a yes or no answer, but that I strongly favored working out reductions in expenses before reducing taxes.

Let me develop this point of view in some detail, because, if I am not mistaken, what we do on taxes and when we do it, is going to have profound economic consequences.

Certainly there should be very little illusion, and not too much disagreement, about taxes as such. Taxes are necessary. No organized society can operate without the public expenditure of money. However, any tax reduces and distorts the buying power of the individual or group paying it.

For instance, a farmer raises and sells 100 bushels of wheat. He has incurred the necessary expense and has performed the necessary work. If his minimum income tax, say, is 20 percent, he enjoys the proceeds of only 80 bushels. Again a workman puts in 40 hours a week and with his income tax being a minimum of 20 percent, he is in effect donating 8 hours a week to his Government, during which time he must maintain himself at his own expense.

Examples can be cited for all classes of society, but the above shows that the tax bill, whatever it is, reduces the national spendable income with which the national product in theory must be purchased. In a sense, taxes produce a deflation gap, as it were, which is relatively as large as the tax imposed. If the tax bill is nominal and wisely spread, the effect of the deflation is unnoticed, but if the tax bill is substantial (and it is more than substantial today) a deflationary force is set up that in time may be devastating. These observations are as sure as death and taxes and is the reasoning that prompts my observation that a yes-or-no answer to the question of what to do on taxes and when to do it is insufficient.

A discussion of some of the background of the present scene might throw some light on this question. We are enjoying a national product of something over $190,000,000,000. This goal requires the employment of on toward sixty million people. The question that comes to my mind is: Are we tooled up to carry on any such activity with any degree of efficiency with the equipment that is available?

Compared with 1939, today's national production is up 67 percent. The scramble for production tools is simply enormous. I doubt if it has yet dawned on the public or even on our legislators that this scramble for capital goods and production facilities is simply a mass effort to get tools and the means to carry on a more efficient national production. The facilities of the country are just not geared up to the job it faces. If we are to maintain our goal, therefore, literally billions of dollars must be poured into the production of capital goods to be used to produce the necessary national production. The resources to purchase these capital goods must be created out of savings, either of the past or the present, and these savings must be measured after taxes.

It is a fact that billions of dollars were spent on production facilities during the war, but, to a substantial degree, these wartime facilities mean little in terms of peace production. Where our Government spent money for war facilities that are currently of use for peace production, our tool inventory was improved. However, the tens of billions of dollars that went into emergency shipbuilding facilities, emergency airplane facilities, uneconomic metallurgical or synthetic-rubber facilities, and the like, represent not only relatively useless tool inventory, but also represent a liability in liquid assets on the balance sheet of the Nation which are in a sense an option on future production which has not yet been arranged for.

We are today producing great quantities of overpriced material. This is only stopgap production in that any decline in demand would price it out of the market, thus deflating production enormously. This great quantity of marginal or stopgap production can only be made into efficient production by the retooling of our capital equipment and such retooling can only be done by the plowing back of savings and profits into capital equipment. It is evident that the influence of taxation on the status of our capital goods is exceedingly important, and it is a serious question whether the tax-take at the present time has not far overreached logical proportions.

There are several angles to the problem that would warrant a little exploration. The American public is well pleased that the pipe lines of industry are filling up, that inventories are growing, and goods are becoming available. For the moment, we like that. It accounts in a large measure for our full employment, it is easier for the housewife, and day after day the problems of the purchasing agents of industry are simplified. As of the first of this year, however, the inventories of the country reached the astounding figure of 36 billion dollars and they are currently growing at the rate of something like 15 billion dollars a year. We might add in this connection, that these inventories are becoming a part of our supply accounts, with wholesale commodity prices 82 percent higher than they were in 1939. Buying and consuming is proceeding at a high pitch, and the demand is being satisfied, somewhat regardless of price, as indicated by the 82-percent price increase, and at the same time, as I said, we are building inventory at the rate of 15 billion dollars a year.

Obviously, the building of this inventory has been an enormous stimulant to production and employment. It compares favorably in volume with the artificial stimulation that we experienced during World War I, for war purposes. It represents the employment of millions of people and is supplying these people with purchasing power for further buying. Let us have no illusions, however. This inventory buying is bound to taper off. The pipe lines in time will be filled, in some cases to overflowing, and, when that day comes, the incident of the present tax-take may be catastrophic. Too many fleas can kill any dog and too much taxation can break any economy.

Before going into any general question of tax reduction, let us examine one of the dangerous features of our present practice. I have drawn attention to the fact that the outstanding need of a sound economy over the next few years is the creation of enormous quantities of capital goods necessary to attain efficient national production. In the past, we have depended to a great extent for this contribution on the little businessman, the new blood of the economy, the young fellow that has know-how or bright ideas, and wants to put them into effect. In past years he could easily put his brain child to work if he stood well in his community. The savings of his friends and neighbors helped him to buy the necessary tools and equipment. We will never realize to what extent this country has depended for its high living standards on the steady emergence of small business into big business. What are today's chances for such undertakings? In the first place, the hardest money in the world to get is money to be invested in fixed assets and the smaller the business the harder it is to get such funds. Our method of taxation has done more to impede progress along this line than any one thing that modern tax technique has accomplished.

Let me illustrate what is actually happening today. Two or three promising young men may need a hundred thousand dollars to exploit some brain child or experience. It may be some patent, or some new industrial technique. To try the scheme out in the big, cold world involves, let us say, the raising of $100,000. This $100,000, or a large part of it, is to be invested in fixed assets. The local banker tells our group that such undertakings are beyond his province. He simply extends temporary and self-liquidating accommodation as he is a commercial banker and cannot face the risk of having his funds tied up in long-time commitments.

The banker may suggest that they seek private money for the undertaking in mind. Our group in seeking private money finds that they must either take small amounts from a great many individuals or a larger amount from some entrepreneur whose business it is to analyze and take such risks. Contact with the larger group for small amounts is made very complicated by our SEC requirements and blue-sky regulations. The cost to raise small amounts of capital makes such a procedure almost out of the question.

Our group tries to interest some capitalist in the neighborhood in the scheme of supplying the front-end money for the new undertaking. They propose a corporation and offer to give the entrepreneur an interest in their capital structure for his hundred thousand dollars. In earlier days the scheme would have been a possibility. If investigation showed promise the money might be arranged for and the undertaking launched. Under present taxation methods it is a different story. The chances are the entrepreneur would not even waste time discussing it. He would simply observe that no matter how good the scheme was or how promising the personnel, he was forced by the tax laws of the land to put his money into tax-exempt bonds, because, considering the ordinary risks of business, the tax laws interfere with the group returning his principal, to say nothing of profit, no matter how well the undertaking worked out.

Why is this the case? In the first place, if the new corporation was a success 40 percent of its profits would be the Government tax-take. Sixty percent of the profits would remain for buying new tools and for paying a return on the capital involved. If half the 60 percent was used for paying dividends a very large percent would again be captured in taxes. The man who puts up the venture-capital to make the undertaking possible would find that if he had a taxable income on $100,000 for the year less than 8 cents of the earned dollar of the new venture would remain in his possession after the corporation and his individual taxes had been paid. We find that the normal sources of money for little business has been relegated to the sidelines and it has happened through a system of double taxation that the public little understands or has any realization of the consequences.

I have not drawn this illustration with any intent of arguing a better deal for the entrepreneur. I am simply discussing the economics of the situation whereby we have closed the door to possible expansion in business activity which the continuity of the American way of life demands be left open.

For some time the economic trend-line studies have indicated a deflationary trend developing in the economy. On a short-time basis, this trend could be accelerated, and I am sure if minor collapsing tendencies begin to appear, the tax burden will exaggerate them enormously. On the other hand, the Government's tax-take must be great enough to meet expenses and it seems only logical that in periods of high industrial production, there should be excess tax-take for debt retirement, as, in this way, our artificially produced bank deposits are reduced. But this policy should not be followed too ardently until a normal economy is reasonably established.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that the first logical step is to drastically reduce expenses as far as possible; second, make reductions where double taxation is unduly penalizing the creation of new capital goods; third, reduce the individual tax burden pro rata and as much as possible in light of the balance between expenditure and income; and finally, set up machinery that will still further reduce the tax burden in case strong deflationary tendencies become evident when our pipe lines are filled and cut-backs in production become mandatory.

The present problem corresponds with trying to repair an old shingled roof. Every move made exposes new trouble and brings to light new difficulties. Whatever we do now in taxation is simply a repair job. The country has a crying need for a new tax structure that will eliminate road blocks to the economy or at least reduce them to minimum proportions. Such machinery should incorporate the idea of a flexible tax structure that would allow heavy taxation in active times and be easily and quickly reduced in times of depression. Let us keep in mind that the taxing technique has unbounded possibilities to distort or even cripple the economy.

CHESTER D. TRIPP.

Montana Senate Joint Memorial on Foot-and-Mouth Disease in Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a senate joint memorial adopted by the Montana State Legislature with reference to the current outbreak in Mexico of foot-and-mouth disease. Residents of all the great livestock-raising States of the West are justifiably alarmed at the spread of this disease among Mexican cattle. The memorial follows:

Senate joint memorial to the Congress of the United States petitioning the Congress to strengthen present sanitary requirements governing the importation of livestock and livestock products, and to appropriate additional funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, in order that border inspection may be strengthened and a system of patrol established along the northern boundary of Mexico to guard against the importation of people, animals and material carrying the infection of foot-and-mouth disease, and also petitioning Congress to offer to the Government of the Republic of Mexico such facilities as may be available from the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, and appropriating money for such facilities and to extend financial aid to the Republic of Mexico in order that foot-and-mouth disease may be eradicated

To the President of the United States and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas foot-and-mouth disease now exists in livestock in the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas the disease has spread from the six original States involved in the vicinity of Mexico City as far west and north as the State of Zacatecas; and

Whereas it is extremely doubtful if the Government of the Republic of Mexico can eradicate the disease from their livestock without additional assistance; and

Whereas the presence of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico presents a very definite threat to the prosperity of the livestock industry and the entire economic welfare of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to strengthen the present sanitary requirements governing the importation of livestock and livestock products from Mexico and from other countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists; be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly petition Congress to appropriate additional funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture in order that border inspection may be strengthened and a system of patrol be established along the northern boundary of Mexico to guard against the importation of people, animals and materials carrying the infection of foot-and-mouth disease; be it further

Resolved, That we petition and urge the Congress of the United States to offer to the Government of the Republic of Mexico such facilities and assistance as may be available from the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, and to appropriate funds to provide for this assistance and to provide direct financial aid to the government of the Republic of Mexico in order that foot-and-mouth disease be eradicated from their livestock; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this joint memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Secretary of State, the Honorable Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana with the request that they bring this matter forcibly to the attention of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Defeat in Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Felix Morley:

[From Human Events of January 22, 1947]

DEFEAT IN VICTORY

(By Felix Morley)

The Polish elections last Sunday, held under conditions which forced three official protests from Washington and three from London, give extraordinary timeliness to Jan Ciechanowski's book Defeat in Victory, published by Doubleday & Co. this week.

This fascinating account of the former Polish Ambassador's wartime mission in Washington is background for the travesty of democracy enacted in the Soviet puppet state on January 19. It will help to prepare the reader for the eventual show-down on the betrayal of Poland. But great as is the importance of Mr. Ciechanowski's book in the field of international relations, it is even greater for Americans concerned with the preservation of their own form of government.

In his day-by-day account of how the Polish Republic was destroyed by its own allies, the wartime spokesman of that Republic in the United States inevitably reveals a part of the contemporary degradation in Washington. It is that secondary accomplishment which makes Defeat in Victory required reading for Americans. A corner of our own iron curtain is raised to give a glimpse of the New Deal as it actually operated. The story of mental and moral bankruptcy under President Roosevelt is not agreeable reading. Nevertheless, "murder will out" and we can be grateful to a distinguished European for his specific evidence on much which has heretofore been gossip.

To Mr. Ciechanowski the wartime betrayal of the American people is an incidental matter. His interest centers on our official contribution to the destruction of his country, and that story is appalling. But the way in which President Roosevelt helped to ruin Poland cannot be told without some consideration of his domestic politics. The revelations, with names and dates and places, are sufficient to give many a lead both to a conscientious Congress and to impartial historians.

How Poland was sold down the river is told in straightforward manner, with a humor which does much to relieve the tragedy. There is a wry smile in such incidents as the one in which Roosevelt is reported urging the Polish leaders to keep their shirt on while they were being dexterously disrobed of everything except their honor.

II

Defeat in Victory opens with Mr. Ciechanowski presenting his credentials to the President on March 4, 1941, when he began his second assignment as the ranking envoy of Poland to the United States—the earlier post was from 1925 to 1929. The book closes with the withdrawal of those credentials, as the first official act of James F. Byrnes as Secretary of State, on July 5, 1945. The intervening pages tell the story of how Poland was made a vassal of Soviet Russia. The author makes few editorial comments. He lets the facts speak for themselves.

It was during this initial interview, the United States being still officially neutral, that Mr. Roosevelt in effect told Ciechanowski to urge Americans, especially Polish-Americans, to scrap neutrality. His deep feeling for Americans of Polish descent, he told the Ambassador jovially, was "not merely because they voted for me so overwhelmingly in the last three elections." Also in March 1941, General Sikorski was allegedly requested to arouse Polish-Americans against the neutrality legislation which Mr. Roosevelt was under oath to uphold.

The sequel to these devious tactics came during the 1944 election campaign when, as Mr. Ciechanowski points out, the Polish-Americans had good reason to fear that President Roosevelt was planning to surrender their fatherland to Communist control. At that time the Ambassador was frequently asked * * * by election agents of the New Deal his opinion of the most appropriate way to obtain the support of what they called the Polish vote for the Democratic machine.

Mr. Ciechanowski then relates how, a week before the 1944 Presidential election, Mr. Roosevelt saw Charles Rozmarek, chairman of the Polish-American Congress in Chicago and definitely promised him to take active steps to insure Poland's independence. Mr. Rozmarek, the Ambassador noted, immediately thereafter made a public statement fully endorsing the Democratic ticket.

The joker was that just 3 weeks earlier, in Moscow, Prime Minister Mikolajczyk, of Poland, had been told by Molotov, in the presence of United States Ambassador Averell Harriman, that Mr. Roosevelt had already surrendered to Stalin. In Ciechanowski's dramatic words:

"At this point Molotov made a surprising statement. He said that he saw it was necessary to remind those present that at Teheran President Roosevelt had expressed his complete agreement with the Curzon Line as the Polish-Soviet frontier and regarded it as a just solution which should be satisfactory both to the Soviet Union and to Poland, and that the President had merely added that, for the time being, he preferred his agreement on this point should not be made public.

"Molotov added that he thought it useful to bring this matter up. He then turned to Churchill and Harriman and challenged them to deny his statement if they considered it inconsistent with the truth, 'because it appears to me,' he said, 'that Mr. Mikolajczyk is not aware of this fact and is still in doubt regarding the position of America on this subject.'

"Molotov paused dramatically for a while to see whether Churchill, Eden, or Harriman would take up his challenge, and when it became evident that they were not prepared to do so, the conversation switched."

III

As the former Polish Ambassador points out, it was the function of OWI to make the American people believe the interests of Poland were being safeguarded even as that country was actually being made over into a Soviet puppet. Defeat in Victory gives illustrations of the extraordinary manner in which this agency undermined our diplomacy.

When Russia broke diplomatic relations with the Polish Government-in-Exile, on April 26, 1943, Mr. Ciechanowski, in an interview on this crisis with Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, drew the special attention of the latter "to the necessity of curbing the exaggerated pro-Soviet tendency of OWI propaganda at this delicate moment."

Mr. Welles, says Ciechanowski, "promised he would try to do so."

In the end the Ambassador realized that he had been too scrupulous for his country's good, under the rules as rigged by the New Deal. In his last official statement, July 5, 1945, Mr. Ciechanowski admitted:

"As long as the war lasted, the Polish Government itself contributed to this regrettable blackout of true facts concerning Polish-Soviet relations for the sake of Allied unity so essential to the common victory."

On the deceit surrounding the United Nations the Ambassador does permit himself a little open indignation. He is sardonic over the story that Mr. Roosevelt "invented the formula of the United Nations" which he "personally carried to one of the White House bathrooms, where Mr. Churchill spluttered his soapy approval." He calls the draft charter which emerged from Dumbarton Oaks "a caricature of democracy in international relations." And on the actual launching of the United Nations, at San Francisco, Mr. Ciechanowski comments:

"The illusory 'unity' of the Big Powers, determined to dominate the postwar world, was being laboriously achieved at the price of

fundamental principles of justice and democracy, sacrificed to that precarious 'unity'."

The Ambassador is also pardonably sarcastic over the conduct of American diplomacy during the regime of Mr. Stettinius, who "appeared to me to regard foreign relations as a mixture of publicity and propaganda." There is a painful passage in which Stettinius, then Under Secretary, confesses that he felt "very bewildered," and beseeches the Polish envoy's advice as to "the best line for him to follow."

But Stettinius is not long depressed. Seeing the unfortunate Mikolajczyk off from the Washington airport, after the Premier's futile visit to Washington in June 1944, Stettinius turns to Ciechanowski and exclaims, so the latter recounts: "Our friend Stan is a regular guy, and we shall do all we can to help in his undertaking."

IV

As the basis of a libretto for a musical comedy, Defeat in Victory would be a wow. There are wonderful wisecracks, as when Harry Hopkins is quoted as saying: "After all, what does it matter? The Poles are like the Irish. They are never satisfied with anything, anyhow."

But the factual diary of the former Polish Ambassador unfortunately does not picture an imaginary Throttlebottom regime, set off with a luscious chorus and designed to provide a relaxing evening. This book is the report of a responsible insider on what transpired in Washington while 300,000 American boys were dying with the assurance that they gave their lives to make a better world.

Between the lines of Mr. Ciechanowski's book, much that has mystified becomes more clear. From it one can understand why Secretary Byrnes resigned. The cruel responsibility for our new Secretary of State is now the drafting of a treaty for Germany which must seek to conceal the shameful wrong which has been done to Poland. Under the unhappy Churchill-Roosevelt formula the Russian robberies would be offset by awarding the Poles purely German territory which they do not want. The Polish underground fully recognizes that this arrangement would perpetuate Poland's dependence on Russian direction and support.

Defeat in Victory gives the most naive reader a glimpse of the problem which is shaping up. Before long the Senate will have before it a treaty which will inferentially recognize American acquiescence in the atrocious Polish "settlement." There will then be no Roosevelt glamor and no OWI further to conceal and obscure the issue. In the cold light of the morning after, the Senate will either have to ratify a treaty which destroys every principle for which the war was fought, or else will have to reject it, ending all pretense of Allied unity.

As the former Polish Ambassador makes clear, any White House leadership worthy of the name could have avoided the dismal swamp of disillusionment which must now be traversed. It was the New Deal achievement to miss every intelligent solution, yet successfully to postpone the day of reckoning for Mr. Roosevelt's unhappy successor.

Management-Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, as the Eightieth Congress sets about its tasks, perhaps the major domestic legislative concern is that of management-labor relations. I shall be happy to cast my vote to break down labor monopolies and to restore again the rightful relationships of labor and management. There must not prevail in this country a monopoly of labor, and I am as zealous as any man on this floor to see that proper legislation is passed to correct these abuses which grew from ill-advised political labor effort during the last 15 years.

As we set about the task of correcting these abuses, that have been brought about by bad legislation, giving labor distinct advantages, we must not overlook other phases of the Nation's well-being, not the least of which is the threat to independent small business.

Sometimes I wonder if the American people really want the antitrust laws fully enforced. Surely, if they want this done, if they desire to maintain free competitive enterprise, then we must begin at once a fight against the monopolistic practices in our country, because these practices are threatening the welfare of free enterprise, a cherished freedom of our people, and certainly are stopping the forward march of all independent small businesses.

It is necessary to begin at once the enforcement of antitrust laws. The Congress must make appropriations adequate for the enforcement, and in all probability it is essential that we introduce and pass additional laws to stop this concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands. We have not become fully alarmed by its present-day proportions. It has been tremendously accelerated during the war and under the last administration, even though the leader of that administration spoke so fervently about the Tories, driving the money changers from the temple, the people's rendezvous with destiny, economic royalists, and the lower one-third.

The people are not aroused to this danger because of the slow, creeping process that characterizes monopolistic growth, while they do become incensed immediately at a Nation-wide railroad strike or a coal strike. The people are demanding that there be legislation passed immediately to curb labor autocracy. They are not fully informed on what transpires in the capital structures. Yet little by little small business is being crowded to the wall. Men with limited capital today have little opportunity to engage in the established businesses of this country.

These incessant demands for curbs upon the power of labor are heard on every side and I, for one, want these curbs to prevail. But at the same time I am desirous—and equally desirous—that we appropriate sufficient funds to enforce antitrust laws against business monopolies.

Labor, no doubt, is making its excessive demands because it appreciates that monopoly in the capitalistic groups is gradually becoming a power almost unmanageable. To say that labor unions shall be restrained—and I say they should be restrained—while the march of monopoly is allowed to continue, is bound to result in the abandonment of industrial democracy.

We cannot—if we are to live and hold to the practices so long considered the fundamentals of our country—allow either monopoly of labor or monopoly of capital to crowd out the independent small businessman. This is a matter for serious consideration at the hands of the Congress at this very hour.

National Defense and National Reputation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address recently delivered by the Honorable William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, before the Twenty-first Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense at Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

An estimate I have received from the Government Printing Office indicates that the address will occupy three and one-third pages of the RECORD, and will cost $236.67.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have dedicated this conference to the subject of national defense. I shall dedicate this talk to the theme of national defense of a new type—a type that is far less understood by the American people than is the atomic bomb.

Military experts say there is no effective defense against the new weapons of war. They are, of course, right. There is no military defense. But there is another, a greater defense, that is not military. We must build that defense, and we must build it now, while there is yet time.

If we cannot surely rely on guns and ships, on airplanes and bombs, what other hope is open to us? The constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization declares: "Wars begin in the minds of men, and it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." Is it in fact possible, by constructing defenses in the minds of men, to progress toward national security that is real and lasting?

The use of facts and ideas, as well as oceans and battleships and tanks, is new to the American people when they think of their national defense. But in the war our Army and Navy learned how potent facts and ideas can be. In cooperation with the Office of War Information, they developed what were called PW units—units dedicated to psychological warfare.

One incident may demonstrate the power of psychological warfare. Marquis Kido, who as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal was an adviser to the Emperor of Japan, has testified that the Emperor had access to the monitoring service on our Voice of America broadcasts in the Japanese language. The Emperor had himself picked up our leaflets

on the palace grounds. The effect of our information activities, and their potential effect on the Japanese people—Marquis Kido's evidence shows—was a positive factor in the decision to issue the Imperial Rescript, which announced Japan's surrender, over the opposition of powerful forces which wanted to fight it out to the bittter end. These broadcasts and leaflets may have saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys. Our ideas were thus weapons, perhaps more powerful than any battleship or task force. The war provides us with countless examples of the power of ideas as weapons.

But I am not here to talk about psychological warfare. That, we hope, is behind us. The value of projecting facts and ideas—honest and unvarnished facts, fair and balanced ideas—can be as great in peace, as a measure of national security, as in war as a weapon of offense. The weapons of the war can be forged into the tools of the peace. This we must do, and now. Among the leading nations, it is only the United States that fails to accord recognition to the power of facts and ideas in time of peace as in war.

We Americans know much about our Navy, the most powerful in the world; about our Air Force; our billions of dollars in gold in the vaults in Kentucky; about our Detroits and Pittsburghs. As a people we know little about the power of our ideas in their potential influence over other peoples. We have as yet shown little faith in their capacity to gain understanding throughout the world for our democratic government and our way of life.

Do we want friends throughout the world? Does having friends not minimize the risk of war? Are they not assets in time of crisis?

We have all of us seen in our own lives, and in the life of our Nation, what a tremendous asset friends can be. We know too that without friends no possible action or policy can bring us permanent security.

Thus it is not merely our economic policy that can achieve the kind of world in which the chance for peace is enhanced and the risk of war is minimized. It is not merely the fear of our military power that can prevent attack upon us. It is also knowledge of what we are and what we do, of our ideas and our intentions; in a word, our reputation. And it is knowledge of our everyday lives that counts as well as our high policy, for one explains the other; knowledge of the high school in Des Moines and the farm in Indiana, of the small factory in upstate New York as well as the big shipyard in California; of the country weekly in Virginia as well as the glossy magazine out of New York; of our churches, with their 68,000,000 membership, our free unions, our multifarious civic organizations.

Congress is becoming increasingly aware of the importance of our national reputation. Senator WILEY has just introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a Department of Peace, under a Secretary of Peace having Cabinet rank. The Secretary of Peace would concentrate the maintenance of peace through promoting better understanding among the peoples of the world of each other, and thus promoting international cooperation; and through advancing freedom of the press and through throwing the weight of moral force behind the removal of international frictions and misunderstandings.

Congressman DIRKSEN has introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a Peace Division in the Department of State, under an Assistant Secretary of Peace, to study the cause and cure of war and develop a philosophy of peace based upon such study.

I know and admire both Senator WILEY and Congressman DIRKSEN. Congressman DIRKSEN, during the war, testified on behalf of the OWI, reporting his observations on a trip overseas, with an eloquence and persuasiveness that demonstrated both his insight and his courage.

I have not seen or talked to either Senator WILEY or Congressman DIRKSEN since their bills were introduced. Can it be they are kidding the State Department? Or is it that they feel the State Department is so remiss in its obligations that the only hope is new legislation of the type they propose? I am grateful to them for these bills, which may focus the attention of Americans on what the role of their State Department must be.

For surely a main function of the Department of State should be that of Senator WILEY's proposed Department of Peace: to foster the kind of world environment that minimizes the risk of war. If it does not do this, it should be, in fact, reoriented in viewpoint by legislation or otherwise. And it is my area of the Department that is specifically responsible for advancing understanding among peoples and helping to construct the defenses of peace in the minds of men. Here, I agree with what is implicit in these bills; the job is being done inadequately, and on a pathetically small scale; and here you women and your organization can help greatly if you will.

As Senator VANDENBERG recently pointed out, national defense requires constant vigilance. It requires also a constant revaluation of the elements that make up our security. Today the elements that compose our defense are shifting so rapidly that they demand the coolest, wisest thought of which we are capable.

To the men of Jefferson's day, as in McKinley's, the phrase "national defense" has meant the defense of our shores against armed attack. It has evoked the picture of an isolated America, warning a hostile world not to trespass. If such a negative concept was ever justified—and it probably was—it is not justified now. The concept of the GAR can no longer be that of the DAR. National defense must today be a positive concept; and you have shown, in the structure of this conference, that you recognize it as a positive concept.

Two new facts of international life, closely related, should produce an overwhelming impact on our conception of national defense.

One fact is the revolution that has taken place in our foreign policy within the last 5 years. That revolution is so profound that we have not fully adjusted our emotions, our actions—or our appropriations—to it, though with our minds we recognize it to be inevitable and irreversible. Our national defense is today the defense of law and justice throughout the world. We are committed specifically to resist aggression wherever it may occur. We are committed generally to a concern with the well-being of peoples everywhere, not for reasons of altruism but in our own interest and for our own protection.

Two weeks ago tonight in Cleveland, former Secretary Byrnes said, "As a great power and as a permanent member of the Security Council, we have a responsibility, veto or no veto, to see that other states do not use force except in defense of law." Secretary Byrnes has been widely praised for that statement. Contrast that with our Neutrality Act of 1939 and you will see what a revolution has taken place in our thinking.

The second new fact of international life is that the instruments of modern war have become so horrible that, if war comes again, it is likely that nobody will win, and almost certain that everybody will lose. The prime objective of national defense is thus to prevent war and at the same time establish justice. That is the task of statesmanship. That is a task to which we are only beginning to be adjusted. That is a task which we do not yet fully understand; and a task on which you women and your organizations are singularly fitted to take leadership.

In our American view, the chief function of the armed forces is to discourage aggressors in advance. We employ force only as a last resort. The dilemma today is that the resort to force may be a last resort, indeed—and for all of us. The victor at the next peace table, if there is still a table, may represent a country with its own cities and civilization virtually destroyed. Such would be no victory, except to the few left alive who can hollowly proclaim, "We have won again."

This dilemma, coupled with our new world-wide commitments, requires us to search for, and to develop as we never did in the past, techniques of national defense in which the risk of resort to naked force is reduced to the absolute minimum.

Fortunately there is a wide range of techniques between the hope for a moral millennium on the one hand, and the resort to force on the other. The American people, as a whole people, have never before had to study and master them. We are now moving to expand and improve our diplomatic corps, a move which should have been made many years ago. We have been reshaping our foreign economic policies. We have shared in the invention and the creation of the United Nations, and its specialized agencies, as wholly new instruments of national defense, in the positive sense of that term. And we are beginning the effort to assure that foreign peoples understand us—understand our people, understand our problems, our policies, and the national life from which these policies spring.

This afternoon you discussed the strengthening of national defense by strengthening democracy at home. It is true that great empires have succumbed from internal decay as often as from extended attack. What I want to stress tonight is the impact abroad of our domestic policies.

Our position as the leading world power makes our domestic, internal activities important to the entire world. How we live, what we do, may affect everyone. Therefore we are objects of intense curiosity. That curiosity symbolizes both the penalty and the opportunity of leadership. It is a new phenomenon. In the nineteenth century older civilizations looked upon us—when they looked at all—as a kind of child prodigy. Their curiosity about the adult is accompanied by many strange and sometimes massive misconceptions. Evidences of these misconceptions flow across my desk in a constant stream.

Perhaps the most widespread and damaging misconception abroad about the United States is that the American economy is sure to prove highly unstable and not to be depended on. Foreign peoples remember the world depression of the thirties as an economic nightmare that had its origin in the United States. Perhaps the greatest single obstacle today to foreign response to our leadership in many parts of the world is fear of economic collapse in the United States. This fear of an American economic break-down is more acute among many foreign peoples who desperately crave security than it is here. They fear that if they tie themselves in with our economy, or emulate our methods, they will commit themselves to boom and bust.

Foreign peoples find it hard to understand, or properly appreciate, the strength and vitality of the American economy, even during a set-back. One hundred years of Marxist indoctrination about the inevitable and bloody collapse of the capitalist system has not made understanding easier.

It is claimed against us that we cannot attain stable employment and high production in peacetime, or that we are firmly in the grip of a growing system of monopoly, or that our system must lead to world-wide economic imperialism. For some countries,

our strikes are dramatized as national disasters—the beginning of the end—even though they affect only a small fraction of our work force.

The moral here for us, in the economic area, is twofold. First, it is in our national interest that we project to peoples abroad the facts of our economic life fully, steadily, accurately, and deliberately, and by every means at our disposal. We can see to it that our reputation is no worse than the facts justify.

The other half of my dual moral is that we must in fact strengthen our democracy—and thus our prestige, our leadership, and our security. There is still truth in the old adage, "What you are speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say." Our efforts will be watched abroad with bated breath. Can we temper the excesses of the business cycle? Can we solve our labor problems?

We cannot blame the French for worrying about our economics when an American coal strike can bring French industry grinding to a halt; or the British, when their meager bread ration is threatened; or the Italians, when their reconstruction program is endangered. Can we steadily expand our production, provide basic security for our people, insure equality of economic opportunity, and at the same time maintain our traditional freedoms?

Can we, in short, put into practice what we have learned since 1929? Of course, we will continue to have some fluctuation. But there is a new spirit in America, and we do have the knowledge, and the power, to take steps that will avoid the extremity of boom and bust, if we have the will.

As we succeed, and as understanding of our progress spreads, it will be no local triumph. It will be a success that will help determine the shape of the future of the world. And it will bear heavily on our national defense, as that term should be broadly and positively conceived.

Tomorrow you will hear about the military aspect of our defense, and the military responsibilities we have assumed through our membership in the United Nations.

This is still a poor world we live in, morally, educationally, and in mutual understanding among peoples. Physical force is still the ultimate arbiter. Sometimes it lies very close beneath the surface of negotiations. Secretary Byrnes emphasized, in several of his public statements last year, that it is unrealistic to think that your words will carry weight in an international conference unless you have force to back them up.

The United States was catapulted into its present position of world leadership—somewhat reluctantly and to its own surprise—not because of its virtue but because of its economic, technological, and military strength. Despite the reservoir of good will we have in many parts of the world, you would be disappointed, if you sat where I sit, to find that respect for our good works, and admiration for our moral or spiritual leadership, lags far behind the knowledge of our economic power and military might.

I am not minimizing the value of a reputation for strength. It is a reasonable assumption that if the Japanese and German people had known the strength and determination of the United States they would never have risked an aggression involving us, or raised up leaders who risked it. They were told that we were weak and divided, decadent from too much luxurious living, and they believed it. Brigadier General Fellers, one of General MacArthur's aides, who interviewed leading Japanese generals and admirals, told me that some of those leaders who knew America best so opposed the attack on Pearl Harbor that they were forced into retirement.

A country must be strong if it is to be a leader, and the United States is strong. But a real leader must have more than power. He must have loyalties and he must have friends; and these friendships must not be based on fear and favors bu on mutual understanding and respect. He must be respected for what he is and for what he does. He must be honest, reliable, predictable. Other nations and their peoples must have confidence that self-restraint will be exercised in the use of power. They must be convinced that the leader will act according to principle, and use power for the benefit of all rather than for narrow selfish ends. Today it is necessary not only to be and to do but to say what we are, and what we are doing, in a voice the whole world can hear.

Former Ambassador Bullitt says in his recent book, "The most legitimate use of force on earth is to gain time to permit the growth of moral ideas." We are now putting a very great deal of money into force and properly so, given the present state of the world's morals, and of the present lack of understanding of the United States. But when you listen tomorrow to a description of our military, naval, and air protection, remember to ask yourselves, "What are we doing to promote the growth of moral ideas? And what are we doing to make clear to the peoples of the world an honest picture of our lives—our achievements with our failures, our aspirations with our shortcomings?"

You will also hear tomorrow a discussion of the United Nations and several of its corollary agencies. I shall now anticipate some of that discussion. These agencies operate in the great field that lies between reliance on pure morality on the one hand and pure strength on the other. I want to bespeak your interest in the United Nations agency that takes the longest view, reflects most closely the moral end of the spectrum of international relations and, potentially, may hold the highest promise for building defenses of peace that will endure.

Last month I had the honor of leading the American delegation to the first general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, meeting in Paris. The program that emerged is one that can contribute significantly to our national security.

UNESCO will seek to eradicate illiteracy everywhere, and to lift educational standards. Illiterate men are pawns in a power struggle. UNESCO will seek to reduce barriers to the free flow of ideas and information everywhere. The most literate peoples can be led and bullied into aggression when they are cut off from a full and steady account of development among other peoples, and fed on lies and distortions. UNESCO will seek to diagnose the social and psychological tensions that lead to conflict, as urged in Congressman DIRKSEN'S bill. And UNESCO will stimulate the exchange of students, teachers, scholars, and experts on the widest possible scale. In such ways UNESCO will strive to lay that solid foundation of understanding among peoples which is the best hope of peace. As UNESCO succeeds, our security, and the world's security, will be strengthened. The operating budget for all of UNESCO for 1947 is $6,000,000. This is, I should guess, one ten-thousandth of the world's military and naval expenditures this year.

UNESCO should have your support, not passive and inarticulate, but active and vocal.

Finally, you should interest yourselves in a new instrument in our program for national security, the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State. This arm of national security is designed to accomplish, on a national and bilateral basis, what UNESCO is designed to accomplish on an international and multilateral basis. Its function is to project to foreign peoples a full and fair picture of American life, and of the aims and policies of the United States Government.

Its policy is to concentrate on those areas, and those media of communication, where private agencies do not or cannot function adequately, to fill the gaps and correct the misconceptions. It is thus the guardian of our national reputation abroad. Its end is to help assure that our country will not again be placed in jeopardy because it is misunderstood.

Our political and military leaders have recognized the new urgency of understanding. President Truman has said, "At no time in the history of man has the survival of man depended so much upon the ability of man to understand his fellow man." Secretary Byrnes has said, "There was a time when we could afford—or thought we could afford—to be unconcerned about what the rest of the peoples of the world thought about us. That time is past." Secretary Marshall, in his report on China, has stressed the confusion that results from distorted propaganda.

General Eisenhower has said, "I am convinced that the world cannot stand another Global War, and, as I see it, the thing to prevent such a tragedy happening is education. No one wants war. The common man everywhere hates war. We must enlist that hatred of war to prevent it happening again. The peoples of the world must be made to realize how much the very thinking of war costs us all, how much of the revenue of our countries is being diverted to the purposes of war—these nonproductive expenditures. I believe so fervently in mass public opinion—look how it armed the United States when war came—and if only it were mobilized in favor of the peace we all want, there never would be another war."

General Eisenhower is right in referring to military expenditures as nonproductive. They are a nonproductive drain on the economy, just as a fire-insurance premium is a nonproductive expenditure for a home owner. Both are necessary for protection. But when his fire-insurance premium becomes unbearably large, the home owner seeks ways to reduce it by reducing the risk of fire. If our State Department's information program helps reduce the risk of war, it can thus help reduce the premium cost of armaments.

The Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs observed its first birthday on January 1. This Office has maintained small information staffs, and United States information libraries, in 62 countries. It has exhibited noncommercial documentary motion pictures about American life to some 100,000,000 people overseas. It has furnished background material, and full texts of official statements, to editors throughout the world. And it has broadcast by short wave around the clock in 24 languages. Next month a twenty-fifth language will be added—Russian.

This Office has also been the focal point for a program of scientific and cultural cooperation, and of exchange of students, with the other American Republics. It awaits congressional authorization to extend this work to the rest of the world. The lack of this authorization, which will be requested in a bill to be introduced shortly, is one of the great gaps in our national security program. It is a gap which I hope Congress will shortly fill.

These efforts are indeed modest in scope, compared with the breadth and depth of the misunderstanding about America. Other powers, under the spur of greater necessity, long ago developed skill in projecting their stories. Great Britain's effort is on at least twice our scale. Compared with the total activities of the Soviet Union, where propaganda seems to be placed in a class with the Red Army as a bastion of foreign policy, the informational efforts of both Great Britain and the United States are minor.

Modest is perhaps too flattering a word to describe our information activities abroad. Our budget for these activities is less than one-quarter of 1 percent of the budget of the armed forces. There was a time last year

when it seemed likely there would be no budget at all. Thus these new activities are still not recognized by Congress and our people as an important and an integral part of the conduct of our foreign relations, and thus as a major element in our security.

The exchange of students is an example. I know of no surer method of increasing understanding of the United States, for the long run, than to bring foreign students to live among us for a year or two. If this is true, and if the understanding they acquire contributes to our security, then we should invite such students not in terms of a few score or a few hundreds but in terms of thousands. And we should widen the area from which we assist such students, not limit it to Latin America. We must widen our horizons and raise our sights. This will require the basic legislation, to which I have referred, and it will then require a budget.

Another example is our foreign-language broadcasting. If this is worth doing, if it contributes to our security—and we in the State Department are convinced that it does—then we should see to it that the programs we broadcast are audible, without fading, in every key area of the globe. This will require additional relay stations abroad, to pick up our programs and rebroadcast them. The cost of these relay stations is negligible compared to the results we are after. Here again congressional action is called for.

I was particularly happy to accept your invitation to speak to you tonight because your 32 organizations represent such an important part of the women of America, and because through your 32 organizations there is such an excellent chance to achieve understanding within our own country of this new opportunity for us in our foreign relations and national security.

I well remember a most exciting event in the life of my mother, when I was a boy in Minnesota. The DAR seemed to me the most important organization in Fergus Falls. Here I spent my summers with my grandmother. When my mother came east from Minnesota to represent the Minnesota DAR at its annual convention we felt that no comparable honor had ever been bestowed on the family. When she returned to Minnesota she spoke with real authority. I remember the pride with which she wore her DAR pin and the long struggle that went into saving the money for those 13 tiny diamonds.

Boys who have been brought up in Minnesota and Montana, as I was, not only know that women are people; they know that they are the most important people of all. My experiences as a boy in Montana, trying to prove up on a homestead, on the frontier, showed me why women have achieved such a unique position in the United States. I used to have to ride 30 miles to attend a dance. There wasn't an unmarried girl within 400 square miles. Women achieved their position in our frontier communities because they were so valuable. They need to continue to be valuable. They need to continue to be valuable, in this modern civilization of ours, if they are to retain their position.

In what ways can they be of greater value to their country than through constructive and positive programs developed by such organizations as yours? Through your membership you can form and give direction to an important part of American public opinion, if you will. The time to arouse public interest in national defense, and do it constructively and imaginatively, is now, at the conclusion of a successful defense of our security, not in the heat and excitement of a new threat. Surely one constructive way is to spread understanding within our own country of the role that American ideas and facts can play in our national defense.

It seems to me that women, much more readily than men, can understand that there are other ways to defend oneself than merely through the use or threat of force. Women are experts at persuasion. As mothers and as teachers they know the value of understanding, in the home and in the community. They have watched the power of education, the power of facts, and the power of ideas, in the unfolding growth of their own children. They know what it means to build the minds of men.

A bachelor's conduct may be his own business—as long as he is a bachelor. This is no longer true when he marries. After 150 years of a pleasant and profitable bachelorhood, the United States suddenly finds itself married. It is married to the rest of the world. Some might call it a shotgun marriage, or an aerial-bomb marriage. But it is for keeps, just the same—and for better or worse. Our private conduct now becomes a family and a community affair.

Understanding, confidence, and example, the bulwarks of family life and of community life, now become the bulwark of the world family and the world community. In the family and community of nations our national reputation is a precious asset. You can help our fellow-Americans to understand what an asset it is. And thus, as our globe becomes, perforce, one great community, you can bring to bear, on an ever larger sphere, your talents and your devotion, as citizens, as patriots, and as women, to the building of peace in the minds of men, and in the minds of men everywhere.

Proposed Reduction of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Can Taxes Be Reduced?" delivered on January 31, 1947, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN TAXES BE REDUCED?

Today America must make a tremendously important choice in this matter of a peacetime tax policy—important to every citizen in the land. And faced as we are with this decision, we find the atmosphere befogged, we find men in places of high public trust misleading our people in the hope of gaining some personal or party advantage.

Tonight I want to talk about taxation without misrepresentation.

Now, nobody in his right mind likes to pay taxes. But neither does anyone in his right mind want to be without a policeman when a thug points a gun in his face—or without an army, so long as the world remains in its present unsettled condition. And taxes pay your policeman and keep up your army.

In the formation of a tax policy, therefore, we must recognize two essentials:

First, that we support a government able to fulfill its responsibilities. This means paying for the essential services.

Second, that we maintain that government in a sound financial position. This means balancing the budget and, insofar as possible, reducing the national debt.

If we can accomplish these two objectives on a reduced rate of taxation, well and good. I am for reducing taxes. But I appeal most earnestly to my fellow citizens tonight—for the security of this America we love and for the individual welfare of every one of us—to face the facts, however unpleasant they may seem. For your safety, I urge you not to heed the siren tune of those who tell you they would reduce taxes first and then see whether we can keep a functioning government and a solvent nation.

Let us beware, my fellow Americans, of the politician who says, "Democracy? Why I can get it for you wholesale."

And yet such an offer has been made to the American people. Republican leaders in the House of Representatives have already introduced a bill which would reduce our individual income taxes by 20 percent across the board.

We are told that the budget presented by President Truman can be reduced by an amount that would take care of this tax cut, which amounts to $3,500,000,000, but what we are not told is that the only sure way such a huge decrease in Government outlay could be achieved would be to cut down on items like the national defense, or the fulfillment of our promise to those war veterans who risked life and limb for us, or the interest on our national debt, or refunds due under our tax laws.

Would the congressional leaders who beckon us toward their financial primrose path cut down on those? Yet the four items I have mentioned account together for more than $25,500,000,000, or two-thirds of the whole outlay for the year in prospect.

Well, then, would they have America renege on her commitments to her neighbor nations in the world? Would they abandon the development of atomic energy, pretend that it doesn't exist? Would they sacrifice the husbandry of our natural resources, forsake the farmer, cancel social security, forget the aged and the infirm?

Is this economy?

Yet it is precisely such essential items as these that account for the bulk of President Truman's budget.

Where, then, is that 20 percent coming from?

We are told that essential Government services will not be sacrificed, but what we are not told is that even if reductions in the Federal outlay could be made to take care of this tax cut, the Government would be left with nothing available for reduction of its debt.

I regard debt reduction as sound business. I believe our national debt should be reduced by at least a billion dollars a year, more if possible.

Has the conservative party in America suddenly decided there need be no hurry about reducing this debt? Have they suddenly changed their minds about red ink, and decided it isn't so dangerous after all? They acknowledged that they were wrong with respect to their hasty promise to eliminate the Federal excise taxes after President Truman's budget message was delivered. I hope they will also admit they were in error in proposing a 20 percent reduction in income tax, and that they will repudiate this reckless and irresponsible course in tax reduction.

The thinking American citizen who understands the meaning of a tax cut of 20 percent at this time, who realizes that in the long run he may have to pay tenfold for any such reduction, may well ask the leaders of the Republican Party responsible for this promise: "Is your proposed tax cut a promise or a threat?"

Promise it may have been in the days when it could be held out as an alluring prospect to the voters. But the election is over now. It is time to reevaluate that promise. To fail to do so, to insist upon it now, is a threat, a threat to the military security of the Nation, a threat to the financial security of every American who has inveated in the obligations of his Government.

For if we are to have a Government that puts tax reduction before debt reduction at a time when the national income is the largest in our peacetime history, if we are to have a Government that puts party politics before national solvency under such conditions, what will become of the investments of those who have had faith in a solvent Nation?

Let us hold high the credit and the integrity of the Government of the United States. It is our best guaranty of continued leadership among the nations of the earth.

When and if the time comes to cut taxes, a straight 20-percent reduction across the board is not the answer. On its face, it has a plausible sound, but when you figure those savings to dollars, you begin to see how absurd this proposal is. A married wage earner with a net income of $2,000, struggling to support his family in these times of high prices, would save $38 under the 20-percent plan. A married man with a net income of $20,000 would save $1,279. A married man with a net income of $250,000 would save more than $38,000. The plan, therefore, shows a shocking disregard for "ability to pay" on which our income-tax system is based. It would spread the savings very generously among those best able to pay and give the lower-income group the least tax relief. If any tax reduction is to come, it must be spread among the lower-income groups who are having a desperate time trying to make ends meet with prices what they are today.

If a tax cut can be made, I will propose at the proper time the simple device of raising the exemption levels. Exactly what that increase should be, no one can safely say at this time. As an example, raising the exemption for married couples from $1,000 to $1,200 and for dependents from $500 to $600 would remove 3,200,000 people from the tax rolls, save the Government the expense of collecting taxes from that many people and would cost the Government in taxes $1,500,000,000. But I repeat this is not the time to spend our energy figuring out ways to reduce taxes. We first have to see whether or not any tax reduction is possible. We have to be hard-headed about this subject. We must not let political and selfish considerations cloud our vision. Until we know what our minimum needs are going to be to operate the Government, no one can truthfully say how much, if any, taxes can be cut.

I want to see the Federal Government operate as cheaply and as efficiently as it can, and I favor any reduction in Government expenditure that is consistent with good Government, but I shall resist any effort to slash taxes which will impair in any degree the credit of our country, its security, or its efficient operation.

A Challenge to the State Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very eloquent and able address entitled "A Challenge to the State Employment Service," delivered by Hon. Jim McCord, Governor of Tennessee, at the Governors' Conference, Miami, Fla., December 6, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When Eric Johnston was president of the United States Chamber of Commerce he made this significant statement:

"Unemployment is the greatest problem of our civilization. We must solve it. It is a terrible, insistent, devastating disease in our lives."

Johnston might have added that this "terrible, insistent, and devastating disease" is not the handiwork of God. It is not like an earthquake, tidal wave, or a hurricane which thus far are beyond the control of man. But unemployment is a disease that is created by society itself. It is an indirect result of man's struggle to conquer his environment and to rise to higher levels of human enjoyment.

Unemployment, especially involuntary mass unemployment, is a man-made problem. It is a part of the price we pay for freedom. Being man-made the problem should gradually yield to the same sort of human dynamics that brought man by progressive cycles from the jungle up through slavery and feudalism to his present social and economic status.

Economists have learned to recognize fairly well the causes that bring on mass unemployment. And they know that there is really only one serious obstacle confronting those who apply checks and remedies to mitigate what Johnston calls "its devastating effects." That obstacle is human inertia. It is seen most clearly in the attitudes of those who believe in letting things alone. These people, quite sincerely, of course, believe that "if we let nature take its course, everything will work out all right." That is a do-nothing policy. But those of us who think differently know that a do-nothing policy has never provided a single job. It has never conquered a wilderness, controlled a river, or penetrated into the mysteries of the unseen world.

Those who believe in doing something about a problem at last have recognized that unemployment is not entirely an individual matter. In its larger aspects, it is a social problem of great magnitude that must be approached and treated with social measures. Fortunately we have recognized that something can, and should, be done about unemployment. Thus, today, we are engaged in a Nation-wide and determined effort to soften the effects of job losses, both as they apply to individuals and to the community at large.

Like diseases of the human body, the causes of an economic ailment may be remote, deep-seated, and difficult to reach. We have seen unemployment crop out in the most unexpected places—among the well-to-do professional men as well as among the laborers who depend on odd jobs for a livelihood.

During the depression of the 1930's it was common to hear it said that "The largest employer of Ph. D.'s in the entire country is the WPA." At that time vast, unseen forces beat against our economy and we saw intelligent men and women of good work habits, cast adrift by movements they could neither perceive nor control. We now know that unemployment begets unemployment. And we know that, if left alone, it quickly spreads like a contagion, from individual to individual, until entire communities are infected. It thus becomes a matter of concern to the community and the Nation to meet unemployment quickly and effectively before it spreads.

It took a long time for this country to realize its obligation to those who are involuntarily unemployed. It would be well to briefly review some of the efforts that have been made to combat the evil through public employment offices.

You are no doubt familiar with the first timid efforts to help persons become reestablished in gainful employment. In 1834 New York City recognized the problem and inaugurated perhaps the first employment service in the country. Other large cities later followed the example. Then, in 1890, Ohio became the first State to pass a law providing for a public-employment office.

In 1913 the newly organized United States Department of Labor took over the function of guiding aliens to jobs. Three years later placement activities were extended to all unemployed groups. By 1915, 23 States had laws providing State employment offices.

During the period of the First World War the Employment Service faced its first serious emergency. Activities at that time swung quickly from job finding to a program of finding workers. The rapid expansion of the employment service during that war forced public recognition of the problems of reconversion when young veterans, who had seen great adventure and had thrilled at the bright spots of cities, showed a reluctance to go back to rural areas. The public soon found that the junior-worker and the farm-labor problems could not be brushed off with the expression, "they just don't want to work." Experience proved that by far the great majority did want to work, but they wanted to work in what they felt was a more congenial environment.

After the end of that war there was a period when people began to smart under the high cost of living, and there was a drive for economy in Government operations. Congress responded to the pressure and reduced many appropriations, including the Employment Service. As a result, most of the 2,000 Employment Service offices were closed, and the scientific approach to a serious social and economic problem received a major set-back.

I think it should be noted here that an economy-minded Congress has followed each war. It may well be for their own salvation the employment services have been returned to the States. Congress can abolish the United States Employment Service, but it cannot repeal the laws of 48 States that require them to maintain adequate public employment offices.

It took a devastating depression to awaken Congress to the need of a public employment service. At the beginning of the depression in 1930, largely through the pressure of organized veterans, about 30 offices were opened. These offices did not try to find employment for all jobless persons. They were limited by the law to the placement of veterans.

Times got worse, and Labor Secretary Doak attempted to reorganize the Federal Employment Service. The mistake was made in opening offices at places where the States already had similar offices. This duplication of effort, to some extent, was responsible for the Wagner bill calling for a Federal-State system of employment offices. This bill passed Congress, but it was vetoed by President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover, it seems, preferred a national employment service wholly administered by the Federal Government.

All of us recall the hectic days of 1933 when the Wagner-Peyser Act was passed by Congress. Under that act a new United States Employment Service was established as a bureau of the Department of Labor. Funds were made available to the States for the development of a Federal-State system of public employment offices. Under that act the States were required to meet certain minimum standards in order to receive Federal funds. The veterans' placement functions of the Veterans' Administration were transferred to the United States Employment Service.

In 1935 Congress passed the Social Security Act. That act placed great responsibility on the public employment offices in the administration of unemployment compensation. The States combined the employment and unemployment compensation functions and, as a result, the offices developed rapidly in size, number, and scope of activity.

We are all familiar with the period when this country turned to national defense. And also the war period when the employment service was loaned to the Federal Government so as to channel available labor into critical industries. The employment service operated as a unit of the Social Security Board. It did a good job during the war. As an example, during 1942 it placed more than 10,000,000 persons in war work.

The employment service is back home in the States where it belongs. Action by Congress to bring it back home to the States was overwhelming. There can be no doubt in the minds of the public that overwhelming sentiment at all levels was that it should be returned to the States. And as I have said, it is home now and home to stay.

All thinking persons realize that jobs must be filled in the communities, not in Washington. No one sitting behind a fine, mahogany desk in that city could possibly know intimately the situation that exists in any community in the United States. Just as unemployment occurs in a community, so must jobs be found in a community.

Although the return of the service to the State places the unemployment compensation and employment service programs under a single State department of administration, where they so properly belong, a great defect which will seriously handicap the States in proper administration of this joint program exists at the Federal level. Under the Wagner-Peyser Act the United States Employment Service exists in the Department of Labor, which develops an over-all national policy with rules and regulations, too many of which are presumed under the act. These are thrust upon the States in their administration of the employment service. On the other hand, the Federal Security Administration under the social-security law develops the over-all policies for the Federal-State administration of the unemployment compensation part of the program. Likewise, two separate financial grants for administration of the two programs come down from these separate agencies, all of which will necessarily result in confusion and complication in the administration of the program.

The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 became obsolete when the Social Security Act was passed in 1935.

These glaring defects on the Federal level should be promptly corrected by the incoming Congress.

Federal provisions relating to the establishment and maintenance of State systems should be of exactly the same nature with respect to both unemployment compensation and the employment service. The Wagner-Peyser Act should be repealed and these two component programs incorporated in one basic Federal act and administered by one Federal agency.

But regardless of this existing handicap at the Federal level, the return of the employment service to the States places on us a heavy responsibility and a great challenge. We must prove that the States can administer the service better than it can be operated by the Federal Government. We must not be satisfied with mediocre performance and we must not fail to move forward to new achievements.

We asked for the opportunity to prove our ability. That opportunity is ours. What are we going to do with it? What is before us? How are we going to meet the challenge of the fast-developing new South?

It is not far from the truth to say that the South has been treated as a province—a producer of raw materials—in times past. Our progress has been throttled to a fraction of what it could have been with certain artificial restraints removed. But we are moving, and moving rapidly, into a period of growth that may well make this region an industrial empire.

Our management and our labor have the know-how. In several fields, notably the manufacture of work clothing, this region leads the Nation. We are becoming important manufacturers of paper. We are developing new uses of pulpwood made from our great storehouse of timber. This promises to be a major industry. There is reason to believe that the manufacture of prefabricated houses will become a prime factor in reducing building costs and making home-ownership more attractive. Our chemical plants are expanding, especially in the field of plastics and synthetic resin. And great industries are being built for the production of derivatives of coal, petroleum, and timber.

I know my own State best. What I say of it applies more or less to all Southern States. Tennessee, ever since it became a State, has been predominantly an agricultural State. During the past few years its economy has changed, and today more of its people receive their livelihood from manufacturing, mining, construction, and services than from agriculture. Taking the one classification of manufacturing as fairly typical of the other groups, employment between April 1940 and May 1945 increased 54.5 percent. This increase was not limited to manufacturing, however, as all insured employment increased during the same period 53.9 percent.

Incidentally, I hope that you will overlook what may appear as unseemly pride, but my State made a truly remarkable record in employment during the war. It led all of the Southern States in percentage gain in employment covered by job insurance and ranked fifth in the entire United States. The last available tabulation revealed that since VJ-day, when large numbers were laid off from war plants, my State has regained much of its insured employment and is rapidly nearing the peak record established during the war.

What does all of this mean to the State employment services? What are the problems that lie ahead in this changing economy? How can we anticipate the problems and help courageous employers to utilize our natural resources and employ our manpower to best advantage?

The problems are highly technical and too specialized to be detailed here, but I feel that we must approach our task with determination and intelligence. Above all, we must keep before us a vision of the possibilities of using this service in a manner that will promote the prosperity and general well-being of the entire section.

The coming industrialization of the South should be so integrated that it will not destroy our equilibrium. While capital is seeking profits we must look at the dislocations that are bound to come. We must see to it that the progress of one industry does not create problems in another that will "upset the boat." For example, we know that a plant is being built to manufacture mechanical cotton pickers. We know that, already, agricultural labor is being made idle by the cane harvester. It is none too soon for us to begin to plan for the coming displacement of a vast number of workers who have no skill other than that of picking cotton.

That means that the States should encourage the establishment of research centers. They also must do all that they can to meet the coming displacement and idleness by providing vocational schools. This will call for close cooperation with management. It will call for encouragement of those with capital who are seeking opportunities for profitable investment. If we fail to plan for the great changes that are coming, we might be compelled to carry a public-welfare load that would strain our financial structure.

This brings us to the moment when the Employment Service is again a State agency. As you well know, unemployment compensation and job placement go hand in hand. The work of these two agencies goes to make up what we are pleased to call employment security—a term we have adopted in Tennessee in naming our department of employment security.

The one branch of the program is to place an unemployed person in suitable employment. Failing in this, the other branch is to pay modest benefits for a number of weeks to bridge the gap between jobs. But before benefits can be paid the claimant must present himself at the employment-service office and "be exposed" to offers of employment. The two services are inseparable. The States must integrate the two divisions to effect economy and to insure efficient and effective service to the public.

It is a well-known fact that the South has the largest birth rate of any section of the country. It is also well known that we spend our tax money in giving our boys and girls the best education possible with the funds that are available. Then what happens? Too often these boys and girls who have been educated at the expense of southern taxpayers seek in vain to find profitable employment in the South. Then, in despair, they break their home ties and journey north, east, or west. As one glaring example of what is taking place, by June 1944, 37 percent of the workers in Detroit were found to be southern born.

The South can prevent this outmigration of its skill and leadership only by creating opportunities that will match or nearly match those of other sections.

The question before us is, Will we have the wisdom to discern, and the courage and resourcefulness to provide, the opportunities that our resources and climate entitle us?

The public employment service can, and I believe will, play a major role in utilizing the brawn and skill and ingenuity of our boys and girls.

Yes; Eric Johnston was right: "Unemployment is the greatest problem of our civilization. We must solve it. It is a terrible, insistent, devastating disease in our lives."

Labor Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial bearing on industrial peace appearing in the New York Post of January 29, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM TRUCE TO PEACE?

The agreement reached between the United States Rubber Co. and the CIO's United Rubber Workers is good news for everybody, because the country wants industrial peace.

The reported extension of contract-termination deadlines by the CIO's big three unions, in electrical goods, steel, and automobiles, in order to give more time for peaceful negotiations, points up an effort by the unions to achieve settlements without major strikes.

The proposed voluntary strike truce on the part of some of the big unions in basic industries clears away some of the political smoke, and highlights the sharp difference between the constructive approach to labor problems supported by President Truman and the strife-breeding offensive of the Republican extremists.

The core of the difference is that Truman's desire to avoid crippling strikes is a move toward industrial peace; but the Republican extremists' drive against unions is a move toward industrial war.

For instance, GOP Congressmen are supporting bills which would outlaw the closed shop, the union shop—under which the employer is free to hire nonunion workers but they must join the union after they are on the pay roll—and maintenance-of-membership clauses.

THE PUBLIC PAYS THE PRICE

A ban on the union shop would encourage labor-management strife by making it possible to bring in scab workers in an effort to break the already weakened union, and even to foster company unions.

It would throw companies where labor relations have been stabilized for years open to furious rivalry between unions. But it would take away from the majority the present practical and democratic solution to jurisdictional strife, which consists, under the Wagner Act, in choosing an exclusive union by majority vote.

Then, having thrown the gates wide open to jurisdictional strikes by law, and shackled the workers' power to end them, the reactionaries could hope to turn public anger and reprisals against all labor.

A law enforcing the open shop could be effective in weakening the big unions. But, like all merely antiunion measures, the price would be more strikes, not peace.

The same thing is largely true of what Senator BALL likes to call equality for employers and workers. Looked at closely, the chief effect of the proposals for establishing equality would be to strip workers of the legal protections for their right to organize and bargain collectively, without reprisals or discrimination, contained in the Wagner Act.

Yesterday, Labor Secretary Schwellenbach warned that if the Congress wants to start out deliberately to create industrial strife, the way to do it is by laws which would destroy union security.

BUT NO MONEY FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENTS

It is time for the public to draw a clear line between the administration's attempt to find fundamental solutions to labor-management relations, and the reactionary antiunion crusade which holds that chaos and strikes are a cheap price to pay for weakening labor.

For instance, Congress has about nine antiunion bills in the hopper. Yet, last year Congress cut heavily the appropriation requested for the National Labor Relations Board. The NLRB had to reduce its personnel by 20 percent, and now reports that the tremendous delay in settling the backlog of cases may well provoke strikes.

But the antilabor Republicans, who claim to believe that strikes are such an urgent problem that it is worth curtailing the fundamental rights of American workers to check them, have shown a suspicious lack of interest in fostering labor peace by giving the NLRB enough money to operate effectively.

The move toward a partial strike truce in basic industries gives the country an opportunity to search calmly for fundamental solutions. They should be based on compromise, not on the fanaticism which thinks a dispute is settled by gagging and shackling one of the parties. And they should be aimed at genuine and lasting industrial peace.

Arkansas State Symphony Orchestra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Musical Courier entitled "Founding a State Orchestra."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUNDING A STATE ORCHESTRA

The Arkansas State Symphony, conducted by William Hacker, will have a full season of about 50 concerts throughout the State. This is rather an amazing number for an orchestra barely 2 years old, and the story of the organization's founding bears retelling.

In June 1944, Hacker took the $35 budget left over from a previous attempt to form a university orchestra at the University of Arkansas (where he had just been engaged as resident pianist) in one hand and his baton in the other, and set out to accomplish a seemingly impossible task—that of creating a symphony orchestra with no music and almost as few musicians and no immediate prospects of any more to come.

Especially since there were no instrumental music students at that time in attendance at the university, it was necessary to invite townspeople to play. The results of that call, from a town of 12,000, were 13 amateur musicians—a far cry from the present 50, at least 50 percent of whom are professionals.

It took but a few rehearsals to impress two things upon the young conductor. Here were people with an inherent love for music who might really accomplish things if given an opportunity. Though this was the case, there was little chance of creating a really good orchestra in any town, because most Arkansas communities are too small to support one.

But the prospect of so many people starved for the best in musical entertainment because of the size of their communities caused him to decide to make his ultimate goal a State symphony which would be of the finest and would serve even the smallest towns, thus being truly a "State" orchestra.

SYMPHONY GROWS

From its humble beginnings as the University-Civic Orchestra, the group began to travel and to play in nearby towns. These trips quickly resulted in additions to the orchestra from many regions and a change in name to that of Northwest Arkansas Symphony. As such, it played 19 concerts including 2 broadcasts from a local station during its first season. Though its members were drawn mainly from the northwest section, it was able to attract substantial artistic help from the nearby Oklahoma City Symphony and Springfield (Mo.) Symphony.

During National Music Week, 1945, the orchestra startled the State by announcing that it would tour. And this it proceeded triumphantly to do, playing in seven towns, six in Arkansas and Memphis, Tenn., where it was presented through the philanthropy of I. L. Myers, local businessman, whose aid to the arts and the Memphis orchestra is well known.

Despite the orchestra's outstanding success in its first season, Hacker was well aware that unless more sponsorship and that of a more sustaining nature were found, the symphony would never progress beyond its status at the close of the 1944–45 season. He was also increasingly aware that in order to assure the orchestra of a permanent place in the State and the lives of its people, something must be done to improve music education in the schools, from which he hopes will come his future symphony players and concert audiences.

Proceeding on the premise that to produce a first-class orchestra he would have eventually to include the entire State, Hacker set about interesting several towns in organizing permanent symphony societies which would sponsor the orchestra for one or more concerts annually and would thus insure a definite financial budget. He made personal trips to several towns, giving talks on his plans for an Arkansas State symphony. He found the people willing and eager to back the orchestra. At the close of the second successful season, the orchestra had 10 permanent organizations in as many towns planning to sponsor it next year. (Now there are 17.—Editor.)

In Little Rock, the State capital, a central meeting of representatives from each town was called in April, and the Arkansas Philharmonic Society—to which each sponsoring organization belongs—was formed. The society will guarantee the symphony season for the ensuing year, and will act as booking headquarters to send the orchestra to other Arkansas commmunities which have not yet permanent sponsoring groups. Thus the plans for an unusual third season of 50 concerts next year.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR YOUNG PLAYERS

In pursuit of his desire to further and improve musical education in the State, Hacker is diverting some of the funds guaranteed by the society to scholarships for talented young musicians, who may have them applied at any college within the State, and who are then given the opportunity to play at back stands in the orchestra.

Another aspect of his plan is the placing of teacher members of the symphony throughout the State, thus providing good teachers where in many instances there have been either none at all or inferior substitutes. In the hope of stimulating interest and desire for music, the sponsorship of the makers of Grapette, a carbonated drink manufactured in Camden, Ark., has been secured to present 20 additional concerts in schools throughout the State.

Another project of the society is the formation of community orchestras in all towns in the State. Many of the teacher symphony members will be acting as conductors of these smaller groups in their own communities. During the summer a 2-week workshop will be held in Eureka Springs, Ark. (the second annual one this year), where both young and older musicians will have the opportunity of study and sight-reading rehearsals of new and classic works amidst surroundings reminiscent of an Alpine village.

In short, during the past 2 years, a whole State has gradually been awakened to the value of and its need for a symphony orchestra as a social force for good in the community. Young people all over the State are showing increased interest in music both as a career and as a cultural pursuit—an achievement which is primarily the result of the dreaming, perseverance, and love for humanity of the founder.

BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

A concert pianist and composer as well as conductor of the symphony, William Hacker has had a short but purposeful career. Not yet 30, he was forming orchestras when still in his teens; was for 2 years conductor of the Albany (N. Y.) Philharmonic Orchestra. Having had the advantage of study under Jose Iturbi, he received degrees from the Eastman School of Music and at the same time managed to pursue his concert career, which had taken him from Maine to Cuba

and Mexico. He spent last summer in Mexico City as a special musical ambassador from the State of Arkansas, playing concerts and guest conducting, and engaging in a search for new Mexican music which he plans to introduce into the orchestra's program during the coming season.

His work in forming orchestras as a boy has stood him in good stead in Arkansas, where until this season he had to be his own business manager, personnel manager, financial secretary, and—almost—librarian. He feels that his entire life has been a preparation for his work in Arkansas and declares that, having made the State his home, he will continue to work unceasingly to give it the finest symphony orchestra possible.

"These are fine people," he says, "and without their cooperation and enthusiastic love for music it would have been impossible for the orchestra to exist, much less to progress as it has during its 2 years of existence."

B. R. M.

Report on Thomas Jefferson Memorial For 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the Thomas Jefferson Memorial for 1946, prepared by A. E. Demaray, Director and Executive Agent for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission. As Chairman of the Commission, I deem it wise to publish this report. Of special interest will be the statement in regard to the progress being made in the casting of the statue. This would all have been done when the memorial was dedicated if it had not been for the fact that during the war when the metal was so scarce the Commission deemed it unwise to use bronze for making the statue. I am sure that it will be remembered by many Senators that when the plaster-of-paris cast was placed in the memorial, it was such a good imitation that the Commission actually received criticism for using bronze at that time.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL, 1946

ATTENDANCE

During 1946, 682,023 persons visited the Jefferson Memorial, an increase of 238,448 over 1945.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The President of the United States, Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, Gen. U. S. Grant III, Associate Director A. E. Demaray and party visited the Jefferson Memorial on January 14, 1946.

Alcide DeGasperi, Prime Minister of Italy, placed a wreath at the base of the statue on Sunday, January 5, 1947. He was accompanied by a party of 35 persons.

CEREMONIES

April 13, 1946, the two hundred and third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, was celebrated at the Jefferson Memorial under the auspices of the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution. Benjamin D. Hill, Jr., president of the local society, was in charge of the ceremony. The principal address was delivered by Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell, Adjutant General of the United States Army. Massing of the Colors, and laying of wreaths by 26 prominent persons and organizations, the President of the United States represented by Lt. Col. James H. Batte, the Secretary of State represented by the Chief of Protocol, the Governor of Virginia, University of Virginia, National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution and others, completed the program. The National Capital Parks arranged a speaker's podium and chairs for the Navy Band and the audience.

Easter sunrise services were conducted on the steps of the memorial on Sunday, April 21, 1946. The program was sponsored by the Washington Federation of Christian Youth with Rev. Thomas M. Steen in charge. Some 3,500 persons were in the audience. There is attached an extra program of these services.

PROGRESS ON CASTING OF STATUE

The Roman Bronze Corp., of New York City, is proceeding with the casting of the bronze statue of Thomas Jefferson. The casting is being made in nine sections, the two legs, circular base, vertical base, upper torso, head, large drape, small drape, and lower torso. As of December 31, both legs, circular base, and vertical base have been molded, cast in bronze, chased, and finished. The upper torso, head, and large drape have been molded and cast in bronze and the chasing and finishing of these three pieces were partially completed. The small drape and lower torso were partially molded preparatory to casting. The small drape should be cast this month, while the lower torso is scheduled to be cast in February.

The schedule calls for the assembling of the statue in April and the applying of the patina during the first half of May. The installation in the Memorial is scheduled to start the latter half of May and be completed about the middle of June 1947.

Due to a truckmen's strike in New York City, the Roman Bronze Corp. was delayed by nondelivery of bronze for 22 days, from September 26 to October 17. Although the contractor's time for the work expires on November 28, 1947, his production schedule calls for the statue to be erected by the middle of June of this year, and the actual work is closely following the production schedule.

On November 3, 1946, the Washington Sunday Star published a story with appropriate pictures in its gravure section regarding the casting of the statue.

LITERATURE DISTRIBUTED

Forty thousand copies of the attached Thomas Jefferson Memorial leaflet were received and distributed during the year. An order for 100,000 copies is now in the hands of the Government Printing Office and are expected before the coming visitor season.

Propaganda Budget of National Association of Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short news item from the January 17 issue of the Farmers' Union Herald, a newspaper printed in South St. Paul, Minn. So much ado has been made on the floor of this body whenever farm organizations, consumer organizations, labor unions, or other groups that represent the interests of the people gather together a few dollars in order to publicize their policies and principles that I thought something should appear in the RECORD to indicate that an occasional dollar is being spent by the giants of industry.

There being no objection, the news item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAM PLANS $4,700,000 FUND FOR PROPAGANDA IN 1947

Regulating the thinking of the American people is an expensive business. The National Association of Manufacturers will spend $4,700,000 on the job in 1947. This is an increase of $1,100,000 over NAM's 1946 budget for propaganda.

First example of NAM's subtle work was released at its fifty-first annual congress, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York. The New York Times publicized the campaign's first blasts with this headline: "Liberal program on labor, economy announced by NAM."

Within 2 days all the Nation's controlled press had picked up the story. The NAM, nearly all agreed, had repudiated its black record of blind reaction and had now become a liberal organization.

This liberal smokescreen is itself one of the biggest propaganda shows ever staged by the industrialists. The show is an added expense to the public, which is providing the $4,700,000 by a nickel or a dime added to the cost of this or that manufactured item.

Members of NAM will collect the money from the public and contribute to the headquarters organization. The collection speech to back the program was made at the Waldorf-Astoria by President J. Howard Pew, of the Sun Oil Co., chairman of the NAM's national industrial information committee and owner of Pew's Farm Journal.

Pew encouraged the NAM-ites to dig down into their pockets, boasting of how the NAM had succeeded in killing OPA. "No more difficult assignment ever faced a group of men," he said, admitting that before the NAM launched its antiprice control campaign about 80 percent of the people favored OPA.

Seven months later, after the press and radio had picked up the NAM propaganda, another public-opinion poll showed that a majority of the people were against OPA controls, Pew said.

Democratic Party Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication published in the Washington Post of February 5, 1947, under the heading "Democratic Party hope."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC PARTY HOPE

The recent defeat suffered by the Democratic Party may not turn out to be as disas-

trous for the party's future hopes as first appeared to be the case. The reason for this is that there are many important problems facing the country which cannot be solved by mere political oratory. These are problems which need answers and if the Republican Party does not possess these answers the 1948 elections might not turn out so favorably for them.

If a recession comes within the next 2 years, the Republicans will have to shoulder part of the blame since they will be in control of the legislative branch of the Government. The continuation of strikes, further shortages, and especially the housing shortage, veterans' problems—and innumerable problems of lesser magnitude—will be blamed to a great extent on the Republican Party. It so happens that the present moment is not a favorable one for an incoming party which has hopes of capturing the executive branch at the next election. From this set of conditions President Truman may take great hope.

The Republican victory was more in the nature of a protest vote against the Democrats than an affirmative gesture toward the Republicans. The question may well be raised as to whether the GOP has any definite program to meet the many problems of the day. To an outsider it appears that they do not possess any comprehensive program of action, or if they do, they have it under wraps. Although all through the New Deal years they freely criticized the late President Roosevelt's attempts to restore prosperity, they appear to have nothing constructive of their own to offer. Those who are in power in the policy-making levels of the Republican Party favor a nineteenth-century laissez-faire which admittedly is incompetent to cope with the present-day complex economic system. This writer does not advocate nor does he pretend to have a panacea for society's ills. However, he did admire Roosevelt's sincerity and willingness to act, and does not find that these qualities exist in the Republican Party of today. Their political program can be compared to a vacuum, and to my knowledge vacuums have never solved any problem.

Herein lies the hope of the Democratic Party. It is now their duty to regroup their forces, weld together a workable program of political action, and await their opportunity to put it into force. Their situation is not by any means hopeless.

MAX WOLD.

WASHINGTON.

Is It a Crime To Make Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me at the Milton Kronheim dinner, Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D. C., February 3, 1947:

Is it a crime to make money? This question is not so irrelevant as it sounds. In our proper approach to this question, we will find why the public relations of the liquor industry is so sadly out of focus. Do not think for one moment that the misconception of the entire liquor industry by the American public in relation to its profits does not constitute a danger and a threat to the industry.

The private-enterprise system, of which we are justly proud, permits one to get rewards for his endeavors, for his rendition of services, and for his making and selling of goods. The profit motive underlies all the diverse activities of our economic system. It embraces the farmer, the clerk, the cobbler, the teacher, the industrialist.

The legitimacy, however, of rewards and profits is never seriously questioned except when it relates to the liquor industry. The liquor industry, although once declared hors de combat, is back in the fold. There are some who find this fact difficult to accept. They view the industry with a malignant eye, and, ergo, anyone who makes money at it should be condemned. Tax the money away with all kinds of unusual levies, they say, bury it under all manner of restrictions, then let it dig its way through if it can.

It has been suggested by a gentleman on Capitol Hill that the liquor dealers be taxed to take care of a Washington Alcoholics Anonymous. If a man gets indigestion from eating too much food, shall the food dealers be blamed and taxed to cure that indigestion? Shall the druggist who sells barbiturates (600,000 pounds are produced yearly) be charged with the abuse of those pills that are habitually taken to induce sleep? And just as logically may I ask that because so many men commit adultery, shall we do away with women?

Assuredly, the liquor industry bears heavy enough burdens of taxation. It need not be saddled with any such proposal.

During the war emergency, the Nation willingly allowed the Government to take a goodly share of its profits in the form of taxes. We are now happily developing our peacetime economy. Those high taxes must gradually be removed. Reduction in taxes is essential for future capital investments, for further business expansion, and for the undertaking of new enterprises.

This is as true of the liquor industry as it is of other industries. However, organizations like the WCTU's, the Antisaloon League, and the Methodist Board of Temperance, if they could have their way, would tax the liquor industry out of existence. What cannot be accomplished directly, they seek to accomplish by indirection. The objective is prohibition.

Small wonder, therefore, that in many States liquor is taxed for all kinds of purposes, for old-age pensions and the like. On the one hand the prohibitionists are happy to get the benefits of those revenues, and, on the other hand, seek to destroy the industry—a clear-cut case of wanting the cake and eating it too.

The recent debates on the matter of the extension of wartime excise taxes show some queer thinking on the part of the Members of the House. The taxes are supposed to yield $1,500,000,000 a year. What year? Last year or next year? Everybody seemed to hang on to that figure for the purpose of arguing for a reduction of personal income taxes. Come up to my bailiwick and you will see a great falling off of the demand for furs, liquor, luggage, toilet articles, etc. The shelves are sagging with merchandise. The price, for example, of furs has fallen 50 percent, and liquor prices are tumbling. The so-called "dogs," like cordials, rums, and gins, can be had almost for the asking. Under the present prospects for business this year on articles subject to wartime excise taxes there will be no such yield of $1,500,000,000 a year. The reduction in the number of sales and the shrinkage of prices are going to surprise many Members of Congress in the sense that the return will not be even one-half billion dollars.

In the argument liquor was sought out as the industry that could carry the heaviest tax burdens. Liquor is always made the scapegoat. Certainly, it can bear its fair share of taxes, but it cannot carry much more than any other industry.

If the Schenley Distillers Corp., the National Distillers Products Corp., Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc., the Hiram Walker Co. made money—and they did—so did the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the United States Steel Corp., General Motors Corp., and the du Ponts.

I had the Library of Congress prepare for me through its legislative reference service a chart revealing the sales and profits of 25 selected-large industrial corporations classified by total asset size. I herewith set it forth:

Sales and profits of selected large industrial corporations classified by total asset size, 1945

Company	Total assets (add 000)	Total sales (gross or net) (add 000)	Net profit before income and profits taxes (add 000)	Profit before taxes as percent of sales	Net profit after income taxes (add 000)	Profit after taxes as percent of sales
1. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)	$2,531,808	$1,638,706	$223,156	13.6	$154,156	9.4
2. United States Steel Corp	1,890,769	1,747,339	88,015	5.0	58,015	3.3
3. General Motors Corp	1,813,886	3,127,935	212,536	6.8	183,268	6.0
4. E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co	1,204,921	631,575	156,761	24.8	77,521	12.3
5. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	1,075,777	828,796	59,429	7.2	42,362	5.1
6. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	946,136	620,138	63,266	10.2	51,732	8.3
7. Bethlehem Steel Corp	880,880	1,326,564	47,147	3.6	34,947	2.6
8. General Electric Co	858,151	1,298,222			56,541	4.4
9. Texas Co	833,854	577,077	62,857	10.9	51,857	9.0
10. Ford Motor Co	815,515					
11. Standard Oil Co. (California)	738,346	343,328	61,855	18.0	55,555	16.1
12. Gulf Oil Corp	652,811	504,692	48,199	9.6	45,214	9.0
13. Anaconda Copper Mining Co	616,058	328,466	[1] 37,198	11.3	[1] 20,536	6.3
14. International Harvester Co	558,715	622,011	36,977	5.9	24,477	3.9
15. Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	520,600	286,742	29,744	10.4	18,913	6.6
16. Kennecott Copper Corp	464,800	209,618	[1] 43,766	20.9	[1] 30,253	14.4
17. Western Electric Co., Inc	463,652	860,713	68,615	8.0	15,126	1.8
18. Sinclair Oil Corp	456,090	406,310	18,953	4.7	13,645	3.9
19. Union Carbide & Carbon Corp	428,078	481,521	96,205	20.0	37,890	7.9
20. Shell Union Oil Corp	426,917	475,911	35,522	7.5	28,712	6.0
21. Aluminum Co. of America	417,183		30,702		19,952	
22. Chrysler Corp	414,229	994,546	58,065	5.8	37,965	3.8
23. Republic Steel Corp	398,157	497,675	26,644	5.4	9,544	1.9
24. Curtiss-Wright Corp	353,833	1,197,705	89,230	7.5	24,430	2.0
25. Swift & Co	353,247	1,307,632	23,821	1.8	12,304	.9
Weighted average				8.1		5.7

[1] No allowance made for depletion.

Source: Prepared from data contained in Standard and Poor's Corporation Records.

You will note that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey has total assets of $2,500,000,000 and that its profit after taxes as a percent of sales, 1945, is 9.4. The E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. has assets of over a billion dollars and its percent of sales profits after taxes is 12.3. The Standard Oil Co. of Indiana has assets of a little less than a billion dollars and its profit after taxes is 8.3 percent. Similarly, the Texas Co. with assets at eight hundred and thirty-three million has a profit after taxes of 9 percent.

Certainly, the distillers do not reach the magnitude of profits of these industrial giants. We hear no outcry against the huge profits of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. or the Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. If it is no crime for these companies to make money it should be no crime for the liquor interests to make profits.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has made a survey of profits and operations of all beverage companies, nonalcoholic and alcoholic. The comparisons are actually startling. The Hiram Walker Co. made a profit of 3.7 percent after taxes. The Schenley Distillers' Corp. made a net profit after income tax of 4.3 percent. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons showed a profit of 2.7 perent. Now compare these profits with those of the nonalcoholic companies. Permit me to list some of them:

Net profit after income taxes

Company:	Percent
Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of New York	8.4
Canada Dry Ginger Ale	4.8
Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of St. Louis	17.3
The Coca-Cola Co. in general	16.9
Dr. Pepper Co	13.6
The Charles E. Hires Co	10.0
The Panama Coca-Cola Co	40.2
Pepsi-Cola Co	11.9
Nehi Corp	11.2

Now, let us look at the over-all picture. Take the weighted average of the profits after taxes of the percent of sales of the 25 largest industrial corporations and compare it with that of the distillers of alcoholic beverages. The industrial corporations have such weighted average of 5.7 percent whereas the distillers have a weighted average of profits after taxes of 3.6 percent. Take the nonalcoholic beverage companies. They have a weighted average of profits after taxes of 13.7 percent.

It may likewise interest you to know that of all retail stores, throughout the country the liquor stores have the shortest longevity with reference to operation. Liquor stores average about 4 years of operation, the lowest average operating life of any retail store.

Yet the liquor industry must always take the rap. Let one member of the liquor industry fall out of line and his sin is visited upon the entire industry. It is blamed for all the ills of the nation.

When I was a lad, liquor was taxed $1.10 per proof gallon; now it is $6. With the wartime excise taxes, it is $9. In addition, there are State taxes and municipal taxes. There is such a thing as charging more than the traffic can bear. Any additional tax beyond the $9 should create the justifiable suspicion that the purpose of the additional tax is to destroy the industry. Furthermore, these taxes piled upon taxes create a mind-set in the public. It has gotten so that whenever a question of additional revenue arises, whatever its purpose, almost automatically the public turns its head toward the liquor industry.

In my opinion, the $3 wartime tax should be removed. Similarly, I am opposed to consumer taxes. They place a restrictive hand on purchases. Consumer taxes are an unfair tax form since they place an equal tax burden on all purchasers, regardless of their ability to pay.

I believe the comparisons of profits which I have made tonight have not been sufficiently publicized. I emphasize that the liquor public relations are not good. Much remains to be done in that regard. People should be told that every liquor man is not a Croesus and that every liquor establishment is not a gold mine.

A Plan for National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by Lt. Gen. I. C. Eaker at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, on January 22, at a luncheon given for members of the Wings Club on the subject entitled "A Plan for National Security":

It is a normal American method, as soon as a war is over, for our people to dust their hands, turn with relief away from war with all its burdens, restrictions, heavy expenditures, and the reading of the long lists of dead and wounded, and to get back with all haste to the more cheerful scenes of peacetime living and the brighter prospects of civil occupations and professions.

I am not suggesting any radical change in the American way. It has been adequate for the winning of two great wars in my lifetime and yours. I am suggesting, however, before we close the books of the late war and start the grim business of paying for it, that we have a last look—rake a few dead leaves, if you will—at least let us determine the reasons why we won and the enemy lost.

Here is my list of lessons from the war, for whatever it is worth. If it is thought-provoking, I have accomplished my purpose in compiling it.

One great reason for our victory lay in the fact that we had more and better manpower.

In the course of the last war, half a million American airmen served under my command. Nearly 100,000 of those men were listed as missing in action; fully half of them will never return to their homes. Having seen their conduct in battle, I think the least I can do is to tell their mothers and fathers the kind of fighting men their boys made.

In the early days in England, when we started the building of the Eighth Air Force with 5 men and when we began our invasion of Hitler's Fortress of Europe with 10 airplanes, one of my worries was as to how our American youth would react to the cruel tests of modern war. I received my answer in those days when the Eighth Air Force was sometimes losing 10 percent of its strength on a single mission, in the days when it looked like we would all be used up and lost in 10 days. Here, briefly, are two typical stories which gave me my answer:

1. In the early days of the Eighth Air Force there was a young bombardier who, because of the skill he had exhibited, was detailed to be the master bombardier on a mission against German targets. As his plane approached the target, a German fighter attacked head-on and fired a 20-millimeter shell into the nose of the airplane. It blew the bombardier to the back of his compartment and tore a big hole in his body. Instinctively, he crawled forward to his bombsight and got off an excellent bombing run, hit the target squarely, as photographs later showed, then fell dead over his bombsight.

This bombardier had a twin brother who was in the same organization. We told his brother that we would like to have him stand down for a few days since we felt the loss of his brother would affect his work. He said: "No. I want to carry on as my brother would have me do." The next day he climbed into the bloody cockpit from which his brother was lifted the day before and took off on a mission from which he never returned.

2. I remember well another instance when, on one of our tough missions, a squadron lost all of its planes but one. We told the squadron commander that afternoon that it would be some days before we could send up new crews and new planes and that his squadron would necessarily be out of the fight during that time. This squadron commander said: "No, sir. We have one airplane left. It came back with 400 bullet holes in it, but I have every man in the squadron working on it tonight, and it will be ready to go in the morning. We are not out of the fight." We admired the spirit of that squadron commander so greatly that we borrowed planes and crews from other squadrons, and he was back in the fight when a mission was launched the following day.

Since my return from the war theaters I have noticed the impression in some quarters that the Air Forces had an easy ride in this war. Our Air Forces in Europe lost more than 90,000 men. The Fifteenth Air Force, under my command in Italy, had a combat strength of 20,000. In 1 year it lost 22,500 men. How many units in this war lost 114 percent of their combat strength in a single year?

Other primary reasons for our victory—

Because we had more industrial capacity to produce more and better weapons of war.

Because we had time in which to gear these tremendous establishments to full-scale stature and production.

Because we had space—great oceans on either side of us, which served as protective barriers and prevented our manpower and our industrial capacity from receiving blows from the enemy while it was being mobilized.

Let us now see whether these factors will be sufficient to place us on the winning side should a war come again. Let me say first, with all the emphasis at my command, that nobody hopes more fervently than we in the Army that the United Nations organization may be so perfected as to prevent any further wars. But until that time comes, we must provide armies, navies and air forces in sufficient force to insure that our country will be protected while we are developing the peace machinery.

I suggest to you that the nature of warfare and its weapons has changed to such an extent that time and space factors have been materially reduced, in fact largely eliminated. If the Germans could in 1944, as they did, produce a rocket which could travel 70,000 feet above the earth for a distance of 280 miles at 700 miles per hour and deliver a ton of explosives with considerable accuracy, it is absolutely certain that any of the principal industrial nations of the earth can, by 1950, develop a super rocket with a range of from 3,000 to 5,000 miles which can travel at a speed of 1,000 to 3,000 miles an hour sufficiently high to overcome the earth's curvature, and deliver 10 to 20 tons of explosives with great accuracy. When that weapon is developed, you can well see that the time and space factors which have stood us in such good stead will largely disappear.

Much has been said in recent times about the effect of the atomic bomb on warfare in the future. We in the Army Air Forces have thought a great deal about it too, and we now have developed a Deputy Chief of Staff for Air whose sole mission is the study of the effect of atomic energy and weapons on warfare and the development of new weapons through the most advanced experimentation and research. We acknowledge the shattering and cataclysmic implications introduced by atomic fission, and we have marshalled our best brains and our whole scientific and experimental organization to think through every possible implication and mold our air establishment accordingly.

In my studies of this problem, I have asked this question: If I had been the head of the Japanese General Staff, how could I have prevented the atomic bombs from being delivered on Japanese targets? This is my conclusion: There are three ways in which this might have been done had the Japanese possessed the necessary military force. The first would have been to destroy the production capacity of atomic bombs at its source in the factories and laboratories of the United States. This would have been the most decisive and effective way. The second method would have been to destroy the bombs, and the planes which were to deliver them, on their bases in the Marshall Islands, before they were launched. The third possible but doubtful method would have been to have had a fighter defense and an antiaircraft defense of sufficient efficiency and intensity all over Japan to have destroyed the planes carrying the bombs as they approached their target. This would have required a larger fighter force and a better antiaircraft defense than any nation in the world has even approached to date. It would have been the most inefficient of the three methods and least likely to succeed.

Now, what sort of force would Japan have needed to accomplish the first two of these methods? The only weapon known to warfare today which could have accomplished these purposes—the destruction of bomb-making capacity in the United States or of the planes carrying the bombs—the long-range bombers on bases in the Marshall Islands—would have been a long-range bomber force such as we alone of all the nations of the earth had in this war. The most powerful army in the world and the most powerful navy afloat would have been impotent to stop these bombers with their death-dealing atomic bombs. Only a long-range bomber force of sufficient power to fight its way through to its targets could have saved Japan from the bombs.

We must revamp our war plans; we must reorganize our military power for a new type of war. If all of us will fully realize these facts and prepare our military machine for the future in accordance with them, our country will still be secure. If we do not, if we insist upon building a military machine with which to win the last war, then we shall have no real security and the tremendous cost will have been an idle expenditure.

You hear the argument that we should not alter an organization which has won two wars. Sitting Bull won the Battle of the Little Big Horn with bows and arrows. Dewey won the Battle of Manila Bay with 6-inch guns. Could anyone suggest that, because two great victories were won with antique weapons, we should hold fast to old means and modes and methods?

There is every indication that we must reorganize our national defensive structure for the new type of warfare I have indicated, where time and space are practically eliminated. We will need more speed of decision than we were able to get in the last war. It is enough to say for the proposed unification of the armed forces, with Army, Navy, and Air Forces on coequal status, that economy in peace and efficiency in war demand it.

A system of national security for the United States in the future must have these ingredients:

First of all, our State Department must be an organization which will entice and offer an ample career to the best brains we can produce in this country. We must always remember that where the diplomat leaves off, the soldier must take up the burden.

Secondly, we must have a central intelligence agency which will tell us what is brewing in every corner of the earth.

Thirdly, we must have a force in being ready to move on a moment's notice to destroy the discovered war chest of the enemy before it is launched.

Fourthly, we must keep our weapons modern. This requires great emphasis on scientific development—research and experimentation. It has been said that every war begins with the weapons of the last war. It may well be that we were given a preview of the weapons which will dominate the next war in the robot bomb, German rocket, V-2, or our atomic bomb. It may well be, too, that some of the technique which appeared experimentally in the last war may be commonplace and routine in the next—such things as radar, blind bombing.

While there is grave danger that the war of the future will be a short war of unparalleled destruction, the first blows of which will come through the air, nevertheless, if we are wise, we will maintain naval and land forces, modern and mobile, the whole to be supported by a National Guard and Organized Reserve, and Reserve Officers Training Corps prepared to mobilize and lead the manpower of the Nation. Then, too, we must have better plans for the conversion of industry to warfare than we have had in the past for the simple reason that there will be less time, plus the great probability that it will have to be done while the destructive blows of the enemy are raining upon us.

This much is certain. There is the greatest probability that the first battlefields of the next war will be the industrial cities of the United States. No aggressor nation of the future can miss the point that the last two wars were lost by the aggressor because he neglected to depreciate the manpower or destroy the material resources of the United States.

Finally, over all this business of sound organization, modern weapons and mobilized industry and manpower, rides this dominant fact—no nation is secure unless the citizen places the welfare of his country above his personal self-interest. During the war the national interest was dominant. Now there are many signs and there is grave danger that personal interest and selfish welfare of highly organized minorities are being placed above the national interest, the welfare of all the people.

As the first plank in our platform for national security, let us make certain that the future generation is educated to put national interest first.

Three Great American Newspapers Conduct Campaigns To Alert Citizens Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had called to my attention three specific campaigns conducted by widely separated American newspapers to alert the citizens of their respective communities against the menace of communism within their midst. Undoubtedly there are many other such examples of public service by newspapers waging specific campaigns against definite Communist activities in their areas; hence the three I am about to mention should in no sense be considered a complete list but I mention them simply to indicate methods which patriotic and public-serving newspapers can employ to help curtail the activities and growth of American communism.

May I say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that these concrete cases of effective campaigns against communism demonstrate that the best traditions of journalism are still existent in this Republic. We hear much criticism of the press to the effect that American journalism is becoming just a conveyor belt for carrying comic strips, gossip columns, and syndicated editorial comment into American homes and that the courageous editorial campaigns against community evils are no longer a part of the service rendered by modern newspapers. Mr. Speaker, I have never been one to accept this pat criticism and this too inclusive indictment of our American press. I believe the three following illustrations will help to discredit critics who condemn modern American journalism with too much haste and too little evidence.

THE MILWAUKEE SENTINEL

In a series of 59 articles the Milwaukee Sentinel recently exposed the activities of Communists in Wisconsin, especially in the important industrial area of Milwaukee. With courage and candor, the Milwaukee Sentinel articles named names, cited instances, spelled out cases—and got results.

As a matter of this great public service by the Milwaukee Sentinel, a number of admitted Communists have been driven out of positions of authority and the Democratic Party went so far as to deny support to one of its nominees for Congress when the evidence demonstrated that he was a Communist operative.

Those interested can secure the series of articles from the Milwaukee Sentinel since they have been prepared in booklet form. The title of the booklet is "How the Milwaukee Sentinel Exposed Milwaukee Communists and Fellow Travelers."

The Milwaukee Sentinel's own summation of its noteworthy crusade against un-Americanism in Wisconsin's largest city is as follows:

What one American city is doing to rid itself of Communist domination of a key union council other cities can do.

It takes time, patience, and some old-fashioned courage, but the job is far from impossible.

A fighting newspaper is the best weapon simply because the Reds can't stand the glare of public exposure. The average American workingman just won't stand still for being a sucker (when he knows about it), and that's what the Commies have made him wherever they have gained control of labor unions.

The clergy, public officials, and the average man on the street will help out once the danger is shown and the battle line drawn.

If the Communists can be rooted out at the local level, they will lose their strength in Washington, and we will have a chance to enjoy the peace our boys bought with their blood.

It can be done.

For further information as to the campaign of the Milwaukee Sentinel I am having reprinted at this point the concluding article of the series run in that great newspaper:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of November 20, 1946]

HOW TO BEAT REDS? WITHHOLD SUPPORT

(By John Sentinel)

How can America rid itself of a too powerful Communist influence? Believing in democratic and humane rights, we Americans do

not kill our opponents or send them to the salt mines as is done in Russia.

The answer to communism in America is simple: Stop giving them support!

If Communists did not draw so much support from non-Communists, they would at once melt down to their own size and their own strength, and be no problem at all.

Trade unionists: When there are union elections, get out and vote! Communist candidates for union office want a small turnout, so they and their lackeys can capture the election.

When you vote, vote for pro-American candidates. This is the way to get the Russia-Firsters out.

Voters: Vote for candidates who have a consistent record of allegiance to the political party of your choice. Watch out for newly made Democrats or newly converted Republicans. As we saw in the last election, some of them were imposters.

Liberals: "United front" with Communists is not liberalism, but stupidity. Playing with tigers is a hazardous sport.

Communists despise liberals, but want to "use" them to give momentum to their own objectives.

A true liberal cannot at the same time condemn injustices in America and apologize for the far greater injustices in Russia. He cannot condemn the ethics of some Americans and wink at the even worse ethics of Communists.

Joiners: Before you join a high-sounding organization or open your pocketbook to it, investigate. Who is soliciting you? Who is the secretary of the group? Communist fronts always give the presidency to an honored citizen, but keep the secretary's job for a Communist.

Many Milwaukee organizations are worthy of your support. They are not Communist fronts. But some are.

Someone may call on you and say that So-and-so, whom you know, has lent the group his name. Remember, he may have been a sucker. Demand better arguments for your joining before you give your name or your money to the organization.

Members of minority groups: Communists make special efforts to win your support by noisily championing your cause. But beware. They have special plans for you. You are to be their shock troops, their "expendables," when they feel strong enough to make a bid for power.

Communists will promise you utopia in return for your support. But they will never deliver utopia to you and your people. Russia is the opposite of utopia, both for the majority group and for the minorities.

When we have the sense to give the Communists the cold shoulder and refuse support of their ventures, the Communist problem will be well in hand.

To assist the public in spotting Communists and Communist sympathizers, the Sentinel is arranging a public service. At your request, the Sentinel will tell you whether a local organization is worthy of your assistance or is a front group.

The Sentinel will advise you as to whether people running for union office or political office have a record of Communist affiliations or not.

Write John Sentinel; and if the information is available, it will be supplied.

THE BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

The largest daily newspaper of Buffalo, N. Y., and one of the most important papers in the upstate area of the Empire State has been running a series of editorials and exposures showing the techniques of Communists by which they infiltrate into front organizations with high-sounding names and perverted purposes and then get gullible but well-meaning Americans to aid the communism program.

In spotlighting this front-organization tactic of the American Communists, the Buffalo Evening News is rendering a significant public service. Americans are notorious joiners—they will pay a dollar or $5 or even $10 to join an organization with a pretty name and a noble slogan without investigating as to the real nature or purposes of the organization. Thus, many thousands of innocents at home are duped. More important, many thousands of respectable Americans lend their names and their finances to the advancement of un-American programs and communistic creeds. The results are equally detrimental whether these giddy joiners are dullards or knaves; they provide the reenforcements and recruits by which crafty Communists and their fellow travelers conceal their objectives while at the same time undermining our basic American institutions.

The Buffalo Evening News has demonstrated that suspicious front organizations cannot thrive when the spotlight of objective publicity is turned upon their real purposes and their red personnel. What that newspaper has done to safeguard Buffalo against these underground, underhand front organizations, other newspapers can do in a thousand different communities in this Republic if they will take the time and devote the talent to scrutinizing and investigating the various "fronts" operating in their localities and appealing for funds from their readers.

THE MEMPHIS (TENN.) COMMERCIAL APPEAL

One of the most thoroughgoing and complete exposures of communism and what its creed threatens for a Christian civilization such as America's, has been made by the Memphis Commercial Appeal. It has made an objective, intelligent, and analytical study of the methods and purposes of communism and it has given its readers the benefit of this information in fearless, factual terms.

Interested citizens can secure a copy of this informative and interesting study by writing to the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn. The studies have been collected in an attractive booklet, the study of which has been recommended by no less an authority on un-American activities than J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Hoover's letter with reference to the classic on communism published by the Memphis Appeal is as follows:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., November 12, 1946.

To the Reader:

The Memphis Commercial Appeal is rendering a real public service in bringing to its readers the mission of communism in America.

The menace of Red fascism will continue to threaten the security of our Nation until its forward march is halted. It has advanced by trickery and deceit, it has infiltrated every phase of American life.

An aroused America means a secure America. When every loyal, patriotic citizen knows the objectives of the Communist Party, United States of America, then and then only will its forward march be halted. The American Communists endeavor to conceal their sinister aims by high-sounding slogans and front organizations, but these are only blinds. The American Communists stand for revolution, they work for revolution, they seek to foment revolution.

They stand for the destruction of American democracy and the cherished freedoms our forefathers fought so valiantly to win.

Only an aroused and an informed America can halt their program of destruction.

J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying and significant developments of the past few months has been the fact that communism has ceased to be either fashionable or respectable in America. The Communist coddler, the liberal (sic) writer and commentator with his abject apologies for communism, the fellow traveler who disguises his Red leanings behind the mask of academic freedom, progressivism, or antifascism has received some rude shocks. Americans, generally, are awakening to the conspirational nature of communism; they are rapidly familiarizing themselves with those who are supporters and those who are opponents of communism. The little fellow in the neutral corner who no longer dares commend the Communists but who will not effectively crticize them is getting more and more lonesome. The great work of papers like the Milwaukee Sentinel, the Buffalo Evening News, and the Commercial Appeal has contributed greatly to this alerting of lethargic Americans to the menace of communism.

A few chapter headings from the highly illuminating booklet published by the Commercial Appeal indicate the scope and significance of that analysis which, Mr. Speaker, would be a highly valuable booklet for patriotic citizens to secure for the purpose of placing it in the libraries of our schools and colleges. The indicative headings follow: "People need the awakening light," "The 'dissolution' was a lie," "Pattern for world revolution," "Communism wants us helpless," and "God or anti-Christ—Which?"

American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars posts, lodges, churches, service clubs such as Rotary and Kiwanis—these and other civic or patriotic organizations would do well to place such booklets as that published by the Memphis Commercial Appeal in the hands of the high-school students of their communities. The United States Chamber of Commerce booklet on communism is equally well suited for general distribution to the youth of the land.

To the individual who sometimes asks himself and others, "What can I do about communism" there is now a direct and challenging answer. He can purchase a few copies of the significant new booklets on the true nature of communism and make certain that they are made available to the youth of America who can be depended upon to curtail communism if the rest of us do our part to make certain they know exactly what it is.

Speech of Senator Raymond E. Baldwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by the Honorable RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, Senator from Connecticut, before the Washington League of Women Voters on February 3, 1947:

Because I believe the women in our party want to take—and should take—a great interest in the issues that confront us, I would like to discuss with you here this afternoon one of the most serious of those problems, one on which, I believe, our success as a party hinges—that is labor-management relations. I know it is a practice for men to choose subjects somewhat different from this when they have the opportunity of appearing before such groups as yours. However, it seems to me that the women of this country not only play an important role in formulating the opinions of the men in their homes, but also now play an active public role in helping to establish and carry out national policies. Consequently, I believe they want to be acquainted with—and concerned about—the most serious problems we face whether or not those issues are entertaining.

I said that I thought labor-management relations was one of the most important issues to be met by our party. Not only because legislation on that subject affects daily the lives and incomes of millions of people, but also because the attitude we take there will probably reflect our general attitude on many other subjects. Of course, there is the added reason that no subject has aroused more violent controversy in the last 15 years, even more particularly in the last 5 years. Now that we, as a party, have become a major influence rather than a minor one, we are expected to produce some legislation in this field that is constructive and wise.

Before analyzing the kind of solutions that have been proposed by Republicans, let us look back a few years to see what has brought on this problem.

The history of disputes between labor and management in this country is a long one. Some of the early chapters are violent and bloody—not pleasant chapters for either side to recall. In more recent years we have, for the most part, found more peaceful and more rational methods of settlement. I hope it shall be our firm purpose to continue in this peaceful direction.

We are all aware that there has been a trend in the last 50 years, accelerated in the last 15, toward the development of freedom and rights for laboring people. Depending upon the administration in power at the time, we have tended to swing first toward giving management the larger portion of the power in disputes and then toward giving labor the largest power.

Collective bargaining was met for many years by both Government and management with considerable hostility. Though between the years of 1880 and 1920 an increasing number of union agreements were made with management, the actual membership of unions was small and that membership rose and fell sharply as economic conditions changed. During these years unions got a foothold in such industries as mining, construction, printing, and railroads. In other industries unionization was small. During this period the courts of our country played a large part in determining the lengths to which unions could go. Labor organizations were weak. They had little support from Government, and the progress toward increased unionization was usually successfully blocked by business. The comparatively few strikes that occurred during these years were frequently won by the employer who used methods common in those days but which would, to us today, appear tyrannical. Bitter hates were developed on both sides. The battles between management and Government on one side and labor on the other cost lives on both sides. In many cases these strikes were literally civil wars and like the Civil War they were forgotten slowly and painfully.

The results were not conclusive. Management felt that labor was getting out of hand and must be quelled. Labor became only more determined to win in the end, regardless of cost. After some gains in membership between 1900 and 1920, the prosperity of the twenties reduced membership in trade-unions. The decline continued during the depression, until by 1932 the total membership was estimated to be only about 2,500,000.

The development of collective bargaining in this country, therefore, was a slow one. It was not until the third decade of this century that such bargaining was more than tolerated. It was not until the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-injunction Act that unions began to flourish. This act was an extension of the Clayton Act of 1914, which had, in many instances, failed in its apparent purpose to exclude unions from antitrust action. Since that time the policy of encouraging unionism has brought the total strength of union membership to somewhere near 15,000,000. Thus, today, a large proportion of our working people have agreements with their employers whereby terms of pay, methods of handling disputes, hours of work, methods of handling grievances, safety regulations, etc., are determined by consultation between owner and worker. These agreements are, of course, intended to—and expected to—preserve peace in industry during the period of their operation.

In 1935 the second law which contributed a major boost to the growth of unions was passed. That was the National Labor Relations Act, more commonly known as the Wagner Act. This act for the first time gave the Government, through the National Labor Relations Board, the duty of not only protecting, but encouraging, collective bargaining. It also gave that Board wide discretionary powers to prevent management from engaging in practices regarded as unfair and from interfering with workers in their efforts to organize themselves for mutual assistance. This Government-encouraged collective bargaining, approved by Congress, is a compromise between individual bargaining and compulsory Government regulation.

Compulsory government regulation or arbitration, of course, in the end amounts to complete government control over wages and working conditions. By and large, such control is regarded by both management and labor as alien to our system of individual enterprise. Individual bargaining is regarded by all labor and by a large part of management today as being unfair to workers because in our complex industrial society no individual worker is capable of himself bargaining on an equal basis with the management of a large plant. The Wagner Act had as its purpose to "diminish the causes of labor disputes." It marked a change in our traditional government policy in regard to labor unionization. It marked the beginning of an era in which government encouraged and supported labor through their own organizations. Armed with this new support, labor undertook tremendous programs of unionization. They sought immediately far-reaching and important changes. Management objected to these violent changes. To enforce their demands, which had now been made legal, the workers went on strike. The result was, until 1937 the number of strikes increased yearly. Many of these strikes have as a basic cause, efforts at increased unionization rather than immediate demands for better working conditions. Thus, clearly, the Wagner Act failed, for reasons that may or may not be justified, in its avowed purpose to "diminish labor disputes." It failed largely because the authors of this act presumed that by giving labor increased backing, the right to freely organize, and the right to bargain collectively, peaceful agreements could usually be reached if the employer bargained in good faith. They forget, however, to provide any machinery to facilitate these agreements. Apparently, it never occurred to the authors at that time that the unions could or would sometime get in a position where they could assume a "take it or leave it" attitude, and with little or no notice go out on strike. The act assumed that by equalizing bargaining power, wages would be raised and stabilized. It did not provide any way of peacefully settling disputes when collective bargaining ended in disagreement. Thus, in effect, any discussion which did not quickly and peacefully produce an agreement was likely to wind up in a strike or lock-out.

The third major piece of legislation affecting labor during the thirties was the Fair Labor Standards Act which effects minimum wages, established the 40-hour workweek, and required payment of time and one-half for work in excess of 40 hours. The overtime provision affected all workers in interstate commerce, not merely those receiving the minimum wage. It was the wage definitions of workday and workweek in this act that brought the portal-to-portal pay suits.

After 1937, a general improvement in business and huge war orders reduced unemployment, the power of labor increased and the number of strikes decreased. However, work stoppages still continued at a high level. It would seem clear then that regardless of the rights or wrongs involved, the Wagner Act did not diminish the number of work stoppages. On this point, the unions, of course, argue that they were justified in these strikes because they had a legal right to strike and needed this weapon to change working conditions about which they had had little to say previously. Management, on the other hand, decried those strikes on the ground that labor had all the power on its side and would only work if all their demands were met. Whatever the reason, or whichever side was most nearly correct, the fact does remain that labor disputes did not diminish.

Up to the time of the war, large sections of the American public were on the side of labor regardless of the issues involved. First, because they felt that labor was only then in a position which management had held for such long years, and second, because most of these strikes did not effect the daily living of any major part of the American people.

During the war period, however, the American public became incensed by continued strikes because they considered these strikes contrary to national interest in that they were a threat to the preservation of our Nation, and also because these strikes affected the supply of goods needed by a large part of the public.

Actually, during this period it was said by both industry and labor that for all practicable purposes the Government directed the conditions under which labor should work

through the War Labor Board. Expanded conciliation services of the Government, the patriotic motive, union agreements not to strike during the war, and the fact that many employers were operating on a cost-plus basis or receiving high prices for their goods, all contributed toward keeping work stoppages at a comparatively low level.

That period also produced another interesting development in labor-management relations. Because the War Labor Board was not able to promptly deal with requests from labor, and because decisions of the Labor Board were frequently not satisfactory to the unions involved, many of the strikes during this period were directed at War Labor Board action—or lack of it—rather than the employer himself.

The public made comparisons between the comparatively low pay and dangerous life of the men in the armed services, and the high pay and normal life of the man working in factories. The result was violently increased public reaction against strikes. In 1943 public demand brought about the Smith-Connally Act which provided principally for a 30-day cooling-off period, and for a secret ballot before a strike. Again, the purpose of the bill was to reduce the number of strikes. Instead, because the bill actually provided a legalized method for striking, the number of strikes increased, until in 1945 that part of the War Labor Disputes Act was repealed.

With the end of the war, rising prices, and reduced working hours, the country saw a rash of serious strikes. While the House of Representatives was debating new labor legislation in early 1946, the number of man-days lost as a result of labor disputes was at the highest level in our history. Again, something had to be done to diminish labor disputes. Serious work stoppages were occurring in practically every major industry. Production was crawling, strikes in public utilities were interfering with normal services the public expected. The difficulties of conversion to peacetime production were intensified. Violent remedies were proposed on both sides. Among legislators and the public alike, there was an increasing feeling of hopelessness. Almost no two people could agree as to what steps should be taken.

The Government had, in general, agreed that labor could obtain whatever wage increases were possible without price increases, on the theory that the elimination of overtime and the down-grading of workers would in effect reduce the total wage payments. Demands for increased wages which management felt it could not meet in October 1945 without increasing prices, became impossible in 1946 because of interruptions in production and increased unit costs.

During this critical time, in both the House and the Senate, new legislation was being prepared. The Seventy-ninth Congress thought it had found the answer in the Case bill, which was killed by Presidential veto. The Case bill contained two major sections. The first dealt with basic collective-bargaining relationships, the second with specific abuses of union activity. Under the first category the Case bill asked for a 60-day cooling-off period during which wage and working conditions would remain as they were. A Federal Mediation Board was created in the Department of Labor, and the bill provided for a clause in all agreements stating that final and binding adjustments of all grievances arising under the agreement must be made. The second group of provisions in this bill imposed upon unions legal responsibilities and restraints believed to be equal to their economic power. These provisions were largely concerned with certain interferences with trade, restrictions on certain payments to labor organizations, joint management of welfare funds, restrictions on the organization of foremen, restrictions on secondary boycotts. They also make unions suable in Federal court for violation of contract. Though passed by both the House and the Senate, this bill did not become law because of the Presidential veto.

By election time in 1946 strikes had decreased somewhat, and still the results of that November election are regarded by many as a mandate from the people to the Republican Party to do something constructive to permanently reduce the number of strikes.

The result has been that some sixty or seventy proposals have already been made in the Eightieth Congress designed to accomplish this end. The purpose of most of these bills is the same as that of the Wagner Act, "to diminish labor disputes." The methods suggested are somewhat different.

By and large, these proposals in one form or another cover the following points: They give the employer a degree of free speech allegedly denied him under the Wagner Act; they require that unions make their internal organizations more democratic; they require that certain types of strikes such as sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, strikes in public utilities, strikes against the Government, etc., be outlawed; they narrow the base on which collective bargaining can occur by limiting such bargaining to individual plants, regions, or segments of industry; they require cooling-off periods before work stoppage; they require compulsory arbitration; they require that unions be made legally responsible by forcing them to incorporate and register basic information; or they outlaw certain alleged unfair labor practices such as coercion, calling strikes without a majority vote by secret ballot, feather bedding, mass picketing, secondary boycotts, etc. Of course, not all are included in any one bill.

On the Senate side, the principal legislation proposed are the bills introduced by Senators CAPEHART and WILEY in regard to portal-to-portal pay; the Ball-Taft-Smith bill designed to provide additional facilities for mediation of labor disputes, to improve procedures for collective bargaining, and to make labor organizations legally responsible; Senator BYRD'S bill to prohibit the closed shop in industries affecting commerce; Senator MORSE'S bill to provide additional facilities for mediation of labor disputes; Senator BALL'S bill in regard to the closed shop; a series of bills by Senator O'DANIEL concerned with amendment or repeal of the Wagner Act; Senator BALL'S bill to amend the Wagner Act to preclude alleged monopolistic practices; the bill introduced by Senators PEPPER, MURRAY, and THOMAS to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act in regard to hours and wages; Senator LUCAS' resolution to direct a study of labor relations; and Senator BYRD'S resolutions requiring labor organizations to incorporate in order to receive protection under the Wagner Act.

From all these proposals undoubtedly will come one or two comprehensive labor bills. It is also probable that the House of Representatives will produce an omnibus bill.

Since work stoppages are now at a comparatively low level, we have an opportunity to carefully consider the type of legislation that will do most to accomplish the purpose so frequently given for such legislation, that of diminishing labor disputes.

I should make one exception here, the damaging portal-to-portal pay suits that have arisen as a result of the indefiniteness of the Fair Labor Standards Act must be settled immediately.

Except for these portal-to-portal cases, the public is probably not now so immediately concerned about labor legislation as it was in 1946. However, there is still a strong feeling that the majority of the people have required this Congress to somehow curb labor's abuses of the freedoms recently granted.

While, as I have said, the new legislation proposed in the Eightieth Congress generally deals with a number of subjects, the methods of dealing with these subjects are quite different. The approaches vary from those which would literally bar labor's privilege of striking to those which would actually increase the wages of labor. Generally, they limit in one way or another the right of labor to strike at any time under any conditions. Many union leaders are convinced the destruction of unions is the real purpose behind any limitation of the freedom to strike. They argue that, while labor has in the strike the potent weapon, the working man cannot afford to use it indiscriminately because of the loss of wages incurred. Management, on the other hand, generally contends that work stoppages must be reduced by methods varying from mild moral obligation not to strike, to a legal prohibition of strikes in certain industries. They emphasize generally that strikes are practically always an inconvenience to the public and that they harm, directly or indirectly, innocent parties.

There are, needless to say, arguments to be presented on each side of each specific proposal in regard to labor-management relations. Our tendency in the past to swing from one extreme to the other in regard to these relations has never produced a final solution to this most difficult of our problems. Therefore, it seems to me that if we, as Members of our new Republican Congress, are to serve our country best, we are charged with the duty of providing the type of legislation and the kind of progress that will make possible greater satisfaction to the public and consequently greater national peace and greater production. In doing this, we cannot accede to the extreme demands of either side. We cannot afford to have another series of stop-gap measures. I am convinced that the Wagner Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act are not only too indefinite, but they have made possible abuses and misuses by some unions who may choose to ignore the common interest.

It is my conviction that in whatever labor legislation we provide, we should maintain labor's right to organize and labor's right to stop work. At the same time, we should make sure that the strength of labor unions cannot become so great as to make it possible for any man or union to bludgeon management or the Government into granting any demand through the threat of the strike weapon. We should provide machinery through which arbitration could be accomplished, knowing full well that granting the right of bargaining between management and labor in itself will not always produce a peaceful solution.

Since our common purpose is to reduce labor-management disharmony, we should make sure that labor can no longer cripple production through strikes having little or nothing to do with the immediate working conditions of the laborers involved; that labor cannot create monopolies too strategic or too powerful for even Government to control; that labor cannot organize for the purpose of excluding other than a chosen membership; and that individual members of unions are protected by increased democracy within the union. On the other hand, any legislation should protect the laboring man by making sure that management cannot through coercion or threat prevent his joining an organization of other laboring men; that management cannot by pitting one man against another lower the wages or increase the working hours of both, and that management cannot refuse to bargain in good faith on matters concerned with working conditions.

Keeping in mind our long history of collective bargaining and our long history of

industrial strife, it is my earnest hope that we as legislators will seek to provide a fair and far-reaching solution to these difficulties. It is my further hope that you, the women of the Republican Party, will take an active part in making sure that we maintain the principles of our party in advancing not the interests of any segment of society, but the interests of all people in our Nation by demanding that labor disputes be diminished by fair, equitable, and far-sighted measures.

Petroleum Conservation and Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, farm crops amount to one of our greatest national resources. Exceeded only by the food value of farm crops is the value of the industrial things that can be made from these crops. All through the recent war there was abundant demonstration of the great variety of uses that can be made of products synthetically created from the common farm crops. These synthetic products not only made war supplies more abundant but actually relieved shortages of the most critical nature.

The war hastened the exhaustion of our great natural resources of petroleum. As the Nation moves away from the war period the threat of agricultural surpluses increases. Rarely have national problems dovetailed in more convenient manner than in these two cases of exhaustion of national petroleum supply and mounting agricultural surpluses. Rubber and motor fuel can be made in abundance and quality from the alcohol derivatives of grain crops. When rubber, motor fuels, and other commodities needed in volume in our national economy are made from grain alcohol the use of petroleum is reduced, our national reserve is conserved, and the products of American farms are profitably used.

This problem, which at the same time is an opportunity, is astutely understood by the new Governor of Nebraska, the Honorable Val Peterson. I include in these remarks copy of a telegram dispatched by Governor Peterson to the President of the United States 2 days ago:

LINCOLN, NEBR., *February 3, 1947.*

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,

The President,

The White House, Washington, D. C.:

In recent months officials in your Departments of Interior and State have indicated that our national petroleum resources would be exhausted in a relatively short period—possibly 25 years. I appreciate these statements are controversial. Now the Senate Oil Investigating Committee declares this country could not fight another major war if it had to rely on its own petroleum resources alone. It urges bold steps to get synthetic-fuel production ready.

These statements, if supported by facts, make the action of Federal agencies in switching from industrial alcohol made from farm products to a petroleum base in the manufacture of synthetic rubber absolutely indefensible in spite of the present cost differential favorable to petroleum. Alcohol is made from starch, which is air, sunshine, and water, and our farms, consistent with good soil-management practices, can produce an endless supply.

The United States must never be dependent again on the foreign-owned rubber cartel which formerly juggled rubber prices at will. We would be paying exorbitant prices for rubber today were it not for our present synthetic-rubber plants. Rubber shortages nearly stalled our military efforts in the recent war.

Further, the bane of farming, surplus production, is just around the corner, 2 or 3 years away. Scarcity production is indefensible by any standard and extremely costly to our taxpayers. Nebraska and the Midwest are determined that the black night of farm depression not be permitted to descend on our homes again. Our hope lies largely in the chemurgic movement and the continuation of operation of the Government alcohol plants at Omaha and Muscatine, Iowa, and others is a vital part of that movement.

Over 600 products are made from industrial alcohol. Had America's rubber alone been made in the period between World Wars I and II from industrial alcohol made from grains there would not have been a single surplus bushel of grain and no farm depression in the degree we experienced.

Militarily we should conserve oil. Militarily we must maintain adequate synthetic-rubber-production facilities. Agriculturally we must eliminate farm surpluses in a sound, constructive manner. As an example, today millions of bushels of Government-owned potatoes are being destroyed. These could easily be converted into industrial alcohol and stock-piled for future use. These objectives can be reached by producing synthetic rubber from industrial alcohol made from farm products. Our entire national economy would reap eventual benefit from such a program. Only the foreign-owned cartel which shamelessly exploits native populations would be in any manner injured.

Midwesterners look to you, as one of them, to take action that will benefit not only agriculture but the entire Nation.

VAL PETERSON,
Governor of Nebraska.

How Roosevelt Double-Crossed the Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of February 5, 1947:

HOW ROOSEVELT DOUBLE-CROSSED THE POLES

Surely by now there is nobody left in the Western World who would argue that Poland got a square deal out of World War II. The record is plain enough.

In March 1939, the Poles were still in a position to sell out to Hitler with minimum losses or stand up to him and risk all for victory.

They were promised unconditional full aid by Britain and France, and so defied Hitler. Late in August 1939, Hitler and Stalin stunned the whole world by making a joint military pact, promptly followed by their joint invasion of Poland.

The Poles fought them both and when they could no longer maintain a government in Warsaw they set up a government in exile. And so Poland became the worst battleground of the whole war, ravaged first by the Germans, then by the Russians, for six terrible years.

But the promises of Britain and the United States, both direct and plainly implied in the Atlantic Charter and the speeches of Churchill and Roosevelt, gave the Poles every right to believe that in victory over Germany Poland would be restored to prewar independence.

It was a false hope based on false promises, as the elections just ended in Poland plainly have demonstrated and as President Truman only yesterday acknowledged in his bitter criticism of those elections to the new ambassador of Russian-controlled Poland.

The fact is that Poland has simply swapped the domination of Hitler for Stalin, and at the most ghastly price ever inflicted upon any people in the modern world.

Not even the defeated Germans and Japanese have been punished so brutally as the Poles in "victory," for their punishment includes along with the loss of men, material wealth, and land, also their loss of faith in us. They were double-crossed by Roosevelt, flat out. He promised them something from the United States of America and he did not keep his word.

Why did he promise that which he could not or would not deliver? You will find the answer in a new book by Poland's ex-ambassador to the United States and ex-passionate admirer of Roosevelt, Jan Ciechanowski.

The name of this book is Defeat in Victory. It is 397 pages long, was published in 1947 by Doubleday & Co., and costs $3.50.

WHY ROOSEVELT BETRAYED POLES

It is the detailed story of Ciechanowski's experiences in this city trying to save his country from the Russians and has no equal as a dictionary and handbook on how a President of the United States can use his great office to deceive, betray, and abuse the confidence of a helpless and suffering people.

Defeat in Victory should be in every public-school library for the education of generations to come concerning another piece of the truth about Roosevelt.

Why did he deceive the Poles? Why did he not have the courage to tell the Poles the truth—that it was beyond his will or his power to rescue them from Stalin as well as from Hitler? Ciechanowski gives a clue:

"I was frequently asked by election agents of the New Deal what I thought would be the most appropriate way to obtain the support of what they called 'the Polish vote' for the Democratic machine (in Roosevelt's term IV campaign of 1944).

"I was repeatedly told bluntly by the New Dealers of the Palace Guard that the appointment of Ambassador Lane to replace Biddle as American Ambassador to the Polish Government on September 2, 1944, was not only a proof of the President's 'abiding' interest in Poland but also a political move which they hoped would be reflected by the Polish vote."

BIDDING FOR THE POLISH VOTE IN 1944

Ciechanowski writes further that in spite of all these maneuvers the Polish-American Congress, representing most voters of Polish extraction, was still doubtful that Roosevelt was positively for a free and independent Poland until he saw Charles Rozmarek, head of their organization, at Chicago on October 18, 1944.

In that interview Ciechanowski reports that Roosevelt "definitely promised" Rozmarek "to take active steps to insure Poland's independence."

Whereupon the main Polish-language press and the Polish-American Congress

came out with a wham for Roosevelt's reelection to term IV. He was reelected.

And thereafter the Poles began to discover what they had bought with their votes. No need here to describe it all again. The record shows plainly enough that even as he was promising the Poles one thing Roosevelt was assuring Stalin on the side by word and deed that it was all just campaign talk.

The details of how the truth came home to Ciechanowski and the Poles in general are blood-chilling to read, but worth every citizen's attention as a lesson in Roosevelt's faithlessness and lack of character.

NEW DEAL PLANS FOR F. D. R. IN 1948

Here is one fair sample, reporting a meeting after the election between Ciechanowski and Harry Hopkins who was even then on the way to Stalin:

"Hopkins was in a jovial mood. He assured me that he would do his best, although it was no easy matter to oppose Stalin. He then added jokingly:

" 'We have to think of other very important things.'

"I asked him what things could be more important at this time than to lay the foundations for the United Nations' collaboration in a secure postwar world on the basis of American principles. He laughed and answered in his humorously cynical way:

" 'Why, we have to prepare the President's election campaign of 1948.' "

Hopkins may have thought that was funny, but he certainly was not joking. The only joke was on the Poles. Those few still alive to receive Stalin's cruel mercies.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

FOOT-AND-MOUTH

The excellent relations existing between Mexico and this country will be fortified by President Truman's impending visit to Mexico City. One problem above all has arisen which should enlist the prompt and serious concern of both countries. This is the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. The disease has been traced to Mexico's import from South America of a few hundred bulls from an infected region. Mexico persisted in letting them in, despite the administration's representations to the government that such a course would be unwise. It was then decided on the American side to close the border as a safeguard for our Southwestern cattle. However, for some reason that Secretary Anderson may explain in his forthcoming statement on the subject, the bars were dropped for a time, only to be put up again when the dread disease broke out in northern Mexico. But, aside from this mistake, our propinquity and our good neighborliness alike require that we do everything possible to help Mexico eradicate the epidemic.

Foot-and-mouth disease is extremely difficult to cope with. In one known instance occurring in California in 1929, the virus lived 345 days after a quarantine had been lifted. It was in a pile of old hay that had not been destroyed. It can be carried in the most unexpected way. An English soldier stationed in Germany, after visiting an infected area, apparently carried the virus on his shoes to England, and passed on the disease to his family's dairy cattle. The Mexicans appear to be doing what they can to extirpate the disease. Eight states are affected, and in them are 600,000 head of cattle, including 200,000 dairy cows, which supply half the entire population of Mexico with milk. Northern Mexico cattlemen have pledged 10 percent of their calf crops and a 100 percent increase in their taxes to help pay for the cattle that must be slaughtered. The President's visit will demonstrate our common concern and combined action in respect of this and other matters in our relations with Mexico.

Exemptions From Certain Income-Tax Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Congress make a study of the exemptions from certain income-tax payments which are granted under present laws and regulations to cooperatives.

These exemptions were originally granted, and justly so, to help farmers in their marketing problems. During the years, however, the cooperative movement has invaded the territory of the taxpaying Main Street merchant, business, and industry.

The result is that the private enterprise merchant and manufacturer, who pay substantial taxes, must meet the competition of cooperative businesses which get off virtually tax-free.

There is little complaint of the farmer type cooperative, nor of the theory of the cooperative movement, but these concerns should remain true cooperatives and stick to the purpose for which they were formed.

The New Jersey Taxpayers Association, one of our State's outstanding civic organizations, has called my attention to certain editorials discussing this serious and growing problem, which follow:

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Evening Times]

THE PRICE OF BUTTER

Revelations concerning the operations of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, representing 60 percent of the producers in the New York milkshed, raise the question of whether there should be a change in governmental policies with respect to farmers' cooperatives. They are granted by law exemption from business taxes levied on private companies. The United States Department of Agriculture aids them in many ways. Their prosperity is advanced materially by Government aid.

Yet, the Dairymen's League has admitted buying upward of 500,000 pounds of butter to sustain the price beyond the deadline for setting milk and butter prices in New York for the month of January. The United States Department of Agriculture has properly ordered an investigation of what was undeniably a case of market rigging for selfish gain if not a criminal conspiracy against the consumers of New York State.

The question of why members of such an organization should be the beneficiaries of important financial concessions by the Government is one for Congress to answer.

[From the Summit (N. J.) Herald of January 30, 1947]

UNMASKED

The mask is off. Cooperative organizations which pay little or no Federal income tax on their profits estimated at $12,000,000,000 in 1945 will have some of their extracurricular activities brought into the spotlight.

The Federal Government has brought a criminal information action against the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, operating with 26,000 dairymen in the Northeastern States, including New Jersey, on the charge of manipulating the price of butter on the New York Mercantile Exchange. The cooperative is accused of buying over 600,000 pounds of butter during a 5-day period at a cost of $561,757 to support the price of milk handled by its members. The New York Consumers League estimates the alleged price manipulation cost the public $15,000,000.

It is high time that these money-bloated co-ops be compelled to toe the mark. The record now reveals that they use their huge tax-exempt profits to manipulate the butter and milk commodity markets, thus imposing a vast economic hardship on the consuming public.

This revelation of co-op commodity price manipulation will have the effect of destroying the aura of benevolence to the public which co-ops have assumed in their Nationwide operations. Depriving the children of low-income families of price-manipulated milk is not exactly an act of philanthropy.

Exposure of the hypocritical co-op game is long overdue. A long-sleeping Congress should speedily come to grips with the co-op tax and economic menace.

The New Jersey Taxpayers Association says: "Recent developments should focus national attention on the co-op octopus which shifts the income-tax load on industry and business with which it is in daily competition and now bludgeons the consumer with commodity-price manipulation."

The co-op masquerade party is at an end.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of January 28, 1947]

MILK-RIGGING FINES

New York City's milk-price scandal has resulted in the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association and four of its executive officers paying a total of $29,000 in fines for violating the Federal Commodities Exchange Act. They pleaded guilty to having bought in a 5-day period hundreds of thousands of pounds of butter for the purpose of keeping milk prices at an artificially high level. The latter are fixed monthly upon the basis primarily of the wholesale butter price in areas operating under the act.

The defendants had attempted to justify their action on the ground of protecting producers from a drastic reduction of prices and preventing a shortage in New York City by diversion of its supply to other sections where prices were allegedly higher. The latter reason was the same that State Milk Director Foran gave in December for raising New Jersey milk prices 1 cent a quart, which increase he recently ordered rescinded, effective February 7. In short, price fixing of milk seems to have become more or less a ring-around-a-rosy game.

Its market-rigging tactics may cost the dairymen's cooperative considerably more than the $25,000 fine imposed on it, depending on how much of the butter it acquired has yet to be disposed of. The cooperative paid approximately 86 cents a pound. The day its butter dealings were exposed the

wholesale price slumped 10 cents. Yesterday it was 63 cents a pound for 93-score. Obviously a difference of 13 cents could mean quite a loss on the cooperative's "investment" in 668,000 pounds.

The effect of the New York episode has been to increase public dissatisfaction with price-fixing systems that are concerned only with minimum prices. It will not be allayed by either the Federal Agriculture Department's order reducing milk a cent a quart in the five large northeastern milk marketing areas or Mr. Foran's similar action. Both systems should be abolished or else revised and coordinated.

H. R. 1671, Introduced Today, an Amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this proposed bill is an amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act and is intended to circumvent secret deals between sellers and buyers, whereby only the largest operators obtain inside prices, terms, or discounts. This has proven a serious detriment to free and fair competition among the rank and file of competing manufacturers and distributors at wholesale and retail.

The sole purpose of this amendment is to eliminate these secret transactions and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act, in the interest of small business. It obligates all sellers in commerce to make known to all their customers all of their prices, terms, and discounts under the same conditions and to make them available to all customers.

This proposal was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It was, in turn, submitted by Chairman Sumners to the Department of Justice, Federal Trade Commission, Department of Commerce, and the Bureau of the Budget. All have endorsed the measure in principle with some strengthening suggestions for changes, which have been embodied in this amendment.

Its purpose is to amend section 2A, following the first proviso, in the Robinson-Patman Act, and is as follows:

Provided, however, That it shall be unlawful for any seller to sell at a price, discount, or other terms, by reason of quantities sold, or seasonal order, or for any other reason, unless he has undertaken in good faith (1) to make known to all of his customers that such price and/or discount and/or term is available to them under the same conditions to all of his customers for a reasonable period of time.

The Congress must do something to safeguard small business from almost complete extinction if such enterprises shall have a free and open field to compete. Small business asks no special favors in this respect, yet in past practices in business certain favored buyers because of their size have been able to force favored concessions from suppliers due to their buying power which are denied to the general run of buyers.

In effect, it means that all customers of a supplier will know exactly all the conditions of sales and shall have all the rights and privileges to purchase on an equal basis.

The present act forbids these discriminations, but there is no provision in the Robinson-Patman Act that requires such terms, discounts, or prices be made generally public to all customers.

This law now provides for other exceptions to prevent "price changes from time to time where in response to changing conditions affecting the market but not limited to actual or imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of season goods, distress sales under court process, or sales in good faith in discontinuance of business in the goods concerned."

It is my sincere hope that this present Congress will speedily enact this amendment to provide equal opportunities to all buyers and special privileges to none.

The text of the bill is as follows:

A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 15, sec. 13 (a)), is amended by inserting immediately after the colon at the end of the first proviso the following: *"Provided, however,* That it shall be unlawful for any seller to sell at a price, discount or other terms, by reason of quantities sold, or seasonal order, or for any other reason, unless he has undertaken in good faith (1) to make known to all of his customers that such price and/or discount and/or term is available to them under the same conditions to all of his customers for a reasonable period of time.

To Avert Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune:

TO AVERT WASTE

Potatoes are all right in their place—but political hot potatoes are something else again.

The Department of Agriculture must be finding that out, for it seems that its experience with Irish potatoes in 1946 is something of a political hot potato.

Last week the Department of Agriculture authorized the dumping of at least 20,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes out of a 45,000,000-bushel surplus. Under a legal commitment to support prices to growers, the Department of Agriculture is removing the surplus from commercial channels.

The unhappy experience will cost the Department of Agriculture around $80,000,000 before it has been concluded, on the estimates of Secretary Anderson.

Some of the surplus spuds went into the manufacture of alcohol. Some more of them may wind up in the school-lunch program. Some of them have gone for livestock feed—and undoubtedly a lot of them just spoiled.

The crop last year was the largest on record, amounting to around 475,000,000 bushels.

It seems unfortunate, to say the least, that abundant production has such unfortunate results for the Department of Agriculture—and the Treasury—when around the world large numbers of people are still undernourished, and when large amounts of other kinds of foodstuffs are being shipped to them, with more to go.

But perhaps there's something to be learned from the potato situation after all. One of the things demonstrated is that it's high time to be thinking about what can be done in case comparable situations develop in other agricultural products—and devising a remedy.

As things stand today, the Government is committed to support prices for nearly two more years on a number of important agricultural articles.

So there is some time left in which to reach a solution, so far as net return to producers is concerned, and to avert the disaster which an overproduction might bring in the way of price declines, in the absence of guaranteed prices. The price supports provide an adjustment period.

With potatoes, the Department of Agriculture has had a demonstration of how production can get ahead of market demands—an expensive demonstration. It has readjusted its sights and trimmed previously announced acreage allotments for potato growers.

Nevertheless a lot of spuds went to waste.

It would be wasteful in the extreme if anything like that is permitted to happen to other food products. Wise planning should avert any such possibility.

The stability of farming may depend, in years ahead, upon the wisdom of the solution which Congress reaches with respect to agricultural commodities, production of which was boosted tremendously during the war years.

TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the editor of the Red Bank Register, a newspaper published in Red Bank, N. J., which letter is written by Mr. W. B. West, member of Boston Society of Civil Engineers, with reference to TVA:

EDITOR, THE RED BANK REGISTER,
Red Bank, N. J.

DEAR SIR: The editorial entitled "TVA Wants More Favors" in your November 21 issue was read with interest, and whereas I felt the urge to write you on this subject, yet it remained for a friend to also call your editorial to my attention before I resolved to write you.

First, as a reader of the Register, and one of your customers, I cannot believe that, at heart, you would willfully be unfair to anyone or to anything, so these remarks are predicated on that thesis.

Second, I must confess complete lack of knowledge of the merit (or lack of merit) of the claim of the TVA for exemption from the order of Reconversion Director John R. Steelman curbing all nonessential contracts; nor do I wish to become involved in your general references to the bureaucratic mind at work.

Third, I do wish, however, to stanchly challenge your statement that, "The Authority (TVA) has principally distinguished itself as an insatiable spender of tax funds." Because, through research and personal observation over more than a decade, I became something of an authority on the Government's Muscle Shoals industries (which formed the nucleus for the TVA) and wrote extensively about not only that project, but also about the TVA and its activities for publications in the United States and Europe, so that surely I should be in a position to challenge such a statement as that quoted above. (See, for example, Scientific American, May 7, 1921, and October 1933, and the Journal of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers for April 1934.)

Fourth, because of other duties, I have not been able to keep abreast of the progress of the TVA for the last few years, but have—on the other hand—been able to glean, from time to time, some information from the public press, and especially from professional and scientific publications which—so I am convinced, proves your statement, as above quoted, to be in error.

For example, consider the following quotation from an article by Theodore B. Parker, head of the Department of Civil and Sanitary Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as published in the Journal of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers for January 1944:

"The TVA development represents a very great investment by the people of this country, who should be vitally interested in the soundness of this investment. The responsibility of expending such a huge sum has been from the start very keenly appreciated. Those who have been concerned with this responsibility are naturally anxious that the essential economy of the whole project be clearly understood.

"As a result of the work now completed or under construction there will be made available:

"1. Six hundred and fifty miles of 9-foot navigable channel from the mouth of the river to Knoxville.

"2. (a) Control of destructive floods along the Tennessee River and the lower portions of its principal tributaries.

"(b) Reduction of maximum flood crests on the Ohio below Paducah and on the Mississippi River at Cairo, by at least 3 feet.

"3. Total power-generating capacity of approximately 2,000,000 kilowatts, capable of producing 1,400,000 kilowatts of continuous power.

"This is without doubt an exceptional example of the merits of multiple-purpose development, where several benefits accrue from the construction of a single set of structures."

Thus, it will be seen the TVA has also distinguished itself in flood control and navigation, to mention but two of its extensive beneficial activities and it would require a long time and many pages of copy to enumerate all of its distinguishing accomplishments.

Again, several foreign governments have sent agents to these shores to study the organization and operations of the TVA in order that similar schemes may be applied to one or more river systems abroad. Because modern science has come to recognize the necessity of thinking of and working on a whole river system (including tributaries) instead of just some particular point on or portion of a stream when attacking flood control, navigation and hydroelectric power development problems.

Finally, the TVA made valuable and significant contribution to the recent war effort. For example, my friend who prodded me into writing this letter has pointed out the following facts which are known to him as a resident of one of the hundreds of communities served by the TVA: Large numbers of naval landing craft and even oceangoing vessels were constructed on a large TVA lake at Decatur, Ala., from which point they were able to pass out to sea—thanks to the TVA (and Mississippi River) navigation systems. He also says there was a great arsenal at Redstone near Huntsville, Ala., where millions of rounds of ammunition were made during the recent war and that the abundance of TVA electric power was a contributory reason for locating this plant in that area.

This was, of course, in addition to tons of explosives turned out at the Muscle Shoals nitrate plants, the power supplied to aluminum factories for airplane materials manufacture, and even the atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

With these facts before you, surely you will agree that when problems of national interest and concern are being discussed, every possible effort should be made to be accurate and truthful and, above all, entirely free from sectional prejudice.

Concerning your reference to the TVA having destroyed the privately owned power companies which had been operating in that area prior to the organization of the TVA, the case was settled by the United States Supreme Court (thanks to the late Wendell Willkie), so the power companies had their day in court. In any event, what is the difference, in righteousness, between drafting private property in the form of a human being for the defense of the Nation in war (with frequent resultant wrecking of his life) and taking over private property for the good of an area or the Nation in either peace or war? On the other hand, many of the private power companies which had been operating in the Tennessee Valley and contingent areas prior to 1933 are yet operating there, some in competition with TVA, so "the fight goes on."

Very truly yours,

W. B. WEST,
Member, Boston Society of Civil Engineers.

America Must Recapture Zeal for Democracy If We Hope To Persuade Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on February 2, 1947:

NOTES ON A TIRED WORD

Did you, too, O friend, suppose democracy was only for elections, for politics, and for a party name?

Walt Whitman asked that question in 1871. It can be asked with far greater cogency today. To Walt Whitman, democracy was not a stale and flabby word, concerning itself with outward forms, but a way of life for which men have died that other men should be free, in body and soul, to pursue happiness.

The reason the United States is doing a poor job in teaching democracy to the peoples of Japan and Germany—to say nothing of humanity everywhere—is that we ourselves have lost the burning, crusading spirit of an earlier America.

Speaking about Austria recently, Leland Stowe said that once the armies of occupation are withdrawn, it would be easy for a right-wing Fascist dictatorship to spawn and grow out of that country's extreme misery. And he added:

"If the armies of the Allied democracies had had some real conception of how to propagandize and inculcate democratic ideas and practices, the long-term political outlook for Austria would not be nearly so disturbing as it is today. * * * Germany, Austria, and Italy (the combined heart of Europe) remain serious danger spots—very much accentuated by our own political ineptness."

It is not enough to blame the armies for failure to spread democratic ideals; the fault lies deeper. The whole Nation takes democracy for granted. We were all born under it, learned about it, often too unwillingly, at school (where it is often taught in humdrum and unimaginative fashion), mouthed its catchwords on the Fourth of July, and accept its blessings as though they were automatically bestowed.

Though the United States has fought in two world wars within a generation, and though we have witnessed and are still witnessing the brutal tyrannies of other forms of government, we still need a rebirth of the democratic spirit—that spirit which animated the Jeffersons, Adamses, and Tom Paines of Revolutionary days; the John Browns, Thoreaus, and Garrisons of the slavery issue. To all these men democracy was not just a word, a static thing, but dynamic; it was not reactionary, but, in the best sense, revolutionary.

We ought to go back and refresh ourselves with the deeds and words of the men who won the liberty we so lazily enjoy today. Old Samuel Adams was not making a political speech when he said in 1771:

"The liberties of our country, the freedom of our civil Constitution are worth defending at all hazards; and it is our duty to defend them against all attacks."

Nor was Patrick Henry, 4 years later, when he stood at the Virginia Convention and cried:

"Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

These were not empty platitudes. They were the prelude to blood and stench of battle—for democracy. And these words of Thomas Paine's were written not in an intellectual vacuum but in the crashing arena of events:

"He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression; for if he violates this duty, he establishes a precedent that will reach to himself."

When the famous New England minister, Theodore Parker, defined the nature of a democratic government it was not an exercise in rhetoric, but a statement arising out of fervent conviction. Such a government, he said, "has laws, and the aim thereof is to give justice to all men. It has officers to execute these laws for the sake of justice. Such a government founds schools for all; looks after those most who are most in need; defends and protects the feeblest as well as the richest and most powerful."

We do not often think of James Fenimore Cooper as a political philosopher, but he said:

"The vulgar charge that the tendency of democracies is to levelling, meaning to drag all down to the level of the lowest, is singularly untrue, its real tendency being to elevate the depressed to a condition not unworthy of their manhood."

It is our tendency, aided and abetted by uninspired school texts and the teachers who interpret them, to embalm the great thinkers and fighters for democracy in lavender and old lace. Thoreau we regard as a gentle naturalist on the shores of Walden Pond, yet he could be as fiery as Danton or Mirabeau. John Greenleaf Whittier was more than a craftsman of rustic verse; he was capable of pouring scorn and invective on the enemies of liberty. Beneath the serenity of Ralph Waldo Emerson was a deep passion for freedom.

The real meaning of America is not to be found—as so many people throughout the world are wont to think—in Hollywood movies, fine automobiles, electric refrigerators and all the gadgets that make for comfortable living. It is in that younger and more virile America that fought for and won its independence; that abolished human slavery; that struggled against wage serfdom and the evils of concentrated wealth.

If we ever hope to persuade Germany, Japan, and other nations to our way of life, we must first recapture for ourselves the zeal, the courage, the eloquence and the inner spirit of the great men in our history who made it possible.

Amend the Civil Service Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, during the emergency preceding the war, and during the war itself, millions of Americans went to work in navy yards and for other branches of the Federal Government. Technically, they came within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, whereby certain amounts were automatically taken from their pay or salaries, and credited to their accounts in the retirement fund.

Obviously, these millions could not hope to keep on working for the Federal Government over the long stretch of years necessary to realize a substantial pension.

And yet, if they have completed 5 years of service, they cannot get a refund of the amounts which have been taken from their wages.

The way the law is framed, they have become the victims of a cruel paradox.

On the one hand, they cannot remain in the employ of the Federal Government for enough years to qualify for a real pension; and, on the other hand, for such employment after January 23, 1942, they cannot secure a rebate of the amounts which they have contributed involuntarily.

At the same time, and quite apart from this issue, they have not had the benefit of coverage under the Social Security Act.

Truly, they are caught between the devil and the deep sea.

Of the many people who have visited my office during the past year, I can say that a majority of them came to consult me on this one question: "How can I get a refund of the deductions which were taken from my pay under the Civil Service Retirement Act?"

And when I explain that, under existing law, if they have worked more than 5 years for the Federal Government, there is no way in which they can get most of their money back, they counter with the protest: "But what if I need it?"

With sympathetic patience I tell them this law did not anticipate the unusual conditions that would be precipitated by war, whereby many people would go to work for the Federal Government, with no intention or opportunity of continuing in such work for the rest of their lives. On May 3, 1945, I filed a bill to amend the law, so that an injustice would not be inflicted on these people, but the committee has not seen fit to report it out for a vote.

As I tell them this, their expressions change from perplexity to disappointment, and as they leave the office I have the feeling that they have lost some confidence in democratic processes.

In spite of the record-breaking number of people at work, and the all-time high in national income, many people find themselves crowded into a corner by the double-pressure of high prices and high taxes. They need money—not for luxuries, but for the day-to-day demands of existence.

They cannot understand, and neither can I, why money withheld from their wages to go into a pension fund which can never be of substantial assistance to them, cannot be refunded to them now, when they need it.

There is much talk of industry reconverting from a wartime to a peacetime status, but little talk of the human being's problem of reconversion.

The Civil Service Retirement Act was never intended to cover those who work for the Federal Government only during an emergency. It should be amended so as to provide upon request, for the refund of the moneys taken from these workers.

To furnish this relief, the Congress should pass the bill calling for the return of deductions to any employee who is separated from the Federal service or transferred to a position not within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act before completing 10 instead of the present 5 years of service.

This is a matter of simple justice for the wartime workers in the Federal Government's employment, who were displaced when the emergency was over. It will provide not a gift or a bonus but a legitimate refund to the many who need it.

The Late Admiral Marc A. Mitscher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to add further words of tribute to the memory of one of the truly great heroes of World War II, the late Admiral Marc A. Mitscher, for whom military funeral services are being held at Arlington this afternoon. It was my great privilege to serve under him for a period at sea and again in the Navy Department at Washington. I would like to echo and affirm the deserved tribute of the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable James V. Forrestal, who has observed truly that the place Admiral Mitscher occupies in the hearts of those who served under him, officers and men, is a firmer basis of tribute than any that words could frame.

There is tragic coincidence in the loss of Admiral Mitscher, following as it does by approximately a year the equally untimely death of Vice Adm. John Sidney McCain, under whom it was my privilege to serve as well. These two great leaders were much alike in career, in devotion to duty and country, and in their contributions toward forging what might well be regarded as one of the greatest single factors in our triumph over the enemy in the Pacific for they brought to its high state of overwhelming power the deadly air-sea arm of our military might that drove the Japanese back to their very home shores.

The Navy was their profession and their very life, but they were among the first to see the potential power of naval aviation and the necessity for a closely integrated striking force known now to the enemy and to history as Task Force 58 and Task Force 38.

It is an obvious deduction to observe that the greatest tribute to Admiral Mitscher, and to Admiral McCain as well, might come from a study of their heroic contributions in seeking the soundest possible solution to a vital problem now confronting the Congress and the Nation—the question of a proper integration of the Army, the Army Air Forces, the Navy and its integral naval aviation units, into the sort of defense establishment best calculated to defend this country under all conditions and from all quarters, and to play most effectively the role of a mighty instrument for the preservation of peace throughout the world.

By unanimous consent heretofore obtained, I insert in the RECORD the following editorials and comment voicing deserved tribute to Admiral Mitscher and Admiral McCain. Their passing is a loss not alone to the armed forces but to the Nation and the world.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of February 4, 1947]

ADMIRAL MITSCHER

It is undoubtedly more than a coincidence that both members of the remarkable Mitscher-McCain team that revolutionized naval warfare with its fast carrier task force strategy and tactics failed to reach retirement age. Little more than a year after the death of Vice Admiral John S. McCain, commander of Task Force 38, Admiral Marc A. Mitscher, who commanded Task Force 58, has succumbed to a heart attack. These men were rugged fighters, as the Japanese found out, but the ruggedness and the tempo of the daring strikes which they led in the Pacific war were enough to shorten the lives of even seemingly steel-nerved men of the Mitscher-McCain tradition.

Admiral Mitscher was not a belated convert to aviation. He was one of the Navy's real pioneer airmen. He had been out of the Naval Academy only a few years when he applied for pilot training and he became the thirty-second naval officer to win his wings. That was before World War I. The dream he had, in those early days, of large-scale carrier warfare between fleets out of sight of each other came to grim realization in World War II, with himself in a leading role. And, with Admiral McCain, he succeeded in perpetrating one of the great strategic hoaxes of the naval campaign against Japan. This was the alternate designation of substantially the same carrier task force as No. 38 or No. 58, depending on which of the two was in command at the moment. The baffled Japs were tricked into believing that two great carrier groups were roaming the seas and the effect on their strategy and morale was devastating.

But, to Admiral Mitscher's way of thinking, there was no trick about the individual successes of our flyers when they came to grips with the best that Japan had to offer. "Our boys are the best in the world," he insisted. He was sure of it because he had helped to train them and equip them. Nor would he fail to give his boys full credit for the honors which came to him in the form of repeated decorations and citations. The "kids who do the fighting and shooting deserve the credit," he declared. Small wonder that Admiral Mitscher was revered by those who had the privilege of serving under him. The Navy in general, and naval aviation in particular, have lost an outstanding officer, advocate, and friend.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 4, 1947]

ADMIRAL MITSCHER

"The admiral had been sleeping quietly, but shortly after 1 a. m. he ceased breathing." Thus the Navy bulletin reported the peaceful death yesterday of Admiral Marc A. Mitscher, one of the outstanding commanders of the Pacific war, the man who led the famous Task Force 58, whose squinted eyes gazed with assurance and capacity from underneath the long-billed baseball cap that was familiar to all Americans in those tremendous years.

Less than 2 years ago Admiral Mitscher was participating in the leadership of the great armada, stretched out for 200 miles, that pounded the Japanese homeland at will. The enemy fleet had been smashed long before, but this must have been the great triumph, the conqueror's return after he had led the venturesome *Hornet* near enough in 1942 to loose the Doolittle raid on Tokyo. Between these two events Admiral Mitscher had a large and personal hand in the operations that pushed westward to victory.

Admiral Mitscher was a flier. He was thirty-third among naval aviators, having been designated at Pensacola in 1916, and was pilot of the NC-1 in 1919 on the first Navy trans-Atlantic flight. These were the beginnings of the mighty test of carrier forces that proved under his leadership—early in 1944 in the Marshalls, at Truk and Tinian and Saipan—that there was no such thing as Japanese invincibility. The enemy was cracked, and Task Force 58 shoved ahead in the coordinated pattern of ruthlessly efficient destruction.

This cool-headed director of battle, a man who had the gift of seizing upon opportunity and making the most of every turn, has high honor and affection in American hearts. The full stature of his naval genius remains to be assessed as the story of the Pacific war is fitted together in history, but we shall always thrill to the name of Admiral Mitscher and Task Force 58.

It would seem altogether fitting that the brief comments of the following might well be added:

[From the Washington Post of February 4, 1947]

Secretary Forrestal's statement on the admiral's death said:

"The place he occupies in the hearts of those who served under him, officers and men, is a firmer basis of tribute than any that words could frame. The United States Navy, with sorrow and pride, sends its deep sympathy to Mrs. Marc A. Mitscher."

Fleet Admiral Nimitz said: "The Nation has lost a great leader. I always had a sense of security and comfort when Admiral Mitscher was the leader of Task Force 58 against the Japanese. I knew that what had to be done would be done in full measure. He needed no detailed instruction. All he needed was opportunity, and he made the most of every opportunity."

Said Army Air Forces Chief General Spaatz: "His death is a great loss to the Army as well as to the Navy."

Our Forty-ninth State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to state that my attention has been drawn to an editorial in the St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette of December 25, 1946, with reference to Hawaii's request for admittance to the Union. It appears to me that it is time this request was granted. Hawaii has proved its value to us in many ways, commercially and otherwise, and particularly in its loyalty and service in World War II. The editorial speaks for itself and is here quoted:

OUR FORTY-NINTH STATE

When the Eightieth Congress convenes shortly it will be confronted with Hawaii's ardent request for admittance to the Union. The last Congress dallied on this issue, but there is no good reason why our national lawmakers should not grant the request speedily.

For many years the people of Hawaii have sought statehood. Sixty-seven percent of the voters there favored it in 1940. The President has given his endorsement and it has been recommended unanimously by a subcommittee of the House.

All the traditional requisites for statehood are fulfilled by Hawaii. In area, it is larger than the States of Delaware, Connecticut, or Rhode Island. In population, it exceeds Nevada, Wyoming, Delaware, or Vermont. It is wealthier than many States and in 1945 it paid in $174,000,000 to the Federal Treasury—more than was paid in by any of 14 States.

High standards in public works and government services prevail in Hawaii. Its standing in education, health, and law enforcement is better than that of some States. Financially, its government is on a sound basis.

Statehood is desired by Hawaii because its people feel they have ended the "period of pupilage." They point out they are now Americans "without representation" and that they may suffer discrimination as a result. Hawaii's young men were drafted in World War II, yet its people had no voice in the draft law or the declaration of war. They pay Federal taxes but have no voice in their levy or distribution. Hawaiians have no voice in laws passed in Washington that directly affect their industry and agriculture.

During the war, Hawaiians demonstrated they are as good and as patriotic Americans as any of us on the mainland. They want this recognized in fact. As their Territory possesses all the other qualifications, we owe them this recognition.

Polish Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of February 3, 1947, entitled "Sounding Out Poland" by Dorothy Thompson:

SOUNDING OUT POLAND—I FOUND NO ONE WHO MAINTAINED THAT THE ELECTIONS WERE FREE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

BERLIN.—The State Department's statement last Tuesday expressing dissatisfaction with the Polish elections, was confirmed in an extensive tour I made in Poland following the balloting. I traveled through central, western, and southern Poland, including the new territories acquired from the Germans and the land between the Oder and the Neisse Rivers.

I made the trip for the purpose of finding out first-hand the answer to the questions which had been studied in Washington and London: Does the government which just claimed such an overwhelming majority, really represent the Polish people? Was the election coerced?

In Warsaw I felt many uncertainties. Any Polish Government would have profound difficulties demanding strength and discipline. But the question in all authority is its legitimacy, and today legitimacy derives from the popular will and a sense of justice.

My trip convinced me that the present Polish Government intends to perpetuate itself almost exclusively by naked force.

Instead of seeking politicians in the Government or the opposition, I asked ordinary people, sounding out their opinions, their feelings toward the regime. Accompanied by a reliable American translator, I entered peasant homes, picking them at random. I visited state farms converted from manorial estates; I talked with teachers, priests, soldiers, and innkeepers, and sat in small taverns picking up conversations.

All this was less difficult in smaller places, for soon I discovered that everyone is inclined to trust Americans. In addition, everyone in small communities knows who is trustworthy and who is likely to be a Government agent.

I thus had personal conversations with scores of people, individually and in groups, throughout the main parts of Poland. I must report honestly I discovered exactly three enthusiastic supporters of the Government. An almost unanimous attitude was the dislike, aversion, fear, and distrust of the Government, which claims almost universal support.

This is true in peasant homes which had party slogans ostentatiously written on the walls. This is true even of people in the administration itself, who testified they wanted to serve Poland, but who hoped the

Government and its policies would change. I found absolutely no one who maintained that the elections were free and uncoerced, and few who thought the Government itself was free and not a prisoner of Moscow.

Many said they had voted for the Government list of candidates because they were compelled to vote; had been compelled in advance to sign a statement that they would vote "List 3"; had been threatened with loss of jobs, property, or other measures if the district went against the Government; and, finally, were convinced from experience in the June referendum that no matter how the ballots were cast the announced result would be the same.

The people invariably began recounting grievances. They covered fear of the secret police, indignation at patronage which meant insecurity in any job unless enjoying party favor, disillusionment with the Government's conviction that the Government was "foreign."

No correspondent who stays in Warsaw can grasp the atmosphere of the country. Despite terrific destruction in the city, there is much vitality, and the government obviously is making a successful effort to restore and revivify its capital. In and around Warsaw are many signs of building activity.

In numerous press conferences and personal social contacts the plans described and arguments advanced by Government spokesmen present Poland as entering a fascinating New-Dealish experiment. But the country itself belies these claims.

Reconstruction is backward, and the policies, good on paper, have not been realized in fact. Apparently, the only public institution really well organized on a nation-wide scale is the UB—the committee on public safety—whose interlocking civil and military bureaus seem designed on the pattern of Himmler's Gestapo.

Though theoretically a semi-Socialist state, apart from the dogged work of land-owning peasants in central Poland and certain industries, the economy largely consists of speculation. In garish night clubs one sees masses of newly rich—vultures preying on the misery of the people, looted first by the Russians and Germans together, then by each singly.

Also a vast migration of 4,500,000 persons from other parts of Poland into the newly acquired territories—being largely without plan—creates a Wild West atmosphere. It also exposes a population, which is entirely dependent upon the Government, to political manipulation and exploitation.

It is impossible to describe Poland in terms of socialism or democracy. It is a sort of national bolshevism to an overwhelmingly rural, conservative, traditionally Catholic people, who, as a peasant lad put it, feel themselves less than the dirt of a field.

Thomas Alva Edison Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now approaching the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison. He was born up in my district at Milan, Ohio, near the shores of Lake Erie. At that time this village was a busy community and the center of the grain trade of the Middle West. Later the family moved to Michigan where he spent his boyhood days in and about Port Huron. Of course, he was best known in the mature days of his life at West Orange, N. J. This is the year of the one hundredth anniversary of his birth and the committee formed by 100 world leaders in science, education, industry, and public service has been preparing for the centennial anniversary more than a year. The committee is headed by Charles F. Kettering, Detroit research specialist and inventor, and includes the Edison pioneers—a dwindling group of men who worked with the "old man."

The day's activities will be highlighted by a ceremony at Milan, where the United States post office will present a memorial album of the special Edison commemorative stamp to Mrs. Madeleine Edison Sloane, of West Orange, daughter of the inventor.

At the same time, at Menlo Park, N. J., where Edison worked before moving to West Orange, Charles Edison will speak at ceremonies dedicating a plaque at the site of the Edison tower and perpetual light—a replica of the original bulb that was to light the world.

That night, from 7 to 11:30, the sky over New York will be illuminated by six Army mobile searchlight units, with a capacity of 100,000,000 candlepower and capable of shooting a beam 12 miles up. The units were developed during the war and their use that night will be their first mass demonstration.

In perhaps every community in the land, some kind of recognition of Edison's great work will be made on the anniversary. In 30,000 public, private and parochial schools in this country and Canada, students will study sets of postures telling in pictures of the life and achievements of the inventor.

Having a special emphasis this year will be at the annual pageant of light at Fort Myers, Fla., where Edison maintained a winter home and a laboratory in which he experimented on the possibility of growing rubber in the continental United States.

As they have done every year since his death, the Edison Pioneers will hold their commemorative luncheon at the Hotel Astor in New York.

In the evening, the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, New York section, will hold a 1,500 guest dinner at the Waldorf Astoria in cooperation with numerous other professional societies.

The achievements of the inventor over the years are innumerable. His education, work and inventions laid the foundation for our modern living. The people of America want to commemorate its most distinguished son in science and invention who has contributed immeasurably to the joy of living.

I am introducing the following resolution to provide for the erection of a memorial to the greatest modern American:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a Thomas Alva Edison Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of seven members, as follows: The Secretary of the Interior and six persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, two of whom shall be from the State of Ohio, two from the State of Michigan, and two from the State of New Jersey. The members of the Commission shall select a chairman from among their number. No compensation shall be paid to the members of the Commission for services as such.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall acquire, by purchase, gift, condemnation, or otherwise, an appropriate site in Milan, Ohio, and shall contract for the construction on such site of a suitable memorial to Thomas Alva Edison, who was born in Milan on February 11, 1847.

SEC. 3. In the executions of its functions the Commission (a) is authorized to employ and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of such stenographic and clerical assistants, and such experts, as may be necessary;

(b) may avail itself of the assistance of any department, agency, or officer of the Government, and any such department, agency, or officer is authorized to render such assistance.

SEC. 4. The Commission may accept from any source, public or private, sums of money to be added to the amounts which may be appropriated under authority of this act.

SEC. 5. The Commission may make such expenditures as may be necessary in the execution of its functions. All expenditures of the Commission (including necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses, not in excess of $— per day, incurred by members of the Commission while absent from their places of residence upon the business of the Commission, and by employees of the Commission while away from their designated posts of duty upon the business of the Commission) shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 6. Such memorial, when completed, shall be under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $1,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

Violation of British Loan Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, I advised the House of my request to Secretary of the Treasury, John Snyder, for copies of correspondence with Hon. Hugh Dalton, Chancelor, British Exchequer, dealing with a reported violation of the British loan agreement in the British-Argentine trade agreement of September 1946.

Today Secretary Snyder sent me copies of this correspondence, which I am inserting in the RECORD for the information of the Members of the House.

A preliminary examination of this correspondence indicates that the British acknowledge the Argentine trade pact includes a provision in violation of the British loan agreement. Hugh Dalton, as Chancelor of the British Treasury, has given the American Treasury two assurances.

The first assurance is that this specific violation will not be repeated in future agreements about sterling balances.

The second assurance is Dalton's assertion that it would always be England's desire to avoid such discrimination, referring, of course, to the clause in the Argentine agreement reading:

If in any year the balance of payments with the sterling area be unfavorable to Argentina, Argentina may furthermore dispose freely within the said area of its sterling balances for an amount equivalent to the deficit.

Beyond the foregoing, Mr. Dalton stresses his contention that the probability of a deficit between the Argentine and the sterling area during those 4 years is hypothetical.

OCTOBER 31, 1946.

Rt. Hon. HUGH DALTON,
Chancelor of the Exchequer,
Treasury Chambers,
London, England.

DEAR MR. DALTON: In examining the agreement signed by representatives of the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina on September 17, 1946, I have noted that section B (6) of article I provides as follows:

"If in any year the balance of payments with the sterling area be unfavorable to Argentina, Argentina may furthermore dispose freely within the said area of its sterling balances for an amount equivalent to the deficit."

This provision, which appears to have the effect of making the amounts so released available for expenditure solely within the sterling area, seems to be inconsistent with section 10 (ii) December 6, 1945, which provides as follows:

"(ii) In consideration of the fact that an important purpose of the present line of credit is to promote the development of multilaterial trade and facilitate its early resumption on a nondiscriminatory basis, the Government of the United Kingdom agrees that any sterling balances released or otherwise available for current payments will, not later than 1 year after the effective date of this agreement, unless in special cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, be freely available for current transactions in any currency area without discrimination."

You will recall that section 10 (ii) was considered by both of our Governments to be a very significant provision, and that it was only after considerable discussion that agreement was reached as to its formulation. It seems clear from the discussions before your parliament and the documentation relative to the agreement that the meaning of this section and the importance attached to it by the United States were fully appreciated by your Government. In the light of these facts, I am sure you can understand the concern of this Government upon learning that the Government of the United Kingdom had entered into a subsequent agreement containing a provision apparently in conflict with section 10 (ii).

While I have not completed my consideration of the other provisions of the Anglo-Argentine agreement, the importance of the apparent conflict explained above impels me to invite your attention to it without delay. I hope it will be possible for you to consider this matter and communicate with me with respect to it at an early date.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,
London, England, December 17, 1946.

MR. JOHN W. SNYDER.

MY DEAR MR. SNYDER: Your letter of October 31 about the agreement signed between the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina on September 17, 1946, was delivered to me personally by a member of the American Embassy in London, on November 27.

I have read it carefully. I agree with you that section 10 (ii) of the Financial Agreement of December 6, 1945, provides that, a year after the effective date of the agreement, any sterling released will be freely available for current transactions in any currency area.

The agreement with the Argentine Government carries this out in respect of current sterling as from the date of that agreement itself. It also provides that a certain amount of the accumulated sterling, standing to the credit of the Argentine, should be released in each of the next 4 years, for use in any currency area.

I suggest that it is not possible to separate the terms of any agreement we can make in this difficult field from the circumstances of the negotiations, or the facts of the trade with the country with whom the agreement is concluded. The parts of the agreement with the Argentine which relate to the treatment of sterling are for 4 years. The probability of a deficit between the Argentine and the sterling area during those 4 years is hypothetical. At present, the Argentine is a large net earner of sterling, by reason of the supplies we are taking from her. This position has regularly marked the position of the trade between the two countries in the past, and it is not likely to be materially changed during the next 4 years.

I suggest, therefore, that further consideration of this hypothetical question might be deferred, until events indicate that there is some reasonable probability of its becoming actual. In the meantime, as I have already stated, all the net sterling that the Argentine is earning will be available for current transactions in any currency area, as well as part of the accumulated balance.

I need scarcely add my personal assurance that I am very mindful of our obligation under the financial agreement.

Yours sincerely,

HUGH DALTON.

JANUARY 27, 1947.

Right Honorable HUGH DALTON,
Chancelor of the Exchequer,
Treasury Chambers,
London, England.

MY DEAR MR. DALTON: I have read with great interest and care your letter of December 17, 1946, in response to my letter of October 31, 1946, with reference to the agreement signed by the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina on September 17, 1946. I am pleased to have assurance of your understanding that section 10 (ii) of the financial agreement of December 6, 1945, provides that 1 year after the effective date of the agreement any sterling balances released will be available for current transactions in any currency area.

May I now advert to two points in your letter which gave me especial concern.

You suggest, first, that "it is not possible to separate the terms of any agreement * * * in this difficult field from the circumstances of the negotiations, or the facts of the trade with the country (concerned)." I assure you that I appreciate fully the difficulties involved in the negotiation of the sterling balance settlements. These difficulties cannot, however, be regarded as justifying commitments which contravene the terms of the financial agreement. Otherwise, as I am sure you will agree, the entire agreement could be rendered meaningless.

Secondly, you point out that in the past Argentina has regularly been a large net earner of sterling and that the probability of a deficit between Argentina and the sterling area during the next 4 years is hypothetical. Your letter suggests, accordingly, that the inclusion of clause I B (6) in the Anglo-Argentine agreement has little practical significance. While this may prove to be the case, this argument overlooks the fact that clause I B (6) itself may furnish an incentive to Argentina to incur a payments deficit vis-a-vis the sterling area. Moreover, I must confess that I am unable to reconcile with the spirit of the United States-United Kingdom agreement any commitment which under certain contingencies, even though remote, might require action at variance with the agreement.

In the light of the not inconsiderable resistance that had to be overcome before we obtained congressional ratification of the financial agreement, I think you can realize our concern over this matter and the importance we must attach to the fulfillment of the obligations undertaken therein by your Government. I am sure you will appreciate also the difficulties which must arise if future agreements involving settlements of accumulated sterling balances should contain provisions similar in intent to that of clause I B (6) of the Anglo-Argentine agreement. I would therefore welcome some statement from you indicating that your Government has no intention of including such a clause in future agreements.

May I also point out that if and when there is reasonable probability that Argentina will incur a current deficit with respect to the sterling area, this Government would expect the United Kingdom to make appropriate adjustments with the Argentine Government, so that no discrimination at variance with the United States-United Kingdom financial agreement would, in fact, arise.

I have spoken frankly because of my fear that instances of this kind, if permitted to recur, may make more difficult the maintenance and further development of those close and friendly relationships between our two countries which, I am sure, both of us wish to foster.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,
London, February 4, 1947.

The Honorable JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SNYDER: Thank you for your letter of January 27 about our agreement of September 17, 1946, with Argentina. I am glad you have written frankly to me; I am replying in the same spirit, being no less anxious than yourself to maintain and develop the most close and friendly relations between our two countries.

In your lettter, you ask me for an assurance that, in the future agreements about sterling balances, we have no intention of including such a clause as Clause I B (6) of the Anglo-Argentine agreement. I am happy to give you this assurance.

I also note that, if and when there is reasonable probability that Argentina would incur a current deficit with respect to the sterling area, the United States Government would expect the United Kingdom to make appropriate adjustments with the Argentine Government, so that no discrimination at variance with the U. S.-U. K. financial agreement would in fact arise. I can readily assure you that it would always be our desire to avoid such discrimination, though I feel bound to say once more that I think that this is a theoretical but not a practical contingency.

Yours sincerely,

HUGH DALTON.

Letter of Hon. William S. Bennet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. William S. Bennet, a former Member of this House:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 20, 1947.*
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: These are times of very serious consideration for every American citizen and, as I once represented for 6 years a district in Congress which embraces everything within the boundaries of the Twenty-first Congressional District which you in November 1946 were elected to represent; and in another Congress represented a portion of the same territory and have not lost my interest in public affairs, I feel impelled to express some individual views as a Republican in the form of a letter to you.

The election figures in New York State give pleasure and satisfaction to life-long Republicans such as myself, and as well to all thinking citizens not Republicans but interested in good government who are gratified at seeing public officials who have given exceptionally good service reelected.

Your own success in the Twenty-first Congressional District is almost without parallel. Your Democratic predecessor was elected in 1944 by a majority of 51,029. You have reversed this and are elected by a majority of over 6,000. Of course this result was brought about by various elements, but I think it is only exact justice to say that you would not have been elected if it had not been for your own personal standing and the extremely efficient campaign which you made.

With Governor Dewey reelected by the largest majority ever received by a gubernatorial candidate in New York State, in a sweep that carried the entire State ticket; an associate justice of the court of appeals; impressive majorities in both branches of the legislature; a United States Senator and 28 Members of the United States House of Representatives, we are quite apt to be confident that 1948, so far as New York is concerned, is already, to use the vernacular, "in the bag." But is it?

As usual with landslides, there were several contributing causes. Governor Dewey and his team had given the State the best 4 years of administration in many years. It was both exceptional and outstanding. Thousands of citizens—both Democrats and independents—voted the straight Republican ticket in emphatic endorsement. Getting that vote was a triumph for good State government. Thousands more—again, Democrats and independents—resented either the acts or omissions of the present Congress with its helplessly divided Democratic control; and thousands more were dissatisfied with President Truman, or commencing to be resentful of the results of some New Deal policies.

How much these voters increased the Republican majority no one knows. That they did increase it, everyone knows. But 1948 will be different. It will be a national year. How many of these now Republican votes can we hold? National Committeeman Clarence Budington Kelland, after the recent national committee meeting in Washington, said: "Now we are going home to earn the victory we have won." Precisely. In the Congress just elected the majority is Republican in both Houses. It is Republican acts that will be scrutinized. I have read one statement that gives me pleasure. Some influential Senators say that they are not going to reject the President's appointees simply because they are Democrats. That is wise. The country is not in a mood to applaud extreme partisanship. Even the most loyal Republicans would dislike it. Two more steps would be profitable. Consider fairly every suggestion that the President makes despite his well-known Democratic partisanship, strictly avoid putting up measures to the President for the purpose primarily of putting him in a hole.

The country is in the most observing frame of mind I have ever known. The education that it has been getting from editors, journalists, columnists, and radio speakers—a lot of it bad, superficial or undigested, but it has at least put the country on notice. Our people want nothing but well-intentioned, patriotic, sincere, and serious action. Fireworks and flag waving are, for the moment, out. If effort is made along correct lines, and clear thinking and hard, serious work are evident, the people will tolerate both some mistakes and a record of achievement considerably less than 100 percent. They know that one Congress cannot conclude everything, but they will demand an intelligent, serious, businesslike effort.

Here are a few things that can be done: Look up the promises in the 1944 Republican platform and try to keep them all. That was what every Republican Congress did from 1860 to 1933. The country always expects more from a Republican Congress than it does from a Democratic Congress. This may not be fair, but it is flattering. There are other things to be done—such as backing up the President's recommendations as to the admission of additional war refugees—particularly displaced persons. The religious majority of this country is Christian—Roman Catholics, Protestants, Greek Orthodox, and others—followers of Christ who gave us the rule "Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you and thus fulfill the law of God." Can a Christian visualize Jesus barring these pitiable people out, even if 250,000 come? Read the parable of the Good Samaritan, get the answer, and as Christians, act accordingly.

Some States are barring constitutionally qualified citizens from voting. Mississippi is the flagrant example. But there are others. The answer is in the fourteenth amendment. Pass the necessary legislation. An antidiscrimination statute is promised in the platform and it is imperative that this platform promise be kept.

Back up the United Nations. It is far from perfect but it has proved itself workable.

While a general reduction in taxation has a popular appeal, it is clearly true that it is highly important to reduce expenditures and also to commence the reduction of our huge debt. After World War I, on the advice of Secretary Mellon, taxes were kept higher than they otherwise necessarily would have been, so that the national debt could be reduced at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year. That was sound finance.

Pass a more certainly constitutional antilynching bill than the Marcantonio bill; do it early in the session and outwear a Democratic filibuster in the Senate.

If we do these things, the people, in 1948, will—as they did in New York State in 1946—reward good work with continuance in office and increased responsibility.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM S. BENNET.

McNabb Case Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

M'NABB CASE AGAIN

The McNabb case continues to hamper law enforcement authorities in the District of Columbia. Latest of the many repercussions of the Supreme Court's much-debated opinion that prisoners must be arraigned immediately after their arrest has just occurred in District Court. Two men who were convicted of housebreaking and larceny have been freed as a result of a ruling by the United States Court of Appeals that even a voluntary reenactment of a crime by a prisoner is of no value unless he was taken before a magistrate as soon as arrested.

The new ruling was made in the case of Carl Akowsky, who, with another man, was arrested about 4 p. m. on March 29, 1944, by police investigating the theft of a large quantity of whisky from a restaurant in Southeast Washington. The men were taken direct to police headquarters and booked on an open charge. Police began to question the prisoners. About 5 or 5:30 p. m. the arresting officers telephoned the United States Commissioner's office, but received no answer to their ring. The questioning continued until about midnight, when, the court stated, Akowsky made an oral confession to the robbery. This confession was reduced to writing and was agreed to by the second defendant.

The court of appeals, in its decision, related that subsequent to the confession, the pair was taken to the restaurant, where they described to the police officers and the proprietor "how they had entered the premises and pointed out correctly the place from which the whisky had been taken." On the basis of the confession and the reenactment of the crime Akowsky was convicted in District Court. He appealed the verdict on the ground that the McNabb case ruled out not only the confession but the demonstration, since police had failed to arraign him before starting the questioning.

What makes the latest interpretation of the McNabb ruling particularly disturbing to the police is the implicit contention of the appellate court that the officers should have taken the prisoners direct from the scene of arrest to the Commissioner's office or the municipal court, instead of to police headquarters. Under this theory police would have no opportunity to develop their evidence, check alibis, etc., before taking a prisoner before the magistrate to be charged. This restriction gravely hampers the police in carrying out their responsibilities to the public and gives the prisoner extraordinary advantage over the law-enforcement officer. There are times when the prompt arrest of a criminal known to be dangerous is essential to protect the public, yet it would be impracticable to arraign him without some measure of preliminary investigation.

This is additional evidence of the need for enactment of the Hobbs bill, which would authorize the questioning of prisoners prior to arraignment and thus end the multiplying absurdities of the McNabb decision. The bill has passed the House twice, but failed of

enactment in the rush of closing Senate business. Congress will render an invaluable service to the cause of law enforcement by passing this important measure.

Backwash of War: The DP Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of December 8, 1946:

BACKWASH OF WAR: THE DP PROBLEM

Among the many delicate issues raised by George Meader in his report on the American occupation in Germany to the Senate War Investigating Committee is that of the displaced persons who have taken refuge in the American zone.

Meader estimates that there are 535,000 homeless refugees in the American zone who cost the taxpayers $109,000,000 a year to maintain in addition to the contributions to their maintenance made through UNRRA and American private philanthropy.

It takes the services of 600 American officers and men to supervise these displaced persons, or DP's as they usually are designated. This supervision is not sufficient to prevent many of the DP's from carrying on extensive black market operations with the goods supplied by UNRRA and private philanthropy or from committing many crimes and depredations in the American zone.

Senator CONNALLY, according to Meader, said the United States "was the biggest sucker in the world" for permitting the authorities in other zones of Germany and other parts of Europe to dump their DP problems in the lap of the United States and for permitting so many other DP's to make their way from less hospitable parts of Europe to our zone.

Meader has told of the low esteem in which many of the DP's are held by the occupation authorities because of their alleged refusal to accept useful employment, their querulousness, their political passions, and their extra-legal activities.

WHO ARE THE DP'S?

UNRRA estimates that there are about one million of them in Europe and it is committed to supervise refugee camps for them until June 30, 1947. The United Nations International Refugee Organization is supposed to assume responsibility for DP's after that time, but there is such a sharp division of opinion about DP's between Russia and the United States that IRO isn't making much headway.

Russia regards many of the inmates of UNRRA camps as renegade Russians, Poles, Yugoslavs, Hungarians, and Balts who ought to be made to return to their places of origin. The United States listens sympathetically to the pleas of these DP's that they not be forced to return to Russian-dominated areas. Such action, they believe, would invite persecution for their political or religious beliefs.

Nevertheless, a good many Poles who had been living in refugee camps have accepted UNRRA's offer to provide them with 60 days' rations after their return to Poland.

Polish Jews, however, are not returning to Poland because they fear anti-Semitism there and wish to find homes elsewhere. Zionist propaganda speaks of a million Jews being eager to go to Palestine which sometimes creates the impression that the refugee problem could be solved by admission of one million refugees to Palestine.

Actually, Jews constitute only about one quarter of the million DP's worrying the authorities. The Zionists get their figure of a million by including all of the Jews in Europe and the Arab countries estimated to be desirous of exchanging their present homes for new homes in a Jewish state.

The DP problem thus consists of 750,000 non-Jews, many of them Roman Catholics, plus Jews estimated from 150,000 to 350,000 in number.

The United States has supported the efforts of Zionists and other Jewish agencies to try to gain admission for at least 100,000 Jews in Palestine. The British refuse to admit more than 1,500 Jews a month because of fierce Arab opposition which has intensified with increased Zionist agitation for immediate statehood.

The Arabs outnumber the Jews in Palestine by 2 to 1 and have 30,000,000 Arab supporters in six neighboring states whose views neither Britain nor the United States can wholly disregard.

Thus Palestine is not going to empty the displaced-persons camps of the American zone. In recognition of this fact, Jews in America, who devoted much of a $100,000,000 fund raised for philanthropic work to assistance of their coreligionists in Europe and Palestine, propose to raise $170,000,000 for the same purpose during 1947.

While such a large fund will help supply the void created by the disappearance of UNRRA and the belated materialization of the IRO, so far as the Jewish minority in displaced-persons camps is concerned it offers no contribution toward the solution of the problem of the non-Jews. Nor does it wholly dispose of the Jewish displaced-persons problem.

Ways must be found for getting all displaced persons out of camps into permanent homes as quickly as possible for the camps are demoralizing to the inmates as well as a burden on society.

Some of the displaced persons are so undesirable socially or politically because of their criminal tendencies and physical and mental condition that they will not be welcome anywhere. They constitute one of the insoluable problems of a war-dislocated continent for which European governments must assume major responsibility.

But there is good human material in the displaced-persons camps which should not be permitted to go to waste. Nor are the inmates of the displaced-persons camps wholly the broken in body and spirit. There are many children in these camps and the birth rate is rising.

A HUMAN SALVAGE JOB

Provided with a place of residence and employment somewhere in the world many of the adults in these camps should become useful citizens and the children should grow into useful citizens.

The problem calls for enlightened cooperation on the part of all the governments.

President Truman is reported to be planning to ask Congress to revise the immigration laws so that a larger number of European refugees may be admitted to the United States. At present the quota regulations permit only 39,000 DP's to be accepted each year out of a possible 154,000 immigrants. That is a constructive approach to the problem, assuming that great care is used in screening the applicants.

We do not want the black marketeers, the rogues, or the defectives among the DP's. We can use more of the sort of refugees who came during the Hitlerian persecutions. The scientific, mechanical, and other skills and the culture brought by many of those immigrants are a permanent contribution to the national welfare and a permanent loss to the countries so foolish as to drive out such good citizens.

If other countries are smart they, too, will welcome such talent and such citizenship from the DP camps of Europe.

Hope in Southern Progressivism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article of the New York Times magazine section of February 2, written by Ellis Arnall, distinguished and able former Governor of Georgia which is thought provoking and worthy of consideration by those interested in political and economic trends.

The article is as follows:

Liberalism in the United States is in transition. Some of its fervor and enthusiasm has waned. The impact of the war upon American habits of thought was less, perhaps, than most Americans believe, but the war served to focus American eyes upon goals other than domestic affairs; and because liberalism is a realistic political faith, it tends to concentrate its efforts upon the domestic front. Moreover, a great many liberals are tired men, physically, spiritually, and mentally, and feel a little unequal to the task of combatting the increase of cynicism among the people.

It seems apparent that cynicism, pervading the entire public's attitude, will be the same menace to American welfare after World War II as after World War I. It is discernible in the indifference of the public to the social tensions implicit in the economic chaos of postwar America. It is evidenced by the rising incidence of juvenile delinquency. It is recorded politically in the trend toward a ruinous normalcy and, in foreign affairs, in the complete absence of a coherent policy. It is expressed in the rebirth of the hatemongering organizations, some of them potent allies of the Axis before Pearl Harbor, when they were driven underground.

The South is a paradox, whether studied economically, emotionally, or intellectually. Because it is a paradox the paradox of growth of liberalism in an era of reaction occurs there more easily than elsewhere in our common country. This is true despite such developments as the current dispute over the succession to the Governorship of my own State of Georgia. Liberalism will be strengthened there by the fight it has been compelled to make against the forces of reaction.

Temporarily, as an aftermath of weariness and apathy, many liberal elements in the United States have compromised with reaction. The cycle of future events in the Nation can be forecast with reasonable accuracy. There will be a brief interval of inaction, followed by some 8 years of reaction, culminating in a degree of economic collapse, which will act as a stimulus to liberal initiative. In that resurgence of liberalism the South will take the initiative in the Nation, simply because its liberal faith is very deeply rooted and because the economic cycle will operate more rapidly within its borders.

It is not a concession to the cynicism of the day to recognize the effect of economic stimuli upon the public's political and social thinking. There are not many people who spend their time in an examination of moral problems. They are busy with the daily routine of birth and burial, bread making and barter. But it is wholly natural to seek the cause of an effect, and the South will see the

results of reaction more quickly than the rest of America. For that matter, the South already is seeing those results. The cotton farmer finds himself in distress, because the markets neither of America nor of the world are free or controlled, but a mixture of the two recklessly established for expediency without regard for the future welfare of all the people.

But the fact that the South more quickly will see the results of national folly is the lesser of the two reasons. Far stronger is the fact that the South has a tradition of liberalism with greater continuity than any other section of the United States.

Since 1796 liberalism has been the dominant political philosophy of the South. This was not always galvanized into political action, of course. There is a segment of the South that reserves the name of Bourbon, although its influence has never been as consequential as many have believed.

For a comprehension of the future of liberal thought in the South a review of the South's contribution in the past is essential. Continuing until the present, the members of the judicial branch of the Federal Government who thought in terms of human rights were chiefly from the South, with the exceptions of four quite recent justices—Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, and Stone. Within the past half century the most vigorous voice raised in the United States Senate on behalf of a moral concept of American relations with other peoples was that of Augustus O. Bacon, of Georgia, and his voice was raised at a time when even Indiana's Beveridge could delude himself with cheap sophistries as to the "manifest destiny" that justified the rape of the Philippines.

The most vigorous native-radical movement in American history, since the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian revolutions, was that of the Populists, and the Ocala Platform still stands as a progressive milestone.

It is not, therefore, exceptional that, more recently, while Nebraska was replacing a Norris with a WHERRY, the least vocative liberal of the deep South's States was replacing a "Cotton Ed" Smith with a JOHNSTON, and the South was retaining BARKLEY, HILL, and PEPPER at their posts in spite of opposition stimulated, to a very great degree, by external influences.

Because of the colonialism that has afflicted the South, especially since 1876, when the Bourbon Brigadiers acquiesced in the electoral commission fraud in return for a restoration of self-government in the South in the form of an actual return of themselves to power, a glance is required at the relationship between southern reactionaries and the forces engaged in exploiting the South's human and natural resources.

It is readily knowledgeable that the reactionary uses the hate merchant as his tool.

The South has more than a fair share of these merchants of hate. They are financed, in general, outside its borders.

A glance at the admitted list of campaign contributors to almost any of the more easily identified demagogue-reactionary southern politicans will show that the money comes from non-residents or from lobbying representatives of non-residents. That most ingenuous of frauds, the American Democratic National Committee, founded admittedly for the purpose of defeating the expressed will of the people in a national election, operated almost entirely in the South. But the men who backed its operations financially were not southern.

The Ku Klux Klan, in each of its lives since it was dreamed up some 30 years ago, has known where to pass the hat. Its most effective hat-passing was in 1928, in the Presidential campaign. The native Fascist groups of the South always disclose, sooner or later, that their dissemination of hate is in the interest of outside exploiters, interested in retaining the South in a colonial status and willing to utilize racial tensions for that purpose. So thorough has been this exposure that it needs no documentation here.

But although hate-mongering is profitable alike to the fuehrers of such organizations and to the demagogic politician, it is almost always necessary for the latter to make a profession of liberal faith in some degree, even in those Southern States that have a definitely conservative atmosphere. Despite campaigns that reeked of racial bitterness, against campaigners who were experienced and wily, in the face of enormous campaign funds, liberals won many battles in the South in 1946. "Big Jim" Folsom, of Alabama, showed the way. Thurmond, of South Carolina, is definitely progressive. The reactionaries won few State House offices anywhere in the South, actually; and when they did win they usually postured as extreme liberals.

Georgia is a fair example. The liberal candidates swept all the minor contests, but, although obtaining a plurality of popular votes, lost the governorship because of the electoral system peculiar to the State. Nevertheless, although vigorously fanning the flames of racial prejudice, the winning candidate made some commitments most unusual for a reactionary. He made solemn pledges to expand further Georgia's expenditures for education, already the highest proportionate to income in the Nation; to subsidize a public hospital in every county seat; to increase old-age and dependent-children benefits; and to provide a quarter billion dollars of rural post roads during the next 4 years.

This does not mean that the damage that will be done to the South by reactionaries, by rabble-rousers, and by demagogs will not be considerable in the next few years. All kinds of misfits, and worse, will win the elections on occasions, in the South and elsewhere, in years to come.

Indeed, although the transient national trend toward conservatism is felt in the South at the moment, and has resulted happily in some instances in replacing arrant demagogs by conservatives, who at best are able and sincere and at worst only stuffed shirts, the South still has grave problems involving the simultaneous eradication of the personal machines of the demagogs and the election of a sound liberal movement not too narrowly parochial.

It must be granted that political liberalism in the South places an unusual emphasis upon the liberation of the Southern States from a colonial system. Since the South is condemned to a one-crop agriculture in the main and retarded in the development of any adequate industrial establishment by relentlessly enforced economic discrimination; the southern liberal is immediately concerned with the problem of economic equality for all sections of the Nation and for all its citizens.

There is an element of self-interest in this approach to the fundamental issue in national politics, but that does not affect its validity. Economic freedom is essential to a continuation of political freedom everywhere in the world.

In the next upsurge of liberalism in America, the choice inevitably will be between decentralization of production on some rational basis and complete centralization of Government to counterbalance central economic control. The liberals of the South will be the major spokesmen for the theory of genuinely free competitive enterprise.

The southern liberal, likewise, sees international problems in better perspective than anyone else in America, except perhaps the people of the Pacific coast. While the Middle West, far from the oceans, thinks deludedly in terms of a new isolationism, the East seems to have clutched to its busom the fetish of some new balance-of-power system, disregarding the fact that such systems always result in a testing of the balance by means of war.

Indeed, it was hardly an accident that the outstanding American envoy of our time, Josephus Daniels, was a North Carolina editor. The brilliance of his achievement in Mexico laid the real foundation for any successes we won in Latin America, and contributed inestimably to the winning of the war. Daniels viewed our Mexican relations from the same vantage point that Georgia's Bacon, three decades before, had examined the consequences of American imperialism.

Here again, the South's advantage seems to stem from its long exclusion from the Union, which it is seeking, despite obstacles, to reenter. Southern leaders are effectively barred from national office, except in the fields of foreign affairs and the judiciary. The asserted southern effectiveness in Congress is a fallacy, although some southern Senators through exceptional talents have attained influence; the southern membership in the House, however, presents another picture. Many Members with seniority, regrettably, come from districts where reduced voting lists and outside interference lead very frequently to the choice of men hardly representative of the section; the more vigorous, younger figures in the southern delegations have little opportunity to assume leadership.

Yet, for all that, the ablest critic of legislative methods, who contributed most to a reorganization of congressional techniques, is ESTES KEFAUVER, of the Tennessee delegation.

Perhaps, paradoxically, the injustice of keeping the South remote from the main currents of American political life for 80 years may prove ultimately profitable to the country. It has developed in the South a critical approach to political problems, which the southerner can view with a certain amount of detachment because nobody intends to listen to his views or will permit him to intrude upon a solution. But in the turning toward liberalism next time, some decade away, the southern voice will be heard.

To think of liberalism exclusively in political terms, however, is to do the liberal an injustice. Although the southerner might be mistaken for a political animal, in the sense that a Marxian philosopher might think of all of us as economic animals, it would be an error as egregious as thinking of the South exclusively in terms of magnolia-scented plantations or battered hovels.

The southerner likes politics; it provides relaxation, barbecues, a frequent good show, and an endless topic of street-corner conversation; but he does not live for it entirely, any more than other inhabitants of our country.

Liberalism in the South, as elsewhere, can express itself in a general attitude toward the social organism. For example, in the field of education, the South presents to the entire Nation an example of a people who act upon the premise that an educated citizenry is essential to a healthy democracy.

Despite its poverty, the South is spending far more proportionately upon education than any other section. Georgia and North Carolina, especially, are giving the common schools an unusual measure of financial support. In Georgia, the sums made available to the common schools for teachers' salaries were increased 126 percent in the last 4 years. In North Carolina, the budget for Negro schools in 1945 exceeded the entire budget for all schools 40 years before.

Liberalism in the South has a practical, realistic economic expression, best evidenced in the widespread assistance given to the minority race in acquiring land ownership. It is a striking contradiction of mistakenly held opinions that the percentage of Negro tenant farmers is smaller than that of white tenant farmers in the Southeast.

The South goes into the forthcoming era of reaction in better economic condition than in 1920, and, since the poverty of the South lies at the base of all its ills, the South will

emerge from the apparently inevitable boom-and-bust era in a more wholesome condition than in 1929. Economic and national defense arguments are so strong in favor of decentralization that the period of colonialism is doomed. Industrial growth will act as a further spur upon liberalism in the South.

Quietly the liberals are making progress. The neo-Fascist hired help of the exploiters are by open defiance of the law frightening natural conservatives into a liberal position. The acceleration of the economic cycle will focus southern attention upon the costliness of reaction to the social system and to the individual citizen. The southern press, independent to an unusual degree and preponderantly liberal, as was evidenced by its 90 percent support of liberal candidates in Georgia in 1942 and 1946, will continue its work of education.

When the next testing comes, something like a decade away, the South will be the sectional core of American liberalism, as it was in 1800 and 1828. In the meantime, southern liberals will not only continue to fight, but to win their local battles more frequently with each passing year and each election.

Helping Yourself to a Good Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Bert St. Clair, who is well known to many Members of Congress as a sound writer and counselor on improved relations between Government and business, recently wrote for Nation's Business an article of outstanding interest and merit. It deals in plain language with the mutual problems of Members of Congress and their constituents and especially emphasizes how business can cooperate better with the legislative branch. I do not recall ever having read an article which dealt with the Congressman's problems with greater understanding and sympathy and I wish that every voter in the Nation might read it.

It is inserted herewith:

HELPING YOURSELF TO A GOOD CONGRESS

(By Labert St. Clair)

THE NEW CONGRESS WILL BE AS GOOD OR BAD AS WE MAKE IT BY OUR OWN ATTITUDE AND ENERGY—AN OLD WASHINGTON HAND GIVES A FEW TIPS ON HOW TO HELP YOUR CONGRESSMAN

1. Write today: Your Congressman will get a lift out of receiving a letter from you—not asking him for anything—but letting him know that you have confidence in him.

2. Act as eyes: Help your Congressman by acting as his local eyes and ears. His chief interests are at home—and will remain there so long as he is Representative.

3. Be prepared: Don't go on record on a bill until you are sure you know exactly what you are talking about. Best preliminary step is to get in touch with your trade association and request every available bit of current information on the subject.

4. Check up: Make certain that no one in your business group—such as an executive secretary—has put the group on record for or against any proposed piece of legislation without first polling the members of the organization on it.

5. Be fair: You have no right as a citizen to ask your Congressman to support any legislation which you, standing in his shoes, would not back yourself.

6. Ask no favors: Don't assume that because you have helped your Congressman you should be given preferece in legislative matters. When your Congressman gets you a hearing he has done a good deal for you right there.

7. Speak up: Don't hesitate to act for fear of being smeared as a "lobbyist." Committees of Congress want your views and advice on legislation.

8. Give name: Until you know your Congressman well always identify yourself fully when you approach him. Suggest to your friends that they do the same thing.

9. Be brief: Don't take too much of his time. Remember you are just one of the many persons in his district he is under obligation to serve.

10. Don't fumble: Don't let him feed you. He may, of course, protest against your picking up the check. But you pick it up anyway. He is under enormous expense, and the chances are that he has to cut financial corners to make ends meet.

A gentleman in the rear of the hall sends this question to the platform: "How much may we expect to get out of the new Congress?"

A question, sir, that can be answered only with another:

"How much will the new Congress get out of you?"

Congress, which usually reflects fairly accurately the attitude, energy, and willingness to serve of the people who seat it, will be approximately as good or bad as we make it.

Whether Congress moves steadily forward, stalls, or slides back depends on the wholehearted efforts of the crews of its doubleheader engines. Those two crews are the Members and the voters. The Member engine will be out in front, puffing, smoking, and sometimes emitting loud noises. We, the voters, man the pusher or second engine and our job is to push and push hard. Especially on the grades. The steeper they become, the greater our obligation to shovel on the coal and build up more steam.

For the next few years particularly, the climb over the hump is going to be a good full two-engine job. More so than ever before in our history, perhaps.

The presence of many new Members in the first engine crew makes it especially important that the second engine crew not falter. Making the grade is difficult enough for old crew Members who have been over legislative hills before. It is much harder for newcomers. There is so much that is new to learn due to greatly expanded Government activities in recent years. Persons unfamiliar with Washington scarcely can realize the magnitude of the job confronting Senators and Members of the House. Even as a 30-year resident, long familiar with congressional and other Government contacts, I find it necessary to explore new avenues daily.

It is to be hoped that you already have registered your willingness to serve in the second engine crew. Perhaps you did it in the campaign just past by helping your Senators or Representative directly or, equally important, by promoting discussion of national issues. Whether you did anything or not, it is important that you get on the crew now.

Today is the time to make a contact with your Washington Representatives and express your interest in their efforts to be of service to the Nation. For the sake of brevity, let's refer to them hereinafter as your Congressmen. All are Members of the Congress whether in the House or the Senate.

Write your Congressman a letter now. Maybe you doubt if you have anything of interest to say to him. But you have, and especially if he is a new Member. Whether he is new or old, like every Member at the opening of a new session, his mind is filled with doubts and perplexities. No matter how brave a front he is putting on, if he is conscientious—and most Members are—he feels his responsibility and may be just a little bit lonely.

Ever in his mind are the many folks he represents. He wants to do the popular thing, of course, for his job depends on that, but he also wants to do the right thing. That, in these hectic days, is not always easy to do because who always knows what is right?

So you can do a real service to him and the Nation if you will, at the outset, just drop him a line telling him something to the effect that the people sent him to Washington because they felt that he would do the best he knew how. You have no idea what a lift that alone will give him.

Maybe it will strike you that this would be a heck of a weak letter to write to a statesman who down in Washington is struggling with great international problems. There are two things wrong with that impression at this stage of the game, and he would be the first to tell you so. First, he probably is not a statesman yet. Second, the leaders have not called him in to date to give them his ideas on a complete foreign program.

Instead, he is the same lawyer who drew that bill of sale for you last October and said $2 was all it was worth.

The only problem with a foreign tinge he has grappled with so far this session is how to get rid of that spot left by a gob of Russian dressing on his blue serge suit.

Of domestic problems, however, he has plenty. Where to find a place to live; how to get all of the boys whose fathers want them back on the farm out of the Army; how to find jobs for the scores of party supporters who are after him; how to reconcile the differences of the opposing Palestine groups that are waiting in his outer office; how to get on a good committee without appearing to be hoggish; how to arrange for the daughter of one of his strongest supporters to meet Queen Elizabeth, and the son of another to be admitted to West Point, and so forth. You think a man who is faced with all of that and much more does not need kind words and support? Brother, O brother!

Whatever you write, do not ask him for a job for anybody. Just about everyone asks Congressmen for jobs.

There are not now, never have been and never will be enough jobs for one-hundredth part of the applicants. To ask for a job now will only embarrass him and add to his burdens.

Don't take the newspaper stories about the Republicans cutting Federal pay rolls immediately too seriously. They may desire to, but they cannot do it, ever.

Just because a million jobs are slated to be abolished does not mean that they will be. A lot of workers, it will be found, are protected by civil service. Others will prove absolutely indispensable.

Not a few hundred will show to the satisfaction of the most ardent political investigator that they have been voting the Republican ticket ever since the first free silver campaign. More than you would imagine will hold tighter to their desks than the varnish on them.

When you write your Congressman, give him your views on outstanding national and international problems. A lot of front-rank members of both major parties do not know all the answers to such questions today. There will be much pondering and some switching of opinions on these issues before the final votes on them are cast. In your letter, ask your member what the thinking is on these issues. If he has personal opinions, he will express them to you. If

he has none as yet, he will be grateful to you for not pinning him down too definitely this early in the session.

With a new party in power, Congress will be somewhat slow in passing even big bills. Of course, there is a flurry of measures of all sizes now, but passage of any of them is weeks away. If Congress this session passes a few big bills dealing with taxation, labor, and curbing of war powers, and cuts costs, it will do well.

Rather than pressing your Member for solutions of all the outstanding problems of the world, help him get his feet on the Capitol ground by acting as local eyes and ears for him at home. There is where his important interests are and will remain so long as he is a good representative of his people. If and when his principal interests move elsewhere, his constituents will sense it quickly—and make arrangements for other representation. Until then the most valuable regular service you can render is to help keep him informed on what is going on among his voters.

Contacts keep jobs

Wise Members never permit their home contacts to languish. One of the smartest politicans ever to hit Washington was the late Champ Clark, onetime Speaker. He kept himself in the House for decades chiefly by maintaining close home connections. Every working morning he would devote all the time he could spare to reading newspapers from his district and getting leads for writing letters back home.

Other Congressmen still follow Clark's plan. Go into the office of any Member of either House who has been in Washington a long time and you will see a stack of district papers neatly piled up awaiting his perusal. Most of these good Members have a standing order that no home papers may be destroyed until they, or someone in their offices, have gone over them carefully.

One veteran Democratic Member in a close middle western district was too ill to go home and campaign this year. Republicans in the district, pointing out the narrowness of his last majority, his current absence and the national trends, assured me that, at last, the old boy was doomed. Without surveying the district, I told them they were wrong, and they were. I knew that every year since the Member has been in Congress he has written at least 100,000 letters to his constituents and thus made his position solid. A good mailing list, carefully nurtured, has kept many a Member in office in the past and will do it again.

Politics involve people

You can be a great help in building up a mailing list. In your letters, mention Bill Jones and Minnie Smith by name. If you can think of something that either has said about the Member or a situation, write about it. Grains of sand? Sure, but they help make concrete blocks for solid political foundations.

The average congressional district consists of about 250,000 persons and a Senator's constituency is his entire State population. Yet every House and Senate Member is supposed, any time after his first election, to recognize the full name of every voter and instantly know all about all the members of his family.

Failure to recognize them when home often is highly embarrassing to a Member. You can help him over such hurdles. If you see him alone among strangers to him but acquaintances of yours, offer your services in helping make identifications.

Until you know a Member well, always identify yourself fully when you approach him. Suggest to your friends that they do the same thing. You have no idea how much it will help him, and he will appreciate it. Sure, he will say, "Why, Bill, you don't have to identify yourself to me." But to himself he probably is saying, "My gosh, I didn't know him from a side of sole leather." It is difficult to remember everybody, even if you are a Congressman.

As the big problems are disposed of in this and subsequent sessions, Congress will gradually broaden its base of operations. Some day something will arise which will be of particular interest to you or your local, State, or National trade, industry, or profession. Then it will be your duty as a citizen and a businessman to do everything you can to help throw light on the situation for the benefit of all concerned.

Don't be scared away

Do not hesitate to act because you feel that somebody will smear you as a "lobbyist." That is a scare term often used by persons who hope business never will express itself on legislation, but supinely accept any suggested measure regardless of its possible effects.

The new law defining lobbying activities certainly does not prevent you from discussing proposed laws with your friends, writing to your Congressman or appearing before committees. The lobbying law was designed largely to bring to light racketeers who solicit fat fees for so-called "influence" and render no service to either their retainers or Congress. Specifically exempted from registration are persons who only appear before congressional committees. Of course, the constitutional right to communicate with your Congressmen also stands.

As a matter of fact, Members of Congress rely heavily on these communications from their constituents and on the advice of the national organizations of businessmen everywhere. They also think businessmen have been too hesitant about vigorously opposing in person bills which they regard as bad or about supporting those they approve.

You will find your member cordial and grateful for the personal interest you have taken in his progress and eager to help you. Do not assume, however, that merely because you may have aided him in his campaign or given him advice or tips that you should be given any great preference in legislative matters. Your case should be strong enough to stand on its own feet. When your Congressman gets you a hearing, he has done a good deal for you.

Many persons who are eager to appear before committees never reach the stand, largely because they never have displayed any interest in Congress until their own interests were aroused. Some come to Washington determined to tell committees where to get off, and when asked the name of their Congressman are unable to give it. They do not get far.

Have all the facts

Thorough preparation is essential before going to the Hill and supporting or opposing any proposed legislation. Never, under any circumstance, make any move toward going on record on a bill until you are sure you know exactly what you are talking about.

The best possible preliminary step is to get in touch with your national trade association and request every available thing of current value on the subject under consideration.

Do this regardless of how voluminous have been your mailings from State and sectional information sources. National groups are set up to render complete and current service, and they do it. Of particular value is their statistical information. Nothing is of more use in making a case before a congressional committee than unassailable statistical material. Such are the only kind of statistics which national associations will provide. Get them to supplement your local factual matter.

Whatever you do, however, do not write your national association telling it of your interest in forthcoming legislation and then sit back and expect the organization to carry on from that point. Be prepared to help the organization when it asks you to. Members of Congress have respect for such official figures as these associations provide, but they want them supported by field testimony, such as you can give. A substantial factual statement of one businessman from the firing line is worth more than reams of testimony from a lawyer or other special pleader.

Don't ask unfair favors

Common fairness also demands that the political welfare of every Congressman be considered in connection with the submission of any proposed legislation. No private citizen has any right to ask his Senator or Representative to support a piece of legislation which he, standing in the Member's shoes, would hesitate to back himself. Yet such unfair requests are made daily in every congressional session.

Seekers after legislation always are filled with vague promises about the support they will provide for their favorite bills if the Member will only get behind them. All too frequently, however, the constituent fades out of the picture once the Member agrees to go along with a bill, and is seen no more. Then the constituent wonders, or says he wonders, why the Member did not push the bill.

Businessmen have much room for improvement of their Hill standing as witnesses and as supporters of proposed legislation. Not all of them have made bad impressions in the past, but the least that can be said about many is that they deserve no orchids for their performances. It is true that in the roaring 'thirties, many congressional committees were loaded with business antagonists who were not always exactly cordial in their treatment of industry witnesses. But not all. Numerous flops of business witnesses should not be attributed to congressional hostility. All too often the causes of bad impressions have been acceptance of poor advice or failure to exercise plain horse sense.

For instance, one scarcely can justly say that congressional antagonism has been responsible for:

1. The attempted promotion of legislative programs through enormous cocktail parties and dinners in the ballrooms of downtown Washington hotels or large rented houses.

2. The sending by wire to congressional members of innumerable fake endorsements of pending measures signed by names copied directly from telephone books and similar lists.

3. The bombarding of Congress with thousands of identically worded form letters and telegrams.

4. The appearance before busy committees of witnesses unable to do more than read prepared statements, and who when submitted to direct questioning demonstrate clearly that they know little or nothing about the subject under consideration.

Here are some preliminary steps which should be taken by business groups prior to appearing before any congressional committee:

1. Be sure that the proposal to which you are addressing your testimony is fully understood by witnesses.

2. Make certain that no one—such as an executive secretary—has put your group on record for or against any proposal without polling the members on it.

3. Offer only witnesses who can both read prepared statements intelligently and answer questions asked by committeemen.

4. Warn all witnesses against ad libbing extensively. Let each present his part of the picture in the most pointed possible manner and then leave the stand.

5. Make certain that you have a man at each hearing who knows the source of every statement your witnesses make and is in a position to provide instantly, or to promise

to supply at a later date, additional facts and figures if they are requested by committee members.

A final word about good rules to observe while visting your Congressman in Washington:

1. Don't take too much of his time. There never are enough hours in the day for him to get his regular work done. When you have finished your immediate business with him, leave his office, take a sightseeing tour, go back to your hotel, or otherwise occupy yourself so that he will not feel obligated to entertain you. No matter how good a friend you may be, you are just one of many persons in his district he is pledged to serve.

2. Don't let him feed you and entertain you at theaters or night clubs. It's mighty expensive. He is under enormous expenses—far beyond his Government pay—and unless he has a neat private income he has to cut financial corners to make ordinary ends meet. Of course, he may protest against your picking up the check, but you pick it up anyhow.

3. Don't stick around Washington after your business is done. If your Member has helped you, you cannot do better than make a bee line for home and spread the good word around that the district has the right man in Washington. Be sure, also, as soon as you reach home, to write him a letter of cordial thanks, and have everyone you know who has benefited from his help do the same thing.

After that, from time to time, when you don't want a thing in the world, drop him a note and ask him if there is anything you can do for him. When he asks you to do something, do it just as if he were the voter and you were in Congress. He, you know, is trying to do as much for at least a quarter of a million persons.

A Serious Menace to Smaller Business in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, having an especial interest in the welfare of the small businessman and the problems and obstacles facing him, and being convinced his voice is not being heard in the volume and to the extent his position in our economic life merits, I requested and was granted permission to have printed in the RECORD the following speech delivered by Mr. Albert H. Redles, a charter member of the American Institute of Smaller Business, to the Fortieth and Market Streets Business Association of Philadelphia, Pa., on Thursday, January 30, 1947, on the subject, A Serious Menace to Smaller Business in America:

Ladies and gentlemen of the Fortieth and Market Streets Business Association: I have come here tonight to discuss a most important subject with you—A Serious Menace to Smaller Business in America.

First of all, let me define who really is a smaller businessman. According to the American Institute of Smaller Business it is the one-man business to the business employing up to 750 persons, and whose stock, if it is a corporation, is not listed on any stock exchange in the United States.

Almost overnight the words "small" or "smaller business" whichever you care to call it, have become magic. Everyone seems to want to help it. But unfortunately, lip service is about all it has gotten so far. Unless smaller business gets down to earth, and faces the facts, and does something for itself, it may not survive in our national economy.

Mr. Dewey Anderson has said: "If the small businessmen of the Nation will organize themselves in a militant, statesmanlike manner, they can make their concerted voice heard and heeded, not only in State legislatures, but in the Congress and the executive departments and agencies in Washington."

Free, private competitive enterprise is on the way out, unless small business as a whole will fight—now and hard—to be heard. Retailers realize an increasing consumer resistance to present high prices, and in some cases, manufacturers still are demanding higher prices, and prices must in some cases come down, and in others hold firm in order to get our national production ability in high gear quickly to avoid a serious business relapse.

It was back in 1850, almost 100 years ago, when Daniel Webster, that great statesman and Secretary of State under President Harrison made this, never to be forgotten, utterance: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it." Portal-to-portal pay suits will certainly hinder instead of help business expansion and continuous strong employment.

In Proverbs, twenty-ninth chapter and the eighteenth verse, you will read these words of wisdom, written by King Solomon: "Where there is no vision the people perish."

Large business is adequately represented in Washington and at our State capitols. Our farmers are well organized and represented and speak with authority. Labor employs skilled men and women to promote and defend their interests. But smaller business is not organized into powerful associations and has no powerful voice in Washington.

It is your duty and mine, as small businessmen, to see to it that this vital segment of our Nation's business (smaller business, if you please) be preserved and protected. It must stand united against all forces that threaten to overpower it. Both Houses of our Congress have had special committees created to study our problems, and they both have done a very good job, although working with very limited appropriations. Both committees should be made permanent committees of the Congress, and given ample funds with which to conduct their vast and most important work.

Alibis, ladies and gentlemen, pay no dividends.

The goal of all business is profit. The ambition of all business is survival.

Survive, you say; why, what do you mean by that? Our business always has gotten along all right, and we expect it will in the future. Perhaps you have not seen some of the pitfalls across the path of smaller business. There are many, but just this one to which I will now refer can be disastrous. Let me tell you about it.

Do you realize that smaller business will not become one of the beneficiaries of the Government's profit-wage policy? The obstacles now rising in the path of small business will retard its progress and cut its profits. These are increased wages and continued high taxes. Small business especially needs some tax reductions.

The recent profit-wage policy, while designed to prevent further inflation through increased production and higher wages, in itself is an inflated policy, based on the assumption of a continuing and inexhaustible demand for manufactured goods and service facilities, without adequate regard to their cost to the public. Will the present pent-up purchasing power of our people outlast the need for continuing this boom policy? Already consumers have lost a great deal of their purchasing power by price advancements. We think all this is a hazardous venture for government to project any such boom policy on boom psychology and inflated conditions. When forced prosperity, stalled purchasing power, and the public savings have spent themselves—and this is bound to come—smaller business will find itself still harnessed with governmental regulations and too heavily burdened with costs of operation (especially increased wages) to be able to survive.

Our Government has no really constructive policy looking toward the protection and preservation of small business beyond well wishing, and maybe an easy loan policy. Right here we could all apply very well some sound philosophy, as expressed by Judge H. H. Tye when he said: "Work, save, and behave." Knowledge isn't power. It is the ability to use power, to know where to find what you do not know. You cannot get to the right place on the wrong road, and you must have a place to go before you can go anywhere.

About a year ago I stated that the Democratic administration would ultimately force many American businesses into bankruptcy by recommending through the State Department lower tariffs on foreign imports.

Such a move is equivalent to selling American business down the river. The move through the State Department was an endeavor to obtain congressional support for the new reciprocal trade agreements.

Adoption of lower import tariff rates on a wholesale basis will mean eventually a flooding of American markets with foreign products, produced more cheaply at a detriment to the welfare of American labor and industry. I remember only too well what Japan almost did to our business before the war. It must not happen again.

How can the American workingman continue to expect a high degree of earning if American business is not protected against a tremendous influx of foreign merchandise, directly competitive, yet manufactured and sold at a much lower cost?

A lowering of the tariffs on foreign products generally will prove a heavy blow to virtually every line of American business. Foreign manufacturers will be capable of competing in the American market with its high rate of manufacturing cost. This will ultimately be very costly to American labor and management.

Among the "ultimate sufferers" if tariffs are lowered will be the textile, candy, and shoe industries, but eventually most American manufacturers will be affected either directly or indirectly.

As a few examples: China will probably replace Japan as a heavy producer of cotton goods. The United States has sent equipment and technical men to China to help in the growth of the industry. This is very humanitarian if for the purpose of helping that country regain confidence and establish employment. However, to highly develop its manufacturing and then authorize lower tariffs can mean, eventually, industrial bankruptcy to American manufacturers in this field.

Keep in mind the abnormally low living standards in China, which will permit them to throw cotton goods on the American market at virtually a fraction of our production costs.

Russia, too, we read, is increasing its cultivation of cotton, and undoubtedly plans eventually to manufacture its own cotton goods. This probably will eliminate Russia some time in the future as a large purchaser of American cotton raw materials. In addition, with lower tariffs, she will help threaten our market with an influx of Russian cotton goods.

The Democratic administration is attempting to build a good-neighbor policy at the expense of American labor and industry.

May I remind you, who are from many small businesses, that common sense is certainly the needed application now, for, as Stowe defines it—let us apply it: The knack of seeing things as they are and doing things as they ought to be done.

Labor and management who go to make up small and big business must realize this deadly menace of unqualified lower tariffs across the board, and we must make known to the Congress the fact that we are looking to them for protection, through and by a clear understanding of our problems.

The lowering of tariffs, I am informed, is planned by the State Department at the 19-country trade conference, to meet in Geneva, Switzerland, in April. The number of tariff reductions will concern several thousand items. Keep in mind that objections have already been registered at Washington, but under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the President is permitted to reduce tariffs up to 50 percent. Congress could stop reductions only by repeal of the act.

Of course, the State Department will say that they plan to use this reduction as a bargaining point to get other nations to reduce import quotas and many other trade restrictions.

Just to give you some of the numerous items in line for reductions, let me name the following: Metals and metal products, like clocks, watches, electrical apparatus, etc.; farm products, like live cattle, spices, etc.; woolen goods, silk goods, paper goods, tobacco, glassware, furs, leather, smoking pipes, and a whole host of other items. Remember, ladies and gentlemen, there will always be a United States of America if we do not give it away.

The Members of the Eightieth Congress must be made to realize that a wholesale tariff reduction can prove to be very harmful to American business, especially small business, and that widespread unemployment will begin to appear. This disturbing fact, combined with the infiltration of Communists into the ranks of labor, can result in a great part of the World War II debt being paid by the ranks of the unemployed. The debt comparison of World War II as against World War I is about $260,000,000,000 against $27,000,000,000. The yearly interest of our present national debt is staggering.

I am convinced that labor has not yet realized what the Communist is trying so hard to do by continuously injecting, by any means, his theory—divide and conquer. Therefore, it is so very, very important that we here in America put our own house in order and keep it in order. A Communist is nothing more than a Russian agent. It makes no difference if he or she be a soldier or a civilian, he or she is still a Russian agent. We in America do not need communism, and if Russia feels she does, let her keep it within her own borders. We have no desire to prevent her from following such a course within Russia, but by the same token she must be made to realize that Americans want democracy, which promotes our system of free private competitive enterprise, and the rest of the world shall have the same fair opportunity of making a selection. I wonder how long it will take the American people to see what is happening to them, their principles, and their way of life?

Our right-wing unionists far outnumber the Communists in the union ranks, but are losing their unions in exactly the same way that the decent American voter can lose democracy—by simply not working at it as hard as those who would change things underhandedly.

In order to arrive at a solution to both important menaces, we should recommend to our Congressmen that immediate action should be taken when it gets the goods on the Communists, and by all means the right wing of labor and management should get together in honest-to-goodness labor-management meetings. To bring the chicken home to roost, let me sum it up in the words of Rudyard Kipling:

"Nations have passed away and left no traces.
And history gives the naked cause of it—
One single, simple reason in all cases:
They fell because their people were not fit."

One of Philadelphia's great men—Russell H. Conwell—gives us a true lesson of life, expressed so very well in Acres of Diamonds when we read:

"To be great at all one must be great here, now, in Philadelphia. He who can give to this city better streets and better sidewalks, better schools, and more colleges, more happiness and more civilization, more of God, he will be great anywhere. Let every man or woman here, if you never hear me again, remember this, that if you wish to be great at all, you must begin where you are and what you are, in Philadelphia, now. He that can give to his city any blessing, he who can be a good citizen while he lives here, he that can make better homes, he that can be a blessing whether he works in the shop or sits behind the counter or keeps house, whatever be his life, he who would be great anywhere must first be great in his own Philadelphia."

Therefore, I appeal to you as free Americans, who are members of the some 3,000,000 or more small competitive ventures that still constitute free private enterprise in America, to dedicate yourselves to the cause of keeping your political representatives well informed of the dangers (if permitted to occur frequently) that can and will bring about small business absorptions. Mergers some call them. A step toward helping this condition occurred the other day when the RFC announced that the BPA (blanket participation agreement) would expire January 22, 1947. This hurts small business. By this method, the larger and better equipped survivors can take over their distressed competitors, and almost eliminate smaller businesses, which to live must do as Edward Everett Hale has said:

"Coming together means beginning;
Keeping together means progress, and
Working together means success."

Tonight let us rededicate ourselves to be always American in our thinking, as well as our doing, and then we in small business can weather the storm of adjustment through 1947, and be ready for some real strong business activity in 1948, keeping in front of us those immortal final words of Abraham Lincoln's famed Gettysburg address as a challenge to us and the world, as he said:

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us. * * * that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Foreign Lending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Henry Hazlitt which appeared in the February 3 issue of Newsweek:

THE FRUITS OF FOREIGN LENDING
(By Henry Hazlitt)

Now that the International Monetary Fund is no longer a dream but a reality, all the problems that were so lightly set aside by the rhetoric and propaganda used to get the plan adopted by Congress are beginning to emerge in their full dimensions. The whole approach at the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference was unsound. The International Bank, and particularly the Fund, were set up to deal merely with the symptoms and consequences of international monetary chaos and not with its causes. The irony of the Fund is that it could work only under practically ideal conditions, in which it would not be needed.

The first thing to remember is that monetary chaos is not primarily international at all. It exists basically within each nation. If each nation's currency unit were freely convertible into a definite weight of gold, if there were no overissue of its currency, so that this convertibility could be at all times maintained, then the relationship of one currency to another would necessarily be fixed and stable. If the dollar were always convertible into, say, one thirty-sixth of an ounce of gold, and the pound into one-ninth of an ounce of gold, then pounds would always be freely convertible into dollars at a ratio of 1 to 4. But where there is no common unit of measurement there cannot be anything more than, at best, a temporary and unreliable exchange stability.

The Bretton Woods arrangements ignored all these basic considerations. They tried to cure international monetary instability by hiding its symptoms or preventing its consequences. They provided in the Fund that when any nation's currency started to slide downward, the nations with relatively strong currencies must use them to buy the weak currencies at par. Of course a currency can be kept at par by doing this—as long as the strong nations are willing to throw their money away and as long as that money holds out.

United States Steel or any other stock could be kept at par as long as someone with sufficient funds kept in a standing bid to take all the stock offered at par. But the SEC and the stock exchange would soon bring charges against such a bidder of flagrant manipulation. If a private agent, moreover, used his client's money to buy stocks or anything else above the open-market price, he would be sued for breach of trust or dissipation of funds. But when governments do such things, they are given pleasanter names and are justified by the complex reasoning of economic experts.

The managers of the Fund are not even permitted to make their buying of currencies contingent upon internal reforms in the nations whose currencies they are supporting. Insistence on such reforms is regarded as interference in the internal affairs of such nations or outside dictation of their policies. The nations with sound currencies are merely permitted—in fact, obliged—to finance the inflationary policies and all the other economic errors of the nations with sinking currencies.

The only real remedy for this fantastic situation would be for the United States to withdraw entirely from the Fund. The articles of agreement themselves permit it to do this at any time. At the very least, if the fund is not to end in a disastrous failure, the United States ought to insist on an amendment unequivocally authorizing the managers of the fund to withhold the use of its resources from any nation which in their opinion is following either internal or external policies not conducive to exchange stability.

Among such policies the amendment should list specifically excessive deficit financing, excessive expansion of currency or bank credit, trade discrimination against other member nations, unreasonable exchange controls, a policy of autarchy, of military or diplomatic aggression, and so on.

When governments could no longer have their economic errors subsidized from the outside, at least major follies might be brought to a halt in time. Meanwhile, our Government continues to pour out billions of dollars of foreign loans. A great deal of these will certainly never be repaid in full. Not only is our Government failing to get really compensating monetary and trade reforms in exchange for these funds, but it is aggravating a domestic boom and inflation, and preparing a corresponding reaction for the future.

Rural Electrification in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of Congress I had the privilege of traveling into every one of the 24 counties which comprise the Third Congressional District of Nebraska and which I have the honor of representing in this body. Much of my time during the 5 months that I was at home was spent in traveling into the rural sections of these counties. I had the great opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to visit hundreds of farms which were equipped with electric power as the result of extension of rural electrification. I found these farmers greatly appreciative of this service which has made farm life less burdensome. Thousands of other farmers, however, Mr. Speaker, are without electricity and are demanding it.

I feel that electric power should be made the cheapest commodity on the farm. With the improvement of farm-to-market roads making it possible for all producing farms to be connected with all-weather roads and extension of rural electrification, that kind of farm economy which is absolutely necessary for future America will be brought about, in my opinion.

One of the real progressive newspapers in my district is the Butler County Press. Florella Clark Owen is the editor and publisher of this newspaper. In an editorial in the Butler County Press, issue of January 30, 1947, Editor Owen has written an excellent article regarding the benefits of rural electrification. In order that the entire membership of this House may have the advantage of reading this editorial, I include it as a part of my remarks:

A drive into the country after dark brings the realization to one of the advancement of rural electrification, for in every direction is seen a myriad of lights stretching as far as the eye can see. These lights bespeak for farm people a lightening of labor of all kinds—milking and later separating the milk by electricity, the grinding of grain, pumping of water for the livestock, as well as having running water in the home by means of an electric pump, the huge floodlights which shed their rays over the entire barnyard, and the lessening of work in the home for the farm wife with all the electrical conveniences. Not only is the progress of REA being made in Butler County, but it is found that way in all other parts of the State and other States in the country. From Sidney, Nebr., comes word that 490 miles of rural lines are to be added to the Pine Bluffs REA district, while Dean Miller, who by the way is formerly of David City, now manager of the eastern Nebraska public power district, states that the district expects to start soon on an expansion program intended to cost $200,000. All of which means that the farmer at long last is emerging from the dark and is able to avail himself of many of the comforts and luxuries which townspeople consider necessities.

H. R. 1672, To Regulate Chain Store Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, by adding section 110, which relates to the tax treatment of chain stores operated at a loss, through which they have obtained decidedly unfair benefits.

Under its provisions—

In the case of any retail store which is part of a retail chain if for any taxable year the amounts which, except for this section, would be deductible on account of such store exceeds the amounts, which except for this section would be includible in gross income on account of such store, the amounts which would be so deductible shall not be allowed as deductions for such taxable year and the amounts which would be so includible shall be excluded from the gross income for such taxable year.

The proposal then defines a chain store. The reason for the introduction of this amendment is that large chain corporations in different lines are able to operate stores at a loss to the injury of independent merchants and other small chains. These losses are then deducted from their income-tax returns. The present law, therefore, is used as a weapon to destroy competitors and at the same time reduce income-tax payments at the expense of the Government. In addition, this also forces a reduction of income-tax payments by competitors whose businesses are made less profitable or they are driven out of business.

This is a common practice among large chain corporations. In establishing stores in a city it is the practice to sell at extremely low prices to entrench such branch stores. This has the effect of making local merchants appear as profiteering. After entrenching such stores, prices are raised. To illustrate my point, the court record in the A. & P. trial, which resulted in the conviction of 24 individuals and corporations for violation of the Sherman Anti-trust Act, including John A. and George L. Hartford, discloses the alarming fact that as many as 4,374 stores of this system were operated at a net loss in 1938 which was charged against the corporation's income-tax return, and an average of 2,954 stores over a period of 14 years. Other exhibits from A. & P. files in evidence show that at a meeting of the executive committee of the New England division at Boston, the Hartford brothers, who are owners of the business of this gigantic chain corporation, authorized its operation of about 800 stores without any profit whatever. The same applies to the Atlantic division at Philadelphia with about 800 stores, or a total of 1,600 units.

This corporation made vicious price wars on the First National Stores of Boston and the independent grocers in the entire New England division in its entire territory, with branches in Albany, N. Y.; Portland, Maine; New Haven, Conn.; Providence, R. I.; and Boston. Testimony in this case from documents in its own files, points out that the New England division adopted resolutions on two different occasions thanking the two Hartfords for their "generosity" in permitting the division to conduct all stores without realizing any profit on their operations.

The court record further shows that the Government was deprived of income tax on $780,000 due to losses of the New England division, and $592,000 in the Atlantic division, or a total of $1,372,000 in 1939, according to the minutes of the divisional president's meeting with the Hartfords, who dominate the policy of this company.

In addition, $300,000 yearly was spent by the National Consumers Tax Commission which disbanded after some years because it failed to function as John A. Hartford wanted it, through the ladies who were chairmen of some 600 such groups in as many cities but who were misinformed of its real purpose as an A. & P. propaganda scheme. In addition, there is the $93,000 yearly fees plus expenses of Carl Byoir & Associates for lobbying and propaganda expenses. It is fair to assume that all of these items were charged off as legitimate expenses which, combined, should represent more than $2,000,000 on which the Government collected nothing in the way of income tax. In order to carry out this "false front" so recognized by United States District Judge Walter C. Lindley in his decision, consumers were assessed 10 points on the price of groceries to pay for this propaganda.

The main dependence for profit by this concern is placed on subsidiary earnings, advertising allowances forced from manufacturers and stock gains commonly known in the trade as short weighting, short changing and price boosting at the check-out counters. Without these outside earnings stores would be conducted at a distinct loss. The effect of this creates a monopoly and cripples or destroys the operations of competing independent merchants and small chain stores. The treasurer of the First National Stores testified at this trial that his company suffered a decrease in earnings of $1,421,000, or 27 percent, because

of these price wars. The Government, therefore, lost that income tax, too, from this corporation, while other competing food dealers were similarly affected, thus increasing the loss to the Government.

There is documentary proof in the evidence that its management boasted in minutes of the divisional presidents' meeting that the aim is to operate stores on such low prices that competitors cannot make any money. Minutes of the New England division of this system show resolutions were adopted thanking John A. Hartford and his brother for the generosity and privilege of operating all stores without profit.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. has 5,700 stores, or 1½ percent of the total number of all grocery stores, including other chains. Its sales are around $1,379,000,000, or about 11 percent of the total grocery business, though operating in but 42 States. This leaves the remaining 89 percent for distribution among 345,611 independent grocery dealers and 34,658 other chains, or a total of 380,269. There are 125 cities in which it has from 20 to more than 50 percent of the business. On these tremendous sales, so the court record shows, it made only $4,199,347, or at the rate of less than one-third of a cent per dollar of sales, yet through its subsidiaries, allowances from manufacturers, stock gains, and so forth, it realized a net profit after taxes of $26,025,000.

Again relying on the court record for the facts, John A. Hartford told the presidents of the seven divisions who meet quarterly to map out the company's policy for the ensuing 3 months and go over past results, that all the owners wanted was a net profit of 0.0022 percent from stores and that headquarters would take care of the rest.

In 1941 it realized but $4,199,347 net profit on sales of $1,379,000,000. It obtained $8,333,000 from manufacturers' allowances in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act despite decision of the Supreme Court. In addition, it obtained $1,933,000 from stock gains explained in the testimony as any sums secured on the sale of these items over and above the price billed by the warehouse. They are secured by such practices in the retail stores as short weighting, short changing, boosting prices at the checkout counters; and so forth. These stock gains over a period of years, according to the record, totaled $42,535,000.

If these stock gains in 1941 are deducted from the reported stores profits of $8,320,000, the company would actually have had a deficit of $4,133,667, yet its over-all profits were $26,025,000 in that year.

Taking all types of chain stores into consideration, with 123,195 units out of a total of 1,770,355 stores of all kinds, the chain corporations have but 7 percent of the units, yet they controlled, according to the last census, 21.7 percent of all the retail business. Included in this total number of chain stores, it should be remarked, are a large number of small local companies, since four stores are considered to be a chain. With these eliminated, the percentage of sales control over the total retail business of every type would be materially increased, while the number of the larger chain systems would be substantially reduced.

Under these circumstances the present Internal Revenue Code, by virtue of passing losses on stores caused by operating many of them deliberately at a loss for a period of time to establish them on a profitable basis at the expense of other retail competitors who have no such cushion, is allowing these big corporations to escape just income-tax payments, create a monopoly, and use this loophole in the law to accomplish their destructive purposes.

If we are to have full employment, build up undernourished areas, provide opportunities for returning servicemen to enter business, protect small businesses in general, collect all just income tax on legitimate earning operations, this amendment should be adopted by the Congress. This would assist in increasing income and aid to that extent in reducing the war debt.

A bill relating to the tax treatment of chain stores operated at a loss

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 109 a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 110. Chain Stores Operated at a Loss

"(a) In general. In the case of any retail store which is part of a retail chain, if for any taxable year the amounts which, except for this section, would be deductible on account of such store exceed the amounts which, except for this section, would be includible in gross income on account of such store, the amounts which would be so deductible shall not be allowed as deductions for such taxable year and the amounts which would be so includible shall be excluded from gross income for such taxable year.

"(b) Definitions: As used in this section the term—

"(1) 'Retail chain' means a group of — or more retail stores which, either directly, or through one or more persons, or by leases, contracts, or other arrangements or devices, are subject to a single common control.

"(2) 'Retail store' means any place at which sales of merchandise, and delivery thereof, are made, or at which services are furnished, to retail customers in the ordinary course of business, but such term does not include any establishment or facility maintained by a common carrier as part of its transportation facilities primarily for furnishing meals or other commodities to its passengers and employees, or any branch office maintained by a newspaper for the distribution of its papers or taking subscriptions or advertisements therefor."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 19—.

Federal Court Tenure Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news article by Mr. David Lawrence, outstanding editor, which appeared in the Washington Star of February 4:

NEW LIBERALISM SEEN IN COURT TENURE BILL—METHOD SUGGESTED TO ASK PEOPLE HOW TO CHANGE CONSTITUTION

(By David Lawrence)

A new liberalism is coming back to America through the Republican Congress.

Instead of sitting by and letting judicial interpretation take away fundamental rights which were reserved to the people under the Constitution, the new Congress is going to let the people decide how and when they want to change the Constitution.

At least two important constitutional amendments have been introduced—one limiting Presidential tenure to two terms of 4 years each and the other prescribing that all Federal justices shall hold office for 10 years and be subject to reappointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate.

The new proposal for a change in the life tenure of justices has just been introduced by Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Republican, of Wisconsin, who has served several years in the House and is one of its able Members.

It is proposed that the justices, including those of the Supreme Court, shall be checked periodically by the people after 10 years of service and that present justices shall not serve beyond 10 years after they took the oath of office or not after December 31, 1948, whichever is earlier, but that they may be eligible for reappointment.

PACKED WITH NEW DEALERS

Representative SMITH points out that the Federal courts have been packed with New Dealers and that the Supreme Court, particularly in the portal-to-portal case, has been usurping legislative functions.

It has been said erroneously by some observers that the new plan proposes to do what was condemned generally when in 1937 the late President Roosevelt—indignant over the decisions of the justices then sitting because they refused to hold valid his New Deal laws—tried to enlarge and pack the Court.

But what Mr. SMITH proposes is the exact opposite. The Roosevelt scheme was to try to do by a statute what the Constitution forbade. The method suggested by Mr. SMITH is to ask the people to change the Constitution. The idea of protesting against Supreme Court decisions is not novel. Abraham Lincoln once said Supreme Court decisions were not irrevocable and that the people had the final say. They do—that is, they can have the final say by utilizing the machinery prescribed in the Constitution itself.

Thus, when the Supreme Court many years ago held that an income tax could not be levied by the Federal Treasury, the matter was submitted to the people and by constitutional amendment they bestowed on the Federal Government that taxing power.

Despite the fact that centralized government in Washington has since 1933 taken over many powers which for decades were rights never before delegated to the Federal Government by the people—as, for instance, control over wages and hours—not a single constitutional amendment has been submitted to the people since 1933. This is because appointees who believe in restricting the power of the people and taking away their rights have been sitting on the Supreme Court Bench. And the Congress has, in effect, been in collusion with the Court because reactionary majorities have declined to submit vital issues of constitutional power to the people for their decision.

ROOSEVELT'S WORDS RECALLED

The late President Roosevelt ridiculed the idea of amending the Constitution in the way prescribed therein. In a radio address on

March 9, 1937, speaking in support of his Court-packing plan, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"I have thus explained to you the reasons that lie behind our efforts to secure results by legislation within the Constitution. I hope that thereby the difficult process of constitutional amendment may be rendered unnecessary. But let us examine that process.

"There are many types of amendment proposed. Each one is radically different from the other. There is no substantial group within the Congress or outside it who are agreed on any single amendment.

"It would take months or years to get substantial agreement upon the type and language of an amendment. It would take months and years thereafter to get a two-thirds majority in favor of that amendment in both Houses of Congress.

"Then would come the long course of ratification by three-fourths of all the States. No amendment which any powerful economic interests or the leaders of any powerful political party have had reason to oppose has ever been ratified within anything like a reasonable time. And 13 States which contain only 5 percent of the voting population can block ratification even though the 35 States with 95 percent of the population are in favor of it."

Mr. Roosevelt forgot to tell the people that the eighteenth amendment was eliminated from the Constitution less than 2 years after it had been submitted to the people by two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress. If there is serious division on any fundamental subject, of course, it is right that the matter should be delayed, but it is illiberal and reactionary to refuse to give the people a chance to amend their own Constitution and to argue that all that is needed is to change the judges.

A New Year Resolve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John Foster Dulles before the National Publishers Association on January 17, 1947:

In accordance with what now is New Year's custom, the American people welcome a new Secretary of State. In January 1944, Secretary Hull held that office; in January 1945, it was Secretary Stettinius; in January 1946, it was Secretary Byrnes; now in January 1947, we have Secretary Marshall. I first pay tribute to our retiring Secretary of State. Mr. Byrnes, at personal risk, gallantly carried a heavy burden. His patient determination during a critical period served this Nation well. It is unfortunate that he could not carry on. Since he could not, it is fortunate that his successor is one whose ability and character have won for him the respect not only of the American people, but of the peoples of all the United Nations. We can hope that his great talents which helped to fashion victory will now equally help to fashion a just and durable peace.

Republicans do not yet have title to Federal appointive office. That gives them at least the advantage of continuity. It may, therefore, be appropriate for a Republican, who had the privilege of close cooperation with the three preceding Secretaries of State, to take this occasion to look back in order the better to look forward.

Last year had some good aspects. There receded a serious risk that the victorious war coalition might break up and its members fight among themselves. It did not end the bid of the Soviet Union for world leadership. That was hardly to be expected. But 1946 did see that bid deflected into channels more compatible with peace.

The Soviet challenge is double-barreled. One barrel aims at social revolution throughout the world. The other barrel aims at nationalistic expansion. The war made both targets easier to hit. Economic misery, the byproduct of war, bred racial agitation throughout the world. The military position of Russia, as the great land power next to Germany and Japan, gave Soviet leadership unique opportunities to bargain for an expansion of their national domain. It is the latter type of aggressiveness which was checked in 1946 when it had already gone so far that persistence would have jeopardized the peace.

Soviet national expansion was going ahead in a big way at the end of 1945. It had begun under the cover of deals with Hitler. With his tacit acquiescence or explicit approval, part of Finland, all of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and large portions of Poland and Rumania were incorporated into the Soviet Union. That was the price of Soviet neutrality while Hitler was attacking in the west. When Hitler turned east to attack Russia, that made Russia an ally of Britain and the United States. It was vital that the war unity of these three should be preserved and Soviet leadership relied on that to bargain at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. As a result, Soviet land power was further extended in Europe and into the Pacific.

After hostilities ended, the Soviet leaders sought to go on with their nationalistic bargaining. The first occasion was the first meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers at London in the fall of 1945. That conference ended with no agreement. It was publicly proclaimed a failure. It was, indeed, a failure from the standpoint of the Soviet Union. It marked the end of the ability of the Soviet Union to expand by bargaining with great powers at the expense of the weak. American idealism had a rebirth. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that our idealism, always latent, could then safely emerge from the recesses into which it had been driven by war necessity. From then on, as Secretary Byrnes well put it, the United States might compromise within principle but it would no longer compromise principle itself.

That was the spirit of 1946. It enabled the United States delegation through patient firmness to obtain peace treaties with Italy and the satellites which, while not ideal, involve no flagrant new injustices. More important, it halted the Soviet program of expanding at the expense of weak neighbors.

When Soviet leaders discovered, at the end of 1945, that they could no longer get our agreement to further expansion, their first reaction had been to go it alone. At the beginning of 1946, Iran, Turkey, and Greece were threatened. The result, however, was not a Soviet success. Throughout the world public opinion reacted adversely. Soviet leaders found that they could not fire both barrels at once. Nationalistic aggression canceled out idealistic propaganda. As against that loss, there was no compensating gain, for Soviet aggressiveness had provoked in the United States and Great Britain a stronger resistance than Soviet leadership cared to face. In these countries public opinion quickly hardened. It supported measures to rebuild military establishments which had been allowed to disintegrate. The United States displayed naval and air power in the Mediterranean. It seemed that if the Soviet continued along the line upon which it had embarked that might even lead to major war. That is one thing which Soviet leadership does not now want and would not consciously risk. Economically, the nation is still weak in consequence of war devastation; also, for the time being, the Soviet military establishment is completely outmatched by the mechanized weapons—particularly the atomic weapons—available to the United States.

So, as competent observers had thought likely, Soviet leaders drew back. That is to their credit. Soviet leadership showed itself to be intelligent and realistic rather than reckless or fanatical. That is a reassuring fact because often leaders who are dynamic and who have had great initial successes become overconfident. They take ever greater risks until they find to their chagrin that they have made a bad calculation and have precipitated trouble which they never wanted or expected. The Politburo, at least in 1946, did not go down that path.

The greatest credit for the 1946 result goes to the American people. They quickly cleared their minds of war romanticism which had overidealized all of the Allies and their objectives. They were able to see realities even when they were unpleasant realities, and, despite postwar weariness, they hardened their wills. There were a few who were gullible and who still believed, because Soviet leadership used idealism as propaganda, that that leadership itself as idealistic. But they were only a small and ineffectual minority. The American people showed that they still possessed to a high degree the ability to see clearly and to think straight.

Bipartisan cooperation played an important part in the result. Governor Dewey, during the campaign of 1944, agreed with President Roosevelt that there should be a permanent world organization. That act made logical a bipartisan delegation to the San Francisco Conference. That worked so well that Secretary Byrnes invited Republicans to participate in negotiating the first group of peace treaties and to participate in the Assembly of the United Nations. Thus Democrats and Republicans sat side by side, and we both learned, at the same time and from the same bench as it were, some of the hard facts of international life. That learning together is the key to effective bipartisanship. In this case it made it natural that Democratic leadership through Secretary Byrnes and Republican leadership through Senator VANDENBERG should speak to the American people in similar terms. That contributed greatly to solidifying the American attitude.

If, as I believe, the November elections put a seal of approval on that kind of cooperation, it is because the American people sensed that during the preceding months it had helped to save them from grave peril.

Credit also goes to the United Nations. Its open processes were what made it impracticable for Soviet leadership to play, at the same time, incompatible roles. It compelled choice between idealistic propaganda in noncontiguous lands and hard-boiled militarism toward neighboring countries. It enabled world opinion to register and show the expediency of the more peaceful course.

We can look back on 1946 with some satisfaction. But it should only be satisfaction that a long, hard task has been well begun. If 1946 saw the Soviet nationalistic challenge become less aggressive, we cannot assume that even that phase is definitely over. Certainly Soviet leadership does not accept as final the present status of the Dardanelles. In its other phase—the ideological phase—the Soviet challenge became increasingly powerful. In most of the world, effective popular leadership is in the hands of persons who are sympathetic to Soviet Communist doctrines and who turn to Moscow for moral support.

In India, Soviet communism exercises a strong influence through the interim Hindu Government.

In China, United States efforts to end the civil war have collapsed and Communist forces hopefully continue their struggle.

Throughout the colonial areas, there is growing rebellion against the white man's assumption of racial superiority. The fighting now going on in Dutch Indonesia and in French Indochina is symptomatic of a widespread condition. These revolutionary movements are encouraged by Soviet leadership which pretend to a "classless" society.

The Arab world grows increasingly hostile as the strain regarding Palestine is prolonged.

In Latin America Communist leaders are steadily gaining in political power. They are effectively agitating against the so-called capitalism and imperialism of the United States. Hemispheric solidarity is precarious and the Monroe Doctrine faces its sternest test.

In western Europe Communist strength has grown so that in France and Italy Communists now exercise a large measure of governmental power.

In the United States, Soviet leaders look to "boom-bust" finally to discredit capitalism and to liquidate the last vestiges of our claim to economic supremacy. That collapse, they profess, is inevitable. However, they deem it prudent to help the inevitable, and to this end their followers have burrowed into the core of our economic body.

At the recent "town meeting of the world," the Soviet delegation achieved a larger measure of leadership. Also, they there did an effective job in portraying the United States as militaristic and imperialistic. They persuaded many that this Nation ought to disarm itself in the interest of world peace. Soviet leaders hope thus to end the military inequality which bothered them in 1946.

Those are some of the items of the 1946 heritage with which 1947 must deal. It is a heritage which is hailed joyfully by the New Year's press of the Soviet Union. It is, for us, a heritage to be accepted with soberness. It does not contain immediate danger, as did the heritage of 1945, but it does threaten us with an isolation which, sooner or later, would gravely endanger us. Also, it is a form of challenge which is difficult to meet. In 1946 our foreign policy had two main elements, negation toward Soviet expansion and relief of those suffering privation. In 1947 we shall still need the ability to say "No." We shall still need to provide some relief. But we shall need more than that. Negation is never a permanent substitute for creation and no nation is so poor as a nation which can give only dollars. The need is for spiritual and intellectual vigor and the leadership which that bestows.

Today most of the peoples of the world find their established institutions swept away. They must build anew. One hundred years ago, 50 years ago, they would have looked to us for inspiration and guidance and they would not have looked in vain. They must not now look to us in vain. Let that be our New Year's resolve.

The forthcoming Moscow conference will show whether we have the wisdom to prescribe healing of such vast dislocations as everywhere surround us. That conference will deal with Germany. Whoever deals with Germany deals with the central problem of Europe. Whoever deals with Europe deals with the world's worst fire hazard. Repeatedly it bursts out in flames. Twice within the last 30 years the edifice has virtually burned to the ground. The human and material losses have been colossal and irreparable. After each past conflagration, the structure has been rebuilt substantially as before.

Statesmanship can do better than go on repeating that folly. The trouble is not hard to find. Our founders diagnosed the situation many years ago. Alexander Hamilton put it in these historic words:

"To look for a continuation of harmony between a number of independent, unconnected sovereignties in the same neighborhood would be to disregard the uniform course of human events and to set at defiance the accumulated experience of ages."

Not only did our founders diagnose the trouble; they found, for themselves, the remedy. They placed matters of concern to all under an administration responsible to all.

The war victors will do well to have that formula in mind. Then, when they plan the future of Germany, they will think more in terms of the economic unity of Europe and less in terms of the Potsdam dictum that Germany shall be "a single economic unit." Of course, there should be an economic unification of Germany. But the reason for that is also a reason for the economic unification of Europe. A Europe divided into small economic compartments cannot be a healthy Europe. All of Europe's economic potentialities need to be used at maximum efficiency and European markets should be big enough to justify modern methods of cheap production for mass consumption. That, no doubt, is why Mr. Attlee declared some time ago that "Europe must federate or perish."

Of course, the German settlement will not of itself bring about a federation of Europe. Only the European peoples themselves can do that, and they will probably move slowly. But the German settlement may decisively determine whether the movement will be toward economic unification or toward rebuilding the old structure of independent, unconnected sovereignties.

The Basin of the Rhine, with its coal and industrious manpower, constitutes the natural economic heart of western Europe. From that area ought to flow vitality not merely for Germans but for Germany's western neighbors. If that happens, western Europe, at least, with its 200,000,000 people, could develop into a more prosperous and stable land. That, however, is not likely to happen if the German peace treaty merely reestablishes Germany as a single economic unity subject to only German political control which, even if originally decentralized, could again become highly centralized. If such dispositions are made, Germany's western neighbors—France, Belgium, and Holland—will hesitate to organize their economies into dependence on a source which may again be controlled by ambitious and vengeful German rulers. That might enable Germans hereafter to achieve, by economic pressures, a mastery of western Europe which they could not achieve by arms. Rather than risk that, the nations of western Europe will probably annex bits of Germany as they can and, as to the rest, accept economic separation. That would condemn western Europe to an unhealthy and precarious future.

Not only is such a solution bad for Europe; it is bad for peace. If the industrial potential of western Germany cannot safely be integrated into western Europe, it ought not to be fully used by Germans alone. It is then logical to impose what the Potsdam declaration calls "industrial disarmament." That is another word for pastoralization. Its inevitable accompaniment is military occupation and charity feeding. Actually, no one of those three elements can have permanency. Not only Germans, but neighboring peoples, will eventually rebel at trying to cover with manure the natural industrial basin of Europe. Peacetime armies of occupation are a tremendous moral hazard to themselves and to others and, while long-term military guaranties as proposed by Senator VANDENBERG will be required, the American people will not indefinitely keep in Germany the huge armies which would be needed to repress restless people deprived of the work for which they are fitted. Also, the American people will not indefinitely provide immense charity to prevent mass starvation which threatens only because artificial conditions are imposed.

Peace should not be made dependent upon artificial conditions which hold only so long as there is external coercion. That was the main trouble with the Treaty of Versailles. Its terms, if enforced, would have kept Germany impotent for a thousand years. But enforcement depended upon external coercion which rapidly evaporated. Peace conditions, to be durable, should be self-enforcing. What is needed in respect of Germany is decentralization. At the beginning, that can be imposed. A large measure of political autonomy can be given to German states. But that decentralization will not stick unless also there develop natural forces which turn the inhabitants of Germany's states toward their outer neighbors. The economic forces operating upon Germans should be centrifugal and not centripetal. Only if decentralization is enforced by such forces can it be depended upon.

When the German problem is thus analyzed, it is apparent that it calls for some application of the federal formula. Under our federal system the citizens of Pennsylvania share with others legislative control over the interstate movement of their coal and their steel products. The Port of New York is operated by an autonomous authority established by treaty between New Jersey and New York. The Tennessee Valley development is operated by a Federal authority, not by the State of Tennessee. We propose an international authority to own and operate atomic development everywhere so that nowhere can it fall under national control which might use it for war rather than for economic welfare.

Such precedents suggest that it is not beyond human resourcefulness to find a form of joint control which will make it possible to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe, including Germany, and do so without making Germans the masters of Europe.

Whether a solution along this line is practical, and the scope to be given it, will depend primarily upon our continental allies themselves. The non-Continental victors—Soviet Russia, Great Britian, and the United States—cannot impose any such solution. If, however, our Continental friends are thinking constructively—and there is evidence that many of them are—we Americans ought to be able to give them precious assistance. We possess, with Great Britain, decisive power in western Germany. We have, more than any other people, experience in using the federal formula and in developing its manifold possibilities. If we employ these assets to solve the problem of Germany, we shall have made a good start in implementing our 1947 resolve.

I have spoken particularly of Europe. But I did so only by way of illustration and not with any thought that we can safely concentrate on one part of the world to the neglect of the rest. Not only in Europe, but in Asia, South America, and the colonial areas there are vast tasks of reconstruction to be undertaken. Old societies need to be rebuilt. Sick societies need to be made well. Societies subject to alien rule need peaceful roads to freedom. We should become again, as we once were, the source to which men turn for inspiration and guidance in the accomplishment of such tasks.

We Americans believe that our individualistic society best qualifies men for leadership. Such a society, we believe, provides the richness of diversity and of experimentation and the stimulus of competition. That, I say, is our belief. But it is no longer the belief

of others. They are skeptical. They are frightened by the unruly aspect we present and they suspect us of a certain moral and intellectual bankruptcy. They are attracted by the apparent smoothness and efficiency of a society where conformity is the rule and where all men walk in step. That is why Soviet communism can seriously challenge us for world leadership. The time has come when we shall have to put up or shut up.

I am confident that out of the physical vigor of our people and the intellectual stimulus of our free society can come the constructive ideas for which the whole world stands in wait. If such ideas are forthcoming, we shall again be safe, for we shall have given leadership and, in return, we shall receive fellowship.

Officer Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Infantry Journal of February 1947:

OFFICER INTEGRATION

The procedure of the War Department in integrating new officers into the regular service has the objective of avoiding the "hump" which plagued Army promotions after 1918. To accomplish this aim new officers are being assimilated into the Army solely on the basis of their age.

Obviously, age is not the only factor which should be considered in evaluating a man's relative worth to the service; i. e., his rank. If age is retained as the sole measure of an officer's value a great injustice will be perpetuated against outstanding officers, both among those to be integrated and those already in the service. Under existing procedures a wartime regimental commander, age 34, with temporary rank of colonel will be eventually reduced to a regular first lieutenant. At the same time a wartime company commander age 35, with temporary rank of captain, will enter the regular lists with that rank. Such violent transpositions, if they are permitted, can only result in lowered morale, incentive and discipline throughout the service. Many officers have given this matter considerable thought. G-1 has no doubt been swamped with suggestions on how to straighten out this complex problem. But as the War Department has not yet announced its plans the following ideas are offered.

Any plan adopted to create the one-time promotion list should be freed, as far as possible, from personal considerations. The plan should be devised in such a way that every officer would be able to figure out for himself just where he stands with relation to any other officer without the aid of a Ouija board. Only in such an objective system can the final integration be completed without destructive ill will between various group of officers.

This can be achieved by the establishment of a fixed integration formula. The factors selected for this integration formula should have a direct bearing on the officer's value to the service and should be available in official records. Three factors are available: Length of active duty, general efficiency index, and the record of temporary wartime promotions.

It is proposed to use these vital factors to compute an integration number. This integration number will be computed as of the day of integration and will automatically establish each officer's position in the regular list.

Let us now proceed to assign numerical values to the integration factors and compute the integration score of Lt. Col. John Doe.

Age: As of date of integration 36 years, 2 months, 3 days. Age factor 36.172.

Length of service: Active duty as of date of integration 7 years, 4 months, 10 days. Length of service factor: 7.357.

Efficiency: Efficiency factor will be keyed to length of service. In order to place new and old Regular officers on the same basis only service completed after the beginning of the national emergency will be considered. This factor will be computed on the basis that 5 years of service with perfect efficiency (7.0) increase the integration score by one integration year. Service between 7.0 and excellent (5.5) will increase the score by a lesser amount, while efficiency ratings below 5.5 will decrease the score.

Formula:

$$\frac{\text{(years of service after Sept. 30, 1940)}}{5} \times \frac{(\text{EF. R} - 5.5)}{1.5}$$

Assume John Doe had 5.5 years of service with an efficiency index of 6.0—

$$\frac{5.5}{5} \times \frac{(6.0-5.5)}{1.5} = 0.366$$

Efficiency factor: 0.366

Temporary promotion: Temporary promotions higher than the rank established by constructive service at the date selected for inaugurating the new promotion list will entitle the officer to progressive integration credit.

Credits will be arrived at in the following manner: Temporary rank one grade above constructive rank (length of service in that rank) $\times .5$. Temporary rank two ranks above constructive rank (length of service in that rank) $\times .75$. Factor coefficient will increase .25 with each higher rank.

Let us compute John Doe's temporary promotion factor: Age at date of integration, 36, gives Doe constructive rank of captain. Doe's 2 years' service as major: $2 \times .5 = 1$. Doe's 2 years' service as lieutenant colonel: $2 \times .75 = 1.5$. Temporary promotion factor, 2.5.

Total integration factor = 46.395.

It should be understood that the coefficients selected for computing efficiency and temporary promotion factors are quite arbitrary. However, appropriate coefficients may be determined by study of a large number of officers' records. For example, the weight given to wartime efficiency is undoubtedly too low. Coefficients selected should not prevent age and service from being the most influential factors in determining rank, but at the same time they should assure that outstanding officers with above excellent war records should be given their proper due.

It has been suggested that all officers be given the integration aptitude test. If this is done, the results of this test should be keyed to the officer's age.

Can wartime decorations be considered? The fact that all officers did not serve in areas where decorations were awarded, and the fact that award of decorations followed no consistent pattern, will probably preclude assigning any relative value to decorations. However, an exception should be made to Medal of Honor medalists, and possibly to holders of the Distinguished Service Cross.

Adoption of this plan will not make every officer happy. It is doubtful if King Solomon himself could work out a solution to the Army's integration problem which would satisfy everyone. However, an open and aboveboard plan, along the lines of the one proposed, might have more success than a system of pulling names out of the hat.

COLONEL, GSC.

McKinley Day Address of Hon. Clarence J. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON H. CARSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, at Canton, Ohio, on January 29, the one hundred and fourth birthday anniversary of President William McKinley:

Congressman Carson, Katherine Kennedy Brown, my good friend—and your county chairman—Ted Dunlap, and my fellow Americans, it is good to be back in Canton, and to have the opportunity and the pleasure of attending another of your McKinley Day banquets. These meetings, held here in the home city of William McKinley to celebrate his natal day and honor his memory, have long been famous throughout Ohio and the Nation.

I am especially grateful to your splendid Representative in Congress—and my friend and colleague, HANK CARSON—for his gracious introduction. Congressman CARSON is an able successor in the Congress of the United States to your beloved fellow-townsman, William McKinley. Like McKinley, he is rendering capable and efficient service to the people of this district, and to the Nation as a whole. I predict a brilliant future for the gentleman from Ohio who now represents your Sixteenth Congressional District in Washington.

It is a pleasure to appear on the same program with my colleague and fellow member of the Republican National Committee, Mrs. Katherine Kennedy Brown, whom we all know so well and regard so highly for her many great contributions to Republican success throughout Ohio and the Nation.

To me it is like old times to be here with your most able county chairman, Ted Dunlap. Ted and I are old friends. We fought side by side in many a campaign during the days when I was a State official. In recent months I have learned something of the trials and tribulations which come with a party chairmanship, and how they are intensified so greatly during the heat of a campaign. I hope you appreciate Ted Dunlap and his work here as we do down at the headquarters of the Republican National Committee.

And to come back to Canton and again grasp the hand of my aged but always youthful friend, Russell Chase—a man who worked so closely with William McKinley back in the fateful days when your fellow townsman was called to the Presidency—means much to me. Russell, like a grateful nation's memory to William McKinley, may you live on forever.

William McKinley assumed the Presidency at a critical period in the Nation's history. His election brought an end to a great depression—the result of a money panic—

which came because our public leaders had drifted away from sound and sane principles.

With forthrightness and courage, Major McKinley faced the issues of his day. His first great task was to restore the people's faith in their Government. He refused to believe the Nation was finished, as many had so dolefully predicted during the dark days of the Cleveland depression. Instead, he was certain the United States of America was just approaching maturity. Because of the sound principles William McKinley championed, because of the sound legislation he sponsored, because of the sound administration he gave, America quickly recovered from its economic and political ills.

As a result of the inspired leadership of McKinley the closing months of the nineteenth century saw the United States beginning to emerge as a world power, soon to become the greatest industrial Nation on the face of the earth.

McKinley was the man of destiny given to us by divine providence in a time of a great national crisis. Today we are living in another period of national crisis and uncertainty. We have but lately fought and won two great wars. Nearly 16,000,000 of our young men and women have seen service under their Nation's flag. Most of them have returned home. They, as well, as our citizenship as a whole, are confronted with the same problems which McKinley faced and solved as President.

The Nation is today in a serious financial plight as a result of the great depression of the thirties, the waste and extravagance of the New Deal, and the high costs and losses of a great World War.

Many of our troubles of the present can be charged directly to the mistakes and the failures of the Democratic administrations which have controlled the Government for 14 long years. Many of these mistakes and failures were tragic. All of them were costly, but perhaps the greatest single injury that has been done to this Nation and its people, as a result of the misguided and almost Machiavellian philosophies and activities of the New Deal, has been the destruction of our American self-reliance—through the false preachments that the people should depend upon their government, rather than upon themselves.

The New Deal is not yet dead in our land, despite the great Republican victory of last November 5th. New Deal advisors still have the ear of the President. Certainly his recent messages to the Congress indicate that he and his administration still believe in the old New Deal maxim—tax and tax, and spend and spend.

In his message on the state of the Union, Mr. Truman continued to espouse such New Deal measures as socialized medicine. In his economic report he indicated he still believed in the theory that we can spend our way into prosperity and came out in full opposition to any of the proposed tax reductions. In his budget message he reaffirmed his belief and faith in high taxes as a social philosophy. He proposed we continue a huge governmental bureaucracy to control and regiment the people—a bureaucracy which would cost more than four times as much each year as our Government ever cost in any peacetime year under President Roosevelt—who was no slouch of a spender himself.

For this coming fiscal year—which begins on July 1—the President proposes the Congress appropriate, and permit him and his subordinates to spend, $37,500,000,000 to run the affairs of your Government. The most Mr. Roosevelt ever spent in any one peacetime year was slightly over $9,000,000,000, at the time when, as you will remember, the New Dealers were endeavoring to spend the Nation's way into prosperity.

Yet, according to the President and his advisers, the Government's total income from taxes and other revenues during the new year will be but $37,700,000,000—or only $200,000,000 more than he proposed to spend.

Our national debt at the present time is $259,000,000,000. If we are to save and apply but $200,000,000 annually to retiring this public debt, as the President proposes for this year, it will only take us 518 years to pay it off completely—providing no new depressions or wars come along to upset the schedule.

But the thing that alarms many thoughtful men and women in America, is that President Truman, in his budget, actually proposes we increase our Federal spending in practically all fields except those of national defense and security. I would like to give you, for example, some interesting figures taken from the President's budget message. He proposes to reduce spending in only two of the major budget divisions, while in the 12 other divisions he proposes we increase our public expenditures for the coming fiscal year by more than $9,400,000,000.

Here are some of the increased expenditures which Mr. Truman and the Democratic administration propose: That we spend twice as much money on the State Department as we did last year; twice as much for veteran's costs; three times as much for REA borrowing from RFC, and three times as much for library service.

But perhaps I can give you a better picture of the situation in Washington by actually comparing the appropriations requested for this coming year by a number of the divisions of our Government, with what they actually spent in a prewar year.

Let us start with the White House, where the President resides. Back in 1939 it cost $160,000 to run that famous dwelling place. In his budget Mr. Truman asks Congress to appropriate $501,800 for White House maintenance and operation for the year beginning July 1, next. Back in 1939 it cost $196,000 to run the executive offices under the President. For this coming fiscal year Mr. Truman tells us he will need $1,417,000 to maintain these offices.

Let us take the Budget Bureau, itself, which, for the last year before the war, cost $396,000 to operate. Now the Congress is being asked for $3,506,000 to run the Budget Bureau just 1 year.

Our Foreign Service back in 1940 cost $14,000,000. For next year the diplomats insist they need $117,000,000.

In the prewar year of 1939 the Labor Department had actual operating expenses of $24,000,000. Now, it is claimed, $106,242,000 is the least possible amount on which Mr. Schwellenbach and his Department of Labor can function in the coming fiscal year.

The Department of Commerce, formerly under Henry Wallace, but now under Averell Harriman, had an operating budget of $20,000,000 for the year 1939; but for 1948 the President is requesting $260,814,000 of public funds.

The Interior Department, in the year before Pearl Harbor, spent $150,000,000, but now it is insisting $363,000,000 are necessary.

The Bureau of Public Roads is asking for an appropriation of $435,000,000 for 1948, in comparison with the $169,000,000 which it spent in 1940.

The Public Health Service wants $182,000,000 next year, as compared to the $48,000,000 expended in the last year before Pearl Harbor.

Public housing is down for an expenditure of $173,000,000 for regular operation (with an additional fund of $443,000,000 for mortgage loans), in comparison with the 1940 cost figure of $19,000,000.

Even in these days, when there is little unemployment and with huge reserves in unemployment compensation and other funds, the administration is asking an appropriation of $720,000,000 for public relief.

And so goes the story for almost every branch of the Government.

The President, in his budget message, made no economy proposal of any kind, with the exception of suggesting that Congress find ways of charging the people of the United States for various services which the Federal Government now renders free, and for a general reduction in agriculture subsidies paid under the conservation program.

Of course, I am confident that the President's budget request for $37,500,000,000 to run the Federal Government during the coming fiscal year will be greatly reduced by the Congress. It is my studied opinion the budget can and should be reduced to somewhere between thirty and thirty-two billion dollars for this coming fiscal year, and down to somewhere between twenty-five and twenty-eight billion dollars for the following accounting year of 1949. I am also confident that, with just a little economy and efficiency in the Federal Government, such lower budget figures will prove sufficient and that no injury will be done the public service.

However, since the President shows such reluctance to come to the aid of the hard-pressed taxpayer by reducing public spending or cutting taxes, I am proposing that Congress itself provide the necessary push in this direction. I propose that we expand the economy studies made by the Byrd committee into a statutory commission, which would thoroughly study and investigate the services, activities, and functions of the executive branch of the Federal Government. There are many good reasons why this should be done.

Thirty years ago the number of executive establishments of the rank of a bureau or equivalent is reported to have been 158. In 1932 the number had increased to 521. By 1944 the number had grown to 1,141. During this same period of time the number of civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government had increased at an amazing rate. In 1916 Federal workers numbered 438,057. In 1926, 528,540. In 1936, 824,259; and in 1946, 2,766,165.

The legislative branch of our Government has already been streamlined and reorganized. The time has now come to take the first step toward reorganizing and streamlining the executive branch. While the President has had the authority, under laws enacted in recent years to reorganize the executive department and its various subdivisions, nothing of real significance or benefit has been accomplished under that authority.

I also wish to emphasize the fact that the Commission will be completely bipartisan and truly representative. Included in its membership will be representatives of the Congress and of the President, as well as of the general public. Inasmuch as it is, after all, the tax-paying public who pays the freight, it is only proper the public should have equal voice with those in Government in deciding what measures are needed to attain the objectives of the bill.

It is contemplated, moreover, that the members of the Commission appointed from private life shall be men of outstanding ability and widest experience in their respective fields of endeavor. They must be civic, business, and industrial leaders, chosen solely for their capacity and qualifications to do the job. No man in the Government, or in private life, is too big to undertake service on this Commission, or could any man make a more patriotic and important contribution to his country. If this bill is enacted into law, and the proper Commission is named, I am confident the result will be the saving of hundreds of millions, and perhaps billions, of dollars of public moneys each year, and

also greatly simplified and much more efficient Government services.

Let me say to you with all the emphasis at my command that in my considered judgment the people of the United States cannot long continue to support the wild spending and the wasteful extravagances which have marked the New Deal administrations of the past 14 years. It is one thing to tax the people until they are bled white financially during the stern days of war, but such a crushing tax burden can only be justified when the military security of the Nation is in question. War is costly, and all of us must sacrifice to meet the expense thereof. But it is an entirely different thing to continue such wartime tax burdens after peace comes, especially when little or none of the revenues derived from such taxes are used to reduce the national debt, but only to maintain bloated peacetime bureaucracies.

No one can rightfully expect the Government of the United States to function as economically now as in the days before World War II, for interest on the public debt and veterans' benefits, in one form or another, will increase the cost of Government for many years to come. Because of unsettled world conditions, we must likewise spend more for national security than we did in the prewar years. However, it cannot be overlooked that what President Truman is proposing to do is to actually spend more money on the ordinary civilian operations of Government this coming year—3 years after the shooting stopped—than we spent on the same operations during or before the war. That, my friends, simply does not make sense.

If America is to hold a place of world leadership, she must be a strong and solvent nation. We must remember that we have the only truly representative form of government left on earth today. Ours is the only large nation in which free capitalism, as such, still survives. All of Europe has turned to the left. Ours is the only nation where dictatorship, communism, or socialism does not control. It is only here on the North American Continent—in this grand and glorious country—that the people still enjoy true liberty and freedom.

There is an old saying that monarchies are destroyed by armies from without, while republics are destroyed by deterioration from within.

Last November 5 the people of America overwhelmingly voted against the continuation of New Deal policies and for the election of a Republican Congress pledged to bring about the reforms they sought.

First of all, they are expecting the Government of the United States to put its own house in order—just as any good business concern would do, by budgeting and limiting its spending so it cannot only live within its income but can also pay off its debts. This the Republicans in Congress are determined to do. I can say to you that the budget will be balanced, that substantial payments will be made on our national debt, and that individual income taxes will be reduced. That is the first order of business for the new Republican Congress.

Second, we are expected to enact legislation which will more evenly balance the scales between labor and management, with especial recognition and protection for the rights of the American people as a whole, the great consuming public.

Not so long ago the larger employers of the Nation were in the saddle and in many instances treated their workers unfairly. The American people, believing in fair play, were resentful of this disregard for the worker's rights. In an effort to correct the evils which then existed legislation was enacted by the Congress and by many of the State legislatures to give greater powers and more privileges to labor organizations. Some labor leaders, following the tactics of some employers, soon took an unfair advantage of the rights and privileges which had been extended to organized labor. Too often these labor leaders became arrogant and selfish. They not only forgot the workers they represented but entirely disregarded the rights of the consuming public. Controlling huge numbers of votes, they became such political powers that even the highest officials in the land pampered and petted them so as to obtain their political support. Unwise and unnecessary strikes and work stoppages became the order of the day and other unsatisfactory conditions developed. But at last an aroused public opinion began to demonstrate itself, and the demand rose for the Congress of the United States to do something to correct an intolerable situation which threatened the very health, safety, and even the lives of great masses of citizens.

I am not interested in labor reform legislation for the purpose of giving any employer an advantage over any employee. Such an arrangement should not—and must not—be tolerated. While I naturally want to see every employer receive fair treatment, I am especially interested in having labor-reform legislation enacted which will protect the individual worker—the ordinary union member—of the country, from those who are injuring the true cause of labor by their tactics.

What do I mean by this? Well, let me suggest some general legislation that would be of benefit to the worker, as well as to the employer and the general public.

Tell me—if you will—why it would not be good public policy, now that labor organizations have such great power and responsibility, to require of all unions, as some already provide by their constitutions and by-laws, that honestly conducted elections must be held at regular intervals for the selection of officers, with every union member being given the opportunity and the privilege of voting?

What is wrong with seeing to it that no alien shall serve as an officer in any American union or represent American workers in collective bargaining?

What is wrong with providing that no man with a criminal record shall be permitted to become a union officer?

What is wrong, if you please, with prohibiting Communists, or any other subversive individuals who do not believe in our form of government and wants to overthrow it, from holding any official position in an American labor union?

What is wrong with providing that the membership of no American labor union shall be called out on strike unless the majority of the members first vote for such a strike?

What is wrong with requiring union officials to make regular financial statements or reports of receipts and expenditures, funds on hand, etc., to every member of the union?

I am proud to say that many American unions already have these rules, but I am sorry to be compelled to report that many others do not have.

Would not such requirements be to the benefit of the ordinary union member—the average worker?

Would not such legal requirements be a long step toward democratizing the labor organizations of our land?

And what is wrong, may I ask, with protecting the right of collective bargaining—and it must be protected and maintained—by making both parties to any employment contract responsible for keeping that contract?

What is wrong with outlawing force and violence on the part of either labor or management?

What is wrong with providing every possible mediation service as an assistance to settling labor-management disputes?

What is wrong with having a cooling-off period before a strike becomes effective, providing the rights of the workers are guaranteed retroactively during such a period?

Personally, I believe most strongly in the right of American labor to organize, to bargain collectively, and to strike—if necessary—in support of legal objectives. I am opposed to compulsory arbitration of labor-management disputes, for I know, if a bureaucratic government is given such a power to settle labor-management differences arbitrarily, that American labor will soon become slave labor, and that the American free enterprise system will soon be entirely destroyed or placed under the domination of the Government.

I want management and labor to learn to live together, to work out their own problems in a democratic manner, under free collective bargaining. I want no unfair advantage for either side. Neither do I want the Government playing on either team. Above all else I want both labor and management to always remember that the public welfare must come first, for both have their greatest responsibility to the general public.

After all, who makes up this great general public? Why, it is the thousands and millions of workers and their families—the tens of thousands of employers and industrialists—the public servants, such as school teachers, policemen, and mail carriers—the tillers of the soil—the old folks, like my mother and yours.

Yes, the Congress of the United States must find some way to fairly balance the scales between labor and management. This is one of the most important problems we now face. I believe we can go far toward reaching that goal in this session of Congress.

Another great task ahead of the new Congress is to finish the work of changing America over from a war economy to a peacetime economy. In recent years the trend has been toward statism here in America; toward some sort of a superstate where most of the power and authority would rest in the hands of a few—who in their official capacities would alone decide what was best for 140,000,000 Americans.

In control of our Government have been those who believed the average citizen was not capable of doing his own thinking and planning, but for his own good, should have his life ordered and directed for him. And, believe me, friends of mine, every effort in the world has been made to do just that. Naturally the people became sick and tired of such controls and regimentation. They wanted their Government out of their hair and back in their hands again—and that is exactly the way they voted last November 5.

Yet the task is not yet completed, for there is still a big job ahead of us to get rid of wartime and other Government controls as rapidly as we possibly can.

Lincoln once said that America could not survive half slave and half free. I say to you that America cannot survive under a bureaucratic Government that makes it's people half slave and half free economically. Human freedom is an all-encompassing thing. Take away just one freedom from an individual and he is no longer a free man.

It was Thomas Jefferson who once said that the greatest contribution this Nation can make to the cause of human liberty is to maintain freedom here—to make representative government work—so that the down-trodden people of other nations might gain hope and inspiration from us to emulate our example.

The world is moving through a great crisis. It looks to America for leadership. Certainly we cannot solve the problems of the world unless we first solve our own domestic problems. Certainly we cannot sell representative government to the other peoples of the world unless we make it work

here at home, as living proof that it is the best form of government ever devised by the mind of man; that it permits the greatest liberty and freedom ever enjoyed by any people; that it offers the greatest opportunity for happiness and prosperity to be found anywhere under the heavens.

But, perhaps what we need more than anything else, is a return to the morality of William McKinley, and to the religious faith that sustained him through his days of trial and tribulation. Let us all, as Republicans and good Americans, take a leaf from the McKinley book of life and rededicate ourselves to the service of the country we love and the divine providence we acknowledge.

Palestine Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of February 6, 1947, is worthy of the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives:

PALESTINE DECISION

To Mr. Bevin, now that both the Anglo-Arab and the Anglo-Jewish conferences have ended in deadlock, goes the responsibility for producing a unilateral policy for Palestine. It is a fateful assignment. Hitherto Mr. Bevin has not been noted for his aptness in handling the situation in Palestine. He is reputed to feel that a delay is on order until the 7-day notice that the British administration in Palestine has served on the Jewish Agency has expired. The due date is next Monday. By then the Jewish Agency is expected to cooperate with the administration in rounding up the terrorists. But, if Mr. Bevin expects this cooperation, he is as lacking in imagination and a sense of realities as the men on the spot in Palestine. The Jewish Agency, no matter how much it condemns the terrorism, will clearly not be put in the position of turning spy and informer. It is too close to the terrorists in opposition to British rule in Palestine to do any such thing. The cooperation asked by the British would be equivalent to a sponsorship of civil war by the Jewish Agency itself. Nor is it likely that the counterterror instigated by the British will browbeat the Jewish Agency into acceptance of the kind of federal state under British administration which goes under Mr. Morrison's name and which Mr. Bevin is said, more or less, to have in mind. Both the Morrison plan and intimidation have run their course, and the line of true statesmanship must be sought elsewhere.

It would seem that the wise thing would be to outline a policy without regard to what is going on in Palestine. Palestine is the kind of problem the unmanageability of which has increased by delay and indecision. Partition, it has long been our view, is the only possible device for application to Palestine, and even that, in the circumstances of present tempers and passions, would have to be imposed. As long ago as 1937 it was laid down as just by the British Peel Commission. But what could have been done then without much difficulty, and even in 1945 with a good chance of success, is now, admittedly, full of danger. Arab intransigence has thriven on British indecision, and many Zionists have become whole hoggers. Yet the nettle must be grasped, not in terms of a phony partition such as was represented by the Morrison plan, but in those of the Peel Commission. Only a partition admitting of a viable state for Jewish Palestine will do—that is to say, one giving an autonomous Jewish Palestine access to the highlands of Galilee and the empty spaces of the Negeb.

The parallel between Palestine after this war and Ireland after the last is becoming uncanny. Repression in Ireland created a terrorist movement which went from opposition to the British to opposition to partition. It developed so alarmingly that the British government simply had to turn to conciliation, as they will have to do in Palestine, if only to allay the growing discontent on the part of the British people, who are impatient over police commitments out of their straitened circumstances. Unfortunately, as Emerson said of British colonial rule nearly 100 years ago, "Whenever an abatement of their power is felt, they have not conciliated the affection on which to rely." This proved to be the case in Ireland. It may, alas, happen in Palestine, for extremism has fed on itself for too long a time to take kindly either to the British or to partition. The only British hope of sowing seeds of tranquillity is to come out with a declaration for a just partition, and let time strengthen the inherent wisdom and justice of it. A just partition, it seems to us, could not fail to evoke American support, as was implicit in the President's statement to ibn-Saud on October 4. Such a statement of British policy would pave the way for American aid, especially in river valley development, which is the only means that will promote the healing that one day will have to be undertaken.

Lift Copper Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waterbury Republican, Waterbury, Conn., February 5, 1947:

LIFT COPPER TARIFF

Against Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON'S proposal for the repeal of the import tax on copper, if coupled with his suggestion of a quota system under which the tax would be reapplied after the present deficiency of copper had been made up, it is hard to think of any reasonable argument. At a time when domestic copper production is inadequate to meet industrial demands, his recommendation makes unassailable sense.

That the Congressmen from the copper States are rallying resistance to this proposal is proof again that shouting before they are hurt is a constant tendency on the part of special interests. An Arizona Representative talks in foreboding terms of the reappearance of the ghost towns which dotted his State in depression days. But refusing to avail ourselves of copper sufficient to meet present industrial needs simply because the Representatives of the copper States want to run ahead to meet theoretical trouble is straight against all good judgment.

Local manufacturers also represent a special interest, but surely it is identical with the broader, national interest when the way in which copper scarcity threatens to reflect itself in the prices charged by the automotive, housing, and other industries shows so general a force and effect to the tariff bar that Representative PATTERSON deplores.

Let that bar be lifted under such restrictions as will restore protection to domestic copper producers as soon as the present deficiency of copper is corrected. That should not be beyond lawmaking ingenuity.

War-Power Extensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of February 4, 1947:

WAR-POWER EXTENSIONS

President Truman's appeal for extension of certain of the war emergency controls to March 31, 1948, is based, of course, on the ground of necessity. He promises they will be relaxed or released as soon as possible. "Since the fighting ceased," he declared in this connection, "it has been my avowed policy to terminate all emergency controls that were no longer necessary or workable." The provisions of the War Powers Act he would continue include the establishment of priorities, rationing, and allocation; the operation of shipping lines by the Maritime Commission and by the Army and Navy to supply transportation for their personnel where public facilities are inadequate.

Retention of these emergency powers for another year is rendered necessary, Mr. Truman argues, by continued shortages of a number of food items, of certain industrial materials and of manufactures such as automobiles, freight cars, and tractors. He promises to limit their use, after March 31 of this year to clearly manageable controls that afford positive aids to business and the public and to the fulfilment of our international understandings and obligations.

Congress doubtless will dissemble its love, if any, for the proposed extensions. Nevertheless it may grant some of them on the very grounds cited by the President. The country had hoped for relief from the war controls within a reasonable time after the conflict's end. But strikes at home, forcing continued shortages of essential goods, starvation and stagnation in war-ravaged lands overseas, prolonged by the wrangling within them and about them that retarded physical and economic recovery, have rendered the length of that "reasonable time" uncertain. With respect to food, for example, the international food council was notified last week that the emergent needs of a dozen nations will continue past December 31, 1947. World food production continues to lag far below prewar volume, necessitating the maintenance of strict controls in all lands suffering food deficiencies. Our own shortages of essential goods including housing persist to an extent almost unbelievable.

While emergencies national and worldwide continue, emergency controls may be necessary to deal with them. Congress and the country, too, must recognize that necessity where it is proven past dispute, however unpleasant and unwelcome both find the war-power extensions. But the necessity for its continuance so long after war's end should be established before every such grant is voted.

Russia in United Nations Hits Personal Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the New York Times entitled "Russia in United Nations Hits Personal Liberty."

This is a graphic illustration of the irreconcilable differences in philosophy and concept of government between our democracy and current-day totalitarianism.

The article follows:

RUSSIA IN UN HITS PERSONAL LIBERTY—ALSO OPPOSES IN HUMAN RIGHTS BILL PROHIBITION OF SLAVERY AND COMPULSORY LABOR

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., February 4.—Russian Communist, British Socialist, and American democratic members of the United Nations Human Rights Commission today argued inconclusively which rights of man should be embodied in an international bill of rights. The bill is fundamental to the progress of the United Nations, they recognized.

As Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, chairman of the Human Rights Commission, summed up, the basic point of controversy in the meeting today was the question of the relation of the individual to the state.

A list of rights and freedoms is being studied by the Human Rights Commission in order to formulate general directions to the group that will write the first draft of the international bill of rights following this session of the Commission.

WHAT RUSSIA WANTS DELETED

Looking at the list, V. T. Tepliakov, of the Soviet Union, urged deletion of all these concepts:

The rights of life, of personal liberty; prohibition of slavery and compulsory labor; right to petition national governments and the United Nations; nonretroactivity of penal laws; right of property and prohibition of unlawful expropriation; freedom of movement (migration); and freedom to resist oppression.

Mr. Tepliakov explained that these rights and freedoms were either superfluous, beyond the present power of the United Nations to lay down, or impinged on the local laws and customs of national states.

"Freedom to resist oppression," he cited. "What does it mean? What is the definition of oppression? It requires elaborate discussion."

During the meeting delegates quoted from the Soviet and Chinese Constitutions. Such topics as the rights of the illegitimate child, equality of the sexes, discrimination in housing in New York, Hitler's theory of race inequity, and a tribute to the irrationalism that served as the spark to all revolution were shredded through the discussion.

The proposal that drew the most fire was this four-point proposal from Dr. Charles Malik, of Lebanon, rapporteur of the commission:

(1) That the human person is prior to any group to which he may belong—class or nation or race.

(2) That his mind and conscience are the most sacred and inviolable thing about him.

(3) That any social pressure coming from any direction which determines his consent is wrong.

(4) That the group can be wrong, just as the human person can be. In any case it is only the human person who is competent to judge.

Mr. Tepliakov, of Russia, immediately opposed this Lebanese concept.

"You can't divide the individual from society or the society from the individual," he said. "We're living as individuals in a community and society and we're working for the community and society, and the community and society are providing materials for existence."

The Lebanese proposal would be all right only if you put the human individual in a glass tower, the Russians went on. He related that 200,000,000 peoples of the Soviet Union are living and enjoying human rights as proclaimed in the Soviet Constitution.

MRS. ROOSEVELT BACKS RIGHTS

Mrs. Roosevelt, speaking as United States delegate, discussed the Lebanese proposal thus:

"The rights of the individual are very important. It is not that you set the individual apart from society but that you recognize in any society that the individual must have rights that are guarded."

Charles Dukes, of the United Kingdom, who is a vice chairman of the British Trade Union Congress, had still another answer to the Lebanese proposal. Mr. Dukes said, "There is no such thing as complete personal freedom." He added:

"If freedom or complete detachment from society were possible it would provide a very poor life, indeed. We must all pay the price for advantages resulting from calling upon the state to safeguard our liberties both in the sense of personal freedoms and also in the direction of the minimum degree of economic security."

Mr. Dukes suggested that state and individual should integrate their rights, commenting that the "right to change the form of government" was one of the highest rights.

Replying to his critics, especially to Mr. Tepliakov of Russia, Mr. Malik of Lebanon said, "The human person who dares say 'No' to the social pressure should not be eliminated." He added:

"The real danger is that social pressure is snuffing out the individual personality. I'm not arbitrarily setting the state against the individual or vice versa. But which, I ask, is for which? I say the state is for the individual."

Spontaneously a few spectators applauded.

The Commission informally agreed that the international bill of rights should be drafted first in the form of a resolution of the General Assembly, with provision for a convention by which states might adhere to the rights agreed upon.

United States Copper's Status Has Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in the Waterbury (Conn.) American, Wednesday, February 5, 1947:

UNITED STATES COPPER'S STATUS HAS CHANGED

What the inexorable necessities of war did to some of America's natural resources was made plain yesterday by representatives of the local brass-manufacturing industry. With reference to an assertion by Representative JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona, that we can meet domestic demands (for copper) in peacetime as well as we did in war, William M. Goss, executive vice president of the Scovill Manufacturing Co., stated, "We didn't meet demands in wartime and we are not meeting them now." Mr. Goss, accordingly, recommended favorable action on a proposal by Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON that the 1932 import tax on copper be removed at least until such time as domestic consumption levels off in reasonable ratio to American production.

The alternative, as it was presented by Mr. Goss and representatives of the American Brass Co., is that unless Congress takes the action proposed by Representative PATTERSON to relieve the present shortage, the brass industry will be faced in a few months with the unavoidable necessity of laying off many workers for the want of material for them to work on. Back in the days before the late war this country was supplied with such ample reserves of copper ore that it could and did export thousands of tons of the product every year.

In 1932 American copper consumers were still so well supplied from domestic sources that they could afford to note with little or no protest the imposition of the present import tax, to protect American copper miners from ruinous competition by cheap foreign labor. By now, however, the situation is represented to have changed to such an ominous degree, as the result of wartime inroads on America's copper reserves, that our remaining sources of copper-bearing ores and concentrates are almost exhausted. It has accordingly become necessary for American manufacturers to import from 50,000 to 60,000 tons of copper a month to meet current civilian demands.

Representative MURDOCK's objection to Representative PATTERSON's proposal to lift the present import tax was based on the point that it might have the effect of reducing copper-mining centers in the West to ghost towns. From general information, about how the domestic supply is petering out, it seems inferable that they are on their way toward becoming ghost towns anyway. They evidently may arrive at that status the sooner if a copper bloc in Congress insists on making American manufacturers depend exclusively on domestic copper as long as it continues to last.

The Late Admiral Marc A. Mitscher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, not infrequently a newspaper editorial writer, choosing his words with skilled objectivity, produces a more accurate tribute to the memory of a man than any which could be written by those who knew him best and loved him most.

Such an editorial is the following, published in the February 5 issue of the Washington Post:

MARC A. MITSCHER

If you wished to give an appellation to Vice Adm. Marc A. Mitscher, it might have been raider of the Pacific. He was the man who demonstrated that the Navy air arm was the most powerful striking force in the sea warfare against Japan. The mental picture that we retain of Mitscher is of a sitting com-

mander looking out to sea from his bridge, his head under a special green canvas cap with a huge visor shading his eyes. He looked every inch a seadog, with a face made leathery by long exposure to the elements, keen cold eyes having a razor sharpness, and so slight and rawboned as to be almost wizened, and what valiant deeds he directed from his carrier. He had himself blazed the trail of his young aviators when he flew in the First World War, and he had the understanding born of experience. During the great battle for Saipan he broke the strict black-out to have searchlights guide the planes back to their carriers and detached some of the protecting destroyers to search for those which for one reason or another had failed to stay in the air. This thoughtfulness made him beloved as well as respected by the young officers. Of words he had few, and he gave his orders with a rare economy of verbiage, which was always direct and staccato. It was by his acts that Mitscher earned his fame in the Pacific Fleet. He was a brilliant tactician who made Task Force 58 immortal.

Research in Humanities and Social Sciences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Dr. Arthur G. Coons, president of Occidental College, Los Angeles, which is located in my district, and, in addition, a resolution adopted by the Western College Association, of which he is also president, on November 15, 1946. Dr. Coons is well qualified to discuss the subject contained in this resolution not only because he is one of the civic leaders of California and has a very fine educational background but also because he himself has seen the result of the destructive forces of science in such countries as Japan and the far Pacific, which he visited as a member of the President's Reparations Committee.

The letter and resolution follow:

WESTERN COLLEGE ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 30, 1947.

The Honorable NORRIS POULSON,
Representative in Congress, Thirteenth District, California, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POULSON: I transmit to you herewith a copy of the resolution passed by the Western College Association, of which I happen to be currently the president, at our fall meeting held at the College of the Pacific at Stockton, Calif., on November 15, 1946. This resolution was prepared as a communication to the directors of major national private foundations and benevolent institutions. It was intended to reflect the judgment of the colleges in the Western College Association as to the need for support to research in the humanities and the social sciences and studies. Otherwise the statement as it appears is self-explanatory. I think it would be quite appropriate, if permitted, for this resolution to receive recognition by being printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR G. COONS,
President, Occidental College.

RESOLUTION ON SUPPORT TO RESEARCH IN THE HUMANITIES AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES PASSED BY THE WESTERN COLLEGE ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 15, 1946

To the Directors of Foundations:

The Western College Association respectfully submits to you the following reflections and recommendation:

1. The Army and Navy of the United States are at present spending vast sums annually for research in science and technology, largely through contracts given to academic institutions. The bill to establish a National Research Foundation which would provide an additional $25,000,000 each year for such purposes will be reintroduced into Congress during the coming session. The effort to include subsidy for research in social studies failed during the past Congress, and, despite the attempt which will be made to restore such provision, may fail again.

2. We greet with enthusiasm the present vast expansion of scientific research under governmental auspices, assuming (a) that in the long run the research thus subsidized will be directed not only toward military ends but also toward human betterment and the discovery of truth, and (b) that subsidies will be administered in such a way as to preserve freedom of research and publication.

3. We fear, however, that these subsidies may further increase the existing lopsidedness in the growth of our civilization, with catastrophic results. It is by now a platitude that our understanding and mastery of nature far exceeds our understanding and mastery of human nature. During the past year even great numbers of scientists, who in the nature of things might be expected last to be disturbed by such an unbalance, have become terrified by the disparity in the development of these two major aspects of human progress. As a people, and as a race, we seem not moral enough to use our present powers for good purposes. The present and contemplated action of our Government may further deepen the contrast between our means and our morals.

4. Morality is the proper understanding of human nature, and action on the basis of that understanding. We recognize that human nature has assumed many variant forms in different times and places. It is plastic. The academic disciplines generally grouped as humanities and social studies are devoted to exploring the nature and causes of its changes in the past and present. They do not, and will not, of themselves induce morality but they develop the raw material for an intelligent morality. As our power increases, they are more than ever indispensable.

5. The recent congressional debates which ended in the defeat of proposals to provide governmental subsidies for humanistic and social research, in addition to research in the natural sciences, clearly indicated that such subjects appear politically dangerous and that there is slender hope that such assistance may be forthcoming in the visible future. That such an attitude should prevail is indication of the foetal condition among us of morality in the basic sense of the word.

6. If the perilous and increasing unbalance of our world is to be remedied, probably it must be accomplished with private support. During recent years the foundations have shown remarkable ability in adapting themselves, individually and as a whole, to the rapidly changing conditions of American life and education. The action of our Government in appropriating for scientific research annual funds several times larger than the combined income of all foundations which support research suggests the wisdom of drastic and speedy redeployment of the resources of the foundations in order to secure even the beginning of a readjustment of equilibrium between the natural sciences and technology, on the one hand, and the studies which assist morality, on the other.

7. We, therefore, propose to the responsible officers of all foundations that, within the limits of legality, and with discriminating judgment as to the comparative contribution of specific projects to human welfare, they withdraw as rapidly as possible from the support of such scientific and technological research as otherwise can be conducted with governmental assistance, and that they marshall their major forces to aid the studies which deal with the problems and potentialities of human life.

ARTHUR G. COONS,
President, Western College Association.

Political Rights of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the members of this House will wish to join me today in an expression of appreciation for the establishment in the United Nations of a Commission on the Status of Women. This Commission will have its first meeting at Lake Success on Monday. The United States is a member of this Commission, and our representative on it, Miss Dorothy Kenyon, is especially equipped for this service since she was formerly a member of the League of Nations Committee of Experts on the Legal Status of Women.

As many of you know, it was my privilege to serve as a member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations last November and December. During this meeting a resolution was introduced concerning the political rights of women. Mrs. Roosevelt spoke in support of this resolution and urged also that it result in energetic action throughout the world. Under unanimous consent, I place this resolution in the RECORD as a supplement to my remarks.

The United Nations resolution refers only to political rights of women. In this country women have had equal political rights for many years. Indeed, it is hard for us to realize that our grandmothers and even our mothers were frequently denied the rights to vote, hold public office, and otherwise express their political opinions. We are proud that the women in Japan have received the right to vote within recent months. Women in France and Italy have also been enfranchised since the end of the war. However, there are still areas in the world where women do not vote and in which they have little opportunity for education to qualify for the franchise. I believe that we will have a better world, and a more peaceful world, when these women are in a position to make their proper contribution as a group and as individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women will be organizing promptly and that the United States is in a position

to exchange information through it as to the progress and problems of women in other areas. The Commission will be considering civil, economic, and social status of women as well as their political rights, and will be in a position to hasten developments along constructive lines. I hope that we will take energetic and positive action in our own country to clear up such problems as remain in this field. Any restraint on the progress of women is a restraint on the total national progress. Theoretical equality is not enough. What we seek is far more than a theoretical equality. We seek rather our full opportunity to serve our Nation and our age, and as so well written in the United Nations Charter—"to seek fundamental freedoms for all without distinctions as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution concerning the political rights of women adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its fifty-fifth plenary meeting on December 11, 1946:

Whereas in the preamble of the Charter, the peoples of the United Nations have reaffirmed faith in the equal rights of men and women, and in article I it is stated that purposes of the United Nations are, among others, to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to sex, and to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends;

Whereas certain member states have not yet granted to women political rights equal to those granted to men;

Therefore recommends:

(a) That all member states which have not already done so, adopt measures necessary to fulfill the purposes and aims of the Charter in this respect by granting to women the same political rights as to men;

(b) Invites the Secretary-General to communicate this recommendation to the governments of all member states.

New Deal Flavor Seen in Tax Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence in the Washington Star of February 5, 1947:

NEW DEALISM FLAVOR SEEN IN TAX BATTLE—PROPONENTS OF GRADUATED SCALE HELD EVADING BASIC ISSUE

(By David Lawrence)

Now that it seems apparent that there will be a substantial cutting of the Federal Budget, a significant controversy has arisen over the question of whether to make a flat percentage reduction in taxes or to graduate it so that the lower-income groups will get the maximum benefit.

What is significant about it is that New Dealism still spreads its socialistic flavor over the Washington scene. So many Washingtonians, including some Republicans, have been indoctrinated with the idea that the tax system should be used either for punitive purposes or to bring nearer the days of state socialism that the advocates of a free enterprise system and a system of taxation primarily for revenue purposes find themselves up against the same insidious propaganda as was prevalent before the radicals were repudiated in the 1946 elections.

The proponents of the graduated scale of reductions are sending forth the usual demagogic arguments that there are more votes in the lower brackets and that the so-called rich would be too much benefited by a "straight across-the-board" cut. The reading public, who for the most part do not know the facts about taxes in relation to business, are led to believe that there are no arguments on the other side at all.

PRINCIPLE BACK OF IDEA

During the war the income of taxpayers in the middle and upper brackets was cut proportionately deeper by taxes than those of any other group and it is, therefore, only equitable that the relationship between rates should go back to the peacetime pattern.

Actually, the amount of money involved in a flat percentage reduction straight across the board is relatively small, but the principle back of the idea of treating everybody alike and removing the penalties on thrift and enterprise is far more important.

It is to the interest of sponsors of state socialism and to the Communists to break down the private enterprise system in America. One way to do it is to destroy incentive and level off everybody's income so that when business expansion is balked and there is depression the State steps in and, by pump priming, adds to the public debt, making it possible for the administration which hands out the money to continue in power and pursue revolutionary schemes.

Ever since the New Deal began in 1933, the tax system has been abused. It has been utilized to persecute the successful and to penalize leadership. There were times when even the language of the advocates of governmental intervention in private affairs was unashamedly the language of revolution, in which the end is supposed to justify the means.

The National Capital still contains, inside and outside of Government, the devotees of New Dealism who look askance at the idea of treating rich and poor alike, not only on taxes but in the courts. Class prejudice is so deeply ingrained that Republicans now are being told they do not dare vote for a flat percentage reduction in taxes lest they be punished at the polls.

The truth is business expansion and the creation of jobs and the development of technological improvements in production so as to help bring prices and the cost of living down depend on what incentive there is for the white-collar workers of America—the business management and professional class. The number of persons who derive their incomes from clipping coupons is too small to be a factor in deciding a broad policy of incentives as against those who earn their incomes themselves.

BASIC ECONOMIC ISSUE

It is being said in some quarters that when the Republicans reduced the surtaxes in the 1920's a boom ensued and a terrible depression followed—as if there was any connection whatsoever between the two things. Actually, the Government collected more rather than less revenues in the twenties when it changed the tax rates so as to introduce new incentives. Actually, also, the panic of 1929 was to a large extent the result of the speculation of the little fellow in the markets and was due to the fact that there were no laws to control effectively the issuance and sale of securities. To say that the economic upheaval of 1929 and 1930 was due to some tax law in the United States is to ignore the conditions then prevailing in Europe as well as the speculative fever of persons of small income.

But in the next few months such distortions will be heard again and again. The test will come when the conservative Republicans and the conservative Democrats are challenged to stand up for incentives in the private-enterprise system as against the demagoguery involved in a plan to remove millions of persons from the tax rolls altogether so that as citizens they will contribute nothing to their National Government.

The issue may appear to be political, but it is basically economic. If the socialistic theory of leveling off and standardizing everybody's pay is to prevail—as advocated by industrial unions in the matter of wages—then the craft workers of the A. F. of L. and the nonorganized professions have much to fear from any legislative support for such a doctrine. If incomes must be brought down constantly to a lower and lower level of standardization irrespective of thrift, ingenuity, resourcefulness or ability, the rest of the road to communism is not distant.

How Safe Is Air Travel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Sunday News of February 2, 1947:

HOW SAFE IS AIR TRAVEL?

Airplane crashes have been coming in clusters for some months last past. The most sensational of these to this writing was the KLM (Royal Dutch) plane or pilot failure at Copenhagen, Denmark, which killed Grace Moore, Prince Gustaf Adolf of Sweden, and 20 other persons.

These tragic accidents, which few ever survive, have stirred up considerable alarm and concern in this country over the safety of air travel.

We heard a great deal during the war about near-miraculous landings of half-shot planes on fog-masked airfields or plunging carrier decks. Were many of those stories fairy tales? Is air travel as hazardous as it was when Lindbergh first flew to Paris back in 1927? Or what is the truth of the matter, anyway?

Secretary of Commerce W. Averell Harriman, whose Government department supervises civil aviation, made some remarks on this subject recently which we think ought to be rebroadcast.

The most reassuring of Harriman's statements was that the safety record of United States air lines in 1946 was 40 percent better than in 1945—and this though our air lines carried a record-breaking number of passengers in 1946.

These occasional crashes grab the headlines, necessarily. The thousands of flights which are run successfully and without incident seldom rate a line of reporting until the safety statistics are tabulated at the end of the year.

By the same token, divorces are news, while happy marriages generally are not; the occasional murderer or rapist or diamond thief is something to put in the papers—to be read about by the millions of quiet, home-

loving, Godfearing, baby-having, etc., citizens who don't get in the papers.

To back up Harriman's reassurances, there is the recently disclosed fact that 84 percent of United States life insurance companies will now insure prospective air passengers' lives without limitations and at regular rates, while only 65 percent would do so last year, and only 4 percent in 1935.

This is no consolation, of course, to anybody who happens to get knocked off in a plane crash; but the fact remains that, on average, air travel is relatively safe now and growing safer all the time.

It would be most unfortunate for the Nation, we think, if the traveling public should be overcome by a lasting panic in regard to planes.

We do think, however, that everything possible should be done to step up the safety of air travel; that a fatalistic attitude on this point would be just about as bad as a let's-quit-flying attitude.

There is plenty that can be done to make civil aviation safer.

Two landing devices, for which great things are claimed, are now available.

One of these is the ground-control approach system (GCA), developed by the Army and Navy, wherewith a man at a radar screen on the ground can talk the pilot of an incoming plane, by minute directions, to a safe landing in practically any weather.

The other is the older instrument landing system (ILS)—the well-known method of bringing a plane in on a radio beam. ILS apparatus is now being installed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration at 110 airports.

With both of these devices, the chief gimmick is that they cost a lot to set up, and it takes highly trained experts to operate GCA.

The air lines apparently can't furnish all the necessary cash, or borrow it, to make their routes as safe as possible via GCA or ILS.

The CAA is squawking that the Budget Bureau wants to make too deep a slash in this agency's 1947–48 appropriations for promotion of safer civil aviation. This scheduled cut is 20 percent—from about $114,000,000 to a little over $92,250,000.

Speaking as onlookers and not experts in the art of paring down Government agencies' requests for money from Congress, we'd say that a lot of useless jobholders and phony Government aids to supposedly independent Americans ought to be lopped off the budget before any sharp cuts were made in funds for so important a thing as safety in aviation.

Come war or stay peace, the continuous improvement of American flying facilities seems to us just about essential to the further progress of the United States.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to address myself to the subject of old-age pensions. I have shared the view of many of my colleagues for a number of years that we should have an adequate, uniform, old-age pension. By "adequate," I mean a sufficient sum to provide such simple necessities as food, clothing, housing, and medical care. Certainly those who have borne the brunt of citizenship until they have reached the age of retirement, if they are not criminals, deserve at least this much. By uniformity, I feel that whatever the National Government provides for old-age retirement in one State should be paid the same in every State. Our present method of matching the State up to a given sum is unfair to say the least. Why should a citizen in one State not feel that he or she is entitled to just as much pension from the Federal Government as the citizen of any other State?

They should feel that way, Mr. Speaker. They do feel that way. And, in my opinion, they are fully justified in that conclusion, whether the State has found itself in position to match the Federal appropriation or not. Our present system provides what we term "old-age assistance" up to a given sum, on condition that the State will provide a sum to match what the Federal Government provides. I am told that under this arrangement the pensioner receives in the different States widely varying amounts from the Federal grant, varying from, say, around six or seven dollars in certain States up to the maximum of $25 per month in others.

This discrimination, Mr. Speaker, should not be. Again I wish to make it abundantly clear that, in my opinion, the largest amounts attainable under our present system are woefully inadequate, even in the States where the maximum is matched and made available. There is also another discrimination that occurs due to this State-matching arrangement in many if not all of the States. That is, they impose a certain so-called property qualification, commonly referred to as a means test before a citizen may qualify as a recipient or pensioner. This test is in many cases so severe that a great number of very deserving elder citizens are prohibited from receiving the State appropriation. Then, under the State-matching requirement, they are also disqualified from receiving any part of the Federal appropriation. This is another form of discrimination that, in my opinion, should have the attention of the House. Many of us feel that our old-age assistance has had its day in this country.

It is time that we admit that it was a mere temporary device to be used only as an emergency measure and during the interim until we could enact an adequate, uniform, old-age pension. Why should a citizen who owns his or her own little home be less worthy of a pension than a citizen who does not? If this Government has an obligation to one, then certainly it has an equal obligation to the other.

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to say that it feels an obligation to relieve the acute hunger or distress of those elder citizens who are charity cases. It is time that we recognize that an honorable old-age pension is a part of our annual National Budget. Let us watch that Budget carefully. Let us remove every item of expense that is not in the interest of the general welfare. But let us hold manfully for every proper appropriation for the good and well-being of our people. I mean all of our people, Mr. Speaker, and certainly this includes those elder citizens who have given so much to the Nation. They also have received so little at the hands of the Congress. Certainly before any additional appropriations are made for the relief of distress in other countries, the actual needs of our own honorable fathers and mothers should be taken care of. Many of us have been in consultation with our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] in the preparation of H. R. 781. This bill is designed to meet this very important and pressing problem. This bill does not provide everything we would like for our elder citizens. It does, however, go a long way toward a reasonable, uniform pension. It is within the scope of what the Congress can and should do now.

Dangerous Short Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune of January 30, 1947:

DANGEROUS SHORT CUTS

The United Nations Charter assigns to the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That primary responsibility certainly includes control of the use of fissionable atomic material. Yet, the United States and Britain are being forced to consider a plan that would separate that responsibility from the Council.

Both Governments are reported to be considering proposals for putting inspection, control, and punishment of violators under an independent atomic-development authority.

The reason, of course, is Russia's persistent refusal to waive the veto power of the Council's permanent members over any Council action against violators of an atomic control agreement.

Neither of the two plans have been formally announced. But the American proposal is said to give the independent agency the power to act only in serious violations, and to permit individual nations to declare war against the violator.

The British outline would make an independent agency responsible for all atomic control, but would compel all governments to act together in any punishment of the violator.

It might be argued that it is results rather than method that count, and that anything which might free the world from a fear of atomic warfare is welcome. But there are dangers in these two proposals that might make them acceptable only as a last resort.

The American idea of moving a dispute out of the Council only at the approach of a crisis seems to us to be better than the British alternative. This at least would keep much of the discussion within the UN, which, after all, was organized to keep the peace. On the other hand, the American plan for separate declarations of war is a questionable solution.

There is a clause in the charter, to be sure, which makes this possible. Article 51 states

that the charter shall not impair "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member."

But this is the old-fashioned method that turns its back on the purpose of the UN and on the lessons of two world wars. It would not permit any move of defense until after the first atomic attack. And even if the self-defense clause were broadened by rewriting, a small nation threatened by a powerful one would probably hesitate to make a lone move without complete assurance of united support.

Basically, these two plans are only a subterfuge. Certainly the American and British Governments know it, and as certainly they must be considering the proposals with reluctance. For the idea of an independent atomic agency is only a sort of legalistic maneuver where no real legality exists.

There is little likelihood that Russia, if she does not like any vetoless function of the Security Council, would like a vetoless independent authority any better. It is extremely doubtful that Russia would be a member of such an authority. And an independent atomic agency without Russia might lead to a United Nations without Russia.

Perhaps the Soviet Government will find more to object to in the new proposals than in the Baruch plan, at which it has balked so long, and hence be more willing to retreat from its original stand.

In any event, the new Anglo-American shortcuts appear from here to be about as thorny as the highway which they would abandon.

Conscription and the Peacetime Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a petition sent me by the Reverend Frank C. Seymour, an outstanding and well-known clergyman in my district, and signed by several prominent citizens, setting forth impressively the case against conscription and the peacetime draft.

The petition follows:

LANCASTER, MASS., *February 2, 1947.*

Hon. HENRY C. LODGE,
Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN:

Whereas voluntary enlistments have exceeded what the Army stated as needed; and

Whereas taxes ought to be reduced; and

Whereas atomic bombs have revolutionized warfare, making large armies ineffective; and

Whereas there is too much compulsion by government; and

Whereas Russia proposes world-wide disarmament; and

Whereas, according to Army records, immorality and the abuse of liquor often corrupt men in training and spread disease;

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to oppose compulsory peacetime military training.

Frank C. Seymour, Esther B. Macdonald, Katherine B. Scott, Chester L. Locke, Agnes E. Richter, Robert D. MacBrayne, Ruth H. Downing, Nellie Blood, Russell MacElhiney, Frank O. Collins, Sylvia Collins, C. Elwin Locke, Florence L. Follansbee, Mary B. S. Bailey, Mr. and Mrs. R. H. Redstone, Irene F. Seymour.

Reciprocal Trade, So-Called

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to renewal of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements, which I believe to be a misnomer, its only accomplishment is the lowering of tariffs whereby cheap-made foreign goods flow freely into the United States, making undue hardship on American industry; and if that were not enough, it further jeopardizes the high standard of living for American workers and eventually forces them to take low wages in order to compete with the low wages paid in foreign countries.

This is especially true and ruinous to those who are engaged in the making of glassware, and I include in the RECORD the very clear statement covering this industry made by Charles W. Carlson, of Tiffin, Ohio, before the Committee on Ways and Means covering the matter of reciprocal trade agreements:

I am appearing here today in behalf of that section of the American Glassware Association membership which produces hand-made table and ornamental glassware. This subject has been discussed with tableware manufacturers who do not belong to the association, and they all concur in the sentiments expressed in the statement I am about to make.

Table and ornamental glassware is sometimes erroneously labeled "luxury ware." It is not luxury ware, because a great volume is sold at prices far below the luxury level. Is a family, enjoying a modest income, living in luxury because it uses a blown goblet instead of a cheese glass? Is a bouquet of flowers arranged in a glass vase the sign of luxury?

Actual market surveys have been made which disclose that hand-made glassware is purchased as freely by persons with moderate incomes as by those in the high-income brackets. This hand-made ware is sought by the public for its beauty and decorative qualities, and because it has a definite utilitarian value.

It is the manufacturers and their employees who will be most seriously injured by any reduction in tariff rates on imports under paragraph 218 (f) of the Tariff Act of 1930. These manufacturers and their employees do not oppose trade agreements as such, but they vigorously oppose any scheme that will close their factories and make their employees dependent upon public assistance. These manufacturers have not forgotten the dark days brought about by the Czechoslovakian trade agreement. Their employees can well remember the suffering brought upon them through tariff reductions.

On January 1, 1945, the tariff rate was 60 percent ad valorem country of origin except where trade agreements made prior to 1945 continued in effect and lowered the rate. There are three of these trade agreements.

First. The Swedish agreement made in 1935 in which the tariff rate on engraved ornamental glassware valued at $8 each or over, country of origin, was reduced from 60 percent to 30 percent.

Second. The United Kingdom agreement of 1939 in which the rate on cut or engraved glassware valued at $1 or more each, country of origin, was reduced from 60 percent to 45 percent.

Third. The Mexican agreement which cut the rate on hand blown or pressed ware known commercially as bubble glass, from 60 percent to 30 percent.

This industry has already shared a portion of the United States market with foreign producers. What the industry fears is that the negotiators will reinstate the Czechoslovakian trade agreement of 1938 in which the tariff rate in paragraph 218 (f) was cut from 60 percent to 50 percent. To the casual observer this seems like a very modest reduction, but this 10 percent cut would represent more than the profit to United States manufacturers on the articles to which it applies.

Contrary to uninformed supposition, the hand-made glassware industry is not a highly profitable one. This fact is disclosed in the Department of Commerce survey of the industry for the years 1937 to 1940 inclusive. A copy of this survey is attached to the industry brief filed on December 21, 1947. During that period, the highest average percent of profit on net sales was made in 1940 and it amounted to 5.5 percent for the entire industry. There were 22 firms reporting and 10 of them showed a loss for that year of 7.36 percent, and 12 a profit of 10.4 percent. The underlying reason for the poor showing was the repercussion from the low selling prices established by importations during the year 1938 when the Czechoslovakian trade agreement was effective. In that year, 1938, the entire industry showed a loss of 3.59 percent on net sales. The unprofitable companies had an average loss of 13.44 percent, and the profitable companies, of which there were only six, showed a net profit of 4.53 percent. These facts established that the industry is not one of the easy money makers, and that any disturbance in price levels adversely affects its ability to operate profitably.

In the year 1938, when the Czechoslovakian agreement was effective, the industry lost 20 percent of its dollar volume. The situation had become so serious that the Committee for Reciprocity Information was approached and a conference between it and several members of the industry was arranged to discuss the matter. The meeting was held in March 1939 and while we were discussing the situation a message came to the meeting that Hitler had invaded Czechoslovakia. Mr. Fox, chairman of the meeting, then remarked that probably our troubles were over, insofar as imports were concerned, because undoubtedly the Czech agreement would be declared inoperative, and he guessed Mr. Hitler had settled our troubles for us. The Czech agreement was declared inoperative in April 1939.

From then on, United States sales of hand-made table and ornamental glassware have steadily increased. In 1939 they were $11,655,000 and the increase continued until 1945, when the Bureau of Census Survey for the Pressed and Blown Glassware Industry showed that table and ornamental glassware sales were $23,256,000 in that year. This steady increase is due to two causes; first, increased national income, and second, because there were no imports coming into this country to reduce United States volume and depress selling prices. During this period many of the companies who previously were struggling financially have gained a firm position which will continue only as long as tariff remains where it is now.

While OPA was operating, this industry held its price levels of 1942 in spite of wage increases of fully 60 percent over 1941. When this ware was removed from price control in 1946, the industry had to increase prices because of rising labor, material, and overhead costs. However, although price increases were necessary to cover rising costs, the prices in this industry did not skyrocket as they did in many others. Inasmuch as price increases were not permitted until 1946 there was no reflection of higher prices in the $23,256,000 volume reported in 1945. This figure represents real tonnage improvement

in volume and is not padded with increased prices. There are no official sales dollar volume totals for 1946, but it is believed that they are slightly over 1945. It is forecast that the quantity volume remains about the same.

In the hand-made ornamental and table glassware business a consumer selling price for an article is very often controlled by 25 percent of the volume sold. For that reason, importers set the price level for the lines which they import and the United States manufacturers, who supply the remaining 75 percent, either have to meet the low import level price at a loss to themselves or quit making the article. The market for this type of consumer goods is entirely different from the market for the so-called necessities. In the latter market the article must be bought when it is needed, whether it be American or import, and pretty much regardless of price. For instance, if you have one pair of shoes and it wears out, you will go out and buy another pair, almost regardless of price. On the contrary, if an ornamental vase is broken, you can replace it at your convenience, and you will hold off buying until the price is right. If the "right" price is set by imports, the American manufacturer must either meet it or go out of that line.

Now, with imports coming into this market and selling at lower prices than our manufacturers can possibly offer them, ultimately the American manufacturer will have this entire profit structure turned into a loss and he will eventually be driven from the market.

United States manufacturers of glassware are not seeking to establish a barrier to keep foreign manufacturers from selling in the domestic market. All they seek is the opportunity to sell United States goods in this market on a fair competitive basis with ware produced by low-priced labor in foreign countries. If the foreign manufacturer, through his ability to design, manage, technically improve, or distribute his goods can outsell up in this market, we feel that he should not be denied selling them here, provided that his advantage is not based on "sweat shop" wage rates. If the foreign manufacturer relies entirely on low wage rates, then it is the function of the tariff to equalize these wages. Then, neither the United States manufacturer nor the foreign manuafcturer will have an advantage over the other. The American glassware manufacturer cannot regulate wages abroad. He must pay the high American wages and still compete with foreign manufacturers paying foreign "sweat shop" rates.

The principle of equalizing production costs was recognized when the Underwood Tariff Act of 1913 was passed. Then we changed from a protective tariff to a competitive tariff in this country. At that time, wages in the glassware industry here were less than 40 cents an hour average and in central Europe they were about 12 cents an hour. Yet, in the Underwood tariff handmade table and ornamental glassware entering this country under paragraph 218 (f) had to pay a 45-percent ad valorem duty. This was a rate established by a Democratic administration in which there was a strong tendency for tariff reduction. In 1947 our average wage rate is $1 per hour and the Czechoslovakian labor average is less than 20 cents an hour for glass workers. In the Tariff Act of 1930, except for the trade-agreement cuts, the rate under which we now operate is 60 percent.

We point out that wages have increased 150 percent in this country since 1913, while in Czechoslovakia they have increased less than 70 percent, and the tariff rate in this country to equalize the labor has only increased 33⅓ percent. I point out to you that in the hand-made-glassware industry 63 percent of our cost is labor. Under the existing trade agreement with the United Kingdom the 45-percent rate established is the same as it was in the Underwood tariff, and the 30 percent established in the Swedish and Mexican agreements is one-third less than established in the Underwood tariff. If the Czechoslovakian agreement rate of 50 percent made in 1938 were revised on the remainder of ware imported under paragraph 218 (f), the rate would be 5 percent less than it was in the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act that was in force in this country from 1922 to 1930, when a rate of 55 percent was established. We are constantly reminded by proponents of trade agreements that the Smoot-Hawley tariff rates were responsible for tremendous economic displacements, and if the United States could have maintained the rates existing before that tariff act, we would have all been much better off. That being the case, we cannot see how a rate of 50 percent that was established in the Czech agreement can be justified by the negotiators, since we have, through existing trade agreements, cut tariffs on the articles before-mentioned and shown that our labor rates have increased far more than they were when the Underwood tariff was enacted, and our tariff equalization has only increased from 45 to 60 percent. We believe that the hand-made table and ornamental glassware industry should not be paralyzed by a reduction in the rate of 60 percent as it now is in paragraph 218 (f). Should a cut be made, we would like to know how it is justified by the negotiators.

To enable you to better understand the labor problem in the hand-made glassware industry, and, after all, this whole discussion centers around labor costs in this country and abroad, I have brought samples of process steps in the manufacture of this ware. These samples will show you why finished design and general workmanship in handmade glassware are entirely different from those of ware produced by machine methods. It will demonstrate why labor cost is 63 percent of our production costs, and also why it is necessary for our employees to devote a long period of training in order to become skilled and proficient in the art of producing hand-made glassware.

The same skilled operations which are necessary in the manufacture of everyday hand-made table and ornamental ware were directed very definitely to prosecution of the war when this industry had to furnish equipment during both World Wars.

This hand-made industry, that in normal times produced consumer durable goods of the artistic variety that we have been talking about, produced 35 percent of the total of the glass war material that was purchased from the pressed and blown glassware industry. You have the full details regarding this production, and the services to which it went, in the industry statement which we have submitted to you.

When we entered the last World War, no one had any conception of how important this section of the glassware industry would be in furnishing equipment. As hostilities progressed, we learned that our enemy had developed many new uses for glass, and when they were brought to this country for duplication and improvement, the Armed Forces Equipment Procurement Divisions came to the industry and urged it to produce them. I believe these services will tell you that we struggled to come through, and had we not had the available trained personnel to produce these requirements, we could not have manufactured the volume needed. We protest any cut in tariffs which will endanger the United States markets for United States table and ornamental ware because it will decrease the reservoir of trained glass workers, and ultimately our national-defense requirements for this type of glassware will either be placed in the hands of foreigners or we just won't be able to get war material when we need it.

Constantly we hear about Congress and other governmental agencies fostering the protection of small business and the need for diversification and decentralization of large units, in the belief that it is best for the country to spread industrial activity and not concentrate it. The hand-made glassware industry amply fulfills these qualifications. There are approximately 30 manufacturers in the business and only 5 of these are in cities of more than 25,000 population. The majority are in localities of less than 10,000 people. There are approximately 12,000 people engaged in production of this ware. They live in communities in West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, with a few scattered in New York, New Jersey, Oklahoma, and California.

The industry localizes around the natural gas fields, for gas is the principal fuel used in the manufacture of this ware. These small communities depend in a great many instances on the glass plant. Without its payroll, these communities will become ghost towns. Many of these small plants produce anywhere from $150,000 to $500,000 worth of glassware a year. They are small business concerns, many of them employing less than 100 people. Not only will the glass plants suffer but there are at least 30 cutting and decorating plants which buy blanks from these glass plants. They employ in the aggregate at least 2,000 people, and their personnel is largely composed of expert craftsmen who etch, engrave, cut and add applied decorations to these blanks. They are likewise small business concerns and are located very largely in small towns.

To make a trade agreement which cuts tariff rates so that the activity of these plants is curtailed will create a hardship in our country which should be avoided, and can be avoided, and will not to any degree cripple our sincere effort to help general labor in foreign countries.

By encouraging the production of glass in this country the abundance of cheap mineral sources located within our borders are directed into revenue and wages. That's what makes prosperity, for when we convert our abundant natural resources so that they will produce pay-roll dollars then we are fulfilling the best concepts of governmental direction. As you know, glass is made by melting sand, lime, potash, other alkalies and metallic oxides, and coloring materials in furnaces fired by natural gas. We are not dependent on foreign countries for a single item and we have an abundance of practically all of these materials. It is the conversion costs—wages which are made possible by the production of glass, which is the large element in the cost of glass, and for that reason its production should be encouraged here, not discouraged. I know of no other industry in which the raw materials used by it are so abundant and cheap and yet produce per pound so much pay roll. The glass industry also produces considerable taxes, both income and real estate, and anything which is done to destroy it works definitely against the welfare of the country.

Sometimes in conversation we hear that the industry is inefficient because it is a hand industry. With this statement we could agree if machine methods could produce ware to satisfy the public demand for finish, design, and workmanship which is now produced by hand, but no machines are available to do it, and I am sure that when they are available the hand-made industry manufacturers will be among the first to secure them. As long as they are not available the end results can only be obtained by hand, and the industry should not be judged as inefficient just because it does something which a machine could not do. For the same reason it is not an unnecessary article so long as the public wants to buy beautiful ware for ornamentation of its homes.

Mr. Clayton has written in a reply to a recent letter to Senator BUTLER recalling that President Truman had given assurances (and from this point on I quote) "that no action would be taken during his administration which would result in grave injury to any essential American industry or agricultural activity." There are just two words in that statement which weaken it from our point of view; they are "grave" and "essential"; they are the jokers, because who decides whether the industry is gravely injured and whether it is essential? It's the trade-agreement negotiators. They sit as judge, jury, and attorney for the prosecution and defense. They are the judge of the entire matter. If they wish to make a deal with a foreign country, they can stretch their yardstick or contract it at will by flexing their judgment on the degree of essentiality of the industry and the gravity of the injury that may be done. This can be easily washed out by the broad statement that it is best for the national economy. It now then is necessary that this section of the industry prove that it is essential and that it will be gravely hurt by cutting tariffs in paragraph 218 (f). We believe we have proven the latter in our brief and in this hearing.

Let us appraise the essential features of the industry to the American economy:

1. In 1945 it did a $23,000,000 business.

2. During the war years it produced $8,000,000 of much-needed war materials of a very technical nature.

3. In 1945 it had pay rolls amounting to about $15,000,000.

4. This pay roll supported merchants and services in many small communities in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and other elsewhere-mentioned localities.

5. It purchased over $2,000,000 of sand, lime, potash, and other alkali, metallic oxides and coloring materials, thereby creating pay rolls for these industries.

6. It consumed about $2,500,000 of fuel, natural gas, oil, and coal and over $1,500,000 of corrugated paper products.

We are sure that this is worth considerable to the community and a contribution to the national economy. Are the negotiators to judge each product on its use as a necessity to life and existence, or are other qualifications to enter into the appraisals of the negotiators in order to determine the essentiality? If only such articles as are essential to existence are to be considered, then may agricultural products such as fancy fruits, and berries, avocados, strawberries, raspberries, and hand-polished apples so that not a blemish shows, be ruled out, as also will be handsome dresses, fine fur coats, long staple cotton goods, and many other similar articles?

These latter are not necessary to existence but they are purchased in large numbers, because they have eye appeal and are beautiful, and combined with these qualities, also have a utilitarian value. That's just the status of hand-made table and ornamental ware. It is just as essential to a well-rounded line of glassware made in the United States of America as these other articles are to their several industries.

We urge the negotiators that they "keep their sights high" when judging the essentialities, never forgetting that if beautiful glassware is essential to the Czech economy it is likewise essential to the United States economy, and it is their job when making a trade agreement to so regulate the tariff that both the foreign and the United States manufacturers will have an equal opportunity to sell in the United States market.

The normal export market for hand-made glassware—including tumblers, table, and ornamental ware—is not over $300,000 a year. That's all we can sell the world in competition with low-priced European and Asiatic ware, in spite of our earnest effort to do it. In 1940, under very favorable terms, all that we could export was $237,112, and in 1941 $358,172, when Czechoslovakia and other European countries were out of the market because of the war and all world stocks of ware from those countries were exhausted. Because of these conditions in 1945 we built this export business up to slightly over $1,000,000. Canada purchased half of it, and that country, plus Brazil, Mexico, and Cuba, took 75 percent of it. Our ware is acceptable but it will not be purchased by glass-importing nations when they can get European glassware cheaper. This, then, denies the United States manufacturers an export market. If the market in this country is forfeited to foreign manufacturers by tariff reductions there is no other place for United States manufacturers to sell their products. What is taken away from us here is a complete loss to the industry.

We are informed that before the war 80 percent of the glassware made in Czechoslovakia and other European countries was exported. With the broad markets of the world to sell in, as they have in the past, we can see no reason why tariffs in this country should be lowered to the point that our domestic industry will suffer, when foreign manufacturers can now place their ware in this market at prices that our manufacturers cannot meet. Why should we give them a further advantage?

The Czechs realize their favorable position in world trade and are going right out after it. In the official magazine for the industry entitled "Czechoslovak Glass Review," September 1946, a review of this situation is printed. I have a copy which I am leaving with you. The article states that the glass industries over there have been nationalized; that manufacturers can make cheaper ware in price than any country in the world; operating plants are shown in pictures, complete plans for launching a campaign to invade the markets of the world are announced. The Czechs are to be commended for their enterprise; we do not wish to deny them the opportunity of selling their goods in this market, but we certainly do protest any lowering of our tariff which will allow them to push us out of our own market only because of the low wages they pay. If they can secure this business by other means they certainly are entitled to it for it is the American way of free enterprise. If they invade this market because they are nationalized and pool orders, fix prices, establish quotas, allot production, and do all of the other things that we are not allowed to do in this country, we urge the negotiators of our trade agreements to so safeguard any agreements that they may write so that American business will not be unfairly hampered in meeting foreign competition due to the nationalization of an industry.

If tariffs existing on January 1, 1945, in paragraph 218 (f) are reduced, our present volume of $23,000,000 will be seriously affected. We forecast that a 10-percent reduction in tariff to 50 percent would ultimately mean that the American industry would not do over $15,000,000 and if the tariff rate were reduced 50 percent to a rate of 30 percent that the American industry would be nonexistent in a very short time. We, therefore, earnestly urge the negotiators to make no reductions in tariffs on importations under paragraph 218 (f) of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Plain Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 6, 1947, entitled "Plain Talk":

PLAIN TALK

It used to be diplomatic tradition that an envoy's letters of credence should be presented and accepted with a lot of high-sounding verbiage. Sometimes it was meant, sometimes not; but the procedure was just the same, nonetheless. In these latter days this sort of thing has been abandoned, at least in this country. Six months or more ago the Yugoslav Ambassador heard from President Truman a reminder that his Government's manners were due for improvement. And on Tuesday the new Polish Ambassador, Joseph Winiewicz, got from the President a verbal reiteration of the State Department's protest against the nonfulfillment of the Yalta pledges of free elections. In these circumstances the President would have been hypocritical to be idly complimentary.

In the absence of law common to all the nations the only basis of relations resides in adherence to specific obligation. The obligation that this country entered into in respect of the new Poland (along with Russia and Britain) was that the Polish people should have the chance of choosing their representative freely. But all reminders of this obligation before the election of January 19 proved fruitless. The election was a palpable fraud, with the government bloc, itself the tool of Soviet Russia, winning easily. Moscow, in spite of our urgent protestations, washed its hands of any commitments arising out of Yalta; and Warsaw, in consequence, was impervious to our warnings.

Nothing more can be done about the problem except to bear the infraction in mind in our diplomacy and, as the diplomats say, protect the record. This must be done wherever there is a flouting of international engagements. Tyranny will have its successes, but they are ephemeral when they come in conflict with the habits, the interests, and the whole moral existence of the people upon whom tyranny is practiced. This, we believe, is the case in Poland. In the meantime the President is serving humanity's cause and our own American interests by upholding the standard of the sanctity of international engagements.

Renewal of 5-Year Level Premium Term Policies of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me and a report thereon:

H. R. 1327

A bill to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year-level-premium-term policies for another 5-year period

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of the first paragraph of section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (47 Stat. 334; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 512), is hereby amended to read as follows: *"Provided further*, That at the expiration of any 5-year period a 5-year-level-premium-term policy may be renewed for a second, third, fourth,

or fifth 5-year period at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination, and in case the 5-year period of any such policy shall have expired between January 24, 1947, and the expiration of 5 months after the date of the enactment of this amendment to this amendatory proviso and the policy has not been continued in another form of Government insurance such policy may be renewed as of the date of its expiration on the same conditions upon payment of the back premiums within 5 months after such date of enactment; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall cause notice to be mailed to the holder of any such policy of the provisions of this amendment to this amendatory proviso."

AMENDING EXISTING LAW TO PROVIDE PRIVILEGE OF RENEWING EXPIRING 5-YEAR LEVEL PREMIUM TERM POLICIES FOR ANOTHER 5-YEAR PERIOD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 1327):

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level premium term policies for another 5-year period, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike the word "last" and insert in lieu thereof the word "second."

Page 1, line 4, after the word "amended" add the words "by the act of May 14, 1942."

Page 1, strike from lines 4 and 5 the words "47 Stat. 334."

Page 1, line 7, strike the hyphen between the words "premium" and "term."

Page 1, line 8, after the words "second" and "third" strike both commas and insert in lieu of each comma the word "or" and also strike the comma after the word "fourth" in the same line 8.

Page 1, line 10, insert the word "fourth" after the word "the."

Purpose of the bill

The purpose of the bill is to authorize holders of 5-year level premium term policies of United States Government life insurance to renew such policies for a fifth 5-year period, at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination. The 5-year level premium term policy was first authorized in 1926. There have been three renewals since authorized for periods of 5 years each, making a total period of 20 years during which such Government insurance may be carried on the 5-year term plan. A bill similar to this one was last enacted on May 14, 1942 (Public Law 556, 77th Cong.). The committee feels that anyone who has such a policy at present should not be denied the privilege of renewing this type of insurance if he so desires. The committee also recognizes that there are cases where protection of a veteran's family in the next few years is a matter of primary concern to him. From this standpoint, the renewal of term insurance may well have advantages over an attempt to convert to other types of insurance at the present time.

However, in the long run, the committee wishes to point out the marked disadvantages of a level premium term policy to veterans as they become older in point of age.

At every 5-year period, as the veteran becomes older, the annual premium will sharply increase. And, furthermore, a veteran relying upon 5-year term insurance does not have the cash, loan, or paid-up values in his insurance which he would have if he converted to another type of policy.

Nevertheless, the commmittee takes the position that veterans who wish the protection of term insurance during the years of the immediate future and who simply cannot afford at present to convert their policies to other types of insurance should not be denied the right to continue their term insurance.

Ramseyer rule

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes made in existing law by the bill are shown as follows (the existing law, which is the second proviso of section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended by Public Law 127 of the 75th Cong., Public Law 556 of the 77th Cong., and Public Law 13, 78th Cong.) is shown in roman type, new matter proposed by this bill is shown in italics, and deleted matter is shown in brackets:

"That the [last] *second* proviso of the first paragraph of section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, *as amended by the Act of May 14, 1942* ([47 Stat. 334;] U. S. C., title 38, sec. 512), is hereby amended to read as follows: '*Provided further*, That at the expiration of any 5-year period a 5-year level-premium[-] term policy may be renewed for a second[,] *or* third[,] *or* fourth[,] *or fifth* 5-year period at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination; and in case the *fourth* 5-year period of any such policy shall have expired between January 24, [1942] *1947*, and the expiration of 5 months after the date of the enactment of this amendment to this amendatory proviso and the policy has not been continued in another form of Government insurance such policy may be renewed as of the date of its expiration on the same conditions upon payment of the back premiums within 5 months after such date of enactment; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall cause notice to be mailed to the holder of any such policy of the provisions of this amendment to this amendatory proviso.'"

The "Jewish" Line of American Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, Congress Weekly, a review of Jewish interests and pro-Zionist in its policy and the organ of the American Jewish Congress, of which the distinguished Dr. Stephen S. Wise is president, has rendered a great service, not only to American Jewry but as well to all the people of this country, by its recent editorial, The "Jewish" Line of American Communism.

The article shows the deep and unbridgeable chasm between American Jewry and the Communist Party. To those who harbor the thought that all or a substantial part of American Jewry is communistic, or to those who would be willing to entertain such thought but who for the present are content with the statement, "If the Jews are not Red, they are pink," I commend the editorial as an eye opener and thought provoker.

America, a Catholic review of the week, published by the Jesuits in New York, says of its contemporary's editorial:

The editorial's criticism follows up the anti-Jewish policies of the Soviet Government point by point, deploring the disintegration of Soviet Jewry as a national and as a religious group; and the hostile Soviet attitude to the Jews in the matter of Palestine, the resurgence of religious and spiritual life, and in the treatment of refugees. A widening and formidable gap, concludes the editorial, now separates the so-called Jewish line of those who follow Communist doctrine and those who worry about the fate of the Jewish people. In the December 13 issue of the same weekly, a member of the CP National Committee defends his party's devotion to a progressive Jewish life. Replying to the same, the editors of Congress Weekly note that his letter consists of stereotyped Communist phraseology and dialectics tending to confuse the issues and push their argument in still further detail. Once more they utter a warning, which we as Catholics will gladly second, against the waves of disintegration that come from either cultural imperialism or from total class ideologies.

Mr. Speaker, it is comforting, but not surprising, that two such publications, representative of different religious beliefs, are united in the common cause of democracy against communism.

The Congress Weekly editorial follows:

THE JEWISH LINE OF AMERICAN COMMUNISM

The Communist Party of the United States has just published an official 10,000-word resolution on Communist work among the American Jewish masses. The resolution is evidently a product of the postwar revision of the party line on various aspects of the Jewish problem, including Palestine, Jewish migration, and, particularly, the American scene. It instructs party members, as well as such friendly and affiliate organizations as the Jewish Labor Council, the Jewish People's Fraternal Order, the Committee of Jewish Writers and Artists, and others on the line to be followed in their activities and propaganda among the Jewish masses. The concepts of Jewish life and destiny and many of the policies established by this resolution are diametrically opposed to those of such Jewish organizations as the American Jewish Congress, dedicated both to the survival of the Jewish people and the development of a positive Jewish life. The resolution therefore calls for a sharp clarification of the points of difference.

BASIC DIFFERENCES

The differences on particular problems in Jewish life between such groups as the American Jewish Congress and the Communist Party stem from their basic differences in approach to the totality of Jewish existence. During the last years of the nineteenth century, two new types of political thinking developed among Jews. One was Zionism and Diaspora Nationalism which, though influenced by external forces, grew mainly out of Jewish traditions and internal historic processes in the life of the Jewish people. The other were the various interpretations of socialism and, later, communism, which, though owing something to the prophetic strain in Hebrew thinking, came from beyond the limits of Jewish life and conceived Jewish salvation as exclusively and inevitably a by-product of the universal salvation of humanity.

The basic difference of approach to the Jewish people and its problems persists to this very day. The Zionist, the Jewish nationalist, the Jewish survivalist, recognizes that the Jewish problem does not exist in a vacuum. He knows that the peace and security of the Jewish people are inseparably linked with the peace and security of all

mankind. But he also insists that the Jewish problem has many unique and special aspects and therefore requires a unique and special solution. He visualizes the integration of the Jew with the rest of humanity as that of a free people, guarding its identity and contributing its creativity to the family of peoples.

The international Communist on the other hand, regards himself primarily as a member of an international class. His first loyalty is therefore to his class interests and ideology as formulated by his party; the solution of the Jewish problem is simply a byproduct of the solution of the general social and economic problem of our age. Changes in the Jewish policies of communism are thus dictated invariably by the overall political strategy of communism and may have no relationship whatever to the internal processes of Jewish life.

During the past 50 years, fusion took place in many cases between purely Jewish and socialist ideals. Zionism and socialism, for example, merged in the Poale-Zion movement which may rightfully claim to have created a Jewish socialism. To some degree, even the Jewish Socialist Bund, which insisted on an autonomous existence within various socialist parties because it professed a Jewish identity of its own, could claim to be the protagonist of a Jewish socialism. That was why Lenin, father of the Soviet Union, regarded the Jewish bundists as bourgeois and chauvinist. There was never, however, any such thing as Jewish communism—i. e., a communism which adapted its philosophy to concepts of historic Jewish existence and the specific needs of the Jewish people. There are Communists who are Jews. There are Communists who work among Jewish masses. But Communists will never admit that there are special Jewish needs or problems which are not identical, or which are sometimes even in conflict, with the needs and problems of communism. The very first sentences of the recent resolution of the Communist Party clearly state this thesis: "Communist work among the Jewish masses, as in all other fields must be based upon the program, policies, and general line of the party. * * * The special policy problems in our Jewish work have to be approached and solved from the general party position. * * *" It is the Communist Party and the general interest of the party that dictate policy on Jewish affairs and not primarily Jewish needs.

WHAT HOLDS JEWS TOGETHER?

1. What holds Jews throughout the world together? According to this party line, the common bond is something called anti-Fascist unity. But fascism is a product of recent decades while the unity of the Jewish people is thousands of years old. Throughout the centuries, Jews achieved unity by means of more substantial and positive bonds than those of defense against enemies. That the enemy of today is fascism does not transform him from a negative into a positive force. If there is anything that unites Jews throughout the world today, it is the common desire and struggle for what we call survival as a people. Of this craving for survival as a people, the Communist resolution is totally unaware. The most it has to offer in terms of survival is expressed in its comments on the Jewish problem in Poland which calls for the building of a new Jewish community. What the functions of that community should be and how it should contribute to Jewish survival, if at all, are clarified only indirectly in another part of the resolution dealing with the final solution of the Jewish question.

THE SOVIET SOLUTION

2. On this, the resolution declares that the final, complete, and permanent solution of the Jewish question will be attained under socialism on the basis of the principles formulated by Lenin and Stalin and as developed in the Soviet Union's solution of the national question.

Groups such as the American Jewish Congress have never minimized the genuine significance of the Soviet program in eliminating anti-Semitism and the attempt to solve the Jewish problem through economic reconstruction and through the assurance of equality both as citizens and as a national minority. But we could not fail to observe that this process of legal, economic, and political restoration has been accompanied by a process of internal disintegration which has rendered the network of Yiddish schools, the Yiddish press, and many cultural institutions superfluous. This spiritual and cultural disintegration of the Jews as a people in the Soviet Union began long before Hitler exterminated half of Soviet Jewry. Today, even the most sympathetic observers have nothing at all to report on any communal or distinctive Jewish life in the USSR. We hear of the deepening of Jewish sentiment among certain sections of the Jewish population but we are aware of no integrated or organized life through which these sentiments can find expression. To us, this disintegration of Soviet Jewry as a national group is the result of the uprooting of the beliefs and ideals and the cultural and religious life which have maintained Jewish existence for centuries. The outlawing of Zionism and Hebrew in the U. S. S. R. has been a major factor contributing to this internal degeneration.

PALESTINE

3. During the war years the Communist Party seemed to retreat from its previous and often violent anti-Zionism and conveyed the impression of supporting the idea of the Jewish national homeland. The ambiguity of its position is now definitely ended. In terse terms, the resolution declares: "We must reject totally and combat systematically the Zionist use of the slogan 'a Jewish national homeland in Palestine.'" Again, the party reverts to its prewar position of champion of the Arab people by reviving the myth that a Jewish commonwealth would "subordinate the national rights of the Arab people in Palestine to those of the Jewish people." It calls for "Arab-Jewish struggle against all schemes for the partitioning of Palestine, since partition would make impossible any free national development of the Jews and Arabs in Palestine." The resolution goes on to summon both Jews and Arabs to a common struggle against British and American imperialism and offers as its own solution an Arab-Jewish state under the trusteeship of the Big Three of the United Nations.

Here, as in other problems with which the resolution deals, the suggested solution is an answer neither to current Jewish needs nor to historic Jewish aspirations for national restoration. It is, rather, one phase of a "Jewish" policy in which Jewish interests are not a primary consideration, if indeed they are a consideration at all. Today immigration into Palestine is the sole hope for hundreds of thousands of Jews in Europe. Such large-scale immigration will be impossible unless the Yishuv is granted its independence, or, at least, unless entry into Palestine is not made conditional on Arab consent. To suggest, as does the resolution, that immigration into Palestine must await Arab sanction and to oppose the immediate entry of 100,000 Jews is, under present circumstances, to doom hundreds of thousands of Jews either to continued confinement in Europe's DP camps or to harrowing insecurity. Nor does the creation of an Arab-Jewish state, subtly camouflaged as an "independent state," make any more sense. We know as fully as does the Communist Party of America that the Yishuv must achieve understanding and agreement with the Arabs. Under present circumstances, the establishment of an Arab-Jewish state would mean subordination of the Jewish minority to the hostile Arab majority and the perpetuation of the white paper which would permanently establish a ghetto status for the Yishuv. A "solution" of this kind, put forth in 1946, can stem only from an attitude less innocent than indifference to the fate of the Jewish people.

DISPLACED PERSONS

4. The same attitude underlies the solution to Europe's Jewish DP's, namely "that the United Nations assume the responsibility for these refugees, that it seek to secure the widest opportunities for the immigration of these refugees into the countries of the United Nations and they provide all means necessary for this." Anyone who is familiar with the results of the various international conferences and who knows the attitudes of most countries towards immigration is fully aware how slim are the chances for the absorption of any appreciable number of refugees outside of Palestine. To suggest that the answer is simply in immigration to other countries today means in practical terms to tell the DP's to remain indefinitely where they are. A solution such as suggested by the resolution can be offered only by people who are less concerned with human misery, human needs and human hopes than with the promotion of policies called for by a party line.

ONE-WAY TRAFFIC

5. The resolution urges closer American-Soviet Jewish collaboration. The establishment of close relations between American and Soviet Jewries has long been the hope of all who believe in the unity of the Jewish people. We hoped that the visit of the first delegation of Soviet Jews to this country in 1943 would mark the beginning of such relations. Despite the enthusiastic welcome that delegation was accorded, the hopes have remained unfulfilled. Nor does the line along which the resolution urges future collaboration carry any promise for mutual understanding.

For the same resolution which urges collaboration also calls for a struggle against both "bourgeois assimilationism" and "bourgeois nationalism." The latter is defined as "based upon a reactionary-utopian concept of a Jewish world-nation with the consequent tendencies towards national chauvinism and separatism." This is what the unity of the Jewish people looks like in Communist interpretation.

On the other hand, the development of close cultural relations between American and Soviet Jews is urged because the latter "are the leaders in the field of Jewish culture."(!) Through such relations, it will, therefore, be possible "to enrich American Jewish cultural life with a progressive and consistently anti-Fascist content." What is envisaged is evidently a one-way traffic. No cultural exchange on an equal basis is offered. What this program calls for is that American Jews become disciples of Soviet Jewry in cultural affairs. And since no direct relations between Soviet and American Jews seem possible, it means in effect that American Jewry is to be taught by the American agents of Soviet Jewish culture—the Jewish Communists.

We are certain that at least some of the authors of the Communist resolution are aware of the fact that there is another Jewry overseas whom hundreds of thousands of American Jews regard as the leaders in the field of Jewish culture—the Yishuv in Palestine. Wholly apart from the Jewish content of the cultures of the Yishuv and Soviet Jewry, a mere quantitative comparison of the output of both cultures hardly puts Soviet Jewry in a favorable light. But Jewish content also happens to be of some meaning and concern to the majority of American Jews. These Jews see in Palestine not only a remarkable renaissance of Hebrew learning and culture, and the shaping of a new

type of complete, integrated Jew. They see in it also the ideals of socialism transformed on Palestinian soil into forces contributing to the renaissance of the Jewish people as a whole. The authors of the Communist resolution, however, pretend never to have heard of the tremendous resurgence of cultural and spiritual life in Palestine and its impact on American Jewry. Only deliberate policy could have caused them to ignore so powerful a factor in the cultural life of the Jewish people as Palestine—a policy nourished by a hatred of Hebrew, of everything created in that language and of Zionism. This is what makes the entire approach of the Communist resolution to Jewish culture unrealistic and narrowly partisan to the point of absurdity. With such principles motivating the program of intercultural relations between American and Soviet Jewries, there can be little hope for the establishment of such relations.

ON FIGHTING ANTI-SEMITISM

6. Finally, the resolution devotes considerable attention to the American scene and to the struggle against anti-Semitism and inequality. It makes a number of points with regard to collaboration with minority groups and with the progressive forces in the United States. With these observations, we of the American Jewish Congress, as well as all genuinely progressive groups, can substantially agree. Indeed, they are basic principles which have guided the work of the American Jewish Congress for many years. But the entire spirit and letter of the resolution casts considerable doubt whether the instructions issued to party members with regard to cooperation with others on these problems is really motivated by a genuine concern for the fulfillment of democracy in this country. Rather, we suspect that common cause is to be sought on these aspects of the Jewish problem in order more effectively to wage the party battle on issues in which the overwhelming mass of American Jewry repudiate Communist policy.

These observations have dealt with only some salient points of the Communist resolution. There are many more statements of policy stemming from these basic principles with which all Jews and Jewish organizations sincerely concerned with Jewish survival will find themselves in sharp disagreement. A widening and formidable gap now separates the so-called Jewish line of those who follow Communist doctrine and those who worry about the fate of the Jewish people.

Get Our Ships Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in carrying on the hearings with reference to ships owned by the United States Government and now under the British flag and operating in competition with the American merchant marine it has been disclosed that approximately 415 ships owned by the Government of the United States and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States have been freely given to foreign nations and between the State Department and the Maritime Commission these ships have been competing against our American merchant marine ever since the end of the war. Not only are these United States owned ships in competition with the American merchant marine but the State Department and the Maritime Commission have given to these foreign nations a very cheap charter; in fact, there is no percentage of voyage profits paid the Government of the United States for the use of these ships, while the same Maritime Commission is requiring of American citizens who charter similar ships, the payment of voyage profits to the Government of the United States. The Ship Sales Act passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress did not give any agency of this Government authority to charter ships to foreigners let alone giving them to foreigners at a lesser price than to Americans. This violation of the act of Congress by the State Department and Maritime Commission is in defiance of law enacted by the representatives of the people.

Therefore, I believe that all such ships paid for by the taxpayers of the United States should be immediately returned to our Government, and I am introducing the resolution herewith:

Whereas the United States Government loaned its merchant ships to foreign nations for war purposes; and

Whereas the war has ended nearly 2 years ago and there is no war-service use of such ships; and

Whereas there are 415 United States-owned merchant ships still in the hands of Great Britain, Russia, and other nations, and being used in competition with the American merchant marine; and

Whereas foreign nations having such ships pay less for their use than American citizens; and

Whereas such use is contrary to the Ship Sales Act enacted by Congress in 1946, and actually gives American taxpayers' money to foreign nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That all merchant ships owned by the Government of the United States be returned to the United States and returned to the United States flag immediately upon completion of any voyage of any such vessel in progress on the date of the adoption of this joint resolution; and no such vessel shall remain under foreign flag and use longer than to complete any such voyage and effect immediate delivery of any such ship to the Government of the United States.

Fertilizer Supply Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, many people throughout New England are familiar with the outstanding work of Mr. Maurice H. Lockwood in the agricultural development in our area during recent years. At present he is president of the National Fertilizer Association, and the information which he has given to the House Committee on Agriculture is well worth the consideration of the entire membership of the House as well as all American farmers.

The statement is as follows:

My name is Maurice H. Lockwood. I am president of the National Fertilizer Association, with offices at 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. The association in its present form dates back to 1925, at which time it was formed from merger of two other organizations which had been representing the industry for many years. It is composed primarily of manufacturers of fertilizers and fertilizer materials, including farmer-owned-and-controlled cooperatives, and has over 400 members from north, east, south, and west.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee and to contribute all the information I can regarding the present fertilizer supply situation in our country. It is my purpose to outline the general picture as it appears to our organization, and then to offer you a series of statements from members of the industry giving various aspects of the story as seen in the leading areas of fertilizer consumption.

During the war and the postwar period our industry has been fully aware of the increasing demand for its products, and we have assumed our responsibility to the Nation and to the American farmer. Despite handicaps of labor, materials and transportation shortages, and through long hours of overtime work, installation of labor-saving machinery and application of advanced techniques, a job has been done of which we are proud. It is going on at an accelerating pace. With more than 14,000,000 tons of fertilizer produced in 1946, the industry has doubled its prewar tonnage and, by materially increasing the plant food content of fertilizer, has more than doubled the volume of plant food provided for American farmers. A tabulation is attached showing the striking growth in fertilizer use during the past 10 years. We expect that production in 1947 will at least equal that of 1946.

The effective job that the industry is doing and is preparing to do is demonstrated in these constructive steps: (1) Our Association's recent survey shows that various firms are planning for additional capacity ranging from 10 to 65 percent of their present facilities; (2) in connection with its allocations of potash for 1946–47, CPA announced that such allocations had been made to 65 new plants that were not in existence in 1945–46 and for 44 expansions of established plants; (3) recent public announcements from numerous fertilizer producers throughout the Nation give information about new construction which has been completed or is under way; (4) new phosphate mines and processing plants are being developed in the intermountain and Southeastern States. A large map, displayed in this committee room, shows the location of fertilizer production facilities, and another map shows, graphically, fertilizer consumption. Comparison of the two maps brings out the coordination of production with consumption.

There is no question in our minds that when new construction is completed and as soon as equipment can be obtained to put into use the technical improvements developed within the industry during the war, production will fully meet the demands of American farmers.

Our confidence that a balance between supply and demand will develop within the not too distant future does not dim our recognition of the fact that a shortage exists currently. This shortage is a matter of deep concern to us as participants in the agricultural production performance. We are determined to minimize this shortage and it should not be permitted to recur. However, if the job is to be done, the industry must not be handicapped by the labor and transportation difficulties which have beset it in the recent past, nor must its materials, products, and equipment be permitted to be arbitrarily diverted to other uses.

Here are a few of the specific factors that have contributed to or threaten shortage of fertilizers: (1) Under the war food program and because of the increase in farm-products prices, the demand for fertilizer

has considerably more than doubled since the beginning of the war period; (2) the emergency prohibitions against new construction prevented substantial increases in production facilities; (3) strikes, embargoes, and maritime shipping stoppages have adversely affected production; (4) there has been a serious shortage of boxcars for the movement of fertilizers and fertilizer materials throughout the war period—for instance, serious delays have occurred from time to time in the movement of potash from producing points, and for long periods the supply of boxcars for phosphate rock has been only 60 to 80 percent of requirements; (5) the recall by the Army of tank cars leased by the Army to the industry for the movement of sulfuric acid, anhydrous ammonia and ammonia solutions, if permitted to be consummated as announced, will seriously curtail the production of superphosphate and nitrogen compounds for use on American farms—there are late indications that this matter will be so handled as not to interfere with domestic supplies; (6) increased shipments to off-shore possessions and to foreign countries have affected the supply available for use on this continent; (7) Canada has not been shipping as much ammonium nitrate to the United States this year as last year.

Consider the shortage in terms of the three major plant foods:

Nitrogen: (1) Nitrate of soda, traditionally used as top- and side-dressing material, will be substantially smaller in supply this year because soda ash is not available with which to make it domestically, and international allocations and strikes and transportation shortages have decreased our imports. (2) Ammonium nitrate. International allocations have decreased domestic and imported supplies. (3) Sulphate of ammonia, a byproduct of the coking of coal, has had production curtailed because of coal strikes, steel strikes, and embargoes. This product is used almost entirely in mixed fertilizers and is being both exported and shipped to offshore territories in larger quantities than last year. (4) Ammonia solutions alone will be in somewhat larger supply this year than last.

Phosphates: Superphosphate production is falling substantially below the volume anticipated. Last July Government estimates indicated a probable 14 percent increase for 1946–47. Our association's tabulation for 120 superphosphate-producing plants which account for about 69 percent of the total United States production shows that during 1946 production was only 1 percent above that of 1945. The lower production is accounted for by strikes in some plants, shortage of boxcars to move phosphate rock, and the delay in reactivating the ordnance sulphuric acid plant at Tallacoosa, Ala. Earnest efforts have been under way for a year to place this plant in commercial operation, but to date this highly desirable end has not been achieved.

Potash: A regular and adequate supply of boxcars for shipment of potash from mines and refineries appears to be the chief need in this segment of our industry.

Great though the need is, it would seem more and more difficult, because of the proximity of the planting season, to take action that would be as broadly effective as could be desired. However, every effort should be made by all concerned to ameliorate the shortage and mitigate the accompanying difficulties in every possible way. The export program should not be so weighted as to give it undue importance in the picture as a whole. Although official estimates indicate that there will be practically as much nitrogen available this year as was distributed last year, reports from many fertilizer manufacturers indicate that they are not receiving anything like the quantity of nitrogen they received last year; in fact, this situation seems almost universal. Important action should be taken with respect to transportation if the farmers are to receive the fertilizer which can be produced and for which they are now asking and later will be pleading. A firm Government policy, backed up with strong directives, must provide transport now for fertilizers. Boxcars must be provided. Tank cars must be assured for anhydrous ammonia and ammonia solutions and for sulfuric acid. Every effort should be made by the carriers to speed up shipments and shorten transit time. Ships are vitally needed to bring in nitrates from Chile and to carry phosphate rock coastwise. Whatever may be said of the immediacy of the need of other American industries that utilize similar transportation facilities—and I am second to none in my respect for American industry as a whole—so far as fertilizers for use this year by American farmers are concerned, time is of the essence. The bulk of these shipments must be made within the next 90 days or it will be too late.

Honor—Country—Cash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 2, 1947:

HONOR—COUNTRY—CASH

Secretary Patterson has wisely rejected the applications for furloughs from the three West Point cadets who wanted to pick up a few tens of thousands of dollars in pin money by playing professional football before reporting for their duties as officers and gentlemen of the United States armed forces. No enlisted man in the service who was in his right senses would dream of asking a furlough for any such reason. Had these applications been granted it would have provided material for fresh attacks on the Army caste system, for it is obvious that in being cared for and educated, at public expense, while millions of their contemporaries were being sent to fight or to labor in far parts of the earth, these young men were already the objects of preferential treatment.

The discouraging thing is that the three cadets evidently made their applications in full expectation that they would be granted. and their neither the cadets themselves nor a very large proportion of professional football fans saw any impropriety in the whole business. They simply felt, as so many do, that a man is a sucker to work for second lieutenant's wages when he could be pulling down 20, 30, or 50 grand.

All this seems to argue that something is seriously wrong with the celebrated educational system at the West Point Military Academy; that it does not infallibly inculcate the special soldierly sense of honor and devotion to duty that has been claimed for it. It also argues that there is something wrong with the conception of the game of football as a great character-building institution.

The next move, of course, is up to the three players. If they wish to resign, they should be allowed to do so. Two of them are said to be, from a technical standpoint, among the greatest players the game has ever produced, and it is quite unlikely that their attitude has cost any diminution of their popularity, except possibly among some of the soldiers who are now dragging out their tours of duty in foreign posts.

Only Tax Exemption Increase Will Help Low Income Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of replying to the February 3 speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], in which he attempts to answer the questions I brought up in my remarks on the Knutson bill on January 29. However, since the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], chairman of the Rules Committee, has advanced another plan as a substitute for the Knutson plan, I felt that I should give my views on that bill. I shall at the same time try to set the record straight, as far as I am concerned.

In his remarks on Monday, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] states:

When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] enters the "forest of taxation," and I call it a forest advisedly, he runs the risk of not only becoming lost and confused, but of not knowing in which direction he is headed.

The gentleman from Illinois apparently takes this position: Only an expert must discuss the subject of taxation in the House. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is not an expert. He is confused, he is lost, he does not know in which direction he is headed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is an expert. He is not lost. He is not confused, and he knows in what direction he is headed. Then confidently, presumably as an expert, he enters that "forest of taxation" and says in effect I am all wrong.

I have never posed as an expert. A person with $12 a week income, whether worker or not, does not have to get an expert to tell him when he is hungry. An empty stomach tells him that. A man and wife do not need an expert to tell them that they cannot live decently on $1,000 or $1,100 a year. Their rent, grocery, clothing bills testify louder than any tax expert can testify to that fact. What we need in the solution of some of these problems is fewer experts and more people with the ordinary horse sense that some of these experts seem to lack so sadly.

WHAT SHOULD BE OUR TAX POLICY?

I stated in my remarks on January 29 that first and above all I wanted to balance the budget. I specifically stated that by balancing the budget I included an amount required to amortize the national debt on a sound basis. If anything was left after that I wanted these 86,000,000 in the low-income group with individual or family incomes of $2,500 or under to be given first consideration.

I further stated that if it were not possible to give everyone the full exemption of $1,000 for a single and $2,000 for a married person, then I would confine the increase in exemption to people with $5,000 incomes or under, following a Re-

publican tax bill which has passed this House and became a law in 1921. All of these facts the gentleman from Illinois conveniently forgets.

CUTTING WASTE AND TAXES GO TOGETHER

My efforts during the past 12 years to cut waste and extravagance in all phases of government speaks for itself. I have been working every day with the chairman and other members of the Appropriations Committee to cut appropriations to the bone and shall continue to do so. It is only by cutting to the bone that we can hope to save enough money to give tax relief to anyone.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] joins the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] in his "punt and prayer" tax policy. They cut taxes first and then pray that the good Lord will increase income enough, or the Appropriations Committee will be able to cut appropriations enough, to make the tax cut possible.

I want to wait until the money is in the Treasury to divide. The Knutson-Mason policy wants to divide it before it is there depending upon the opinions of so-called tax experts as to whether or not it will be there. I do not require any tax expert under my policy to learn whether the money is there or how much money there will be to divide. An adding machine will tell me.

ARE THERE $12-A-WEEK WORKERS?

In referring to my illustration of the $12-a-week worker, the gentleman from Illinois says, in effect, "There just is not such a thing," that the wage-and-hour bill provided for a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour. Does he not know the Wages and Hours Act leaves out millions of workers, that it applies only to workers engaged in work that comes under interstate commerce?

Let me refer the gentleman from Illinois to an article from the January issue of the Reader's Digest, page 55, entitled "How Georgia Teachers Got a Raise." A headnote called it "An amazing campaign to rescue teachers from starvation." The article quotes from a letter received by Mr. Mauney D. Collins, Georgia State superintendent of public instruction, from one of his teachers whose name was George Thomas. The letter reads in part as follows:

DEAR SIR: I don't think I'll teach any more. I am now earning $8.25 weekly. I can't get married on that.

The article continues:

George Thomas' resignation was the six thousand six hundred and ninety-ninth submitted by Georgia teachers in 18 months. Teachers who had left during the war were not returning—nor would they as long as factories paid $25 a week for semiskilled workers.

The article then states that teachers' pay was raised 50 percent. If these teachers who received as low as $8.25 a week were increased 50 percent, the man who took Thomas' place would now be receiving $12.37½ a week, less 12 cents tax deduction weekly. And yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] who taught school for 33 years, says there is no such a thing as a $12-a-week worker. The same condition exists in many other States.

Under the Knutson plan which the gentleman from Illinois is defending, he would receive 2 cents a week tax reduction, while the man with a $300,000 income would receive nearly $44,985 a year reduction.

If the gentleman from Illinois will examine the Treasury records he will find that in 1944 there were 21,600,000 individuals with incomes of $1,000 or under, 9,370,000 of whom were heads of families. Those people paid more than $500,000,000 in taxes of various kinds in 1944. Many were workers, others were retired employees and still others were aged people trying to earn enough over and above their social security or retirement pay to make a livelihood.

I am placing into the RECORD excerpts from a very few of the many, many letters I have received on this subject. There is one, however, that I want to include in my remarks at this point. From an aged Florida resident I received the following letter:

That the little man earning $10 a week has to make an income-tax report is something that doesn't make sense. I had to. At the age of 80, hardly able to earn $10 a week, I have filed a report for about 5 years and in that time only once have made enough to go over $500 in any one year. What a waste of paper and time of auditors to check such a report.

I am sure that this man does not have to have a tax expert or tax payment to make him tax conscious. Of course, the gentleman from Minnesota, with his occasional political foresight, has placed a provision in his bill which will make it unnecessary for this man to pay a tax. Dr. Townsend will undoubtedly show his profound gratitude to the gentleman from Minnesota by publishing his picture over proper laudatory remarks in the next issue of the Townsend Weekly.

And now comes the other gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], chairman of the Rules Committee, who is on the Republican steering committee of the House and one of the Republican House leaders, with a substitute plan which will give preference to the low-income group.

Let us see in what way the Allen plan differs from the Knutson plan which they are now apparently willing to throw into the ash can. The Knutson plan gives this low-income group, $2,500 a year or under, which I am trying to help, a 20 percent reduction. The Allen plan gives them the same 20 percent reduction and cuts reductions in the higher income brackets to 17½, 15, and 10 percent. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] walks up to this school teacher and others like him and says "The Republican Party is your friend. We are giving you the same 2-cent reduction that Mr. KNUTSON was going to give you, but we are only cutting that $300,000-a-year man's tax $24,492 instead of $48,985 a year."

The hands are the hands of Esau but the voice is the voice of Jacob. The word "hell" is a perfectly good Biblical word. It describes a place that is so hot asbestos will burn and, of course, paper does not stand a chance. I hope I am within the rules when I tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], that his plan is altogether too slight an improvement; that I would consign his plan to the same place to which I consigned the Knutson bill in the House cafeteria the other day.

Here are a handful of typical excerpts from the hundreds of letters I am receiving:

From an Indiana former civil-service employee:

I am a retired civil service employee having worked in the local postoffice for nearly 40 years. I receive an annuity of $1,200 per year. In these times and under present conditions a man and his wife must do an awful lot of figuring to make a sum like this provide adequate living. But I can't count on all of this $1,200 as it is subject to the Federal income tax.

From a Massachusetts school teacher:

Several years ago, the school teachers were exempt from the Federal income tax. How did it come about that they lost that compensation? Two thousand dollars a year is little enough to pay a teacher, but lop off $400 income tax and what have you but a starvation wage?

From a West Virginia doubting Democrat:

I was surprised when I noticed that you were in favor of cutting the taxes in the lower brackets in order, as you said, to favor the poor man. I should think that this would be a radical departure from the old Republican Party line. If the rest of the Republican Party comes around to your way of thinking they can be assured of my support in 1948.

From a New York ex-teacher:

I happen to be a retired teacher and 20 percent reduction of income taxes would amount to 55 cents a week.

From a widow in New York State:

I am a widow 58 years old. I am trying to maintain a home by doing practical nursing. It cuts pretty deeply to have to pay the present 20-percent tax above $500 incomes. I have no dependents. Probably the most practical solution would be to get one, but I prefer not to do so if I can make the grade without.

From Austin, Tex.:

We shall use our efforts in every way to help defeat each and every Member who votes for a straight cut of 20 percent across the board.

From a Michigan insurance man:

In the past week I have heard a lot of discussion throughout central Michigan, and I believe that over 90 percent of our people favor your plan over the other.

From a New Jersey doctor:

I have been a Republican all my life and am a retired M. D. I receive a small pension of $73 a month. This, plus some savings, my wife and I must live on. I assure you it is a problem with the cost of food and commodities. Your plan is sensible.

Relieving Human Suffering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Oberlin (Ohio) Times of January 30, 1947:

RELIEVING HUMAN SUFFERING

With the war so many months over and the peace still not fully won, our devastated and divided world has reached new depths of grief and despair, of hunger and confusion. Into all this, which has most voluntary agencies standing aghast, the American Friends Service Committee has thrown its efforts to relieve human suffering and increase good will and understanding among men. The committee is working in 10 foreign countries and plans to carry its work into others as soon as possible.

The friends have no axes to grind. Their laudable history is one of work carried out in a spirit that seeks not merely to alleviate distress but to reconcile the discordant elements that caused it. All of the work of the committee grows out of the basic Quaker belief in "that of God in every man" and a profound faith in the power of love to "take away the occasion for all wars."

To do relief work, which is temporary, in a spirit that makes for permanent good will is one of the committee's major purposes. In all of its work, both at home and abroad, the committee seeks to penetrate beyond the demands of the immediate need to the deeper ills of the spirit which cause conflict among men.

Famine this winter hovers like a vulture over the ravaged earth. Fear and distrust and bitterness divide the nations, victors and vanquished. Man, instead of laying down his arms, is inventing yet more terrible weapons of destruction. It is heartening, in the face of all this, to know that the American Friends Service Committee, strengthened by the support of an ever-increasing host of like-minded individuals and groups, prepares to extend its work at home and in foreign fields.

It is heartening to know, too, that this community has an impressive participation in the Friends' relief work. Mr. and Mrs. Imre Domonkos, in charge of shipments from this vicinity, report a gratifying response from the college dormitories where they make monthly collections of clothing. They praise, too, the work of local farmers who have donated grain to the AFSC's Ralston relief cereal program. Oberlin, always quick to feel and heed the wants of the unfortunate, has been deeply unselfish in this work which is so important to the postwar world. Just last week, for instance, a local store contributed 354 pairs of hose and socks to the committee's program. Perhaps you, too, would like to make a contribution which, however small, will be gratefully received. A brief phone call to Imre Domonkos at Oberlin 9361 will give you an opportunity to do your part in relieving human suffering and increasing good will and understanding among men.

The Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include as a part thereof an article written for the Southern Lumberman by Charles P. Rogers, an attorney of Portland, Oreg. This article is an excellent statement of the portal-to-portal pay controversy, which at present is undergoing consideration by Congress.

Following is a copy of the article mentioned:

One of the most pressing problems which will face the new Congress when it convenes will be that of enacting long-overdue amendments to the Wage-Hour Act. The tremendous potential liabilities which business of all kinds is facing as a result of twisted and tortured interpretations and administrations of this law are so staggering that only by the speediest action reestablishing the original intent of Congress can most American business be released from the danger of bankruptcy. Most students of the activities of the Wage-Hour Division and the Supreme Court under this act are convinced that the uncertainties which now surround it are principally responsible for the production difficulties that have plagued industry in the last 2 years. New machinery, new plants, new research and development programs, and all capital investments needed to replenish and enlarge American industry are jeopardized or completely halted until business can know whether it is bankrupt or solvent.

When it is remembered that the primary purpose of this law was to eliminate child labor and sweatshop conditions, the perversion of the act is apparent. There is hardly an employee in the United States today who is not receiving more than the minimum wage; yet there is hardly an employer who is not threatened by some new interpretation of this act, with a possibility of retroactive double liability sufficient to bankrupt him, whenever the Administrator or a disgruntled employee gets around to it. Unless the act is immediately returned to its original concept—that of minimum wage and maximum hour legislation, American industry will continue to be completely hobbled in its effort to pour out its maximum production and thus solve our inflation and strike problems.

POSSIBLE LIABILITIES TREMENDOUS

The possible back-wage liabilities under the act as it is now being interpreted and administered, are fantastic. The logging and lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest States alone estimates its possible retroactive pay claims at $172,000,000, including the mandatory double damages now in the law. The steel industry guesses a possible $500,000,000; chemicals, $200,000,000; automobiles, $200,000,000 to $300,000,000, and so on down the line of every major industry in America. And these are back wages only—they do not take into account the greatly increased costs of future production or the decline in the amount of goods which will be produced. Using the Northwest logging and lumbering industry again for an example, it is there estimated that logs will cost $1.75 per M more to produce, and production will drop by 2 billion feet annually—a loss of approximately 93,000 badly needed new houses each year. And in proportion to its production and wages, the Southern logging and lumber industry can compute a possible retroactive wage liability, cost increase, and production loss in all respects comparable to this.

The Wage-Hour Act is, in fact, interpreted and administered as a relic of the Wallace pig-killing economy of scarcity days. In a time of our history when the national interest—even the survival of our freedom as a people—demands the maximum outpouring of goods at the lowest cost, this law is so administered as to result in lessened production and high costs. It is thus achieving the very opposite result Congress intended for it.

WHAT IS WORK?

The major troubles of the lumber and mining industry, and all industries having large manufacturing plants, are known as the portal-to-portal, travel time, or gate-to-gate theories of work. These concepts, which are different names for the same thing, arise under section 7 (a) of the act, which requires pay at one-and-one-half times the employee's regular rate for all work in excess of 40 hours per week. The specific difficulty arises because Congress did not define what is meant by the word "work." A reading of the debates, committee reports, and all other source material demonstrates clearly that nobody in Congress believed the word needed definition—whatever the parties involved had agreed was work, or custom, or practice defined as work was work. Congressmen involved also knew they were legislating to affect hundreds of different industries, thousands of plants, and millions of employees, and that no rigid definition of "work" was possible or practical. They therefore failed to define the word, which under the accepted rules of construction of statutes should have the meaning it had to the interested parties the employer, and his employees, as embodied in their custom, practice, or agreements, express or implied.

However, the Administrator and the Supreme Court have done what Congress refused to do. In the Tennessee Coal & Iron and the Jewell Ridge Coal Co. cases it was held that the dictionary definition should be applied to the word "work," whatever it meant to the employer who was paying for it and the employee who was doing it, and the man was "at work" if what he was doing:

1. Took place on the employer's property;
2. Involved physical or mental exertion; whether burdensome or not;
3. Was for the employer's benefit; and
4. Was under the employer's direction or control.

Thus it was decided that the men involved in those cases were at work while riding from the collar or portal of the mine to the working face and return, although in the latter case (Jewell Ridge) the employer and the men, through their union, the UMW, had agreed in a solemn union contract that the men were "at work" only at the working face, and were paid only on that basis. This contractual arrangement only expressed a long-continued custom of the industry, but neither the custom nor the union contract was held important in the face of the dictionary definition.

WALKING TIME

The next logical extension of this substitution of the dictionary for the ideas and agreements of men came in the Mount Clemens Pottery case, where it was decided that men were working when they were walking to work from the gate where they punched the time clock and back again at the end of the day, though this time the travel was walking, and instead of underground in a mine was in a brightly lighted factory over clean, painted floors. It was on the employer's property, walking involves exertion, the employer could not produce and sell his goods if the men did not walk from the gate to the machines, and the men were subject to the employer's control, the court said—so the men were entitled to retroactive pay for that time at the overtime rate, doubled, once again notwithstanding a long-continued custom to the contrary.

This is the situation which must be faced by the whole logging and lumber industry, the steel, rubber, aircraft, chemical, meat, automobile, and all other industries having woods or large plants to man. The meaning of the word "work" has been changed, not by Congress but by the Wage-Hour Administrator and the courts which acquiesced in his ideas. And it has been changed not only for the future, which would be bad enough, but for the past, and not only at the hourly rate but for three times that amount, since it is double the overtime rate.

Nor are the act's complexities, with its double, retroactive penalties, confined to this subject. The meaning of "regular rate" is now claimed to have changed to the "average rate" per week, arrived at by dividing all amounts paid by the hours worked, in the computation of overtime—an idea which

often results in pyramiding overtime on overtime, and if upheld would cost the United States Treasury somewhere between two and six billion (this is not a misprint) dollars under cost-plus stevedoring contracts.

Every business, no matter how small, faces the heavy fog of financial uncertainty—likewise double and retroactive—when window washers of an office building are said to be necessary for production for interstate commerce, or a small garage repairing an occasional log truck is said to be subject to this Federal law.

NO COMPROMISE

And if the crystal ball and the lawyer can't predict what will change next under this law, and the employer is found to have violated it unknowingly, with the heavy penalties facing him, he may not, the courts say, compromise this past burden with his employees, though not to do so may mean bankruptcy and his employees might want to compromise rather than lose their jobs through the employer's insolvency. This is not a situation created by Congress, for nothing in the act forbids such an agreement—it results solely from decisions of the Supreme Court.

In short, the wage-hour law has been turned far away from the objective Congress had in mind, and has become a legal booby trap so dangerous as to threaten all industrial and economic progress of our Nation. This is a situation demanding the promptest action by the new Congress, for until the shackles of uncertainty and bankruptcy can be struck from business, large and small, expansion, new equipment, and research are almost impossible. No real industrial progress will be possible in America until Congress strikes down this great evil which is being perpetrated in the name of social progress.

Letters to Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday February 6, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the New London Day on February 4, 1947, entitled "Letters to Congressmen":

LETTERS TO CONGRESSMEN

The CIO News has been endeavoring to awaken members of CIO unions to their right—nay, their duty—to write to their Members of Congress about important legislation. Much of what the CIO newspaper says is literal truth—not subject to the slightest criticism.

It points out that the Member of Congress represents the voters of his district or State, as the case may be; that what the voter thinks and wants should have considerable influence with the Member (there is room for a little qualification on that score, but more on that point later); that unless the voters write to him and tell him what they think, he won't know; that no one letter is going to influence his vote one way or the other, but many letters will, presumably; that the quickest way of putting your Congressman to work for you is to write to him, not once but frequently, as the occasion demands.

This is all very fine if all of the people, representing all shades of opinion, can be induced to write to their Representatives and Senators, not just once but frequently, as the need seems to arise. If only the CIO members follow this advice, in any great numbers, it stands to reason that the legislator is going to get a very one-sided picture of what his constituents want him to do. As for the influence upon the Member, there is reason for some argument there. There have been legislators who have bluntly refused to vote for some measure that they knew to be unwise even though deluged with a letter-writing campaign induced by some special interests. Thus, during the OPA fight, there was a determined effort on the part of OPA to bury legislators in letters favoring continuance. They urged people to write Congress. No one urged those against continuance to express their views.

In short any Representative or Senator must bear in mind that his mail does not necessarily provide a true cross-section of the wishes of his constituents, particularly when he begins getting form letters or form postcards. He must learn to separate the inspired letter from the spontaneously sincere letter. Certainly inspired letters should carry some weight with him, but they are not as valuable as an indication of what the people want as the uninspired ones. Evaluation of these letters is part of the Congressman's job. After he has digested all of them, he must still use his own best judgment in deciding how he will vote, if he is to represent the people properly. If he doesn't do this he will, quite likely, be voting for an organized minority instead of for the rank and file of the people—for the majority of his constituents, insofar as he can determine what they want.

Finally, there is one point that some organizations advocating letter writing to congressional organizations do not altogether appreciate—the fact that the Congressman or Senator may have no means of handling many thousands of letters readily. The late Senator Francis T. Maloney once said that he received 15,000 letters on one important issue before Congress, and that it took weeks for his clerical staff to sort them out, answer them, and give him, the tabulated result, by which time he had made up his mind what he was going to do in this important matter anyway, since far more information on it was available to him than to 90 percent of the people who wrote to him.

A St. Louis World's Fair in 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday February 6, 1947

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, recently the suggestion has been advanced that a second World's Fair be held in St. Louis in 1953, commemorating the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase. The suggestion has met with enthusiastic response by representatives of over a hundred civic groups in St. Louis and the idea seems to have caught on. At the present time a large committee is working on the project and it seems really probable that the idea has a good chance to materialize.

Under leave granted me, I include, as part of my remarks, the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times on January 27 on the subject of another St. Louis World's Fair:

AN IDEA TAKES SHAPE

The dream of another St. Louis world's fair—a supercelebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase in 1953—began to assume form at last Friday's meeting of the representatives of 80 outstanding community organizations in the Academy of Science. Further progress will be the announcement, in a day or two, of a preliminary survey committee by Stratford Lee Morton, temporary chairman.

This group should study all the major aspects of the proposal—theme, site, scope, cost, financing, participants, publicity, construction, housing, etc.—so that a fairly comprehensive picture may be unveiled in April. This report, obviously, will be subject to change; but it ought to get the many ideas expressed more or less spontaneously on Friday down to a few common denominators as the base for more specific plans.

The measure of enthusiasm which St. Louis can muster for this work may well be a prevision of the city's future. Eagerness and imagination—tempered by prudence—will promise even more than a thrilling exposition. Naturally, we are unmindful and proud that the suggestion for a 1953 fair was first made on this page, yet we concede that the idea is too big to be exploited as a one-newspaper promotion.

We feel that not only the other newspapers, but all agencies and institutions of influence in St. Louis will further the project with zeal and with energy as its feasibility and its many advantages are made increasingly apparent.

There are those who say that the day of great fairs is past, but the evidence is against them. The pattern of 1904 may well be outdated, but a new pattern can be found for new times—times in which the ease and speed of travel and the heightened interest of people everywhere in people everywhere else can bring together larger crowds than any before assembled. Others say that the world is now too poor for such ventures. But is not enterprise the specific for poverty? Consider Chicago's two fairs held in years of panic and depression. There is no obstacle which will not yield to intelligent determination.

The occasion is a significant one—commemoration of the "real-estate deal" by which Thomas Jefferson insured that the United States should become a world power. It is fitting that the other powers should now join in a celebration which in itself could make a great contribution to that closer union of the peoples of the world which will enable them to live in peace and plenty.

It is a great undertaking worthy of great effort.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include two articles from the United States Municipal News, a service of the United States Conference of Mayors, entitled "Rent Control" and "For the Record." They follow:

RENT CONTROL

In connection with a resolution adopted by the United States Conference of Mayors calling for continuation of adequate and fair rent control, the New York Herald Tribune on January 26 said:

"ADEQUATE AND FAIR CONTROL

"The Nation's mayors in conference in Washington regarded housing as their most urgent problem. Accordingly they endorsed the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill as the 'only practicable means' of meeting the housing needs of all. They also asked Congress to continue 'adequate and fair' rent control until the housing shortage ends. That the shortage will not end on June 30, the date of expiration of rent control, is evident to all.

"The mayors agreed that removal of all control would result in hundreds of thousands of evictions and disruption of the lives of millions. Without rent ceilings, said Mayor Stanley Church, of New Rochelle, homes in many areas would go to 'the highest bidders, forcing rents above the ability of veterans and people of modest means to pay.' The argument of those who would have controls lifted immediately is that rent increases would be temporary because relief of the housing shortage would be speeded. But because it takes months to build homes, particularly apartment houses and huge rental housing projects, the period before relief can come must be longer than in the case of food, clothing, and other necessities of family life. This time element is, of course, but one factor which puts rents in a special category. It seems to us to make clear the need for rent control, even without consideration being given to the added inflationary pressure that would be exerted by a sharp upward movement in the cost of so substantial an item as rent in the ordinary man's budget.

"Senator TAFT told the Mayors' Conference that he would support some form of extended rent control. Despite tremendous pressure against it, that seems to be the prevailing attitude in Congress. Ceilings may have to be modified, since landlords' expenses follow a general upward trend. But the counsel of the mayors, based on experience with the plight of home seekers in all parts of the country, should find responsive ears in Washington. The multiple hardship that would follow removal now of the protection afforded by adequate and fair control is something that no mayor or no Member of Congress can contemplate with equanimity."

FOR THE RECORD

From the proceedings of the annual conference of the United States Conference of Mayors on January 21, 1947:

"Mayor RILEY, of Portland, Oreg. I should like to ask Mr. Green if the American Federation of Labor condones, supports, or believes in municipal employees striking against their government.

"Mr. WILLIAM GREEN, president of the American Federation of Labor. I will say to you, Mayor, frankly, that the American Federation of Labor made a public pronouncement a long time ago that the employees of States, counties, and municipalities occupy a different relationship to the people and to their employers than do those employed in private industry. For that reason, the American Federation of Labor does not condone or approve strikes of State, county, or municipal employees against the government."

Break-Down in Occupation Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, what is happening to our occupation forces in Germany? When this question was first raised, some weeks ago, the State Department was quick to discourage any thought of an investigation. To probe into the matter at this time, it was claimed, would embarrass the Government in its negotiations with the other powers.

And so the question was sidetracked.

The hush-hush policy of the State and War Departments has veiled the whole affair in official secrecy, but the letters coming through from the men who serve in the occupation army, tell us that all is far from well.

Perhaps our officers are becoming infected with the atmosphere of military caste, which is so characteristic of the country which they occupy.

On the theory that an officer can do no wrong, a wide gulf is now separating them from the men in the ranks whom they profess to lead. Discipline is weakening. Demoralization is setting in. There is no doubt but that the Germans are privately ridiculing our behavior.

Here's what one American soldier reports of the goings-on, and I quote from a letter which reads as follows:

HEADQUARTERS AND HEADQUARTERS TROOP,
FORTY-SECOND CONSTABULARY SQUADRON,
Freising, Germany, December 8, 1946.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
Lawrence, Mass.

SIR: I feel it necessary to bring to your attention some very adverse conditions being practiced over here in this particular unit.

As you know and I know, our food situation is in a serious condition, yet there are numerous high-ranking officers here that have their American families as well as having German families eating our basic rations. The local officers' mess located here in Freising for the field grade has nine and sometimes more "krauts" living in the mess quarters and, of course, eating as well. The officers can't shake these "shack" material because they know too much of what is going on here. This is a little example: The mess sergeant is told how and what to do by a lieutenant colonel's "kraut." Good many times we GI's have to go without fresh meats and other perishables, yet it has been politely told that what these "krauts" want they will have it. This is going a bit too far, so am writing you to see what can be done to remedy such conditions. This is not the only case like this and I know some other conditions where we are definitely being held down because someone is afraid we will talk.

In the meantime, I hope you can find some solution and remedy it.

Respectfully yours,
AN AMERICAN SOLDIER.

We set out to show the Germans the qualities of our democracy. We spoke to them of our way of life in glowing terms. We forgot that example is the most effective teacher. The example quoted above belies all the noble words. The conduct of some of our officers is not calculated to reeducate the followers of Hitler. It merely confirms that misguided belief. If this continues, the great efforts and sacrifices that were made to win the war will be undone by the selfish and irresponsible actions of a few who bring disgrace to the country they represent.

This let-down is indefensible.

It must be stopped before it gets worse.

To attempt to conceal it, on the grounds of political expediency, is to condone the evil.

Not only is the long-range purpose of our occupation being undermined by this lax behavior but the men in the ranks are becoming cynical and disillusioned. This is reflected in the letters they send home. It is with mixed feelings of worry and anger that we receive the news of deterioration in the morale of our occupation forces in Germany.

For the sake of men like An American Soldier, who have the courage to brave official displeasure, in order to expose these discriminatory and demoralizing practices, the Congress should demand an immediate and thorough investigation.

The war is over and there is no justification for secrecy. The American people want to get at the root of this problem. The sooner we clean house in our occupation forces, the sooner we shall restore morale to the Army, and show the Germans a true example of democracy.

The time has come to open the book and get the whole story.

Deportation of Hungarian Inhabitants of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram and letters:

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., *January 18, 1947.*

Congressman JOHN D. LODGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Clergymen's directors of New England Hungarian Press protest inhuman that deportation of Hungarian inhabitants of Czechoslovakia into slave labor. We request immediate intervention in their behalf.

Father CHERNITZKY, *Editor.*

JANUARY 21, 1947.

Father CHERNITZKY,
Bridgeport, Conn.

DEAR FATHER: In reply to your telegram, I am pleased to advise you that I immediately communicated with the Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, protesting vigorously the inhuman deportation of Hungarian inhabitants of Czechoslovakia. I also requested the Under Secretary to investigate this matter and to give me a full report. I want to assure you and all my good friends of Hungarian descent in Fairfield County that I am extremely sympathetic in respect to this matter, and that I shall do everything I can to remedy this inhuman situation.

With best wishes and looking forward to seeing you very soon.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

JANUARY 21, 1947.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Under Secretary of State, State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ACHESON: I have received a telegram from a very eminent constituent of mine, Father Chernitzky, of Bridgeport, Conn.,

protesting the inhuman deportation of Hungarian inhabitants in Czechoslovakia into slave labor camps.

I shall appreciate it if you will be so kind as to have an investigation made into this matter and give me a full report at your earliest convenience. I feel very strongly that we must take the lead in this country in protesting such actions.

I thank you in advance for your courtesy in this matter and send you my best wishes and kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

FEBRUARY 4, 1947.

The Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LODGE: I have received your letter of January 21, 1947, in which you refer to a telegram addressed to you by Father Chernitzky of Bridgeport, Conn., concerning the situation of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia and request a full report on the matter.

The position of the United States Government on the transfer of populations generally and of Hungarian minorities specifically was set forth in a Department of State press release of December 7, 1945, as follows:

"It is this Government's view that problems involving the large-scale transfer or exchange of populations are susceptible of solution only on the basis of international agreement and not by unilateral action. Where such problems affect Hungary, we would regard them as proper subjects, in the first instance, for mutual agreement between Hungary and the neighboring states directly concerned and ultimately for consideration or review in connection with the peace settlement with Hungary. This Government will use its influence to seek solutions which promise to contribute to friendly and cooperative relations between the nations immediately concerned and to assure freedom from persecution and from unnecessary hardships for the ordinary men and women involved."

Pursuant to the policy thus stated, this Government has sought to encourage the Czechoslovak and Hungarian Governments to resolve through friendly bilateral negotiations their differences concerning the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia, a problem which took form with the peace settlement of 1920 and became acute as a result of Hungary's role in World War II as an Axis satellite and the expressed desire of Czechoslovakia to expel from its territory a large part of the minority. Negotiations undertaken by the two governments led to the conclusion of an agreement on February 27, 1946, providing for an equal exchange of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia and Slovaks in Hungary. This voluntary agreement was welcomed by the United States Government, although it was recognized as affording only a partial solution of the problem inasmuch as the number of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia greatly exceeded the number of Slovaks in Hungary. Unfortunately, the agreement has not been carried out in the intervening months, and controversy has arisen between the two signatory governments over the interpretation and execution of its terms and the treatment being accorded to the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia. In the latter connection, the operation of the Czechoslovak compulsory labor decree of September 1945, which in Slovakia is applied to Hungarians as well as Slovaks, has intensified differences between the two countries and served to delay implementation of the February 194[illegible] agreement and impede amicable settlement of the minority issue.

Meanwhile, in the discussion of the problem of the Hungarian minority at the conference of 21 nations which met in Paris, July to October 1946, the United States delegation opposed a Czechoslovak amendment to the draft peace treaty with Hungary which would have authorized the forced transfer of a maximum of 200,000 persons of Magyar ethnic origin. The delegation supported, however, the inclusion of clauses (Article 5 of the treaty) calling for bilateral negotiations between Hungary and Czechoslovakia for the settlement of the minority problem. In stating the views of this Government on these matters at the Plenary Session of the conference on October 12, 1946, the Honorable Walter Bedell Smith reaffirmed the basic position of the United States as follows:

"We sympathized with the motives behind the Czechoslovak desire to solve this minority problem once and for all but for humanitarian reasons we could not look with favor on incorporating into a treaty of peace the principle of a forced unilateral transfer of population. The United States consistently supported the view that the subject was one for bilateral negotiations between the two countries concerned and that any solution of the minority problem which was not based on a mutually satisfactory agreement would remain a source of future friction between them and hamper the growth of friendly relations which is so necessary for the peaceful development of Central Europe. We also believe that the principle of voluntary transfer should be stressed to the utmost and that every effort should be made—through minor territorial adjustments if necessary—to reduce to a minimum the number of people to be uprooted from the land on which in many cases they and their ancestors have been living for generations."

The Department of State is giving close attention to the Czechoslovak-Hungarian minority question in all of its aspects. The Department considers the early implementation of the February 27 agreement as a most important and desirable step preliminary to the initiation of the further bilateral negotiations envisaged under the terms of the peace treaty and will continue to encourage such negotiations looking toward a definitive solution of this difficult problem and the promotion of peace and stability in the Central European area.

Copies of Department of State press release No. 725 of October 14, 1946, and the text of article 5 of the peace treaty with Hungary as finally approved by the Council of Foreign Ministers are enclosed for your convenient reference.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Under Secretary.

FEBRUARY 5, 1947.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Under Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ACHESON: Thank you very kindly for your courteous and early reply to my letter of January 21, with respect to the predicament of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia.

I am pleased to have the statement of the Hon. Walter Bedell Smith and also the copy of the text of article 5 of the Peace Treaty with Hungary.

While the bilateral negotiations recommended by the American Ambassador to Russia are infinitely to be preferred to a forced unilateral transfer of population, I feel that it is also vital that we do our best to prevent what in fact may be a forced transfer under the guise of bilateral negotiations. This would be contrary to the intent of the article in question. From the American Ambassador's statement I assume that we shall be ready at all times to protect these minorities against inhuman treatment.

As often happens in human affairs, there may be a wide gap between the agreements reached and the action taken under these agreements. I am of the opinion that our responsibility in this connection does not cease until the terms of the agreement have in fact been carried out.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of your letter to Father Chernitzky and I know that it will be of great interest to the Americans of Hungarian descent in my congressional district.

With renewed thanks and kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

FEBRUARY 5, 1947.

Father CHERNITZKY,
Bridgeport, Conn.

DEAR FATHER: In further reference to your telegram and to my letter to you of January 21, I am sending you herewith a copy of a letter which I received today from the Undersecretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson, as well as a copy of my reply to his letter.

These letters are self-explanatory, and I shall be interested to have your comments.

In any event you may rest assured that my interest in this matter will not abate until it has been brought to a satisfactory and humane solution.

With best wishes and regrets that I did not see you on January 26.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

Westward the Course of Empire Takes Its Way—True in American History

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the term "West," even as a geographic designation, has had varied and different meanings at different periods throughout American history. However, regardless of its different meanings, at all times it has been a lodestone attracting adventurous spirits toward the setting sun, and it has always connoted a realm of opportunities for freer life and greater prosperity for those who migrated thither. Especially after each war in American history have adventurous veterans, still full of energy and excitement, turned their faces toward the West to carve new homes or fortunes in the wilderness, and thus America has expanded from sea to shining sea. This is to say that war veterans have swelled the ranks but have not been the only sons of America who faced toward the West to build new communities.

We may properly consider the Original Thirteen States as the mother country and all of the other 35 States in the present Union as colonial offspring. Viewed in that light, the United States of America, considering the mother country consisting of the Thirteen Original States, has been the greatest and wisest colonizing Nation in the history of the world, because the parent Nation has been liberal in encouraging the growth of western communities to make new States and has helped them paternally, rather than selfishly, and in turn has been mutually helped by the new commonwealths which have grown up

throughout the West. Such has been the policy of mutually helpful development viewed generally, but it has not been entirely good and wholesome in all respects.

POLICY OF THE EAST TOWARD THE WEST

Perhaps we ought not to mention exceptions to the rule, but the policy of the East toward the West in American history has not been altogether altruistic and consciously helpful. There have been some unworthy exploitations and considerable neglect of the offspring by the parent. There have usually been in each generation some timid souls in the old home portion of the country who fear the West and who wish to legislate and so shape national policies as to curb the growing communities of the West. Other selfish souls have desired and attempted to exploit the West, and I am sorry to say have succeeded in too many cases. That is the reason why, in describing the attitude of the mother East toward the offspring in the West, it is only in general and viewed as a whole that we can say it has been wise, broad visioned, and mutually helpful.

Politically, the founding fathers not only made it possible for new commonwealths to be peopled and developed in the West, but gave encouragement to such a policy and then gave to all of them a share in the political heritage of America and a rightful place in the political system of our Government. Several ordinances, beginning in 1784, but particularly the ordinance of 1787, furnished wise provision of law for the colonizing of the West and offered great inducement for settlers to move out of the old communities and make their homes in such new communities. The Constitution of the United States, framed in 1787, went even further in this wise and generous policy by providing that new States should be formed as the western territory became settled, and when such new States were formed, they should be admitted to this Union on terms of equality with the original States. With all of these generous basic provisions, the American people were enticed to leave their homes in the Eastern States when conditions became a little too crowded and to make new homes further west where all the political advantages, rights, and privileges of citizens, should prevail and be fully as wholesome and American as those they had previously known. Thus the United States of America has grown from Thirteen Original States to a group of 48 equal States in one indestructible Union.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES "OUT WEST"

It was the economic opportunities that appealed to many Americans to move west, but without political equality offered in the new home, every western migrant might have hesitated to give up what he had and was sure of in the old home along the Atlantic seaboard to go into a new commonwealth, or a commonwealth to be, some place farther west. What were these economic inducements? Well, they were many and varied. Perhaps the first that should be mentioned was land—new land. There was an abudance of land all during the early years of American history, for fortunately our young Republic from the beginning had extended boundaries, offering plenty of room to grow. Until recently, the presence of a great body of land belonging to the Government and considered as public domain, and which might be had for the asking, has been a powerful drawing card. As time passed, much of this good land was taken by settlers as new homes in private ownership. While great areas still remain as public domain, we reached a time about a generation ago when it appeared that practically all of the good land had been taken by settlers and that which remained was hardly worth the taking. This last conclusion seems logical, as is generally accepted, but it is found not to be so, and I shall want to return to it later for an explanation.

Besides the inducement of free land on which to make new homes, there was wealth to be expoited in the West. Some of this natural wealth might be considered separate and apart from ownership of the land, although some of it was bound up with land ownership. One of the greatest sources of natural wealth offered the daring and hardy American adventurers at the very beginnings of western exploitation was in the valuable pelts of the fur-bearing animals. A host of American pioneers became hunters and trappers. Daniel Boone might well be cited as an example of those early pioneers who lived by their skill as hunters. The area west of the Mississippi River was first explored and made to yield profits by the fur hunter and the trapper. Not only did the Hudson Bay Co. in the northern wilds have a vast army of men gathering pelts from all over North America, but American citizens under the Stars and Stripes, and often before our flag was raised, rivaled the Great English Hudson Bay Co. in that business.

Certainly first explorers in the Rocky Mountain area were the fur trappers and traders. The story is told that an eastern traveler, seeing a huge sign over a trading post with the letters "H. B. C.," which meant, of course, the Hudson Bay Co., said, "I presume that means 'Here before Christ'." Well, the Hudson Bay Co.'s men were in the West not before Christ but before any other white men or civilized men attempted to live there. However, the Hudson Bay Co. employees, even in the Rocky Mountain region, which is now a part of the United States, were not there before our own hardy and courageous American mountain men who were tapping the same resource and rivaling the British company in this work. Our Nation clinched its hold upon the Columbia River watershed because American fur traders beat the British at this game in that area. John Jacob Astor not only built a fortune out of Rocky Mountain pelts, so that it may be said "he made his money out of our hides," but he established America's claim to what is now our Pacific Northwest, because of this successful business. Astoria, near the mouth of the Columbia River, attests to that success.

The wealth in the hidden minerals was another great inducement to move west. Of course, gold was the chief attraction to begin with, and still is important, but other minerals regarded as less valuable have caused great portions of the West to be developed. Silver has been only a little less significant than gold, and copper and other utilitarian metals have caused entire communities to grow up and whole commonwealths to be supported by the wealth taken from the earth. The history of American mining is a thrilling and exciting one, and the gold rushes have been only a little more dramatic than some of the other mining developments. Whole chapters in American economic history have been written by gold, by silver, yes—even by copper—when the story is completely told.

Now, some of these natural sources of wealth may have been exploited and apparently exhausted and new sources have come into play to take their place, but I know of none of these original sources which have been completely exhausted and the end of their story written. Such is not true even of the fur trade that it is ended, for the West is still producing furs. Certainly it is not true of mineral production, for the West has scarcely been scratched as to its possibilities for producing mineral wealth. All that has already happened in American mining is but a prelude to the whole story.

Stock raising and grazing on the public domain has been another fruitful source of wealth to the western pioneer, and a great inducement for people to go out West to make their homes. This industry has been one of the basic foundations of every far western community, and although there is now less range land that may be profitably grazed today, the livestock industry in the West is not declining, but rather it is now going through a stage of evolution with the prospect that it may be a greater source of wealth than heretofore. No more thrilling or interesting history can be found in the whole epic of America than the story of the cattle industry and related branches of the livestock industry on the Great Plains, in the mountains, and on the ranges between the Mississippi River and the Pacific Ocean.

Regardless of what language is spoken, or rather what accent is used, in about 20 of our Western States, there is always to be found a cowboy or many cowboys named "Tex" because they are from Texas. That is rather logical because the four-footed inhabitants also came from Texas. Their first basic economy in most of these Western States was a bovine economy which also came out of Texas. Not that the cattle phase overshadows the human phase of the civilization, but altogether the civilization of 20 Western States may not inappropriately be called "a bovine civilization." The Longhorns out of Texas, north and west, gave economic stability and wealth to the Great Plains and to the intermountain region, and put meaning into the

statement that "the cow is the mother of the West."

The story of the West cannot be told without that part of it which deals with trail blazing and trail making. This involves not only routes of travel but methods of travel. Especially does it involve the thrilling story of the conquest of desert and mountain in such a way that only a decade or two before was thought to be impossible. Less than 20 years before the driving of the golden spike near Ogden, Utah, which completed the first Pacific railroad, it was universally believed that it would never be humanly possible to build a railroad from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, the conquest of the West includes the conquest of hostile area and the making of quick and easy transportation possible. The iron horse did it.

IRRIGATION—GREATEST PHASE OF WESTERN DEVELOPMENT

In recent years the development of new farm homes on irrigated land has become the most noticeable phase of western development. For four decades the Government, through the Bureau of Reclamation, has been reclaiming arid and semiarid lands in 17 Western States and making such land, otherwise valueless, the most productive in the world. Nearly a billion dollars to date have been expended of Government funds in this great capital development. Under the provisions of a wise reclamation law, sponsored by Theodore Roosevelt and other leaders in his day and enacted in 1902, every dollar of Federal funds thus invested in reclamation projects is reimbursable and thus returned to the Federal Treasury.

Of the 20,000,000 acres of irrigated lands in our West, only 20 percent has been developed by the Government through the Bureau of Reclamation, the other 80 percent having been privately developed. This private development, however, was encouraged by the Government assistance in the program, and much of it could not have been done without the basic work which the Government provided. It should be clearly understood that, although another 20,000,000 acres are possible of reclamation through the maximum water uses in the West, the easier projects which private enterprise could and did develop have now been completed and practically all of the remaining work must be done by the Government, if done at all. An important fact to bear in mind is that the investment which the Government has made, which outlay itself is returnable to the Treasury, has been the cause of many times that amount of private wealth production. The benefits are multiplied, for irrigation projects have each year brought into the Treasury, through taxes, more than the total the Government has thus far spent on them through these four decades.

In the critical periods of our national economy following each war, the West has offered wealth-producing opportunities which the American people have wisely utilized. Not to go back to the earliest wars, I need but mention that after the Civil War many veterans who had worn the blue and many who had worn the gray made their homes in the far West, and the energies of our young Nation went into conquering the wilderness—a part of which consisted of building transcontinental railroads. The impossible was accomplished in a remarkably short time, and a vast area greater than the original United States was added to America's economic map and to our National Capital. After the First World War, there was the same westward urge for veterans, and a disproportionately large number made their homes in the West. The manufacture of millions of automobiles and automotive vehicles, the paving of millions of miles of public highways, gave an outlet to the Nation's energy, gave employment to the released labor force, and increased the Nation's wealth. The Second World War, having been greater than all the others, now calls for opportunities of recuperation greater than the others. My thesis is that a wise and proper development of the West will answer the Nation's needs in the present post-war period for expanding economy, profitable employment of labor, and opportunity of creating new wealth better than the West has ever done that before. How can this be done?

It can be done with renewed effectiveness by extending each and every line of western development which has heretofore been used so profitably. To pass over the possibilities of mineral development, livestock production, and the garnering in the natural wealth of the land, I would first suggest the development of our western rivers, using their life-giving waters for making the warm earth fruitful, and in conjunction therewith producing an abundance of hydroelectric power. Even with a $1,000,000,000 investment in reclamation projects and 20,000,000 acres of land irrigated, already less than 20 percent of its possible wealth production has thus far occurred even though 50 percent of the land possible of irrigation has been reclaimed. I am convinced of the accuracy of the figures just quoted, but I can see the need of further explanation of them which I hope later to give.

THE SUNSHINE RUSH

There are intangible values which cannot be measured in the Nation's balance sheet. Great and dramatic as the gold rush was, the sunshine rush has been greater, even more dramatic, and I think of greater value to our people. Climatic advantages throughout the West are recognized so that a great and increasing stream of migration, much of it under doctor's orders, is heading toward the West. The West is not only a good place in which to get well but is even better as a place in which to stay well. Tourists and the sight-seeing public find that the marvelous West has a cure for the mind as well as the body, and for that reason large sections of the West have become the Nation's recreational area and the playground of the people. In stabilizing our postwar economics and building a better America, the best and most fruitful section of the country on which to spend our energies is the far West.

The Jenkins Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of manufacturers of highly competitive products, such as textile, shoes, glassware, watches, and pottery, and their many thousands of employees are very fearful of the great influx of goods into our country that is sure to follow from the free-trade policies of the present New Deal State Department.

The cheap-labor countries, now that the war is over, are stepping up their production tremendously. The State Department under free-trade policies of Hull and Clayton have reduced tariff rates until many of them are lower now than they have ever been. They propose to lower them further. The result can only be a flood of our markets with the cheap labor goods of the world. In 1946 more goods were imported than in any year in our history. Europe and Japan are already preparing to take our markets. What will our workingmen do who produce these commodities? The situation demands immediate action and the Republican Party cannot shirk the responsibility.

House Resolution No. 52, known as the Jenkins resolution, would, if passed and carried out by the President, relieve this situation. These manufacturers and their employees have been loyally supporting this resolution. It is important that something be done at once for the State Department is making all preparations to go to the Geneva Conference in April to carry out its well-known purpose of establishing free trade.

According to the press, certain prominent Senators are cooperating with the State Department in a program which will not relieve the situation and which plan has been rejected by the Republican membership of the Ways and Means Committee. The Ways and Means Committee now proposes to hold public hearings on the whole subject commencing on February 24. I am sure that these hearings will develop facts that will justify the immediate adoption of the Jenkins resolution.

The industries and their employees know that they can expect no relief from the State Department. Naturally, they are looking to the Republican Party. I hope the Republicans will assume this responsibility courageously. The State Department's claim, that no course except its course will assure the successful completion of peace conferences now pending, is not well founded. We have not forgotten the State Department's strong claims made before the war that the passage of the reciprocal-trade-agreements bill was absolutely necessary and would be a complete guaranty of peace. In spite of this guaranty we had the greatest war that the world has ever seen.

It is one thing to give away food and clothing to the needy, but it is another thing to give away our industry and the jobs of workers of our country.

Pertinent Observation Concerning Income Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1947

REDUCED TAXES AND INDUSTRIAL UNREST

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a cut of 20 percent in our personal income taxes would amount to a rebate of three and a half billion dollars to the American taxpayers. Treasury officials tell us that the greater part of the three and a half billion rebate would go to taxpayers in the lower brackets. That means Uncle Sam would not dip his big hand quite so deeply into the pay envelopes of the workingmen of America; it means their take-home pay would be increased by that amount; and it means the housewives of America would have that much more to spend for necessary food, clothes, fuel, and rent. Such a tax reduction, therefore, would operate the same as a pay increase for the workers of America.

Today rumblings of industrial unrest fill the air. Threats of strikes and work stoppages that are to come are heard everywhere. An automatic increase in take-home pay for the workers of America at this time, brought about by a reduction in the amount Uncle Sam extracts from their pay envelopes, would act as an antidote for these threatened strikes for higher pay.

HOW OUR PRESENT INCOME TAX WORKS

Mr. Speaker, here are three illustrations of how our present income tax works:

First. John Jones is a successful farmer. As such he pays a 20 percent Federal income tax. He raises 1,000 bushels of corn, or wheat, or soybeans, or any other grain. Uncle Sam takes 200 bushels of the 1,000 bushels for taxes, leaving John Jones 800 bushels for himself. If John Jones raises cattle or hogs, Uncle Sam takes one out of every five for taxes.

Second. John Smith is a factory worker receiving good pay. He works 40 hours per week. Uncle Sam takes 8 hours pay out of the wages John Smith earns each week for taxes, leaving John Smith 32 hours' wages. John Smith therefore works one 8-hour day each week for Uncle Sam, and four 8-hour days each week for his family.

Third. John Doe is a successful lawyer, doctor, dentist, teacher, or merchant, with a good income. He has to pay Uncle Sam more than 20 percent of his income in taxes, so he works for Uncle Sam more than one day in five each week.

Perhaps Uncle Sam is getting more than his share of the American taxpayer's time and money.

THE TAX PROGRAM OF CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, the following is the tentative tax program of the Eightieth Congress as I see it:

First. Freeze war-excise-tax rates at present levels for an indefinite period to give time for a complete study and overhauling of the whole tax structure.

Second. Reduce Federal income taxes immediately to carry out a definite promise made; to stimulate business expansion; and to provide necessary investment capital.

Third. Make a thoroughgoing study of the entire Federal tax structure with the view of making necessary adjustments, removing present inequities, abolishing certain nuisance taxes, and with the hope that a tailor-made, integrated, smooth-working, efficient tax program can be worked out that will fit into the economic situation of today. This is a monumental task that will require exhaustive public hearings, months of time, and real work. This task must be done if we want to insure industrial activity, full employment, and an expanding economy in the years ahead.

DO YOU KNOW?

Mr. Speaker, a $1,500-a-year man, with a family of two children, pays no Federal income tax. A $2,500-a-year man, with a family of two children, pays $95 Federal income tax. A $3,000-a-year man, with a family of two children, pays $190 Federal income tax. A $5,000-a-year man, with a family of two children, pays $589 Federal income tax. A $10,000-a-year man, with a family of two children, pays $1,862 Federal income tax. A $50,000-a-year man, with a family of two children, pays $24,111 Federal income tax. A $500,000-a-year man, with a family of two children, pays $406,600 Federal income tax. A $1,000,000-a-year man, with a family of two children, pays $838,850 Federal income tax.

And on top of these Federal taxes the taxpayer must pay State income taxes in most States which further greatly reduces the amount he has left after Uncle Sam gets his.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent request that was granted, I now insert two short timely editorials that I want every Republican Member of this House to read and ponder over.

[From the Chicago Tribune of February 3, 1947]

THE REPUBLICAN TAX PROGRAM

When Representative KNUTSON first proposed the 20-percent cut across the board in taxes on 1947 individual incomes, the plan was widely and instantly acclaimed. It offered the people exactly what they expected a Republican victory to yield them—prompt and substantial tax relief.

Many Republican leaders in Congress endorsed Mr. KNUTSON'S proposal. For example, a few days after the election, Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts, slated for the Speakership, gave the plan his blessing. He said Congress should approve the 20-percent cut as quickly as possible and then, when plenty of time was available, consider the longer range tax program.

That was good advice in November and it is still good advice. Failure to follow it will prove extremely damaging to Republican prospects in 1948.

The people threw out the New Deal because they had had more than enough of New Deal theories of government, prominent among which was the use of taxation as an instrument for social revolution. The New Dealers for years had been using the taxing power to punish success in business and the professions. The Republicans won; and now we find many influential leaders of the Republican Party in Congress talking like the best of New Dealers.

"As a dog returneth to his vomit," reads the familiar verse in Proverbs, "so a fool returneth to his folly." The opponents of Mr. KNUTSON'S plan are out-dogging the proverbial dog. It isn't their own folly to which they are returning but the folly of the party whose policies they were pledged to overthrow.

Representative ENGEL of Michigan is known as an able and conscientious Congressman but he deserved the rebuke that Mr. KNUTSON handed him the other day. Mr. KNUTSON wanted to know if Mr. ENGEL had joined the CIO, and it was a fair thrust for Mr. ENGEL is behaving in this matter like a faithful exponent of the CIO line.

The Knutson proposal is comprehensive and comprehensible, great and rare virtues in a tax bill. Everybody can understand what the plan means without the assistance of learned counsel and a certified public accountant. A return to the New Deal theory of taxation for punishment will achieve nothing better than confusion of the public, division in the Republican ranks, and the resumption of class conflict in all its bitterness. In these circumstances, the victory in November will prove to have been nothing more than the victory of the Republican New Dealers over the Democratic New Dealers.

[From Washington Times-Herald of February 1, 1947]

FISH OR CUT BAIT

Tax reduction is taking up much of the attention of the Republicans controlling the Eightieth Congress. From remarks dropped in the last few days by men like Speaker JOE MARTIN, of the House, and Representative KNUTSON, of Minnesota, we infer that the tax-cutting job does not look as easy now as it did before the election.

MARTIN, for instance, says that, while the Republicans still would love to cut personal income taxes 20 percent across the board, "of course, that has to come after we find out whether we can balance the budget."

The budget referred to is the Truman request for more than thirty-seven and one-half billions for the Government to spend in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. When the President first unveiled these colossal demands, the Republican leadership gave them the "horse laugh" and talked confidently about slashing them by four to eight billions.

Now, apparently, the facts of budget life are coming home to Martin, Knutson & Co.

The Democrats have greeted this shift with loud and joyous yelps of "flip-flop" and the like.

Our own feeling is that the Republicans had better, by some means and at this session of Congress, cut taxes substantially, balance the budget, and put a payment of reasonable size on the national debt.

That is what they said they could do in the campaign which led to their sweep at the polls last November 5.

Voters' memories are proverbially short. But a specific tax-cut campaign is one thing which most tax-burdened voters can remember, especially if it isn't kept.

Our feeling is that if the Republicans welsh on this promise they will draw down on themselves the scorn and ridicule of millions of voters who supported them last November, and may lose the 1948 election.

Most of the voters are aware, of course, that the Republicans inherited a frightful governmental mess from the New Dealers, the

most extravagant gang of wastrels ever yet to hold power in Washington for any considerable time. It will be no easy job to clean up that mess.

But the Republicans said during the campaign that they could clean it up, and would welcome the assignment if the voters would give it to them. The voters did as requested. It is now up to the GOP leadership in Congress, we think, to fish or cut bait.

A SIGN OF UNEASINESS

In which connection, a printer friend of ours the other day made a few remarks which we would like to pass along. As not too many people know, most printers are as shrewd, acute and tough-minded gents as you can find anywhere. This one was discussing the Republicans' recent decision to keep the 20 percent luxury taxes; and here is about what he said:

"Well, of course I can't sob over people who buy $6,000 mink coats and have to pay 20 percent taxes on them. Just the same, those Republicans told us they would reduce taxes, and now they have reneged on these particular taxes.

"It looks to me as if they may be horsing around to find, after a while, that nothing can be done about any of the taxes. Hope I'm wrong—maybe it's too soon to squawk—but—."

O. Max Gardner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON C. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. The Nation has lost one of its greatest men in the passing of Hon. O. Max Gardner, former Ambassador to England. The State of North Carolina has sustained an irreparable loss in this great leader. Governor Gardner, as he is affectionately called, has been a leader of the Nation and of the State of North Carolina for a good span of years.

When quite a young man, Max Gardner began to lead the people of his State even before graduating from college. He attended State College at Raleigh, N. C., where he was one of the recognized college leaders of the State. He then came to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for the study of law. He was recognized as one of the outstanding young men of North Carolina and one of the best star athletes of football at both State College and the University of North Carolina.

Upon leaving college Max Gardner began to lead the youth of the State in a conspicuous and intelligent manner. He served at an early age in the State senate, became speaker pro tempore, and then Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina. Later, without any opposition, he was elected Governor of his State. He began his duties as Governor during the depression days, specifically, in 1929. North Carolina, like the Nation, was faced with financial crisis, and by his fine judgment and business sense steered the State through these trying times and launched it upon a period of success from which it has never turned even momentarily backward.

In a program of economy Governor Gardner combined the University of North Carolina into one great institution, including the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, State College at Raleigh, and the Woman's College at Greensboro, and today I believe that Max Gardner should be given credit for the splendid institution known as the Greater University of North Carolina.

His administration was characterized by business acumen, good judgment, and far-seeing, sound principles of government.

As Governor of North Carolina, he was one of the advisers of President Franklin Roosevelt in his aspirations to become President and helped pave the way for a nomination for the Presidency in 1932. After his ascendancy to the Presidency, Franklin Roosevelt naturally had Governor Gardner as one of his early closest advisers.

At the expiration of his term as governor, Max Gardner established a most successful law firm in Washington with Dr. Fred Morrison in the city of Washington. This firm is continued today as one of the outstanding law firms in America, Governor Gardner's able son, Ralph Gardner, becoming a member of the firm when his father was appointed Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Governor Gardner served most capably and with such distinction as Under Secretary of the Treasury that President Truman appointed him to the high honor of Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, as great an honor as an American can reach, with the exception of the Presidency of the United States.

In business life Governor Gardner was conspicuously successful, engaging in many activities of business, and especially in the textile field, where he was operator of the large Cleveland Cotton Mill at Shelby, N. C. He sold this plant at an attractive price to enter the high position of Under Secretary of the Treasury.

As a civic leader, he was in the forefront of practically every worthy cause in North Carolina during his adult life. In the field of farming especially did he lead out in urging a program of "live at home." After leaving the office of Governor of North Carolina, in connection with other distinguished leaders of Cleveland County, he established his native county of Cleveland as the leading cotton-growing county of North Carolina.

As a lawyer, Governor Gardner was successful, most able, and ever ready to undertake any legal task that would promote the welfare of his State or the Greater University of North Carolina. At the time of his death, he was engaged in an important lawsuit to bring to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill a much-needed museum of art.

As a patriotic citizen of his Nation and State, he was conspicuously outstanding, contributing all of his great talents and ability to every war effort or war endeavor that he was called upon by the President of the United States to undertake. He served in the capacity of chairman of the Advisory Commission to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion Division.

As a churchman, he was a lifelong and devoted member of the Baptist church, conducting a bible class in the First Baptist Church of Shelby, N. C., and being a leader in this large and influential church for many years. His Christianity expressed itself in many philanthropic gifts, especially to Gardner-Webb College to which he gave liberally.

The Nation and especially the State of North Carolina have lost a distinguished citizen, an able lawyer, a progressive and unselfish civic leader, a talented and brilliant public official, and one of the most patriotic and conspicuously able leaders in the life of our Nation today in the passing of the Honorable O. Max Gardner.

They Also Served

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, designed to give each veteran a stake with which to pick up the ways of civilian life, excluded men over 38 who were discharged because they were unable to keep up with the physical demands of military service from the benefits of this act.

We drew a false line between those who served—and those who served.

Under the strain of emergency, perhaps it might have been excused; but as we look at it now, we have no recourse but to change this amendment and make restitution to those who have been justly offended by our discrimination against them.

Most of these older men were called up in 1942 when the war was going badly for us. They were called long before millions of younger men were called. And though they were beyond their physical prime, they were pooled with men who were as young as their sons, and were subjected to the same rigorous training. For them, the effort was doubly difficult. They did not seek to evade military service because of their age. They were called, and they responded. Surely it was no fault of theirs that they could not keep up with the exhausting demands of military life.

But as the hospitals began to fill up with these men, the Army made a discovery which most of us knew all along. A man of 38 or over cannot compete physically with a man of 21, or 26, or 28. It was as biologically simple and pathetic as that.

The Army did not admit this in so many words. It felt called upon to discharge these men, while saving its own face, and so this pretext was found. Men over age were released on their own initiative to accept employment essential to the war effort. As if, having gone through what they did, they would do any less. Millions of civilians found war work attractive and profitable. But the

Army seemed to imply that these men who were the victims of the Army's misguided policy would loaf, and so the Army added insult to injury.

But this diversionary language did not fool the men over 38. They knew that the Army was passing the buck to them for its own mistakes.

However, when the Congress itself followed the same line and excluded them from the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act, they were surprised and embittered. They had served on exactly the same basis as other men who remained in this country, and yet a line was drawn between the two. Some got mustering-out pay and others did not. Somehow, the implication was made that their service was dishonorable, for how else could this unfair discrimination be justified?

Denying them the mustering-out pay was one wrong. Putting them in the same category as those who were dishonorably discharged was another and more grievous one which still rankles in the hearts and minds of several hundred thousand men.

The charitable view is that Congress was careless in the matter, for which it is not too late to make amends.

For our own self-respect, and in justice to the veterans who were released because they were over age, I ask the Members of this Congress to correct the oversight and grant mustering-out pay to the men who were treated so unfairly in the original bill.

They look to us to do the right thing—now.

Extension of Sugar Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill to permit the extension of sugar controls until March 31, 1948. The present authority to control sugar expires on March 31 of this year. The bill which I am filing would, however, allow the Secretary of Agriculture to discontinue controls prior to that time if, in his opinion, the supply situation would allow of an orderly marketing and distribution of sugar.

This bill is being filed primarily in the interests of the housewife or family consumer of sugar. The existing world shortage of sugar cannot be relieved until another crop-year comes around. In the meantime if controls were lifted, the housewife would be obliged to compete in an open market for her sugar not only against industrial users of sugar but also against all the nations of the world. The price would inevitably rise very high, and it is doubtful if the amount which the housewife would be able to purchase would be as great as she can get under orderly rationing and pricing. I am hopeful that both the housewife and the industrial user of sugar in this country will be able to get a larger allotment than last year, and I am also hopeful that when next year's world sugar crop can be ascertained, it will be sufficient to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to lift all controls before the expiration date of this bill.

Many people in this country, unfortunately, have the impression that because the United States purchased the entire Cuban sugar crop, we should be allowed to consume all of it within the United States. The purchase of that entire crop was made by agreement with other nations in order that the entire world should not be competing for the small supply available, thereby driving the price to exorbitant heights. Other nations in staying out of the Cuban market have trusted us to make a fair allocation, and we have a strong moral obligation to do this. Even with rationing, our consumption of sugar will be as great, if not greater, per capita than that of any other nation in the world.

The text of the bill reads as follows:

House Joint Resolution 112

Joint resolution to extend to powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes

Whereas the war has resulted in an acute shortage of sugar to an extent which is impairing the reconversion of the national economy from war to peace; and

Whereas it is in the interest of national defense and security to effectuate an orderly distribution of sugar at reasonable prices in order to prevent profiteering, hoarding, market manipulation and speculation in sugar, waste or spoilage of perishable agricultural commodities, and to prevent or eliminate other disruptive practices arising out of the scarcity of sugar: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any other provisions of law (1) the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 23), the Stabilization Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 765), title III and title XIV of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177), and the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), all as amended and extended, shall continue in effect with respect to sugar to and including March 31, 1948; (2) sugar may be allocated without regard to the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 787); and (3) the term "sugar," as used in this act, means any grade or type of saccharine product derived from sugarcane, sugar beets, or corn, including liquid sugar, sirups, molasses, or mixtures thereof, and sugar-containing products, which contain sucrose, dextrose, or levulose.

SEC. 2. Prior to the expiration of this act the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all controls with respect to any product over which control is authorized by this act when in his judgment the supplies of sugar are sufficient to warrant such action.

SEC. 3. (a) The powers, functions, and duties of (1) the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942; (2) the President or any executive department under the act of July 2, 1940; and (3) the Price Administrator under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the Stabilization Act of 1942, all as amended and extended, shall, insofar as they relate to sugar, be vested in and executed by the Secretary of Agriculture upon the enactment of this act.

(b) All orders, directives, rules, and regulations relating to any function transferred by this section or issued in connection therewith by any agency heretofore performing such function, which are in effect on the date of enactment of this act, shall continue in full force and effect unless and until modified or revoked by the Secretary of Agriculture or at his direction or under his authorization.

(c) So much of the unexpended balances, appropriations, or other funds available for the use of any agency in the exercise of the functions transferred by this act as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred for use in connection with the exercise of such functions.

(d) With respect to violations, liabilities incurred, or appeals taken thereunder, all provisions of orders, directives, rules, and regulations, pertaining to sugar heretofore used under the act referred to in section 1 hereof, shall be deemed to remain in full force and effect for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or other proceeding with respect to any such violations, liabilities, or appeals.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall become effective immediately upon enactment.

Organization of the World for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege last Saturday night to be present at a meeting of the New York State Bar Association which was addressed by our former colleague, Senator Austin, now the representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations.

Senator Austin spoke about the problem, in all of its aspects, of organizing the world for peace. The address is of such importance that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am advised that the address will fill more than the two pages allotted under the rule, and that therefore it is necessary to submit an estimate of the cost. The estimate indicates that this manuscript will occupy about two and one-third pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and its printing will cost $165.67.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are at a most critical point in the long struggle of man to progress from savagery to civilization through the rule of law in international relations.

The great question before us today and in the years immediately ahead is this: Can our present efforts to develop a genuine community of nations, living at peace under law enforced by collective will and action, succeed where all previous efforts in this direction have failed?

I believe that there are valid reasons for confidence that this time we can succeed.

Never before have so many people seen so clearly that wars cannot continue without resulting in destruction of civilization as we know it. Never before have so many people made up their minds that the choice no longer lies between winning or losing the next war. The choice lies between preventing World War III and irreparable disaster from atomic bombs and other weapons of possibly greater destructiveness.

The memory of failures of the past will spur us forward as we face the imperatives that contemporary science and technology have placed upon social progress. To save mankind, we must speed the control of the terrible and wonderful forces that could otherwise destroy us.

In the Charter and institutions of the United Nations we have created the instruments by which we seek to build, upon the experience of the past, the peaceful world society of the future that the imperatives of the present demand of us. We have heard it said that because it is not a world government, the United Nations is too weak an instrument for the purpose. Certainly the United Nations is not a world government. It could not be at this stage in history, but this does not mean that it is incapable of exercising, in effective combination, the several sovereignties of its member states. Others look upon the record of history and all the dangers and tribulations of the present and fear that the cause is hopeless anyway, thus leaving no choice but to prepare for the suicide of western civilization.

We can afford neither to minimize nor exaggerate the difficulties and obstacles in our path. We cannot afford to misunderstand the fundamental assumptions and requirements of our times. It will be my thesis here tonight that the United Nations is firmly based on the realities and that the potential power inherent in its Charter and in the development and uses of its institutions is far greater than is commonly supposed.

The Charter of the United Nations, which is now part of the law of nations, finds its sources in the evolution of international law over the past century, and especially over the past 50 years.

I do not need to remind this distinguished assembly of jurists and members of the legal profession that the sources of international law are the convictions and standards of right and wrong that men apply to the conduct of nations. International law reflects the development of the wisdom and the spiritual progress of the peoples of the world.

Take, for example, the evolution of international law in its attitude toward war over the past 50 years.

The first Hague Convention in 1899 bound the nations to settle disputes by pacific means whenever possible. The third Hague Convention of 1907 provided that "the contracting parties recognize that hostilities between themselves must not commence without previous and explicit warning, in the form either of a reasoned declaration of war or of an ultimatum with the conditional declaration of war." Thus far, pacific settlement was encouraged and undeclared wars were branded crimes, but war, itself, provided sufficient warnings were given, was not branded as illegal.

In 1919, after the First World War, the League of Nations Covenant bound the members not to resort to aggressive war and provided means for the peaceful settlement of disputes and sanctions against aggression. Then, in 1924, the Geneva Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, later signed by 48 nations, declared that "a war of aggression constitutes an international crimes." In 1927 the League of Nations unanimously adopted a resolution to the same effect.

The Habana Conference of American States in 1928 declared that a "war of aggression constitutes a major crime against the human species * * * all aggression is considered illicit and as such is declared prohibited." In the same year all the signatories of the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris renounced war as an instrument of national policy.

Thus, between 1907 and 1928, all civilized nations had advanced in their conception that war was merely undesirable and when fought should be fought according to the rules, to the concept that aggressive war is a criminal act. In the perspective of the long centuries of recorded history this evolutionary change in the law reflected remarkable progress in the attitude of men toward war.

Nevertheless, the law against aggressive war has been feloniously and treacherously violated.

The aggressions of the Axis Powers culminating in the Second World War were the first to be committed since the law against waging war had acquired full validity as part of the law of nations. But they did not destroy the law. The law prevailed and the civilized community applied individual punishment to the leaders who planned and carried out this crime against humanity.

I shall return in a moment to the great significance for the future of the United Nations, of the charters of the Nuremberg tribunal and of the tribunal of the Far East.

Now I wish to point out three significant and hopeful factors: First, the law against aggressive war gained universal acceptance and validity only a short time ago. Second, it was possible to defeat the first nations to violate the law and to punish them only because the great majority of the nations of the world joined together to enforce the law. It is true that they were slow to understand that their self-preservation was dependent upon such collective action, but they did understand and act in time to prevent the victory of those who broke the law. Third, the doctrine of individual responsibility for an international crime has been applied for the first time.

Just as democracy has brought the prince or governor under the law of the state, so the development of international law has brought him under the law of nations and made him responsible to the civilized community of mankind for violations of that law.

Thus, great strides have already been made toward the rule of world law and peaceful order that we seek to establish under the Charter of the United Nations and through its institutions.

These institutions and the powers conferred upon them through the charter by the member states are so designed that they are capable of developing the law of nations to an extent and at a rate previously impracticable.

In the first place they are by their nature most responsive to the opinions and the judgments of the peoples of the world. They are also by their nature catalysts for the evolution and crystallization of these judgments and opinions, which are in turn a source of law.

The Security Council has been in existence for less than a year and it has had the usual difficulties of new institutions. Yet it has already demonstrated its great potentialities in this regard. It meets in public. It is so organized as to function continuously. Its application on a continuous basis of the public and peaceful methods of the Council chamber to the settlement of disputes between nations is a new technique in international relations of the highest significance for the future. Through its influence and public scrutiny it has demonstrated how much it can do as it grows in strength and experience toward directing the nations into the paths of conciliation and agreement in accordance with standards of law and justice.

I believe that every delegate who attended the recent session of the General Assembly here in New York was deeply impressed by the great power of public opinion which the Assembly's deliberations focused upon the policies of the member nations. This power was reflected in the results that were achieved.

The Assembly does not legislate. It recommends. Its recommendations can acquire the force of law only when they are accepted by the member states. But this meeting of the General Assembly clearly showed that its recommendations had behind them a moral equivalent of the power of enforcement. Time after time the delegates declared that their nations would feel morally obligated to accept and act upon a recommendation of the Assembly even though they were not technically bound to do so.

The Economic and Social Council, like the Security Council and the General Assembly, meets in public. It is the focal point of a network of commissions and specialized agencies through which the members of the United Nations have begun to work together on an organized and continuing basis in almost every field of human activity in which they have a common interest.

These organs of the United Nations—above all the General Assembly—have a role to play in the development and codification of international law. Decisions of the Security Council can establish precedents that will raise the standards of law and justice as applied to the settlement of international disputes. The General Assembly has the power to recommend to the member states conventions or treaties on any matter affecting the general welfare, or the maintenance of international peace and security. These recommendations will gain the force of law when they are ratified. The Economic and Social Council and its related specialized agencies have the power to build up a vast new body of law relating to such matters as human rights, international trade, economic development, and social welfare by winning agreement on and ratification of treaties and conventions on matters in this field.

The General Assembly, at its recent session, took a most significant first step toward strengthening the law of nations. On the initiative of the United States it affirmed the principles of international law recognized by the charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal. It created a committee to study the codification and development of international law. It directed this committee to place primary importance in this connection upon the principles of the charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal in the context of a general codification of offenses against the peace and security of mankind, or of an international criminal code.

Note the progress in international law reflected by this affirmation by 54 nations and the potentialities in effective and enforceable law of the phrase "international criminal code." I intend, in this connection, to call to the attention of the Assembly's Committee on Codification the Charter of the International Military Tribunal of the Far East so that this charter may be placed side by side with the Nuremberg Charter. That charter was agreed upon by 11 states, representing more than one-half the population of the earth.

The General Assembly also affirmed that the crime of genocide—the deliberate extermination of a race or class, or any other human group—is a crime under international law for which the punishment of those responsible is a matter of international concern. Here is another case where individuals, as well as states, are to be made responsible before the international bar of justice.

At the center of this developing system of international law stands, of course, the International Court of Justice. All members of the United Nations have bound themselves under the charter to comply with the decision of the Court on any case to which it is a party. The Security Council is directed "to take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court." Both the General Assembly and the Security Council may request the Court to give an advisory opinion on any legal question, including interpretation of the charter.

The statute of the Court also enables the member states voluntarily to accept in advance compulsory jurisdiction of the Court

in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation in all legal disputes concerning:

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) Any question of international law;

"(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation.

"(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation."

A similar provision in the statute of the old World Court was accepted by 44 nations. The United States, which refused even to join the old Court, has now not only become a member but has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction clauses of the statute of the present Court.

This advance acceptance of the jurisdiction of the Court is essential to the establishment of a rule of law in the world. Neither the existence of a Court nor the existence of a body of law can bring this about if it is possible for a state party to a dispute to stand on its own interpretation of the law and refuse to submit to an impartial adjudication.

So far the members of the United Nations have been slow in acting to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Only six acceptances have been deposited to date. All members of the United Nations should, and I believe will, accept this obligation.

The United States, in accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, made one reservation which I regret. Matters which are essentially within domestic jurisdiction are not within the competence of the International Court. It deals only with questions concerning the rights and duties of States toward each other. The United States has, however, reserved the right to decide for itself which questions are essentially within its domestic jurisdiction instead of leaving the question of jurisdiction to be decided by the Court itself.

It is easy to understand why the United States Senate wanted this reservation. In making as broad an acceptance as we did we were taking a step far in advance of anything that would have been possible 10 years ago. Furthermore the Senate debate made it clear that this country should invoke the reservation only in a clear case.

Nevertheless the reservation has implications going far beyond any use that may be made of it by the United States. If generally adopted, this type of reservation would create a large loophole by which states desiring to do so could withhold their cases from the Court and our long-range goal of utilizing the Court to advance the rule of law would be impaired. I was for this reason that I stated in the Senate debate that I preferred the resolution without this reservation.

I mention this now because the reservation has already received considerable comment. Our declaration is in force until 1951, and the matter seems to be one to which the legal profession could well give some throughtful consideration during the intervening period.

This question involves the relationship of the sovereignty of the individual nations to the organization of the international community of nations. That relationship, in turn, lies at the heart of the greatest task of all that remains to be accomplished if we are to develop and maintain a peaceful world order under law. I refer to the sanctions of the spirit and the sanctions of force that must be created or perfected to maintain and enforce the law of nations.

The United Nations is rightly founded on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members. The sovereignty of the United States is sacred to all of us. But no nation is now, or ever has been, absolutely sovereign in relation to other nations. Sovereignty is relative. Every nation's sovereignty is limited by all its treaties and agreements with other states.

Every member of the United Nations has relinquished some part of its sovereignty to the organization. By this act, however, external sovereignty is not lost. No member of the United Nations has lost any degree of its independence in relation to an other nation by adhering to the Charter, because each makes the same relative contribution to the common authority.

The States of our Federal Union remain sovereign States. Through an original act of external sovereignty they granted in our Constitution those powers to the Federal Government that they deemed necessary for their common welfare and security. But all the powers not granted to the Federal Government were and still are reserved to the States or to the people.

The most imperative function of sovereignty is such exercise of it as will preserve the security of the state and the lives and property of its citizens. That being the case, there can be no more vital or imperative exercise of sovereignty than to use it in partnership with other nations to establish and maintain security from war. To use external sovereignty in order to build collective security is not to impair the freedom and independence of this or any other state member of the United Nations, but to protect that independence and preserve that freedom. Neither could exist for long without collective security.

The sovereign members of the United Nations have agreed upon this proposition in the Charter of the United Nations. The Charter carries within it duties and obligations that point the way to the development of collective security, both through the progressive removal of the causes of war and through provision for collective enforcement of the laws of peace.

The Charter, however, is not self-operating, nor do its terms in themselves create all the means that will be required. The obligations are there. The powers are there. The obligations must be carried out, the powers used.

Building a system of collective security that will develop and enforce the rule of law is the supreme task before us now. It will not be completed this year, nor next year, but the urgency of it is with us today and will be with us from day to day until it is completed.

The Security Council, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Military Staff Committee are now engaged upon two phases of this great enterprise. One phase is the completion of the special agreements called for under article 43 of the Charter, which will place at the disposal of the Security Council peace forces to enforce its decisions. The other phase is the development of a system of international control over atomic energy and over armaments generally.

This is at the very heart of the problem of achieving collective security. If such a system can be established, complete with provisions for effective international operating controls, including international inspection, and for appropriate punishments that cannot be obstructed by a violator, then we shall have established safeguards that will enable the world to disarm with security.

The world can achieve neither security nor disarmament without such a system. The price that all the nations will have to pay is a further delegation of sovereignty. The stake that is involved is civilization itself.

I said a moment ago that the obligations and the powers upon which such a system can be erected already reside in the Charter. What remains is to reach agreement on applying and using them.

There is the obligation "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace" contained in article 1 as the first purpose of the United Nations.

There is the obligation to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations," contained in article 2.

These, like other obligations of the Charter are definitive and unequivocal. They are the law. They are not circumscribed by any voting rules whatsoever. They apply to the permanent members of the Security Council equally with all other members of the United Nations. The rule of unanimity of the permanent members does not legalize any violation of these or any other obligations. Indeed, to use the so-called veto power to protect an aggressor from punishment would be as much a violation of the Charter as the act of aggression itself. It would be nullification. No country can veto itself out of its obligations.

The United States supports the rule of unanimity in the Security Council for the reasons that placed it in the Charter. It is there to promote agreement on positive action to carry out the Charter among the great nations that possess among them the power to keep or break the peace. It is there to preserve and strengthen, and place at the service of the peace and security of all nations, that concert of power that brought retribution to the Axis criminals who destroyed peace and security in the last war. It is there to discourage division among these nations so that a world that can remain at peace only if it remains one, does not become irrevocably split into hostile camps.

The United States believes that the rule of unanimity in the Security Council should be used in order to promote and not to hinder agreement on precisely such positive steps to carry out the purposes of the Charter as the establishment of international control of atomic energy and other armaments. Without unanimity of the great nations on its provisions such a system could not be established.

As a corollary to this, however, the United States believes that there is an obligation on all the great powers to find agreement on such a system, with all the effective controls and genuine safeguards that go with it, because without such a system the central purpose of the United Nations, security from war, cannot be fulfilled.

The Charter of the United Nations confers primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security upon the Security Council and imposes the rule of unanimity upon its permanent members. But the Charter does not confer on the Security Council exclusive responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security. That responsibility is shared by other organs, primarily the General Assembly, and by the individual member states.

Furthermore, the Charter provides safeguards against any act of nullification by a permanent member which could result in temporarily paralyzing the Security Council. I have referred to the general obligation of article 1 to take collective action against a threat to the peace, or breach of the peace.

This obligation exists, whether or not the Security Council acts. It could be carried out through a recommendation by the General Assembly directly to the member states to take such action. There is also article 51 which specifically reserves the right of collective, as well as individual, self-defense against an armed attack, in the event of any failure or delay by the Security Council in fulfilling its responsibilities. Any or all these provisions of the Charter could be drawn upon and used as the basis of those ultimate safeguards in regard to collective enforcement that the control treaties must include. I emphasize the word "collective," for individual self-defense is not the answer that we seek. They should be explored and thoroughly discussed.

In so great a matter as the control of atomic energy to insure its use for peaceful purposes only, and control of other major weapons of mass destruction, the great nations should be ready and willing to apply the obligations and use the powers of the Charter.

That means agreement on a system under which international controls are so effective that violations can be surely detected and corrected before they endanger the peace. In addition, however, it is essential that full provision be made for collective enforcement of the law against any nation whose violation is such as to constitute a threat or act of aggression, without that nation being able legally to protect itself from the consequences of its crime.

The Congress of the United States has acted specifically with respect to this problem in section 10 (a) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which reads as follows:

"That until Congress declares by joint resolution that effective and enforceable international safeguards against the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes have been established, there shall be no exchange of information with other nations with respect to the use of atomic energy for industrial purposes."

The report of the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Assembly's resolution on the regulation and reduction of armaments represent encouraging progress in the direction of agreeing on the essential principles of such a system. But an immense amount of further negotiation, exploration, and study of the problems, and all of the drafting of air-tight treaty provisions, remain to be accomplished in the Security Council and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The United States stands firmly in support of the principles embodied in the General Assembly's resolution and the recommendations of the Atomic Energy Commission to the Security Council.

In our concern with these problems, we can never forget that no matter to what degree we perfect the provisions of the law against war and for enforcement of the law, this alone will not bring the certainty of abolition of war. The ultimate sanction of law does not reside in treaties or constitutions or in anything written upon paper. It resides in the hearts and minds of the peoples of the world.

By using and developing the Charter of the United Nations to the full, mankind can meet the great challenge of our times, provided the dictates of the public conscience give life and force to the law of nations.

As we use and develop the institutions of the United Nations to the full, we will gain the experience in cooperative action, and the fuller understanding that will habituate the nations to living and working in peace together for the common welfare.

To that goal, with patience and firm determination, let us dedicate ourselves.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 7, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered last night by Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, at the Lincoln Day banquet sponsored in Washington by the Republican Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you all for this opportunity to join in the tribute of the Republican Members of the Congress and the Republican women of the District of Columbia, to the humbliest, the greatest, and the best beloved of all the heroes of our Republic.

This is the seventh year in which, as Governor of the State of Illinois where Lincoln laid the foundations of his service to our country, it has been my privilege to participate in ceremonies honoring the anniversary of his birth. Always on these occasions I have a feeling within me which I think is best described in Kipling's famous words of the Recessional, "an humble and a contrite heart."

I cannot hope that any words of mine can properly measure the glory of Abraham Lincoln; I know that no words are needed to tell Americans of his immortal work, which preserved our Union and advanced the cause of liberty and opportunity and tolerance throughout the world. I can only hope that all who are gathered here, and who are listening in the radio audience, can be as aware of the nearness of Lincoln as I am on these occasions, and particularly in our annual Lincoln Day ceremony at Springfield, when we lay a wreath upon his tomb.

Certainly there is no more fitting place to honor Lincoln than here in Washington, where he guided our Nation through the greatest crisis of its history, and where he laid down his life for his country, and it is altogether proper that the tribute is arranged by the Members of Congress, to which he himself came as a new Member of the House of Representatives 100 years ago. I am particularly glad that the celebration is arranged by members of the Republican Party.

Lincoln, indeed, belongs to the ages, and to all men of every age, yet the first Republican President always will be the special hero and the source of inspiration for the party which gave him to the Nation. In these days, when party service is too often looked upon as something less than patriotism, it is well to remember that Lincoln was a product and an exponent of our party system. Just as the Republican Party probably would not exist today if it had had no Lincoln, just as surely he never would have been President, and the course of history might have been sadly altered, but for the ardor, the enthusiasm, and the effective political work of the Republicans of his day.

The record shows that Lincoln was a good party man. In the old capitol of Illinois at Vandalia they still show you the window through which, legend says, the long-legged Lincoln vaulted in order that no quorum should be present for the adoption of a measure which his party opposed. In Congress, he was a good Whig and, as President, he was a good Republican. In the fateful days in which he assumed the Presidency, he gathered into his Cabinet the leaders of his party, even those who had most actively and bitterly opposed his nomination for the Presidency.

I emphasize that point to remind all Americans, and particularly young men and women who may wish to honor Lincoln by doing their full duty as citizens, that under our American two-party system effective citizenship begins with active participation in the political party of their choice.

To every student of American history—be he the most learned professor or an amateur reader—comes the great realization that the tragedy of the assassination was that it removed from the American scene the wisdom and mercy of Lincoln in the difficult days of postwar reconstruction.

The task of "binding up the Nation's wounds," as Lincoln described it in the second inaugural, and restoring real peace and prosperity to a war-ravaged and divided country, called for both an uncompromising devotion to fundamental principles of liberty and justice and an almost divine spirit which could look upon a vanquished enemy without malice, and see in every man—friend or foe—the image of his God. Lincoln had both of these attributes, as few mortals do. Had he lived, the story of reconstruction might have been very different.

Today, we are on the threshhold of another period of reconstruction—the reconstruction of a war-ravaged world, divided by hates and fears—and the reconstruction of our own American life, disturbed by conflicts resulting from that struggle. For the solution of these difficult problems, we must find the guidance and the inspiration for Lincolnian conduct in the study of the works of the Great Emancipator.

The fine words of the Covenant of the United Nations, and all the elaborate machinery of its operations, will only mock our hopes for lasting world peace unless we get back to firm allegiance to the moral philosophy of the historical documents which are signed simply, A. Lincoln. It is impossible to imagine the Lincoln who believed in the letter and the spirit of the Constitution doing what was done at Yalta or Potsdam.

We dishonor the memory of him who said, "This Nation cannot exist half slave and half free," when we try to organize the world on that basis. When we give secret or tacit consent to the permanent enslavement of prisoners of war, taken in battle by us and our allies, and when we subscribe to the abolition of national freedom, the suppression and persecution of religion, and mass exile and starvation of peoples in Poland and the other countries which have been overrun by agents of the Red Empire—when we do that, we throw out the window the three documents which Lincoln held to be the most sacred things in life—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The way to reconstruction in 1947, as in 1867, is to be found not in the law of "an eye for an eye," but the nobler law of the Sermon on the Mount.

Perhaps at this point some cautious soul would rise to remind us that ours is a practical problem, to maintain friendly relations with a great and powerful nation. That is our problem; but have we solved it by the futile policy of appeasement of the last two Presidents, in which we have abandoned the noble principles for which 300,000 Americans believed they were fighting when they laid down their lives in the most terrible war of the world's history? Are we weaker today than in the darkest days of the War Between the States, when Lincoln defied the mighty British Empire on the issue of its interference in behalf of the Confederacy?

We want peace and we shall work for peace. Yet our hope for peace must be our faith in the right as God gives us to see the right, and in the preservation of every military and economic resource of our national strength. Today, as never before, the strength and courage of a free America is the hope of liberty-loving men and women everywhere.

When we say the preservation of every military and economic resource of our national strength we must mean all that those words imply. We must mean the full development of atomic weapons until the world has reached a condition of security far beyond what confronts us today. We must mean the prompt acquisition and full equipment of every essential naval and air base to protect the continent of America from attack by any conceivable instruments of modern warfare. We must mean the maintenance and advancement of the American air supremacy which was established during the war.

We must mean the conservation and protection of the economic assets of our natural resources and our industrial system to fit the possible military requirements of our national defense. That must imply the full protection of our world trade by every means essential to guaranteeing adequate supplies of all basic materials not produced in our own country. Specifically it must mean the development of American lines of world air commerce in order that in international aviation we shall not be dependent upon the facilities of any other nation, no matter how friendly. Particularly we must not permit the British to monopolize international air lines with exclusive privileges in many parts of the world, for which the British Government proposes to spend $600,000,000 borrowed from the American people.

No more than could Don Quixote, can we correct all the evils of the world, but we can—and must—refuse to be a partner in the perpetuation of wrongs. We will, as we have, spend our money to relieve starvation and acute suffering. Yet it is high time to quit wasting the American people's tax dollars in vain attempts to buy international good will and in financing the experiments of governments founded on philosophies we believe to be false and sustained by actions we know to be morally wrong.

Above all, we must remember that our first objective in Europe, and all sections of the world, should be to adopt and promulgate policies which will restore justice, order, and decency, so that the sons of the plain people of the United States, whom Lincoln never forgot, shall not be required to stand guard 1 day longer than is necessary over smoldering tinder boxes of hatred and despair.

There, as I see them, are the fundamentals for an approach to an American policy for world reconstruction. I believe they are the principles guiding the Republican leadership in Congress which has undertaken, so intelligently and so energetically, to straighten the faltering course of our ship of state, both abroad and at home. I hope they will be the principles which will guide General Marshall in the State Department, and that a united America may support and advance them.

The Republican Party, to which the people of America turned for relief from confusion and distress last November, has equally grave problems to meet in the restoration of prosperity and tranquillity to our domestic economic life. There, again, we shall need the firmness of a Lincoln in adhering to our deep convictions, and at the same time, his kindly and genuine concern for the rights and well-being of all the people.

The cornerstone of our Republican domestic program, I venture to suggest, must be the speedy fulfillment of our party's pledge for a 20-percent reduction in personal income taxes. The fulfillment of that promise will be a boon to every man who works for the advancement of himself and his family, regardless of the amount of his earnings. More than that, it will provide the increased investment capital, the lower costs, and the added buying power which may be the determining factor in whether or not the business recession—about which the economic experts are now arguing—is really to overtake us.

Yet there is another aspect to the fulfillment of that pledge which is perhaps even more important. When the Republican Congress enacts the income-tax-reduction legislation, which already is in the legislative process, it will mark an end to the double-dealing and deceit which the American people have come to expect from their political leadership after 14 years of sad experience with the false promises of the New Deal. The speedy fulfillment of that pledge will be in sharp contrast to the record of the Democrats, whose every campaign plank of economy has been mocked by new extravagant and wasteful expenditures.

The 20-percent income-tax reduction will be proof to the American people that the word of the Republican Party in 1947 is as good as it was when it was voiced by Abraham Lincoln. Therefore, with our Republican leaders in Congress, I say to the doubting Thomases and the reluctant defenders of the New Deal philosophy of tax and spend—and elect—the tax reduction can be done, and it must be done. And to that I would add the ominous warning which I sometimes heard from a Hoosier schoolmaster back in Indiana, "It had better be done."

Another principal pledge of the Republican campaign of 1946—to end the governmental controls which were shackling the production of American industry, agriculture, and labor—also is in process of fulfillment. Indeed, so sound was our logic, and so plain were the election returns, that a sadder but wiser Truman administration had removed many of the controls even before Congress convened. The soundness of our position is now proved by the record. Supplies of scarce foods and materials are constantly increasing, and the trend of prices is downward. In spite of all the wailing forecasts of the champions of OPA, the experts in the Bureau of Labor Statistics now estimate that by the end of 1947 the cost of living in America will have declined from 1946 levels by from 5 to 12 percent.

It now remains for us to finish the job and to repeal the laws which might permit a future bureaucracy to fasten similar needless chains on our free America. Also, we must separate from the national pay roll the bureaucrats who still remain in offices no longer functioning, or who have fled to temporary security on the pay rolls of overstaffed sections of the permanent departments of the Government.

The Republican Party also quite properly has undertaken to deal with the grave perils to economic stability, and even to the health and safety of our people arising from labor strife in our land. Yet in dealing with our complex and perplexed labor relations, we have particular need of following the watchword of the second inaugural, "With malice toward none."

Perhaps we need to remember that Abraham Lincoln said at Hartford, Conn., on March 5, 1860, "I thank God that we have a system of labor where there can be a strike." Strikes are always an expensive and wasteful way to settle labor disputes, but the right to refuse to work is still the cornerstone of the worker's freedom.

In the reexamination of our labor laws, let us be sure that the faults in their operation have been in the laws, and not in foolish rules and obstructive attitudes of those who have been entrusted with their enforcement. Let us remember that when we talk about enforcing labor contracts, we are undertaking to determine who broke the contract which is violated. Let us never forget that under our system of free enterprise, the hope for easy labor relations lies in free collective bargaining between honest employers and honest employees.

There has been much loose talk about punitive labor legislation. There is no occasion to punish labor. The American Government, which is the American people, has no quarrel with the American workers. But there should be effective means to deal with leaders of labor or management who are false in their responsibilities to their members or their stockholders.

We must prevent the arbitrary action of ruthless men from causing the paralysis of our systems of transportation, communications, lighting, and heating. Individual workers must be protected from the autocratic power of union officials, who in certain cases have exercised dictatorial power over their members' right to earn a living, and even their freedom of speech and political action. Certainly a government which regulates industry and commerce to insure fair competition and honest practices should require as much from labor organizations.

Let us guard the gains which American labor has made through the trade-union movement as carefully as we guard the welfare of the American farmer. Let us never forget that American high wages and the American standard of living provides the greatest market for American producers we have ever known. That market has been built through the years largely by the persistent effort of the leaders of American labor.

What America needs most today to solve its labor problems is a clear realization of the interdependence of labor and capital, which is expressed so often in the writings of Lincoln. He appreciated it so thoroughly because he had been both employee and employer.

Indeed, the greatest peril to American prosperity today comes from the Marxian theories which swept the world in the period of the dictators and even permeated so much thinking under the New Deal regime. Those ideologies did not die with Hitler and Mussolini. They now govern the economic policies of most of the countries of the world outside America, and we must constantly be on our guard against them here.

The Republican Party has no more important task ahead of it than the war it has undertaken to stop the spread of communism here in America. We must be unrelenting in our efforts to drive the Communists from every hiding place in our National Government. We must fight their doctrines which threaten not only our system of free enterprise, but our American ideals of personal and religious liberty. On that issue our position must be as final as that of Abraham Lincoln on slavery. You will recall that when he called his Cabinet together to read them the Emancipation Proclamation, he told them: "I do not ask your opinion on this. I have decided to issue it."

Finally, in our plans for the reconstruction of America in 1947, we must give the welfare of our veterans the same position of prominence which he gave it in the second inaugural. It is still our responsibility "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan."

Urgent as is the need for national economy, we must not stint in our provisions for those who are paying, and through the years must still pay, the price of American victory in the war. We must not stint in the fulfillment of the provisions of the GI bill of rights for education and other services to our veterans. I think we must be prepared to extend all the benefits of that bill to the brave young Americans who, since the end of hostilities, have interrupted their lives to undertake the responsibilities of military service to meet the continuing needs of our country.

Certainly we owe it to the veterans to find an adequate answer to the most urgent and the most perplexing problem confronting our Nation, the housing of our people. The one great challenge which our Government and our free-enterprise system face together is to find the means by which we shall construct, sell, and rent the houses and apartments without which the pursuit of happiness will be in vain for millions of Americans.

Yet our obligation to our veterans goes far beyond the individual benefits which we may provide for them. Our basic responsibility is to preserve for them the freedom and the opportunities of our American life, the op-

portunities which permitted Lincoln to rise from humble and obscure beginnings, through his own efforts, to a position of national leadership and service.

The obligation of all of us in every branch of Government is to cling to the ideals of honest public service which Lincoln preached and lived. We must guard well the sacred heritage which we have received from each generation of free Americans, so that we may turn it over, safe and unsullied, to the brave generation which protected it on the world battlefields.

We shall best honor Lincoln, not by our homage and praise, but by drawing from the inspiration of his words and his martyrdom some share of his faith in America and its people and a new devotion to our own tasks in the America of today.

National Representation for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able editorial on national representation for the District of Columbia, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HEARING WE DESERVE

Decision of the Senate Judiciary Committee not to hold hearings on the national representation amendment is understandable. Volumes of testimony on the subject from past hearings are available. Additional hearings would present little that is new. We have, here in Washington, a glaring contradiction of the fundamental principles of our own system of government. We are taxed without representation. We are held to all the obligations of citizenship and denied the most valued privilege of citizens. All this is known and recognized. There are few men willing to defend it. The simplest and most effective remedy is an amendment to the Constitution, giving to Congress the power—which it now lacks—to confer on the people who inhabit the seat of Government the degree of representation, in Congress and in the choice of a President, that Congress considers wise. There would be no conflict between such an amendment and the wise control, by the Nation, of its seat of government. The District of Columbia would not become a State. It should not become a State. The District would attain a new and unique status in a Union of sovereign States. Its status is now unique. But the new status would be in keeping with the principles of representative government, whereas the present status is a stigma on representative government. We do not need new hearings on this question, with repetition of so much that has been said before. We need the willingness of men, who have the power to do it, to submit the question to the Members of Congress and to the people of the United States and to submit it in the spirit of men anxious to right a wrong. The hearing that should be given now is in the forum of Senate debate. The members of the Judiciary Committee have the opportunity to make that hearing possible. They should have the will to do so.

Economic Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Economic Nationalism," published in the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate of January 27, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC NATIONALISM

It is often stated that American isolationism is dead. Maybe so. But its twin brother — economic nationalism — is very much alive, indeed.

This is evidenced by the growing debate about our trade-agreements program. Last November the Government announced its intention "to enter into concerted trade-agreement negotiations with 18 other principal and representative trading nations for the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers and the substantial elimination of trade discriminations among the nations participating." Not only are the projected negotiations now being challenged in responsible Republican quarters but the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its entirety is once again under attack.

This act was originally passed, and later extended, over strong Republican opposition. It will not come up for renewal until 1948, and before then it can hardly be repealed over a Presidential veto. But the attitude of the Congress toward the whole subject can seriously hamper all negotiations in the intervening period.

On this account, it is well to point out the importance attached by the administration to its program. According to the State Department, it is central to the structure of international economic cooperation; it is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Atlantic Charter and of article 7 of our mutual-aid agreement; it is necessary to strengthen and support the foundations of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and to pave the way for the kind of economic world envisaged in the Charter for an International Trade Organization, which is to be the subject of discussion at the Geneva conference in April.

The device of reciprocal-trade agreements grew out of our experience following the First World War. We had been transformed from a debtor into a creditor Nation, with constantly growing claims against the rest of the world. The interest and amortization on our foreign advances could only be paid in gold or in goods. We raised our tariffs so as to make payment in goods exceedingly difficult, and we drew gold from other nations in such volume as to undermine their banking and currency systems. The world sank into a morass of competing economic nationalisms, and the great depression was ushered in. We learned a bitter lesson, and under the enlightened leadership of Secretary Hull we embarked upon a new course.

There is danger that this lesson may be forgotten and that the course we have set may be heedlessly modified. It is quite true, as some have pointed out, that we have had little peacetime experience under the trade agreements already negotiated. But we have had recent and ample proof of the impossibility of sanely pursuing a restrictive tariff policy in the face of our creditor position. The devastating effect on our economy of such a policy was convincingly demonstrated in the years of the great depression.

Trade agreements have been cautiously negotiated. Insofar as they permit the entry into this country of a larger volume of varied foreign goods at a lower price, the standard of living of our people is increased. As they are reciprocal, easier access to foreign markets is obtained by American producers, and this adds to the general prosperity. But above all, they are an essential element in the development of a well-knit and prosperous world economy, which in turn is the only secure cornerstone for world peace. Accordingly, they further a broad national interest which should outweigh the clamor of every special interest. And parenthetically, there is as yet little convincing evidence that any special interest is in fact threatened with adverse consequences.

It would be tragic if congressional agitation were to interfere with the success of the administration program. Once again we face a world at peace as a great creditor nation. We have acquired a wider knowledge of the interplay of economic forces. We can ill afford to repeat past mistakes.

Address of Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, Before Michigan Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a great address delivered by a great Senator of the United States, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the President pro tempore of the Senate, before the Michigan Republican State Convention at Grand Rapids on February 8, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to greet the militant, forward-looking, forward-marching Republicans of Michigan at a moment of both triumph and dedication. It is my first opportunity to thank you for your generous support throughout the last campaign when I was unavoidably absent on business for the Nation and for peace. The result required no recount. I thank you from a very grateful heart; and I pledge you every effort within my power to vindicate your faith.

This also is my first opportunity to present my compliments to Michigan's new, hard-riding, hard-fighting Republican leader for whom the honor and integrity of the peoples' government takes priority over every other trust. I salute Governor Sigler with complete conviction that he will brilliantly serve the State which has so spectacularly acclaimed him its first citizen.

This also is my chance to pay tribute to my Republican colleagues from Michigan in the Congress at Washington. Michigan, indeed, has come into her own. Five important chairmanships out of 19 in the streamlined House of Representatives are held by Republicans from Michigan, as is also the

Republican conference leadership; and, in the Senate, I am proud to report that the junior Senator from Michigan, Mr. FERGUSON, has made a more powerful place for himself in four short years than any first termer I have ever seen. The Senate's conscience is in the best of hands when he walks sentry post.

I feel sure, Mr. Chairman, that republicanism will justify its new responsibilities and thus, by its deserving works, will assure America's final and complete achievement of sane, sound, solvent Republican administration in 1948. I hasten to add that this is my only interest in 1948. I charge you to ignore all consideration of localized allegiance, if such there generously be, and, when the time appropriately comes, to join freely in the Nation-wide Republican quest for the best available next President of the United States.

But having thus set the long-range sights, I prayerfully suggest that we forget 1948 for the time being; that we concentrate on the critical tasks at hand; that we undertake to deliver the goods; and that we proceed on the invincible theory that the best service we can render is the best politics we can play.

In these perilous times, which require all the vision and all the courage we can muster, we are once more at Gettysburg with Lincoln as he pled that government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall not perish from the earth. Republicanism—now as then—is not an end within itself. It is the means to an end. The end is the healthy preservation here in the United States of free institutions, free enterprise, and free men, amid a disorganized and distraught world not yet recovered from the shock and wreckage of total war. The end is the restoration of those stabilities which shall rekindle the hopes of all western democracy everywhere that here is the true way of life, liberty, happiness, and peace. The end is the maintenance of this American bulwark against all the sinister forces of communistic subversion, no matter how plausible their guise, which thrive upon chaos and treachery and confusion, and which threaten not only the freedoms but the very souls of men.

The American people have turned to the Republican Party as the means to these ends. We must not let them down. The task is bigger than any party. It is as big as destiny itself. It forecasts not only the kind of a country but also the kind of a world in which we shall live. If we concentrate upon this task we shall find that we have raised standards to which men and women of all parties will repair. And so, my fellow Republicans, let this be our grand strategy. Let us plan to win because we plan to deserve to win, and because we plan that America wins with us.

This should not be too difficult for men of good will, common sense, Lincoln tradition, and constitutional fidelity. Indeed, here at home, there probably is no reason why the people of the United States should not right now be upon the threshold of their greatest era of sustained, mass prosperity. If we quit abusing our illimitable opportunities; if we quit making senseless war against each other here at home; if we quit false theories of fake economics, still dished up by the repudiated peddlers of yesterday's nostrums; if we quit corruption, including corruption of the spirit; if we quit shackling initiative and stifling thrift; if we quit the tyranny of bureaucrats and pressure groups and special interests; in a word, if we quit aborting the American way of life the future is rich with cheer. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that we have a mandate from the American people not to quit ourselves until all the rest of this quitting is accomplished.

America has the resources. It has every element for a great and wholesome prosperity. It has this great chance. I sometimes wonder if our people fully realize their relative blessings—particularly when they allow themselves even temporarily to flirt with alien lures or with the phobias of some of our high-falutin domestic crackpots and fellow travelers or with the melancholy nonsense of such distinguished, so-called liberals as the top agitator of them all who warned us in 1945 that we would have from six to eight million unemployed in 1946. Let me give you an exhibit which points a moral to adorn this tale.

At the last General Assembly of the United Nations, we had to allocate to each of the 55 member nations its share of the annual budget on the basis of relative capacity to pay. Experts presented an intensive study of the subject and said that the United States has 50 percent of the total income capacity of all these 55 nations. I fought the accuracy of this study as a basis for assessments. But I said to my Soviet colleague and his satellites: "If our economic system is so good that 5 percent of the people of the earth have anything like 50 percent of all its income capacity, then our economic system ought to be made mandatory for all members of the United Nations so they can catch up with us." That rankled for about 10 days. Then I got this public answer from my Soviet colleague: "You have put the wrong interpretation on these statistics, they do not testify to the superiority of your economic system, they simply reflect the fact that not one bomb fell on America in World War I and not one bomb fell on America in World War II."

Mr. Chairman, we both were right. On the one hand, it is very necessary for us to remember that, despite all our tremendous sacrifice and loss in the war, we were mercifully spared the physical destruction which made a tragic shambles of countless Allied areas—and we are not through with our war responsibilities until we have cooperated in their recuperation. On the other hand, if, even in the presence of these dislocations, the United States with 5 percent of the earth's population, has even 40 percent of the world's income capacity (and that is the temporary figure finally certified), our system of free enterprise and freemen is unanswerably demonstrated to be the best on earth. We would be fools to desert it in any aspect. It must be faithfully nourished and maintained. And that is what the American people said with their ballots last November. And that is our Republican job.

Now, my fellow countrymen, this calls, first of all, for peace—and I mean peace at home. With this tremendous heritage, it is sheer public suicide for labor and capital to be ever at each other's throats; and it is wanton neglect of the public welfare, including the true welfare of every man who toils, to longer ignore the need for rational progress in the law respecting labor-management relationships. I hasten to say that the surest improvements will be those which flow from voluntary agreements and from mutual acceptance of the axiom that in the long run capital and labor will sink or swim together. Their destiny is indivisible. But some new law seems unavoidably required—not in a punitive spirit of revenge because of recent threats to the whole national life, but in a spirit of prudent preparedness against a repetition of evils which must end for the common good, including the good of healthy organized labor itself.

I am thinking, for example, that strikes against the Government or summary strikes against public health and safety, like any other civil rebellion, cannot be tolerated; that jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts must stop; that unions must be made as effectively responsible for the integrity of contracts as are their employers; that the new monopoly power of labor leadership must be tempered with greater rank-and-file democracy; and that violence and force must be as illegal here as in every other phase of life under law in America.

I would protect labor's total right to free collective bargaining—on a two-way, fair-play basis—to the last ditch. I would not retrogress 1 inch. But free, collective bargaining will be the more impregnable when it is reasonably mutualized and when it is purged of the excesses which cost it so heavily and so dangerously in popular good will.

I would seek for labor the highest practicable wage. Our national economy requires it. But I would recognize the fact that high wages must be accompanied by high production or high prices will continue to nullify the net gain and will pyramid to ruin for all concerned—despite reliance too often on fanciful, deceptive, self-serving statistics to the contrary. I should like to hear an authentic labor voice in the United States saying what the seasoned President of the British Trade Union Congress recently said:

"We shall have to reexamine many union-trade practices where they tend toward restriction on production. If high real wages—high purchasing power for workers—is the goal our own leadership must preach the gospel of high production."

In my view, that way lies high wages, low prices, and a minimum of frictions. Then if you will add a constant study of the flexible profit-sharing principle—despite its complications and its difficulties—and if we may reduce work stoppages to a minimum, we may find the greatest good for the greatest number, and we can here perpetuate free enterprise for freemen under an economic system which is the envy of the common man all around the globe. The advantage, to say nothing of the joy, flowing from the current lull in industrial strife—compared with 113,000,000 man-days of idleness from this source last year—is a stimulating sample of the universal importance of pursuing these objectives to the last attainable degree.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me repeat my theme. The people have told us with their ballots that they want this American way of life nourished and maintained, and this is our Republican job. There can be no doubt this means the earliest possible termination of all war controls—with rare and temporary exceptions where supply lags far behind demand. It means the utmost voluntary restraint in pricing lest shortsightedness invite consumer reprisals. It means the maximum demobilization of bureaucrats and overlords. It means that red tape must be fought as relentlessly as red ink. It means aggressive social progress without state socialism—and nowhere has this possibility been better demonstrated, as in public health, than right here in Michigan. It means the vigilant preservation of free competition against monopoly. It means a chance for little business as well as big. And certainly it means sleepless battle against the poisons of imported Communist subversion which gnaws not only at our livelihoods but also at the very foundation timbers of the Republic.

It means, also, an end to waste and extravagance in Government; an end to the morass of deficit spending; a beginning of sound fiscal policy which reduces expenditures, public debts and taxes—each in its own time and place. The President's budget of $37,500,000,000 is timid medicine. It requires major surgery. It would mean that in our third postwar year we shall be spending 38 percent of our wartime maximum. By contrast, in the third postwar year after World War I, expenditures had fallen to 19 percent of the wartime level. Further, the proposed $37,500,000,000 expenditure compares with only 13 billions in the last prewar budget of 1940 and is 4 times our budget in 1939. Such comparisons make a mockery of the President's budget, and suggest a congenital hang-over from the reckless New Deal yesterdays when a dollar too often was just something to print instead of something to earn.

The Republican pruning knife is out and sharpened. It must not cut at the expense of adequate national defense during this critical era when there are still great powers which think only in terms of force. It cannot cut at the expense of our veterans. It must not be Shylock's knife. But it can and it must cut at the expense of every dispensable expenditure in the vast and still swollen Federal machine. The benefits must go, first, to a reasonable reduction in the public debt which is a priority mortgage upon everything that any of us own or hope to own; and then it must go to reasonable relief for the hard-pressed taxpayer particularly in the lower brackets where the increased costs of living have imposed a particularly cruel burden.

Republican administration cut the national debt 40 percent in 10 years after World War I. Republican administration also cut the peoples' taxes. Yes; and it is significantly worth remembering that every time the rates went down the resultant revenues went up. I venture the belief that the country this year will enjoy sound, fiscal management for the first time in fourteen prodigal years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit a few swift paragraphs on a few other matters before coming to my final and most important theme of all.

I should like to say that the Republicans in the Senate have insisted upon maintaining the famous Truman committee for the impartial and implacable investigation of war frauds, despite the united opposition of our political opponents who sought to detour this chastening justice into other hands. It is my view that the American people want a complete and relentless audit of the $400,000,000,000 spent in the war years; and one of their mandates to us is to see that the guilty, if such there be, shall not escape the retribution due those who took illicit toll of our sacrificial flesh and blood. That's what jails are for.

Then I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we intend to do something about this scandalous portal-to-portal outrage which violates every American concept against ex post facto laws; which abuses the legislative intent of Congress, not a man of whom remotely contemplated any such perversion when the Wages and Hours Act was passed; which threatens the solvency of many a business and the jobs of its employees—to say nothing of the Treasury of the United States. Imagine what labor would say if the courts, in a reverse situation, were to find some excuse for employers to go back over the years and recapture some of the wages paid upon jobs long since finished and forgotten. The principle of the thing cannot be allowed to stand if any sort of a stable economy is to save America.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that it is the Republican purpose at this session to initiate studies which shall lead to a liberalization of coverage and benefits in old-age insurance on a pay-as-we-go basis. This involves elementary, humane, and decent fair play for those who are passing into sunset years which must not be poorhouse years.

I should like to say that we are urgently seeking ways and means to straighten out the housing mess.

Also I have no doubt that we shall enthusiastically give the Michigan Legislature a chance to enthusiastically approve a constitutional amendment enthusiastically limiting the Presidency to two terms.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to make one other suggestion to the legislature. I wish it might make it a little more dangerous for irresponsible mud slingers to rape the truth in our political campaigns. I speak out of personal experience. Last fall the CIO-PAC put out a vicious, race-baiting circular in Detroit which accused me of being a leader against anti-poll-tax legislation, against antilynching legislation, and against the FEPC, although I have consistently supported all of this legislation without a break from start to finish. It was an unmitigated lie. Probably it did no harm. That is beside the point. It was a filthy fraud upon the electorate. To the credit of some CIO leaders with whom I have discussed the matter, I hasten to say they agree that any such bald perversion of facts ought to be stopped. I do not mean these were the only offenders. There are plenty of others on all sides. Nor would I for an instant curb free speech. Nor would I fail to realize that certain latitudes of the imagination are a traditional part of our campaigns. But for the sake of decency and honest elections I wish you could find a way to put deliberate, self-confessed, political libel and slander out of business.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I come finally to the subject dearest to my heart and to the heart of the Nation and the world. I speak of something which utterly transcends politics. I speak of peace. I speak of stopping World War III before it starts. I speak with what I hope is justified pride in a record of Republican cooperation which has done its full part in making possible united American foreign policy in pursuit of peace with justice in a free world of freemen. If Republicanism is true to its best instincts, this cooperation will continue to the last practicable degree.

None of us can face the facts of life and deny to science the grim and sanguinary credit for such progress in the bitter arts of cruel mass destruction that another total war—measured perhaps in minutes instead of months—would almost literally consume the earth. Time and space and distance no longer matter. Pearl Harbor ended one era. Hiroshima began another. Therefore none of us can face the facts of life and deny that no nation hereafter can defend its peace alone. The peaceful nations of the world must defend their peace together. They must covenant in advance against the aggressor of tomorrow. In our own enlightened self-interest we have helped to build the United Nations, and for the sake of our own children we must give it all our strength and all our prayers.

I have no illusions regarding its sufficiency. It needs growth, improvement, and power. But neither have I any illusions regarding its indispensability. Already it has tempered many a situation which, under the old order, could have flamed into the racing prairie fires of conflict. It is the world's safety valve. So long as it works, the world's boilers will not blow up. So long as we keep controversy in the council chamber it will not graduate to battlefields.

Under the auspices of the United Nations we hopefully approach the beginnings of world disarmament. Our own American position is clear. We shall not disarm alone. We shall not trust to example. We shall not repeat our mistakes of 25 years ago. We shall take no "sweetness and light" for granted behind the iron curtain which still blacks out great sectors of the earth. We do not intend to be at anybody's mercy; nor do we intend to emasculate our authority with those who still think in terms of force. But we will joyfully match the utmost limits of disarmament to which other great powers will go, if there be summary disciplines which guarantee against bad faith. I repeat, however, that this cannot happen in ambush or on a one-way street.

So, too, with atomic bombs. We monopolize the secret for yet a few more years. In the greatest exhibition of international good will since time began, we are prepared to abandon this advantage if, as, and when all the world is prepared to outlaw the destructive use of atomic energy for keeps; if, as, and when this renunciation is protected by totally and provably competent inspections and controls; if, as, and when the world in general—and Soviet Russia in particular—agrees to swift and conclusive punishment which shall stop treachery at its source. This is our price; and the price must be paid. We shall not trust alone to fickle words. Too many words, as at Yalta and at Potsdam and in Poland at this very hour, have been distorted out of all pretense of integrity. We ask nothing for ourselves. We ask everything for peace.

The record, Mr. Chairman, stands clear. We plan no conquests against any other power on earth. We are no shadow of a threat to any peace-loving land. We shall no longer condone or appease the conquests of others. We shall maintain maximum national defense until alternative reliances prove their dependability. There are deadlines in our ideals which all the world must come to know we shall never again desert. To this end we must always say what we mean and mean what we say. We will live and let live in this world of rival ideologies, if we are allowed to do so. For the sake of all these objectives, Mr. Chairman, we must faithfully sustain all sound efforts, both economic and political, to make collective security succeed through international cooperation, international law, and international good will in behalf of peace with justice in this wrecked and mangled world. Anything less would be treason to our own self-interest. I hope we shall make it plain to an earth which craves our moral leadership that no change in American administrations will dilute these fidelities. As an American first, and then as a Republican, for myself, I take this pledge.

Ladies and gentlemen of the convention, it has been a great joy for me to have been able, at long last, to come back to home sweet home with these greetings to my fellow citizens who have been so generous to me in my absence. I congratulate Republicanism upon its reborn vigor and vitality. I congratulate you particularly upon your magnificent sweep of victory in Michigan. I congratulate Republicanism upon its opportunities—and then upon its destiny when we make good.

Soon we shall be celebrating our dedication to the memory of the greatest of all Republicans—the immortal Lincoln—on the approaching anniversary of his birth. If we may catch some measure of his spirit, of his dedication, and of his pattern, we can deserve the good opinions of mankind. God willing, this is our great chance.

A Plan To Prevent Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Paul F. Fratessa, prominent attorney at law of San Francisco, Calif., in which he encloses a copy of an article which he has written entitled "Positive Prevention of Depressions."

For many years Mr. Fratessa has made a study of the American economic and financial system, and he has asked me to bring his conclusions to the attention of the Members of Congress. I am complying with his request under permission to extend these remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Fratessa's article is as follows:

POSITIVE PREVENTION OF DEPRESSIONS

(By Paul F. Fratessa)

Depressions can be eliminated, but only if we work from the bottom and reconstruct

our entire capitalistic systems. We must provide the necessary mechanics to sustain the entire population and thereby produce conditions which will wipe out communism forever.

The cause of our economic difficulty is the failure of the capitalistic system to deliver sufficient purchasing power to every person who is in need of purchasing power. The theory of profit is sound, provided the profit (which is added to the cost of production and distribution) is not locked up in a safe-deposit box. At present it goes completely out of reach of some consumers who really need the purchasing power it embodies, because we have failed to take the precautions to see that it is actually returned to the consumers who can keep it in circulation.

When industry as a whole thinks it has created a profit and deposits it in a bank, that profit is to all intents and purposes locked away in a safe-deposit box. For a sound economy all such profits should be immediately put back into circulation, or the equivalent in new credits. Unemployment could not exist if such a course were universally pursued.

We have about 45,000,000 families in the United States today with an average of 3 to each family. No one will question that it requires at least $300 per month to maintain a family of 3 at the present cost of living. This means 300 times 45,000,000 or thirteen and one-half billion dollars per month as a minimum income to sustain our population. Anything less means "want in the midst of plenty."

Every person willing and able to work should be able to do so at an anual living wage, but labor must understand that we must all prosper together. One group should not take more of its just share, which is true of all those who make a living from profit. When labor, through strikes and lock-outs, forces wages to rise inordinately, it also forces up the cost of living to the detriment of a vast group of so-called white-collar workers and helpless people dependent upon a fixed income. This creates as definite an injustice as anything which could be done by capitalism. Profits must always be reasonable and this principle applies to labor as a commodity exactly as it applies to more tangible merchandise.

Those who cannot work through no fault of their own should be provided with a livable income; otherwise it throws our entire economy out of gear. Common sense dictates that we should stop quibbling over this question and proceed to determine the fact by setting up the machinery which will deliver the proper income to all potential consumers, then communism will disappear. We must make our choice—either subsidize all industry, including agriculture, in order to guarantee them a reasonable profit so that they can pay a living annual wage to all workers without this continual strife; or, subsidize all low-income groups. At present we are paying subsidies in various forms: Newspapers and magazines are being handled by the post office at a loss; banks are collecting interest on bonds which cost them but a book entry; certain farmers, air lines, and steamship companies are receiving aid. If our present subsidies are justifiable, then a general subsidy for the purpose of putting an end to the quarrels between capital and labor is more than justified.

Where is the money coming from, you will ask. Where did our present money come from? We, the people, as a whole, have, through our sovereign power, created some of it and the rest was created by our banks through power delegated to them by Congress in violation of our Constitution. When enough people understand this truth, the mystery of money will disappear, and then we can elect men to office who will act for the common good. We then can punish the profiteer as profiteering is the cause of the declining value of our dollar.

When Congress rectifies this mistake of allowing the private creation of money, every State in the Union would then pass the necessary legislation and take over the operation of every function required for the common good. When the people use their own money, there will be no interest charge attached to it, and every State could be furnished with new credits by the Federal Government so that they could keep their budgets balanced, and at the same time make proper provision for the entire population irrespective of amount.

Congress could make a condition precedent requiring every State to pass legislation that every man shall do his just share of work in producing for the common good and receive just compensation. Each State should regulate the profits and prices in the same manner as we now regulate our public utilities and thus completely control the cost of living in order to determine what constitutes a livable income for those who cannot work through no fault of their own and a just living annual wage for those who are able to work. Congress can do this without taxation—at least for several years. This would only increase the size of everybody's bank account. To do this, Congress must first exercise the right it has to purchase the Federal Reserve System from private ownership. This action would enable the Treasurer of the United States to issue noninterest-bearing certificates and deliver them to the Federal Reserve System to be monetized, all for the cost of bookkeeping. Our public debt could be wiped out, which would still further reduce the cost of living. This one act alone would forever remove our economic shackles.

Our States, having assured to industry and agriculture a reasonable profit, to the worker a living annual wage, protection against profiteering, there can no longer be any fear of inflation which has always been the cry of free enterprise each time we desire to correct the existing wrongs in our monetary system.

When our national debt, in fact, all public debt, has been wiped out by having the owners of the bonds deposit them as cash in their own bank accounts, such a program will make all government the real servant of all the people. We know that local government responds more promptly to the will of the people, and for that reason the Federal Government should only do the financing and withdraw entirely from every field which can be better handled by our local governments.

At the present time, due to lack of proper administration, too many are drawing unemployment benefits. This is the fault of the system which fails to supply the job, but instead permits the benefits to be paid while there is work to be done.

When we have a general subsidy for all operations, the banks can be called upon to see that all social benefits are paid to the right people and only to those who are justly entitled to them.

If we abolish Federal taxes completely for several years, our bank balances will then be so large that we can abolish all local taxation and adopt one method for all purposes, which again would further cut the cost of living. Congress can levy a tax once a year upon all bank accounts, allowing the local tax authorities to collect it, turn it over to the State for distribution to the Federal, county, and other political subdivisions. This plan would necessitate the issuance of new money once a year in order to collect the tax on the outstanding money, as well as the money in the bank, thereby preventing hoarding and counterfeiting.

Our foreign transactions can be simplified. Every nation in the world now owes us money, which it cannot pay unless we accept goods or send travelers to those countries to spend their own money. Our Government can sell money orders to those who desire to travel, which would be honored by the foreign countries if they, too, owned their central bank of issue, as herein proposed. Under such an arrangement, every government would be in a position to pay the shipper for all materials and goods sent to any foreign nation and a record of the transaction be made by some division of the United Nations. This would mean more employment for the shipping nation paid for by its own government. No nation should allow the shipment of any item to another nation without a request from the buying nation. It is sheer nonsense for any nation to import goods which can be manufactured at home, thus creating unemployment. All raw materials in any nation should be accessible to every other nation upon request. National boundary lines have been established without any consideration being given to the location of raw materials, which has been at least one of the causes of war between nations. We must recognize this as one world with every nation and every individual being entitled to their just share of whatever is required for their existence—otherwise, there can be no peace.

God has provided we must distribute according to his will, so that all may live without fear of one another, in complete security, by making every government the servant of all the people and not of a few groups who have been controlling our economy.

Pope Leo XIII understood this principle 50 years ago and issued an admonition to the industrialists regarding it. Had this admonition been heeded, socialism and communism would be unheard of today. We recommend to the attention of all earnest thinking people, the Report of the Vancouver Board of Trade of British Columbia; also Out of Debt, Out of Danger by Jerry Voorhis, former Congressman from California.

Let us seek, not to patch up the old machinery which has failed us so many times already, but to create new implements to meet the needs of the modern world. Unless we do this, we cannot prevent the next depression which will overshadow any financial calamity we have ever known.

Memorial to Jewish Children Slain in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding a children's memorial forest in Palestine, a gift of America's Christian children in memory of a million Jewish children slain in Europe.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILDREN'S MEMORIAL FOREST IN PALESTINE—GIFT OF AMERICA'S CHRISTIAN CHILDREN IN MEMORY OF 1,000,000 CHILDREN SLAIN IN EUROPE

History has not recorded a tragedy equal to that which befell the Jewish children in Europe. Between September 1, 1939, and May 10, 1945 (VE-day), the Nazi mass murderers cruelly put to death more than 1,000,000 boys and girls, hopeful and promising like our own. This criminal slaughter of the innocent was carried out methodically in concentration camps by starvation, medical

experimentations, and lethal gas chambers. These little children, between the ages of 1 and 12, too tender to be exploited as slave laborers, were sacrified to the Moloch of hatred.

America was horrified at these heinous deeds. We remember our grief made more acute by our sense of futility, because we could not prevent this monstrous crime of Hitlerism. Our Christian civilization could not provide protection for those of whom Jesus said: "Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

But, as Christians, we have not yet expressed in any concrete form our deep sympathy with the victims nor our profound concern for the break-down of Christian civilization. It seems most appropriate therefore that Christian America be given an opportunity to express a sense of bereavement and at the same time a high resolve that such a tragedy shall never again befall any children anywhere in the world.

This is to be made possible through the children's memorial forest in Palestine—a gift of the Christian children of America in memory of the Jewish children who were slain during the reign of hate in Europe. This is the great and living shrine in the planting of which all Christians are invited to help. The response to this invitation should provide an expanse of trees whose very number will compare with the enormity of the tragedy which we seek to memorialize.

Situated in the hills of Galilee, on the very slopes where our Saviour trod and taught, the children's memorial forest will be an everlasting monument to the souls of young martyrs and a testimonial to the keen and pulsating conscience of America.

A HOME FOR THE SURVIVING CHILDREN

One of the brightest chapters in the dark record of the war years is the rescue of some of Europe's Jewish children. This number was, alas, too small.

The life-saving work was facilitated by the policy of the United States Government which created a special agency for this purpose. This War Refugee Board aided the efforts of organizations and groups whose energy and treasure were devoted to the saving of human lives, especially the lives of children.

Many of those who escaped from the concentration camps and the human slaughterhouses found a home in Palestine, prepared for them by the thousands of Jewish pioneers, who within several decades have transformed sand dunes into thriving cities, swamps and wastelands into flourishing settlements. Isaiah's prophecy that the "desert shall blossom as the rose" is coming true. Christians who love Palestine because it was the homeland of Jesus have an opportunity now to help make it not only more habitable for the descendants of His people but also beautiful and productive for all mankind.

Since VE-day hundreds of surviving children have arrived in Palestine, but many more still remain in Europe, living only with the hope of eventually going to their homeland. Once there, these children are cared for in special training centers and agricultural settlements where they are reared in a free, happy, self-respecting way of life.

The children's memorial forest will serve this and future generations of Jewish children, and will be a source of joy and pride to every Christian tourist who visits the boyhood home of Jesus.

"A TREE PLANTED BY STREAMS OF WATER"

The children's memorial forest, in which your trees will be planted, will grow on a tract of land which has been set aside by the Jewish National Fund. This agency has a distinguished record of achievement in the reforestation of Palestine. Its forestry department, manned by an expert staff, not only plants the trees but exercises vigilant care over them.

During the last 45 years the Jewish people have planted more than 50 forests comprising many millions of trees. Notable among these is the George Washington Forest planted in 1932 on the occasion of the bicentennial anniversary of Washington's birth and situated at Kfar Ha'Choresh in the hills of Galilee.

During the centuries since the time of Jesus all ancient forests of Palestine were destroyed. The early Jewish pioneers found a treeless land and their first act was to plant trees. For the tree has a vital and constructive purpose to serve. It conserves the soil, converts uncultivable areas into fertile fields, reclaims malarial swamps, prevents soil erosion, beautifies the landscape, and provides parks and playgrounds for the youth.

The children's memorial forest will comprise the kind of trees familiar to all readers of the Bible. Here they are pictured with their names. When the prophets and seers of the Bible sought a fitting symbol to portray a righteous cause or an upright man, they were likened to a tree. The Psalmist describes the godly man as one who "will be like a tree planted by streams of water." Today, as in antiquity, the tree in Palestine is not only a symbol of growth, but an essential of life and hope. Through the memorial forest Christians will give life and hope to a suffering people.

CHRISTIAN LEADERS SUPPORT THE PROGRAM

The children's memorial forest is the fulfillment of a wish—widely expressed throughout the country—for some concrete way in which Christians might give expression to their feelings of horror at what happened in Europe, and to their hope for what Palestine may mean to the Jews of the world.

This project was originally the suggestion of Mrs. Ruth Abernethy, secretary of the St. Paul Chapter of the American Christian Palestine Committee. Announcement of it has evoked a spontaneous chorus of enthusiasm and approval from Christian leaders throughout the country.

Here are some of the messages received:

"I believe in everything for which the children's memorial forest will stand—the fertility of the soil, the beauty of nature, the sacredness of childhood, the supreme value of human personality, and the brotherhood of man." (Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, presiding bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church.)

"The children's memorial forest is not only an expression of sympathy but a condemnation of anti-Semitism everywhere. May it ever stand as a testimony to Christian good will." (G. Bromley Oxnam, bishop of the Methodist Church, the New York area.)

"The One whom we worship as Saviour and Lord was a Jew who loved the hills and valleys, the streams and trees, and all living things of His native land. The children's memorial forest will help restore the barren wastes of Palestine to their ancient beauty and glory and will, at the same time, help to fulfill His dream of security for all children everywhere." (Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor, Christian Herald.)

"As Christian children participate in the children's memorial forest, they will develop a new appreciation of the meaning of international cooperation and world brotherhood. This project will not only beautify the home country of Jesus, but provide for the needs of some of the surviving children of Europe." (Harold E. Stassen, president, International Council of Religious Education.)

"All of us were shocked and grieved by the tragedy that befell the Jewish children of Europe. The children's memorial forest is not only an appropriate expression of sympathy, but also a testimonial to our faith in a new world in which all children may henceforth live in freedom from fear and from want." (Eleanor Roosevelt.)

"The idea of the children's memorial forest appeals to me greatly and I am sure will be equally appealing to a multitude of Christians throughout America. Christians think of Palestine as the land of the Jews, and it is most appropriate that this forest, in memory of Jewish children, should be planted near the boyhood home of Jesus." (Alf M. Landon.)

"The opportunity for Christian Americans to express their horror at the murder of the Jewish children of Europe will appeal to the hearts of all. The children's memorial forest will stand as a new evidence of our dedication to democratic principles and our belief in the justice and decency in human relationships." (Harold L. Ickes.)

"The Christian women of America will surely support the planting of the children's memorial forest. It will ever stand as an indignant protest against the 'murder of innocents' and as evidence of our desire to provide for children everywhere the opportunities of rich and abundant living." (Carrie Chapman Catt.)

"Christians should share in the redevelopment of Palestine, and in what more appropriate way can this be done than in planting a forest near Nazareth, as a symbol of our faith in a kindlier, more cooperative, and more brotherly world." (Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, minister, Christ Methodist Church, New York.)

"The children's memorial forest is a magnificent conception. Those who cooperate in the planting of this forest will not only beautify and enrich the Holy Land but they will be cultivating the spiritual resources of their own souls." (Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, minister, Marble Collegiate Church, New York.)

"Christians everywhere should welcome the opportunity to participate in a demonstration of such high social sensitiveness as the children's memorial forest. It will ever remain as a symbol of hope for a better world." (Rt. Rev. W. Bertrand Stevens, Episcopal Bishop of Los Angeles.)

"On behalf of the Christians of this area, I can assure you of our cooperation in the planting of the children's memorial forest in Palestine. Long may this forest stand as visible evidence of our common spiritual heritage." (Raimundo de Ovies, Dean, Cathedral of St. Phillip, Atlanta, Ga.)

"Reclamation and restoration by Jewish colonization of old damaged lands in Palestine is a worthy miracle of modern times. A children's memorial forest will increase the growing productivity of the Holy Land as a symbol of conservation of natural and human resources and as a lasting benediction on the children of the future." (Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, Assistant Chief, Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.)

"I am happy to commend the children's memorial forest in Palestine. Such an undertaking on the part of children around the world will serve to emphasize in their own minds the deadly nature of prejudice and suspicion, and will make them all the more conscious of the necessity of creating understanding and good will." (Dr. Edward Hughes Pruden, minister, First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C.)

HOW YOU CAN HELP

You can have a direct part in the planting of the children's memorial forest in Palestine—you, and every other American with whom you will want to associate in expressing your interest in the establishment of this fitting memorial of a great tragedy. The appeal tugs at your heartstrings; its spiritual significance is more than worth the small investment it requires. There are several ways in which individual donors, church groups, and schools can participate:

I. The cost of planting one tree is only $1.50. Buy at least one tree. Plant it in your name or in the name of a child you love.

II. Get others to plant trees, either as individuals or as a special project of any group to which you belong. The children's memorial forest is a manifestation of our will to brotherhood and cooperation. Every person opposing hate and prejudice, as destructive of our democratic ideals, will wish to participate with you.

III. Group contributions of 100 trees or more will constitute a garden bearing the name of the group.

IV. Every Sunday School should plant trees. Here is a unique opportunity for every child to share in the active experience of brotherhood and to practice the Christian faith that they are taught. Some children will wish to plant a tree all by themselves. Others may make the planting of trees in the children's memorial forest a class project. In that case, the class will be listed as donor.

V. Committees are being formed in many cities all over the country. You may wish to take part in this project as a member of the community in which you live. A grove (1,000 trees) named for your community will be the aim of the committee in your city. Give it your cooperation, support, and active assistance.

RECOGNITION FOR TREE PLANTERS

All donors, both individuals and groups, will receive memorial certificates. A facsimile of the attractive certificate which will have lasting significance is reproduced below. In sending in group remittances, please make sure that individual donors and their accurate addresses are listed.

The names of donors will be recorded in permanent and appropriate form within the area of the children's memorial forest. Their names will thus forever be linked with the trees which will beautify the hills of Galilee.

Gardens and groves will be named for the groups, communities, or individuals who purchased the requisite number of trees.

The Sunday Schools which in proportion to their size have the highest record of giving—not only in terms of trees, but in the number of contributing children—will be appropriately recognized.

CONTRIBUTIONS

All gifts should be sent to Dr. Daniel A. Poling, treasurer, post office box 206, Grand Central Station, New York, N. Y. Children's memorial forest offices are located in Suite 707, 41 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

American Christian Palestine Committee, 41 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.: Founders and honorary chairmen, Senator Robert F. Wagner, Rev. Dr. Henry A. Atkinson; cochairman, Hon. Owen Brewster, Hon. James M. Mead, Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling; vice chairmen, William Green, Eric A. Johnston, Hon. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Hon. John W. McCormack, Senator Warren Magnuson, Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Philip Murray, Mrs. Ruth Bryan Rohde, Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, Hon. Sumner Welles; secretary, Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas; treasurer, Dean Alfange; director, Dean Howard M. LeSourd; extension secretary, V. D. Furnad; executive council, Rev. Dr. Carl Hermann Voss, chairman, Father George B. Ford, Prof. Carl J. Friedrich, Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Prof. Eduard C. Lindeman, Mrs. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, Robert E. Smith, Rev. Dr. Ralph W. Sockman; national advisory council, Prof. James Luther Adams, J. M. Bialock, Dr. John W. Bradbury, Hon. Oscar Chapman, Rev. Karl M. Chworowsky, Rev. Dr. Clark Walker Cummings, Rev. Dr. Albert E. Day, Representative Everett Dirksen, Mrs. Walter Ferguson, Representative Daniel J. Flood, Judge John Gutknecht, Prof. S. Ralph Harlow, Rev. David R. Hunter, Dean Sidney Lovett, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, Prof. Halford E. Luccock, Rev. Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, Senator Claude Pepper, Hon. Frank A. Picard, Miss Daphne Robert, Rev. Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, Senator Elbert D. Thomas, Prof. Paul Tillich, Dr. Howard B. Warren, Prof. Henry N. Wieman, Dr. Mary E. Woolley.

Responsibilities of Reserve Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by me for the Reserve Officer magazine and appearing in the December issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS PAST IS PROLOGUE

(By Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee)

In the moment of the blinding flash of the first offensively used atomic bomb at Hiroshima the strategic situation of this Nation, as of all nations in this world, was drastically revised. We are yet engaged in the toil of comprehending the consequences of the bomb and the portent of the weapons of war promised for development in this new era, but it is not too early to accept the realization, in consideration of military matters, that henceforth this Nation's primary defense is the political defense.

The simple fact of our democratic and constitutional structure prevents this country from taking the initiative in war. We might take a threatening position with an array of military might, but we cannot start the fighting. It is quite possible that the aggressor in any future war may achieve such an advantage that any retaliatory effort will be inadequate to turn the tide. Such a concept involves a pessimistic point of view perhaps, but it nevertheless accentuates the need for developing real international political strength to preclude the possibility. And it also defines with clarity and force the assignment devolving upon each of us as members of a peace-loving nation; to provide our elected leaders with the active support essential to their successful negotiation with the representatives of foreign governments.

The form of our Government as devised by the gifted framers of our Constitution has been preserved. We have had to fight to repel threats to our Government from within and without, but we have preserved it by exerting the utmost of our physical strength because we have the proof that it works in our best interest. But there have been interim periods when reaction from such exertion caused a deterioration in the solidity of the foundation for our Government. That foundation is, of course, the people, for our Government is yet dependent on the people it serves. The defeat of President Wilson's carefully nurtured plan for peace after the first great war may be cited as an example, despite its controversial nature. That defeat was engendered by a Senate reflecting the will of an indifferent populace hastily withdrawing into the darkened folds of isolationism.

There is much evidence available today that too many people proudly wearing the title of "Citizen of the United States" have not bothered to acquaint themselves with the duties and responsibilities which go along with the title. Each of us should be students, in the best sense of the word, of governmental problems. In this dawning era we must conscientiously attempt to remain abreast of the issues pertinent to our international relations. That only means accepting the theory of our Government.

The Reserve officer is one who has learned at first hand the lesson of modern warfare with its significant implications for the future. Also, he is one who generally holds a position of influence at least in his immediate sphere of action. It is my belief that the reserve officer is thereby specially qualified and enabled to stimulate interest in his fellow men in the problems of the day. If real interest is generated in those problems public opinion thereon will inevitably find its expression.

That opinion lends great weight to the efforts of the diplomats who serve as our international representatives. Public thought was recently aroused by the incidents occurring in Yugoslavia and it is not to be denied that the settlement of the issues created there was heavily influenced by the very fact that our citizenry was aroused and that our press reflected a practical unanimity of feeling in this country. I have stated before that men do not steal governments from those who are watchful of their rights. In this conception we can consider such indifference as characterized our reaction from the last war an enemy to our future security. Intelligent study, due consideration, and reasoned judgment will create a potent force for the subjugation of that enemy.

As a Reserve officer you will constantly be reminded of your duty to maintain your knowledge of the methods of warfare. As a former reserve officer and one intimately connected with military matters I would be the last to derogate the importance of diligence in that respect. I would only ask that you more fully discharge your responsibility as the holder of a commission by extending your influence as a citizen to prevent the necessity of again becoming an actively engaged soldier. No greater opportunity exists for any of us than to aline ourselves with the founding fathers and to assist, through study and action, in the accomplishment of the purposes of which they dreamed when they set up this Nation for the benefit of mankind.

Let us all remember that no nation on earth is worse off than one whose people refuse to be bothered with the questions that may decide their fate.

Congressman Gordon L. McDonough Urges Corrective Labor Legislation

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the membership an editorial recently written by David Lawrence in which, in my opinion, he makes a very keen observation concerning the proposed labor legislation we shall be called upon to pass. He says that he believes that the labor legislation we pass will be prolabor for the reason that the average man in labor's ranks expressed himself at the polls last

November to free himself from the autocratic and dictatorial leadership of his individual union. He knew that the votes at the polls would be counted properly where in many instances in various unions they would not be, and for that reason the majority of the members of the Republican Party were elected for the purpose of passing not punitive labor legislation but beneficial labor legislation for the rank and file of labor.

I believe the rank and file of labor want jurisdictional and sympathetic strikes abolished; they want secondary boycotts abolished; they want equal rights and obligations for employee and employer by amending the Wagner Act. They want the right to express themselves freely, by ballot, without threat or fear; who should be their leaders and whether the questions involved between employer and employee are serious enough to require a strike. Sentiment is growing in favor of permitting employees to determine by free, secret ballot whether they want a closed shop or not.

In short, the rank and file of labor are a little weary, yes, perhaps downright disgusted and resentful of autocratic dictatorial leadership who have used them as pawns to promote their own selfish ambitions. Having lost faith in their leadership they are looking to the Congress to protect them and prevent useless work stoppages, which have caused them useless loss of wages and brought misery to themselves and their families.

The rank and file of labor want steady jobs, good wages, peace and freedom from pugnacious leadership which has dominated them. They want freedom, and this Congress should see that they get it. The public and nonunion members want peace, prosperity, and production and this Congress should see that they get it.

I am convinced that this Congress will pass, and I shall support, corrective labor legislation that will protect the wage earner whether he be union or nonunion member, legislation which will protect the public interest and bring peace, prosperity, and production.

I wish everyone would read this editorial.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

LABOR LAWS TO BE PROLABOR

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 4.—Predictions by labor leaders of an era of good feeling between management and labor come like soothing sirup at a time of irritation. But such assurances are illusory. They have been made time and again whenever Congress has become aware of an aroused public opinion and started to legislate a remedy for labor troubles. Then when all threats of legislating at a particular session vanish, labor strife usually is resumed.

Naturally, the labor leaders are trying by every means to dissuade Congress from doing any legislating at all. The Truman administration would really like to leave the situation unchanged, although it does sponsor some unimportant changes. The left-wing propaganda machines are working overtime with the old wheeze that legislation cures nothing, but the moment anybody suggests a repeal or amendment of existing laws, which are also "legislation," there is a howl of protest.

The truth is Congress is face to face now with legislating on the labor problem not only because the employers want it but because the rank and file of the workers really want it, too. The biggest issue before the country is the emancipation of the worker from the totalitarian dictatorships that exist in labor unions.

The closed-shop issue is not merely a matter of monopoly whereby the Nation's economic system can be paralyzed. It is a matter of liberation of the individual worker from the clutches of oligarchies which can determine his livelihood unless he bows to the will of a clique or pays tribute to them.

If the American people want to erect a supergovernment which shall transcend their representative system, they will get it through closed-shop monopolies and a system whereby the employers collect dues and really maintain the membership rolls for the unions at the behest of unions.

But the workers themselves are beginning to talk. Information is flowing into Congress which is opening the eyes of Members to the abuses which exist inside labor unions and particularly the undemocratic procedure whereby minority rights are so readily trampled on.

The labor issue is a deep-seated one. No proposals have been advanced by anybody in Congress to weaken collective bargaining or to take away basic rights from labor, but the remarkable opposition being manifested by labor unions toward any changes in existing laws is confirming the general impression that vested interests and special privileges die hard, no matter whether on the side of labor or management.

What the labor leaders may not realize is that the rank and file are out of sympathy with the high-handed tactics of the international and national boards of unions and that the safeguards in local unions against crooked use of the ballot and mishandling of union finances are not adequate.

The majority in Congress, consisting of Republicans and Democrats who want to pass legislation to cure the labor situation, is by no means antilabor. It is more prolabor than any Congress has been in 20 years, because it is trying to follow the mandate of the last election. The rank and file of the workers found in the secret ballot a chance to protest against irresponsible strike action and the dictatorial conduct of labor unions. It was the votes of labor-union members which brought the Republican Party into power.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Settlement of Utah—Official Centennial Picture, Ramrod

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning the premier of the picture, Ramrod, which has been designated as the official centennial picture in connection with the one hundredth anniversary of the settlement of Utah.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For generations, thousands upon thousands of tourists from all parts of America and the world have come to the State of Utah to enjoy its hospitality and scenic wonders.

This year, marking Utah's centennial, through the magic of the motion-picture camera, additional millions will enjoy its awe-inspiring grandeur.

During the past summer a production unit of Enterprise Studios, of Hollywood, has been on location at Zion National Park, in southern Utah, for the filming of the motion picture entitled "Ramrod." I have been informed that this picture, Ramrod, has been designated as the official Utah centennial picture by the Utah Centennial Commission and will receive its world premier at Salt Lake City on February 21 as part of the Utah centennial celebration now in progress.

Because of its spectacular natural attractions Utah is now recognized as an important production area by the motion picture industry. Mr. Harry Sherman, well-known Hollywood producer, selected Zion National Park as the locale for Ramrod after exploring thousands of miles throughout the West. The production unit was based at Zion National Park Lodge, and the State of Utah cooperated in many ways in the filming of this epic. More than 100 Utahans, residents of Rockville, Springdale, and St. George, found employment while the Enterprise company was at work.

I am sure that I speak for all of the people of Utah when I say that we are delighted that through the eyes of the motion picture camera, millions of theatergoers at home and abroad will be visiting our glorious State during our centennial celebration. Truly, Zion National Park is one of the most magnificent of God's creations. Brilliant in hues, sweeping in grandeur and inspiration, its majestic precipices, indeed, reminded the early settlers of the temples of God.

Utah has been richly endowed. In addition to her scenic splendor, she has been blessed with an industrious people who cherish their pioneer heritage; mineral resources and fine agricultural products have made her economy stable, prosperous, and progressive.

Through the medium of Ramrod many of Utah's friends will have an opportunity to revisit scenes of many happy hours, and countless friends will be made. Enterprise Studios is to be congratulated for dedicating this picture to the Utah centennial. In doing so, it has projected our great State to all parts of the world, and has brought us still closer to our neighbors.

Statement of Hon. Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, in Opposition to Confirmation of Nomination of David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I issued to the press this morning

in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am strongly opposed to the confirmation of David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The study of Mr. Lilienthal's nomination has gone on side issues, among which is Senator MCKELLAR'S personal objection to Mr. Lilienthal. The vital issue is being obscured.

The chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission is one of the most important administrative jobs ever created in the history of American government. There are few positions within any government as closely related to the destiny of the world. It follows, then, that the American people have a right and duty to be absolutely certain of the qualifications of the citizen who is to fill this post. We simply cannot afford to take a chance where there is a shadow of a doubt.

Mr. Lilienthal is an extreme New Dealer. In part, I base my objection to his confirmation upon that fact. As with all left-wingers, it is indicated Lilienthal is sympathetic towards Russia which is Communist controlled. The report he wrote for Mr. Acheson proposed to turn over the atom bomb and secret to the United Nations, including Communist Russia, without the safeguards later insisted upon by Mr. Baruch. It is such a proposal as Lilienthal's that Russia completely approves and has fervently hoped for. In the light of Russia's persistent indifference towards basic principles of peace, neither America nor the world at large can afford to have an appeaser of Russia as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Lilienthal has directed the Tennessee Valley Authority, a social experiment, which is a wide departure from the American system of private ownership of property. Mr. Lilienthal's personal belief in public ownership is so profoundly strong as to tend towards socialism. It is a belief shared generally by extreme New Dealers.

At the last election, a majority of the American people repudiated the New Deal and the philosophy of government which Mr. Lilienthal shares. Certainly that repudiation was intended to include a bar against the appointment of an extreme New Dealer to such a vital post as the Chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Senate is asked to confirm extreme left-winger, New Dealer Lilienthal in a position which would give him almost unlimited power over all atomic energy and many other phases of American life related directly or indirectly to the development of atomic energy. The Commission will have jurisdiction over tremendous manufacturing plants and whole communities of American people. The Commission can well become America's and the whole world's hand of fate.

Mr. Lilienthal has a domineering personality. He has displayed it frequently, particularly in his ousting of Arthur Morgan from TVA. There is every reason to conclude that he might deal with this atomic power of life and death by the same New Deal method of stretching statutory powers into complete government, if not personal domination.

My expression of opinion is no reflection upon Mr. Lilienthal's character. It is simply a statement of a fundamental difference with his political philosophy which the American people repudiated last November.

I believe the Republican majority in the Senate will be subject to the serious, emphatic criticism of the people if they weakly approve the Lilienthal nomination.

America's future security and the peace of the world are so uncertain that we cannot afford to gamble. There are many outstandingly capable men in America who could serve as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and upon whom no doubts have been or could be cast. In this vital hour it is the duty of the President to nominate and the Senate to confirm one of these. For the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Senate should not confirm any man concerning whom there is the slightest doubt. The country expects the Senate to be firm in that position.

Preparation for Emergencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio address which I delivered yesterday. This message was in the form of an open letter to President Truman. It was broadcast from Station WPIK, in Alexandria, Va., on the "Charles Parmer From Washington" program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

TIME EXISTS NO MORE

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The atomic bomb which dropped on Hiroshima blotted out forever the time which we formerly used to rectify our mistakes—the mistakes of not being prepared to defend our homeland from attack from without.

Since the human brain, especially when it is encircled by gold braid, has a tendency to lag and forget, I am making this letter public, Mr. President, in the belief that an aroused public opinion will demand that you, as Commander in Chief, together with America's military and naval leaders, the Members of Congress, and all of us, take action to protect our Nation of 140,000,000.

On behalf of these millions—who have been kept in ignorance of our true world situation and our helpless state—I respectfully urge the need for more immediate push-button plans for the push-button warfare that will come unless the nations of the earth will otherwise and, particularly unless the Big Five, will create an international organization that will do away with all warfare. The hope of humanity is that UN will perform that function.

But, Mr. President, we must plan for government by remote control, and for a continuity of succession if the Central Government including you and Members of Congress are wiped off the map by atomic attack on our Nation's Capital. Your plan doesn't meet that problem. I warn, Mr. President, there will be no time then—and we in authority will be primarily to blame if we do not take leadership now. No one underestimates the multitude of problems which you face, but national defense must take No. 1 place on your priority.

THE RECORD OF REJECTED APPEALS

Need I remind you, Mr. President, that those who urge you to do this are not mere flashes in the pan. Long before Pearl Harbor, I, for one, warned our administrative authorities of this Nation's needs—and was grandly given the brush-off. Ten months before we were disgraced by Japan I called for the Secretary of State to make a report in executive session to the Senate on the far eastern situation. Proposal rejected! We and the Nation were kept in ignorance.

I urged stock-piling of hemp—the War Department ignored my suggestions, to its bitter regret. I presented a measure to give us needed zinc ores and slab zinc—but the administration wouldn't listen to that until it was too late. I recommended to the Naval Secretary that Great Lakes shipyards be constructed immediately to produce great fleets of corvettes. My recommendation gathered dust; yet within 2 years we suffered terrible losses in the oil fleet—for lack of small vessels to meet the submarine menace off our coasts.

My humble proposals were but a few of many constructive suggestions offered by others, which were also cold-shouldered. It matters not one jot that it was my personal recommendations that were rejected; their authorship is absolutely immaterial; what is important was that sound ideas were callously spurned.

THE SITUATION NOW

Well, Mr. President, we are now living in two worlds, ideologically. There stands the Russian Bear, whose official literature proclaims inevitable conflict between the communistic and capitalist worlds.

Are we ready? We are not, Mr. President. Nor have we even made plans to be ready. Many of the brass hats, fattening on belated success, are lolling back in the same mental attitude as that of 1917, and of 1939.

After the First World War they were content to improve on "squads right," sink our battleships, and ignore Billy Mitchell's warnings. In fact, the brass hats tried to disgrace him for his patriotic warnings * * * then came World War II. Hitler's chieftains had not been asleep, as ours had. They mechanized and synchronized their forces. Twelve panzer divisions of 12,000 men each, synchronized with Stuka strafing planes, brought 3,000,000 armed Frenchmen to their knees.

Oh, yes, I know: we've synchronized and mechanized now. But that's just a step beyond the last war. We can't let it go at that in a shrunken world where time no longer exists. What is sufficient for one era is not necessarily so for another.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF AMERICAN PLANS

We must announce total preparation to meet any emergency. This will be a warning to any potential enemy that we will not again be caught in a Pearl Harbor sitting-duck posture.

This over-all, total war plan which I present does not in the least interfere with creating harmony among nations, nor will it interfere with operations of a world police force. A United States defense second to none is still the best insurance of world peace.

If we are to bring peace and harmony to nations, Mr. President, we must not ignore history. We had a League of Nations. It failed. We passed the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war—and war came. Now we would outlaw the atomic bomb, nevertheless we should maintain our national police and fire departments, so to speak, ready to go into action instantly; for our safety and peace. First things come first.

Here is a proposal for total defense against over-all warfare which I urge you to sponsor—not as a party leader, but as an American. Announce it to all the world, so potential enemies will know we are ready, that attack on us will be useless.

The first target in the next war, Mr. President, may well be the White House and you, and Congress and us; for a nation whose governing heads are stricken will be thrown into chaos.

So let's prevent that. Let us lay plans for government and legislation by television, if need be. Let us have procedure for immediate succession of authority and continuity of government if we are killed by atomic attack. All this must be done now, for there will be no time in the next war.

TOTAL PLANS AGAINST TOTAL EMERGENCY

Let us—you, and the Congress—be adequate to meet every emergency and to have plans ready beforehand. These plans should include:

1. The economic field: The Army and Navy must encourage decentralized factories, in mountainous and other relatively inaccessible spots. These must be ready to go into production within a few hours' notice from Washington.

2. Unification. The minimum we should seek is unification of manufacture, purchase and distribution of supplies for all armed services. Need I mention the need for standardization of shells and other matériel?

3. Personnel: We want no more wagon generals and rowboat admirals. We want Army, Navy, and Air personnel advanced by selection and fitness, men fully equipped for atomic and bacteriological warfare.

4. Appropriations: Necessary as economy is, we must not slash vital appropriations for our defenses, especially for bacteriological, atomic, and guided-missile research and for a world-wide intelligence system superior to that of any other power.

5. Research: Colleges and universities must be encouraged to continue research, particularly in the field of pure science; we must have on tap a reservoir of scientists trained in atomic and bacteriological warfare—not for popgun fighting. This means we should have physicians, nurses, technicians trained to cope with diseases which may infect us in the next war—a war which will have no rules.

6. Stock piling: We must have and maintain in usable condition stock piles of every essential needed by the civilian populace as well as the military to carry on in event of attack. Especially basic commodities. Shall I recall our failure, of civilian and military and naval heads, to have adequate supplies of rubber, hemp, zinc—and even boats—at the beginning of the last war?

7. Housing: The surest way to hold back production is to lack available personnel. If we have decentralized factories, and that is a first essential, then adequate housing facilities must be nearby, ready to move thereinto.

8. Emergency agencies: There'll be no time for setting up Federal emergency agencies—this must be done in advance; an agency for every conceivable activity must be planned on paper, set up in skeleton form, and from time to time "dry runs" must be held to show the feasibility of details. No bureaucratic empires, no maze of offices tying each other up in knots, but streamlined offices designed for split-second decisions.

9. Psychological: Sound trite, Mr. President, but we must remind our people that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. That while the millennium may be around the corner, it is a far-away corner to foster our esprit, we should do what I urged in 1939, maintain mental poise, spiritual balance, and morally rearm, while keeping our powder dry.

Above all, Mr. President, let me urge again the need of providing for government by remote control, and for a continuity of succession, if you in the White House and we in the Congress are smashed off the earth's face in one atomic flash.

There is no more time, Mr. President.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Comments by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, on Article Entitled "The Armed Forces"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, dealing with demobilization, which I wrote to the publisher of the magazine Fortune on August 29, 1946, in connection with an article entitled "The Armed Forces," published in the September issue.

Portions of my letter have been published in Fortune.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 29, 1946.

Mr. WILLIAM D. GEER,
Publisher, Fortune Magazine,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. GEER: It happens frequently that I am called upon for comments regarding magazine articles on various topics. By nature I am inclined to make a serious attempt at compliance with the apparent spirit of such requests, although I have no real evidence that my comments are ever received with equal seriousness. At any rate, I have read with much interest the proofs on the article entitled, "The Armed Forces," which is to appear in the September issue of Fortune, and I appreciate your asking for my comments thereon.

Befitting the standard of Fortune the article is, in my opinion, well written. It does seem, however, that it emerged from a rather narrow avenue of thought. We are now a year advanced from VJ-day and therefore may enjoy a vantage point for appraising the developments which have followed the victory. The most notable of those developments from a national standpoint is, of course, demobilization. In a very real sense demobilization was a retreat, commanded by the people of our country. (That the command had a general source is very nearly stated in the article by reference to the serviceman, his family, his friends, and Congressmen—or that grouping excludes very few in our populace.)

Retreat is an important fundamental in military tactics; to be successful it must be an orderly movement, in which circumstance it differs from a flight or a rout. The very fact of demobilization, as it has been accomplished in 1 year, bespeaks the success of the operation. Actually it was accomplished with a real measure of discipline and I believe it is deserving of our acclaim as a magnitudinous operation executed in order and with dispatch. Certainly it is not deserving of the description, utilized in the article, as a rout.

With regard to the personnel difficulties which have accrued to the Armed Forces from demobilization, it is no doubt true that they have been many and great. But they have not been insurmountable. In this connection the lead paragraph of the article employes the example of a naval craft which wallowed helplessly at sea a few hours after beginning its voyage because it was so sadly undermanned. The personnel capabilities were patently evident before that voyage was begun, apparently, and in the absence of explanation that the voyage was compelled by necessity it seems an error in its inception, and not an inescapable consequence of demobilization. Granting its purpose as that of a preface to a severely stated report on the state of our armed forces, the extremeness of the example flavored the report a little too strongly for my taste.

The use of the term "bodies," despite its alleged origin in usage among military leaders, continues an extreme point of view. There was practically an entire conversion of the purpose of our armed forces following the cessation of combat, which came with a suddenness that enlarged the difficulty of conversion. And there was a conversion of the will of the supporting civilian populace, which found expression in the call for the wartime soldier to be returned since "peace" had been achieved. The natural opinion so generally shared was that the atomic bomb precluded the danger of further warfare for some time to come, and that it practically gave assurance that the peace treaties would be promptly negotiated in terms of necessity.

Our military authorities understood the new purpose, as well as it could then be defined. With cognizance of the minimum strength necessary to carry out their assignments they did, however, devise and carry out a program of demobilization on a scale and at a rate which exceeded the demands of Congress, acting as spokesmen for the people. It was obviously desirable to compose that minimum strength entirely with volunteer soldiers. Because our national character broods anathema for compulsory military service once the shooting has stopped it was hardly reasonable to infer that the nonprofessional trained soldiers could have been held, in any majority, for the postwar tasks. There was the solid core in the service composed of the officers and men who conscientiously and proudly were "regulars," but their number was too small. Volunteers stayed on to join them, but the means were never developed to immediately attract sufficient volunteers.

The replacements who were necessarily inducted to maintain the necessary minimum strength of the armed forces were subject to many distractions naturally incident to the transition which were detrimental to their training. Also, many of them felt the punitive effect which the draft inevitably tends to produce after it has been in operation over a relatively long period of time. It is to be admitted that many men in uniform today are ineffectively trained, and some are serving expressly against their will. But the number of good soldiers in the armed forces today is far too great to warrant the hypercritical connotation implied by the use of the term "bodies" in reference to the uniformed personnel.

On the point of matériel it is yet a matter of proof that this country occupies a superior position. The research programs now under way promise our continued retention of predominance in the field of ordnance. It will be our manifest duty to foster the growth of these research programs and to apply the developments in a manner consistent with our position of dominance among the nations of the world.

It is agreed that it is paradoxical that the men who were discharged in such great numbers from the Army and Navy during the past year form the reservoir of manpower which the armed forces are now dependent upon for strength in depth in consideration of the prospect of another war. For at least 2 years, in all probability, it will remain a reservoir of trained manpower. These men are being cared for in many ways authorized by Congress, and it is demonstrative of an encouraging consciousness on their part of

the necessity for preparedness that so many have elected to assume a formal Reserve status.

During the past year much has been done to assist the establishment of our armed forces on a sounder basis than they have previously enjoyed in peacetime. By increasing the size of our armed forces and by adopting measures calculated to enhance the attractiveness of the service as a career our forces in the air, on the sea, and those trained for ground combat should be properly representative of this Nation. It is significant that all of the measures designed for the improvement of the armed forces have received at least tacit ratification from the people. We have had such a stern lesson in warfare this time that the Army and Navy should never again have to suffer the neglect of a disinterested public.

The two main tasks confronting the armed forces in the past year were policing and demobilizing. The latter task was admirably performed, while the job of bringing defeated countries under peacetime military control, with all of its ramifications has been handled at least satisfactorily, and historians may well find this accomplishment worthy of acclaim. It was a turbulent year, but the armed forces maintained their balance quite well, all things considered.

Again I say that I enjoyed reading the article, and I am sure that the interest in it for me was greatly increased by your solicitation of my comments. It would be my preference to discuss such a topic as this in a personal conversation, but in lieu of that possibility I have enjoyed setting forth these few comments here.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ELBERT D. THOMAS.

America's Declaration Accepting Jurisdiction of World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress the Senate adopted what was known as the World Court resolution.

The resolution contained certain amendments, one known as the Connally amendment, and another known as the Vandenberg amendment. The resolution, as amended, has resulted in considerable discussion within the legal profession of the country. I received a letter from Mr. William L. Ransom, past president of the American Bar Association, calling my attention to a very scholarly article by Manley O. Hudson, that appears in the December issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

As the Senate knows, Mr. Hudson formerly was a judge on the World Court. The article is in keeping with the previous scholarly writings of Mr. Hudson on the problem of the relation of the World Court to international law.

I suppose no one will doubt that Mr. Hudson, now of Harvard University, is considered at least one of the two or three greatest living authorities in the field of international law.

Mr. Ransom suggests, in his letter to me, that this article is of such a very high quality that it should be read by the Members of the Senate, and that it would, therefore, be quite appropriate to have it published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hudson's article entitled "The World Court: America's Declaration Accepting Jurisdiction," published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am advised by the Government Printing Office that the manuscript of the article is estimated to make three and three-quarter pages, and will cost $266.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD COURT: AMERICA'S DECLARATION ACCEPTING JURISDICTION

(By Manley O. Hudson)

Has the United States set what might become an unfortunate precedent for other nations, in the reservations and conditions which it attached to its acceptance of the jurisdiction of the World Court? Judge Hudson discusses both the ground gained in the American declaration and the questions which it leaves unsettled for the troubled time when a provocative dispute may arise. Because of his long and outstanding services to international law and adjudication, his present article will be read and studied by lawyers in all lands. Most heartening news is his demonstration that the Chinese Government, in its recent declaration, did not follow the pattern set by the United States. During the past 2 years Judge Hudson has worked closely with an for the association's special committee for peace and law through United Nations.

President Truman's declaration by which the United States recognized the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court under article 36 of its statute, was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on August 26, 1946.[1] The action marks a turning point in American history. At long last it brings the United States partially into line with other states in a significant development of international law. Paradoxically, however, the declaration is in such form that it may inaugurate a seriously reactionary development.

Great progress has been achieved in the field of international adjudication since the statute of the World Court first entered into force 25 years ago. With an adequate tribunal at hand in the Permanent Court of International Justice, many states showed a willingness to confer jurisdiction upon it. Hundreds of treaties were concluded which contained provisions adapted to this end, and in the interwar period 46 states subjected themselves to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court for definite or indefinite periods of time. The Court exercised the jurisdiction thus conferred in a substantial number of cases, and without any untoward incident.[2]

Naturally, therefore, when the revision of the Court's statute was undertaken in 1945, many states were disposed to drop the option left to states by article 36 of the 1920 statute with reference to the recognition of compulsory jurisdiction,[3] and to make such recognition obligatory for every party to the revised statute. That disposition did not prevail at San Francisco largely because of the opposition of the United States and the Soviet Union, neither of which had become a party to the 1920 statute.

LONG STANDING ATTITUDE OF THE SENATE

Insofar as the United States was concerned, the reluctance of the American delegation was due to a long-standing Senate tradition[4] which, over a period of 40 years, had pre-

---

[1] The text of the declaration, as published in the Bulletin of the Department of State, September 8, 1946, pages 452-453, is as follows:

"I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, declare on behalf of the United States of America, under article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and in accordance with the resolution of August 2, 1946, of the Senate of the United States of America (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), that the United States of America recognizes as compulsory, ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning:

"a. The interpretation of a treaty;

"b. Any question of international law;

"c. The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"d. The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation:

"*Provided*, That this declaration shall not apply to:

"a. Disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; or

"b. Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America as determined by the United States of America; or

"c. Disputes arising under a multilateral treaty, unless (1) all parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the United States of America specially agrees to jurisdiction; and

"*Provided further*, That this declaration shall remain in force for a period of 5 years and thereafter until the expiration of 6 months after notice may be given to terminate this declaration.

"Done at Washington this 14th day of August 1946.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

[2] See Hudson, Permanent Court of International Justice, 1920-1942, chap. 21.

[3] Article 36 of the 1920 Statute provided:

"The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in treaties and conventions in force.

"The Members of the League of Nations and the states mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant may, either when signing or ratifying the Protocol to which the present Statute is adjoined, or at a later moment, declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all or any of the classes of legal disputes concerning:

"(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) any question of international law;

"(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

"The declaration referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain Members or states, or for a certain time.

"In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

[4] This was admitted by Senator VANDENBERG in 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 8108 (July 27, 1945).

vented our keeping abreast with other nations of the world—a tradition to the effect that the United States would not undertake any obligation to arbitrate or adjudicate our international disputes unless there should be as to each particular dispute a special agreement advised and consented to by the Senate by two-thirds vote.

The result was that in the revised statute of 1945 no step could be taken to register the progress made during 24 years, and the 1920 text of article 36 of the Court's statute was continued without substantial alteration on this point. Fortunately, the declarations which had previously been made by a number of States under that earlier text were still in force in 1945, and they were continued in force.[5]

INACTION IN THE SENATE

When the Charter came up for debate in the Senate, the administration leaders were unwilling to complicate the situation by proposing an acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction. Yet the lead was taken on July 28, 1945, by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, who sought to keep faith with the Charter by proposing a recommendation by the Senate that the President should make a declaration by which the United States in exercise of the option would accept the Court's compulsory jurisdiction in the terms of article 36 of the statute.[6]

Without the support of Senate leaders, the Morse resolution remained buried for almost a year in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

AN AVALANCHE OF INSISTENCE

Meanwhile, an avalanche of insistence on the adoption of the resolution poured in on the Senate, and after some months the President and the Secretary of State gave somewhat desultory expressions of their approval. On July 11, 12, and 15, 1946, public hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations.[7] They revealed a wide support of the Morse resolution, led by the American Bar Association and the American Society of International Law.

On the principle involved there was no opposition. On specific features of the resolution, some varying opinions were voiced before the subcommittee. A clarifying criticism was made, in the light of experience under the statute, by Lawrence Preuss, and a memorandum was presented by John Foster Dulles which ignored that experience.[8]

A REPORT UNANIMOUSLY FAVORABLE

On July 17 and 24 the subcommittee rendered reports to the full Committee on Foreign Relations, and on the latter date the committee voted unanimously to recommend favorable action on the resolution. In its report of July 25,[9] the committee stated that "the ultimate purpose of the resolution is to lead to general world-wide acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in legal cases. The accomplishment of this result would, in a substantial sense, place international relations on a legal basis."

Following a plea by Senator MORSE on July 31,[10] the resolution was considered by the Senate in executive session on August 1–2.[11] Apart from the contributions by Senator MORSE and Senator THOMAS, the end-of-the-session debate in August was not in high key, and it certainly was not up to the standards of the best traditions of the Senate.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION AS REPORTED

As reported to the Senate by the committee, the resolution read as follows:

"*Resolved* (*two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein*), That the Senate advise and consent to the deposit by the President of the United States with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice recognizing as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning—

"(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) any question of international law;

"(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation:

"*Provided*, That such a declaration should not apply to—

"(a) disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; or

"(b) disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States:

"*Provided further*, That such declaration should remain in force for a period of 5 years and thereafter until the expiration of 6 months after notice may be given to terminate the declaration."

Subparagraph (a) of the first proviso in this resolution followed language in article 95 of the Charter of the United Nations, and the significant subparagraph (b) followed language in article 2 (7) of the Charter.

QUESTIONS DEBATED IN THE SENATE

The debate in the Senate was chiefly concerned with three questions:

(1) Who should decide that a matter is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States?

(2) Should disputes arising under multilateral treaties be specifically dealt with? and

(3) Should prior agreement be required in some cases on the law to be applied?

The first question touched a sensitive nerve in some Senate circles. Disputes concerning domestic matters gave rise to American apprehensions when the Covenant of the League of Nations was drafted in 1919,[12] with the result that article 15 concerning the Council's handling of disputes provided that—

"If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the Council, to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement."[13]

RESERVATIONS AS TO "DOMESTIC JURISDICTION"

This text inspired a provision in article 39 of the Geneva General Act of 1928 which listed among possible reservations to be made by acceding states "disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of states." It was doubtless in consequence of this latter provision that some of the subsequent declarations recognizing the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court made a similar exception. The British Declaration of September 19, 1929, recognized the Court's jurisdiction over certain disputes "other than * * * disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom." Other states followed this lead,[14] and

---

[5] On August 1, 1946, the declarations in force were those of Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Great Britain, Haiti, India, Iran, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, El Salvador, South Africa, Uruguay, and (possibly) Argentina.

[6] Originally Senate Resolution 160. With the aid of his advisers, Senator MORSE revised the text of his resolution; and the revised text was introduced in the Senate with additional sponsors, as Senate Resolution 196, on November 28, 1945. A similar text was embodied in a resolution (H. J. Res. 291) introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. HERTER on December 17, 1945. Whereas the Morse resolution required a two-thirds vote in the Senate, the Herter resolution would have required but a majority vote in the two Houses of Congress. A precedent for such action was set in 1934, when the two Houses adopted a resolution authorizing the President to accept membership in the International Labor Organization, and it is to be noted that the constitution of that organization conferred a measure of compulsory jurisdiction on the permanent court. Senator CONNALLY said in the Senate on July 31 that he had a "predilection" that the matter could "very properly be acted upon by both the Senate and the House." (92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10554.)

[7] Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, 79th Cong., 2d sess., on S. Res. 196.

[8] In view of the fact that the Dulles memorandum figured prominently in the Senate debate, its six points are commented upon: (1) That the jurisdiction to be recognized should not apply to advisory opinions. The committee's report indicated that this point was without substance. (2) That compulsory jurisdiction should be reciprocal. This is clearly provided in article 36 (2), but the suggestion led to the unfortunate Vandenberg addition. (3) That prior agreement should be reached in certain cases on the applicable law. This led to the proposed Millikin amendment, which, fortunately, was defeated. (4) The reference to domestic jurisdiction was inconclusively put, but it encouraged the unfortunate Connally amendment. (5) This point and point (6) had already been met in the Morse resolution.

On August 2, Senator VANDENBERG made to the Senate a "statement regarding the attitude of Mr. Dulles," in which he said, "I specifically asked him whether he desired them [his suggestions] to be put in the form of amendment, if necessary, and his reply was that he did not consider them of that importance, and that his interest was in having the resolution adopted substantially in its original form." (92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10701.)

Senator THOMAS told the Senate "out of fairness to Mr. Dulles, the committee, and all of us concerned, that other rather substantial international lawyers appeared before the committee and did not find the same thing to be feared that Mr. Dulles has found." He mentioned the Assistant Secretary of State, the legal adviser of the Department of State, Mr. George A. Finch, Mr. Philip C. Jessup, Mr. Pitman B. Potter, Mr. Lawrence Preuss, and Miss Helen Dwight Reid—all of whom had appeared at the hearing—and said "they did not share the views which Mr. Dulles expressed."

[9] Report No. 1835, 79th Cong., 2d sess. The report is reprinted in the ninety-second CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 10706–10709.

[10] Ninety-second CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10534. For the debate on procedure, see pp. 10553–10557.

[11] Ibid., pp. 10613–10618, 10621–10626, 10628–10629, 10683–10696, 10698–10706.

[12] 1 Miller, Drafting of the Covenant, pp. 276, 322. An American reservation on this point was later proposed in the Senate.

[13] The provision was interpreted by the Permanent Court in the Tunis and Morocco Nationality Decrees case (1923), series B, No. 4; 1 Hudson, World Court Reports, p. 143, in which the Court said: "The question whether a certain matter is or is not solely within the jurisdiction of a state is an essentially relative question; it depends upon the development of international relations."

[14] Albania, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, New Zealand, Poland, Rumania, South Africa, and Yugoslavia.

the same exception found place in their declarations.

In these cases, however, the declarations were subject to the provision in article 36 of the statute that "In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

THE RETROGRESSIVE FORMULA OF THE CHARTER

A new formula was adopted in drafting article 2 (7) of the Charter of the United Nations, reading as follows:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII."

This text marks a distinct retrogression. Unlike that in the Covenant, and unlike the previous declarations accepting the Permanent Court's jurisdiction, it provides no competent forum for the determination of the question whether a matter is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. Yet it is to be noted that article 2 (7) of the Charter places no limitation on declarations made under article 36 (2) of the statute.

In view of this history, it seemed inevitable that the American declaration should make some reference to domestic jurisdiction.[15] Senator MORSE's first resolution dealt with this point by excepting "disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United States." His revised resolution brought this text into conformity with the Charter language, and excepted "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." Under either text, it would have been for the Court to say what was essentially within our domestic jurisdiction.

THE QUESTION BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE

In the hearings before the Senate subcommittee, Senator AUSTIN raised the question as to who should take this latter decision, suggesting to amend the Morse resolution so that it would exclude "disputes which are held by the United States to be with regard to matters which are essentially within" its domestic jurisdiction. In behalf of this amendment, Senator AUSTIN stated confusedly: "Otherwise, I foresee the conflict that naturally would arise over such questions as immigration, the interpretation of a treaty for example with respect to the immigration of orientals."[16] If there were a treaty, then the subject would pro tanto be removed from domestic jurisdiction.

Surprisingly, however, Senator AUSTIN's language was accepted at the time by Senator Morse, though he later retracted his acceptance in the course of the Senate debate.[17]

The Senate committee decided "that a reservation of the right of decision as to what are matters essentially within domestic jurisdiction would tend to defeat the purposes which it is hoped to achieve by means of the proposed declaration as well as the purpose of article 36, paragraphs 2 and 6, of the statute of the Court."

THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT ON THE FLOOR

In the debate on the floor of the Senate, Senator CONNALLY proposed the following text for the second subparagraph of the first proviso in the resolution (as reported):

(b) disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, as determined by the United States.

After referring to disputes concerning immigration, tariffs, the navigation of the Panama Canal, and the regulation of tolls through the Panama Canal, he declared:[18] "I am in favor of the United Nations, but I am also for the United States of America. I do not want to surrender the sovereignty or the prestige of the United States with respect to any question which may be merely domestic in character, and contained within the boundaries of this Republic." Such a trenchant outlook always falls on willing ears in the Senate, and it readily forecloses further serious consideration.

The Connally amendment was accepted by 51 votes to 12.

THE AMENDMENT AND THE CHARTER

The question arose in the Senate as to the consistency of this amendment with the text of the statute; more particularly, its consistency with paragraph 6 of article 36. Yet in view of past practice, there can be little doubt that under article 36, paragraph 2, a state may make exceptions to the jurisdiction which it recognizes;[19] and while the amendment is not in the spirit of paragraph 6 of article 36, it seems difficult to maintain that it constitutes a violation of that provision. It is still for the Court to decide upon the jurisdiction conferred by the American declaration, though it will have to say that no jurisdiction exists when the United States, or the state against which the United States may be proceeding, has determined that a matter is within its domestic jurisdiction.

Hence, the Connally amendment has the effect of greatly narrowing the jurisdiction recognized by the United States. It not only prevents the Court from exercising jurisdiction under the declaration where the United States as respondent determines that a matter is essentially within its domestic jurisdiction. It also prevents the Court from exercising that jurisdiction in a case in which the United States is a complainant and where the respondent determines that the subject matter is essentially within its jurisdiction. For the exclusion works both ways.[20] The amendment does not mean, however, that in its exercise of jurisdiction under a special agreement to which the United States is a party, or under a compromissary clause in a treaty to which the United States is a party, the Court is prevented from dealing with matters which the United States may contend to be essentially within its domestic jurisdiction

POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON OTHER DECLARATIONS

Apart from the serious limitation on the jurisdiction recognized by the United States, the Connally amendment seems unfortunate because it may be repeated in future declarations made by other states. In the past, no state has imposed a comparable limitation in a declaration recognizing compulsory jurisdiction. In this connection, however, there is a great tendency for states to imitate, and if in the future other states put into their declarations, exclusions such as this adopted by the United States, the Court's compulsory jurisdiction may be so greatly restricted that it will cease to be a foundation stone of the international law of the future. The Connally amendment, therefore, places in jeopardy the great gain made since 1921 under the text of article 36.

DISPUTES UNDER MULTILATERAL TREATIES

(2) On the subject of disputes arising under multilateral treaties, an addition to the resolution was made by the Senate which may also have unfortunate consequences.

In what seems to have been a jumble of ideas, the Dulles memorandum raised this question before the subcommittee by the statement that oftentimes "disputes, particularly under multilateral conventions, give rise to the same issue as against more than one other nation. Since the Court statute uses the singular "any other state," it might be desirable to make clear that there is no compulsory obligation to submit to the Court merely because one of several parties to such dispute is similarly bound, the others not having bound themselves to become parties before the Court.[21]

The published documents do not indicate that this matter was explored at the hearings before the subcommittee. The committee suggested that Mr. Dulles' objection might be met by adding the following to the exclusions from the jurisdiction accepted:

"c. Disputes arising under a multilateral treaty, unless (1) all parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the United States specially agrees to jurisdiction."

The drafting of this provision shows a confusion of thought, for if the United States specially agrees to jurisdiction, the special agreement would constitute the basis for the Court's exercise of jurisdiction and there would be no question of applying the declaration.

THE VANDENBERG AMENDMENT

On the suggestion of Senator VANDENBERG, the foregoing text was added to the resolution in the Senate, without demur and without a vote.[22]

Mr. Francis O. Wilcox[23] has attempted to explain that "a narrow interpretation" of the Vandenberg addition would undoubtedly go "beyond the intent of the Senate." Even if the "intent of the Senate" could be shown—and the published documents rather indicate that the Senate had no clear intent in this connection—it seems doubtful whether the International Court would pay any regard to it in construing the President's declaration, in the event of a contest concerning the jurisdiction conferred.

Some elasticity in the provision may be sought in the phrase "parties to the treaty affected by the decision." Does this mean that the treaty should be affected, or that the parties to the treaty should be affected, by the decision?[24] If the former, then the exclusion would clearly require every party to the treaty affected to be before the Court as a party to the case. If the latter, when would a party to the treaty by affected?[25] Only if it were a party to the case or an intervener would the decision have binding

---

[15] Even apart from article 2 (7) of the Charter, the language of article 36 (2) of the statute does not include disputes concerning matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. So that if a declaration were silent on the subject, such disputes would not be within the jurisdiction accepted; it would be for the Court to say, however, whether a dispute has that character.

[16] Hearings, p. 36.

[17] "After making a thorough and complete study of the matter I reached an opposite conclusion." (92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10695.)

[18] Ninety-second CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10696.

[19] This was expressly declared by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations in 1924, and by the Ninth Assembly in 1928.

[20] Only the common ground of the parties' declarations will be the basis for jurisdiction. See Hudson, Permanent Court of International Justice, 1920–42, p. 466.

[21] Hearings, p. 44.

[22] On the exclusion in arbitration treaties of disputes which involve the interests of third parties, see Hudson, International Tribunals (1944), p. 97.

[23] Mr. Wilcox, who is head international relations analyst in the Library of Congress, served as assistant to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations throughout the consideration of this matter. The quotation is from his article in 40 American Journal of International Law (October 1946).

[24] Mr. Wilcox seems to think the latter, and he wishes to interpret "affected" to mean "directly affected" or "legally affected."

[25] It is clearly for the Court to decide this question in any dispute as to its jurisdiction under the American declaration.

force for it under article 59 of the statute. To restrict the meaning of "affected" to being bound, however, would be to render the exclusion meaningless.

If a party to a treaty were not a party to the case and did not intervene, it still might find itself in some way prejudiced by an interpretation of the treaty given by the court, and to this extent it might be affected. Hence, in the case of a dispute as to jurisdiction under the American declaration, the Court might decide that any party to the treaty would be affected by the decision.

COMPLICATIONS WHICH MAY ARISE

Perhaps articles 62 and 63 of the statute, both dealing with intervention, offer some aid for interpreting these words in the American declaration; for it is to be noted that the phrase "affected by the decision," employed in the American declaration, is also to be found in article 62 of the statute. Intervention in a case before the Court by a state not originally a party, is possible on either of two grounds: (1) Under article 62, that the state considers, and the court finds, "that it has an interest of a legal nature which may be affected by the decision in the case"; (2) under article 63, that the case involves the construction of a treaty or convention to which the state is a party, in which event intervention is a matter of right. In other words, for purposes of intervention, a state found by the Court to have "an interest of a legal nature which may be affected by the decision in the case" is placed on a par with a state which is a party to a treaty or convention being construed by the Court.

It seems probable that the Court would be inclined to give to the words in the American declaration the meaning which they have in article 62; i. e., a party to the treaty would be "affected by the decision" when it "has an interest of a legal nature which may be affected by the decision." Article 63, read with article 62, seems to indicate that when a treaty or convention is being construed, every party to the treaty or convention is in the position of having such an interest.

On this view, it seems necessary to conclude that, whether the phrase "affected by the decision" applies to the parties to the treaty, or only to the treaty itself, the Court would lack jurisdiction under the American declaration unless every party to the treaty is a party to the proceeding before the Court.

The result might be a serious one insofar as the United States is concerned. It means that in a dispute between the United States and some other state concerning the interpretation and application of a multilateral treaty, the United States may not be able to proceed against, or be proceeded against by, the other party to the dispute, unless all of the parties to the treaty—and there may be 50 or more of them—come in as parties before the Court. Thus the jurisdiction conferred by the President's declaration would be seriously diminished.

More serious, however, is the possibility that this exclusion may be copied. No state in the past has made any comparable exception, but imitation may lead to the repetition of the exclusion in the future declarations of other states. If this should take place, the usefulness of the Court as the great interpreter of world law would be greatly curtailed.

THE WORLD COURT AND MULTIPARTITE INSTRUMENTS

The history of the permanent Court shows quite clearly that one of its great functions was to interpret and apply multipartite instruments. In a large percentage of the cases before it, provisions of multipartite instruments were involved, and in most of these cases all the parties to such instruments were not before the Court.[26] The greater part of our present-day international law is probably contained in such instruments; and, if the Court is to be the organ of world law, its interpretation and application of their provisions should not be stymied by the limitation on its compulsory jurisdiction that all parties to the instrument involved must come into the Court as parties to the case.

Indeed, there has been some tendency in recent years to say that the Court should be given such jurisdiction to interpret multilateral conventions that its interpretation should be binding on all parties to the convention even though they are not parties before the Court.[27]

This exclusion seems the more remarkable when the fact is recalled[28] that in 1934 the United States, by becoming a party to the constitution of the International Labor Organization, conferred on the permanent Court (under art. 37 of the constitution) jurisdiction over "any question or dispute relating to" that constitution or to any labor convention concluded by the members of the Organization. These are multilateral treaties,[29] yet nothing was said at that time about the necessity that a party to the treaty affected by the decision should be a party before the Court. Under article 37 of the revised statute, the United States is still bound in this manner, and the new declaration has not modified its position.

(3) A third matter to occupy the attention of the Senate was a ghost which stalked out of the Dulles memorandum in its comment on article 38 of the statute. The memorandum suggested that a prior agreement as to what are the applicable principles of international law should be required when the basic legal principles are not derived from a treaty or convention to which the United States is a party. The legal adviser of the Department of State, Mr. Charles Fahy, replied that "it was most inadvisable to accept this view,"[30] and the suggestion was rejected by the committee. In the Senate Senator MILLIKIN proposed to revive it and to exclude disputes where the law necessary for decision is not found in existing treaties and conventions to which the United States is a party and where there has not been prior agreement by the United States as to the applicable principles of international law.

This would have been utterly unworkable in practice. At what stage could it be known that the law necessary for a decision could not be found in existing treaties and conventions? When known, a special agreement would have been required before the Court could proceed, and the parties would have had to reach accord on the issues involved in order to lay down the law to be applied to them. Fortunately, when the Millikin amendment came to vote on August 2, only 11 Senators voted for it and 49 voted against it.

The Senate resolution, containing the Connally amendment and the Vandenberg addition, was carried, on August 2, by a vote of 60 to 2.[31] On all points of substance the text of the President's declaration, deposited on August 26, follows textually the Senate resolution.

MERITS OF THE AMERICAN DECLARATION

The text of the American declaration has some distinctive merits:

(a) It applies to all "legal disputes hereafter arising," but omits the limitations attached by many states in previous declarations that such disputes should be "with regard to situations or facts subsequent" to the effective date of the declaration.

(b) It provides that the declaration shall "remain in force for a period of 5 years and thereafter until the expiration of 6 months after notice may be given to terminate the declaration." This is a decided improvement on the declarations previously made by other states; the 6-month period would enable a case to be brought against the United States even after it had given notice of termination.

(c) The exclusion of "disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals" is also an improvement over the formula used in many previous declarations, excluding "disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement." None of these three points gave rise to any extended consideration in the Senate.

Yet the declaration leaves so much to be desired that one may doubt whether great gain has been registered. If the United States were alone in the picture, the declaration would represent a significant progress because it sounds the death-knell of a paralyzing tradition. If, on the other hand, other states should now follow the course adopted by the United States, a great backward step would have been taken in the development of international jurisprudence. To confirm this statement, one has only to compare the text of the American declaration with the texts of declarations previously made by other states.[32] Let it be compared also with the text of a declaration made by the Government of the Netherlands,[33] deposited on August 5, 1946:

"I declare that the Netherlands Government recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement in relation to any other member of the United Nations and any other state accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court, for a period of 10 years as from August 6, 1946, and thereafter until notification of abrogation is made, on any future disputes, except those in regard to which the parties would have agreed, after the coming into force of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

"E. N. VAN KLEFFENS."

The Chinese declaration, made on October 26, 1946, is even more concise:

"The Chinese Government recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any state which accepts the same obligation and on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with article 36, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Statute of the International Court

---

[26] Among others, one may cite the Wimbledon case, the two Mavrommatis cases, the Treaty of Neuilly case, the Lotus case, the Oder case, the Free Zones case, the Memel case, the Pázmány University case, the two Lighthouse cases, and the Chinn case. For an analysis of the jurisprudence, see Hudson, World Court Handbook (1938).

[27] See Institut de Droit International, 39 Annuaire, 1936, p. 305; Hudson, International Tribunals (1924), pp. 218–219.

[28] The fact was not recalled in the Senate debate.

[29] The United States is a party to five labor conventions.

[30] Ninety-second CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10702.

[31] Ibid., p. 10705. It was stated that 18 absent Senators would have voted for the resolution if they had been present.

[32] The texts are collected in Hudson, Permanent Court of International Justice, 1920–42, pp. 682–703.

[33] Renewing the Netherlands declarations of 1921, 1926, and 1936.

of Justice for a period of 5 years and thereafter until the expiration of a 6 months' notice of termination."

CONSISTENCY OF THE AMERICAN POSITION

In transmitting the President's declaration to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the American declaration stated that we "look forward to a great development of the rule of law in international relations through a broad acceptance of the function of the Court in the spirit of the Charter."[34] This is a commendable goal, but one can hardly say that it is reflected in the American declaration.

Americans are the less critical of what we do because of our conventional unction. We continue to think of the United States as the great leader in this field. Mr. Dulles began his memorandum by saying that the United States, since its formation, has led in promoting a reign of law and justice as between nations. If substantiation of that statement is to be found in certain periods of our national history, the statement is manifestly not true in the period between two world wars which saw such significant developments in this field. For in recent years we have been handicapped, as Senator MORSE put it, by fear of being trapped. He might have added also that in spite of the long debate in this country, a debate which should have produced here a greater understanding of the court than in any other country, the problems involved in the declaration are still but dimly understood in our higher circles.

Some years after the United States had failed to ratify the Treaty of Versailles containing the Covenant of the League of Nations, it promoted the conclusion of the 1928 Treaty of Paris for the renunciation of war. In that connection the parties to the treaty took the backward step of agreeing to Secretary Kellogg's statement that every nation is free at all times and regardless of treaty provisions to defend its territory from attack or invasion and it alone is competent to decide whether circumstances require recourse to war in self-defense.[35] During 20 years the United States failed to become a party to the statute of the World Court; we have now accepted compulsory jurisdiction in terms which, if imitated by other states, would set back much of the progress made since the permanent court was established. The world will be fortunate indeed if we have not inaugurated a new and backward movement in this field.

The United States can repair its position in this regard. During the next few years, a modification of its declaration might be thought to require the consent of other states. Six months before August 14, 1951, however, the present declaration can be terminated and a new declaration might then be made which would omit both the Connally amendment and the Vandenberg addition.

[34] Bulletin of the Department of State, Sept. 8, 1946, p. 452.

[35] United States Foreign Relations, 1928, 1, p. 36.

Why the Atrocities in Palestine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some remarks on the subject Why the Atrocities in Palestine? made by me this noon at the Mayflower Hotel before the American Christian Palestine Committee, of which the President pro tempore of the Senate is a distinguished member.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The $64 question today for Christian and Jew alike is, Why the atrocities in Palestine?

I speak neither to condone nor to condemn.

Let responsible Englishmen answer this out of their own mouths.

Winston Churchill on the floor of Parliament denounced the white paper representing present British policy in Palestine as "a plain breach of a solemn obligation * * * to world Jewry," and of the Coolidge Treaty with Great Britain on Palestine.

Why, then, this default? The Archbishop of Canterbury hinted at it in the following statement in the House of Lords:

"I am well aware of other reasons, of another kind, which lie apparently behind these proposals, and which have led the Government to be particularly careful lest they should offend Arab susceptibilities. I recognize the force of those reasons. I think they may be exaggerated, but at least I cannot think they are sufficient to justify what seems like very scant justice to the Jews."

Herbert Morrison, present leader of the majority in the House of Commons, however, made the reasons for the default quite clear in these words: "The Jews must be sacrificed to the Government's preoccupation with exclusively imperialist rather than human considerations."

This tragic default came after 10 years of Arab atrocities dating from 1930, and Morrison made it clear that the British Government was surrendering to these atrocities if, indeed, as intimated, it did not sympathize with them. These are his words: "I should have had more respect for the [Prime Minister's] speech if he had frankly admitted that the Jews would be sacrificed to the incompetence of the Government in the matter, to be sacrificed to its inability to govern, to be sacrificed to its apparent fear of, if not, indeed, its sympathy with, violence, and these methods of murder and assassination."

Is it any wonder that there should be an impression abroad that the only language the British Government understands is "these [Arab] methods of murder and assassination"?

At any rate, these quotations from responsible Englishmen may enable America better to understand and appraise current events in Palestine.

Income-Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are daily becoming more tax conscious, which is to be expected in view of the burdensome tax load that they are carrying. It may not be generally known, but our people are the heaviest taxed in all the world, when we take into consideration the multiplicity of taxes imposed by both the Federal and State Governments.

The following editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal should interest every Member of Congress. It is factual and unbiased. The editorial follows:

JUST WHO WILL BENEFIT BY INCOME-TAX CUTS?

Marquis Childs, in his Washington dispatch on this page, presents the administration view on income-tax cuts—another variation of the soak-the-rich theory.

Such advocates overlook one important fact—if the Government taxed away all the income in brackets above $25,000 it would get only $3,000,000,000. So a government planning to raise something over $20,000,000,000 from income taxes must dip into the low and middle brackets for most of the revenue.

The Star has pointed out before why some tax reduction in the upper brackets is important to our system of free enterprise. From such incomes the savings are made which create new businesses. Childs argues that tax reduction on small incomes is more important, to keep purchasing power high. But how is workers' pay to be kept up if there is no new investment?

Childs argues that the present situation is like that in the 1920's. But income taxes were a very minor factor in those days. Take a look at these comparative figures on the tax burden:

Income before exemptions	1929	1939	1945	1946
$3,000	----	----	$275	$190
$5,000	$3	$48	755	589
$10,000	40	343	2,245	1,862
$25,000	838	2,327	9,705	8,521
$50,000	4,166	8,621	26,865	24,111
$75,000	9,146	18,403	46,785	42,322
$100,000	14,846	31,997	68,565	62,301

The big boosts have come since 1939. Individually, the great increase has been on the larger incomes. That condition was accepted for the war period, with an implied understanding there would be a return to more normal rates with peace.

Considerable dispute has arisen as to who would benefit the most by an across-the-board reduction in income taxes—say, 20 percent. Each person would benefit according to his earning ability.

A man in the upper brackets naturally benefits more in dollars. He pays much more. But in the total, the largest benefit goes to people in the lower-income brackets because there are so many more of them. Those in the two lowest brackets comprise 9d percent of all taxpayers. This table shows how a 20-percent cut would affect various groups of taxpayers:

Net income bracket	Number of taxpayers	Percent of all taxpayers	Amount of reduction (millions)	Percent of total reduction
$2,500 or less	35,770,000	67.5	$898	26.8
$2,500 to $5,000	15,218,000	28.7	1,039	31.0
$5,000 to $10,000	1,320,000	2.5	288	8.6
$10,000 to $25,000	554,000	1.0	288	8.6
$25,000 to $50,000	110,000	.2	291	8.7
$50,000 to $100,000	33,600	.06	221	6.6
$100,000 to $300,000	8,599	.016	147	4.4
$300,000 to $1,000,000	981	.002	40	1.2
Over $1,000,000	61	.000001	6.7	.2
Total	53,015,241	----	3,218.7	----

Surely ability to pay is one of the main guides in taxation. But too restrictive taxes on incomes are a clot in the bloodstream of our economy. Tax policy which encourages business expansion helps promote full employment at good wages.

National Representation for the People of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I presented today to the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of my measure, Senate Joint Resolution 6, to grant national representation to the people of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE BY SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER IN SUPPORT OF HIS PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION TO GRANT NATIONAL REPRESENTATION TO THE PEOPLE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate highly your courtesy in affording me the opportunity to discuss with you Senate Joint Resolution 6, which it was my privilege to introduce in the Senate.

This resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution under which the Congress would be given power to provide our voteless and unrepresented fellow Americans of the District of Columbia with representation in the Senate and House of Representatives and among the electors of President and Vice President.

The decision of the committee not to hold public hearings on this proposal is, to me, indicative of an intent to report the measure favorably to the Senate with such perfecting amendments as are deemed necessary.

I know that the committee has before it many matters of national interest, but this proposal is also one of vital national importance. It involves the integrity of our American system of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Without this question being settled affirmatively, we cannot consistently boast of adherence to our underlying principles of representative government; nor can we reconcile the voteless and unrepresented condition of the people of this National Capital with our professions expressed through our adherence to the United Nations Charter, which was ratified by the Senate.

To provide this large group of Americans with this, their birthright, will be doing an act of simple justice. Such action is long overdue, as the Congress years ago should have provided a political status for these people, a duty which must not be longer delayed.

These good people of the District of Columbia have been pleading for these well-deserved rights for participation in their National Government for nearly 60 years. The first proposed amendment to do this act of justice was introduced in the Senate in 1889 by the Honorable Henry W. Blair, a Senator from New Hampshire. Similar amendments for the same purpose have been before practically every Congress since that time.

During later years I have introduced in each Congress similar proposals for a constitutional amendment in varying forms. These changes of form were made after conference with local civic leaders, with whom I have for many years maintained most cordial and friendly relations. The changes were intended to make the proposal conform more to ideas and to meet objections raised by Members of the Congress.

My long and active membership on the Senate District Committee has brought me closely in contact with the people of the National Capital, and I have tried to represent them as faithfully as I have tried to represent the people of the State of Kansas. I know the fine quality of these Americans here, whose public interest is keen and whose intelligence and patriotism are not surpassed by any other Americans.

My continued and consistent support of the District of Columbia's constitutional amendment has by no means been a mere perfunctory performance. I am deeply and sincerely interested in seeing it written into the Constitution. These people here need and deserve these rights of national citizenship, which they are now denied, as surely as do the people of your State and mine. They obey the same laws of Congress, pay the same taxes, fight in the same wars, bleed and die, just as do our constituents. They bear all of the burdens of citizenship just as you and I and our constituents bear them.

Numerous full hearings on this proposal have been held by committees of the House and Senate during the many years it has been pending before Congress. The resulting record is full and convincing and has probably had careful study by the committee. The Senate District Committee, following a full hearing in 1922, reported the proposal favorably and in two subsequent Congresses reaffirmed its 1922 report.

The House Committee on the Judiciary made favorable report with amendments on House Joint Resolution 257 in the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, on August 5, 1940 (Rept. No. 2828).

As this was an election year, near the end of the session, and being No. 320 on the House Calendar, the measure could not be reached before adjournment unless under a special rule. The Rules Committee declined to supply the needed rule.

Favorable subcommittee reports were made during the Seventy-ninth Congress to both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees without action by the full committees.

During all of these many years this important question has never been debated on the floor of either branch of the Congress.

Only once has there been an unfavorable report and that was by the Senate Judiciary Committee in the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, on July 28, 1941.

With due respect to the Judiciary Committee of the Seventy-seventh Congress, I have never felt that reasons contained in its adverse report were justified by the facts or its conclusions consistent with our fundamental principles and rights.

The only reason or excuse for creating the anomalous political situation prevailing at the seat of the Government was for the protection of the national interest. Granting these people participation in the National Government would in no way lessen the protection. This phase of the question was well discussed in the Citizens Brief which you will find in full as an appendix on page 28 of the argument of Theodore W. Noyes before the House Committee on the Judiciary in the Sixty-sixth Congress in January 1921. I am leaving a number of copies of this document for information of the committee.

I quote a small part of this illuminating brief which was prepared by a group of very able lawyers:

"In a word, the object of the framers was unity of governmental powers, not negation of political rights.

"For it is manifest that every purpose for which the power of exclusive legislation was conferred can be accomplished in the fullest measure without denying political rights to the inhabitants. To insure the supremacy of a single legislative will, obedience to a single system of law and the total exclusion of any possible claim to authority on the part of another sovereignty, it is not necessary in the least to shut out the citizens who are subject to that law from participation in the making of it.

"The legislative power of Congress over the District of Columbia will be no less exclusive, the authority of the National Government no less supreme, when the inhabitants shall have been admitted to be heard in Congress by their representatives, than it is now, or has been at any time in the past.

"OUR SOLUTION SIMPLEST AND BEST

"Some solution for the problem must be found. Whatever may be its nature it necessarily involves some change in the Constitution. We cannot but think that the one we offer is the simplest and the best.

"Instead of seeking, as in 1871, to transfer the whole or some part of the legislative function from Congress to another body, a constitutional amendment which would work radical changes in the power and position of Congress, we propose just the opposite. We propose to add to the present powers of Congress the further power to admit, whenever in its judgment the time therefor shall have arrived, the representatives of the people of the District to a seat in the National Legislature.

"By this method we preserve, unimpaired, intact, the primary purpose of the creation of a special Federal district for the seat of government; namely, the absolute supremacy therein of a single legislative will. All conceivable conflict between local authority and Federal authority will be impossible then, just as the framers of the Constitution intended that it should be impossible. Then, as now, there will exist but one judiciary, local and Federal; one Executive, one legislature. The National Government will continue, as now, supreme in every respect. But this supremacy will no longer be exercised at the cost of a humiliating repudiation of the principles of American government. It will be maintained without the sacrifice of the rights of nearly half a million of law-abiding and patriotic American citizens."

I understand that this committee would like to get rid of this matter which has been in its lap for so many years and my advice, as an old experienced Member of the Senate, is that the best way in which to accomplish that desire is to report the proposed amendment out to the Senate where it can be debated in the open. Then, being a perfectly reasonable and fundamentally American proposal, it should be approved by the Senate and sent on to the House of Representatives for similar action and then on to the State legislatures for ratification by three-fourths of the States.

This vital matter of fundamental Americanism should, as I have before stated, be squared with our American principle of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Ours should not be a government of a part of the people, by a part of the people, and for all of the people. It should also be squared with the United Nations Charter. Our solicitude for the peoples of all lands is a lofty sentiment which should extend to these Americans at the very heart of our great Republic. Then, and then only, will our actions as a Nation ring true to our pretensions of solicitude for the people of all lands.

This being a committee of lawyers, I am not surprised that some are inclined to find flaws in the language of the proposed amendment. Fears have been expressed that in its present form it is so indefinite regarding the extent of representation which might be given these people under its terms that it might empower Congress to grant them even greater representation in the Congress than is accorded a State.

It seems to me that the pending proposal can be readily amended so as to quiet any such fears.

This proposal should not be put aside or a favorable report withheld because of any apparent defects in the wording of the amendment as proposed, and an adverse report is unthinkable.

The preamble in the joint resolution, which reads as follows, clearly and concisely sets forth its purpose: "Whereas in recognition of the fact that the District, which is the seat of the Government of the United States, is a populous and permanently separate political unit which, in keeping with its special purpose, is not and should not become a State or part of a State; and with intent that the effective rights of citizens resident in that District, including their participation in the Government of the United States, shall be as nearly similar to those of citizens resident in the several States as may be without impairing the supreme authority of the said Government over its Capital * * *." Framing an amendment which would fulfill this purpose and at the same time meet the approval of this committee ought not to be too difficult an undertaking.

Your committee must surely concede that these people are fit and are in every way deserving of the enjoyment of the same rights of participation in this Government of the United States as you and I. I would hate to think for one moment that this committee and the Congress will at this time lightly brush aside the earnest petitions of our own people of a community with a population exceeding that of each of 12 or 14 States. I beg of you to whip this amendment into what you consider proper form and send it on to the Senate with a strong report recommending its adoption by the required two-thirds vote of that body.

And in conclusion, let me tell you, my friends, that until justice is done for these fellow Americans of the Nation's Capital, this proposal will continue to be in the lap of the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is absolutely true that no question is ever settled until it is settled right.

The eyes of the nations are upon us—do we practice what we preach?

Before We Disarm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press:

BEFORE WE DISARM

When Soviet Delegate Gromyko tells the United Nations Security Council that the way to get world security is for the nations to disarm, it is to be feared that what he really means is that the way for Russia to get rid of effective opposition to its expansionism is to render the United States powerless.

The sea, air, and land power of the United States, coupled with that of Great Britain, has been the obstacle on which Russian diplomacy has found itself stalled short of the key points toward which it started its march as soon as the Axis was defeated. To remove or reduce this obstacle has become the goal of Russian diplomacy.

Such is the purpose when Stalin tries to drive a wedge between Britain and America, assisted by left-wing elements in both countries. And such is also the purpose when Gromyko demands that American and Britain strip themselves of their sources of power in advance of any guaranties or assurances that Russia will likewise deplete its power.

The sources of American and British military power depend on technical and industrial superiority, from the atomic bomb on down. Once destroyed, such forms of power are not readily replaced. Russia's source of military force lies in its manpower. An army which depends for its might on the stupendous masses of its manpower and its willingness to expend that manpower without stint can be demobilized but is never destroyed.

The prerequisite for disarmament both atomic and general must therefore be an airtight system of inspection and controls. Disarmament must always work more completely against navies and air forces and atomic weapons than against masses of soldiers. We and the British would then be most stupid if we were to divest ourselves of the machines of war without even having means of ascertaining whether Russia had divested itself, however temporarily of its armed manpower, as well as its technical weapons. What America and Britain have is, in general, an open book for any Soviet agent to read. Our military budgets are made in the daylight of democratic procedures and our Russian friends can come and go among us as they please. But Russia is not only a dictatorship but a closed territory, under control of the secret police.

The Soviet Government should by this time clearly understand that America has no intention of disarming without adequate proofs that Russia has made as nearly equal a disarmament as their differing circumstances permit. United States Delegate Austin, Tuesday, made this point very emphatically and there should be no retreat.

Industrial Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address on the subject Industrial Stability, delivered by C. H. Kreienbaum, president of the Simpson Logging Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our industry today, after the many years of depression, the NRA, and finally the war, during which we were either in economic difficulties or in a strait-jacket of regulation, has a future with more promise of constructive effort than ever before, because of (1) the return of our country to a free economy and (2) the assurance of a stable forest base.

The management of your association has spent much of its time in our national capital during the past 12 months, trying to make some sense out of the maze of regulation under which we were trying to exist. This nightmare is now over. The people have forced our Government to return to a free economy. We can now do some sober thinking as to just what has happened to our business.

Our past is marked by the violent swings between short profit periods to longer periods of low profit to periods of heavy losses. At the moment we can say that we are enjoying a period of prosperity. Are we riding one of these short periods of profit realization?

Runaway prices have been the subject of much discussion recently. At this moment I doubt that anyone can say exactly what is the price on any particular size or grade of lumber. This situation is the result of the sudden breaking of the bonds of our rigidly regimented economy. It is peculiar not only to trade and industry but labor also, being frozen during the war, when freed of its bonds, for a time lost its equilibrium. Our situation can be very dangerous if this condition continues for any length of time. The inevitable result of the wildcat prices of which we hear so much, however, is now apparent. Resistance to such opportunism is being felt and soon we should see some semblance of order in our markets. While such a situation is deplorable, I cannot be as concerned about it as I am concerned about our costs and the resultant prices necessary to cover them.

For the purpose of making some comparisons with the Bureau of Labor Statistics I used the year 1926 as a base against October 1946, just prior to the dropping of the Office of Price Administration controls. Since the year 1926 was a loss year for our industry, our price figures of that year and October 1946, would not be comparable, but it is most interesting to note the increases in our costs over that period as compared to the prices of other commodities.

Index figure of—

Price of all commodities	134
Price of semimanufactured goods	118
Price of manufactured goods	129

Index figures of our average lumber-production costs 180. Remember these comparisons are for the month of October 1946, and prior to the expiration of OPA controls. Since that time we have had another increase in our labor costs. These exceptional increases in the index figures covering our costs are the result of a very high percentage of increase in labor costs, both in rates of pay and in the man-hours of work required to produce the raw materials. Our industry is reaching farther back into rough country for timber. It is becoming more seasonal, and with it all, the prices of stumpage are higher. When we add to these costs increases in our freight rates, both by rail and by water, and handling charges at the retail end, it makes one wonder just where we do stand in the competitive field.

We have heard much said by our critics about pricing ourselves out of our markets. Unwise price policies are dangerous and should be condemned. Our real danger, however, lies in cost levels which can permanently cripple our industry. I believe we should stop, take inventory of our present situation and make certain we do not wake up some morning fighting a situation worse than the one from which we have just emerged. If our management and our labor will think and act soberly in this matter; if we again turn our attention to our markets and appraise them properly, I believe it is possible that we can continue in a reasonably profitable position for some years ahead of us.

In July 1946, your association published the so-called Kirkland Report on the Forest Resources of the Douglas Fir Region. This report was prefaced by a statement made by your Joint Committee on Forest Conservation, which I believe has given a practical approach to the question of the extent of our industry activity in the future, and our forest situation.

Before I comment on the details of this report, it might be well to review our forest situation prior to the war. For many years and until only recently the pressure of liquidation of private timber has been a de-

pressing influence on the economics of the industry. The burden of carrying large timber reserves was constantly pressing on the production of lumber which at times was forced on an unwilling market. During the depression years of the thirties the industry lost a large percentage of its capital. Late in the thirties, of all the privately held lands in the counties of western Washington, almost 30 percent was tax delinquent or held by the counties as tax-title lands. A similar condition of instability existed in western Oregon. To interest anyone in stable-land ownership, in land management, in growing of timber under such conditions was impossible.

The dynamic energy of this industry, however, has been illustrated in the sudden and complete reversal of this situation. Within the last 7 or 8 years we have seen our "Keep Washington and keep Oregon green" campaigns get started; men have begun looking around, first realizing the potentialities of well-stocked second-growth lands. A new movement has taken hold and is growing very rapidly; that is, the development of tree farms. The realization that land management for timber growing has large possibilities has reversed the trend of tax delinquencies, and the tax-title lands are fast passing back into private ownership and thus onto the tax rolls. Within the last 6 years we have seen a radical change in the pattern of timberland ownership in western Washington. The independent logger who owned large acreages of timber has either sold or merged his holdings with those of processing operations. The open log markets of Puget Sound and Grays Harbor have practically disappeared. The industry of western Washington is developing rapidly into stable ownership.

Within the last few years also Congress has passed sustained-yield laws, permitting the Federal agencies to cooperate in the establishment of sustained-yield units. The first such cooperative sustained-yield unit has been established. The Portland office of the Forest Service has announced that they have recommended to the Washington, D. C., office the establishment of more cooperative units, plus a Federal unit, within the near future. The Oregon and California Land Grant Administration have plans for the establishment of other units.

I was interested to note that the public officials of Douglas County of Oregon were under attack because they were endeavoring to integrate the county lands into long-time operating units. I congratulate these officials on the courage that they have thus displayed.

Oregon is now becoming the dominant lumber-producing State, and fortunately at a time when every effort is being made in the direction of stable timber management and integration. The State of Washington is fortunate in that its period of forest stability is beginning while it has sufficient resources remaining to be of importance to its economy.

Inasmuch as our industry is of such tremendous importance to the States of Washington and Oregon, it has endeavored for years to assure the people of the two States that there would always be a forest-products industry to support their economy. The first requisite to such a promise is stability of land and timber ownership and a wedding of the raw materials and the processing plants; in other words, more complete integration of the processes that are necessary to the full utilization of what an acre of ground will grow in our two States. If the momentum of this development that has taken place in the last 5 or 6 years continues into the future, I believe we can fairly well predict the extent of the future operations of the forest-products industry of our Douglas-fir region.

Going back to the Kirkland report, I would like to quote a section of the prefaced statement by your Conservation Committee. It is the most significant part of the report:

"Considering Kirkland's data in the light of current industry trends, the committee regards as reasonable a minimum yearly cut of 7,500,000,000 feet, including pulpwood, during the next 5 or 10 years.

"Let it be emphasized that this forecast is based upon present operating methods and sustained yield calculations. This much regional production seems to be assured.

"Log supply may be increased by the liquidation of more private timber than has been estimated or by cutting second growth at a greater rate. And it may be increased by improvements in utilization."

Where the report speaks of a minimum yearly cut of 7,500,000,000 feet it is speaking of logs. This compares with the average production of logs over the last 13-year period of 7,400,000,000 feet, and a peak production of logs reached in 1929 of 10,200,000,000 feet.

Giving consideration to the logs that are used by pulp mills, the plywood plants and shingle mills, the balance of the log production will permit of a production of approximately 6,000,000,000 to 6,500,000,000 feet of lumber. This is compared to the average production of lumber in this region during the last 13-year period of 6,650,000,000 feet.

Remember that the Joint Conservation Committee said: "The committee regards as reasonable a minimum yearly cut of 7,500,000,000 feet, including pulpwood during the next 5 or 10 years." The question immediately comes to mind as to what happens after the next 5 or 10 years.

The Kirkland report strongly indicates that the annual cut of logs can drop to as low as 3,500,000,000 to 5,000,000,000 feet, should all privately held timber lands be operated on a liquidation basis. A drop to such a level would provide for a production of lumber barely enough to supply the needs for our products of the Pacific Coast States. That is not going to happen. There are many things this industry can and, I believe, will do to level off its harvest of timber and create the stable forest condition the report indicates can be ours in the future.

A very large portion of private timber now is being operated on a sustained basis. The Federal and the Oregon and California Grant Cooperative sustained-yield units will bring in more. Management of integrated operations will not allow the woods wastage existing a few years ago, because of scarcity of stumpage and the high price of stumpage. Government agencies cannot allow a lesser degree of utilization on their lands than the best that private operations reach on their lands or on the cooperatively managed lands. During the next 10 or 20 years other large acreages of second growth are coming into size for management and harvesting. The great effort that is made today through experiments in equipment and means of a higher degree of utilization at low cost cannot do other than to bring results which will add to the momentum of utilization. Research in new processes in this industry has only gotten started and it too is gaining momentum. There will be sale for lower grades of lumber because of a price structure to support such utilization.

The sales of the Forest Service have reached a volume of about 1,200,000,000 feet a year. The estimated allowable cut on the national forest in this region is 1,700,000,000 feet. The operating budget of this region of the Forest Service is threatened with a reduction of some $300,000. If this occurs, or if their budget remains static, I understand there will be difficulty in expanding the forest-management organization of the Forest Service sufficiently to fully develop its program of allowable cut. It is estimated that there is a possible 20 percent of the national forest that can be included in cooperative sustained-yield units and another 10 percent will be set aside to create Federal units. The remainder of their timber will be sold in line with their past policy. Of the Oregon and California land grant a considerable portion is so situated as to form practical cooperative sustained-yield units. The allowable cut on the Oregon and California land grant is estimated to be about 600,000,000 feet a year. The State of Washington holds some 21,000,000,000 feet of timber in the Douglas-fir region. The manner in which these lands will be managed has not been made clear. In the Olympic National Park in the State of Washington is reserved some 17,000,000,000 feet of timber which is not now available for cutting. A bill has been introduced in Congress proposing the study of this park reservation by an unbiased commission. Knowing the situation on Grays Harbor, I feel certain that if this bill passes Congress, and the commission approaches its study from a practical standpoint, much of this timber will be released for management and utilization.

These are all matters of particular interest to our industry and to this association. They suggest the closest kind of cooperation between our industry and all public agencies dealing with our timber resources.

Since the Kirkland report was written much has happened to lay emphasis on the subject of sustained yield. The Government agencies, holding 60 percent of the remaining mature timber in the Douglas fir region, with laws permitting the establishment of sustained-yield operations, cooperative as well as otherwise, pressed by public opinion in the interest of stability, are taking active steps to follow through on their programs.

If we will develop the cooperation between industry and the Government agencies, and act with a singleness of purpose, I am personally convinced that there is a strong possibility that the industry of this region can have a sustained cut of logs averaging around 7,000,000,000 feet for the next 20 to 25 years. The tendency toward further integration of our industry, bringing with it a higher degree of utilization, will have arrested the trend downward in annual volume of log cut. From that point on we should see an expanding industry develop. I am convinced that we can say to the people of Oregon and Washington that not only will we always have a forest-products industry but also a stable and, someday, an expanding industry.

Work of the Agriculture Conservation Association of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Third District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert a table showing the work done by the Agriculture Conservation Association of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Third District of Arkansas, which I have the honor to represent. I think this is a very remarkable report and the request for funds for this great effort is certainly

modest. It is one of the essential programs of good government.

The report follows:

We, the County and Community Committeemen of the Agricultural Conservation Association of the Production and Marketing Administration Field Service Branch program, have prepared some informational material and facts relative to the accomplishments and needs for your information. We ask your support in securing ample funds for administering the program properly, as funds at present are not sufficient to administer the program. The funds for administering the program have been reduced by 50 percent since 1943 even though the county committee and county office have had more responsibilities. We have lost many trained and valuable office personnel due to higher living costs and curtailment in funds to such an extent that we could not maintain adequately trained people. We trust that this information will be of assistance to you in securing ample funds for administrative expense for the fiscal year, and in representing all farmers in your district.

Number of farms in district	26,396
Cropland acreage in district	1,041,855
Commercial orchard acreage in district	31,263
Noncrop pasture land in district	394,930
Number of leading farmers elected as county and community committee	1064

Practices	Participating farms, extent and value of soil-building practices carried out by practices in connection with the AAA program from 1936 through 1945, on a yearly average			Extent of soil-building practices needed yearly by practices in connection with the AAA program	
	Number of participating farms	Extent	Value	Number of farms needing practices	Extent needed
Phosphate	3,879	7,611,779 pounds	$73,211	22,153	95,621,500 pounds.
Limestone	1,666	17,922 tons	44,745	19,046	534,110 tons.
Potash	21	19,430 pounds	408	10,888	4,485,800 pounds.
Mulching material	40	453 tons	352	2,395	239,300 tons.
Winter legumes	1,780	14,233 acres	22,872	12,424	242,702 acres.
Green manure crops	2,436	16,398 acres	25,307	17,737	100,478 acres.
Summer legumes	3,394	21,321 acres	22,638	13,723	88,578 acres.
Lespedeza	8,135	120,421 acres	129,680	15,112	291,543 acres.
Terraces	218	11,327 hundred linear feet	7,317	10,902	703,516 hundred linear feet.
Stockpond	173	243 ponds	28,826	3,200	3,270 ponds.
Contouring pasture	42	1,643 acres	4,310	9,414	194,149 acres.
Waterways	7	10 acres	209	1,786	3,383 acres.
Pasture grasses	791	7,148 acres	25,506	12,663	220,883 acres.
Legumes on grass	1,636	14,063 acres	13,374	13,193	113,953 acres.
Mowing pasture	1,578	24,624 acres	15,313	12,052	238,691 acres.
Clearing land	97	890 acres	4,570	8,111	75,137 acres.
Biennial perennial legumes and grasses	6,280	31,393 acres	42,734	13,921	87,945 acres.
Pasture mixtures	596	10,290 acres	14,201	7,443	86,860 acres.
Sericea Lespedeza	38	282 acres	614	2,045	9,365 acres.
Kudzu	15	28 acres	138	0	None.
Alfalfa	607	3,550 acres	6,512	5,740	30,628 acres.
Ryegrass	937	10,041 acres	18,897	20,450	170,334 acres.
Harvesting seed	663	6,232 acres	19,181	7,960	76,875 acres.
Emergency pasture	61	329 acres	329	5,173	28,682 acres.
Contour farming	906	11,362 acres	6,456	11,895	240,072 acres.
Drainage ditches	13	5,065 cubic yards	3,054	1,426	84,578 cubic yards.
Two or more legumes	215	4,240 acres	8,482	7,931	93,729 acres
Establishing forest trees	32	125 acres	697	2,293	11,699 acres.
Maintaining forest trees	32	125 acres	429	6,026	67,780 acres.
Firebreaks		None		8,319	70,420 hundred linear feet.
Removal of apple trees	261	22,507 trees	7,613	0	None.
Home garden	8,589	9,829 gardens	14,758	0	None.
Renovation of pasture	80	109 acres	682	9,021	110,111 acres.
Continuous system of grazing	2	85 acres	637	8,573	73,136 acres.

Percent of increase in livestock as a result of AAA's pasture program, 41.

Percent of increase in dairy production as a result of AAA's pasture program, 59.

The following have been established from 1936 up to the present, principally due to AAA production practices causing diversified farming:

	Number
Livestock sales barns	12
Milk plants	4
Cheese plants	7
Milk and cream routes	66
Cream stations	109
Lime plants	6
Canning factories	81
Frozen food locker plants	7

The Philosophy of Thomas Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as we have all seen by the newspapers, tomorrow, February 11, is the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas A. Edison. In this connection I have just read an article entitled, "The Philosophy of Thomas A. Edison," written by the well-known writer, Larston D. Farrar and appearing in the Public Utilities Fortnightly magazine. I believe that in this article Mr. Farrar has brought out some angles and emphasized some points about Mr. Edison that have been overlooked by many others who have written about Edison lately. I wish that everybody in the United States could read this article, for, if so, there would be more emphasis on hard work and less tendency for government to grow. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, as follows:

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THOMAS EDISON

(By Larston D. Farrar)

Tom Edison once said that genius is 1-percent inspiration and 99-percent perspiration. That could be paraphrased to describe the effect of his life and works on millions of people. They accepted his inventions to save themselves 99-percent perspiration, but they have not yet learned that Edison's life and philosophy could furnish a vital 1 percent of inspiration even though he is dead.

Man has made great use of Edison's material inventions. London, Paris, Moscow, Berlin—all are lighted by the lamp which was perfected by his fertile mind and his patient hand. But modern man has failed to learn the lessons Edison learned the hard way in the field of government and in the realm of social philosophy.

There are millions of persons who revere his memory, yet do not follow the course he set because they do not know of it. There are even some today who have been led to believe that he was against the common man's aspirations. In his day—and that was not more than two decades ago—there were no so-called common men in America, in the sense that term is used now. The followers of Karl Marx were just getting started in their world-wide crusade to set class against class, to pit brother against brother, and to make poor men think they could change their fate by changing the "system."

In Edison's day, the cloud of communism was no bigger than a man's hand. In America, we were all just citizens—some rich, some well-to-do, some poorer than others, but all free citizens. There were class distinctions then, but men passed from class to class—becoming richer or poorer as their talents and abilities merited. American society had not yet become stratified through the workings of pseudo-liberalism. And there was no mass, organized movement trying to pit workers against managers and seeking to set up artificial standards by means of which common men could be separated from capitalists.

Edison understood well the nature of government, and its place. He looked on people as individuals and not as numbers in a file case, and that is why he will be more respected and admired a century from now among all freemen than he is even today. In his way, he was a social philosopher pointing toward a better way of economic and social reform—a way that consisted in doing big things instead of talking big things.

His statement about government in business, given to Samuel Crowther in 1929, is more apropos today than the day it was uttered. Read these words again, in the

light of modern events, to see how very strikingly he summed up the eternal battle between freemen and totalitarian government:

"There is far more danger in public monopoly than there is in private monopoly, for when government goes into business it can always shift its losses to the taxpayers. If it goes into the power business, it can pretend to sell cheap power and then cover up its loss.

"The Government never really goes into business, for it never makes ends meet. And that is the first requisite of business. The Government mixes a little business with a lot of politics and no one ever gets a chance to find out what is actually going on.

"A large extension of the Government into business affairs—no matter what the pretense and no matter how the extension is labeled—will be bound to promote waste and to bring a curb on our prosperity and progress. Somehow, and probably it is in the very nature of things, a Government office is below the level of a private office."

Edison often used to laugh about how, during World War I, he was head of an important group of scientists in the Navy Department in Washington. He wanted a little implement made of tin, and he made out a requisition to that effect. On each of the next three days he received messages from the Navy bureau that the implement would be forthcoming. Four days after he sent in the order the implement was delivered. When he later returned to his factory in West Orange he wrote out a requisition for the same tin implement—just to see how long it would take to have it delivered to him. He got the implement in 2½ hours.

That is a good standard of measurement, he said, of the relative efficiency of private business and Government business.

Thomas A. Edison has been portrayed as an indefatigable worker and as a hard-bitten skeptic in every field, so often in recent years that there is a real danger that many will forget that he was a man—even as you and I—and subject to all the foibles and frettings that bother all men. In a recent interview with Charles Edison, former governor of New Jersey, who bears a striking physical likeness to his distinguished father, I was able to learn some points about Edison, the man, that emphasize greatly his essential beliefs and his towering intellect in all fields.

"I remember Thomas A. Edison as three different men," Charles Edison told me. "As a kind and loving father when I was his child; as my boss when I reached maturity and worked with him; and as a public figure whose head was never turned by the adulations heaped upon him by a grateful mankind.

"As a practical child psychologist and as a companion to me and my brothers and sisters in my boyhood, he had no peer. I can remember only one spanking—the time I wouldn't take some quinine the doctor had prescribed. He was 'dad' to all of us children, one of which we could be proud. Perhaps because of his deafness he never was annoyed by our petty quarrels and the household noises that irritate so many fathers. He was aloof enough to make us respect him, but companionable enough to make us adore him.

"My fondest memories of my boyhood are those he spent with us children on the Fourth of July each year. He liked that holiday better than any other and he made it a symbol of fun and fanfare for us. There was something loud and carefree and wild about the Fourth of July practices of those days that made him forget utterly the cares of his business enterprises and his laboratory work.

"Early in the morning of a Fourth he would get out on the wide lawn with all of our family and the neighboring children and would play all kinds of romping games. He would shoot off firecrackers and toy torpedoes. He would take off his shoes and would make us all remove our shoes and then give each of us a supply of torpedoes. It would make him laugh to throw the torpedoes at our feet. He could take it as well as dish it out. By noon we would all be ready for the special feast. After a heavy meal there would be a siesta time, during which he would rest and read the newspapers. Then, as darkness fell, we would start the fun all over again. He always had a quantity of rockets and other fireworks on hand, and he was adept in their use.

"He seldom played card games, but he used to love to play parcheesi with us children and got a kick out of the way the dice would fall. By the time I was a young man (and was the only boy at home), the old electric automobiles came out. He, of course, owned one of the first Bakers. Then came the White steam car. After I had taken a course in operation and repair from a dealer, my father purchased two of these in 1904. He nicknamed them Discord and Disaster. I always had to drive—and fix the punctures. We were lucky, on a 100-mile round trip, if we did not have more than 8 or 10 punctures. He was always talking about how someone would develop a new and batter type of motor than that in the steam car—and, inadvertently, he had encouraged Henry Ford to do that very thing.

"My father was an adventurer. He was absolutely unafraid to try anything. I can prove that statement simply by relating that he and I and three other explorers actually drove two White steam cars from West Orange, N. J., to the mountains of North Carolina in 1905.

"It took us 3 days to get to Washington, D. C., although that was the easiest part of the trip. From then on, through Virginia and North Carolina mountains, we suffered all the torments that have plagued motorists to greater or lesser degree throughout the century. We were looking for cobalt—and we found it. He never took part in any enterprise that ended quite as miraculously—we returned home with both steam cars, although at several blacksmith shops en route we had to forge new parts for the ailing vehicles.

"At 24, after having completed my formal education, I went to work at my father's plant in West Orange. Then I saw that he was an entirely different man from the homebody and father I had known."

Edison often has been accused of having been a poor businessman. But it is a remarkable fact that he never worked on a useless invention. Many of the industries of modern times are based on the product of his genius. If the definition of a good businessman is one who devotes his life only to the acquisition of wealth, then Edison was not a good businessman. His one passionate desire was to wrest secrets from nature that would benefit mankind. When he had succeeded in doing so and had found it a business, his interest ended. He wanted to delve again into the mysteries of nature.

He could have been the wealthiest man that ever lived. But he looked upon wealth as merely a means to an end. He used money as a laborer uses his pick and shovel. He often remarked that he never wanted more than a million dollars, because, he said, "When a man has more than a million dollars, he has to quit whatever else he is doing and look after his money." The truth is, he left an estate of more than a million dollars, but not through any plan of his own.

One time Edison had a partner in a certain chemical enterprise in which each man invested millions of dollars. They decided that they would build the plant only for wartime operation, and that they would set up a fund during the period of high profits so that, if they lost money in the period of liquidation, they still would be better off than they had been at the beginning. This fund consisted of $6,000,000. When half of it later was lost, as anticipated, the partner became a nervous wreck. The loss preyed on his mind and it was obvious that to him the money was all important. Edison dismissed the loss of the $3,000,000 as casually as many men would dismiss the loss of a cigarette lighter.

Another time Edison invested heavily in a certain plant designed for the magnetic separation of iron ore. Then the great Mesabi range was discovered in Minnesota, making useless his inventions in magnetic separation. He was on a train when his associates, chagrined at learning the news of the Mesabi discovery and its verification, told him of it. He knew immediately that it meant the loss of millions of dollars and months of heartbreaking effort. But he shrugged his shoulders, gave a wry grin, and remarked: "Well, boys, we had a helluva good time spending it, didn't we? Let's get busy on something else." And that was the last he ever worried about the whole thing.

He was an odd employer. To the regular employees of his various plants, he was a mystical figure. They would see him only intermittently. He cared very little for production, compared to his love for research and investigation. His laboratory employees viewed him as a dynamo of energy, a veritable demon for work. He would take it easy for a while, then go on what he called "campaign." He would make his plans to begin working around the clock at the laboratory, sleeping only intermittently and seldom more than 4 hours out of 24. This would continue sometimes for as long as 3 months, when he would accomplish his goal and revert to a more normal routine. They called the men who worked with him the "insomnia squad." These men knew—as his children learned early in life—that he was an inveterate practical joker and prankster. Nobody ever knew when he would start pulling a practical joke, but it generally was after he had done his work and wanted to relax mentally as well as physically. Sometimes, for recreation, he would get together a few of the laboratory assistants for a music fest. He played the organ, the little glass blower played the zither, another of the men played on tin pans, and two others played bones. They could render any of the popular tunes of the day, and some others with words that were never heard outside the laboratory.

He was always slow to anger, even in the laboratory. He never became impatient at the failure of others to perform as quickly as they should, but he made it a point to have around him only men who wanted to get things done as much as he did. It took a lot of determination for a man to remain on the "insomnia squad."

In 1929, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the invention of the electric light, Edison was honored by the President of the United States, the heads of other nations, and the most eminent scientists of the world. On that occasion, he made a brief speech in which he revealed his attitude toward himself and his fellow-workers:

"I would be embarrassed at the honors that are being heaped on me on this unforgettable night were it not for the fact that in honoring me you are also honoring that vast army of thinkers and workers of the past, and those who are carrying on; without whom my work would have gone for nothing," he said. "If I have spurred men to greater effort, and if our work had widened the horizons of men's understanding even a little and given a measure of happiness in the world, I am content."

Charles Edison tells this story to illustrate what a kick Thomas Edison got out of working:

"My father's life in the laboratory was long, but it was never really hard. One time a friend visited him at the laboratory and my father remarked that he had been working for three months on an invention.

"'Why, you never did a lick of work in your life,' the friend remarked with a smile.

"'What do you mean?'

"'You've been enjoying yourself all your life,' the friend declared.

"My father laughed and admitted it was true, for the most part. It was his desire to do things that kept him going.

"But, outside of the laboratory, he always was relaxed and took things easy. He could turn his mind off like a stop watch and start it up again when he wanted to. When my mother would urge him to get out in the open and get some exercise, he would smile and quote Mark Twain to her:

"'Every time I feel the urge for exercise, I lie down and sleep it off.'

"He was always in good health up until the last few months of his life. Never physically strong in the manner of Charles Atlas' adherents, he always ate good food and maintained his vigor until he was stricken fatally."

At the time of Edison's birth, a hundred years ago, there was darkness over the face of the earth when the sun went down. On October 21, 1879, a new light was born. On that day, after more than 6,000 consecutive experiments extending over a period of many months, he produced the first successful incandescent electric light bulb. An incredulous world beat a path to his laboratory at Menlo Park to witness this new marvel of science. He already had become known as the Wizard of Menlo Park, having proved another device that was to put music in millions of homes—the phonograph.

Edison, in effect, was the creator of the present vast electric light and power industry. He always considered it his greatest monument. But he sold his electric light business soon after his invention for a comparatively paltry sum and dumped most of his light and power stocks on the market in the early nineties so that he could have funds to carry on experiments in other fields.

Three years after the electric light and power industry was born, in 1882, he established the tiny Pearl Street station in New York. At that time, nothing existed which he could use, so he had to design the generator, distributing system, meters, and everything else that went into the construction of this plant. It had a capacity of only 1,200 horsepower and its first customers were a few hundred wealthy persons living in an area of about 12 city blocks. From this humble beginning, the power and light industry grew until it is today one of the greatest industries in the United States. It has a total investment of more than 15 billion dollars; it can deliver untold millions of horsepower, and it employs more than half a million persons.

It is a far cry from that first lamp of 1879 to the perfected lamp of today; from the Jumbo of Pearl Street station to the multiple horsepower units of today. But the basic principles underlying the new and the old are identical. Edison invented—other great minds perfected.

In the early days, both the bulbs and the power were far too costly, except for the rich. In the short span of 60 years the number of electric lights has been increased from a few hundred to tens of billions. Whereas 60 years ago only wealthy families could afford electric light, now the poorest families can have it in their homes. The average cost is less than for cigarettes.

As an inventor of international fame in the later years of his life, and, therefore, a public figure of world interest, he realized his responsibilities and felt keenly the influences of his words and acts. That is why, in his later years, he become more taciturn in speaking for the public, since words have a way of becoming two-edged. It is easy for myths to grow up around great men, and no man's memory has been subjected to more such bad ideas than that of Edison.

His son makes it plain that Edison's ideas on religion have been misinterpreted in some minds:

"It is commonly said that my father was an atheist—that he disputed the existence of a Supreme Being. Nothing could be farther from the truth. No man ever lived who had greater faith than Thomas A. Edison; no man stood in greater awe of the Unseen Hand which guides the destinies of men and planets; no man ever believed more firmly in the existence of a Supreme Intelligence who patterned both the contours in the snow and made possible the lilies of the field.

"My father often mentioned this Supreme Intelligence. He had more reason to believe in the existence of a divine order in nature than do lesser men, for he had occasion to know more intimately of the order that existed in nature and to marvel at the immutability of natural laws.

"To be sure, he was not an orthodox religionist, and he was as skeptical of creeds in religion as he was in physical science. He refused to believe the commonly accepted doctrines of his day in any field. The application of this attitude in the field of science made it possible for him to invent the electric light, the phonograph, and other inventions which emerged regularly from his laboratory over a period of many decades. Only a few months before he perfected the filament which made it possible to construct an incandescent electric light, one of the world's most eminent mathematicians had said that it was absurd to think that such a thing could be done.

"In religion, as in material science, my father saw that men are bound down only by their own limited and self-designated horizons. He saw that knowledge, in either the spiritual or the material world, is as shoreless and as limitless as space itself. Some remarks often attributed to him may or may not have been made by him, but if any of them tend to make it seem that he did not live in constant respect of a Supreme Intelligence, they do him and his memory a great injustice.

"It is often said that he never attended church. This is only partly true. When he was courting my mother in Akron, Ohio, he was a regular attendant with her at the First Methodist Church, and they were married in a Methodist church. As he grew older, he did not attend because he found it a source of great discomfiture to fail to hear the preacher. He contributed funds regularly to the Salvation Army and often expressed to me his feelings for that organization. He also contributed to churches. He felt that the Salvation Army, in its field, was attempting to do the same thing he was doing in his field—to bring help to the great masses of people who really needed help."

He wanted desperately to contribute to the well-being of every American. Essentially, that is why he lived, and that is why he worked so hard all the days of his life. He wanted to help mankind.

Edison's most important inventions were not happy chance. They were planned. And they were planned to help the greatest number of persons at the cheapest possible cost. He was a man with a one-track mind when he set out to invent something that he knew, if invented, would help the great masses.

For example, in experimentations leading up to the invention of the incandescent electric light, he ran into dozens of facts that would have helped him invent something else that would be commercially profitable and useful. He would jot down such a note as this: "So-and-so would be useful in constructing a hearing device." But he would not let concommitant facts draw him away from his original purpose. He discovered truths and made notes of phenomena that were useful to other scientists in inventing a whole line of "minor" inventions compared to those which he himself was trying to perfect. He would not allow himself to be shunted away from his original goal—to invent a light that would be useful in every home, or to invent a talking machine that could bring entertainment to all the people.

In the small, but distinguished, group of Nineteenth Century inventors, all of whom have achieved immortal fame, Edison's views were well known and respected, for each of the great men in his own field who knew him also held his great intellect in awe. He contributed to their work—and they to his.

This little group included Henry Ford, who, at a crucial period in his work on the development of a gasoline engine, was encouraged by Edison; Guglielmo Marconi, to whom Edison sold the patents that helped make wireless practicable; Harvey Firestone, the great tire inventor; Luther Burbank, the botanist, with whom Edison worked; Dr. Charles Proteus Steinmetz, the electrical genius.

He knew all of the great and near great in virtually every field of American endeavor. But you would never have known it if you had waited for him to tell you. He never boasted of knowing either President or prince. He knew every President from Rutherford B. Hayes—Arthur, Cleveland, Harrison, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

If there was one lesson, however, he would have taught the world, it is that men must think and work if all men are to be helped, if the human race ever reaches that pinnacle of prosperity for which men have yearned through uncounted centuries. All his adult life, Edison kept this framed quotation by Sir Joshua Reynolds in his laboratory and office:

"There is no expedient to which a man will not resort to avoid the real labor of thinking."

The End of the Beginning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edna Lonigan from Human Events:

THE END OF THE BEGINNING

(By Edna Lonigan)

The New Deal is dead but the evil that it did lives on. Because it is now without a leader, a party, or even a symbol we tend to forget how deep were the changes it made, and how much effort will be needed to repair the damage wrought.

Political changes in this country after 1933 are usually pictured as a growth in the power of the Executive, or even of one man. Such superficial analysis ignores the fact that the New Deal was part of a world-wide retreat from responsible representative government which began a generation ago and has now become almost universal.

The people of the United States were almost unconsciously swept into this rout. We lived for 14 years in a revolution, but it was revolution under an anesthetic. The change in American government was the work of appointed officials. Most citizens

were outside what Human Events has well described as our own iron curtain.

Neither the death of Mr. Roosevelt nor the Republican congressional victory has ended this counterrevolution against the fundamental principles of the Republic. But the Congress now about to convene can at least bring the crisis into the light. The final decision can then be made by alerted voters, rather than by officials who stand to gain from further surrepitious growth of their power.

Americans are disheartened because our efforts to make a "people's peace" have been met with doubt and cynicism. The reason is that we do not know what we mean when we talk of a people's peace and are even uncertain as to whether we want free enterprise or an officially planned economy at home. Everyone outside the United States recognizes the split that runs through our contemporary political thinking. And as we solemnly attempt to decide the future of other nations, of which we know little or nothing, it would seem reasonable to devote at least a portion of our intelligence to our own future.

American political institutions no longer rest, as formerly, upon hard rock. The ground beneath them has been mined. We cannot have peace at home or peace in the world until our own foundations have been reestablished.

II

All over the world, governments have enlarged their economic powers since 1918. But this has happened as a sequel to another, less obvious, revolution under way in the political field. Two cataclysms have joined to make the tidal wave of change in our time.

The economic innovation was to develop the role of government as an agent of production. Under many different forms, governments have taken over the direction of capital and markets. The new economic role of the state as enterpriser can be traced back to the national workshops of 1848 in France. The lavish promises made for these ateliers nationaux are still repeated. Their lugubrious failure is forgotten.

State socialism, however begun, soon shifts to an oligarchy in which a small elite assumes control of the productive life of the nation. The voters have far less influence on its higher strategy than have small stockholders of a big corporation. The voters cannot sell their shares and invest elsewhere when governmental mistakes are made.

The political revolution of our time depends on the technique of organizing voters into masses. It was first perfected by Louis Napoleon Bonaparte of France, whose assets—recognizable by Americans—were a well-known family name and demagogic skill in manipulating crowds. Blocs of voters, swayed by deceitfully clever propaganda, give the man who organizes them the plebiscites he needs to be returned to office again and again. So Louis Napoleon, elected President of France in 1848 by over five million votes, had himself made Emperor, in 1852, by a plebiscite of eight million votes. In the words of an English historian (E. Lipson): "The fundamental idea underlying the Napoleonic regime was that of inverted democracy, Caesarism founded upon a popular basis."

Napoleon III, as he called himself to exploit the name of his famous uncle, solved the problem of establishing personal power in the era of universal suffrage. He showed how the right to vote could be neutralized by propaganda; how, without depriving the citizens of their franchise, a skillful leader could keep them from voting the government party out and the opposition in. Inverted democracy restored the Prince.

Years later Hitler saw how to adapt inverted democracy to the age of radio. "Men are won less by the written than by the spoken word," he said in the preface to Mein Kampf. Roosevelt wrote practically nothing, other than speeches.

The undermining of a free society from within, by calculated debauchery of its citizens, has a long tradition. Bread and circuses in Rome; art and poison in Florence—much the same wiles are described by all the great political writers. Circe who, with siren voice and sweet song, turned men into pigs and made them forget their natural dignity, was no idle myth. That legend shows the way in which the practical Greeks taught each generation the hazards of political life.

Louis Napoleon is notable primarily as the first of the modern Caesars, marching at the head of columns of docile voters, chorusing "Ya! Ya!; Yes! Yes!; Oui! Oui!" as the case may be. Today any leader with a mass following will outstrip the little Napoleon by taking over economic as well as political control. Any party—like the British Labor Party—which begins by storming the economic heights will soon be controlled by the party leader most skilled in using Bonapartist blocs in his climb to power. The man to watch in England is the man who aspires to be Attlee's successor.

III

The same double (political and economic) revolution that took place in Germany and Russia has been proceeding here. But in the United States, sleeping pills were used instead of concentration camps.

No one in the administration actually "planned it that way." A few clever men saw that with lump-sum appropriations they could spend increasing amounts of money for purposes so vague and noble that Congress would not oppose them. The big spending agencies were the political arm for the creation of a mass following and a propaganda front. Harry Hopkins kept first place among New Dealers because he best understood the arts of Bonapartist collectivism. Many people still think of "blocs" as pressure groups. A pressure group wants to influence the law; a bloc merely surrenders judgment to the chief.

The New Deal democracy was not a representative party, based on free individual choices, but a pyramid of blocs—farmers, labor, Jews, Negroes, southern Democrats, little businessmen, etc.; there was the right bait for all of them. American foreign policy, from the destroyer-bases deal to Tehran and Yalta, was not the policy of a government answerable to its citizens. Again it was like the personal rule of Louis Napoleon, of whom Bismarck said: "He was vaguely aware that he needed a war."

Congress saw what was going on, but nevertheless surrendered—in effect—the all-important power of the purse. Congressional alertness made it necessary, however, that the coup d'état in the United States should not be alarming. Thus the American experiment in collectivism showed that the leader need not have a secret police if he has enough fiat money to lull the voters to sleep.

Many people noted the rise of bureaucratic collectivism in the economic sphere but wistfully expected that Congress would stop it. Others observed the linking of incongruous blocs, but hopefully assumed that an old-fashioned bankruptcy would end irresponsible government. Few realized that the government which manipulates the masses can have its own managed currency, and therefore cannot be stopped by insolvency. The confluence of two revolutions has so magnified the power of the State in our time that none of the traditional defenses of society can be counted on to protect the latter.

IV

The war was fought without waking us from our dream. While the people supplied soldiers and guns, political strategists of the inner circle consolidated the all-powerful state. At the end of the war they had assembled all the money and all the powers they needed to continue the collectivist leadership state in peacetime.

By the accident of Roosevelt's death these powers are now in the hands of a President who has not used them for the purpose for which they were designed. The voters freed themselves from the spell when Circe's song was stilled. Now the question is whether Americans can learn to confront, in a few years of grace, the problems that Europeans have failed to solve in the century since 1848.

Napoleon III and Hitler are not important for their personal vices. They are historically significant because they so skillfully exploited the real weakness of urban industrial society, the masses who have no education in freedom. Both Madison and Jefferson foresaw that weakness, and warned us against it.

The American Republic cannot now be restored without a struggle. Power seekers do not stop unless they are stopped. Would-be leaders, like Wallace and PEPPER, know how to convert mass propaganda into absolutist power. The Communists lead from the rear. They have adopted all the Nazi techniques for building the leadership state by inverted democracy. Only greater strength and greater faith will stop them. The Constitution cannot save us. The question is whether we are wise and strong enough to save the Constitution.

In all probability the year that is dawning will show whether we have it in us to give an affirmative answer.

The Tariff Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of February 6 and 7, 1947:

[From the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of February 6, 1947]

TARIFF TRICKERY

When Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton succeeded in getting Republican leaders in Congress interested in an escape-clause compromise on the tariff issue, he got away with the slickest bit of gold bricking seen in Washington in many months.

He succeeded in upsetting the GOP tariff alinement and caused a serious delay to Republican plans for tariff amendments, by offering them something they already had.

That's about as good a trick as selling a man his own house.

Fully to understand the irony of the situation, a little background is necessary. The Republican Party recently came back into power after years of protesting the New Deal's reciprocal-trade agreements on the grounds these were robbing American industry and labor of the protections of adequate tariffs.

The rank and file of the Republican membership is as fully committed as ever to the protective principles which have been the backbone of the party since its first few years of life. Nevertheless, within the party are a few so-called internationalists who have been fooled by the propaganda of global free trade.

A split between these factions has threatened the Republican membership in Congress since that body met.

Meanwhile the New Dealers, armed with power to use further tariff cuts of 50 percent as a bargaining power in foreign politics,

have been frantically seeking means of preventing the Republicans from curbing this authority.

In this tug-of-war the New Deal fight is in the hands of President Truman and such assistants as Under Secretary Clayton.

The identity of the Republican leadership is not so clear. According to current reports the most powerful Republican in Congress, Senator TAFT, has washed his hands of the matter for the time being. This left it to Senator VANDENBERG as a sort of unofficial second in command.

Senator VANDENBERG has been obviously reluctant to bring the tariff issue to a head because it very easily could lead to a review of the United Nations program, which the Senator, by reason of his own participation, presumably would feel to be both premature and embarrassing.

In this deadlock it was announced this week with a great deal of pride that Senator VANDENBERG, assisted by Senator MILLIKIN of Colorado, had worked out a compromise or middle-ground tariff position with Under Secretaries of State Clayton and Dean Acheson.

This proposal is set forth by the New York Times in the following words:

"Under the new plan, which will probably be adopted regardless of opposition in the House, the administration will undertake to write into every trade agreement with foreign countries a provision under which either party to the agreement could modify or withdraw any tariff cut that was working undue hardship on any enterprise."

A great many casual followers of the tariff fight greeted this as a happy thought, and were somewhat surprised that, instead of smoothing down the developing fight, it seemed to have made it still more turbulent.

As a matter of fact, the proposal was a slippery piece of double talk that shouldn't fool anyone a minute—certainly not anyone qualified to discuss tariff issues. Why?

It's already being done.

This statement is perfectly easy to prove. The texts of all trade agreements after the first one or two experimental ones all contain escape clauses of some kind. Recent ones have been standardized, and are identical with what is offered by the new proposal.

For a more detailed statement of the matter, turn back to the record of the House Committee on Ways and Means on the Trade Agreements Act. The date is April 26, 1945. The witness is the Honorable Oscar B. Ryder, Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, submitting a prepared statement on behalf of the extension of the act.

Here is what he said about the escape clause, now submitted as a fresh scheme for a compromise:

"In order to protect against unforeseen situations which may develop after a trade agreement is made, more general safeguards are required than those which relate to individual concessions. * * *

"Such a provision was first included in the agreement with Argentina (proclaimed on October 31, 1941), article XII of which stipulates that either country may terminate the arrangement in whole or in part, on short notice, in the event that any circumstance arises to prejudice its industry or commerce, and that it is found impossible to adjust the matter satisfactorily. * * *

"Practically all agreements contain a provision permitting quota action to regulate imports of any scheduled article if necessitated by governmental measures operating to regulate or control the production, market supply, or price of the like domestic article, or to increase the labor cost of production of such articles."

It might be observed that a close reading of the trade agreements would seem to make it virtually mandatory upon the President to insist that some such escape clause be inserted in all the agreements.

Propagandists fighting to save the trade-agreement scheme are centering their publicity on the escape clause as the principal point in the suggested compromise. The plan has, however, two other supposedly new points—one, to give all interested parties a hearing before tariff changes are put into effect; and the second, to call upon other Cabinet members besides the State Department to backstop in making the decision.

How far these points are from being new can be shown in a single quotation from none other than Mr. Clayton himself, in the House Ways and Means Committee hearings already referred to (April 20, 1945):

"The act [Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act] says that before any trade agreement is concluded we must make a public announcement of intention to negotiate such agreement and give all interested persons an opportunity to present their views; moreover, the act provides that prior to making an agreement, information and advice shall be sought from the United States Tariff Commission, the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, and other Government agencies."

The boldness of presenting these points as being a new ground for compromise, when they have existed since the act was written, is staggering. This is audacity, with a vengeance.

Of course, the trickery back of the move is easy to see.

The Republican majority is being offered what is called a compromise—a list of "concessions" which concede nothing. Since the public at large is wholly unaware of the true nature of these details, and since many Republican Congressmen themselves are unacquainted with the provisions of the law, the tendency will be to accept the proposals at their face value.

The expected reaction will be that President Truman and his staff have made a fair and honest effort to meet the Republicans halfway—when nothing of the sort has happened.

None of these "safeguards" has safeguarded industry and farming in the past.

Trotting them out now as something new and conciliatory is the most blatant sort of political trickery.

[From the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of February 7, 1947]

A TARIFF LEGEND

Entering into current arguments over the tariff issue is an imaginative tale which might be called the McKinley legend.

This is to the effect that President McKinley, one of the most ardent supporters of the protective tariff, underwent a sort of deathbed repentance and renounced this faith as the last act of his life.

The evidence is the text of the address which he went to Buffalo to deliver on September 5, 1901. He was assassinated at a public reception the following day.

In the course of his remarks, he made the following statement:

"A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. * * * We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the mutual outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established."

This has been quoted a thousand times by New Deal propagandists for global free trade, in an attempt to argue, first, that what the martyred President said in the closing hours of his life was inconsistent with the Republican Party's tariff position prior to that time; and second, that it committed President McKinley—if not indeed the whole Republican Party—to support the Roosevelt-Hull program of reciprocal-trade agreements.

For example, a few days ago Thomas L. Stokes, an ardent New Deal protagonist whose column appeared until recently in the Philadelphia Record and now is in the Evening Bulletin, commented with much sarcasm on the inconsistency of Republicans who wore red carnations in observance of McKinley Day—but at the same time were busy trying to curb the trade-agreements program. Now it may be stated categorically that those who use this legend must fall under one of two headings: Those who have learned so little about tariff history that they are gullible enough to be taken in by the legend, and those who know better themselves, but pass the story along hoping their hearers will be gullible enough to believe it.

The legend as told simply isn't true. Neither are the two lines of reasoning it is supposed to prove.

Of course McKinley made the speech. But there was nothing new in his views. Nor did these views have anything whatever to do with the present trade-agreements schemes.

Reciprocity of the form which McKinley advocated had been standard Republican doctrine for better than 10 years at the time of the speech in question. This can be proved by the most superficial research.

For example, the Republican platform of 1892, 9 years earlier, said:

"We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops."

Said the 1896 Republican platform, upon which McKinley was elected President:

"We believe the repeal of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity. * * * Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand."

So much for the theory that McKinley's "last words" were inconsistent with the Republican Party's stand on tariffs.

As to their bearing on the current reciprocal-trade agreements, this is a matter hinging solely upon what the word "reciprocity" meant to McKinley and what it meant under the New Deal.

What it meant to McKinley and to the Republican Party is easy to show. The Encyclopedia Britannica, fourteenth edition, written and published between 1929 and 1932, just before the New Deal came to power, puts the definition in authoritative form as follows:

"Reciprocity, the condition or state of being reciprocal, etc., etc. In a more particular sense, reciprocity is a special arrangement between two nations under which the citizens of each obtain advantages or privileges in their trading relations with each other * * * In the United States, reciprocity is the term applied to the concessions or arrangements made between that country and another without reference to any third country. Thus in the United States there is a maximum and minimum tariff, the rates of the maximum tariff being enforced on the goods of those countries which have no reciprocity treaty with the United States, and the rates of the minimum on certain products of those countries, have by a reciprocity treaty, given special advantages or concessions to certain products of the United States."

The policy of the reciprocal-trade agreements now in effect differs in every important point in its interpretation of "reciprocity."

McKinley reciprocity was between this country and some one other favored nation—one standing in a special geographic, political, or trade position and therefore given concessions which were withheld from other nations.

As an example, those interested may dig into the history of his reciprocity agreement with Brazil. In return for his promise not to levy a tariff upon the imports of coffee from Brazil, that nation made large and helpful concessions concerning our shipment of various of our products into that country. This was true reciprocity—a special understanding between the two nations, helpful to both.

The Roosevelt-Hull scheme is not truly reciprocal in any sense of the word. The agreements are worked out with a single foreign nation, it is true—but the concessions become available to all. We "bargain" with France, for example, and perhaps win a concession—but Belgium, England, Czechoslovakia, and all other countries get the benefit of our reductions without any concessions on their part.

Under the McKinley idea, the principal thing was to protect American industry and labor. The reciprocity plan was closely integrated with a strongly protective system of tariffs.

Under Roosevelt and Hull, on the contrary, the trade agreements were a device to tear down tariff protections. In about 1,200 separate items, tariffs have been drastically reduced to all nations—in most of them, a 50-percent cut. The State Department is now threatening to cut the remaining tariffs another 50 percent.

In the technical end of the matter, there are other very important differences. For instance, the Republican reciprocity program kept the tariff power in the hands of Congress, where the Constitution placed it; the President had only transient authority under sliding-scale rates. By the present scheme, all the authority is delegated by Congress to the executive branch of Government.

Again, Republican reciprocity safeguarded the right of all Americans to seek redress and protect themselves by recourse to the courts—as the Constitution clearly intended. The present scheme makes it wholly impossible for any person injured by tariff changes to appeal to the judiciary. It has not been possible even to review the constitutionality of the act, although a great many lawyers believe it a clear violation.

The fundamental purposes are wholly different. Reciprocity, to McKinley, was a device of building up and strengthening the American economy; of enriching this country and its people.

The Roosevelt-Hull scheme is a gadget with which to play international politics—an authorization for them to trade out the interests of American industry and labor for pretended or fancied benefits to some foreign country.

Trying to tag this as a McKinley idea is preposterous.

Proposed Sale of Town of Dragerton, Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a house concurrent memorial passed by the Legislature of the State of Utah, relating to the disposal of the town of Dragerton, Utah:

Whereas the War Assets Administration is advertising and offering for sale as a unit sale the entire town of Dragerton, Utah, consisting of 604 dwellings, 377 acres of land, a dormitory, schoolhouse, hospital, church, theater, store buildings, waterworks system, sewer system, and electric-lighting system; and

Whereas the town of Dragerton was built by the Government during the war for the purpose of housing employees of the Geneva mine at a cost of more than $5,000,000; and

Whereas the sale of this town as a unit sale would permit but few bidders to participate therein; and

Whereas said sale would preclude people in ordinary circumstances from participating; and

Whereas the buildings and homes of this town are now occupied by tenants who are employees of the large coal mines in that vicinity and by veterans of World War II; and

Whereas there is much concern and unrest among the present occupants of the buildings over the proposed sale since it precludes them from purchasing any of the homes and lots; and

Whereas bids are to be received for the purchase of this entire town as a unit sale on or before 2 p. m., February 14, 1947, at Building No. 3, 1710 South Redwood Road, Salt Lake City, Utah: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to withdraw from sale as a single unit the town of Dragerton, Utah, and that all bids received for the purchase of this town as a unit be canceled; and be it further

Resolved, That each house and lot in said town be offered for sale at a fixed price, first, to the present occupants of said home, second, to veterans of World War II, and third, to other interested persons; that such sale be made upon the conditions of a reasonable down payment and reasonable terms; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the President and Congress to give their immediate attention to this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state shall be directed to immediately send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the United States Congress from Utah.

Death by Beetle: Oregon Timber Faces New Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert E. Mahaffay from the Sunday Oregonian of January 12, 1947:

DEATH BY BEETLE: OREGON TIMBER FACES NEW THREAT—ONE BILLION BOARD FEET OF PRIME FIR DEAD OR DYING IN SOUTHERN COUNTIES AS BUGS BORE INTO VALUABLE STANDS

(By Robert E. Mahaffay)

Though the rain may hammer it, and the wind snatch roughly at it, the reddish dust remains. Those rusty particles, lying in the dark crevices of the Douglas fir, mean trouble. Bad trouble.

They mark the trail of as destructive a horde of insect invaders as the Oregon timber has ever known. They spell death—vast stands of gaunt, bare-boned trees—where the living forest wealth of green stood yesterday.

The Douglas fir bark beetle, no bigger than a match head, does that—is doing it now.

An estimated 1,000,000,000 board feet of prime timber in Coos and Douglas Counties is dead or dying. Dying now, today. The killer is this crawling, flying, boring match head. A killer one-fifth of an inch long, covered with conspicuous long hairs.

After the Tillamook burn of 1933 it is estimated that armies of the winged insects swarmed savagely out of the fire-ravaged area and in 3 years took the life out of 200,000,000 board feet of timber the flames had spared.

FORESTERS EXPRESS ALARM OVER NEW MENACE

In this case it's worse. It may cover the entire region, and foresters are wondering how much loss there will be when the next break-out comes.

Tomorrow's threat becomes immediate when foresters, normally the most conservative of men, report:

"No condition similar to that prevailing in saw-timber stands on the upper drainage of the Coos and Millicome Rivers has previously been recorded."

Attacks of this obscure bark beetle occur in cycles, and their virulence may extend over several years. The most recent flooding wave of the beetles in Coos and Douglas Counties is believed to have reached its peak between 1936 and 1941, coming as an indirect result of the disastrous fires in the Bandon and nearby forest areas.

What causes apprehension among foresters is the fact that new aggression of unpredictable importance may begin at any time.

There is a growing realization that if the billion-dollar Douglas-fir industry is to be properly safeguarded, a full study of this disregarded danger must be undertaken at once.

Thus far, only the most cursory investigation of the insect has been attempted—this despite the fact that insect menaces in general rank second only to fire as ravagers of our west-coast forests.

Although little is known about the Douglas-fir beetle, its cousin, the pine beetle, has been the subject of intensive study for decades.

Fabulous, indeed, are some of the suppression experiments conducted on the pine beetle. Many of these experiments have failed, but they have led eventually to development of what promises to be an effective and practical means of control.

It is hoped that some of this experience may be diverted to studies in the Douglas fir region.

Closely concerned with pine-beetle control efforts in the past has been John Whiteside, associate entomologist with the Federal Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

"Once the pine-bark beetle attacks a tree, there is no known way of destroying the insect," Whiteside reported.

"We tried every way previously used, recommended or suggested. We tried felling the trees and burning the bark. We tried sun-curing. We used trap trees—that means deliberately felling trees in the hope that the beetles would fly to them so we could burn the stump.

LOGGING OF INFESTED TREES HELPED IN PINES

"In an effort to eradicate the population we logged out the infested trees. We even experimented with chemical injections, radio waves and electrocution. We actually tried passing high-voltage electricity through the trees. Not one of these methods proved to be a practical solution to the problem.

"Still, these efforts resulted in eventual success. It was discovered that the pine beetle showed a definite preference for certain types of trees—those showing symptoms of weakness in their foliage and tops.

"By a light selective cutting these more susceptible types were removed and the forest made so resistant to beetle attack that losses dropped to negligible amounts.

"Wherever it has been tried, this so-called sanitation-salvage method of pine-beetle control has reduced losses by 70 to 100 percent, for periods up to 10 years.

"We now have what appears to be a most promising method for control of the pine beetle. An opportunity to undertake similar research may well develop an equally successful method of holding the Douglas fir beetle in check."

It was Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. foresters who first discovered that the Douglas fir beetle had made appalling inroads on 200,000 acres of land owned by private individuals, the State of Oregon, the Weyerhaeuser Co., and the Federal Government in Coos and Douglas Counties.

Research foresters for the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. estimated after a preliminary survey that 5,000 board feet of timber per acre in the over-all area had fallen prey to insects during the past few decades, with the heaviest damage coming in recent years.

Called in to examine the alarming discovery were experts, Paul Keen, forest entomologist for Washington, Oregon, and California, and Robert L. Furniss, entomologist in charge of the forest-insect laboratory in Portland. Their report served only to underline the dangerous nature of the outbreak.

"For many years," Keen said, "the Douglas fir beetle has been recognized as the most serious insect enemy of Douglas fir in the Rocky Mountain region, but until this present situation in Oregon was brought to our attention, we thought that our fine west-coast forests were relatively safe."

INSECT HAS NEVER BEEN FULLY STUDIED

"Unfortunately, although millions of board feet of Douglas fir have been destroyed by periodic outbreaks elsewhere, no detailed investigations of this insect have ever been made. Consequently, we are unable to advise as to control or preventive measures.

"Nor are we able to predict when this bark beetle may again become epidemic in the commercially valuable stands of the Douglas-fir region and seriously disrupt plans which industry is making for sustained-yield operations."

Historically, the Douglas-fir bark beetle is native to the Douglas-fir region. For its size it bears a staggering name, Dendroctonus pseudotsugae.

Its customary breeding place is in windfalls and injured or fire-killed trees. These do not have the resistance necessary to repel its attacks.

Occasionally the beetle population increases in such overwhelming numbers that the hungry multitude pours out and engulfs great stands of undamaged trees. This is what happened in Coos and Douglas Counties, but never before has a series of attacks involved such enormous acreage.

Probably the most extensive Douglas-fir beetle study, which, though valuable, is still only a beginning, was made by the late W. G. Bedard, formerly an associate entomologist with the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. Bedard's study, however, applied primarily to conditions in the northern Rocky Mountain region.

"Usually the timber owner or forest manager first realizes the presence of the Douglas-fir beetle when trees with faded or red foliage begin to appear singly or in groups within his forest," Bedard wrote.

"Several months before this, however, the first indication of attack appeared in the form of red boring dust lodged in the bark crevices or bark scales along the trunks of the infested trees."

Bedard described the invaders as reddish-brown or black, cylindrical in form and rather stout.

"The adult females," he continued, "lay eggs which hatch into small white legless grubs or larvae with small heads. They vary in size according to their age, from the size of a sharp pencil point when first hatched to nearly the size of the adult beetle. The larvae transforms into a white pupa which is an intermediate resting stage before the transformation into the adult beetle occurs.

"Douglas fir beetles emerge from the trees or logs in which they developed and fly to uninfested ones. Upon arrival at the fresh host material each female, followed by a male, bores directly through the bark to the wood surface, and then excavates an unbranched longitudinal egg gallery up the tree in the inner bark, grooving the wood slightly.

"The beetles bring with them the spores of a blue-staining fungus which develops in the conducting tissues of the tree and blocks the flow of water, thus assisting the beetles to girdle the tree, which dies in a few weeks."

Killing of the trees is attributable in part, also, to the longitudinal gallery or mines dug by the larvae. The larvae feed on the cambium layer—the soft, pulpy, growing layer of the tree—savoring the sugars and proteins it contains. The mines cut off the flow of sap to the branches.

The vaunted effectiveness of DDT is regarded doubtfully by those who have had first-hand experience.

"Thus far no acceptable means of spraying for bark beetles has been devised," Whiteside explained. "A 10-percent DDT solution will prevent attacks on logs, although the duration of effectiveness is not known. But the logs have to be down where you can get at them. You can't spray standing trees 200 feet or so high.

"There really is only a very short time in which to work on the insect. Any chemical must be applied to the trees while the beetle is in flight—normally in the spring or early summer."

FUNDS ASKED BY INDUSTRY FOR INVESTIGATION

So this tunneling match head—this insignificant despoiler—remains a mystery, and the emerald needles of the Pacific Northwest's major resource continue to turn to a yellowish green, to sorrel, to reddish brown.

Efforts were begun some months ago to challenge the destruction. The lumber industry and timber owners, faced with this bark-beetle menace, urged that the United States Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine investigate the problem and try to find a solution. They suggested that a minimum of $20,000 should be allotted to this study.

Approached on the matter by industry representative, Senator GUY CORDON expressed his deep concern.

"We hope," wrote the industry spokesman, "that through your representation with the Bureau of the Budget the necessary funds may be provided for study and control of the Douglas-fir beetle."

"Adequate study and control of this destructive forest insect now by the Bureau may save many thousands of dollars in damage to Oregon's forest acres in the future."

COUNTY HEADS ENDORSE PLAN FOR BUG ERADICATION

Replied Senator CORDON: "The outlook for getting increases for the next fiscal year is decidedly unfavorable. However, I shall do everything I can to have an exception made for insect control."

Help was mustering, meanwhile, in other quarters as well. As a result of action by County Judge Louis D. Felsheim, the Association of Oregon Counties pledged cooperation at its December convention and urged that Federal assistance be granted in an eradication program.

H. V. Simpson, executive secretary of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, emphasized the threat that continued insect depredations present to an effective sustained yield forestry program.

"This damage represents only a small part of our 26,000,000-acre forest, but it is of vital importance," Simpson said.

"At a time when the industry is devoting its most serious efforts to development of a forest-management plan which will provide jobs and incomes and forest products for generations to come, such an enormous loss is something the region can ill afford.

"What has happened in Coos and Douglas Counties was not anticipated. It is not anticipated elsewhere, but it can happen. Certainly the long-range economy of a region should not be jeopardized by continuing indifference to a problem which is proving so vital.

"The problems of any locality in the Douglas-fir region are of importance to every community dependent in whole or in part upon Douglas-fir timber. Appropriation of funds for a study of the Douglas-fir beetle has been neglected far too long."

Veterans' On-the-Job Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from a veteran at Miami relative to the limitation of pay to veterans working under the program for "on-the-job training." I have received a large number of letters from veterans relative to this matter, all of them pointing out the great injustice that the Government did in backing out on the original provisions of the GI bill of rights which had to do with on-the-job training.

This letter of Mr. Crouch, however, very ably points out the great injustice which was done by the passage of Public Law 679 and the urgency for the Congress of the United States to remedy this present intolerable situation.

The letter follows:

CORAL GABLES, FLA., *February 3, 1947.*
Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I am taking the liberty of writing to you in regard to one of the bills you are sponsoring. I do definitely know that you are pushing, introducing, pleading, and almost begging for the passage of this bill; but thought that perhaps I could tell you of my case and perhaps you would get a few favorable arguments, from my situation, that would aid you in securing enough backing.

I was in the Navy for 4 years. While in the Navy Public Law 346 was passed. Public Law 346 stated in effect that men in the service, upon being discharged, would be entitled to attend college, single men would receive a subsistence allowance of $65 a

month, married men $90 a month. I had a little money saved and made arrangements to move my furniture, and family to Miami in order to enroll at the University of Miami and secure a law degree. Well Mr. SMATHERS, I did move my furniture and family (a pregnant wife, and a 5-year-old son) to Miami and enrolled at the university. I knew that the cost of living in Miami was high, and counted upon the cost of living being high, but I also counted upon receiving a $90 a month subsistence check, in accordance with an act of Congress. Well you know the story.

A ceiling was placed on single men at $175 a month, married men $200 a month. In other words it only costs $25 a month to feed, clothe, house, pay doctor bills, hospital bills, and buy medicine for a wife and two children. My doctor, hospital, and medical bills for the months of December 1946 and January 1947 totaled over $400. But here is my main kick. I know several men who are attending school under 346 (as amended), who have no children, whose wives are healthy and earning from $150 a month upward. Now the husbands earn $110 a month and still receive the $90 a month subsistence, a total of $350 a month for two people. This is one of the minor cases. I know others who receive as much as $500 a month from investments; but since this is not considered as compensation for productive labor, these men still receive the $90 subsistence check monthly.

As might be expected, my subsistence checks have been discontinued.

I now know that I will have to drop out of school unless something is done to restore the subsistence check which I am entitled to. (I am entitled to it as well as anyone else.)

I am not asking for a thing that I am not entitled to. I only want what I was promised. I planned things so that I could eke out a living with the subsistence check, and with confidence too, since an act of Congress authorized the payments.

Public Law 346 (as amended, Public Law 679) states in effect, "If a married veteran is attending school, has no children, his wife works and earns a fair salary, and the veteran has no financial worries, then he is entitled to a subsistence check of $90 a month, or, if the veteran is receiving an income from other sources than from productive labor and is not forced to work for a living, then he is entitled to the subsistence allowance"; but, "If the veteran is married, has children, his wife is unable to work, and the veteran is forced, through circumstances, to work in order to provide food for his wife and children if he is a hard worker and uses time he should be sleeping and studying for the purpose of providing for his family, then this veteran is no damned good and will not be entitled to the subsistence check." There is no other interpretation, not with the $200 ceiling in effect. For after all the ceiling does not include other income, interests, investments, donations, and spouse's income; therefore, the law was passed as a discriminatory measure against the veteran who has a family, who is poor financially, and who must work in order to provide for his family.

Yes; Mr. SMATHERS, I know that you and many more like you in Congress are trying to adjust matters so that there will be less discrimination in the law, and personally I feel that you will be successful. If I did not feel that you would be successful, then I would drop out of school immediately for my debts are piling up on me; and I must meet these obligations someday. As you know, it is impossible to live in Miami with a family of a wife and two children, and care for them in any manner whatsoever on $200 a month.

Respectfully submitted.

NORMAN E. CROUCH.

Grant of Easements in Lands Under Control of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill and letter of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he deems it advantageous to the Government and upon such terms and conditions as he deems advisable, is hereby authorized on behalf of the United States to grant to any State, or any agency or political subdivision thereof, or to any public-service company, easements in and rights-of-way over lands belonging to the United States which are under his supervision and control. Such grant may include the use of such easements or rights-of-way by public utilities to the extent authorized and under the conditions imposed by the laws of such State relating to use of public highways. Such partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction over the areas covered by such easements or rights-of-way, as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs deems necessary or desirable, is hereby ceded to the State in which the land is located. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to accept or secure on behalf of the United States from the State in which is situated any land conveyed in exchange for any such easement or right-of-way, such jurisdiction as he may deem necessary or desirable over the land so acquired. Any such easement or right-of-way shall be terminated upon abandonment or nonuse of the same and all right, title, and interest in the land covered thereby shall thereupon revert to the United States or its assignee.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes, with the request that it be introduced in order that it may be considered for enactment.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to confer upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs authority to grant to any State, or any agency or political subdivision thereof, or to any public-service company, easements in and rights-of-way over lands belonging to the United States which are under his supervision and control. The drafted bill is designed to require personal action by the Administrator in the exercise of the authority proposed by the bill.

Under existing law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is not vested with such general authority, and it is necessary to request the Congress to enact legislation in each individual transaction pertaining to the granting of an easement or right-of-way in land held by the United States and controlled by the Veterans' Administration. Even such a matter as the construction of a sidewalk by a municipality upon land occupied by a Veterans' Administration hospital cannot be undertaken until an appropriate easement for the project has been authorized by act of Congress.

If the proposed legislation is enacted it will no longer be necessary for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to submit to the Congress, for consideration and enactment, special authorizing legislation respecting each and every such grant which is deemed desirable and in the interests of the Government. When a request for an easement or a right-of-way is received by the Veterans' Administration and the facts clearly indicate that the interests of the Government would be furthered by granting the same, the nature of the project involved ordinarily requires prompt action. The time consumed by the submission of each such case to the Congress for authorization involves a delay which may in some instances jeopardize the interests of the Government. The proposed legislation, if enacted, would greatly expedite the handling of such transactions and would accomplish a material saving in time and expense.

Since September of 1940, 10 laws have been enacted authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant specified easements in particularly described land under his control. The number of requests for such legislation and the need therefor will doubtless increase during the coming years, with the execution of the greatly expanded hospital program of the Veterans' Administration. It is believed, therefore, that the need for general authority such as that provided in the proposed legislation will become increasingly more urgent in the future than it has been in the past.

Sound precedent exists for the enactment of legislation of this character. Authority to grant rights-of-way has been conferred by law upon several of the departments of the Government having under their control substantial tracts of land belonging to the United States. The Secretary of the Interior is vested with the authority to grant certain rights-of-way over the public lands, national parks, and Indian lands. The Secretary of Agriculture has been given authority to grant the use of certain types of rights-of-way over the national forest lands. The Secretary of War is authorized to grant easements for rights-of-way over military reservations and lands acquired by the United States for river and harbor and flood control purposes. The Attorney General is also authorized to grant easements in lands under his supervision and control.

As above indicated, the bill, if enacted, will result in a material saving of time and expense.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army, Administrator.

The Third-Term Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 7, 1947:

THE THIRD-TERM ISSUE

The strongest argument to be made against a constitutional prohibition of a third term for an American President is that in some grave future national emergency it might tie the hands of the electorate and prevent it from exercising a free choice in its own best interest. This argument was made repeatedly on the floor of the House of Representatives yesterday, before that body voted in favor of such a constitutional amendment, and there is no denying that it has some force. To take an extreme case, the Nation might find itself in a state of war when the second term of a President in office expired, and the case for continuing him in office could be very strong indeed. Some such situation did, in fact, present itself in 1944, when Mr. Roosevelt was guiding the foreign policy of the United States in the life-or-death struggle between western democracy and the Axis, and this policy had the full support of the Democratic Party, while it had been opposed at vital points (repeal of the arms embargo, enactment of lend-lease, etc.) by the congressional Republicans of that day.

But the clear and persuasive answer to this argument is that if a constitutional amendment against a third term (let along a fourth) were in existence, whatever President was in office would find it necessary, and surely possible, to develop within his own administration, or elsewhere within his party, an alternative leadership to his own, fully capable of presenting his policies adequately to the electorate. This Mr. Roosevelt failed consistently to do, and it was as a result of this failure that the Nation found itself, in 1944, confronted by a choice between a fourth-term President and a still too strongly isolationist Republican Party. A constitutional amendment would prevent a similar situation from arising in the future, and at the same time help to develop its own assurance that, however grave the emergency, the voters, if they so desired, would be able to achieve a steady continuity of policy in the White House.

With this argument met, the case for enactment of a constitutional prohibition of a third term is, we believe, compelling. Long tradition, the sound advice of the founders of the Republic, the enormously increasing powers of the Presidency, and the obvious hazards of an overcentralization of these powers in one man's hands, particularly in a day when one-man government has been so common, and can so easily be imitated, all argue strongly in favor of such a prohibition. We believe that the Senate will do well to concur in the action of the House, and submit the question to the States.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Irving M. Ives, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by the Honorable IRVING M. IVES, Senator from New York, on the evening of Saturday, February 8, at the annual Lincoln Day dinner of the Queens Village Republican Club, Queens Village, New York:

It gives me great pleasure again to be in Queens County and in the greatest Republican stronghold of the Nation. I extend to you my hearty congratulations upon your success in the recent election, and thank you deeply for the tremendous support which you gave to me.

It was stated, you may recall, that the year 1946 was to be a year of great decision. Certainly, from a political standpoint, the decision of 1946 was satisfactory to Republicans. It must now prove just as satisfactory to the Nation.

Following the election, it soon became apparent that a magnificent Republican victory had brought with it a tremendous Republican responsibility. If 1946 was a year of political decision, 1947 is likely to prove to be a year of economic decision, in which may be determined the fate of our country for generations to come.

Today, as a nation, either we stand on the threshold of great new achievement and progress and enlightenment which can provide for all our people greater opportunity and happiness than any we have ever known, or we face a time of reaction and retreat which ultimately can cost us our independence as a nation and our freedom as individuals. In choosing the course to be followed, the decision must rest finally with the American people but in pointing out the way the initial responsibility now lies with the Republican Party.

In the last two decades we in America have experienced the greatest boom, the most severe depression, and the most terrible war in all our history. In this same period of time the whole world has been passing through an even greater social and economic and political upheaval.

Only a generation ago freedom was regarded as man's most cherished possession. Then, in the midst of the social turmoil and economic wreckage which engulfed much of the world following World War I, there emerged as the chief end and aim in living the concept of economic security for the individual. Revolutions became frequent, governments were overthrown, and there was revived as the compelling force in the lives of men—the power of the state.

Peoples everywhere, even in America, were told that government could provide for them everything they wanted. Helpless and hopeless and in unthinking desperation, hundreds of millions sacrificed their birthright of freedom for this pot of gold at the foot of the rainbow.

To be sure, this world-wide movement was temporarily checked by World War II. But it still continues, until today among the great powers of the earth only America clings to the basic idea of freedom.

We believe that freedom and security are not incompatible. In fact, we believe that without freedom there can be no security. We believe that only through free government can there be freedom for the individual and economic security for all.

So the challenge we face is clear, but our task is difficult. If we are to succeed, our system of free competitive enterprise must be made to work successfully. To be sure it is not perfect, but it is more nearly perfect than any other system yet evolved by man and under it human beings have made greater progress and have enjoyed greater freedom and security than under any other system yet devised by the mind and experience of man.

Our first task then is to correct the defects in our system. Fortunately, only a few of these defects are serious and every one of them can be largely corrected if we have the will to do so.

It would appear obvious that in this undertaking we should begin by assigning to government its proper role in a free economy. Too much or too little government will inevitably bring the very results we are seeking to avoid. Therefore, our path must lie somewhere midway between these two extremes.

Most fortunately for us, from the lips of a very great American, the anniversary of whose birth we are commemorating this evening, came words of counsel to guide us in our present course. Speaking on July 1, 1854, on the subject of government, Abraham Lincoln made the following signified statement:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate or individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

This is safe advice for us to follow. In substance, Lincoln said that government should exercise only that power and authority to do for the people what the people need and cannot otherwise do for themselves, and that government should go no further.

It seems to me, then, that the role of government should be one of sympathetic cooperation toward all of the component parts of our national economy. It should act with fairness toward all.

Mindful of the words of Lincoln, let us examine our national status as it exists today. Let us note some vital areas wherein action by government alone is indispensable and other areas where government acts as a cooperative force, helping the people to help themselves.

International relations fall strictly in the area where government must act almost entirely alone. Happily here, through the operation of our bipartisan foreign policy promulgated in 1944 by our great Governor, Thomas E. Dewey, and subsequently carried out through the joint operation of our two major political parties, we have strongly supported the United Nations and have accepted our full measure of responsibility in world affairs. Our activity in the field of political international affairs is successful. Let us hope that our economic international relations will be equally successful.

In its internal fiscal affairs our National Government is right now faced with one of its most serious problems. Here again is an example of government's sole responsibility.

In this connection it seems to me that our first job is to get properly oriented. Unfortunately, in this instance, there has sometimes been a tendency to put the cart before the horse.

To be sure, all of us want reduced taxation. There can be no quarrel about our desire here. But the amount of tax reduction and the kind of tax reduction, it seems to me, should depend upon our condition after we have done several other necessary things in putting our fiscal house in order.

As I see it, our first and compelling job is to make sure that our Federal Budget is finally balanced in fact—not just on paper—when the Congress shall adjourn, but in such a way that our figures will be in the black when the fiscal year ends in 1948.

As the first order of business in bringing this necessary result, every governmental function which is not essential should be eliminated, and expenditures for every other function should be cut to the bone. In fact, only those expenditures which can be fully justified should be allowed.

Then it seems to me that our next task is to begin to reduce our crushing burden of debt. Unless we reduce our debt when business is good, we shall never reduce it at any other time.

Then, and only then, should we consider tax reduction. By all means, if we have any margin left with which to do so, we should reduce taxes.

In those activities wherein the role of government should be basically one of cooperation and helpfulness, I place foremost the field of human relations. Here resort to government should be last and not first in resolving differences.

Industrial and labor relations are foremost in this field of human relations. Here we would do well to follow a few guiding principles. In the first place, let us remember that the rights and obligations of the workers are commensurate with the rights and obligations of employers. Next, in the consideration of legislative proposals dealing with the relationship between labor and management let there be no doubt that those proposals which may be adopted will help to produce peace between labor and management and will not serve merely as instruments for more misunderstanding and strife. To this end, let us make sure in what we do that we gain genuine, free, collective bargaining, that our mediation services are improved, and that the machinery for voluntary arbitration is made more easily available and effective.

These are the processes of government which can aid management and labor better to work together, to understand one another, and voluntarily to solve their own problems. These are the processes of government which can help to bring peace between workers and employers.

Among these processes the most important is the establishment of a system of real collective bargaining by which agreements can be reached and contracts consummated. Whether between nations or between individuals or between management and labor, there must be integrity, good faith, and a high degree of responsibility toward all contractual relationships. The sanctity of the contract is the keystone in the arch of free collective bargaining. It is the foundation under the edifice of happy industrial and labor relations.

The objective we are seeking in the field of industrial and labor relations can never be gained through partisan political approach. It can never be gained through a Democratic program or a Republican program. It can never be reached by a labor program, or by a management program. It can only be achieved by all of us—Government, management, and labor, Republicans and Democrats—working together for the common good of all.

Many of you know of the great advances which have been made already in New York State. Under the leadership of Governor Dewey, Democrats and Republicans, labor and management, working together, have removed from partisan politics issues of this kind. If this can be done in New York State, with all of our variations in interests, in industries and in population, it can be done in the Nation.

If we are to retain our free economy in America, moreover, these objectives of which I speak must be attained in the Nation. Both management and labor must come of age and reach that state of maturity wherein they can peacefully solve their mutual and common problems and settle their differences in harmony.

This, as I see it, is the great test with which we are faced today. Government can lead the way, government can assist, but government alone can never produce the results which are required.

As freemen we must compete against economies of the world where there is no freedom. As freemen we must compete against regimented orders where the dignity of man and the brotherhood of man are despised. As freemen we must face this economic challenge, ourselves still remaining free.

I believe we can win in this struggle for survival. I believe we can win because I have faith in the American people. I believe that the American people can work together voluntarily and happily. I believe that the American people, once they understand the realities of the conditions which confront them, will join in the common cause of freedom, wholeheartedly and unitedly. I believe the American people have that faith in themselves, that faith in one another, and that faith in Almighty God, which will bring us victory in this fateful struggle for freedom.

How Do You Feel This Morning?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster (Pa.) Intelligencer-Journal of February 7, 1947:

HOW DO YOU FEEL THIS MORNING?

How do you feel this morning?

Pretty good?

Well, you shouldn't.

The United States of America is in danger; and the danger is as great, if not greater, than ever before in our history.

Why?

Because the Communists are working hard to overthrow our Government.

There is no longer any doubt about it. For yesterday, down in Washington, the growing fear of every good American was confirmed beyond reasonable doubt.

There, in the shadow of the Capitol of the United States, an Austrian-born woman positively identified her brother; one Gerhard Eisler, as the "No. 1 Communist" of America; the American agent of the Comintern of the International Communist Party.

Imagine that, can you?

A foreigner, living amongst us, directing the task of attempting to overthrow our Government.

What fools we mortals be.

Now, Congress is excited, as well it should be. Every good American should be excited.

Congress proposes to charge Eisler with conspiracy to overthrow the Government, with contempt of Congress, with perjury, with income-tax evasion, with falsification of his passport.

That's a lot of poppycock.

What we want to know is:

How did Gerhard Eisler get into this country?

How many Gerhard Eislers are there in this country?

Who let the Gerhard Eislers into this country?

How long is it going to take Congress to throw out Gerhard Eisler and all the other Gerhard Eislers?

That is what must be done.

Throw them out, every one of them, whether they have gotten by the citizenship courts or not.

Throw them out—and keep them out!

The time has come for action.

Every foreign-born Communist within the confines of the United States and its possessions must be thrown out.

Every native-born American who has in any way aided or abetted these Gerhard Eislers must go, and that includes those who let them in.

Throw them out.

All of them.

There is nothing like an American Communist, and very few native-born Americans claim to be Communists.

A Communist cannot be an American.

An American cannot be a Communist.

The time has come to act.

America—that's you and I—must act now—at once—if we are going to save this Nation.

Congressman Stevenson Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following report to my constituents:

Due to the Reorganization Act it has taken more time than usual to get the new committees of Congress organized. For instance, the new Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is now made up of the former Civil Service Committee, Post Office and Post Roads Committee, Census Committee, and the Congressional Library Committee. Instead of having 4 committees with 80 members, we now have the streamlined Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, comprising only 25 members, of which your Congressman is the ranking Republican member, with Congressman EDWARD REES, of Kansas, chairman.

Over 70 bills have already been referred to our committee and more are being referred to us daily. As you know, when bills are introduced in the House of Representatives they must be referred to the proper committee for consideration, where proponents and opponents of each bill present their views. Such committee action on all bills is a necessary precedent to action by the House. Practically every committee of the House has been busy on hearings the past 2 or 3 weeks. When the hearings are finished, and after thorough discussion and probable committee amendment, a vote is taken by the committee, whether the bill shall be reported to the House. It then goes to the Rules Committee, who decide how much time shall be allowed for debate of the bill on the floor of the House, and whether it may or may not be subject to amendment by individual members on the floor of the House. The Rules Committee also has power to stop a bill from coming out on the floor of the House. The Rules Committee is therefore one of the most powerful committees in the House of Representatives.

Much has been said about an immediate curtailment of expenditures by Government agencies that were in existence before the Republicans took over control of Congress, some people thinking that expenditures of any Government department or agency can be curtailed forthwith. It should be made clear that all branches and departments of the Government, including all bureaus, agencies, boards, and commissions, are operating under appropriations passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, which, of course, was controlled by the Democratic Party. These appropriations will continue until July 1, 1947.

After that date the real effect of curtailment on appropriations under the economy program of the present Eightieth Congress will become apparent.

The only method available to cut funds from the executive department or other Government bureaus in the immediate future is through rescission of former appropriations, by vote of both Houses of Congress.

All rescission bills must be signed by the President. The President would not sign a bill cutting off appropriations for his own executive department; and it requires a two-thirds vote in both the House and the Senate to pass a bill over the President's veto. The Republicans do not have a two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress. But the Appropriations Committee has been busy for several weeks studying all governmental activities and appropriations of last year, with the intent to wipe out every single nonessential Government activity. Members of the Appropriations Committee tell me they will make a real and substantial curtailment in public spending by Government agencies and departments commencing July 1, and all needless bureaus and activities will be dispensed with completely; but that needed activities of Government will be preserved.

In order to ward off inflation Congress must balance the Budget. We must then acquire sufficient surplus to permit a systematic reduction of our national debt; then we should think of cutting taxes. To accomplish this we must stop prodigal spending and stop giving away billions to any and every foreign nation that requests or demands a hand-out. The national income must be maintained at a high level. And to help Congress accomplish this, State and local governments should refrain from demanding subsidies and hand-outs from Washington. State governments, too, should start on a program of retrenchment. Reports and letters from the people back home indicate they want retrenchment in public spending in their local municipalities and State governments, as well as by their National Government. I believe it is possible by such retrenchment to achieve an equitable reduction in our individual tax burdens.

A poll of all weekly newspaper editors whose papers represent over 70,000,000 American readers shows that a large majority of American editors want Congress to eliminate wartime bureaus, get rid of unnecessary Federal employees, slash loans to foreign countries, and cut down on farm subsidies. They demand a tougher policy toward Russia and Communists, and favor continued support of the United Nations and the present foreign policy of the United States; but they do not favor a return to the high tariff policy practiced by former Republican administrations. They want more legislative responsibility returned to and taken over by the State legislatures.

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation can well be shocked at the revelations that were made before the Un-American Activities Committee last week, particularly as they pertain to the destructive influences of communistic elements within our own country. With such practices invoked, it is extremely hard for many of us to maintain our normal enthusiasm for the principles that back up and lay the foundation—if you please—for the United Nations.

Surely if the United Nations is to move forward and to serve as the instrumentality of people and a common understanding among the nations of the world, it is the plain duty of one of the great members of that organization to begin to put its house in order so far as interfering with the policies within our own country.

It will be of particular interest to the Members of Congress to read the words of DeWitt M. Emery, Akron, Ohio, president of the National Small Business Men's Association, when he tells an audience in Fargo, N. Dak., the story of the textbooks that are to be found in many of the schools in the United States today. It is of particular alarm to me, as I read this article, because so many of the schools in my own State seem to be using this textbook. And the alarming situation is that the authors of the textbook are evidently professors from schools of importance within our own Nation. They are not the handiwork of the Russian people themselves, or any of our communistic travelers, but they are evidently the handiwork of men reared and educated in our own great America.

DeWitt M. Emery has rendered a great service to the Nation in presenting to the people of North Dakota, and the country generally, the fact that the textbook entitled "Economics: Principles and Problems" is to be found in so many schools in the Northwest.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a statement taken from the Fargo Forum, of February 5, which quotes Mr. Emery, of Akron, Ohio, president of the National Small Business Men's Association:

EMERY CLAIMS AC TEXTBOOK COMMUNISTIC

An NDAC economics class is using a textbook tending to spread what he termed communistic ideas, DeWitt M. Emery, Akron, Ohio, president of the National Small Business Men's Association, told the newly formed Associated Industries of Fargo Tuesday night.

The book in question is Economics: Principles and Problems, by Paul F. Gemmell, University of Fennsylvania, and Ralph H. Bodgett, University of Illinois. It is an accepted textbook in 195 other United States colleges, Emery said. Harper & Bros., New York, published the book.

The speaker said five other schools in the State—Jamestown College, Wahpeton School of Science, Bottineau School of Forestry, and Mayville and Minot State Teachers Colleges—are using the text. Minnesota schools using the book include St. Olaf and Hamline, he said.

Emery contended that sections of the book advocate abolition of inheritances, that the wealthy be asked to pay a very large part of the running expenses of society, that the Government acquire all land used for business purposes and rent it to the highest bidders, and that social services be extended with the funds obtained.

Emery referred to the textbook as an example of what he described as "an infiltration of communism into American life," telling his audience of about 300 Fargo and Moorhead businessmen that "Communists have held many high positions in the Federal Government and they must be cleaned out."

He said the Gemmell-Blodgett textbook was used during the war as part of an Armed Forces Institute course in economics, selected for AFI by "a group of prominent educators under supervision of the American Council on Education."

"I believe the principles advocated in parts of the book are inconsistent with the American economic system," Emery said.

The Wool Situation and the Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement I made last week before the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

May it please the committee, I desire to make a brief statement regarding the agricultural problems which must be considered in connection with the pending negotiations of reciprocal-trade agreements. While agriculture in general has an interest in common, I shall direct my remarks in particular to the domestic wool industry.

The reciprocal program is, in my judgment, when prudently administered, a wise one. When wisely applied it may be helpful to our economy and to the general cause of world trade. If administered unwisely, the reciprocal agreements may be destructive of vital segments of our economy, reduce our buying power of imports, hamper world trade, and reduce our standard of living.

It will be recalled that when the Reciprocal Trade Act was enacted back in 1934, section 350 (2) provided in part:

"For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production."

The act further provides in section 350 (a) that the President may, "whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States" enter into foreign trade agreements.

I understand this Committee on Reciprocity Information is giving consideration to the question of reducing the present duties on imported wools. The domestic wool growers are deeply alarmed over such a possibility and have a right to be. Any reduction at this time would be quite disastrous to a great industry that is already in a state of decline. Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to dwell at any length upon the plight of the American wool grower. His precarious position is recognized on every hand. The President in a message to Senator O'MAHONEY on March 11, 1946, stated: "At the present time there is a serious worldwide wool situation." He went further to

state: "There is general agreements that this Government must protect the incomes of wool growers on a level comparable with that afforded producers of other agricultural commodities."

In discussing the wool situation following weeks of exhaustive hearings, the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool pointed out that failure upon the part of the Government to meet the world situation created by the world surplus and the British monopoly plan means disaster to so large a segment of our domestic economy that it is imperative for the United States to adopt a long-term policy.

The British monopoly referred to grew out of the fact that nearly 2 years ago the four governments of the United Kingdom and of the three dominions, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, formed a joint organization to hold and market the huge British stocks of surplus wool which overhang the world market. As much as 85 percent of the total world supply of wool, it was found, estimated at more than 4,000,000,000 pounds for more than a decade to come will be controlled and handled by this state-managed monopoly.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to the report made following the international wool talks in London last November 11–15, where delegates assembled from 13 countries. That report, made by our State Department, states the total world stocks of apparel wool on June 30, 1946, was estimated at approximately 5,000,000,000 pounds, grease basis. The report contains this statement:

"It was recognized in the discussion that some major importing countries are confronted with a problem of maintaining a domestic wool industry in the face of cheap imports, which possibly may involve the use of subsidies or other measures.

"Emphasis was laid upon the importance of avoiding prices so low as to cause widespread hardship to producers and serious damage to economic structures."

It is evident, of course, that reference was there made primarily to the United States and our own domestic growers.

Aside from the official expressions of concern over the future of the domestic wool grower, the undisputed facts themselves speak loudly. In considering this subject, it must be borne in mind that:

1. During 1946 more than 80 percent of wool consumed by our mills was imported. The Census Bureau reports that during the first 11 months of last year the consumption was 590,321,000 pounds of foreign and 99,580,000 pounds of domestic, scoured basis. Contrast this with 1939 when textile mills processed just under 600,000,000 pounds of domestic apparel wool, compared with only 80,000,000 pounds of imported fleece.

2. In 1946 sheep in the United States was the lowest in 20 years. This decline has been steady since 1942, until today it has dropped an average of 23 percent. During the same period wool production has decreased 24 percent and the dollar value of return has declined 23 percent. The decline in numbers went from 49,955,000 in 1942 to 37,548,000 in 1946. Wool production went from 392,873,000 pounds in 1942 to only 287,000,000 in 1946, and during the same period income from wool sales dropped from $157,235,480 to $122,713,680 in 1946.

3. Our own markets are so completely controlled today by the British monopoly that between 80 and 90 percent of every wool product worn in this country was made of foreign wool. And this is true even though a vast stockpile of 500,000,000 pounds of domestic wool is owned and is for sale by the Government of the United States.

4. The United States which in 1942 was the second largest producer of fine wools in the world has now dropped to fourth place.

5. During the 5-year period from September 15, 1941, to September 15, 1946, the wool growers of this country received an average price increase of only 13 percent for this wool. During the same period, the average price increase for 23 other farm commodities was 94 percent. Wool received the lowest price increase and the next lowest was an increase of 37 percent.

6. England and her dominions shipped 600,000,000 pounds of apparel wool to this country for the year ending last July and Argentina shipped 347,000,000 pounds for the year ending last September.

From these facts it should be abundantly clear that there is at present no barrier to the import of wool to this country. Certainly the facts show that the present tariff rate of 34 cents per pound, scoured basis, does not impede the movement of foreign wool to this country. It is equally clear that any reduction in the present tariff level will mean a corresponding reduction in the price the wool grower will receive for his product.

Yet the President of the United States, as I have pointed out, recognizes the fact the world situation is such that the domestic grower must be supported or otherwise protected. The report from the London conference is to the same effect.

Tariff serves as an equalizer between our own cost of production and that of other countries. A British mission this year reported to Lancashire that British spinners produce 18 to 49 percent less per man-hour than Americans, and British weavers 56 to 67 percent less. The same contrast is generally true of other labor costs and other factors that enter into cost of production of wool abroad. The purpose of the tariff being to equalize the difference in costs at home and abroad, it therefore follows that the present equation is out of balance. The average hourly earnings in the wool textile mills in England as of last November was 35 cents, whereas in the United States it was $1.05. Any decrease in the duty on imported wools or wool textiles would really amount to an indirect subsidy to the textile industries and the wool producers abroad. It is inconceivable that the present level of protection will be reduced in view of the direct effect it would have in our own industries at home. It would mean a serious threat to this segment of our peacetime national economy and to our essential defense requirements.

This issue comes up, Mr. Chairman, at a time when we face the future filled with unknown and unpredictable quantities. Instead of taking steps that would jeopardize the stability and prosperity of a great industry at home, we should be thinking of ways and means of giving it strength and security, such as the President has said is needed. It is the prosperity of our own markets that enables us to be the largest consumers of imported materials and consequently the world's best customers of imported goods.

We can prosper most by supporting our own industries, while encouraging trade and exchanges with foreign countries of goods not so highly competitive with our own products. We cannot aid our strength or prosperity by following a course that will materially reduce or abandon any kind of production at home.

Here in this country the wool grower competes with a world monopoly controlling the disposal of most of the world stockpile of wool. We compete with countries where very low labor costs produce their products; where there are no minimum wage scales; where the rates of workmen's compensation and social-security taxes are much lower; where income-tax payments are much lower; where all factors of production, transportation, and marketing are much lower; where the standard of living is much lower, and a tremendous public debt does not have to be serviced and paid. A reduction in wool tariff would amount to an export of American jobs.

It is axiomatic that the prosperity of the Nation depends upon the prosperity of our own agriculture, which, of course, includes the wool grower. Let us not sacrifice the American market to foreign producers who can, because of reduced costs, ship wool and other products here and sell below our actual cost of production. At present there can be no claim that foreign wool is not moving quite freely into our own markets. Why consider a reduction in tariff rates where there is no need shown from the standpoint of world trade and where the present protection is admittedly inadequate?

Today we deal with governments that in the main are socialistic and where the governments themselves largely control by subsidies and otherwise their economies and the patterns of their export business. It is of utmost importance in the development of reciprocal agreements that any agreements contain provisions to protect American agriculture.

I make this plea for the American wool grower. He stands virtually at the mercy of the world market that is dominated and controlled by our foreign competitors protected by a subsidized state monopoly. At the present the domestic wool grower is not even included in our agricultural support program under the so-called Steagall Amendment. Except for the wartime Government purchase program, undertaken for security reasons, which expires in April, our growers are not included in Government support. I repeat that his only support comes from the tariff. To give the producer the minimum of protection to which he is entitled in our economy, the tariff level instead of being reduced should be increased a few cents. That course would not impede or unduly burden an adequate importation of foreign wools to meet our own needs. It would not be a barrier to world trade. It would not be contrary to the spirit and original purpose of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

The American Veterans' Committee Comments on President Truman's Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter written by Mr. Charles G. Bolté, national chairman of the American Veterans' Committee, to President Truman, commenting on the President's legislative program which was recently submitted to the Congress. I know the Members of the House would like to have the views of this veterans' organization on the various national programs facing the new Congress.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The American Veterans' Committee (AVC) was deeply interested in your State of the Union and Economic messages which outlined to Congress the administration's legislative program for this

session. We were, of course, particularly concerned with the sections of your program dealing with housing and veterans. But we found also that other sections dealing with problems of the national welfare affecting veterans as well as all other citizens tied in closely with the AVC program approved by our membership at our last national convention. The guiding theme of the AVC is "citizens first, veterans second." In the legislative field this means that we are actively concerned with the basic social legislation which affects us all.

The AVC is convinced that the No. 1 problem faving veterans this year is housing. No one has denied that an acute problem exists, but there are, unfortunately, some groups which would like to place nonresidential construction ahead of veterans' housing. Because this conflict exists the AVC was delighted to read that you favored an "aggressive" program to encourage home construction and advocated continued limitation of nonresidential construction. We believe that one of the most important means of encouraging a dynamic housing program is to stimulate the development of the industrialized housing industry. We urge that this infant industry with its abundant promise be given a'' possible assistance. The housing crisis demands that American production ingenuity be applied to the development of industrialized housing within the reach of all citizens.

In your address you stated that to reach our long-range goal of adequate housing for all our people comprehensive housing legislation is urgently needed. AVC believes that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is the key to providing the needed large-scale rental housing projects. We are, however, seeking certain amendments to the W-E-T bill, which we feel will provide further incentives to builders of rental housing. We advocate extending the amortization period of insured loans from 40 to 50 years, and reducing the interest rate on these loans from 3½ to 3 percent. We feel that the longer period required for repayment and the lower interest rates should vitally aid in producing units which would rent at figures the average veteran can afford.

I am sure that the overwhelming majority of veterans were pleased to hear that the administration was firm in opposing the removal of rent controls. AVC has repeatedly declared that removal of rent controls would be catastrophic. When rent controls were removed after World War I, rentals went up 312 percent. If controls were removed now rents would not come down when the general price level declines, because of the acute shortage of housing. This would mean that with controls removed the average veteran would be forced to put out a disproportionate part of his income for rent.

Veterans are also greatly concerned about the danger of continued inflation of prices. All of the benefits which a grateful Nation has extended to its veterans, ranging from disability pensions to the subsistence allowances of student-veterans, are threatened by the continued tendency toward price increases.

In speaking of the administration's veterans' program you remarked that the Government's program of benefits to veterans is substantially complete. The American Veterans' Committee (AVC) is opposed to Treasury raids in the belief that what the World War II veteran wants is assistance in readjusting to civilian life rather than a hand-out. We heartily agree with your statement that the success of the veterans' program will be judged by the contributions which the program enables the veterans to make to their country. We do believe, however, that in order to obtain this purpose, certain improvements in the present program of benefits to veterans are needed. Revision of the GI bill of rights is necessary, for example, to provide an increase in the subsistence payments to student-veterans to $100 for single veterans and $125 for married veterans, and to raise the on-the-job-training ceilings to $300 and $325.

A number of surveys recently completed have indicated that the veteran on the campus is just not able to make ends meet with his present allowance. We feel that the proposed increase of $35 per month would provide a bare minimum under which veterans can attend school. They will still find it necessary, in most cases, to supplement their income from outside sources, principally by working at part-time jobs. But, unless the benefits are raised in the very near future thousands of veterans will be forced to abandon all effort to take advantage of the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights. This is particularly true of married veterans with children.

In another section of your state-of-the-Union message you dealt vigorously with the problem of monopolies. The American Veterans' Committee, which was the only veterans' organization to submit a statement to the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, endorses the administration's effort to face and solve this problem. We recognize that the present alarming trend toward concentration of economic power is one of the paramount issues facing our society. Veterans engaged in business fall in almost all cases in the small-business category. The threat of the ever-expanding monopolies affects them concretely, in addition to undermining the basic foundations of our free-enterprise system.

You also urged Congress to develop a program to provide adequate medical care to all who need it. We feel that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, introduced during the last session, provides the means for achieving the sound national health program you advocate.

AVC, at its last national convention, endorsed the creation of valley authorities for the development of our natural resources. We, therefore, offer our full support to your declaration of the importance of action in this field.

We also desire to commend your appointment of a Civil Rights Committee to recommend to Congress legislation to preserve and guarantee the basic civil rights of all our citizens. We hope that this committee will urge action on FEPC, antilynching, and antipoll-tax legislation.

It must be emphasized that as veterans we know that without world peace and understanding the best domestic program is meaningless. AVC was the first national organization to give full support to the Baruch plan for United Nations control of atomic energy. We urge as a logical corollary of this plan the creation of an international authority to control and limit all armaments. We believe in the development of world government through the United Nations.

I know that you will understand, Mr. President, the keen interest that the American Veterans' Committee has in the legislation passed during this session. While we have been organizing AVC as a World War II veterans' organization to represent World War II veterans, we have often recalled your statement that as a veteran of World War I, you would be unhappy to have veterans of the Spanish-American War handling your affairs. The members of AVC, now represented in every State in the Union, have joined together to work in peace, as they did in the recent war, for a more democratic and prosperous America and for a stable world. We feel that the administration and Congress, by cooperating on a far-sighted legislative program in this crucial year, can take a major step toward that goal.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES G. BOLTÉ,
National Chairman, American Veterans' Committee.

Limit the Tenure of the Office of President to Not More Than 8 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of House Joint Resolution 27, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of office of the President to the whole or any part of each of two separate 4-year terms. This measure would eliminate the possibility of a Chief Executive and those around him perpetuating in an office so great and powerful as that of the President of the United States, an individual whose doctrine of Government may be contrary to the best interests of our people.

The official motto of the State of Delaware is "Liberty and independence." I firmly believe that this motto ably expresses in so few words the basic principles which have guided our country to its position of world leadership and raised our standard of living to the highest in the world. Our country will continue to grow in strength and purpose and carry out its responsibilties of leadership if every effort, and every precaution, is taken to preserve unto our people their liberty and independence, and the right of choice and decision in the direction of our Government.

As we look back over the history and growth of our country, we find that the Federal Government has been reasonable in its operation and has, in most instances, carefully guarded individual rights and liberties. Yet when the expenditures of the Federal Government reach the astronomical figures of recent years, it became imperative for the people to establish additional safeguards to preserve their fundamental rights and liberties. Therefore, it seems to me that this resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is timely, appropriate, and desirable. I supported it in this House, in order that it might be started on the road to consideration by the people of our country. Whether or not this amendment is ever adopted, it is important that the matter be placed before the people in the various States, in order that they may, at the conclusion of the abnormal conditions imposed by the recent world conflict, review and study our fundamental charter and the operation of our Government under it. Only by such continuous review and vigilance, by the people them-

selves, will we be able to preserve in fact all of our cherished liberties and rights as individuals.

There are many other reasons which have been ably presented in support of an amendment to the Constitution to limit the tenure of the office of the President which commend themselves to our American way, but none is more important than a clear recognition of the need for safeguarding, at all times, the rights of the people to liberty and independence.

United States Press Criticizes Work of Sugar Pool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 30, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Sugar Facts, published at Chatham, Ontario, of January 15, 1947:

UNITED STATES PRESS CRITICIZES WORK OF SUGAR POOL—EDITORIAL COMMENT SUPPORTS REPRESENTATIVE WOODRUFF'S CHARGE UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE—CANADA ATTACKED AS ONE GIVING LESS

A letter forwarded to Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, chairman of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, with respect to the sugar situation has occasioned a flood of editorial comment throughout the United States. Author of the letter, Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF (Republican), of Michigan, wrote in part: "With our beet-sugar production up and Cuba's production up, one may well ask why our sugar bowls are empty and why so much fruit and vegetables cannot be canned for lack of sugar. The answer is found in the program carried out by the Combined Food Board, which has lately been expanded into the International Emergency Food Commission. The Combined Food Board was composed of the United States, Great Britain, and Canada. The United States and its offshore territories make the greatest contribution to the pool, as they furnish over 60 percent of the sugar consumed in this country in addition to sharing with other nations the 3,768,000 tons which the United States bought from Cuba. In short, United States consumers get only 2,125,000 tons from Cuba, and the remaining 1,643,000 tons are distributed to other nations by the Commission. By comparison, Britain will provide less than 30 percent of her sugar consumption, whereas Canada will produce only 18 percent of its sugar needs.

"Sugar rationing continues in the United States with promise of only a microscopic increase in allowances, yet Canada recently declared a sugar dividend of three extra pounds per person to her household consumers. This dividend has been reported in the press as being justified by increased supplies of sugar. Canada is producing only 65 percent of its beet-sugar plant capacity, with the largest beet-sugar plant in Ontario standing idle for the past 5 years."

Mr. WOODRUFF's letter goes on to quote J. H. Blackmore, MP, who told the Canadian House of Commons, "I am utterly amazed at the indifference which prevails in this House and in the Dominion of Canada with respect to the sugar supply."

"It is obvious," wrote Mr. WOODRUFF, "that the administration in Washington has simply stood on the sidelines and let the American producers and consumers carry the load for other nations."

The press of the United States sprang eagerly to Mr. WOODRUFF's cause. The Tri-County Banner, of Blanchard, Mich., ran his letter under a page 1 headline, "Bureaucrats cause of sugar shortage, claims WOODRUFF." The Bay City Times editorialized "He deserves the gratitude of the public for starting the ball rolling." The Detroit Sunday Times, reporting a speech by James Vernor, ginger-ale tycoon, headed the story, "United States sugar shortage laid to New Deal plan." The same paper, in another story, reports "In Washington, stacks of letters from outraged housewives, denouncing the sugar shortage and demanding relief, are being exhibited by Congressmen."

The Los Angeles Examiner ran a banner headline, "Housewives' sugar fight urged," with a page 1 box, "Want more sweets? Tell Congressman." The Detroit Times of December 24 cried plaintively, "Europe got [our] Yule sugar."

Senator BRIDGES, Republican, from New Hampshire, warned Secretary of Agriculture Anderson to supply sugar, declaring that while Anderson is prepared to ask only 9 pounds more sugar per person in 1947, sugar industry experts have produced figures showing that were Americans to get their rightful share they would have 19 pounds more sugar per person than in 1946.

The Detroit Free Press quoted Chairman JENKINS, of the Republican Food Study Commission, as saying, "The American housewife has suffered more than her share of the wartime sugar shortage as compared with the industrial user of sugar * * * any increase in the ration for 1947 beyond the 20 percent extra already recommended should go directly to individual housewives." (The 20-percent increases suggested by JENKINS are double the amount of increase considered likely for 1947 by the Department of Agriculture.)

The Daily Sugar Trade Journal, in the December 3 issue, quotes J. G. Diefenbaker's address to the Progressive-Conservative Businessmen of Toronto under the head "Assails Ottawa for shortage of butter and sugar." Mr. Diefenbaker claimed, "More sugar would increase the ration, but the Government's attitude on controls shows that greater production is the lesser aim. Control for control's sake is paramount."

"When it becomes generally known in the United States that the Ottawa Government is not now (even after the war) and has not for some years, worked to produce as much sugar as it could, our position in the three-way partnership will be uncomfortable. As hitchhikers we may be asked to get out and walk."

Lincoln Day Address of Mabel S. Fraser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, on February 6, Mabel S. Fraser, of Indiana, delivered a very fine address before the annual Lincoln Day banquet, held at the Statler Hotel, in Washington. Mabel S. Fraser is the vice chairman of the Republican Central Committee of Indiana, as well as vice chairman of that committee in the Second Congressional District of Indiana. Her speech was well received by the large audience present at that meeting.

Under leave, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therewith the address delivered at the annual Lincoln Day dinner, in Washington, by Mabel S. Fraser, which follows:

Mr. Chairman, Speaker MARTIN, Governor Green, distinguished guests, Republican friends, it is a profound pleasure to be here with you. It is a flattering honor—almost an overwhelming one—to be privileged to address this fine audience.

We have met to rekindle our memory of a great man and the things for which he stood. With humble sincerity not unlike his own, we feel it "fitting and proper that we do this."

Of Abraham Lincoln, Elbert Hubbard wrote:

"Lincoln sought to lose himself among the people. And to the people at length he gave his time, his talents, his love, and his life. The memory of his gentleness, his patience, his firm faith. Is the priceless heritage of a United land."

Tonight, as Americans rededicating ourselves to the precepts of an immortal leader, and as proud partisans concerned with the principles of our first republican President, we might well give more than passing reflection to his one tenet—firm faith.

Throughout this universe of ours, faith is on trial. Disillusioned millions, spread across a war-ravaged earth, must rediscover in their hearts, their daily living, and their institutions, a faith that will consolidate all mankind in its pursuit of peace, security, and plenty.

You and I, from childhood onward, have come to know Abraham Lincoln. For us the episodes of his life pass by in a familiar recollection: The poor-born boy, the hard-worked youth, the struggling lawyer, the country politician. Thence the Springfield legislator, the respected debater, and finally for him, the call to the highest public office within the gift of his people. After that, the long cruel test of statesmanship against the passions of a dividing people; his fine resolved and final success in keeping this nation one and indivisible, and then so tragically, his death at the point of a madman's pistol.

To review that career, with an exactitude of date and detail, would but consume your time. I could as profitably set out to convince you that the Christian is a good religion. Rather than lean backward then to examine Lincoln, the man, might we not better reach out in quest of Lincoln, the spirit?

What, in simple analysis, could have endowed this very human being with principles so noble, humility so deep, and character so rugged that in far corners of the earth, freemen engrave his image upon their temples of liberty?

And what, further, did this first and greatest of all Republicans leave behind to serve the faithful of our generation as an inspiration and a sacred trust?

It has been the finding of persons more scholarly than I that from earliest days of cornfield speaking, through the hour he slipped away into death, Abraham Lincoln held fast to a twofold faith. In those darkest days at the White House, when this Nation was rent apart by war, Lincoln never faltered in that faith. Through pain, anguish, and mental distress, he sought in prayer and by act to save the two of his

firm faith—the American people, and the Constitution. Even in the awful hour when bloodshed could no longer be averted or postponed, he stood steadfast.

"Others," he reasoned, "are bent upon the destruction of the Constitution, but I, before God, have taken a solemn oath to preserve and protect it."

For us, as for him, our firm faith must dwell in the people and their Constitution. We today remain his people, and we—thank God—remain a Republic under that Constitution.

Today, of course, our numbers are greatly multiplied, our interests more diversified, and our economic life more complicated than Lincoln could have foreseen. But through all the difficulties that beset us, we can and must stand as Lincoln stood—with supreme faith in the people—all our people, and with a firm regard for that treasured instrument of justice which guarantees orderly government by law rather than rule by whim.

We are experiencing a happy but serious interval of history when the star of republicanism is ascending the political heavens. That star—if we keep faith—will wend its way higher and higher until it shines majestically—not only a beacon guide for the welfare of this land, but as well for all lands where men are striving to revive freedom and opportunity for the masses.

I am not going to take you back 14 years. The going, even in reminiscence, would not be to your liking. But I shall dare assert that an era has ended, and I am going to point out that the era ended because the people ended it. Through the ballot box this past November, the American people—labor, capital, farmer, merchant, veteran, and housewife—spoke their mind. They spoke, too, with such clarity, courage, and volume that there can be no misjudging their sentiments or misrepresenting their will.

They called upon this party of Lincoln's for a change—not just the unscrambling of countless errors, but—and this is more important—a drastic, unmistakable change of Government attitude and Government spirit. They, to be sure, did not ask to go back to anything but they demanded the right to march forward with more honesty, more self-respect, and more individual freedom.

In these crucial days, not only of America's destiny, but, indeed, the destiny of civilized mankind—here in this, still the strongest and richest of nations, the Republican Party has been given a brief 2-year recall to prove its mettle. Already, however, in many scattered capitals—courthouses, statehouses, and this—your Washington—the forces of common sense, sanity, and simple honesty in public affairs are in motion. They are weaving together into a pattern of responsive and responsible government the long-neglected fibers of state thrift, public economy, and sound Americanism.

Less than 2 years hence, when the American people have tested this handiwork and found it good, they will seal their vote of confidence by sweeping into the White House a man worthy of Lincoln and his faith—a vigorous, forthright Republican.

In political terminology, this is an off year. But those of us residing beyond this city know that from this moment until the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November 1948 real Republicans will take no time off. Whether citizens or officeholders, we realize that in a mere 2 years we must redeem all that was bent and broken in 14 of them.

Our highest party leadership is here in Washington. To those now working overtime on Capitol Hill, to make the record of the Eightieth Congress an outstanding one, I can say this:

Squarely behind you, in patriotic support of your arduous toil, are the dominant millions of plain, clear-minded Americans. They share with you a vivid realization of the monumental labors you face. They have complete confidence in your ultimate success.

From Lincoln we have learned that, as Republicans, we must maintain a lasting faith in our people and our Constitution. From him, too, we know our final trust is to stand by our American way of life. That way, in essence, is free enterprise. To me—and I feel sure, to millions of like sta us—our American system of free enterprise means a maximum of social and economic opportunity for everyone.

To us there is little glamour in a synthetic, stratified economy, whether Communist or Fascist. To us the one system that through all history has produced the greatest abundance for the greatest number is that by which this party traditionally stands—the American system of free competitive enterprise, under it, not only may every man do the most for his own good, but every man is challenged to do his utmost for the common good.

In the art and science of government, there is something greater than the opportunism of the moment. It is a quality of devotion to fundamental principles and moral honesty that is above immediate advantage. Lincoln could have been Senator, if, in his debates with Douglas, he had been willing to compromise—compromise what he sincerely believed was for the good of the country. Yes; he could have been Senator, but he never would have been President. That, in itself, is a testament of the "ultimate justice of the people."

If we have faith in that justice, we shall have the courage to join Lincoln in saying: "Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

If we would understand our duty, we have only to recall his words: "What constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea coasts, our Army and Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of these may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us."

And if we follow in his footsteps, and are guided by his great spirit, we cannot go wrong in this hour of our testing.

The task is ours—to rebuild America, for Americans, in the American way. To that task, let us humbly dedicate ourselves as Lincoln prescribed in times much like these:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in: To bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who has borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan; to do all which may achieve a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

On a wall not far from this place, seen and remembered by endless thousands, are words as imperishable as the man for whom they were conceived:

"Here, as in the hearts of his countrymen, for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever."

When we depart from these walls, may all of us, great and small, high or humble, carry away within our hearts those of Lincoln's principles entrusted to our keeping.

In the American people, in the American Constitution, in the American system of liberty and free enterprise, we pledge our faith, now and forever.

Nation Within a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of February 4, 1947:

NATION WITHIN A NATION
(By Philip H. Parrish)

Our party of a dozen editors, touring Germany in October, found American and British officials in the midst of negotiations for economic merger of the American and British zones of occupation. Those negotiations were completed after our return, and the merger became effective on January 1. It has now been operative for a month.

Little could be expected in that brief time, particularly in view of the severity of the winter in the Rhine Valley. It has been difficult to move even absolute necessities. Such rivers as the Neckar and the Main have been frozen, and the railroads, possessing only some 30 percent of prewar rolling stock, have had difficulty in handling the absolute essentials.

However, we all should watch this experiment with the deepest interest during the coming months, and the coming year or two, if it continues during that period.

The situation rises from the fact that though, under the Potsdam agreement, the powers expressed the intention of treating Germany as an economic unit, they have not done so. The conquered enemy was sliced into four parts for occupation purposes, and the four zones began operating in what amounted to economic opposition to one another. Russia got the east, including the Silesian basin; Britain drew the northwest, including the vital Ruhr; France claimed detached areas on her side of the Rhine, including the very important Saar; the United States fell heir to that part of the south not held by France, including the scenic Bavarian Alps. Then it developed that France desired this division to continue. France could not bear the thought of a reunited Germany, fearing resurgence of Germany as a military force on the one hand and enjoying exploitation of the Rhine provinces on the other hand. Meanwhile Russia was operating mysteriously behind the iron curtain in the east, apparently stripping German industry; so Russia strung along with the French, at least for the time, in support of German fragmentation.

That let only the United States and Britain immediately interested in carrying out the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement. The position of the United States proved, upon analysis, to be especially difficult and costly. Our German zone is rich in agriculture and forestry and has considerable in the way of industry, but lacks the raw materials for much of that industry. The British also were in an unfavorable situation. Their highly industrialized area contains about one-third more people than ours, with a much lower per capita food production. So the British, in spite of their hunger at home, have had to ship to their occupied zone in Germany a much greater amount of food than the United States has had to ship to its area.

The result was that the United States and Britain decided that since Russia and France would not cooperate, the next best thing was

cooperation between themselves. Why not unite the great industrial capacity of the British zone with the agriculture, forestry, and factory capacity of the American zone? They mulled this over and decided upon it.

Now, the question is, What can we expect from it?

According to an analysis released recently by Brig. Gen. William H. Draper, Director of the Economic Division of the Office of Military Government for Germany (in private life a distinguished New York banker and certainly one of the most impressive officials met on our trip), the United States has been spending $200,000,000 a year in our zone just to keep our German charges alive, and without any prospect of escaping from that financial burden short of an arrangement by which the Germans could export enough to pay for their imports of food and materials. He holds the economic merger with the British zone to be such an arrangement. During the first year—the present one—we will have to spend an additional $130,000,000 in order to take care of our share of the feeding problem in the more thickly populated British zone. But during that time we will be receiving raw materials to an equal amount from the British zone, particularly Ruhr coal, and will be sharing in that zone's industrial capacity. The theory is that within 3 years the capacity of the merged areas will result in exports sufficient to enable the Germans to pay for their own imports of food and raw materials for manufacture.

Thus, by taking on an additional expenditure of $130,000,000 this year, and a lesser amount next year, the United States may avoid any expenditures at all beyond that.

All this, clearly, will have a part in negotiations over the German peace treaty. We observe that even during the past few weeks the Russians, French, Belgians, and others have been coming forward with various placating suggestions. We have no doubt that these suggestions have been hastened, and forced into the open, by the American-British merger. That merger holds out definite possibilities of success, and the states which have been in opposition are compelled to reorganize their approach to the German problem accordingly. For one thing, America's attitude toward its responsibilities in Europe would be far different if no appreciable drain upon American resources was involved. So with Britain. In fact, a workable and balanced state, stretching from Austria to the North Sea, would alter the entire basis of bargaining so far as the reorganization of the continent is concerned.

He's My Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Katheryn Launtz, one of the editors of the Washta Journal, published at Washta, Iowa, in my congressional district, in her weekly column called Kitty's Korner, has long delighted her readers with her original poems and editorial comments. Just recently there appeared in her column a short poem about friends, which I include herewith as part of my remarks. We all have friends but ofttimes so little appreciate them. We take them as a matter of fact.

The poem follows:

HE'S MY FRIEND

He may be six kinds of a liar,
He may be ten kinds of a fool;
And also he may be a wicked high flier,
Beyond any reason or rule.

There may be a shadow above him
Of ruin, and woes that impend,
And I may not respect, but I like him.
Because? Well, because he's my friend.

I know he has faults by the millions,
But his faults are a portion of him;
I know that his record's vermilion—
He's far from a sweet seraphim.

But he's been straight with yours truly,
Ready to give or to lend,
And if he is wild and unruly,
I like him because he's my friend.

I knock him, I know, but I do so
The same to his face or away.
And if others knock they're soon sorry
And wish they'd had nothing to say.

I never make diagrams of him,
No maps of his soul have I penned;
I don't analyze, I just love him,
Because? Well, he's my friend.

Return Our Government to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have read many articles and received many letters from people who are interested in seeing a return to the States and political subdivisions of the several States of the prerogatives, powers, and activities that were either borrowed or surreptitiously taken from them during the war, under the guise of being justified by some emergency or other.

This was sometimes accomplished by bait in the form of promises dangled before the people. In some instances, it was nothing less than bribery. It was part and parcel of the scheme of planned economy of the New Deal, and was obviously designed to wrest from the people their right to local self-government, and permit an assumption of authority by the Federal Government to regiment and control the people and their economy.

This program has grown to such proportions that today we witness the horrible spectacle, in peacetime, of the people being harassed on all sides by bureaucrats and of being forced to obtain permits before they can embark upon, enter, or operate almost any line of business.

The people are seriously fearful that, if they do not do thus and so, the assistance or Federal money to be matched with State funds will be withheld from the States or local subdivisions. The people are led to believe that it is necessary for their activities to be planned by some bureau or group of bureaucrats, all of whom are appointed directly or indirectly by the President. They are told that we need uniformity of legislation in the various States, and that it takes the Federal Government, through its bureaucrats, to tell us how these uniformities may be accomplished. The people are taxed for all of this, and what is worse, they are taxed to be propagandized by the bureaucrats. They are taxed to be told that they can or cannot do this, that or the other, which formerly was a matter of their own volition and decision. They are taxed to have some bureaucrat tell them how to conduct their own business, whereas our history plainly shows we prospered under a system of free enterprise.

This condition has reached alarming proportions. We are just now beginning in Congress, to look in upon and take inventory of what has happened during the past 14 years. We are just now beginning to see how serious is the situation. The people are just beginning to awaken to a realization of the fact that our form of Government is in jeopardy, and that these socialistic, and in many instances communistic, or at least Communist-approved, programs, are wholly un-American. They do not fit our traditions. On the contrary, they belong to, and came from, governments where the worst forms of dictatorship have prevailed.

Another matter that should be brought to the attention of the people back home is that Uncle Sam is financially embarrassed, while many of the States and local governments are in good financial condition. They are much better able to handle their own business, without the interference of Federal bureaucrats, and to pay for their projects without Federal governmental interference, than they were during the days of depression and war. It was always bad in principle. But the bribery worked, and the people yielded, temporarily. They did not think it was to be a permanent arrangement. The trouble with any form of bureaucracy is that, once it gets a stranglehold upon the people, it is almost impossible for the people to extricate themselves from its control. Insidious and plausible plans and schemes were devised, all sorts of benefits were promised, and Federal funds were offered, if only the bureaucrats were permitted to make suggestions, outline programs, and direct the activities of our people. Many of these bureaus have mushroomed and grown to alarming proportions.

All of this is brought to the fore in a letter from the Governor of the great State of Indiana dated February 6, 1947, addressed to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Indiana and all other States, which I quote as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
February 6, 1947.

To Senators and Congressmen of Indiana and All Other States:

I commend to your serious consideration the enclosed resolution adopted by the Indiana General Assembly now in session.

Copies of this resolution are being sent not only to Indiana Members of Congress, but also to those of other States—for the reason that, from a practical standpoint, if the high

intent of this resolution is to be realized only Congress can achieve it.

When a State legislature is confronted with a Federal-aid law, the legislature either must comply or forfeit money which has been or will be taken from the State's citizens in taxes. The effect is virtually compulsion.

To this resolution, please let me add my own respectful request that you examine carefully every proposed expenditure of Federal funds for "aid" to States or local units of government. Is it really a matter for Federal legislation, or should the determination be made within the States? We in Indiana believe all of us will have a better government of, by, and for the people if the people of each State and each community exercise the responsibilities which are rightfully theirs.

Respectfully,

RALPH F. GATES,
Governor of Indiana.

The Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Indiana, fully cognizant of the serious inroads that have been made, and the dangers that lie ahead, undoubtedly planned that way, to deprive the people of local self-government, has voiced its sentiments in a resolution adopted by it, which I quote:

House Concurrent Resolution 2

Indiana needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington, will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States.

So we propose henceforth to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully petition and urge Indiana's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county courthouses and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come home.

Resolved further, That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us, and we with them to restore the American Republic and our 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

Compensation of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the compensation of postal employees, to provide for adjusting compensation of clerks assigned to terminal railway post offices, air-mail field transfer offices, and office clerks, and study allowance time credits for certain employees.

This will provide for a graduated scale of promotion for clerks assigned to terminal railway post office and air-mail field transfer offices based on their length of service. It would also allow clerks assigned to these offices a time allowance of not less than 30 minutes per day for 253 days per annum for all service required on lay-off periods.

I believe this measure to be a very meritorious one and sincerely hope that it will receive the full attention of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Lake Erie and Ohio River Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me:

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LAKE ERIE AND OHIO RIVER CANAL (PITTSBURGH-ASHTABULA ROUTE) MAHONING AND GRAND RIVER BASINS, OHIO MAHONING RIVER, LOWELLVILLE-NILES, OHIO

(Statement in opposition to the construction of the proposed canal by LOUIS E. GRAHAM, Member of Congress)

The proposed canal would begin at a point on the Ohio River 25 miles below Pittsburgh where the Beaver empties into the Ohio between the boroughs of Rochester and West Bridgewater and extends through the Twenty-fifth Congressional District to a point on the Pennsylvania and Ohio line where it would enter the State of Ohio. The distance covered in the Twenty-fifth District being approximately 32 miles. From testimony given in former hearings it appears that this was the fourth largest canal under consideration by the Public Works Committee, only exceeded by the St. Lawrence seaway, the Florida Ship Canal, and the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal.

At the point where the Beaver River empties into the Ohio the Beaver is approximately 600 feet wide and gradually narrows to the point where it is formed by the confluence of the Shenango and Mahoning Rivers, this point being approximately 21 miles from the place where the Beaver enters the Ohio. The Beaver is bordered on both sides for many miles by high hills, the banks are very sharp and precipitous and in some places the hills are between 300 and 400 feet high. From a point about 10 miles from its mouth there is a drop of 68 feet in the Beaver and the course of the stream is narrow, tortuous, and difficult, it is obstructed by numerous bridges, highway and railway, a number of dams, and is deficient in low-water flow. From former testimony it was set forth that it would be necessary to raise 26 bridges, both railway and highway.

In 1933, R. C. Moore, lieutenant colonel, acting division engineer made a report concerning this stream as follows: "The improvement of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers to Struthers, Ohio, mile 35, by the Federal Government, in accordance with the plan presented by local interests, is not warranted." Again in the report submitted in 1934 based on Colonel Styers' investigation and surveys it is stated, "Therefore the district engineer recommends that the improvement of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers be not undertaken by the Federal Government."

The Pennsylvania Railway main line lies along the eastward side of this stream and the main line of the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie on the westward side, these railway lines having been constructed at great cost to the railroads. The tracks of the Lake Erie Railroad are also used by the main-line trains of the Baltimore & Ohio and also by the Erie Railroad from Youngstown, Ohio, to Pittsburgh.

At present between Beaver Falls and the mouth of the river there are three dams in the stream. These serve a double purpose. They impound water for millraces and also furnish the basis of the water supply for the Beaver Falls Municipal Authority. This municipal water authority bought the Beaver Valley Water Co. several years ago and serves 14 communities in Beaver County with a population of approximately 75,000 people. Under the law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, this authority cannot borrow money from the city of Beaver Falls, the county of Beaver, or the State of Pennsylvania. The only manner in which they can raise money is by the sale of its bond, and, of course, the revenue must be derived from the sale of the water. At the time of the hearings in October 1941 it was testified that the authority had $4,300,000 worth of property and had sold $4,490,000 worth of bonds, and to guarantee the payment of these bonds it had pledged its revenues.

This is the only source of water supply that these 14 communities have to supply their needs.

In testifying at that time, Col. Earl E. North states: "Whatever they are, whatever damages these people get in court, would have to be paid by the local interests. The Federal Government does not propose to assume any of these damages. It never does in any waterway. All our waterways are constructed with that proviso, that any damages resulting from the improvement are to be borne by the local interests."

This was followed by testimony that the county of Beaver is not in any position to assume any costs in connection with the proposed canal in any manner whatsoever.

In 1934 competent engineers estimated that if this canal were built it would take out the two dams, would require the lowering of eight water mains that cross on the floor of the river and would put out of commission the New Brighton pumping house which was below the level of the canal. In this connection it is well to note that 95 percent of the power that goes to pump water out of the Beaver River is pumped by the force provided by the water from the old mill races and the original power dams.

To sum up. The Beaver Falls Municipal Authority must raise its money from the sale of water. Its bonds are pledged for that purpose. First, there is the very involved question of its property rights in the bed of the Beaver River. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania sold these rights many years ago. Several of these dams have been in existence for over 100 years. Unquestionably it would take the adjudication of the highest courts to determine who owns the bed of the Beaver River at this point and to whom these water and power rights belong.

Next, in the testimony given in October 1941, it was shown that the damages estimated by the Army engineers would be totally inadequate to cover the amount of damage suffered by the municipal authority caused by the removal of its eight water lines under the bed of the river and the destruction of its power plant. An all-important item in this connection is the fact that one of its pumping plants is operated entirely by water power for which it pays nothing and, of course, this item enters into the financial set-up of the municipal au-

thority in selling its bonds as one of its elements of cost of operation.

All the foregoing facts do not include the all-important fact that if a system of dams is built in the Beaver River and the sewage of the city of Youngstown and New Castle is allowed to remain in the pools formed above the dams, the whole source of water supply of approximately 75,000 people will be contaminated and polluted to the point of absolute physical danger.

In the former hearings it was admitted that there would not be sufficient water flow to provide for navigation and it would be necessary to drill wells to supply sufficient water and then repump the water back to the head of the proposed canal. Of course, this referred to the stub-end canal, but nevertheless, the element of sewage contamination is present due to the fact that there would not be a clear and uninterrupted flow of water in the Beaver River. Whether there would be sufficient water flow from the newly constructed dams in the State of Ohio is a matter to be determined.

The next phase of this matter is not only the destruction of certain plants now abutting on the Beaver River but also the loss of time in the reconstruction of new plants and the possible removal of these plants from the Beaver Valley. For instance, the plant of the Townsend Co. at New Brighton, the plan of the Mayer China Co., at Beaver Falls, the Beaver Falls Planing Mill Co., and other small plants would be completely destroyed. While it is true that in a condemnation proceeding damages would be recovered for actual loss sustained in the destruction of the plants, no recovery could be had for loss of time and income during the period in which the plants were being reconstructed. In the event this canal is built these plants may not be rebuilt in Beaver County and, therefore, this county stands to lose both in manpower and in taxable property which would be stricken from the tax rolls.

As to the cost of relocating and realining the present railroad tracks I am unable to give any estimate. However, there are 26 bridges, both railroad and highway, crossing the proposed canal within the limits of the Twenty-fifth Congressional District. It would be necessary to raise all these and this, with the attendant raising of grades to meet the higher levels of the bridges, will be a tremendous element of expense both to the railways and to the communities affected.

With the present national debt of over $265,000,000,000 and with every community, local, county, and State, burdened with debt, with a depression of railway stocks and bonds this is no time, in my judgment, to incur an expense of such a character.

Next, as to the navigation in the canal. As before stated, the Beaver River is about 600 feet wide at its mouth, gradually narrowing, and this would necessitate barges being towed rather than pushed in fleets as is done on the Ohio River which averages 2,000 feet in width. The course of the canal would be very tortuous and straight stretches would be few and far between. Therefore, in flanking the bends in the canal the rate of progress would be very slow and very difficult and only a few barges moved at a time and at great cost.

At the present time the Pennsylvania Railway at Conway, Pa., and the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie at Colona have erected large hoisting plants. Both of these points are within a few miles of the mouth of the Beaver River. Coal is brought down in barges to these points and then hoisted into railway cars and transported. Fourteen miles below Beaver at the mouth of the Little Beaver Creek, the bed of that creek has been widened and deepened and barges of coal float into that. Coal again is hoisted from barges at that point and transferred to railroad cars and, in turn, moved into Youngstown, Ohio.

The building of this particular canal has been agitated over a number of years by manufacturing interests in the city of Youngstown, Ohio. This was amply demonstrated in the hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941, when those interests made a tremendous effort to have the so-called Stub-end canal built between the Ohio River and their plants in the city of Youngstown.

It is hard to conceive of a single benefit that would accrue to the people and communities of the Twenty-fifth Congressional District as a result of the construction of this canal, while on the other hand, tremendous property damage will be incurred which must be met by the local communities who will receive no direct benefits. This, coupled with the fact of the resultant hardships and necessary delays and interruptions in traffic will cause a tremendous upheaval in the lower Beaver Valley. Roads will be torn up, bridges in the process of being raised will be inaccessible, long detours must be resorted to, and innumerable physical handicaps in locomotion and transportation will be placed upon a community that, in no sense, desires the construcution of such a canal.

It has been shown repeatedly that the remedy of the Youngstown interests lies in securing a cheaper freight rate which is a matter to be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission, yet to gain this advantage these interests are active in promoting a canal which will burden the taxpayers of this country to the extent of millions and millions of dollars at a time when we are already tax-ridden beyond the point of endurance. This, coupled with their opposition to the use of the Allegheny River and French Creek routes, is proof positive of their peculiar interest in the construction of this canal.

For these reasons I am strenuously opposed to the construction of this canal.

Morgan L. Fitch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of Mr. Morgan L. Fitch, of Chicago, on assuming the presidency of the National Association of Real Estate Boards on January 29, 1947, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

One of America's greatest success stories could be written around the life of Mr. Fitch. He has given unselfishly of his time, talents, and energy during the past 25 years to the advancement of the real estate business, which field he selected for a career. Mr. Morgan L. Fitch has been a neighbor and friend of mine for many years, for which I am justly proud.

As a neophyte who has just taken the vows which bind him to the service of your organization for a year, there is so little that I can properly say on this occasion. I would prefer that I should be judged not so much by words of promise, but rather by deeds of action, halting and awkward as they may be. A year from now will be early enough to take the tally and the measure of the gains, if any there shall be.

Nothing that I might say could be so fitting to this occasion as to add my own appreciation for the distinguished leadership which has been given the National Association of Real Estate Boards during the past 12 months by our eminent leader who retires from office, but not from service, today, a true friend of mine, the now past president, Boyd Barnard.

Perhaps it is worthy of passing interest to note that this date of January 29 has a twofold significance to me. Not only does it mark the initiation of my labors as president of your organization, but it also marks the silver anniversary of my entrance into the business of selling, renting, insuring, and financing real estate.

As I look back over 25 years to those days of 1922 they seem to be not so long ago—and I particularly remember with what confidence, self-assurance, and complete command of the situation, I set about to revolutionize the business of real estate and all of its parts. There I was, a green kid, fresh from school, without knowledge of the difference between an abstract and a 5-day notice, but nevertheless entirely satisfied that the real-estate business was, after a manner of speaking, duck soup. How fortunate that I could not look ahead and see 1933, when the soup turned with instantaneous petrification to the consistency of granite.

What I would give tonight as I start another quarter century, this time in your service, for one-tenth, yes, one one-hundredth of the feeling of adequacy and competence that I possessed 25 years ago. Perhaps the difference tonight is that I do have some knowledge, some comprehension of the burden of the assignment that you have given to me. If then this administration shall fail, it will not be chargeable to lack of comprehension of the duties involved. If it shall succeed—and God grant that it shall—it will be due to the understanding we have between us and our common will for service in the general welfare, not alone of the real estate trade, but of society as a whole.

So many things have happened in the past quarter century—so many things that might be measured as progress. And yet, one is given to wonder sometimes. Is it progress that we have developed a substance, a handful of which will devastate two cities like Washington? Is it progress that we have accelerated the speed of flight to a velocity perhaps double that which the body of man can absorb? Is it progress that we have developed a machinery of manufacture so complex that it is subject to the whim and caprice of a handful of willful and arrogant men to imperil the well being of a people? Is it progress to so enlarge communications that millions of people come to think by ear rather than by intellect? Is it progress when a government appropriates so much centralized power that it deliberately, consciously, and maliciously deprives veterans and other citizens of a house in which to live while it plays political football with the vested interest tenant?

Yes, indeed; those 25 years have been years of change but have they likewise been years of progress? Do we have more of happiness, more of understanding and fellowship between men, more of freedom of intellect, body, and spirit? Of such is progress. If we do not have those things, then indeed our prattle of progress has "become as sounding brass and tinkling cymbal."

It is a privilege and a delight to me to join with you in welcoming the honorable gentlemen of Congress who are here tonight. Some of you are veterans of public service who know us well and long. But to some of you we may be relatively strange. But with all of you we hope that we may become better acquainted, better understood, not that we may seek to guide your thinking or your conclusions as to matters of national interest. But rather, I hope, that you may have our testimony for whatever it is worth, from us as technicians of real estate

and housing, and as volunteer representatives of the little people, the average people, the home owners of this Nation.

We neither seek nor ask special privilege or favor. We request only that which will be good for us because it is first good for all.

We are conscious that there are going to be some changes made here in Washington. It is a comforting feeling. We are hopeful that as the year unfolds, there will be in Washington less New Dealing and more fair dealing; less brain trusting and more antitrusting; less prodigality and more frugality; less Government control and more self-control; less public housing and more private housing; less liberalism and more liberty.

To those ends, to the future prosecution of the objectives of the administration of my distinguished and eminent predecessor, Mr. Boyd Barnard, to the preservation of freedom for man as a sacred creature of God, this administration dedicates itself and the realtors of America.

Lincoln Day Address of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, at the annual Lincoln Day dinner held at the Statler Hotel, in the city of Washington Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, was one of the outstanding speakers on that occasion. He delivered an excellent address before the large crowd present which was filled with constructive thoughts and timely suggestions.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the very excellent address delivered by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which follows:

It has long been the custom of the Republican Party to pay a special anniversary tribute to Abraham Lincoln. We Republicans honor the memory of a statesman who belonged to the whole Nation. The inspiration of his life and character belongs to the whole Nation.

Abraham Lincoln was the founder of the Republican Party.

Abraham Lincoln felt his ideals; he lived his principles. In the plain, simple language of the people, he stated them profoundly and persuasively. His homely phrases, I believe, have done more to keep before us the basic principles of free government—of the people, by the people, for the people—than all the books on the theory of government ever written.

Basic to his ideas was the principle that our Government's proper and constitutional function is to preserve the liberties of its citizens, not to pander to the selfish wants of any single group or be a burden on the Nation's economic life.

At Gettysburg in 1863 Lincoln reminded us that "our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." He declared that "now we are * * * testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

Again we are testing in America whether our Nation, conceived in liberty and equality of opportunity, can long endure.

Our battlefield is the entire Nation. The results of our struggle will have world-wide effect. They will determine whether liberty or tyranny is finally to follow the heroic sacrifices of our own, and of those of other countries, who, through the years, have laid their all upon the altar of freedom.

If Abraham Lincoln were among us today, he would be the first to see that upon the new Republican Congress has devolved a grave responsibility to correct errors which, if not checked, will surely destroy our system of free government.

Abraham Lincoln knew the tendency inherent in all governments constantly to encroach on the liberties of the people. They seek more and more power for themselves. They impose higher and higher taxes with which to pay for their extravagances and to maintain themselves in power. History records that when governments have gone too far in depriving the people of their liberties, or have imposed taxes too great for them to bear, the people moved to remedy the situation—even though the only remedy available to them was rebellion. We mean to secure this relief for the people the easier way—by legislation. That is one of the great advantages of our American system.

The Republican Congress is pledged to the paramount and undeviating purpose of cutting the budget to the last possible dollar, forcing efficiency to replace waste and extravagance, of balancing the budget, of beginning payments on the national debt, and of reducing taxes. The Republicans have not the slightest intention of turning away from this firm purpose.

Our tax burdens must not continue to grow unchecked as they have the past several years. We must not let the Government, feeding on excessive taxes, continue to expand its powers and impose more and more controls upon us.

No true American would give up free speech for a free lunch.

Fortunately we now have a Congress firmly determined to relieve the taxpayers of some of their tremendous burden—the greatest tax burden in our history. We have a Congress determined to eliminate unnecessary functions in the Government—and to demand efficiency and economy in administration.

The budget must be cut to the lowest figure humanly possible for the sake of the Nation.

Why are our taxes so high? Why is the national debt many times what it was a few short years ago? Is it because we have just been through a horrible and expensive war? In part, yes. But you will remember taxes were high, and the national debt was mounting skyward long before we were plunged into the war. Why?

The answer is simple. The implications are profound. Taxes rose and the debt mounted beyond all reason because the Nation abandoned for a time a fundamental principle laid down by the men who founded our Republic—the principle that this should be a government of laws and not a government by men.

For more than a dozen years the Congress surrendered much of its power to the Executive. The executive branch gained undue power. In large part Congress delegated its constitutional duties to the executive departments. Our Federal Government, therefore, became all too much a government by men—the men in the administration—and ceased to be a government of laws enacted by the people's representatives. Over those years more than 76,000 departmental regulations having the force and effect of law were issued by the bureaucrats. Many of them are still in effect—how many we do not know. We mean to find out. There was during those years little inclination on the part of the party in power to check the tendency of a bureaucracy to add new functions—therefore new agencies and bureaus—therefore higher taxes to maintain them.

And what do we face today? A national debt of $259,000,000,000—more than $1,800 for every man, woman, and child in the United States—and the biggest tax burden in our entire history.

One of the most important obligations facing the new Republican Congress, therefore, is to give the country relief from its tremendous burden of taxation. And Congress is going to do that. We shall carefully, intelligently, examine the entire Federal Government and determine what of its functions are useful and what are not worth their cost to the country. We mean to find what functions or powers can be done better and cheaper by the States, by counties, or by municipalities, and to return those functions and powers to them. Yes; and what can be done better by private business and private groups or individuals will be returned to them. Every Federal Government activity will at last have to prove it is worth its keep.

The Federal Government has got to learn to live within its budget.

The money so saved in Government operations will help everyone. It will help reduce personal income taxes, to give tax relief to business where heavy taxes are slowing up production and keeping business from making jobs for the people, and to reduce the national debt.

The only way to raise our standards of living is to produce more of the things we want and need. Heavy taxes are a brake upon production. But taxes are not the only brake. There are others. Chief among them is the present confused state of management-labor relationships. We must find better ways of dealing with those industrial disputes which retard or stop production and injure our whole economy.

We must enact intelligent legislation to hold both labor and management to full responsibility for their contracts and agreements.

Light, heat, water, power, communications, transportation—each is vitally essential to our orderly economy. To be deprived of one, for even a short while, results in discomfort, if not danger and suffering, to the innocent public, and injures every businessman and every worker wherever he may be.

We can have a vastly increased output of goods and services if both the men of management and the men of labor give their individual and collective best to their jobs.

Industry and labor, taking advantage of modern methods, can increase production and reduce costs without increasing the hours of work or reducing wages.

A stable economy requires labor and agriculture to have the highest wages and revenues possible under sound practice. Business should have reasonable profits. The public must have minimum prices and maximum quality. All this is entirely possible in America. Free competition—in a free market—with full production will reduce prices to proper levels and, at the same time, give us more in goods and services of better quality for every dollar we spend.

There are great readjustments which have to be made, both in government and in industry. But with determination, with energy, with the American know-how to get things done, we shall succeed in again putting our country on the high road to prosperity and plenty.

America wants peace with all the world. But we want peace to govern ourselves in our own way without interference from any outside source or power.

War is no longer a parade with bands and banners. It is a nightmare of mud and

misery, of suffering and horror, of blood and agony.

After the thunder and horrors of war, comes the drudgery of clearing up the wreckage. A shattered world must rebuild itself. Shattered ideals must be reestablished in a welter of cynicism, and a reaction of recklessness. Shattered economies must be reconstructed by peoples almost too war-weary, frustrated, and discouraged to make the effort. Out of chaos and ruin must be forged new hope, new energy, and new endeavor.

We in America—all creeds, all races, all parties—all as Americans—must consecrate curselves anew to the task, under God, of preserving the freedom and progress hallowed by the brave men and women who have struggled, and who still struggle, against the evil tyranny, brutality, and ruthless lust for power which would creep across the world and extinguish in suffering and slavery the light of hope for all mankind.

The price of liberty has been lives which were priceless; and human agony so vast and deep no words can be found to express it. Millions have died for peace. We must learn, we must learn, under the banner of Christianity, to live for peace.

This world-wide task must be accomplished in day-by-day living; day-by-day sacrifices; day-by-day progress to better conditions. These tasks may be undramatic, but upon the fidelity with which the people perform them rest the liberty and progress of all the world.

In America, peace and progress will be found in full production, full employment, lower prices, better quality, lower taxes, more home rule and less Washington rule, more individual opportunity and initiative and less bureaucratic dictation and regimentation.

America has led the world in human liberty and progress. We must continue to do so. The reason we have excelled in human liberty and progress is because we have achieved all our blessings, under the Bill of Rights—through devotion to God, country, and freedom. Only in that way—our American way—can human progress and liberty continue.

Freedom is more precious than life. But nevertheless it works better on a full stomach than on an empty one; in a comfortable home than in a hovel; with a good job than in unemployment, want, and worry.

All the world will note, and forever remember, what we in America do in this continuing battle for liberty and progress.

Civilization in the world cannot long endure half slave and half free, any more than could Lincoln's America.

We may let our hearts be lifted up by hope. We may, with courage and faith, raise our eyes and our aims to new heights of human happiness and achievement. The America which accomplished such a marvel of winning two wars without losing liberty may with certainty look forward to winning peace and plenty in freedom.

We must remember Japan planned and worked for war for 40 years; Mussolini spent 20 years arming for the struggle; Hitler spent 12 years.

We in America started practically from scratch when we were attacked. Yet in 3 years we were able to equip and train vast armies for the European and African fronts. We sent billions upon billions in war supplies to our allies across the Atlantic. And, on top of all that, we were able to win the war in the Pacific practically unaided.

A nation which, under God, can do that is a strong nation, a determined nation. It is a nation which has yet to reach its full stature, which has yet great promise for the future; a nation whose prosperity and progress in peace is as certain and assured as was its invincibility in war.

British Decorate Nebraskan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in announcing that Robert G. Baird, a prominent veteran of World War II, has been honored by the British Government with a military medal. The Clarks Enterprise, which is located in my congressional district, gives an account regarding the signal honor conferred on this fine young Nebraskan. I include the account as part of my remarks:

ROBERT G. BAIRD HONORED—RECEIVES CITATION FROM BRITISH EMBASSY AS AWARD

Robert G. Baird, prominent Clarks young man and veteran of World War II, was signally honored recently when he received an invitation to go to Washington to be decorated by the British Embassy.

Following is the letter of citation as received from the Embassy:

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1947.
Sgt. ROBERT G. BAIRD,
Central City, Nebr.

DEAR SERGEANT BAIRD: It is with pleasure that I inform you that the Military Medal awarded to you by His Majesty, the King, has been received at this embassy. I understand that you have been previously notified of your decoration by the United States War Department.

In order that appropriate arrangements may be made for the presentation of your insignia, I should be grateful if you would indicate your wishes on the enclosed form and return it to me.

Owing to the large number of decorations for members of the United States forces which have been received here since the war, careful preparations (which sometimes call for 3 or 4 months) have to be made for the ceremony of delivery. I hope, therefore, that you will be patient if we appear to be moving slowly.

Lord Inverchapel, the Ambassador, has asked me to convey to you his personal congratulations on this well-merited award.

Yours sincerely,
H. R. F. BRETT,
Honors and Awards Section.

Mr. Baird, now operating a farm 5 miles west of Clarks, entered the service in April 1941, joining up with Headquarters Company of the Ninetieth Division, stationed at Camp Barkeley, Tex. This outfit was dubbed the TO's, an abbreviation for Tough Ombres.

Following his boot training he went overseas in February 1944 and was assigned to the Third Army under General Patton. He was a member of the invasion forces that established the Normandy beachhead on D-day, going through all the hell that broke loose in this murderous task.

Among many other harrowing experiences he was in a boat capsize during a later river crossing, at which time he received a severe injury to his left arm.

Some of the decorations already bestowed upon Mr. Baird are the Purple Heart, the Silver Star for distinguished service while under enemy fire, and the four battle stars award for service in the European theater.

He returned to America in June 1945 and was mustered out in September of that year, having been in the service of the United States Army 4½ years.

Ottawa's Spy Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 5, 1947

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rex Collier, of the Washington Evening Star, has rendered an important service by digesting and commenting on the report of the Royal Commission to investigate the facts relating to and the circumstances surrounding the communication by public officials and other persons in positions of trust of secret and confidential information to agents of a foreign power. This report is contained in a 700-page Canadian blue book, few copies of which have been available here, and not all of those who have seen it have had the time necessary to read it carefully. Therefore, Mr. Collier's research into, and review of it, is all the more valuable and appreciated.

It gives me pleasure to pass on to those who may be interested the editorial, It Could Happen Here, appearing in the Evening Star of January 27, 1947, with which the series of six articles by Mr. Collier, entitled "Ottawa's Spy Case" was announced and introduced:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 27, 1947]

IT COULD HAPPEN HERE

The Star begins publication on this page today of a series of articles concerning Russian espionage in Canada that should be of interest to every American citizen, not only because it is a fascinating real-life spy story but because it describes a pattern of fifth column infiltration that could happen as easily here as it did in Canada.

The series is based on the report of the Royal Commission whose investigations have resulted in conviction of a member of the Canadian Parliament and a number of trusted Government scientists and other civil servants who placed loyalty to communism above loyalty to their government. Some of the story has been printed piecemeal as the amazing and disturbing revelations unfolded in recent months. The purpose of the present series is to bring the significance of the complete report into sharper focus.

The report makes it clear that Canadian Communists are no different from United States Communists, that their ideological concept of loyalty bears no resemblance to the ordinary meaning of the word in a democracy, and that this ideological fixation renders them readily vulnerable to the inducements and persuasions of those who would recruit them for undercover service to Russia. As the Royal Commission puts it, the Canadian spy operations followed a general pattern of communistic strategy that has become familiar in other democratic countries.

Against the background of conspiratorial operations revealed to have invaded the innermost circles of the Canadian Government, the disintegration here in the past few months of our own safeguards against communistic infiltration of the civil service, because of inadequate appropriations, is something to worry about. The Royal Commission's report should be required reading for every Federal personnel officer, for the Civil Service Commission, and for Members of Congress.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 27, 1947]

OTTAWA'S SPY CASE—THE FULL STORY OF WHAT HAPPENED IN CANADA HAS A BEARING ON WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN HERE

NO. 1

(By Rex Collier)

When 27-year-old Igor Gouzenko, cipher clerk in the office of the Russian military attaché, walked out of the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa on the night of September 5, 1945, he carried with him documentary material for one of the more remarkable and disturbing international spy stories which have come out of World War II.

It is a lurid, near-incredible story of espionage by a wartime ally on its comrades-in-arms, replete with fiction-like, cloak-and-dagger episodes involving subversion of highly placed, trusted government servants, theft of top-secret papers and articles, clandestine meetings on dark streets and in other rendezvous of agents and informants, exchange of curious code messages, passage of money hidden in whisky bottles, and even conflict between rival nets of Russian spies, operating independently.

And it is a story of particular interest and concern to the United States, not only for the reason that much of the information sent to Moscow had to do with such American secrets as the atomic bomb, proximity fuzes, radar, sonar, and the like, but because the well-authenticated evidence makes it plain that the Canadian networks were paralleled by similar Moscow-directed spy rings on this side of the border.

REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION

The whole amazing tale is contained between the covers of a 733-page Canadian blue book with the colorless and somewhat labored title, The Report of the Royal Commission To Investigate the Facts Relating to and the Circumstances Surrounding the Communication by Public Officials and Other Persons in Positions of Trust, of Secret and Confidential Information to Agents of a Foreign Power.

Although this report was released on June 27, 1946, few copies have reached the United States and little of its sensational contents have been published in this country.

Yet, as the commission points out, a general pattern of espionage activities is revealed which is applicable to countries other than Canada. Indeed, in a section devoted to international links of the Canadian net, the commission states: "It is not within our province to investigate spying activities in other countries, but some of the activities carried on in Canada were so linked with what happened elsewhere that we feel bound to mention them in this report. In general, the espionage network in Canada, headed by Col. Nicolai Zabotin, was a self-contained unit directed from Moscow. At times, however, the documents from Colonel Zapotin's secret archives refer specifically to espionage networks in other countries. Some of these documents relate to the handing over from one espionage network to another of agents who have moved or are about to move to Canada from another country." The United States was one of the countries thus mentioned.

GENERAL PATTERN OF APPROACH

Furthermore, the general pattern includes a detailed outline of how Communist Party members and Communist sympathizers in a democracy, even though native-born and of supposedly high character and unquestioned loyalty, may be induced, through a carefully planned ideological approach, to betray their country and even to compromise its security in time of war.

The implied warning written into the report at several places is that what happened in Canada can—and probably does—happen in the United States, in England, and the other non-Soviet countries; that Communists all over the world have similar international concepts and loyalties, overriding their oaths of allegiance to their own government, and making them easily susceptible to the wiles and guiles of Soviet agents.

The Royal Commission, composed of Justices Robert Taschereau and R. L. Kellock, of the Canadian Supreme Court, was appointed February 5, 1946, following weeks of intensive investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and other authorities and the round-up of more than a score of suspects whose names or cover names were mentioned in the voluminous papers which Cipher Clerk Gouzenko took from the Embassy.

Gouzenko's act was wholly voluntary. As will be disclosed in the next article, he realized he was undergoing grave risks in making his daring decision and, as a matter of fact, he narrowly escaped capture by his irate superiors of the military intelligence organization operating from the Embassy.

FALSITY OF COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

The commission was unable to find any other motive for Gouzenko's defection from the organization than the one he gave to the police, namely, that 2 years of residence in Canada had convinced him of the falsity of Communist propaganda regarding democracies and that he no longer could stand to see Canada "stabbed in the back" by Russian "double dealing." Of him the commission commented:

"He has undoubtedly been a most informative witness and has revealed to us the existence of a conspiratorial organization operating in Canada and other countries. He has not only told us the names and 'cover' names of the organizers, the names of many of the Canadians who were caught 'in the net' (to employ the phrase used by the documents) and who acted here as agents, but he also has exposed much of the set-up of the organization as well as its aims and methods here and abroad.

"There can be no doubt in our minds that these attempts, very often successful, to obtain here secret and confidential information cannot be qualified as casual or isolated. They are not merely the acts of overzealous Soviet employees anxious to inform their own government.

"The set-up of this organization in Canada is the result of a long preparation by trained and experienced men, who have come here for the express purpose of carrying on spying activities, and who have employed all the resources at their disposal, with or without corruption, to fulfill the tasks assigned to them.

"Some of these men have undoubtedly been well schooled in espionage and fifth-column organizational methods, and in political and psychological 'development' techniques."

Gouzenko's revelations had to do chiefly with the military intelligence organization which was headed by Colonel Zapotin, who was Russian military attaché. Zapotin brought Gouzenko, a lieutenant in the Red Army, to Canada with him when he arrived in June 1943, to take over and enlarge an already well-established military espionage system. The commission traced this organization back as far as 1924.

A RIVAL "NET" AT WORK

In addition to the military set-up there was a rival "net" of Russian agents in Canada directed by the NKVD, or secret police. The latter was referred to by Colonel Zapotin's agents as "the neighbor." The documents show that there were frequent clashes between the two groups of agents, principally over efforts to recruit the same Canadian Communist or fellow-traveler for their respective outfits. These disputes usually were settled by Moscow. There was no apparent interchange of information between the two organizations, nor between them and the Russian Ambassador. Both communicated their intelligence direct to Moscow and received their orders from there independently.

There was also evidence of a developing naval intelligence organization and of a political intelligence group consisting of Communists controlled by the professedly defunct but apparently still active Comintern, or international Communist headquarters in Moscow.

All of these undercover agencies had their offices in a secret wing of the Russian Embassy, the windows of which were shuttered and barred and the entrances to which were carefully guarded against intruders—including other employees of the Embassy.

Gouzenko told the commission: "They (the Soviet Government) were trying to establish a fifth column in Canada. What transpired is only a modest or small part of all that is really here. You may have discovered 15 men, but it still leaves in Canada this dangerous situation, because there are other societies and other people working under every embassy, under every consul in each place where there is a consulate. It is just like a number of small circles. There are parallel systems of spies or potential agents."

The extreme secrecy with which these agents operated is indicated in their use of codes and cover names, such as "Lesovia" for Canada, "Metro" for the Soviet Embassy, "shoes" for passports, the corporation" for the Communist Party, "roof" for a legal front for illegal activities, and "Gisel" for the military intelligence organization itself.

BUT SOME WERE NOT BURNED

Most of the written orders given to agents concluded with the curt admonition, "After reading, burn."

Unfortunately for Colonel Zapotin and his colleagues, however, the destruction advice was not always carried out.

Largely because of this oversight, plus the decision of Gouzenko to cut loose from the whole sordid business, Canada was able to smash the then existing Russian military-intelligence ring within her borders, force the recall to Moscow of the embarrassed Colonel Zapotin (who, according to one unconfirmed report, died of "heart failure" 4 days after arriving in Russia), wring an official admission from the Soviet Government of "inadmissible" activities by Zapotin, and, finally, launch a series of trials that have resulted in convictions or guilty pleas from nearly a dozen Canadian citizens, including a member of Parliament, distinguished scientists, members or former members of the armed forces, and veteran civil servants.

How this so-called fifth column was developed and what some of its sinister assignments consisted of will be disclosed in subsequent articles in this series.

(Tomorrow: How a man whose conscience troubled him decided to tell what was going on and the difficulty he had in making anybody believe him.)

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 28, 1947]

OTTAWA'S SPY CASE—HOW A DISILLUSIONED COMMUNIST, AT GREAT RISK, "SPILLED THE BEANS" ON SOVIET INTRIGUE

NO. 2

(By Rex Collier)

(This is the second of a series of articles based on the Canadian Royal Commission's detailed report on operations of a Russian spy ring in Canada during and after World War II.)

Lt. Igor Gouzenko of the Red Army told the Royal Commission that he was taking his life in his hands when he emerged from the Soviet military intelligence office about 8 p. m. on September 5, 1945, with an armful of secret papers which he had made up his mind to turn over to the Canadian Government.

What happened during the ensuing several hours lent weight to his fears.

And his inability at first to find anyone in Ottawa who would believe his story added to his growing fright. It was not until 2 days later, and after Russian espionage agents had broken into his apartment and ransacked it in search of the missing documents, that Gouzenko was able to hand his sensational data to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and receive the protection he needed.

GOUZENKO'S MENTAL STRUGGLE

Gouzenko told police he had been having a mental struggle for some time over the double dealing which, as cipher clerk in the Russian Embassy, he saw going on daily right under his nose. His 2 years of life in Ottawa with his wife and baby, he said, had opened his eyes to Communist lying propaganda about decadent democracies.

"I was surprised during the first days" (in Canada), he told the commission, "by the complete freedom of the individual which exists in Canada but does not exist in Russia. * * *

"To many Soviet people here abroad it is clear that the Communist Party in democratic countries has changed long ago from a political party into an agency net of the Soviet government, into a fifth column in these countries to meet a war, into an instrument in the hands of the Soviet government for creating artificial unrest, provocation, etc.

"Through numerous party agitators the Soviet government stirs up the Russian people in every possible way against the peoples of the democratic countries, preparing the ground for the third world war."

RESENTED "STAB IN THE BACK"

"During my residence in Canada I have seen how the Canadian people and their Government, sincerely wishing to help the Soviet people, sent supplies to the Soviet Union, collected money for the welfare of the Russian people, sacrificing the lives of their sons in the delivery of these supplies across the ocean—and instead of gratitude for the help rendered, the Soviet government is developing espionage activity in Canada, preparing to deliver a stab in the back of Canada—all this without knowledge of the Russian people.

"Convinced that such double-faced politics of the Soviet government toward the democratic countries do not conform with the interests of the Russian people and endanger the security of civilization, I decided to break away from the Soviet regime and to announce my decision openly.

"I am glad I found the strength within myself to take this step and to warn Canada and the other democratic countries of the danger which hangs over them."

The catalyst which crystallized Gouzenko's troubled thoughts into a decision to make the final break was word from Moscow that he and his family must soon return to Russia. He learned this bad news about the 1st of September. During the next few days he surreptitiously bent the corners of a number of top secret documents which he carefully selected from the files of his boss, Col. Nicolai Zapotin, listed by the Embassy as military attaché, but actually head of Russia's military intelligence set-up in Canada.

HE LEAVES THE EMBASSY FOR GOOD

Collecting these marked papers from Colonel Zapotin's office in a heavily guarded wing of the Russian Embassy on the night of September 5, Gouzenko slipped unnoticed out of the Embassy and went to a newspaper office in Ottawa. His idea, he said, was to have the secret documents published immediately for the information of the people of Canada.

He returned to his apartment and made preparations to move his family to another place the next morning. When the newspaper failed to publish his papers or story the next day he visited what the commission described only as "a number of official offices" and also revisited the newspaper.

"He was unable that day," the report states, "to have anyone accept him seriously."

Becoming more and more worried over his predicament, and realizing that his failure to report for work that day would start inquires which would reveal the rifled files, Gouzenko returned to his apartment "under some apprehension as to his personal safety and that of his wife and child." The report goes on:

"He says that he had not been long in the apartment, which is No. 4, when he noticed two men standing on the opposite side of the street who appeared to be keeping him under observation. Shortly after that someone knocked on the door and called his name. While he did not answer the door, his presence in the apartment was disclosed by the noise of his child running across the room. He says he recognized the voice as that of * * * one of the drivers for the military attaché."

Gouzenko then went through a back door to an adjoining apartment, occupied by a noncommissioned officer of the RCAF, and asked that his wife and child might be permitted to hide out there. Eventually arrangements were made for the Gouzenkos to spend the night in another neighbor's apartment, while the RCAF man, on his own initiative, went to a police station for assistance. Two constables returned, heard Gouzenko's story and promised to keep the apartment house under surveillance during the night.

HIS APARTMENT IS RANSACKED

About midnight four men entered the building and knocked at the door of Gouzenko's unoccupied apartment. When the RCAF officer poked his head out of the adjoining apartment, the men asked if he knew Gouzenko's whereabouts and on receiving a negative answer they went downstairs.

They soon returned stealthily, however, put their combined weight against the door and broke it open. The RCAF officer meanwhile had called the police and when they arrived they found the intruders in the act of ransacking the apartment.

The men told the constables they were Russians and that the owner of the apartment was out of town and had given them permission to search for some papers which belonged to the Russian Embassy.

The men identified themselves as Vitali G. Pavlov, second secretary of the Embassy (who is described in the commission's report as head of the NKVD secret police in Canada); Lieutenant Colonel Rogov, military attaché for air (listed as on the military intelligance staff); Lieutenant Angelov (also of military intelligence), and Alexandre Farafontov, a cipher clerk.

The police made no attempt to restrain the quartet from leaving, which they did in short order.

Gouzenko and his family remained in another apartment under police guard until the next morning, when Gouzenko was turned over to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. His documents were accepted by that organization, and the real investigation finally began.

The following day the Russian Embassy sent a note to the Canadian Government complaining of the "rude treatment" accorded Pavlov and his companions by the police and requesting Canadian assistance in seeking and arresting Gouzenko, who was described as a "capital criminal who has stolen money belonging to the Embassy." A second urgent request was sent a week later. The Canadian Government countered with a polite request for more details concerning the alleged theft, but no reply was received.

The commission exonerated Gouzenko of the money-theft charge.

GOUZENKO'S GREAT PUBLIC SERVICE

From the questioning of Gouzenko it was learned that he was born in Russia in 1919, attended the Academy of Engineering in Moscow and a special school conducted by the Red army general staff, became a member of the Komsomol of Young Communists at 17. At the staff school he learned the secret codes which he later worked on at the Embassy. He was sent to the front in May 1942, remaining in the combat zone for about a year.

The next year he was detailed to accompany Colonel Zapotin to Canada to assist in the planned expansion of the military espionage system there.

"During 2 years of life in Canada," Gouzenko told the Royal Commission, "I saw the evidence of what a free people can do. What the Canadian people have accomplished here under conditions of complete freedom, the Russian people, under conditions of the Soviet regime of violence and suppression of all freedom, cannot accomplish even at the cost of tremendous sacrifices, blood and tears."

The Commission points out that it was "under the influence of such considerations that Gouzenko finally decided to leave the Soviet service and to take with him documents which would establish the kind of activity being carried on under cover of the Russian Embassy.

"In our opinion Gouzenko, by what he has done, has rendered great public service to the people of this country and thereby has placed Canada in his debt."

(Tomorrow: United States ramifications of the spy network and its successful request for data on the atomic bomb.)

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1947]

OTTAWA'S SPY CASE—EVEN UNITED STATES ATOMIC BOMB SECRETS WERE NOT SECURE FROM SOVIET MILITARY INTELLIGENCE

NO. 3

(By Rex Collier)

(This is the third of a series of articles based on the Canadian Royal Commission's report on operations of a Russian spy ring in Canada during and after World War II.)

Although the Soviet military intelligence organization operating out of the Russian Embassy in Ottawa was concerned primarily with delving into Canada's war secrets, there is ample evidence in the Royal Commission's report that agents of the ring occasionally visited the United States.

These visits not only were for the purpose of making contact with Russian agents in Washington and elsewhere, but, believe it or not, for the inspection of some of our most secret laboratories and offices. Incredible as it seems, several Canadian scientists who were in the Russian "net" actually gained access—through their scientific connections—to the atomic bomb laboratory at Chicago University, to the research center at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and to other guarded places.

For example, Dr. Allan Nunn May, noted British nuclear physicist, known to his fellow agents as Alek, who confessed that he gave to Russia top secret data on the atomic bomb, accompanied by samples of enriched uranium 235 and uranium 233, visited the Chicago University laboratory on at least three occasions in 1944, when the A-bomb was still in its formative stages.

Durnford Smith (cover name: Badeau), member of the microwave section of the radio branch of the Canadian National Research Council, is said by the commission to have visited MIT for the purpose of discussing secret equipment. There was found this notation in his Russian Embassy dosier, under

date of August 8, 1945: "He has just returned from the United States, brought nothing. He will bring for the next meeting his account of his journey in the United States of America and other materials in accordance with our directive."

INFORMATION SOUGHT ON UNITED STATES PLANTS

Lt. David Shugar, employed by the director of electrical supply (Navy) was listed in the report as having been assigned the task on December 16, 1945, of getting information on "plants, workshops, scientific research institutes and laboratories in England and the United States which are making and planning hydrophonic apparatus."

According to the report, Shugar "had occasion to visit a number of establishments in the United States. * * * All this was, of course, secret work."

In interrogating Shugar, the commission asked:

"How many laboratories did you visit all told in connection with your work?"

"You mean everywhere?"

"Yes."

"Shall I rattle them off by names or give the number?"

"By name if you prefer and if it will assist you in answering the question."

"There were the ones mentioned previously in England. In the United States there was the Bureau of Ships, the Naval Research Laboratory, the laboratory at Orlando, Fla., and at Fort Lauderdale. There was one laboratory at Mountain Lakes, N. J. Then there was the one at Sagam and in Springfield, Ill."

However, Shugar eventually was acquitted of a charge that he conveyed secret information to the spy group.

The job of coordinating efforts of the spy ring to obtain scientific data, particularly concerning the atomic bomb, was given to Capt. David Gordon Lunan, of the Canadian Army, assigned to the Wartime Information Board. Lunan, whose cover name was Back, reported to Major Rogov, assistant military attaché for air and colleague of Col. Nicolai Zapotin, head of the espionage set-up.

ATOMIC BOMB WAS MAJOR GOAL

Section III of the Royal Commission's report states:

"One of the many objectives of the Russion organization in Ottawa was the atomic bomb. The exhibits produced reveal how anxious the organization was to obtain as full information as possible about the work done by the nuclear physicists in connection with the use of atomic energy.

"As far back as March 28, 1945, Lunan reported to Rogov: 'Badeau (code name for Durnford Smith) informs me that most secret work at present is on nuclear (bombardment of radioactive substances to produce energy). This is more hush-hush than radar and is being carried on at the University of Montreal and McMaster University at Hamilton. Badeau thinks the Government purchasing of radium-producing plant is connected with this research.'

"Lunan was here transmitting a report from Durnford Smith on the work of the National Research Council.

"In mid-April of the same year one of the tasks given to Lunan and set out in the 'organizational directives' for his group was: 'Ask Badeau whether he could obtain Uran. No. 235; let him be cautious. If he can, let him write in detail about the radium-producing plant.'

"At about the same time Motinov [assistant military attaché] prepared a draft of a telegram for Zabotin to send to Moscow which reads: 'As a result of experiments carried out with uranium it has been found that uranium may be used for filling bombs, which is already, in fact, being done. The Americans have developed wide research work, having invested in this business $660,000,000'."

The commission says that this telegram apparently never was sent.

RING OBTAINED URANIUM SAMPLES

It was around this period that Lieutenant Angelov of Russian military intelligence approached Dr. May with a request for a sample of uranium 235 and for "information as to the location of the United States atomic bomb plant," the report asserts.

Dr. May had come to Canada from London in 1944 as leader of a research group under the Canadian atomic energy project. The report states:

"In the performance of his duties May had access to a substantial amount of knowledge of the work that was being done in connection with the atomic energy project. The evidence shows that before coming to Canada he was an ardent but secret Communist and already known to the authorities in Moscow.

"Not long after his arrival here he was contacted on instructions from 'the director' and given the cover name 'Alek' by the organization of Colonel Zapotin. * * * On August 9, 1945, the following telegram was sent to Moscow by Zapotin:

"'To the director—facts given by Alek: (1) The test of the atomic bomb was conducted in New Mexico (with 49, 94-239). The bomb dropped on Japan was made of uranium 235. It is known that the output of uranium 235 amounts to 400 grams daily at the magnetic separation plant at Clinton. The output of 49 is likely two times greater (some graphite units are planned for 250 megawatts, i. e., 250 grams each day). The scientific research work in this field is scheduled to be published, but without the technical details. The Americans already have a published book on this subject. Alek handed over to us a platinum with 162 micrograms of uranium 233 in the form of oxide in a thin lamina.'"

PROXIMITY FUZE DATA SOUGHT

The report also says that May gave the Russians data on proximity fuzes, which the agents called "electronic shells being used by the American Navy against Japanese suicide fliers."

In his confession Dr. May was quoted as follows:

"I gave and had given very careful consideration to correctness of making sure that development of atomic energy was not confined to the United States of America. I took the very painful decision that it was necessary to cover general information on atomic energy and make sure it was taken seriously. For this reason I entertained the proposition by the individual who called on me. * * *

"At one meeting I gave the man microscopic amounts of U. 233 and U. 235 (one of each). The U. 235 was a slightly enriched sample and was in a small glass tube and consisted of about a milligram of oxide. The U. 233 was a very thin deposit on a platinum foil and was wrapped in a piece of paper.

"I also gave the man a written report on atomic research as known to me. This information was mostly of a character which has since been published or is about to be published. The man also asked me about the United States electronically controlled antiaircraft shells. I knew very little about these and so could give only very little information." * * *

MONEY IN WHISKY BOTTLE

"The man also gave me some dollars (I forget how many) in a bottle of whisky, and I accepted these against my will * * *

"The whole affair was extremely painful to me and I only embarked on it because I felt this was a contribution I could make to the safety of mankind. I certainly did not do it for gain."

In sentencing May to 10 years in prison, Justice Oliver said:

"I have listened with some slight surprise to some of the things which your learned counsel has said he is entitled to put before me—the picture of you as a man of honor who had only done what you believed to be right. I do not take that view of you at all.

"How any man in your position could have had the crass conceit, let alone the wickedness, to arrogate to himself the decision of a matter of this sort, when you yourself had given your written undertaking not to do it, and knew it was one of the country's most precious secrets, when you yourself had drawn and were drawing pay for years to keep your own bargain with your country—that you could have done this is a dreadful thing.

"I think that you acted not as an honorable but a dishonorable man. I think you acted with degradation."

(Next: How Canada's spy net was expanded until it included even a member of Parliament and other Government officials.)

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 30, 1947]

OTTAWA'S SPY CASE—KEY SCIENTISTS WERE RECRUITED FOR THE SPY RING BY A MEMBER OF CANADA'S PARLIAMENT

NO. 4

(By Rex Collier)

(This is the fourth of a series of articles based on the Canadian Royal Commission's report on operations of a Russian spy ring in Canada during and since World War II.)

The Royal Commission found that of all the agents, Communists, fellow travelers, and others referred to in the secret documents taken from the Russian Embassy in Ottawa by the disillusioned Communist, Igor Gouzenko, "none, Soviet officials excepted, have been more repeatedly and prominently mentioned, either under their names or cover names, than Fred Rose and his fellow spy and conspirator, Sam Carr."

Fred Rose, whose code names were "Fred" and "Debouz," was a member of the Canadian Parliament until his arrest and conviction for conspiracy to violate Canada's Official Secrets Act. He is now serving 6 years in prison for his key part in organizing the Russian spy ring in Canada. He did this in collaboration with Carr, whose real name is Schmil Kogan and whose spy pseudonyms were "Sam" and "Frank." Carr fled from Canada when the spy case broke and is still at large.

The report states that the espionage activities of this pair have been traced back as far as 1924, about which time the Russian military intelligence systems in Canada and the United States are believed to have begun to take shape.

That the systems were interlocking is evidenced by the fact that Rose made frequent visits to the United States. On at least one of these trips, according to the Russian records, Rose arranged to confer with a Soviet agent in New York City known as Steinberg (code name "Berger"). One order to Rose (Debouz) read as follows:

"CONTACT IN WASHINGTON

"To Debouz—Debouz is to tie up with Berger and depending on the circumstances is to make a proposal about work for us or for the corporation. Contact in Washington with Debouz's person. To work out arrangements for a meeting and to telegraph. To give out $600. If Debouz should be unable to go to United States of America, then there should be a letter from Debouz to Berger containing a request to assist the person delivering the letter to Berger."

This order was dated May 12, 1945. The corporation for whom Berger's services were being sought was the military intelligence net headed by Col. Nicolai Zapotin and operating from a secret wing of the Russian Embassy in Ottawa. Gouzenko told the

commission that Rose made the contact with Berger in the United States.

Rose, whose real name is Rosenberg, has been a Communist agitator in Canada for many years. He arrived in Canada in 1920 from Russia and attained Canadian citizenship in 1926. He was born in Poland of Russian parents.

In September of 1942, Rose, with Carr and a number of other prominent Canadian Communists, was arrested and interned under the security provisions of the Official Secrets Act of 1939. At that time the defense advisory committee gave this history of him:

ROSE WAS LONG A COMMUNIST

"In 1925 he joined the Young Communist League and was appointed national secretary for that organization in 1929. As such, he went to Russia for a course of instruction in 1930, where for a period of 6 months he served on the international executive committee of the Young Communist League. He became a member of the Communist Party of Canada in 1927 and was appointed to the central executive committee of the party in 1929.

"He admitted in 1942 the truth of charges that he was a leader in and supporter of subversive policies of the Communist Party in Canada; that he had written a pamphlet in which he disloyally opposed the Canadian-United States of America defense alliance; that he had attacked Canada's war effort; and that he had engaged in other disloyal activities designed to weaken Canada's war effort. All of these public activities took place, of course, before the German attack on Russia. Thereafter the Canadian authorities decided to release him, believing that he would follow the party line of supporting the war effort of Canada."

SOON VIOLATED HIS PLEDGE

"Before his release, Rose signed an undertaking not to indulge in any subversive activities of any kind.

"'Like Sam Carr (who had been similarly interned and released),' the Royal Commission reported, 'Fred Rose lost no time in violating his undertakings.'"

Rose and Carr proceeded vigorously to build up in Canada an effective spy network, their recruits eventually including Government physicists working with United States scientists on the atomic bomb, trusted Army and Navy officers having access to top secret radar, ordnance, and other information and women civil-service employees in position to disclose military and diplomatic secrets.

Rose, a persuasive speaker, did much of his recruiting of agents at the so-called study groups organized by the Communist Party among Canadian Communists and Communist sympathizers.

One of Rose's chief assignments was to develop sources of information at the headquarters of Canada's highly secret war agency, the National Research Council. The commission found that Rose was successful to an almost unbelievable degree in actually organizing a group of Soviet agents among communistic members and employees of the council.

One of these scientists known to the spy ring as the "professor," was enlisted through direct contacts. The professor was Dr. Raymond Boyer, of McGill University, according to the report. Several other scientists were recruited by Rose's colleague, Capt. David Gordon Lunan who worked in the Canadian Office of Wartime Information. Lunan was assigned the specific task of obtaining the cooperation of three officials of the National Research Council. They were Durnford Smith, electronic engineer and expert on radioactivity; Edward Wilfred Mazerall, radar engineer; and Maj. Israel Halperin of the Canadian Army, ordnance authority.

GIVES FULL INFORMATION

In a notebook of Colonel Zapotin was found the following entry regarding Dr. Boyer: "Professor—Frenchman. Noted chemist, about 40 years of age. Works in McGill University, Montreal. Is the best of the specialists on VV on the American Continent. Gives full information on explosives and chemical plants. Very rich. He is afraid to work. Gave the formula of RDX; up to present there was no evaluation from the boss."

"VV" is a Russian abbreviation for high explosive. "RDX" was a secret explosive being developed by the Canadians. The report points out: "This work was classified as secret during the war and information with regard to it was restricted to a definite number of authorized persons. As late as March 1946, information with regard to RDX had not been released."

The Royal Commission asked Boyer what moved him to hand over to somebody who was obviously an emissary of the Russians information "which your oath of secrecy forbade you to give." He replied:

"I have already made a statement how Mr. —— was willing to give it to the Russians and was not allowed to do so by the Americans. I felt throughout the work that it was unfortunate that there was not closer scientific liaison in connection with such information between the Russian war effort and ours. In fact, I mentioned that a good many times. I was very anxious to see a technical mission, a British-American-Canadian technical mission in Russia and a similar Russian mission in Canada. I felt it was of great importance that the scientific war effort on the two fronts should be coordinated. That is all I have to say."

WERE COMMUNIST SYMPATHIZERS

The commission said that the other trio of scientists, Smith, Mazerall, and Halperin, "were obviously considered at the Embassy to be Communist sympathizers. Although they testified they did not know Zapotin and his associates, their names appear in the assignment of tasks given to Lunan from time to time by Rogov (Zapotin's assistant), and it is also clear that the latter knew the nature of the work they were engaged in at the National Research Council, and enough about them to presume their willingness to cooperate. All the information concerning these three recruits had necessarily been previously furnished to Zapotin and Rogov, who were undoubtedly confident in view of what they had learned, probably from Rose, that the scientists would be receptive to Lunan's propositions."

It was Smith whom Lunan approached first, because he knew him personally. The report quotes Lunan as testifying that he started by trying to feel him out asking him about his work. "I think it became clear to him what kind of proposition I was making to him," Lunan told the commission. "We were fencing with words, as it were, and I could not say at what particular stage of our conversation he understood exactly the nature of the proposition I was making to him."

Similar indirect approaches were made to the others, he said. In one report to the Embassy, Lunan wrote: "I believe it wise to approach them carefully and not to advance too great an assignment to them at one time * * *. Another slight resistance to be overcome is the strong sense of security about their work that these men have developed as war scientists." In the same report, however, he said that some information already had been obtained and more was promised.

The commission declared that Lunan, Smith, Mazerall, and Halperin "did communicate directly or indirectly secret and confidential information * * * to the agents of a foreign power." Lunan, Smith, and Mazerall have been convicted and Halperin is awaiting trial.

(Tomorrow: Ideology versus loyalty.)

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 31, 1947]

OTTAWA'S SPY CASE—"IDEOLOGICAL MOTIVATION" OVERRODE LOYALTY AND ETHICS OF COMMUNIST SPY RECRUITS

NO. 5

(By Rex Collier)

(This is the fifth of a series of articles based on the Canadian Royal Commission's report on operations of a Russian spy ring in Canada during and since World War II.)

It was Communist ideology, not mercenary motives, which led some of Canada's key war scientists and civil servants to "communicate directly or indirectly secret and confidential information, the disclosure of which might be inimical to the safety and interests of Canada, to the agents of a foreign power."

The mere mention of money, several of the Soviet agents reported to their military intelligence bosses at the Russian Embassy, was enough to cause some of the prospective "recruits" to freeze up. As one agent said, the suggestion of payment tended to put too much emphasis on the "conspiratorial" aspect of the nefarious operations, with adverse results on the "recruiting approach."

Because the Royal Commission's discussion of the "ideological motivation" which overrode ethical and loyalty considerations is of interest to the United States as well as Canada, this article will quote liberally from the commission's report.

"Perhaps the most startling single aspect of the entire fifth column network," the commission stated, "is the uncanny success with which the Soviet agents were able to find Canadians who were willing to betray their country and to supply to agents of a foreign power secret information which they had access to in the course of their work, despite oaths of allegiance, of office, and of secrecy which they had taken.

"Many of the Canadian public servants implicated in this espionage network were persons with an unusually high degree of education, and many were well regarded by those who worked with them in agencies and departments of the public service, as persons of marked ability and intelligence."

RECRUITS WERE IN KEY JOBS

The report cited as examples Prof. Raymond Boyer, of McGill University, "a man of very substantial independent means"; Maj. Israel Halperin, Army research expert; Durnfold Smith and Edward W. Mazerall, McGill graduates and scientists of the National Research Council; Kathleen Mary Willsher, employee of the Office of High Commissioner of the United Kingdom; and Capt. David Lunan, of the Wartime Information Service.

The commission felt that the motivation which led "persons such as these to take part in an espionage conspiracy directed against Canada by agents of a foreign power is significant and seems to us to be of great importance."

There is no evidence, the commission says, that money played any important part in the original motivation.

"On the contrary," the report states, "the evidence is overwhelming both from the documents and from the testimony of several such agents themselves, e. g., Lunan, Mazerall, Willsher, Boyer, Gerson—that their original motivation was a product of their political ideology and of the psychological conditioning received in the study groups."

In the course of the development of the agents, however, money in small amounts was passed out—for expenses.

"Care was taken by the espionage recruiting agent," it was explained, "not to mention the possibility of monetary rewards at the time when the first assignment or request was put to the selected recruit."

The reason cited for this by the Commission was that "the senior members of the network felt, probably rightly, that mention of money at this stage would act as a deterrent rather than as an inducement to secret Communists facing consciously for the first time the critical issue of invitation or initiation into what was obviously an illegal conspiracy directed against Canada. The Russians thought they could obtain better results in the early stages by allowing the recruit to regard the matter solely as an ideological assignment."

TACTFUL APPROACH SUCCESSFUL

This discreet approach produced results, too. For example, Mazerall, when asked about any money offers he received, said: "I am positive, knowing myself, that the slightest suggestion of it would have discouraged it, as far as I was concerned, entirely. * * * I would not have accepted money. If it had been offered to me I would have said no, at the moment, and I know I would have told him [Lunan] to get out of the car, and I would have driven away."

It was the practice of the conspirators later, however, to urge the potential spies to take small sums of money—up to $200—after they had undertaken their initial assignments. Captain Lunan told the commission he and the three men he was supposed to enlist, viz, Smith, Mazerall, and Halperin, rejected even the suggestion of "expense money."

"From what you say I take it they did not want to take any money," a member of the commission asked Lunan.

"Correct."

"Either as a disbursement to cover expenses or otherwise?"

"That is correct."

"What was their motive to do what they did?"

"Their motives would be idealistic or political."

"What do you mean by political?"

"That they felt they were serving a valid political motive in doing this——"

"Party sympathy?"

"Yes; that would be fair."

"When we say 'party' there is only one party that is meant, the Communist Party?"

"That is correct."

But the Russians persisted in trying to compel the recruits to take "expense money," at least. It was pressed into their hands, or, on at least one occasion, was stuck in a bottle of whisky presented to one scientist (Dr. Allan Nunn May, atomic physicist).

"MORAL CORRUPTION" PLANNED

"One purpose of the directors of the network," the commission asserts, "in insisting on paying money, even relatively small sums, to recruits would be to further the moral corruption of the Canadians caught 'in the net,' and thus to assist in their further 'development.'"

Receipts were obtained whenever possible, the commission commenting that such receipts "could, if necessary, presumably be used for blackmail purposes if the agent's enthusiasm for the cause should wane."

In a section title "The Development of Ideological Motivation" the commission reveals that "the evidence before us shows that in the great majority of cases the motivation was inextricably linked with courses of psychological development carried on under the guise of activities of a secret section of what is ostensibly a Canadian political movement, the Labor-Progressive Party, or Communist Party of Canada; that these secret 'development' courses are very much more widespread than the espionage network itself; and that the Canadian members of the espionage network themselves took an active part in directing and furthering such courses for other Canadians, which were calculated to allow them to draw suitably 'developed' persons later into active participation and thus to expand the network itself. * * *

"The inquiry revealed the names of a number of Canadians employed in various agencies and departments of the Government who, while presumably quite ignorant of the espionage network and certainly innocent of implication in such illegal activities, were being subjected to development by the same means for use in the future."

The report says that "it seems to be the general policy of the Communist Party to discourage certain selected sympathizers among certain categories of the population from joining that political party openly. Instead, these sympathizers are invited to join secret cells or study groups, and to take pains to keep their adherence to the party from the knowledge of their acquaintances who are not members of the party."

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES PREFERRED

These selected categories include students, teachers, scientific workers, office and business employees, executives and any group likely to obtain any type of Government employment.

Although the reason given for this secrecy was to avoid discrimination in obtaining positions, the commission concluded that this party technique had far different objectives.

"One objective," the report states, "is that this technique facilitates the achievement of a basic policy of the Communist Party, to get control, through the election of secret members to the directing committees, of as many types of functional organizations as possible, including trade unions, professional associations and broad nonparty organizations such as youth movements and civil liberties unions."

The cells or study groups seemed to have a particular appeal to certain types of intellectuals and students. A strong factor was a belief that the study groups could do something about the social evils of anti-Semitism and racial intolerance. Others, like Prof. Boyer, said they were seeking to advance international scientific collaboration. In some cases it was a desire for companionship and intellectual discussion, or a sense of adventure inherent in the conspiratorial methods and purposive activity of the groups."

"The indoctrination courses in the study groups," the report comments, "are apparently calculated not only to inculcate a high degree of loyalty to the party and obedience to the party, but to instill in the mind of the adherent the view that loyalty and obedience to the leadership of this organization take precedence over his loyalty to Canada, entitles him to disregard his oaths of allegiance and secrecy and thus destroy his integrity as a citizen."

(Tomorrow: Conclusions and recommendations of the Royal Commission.)

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 1, 1947]

OTTAWA'S SPY CASE—WHY THE ROYAL COMMISSION WARNED DEMOCRACIES AGAINST COMMUNISTIC INFILTRATION

NO. 6

(By Rex Collier)

(This is the last of a series of six articles based on the Canadian Royal Commission's report on operations of a Russian spy ring in Canada during and since World War II.)

Outstanding among the lessons which Canada learned from her experience with a deep-rooted Russian espionage network, directed from Moscow, is that it is dangerous to give Communists positions of trust in a democracy.

In a move suggestive of locking the door after the horse has been stolen, the Royal Commission recommended "additional security measures to prevent the infiltration into positions of trust under the Government of persons likely to commit acts such as those described in this (the Commission's) report."

To what extent the security of Canada—and of the United States as well—was compromised by the "communication to a foreign power of secret and confidential information" the Commission could only guess.

Of particular concern to the Commission was the fact that the Soviet-controlled fifth column sought, and obtained, not only top secret information about the atom bomb, electronically operated missiles, radar, and the like, but military, economic, and political data of postwar significance.

In this connection the Commission reported:

"We can say that much vital technical information which should still be secret to the authorities of Canada, Great Britain, and the United States has been made known to the Russians by reason of the espionage activities reported herein. The full extent of the information handed over is impossible to say. As we have pointed out, these operations have been going on for some time.

DATA ON POSTWAR DEFENSES

"We should emphasize that the bulk of the technical information sought by the espionage leaders related to research developments which would play an important part in the postwar defenses of Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States."

Apart from the technical data collected, the commission point out, was "economic information" regarding such matters as industrial production, location of industries, transportation facilities, finance, and industrial planning.

"It is sufficient to say here," the report states, "that the amount of material in this category which was handed over was very great indeed, and that much of it was classified as secret or top secret.

"Regarding the evaluation of this material, we will say only that this information appears to have been such as would be designed to facilitate detailed estimates of Canada's postwar economic and military potential.

"Parts of this information could also be useful in connection with possible sabotage operations."

A third category of information which the spies sought eagerly was of political and diplomatic nature.

Agents of the ring employed in the cipher division of the Canadian Department of External Affairs—counterpart of our State Department—and in the registry of the office of the United Kingdom High Commissioner, at Ottawa, the commission say, divulged highly secret intelligence relating not only to the policies of the Canadian Government, but to those of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States.

Citizenship documents, passports, marriage or birth certificates were sought for illegal purposes. The records of the agents disclosed that such papers were for use in the United States as well as Canada at some time in the future.

POSSIBILITY OF SABOTAGE

Such forged papers, the commission comments, "could in time be used by planted agents not only for espionage, but for sabotage, leadership of subversive political groups, and other purposes. It is unnecessary to comment on the possible gravity of these operations."

The fact, in all this, that should not be lost sight of, the Royal Commission stresses, is the apparent ease with which the Russian military intelligence agents were able to recruit native-born Canadian citizens for what the commission is convinced was a potential fifth column.

"Of paramount importance," the report states, "is the fact the Canadians were willing to give secret information, no matter what its importance, and were carrying out their agreements. Some gave all they had or all they could get; others apparently gave only some of what was in their possession; some had not much to give, but were in positions where they would, in the future, have been able to give more, and they undoubtedly would have done so.

"The most important thing is the agreement of certain Canadian Communists to work under foreign orders in a conspiracy directed against their own country."

As discussed in the preceding article in this series, the Russians used a sort of psychological warfare in their carefully plotted campaign to enlist the services of Canadians who they knew were Communists or Communist sympathizers.

Considerable light was thrown on this technique by Miss Kathleen Mary Willsher, veteran employee of the office of the High Commissioner for the United Kingdom. Miss Willsher, who was known to the espionage group as Ellie, pleaded guilty to violation of the Official Secrets Act and is serving a prison term of 3 years.

According to the commission, Miss Willsher had been an admirer of communism for a long time. Eventually she joined the Communist Party and began attending one of its study groups, the stated purpose of which was to read and discuss Marxist literature. The commission asserts that these groups actually served as recruiting centers for the spy ring.

LOYALTY TO COMMUNISM

It was at one of these meetings, she confessed, that Fred Rose, a member of the Canadian Parliament (since convicted as a Soviet agent), first broached the idea that she could be useful to the party by giving him general information concerning work of the High Commission.

"Miss Willsher," a commission member asked, "you recognized, I suppose, when Mr. Rose made that suggestion to you, that he was suggesting an improper thing for you to do?"

"Well," she replied, "I did, but I felt that I should contrive to contribute something toward helping this policy (of a 'united front') because I was very interested in it. I found it very difficult, and yet I felt that I should try to help."

"Then you appreciated that from the standpoint of your relationship to your employer it was an improper suggestion. That is right?"

"Yes. I also felt that I had something to contribute."

"Would it be right to put it this way—that you felt there was a higher law, owing to your, let us say, political convictions?"

"Yes. It was a struggle. It was always a struggle."

"You cannot serve two masters without a struggle," the interrogator remarked.

Pressing for a "clearer understanding" of her motives, the commission asked Miss Willsher:

"Do you mean that by becoming a member of the Communist Party you are expected to do what you are asked to do regardless of any obligation you may have in any other direction; is that what you mean?"

"That is the sort of thing, yes," Miss Willsher replied.

"And that being called upon to make a decision as between your master and the country you were working for, on the one hand, and the Communist Party, on the other hand, you told us that you decided in favor of the Communist Party?"

"Yes."

"Because you felt that you owed loyalty to the Communist Party first?"

"Yes."

LESSON FOR UNITED STATES

Other officials and employees of the Canadian Government who were caught in the net expressed similar views to the commission.

Moreover, the Commission found from the evidence that similar psychological techniques of gaining recruits for espionage work were being used in the United States and elsewhere.

"The Russians would know from their agents in Canada," the report says, "that information was being pooled. By getting some information here, some in England, and some in the United States, and then assembling it, a very large body of data could be built up."

These are some of the reasons which impelled the Royal Commission to warn Canada, and implicitly the United States and other democracies, to strengthen the bars against Communist infiltration in governmental agencies.

Had there been better safeguards Col. Nicolai Zapotin, head of the Soviet military espionage set-up in Canada, could never have won the two awards of the Order of the Red Banner for good organization work, nor the telegraphed congratulations of the chief of the general intelligence in Moscow, who added: "I wish you further success in your honorable work."

Canada intends to make sure that this fine sentiment does not develop beyond the stage of wishful thinking. And the Royal Commission made it plain that the United States cannot afford to ignore the lessons which Canada has learned at painful cost.

Army-Navy Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my thanks and congratulations both to the War and Navy Departments for having gotten together regarding the making available of Army commissary stores to naval personnel in the Washington area.

I believe that there have been five Army commissaries within the greater Washington area for quite some time, but that there were no Navy commissaries; also, the Army refused to permit naval personnel to patronize the Army commissaries. This has resulted in extreme hardship in some cases of nonofficer naval personnel who were denied subsistence allowances as of December 15, 1946. I desire to quote one paragraph from a letter received by me from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. James Forrestal, in reply to my inquiry to him of January 17 regarding the making available of Navy commissaries:

However, arrangements have been made with the War Department recently which, it is believed, will provide commissary store facilities through Army commissaries to meet the need expressed in your letter that such privileges be available to enlisted personnel, especially those with dependents who, because of restrictions on appropriations available, were denied subsistence allowances as of December 15. The War Department has granted the Navy permission to authorize 2,500 active-duty Navy personnel to patronize Army stores. In issuing permits preference will be given to the lower enlisted ratings with dependents.

This will come as good news to naval personnel in the enlisted ratings, and again I want to congratulate the Army and Navy for getting together on this important subject.

Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following copy of House Concurrent Resolution No. 2, adopted by the Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Indiana, clearly demonstrates the thinking and the attitude of the people of the great State of Indiana regarding Federal aid. They realize that the Federal Government collects taxes from the people of the various States and then, through legislation providing for Federal aid, returns a part of the tax money collected to the States, but with many controls and regulations with which the States must comply or forfeit the Federal aid.

When State legislatures are confronted with Federal aid law, the legislatures must comply with the provisions of this Federal law or forfeit the money which has been taken from the States' citizens in taxes. In effect this is Federal control and amounts to compulsion on the States by the Federal Government.

The people of Indiana have learned by experience that the tax dollar sent to Washington has become much smaller when it is returned to the State as Federal aid.

House Concurrent Resolution 2

Indiana needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States.

So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the senate concurring), That we respectfully petition and urge Indiana's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county courthouse and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come home.

Resolved, further, That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good

citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us, and we with them to restore the American Republic and our 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

The American People's Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by Mr. Earl Bunting, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, delivered by Mr. Bunting on the occasion of the annual meeting and banquet of the Wilmington (Del.) Chamber of Commerce, January 30, 1947:

As I see it, there is a great job of human relations to be done in this country. It is a tough job, and a big one—so big that it will never get done unless every individual and every group in the land understands its potentials and does his share of the job. If we fail to build real unity, the American people will miss the greatest opportunity to prosper that we have ever had. If we succeed in reviving the American ideals of fair play and united teamwork, the public—which is all of us—will reap the richest reward Americans have ever earned. Unity, and unity alone, can bring this now—and for many years to come.

Unity is always a tough job because human beings happen to have toes that get stepped on easily, tempers that flare up, and a deep-rooted suspicion that they are right and everyone else is wrong. Any man worth his salt has some of this pugnacity; this depth of conviction about him. But he also has a way of getting along with his neighbors who, when you add them all up, are the public to whom this country belongs. We are part of it. And because all of us are part of it, the public interest must come before any other interest. Unless we keep that yardstick firmly in hand, as the common measure of all that we do, Americans will fall short of their peacetime possibilities.

Industry realized this when we reconverted factories and machinery to peacetime production. It was a job that had to be done fast. The other fellows' jobs—millions of them—depended on it. The job was done—and fast. It was done a year ago, for all practical purposes. As a result, more men are now working, at better wages, than in any other peacetime year. That's good for labor. It's good for government. It's good for business. It's the sort of thing of which the whole American people can well be proud.

I am quite proud of it myself. And I know that you are. I believe that, more than any other people, the men and women of this country like to feel that whenever something really worth while is accomplished here we are all part of it. This conviction is well founded.

Yet, despite this great record of accomplishment, this country has fallen short of doing the best postwar job it could.

Let's not lecture the labor leaders and bureaucrats because we "missed the boat." Let's not lecture anybody. Instead, let's try to see—in broad terms—just why our mental reconversion has lagged behind and is only now getting under way.

To start with let's assume, as I think we can, that the public is not interested in reconverting to the prewar habit of looking to Washington for bread, circuses, pump priming, and economic shots in the arm.

Let us also assume, as I think we must, that the public is equally uninterested in reconverting to the days and ways of the prairie schooner, the clipper ships, and the backwoodsman who bathed when he felt like it—but didn't often feel like it.

Where does that leave us? Let's take off the trimmings and see.

One obvious reason why the public has seemed slow to reconvert its thinking to postwar channels is that a lot of straight thinking has had to be done. Like the veterans, the public filled out during the war. People are no longer comfortable in what was good enough before the war. They are in the market for sound ideas as well as sound goods. They want something not merely every bit as good as Americans ever had, but a great deal better.

The public is wiser than government. Wiser than labor. Wiser than business. We are all part of it and can well take our lessons from it. I certainly can, because one of the things which the public doesn't do is make speeches.

One of the greatest lessons that government, labor, and business can learn is that the public never forgets anything. Oh, it seems to. But it doesn't. It hasn't forgotten, for instance, that people come to this country for two things—freedom and tolerance. It hasn't forgotten that you can't have one without the other.

Another thing that the public doesn't do is quibble. To have freedom you have got to be tolerant, and the public earns its freedom every inch of the way.

At times it seems as though the public will put up with anything. Some businessmen once made that mistake. Instead of realizing that the public tolerated them, encouraged them, and patronized them because of their services, they took a public-be-damned attitude. Then the antitrust laws hit them like a ton of bricks. Once the public went into action monopoly was out of business—period.

We are part of the American public—you and I. Like the rest of the public—it has become noticeable even in labor circles—we have lost all patience with labor monopolies and abuses. The sooner an end is put to organized labor's monopolistic powers, coercive violence, and special privileges, the sooner the American public will be free from fear, privation, and racketeering in our economy.

But—and this is even more important—unfairness can only be corrected by fairness—fair rules and fair play applied to everybody, without discrimination.

It is all too easy to let the blood pressure mount and tempers grow blistering when labor pushes the right to strike, and the claim for back pay on time not worked, to absurd and disastrous lengths. However, as the National Association of Manufacturers sees it, action conceived in anger would make labor relations worse—not better. In advancing our 10-point program for industrial harmony, we were scrupulously aware that if labor were to lose its legitimate gains it would be a black day for industry. But we were equally aware that the day has long since passed when American labor could be regarded as a fragile Casper Milktoast, needing special privileges which the rest of the public were denied.

American labor, both union and nonunion, are here to stay and here to thrive. But they can thrive only if they serve the public interest, which is greater than anybody's interest—I don't care whose.

My employees are unionized. In our case I think it is a good thing for them. And I think it is a good thing for this company. But I am equally positive that a closed shop, which turns the basic freedom to work into a monopoly, would be as thoroughly bad all around as it would be if we repealed the antitrust laws, and said that nobody but O'Sullivan could make shoe heels.

I do not want to make this labor-better-be-good-or-the-boogy-man-will-catch-it talk. But I do want to point out that it is not in the public interest to carry either good or bad things to extremes.

Legitimacy for instance, is an excellent thing. And the closed shop is, in my opinion, a very bad thing. Yet the two have been very curiously combined in one of the most exclusive organizations in the world.

This organization is the closed-shop union representing newspaper deliverymen in New York. You may recall waiting for them to come along with a late edition. One of their bylaws states that no one can join them—no one can deliver a newspaper in New York City—unless he is the legitimate son of a member of that union.

It is not in the public interest to limit opportunity—whether it be the opportunity to deliver papers or the opportunity to manage a business concern. And if we, and labor, and all other Americans, don't look out for the public interest there isn't going to be any public interest left for us to look out for.

The crux of labor relations as I see them is that there simply is not enough understanding to go around. We can overcome that. It's not easy to do, but we can swing it.

Part of the job lies in getting the general public to understand that labor, like anyone else, will abuse special privileges if it has them, and that our labor laws have got to be as fair and impartial as any other laws. Certain labor leaders, grown reckless with power, have gone further to convince the public of this than any words of management could ever do.

Part of the job lies in getting employees to understand that in a very large measure they fill in their own pay checks. If they produce more, there is more money to pay them with. If production drops, they and the American public are that much worse off.

No small part of the job is right in our own laps. Labor may overreach itself here, and get completely off base there. But basically American workers want perfectly natural and legitimate things.

They want to feel that they are an important part of their business outfit. And they are.

They want to feel that their jobs won't fold up on them. And it is definitely in management's interest, as it is in labor's interest, for industry to stabilize employment to the greatest possible degree.

They want more earning power. And that goes back to where we started. Real earning power comes out of service to the public—and there isn't any substitute for it. It can't come out of strikes. It can't come from unprofitable businesses. It can't come out of high prices.

It does come out of a working harmony between the man who invests his savings to buy the machinery, the man who uses this equipment to speed his work, and the consumer who pays for the work produced.

That harmony is what we've got to reestablish. All that we have in this country came from it. And what we have is well worth having.

Did you notice the New York Times survey of living conditions throughout the world on the first of the year? Correspondents in many countries reported on representative railroad engineers—what they earned and how they lived.

The Chinese engineer who earned $45 a month summed it up for most of the world when he found life "bitter—very bitter indeed." The Soviet engine driver thought himself lucky with one room for a family of four to live in. The British engineer had about $78 a month left after his income tax was paid. He was not anxious to earn more

because it would take him into the higher income tax brackets.

The American railroad engineer interviewed was George Teese, who works hard and, in his own words, "does all right." He, his wife, and their two children live in six of the pleasantest rooms in Harmon on the Hudson. They use 6 quarts of milk a day. They have a Packard, tiled bath, electric refrigerator, two radios, and a big yard for the children to play in. It's a nice family.

George Teese's father was a "firm hand at the throttle" too, but running a locomotive brought him only $78 a month. We have come a long way since then. But every foot of the way has been made possible by the whole crew—not just the engineer, not just the brakeman, not just the passengers, stockholders, freight shippers, and the farmer's son who waves when the trains roll by, but all of them—the whole American public.

As I said, the public is just about the most tolerant group you can imagine—up to a point. For 15 years Americans personally pinched and scrimped, which they don't like to do, while their Government ran headlong into debt. Every year was a deficit.

But the public figured: Well, there was a depression; and then there was a war; and then in the first year after the war maybe the Government needed time to straighten itself out. Sometimes the public's gift for seemingly unlimited tolerance can mislead people.

But in the back of the public's mind, if the back of my own mind is a fair example, was the conviction that the time would come when government need not be so costly. I don't think there is any doubt that the public had that idea very definitely in mind during the last election.

Yet the President's latest budget estimate, balanced only if our Government sells $2,000,000,000 of war surpluses, represents an annual expenditure of $1,000 for ev[illegible] family in the United States. This is fo[illegible] times what government cost us immediately before the war. It means that while the public is reconverting its thinking—fast—the executive branch of our Government has failed to keep pace with the thinking of those from whom it derives its authority.

The public is not in the habit of going off half-cocked. Witness the fact that it has waited 15 years for our Government to stop spending more money than the American family can, by any stretch of the imagination, afford. But if we leave out the amount for the Army and Navy, for the veterans, and for the interest on our national debt, the President still proposes to spend 74 percent more than Federal Government cost in the year before the war. It was no bargain then. And $1,000 out of every family's pocket is a long way past the American people's boiling point.

The Congress which they elected to do a long postponed job of economy and tax reduction, is much in the public eye. Personally I don't know of any family which has a thousand dollars they want their Government to spend for them.

The bureaucratic mind and the public mind work very differently. To the public, abolishing wartime controls means just what it says. It might have to allow for keeping a few controls which are still tied up with national security. But it definitely means reconverting to peace by restoring the freedom that goes with peace.

What has actually been done, through the belated declaration that hostilities have officially ended, was to abolish 51 wartime controls—leaving some 450 others; "sleepers" ready to use at any time.

Is the war over, or isn't it? The veteran no longer carries a loaded rifle around with him. He would feel uncomfortable, and his neighbors would be alarmed if he did. These controls that the Government is hanging on to are loaded. Even when they aren't used, 450 unrepealed controls in your Government's hip pocket do not make for a peaceful, confident economy.

The President declared in his message to Congress that:

"Private enterprise must be given the greatest possible freedom to continue the expansion of our economy * * *. It is up to industry not only to hold the line on existing prices, but to make reductions whenever profits justify such action. It is up to labor to refrain from pressing for unjustified wage increases that will force increases in the price level. And it is up to government to do everything in its power to encourage high-volume production; for that is what makes possible good wages, low prices, and reasonable profits."

These words sum up accurately the broad program which NAM laid out at its December Congress of American Industry.

Among the factors beyond industry's control which could increase costs and prices alarmingly are the portal-to-portal suits, and the CIO's worn-out theory that wages can be increased as much as 25 percent without raising prices. They tried that last year. It didn't work.

As for the Government, it can do far more than appoint a commission to study the labor problem. The public expects it to do more. The American people are, in their own way, a large and effective commission. Throughout last year we found ourselves making an exhaustive and exhausting study of the labor problem at first-hand. Now the public wants not another year of such study, but action. Certainly we want laws to prevent jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. But Americans also want uninterrupted production. They want an end to union monopolies and immunities which brought on the coal, steel, motor, shipping, and general strikes last year. No study is needed to prove that we shall face them again so long as there is one set of laws for the labor leader and another for the rest of us.

This year brings the greatest opportunity this country has ever had. It brings the people of America their chance to bring back unity, fair play, and tolerance; their chance to restore the ideals by which the American public lives and lets live, builds, and prospers. These ideals have been tarnished by the abuses of people who prefer monopolistic powers and special privileges for themselves to putting the public interest first. But they are still in perfect working order for Americans who have the understanding and the courageous hearts to use them.

When I speak of the American people, I don't mean that because something is everybody's business and in everybody's interest we can sit back and consider it as good as done. We can't. We are part of the public, and we have got our work cut out for us.

The election last fall showed that the American people realize the need for action. It did not solve this country's problems. It did open the way for business to offer effective ideas, ideals, and leadership.

For these to be accepted, they must be unselfishly conceived and understandingly sustained. The yardstick of the public interest is the only measure that will stand up.

We can't dump a labor crisis on the White House and say, "You handle it." On the contrary, to establish working harmony we have got to get labor relations out of the White House; off of the front page and into an honest effort of fair men to agree.

Better labor laws can help. They have got to help. But you can't build good human relations by laws alone. We have got to know, and we have got to understand the other fellow before we can hope to get along with him.

We can't delegate our responsibilities to the White House and hope for the best. Neither can we expect Congress to do the hard, essential job of slashing Federal extravagance and providing relief from the dead weight of overtaxation on our economy, unless we keep it crystal clear that our Government must live within the means of its citizens.

These things are in the public interest. As members of the public each one of us is responsible for them.

What can the American consumer—and who isn't—expect now that the ill-starred experiment with price control is abandoned, and other war controls are on their way out?

Americans again enjoy freedom of choice. Goods again fill shelves which long stood empty. Black marketeers have long since dumped their hoardings into the market and the curtain has fallen upon their ugly act. Competition is readjusting prices. America is being reconverted into a buyer's market.

Shopping is being made easy and convenient by everyone who expects to sell goods or services to the buying public. It has again become profitable to render the best possible service at the lowest possible prices. It has again become unprofitable not to do so.

Competition and confidence in a free market is restoring the economic balance necessary for a free flow of goods and prosperity for all. No longer do mechanical refrigerators stall in the production line because Washington guessed wrong in fixing the ceiling price of some obscure but essential part.

What can all Americans who work for their living count on if a fair national labor-relations policy replaces the present crazy quilt of special privileges for union leaders?

They can count on fair play for all, and special privileges to none; less reason for friction between employers and employees; and fewer and smaller strikes. A chance for collective bargaining to settle differences without strife would reverse the increasing emphasis on collective coercion.

They would enjoy a smoothly functioning economy which is essential to the prosperity of every man and woman. They would also enjoy more purchasing power, increased security, steadier employment, and uninterrupted earnings. It will take Westinghouse workers 14 years to make up the pay they lost during a 117-day strike.

They can expect more and better jobs. In less than 1 year private enterprise has provided jobs for ex-servicemen and ex-war workers to achieve a high level of employment at top wages—a goal which the former Secretary of Commerce could only promise to achieve in 5 years through the expenditure of vast sums of borrowed money in Federal make-work projects.

What can the American taxpayer—and no one escapes taxes in one form or another—look forward to if the Federal Government starts living within its citizen's means?

He can look forward to getting out of debt. Our Government is not something separate and distinct from us. If it is in debt, we are in debt. If extravagant Federal spending is stopped, the national debt can be steadily diminished.

He can look forward to a decided increase in production if nonessential Federal employees resume productive work.

He can look forward to an immediate reduction in the individual's tax burden, with the prospect of more rather than less money available for total tax revenues.

When heavy taxes crush the spirit of enterprise, there is less national income. Each individual's tax bill is higher and harder to pay. If, on the other hand, the tax level is moderate, there is more money to invest, a sound reason for launching new enterprise, more business, more jobs, more income for all. Each taxpayer's share of the tax bill is less. And yet there are ample tax revenues available for all necessary purposes.

What will happen if Americans are again encouraged to be enterprising—to save and

invest their money, rather than having venture capital treated as a dangerous gambler?

There will be more saving to invest, and a real incentive to invest them.

The chance of a fair return on venture capital would again offset the risk of loss. Investment would pour into new inventions and enterprises.

There are opportunities unprecedented in our history for the launching of new businesses on every scale. Services are needed. Goods are needed. Fair play for American savers and investors will insure that the American public get them in abundance.

New ideas, processes, and inventions await development. The wonders of the postwar world are within reaching distance. Electronics, television, new fabrics, new ways of combatting extremes of temperature, wear and tear, rust and insect pests, better ways of bringing you fresh foodstuffs, equipping your home with small convenient motors, tapping great sources of energy, and taking the drudgery out of American lives—are no mirage. They proved entirely practical for military uses. The engineering problems of adapting them to civilian use are easily within Americans' abilities. A fair return on American's invested savings would make them part of our lives today.

As industry sees it, there is no room in the picture of America's future for selfish interests. What is good for the public is good for us, and for every other group. Those who want to grasp more than their share soon destroy their own future, as well as the greatest opportunity Americans have ever had to achieve prosperity for all.

Unity, understanding, and tolerance are Americans' way of getting their great jobs done. They are our most precious possessions. They never wear out. Let us use them until they shine again, and with them the future of the American people shines dazzling bright.

War Liabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the February issue of the Washington News Digest:

WAR LIABILITIES

(By Representative HOWARD H. BUFFETT, of Nebraska)

Taking inventory is an old custom. In business stockholders sometimes find that an optimistic management has overvalued the assets and understated the liabilities. It is time to start to inventory World War II in terms of assets and liabilities. You can draw up your own list of values or assets gained from World War II. This report will briefly appraise two of the continuing financial liabilities of the war.

One liability is our duty to the widows, orphans, dependents, and wounded of the war. As of November, 2,054,515 persons were receiving World War II pension or compensation checks. The list is permanent and steadily increasing. It does not include those receiving temporary GI benefits.

The second financial burden is the war debt. After World War I our debt reached $26,000,000,000 in 1919. That debt was reduced to less than $16,000,000,000 by 1930. Before Pearl Harbor, the date of our official entrance into the war, deficit spending had increased this debt to over $54,000,000,000. On December 15, 1946, it was over $259,000,000,000. Interest and veterans' benefits now cost about $11,000,000,000 annually.

The debts owed war victims and war-bond buyers can be met in three ways: (1) They can be repudiated outright. (2) They can be largely repudiated by payment in vastly cheapened dollars. (3) They can be paid in dollars of at least present purchasing power.

Obviously, there is only one honorable course. It is to pay these debts in dollars of at least today's buying power. That road will not be easy. It will call for high taxes and Government economy—not for a few years but for generations. Not a pleasant prospect, but the chance to avoid this burden ended when we were maneuvered into war.

The American people cannot make good on these sacred obligations if gigantic spending continues. Will the new Congress stop the persistent outpouring of our resources to foreign lands? How the Eightieth Congress meets that question is all-important to those who sacrificed to win the war. Their claims can be paid in full, only if spending is reduced and tax rates are kept commensurate with our war commitments to our own people.

Two Great Newspapers View Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 7, 1947, on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements, and also an editorial from the Denver Post referred to in the Post-Dispatch article. The Post-Dispatch article follows:

SUPREME GOP ISSUE

Shall we turn back toward the foreign trade policy of the 1920's? Eric Johnston, a good Republican, calls it the supreme issue facing his party. Senator VANDENBERG'S associates say the fear that it may happen is a main reason he will not attend the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers. The decision is that serious. Our whole foreign policy is at stake, for, as Mr. Johnston says, "You can't have political cooperation without economic cooperation."

The issue arises because the administration has scheduled conferences to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements with 18 other nations. The State Department intends to draw on a power conferred by the previous Congress, to reduce our import duties up to 50 percent in return for equal concessions by others. But a mighty effort is being made in the present Congress to block or withdraw that power.

No matter to high-tariff Congressmen that tariffs have already been materially reduced under the reciprocal program without provable harm to any American industry. They want detailed control taken back by Congress anyhow. But, as our tariff history shows, that would mean swapping higher rates on A's wool for higher rates on B's cotton goods, and so forth. The last time these logs were rolled, the product was the Hawley-Smoot tariff of evil memory.

Tariff-raisers want only to push domestic prices up by restraints on imports, but they are never that truthful. Instead, they wail of impending ruin—as though American productive and competitive genius were dead. Again, they label tariff reduction as global do-gooding.

It is anything but do-gooding. Mutual lowering of trade barriers simply proceeds from the hard fact that we have got to buy more goods to sell more—unless we want to give our goods away, which we don't. The Denver Post, published in what was once a great citadel of isolationism, faces that fact in an editorial reprinted on this page today. The war has left us perilously short of various key commodities; we have either got to buy them in much greater quantity from others or throw our prosperity and security into a gamble against odds. The administration's purpose is that hard-headed.

It is equally long-headed. Enlarged trade raises living standards in all the trading countries because each can concentrate on goods for which it is best fitted.

We tried in the 1920's to wall in our American comfort, and failed. Other nations built walls against us. That game made fertile ground for Adolf Hitler, which was won back only at a terrible price. Thus, Mr. Johnston may be conceded his superlative supreme issue. And he is not exaggerating when he adds:

"The Republican Party is rightly looked upon as the conservative party. It is a striking fact that it was given the reins of power at a time when almost the entire world was marching steadily toward the left. There is no need of disguising the fact—the left-wingers are in power in Europe because the conservatives fell down on the job. * * * They bungled a large part of Europe into socialism or something worse. The price paid for their stubbornness is almost beyond comprehension. They lost not a battle but a continent."

Our foreign-trade policy of the 1920's proved not conservative. In the strict sense of a word too often used loosely, it is reactionary to think of risking a return of that policy. Democrats, too, are on trial, but the power of decision rests with the Republicans.

The Denver Post article:

MORE THAN A WORLD HOCKSHOP

The country is still waiting for a frank indication of Republican intentions on the reciprocal trade agreements program. Spokesmen of the congressional majority have repledged continuing support of a two-party foreign policy in its major outlines. But they have left a cloud over one important element of that policy, their tariff outlook. This very likely will prove the severest test of postwar internationalism.

There is a great suspicion among other peoples that Americans may look at trade as a one-way street. Our policies in the past have engendered this fear; and we have not removed it. Indeed, it has been heightened by the profound changes in the relationship of our economy to that of the world.

The United States has become almsgiver, hockshop, banker, field, and factory for the world. To a large extent this has been humanitarian. To a larger degree it has been the cost of victory and it may eventually be written off as such.

RICH UNCLE FOR HOW LONG?

But even with our vast industrial capacity, more than equaling that of the rest of the world combined, we cannot continue to play rich uncle. This is a position healthy neither for us nor for our neighbors.

Trade must be put on a mutual basis. For every dollar's worth of credit, goods, and services we extend other nations we must accept the equivalent from them. That is not a Henry Wallace theory—it is elementary good sense.

There is real cause for anxiety in the support now claimed for a movement to require congressional approval of reciprocal trade agreements. This would almost certainly

mean the death of the whole program for freer trade. It would result in logrolling by regional interests—in which a "wool Senator" would make a deal with a "cotton Senator," etc.—and insure continuance of trade restrictions. Those who hope for an economically stable world must defeat this proposal.

NATURAL BUT DANGEROUS

The Rocky Mountain empire, like other regions, may see its special interests threatened by the trade-agreement program. Our inclination here may be to resist concessions on the cattle, wool, sugar, and metals we produce, for example. Such resistance conforms to the natural impulse for self-preservation.

Concessions like these offer a most difficult and disturbing trial for our internationalism. Yet the entire structure of world cooperation and perhaps peace itself may depend upon them.

Between now and April, when the International Trade Organization will be formed in Geneva, Switzerland, the world will learn to what degree the United States intends to cooperate economically. The clue to this cooperation is held by the Republican Congress. We hope they will give it positive support.

Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit House Resolution No. 23, which was adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, on January 28, 1947, which calls attention to the fact that the Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, should be made available to the war veterans who need hospitalization.

Before coming to Congress, this situation with reference to the Schick General Hospital was brought to my attention. While other hospitals are being made available for the care of veterans, many people wonder why the facilities of the Schick General Hospital are not utilized.

I submit herewith House Resolution No. 23, which, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

House Resolution 23

Whereas numerous war veterans residing in eastern Iowa and western Illinois are urgently in need of hospitalization; and

Whereas the facilities of the hospitals which the Veterans' Administration now maintain at Hines, Ill., and Des Moines, Iowa, are barely able to take care of applicants from the Chicago and Des Moines areas; and

Whereas there now exists in the city of Clinton, Iowa, a group of buildings which, during the war, were used as Schick General Hospital; and

Whereas these buildings are admirably equipped to house a modern veterans' hospital; and

Whereas the United States Veterans' Administration has been deaf to the plea that Schick General Hospital be reconverted into a veterans' hospital and has persisted in its policy of building new hospitals in localities where the need is not nearly so great; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has advanced no sound reasons for its failure to remedy this unfortunate situation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we urge the Congress of the United States to take such immediate action as will cause the Veterans' Administration to reverse its present position and that will insure the prompt restoration of Schick General Hospital as a medical institution devoted to assistance of the Nation's war veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, Gen. Omar Bradley, the Honorable SCOTT LUCAS, the Honorable C. WAYLAND BROOKS, and to the 26 Representatives of the State of Illinois in the Eightieth Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house of representatives, January 28, 1947.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House.

The United States Under the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article in a series, The United States Under the Republicans, published in the Morning Herald, of Gloversville, N. Y., as written by its chief editorial writer, Edwin K. Gross, formerly a congressional secretary and a member of the Washington Post editorial staff:

TRULY, JEFFERSON PATRON SAINT OF GRAND OLD PARTY — GREATEST DEMOCRAT BEQUEATHED NAME AND PURPOSE FOR BEING; REPUBLICAN PARTY SOON BECAME NORMAL MAJORITY IN A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT; INSURGENT SPIRIT ELECTED OUR DEMOCRATIC REGIMES

The Republicans return to national leadership. Back from their deepest and longest political depression during an unprecedented Democratic era they have climbed, to fill again the vast majority of local offices throughout the nation, a majority of the governorships, and the majority of the seats in Congress. The GOP (Grand Old Party) is once more the majority party of the Nation and holds the advantage for the 1948 Presidential election. "The party that was dead" is alive and dominant, the party of power; the Democrats become now the party of protest.

From the political wailing wall, in the wake of the Republican landslide of 1946, were heard the implication that the world began and ended with the Democrats New Deal, and predictions that ("the Republicans being a party of reaction, defeatism, corruption, depression, isolation, war, and disaster") America is about to be pushed over a precipice.

The recent Democratic national history is, as of now, our modern history; the Republican record is our ancient history. As a result, memories of older Americans concerning Republican capacity to govern the Nation are unreliable; for them and for a whole new, unacquainted generation, research into the Republican past would be a liberal education.

So here, in summary, is the Republican story—the forgotten facts during the late years when the Republicans and all their works were discredited, and all human error was attributed to their party and a man by the name of Hoover.

This is not a release from Republican national headquarters. It is a result of sifting of historical material—and of a study of the worst which opponents and historians have said about the Republicans. It is an honest appraisal of Republican contribution to what America has been, and is.

No thinking person can approve altogether the performance of any political party, nor can he paint it completely black. An intelligent judgment embraces many considerations.

The story of all our political parties, actually, is a vindication of the basic worth of the American system. The next time the Nation turns to Democratic leadership someone should write a review of that party's achievements to reassure the pessimists. Under our party government we have had better government than the whole people have deserved, considering the disinterest of so many of them in voting, their failure to inform themselves more broadly on public questions and personalities, and their own passion and prejudice.

Believe it or not, but not as strange as it seems, the Republican Party derived its breath of life from the so-called Democrat, Thomas Jefferson.

The differences between Republicans and Democrats are real, yet some of the greatest Democrats have been in the Republican ranks and some great Republicans have borne the label of Democrat.

The work of Republicans, so-called, has cut across party lines. Independence and courage are not commonplace, but they have been found in both the great parties—and the spirit of insurgency has run high in the Republican Party. Republicans helped bring to power the four Democratic Presidents since Lincoln—Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman. A Democrat cannot be elected President. Democratic Congresses are not ever elected without a considerable defection from the Republican Party.

"Mugwump" Republicans requested the Democrats to make Cleveland their nominee. Republican division, when Theodore Roosevelt led a Progressive offshoot, assured the Wilson victory. Big-name Republicans bolted their party and campaigned for F. D. R. in 1932. Senator JOSEPH BALL came out for the Franklin Roosevelt-Truman ticket in 1944.

The Democrats once adopted a platform offered by the Liberal Republicans and nominated Republican Horace Greeley, and a Democratic straight-out party assailed the Democratic National Convention for betrayal.

William Jennings Bryan and his supporters charged Cleveland with changing, in office, into a Republican. The Democrats repudiated their Democratic administration and denounced their President Cleveland. In that campaign, in 1896, there were not only Republicans and Democrats but also "silver" Republicans supporting Bryan, and "gold" Democrats backing William McKinley.

In the annals of the Nation are written imperishably the services of many great Republicans, men who were defeated for the Presidency, Vice Presidents, members of the Cabinet, Justices of the Supreme Court, Members of Senate and House, administrators of departments and agencies, governors, and mayors; Hannibal Hamlin, Schuyler Colfax, Henry Wilson, William A. Wheeler, Levi P. Morton, Garrett A. Hobart, Charles W. Fairbanks, James S. Sherman, Charles G. Dawes,

Charles Curtis, James G. Blaine, William H. Seward, Salmon P. Chase, Edwin M. Stanton, Gideon Welles, Robert T. Lincoln, William M. Evarts, Benjamin H. Bristow, James Wilson, Ebenezer R. Hoar, Hamilton Fish I, Alfonso Taft, Lafayette S. Foster, Thomas W. Ferry, David Davis, George F. Edmunds, John J. Ingalls, William P. Frye, Carl Schurz, John Hay, Charles Francis Adams, George William Curtis, Elihu Root, Philander C. Knox, George B. Cortelyou, Gifford Pinchot, William Tyler Page, Nicholas Longworth, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Charles Evans Hughes, Harlan F. Stone, Owen J. Roberts, William E. Borah, George W. Norris, Robert M. La Follette, Sr., Frank B. Kellogg, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., and numerous others.

Abandoning partisan spirit, the Republicans supported loyally the war programs of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. When the British Government refused to arbitrate a generation-long dispute with Venezuela over the western boundary line of British Guiana—and Venezuela finally appealed to her "big sister" Republic of the Americas—Cleveland sent a message to Congress stating the duty of the United States in the protection of Venezuelan rights. His demand for arbitration forthwith thrilled the Nation. The Republican Congress backed up the President's message. Within 3 days money had been voted for a commission of inquiry. All the world knew then that the Republican Congress and the Democratic President stood together in the reassertion of the Monroe Doctrine and Britain yielded.

Arthur's Secretary of the Treasury, Walter Q. Gresham, became Cleveland's Secretary of State; William Howard Taft served on Wilson's War Labor Board; Herbert Hoover, under Wilson, organized and operated the American Relief Commission to feed the starving Belgian nation when Germany had ravaged that country in the First World War, and headed the Food Commission to conserve our food and increase production; Henry L. Stimson and Frank Knox accepted the Secretaryships of War and the Navy in Franklin Roosevelt's Cabinet; Gens. Patrick J. Hurley and William J. Donovan performed missions for F. D. R.; upon assuming the Presidency, Truman consulted with Hoover, Alf M. Landon, and Thomas E. Dewey; Hoover made a world food survey for Truman; Arthur H. Vandenberg, Charles Eaton, John Foster Dulles, and Warren R. Austin have cooperated magnificently with the Democratic administration in bipartisan foreign policy.

One of the greatest of great Republicans who missed the Presidential honor (and by a hair)—Charles Evans Hughes—as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court alined himself many times with the liberal wing of the Court in decisions on the constitutionality of New Deal legislation, but he was influential in the defeat of Franklin Roosevelt's scheme for a New Deal Court by letting it be known that if the plan to pack the Court by adding six pro-New Deal justices succeeded he might be known in history as the last Chief Justice of a Court truly independent of the other branches of the Government.

Some of the greatest leaders of the Republican Party—like some of the greatest Democrats—never got to be President. This regrettable fact is as much a commentary upon the people as upon the parties, for it has been shown, though rarely, that a demand from the people for the services of a particular man—as when Wendell Willkie, who had been a Democrat, was nominated by the Republicans—cannot be ignored by the parties.

Nevertheless, in total, the American people have had good Presidents in that great Republican who signed himself "A. Lincoln" and those other great Republicans, U. S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, James A. Garfield, Chester A. Arthur, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, and Herbert Hoover.

The Republicans have gone to the voters with a squad of military heroes: Generals Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, and Harrison, and Major McKinley, all Civil War veterans, and Colonel Roosevelt of the Rough Riders of Spanish-American War fame.

Hayes, Harrison, McKinley, Roosevelt, and Coolidge had been Governors of their States. Hayes, Garfield, and McKinley had been Congressmen, and Harrison and Harding United States Senators. Grant, Taft, and Hoover had been members of Presidents' Cabinets.

In earlier occupation Grant was a store clerk, Hayes a lawyer, Garfield a canal boy, Arthur a teacher, Harrison a farm hand, McKinley a teacher, Roosevelt a rancher, Taft a lawyer, Harding a newspaper publisher, Coolidge a lawyer, Hoover an engineer.

The Republican Presidents, with one exception, have been alike in modesty, endearing themselves, above all else, for that great virtue. The exception, Theodore Roosevelt, was the stand-out among them as a man of action. The youngest President at not yet 43, he delivered the shortest inaugural address of all our Presidents—50 words.

Coolidge was the only man in our political history who succeeded in defeating the Democratic Franklin Roosevelt. That now special distinction came to Coolidge in the Vice Presidential contest of 1920.

Theodore Roosevelt and Coolidge, moving up from the Vice Presidency on the deaths of McKinley and Harding, respectively, so satisfactorily conducted the high office that each won election in his own right to a full term.

Political parties are the people. Politicians come up from the people. Our system is grounded in partisanship. Though the Constitution made no provision for political parties, we have government only by choosing sides and electing through the parties.

Between the parties, major and minor, there has been, and is, a fundamental conflict of philosophy. But, on the record of the major parties in national office, it is apparent that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans when given the power of government deliberately embark upon a course of ruining the country.

The Republican Party, however, has been the overwhelming popular choice of the Nation. The United States is normally Republican because the Republicans are the normal governing authority. The country has declined to raise a third party to national control, though the two old parties have incorporated many minor-party planks into their platforms and into the law of the land.

Our form of government is republican. We are neither a political, an economic, nor a social democracy. The Nation was founded as a republic, not as a democracy. The Constitution declares in article IV, section 4: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." The word "democracy" is absent from the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution of the United States, and the constitutions of all the 48 States.

James Madison, who wrote the major portion of the Constitution, said: "Pure democracies have ever been the scenes of turbulence and contention, have ever been found incompatible with personal security or rights of property."

No word in our political history, therefore, is more significant than "Republican." The modern Republican Party, organized in 1854, may trace its lineage back to the birth of the Nation and all party beginnings.

Jefferson, "the greatest Democrat," actually is the patron saint of the Republican Party. Jefferson did not call himself a Democrat, never used the word in his public addresses and papers, nor did Andrew Jackson proclaim himself a Democrat in any of his state papers or addresses; the "Democrats" Madison, Monroe, and even Jackson clung to the name Republican.

In the political awakening of the young United States, local societies of political education and propagandizing were organized under such titles as "Republican," "Democratic," and "Republican-Democratic." But the affection of the Nation for the name "Republican" has always been peculiarly strong. There was, even, a short era of only one party—the Republicans, while President George Washington attempted a nonpartisan administration, Jefferson first applied the term "Republican" as a party name in a letter to Washington in 1792, when he wrote: "The Republican Party among us * * * wish to preserve the government in its present form." Years later he said: "The contests of that day were contests of principle between the adherents of republican and of kingly government."

The roots of our party family trees soon sprouted as Washington and John Adams' Federalists (in large part Republicans—National Republicans, Whigs, and, at length, Republicans purely) and Jeffersonian democracy (actually Jefferson Republicans originally, then Democratic Republicans, and eventually plain Democrats).

It has been written that "some men became Federalists because they were high-minded, and some because they were narrow-minded, while the more far-sighted and also the less scrupulous became Republicans."

But whatever variations the party labels took over the long years, our political system—our government by party—has been essentially republican. The so-called Democratic fathers have differed in degree, Jeffersonian democracy teaching that the people should be governed as little as possible, Jacksonian democracy that the people may govern as much as they like. So we have had, not only in the clash of Democratic and Republican attitudes, but also within the so-called Democratic Party, an eternal debate over how powerful the Federal Government shall be, over States' rights, over rugged individualism—and, except in the struggle over slavery and in the Franklin Roosevelt years, the Democrats in power have not departed from the republican fundamentals of our republican ancestry.

Not being literally a democracy, for the 140,000,000 Americans of today, men, women, and children could not be assembled to cast 140,000,000 votes on every national question, that part of the population which is eligible by fulfillment of voting requirements determined by the individual States, delegates responsibilities of decision to some chosen from among them—and these, the President, the two Houses of Congress, and the judiciary govern under laws and function as checks and balances against each other; and always there is the check provided by the party out of power against the party in power.

Every 2 years in congressional elections, every 4 years in a Presidential canvass, the Nation reconsiders its wishes and its party preference, and the shift of a small part of the total vote can overthrow the ruling party.

When the Federalist Party had long been dead, the Whig Party was dying, and under the Democrats the Nation was torn by the slavery issue, many citizens in the North demanded a new party committed against expansion of slavery into the territories—the vast regions of the West. At meetings in Ripon, Wis., in 1854, a coalition of Free Soilers, Whigs, and Democrats began the organization of that new party. The shrewd managers adopted the old but ever-appealing title which had been preferred by Jefferson for his party—Republican. Horace Greeley had been an early sponsor of that name for the new organization.

Jefferson himself had laid the foundation of this new Republican Party when he introduced in the pre-Constitution Congress in 1784 a resolution for the organization of territorial governments in the regions of the West which the larger States had recently

ceded to the Union, with the motive behind the resolution being to prevent the extension of slavery into any of those regions.

In an oak grove near Jackson, Mich., July 6, 1854—the date accepted as being the actual birthday of the Republican Party, a Statewide convention proclaimed that "the safety of the Union—the rights of the North—the interests of free labor—the destiny of a vast territory and its untold millions for all coming time—and finally, the high aspirations of humanity for universal freedom, all are involved in the issue forced upon the country by the slave power and its plastic northern tools."

The new Republican Party did not perfect its organization or consolidate its strength soon enough to win the next Presidential election, in 1856, when it nominated the California explorer, Gen. John C. Fremont, and adopted the campaign motto, "Free labor, free speech, freemen, free Kansas, and Fremont."

By 1860 the Republican Party, dedicated to freedom, was ready to win—with Abraham Lincoln, a former Whig who said that he had learned the first principles of popular government from Jefferson.

Because the Republicans under Lincoln then began their record in government by saving the Republic from its most awful civil convulsion, the people collectively, never turning to a third party for government and seldom switching back to the Democrats, have generally preferred the Republicans as their delegates at the National Capital.

Except for the years 1885–89, 1893–97, 1913–21, and 1933–49 the President has been a Republican and, for a vast majority of the 86 years since 1861, Congress has been Republican. Predominately, the United States has been a Republic under Republicans.

Schick General Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly of Iowa:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Whereas present facilities for caring for all veterans are inadequate, and

"Whereas many patients requiring immediate medical attendance are neglected due to lack of facilities, resulting in undue hardship, suffering and death, and

"Whereas there are at present existing facilities that can be utilized without further expenditure of public money and use of critical materials, and

"Whereas Schick General Hospital, a $12,000,000 Army Hospital located at Clinton, Iowa, is now available for such contemplated uses, now therefore

"Be it resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Veterans' Administration is respectfully requested to utilize Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and very desirable location for the permanent care of veterans, and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress and General Omar Bradley of the Veterans' Administration.

"O. H. HENNINGSEN."

We, Kenneth A. Evans, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa, and W. J. Scarborough, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

KENNETH A. EVANS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
W. J. SCARBOROUGH,
Secretary of the Senate.

Invocation by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Eric F. MacKenzie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 11, 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an invocation delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Eric F. MacKenzie before the Clover Club of Boston, on February 1, 1947.

This particular prayer appealed to me as being among the most appropriate to a festive occasion, reminding us of the eternal source of all our joyful benefactions.

There being no objection, the invocation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the name of the Father.

Dear Lord Jesus, our Friend and our Savior: Gathered tonight in happy anticipation of an evening of festivity and friendship, we pause first for a moment of recollection. We call to mind that You loved us from all eternity, and for this reason assumed our human nature. You came to earth to teach us the eternal laws of life, and to bear the burden of our iniquities, expiating them on the cross of Calvary. But before You undertook the grim struggle with the prince of evil, You lived long years in Nazareth sharing there the quiet human joys of family life with Mary and Joseph, and long evenings with good friends and neighbors of the town, spent in good talk and memories and friendly jests. We recall, too, that Your first miracle, even before You began publicly to teach and preach, was not one inspired by a major question of religion and revelation; not even from Your ever warm sympathy for the desperately sick and maimed; but rather from a generous concern that a marriage party should not be ruined by a lack of wine. You were ready to use even the power of Omnipotence that a happy festive evening should continue even more happy and more festive than before.

Dear Lord Jesus, we know that sin and pain and tragedy are all about us, and that we must do our share in the battle against the prince of evil. Tomorrow and tomorrow, we must carry, behind You, some small share of the weight of Your cross. And this we will do.

But tonight we are at Cana. Bless us now, as You blessed that happy festive group. Teach us to be grateful for Your gifts to us of peace and ease and friendship, so that, savoring them to the full we may know them as gifts from You; and then, in proof of our gratitude, we may be strengthened against our return to hours less pleasant, more filled with strife and tears and pain. Make us Your followers, not merely to the pleasant hours of Cana, but also to the inevitable hours of trial and death and resurrection.

These are our thoughts, and these our prayers, as we recite with recollection Your prayer wherewith You taught us to pray: Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.

In the name of the Father.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 11, 1947

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rock-Bottom Nonsense," from the Morning World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., for Tuesday, February 4, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

ROCK-BOTTOM NONSENSE

Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, chief congressional mouthpiece of the administration's party line, says President Truman's $37,500,000,000 budget is absolutely rock bottom.

Nonsense, double distilled.

Anyone who has had dealings with the Government bureaus is well aware that the budget can be cut, that costs can be reduced, that the pay roll can be slashed—not just a little, but deeply and drastically.

The Kentucky Senator is not, of course, speaking only for himself and the President. On this issue the administration has yielded to its allies of the left. To the Wallaces and PAC'ers and the whole motley crew which wants to keep the Government's finger in every pie—a Government chicken in every pot.

According to dispatches, they have set out—these left-wingers—to apply pressure on Congress in a typical left-wing way. They are calling on their henchmen to write letters to Representatives and Senators demanding that they "hold the line" for big government and the Truman budget. They are trying, as always, to give the impression that they are America—or at any rate liberal America.

Whether Congress will permit itself to be intimidated remains to be seen.

Certainly realistic Representatives and Senators of both parties are aware of the real situation. They are in position to see with their own eyes the waste, the duplication of effort, the pointless and unnecessary activity of the postwar bureaus.

Representative TABER, of New York, who is chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and who happens to be a Republican, estimates that 1,000,000 Federal employees could be lopped off the pay roll without harming necessary activities or the national defense.

Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, former chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, who happens to be a Democrat, estimates that 500,000 pay-rollers could be fired.

Even if the lesser estimate is accepted the saving would be $4,000,000,000. That was quite a sum of money in older, less sophisticated days. Even today it is enough to make

the difference between a payment on the national debt and no payment, between a tax reduction and no tax reduction.

But it seems reasonably certain that the Tabers and Georges won't prevail unless the people make their real feelings known.

If the mail coming into Washington is mainly the inspired writing of the left-wingers, then those Congressmen who customarily keep one finger on the public pulse while casting their votes may jump to the conclusion that the people want big government. That they are not interested in economies. That they are not concerned about a balanced budget or a lowered debt or a cut in taxes.

Perhaps it would be well for those who favor a reduction in the pay roll, who support the views of Senator GEORGE and Representative TABER, to make their attitude known. Organized pressure, whether applied by the left wing or the right, is a reprehensible weapon. But certainly no Congressman can resent, almost all Congressmen welcome, sincere expressions of the opinions of their constituents. If the great, unorganized majority doesn't express itself there is danger that tightly organized minorities will succeed in giving the impression that they speak with the voice of America.

Nebraska's Representatives, HOWARD BUFFETT, KARL STEFAN, CARL CURTIS, and A. L. MILLER, may be addressed at the House Office Building, Washington, D. C. Senators HUGH BUTLER and KENNETH WHERRY may be addressed at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Letters from Nebraska voters and taxpayers to any or all of them may be helpful in bringing about a real deflation of big government.

Disputed Portal-to-Portal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the opinion handed down by Judge Frank A. Picard, of the eastern district of Michigan, in the now-famous and so-called portal-to-portal pay suit as it appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, February 9. I am anxious that it be made available through the RECORD to all Members of the House in order that previous misstatements regarding this decision may be corrected. I make this request notwithstanding the fact that the cost of printing exceeds the amount allowed under the rule.

The article follows:

TEXT OF JUDGE PICARD'S DECISION OVERRULING CLAIMS FOR PORTAL PAY

Because of the interest and discussion that this case has stimulated, we deem it advisable to give a brief history of its developments which finally resulted in necessity for this court's present determination.

When this matter was first heard (60 F. Supp. 146) plaintiffs were not seeking pay for time consumed walking to their jobs nor for preliminary activities necessary for production work. The only question discussed by either counsel was whether defendant company had instructed plaintiff employees to punch in 14 minutes before the scheduled starting times in the morning and afternoon and punch out 14 minutes after the scheduled quitting times at noon and afternoon.

Plaintiffs insisted that they were expected to and did work during these additional periods but that this time was not computed in determining whether they were exceeding the legal workweek. If true, plaintiffs were thus being deprived of the extra half-time for pottery produced in hours over the legal week.

(NOTE.—The legal workweek was 44 hours, October 24, 1938, to October 24, 1939; 42 hours October 24, 1939, to October 24, 1940; 40 hours October 24, 1940, on.)

The master's report concluded that the employees had not substantiated their claims and we agreed with that report in all but one particular. We held that plaintiffs had met the test required; that they had proved that they were directed and encouraged to reach their workbench early in the morning and back after lunch and actually produced pottery during these minutes for which time was not computed.

MEN BELIEVED ACTUALLY LABORING AT PRODUCTION

We selected a figure of 7 minutes before the scheduled starting time in the morning and 5 minutes before the scheduled starting time following lunch for which the employers were not obligated to pay, including therein time it took plaintiffs to walk to their respective places in defendant's plant. For the differences between those 7 and 5 minutes and the time punched we held the employer liable if such additional minutes brought the employee over the allowed workweek. We so found because we believed the man actually worked at production labor.

The Court of Appeals (149 F., 2 D. 461), following rule 53 (3) Federal Rules of Civil Procedure held that we were bound by the master's conclusions unless clearly erroneous and it was sustained by the Supreme Court on this issue. Ordinarily this would have ended the case then and there.

In the master's report and record of the testimony, however, there was much discussion about minutes consumed walking from time clock to workbench and for preliminary activities but counsel for both plaintiffs and defendant used this evidence solely to support their respective positions on the only question before the court—overtime.

Here it is well to note that in 1943, defendant contended that it was necessary to start plaintiffs clocking in 10 to 14 minutes before starting time because of the distance the employees had to travel within defendant's plant to their workbenches and because they had to perform a lot of other preparatory duties after checking in. One defendant witness said it would take 6 minutes to walk 400 feet—a rate of less than 1 mile per hour.

On the other hand, and in contrast, plaintiffs, in 1943, minimized time consumed in preliminary duties such as greasing arms, putting on aprons, gloves, and small cots to protect their fingers, insisting that they could and should do all these things, including walking to the farthest point in the plant in time not to exceed 2 minutes. Arriving at their work places, they contended, they usually started work immediately.

In the Court of Appeals the issue was also confined to overtime, or time allegedly actually worked by plaintiffs in production labor before the scheduled starting hours in the morning and after lunch.

PLAINTIFFS' PETITION FOR CERTIORARI CITED

From this status the case moved to our highest tribunal and we cite plaintiffs' petition for certiorari as their understanding of what had been proven before the master, and why they were asking the Supreme Court to reverse the Court of Appeals, and affirm this court:

"The evidence also revealed that it took between 1 minute and 2 minutes from the time when the employees checked through the time-clock cards to the time when they undertook productive labors."

But that petition also reveals plaintiffs contending:

"That they should be paid by the time-clock cards as maintained by the employer. The travel time between the time clocks and their workbenches as well as all other activities after punching the time clocks bears all the indicia of work," citing *Tennessee Coal Co.* v. *Miscoda Local* (321 U. S. 590, 598) and *Jewell Ridge Corp.* v. *Local* (335 U. S. 161, 164–168).

Here enters portal-to-portal for the first time.

Here we find that in approaching the Supreme Court, plaintiffs start out strenuously urging that this court's judgment eliminating checking in and travel time be sustained, and in the same petition ask portal-to-portal pay.

This was followed by plaintiff's brief to the Supreme Court which also urged the portal-to-portal theory in one part and ended by asking that court to approve our decision wherein we eliminated walking time.

QUESTION NOT INJECTED BY SUPREME COURT

On the other hand, defendant, while contending that "portal-to-portal" was not properly before the Supreme Court, consumed several pages in its brief denying applicability of the Tennessee and Jewell Ridge cases and citing many inferior courts on similar-fact situations. But here again we find defendant emphasizing that—

"It took a minimum of 12 to 15 minutes to get the workers into the plant."

It must, therefore, be apparent that if the portal-to-portal question is now in this case, it was not injected nor inserted therein by the Supreme Court.

It's here because defendant company oversold its defense before the master 4 years ago in explaining why its employees reported 14 minutes before starting hours. This was quickly taken advantage of by plaintiffs in the interim between the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court.

In fact, when the Supreme Court held that this court was wrong in granting overtime for what we believed was real production labor, it found itself in the position where it must in all fairness at least inquire into the extent of walking time and preliminary activities to which defendant company was apparently admittedly subjecting its employees, and which seemingly reached the proportion of 25 to 30 minutes each day.

CHAMELEONIC PATTERN OF THE FACTUAL FABRIC

It was this chameleonic pattern of the factual fabric which the Supreme Court decided needed clarifying and since the master had placed upon plaintiffs the burden of showing time necessarily spent on the employer's premises in preliminary activities, it held that this was not a fair interpretation of the law.

"Assuming that the employee has proved that he has performed work and has not been paid in accordance with the statute."

And:

"It would be a perversion of fundamental principles of justice to deny all relief to the injured person, and thereby relieve the wrongdoer from making any amend for his acts."

The Supreme Court further held that—

"Time spent in walking to work on the employer's premises, after the time clocks were punched, involved 'physical or mental exertion (whether burdensome or not) controlled or required by the employer and pursued necessarily and primarily for the benefit of the employer and his business.' * * * Work of that character must be included in the statutory workweek and compensated accordingly, regardless of contrary custom or contract."

We were therefore instructed to determine:

First, how much walking time was involved in going from the time clock to the several respective work places; and

Second, time necessarily consumed "putting on aprons and overalls, removing shirts, taping or greasing arms, putting on finger cots, preparing the equipment for productive work, turning on switches for lights and machinery, opening windows and assembling and sharpening tools."

RULE FOR APPLICATION IN LIGHT OF REALITIES

But the Supreme Court has given us two other mandates. The Supreme Court directed that—

(A) When we had obtained this information we must, in computing damages, apply the rule of de minimis non curat lex (the law cares not for small things) (26 C. J. S. 705), and

(B) Apply the rule to a workweek contemplated by section 7 (A), Fair Labor Standards Act, "In light of the realities of the industrial world."

There is nothing in the Supreme Court's decision to justify our including other minutes spent on the company's property, nor are we concerned with the question of whether the time spent in preliminary activities or walking are compensable. The holding of the Supreme Court in this case is that they are compensable subject to the de minimus rule and "In light of the realities of the industrial world." Whether certain acts are or are not preliminary activities, however, is still for us to determine.

And since we are bound by the master's finding that plaintiffs were not required to work at production labor before or after any of the scheduled starting and quitting times, the question of overtime of the genus, originally before this court is not to be considered by us.

THE FACTS

Since our order to the master did not contain instructions to compute the time consumed walking and in preliminary activities, and because, when we were ready to proceed, the master was no longer available, it was necessary for this court to hear the further testimony in order to comply with the Supreme Court's direction.

In arriving at these facts, the following was agreed upon:

1. That at the rate of 2 miles per hour a man walks 9.93 feet per second or 176 feet every minute.

2. That at the rate of 2½ miles per hour a man walks 3.67 feet per second or 220 feet every minute.

3. That at the rate of 3 miles per hour a man walks 4.4 feet per second or 264 feet per minute.

4. That at the rate of 4 miles per hour a man walks 5.86 feet per second or 352 feet per minute.

5. That the following table indicates the distances in feet from time clocks to the several departments in this particular plant:

Department	Distance		
	Shortest	Mean	Farthest
Clay shop	400	600	800
Bisque bagger filling	485	528	570
Bisque car loading	430	480	530
Casting	685	753	820
Mold	820	855	890
Slip house	590	650	710
Sagger	450	580	510
Decorating	170	260	350
Packing	465	612	760
Chippers and selector	285	368	450
Glost sagger fillers	310	365	420
Glost car loaders	225	275	325
Glost sagger unloading	160	255	350
Glost kilns	130	227	325
Bisque kilns	430	625	820
Dipping and brushing	385	447	510
Glaze room	450	530	610
Maintenance	550	570	590
Boiler and engine room	680		

The impracticability of determining the distance to each work bench being apparent to all parties, this court informed counsel that from the above stipulation 5 he would select the "mean distance" as the point in each department to which walking time would be computed. The mean distance was explained on the record to be not "as the crow flies," but as the halfway point along the routes taken by the employees in going to their work benches.

PLAINTIFF WITNESSES UNBELIEVABLE AT TIMES

As we anticipated, the testimony on how long it would take a person "walking at an ordinary rate along the most direct route from time clock to work bench," was at great variance, and at times plaintiff witnesses were unbelievable. One plaintiff witness said she would walk 73.6 feet per minute, which is 0.83 mile per hour. Defendant's witnesses said they walked through the plant at between 282 and 330 feet per minute.

Plaintiffs' witnesses, in an obvious effort to build up "walking time," discovered much impedimenta and many difficulties in the paths that they had to take although there was no hint of such impedimenta or difficulties when plaintiffs were testifying in the original suit. Their entire testimony was very unsatisfactory and made little impression upon this court.

If the plaintiffs' witnesses were telling the truth, they went to work each day under the most adverse conditions possible. In truth no obstacle race could have had more hazards, one witness saying that boxes were strung all along the entire 500 feet she had to walk. On the other hand, defendant in the main also reversed its field, and took a much smaller figure in computing walking time than it did in 1943.

After hearing the testimony, and both parties having consented that this court might utilize its knowledge of the plant itself, we arrived at the conclusion that with due consideration to intermittent presence of any trucks, or train of trucks, or the coming and going of other employees, a rates of 250 feet per minute from the south clock, and 275 feet per minute from the north clock, under travel conditions usually existing in that plant, would be fair. On that basis the time taken to travel from time clock to the several departments is as follows:

From north clock

Department	At 275 feet per minute	Number of minutes
Clay	600	2.18
Bisque sagger filling	528	1.92
Bisque carloading	480	1.71
Casting	753	2.74
Mold	855	3.10
Slip house	650	2.36
Bagger	480	1.71

NOTE.—Only the mold department shows a walking distance of 3 minutes, and there is no evidence that any plaintiff comes from that department.

From the south clock

Department	At 250 feet per minute	Number of minutes
Decorating	260	1.05
Packing	612	2.45
Chippers and selectors	388	1.47
Glost sagger fillers	365	1.47
Glost car loaders	275	1.1
Glost sagger unloading	255	1.02
Glost kilns	227	.90
Bisque kilns	625	2.5
Dipping and brushing	447	1.78
Glaze room	530	2.12
Maintenance	570	2.28
Boiler and engine room	680	2.7

NOTE.—No department is 3 minutes from the time clock.

PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES

Here again we found the evidence most conflicting, and it is our conclusion that when plaintiffs, testifying in the hearings before the master 4 years ago, stated that the time necessary for preliminary activities was practically nil, they were much nearer the truth than they were at our recent hearing.

From the evidence we find that:

(a) Putting on aprons and overalls, which was the custom of about five-twentieths of the employees, consumed less than half a minute a day. This was voluntary, and for the benefit and comfort of the employee himself.

(b) Removing shirts varied with the weather, was also voluntary, and would consume only a few seconds.

(c) There was no taping of arms, except by one woman who had met with some kind of an accident. Some put a piece of tape between the thumbs and the forefinger, probably 5 seconds, and this was also voluntary.

(d) Only a few who were in the small dipper department greased their arms; that this was voluntary and consumed about 30 seconds a day.

(e) Putting on finger cots and taking them off, each twice, would take about 1 minute.

(f) Putting on gloves and taking them off would take less than a minute, but this was confined to a comparative few in one or two departments, and those who put on finger cots did not put on gloves.

PREPARING EQUIPMENT FOR PRODUCTIVE WORK

(g) The only preparing of equipment for productive work was taking off the water that had accumulated on and stirring the glaze. It took time not to exceed 2 minutes at the start of the workday, and the evidence, we believe, indicates that this was done after starting hour. In addition it was part of the job and was considered in the rate of pay at which this particular function was compensated.

(h) Turning on light and machinery switches was practically nil in time consumed, 1 or 2 seconds, and that opening windows was not done by anybody but the foreman.

(i) There is no evidence that these employees had to assemble and sharpen their tools.

(j) The scraping of the block consumed a minute or so and that this was repeated throughout the day the man was working But this was part of that particular employee's job since it was repeated time and again during his work hours, as clay might gather on the block. It was all considered in his rate of pay.

(k) Taking off clay from the jigger machine was another part of the job that took less than a minute, and was repeated throughout the day.

(l) In the sliphouse department, where the men had to change clothes, that 5 minutes a day should be allowed since the evidence proved that this had to be done before starting on the employee's own time, but not after work—then he changed on the company time. This particular group did not go out to lunch, were paid for the full half hour, and walking time plus preliminary activities here amounted to 9.68 minutes per day.

(m) There was no cleaning up performed by plaintiffs after working hours. In fact, the cards indicate that the employees in many instances were at the time clock within 3 or 4 minutes of the closing hour. Some punched out exactly at the closing hour after walking to the time clock before quitting time and waiting until the even hour. The only cleaning up that plaintiffs did was policing around their particular job on company time. This was also in conformity with the findings of the master.

SUM TOTAL WOULD REACH LESS THAN 3 MINUTES

While we do not consider A, B, C, D, G, H, J, or K above as preliminary activities, nevertheless, if the Supreme Court's opinion means what plaintiffs contend, to wit, that they are, the sum total for any one person would be less than 3 minutes a day.

From the testimony this court has arrived at the conclusion that in only three departments, the glost belt, where gloves and hand rags were put on, the slip house where clothes were changed, and in the dipping and brushing department where finger cots were used, were there any preliminary activities that we could consider in any way not part of the job, and necessarily performed before the employee started to work; and that in the glost and dipping departments those preliminary activities would not take 2 minutes a day, adding walking time and preliminary activities.

While perhaps the following should properly be under conclusions of law, for convenience we place this finding and statement here.

There was much urging that the court should pass separately upon the de minima features of preliminary activities, and walking time. And there is some reasoning to support this since the Supreme Court, referring to preliminary activities and the de minimis doctrine, used the significant words "here again" indicating the two, "walking time" and "preliminary activities," were to be considered separately.

Still we reject this theory.

We believe that if time is used in walking, and any time in preliminary activities either before or following the walking, that they should be considered together. Even if standing apart they would be de minimis.

As we interpret the instructions of the Supreme Court, however, it makes no difference in this case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW: "DE MINIMIS NON"

Much has been written in briefs submitted about "de minimis non," one laying foundation for discussion by treating the subject historically. But for the most part counsel devoted their efforts advocating legal principles on which there is no disagreement and very often the expounder lost sight of the fact that here we are bound by the master's report. The question here is not whether the employees were compelled to be on the premises 14 minutes before starting or after quitting time. The Supreme Court has already upheld findings of the master that they were not. But most of the cases cited are along these lines and not at all in point.

Decisions on the vital issue "de minimis" leave something to be desired and we submit that the only real aids lies in those cases, bulletins, etc., which treat of the application of de minimis non to section 7 (A) of the Fair Labor Standards Act; not in lawsuits involving 3 or 4 cents, nor what percentage of interstate commerce is necessary to place some firm under the act.

However, we do find in the Wage and Hour Manual, 1944–45, page 234, in answering a query as to how a certain employer was to compute worktime for his employee who spent 15 to 25 minutes each day going between the job and the time clock, the Chicago regional attorney held that if the employer's records of hours actually worked by the employee were kept in good faith, any disparity between those records and time-clock records might be accounted for by these factors, and the pay-roll records would be given weight in determining the hours worked. Here, though not exactly in point, is an indication of de minimis non since part at least, if not all, of that 15 or 25 minutes had to be used in walking.

In volume 5, Wage and Hour Reporter, at page 148, answering an inquiry, the Public Contracts Administrator said:

"As to recorded time, the department makes allowances for a reasonable period of time to cover the period between the time an employee ceases work and the time he punches out on his card. However, a period in excess of 15 minutes is regarded as unreasonable."

This, of course, indicates 15 minutes only after work and presumably 28 minutes for coming and going was de minimis.

In *Walling* v. *Peavy-Wilson Lumber Co.* (49 F. Supp. 846, at pp. 883 and 886) the log sawyers walked a distance from practically nothing to 1,500 feet, under bad walking conditions, which would take them from zero to a maximum of 12 minutes. The court held that "between the time they got the work train and the time they reached the actual point where they do work is so short that the issue is insignificant, and accordingly we shall not allow it as worktime."

This, of course, was walking one way, making at least 24 minutes daily which was de minimis.

BENDIX CASE CITED IN SHORT PERIODS

In *Cameron* v. *Bendix Aviation Corp.* (65 F. Supp. 510), where plaintiffs were seeking to recover for time waiting in line to punch the clock, the court held that periods ranging from a fraction of a minute to 2½ or 3 minutes' time did not constitute "considerable" periods of time within the meaning of the Administrator's ruling, "employment" within the intent of the act. This was de minimis.

In *Buslow* v. *Connor Lumber & Land Co.* (11 Labor Cases, pars. 63, 220) the court held that 5 minutes spent by an employee in preparatory activities prior to starting time could not be recovered since the amount involved was insignificant. This case used the words "de minimis."

In 1944–45 Wage and Hour Manual at page 1193, in response to an inquiry, the Public Contracts Administrator, who is also Administrator of the Wage and Hour Act, held that a period of some 3 to 10 minutes to permit the employee to get from the time clock to his place of work would not be regarded as working time under the act. Thus, 20 to 40 minutes a day, if counted four ways, would be de minimis.

From the CIO (amicus curiae) on behalf of plaintiffs, came a reference to the Wage and Hour Manual 1944–45, at page 242, which held that the employer could not deduct a 15-minute lunch period because the time consumed was "too short to utilize effectively in the employee's own interest and is more akin to a waiting period or short rest period."

This is not in point, unless we must consider it as de minimis in reverse and is, therefore, against plaintiffs.

Ulle v. *Diamond Alkali Co.*, cited by plaintiffs and found in 8 WHR 1043, is not in point, since this was a decree entered by consent of the parties covering portal-to-portal.

DE MINIMIS NOT INVOLVED IN COAL MINERS' CASE

In 2 CCH Labor Law Reports, 0–4, 33080, there is an opinion of the Solicitor's office of the Department of Labor, addressed to the National War Labor Board and cited by the CIO (amicus curiae), which merely held that miners should be compensated for travel from the rim of the mine to their actual working place. The question of de minimis is not involved.

Before the Supreme Court in this very case, a letter attached to the brief of L. Metcalf Walling, the Administrator of the Wages and Hours Act, stated that 30 minutes used in preparing machinery for work was not de minimis and should be paid for.

These are the main cases cited by all parties. Plaintiffs presented no case directly on the de minimis non doctrine.

From the above it is apparent that this Court not only could but should, by the great weight of what authorities there are, declare all walking and preliminary activities time involved in this case as de minimis.

We so hold as to activities.

However, when we consider walking time, the solution isn't quite so simple. On page 8 (slip opinion) the Supreme Court, in holding walking time to be compensable, said:

"Those arrangements in this case compelled the employees to spend an estimated 2 to 12 minutes daily, if not more, in walking on the premises."

With that statement before us, is this Court required, as urged, to hold that when walking time reaches the total of 12 minutes daily it is not de minimis, past holdings of inferior courts, regulations, memoranda, opinions, letters, etc., of the Administrator of the Wages and Hours Act to the contrary notwithstanding?

If so, just what did the Supreme Court include as walking time?

Our attention is challenged.

It is most essential that we make inquiry because if we are to follow the language of the Court by reference or deduction in accepting a mandate of 12 minutes' walking time as not de minimis, should we not follow the same court when it uses language that is direct, plain, and unambiguous?

EXAMINES COURT STAND ON WALKING TO WORK

Let us then examine what the court said just before it mentioned those "2 to 12 minutes" and we find:

"But the time necessarily spent by the employees in walking to work on the employer's premises, following the punching of the time clocks, was working time within the scope of section 7 (A)."

And again, following the words "2 and to 12 minutes" but in the same paragraph, the court stated what appears to be its conclusion:

"It follows that the time spent in walking to work on the employer's premises, after the time clocks were punched * * * must be included in the statutory workweek."

We have examined the Supreme Court's decision in vain to find any reference to walking time involved in coming from work as being compensable.

On page 7 (slip opinion) the Court does refer to the same activities in reverse, but these words are followed by a pointed reference to activities which throughout the opinion is always divorced from walking time. If the Supreme Court meant to including walking from the job as walking time, wouldn't it have said so?

That is the first point.

The second is that the Supreme Court (p. 8, slip opinion) refers to walking time as being compensable when it bore no relation whatever to the convenience and necessity of the employees and was "pursued necessarily and primarily for the benefit of the employer and his business.

It is elementary to this court that one who is on his way to his own lunch in a cafeteria set apart for him by his employer, or outdoors, is walking there for his own convenience and necessity, and not necessarily and primarily for the benefit of the employer and his business.

The cafeteria affords him an opportunity to eat his meals amid clean and comfortable surroundings. Here he gets away from his work. Here he meets with his fellow employees and talks about sports of the season, fishing, hunting, football, baseball, and some of their own common pleasures.

A cafeteria in a plant that size could not be located in every department. It had to be in one central place. And while it undoubtedly helped the employer by increasing productivity, it was just as important, if not more so, to these workmen as individuals, since these employees were on piecework. The lunch hour provided them relaxation, and an opportunity to make more money when they returned to their jobs.

Can we then say that the walking time at noon, under these circumstances, bore no relation whatever to the employees' convenience and necessity? Can we by any

stretch of reasoning say that when an employee eats his lunch he does so necessarily and primarily for the benefit of his employer? We think not. Such reasoning is specious and deceptively beautiful.

And since only walking time for the convenience or necessity of the employer and necessarily and primarily for the benefit of the employer was specified as the kind of walking time to be computed as working time, what more clarifying statement from the Supreme Court to eliminate the noon-hour walking time can this court receive?

HAZARDS TO MINERS OFFER DIFFERENT PICTURE

Plaintiffs contend that the Tennessee Coal and Jewell Ridge cases govern the case at bar. Well, let us analyze those cases even though the court has never subscribed to the thought that either of them has very much in common on the facts with this case. Miners going down a mine shaft, jumping into a transport vehicle where at times some turned their ankles and others broke their legs; crouching down so as to avoid beams, heading, electric wires, and other inconveniences to comfort and to life itself; traveling long distances in the bowels of the earth, with water dripping from the sides and from above; then getting out and walking to the face of the coal presents an entirely different picture than visualized when one walks through a modern factory, shielded and protected from both the heat and the cold, from the rain and the snow, from crossing railroad tracks, in the light of day and above the earth.

Yet in both of these landmark cases no compensation was granted for going from the time clock to the shaft. In Tennessee Coal the district court included above-the-earth activities as among the compensable items of the employee, but the Court of Appeals reversed only this part of the decision, and the Supreme Court did not reinstate that element of compensation. In fact the Supreme Court said, "these activities consume but a few minutes." Attorneys for plaintiffs suggest that the miners waived this compensable item but under the many decisions of the courts on the relationships between labor and capital, there can be no waiver of a fundamental right (*Brooklyn Savings Bank* v. *O'Neil* (324 U. S. 697, at 704)), and cases cited.

Granting that the Fair Labor Standards Act is a humanitarian instrument, aimed at improvement of the relationship between capital and labor, but above all aimed to prevent exploitation of the laborer who under dire requirement of providing necessities of life for himself and his loved ones might make any kind of a bargain in order to get a job, still how can anybody claim that if we are to be guided by the principles enumerated in either the Tennessee Coal or the Jewell Ridge Co. cases, that walking time of the type and amount involved in this case can be considered as compensable in light of the realities of the industrial world?

ALL DE MINIMIS

We hold, therefore, that, accepting for the purpose of this decision the theory that the Supreme Court set at least 12 minutes of walking time daily as not being de minimis, it did so with one, if not two, restrictions to be used in computing what these 12 minutes should cover:

(A) That it is only the walking time to and not from the work bench; or

(B) In no event can we consider walking time involved in going to and from lunch for one's own convenience and necessity, and which is not necessarily and primarily for the benefit of the employer and his business.

The maximum walking time under such yardstick that can be reckoned in favor of any plaintiff in this case is 6.2 minutes daily (mold department).

If, on the other hand, the Supreme Court did not intend to even intimate or indicate what it thought was de minimis in walking time, it is our opinion and we hold that we would not go lower than 12 minutes as above restricted (the minority opinion indicates that 10 minutes would surely be de minimis) and without setting any de minimis figure herein, hold all the walking and preliminary activities time consumed in this case is de-minimis.

RETROACTIVITY

We go one step further, and we hold that should we be in error in determining what the Supreme Court meant; should it be held that the Supreme Court intended the walking time to be computed both ways—morning, noon, and night—and that this pyramided walking time being over 12 minutes was not de minimis, we then believe that in all fairness to this defendant such a holding would be of a nature not intended by either the Fair Labor Standards Act or Congress, and that it would amount to an unfair and unexpected penalty against this defendant unless we took a second step and applied the doctrine of retroactivity in alleviation.

In this particular case this company relied upon the Wages and Hours Act as administered and interpreted by the Administrator and the courts. A representative of that department checked on the method of computing time and overtime at this plant in 1939 and placed its stamp of approval thereon. If the opinions, administrative letters, regulations, and decisions of our courts were followed this would warrant any industry, including this defendant, in not computing less than 20 or 25 minutes a day, in walking time and preliminary activities, as compensable (Tennessee and Jewell Ridge cases).

The doctrine that walking time and preliminary activities under some circumstances are compensable is not new. But a close analysis of cases that have passed upon the question indicates that they do not apply to the general field of manufacture, except where the employee admittedly had to report at a certain hour or the walking and preliminary activities time was considerable or substantial.

Never before has any one attempted to bring walking and preliminary activities time consumed into such a narrow, picayunish, meager sphere. Furthermore we do not believe that the Supreme Court ever intended such an interpretation.

This is not the case of a plant-protection man who has to don a uniform, respond to roll call, stand for dress inspection, look for his assignment, and walk to his post (*Yellow Truck & Coach Mfg. Co.* v. *Edmondson* (155 F. 2d 387)). This is not the case of firemen, who, in order to relieve other firemen, had to come in early to be ready to take over (*Ballard* v. *Consolidated Steel Corp.* (61 F. Supp. 995)).

CASE IS MANUFACTURING, DIFFERING FROM OTHERS

This is an out-and-out manufacturing case, differentiated from coal mines and other specific types, and what applies here may later be held to apply to industry in general. And this court takes the position that since the question of retroactivity was never raised before the Supreme Court at any time, we have the duty of passing upon that question here in conformity with the opinion and judgment of this court as according to right and justice and the laws of the United States. (See mandate.) (See also 12 Cye. Fed. Procedure 621.)

Time and time again it has been held that the regulations of the administrator, his opinions, his letters, should carry great weight, *United States* v. *American Trucking Association, Inc.* (310 U. S. 549); *Jewell Ridge Coal Corp.* v. *Local 6167 UMWA* (supra), and applying that rule to the case at bar the plaintiffs cannot recover. Any change in walking and preliminary activities times to below 20 or 25 minutes daily, adding the two together and counting walking time as the time consumed going to work in the morning, going to and returning from lunch, and then after work, would, we believe, call for a holding by this court that such new figure should apply only prospectively as a guide to industry, not retroactively as an unfair burden. Custom and usage should be considered.

All employers who were not even vaguely abiding by the Administrator's previous rulings could and should be held retroactively. But under no circumstances do we believe that this defendant should be placed in that category. Not only this defendant but the manufacturing industry in general should always be able to rely upon those who must administer the Fair Labor Standards Act until the Supreme Court has spoken, and any change should put industry automatically on warning for the future. One should be protected for past acts done in good faith. Otherwise there can be no stability in an industrial world when tomorrow may see some new interpretation of the workweek that would disrupt our entire economic structure.

We grant that the scope and effect of the Supreme Court decision in this case has been distorted beyond recognition, but even here, when in our opinion a holding to the contrary would not be calamitous, we still believe that the doctrine of retroactivity should be applied.

This court in *Anuchick* v. *Trans-American Freight Lines, Inc.* (46 F. Supp. 861, at pp. 866 and 867), in construing this very same act but on a different point, said:

"In the light of this history it would be manifestly unfair to expect a businessman to come to a conclusion on what these two laws meant when read together, under pain of heavy penalty if he didn't guess right. * * *

"But where a group of men have made the laborious efforts that defendant and its competitors have to find out where they stand on these two laws it must be readily agreed that they should not be made to pay a penalty before the law was properly interpreted. * * *

"How can we legally or equitably enforce a penalty for failure to conform with a statutory mandate when the nature of one's duty is not disclosed by the act itself?"

CONSTITUTION INFRINGEMENT CITED IN RAILROAD CASE

See also *Great Northern Railway Co.* v. *Sunburst Co.* (287 U. S. 356), where the court said:

"This is a case where a court has refused to make its ruling retroactive, and the novel stand is taken that the Constitution of the United States is infringed by the refusal.

"We think the Federal Constitution has no voice upon the subject. A State in defining the limits of adherence to precedent may make a choice for itself between the principle of forward operation and that of relation backward. It may say that decisions of its highest court, though later overruled, are law nonetheless for intermediate transactions. Indeed there are cases intimating, too broadly, that it must give them that effect; but never has doubt been expressed that it may so treat them if it pleases, whenever injustice or hardship will thereby be averted."

See also Judge (now Chief Justice) Vinson's opinion in *Warring* v. *Colpeys* (122 F. (2) n., 642).

OTHER CLAIMS

While defendent contends that plaintiffs cannot recover in this case for the reason that in the original suit they were not seeking compensation for time consumed in walking or preliminary activities, it is sufficient for this court to know that this point was

previously advanced before the Supreme Court and then remanded to our attention.

In view of our previous findings and opinion we do not deem it necessary to touch upon other reasons advanced by defendant why plaintiffs should not recover, such as offsetting against any plaintiff's walking time the amount of time used by employees going to the wash room, or for other personal pursuits, nor the claim that a bonus really given as a gift at Christmas or for vacation can effect possible damages. Nor can we take seriously the claim of plaintiffs that the Supreme Court meant that all walking time over 2 minutes a day or all preliminary activities that contributed in any way to the benefit of the employer is compensable. We believe that if the Supreme Court meant this it would have said so.

ATTEMPTED TO ABIDE BY COURT'S MANDATE

We conclude this opinion by inserting an unusual observation; but chance has made this an unusual cause. We have, of course, endeavored to abide by the mandate of the Supreme Court and we are not unmindful of the astonishment set out in its opinion that our decision be made in light of the realities of the industrial world. In this connection we have not considered those who seemingly believe that the workingman is entitled only to what has often been termed "the crumbs from the table"; nor have we considered the equally abhorrent ideology of others who would seek by their strained interpretation of what the Supreme Court said in this case to further widen the gulf between capital and labor. We ought to have in mind always that we are in great part an industrial nation where very recently mass production and fair relations between capital and labor served us so well; that we should look upon labor and industry as a team pulling in the same direction, or as husband and wife where the give or the take is not all on one side.

We believe that "in light of the realities of the industrial world" means that our decision should, if consistent with law, aid in promoting accord and not inciting discord, and that we should treat industry fairly while granting labor all its rights. We believe that "in light of the realities of the industrial world" means that without labor there would be no industry, and without industry there can be no labor.

It was the light of all the realities of the industrial world, not only part, that we have attempted to decide this case.

CONCLUSION

We cannot, however, reach our final decision without expressing some regrets for the original plaintiffs. Our recent observances have proven to us that when these employees claimed they were actually working at producing pottery before 7 o'clock in the morning and 1 o'clock in the afternoon, "jumping the gun," and not having that extra time counted in their workweek, they were telling the truth. We believed it then—we believe it now; but the master in 1943 found otherwise, and under the rules we must follow the master's findings.

Let us not be understood as holding that all portal-to-portal suits should be dismissed. There may be, and perhaps are, many instances where walking and the preliminary activities time consumed is of such an amount as to call for compensation that the worker is not now receiving. But this is not one.

Four years ago we held that time consumed in walking and preliminary activities in this case was not substantial and too insignificant to be considered.

A judgment consistent with this opinion may be submitted for our signature.

Moral Fiber and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford Courant of February 10, 1947:

MORAL FIBER AND EDUCATION

Representative W. STERLING COLE, of New York, holds that one of the reasons why young people go astray, if not the main reason, is that they do not properly understand what is good and what is bad in the field of human relations. He would strengthen the moral fiber of the Nation by providing instruction in the public schools in morals, temperance, and good citizenship. To that end Mr. COLE would establish a Federal Board for Character Education, and appropriate $5,000,000 to be distributed among the States to provide programs in character education that meet with the approval of the Washington agency.

Educational authorities may be expected to protest that schools are developing character. But there is more than a modicum of justice in the charge by Mr. COLE, who besides being a trustee of Colgate University has long been interested in many phases of problems concerning education. Were it not for the distressing record of crime among youth, for the prevalence of delinquency and for many concrete acts such as the picketing by Brooklyn high-school children of the hearings on the Graziano bribe charge, Mr. COLE's complaint might be summarily dismissed. No matter how generously the boxer Graziano has been with his support of athletics and playground facilities, picketing on his behalf reveals gross inability to distinguish between what is good and what is bad in the field of human behavior.

In a letter in the New York Herald Tribune for February 2 Dr. Helen M. MacCadden severely criticized education's failure to build character. With a justifiable pat on the back for those few teachers who have attempted "to instill moral principles and to demand responsible good conduct from their pupils" despite the attitude of higher educational authorities, Dr. MacCadden blasted "prevailing educational philosophies" that have displaced "the old-fashioned meter of moral judgment" with the teaching that all behavior is relative and "contingent upon circumstances beyond the individual's control." Instead of emphasizing that we must be the guardians of "ethical, cultural, and religious traditions that are our richest heritage," Dr. MacCadden asserts, the so-called progressive educators have been stressing a "deterministic, materialistic version of social studies." And other media of public-opinion formation such as radio and motion pictures, according to Dr. MacCadden, must share in the responsibility for "the negation of moral values."

Perhaps Dr. MacCadden has been too generous with her "pouring it on." Yet we cannot escape the record of crime, delinquency, and materialism that is America's today. Nor can we lead the world to a higher level without realizing, as the Rev. Joseph T. O'Callahan, of Holy Cross College, put it said last Sunday, "the importance of spiritual and religious values." With full justification, Matthew Arnold wrote of the modern world as "a darkling plain * * * where ignorant armies clash by night." The lack is not of knowledge of things and of science, but of moral values, and of how to translate them effectively into building national character and international peace.

Imperative as is the need for character building all the way from the primary grades through colleges and into the hard school of experience, we are unable to subscribe to Representative COLE's proposition of Federal aid. It does not contain the answer. The responsibility that he would impose on this new agency rests upon all educators at all levels. It cannot be made effective by the imposition of a superstructure. In these days when those in public education are demanding larger monetary returns for their efforts the public has the opportunity, yes the responsibility, of insisting on a fair return on its investment. Higher salaries may attract better material to the teaching profession. But even such a potential reservoir for character building can be nullified by those educators who in the past 20 years or so have stamped diplomas with dollar signs rather than with the intangible elements that constitute solid character.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

PRUDENVILLE, MICH., *February 5, 1947.*

CHAIRMAN, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a copy of a letter to my son that will reach him on his seventeenth birthday, God willing that he sees that day. I do not pretend to be proficient in the use of the English language. All that I ask is that you give the thought behind this letter due consideration, and if you see something that you and your colleagues on the committee have overlooked, please bring it to their attention. I feel it a duty to send this to you so that future Americans will have both sides of the case presented for them.

Yours very truly,

RALPH W. FISHER.

FEBRUARY 5, 1947.

DEAR DOUGLAS: Today, as you are approaching the ripe old age of 5 years, our country is in the throes of many perplexing problems which will directly affect you and your two younger sisters. Unlike the generation which preceded mine I am going to join my generation and attempt to steer you around the pitfalls we encountered. As I see it today we are headed for World War III, although I believe we can avoid it. Until peace of some degree is assured the world through the government of the United Nations, the United States of America must remain strong. One way of maintaining our strength is to have universal military training for our youth of today and tomorrow.

I need not tell you of the League of Nations and all that happened after World War I and the events leading up to World War II for, by the time you have read this, you will have studied these subjects in your history books. You will be sitting in judgment of the generation of my mother and my father. I am

supporting universal military training as a program for you, my son, so that your children will not have found my generation lax in regards to its duties to you. There are a large group of my generation that are following in the steps of their forebears. I believe they can be awakened if approached with sound logic.

Unlike our two past wars of commercialism, we are faced today with a future political war. There are two dominant political beliefs abroad today. Our belief in what we tend to call democracy is faced by what some of our "world perilists" call the "red menace" or better known as communism. There are many harsh differences in the two ways of life. They are alike in that they are based on the material things of life. Each belief is backed by large material resources either in a finished state or in raw deposits. For the foregoing reason our chances of averting World War III are good. Political thinking, given plenty of time, between two ways of life can be amalgamated. The best intentions of men often go awry however. For this reason we must maintain our military strength until definite means of assurance to world peace are presented to us and the rest of the world.

On December 7, 1941, shortly before you were born, my generation was sharply awakened to their duties of citizenship. Perhaps, it is in the realm of theory, if we had been trained in certain duties of citizenship, such as death for certain ways of life, we would have taken keener interest in our role in the world before World War II. Who knows, we may have staved off that catastrophe? When you study at preparedness you face the possibilities of death without end. A thinking people will try to avert such an eventuality, but at the same time will be placed in a position to best protect their country from such a possibility. Self-discipline and teamwork will be greatly facilitated through military education. We cp see the break-down of this duty of citizenship in our strikes against the citizenry today by both labor and management. I do not say this will get away from such strife, but that when it comes there will be a better chance of getting their heads together. Racial problems will be negligible as each person and peoples will find that one depends on another, with certain work for each. Efficiency and harmony cannot come from one person or peoples infringing on another's rights or labor. Each has certain qualities and talents to offer that are necessary to a democracy. Regimentation would be the word thrown by the word perilists on the foregoing, but such a state cannot be implemented by a year's education over a small span of civilization's life.

Much of our thinking along these lines today is not aggressive enough. The mythical thinking that European and the World Wars were caused by compulsory military training, which is far different than our thinking of universal training, is cowardly. This thinking is advanced by those who want to evade the fundamental issues underlying the last two wars, or are slackers amongst our citizenry. Even if you would want to accept such type of thinking, let us put it in reverse retrospect. Would there have been the last two wars if we had been able to back up our moral ideals?

Last but not least, my son, the last two generations were not ready for war, if war is inevitable. Nor were they ready for peace when it came. Universal training is actually a cause-and-effect training. It teaches you to prepare for the cause and at the same time looks forward to preparedness for the effect.

I am for universal training, you see, my son—for what I believe is for your benefit. You are headed for manhood in a vibrant world. World War II saw women volunteer for military service. In another war they will be drafted. I hope that this does not face your sisters.

With my face to your future, and with love,

DAD.

Nebraska's Place in Reclamation's Missouri Basin Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1947

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from an address by Goodrich W. Lineweaver, Director of the Branch of Operation and Maintenance, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C., before the Nebraska Reclamation Association at Lincoln, Nebr., on January 13, 1947. The Nebraska Reclamation Association is an organization formed several years ago to bring home to the people of Nebraska the importance of water conservation for irrigation and incidental hydroelectric power production.

The association has performed yeoman service in arousing interest among Nebraskans, who are coming to understand that only through irrigation can the arid and semiarid areas of the State cope with future drought. The program of the Bureau of Reclamation for extending irrigation in Nebraska in connection with the Missouri Basin development has the wholehearted support of the State. Our only complaint is that the work is not going forward fast enough. That may be partly the fault of the Bureau of Reclamation and partly due to the lack of adequate funds for construction purposes. Whatever the reason for delay is, I hope to see the cause removed and more rapid progress made on the construction of such works as Enders Dam, of the Frenchman-Cambridge project, for which a contract has been let.

Mr. Lineweaver's remarks in part are as follows:

In coming to Lincoln today I call the attention of the Nebraska Reclamation Association to the important place your State has in the Eightieth Congress, especially in connection with the Federal reclamation program, and I am glad to pay tribute to the cooperation and interest your Senators and Representatives are taking in the extension of irrigation and other reclamation activities through the Missouri Basin project which means so much to Nebraska. The distinguished Representative from the district in which Lincoln is located, Hon. CARL T. CURTIS, is a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee but finds time to take a lively interest in reclamation. Your senior Senator, Hon. HUGH BUTLER, is chairman of the important Senate Public Lands Committee, which deals with reclamation and irrigation activities. Senator KENNETH WHERRY is chairman of the highly influential Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Representative A. L. MILLER is an active member of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee. Representatives BUFFETT and STEFAN frequently express interest in the reclamation program.

In speaking to you about the Missouri Basin project and how Nebraska fits into the plans for putting its vast water resources to work, I am making a request. It is this: Let's take off the rose-colored glasses and look at things realistically. And that might apply also to any who might be wearing dark, smoke-colored glasses. Let's take them off, too, and get rid of our double-jointed vision.

For we want, above all, to look at things clearly. Then we can see the basic factors in sharp focus. I want to call attention to two of these factors. First, to be practical, we agree that the ideal climatic growing conditions and high prices we have had during the war will not continue indefinitely. Second, the path ahead for the Missouri Basin project is one that will require the full cooperation of the people of the entire region.

The farmers of the Missouri Basin have had the best crop years in history and the prices received have dimmed the recollection of the drought and depression of the '30's. Consequently, many areas are somewhat indifferent about irrigation, and the job of the leaders of every State is to remind the people that the years of plenty will be followed by periods when water conservation and irrigation will be essential to the economic stabilization of the Missouri Basin.

The Bureau of Reclamation is prepared to do its part. Our program for the next 6 years calls for the expenditure of more than half a billion dollars on the Reclamation irrigation, power, flood control, and related features of the Missouri Basin project. Realization of this program depends on appropriations for construction and those appropriations depend on the understanding the Congress has of the need for and importance of the Missouri Basin project.

Nebraska has a major place in the Bureau's program for the Missouri Basin. I am glad to advise you that the contract for the construction of Enders Dam of the Frenchman-Cambridge propect on the Republican River has been executed. The contractor is preparing to make the dirt fly, and this key facility will serve not only for irrigation but to aid in retarding floods like that which snuffed out 112 lives in the Republican Valley in 1934.

The factors that relate to drouth protection and the future of the Missouri Basin project tie together, but are dependent on the cooperation of the people. It's a long loop, but one definitely is connected with the other. Let's pick up the thread at the point where it first started to ravel.

People have been talking about putting the Missouri River to work ever since Maj. John Wesley Powell made his great speech on water conservation before the North Dakota Constitutional Convention back in 1889. But no one got around to doing much about it until the black years of drouth which came in the 1930's. At that time, in the emergency, it was too late to do much about water conservation and utilization, so the Government concentrated on doling out millions of dollars to the stricken farmers. And even that did not save a lot of them. Nebraska lost a sixth of its farm operators between 1930 and 1940. Those were bitter years indeed.

But out of them came the incentive to really do something to counteract the recurrent drouth hazards. And at the same time, the idea grew that something might also be done to protect against the almost yearly flood damage of the Missouri. The multiple-purpose Missouri Basin project is the result. This comprehensive plan, culminating preliminary work by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, was

given congressional approval in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

It is a major step in preparedness for that time when the ideal growing conditions we have been experiencing change to less favorable, or even totally unfavorable, conditions. We know they will come. We have had them before, as many, perhaps all of you can remember.

The Bureau of Reclamation plans to move along on the Missouri Basin project so that you and we will be ready for any eventuality. Just now it might appear that everything is moving along nicely. The Congress has approved the comprehensive Missouri Basin plan coordinated with that of the Corps of Engineers, and has authorized appropriation of $350,000,000 toward the construction of the reclamation features. It is a good start toward the ultimate realization of the full plan. Further, funds totaling $31,400,000 have been actually appropriated, and construction contracts awarded so far total $11,090,000. These contracts are on units which will cost $41,000,000 to complete—unless prices take another big jump. The President has just sent to the Congress a recommendation for additional appropriations of $23,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948. All of this will be needed for construction and necessary field work on the over-all plan.

The assembly and analysis of field data on water supplies, the productiveness of land, and information as to agricultural and human conditions are vital to further progress. The Bureau of Reclamation is concerned not only with building irrigation systems, power plants, and transmission networks, but is keenly interested in what these developments will do for the people of the Missouri Basin. After all, service is a prime consideration of any Government agency, and that is what we are offering Nebraska and the other Missouri Basin States.

Regional Director E. B. Debler, to whom the Bureau of Reclamation looks for the closest contact with Nebraska, tells me of the plan for a conservancy district that will sponsor the development of this area in central and eastern Nebraska. More power to the idea that brings cities, towns, railroads, and other public utilities into partnership in Reclamation developments. That is the central objective of the conservancy district program that has appealed to the people of your neighboring State, where the Northern Colorado Conservancy District is sponsoring the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The district is the contracting agency with the United States for the repayment of the reimbursable construction costs. It also is the contracting agency for the sale of water transferred from the Colorado River to the South Platte Valley through the Alva B. Adams tunnel under the Continental.

The partnership of hydroelectric power in the Colorado-Big Thompson project is significant of all large-scale reclamation developments being planned today, and that includes the Missouri Basin program. Without consideration for the revenue from power, there would be no Colorado-Big Thompson project. The Columbia Basin project in Washington would still be in the dream book and the Missouri Basin program could not have been launched.

It is a far cry from the early-day reclamation projects to such far-reaching and comprehensive plans as are entailed in the construction of the Missouri Basin project. To compare simple dams thrown up across rivers for water diversion and storage purposes to the Missouri Basin project is about like comparing the horse and buggy to a shiny, new automobile, or the first wood-burning locomotives chugging their way across the plains of Nebraska to the sleek streamliners that now glide along your network of railroads.

Not that the horse and buggy didn't get you there. And the early irrigation projects played an important and historic part in the pioneering and early development of the West. They set a pattern of water conservation and use which has been a bulwark of western agriculture. From the time the first ditches were dug and dams built most reclamation projects have been stabilized oases in a fluctuating agricultural economy otherwise governed pretty much by the ups and downs of the weather.

Your own North Platte project and other developments along the North Platte River can again be used as examples. From the time the first water became available on the North Platte project it has been a steady and consistent producer of agricultural wealth. With the other developments along the North Platte River it has eliminated danger of floods and has made the Platte, which bisects your State, one of the "workingest" rivers in the country. But today we are on the threshold of a new, modern era in pioneering—pioneering this time in the control and harnessing of rivers in an entire drainage basin.

Along your eastern border flows the Missouri, one of the great rivers of America. Within its watershed is more than one-sixth of the geographical area of the United States. Strangely enough, although it drains an area six and a half times the size of Nebraska, your State is the only one completely within its boundaries. This in itself is not significant, but it is typical of the importance of the Missouri Basin project to Nebraska and the key position the State holds in its completion. It is not exaggerating to say that the Missouri Basin project will affect virtually every resident of Nebraska in one way or another.

The pattern has been laid. Future progress is up to the Congress, which controls appropriations, and to you people out on the firing line, down in the grass roots of reclamation, who must make known what you want. The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to be ready, but we each have a distinct task to do, and each task is complementary to the other. There can be no real progress unless we work together in its achievement.

For one thing, in order to initiate construction of other units authorized by Congress, a prime requirement is repayment arrangements for that share of the costs chargeable to irrigation. Congress will not appropriate millions of dollars for construction of the various units of the Missouri Basin project nor will the Secretary of the Interior approve start of such construction unless there is satisfactory evidence of the willingness of the water-users to repay their share of construction costs. Your continued active endorsement will help speed this essential step. But that support must be given; not only by you, but by those beyond the boundaries of your State.

A major educational task for each Missouri Basin State is to let the rest of the Nation know of your convictions as to the importance of the Missouri Basin development. The East and the South and the Far West must appreciate that the Missouri Basin project is vital to the Nation as a whole and that the appropriation of funds for project construction is in the national interest. I cannot too strongly urge you to accelerate the effective work you have started in capturing national attention and national support.

Getting back to repayment of construction costs, a major factor to be considered in working out arrangements is the increased cost resulting from wartime conditions. For example, on the Frenchman-Cambridge unit, construction costs have increased about 50 percent over the 1940 estimate. I want to extend a pat on the back to the directors of the Frenchman-Cambridge district for the forthright manner in which they met this increase. They voted last July to enlarge the repayment obligation of the district to reflect this added cost. This action cleared the way for the Secretary of the Interior to approve the letting of construction contracts, of which the Enders Dam was the first. In the meantime, the repayment arrangements are being negotiated on the increased cost. This is a sample of positive action that can be reported to the Congress as a definite indication of the faith of the people directly concerned in the Missouri Basin project and their determination to proceed despite the increased cost of construction.

Repayment of these increased costs brings me to another important subject particularly applicable at this time to the Missouri Basin project, to which I have already referred. This is the new type of combination water service and repayment contract which is being introduced in negotiations with water users on the Frenchman-Cambridge unit and also the Heart River unit in North Dakota. Under this proposed contract, the water users agree to repay the distributions system construction cost as increased by higher labor and material costs. However, the rate of repayment is based on the repayment ability of the water users. This ability in turn is determined by application of realistic analyses of agricultural and economic factors in each area. In addition, in return for the delivery of water to the irrigation districts the water users also agree to pay a water-service charge which will contain a construction component consistent with the increased cost of the water-supply works.

These contracts, in conformance with policies initiated by the Congress, are designed to recover the proportionate share of construction costs which are of direct benefit to the water-users. On the basis of the original authorization of the Missouri Basin project, irrigators are to repay about 23 percent of the costs.

This discussion of the repayment program for such far-reaching developments as the Missouri Basin project raises another question of major policy in the reclamation program—a question which calls for a complete reexamination of the laws governing operation of the reclamation program. The Bureau of Reclamation is in the business of building projects to serve the people—all the people. In Nebraska it can best serve by providing a stabilized, secure, agricultural foundation on which to build your economy.

Here in Nebraska, rainfall is in the in-between class. There is far more rain than in some of the more western areas—which, incidentally, through irrigation, are also among the most profitable agriculturally—and much less than in the eastern areas, from the Mississippi River on to the Atlantic. But weather and rainfall are quite variable. Irrigation already has stabilized large sections of the Nebraska agriculture. Let's go back again to the North Platte project, with which I am familiar because it is a Federal reclamation development, for an apt illustration of the effect of irrigation during the last decade of ups and downs caused by weather and price changes.

During the bottom year of agricultural prices—1932—gross income from farm crops in Nebraska was $42,832,000. In 1933, Nebraska gross crop values went to $62,446,000. The big drought hit Nebraska and the Great Plains States in 1934. Gross income from crop production in this State dropped to $21,082,000. Two-thirds of the previous year's income went up in dust. It was a terrible blow to our economy. With 1935, there began a slow climb upward, and it was not until 1937 that the 1933 level was reached. And then, in 1938, another drought sliced the gross farm-crop income by 25 percent, and it was not until just before the war that income again reached the 1933 level.

That is the picture for the State as a whole. In the same period, what was happening on the North Platte project? Of the $43,000,000 crop income of the State in 1932, the North Platte project contributed $3,000,000, or, roughly, 7 percent. In 1933, the North Platte

income jumped 60 percent, to $4,790,000, compared with the State as a whole, which gained 50 percent. In 1934, the North Platte project dropped about 3 percent, to $4,651,000. This was the year of the big drought, remember, when the State as a whole lost 66⅔ percent of its gross farm-crop income of the previous year. Almost one-fifth of Nebraska's whole crop value came from the North Platte project. And that was the low point for the North Platte project. Thus, the North Platte project dropped below the 1933 level only once in the turbulent thirties, while State agricultural income as a whole took most of the decade to fight its way out of the 1934 drought and depression.

The ultimate plan for the Missouri Basin looks to the transformation by irrigation of more than 5,000,000 acres of range and dry lands into 5,000,000 acres of this same kind of solid, steady, wealth-producing land.

The cash value of crops to be produced under irrigation will increase $130,000,000, even if based on prewar prices. Add to this the tremendous value of a stabilized livestock-feeder industry and you have some idea of the solid-cash benefits possible through this greatest single water-source development that the Government has ever undertaken.

Creation of these irrigated family-size farms will provide another real benefit, one particularly timely, as millions of young men and women home from the wars are casting about for a home and a job. The Missouri Basin project will offer unequaled settlement opportunities for thousands of war veterans.

Another major advantage is the large amount of low-cost power which will be available to illuminate ranches and homes, lighten the burdens on the farms, and for industrial purposes. Generators of nearly 2,000,000-kilowatt capacity are included in the projects being readied for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. All of this power will be linked by a transmission grid, making it available in all sections of the Basin rather than exclusively in the immediate vicinity of the individual hydroelectric plants.

We must keep in mind, too, that the Missouri Basin has areas of outstanding importance in the conservation of fish and wildlife and recreation, which will benefit from this program. Silt control, irrigation of Indian lands, further development of mineral resources, and numerous other advantages must be taken into consideration along with the major contributions to irrigation, flood control, and power production.

All of these benefits, including reclamation and power, are so widespread that they affect all of the people in the Basin and, to a certain degree, all of the people within the United States. That generates another question. Why must these coordinated multiple-purpose basin developments be financed on a repayment basis which is much the same as in the old horse-and-buggy days, when legislation was enacted primarily to fit the pioneer single-purpose reclamation projects?

A principal point the Commissioner has in mind is the reduction of interest on power investment. He asks why the United States should charge western power users 3 percent interest for investments in developing the power of rivers in our own country while we lend billions of dollars at less than 2 percent interest to countries all over the world for the same and other purposes. We are discriminating against ourselves, but have no alternative under the present laws.

Another pertinent question to consider in modernization of the reclamation laws is why we should insist, as the law now does, that water users return all allotted costs of construction in 40 to 50 years for dams, reservoirs, and canals with proven useful life of 100 or 200, or, for all we know, thousands of years.

The last Congress started a reexamination of the reclamation laws. The undertaking will undoubtedly be resumed by the Eightieth Congress which has just been convened.

You should give the modernization of the reclamation laws real attention in the coming months so that the Nation can go forward to the goal of putting available water in the arid West to useful work. I urge you to join with us in meeting these problems on a realistic and cooperative basis. Legislation, repayment contracts, authorizations, appropriations, construction, and all the other necessary steps can forge ahead simultaneously on the Missouri Basin project if we pull together.

Nebraska's place in Reclamation's Missouri Basin program will be determined by the aggressiveness, leadership, and vision of organizations like the Nebraska Reclamation Association and those of the water users who are directly concerned.

The United States Under the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present another in a significant series of article on the United States under the Republicans, written for the Morning Herald, of Gloversville, N. Y., by its chief editorial writer, Edwin K. Gross:

BUT FOR LINCOLN, PARTY, THIS UNION WOULD BE ASUNDER—THEIR RESOLVE KEPT "ERRING SISTERS" IN HOUSEHOLD; REPUBLICANS' IMAGINATION AND INITIATIVE BUILT US A GREAT LAND; WOODROW WILSON LAUDED THEIR WORLD LEADERSHIP; THEY LAUNCHED "GOOD NEIGHBOR" POLICY

The country was falling apart under Democrat James Buchanan, who could hardly wait to be relieved of his burden, when the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, was elected over John C. Breckenridge. Lincoln, a small-town lawyer, as a Congressman was defeated for a second term because he had opposed the war with Mexico, and at a time when United States Senators were not yet elected by direct vote of the people was robbed of a senatorship from Illinois when the Democratic-controlled State legislature chose Stephen A. Douglas notwithstanding an unofficial vote of the people in which Lincoln was their choice.

Thirty-three States cast ballots in the 1860 Presidential election; the results—1,866,352 popular votes, 180 electoral votes for Lincoln against 845,763 and 84 for the Democratic nominee; but typical of the quirks of life and politics, in the total vote cast for all Presidential candidates, the election of Lincoln was by approximately 40 percent of the people. Even prominent Republicans did not see in Lincoln the qualities which were to place him among the immortals.

The slavery controversy had brought American brothers close to blows. Southern States had threatened secession and before Lincoln could take the oath of office were beginning their exodus from the Union.

Buchanan had said in his final message to Congress that the Constitution gave no State the right to secede, but (curious paradox) that it gave the Government no right "to coerce a sovereign State" if it did secede. Seward, Lincoln's appointee as Secretary of State, wrote a witticism that the message showed "conclusively that it is the President's duty to execute the laws—unless someone opposes him—and that no State has a right to go out of the Union—unless it wants to."

Government and people were hesitating, shocked by the fact of secession, reluctant to invoke force of arms. Through the North was heard the cry, "Let the erring sisters go in peace."

Secession was no new idea. Northern States had sometimes threatened it. But the Republican Party platform of 1856 had resolved "that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States shall be preserved" and assailed "those twin relics of barbarism—polygamy" (under Mormonism in Utah) "and slavery." That resolution was repeated in the 1860 platform. The South had expected, by secession, only to provoke a constitutional crisis and drive the North to a favorable compromise on the extension of slavery. It had not planned for a war. Lincoln was conciliatory, seeking to hold together the 31,000,000 Americans of North and South.

But, promptly and firmly, he denied the right of secession and declared that his oath required that he should "preserve, protect, and defend" the Union; that this Union was perpetual; and that the Constitution contained no provision for its own destruction. His affirmation had the effect of persuading some of the slave-holding States against joining the Confederacy. The southern temper rose, however, and then the guns of the South were turned on Fort Sumter, which Lincoln had determined to hold from rebel seizure. All debate was now terminated. The brothers decided for war.

While for 4 years their civil combat sent thunder-and-lightning flashes through the land and the brothers bled, the tall, rugged, anguished man in the White House kept his eyes unwavering upon his great goals—the preservation of the Union, and the freeing of the slaves which he had promised himself as a youth to do if he ever had a chance. With unique skill, he stayed attuned to the people, so that he might know how fast he could move toward those ends, while noisy extremists would have had him move faster or slower.

In an Executive order, issued under the war powers conferred upon the President by Congress, Lincoln proclaimed emancipation in the States at war against the Union. Congress abolished slavery in the District of Columbia and in the Territories. Lincoln's "Emancipation Proclamation" increased the Northern armies by 104,387 Negroes enlisted from Confederate territory. Simultaneously, a danger of foreign intervention dissipated as Great Britain, previously prosouthern, accepted the Lincoln war measure as meaning that the American Civil War was now a crusade against human bondage. Permanent and complete emancipation was written into the Constitution by amendment, the thirteenth, during the next years. The striking of the shackles from 4,000,000 bondmen was the greatest act of liberation in the wretched history of slavery.

Largely, Lincoln's leadership had united the North, including the northern Democrats. To strengthen northern unity and recognize the part which the war Democrats were playing in supporting the administration, the Republicans gave Lincoln in 1864 a Tennessee Jacksonian Democrat, Andrew Johnson, as his running mate for Vice President and called this ticket the National Union. The platform called for unconditional surrender by the rebel States.

Fremont was nominated against Lincoln by a radical Republican convention, but he withdrew from the campaign and recommended support of the Union candidates. The race was left to Lincoln and the Democrat, Gen. George B. McClellan. Lincoln won reelection.

With the South finally beaten on the field of battle, the Supreme Court read into the

Constitution, by interpretation that the United States was an "indestructible Union of indestructible States."

As early as 1863 Lincoln had announced a plan of reconstruction. One of the last things he said, before a fanatic's bullet struck him down, was this: "I hope there will be no persecution, no bloody work after the war is over. * * * We must extinguish our resentment if we expect harmony of the Union." He would have bound up the Nation's wounds like a gentle nurse. He would have been a mediator between North and South. But he never had the opportunity to treat with the returned brothers. The country turned from his generous spirit to a bitter transition.

The London Punch, which had ridiculed Lincoln, now wrote:

"The words of mercy were upon his lips,
Forgiveness in his heart and on his pen,
When those gaunt long-laboring limbs were
laid to rest."

Johnson, distrusted in the North because of his southern Democratic antecedents and in the South because of his loyalty to the Union, tried to maintain the Lincoln policy of charitableness, but failed. When the battle between the President and the Congress led to impeachment proceedings against Johnson, seven Republican Senators voted courageously for acquittal—and by one ballot they saved the President, but they thereby voted their public careers to an end.

The fourteenth amendment, under Republican auspices, conferred citizenship upon the freed Negroes and guaranteed them equal protection; the fifteenth amendment, also of Republican origin, forbade discrimination in voting on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Lincoln's military equivalent in the saving of the Union—General Grant—sought to end the campaign of hate persisting after the fighting. The Republican slogan in 1868 was "Let us have peace"—Grant's own words in accepting the Presidential nomination.

Harsh though the terms of reconstruction proved, the program was considered by the Republican 1872 platform as, in truth, "exhibiting unparalleled magnanimity; it criminally punished no man for political offenses."

When Hayes was declared the victor over Samuel J. Tilden by an electoral commission appointed by Congress in a disputed Presidential election involving frauds in Southern States, he made a conciliatory inaugural address and then withdrew the Federal troops from the South so that the disreputable carpetbag governments might collapse and the southerners could organize their own governments.

President McKinley strove for a reconciliation of sentiment with the people of the Southern States and to obliterate sectional differences.

The country, in war and in peace, grew. Republican imagination and initiative built us a greater nation.

Secretary of State Seward completed in 12 hours of negotiation the purchase from Russia of more than half a million square miles of immensely rich territory, Alaska, equal in area to the 13 original States. It was many years before the wisdom of that transaction, approved by a Republican Congress, of a nation carrying a huge war debt, become fully apparent; many people thought of Alaska as only an icebox and called the purchase "Seward's folly."

Under Lincoln, was begun the organizing of the domains west of the Mississippi for early admission as States. The popular slogan of the Republicans in 1860 had been "Vote yourself a farm," based on the Republican proposal, made originally in 1856, to allot a farm in the West to anybody who would go out and till it. The Homestead Act induced thousands of soldiers at war's end to go West.

A transcontinental railroad was brought to fruition by Republican government. Under Lincoln, laws were passed which chartered companies to build railway lines to the Pacific coast; the Republicans in 1856, already, had declared that a railroad to the Pacific * * * is imperatively demanded. With financial and land grants from the Government, the rails were laid through 2,000 miles of desert, the continent was spanned, and in 1869 President U. S. Grant saw the realization of that Republican dream with the meeting of the rails near Ogden, Utah.

Republican administrations readmitted the seceded States and admitted to statehood Kansas (1861); West Virginia (1863); Nevada (1864); Colorado (1876); North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington (1889); Idaho and Wyoming (1890); Oklahoma (1907); New Mexico and Arizona (1912). A Republican Congress voted to admit Nebraska in 1867.

Another national dream, the Panama Canal, was realized under Republican government, with Theodore Roosevelt inaugurating the project by a treaty with the Republic of Panama for a perpetual lease of a 10-mile-wide zone across the Isthmus, and with Taft carrying it to completion. The waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific were joined, the voyage between New York and San Francisco was shortened by nearly 8,000 miles, and a direct route was provided from western Europe to the Indies.

America under the Republicans participated wholeheartedly in the world in which it lived.

Grant and Theodore Roosevelt, after retiring from the Presidential office, made world good-will tours. Harding paid a visit to British Columbia, Canada, on an Alaskan trip on which he died while returning to the National Capital.

The Grant administration achieved a brilliant victory for arbitration between nations when, after 6 years of wrangling between the United States and Great Britain, a tribunal of arbitration awarded us $16,500,000 in gold as reparation for damage to our commerce during the Civil War. The *Alabama* and several other Confederate cruisers in the war had been built in English shipyards or purchased from British subjects, and their crews consisted chiefly of English sailors. The acquiescence of the British Government was a flagrant violation of neutrality. Out of that Geneva arbitration has grown the whole international arbitration movement.

Republicans instituted the good-neighbor policy about which the Franklin Roosevelt administration made great ado for itself. On Secretary of State Blaine's initiative during the term of Benjamin Harrison, a Pan-American congress for commercial arrangements was held in Washington.

The Cubans had long struggled against Spanish injustices. Prophetic of the Spanish-American War to come was Cleveland's annual message of 1896, in which he said: "By the course of events we may be drawn into such an unusual and unprecedented condition as will fix a limit to our patient waiting for Spain to end the contest, either alone and in her own way or with our friendly cooperation." The Republican platform of that year avowed that "we watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the Cuban patriots against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined combat for liberty."

McKinley, according to our Democratic World War I President, Woodrow Wilson, "diligently pressed upon the Spanish Government every argument for peace with its Cuban subjects, for accommodation, for friendly intervention by the United States, for reform and concession in the government of the island that diplomatic usage and international courtesy permitted, and yet the end of the Cuban trouble seemed no nearer than before. He quickened his pace in the business as he saw opinion advance and the Houses grow impatient."

The Spanish commander in Cuba inflicted deadly suffering upon women and children in concentration camps by denying them food or proper care. Stories of atrocities headlined American newspapers. The national sentiment moved toward war. Then, February 15, 1898, the American battleship *Maine*, sent to Cuba to protect American lives and property, was blown up in the harbor of Habana with a loss of 260 officers and men. "Remember the *Maine*" became the cry of our people.

McKinley renewed his efforts for peace, but when Spain finally indicated readiness for concessions it left doubt as to its good faith, qualified an answer to McKinley with proposals which might have much longer deferred the settlement of the issues. Then it was that McKinley recommended intervention to the Congress.

The Nation was thrilled with a new sense of union as elderly southerners who had been Confederate officers asked for commands and received them.

Spain was no formidable enemy. The war lasted only 110 days.

By the treaty of peace Cuba was made free, the Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam were ceded to the United States. Americans supervised the organization of a Cuban Government and wrought many improvements for the new Republic. Beneficient sanitary work was accomplished in that island by our Army physicians; when the American troops left Habana that city was free from yellow fever for the first time in 140 years. Hawaii was shortly annexed to the United States on the appeal of the Hawaiians. A government was set up in the Philippines, with Taft as the first Governor General; the extent of Filipino participation in the administration was gradually increased, and those islanders, too, prospered under American guidance until one day, when they were schooled for self-government, they were granted complete independence.

The United States was no political isolationist from the rest of the world; but the Democrats branded the Republican policies as imperialism. The Republicans replied: "To ten millions of the human race there was given a new birth of freedom" and to the American people "a new and noble responsibility."

As wrote a poet of the Philippines:

"See, vast trackless spaces,
As in a dream they change, they swiftly fill,
Countless masses debouch upon them,
They are now covered with people, arts,
institutions."

The "open door" policy for the maintenance of freedom of trade in the Orient was pronounced by Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of State, John Hay, when outrages by Chinese antialien societies ("Literary Patriotic Harmonious Fists" or "Boxers") and a siege of the British legation at Peking (now Peiping), to which many foreign residents had fled for protection, led to a fighting advance by a joint force of American, British, French, Russian, German, and Japanese troops. Hay feared that a partition of China might be attempted and the Chinese markets of other nations might be jeopardized. His "open door" declaration was accepted by the great powers.

Theodore Roosevelt placed a new interpretation upon the Monroe Doctrine when he asserted the right of the United States to intervene in the internal affairs of weak Latin-American states when their stability was threatened. European countries tried to collect on claims of millions of dollars against Venezuela, and Germany prolonged a blockade of Venezuelan ports. Having urged arbitration upon the Kaiser and received no reply, Roosevelt sent a fleet to the

Caribbean and gave the Kaiser 48 hours to withdraw. Germany accepted arbitration.

In the Russo-Japanese War, Roosevelt invited the belligerents to negotiate a peace on American soil—and the Treaty of Portsmouth (N. H.) followed. For this service our President was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

Later, however, when relations between the United States and Japan became troubled, T. R. dispatched a fleet of 16 battleships on a world cruise, to impress upon Japan that the United States was prepared for war. The Japanese leaders hastened to welcome the floating armament to Nippon, where our envoys were royally entertained. On the return of the fleet, T. R. greeted the officers and men as the best of all possible ambassadors and heralds of peace.

Our good-neighborliness was given a significant manifestation when Hoover, between his election and inaugural, toured the Republics of South and Central America. Earlier, the diplomacy of Coolidge's Ambassador Dwight W. Morrow had already restored good feeling between the United States and Mexico. During Coolidge's term a Pan-American Conference on Conciliation, held in Washington, arranged for arbitration of a border-warfare dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay—and our Senate ratified a treaty, proposed to all American Republics by that same conference, for submission of controversies between the Americas to an impartial commission.

Senator Borah, Secretary of States Hughes, and President Harding collaborated to stage a Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments, in which Japan joined with Great Britain and the United States in the pledge of a 10-year naval-building holiday, and causes of friction then existing in the Pacific were eliminated.

The Dawes plan sponsored by the United States in Coolidge's time averted an acute crisis between France and Germany over World War I reparations.

Our country, together with France, promoted, also when Coolidge was President, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which was our sincere attempt to make provision for world peace. The great nations of the world agreed in that compact to outlaw war as an instrument of national policy, to settle their disputes by peaceful methods.

When in 1931 the Japanese invaded Manchuria the Hoover Secretary of State, Stimson, appealed for united action by the great powers to put down aggression. His plea went unsupported.

In that same year President von Hindenburg implored Hoover to save Germany from economic ruin in the depression then increasing in fury around the world. To enable Germany and other European countries to regain their equilibrium, and also because we here in America were adversely affected by the conditions in Europe, Hoover proposed and obtained a year's moratorium on payment of war reparations and debts.

The United States had traveled a long way, under the Republican administrations, from a country in rebellion to a role of helpfulness in the family of nations.

That great Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, in his A History of the American People said this about Republican America as it entered the twentieth century:

"It was interesting to note with how changed an aspect the Government stood upon the threshold of a new century. The President seemed again to be always in the foreground, as if the first days of the Government were to be repeated—that first quarter of a century in which it was making good its right to exist and to act as an independent power among the nations of the world. Now, full grown, it was to take a place of leadership. * * *

"America played her new part with conspicuous success. Her voice told for peace, conciliation, justice, and yet for a firm vindication of sovereign rights. * * *

"Sections began to draw together with a new understanding of one another. * * *

"Statesmen knew that it was to be their task to release the energies of the country for the great day of trade and of manufacture which was to change the face of the world; to ease the processes of labor, govern capital in the interest of those who were its indispensable servants in pushing the great industries of the country to their final value and perfection, and make law the instrument, not of justice merely, but also of social progress."

Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 10, 1947.

Mr. HAROLD V. ELLIOTT,
Anderson, Ind.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: Thanks for your recent letter on current tax problems. I am glad to hear from you, and to have this opportunity to enlarge upon the recent newspaper reports of my views on the subject.

First, let me make it clear that I have at no time committed myself to any specific formula for tax reductions, as readers may have inferred from the reports. I have warned against the danger of making reductions upon the basis of political expediency, rather than upon sound economic principles, for there are many people both in and out of Congress who would shortsightedly continue to make taxation the political football it has been in recent years.

My desire is to spread any possible reductions in a way to bring the greatest possible benefits to the economy as a whole. I am confident that if we follow that principle there will be real benefits not merely for one class or another, but for all people. In arguing for this approach I have pointed out that there is sound reason for granting equal cuts well up into the higher-income brackets. I believe the reports you saw quoted me as saying that a flat percentage cut should not apply to incomes above $100,000. In other words, I share your opinion that the benefits accruing should be reduced on a graduated scale above some reasonable income point.

But before we can definitely determine the tax policy, we must settle the question of Federal spending, for taxing and spending are both inseparable parts of the larger question of national fiscal policy. We have experienced a 15-year orgy of boot-strap economics, during which a majority of the people chose to believe the pleasant propaganda that somehow or other the little fellow, the common man, could escape the costs of unlimited spending indefinitely if we merely soaked big business and the rich hard enough. In fact, a majority chose to cling to that pleasant hoax even after it was thoroughly exposed by the increased levies and reduced individual exemptions which began to throw the load directly upon the lowest-income groups.

Apparently, however, nearly everyone is at last tax conscious, and at last demanding a balanced budget. But after it is agreed that Government must operate on a pay-as-you-go basis, we still must face the fact that big Federal budgets mean big taxes in all brackets. If we balance the budget at the figure of $37,500,000,000, recently suggested by the President, I frankly doubt that we can cut taxes appreciably for any group. Real cuts should be possible, however, if we trim the budget the way it can and should be trimmed.

How possible tax cuts are to be distributed is, of course, a highly complex problem. And, unfortunately, the more we inject politics into it, the more difficult the solution will be. Since taxation is still being treated as a political football by those who cling to the New Deal propaganda line, you can very effectively answer their arguments with these significant facts: In 1932, upon the advent of the New Deal, the individual income-tax exemption was $1,000. Married couples enjoyed a family exemption of $2,500, with $400 additional for each dependent. Despite their continuous lip service to the common man, the New Dealers brought the present burdens to the lower-income groups by 15 straight years of profligate spending. It is ironic, therefore, that the people largely responsible for the present situation, and the people who are now trying to saddle the country with a budget over three times as large as we ever carried in any previous peacetime year, should be yelling loudest now to relieve the little people upon whom they placed the yoke in the first place.

It would probably be politically expedient to grant all the tax relief on the low end of the scale. As you point out, there are only a few people or industries in the top-income brackets, whereas there are millions in the lower-income groups. That kind of expediency can be effective in vote-getting as the repeated New Deal election successes proved. On the other hand, it would be dangerously unrealistic to go on ignoring the fact that upper-bracket taxes are now so high that they are at, or near the point of diminishing returns. They are in actual fact drying up investment of venture capital and seriously limiting business opportunity.

The small taxpayer, chafing under his share of the load, frequently loses sight of the fact that levies on big incomes have been increased almost to the point of confiscation. For example, the $100,000 income, which was taxed $30,000 in 1932 is now taxed $67,320; the $200,000 income, which was taxed $86,000 in 1932 is now taxed $156,820. Corporation taxes nip the big business incomes about as sharply; but in addition, any net profits from business remaining for distribution in dividends are taxable again as personal income of stockholders.

I assure you the foregoing is not offered in defense of big business and private individuals with large fortunes. In fact, it is another of the bitter ironies of New Deal tax philosophy that present heavy taxes work less hardship upon old, well-financed industries, and established private fortunes than upon struggling younger companies and individuals seeking to attain financial independence. A well-established industry feels the tax burden, to be sure, but it rarely if ever needs as large a portion of gross profits for development and expansion as the newcomer in the field. In fact, these extremely high levies may often prove to be a cheap form of insurance for big business against potential competition. Likewise, high taxes do not necessarily hurt the rich individual; for he can shift his investments to tax-free securities, or even let his money lie idle without taxable income without personal hardship.

The real burden falls upon the newer enterprises which are now denied all opportunity for reasonable growth. And the real danger lies in the fact that present tax rates discourage investment of venture capital and prevent the undertaking of new enterprises. When business investment dries up, employment opportunities dry up with it. The program supposedly designed for the relief of the common man, therefore, is actually most damaging to his interests.

Under the New Deal methods of taxation the small-income groups are not only hit hard by direct taxes, but are hit even harder through indirect taxes which are actually a big part of prices on everything he buys as a consumer. In fixing prices on goods and services, industry must provide for the taxes and add them to the bill which the consumer pays.

Every dollar siphoned off unnecessarily in the form of taxes is just that much money withdrawn from the pool of creative capital, which is our sole source for new economic growth and expansion. The damage thus done to the economy may not show up immediately, but so far as the individual common man is concerned, the injury is immediately apparent. For the taxes thus siphoned off represent money which should, and almost certainly would, otherwise be divided among workers in higher wages, consumers in lower prices, and investors in better dividends. Tax relief for industry and the upper-bracket income groups would afford greater incentive for investment in new business and enterprise, which, in turn, would create new competition and greater efficiency in production. And that, in turn, of course, would mean lower prices and greater values for the consumer.

Our own experience after the last war proved that intelligent tax reductions all along the line can, and do, stimulate the economy and return more gross revenue than restrictively high tax schedules.

There are just two systems of production: Private enterprise and state socialism. The first, as we have followed it in America, is based upon personal initiative and the voluntary investment of private savings. The alternative is some brand of totalitarianism in which, of course, the individual makes forced contributions for the capital structure.

We can kill or cripple private investment only at the risk of having the Government step into that function. Of course, we have not designed the present tax structure with the deliberate purpose of killing private investment. In fact, I am sure a preponderant majority of Americans want no part of the socialist state, which is the inevitable alternative. It would be foolish of us, however, not to recognize the fact that there are numerous and influential left-wing elements in the country which zealously hope to follow the present trend to its logical and inevitable conclusion.

It will not be easy, therefore, to shake off the old delusions. Neither will a course of real economic statesmanship be pleasant and painless. The plain truth of the matter is that everyone, regardless of income, will be required to carry a heavy tax load, either directly or indirectly.

Let me repeat that I am committed to no specific formula for the tax reductions which will be possible if we cut Government costs to the bone. I have written in this detail only to invite your further careful study of the problem, since I feel very strongly that active, enlightened public interest is imperative if we are to reach an intelligent solution.

Your own interest in the subject is deeply appreciated. I hope you will feel free to give me your further comments and suggestions.

With very best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FOREST A. HARNESS.

Abraham Lincoln on Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress has one of the greatest opportunities that has ever fallen to the lot of any American Congress for constructive service to the American people. It is the first postwar elected Congress and it has come into being during this period of transition from war economy to peacetime economy.

War inevitably brings distortion to the pattern of a nation's economy and it is our opportunity to constructively aid the Nation in its return to a peacetime economy.

All national economy is founded upon the efforts of the men and women who toil, whether they be on the farm or in the factory.

Those who would unconsciously lay a heavy hand on the 58,000,000 workers of this Nation should well consider the attitude of the great Lincoln, whose memory we honor today. It was Lincoln who said:

To elevate the condition of men; to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life—this is the leading object of the Government.

What was true when Lincoln said it is even more true today in the civilization in which we live.

In a message to Congress, on December 3, 1861, Lincoln again said:

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration.

In this statement we find the humanitarianism reflected that made Lincoln the great man that he was. Human rights were to him above cold property rights.

It is in this same humanitarian spirit that the problems of today must be solved in equity and justice to the 58,000,000 workers of this country.

National Heart Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1947, I introduced House Joint Resolution 15, a bill to designate the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week. The red heart which symbolizes St. Valentine's Day calls attention vividly to the Nation's most important medical and public-health problem, heart disease. It affects more persons than any other disease, leads all others as a cause of death, occasions a greater number of days lost from work than any other cause, and is one of the major reasons for rejection from military service.

It was impossible to get action on the resolution this early in the new session so I wish to commend the President for issuing on February 6 the following statement. I hope St. Valentine's week, each year, can, by act of Congress, be officially declared National Heart Week.

The health of the Nation is a matter of paramount concern to all our citizens. Good health is, after all, a priceless asset to the Nation and to the individual. Perhaps it is our greatest national asset.

This country was spared many of the ravages of war which have left in less favored countries a heritage of disease and the ills of pestilence and famine inevitably following in the wake of war.

We have been inconvenienced, but the national health has not suffered because of short rations. But we do have a health problem which arises out of the increased tempo of our modern American life.

All thoughtful citizens must be alarmed by the increasing incidence of heart disease. The physician knows, and the rank and file of our citizens should understand, that heart disease is now the leading cause of death. It is an alarming portent that 400,000 Americans will die of heart disease this year, and it is distressing to know that one out of every 20 persons now suffers from serious diseases of the heart and blood vessels.

In the face of these grim facts, I appeal to all my countrymen to cooperate with every agency and organization and every individual doctor in fighting the present-day national peril—heart disease.

Can Labor Legislation Bring Industrial Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Columbus town meeting, Columbus, Ohio, Sunday, February 9, 1947, on the subject entitled "Can Labor Legislation Bring Industrial Peace?":

"Can labor legislation bring industrial peace?" To ask the question, I think, is to provide the answer. Industrial peace is the product of wholesome industrial relations, and industrial relations are simply relations between groups of human beings. In a democratic society we cannot, and do not want to, regulate by executive decree or legislative fiat every aspect of the complex relationships among citizens. The duty of government, obviously, is to set up broad rules for human conduct and attempt to create a well-integrated, prosperous society, and having done so, place faith in the good citizenship of the people, relying upon and leaving it to them to work out their problems and their destiny.

Even the wisest Congressman would shrink from the task of seeking a legislative cure-all for every discord, and yet we now have

some 75 bills in Congress—all dedicated to the proposition that industrial relations will improve the moment they have been written into law.

The sponsors of most of these bills are members of the political party which for the past 14 years has expounded the belief that the less government is the better government. They have resisted extension of broad regulatory powers in such fields as price control and rationing of scarce commodities; they have opposed Government construction and operation of great projects like the Tennessee Valley Authority, and control of the sale of stocks and bonds to a sometimes gullible public. Their entire philosophy—with which I personally express disagreement—is one of letting dog eat dog.

Yet suddenly they have jumped over the ideological fence. They suggest laws in connection with labor unions which would force the Government to expand its jurisdiction into almost every phase of the industrial process. I am convinced that these bills, if enacted into law, would bring in their wake a host of new Government boards, of inspectors, of police agents, and even labor spies. For what purpose? To impose upon labor organizations a series of restrictions which, instead of leading to satisfactory collective bargaining among equals, would produce penalties upon one party in the negotiating process. The results can be only bitterness and strife.

Most of these proposals emanate from legislators with little or no direct understanding of the human relationships between union and management in the great industries of this country. One cannot sit in Washington, read the scare headlines of a press which is frequently prejudiced against labor organizations, and hope to produce industrial peace by incorporating the propaganda of newspaper columnists into law.

Collective bargaining between the representatives of labor and the representatives of management, unhampered wherever possible by obstacles imposed from the outside, remains the only practicable method for achieving industrial peace.

We hear little about the thousands upon thousands of agreements between industry and labor which are signed every year. But the press and the radio fasten our attention quickly upon the few cases where negotiations break down, and the parties involved turn to their final resort, the lock-out or the strike.

Workers don't want strikes. They want to work, to earn a living wage with which to support their families—to produce the goods which they and all the rest of our society require. The American worker—the fellow who sits across the aisle from you in the trolley car or in the next seat at the baseball game—is motivated by thoroughly democratic instincts. But being an American, he doesn't want to be pushed around by anybody, he'll have nothing to do with involuntary servitude, and he won't tolerate working under unbearable conditions.

That labor organizations are reasonable is amply proven, I think by the circumstances of the past few weeks. We have seen the CIO steel workers union agree to an extension of its existing agreement for a dozen weeks, pending negotiations of a new one. There have been similar actions in the automobile industry. The clothing and textile unions have signed hundreds of agreements without any threat to industrial peace. The packinghouse workers have signed amicable contracts—without the loss of a single day's working time—with the giant meat-packing firms. The rubber workers have negotiated contracts for their membership in similar fashion. And just the other day President Truman was able to announce a highly significant agreement between the construction industry and the A. F. of L. building-trades unions, in which both parties agree to set up machinery for settlement of disputes without resort to the strike or lock-out.

On the basis of the record, I would say that we have achieved industrial peace in this year 1947—and without resort to legislation.

The bills before Congress, of course, are based largely on what happened in 1946—a year of reconversion, of stresses and strains in every phase of our national life as we passed over from the giant undertaking of war to the equally sizable problem of creating full employment and prosperity in times of peace. Many, if not all, of those 1946 strikes were the result of special circumstances.

American workers, and the major segment of American industry, want to get on with the job. They want to produce the things we need; they want to operate our factories in order to present stockholders with fair dividends and workers with decent American wages. Together they are tackling that job with typical American ingenuity and perseverance. Industrial relations, after the shocks of postwar adjustment, are rapidly stabilizing. Yet at this very moment we are faced with a series of impractical, poorly conceived legislation which offers us not industrial peace but industrial turmoil.

Let us leave industrial relations to the people with experience and practical knowledge—the men and women of industry and labor. Upon them, in the final analysis, rests our hope for continued industrial peace, through democratic collective bargaining based not on will-o'-the-wisp theories, but on the hard facts of reality.

Mrs. Carnicom's One Hundred and Second Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in Glenford, Ohio, located in Perry County, one of the fine counties in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, lives a grand lady by the name of Mrs. Carnicom, who today—February 12—will celebrate her one hundred and second birthday.

I believe the best way for me to recognize this great event is to include with my remarks the attached article written by Mr. D. N. Belt, editor and publisher of the Thornville News, a village adjacent to Glenford. Mr. Belt's article follows:

MRS. CARNICOM WILL CELEBRATE ONE HUNDRED AND SECOND BIRTHDAY FEBRUARY 12

With the approach of Lincoln's birthday, February 12, the people of the Glenford community are recalling the birthday of its oldest resident and getting ready to celebrate the event. Mrs. Elizabeth Carnicom will be 102 years young on that date. She prefers to celebrate in a quiet way, but her scores of friends and relatives want the celebration to be more elaborate.

Mrs. Carnicom, the widow of Jacob Carnicom, a Civil War veteran, is known to nearly everyone in a large part of northern Perry and southern Licking Counties. She is the mother of two daughters, Mrs. Sarah Ridenour and Mrs. Ethel Swinehart, both of Glenford, and two sons, Herbert, of Zanesville, and Lewis Carnicom, of Wallbridge, Ohio. She has 17 grandchildren, 15 great-grandchildren, and 3 great-great-great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Carnicom, who has seen the United States involved in four wars during her life, is the daughter of the late Peter and Salome Ziegler and was born in a cabin near New Readington, Perry County, in the year of 1845. Her father died when she was but 6 years old, and in 1854 the family moved to Illinois, where they were living at the time Lincoln was elected to the Presidency.

During the Civil War, Mrs. Carnicom returned to Perry County to live with her sister, Mrs. Mary Lattimer, who died in 1939, a few months before her ninety-eighth birthday. She became the bride of Jacob Carnicom on New Year's Day, 1868.

The aged lady now makes her home with her daughter, Mrs. Sarah Ridenour, and during the past year has made several automobile trips with relatives over the State.

Mrs. Ridenour, in speaking of her mother, said, "Don't know but what mother stands this cold weather better than us younger folks do. Her eyes are now not so good as they used to be, but she goes out occasionally to visit the neighbors, and it insults her if I don't let her wash the dishes and help with the housework. She is in unusually good health this winter."

Mrs. Carnicom had 16 relatives in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I desire herewith to extend my sincere congratulations to this splendid constituent of mine.

Present Status of the Redevelopment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH A. MEADE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of February 9, 1947:

PRESENT STATUS OF THE REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Established only a year ago, the Baltimore Redevelopment Commission has been slowly laying the basis for a program of slum clearance and redevelopment. Its research staff, after a careful survey of present substandard structures, has delimited 12 slum areas surrounding the heart of the business district as blighted sections of the city. The commission is now asking the city council to support its long-range rehabilitation program for Baltimore by officially designating the 12 areas, comprising 650 acres, as blighted in ordinances to that effect. Public hearings on these ordinances are now being held.

Once the areas have been classified as blighted, the Redevelopment Commission is empowered to take over the property either by condemnation, purchase, or lease. Since this move requires money, a bill which represents the second step in the redevelopment program is under consideration at Annapolis to authorize a bond issue to provide $10,000,000 in capital funds for the commission. The senate has already given its consent, and if the house follows suit, the next step will be to have the mayor and the city council place the bond issue on the ballot for approval by the voters of Baltimore.

The redevelopment program is not to be confused with public housing projects. If working funds are made available, the Redevelopment Commission will take over the blighted areas for renovation and reconstruction by private investors and cooperative redevelopers, either through resale or leasing. The commission is authorized by State law to dictate to private interests the manner in which the land shall be redeveloped, setting a limitation on profits and setting standards for population density, property maintenance, types of enterprises and architectural details, subject always to the approval of the Commission on City Plan. The whole program is a move to encourage private interests to replace slum areas with decent dwellings and new commercial enterprises—and to help them over the worst obstacle to redevelopment, which is the assembling of land.

Private large-scale redevelopers are all too often frustrated by a few owners who hold out for exorbitant prices on key spots in an area under consideration and thus greatly inflate the cost of redevelopment. The Redevelopment Commission, armed with the power of condemnation, is essentially an effort to get around this obstacle. Yet so powerful is the urge to profit through shifts in land use that, despite the prospect of condemnation, the get-rich-quick element is even now seeking to exploit the situation. The method is to seek out real estate "bargains" in the regions about to be designated blighted areas and to gamble that, once condemnation proceedings are carried through, the "fair price" so determined will still yield them a speculative profit.

Doubtless in some cases it will. At any rate, there is now a chance of assembling land in slum areas at prices which will allow private capital to make its contribution to slum clearance and low-cost housing. Formerly there was no chance at all.

Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McDOWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the magazine Progress, of District Council No. 6, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America:

FOR THE RECORD

The response of a Senator and two Congressmen to a letter they received from District 6, President Tom Fitzpatrick, urging the continuation of strict rent controls should interest the membership. Senator MYERS and Congressman BUCHANAN, friends of the people, promised to support rent controls. Congressman JOHN MCDOWELL, whom President Roosevelt referred to as "that black Republican from Pittsburgh," responded in the interests of big business whom he serves so faithfully. Here are the answers:

THOMAS J. FITZPATRICK,
President, District 6, UERMA, CIO, Pittsburgh:

Will do everything possible to maintain rent controls.

FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate.

JANUARY 21, 1947.

DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: I have your letter of January 16, which I have read with much interest.

I am glad to have your views relative to controls on rents and wish to state that as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, to which I have just been elected, I certainly will oppose any attempt to lift rent controls.

Do not hesitate to write me at any time on any subject in which you or the membership of your organization may be interested.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

FRANK BUCHANAN,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 27, 1947.

DEAR SIR: After reading the copy of your telegram to Gen. Philip Fleming, Office of Temporary Controls, here in Washington, it occurs to me that if you are actually expressing the opinion of the thousands of members of UERMA in western Pennsylvania and West Virginia, it is the first time, to my knowledge, that you have done so.

I remain,
Very truly yours,

JOHN MCDOWELL,
Member of Congress.

As local 610 Business Agent Clyde Johnson pointed out at the district council meeting, if only 10 percent more Democrats had voted, the Twenty-ninth District would be represented by a progressive like Harry Davenport instead of by MCDOWELL who just does not believe in ever giving the people an even break. Local 610 is starting now to get rid of MCDOWELL in 1948.

Portal-to-Portal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that it is becoming more and more necessary for the Congress of the United States to clarify by legislative action situations which were formerly quite obvious. Such clarification appears to be necessary in connection with the so-called portal-to-portal pay situation.

As an employee and as an employer I never found it difficult to figure out the time for which a man should be paid. Now we are confronted with a fantastic situation. Even the people who have been encouraged to believe that they can benefit as the result of suits for portal-to-portal back wages must be amazed at the very thought of such a possibility.

The initial enthusiasm is dying out and the workers who think have come to the sound realization that no useful purpose will be served in prosecuting the alleged claims. Bankrupt industries will not provide a living for those who must be gainfully employed.

I submit an article from the American Federationist, the official monthly magazine of the American Federation of Labor. This article is written by John P. Frey, president, Metal Trades Department, American Federation of Labor. It is entitled "No Fair!" This article appeared in the February 1947 issue:

NO FAIR!—PORTAL-TO-PORTAL SUITS VIOLATE A BASIC PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(By John P. Frey, president, metal trades department, American Federation of Labor)

In reaching a decision on the question of suing employers for so-called portal-to-portal back wages, the executive council of the metal trades department was governed by one basic consideration—its faith in and loyalty to collective bargaining.

It is through collective bargaining that our trade unions, in negotiations with employers around the conference table, are able to reach acceptable agreements covering the terms of employment and the conditions of labor. Without such mutual agreements there could be no satisfactory or stabilizing industrial relations; chaos would exist.

The value of collective industrial agreements to both labor and management is similar to government by law through the people's duly elected representatives; in fact, and not in theory, it is self-government by labor and management.

When labor and management enter into negotiated agreements, the integrity of both are involved. Unless such agreements can be depended upon by both parties, collective bargaining cannot be successfully continued.

The international unions which comprise the metal-trades department have practiced collective bargaining with employers rom the beginning. It has been their definite policy to strengthen collective bargaining in every way possible, to benefit their membership and to retain the employers' confidence in this method of regulating industrial relationships.

Throughout the Nation, the international unions have negotiated many thousands of these agreements with employers in the metal-working industries, which are now in effect. When these agreements were negotiated there was a free, open, and aboveboard presentation of all the conditions which the unions desired to have incorporated, including the wage rates, overtime rates, classifications, and all other items a: ecting wages.

When these agreements had been negotiated and signed, they specifically expressed what the employers were willing to pay in the field of wages and what trade-unionists were willing to accept for the period covered by these agreements.

In the application of all terms and provisions of agreements during their life, the question of each party's good faith and integrity is involved. Without this good faith and integrity, collective bargaining would be of little, if any, value to either labor or management.

When an agreement is entered into, the employer knows what his labor costs will be, so far as wages are involved, for the period of the agreement. Trade-unionists under the agreement pledge themselves not to introduce new questions of wages during the life of the agreement unless the agreement specifically contains a provision for the reopening of the agreement for this purpose during the period of its existence.

To inject now the question of back pay for portal-to-portal time would be an admission that when wage agreements were signed by trade-union representatives they had been insincere during the negotiations and had held mental reservations which they were unwilling to discuss with employers while seated at the conference table.

Our trade-union movement has no assets more valuable than its agreements with employers and the integrity which is involved.

There is nothing to prevent the discussion of portal-to-portal pay when existing agreements with employers are negotiated and the inclusion of this form of payment in the new agreements. But as to existing agreements with employers, many of them entered into with the same corporation for a generation

or more, the executive council of the metal trades department has definitely recommended that existing collective bargaining agreements must not be dishonored by now entering into legal suits to secure a form of wages which were not provided for when the existing agreements were negotiated.

Portal-Pay Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Johnstown Tribune, of Johnstown, Pa.:

PORTAL-PAY LEGISLATION

Of all the legislation dealing with the relations between labor and management that will presently be debated by Congress, none is more urgent than some measure to put an end to the portal-to-portal foolishness. We say foolishness, but it holds the possibility of very serious consequences to the national economy.

Until Congress does act, industry will be beset by uncertainty rising out of the billions of dollars in claims that have been filed against it. Because these claims cover past years on which management has long since closed its books, a decision favorable to the collection of these claims would in many instances plunge industrial corporations into bankruptcy.

Workmen generally, if our own observation is correct, regard the portal-to-portal suits with disfavor, particularly the effort to make collection retroactive. They concede that the granting of portal pay to the coal miners may have been justified because of the distance many of them travel from the pit mouth to the face of the workings, but that is a condition that seldom is present in other industries.

The form in which legislation on this subject will be passed by Congress is not yet certain. The United States Senate hearings so far are proceeding along the lines of direct amendment of the fair labor standards (wage-hour) law. Sentiment in the House seems to favor amendment of the Judicial Code to impose a 1-year statute of limitations on claims. There remains a question of which procedure would stand up better under the Constitution.

We cannot believe that organized labor, which has filed these claims against industry, would be willing to wreck companies by which it is employed in order to collect money for which it has no legitimate claim. It may be, of course, that the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which is the organization pressing the suits, has been misled by an overzealous legal department.

True Description

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sparta (Wis.) Herald:

TRUE DESCRIPTION

After a male baby has grown out of long clothes and triangles and has acquired pants, freckles, and so much dirt that relatives do not dare to kiss it between meals, it becomes a boy. A boy is nature's answer to the false belief that there is no such thing as perpetual motion. A boy can swim like a fish, run like a deer, climb like a squirrel, balk like a mule, bellow like a bull, eat like a pig, or act like a jackass, according to climatic conditions.

He is a piece of skin stretched over an appetite. A noise covered with smudges. He is called a tornado because he comes at the most unexpected times, hits the most unexpected places, and leaves everything a wreck behind him. He is a growing animal of superlative promise, to be fed, watered, and kept warm; a joy forever, a periodic nuisance, the problem of our times, and the hope of the Nation.

Every boy is evidence that God is not discouraged of man. Were it not for the boys the newspapers would go unread and a thousand picture shows would be bankrupt. Boys are useful running errands. A boy can easily do the family errands with the aid of five or six adults. The zest with which a boy does an errand is equaled only by the speed of a turtle on a July day. The boy is a natural spectator. He watches parades, fires, fights, ball games, automobiles, boats, and airplanes with equal fervor. But he will not watch a clock.

Boys faithfully imitate their dads in spite of all efforts to teach them good manners. A boy, if not washed too often, and if kept in a cool, quiet place after each accident, will survive broken bones, hornets, swimming holes, fights, and nine helpings of pie. (Don Radde, Sparta Herald.)

Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an interesting letter to the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard in respect to beet-sugar lobby.

I had been much interested in the reports which have been presented by the committee studying the sugar shortage. Since the OPA announced on the day following the House committee's report on sugar that on April 1 a stamp would be validated for 10 pounds of sugar, as will each successive stamp for the balance of this year, with no additional stamps for canning purposes, this leads me to believe only two more stamps will be validated this year, making a total allotment of 35 pounds for individual consumption. In view of this fact, I urge that an additional stamp of 10 pounds be released during the canning season for each individual. If there is not enough sugar available for this additional amount in the allotment allocated for home consumption, I, as an industrial user, recommend that the increase for industrial use for the third quarter of this year be set at 70 percent of the base amount used in 1941, instead of the 80 percent now recommended by the committee, and this 10 percent be credited to the allotment for individual consumption. This, I feel confident, would supply the coming need for the housewife during the canning season and would not have a serious damaging effect on industry. The housewife has had a great deal of patience and has shown fine cooperation during this sugar crisis. Should she not deserve our serious consideration now?

The article follows:

ATTACKS BEET-SUGAR LOBBY—WESTERN INTERESTS STRIVE TO CRUSH CUBAN GROWERS

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-STANDARD:

Housewives, children, bakers, candy makers, canners, tobacco processors, manufacturers of drink, hard and soft, users of alcohol and molasses—prepare to make your wants known or get socked again.

Here is why:

1. Agriculture Committee is waiting to hear what the sugar industry wants.

2. Chairman HOPE would like to get some idea of what the industry wants done. (This refers to the United States producers—predominantly beet-sugar interests. No thought arises or is mentioned as to what consumers want.)

3. Senator O'MAHONEY introduces new sugar bill.

4. This bill prohibits about one-half of Cuba's cane sugar from entering this country.

5. Raises the allotment of beet sugar several times its annual production during the last 4 years of sugar shortages.

FORCING SUBSTITUTE

What does this mean? Just this: The powerful beet-sugar lobby is again trying to grab, even if it corrupts government by log-rolling and vote-swapping, pinches the consuming public, and squeezes the life out of the Republican Party as it helped to do in 1929 with the Hawley-Smoot high tariff. It is trying to throw into bankruptcy the Cuban sugar companies as it helped to do in the thirties. It is trying to force on the American public the use of a substitute for cane sugar. It is trying to force every man, woman, and child in the United States to pay to them 75 cents each for their trouble each year for producing a product which many housewives, bakers, and candy makers consider inferior for their purposes, and which they failed miserably to produce in the crisis of both World Wars. They are asking the American public to pay them through a subsidy 1 cent per pound more than the price for the real article—cane sugar from Cuba.

The whole question of a necessary household food should be completely eliminated from politics, Government controls, regulations, allotments, prices, and tariffs as soon as practicable—particularly sugar. Look back at the record and history of sugar for a few years. The beet sugars were highly protected in peacetimes before World War I, and in the way they fell down woefully. Cuba rallied and supplied the gap by tremendous production. They did so largely with bank loans from American banks—much to their sorrow.

After World War I the beet interests again entered the picture through politics and high tariff, and gradually helped in forcing nearly every Cuban sugar company into bankruptcy and thereby ruining their credit at banks because of defaults. The high tariff on sugar under the Hawley-Smoot bill also caused tremendous losses to American banks and American investors as well as bringing down the vengeance of the consuming public on the Republican Party.

Again in World War II beet producers failed utterly. Again Cuba came to the rescue, raised their production from less than 2,000,000 tons to more than 5,500,000 tons, despite

bungling, dictation, and regulation by incompetents at Washington, and had they not supplied the sugar and alcohol the war would have been greatly prolonged and with greatly increased seriousness and costs. Now the beet interests again sense a little profit and a chance to cripple Cuba again. It should be noted also that nearly every dollar paid to Cuba for sugar returns to the United States for goods made by American labor.

CUBAN PROFITS LOW

The general impression is that Cuba did this solely for profits. Just note the results—very few Cuban sugar companies paid a dividend of more than 25 cents per share per year for the 4 years of the war. Many have not paid one cent dividend in 18 years, and most of the companies are still in debt. This seems unbelievable unless you know that Cuban companies are taxed 34½ percent of their earnings in Cuba, and if they are subsidiaries of American companies their earnings when turned over to the parent company are taxed again about 60 percent by the American Government.

Who are these Cuban sugar companies? They are almost completely managed by Americans and almost as largely owned by American investors as are the beet-sugar companies. In this city of Syracuse alone there are stockholders in 7 or more Cuban sugar companies, and in one company alone there are over 49,000 shares distributed among hundreds of citizens in which they have received not one cent in dividends.

Now the western beet-sugar interests are trying to crush the eastern cane-sugar interests through Government help. One of their arguments is to help American labor. Yet the records show that most of the hard labor was performed by Mexican families imported by them to work for a few cents per day. Another argument of theirs is that it is an American industry. This is scarcely more true than the Cuban sugar companies. The argument that we need to help the beet interests in case of future critical sugar shortages explodes in their faces when we examine the flop they made in both World War crises and shortages.

There is one ray of hope that this aggression against and utter disregard of the consuming public will be rectified if we have a little patience. The shortages caused by bungling and special favors cannot be helped much immediately, simply because there is not enough sugar. Given a free market, Cuba could produce our total requirements at lowest costs.

The consuming public comprises the voters, and they have elected a new Congress to straighten out the mess, and it is hardly conceivable but that a majority of the new Congress knows why they are there and will operate for the best interest of the great majority. We, the consumers, must let Congress know what it is we want and not just let Congress sit by and wait to hear what the sugar industry wants.

ROY E. WILSON.

SYRACUSE.

Communism Is Anti-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the ever widening and impending threat of communistic influences, I include in the RECORD the following erudite and forceful address delivered by former Judge Edgar F. Hazleton, of the New York City courts, and for the past 10 years county counsel of Suffolk County, before the Ketewamoke Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at Huntington, on December 2, 1946:

The conflict in the world today is essentially the same as that of old, since the struggle between the east and the west has never abated from the time the Mongol hordes of Genghis Khan spread out from Karakorum. Western civilization believes in preserving the dignity of man. Here every man is a king and his home his castle, while in Russia he is but a vassal of the state.

As far back as the days of President James Monroe it was the autocratic Czar Alexander I who planned to end representative government and to destroy the young democracies of America.

The historian Alexis de Tocqueville wrote over 100 years ago:

"Two great peoples, starting at different points, go forward toward the same end; these are the Russians and the Americans. The others seem to have attained the limit that nature traced for them; these two alone go forward in a race of which the eye cannot see the limits.

"To attain this end, the American relies on the strength of reason of individuals; Russia concentrates in one man all the power of society. The one has for his principle means of action, liberty, the other servitude. Their points of departure are different; their paths are diverse. But each of them seems called by a secret design of Providence to hold one day in his hands the destinies of half the world."

Lenin has pointedly put us on notice in volume 24 at page 22 of the Russian edition of his collected works, where in these words he predicted wars with non-Communist states such as the United States: "We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois state is inevitable."

Thus it is clear that the menace to western civilization from the east continues today, as it did when Greece and Persia were mighty powers. Then it was other oriental hordes, while now the danger is spearheaded by the Red Fascists of Russia who dictate and direct from Moscow the Lenin-Stalin plan for world-wide communism.

Therefore it follows that wherever men foregather, and whatever their lot in life may be, it would be well if they paused and pondered why their vision is blurred and their hopes and aspirations in the pursuit of peace and surcease frustrated, even though Hitlerism has been vanquished.

Our confusion and disappointment are not due to fear of a third world war or even the atomic bomb, but instead grow from the specter of communism which, like a heavy cloud, hovers over the world, as it becomes apparent that Russia's real purpose in fighting the war was not only the defeat of her former ally Hitler, but mainly to use the Second World War as a means to accelerate Russia's program of world-wide communism to be brought about as Lenin taught, by any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, and concealment of truth, and, therefore, as Stalin has warned, "The American Communist Party should be fully prepared to assume the leadership of the impending class struggle in America. We must form in America real revolutionary regiments and a real revolutionary leadership capable of leading the millions of America's workers into revolution."

We had hoped that totalitarianism had died with the defeat of Hitler. It is not even asleep, but marching on stronger than ever under the cloak of communism. President Franklin Roosevelt said, "The Soviet Union, as everybody who has the courage to face the facts, knows, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world," while Stalin insists that dictatorship means unlimited power, resting on violence and not on law. The ruthless reign of Ivan the Terrible was no worse than the dictatorship of Joseph Stalin.

The paramount objective of the Soviet Government is that world-wide communism should prevail all over this globe. Its immediate objective consists of bringing its neighboring nations within its grasp to have them serve as jumping-off places for further conquests. This is the technique being used today in Asia and Europe. The objectives of communism have never changed and its methods seldom varied. As Stalin writes: "The development and the support of the revolution in other countries is an essential task of the victorious revolution. Thus the revolution, victorious in one country, must not consider itself a self-contained entity, but a support, a means of speeding the victory of the proletariat in other countries."

Lenin briefly expresses this thought in saying that the task of the victorious revolution consists in the accomplishment of the maximum possible in one country for the development, support, and stirring up of revolution in all countries.

Consider how the Russian delegates continue to block the international refugee organizations in aiding the homeless refugees and displaced persons who are afraid to return to their fatherlands because they are politically opposed to Russia's satellite governments in control of those countries. The Russians proclaim the rights of minorities inside the United Nations, yet they have no sympathy whatsoever for any political minority who has dared to reject the Soviet system.

Therefore, communism as it is now propagandized in our country is an un-American system that would destroy the fundamental freedoms upon which our Republic rests. Its party is fifth columns for Moscow, and its members quislings owing allegiance to the Soviet Union. Do not confuse communism with liberalism since such would be like putting the works of the Devil and the Bible in one book.

We should recall that by the terms of the agreement reached in 1933 between the Soviet Government and ourselves, the Soviets agreed not to interfere in the internal affairs of the United States. The record shows that this promise, along with others, has been broken. As stated by Robert Miner, national vice president of the Communist Political Association, at a meeting held in New York city on June 4, 1945, Joseph Stalin is the true disciple of Lenin in the struggle for communism all over the world. That statement together with the teachings of Marx and Lenin prove clearly that communism always has been and continues to be bent on establishing Communist dictatorships in all countries. Their theme is exactly the same as Hitler's was: "Today Russia—tomorrow the world." Their plan is one of Trojan horse tactics consisting of infiltrating into our Government, educational systems, communications, transportation, labor unions, military forces, and political parties in order to confuse, divide, and take over. As stated by J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who knows what he is talking about:

"The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims some 100,000 members has lulled many Americans into a feeling of false complacency. I would not be concerned if we were dealing with only 100,000 Communists. The Communists themselves boast that for every party member there are 10 others ready to do the party's work. These include their satellites, their fellow travelers, and their so-called progressive and phony liberal allies."

After an exhaustive study of communism in 1942 former Attorney General Biddle reported that "the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

Part of their scheme is the persistent hammering by the Red press against the United States and the brazen attempts to sow the seeds of dissension in our large Negro population as well as other groups. To be specific, I refer to the Moscow edition of the New Times, under date of April 15, 1946. On October 5, 1946, American Negroes complained to the Assembly of the United Nations that trial by jury, personal liberty, freedom of the press and speech, freedom of religion, assembly, and association, freedom from arbitrary arrest and free election were commonly denied to African people. This is unjust and should be corrected, so that Negroes would receive equality with other citizens in every phase of life. But it would be well for those who complain about civil rights to the United Nations to bear in mind that one member of that body who possesses and wields its veto with vehemence deprives its own citizens of freedom of the press, freedom of religion, free speech, freedom of assembly, and the right to a trial by a jury of one's peers. In Russia the notorious NKVD—secret police—see that a supply of slave labor in the millions is always available. How many workers are actually condemned as so many serfs to forced labor the Soviet Union refuses to reveal. But we do know that in 1933 they amounted to about 6,000,000 and in 1945 were estimated at from 14,000,000 to 18,000,000. I quote from page 56 of House Document No. 754.

We are not concerned how the Reds rule themselves in Russia but are opposed to their propagandizing communism in the United States and planning to set up here a prototype of their police state. Since Moscow and American Communists insist upon establishing by means of deceit, infiltration, and force if necessary, a Communist government in this country, they can no longer be tolerated here. There is a point at which our cooperation with Soviet Russia ceases and our duty to safeguard American institutions begins. That point is at the territorial borders of the United States of America. Whereas the allegiance of all Communists belongs above all else first to Moscow, then it follows as the night the day that a Communist cannot be a loyal American and a loyal Communist at the same time any more than a man can serve two masters. "For either he will hate the one and love the other or else he will stand by the one and despise the other." All Communists love Russia and despise the American system of free enterprise. As William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party in the United States, proclaimed before a congressional committee: "The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag, and that is the Red flag."

It was never intended that our Bill of Rights should serve as a shield providing sanctuary for a revolutionary and traitorous group as it prepared to destroy that very form of government that preserves the Bill of Rights.

This is precisely the situation we face insofar as American Communists are concerned, so that to deny it would be calling fact false and truth a liar. An American who becomes a Communist or a member of a Communist-front organization should at once be considered as having in effect renounced his American citizenship. Certainly he can no longer be a loyal citizen of a country whose form of government he despises, hates, and hopes to see destroyed. That fellow belongs in Russia physically as well as politically.

Since the record proves Communists and loyal Americans cannot mix any more than oil and water and that the alien creed of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin must be kept out of the United States, what is the means to be adopted in order to achieve that end? Obviously, our counter methods should be as complete and all-inclusive as those of the Communists. First, let us combat famine by feeding the hungry and relieving distress throughout the world, and give shelter, warmth, and work to our own, for communism thrives on human misery, a weak economy, and man's unhappiness. And since the Moscow Trojan-horse technique involves infiltration, confusing and dividing in order to conquer, no Communist or member of a Communist-front organization should be permitted to hold any position whatsoever in our Federal, State, or municipal governments. They should be removed and kept out of our armed forces, our schools and colleges, as well as all positions of leadership in labor unions. In other words, notice should be served that no one can salute the red star of Russia and the stars and stripes at the same time and be on the level with America.

I am aware that all this will be difficult to accomplish and cannot happen overnight. Nevertheless, this change must be brought about because of the very necessity of the thing itself if western civilization, with its freedoms and dignity of man, is to withstand the assaults of Asiatic avarice.

Concededly the Soviet is succeeding in communizing Europe and the Near East. Britain fears a Soviet rule in India, and communism, while not an immediate menace in England, is a real danger in our country, due to our heterogeneous population. Americans must be aroused to understand that since Communists and their front organizations constitute a threat to the United States that communism in peacetime should be outlawed just as we banned other un-American activities during the war. We should not wait until we have another war, when it may be too late. Communists within the United States should have no more rights than Republicans, Democrats, and Socialists have in Russia.

As Fritz Kuhn and his bund were agents of Hitler, so our American Communists are the agents of Stalin and his Red Russian Fascists in their plan to communize America.

Anent the necessity of banning communism from the shores of our country, it is fortunate that the Monroe Doctrine provides that any attempt by a foreign power to extend its political system in the American hemisphere would be considered dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States.

The real reason for the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine was the fear that our country, with its system of free enterprise, would be in danger if the great powers of Europe, leagued together, should be able to increase their influence in the Western Hemisphere by colonization, war, or intrigue.

It was in 1821 that Czar Alexander I, together with his fellow autocrats, sought "to put an end to the system of representative government" and commenced planning to destroy the young democracies of America. This impelled President Monroe on December 2, 1823, to issue his famous message, in which he said: "The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. * * * The political system of the allied powers is essentially different from that of America. * * *

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration, and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling * * * their destiny * * * in other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent (North and South America) without endangering our peace and happiness."

The Soviet Government in unmistakable language makes it clear that it plans to extend its political system to both North and South America. It is now building up its alliances throughout Europe and the Near East and has its agents in the form of Communist societies and otherwise in every country in the Western Hemisphere. The world is being turned against us through distortion of news, suppression of facts, and misstatement by Communist press and propaganda. Thus, not only does the danger which President Monroe condemned exist but it is clear that the Communist dictators are more hostile and more of a menace to our democracy than the autocratic Czar Alexander I.

Therefore, serious consideration should be given to enforcing the Monroe Doctrine as well as banning communism itself by operation of law throughout the United States. We are not interested in interfering with the internal affairs of the Soviet Government but should repel their further interfering in ours. While I agree that in our country, a man is entitled to choose his political party, I, nevertheless, insist that when that party is part of an alien system working for the overthrow of our Government, that both the individual and his party do not belong in America.

Since at the last election it was made clear that America is overwhelmingly opposed to further propagandizing or infiltration by Communists, the President and our legislative bodies should implement by proper action the expressed will of our people.

Granting that legislation cannot completely curb communism, it nevertheless can create a stopgap in order to give us time to do by education and religion what we have woefully failed to do to date.

However, I believe this will not be accomplished until your group and others like you, who put God and country first, bring home to our people a realization that the advance of atheistic communism is more of a menace to our western civilization than any previous threat coming out of the Orient.

German Peace Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution which, if passed, would put the House of Representatives on record as favoring the type of peace settlement with Germany which, in my opinion, would best insure a lasting peace and economic stability in the whole of Central Europe. The resolution follows very closely the general outlines of policy as made in public statements by Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, commander in

chief of the American forces in Germany, Gen. Lucius Clay, John Foster Dulles, and former Secretary of State Byrnes. I am convinced that our continuing occupation of Germany and all our efforts to restore an economically stable Europe will be in vain unless a solution is reached with respect to Germany which, while keeping that nation effectively disarmed, will allow it soon to become self-supporting and no longer a charity patient of the United States, or Great Britain, or Russia.

The decisions which are reached at the Moscow Conference will be of the utmost importance to the future. I feel that it would be most helpful to those who are negotiating on behalf of the United States at that conference to feel that the Congress is standing solidly behind them on fundamental policy.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas a council meeting of the foreign ministers of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union will be held in Moscow on March 10, 1947; and

Whereas the agenda for this meeting includes the discussion of the economic and political future of Germany under quadripartite control, the development of a provisional and permanent German Government, and the general outline of the peace treaty with Germany: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the House support the creation of a peaceful, democratic, and self-supporting Germany which shall never again become a threat to the peace of the world; be it further

Resolved, That the House consider the disarmament of Germany and the development of a unified and stable German economy under a federal democratic system the strongest guaranty against the revival of an aggressive Germany and for the growth of mutual confidence and prosperity in Europe.

Address of Hon. Harold E. Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, delivered at the annual Kansas Day celebration, sponsored by the Republican Party of Kansas, at Topeka on January 29, 1947:

Your Excellency, Governor Carlson, Hon. Alf Landon, distinguished guests, fellow Republicans, this is the first time in 16 years that Kansas Day has in it a note of national Republican victory as well as of State Republican celebration. On last November 5, the citizens of our country definitely named our Republican Party as once again the majority party of the United States of America. This significant result of that free ballot is quite naturally the cause for some spirit of celebration. But even more, as I know you all recognize, it is a result to be viewed with a sense of humility and of responsibility by our Republican Party in this crucial period in the wake of war and at the opening of the atomic age.

Down through the years from that 29th day of January in the year 1861, when this State was admitted to the Union and the thirty-fourth star was added to the field of blue, the people of the State of Kansas have been very alert participants in the development and the decisions of national Republican policy. Our contemporary scene is no exception to that history. Numbering in your ranks that farseeing and beloved statesman who carried our standard in the difficult campaign of 1936, the Honorable Alf Landon; that outstanding student of agriculture, now chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, CLIFFORD HOPE; your able Senators CAPPER and REED; and Representatives REES, SCRIVNER, COLE, SMITH, and MEYER; your able Governors, past and present, the Honorable Andrew Schoeppel, and the Honorable Frank Carlson; and the strong, respected, and solid Republican delegation in the Senate and House, Kansas has and deserves to have a strong place in the councils of our Republican Party.

Thus, in responding to your invitation on this unique annual occasion, I am moved, with your permission, to speak directly and frankly about some phases of national policy for our Republican Party. If our Republican Party follows through and discharges well its limited responsibility as the majority party in the legislative branch of Government, it is quite apparent that it is the intention of the voters of America to place our Republican Party in charge of the executive branch, as well, in 1948. It is also very clear that the decisions of our country in the years immediately ahead will have far-reaching effects, not only as to the future freedom and welfare of the people within our borders, but also throughout the world.

Clearly, then, the internal development of policy within our Republican Party will be of paramount significance in the months ahead.

It is my view that that policy should be developed by open and frank discussion. We should explore together the economic and social facts as we find them to be, and consider proposals to meet the problems before us. We cannot go back to where we left off 16 years ago. It is never possible to move backward in social and economic policy, any more than it is possible to turn back the passage of time. The question before us is, rather, How shall we advance from the point at which we find ourselves toward the goal of individual freedom and high standards of living for us and for others in a world at peace?

To me this means that we must find our way through to new, dynamic, and humanitarian policies on a number of major problems.

First among these is the development of a new national labor policy establishing a fairness and balance in the relations between capital and labor on a basis of individual freedom of both, with high production and a minimum of governmental power.

Second is the development of a new world economic policy to adjust to the tremendous change in our relationship to the rest of the world as now the major creditor nation undamaged by war and with extreme productive ability.

Third is the implementation of the growth and development of the United Nations in its search for the means of a just and lasting peace, including the evolvement of atomic-energy policy, the control of armaments, and our program toward our defeated enemies.

Fourth is our long-term relationship with the peoples of other nations of the world, particularly Russia and Great Britain.

Fifth is the necessity of maintaining resilience and resourcefulness and vigor in our structure of private capital.

Sixth is the need of improving our economic system, particularly in those areas where decades of experience have indicated deficiencies, such as in housing and in health and in education.

Seventh is the development of the means by which agriculture can remain free and yet maintain an excellent parity income.

Obviously, each one of these major questions of policy could well be the subject of this entire address. It appears to me that a thorough discussion of future agricultural policy might better await the careful hearings and analysis to be made during this year by the House Agriculture Committee, in view of the fact that our national policy is fixed for the next 2 years and the situation as to postwar agriculture around the world is yet to be clarified.

It also appears to me that the proper place for a thorough discussion of labor policy currently is in Washington in the committees of Congress, which are even now considering specific legislative proposals upon this No. 1 domestic policy.

But I would like to discuss with you in some detail the fifth question of policy. It involves this entire matter of the resilience and resourcefulness of our free economy in the years ahead. This involves a consideration of the basic functioning of our capitalistic system, not from a standpoint of any one special interest but from that of the welfare of the people as a whole.

It involves a frank discussion of big business and of small business.

I believe that for the future vigor of a free economy in America and of a high standard of living with individual liberty it is essential that our Republican Party in the years immediately ahead be the champion of small business.

The future high productivity of this entire economic system of ours depends in large measure upon a high birth rate of new small businesses throughout the country, and upon the growth and development of many of these small units, and upon the constant maintenance of a very large element of small independent enterprises throughout the land.

There are many reasons for this conviction that small businesses are the red corpuscles so vital to the healthy arteries of American enterprise. The world economic history has shown that nationalization and socialization has come when there has been complete consolidation and combination of industry, and not when enterprise is manifold and small in its units. World economic history has also shown that when there is a legion of men in enterprise who have the authority to make their own independent decisions, then there is a toughness and vitality in an economic system not found on any other basis.

This is not to say that we should oppose big business merely because it is big. A big country needs a strong element of big business as well as of small business. The most efficient and effective mass production of articles for Nation-wide and world-wide distribution must come from large industries. But it does mean that we must vigorously oppose all monopolistic practices of big business. We must insist that there be big business to compete with other big business and that the avenues of small business competition also remain open. It also means that we must be alert not to permit big business to dominate our Republican Party. We must not permit major political power to be added to the other great powers that are accumulated by big-business units. Excessive concentration of power is a threat to the individual freedoms and liberties of men, whether that excessive power is in the hands of men of government or of capital or of labor. We must be vigilant to diffuse power and keep it responsive to the will of the people.

A rather serious situation developed respecting small business in America through the war. By reason of a combination of factors the numbers of small businesses in America declined very sharply. It is quite apparent that the conditions of war, the allocations of priorities of material, the scarcity of manpower, the complicated regula-

tions and controls, the departure of owners themselves for military services, the urgent need of concentration of war production, combined to bring these results. Statistics show that in 4 years' time through the war, from 1940 down to 1944, the numbers of small businesses decreased to the extent of 500,000 In other words, in 1940 there were 3,307,000 small businesses. By 1944 this had dropped to 2,839,000.

With the ending of the war, this very adverse trend changed, and the number of small firms has been on the increase, to the extent of 300,000 or more. But on every hand come indications of the difficulties of new businesses in endeavoring to meet conditions, and particularly of the difficulty in expansion.

There can be no question that the ease of going into business in America in earlier decades has been a very major factor in the whole development of our country. The ease of starting an enterprise, and then of plowing back in early receipts resulted in developing amazing production and distribution, and in creating high employment and excellent standards of living. It made possible the starting of the small blacksmith shop and the growth to the great factory. It made possible the use of a small pushcart and the growth to the huge fruit-distributing company. It made possible the origin of the small local bus line and the growth to the extensive transportation system. It made possible the small experimental laboratory, and the growth to remarkable electrical enterprises. Specifically, as to the days ahead, it appears to me to be essential that we make it easier than it now is for new small businesses to start and to grow and expand.

Included among the steps toward this end, I would suggest the following:

First. A special adjustment of our tax structure reducing the tax on the first portion of business net income to facilitate the survival and expansion of the small enterprise.

Second. Revision of our tax laws to permit the small enterprise to build up its reserves and its capital structure, whether incorporated or not.

Third. Simplification of governmental controls, even when they are essential, so that they can be readily complied with by small enterprise without extensive legal or accounting advice.

Fourth. Correcting the collective-bargaining procedure so that if the employees are unionized, a small business is not confronted with a large number of unions to negotiate with. This might be accomplished through a provision requiring various crafts to designate the same bargaining representative in a small unit.

Fifth. Decentralizing the administration of national governmental policies so that the small businessman can complete his dealings on local levels of government without the expense and delay of dealing with the National Capital.

Sixth. Constant vigilant opposition to all monopolistic practices and unfair combinations which tend to wipe out competition or to stifle the new growth of small enterprise.

Each of these specific steps is attainable if there is a determination to work them out. I do not present them with any attitude of finality, but rather to stimulate other proposals toward the same objectives within our Republican Party. I am convinced that our Republican Party should definitely develop and carry through proposals of some such nature to make it easier once again for small businesses to be born and to grow and to expand.

The proposals as to taxes need not be extreme and need not involve large sums of money. A total of a half billion dollars in prospective tax revenue applied in reduction of taxes for these specific purposes would give very significant assistance to small business in the country. This half-billion-dollar reduction of taxes should be readily available if we make the $5,000,000,000 cut in the extravagant budget of the President which should be made.

Equally, the simplification of governmental controls and regulations, and the decentralization of their administration can be brought about if we approach them with the determination to reduce the power in Washington and to make compliance with the law clearly understandable.

Let me also emphasize again that these proposals are not made just for the sake of the men and women who are engaged in small business. They are made for the long-term effect upon the whole strength of our free economy and the welfare of all. It is very important to the maintenance of future free big business that there should be strong numerous small business in America. It is very important to the future of agriculture that there should be, to an increased measure, decentralized small enterprises throughout the agricultural areas.

There should be not only mercantile establishments, but also small processing and manufacturing plants, utilizing agricultural products, preparing goods for local consumption, and playing a part in the development of thriving small communities in the midst of our great agricultural plains, furnishing employment, assisting in supporting the schools and other governmental activities, and contributing to a rounded, enjoyable community life.

Equally is this important to those who labor for the development of jobs and for the maintenance of freedom of capital which is essential if labor is to continue to be free.

I have spotlighted this one policy toward small business this evening, because I consider it to be one of the eight important policies which must be brought to the front in the Republican Party in this interim period.

Let no one underestimate the importance of these decisions of Republican policy. In the tragic wake of war the standards of living and the individual freedoms of men have suffered to an extreme degree around the world. The trend is adverse. But if, with ingenuity and initiative and determination, but with a firm adherence to our fundamental concepts, we demonstrate anew the success of our American economic system, a few short years will witness a shift in the world-wide trend toward increased individual freedoms throughout the world. Such a favorable world trend would be the best assurance that future Kansas Days may be held under conditions of peace and well-being for the people of Kansas, and of America, and of the world.

Dedication Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
AUXILIARY TO SONS OF UNION
VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR, U. S. A.,
Trenton, N. J., February 10, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEATING: I would like to take this opportunity of requesting you and the Committee on the Judiciary for favorable action on House Joint Resolution 82 relative to designating November 19 as Dedication Day.

It is my personal knowledge that last year, the public cooperated wholeheartedly and approved of demonstrations honoring the event. This organization planned and executed suitable programs amongst its members all across this land.

It is our purpose to continue to draw attention to the Gettysburg Address, and favorable action on this resolution would, I am sure, be welcome by the general public as well as our own organization.

Sincerely yours,

EDNA S. LAMBERT,
National President.

Control and Development of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the gravest problem facing this Nation and all civilization is the control and development of atomic energy. All thoughtful Americans who have read the hearings of the McMahon committee and the reports of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey, the reports of Operations Crossroads, as well as the expressions of Mr. Baruch and of the United Nations committee, are appalled at the frightful potentialities that this new destructive force has for all of mankind.

It is therefore to be regretted that a partisan fight is now being waged against the confirmation of David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Lilienthal has demonstrated, not once but many times, that he is a great American and a man possessing the vision, the integrity, and the character necessary for the high position to which our President has appointed him.

I was very happy to note in its issue of Monday, February 10, that the New Orleans States, one of the great newspapers of the South, had deplored the tactics resorted to by his enemies. History has demonstrated that it is not possible for a man to take definite positions and to be forthright in his advocacy of principle without creating lasting enmities. Mr. Lilienthal is no exception to the rule.

I was very much impressed by the editorial reaction of the Washington Post in its issue of this morning, which I herewith include in my remarks:

ATOMIC REACTION

The opposition to Mr. Lilienthal developing among ultraconservative Republicans and southern Democrats is in reality an opposition to the atomic energy law which Congress itself enacted last year. The awe inspired by discovery of the cosmic force inherent in nuclear fission has now somewhat diminished. And accordingly there has set in a reaction from the high-mindedness which prompted Congress to treat atomic energy as a stupendous gift of nature to be exploited only under public authority for the

general welfare. In its place is an enterprise-as-usual attitude which would treat the atom as just another invention—a new type of plastic, say, or a synthetic fuel—and turn it over to private exploitation for profit. But the Senate, at least, was unanimous in its statesmanship last year. Those who now deplore that statesmanship dare not openly attempt to change the law. So they seek, instead, to set aside Mr. Lilienthal because he is an administrator who believes in the law and would enforce it.

The atomic energy law imposes two severe restrictions upon enterprise as usual. It takes large areas relating to the production of fissionable materials and declares that inventions respecting them are not patentable. It provides for just compensation to the inventors through royalties but requires that the inventions themselves become the property of the Atomic Energy Commission to be utilized as the Commission sees fit. In short, it forbids private monopoly in the atomic field. The second important restriction imposed by the law is that it makes anything essential to the utilization of atomic energy, whether directly in the field or not, subject to licensing by the Commission. In other words, no patent holder may frustrate the development of atomic energy by withholding use of his invention from a company licensed to use it by the Commission.

It seems to us that this measure of public control—call it socialism, if Senator BRIDGES prefers—is dictated by both morality and expediency. The release of atomic energy was accomplished by the teamwork of many men of science working as Government servants with the aid of huge public funds. To permit the capitalization of their discovery by commercial interests or to allow a concentration of control to pass into the hands of the few giant corporations capable of financing activities in this field would be grossly inequitable. It would plainly, moreover, endanger the secrecy essential to the maintenance of military security. And, finally, it would make impossible the national control indispensable to international control.

What Senators BRIDGES and TAFT and WHERRY have in mind when they berate Mr. Lilienthal as "an extreme New Dealer" is that he would not countenance private monopoly in respect of atomic energy. He would resolutely execute the intent of the congressional act. But their quarrel is not with him. It is with the idealism and exaltation, in which momentarily they themselves shared, that led Congress to build better than it knew. It would be tragic if the winds of reaction were now to blow that structure down.

Welles on Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Mr. Sumner Welles, which appeared in the Washington Post of February 12, 1947:

ARGENTINE POLICY

(By Sumner Welles)

CLARIFYING THE ISSUE

The circumstances surrounding Ambassador Messersmith's return to Buenos Aires requires ventilation. They demand a fuller measure of public understanding than they have yet received.

George Messersmith is one of the outstanding public servants produced by the American Foreign Service.

He was consul general in Berlin during the early years of the Hitler regime. The records of the Department of State will show that no representative of the United States in Europe at that time foresaw more clearly the dangers to world peace implicit in nazism, or was so profoundly revolted by Hitler's crimes against humanity. The Nazis had no more bitter and no shrewder antagonist.

In 1936 he was promoted by President Roosevelt to be Minister to Austria. The service he rendered during the critical months prior to Austria's annexation was even more valuable to this Government.

Later, both as Ambassador to Cuba, and as Ambassador to Mexico, he greatly advanced the interests of the United States. But this was invariably done in cooperation with the governments of those countries, with full respect for their legitimate rights, and without injury to the susceptibilities of their nationals.

He was a convinced believer in the good-neighbor policy. Recognizing the advantages to be derived by the United States from the observance of its principles, in act as well as in word, he succeeded in strengthening inter-American solidarity.

Because of ill health, he was considering retiring in the spring of 1946. On April 1 of that year he was unexpectedly asked by former Secretary Byrnes to go immediately to Buenos Aires. He undertook the mission reluctantly and with full knowledge of its difficulties. He accepted the embassy only after receiving categorical assurances from the then Secretary of State that he would be given full authority by this Government to carry out the policies in which he himself believed.

No one with any knowledge of his previous career could have for one moment imagined that Ambassador Messersmith, once in Buenos Aires, would not have devoted himself to the eradication of every remaining vestige of Nazi influence. But he saw clearly that this could only be satisfactorily accomplished if the Argentine Government undertook the necessary measures as of its own sovereign initiative and within the framework of the laws and constitution of the Argentine Republic, and that the desired ends would not be attained if the State Department persisted in its fatally mistaken policy of unilateral imposition.

It has been his consistent purpose gradually to eliminate the causes for dissension between Argentina and the United States and to work toward the restoration of hemispheric unity.

The substantial results achieved are already a matter of record. If Ambassador Messersmith is permitted to continue on the course which he has set for himself, the remaining differences between the two governments can soon be solved.

It is, however, notorious that the efforts of the Ambassador are being deliberately sabotaged.

Every official of the United States must be willing to undergo public criticism of his actions and policies. Such criticism, when it is genuine and spontaneous, is salutary and in keeping with our democratic tradition. But much of the vilification to which Ambassador Messersmith has been subjected in recent months is of a very different nature.

A part of the criticism directed against him stems from persons who sincerely believe, notwithstanding the lessons of experience, and notwithstanding the lip service which they give to the principle of self-determination, that this Government should impose its own views as to the kind of representative government other independent and sovereign peoples should enjoy.

But much of it has been artificially generated by elements that should be brought out into the open. It is these that have tried to make American public opinion believe that the Ambassador's endeavor to achieve the desired objectives by constructing a cooperative relationship between his own Government and a constitutional government of Argentina, freely elected for a term of 6 years, represents the "appeasement" of a "Fascist dictatorship." This propaganda, reportedly encouraged by several officials in Washington, has resulted in some strange anomalies.

Because the Ambassador, as was his unquestionable right, had written to a few personal friends in this country, who were Members of Congress or newspaper publishers, to explain the situation in Argentina as he saw it, and the reasons for the policy which he was pursuing, he has been assailed as insubordinate.

Because he succeeded in winning the respect and confidence of the officials of the Government to which he was accredited, he has been accused of licking the boots of a dictatorship—and this with regard to the same man who was the first to warn of the dangers of Hitlerism. After having accepted his present post only upon the urgent insistence of the former Secretary of State, he has been attacked as being sly and ambitious.

If Ambassador Messersmith is fully supported by Washington in the policy which he was originally authorized to undertake, inter-American solidarity will be restored and the regional system of the Americas will again be able to function. Should his opponents within the Government be permitted to continue their present campaign, the successful conclusion of his task will be rendered impossible.

Those members of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees who see the imperative need for the prompt restoration of hemispheric unity, and for the conclusion without further delay of the hemispheric treaty of defense which is still blocked because of the recent policies of the State Department, would perform a national service if they investigated every aspect of this situation in order to ascertain with entire precision who the individuals and influences may be that are responsible for a campaign which jeopardizes the highest interests of this country and of all the Americas.

Lincoln and Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we are commemorating on this occasion, would say about the unjust attacks being made upon capable public servants who have been nominated for high office. Abraham Lincoln's high character and sense of fairness gives us a ringing answer. He would be shocked with some of the proceedings we are witnessing today.

Consider this marvelously wise statement of Abraham Lincoln:

I shall do nothing in malice. What I deal with is too vast for malicious dealing.

Recently we have heard objections to public servants because their parents, while naturalized citizens, happened to have been born in another country.

This is what Lincoln would have to say on that subject:

Let us remember that all American citizens are brothers in a common country and should dwell together in the bonds of a fraternal feeling.

Capable and patriotic public servants who have gained enmity of people in high office because they have conscientiously done their job as they saw it will find some consolation in these words of the Great Emancipator:

Let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

Members of Congress often wonder why more capable people do not offer themselves for public service. Part of an editorial of February 9, which appeared in the Chattanooga Times, is pertinent. It is as follows:

We wonder why more able and devoted men do not offer themselves for public service. Then we see Lilienthals, Clapps, Conants, and men of their caliber badgered and belittled for partisan or even lower personal reasons by men holding, but not honoring, political office—by men who ought to pray for enough understanding to grasp what Mr. Lilienthal meant in that moving definition of democracy.

We should feel a sense of shame at what has been presented to the committee in the guise of competent and relevant testimony. If there is any real evidence of communistic sympathies on the part of one nominated for office, we should have it made public. But we have had paraded before us gossip barely above the level of talk in a river front saloon—and this has delayed the labors of a Commission facing the task of making policies on atomic power.

The Flag of the United States!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, apropos of my bill (H. R. 234) to impose penalties upon those who willfully desecrate or mutilate the flag of the United States, a measure which the Congress should have long ago enacted, I am happy to offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article on the proper use of the flag from the facile pen of Mr. Gridley Adams, of New York City.

Mr. Adams, who entitles his article "Fly It Right," is director-general of the United States Flag Foundation, and chairman of the National Flag Code Committee, and, as such, speaks with greater authority in respect to the proper display of the flag than any other living person. Consequently, that which he has to say on this subject is of the utmost importance when legislation affecting the flag is under consideration.

The article, Mr. Speaker, to which I have just referred, is the following:

FLY IT RIGHT

(By Gridley Adams, director-general of the United States Flag Foundation and chairman of the National Flag Code Committee)

(Thousands have died for the flag, but not one in a thousand knows how to display it correctly. The top authority on the subject tells you how.)

During the war, a patriotic mother whose two sons were in the armed services kept an American flag flying night and day over her house in Tuckahoe, N. Y. Often of a morning she would find the flag torn from its halyard and thrown on the ground, presumably because she had left it flying after sunset.

Even an Army officer wrote her objecting to the flag being flown at night.

But, actually, those who attempted to correct what they considered a disrespect for the national emblem committed the very limit of desecration. For there is no Army rule against flying the flag 24 hours a day except, as the Army's Flag Circular says, "for advertising purposes."

The Army hoists the flag in the morning and lowers it at sunset to note the beginning and end of the Army's normal business day. It has no other significance.

Furthermore, if Francis Scott Key had not seen "by the dawn's early light, what so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming," we might never have had our national emblem. And for more than 40 years the flag has flown night and day over the grave of Key. It is also flown night and day over the Worcester (Mass.) War Memorial. And when either branch of Congress holds a night session it flies over the Capitol Building.

This misconception about flying the flag at night is only one of scores that have developed over the years, largely because most flag codes fail to set out fully all the rules necessary for reasonable respect to our flag.

The thousands of letters I have received over the last 20 years reveal a serious desire on the part of most Americans to be fully informed about flag procedure.

Yet nowhere in the manifold bureaus of Washingon will you find a single central agency where a citizen can obtain authentic information concerning flag procedure. The War and Navy Departments, for instance, say they have jurisdiction over flag usage only within their own provinces.

It wasn't until 1942, 165 years after the flag's adoption, that Congress ventured to draft a Federal Flag Code. One of the most important changes incorporated in the code when it was amended that same year (1942) was the adoption of the Lincoln hand-over-heart salute to supplant the old extended-arm salute which had been used for years in the public schools.

The Lincoln salute is supposed to have had its origin while the President was watching a parade. Beside him was a young woman who said to him: "Mr. Lincoln, whenever I see the flag pass I have such a feeling of exultation here [placing her hand over her heart]. How can I show that feeling?"

To this Lincoln is reported to have replied: "By standing just as you are, with your hand over your heart." When I told this story to a congressional committee working on the flag code, the committee immediately adopted the Lincoln salute for universal use.

In connection with saluting the flag, policemen and firemen, when on duty, are not permitted to remove their headgear because a part of the insignia of their office is on their caps, and to remove any part of their "office" takes away their authority. Many persons have written to me criticizing these hatted officials for their manner of saluting the flag. What the critics apparently don't know is that when policemen and firemen salute the flag they touch the brim of the cap with their fingers, which is tantamount to their saying: "I would like to remove my hat, but not being allowed to do so, I am doing the next best thing." Actually it is absurd to see a bare-headed man touching his fingers to a hat which just isn't there.

As for penalties for misuse of the flag, they are provided for in the criminal codes of every State. But the Federal Flag Code is not implemented by law. It is a code and nothing more, though efforts have been made repeatedly to have a flag law enacted. Within the last 3 years two such bills were unanimously passed by the Senate but were sidetracked in the Judiciary Committee of the House.

Abuses of the flag in most cases, of course, are due to thoughtlessness. For instance, at the first flag conference in Washington, the late Samuel Gompers made a stirring speech. When he finished, I showed him a photograph taken sometime previously while he was making a speech in Los Angeles. It showed him standing on the flag. He was shocked by his own carelessness.

And, again, there was the wife of a United States President who crocheted a spread for the Lincoln bed in the White House. In the design she had put nine United States shields, and not one of them with the correct stripes. And the eagle was shown holding in his right (dexter, honor) talon not the olive branch but 3 (not 13) arrows, and in his left (sinister, dishonor) talon the olive branch. As President, her husband's signature to any official paper would have been worthless unless that paper had borne the impress of the great seal, from which the shield is taken. Yet his wife didn't know how to copy the great seal correctly.

A swank sporting-goods store in New York City still persists, even after being many times told of its error, in putting the flag on both sides of a picture or object in its display window. Recently, there was a dummy dressed in a captain's uniform standing between two flags. A real flesh-and-blood captain who knowingly placed himself to the right of the flag would expect to be demoted. The only man ever permitted to stand or march on the flag's own right is a color guard with a rifle over his shoulder.

In an assembly hall you often see two flags at the rear of the stage. The only place the flag should occupy on any platform is at the extreme front of the stage, and just in front of the line of the speaker's reading desk. This is the "military right of line." Thousands of motorists have carried a small metal flag attached to the auto's rear license plate, not realizing that the flag never trails anything; its correct position is always at "the front."

And the position of the flag in the churches has long been in dispute. For example, the minister of a church in a Virginia town placed his church's flag in the position of honor—that is, at his right—and relegated the United States flag to the secondary position. To back up his contention that it was correct flag usage, he said the Navy flew the church flag over the ensign on shipboard.

Some of his church members appealed to me. And in a letter to the local paper in the minister's town I explained that a Navy chaplain's private pennant (its correct name) over the ensign was a signal to surrounding ships that the crew was at divine service. Such a practice is not intended to represent God above country, as so many believe. Certainly it would be a bit strange to proclaim a ship Christian for a few minutes each Sunday and a pagan vessel for the rest of the week.

That Virginia minister could speak to his congregation and didn't need to resort to a special pennant announcing that divine service was in progress.

During an American Legion convention in New York City the Legionnaires arrived for services at a big church to find the United States flag given a secondary position. Some of the Legion members had to be forcibly restrained from moving forward during the service and putting the emblems in their proper order.

One fact that is overlooked by some members of the clergy is that without the protection of the United States flag we might not have freedom of worship.

Some women seem to think that the flag can be used effectively as part of a costume.

A society woman in a western city, for instance, was seen wearing the flag as a bandanna. The flag should never be used as any part of one's costume. Another woman, shopping in a Detroit department store, and looking at some flag pins, surprised the saleswoman by asking, "Haven't you got them in any other colors?"

This brings up another misconception about our flag. George Washington, in describing the new flag, said: "We take the blue from heaven," etc. And in heraldry blue outranks red. But in spite of that, the song writers, to suit their rhyming problems, long ago set the flag colors down as red, white, and blue. The order should be blue, white, and red. Army literature, Boy Scout manuals, and the Federal flag code itself all give the colors in that correct order.

Because our Navy in its infancy got all its accouterments from France, it had to stand the unfair stigma of running away from the fight for more than a 100 years. It came about because the French eagle faces its left, or the sinister. The late Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, finally ordered a change by declaring that "the old bird has looked the wrong way too long."

Artists and illustrators frequently make errors in reproducing the United States shield. The old 25-cent and 50-cent silver pieces bore on their reverse sides the great seal of the United States. Millions of people handled and saw these silver pieces. Yet over the past 20 years I have seen outside of Government literature, only three correct reproductions of the United States shield. And if you ask the average person to describe the elements in the shield, he'll tell you, "seven red and six white stripes," etc. But the shield has only six red stripes and seven white stripes. And there are no stars in the blue band. It may also surprise you to know that this mistake has been made in Government literature many times.

Similarly, few people understand the point of honor in the flag. Primarily, flags were devices of war, and the simplest weapon of war is the spear. A spear's only use was as a weapon. And in attacking an enemy you keep the point to the front, toward the enemy. Now the flagstaff is always a spear. The original horseman was a lancer and his weapon was a lance and the colors attached to that lance were called a standard. The original foot soldier was a pikeman, and his weapon was a pike, while the colors attached were called a color. As the column moved forward, the points of lances and pikes, being toward the enemy (the point of danger), became the honor points. That portion of their scarves being next to the spear point became the honor point of the scarf. Thus, the staff-head of a staffed flag is the danger point and that portion of the flag, the blue canton with the stars, becomes the honor point of the flag.

In the days of militant knighthood a man was judged by his physical courage. In order to appreciate fully the significance of the word "sinister," and the care taken in heraldry that ordinaries, charges, crests, and accessories shall not face the sinister direction, one has but to remember that the arms on a shield and the crest on a helmet of a knight proclaimed his family, his name, and his personal identity. And when engaging in combat he took especial care that the charges on his shield, his helmet itself, and the crest surmounting it and waving proudly aloft should all face the enemy. To insure this, they had to face toward their right (their sword or right arm) side, the dexter direction. Had they pointed to the left, or sinister, they would have faced away from the enemy. To face danger was honor, and the avoidance of danger was dishonor. Thus the word sinister came to mean something ignoble and cowardly.

Another point to remember about the flag is that it should never be displayed below the heads of seated persons. This happened at one of the late President Roosevelt's inaugural ceremonies. The flag was tacked flat on the support of, and below, the reading desk. One of the President's secretaries insisted that such a display was in accordance with all flag rules. In reply I sent him a printed copy of the Flag Code which the President had signed (and sent me the pen he signed it with) only a few months previous. But I received no answer.

Within the last few months the Post Office Department has issued three commemorative postage stamps in the designs of which have been incorporated the flag of the United States. Two of these, the Texas and Michigan stamps, violate the criminal codes of all 48 States and the District of Columbia. Nevertheless, these two and the Iwo Jima stamp, all bearing pictures of the flag, are smeared by post-office canceling machines throughout the land. The Post Office Department's answer to that is, "The flag was used on a stamp in 1869."

In dedication ceremonies the flag should be the supreme factor, and should fly aloft and free. It should never be used as the unveiling material. And yet, at a dedication in Washington of a bronze plaque of the Declaration of Independence, and given under the auspices of a widely known patriotic society, the flag was used as the veil.

And symmetry should play no part in a flag display. You often see a row of flags on staffs. Every other one or so is the United States flag. No flag is ever placed on the right of the United States flag; and if there are several United States flags and only one city, Red Cross, or other banner, then that one flag goes to the extreme left of the "military right of line," never in the middle, for symmetry's sake. Watch the manner in which B. Altman & Co.'s store in New York makes its display, if you would be correct.

The present President's flag has been in error since May 1916, when President Wilson had a new Presidential flag designed. The artist commissioned to do this redesigning probably thought the "old bird" had been looking one way so long he would like a change. And so, wholly ignorant of the heraldic factors involved, that artist drew the eagle looking to his sinister. Several Presidents have been appealed to to have the error corrected, but they have tacitly accepted the omen.

Many people are unaware of the reason why the flag upon the casket of a dead soldier, sailor, or anyone who has seen service in defense of his country is reversed, in that the canton is placed over the left breast of the deceased. This is the only time that the flag can pay its respect to one who has once offered his life in its service, and therefore it is "reversed" and seemingly clasps the soldier to its bosom. It should be particularly remembered that never should the flag cover the bier of anyone except those who have seen military or naval service. A lighted torch held upright signifies life; pointed downward it signifies death. In a military funeral, going to the grave, the muskets are reversed (muzzles down); coming back, the rifles are carried over the shoulder (muzzles up). If a general's horse is led in the procession behind his coffin, the stirrups are turned to "face" backward.

It is only for military or naval personnel that the flag should ever be at half staff. If the deceased has been in the employ of a State, then that State's flag should be half-staffed, while the United States flag beside it remains at full staff. If a member of a police force, then the flag of that organization is the one to bear evidence of his loss to that organization. If he has been a city official, then that city's official flag is the one to be half-staffed. But in any half-staffing, the United States flag should so remain only until noon, when at that precise moment it should be hoisted to full staff, "for the country still lives and the flag is the symbol of the living country." The Navy thinks so much of its ensign that it goes the Army one better: Instead of the one-half day in the year that the Army half-staffs the flag for its soldier dead, the Navy half-staffs the ensign only during the few minutes of firing the salute.

In purchasing a new flag, remember fringe and tassels have no place on it. The flag needs no passementerie; no "painting the lily."

It is your flag—not the property of the Government or any branch of the Government, but yours to fly whenever you desire, as long as you do so with respect.

Long may it wave.

The Moscow Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the February 12, 1947, issue of the Christian Century:

FOR A DEMOCRATIC OFFENSIVE

At the approaching Moscow Conference, the principal nations confront an hour of decision which will determine the pattern of postwar politics. Because the course of history will be defined at this meeting, the Conference is likely to be protracted. Its agenda is dictated by the nature of humanity's postwar crisis. The steady disintegration of Europe since Potsdam lays upon the Moscow conferees a mandate they cannot escape. Inability to reach an agreement will in itself constitute a decision, and of such catastrophic significance that no statesman will want to assume responsibility for blocking a possible accord. By this time the obligation to determine the destiny of Europe which the victors have taken on themselves can no longer be evaded.

The central problem of European recovery is the future of Germany. Since this is determinative, all that has gone before must be considered preliminary. The agreements reached after more than a year of negotiation concerning the satellite nations are binding in form, but they are tentative in fact until an accord is reached on the central issue. The same can be said of the badly strained wartime agreements between the major powers. The future relationships between these powers will be fixed in considerable part by the pattern to be laid down at Moscow. The accord reached in the United Nations is in similar case. That international body can hardly continue to function in the manner prescribed by its Charter if the principal nations which drew up the Charter fail to reach an agreement which is consistent with international cooperation.

It is a foregone conclusion that the principal obstacle at Moscow will be the difficulty of reaching an understanding between the United States and Russia. Because of its preponderance of power, the United States must assume responsibility to speak for that part of the world which lies outside the Russian sphere of influence. The voices of Great Britain and France and, we hope, the smaller nations will be heard. But their views will have to take into account the fact that their weight in international affairs would be small indeed if they could not count on American backing.

It is therefore incumbent upon the United States to go to Moscow with a clearly defined policy, not only toward Germany and Europe but also toward the rest of the world.

Our foreign policy requires integration, so that it makes a consistent whole. There is some evidence that we have been moving toward a policy of resistance to Russia wherever Russian influence threatens our interests or those of nations with which we identify ourselves. Since Russian influence is making itself felt throughout the globe, our resistance attains something of the planetary character which the indivisibility of world society imposes on any national policy. But our present policy is negative, and it places us in the position of always fighting a rearguard action. What we need is a positive program which permits us to regain the initiative. Only by such a policy can we hope to throw our great influence in the direction of world recovery on a basis which holds promise of peace with justice.

On what conception can a global foreign policy for America be built? It can assume no other character than that of a democratic offensive which aims at the establishment of self-government throughout the world within the next 10 years. The United States can and should openly take the lead in this offensive. To do so we should recall world diplomacy to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. This Charter became the basis of the United Nations, for 47 countries subscribed to it during the war, and its basic principles were incorporated in the Charter of the United Nations organization. Although it has repeatedly been violated, as the Christian Century has not hesitated to point out, the basic conceptions of the Atlantic Charter still stand as the minimum core of international morality. Let us recall what they were.

1. No aggrandizement, territorial or other.

2. No territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

3. Respect of the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; restoration of self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of it.

4. Furtherance of the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

5. Fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security.

6. Peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and freedom from fear and want.

7. Traversal of the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

8. Lightening for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

The application of these principles to Germany is still possible, although it would require the repudiation in considerable part of the Potsdam declaration. For example, the first principle of the Charter would require reconsideration of the eastern boundary, for which the United States has called. Second, there is no doubt that the freely expressed wishes of the German people would prevent the partition of their country between the nations now dividing its territory into four zones. There is little reason to believe that the Germans are not now capable of electing their own democratic government. Such an exercise of self-government is necessary. The application of the fourth principle would enable Germany to restore her economy, in the course of time, to a point where her people would be self-supporting.

In action, the fifth principle of the Atlantic Charter would permit ourselves and other nations to aid in the development of the Rhine Valley along the lines proposed by John Foster Dulles, with other valleys or regions to follow as means became available. The sixth principle, as applied to Germany, would result in the establishment of an inspection system which would make sure that reindustrialization of Germany would not be turned to military purposes. The seventh would open the possibility of a resumption of foreign trade, which is necessary if millions of persons are not permanently to depend on relief for the necessities of survival. From the eighth, disarmament, the victors would benefit as well as the vanquished.

But it would be impossible to limit the democratic offensive to Germany alone. Throughout the countries lying on the perimeter of the Eurasian continent the struggle for self-determination is going on. To India and Burma, Great Britain, formerly the most intransigent of the imperialist powers, has offered independence. The Netherlands is according Indonesians a considerable degree of freedom for which they have fought. The United States has freed the Philippines politically, but hesitates to take steps which would reconstruct the island's economy on the basis of self-support. We are conducting the occupation of Japan in a way which looks toward the liberation of that nation as a free and democratic people. These moves represent a heartening beginning.

But they are only a beginning. What is needed is that the world be permitted to link together these beginnings by recognizing their true nature. Are they only a series of concessions, reluctantly granted in the face of overwhelming force, as the enemies of democracy charge? There can be no doubt that in some instances they are that, but not in all. The fact should be proclaimed that the democratic nations, whatever their difficulty in living up to the consequences of their actions, have disseminated the democratic conceptions which are now bearing fruit in the movements for self-determination throughout the world. It is not merely making a virtue out of necessity if we now claim these movements as our own and help them to realize their objectives. This would require strong corrective action in some places, such as Indochina, where France is ruthlessly attempting to suppress an independence movement, or cooperative action under the United Nations in such areas as China and the Near East.

A democratic offensive which would accelerate the drive for self-determination in the occupied countries and throughout the world would do more to deflate the nationalistic expansionism of the Soviet Union than anything else. Now the peoples of dependent countries are being told that only Russia is anti-imperialist, only Russia favors self-determination, only Russia is democratic, only Russia seeks economic justice and opportunity for the little peoples of the world. That is not true. Russia has a stake in stirring up trouble wherever she can, and the nationalist drives offer here an opportunity. But it is a short-sighted view which holds that the democratic nations must cling to the status quo. Rather we should take advantage of the gains we already have to our credit and present them to the world as the solid achievements of democracy that they are, and as pledges to further action of the same kind. Such an offensive would not only deflate Russian propaganda but would be impossible for Russia to counteract, stop, or pervert.

A democratic offensive would not only aid in the writing of a European peace, and calm the unrest among dependent peoples. It would also help to avert the world-wide economic collapse which leading economists warn is imminent. The official representatives of the 17 governments which are now considering the food needs of the world at United Nations headquarters warned last week that unless there is a quick expansion in both production and consumption, the world is headed straight for its severest economic collapse. Lord Bruce, chairman of the World Food Board, said: "The preparatory commission definitely states that unless action is taken, we are heading for a disaster greater than that of 1929 to 1932. This is not a pronouncement of irresponsible analysts. It is the considered judgment of responsible representatives of 17 governments, including the delegates of the greatest industrial and commercial nations—the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada."

A world-wide democratic offensive is necessary if we are not to drift into economic collapse and chaos, into conflict with Russia, into incredible turmoil throughout the colonial world. Resolute action on a world scale not only offers the best chance we have for averting catastrophe but it also illumines the path toward a larger fulfillment of man's hopes for peace and justice than he has yet dreamed is possible. The United States ought to lead this offensive. We can do so if we stop trying to develop a dozen contradictory policies in our international diplomacy and settle on the one policy which can win the wide support of our people. That policy can be expressed in three words to which even the people of Russia are ready to listen—peace, bread, and freedom.

Approach to Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Approach to Labor Legislation" from the Winchester Evening Star, Winchester, Va., of February 1, 1947, written by Harry F. Byrd, Jr.:

APPROACH TO LABOR LEGISLATION

The most important single issue facing the Eightieth Congress is the enactment of legislation to achieve a just balance between legal rights and responsibilities of employers, employees, and unions in their relations with one another. Common sense and the November election dictate the importance of formulating such a program. Its shape, not yet discernible, may become apparent during the month of February.

In preparing such a program it should be recognized that unions have become big business. Some control many millions of dollars and pay their officers salaries equivalent to those paid corporation executives. And, to cite one example, Joseph S. Fay, fourth vice president of the International Union of Operating Engineers, AFL, testified that he spent $40,000 in cash in entertaining leaders of other unions and otherwise maintaining labor peace on a particular project. So why shouldn't this big business be subject to the same rules and regulations which govern the conduct of corporations?

Not many persons will question the assertion that the root of the evil threatening our domestic economy stems from the unsound and utterly biased Wagner Labor Act. This measure was passed in 1935 by a vote of 63 to 12 in the Senate, and without a recorded vote in the House. Of the 12 Senators who voted against it, only 3 remain—Democratic Senators BYRD and TYDINGS and Republican Senator VANDENBERG.

The splendid Democratic platform of 1932 committed the Democratic Party to the strengthening and impartial enforcement of the antitrust laws, to prevent monopoly, and unfair trade practices. * * * And, yet, the Roosevelt administration, through the Wagner Act, permitted, encouraged, and fostered the greatest monopoly this Nation has ever known—the union monopoly. Never could the power of the captains of industry

of the early twentieth century compare with the destructive potential of John L. Lewis, James Caesar Petrillo, A. F. Whitney, and Philip Murray.

Involved in the issue facing the Congress are the legal rights and obligations of employers and unions, but paramount are the rights of the general public. It is because the general public has become one of the major victims of recent industrial strife that the need for legislation is so acute.

Excepting those leaders who face a loss of power, virtually every thinking American admits that our labor laws must be revised. How could an independent, freedom-loving individual feel otherwise when, within the space of a few short months, we saw one man, Mr. Whitney, bring to a stop every major railroad in the United States, and one man, Mr. Lewis, shut down 99 percent of the Nation's coal production? Mr. Lewis, it is true, called off his coal strike, but his decision was his own. Under our laws, it is in Mr. Lewis' power to take away our coal, and it is likewise in his power to give it back. Nor is Mr. Lewis the only one. Mr. Murray can accelerate or shut down steel production; it is only by the grace of Mr. Petrillo that we are permitted to hear the music we wish; Mr. Whitney is only one of several labor leaders who, individually, have the power to stop the Nation's railroads. When a few men possess such vast power, are we justified in calling ourselves free?

TO WHOM MAY THE PUBLIC LOOK FOR LEADERSHIP

If we are willing to admit the time has come when it is essential to curb the abuses of power and the excesses of the leaders of organized labor—just as years ago an aroused public clipped the wings of overly powerful capitalists—the question arises as to how and to whom should the people look for leadership.

Let's take the last first. Certainly precious little of a constructive nature has come from the President of the United States. He admits there should be a few changes in the details of the Wagner Act, which act he voted for as a Senator, but he has failed completely to come to grips with fundamentals. What good does it do to change a detail here and there when the underlying evil remains? His Secretary of Labor, ex-Senator Schwellenbach, who also voted for the Wagner Act, likewise has failed to face the realities involved in placing our domestic house in order. Among the Republicans, Governor Dewey, although titular head of the party, has no real responsibility in the field of labor legislation since he is occupied at Albany; ex-Governor Stassen, who, according to the Gallup poll, is second to Mr. Dewey in popularity, seems to have taken the position of attempting to be all things to all men, hence can be expected to contribute little, other than generalities. So in the majority party, the leadership will rest with Senator TAFT, of Ohio, chairman of the Labor Committee, and Senator BALL, of Minnesota. Senator BALL, for many years a dues-paying union member, is young in age and service but his ability and his political courage have stamped him as probably the most effective leader in this important fight. He is likely to contribute more than Senator TAFT because he lacks the ambition of the Ohio Senator.

FOUR FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

In seeking solutions to the problems of labor legislation, four fundamental principles should be applied. The first is the principle of equal justice under law, which is not applied in labor relations today. The second is that any concentration of power which approaches monopoly proportions is dangerous to freedom and detrimental to the public interest. The third principle is that free collective bargaining should be our primary method of settling disputes between individual employers and their employees, with the rights and responsibilities of the two parties roughly equivalent. The final principle is that Government intervention in labor disputes should be kept to the absolute minimum, consistent with a proper concern for the public welfare.

EIGHT ESSENTIAL CHANGES

With these principles in mind, and if it is conceded that they are sound, these fundamental changes in the Wagner Act must result:

First and foremost, industry-wide bargaining must be prohibited. Senate bill 133, introduced by Senator BALL on January 10, deals with this problem and drastically prohibits industry-wide bargaining when two or more competing employers are involved. The purpose and effect of the bill, says Senator BALL, would be to place the bargaining power of both unions and employers at the local community level instead of permitting it to be concentrated in international unions controlling the total labor supply of an entire industry, or in employer associations bargaining for a whole industry. This, in our opinion, is not only sound from the standpoint of the public but likewise from the standpoint of the individual employee. From the public's point of view, why should one union be permitted to close down all the coal mines, or all the railroads or all the steel mills? And from the employee's point of view, why shouldn't bargaining power be returned to the local union where the individual employee can participate more directly, and certainly will have stronger voice in the decisions which affect him so closely.

Second. The closed shop should be prohibited by law. A free American citizen should be guaranteed the right to work without paying tribute to anyone. He should be guaranteed by law the right to join a union or not to join a union, just as he sees fit. We think Senator BALL is on sound ground when he says, "The present strength of unions, the closed shop, the union shop, and maintenance of membership clauses have become more and more a device to consolidate the power of unions—not so much their power to deal with employers as their power over employees. The abuses of this power by unions during the war are notorious."

To be sure, there are many unions where there is little, if any, abuse of this power, but as Senator BALL points out, "The fact that here and there we find benevolent despots is no valiant argument for the institution of tyranny." The closed-shop turns over to an outside agency absolute control over the individual's right and opportunity to work and earn a livelihood. Isn't it logical to state that the temptation to abuse that kind of power is too great to place before any human being? Thomas Jefferson stated it another way. Said he: "Put not thy faith in man but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Third. The law must prohibit a strike against an employer because of a dispute between rival unions.

Fourth. Fairness and common sense demand that the law take away from unions the privilege of refusal to work on products manufactured by rival union members, or nonunion workers.

Fifth. Fundamental justice demands the guaranty to the employer of the same right of freedom enjoyed by a representative of the union.

Sixth. Unions should be required by law to submit annual reports showing the amounts of dues collected, and how this money was spent.

Seventh. Unions should be equally liable under the law for breach of contract.

Eighth. The company should be permitted the right to petition for employee elections to determine if employees desire union representation.

The issues involved in amending the Wagner Act, and in correcting the abuses it permits, are fundamental. The public should demand that their representatives adopt a forthright stand.

How To Get Along With Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Miss Marie Joubert, of West Warwick, R. I., recently sent to me a copy of the magazine Nation's Business, which contained an article entitled "Helping Yourself to a Good Congress."

I enjoyed reading this article; and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting it in the RECORD in the hope that other Members of the House will read it. I am sure they will find it interesting. It follows:

HELPING YOURSELF TO A GOOD CONGRESS

(By Labert St. Clair)

The new Congress will be as good or bad as we make it by our own attitude and energy. An old Washington hand gives a few tips on how to help your Congressman:

1. Write today: Your Congressman will get a lift out of receiving a letter from you—not asking him for anything—but letting him know that you have confidence in him.

2. Act as eyes: Help your Congressman by acting as his local eyes and ears. His chief interests are at home—and will remain there so long as he is Representative.

3. Be prepared: Don't go on record on a bill until you are sure you know exactly what you are talking about. Best preliminary step is to get in touch with your trade association and request every available bit of current information on the subject.

4. Check up: Make certain that no one in your business group—such as an executive secretary—has put the group on record for or against any proposed piece of legislation without first polling the members of the organization on it.

5. Be fair: You have no right as a citizen to ask your Congressman to support any legislation which you, standing in his shoes, would not back yourself.

6. Ask no favors: Don't assume that because you have helped your Congressman you should be given preference in legislative matters. When your Congressman gets you a hearing he has done a good deal for you right there.

7. Speak up: Don't hesitate to act for fear of being smeared as a lobbyist. Committees of Congress want your views and advice on legislation.

8 Give name: Until you know your Congressman well, always identify yourself fully when you approach him. Suggest to your friends that they do the same thing.

9. Be brief: Don't take too much of his time. Remember you are just one of the many persons in his district he is under obligation to serve.

10. Don't fumble: Don't let him feed you. He may, of course, protest against your picking up the check. But you pick it up anyway. He is under enormous expense, and the chances are that he has to cut financial corners to make ends meet.

A gentleman in the rear of the hall sends this question to the platform: "How much may we expect to get out of the new Congress?"

A question, sir, that can be answered only with another:

"How much will the new Congress get out of you?"

Congress, which usually reflects fairly accurately the attitude, energy, and willingness to serve of the people who seat it, will be approximately as good or bad as we make it.

Whether Congress moves steadily forward, stalls, or slides back depends on the wholehearted efforts of the crews of its doubleheader engines. Those two crews are the Members and the voters. The Member engine will be out in front, puffing, smoking, and sometimes emitting loud noises. We, the voters, man the pusher or second engine, and our job is to push, and push hard. Especially on the grades. The steeper they become, the greater our obligation to shovel on the coal and build up more steam.

For the next few years particularly, the climb over the hump is going to be a good, full, two-engine job. More so than ever before in our history, perhaps.

The presence of many new Members in the first engine crew makes it especially important that the second engine crew not falter. Making the grade is difficult enough for old crew Members who have been over legislative hills before. It is much harder for newcomers. There is so much that is new to learn due to greatly expanded Government activities in recent years. Persons unfamiliar with Washington scarcely can realize the magnitude of the job confronting Senators and Members of the House. Even as a 30-year resident, long familiar with congressional and other Government contacts, I find it necessary to explore new avenues daily.

It is to be hoped that you already have registered your willingness to serve in the second engine crew. Perhaps you did it in the campaign just past by helping your Senators or Representative directly, or equally important by promoting discussion of national issues. Whether you did anything or not, it is important that you get on the crew now.

Today is the time to make a contact with your Washington representatives and express your interest in their efforts to be of service to the Nation. For the sake of brevity, let's refer to them hereinafter as your Congressmen. All are Members of the Congress whether in the House or the Senate.

Write your Congressman a letter now. Maybe you doubt if you have anything of interest to say to him. But you have, and especially if he is a new Member. Whether he is new or old, like every Member at the opening of a new session, his mind is filled with doubts and perplexities. No matter how brave a front he is putting on, if he is conscientious—and most Members are—he feels his responsibility and may be just a little bit lonely.

Ever in his mind are the many folks he represents. He wants to do the popular thing, of course, for his job depends on that, but he also wants to do the right thing. That, in these hectic days, is not always easy to do because. Who always knows what is right?

So you can do a real service to him and the Nation if you will, at the outset, just drop him a line telling him something to the effect that the people sent him to Washington because they felt that he would do the best he knew how. You have no idea what a lift that alone will give him.

Maybe it will strike you that this would be a heck of a weak letter to write to a statesman who down in Washington is struggling with great international problems. There are two things wrong with that impression at this stage of the game, and he would be the first to tell you so. First, he probably is not a statesman yet. Second, the leaders have not called him in to date to give them his ideas on a complete foreign program.

Instead, he is the same lawyer who drew that bill of sale for you last October and said $2 was all it was worth.

The only problem with a foreign tinge he has grappled with so far this session is how to get rid of that spot left by a gob of Russian dressing on his blue-serge suit.

Of domestic problems, however, he has plenty. Where to find a place to live; how to get all of the boys whose fathers want them back on the farm out of the Army; how to find jobs for the scores of party supporters who are after him; how to reconcile the differences of the opposing Palestine groups that are waiting in his outer office; how to get on a good committee without appearing to be hoggish; how to arrange for the daughter of one of his strongest supporters to meet Queen Elizabeth, and the son of another to be admitted to West Point, and so forth. You think a man who is faced with all of that and much more does not need kind words and support? Brother, oh, brother.

Whatever you write, do not ask him for a job for anybody. Just about everyone asks Congressmen for jobs.

There are not now, never have been, and never will be enough jobs for one-hundredth part of the applicants. To ask for a job now will only embarrass him and add to his burdens.

Don't take the newspaper stories about the Republicans cutting Federal pay rolls immediately too seriously. They may desire to, but they cannot do it, ever.

Just because a million jobs are slated to be abolished does not mean that they will be. A lot of workers, it will be found, are protected by civil service. Others will prove "absolutely indispensable."

Not a few hundred will show to the satisfaction of the most ardent political investigator that they have been voting the Republican ticket ever since the first free silver campaign. More than you would imagine will hold tighter to their desks than the varnish on them.

When you write your Congressman give him your views on outstanding national and international problems. A lot of front-rank members of both major parties do not know all the answers to such questions today. There will be much pondering and some switching of opinions on these issues before the final votes on them are cast. In your letter, ask your Member what the thinking is on these issues. If he has personal opinions, he will express them to you. If he has none as yet, he will be grateful to you for not pinning him down too definitely this early in the session.

With a new party in power, Congress will be somewhat slow in passing even big bills. Of course, there is a flurry of measures of all sizes now, but passage of any of them is weeks away. If Congress this session passes a few big bills dealing with taxation, labor, and curbing of war powers, and cuts costs, it will do well.

Rather than pressing your Member for solutions of all the outstanding problems of the world, help him get his feet on the Capitol Grounds by acting as local eyes and ears for him at home. There is where his important interests are and will remain so long as he is a good representative of his people. If and when his principal interests move elsewhere, his constituents will sense it quickly—and make arrangements for other representation. Until then, the most valuable regular service you can render is to help keep him informed on what is going on among his voters.

CONTACTS KEEP JOBS

Wise Members never permit their home contacts to languish. One of the smartest politicians ever to hit Washington was the late Champ Clark, one-time Speaker. He kept himself in the House for decades chiefly by maintaining close home connections. Every working morning he would devote all the time he could spare to reading newspapers from his district and getting leads for writing letters back home.

Other Congressmen still follow Clark's plan. Go into the office of any Member of either House who has been in Washington a long time and you will see a stack of district papers neatly piled up awaiting his perusal. Most of these good Members have a standing order that no home paper may be destroyed until they, or someone in their offices, have gone over them carefully.

One veteran Democratic Member in a close middle-western district was too ill to go home and campaign this year. Republicans in the district, pointing out the narrowness of his last majority, his current absence, and the national trends, assured me that, at last, the old boy was doomed. Without surveying the district, I told them they were wrong, and they were. I knew that every year since the Member has been in Congress he has written at least 100,000 letters to his constituents and thus made his position solid. A good mailing list, carefully nurtured, has kept many a Member in office in the past and will do it again.

POLITICS INVOLVE PEOPLE

You can be a great help in building up a mailing list. In your letters, mention Bill Jones and Minnie Smith by name. If you can think of something that either has said about the Member or a situation, write about it. Grains of sand? Sure, but they help make concrete blocks for solid political foundations

The average congressional district consists of about 250,000 persons and a Senator's constituency is his entire State population. Yet every House and Senate Member is supposed, any time after his first election, to recognize the full name of every voter and instantly know all about all the members of his family.

Failure to recognize them when home often is highly embarrassing to a Member. You can help him over such hurdles. If you see him alone among strangers to him but acquaintances of yours, offer your services in helping make identifications.

Until you know a Member well, always identify yourself fully when you approach him. Suggest to your friends that they do the same thing. You have no idea how much it will help him, and he will appreciate it. Sure, he will say, "Why, Bill, you don't have to identify yourself to me." But to himself he probably is saying ,"My gosh, I didn't know him from a side of sole leather." It is difficult to remember everybody, even if you are a Congressman.

As the big problems are disposed of in this and subsequent sessions, Congress will gradually broaden its base of operations. Someday something will arise which will be of particular interest to you or your local, State, or national trade, industry, or profession. Then it will be your duty as a citizen and a businessman to do everything you can to help throw light on the situation for the benefit of all concerned.

DON'T BE SCARED AWAY

Do not hesitate to act because you feel that somebody will smear you as a lobbyist. That is a scare term often used by persons who hope business never will express itself on legislation, but supinely accept any suggested measure regardless of its possible effects.

The new law defining lobbying activities certainly does not prevent you from discussing proposed laws with your friends, writing to your Congressman or appearing before committees. The lobbying law was designed largely to bring to light racketeers who solicit fat fees for so-called influence and render no service to either their retainers or Congress. Specifically exempted from registration are persons who only appear before congressional committees. Of course, the constitutional right to communicate with your Congressmen also stands.

As a matter of fact, Members of Congress rely heavily on these communications from their constituents and on the advice of the national organizations of businessmen everywhere. They also think businessmen have been too hesitant about vigorously opposing

in person bills which they regard as bad or about supporting those they approve.

You will find your Member cordial and grateful for the personal interest you have taken in his progress and eager to help you. Do not assume, however, that merely because you may have aided him in his campaign or given him advice or tips that you should be given any great preference in legislative matters. Your case should be strong enough to stand on its own feet. When your Congressman gets you a hearing, he has done a good deal for you.

Many persons who are eager to appear before committees never reach the stand, largely because they never have displayed any interest in Congress until their own interests were aroused. Some come to Washington determined to tell committees where to get off, and when asked the name of their Congressman are unable to give it. They do not get far.

HAVE ALL THE FACTS

Thorough preparation is essential before going to the Hill and supporting or opposing any proposed legislation. Never, under any circumstances, make any move toward going on record on a bill until you are sure you know exactly what you are talking about.

The best possible preliminary step is to get in touch with your national trade association and request every available thing of current value on the subject under consideration.

Do this regardless of how voluminous have been your mailings from State and sectional information sources. National groups are set up to render complete and current service, and they do it. Of particular value is their statistical information. Nothing is of more use in making a case before a congressional committee than unassailable statistical material. Such are the only kind of statistics which national associations will provide. Get them to supplement your local factual matter.

Whatever you do, however, do not write your national association telling it of your interest in forthcoming legislation and then sit back and expect the organization to carry on from that point. Be prepared to help the organization when it asks you to. Members of Congress have respect for such official figures as these associations provide, but they want them supported by field testimony, such as you can give. A substantial factual statement of one businessman from the firing line is worth more than reams of testimony from a lawyer or other special pleader.

DON'T ASK UNFAIR FAVORS

Common fairness also demands that the political welfare of every Congressman be considered in connection with the submission of any proposed legislation. No private citizen has any right to ask his Senator or Representative to support a piece of legislation which he, standing in the Member's shoes, would hesitate to back himself. Yet such unfair requests are made daily in every congressional session.

Seekers after legislation always are filled with vague promises about the support they will provide for their favorite bills if the Member will only get behind them. All too frequently, however, the constituent fades out of the picture once the Member agrees to go along with a bill, and is seen no more. Then the constituent wonders, or says he wonders, why the Member did not push the bill.

Businessmen have much room for improvement of their Hill standing as witnesses and as supporters of proposed legislation. Not all of them have made bad impressions in the past, but the least that can be said about many is that they deserve no orchids for their performances. It is true that in the roaring thirties many congressional committees were loaded with business antagonists who were not always exactly cordial in their treatment of industry witnesses. But not all. Numerous flops of business witnesses should not be attributed to congressional hostility. All too often the causes of bad impressions have been acceptance of poor advice or failure to exercise plain horse sense.

For instance, one scarcely can justly say that congressional antagonism has been responsible for:

1. The attempted promotion of legislative programs through enormous cocktail parties and dinners in the ballrooms of downtown Washington hotels or large rented houses.

2. The sending by wire to congressional Members of innumerable fake endorsements of pending measures signed by names copied directly from telephone books and similar lists.

3. The bombarding of Congress with thousands of identically worded form letters and telegrams.

4. The appearance before busy committees of witnesses unable to do more than read prepared statements, and who when submitted to direct questioning demonstrate clearly that they know little or nothing about the subject under consideration.

Here are some preliminary steps which should be taken by business groups prior to appearing before any congressional committee:

1. Be sure that the proposal to which you are addressing your testimony is fully understood by witnesses.

2. Make certain that no one—such as an executive secretary—has put your group on record for or against any proposal without polling the members on it.

3. Offer only witnesses who can both read prepared statements intelligently and answer questions asked by committeemen.

4. Warn all witnesses against ad libbing extensively. Let each present his part of the picture in the most pointed possible manner and then leave the stand.

5. Make certain that you have a man at each hearing who knows the source of every statement your witnesses make and is in a position to provide instantly, or to promise to supply at a later date, additional facts and figures if they are requested by committee members.

A final word about good rules to observe while visiting your Congressman in Washington:

1. Don't take too much of his time. There never are enough hours in the day for him to get his regular work done. When you have finished your immediate business with him, leave his office, take a sightseeing tour, go back to your hotel or otherwise occupy yourself so that he will not feel obligated to entertain you. No matter how good a friend you may be, you are just one of many persons in his district he is pledged to serve.

2. Don't let him feed you and entertain you at theaters or night clubs. It's mighty expensive. He is under enormous expenses—far beyond his Government pay—and unless he has a neat private income he has to cut financial corners to make ordinary ends meet. Of course, he may protest against your picking up the check, but you pick it up anyhow.

3. Don't stick around Washington after your business is done. If your Member has helped you, you cannot do better than make a beeline for home and spread the good word around that the district has the right man in Washington. Be sure also, as soon as you reach home, to write him a letter of cordial thanks, and have everyone you know who has benefited from his help do the same thing.

After that, from time to time, when you don't want a thing in the world, drop him a note and ask him if there is anything you can do for him. When he asks you to do something, do it just as if he were the voter and you were in Congress. He, you know, is trying to do as much for at least a quarter of a million persons.

The Late Honorable O. Max Gardner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, we people of North Carolina and the Nation will miss O. Max Gardner.

He was a true liberal who believed in the past achievements of the American people, by bringing them up to the present time and improving on those achievements for the benefit of future society.

He believed in the dignity and worth of the individual human being, which is the basic tenet of the American way, and he supported this vigorously while in public office and as a private citizen.

He believed in a citizenship that is morally sturdy and was aware of spiritual values. He was convinced that every individual has a responsibility to uphold and a contribution to make for the betterment of human society.

He believed that an uneducated citizenship is a liability and gave much of his public life and means for advancing this cause.

He accepted responsibility in a period of world-shaking revolutions in science and politics. We must not falter or fail his ideals.

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

SHELBY, N. C.—On February 6 the lead story in this column began: "Today O. Max Gardner sets sail for his new post as American Ambassador to the Court of St. James's."

This writer has never made a correction with more sorrow and regret, but that column should have read: "Today O. Max Gardner sets sail for a great new destination to serve at the court of his Maker."

And it should have continued: "Max Gardner in life seldom had time to do the things he wanted to do. He was too busy doing things for others. He was not so well known to the Nation because he spent so much time working for his friends.

"Max Gardner was the type of man who, when he sat down for a visit, wanted to know all about the other fellow's problems—never mentioned his own. When Harry Hopkins was having trouble getting confirmed as Secretary of Commerce, it was Max Gardner who sat up long midnight hours preparing him for the senatorial cross-examination. When Stuart Symington was having headaches as War Surplus Property Administrator, it was Max who gave him wise and patient counsel. And when this column was sued by former Congressman Sweeney, of Ohio, in one of the biggest libel suits in history, it was Max Gardner who spent long and tedious hours battling that suit.

"Max Gardner was offered many high offices, but turned most of them down. He loved people more than position. In fact, he hesitated a long time before accepting the proffered post of Ambassador to London."

GARDNER'S BUSINESS CAREER

"I was scooped on his appointment. Max had asked my advice about taking the plunge into diplomacy—a new field for him—and this tied my hands regarding any public comment. My advice, I'm sure, made little difference, but I felt that our relations with Great Britain never were more important, never more needed a blunt-speaking bona

fide American Ambassador, not a social-whirler, to interpret the people of the United States of America to the people of Great Britain.

"A few weeks earlier, MAX had sold his North Carolina rayon mill. He had built it years before, when rayon was new and had a highly hazardous future; so in many ways he hated to part with it. But his son, who had managed the mill, was dead. With his passing, something went out of Max's life and finally he sold out.

"I remember the day Max deposited the check in the bank. With some pride he showed me the deposit slip—in seven figures.

"'You're looking at a real live millionaire,' he said, whimsically. 'And I've no idea what to do with the money.'

"Yet, in making that money, Max had never deserted his creed that it pays dividends to look out for the other fellow. His mill was the first in the South to adopt the minimum wage; and last year, while Northern labor leaders were battling with United States Steel and General Motors for wage increases, Max voluntarily increased wages in his mill. He had found it always paid him dividends."

HOW NEW DEAL BEGAN

"Nor did Max, despite his wealth, ever desert his belief that the world must move forward to more liberal things. He always believed in the creed he expressed in a letter he wrote Franklin Roosevelt when F. D. R. was Governor of New York and Max was Governor of North Carolina.

"'The American people are on the move,' Max wrote. 'If I were you I would become more liberal, because I tell you the masses are marching, and if we are to save this Nation, it has got to be saved by the liberal interpretations of the sentiments now ruling in the hearts of men.

"'I am satisfied we are in the day of a new deal, and that many of our preconceived ideas and formulas are going to be thrown into the discard. We are more than blind if we think the American people can be hitched to the status quo. The campfires of the past are now abandoned and the frontiers of thinking have extended beyond the limit heretofore held sacred by the conservative minds of this country.'

"Max believed that creed not only in 1932 when he wrote to Franklin Roosevelt, but to the very end.

"So having sold his mill and deposited the money in the bank, Max decided he could devote the next years of his life to doing on a broader scale what he had long been doing on an individual scale—bettering relations between people. He accepted the President's offer to become Ambassador to Great Britain.

"Just a few hours before he died, Max phoned me from New York to say good-by. He was in excellent spirits and full of enthusiasm for his big new job.

"Only a few people outside the family knew that Max for many years had nursed a heart condition. That was why he did not run for the Senate in 1944. Bob Reynolds' term was up in that year, and though the two had been good friends and once shipped to Europe on a cattleboat together, Max was thoroughly disgusted with Reynolds' wartime isolationism—as were most of the people of North Carolina. All his friends urged him to run for the Senate, and he planned to do so.

"But at the last minute his doctor, in effect, said no. MAX stepped aside and his brother-in-law, CLYDE HOEY, won an easy victory.

"Though Max Gardner lived for his friends, in a way what killed him was his friends. After he was appointed to the Court of St. James's, he found that he had more friends than he had ever dreamed. All sorts of people, many with scarcely a nodding acquaintance, bobbed up with invitations to dinners and cocktail parties. It was a worse ordeal than if he had compaigned for the Senate. Yet, figuring it was a part of the new diplomatic game, Max went through with it.

"At one of these parties, given by Mrs. George Mesta, Washington's most lorgnetted cave dwellers were present, most of them strangers to Max. It was a social set that would almost rather dine at the British Embassy than with the President of the United States, especially with the Democrats in power. The speeches were more flowery than ever. Ornate compliments were heaped on Max's head. Former Senator Ashurst, of Arizona, even called the roll of United States Ambassadors who had become Presidents of the United States. Max Gardner, he implied, would be one of them.

"Finally, the new Envoy rose. And in very simple language he told the story of his first trip to England on a cattle boat. Falling back on his amazing memory, he quoted Little Breeches, the poem of an earlier Ambassador to London, John Hay, which concludes:

> "'* * * saving a little child
> And fotching him to his own,
> Is a darned sight better business
> Than loafing around the throne.'

"And even that starchy audience applauded the inference that as new Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, he was going to mix with the common people, not loaf around the throne.

"That was Max Gardner, who always enjoyed sitting on his front porch in a rocking chair given him by the Negroes of Shelby, and who now sets sail for a great new destination where he can sit and rock and loaf around God's Throne."

The Hardships of Abraham Lincoln in His Boyhood Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Will L. Krietenstein:

THE HARDSHIPS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN IN HIS BOYHOOD DAYS

(By Will L. Krietenstein, Orland, Ind.)

A short genealogy of the Lincoln family may be of interest before relating the many hardships encountered by Abraham Lincoln during his boyhood days.

About the year 1638, Samuel Lincoln, of Norwich, England, county of Norfolk, came to the United States and located at Hingham, Mass. A grandson named Mordecai located in Monmouth, N. J., afterward moving to Pennsylvania, settling in Berks County, where he died in 1735. Mordecai Lincoln was a man of property, which he willed chiefly to his son, John Lincoln. John removed to Rockingham County, Va. He had five sons, named Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Thomas, and John. Abraham was the grandfather of the future President of the United States. He moved to Kentucky in 1780. Daniel Boone and Abraham were very good friends, and this friendship may explain the latter's removal to Kentucky. The Indians killed Abraham in 1786, and three of his sons, Mordecai, Josiah, and Thomas, almost met the same fate. Thomas Lincoln, father of one of the most illustrious characters of all time, became a carpenter; no ambition, a friendly and most jovial of gossips; and when his slow anger was aroused, he was a formidable adversary. Bullies at different times nagged him indiscreetly, and he immediately proceeded to dispose of each and every one of them. He was of medium height, strong, well knit, and sinewy. On June 12, 1806, he married Nancy Hanks, the niece of his employer. Nancy was handsome, could read and write, and in this respect was superior to Thomas, who was not thrifty. He bought a small farm on easy terms on Big South Fork of Nolin Creek, in what after was Larue County, Ky., several miles from Hodgenville; a very uninviting region, soil barren and unproductive.

In a very rude and lowly cabin, of parents most humble, unlearned, and unaspiring, steeped in poverty most dismal and sordid, was born on the 12th day of February 1809 a child—a child that was at mature years to control the destinies of his country in one of the most critical and trying periods of her history, and after death to leave behind him a most illustrious name and character that shall always be revered and honored by future ages.

Of the parentage of Abraham Lincoln little can be said. While but a very young child, his father growing weary and tired of the unproductive and miserable farm upon which he lived, moved to another location a few miles distant, cleared a patch of ground large enough to raise a little corn, built a rough shanty, and again went to housekeeping. The family remained here until Abraham was 7 years of age, and it was here that Abraham and his elder sister Nancy, called Sally at home, received a few months' education such as to be had from the country school teacher in that wild and remote region, whose name was Caleb Hazel, and who succeeded to give young Abe a slight knowledge of the three R's. Abraham was quick to learn and never forgot what he once mastered.

In the year 1816 Abe's father, Thomas becoming very discontented with his Kentucky home and prospects, longed to move toward the frontier, and now advanced to Indiana. When he laid his plans for removal to Indiana before his wife she did not oppose him, as she said they could not be worse off anywhere than they were in Kentucky, and thought possibly the change might be for the better. So he sold everything not absolutely needed, and with the money he bought lumber to build him a flatboat and enough produce to load the craft when completed. Thomas immediately set out on a voyage of trade and discovery down Salt River and the Ohio, his intention being to sell his flatboat and cargo, locate a land claim in Indiana, and return by land for his family in about 3 weeks. He did so return, but part of his cargo was lost by the upsetting of his boat. The loss of a portion of the cargo was lost sight of by his enthusiasm over the grandeur of the location he had made in Indiana. The Lincoln family prepared to move northward at once. They had few neighbors to leave and not very many belongings to take. For a trifle, two horses were purchased, enough to carry their burdensome load. The entire Thomas Lincoln family was shoeless, very scantily clad, accustomed to hardship, and the children could withstand the day's rigorous exercise without any apparent fatigue.

Crossing the Ohio River at Browns Ferry, Lincoln's remaining belongings stored there after his disastrous voyage a few weeks previous were assumed and the 16 miles back into the wilderness was begun. There was no road and much clearing and ax work to be done. After borrowing a wagon they finally reached their new location. Here was their new home, miles from any neighbor, in the heart of the forest, which was inhabited by the panther and bear and the cruel Pawnee and Sioux Indians. Winter was coming and a roof was needed. Abe's father had no time to build a house at this time, so a pole shelter

was erected. Four forked poles set in the ground, two of them longer than the others, to give the roof a pitch. Across these, from fork to fork, other poles and more poles, cut to proper lengths and fastened close together on three sides, the chinks filled with mud; bark laid for a roof, a stick and mud chimney, the earth firmly pounded for a floor, and the fourth side quite open for entrance—and this home Thomas Lincoln's family occupied for their first winter. That winter Thomas Lincoln worked hard. Mrs. Lincoln and the children assisted in the heaping of brushwood upon the logs and burning them. Spring arrived and corn was planted—a few hogs fed in the dense forest and a log house was built. Although Thomas Lincoln was a carpenter and had plenty of tools, the house had but one room and a loft. The ground was the floor. For more than 2 years the house had neither windows nor door. Not even a bedstead and only such tables and chairs as Lincoln found time to build. One tin oven, a skillet, a few tin dishes, earthen pot or two comprised the cooking utensils; forks and tablecloths were unknown luxuries. Even from the standpoint of the pioneers this was poverty. Game, furs, and fish were available. Had it not been for these actual starvation would have befell the future President of the United States. Beyond shelter and food the Lincoln family had but little. The father and the son dressed in buckskin from deer shot by Thomas and tanned by him. Mrs. Lincoln made the garments. Caps were made from coonskin. Only in the very coldest of weather the Lincolns went without shoes. Stockings were unknown to them. Mrs. Lincoln and daughter wore linsey-woolsey and each dress did long service.

Thus it is shown in what circumstances and poverty Abraham Lincoln passed his early boyhood days, and it is necessary to know from what he struggled up. Everyone knows where the end of his wonderful life found him, but can one really appreciate what hardships the boy endured?

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Sparrow came from Kentucky and occupied the "pole shelter." Dennis Hanks came with them, who was a nephew of Mrs. Sparrow. Dennis was about the same age as young Abe, and they had been playmates together in Kentucky. Mrs. Sparrow was Mrs. Lincoln's aunt. The Sparrows were quite as poor as the Lincolns.

The summer of 1818 was a very hot one and brought with it a mysterious and fatal epidemic—fatal to both men and cattle. It was called milk sickness. Even physicians in the older communities were powerless to control the disease. Mr. and Mrs. Sparrow were among the first to be attacked and they with little Dennis were brought to the Lincoln cabin. Soon after Mrs. Lincoln contracted the ailment and through all the hot and weary days of August and September, without any medical attention, the sufferers tossed in the agony of the disease. On October 1 both Mr. and Mrs. Sparrow died, and on October 5 Nancy Hanks Lincoln passed on to her reward. Not even a clergyman was available, but it must be said of Thomas Lincoln, who had not always lived in entire harmony with his wife, he so far remembered and respected her in death that, when a traveling preacher came their way, he had service held in her memory.

Thomas Lincoln was left a widower, and with the care of three children—for Dennis Hanks was from this time on his charge. The girl and boys kept house, and with a father so unscrupulous, one can imagine just what condition everything about the house drifted into. As time went on the children became dirtier, unkempt, and ragged. Passersby, and they were few in that wilderness, commented upon the filth and miserable conditions existing. Matters went from bad to worse. In November 1819, more than a year after Nancy Hanks Lincoln died, Thomas Lincoln sojourned in Kentucky. He did not tell anyone about the object of his trip, but had left the children with food, bacon, and some firewood, and with ammunition and guns so they could provide for themselves. They were lonely and had no shoes to wear when cutting wood or hunting in the snowy woods. In December Lincoln returned. He had persuaded Sally Johnston, of Elizabethtown, Ky., an estimable woman with much force of character to whom he had in vain proposed marriage in his younger days, to become his wife and she returned with him. They brought with them a heavily laden wagon containing her belongings and household goods. There is no doubt that she was sorely disappointed when she found only a small clearing and a rough log cabin, but she was filled with profound pity for the poor neglected Lincoln children. They were soon cleaned and washed as well as dressed, as Mrs. Lincoln had brought along with her much clothing for her own three children. Soon she had windows and a door placed in the cabin and together with her furniture and other utensils soon had the place looking in comfortable condition, even though there were two grown people and five children to live, eat, and sleep in just one room and a loft. Sally Johnston Lincoln took the children to her heart and young Abe was her favorite, and young Lincoln considered Sally as his mother. She was quick to discover and to encourage his leaning toward study and wanting to learn. Human sympathy and deep affection soon sprang up between the two, which ended only at his death.

A new life was Abraham's, not by any means a life of ease and plenty, but it was so different from the life he had encountered during previous years. Two miles from the Lincoln home on Pigeon Creek, a schoolhouse and meeting house had been built. One Hazel Dorsey, who could teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, came to the school. What was walking 2 miles to school for Abe, when in afteryears he would walk 20 miles for the privilege of reading one book? The five children tramped the 2 miles through the snow and inclement weather. Abe already could read and write. When spring called teacher and the youngsters to farm work Abe had the pedagog's stock of knowledge practically exhausted. Abe was growing, not only by observation, but by thought. His principles were broad. The thirst for book knowledge was uppermost in his mind. One of Abe's characteristics and qualities was his passion for storytelling. He had in him an instantaneous appreciation of humor and mimicry and the talent to make other people laugh—the simple pathos, which in afteryears so often drew tears from those who heard or read his words. Young Lincoln, with his sense of the humorous, his remarkable memory, and his natural gift of language, together with his insatiable hunger for learning, led him at once to absorb all he heard, the good as well as the bad, and he became the most noted raconteur for miles around. He heard little that was elegant, but much that was low. The community in which he lived was not overnice and he never could or did forget. His heart was pure. We all knew what this storytelling served to him in his stormy public career and life. Gentryville was now becoming a business and social center. The barefooted boy was studying human nature every day and was learning unconsciously the art of drawing all men to him, which was of so much value to him in later years. If newcomers came he was the first to make their acquaintance, sometimes helping clear a patch of ground and telling a story or two, then—which was most important to him—borrowing their books if they had any. Three of the books, among the first he read, were Aesop's Fables, Pilgrim's Progress, and Robinson Crusoe.

After the opening of the year 1820, the Hazel School was closed until the winter of 1821–22. Then it was opened by Andrew Crawford, whose attainments were nearly as small as those of his predecessors. Abe was the prize scholar. At will, he could spell down the entire school, outread, outwrite, and outcipher anyone in his classes. The school term closed, and with it closed Abraham Lincoln's school life, covering in all hardly a year's time. Of geography, of grammar and compositon he had not been taught a word. In time, as he found out that the world is round and said so to his girl friend, his statement was laughed at. "One of Abe's jokes," she said. He obtained somewhere a blank book. In this he copied many quotations from books. Paper was very costly and other blank books hard to obtain. Before any sentence was written in the blank book every useless word was eliminated. In order to do this he had recourse to genuine backwoods inconvenience. By the fireplace stood a wooden shovel. Smoothing and shaving it with his father's tools, and with a little charcoal, he tried his literary experiments. A new shingle by day served the purpose and the practice was inexpensive. Who can visualize what good influence this lack of paper had in fitting him to write the great Cooper Institute speech, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the Gettysburg address. All classics. A United States history fell into his hands about this time and was eagerly read. He borrowed a copy of Weems' Life of Washington from a neighbor. One rainy night, before he climbed the pegs which served as a stairway to his loft, he laid the precious history upon a shelf and the next morning found it soaked with water, which had entered through an unsuspected leak. After drying the book, he found that it was in no condition to return to the owner, so he had to pull corn fodder for 3 days for the neighbor at 25 cents a day, and earned his first book. Abe knew the man had driven a hard bargain and they were never friends after that.

Abe's only sister died at this time and the boy was left with but one near relative—his father. Abe was 15 now and as large as any grown man and at 17 reached his full height—6 feet and 4 inches without his shoes—he had no stockings. Mrs. Lincoln insisted that the farm work should be done and as Dennis Hanks and young Johnston could do most of the work, Abe hired out to other farmers and had access to reading books as well as new characters. The small wages he received went to his father. His longest service at this time was with John Taylor, who owned a ferry at the mouth of Anderson's Creek on the Ohio River. Here he read many books and met a great many travelers, from whom he obtained as much information about everything of interest as he possibly could. At all gatherings where feats of strength were performed he was always first. He could throw a heavier hammer, could lift a heavier dead weight, and outrun and run farther than any other contestant, as well as throw any man in the region at wrestling. These feats gave him much popularity in the community. Abe had one peculiarity that puzzled people and that was he refused to drink liquor.

In 1828, when 19 years of age, Abe Lincoln engaged with Mr. Gentry for service to be performed at Gentry's Landing, near Rockport on the Ohio River. Soon, Mr. Gentry planned to load a flatboat with staples—bacon and corn—and send it down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to New Orleans. Abe was engaged as bow hand at $8 a month and his rations and a return steamboat passage. Three months were required in completing the round trip. These trips made Abe familiar with the slave system. He saw it in its worst and most barbarous form. He saw men and women working under the lash in the dusty fields. He saw the whip applied in barbarous punishment. He saw men and women driven like hogs to market and ne

saw the sale of human beings under the hammer at the slave markets. And this made of Abraham Lincoln an abolitionist in heart from his very boyhood. The wish for freedom was at all times in his thoughts.

Even after his admission to the bar in 1837 poverty and hardships were encountered by Lincoln. Poverty was still his bedfellow, for he had debts to discharge and he was too honest to spend an unnecessary cent until they were paid. He boarded at the house of a political friend, but he could not afford a bedroom, and his lodging was in his own office, where he slept upon a narrow lounge.

Thus it will be seen what the barefooted plowboy and farm laborer, who in later life was elected to the highest office within the gift of the American people, underwent during his boyhood days, hardships and trials unequaled in history—a boy whose school education was less than one year.

A careful study of the life of Abraham Lincoln from the old Kentucky home to the fatal box at Ford's Theater, shows how good a tutor is the fate that shapes the destiny of nations, prepared and developed for the great service of the future by the experiences and hardships which he was called upon day by day to pass—how every mental and physical quality of the future President was shaped. May his bravery, his love for his beloved country, his constancy, his justice, his mercy never die in the hearts of his countrymen and those that are yet to come.

Lincoln and Contemporary Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Asheville, N. C., on February 10, 1947:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot tell you how much pleased and flattered I am to receive your hospitality this evening. As a Maine Yankee I discovered the Southern States quite a few years ago. I can assure you that many of my fellow New Englanders have done likewise. In fact, there is some concern in New England, because it has been discovered that cotton mills can be located in North Carolina. But I didn't come here to talk about that.

It happens that this is my first visit to your beautiful city, though I have heard of it all my life and seen it portrayed in pictures. Certainly nothing could be finer than your landscapes, with their mountain outlooks, and I hope to come down here in the rhododendron season. You have shown me the utmost kindness and consideration on this brief visit, for which you will be poorly recompensed by any eloquence of mine.

Before coming down here I thought that perhaps a Maine Republican would find himself lonely in a Southern State such as yours, so I took the trouble to look up the 1946 election returns in your congressional elections. And what did I find? That outside the First Congressional District, where my friend, HERBERT BONNER, won an 8-to-1 victory over his Republican adversary, and the Second Congressional District, where there was no contest, elections in your State are nowhere nearly as one-sided as most of us in the North imagine.

For example, in the Third Congressional District, the successful Democratic candidate got 66⅔ percent of the vote; in the Fourth, 62 percent; in the Fifth, 60 percent; in the Sixth, 65 percent; in the Seventh, 75 percent; in the Eighth, only 53 percent; in the Ninth, represented by that famous veteran, BOB DOUGHTON, only 55 percent; in the Tenth, only 53 percent; in the Eleventh, 58 percent; and in this district, 60 percent. So that 9 of your 12 districts were more closely contested than our districts generally are in Maine, where we Republicans generally win the seats. In the State at large the Democrats are getting only 61 percent of the total vote. But in your State the Republicans run better than in most of the Virginia districts, except in extreme southwestern Virginia where Congressman JOHN FLANNAGAN squeaked by with only 3,500 votes. His district was represented by a Republican well within my recollection. Two of Tennessee's districts are always Republican, and we now have three of Kentucky's nine.

I should like very much to live to see the day when all the States, north and south, voted entirely according to their convictions on the issues of today without being influenced by old, far-off forgotten things, and battles long ago.

V Yankees realize soon after coming to Congress that our philosophies of government are so close to those of our southern friends that it is generally impossible to perceive any distinction at all. In these later days when we have clashed with the leftist philosophies that captivated the New Dealers and so largely influenced the Seventy-ninth Congress, the voices of the southern Members were about as often as not heard to match their yeas and nays with ours in roll calls. They were voicing convictions which I believe to be conservative in the best sense and liberal in the best sense.

Fourscore and seven years ago, our fathers elected the first Republican President of the United States. He was born 138 years ago day after tomorrow and died a martyr's death at the age of 66, leaving an imperishable memory as a great interpreter and seer of the democratic philosophy, and as perhaps the noblest spokesman of its faith. In birth, Lincoln was more a southerner than a northerner. Probably the greatest contribution of his statesmanship was to the South, since the South could never have realized its destiny, either as a slave-holding sovereignty, or in isolation from the more populous and industrial communities of the North. Had he lived, his contribution to the South would have been far greater. For when Lincoln said "malice toward none," he meant it. Few political leaders of the decade following the War Between the States were capable of that magnanimity.

But we Republicans shall not achieve executive power in '48, or even retain the legislative power which we won so dramatically last November, by basking in the light of Lincoln's greatness. We shall not even, in my opinion, retain merely by momentum from the past a place as a respectable minority party.

Our future depends on our capacity to interpret the world of today and to lead it to better things. The world of today is not a lovely place. Let us have the courage to say that for a generation, at the least, the world has been in retrogression. Thirty-three years is generally regarded as a generation and it was almost exactly a generation ago that Wilhelm Hohenzollern embarked on a course that proved the direful spring of woes unnumbered to this unhappy planet.

Let us try to gather a little perspective by surveying this generation as I think Lincoln might have done.

As it happens, I lived in Europe in the 3 years just before the first war. I traveled pretty well over western Europe and as far east as Greece. I never owned a passport. Turkey was considered by me and my friends as a rather barbarous country because to visit it one required a passport. The gold standard in those days regulated international fiscal relations in a perfectly satisfactory manner. The exchange between the dollar and all European currencies was perfectly fixed. There were approximately four English shillings, German marks, or Austrian crowns to our dollar. Other European currencies, whether called francs, lire, drachmae, and so on, were five to the dollar. One passed from one European country to another in those days much as we pass from State to State in this country.

There was in Europe, outside the Russian despotism and the Turkish despotism, no secret police of any consequence. Even in Russia, the Czar's policemen were children beside their modern counterparts.

Monarchies were universal outside of France and Switzerland, but in all European countries besides Russia and Turkey they were limited monarchies. The popular will always found expression. Civil rights were generally respected.

Taxation by today's standards was nil. This country first got an income-tax amendment and an income-tax law in 1913. The rate was 1 percent, with an exemption of $3,000 to single persons and $4,000 to married persons. There was a surtax of 1 percent on incomes from $20,000 to $50,000, and the surtax got up as high as 6 percent on incomes above $500,000. Think of that, and burst out crying. The precursor of the present Federal estate tax came in 1916. The rate of tax on the net estate was 1 percent up to $50,000. Estates over ten million paid 6 percent.

Many people in those days got very rich. I dare say many of them were more respected than they deserved to be, but there was at least general acquiescence in the principles laid down by Lincoln: "Each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights. The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues, and kindreds. Nor should this lead to a war upon property, or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

And again, "While we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

Or again, "That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interest should after a while accumulate property and after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace is right. The prudent penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves his surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires another to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all and consequently an improvement of condition to all. I hold that if there is any one thing that can be proved to be the will of heaven by external nature around us, without reference to revelation, it is the proposition that whatever any one man earns with his hands and by the sweat of his brow, he shall enjoy in peace."

I can understand these doctrines. They breathe the idea of freedom as I learned it in Maine and saw it widely over western civilization in the years before World War I. I believe these doctrines breathe your concepts of freedom. But this idea of freedom

is now ridiculed. It was ridiculed in Lincoln's own day by Karl Marx. It was ridiculed by the people who first made socialism fashionable in England. It was ridiculed by economists of the Maynard Keynes school as the doctrine of laissez-faire. It came to be most ridiculed by our most recent ex-President when the aftermath of a world war and bad banking practices struck our economy after 1929. He garnered his ideas everywhere except in the American past which he despised. Ours, he pointed out, was a mature economy. The old jigs were now up. There were to be all new tunes played by new pipers who took their pay not in money but in power.

Let us turn from Lincoln's liberalism to the liberalism of today. Let us take a definition from the mouth of the darling of some of our modern liberals, a former Vice President, who escaped the White House by only 3 months, the adored prophet of the common man. "Liberalism," says Henry Wallace, "is that particular type of leftward trend which best preserves and enriches humanity in its control over and appreciation of nature." In other words, in the gospel according to Wallace, liberalism is only a subspecies of the leftward trend and all you have to do is to decide whose leftward trend best preserves and enriches humanity in its control over and appreciation of nature. Is it Earl Browder's or William Z. Foster's or Claude Pepper's or Gerhard Eisler's? Any time you meet a man with a leftward trend ask him if it "best preserves and enriches humanity in its control over and appreciation of nature." Then you can tell whether he qualifies as a Wallace liberal.

What is this road from Lincoln to Wallace? The road even from the elder Roosevelt and the elder Taft as many of us remember them down to Wallace. What are the landmarks on the way? Adolf Hitler preaching the supreme state; Mussolini boasting that he bestrode the dead corpse of liberty; the dictators who still flourish in the unredeemed countries of Europe.

We have in all countries, ancient and modern, even the most primitive, great institutions which play their part, the family, the church, the state. And to these must be added, in modern industrial countries, the basic economic relationship of employer and employee.

Tyranny comes when one of these institutions unduly preponderates over the others. "Revolution is the result of the excessive power of one institution."

If the family predominates over church and state you have conditions that existed in medieval Italy and in some phases of modern gangsterism. If the church predominates, you have corrupt, priest-ridden societies. And if the state predominates, you have statism, autocracy, totalitarianism. This is the world-wide phenomenon of the last generation—the increasing absorption by the state of the functions and activities natural to man and to society. This absorption became complete in Hitler's Germany and in Lenin's Russia. It was approaching completeness in Franklin Roosevelt's America.

The facile apostles of New Deal concepts of the state loved nothing so much as to identify the changes they brought about with progress. Those who would turn back from the road to serfdom were called reactionaries. Let us accept the challenge. Why be scared by an epithet. If the road from state serfdom to a society of balance between individual, family, church, state, and the employer-employee relationship is reaction, make the most of it. I say it is progress. Your car progresses when it gets out of the mud even when it has to reverse to get out.

Lincoln was no doctrinaire. He did not think novelty was progress, still less that calling old ideals by new names was progress. On the contrary he said in his homely way that calling a cat's tail a leg didn't make it one. A cat was still a quadruped, whatever you termed its tail or its whiskers. In the Wallace form of liberalism calling a cat's tail a leg would probably "enrich and preserve humanity in its control over and appreciation of nature."

Last November, the American electorate swept our party back into control of Congress. If 1946 had been '48 it would have swept a Republican into the White House. We mean to put a Republican into the White House in '48.

Up in New England we invented a slogan that caught the country's fancy. It was, "Had enough? Vote Republican." We meant by "enough" enough of tax and tax, enough of spend and spend, enough of the totalitarian philosophy, of substituting price control for the law of the free market, of scarcity under regimentation for abundance under free contracts, of people who disbelieved in the American past for those who believed in it, of deficit financing for balanced budgets.

I shall attempt no catalog of the New Deal things that America has had enough of. You can all do your own catalogs if you will give yourselves plenty of time.

So in Congress, we have started the job of liquidating the New Deal. It is a big job. I shall boast neither of our prowess nor of our accomplishment. The people in due course will see our handiwork and, in another 21 months, they will decide whether we have been faithful servants.

Some things I feel sure we shall do.

We shall balance the national budget. We shall reduce the cost of Government. We shall take men off the Federal pay roll (which stands at 2,300,000 today). We shall start to peg away at the national debt. I hope we shall reduce personal-income taxes. I cannot say how much. This fiscal problem is not simple. We are much more likely to err on the side of hurrying it, oversimplifying it, than on the side of deliberation and calm.

We shall attempt a solution of the problems of labor-management relationships. We shall legislate to protect the rights of the public when the public health and safety are endangered by work stoppages. We shall define the limits of the right to strike which, like all the great civil rights, is a qualified right and not an unqualified right.

We shall amend the Wagner Labor Relations Act to give a broader definition to unfair labor practices. We shall say what is not cricket for employees and what is not cricket for employers. We shall deal with jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts, secondary picketing.

We shall take steps to democratize labor unions and make them answerable for contracts, not merely to other organizations but to their own members. We shall make the labor union man stand erect in his union and not cower before his union leaders.

We shall be denounced for all this. The labor union leaders will shriek that we are enemies of labor, that we are robbing labor of its bargaining power, that we are Fascists. And so on. The public will not believe them. The rank and file labor union man will not believe them. We shall do more than any other administration has ever done for the honest, industrious, decent laborer who wants to work and produce and not to featherbed or malinger or be paid overtime for putting on his overcoat. Those are the men who really represent American labor and not the usurpers who see in the labor union only a means for their own advancement, a stepping stone to more and more political power.

We shall restore constitutional government. We shall strike at regimentation wherever we see it. When we Republicans destroyed OPA last summer we did the best thing that could have been done for the American economy. We were denounced for causing inflation. Instead, we put a stop to inflation. To be sure prices rose for a little while. Today all along the line they are coming down. The free market is making what it always makes—freemen.

We shall make Congress the legislative body in the country, and strike at the tomes of directives and Executive orders which are bigger than the metropolitan telephone directories, and make less sense.

We shall try to restore respect for the judiciary. We shall make character and learning in the law the dominant prerequisite for judicial office, not the espousal of a social theory, or servility to a party organization.

I think we shall do these things and more. When we have done them we shall have been the most progressive reactionaries the country ever saw. We shall not have to witch hunt for Communists. In a prosperous America the Communists will never gain a foothold. Intellectual confusion makes Communists. Moscow only keeps them up to mischief.

The Democrats will taunt us. They will play all the demagogic tricks. They will hark back to the New Deal philosophy which taught that every man with more than a minimum income was an economic royalist, a money changer, an idler lolling in his club. We shall see whether this hokum will pull crocodile tears from the audiences of 1948.

I should like to see a Republican Party courageous enough and honest enough to face the facts of our economic life, whether people like them or not. If we are right we shall elect Presidents. If we are wrong, we shan't deserve them.

The object lessons of failure surround us. Shattered Europe is the monument of totalitarianism. Even in poor England, a Labor government is passing an agricultural act which will take a man's farm away from him if he doesn't farm to suit the authorities in Westminster. How long will Britishers endure that?

When Lincoln said that we should not endure half-slave and half-free he spoke a far greater truth than he knew. He was talking of America. We are talking of the world.

If the Republicans have vision and courage they will be worthy of their first President. If they have it not, then let us not try to conjure with the name of Abraham Lincoln.

O. Max Gardner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I attended the funeral of one of the most distinguished sons ever produced by the great State of North Carolina, the Honorable O. Max Gardner.

One time governor and always a great leader, he passed away at the height of his fame and glory. The archives of North Carolina's political history will record him as one of the superb statesmen of his day.

Many fitting tributes have been paid to Governor Gardner since his departure. I witnessed the outstanding event of them all. I saw 10,000 people with expressions of sorrow upon their faces pass before his bier. They were people of all walks of life in America, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the white and the black. A great majority of them, as was expected, were North Carolinians. They were people whom he had served as Governor, as counselor, and as leader. For decades they had pointed to him with pride because indeed he represented the

spirit and aspiration of all Tarheelians. He fulfilled their ambition of "men to match our mountains."

While the Nation mourns the passing of this great statesman the people who knew him best and who loved him most, the citizenry of North Carolina, are the most profoundly bereaved.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that O. Max Gardner has left a great heritage to the people of his State, a shining example of accomplishments through courage, determination, and a life sublime.

Supply of Fertilizer Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement, which was made by Mr. Herbert H. Meyers, vice president of the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corp., Richmond, Va., before the Fertilizer Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture at its hearing January 31, 1947:

Gentlemen of the committee, it is a privilege to appear before you to discuss the supply of fertilizer materials for the current season.

It seems to me that the emphasis has been wrongly placed when referring to the fertilizer situation in the United States for this spring season. The supply of fertilizers and materials, despite local shortages, probably will equal, if not break, the all-time record for the country. The emphasis should be placed upon the demand, which is also a record breaker.

The achievements of the fertilizer industry over the war period in reference to production and distribution are something that the industry should be proud of and for which it should receive commendation. In spite of all the hindrances and adverse circumstances which prevailed during the war period, the industry was able to more than double its production of all essential materials in the period between 1938 and 1946. Even last year, in the 1945–46 period, under conditions of interrupted production, because of strikes on the railroads and in the coal industry and steel industry, the production and distribution of fertilizers increased sufficiently to establish a new record, and the present season bids fair to equal that record. I will not burden you with detailed statistics because they have been adequately presented in a statement by the United States Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration, in the 1946–47 fertilizer program issued this month, but I shall refer you first to their statement on phosphate production.

It is likely that the production of superphosphate this year will exceed last year's record production. The essential materials in the production of superphosphate are phosphate rock and sulfuric acid. Approximately 6,000,000 long tons of phosphate rock will be produced in this country this year, of which probably less than 10 percent will be exported. The major portion of the rest will be converted to superphosphate for domestic use. Compare this with the year 1940, in which about 4,000,000 tons were produced, of which about a million tons were exported. Increased production in phosphate rock was accomplished by construction of new plants in spite of the difficulties involved in new construction during the past year. As an illustration, the corporation with which I am associated has completed since VJ-day a new plant for production of rock which in itself has added a capacity for half a million tons annually to the domestic production. Another company in the Florida field has announced the installation of a new unit scheduled for completion next summer which will have a capacity for an additional million tons per year, and other producers are increasing their production so that next season a million and a half to 2,000,000 tons of additional rock supply should be available.

The other essential ingredient for the production of superphosphate is sulfuric acid. Sulfuric acid is the barometer of the chemical industry in the United States. It is used in innumerable processes and the demand for it is very great under present economic conditions. The fertilizer industry probably uses at least one-third and possibly more of the total production in the country and it has been pressed to obtain all it needs to acidulate the rock available. The demand is such that it has been necessary to haul acid relatively long distances in tank cars to meet the changing pattern of demand for superphosphate in the country. Lack of tank cars in many instances has slowed down or interfered with the production of superphosphates, and local shortages of acid in various parts of the country have created local deficiencies in supply and dislocation of distribution of superphosphate. Transportation difficulties also in obtaining sufficient boxcars have seriously interfered with the delivery of phosphate rock in various sections of the country. Officials of the American Association of Railroads tell us that the railroads are retiring cars of all types at the rate of approximately 5,000 per month, while the rate at present of building new cars for replacement has been averaging about 3,300 per month. Nevertheless, in spite of all these difficulties the production of superphosphates will probably exceed that of any year in the history of the country.

As shown in the report of the Department of Agriculture, there is no dearth of capacity to make superphosphates. The capacity to produce concentrated superphosphate is at present being expanded materially by industry. It may be interesting to note that a large plant for this purpose has gone into production within the last year or two, but some of its output is being exported at the direction of the Government. The production of superphosphates now is merely limited by the ability to supply raw materials and to expand productive capacity of both rock and sulfuric acid. The industry is expanding the capacity for both these materials just as rapidly as building supplies and machinery become available.

NITROGEN

Referring again to the report of the Department of Agriculture, it is indicated in this report that an over-all anticipated total supply of nitrogen for the current season will be about 693,000 tons in comparison with 702,000 tons last year and an average of 371,000 tons for the prewar period 1935–39.

It is obvious that there will not be any serious diminution in over-all supply in comparison with the previous year and that there is a vast increase in comparison with the prewar period. However, the nitrogen picture is far more complicated than that of the phosphates because of the various forms in which nitrogen is used and because of the agricultural methods of using nitrogen containing materials. Furthermore, the impact of world demand for nitrogen has been much more significant in relation to our domestic supply than in respect to phosphates. The allocations of the International Emergency Food Council and the action of the Army in supplying occupied territories have had a significant effect both in the amount available and the timing of deliveries of domestic supplies. A large amount of the nitrogen available in the United States for use in fertilizers is produced in the form of liquids which only can be used in the preparation of complete mixed fertilizers and then only to a limited extent. These liquids or solutions are furnishing a major portion of the nitrogen needed in mixed fertilizers, but a certain amount of solid forms is necessary to make the required grades of mixed fertilizers. However, a greater amount of the solid nitrogen-containing materials is used for direct application to the soil as so-called top dressers. The primary materials used for such purposes are nitrate of soda and ammonium nitrate. Traditionally, nitrate of soda has been the main material for top-dressing purposes. Chile supplies the major portion of this material. In accordance with the allocation of the International Emergency Food Council, slightly over 600,000 tons of Chilean nitrate of soda has been set aside for importation into the United States during the current fertilizer year. This amount is probably no greater than that imported into the United States, on the average, in the years immediately preceding the war. For several years during the war period a million or more tons a year were imported into the United States. Unfortunately, it is now questionable whether the total amount allocated this year will arrive in the country in time for use this fertilizer season. The principal reasons for this are the maritime strikes in this country and dock strikes in Chile and other labor disturbances occurring last fall, plus the lack of satisfactory shipping facilities, all of which are obviously beyond the control of the fertilizer industry. Present imports are far behind schedule, and the prospects for completion of the total schedule are not bright, so that a shortage of Chilean soda is to be very definitely anticipated this spring.

The other major source of supply of nitrate of soda is synthetic nitrate of soda made in this country by the use of soda ash and nitric acid. This domestic source also will be in short supply this spring season, not because of lack of nitrogen, but because of inability to obtain the necessary soda ash, for which there is an unprecedented industrial demand beyond the ability of the alkali industry to supply. The net result undoubtedly will be a drastic reduction in the production of domestic nitrate of soda from synthetic nitric acid.

The other major source of solid nitrogen containing material for top dressing is ammonium nitrate. The amount of this material available by production in this country and imports from Canada probably will be somewhat greater this year than last, as indicated in the report of the Department of Agriculture. Unfortunately, however, due to arrangements made by the Army to supply ammonium nitrate to the occupied countries and to allocations for export made by the International Emergency Food Council, the timing of the delivery of this material for domestic use will be such that it will be in relatively short supply when most needed by the agricultural interests of the country. This condition has been aggravated by the coal strike and by other industrial conditions. While the total amount of ammonium nitrate anticipated may be available at some time or other during the season, it will not be at the right place at the right time for most effective use because of the complications indicated. Growing crops do not await the convenience of boards or committees. Another factor in the supply of ammonium nitrate is the pattern of distribution of this material which is somewhat different during the current season than in the preceding few years. Much of the amount imported from Canada, which for the most part is produced in British Columbia, is not reaching eastern markets this season but is being consumed in the far West which is its logical

market. A somewhat greater amount of domestic production is also probably moving west than in previous years.

The amount of cyanamid, also a synthetic solid nitrogen material for top-dressing use, which is imported from Canada probably is approximately normal and its distribution much as usual.

The supply of sulfate of ammonia, which is a by-product in this country of the coking of coal, for metallurgical and domestic purposes, will be somewhat less than last year, as indicated by the United States Department of Agriculture report. The recent coal strike reduced the supply of sulfate by about 30,000 tons. While this material is used to some extent as a top dresser, particularly in certain sections of the country, the major portion of it is used in the production of complete mixtures and its distribution in general this year will not be very different than in previous periods.

To summarize the nitrogen situation briefly, it may be said that the total supply is close to the peak for the country. The amount used in making complete mixed fertilizers will not differ greatly from the previous year. However, notwithstanding the total nitrogen supply situation, there will be a serious dislocation in the distribution of top-dressing materials such as nitrate of soda and ammonium nitrate, which will affect particularly the South Atlantic States in which a shortage undoubtedly will occur. This territory normally consumes large quantities of these materials for top-dressing purposes and they will not be available in sufficient quantities at the right times this season.

A Thought-Challenging Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following letter from Mr. W. Hume Logan, Jr., of Louisville, Ky., which is a thought-challenging letter.

I want to suggest that this letter reflects the sentiments contained in hundreds of letters I have received on the subject of labor legislation, which the public is demanding this Congress consider and act upon. I am firmly convinced that the public will not be satisfied with appeasement, evasion, or nonaction. They have had all they want of the New Deal method of pampering and yielding to the whims and demands of labor-union bosses and racketeers. I believe a large percentage of the rank and file of labor is thoroughly disgusted with the way the New Deal has handled labor problems and the labor legislation that was enacted by the New Deal administrations during the last 14 years. They demand action and are entitled to it.

I quote Mr. Logan's letter in full:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *February 10, 1947.*

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Somebody please explain:

Wagner Act in operation, 1935. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1936. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1937. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1938. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1939. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1940. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1941. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1942. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1943. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1944. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1945. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

Wagner Act in operation, 1946. The result: More strikes and labor racketeering. Congress says: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

So we have had 12 years of "not being too hasty."

And now we are beginning to hear the same old song as the time nears for action: "Let's not pass any hasty legislation."

What is the Republican definition of "hasty," when a bad situation has existed and has been discussed and considered for 12 years?

Do you think Republicans will be elected in 1948 if they pass some kind of half-baked labor legislation, after seeing what happened to the Democrats last November because they would not act?

The public is tired of unjustified strikes, high prices resulting from less work and more pay, and union immunity from the laws that the rest of us willingly obey. You were elected to correct this condition, and the majority of the public wants action. (This includes the 75 percent of union members who were forced to join unions against their will.)

Do you really think you should ape the New Deal?

Yours truly,

W. HUME LOGAN, Jr.

Abraham Lincoln—American, Republican, and Contemporary Prophet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by the Honorable HAL HOLMES at the Lincoln Day banquet held in Olympia, Wash., February 12, 1947, on the subject entitled "Abraham Lincoln—American, Republican, and Contemporary Prophet":

Although he is acknowledged as the greatest of our national heroes, it is only occasionally, not more than once a year at most, that we pause in our hurried lives to do honor to Abraham Lincoln.

We honor him for many reasons and from many differing points of view. We honor him as a great man who exemplifies all that is American.

The contrasts of his life were many. He came from poverty and obscurity to the highest post in his country. He developed from an uneducated rail splitter to a skillful attorney at law. He adapted himself from the humility and gentleness of his natural disposition to the rank and pomp of Commander in Chief of the Army and President of the United States.

The accomplishment of his life was in the American tradition. He saved a great country as a union. And the personality of the man, too, was American. It was full of complexities, and yet utterly simple in integrity, benevolence, and fundamental goodness. He was religious, a God-fearing boy and man. He said once, "Often I go to my knees because there is no other place to go." He was full of fun and loved the jokes and broad humor of his day. As a boy he liked to go to the mill and to loaf in the country store, swapping stories and debating local political questions. He is described by contemporaries as being manly, courageous, sympathetic, and honest.

All of these things, the contrasts, the accomplishments, the personality, serve to point up and single out the great genius of the man as an American. He remains the great embodiment of the American dream. As a typical American he came from the soil and interpreted our common needs in terms of common humanity.

Many of you men in this audience exemplify this same sort of thing. Many of you were poor boys. Many of you can easily remember your first jobs and the various hardships you endured. You can readily understand some of the handicaps he had to overcome in pulling himself up by his own bootstraps. You can appreciate some of the hardships he mastered as he turned them into assets in building a rugged character.

In all these things he is the great American, even in many little incidental ways. Like many American boys he grew fast—out of one pair of made-over trousers into another. Once he was kicked by his father's old gray mare and given up for dead, coming back to consciousness next morning with the ejaculation, "You old hussy!" Growing up this gangling, awkward youth gave little special promise—a deck hand on a flatboat, a clerk in a country store, an officer (not a particularly good officer) in the Black Hawk War. Yet today no figure in our American folklore or in the annals of our history is more loved than American Abe Lincoln.

Secondly, we honor him as the guiding spirit of our national Republican Party. It is significant that he early brought into our party a keen sense of the humane and the just. He constantly amplified his firm belief in the dignity and worth of the common man. The give and take of the life in which he grew up on the Kentucky and Indiana and Illinois frontiers of his day had taught him a sportsmanlike attitude of fair play. He was progressive and liberal in his viewpoints. He was both a practical politician and a man of vision. He had an unlimited capacity for hard work, although as a youth he once remarked that his father had taught him to work but hadn't taught him to love it. He had a keen balance between his more serious utterances and his ready wit and native humor.

Examples of his storytelling are many, particularly in the war years when he turned to the humor of Artemus Ward and Petroleum Nasby for relief and enjoyment. His wit was quick. One visitor at the White House inquired about the number of men in the field in the Confederate Army. "Well," said Lincoln, "there must be around 1,200,000." "How can that be?" asked the startled guest, "when the Union forces number only 400,000 men in the field?" "Oh," said Lincoln, "you see, when our generals get whipped they always tell me that they were outnumbered from three or five to one, and it's as plain as the nose on your face that that gives the Confederates at least twelve hundred thousand men." He liked to quote Artemus Ward's definition of the M. C. initials after a Congressman's name as meaning "Miserable Cuss."

Lincoln was ambitious and, in the face of his early poverty, he was a well-to-do man before he ever approached the Presidency. He had always a real appreciation of the practical aspects of life. His combination of sadness and sociability fitted into the many moods which politics brought him. But the outstanding contribution to the Republican Party was his appreciation of the rights of the people through representative government.

As Republicans, then, we can well return to him for inspiration in purely party matters.

We honor him as an American and as a Republican. And, today, when we all stand in need of wisdom and vision in face of the conflicting problems which confront us, we honor him as our contemporary in spirit.

What was the background, and what the molding forces that make him so up to the minute in our own problems of the present hour?

We all know the story—the log-cabin birth, the shiftless, wandering father, the hard physical toil, the meager formal schooling, the pioneer communities, the rough, boisterous play, and the regular church attendance, the mastery of law through sheer determination, the practice of law, the service in the State legislature, and, later in Congress, the trials and tribulations of his private life, and, finally, the arduous, heart-breaking tragic years of the Civil War. The outline is familiar to us all. We know, too, that he had a magnificent endowment of brain and spirit. And through the many years of his making, tested in the fires and on the forge of this new country, he came out as the finest steel to meet the gravest trials. His contemporary aspect is exactly this, that so thorough was that forging and so great that natural endowment, that he could step into our lives today with equal vision for the tasks ahead.

Listen to his words when he spoke in one of his earliest known speeches in 1838 before the Young Men's Lyceum in Springfield. He said, in part, "At what point is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us, it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide." We return to Lincoln as to a contemporary because in his great utterances we find wisdom and understanding for the present hour.

"This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it," he reiterates, and, "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere." And, again, "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?" And, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Any one of us here could find quotation after quotation as fresh and applicable today as when Lincoln first wrote or spoke it.

The reason he is so ever current in our thought is because of his emphasis on fundamental truths and verities both of the individual and of government itself. Because his grasp on the purpose of government and the importance of union was so complete, we seek his words today in this central problem facing us.

What is, then, this central problem, or what are the interrelated problems of our Government as Lincoln might have understood them?

The perennial problems which face our Government are closely related and are essentially twofold: (1) How to preserve a strong, effective, central government without jeopardizing the dignity and the freedom of the individual, and (2) how to harmonize conflicting groups, interests, and even sections of the country without resorting to undue concentration of governmental functions. These two problems which confront us now in relation to the problem of labor, in relation to the veteran, in relation to pressure groups, all are but variations of the problem of the Union which Lincoln so clearly understood. This problem of Union, which is the central core of our Government, is linked up with the thought of every one of the great figures in our past history. As Washington clearly saw, our international problems spring from the strength or weakness of our concept of government as a whole. Alexander Hamilton in the finances of a new country, and Marshall in the jurisprudence of a new country, were concerned with this problem of union. In a sense, Lincoln, writing and speaking on what appeared to be issues of his own day was really the universal voice of this universal American problem.

That this need of intelligent union without usurpation by any branch or individual in the Government is just as urgent now as at any time must be apparent to us all. Although the New Deal is dead, much of its propaganda and technique lives on. And this is, as Lincoln pointed out in the first quotation I read you, our gravest danger. The evil is a part of our thought. We have too long succumbed to the blandishments of free services of every sort. We have too long become used to the bureau or the agency or the department doing for us what we ought to do for ourselves, and what, God knows, we always wanted to do for ourselves. We cry out now for more and more of the governmental pap. Like the Romans of old who were debauched by ever greater circuses and free wheat, like the French under Louis Napoleon in the middle eighteen hundreds—yes, even like the Germans under Hitler and the Italians under Mussolini—we blindly have been taking what we get, doing as we're told, and turning everything over to the Government. This is not right. It is no way to continue a strong, healthy Union of free States and localities. It is a gross seizure of power, and we must fight against it as Lincoln would have fought had he been our leader today.

How did any government effect such a complete absorption of powers and prerogatives at the expense of the individual and at the expense of representative government? It did so through seemingly harmless and benevolent appropriations of so general and vague a character but with such high sounding purposes that Congresses in the past were ashamed to oppose them. The big spending agencies were always political in their contacts, and kept a large and enormous mass following assured. Together with the propaganda which was necessary to keep up their fronts, they became well nigh invincible.

The danger of this immediate philosophy of government under which so many of our young people have grown up is far more insidious than the slavery which Lincoln fought. It would make a form of slavery or subservience for all of us—slavery to government, slavery to softness, slavery to our own easy-going acceptance. We have been too greatly influenced by a policy of propaganda and spending, until we need above all things to go through the fires of denial and self-scrutiny which Lincoln so well understood, and which alone can save us. This pampering of a free country from within its own borders, has a long history. We recall the Roman circuses, but we forget our own past political circuses, with the old wiles in new guise. Past Congresses may have seen what was going on, but nevertheless surrendered, partially at least, the all-powerful control of the purse. The recent experiment in American politics showed that the leader must have enough fiat money to lull the voters to sleep.

As one journalist, writing as of January 1, 1947, remarks, "The Constitution cannot save us. The question is whether we are wise and strong enough to save the Constitution. American political institutions no longer rest, as formerly, upon hard rock. The ground beneath them has been mined. We cannot have peace at home or peace in this world until our own foundations have been reestablished." Do you recognize in this quotation as of the beginning of this Congress, the identical thought of Lincoln when he said that our gravest dangers are from within? The perennial problem of Government, as we see it dimly today, and as Lincoln saw it so clearly and so tenaciously all through the tragic years when we fought to preserve the Union and the rights of the common man—the perennial problem of Government is our problem here and now—how to save our system of free enterprise and the representative form of government in the face of internal lassitude and organized propaganda.

We turn once more to Lincoln in the threefold aspect I have mentioned—as our great American, as our great Republican, as our contemporary in mind and spirit.

The terrific rapidity with which our country has leaped from obscurity and poverty and pioneer freedoms to a position of power and prestige is paralleled by the life of the man we honor tonight. Our common national life has the same character of meteoric swiftness that marked Lincoln's rise to prominence. That our country as a whole may sustain the rugged character and stern integrity which was Lincoln's must be our constant hope, vigilantly guarded.

Yes; we return to Lincoln because we remember that he was wise, kind, strong, human, adaptable. He loved people. He shared in common sorrows and in common joys. He had experienced sorrows. He knew first hand the hardships of excessive poverty and hard work. He came to his great tasks by the hard way, the pioneer way, the straight and narrow path of many frustrations and disappointments.

In a sense we must all, as public-spirited citizens, dramatize ourselves in the roles of the Lincolns, the Jeffersons, the Washingtons of the past. Without chauvinism or imitation or mimicry or plagiarism, we must make a part of our very lives the great-hearted, broad-visioned humanity of our great historic citizens. Lincoln's utterances have become a part of the web and woof of our daily lives. A few weeks before his tragic death he wrote these words which we all remember, which embody our faith as a nation, and with which we close our eulogy tonight: "With malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

United Nations Must Make Poland Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from my address on February 12, 1947, before the members of the Polish-American Congress, Inc., at the ceremony at Lafayette Square, Washington, D. C., in memory of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, Polish-American patriot:

I wish to extend my thanks to Mr. Charles Burke, and the members of the Polish-American Congress, for the invitation and honor to join with you in paying tribute to the memory of that great Polish-American hero, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko.

There is no need for me to recite, in detail, upon the life of honor, and the deeds of valor, performed by this magnificent soldier and patriot. It is with just pride that you recall today that, of all the unknown soldiers coming from foreign lands to take part in the American Revolution, Kosciusko alone rose to international fame as an apostle of freedom. His contribution to the American cause is marked indelibly in our history pages to insure the perpetual respect and gratitude of this Nation. Every American knows that he was the outstanding military strategist-engineer of the American war for independence.

There is even less need for me to unroll, for you here, the record of his valiant but unhappy efforts for the liberation and independence of his own nation. Equally great in devotion to his God, and love of his country, he lived and died exclusively for the freedom and independence of Poland. The character of his life's work is cited for posterity in those famous lines of Thomas Campbell:

"Hope for a season, bade the world farewell,
And freedom shrieked—as Kosciusko fell."

It is easy for us to appreciate why Poland and American honor Kosciusko—he fought for America and he fought to save his homeland from the aggressor—for this he received the grateful thanks of his adopted country and his own nation—but these activities alone are not the reason he is given homage by the world. I would like to emphasize to you that the international importance of General Kosciusko, during his lifetime and today, lies in the fact, that along with the other great democratic liberals of the world's history, he stood, all his life, for individual freedom, as well as national, and for the right of a man to his own soul.

In this respect, I would like to quote just one sentence from a letter Kosciusko wrote to Michael Zaleski in April 1792: "There should be no unfree men in any civilized state, indeed, the word 'unfree' itself ought to be banished from every legal code."

Kosciusko's tears of spiritual anguish must be falling upon his native, blood-stained soil, as from behind the "hid battlements of eternity" he gazes down upon the advancing tragedy—of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism—that is enveloping Poland today.

From the recent formal statement of our State Department about coercion and intimidation in the January 19 Polish elections, we may well judge that the principle of political independence enunciated in the declaration by United Nations and the Atlantic Charter, is a hollow mockery in the present unrepresentative government of the Polish nation. It is evident that the Government of the United States is fast coming to the conclusion that Poland is not passing through a revolution, but is undergoing a shameless conquest, the victim of as bold and cynical a diplomatic campaign as any big state has ever waged against a gallant, honorable, but weaker neighbor.

Quoting the paragraph of this State Department release of January 27, which says: "The United States Government firmly intends to maintain its interest in the welfare of the Polish people," let us hope this means that practical measures, when necessary, will be taken to insure that Poland shall not suffer defeat in victory.

You must dedicate yourselves today to the determined revelation and presentation—to the world—of the facts and the truth about Poland so that the United Nations shall be called upon to meet their full moral and humanitarian responsibility by assurance that your nation, which during the war stood first in honor and glory, shall not, in peace, be rewarded by denial and betrayal.

In this cause, you will have the complete support of freedom-loving men throughout the world, and they will join in your prayers that, through a free and independent Poland, the bitterly tormented spirit of Kosciusko may finally rest in peace—forever.

Limit the Tenure of the Office of President to Not More Than 8 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT NODAR, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. NODAR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to emphasize my support of House Joint Resolution 27, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of office of the President to not more than 8 years.

Since the year 1787 when the Constitutional Convention settled on a 4-year term with no ban on reelection, it has been accepted as a custom and tradition of our country that two terms in office be the tenure of the President. George Washington, the first President of our country, retired after two terms. Thomas Jefferson followed the same course and thus established this precedent. Many people during the time that Washington was President considered him indispensable, and it has been often said that he might have been the first king of the United States had he so wanted. The laws of our land are based mainly on our Constitution and Bill of Rights, but precedent has long established many of our rights. These rights have grown and have become not only traditional but sacred. During the last decade many of our traditions have been broken and many of our rights violated. The tradition of no third term was one that was held especially dear by many Americans. I have always felt that this tradition was as much a part of the law of our land as any constitutional right that was actually set forth in the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. I was brought up to believe in and respect established precedent; therefore, I have cast my vote with all the other members of my party, and a goodly number of the opposition who hold, as I do, that the tenure of office of any President should not be more than two terms of 4 years each. Only in this manner can that system of government which has so long endured be perpetuated, and only in this manner can we prevent any group or party from dominating our country to the extent that our form of government will be endangered.

David Lilienthal—A Worthy Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of judgment and appraisal of David Lilienthal, public servant, we would like to call attention to some comments made by the Progressive Farmer, a well-known agricultural magazine, on his public record as a great and capable public servant. In January 1946 this publication designated Mr. Lilienthal "man of the year in service to southern agriculture." Since 1936 the Progressive Farmer has selected some most worthy leaders for this honor. Among the outstanding men who have received this honor were D. M. Clements, southern leader of vocational agriculture teaching; Dr. George W. Carver, foremost Negro scientist; and Dr. C. H. Herty for research in making paper from pine.

Russell Lord, staff writer for this magazine, writes of some of the early days of Mr. Lilienthal's career:

He made friends at a fairly tender age—

He writes—

with a prizefighter called the Tacoma Tiger. The Tiger undertook to make a light heavyweight champion out of Dave. "He blame near killed me," Dave remembers, gently smiling, "but he taught me how to come up off the floor and take some more."

Mr. Lilienthal has had a testing time in the past few weeks.

In 1933 he came to the South as TVA Board member. He recalled that he had an uneasy feeling about being a public man. He kept his suitcase packed.

I'm not looking for security in Government work. That can soften a man so that all he thinks about is his security and that weakens his ability to stand up to things.

If Mr. Lilienthal had any fears about whether he could stand up to the storms and stresses of public service, he had chosen a service wherein he had ample opportunity to prove himself to himself.

Mr. Lord continues:

He needn't have worried. Between battle with great business leaders—such as Arthur Morgan and Wendell Willkie—and with political leaders—such as Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR—Dave Lilienthal, who now is Chairman of the TVA Board has enjoyed not so much as one deadening day of security since 1934—and that suits him. I know of no man who takes his work more seriously,

or himself less so. There is little or no hate in him and no sham. He stands up to things with a shy, quick grin and fights for what he believes in, without hard feelings.

This reveals something of the measure of the man who stands before the Senate committee for confirmation of appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Passing of Isidore B. Dockweiler, One of California's Most Prominent Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to inform the Members of the House of the death of one of California's best beloved and most prominent citizens, Isidore B. Dockweiler, the father of a former Member of the House, the Honorable John F. Dockweiler.

Isidore B. Dockweiler was a native son of California, born and raised in Los Angeles. He was a prominent member of the bar and active all of his life in civic and political activities of California. For 16 years he was Democratic national committeeman from California. He was, however, the kind of Democrat whose loyalty to good Americanism and sound government was above reproach. Because of his high integrity and dependable character, he had thousands of friends among both Republicans and Democrats throughout the Nation.

He was a member of the State Park Commission of California, appointed by Gov. Earl Warren. He was also chairman of the Los Angeles County Housing Authority.

Isidore B. Dockweiler was a fine and noble gentleman whose talents and abilities were freely given to build the State of California and Los Angeles County to their present prominence. His passing is a great loss.

The Los Angeles Times editorial follows:

THE PASSING OF ISIDORE B. DOCKWEILER

The great and humble will gather to do last honors to Isidore B. Dockweiler. The recitation of his accomplishments in the law, the church, public affairs, and community development is a long one and justly honorable.

But it is in his role as a fine American gentleman that Isidore Dockweiler will linger in the memory of his multitude of friends. And a multitude it is in fact. He was born 79 years ago on the perimeter of the civic center where he gained many victories in the law courts and in the political field and he used those years to mingle with his fellow citizens, to learn and share their woes and triumphs, and leave behind him a kindly word or a generous act.

To all his acquaintances he was thoughtful, kind, courteous, deferential, and he had a delightful touch of humor and camaraderie that endeared him. He was stouthearted and loyal to his principles. He was a Democrat and through the thin years of the party in California he marshaled the wavering ranks and showed a brave face to the enemy. When the party triumphed he stepped back from the scramble for preference.

Mr. Dockweiler loved the old, expansive California life and labored fruitfully to keep alive the generous spirit of that era. The traditions of the community, to a great extent, are of his making.

He reared a family of fine sons and daughters and they remain as his legacy to the community.

GOP Elephant Can't Forget the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of February 12, 1947:

GOP ELEPHANT CAN'T FORGET THE PAST

Antics of the Republican elephant in the Halls of Congress so far this year have revealed that it is still a cumbersome animal, full of the same old tricks.

In some respects, this ponderous pachyderm is akin to that strange prehistoric bird which flew backward to see where it had been. They say an elephant never forgets. But the GOP elephant beats even this. It has eyes on its rump and they look constantly on the past. Consider a few recent examples:

REVENGE ON ROOSEVELT

The Republican House passed a bill limiting the President to two terms before it took up the proposal to make the Speaker of the House second in line to succeed to the Presidency after the elected Vice President.

In putting on the two-term limit the Republicans were, of course, getting even with Roosevelt, who was elected to four terms. It will be 10 years before the third-term issue can again come to the fore. It may never again be an issue. But the GOP elephant, unable to forget the past, makes this old grudge fight its first order of business. The immediate and far more pressing problem of Presidential succession is bypassed.

Instead of sticking to the Congressional Reorganization Act passed by the last Congress, the Senate GOP majority upsets it. Instead of sticking to the simplified committee structure created by this bill, the Republicans create two special committees to investigate the war effort and study the problems of small business. Both jobs could have been handled by standing committees of the new Congress. But it was unwilling to break with the past.

LABOR BILLS THROW-BACKS

When the new Committee To Investigate the War Effort is organized its chairman, GOP Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, announces his program will be to investigate past scandals. It is a line of policy that seems more interested in showing what a bad record the Democrats made than in showing what a good record the Republicans can make.

In their approach to the labor problem the Republicans seem similarly motivated. Most of the labor-reform bills thus far introduced look backward. They would restore conditions that existed after World War I. They are throw-backs. The world never has moved backward, and it's a fair bet it won't shift into reverse now.

To bring down the high cost of living, the present congressional contribution thus far is an inclination to allow rents to go up.

As a further contribution to higher prices the Republican approach to the tariff problem has been strictly out of the era of Fordney and McCumber. The fact that high tariff walls helped bring on the last world-wide depression seems entirely forgotten.

GOP opposition to the forthcoming International Trade Organization meetings is another manifestation of lack of realization that there must be expanding world trade if there is to be continuing United States prosperity. The fact that there must be bipartisan international economic policy as well as nonpartisan foreign policy has not registered. The desire to put things back the way they were is too strong.

The GOP and Reciprocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times on Saturday, February 8, 1947:

THE GOP AND RECIPROCITY

The necessity for extending the 12-year-old Hull reciprocal trade-treaty program at the scheduled Geneva conference ought to be beyond all argument. American productive facilities were so enlarged during the war that we are more than ever dependent on foreign markets for full production and full employment. Yet we cannot expect to sell billions of dollars' worth of goods abroad if we do not also buy abroad.

Continuing trade must be a two-way affair. International business is bound to come to a dead stop if all the goods go one way and all the money comes the other way. Foreign customers will soon run out of cash if they cannot raise more by selling their own products.

In actual fact, of course, it would not be as simple as that. Nations from which we refuse to buy simply would raise barriers against our goods in self-defense. They would open their markets to those who, unlike us, were willing to buy as well as to sell. That is reciprocity.

The reciprocal trade law runs for another year, and under it the State Department can negotiate concessions in foreign tariffs in return for reductions in those of the United States. For the time being, Congress cannot stop this. Nevertheless, State Department efforts could be gravely handicapped by antireciprocity speeches in Congress. These would be a clear warning to foreign nations that Congress intends to scuttle the policy as soon as possible. Already some Republicans have made such speeches. And it would seem that they have done so more out of the spirit of opposition to all things Democratic and New Dealish than out of regard for any considerable American demand for higher protective walls. For the most part, certainly, American business has come of age and realizes the necessity for two-way trade.

The New York Times has a little lesson in history for those Republicans who are acting entirely in the spirit of political opposition:

"Historically it is the Republicans, and not the Democrats, who are the party of reciprocity. Look at the record. It was a Republican Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, who championed reciprocity as early

as 1890 as a means of opening Latin-American markets to United States farm products. The principle of reciprocity was endorsed in national Republican platforms from 1892 to 1904 and was given practical application in the Republican Tariff Acts of 1890 and 1897. In the last speech of his career, a Republican President, William McKinley, declared that 'reciprocal trade arrangements with other nations should in liberal spirit be carefully cultivated and promoted.' "

Not Across the Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of February 6, 1947:

NOT ACROSS THE BOARD

The Republican promise of a tax reduction of 20 percent across the board seemed like a good slogan in the Presidential election campaign last fall because it appealed to all classes. But now, when the party leaders get down to working it out in practice, they feel it might be improved upon for two reasons. First, a reduction of 20 percent for big and little would mean a sharp loss in Government revenue which the budget makers find it hard to stand. Second, as a matter of political expediency, and looking ahead to the all-important Presidential election next year, the Republicans feel they might make a better appeal to most voters by giving the great mass of little fellows the full 20-percent cut promised, but to allow the small group of big fellows, say, only a 10-percent cut, or less.

In the matter of reducing taxes, and therefore the Government revenue, it is found that even President Truman's $37,500,000,000 budget is not so easy to pare down as at first seemed. Most of the biggest items in this budget are allocated to veterans' pensions, bonuses, hospitalization, etc., which simply can't be reduced at all. Others have to do with foreign commitments already made by treaty of or by solemn agreement ratified by Congress, such as the British loan. A third big enormous item, of course, is the national defense, the appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Forces; and while in times of peace the present national defense budget calls for $11,000,000,000 would seem to provide plenty of room for cutting down, most people realize that it is pretty good insurance against future war threats to maintain our armed services at a level where no aggressor would feel it worth his while to take a chance of starting trouble.

So the campaign pledge of a 20-percent cut in income taxes, which also included the pledges to bring about a balanced budget, a substantial reduction in Federal expenditures, and a start on making payments on the national debt, all of which seemed easy enough to the Republicans when they were on the outside looking in, are not so easy now when they are on the inside and have not only the power, but also the responsibility of carrying on the Government and providing for the national defense.

Some of the Republican critics of the proposed tax cuts urge that all should be treated alike, meaning that the 20-percent cut should apply equally to rich and poor, to stand by the original pledge of a 20-percent cut across the board. But clearly this is not treating all alike. On the contrary, it is bearing down heavier on the small incomes than on the big ones, because, even if the big-income fellow has his taxes reduced only 10 percent, he still has plenty left, while any kind of tax at all is a grievous burden for the little fellow making $2,000 a year and trying to support a family of four or five persons with living costs as high as they are now.

The argument was advanced several years ago that the tax base should be broadened so as to take in practically every person in the country, even down to those with an income of $500 a year. It was urged that by doing this it would make the general public more tax conscious, and that, therefore, they would be more critical of Government expenditures. But apparently this theory does not work out as had been expected. The public are tax-conscious enough, but they find it hard to make a dent on the various Government expenditures, as is shown here in Massachusetts, where, after the Republicans had been howling against the spendthrift Democratic administrations as inviting economic ruin, when the Republicans came into power they now put forth the $146,000,000 budget, running a score of millions more than anything the Democrats ever asked.

It has been our experience that almost every government will find a way to spend every dollar it raises in taxes and then some. We have to go back more than 100 years to Andrew Jackson's time to find a government that had a surplus to divide with the people. So the way to cut the big Government expenditures is to cut the taxes, and then the bureaucrats will have to cut down their expenditures.

Nebraskan Wins Navy Decoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of apprising the membership of the House that another young man from my congressional district has been awarded a medal for unusual service. In the February 6, 1947, issue of the Wahoo Democrat, of Wahoo, Nebr., occurs the following account of the decoration of John V. Polak of that city:

John V. Polak, of Wahoo, has received a permanent citation for his Medal of Freedom from Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, for the President.

Mr. Polak earned the award for meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service as leader of the civilian group of war prisoners interned in the Shanghai war prisoners' camp.

During the war, citations were temporary, or incomplete, for security reasons.

Text of the complete citation is as follows:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services as leader of the civilian group of war prisoners interned in the Shanghai war prisoners' camp from February 1, 1942, to June 19, 1945. During this extended and arduous period, Mr. Polak devoted untiring efforts and zealous care to his assigned work as a leader of the civilian war prisoners, often handling situations which might have broken down the morale and adversely affected the welfare of the camp as a whole. Closely cooperating with the senior prisoner of war to control precarious situations caused by the mixed personnel interned there by the Japanese, Mr. Polak, by his tact and diplomacy in dealing with the Japanese, despite continuous hardships and humiliations, contributed materially toward smooth administration of the various groups in the camp and thereby rendered a service of great value."

Lincoln as He Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 12, 1947:

LINCOLN AS HE IS

(The editorial which follows is taken from the Tribune of May 23, 1860, 5 days after Lincoln's nomination. Joseph Medill, the editor, and his associates had striven for this result with unflagging energy for many months. The Tribune's profile of the candidate was widely reprinted at the time, for it was recognized as the work of a man who knew Lincoln as only an intimate and devoted friend could know him. This is one of a collection of famous Tribune editorials which will be published in book form in connection with the newspaper's centennial in June.)

Ten thousand inquiries will be made as to the looks, the habits, tastes, and other characteristics of Honest Old Abe. We anticipate a few of them.

Mr. Lincoln stands 6 feet 4 inches high in his stockings. His frame is not muscular, but gaunt and wiry; his arms are long, but not unreasonably so for a person of his height; his lower limbs are not disproportioned to his body. In walking, his gait, though firm, is never brisk. He steps slowly and deliberately, almost always with his head inclined forward and his hands clasped behind his back. In matters of dress he is by no means precise. Always clean, he is never fashionable; he is careless, but not slovenly.

In manner he is remarkably cordial and, at the same time, simple. His politeness is always sincere but never elaborate and oppressive. A warm shake of the hand and a warmer smile of recognition are his methods of greeting his friends. At rest his features, though those of a man of mark, are not such as belong to a handsome man; but when his fine dark gray eyes are lighted up by any emotion, and his features begin their play, he would be chosen from among a crowd as one who had in him not only the kindly sentiments which women love, but the heavier metal of which full-grown men and Presidents are made.

His hair is black, and though thin is wiry. His head sits well on his shoulders, but beyond that it defies description. It nearer resembles that of Clay than that of Webster; but is unlike either. It is very large and, phrenologically, well proportioned, betokening power in all its developments. A slightly Roman nose, a wide-cut mouth, and a dark complexion, with the appearance of having been weather-beaten, complete the description.

In his personal habits Mr. Lincoln is as simple as a child. He loves a good dinner and eats with the appetite which goes with a great brain; but his food is plain and nutritious. He never drinks intoxicating liquors of any sort, not even a glass of wine. He is not addicted to tobacco in any of its shapes. He never was accused of a licentious act in all his life. He never uses profane language.

A friend says that once, when in a towering rage in consequence of the efforts of certain parties to perpetrate a fraud on the State, he was heard to say, "They shan't do it, damn 'em!" but beyond an expression of that kind, his bitterest feelings never carry him. He never gambles; we doubt if he ever indulges in any games of chance.

He is particularly cautious about incurring pecuniary obligations for any purpose whatever, and in debt he is never content until the score is discharged. We presume he owes no man a dollar. He never speculates. The rage for the sudden acquisition of wealth never took hold of him. His gains from his profession have been moderate, but sufficient for his purposes. While others have dreamed of gold, he has been in pursuit of knowledge.

In all his dealings he has the reputation of being generous but exact and, above all, religiously honest. He would be a bold man who would say that Abraham Lincoln ever wronged anyone out of a cent or ever spent a dollar that he had not honestly earned. His struggles in early life have made him careful of money; but his generosity with his own is proverbial. He is a regular attendant upon religious worship, and, though not a communicant, is a pewholder and liberal supporter of the Presbyterian church in Springfield, to which Mrs. Lincoln belongs.

He is a scrupulous teller of the truth—too exact in his notions to suit the atmosphere of Washington as it now is. His enemies may say that he tells black Republican lies; but no man ever charged that, in a professional capacity or as a citizen dealing with his neighbors, he would depart from the Scriptural command. At home he lives like a gentleman of modest means and simple tastes. A good sized house of wood, simply but tastefully furnished, surrounded by trees and flowers, is his own, and there he lives, at peace with himself, the idol of his family, and for his honesty, ability, and patriotism, the admiration of his countrymen.

If Mr. Lincoln is elected President he will carry but little that is ornamental to the White House. The country must accept his sincerity, his ability, and his honesty in the mold in which they are cast. He will not be able to make as polite a bow as Frank Pierce, but he will not commence anew the agitation of the slavery question by recommending to Congress any Kansas-Nebraska bills. He may not preside at the Presidential dinners with the ease and grace which distinguish the "venerable public functionary," Mr. Buchanan; but he will not create the necessity for a Covode committee and the disgraceful revelations of Cornelius Wendell. He will take to the Presidential chair just the qualities which the country now demands to save it from impending destruction—ability that no man can question, firmness that nothing can overbear, honesty that never has been impeached, and patriotism that never despairs.

Business and the New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Milwaukee Association of Commerce, February 10, 1947, entitled "Business and the New Congress":

In discussing the subject Business and the New Congress assigned me tonight I wish, at the outset, to make it clear that I do not speak as the official representative of any political party, or of any organized economic or social interest.

What I shall have to say on various urgent public issues will be my own reasoned conclusions for which I accept full personal responsibility at the bar of an American-minded public opinion.

The outlook for constructive statesmanlike action by the Eightieth Congress is good. The level of intelligence and character in both branches of Congress is higher today than it has been since the New Deal ushered in the social and economic "Kingdom of God" in 1933.

Political accidents and economic crackpots who so joyously rubber-stamped the policies of the New Deal dictatorship have disappeared into the oblivion from which they came.

The older Members of Congress who have weathered the political and social storms of the New Deal era are for the most part American-minded, with strong leanings toward the use of common sense in deciding public questions, and with an unshakable faith in and loyalty to our tested American ideals and principles of life and government.

The new Members, of whom there is a large contingent, are unusually competent and morally sound in their approach to their new legislative duties.

And it gives me pleasure to report to the people of Wisconsin that their Representatives in Congress deservedly hold high rank among their fellow members in ability, integrity, courage, and loyalty to our American way of life.

In coupling Congress and business in our discussion tonight you have gone at once to the most central issues in our national economy. Working together in full understanding and cooperation, Congress and business can and will advance and safeguard the social and economic well-being of all our people here at home and at the same time insure our security and leadership among the nations of the world.

This, of course, would become an idle dream if Congress were to attempt in any degree to function as the master rather than as the servant of the people; and if, at the same time, business, which includes the entire wealth-producing and wealth-distributing agencies of the Nation, should fail to think and act in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

Unless I misjudge the temper and purpose of the new Congress it will reject in principle and practice the New Deal theory that any citizen who gives employment to another is essentially a public enemy and must be dealt with accordingly.

The Eightieth Congress will pry business loose from the deadly embrace of the bureaucrat. It will protect and encourage free enterprise. It will stand for the American ideal of individual liberty, opportunity, and responsibility. It will seek to discourage and soften class hatred. It will repeal or amend existing class legislation. In a word, the new Congress will go American in all of its legislative objectives. And in striving toward these wholesome and necessary American objectives it will need and will welcome the courageous united support of every wealth-producing agency in the Nation. To become really effective on the national level this support ought to include employer and employee, big business, little business, the farmer, and all professional groups which minister directly to the spiritual and physical well-being of the people.

I know that such complete cooperation between Congress, business, and other organized interests of our citizens sounds like a counsel of perfection. But the grim fact is that unless we can make at least an intelligent start toward cleaning up the social and economic mess bequeathed us by the New Deal and by two world wars, we might just as well relax and get what selfish enjoyment we can in the brief period before we plunge over the precipice into the chaos which has already swallowed up so large a portion of the world.

Primarily, what we have at stake today is not the Republican or the Democratic parties, nor big business and little business, nor unionized labor. What we have at stake is the United States of America—that greatest and most successful of all experiments in free self-government, free enterprise, individual liberty and responsibility, and in social and economic cooperation. If in this hour of world stress the United States of America were to falter or fail in complete loyalty to its own genius and duty and destiny, it will have given to the history of mankind a record of its greatest failure.

We shall not falter. We shall not fail. During the war we achieved unity of effort, purpose, and sacrifice. We were working and fighting for our country as a whole and not for any section or sect or interest. We can, because we must, achieve a deeper and more permanent unity in remolding our vast economy under conditions of peace.

A chief obstacle in achieving this unity of purpose and effort is the inveterate belief among our people that a part is greater than the whole. We think normally in terms of our own special interest rather than in terms of the Nation. We are separated into big business, little business, agriculture, transportation, housing, finance, labor, veterans, and a host of important but secondary special interests—racial, economic, ideological—each absorbed in its own advancement. These are all important interests, but they derive their importance and their vitality from the common body of which they are all members: namely, the United States of America.

The two most urgent problems with which the new Congress must deal, supported by the wealth-producing agencies of the Nation, are: First, the setting of our Federal financial house in order; and, second, a solution of the critical issues connected with the enormous growth and economic power of organized labor.

Of course, we shall have to do all possible for the advancement of small business, agriculture, and allied interests, but our first task will be to balance the budget, reduce expenditures, and lift at least a portion of the paralyzing tax burden now resting upon our people. This three-cornered set of problems is of most vital interest to the wealth-producing agencies of the Nation. We cannot have a prosperous private enterprise based upon governmental economic bankruptcy. The time has come to abandon the New Deal theory that it is possible financially to get more meat out of an egg than there is in it.

For 16 years our Federal Government has operated in the red. If we were to continue this suicidal system we would be like the old farmer in the Bay of Fundy foggy country who was shingling his barn one day in the dense fog and shingled right out on the fog and did not observe this until he fell down and broke his neck.

Our public debt now amounts to $260,000,000,000. This means a debt, which must be paid, of $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation, and a first mortgage, from which there is no escape, of $10,000 upon every home of five members. The carrying charge on the public debt amounts to $5,000,000,000 a year.

President Truman's budget for the fiscal year 1948, in round numbers, calls for an expenditure of $37,500,000,000. Allowing $3,500,000,000 for political padding this budget would still call for an expenditure next year of $34,000,000,000.

It is proposed to reduce the present level of tax collections somewhere between three and four billions of dollars and the whole economic problem is to be solved by a long-deferred and much-needed cut in governmental expenditures. Vast sums of the taxpayers'

money can be saved by a much-needed reduction in the number of governmental employees, which even now number 2,600,000 persons. Then, of course, there is the long-delayed but acutely necessary operation of closing down a large percentage of the commissions and bureaus which have multiplied under the New Deal like the plagues of Egypt.

A tax cut of 20 percent across the board has as its objective the liberation and encouragement of some eighteen billions of venture capital, which will thus be available for developing new productive business enterprises.

In the working out of this delicate and difficult economic program, Congress will need and ought to receive the guidance and support of the best business minds in America regardless of political labels, and it will be necessary for special groups of our citizens like the veterans to modify and hold back their ever-increasing demands for Government assistance.

That the American people desire to do everything possible for our veterans is made evident by the fact that in this year we are spending in the interest of veterans around $7,000,000,000. It has cost nearly a billion dollars to administer pensions, schooling, and loans to veterans. The taxpayers will have contributed in the present fiscal year for veterans' benefits practically as much as they contributed for all costs of Government in a single year before the war. In fact, the taxpayers put up more money for veterans alone in this one fiscal year than they ever had to pay to support the Federal Government in any year before 1941.

It must be self-evident to any observant and thoughtful mind that unless we call a halt in our tremendous outpouring of financial assistance, not only to our veterans but to a multitude of other deserving interests, it will be an absolute impossibility to restore our national economy to a healthy and sound condition.

While Congress by legislation, and business by the processes of free enterprise, are working together to reestablish our domestic economy upon sound and progressive American principles, the results of our united endeavors are of necessity projected against the background of an uncertain and complex world economy.

This sets our reciprocal trade-agreement policy in a new focus. Already there has developed a sharp difference of opinion between advocates of a high tariff policy and those who favor the reciprocal trade-agreement system. Regardless of how this dispute may eventually be resolved, the fact remains that our great productive capacity and financial superiority cannot permanently sustain themselves in a bankrupt world. We learned this bitter lesson in the world depression in the early thirties, and one expensive lesson of that kind ought to be enough.

Whatever other issues may have been involved there can be no reasonable doubt that the voters in the election of November 5, 1946, registered a mandate to the new Congress to relieve the country by appropriate legislation of the abuses growing out of the application of the Wagner Act to the industrial organizations of our country. The title of the Wagner Act runs as follows, "To diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes."

The fatal fallacy of the Wagner Act lies in the fact that it places the relations of employer and employee by law permanently upon a war basis. The underlying assumption of the act is that the ultimate interests of employer and employee in American industry are absolutely irreconcilable. Whereas the fact is that the ultimate interests of employer and employee are absolutely identical. The success or failure of one involves the success or failure of both.

What is an industry? It is nothing more nor less than a social service. Wages are what the community is willing to pay for the products of this social service which it needs. Salaries and profits are what the community is willing to pay for the necessary investment in plant and management. If the product of this social service is offered at a price which the community deems unreasonable, the community will cease to buy and the enterprise will eventually fold up and disappear. In other words, in this essential social service the employer and employee are partners.

So far from diminishing the causes of labor disputes as stated in the title of the Wagner Act, the Nation has been cursed by an enormous increase in labor disputes ever since the act became a law. In each of the 10 years before the act, strikes averaged 1,040. In each of the 10 years after the act, strikes averaged 3,270. In 1945 there were 4,750 strikes.

In my personal approach to the problem of dealing with the present labor situation by Congress, I want it distinctly understood that I have always been a believer in the necessity of union organization. When by law there was substituted for the individual employer a great impersonal corporation, the individual employee was rendered practically powerless to defend his individual rights. As a practical necessity the labor union came into being and the Wagner Act was supposed to be the charter of employee rights and liberties, but with little or no attention to labor's responsibilities.

It is not necessary to set forth in much detail what has taken place in the relations between employer and employee under the malign power of the Wagner Act and subsequent legislation. The labor union, in many cases under alien-minded leadership and encouraged by the New Deal philosophy, has developed into what amounts to a dictatorship form of private government over great masses of our citizens. And it is well known that a very large proportion of the members of these great unions are opposed, so far as they dare announce themselves, to this form of a government within a government.

When the CIO organized its Political Action Committee it revealed the alien and un-American origin of its methods and objectives. It is to the everlasting credit of Amercan laboring men and women, as well as of the citizenship in general, that this malignant alien attack upon our liberties has been repudiated. But drunk with power, union leadership at this moment stands at the bar of public opinion and is due for a considerable reduction in its importance.

Probably the most ridiculous and absurd demonstration of this reckless use of power is the pending attempt to extract from the employers of the country about $5,000,000,000 in what is called portal-to-portal pay. When an American workingman or any other kind of an employee has to be paid for walking from the front door of his office or factory to where his job is located in that building, we have reached the bottom in frivolity, stupidity, and selfishness.

All of these tremendous disturbing issues with which Congress, business, labor, and every other interest in the Nation must deal are a part of a world-wide revolution. We are in an economic age in which the masses of men are striving to achieve economic freedom as, in generations gone by, they have achieved political and religious freedom. In this age organized industry becomes the chief organ of civilization. Wherever employer and employee meet there is being fought out the great central issue of our time. It is well for every American to understand that in this world age what seems to be a domestic issue stems from an irreconcilable conflict between two philosophies of life, one of which must eventually rule the world. On one side are arrayed the Russian system of communism, supported by a great company of lesser but similar ideologies; on the other side stands the American system, fundamentally and eternally opposed to the surrender of the individual to control of the state or to any other form of dictatorship. Reduced to its simplest terms, this world conflict is between slavery and freedom, and measured by spiritual standards and ideals it is a conflict between antichrist and Christ.

We are only at the threshold of a new world age. Years and generations will come and go before there emerges a world civilization based upon the eternal principles of law, justice, brotherhood, and spiritual unity among the people. Meanwhile, it is the solemn duty of every free American, regardless of his politics or his economic relations, to reaffirm the ideals and principles that have made our country the hope of the world and rededicate himself to their advancement and security.

Red Fascism in the United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in the recent campaign preceding the election of last November 5, many of us candidates were opposed by Communists and communistic influences at work in this country. The infiltration of communism in the United States has reached alarming proportions. The insidious methods employed by its devotees are almost unbelievable and are unknown to most of our citizens.

Perhaps the best informed man in America, and the one in the position to know best just how far communistic influences have progressed in our country, and the devious, underhanded, and unscrupulous methods employed to spread communism in the United States, is John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover has written a most revealing article on the subject Red Fascism in the United States Today, which appeared in the February issue of the American Magazine, which I have obtained unanimous consent of the House to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and which is quoted below:

RED FASCISM IN THE UNITED STATES TODAY

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

(Nobody would believe Hitler when he proclaimed his plans for Nazi domination. Here, the head of the FBI discloses the aims and methods of the American Communists as portrayed by their own acts and words.)

The objective of the Communist Party of the United States of America is the destruction of the American way of life.

The disastrous consequences of its advances, unless halted, will bring the same terror, oppression, and tyranny that the forces of fascism would impose upon us. Both are ways of life that are alien to America. The Red scourge of communism in America is boring its way through our land like a termite. Its power and influence are out of proportion to its membership.

Too often, liberty-loving Americans dismiss the menace of Red fascism as inconsequential. They judge its followers as a vocal group of malcontents attracting a lunatic fringe. They forget that communism is a cold, harsh, and ruthless system which builds slowly but inexorably to the day when our democratic government will be superseded

by a Godless, tyrannical, communistic dictatorship in the United States.

The American Communist, on the basis of his own teachings and his own statements, must be placed in the same category as the Ku Klux Klan, the now defunct German-American Bund, and other totalitarian groups. Instead of the K. K. K.'s hooded nightshirt, the American Communist is cloaked in stealth and intrigue. As common criminals seek the cover of darkness, Communists, behind the protection of false fronts, carry on their sinister and vicious program, intent on swindling and robbing Americans of their heritage of freedom.

The Communist movement in America dates back to 1919. Its party, like a whirling dervish, has changed its name and its party line whenever expedient. Never has it abandoned its fundamental principle of Leninism by failing in displaying maximum flexibility in its tactics.

It has operated underground, on the surface, and behind hundreds of fronts. Party members are constantly admonished, "Whatever changes we may make * * * the fundamental objectives and characteristics of our party will remain," and "what Communists do not change, of course, is their strategic aim, the proletariat revolution and socialism."

No member of standing in the party, which bases itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism, can hide behind the shield of ignorance of the true revolutionary intent of the American Communist Party. Its latest constitution specifically provides, "All members shall strive to acquire an understanding of the fundamentals of Marxism and at all times aim to apply Communist consciousness, understanding, responsibility, and initiative in their work and activity." In short, become a revolutionist, for that is what Marxism stands for. Karl Marx was the creator of modern communism; V. I. Lenin was the strategist who translated Marx's theory into action.

As "Marxism-Leninism * * * guides our party and the masses in the struggle," the Communist Party fervently brings its "Marxist-Leninist analysis of the United States as an imperialistic country to the masses."

Hence, last fall the party launched an intensive training program for the 15,000 new party members, as well as for the older ones.

In September and October, teachers were selected and given special training. The 3-month training program, scheduled for November, was based on self-study guides, including a glossary of terms, central questions, and supplementing facts prepared by the national educational department. Textbooks included such standard Communist works as the Communist Manifesto, History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the writings of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and the writings and speeches of American Communist leaders. No party school would be complete without regular references to the Daily Worker, Political Affairs, the monthly theoretical organ of the party, and other Communist publications.

Every Communist is taught the basic principles of organization, agitation, and propaganda, for the teachings of "Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin * * * enable the party to direct the struggles of the working class along the correct line and to gain victories while avoiding unnecessary sacrifices." By "these teachings the Communist Party is able to find the best methods of struggle * * * against capitalism," as the party "leads the working class in the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism for * * * the establishment of a Socialist Soviet Republic in the United States."

American Communists are the first to admit that before they can foment their revolution, certain conditions must be met. These are outlined by Lenin, "for revolution it is essential, first, that a majority of the workers * * * should fully understand the necessity for revolution and be ready to sacrifice their lives for it; secondly, that the ruling classes be in a state of governmental crisis which draws even the most backward masses into politics * * * weakens the government, and makes it possible for the revolutionaries to overthrow it rapidly."

To that end the Communists are eternally on the alert to mobilize and extend their forces; then either to create or to seize upon a crisis as a springboard to revolution. A Communist pamphleteer proclaimed that they go to legislatures, not to secure legislation to aid capitalism, "but to be a monkey wrench in their machinery, preventing it from working smoothly." A former Communist Party organizer quite openly admitted that a good economic situation does not serve the Communist Party, as it "realizes that a revolutionary movement can only be built among the people who have a grievance, real or imagined or invented."

Every strike is closely watched by Communist observers, for out of every struggle the workers can gain experience that will teach them the correctness of its revolutionary policies and tactics and win their confidence and support.

The world's foremost authority on communism has already laid down the party line to American Communists: "I think the moment is not far off when a revolutionary crisis will develop in America, and when a revolutionary crisis develops in America that will be the beginning of the end of world capitalism as a whole. It is essential that the American Communist Party should be capable of meeting that historic moment fully prepared and of assuming the leadership of the impending class struggle in America. * * * For that end we must work in order to forge real revolutionary cadres and a real revolutionary leadership of the proletariat, capable of leading the many millions of the American working class toward the revolutionary class struggles."

The Communists propose that a crisis will develop, either out of an imperialist war or out of a domestic situation. If their tactics are proper, the ground is prepared for action when war comes. It can be delayed by answering the call: "Workers in ammunition plants, go on strike. Shut down your plants. Prevent governmental strikebreakers from resuming work. Railroad men, refuse to handle war materials or transport troops. Marine workers, do not load either men or ammunition. Truck drivers, refuse to assist in war work. Workers of other industries, help the strikers. Farmers, refuse to give your foodstuffs and raw materials to be used for the slaughter."

This Communist teacher then observes: "If the workers rise in this way against war, the capitalists with their armed forces will try to break the deadlock. There will be attacks on strikers. The workers will have to offer resistance. We Communists do not close our eyes to the fact that this means civil war," and "victory in the civil war spells the doom of the capitalist state."

The American Communists publicly avoid admitting plans for revolution by force and violence, as this antagonizes good Americans. Among themselves they admit, however, that some form of violence is unavoidable. They were so concerned over the thought of force and violence that at one of their conventions the Communists adopted a resolution designed "to smash once and for all the superstition * * * that our party is an advocate of force and violence." Hypocritically the party said, "The revolution does not simply happen; it must be made."

In the training schools operated by the Communist Party the instructors are certain to tell their students to deny, if questioned by the FBI, their revolutionary intent with force and violence, and then in the same breath will admit that they can never create a communistic government without revolution.

While Attorney General the Honorable Francis Biddle, after a lengthy review of the background and aims of the party in 1942, ruled, "The Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States." For this, he incurred the party's wrath and condemnation.

The party's record in recent months makes this decision all the more important today. For the Communist record is clearly one of "flip-flops," which gives positive evidence to the force of theses and resolutions of the Third World Congress of the Communist International in 1921, which provided, "The unconditional support of Soviet Russia is still the main duty of the Communists of all countries."

William Z. Foster, chairman and chief Communist spokesman in the United States, put it this way, "In supporting the Soviet Union, the Communists in a given country are thereby also furthering the best interests of their own people."

Foster's observations were consistent with those he made on one occasion before a congressional committee, when, in response to the question as to whether the Communists "look upon the Soviet flag as their flag," he said, "The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag, and that is the Red flag."

Two day after Germany and Russia became partners in the rape of Poland the party line was fixed by the issuance of a manifesto urging, "Keep America out of the imperialist war," as it was not a "war against fascism." The American Communists threw every possible obstruction in the way of our defense effort. New front organizations were created to carry on the campaign "Keep America out of war," to block lend-lease, the draft, and the building up of our armed forces.

The American Communists employed every stratagem and tactic to impede the defense of America. That line was followed until the German invasion of Russia on June 21, 1941, and then, overnight, the Communists buckled down to the business of all out production. Their new slogan became: There can be no excuse for interference with production to aid the Soviet Union and its Allies.

But once the war was over they reverted to form. Earl Browder, for years the foremost party spokesman, was expelled from the party on charges of "revisionism." The Communist Political Association, created to perpetrate the fiction that the party had no revolutionary aims, was dissolved after 14 months' existence. The party assumed its old name. The Communists promptly charged our Government with following "an imperialist program * * * leading to the growth of reaction * * * to anti-Soviet incitements and toward the outbreak of a new world war."

American foreign policy was referred to as "The enemy" in the Daily Worker, and William Z. Foster took the stump campaigning against "American imperialism" and "American monopoly capital." Communists spokesmen in Latin-American countries echoed with denunciation of "Yankee imperialism."

The disloyalty of American Communists is no longer a matter of conjecture.

The aims of the American Communists of ultimately destroying our democratic form of government call for work on many fronts. To reach their objectives they must mobilize a force willing to follow their leadership. Their traditional point of attack is through trade-unions. The good American labor leader and the patriotic American union member have a single objective—namely, the betterment of the worker—the obtaining of greater security and improved economic positions. But not the Communist. He is first a Marxist—a Leninist—and as such he seeks to infiltrate the ranks of labor, not for the purpose

of bettering labor, but for the purpose of using labor for the revolutionary purposes of the Communist Party.

They employ many tactics in winning their points. Communists are thoroughly schooled in implementing the directive of Lenin: "* * * to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even, if need be, to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into trade-unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs." In other words, followers of Lenin are urged to employ trickery, deceit, lawbreaking, withholding, and coloring truths to accomplish the Communist aims.

They are tireless workers, excellent organizers, thoroughly trained in all phases of union activities, persuasive talkers, and zealots beyond words. They capitalize on the seeming apathy of union members in following union business. While "plants grew to employ ten, twenty, and thirty thousand workers * * * their local unions rarely attracted more than a few scores at membership meetings. The organized minority of Communists, who made it a point to attend meetings with their followers, thus were able to maneuver themselves into positions of importance.

In one key war plant with a total personnel of 8,500, an American unionist lamented that he and his associates endeavored to oust the Communists, only to meet defeat despite the fact that there were less than 200 Communists in the union.

Another unionist observed from years of experience that Communists would follow the party line when it conflicted with union instructions.

In recent months, Communist leaders have been advocating a "concentration policy of the entire party, which must bring about a decisive change in the work of all the progressives in the A. F. of L." One thing is certain, the Communists will try to infiltrate and change the policies of the labor leaders who are characterized by William Z. Foster as "these antediluvians entrenched in the A. F. of L." The word has been widely circulated that the party program calls for the infiltration of thousands of Communists into the ranks of the A. F. of L. Obviously, the party will not wish to publicize their membership goals.

A. F. of L. President William Green and his associates know the Communist Party for what it is. The American Federation of Labor, to its credit, has repulsed with characteristic American frankness and vigor the infectious germs of Communist paralysis. Their biting denunciations of it have won them the antipathy of the Communists. The same is true of those anti-Communist leaders in the CIO who are the targets of undercover attacks by the Communists.

For years, the Communist Party has been trying to penetrate the unions of railroad workers. In fact, William Z. Foster has been blunt in expressing himself on the subject. A few years ago he told a meeting of Communist leaders, "I unhesitatingly say this is the most important 1,000,000 workers in the United States. You can have a strike of steel workers for 6 months, and the country could limp along somehow. * * * We have seen coal miners' strikes last for many months, but let the railroad workers go on strike, and at the end of 3 days the country is in a state of prostration economically. This is how powerful the railroad workers are."

Apparently, the Communists feel that the time is ripe for an offensive against railroad workers. The organizer assigned to the national railroad committee of the party has revealed that the strike of last May has * * * created conditions in the industry favorable to building the party, and that in a recent conference a campaign had been decided upon to bring 500 new railroad workers into the party.

Last October, the same organizer announced the creation of a special monthly paper, the Railroad Worker's Link, in a statement headed by Lenin's observation, "A newspaper is not only a collective propagandist and collective agitator, but also a collective organizer." The Communist railroad program, among other things, calls for "nationalization of the railroads" and for a "socialist reorganization of our country."

The Communists will undoubtedly seek to recruit party members among railroad workers by seeking to shake their confidence in their leaders with the old Foster charge, "* * * it is the union leaders' policy to sneeze every time the railroad owners catch a cold."

Regardless of the economic basis of many of the recent strikes, the Communist sees in each a Marxian lesson and is not the least reluctant to boast that in the strike struggles the positive and influential role of the Communists is to be found and in some of the trade unions the Communists play a key role in helping shape vital strike strategy and tactics.

The revolutionary aims of the Communist Party furnish the explanation for their antipathy to religion, which was branded by Marx as an opiate. The Communists contend that religion and religious institutions hold the masses in check and blind them to deplorable conditions by the hope of a reward after death.

William Z. Foster in 1931 stated, "Our party considers religion to be the opium of the people * * * and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices amongst the workers." But since this view has met with so much opposition, the Communists now, in their public utterances, try to explain their position by saying it was a sectarian position of the party, and that they now stand for freedom of worship. But in the same breath they say they also stand for education against beliefs in the supernatural that will remove the religious prejudices which stand in the way of organizing the masses for socialism.

In their scheming manner they hold that, as Marxists, they must seek ways to unite church people, when possible, "on issues however moderate and always with sensitive regard for their deep-going religious feelings," in order to win them for "democratic advance"; in other words, to hoodwink church people while they would undermine the church. Despite their claims for freedom of religion they "do not consider religion to be a private matter as it concerns members in our revolutionary party."

Regardless of their explanations, the truth remains that atheism is as fundamental a doctrine with Communists as the existence of God is to all religious faiths. One or the other must inevitably triumph. Marxism-Leninism as a way of life for the American Communist stands for Godlessness, a distorted sense of morality, and the subjugation of freedom of thought, act, and deed to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The youth work of the Communist Party reveals the same deceit and trickery that characterize the communistic approach. For years the Young Communist League was used as a recruiting field for party members and as a proving ground of Communist leaders. Then the Young Communist League could no longer conceal its real purposes from American youth and had served its usefulness to the party.

In mid-October 1943, the Young Communist League dissolved, only to be reactivated the following day under the high-sounding name, American Youth for Democracy, with Carl Ross, former head of the Young Communist League in New York, as its executive secretary. This new front then embarked on a program of activities, among other things establishing youth centers ostensibly to combat juvenile delinquency. More properly, these centers could be termed Communist youth-recruiting centers.

The importance which the Communists place on youth work is reflected by a party lecture outline in a youth leadership course which concludes with the admonition, "We need a Communist youth movement which can furnish leadership for mass work."

The Communist view on veterans is identical. They want them for party work. When they champion the veterans' cause they do it because it serves the Communist cause. Proudly pointing to an alleged 15,000 Communists who served in the armed forces, they regard such of them as have come back into the party as a nucleus around which to build in the future. Traditionally, they have vilified and smeared the principal veterans' organizations who put loyalty to their country above subservience to totalitarian philosophies.

Increasingly, the American Communist has aimed his efforts at enlisting the support of the American Negro. Under the guise of championing a just cause, the Communist seeks to further his own diabolical ends. Much is promised, little given. The class-conscious Communists recognize Negroes as merely allies of the American working class. Communists attempt to supersede the thoroughly worthy American Negro organizations as the Negroes' champion. Many liberals seeking to better the Negro's plight, who will have no part of the Communists' real program and whom the Communists cannot influence, are labeled Trotskyites. Doubt is adroitly raised by the Communists concerning these American leaders in Negro organizations, in an effort to discredit them.

The record would clearly indicate that the American Negro recognizes the fact that the Communists are seeking to use him in developing the class struggle. Communist officials lament the low percentage of Negro party members.

American Communists exact a high degree of loyalty from their members and not only teach discipline but demand it. Once a party member deviates he at once becomes the target of a campaign of mass hatred and is designated as a class enemy or a labor spy. Recommended methods of treatment include the publication of the enemy's picture in the Daily Worker, organized agitation against him among the workers, a mobilization of the women and children in the block where the enemy lives to make his life miserable, the boycotting of his children. In short, the enemy will be purged through real mobilization.

The Communists teach that: "Attacks upon our party are attacks upon all labor. Every oppressive move against the Communist Party must be combated as a violation of the Bill of Rights. The newspaper liars are out to foment a war tension between us and the Soviet Union. Under cover of attacks against the Communist Party the assault against everything progressive is being made."

That their defensive tactics have been successful is found in the fact that any exposure of communism is Red baiting in certain circles. A countertactic calls for the labeling of anti-Communist statements as denunciations of liberals and progressives. Their reasoning that Hitler criticized the Communists, hence anyone else who criticizes communism is a Hitlerite, is illustrated almost daily in their publications when they label anti-Communists as Hitlerites, Fascists, or Nazis.

If we are to preserve the American way of life, the menace of communism must be met and its forward march halted.

Truth was our propaganda in World War II. It is the best weapon to use against Red fascism in America today. A Communist, steeped in stealth, trickery, and deceit, cannot long survive the truth. The healing rays of the spotlight of public opinion focused on communism will have the same curative effect that X-rays have upon cancerous growths, if applied in time.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 14, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me on February 12 at the Lincoln Club in Louisville, Ky.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a very great pleasure to be here in Kentucky and to have the honor of addressing this influential organization. I appreciate this opportunity to be with you for many personal reasons; I have lived in Kentucky as a soldier at Fort Knox and have traveled through part of this beautiful State. Then my life has been enriched by close friendship with Kentuckians whom I have met in college, in public life, and in the Army. To one Kentuckian, your own wonderful Dr. Fred Rankin, of the University of Kentucky, I owe a debt of gratitude of the sort which cannot be repaid.

As a Republican, I am naturally well aware that Kentucky was one of the States to start the Nation-wide Republican trend by electing Governor Willis. We outside of Kentucky have heard good reports of his administration and of the service in the Senate of Senator Stanfill. Now, Kentucky is ably represented in the House by Congressman MEADE and Congressman MORTON, and, of course, by former Senator ROBSION, whom I first met when I was a young newspaperman in Washington and with whom I have kept in friendly touch ever since.

Let me particularly and personally congratulate you and the voters of this State on having sent Senator COOPER to represent you in the United States Senate. Although we have only served together a few short weeks, I have come to appreciate his sound judgment, his independence, and his fine character. He has, to a very remarkable degree, won the esteem of his colleagues. I predict big things for him.

So you see there are strictly personal reasons why I am glad to be here. Then there are civic and patriotic reasons, because who can be in Kentucky at any time—and least of all on February 12—without thinking of Abraham Lincoln whose birthplace at Hodgenville I have, in common with so many millions of other Americans, visited. To speak in Kentucky without basing one's thought on Lincoln would be almost an irreverence.

Carl Schurz, biographer of Abraham Lincoln, said that Lincoln had a "weird mixture of qualities and forces." What were some of them?

First, there was his hatred of cruelty, which we see in his early childhood when he reproved some of his boyhood acquaintances for cruelty to a dumb animal. This same hatred of cruelty appears in his fight for the down-trodden man, and we see his greatness of heart in his letter to Mrs. Bixby, who, in losing her five sons in the War Between the States, had, as Lincoln said, "laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

He loved his fellow man. Such love must be the guiding motive of those who govern in a democracy.

Secondly, was his honesty. Horace White, of Illinois, a contemporary of Lincoln's and an active Republican of that era, says this:

"The popular conception of Mr. Lincoln, as one not seeking public honors, but not avoiding public duties, is a post bellum growth very wide of the mark. He was entirely human in this regard, but his desire for political preferment was hedged about by a sense of obligation to the truth which nothing could shake. This fidelity to truth was ingrained and unchangeable. In all the speeches I ever heard him make—and they were many—he never even insinuated an untruth, nor did he ever fail when stating his opponent's position to state it fully and fairly. He often stated his opponent's position better than his opponent did or could. To say what was false, or even to leave his hearers under a wrong impression, was impossible to him. Within this high enclosure he was as ambitious of earthly honors as any man of his time. Furthermore, he was an adept at logrolling or any political game that did not involve falsity. I was secretary of the Republican State Committee of Illinois during some years when he was in active campaign work. He was often present at meetings of the committee, although not a member, and took part in the committee work. His judgment was very much deferred to in these matters. He was one of the shrewdest politicians in the State. Nobody had had more experience in that way; nobody knew better than he what was passing in the minds of the people. Nobody knew better how to turn things to advantage politically and nobody was readier to take such advantage, provided it did not involve dishonorable means. He could not cheat people out of their votes any more than out of their money."

Such a principle is a charter for the enduring freedom of a people truly and enduringly free. Such a charter should be, and will be, the charter of the Republican Party, not for today or for a single adventure, but for all the times that are to come.

Third on my list was his desire to unite the people. It was Lincoln who asked the famous question: "Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its people or too weak to maintain its own existence?" According to Schurz, his was "the leadership which does not dash ahead with brilliant daring, no matter who follows, but that which was intent upon rallying all the available forces, gathering in the stragglers, closing up the column, so that the front may advance well supported."

Lincoln expressed his passion to unify the people in his ringing and solemn utterance: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half free and half slave. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will cease to be divided."

In our contracted modern world, where we live shoulder to shoulder with other nations having different views of life, how vital it is for us never to be a house divided.

These then are three pinnacles of Lincoln's life: First, his loving kindness for his fellow men; second, his honesty; and, third, his passion to unify the people. There is, of course, one more. You may call it, as history has, a radical trait. Phillips Brooks, the great clergyman of Boston, described it in these words:

"The union of the mental and moral into a life of admirable simplicity is what we most admire in children; but in them it is unsettled and unpractical. But when it is preserved into manhood, deepened into reliability and maturity, it is that glorified childlikeness, that high and reverent simplicity, which shames and baffles the most accomplished astuteness, and is chosen by God to fulfill his purposes when he needs a ruler for his people, of faithful and true heart, such as he who was our President.

"Another evident quality of such a character as this will be its freshness and newness, if we may so speak. Its freshness or readiness—call it what you will—its ability to take up new duties and do them in a new way, will result of necessity from its truth and clearness. The simple natures and forces will always be the most pliant ones. Water bends and shapes itself to any channel. Air folds and adapts itself to each new figure. They are the simplest and most infinitely active things in nature. So this nature, in every virtue of its simplicity, must also be free, always fitting to itself each new need. It will always start from the most fundamental and eternal condition and work in the straightest, even although they be the newest, ways to the prescribed purpose. In one word, it must be broad and independent and radical. So that freedom and radicalness in the character of Abraham Lincoln were not separate qualities but the necessary results of his simplicity and childlikeness and truth."

This man "of freedom and radicalness," let us well remember, reminded his fellow countrymen that "this country with its institutions belong to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

We cannot be timid and be worthy of Lincoln.

There is one final word from him, one word of thunder that comes breaking out from the past to help us today: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

"Think anew and act anew"—pretty good words for Republicans, indeed for all Americans, to remember.

"Think anew and act anew"—thoughts which, judging by the election returns last November, were uppermost in the minds of a very large number of voters.

Well, what should we think and how should we act?

We can think of many ways in which we should not act—certain examples which we should not follow. I remember an incident which took place in 1930 which illustrates my point. That was the year that the Democrats took over control of Congress for the first time in many years. An energetic young newspaperman was anxious to find out what the Democratic program was going to be for the forthcoming session and sought an interview with a very senior Congressman who was known to be affable and approachable. The reporter said to the Congressman: "I suppose you Democrats will have some very important decisions to make now that you have gained control of the Congress."

"Oh, yes," said the Congressman with emphasis. "We will have some mighty important decisions to make. In fact, I have just now been thinking about one of the most important things—one of the things which we should do first."

The reporter braced himself to receive an enunciation of policy on foreign affairs or the balancing of the budget.

"Yes, Congressman," he said. "And what should that first policy be?"

Without hesitation the veteran legislator replied:

"To get rid of the Republican elevator operators in the Capitol."

Ladies and gentlemen, that is a good example of how not to do it—and of course I say that without regard to which party's elevator operators are involved.

Well, when we say "think anew and act anew," what do we mean?

We can answer this question in two ways—by the kind of program we adopt and by the attitude of mind and of character of our elected Republican policy makers. Remember, of course, that we are not yet in control of the Government of the United States of America. I say "not yet" because I not only

hope—I also believe—that the Republicans will conduct themselves in such a way as to win the Presidency in 1948. Until that occurs, it should be remembered that the Republican Congress is not all-powerful. We can enact sound legislation; we can seek to offset and prevent ill-advised actions by the administration; we can lay down intelligent plans for the day when we do take over; we can investigate suspicious episodes in the recent past—but the President still has the veto power and the executive branch still administers the laws which Congress enacts.

Then there are some important areas of Government in which partisan competition would be definitely out of place. The conduct of foreign relations, for example, inescapably involves the issue of life and death for the American people. We rightly support an American foreign policy of vigorously building up and strengthening the United Nations. Our armed forces too are indispensable to the conduct of foreign relations. In both cases the bipartisan approach must be continued. Partisanship not only stops at the water's edge; it also must stop at anything involving the very life of the citizen.

What of domestic policy? In Massachusetts the Republican State committee developed a slogan last fall, which attracted much favorable attention. The slogan said: "Had enough? Vote Republican." The returns showed that evidently many voters had indeed had enough—in fact they had had too much of confusion, of corruption, of un-Americanism and of general incompetence.

But this slogan, effective though it was, only tells half of the story—the negative half.

In pursuance of this slogan we must clean up the mess in Washington. That means the rooting out of corruption, the elimination of waste, the abolition of overlapping and duplication, and the intelligent assignment of functions to the executive branch. This is a job which cannot be done overnight. In fact, on most of these things the facts are not known. We need investigations by men of the highest ability and integrity to find out what the truth is regarding the present governmental tangle. Today it is difficult to prune out surplus deadwood without cutting down a valuable tree. No reorganization of the executive branch of the Government has taken place since the war. Congress has tried to streamline itself; it is high time this was done for the executive branch as well. If you will forgive a personal note, I have introduced a bill for a commission to reorganize the executive branch which is to report by January 1949, just in time for the opening of the Eighty-first Congress. Now is the time to begin such a study, just as the partisan composition of our Government is changing.

But there is another half of the story. The same voters who agreed that they had "had enough" did not intend that in voting Republican they were voting for reaction. We were not put in office in order to put back the clock. We were, in my judgment, sent there in order to wind it up, get the crumbs and rats' nests out of the gears and get it going again. In a word they were voting to make their Government once again an effective agency for translating into action the aims and the aspirations of the American people.

That is the very basic truth. All of us who were in the services during the war and who have seen the rest of the world at first-hand know very well that the fundamental reason why popular government has so largely disappeared in the Old World is because it was no longer able to give effect to the popular will. When that happens people are ready for the dictator. The American voters in November 1946 were determined that this should not happen here.

We Republicans are on probation. Many people did not vote for us so much as they voted against the things they did not like. And, once we have cleaned up the mess and made an effective Government in Washington, there are some more positive steps to be taken. We must develop a balanced budget, because with Government finances in a healthy condition, there will be new jobs and better living for all. If the balancing of the budget permits, we should seek to reduce taxes, bearing first in mind those persons with fixed incomes whose standard of living has been so grievously cut by the inflation of prices for all the necessities of life. We must also ease those "taxes on ambition" which lessen economic opportunities for those who need them most.

The American community must guard itself against stoppages in essential industries which threaten the health—and even the life—of the men, women, and children of this country. But remember that true industrial peace does not and can never be brought about by legislation. There must be no hate-filled action—only honest treatment of labor and management for the good of all the people of whom labor and management are a part.

Our prime reliance for the well-being of the citizen must always rest on having a private-property economy. We believe he prospers better under such a system, and we know that without a private-property economy a political democracy is impossible. The two go hand in hand. Destroy private property by direct or indirect action and you destroy human freedom. But there are chinks which our private-property economy does not always reach, and there are certain things which it is more convenient for us to have government do—and government, we hope, will under Republican guidance become an efficient tool to do whatever the people want it to do. For example, there are useful steps which government can take in the field of public health without in any way bringing to the needy and the sick dangers of so-called socialized medicine. One such step is to make a free distribution to the needy sick of certain medicines the value of which is proven and which are beyond the financial reach of many persons. Nor is it disputed that government has an obligation toward aged persons who come to the end of their lives without adequate means, just as government has the duty to help effectively in easing the present acute housing shortage which is striking such a blow to family life in America.

There are many reasons for believing that Government funds should be used to facilitate scientific research, but not under conditions which impose governmental dominance of scientific thought.

Then, we know that in the past few years the United States, universally known as the richest Nation in the world, has actually become a have-not nation. We are no longer self-sufficient in many vital minerals. Never again will we be able to supply our own military needs in time of war from our own oil resources. Careful study should be given to the proposition of acquiring foreign oil for our routine consumption so that our own domestic resources may be conserved.

Some of these measures may require the expenditure of funds, but if something is necessary to the continued well-being of the Nation it is not true economy but foolishness to refuse to do it. We do not favor foolish economy; what we oppose is any kind of waste or duplication.

I sum up in a few brief phrases:

1. Continuation of bipartisan approach to foreign policy and national defense.

2. Root out corruption, eliminate waste, abolish overlapping, and get plans ready for a complete overhauling of the Government in January 1949.

3. Government finances to be put in healthy condition, making possible better living for all.

4. Protective measures against stoppages in essential industries which endanger the life and health of everyone.

5. Measures in the fields of public health, social security, housing, and scientific research to meet situations not adequately reached by our private-property economy.

6. Vigorous program to acquire abroad essential mineral and other products, the shortage of which now make us a have-not nation.

7. Public officials to have a selfless attitude and to seek to unify the people.

In other words, my friends, we are embarked on the most constructive possible program—that of getting our great country going again. We know that we have the natural resources and the human resources in America so that all can have a good life—if only things are organized right. It's really a pleasant picture. All that is needed is some leadership in Government which is intelligent, unselfish, and courageous. Programs in themselves are not enough. The attitudes of those who carry them out are also vitally significant.

For an attitude we cannot do better than to go back to Lincoln's character—to his human, loving kindness, his honesty, his passion to unify the people.

May we love our fellow men as Lincoln did. May we who are officeholders be selfless, as he was, and remember that we are personally unimportant; that we are not elected in order to try to hang on to office for dear life; that we are political expendables.

May we, all of us, in and out of office, Republicans and Democrats alike, unite as Americans. A united American people, filled with a flamelike faith in our country's future, can overcome all obstacles and advance to greater heights of material and spiritual well-being than any previous organization of human beings has ever known.

America's Effort for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 14, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, on the evening of February 11 last, in Winchester, Va., at the fiftieth anniversary banquet of the Charles Broadway Rouss Volunteer Fire Company, our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] delivered an able, timely, and illuminating address on the subject Our Nation's Effort for World Peace. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATION'S EFFORT FOR WORLD PEACE

As we survey our accomplishments since VJ-day in the field of international relations, particularly from the standpoint of measuring our progress toward peace, I feel that there is much in the record from which we may derive great satisfaction. We should not, of course, be starry-eyed idealists who fail to realize that we are up against the hardest task in international relations that

our Nation has ever confronted. But we have made so much sound progress that I feel completely out of sympathy with those citizens who are wailing that the effort for peace has already been lost and that we are pursuing a hopeless objective. This defeatist attitude is not justified and will not furnish us the inspiration to continue unremittingly on the long, difficult, and continuing path which undoubtedly lies ahead of us, but which we must safely traverse, by using every means and resource in our command and all the patience and wisdom that we can possibly muster. The objective for which we strive—permanent peace for a war-weary world—is so infinitely worth while for ourselves, our children, and all of mankind as to challenge our greatest efforts and our most devoted service.

In looking back on the record already made, one of the outstanding facts is that we have been able to avoid some of the major mistakes which we made following the end of World War I. In conducting with the leaders of our allies his historic conferences during the war, the late President Roosevelt was careful to recognize the interest and constitutional jurisdiction of the Senate in foreign affairs. You will recall that he took with him, to assist and advise him in every step which was taken, Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG, the Senate spokesmen for the two major political parties. Likewise, in the San Francisco Conference, which perfected the planning for the United Nations organization, the full participation of these Senate leaders was invited and given. Largely as a result of this considerate and wise approach, which since Mr. Roosevelt's death has been consistently followed by President Truman, our Nation speedily entered the United Nations organization and became its chief sponsor. We joined the World Court and the World Bank, took a leading part in UNRRA, and attained such leadership and prestige in the international approach to peace that the other nations of the earth felt that the headquarters of the United Nations, the new world capital, should be located nowhere else than in the United States. This bipartisan approach to the problems of the war and to the establishment of the United Nations was continued and extended to cover the general field of foreign policy. It was evidenced under the eminent and firm leadership of Secretary Byrnes in the negotiation of the peace treaties, five of which are now being signed. It was evidenced by the appointment and the speedy confirmation of Senator Austin, a Republican, to represent our Nation officially in the United Nations organization. It is apparently surviving the present difficult test resulting from Republican control of both Houses of Congress, while the executive department of the Government is headed by a Democratic President. The immediate and unanimous Senate confirmation of General Marshall as the new Secretary of State was enheartening. I thought that the announcement last Friday by two leading Republicans, Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN, that they expected to continue to support the reciprocal-trade-agreement policy of our Nation should give strong assurance to the world that we shall continue the bipartisan handling of our economic relations with other nations.

In yet another respect we have shown clearly that we learned lessons from our failures following the First World War, which is that we have insisted upon the diligent prosecution and punishment of war criminals, both in Europe and in Japan. Many of the leaders have already paid the supreme penalty or received other punishment. Many others are being reached methodically and fairly by our trial tribunals. It has been a source of astonishment to much of the world that these tribunals have been so insistent upon fair trials that there have actually been some acquittals of individuals who were presumed, at least by the public, to have been guilty of war crimes. In many other fields our accomplishments have, in my humble judgment, earned the confidence and respect of the rest of the world. The fact that we went ahead with our plans for granting freedom to the Philippines must have made it crystal clear to the people of East Asia and the Pacific that we have no imperialistic designs in that area. I feel that it will be good policy for us to continue in this fair and even generous treatment of the Filipinos, most of whom stood by us so loyally, by aiding them substantially in their heavy task of rehabilitation and by according to their fighting veterans the same kind of consideration that we accord to our own returned servicemen. After all, they fought shoulder to shoulder with us in those desperate days on the Bataan Peninsula and they kept up guerrilla warfare throughout the years of the Japanese occupation so as to remain a constant thorn in the side of the Imperial Japanese staff.

In the case of the reorganization and democratization of Japan, which by the way is the only place where our American genius for organization has been given relatively free rein, we have made such great progress that even we ourselves have been astonished by it. In the case of our relations with many small nations on this side of the earth, not only in Latin America but likewise in our dealings with little Iceland, with the Danes in Greenland, and elsewhere, we have shown a willingness to be fair which, I am sure, must have impressed all of the small nations of the earth. We have seen Great Britain, the nation to which most of us look as our motherland, begin the long and difficult task of straightening out her imperial relations and recognizing the fact that many of her former dependencies desire to be independent and are entitled to their freedom. Great Britain is withdrawing from Egypt. She has assured Burma that she may be free, either within or without the Empire. She has offered relative freedom to India, and the divided races of that great and unhappy land are even now striving to work out the governmental machinery under which they may practice self-government. Only the future will disclose how important a part in the reaching of these difficult decisions by Great Britain has been the British desire to retain the friendship and sympathy of the United States. Many difficulties still lie ahead, but the point is that we have made real progress, and I think that we should take comfort from that fact, and work on with redoubled vigor to solve the vexing problems, some of the most difficult of all, which still lie ahead, particularly the reaching of full understanding with Russia.

While all this progress has been made, we have done one more thing which marks a complete departure from our path following the First World War, in that we have not abandoned our leadership in military experimentation but have gone ahead in a painstaking way to continue to develop the weapons of modern war so that the rest of the world may see that we do not intend to again become weak or defenseless. The experiments with the atom bomb at Bikini, the continued work with jet-propelled planes which are now traveling at almost supersonic speeds, our continued experimentation with rockets and with planes and missiles which are guided by remote control, the announcement of our work in developing the means for bacteriological warfare—all of these well-publicized steps have impressed the world with the fact that we expect to remain strong and they are also constant reminders of the fact that modern warfare and any war of the future has for the human race such terrible power of destruction that all peacefully inclined men must do their utmost to build a stable framework upon which war will be avoided and world peace attained and preserved.

While we have thus been moving toward peace in our international activities, more slowly and more painfully than we had hoped but nevertheless surely and perseveringly, it has become increasingly clear that there are domestic problems which require prompt solution if we are to preserve our own strength and self-respect and at the same time continue to enjoy the prestige and opportunity for leadership which we now hold in the minds of other nations. One of the foremost of these domestic problems is that of setting our public financial affairs in order.

I have no quarrel with those in the immediate prewar years who felt that deficit spending was necessary for us to overcome the greatest depression which the world has ever seen, nor can we question the judgment of those who felt that we must draw upon our every resource in order to win the war, regardless of the financial cost. But now, in these days when we are experiencing the best business that our Nation has ever enjoyed and when there is need for every useful article that we can manufacture and every bit of food that we can produce, at such a time as this it seems to me to be an imperative necessity that we promptly balance our budget, live within our means, and begin an orderly retirement of our huge national debt which is far the largest per capita that exists in any nation. Our failure to take this step would not only destroy the confidence of our prudent citizens in their Government, and most citizens are inherently prudent, but it would also serve to destroy the belief that is prevalent throughout the world that our Nation is the strongest financial power in the world and has the ability to manage its public business in such a way as to conserve and enhance our strength rather than to devour it. Our potentiality for leadership in the quest for permanent peace is very definitely at stake in this matter.

To me it is encouraging to note that so many of our leaders in both parties are adding their voices to the voice of your distinguished senior Senator who so long has been calling for sounder business management in our Government and for better handling of our fiscal affairs. The conviction that this problem must be solved is found in the leaders of both of our national political parties. President Truman had already gone far in the direction of pruning the budget before January 3, when the new Congress met. Since that time it has become increasingly apparent not only that a majority of both parties are insisting upon the effecting of large economies in government, some of which may be passed on to the individual taxpayers, but also that this policy follows the conviction of the great body of our citizens throughout the Nation.

The States in general had had an opportunity to learn this lesson during the war years, and most of them emerged from the war in the strongest financial condition of their history. In view of the number and size of their postwar problems, it seems reasonably certain that the States will insist upon prudent and economical handling of their public business. The Nation is just now having its chance to take this same step, and I think it is reasonably clear that it will take the step and will restore the former strength and prestige to our national financial structure.

As a second domestic problem which demands attention I mention the necessity of returning to the States and local governments and to the people many of the powers which have been taken away from them either because of war necessity or otherwise and which can better be administered by State or local agencies. We do not, of course, fear our National Government; it is only one of our hands functioning to serve us in those fields where a National Government can best

serve. Our other hand represents State and local government, serving us in the fields where local government can best serve. It has been axiomatic in our Nation since its very beginning, and I hardly think I need to make this point in the Old Dominion State, that that government is soundest, most economical, most serviceable, and most democratic which is kept as close as possible to the people who are served by it and who finance its activities. That axiom of government is just as sound today as it was in the days of the founding fathers, and I think I can see in the utterances of many of our leaders of both parties and in the present attitude of the general public an insistence that we return to sound fundamentals of democratic government and to the preservation of States' rights.

The recent return of the Employment Service to the States is a step in the right direction. The fact that the people of 13 of the States have seen fit to send their wartime governors to the United States Senate—a phenomenon which has not been equaled in a long, long time, if ever—is an indication to my mind that the general public expects a reversal of the trend toward further centralization of power in Washington which has been manifest during the last generation. The wartime governors, individually and collectively, on many occasions were forced to stand up for the rights of their States to function as soundly run units of Government. There are other indications, which I could mention of this trend, which I think is important, for the National Government is going to have a terrific burden of its own if it lives up to its obligations of leadership for peace amongst the other nations of the earth and of proper handling of the problems of government which are truly national and which are increasing as science creates more and more activities which cut across State lines.

There is still another domestic problem which I think calls out for early attention, both for our own sakes and for the sake of maintaining our leadership in the quest for world peace, and that is the need for prompt and effective handling of the difficulties growing out of industrial disputes and work stoppages, particularly in our vital industries. I do not think that any intelligent American would change, if he could, our established doctrine that neither men nor money can be forced to work, and that collective bargaining shall always be emphasized as the first and preferred method of approach. Nor do I think any intelligent American wants to abandon the progressive course which we began in 1933, providing for the handling of labor disputes through public machinery of quasi-judicial character.

It would be unthinkable to return to the old cutthroat days when labor and industry fought out their quarrels with every sort of violence while the public looked away and hoped for the best. But it has become increasingly clear that the legal machinery set up under Federal law to handle labor disputes has not functioned either fairly or effectively and that our labor laws must be so revised as to give equally fair treatment to labor and industry and so as to always keep in first position the safeguarding of the interests of the general public. Many of the abuses which have come into being under the too often one-sided administration of the labor laws must be brought to an end. The leaders of both political parties recognize the pressing need for solving this problem and its solution is even now being laboriously and conscientiously attempted by Congress on a nonpartisan basis, as the insistent effort for new labor legislation cuts squarely across party lines. Surely the public has, whenever the chance was given, expressed itself in favor of urgently needed amendments of the present law. It is my definite conviction, based on what I see and hear at Washington and on my belief as to what is the attitude of the public generally, that strong and effective action will be taken by the present Congress. Such action in this domestic field is fundamental, as I see it, to our retention of the confidence of our own people and the respect of other nations of the earth.

And so, on this date almost 18 months after VJ-day, it seems rather clear that wherever we turn we see clear evidence of the fact that our Nation has doggedly set about the doing of its full part as a recognized world leader in winning a permanent peace which has become decidedly more necessary to all mankind than it has ever been before. In the field of international relations we have accomplished a great deal and we have done so through a bipartisan effort which bids fair to continue and which is a marked departure from our course of action following World War I, or at any other time in our Nation's history. In the field of domestic readjustment, in safeguarding and strengthening our Government at home so that it may continue to have the confident loyalty of all Americans and the high respect of all other peoples and nations of the earth, we have done much and we are even now in the course of other activities which bid fair to be completed in the near future. Most thinking Americans realize that we have embarked upon the greatest effort that has ever been made by our Nation or, for that matter, by mankind. And yet the stakes are so high that we dare not give to this effort anything less than our full strength, our greatest wisdom, and our continued zealous service. It is my hope and prayer that this greatest of all free people will persevere in its present effort to make this single objective—the attainment of world peace—its big and continuing task throughout the long years of patient, hard work which must lie ahead. We know that certainly no other people or nation have it within their power to lead successfully to the attainment of this supreme prize toward which the hearts of men, women, and children all over the world have been turning for countless centuries.

May we of America, by our dedicated effort, bring it to pass that our own Nation with its incomparable citizenship and its unsurpassed material resources shall be the means through which the blessings of permanent peace may be attained for all mankind.

Retirement of Ralph K. Davies From Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Petroleum Council on January 21, 1947, in reference to the services of Hon. Ralph K. Davies in directing operations of the Government as to the production and supply of petroleum for military purposes during the war.

On December 30, 1946, the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, of which the members were Clarence F. Lea, chairman, Lyle H. Boren, Oren Harris, John B. Sullivan, Charles A. Wolverton, Pehr G. Holmes, Carl Hinshaw, and Clarence J. Brown, filed its final report recording the activities of the Government and the petroleum industry in the supply of its oil and oil products for military and civilian purposes during the war. The facts therein recited give a remarkable story of accomplishment.

So many industries made such notable contributions to the success of the war effort that I am loathe to give any one of them the highest honor of all. I believe, however, that no industry made a more essential or successful contribution to winning the war and the saving of human lives than the petroleum industry.

Hon. Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for the Petroleum Administration for War, performed a devoted service of marked ability in organization, leadership, and securing cooperation of the industry and the Government in this gigantic effort.

During the war the Allied and neutral nations, outside of Russia, produced 7,500,000,000 barrels of oil. Over 75 percent of this came from American sources. It may help us to visualize the extent of this accomplishment if we realize that to transport this vast volume of the total production at one time would require 20 trains of tank cars, each completely encircling the globe.

Mr. Davies, who has now retired from public service, in his work of organizing and directing this vast effort, gave an ability and patriotic devotion which has merited the tribute paid him in the resolution adopted by the National Petroleum Council on the 21st of January, and which resolution is as follows:

Whereas Ralph K. Davies, as the first Director of the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior of the United States, has now successfully completed the initial organization of that Division, and through the creation of a National Petroleum Council blazed a new peacetime trail for governmental and industrial cooperation in the public interest; and

Whereas despite having every right and personal reason to leave the public service after more than four grueling years directing all of the major operations of the Government in relation to the petroleum industry throughout the Second World War, Ralph K. Davies remained at his post during the difficult first year of peace both to fulfill completely his promises to the petroleum industry to end wartime controls when hostilities were ended and to launch what is confidently expected to be the beginning of a new era of Government-industry cooperation for the welfare and security of the Nation, its people and all branches and segments of the petroleum industry; and

Whereas now that his great tasks have been completed, Ralph K. Davies has announced his return to private life: Now, therefore, be it unanimously

Resolved by the National Petroleum Council in meeting assembled in the city of Washington on this 21st day of January 1947, That this council hereby records its very great appreciation for the public service rendered by Ralph K. Davies to the Nation and the entire petroleum industry in organizing and creating a partnership between the Government and the petroleum industry; and be it further unanimously

Resolved, That this council express to Ralph K. Davies its unstinted confidence in his integrity, intelligence, leadership and never-failing devotion to duty.

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 14, 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from today's New York Times, entitled "Mr. Lilienthal's Training."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. LILIENTHAL'S TRAINING

When President Truman was trying to find a competent Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission he turned to Chairman David E. Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority. His reasoning was sound. TVA was the biggest civilian peacetime enterprise the Federal Government had ever undertaken. It was a training ground for a bigger enterprise. What do we want of the AEC? We want it to be nonpolitical. Under Chairman Lilienthal (as under Chairman Arthur E. Morgan and Chairman Harcourt A. Morgan) it has been absolutely nonpolitical. We think the case is proved that this is why Senator MCKELLAR does not like Mr. Lilienthal. No politics, no patronage.

We want AEC to be efficient. Under Mr. Lilienthal TVA has mastered the Tennessee River with dams, built transmission lines, acquired 700,000 customers, made contracts with 138 municipal and cooperative systems, increased the average residential use of electricity in its area to 50 percent above the national average. TVA is a success.

We want AEC to control the dangerous uses of the split atom. We do not want it to set up a great centralized power. We do not want it to stifle business enterprise. Under Chairman Lilienthal, TVA has stuck to the policy of decentralization. No law, except the law of falling water and the laws of electricity, chemistry, and physics, has been imposed upon the Tennessee Valley. Local initiative and local enterprise have been encouraged, not stifled. Great businesses have entered the valley since TVA came in, or have grown from smaller businesses. Hundreds of little enterprises have started and flourished.

We want national security. TVA has given that, too. During the war TVA power fed into an interconnected system from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. It fed the aluminum mills, the chemical factories, the airplane factories in the valley itself. It fed the Oak Ridge atom plants from the generators of dams constructed in world-beating time. This was one kind of security. And no secrets—especially no secrets about the great atom fission plants—leaked out. This was another kind of security.

Mr. Lilienthal would not say that he alone, or chiefly, was responsible for TVA's moderation, good sense, efficiency, democratic policies, patriotism. But he would have had to bear the blame if these qualities had been violated. If politics is not the determining factor in the decision now facing the Senate, he will be confirmed, and so will his four associates and their general manager, Carroll Wilson.

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 14, 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Attack on Lilienthal," published in the New York Times of February 12.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATTACK ON LILIENTHAL

Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, who has become majority whip in the upper branch of Congress by virtue of his party's victory in the last election, has announced that he will vote against confirming the President's appointment of David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. "Friends of Senator TAFT" are quoted as saying that he will do the same. Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, is out in opposition. And there is now speculation in Washington as to whether a major controversy may not develop over the ratification of an appointment which seemed only a few days ago to command all but unanimous approval. What is the reason for this sudden change?

Senator WHERRY's argument is that this vastly important position in the Government should not go to any man about whom "a shadow of doubt" can be raised. But it is clear enough that this nomination would have been sent from the committee to the Senate long ago except for the opposition from the unyieldingly bitter senior Senator from Tennessee, KENNETH MCKELLAR, who has fought Lilienthal for years over the question of political patronage at TVA.

The character, the loyalty, and the special ability of this particular nominee to handle this particular job have been endorsed by trusted leaders who are in a position to know both the man and the nature of the job. They have been endorsed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which initiated the whole project of the search for the key to atomic energy. They were endorsed yesterday, and warmly endorsed, by Secretary of War Patterson, who also knows something of the project and the problem. The charge that TVA employed many Communists while Mr. Lilienthal was in control of its activities has been exploded on the evidence of former Representative Joe Starnes, of Alabama, who was chairman of the subcommittee of Congress which investigated this very charge under the all-seeing eye of Mr. Dies and found it false. There remains the accusation that TVA is a Government monopoly and that Mr. Lilienthal served as its director. This much is true. But the work of the Atomic Energy Commission is also to be a Government monopoly, and a very tight one, and the efficiency of Mr. Lilienthal at TVA speaks for itself in the record of achievement of that mammoth organization.

It is difficult to avoid the suspicion that the battle over Mr. Lilienthal's appointment was as good as ended last week until some Republicans thought they saw in the slow-motion tactics of Mr. MCKELLAR an opportunity to make political capital at the expense of the administration.

If that is a fair appraisal of the situation, it should be coupled with a fair warning that in that way lies danger for a party newly come to power on Capitol Hill.

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 14, 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in today's Washington Post which has a bearing on the subject of the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal. It is entitled "Grudge Fight," and is written by Marquis Childs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

GRUDGE FIGHT

While the question of the confirmation of David Lilienthal is important as an issue of immediate policy, it is even more important as a symbol. So much of the confusion and conflict of our time adheres around it. It cuts so many ways.

On the political side, it puts an important segment of the Republican leadership in the strange position of following the lead of vindictive Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR. Senator KENNETH WHERRY would have it otherwise, but the facts speak for themselves.

It was MCKELLAR'S grudge fight, abetted by the Hearst-McCormick-Patterson press, that set this policy. The Republicans who follow along are merely saying, "Me, too."

Except in a glancing way, the core of this controversy has not really been touched on. Behind the noisy clamor over communism is a struggle to get all power production back into private control. Not Lilienthal, but the Tennessee Valley Authority is the real target of this attack.

Back of that is an even more significant triangle of conflict. Private control over atomic power is the objective of a little group who, if the whole story could be bared, would be seen to be inspiring the fight against Lilienthal. That helps to explain the otherwise inexplicable anger with which certain Senators turned on Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson when he went before the Atomic Energy Committee.

Their anger was directed at Acheson for releasing the Acheson-Lilienthal report, which recommended putting control of atomic energy under an international authority. The group that helped to draft that report included distinguished scientists and businessmen who worked under the chairmanship of Lilienthal.

They concluded, in effect, that this power was so overwhelming it could not be left to the exploitation of private interests. Private competition would inevitably mean private monopoly. And a monopoly of that kind would finally be a dictatorship.

Under the plan they proposed, atomic power would be available to private business just as TVA power is available at a low cost to private business throughout the Tennessee Valley. It was TVA power which made possible the expansion of the private aluminum industry and the production of more airplanes by private firms than the world had ever dreamed possible.

TVA is grounded in a natural resource, in the rivers that run to the sea. In the same way, atomic power derives from the very stuff of life and from the complex knowledge and skills of thousands of men and women. Incidentally, the atomic power project that is

a going concern today cost $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

It would be interesting to be able to identify those who are exploiting the attack on Lilienthal. They, of course, keep discreetly in the background. They know how to employ the technique of the smear and the irrelevancy. For example, the irrelevant, trivial complaints that came years ago from A. E. Morgan, a former member of the TVA Board. These complaints were shown to have been without any substance whatsoever. Yet Morgan is brought back before the congressional committee, and the old jealousies and rivalries are aired once again.

One thing this controversy demonstrates is the way in which communism can be used to distract and divert us. It can condition decisions that should be made on the basis of what is best for us as a nation. The reality of communism is one thing, as we learned—or should have learned—from the espionage case in Canada, where the matter was handled with dispatch and efficiency. But the hysteria provoked by the smear is something quite different. Hysteria can corrupt our decisions so that we act in fear and not in reason.

The probability is that Lilienthal will be confirmed. If he fails of confirmation, then the possibility of finding other civilians who would be willing to submit to this form of Indian torture is slight.

That raises still another point. The shadow of stalemate between a Republican Congress and a Democratic Chief Executive has already fallen across this critical year. If the next 18 months are to be given over to futile wrangling, then our position and prestige before the world will rapidly vanish.

At times you have a little of the feeling that it was at this point in the movie that you came in. Perhaps the film of the twenties is to be run off again, but faster, much faster, this time.

America's Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 14, 1947

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, recently in Rochester, N. Y., Mr. Eric Johnston delivered an address which is most pertinent in its bearing on international economic affairs and in its analysis of and in the way it treats this field of economic relations. It is so important that I think it should become a part of our RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the big question marks before the world today is this:

"What is America's foreign economic policy?"

If that question sounds dull, let me assure you the subject is far from dull. It's real, it's vital, and it's here before us now.

Within the next few months we must give our answer. America and 18 leading commercial nations will gather at Geneva in April to try to work out a mutually beneficial program for world trade revival and expansion. This will be the world's first postwar trade conference.

This meeting lacks the glamour, the fanfare, the public interest of the conference in San Francisco where the United Nations was born.

Yet this meeting will have a vital effect upon the course of our postwar economic life. And it means more than that—it is tightly bound in with the whole scheme to insure a peaceful world.

We are the host at the Geneva Conference and the world is looking to us for constructive economic leadership. We have decisions to make—vital decisions that affect every American. Are we going to continue our reciprocal-trade policy? Are we going to make new concessions to countries which make new concessions to us? Are we really prepared to take the necessary measures to promote freer international trade?

The questions which I raise are the questions which were put to me when I was recently in England.

My British friends knew I was a Republican and they wanted to know what Republican policies were going to be.

You must remember, gentlemen, that in the last 14 years England hasn't seen very many American Republicans. I suspect it will see a few more from now on.

Our friends over there have long memories. They wondered whether the Republicans would plant a thick hedge of new, high tariffs around America; whether the history of a quarter century ago would repeat itself. They reached down in Davy Jones' locker and dredged up the Smoot-Hawley Act and the Fordney-McCumber Act. They asked whether those old Republican-authored tariff laws were really dead or just in cold storage.

I couldn't answer those questions then. I can't answer them now. I can't speak for the leadership of the new Congress. As a Republican, I know what I would like to see. As a businessman I know what I would do. I'd like to see our reciprocal-trade program continue.

For the continuation of an American reciprocal-trade program will determine whether we shall have world economic cooperation or economic chaos. It will determine whether we shall have international trade expansion or international trade stagnation.

But the United States alone cannot assure the success of the Geneva Conference. If the British are worried about our foreign economic policy, so are we worried about Britain's economic policy. And that goes for the rest of Europe, too. The most disturbing sign on the international horizon today is the tendency in many countries to go back to the self-defeating doctrine of economic nationalism.

There is a large and alarming sentiment in England against Britain's traditional policy of freer trade. This takes two forms: one is a move for higher curbs on imports and the other is a move to tighten the system of trading preferences within the Empire.

If this trend grows it will dim the chances for success at Geneva, and it will enormously weaken the position of those in America who advocate freer trade as the keystone of world recovery and world peace.

I should like, therefore, to put a frank question to the British, in the same spirit as they asked questions of me:

Is Britain prepared to join with other nations in lowering the massive dam of barriers, quotas, and restrictions that impedes the natural flow of commerce?

This is not an academic question. It is pertinent and real. Britain today has some pretty stiff barriers against foreign products. Because of my association with the motion-picture industry, I am naturally familiar with the restrictions which Britain imposes on American films. We, in America, have none against British or other foreign films.

Yet, on the eve of the Geneva Conference, what is occurring in Britain with respect to film restrictions? There is great, and frequently unfair and abusive, agitation to impose even greater restrictions on the showing of American pictures.

I must remind our friends abroad that they can't expect America to make all the concessions.

America alone can't give the world freer and expanded trade.

But let us not use the statements of some of our British friends as an alibi for the revival of economic isolationism in this country. And that goes for all of us.

Two years ago at San Francisco, the community of nations laid the foundations for political cooperation. Under the horrible urgency of war, it was universally recognized that unless this step was taken civilization could not survive.

In a reversal of its traditional policy, the United States joined with all its heart and soul in the construction of the United Nations.

We worked hard to create the United Nations. We've worked even harder since to make the idea work—and we're making progress.

We know the American people are willing to share world-wide political responsibility. We are making a contribution to peace.

Our foreign political policy is bipartisan and nonpartisan. The elephant and donkey, hitched side by side, are pulling together.

We have discovered that we get along best in the world when we deal with foreign political affairs as a united people and on a permanent basis instead of shifting our course with each change in political power here at home.

We have learned that we cannot play politics with international peace.

When our representatives talk in the United Nations, they know and everyone else knows they have the American people behind them. At home, those same spokesmen are Democrats or Republicans. In the halls of the United Nations they are just Americans interested in peace.

So we have faith in the United Nations.

But, gentlemen, let me give you this warning:

The temple of the United Nations will be a hollow structure in a world of want, hunger, and misery.

Geneva may, therefore, be as important as San Francisco. You can't have political cooperation without economic cooperation. Without one, the other will collapse. The most compelling condition for peace is the revival of normal trade. The best environment for peace is a prosperous world.

What, then, can the Geneva meeting accomplish to turn us away from a world of economic stagnation and chaos? In the first place, it can do in the economic order what San Francisco did in the political order. It can contribute to world economic cooperation by practical, joint agreements to reduce trade barriers. With this decisive step it can start the work of trade reconstruction. It can halt at once the disturbing trend back toward economic nationalism and isolation.

It can establish rules and conditions under which goods and commodities may start flowing in the normal channels of commerce between nations. It can revive the principle that commerce between countries should serve the economic needs of the countries involved and not be employed as a weapon for political purposes.

In pinning our hopes on the Geneva meeting, we must not expect too much. We must not anticipate that it will bring about immediate world prosperity any more than the United Nations can assure the immediate ushering in of permanent world peace. Geneva simply marks the turning point which will determine the future course of world trading policy. It will determine whether we go forward or backward.

We must not assume that reciprocal-trade pacts constitute the panacea so eagerly

sought by mankind. They are nothing of the sort. They simply represent a workable formula for helping to solve a very vexing problem. They involve the kind of give and take on all sides without which any kind of international understanding is impossible.

Now we come to another question. From the standpoint of our own self-interest, this is the most important question of all. What good are reciprocal-trade pacts to the United States? I shall try to answer this as simply and as honestly as I can.

During the recent global war, we built up in this country the greatest production plant the world has ever known. This plant can produce at least half as much again as we ever produced before.

Now we face a supreme task. We have created this gigantic mass-production machine, but mass production needs mass markets, both at home and abroad. That is true of us. It is true of every other industrial nation.

What I am saying is that American prosperity depends in large measure on a high level of world prosperity. The reverse is also true. Britain and other commercial nations need a prosperous America as a market for their goods. Each nation has a stake in the prosperity of the other. That prosperity is dependent on an expanding trade. Since the Middle Ages, trade among the nations has been the expansionary force in the economy of each.

That force has been dynamic. That force has made jobs and built cities. That force has made whole industries. It has lifted living standards. It has brought luxuries to doors where only poverty camped before. Through the ages, the story remains the same. The merchants and the people of the China seas and the merchants and peoples of Europe had their first taste of real prosperity through interchange of goods and services. History teems with the struggle of man to reach the Indies. Trade, indeed, built more than industries and cities. The pursuit of trade found continents—and built nations.

That is the history of trade. The future is vastly more important and promising.

A nation today which attempts to live by itself economically is the modern version of the hermit in the cave. He sought the cave to escape from it all; perhaps he sought it through some misguided sense in self-reliance. But his life in the cave was neither comfortable nor complete. He had independence, perhaps, but he was dependent on scanty rations; he had a high degree of individualism, but a low standard of living.

The simple moral is just this: Self-sufficiency today inevitably leads to lower living standards.

It is just as important to tell what reciprocal-trade pacts are not as it is to tell what they are. This whole business of America's foreign-trade policy is so beclouded by confusion and distortion that it could easily founder on the rocks of public misunderstanding.

These pacts are assailed by critics on the right and critics on the left for totally different reasons.

The fear has been expressed, and I think honestly so, by a great many people that the purpose of these agreements is to tear away the last vestige of America's tariff structure. The charge is made that the basic purpose of the Geneva meeting is to force free trade upon the nations of the world, especially upon America.

That charge is based on unreality and it has absolutely no basis in fact. Such a course would be unthinkable. It would be as absurd to tear down our whole tariff structure to promote world trade as it would be to scuttle the Army and Navy to promote world peace. No responsible person has any such insane goal in mind.

The sole purpose of the Geneva meeting is to work out a sensible policy that will promote greater exchange of goods and services without injuring the internal economy of this or any other nation.

There is another charge, pressed with equal vehemence. Its basis is less honest. This is the stale old tale about dollar diplomacy—now transformed into the high-sounding epithet of American imperialism. This is the charge that the United States is forcing its trade and its dollars upon bankrupt nations in order to control their political destinies.

I have no patience with that charge and I have no hesitancy in calling it what it is. It is a lie. It is an unworthy accusation brought against this country for unworthy motives.

I hope that you in this audience and all other Americans will not be timid in meeting this baseless accusation. America has no apology to offer for its efforts in world reconstruction. Not in the spirit of boasting, but in the spirit of truth, we are justified in telling the facts. Suppose we review them.

This Nation sought no territorial gains from the recent war. It has not sought reparations from prostrate enemies. In a sense, it is paying reparations by helping the financial rehabilitation of the German and the Japanese peoples. It has made a loan to a former enemy country—Italy. It contributed heavily to the support of UNRRA. It has played a fair and decent part in every organized effort of the nations to stimulate postwar reconstruction.

I know of no other instance in history where a nation has contributed so handsomely and so unselfishly to world recovery after a great war.

That is not a record of American imperialism—that is a record of humanity of which every American may be proud.

Those who advance the charge of American imperialism know its falsity just as well as you and I know it. But they have a purpose in making it. If they can choke off these efforts at international trade revival, they can isolate capitalism in America. And the isolation of capitalism in America happens to be their goal at this moment. They fear that a revived Europe may turn its face away from statism to assume its rightful place in the community of free nations.

As a Republican, I sincerely believe that this issue of reciprocal trade provides the supreme issue for my party. There may be more spectacular issues before this present Congress, but there will be none more important.

I believe that a return at this time to the outmoded high protective tariff policy would be disastrous for the country. I believe that such a policy, adopted now, would repay a whirlwind of economic disasters a few years from now. The theory of economic isolation is simply unthinkable for the greatest creditor nation in the world.

The Republican Party is rightly looked upon as the conservative party of the country. It is a striking fact that it was given the reins of power at a time when almost the entire world was marching steadily toward the left.

There is no need of disguising the fact—the left-wingers are in power in Europe because the conservatives fell down on the job. These conservative groups failed to move with the times, they lost touch with the people, they insisted on conserving everything in the old order, whether good or bad. They bungled a large part of Europe into socialism or something worse. The price paid for their stubbornness is almost beyond comprehension. They lost, not a battle, but a continent.

But conservatism in America draws its strength from a system of capitalism which benefits all the people. We want to keep that system and make it even more responsive to the popular need. We want to keep it as other peoples may wish to emulate it.

As the majority party of the country, the Republican Party's role now changes from one of opposition to one of leadership. In evidence of this new leadership, I hope the Republican Party will embrace a reciprocal-trade program. It should not be a grudging, half-hearted acceptance. It should be a full and hearty acceptance of a program which affords the best chance for a flourishing foreign trade.

We have now come to the critical stage of postwar readjustment.

In America, we are determined upon peace. And we know that we cannot maintain here an oasis of prosperity with the rest of the world in a desert of despair.

That gives us a big stake in the Geneva conference. It is not a partisan stake. It is an all-American stake.

That's why we need a united foreign economic policy just as we have a united foreign political policy. Our American delegation at Geneva will speak with greater force and authority if it has the joint backing of both parties. It must speak with the clear, decisive voice of all the people. It must speak the voice of America.

Tribute to Hon. Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont, by Hon. William Benton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 14, 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on January 17 the Committee for Economic Development gave a luncheon in New York in honor of my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. At that time a tribute was paid to Senator FLANDERS by Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, and I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Benton on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are gathered today to honor RALPH FLANDERS, of Vermont.

In my early work with Paul Hoffman in setting up the CED, he said, "RALPH FLANDERS is the one man in the country with the background, the leadership, and the rare qualities of mind and temperament for the role as chairman of CED's research committee; with him responsible, our research program is bound to succeed."

RALPH FLANDERS' whole life had trained him for that assignment—he was the right man, in the right place, at the right time.

Others may match his skill as an engineer or may rival him in his famed improvements and inventions on lathes and screw machines. There are other businessmen, with not inconsiderable prestige, who have never seen Vermont, and there are even others who match his firm allegiance to the Republican Party. But there is no other in the business community, known to me, who combined so many qualities for this particular assignment—including breadth of vision and depth of mind, patience and tolerance, and a rare skill based on tact and humor as a presiding officer.

RALPH FLANDERS is one of the best-educated men I know. I once asked him whether this was because he had spent his life in Springfield, Vt., where he had had time to read—and to think—and both the time and the courage to write. Yet he wears his learning

lightly, like a service chevron on his sleeve. I remember once, when one of the CED economists remarked, "We have arrived at a dichotomy." Mr. FLANDERS instantly rapped the gavel and said, "Just a minute. I don't want any more words like that to whizz by me."

RALPH FLANDERS' character has been the hallmark on CED research, which has helped give it a reputation for integrity and objectivity unparalleled in the history of American business. You must live in Washington to discover what a priceless asset this is to the CED.

It is my honor, Senator FLANDERS, as you give up your role as the leading intellectual statesman of New England's business community, and merely become one of the 96 senior statesmen of Congress, to present to you this scroll on behalf of the CED board of trustees. However, in your fifty-odd years of reading in Vermont you may not have mastered the CED version of Old English script. I shall therefore translate this for you:

"Whereas RALPH EDWARD FLANDERS, businessman, banker, engineer, author, economist, statesman, and one of the founders of the Committee for Economic Development, has been selected by his fellow citizens to represent the State of Vermont in the Senate of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the duties and responsibilities of the high office that he has assumed through public mandate will require and receive from him the fullest exercise of his outstanding abilities; and

"Whereas the acceptance of this public office and the obligations inherent therein have compelled him to relinquish his duties as vice chairman of the board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development and as chairman of its research and policy committee; and

"Whereas his wise guidance, impartial chairmanship and sincere devotion to the general public welfare have contributed uniquely to the development of CED policy recommendations and research reports designed to assist in the solution of both transitional and long-range critical problems confronting the Nation; and

"Whereas his broad knowledge and experience, his mature wisdom, human understanding and mellow humor have clarified many an issue, enlightened many a long and wearisome discussion and earned for him the admiration, respect, and affectionate regard of each and every one of his associates: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of trustees accept with profound regret his resignation from these two offices and tender to the Honorable RALPH EDWARD FLANDERS their deep appreciation and sincere admiration for his outstanding contribution to American enterprise and the American public; and further be it

"*Resolved*, That they extend to him their warmest wishes for his success in his new duties as a Member of the Senate of the United States, knowing that the qualities of heart and mind that have made it a pleasure and a privilege to work with him will continue to be effectively exercised for the future welfare of the people of our Nation."

Mr. Senator, the most crucial problems in world history await you in Washington. Never was there a man better prepared for the role you are about to assume. The country needs you, the Senate needs you, and there are even some of us who will agree that the Republican Party needs you. So to you, RALPH FLANDERS, I propose a symbolic toast: To your courage, and to that fidelity you bring to your trust!—and may those with whom you will be working in Washington listen to you and learn from you, and share your humility and partake of your penetrating insight—as have all of us who have been privileged to be associated with you in the Committee for Economic Development.

The Palestine Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 14, 1947

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of February 6, entitled "Palestine Decision." I do not necessarily adhere to every statement in the editorial, but it is a very thoughtful editorial, and I ask that it be printed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed, as follows:

PALESTINE DECISION

To Mr. Bevin, now that both the Anglo-Arab and the Anglo-Jewish conferences have ended in deadlock, goes the responsibility for producing a unilateral policy for Palestine. It is a fateful assignment. Hitherto Mr. Bevin has not been noted for his aptness in handling the situation in Palestine. He is reputed to feel that a delay is in order until the 7-day notice that the British administration in Palestine has served on the Jewish Agency has expired. The due date is next Monday. By then the Jewish Agency is expected to cooperate with the administration in rounding up the terrorists. But, if Mr. Bevin expects this cooperation, he is as lacking in imagination and a sense of realities as the men on the spot in Palestine. The Jewish Agency, no matter how much it condemns the terrorism, will clearly not be put in the position of turning spy and informer. It is too close to the terrorists in opposition to British rule in Palestine to do any such thing. The cooperation asked by the British would be equivalent to a sponsorship of civil war by the Jewish Agency itself. Nor is it likely that the counterterror instigated by the British will browbeat the Jewish Agency into acceptance of the kind of federal state under British administration which goes under Mr. Morrison's name and which Mr. Bevin is said, more or less, to have in mind. Both the Morrison plan and intimidation have run their course, and the line of true statesmanship must be sought elsewhere.

It would seem that the wise thing would be to outline a policy without regard to what is going on in Palestine. Palestine is the kind of problem the unmanageability of which has increased by delay and indecision. Partition, it has long been our view, is the only possible device for application to Palestine, and even that, in the circumstances of present tempers and passions, would have to be imposed. As long ago as 1937 it was laid down as just by the British Peel Commission. But what could have been done then without much difficulty, and even in 1945 with a good chance of success, is now, admittedly, full of danger. Arab intransigence has thriven on British indecision, and many Zionists have become whole hoggers. Yet the nettle must be grasped, not in terms of a phony partition such as was represented by the Morrison plan, but in those of the Peel Commission. Only a partition admitting of a viable state for Jewish Palestine will do—that is to say, one giving an autonomous Jewish Palestine access to the highlands of Galilee and the empty space of the Negeb.

The parallel between Palestine after this war and Ireland after the last is becoming uncanny. Repression in Ireland created a terrorist movement which went from opposition to the British to opposition to partition. It developed so alarmingly that the British Government simply had to turn to conciliation, as they will have to do in Palestine, if only to allay the growing discontent on the part of the British people, who are impatient over police commitments out of their straitened circumstances. Unfortunately, as Emerson said of British colonial rule nearly 100 years ago, "Whenever an abatement of their power is felt, they have not conciliated the affection on which to rely." This proved to be the case in Ireland. It may, alas, happen in Palestine, for extremism has fed on itself for too long a time to take kindly either to the British or to partition. The only British hope of sowing seeds of tranquillity is to come out with a declaration for a just partition, and let time strengthen the inherent wisdom and justice of it. A just partition, it seems to us, could not fail to evoke American support, as was implicit in the President's statement to Ibn Saud on October 4. Such a statement of British policy would pave the way for American aid, especially in river-valley development, which is the only means that will promote the healing that one day will have to be undertaken.

Peace With Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 14, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "Peace With Brotherhood," written by James Patrick McGovern, and published in the Christian Advocate November 21, 1946.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE WITH BROTHERHOOD

(By James Patrick McGovern)

Christ, the atom bomb, the wandering Jew,
Like trumpets sounding at walled Jericho,
Warn today of mankind's final throe,
Save peace with brotherhood be born anew.
Again the martyred Jew is doomed to roam—
Now at the nadir of his destiny
Since Christ, his kin, gave life to set man free
Upon high quest as prophet but at home.
International by choice and fate
For fifty hundred years in war and peace
The Jew as man, not Jew, sought pain's surcease—
The citizen where freedom ruled the state.
Like Christ by love, or atom bomb by fire,
Gentile and Jew will live or light earth's pyre.

Liberty, Equality, Government for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered in Charleston, W. Va., on February 12, 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, this very excellent speech will be printed in the RECORD.

Fellow Republicans, we meet tonight to commemorate the birthday of the first Republican President, a man whose principles have inspired the Republican Party from that day until now. A hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln entered national politics and sat in the House of Representatives through the years 1847 and 1848. He had come up the hard way. He was a country lawyer in a provincial town. With little knowledge of national problems, yet he had thought through the fundamental principles of American Government. Those principles stood out more clearly then—as they stand out more clearly today—in the small towns and rural districts where they had not been complicated by the economic forces of large-scale commerce and manufacturing. His service in Congress for the brief period of 2 years attracted little public attention. He did not hesitate to oppose the Mexican War, although it was exceedingly popular in his home district. He voted to restrict slavery, although it might have made impossible any further advance in national politics. No one could doubt his courage or his determination to express the opinions which he had formed after careful consideration.

His session in Congress undoubtedly gave him a picture of national affairs which improved his judgment in future years. Certainly by the time he became President, he had a comprehensive philosophy of government which colored every act. No one has ever stated that philosophy more clearly than he. Conditions have changed since his day, particularly in the economic field, but the Republican Party still holds those principles as a torch to lead it through the tangled problems of the modern economic and bureaucratic forests. It seems to me that in the Gettysburg Address Lincoln summed up the basic principles of the American Government: That the Nation was "conceived in liberty," that it was "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," and that the ultimate purpose of free and equal government was that it should be "for the people."

Liberty, to me means first, liberty of the individual to choose his own occupation in life and to live and conduct his business as he sees fit so long as he does not thus interfere with the liberty of others; and, second, the liberty of communities to govern themselves, to decide what the scope of their government activities shall be and how their children shall live and be educated. Equality means equal opportunity to get started in life, and equal justice under law before impartial tribunals. Government for the people means that the Government shall abhor special privileges and shall be concerned with the welfare of all the people no matter what their economic status.

REPUBLICANS HAVE TAKEN OVER

Our problems today are more complicated than the problems which Congress and Lincoln faced in 1847. There are six times as many people. Production has increased far more than that and achieved infinitely far more complexity. In our desire to solve some of these economic problems, and improve material welfare, we have wandered away from our basic principles without solving the new problems. In the last 14 years the individual has been the forgotten man and his liberty has been no concern of any New Deal planner. Every program has been based on arbitrary government action, with unlimited power backed by unlimited money. Every law has been drawn to avoid any recourse to the courts which could assure justice. While there has been constant weeping for the plight of the low income groups, the programs for social security have been ineffective and badly administered. Many sound precedents and many accepted principles have been swept away, and nothing has been substituted in their place. It is the task of the Republican Party to work out a sound solution of present-day problems within the basic principles which, for more than 150 years, steadily built this country to be the freest—and the most powerful—country in the world today.

What are the basic problems today, and how can they be worked out within the principles of Abraham Lincoln?

The first problem and a practical one is to keep our economic machine running at a speed high enough to support a constantly increasing standard of living, but not at an artificial and inflated speed which can only be maintained for a brief period and then produce maladjustments leading to deflation. We have had recurrent economic depressions in this country causing hardship and poverty from 1800 on. Perhaps we know enough about economic forces today to prevent or alleviate those stoppages. This is not an emotional problem. Our joint committee on the economic report proposes to make a complete study of the causes of depressions and try to formulate the principles on which government can act, and can urge the people to act. In the long run, better machinery can help, but the result will depend even more upon the ability and the good sense of those who are administering the Government at the time.

The first basis for Government action must be sound finance. We have not balanced the Budget for 16 years. The Republican Party proposes to see that it is done in the next fiscal year. The President has submitted a budget calling for the collection of taxes in the huge sum of $39,000,000,000, and the expenditure of $37,000,000,000 for Government expenses for the year beginning the first of next July, the third postwar year. This is four times the expenditures of the Government just before the war. If we add local and Federal taxes, it imposes a tax burden of $50,000,000,000 a year on the American people, nearly one-third of the national income. That means that every man and woman is working one day in three for Government.

Since it is impossible to distribute the burden with perfect equality, it falls with crushing force on some industries and some groups of people. It discourages incentive and expansion. Such a tremendous burden in time of peace must lead gradually to the socialization of industry. The President says the expenses cannot be reduced. The Republicans propose to reduce them by four and one-half to six billion dollars this year and more next year. With this reduction it will be possible to lighten the tax burden by a sum equal to 20 percent of the personal income-tax yield, or $3,500,000,000, and still devote two or three billion dollars to the reduction of the national debt.

This program I believe to be essential. We cannot have free expansion of our commerce and industrial system if it has to carry the burden of a government taking one-third of the national income. Since there will be a deficit in the fiscal year ending July 1, I do not believe there should be any tax legislation which will result in a lesser income to the Government before July 1, 1947, thereby increasing the Truman deficit of 1947.

The program I have outlined will not be easy to carry out. The very people who applaud our reduction of the over-all expenditure will descend upon Washington later and insist on more expenditures in the field of their own special interest. For years the people have been taught that the Federal Government is an inexhaustible well of dollars. Every local official in the United States and every foreign prime minister seems to think the Federal Government is a lavish spendthrift. We all have inflated ideas of Government spending ability. The man on the street doesn't distinguish between a million and a billion. Even learned Congressmen become confused. There must be no increase in the national debt, but rather a steady decrease if we are to maintain solvency, and on the solvency of the Government and the people's belief in its solvency depends the successful operation of our economic machine. The Government has not balanced its Budget for 16 years. Before it tries to regulate other people, it certainly must put its own affairs in order.

The problem of stability seems to me to rest primarily on a continuing balance between competing forces, a balance between taxes and Government spending, a balance between wage levels and price levels, a balance between savings and consumption, a balance between agricultural and industrial income.

Wages and prices must be in proper relationship. If the price level rises faster than the wage level, buying power ceases and production falls. If the wage level rises above the price level, there is no profit in business operation and all expansion, at least, ceases. Such a general increase in all wages and salaries as was promoted last year by the administration could only create confusion, higher costs and higher prices, threatening a continuing inflation which throws many other factors, like white-collar salaries, and the cost of living, out of line. Such a general and unjustified increase as occurred last year brought about no increase in real wages, because it forced prices up about as much as wages. Today the best we can do, apparently, is to stabilize wages and prices at about 50 percent over prewar.

Of course to the extent that we can increase the productivity of the worker, we can increase wages without increasing prices. I hope that we may create a special committee after the passage of our labor bill, to study the whole problem of employer-employee relations and their effect on productivity. Today profits have been high in many industries, low in others. Where there are profits, they ought to be reflected immediately in a reduction in prices rather than a further increase in wages. Only thus can the whole people get the benefit. I am confident that competition is rapidly being restored to a point in which it will force such a reduction in prices where consistent with adequate production.

A stable economy depends also on equality between agricultural income and industrial income. The Republican Party has 2 years in which to develop a permanent agricultural policy, designed to promote an average price level for agricultural products comparable to the prices which have to be paid for industrial products. It is not an easy task, but many solutions heretofore proposed are before us for consideration.

While government has to take an interest in these various relationships, it cannot undertake a detailed regulation of commerce and industry, or of prices and wages, and hope to maintain our principles of liberty. We must have a proper incentive for men to put their brains, their energy, and their money to work with an opportunity for generous reward. We have built up this country and created jobs by inducing men to go out and start new industries, to develop new ideas, to put a few men to work and then hundreds and then thousands. We have seen during the war how Government control checked incentive, and finally broke down after the war through the very inability of any mind to deal from one central point with the vast detail of economic machinery in a nation of 140,000,000 people. The removal of business control had a far less upsetting effect on production and stability than did the general increase in costs promoted by Government planning interference in 1946. The Government has always exercised a control over credit inflation in its various forms. It can exercise an influence in many other fields without detailed regulation and intereference with the freedom of enterprise.

A few war controls remain. They should be eliminated as rapidly as possible, but it may be necessary to carry over a few where great war shortages still persist, notably sugar, rubber, and rents. A great increase in the price of these articles and in rents might not completely upset the price level, but it would be a disturbing factor. In the case of sugar and rubber the increased price would go, for the most part, to foreign countries. If it is found necessary to continue rent control, it must be adjusted to give an adequate return to landlords on the money they have saved and invested in houses and apartments.

One of the phases of economic activity which has always been the subject of Government action by statute, tariff or otherwise, is that of foreign trade. Of course a substantial foreign trade is highly desirable, though the foreign market is not a large percentage of the domestic market. Our foreign trade, however, is certain to be substantial regardless of tariffs if our domestic economy is prosperous—witness imports of more than $4,000,000,000 in 1929 when tariffs were almost at their peak, the highest peace year in our history. The question we have to consider is how far we shall promote foreign trade beyond its usual scope by reducing tariffs so that foreign industries can undersell the products of established American industries. Without any change in our present tariff rates, we will have a substantial trade. Probably three or four billion dollars' worth of merchandise will have to be imported because we do not produce it here. American tourists are likely to spend a billion dollars a year in travel. American loans and investments abroad are likely to average a billion dollars a year for many years. So, without further tariff reduction, we would be making available some five or six billion dollars to foreign nations to come and spend for goods in this country. This is in addition to some $20,000,000,000 made available by authorized loans and advances under the Bretton Woods agreements, the Export-Import Bank, and the British Loan agreement.

Should we further lower our tariffs? The whole tariff question, it seems to me, is a question of degree. Tariffs should permit the importation of goods in fair competition with American production. They should not be so high as to amount to an embargo, but they should not be so low as to depress seriously any existing American industry able to provide a substantial part of American consumption. Perhaps by free trade we might increase our imports several billion dollars and perhaps ultimately increase our exports by the same amount but the additional exports in such an amount, perhaps one percent of our total production, seem to me a small gain compared to the danger of throwing thousands of men out of work and destroying established industries.

I should be opposed to a return to congressional tariff making with the inevitable logrolling which accompanies that process. I should favor delegating to a commission the power of fixing tariffs within wide statutory limits, with a definite rule that no tariffs should be reduced to such an extent as would do serious harm to American industry supplying a substantial part of the American demand for its product. We cannot afford to give our competitors the finest machinery made on credit to be used by workmen receiving less than half the wages paid in this country; and then permit the resulting product to be sold at prices to put our workmen out of their jobs. American costs are substantially higher in many fields, and foreign workmen are willing to accept a standard of living far below that which we maintain in this country.

The action of the Tariff Commission could well be supplemented by reciprocal trade agreements if the additional reductions made are found by the Tariff Commission not to violate the same standard. Nor do I see any reason why the most-favored-nation principle should apply to every reciprocal-trade agreement. We may well wish to help out a special situation where economic distress would otherwise result without giving the same advantage to the entire world.

The trouble with the present Reciprocal Agreements Act is that it places complete discretion in the President to make any reductions without any standard whatsoever being prescribed, regardless of the effect of such reductions on American industry and American standards of living. The present act, as amended in 1945, in fact, permits the President to establish almost complete free trade, certainly a tariff schedule below that of the Underwood tariff which was considered a tariff for revenue only. It is an unlimited delegation of legislative power affecting the vital welfare of the country.

In short, our first task is to maintain a stable and expanding economy, increasing the standard of living of our people by continually increasing productivity through the most modern methods.

But in performing this task, liberty must still be the guiding principle of the Nation. We want no detailed control of prices, wages, or distribution. We are determined to prevent any monopoly control by industry which destroys the liberty of economic law and may destroy the liberty of the people themselves. We want no arbitrary control by labor leaders restricting the liberty of the individual to work, or upsetting the proper relation between the income of industrial employees, of farmers, and of white-collar workers. In recent years, through the support of Government, through Federal laws, through bureaucratic regulations, through court decisions, and through the partiality of the Executive, labor leaders have acquired the power to make unreasonable demands and get away with them. The people in the last election showed their clear belief that such powers must be curbed, because they are contrary to liberty and equality.

The Republican Party proposes to enact laws which will restore equality in collective bargaining so that neither side may be in the position to make unreasonable demands. I am opposed to compulsory arbitration, because I believe it involves Government wage fixing and destroys liberty. The basis for free relations between labor and employer must be free collective bargaining, equal responsibility, and equality in power.

The threats to liberty today from business and labor, however, are minor compared to the threats to liberty from Government. Government has become the one big monopoly. Every war power must be eliminated. If any continue in special fields, they must expire in 1948. The President asked for authority to continue his powers under the Second War Powers Act if he found a national emergency to exist. The Republican Party has served notice that the day of emergencies is over. Government, like all its citizens, must be subject to equal justice under law.

It is equally important to restore justice and equality to all individuals and all groups. Hereafter, every man should have his day in court and a fair hearing before an impartial judge. The decision of a Government board with a distinct bias toward the Government or toward some protégé of the Government should never again be final. It isn't as easy today to determine what equality is as it was in the days of Lincoln, but equality before the law is, and must be, the constant goal of the Republican Party.

Finally, Republican policy must be determined by Lincoln's determination that government "be for the people." Lincoln had a profound sympathy for the common man and for the poorest of the common men. He knew what poverty meant. He had a warm heart for every widow and for every unfortunate. Our economic welfare, as a whole, depends on the successful continuation and equal operation of the economic machine, but no matter how successful that may be, there will be millions of low incomes and millions of persons, through misfortune or perhaps through their own fault, living below the minimum standards which we think of as American. I am convinced that the American people believe that a nation as wealthy and productive as this one can prevent extreme hardship and poverty. Aid to the unfortunate is no new principle in Anglo-American government. We have recognized it in our poor laws and in our giving of free medical care in general hospitals and otherwise.

Such assistance is primarily the concern of State and local government. But the Federal Government cannot turn its back on the problem. Its financial resources are much greater than the State. It can set an example and suggest a remedy. It can give the State assistance so that systematic programs may be developed to see that the lowest income groups all have minimum subsistence, shelter, medical care, and education. Such programs must not undertake to interfere with the power of the State and local community to determine their own policies and administer their programs. The place of the Federal Government should be only one of advice and assistance.

Not only will such a program help the unfortunate parent, but even more important it can help equalize somewhat the opportunity for the children of the unfortunate parent. We cannot give equality of mental capacity, but we can hope that every American child has reasonably decent home surroundings, reasonable medical care and enough education so that he at least understands the opportunities which are open to him if he goes further.

The Republican Party has a great opportunity. In the principles of Abraham Lincoln, it finds its aspirations. They will not solve all our problems, but a constant concern for their integrity is vital if America is to go forward along the lines of progress established by our forefathers. This is no turning back to former days. It is a program of progress toward peace and prosperity within the eternal principles of liberty, equality, and humanity.

Address by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan at Testimonial Dinner in His Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General of the United States, at a testimonial dinner given in his honor by the postal supervisors of New York at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City, on February 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Postmaster Goldman, Mayor O'Dwyer, distinguished guests, and friends, it is always difficult to speak the language of the heart. We feel so much more than we can say.

The kinship of loyalty and service is so warm and close in the Postal Department that this gathering is like the thanksgiving of a large family.

In these warm respects you pay to me there is really a greater testimonial to your own unselfish devotion and dynamic strivings for postal progress.

Here is proof that our work goes beyond dollars and directives.

Here is proof that our postal family maintains an active partnership between our headquarters and field staff.

All ranks are represented here tonight. All ranks share with me in the glory of our achievements—and the promise of our future.

Deep down in all of us is the guiding belief that no man can better his own organization without bettering himself. Your own postmaster—in this the largest and best-run post office in the world—is a prime example of that. Postmaster Goldman has a passion for constructive action—and understanding of his fellow workers. He has known no clock nor calendar in performing the thousand and one duties that fill his day.

New York City knows his worth. The Nation—through President Truman and the War Department—has honored him with the Medal of Merit for his outstanding zeal in moving mails to the troops. He said then as he would say now that any reward for his achievements belongs in greater part to you men and women who worked with him in the Government's greatest business organization and the Government's proudest service.

That's the keynote—service—that motivates all our activities.

As postal supervisors, you have been in the front ranks in providing the good sense and good will that puts heart into Government enterprise.

Now, as makers of the peace and pioneers of the future, we are making new plans and facing new horizons.

All of us want the postal service to make progress in a way that sets the pace rather than following the leader. We accept our right and responsibility of leadership to serve the new opportunities of business, to help in rolling back frontiers of our social and cultural life, to reach the far places of the world more quickly with life-giving messages and materials.

We want to widen the pathways of commerce and communication, whether in the air, on the land, or over the seas, by plane, rail, ship, or truck.

We have come to realize that our pioneering in the air has paid rich dividends in new business and, more importantly, new hopes for the human family. We know that if rightly developed the air-mail service will maintain prosperity at home and help to fortify peace throughout the world.

In the past year we have created ambitious programs to increase the use of air mail both at home and abroad. And for tomorrow we are mapping plans for even further advancement.

Last October 1 we undertook the far-reaching objective of carrying domestic air mail at 5 cents an ounce, "Wings for a Nickel."

Many were quick to say that it was a daring step; others in the face of rising costs and wages termed it reckless. I never shared their dim view of the future of 5-cent air mail.

I recommended that reduction because I believed that we could realize important collateral objectives without loss of revenue. I tried to impress upon my associates in Washington and you on the front lines in the field that nickel air mail could succeed only if the volume showed a sharp rise. I knew we could get that volume only if our message got home to the American people. I never had the least doubt that the fundamental principle was correct.

Time and again American business has proved that more production plus more volume lowers the unit cost and spreads the availability to more users. Our problem then—as it is now—was to persuade greater numbers of people to use our product.

Again we turned to the experience and initiative of good American business. We used advertising as the vital spark in bringing our message to the people.

The Post Office Department is not only a group of producers—it is also a group of salesmen.

The figures on that air-mail advertising program tell an eloquent story. In September of last year 4,850,000 pounds of domestic air mail were dispatched. In December there were 8,100,000 pounds—almost double. I know that the December volume may represent a great deal of Christmas mail—but month after month there has been a steady gain. Millions have heard the message of "wings for a nickel." They know now that they can send mail by air—better, faster, cheaper.

We have not stopped our promotional activities. To speed the Nation's commerce, to insure its defense by improving our aviation fleet, and to expedite mail between our people, however remote the community, we need greater air-mail volume. I am relying upon the same ingenuity and resourcefulness that sparked our past efforts to keep us alert and active in expanding air-mail volume today and tomorrow.

We sought to pioneer new concepts in the dispatch of our international mails. In lowering the international rates last November, we found when the December receipts were in that our volume had almost doubled. Here again Christmas mails played their part. But it is encouraging to note that the international mail leaving New York for the first half of January is 50 percent greater than for the first half of last October.

When our postal department took the lead in lowering international rates, what did other countries do about it?

Since we have reduced our international rates, 22 countries have followed our lead:

Already, under an arrangement with Switzerland, air parcel post from that country is being received here. We are notifying other postal administrations throughout the world that we stand ready to receive their air parcel post.

These are some of the vital preliminary steps which we are taking to clear the way for one of our major operations—sending American parcel post abroad by air.

The day before yesterday, I sent a petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board, asking that a reduced and special rate for air mail shipment of newspaper and news magazines to foreign countries be granted.

In my round-the-world flight with Gael Sullivan, I witnessed the news-hunger of many of our own nations and thousands of our friends in other nations—but the news was sometimes months old when they got it.

While I hope within 6 months to see foreign air parcel post a reality—we shall pass, within a few weeks, an historic milepost in our postal progress, with the inauguration of the foreign air letter, to be sent anywhere in the world for 10 cents.

This air-letter sheet, similar to the V-mail, has attracted the interest of hundreds of business houses and thousands of postal users who want a convenient, swift, and cheap means of getting their messages to foreign lands. The benefits of this air letter to our people will be tremendous. Because of the uniform size and weight—and the large volume—140 of them to make up a pound—they will pay their own way in Department revenues.

All this is on the asset side of the ledger * * * and what of our liabilities?

The Post Office is confronted with a huge and mounting deficit. The postal pay increases of the past 2 years will have added close to a half billion dollars to our expenditures by next year.

President Truman, in his budget message, in referring to the postal deficit, directed that a study be made with a view to postal rate revisions.

This we are now doing—but this, I assure you—neither President Truman nor the Congress wants any rate revision studies sent to the Congress that would jeopardize the security of employees or impair the kind of service we are now giving the people of this Nation.

The final judgment on rate revision will rest with the Congress—and while our fact-finding may reveal certain inequities, I know that Congress will not reach any hasty decision in setting forth their ideas on postal rate revision.

We are committed to a program of helping to balance the budget and reduce our national indebtedness—but the people of this Nation never expect and never want "too little and too late" from the Post Office.

New conditions mean new challenges. We will never be satisfied with the sterility of the status quo.

Our morale for the great tasks ahead is the highest in our history. Never in our time will the spiritual assets of loyalty, initiative, and cooperation be more needed than now.

Our deeds must match our dreams—our performance must equal our promise.

But it is not only in the performance of the post office that we may take pride and feel the satisfaction that comes of a job well done.

Look at America. Take stock of this Nation today, only 2 years after the greatest conflict the world has known. What do we find?

We see a Nation firmly and courageously assuming her rightful leadership in the quest of the world for lasting peace.

We see the foundations for that peace solidly laid, the structure rising, stone upon measured stone.

We see an orderly return to the ways of peace, a reconverted economy, a free people at work. And through these years of ordeal by fire, we see the American way preserved, a system that we can hold as an example and as an inspiration before the groping world.

It is this broad perspective that I ask you to view with me today.

Satisfaction? More than that—for we cannot appraise; we cannot compare; we cannot hark back to those gaping pitfalls that lay in our Nation's path only a short time ago without a deep sense of gratitude.

But who has kept us on our course? Whose the firm and skillful hand at the helm of this Nation that has guided it past the hazards? Whose the courage to stand up before all the adversities that loomed ahead to see America through this crisis?

Two years ago Harry S. Truman became President of the United States.

He was a man of proved abilities. Through his 10 years in the United States Senate, he had shown consistently sound judgment.

But above all else, Harry Truman had in him a granite courage and the quiet quality of good will.

This he possessed, and this he has retained.

To those overwhelming responsibilities that suddenly descended on him in April of 1945, he applied himself with a level-headed wisdom that was already known to us, with courage and determination, and with a cooperative spirit toward his fellow citizens.

You may recall that at the time he took over as President, there was a great buzz of speculation. Would Truman go to the right? Would he go to the left? Would he travel a middle course?

These were shallow questions, raised by shallow minds. The facile bandying about of such oversimplified labels showed how little these questioners understood the man who had become President.

For with Harry Truman, it was never a question of right or left. As he saw his responsibility then, as he sees it now, his choice lies not between right and left, but only between right and wrong. From the course that is best for America as he sees it—and that is the only "right" that Harry Truman knows—he has never deviated. And he never will.

Immediately after assuming the Presidency, he was confronted with an important decision—the use, in war, of the atom bomb. But the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys were at stake. And Harry Truman did not hesitate a moment in his decision.

On the night that Harry Truman took his oath, he told America the San Francisco Conference to adopt a United Nations charter would be held on schedule.

And from that time on, the story of world peace was a story of personal courage, of integrity, of statesmanship on the part of President Truman.

Three months after he became President, he went to Potsdam to confer with the chiefs of state of our allies in war. And at that meeting it was largely through the statesmanship of Harry Truman that a sound cooperative relationship, looking toward the end of the war and to the peace beyond, was established among the great powers.

Thereafter, almost daily he was faced with decisions of grave importance, crucial to America and crucial to the world. And day after day, the challenge was met, the decision made. The series of mighty strides may well make us proud as we look back on them. Here are some of the steps that were taken to alleviate the sufferings of a world at war and to rule out forever any recurrence of that horror from the future of a world at peace:

An international bank and world monetary fund were set up.

A loan was made to Great Britain.

Aid was given to the starving peoples of war-devastated areas.

The reciprocal trade agreements were extended.

A Secretary of State was appointed—James F. Byrnes—who faithfully carried out President Truman's policy of firmness, patience and good will.

When the post of Secretary of State became vacant recently, a statesman—one of the greatest of his time and of all time, a true soldier of peace as he was a skilled and gallant man of war—was appointed, Gen. George C. Marshall.

We in America know that a world yearning for peace has not yet completed its task. We know there are dangers. We know there are men who seek to undo the good work that has already been done.

But we know, too, that in this crucial hour, while the citadel is rising, a sentry stands on guard, clear-eyed and alert. We know that George Marshall is on the job. And that citadel of the world's hope is safe.

In meeting the all but superhuman task of bringing our economy through an orderly change-over to peace, and in surmounting other vast domestic problems, President Truman has exercised the same courage and integrity, the same quiet quality of good will, as he has shown in the field of foreign policy.

It was right, as Harry Truman saw it, to stand by the men who came back to us after defending their country at war. As a result, we now have the GI bill of rights and a whole program for assistance to veterans.

As a precaution against abuses, control of atomic energy has been retained in civilian hands.

Back in December of 1945 he urged upon Congress a merger of the Nation's armed forces. In this he was vigorously opposed. But the President was convinced of the improvement in defense and the greater economy which his plan meant. Courageously, he stuck to it.

Today, those who formerly opposed him have become convinced and have accepted the basic proposition of merger. A plan, agreed upon by both the Army and Navy, is now before Congress.

Under the President's leadership, we have moved ahead with other big strides for the public welfare and protection.

For the development of atomic energy, and as a precaution against abuses, a Federal commission has been established. The control of that commission is in civilian hands.

It was a decision of Harry Truman that maintained rent control, protecting millions of American families against profiteering in a time of housing shortage.

In the aftermath of war, it was inevitable that the country would face pressures for higher prices and higher wages. This meant labor-management disputes.

Almost daily, the President was plagued with these problems. But he met them head-on, and in every situation he squared his decision with his own concept of what was best for America. That came first. And no special interest, no strong-arm tactic, was allowed to prevail against it. Harry Truman was looking out for—and taking action for—the good of the whole people.

Today, with the President's personal example before them, labor and management are finding their way toward agreement. We have emerged into a time of good will.

A few weeks ago the President sent to Congress three messages—on the state of the Nation, on the economic prospect, and on the budget.

In these messages, with the same sound judgment, the same spirit of American teamwork that have marked his every official act, he has outlined his policy in such matters as taxes, Government expenditures, labor legislation, employment, military security, housing, and protection for the small businessman and the farmer.

In his decisions on all these matters, he has chosen to be guided, not by right as distinguished from left, but by right as distinguished from wrong.

Addressing himself to a Congress dominated by a majority of the opposition party, the President said:

"The power to mold the future of this Nation lies in our hands—yours and mine, joined together. * * * On some domestic issues we may, and probably shall, disagree. That in itself is not to be feared. It is inherent in our form of government. But there are ways of disagreeing; men who differ can still work together sincerely for the common good."

Those are words of high statesmanship, because they are words that put country ahead of everything else. There is no higher form of statesmanship than the simple acknowledgment of brotherhood, regardless of party, under a free flag.

Time and again the people of this country have seen President Truman's judgments confirmed by the course of events.

Only recently we have had several striking instances of this. Consider, for example, his view on taxes. His political opponents, as part of their campaign in the election of last November, promised to end the excise taxes on luxury goods.

Harry Truman counseled against abandonment of those taxes.

Who was right?

A few days ago, Congress voted to continue the luxury taxes, and the very men who had promised to repeal them in their election campaign now switched position, and voted to retain them.

Or consider the question of a reduction in income taxes. The President's political opposition promised the people to cut income taxes 20 percent "across the board."

The President already has pointed out to Congress the danger of promising a reduction in taxes before making certain that this can be done without unbalancing the Budget. He has opposed any reduction in taxes that will mean failure to reduce the national debt. And he has strongly urged that persons of small income be made the major beneficiaries of any tax reduction.

Who was right?

Now, we find the Republican opposition weakening in its ill-advised stand. We hear the belated admission that budget-balancing must come before tax reduction. And Republicans, themselves, are attacking the "across the board" feature and urging their own leadership to abandon it.

Another great question bearing on this Nation's future is our commerce with the outside world. President Truman has called the attention of Congress to the proposed organization of nations to promote world trade, and has pointed out that America's reciprocal trade agreements will be vital to the success of this effort.

But economic isolationism is finding its voice again. Within the past few days, a virulent attack has been launched by certain Members of Congress against the reciprocal trade agreements.

Who is right?

Well may we pray that the majority of the Eightieth Congress, for the sake of humanity, will accept the advise of the President and vote for the trade of the world which is so vital to the peace of the world.

To those of the opposition who decide to follow Harry Truman's better judgment, we say:

"For your reversal of position, for correcting your own errors of the past, we have only praise. May you, for America's sake, always do so. The only difference now between your position and that of the President is that he was right the first time."

More and more, the people of America are confronted with these proofs of the wisdom and foresight of Harry Truman. Now that they see our economy back on an even keel, less than 2 years after the war, now that they realize how many were the obstacles along the road, the people are wondering:

How has this come about?

Do nations automatically emerge unscathed from a great world conflict:

If you think so, look at a map of the world. Try to put your finger on one world power—outside of our own—one great nation whose people, whose economy, whose very soul has not been seared and left bearing scars for generations hence.

America has not won back toward peace and prosperity by resting on her historic laurels or by dropping her destiny in the lap of fate.

How, then, has it come about?

We have won back, we are winning back, because we have had sound leadership. We

are on our way toward peace and prosperity because the leadership of President Harry Truman has been a leadership of integrity and good will, of courage and foresight.

It is true that in the beginning many Americans did not know the abilities of this man who had become President. From the day he took over, voices were raised against him by men long-embittered, men who were blinded by their own narrow political bias. Without waiting for the test of office, they spoke in belittlement of his stature.

They do not do so today. The people of America have learned that Harry Truman wears well. At all times when the good of the country was at stake, they have seen him set an example for these critics by rising above political animosities. The bitterness and hate that might otherwise have spread and undermined our strength as a nation, he has checked at the very source. With the philosophy of good will, he has disarmed the haters and the champions of strife and distrust.

The world is hungering for more of that kind of leadership. The world needs more statesmen with vision and a firm, unswerving stride.

Here in America we shall march on with President Truman toward our goal as a prosperous people, a strong and secure Nation.

We have gone far and fast, but the task of leading us to peace and plenty is not accomplished in a day nor a year.

Until that work is done, we are ready to call upon our President again as the man who has proved himself fit for the job. America will give him the support and loyalty that he deserves of us all, through the years ahead.

Jim Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Kays Gary, a staff writer of the Shelby Daily Star, Shelby, N. C., and which appeared in that newspaper on February 4, 1947, describing the success of Jim Camp, a Negro farmer in Cleveland County. I wish to place this article in the RECORD because it illustrates what Negroes are accomplishing throughout North Carolina and the South.

Jim Camp lives in my own county, and I have known him all his life. He has risen from the position of an ordinary tenant farmer to the ownership of 785 acres of fine farm land, all of which he has bought and paid for through his own industry, energy, and thrift. His success is another illustration of the fine treatment accorded the honest and ambitious Negroes in the South and the opportunities which are open to them. His last purchase of land was made a few weeks ago, when he paid $23,000 in cash for 226 acres of land which he purchased to add to his total farm of 785 acres.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUCCESS STORY OF A NEGRO TENANT FARMER—JIM CAMP ACQUIRES ONE OF COUNTY'S LARGEST FARMS BY THRIFT, HARD WORK

(By Kays Gary)

Fifty years ago in the mind of a tiny, ebony-faced lad there was born the determination to own a plantation in the white man's world.

It couldn't happen in the South—in the middle of the land lashed by the criticisms of a liberal society for its racial intolerance—but yesterday in Cleveland County, James Camp, Negro, swung astride his five-gaited horse and began a gallop over a part of a 785-acre farm—all his.

A DREAM BORN

It began in the late 1890's when the landlord of the boy's father singled him out as a favorite and allowed the ragged child to ride on a prancing saddle horse with him on regular treks over the spacious, rolling farmland. Behind the half-moon grin and sparkling eyes of the youngster was born this dream—to someday duplicate the success of his first white friend.

And yesterday James Camp would give the credit for his accomplishment to the inspiration of John Mintz, the white man, to the keen, but humble, support of his wife, Florence Hardin Camp and to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The dogged, determined decades of Jim Camp's labor would not be mentioned by him.

Today, it appears, little seems to be lacking from the original dream. There is the Camp sawmill, the fish pond, the 300 acres of timberland, the 135 acres which this year produced 160 bales of cotton, the 30 acres of grain, other acres of pasturage, livestock, mechanical farm devices, and a modern home. Still Jim Camp will be found in the late afternoon building single-handedly a new tenant home—making a total of 23 houses on his land.

It is all there because a tremendous price was paid in scrimping, saving, doing without, laboring day and night for pennies, buying a scrap of land with the pennies and, with the profits, the buying of another scrap of land.

To accomplish the building of this little plantation, James Camp had to run away from home at the age of 19, after he failed in attempts to persuade his father to buy his own farm.

He began by splitting cordwood at 35 cents per cord, taking his pay in food from Schenck's store. His next important move was the acquiring of Florence Hardin as his wife, and the two, with three chickens, a wheelbarrow and horse and buggy began the struggle for independence.

Camp and his wife settled closely by Shoal Creek church, near his own home place, and near his present home site. In the early dawn he left for labor and returned late at night. His wife found food in molasses and fruit and greens. "Money food" was taboo. Money went for the first down payment of 47 acres of land that belonged to the Pink Wood place. Now, rest perhaps? Now, maybe there would be plenty of food? Not yet. The Camps had to buy fertilizer to make their crops the best.

That was the process for endless years as small plots were added to the Camp farm—and then bigger ones. A few weeks ago, Camp pulled out a checkbook, a pencil, wrote out a check for $23,000, cash payment in full after a previous $5,000 "clincher" for the largest land purchase to date—226 acres adjoining his estate.

"It's all in one piece," sighed Jim, "where I can see it."

But this, the story of the acquisition of lands that put him in the top dozen of individual landowners in the county—white or black—is simply the beginning. It would seem thus far, a story of grasping for himself, for his wife and son. There wouldn't seem a possibility for any beneficence.

But go to the home of James Camp, that modern 13-room structure 6 miles south of Shelby on highway 18. In the kitchen you'll find a little boy who constantly went wrong in Shelby. Jim Camp took him in, taught him to work, and now Jim is to the lad what John Mintz was to Jim years ago.

CARPENTERING

Ride over to an adjoining plot where a new house is being built. There you'll see a grown Negro boy who couldn't get along elsewhere. You'll see him asking James Camp where this piece fits, where that beam goes, eagerly. He wants to learn the carpentering trade, and Camp is showing him.

Look 100 yards from the homestead, and you'll see the Camp Negro School, named "Camp" by the county commissioners, because he gave the land, because, in his own words, "My race needs help bad, mighty bad."

Attend the Negro Sunday school nearby, and you're likely to hear the voice of Florence extolling the virtues of principled living, or a parent-teachers' meeting where her warning, "Buy a cow before a car," will reverberate from the walls of the rooms.

For, man and wife, the Camps believe that if a person, white or black, wants something badly enough, and if it's right, he can have it, for a price.

But the Camps' leadership isn't all in preaching. The farm's available for teaching, for cooperation with farm authorities in showing neighboring Negroes how to make the most of the least. At every annual fair the Camp exhibits depict in facts, figures, and charts the means by which a man can truly become master of his own fate on the farm.

The living example should be enough. Quiet, modest, fearful any publicity might "make us seem proud," the Camps showed the reporter through their home. There's running water, automatic heat, modern furniture, a gleaming white kitchen. In an ideal, spic-and-span cellar, shelves are lined from floor to ceiling with canned goods. No meat has been bought by this family—no meat or flour—for 23 years. It all comes from the farm.

In the maze of outbuildings and barnyard wander 14 mules—several others are out with the 16 tenant families on his place. There are four milk cows, but right now Jim is in the process of starting his own registered Hereford herd.

He wouldn't hear a price for his giant tractor which has for 8 years roamed the vast tract doing all types of work. He has another on the way from the factory. A truck does the hauling work.

Jim Camp becomes almost reverent when the name of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt is mentioned. "He did me and my people a heap of good," he says, "He showed us a lot of things about how to get along."

For that reason, he supports to the limit the farm programs inaugurated by the late President.

The Camps have one son, J. B., now in Agricultural and Technical College for Negroes, at Greensboro, studying agriculture. J. B., back from service in Italy, wants his own farm—not his father's. More than that he wants not 785 acres, but 1,000. He does not bet, but if he should for those who know the Camp blood best—there'd be no one with money to say differently.

Young Jim has ridden on the horse with his father. He has listened carefully through the years to his mother. He will buy a cow before a car.

Management of the Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the national debt is of growing concern to all of our thinking citizens who are interested in the preservation of our Republic. At the recent annual meeting of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, the program included a discussion of this vital subject and it was my privilege to address this well-known organization. Under the unanimous-consent order extended me, I include my remarks on that occasion:

Mr. Chairman and American friends and fellow citizens, I feel greatly honored. This is a real privilege for me to come here and meet with this group today, because I have been wanting to get better acquainted with you for many, many months, some years, and without dealing with a lot of miscellaneous remarks, I want to directly give you in a few words what I have to present. They may be somewhat heavy following this grand luncheon, but we have here in this group a type of literacy that has come here from different parts of this country, and I cannot afford to let you go away from Washington without getting these thoughts before you

Last summer it was my privilege to be in Rome for a few days and I visited with His Holiness, Pope Pius XII. We had a very friendly conversation, the substance of which was this: "You people who have the chance to get out and look around, see what is going on in the world, make these contacts and meet these people that you do meet, and thus have the opportunity to put two and two together, when you return home there will be a very great responsibility upon you to say some things to your fellow citizens who did not have the same opportunity that you had."

That is a philosophy in which I very much believe. In other words, I think that all of us must walk in the light which falls before our feet, and I think it is our responsibility to seek light and to use it, and to spread it wherever we go, and not crawl within our shell and hold back the good things of earth from others who are not quite so fortunate.

Certainly this group and this organization seek light, and you walk in it after you get it, so I feel perfectly at home here with you today.

It seems to me that there are three questions in which every American citizen is vitally concerned today, and three questions which are immediately before the Congress. I refer specifically to the matter of material alterations in the several labor-management-general-welfare laws which we have, such as the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and we might go as far back as the Sherman antitrust law. It seems to me that those acts must all be considered by you, by management, by labor, by all interested in the general welfare, by the Congress of the United States, by the White House, and by the agencies of Government, as we face this problem or question or program of materially altering the present labor laws of the Federal Government.

Another thing that all of us are vitally interested in—I cannot imagine anybody in this group not being interested in it—is the question of the revision of the revenue laws as they relate to corporate enterprise, to capital gains and/or losses, to normal tax and surtax on individuals, to the exemptions and credits allowed our people classified in the different groups.

My third point is the question of the management of the present Federal interest-bearing debt. I am not now specifically referring to the question as to whether or not we are going to permanently arrest the growth of that debt; I am referring to the management of the present debt, assuming that it does not grow any more.

I think it can conservatively be said that as to how this present debt is managed or mismanaged during the next 25 to 50 years, will determine the effective wage which our people receive, the price level of our homes, of our equities, of our life-insurance policies—that is, the buying power of those—the economic or buying power or value of our savings in whatever form they may be, whether invested in trust funds or in building and loan associations or time deposits in the banks, or in the form of different insurance contracts. In other words, briefly, the management or mismanagement of the present Federal debt will, in my opinion, during the next 25 to 50 years determine the social and economic status of our people here in the United States.

Let's take these three questions and very briefly deal with them, and if it is agreeable with the chairman and with you, the audience, I will stop soon enough so that we can spend a few minutes here in questions and answers, so if you think of something you want to ask a question on as we go along, feel free to do that.

Let me give you a few hitching posts. To start with, referring to the January 16—this month—statement of the Federal Treasury, we have a $278,000,000,000 total gross public debt and guaranteed public obligations. We start out with that figure. If we make our chairman here the Secretary of the Treasury for a few minutes, I want to show you what he is up against and what you are up against as citizens of this great country.

He has that problem of management. What is that problem, very briefly? In my hand is a broken-down analysis of the debt which shows that within 1 year from last September 30 he has to refinance seventy-four billion five hundred million of that total which comes due within 1 year. Let's bring this right down to earth. Suppose you, a family, have a $50,000 debt that the family is responsible for; you have forty thousand of it financed on a 15- to 30-year mortgage and ten thousand in short-term paper that you have got to meet. That would be one problem. But suppose you twist that around and you have $40,000 of short-term paper to meet and only $10,000 financed on a long-term basis, and you are short on income; you can see that last proposition is a different problem from the first.

Our Secretary of the Treasury here has a certain group of securities aggregating seventy-four billion five hundred million that he must refund or refinance or pay off one way or another, either by refunding operations or by collecting taxes, within a year. That isn't all. On top of that seventy-four billion five hundred million, he has another $57,500,000,000, representing saving certificates which you, the people of this country, hold, and which are a demand call upon him for dollars at any time you desire to exercise that call, and at any time within 60 days after which you become the owner of a savings certificate you can go to the Treasury and say, "Mr. Secretary, I want my currency," and he has to hand you the currency if you want it to meet the contractual provisions set forth in that savings certificate.

The sum of those two items subjects the Treasury to a call within 1 year from last September 30 of $132,000,000,000 of refunding operations. Where is he going to get the money? That is a very practical question. He has to meet those calls, if you make the call, and if you hold your savings bonds and do not cash any of them in, he still has to raise seventy-four and one-half billion. That gets into the management of this debt.

Let me give you one or two hitching posts on this. When you jump down now into another group of securities, Treasury notes, Treasury bonds of short-term duration, we find that between September 30 last and December 31, 1950, our Secretary here must refund (including payable on demand paper) one hundred and fifty billion. Now, how is he going to do it? Well, he can help sustain a tax take-away from you and bring in some of it, provided you can stand the tax burden, but that will be a very small amount of the total because you have only got 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950. That is only 4 years. If he brought about the balancing of the budget and took $4,000,000,000 away from you each year in excess of the budget needs in the 4 years, he would only raise sixteen billion of the one hundred and fifty required; so he still has a financing problem on his hands. Of course, if you make no demand calls on the Treasury, that will very greatly assist the Treasury in handling his problem.

He can resort to the printing press and turn out sheer printing-press money and hand to you, in exchange for those bonds as they mature and let you take the economic consequences of such printing-press financing, and certainly the Secretary of the Treasury is not going to advocate that—not this Secretary of the Treasury.

He can go and reissue, or I should say issue, new bonds or refunding bonds to be sold—to whom? Why, he can sell the refunding bonds to you individuals and have you issue a check or draw the currency out of the bank and bring it to him and pay off that bond, and thereby diminish your buying power as related to real estate or commodities or securities issued by the corporate enterprise of this country, or consumer goods on the market. You decrease your immediate buying power by handing the dollars to him and taking his promise to pay in exchange, and thereby you deflate your momentary buying power or speculative power measured by your bank account or currency in hand.

That would be a very constructive step for you, the individual citizen and you, the Secretary of the Treasury, to follow. But in the event you, the citizens of this country, do not participate in the purchase of these refunding issues, and if he brings out refunding issues instead of issuing printing-press money, where is his market for the bonds to be sold? Commercial banks, insurance companies, savings institutions of different kinds, and Government trust funds, we might say. To the extent the Treasury sells these new refunding issues to the commercial banks, that is, practically speaking, the equivalent of using printing-press money, because as he says to you, the banking fraternity of this country, "You take $10,000,000,000 of these new issues and credit my account for $10,000,000,000 and I will start drawing checks against that accouunt tomorrow afternoon," to that extent you, the commercial banks, create $10,000,000,000 worth of demand deposits against which the Treasury begins to draw checks, and he hands them out to people, and as they are transferred into the hands of those people they become buying power. So, I believe this group would go along with me on the proposition that the Treasury should not sell the re-

funding issues to the commercial banks in a manner which brings about increased demand deposits, thereby expanding your potential inflationary base.

I think you will go along with me to the effect that the Treasury, in putting out the new bonds, should do everything that is necessary to be done to get these refunding bonds into the hands of you, the private citizen, thereby evidencing your belief in the purposes for which this debt was created and your willingness to carry those securities until maturity date arrives, and thereby sustain your Government on a sound economic basis.

What is the Treasury to do? You say, "I will take some more of the Treasury bonds if the Treasury will increase the interest rate on the new issue." Group (a) here are interested in buying the new issues; group (b) here have all the old issues that they can carry. If the Treasury puts out a new issue at a higher rate than similar term bonds of the old issue carry, what do you think will happen to the market value of the old bonds which this group holds the day the new bond with the higher interest rate goes on the market? The market on your bonds drops to bring your effective interest rate on old bonds substantially in line with the earnings on the new bonds. That presents quite a great difficulty to the Treasurer if the only way he can sell you the refunding issues is through raising the interest rate. That is one problem.

Forget that you are investors and all of you are taxpayers, and here is a $278,000,000,000 debt. The Secretary of the Treasury says: "If I raise the interest rate on bonds issued by the Treasury, then I have got to raise the tax burden on the people to bring in more money with which to service the debt, which is carrying a higher interest rate, and I haven't got the political courage to do that, so I am not going to raise the interest rates."

But you say: "I am not going to buy the bonds unless I get an increased interest rate. I am going to put my money over in industry, expand the plant capacity, increase the machinery, the productive capacity, so that more workers can have more tools with which to produce goods, and thereby bring about greater production of goods, and on the basis of greater per capita production participate in greater income in the way of increased wages and salary."

That throws the burden back to the Treasurer, and he says, "How am I going to finance this debt—refinance it, if you please?"

So you see how that all ties into this question of the inflation of prices, the inflationary movement, the inflationary forces we hear a great deal about—and which, by the way, are not yet behind us, because it comes back to the question, "How is the Secretary of the Treasury to manage this debt?"

Emergency Action Is Needed—Now!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Potters Herald, of East Liverpool, Ohio, of February 13, 1947:

EMERGENCY ACTION IS NEEDED—NOW!

Present-day conditions in Washington are comparable to the days of Rome when, it is said, Nero fiddled while Rome burned.

Briefs, under oath, embodying the protests of hundreds of thousands of American citizens, industrial workers, miners, fishermen, farmers, employers, and others were filed last December with the State Department's Committee for Reciprocity Information protesting against further reductions in tariff rates on competitive imports.

In addition, hundreds of representatives of these American citizens, in January, personally appeared before this same committee, and, under oath, presented substantial reasons why no further tariff rate reduction should be agreed to until a study had been made of the effects of the tariff rate reductions already made.

There is evidence, we believe, which leads us to the conclusion that these protests and these appeals have fallen on closed ears.

The Congress of the United States is now the last court of appeal.

The official evidence, presented to the Congress by Government agencies, warrants the Congress acting now. It will be too late to act or to go through the motions of trying to act after solemn and binding obligations have been entered into with foreign governments wherein the United States has agreed, for a period of some 3 years and 6 months, to permit of the dumping into American markets of competitive imports at total delivered costs, tariff duties paid, which are less than American costs of production of comparable or competitive goods.

America's industrial workers, especially those workers, such as the pottery workers, who are dependent for their livelihood on the production of goods which compete in American markets with competitive products of workers of other countries, realize that unless tariff duties are levied on competitive imports which equalizes the differences in labor costs of production they are deprived of their work opportunities.

America's industrial workers realize the value of and seek full employment.

We know that we cannot have full employment if competitive imports can be delivered into our own markets at total costs, tariff duties paid, which are less than the labor costs of production of our products.

We are not exclusionists, but we insist that present tariff rates are inadequate. Our contentions are sustained by the official reports of the Tariff Commission to the Congress of the United States.

We do not oppose the entry into America's markets of competitive imports. We do oppose the entry of competitive goods at total delivered costs which are less than our costs of production.

The world has been at war for the past 8 years. During at least 5 of those years there has been little, if any, commercial trading in the accepted meaning of that word.

The United States Tariff Commission, in an official presentation to Congress has reported: "The economic conditions throughout the world were so disturbed in 1939, as the result of preparations for and actual outbreak of war, that the statistics of United States imports for that year cannot be taken as indicating what would have been the effect of these (tariff) duty reductions under peacetime conditions; the import data for the war years are still less indicative of what would have been these effects," on competitive imports.

The United States Tariff Commission has also advised the Congress "that comparative data on wages and productivity for the United States and foreign countries are fragmentary, and, on the whole, quite unsatisfactory." "Few studies have been made that furnish an adequate comparison of worker's earnings and productivity in manufacturing industries between different countries."

The United States Tariff Commission has also officially advised the Congress that: "The approximate average unit value at the factories of the small amount of medium-priced china made in the United States in 1937-39 was $4.50 per dozen pieces. The landed duty-paid average unit value of ware of similar grade imported from Japan was 40 percent of that figure ($4.50) and that from Germany and Czechoslovakia was about 60 percent of it." ($4.50).

"According to official figures, the average hourly earnings of pottery workers in 1945 was 90 cents in the United States and 28 cents in the United Kingdom.

"Japan's chief competitive advantage lay in her low wage rates. In 1939 the average direct daily wage for a 10-hour day was about 50 cents, to which should be added perhaps 10 cents for social benefits."

It stands to reason that the Tariff Commission, the agency of Government which supposedly supplies the State Department and those entrusted with the negotiation of trade treaty agreements with other countries, through which tariff rate reductions are agreed to, in view of these official admissions, cannot supply the data which will justify any further tariff rate reductions at this time.

The international "do-gooders" of our State Department, temporarily in control of our economic affairs, blandly ignore these findings of the Tariff Commission and the protests filed and the appeals made, and continue their preparations for a meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, in April with representatives of 18 other nations.

There is only one purpose in this meeting. There is no concealment of the intent. It has been well advertised that the purpose of this meeting is to agree to a reduction in tariff rates, irrespective of the merits thereof.

There has been nothing said that tariff rates will be maintained or built on the basis that such tariff rates, levied on competitive imports, shall be such as will equalize the difference in the labor costs of production of the different countries.

Almost every other country protects its competitive industries by levying tariff duties on the basis of the value of the competitive articles in their own markets. Uncle "Sap" Sam still adheres to the policy of levying import duties on competitive imports on the values of such products in the country wherein they were produced.

This system grants to the lower-wage-and-lower-living-standard countries a decided advantage not alone over the products of the United States, but also those produced in the more progressive countries, with higher living standards, such as England.

At this Geneva meeting the United States will be represented by those who considered it good trading to reduce our tariff rates some 15 percent in return for a reduction of some 2 percent in the tariff rates of another country. Of course, it is highly probable that the negotiators for the other country also agreed to enlarge their purchases of American cotton at some 4 cents a pound less than the same American cotton is sold to American cotton mills for.

This 4 cents a pound cotton export subsidy is not paid by the American cotton producers. It is paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

In other words, the taxes paid, by American pottery workers, in part, are used by our Government officials to promote the sale in American markets of competitive pottery articles of other countries, as the Tariff Commission reported, at delivered costs, tariff

duties paid, of from 40 percent to 60 percent of American costs of production of competitive wares.

Surely, no one will contend that such importations will insure full employment for American pottery workers or will permit a condition wherein the products of American pottery workers will have an equal opportunity of sale in our American markets.

We find that despite the official evidence presented to the Congress, that some of our officials contend that nothing can be done before June 1948 when the present law expires.

We are aware, and we believe that the Congress is advised, that the trade-treaty agreements which our State Department internationalists and do-gooders plan to enter into with these 18 other nations will tie the hands of the United States Government for a period of 3 years and possibly an additional 6 months, from April 1947 to October 1950.

Admitting that the present law does not expire until June 1948, and assuming that such law will not be renewed or extended, we believe that we should play fair with the American people and with foreign nations.

We contend that Congress can and should now adopt legislation or take action which will, in substance, advise the State Department officials, the American people, and foreign nations, that no tariff rate in any trade agreement will be honored by the Congress which tariff rate does not equalize the differences in the labor costs of production of competitive American and foreign goods sold in American markets, after the expiration of the present law.

We believe that the American people, and we know that America's industrial workers will give very little credit to those who, if they fail the American people now, will, in 1948, claim that they can do nothing to relieve the distress of America's unemployed workers until the trade-treaty agreements entered into in April 1947, expire in April or October of 1950.

Surely the majority of the Congress of the United States is sufficiently interested in maintaining full employment for America's workers to take such action now as will permit them to be in a position to correct, at least in 1948, such reductions in tariff rates as they will find necessary in 1948.

Address of Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Before Red River Valley Improvement Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, before the Red River Valley Improvement Association, February 10, 1947, Shreveport, La.:

It was with deep regret last year that I was forced to forego the pleasure of accepting your cordial invitation to attend the convention of the Red River Valley Association and to participate in the program. I was correspondingly glad this year when Congressman OVERTON BROOKS conveyed your renewed invitation, affording me this second opportunity. It is delightful to be here, and it is a privilege to address this gathering.

For more than a score of years now—since your association was organized in 1925—we have worked together in a common cause. It has been your purpose, as it has been the purpose of the Corps of Engineers, to control and to improve the Red River system—to transform it from the character of master-at-will of this rich valley, and give to it the proper role of benign servant—a servant of ever-expanding usefulness to the people.

The activities of your association in recent years were spearheaded by a citizen whose absence today is noted with deep regret by all of us. I refer to Mr. Claudius M. Dickson, whose death last November closed a career of sterling service to this valley. The growth and accomplishments of your association during the 6 years he served as your president, bespeak his able leadership in advancing and broadening the trail blazed by his predecessor, the late W. H. Hodges, and other officials who pioneered the work of this association.

The expansion of the association to four-State proportions—to include with Louisiana, the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, through which the Red River flows—was a noteworthy step.

The establishment of a four-State planning committee, consisting of the State engineers of Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, provides a medium for the closest possible cooperation between Federal and State agencies, and coordination of Federal and State activities. It assures that the State and local points of view are fully represented in any discussion of plans and work to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers in the Red River Valley.

With these achievements of your association there also must have come a great personal satisfaction to your late president during his final year in office when the two major objectives in your worthy program achieved tangible recognition. The Congress, in 1946, authorized substantial expenditures for both flood control and navigation improvements in your valley.

Mr. Dickson's active interest will be missed not only in this association and in the valley, but also in the offices of the Corps of Engineers, where his opinions were highly respected, and his vision was greatly admired.

The congressional Representatives and Senators from the great are of the Red River Valley have attained national stature by their vigorous and thoughtful activity in behalf of Federal waterway improvement. It is regrettable that one of the stanchest leaders among this distinguished group—the Honorable JOHN H. OVERTON, senior Senator from Louisiana—has been prevented from being with us today by the press of congressional duties. I assure you that it was as much a satisfaction to the Corps of Engineers as it was to your association and to the people of Louisiana that the authorized lateral canal from the mouth of the river to Shreveport was named by Congress the "Overton-Red River Waterway."

As you know, the Corps of Engineers carries out its river-and-harbor improvements and flood-control works only upon congressional authorization, following requests for such work from the people, expressed generally through organizations like your own. This democratic process under which we work contemplates that the people shall make known, through their congressional representation, the types of work desired, and have full opportunity to express themselves fully upon any recommended works before they are eligible for construction.

This democratic process also precludes the possibility of initiating any works contrary to the desires of the people themselves, irrespective of how useful or promising such works may appear in the eyes of planners who do not dwell within the area affected by such works.

Various matters allied to the basic work of flood control and river-and-harbor improvements have been progressively added to the scope of our work. Congressional directives have called for full reports, not only on flood control and navigation possibilities, but also on the potentialities of such kindred benefits as the provision of water for irrigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, elimination of pollution, the restoration and preservation of fish and wildlife, and water conservation in the interest of domestic, municipal, and industrial use. Soil conservation and headwater drainage are also supplementary to, and complementry to, flood-control measures.

In regard to navigation improvement and flood control, the Red River presents a two-fold problem that demands all the engineering resources of the Corps of Engineers. On the one hand, the normal river levels are too low to permit modern navigation on more than a relatively short distance of the river. Furthermore, we have found that even with all existing and all authorized and recommended reservoirs fully operating the low-water flow in the river is insufficient to maintain adequate navigable depths by open-channel operations. Canalization of the river proper has also been found impracticable. Consequently, until the authorization of the Overton-Red River waterway, navigation improvements were confined to a systematic clearing of the river banks, snagging, dredging shoals, closing outlets, revetting caving banks, and preventing injurious cut-offs.

As authorized, the Overton-Red River waterway will be a $42,000,000 lateral canal which will make possible modern barge navigation from the mouth of the river up to Shreveport, giving this city and the Red River Valley direct connection with the great Mississippi River waterway system. The proposed waterway includes a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Mississippi River through Old River and Red River, and thence by a lateral canal along the right bank of the Red River. It will extend through land cuts and existing waterways and along the south bank of the Red River flood plain to Shreveport.

The plan contemplates 9 locks, with chambers 55 feet wide, 650 feet long, and 12-foot depth over the sills. A pumping plant on Red River near Shreveport will supply water adequate for maintenance of pool level in the terminal basin and uppermost pool, and for lockage during low-flow periods in Bayou Pierre.

Benefits from the estimated $42,000,000 Federal expenditures and the estimated $2,000,000 cost to local interests are figured at $3,500,000 annually. The principal commodities that will move on this new low-cost waterway will be petroleum and petroleum products, manufactured iron and steel, fertilizers, grain and cotton, with a large variety of other commodities in smaller volume.

Our engineers view the proposed canal as an increasingly important branch of the Nation's existing waterway system. Experience on the Nation's waterways indicate clearly that commerce on the canal will be increased above present estimates, and that industrial development of the Red River Valley will be definitely encouraged. Certainly, it needs no stretch of the imagination to visualize the substantial economic improvement to the Red River Valley that will result when this waterway is completed. Low-cost, all-water transportation to Shreveport will prove a primary asset in enabling this progressive city to become a greater distributing center for the many products that can be shipped here by barge and are needed in the Red River

Basin and beyond. At the same time, the waterway should help promote low-cost shipment of the products which the Red River Basin sends out for the use of other parts of the Nation and the world. The whole basin should be benefited.

The new lateral canal, however, will resolve only one aspect of the valley's primary problem of water control and usage. Destructive floods have periodically swept the region—so many, in fact, that our division engineer has estimated that, under existing conditions, the inflow from uncontrolled areas can be expected to produce flood stages on the main stem below Boggy Creek every other year, and serious floods on an average of once in 10 years.

Many constructive steps have been taken by the people in the valley, and by the Federal Government, to protect life and property from these floods. These accumulative efforts have culminated in the presently authorized interim flood-control plan passed by the Congress last year and included in the 1946 flood-control bill. Behind this plan—if I may reiterate for emphasis—lie many other smaller, related plans and undertakings to control the waters of the valley and put them to beneficial use.

I should like to dwell for a moment on these previous undertakings and accomplishments.

The greatest of these projects in point of size, expenditure, and multiplicity of benefits to be derived to the valley is, of course, Denison Dam, which was placed in operation in 1944. This dam—among the largest earthen dams in the world—is designed to control as completely as possible the flood flows which can reasonably be expected in Red River above Denison, Tex., and also to provide sufficient storage to generate a substantial block of hydroelectric power.

In addition to Denison Dam, local valley interests have constructed levees and appurtenant works intermittently along the river at a cost of approximately $25,000,000. There are six Federal levee projects, with appurtenant works, along the main stem of Red River. On four of these projects the levee work has been constructed. Two short cutoffs on the main stem also have been completed. Yesterday, the Wallace Lake Reservoir on Cypress Bayou was officially dedicated. This dam and reservoir—today practically complete at a cost of over a million dollars—was constructed for the single purpose of flood control. Substantial progress has been made on bank protection in the Shreveport area, and the channel of the Bayou Pierre has been enlarged along the lower 30 miles.

The flood-protection project for Bayou des Glaises, La.—located in the Mississippi-Red River backwater area, and providing a diversion channel from the bayou to the borrow pit of the west Atchafalaya Basin protection levee—has been completed. Work on the reservoir authorized on Bayou Bodcau is under way.

These extensive projects have been, and are, worthy constructions in bringing needed benefits to the valley. But without the works authorized in the 1946 act, they would be vastly inadequate protection for the people and property of the valley against the largest floods. During the extensive investigations undertaken by the Corps of Engineers, a designed flood was developed. A designed flood is a flood larger than any other experienced during the period of our records, but which is considered possible in the future. According to our calculations, this designed flood would overflow approximately 1,700,000 acres along the section between Boggy Creek and the Mississippi backwater area.

Naturally, you were not satisfied with this situation, either as individuals or as a group of progressive citizens. Through your congressional representatives you made the valley's great need for further—and much more adequate—protection known. Congress recognized these needs as being a Federal responsibility and, as consulting engineers for the Congress, the Corps of Engineers, after extensive investigations, recommended the project that has since been authorized—the interim flood-control plan. I should stress here that this project is an interim action. It and the Overton-Red River waterway project forms part of a great comprehensive development program for the entire Red River and its tributaries. This comprehensive over-all plan should be completed this spring. It will consider a program for the complete development of Red River and its tributaries for flood control, navigation, electric power, the provision of water for irrigation, water conservation, and related benefits. Because the Ouachita-Black, the principal tributary, joins the Red River so near the mouth, it has been investigated as a separate stream and will be made the subject of a separate report.

The interim flood-control project, as authorized by the Congress last year, calls for an estimated expenditure of $77,500,000. It entails flood protection on the main stem of Red River below Denison Dam, and includes the construction of six reservoirs on tributary streams. Tentatively, the reservoirs are Boswell, on Boggy Creek; the Hugo, on Kiamichi River; the Millwood, on Little River; the Texarkana, on Sulphur River; and Ferrells Bridge and Mooringsport, both on Cypress Creek. These six reservoirs would control a combined drainage area of 14,240 square miles.

The authorized interim project also calls for enlargement of existing and authorized levees, and for the provision of floodgates, as well as the construction of additional revetments, dikes, and similar works to stabilize the banks of the Red River.

The projects will provide substantially complete protection from headwater and tributary floods along the main stem of Red River between Denison Dam and the limit of the Mississippi-Red River backwater area.

Both the Overton-Red River waterway and the interim flood-control plan have been approved and authorized by the Congress, but I remind you that no construction work has been done as yet on either project. Such work is dependent upon future appropriations by Congress.

It is important to note that the 1948 budget for civil works contemplates only funds for continuation of construction on projects already in process of construction or on which work may be initiated this fiscal year with funds previously appropriated. Projects in the Red River Valley on which we expect to be able to proceed this year include construction of the Bayou Bodcau Reservoir; additional bank protection at Shreveport; a local protection small channel clearing project on Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou; and the final small jobs on the Wallace Lake Reservoir.

Installation of a second power unit is presently under way at Denison Dam. Levee construction or drainage work is expected to be initiated in the Red River backwater area before the end of the present fiscal year. Authorized local protection work in the Pineville and Aloha Rigolette area is under study.

In regard to the Red River Valley, and in all of our basin-wide development programs, we who are responsible to the American people through Congress have been impressed again and again with the need for the fullest participation of all responsible citizens in the formulation of the projects required. Regional development of our land and water resources must be the culmination of many years of work, representing the sum total of our engineering knowledge and experience. Exhaustive investigations, intensive study, and intelligent planning must be preceded by other years of observation and the accumulation of accurate records. Even then, such engineering knowledge cannot in itself arrive at an ultimate program without the support of an informed public opinion and the fullest cooperation of all interested Federal and State agencies and local citizens.

The policies established by Congress are sound, particularly in the way they emphasize that our program must begin at the grass roots, in the needs and desires of the people as expressed through their representatives.

Public-minded associations such as yours are rendering a necessary service in informing the people of the virtues of these democratic processes and alerting them against encroachments by any special interests, at any time, anywhere.

As representatives of the local interests and the citizenry of the Red River Valley, the initiative for waterways improvement needs in your great region remains with you.

The Corps of Engineers, through the Congress, is at your disposal.

David Lilienthal: The Man and His Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of a radio program of February 14, 1947, known as Headline Names, conducted by Russell Turner over WOL, Washington. The program consists of a colloquy between Turner and myself relative to David Lilienthal.

It is as follows:

Mr. TURNER. The most controversial name in this week's headlines undoubtedly is David Eli Lilienthal, President Truman's nominee to be chairman of the new Atomic Energy Commission.

When Mr. Truman sent the nomination to the Senate, more than a month ago, no one believed there would be any serious opposition. Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR was, of course, expected to wage the same fight he has put on for several years every time Mr. Lilienthal's name has come up for anything. But everyone expected the McKellar fight would be just as futile as it always has been in the past. But in the last week it suddenly has become a serious and substantial fight, with a definite possibility that Mr. Lilienthal may not be confirmed.

The issues involved have gone far beyond the McKellar-Lilienthal feud. But an understanding of David Lilienthal the man, how he got where he is, the principles on which he operates, and the principles for which he stands; that background will help understand the issues involved now.

To start at the beginning, Mr. Lilienthal was born in Morton, Ill., in July 1899, the son of hard-working immigrant parents. Despite having to largely work his own way through school, he was only 20 when he graduated from DePauw College at Greencastle, Ind. He won his law degree at Harvard, then began practicing in Chicago in partnership with Donald R. Richberg, at that time known as one of the country's outstanding young liberal labor lawyers.

Mr. Lilienthal spent much of his time on utilities litigation and wrote several articles on the subject, enough so that he soon won recognition as an expert in that field, and in 1931 was named a member of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. Two years later, with the advent of the New Deal, the long-discussed Tennessee Valley Authority became reality. And the late President Roosevelt, at the suggestion of then Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., chose Wisconsin's capable young public service commissioner to be one of the three TVA directors.

But for the rest of the story, here in the studio with me is Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER, of Chattanooga, Tenn., whose district lies squarely in the Tennessee Valley. Mr. KEFAUVER, incidentally, probably knows David Lilienthal better than any other person on Capitol Hill.

Mr. KEFAUVER, would you tell us something about Mr. Lilienthal as a person and the kind of job he has done with TVA?

Representative KEFAUVER. Well, to begin with, Mr. Turner, I feel confident he did not want the atomic job. He liked the TVA, he liked what he was doing there, he liked Tennessee, he had just recently been confirmed by the Senate for another 9 years.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. KEFAUVER, what is David Lilienthal like as an individual?

Representative KEFAUVER. Well, he's meek, mild, even-mannered. He's quiet, but he enjoys going around meeting people and talking with people. He does not push himself forward, and he's not at all the arrogant, pushing man some people now are trying to make him out to be.

Mr. TURNER. Right on that point, Mr. KEFAUVER, Fred Othman, the United Press columnist, tells a story about the time he was assigned to cover a TVA press conference back in 1935, when Fred was relatively new to Washington. A few minutes before the conference started Fred discovered he did not have a pencil. Sidling up to a quiet, unostentatious, youngish-looking man, Fred said, "Son, do you happen to have a pencil?" "No, sir," replied the youngish-looking man, "but I'll get you one." The unknown left the room and returned in a couple of minutes with a pencil, for which Othman duly thanked him. You can imagine Fred's embarrassment a few minutes later when the same young chap introduced himself to the conference as David E. Lilienthal.

Representative KEFAUVER. That story is exactly in character.

Mr. TURNER. But let's get back to the TVA, Mr. KEFAUVER. Wasn't it in 1935 when Mr. Lilienthal had his knock-down fight with the TVA chairman, Dr. Arthur E. Morgan?

Representative KEFAUVER. That's right, Mr. Turner. Norris Dam had already been built, and Dr. Morgan wanted to concentrate on it and the power it produced. But Lilienthal and Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan, the other Director, felt the mandate of the TVA law required further expansion. He felt that flood control and navigational improvements were an integral part of the TVA program and that additional dams were essential to carry it out. A full-dress congressional investigation failed to produce any major criticism of his ideas, and President Roosevelt finally upheld Lilienthal. Dr. Morgan resigned.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. KEFAUVER, Senator McKELLAR's feud has been going on for several years. Has there been more to it than the fact that the Senator could get nowhere in trying to build up a patronage list on the TVA pay roll?

Representative KEFAUVER. Yes; there has been. David Lilienthal never has paid any attention to politics in running the TVA, and most of us have come to accept that. We know that a Congressman's endorsement for a TVA job is more likely to do harm than good. Patronage troubles probably were the beginning of Senator McKELLAR's opposition to Lilienthal. But the real fight came in 1941.

Additional power was desperately needed, in those early days of the war for the aluminum plant at Alcoa, about 10 miles south of Knoxville. TVA itself and the Army engineers were agreed that the only way the power could be obtained for the aluminum plant that year, in the quantity needed, was to build the Douglas Dam, about 25 miles north of Knoxville. Two other dams had been proposed and Senator McKELLAR argued at length for them. His biggest reason for opposing the Douglas Dam was that it would flood several thousand acres of rich bottom land, most of it owned by a large canning company. Senator McKELLAR did manage to hold up a start on the dam for 2 months, but he finally lost out and the dam was built.

After that, Senator McKELLAR began his real fight. He had an amendment written into an appropriation bill requiring Senate confirmation of all TVA employees making more than $3,800 a year, but the figure later was raised to $4,500. Then he tried to hamstring TVA operations by requiring that Congress make specific appropriations for all of its expenditures. Under its charter, TVA is allowed to spend its receipts from power sales for operational and maintenance items, and then turn the balance over to the Treasury at the end of the year. Senator McKELLAR tried to make it so that these power-sales receipts would be blanketed into the Treasury as they were collected, and nothing could be spent unless it was specifically appropriated. Now that, of course, would be impossible in an operation like TVA, where they never can tell what may come up—storms may blow down transmission lines or damage other distribution facilities, and any one of a thousand other things may make it absolutely essential that substantial sums be spent for maintenance work immediately, without waiting for a congressional appropriation. Senator McKELLAR did persuade the Senate to adopt such an amendment two or three times, but it always was knocked out in the House.

Mr. TURNER. So that's the story of the McKellar-Lilienthal fight.

Representative KEFAUVER. Yes. Incidentally, I might point out that in spite of some of the testimony being offered by Senator McKELLAR's witnesses, David Lilienthal is extremely well-liked by people who work for TVA. He is a very able administrator, and has an unusual ability to select capable and loyal personnel. Personally, I have always felt that one of the main reasons for the success of the TVA has been its ability to make decisions in the Valley, without having to refer matters to Washington. It's an example of real regionalized control. And it occupies that status because Lilienthal has always insisted that it operate that way. He has made it work with and for the people of the seven States in the Valley; he made it work in cooperation with State and local officials; he made it work with and through other agencies which are working in the area, such as the Soil Conservation and Forest Services.

Mr. TURNER. What do the farmers in that area think of him?

Representative KEFAUVER. They believe in him. For example, the great conservative farm magazine, "The Progressive Farmer," selected him as the "man of the year" for 1945. Their citation was to the man who made the greatest contribution to southern agriculture during the year 1945.

Another point in Lilienthal's favor is that TVA always has built dams for less than was authorized by Congress. It never has had to come back and ask for a deficiency appropriation to complete some project.

There's one further example of David Lilienthal's complete interest in TVA. A few years back, he wrote a book called "Democracy on the March." It sold many thousands of copies, and the profits were substantial. But Lilienthal did not keep a single cent of those profits. Instead, he divided them between a special fund to defray incidental expenses of entertaining visitors to the TVA and a charity fund for TVA employees.

Mr. TURNER. And that's the background of the battle that's going on now.

Representative KEFAUVER. Yes, it started off as just another round in Senator McKELLAR's constant fight against Mr. Lilienthal and against everyone who has been closely connected with him. Now, however, it has become more than that. With Senator McKELLAR having been able by himself to hold up confirmation for a matter of weeks, different other groups have lined up against Lilienthal for various reasons of their own. In general these are the forces of economic and political reaction and isolationism. They include, among others, the power lobby which has long fought Lilienthal because he symbolizes public power at cheap rates. And there are others of like character. Whether they'll win or lose is something only time can tell.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you very, very much, Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER. I'm sure that, thanks to you, we all know a bit more about David Lilienthal, and therefore understand a little better the issues involved in the battle over his nomination to be chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Continue Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to the President of the United States concerning the necessity of continuing rent controls. This letter is signed by able men who are thoroughly qualified to write and speak on this subject:

FEBRUARY 7, 1947.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Americans for Democratic Action strongly endorses your stand against any general rent increase. We are disturbed, however, at the possibility that the Congress may pass legislation effecting such an increase. Only vigorous leadership and the united efforts of all Members of the Congress who support your stand can protect the American people from that danger.

The overwhelming majority of the American people oppose any general rent increase. Every public-opinion poll proves this. Representatives of organized labor and of consumers' and veterans' groups have already appeared before the Congress to express their opposition; and in this regard they spoke

not only for their membership but for the great mass of ordinary people who will suffer from a rent increase and who have no way of making themselves heard in Washington. It is especially for these millions of people who have not been heard—unorganized wage and salary workers; Federal, State, and local government employees; teachers; firemen and policemen; clergymen; elderly people who live on pensions, and all the others who live on relatively low fixed incomes—that we should like to speak.

A great clamor has been raised for a general rent increase by the landlord association, their lobbyists, and, unfortunately, some Members of Congress. But no facts of any kind have been presented by landlords or their spokesmen, in and out of Congress, which would remotely justify such action. Landlords today, as a group, according to official and unchallenged figures, are far better off than they were before the war. The issue is whether the will of the people or the high-pressure lobbies will prevail.

We recognize that there may be some individual landlords who are suffering hardship. That hardship should be relieved. I t the fair and just way of taking care of these cases, as you have pointed out, is on an individual basis. The Congress, therefore, should appropriate the funds needed to handle these cases expeditiously. To increase all rents in order to take care of a relatively few hardship cases will give landlords generally an inexcusable windfall at the expense of a heavy and unwarranted burden upon millions of people.

To maintain full employment and industrial peace, the real income of our people must be increased. Yet, as you pointed out in your economic report to the Congress, the $46 weekly take-home pay of the average factory worker in October 1946 bought only about as much as the $35 he received in April 1942. If the Congress were now to cut further into real income by raising rents generally, your program of attempting to secure price reductions throughout industry would be smashed.

A general rent increase of 10 percent would add $500,000,000 to the Nation's rent bill; 15 percent would add $750,000,000; 20 percent, $1,000,000,000. Additions of those magnitudes to the cost of living would undermine the possibilities for labor peace and destroy the foundations of high-level business activity. Labor could not reasonably be expected to exercise restraint in the face of such an attack to their living standards, nor would their earnings suffice to clear the markets of the enlarged volume of goods and services which will be produced in 1947.

The property owners' lobby protests that all other business enterprises have been permitted to boost prices—and profits—at will. The regulation of an industry or group is always met with cries of "discrimination." The real question is whether the regulation is fair and reasonable.

In the case of rent control we are faced with the simple issue whether the income of the great body of citizens shall be further reduced to alleviate the fictitious grievances of most landlords. Landlords today are in a more favorable position than ever before both because of the housing shortage and adjustments granted by OPA, and there is no prospect whatever that the shortage will be reduced in the near future to permit the play of supply-and-demand forces that operate in other areas of the economy.

Every consideration of public policy requires the defeat of the proposal for a general increase in rents. The administration has a moral obligation to assume leadership in the fight against the efforts being made to bestow unwarranted benefits upon the great majority of landlords at the expense of millions of tenants.

We look forward confidently to your assumption of leadership in this fight. We urge that you make your intentions crystal clear to the Congress and to the people. We urge:

1. That you address the people reiterating your call for extension of the present rent-control law.

2. That you make it clearly known that you will veto any bill which calls for general rent increases or contains other crippling amendments.

3. That you exercise the full powers of your office in the fight for continued effective rent control.

The landlord lobby's campaign represents a new flagrant attempt to sacrifice the interests of the many to augment the profits of the few. We urge you to accept the challenge unequivocally.

Respectfully,

LEON HENDERSON,
WILSON W. WYATT,
Co-Chairmen, Organizing Committee, Americans for Democratic Action.

Statistical Summary of Veterans' Administration Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following statistical summary of Veterans' Administration activities as of January 31, 1947. I believe that most of the Members of this House will want to study these figures carefully in order to bring themselves up to date upon the important subject of the care of our veterans.

Statistical summary of VA activities, Jan. 31, 1947

Subject	January 1947 [1]	December 1946	July 1945
Veteran population:			
1. Total number of veterans, end of month	18,277,000	18,161,000	6,712,000
2. Number of World War II veterans, end of month	14,341,000	14,230,000	2,688,000
3. Number of veterans of other wars and Regular Establishment, end of month	3,936,000	3,941,000	4,024,000
Vocational rehabilitation (Public Law 16):			
4. Total number of applications received during month	27,963	23,757	9,148
5. Number of applications pending advisement, end of month	46,759	45,689	12,810
6. Total number in training, end of month	201,043	190,464	16,003
7. In educational institutions [2]	112,540	106,822	9,650
8. In job training	88,503	83,642	6,353
9. Number who had completed or discontinued training during month	10,779	9,223	1,343
10. Number of regular payments for subsistence allowance made during month	157,712	138,215	12,705
Education and training (Public Law 346):			
11. Total number of applications received during month	253,328	180,392	14,131
12. Number of applications pending, eligibility not determined, end of month	24,774	27,327	7,107
13. Total number in training, end of month	2,228,970	2,201,295	22,349
14. In educational institutions [2]	1,596,969	1,572,719	20,229
15. In job training	632,001	629,157	2,120
16. Number who had completed or discontinued education or training during month	179,867	141,816	3,651
17. Number of regular payments for subsistence allowance made during month	1,580,881	1,482,897	13,281
Loans:			
18. Total number of loans approved for guaranty through 25th of month	639,205	591,302	15,249
19. Total amount of loans approved for guaranty through 25th of month (thousands of dollars)	$3,421,245	$3,139,284	(3)
20. Total amount of guaranty and insurance of loans approved through 25th of month (thousands of dollars)	$1,584,847	$1,453,881	$24,894
Readjustment allowances:			
21. Number of initial unemployment claims filed during week ending last Saturday of month	126,185	104,848	[4] 10,000
22. Number of continued unemployment claims filed during week ending last Saturday of month	1,162,247	934,704	[4] 49,000
23. Number of self-employment claims filed during month	(3)	169,982	13,211
24. Amount of unemployment allowances paid during 4 weeks ending last Saturday of month (thousands of dollars)	$91,303	$73,196	$3,523
25. Amount of self-employment allowances paid during month (thousands of dollars)	(3)	$15,317	$1,210
Disability compensation or pension cases: [5]			
26. Number of new cases received during month	69,842	62,055	94,530
27. Number of new cases adjudicated during month	68,762	65,280	[4] 75,259
28. Number pending adjudication, end of month	153,940	150,968	107,499
29. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	2,187,202	2,168,772	1,052,213
Death compensation or pension cases: [5]			
30. Number pending adjudication, end of month	19,851	20,464	52,902
31. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	452,915	452,895	289,243
Automobiles for disabled veterans:			
32. Number of applications filed to end of month	18,387	17,261	----------
33. Number of applicants certified as eligible to end of month	13,318	12,537	----------
34. Number delivered conveyances for which VA has made payment to end of month	7,354	5,600	----------
National-service life insurance:			
35. Number of applications pending, end of month [6]	18,894	19,413	170,634
36. Number of insured lives on which payments of death claim awards were active, end of month	377,308	376,244	237,993
37. Number of death claims (beneficiaries) awarded during month [6]	2,889	2,593	26,738
38. Number of death claims (beneficiaries) pending, end of month [6]	17,381	17,308	27,901
39. Number of disability claims (waiver of premium) awarded during month [6]	2,434	2,728	31,257
40. Number of disability claims (waiver of premium) pending, end of month [6]	1,962	1,721	29,464
Requests for physical examination:			
41. Number cleared by examination during month	95,494	87,513	28,997
42. Number pending, examination not completed, end of month	221,770	224,882	137,562
Applications for hospital or domiciliary care:			
43. Number received during month	81,463	63,387	30,114
44. Number disposed of during month	80,483	66,464	29,469
45. Number pending, eligibility not determined, end of month	10,400	9,420	4,377

[1] Preliminary; subject to revision.
[2] Includes cooperative training.
[3] Not available.
[4] Estimated.
[5] World War II, World War I, and Regular Establishment.
[6] Central office only.

Statistical summary of VA activities, Jan. 31, 1947—Continued

Subject	January 1947 [1]	December 1946	July 1945
Veterans awaiting hospital admission:			
46. Total number, end of month	22,094	22,395	4,329
47. Number with service-connected disorders, end of month	58	55	169
48. Number with non-service-connected disorders, end of month	22,036	22,340	4,160
Beneficiaries remaining in Veterans' Administration hospitals or homes:			
49. Total number in hospitals, last Wednesday in month	90,628	[2] 82,808	67,320
50. Veterans with service-connected disorders	29,042	26,230	22,700
51. Veterans with non-service-connected disorders	60,401	55,529	43,907
52. Others	1,185	1,049	713
53. Total number in homes, last Wednesday in month	(3)	13,498	9,086
Beneficiaries remaining in non-Veterans' Administration hospitals:			
54. Total number, last Wednesday in month	14,110	[2] 12,239	4,459
55. Veterans with service-connected disorders	5,668	4,970	841
56. Veterans with non-service-connected disorders	8,371	7,189	3,564
57. Others	71	80	54
Present program hospitals:			
58. Number for which type, capacity, and general location have been approved	75	74	[3] 21
59. Number for which funds have been appropriated	75	74	[3] 21
60. Number for which specific sites have been selected and approved by the President	68	67	[3] 16
61. Number for which plans and specifications have been completed and approved	7	7	[3] 2
62. Number under construction	4	4	[3] 1
63. Number completed	0	0	[3] 0
Supplemental program hospitals (awaiting appropriation of funds):			
64. Number for which type, capacity, and general location have been approved	15	16	[3] 0
65. Number for which funds have been appropriated	0	0	[3] 0
Present program additions to hospitals:			
66. Number for which type, capacity, and general location have been approved	48	47	[3] 36
67. Number for which funds have been appropriated	48	47	[3] 36
68. Number for which plans and specifications have been approved	32	32	[3] 30
69. Number under construction	13	13	[3] 28
70. Number completed	19	19	[3] 0
Supplemental program additions to hospitals (awaiting appropriation of funds):			
71. Number for which type, capacity, and general location have been approved	1	2	[3] 0
72. Number for which funds have been appropriated	0	0	[3] 0

[1] Preliminary; subject to revision. [2] Data as of Jan. 1, 1947. [3] Data as of June 30, 1945.

Reparations: Antidote for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM RAYBURN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ambassador Edwin W. Pauley, United States reparations representative, before the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., February 12, 1947:

The forthcoming meeting in Moscow on the German peace treaty, the middle of March, makes reparations a timely subject right now. The agenda of that meeting will embrace two principal parts: Political and economic, and certainly reparations is the most important part of the economic problem. Deputy Foreign Minister Vishinsky said during last fall's Paris conference that "Reparations are the most important factor in the peace." So, I think it's worth a look.

To begin with, it seems to me that the reparations problem cannot be understood unless the purpose is understood. In fact, it is clear to me that misunderstanding of the purpose of our reparations program—both as to Germany and Japan—is the cause of much of the criticism that is occasionally heard.

In the past, military victors have usually demanded reparations from the vanquished primarily for repayment of war costs—in money—or for revenge. In the process they have frequently blundered into strengthening their former enemies—just as the Allies did after the victory of 1918.

This time we have not been motivated by these goals. The fundamental purpose of the German reparations program is security—security against another outburst of German aggression. As stated in the Berlin protocol, the aim is "to secure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbors or the peace of the world." If we bear that in mind, we will avoid the errors of analysis that have been made by some who have been critical of the program.

In order to achieve the security which was our basic aim, the Big Three agreed at Potsdam to take two major steps:

First, to eliminate German industrial war potential by removing from that country plants designed specifically to make war matériel, and to control rigidly certain types of heavy and specialized industry directly necessary to war economy, such as metals, chemicals, and machine tools.

Second, to transfer to Germany's victims the surplus industrial equipment beyond what Germany needs for a peaceful economy, in order that they might be able to rebuild and strengthen themselves against the future.

I will not go into the details of the recommended removals from Germany, because this information has already been made public. Suffice it to say that the program calls for the destruction or removal of varying percentages of a number of categories of industry—in other words, the taking of things, instead of money. Such a program makes it possible for us to avoid the blunders of World War I, after which the Allies demanded money reparations. You will recall that Uncle Sam loaned Germany the money to build up its industry so that it could pay money reparations to the other allies. And what happened? Well, Uncle Sam never got his money back—but his money enabled Germany to erect the industry with which it mounted World War II.

Yet, in the face of that tragic lesson, there has now developed a body of critics who suggest that we repeat the mistake. The gist of their argument goes something like this:

"Look, Germany is the industrial heart of Europe. It is unrealistic to think that you can move industry out of there. If you do, the Germans will starve, and the entire European pattern of commerce will be disrupted. The smart thing to do is to leave the industry in Germany, and collect reparations from current production."

That is the argument that one hears these days, and almost invariably it winds up with the inference that the men who fashioned the reparations program were small boys who should have been home flying kites instead of tinkering with things they didn't understand.

Well, of course, the taking of reparations from current production is just what our Soviet colleagues have been insisting upon since Potsdam, and I will point out in a moment the grave dangers inherent in such a course. Meanwhile, let's look back very briefly and see how and by whom the German reparations program was devised.

The preparatory work actually began 2 years before the negotiations started. Intensified work was under way many weeks before the opening of the first meetings of the Allied Commission on Reparations in Moscow. In Washington, in London, in Paris, in Germany, and in the neutral countries, recognized specialists carried forward thoroughgoing studies of all phases of the problem that was to be faced. They went into the economics, and into the engineering and sociological aspects, both current and historical. They worked out the most careful kind of forecasts as to the likely consequences of alternative courses. At all times, they worked closely with the military, so that reparations plans would harmonize with Army and Navy plans.

Concurrently, the development of an agreed-upon United States Government policy was being undertaken by the group designated as the Informal Policy Committee on Germany. This group was made up of representatives of the State, War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, the Foreign Economic Administration, and my mission. We had the benefit of frequent talks with the President and extensive consultation with members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. Among the many distinguished people outside of Government whom we called upon for counsel was Mr. John Foster Dulles, who not only approved the program but heartily endorsed it.

And, so, when one refers to the German reparations program, he is referring, in fact, to a document known as a Memorandum of the Informal Policy Committee on Germany, or, as we know it for short, IPCOG TWO. This is not just Ed Pauley's program—although I fully support it and am quite ready to accept any blame that may attach to it. It is a program signed by the Secretary of State, by the Secretary of War, by the Secretary of the Navy, by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by the Foreign Economic Administrator, in addition to Ed Pauley.

Finally, the staff of my mission were men of acknowledged ability and experience, drawn from Government, industry, and the professions, and others with special knowledge of conditions in Germany and Europe. Anyone who will take the time to look at the list of staff members will recognize their competence.

I have given you this detail simply by way of suggesting that the American delegates to the reparations meetings were not doing a job of ad libbing, and they were not second-

stringers. As a matter of fact, anyone who will examine the record objectively will, in my opinion, come away with the realization that a particular feature of the German reparations job was the unusual amount of preparation and the high quality of the staff.

Now, we face the German peace-treaty negotiations at Moscow; and one of the major ingredients of those negotiations will be the reparations program. The question then becomes, What will happen to that program at Moscow? Should it be revised, as our Soviet colleagues—and some American critics—have so strongly urged? Or, should we stoutly insist upon its execution? In order to answer, we need to consider what has happened to the program since it was embraced in the Berlin Protocol signed on August 2, 1945, by President Truman, Generalissimo Stalin, and Prime Minister Attlee. We need to consider, also, the principal objections that have been advanced, domestically and abroad.

One of the difficulties has concerned the Soviet desire to take large-scale reparations from current production. Now, we do not object to the Soviets taking reparations from current production if certain prerequisites are fulfilled. One of these is that there are first removed from Germany the plants designed specifically to make war matériel. Another is that there also be first removed from Germany such other industrial plants and equipment as the Germans do not require to maintain a peaceful economy. The third is that, before reparations are taken from production, the Germans first be allowed to retain sufficient for the agreed-upon subsistence level, plus enough to pay for necessary imports. Now, if these prerequisites are met—as was agreed at Potsdam—will someone please tell me how there can be anything left for reparations from current production? More than that: Will any red-blooded American—remembering the sacrifices that have been made in two world wars—dispute the principle that these prerequisites must be met?

These aspects of the matter of taking of reparations from current production involve highly important considerations, and need to be understood, whatever the ultimate determination may be. It was a subject that received most careful consideration by all departments concerned, during the preparatory studies in Washington. I am now at liberty to reveal the instructions which I had from the President on this score—and again I would point out that these instructions were signed, not only by the President, but by the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Treasury, and by the Director of the Foreign Economic Administration.

I quote:

"To the maximum extent possible, reparations should be taken from the national wealth of Germany existing at the time of collapse, with primary emphasis upon the removal of industrial machinery, equipment, and plants, particularly the shipbuilding, metallurgical, machine-tool producing, electrical machinery, and chemical industries (including all industries producing oil and oil products, synthetic nitrogen, and synthetic rubber), ships, rolling stock, patents, copyrights, and German foreign exchange assets, including investments abroad."

It was fully recognized that there might be strong insistence by our Soviet allies upon reparations from current production, because we were well aware of their great need for consumer goods. Therefore, in anticipation of such a development, my instructions read—and again I quote:

"Such goods should be of such a nature and in such amounts as not to require the maintenance of the German war potential or the continued dependence of other countries on Germany after reparations cease. Accordingly, recurring reparations, over a period of years, should be—

"(1) As small as possible in relation to the reparations to be paid in the form of industrial plants and equipment; and

"(2) Primarily in the form of raw materials and natural resources, and to the smallest extent possible in the form of manufactured products."

Now, as I have pointed out frequently, there was a very sound reason for these instructions, and they grow out of our sad experience following World War I.

After World War I, the Allies—excepting the United States—demanded reparations from Germany in the form of a huge sum of money. But Germany didn't have any money. The only way it could get it was to build up its foreign trade. Good old, patient Uncle Sam obligingly supplied credits, and Germany began increasing its industrial structure so that it could develop the foreign trade that would give it the money to pay reparations.

The consequences of this blunder are, of course, an old—and bitterly tragic—story. Germany built up its industry so effectively, and fashioned its cartel arrangements so skillfully, that it brought most of Europe under its economic dominance. Worse still, this hampered or actually prevented the development of essential techniques in the countries which had been her conquerors—and it gave Germany the industrial plant that readied it for its next try at world conquest.

And, please note this basic point: This result was brought about by demanding reparations from the proceeds of current production—the course that we now hear advocated by Americans who seem completely unwilling to learn from history.

The United States Government had determined that we would not repeat this error. That is why we stood so strongly at Moscow—and again at Potsdam—in favor of taking reparations this time in the form of things—capital goods that would take out of Germany the physical wherewithal for plunging the world into war again.

But, the critics will tell you: "You can't do that. Germany is the industrial heart of Europe. Remove industry from the Reich, and all Europe will suffer."

Freed from military and political pressures, and from the coils of restrictive cartels, why cannot France and the U. S. S. R., Belgium and Czechoslovakia, and the other ravished nations of Europe provide Europe with its industrial needs just as well as Germany has done in the past?

It may be answered: "Well, in the first place, it will take time to transfer equipment out of Germany to other countries; and Europe needs production now. Besides, industrial installations are built where they are because of specific reasons: availability of raw materials, power, labor, transportation, markets, and so forth. You can't just pick them up and move them willy-nilly to some other place."

Let me say that I recognize that these are disadvantages, and serious ones. But certainly everyone agrees that we cannot let the Germans reconstruct their former might—and offer it to the highest bidder for another adventure in conquest.

Meanwhile, what of the further allegation: That the reparations program is forcing Germany into starvation and thereby breeding unrest and hampering the development of democratic elements? Of course, the first answer is that the reparations program could not possibly have brought about such a condition, because the program of removals in the western zones has been necessarily delayed. So let's not try to pretend that reparations are responsible for Germany's admittedly unhappy present state. Let us rather recognize—what any schoolboy should realize—that there was a war not so long ago. So it is just barely possible that bombs and artillery and the collapse of a totalitarian economic organization might have had some slight part in putting Germany in its present condition.

What, then, of the future effect of reparations? The answer is: "Yes—sure—reparations removals will affect Germany adversely, but there is no desire or intent to starve Germany or to turn the country into a vast poorhouse. President Truman recognized this when he noted in his instructions to my mission:

"It will be inevitable that the German standard of living will be adversely affected by the carrying out of the reparation plan. However, the reparation exactions should be held within such limits as to leave the German people with sufficient means to provide a minimum subsistence standard of living without sustained outside relief; but under no condition should this limitation operate to require the retention in Germany of means to support basic living standards on a higher level than that existing in any one of the neighboring United Nations."

This philosophy is embraced in the Berlin protocol. To implement that protocol, very careful calculations were made by very capable people to determine the level of industry which would, in fact, enable Germany to sustain itself on this basis.

Now, what is unreasonable about this? Are the critics going to argue—with any pretense of seriousness—that the victorious Allies owe some responsibility to subsidize Germany? Is it being suggested that Germany is just an unfortunate friend who had an accident? Has it been forgotten already that Germany started the war—that Germany devastated most of Europe and a good deal of the United Kingdom for no other purpose than to gain world empire? Do we overlook the fact that some fellows from this country had to go to Africa and Europe on troopships and didn't come back?

I do not ask these questions with the idea of stirring up the lust for revenge upon Germany. We are not a revengeful people. But I will confess to feeling a rise in temperature when I hear the suggestion that it is our responsibility to repair the enormous damage that Germany brought upon itself. I submit that all that we, as a humanitarian people, owe to Germany is a chance to do their own rebuilding with only the minimum help that is needed during the transition to self-sustenance. This is precisely the viewpoint that was taken by the Government representatives who drew up our policy on German reparations before I went to Moscow. It is precisely the viewpoint expressed by the President when he instructed me—with the concurring signatures of the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, Treasury, and the Director of the Foreign Economic Administration. I quote:

"This Government opposes any reparation plan based upon the assumption that the United States or any other country will finance directly or indirectly any reconstruction in Germany or reparation by Germany."

If anyone chooses to call this callous or cold-blooded, my answer is: Let them tell it to some people in uniform who went ashore at Normandy one June morning. With no thought of vengeance, but with simple realism, my attitude is plainly this: Germany has dragged the world into war twice in our time. If it is necessary for the German people to endure some rigors in order that a third such calamity be prevented, then let those rigors be endured.

At the same time, I would point out—and emphasize—that it is extremely important in my opinion that we avoid anything that borders on persecution of the Germans, or anything that could be interpreted as repressing their reconstruction. After all, we are supposed to have hunted out and punished the war criminals. If there are any whom we have not hunted out and punished, then we had better do it right now.

Thereafter, it seems more than a little important to me that the rest of the German people—so long as they fulfill their obligations under Potsdam—be spared from the imposition of any unnecessary handicaps. (In other words, I think they should be entitled to what we might call an "E" for effort.) Only thus can we encourage democratic elements within the country; only thus can we avoid the disgruntlement and unrest which can lead only to the resurgence of some new form of Hitlerism.

The program has, of course, not gone forward as all of us had hoped that it might. One reason is the delay that has been experienced in persuading our Soviet friends to accept the principle—agreed by all at Potsdam—that Germany should be operated as an economic unit during the period of occupation. Such unification is important because the level of industry, upon which the proposed reparations removals are based, is predicated upon it. Thus it is obvious that Germany can sustain itself with less industry if it is operated as a unit than if four separate units have to be made self-sustaining within themselves.

Another obstacle has been Soviet resistance to the principle of making necessary imports a first charge against exports. This is a point that is important to the American taxpayer. The proposal advanced by the American reparations delegation went like this: Germany has to have certain imports to meet its essential requirements. But the only way it can pay for these imports is to export sufficient raw materials and finished products to give it dollar exchange.

The Soviets accepted this principle at Potsdam, but since then they have stood strongly for its revision, and for a reason which we can understand even though we may not approve. That reason is one which I mentioned earlier—if imports are made a first charge against exports, and if certain other specifications are met, then there will be nothing left from current production to go into reparations.

I pressed this point long and vigorously at Moscow, first with Ambassador Maisky and later with his successor on the Reparations Commission, Mr. K. V. Novikoff, not the present Russian Ambassador to the United States. At one point, after the discussions had been in progress for exactly 1 month, I wrote a letter to Mr. Maisky in which I said—I quote:

"I want to make my position perfectly clear with regard to the charges against German exports which we discussed yesterday.

"Surely we both understand that there can be no current annual reparations from Germany except as more goods are shipped out of Germany than are shipped in, that is, there must be a large export balance. An export balance cannot be produced in Germany without some imports, such as food, alloys, cotton, etc. If these indispensable imports (without which there would be no exports of certain highly important types) are not a charge against the exports, then you, or we, or some other economy will have to pay for the imports. Neither the U. S. S. R. nor the U. S. A. can think of recommending to its people a reparations plan which overlooks this elemental fact.

"Mathematically it may be stated as follows: Current reparations equal German current production less the sum of occupation costs, minimum essential German consumption and imports required to achieve the production permitted by the Allies. In symbols this reads:

$$R = P - (O + C + I)$$

"You say that the Russian people are more interested in R (reparations) in this formula than in anything else. My people, remembering the last reparations settlement, when the final element of this formula was overlooked, insist that we do not forget the I, the imports. But we do so in order that the R will be true net reparations, and not fictitious reparations which come out of your pockets or ours. When we say that essential imports are a prior charge on exports, this is not because we think that imports are more important than reparations. Quite the contrary. All we are saying is that you must feed the cow to get the milk. The food is a prior charge; it comes first in time, but it is not more important.

"Without carrying this simile too far, could we say that you want a cow which will give lots of milk. We both expect that the cow will lose both horns and will get mighty thin. We want to be sure that the small amount of fodder required will be paid for with some of the milk. Last time we put up the fodder.

"If you can think of any way of making this clear in economic language which says just this and will be more acceptable to your people than the words of principle 8, I shall be more than happy to agree, as I know that we are pursuing the same objectives."

Principle 8 was the American proposal which provided for imports being a first charge against exports. It was never accepted during the Moscow negotiations, but it was accepted by Generalissimo Stalin at Potsdam.

Let us remember that Potsdam, like any other international agreement, was a compromise. When you go into any meeting with other people—whether in government or in business—you maintain your own viewpoint because you think it's right. The other parties try to maintain their own. Obviously, the only way by which agreement is reached is by compromise. We who negotiated with the British and the Soviets at Moscow, and later at Potsdam, know that the agreement we reached was not a perfect agreement. But, I would ask you note this: We also knew that, if we waited until later, it would be still further short of what we believed desirable. And, I say without hesitation that the agreement which was signed is far better than anything that is now proposed.

I might interpolate at this point that, while I have confined my comments to Germany, the same general principles apply to Japan, which is even more barren of natural resources than Germany without the Ruhr. It is in the rest of Asia where the raw materials exist and this is a point which was kept constantly in mind in the development of our Japanese reparations program. But, enough of Japan.

As the Moscow meetings draw near, we find reparations to be an extremely important part of the agenda, with significant problems still unsettled. Despite all criticism, I still believe in the soundness of the program evolved at Potsdam. I believe it is worth defending. I believe that this program can be a very important factor, indeed, in the job of working out a peace that will last at least somewhat longer than the last one, and one fervently hopes forever. I don't want to sound maudlin or to slip into burbling bromides, but, seriously, we can't go on indefinitely sacrificing our young men every 20 years. I believe very strongly and very sincerely that the reparations plan can help prevent that from happening. That is why I am eager to support it with all the vigor at my command. That is why I am sincerely grateful for the chance to state the case to you men today. I want as many people as possible to understand the problems ahead, because there will undoubtedly be debates with our Soviet friends, and it just isn't possible to get anywhere in international negotiations without support at home.

I thank you.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address titled "National Security," delivered at Boston, Mass., February 15, 1947, by Louis E. Starr, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

One week from today is the two hundred fifteenth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, soldier, statesman, President; the Father of our Country. No one could speak in the Boston area where Washington took command of the Continental Army without paying tribute to him and his patriot followers, whose vision and fortitude made possible American independence.

Today, our leaders again face a Herculean task. At no time since the days of Washington has their assignment been so baffling. Theirs is a job of shaping a just peace in a world seething with hate. They must prevent World War III. They must make the United Nations organization work.

Two million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are vitally concerned with this task of our statesmen. If they succeed, we shall live in peace. If they fail, World War III is inevitable, and World War III will mean the destruction of our present-day civilization. Governments have had their last chance to resort to war to further their aims. The next war will destroy them.

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, having served in combat areas overseas, are eager to lend full support to our statesmen. In this turbulent world, our members realize, that the prestige which our representatives of the United States have a right to enjoy, can stem only from modern military might.

Consequently, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of right, has come to certain definite conclusions as to what constitutes military might.

George Washington, who still stands as the greatest of our military leaders, enjoined our people to make themselves available for military service. And in his day a trained soldier with a rifle was the greatest fighting unit in existence. Today the Veterans of Foreign Wars feels it can turn to no better advice than that of General Washington: to put the best available weapon in the hands of trained, talented youth.

The outstanding lesson of World War II was the emergence of air power as the greatest striking force known.

Air power alone defeated the British Mediterranean Fleet in the Kythera Straits in May 1941.

Air power totally defeated the Japanese in their homeland. Air power forced surrender of the Japanese homeland Army of two and a half million men, trained tough, physically and spiritually. Yet this army surrendered unconditionally, although it had never been engaged.

I am positive tonight that if George Washington were alive today he—as he did more than a century and a half ago—would place as first priority in his national-security program, the maintenance of the most modern and powerful air force in the world. I am positive also that George Washington would organize our industry so that this air force

could be rapidly expanded. Such action would be most consistent with the combat effectiveness which he prescribed for his day—the utilization of the rifle, and every man trained to use it.

This does not mean that air power alone is all that is essential to national security, but since it is the greatest striking force known and could punish an enemy before any other force, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has placed air power first on the list of budgetary and actual requirements. We are determined that, in these turbulent times, we shall have a real air force in being.

In order to keep the best air force in the world, exhaustive scientific research and development is necessary.

It is our contention that, in building our national security, there must be created a joint civilian-military agency to undertake the scientific research and development which is essential to keep production as advanced as American genius for invention, development, and productivity can devise. Such an agency requires ample liquid funds; and in spite of any desire for economy—a principle which, by the way, our organization endorses—we must have the money for this research.

While it is difficult to predict the modern trend in striking power—which might today be in a period of transition from the bomber to the guided missile—certain developments are already worthy of note.

The recent controlled flight of pilotless aircraft from Honolulu to San Francisco and the use of electronics to guide pilotless planes into their target, enable us to sense the need for further electronic development. If, by electronics, planes were flown pilotless from Honolulu to San Francisco, then by the same process—electronics—those planes might be turned around or guided into the ground before they reach their target.

Air attacks once launched always go through to their objective. There may be losses en route, but experience is conclusive that air attacks go through. It is, therefore, necessary for the proposed research division to undertake the creation of an electronic defense against aircraft attacks and attacks from guided missiles.

Only 2 weeks ago, Glenn L. Martin testified before the Senate that the United States is 18 months to 2 years behind Great Britain in jet propulsion. Two articles in one of our leading magazines last month emphatically asserted that the United States is far behind Soviet Russia in the development of rockets. The reason for this lag is not that we lack the genius to progress, but rather because we have not allocated the funds necessary for research.

Let me pose this question: How can any American sanction foreign loans and then deny funds for the research which is so essential to our existence?

Since the primary striking force is air power, friendly strategic air bases are essential. The Veterans of Foreign Wars believes it is vital to national security that we maintain some 10 regular, well-trained, professional divisions, capable of being flown as an air army to any point in the world. An expanded and improved National Guard and organized Reserve are also essential, so that National Guard and Reserve divisions will be immediately ready to take the place of regular divisions as they are committed.

There is a precedent for the concept of an air army. From the 20th to the 24th of May 1941 the Luftwaffe flew 35,000 troops into Crete, landed them physically on top of a numerically equal force, supported and supplied this air-borne army by air, and in 11 days the German forces captured the island of Crete. This was the first and possibly the only separate operation in World War II which was entirely air borne and air supplied.

The exploitation of the talent and genius which is peculiar to America in the development of air-striking power is not alone sufficient for national security. As long as we have interests overseas, a modern Navy is an essential element in national security. The advent of air power, the atomic bomb, and the fact that our potential enemies do not possess fleets in no way lessens the importance of the Navy. The Veterans of Foreign Wars believes that the role of the Navy in keeping communications free and in supplying our overseas units is still as important as ever. Fortunately, today we have the best Navy in the world. It must be maintained in keeping with war's modern potential.

In the past, our armed services have failed miserably in the field of military intelligence. This failure has been due primarily to treating this most important phase of national security as an amateur activity. Many of our military attachés were afflicted with social ambition, were not inclined to associate with the right people where they were stationed. Too many depended on the gems of wisdom which dripped from the tea tables at social functions. The trend toward superficiality led them merely to count cannon and tanks and ships and airplanes, and from this numerical count, attempt to assess the war potential of a power. In making these careful material assessments, we neglected, to a great extent, to consider the temper, racial characteristics, and religion of the people. These human traits, possibly not quite as evident as cannon, are nevertheless more important in evaluating the combat efficiency of a nation.

Today, a central intelligence group has been created to perform this extremely important mission of evaluating human as well as material factors. But the group is handicapped by inadequate funds. The Veterans of Foreign Wars advocates the allocation of whatever funds are necessary to enable our central intelligence group to perform its mission properly.

More than ever before in our history, economy in government is essential. We are far advanced on the inflationary spiral. Spending must be curbed, taxes lowered, the budget balanced and then reduced. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is convinced that some economy can be achieved in military expenditures without sacrificing national security. Duplication of effort and cumbersome administration must be eliminated. Still more important, duplication of missions among the armed forces must be eliminated. Obsolete weapons, organizations, and equipment must be abandoned. These measures will affect our economy materially.

But the Veterans of Foreign Wars will oppose to the limit of its capability any economy which will prevent the maximum development in scientific research. It will oppose any economy which prevents our maintaining, in being, the most modern and powerful air force in the world, capable of rapid expansion. And the Veterans of Foreign Wars will oppose all economies which would impair the creation of, and proper functioning of, the essential elements in national security, which I have just outlined as vital to the existence of our people.

The allocation of funds today for the purpose of purchasing national security is a sound and practical investment. We have just fought a war—we were told—to make the world free. Unfortunately, after the war ended, there are fewer people free and fewer nations free than there were before the war started.

Selfishness and hatred are rampant in the world today, yet no nation need fear American aggression. If we had possessed aggressive intent, we would have taken what we wanted 18 months ago when we had the most powerful ground force, fleet, and air force in the world.

Our investment in national security is a prerequisite to the maintenance of the prestige of our statesmen in their endeavor to effect a just and lasting peace.

We own the atomic bomb. It will be 5 to 7 years before any other country can produce it, even though that power may know how to do it.

The fact that we possess it offers the best possibility—and I regret to say the only possibility—of preserving world peace for the next 5 years; and a 5-year period should give our statesmen the opportunity to shape a peace which will last.

Nothing is so vital today as the maintenance of our national security. It must be so effective that an attack upon us by any power or coalition would mean its prompt destruction.

Today the question is not: Can the United States afford to buy national security? But, rather: Can we afford not to buy it? Any economy or obstruction which impairs our national security will spell self-destruction.

Dedication of Wallace Lake Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, at Wallace Lake Dam dedication, Shreveport, La., February 9, 1947:

The presence of such a large and distinguished gathering for ceremonies marking the dedication of the Wallace Lake Dam today is a tribute to the importance of this occasion, as well as a tribute to the Nation-wide cause of flood control.

The linking of these ceremonies with the public generally by radio is particularly appropriate. By this means thousands of people who will benefit primarily from the Wallace Lake project, yet who are unable to be present, will be able to participate with us in today's proceedings. It rightfully should be a matter of satisfaction and pride to them, and to all of us, that substantial protection against floods has been provided for the area. At the same time, other areas of the country also menaced by floods, but not as yet provided with adequate protection, can take encouragement from events such as this. It is tangible evidence that the Nation is steadily making progress in its extensive program to reduce flood losses throughout the country.

And the need is great. During the 22-year period, 1924–45, nearly 2,000 people lost their lives due to floods in the United States. In addition, more than $2,000,000,000 were lost in property damage. In 1945, the latest year for which the River and Flood Forecasting Service, of the United States Weather Bureau, has made a provisional estimate—the toll was 73 lives and $178,000,000 in property damage.

The completion of another new unit of protection—the Wallace Lake Dam—is an occasion for gratification. It also is an occasion to renew our determination for a realization of adequate protection for all people throughout the Nation, wherever they may be, who may be threatened with loss of life or property by the menace of recurring floods.

As Chief of the Corps of Engineers, I am happy to have a part in today's ceremonies.

For, with completion of the Wallace Lake Dam, another forward step has been achieved in the fight against floods in the Red River Valley. It is a milestone, officially marking completion of the first dam and reservoir to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers in Louisiana. The Wallace Lake Dam is the most important extension to date of our flood-control activities below the main-stem Denison Dam, and into areas off the main stem that have suffered greatly from floods arising from the tributary streams.

One aspect deserving of special mention here today, is the cooperation of local interests in expediting the Wallace Lake project. Their desire for greater flood protection prompted the offer which provided the necessary lands and rights-of-way at only a nominal or token cost to the Federal Government. We are grateful for this generous assistance.

The Wallace Lake project, dedicated here today, consists of an earth-filled dam 4,940 feet in length—including the 644 feet of spillway and outlet works. It rises 48 feet above the stream bed. The reservoir provides storage for 96,200 acre-feet of water, including a conservation pool of 7,600 acre-feet. This reservoir will control 260 square miles, or approximately 20 percent of the total drainage area of Bayou Pierre, Cypress Bayou, and tributaries, and will afford protection against major floods for about 90,000 acres of valley land below the dam.

This dam is already in operation, with only a slight amount of work remaining to be done. The spillway, outlet works, and north embankment were completed under a contract with Newsom Bros. and J. W. Snowden, of Columbia, Miss. The main portion of the dam, work on which was started in August 1942, was completed during the fiscal year 1943 with the exception of the closure section and reinforcing of the railroad embankment. Work had to be suspended on January 9, 1943, in accordance with the then existing Federal policies on wartime construction. It was resumed in the summer of 1946. A contract was awarded to T. L. James & Co., Inc., of Ruston, La., and the job was practically completed in late December of last year. No relocation of utilities was required by the project, but protection of the Kansas City Southern Railway across the reservoir was necessary. The dam was designed by our Vicksburg district engineer and his staff, with the late O. N. Floyd, of Dallas, noted authority on dams and similar structures, serving as consulting engineer.

The Wallace Lake Dam is an integral unit in the over-all pattern for flood control in the Red River Valley. It also will fit into the comprehensive plan now in preparation for the complete development of the water resources of the Red River Basin—a plan that includes adequate protection against recurring floods. The over-all cost to the Federal Government for the Wallace Lake Dam has been $1,182,000. This money is a sound investment for the social, economic, and physical advancement of the people of the area, and through them, for the Nation as a whole.

The project is the first single-purpose dam to be built in the Red River Valley. Denison Dam is a multiple-purpose project, with sufficient storage capacity to generate a substantial amount of hydroelectric power and to provide other benefits. Wallace Lake Dam has been constructed to meet the primary need of flood control.

It is appropriate, I think, to invite attention at this time to the fact that the flood-control plans recommended to the Congress by the Corps of Engineers for more than 200 river systems in the United States include a great variety of proven measures—multiple-purpose dams, single-purpose dams, levees, walls, channel improvements, diversion channels, and floodways. The Corps of Engineers is not wedded to any single type of structure or method of flood control. Our desire is to determine and recommend the plan best qualified for solving each problem individually, with the over-all program and all physical and economic factors considered. We have a duty under existing law—and the repeated directives of the Congress—to report fully on the potentialities for control and utilization of the country's water resources, and to evolve such plans as will afford maximum benefits from any stream under authorized investigation.

The Corps of Engineers considers not only the basic matters of flood control and river and harbor improvements but also such allied factors as hydroelectric power, irrigation, abatement of stream pollution, and the preservation of fish and wildlife. In some areas sites are available and desirable for reservoirs which will serve two or more of these purposes. In other areas multiple-purpose reservoir sites either are not available or are not needed, as single-purpose projects meet both requirement and desires of the local people. The matter is one to be determined by the people to be benefited, and by the Congress of the United States.

In planning and execution of comprehensive basin-development programs the Congress utilizes the several departments of the Federal Government which are acknowledged experts in water and land resources. There is no duplication of effort or waste of public funds. In this sound, time-proven way the public is assured of fully integrated plans for development of the watersheds of the Nation.

After the years of war, it is good to attend ceremonies devoted to the works of peace. Here, today, we are dealing with constructive projects, designed to serve the peacetime needs of our citizens over the course of years. We in the Corps of Engineers, in keeping with our custom dating back more than 170 years, have turned happily and eagerly from the grim duties of war to the constructive tasks of peace. Traditionally, during peacetime, the Corps of Engineers acts as consultant to Congress in carrying out authorized investigations, and is the executing agency for construction and maintenance of the Nation's rivers and harbors and flood-control projects. To date, the Federal Government has spent approximately $3,500,000,000 on such improvements. Much remains to be done in both flood control and waterway improvements—here in your own Red River Valley, and elsewhere.

But America is on the march. In the years happily behind us, together we built the arsenal of the democracies. Together, we solved almost insurmountable engineering, construction, and production problems. Together, we turned back the floodtide of enemy power abroad.

Now, we have accomplished the transition from war to peace, and, together, we are advancing against the destructive floods within our own borders. The pace of the attack must not be permitted to diminish. We must be fired by the same unity that bound us inseparably in our common objective of the war years. The peacetime tasks in river valleys are many and formidable, but to their ultimate and successful accomplishment, I pledge you the best efforts of the Corps of Engineers.

The Lilienthal Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last week I have been receiving numerous letters and protests from citizens in Indiana regarding the unfair attacks being made upon the President's nominee, David Lilienthal, to head the Atomic Energy Control Commission.

I am submitting an editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, regarding some of the unfair charges against Mr. Lilienthal.

M'KELLAR HITS A FOUL BLOW

There are complaints that we are unable to get really big men to take Federal office, except under the stress of wartime. It's not surprising, when a prospective appointee must face treatment such as Senator McKELLAR has directed at David Lilienthal, designated to head the Atomic Energy Control Commission.

McKELLAR has several achievements to mark down on his Senate record. One is the length of his service in the Senate. The other is the vast amount of patronage he has collected during the years. His ability to get political spoils, and his long and close alliance with Boss Crump, of Memphis, bear more than a slight relationship to his many terms as a Tennessee Senator.

McKELLAR is against communism, and so are we. But his conduct in the Lilienthal hearings makes one wonder whether he is half as opposed to communism as he is irate against Lilienthal who opposed his patronage assaults on the TVA. Perhaps there are excellent reasons for rejecting the Lilienthal appointment, but they will have no connection with McKELLAR's opposition to his nomination.

When McKELLAR draws out that Lilienthal's parents were born in Czechoslovakia, and then interjects that Czechoslovakia is under Russian domination, he is hitting a foul blow. And so is he when he proposes that appointments on the Commission should be denied to men whose parents were foreign-born. As Senator McMAHON replied, that's a barrier we don't even place against candidates for the Presidency.

Nominees for Federal appointments should be subject to searching inquiry. Nominees for appointment to the Atomic Energy Control Commission should be able to meet the highest test. But men asked to serve their Government ought not to have to stand for the abusive treatment McKELLAR has been dishing out. He reflects discredit upon himself and upon the Senate to which he belongs. And he only befogs the real issue of Lilienthal's worthiness for the position.

Defects of Electoral College and Succession Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a thoughtful editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on February 11, 1947. The editorial is as follows:

ACHILLES' HEEL

If Members of the House listened to the address delivered by Representative KEFAUVER recently, they ought to be frightened into prompt action on the Presidential succession problem. Mr. KEFAUVER outlined numerous contingencies that may leave the Nation without a directing head. Considering the dangers inherent in this situation we are

frankly at a loss to understand the seeming complacency in Congress on the matter.

Nor is it merely a question of who would succeed to the Presidency in contingencies that the founding fathers overlooked. The truth is that our method of choosing our President is flagrantly obsolete. The average citizen would count the privilege of voting for Presidential candidates as one of the foremost rights given to him by the Constitution. But that supposed right rests only on custom. For the unquestioned purpose of the founding fathers was to prevent the people from electing the President. In pursuit of that aim they authorized the States to name electors who would, in their superior wisdom, select a President from among the Nation's great. There is no requirement that these electors shall be chosen by vote of the people. Indeed, as Mr. KEFAUVER pointed out, South Carolina's electors were chosen by the legislature until the 1860's. All of the States could conceivably go back to the arrangement of "appointing" electors, thus denying the supposed right of the people to elect their own President.

The Presidential candidate favored by the people might also be defeated in a close election by the refusal of individual electors to carry out their instructions. In 1944 a group of electors who had been chosen to represent the Democratic Party in Texas threatened to bolt and vote against that party's candidate. Should such threats be carried out, our electoral system would be plunged into chaos. No mere patching of this electoral machinery designed to prevent the popular election of the President will suffice. It ought, in our opinion, to be completely overhauled.

Several proposed amendments to the Constitution for this purpose have been before Congress in recent years. Probably the best of them would abolish the office of elector and cause all votes to be cast directly for Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. The States would retain the same number of electoral votes they have now—one vote for every Senator and Representative. Instead of swinging all the electoral votes of each State to the candidate receiving the largest number of popular votes, however, the electoral votes would be divided among the candidates in the same proportion as the popular votes. The effect of such an amendment would be to eliminate the dangerous loopholes in the present electoral system, to permit the people to vote directly for presidential candidates, to reduce virtually to zero the possibility of a tie vote, and greatly to stimulate interparty contests in States that are now automatically put into the Democratic or Republican columns.

The advantages of this amendment are many. And the arguments for abolishing the present elector system are unassailable. "Since, therefore, the electoral college is of no real use—it is a formality that is gone through with, but it is still a formality that carries with it a great deal of danger," Mr. KEFAUVER concluded, "let us remedy the situation before it causes chaos."

Russia and Our Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States of February 14, 1947:

RUSSIA AND OUR DEFENSE

America is nearing the danger point of national defense.

Congress plans to slice the Navy $500,000,000, which the sea arm of our defense system says will immobilize the fleet.

Congress plans to slash a total of $1,175,000,000 from all armed forces. General MacArthur from Japan says we might as well pull out if they do. Secretary of War Patterson says both Eisenhower and MacArthur have said such a slash "invites disaster" and jeopardizes occupation chores in Germany and Japan.

It's the opposition of the American purse to our military. Nobody likes high taxes.

The War Department has announced plans for a mobilization day Army of 1,750,000 men and expansion within a year to 5,500,000 soldiers, based upon a universal military-training program.

Secretary of State George Marshall has already expressed the conviction that universal military training is necessary to our national security, though there has been considerable congressional opposition to the plan.

This opposition has its roots in the American home. Americans just naturally are opposed to universal military training. It goes against our every trait of a freedom-loving people. Yet the very existence of that home has been threatened twice by European wars. On each occasion we had enough time to prepare for the victory.

In the last war, we had just a little over a year from the first draft call to the attack on Pearl Harbor. In this time we prepared our nucleus, the spearhead that shoved the Nazi out of Africa.

We may never have that much time again. We should be ready for any eventuality. If it takes our sons from our homes for a period of time for the necessary training to fit them to fight, we should give them gladly. For they are learning to protect that very home they leave.

Cosmopolitan magazine, in the February issue, tells the story of the Russian spy ring in Ottawa which has been trying to break through the secret of the atom bomb. The series is by Igor Gouzenko, a former cipher clerk in the Russian embassy in Canada.

Guozenko says that on VJ-day, a Colonel Zabotin, chief of Soviet military intelligence forces in Canada, proposed a toast:

"Yesterday our allies, today our neighbors, tomorrow our enemies."

This toast was directed at the United States, Gouzenko says. A VJ-day celebration at the Russian embassy must have seen the vodka flowing freely. It is quite possible that Colonel Zabotin's toast was just an instance of pot-valor. Yet Gouzenko further says:

"I heard no mention of hope of international control of the atomic bomb. All the higher ranking officers said the same thing: 'Now that the Americans have invented it, we must steal it.'"

This country doesn't know if they have succeeded or not. Admiral Standley said here recently that Russia didn't have the know how to invent the bomb. If what Gouzenko says it true, they don't have to know. They can steal it. So can others. No one knows who may be America's enemy tomorrow. When we were flying the hump into China to aid her, we were their heroes. When we landed on her shores we were hailed amid rejoicing. That was just 18 months or so ago. We aren't very popular in China now.

The best way to keep nations our friends is to be so prepared that they dare not become our enemies no matter what their ambitions toward us.

Work of the Agriculture Conservation Association of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Third District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following report showing the work done by the Agriculture Conservation Association of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Third District of Arkansas, which I have the honor to represent. I think this is a very remarkable report, and the request for funds for this great effort is certainly modest. It is one of the essential programs of good government.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration offers the following objectives: (1) Help farmers get a fair share of the national income. (2) To protect consumers by producing abundant supplies of agriculture products at a price fair to all. (3) To improve the health and living conditions of the people by increasing food and feed production of good variety with essential minerals and nutrients for home use and abroad. (4) To maintain and build the productivity of the soil through better soil and water conservation.

During the recent national emergency our Government called on farmers to increase production on practically every agricultural commodity. In order to do this it was necessary to sacrifice conservation to a large extent and the results have been, in many cases, a tired, run-down soil. This makes it essential that we now enter into a vigorous campaign against erosion and for a wider use of soil and water conservation practices that will bring our soil back to its original and higher productive capacity. This can be accomplished only by extending the present AAA assistance which will put into effect conservation and production practice that will bring about a more balanced agriculture, conserve the soil and water, improve the fertility of the soil, and hold a major portion of rainfall on the land where it falls so as to avoid quick run-off of water.

Recent years have brought to our attention many disastrous floods in the delta area and much concern is now being expressed, not only by individuals but also by our National Government about these conditions. Millions of dollars are wasted each year in floods which can all be traced back to poor conservation measures. Floods can never be controlled until forest and farm lands are developed in harmony, and such conservation measures are taken as to avoid quick run-off of water.

If the soil is exposed or unprotected from the rains the people and the Nation will become poorer and poorer as the soil gradually moves off the land and down the muddy streams beyond the reach of any conservation measure or practice. As good land becomes more scarce, farmers will be forced to use land much in the same way as they have during early agriculture and the recent World Wars. Erosion will be speeded up and in relatively few years our agricultural areas will be reduced to poverty. We have only to look around in the upland area to

see land that is no longer productive due to erosion, and to move only a few miles to the delta area to find land unsuitable for cultivation due to being flooded by waters from streams filled with good soil to the extent that the water carrying capacity has been reduced to the point where the streams are no longer capable of carrying the excess amount of water released into them. Nor is erosion completely confined to the upland areas. Large areas of our delta is of such nature and follows a contour that makes them extremely hazardous from an erosion standpoint.

With AAA production practices carried out, old meadows improved, new meadows planted, pastures improved, contour farming used on every farm, cover crops planted on exposed land during the winter seasons and timberland protected from fire, all these disasters can be avoided. With conservation practices applied to our agricultural areas and to our forest land, the soil will absorb most of the surface water run-off and will serve as reservoirs, thus storing the water on the land where needed most.

Before these objectives can be accomplished, all people, not just farmers, must become conservation-minded. Our Representatives in Congress must see the urgent need for expansion of the AAA program. They must see the disastrous results that will follow if time is wasted and conservation practices are not put into effect. We must become so conservation-minded that each year we will put into the soil more than we take out.

To do this financial assistance must be made available to expand a vigorous AAA agricultural program through the administering agency. Trained farmer committeemen must take the idea of conservation to the farmer on the farm and machinery and materials must be made available. With this accomplished, we feel that conservation of the soil and water will be greatly improved and that we will begin to keep the soil and water on the land, and stop our major floods and to preserve the lifeblood of the Nation, the soil.

Farmers, however, have accomplished unbelievable results with the assistance of the AAA program, but we have only scratched the surface on the soil and water conservation needs.

Conservation needs by far outstrips our progress. Furthermore, our objective lies beyond the simple restoration or maintenance of what we consider normal productivity. We must conserve our soil and water by the use of production practices and build the productive capacity of our land to higher productivity through sound conservation farming, since it benefits consumers by giving them more nutritious food, and producer by making the soil more fertile.

Conservation farming increases crop and pasture production an average of 30 percent, and also saves labor and equipment on four farms out of five.

Farmer committeemen and other substantial farmers from all sections who have practiced conservation farming state the acre yields and total production rises sharply after the application of AAA production practices are applied. With three-fourths fewer acres in cotton, we are producing 70 percent more pounds of lint cotton per acre. With one-half fewer acres of corn, we are producing four-fifths more bushels of corn, and other crops production increases are equal to and some exceed the above crops. With the use of idle acres, we have increased grain, hay yields, and larger and better pastures through the use of AAA production practices on our farms and have been able to start, or to expand livestock enterprises. The number of livestock has been increased 41 percent by putting production practices into effect on our farms since the start of the program, but we must continue to improve if we expect to go forward as a great nation and people.

Conservation farming is efficient farming. Where practiced it has brought a 30 percent increase in production per acre on an average. It has provided a practical guide for greater crop diversification and has resulted in greater diversification. It has meant savings in seed, fertilizer, labor, and power. It has permitted the greatest possible degree of protection and improvement to soil and water resources under the pressure of intensified wartime production. It offers the farmer and rancher a sound avenue for shifts in type or intensity of production that has become necessary to meet changes in the price and demand for agricultural commodities.

The soil, which all of us, city and country people alike, live from, is our Nation's most important resource. Industry and labor, and professional people, as well as farmers have a large stake in the country's land. Today they all are rightly concerned about America's productive soil and water resources; they realize as never before that these basic resources are linked directly to the United States' future prosperity. These same resources also have a real bearing on the future of civilization. Food which comes from the soil was an important weapon in the war and it is equally important in the peace. Productive soil, therefore, is our base for everything we do, all we share, even whatever we amount to as a greater people, begins with and rests on the sustained productivity of our agricultural lands.

To maintain and rebuild our soil at its present and higher productivity, it is essential that more production practices be put into practice. To be able to accomplish this, it is imperative that more funds be made available for administrative expense in administering the program so that we farmer-county committeemen can maintain an adequate office personnel and be able to use the community committeemen to take the program to the farmers on the farm. We are positive, if the funds for administering the program were twice the funds ($549,599 administrative funds for Arkansas) for the present year, we could double the conserving of our soil and water resources over the present rate of conservation. We also believe this would be cheaper to the people than the erosion today that is playing havoc with the soil.

WALTER D. RAMEY,
Winslow, Ark.
RALPH HUDSPETH,
St. Joe, Ark.
JESS PARRISH,
Lowry, Ark.
J. M. PARKER,
Huntsville, Ark., Route No. 4.
H. E. MCMORRIS,
Green Forest, Ark.

Foreign Policy: Ideals, Not Deals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding international authorities on United States foreign policies is John Foster Dulles, of New York City. He recently spoke to the Inland Daily Press Association in the city of Chicago. It was my privilege to have read his address before it was given, and it is my opinion that Mr. Dulles has made an important contribution to our thinking on this subject which is extremely helpful at this time. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including herewith his address in full:

United States foreign policy is made at home. It is the projection abroad of our national will. Diplomats, politicians, professors, and columnists may concoct what they think American foreign policy ought to be. Their devisings will come to naught unless they reflect the simple, basic will of the American people.

Our will flows from the fundamentals of our faith. Our founders believed that there was a moral law which gave reality to such concepts as justice and righteousness. They believed that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights" and consequently that government ought to be a means of releasing, not repressing, the individual personality. They believed that men had not only rights, but also duties, to God and to each other. They felt a sense of mission in the world. The "great American experiment" was not a selfish venture. It was the design of men and women who conceived that their conduct here could be an example which would set in motion great forces everywhere. I mention, finally, that our founders believed that freedom would never be secure unless free men were vigilant to defend their freedom and, if need be, die for it.

Such basic beliefs have fixed the course of our Nation in history. They will continue to fix our course so long as Americans are true to their tradition.

A first great external manifestation of American will was the Monroe Doctrine. The holy alliance—Russia, Prussia, Austria, and France—threatened freedom in the newborn republics to the south of us. So President Monroe declared that "We owe it * * * to candor * * * to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous t our peace and safety." In 1895, when the Monroe Doctrine seemed threatened in Venezuela by Great Britain, President Cleveland proclaimed "the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power."

A second great external manifestation of American will was in relation to China. Largely through missionary societies the American people had developed friendship for the Chinese people. Also, our interest in the Far East greatly increased when we acquired the Philippine Islands. So, at the beginning of this century, when the Chinese were squeezed between the rival imperialisms of Russia and Japan, our Government intervened. President McKinley and Secretary Hay pronounced the doctrine of the "open door" and of territorial integrity for China. President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Secretary Hull repeated that when Japan sought to control China through a puppet regime. On November 26, 1941, in what was a virtual ultimatum, they demanded that the Japanese Government should "not support—militarily, politically, economically—any government or regime in China other than the national government with capital temporarily at Chungking." Our Nation risked—accepted—war rather than let the Chinese people fall, even by indirection, under the domination of a foreign power.

A third great external manifestation of American will was in regard to Europe. Our Nation had been founded by those who came from Europe to avoid its quarrels. But Europe was still the land of their fathers and the cradle of western civilization. Also, as science made the world smaller, the fate of western Europe became increasingly significant to us. When the Kaiser's armies moved westward toward the Atlantic, the American

people quickly came to feel that they were more than spectators. In April 1917 the United States declared war because, as President Wilson said, "the world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty." Again in 1941, we fought to free European democracy from the heel of Nazi tyranny.

A fourth and recent external manifestation of American will is in relation to the United Nations. That organization was first thought of as a perpetuation of the United Nations war alliance, to be dominated by the Big Four. Governor Dewey said, during the campaign of 1944, "That would be the rankest form of imperialism. Such a proposal would be rejected by the American people."

It fell to Senator VANDENBERG to play a great part in transforming the original design. At the San Francisco Conference of 1945, the General Assembly was charted as a "town meeting of the world" where all of the nations, strong and weak, could speak freely and as equals; where the conscience of the world could make itself felt; and where justice could be sought. Today, the American people, without reserve, support that kind of a United Nations.

The four foreign policies I have described reflect the practical idealism of America. They are idealistic because inspired by a desire to promote justice, as we see it, and to preserve human liberty. They are practical because they recognize that our own freedom would be imperiled if there were only wind and water between us and militant dictatorship.

No doubt our Nation has at times been hypocritical. Some of our external exploits were ignoble. Some of our trade policies lacked enlightenment. We have not fully realized at home the human freedom and political equality of which we talk abroad. We have no call to be vainglorious. But we can humbly recognize that our foreign policies in their broad lines have reflected a great faith and a great tradition. As such, they are neither partisan nor sectarian. Republicans and Democrats, residents of seaboard and of interior, have joined together to make those policies and, when necessary, to write them with their blood—and that is the most indelible of all writings.

Today these policies face a serious challenge from the Soviet Union. The professed social goals of Soviet communism are not unlike our own; but Marxian communism is atheistic in conception and materialistic in its view of man. It does not admit of a Creator who establishes eternal principles of right and justice or who endows His creatures with inalienable rights. It denies the sacredness of the human personality and would force human beings into spiritual strait-jackets.

Those Soviet beliefs generate a will which is being projected into the world. Soviet Communists have long taught that their goals can be achieved only if, as Marshal Stalin put it, "the capitalistic encirclement is liquidated," and only if free societies give way everywhere to "the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Soviet foreign policy can conveniently be analyzed in relation to what I call the Soviet inner zone, middle zone, and outer zone. The inner zone is the Soviet Union itself. That has been much expanded. The military position of Russia, as the great land power next to Germany and Japan, gave Soviet leadership unique opportunities to bargain. With the tacit consent or explicit approval of Hitler, part of Finland, all of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and large portions of Poland and Rumania were, in 1940, incorporated into the Soviet Union. That was the price of Soviet neutrality while Hitler was attacking in the West. When Hitler turned east to attack Russia, that made Russia an ally of Britain and soon of the United States. It was vital that the war unity of these three should be preserved and Soviet leadership relied on that to bargain at Teheran and Yalta. As a result, Soviet land power was further extended in Europe and in the Pacific.

The Soviet middle zone comprises the states, about 20 in number, which are near to the Soviet Union itself. The zone is a band running from the North Cape south to the Mediterranean, then east and then north to the Sea of Japan. Much of that zone is, or recently has been, occupied by the Soviet Army. Even where there is no present occupation, there is fear that it might happen. The governments of those border countries are partly puppet governments and partly independent governments which are under strong pressure, from without and from within, to take guidance from Moscow.

The outer zone comprises the rest of the world. There, the Soviet Communist Party employs idealistic propaganda to woo those who are disaffected and to capitalize on the accumulated errors of western civilization. It employs "smear" against those who state truths they find unpleasant. It employs secret infiltration for spying and fifth-column activities.

Soviet foreign policy conflicts with American foreign policy. In South America, Communists and left-wingers, with Soviet support, agitate against the United States and seek to promote there the Soviet system of proletariat dictatorship. That effort comes up against the declaration of President Monroe, that for Russia and others "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere [is] dangerous to our peace and safety."

In China, Communist armies, with Soviet sympathy, seek to supplant the national government. That comes up against the policy which led our Government to demand of Japan that it must "not support—militarily, politically, economically—any government or regime in China other than the national government."

In Europe, the Soviet inner and middle zones have been enlarged without regard to our Atlantic Charter commitment to "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live." The Soviet influence flows westward into France and Italy, where Communist parties now exercise a large measure of governmental power. That could jeopardize the foundations of political liberty, which in 1917 and 1941 we fought to preserve.

In the United Nations the Soviet Union still seeks great power rule. Its representatives insist on the veto at all points because they believe that ultimate authority should be vested in two or three great powers which themselves are not bound by any law.

I have described the Soviet challenge and its points of conflict with American policy because the American people ought to know the facts. It is they who make our foreign policy and they cannot make it well if they make it blindly. Also, they cannot make foreign policy well unless they make it all together. Sometimes it seems that those along our seaboard are unduly sensitive to foreign events and not sufficiently rooted in American tradition. Sometimes it seems that those who are inland feel somewhat insulated from foreign events and less instantly sensitive to external hazards. However, there has never been a critical period in American foreign relations when the American people did not come to act unitedly. That is essential to our safety. Editors of newspapers have, in this matter, a great responsibility. News is unlimited, paper is limited. Therefore, you who edit the newspapers must make a choice. Upon that choice much may depend.

The American people not only need facts, and need them simultaneously, also they need to appraise them wisely. Facts are quite often horrid things. Today, as the mist of war romanticism is lifted, facts emerge which might make us panicky and lead us either to strike out in anger or to retreat in fright. There is occasion for soberness, but not for panic.

Every civilization faces periodic challenge. That is the kind of a world God put us in, and there is no ground to question His wisdom in that respect. Western democracy has for many centuries held unquestioned supremacy in the world. It is natural and even healthy that we should now have to evaluate again our place in history, to clear away some of the barnacles that have gathered and to reinvigorate the basic and worthy features of our historic faith. There is no reason whatever to assume that the Soviet challenge makes war inevitable. Soviet leadership does not want a war. The American people do not want war. Also, we know from our own experience here at home that strong, conflicting, and dynamic faiths can exist side by side in peace. Some talk as though the United States itself seeks war—a so-called preventive war. That is one of those theoretical concoctions which ignores American tradition. It will not happen. There is risk that we may provoke war by a retreat which would cause Soviet leaders to push on recklessly. The greatest danger of war is from possible Soviet miscalculation. Political leaders who are dynamic and who have had great initial successes often become overconfident. They are apt to take even greater risks until they find to their chagrin that they have made a bad calculation and have gotten into trouble which they never wanted or expected. I believe that Soviet dynamism will keep within tolerable bounds; but that will be because it come up against something that is vigorous, not because it encounters mushiness.

Twice within 25 years the United States has been drawn into war because the American people finally came to feel that aggressive policies in Europe and Asia threatened our free society. In each case the foreign leaders would probably have followed a different course had they, at any early stage, realized that the American people would react as they finally did. By not making apparent, in time, our devotion to our ideals, we were guilty of contributory negligence. We must not make the same mistake three times in a generation. Peace lies not in compromising, but in invigorating, our historic policies.

1. Here at home we need to demonstrate anew the value of our free society. That kind of society has been smeared throughout the world by Communist propaganda. Of course, it has defects. We should constantly seek to improve it. However, even as it is, our society is a miracle of achievement. At the last Assembly of the United Nations it was estimated that our economic capacity was equal to that of all of the rest of the nations put together. We must, however, be sure that that vast potential works. If it were to break down, that would confirm Communist prophecies. If it maintains sustained production, that will discomfit its detractors and, more than any other one thing, restore our prestige in the world.

2. We must maintain a strong Military Etablishment and keep the will to use it if necessary. The last two wars came upon us when some foreign leaders thought that our nation had become spineless. A big military establishment, however, is not itself an all-sufficient end. It is more important to have a people possessed of moral stamina and sound judgment. We must make certain that our Military Establishment is not bought at the price of impairing the moral and educational development of our youth.

3. We should promote hemispheric solidarity. The Declaration of Chapultepec promised an early treaty between the American states to implement the idea that an act of aggression against one is an act of aggression against all. That principle of collective self-defense was, in turn, sanctioned by the

United Nations Charter. We should move promptly to realize that arrangement. It is not enough, however, to rely on inter-governmental compacts. We must help the countries to the south of us to develop more vigorous and healthy economies which will end the mass discontents which too widely prevail. That will not require any vast grant of our money. Rather, it requires an intelligent comprehension of the possibilities of these naturally rich lands.

4. In Europe our policy should be guided by the great dictum of our founders that:

"To look for a continuation of harmony between a number of independent, unconnected sovereignties in the same neighborhood would be to disregard the uniform course of human events and to set at defiance the accumulated experience of ages."

Of course, increased unity on the Continent depends primarily on the continental peoples themselves. But the United States has there both moral rights and political power. Formerly Europe could have its wars without involving us. Now American blood, shed in two European wars, gives us the moral right to speak. Also, the United States, with Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and France, possesses decisive power over Germany. What is done with that power will either promote unity in Europe or perpetuate disunity. We have a responsibility that is inescapable. The four of us could contribute much to make continental Europe something better than the rickety fire hazard of the past. If the Soviet Union does not want to advance continental units as a whole, then a worth-while start could still be made in western Europe. There, 200,000,000 people could, through increased unity, achieve increased prosperity, freedom, and peace.

5. We must continue to safeguard the integrity of China. That calls for support of the National Government. As General Marshall has said, we ought to encourage its more liberal elements. But we cannot abandon that government without abandoning that for which we fought the Pacific war.

6. We should begin to use the United Nations to mobilize world opinion against international injustices. Article 14 of the Charter was intended to make it possible to relieve injustices like those occurring in Poland. At the last assembly that article was invoked by India, with Soviet backing, in relation to discrimination against Indians in the Union of South Africa. The Soviet Union also proposed that the United Nations should call conferences of non-self-governing peoples, such as those of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, to promote their aspirations. It may be that the time has come for the United States to ask the Assembly to concern itself with areas in Europe where purges and discrimination go on despite international pledges, and where aspirations for self-government are suppressed.

Through such invigoration of our historic policies we can readily assume a leadership which will make us safe. We have the ideals, we have the "know-how," and we have the power. We should put all three to work in harness.

During the First World War, President Wilson proclaimed, as 14 points, great goals of victory. They reflected the finest American tradition. They rallied the wavering forces of democracy and men went on to die that those ideals might live. But at Paris, Mr. Wilson was confronted by the secret treaties of London and he had to deal with Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Clemenceau at that low level. The result was widespread disillusionment. Secretary of State Lansing, when he first read the draft Treaty of Versailles as a connected whole, commented: "The impression made by it is one of disappointment, of regret, of depressions."

During the Second World War, President Roosevelt with Prime Minister Churchill, proclaimed, as the Atlantic Charter, great goals of victory. Again, they reflected the traditional faith of America. The United Nations all endorsed them and, a second time, men died that those ideals might live. Now there is danger that the peace will reflect, not the high ideals of the Atlantic Charter, but the secret deals of Teheran and Yalta.

Since the collapse of the Roman Empire, there has never been a nation which possessed so great a superiority of material power as does the United States today. Also, as we have shown, we still possess deep springs of faith on which we can draw for ideals which respond to the aspirations of men everywhere. Only as we use the prestige of our power to achieve such ideals can we be safe in the world. Otherwise we shall be merely one more great nation gone decadent and ripe to be plucked.

Our Nation was never destined to become involved in cheap intrigue with foreign rulers. We do not do that well. President Washington's advice to avoid that still stands good. We have a different destiny. It is to forge spiritual alliances with the peoples of the world. President Lincoln said of the Declaration of Independence that it offered "liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time. It * * * gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, that all should have an equal chance."

That is the spirit which ought to pervade our foreign policy. It is not a spirit which is easily translated into international treaties. It would, however, be better to accept that difficulty than to be unfaithful to our spiritual heritage.

Inviting Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 13, 1947:

INVITING DISASTER?

Until it becomes clear just where all the cutting is to be done, there will have to be a crossed-fingers attitude toward the huge spending slash approved by the Senate-House Subcommittee on the Budget. The President's program for fiscal 1948 calls for expenditures of some $37,500,000,000. The subcommittee would reduce this by $6,000,000,000, and the full committee is expected to agree. At a time when economies in Government are highly desirable, this proposal has an undeniably attractive sound. Unfortunately, however, unless its advocates can prove otherwise, it must be received with the most serious misgivings, especially as regards its bearing on national defense and foreign policy.

In the President's budget a sum of approximately $11,300,000,000 has been set aside for defense purposes. Under the plan of the Senate-House subcommittee this would be cut to less than $10,000,000,000 by lopping off $1,000,000,000 from estimated Army outlays and $750,000,000 from the estimates for the Navy. In addition there would be a reduction of $500,000,000 in the War Department's expenditures on civil functions. The balance of the proposed $6,000,000,000 slash presumably would have to come from the sums budgeted for international affairs and finance, veterans' activities, social welfare, and the numerous other fixed undertakings of the Government.

Offhand it is difficult to see how an economy move of such dimensions can be put into effect at this time without unsettling several programs. Of course, considerable savings may be possible in some fields, but there is good reason to wonder whether the congressional budget group has not set its sights much too high. Certainly, as far as defense is concerned, skepticism of the strongest sort seems justified. This skepticism has been well expressed by Senator CHAN GURNEY. As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, he believes that the Army and Navy may each be able to stand token cuts of a couple of hundred million dollars, but he does not see how they can function effectively if the pruning knife is to be applied more deeply than that. In his judgment, excessive economy in this instance, instead of being economical, would weaken Secretary Marshall's hand at Moscow and do harm to our security by undermining the power basis of our diplomacy. For its own part, the Navy flatly declares that a retrenchment of even $500,000,000 in its estimates would render it practically immobile and impotent as an instrument of national policy. And Secretary of War Patterson, speaking for the Army, warns that the proposed cuts will invite disaster.

These somber views must receive the most earnest consideration. Economies to pay off part of the debt and permit tax reductions may seem wholesome on their face, but they will be penny-wise and pound-foolish if they hit at our defense and pull the rug out from under our foreign policy. In the present unsettled state of the world, the well-being of the United States demands that Congress show the greatest foresight and wisdom on this point.

Amendment of Pay Readjustment Act of 1942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, to remove the discrimination between Regular and Reserve components of the services in the act in regard to transportation of dependents and household effects.

In a ruling on an initial pay act, the Comptroller General denied payment to members of the Regular services for transportation of dependents and household effects on the reasoning that separation from service by way of being discharged is not covered in the construction of the statute. The use of this construction in subsequent pay acts gave confirmed congressional authority to this interpretation. It is a well-established rule of statutory construction that when a long and uniform construction has been given a statute by the Government agency concerned, similar language in a subsequent statute on the same subject will, if possible, receive the same construction. This was the foundation of the decision No. B-35081 of the Comptroller

General dated August 4, 1943, whereby the construction of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 denies transportation of dependents and household effects to members of the Regular services of this act.

My attention was called to this situation last summer in a letter from a veteran discharged from the Army. His case is representative of thousands. After the inception of the draft, many of the youth of America heeded the call to the colors and volunteered their services, not waiting till their number came up. Motivation of service is not a question, the fact remains that the greatest majority of them put on the uniform in the same years and those, pursued by aggressive recruiting stations, that went into the Regular component of the services were no different than those that went into the Reserve component. They were motivated by the same causes, accepted service simultaneously, served approximately the same tour of duty, and were released from service relatively together. An enlisted man or officer of the Regular service, honorably discharged because of a physical disability, resulting from the line of duty, does not receive the same treatment as his Reserve counterpart. Also in the case of hardship discharges, the regular is not on the same basis as a reserve. Those in the Reserve component received the benefits of transportation for their dependents and household effects upon release from service while those in the Regular service did not. By personal contact, I have affirmed that this was not the intent of the framers of this act.

Injustice has been accorded that portion of American service people by this discrimination, perhaps unintentionally by this body, but it can be rectified by this body by passing this measure.

Appropriations for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM RAYBURN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 16, 1947.*

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Three and one-half million men who fought our country's two world wars know from first-hand experience the value of national security and the folly of unpreparedness.

These veterans are righteously alarmed at the prospect of further reducing the strength of our armed forces. Such reductions are implied by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee's irrationally recommended $6,000,000,000 cut in the National Budget.

They vigorously oppose the reported slice of $2,250,000,000 for the armed forces, including a cut of $750,000,000 which would destroy the Naval Reserve training program and preclude further developments in naval aeronautics; the proposed slash of $500,000,000 intended to feed the starving people in occupied countries whose behavior might otherwise necessitate the expense of additional troops; the terrific hacking away of Air Force funds and the $200,000,000 reduction in the Veterans' Administration appropriations. They are appalled to learn that their Government contemplates sabotage of the proposed universal military training program, recommended by high Government officials and demanded by the public, through a $1,000,000,000 cut in Army appropriations.

Are we to discard already the lessons learned in the last war?

After each war we have adopted the penny-wise, pound-foolish philosophy which has reduced our armed forces to impotency. Our token forces in occupied countries are now dangerously near tourist strength. Through our weakness after each war we have invited aggression. These world wars created the heavy taxes which Congress is now trying to reduce. Wars are responsible for the enormous public debt.

For more than a century and a half America has refused to make the small sacrifices in peacetime which would have prevented such great sacrifices in men and money. As a result this Nation whose people cherish peace has found itself regularly at war.

Must we again confess our guilt in weakening ourselves in the eyes of the whole world and rendering ourselves incapable of securing in peace our wartime victory?

Are we to ignore our international commitments to the extent that our representatives at peace parleys become the targets for contemptuous mockery by nations which have remained strong and influential?

In this critical and turbulent hour, a world of nations watches us to see what action we will take to maintain our leadership in world affairs. There is a solemn and sacred obligation upon America to remain strong until a permanent, feasible peace plan is established.

We must not permit America's insurance policy to expire at this uncertain hour.

The American Legion has always been a proponent of economy in government. It detests "red tape" and bureaucratic bungling that penalizes taxpayers and prevents good government. The American Legion is confident, however, that economy achieved at the expense of security or veterans is no economy at all.

May I respectfully remind Congress that it is directed by the United States Constitution to provide for the common defense of the several States.

If the issue involved must be resolved by guaranteeing citizens their constitutional rights or fulfillment of campaign pledges, there can be only one American answer.

PAUL H. GRIFFITH,
National Commander,
the American Legion.

San Francisco Bay Bridges

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a Joint Army-Navy Board, operating under authority of this House, recently completed its work and made a recommendation as to the form that a second transbay crossing between San Francisco and the east side of San Francisco Bay should take.

It recommended a six-lane combination viaduct trestle with a tube under the bay channel. This crossing would start near the foot of Army Street in San Francisco and hit the east shore near the foot of Fifth Street in Alameda, a "freeway" across the Alameda and then a tube under the San Antonio (Oakland) estuary, coming up at Fifth Street in the vicinity of Washington Street in Oakland.

This is a logical solution of the problem of a second transbay crossing and has many desirable points about it that more than outweigh those that can be raised against it. In support of this type of crossing, under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Oakland (Calif.) Observer under date of February 8, 1947:

As forecast exclusively by the Observer last week, the Joint Army-Navy Bridge Board of Engineers has recommended a combination viaduct, trestle, and tube low-level crossing of San Francisco Bay from the vicinity of Fifth Street, in Alameda, and entering San Francisco at Army Street, after passing under the deep-water channel. Just as we predicted, the advocates of a second high-bridge crossing, from State Public Works Director Charley Purcell down to the local yokels, who resoluted in favor of such an infeasible plan, received a distinct shock. While the Observer had no inside leak tipping it off as to the nature of the recommendations of the Joint Army and Navy Board, we did feel we had judged the temper of both the Army and Navy authorities toward a second high-level bridge plan, and especially the idea of paralleling the present structure and still further increasing the intolerable traffic congestion at the approaches on both sides of the bay. The plan proposed by our own home neighbor, Col. Frank E. Bonner, of Piedmont, formerly of the United States Engineers, and which we have advocated from the start, is practically the basis of the Joint Army and Navy Board's recommendations. The report distinctly does not recommend providing accommodations for bringing the transcontinental railroads into San Francisco via the new crossing. The phobia against this possibility, apparently, is at the bottom of the stubborn opposition of the local boards and governmental groups, chambers of commerce, etc., to any type of viaduct, or low-level crossing.

Already a fire has been started by the same old downtown group, which has run Oakland into the ground for lo these many years, to scuttle the proposed low-level plan. They are for a high bridge type of crossing, and have apparently geared their support of such an out-dated type of crossing to fit in with their own pecuniary interests—although to our way of thinking nothing could be sweeter for the development of central Oakland than the proposed Army and Navy plan. We shall not repeat its details, as they have been given in great detail by the daily press, but we wish to call attention to an important feature about it. The Joint Army and Navy Board plan is not only a formula for a bay crossing in what we believe the most feasible way, but, it calls attention to the lack of any master transportation and traffic plan in Oakland, and makes recommendations for a splendid system of connecting highway approaches, tubes under the estuary connecting Oakland and Alameda with the proposed transbay crossing. It then goes on to recommend that the East Bay cities get busy to have an adequate master traffic and transportation plan worked out as a guidebook for future development.

Now isn't that something? It is just as the Observer has repeatedly declared: That if Oakland and its neighbors do not quit

their sectional squabbles, downtown versus uptown and central versus east of the lake areas, someone is going to step in some day with the authority to force such a plan upon us, not of our own devising, because that someone's interest, which might be paramount—as in the case of the Army and the Navy, are being jeopardized by our not doing the job properly ourselves. Apparently, however, you cannot teach old dogs new tricks, as we find the mouthpiece of the group in the saddle already snapping at the heels of the Joint Army and Navy Board's recommendations. The same old formula is being followed. It is being belittled, damned by innuendo, blamed for inadequacy at the same time its over-all cost of some $261,000,000 is being held up in horror, and compared, unfairly, with the alleged cost of a second high bridge. That is the trouble with Oakland. It has been fed with such Machiavellian propaganda for years that it is no wonder its municipal thinking is muddled and warped.

We have been informed that a joint meeting of the San Francisco and Oakland Chambers of Commerce was called for Thursday to try to coordinate effort toward united support of the Joint Army and Navy Board's recommendation, and the speeding of plans for building the badly needed second crossing. That, even if this second crossing is built speedily, the growth of traffic in the bay area is so phenomenal, Colonel Bonner points out, that whereas conditions are now so acute, with our present State registration of 3,000,000 plus cars, what will it be like in 5 years, when all indications point to a registration of 7,000,000 cars in California. Strangely enough, while even the Joint Army and Navy Board points out that in a few years the second crossing will be insufficient to handle the estimated traffic, the opponents of the low-level crossing are using this as an argument against building it. Can anyone, whose judgment is not warped by self-interest, argue that a second high-level bridge, paralleling the existing structure and dumping its added traffic load upon the already congested arterial approaches, will be more helpful? Let's quit quibbling and get action.

A Blow to National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

In view of the impending vote on the proposed cut in the President's budget, and because that proposed cut may vitally affect the peace of the world by weakening our armed forces and evidencing our waning interest in world peace, this editorial herewith introduced is a timely and thought-provoking work that merits the attention of every Member of the House.

A BLOW TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Our very security will be dangerously weakened, President Truman warns, if the budget slashes stay in force. There is all too much reason to fear he is right. It is obvious that the subcommittee which cut $1,750,000,000 from the Army and Navy and another half billion from the Army's civil functions acted without a close study of the armed services' needs. Our peace diplomacy has thereby suffered a heavy blow; our hand is weakened in the current UN negotiations and the forthcoming Moscow conference on the German peace settlement.

Secretary Patterson says flatly that the cut will keep the Army from carrying out its assignments. It means 35 air combat groups instead of 55, only 500 new planes a year instead of 900. "In 3 to 5 years," General Spaatz testifies through Patterson, "we will have a second-rate Air Force largely equipped with obsolete planes."

Patterson reports for Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur that the cut will reduce "the already dangerously low civil ration in occupied areas. Starvation is inevitable"—and then insurrection. "Any successful defiance of our authority in occupied areas would quickly mushroom to dangerous proportions."

Secretary Forrestal has said that a threatened smaller cut than the one actually voted "would so greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Navy as to render it practically immobile and impotent as an instrument of national policy." Among other things, it would sharply curtail pilot training and break the enlistments of men who joined the service in good faith.

Yet some Republican leaders still contend, in Representative DIRKSEN'S words, that the warnings are only a campaign "to keep the fat and padding" in the original budget. Maybe so, but Patterson cites figures showing how sharply his subordinates' plans were trimmed before being submitted to Congress. If the Dirksens are right, it is only by rare coincidence, because they actually don't know what they are talking about.

Patterson and Forrestal are armed with information. The subcommittee did not bother to arm itself by close study; it preferred the meatax. Its act was irresponsible—gravely irresponsible, because it weakens us in international political affairs of the utmost importance to our own peace and security.

Fortunately, this lapse can still be retrieved. The full budget committee of 102 members can reverse its subcommittee, confess in effect that the Presidential request has not been thoroughly explored, restore the whole amount tentatively, and leave the actual limits on expenditures to subsequent hearings and debate. A special committee was created to avoid such lengthy indecision, but its negligence leaves no other tolerable course this year. National security and effective domestic government being at stake, no less a course is tolerable.

Coal Crisis Points Up British Empire Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mallory Browne, from the New York Times:

COAL CRISIS POINTS UP BRITISH EMPIRE PLIGHT—THOUGH NATION IS CONFIDENT, TWO WARS HAVE WEAKENED ITS POSITION

(By Mallory Browne)

LONDON, February 15.—The coal crisis in Britain is an uncannily accurate symbol of the present plight of the British Empire. In both cases the underlying problem is one of power.

Over here in gloomy, blacked-out, half-frozen London, Britons are more surprised than annoyed to read excerpts from the American press telling them that what is happening is the "disintegration" of the British Empire. In the first place, the average Englishman is much too busy trying to keep warm to think about the international implications of the coal shortage. In the second place, the British, who are always at their best in adversity, are as confident that they will weather this current crisis as they were during the Dunkerque evacuation when the rest of the world thought Britain was finished.

BASIC ISSUES REMAIN

Yet thoughtful people here in Britain are beginning to perceive that the mere fact of surmounting the present acute coal shortage, important and difficult as that is, will not solve the basic problems of the British Empire.

"The day of great European-ruled empires is finished." This is not a quotation from an American or Asiatic newspaper. It is a statement made this week in Glasgow by Sir John Boyd Orr, director general of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization and one of the most respected advisers of the British Government.

One of the most thoughtful and responsible newspapers in England, The Yorkshire Post, wrote this week that "large forces now being maintained abroad will have to be reduced to provide more manpower for industry at home." And it concluded, "The time has now come when Britain may be forced to reduce some of her armaments."

RECOGNITION OF REALITIES

This typically British understatement reveals the fundamental significance of the present crisis, which is simply that Britain is being forced by it to face up to the real situation at home, in the Empire, and in the world.

This true situation is, of course, not simply, as The Yorkshire Post cautiously suggests, that Britain "may" be forced to reduce some of her commitments but that it has been for some time and is being obliged to reduce many of its international commitments and to withdraw from strategic positions hitherto held vital to the existence of the Empire: India, Egypt, and now Palestine.

What is it that is forcing the British to these Empire-shaking withdrawals? How did Britain get into her present sorry plight?

Not, of course, either domestically or internationally because of the shortage of coal. The coal crisis is not—except superficially, and in the most immediate sense—a cause. It is an effect, or perhaps more exactly a symptom. It is a symptom of Britain's loss of power.

The plain hard fact is that Britain, which 40 or 50 years ago was the most powerful nation in the world with a far-flung empire on which the sun never set, has now become a vulnerable little island kingdom off the coast of Europe without enough power to hold its Empire together—perhaps even without enough power left to maintain its former high standard of living at home.

CHANGES ARE RECOGNIZED

Only this week Ernest Bevin, Britain's Foreign Secretary, was wistfully lamenting these changes. "Facts are facts and must be faced," he said in a speech, and the imposing fact of the postwar world was that "the United States and the Soviet Union have come out of the conflict very powerful."

He went on to say that if he had 40,000,000 tons of coal he would be three times more powerful in European diplomatic councils than he is at present. He could, he said, "do a lot better in peace-making if he could get the manufactured goods for export, while if

only Britain had financial credits to give, he could do an enormous amount."

What is the explanation for the decline in British power so sadly summarized by Mr. Bevin? Two main reasons are the two world wars in one generation.

Both these wars weakened Britain. Directly they weakened her through loss of manpower. Not only were there millions of British casualties but the population trend, which before the First World War had been upward, turned downward.

WEAKENED BY WARS

Indirectly, too, both wars weakened Britain. They resulted in or at least hastened the development of the United States into the greatest industrial, military, naval, and finally, air power, and also as the greatest economic and financial power. At the same time the wars were accompanied by the rise of the Soviet Union to the position of the world's biggest military power on land and to the status of the dominant diplomatic power in both Europe and Asia.

There is another basic reason for the decline in Britain's power at home and abroad, less direct than the effects of the two World Wars but equally operative. Out of the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century has come the social revolution of the twentieth. Power has passed to the masses under a Labor Government dominated by the British trade-unions.

However excellent the ultimate effects of this change may be, one immediate result has been to entrust the authority to rule an empire to individuals unaccustomed to ruling. It is true, of course, that the change was cushioned by the permanent civil service in Britain. But even so the British grip on things, both domestically and imperially, has inevitably lacked some of the sureness and firmness of the past.

This has been doubly important because, as part of the world-wide revolution of the masses, there has been a great political awakening of the so-called backward peoples. In India, in Burma, in Egypt, and in many British colonies, political nationalism has flamed up, partly as a result of war, partly because of a train of circumstances reaching back into history.

RUSSIAN INFLUENCE

This upsurge of the colonial peoples toward independence has been aided and abetted by Moscow Communists in many places. There is no room left for doubt that the Soviet Union regards itself as a rival of the British Empire and the potential heir to any fragments it can help to detach.

More and more it looks from London as if the only hope of "something new and better" resides in the United Nations. It is significant that both the Egyptian and Palestinian crises are now virtually certain to come before the United Nations soon.

Furthermore, the British are aware, though they do not often talk about it, that the atomic bomb has altered their whole strategic outlook. England, with its highly concentrated industrial population dependent upon imported food for its existence, is admittedly the most vulnerable of all countries to attack by atomic weapons.

HOPE IN UNITED NATIONS

Sometimes it seems to the British themselves as if the problems facing them were beyond their immediate means. Ultimately, they place their hopes in building up a United Nations organization that will work.

The only visible short-term solution would be a real improvement in Anglo-Soviet relations. This, if it was genuine, would allow Britain to reduce its manpower commitments in places like Greece and Palestine where the shadow of the Soviets is the underlying problem.

Mr. Bevin hopes that something along this line may be done in Moscow next month. The present electric-power crisis has hardly strengthened the British bargaining position, however. The outlook for Britain abroad, as in her blacked-out streets at home, is not bright.

The United States Under the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein another article in a series, The United States Under the Republicans, which has been reproduced in booklet form by its author, Edwin K. Gross, after publication in the Morning Herald, Gloversville, N. Y., of which he is chief editorial writer:

SINGLE-TERM TRIO RANK AMONG OUR BEST PRESIDENTS—WITHIN THEIR OWN PARTY, REPUBLICANS DEFEATED EVILS OF SPOILS; M'KINLEY FOSTERED RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS; GOP LONG AUTHORED "THE MORE ABUNDANT LIFE" BEFORE OPPONENTS USED THE PHRASE

The Republicans defeated the wickedness in spoils, in a fight within their own party. Office seekers and trivial matters were formerly, even more than today, the bane of Presidents. Lincoln said to an old Illinois friend: "It isn't this war that's killing me, Judge; it's your confounded Pepperton post office!" James A. Garfield found a third of his time consumed by the office hunters, who "waylaid him when he ventured from the shelter of his home, and followed him even to the doors of the church where he worshiped." Within 4 months after his inaugural Garfield was slain by a disappointed job seeker.

"Any system of civil service under which the subordinate positions of the Government are considered rewards for mere party zeal is fatally demoralizing," the Republicans' 1872 platform asserted, "and we therefore favor a reform of the system."

Grant then made an attempt at reform through a Civil Service Commission. "The present system," he said, "does not secure the best men, and not even fit men for public place."

Hayes issued an order against "offensive partisanship"—forbidding Federal employees to participate in political organizations or campaigns, and also banning political assessments upon public workers. He steadfastly refused to build up a personal following through his patronage power. In answer to those who charged that he was ruining the party because he did not make the political appointments asked of him, Hayes said: "He serves his party best who serves the country best."

The Hayes Cabinet included as Postmaster-General a former Confederate officer. Because this President dismissed worthless officeholders even though they were Republican Party members, stalwart Republicans called him a "half-breed."

But the fight between merit and spoils continued to rage until the shots of an assassin felling Garfield rang in the ears of the country—confirmation of the evil to which the advocates of civil-service reform had pointed. Our politics, not surprisingly, has given us more mere politicians than statesmen, but, with the death of Garfield, a man who had been a machine politician, Vice President Chester A. Arthur, succeeding, "filled the country not less with surprise than with deep satisfaction" (the Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, wrote) when, instead of presiding at a lavish pie-cutting, he pressed for the passage of the act of Congress which in 1883 provided for competitive examinations for public jobs and prohibited removal for political reasons.

Arthur had been displaced by Hayes as Collector of the Port of New York for evading Hayes' instructions to rid his custom house of hundreds of clerks who had nothing to do and some of whom were so illiterate that they could hardly write their names. But now, as President, Arthur emulated Hayes, became a vigorous reformer.

About 12 percent of all Government jobs were placed on the classified list during Arthur's tenure; the list was steadily extended; Taft added a great number of offices; and the work of Hoover's administration in this direction brought the Federal posts under civil-service protection to about 63 percent.

When Benjamin Harrison appointed Theodore Roosevelt to the Civil Service Commission, that young reformer at once injected new energy into the law and rallied fresh enthusiasm among the people to its support. The spoilsmen had reviled the mild-mannered members of the Commission, but T. R. fired back at them, as when he handed them the blast that a large portion of the political contributions extorted from reluctant officials was "retained by the jackals who collected it."

Hayes, Arthur, and Harrison, among our best Presidents, though not glamorous, are examples of what a President can do with one term in the White House when he keeps his mind off reelection.

The veto was frequently used by Hayes. He protested against coupling of bills which had little or no relation—a congressional device to force approval of obnoxious legislation through attachment to an urgent measure.

Under Hayes the Life-Saving Service was established—the first life-saving institution ever authorized and supported by any government.

Arthur's initiative rejuvenated an enfeebled Navy.

Against pressure to protect the guilty in a discovery of graft on the Post Office star-route contracts, Arthur removed the officials involved, including an assistant postmaster general.

Woodrow Wilson, in tribute to Hayes and Arthur, said:

"The 4 years of Mr. Hayes' term in the Presidency, with their restful discontinuance of party legislation, afforded not only a time of calm in which thoughtful men could look about them, but also a clear stage upon which it quickly became evident that new scenes were being set." * * * Arthur "dealt with the bills sent to him by Congress in a way that lacked neither courage nor discrimination. Factions were quieted and the course of affairs ran cool again, with an air in which men could think."

Wilson said of Harrison (grandson of President William Henry Harrison) that he was "a man * * * gifted above most of his predecessors with the power to think and speak clearly, impressively, and to the point upon every public issue. There was a pleasing independence in the way in which Mr. Harrison showed his good conscience and careful diligence in affairs."

In his inaugural address, Hayes pledged himself to a single term and recommended a constitutional amendment limiting the President to one term of 6 years.

When Grant was twice boomed for a third term, objection within the party to the shattering of American tradition against more than two terms for any President was effective. In 1874 the Republican Convention of Ohio, Grant's own State, resolved that the observance of George Washington's example was an essential rule of unwritten Republican law. In 1880 a convention of independent anti-third-term Republicans was held in St. Louis to protest against a Grant renomination. No

case was ever more sincere, therefore, than the Republican position against the third and fourth terms to which the Democratic Roosevelt won election.

One of the greatest parliamentary landmarks in the Congress was laid down by a Republican Speaker, Thomas B. Reed. He believed wholeheartedly that the incumbent party's duty was to see that its policies were carried out. Before 1889 it had been the custom of the minority Members to obstruct the business of the House by the expedient of refusing to answer the roll call, though present, to deny a quorum. Speaker Reed ordered the clerk to record unresponsive ones as present but not voting. When the opposition objected, charging that he was upsetting precedent of a hundred years, he replied: "Yes, and I am establishing precedent for the next 100 years."

Coolidge's Vice President, Dawes, made an inaugural address as outspoken as if he was addressing a private business conference. He assailed moss-covered Senate traditions and rules, principally those which permitted one-man filibustering.

Lincoln's administration and Republican successors increased the Federal revenue by the indirect method of building up the wealth of the country, offered bounties not only for construction of railroads but also for increased production of needed goods, aided agriculture, assisted internal improvements, pursued a liberal immigration policy because of the need for additional labor.

From 1860 to 1870 the number of factories increased 79.6 percent, and the persons employed in them almost doubled. In 1860 the United States ranked fourth among the nations of the world in industry, by 1892 it led them all; the number of factory workers increased threefold, the total value of their products fivefold.

The expansion of capital in itself led to the organization of labor unions to protect the rights of the workers.

The Republicans' 1872 platform, when Grant was reelected, recognized "the duty of so shaping legislation as to secure full protection and the amplest field for capital; and for labor, the creator of capital, the largest opportunities and a just share of the mutual profits."

The Republican platform of 1888 declared opposition to all combinations of capital organized in trusts; President Benjamin Harrison recommended that Congress consider restraints, and in 1890 he signed the resulting legislation, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, "to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies."

Advocating a "square deal", denouncing "malefactors of great wealth", the abuses of corporations, the poverty in great cities, and the social perils in existing inequalities, Theodore Roosevelt became the fiery trust buster, smashing the oppression and arrogance of capital.

In his first message to Congress, he proposed regulation of industry with an attack on unfair practices, and Congress responded by creating the Department of Commerce and Labor. He maintained that the biggest corporation, like the humblest private citizen, must be held to strict compliance with the will of the people.

T. R. instructed his Attorney General to bring suit against the Northern Securities Co., a holding company organized by James J. Hill, J. P. Morgan, and E. H. Harriman, for the purpose of controlling the stock of the Western Pacific, the Great Northern, and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroads. Court order that the corporation must be dissolved was a great victory for the Government. No fewer than 44 such antitrust actions were instituted by Theodore Roosevelt.

And William Howard Taft continued actively the prosecution of the trusts. In his administration the Interstate Commerce Act was amended to give the Commission jurisdiction over telephone, telegraph, cable, and wireless companies; a Federal parcel-post service was established to break the monopoly of the express companies, whose rates were excessive; and, similarly, the Postal Savings Bank was founded in the Post Office Department to which the Republican Congress during Johnson's tenure had given the postal-money-order system.

Theodore Roosevelt won for the coal miners the principle of collective bargaining when he compelled the operators to arbitrate a strike.

With the country confronted with a distressing winter in 1902–3, T. R. commanded the operators and strikers to send representatives to a White House conference. When an operator objected "to being called here to meet a criminal, even by the President of the United States," the Republican Roosevelt wielded his "big stick"—informed the operators that if they would not arbitrate he would take over the mines by force and operate them in the public interest, though he had no constitutional authority for such procedure.

With reference to the insulting operator, Theodore Roosevelt said later: "If it wasn't for the high office I hold, I would have taken him by the seat of the breeches and the nape of the neck and chucked him out of that window."

To Speaker of the House, Joseph G. Cannon, when they were discussing the President's lack of legal right to interfere, T. R. said: "I would have seized the mines and the roads and would have given the freezing people coal, and Congress could have impeached and be damned."

He said that he was functioning according to the Jackson-Lincoln theory of the Presidency, "that is, that occasionally great national crises arise which call for immediate and vigorous Executive action, and that in such cases it is the duty of the President to act upon the theory that he is the steward of the people."

War-Born Devices Should Be Utilized To Make Rail Travel Safer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial on air and railroad safety. The article, which was published in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat on Saturday, February 15, supports a bill which I recently introduced in the House to promote the safety of railroad employees and passengers. This legislation is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I recently appeared before that group in support of this measure. The editorial follows:

NECESSARY MEDICINE

At the moment public attention is focused sharply upon the suffering safety record of the air lines. The frequency of serious crashes has jumped to the extent that the fly-line customers are canceling their reservations in favor of other modes of transportation.

The record of the railroads, however, is not impeccable by any stretch of the imagination, and these carriers have been having their safety headaches, too. Major accidents, seemingly, are just as frequent on the ground lines as in the air lines.

Accidents are costly, wasteful, and all too frequently avoidable. Often they take lives, always they smash up valuable equipment, and invariably these foster an aversion for travel which is mirrored in future business.

During the recent war the armed forces made great strides in the development of radar and other electronic-control equipment to minimize the human error which, in most cases, is responsible for the difficulties. And these inventions worked miraculously.

It is therefore fitting that the benefits of these war-born devices be utilized for peacetime pursuits. This week the Civil Aeronautics Administration, alive to the problem, asked Congress for $1,600,000 to effect conversions on 20 terminal airports. And their chances of getting it look pretty favorable.

Similar favorable attention should be conferred upon a bill which has just been introduced to the Eightieth Congress by Representative MELVIN PRICE, which seeks to promote the safety of both passengers and railroad employees by requiring the carriers to install similar electronic-control devices.

This is a matter which the Interstate Commerce Commission itself should have attended to long ago without the necessity of intervention by Congress. But in this regard the ICC has been derelict in not being abreast of the times.

As late as last August it had only one employee with any previous experience in radio communication and none with previous experience in radar. And, in view of its past record, we seriously doubt that this status has been materially improved.

The vitality of America's railroads is important to the continuing health of the Nation. The rail carriers represent an important resource upon which all of us are tremendously dependent, which explains the official interest of Congress in their continuing welfare and justifies the steps it takes to force them to keep up to date.

Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the country is seldom hurt by laws that Congress does not pass. This Congress might do well to wipe out of existence some laws adopted in the last 14 years and that now are no longer needed.

With that thought in mind, Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing my resolutions to declare the end of the Second War Powers Act and to declare the war officially over. If we do these two things, it will shortly terminate several hundred Executive orders and laws, and, of course, put out of business a score or more of Government agencies with their thousands of employees. The few laws that may be necessary to continue can be passed and their administration placed in old established Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this step the first approach to the weeding out and the necessary pruning and elimination of the duplication and confusion which now exists in our Government. Unless this is done, we can expect Government agencies to grow in number as they have been

doing since VJ-day. I hope the proper committee will give these two resolutions an early hearing. I believe they are a must and a mandate from the American people.

The next step, Mr. Speaker, is to make strict economies in Government. This can be done by refusing appropriations to unneeded Government agencies. According to a good Democratic Member of Congress in another body, these agencies and commissions number more than 1,100 as of today. They consume the taxpayer's dollar like the thirsty camel at his far-between water holes. When a reduction in Government expenditures has been achieved, the next step must be to reduce and balance the budget. Then follows debt and tax reduction.

The people also expect the Congress to pass legislation and set up machinery to bring about more labor and industry peace. This is a legislative must. The two committees in this Congress are now holding hearings and it is hoped good, constructive labor legislation will be before this body in a short time.

When this is done, Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Congress could well afford then to go home. We do not need a host of new laws on the book. We need to do some unscrambling of laws that have already been passed to clarify the functions of government.

Good Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit herewith a letter received from one of the highly esteemed citizens of Lake Charles, La., in my district.

This fine lady is of the old school and has been one of the most active civic workers in Lake Charles for many, many years. She is universally esteemed and highly respected for her fine judgment, tolerance, charity, and her unselfish work for her city and country.

The letter follows:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *February 11, 1947.*
Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE,
United States Representative from Louisiana.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing to express my views on some important measures that are up in Congress this session and I feel that it is time that we, the people, let our lawmakers know how we feel about some of the things that have been imposed upon us under the guise of wartime necessities.

First, I believe it is time to stop so much waste in operating unnecessary Government agencies and I favor a more economic administration of Government affairs.

I am not in favor of any across-the-board reduction in income-tax rates, but I do favor some form of relief for those in the low-income bracket. National debt should be reduced if possible, sir, and I am opposed to the continuance of any wartime measures and restrictions beyond their present expiration date. We feel that these have served their purposes. The worst is over and I can see only conflict and confusion among our citizens by continuing them longer. I consider it a waste of our taxpayers' money keeping a lot of Government agents scattered over the country telling us how to operate our business now that the emergency is over.

Let's get back to the good old democratic way of running the affairs of our great Nation. Let's keep it great by encouraging free and competitive enterprise in every way possible.

Hoping that you are giving all matters of importance your most sincere consideration, I am,

Yours respectfully,
(MRS.) MARY E. JARDINE.

Carroll, of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am pleased to insert an article about our colleague, the Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 15, 1947. I know from personal observation that JOHN CARROLL will be a real asset to this House and will be able to contribute greatly of his knowledge in behalf of his State, his country, and the world. We of the Rocky Mountain region are extremely glad that we have such a vigorous and promising Member and we know he will add greatly to our strength in this body.

THERE ARE ONLY THREE OTHERS LIKE HIM

Twenty-five years ago Colorado's Representative JOHN ALBERT CARROLL was a young war veteran with an itch to become a lawyer, but without the financial wherewithal to soothe it.

So he joined the Denver police force, pounded a beat by day and studied law at night. For 6 years he toiled at his police work and his Blackstone, but he finally got his law degree.

LEARNED EARLY

He grew up in a family he describes as of moderate circumstances, had to quit high school, and lie about his age in order to get into World War I. He learned early the know-how of success against odds.

Mr. CARROLL, a Democrat, chose 1947 as the year in which to make his congressional debut. To reach Capitol Hill he had to defeat a Republican incumbent. He did. All told, only 4 Democrats replaced Republicans in the House this year, while 54 Republicans ousted Democrats.

The Carroll-Gillespie (Dean M.) election campaign was a struggle between opposites, between a relatively young lawyer who isn't afraid of the label New Dealer and an elderly businessman and veteran conservative Congressman.

"THAT GOT HIM"

Perhaps an explanation of Representative CARROLL's success can be gleaned from accounts of a debate he and Representative Gillespie participated in. Representative Gillespie, Mr. CARROLL recalls, denounced the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill as socialistic. He chortles: "I asked him if that meant he considered his own leader, Senator TAFT, a Socialist. That got him."

The new Congressman brings to Capitol Hill a veteran's viewpoint—besides service in the Philippines during World War I he served 2 years with AMG in Africa, Corsica, Italy and France in World War II.

His interests reflect that viewpoint. One of the things he is primarily interested in seeing Congress work out, he says, is a "real housing program." He says "housing means a lot for prosperity."

The Carrolls (the new Congressman is married to a Denver girl and they have a 15-year-old daughter who goes to the Georgetown Visitation School) like Washington. However, Representative CARROLL admits he's a bit disappointed by some aspects of life here.

"I don't quite meet the hospitality you get in the West," he complains. "Particularly, that goes for the tradespeople. I guess they're tired out after the war."

Also, he says, he was amazed to find slum areas sticking out like sore spots in otherwise well-groomed sections of the Capital.

The Carrolls have been fortunate to find an apartment—in the Wardman Park Hotel.

But the Representative isn't completely happy about that, either. "The rent's sort of stiff for a boy from the sticks," he sighs.

School Lunches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution urging that funds be made available to permit continuance of low-cost-luncheon program in the schools of the city of Chicago, adopted by the City Council of Chicago on February 10, 1947:

"Resolution urging that funds be made available to permit continuance of low-cost-luncheon program in schools of the city of Chicago

"Whereas the Federal contributions which, with State and local funds, have made possible low-cost luncheons in the public schools of the city of Chicago, are reported to be nearly exhausted, and the Board of Education of the City of Chicago will be forced to increase the price of luncheons in the public schools by approximately 33⅓ percent after March 10, 1947; and

"Whereas low-cost balanced luncheons are imperative for the children in the schools to maintain the health and well-being of our children, to aid them in growing up to be strong and healthy citizens, and to enable them to maintain high educational standards in their school work; and

"Whereas it is unthinkable that any misguided efforts at economy in government should be permitted to affect the health and development of these children or the success of the low-cost-luncheon program, which has so vitally influenced their physical and mental well-being: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the city council does urge the Congress of the United States to make available at once funds sufficient to permit the continuance of the low-cost-luncheon program in the schools of Chicago; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the city clerk to the Representatives in Congress from the districts embraced

within the city of Chicago with a request that they lend every aid and assistance available to them to secure favorable action by the Congress on this request."

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Monday, the 10th day of February A. D. 1947.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago, 13th day of February A. D. 1947.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

In Defense of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Summit Sun, Mrs. Mary Cain, editor and publisher, Summit, Miss., date of February 13, 1947:

IN DEFENSE OF MISSISSIPPI

Under the above caption, brilliant Clayton Rand, of Gulfport, writes:

"Not since the War Between the States and Reconstruction has the fair name of Mississippi been so besmirched and maligned. Libeling Mississippi has become the favorite pastime of radio broadcasters and news commentators, from Washington to Moscow. To millions of people Mississippi is a State populated only by bigots and yokels. Capitalizing on the Bilbo fiasco we are publicized by greasy-tongued scandalmongers to gratify the greed of the perverted and prejudiced. Unfortunately, we are on the defensive.

"Neither in the light of history nor in the living present is Mississippi a prostitute in the sisterhood of States, to be slurred and insulted by publicity pimps and political nincompoops.

"We may hold no brief for Bilbo, but we can speak for Mississippi. As States go, she is not rich, but we are not ashamed of our poverty. Primarily rural, her people have fought against overwhelming odds to enrich the Nation's economy. Starting almost from scratch, no State is making more rapid progress in industrial development.

"With the highest birth rate in the Union, Mississippi leads in the production of men and women, many of whom have gone forth to all the States to help build the fortunes of the whole country.

"Mississippi is no benighted part of a proud Republic. Ours is a singular achievement. Otherwise, how could we be, as the super-critics say, a State populated by illiterate peckerwoods, and then lead the other States in the production of literature?

"Never in the history of Mississippi have her people tried to dictate the internal affairs of other States. Yet for more than a hundred years now we have been relentlessly pestered by snoopies telling us what we ought to do in Mississippi. We do not like some of the things they do, some of the candidates they elect; but that is their business, and why in hell don't they leave us alone? The most interesting thing about America is that all Americans are not alike. We Mississippians may be a little peculiar, for we prefer to be individualistic and independent.

"If Mississippians enjoy paying a poll tax, is it not their own business as much as it is the right of Minnesotans to penalize the sale of oleomargarine, or Nevadians to provide reliefs from matrimony with easy divorce laws, or citizens of other States under community property laws to cheat the Federal Government out of income taxes by permitting a husband to split his earnings with his spouse? Massachusetts has a law forbidding a man to kiss his wife on the Sabbath.

"Is there any more reason why we should compel each State to conform to the same federalized pattern than to enforce our citizens into uniformity by requiring them to stereotype their thoughts and acts or to eat spinach? Shall we substitute for the regimentation of the individual under alphabetical agencies the regimentation of the States under the GOP?

"Is it not as silly to extinguish the peculiar characteristics and customs of the State as it is to destroy the personality of the individual? Under our singular form of government, is not the sovereignty of the State as essential to the preservation of the Republic as the freedom of the individual citizen?

"Haven't we had enough of these butt-headed buttinskies who would change us? Shall we not declare open season against all meddlers into the internal affairs of Mississippi? Fighting is a tradition with us, proven on countless battlefields and at as many forums.

"Mississippi is the mother of soldiers and statesmen. But we are a State of pikers if we refuse much longer to meet what has become a challenge to our pride and patriotism.

"Mississippi needs a statesman in the United States Senate, a fearless advocate, fully qualified and equipped to meet all comers in a match of wits and words. But more than that, we need a quickened conscience among our people, expressing itself in bold print and courageous speech. Mississippi cannot take the slander of loose tongues much longer and retain her self-respect. Don't you think we have been kicked around enough?"

To which every Mississippian worthy of the name will add a hearty "Amen!" but editor Ned Lee goes further. "Wit and words," thinks editor Lee, "are not enough." A real fight to the finish is what we must have. And he proposed to begin that fight by cutting from his paper such mud-slingers at Mississippi as Walter Winchell, whose column he has carried for many years. And he added, "In connection, we heard a local lady say that never in all the rest of her days will she use again a certain hand lotion long associated with the name of this South-hating and South-insulting, reckless, unthinking, and ignorant columnist-radio commentator."

The lady is doubtless right. As long as we take the comments of men like Winchell and continue to buy the products they sponsor, those sponsors will continue to let them go on spreading poison. But if sales slumped, the sponsor would soon cause Mr. Winchell and his ilk to pull in their fangs.

We're not possessed of a vindictive spirit but we are inclined to agree with Editor Lee that the fight must be carried on in every Mississippi home. If we analyzed the South haters and refused the products they boost, we might hear a different story from them.

Moreover, it's high time some of us went into other States and told of some of the horrible things we could find there. For instance, New York slums could be described in the minutest detail, and we could keep harping on it until every State in the Union was conscious of the filth and insanitary condition of the average New York slum district. Every State in the Union has its weak points. We are not alone. The trouble with us is that we're too busy trying to clean up our own yard to tend to those of our sister States—but they're never too busy to pop over and tell us how to manage ours.

National School Health Services Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of the National School Health Services bill, which I have proposed in legislation introduced in the House today.

The summary follows:

The Federal Security Administrator, through the United States Children's Bureau, as authorized by title V of the Social Security Act, now makes grants to the States for the purpose of extending and improving (1) maternal and child-health services, (2) services for crippled children, and (3) child-welfare services. This proposed bill would establish a new grant-in-aid program for (4) school health services. School health services consist, in the main, of periodic school health examinations to discover physical and mental defects, and preventive and corrective services rendered by physicians, dentists, nurses, and mental hygiene specialists.

PURPOSE

The basic purpose of this bill is best expressed by its section 2 which consists of a proposed declaration of policy by the Congress:

"The Congress hereby declares that in order that no American child shall come to adult life with physical or mental defects or conditions which can be prevented or corrected at an early age, it shall be the national policy to provide assistance to the several States to enable them to establish and develop school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions of school children, with special reference to the correction of defects and conditions likely to interfere with the normal growth and development and educational progress of children. Such school health services shall utilize and develop, insofar as feasible, the qualified public health, medical, dental and hospital facilities already established in each community."

In respect to treatment of physical and mental defects found, the bill specifies that this shall be provided especially in rural areas and areas suffering from severe economic distress. The bill further specifies that funds may also be used for the training and supervision of school personnel in utilizing the findings of health examinations, but excludes health instruction other than that given as part of examination, diagnosis or corrective procedures.

STATES WILL DETERMINE PROGRAM

This bill would apply to the problem of establishing and strengthening school health services, the same general pattern of Federal-State cooperation that has worked so successfully in improving maternal and child health services, services for crippled children, and public child welfare services. Under this bill the States rather than the Federal Government would determine how they want to and can provide school health services. On the State level the program would be administered as provided by State law either by the State health agency or the State education agency, or jointly by these two State agencies, with the advice of a State advisory committee consisting of representatives of public and private agencies concerned with health, education, and child welfare, and the public at large. Each State

would determine how the health and education authorities will cooperate in making available all health services to school children provided for in the bill. Each State would draw up its own plan, according to its own needs.

FINANCING

For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1947, $12,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, $18,000,000 would be appropriated, and for each succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

1. Half of the sum made available for allotment to the States each year would be apportioned among the States as follows: $20,000 to each State and the balance on the basis of the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive. This amount would be matched dollar for dollar.

2. Half of the sum made available for allotment to the States each year would be apportioned according to the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan after consideration of the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive. These funds would not be matched.

3. Of the sum appropriated each year, $2,900,000 or 10 percent of the sum appropriated, whichever is greater, would be available to enable the Children's Bureau to administer and to provide demonstrations, to pay salaries and expenses of personnel detailed at the request of State agencies to assist them in carrying out this program, and for the training of personnel for State and local school health services, through grants to accredited schools of public health or other professional institutions.

APPROVAL OF STATE PLANS

The Chief of the Children's Bureau is required to approve any State plan for expenditure of these funds which meets the following conditions: (1) Financial participation by the State. (2) Administration or supervision of the plan by either the State health agency or the State education agency, or jointly by these two State agencies. (3) The plan must be concurred in by both the State health and the State education agencies. (4) Such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan, including maintenance of personnel standards and selection on a merit basis. (5) Provision for necessary reports and provision for carrying out the stated purposes of the act. (6) Provision for cooperation with medical, dental, health, nursing, education, and welfare groups and organizations in the State, and where necessary for working agreements with State or local public agencies having authority under State law for the care of crippled or otherwise physically handicapped children, or for other necessary health services. (7) Provision for the designation of a State Advisory Committee to include representatives of nongovernment organizations or groups, and of State agencies, concerned with health, education, and child welfare, and the public at large, to consult with the State agency in carrying out the State plan. (8) Provide that the health services described in the State plan shall be available to children without regard to race, color, creed, or nationality, on a basis that is equitable in view of need for services.

The Chief of the Children's Bureau, acting with the advice of a School Health Services Board composed of himself as chairman, the Commissioner of Education, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall approve any plan which fulfills the condition specified above, except that if a State plan, or any portion thereof, is to be administered by a State education agency it shall not be approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau unless the plan, or such portion of it, shall have been approved by the Commissioner of Education.

A National Advisory Committee for School Health Services, consisting of 12 members, shall be appointed by the Federal Security Administrator on recommendation of the Chief of the Children's Bureau, the Commissioner of Education, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. The members must be persons representative of the fields of health, education, and child welfare, and the public at large, one-half of whom shall be selected from panels of at least five names by representative national organizations, and at least three members shall be doctors of medicine and at least one a doctor of dental surgery.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

With the advice of the School Health Services Board and the National Advisory Committee, the Federal Security Administrator shall administrate this act through the Children's Bureau, except that he shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in matters involving State education agencies and in matters pertaining to the training and supervision of school personnel. The Chief of the Children's Bureau must consult State health and education authorities before issuing regulations with respect to grants to States and in matters of general policy with the advice of the National Advisory Committee, and insofar as possible to obtain their agreement. The Chief of the Children's Bureau is authorized to provide demonstrations and for the training of personnel for State and local school health services, and to detail technical staff upon the request of the State agency for consultation, advice, and assistance to the State and its local communities in planning, organizing, and improving school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions likely to interfere with the normal growth and development and educational progress of school children.

Orderly Debt Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly of Iowa:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

Whereas the national debt remains at one of the highest amounts in our history; and

Whereas it is the universal desire of all citizens that we adopt a national fiscal policy which will provide for an orderly liquidation of the national debt, eliminate deficit spending, and place the National Government on a pay-as-you-go basis; and

Whereas the senior Senator from Iowa, the Honorable GEORGE A. WILSON, has introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 in the Senate of the United States, which said resolution will result in the aforesaid objective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to give early and favorable consideration to Senate Concurrent Resolution 5; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate, to the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives in Congress, to the chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the chairmen of the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

ALDEN L. DOUD.
JAY C. COLBURN.
HERMAN M. KNUDSON.

We, Kenneth A. Evans, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa, and W. J. Scarborough, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

KENNETH A. EVANS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
W. J. SCARBOROUGH,
Secretary of the Senate.

Extension of Authority of United States Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the city council of the city of Long Beach requesting that the Congress of the United States immediately enact legislation extending the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to continue the operation of coastwise and intercoastal water freight services beyond March 1, 1947:

Whereas the city of Long Beach has expended millions of dollars in developing and expanding the harbor and port facilities that serve this community; and

Whereas the industrial facilities of this community, now reconverting from a war to a peacetime operation require every advantage in service needed for the transportation of raw materials and finished products; and

Whereas this community is suffering from a severe housing shortage which can only be remedied by a steady flow of building materials; and

Whereas thousands of local citizens are now employed by and receiving wages from the waterborne shipping industry and other industries dependent on it; and

Whereas the activity and prosperity of Long Beach's harbor facilities must in great measure depend on a continuing and expanding coastal and intercoastal steamship service; and

Whereas the industrial facilities in this community must look to coastal and intercoastal water services for many of their supplies of raw materials and as an expeditious and economic means of transporting finished products and goods to other markets; and

Whereas lumber and other vitally needed building materials are now being transported to this area by coastal and intercoastal water traffic; and

Whereas any reduction or cessation of coastal and intercoastal water freight services will eliminate work opportunities for thousands of our citizens as well as seriously disrupt local manufacturing facilities and serve as a decided set-back in our activities to solve our housing problems; and

Whereas it is apparent that the United States Maritime Commission did, on February 5, 1947, issue instructions which will mean the end of coastwise, intercoastal, and some territorial steam services as of February 28, 1947; and

Whereas these instructions by the United States Maritime Commission were given because the Congress of the United States has thus far failed to act in extending the Maritime Commission's authority beyond March 1; and

Whereas the President of the United States did, on January 21, 1947, state to the Congress of the United States the national economy and interest will be seriously prejudiced unless shipping operations continue and unless the Commission is given additional time to dispose of the merchant ships left under its jurisdiction; and

Whereas failure of Congress to extend the authority of the Maritime Commission beyond the date of March 1 will inflict a serious social and economic hardship on this community and on the Nation;

Now, therefore, the city council of the city of Long Beach resolves as follows:

SECTION 1. The city council of the city of Long Beach hereby urges the Congress of the United States to immediately adopt such legislation as shall be necessary to extend the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to continue coastwise and intercoastal water freight services to a period beyond March 1, 1947, in order that there shall be no interruption in the continuation of such services.

SEC. 2. That the city attorney of the city of Long Beach is authorized and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to all California Congressional Representatives and to the California Members of the United States Senate.

SEC. 3. The city clerk shall certify to the passage of this resolution by the city council of the city of Long Beach, and cause the same to be posted in three conspicuous places in the city of Long Beach, and it shall thereupon take effect.

Seeking Solutions the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I made before the annual meeting and banquet of the Chamber of Commerce of Newark, Del., on the evening of February 13, 1947. The address is as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, and members of the Newark Chamber of Commerce, it is a real pleasure to be with you this evening and to renew many fine friendships and to make new acquaintances. I am very grateful to you for your kind invitation to participate in your annual meeting and discuss with you some of our problems.

It would be disrespectful to proceed further, however, without recognizing that yesterday was the anniversary of the birth of one of our Nation's most beloved and greatest leaders. I refer with all humility to the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln belongs to the ages and to all men of every age. He reflected in all his acts and words our American interpretation of wisdom, tolerance, and understanding. He had an uncompromising devotion to the fundamental principles of liberty and justice. Had he lived to bind up the Nation's wounds, I am confident, "with malice toward none" that he would have resisted the pressure groups of that day and continued in his uncompromising devotion to the principles of liberty and justice in restoring real peace and prosperity to a war-divided country.

As we meet here tonight during the period of reconstruction, after another great war, we know that we are all striving for the solution of many difficult problems, and from Lincoln's great example we find guidance and inspiration. Lincoln, even when he became President of the United States, had the ability to think in terms of the average citizen's welfare. In so doing, he was able to recognize the importance of great principles and their application to everyday life in the development of our country. It is my hope and belief that we today will further the best interests of all our people if we are able to recognize, through the great maze of confusion, the important and fundamental principles upon which this country has so swiftly developed and which are so necessary to our further progress.

All of us, regardless of our business, rank, or station in life, want peace at home and abroad. We will work for peace in every phase of our life, but we cannot compromise those fundamental principles of liberty and justice which so become the dignity of each human individual.

In matters of an international nature, we must have the strength and courage to maintain ourselves as a free America, the hope of liberty-loving people everywhere.

In domestic affairs we have a more difficult problem, because we are set upon by subtle subversive elements within our society, who, by their infiltration into many well-meaning organizations from all quarters of our national life, endeavor in the most unsuspected manner to destroy from within the very basis upon which our great Nation has been built. In addition to these subversive elements, we have organizations of tremendous pressure whose private interest sometimes seems paramount to that of our national welfare. Therefore, at home during this coming year it is more important than ever that we reexamine the whole idea of our free American system and the fundamental principles upon which it has been built. With those fundamental principles, plus the experience of the years, clearly in mind, we must measure our many and difficult problems in our search for solutions which will mean the greater good for each individual citizen. There, as I see it, is the approach in these decisive times.

Some of us are called small businessmen, some of us are called big businessmen; others of us are sometimes called agriculturists, while others of us are industrialists; some of us are sometimes called laborers, others are sometimes called other things. Nevertheless, we all are fundamentally American citizens and as such we each know that the sum total of our national prosperity and well-being is no greater than the sum of our individual well-being.

Therefore, the difficulty in these times is reaching solutions which are proper and sound for us as citizens, regardless of the group with which we may sometimes be classified. Or, to put it differently, the solution to our problems which is satisfactory to us as a citizen should also be proper from our point of view as an agriculturist today, an industrialist tomorrow, a laboring man the next day, and so forth. As a Member of Congress, and from my association with many Members on both sides of the House Chamber, I am finding widespread evidence of an earnest desire to meet our problems along the lines I have just suggested.

I know that the chamber of commerce is comprised primarily of businessmen who are vitally interested in making their particular enterprises function successfully. This is only right and proper.

I was a small businessman here in Newark where I owned and operated a restaurant while I was a student at the University of Delaware. It has been my privilege and pleasure to know and associate with many of your members. You have always had a broad outlook recognizing the necessity for business and every other phase of our life to have an opportunity to prosper and grow. The ideals for which you strive here in Newark are the same as those sought by American citizens throughout our land. They are the opportunities for the private individual and for business to forge ahead in our traditional American way.

In government, there are obstacles in our way. First, there is the huge and overburdening cost of operating our Federal Government. Second, there is the tremendous national debt. Third, there are the abuses of our American way which have developed in recent years in government and in our industrial life. Fourth, we have the tremendous burden of high taxes.

I mention these matters now, because there seems to be almost an unanimous opinion throughout the country that we cannot expect to move forward until some satisfactory solution to these problems is worked out. I can assure you that the Members of Congress are approaching these subjects with a careful, thoughtful, attentive attitude. While final determinations on these problems have not yet been made, the plans and policies being formulated are such as to enable me to say that I am confident that you may expect sound, fair, and forward-looking action on these important matters. I firmly believe that there is every reason for you to have confidence in your business and the opportunity for its future prosperity and development.

I have just mentioned that the Congress is approaching the vital issues with which it is now faced in a careful and thoughtful manner. Many people, I think, have considered this attitude as a form of procrastination and unwillingness to come face to face with the real problems at hand. I believe that when all the facts are known you will concur in my opinion that such a cautious approach to such questions as reduction of taxes, national debt, and the other many problems is much more to be desired than a precipitous one which might produce corrective measures in some areas while failing to bring about proper and needed revisions in others.

For example, there is a strong current of opinion that an early and sharp reduction in individual and corporate tax rates will of itself best serve individuals and business enterprise. On the other hand, strong evidence exists to support a contention by many qualified and authoritative sources that a substantial reduction in the national indebtedness would serve the purpose of stabilizing and reducing the high cost of living, in such a manner as to create more dollar value purchasing power, requiring greater productive activity, and resulting in more profitable business operation.

I cite this as a single example of the interrelationship of so many of these problems and as a reason why the Congress is proceeding slowly, step by step, in a sincere effort to find a means of legislative action which will truly be most beneficial to the Nation and to the people.

In a recent address in which he discussed the causes of our present state of affairs the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, said, "The answer is simple. The implications are profound. Taxes rose and the debt mounted beyond all

reason because the Nation abandoned, for a time, a fundamental principle laid down by the men who founded our Republic—the principle that this should be a government of laws and not a government by men."

It is generally recognized that the war effort had a tremendous influence on the State of our Government. But the war is over now and it is essential to free enterprise and opportunity that government be curtailed in the best interests of our people, making room for greater opportunities and the exercise of more individual initiative. In this connection I would like to say that many of us lately have placed too much emphasis upon what the Government can do. There are many instances all through our history where government has created favorable situations to help this or that phase of our national economy get started so that we might have a more vigorous and healthy country, and in order that we might create more employment and better living for all of our people. However, it is fundamental that the private individual and private enterprise through vigor and initiative take every possible means to increase efficiency and productivity. Only through competition in these respects can the full benefit of our progress be spread to all of our people.

As we study many of the problems arising out of present circumstances, it becomes more and more apparent that we have overlooked the fundamental and basic structure of our Government here in these United States. We must naturally expect large combinations and monopolies if we are to tolerate a Federal Government which takes unto itself the centralized control and regulation of American life. The trend of the Federal Government in recent years has been monopolistic—to absorb every possible function of government, although it be a matter of State, county, or municipal concern. It is impossible for the average businessman or the average individual to keep abreast of current directives and regulations promulgated in a federally centralized bureaucracy. It becomes imperative, therefore, that once again we must look to our basic structure of government and see to it that each subdivision of government is permitted to carry out its functions and at the same time we must take such action as would prevent large national pressure groups from being able to concentrate untold power in the hands of a few individuals.

This brings up that fundamental principle: The people of our country gave to the Federal Government only such rights as were enumerated in the Constitution and reserved unto themselves all others. If we remember this in the solution of our present-day problems, we can and will solve these problems to the satisfaction of our people.

I think Lincoln, were he living today, would be the first to recognize the necessity for this restoration of authority to the people, thus preventing the formation of monopolies and large Nation-wide pressure groups, be they in government or out. He would want, I feel sure, the average individual to have an opportunity to compete on an equal basis with any other individual. He would want the people of this country to control for themselves their individual destinies and through their elected representatives the destinies of this Nation.

I have only mentioned specifically a few of the many problems with which we are faced. I could not, in these brief remarks, even enumerate all of the many and varied matters confronting us. Therefore, hoping that I might to some degree give you confidence in the future, I have attempted to reassure you that all of these many and difficult problems will be met with a renewed application of the fundamental principles of our American way. That is, minimizing the importance of government and emphasizing the importance of individual opportunities. In America, peace and progress will be found in full production, full employment, lower prices, better quality, more home rule and less bureaucratic dictation, more individual opportunity and initiative, and more attention to human liberties and progress built upon individual freedom, courage, faith, and initiative.

There are many readjustments which will have to be made, both in Government and in private enterprise. But with determination, with energy, and with American know-how, we shall succeed in putting our country on the highroad to enduring prosperity and peace.

In conclusion, may I tell you again how grateful I am to you for the opportunity to share in this most pleasant occasion.

Lincoln's Cousin Moved South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 12, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln's birthday, insofar as speeches are concerned, belongs to our Republican friends but as some of them have so well said, Lincoln belongs not to one party or one nation but to humanity. In this extension of remarks, therefore, I wish to include an item which may be of some interest to students of the Lincoln family. It involves a first cousin of Lincoln, a Dr. Le Grand, the son of Thomas Lincoln's sister. He practiced his profession of medicine in Newton County, Ark., from just after the war until his death around 1900. The facts recorded here were supplied by my father who, as a young school teacher, lived in Dr. Le Grand's community in 1897 and often talked to him about his distinguished cousin.

Dr. Le Grand was of "the Kentucky Lincolns" and was 10 years younger than his famous cousin. During the 1840's he lived for a period with the Lincoln family in Springfield and pursued his medical studies there.

He served in the Union Army as a surgeon, and at the end of the war he looked around for a peaceful place in which to live. It is significant that he chose a Southern State, and that he found friendliness and congeniality there; though historical accuracy forces me to add that he lived in a Republican community and that its political character unfortunately persists till this day. He told my father that he chose his Ozark home because he wanted something like his Kentucky background and that he liked the clear streams and tree-covered mountains. Dr. Le Grand was well received outside of the Republican circles. He probably attended Confederate reunions in later years, at least it was a common practice in parts of the South to invite onetime enemies to share the pleasure of these occasions. One of my vivid recollections of the Confederate reunions of 40 years ago is that of "Uncle Fate" Breashers, a Union veteran, mixing with Confederates at Gravel Hill, Ark., and enjoying their hospitality.

Dr. Le Grand's life among us was indicative of the interest that the people of the South had in Lincoln, and, from our perspective of later years, I should add that it was indicative of an appreciation of Lincoln's sentiment toward our people.

In a previous extension of remarks, I quoted Lincoln's statement "I have not suffered from the South, I have suffered with the South." This was not in a letter, as my extension indicated, but was in a conversation with George Floyd, of Quincy, Ill.

One more reference, Mr. Speaker, to our interest in the Lincoln career and philosophy. One of the most valuable recent publications on Lincoln is by Prof. Roy P. Basler, of George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn. In his preface to Dr. Basler's book—Abraham Lincoln, His Speeches and Writings—Carl Sandburg says:

> Basler's years of final painstaking labors on this present book have been at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville from which place he wrote to his loyal and indefatigable Chicago friend, Ralph Newman, of the Abraham Lincoln Book Shop: "I suppose that it would be a pleasure to teach Lincoln, Emerson, Melville, Walt Whitman, and Mark Twain to college students anywhere; but I doubt that it could be any more fun than it is in the South."

Dr. Basler has reflected in these lines the prevailing sentiment of the South toward Abraham Lincoln.

The Merrimack Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the following address I delivered over radio station WMEX, Boston, February 6, 1947, on the Merrimack Valley Authority:

What first attracted industry to New England during the middle of the last century? The answer is the abundant water power of our rivers and streams.

Look around you today. Most of our manufacturing cities are located on the banks of rivers, where the use of water pressure provided the first and cheapest energy to turn the wheels of industry. But the world has moved forward since the days when those cities were established. Industry has changed from the direct use of water power to electricity generated by coal and oil and, finally, to hydroelectric power.

New England has not caught up with the last advance.

We still have the abundant water, but we are letting it flow past us to the sea and allowing some of its potential power to go to waste.

Slowly but surely we are paying the price for our lack of vision and common-sense initiative.

Let me list for you a few of our losses.

The Pacific Mills have moved many of their units to the South.

Textron, Inc., is trebling its manufacturing operations but they are to be located in North and South Carolina.

The Utica & Mohawk Cotton Mills are investing more than $15,000,000 in Seneca, S. C.

The Burlington Mills' projects in North Carolina and Virginia will exceed $12,000,000 in cost.

The Chicopee Mills has an enlargement program of more than a million dollars in the Cornelia, Ga. area.

The du Pont Co. is building plants worth more than $15,000,000 in Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

The American Enka Corp., which Massachusetts needs, is spending $60,000,000 in Morristown, Tenn.

Once upon a time, New England was a leader in textile manufacturing. That day is gone. The South is taking this industry together with tens of thousands of jobs, away from us. And the irony is, that we in New England have helped to finance this competition with the money we have paid in taxes. But that is not all. We shall lose other industries to the South and the West unless we learn to compete with areas which obtain their electricity from rivers at a cost far below that which we in New England now pay.

To reverse this dangerous trend, I have introduced to the Congress a bill called the Merrimack Valley Authority Act.

The purposes of this bill are to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Merrimack River and surrounding region * * * in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes.

This project is to be patterned, on a much smaller scale, after the Tennessee Valley Authority, better known as the TVA. In 1933, the Congress created the TVA which was authorized to issue securities; to construct dams, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines, and incidental works on the Tennessee River, its tributaries and its watershed. From this multipurpose program, the TVA is further authorized to produce, distribute and sell its surplus electric power to States, districts, counties, municipalities, and to cooperative and other organizations designed primarily to supply electric energy to their members at the lowest rates possible. It will be the policy of the Merrimack Valley Authority, like the TVA, to help make its power projects self-supporting and self-liquidating.

Regularly twice a year for the past several years we in New England have suffered from man-made stoppages in our coal supply. This has resulted in a forced curtailment of light and a slow down in production. It has brought the fear of unemployment into many of our homes. And the prospect is that we may have more of these interruptions in the future. To say that we are tired of this constant war on our nerves as well as our livelihood is putting it mildly. In this captive condition, shackled by the private-power interests at home and the fuel monopolies outside our region, we look about us for some means of escape. Inevitably, we must think in terms of the TVA.

Comparing it with the proposed MVA, Congressman SAVAGE, of Washington, observed: "I just want to say that the gentleman is certainly advocating something that can be of great benefit to his people. In Pawtucket, R. I., for instance, I notice that electricity which costs $90, the people in my State could buy for $17.50. So if the gentleman can help cut the rates to the point where his people can use more electricity for production, for farming, and for homes, he will certainly raise the standard of living and the happiness of his people."

Congressman GORE, of Tennessee, stated: "Before the TVA came, the average domestic consumer used 600 kilowatt-hours of electricity per year. That cost an average of $35 per consumer. Now the average domestic consumer uses almost three times that much—1,780 kilowatts—and he gets this for $2 less."

These statements indicate that what the TVA did for the people of Tennessee similar projects can do for us.

Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration said, and I quote: "New England cooperatives are paying up to five times the rates being paid for power from the Bonneville Dam in the Pacific Northwest.

"I wonder how long the power companies will be able to fool any considerable number of sensible New Englanders with their explanation that taxes paid by the utilities are the reason for this wide difference in rates.

"In other sections of the country, electric power rates have been brought down wherever power installations have been made at dams built by agencies of the Federal Government for the purpose of controlling floods and developing rivers, as well as generating power.

"These dams have insured a more adequate source of power and at the same time have reduced the power costs to the people by many millions of dollars. The whole country has benefited from the improved economic conditions of these sections. These benefits undeniably refute the claim that it is necessary to charge the people the high power rates which will provide taxes to insure the economic stability of the country.

"This kind of hydroelectric program has been kept out of New England. Even where federally financed flood-control dams have been built, power installations have not been made."

We have paid too much attention to the propaganda of trusts and monopolies and have neglected our greatest natural asset—water power. In the past we even refused grants for hydroelectric projects from the Federal Government and allowed the money to go to other areas which are taking away our industries and our jobs.

But New England is stirring to the challenge. Week after week the Boston Daily Record and the Boston Sunday Advertiser have been bringing the facts of economic life home to us. Their crusade to develop New England's water power needs our support.

Lacking any encouragement from us, the attitude of the Federal Government has been one of hindsight. Only under the pressure of emergency has it been moved to do something, and that in a halting, piecemeal fashion.

There is no over-all program to insure flood control; to solve the sewerage problem; and, on the positive side, to utilize the wealth-producing energy of this river which is now going to waste. The destruction caused by the flood of 1936 convinced the Federal Government that measures should be taken to eliminate this danger. But the Government thought in terms of flood control alone. The remedies effected bore no relation to other problems and other opportunities along this waterway.

It was not until this year that the State government assigned a commission to study the conditions which have caused this river to be described as the dirtiest open sewer in the Nation. In its report to the legislature, the commission gave these figures: The Merrimack River receives pollution amounting to 21,000,000 gallons daily at Lowell, 47,000,000 daily at Lawrence, and 12,000,000 daily at Haverhill. All shellfish areas in Newburyport Harbor had to be condemned. The commission recommended the establishment of a Merrimack River Valley sewerage district and the construction of interception sewers and chlorination plants at Lowell, Lawrence, Haverhill, and Newburyport, at a total cost of $27,500,000. But the Merrimack River would continue to be filthy and dangerous from the thousands of tons of human and industrial waste flowing down from the cities and towns of New Hampshire.

We cannot have one approach to flood control, another to sewerage disposal, and a third to hydroelectric development. The Merrimack River runs through New Hampshire and Massachusetts. The people of any one community, or the people of any one of the two States concerned, cannot do the job. It is a matter of local, State, and Federal cooperation.

We need a complete and coordinated program to solve the problem as a whole and not by some of its parts. To promote the health, the safety, and the prosperity of the communities along this river, we need to establish a Merrimack Valley authority.

It is time for us to wake up. Low-cost power is the heart of production. Too long have we depended upon coal and oil to run our industrial machines. This is a costly method, subject to transportation and handling charges and interruptions in delivery, over which we have no control.

And all the while, in our own backyard, we have the means to provide our own light and power.

We must become river conscious for our own economic salvation.

These waterways belong to the people. They must be placed under a unified public control which will utilize them for the benefit of the greater number.

I urge all consumers and all civic-minded organizations to rally to the support of the MVA in the coming session of Congress. Beginning with the Merrimack, let us make these idle waterways serve our homes, our farms, and our industries.

With low-cost light and power, generated from the natural resources which we possess, we can and will make New England great again.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a radio address by the outstanding commentator, Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., which was delivered last Friday night over radio station WOL. Mr. Lewis calls attention especially to the propaganda being spread against cuts in the Federal budget as proposed by the Republican Members of Congress. I commend it to every Member of this body. It follows:

Well, the 102-man superbudget committee of Congress spent almost an entire day battling over the budget ceiling which is to control appropriations during the present session, but the regular Republican high command, which has been insisting on cutting the President's $37,500,000,000 figure to $31,500,000,000 finally came out victorious, in the end. That's what the figure is tonight—$31,500,000,000—and while the figure still has to be approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives, there is little doubt about that. The process is little more than a formality, from here on. The final vote was 50 to 22.

The Democratic leaders held out to the bitter end, and then attempted to insert a provision which would have eliminated any tax reduction by requiring that all savings in the budget be devoted to amortization of the national debt, but that was ridden down by a heavy majority.

There were several Republicans who were playing along with the Democrats in their efforts to prevent any cuts of the budget for the armed services, notably Senator CHAN GURNEY, of South Dakota, and Representative WALTER G. ANDREWS, who are the respective chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House. Senator GURNEY particularly sang the eternal song of the Army and Navy that any reductions in their budgets will mean disaster to the national defense—which is strictly not true—and will weaken our position in international affairs, which also is strictly not true. It always seems, however, that the armed services are able to take completely into camp the higher ranking members of their committees in Congress, because every time this same thing happens.

In a few moments I'll give you a few items about the Army and Navy budgets which may enlighten you as to whether or not their budget requests can be cut to eliminate sheer profligacy and the utter throwing of money away without any real impairment of the size or effectiveness of the Army or Navy as such in the slightest degree.

Of course, the truth is that no sane person in or out of Congress wants to cripple the Army or Navy, or even impair its effectiveness. But it also is very true that both services are still living in a sort of dream haze, of a dance of the billions, a financial Roman holiday, and apparently from performances to date they simply will not do their own house cleaning and get rid of their own wastefulness and close up their own rat holes, which presents the unhappy alternative that Congress has to do so.

As a matter of fact, it comes with rather bad grace when you consider it seriously that the Army and Navy, which are crying so loudly about not being cut in their appropriation requests, have offered nothing to Congress in the way of a voluntary effort to reduce expenditures that must be reduced. Between them they still have the fantastic total of more than a million full-time civilian employees—clerks and stenographers and messenger boys and photographers and moving-picture operators, and heaven knows what all, more than a million of them, 25 percent more than it took to run the entire United States Government, including even the Post Office Department, in the 1930's, and even then it was agreed on all sides that there were twice as many people on the pay roll as there should be.

In this session this afternoon efforts were made to limit the cut in Mr. Truman's figure to three and one-half billion dollars—which, as a matter of fact, is exactly the amount of padding which the White House had put into the budget, on the confident expectation that the Republicans would lop off something just as a matter of principle. If that had gone through, the result would have been to set the budget ceiling at exactly the figure that the administration forces wanted it set in the beginning, so it really would have been no cut at all. But that failed by a heavy majority.

Of course, these insistences that every item that is requested by the Army and Navy—the Army particularly—is sacrosanct, absolutely indispensable, and must not be curtailed are not too convincing in the light of past experiences with the Army on such matters. If there were a background record in which the War Department high command had shown an approach of sincerity and good faith in attempting to control and eliminate waste in the past, it would be an entirely different matter. But there is no such past record, and, in fact, the past record is exactly the opposite.

If you'll think back to Gen. Brehon B. Somervell—who, by the way, was persistently supported at every turn by Secretary of War Patterson—you'll remember that General Somervell said the same thing about the Canol project, and the Latin-American Highway, and the endless other fiascoes which took place under his command. Col. Theodore Wyman, Jr., "was a wonderful officer, and could do no wrong." When they got into arguments about the merits of a given project, and it was thoroughly proven on the record that they had been wrong in undertaking the project, the policy was to insist upon going ahead with it, anyway, and pouring more tens of millions of dollars of good money after the bad, solely to save face and to justify themselves.

Everything was always necessary and indispensable, and the same old story was chanted then that is being chanted now—that to make any cuts in appropriations would be to invite disaster.

With that background, the only course Congress can take is to refuse to believe what the Army has to say on such matters and to make up its own mind and decision as best it can. That's what this superbudget committee did today, and the armed services has nobody to blame but themselves.

As to whether, in reality, the Presidential budget estimates for the armed services can be cut, let's take a casual look at a couple of them just for curiosity.

The Army engineers, as you probably know, do the rivers-and-harbors and flood-control work and the reclamation projects of the Government, and have for many years past. Those are heavy public works—the sort of projects that are invaluable in recession times, to provide employment and help get the economic cycle turning a little faster, once again—priming the pump, as it was called back in the early thirties. It is work that is strictly in competition with home and business construction work; it competes in the labor market for the labor that is available; and in times when there already is a heavy inflationary pressure on the building and construction industry, it merely adds to that pressure. You might be interested to know that the present budget, which the Army says cannot be cut, contains an item of $365,000,000 for the Army engineers, who do that work.

Or would you be interested in knowing what the Secretary of War himself has requested for the operation of just his own office in the War Department during this coming year. This is another one that cannot be cut, you understand.

This figure does not include any salaries, either for the Secretary himself or for any of his employees. It doesn't include any postage, because all of his mail is franked. It does include telephone and telegraph and a very small item for travel expenses, and it includes a little fund for extraordinary military expenses, whatever they may be in time of peace. I might mention that the Secretary of War has, in his offices, a total of about 1,000 employees. Just why he needs any such staff as that may be a mystery to you. That is purely the civilian staff of the Secretary's office, and it has nothing to do with any activities or any duty of the military side of the Army at all. And remember, it includes no salaries of any kind.

What would you think a fair figure would be, in this War Department budget, for those expenses of the Office of the Secretary of War? Fifty thousand dollars, maybe, or a hundred thousand, or five hundred thousand, or would you think it might be a million? Would you think that $5,000,000 is fantastic?

Well, here's the figure, in black and white, at the bottom of page 823 of the Budget, which President Truman submitted to Congress; the office of the Secretary of War, $25,500,000.

And believe it or not, the same item, listed in this budget for the same purposes for the present year—what would you think that would be? Certainly, the coming year being further away from actual wartime than the present year is, with a lessening of the duties of the Secretary of War generally, surely, the amount for this present year must be more than the amount requested for the coming year—less than the twenty-five and one-half million. Well, it happens that the figure listed here for the present year is about $14,500,000, and still the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, wants twenty-five and one-half million for the year to come.

What do you make of that?

No Lack of Colonels in Peacetime Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to an article which appeared on page 2 of yesterday's Washington News and which is entitled "No Lack of Colonels in Peacetime Army." The figures there presented form, in my opinion, a very fertile field for the budget makers to examine.

In June 1945, when the Army was at its peak, there were 8,000,000 enlisted men, while on January 1 of this year that number had gone down to 1,070,000. This is a reduction of approximately 8 to 1. On the other hand, we find that the number of colonels has been reduced from 10,590 to 6,489 or a reduction of only 1½ to 1. Almost the same thing is true of the lieutenant colonels who have been reduced on a ratio of about 2 to 1 and of the generals who have been reduced on a ratio of 2½ to 1.

While we find the colonels being reduced at a rate of only 1½ to 1 and the enlisted men at a ratio of 8 to 1, we also notice that the number of lieutenants in the Army has been reduced on a basis of 8½ to 1. The same thing is generally true of the intermediary ranks with the reduction greatest in the lower grades and rising as the grade increases to colonel and decreasing only slightly in the case of the generals.

One reason given for this disproportionate decrease of rank is that "a peacetime force must be a nucleus for the organization of a wartime agency. This requires a higher percentage of senior officers than in wartime." This would seem disproved if we examine the figures for June of 1941. These were furnished me by the Library of Congress. At that time we had 89,500 officers of all grades and 1,441,500 enlisted men. That is a ratio of 16 to 1. Today that ratio between officers and enlisted men is just half that figure. It is 8 to 1.

It seems to me high time that the Army cleaned its own house and abandoned its

apparent theory that inflated wartime rank must be maintained. I have no brief either for or against military brass and fully realize that we must have in our top military commands capable men of rank, just as we have top executives in our large corporations. However, I don't think even our wealthiest corporation could continue to long exist with a personnel cut of 8 to 1 while reducing its top executives on an average basis of only about 2 to 1. I fear that the military has become too fond of their stars and eagles to want to give them up, but I feel it is about time they were foregoing this luxury and economizing in their own front yard.

The news article to which I refer reads as follows:

NO LACK OF COLONELS IN PEACETIME ARMY

Some officers on duty at the War Department say one trouble with the peacetime Army is "too many chiefs—not enough Indians."

There are 6,439 colonels in an Army of 1,070,000 enlisted men compared with 10,590 colonels when the Army enlisted strength was at a wartime peak of 8,000,000 men.

ONE COLONEL PER 165 MEN

That is a ratio of one colonel to every 165 men. The wartime ratio was one colonel to every 755 men.

The Army is struggling with the problem of getting enough enlisted men to meet its requirements without the draft. It has a "shortage of second lieutenants for duty overseas."

But there is no shortage of high-ranking officers. Here are the figures:

	Jan. 1, 1947	June 1, 1945
Generals	556	1,474
Colonels	6,489	10,590
Lieutenant colonels	11,415	28,183
Majors	17,650	69,242
Captains	38,392	195,229
Lieutenants	61,164	530,816
Total officers	135,666	835,534
Enlisted men	1,070,000	8,000,000

The Army points out that a peacetime force must be a nucleus for the organization of a wartime army. This requires a higher percentage of senior officers than in wartime. There are also large contingents of overhead troops in a peacetime army which do not expand as rapidly as combat groups in wartime. Combat troops require only five colonels in a combat force of 15,000.

The Army at present is taking no action to cut down the number of high-ranking officers. A demotion program was suspended in June 1946 because of shortages in the officer grade.

Letter of Mrs. J. D. Bragg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mrs. J. D. Bragg, president, Woman's Division of Christian Service of the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church, as follows:

WOMAN'S DIVISION OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE OF THE BOARD OF MISSIONS AND CHURCH EXTENSION OF THE METHODIST CHURCH,
New York, N. Y., January 17, 1947.

To Members of the Congress of the United States:

DEAR SIRS: I wish, at the request of our organization, to extend to each one of you our very best wishes as you have entered upon this momentous session of Congress. We realize that there will be many unusual problems which you will be called upon to face during the months ahead.

As a Christian organization, with more than a million members, we are vitally concerned for the welfare of peoples, not only in the United States but in all parts of the world. We are eager for our country to continue, even more effectively, to take its place of leadership by every means possible to help establish the Christian principles which are necessary if we are to have permanent peace and good will among all men.

We are eager to see (a) the United Nations strengthened in every way possible; (b) full cooperation in the early establishment of the trusteeship council of the United Nations and territories in the Pacific occupied in the recent war placed under the trusteeship council of the United Nations; (c) full support given to international, not national, channels to the interim relief program set up since discontinuance of UNRRA; (d) speedy congressional ratification of our financial obligations for the International Refugee Association and liberalizing our immigration policies so that the United States might receive its proportionate share of refugees and displaced persons and integrate them into its normal life; (e) an adequate housing program for our own country so as not to further jeopardize the establishment of homes; (f) all provisions necessary for protection of rights and privileges of all our citizens.

These are only a few of our concerns and even as we share these with you may we assure you of our deep appreciation for the exacting task which is yours and wish for you a most successful session of Congress.

Yours very sincerely,
Mrs. J. D. BRAGG,
President.

Editorial for School Paper in Bronx County, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make the comment that a short time ago I was asked by a Bronx public-school teacher to write an editorial for the school paper. I know that I was approached on the subject with the apprehension that I might think I was too busy or that there were more important things requiring my attention.

Actually, I felt flattered at the invitation and I considered it a distinct honor and privilege to be asked to write an editorial for the boys and girls of her school and I hope it will not be the last time I shall have that pleasant opportunity. What could be more important than getting home a meaningful message to the boys and girls of our great country, who in a relatively short time will have to carry on with the great problems which must be met.

The editorial appended hereto appeared in Dot and Dash, January 1947, the school paper of Public Schools 87 and 15, Bronx County, State of New York:

When I was a boy, I went to public school in New York City, just as you are doing. I studied about Washington and Lincoln and many other great men in American history and was thrilled at their great deeds. I read about America being the land of opportunity; that its people could get an education without tuition. All they had to have was a desire to learn.

You are getting an education from the finest school system and the best teachers to be found anywhere in the world.

Now that we are approaching the time of year when the birthday of Lincoln is observed, we would do well to ponder what he was able to accomplish in our land of opportunity.

You know that for a long time he had only one book and how well he studied it, reading and rereading it—not by a convenient electric light which you and I have, but by the flickering light of a wood fire. He did not have the books on different subjects which, conveniently, you have.

But he had the desire to learn and he did learn with much less than you have to help you.

You know that he became a lawyer and a great orator and finally, in my opinion, the greatest President America has had.

Very few countries offer that possibility—that from such a humble beginning, one could become President.

In a lesser degree, I have experienced the blessings which America conferred upon Lincoln and which she is ready to confer upon you if only you will do your part. America gave me my education in her public schools. She gave me the chance to go to high school in the evening when I had to work by day. She held open the arms of City College, that I might study there at night. She gave me the privilege of studying law at night and of doing postgraduate work in law, and of attaining my boyhood ambition of becoming a lawyer.

America is anxious to pass her blessings on to you to enjoy. From a humble beginning but with hard work every one of us can attain success in one field of endeavor or another. All America asks us to do is to work.

I am grateful to the people of our congressional district for the privilege of representing them in the same Halls where Lincoln, in Congress, represented his people so well. I remember that as I visit the Lincoln Memorial here in Washington.

That is America—the land of opportunity.

Tribute to Frances E. Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we commemorate the life story of a great and distinguished American today. We honor ourselves, we honor America, in honoring Frances E. Willard. Frances Willard was born in

the State of New York in 1839. She moved to Ohio, then to Wisconsin, and then to Illinois. We are informed she was frail in health. As a matter of fact, it was during a serious illness, about the time she graduated from college, that she resolved to devote the remainder of her life to Christian work. Someone has said she lived 50 years ahead of her time. She fought for political franchisement, for equal opportunities and responsibilities for women in industry, in the home, and in politics. It was through her leadership that women were given a right to cast their ballot. She championed the rights of labor. She insisted that the most important factor in education was education for citizenship. She believed in the union of the churches. She was an all-round civic leader.

Miss Willard graduated from college when she was 20 years of age. She became a teacher. She resigned an important professorship in a university and assumed the leadership of an organization to combat intemperance, the Women's Christian Temperance Union. Under the leadership of Miss Willard, this organization became a world-wide power for sole justice. Her fame spread over the country. She traveled far and wide through the States on her lecture tours. She traveled in Canada and in Europe. In fact, she went to almost every civilized country in the world. Miss Willard organized the international WCTU, the first organization of world women for any cause whatever. That organization became a clearing house for women's activities throughout the world. She was president of the WCTU for 19 years, and 7 years president of the International WCTU.

Miss Willard was not only a reformer, she was a woman of vision. She was a crusader of the highest type. In 1905 the great State of Illinois voted to place this marvelous statue of Miss Willard in the Hall of Fame in the National Capitol. It is the only statue placed in this hall in honor of a woman. Throughout the years, many eulogies have been delivered in honor of this great woman, but one of the finest statements made are the words of Miss Willard herself. These words appear on the pedestal of the statue:

> Ah! it is our women who have given the costliest hostages to fortune! Out into the battle of life they have sent their best beloved with fearful odds against them. Oh by the dangers they have dared; by the hours of patient watching over beds where helpless children lay; by the incense of 10,000 prayers wafted from their gentle lips to heaven, I charge you give them power to protect along life's treacherous highway those whom they have loved.

My friends, the American people do well everywhere to revere the life and the service of a noble woman, a great soul. As the pages of history turn from one generation to the other, the life and work of Frances E. Willard will stand out among the greatest in the history of America. I close with the words of Katherine Lent Stevenson, who wrote these lines in honor of Miss Willard:

How great she stands!
A mountain peak, her soul!
An ocean wide, a river sweeping on with full free tide;
A sacred shrine where holiest things abide;
How great she stands!
Stand, radiant soul!
Here in the center of our Nation's heart;
Forever of its best life thou'rt a part
Here thou shalt draw thy land to what thou art;
Stand, radiant soul!

Rent Control in Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, during a recent trip to Louisville, Ky., the principal city in the district which I have the honor to represent, a matter was called to my attention which I think will prove of interest to the Members of the House. This is the very flagrant maladministration of the Rent Control Act in the city of Louisville. In spite of all the pressure and publicity for some adjustment in rent ceilings to give expression to the higher costs of property maintenance, and in spite of recent directives from Washington suggesting more liberal hearings and actions on hardship cases, the acting rent director in Louisville, Mr. Joseph C. Cantlon, is arbitrarily cutting rents on residential property throughout the city. His authority for making these reductions is section 5 (c) 1 of the Rent Regulations. For the most part, these arbitrary reductions are made without petition by the tenant and without inspection of the property. Mr. Cantlon seems to be unwilling to recognize the fact that there are differences in the value of property in any given neighborhood. He seems to be working on the theory that the low rental units in a neighborhood determine the rental value of all property within that neighborhood. For the sake of illustrating my point, I will give a few examples of just what is happening.

At 1838 Grand Avenue there is a six-room residence with bath and furnace which has been renting for $45 per month since the owner died in 1942. On January 21, 1947, Mr. Cantlon ordered this rent reduced to $36 per month.

At 1011 Walter Avenue, Mr. Cantlon has ordered a reduction from $40 per month to $27.50 on a four-room house with bath and furnace. At the same time, the OPA is approving $50 to $60 per month rentals for similar units being built at present. The owner of this particular property has similar houses in the same neighborhood and in these cases the $40 rent is not being changed.

In the case of an apartment at 433 Park Avenue, Louisville, an excellent location fronting Central Park, Mr. Cantlon has ordered a reduction from $65 to $45 per month. Another apartment in this same building is being reduced from $50 per month to $37.50 per month.

At 432 East Chestnut Street there are three efficiency apartments of two rooms each. Under OPA, these apartments have been renting for $30 per month. Mr. Cantlon has ordered a reduction to $15 per month.

At 2908 South Fourth Street there are two nice five-room apartments which have been renting for $45 per month. Mr. Cantlon has ordered a reduction to $37.50 per month.

At 903 South Preston Street there are two identical apartments, one renting for $14.50 per month and one for $20 per month. The OPA has finally agreed to let the owner raise the price on the $14.50 apartment to $18 if the tenant sublets two rooms.

At 2236 West Chestnut Street there is a house which has been rented for $40 per month. Mr. Cantlon has ordered a reduction to $30 per month. It so happens that in this case, the tenant is subleasing at $67 per month, but this price is unaffected by the order. The only sufferer is the property owner, and the ultimate tenant is not a beneficiary of the reduction.

At 204 Fenley Street, the property has been rented for $85 per month under OPA approval for 2½ years. On February 13, 1947, Mr. Cantlon ordered a reduction to $67.50 per month.

I will not burden the RECORD with further examples. I feel that those listed above fully illustrate my point. Arbitrary action of this kind is increasing the problem which we face in Louisville in the acute shortage of rental property. Landlords who do not want to sell, but who wish to retain their investment, are being forced to sell. Tenants who do not want to buy are being forced to load themselves with heavy debts and buy property in order to provide a roof over their heads. This unrealistic and unimaginative approach to the solution of our most critical civic problem in Louisville is an example of what can happen when we have government by men and not by law.

A High Dam Should Be Built Against Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following copy of my speech before the Mississippi Valley Association's annual meeting, St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, January 20, 1947:

It has been my privilege to be asked by your association to speak this morning on the subject of flood control. I have enjoyed being your guest on other occasions. Your association has rendered a fine public service over many years. The opinions which I shall express here should not be interpreted

as a party position, but rather my own. It is naturally my hope that your group can find reason to agree.

The Nation today is in the midst of its most crucial financial period. The actual budget receipts for the fiscal year of 1946 were $43,038,000; the budget as proposed by the President calls for $37,500,000,000, and the Federal financial statement is heavily weighted with debt. During the past decade and a half, the American people have allowed themselves to be lulled into a false belief that public debt is neither problem or obstacle. Instead of being totally honest with ourselves, we have come to a point where we seem to lack a comprehension of the enormity of our fiscal problem—the debt of $270,000,000,000.

The Presidential budget message for 1947 reflects either an utter disregard for the pending weight of our problem or a political unwillingness to deal with first things first. Our current prosperity, and our unparalleled standard of living can only be maintained or bettered by the people demanding of their Federal Government an immediate, realistic handling of our fiscal problems.

The proposed budget shows an unwillingness on the part of the Executive to radically reduce Federal spending. It now becomes the full responsibility of the Congress to bring about the drastic reductions necessary. Spending must be reduced to a minimum—now. The frills of bureaucracy must be eliminated forthwith, and all of those services of Government, which are not essential to the maintenance of our free, competitive system of economy—or to the basic social welfare of the people—must be dispensed with. It is most important that we survive economically as a national unit.

In the fiscal year 1948, which begins July 1, 1947, we should begin the drastic and the systematic reduction of the budget. Budget balancing is a prelude—the first step—but in order to reduce the debt we must do much more than balance the budget. We must have a surplus budget, and the very first application of surplus, or a goodly portion thereof, must be for debt reduction. Tax reduction is the third step. It has, however, a very definite relationship to budget reduction in that if tax reduction is properly applied, it can be an incentive to increased revenue and receipts for the Federal Treasury and thereby be some assistance to debt reduction.

Since the actual end of hostilities, there has been a great flood of propaganda to continue Federal spending. The spenders—both within and without official Government circles—seem to heave a great sigh after the war and say, "Now is our time for a new spree." They have visions of enormous public works, much of which may seem desirable, but certainly not fitting for the future of a Nation which today operates its Federal budget with an insolvent foundation. Today's slogan should be public works for immediate use only, and we should be keenly cognizant of the fact that we cannot afford public works which are not for immediate need and use.

I have never objected—in fact I welcomed—a shelf of projects which may be either needed or desirable for the future when we can better afford them.

I am fully aware that the theory of a shelf or reservoir of public works for the mere sake of spending for the cure-all or correction of unemployment periods was exploded by the failure of the Roosevelt era. The great resource, known as American ingenuity, must devise within our free system national methods whereby industry, in the main, learns to bridge the unemployment gap with private funds.

Effecting our economy, particularly in the great valleys, is the recurring threat of flood. Those who produce from the soil and seek to do it in the most fertile areas, have a keener realization of the ravages of flood than the highlanders who are not actually witnesses or victims. It is the common responsibility of all the people to do that which is economically within their power to protect against the destruction of the fertile valleys and to further protect against the destruction of the millions of dollars of investment in industrial enterprises located in those valleys. Transportation on the rivers of America is also a major consideration in whatever methods we may devise against the ravages of flood.

Within the Government we have a constant tug-of-war between two groups supporting different theories. One would think at times that some use flood control more as their excuse than their objective. Some support the theory of the creation of autonomous units, corporations or authorities, which take into themselves powers superior to those of the States, or the various subdivisions of the State, and powers superior to the private rights of the individuals.

Such a plan resulted in the Tennessee Valley Authority—such a plan is advocated in the Missouri Valley Authority and others. Conversely, we have the continuing theory and belief that the rights of the individual and the rights of the sovereign States, and their political subdivisions should be preserved and that whatever help is given by the Federal Government for the protection against floods, it must not be carried to the extreme nor done so by usurpation. There are those in both schools which advocate the building of great high dams, as the solution in flood control. Their programs are costly in the extreme and yet not proved to be economically feasible.

I can at the present time think of one high dam which I would like to see built, which has to do with another type of flood control—that is a high dam against Federal waste and whoop-la spending. This dam should be built by public opinion and public action and not concrete. It must be a high dam of high purpose and firm resolution for a solvent and successful Government. It would probably not permit the building of other uneconomic high dams to control watersheds.

There is in contemplation at the moment a high-dam program which would seriously affect the State of Missouri and call for the inundation of thousands of acres of fertile farm land. High dams are usually constructed for more than one purpose. Where such purposes are essential and do not bring with them economic losses, which are never shown in the Government's balance sheets, such dams can be desirable.

But, in the main job of flood control, multiple-purpose dams are usually self-defeating. For example, flood-control projects require an empty dam and hydro projects require a full dam. As I have already inferred, high dams flood the best agricultural land of the watershed above them and by their very nature create unsightly mud flats and hazards to health. High dams are not usually economically feasible. Of course, in most instances, their construction has been paid for by the Federal Government and since no satisfactory accounting method has been developed to show their actual profit or loss in dollars, the entire subject continues on a highly debatable plane.

In many cases, the number of acres drowned out by impounded water and the loss of the crops formerly produced in the area are in excess of the acres protected or crops produced below the dam; they are all too frequently a detriment to wildlife. But, from an economic standpoint, we have a very good case in point.

In the TVA we have a total investment of dams, reservoirs, hydroelectric and fuel generating stations and transmission facilities, as of June 30, 1945, of $736,693,279. The allocation of this investment, in accordance with the provisions of section 14 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, was $144,568,368 to navigation; $150,951,945 to flood control; and the remainder, $440,772,966 to hydroelectric power.

It is a matter of record that the allocation of navigation, flood control and power programs, in the fiscal years of 1946 and 1947, have been made by the same allocation percentages. Maintenance and depreciation of cost for the TVA have been allocated—40 percent to power, 30 percent to navigation, and 30 percent to flood control. Amazingly enough, the cost of operation is allocated one-third to each subdivision of the program.

According to field surveys recorded by Army engineers, the accuracy of which has yet to be disputed, the average loss for floods in the Tennessee Basin, covering a period of more than 20 years, was $1,780,000 annually. The largest flood of record in that period was when the losses approximated $2,600,000 damage to the city of Chattanooga.

TVA claims their high dams have controlled floods in the Tennessee Valley. Yet, Army engineers have found that there was only about 620,000 acres of land in the Tennessee Valley which was subject to occasional floods before the TVA was created. In accordance with TVA reports, the area permanently inundated at operating levels by reservoirs constructed by the Authority, is 448,600 acres. This land is permanently out of use, and, in addition, there is an area of 127,800 acres subject to occasional inundation.

It is quite evident, from the reports of what happened in Chattanooga in January 1946, just 1 year ago, that the TVA program has not yet accomplished flood control in the Tennessee Basin, after the expending of $150,000,000 to do so, and it is proposed that another $15,000,000 be spent by Army engineers for the construction of a levee system to protect Chattanooga against floods. So, after the allocation of $150,000,000 for flood control in the Tennessee Valley, under the autonomy known as TVA, it is still necessary to go back to the Army engineers' original plan and build a levee around Chattanooga. It simply is not sound economics to spend $150,000,000 as the investment, to say nothing of the actual operating cost in a high dam flood-control program to save an annual loss of $1,780,000. It simply is not sound economics to spend $150,000,000 as a high dam investment to protect against an annual loss of $1,780,000 and, at the same time, cause an additional permanent annual loss of crops formerly produced from the inundated area, of $13,500,000 annually. Instead of creating new wealth on such projects, we have destroyed it. It is by such examples that opposition to these high-dam programs grows.

While a great deal of opinion has been expressed, the statistics have been gathered to defend or propagandize in behalf of either side of the question, it is my opinion that the long-range benefits in flood control are more likely to be obtained by the construction of small dams up in the watershed. This opinion is applicable to the flood-control program, and I certainly do not propose it as a solution to other problems.

For the next several years, it appears to me that the Nation, particularly in the Middle West, would be much more prosperous under a small-dam program which we can afford. Such a program will probably lead us to new and vital experience, which will give us a far greater knowledge of what to do in the field of flood control.

American Veterans Who Were Prisoners of War Are Entitled to Payment of Individual Claims as Provided for in H. R. 1000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1947, I introduced H. R. 1000, designed to create a commission to examine and render final decisions on all claims by American nationals who were members of the armed forces of the United States and who were prisoners of war of Germany, Italy, or Japan, for payment of its awards and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation has been declared timely by various organizations and individuals who recognize the right of each prisoner of war to obtain justice on his individual claim.

In support of this legislation a letter has been received from Col. George E. Ijams, director, national rehabilitation service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Colonel Ijams for 27 years was Assistant Administrator of the United States Veterans' Administration and predecessor organizations and is fully cognizant of the rights and privileges of veterans. He was appointed by President Truman in 1945 as a member of a commission headed by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, to visit the Philippines and study the destruction of property and the plight of individuals in that area.

It was during Colonel Ijams' visit to the Philippines that he came in contact with American prisoners of war who were returning to the United States from Jap prison camps.

Colonel Ijams' letter follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN
WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1947.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: I wish to commend your action in introducing H. R. 1000 providing for the establishment of a Claims Commission to examine and render final decisions on all claims of American veterans of the armed forces who were held as prisoners of war of Germany, Italy or Japan, in World War II.

Your bill will benefit veterans of our armed services who were subjected to indignities and torture, and who suffered disabilities while prisoners of war. The national rehabilitation service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has received hundreds of letters from former prisoners, but to date has found it necessary to inform these men that our Government has not yet set up any organization to which such claims can be presented, for consideration.

The American people were shocked when they learned of the atrocious and inhuman treatment accorded thousands of our defenders who were forced to surrender. We knew that about 40 years ago a solemn covenant was entered into by most of the civilized nations of the world covering the treatment to be accorded to prisoners captured in any future wars. We knew that our enemies in World War II signed this solemn covenant, and we naturally assumed that they would abide by its provisions. Even when we learned through the press that certain violations of the Geneva Conference had been reported, our people did not fully appreciate what those violations actually meant until we saw pictures of our liberated prisoners, many of whom were not only starved and beaten by an arrogant and inhuman enemy, but suffered physical tortures and in many cases death for the amusement of a half-civilized people.

You and I saw these men in the Pacific Islands shortly after they were liberated; therefore, it is quite natural that I should advocate the passage of your bill, and that you as a Member of Congress should introduce this splendid piece of legislation in the House of Representatives.

Following the victories in Europe and Asia the Allied Governments determined to prosecute the perpetrators of these fiendish crimes on unarmed and helpless prisoners of war. Following fair trials many of the perpetrators of these crimes have paid the supreme penalty. Others will no doubt be convicted as the result of trials now being held.

Thus have the Allies in World War II imposed verdicts of criminal liability upon the perpetrators of inhuman treatment accorded prisoners contrary to the laws of civilized warfare. Having established the justice of criminal liability, should we not also establish the principle of civil liability, and make certain that those who suffered disabilities as the result of inhuman treatment are compensated, and that widows and orphans of those defenseless prisoners who suffered tortures and death are also compensated for the loss of their loved ones.

It would appear that we have in fact established the principle of civil liability in the action recently taken by the American Government in connection with the destruction of an unarmed American plane while flying over the territory of a supposed ally. Reparation for the death of these men was demanded and received by the United States Government. This money was distributed to the families of those killed in this unwarranted attack. If we were right in proceeding as we did against a supposed ally, certainly we have all the more reason to apply the same principle of civil liability against our enemies.

Fortunately, the bill which you proposed will cost the American taxpayer nothing. You have wisely provided that all awards made and all administrative overhead expenses of the Mixed Claims Commission shall be paid from the assets of Japan, Germany, and Italy now held by the United States Government. And, in the event these assets are not sufficient, then any additional amounts required shall be assessed against the countries responsible for the inhuman treatment of our veterans.

I feel confident the American people would approve the payment of awards to these former prisoners if every dollar of the money for this purpose were charged to the American taxpayers. But, realizing that we now hold the funds of the perpetrators of these crimes, I feel confident the American public will insist that this money be used to reimburse those living men for disabilities suffered, and the widows and orphans of those who were murdered by a fiendish and inhuman enemy.

When your bill has been enacted into law the national rehabilitation service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States will gladly represent those veterans and their dependents having claims against enemy countries without any cost whatsoever to the claimants, just as we now represent hundreds of thousands of our war veterans in other matters before the various Government departments.

Many months have passed since the unconditional surrender of our enemies in Europe and Asia. It is certainly time for the establishment of a commission armed with authority to adjudicate claims of these unfortunate men, their widows and orphans. Ample funds are at hand and in our possession to make awards, and to pay all overhead expenses without any cost to the American taxpayers. I sincerely hope that all the Members of Congress of the United States will appreciate the need for the speedy enactment of H. R. 1000.

Very sincerely,

GEORGE E. IJAMS,
Director.

Social Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following speech of Judge Elijah Adlow, of the Boston municipal court, delivered before the New England Council on November 17, 1946:

A passenger in a New York subway train recently was amazed to discover that a man seated opposite him was holding his newspaper upside down. He got up, walked over, tapped the man on the shoulder, and said, "Mister, you're reading your paper upside down," and the man answered, "Do you think it's easy?"

Tonight I'm going to try to appraise certain conditions in a world that appears upside down. I don't mind saying that the task isn't easy. So many factors appear to be involved in the situation that it is hard to know where to begin. I am very much in the position of the man who once answered to a drunk charge in court. When I found him "not guilty" he became bewildered, held up his hand and said, "Let me recite a toast. There are a thousand good reasons why I shouldn't take a drink but I can't think of one of them right now."

Despite the baffling perplexities of the contemporary scene, there is one aspect of it that stands out and is markedly conspicuous, and that is the widespread dissatisfaction with conditions. Everybody is unhappy. Rich and poor alike share in the current unrest. The period of the war was an era of hope. Everyone expected that calm and quiet would come with the advent of peace. It now appears that those hopes were groundless. More than a year after the termination of hostilities the unrest is more acute than ever. Nineteen hundred and forty-six is truly a year of disillusionment, frustration, and disappointment.

To further complicate the picture there are present a multitude of conditions which are ordinarily associated with prosperous times. Employment in the country is alleged to have attained an all-time high. The prosperity which derived from the demands of a country at war has not been entirely liquidated yet, and a generous public has spared nothing to smooth the way back to civilian life for the returning veteran.

What is noticeably lacking today is peace of mind. It is not without reason that a volume of this title is the current best seller. Aside from the intrinsic merit of the book itself, the very title suggests a condition for which everyone yearns. Modern man wants peace of mind.

Now this is not the first time that man has been unhappy; nor is it the first time that a condition of general unrest has disturbed society. What provides the enigma of our era is that we have gloom without a depression, misery without want, and a widespread dissatisfaction with everything. Fifteen years ago conditions were vastly different. There was widespread unemployment, business was bad, and there was a logical basis for the unrest which required no intensive investigation to discover. At that time all that people hoped to achieve was a return to normalcy, and the Government set out to help both capital and labor to regain that equilibrium ordinarily identified with normalcy. In some quarters the hope was expressed that the recurrence of such catastrophes might be prevented or their consequences mitigated by the adoption of certain measures, and to this end the American people undertook a drastic revision of our social and economic systems.

The planners of a better order set out to provide for man's future happiness and security by dedicating the public to unprecedented responsibilities with respect to capital and labor, to the young, and to the old. They were given a blank check for the task and told to go ahead. As a result, the past 15 years have witnessed vast changes in the structure of our body politic. Most of these innovations have already survived the experimental stage. No one can say that they have not been given a fair chance to function. If anything their success has already been proclaimed by their sponsors who have proudly branded them as social gains, and the slogan of our day has become, "Save the social gains."

It is to these social gains and their implications that I propose to direct my remarks tonight. I appreciate that there is a taboo on a frank discussion of all that they involve. The appraisal of them has heretofore been one-sided; they have been discussed but rarely debated, and a tradition has already grown up which enjoins frankness. But truth can never be completely suppressed. Already the stirring restlessness of the Nation has made itself articulate at the ballot box. This verdict cannot be ignored. It concerns neither parties nor persons; if the American people have changed direction, it is not because of men, but rather by reason of measures.

These measures, and they have been sponsored by Republicans as well as Democrats, represent a marked deviation from the traditional American way of life. They are based on the concept that government owes everyone a living, and for the past 15 years neither effort nor money has been spared to make an actuality of this theory. In line with this concept an elaborate system of old-age pensions has been put into operation; welfare measures have been radically liberalized; mother's aid has been raised to a level which its original sponsors never imagined it might attain; and social security has been welded into our economic structure. Every conceivable contingency from which hardship or suffering might emerge has been provided against.

At the same time labor's position has been markedly improved by the passage of the Wagner Act and other measures too numerous to mention. Higher wage levels, shorter workdays, and a variety of improvements in conditions of employment were insured to workers through the direct action of the Government which openly stood on labor's side in its struggle for a better life.

Notwithstanding all this, discontent is widespread and has been so for a long period. These claims of social gains appear to have validity so long as we confine our study of them to the vast expenditures which they involve. If the amounts spent by the public in their attainment have any significance, then they certainly have been a huge success. But social gains can never be measured by their cost. We must look rather to the sense of security which they have inspired and to the peace of mind which they have conferred. When we view the depressed morale and the general dissatisfaction to be found in the very groups immediately benefited by these social gains, their value is not so apparent. These measures were undertaken with a view to improvement of social conditions. But who can honestly contend that we have realized that improvement?

There's a story of a woman whose husband was taken to the hospital. Every day she inquired about his condition, and the answer invariably came back, "He's showing improvement." But one day the woman was called and informed that her husband had died. Neighbors came in to comfort her in her grief, and to one who inquired about the cause of her husband's death she answered, "He died of improvements."

The idea that money can solve every human problem has enjoyed a considerable vogue for many years. If it could, we should now be well on the way to a realization of that blissful and happy society for which we all yearn. Unfortunately money alone can accomplish little. A disappointed litigant in my court once wrote me a letter and reminded me that "Man does not live by bread and mink coats alone." My critic was right. There are elements of the spirit that contribute to the realization of a happy and useful life, and no fair appraisal of these expedients can be made without considering their effect on the spiritual and moral foundations on which our society rests.

When I was a boy, it was a matter of pride among the most humble folk that they had never been the recipients of public welfare. To "live on the town" was considered a calamity, and families would put up with almost anything before resorting to it. A sentiment rooted in self-respect gave them a strength to fight adversity on their own. I do not need to remind you of the many noble examples afforded by every community of families which solved their problems of adversity without public assistance. Equally impressive was the prejudice which people held against those who neglected their aged parents, and I distinctly remember the criticism leveled against those who sent their aged parents to public institutions. People might have been poor, but they never considered themselves unfortunate except under circumstances where sickness or misfortune rendered them helpless. The greatest asset of every man was his pride, a pride rooted in self-confidence and self-respect.

Another noteworthy aspect of our earlier days was the peace of mind that was generally enjoyed despite the most trying conditions. The generation of our fathers was very realistic. It viewed life with philosophic detachment. It didn't expect miracles. It paid little attention to campaign promises. It knew that the concept of complete happiness was an empty dream, that life needed a little of everything, that it had its joys as well as its sorrows, its light as well as its darkness, its pleasures as well as its pains. And because it accepted the world as it was it found life more agreeable. Who can deny that, despite the amazing disparity in the standards of living of the present generation and that of our fathers, the old-timers enjoyed an infinitely greater measure of peace of mind than is evident at present? That capacity to make the best of life out of conditions in a far from perfect world was one of the peculiar attributes of former generations that is not so evident today. The difference derives from a transformation in the philosophic attitude toward life.

It took a great deal of effort to destroy man's capacity for optimism. The apostles of gloom have been working overtime in late years. Their campaign to spread unrest has been waged on a broad front, and the good as well as the bad has felt the weight of their assault. There is a story of an agitator named O'Leary who for years stood on a soap box in Union Square, New York, and denounced the rapid-transit companies for charging a 10-cent fare. Finally the New York Legislature passed a 5-cent fare bill, and the habitues at Union Square wondered what O'Leary would do next. But that night O'Leary showed up as usual, climbed up on his soap box and said, "Ladies and gentlemen, things are worse now than before. This morning a poor man walked downtown to work and saved 10 cents; tonight he'll walk home and only save a nickel."

This story is not as far-fetched as might appear. Were the aged ever as unhappy as they have been since a generous public provided them with old age pensions? Were the unemployed ever more bitter than they have been since a system of social security has been in effect? Have welfare recipients ever complained as much as they have since the provisions of our welfare laws have been liberalized? Some people may view these measures as social gains, but when the bitterness, the hostility, the class hatred, and the general gloom that have attended their advent is considered we may well view them as a social detriment. Anything calculated to make people unhappy is a social loss.

Equally unfortunate has been the effect of these measures on the attitude of people toward dependency. People have been taught to view public welfare as a routine service in the administration of public affairs. What is more, they have been told that dependency is honorable. Once upon a time people who lived on the town paid this deference to the spirit of independence—they tried to keep their peculiar condition a secret. Today they do not hesitate to let the world know about it. With these people their right to support is vested, and the abuse received by our public representatives charged with administering these welfare agencies is the best evidence of the attitude engendered by dependency.

But most tragic of all has been the effect of these measures on those virtues identified with temperance, frugality, and industry. There was a time when the most humble strove to set something aside for a rainy day. We can be thankful that many still do so today, but we must regret the vast array that has been taught to view their future as a public concern. Consider the extravagance of the high-wage war workers who heeded little the prospects of reduced earnings and lay-offs because they knew that social security or public welfare would provide the means of existence. Consider also the multitude capable of work who at a time when ample jobs were available preferred to live on unemployment compensation. Habits of industry have suffered a staggering blow under the impact of a system that makes idleness financially attractive. And we must never forget that habits of industry once lost can only be retrieved with difficulty.

When I was a boy, young men embarking on their careers were content to start at the bottom. As beginners their value to employers was limited, and their salaries were low, but they were content because they knew they had to learn. Today the provisions for unemployment compensation afford as much, if not more, than a beginner's job can pay. Is it any wonder that so many have marched in the ranks of that fraternity known as the 9–20 Club? And what about those who—the beginners—have through the medium of on-the-job training been paid the wages of experienced men? How happy will these men be when they will have to stand on their own and work for what they are worth. The problem of the returning GI has not been

solved by the GI bill of rights; it has been further complicated by it, and those who speak of social gains should consider the debilitating effect of all these expedients on the spirit, the ambition, and the courage of young America.

Equally devastating has been the effect which the spectacle of all this has had on the millions of men and women who have resisted the alluring appeal made by public welfare and still stand on their own. Does anyone for a moment believe that they're happy about the idea of others languishing in idleness while they work? We must remember that a large portion of the American people still cherish those time-honored concepts of independence and industry. They live simple lives, work hard, have bank accounts, and by precept and example struggle to instill in their growing families those virtues which will help them to face life's problems with fortitude and hope. How cheerful can they be when a definite trend toward dependency threatens to undo all their work? How cheerful can the man who works be when the following newspaper item which recently appeared in a Boston paper is called to his attention? I quote from an interview with the business manager of the Boston Welfare Board:

"There is no ceiling on aid to families with dependent children. Under the new budget families with five children or over will receive $175 a month or more, while in some cases the allotment will reach as high as $290 per month."

These dependent families now receive a higher income than the families of thousands of workers. They receive more money than the families of policemen, of firemen, and of clerks. Is it any wonder that the people who work are restless, dissatisfied, and unhappy when dependents are treated better than they? Dependency can become attractive when there's more money in it.

It took a long time for the human race to acquire a consciousness of social responsibility which called on every man to do his fair share of work in the struggle of life. In our own time idleness was scoffed at as a form of parasitism and the complaints against the idle rich keynoted the unrest of the early part of this century. How much worse is the condition today when to the fairly exclusive fraternity of nonproducers known as the idle rich have been added that considerable group better labeled the idle poor.

It took a long time to establish the virtues of industry in the social attitude of the people. It has been an integral part of the entire process of civilization. But when the wages of idleness become attractive there is a dangerous tendency for the weak to succumb to the temptation. After all, it takes a lot of courage, self-respect, and independence for man to keep working when life is possible without it. Unfortunately, a great many have succumbed under the temptation.

A recent dispatch from Wellington, New Zealand, dated June 27, 1946, appeared in a Boston paper under the heading "Easy cash is menace to Maoris—Social security keeps 100,000 from work." The context of this article serves only to confirm what our own observation suggests. It recites, in part:

"The existing situation is that many Maoris are refusing to work, ignoring their leaders who urge the clearing of land, sowing it for pasture, plowing, raising of sheep and cattle. They are content to receive the social-security hand-out each month. * * * Other natives restrict their earnings to a level which will not interfere with social-security payments." Despite our higher civilization and advanced culture there is an amazing resemblance in the resultant effect of these measures on human character wherever we find it.

The cumulative consequence of all this has been to exalt dependency, to discourage thrift, and to promote idleness. There was a time when people were unhappy because they wanted work. Today many of them are miserable because they have to work. These people are the victims of a vicious philosophy that enjoys a vogue in our era. It is a philosophy that prefers idleness to work. It is a philosophy based on the false premise that all man needs to complete his happiness is an act of Congress and an appropriation from the Public Treasury. It is a philosophy based on the false theory that the way to avoid the evils of unemployment is by destroying the desire for employment.

And because this philosophy has acquired the status of a cult which has many devotees worshipping at its shrine, we have had to endure the consequent evils. Let no one delude himself about the delinquency that is rampant, the alcoholism that is on the increase, the gambling that is widespread, all these derive from conditions of idleness that are not only sanctioned but supported by public authority. Instead of helping people to help themselves we are accelerating the process of moral collapse and spiritual decay.

After all, life without useful work can be miserable. There is a story of a man who died, and when he crossed the threshold into the next world he was greeted by a liveried valet who took him in charge and served his every want. For weeks he loafed around enjoying every luxury. But finally he tired of the easy life and expressed a desire to work. But the valet put him off from one day to another until the man in desperation said, "Look here, if I can't do any work, I'd rather be in hell," and the valet answered, "Where do you think you are?"

The parable is appropriate. Life to be worth while must be useful. The useful man is a king in his own right. He is sustained by a consciousness of his own independence. Our parents worked harder, enjoyed fewer luxuries, and had less than we have, but the knowledge that they were independent and self-supporting gave them a consciousness of well-being which enabled them to enjoy their work and to enjoy life. They had peace of mind in the true and complete sense. It is in this spirit of independence that the greatness of America is rooted. The founders of our country were no strangers to work. The pioneers who blazed the trails to the West risked all they had for the mere privilege of working so they might live. And the great builders and organizers whose talents helped America attain its present grandeur all started at the bottom on their own. Everything that is worth while in our American tradition derives from common sense, good faith, and hard work.

The idea that these measures have conferred social gains is a myth. Not only has the experience involved great expenditures, but it has been purchased at the cost of a weakened spiritual and moral fabric of our society. But the damage is not beyond repair. Over a century ago the menace of parasitism in England forced a drastic revision in the poor laws of that country. A change in policies of administration is suggested by conditions here today. Those who have been lured away from useful enterprise by the something-for-nothing philosophy must be won back to the ranks of the workers. A revision of allowances should be effected so that the absurd financial advantages now enjoyed by dependents over workers will be removed. And, above all else, only the worthy should receive these benefits. This can be attained by an honest, competent, and courageous administration of our laws. It takes a lot of courage to tell a man to go to work, but once public opinion is alerted to the dangers of the present trends there can be no doubt that it will come to the support of our authorities in helping restore the virtues of industry and responsibility to their proper places in American life.

Tariff Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 11, 1947.*
The Honorable THOMAS L. OWENS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing to you at this time asking that support be given to postponement of State Department action on further reduction of tariffs until the present Congress has an opportunity to consider relating developments since 1945, when the present act was extended. Postwar world conditions affecting international trade are just beginning to take form and tariff reductions made now by the State Department may be contrary to current sound domestic economy.

There exists a serious question as to foreign sincerity toward the idea of international cooperation. Last October, when Clare Wilcox, spokesman for the Department of State, at the meeting of the preparatory committee of the United Nations Trade and Employment Conference, presented our proposal to representatives of the 17-nation assembly in London, there was no enthusiastic response. Since then, Great Britain has given no tangible evidence of dissolving the sterling bloc within 1 year as contemplated when the $3,750,000,000 loan was passed, nor is there any apparent lessening of the restrictions under their policy of Dominion preference in trading. Recent British agreements with the Argentine restrict expenditures of trade balances to British sterling.

Many developments point to foreign resistance toward tariff concessions favorable to the United States and it would seem that our offer of further tariff reductions should be reconsidered until the whole international situation may be resurveyed by Congress for determination of sound instructions to the Department of State.

As a bicycle manufacturer and a member of the Bicycle Institute of America, we have our continued existence at stake in this matter. As an individual industry, we cannot possibly gain by any tariff change except an upward revision of existing duty rates on bicycle imports. Our market is here, in America; foreign markets are closed by competition of low-cost manufacturers, principally in Britain.

The Bicycle Institute has presented a petition to the Committee for Reciprocity Information protesting further tariff concessions that may be considered in the forthcoming reciprocal-trade-agreement negotiations. Through an elaborate brochure in which facts are presented in support of our contention, we point out that:

1. The industry has already been hurt by increasing imports encouraged by a 50-percent reduction in tariffs by the United Kingdom Trade Agreement of 1939. No benefits to the industry have resulted from this agreement.

2. Further tariff reduction now would force the American industry into liquidation. Twelve thousand jobs and $50,000,000 of specialized plants and equipment would be lost.

3. Our industry, in common with many others, is faced with cost competition from abroad with British wage and material costs half of comparable costs in America. At this time, Britain is doubling efforts to establish

American consumer acceptance and distribution outlets in anticipation of a further lowering of tariffs.

4. The Bicycle Institute of America does not ask that foreign bicycles be excluded. The English lightweight type of bicycle with the light frame and narrow tires is no threat to American manufacturers as our market prefers a heavier, double top bar, balloon-tire bicycle not produced abroad. We learn, on good authority, however, that British manufacturers are prepared to invade America with the heavier, standard type and tariff concessions would hasten this. If we lose our domestic market to the British, the American industry will be destroyed. Our petition to the Committee for Reciprocity Information contained a plea asking for tariff protection for the American type of bicycle by raising the present effective rates to apply to this type and to establish quotas limiting the volume imported.

Copies of the Bicycle Institute brochure are available on request or one may be examined along with complete transcript of the hearing before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, in the files of the Tariff Commission.

Any effort you may extend toward protecting the interests of this long-established American industry and the jobs of your many constituents employed in our plant, will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

ARNOLD, SCHWINN & CO.,
W. J. FRITZ, *Secretary.*

Citizens Demanding Budget Reductions and Payments on National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent given me, I submit the following observations on several national issues which I made in a recent address:

There are two primary forces which enter into this general picture of management of the national debt. One is the natural, normal economic forces; the other is the political forces wrapped up in the present Congress, wrapped up in the forthcoming Presidential campaign. What are the political forces? What will the politicians do during the next 12 to 18 or 24 months which will disrupt the sound policies which the Secretary of the Treasury would like to follow? I wish I could crystal-gaze and give you an accurate answer to that question. What will the politicians do? But at least the politicians and the political forces are concerned about the tax rate and the total tax burden.

The President comes up to Congress and he says, "We need $37,500,000,000 to run the Federal Government from July 1, 1947, up to June 30, 1948." The present House and Senate majority say that is too much. Some think it is $7,500,000,000 too much; some think it is $3,000,000,000 too much; and some think it is $4,000,000,000 too much.

Let me submit this simple question to you. Take any home that has been loosely managed, economically speaking; take any little proprietorship, partnership, small, medium-sized, or big corporation that has been managed loosely for 1, 10, 15, or 20 years, and the time comes when you have to change business management; do you know of any situation where bringing in good business management could not reduce the expense of that home or that little business or medium-sized or large business at least 10 percent, and at the same time increase the efficiency?

I happen to be one of those who sincerely believes—I believe it with all my heart and soul, and all of the economic ability that God Almighty permitted to be born into my soul and body and "think tank"—that we can reduce a $37,500,000,000 budget from 10 to 20 percent and increase the efficiency of Government of the United States. I believe that. And I do not think we should lose any time in proceeding to do it. I think every consecrated man and woman in this country, in politics or out of politics, public servant or private citizen, should throw their shoulders behind that kind of movement.

Why do I say that? Since January 1, 1940, we, the people of the United States, through the enunciation of our President, through acts of our Government operating through the agencies of the State Department and otherwise, through the acts of Congress, have entered into some 12 or 15 very far-reaching, deeply involved, basic international agreements. I will mention just a few of them.

First, we had the enunciation of the "four freedoms." Then came the Atlantic Charter; there followed the declaration of the United Nations; we brought into operation lend-lease with its general concepts, which has brought upon the taxpayers of this country—taxpayers and bond buyers—a bill in excess of $50,000,000,000, which bill is embraced within this debt figure I have mentioned. It is still there.

We have the United Nations Rehabilitation Administration, we have the International Food Collaboration Program which is still operating, and which, as you remember in 1943, it was agreed would follow the operations of UNRRA.

We have the United Nations organization with all of its involvements, with all of its costs, with all of its confusion. We have still got to go through all the woods incident to that operation. We are just starting in.

We have the Bretton Woods agreement, wherein, if it is to succeed, we taxpayers and bond buyers must primarily finance not only the capital structures for the future operations of the currency stabilization fund; which was created for the purpose of stabilizing the international currencies, so as to facilitate the movement of goods across international boundary lines. The other part of that operation is the capital structure and the operation of the International Credit Bank.

After you set up the capital structure of a bank, something else has to be done. If the bank is making dollar loans to the various countries of the world, running anywhere from five billion up to twenty billion dollars per annum, that means to say, you, the American citizen, must be thrifty in the first place; invest your savings in the debentures issued by this bank in the second place, so as to enable the bank to extend these dollar-credit loans to the nations of the earth for the purpose of developing the natural resources of those nations, expanding their old enterprise, and building new enterprise.

As the world's creditor nation, you are brought into the picture through the Bretton Woods agreement to export your savings in the form of capital to other countries of the world in the form of long-term investments; so if Bretton Woods is to operate to any great extent, you, the American people, will have to buy those debentures.

Don't understand me to be up here making a sales talk to the effect that you should buy those debentures. I am not doing anything of the kind. I pointed all this out when the hearings were going on on that proposal, and I said to our top officials, "Who is going to buy the debentures? That is when you will run into difficulty with the Bretton Woods agreement."

I might say, "Who is going to be president of the International Bank?" Yes; who is going to be? Do any of you want the job? They are looking for applicants. Frankly, I think you will have to sit down and rewrite the entire rules of procedure of the International Credit Bank before you can get anybody to take the job of president and carry it out. That is a problem we have got to think about.

Here is the British loan of $3,750,000,000. Where is that money coming from? That is a direct transaction of the Treasury and you, the taxpayers and the bond buyers, have to furnish the Treasury the dollars with which to finance that operation.

We come on down to the International Trade Organization. That is a part of the Bretton Woods agreement. That is a part of the British loan agreement. It is a part of all these other international things. They are all tied together like a bundle of sticks. They constitute very substantially the written word of what we will call the foreign policy of the United States. How many of our people out through the sticks and the Territories and the congressional areas have assimilated and comprehended what is involved in these international agreements to which I have referred, as related in this debt and as related to the tax burden that we have got to meet incident to the servicing of the debt and paying off the principal sum?

How many on the Hill have comprehended these involvements? How many in the Government departments understand it? How many of our people in the Foreign Service know why they are in these foreign countries on the pay roll which is financed by you, the bond buyer and the taxpayer?

Those are problems that I think we have to discuss in minute detail in forums such as we have here today. You have a chance to come down here and absorb some of these general reactions and thought-stimulators, and I think it will be your duty to take them back to your respective communities. Get copies of these various agreements, sit down with your neighbors and friends and your club associates and say, "Listen, here is an agreement which you and I must go along with or repudiate or pay off or work out of in some way. Did you know we had this proposition on our front doorstep?" And get a right up-to-the-minute and down-to-earth comprehension of these things.

This all ties into the general tax picture. Should we at this time, with the national income kicking along at the rate of about $170,000,000,000 per annum, reduce the income tax? You don't have to answer that. Should we reduce or completely remove the capital-gains tax? There are arguments on both sides. I don't mind telling you that about 80 percent of the letters which come to my desk, written by intelligent people, top-level people, in my district and out of my district, are against reducing the income tax at this time. I am simply telling you what the correspondence is saying. What it will be 90 days from now, I do not know.

What do they emphasize? They say, "Let's hold taxes where they are, cut Government expense, get this budget balanced, and take the surplus and pay it on the principal. We do not want to live under this debt forever." That is what the correspondence is running at the present time, fully 80 percent of it that comes to my office. I don't know what the other fellows are getting. I am getting very fine letters from very fine people.

But the party in power in the House and the Senate has said, "We are going to reduce the income tax." I will make a guess with

you that the reduction will run on the average somewhere between 5 and 10 percent. Your guess is just as good as mine. I will be surprised if on the level, all the way across, it runs more than 10 percent. I am talking about reduction in rates. There may be an increase in exemptions so as to make that more beneficial to certain groups.

What are you going to do about corporation taxes at the present time? There isn't so much being said about that because they figure that the corporations are getting along fairly well. Mr. Bob Nathan, you know, thinks that they are making excessive profits. With that, I would have to disagree. I think the Nathan report is an intellectually dishonest presentation to the American people, because if anybody on earth knows the general picture, Bob Nathan should know it, and if he knows American enterprise, he knows you cannot capture profits away from the American industrial system and reflect it in increased wages. That is not the way you get increased wages, and Bob Nathan knows it. I think it is a terrible thing to have promoted that philosophy at this particular time.

But shall we, the American people, impose a greater burden on the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the management of the debt by hammering for decreased taxes and leaving the budget just about balanced, and saying to him, "You have got to go out and refinance these maturities without any material reduction in the principal sum per annum," when the national income is kicking along at about $170,000,000,000 a year, when the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board continually tell us that the potential inflationary base is in excess of $225,000,000,000, and when we have in the portfolios of the commercial banks of this country approximately $96,000,000,000 worth of Treasury issues? That is something that all of us must better understand. It goes directly to this question of reducing taxes.

Let's take the labor laws for just a moment. What are we going to do in situations like portal-to-portal pay? Here is my friend, the corporate enterprise manager. I speak for organized labor and I go to him and say, through the Nathan report, "You can afford to give me a raise of 24 percent because your profits have been running so high." Ten days later I bring a suit against him for $25,000,000 for portal-to-portal pay, back pay, retroactive, which when appied to his capital structure takes all of his profits away for the entire year 1946. I bring $4,000,000,000 worth of suits against the entire corporate enterprise structure that I said was making too much profit and wipe out all the profits I said they were going to make. You see how senseless the whole thing becomes, how utterly destructive it becomes in the light of these international agreements and obligations and burdens to which I have referred.

Are the people of the United States going to carry through with these agreements or are we going to repudiate them and take the economic and social consequences? We are going to have to decide that. We, the American people, will have to decide it.

Personally, I am a strong advocate for material alterations in present labor laws, setting up the rules of the game so that there will be comparable responsibility on both sides of the agreement, with the elimination of all wildcat and all jurisdictional strikes, with the tempering down of all mass picketing to a point where the general welfare is protected, the removal of monopolistic power of organized labor, and the giving of some rights to the 75 percent of the people who are not spoken for by organized-labor leaders, making unions responsible to their members so that I, a local contributor to a union treasury, have a right, and so that the local officials of that union must report to me on an annual basis, from certified public accountant audit, exactly what they did with the funds which I helped to contribute through the assessment they made against me. I could enlarge on this by 15 or 20 more basic points, but I am not going to take the time to do that.

Charles Augustus Otis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on January 28 a civic testimonial dinner honoring Charles Augustus Otis was held at the Carter Hotel in the city of Cleveland.

Charles Augustus Otis comes from a long line of able pioneers who played an important part in the development of New England and who later brought leadership to the Western Reserve. William A. Otis, his grandfather, was a direct descendant of Samuel Otis, who held the Bible upon which Washington took the oath as President. William A. arrived in Cleveland in 1836 and immediately became a leading commission merchant. When iron was dicovered he became the pioneer iron master of Cleveland, and his business interests broadened to include railroad development and banking.

His son, Charles Augustus Otis, Sr., succeeded his father in the iron business, set up the first forge in Cleveland, and introduced the open-hearth process of making steel. He found time to give admirable service as mayor of Cleveland and advanced many worthy enterprises.

Charles Augustus Otis, Jr., was born on Wood Street, July 9, 1868. His interests, since graduating from Yale, have been many. For several years he enjoyed partnership with his lifelong friend, Dan D. Casement, in the Unaweet Range, which was one of the last frontiers of the real cowboy life of this country. When he returned to Cleveland, he formed the firm of Otis & Hough, agents in iron and steel and later stockbrokers.

On July 11, 1894, he married Lucia R. Edwards, and their two children are William Edwards and Lucia Eliza. Mrs. Otis was the daughter of Col. William Edwards, for many years a civic and business leader, and sister of Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, West Point graduate, with many military achievements to his credit, culminating in leadership of the famous Yankee Division of World War I.

He helped to organize the Cleveland Stock Exchange and was the first Clevelander to hold a seat on the New York Stock Exchange. Twice president of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, Otis brought to the organization a new enthusiasm that resulted in a greatly increased membership.

He purchased the Cleveland World, the Cleveland Leader, and the News and Herald, thus developing the World, which became the Cleveland News.

For several years he served as president of William Edwards & Co., the wholesale grocery business founded by his father-in-law, and later he became vice president of Carling's, Inc., which position he now holds.

As a dollar-a-year man, he gave distinguished service to the War Industries Board, under the chairmanship of Bernard Baruch, and his city has profited over the years by his service on business, civic, and social committees.

His love for all that entertains and improves his fellow man, his affection for horses and dogs, his fondness for sports and the theater have made him popular at home and beyond the city's borders.

He has the reputation of knowing more prominent people in all walks of life than any other Clevelander. For nearly a half century his wit and humor, his good fellowship, his personal enthusiasm, and his genuine friendliness have won for him the title "Cleveland's best-known citizen."

Included among the tributes to Mr. Otis at the civic celebration was a testimonial by Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press, which follows:

LOVED BY SO MANY

The place Charley Otis holds here tonight in our hearts and lives will never be filled by other than this peerless human being before us, "Mr. Cleveland" himself. Long may he continue to fill that place!

Back in 1938, long before the glowing record of the great Sesquicentennial cochairmanship was written by Cleveland's honored guest of this evening, the Press ran a tribute to Charles A. Otis, herewith reprinted. It was written from the heart by Ben Williamson, then of the Press, now associate editor of Time magazine. It bears witness to what we all know, that Charley Otis was "Mr. Cleveland" for years before he added the glamorous achievement of the Sesqui chairmanship to his other laurels.

The mighty civic milestone of the Sesqui is now "something added." If we could fire another gun, it would add a ringing note to all that went before.

Tonight we thank Charley Otis with all our hearts for the endless hours and the tireless work he put into making the celebration of Cleveland's one hundred and fiftieth birthday a great success. But our tribute—the tribute of his fellow townsmen here tonight—the tribute of the Press and those who comprise its organization—goes even deeper. It goes to the man, the warm, lively, colorful, happy personality about whom Ben Williamson wrote—Charley Otis, the great Clevelander whom we salute tonight.

Our tribute goes to great years lived, and great years ahead. To the golden years that he has shared with his wife, his fine, warmhearted partner, Lucia Otis. May their years together be forever golden and many more.

Many men have been honored by Cleveland, but none in our memory quite as Charley Otis is being honored, because he is personally loved by so many citizens of this goodly city.

Address Before Welcome-Home Banquet, Veterans of Greek Extraction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I wish to include herein my remarks at the welcome-home banquet, World War II veterans of Greek extraction, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, February 9, 1947, as follows:

From Plato's republic to the Republic of the United States; from the Greek word "deemos" to the American word "democracy"; from Thermopylae to the Battle of the Bulge, all of us who are assembled here tonight owe more to the ideas and inspiration we drew from ancient Greece, the mother of all civilization, than to any other people in all history.

For the Greeks were the first to fight for human freedom.

Over 2,400 years ago, they stood up against the Mussolinis and Hitlers of those times and beat back the tide of tyranny which was sweeping over the world.

Boys and girls in high schools and colleges today, reading of the glories of those ancient times, feel a sense of kinship that melts time and distance. And when they leave their studies to assume their place in the world, they are better citizens because they are molded by the truths first found in that remarkable little country called Greece.

Truly Americans and Greeks of today are brothers—not by the accident of birth but by that higher relationship of mind and soul and devotion to the same ideals.

We know that in peace, no less than in war, the fight to make life better goes on.

Tonight we welcome home those who fought against the most destructive of all tyrants. We welcome them in two ways. First, as fellow-Americans, who did the hard part of the job for us. And secondly, because they are Americans of Greek origin, who are justly proud not only of their ancient history but of the amazing courage and unquenchable passion for liberty which characterizes the Greeks of today.

We who have lived through this most terrible of all wars, will not forget those dark days in early 1940, when the Fascist menace seemed unbeatable. Freedom-loving men all over the world began to lose heart. Even in our own country we were discouraged because a few men started to talk about "doing busines with Hitler."

Even great and once-proud nations bent the knee before the modern antichrist. All that was worthy of dignity in the life of man seemed lost.

And then the sagging spirits of men everywhere were electrified. Mussolini, the pirate Goliath, sent his armored forces against the tiny David that was Greece. And a miracle happened, a miracle brought about by that divine quality which we call the spirit of man. Faced with overpowering material force, the small legions of Greece fought with their hearts and their heads. Fighting man to man in the mountain passes as did their ancestors at Thermopylae, they routed the Fascist invaders. The sawdust Caesar retreated in humiliation and confusion.

It was then that the world woke up. True—Hitler in his fury swarmed over Greece with his tanks and planes and his masses of men, but it was too late to save the face. Greece was physically conquered for the time being, but she had opened the eyes of the world and shamed it out of defeatism.

Tiny Greece stood up and fought and suffered and showed the world that Fascism could be licked. And from this gallant and inspiring stand, came the turn of the tide. If little Greece could do it, was there any excuse for larger nations? The answer was none. From that period forward, civilized men everywhere, when the going was tough, said to themselves "Remember Greece." That example gave them the faith and determination to fight through to victory.

The price was high. Ten percent of Greece's population was sacrificed to slow down the sweep of barbarism and spark faint hearts elsewhere with fresh hope and courage.

The war has ended, but peace has not come to Greece. It is tragic that after 5 years of heroic resistance against the Axis Powers this country should become a focal point in the struggle for position between Soviet and British interests. The great efforts that must be made to rebuild Greece have been delayed by this interference. Civil war has broken out—aided and abetted by foreign interests. Greece occupies a strategic place along the borders of that great inland sea—the Mediterranean. But geography alone is not the reason for this contest. There are forces in this world which can never rest while Greece stands as the symbol of human dignity and freedom. These forces are even now trying to bore from within, stirring up unrest, preventing rehabilitation, trying to break by propaganda that spirit which has never been broken by physical power.

It is time for the big powers to stop meddling in the internal politics of Greece and let the people of that nation govern themselves. Help Greece financially—help her with food and clothing in order that she may get on her feet again as a self-sustaining member of the family of nations—but stop using Greece as a pawn in the vicious game of power politics.

The Greeks were experimenting with self-government when the big powers of today were savage tribes. If left alone, they will decide what is best for them, as they have always done, developing the finest qualities in each citizen for the greater good of the group. In fact, the Greeks could well give some lessons in the real, and not the fictitious, meaning of democracy to some of these nations which are trying to exploit them today.

I repeat, the intriguing powers must get out of Greece, and in the process of getting out make certain that the Dodecanese Islands in the eastern Mediterranean are returned to her. In origin, in language, and in custom these islands have been Greek since the dawn of history. Greece wants them, not only in name but in fact, clear of foreign agents and foreign propaganda. The return must be complete.

Why do I speak of these matters at this banquet held in honor of our war veterans? It is because they know that the battle is only half won. The physical fighting is over, but the men who have come back are determined to work for victory in peace as well as in war. We cannot go back to the old way of doing business, because it was that old way which helped to bring on the war. The men and women here tonight are resolved that their children will not be called upon to pay in blood and agony for the mistakes of their parents. Our veterans know from their own experience that the doctrine of every man for himself won't work. The one memory of their service that they cherish above all is that they came to know their buddies, to help them and be helped by them, and through this to have a greater regard for one another.

Is it any wonder that our veterans miss this when they return to civilian life? They see the people back home absorbed in their personal interests, blind to the larger area of cooperation which must be developed if our democracy is to survive. For the surest way to invite communism is to commit all over again the mistakes of yesterday.

That we must not do.

There is a struggle going on in the world today which in time may have more far-reaching effects than the war itself. The struggle is between American democracy and Russian communism. This conflict does not have to be decided by war. In the long run it will be decided by one fact and one alone—which system works best.

We can lose freedom—the last, best hope of earth—by our indifference. The moment we take it for granted, that moment we begin to lose it.

And so, the struggle in peace goes on, the everlasting fight to conquer ignorance, intolerance, poverty, and disease, and the effort of each man, made in the image of God, to realize the best that is in him, for the sake of others as well as for himself.

To succeed in this, we must give every man a chance.

There are encouraging signs that some of our leaders have learned that when all people work and have decent incomes, the whole Nation prospers. This is what we mean when we speak of economic freedom, the new freedom which we must strive for from this day forward. But we shall not get it by sacrificing the freedoms of thought and speech and expression, which, to the eternal glory of Greece, she first gave to the world.

Veterans of World War II, we need your help.

Mindful of the lessons you learned the hard way, we ask you to give the folks at home the benefit of your experience. Teach them the need of pulling together.

In this call to mobilize for the tasks of peace, we depend on you, the veterans, to show the way. For you are awake to the fact that people must prosper together. No man in this modern world can find security for himself at the cost of insecurity to others.

In this spirit we welcome you home. As relatives or friends, we are glad that you have come back safely to us.

The redeeming comradeship which you found in war we must save and develop for the constructive work of peace.

With common goals clearly sighted, to which all of us can give our faith and will and energy, we shall go on with the job of building a better nation in a better world.

Trade Associations: Their Relation to Monopoly and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address made by me at the first annual meeting of Potash Soap Association, Cleveland, Ohio, on January 14, 1947. The address is as follows:

The purpose of your association, as I understand it, is to work for the welfare and development of the potash-soap industry, which is composed of small soap manufacturers. I am always interested in lending my support to an association which has as its objective the development of small firms in any line of business. It is frequently and truly said that small business is the backbone of the economic life of America. We need small business. They are essential to our freedom of enterprise and our democratic way of life. Without the millions of small enterprises throughout the Nation, the spirit of private ownership and individual adventure would be stifled. The community life of our small towns would give way to planned regimentation. Competitive trade and service would soon disappear.

I have no argument with big business as such. Growth is the hope of every small business. In our country most of our large enterprises have had small beginnings. Nevertheless, in order to keep a healthy balanced situation in any industry, it is important that

there be a number of small businesses which can operate on their own, uncontrolled by larger segments of the trade. They are essential to the public interest in keeping prices and services on a truly competitive basis.

The present trend toward concentration of production and distribution of goods into the hands of fewer and larger corporations constitutes one of the gravest basic issues of our times. It threatens the continued existence of free and independent enterprise, the traditional American way of doing business.

The attitude that small business alone is responsible for its own welfare is not realistic. Our economic system today is much too complex for any one part of it to operate independently. Each vein in the great arterial structure which leads to the heart of our business economy is necessarily dependent on the function of the other. The interests of all, from the biggest manufacturer to the smallest retailer, are closely bound in a vast network.

The welfare of small business is an important responsibility of both big and little business, of the whole economic community—of the Government itself. There should be the understanding that the small business of today may well be the big business of tomorrow, and that the big business is dependent on many thousands of healthy small businesses to support it. Small enterprise protects our economic freedom. If it were to disappear to any great extent huge trusts and monopolies would unavoidably arise to replace it. Strict Government control would be necessary to protect the welfare of the people and eventually Government operation would ensue.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The problems of the potash soap business are in most respects the same problems with which other small businesses are confronted. I feel that small business generally is entering a new phase in the postwar period which is bright but fraught with some dangers.

Without particular reference to the soap industry, we in America must decide very quickly what sort of a country we want to live in. This Nation was founded and built by men who believed in individualism. It has grown under a system carried on largely by individual capital. The increasing concentration of economic power may some day doom free enterprise. The present trend of great corporations to increase their economic power is the antithesis of meritorious competitive development. It is no accident that we now have big government, big labor unions and big business. The concentration of great economic power in a few corporations necessarily leads to the formation of large Nation-wide unions. The development of the two necessarily leads to big bureaus in the Government to deal with them. Local economic independence cannot be preserved in the face of consolidations such as we have had during the past few years. The control of American business is steadily being transferred from local communities to a few large cities in which central managers decide the policies and the fate of the far-flung enterprises they control. Millions of people depend helplessly on their judgment. Through monopolistic mergers the people are losing power to direct their own economic welfare. When they lose the power to direct their economic welfare they also lose the means to direct their political future.

Let's examine what has happened to our free competitive system in the last few years. According to a report by the Federal Trade Commission, three companies control 78 percent of United States production in copper. In lead mining, four companies control 80 percent. In farm implements, six companies control 80 percent of manufacturing. In dry ice, two companies control 70 percent. In rubber tires, four companies sold nearly 90 percent of all tires sold during 1943.

In the soap business you independents are operating in the face of a potential substantial monopoly. According to the staff report of the Small Business Committee, 80 percent of the soap business is controlled by three large companies. The staff of the Small Business Committee making a special investigation into the soap business found that seven companies control about 90 percent of the business. The balance of the business is distributed among approximately 1,200 soap producers in the United States.

Soap is essentially a simple commodity that can be made in anyone's kitchen and it would seem difficult for this concentration to have much to do with the success or failure of the small independent soap manufacturer. And yet, in this business where one manufacturer can make soap about as good as his competitor, the concentration is still dangerous to the small independent because of the control over the sources of raw materials. The large businesses in the industry are in a position to make agreements with other manufacturers and with wholesalers and retailers which adversely affect the small soap manufacturers. The large companies are acquiring related lines of merchandise which gives them a preferred sales position. The big three in the soap industry may not use any monopolistic practices. But the power to do so is certainly present and one should be in a position to protect his industry if that power is used.

I am glad to see that your new Potash Soap Association organized with the determination to see that your own segments of the soap industry has strong representation. It is essential to the protection of your own interests that you have an organization through which you can present your own viewpoint on any issues that may develop because you are certainly confronted with one of the strongest combinations which could use its position to create a monopoly.

I am certain it is your desire to strengthen the position of the small soap manufacturers and to make sure that the industry does not become the victim of economic concentration. The formation of an active, vigorous association which will give your interest a voice is the first necessary step. The set-up of your organization as stated in your published program offers these protections. It stresses the importance of getting before Congress and governmental agencies complete and accurate information on issues affecting your group, a secretary-manager to deal with your problems within your industry; assistance in dealing with technical problems; statistics of market trends, to mention a few.

It is interesting to note the extent to which your organizers have gone to keep your new association truly democratic. Your bylaws safeguard the individual member's right and interests in any policy decision that is made. This is effective in eliminating from your organization the possibility of controlling cliques that so often dominate trade associations. It is unfortunate for their industries and also the trade-association movement in this country that some associations continue perennial directorates who dominate actions and policies. There are associations with large memberships where certain companies representing less than 5 percent of the numerical membership have retained their seats on the boards of directors from 10 to 20 years. This put such an association in a class similar to that of a proprietary organization. Big business would be very wise to help democratize trade associations of which they are members. Some are doing so.

Another feature of your new association is a definite limit on the amount of money any member may contribute in any one year. The fact that the top membership fee is relatively small relieves the management of your association of any temptation to give preference to any member. Reasonable limit on contributions helps to correct this tendency. Your organizers were wise in adopting this policy.

An association that is devoting its time and energies to helping you and others in your particular field deserves your wholehearted support in both money and time. Your interests can best be served through cooperation and working together.

One distinguishing feature about small business today is that it is not collectively vocal. Trade associations can be an effective remedy for this. Where an industrial giant can claim national front-page space to voice its grievances, small business is not able to command a similar presentation of its needs to the public. So they frequently go unheard and unheeded. Through unity you achieve strength and can command a hearing.

GOVERNMENT IS CONSCIOUS OF IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESS AND ITS PROBLEMS

Small business problems are many and complex. Here are some of its principal difficulties. I list them briefly:

1. Lack of access to adequate initial capital and long-term financing.

2. Inability to cope with involvements of governmental red tape and regulations.

3. Lack of adequate managerial, scientific, and technical skills.

4. The burden of high unit costs attendant upon small-scale operation, especially in manufacturing.

5. Cost of extensive research and development activities.

6. Victim of discrimination in the procuring of materials and supplies and unfair competitive practices in times of plenty.

7. Because of tax laws, inability to create adequate financial reserves to weather business lulls.

Small business uses its more limited capital to better advantage than its big business competitors. This is shown by the proportionately larger volume of sales compared with working capital available. Yet in spite of this, studies reveal that small business suffers from undercapitalization and has more difficulty obtaining business loans or equity financing than the big competitor. The cost of money is relatively higher to small business than to large. Its members are usually regarded as poorer risks, for lenders too often base credits on bricks and mortar security rather than on the proven ability and integrity of the enterpriser. This tends to give big business an undue advantage. These barriers prevent many small businesses from making a start and cause fewer to succeed. Private groups under Government encouragement are creating credit pools. This is one answer to the financing problem.

The Department of Commerce offers many aids which are of great benefit to small enterprises. Their services are of great benefit. They advise small businesses where raw materials can be secured, of markets for products, and places to secure subcontracts. The Department has plans whereby small businesses can secure export contracts. To further assist, the Department has recommended to Congress that it be empowered to carry out the following program:

1. An immediate and well publicized campaign to dispose of surplus plants to small business concerns through use of high priority and liberal financial assistance.

2. More liberal use of priority powers to purchase machinery and machine tools for resale to small business.

3. Acceptance of old machinery or scrapping the same in part payment for surplus equipment.

We feel that the Small Business Committees of the Senate and the House have been of substantial assistance to small independent business and that these committees should be continued in the Eightieth Congress. If associations like this one make their feelings known in this matter, I am certain that such approval will aid substantially in securing continuation of the committees.

The welfare of small business must have the cooperation of the executive department, the Congress, and of associations such as this one. By working together we can accomplish much. We can erect a sound basis upon which small manufacturers can expand, profit, and contribute to the welfare of the consumer and of the country generally. I hope we can enter this period with such cooperation.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have the pleasure to include a statement made by Mrs. Mabel W. Hughes, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, on the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of that splendid congress.

The national congress now numbers over 4,000,000 members in 27,000 local parent-teachers' associations. It was founded on February 17, 1897, by Alice McLellan Birney and Phoebe Apperson Hearst. With two such outstanding women at its head, the movement toward organized protection of the rights of children could scarcely fail to reach new levels of conception and execution. Many changes have taken place in the field of child welfare, and many of these changes have been brought about by this organization.

On today, February 17, that organization is celebrating its golden jubilee anniversary. At the first convention 50 years ago many men and women prominent in the affairs of the Nation at that time participated in the first meeting. Among them were Mrs. John G. Carlisle, wife of the Secretary of the Treasury; Mrs. Daniel Lamont, wife of the Secretary of War; and Mrs. Judson Harmon, wife of the Attorney General of the United States. Mrs. Grover Cleveland received the delegates at the White House.

Up until the war years the officers of the organization were subsequently received by the President of the United States and his wife at the White House. The golden jubilee convention is being held this year in the city of Chicago in June. It is hoped that President Truman will find it possible to attend that meeting and to address it.

Mrs. Hughes, the national president, is from my congressional district. For many years she has been interested in this great program, first as a teacher and then as a mother. She is a woman of great personal charm, fine intellect, and possesses vision and is endowed with unlimited energy and industry. We are proud to have her as a Tennesseean. We are still happier to share her influence and usefulness to the Nation. Well did the members of the national congress select her as president; equally responsive to this high honor will be her continued service to the youth and to the teachers of this great country.

Her statement follows:

On the 17th day of February we shall have completed our fiftieth year of service as an organization widely known and respected in America. And on our fiftieth birthday we can surely pause not only to praise our predecessors but to recall with pride our own accomplishments as well.

On this founders day it is especially fitting that we look to the future as well as to the past. In terms of what has already been done, let us ask ourselves what there is yet to do. To begin with, there are many people who do not know the purposes of the PTA. And there are still others who must be taught more about the way in which these purposes are achieved.

From time to time I hear comments—usually from persons not familiar with the work of our organization—implying that our local associations are not doing as good a job as they should. In an organization as vast as ours—one whose membership is a cross-section of the American people—it would of course be quite foolish to expect that our 27,000 units would have equal attainments. Human nature being what it is, there are bound to be certain shortcomings in leadership, certain mistakes in judgment, certain failures among chosen projects. Yet imperfections here and there do not and cannot alter the excellent over-all picture of parent-teacher achievements to which we can point with justifiable pride.

Because our organization does not concentrate its energies upon self-glorification, we shall no doubt always receive some criticism from the uninformed. Perhaps there are times when we should not be quite so modest. Without ostentation we might well embark on a dignified campaign to acquaint the public with the many, many worthwhile activities of PTA's in communities all over America. Let us review together a few of our contributions to the welfare of children and young people in the past 50 years. In this way we may be helped to tell the parent-teacher story to those who have not heard it.

ON BEHALF OF THE SCHOOLS

Few schools having congress PTA's lack concrete evidence of members' interest in the comfort and convenience of those who use the school plant—pupils, teachers, administrators, and adults of the community. Local units have helped to supply motion picture projectors, sanitary equipment, recreation facilities—even clothing and school supplies for underprivileged school children. But this is only one short chapter in our ambitious tale.

Recently many magazines and newspapers have given publicity to the teacher shortage as well as other timely problems of education. To some it may seem that America is just beginning to wake up—but who started the awakening? For years the national congress has worked to secure legislation on behalf of the schools, to increase teachers' salaries, to keep professional standards high, to improve the status of the teacher as a person in the community, to retain for the benefit of children the lands granted by the Federal Government to the various States. (See the February issue for an account of what the Washington congress recently did to protect State school lands. Watch, too, for the "PTA Frontiers" article in the February 1947 issue of the National Parent-Teacher, describing how our Oregon State branch secured passage of the basic school support fund bill in that State.

We have not merely talked about these things; we have helped to translate them into reality. Genuinely concerned about the teacher shortage, many State congresses have taken steps to improve present critical conditions. The California congress, for example, has done an outstanding piece of work in encouraging high-caliber students to enter the teaching profession (see the October 1945 National Parent-Teacher). First establishing a scholarship fund of $50,000 to be used for the education of teachers, California augmented the fund by $30,000 this year. Illinois and Massachusetts have sizable scholarship funds, and Connecticut and Pennsylvania also offer aid to selected students in teacher training colleges. The Georgia congress is supporting a bill to increase teachers' salaries. Hawaii is striving to improve the standards of teaching. And Idaho is working on legislation to provide a teacher retirement system. So we could go on, naming State after State. Indeed, it is difficult to cite a single congress that is not working in one way or another to improve our public schools.

CONCERNING PARENT AND FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION

Parent education, long one of our main concerns, is so deeply ingrained in the whole pattern of parent-teacher work that it seems to permeate every project. Each year thousands of local associations, both urban and rural, foster the development of an enlightened American parenthood. It might even be said without exaggeration that one can scarcely retain parent-teacher membership without receiving some form of liberal education.

Our congress publications, particularly the National Parent-Teacher with its eminent study courses, bring to parent-teacher leaders material tailor-made to their requirements. Published study courses, I might add, are no new or untried venture for us. As early as 1924 the Child-Welfare Magazine, ancestor of our present publication, carried a series of home-study courses in cooperation with Columbia University. That same year the congress adopted the Children's Foundation study course, The Child: His Nature and His Needs, as the basis for a series of 12 outlines, which were published each month beginning in January 1925.

Clearly can we see a consistent thread of parent education throughout our early history. Today there is scarcely a single authority in the range of parent-teacher interest who has not contributed to these courses. Nor is there one who fails to acknowledge the value of such study to the country at large.

Incidentally, since we mention the National Parent-Teacher, may I say that the publication of a magazine of such excellence—one that is read by more than 300,000 persons monthly—is in itself an achievement worthy of note. Especially is this true when one realizes that the magazine is promoted wholly by volunteer parent-teacher workers and supported on a $1 subscription rate, entirely without advertising.

The monthly meetings of each PTA are themselves a forceful means of deepening our understanding of the needs of youth. But the parent-teacher movement is far more than a once-a-month event. The activities of each local association go on continuously by means of committee meetings, participation in local projects, and smaller study groups that meet to discuss parents' prob-

lems, current ideas on child growth, and various matters of civic, national, or international interest.

Then there are the special conferences and institutes, the short courses at college and universities, and our weekly radio broadcast, "The Baxters." All these give to parent-teacher members a definite personal enrichment, which is in turn reflected in their deeper responsibility as citizens of a democracy.

FOR THE GREATEST GOOD

The parent-teacher organization supports those objectives, national and international, that are for the best interests of the Nation and its children. Working in cooperation with other civic groups, it has supported tax measures that have raised school standards in countless districts. Parent-teacher leaders are in the foreground of campaigns for protective child-labor laws, for maternal-welfare legislation, for Federal aid to the schools, for housing statutes, and for innumerable other tangible goals directed toward the betterment of the family.

Although this support is centralized at the national level, its strength comes directly from the 3,910,106 local members who actively exercise their rights as citizens. The very existence of an organized parent-teacher association in any community tends to restrain those who might be likely to exploit children or their parents. There is really no way of knowing fully how much insecurity or how many hardships have been averted because our PTA's have striven consistently for the greatest good of all.

Then think for a moment of what we have done to foster world understanding, to educate the public about the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the San Francisco Conference, the United Nations organization, and UNESCO. But remember, too, that our job is far from done, that we must continue to strive for an enduring peace. A better world tomorrow depends upon the parents and teachers of today. Only if they are well informed and earnest will they be able to pursue a course of action that will ensure the building of a peaceful and prosperous world for all mankind.

STRESSING SAFETY

In this field it is also interesting to speculate on how many lives we have saved, how many accidents we have prevented. We know they are legion, for safety has long been prominent in our program. At parent-teacher insistence, school safety patrols have been organized, safety ordinances enforced, school bus regulations improved, school courses in safety urged. Though the list is too long to be completed here, we can be absolutely sure that we have made America a safer Nation in which to rear our children.

REGARDING HEALTH

One of our best-known health projects is, of course, the summer round-up of the children, but often even its story goes unheralded, although the idea has been taken over by many State health departments. Through the efforts of our PTA's in the last 20 years 1,748,227 preschool children have had a medical check-up before entering first grade. We cannot say exactly how many of the defects discovered by these examinations might have gone undetected for years, or how many children might have been retarded in school because of poor eyesight or hearing handicaps. But again we know that if such statistics could have been gathered together, the health debt owed by the Nation to our Congress parent-teacher associations would truly be tremendous.

Realizing the importance of diet to health, our PTA's were the first groups in America to sponsor school lunches that would give pupils the benefits of a hot meal during the noon hour at school. From one section of the country to the other, parent-teacher members once more did not merely talk about the need for school lunches; they rolled up their sleeves, donned their aprons, and went to work helping to prepare and serve the food.

Soon other local, State, and Federal agencies entered the picture, until today millions of children are receiving school lunches daily. Now, in many communities the PTA may give only indirect aid to the school-lunch project, because that is all that is needed. Nevertheless, in the beginning it was our interest and our example that gave impetus to what is now an accepted feature of the Nation's schools. Moreover, we still lend practical assistance to other phases of school-lunch support. The Federal school-lunch bill was passed last year, largely because parent-teacher members worked so diligently for its enactment. And every harvest season still finds many a local unit canning jars of foods for school lunches. In 10 States, for instance, our associations last year planted and cultivated 2,141 gardens, processed 921,731 units of food, and contributed 225,000 hours of volunteer work. Who, we wonder, can possibly say we are not doing enough?

Radio Address of Hon. Edwin Arthur Hall, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me over station WNBF, Saturday evening, February 15, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, the delightful results I obtained from my announcement last week that a list of the names of those who are persecuting me would be mailed to every voter in this district were really astonishing. They suggest that perhaps it would be accomplishing more to withhold this list a few days longer so it would be more complete. They suggest that more people might come forward voluntarily as a few already have and try to put the shoe on to see if it fits.

But I imagine some of those folks will be concerned with things from now on that should worry them a lot more than their intolerance and irritation over me. Troubles are apparently setting in for many newspaper publishers all around us. A few days ago I talked with a Congressman from up-State New York.

"Frankly," he said, "I don't know what I'm going to do. I can't get any publicity back home because all the newspapers in my home city are closed down because of a strike. I don't even dare to die. Just think, no one would see my obituary."

"You certainly have a problem," I answered, "favorable publicity is something every man needs to stay in Congress. But you'll have to find other means, just like I've had to do. You'll have to keep in touch with your folks in a dozen different ways as I've had to. Naturally, you can't depend on your newspapers if they're out on strike. People can't read about you if you depend on a newspaper, when it isn't being published."

Yes; our newspapers are certainly facing quite some problems these days. God forbid that such a situation be visited upon the Triple Cities.

Another report came to me that newsprint is becoming scarcer and scarcer. I suppose that gives rise to the statement some publisher made last week that many newspapers would be forced out of business unless some solution is found to make up for this dearth.

I assume this newsprint shortage will not affect Triple Cities newspapers as I have had no appeals for help from them as I did a few years ago when wartime limitations were being imposed on paper and newsprint.

If, however, any such tragic circumstances such as my friend in Congress is now facing, namely having his newspapers closed for one reason or another so that he cannot let his people back home know what he is doing, if, as I say similar tragic circumstances should affect your own Congressman, you must depend upon this program to keep you informed of what I attempt to do in Washington, what bills I introduce and what remarks I make. This program will serve you in such an emergency just as it serves you now. Let me thank you for the fine letters you write me praising the way I conduct this program.

After all, why not? It is a program dedicated to you, and to the service of all of you.

As you Triple Cities readers did not have the chance to see my recent speech to Congress in print calling for a 25-pound sugar bonus to every American housewife, I will read it herewith:

"Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to suggest to the House a bonus, not to veterans this time, not to any one else but to the individual American family. I should like to instruct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Office of Temporary Controls to reexamine the possibility of giving a special bonus of 25 pounds of sugar over and above any regular 1947 allotment per capita to each American housewife so that she can do more baking in the home, giving her children and her family; the chance to consume more nutritious and palatable food.

"So far we have done nothing but shadowbox with the sugar shortage. Speaking for myself, I think the time has come to give the people we represent a break. Why deprive them of a standard of living that has made Americans the happiest people in the world?

"I would not propose this if I did not know that more sugar will be available for domestic use this year than at any time since before the war. We can well afford the extra distribution, especially since no family today has enough sugar on hand.

"This sugar bonus will show the folks back home this Congress is on the job, looking out for their welfare, and interested in seeing a well-nourished, strong and healthy Nation, capable of taking the lead in bringing peace and progress to the whole world."

Portal-to-Portal Suits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Ottumwa (Iowa) Manufacturer's Association is a community organization in one of the industrial cities of Iowa. Recently this association adopted a resolution on the subject of portal-to-portal

suits that I desire to call to the attention of the House membership. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include therein this resolution:

Whereas the widespread filing of portal-to-portal suits on the part of employees has reached such an extent as to endanger the very foundation of American business, which would, in turn, be to the ultimate detriment of American labor; and

Whereas such suits, if successful, in any degree, would place upon management a burden which could not have been foreseen,

The Ottumwa Manufacturer's Association, the membership of which includes all manufacturing interests in this community, hereby resolve that this association should, and does hereby, appeal to the United States Senators elected from the State of Iowa, and to the United States Congressman elected from this district, to assert their utmost influence in taking any and all possible legal steps to secure the enactment of legislation curtailing and eliminating, insofar as possible, the prosecution of cases already filed, and preventing the filing of such similar cases in the future, particularly where employees have been, and are, or may hereafter be, working under written contracts governing the terms and conditions of employment and the rate of pay therefor.

Respectfully submitted.

OTTUMWA MANUFACTURER'S ASSOCIATION,
LLOYD WINGER, *President.*

Preparedness for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARTER MANASCO
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a letter received from Mr. F. Lloyd Wassell, of Westport, Conn., bearing on the question of preparedness.

Three sons of Mr. Wassell gave their lives in World War II for the protection of our liberties. If we follow Mr. Wassell's suggestions, in all probability no other American mother and father will be called upon to give the lives of their loved ones for our protection. When we start cutting the appropriations for the Army and the Navy, let us not forget that the lives of 350,000 American boys might have been saved in World War II if our country had been adequately prepared.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 1947.

Hon. CARTER MANASCO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANASCO: The above are photos of my boys, and I am speaking to you as their Representative and that of millions of other boys who gave their lives for you and me and in thousands of cases because of our inefficiency and pure selfishness.

You or your predecessors failed to provide proper police protection, and as is always the case, hell broke loose.

One of these or all three of these boys might have been your sons, or might be your sons 5, 10, or 20 years from now. Bear that in mind as you read the following results of you or your predecessor's bungling or selfishness in connection with our national safety.

Bud (F. L., Jr.) was the first to go at Avon Park, Fla. Reputedly, a fine flier, a fine pilot instructor on the early B-26 (commonly called "widow makers"), he brought in a B-26 on its belly without a scratch on the crew. On Sunday, February 28, 1943, he was killed—one plane cut off the tail of another in midair. Whose fault—yours and mine for not providing in the years 1920 to 1940 adequate amounts for training of personnel and proper equipment. The reasons given were necessary speed-up with too little training. Are you going to let this happen again because of lobbying of selfish interests from all walks of life?

I heard a so-called educator lobbying over the air against military training. He spoke of refusal of educational funds where they did not have ROTC and of such military training being proposed by our Army personnel to build a military hierarchy to get us into the next war. He did not mention his own selfish interest or his own communistic leanings and teachings under the guise of education.

Personally, I am a Republican, a great believer in college education, a believer in higher pay for educators and teachers, and especially if we can weed from our entire educational system communistic windbags of this type who have taken the education received at the expense of taxpayers of a free democracy to undermine that democracy in the minds and thinking of our younger generation.

Frank Lloyd Wassell, Jr., might probably be here today with many thousands of other fine upstanding patriotic, democratic, right-thinking young men who should be our future leaders. He loved life, the people around him, his home, and his country.

You are representing these young men, and especially the youngsters they left behind. In the names of those men and regardless of your political affiliations, examine what we have suffered in the past through our failure to provide means of self defense. We know what happened twice in the past. We do not know what the future holds, but we know that criminals do not attack in broad daylight from the front. They attack in the dark and from the rear.

In later letters I will give you two additional true stories from the lives of my two other boys whom you will have to represent since they are not here to represent themselves.

I firmly believe that President Truman is first an American, and second, a Democratic Party President. As an American thinking in terms of the protection of its interests through compulsory military training, he should be given the unselfish and nonpolitical backing of every Member of Congress.

Remember those who gave cannot speak for themselves.

Sincerely yours,

F. LLOYD WASSELL.

Freedom for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when Lithuania won her freedom in 1917 the world had reason to believe that her subjection to Russia was a thing of the past never to be revived. The great rejoicing among Lithuanians in this country and everywhere was unclouded by any fear of a qualification upon the sovereignty of the new nation, surely not so soon as October 10, 1939.

Those who know history know that Lithuania was once the greatest power on the continent of Europe, her might extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea. When she joined with Poland it was not conquest which dictated the union, but a voluntary desire and a freely entered contract which arranged for the marriage between the two great liberty-loving states.

From the middle of the sixteenth century until the Russian conquest Lithuania maintained her individuality, culture, and national idealism. Throughout the period of Russian rule the beacon of freedom was never lost from view, and when freedom did come in 1917 Lithuanians in Russia and in this country greeted it eagerly. To them it meant the resurrection of the great state of Mindaugas, Gediminas, and Vytautas. Subsequently Lithuania had by war with the Bolsheviki struggled to acquire Memel, and engaged in long drawn out conflict with Poland over Vilna. Other troubles too filled the years of Lithuanian independence, but these were cheerfully borne and remedied. The important fact always was that Lithuania at last was free. She could choose her government and she could regulate her own affairs. Once again Lithuanians breathed the sweet air of poltical independence.

One of the most remarkable aspects of the period between 1918 and 1939 was the way in which the newly created Baltic states were able to establish themselves and set up independent and workable economies. Among these states Lithuania made a most outstanding record. Not only did she redistribute her agricultural land and set up an excellent agricultural system, but she made notable advances also in textiles and manufacturing generally. Trade and commerce flourished. Banking and currency regulations were enlightened and modern. The constitution worked.

In education Lithuanian institutions after 1917 contrasted sharply with the sketchiness of those under Czarist Russia. Welfare measures were modeled upon those of the Scandinavian countries and Lithuanian law and courts made notable progress. In short Lithuania was making long strides forward in national independence and growth.

Lithuania, however, had one serious handicap—her geographical location on the borders of both Soviet Russia and Germany. Thus, when these two powers in 1939 divided eastern Europe into spheres of influence, Lithuania was placed in the Soviet sphere, and in 1939 was forced to yield her national interest and welfare to Russian strategic interests. At first it was believed that occupation by a limited number of troops was all that Russia would require, but disillusionment was not long in coming. In June 1940 Russia sent her military forces and political agents into the country and converted it into a new Soviet republic—the fourteenth.

As if that with its ensuing socialization of the principal forms of corporate wealth and property were not enough,

there came in June 1941 the occupation of Lithuania by Nazi forces during which time Lithuania was included in the administrative area of Ostland. And on top of all this, as if the country had not already suffered enough, it was "liberated" by Russian forces who fought the Germans and drove them out of the land—but what a land. For 5 years fire and sword had been supplemented with mass transfer of Lithuanians—thousands to the interior of Russia, other thousands sent into forced labor in Germany. The ghastly story of these hardships can never be known in detail. The firing squad, the noose, the ship added their share to the tragedy. Hundreds of thousands perished or were lost. But even that is not the full tale of woe of this heroic country.

Today Russia and her agents are back again. The Lithuanian people and land are once again the fourteenth Soviet republic with Russian members in the cabinet. An iron curtain of press censorship shuts out all news of the national tragedy. Few Americans outside those of Lithuanian origin know this chapter of human suffering. It has been obscured by more dramatic and highly publicized suffering elsewhere.

But, let there be no mistake about where the United States stands. We have never condoned these acts. Sumner Welles said in 1940 that the "devious processes whereunder the political independence of the three small Baltic republics [was] deliberately annihilated" were opposed to our ideas of free government and the right of states, no matter how weak, to handle their own domestic affairs. That was our policy then. That is our policy now. Other Secretaries have said so more recently. We refuse to recognize the predatory destruction of Lithuanian independence as valid. We still regard Lithuania as an independent state. On this anniversary of Lithuanian freedom we look forward to the day when we shall see Lithuania resume her admirable progress in self-government.

The United States Under the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein continuation of article in a series entitled "The United States Under the Republicans," by Edwin K. Gross, which appeared in the Morning Herald, Gloversville, N. Y.:

Protective tariff was for many years the keystone of Republican prosperity policy. The tariff prevented the products of cheap labor abroad from flooding the United States and destroying our higher-price, higher-wage system.

Nevertheless, Republicans fathered reciprocal trade agreements, which, advanced again by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, were a major program of the Democratic Roosevelt's administration.

When the McKinley tariff bill was passed in 1890, a reciprocity provision was included, as a result of the influence of Secretary of State James G. Blaine, and several treaties were at once negotiated. In 1892 the Republican platform pointed to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, but the Democrats won the election and the panic which came in 1893 was charged to a lack of confidence in the pending tariff legislation of the Democratic administration.

McKinley said in support of the tariff: "We lead all nations in agriculture, we lead all nations in mining, and we lead all nations in manufacturing. These are the trophies we bring after 29 years of protective tariff." Gradually, however, he became the great champion of reciprocity.

The 1896 Republican platform, on which McKinley stood for President, stated: "Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy, and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished."

In his second inaugural address, in 1900, McKinley, after having negotiated a number of new treaties, asserted: "Reciprocal trade arrangements with other nations should in a liberal spirit be carefully cultivated and promoted." In what became his farewell address, at Buffalo on the eve of his assassination, McKinley declared: "The period of exclusiveness is past. Commercial wars are unprofitable. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times."

Lincoln's administration created a system of national banks.

When it was proposed after the Civil War to repudiate the national debt, the Republicans stood for payment according to the spirit of the contract. "The national debt, contracted as it has been for the preservation of the Union for all time to come," they said in their 1868 platform, "should be extended over a fair period for redemption."

Grant vetoed an inflation bill, which would have considerably increased the large volume of legal-tender paper money, at that time not being redeemed by the Government. This veto set the face of the Government toward specie payment and honest money.

The Grant administration restored the gold standard in 1879 in the midst of a world-wide depression, and our business began to boom as applications for United States bonds came from all over the world.

The ability of the American Government, thus demonstrated, to fulfill unprecedented financial obligations of war enhanced its credit; revenue mounted even while Grant reduced the burdens of taxation and the national debt, and for a decade the Treasury had a surplus.

With Hayes and McKinley their later spokesmen, the Republicans waged a winning fight for sound money again in 1876 and 1896.

When the Treasury reached an annual surplus of $100,000,000 the appropriations of Congress for the first time exceeded a billion dollars. The Democrats were loudly critical. Speaker Reed explained, "This is a billion-dollar country."

A succession of Republican leaders cared generously for disabled war veterans by pensions.

The Lincoln government established a Department of Agriculture and granted land to the States for establishment of agricultural colleges (to teach agriculture and the mechanical arts). Farm area greatly increased, the farmer's use of machinery was encouraged, and by the 1880's and 1890's farm surpluses were being sent abroad to pay for our imports.

Giving emphasis to the conservation of natural resources, Republican Presidents Harrison, McKinley, and Roosevelt withdrew millions of acres of forests for reserves, and Government reclamation of dry lands was begun under Roosevelt.

When it was discovered that "embalmed beef"—the stinking left-over refuse of the Chicago packing houses—was sent to our soldiers in the Spanish-American War the Pure Food Act was enacted under Roosevelt forbidding interstate commerce in adulterated foods and providing for rigid meat inspection.

With Taft as President the Children's Bureau was added to the Government machinery, the 8-hour day was granted to all Government employees, the sixteenth amendment authorizing an income tax (for the more equitable distribution of wealth) was enacted, and the seventeenth amendment for the election of United States Senators by popular vote rather than by State legislatures was initiated.

The progressive Republicans, whose leadership evolved into Theodore Roosevelt's Progressive Party in 1912, advocated a system whereby the farmer could obtain credit more easily, stricter antitrust laws, social insurance, laws to protect workers against sickness, old age, and unemployment, minimum wages for women, laws to prevent or control child labor, and woman suffrage.

When the Republicans were again in charge during the years of 1921-33, a whole series of measures for assistance to farmers was enacted, with credit extended by the Government and organization of agricultural cooperatives encouraged.

The first old-age pension law was enacted when Republican Harding was President, and 17 States also had such laws before the Democratic New Deal came in.

The number of child workers was reduced by two million between 1910 and 1930, with most of the decrease being accomplished during Republican years. Congress adopted in 1924, with the approval of Coolidge, a resolution amending the Constitution so that Federal authorities could regulate or abolish child labor; though the act was not ratified by enough States, some of its aims were later realized in other ways.

Immigration was put on a quota basis by the Harding administration.

Harding's Congress placed the national finances on a unified budget basis which at last applied the principles of business to the regulation of the Government's income and outgo.

Coolidge's administration reduced the cost of government by systematic paring. Tax rates were cut four times. He was the great exemplar of economy in Government. (The Democrats had attempted to beat him in 1924 with a corporation lawyer as their nominee.)

Between 1922 and 1927—Harding-Coolidge years—the purchasing power of American wages was increased at the rate of more than 2 percent annually.

In the Department of Commerce, then headed by Hoover, ingenious techniques were developed for the improvement of industry.

Corruption, which reared its ugliness after World War II as after the Civil War, is not the sin of a party, but rather a sin of the human race. Grant had said: "Let the guilty be punished." Heads fell in the Cabinet as Coolidge gave support to a Democratic investigation and exposé, his administration started lawsuits in the courts against those accused of fraud—and oil reserves stolen by private concerns were restored to the Government.

The Coolidge who as Governor of Massachusetts during a strike by Boston police had telegraphed the president of the American Federation of Labor that "there is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody,

anywhere, any time" signed the Railway Labor Mediation Act of 1926—progressive legislation for mediation of labor disputes.

His Republican Congress gave to longshoremen and harbor workers the benefit of compensation for injuries.

A stringent anti-injunction law, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, underwriting the principles of collective bargaining, was passed in 1932 under the sponsorship of two Republicans, Senator George W. Norris and Representative Fiorello H. LaGuardia, and signed by President Hoover.

An economic storm which whipped across the earth beat against Hoover as one of many millions of innocent victims. A few times in history men have been really bigger than events, but almost always events are bigger than men. Franklin Roosevelt, too, sought to stem the upheaval. Both fought valiantly, each according to his own philosophy. But no President and no administration have yet liquidated a depression. Six and a half years after Franklin D. Roosevelt had been first inaugurated, and notwithstanding good deeds, the unemployed in the United States still numbered 10,000,000—and until after a new world war had been in progress for some time.

Hoover, like Grant in his own time and Cleveland in his, had no more to do with the causes of depression than had the Doorkeepers of Senate and House. But no President ever moved into action more promptly and efficiently than did Hoover when the big bull market crashed in 1929; no President had ever before undertaken so much as did Hoover to relieve the distress of the poor, to help business revive, and to provide work for the unemployed.

Hoover promised a reduction in taxes. He held conferences with business leaders who gave him their pledge to maintain pay rolls and pay envelopes. He recommended to Congress a large-scale construction of public works to take up the slack in employment. He urged the governors of the States to press for similar remedial measures in their legislatures. And he attempted to build up the shaken morale of business.

Moreover, Hoover approved legislation extending Federal credit to States and municipalities struggling with unemployment and poverty. He thereupon became the first President to make Federal funds available for unemployment and welfare relief.

Hoover constantly emphasized the fact that the American depression which followed the stock-market crash was in large part psychological—which F. D. R. denied during his 1932 campaign but admitted in his first inaugural address when, simply repeating Hoover's premise in other words, he said: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Hoover recalled that the Nation had passed through no less than 15 major depressions within a century, and said: "We have come out of each * * * into a period of prosperity greater than ever before."

Hoover recommended, and Congress adopted, two great proposals for interfering in the natural course of free enterprise and periodical depressions: The creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to relieve the frozen credit of financial institutions and to make loans to banks, insurance companies, trust companies, railroads, and other industries in financial difficulties; and the establishment of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, to aid people in peril of losing their homes under foreclosures of mortgages.

The life of the RFC as a Government lending institution has been extended by Franklin Roosevelt and Truman. Its value has thus been acknowledged for 15 years since its founding by Hoover.

Democratic tactics in the Democratic-controlled House were principally confined to obstructing and harassing Hoover. The Democrats proposed no constructive measures to overcome the depression. They were a party without a program—and when Franklin Roosevelt went before the Nation as Hoover's opponent he was a man without a program. All they gave was denunciation. Within months after his inaugural F. D. R. had junked many of his planks. For instance, in experience he discovered that the economy which he promised when he assailed Hoover for extravagance was impossible in a Nation in need.

The Democrats in 1932 did nothing to help a proposal by Senator VANDENBERG for bank-deposit insurance, which became a first measure of Franklin Roosevelt's administration.

The Democratic Roosevelt declined Hoover's invitation for a joint statement of reassurance to the country by the outgoing and incoming Presidents in the election-to-inaugural interlude, and panic ensued and the entire banking structure tottered.

Although unreal values had crashed on Wall Street, the Nation foolishly could not appreciate that it still had as many resources as before; it no longer believed in itself, and, truthfully, it failed itself while Herbert Hoover became worn in the service of his country, toiling through the long days and nights, herculeanly seeking to reverse the tide of fear psychology.

Hoover's greatest mistake was in getting himself elected to the 1929–33 Presidential term; the man he defeated, Alfred E. Smith, must have felt like a person who misses a plane and the next day reads that it crashed. It was no more possible to stop the psychological pendulum on its downswing than it had been for the Federal Reserve Board to stop it on its upswing.

Fate had inflicted on Hoover, philanthropist and man of avowed social sympathies, the unkindest cut of all.

His enemies, slinging their mud upon the person of Herbert Hoover to this day, raving about "Hooverism's bread lines and apple-selling ex-servicemen," have depicted him as an incarnation of the Head of Hades, Benvenuto Cellini, Jay Gould, and Benedict Arnold.

But there is a Herbert Hoover who by the facts here reviewed is given a faithful portrait for posterity. He deserves nothing less, this President who labored and sweated, yet never accepted a salary for his 4 years in the Presidency but turned the money due him back to his country.

The man who vacated the White House when the New Deal moved in was to have the satisfaction of prophetic vision. The addresses of his losing campaign for reelection and his utterances thereafter as our only living former President are clear-seeing classics, forewarning of the evil which was to be sown by the New Deal philosophy.

In the course of political turns the New Deal, too, was to experience repudiation, but the stature of the last of the Republican Presidents until 1949—the stature of Herbert Hoover—rose while the New Deal declined, and there came a time when Franklin Roosevelt's successor, Truman, summoned Hoover to a new service to humanity in a survey of the world's postwar food needs.

You have been reading only some of the highlights of Republican action in behalf of prosperity and equal opportunity; for production, employment, high wages, improved working conditions; to help the worthy needy; for a happier society.

Although under the Republicans we have not been ushered into heaven, which must remain awhile, our promise of future reward, we on the earth of the United States have in the aggregate enjoyed great living standards.

Do the historical facts identify the Republican Party as one of reaction, depression, and disaster, or is it not nearer the truth to say that the American people have not only substantially prospered, but also outstandingly among the nations of the world, because of the Republican Party?

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an editorial from the Detroit News, citing an additional reason for building the St. Lawrence seaway, as pointed out by Secretary of the Interior Krug in his recent annual report. Also an editorial from the Star Journal, Minneapolis, Minn., regarding new support for the St. Lawrence seaway from General Marshall, Secretary of State They follow:

SEAWAY VITAL TO OUR INDUSTRIES

Secretary of the Interior Krug, in his recent annual report, pointed to an additional reason for building the St. Lawrence seaway—the prospective exhaustion of reserves of high-grade iron ore on the Mesabi Range.

Krug made the point in connection with his recommendation of a billion-dollar survey of remaining mineral resources, whose dwindling threatens American industrial supremacy.

It is not merely the prosperity of the East North Central industrial district but our whole industrial preeminence as a nation that has been built on the water-borne meeting of Mesabi iron ore with Appalachian and Illinois coal and limestone.

It was the fortunate location of these basic resources on the Great Lakes chain that gave this country cheap steel, its primary advantage over other industrial nations.

Coal, iron ore, and limestone, the ingredients of iron and steel manufacture, are found in close conjunction at only a few points on the earth's surface. The Alabama steel industry is located at one of those points, but the resources there are not large. Eighty-five percent of American steel is made from Mesabi ore, carried by low-cost water transport to the neighborhood of the Illinois and Pennsylvania coal deposits.

The prospective exhaustion of the higher-grade Mesabi ores means costlier steel in and not-distant future, unless these ores can be supplemented at low cost by purer ores brought in from abroad.

There is no lack of such ores conveniently located with reference to ocean transport. The largest deposit in the world, of one of the purest of iron ores, is found in Brazil, within an easy, down-hill haul of ocean ports. This deposit now is being developed with American capital. There are others in Cuba and Labrador.

But these foreign ores must be brought cheaply to American centers of steel manufacture, if America is to retain the competitive advantage of cheap steel. That is what the seaway, by admitting low-cost ocean transport to the Great Lakes, will do.

This is by no means the only way in which the seaway's contribution to over-all national efficiency will help to keep this Nation ahead of rivals in a competitive world. But the depletion of the Mesabi ores foreshadows a crippling handicap of sufficient imminence to underscore the demand for early completion of this project, already too long delayed.

VOTE THE SEAWAY NOW!

The St. Lawrence seaway is getting new support. General Marshall lists it among the things the State Department wants from Congress. Senator VANDENBERG suggests tolls

on transocean traffic into the Great Lakes to make the project self-liquidating.

Even the Chicago Tribune, long a foe, thinks the time has come to reexamine the proposal. The Chicago Tribune indicates it may support the seaway for the power development which would be a part of the project. Such a power supply could help overcome the threat of recurring coal shortages, the Chicago newspaper says editorially.

But the 27-foot channel from the lakes to the sea is the primary reason for the undertaking, which would take 4 to 6 years, involve 83,000,000 man-hours of work, and cost something over half a billion dollars. The canals between the lakes would have to be deepened, new locks constructed. Then 27 cities of the interior of the continent, including Duluth and Superior, would become ports into which all but the largest ocean-going ships could sail.

Julius H. Barnes, president of the Erie & St. Lawrence Corp., announced in Minneapolis recently that his shipping company would begin regular package freight service between Duluth and New York this spring. With the seaway, similar service for any freight could be established between Minnesota and any part of the world.

Congress has heard all the arguments on the seaway many times. There is no need for another long committee session. But there is need for an affirmative vote. As a defense measure alone, the Nation should have this added access to the sea.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the five points expressed in the following resolution be carried out by our State Department:

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES,
Baltimore, Md., February 17, 1947.
The Honorable THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Kindly find and note enclosure containing copy of the resolution passed on the occasion of the commemoration of the twenty-ninth anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, held at the Lithuanian Hall on the 16th day of February 1947.

Respectfully yours,
ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President.

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OBSERVANCE OF THE "REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA INDEPENDENCE DAY"; ALSO STATE OF MARYLAND GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES OF BALTIMORE ON FEBRUARY 16, 1947

Whereas the oppressed people of Lithuania are unable to express their grievances, defend their rights, and voice their view in protest against the incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics; and

Whereas we, as citizens of the United States of America, are deeply concerned with the destiny of Lithuania and especially her right to be recognized as a free and independent nation: Now, therefore, be it and it is hereby

Resolved, That we urgently appeal to the Government of the United States to fulfillment of its policy declarations and in particular the following:

1. To continue to recognize the sovereignty of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

2. To protect and assist Lithuanian refugees in Europe;

3. To insist that free and unfettered elections be held in Lithuania;

4. To adhere to the twelve points, as expressed by President Truman;

5. That Russia immediately withdraw her armed forces and secret police from Lithuanian territory.

ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President.
VERA MIKUSAUCKAS,
Secretary.

Keep Our Synthetic Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald, of date February 17, 1947, entitled "Keep Our Synthetic Rubber," as follows:

KEEP OUR SYNTHETIC RUBBER

The average American got two, maybe three, new tires for his car last year. And things like rubber overshoes, hot-water bottles, raincoats, golf balls, and garden hose have been showing up in the stores. So most of us aren't worrying about scarce rubber any more. And some of us have probably forgotten that, just a few years back, we came too close to losing a war, one embarrassing reason being that the Japs caught us with our rubber pants down on December 7, 1941.

That's why we're glad that President Truman, the other day, sent a second reminder to the Congress, expressing the hope that our lawmakers would give careful consideration to our rubber problems and take speedy-as-possible action on same.

The President said first, and politely, that the Strategic and Critical Stockpiling Act, passed by Congress in 1946, had already given us a permanent stock pile of rubber.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which handles all sales in imported crude rubber, is holding onto a reserve of at least 160,000 tons. Mr. Truman seemed to think that was all right.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER CALLED ESSENTIAL

Mr. Truman next made his most important request, for a continuation of the Second War Powers Act, or those parts of it pertaining to our continued production of synthetic rubber. We spent $700,000,000 to build 52 synthetic-rubber factories, he reminded Congress. Over half of them are still going at full blast. But the British and Dutch have been shipping us record-breaking cargoes of natural rubber for some months, and by early 1948 may be getting enough crude rubber from their Malayan and East Indian plantations to supply us with everything from tires to rubber bands.

In the meantime our production of synthetic rubber has dwindled a bit, from 820,000 tons in 1945 to 750,000 in 1946. The experts say we'll need only about 478,000 tons in 1947. And, as mentioned by Mr. Truman, come 1948 we could rely on imported rubber altogether, and simply scrap our synthetic plants—assuming that we have forgotten all about Pearl Harbor, and gone a bit nuts to boot.

The President, backed up by the Army and the Navy, says that we should keep our synthetic rubber production going at about 250,000 tons per year, with enough emergency plants standing by to give us 350,000 tons more, on quick notice. Our synthetic factories as they stand are geared to produce 1,000,000 tons per year, but the experts seem to believe that 600,000 tons, plus our stock piles, will fill the bill.

Our rubber technicians have done a fine job of improving the quality and versatility of our synthetic products. Nearly all of our rubber is now derived from petroleum, rather than the alcohol which some scientists recommended in the beginning.

Cheap, ready petroleum is now giving us no fewer than 47 varieties of synthetic rubber, all good. Some species have completely replaced natural rubber, which can't be used successfully in contact with oils and certain chemicals. Natural rubber is still better for heavy duty truck and bus tires, but synthetic may catch up there, too.

The rest of Mr. Truman's thoughts on rubber did not deal directly with our national security, but they are nevertheless of interest to all of us citizens of the Temperate Zone, where rubber doesn't grow.

CRUDE PRICES WERE RIGGED

We American tire and tube buyers still haven't forgotten the fancy squeezing which the British-Dutch-French cartel boys gave us back in 1928. That was the year when this jolly foreign monopoly took us over the barrel for $1.25 a pound, which we had to pay, or else. Our squawks that this $1.25 rubber was worth only about 6 or 8 cents at the plantation just didn't change the price.

Right now crude rubber is selling at 25¾ cents, as compared to 18½ cents for our synthetic. But within a year or so, the traders say, our British and Dutch friends may be offering their rubber at a dime or less, whereas we'll have difficulty in getting our synthetic costs down below 14 cents.

But, for national security, and because it's common-sense business, we hope Congress will keep about 25 percent of our rubber plants running, with more ready to swing into action. These Government-owned, privately operated factories cost us $700,000,000 but, so far, they have been one of World War II's few good investments. Let's hang onto them.

The Lilienthal Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Washington Post of February 14, 1947:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)

GRUDGE FIGHT

While the question of the confirmation of David Lilienthal is important as an issue of immediate policy, it is even more important as a symbol. So much of the confusion and conflict of our time adheres around it. It cuts so many ways.

On the political side, it puts an important segment of the Republican leadership in the

strange position of following the lead of vindictive Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR. Senator KENNETH WHERRY would have it otherwise, but the facts speak for themselves.

It was MCKELLAR's grudge fight, abetted by the Hearst-McCormick-Patterson press, that set this policy. The Republicans who follow along are merely saying, "Me, too."

Except in a glancing way, the core of this controversy has not really been touched on. Behind the noisy clamor over "communism" is a struggle to get all power production back into private control. Not Lilienthal but the Tennessee Valley Authority is the real target of this attack.

Back of that is an even more significant triangle of conflict. Private control over atomic power is the objective of a little group who, if the whole story could be bared, would be seen to be inspiring the fight against Lilienthal. That helps to explain the otherwise inexplicable anger with which certain Senators turned on Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson when he went before the Atomic Energy Committee.

Their anger was directed at Acheson for releasing the Acheson-Lilienthal report which recommended putting control of atomic energy under an international authority. The group that helped to draft that report included distinguished scientists and businessmen who worked under the chairmanship of Lilienthal.

They concluded, in effect, that this power was so overwhelming it could not be left to the exploitation of private interests. Private competition would inevitably mean private monopoly. And a monopoly of that kind would finally be a dictatorship.

Under the plan they proposed, atomic power would be available to private business just as TVA power is available at a low cost to private business throughout the Tennessee Valley. It was TVA power which made possible the expansion of the private aluminum industry and the production of more airplanes by private firms than the world had ever dreamed possible.

TVA is grounded in a natural resource—in the rivers that run to the sea. In the same way, atomic power derives from the very stuff of life and from the complex knowledge and skills of thousands of men and women. Incidentally, the atomic power project that is a going concern today cost $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

It would be interesting to be able to identify those who are exploiting the attack on Lilienthal. They, of course, keep discreetly in the background. They know how to employ the technique of the smear and the irrelevancy. For example, the irrelevant, trivial complaints that came years ago from A. E. Morgan, a former member of the TVA Board. These complaints were shown to have been without any substance whatsoever. Yet Morgan is brought back before the congressional committee, and the old jealousies and rivalries are aired once again.

One thing this controversy demonstrates is the way in which communism can be used to distract and divert us. It can condition decisions that should be made on the basis of what is best for us as a nation. The reality of communism is one thing, as we learned, or should have learned, from the espionage case in Canada, where the matter was handled with dispatch and efficiency. But the hysteria provoked by the smear is something quite different. Hysteria can corrupt our decisions, so that we act in fear and not in reason.

The probability is that Lilienthal will be confirmed. If he fails of confirmation, then the possibility of finding other civilians who would be willing to submit to this form of Indian torture is slight.

That raises still another point. The shadow of stalemate between a Republican Congress and a Democratic Chief Executive has already fallen across this critical year. If the next 18 months are to be given over to futile wrangling, then our position and prestige before the world will rapidly vanish.

At times you have a little of the feeling that it was at this point in the movie that you came in. Perhaps the film of the 1920's is to be run off again, but faster, much faster this time.

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

THE SENATE PLAYS WITH DESTINY

It is not too much to say that the American future may hang on the outcome of the fight on David E. Lilienthal's confirmation as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Soundly developed, the incalculable force of atomic energy is capable of revolutionizing the world's sorry economic pattern, and laying the foundation of general plenty within the foreseeable future. Lilienthal and his colleagues, who are not simpletons, have frankly said as much after their survey of the Manhattan District's facilities and installations. Sumner Pike, who is a New Englander, a Republican and a businessman who quite successfully "met a pay roll," virtually testified to this effect at the Senate hearings.

Sound development of these immeasurable potentialities in this country will, in turn, vastly strengthen the American effort to place atomic energy under international control. And here we see the other side of the medal. For atomic energy is not only the means of life; it is also the means of death. And if control is not achieved, wise and informed men must join the Seventh Day Adventists and the Shakers of the old days, in making ready for something not too unlike the end of the world.

These grim facts, which are all too easy to forget, provide the almost melodramatic background for the sordid scene now being enacted in the Senate Office Building's No. 2 hearing room. In Lilienthal, President Truman selected one of the two or three men who have in recent years earned the title of great public servants. He has conserved the TVA resources, and raised the level of life in a whole vast region of this country which had been sinking into poverty and devastation. In the Tennessee Valley, furthermore, he has set an example of decentralization of Government power, of democracy in action, of constant, friendly responsiveness to the will of those he served. When he was named, the immense majority of Americans told themselves, with a sigh of relief, that the President had chosen the best man available to handle the biggest administrative job in the country.

He is now under attack by a survivor of the Paleozoic era of American politics, an aged Senator who has lived all his political life by the greedy pursuit of pork and patronage, and hates Lilienthal only because these insatiable appetites of his were not adequately catered to by the TVA. Yet a sufficient number of other Senators are joining Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR to make it doubtful whether Lilienthal will be confirmed. They are doing so, moreover, although they well understand MCKELLAR'S motives; although they know the charges against Lilienthal are trumped-up nonsense; and although this man, accused of communism, has answered his accuser with the best statement of the meaning of democracy that America has heard in the past decade. That, quite, literally, is the scene that meets the eye these days at the Capitol, with the ominous question of life or death for its dark backdrop.

What is the explanation? The mere presence of MCKELLAR in the Senate has made most of his colleagues reasonably self-conscious for a good many years. If no one believes his charges, and no one admires his character, where on earth does his support come from?

The answer, which is very simple, comes in two parts. It is significant, first of all, the first voice to be raised against Lilienthal after that of MCKELLAR should have been the voice of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire. BRIDGES' burning conviction that the views of the power lobby were the charter of American liberties has long been known to most people in Washington. It is also significant that one of the two or three atomic committee members probably opposed to Lilienthal should be Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, which is about the only remaining State where the power people have a real grip on local politics.

These are straws in the wind which point to an important truth. The majority of the American power industry has gained in wisdom in the past 14 years. But there is still a strong minority who talk of free enterprise and mean freedom to behave in the manner of Samuel Insull, and blather of communism and mean the saintly George W. Norris. These men are putting the heat on. And they are putting it on, furthermore, because they are well aware of the probably revolutionary effect on energy production of atomic fission, and wish to get this incalculable asset into the kind of mediocre, fumbling hands they regard as safe.

Secondly, a good many Republicans are beginning to be gripped with a reaction of plain, narrow partisanship. Even Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, the Republican leader, is understood to favor rejection of Lilienthal's nomination on the simple ground that he is a New Dealer, without further reference to the merits of the case. The idea is that the Senate must teach President Truman a lesson. Truman must be shown that nothing even faintly tinged with any reminiscence of the accomplishments of the last 14 years will be tolerated for an instant. It may or may not be true that Senator TAFT subscribes to this extraordinary doctrine which implies that the golden age ended with the defeat of President Hoover. But a good many Senators, such as the loquacious former undertaker, KENNETH WHERRY, have taken this position.

Thus far, on the other hand, there is every indication that TAFT's coleader, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, will show in this connection the same grasp of the realities of modern life that he has shown before. It is difficult to believe that he or any other sensible Republican can expect the party to forge on to victory bearing a banner with the strange device:

"Back to Herbert Hoover, Calvin Coolidge, and Warren Gamaliel Harding."

Xen Hicks, Senior Circuit Judge, Sixth Circuit, One of America's Great Jurists

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, Judge Xen Hicks, whose home is at Clinton, Tenn., is one of the Nation's most capable and well-loved jurists. The February 1947 issue of the American Bar Association Journal contains an excellent sketch of Judge Hicks. In his seventy-fifth year, he is completing 34 years of diligent service in the courts of Tennessee and of the United States. He has served 24 years on a Federal bench, nearly 19 years of which has been in his present court. His long, capable, and splendid service has gained for him the admira-

tion and respect of members of the bar, not only in his own circuit but throughout the United States.

The American Law Journal's article is as follows:

SKETCH OF JUDGE HICKS

While five senior circuit judges have served longer than he on the Federal bench, only one received his judicial commission before Judge Xen Hicks began his career in the State courts of Tennessee.

Judge Hicks is a product of east Tennessee—a region unique and celebrated in song and story. Most east Tennesseans are individualists, have strong convictions, and are undisturbed by their nonconformity to the mores of the State's other two "grand divisions" as they are referred to in the Tennessee Constitution—middle and west Tennessee. They have adhered to the Republican Party since its formation and at each biennial session of the Tennessee General Assembly their senators and representatives form an articulate and effective minority. During the Confederate War the east Tennesseans were not only overwhelmingly Unionist in sympathy but no area with a comparable population furnished more volunteer soldiers to the Northern armies.

A native east Tennessean who served 4 years as a Federal soldier was Judge Hicks' father, William R. Hicks. After the war he was elected judge of the circuit court—Tennessee's nisi prius court of general jurisdiction. He must have accomplished the difficult task of giving general satisfaction to the lawyers of his circuit, for Judge Hicks is the possessor of a gold-headed cane which the bar of the circuit presented as a token of esteem to his father.

Judge Hicks was born 74 years ago—14 years before his father went on the bench—in the small mountain town of Clinton. At 19 he was graduated from a nearby college, significantly named for Gen. U. S. Grant. For his law course he went to Tennessee's blue-grass country and the law school of Cumberland University, then one of the most renowned of the South. He and his classmate and roommate, Chief Justice Grafton Green, of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, received their LL. B.'s in 1892. Shortly thereafter Judge Hicks returned home and entered upon active practice.

CONDITIONS OF HIS EARLY PRACTICE

While Judge Hicks has always maintained his home at Clinton, in his practice he rode the circuit through several east Tennessee counties. His career at the bar fitted him to meet the most rigorous requirements of those who believe that trial experience is an essential qualification for any judge. Opportunities were abundant. One proposition from which no Tennessee appellate judge has ever dissented is that more litigation originates in east Tennessee than in all the rest of tne State combined; indeed, some have gone so far as to hold that during the period when Judge Hicks was at the bar, all major controversies of the mountaineers and most minor ones eventually found their way into court.

The east Tennessean is inclined to the view that no lawyer is entitled to retain his license unless he is able to hold his own in the give and take of the courtroom. Physically and mentally vigorous, fearless and forceful in advocacy, Judge Hicks participated in the trial of probably every kind of a case—civil or criminal—that later came before him as a State or Federal trial judge.

His capacity for work is demonstrated by the fact that during this busy period he found time to serve in many public positions—among others, city attorney, county attorney, member of the State senate, and assistant prosecuting attorney. In the two decades of his practice he permitted himself only one sabbatical year during which he served as a captain in the Sixth United States Volunteer Infantry in the Spanish-American War.

TEN YEARS OF SERVICE ON THE STATE BENCH

In the last half century Tennessee has had only two Republican Governors. Of these, Ben W. Hooper was a highly controversial character, but even middle and west Tennessee Democrats are said to admit that he performed some creditable acts. One of these was his selection in 1913 of Judge Hicks as judge of the criminal and law court of the second circuit. The appointment evidently met with the approval of the people of the circuit, for when the court became a circuit court, Judge Hicks was in 1914 elected circuit judge without opposition, and in 1918, again without opposition, reelected for a second term. He served an even decade on the State bench, until he was appointed United States district judge in 1923.

These were full years. Most of the circuit was mountainous. Two of its counties were inaccessible by railroad, and at that time few of the highways were even graded. To get to Hancock County, Judge Hicks had to travel overland for 40 miles over one mountain and across two rivers which were frequently swollen. Fentress County was equally inaccessible.

HELD IN HIGH RESPECT BY THE PEOPLE

These mountain people liked Judge Hicks and he liked them. He once described them as "on the whole honest, intelligent, debt-paying, God-fearing folk." They had great respect for the courts. Young and old alike stood uncovered in Judge Hicks' presence and all made way for him as he walked from his lodgings to the courthouse. Typical of these people is Alvin York, who was born and still lives in Fentress County. Judge Hicks, of course, knew Alvin York and all the members of his family, for he was as well acquainted with the people of his circuit as he was with his fellow townsmen at Clinton.

The difficulty of travel was not the only burden imposed by this rugged circuit. The dockets were heavy, and Judge Hicks had hard work in disposing of them. Some of the counties were criss-crossed by railroads and dotted with coal mines and other industries which gave rise to intricate and important litigation. So absorbing were Judge Hicks' duties that he was at home only 3 or 4 weeks a year. Many of the cases tried before him were appealed to the Supreme Court of Tennessee, but few were reversed.

Nineteen twenty was an especially onerous year for Judge Hicks; that year he presided in 20 trials for murder, resulting in 18 convictions. All of the death sentences were appealed and affirmed, and there were seven electrocutions.

APPOINTMENT AS A FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE

It was because of his excellent record as a State trial judge that President Harding in 1923 nominated Judge Hicks as United States district judge for the eastern and middle districts of Tennessee, to succeed Judge Edwin T. Sanford, who had been elevated to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The transition from the State to the Federal bench was quickly accomplished. Most of Judge Hicks' work had been done in the eastern district, which embraced the entire east Tennessee "grand division" of the State, including Judge Hicks' old circuit. Except for those which contained the cities of Knoxville and Chattanooga, most of the counties of the district were similar to those with which Judge Hicks was already so intimately acquainted. He therefore came to the Federal bench with a thorough knowledge of the people, the problems, and the business of his district.

Moreover, he had previously had considerable practice in the Federal courts, and was familiar with all the categories of litigation which were likely to come before it. On the State bench Judge Hicks had become well versed in the judicial process and had proved himself extraordinarily capable. However, for 10 years he had had no contact with Federal practice and procedure. Cases tried under the Conformity Act gave him no concern, for his varied experience as circuit judge had made him an expert in Tennessee practice. But he was required by force of circumstances to master quickly the unique intricacies of the old Federal practice, for he was confronted with a heavy task.

When he left the district bench its docket was current. That this was accomplished without any sacrifice of justice is evidenced by the fact that of 57 of his decisions which were appealed, all but 6 were affirmed.

ELEVATION TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

On the nomination of President Coolidge, Judge Hicks became a member of the circuit court of appeals on June 12, 1928. For 9 years he has been the senior circuit judge for the sixth circuit.

Since the organization of the circuit courts of appeals in 1890, the sixth circuit has consistently had an excellent record in the administration of justice. Above the bench in the courtroom at Cincinnati are the portraits of three judges (Howell E. Jackson, Horace H. Lurton, and William R. Day) who went from it to the Supreme Court, and of one (William Howard Taft) who became Chief Justice of the United States.

MARKED DIVERSITY IN THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

No doubt one reason why its opinions are so frequently cited is the great variety of the questions with which it has dealt. This is the result in part of the marked diversity of the area which comprises it. It slices the heart of the Nation from north to south—from the Canadian border to the north line of the Gulf State—Mississippi. Cases come to it from "the western waters"—the Ohio and Mississippi; from the Great Lakes; from the Ohio farm lands and the cotton plantations along its southern boundary; from the blue-grass country and the mountains of Kentucky and Tennessee; from the great industrial cities of Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Detroit.

The sixth has escaped few problems that have been posed for any other circuit court of appeals east of the Mississippi. It has had its quota of cases in the specialized fields of admiralty and patent law. Some of the seacoast circuits have decided more admiralty cases, but the sixth is near the top in dealing with important patent litigation.

Although when Judge Hicks became a circuit judge he had had little experience in patent work, he demonstrated his balanced judicial competency by quickly mastering its intricacies, and has written 48 percent opinions, covering a wide range from foundation garments for women to a method of carburetion for multiple-cylindered engines.

The work of the court has constantly increased. Prior to Judge Hicks' appointment it consisted of three judges; he became the fourth member when Congress authorized an additional judge. There are now six circuit judges and during the same period the number of district judges in the circuit has been increased from 10 to 20.

SCOPE AND VARIETY OF JUDGE HICKS' OPINIONS

During his incumbency as circuit judge, Judge Hicks has sat in 2,130 cases and has written opinions, including dissents, in 467 cases. Unlike some judges, he has specialized in no particular field: one of his salient characteristics is his versatility in dealing with significant cases of first impression. He presided over the initial sitting of his court en banc and wrote the opinion in the first treason case to reach a United States appellate court—an opinion that admirably discloses the meticulous care he exercises in disposing of every substantial insistence

made in an important case. He interpreted the Lindbergh (kidnapping) Act, holding that the jury was warranted in recommending the death penalty under the facts of the case and affirming the sentence. He established liability for double assessment of stockholders of a holding company which in turn owned the stock of defunct national banks. He limited the bargaining rights, under NLRA, of armed guards and others who had taken an oath as military police of the United States Government, emphasizing the obligation of the National Labor Board to perform its duties in the interest of the public.

Only one of Judge Hicks' opinions negates the validity of an act of Congress. This held unconstitutional, on the ground that there must be a logical connection between the proven and presumptive facts, a statute enacting that a firearm found in the possession of one who had been convicted of a crime of violence would be presumed to have been transported in interstate commerce in violation of the Federal Firearms Act. Nor has Judge Hicks been inclined to invalidate State legislation. Typical of this attitude is his opinion holding the Tennessee poll-tax requirement for voting constitutional, even as to election of a Federal official, in this instance a Representative in Congress.

Although few circuit judges have more frequently voted to affirm criminal cases, Judge Hicks is always alert for any substantial invasion of the rights of the accused. He is inclined to pay close attention to any claim that evidence has been improperly obtained, and is not reluctant to reprehend officers for the improper or careless use of firearms. In such cases his conclusions rest—to use the language of Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr., which he once quoted—"not so much upon a higher critical examination of the accumulated decisional gloss as upon a common-sense determination." Thus, in a case where the Supreme Court reversed because the record suggested that confessions were improperly obtained, he did not upon another appeal hesitate to write an affirmance of a second conviction when he believed that on the new trial the Government had sufficiently proved that no statutory or constitutional right of the accused had been invaded.

An opinion of Judge Hicks' which is frequently cited and relied upon is an excellent exposition of the scope of review by an appellate court of an order of the National Labor Relations Board.

Judge Hicks has always enjoyed the equity side of the dockets in both the district and appellate courts; he has also maintained his keen interest in questions of practice and procedure. In an involved reorganization case he welcomed the opportunity to discuss the weight to be given the findings of the master and district judge, writing as always succinctly and with admirable lucidity.

The reluctance of the Supreme Court to deal with common-law questions has so increased that only 1 of its 137 opinions delivered during the last term was without some Federal question. The result is that the circuit courts of appeals have become in reality courts of last resort for a large number of cases in which the jurisdiction of the district court was based solely upon diversity of citizenship. Judge Hicks' 10 years as a State judge and 5 years as a district judge have admirably equipped him for deciding cases of this nature.

Illustrative of his approach and reasoning are his opinions in three leading cases: One fixing the common-law liability of bank directors for negligence in supervising the activities of the bank's officers; another construing a clause in an insurance policy denying recovery of double indemnity for death where insured "participates in aviation or aeronautics" so as to permit recovery where death of a passenger resulted from the crash of a commercial air liner; and a third applying the law of libel to almost incredible facts of mistaken identity.

Judge Hicks, despite the eminence to which he has attained, does not flinch from laboring in the dreary fields of "facts." His training and experience have conditioned him to respect the realities; he does not decide cases in vacuo. Rather, with painstaking care and self-effacement he examines the data included in the printed record; he marshals, rearranges, analyzes, synthesizes it; he brings it to life and traces it from a definite point of beginning through a charted course to a point of conclusion—and inexorably his legal conclusions are shaped by this process.

Cases that turn upon the common law probably most accurately disclose Judge Hicks' methods and best illustrate the style of his opinions. There is always a willingness to follow binding authority; there are few citations, and these only of cases directly in point; no authority is relied upon without having been carefully examined—not even an earlier opinion written by himself. When the law is not definitely settled there is rarely an attempt to deduce a rule from a multitude of conflicting cases or from oblique opinions of other judges; instead, the holding is based upon reason and the dictates of justice. There is no pontification, no generalization, no dictum. The sentences are lean and devoid of ornament, the opinion succinct. Words are used for their precise denotations, not their suggestive connotations. Clarity, not fine writing, is the objective. His métier is neither the sparkling epigram nor the quotable phrase, but exact exposition. He is of the school of Hughes, not that of Holmes or Cardozo.

TERSENESS AND RESTRAINT ON THE BENCH

Always there is a terseness amounting almost to reticence which is characteristic of many east Tennesseans. On the bench he is not an overspeaking judge. If he does not go quite so far as St. Paul and suffer gladly those who speak unwisely and beside the point, at least he does suffer them patiently. He always permits counsel to open his case fully; indeed, he rarely at any stage interjects a remark or question, and then only when the thread of argument disappears in a fog of obscurity or when there is an obvious waste of time. This reserve of Judge Hicks' is not a recently acquired trait. Not only was it noticeable when he first went on the circuit bench, but he was never loquacious as a district judge.

The young lawyer who appears at the opening of court at 9 a. m. for enrollment and immediately thereafter argues his first case is usually so impressed by Judge Hicks' dignity and silent restraint that he thinks he senses about the senior judge and the court an aura of austerity. Experience, however, soon convinces him that the sixth circuit court is a delightful tribunal before which to argue a case. That experience almost always begins that same afternoon, when he is taken to Judge Hicks' chambers for a personal introduction. He is likely to find the dignified gowned judge of the morning with his coat off and his office in disarray, hard at work on an opinion or some problem of court administration.

Genial and companionable as well as informal, Judge Hicks is never too busy to greet either an old friend or a young lawyer. No one meets him without being impressed by his naturalness and his unaffected interest in individuals, and few leave him without having enjoyed his quiet humor. The fortunate learn that he is a gifted raconteur with a seemingly inexhaustible fund of fresh and pungent stories, racy of his beloved mountains.

When one reflects that this senior judge has not only a gentle sense of humor and liking for and understanding of people but is a practicalist, not a dogmatist; is tolerant of the views of others and always willing to have his own challenged; that he wears no pride of office; then perhaps one has in part at least the clue to the unusual harmony which prevails in the sixth circuit court of appeals. If one could penetrate the conference room one would find the presiding judge always poised and quietly attentive to the divergent views expressed by his colleagues and would hear them affectionately refer to him as the Captain. No lawyer at least will argue that any mundane judge has ever been invariably right; but Judge Hicks' admirers can claim for him that he has never been betrayed into any hasty or insufficiently considered utterance or action on the bench, in conference or in performing his administrative duties. Those who know him best will not be surprised to learn that of the 208 opinions which he has written since he has been senior judge only 7 have been dissents, or that in the 940 cases in which he has sat during that time only 27 dissenting opinions have been filed. Even more revealing is the fact that not one of these dissenting opinions, by whomever written, contains any ill-tempered language or caustic reference to the views of any other member of the court.

Judge Hicks can spare little time from his judicial duties for outside activities. When he is in need of rest or recreation some Antaeus-like instinct sends him back to his old home at Clinton. On its spacious grounds there is a magnificent grove of ancient trees which the judge refers to as his judicial forest. Many of the oaks and elms have been named for those he admires in the judiciary. A mighty elm, towering above all the others, he long ago christened "Old John Marshall."

Resolution of Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the attached resolution of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore.

I hope that our Government will wholeheartedly support the principles and objectives of this resolution, and that we will not only continue to recognize the sovereignty of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia but that we shall exert our effort and influence to the reestablishment of those Republics.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OBSERVANCE OF THE "REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA INDEPENDENCE DAY," ALSO STATE OF MARYLAND GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES OF BALTIMORE ON FEBRUARY 16, 1947

Whereas the oppressed people of Lithuania are unable to express their grievances, defend their rights and voice their view in protest against the incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas we, as citizens of the United States of America, are deeply concerned with the destiny of Lithuania and especially her right to be recognized as a free and inde-

pendent nation: Now, therefore, be it and it is hereby

Resolved, That we urgently appeal to the Government of the United States to fulfillment of its policy declarations and in particular the following:

1. To continue to recognize the sovereignty of the Republics of Lituania, Latvia, and Estonia;

2. To protect and assist Lithuanian refugees in Europe;

3. To insist that free and unfettered elections be held in Lithuania;

4. To adhere to the twelve points, as expressed by President Truman;

5. That Russia immediately withdraw her armed forces and secret police from Lithuanian territory.

ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President.
VERA MIKUSAUCKAS,
Secretary.

Address by Hon. George D. Aiken, of Vermont, on Problems of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] before the Vermont State Legislature on February 4, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At no time since history began have the people of the world been faced with such complex and multiple problems as they are today

World War II resulted in the elimination of distance; in the development of the means to destroy entire cities or nations from remote points of vantage, and in other developments of science far beyond the stage which we have reached in our social and moral progress.

Regardless of where scientific knowledge originates today, it soon becomes known in all parts of the world.

Race and color are no barriers in the acquisition of such knowledge.

Conflicting ideologies of government have divided the world into nationalistic groups, distrustful of one another.

The peoples of the Orient, comprising half the world's population, are seething with restlessness, a restlessness accentuated by the scientific advancements of the war and the political promptings of strife-provoking ideologists both from within and without.

Seventy-five percent of the world's inhabitants are chronically in fear of famine, and they look hopefully and enviously, even covetously, upon those few nations where fortune has smiled more generously.

The United States holds the paradoxical position of being the most fortunate nation on earth today, while at the same time we would be the first great nation marked for destruction in the event that human minds cannot devise a means of preventing further war.

Our people comprise about 7 percent of the world's population.

We own only 9 percent of the world's resources and yet control over the concentrated wealth of the world lies largely in our hands.

We have tremendous political and economic power today—power which if used wisely can lead the world to a better day for all.

Yet, with this clear obligation to lead before us, we are, as a Nation, confused in our thinking and conflicting in our policies.

Since fortune has placed in our hands a power and a duty such as has never rested in a nation before, we ought, above all else, to maintain the ability to continue this leadership and to exercise it wisely.

That means we must, first of all, keep our own Nation strong.

Such determination will not conflict in the least with our duties to the rest of the world.

Unless we maintain strength commensurate with our responsibilities, we cannot expect to retain such leadership.

How can we continue to keep the United States the strongest nation in the world?

We can do this by simply making use of the resources which we possess.

The first and most important of these resources is our human wealth—the men and women who make up our population. Upon them all else depends.

Therefore, it is our duty to see that we are prepared not only to accept our responsibilities as a nation but that as individuals we are prepared mentally, morally, and physically to perform our duties in this respect.

No matter is of more vital importance than the adequate education of our children.

We are learning to our sorrow what failure to give heed to the needs of education means to our country.

It cost us untold billions of dollars during the late war.

I am told that it cost the Army $175 per month per person to teach grown men how to spell "cat" and "dog" with wooden blocks, as compared with a cost of $100 per year to provide a fairly good education in childhood.

Education in the United States today is backed up against the wall. Only a very small percentage of our young people are willing to embark upon the teaching profession. Since 1939, 350,000 public-school teachers have quit their work. We must face this problem, and face it without delay.

It is very gratifying to see that Vermont is cognizant of this situation and intends to do something about it.

Education, however, is not a matter for each State to deal with by itself, but has become a first-grade national problem.

A large percentage of our people do not settle down and make their living in the State where they received their education, and an uneducated person from New England may become a human liability in some other part of the country in later years.

Further than that, the wealth of our Nation, although created in all States, has become largely concentrated in a few populous centers.

I believe that while States and communities should never be relieved of the responsibility for educating their children and should have the duty and authority to do this, that the time has come when, through the Federal Government, we should tax the wealth of the Nation wherever it is to be found and redistribute such funds collected wherever the need is.

It was this belief that prompted me to introduce a bill into this Congress which would put a floor of $100 per pupil under the education of every child in America and insure this minimum education to all our boys and girls.

I would eventually have the Federal Government be responsible for collecting and distributing funds equal to about one-third the cost of all education in our elementary and secondary schools.

This would be accomplished through the ultimate contribution of $60 per pupil to the education of every child in the public schools of every State.

Every dollar of such contribution would be spent under the authority of the State itself.

I also hold that the health and welfare of each child is of equal importance to us nationally, regardless of where he attends school.

Therefore, I would also make available a contribution which would provide from $20 to $30 per pupil toward the maintenance of health and educational facilities in nontaxable, nonprofit private schools, of which Vermont has a great many.

The proposals embodied in my bill will cost the Nation considerable money in terms of dollars, but actually less than 1 percent of our national income.

Those who advocate a floor of $40 per pupil for education are proposing a totally inadequate means of meeting the situation, for the State that spends the least per capita on education today spends $43 per pupil.

We must decide whether an adequate education for all is worth the cost. I believe it is.

I believe that such an expenditure would be an excellent investment which would yield returns far out of proportion to the cost.

I do not know what the Congress will do about Federal aid to education, but I believe that whatever we do, we should do right, with a view to having the best-educated nation in the world and not to offer this aid as a political sop to a restless voting public.

Next to an adequate education, in the conservation and development of our national resources, I would place the health of our people.

We learned during the war that by neglecting the health of our youth we had wasted resources of a greater value than the entire cost of providing adequate medical and hospital care to all our people would have been.

We ought to be shocked and chagrined at the revelations which exposed our neglect of this resource.

I am particularly pleased that your Governor has placed so much emphasis upon the maintenance of good health in our schools, and I don't believe that Vermont is going to further neglect this obligation as far as it lies within the State's power to meet it.

The Federal Government is doing much toward this end. The present Congress will continue to make contributions to improved health now that the need has been so tragically shown.

Next to the conservation of human resources, the proper utilization of our natural resources is of vital importance.

Our soil, our mineral, our forest, and our water resources must command our attention if we are to remain nationally strong and prosperous.

Although America has produced record-breaking crops during the last few years, we have now exhausted the virgin fertility of the soil until this year nearly every part of the United States is demanding large amounts of commercial fertilizer in order to maintain food production on a level which the needs of the world demand.

Only a few short years ago, the use of commercial fertilizer was practically unknown in the grain-producing areas of this country.

We must restore and maintain soil fertility if we are to avoid the predicament of many overpopulated Old World nations.

An effort will be made in the Congress to reduce the soil-building program by one-third. The President has recommended it in his Budget message.

I believe it would be a shortsighted policy to further deplete our topsoil, on which the life of the individual and the Nation ultimately depends, in order to save $100,000,000.

Our soil and our forests are basic foundations of our economic life which must be preserved at all costs.

One of the greatest problems facing the Nation today is the shortage of electrical energy.

Even those areas where a few years ago it was thought the power supply would be adequate to meet demands for many years into the future are now beginning to feel the pinch.

This lack is likely to be felt most keenly in northeastern United States, and particularly in New England.

I recently made an inquiry of the Federal Power Commission regarding the supply and demand of the power companies doing business in Vermont and was advised that the demand has already exceeded the dependable supply. The area covered by these companies covers all New England States, except Maine.

Let me quote from the letter which I received from the Federal Power Commission:

"The conservatively estimated peak load of 686,540 kilowatts for 1946 exceeds the present assured capacity by 9 percent and is actually higher than the scheduled capacity for 1947, which will not be available until the latter half of this year."

Thus it appears that, with a rapidly increasing need, there is virtually no possibility of an expansion of industry using substantial amounts of electric energy in Vermont and no possibility of supplying all farm homes with the power they will need when electrical equipment becomes available and hundreds of miles more of lines are constructed, unless we develop additional sources of power.

The only sites in the Northeast offering large sources of power which can be developed at low cost are those on the St. Lawrence River and the Niagara Falls.

Here is approximately 2,000,000 horsepower going to waste while our industry and our farms and our homes are restricted.

Right now our industries can find markets for all they produce; but, once production equals demand, many of them will be unable to meet the competition from more favored sections and will have to move away or go out of business unless our power and transportation facilities are improved.

It seems so foolish for us to tolerate the obstruction of developments which would bring to us the greatest industrial advantages enjoyed by any part of North America.

In addition to the need for electrical energy, we need better transportation facilities of all kinds not only in Vermont but in the entire Nation.

The highway-building program must be expanded.

The development of airports of all sizes must go on.

Waterways which will provide cheap transportation for certain kinds of freight must be developed.

Yet, down in Washington high-paid lobbyists are at work day and night to prevent the expansion of these transportation facilities upon which the greater future of the United States depends.

For a generation, the over-all growth of Vermont has remained stagnant, and it will remain so until the people of this State join with the people of other States in sweeping aside obstructionists and the disciples of scarcity and high prices.

Any discussion of the work lying before the Eightieth Congress would, of course, be incomplete if no mention were made of the great mass of proposed labor legislation which confronts us.

Legislation of this nature is uppermost in the minds of a great many people.

During the years of war, labor and industry toiled heroically and almost without interruption to set a record for production far beyond anything the world has ever seen.

Although both wages and profits were high, the strain of the war left its marks upon the industrialist and upon his employees.

Nerves on both sides were taut, and, with the ending of the war with Japan, tempers which had heretofore been restrained flared up and disputes which had so far been adjudicated solely by Government orders again erupted.

Millions of civilian workers and employers who had been afflicted with war nerves and laboring under Government controls and restraints threw off these shackles and the accumulated grievances of 4 years of war burst into the open.

The series of crippling strikes which occurred late in 1945 and the year 1946 were part of the price we had to pay for war.

The coal miners' strike of December 1946 brought home to both employers and employees the realization that a continuance of these strikes would inevitably bring about a change in our form of government.

This realization apparently had a sobering effect upon all believers in democracy and the free enterprise system.

Right now there is a greater willingness to practice genuine collective bargaining on the part of both employers and the unions than there has been for years.

There is rapidly increasing evidence that labor and industry are more willing to settle their differences the Vermont way, which is simply the application of common sense on the part of both.

The country is virtually rid of strikes today and there is good reason to believe that we can enjoy a long period of prosperity for both industry and labor.

However, the paralyzing effect of the coal strike created an almost universal demand for Congressional action to protect the Nation in the future.

Congress now has dozens of bills before it for action. Some new laws will be enacted.

Labor leaders privately admit that some of the positions they have taken in the past are untenable.

Industry as a whole is more interested in continuous and profitable production than it is in getting even with certain union leaders.

I believe that the Congress will enact legislation which will make clearer the responsibilities which both employers and the unions have to the Nation.

I do not believe that any legislation which would destroy the unions or deprive the workingman of the rights guaranteed him by our Constitution will become law at this session of Congress.

In considering the over-all problems of labor relations, we should divide labor disturbances into two classes—those which cause national paralysis, such as strikes in coal mines and railroads, and strikes of a different nature where the controversy lies principally between a private employer and those who work for him.

The problem of the Congress is to find some way whereby strikes causing national paralysis will be eliminated from the economic scene without doing violence to our form of government.

The correct solution is not easy to find, but I feel that substantial progress will be made in eliminating the threat of disastrous labor disturbances for some years to come.

In addition to these issues I have mentioned, there are other categories of work which will devolve upon the new Congress. There is, for example, the question of clarifying the relationship between the Federal Government and State governments.

For nearly 15 years the State as a unit of government has been relegated more and more into a subordinate status while political power has been concentrated more and more with the Federal Government.

In the Eightieth Congress, however, we will undoubtedly see a greater clarification of the functions of both the State governments and the Federal Government and a clearer definition of the responsibilities of each.

The trend today is distinctly toward a return of authority and responsibility to State and local governments.

Perhaps this is because State and local governments in general are better prepared financially to accept responsibilities than they have been for many years past.

I do not mean to infer that the Federal Government is going to assume less importance. Such a statement would not accord with the facts, but I do mean that State and local governments ought from now on to prepare themselves to accept greater responsibilities and to rely less upon Federal agencies when they become involved in difficulties.

It so happens that one of the duties of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman, is to study the relationship of the Federal Government to the States.

I am fortunate in having on my committee five ex-governors besides myself, who are amply qualified to make such a study.

We are authorized under the law not only to study State-Federal relationships as relate to grant-in-aid, but also such other matters as a division of the field of taxation between the States and the Federal Government.

I do not want anyone to expect too quick results from this study because it is a long, hard job in itself, and is only one of the many duties which devolve upon this committee.

You may be interested to know that the committee is also charged with the duty of studying the operations of government at all levels, with a view to determining its efficiency and economy.

I sincerely hope that before we get through we may be able to imbue the Federal Government with some degree of the economy and efficiency for which the Vermont State government is traditionally well known.

This does not mean that we should blindly oppose the spending of money—even the taxpayers' money.

Through tax money well spent, we are able to obtain benefits for all of us which we could never hope to achieve as individuals or groups.

Our aim should be, and the aim of my committee will be, to see that we get the maximum value possible out of every dollar spent; to see that every dollar spent by Government is spent as an investment which will yield satisfactory returns on that dollar.

This thought brings me to the subject which is perhaps most widely discussed in connection with the Eightieth Congress. That is the subject of tax reduction, debt reduction, and lower expenses of Government.

After last fall's election, I was disturbed when prominent leaders of my party announced that we would seek a reduction in the budget to $30,000,000,000 or less and would give the income-tax payer a flat cut of 20 percent straight across the board.

Perhaps it was the flush of victory that prompted such promises and predictions, but now that the Congress is in session, we are faced with the cold, bare facts and must realize that we can neither cut the Federal spending this year to less than $30,000,000,000 nor reduce taxes 20 percent across the board if our governmental economy is to remain on a sound basis.

The principal expenses of the Federal Government today are for interest on our national debt, payments for services to veterans, and the expenses of maintaining our

armed services both here and throughout the world.

The budget request for these items alone amounts to about $24,000,000,000, or three times the total expense of the Federal Government before the war.

Add to this the amount needed for tax refunds, for fixed foreign commitments, and for social security payments required by law, and you have $30,000,000,000 right there.

With the exception of national defense costs, there is no chance of reducing these fixed commitments.

While the request for the armed services will probably be cut somewhat and there is an opportunity to eliminate wastefulness in these services, yet the world today is not in such condition politically that we can afford to weaken the defenses upon which the security of our Nation depends.

Besides these items, all the rest of the requests for Government expenses this year amount to only between six and seven billion dollars.

There is undoubtedly a chance to reduce these amounts somewhat, but we cannot approach very closely the post-election enthusiasm and optimism of those who predicted a reduction of over $10,000,000,000 in Government expenses this year.

Not only should we not gamble with the safety of our country, but we should make adequate provision for a substantial reduction in the two-hundred-and-sixty-odd-billion-dollar national debt which hangs like a millstone around the neck of every American citizen.

After we do this, we will know how much taxes can be lowered.

We will reduce expenses. We will reduce taxes somewhat, but we must not reduce them below the point which means the margin of safety for all of us.

In this talk today I have tried to call to your attention some of the more pressing problems with which the Nation and the Congress are confronted.

They are not the only ones, by any means, and perhaps not the most serious ones, but they are indicative of the great task that lies before us.

If one chooses to look only on the dark side, the future may seem very depressing indeed. However, we have had seemingly insoluble problems before. There have been times when things looked as hopeless as they do now and somehow or other we found the means to cope with our troubles and to come through stronger than ever before.

I am confident in our ability to do so again, in spite of the fact that these problems are more complex and of wider scope than ever before.

I am optimistic that the entire world will emerge from the fog of uncertainty and distrust into a field of expanded social, economic, scientific, and political progress.

We should not be depressed by the confusion which now engulfs us, but should lustily accept the challenge to bring about a healthier, happier, and more prosperous world.

Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last night in New York City I delivered a speech commemorating the fifty-fifth anniversary of the birth of that great American whom I considered one of the greatest members of our party—Wendell Willkie. The speech is entitled "Wendell Willkie—One of the Great Ones." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WENDELL WILLKIE—ONE OF THE GREAT ONES

It is a great honor and a solemn responsibility to speak words of tribute to the memory of Wendell Willkie. I am humbled by the honor. I fear that I cannot meet the responsibility except insofar as my lips freshen your memories of some of Wendell Willkie's great words which were so prophetic of the issues and struggles which confound the Nation and the world today.

I speak not only out of deep admiration for Willkie as a man and a leader of men but also from the depths of my conviction that the dynamics of Willkie's social and political philosophy point the way to economic stability within our Nation and to peace among nations.

Willkie's abiding faith in the principles of human rights, civil liberties, racial tolerance, equality of economic opportunity for all, free of unfair discrimination because of race, color, or creed, the superiority of the dignity of the individual over liberty-destroying claims of the state, the importance of free education to free minds, is beautifully epitomized and memorialized in the living actions and humanitarian programs of Freedom House.

His code of human rights was the foundation upon which he built his "one world" philosophy. He knew what so many here at home, as well as abroad, still have to learn—that human rights cannot be nationalized or become the monopoly of any nation or any group within a nation because in their true essence they are the teachings of God.

Willkie also knew that any political party which barters, sacrifices, or exploits human rights is bound, sooner or later, to write its own political doom. He warned us that in the new, and now very small, "one world," that since his death has been made even smaller by the atomic bomb, no nation can live unto its selfish interests alone. Would that my Republican Party, through its leaders in Washington today, could grasp the full significance and true meaning of the great principles, teachings, and warnings which Wendell Willkie gave to his party and to his country. I wish to mention a few of them tonight, but before I do that I want to answer the small critics of that great man—some of them being so-called professional liberals—who have tried to picture Willkie as a man who had changed.

They describe him as an opportunist in business and as a naive amateur in politics who took a trip around the world, at the suggestion of Mr. Roosevelt, and suddenly learned some great principles. They charged that he had gotten religion. This myth was spread by such propaganda forces of reaction and blind nationalism as the Chicago Tribune. Nothing could be further from the truth as any seeker after the truth can see for himself if he studies the life of Wendell Willkie from boyhood until his untimely death.

As a boy and as a student he had a delicate sensitivity for human wrongs. He believed that democratic government exists primarily to promote and advance human rights rather than the selfish economic interests of those who would return us to a laissez faire economy which feeds upon the exploitation of human beings for profit dollars. Willkie's liberalism was his convictions of youth put into adult practice. Thus between 1923 and 1926 he was a leader in northern Ohio against the Ku Klux Klan. He actively joined in fighting a great fight against the Klan, which sought to gain control of the schools in Akron. He was the manager of the campaign for the election of independent school-board commissioners who dared to oppose the Klan. Willkie, as a sound liberal back in those years, won that fight.

Many of his liberal economic views and balanced understanding of labor problems undoubtedly developed from his association with his father, who was a labor lawyer in Indiana. Willkie's one-world philosophy was a reiteration of principles that he had enunciated for many years. He greatly admired Woodrow Wilson and was an ardent advocate of Wilson's League of Nations program. In fact, Philip Willkie has told me that his father made more than 1,000 speeches in Ohio and Indiana during the years 1919 and 1920 in behalf of the League of Nations.

Yet there are those detractors who, for their own political purposes, want a Nation to believe that Wendell Willkie's one-world philosophy was not deep-rooted in his convictions. No; the great leader who won the nomination of my party in 1940 in one of the few, if not the only, unbossed, spontaneous conventions in the history of the Republican Party, was a liberal all his life. A man of independence of judgment, who dared to stand up for his convictions against the hysteria of the crowd, a political leader who recognized that it is the duty of a political party to stand first for sound principles and second for election. He knew that standing for just anything for election's sake in order politically to capitalize upon the prevailing prejudices and misinformation of the people is the surest way to weaken and betray a political party.

Some Republican leaders in Washington these days are beginning to comprehend the significance of that principle. It is not too late for the rank and file of Republicans throughout the country to make clear to those leaders that a return to the economic mistakes of the Republican Party of the 1920's will and should mean the repudiation of the Republican Party in 1948. I am convinced that the only long-time hope for the Republican Party and for the Nation is in a forward and not a backward direction.

The heights to scale, the barricades to surmount, in the ever constant struggle but forward march for liberty and human happiness are still those so frequently referred to by Wendell Willkie. For those who will read and think, he has left a heritage not only of great words but of great challenges—challenges of the ages, it is true, but we of this generation will record our progress or retrogression by what we do toward advancing the causes of human freedom, which, in the last analysis, must rest upon a one-world philosophy of permanent peace.

This is no partisan challenge and no political party should be allowed by the people of America to make the challenge of peace a partisan issue. One of Willkie's great qualities was his nonpartisan ability to place country above party. Thus he joined with Franklin Roosevelt in supporting selective service, in approving the transfer of 50 destroyers to Great Britain, in urging the National Defense Act, in supporting lend-lease, and in favoring the other defense programs so necessary in those dark days if America was to secure the precious time necessary to get herself ready to strike victorious blows in defense of human rights everywhere. He was bitterly assailed by those forces of reaction and isolationism for which some Republican leaders were spokesmen. However, Willkie refused to play partisan politics with the destiny of our country.

In my opinion, his nonpartisanship on international issues was the highest type of loyalty to the Republican Party; was proof of his statesmanship in contrast with the partisanship of those Republican leaders who sought to play politics with national defense.

I hope that the rank and file of my Republican Party today will recognize that we have yet to win the peace and that we cannot afford to adopt a partisan course of action on the national budget or trade policies or international economic responsibilities to a war-torn world which may threaten that peace. On such issues all leaders in both of our great parties need to heed the lessons taught by the statesmanlike nonpartisanship of Willkie.

Thus let me speak to you some of the words of Wendell Willkie. On March 21, 1944, he said:

"There is an even better way to destroy a political party than by adopting tactics of negative partisanship, and that is, to take no stand on the issues at all. Men who view a political party as nothing more than a piece of machinery for gaining office are apt to resort to this tactic. * * *

"In times of crisis, the American people have always been more concerned with issues than with personalities. A political party, therefore, which aspires to lead the country, in time of crisis, must face the issues and provide solutions for them. At such times trimmers and dodgers lead their party to destruction."

May I digress to say that one of my great disappointments and great disillusionments in politics has been the extent to which political leaders in both parties, and too frequently the party organizations themselves, evade the responsibility of intellectual honesty in dealing with issues. Wendell Willkie did not believe in being all things to all men. Neither did he believe in the political strategy of keeping them in doubt as to where you stand on an issue until after the votes are counted.

Thus on one occasion he said:

"This means that the leaders of the party must earn and hold their leadership, not through the manipulation of its machinery, but by dealing openly and constructively with the issues of the time. And it must not determine its convictions about these issues by the poll-taking method."

In that last-quoted statement Wendell Willkie pointed out one of the greatest dangers that threatens representative government in America today, namely, pressure-group politics. The notion is too prevalent that the men in the Congress of the United States should vote in accordance with the results of national polls or the pressure mail that they may receive on a given issue.

When such polls of public opinion or such pressure-group tactics cannot be justified on the merits of the issue, then clearly the Willkie principle of voting one's convictions born from the facts on the issue becomes the clear duty of a public official if he is to follow a course of political leadership rather than political fellowship. Last Friday I stated this Willkie principle on the floor of the Senate, when in a speech in opposition to a blanket $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget, proposed by some Republican leaders, I said:

"I do not know what businessmen as a whole, workers as a whole, or farmers as a class would say in a referendum on that issue if all the facts were presented to them, but I think it is my obligation as a Member of the Senate of the United States to consider all the economic facts and to reach an honest, independent judgment as to what is best for the economic future of my country, and then vote accordingly. It is my duty to cast such a vote, even if an overwhelming majority of the American people think I should vote the other way. That happens to be a conviction of mine as to what the responsibility of a Member of the Senate is, because I do not share the notion that I should vote in accordance with pressure politics. All of us have seen American public opinion change overnight once it came to understand the real issues at stake in a problem. My confidence in the long-time judgment of the American voters is so deep that I believe I can hear them saying to me by the millions, 'Vote what you think the facts on this fiscal policy dictate.'"

I think one of the greatest utterances of Willkie on the duty of a political party to adopt a progressive course of action was set out by him in these words:

"And this leads me to what is perhaps the most fundamental point of all. Life moves around us. Old problems are solved, new ones arise. New needs are created; new vistas are opened. Therefore a political party can never stand still. However great its achievements in the past, these alone do not entitle it to regard in the present. Its most cherished doctrines must all be subject to constant reexamination, constant revision. Those leaders of a party who insist on applying old formulas to present problems merely because those formulas worked in the past are damaging the party and will eventually destroy it. For they are standing still, whereas the world around them moves."

One of the statements of Willkie's that I highly cherish, the rich meaning and significance of which I would like to have you share with me tonight, is the statement he made in answer to the charge that was raised against him that his liberal program of human welfare could be accomplished only at the sacrifice of our American system of economic incentive and free enterprise. His answer to that argument is one which every member of the Republican Party should contemplate today, because I consider it a complete answer to those reactionary forces within the Republican Party who are trying to lead this Nation backward to the mistakes of the 1920's.

Here is what Wendell Willkie said on this issue:

"The total result, consistently fostered by the administration, has been the illusion that there is an irrepressible and inevitable conflict between a society built upon economic incentive and a society of human welfare.

"This is not alone false; it is impossible in a free society.

"Too long and too often have we been led to regard human values as the opposite rather than the supplement of the incentive system. We have been presented with the two alternatives.

"Do you want security, or initiative?

"Do you want protection, or adventure?

"This is a factitious issue. We need both. Indeed we cannot have one without the other. We cannot have security in terms of an advancing standard of living without responsible enterprise. We cannot have the initiative and energy we need for an expanding economy without preserving and increasing the vigor of our human resources.

"The Republican Party, alert and evolving, must recognize this fact if it is to win the confidence of the people."

I hope that the great American business forces, sometimes referred to as big business, will recognize the soundness of this last-quoted statement from Willkie because they as well as the Republican Party, and the two are not synonymous—at least not yet—must be made to see that the strength of our private property enterprise system rests on the degree to which business working in cooperation with a friendly government provides economic security and promotes the social welfare of all of our people.

Let big business and both political parties never forget that the right to individual initiative and the lure of economic adventure provide little security or protection in the depths of a depression such as the business and political mistakes of the 1920's visited upon the American people in 1929.

Thus I might go on quoting from Willkie's writings one great tenet after another which embraced his sound political philosophy of true liberalism and which stemmed from his abiding faith in our system of political and economic democracy in America; a faith which recognized that liberty for the individual will be lost in America if we ever sacrifice either our private-property economy guaranteed by the Constitution or the bill of human rights set forth in the Bill of Rights of that great charter of free government by freemen.

However, I prefer to close not with Willkie's words but with the words of Frances Holmstrom, who, with poetic beauty, paid great tribute to men such as Wendell Willkie when she wrote her poem entitled "The Great Ones" in these words:

"I know such souls—a few such souls—as these,
Akin in grandeur to the lonely trees
Upon the mountain top; they breathe an air
We of the valleys are too tame to share.
They root in rock as we in well-tilled sod.
They look afar, they stand nearby to God.
They vision greatness that we may not know
In sheltered quiet. When the tempests blow
The shock is theirs; they but repeat the tale
Softly unto the dweller in the vale
Who does not sense the struggle, till at last
They yield themselves up to some mighty blast,
And we small folk, who hear the groan and fall,
Say, 'In the night a tree fell.' That is all."

David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very forthright article by the esteemed correspondent and writer for the Baltimore Sun, Frank R. Kent, calling the attention of the Congress, and particularly Members on my side of the aisle, to the opportunity they have to confirm the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal as a most constructive act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—POLITICAL OPPOSITION TO LILIENTHAL SEEN LIKELY TO REACT AGAINST REPUBLICANS

(By Frank R. Kent)

In a few days now, after an intensely ugly and bitter fight which has aroused feeling in all parts of the country, the United States Senate will decide whether to confirm or reject the President's appointment of Mr. David E. Lilienthal, former head of the TVA, to become Chairman of the extremely vital Atomic Energy Commission.

This is a fight which never should have taken place. It never would have taken place save for the personal animosity toward Mr. Lilienthal of Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat,

of Tennessee, one of the least admirable or esteemed Members of the Senate.

For years Senator McKELLAR has waged unceasing warfare upon Mr. Lilienthal. The original cause of his resentment was the refusal of Mr. Lilienthal to accord him patronage rights in TVA appointments, which was certainly to Mr. Lilienthal's credit. Since then Senator McKELLAR has missed no chance to strike at Mr. Lilienthal.

Notwithstanding, Mr. Lilienthal has established an outstanding reputation as an able and efficient administrator. His character and courage as well as his competency also are generally recognized. In addition to these attributes, he is particularly qualified for this position by his knowledge of the subject, reflected in the Acheson-Lilienthal report, concededly the basis of the Baruch report.

Indorsed by Secretary of War Patterson, Dr. Vannevar Bush, Bernard M. Baruch, and many others, he seems unquestionably the best qualified and available man for the job. The degrading efforts of Senator McKELLAR to smear him, by themselves, would not have affected his overwhelming confirmation.

But, unhappily, last week Senator McKELLAR found unexpected support. First, there was a charge that the TVA under Mr. Lilienthal had been infested with Communists and that he had done little about it. This charge was exploded long ago by the report of Representative STARNES, of Alabama, who, as chairman of a subcommittee operating under the eye of the vigilant Mr. Dies, made an investigation and found it false.

NOT CHARGED AS COMMUNIST

No one, of course—not even Senator McKELLAR, whose hatred of Mr. Lilienthal makes him willing to do pretty nearly anything—has charged that Mr. Lilienthal himself is sympathetic with Communism and no one could read his recent statement and entertain any doubt as to the undiluted quality of his Americanism.

Actually, the only allegations at this time against Mr. Lilienthal, susceptible of proof, are that he was a devout follower of the late Mr. Roosevelt; that he was a strong New Dealer; that is, in fact, a "true liberal." For these reasons apparently, most of the conservative Republicans and some conservative Democratic Senators have swung against him and his confirmation is in doubt.

Certainly, the writer of this column is not one to regard devotion to the late Mr. Roosevelt, the New Deal, and the "true liberalism" as desirable assets for public men in high posts—quite the reverse. Certainly, it is not the rule for men who can be thus classed to be noted for either unusual character or unusual capacity—rare, indeed, when they are adequately endowed with both.

But there are such men, and the overwhelming and convincing testimony is that Mr. Lilienthal is one of them. When to this is added his special experience and attainments in the field of atomic energy, opposition of the conservatives on the ground that he was a Roosevelt man and a New Dealer seems indefensible.

If President Truman, for personal or political reasons, had passed over a better or as good a man as Mr. Lilienthal for this place there would be sound ground for opposition. But that is not the case and his rejection would render inevitable the nomination of an inferior man.

WOULD PUT GOP IN BAD POSITION

Obviously, Mr. Lilienthal's present Senate ordeal would make the top men still more reluctant to serve. Under the circumstances, defeating Mr. Lilienthal would put the conservatives—particularly the Republican conservatives, because the blame would be on them—in a bad position. It will make them seem so narrow, partisan, and prejudiced that they pushed aside the best available man in the Nation for this supremely important post.

That is exactly what the late Mr. Roosevelt did in the recent war when, despite the fact that Mr. Herbert Hoover was concededly the most experienced and equipped man in the world to deal with the problem of food, he refused all suggestions to make him food administrator, turning the job over to incompetents who botched it dreadfully.

Clearly he sacrificed the national interests to his personal spleen. It was a vindictive, petty, and discreditable thing to have done. If now, for a no better reason than that he was a Roosevelt New Dealer, the Republicans deprive the Nation of Mr. Lilienthal's services, the same indictment can be made against them—and should be.

It will not lie in their mouths to criticize Mr. Roosevelt if they equal him in pettiness and prejudice. In addition, theirs is a foolish complaint. Conceding that Mr. Lilienthal is a "liberal," look at the other members of the commission. There is Mr. Lewis Strauss, the banker; Mr. Waymack, the editor; Dr. Bacher, the physicist.

They constitute a majority, and "true liberals" is not the way to describe them. If the Republicans cut Mr. Lilienthal down without better reasons than now exist, it will be an act of great stupidity, which they will rue in the next campaign, when they will have to defend it.

Wanted: A United States Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stanley High from the Reader's Digest for March 1947:

WANTED: A UNITED STATES CONGRESS

(By Stanley High)

A major source of waste and ineffectiveness in United States Government and a major cause of disunity in the Nation is the self-serving localism of so many Members of Congress. This localism stems from the legislator's conviction that his foremost duty is to get himself reelected. Like the time-wasting business of being errand boy for his constituents, it is part of the venal political system by which too many congressional seats are bought, with free use of public money and scant regard for public weal.

A Member of Congress should of course hold himself accountable to his own constituency, and the problems and legitimate interests of that constituency should be his special concern. But localism is a perversion of that responsibility. In the practice of localism a Member of Congress puts his accountability to his separate political locality ahead of his accountability to the Nation. What he seeks to get for his constituents is of greater concern and takes more of his time than what he seeks to do for the well-being of all the people.

Asked how he knew how much public money he should try to get for his constituents, a Congressman replied: "I just get all I can." Another Congressman had imprinted on his stationery, in an election year, the legislative services which he thought justified his reelection. These services added up to $100,000,000 in various appropriations for his district. For postage-free circulation in last fall's campaign, a Congressman listed 10 juicy financial benefits which he had won for his city constituency, and added: "It would be immodest of me to go further in any listing of what I have done for my city; the record speaks for itself."

In the House of Representatives last June, the Rivers and Harbors Committee—long a lush pork barrel—presented a bill which, among $520,000,000 worth of undertakings in 35 States, included a project which required large Federal expenditure in Tennessee. A courageous Tennessee Congressman, JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., opposed the bill on the ground that the need for Government economy was more important than Tennessee's need for this project. "The time has come," he said, "to quit wasting at the bung and saving at the spigot and to balance the Budget." The spirit of localism was never more clearly summed up than in the reply of an angry colleague: "How any man from Tennessee can oppose this great waterway is more than I can understand. With the exception of the TVA, this is the greatest project ever proposed, so far as Tennessee is concerned."

Localism carried the day. In both House and Senate the project was approved.

The Member of Congress who puts responsibility to his State or district ahead of responsibility to the Nation readily comes to regard himself as a special ambassador of a bloc or minority interest, bent on promoting its advantage and dependent on its favor. Thus there are silver Senators and cotton Senators and wheat Senators and labor Senators and big-business Senators—and too few United States Senators.

"Is that special legislation for cotton?" inquired a wheat-State Senator of a cotton-State Senator in last summer's debate on commodity prices.

"If the Senator wishes to call it that, he may do so," replied the cotton-State Senator.

"Why not include wheat?" asked the wheat-State Senator.

"I do not say there is any objection to doing so."

Cotton and wheat got their "special legislation." A beet-State Member got the same for sugar beets; an oil-State Member for oil; a spokesman for the poultry interests for poultry; a Member from an automobile-producing State for automobiles; the wool-States bloc for wool; the dairy-States bloc for dairy products; the silver-States bloc for silver.

"Mr. Speaker," said a Member of the House during last year's debate on housing, "I do not know of any Member of the House who does not want to get on the veterans' bandwagon because there are several million veterans who are going to vote at the next election. I am going to get on that bandwagon just the same as all the rest."

Thus Congress becomes an instrument of special favors. The Nation comes to regard it not as a dependable source of good government but as a dependable source of local, bloc, and sectional largesse. By this perversion of responsibility, representative government itself is brought into disrepute. Chief responsibility for this evil belongs to Congress. Only Congress can cure it.

Materially and mechanically, the present Congress is one of the best equipped in United States history. By the passage of the La Follette-Monroney bill, last summer, congressional machinery has been streamlined for statesmanship. Members of this Congress get more pay plus a pension, have more technical and expert help, have fewer committee assignments and are less burdened with legislative trivia than their predecessors. But better congressional machinery does not

cure the evil of localism; indeed, it may provide many members with more time and better facilities for its practice.

The truest definition ever made of the function of the responsible legislator in a national assembly was given by Edmund Burke in his historic address to his constituents in the English city of Bristol in 1774:

"Certainly it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him, their opinion high respect, their business unremitted attention.

"But Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole; where not local purpose, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good. You choose a member, indeed. But when you have chosen him he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a Member of Parliament."

I believe that an overwhelming majority of Americans want that kind of man in Congress, dedicated not to local purpose but to the general good.

Because he put the general good ahead of local purpose, practitioners of localism freely predicted the defeat of JOHN JENNINGS, JR., in Tennessee. With a record-breaking vote he was reelected.

I believe that most American communities are like Cushing, Okla., which last fall helped to reelect MIKE MONRONEY—coauthor of the La Follette-Monroney bill. "Congressman MONRONEY hasn't done anything big for Cushing," said a front-page editorial in the Cushing Daily Citizen. "But he has stood out from the rubber-stamp politicians by voting as his conscience dictated, rather than as party leaders suggested. We need to vote for the best man for our Nation, rather than the best man for our occupation or our district."

The roots of congressional localism are deep, its vested interests powerful. But against this evil there are enough nationally minded legislators already in Congress to reaffirm the principles of the general good and, by example, begin its reestablishment.

Such action must be concerted and aggressive. It will require the speedy enlistment of many of the 126 new Members of the House and Senate, who have not yet fallen victim to the demands and pressures which put local and sectional interest ahead of the Nation. The time to act is now.

Such action would be a congressional vote of confidence in the good faith and sound purpose of the American people. It would help to unite the Nation. It would be heartening reassurance—to America and to the world—that the fateful issues confronting us will be met on a level of wisdom and vision in keeping with our national aspirations.

Address Prepared by the Late Senator Josiah W. Bailey, of North Carolina, for Delivery to the People of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, my late lamented colleague in the Senate from North Carolina, Hon. Josiah W. Bailey, was ill for several months preceding his death on December 15, 1946. During this period he reached a decision not to become a candidate for reelection to succeed himself in 1948, and prepared an address to the people of North Carolina apprising them of his determination and making a statesmanlike review of our present situation and expressing his views in his well-known fearless and courageous manner. He intended to issue the statement early in 1947 after Congress convened, when he expected to be present for the opening session. Since his death occurred before that date the statement which he had prepared and signed was released through Claude Ramsey, special Raleigh correspondent of the Asheville Citizen, last Sunday by James H. Pou Bailey, son and law partner of Senator Bailey. The address has been read with profound interest by the people of North Carolina. I feel that his former colleagues in the Senate would like to read this able and thoughtful address, which is veritably his last will and testament on public questions, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD, including the summary of the high lights of Senator Bailey's address.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I am sure that the Senate will unanimously agree to the request of the Senator from North Carolina.

There being no objection, the address, including the summary, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIGNIFICANT REMARKS IN BAILEY STATEMENT

Some of the most significant high lights in Senator Bailey's statement follow:

"The question in America today is whether this country shall be run by the people or by labor leaders not responsible to the people. This question must be settled and settled right.

"The working men ought to be free. They ought to be free to join a union or not to join one. Employers ought also to be free.

"The labor unions can be made to do bargaining and prevented from dictating. They are now not bargaining but dictating.

"A government that will not put an end to this sort of thing is not worthy to be called a government.

"Labor has no more right to interfere with commerce than anyone else and it is the duty of the Congress to protect commerce and to preserve its freedom.

"If collective bargaining shall be preserved, the labor unions must be required to perform their contracts or be held liable in damages.

"So far, Russia has made a policy of dissent and obstruction. There are those who think that Russia does not intend to destroy the United Nations organization. It is my opinion that Russia does not intend to go along with it unless Russia can have her way. She means to dominate Europe and Asia, and then the whole world.

"No country has ever spent the earnings and the substance of its people as this country has without ruining itself and its inhabitants. * * * We must stabilize our currency and our economy at the earliest moment possible if we are to avoid disaster and chaos."

To the People of North Carolina:

I shall not be a candidate in 1948. Physicians advise that I may recover fully from my recent illness and be able to perform the duties of a Senator through the remainder of my present term. This I hope to do. I would be unwilling to attempt more. It will be better to elect in 1948 to the Senate some one in the full vigor of the prime of life.

GRATEFUL TO PEOPLE

In making this decision I have been moved to issue a statement which follows:

I shall always be grateful to the people of North Carolina for the great honor they gave me and the trust they reposed in me. It seemed to me from the outset that the least I could do by way of appreciation was to be honest with them. This I have done.

I could not support a considerable number of measures put forward by President Roosevelt because upon reading them it was plain to me that they were unsound and the long-run consequence would be bad for the people. I voted against the Wagner Act, for example. It was and is a plain piece of political class legislation. We now see its consequences. Purporting to avoid strikes, it is an inducement to strike. Proposing to free the working men, it has placed them under the power of labor bosses.

The question in America today is whether this country shall be run by the people or by the labor leaders not responsible to the people. This question must be settled and be settled right. No man should be elected to the Senate from North Carolina who does not ring clear on this issue.

PREDICTED REFORMING OF ACT

The act can be reformed and I think it will be. It would have been reformed long ago but for the power of the labor organizations in the Senate. The working men ought to be free. They ought to be free to join a union or not to join one. Employers ought also to be free. The labor unions can be made to do bargaining and prevented from dictating. They are now not bargaining, but dictating. Certain of the railroad unions went so far as to vote for a strike against this Government in the midst of the war. It was a plain and shameful threat to deliver the country over to our enemies unless the labor leaders should have their way. They would have deprived our fighting men of food and munitions on the fields of battle. Recently they and others have been inflicting untold injury upon the entire population. They were paralyzing the American economy. Their demands are demands upon every person. They should not have this power. Regardless of the merits of their demands they ought not have power to injure the people of this country. None may be trusted with such power.

NO REASON FOR CONFUSION

They are not putting forward any argument for these demands, but saying in plain language we must have our way or the American people must pay the price of suffering and ruin. There is no right to do this or anything like it. Any individual has a right not to work at any given task, but no group of people has a right to injure and punish others in order to dictate terms to their employer. Woodrow Wilson was clear enough on this subject in 1916, and there is no reason for confusion. There is no moral right for a group of men to strike and hold up the people of this country, preventing others from working, and inflicting untold injury upon millions.

A government that will not put an end to this sort of thing is not worthy to be called a government. The fact is that the American people have never failed to respond appropriately to such a challenge; whenever any group has assumed power to subordinate the general welfare to its special interest, people, President, and Congress have taught it the necessary lesson; and so long as this shall be their way, this Republic is secure as a Government of and for the people. This is precisely what has just happened, and it is most heartening.

LOSE GOOD WILL THROUGH LEADERS

The workingmen ought to bear in mind that they always have the sympathetic good

will of their fellow men, and that they lose it only when they permit unwise leaders to put them in the position of ignoring the public interest.

We can apply our antitrust laws to monopolistic practices in labor relations just as we can apply them to any other relations affecting commerce among the States—and we should do it. We ought to restore the remedy of injunction to prevent irreparable injury. The labor leaders have repudiated collective bargaining and undertaken to substitute dictatorial demand for it.

Labor has no more right to interfere with commerce than anyone else, and it is the duty of the Congress to protect commerce and to preserve its freedom. Only the Congress may regulate interstate and foreign commerce. It has plenary power to do so. Employers have a right to present their case to their employees and they also have a right to select their employees. Granted a man has a personal right to strike, he has no right to a job he has left. As matters now stand a man has to belong to a union and obey its boss in order to get a job. There can be no right to prevent others from working. This is not freedom, it is coercion. Nor do men have right to join in a mutual movement to stop production and thereby paralyze commerce.

UNIONS MUST BE HELD LIABLE

If collective bargaining shall be preserved, the labor unions must be required to perform their contracts or be held liable in damages.

Controversies ought to be settled in our courts of justice, and not by boards, commissioners, or panels.

The CIO and the PAC are now invading the Southern States and in particular they are invading the Democratic primaries. They have captured the Democratic Party in the North and propose to capture it in the South. The CIO and PAC are political parties and they are united in the American Labor Party—confessedly a radical class party.

The American people will be well advised to realize that the professional Communist proceeds by way of deceit. He will profess to be a Democrat in order to carry his point. He intends that the American Labor Party shall take our party over. The people of North Carolina will do well to suspect any candidate who is supported by the CIO or PAC, whether in the primary or the general election. They have drawn the issue and we must meet it. It is an issue we must meet squarely and in the open, and any man who runs for office without frankly stating his position ought to be voted against. Amongst other things they propose to overthrow white supremacy in the South, and vote great masses of the ignorant for their foul purposes.

GRAVE PARTY DANGER SEEN

If this movement by the CIO-PAC shall succeed there is grave danger that the Democratic Party will go the way of the Liberal Party in England; that is, be absorbed by the Labor Party.

I have been greatly disturbed by the international situation. So far Russia has made a policy of dissent and obstruction. There are those who think that Russia does not intend to destroy the United Nations organization. It is my opinion that Russia does not intend to go along with it unless Russia can have her way. She means to dominate Europe and Asia, and then the whole world. There is evidence that Russia is operating in this country now by way of propaganda and infiltration. Her partisans are everywhere professing on some occasions to be Republicans, and professing on others of being Democrats, but being at heart Communists loyal to Russia and not to the United States. This issue is drawn in this country and in the world.

If the United Nations organization fails, this does not necessarily mean war. It does mean that it will be necessary for us to get along in a world not fully organized for peace, which will be most difficult. We must avoid war, engaging therein only when the independence of this country and the security of our people are plainly at stake. Isolation is obsolete. But internationalism does not predicate that our country must have a hand in every controversy or that we should assume responsibility everywhere. Let us press in all events for a world organization to preserve peace throughout the earth.

NEED MIGHTY ARMY AND NAVY

This country can get along in the existing circumstances only by way of being armed to the teeth. We must have a mighty Army and a mighty Navy and a mighty Air Force, and a mighty industrial and agricultural capacity, and everything in armaments that will give us superiority. The way to peace for America in such a world is by way of being so strong that we will be able to beat down into the dust or ruin any nation that attacks us—just as we beat Japan down and Germany down. They will not attack us again. They attacked us because they thought we were weak. If they had known we were strong they would not have dared lift a hand against us. If they had known 5 years ago what they know now there would have been no world war, and we would have been delivered from the ordeal through which we passed in great tribulation. We must not run the risk of being attacked again. We must avoid war and establish our peace. And in order that we may, we must be so strong that every nation will know that we have the power to crush and to destroy any who rise against us. This is hard doctrine, but it is necessary. We may hope for a time when the nations disarm in the interest of peace, but we must not be the first to disarm. We must not disarm until we know that every other nation is disarming. This is why I am for the selective service and compulsory military training. I am for the peace and security of our country.

SHOULD ACT IN SELF-INTEREST

I do not think we should tie ourselves up with the destiny of the United Kingdom of Great Britain. We should be as friendly as possible with every nation, but should act only in our own self-interest. I voted for the lend-lease bill in order to get time in which to prepare this country for the war which was surely coming. Mr. Roosevelt felt that he could head off the war.

I followed Mr. Roosevelt in his measures of foreign policy prior to and throughout the war. This was because I was persuaded that he was doing everything to keep this country out of the war, and once in he was doing all possible to win. He was mistaken because he did not give Japan credit for the ignorance under which that country was laboring.

There is no reason why we should attach our fate to the United Kingdom of Great Britain. We cannot fight her battles, nor can we afford to make her foreign policy ours. We must have our own foreign policy—the policy of being strong, firm, and peaceful, and of getting into no controversy except in clear defense of our own country.

DIRECT LOANS NOT WISE POLICY

I am not opposed to the loans to foreign nations, except through the International Bank authorized by the Bretton Woods agreement. I was paired against the loan to Great Britain. I shall not support a direct loan for Russia nor for France nor for any other country. It is not wise policy. I question whether we have the right in time of peace to tax the American people for the sake of the economy of any other nation. Other nations will depend upon us and call upon us again and again as long as they find we can be persuaded to borrow money and send it to them. We owe too much now. We have enough here at home to take care of our own people and their security without undertaking to fight either the domestic or foreign battles of other nations. Our true course is to play the role of umpire in the United Nations organization in matters of no import to us, undertaking to see that justice is done and that the American security is protected. We cannot be a disinterested umpire in all cases We must resolve every doubt in favor of the security of our country. I do not think we should be involved in the small quarrels of the little nations of Europe and other portions of the earth. Their interests and ideas are entirely different from ours. We should protect the Western Hemisphere and we will have our hands full doing that. It is no concern of ours what sort of government Spain may have, or whether Russia is communistic or not, or whether France is communistic or not. Let them have such a government as they please. Let us preserve the American Republic as received from our fathers and proved by experience.

WAS FOLLOWER OF WILSON

When I took the oath of Senator I was resolved to preserve this Republic in the true character in which it had served our people so well for 150 years. I was more a follower of Woodrow Wilson than of any other person. It seemed to me he understood the character of our Government and was determined to preserve it. I read all of his works in the interim between my nomination and the time I took my oath as Senator. I do not regret the fight I made, but I do not think it was won. I did my best. We will never know what was averted. I do not think the fight has been lost, although I realize our Republic has been changed to a great degree and very much to its injury. Much may be retrieved that now seems lost.

Let me conclude with one remark: Before the war our country had run a deficit of about $3,000,000,000 every year since 1932. No country has ever spent the earnings and the substance of its people as this country has without ruining itself and its inhabitants. The war expenditures were necessary, but there is absolutely no excuse for the extravagant civilian expenditure during the period in which I have been Senator. We must have an end of it and without further delay. We must stabilize our currency and our economy at the earliest moment possible if we are to avoid disaster and chaos. No man should be elected to the House or Senate until he has pledged that he will reduce expenditures and balance our budget and keep it balanced. An eminent historian prophesied early in the nineteenth century that our Republic would be plundered in the twentieth century not by a foreign invader but by its own people. That plundering is now and has been for several years going on.

It seems to me to be appropriate that at this time I should lay this statement before our people. These are my views, honestly expressed, and I express them in part discharge of the great debt I owe the people of our State.

JOSIAH W. BAILEY.

Article by Senator Wiley on Evaluating Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article which I contributed to the February 1947 issue of the magazine Tax Outlook, which is published by the Tax Foundation of New York. The subject of this article is a consideration of the standards by which a citizen may evaluate Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTEEN TESTS FOR YOUR CONGRESSMEN

By ALEXANDER WILEY)

How good are my Congressmen? This is a crucial question for every American to ask himself. It is especially important today, as the Eightieth Congress delves deeper into the economic problems of the Nation. To business leaders, who have the ultimate responsibility of keeping the national economy in healthy working order, it is a question which demands the most careful consideration.

It is as important for the businessman to evaluate correctly his two United States Senators and his Representative in Congress as it is for him to evaluate his own business partners or his colleagues on a board of directors. Because, as all enlightened businessmen know, their lawmakers in Congress make as many decisions which influence a given firm's profits, taxes, labor relations, and wage levels as do the men who head up that firm.

I believe that all citizens—and businessman especially—should have an objective criteria with which they can evaluate their lawmakers. The results of these evaluations should be borne in mind when legislators are discussed, as well as on election day.

As both a businessman and a legislator, I am personally interested in seeing to it that businessmen, like every other group, learn to make such evaluations discerningly. I am convinced that citizens are learning this lesson. Only when people are able to make such evaluations can legislators be put on their finest mettle, and live up to—and surpass—the necessarily high standards for their conduct.

The citizen's responsibility for knowing his lawmakers in Congress does not begin a week before election day, nor does it end when the polls close. It is a responsibility every day, every time the citizen looks into a newspaper or magazine or listens to the radio to learn the facts about his lawmakers' actions.

Did somebody say that we are all very busy these days, and that we do not have time to be studying the news from Washington? The answer to that is clear: The decisions made in Washington today vitally affect every aspect of life in America. Those who are the builders, the creators, the employers, cannot stand aside while their efforts toward creation of a better America are handicapped by lawmakers who are indifferent toward their efforts.

Establishing standards for judgment is a hazardous undertaking—particularly for anyone who himself will be judged by them. To some extent, standards for passing on Congressmen must be subjective; some legislators just strike the conscientious citizen as being sound leaders, whereas others (despite many objective virtues) simply cannot gain the citizen's confidence.

I think it is important to remember that no Congressman will win a 100-percent rating on any fair test. Nor is this important, because one category of judgment may be more important than others. A few outstanding virtues may compensate for many small deficiencies. It is up to the citizen to decide which combination of virtues is all-important.

Here are the 15 standards I suggest for evaluating a Congressman:

1. Americanism: Does the Congressman believe in and support the American system of constitutional government through checks and balances?

2. Freedom: Does he believe in free enterprise and in opportunity for the diligent to earn rewards?

3. Allegiance: Does he believe that the welfare of all the American people is more important than the welfare of any group or any section of the Nation or of any political party?

4. Tolerance: Is he free from racial, religious, or class prejudices?

5. Perspective: Does he believe in satisfying the needs of the America of tomorrow, rather than in mere temporary epedients for the present?

6. Selflessness: Does he believe in doing an honest job for the American people, rather than looking out for his own welfare?

7. Independence: Does he prove in his actions that he follows his own judgment, rather than merely serving as a Charlie McCarthy for some pressure group?

8. Integrity: Does he support causes he believes in, although they may be temporarily unpopular?

9. Self-discipline: Does he avoid rash promises, foolhardy predictions, and premature judgments?

10. Faith: Does he have a belief in the wisdom and honesty of the American people?

11. Leadership: Does he help to mold public opinion, rather than merely being content to follow it?

12. Constructiveness: Does he sponsor legislation which is well thought out and constructive?

13. Perseverance: Does he apply industry and ingenuity to advancing legislation which may be blocked by legislative technicalities?

14. Skill: Does he display parliamentary adroitness in accomplishing his objectives?

15. Loyalty: Is he loyal to his work and consistent with his announced policies insofar as humanly possible?

Those are the 15 tests I should like to believe American citizens were applying to their lawmakers.

There are others which might be added. Does a lawmaker keep in touch with the people he represents, and does he give them prompt help with their problems? Does he contribute to the moving of the legislative machinery? Does he use tact and persuasion in the necessary give-and-take in working with lawmakers of different viewpoints? Does he associate only with persons and organizations of unimpeachable characters?

Really, of course, the kinds of standards selected are less important than the fact that standards are set up. For all too often a citizen gives support to a lawmaker because he voted for (or against) some measure in which that citizen was particularly interested. There is probably no worse way to judge a Congressman.

The citizen will do his job—and the citizen does, indeed, have a job—if he will forget the one or two or three pet measures in which he is interested. He will remember that his fellow citizens had their pet measures, too, probably different from his. He will think of his Congressman's action on all measures. He will think, in short, of what is best for the Nation, rather than what is best for himself. Then he will intelligently decide: "How good are my Congressmen?"

Don't Cheer Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that my advocacy of a tax cut for 1948 finds strong and intelligent support in the editorial published in the Washington Daily News of February 12. Events subsequent to my tax speech as reviewed in the editorial confirm my position. The editorial conforms with my expressed views and actions.

The editorial follows:

DON'T CHEER YET

Republicans in Congress have prepared a legislative budget $6,000,000,000 smaller than President Truman's $37,500,000,000 executive budget for the coming fiscal year.

Many of them seem to feel that, having done this, they are all set for the pleasant job of cutting taxes.

But don't cheer yet.

Adoption of the legislative budget, required for the first time this year under the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, will be an important forward step. It will give Congress a definite economy target to shoot at. However, it will be only a hopeful promise, not a guaranty of performance.

The Republicans don't yet know how, where, or whether they can slash six billions from Mr. Truman's spending estimate. They won't know until Congress gets through passing appropriation bills, 3 or 4 months hence. A tax cut voted now, in the pious hope that the legislative budget wouldn't be exceeded, might put and keep the Government in the red for another fiscal year.

So we don't wonder that cautious Senator TAFT has proposed waiting until July to make any income-tax reduction effective.

But wouldn't it make sense to go farther than that, wait until January 1, 1948, and be sure that the actual budget is balanced with leeway for substantial payments on the huge national debt?

One of the most irritating and damaging phases of our tax-legislating technique is its retroactive aspect. Congress usually spends a big part of a calendar year revising taxes for that same calendar year. Result: uncertainty, inability to plan with assurance for the future.

It would be much better to say: "This is what taxes will be for the 12 months beginning next January," than, "Here are new taxes for months that are past and gone."

The certainty gained for 1948, we think, would more than offset the tax cut that might not come for 1947.

And bear in mind that there's a place to put any money the Government might save by not cutting taxes this year—that place being a payment on the debt.

Brotherhood Week and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an outstanding editorial on the subject, Brotherhood Week and Democracy, from the La Crosse Tribune, of La Crosse, Wis., as follows:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK AND DEMOCRACY

Americans are convinced that democracy as we know it here, with liberty and justice for all, is the most perfect form of political community yet known.

We were warned some years ago by totalitarian leaders abroad that democracy might

suffice in peace but could not win a war. But democracy has demonstrated its efficiency in war as in peace. No one knows better than ourselves the dangers that dog the steps of democracy, the weaknesses in its structure that need buttressing, but we cherish it and choose it for ourselves and our children.

We are not so blind, moreover, as to be unaware that in the kind of a world in which we are living democracy is not altogether safe. A large part of humanity still lives under some form of autocracy. There are influences in our own land which, unchecked, would undermine democracy. If our democracy is to be preserved we must uphold it with vigilant and sacrificial devotion.

We must be vigilant to detect and resist all who are at work among us to spread distrust among the groups that make up our citizenship. Distrust is a subtle poison. It dissolves the bonds that hold us together as a people. No hostile influence from without can disturb any nation where citizens have learned to trust one another.

Patriotism, loyalty to America and her institutions, is not the exclusive prerogative of any group in our country. However citizens may differ as to race, religion, or national origin, the war from which we have emerged has taught all of us that we all, alike, love America.

To recognize that and freely to acknowledge it is essential to national unity. We must have a patriotism so great that one citizen cannot hate another on the pretext that he is not a good American.

America is a composite of many racial and religious groups, no one of which can truly claim superior loyalty. Each of these groups has made its own distinctive contribution to the national life. America would be the poorer if any one of these groups should be eliminated. We need them all.

That a nation is strong in proportion as differences are suppressed and its people cast in a single mold is a fallacy congenial to totalitarianism. It has no place in democracy. Variety is a source of strength to the nation. Variety, with mutual tolerance, has a vigor that enforced uniformity can never hope to gain.

Our country is founded on the faith that men may differ in religious convictions and yet unite in defense of American liberties. That faith has been justified in the history of the Republic.

Democracy is a term that is obscure until it has been defined. It has become increasingly plain in recent months that in Russia democracy means something quite different from democracy in the United States.

By democratic liberties we mean freedom for all, whatever their religious affiliation. The American liberties are guaranteed by the Federal Constitution and by every State to citizens of all faiths equally.

Bound up thus in one life, therefore, every distinctive group in America is interested in the maintenance of liberty, not only liberty for themselves but for every other group.

For whatever threatens the liberties of any of our people threatens those of all.

Overton-O'Mahoney Formula for Federal Contribution to the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Measuring an Obligation," written by John W. Thompson, Jr., and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 8, 1947. The article deals with the question of how the Overton-O'Mahoney formula would work in deciding what the Federal Government should contribute toward the expenses of the District of Columbia. I also ask that a letter which I wrote to Mr. Thompson be printed following the article.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEASURING AN OBLIGATION—HOW THE OVERTON-O'MAHONEY FORMULA WOULD WORK IN DECIDING WHAT THE NATION SHOULD PAY

(By John W. Thompson, Jr.)

District hopes for a bigger annual Federal payment toward city expenses today are wrapped up in the Overton-O'Mahoney-Hébert formula.

This is the only plan pending under which the United States would assume a proportion of the cost of city operation instead of appropriating each year an arbitrary lump sum.

In the Senate the measure is being sponsored by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming. A companion bill in the House has been introduced by Representative HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana. Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, first proposed the idea and worked it into shape.

The principle of the formula is to repay the District for the large amount of land which the Federal Government owns here tax free which in private hands would be taxable.

HOW IT WORKS

Reduced to a percentage, it asserts that the Federal Government owns 18.66 percent of the total area of the city exclusive of parks, streets and alleys, and District government holdings.

Under the plan this percentage figure—to the nearest percent—would be multiplied by the total tax income of the last completed fiscal year to get the amount of Federal payment.

For example, should the bill be passed this year and the formula used in the new District budget for the year beginning July 1, District officials would add up the total tax collections for the fiscal year ended last June 30 in the three city income funds—water, highway, and general. They would then multiply by 19 percent to get the total Federal payment, which would be about $11,666,980.

This payment would then be split across the three funds according to the percentage each represents of the total revenue figure.

There is a double safeguard to the city in this formula. It would increase the Federal payment as Federal land holdings increase. It would also boost the national share as new or increased taxes boost the total revenues. In any case it would yield more than the $8,000,000 lump-sum payment made this year and the $6,000,000 payments of the preceding 7 years.

WHY THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD HELP

But why should the Federal Government pay anything toward the city?

The answer is that the obligation is first a moral one, secondly a practical one, and thereby hangs a tale.

It harks back to June 19, 1783, when a band of soldiers gathered outside Independence Hall to present grievances to the executive council of the State of Pennsylvania. The Congress of the Confederation was meeting in the same building at the time. Its members appealed to the Pennsylvania Council to suppress the disorder but no action was taken. Congress then adjourned to Princeton a few miles away.

To this incident historians attribute the decision of the Confederation leaders to establish a capital outside existing cities where Congress would have exclusive authority and control. It was so ordered in the Constitution.

In line with this decision, original owners of the area selected along the Potomac River donated five-sevenths of the city soil on the understanding that the Nation would here develop a magnificent headquarters at its own expense. Part of the cost was to be made up by the National Government through the sale of the donated lots.

The moral case for Federal payment thus rests on the principle that with exclusive control and paramount national interest goes the obligation to support that interest. It also arises from the deal under which the Government obtained the land. A capital belongs to a nation, not to its local inhabitants alone.

The practical argument is that community resources alone are not enough to develop Washington according to the Federal plan for it. From 1800 to 1835, the city, neglected by the Federal Government, ran into debt to the point where it had to be rescued by Congress. Forty years later the same thing happened again resulting finally in recognition of the obligation by Congress in the act of 1878. The Federal Government agreed to match the community dollar for dollar in Capital development.

This was the high point in Federal-city relation—the best deal Washington ever got from Uncle Sam. It remained effective until 1921 when Congress reduced the Federal share to 40 percent. Four years later a hostile House shoved through the arbitrary lump-sum payment that now prevails regardless of need or of mounting city expenses. And once again the city is rushing toward a debt.

The principal factor in community inability to pay—even if the moral obligation were otherwise—is the Federal requirement of magnificence on the one hand and the Federal withdrawal of tax resources on the other. Land is historically a basic item in taxation. Yet the Federal Government has fixed the area of Washington beyond possibility of extension and then grabbed 42 percent of it, including the parks, for Federal purposes. Diplomatic missions here for purely Federal purpose retire more land from taxation, so that today less than half the city is available for real-estate levy.

When the city has tried to branch out into other taxes such as sales or income levies to compensate for this situation, Congress in the exercise of its exclusive authority has either killed them or mangled them in an effort to steer the burden away from themselves and their constituents.

A city in this predicament cannot afford large park areas, or a fort drive. It cannot afford to build a Federal courthouse equal in magnificence to the Supreme Court and more expensive. It cannot afford to pay for the millions of gallons of water used annually by the Federal Government. Yet everything it does must not only meet a need but be upon a scale of grandeur imposed by the Federal pattern.

Thus practically and morally the Federal Government should pay heavily toward city expenses. That payment should be proportional because it should increase as expenses increase.

Even in the early stages of lump-sum payment the District fared better than it does now both in amount and purchasing power of the Federal share. From 1925 to 1930 the payment was at least $9,000,000 in prewar dollars and in days when total District expenses amounted to less than $50,000,000. In 1931 and 1932 it reached an all-time high of $9,500,000 and in 1937 a low of $5,000,000 which was continued through 1939.

Today the District is receiving $8,000,000 against total expenses which will exceed $85,000,000 by June 30.

THEY PREFER THE OVERTON PLAN

While District officials are 100 percent behind the O'Mahoney formula, and it has the endorsement of the White House, it is less advantageous to the city than the old Overton plan out of which it grew.

The earlier plan, developed by Senator OVERTON, Democrat, of Louisiana, carried a similar land-based formula with these differences:

1. Only excess parkland over the normal in comparable cities was deducted in figuring the percentage.

2. The percentage figure was to be multiplied by general-fund appropriations, rather than the tax income of the three funds.

3. The total amount of Federal payment was to go to the general fund.

Under the Overton formula the city would get some $14,854,780 from the National Government this year on the basis of Budget expenses.

In general, District fiscal officials would rather have the money go entirely to the general fund, because they think that is where it is really needed. It is also where the present lump sum is credited.

The highway and water funds are separate, self-sustaining funds, with their own sources of income. The highway fund especially has access to Federal grants on a matching basis similar to the several States.

If the O'Mahoney plan is approved, District officials feel it will complicate their efforts to have the Federal Government pay the water fund for the water it uses. They feel Congress will look upon O'Mahoney money going to the water fund as payment for the water.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1947.

Mr. JOHN W. THOMPSON, Jr.,
The Star, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have just read your story entitled "Measuring an Obligation," appearing in the Star under date of February 8, 1947, with respect to the Overton formula of Federal contribution as revised under the O'Mahoney-Overton substitute. I congratulate you upon it. It is the most comprehensive and at the same time the most succinct statement that has as yet been made in regard to the much discussed formula. Even Mr. McKelway, whom I regard as an expert in the fiscal relations between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, has never written editorially or otherwise anything better than your contribution.

Now, the purpose of this letter is not only to congratulate you but to suggest that you have tear sheets of your article sent to each member of the House District Committee and also to members of the Senate District Committee. I shall, next week, have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. OVERTON,
United States Senator.

National Freedom Day Address of Hon. Robert N. McGarvey, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARDIE SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by the Honorable ROBERT N. MCGARVEY, Congressman, Second District of Pennsylvania, at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia, on February 2, 1947, in honor of National Freedom Day:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be here tonight to celebrate National Freedom Day. I was honored when Maj. R. R. Wright asked me to introduce a resolution in the Eightieth Congress requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

When Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution proposing the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, he must have had a vision of the great work which the race he had liberated would do. Unfortunately, he never lived to see them take even the first stride toward the distant goal he had envisioned.

One of the great men of the Negro race, Booker T. Washington, in 1901 wrote a book called "Up From Slavery." Those three words are very significant. They could be taken as the theme of the Negro race in America, for surely no other people could have accomplished what the Negro has in the 80-odd years since he has been freed from serfdom and utter oppression.

You have made great strides in the fields of medicine, having Negro doctors and clinics run by people of your race for your race, Negro lawyers helping those oppressed as they once were.

But perhaps the greatest accomplishments have been made in the fields of religion and education. The Negro has always been recognized as a deeply religious race. You must be thankful that this is still true in these troubled days when your ministers and priests, your missionaries in far-off lands are guiding people once more to God.

As we look about us, we see Negro schools, colleges, and universities. We read books by distinguished Negro authors and benefit by the research of Negro scientists. Our culture is enriched on all sides by Negro artists.

These facts are surprising when one considers that the group that accomplished all this lived in almost total ignorance 80 years ago. What makes it almost unbelievable is the fact that to do so, they had to struggle against the overwhelming forces of ignorant intolerance and oppression.

Yes, "Up From Slavery" to the present day when we celebrate National Freedom Day to mark the great accomplishments of the Negro race. The importance of national freedom day is doubly significant this year when the nations of the world are seeking to maintain a just and lasting peace, to abolish all war so that we shall never again have to undergo another such as this last, terrible conflict.

I must mention here the contribution of the Negroes who fought in the armed services in World War II and pay tribute to those who died for their country. These silent dead are perhaps the strongest persuasion that National Freedom Day has for recognition. For surely, if white and colored can die together for the ideals of American democracy, then they can live together striving for those same ideals, embodied so well in the words of Maj. R. R. Wright, which I quote: "• • • the fundamentals of good citizenship • • • affirm(s) and advocate(s) that neither discrimination nor segregation should be tolerated in our free Republic; that every step or act in such direction is not only thoroughly inconsistent with freedom but absolutely antagonistic to the peace, progress, and happiness of every citizen of our commonwealth."

I am honored to be a Member of the Eightieth Congress which will direct the peace aims of America and therefore of the world. America, our great country, which is dedicated to the principle that all men are created equal, will have perhaps the strongest voice in determining the future of the world. Let us hope so. For a country which has always decreed liberty and freedom for all could make of the new world on whose threshold we stand a world of peace, justice, and security, where all men would be equal regardless of race or creed.

Before concluding I must pay special tribute to Maj. R. R. Wright, an honored leader of his race, who conceived the idea of National Freedom Day. It is he who has made tonight's celebration and past celebrations possible. I am proud that Major Wright chose me as the Philadelphia Congressman to introduce the resolution to the Eightieth Congress, for he is a distinguished American, whom all his fellow Americans should honor.

I congratulate him and all here gathered tonight for your great work in behalf of National Freedom Day. We have all worked together to make America the great country that it is and in years to come may we strive toward the goal of a better world.

David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there have appeared in various newspapers of the country a great many fine and strong editorials endorsing the appointment of Mr. David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. One of the best and strongest was published in the Washington Times-Herald of October 29, 1946. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LILIENTHAL AS ATOM CHIEF

David E. Lilienthal has been named by the President to head the five-member United States Atomic Commission. This Commission is to have over-all charge of the development of nuclear energy in this country for both military and peaceful purposes.

The nomination looks good to us on the strength of Lilienthal's record. He is the man who has been in charge of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the last 13 years.

In that job, Lilienthal could have yielded to the ambitions of Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR (Democrat), of Tennessee, to turn the TVA into a big patronage machine for the political welfare of MCKELLAR. Or Lilienthal could have knuckled under to a horde of idealists, doctrinaires, Socialists, and Communists who have long wanted to use the TVA primarily as a device for hurrying this country toward collectivism.

Lilienthal did neither of these things. He has run TVA on businesslike principles, thereby thwarting the radicals, and he has kept it from becoming a political football, to the great and continuing rage of Senator MCKELLAR, who says he will fight this nomination.

We need a man of Lilienthal's character to head the Atomic Commission. He is further recommended by the fact that he led the group which got out the atomic energy report utilized by Bernard M. Baruch in formulating the Baruch plan for eventual international control of atomic energy and development.

The Baruch plan is the one which the Russians don't like, because it calls for the

United States to be 100 percent sure that no other nation will cheat, before we tell any other nation how to make atom bombs.

With a Baruch plan sympathizer as Chairman of the Atomic Commission, we should be much safer for the next few years than if the Chairman were a Wallace-minded gent anxious to cut the rest of the world in at once on our technical atom-bomb secrets.

All in all, we don't know of anybody we'd rather have seen appointed to this enormously important post than Lilienthal.

A Staggering Blow at Religious Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Southern Baptist Convention is Dr. Louie D. Newton, pastor of Druid Hills Baptist Church in Atlanta, located in the district which I have the honor to represent. Dr. Newton has served in many capacities and official positions in local, State, regional, and world Baptist organizations. Largely because of the esteem and affection in which he is held by all Baptists everywhere, and as a tribute to his Christian personality, the World Baptist Alliance several years ago held its world-wide convention in Atlanta. His Christian service is not confined to members of the Baptist denomination. Because of the fact that he works for the advancement of the kingdom of God with all races and denominations, he is beloved by Jew and gentile, Catholic and Protestant, white and black. He is recognized everywhere as an apostle of true Christian brotherhood.

Dr. Newton is known as a leader who has the courage of his convictions. He was in Washington last week when the Supreme Court handed down its decision concerning transportation of school children to schools other than public schools, and is seriously concerned with the possible effect which this Court decision may have upon the principle of separation of church and state, one of the foundation stones upon which our form of government is built.

For the information of Members of Congress and the public, I am inserting Dr. Newton's statement, which follows herewith:

I listened to the majority opinion of the Supreme Court's decision in the New Jersey case this afternoon, as read and argued by Mr. Justice Black, and I could not disassociate the name of the eloquent jurist with a shadow, now no larger, it may appear, than a man's hand, but portending a great and terrible cloud that may be drifting out over every hamlet and dale from Plymouth to the Golden Gate to darken the torch of religious liberty in our beloved land.

I also listened to Mr. Justice Jackson as he rendered the minority opinion and referred to the Court as turning back the hands of the clock to those dark days of ecclesiastical dominance and tyranny which finally prompted Jefferson and Madison to write the first amendment into our Constitution.

While acknowledging the frightening effects of the majority opinion, as it will be seized to further hammer down the wall that separates church and state in our country, I do take courage in the fact that the minority opinion restates the case in the full light of history and in terms of invincible logic.

I hope and pray that this omnibus decision may serve to arouse the freedom-loving people of this Nation to prompt and uncompromising action by which the pressure of ecclesiasticism shall be finally lifted from the administrative, legislative, and judicial branches of government, local, State, and National.

The next battle in this war on the time-honored citadel of religious liberty in the United States will take place in the Congress, when pending bills to provide Federal funds for education, with loopholes for use of such funds in parochial schools, are argued. Remembering that public opinion is the final court of appeal in a democracy, it is still our privilege to let our lawmakers and public servants know how we believe and feel on this vital issue.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in this day of hysterical discussion of the atomic bomb and its implications, I desire to include in the RECORD a very sober letter that was written to Mr. J. H. Leib, of Arlington, Va., by the Honorable Warren R. Austin, United States Delegate to the United Nations. Mr. Austin in a very few paragraphs very convincingly deals with the necessity for adequate controls of atomic energy.

I commend the statements of Mr. Austin to those who habitually think of atomic energy only in terms of a weapon.

We cannot fail in our determination that our Nation shall participate in collective action to control this indefensible weapon. As Mr. Austin says:

I am confident that with patient and persistence we shall find a means for an agreement on the control of atomic energy.

The letter follows:

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO
THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N. Y., February 10, 1947.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
Arlington, Va.

MY DEAR MR. LEIB: Thank you for your frank letter of January 29 asking my views on the likelihood of a future war.

If I thought war was inevitable or even very likely, I would not be devoting myself completely to the work of the United Nations. I believe in the United Nations as the best hope the world has for making peaceful progress. It cannot guarantee peace but it does offer us political, social, and economic institutions through which peoples and governments can create the conditions of peace and the collective enforcement of the charter.

I do not think that any nation aside from our own has the facilities for making atomic bombs, but the scientists are certain that other nations can secure these facilities within a few years. It is, therefore, of first importance that we get agreement on the control of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only.

I am confident that with patience and persistence we shall find a basis of agreement on the control of atomic energy. If we can do this, we can also work out a system of inspection and control for other major weapons.

We have a greater stake than any other nation because our concentrated industrial society is most vulnerable to this weapon and we do not know of any defense against it. This fact should not make us hysterical because in such a mood we are likely to do the wrong thing and make matters worse. Rather, we must have a public opinion which is sober and responsible, ready to take the practical next steps, using what we have, to achieve the best results we can.

In the last analysis, the hope for peace rests with the people. If they are ready to support their governments in collective action to create the conditions of peace through intelligent collaboration for economic stability and world prosperity and, at the same time, for the employment of collective military power against any threat of aggression, we will have peace.

I hope these brief comments will answer your letter.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

MVA: A Lifesaver for New Hampshire Users of Electric Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein my remarks with reference to a statement made by Avery R. Schiller, president of the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire:

As sponsor of the MVA, or Merrimack Valley Authority, bill in the present session of Congress, I want to take exceptions to the criticism of this measure made by Mr. Avery R. Schiller, president of the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, which sells power and light to such representative cities as Manchester, Nashua, Berlin, Keene, Laconia, and Rochester.

He says, among other things: "Let us permit private capital to do these jobs which long experience has shown that private capital is best qualified to do."

I will amend this to say that private power utilities are doing a job on the people of New Hampshire.

Here are the facts, quoted from a 1946 report of the Federal Power Commission:

On average monthly bills for cities of 2,500 population and more, New Hampshire ranks last among the 48 States in the matter of reducing 100 kilowatt-hours residential service.

Tennessee, home of the TVA, ranks first.

Breaking it down more specifically, let us see how the people of Manchester, serviced by Mr. Schiller's company, are doing with their electric bills.

When we look into the report we find reasons why Mr. Schiller is opposed to an MVA.

During the period January 1, 1936, to January 1, 1946, all except five of the cities of 50,000 or more population in the Nation had reductions in two or more of their typical bills for residential electric service. Among the five who failed to give a break to their consumers was Manchester, N. H.

Among the communities cited where monthly bills showed no change for 25 kilowatt-hours residential service, Manchester tops the list with the highest average, $2; while Washington, D. C., of whose intentions Mr. Schiller is so suspicious, has a rate of only 98 cents.

In another category—100 kilowatt-hours residential electric bill reductions for the 10-year period—the utility servicing Manchester stubbornly resisted any decrease. Of the cities showing no change, Manchester again has the dubious distinction of heading the parade with the highest rate—$5 for 100 kilowatt-hours.

Coming to the third category—250 kilowatt-hours residential—Manchester, the leading contender for high rates, again shows no decrease and once more tops the list with a charge of $8.

In view of these facts, which prove that the people of Manchester are paying through the nose for their electricity, is it any wonder that Mr. Schiller is opposed to the MVA.

Furthermore, about 3,000 New Hampshire farms still are without electric service. They are not being served because they are not considered profitable by normal power company standards. When, however, the Federal Government began to encourage the development of nonprofit cooperatives in these rural areas, the commercial power companies opposed construction of Rural Electrification Administration lines. They suddenly became interested to the extent of constructing spite lines. It appears to me that some of these companies are afraid that they are going to be exposed by cheaper rates.

Mr. Schiller carefully avoids the fact that a private company recently purchased a floating power station from the Federal Government to anchor in Portsmouth Harbor, as insurance against the possibility of an electrical famine which would cripple the southern part of New Hampshire.

It is odd that, coming from the State of Washington, he should be suspicious of a New England-born Congressman who does not want to see our one natural resource go to waste.

A Congressman from Tennessee—home of the successful TVA—and a Senator from Mr. Schiller's native State of Washington, where federally sponsored hydroelectric developments have brought great benefits to industry and the people, have both congratulated me on my plea to establish a Merrimack Valley Authority. In both cases they said: "It's about time that New England woke up."

Mr. Schiller speaks guardedly about States' rights. Fine for certain purposes of government, but the 5,000-square-mile basin of the Merrimack, with all its economic potentialities, was fashioned by the hand of God and cannot be split up and isolated by States' rights.

The South once believed passionately in States' rights until the TVA showed them a better way, in which the people of several States get together to share a much-needed development of their common wealth. And who has a greater claim to the efficient service our rivers can give than the people?

When men like Governor Dewey, of New York and General Marshall, among others, urge more projects like the TVA, I should think that Mr. Schiller might heed their advice.

Instead of vaulting to the need of "one world," let us make a modest and practical beginning. Through support of the Merrimack Valley Authority, we shall not only get more and cheaper electricity for all (including private utilities), but we shall show our capacity to solve, through democratic methods, the economic challenge of our times. We've got to produce and distribute and provide the lowest possible prices for electric power and light for all of the people.

Job-Training Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire you to include the following transcript of the testimony given by my fellow Missourian, Gen. Omar Bradley, the distinguished Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, before the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House on Tuesday, February 18, 1947:

In view of the confusion that has again and again obscured the fundamental issues at stake in public discussion of job-training ceilings, I am glad of this opportunity to offer my views freely and in open session before your committee.

During previous executive committee hearings of the Eightieth Congress, I have purposely avoided any reference whatsoever to this controversial question. I have likewise refrained from any previous expression of opinion before this or any other committee on pending legislation which would increase or remove ceilings established by Public Law 679 on the subsistence allowances paid veterans in education or training.

There is a direct involvement of public interest here that goes far beyond the hundreds of millions of dollars at stake. For the principle of a ceiling reaches deeply into the basic intent and the fundamental objectives of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

It cannot be resolved—or even understood—until the issue is approached as a vital question of national policy.

I have already submitted to your committee the formal report requested on H. R. 488 and H. R. 870, both of the Eightieth Congress, together with my comments on 17 other bills proposing changes in existing laws on the payment of subsistence. This report was accompanied by a statement and factual study on findings of the Veterans' Administration in the enforcement of statutory ceiling limits. There was also attached a comparative chart summarizing the principal features of each of the 19 bills now before your committee. I likewise included a statement on the historical background of administrative policies pursued by the Veterans' Administration in the conduct of education and training prior to the passage of ceiling controls. I respectfully ask that this material be inserted in the record at this point.

In that formal report, I said that ceilings were devised not to restrict application of the Readjustment Act but to channel tax moneys into sound and useful job-training programs that would honestly benefit veterans seeking wage-earning skills.

I stand by the theory of a ceiling, not because we are irrevocably committed to one in the administration of our laws, but because I do truthfully believe a ceiling is needed to establish national policy in determining how far we shall go in the payment of subsistence to veterans. Without some such determination from the legislative branch of the Government, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is given power actually to determine national policy.

In the arbitrary exercise of that power, one man could conceivably commit the Government to the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in excess of that envisioned by Congress. One man could restrict the opportunities for training to the eventual detriment of thousands of veterans. Or, in declining to exercise that authority, one man could undermine the basic training objectives of the educational provisions of the Readjustment Act. I believe it is unwise to concentrate that power in the hands of one man.

To understand the importance of this statutory ceiling limit, it is necessary first to understand the sequence of events that brought it into being.

During the war, we faced a national crisis when manpower reserves failed to meet pressing military requirements. As a result, the draft law was extended to include youths of 18. Many of them were students in high school or college. Others were working, but only a negligible few had acquired job skills or experience suited to their peacetime needs. There was the danger that this wartime dislocation might easily result in permanent loss of their opportunity for education and training. It was this realization that contributed to the early proposals for a Government-sponsored program that would provide incentives to resume education and training. Such a program would not only benefit the individual by equipping him for a productive and self-supporting life, but it also promised to increase the wealth of the Nation by enlarging our reservoir of employable skills among this age group.

When the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was enacted by Congress, it provided liberal opportunities for veterans whose education or training had been interrupted by war. To insure liberal interpretation of this provision of the law, the Readjustment Act established that interruption of education would be assumed in the case of any veteran who was under 25 at the time of entry into service.

At the same time, the law extended beyond recognized institutional education and established apprenticeship courses to include the indeterminate "other training on the job."

In theory this was a program of readjustment devised to heal the economic scars of war in the lives of these young men. It gave them opportunity for greater economic self-determination. It sought to restore lost learning and skills with fresh opportunities for education and training. And it minimized cost as the controlling factor in a young man's selection of his lifetime career.

When the war ended and the Readjustment Act was put to a practical test, there soon developed wide misunderstanding of its actual provisions.

Although the original law provided benefits to veterans on the theoretical basis of need resulting from interrupted training, public opinion soon swung to the support of a principle that would open education and training to all veterans, irrespective of age, and irrespective of whether or not the war had interrupted their training.

At the same time rapid increases in the high cost of living had the effect of diminishing the real value of subsistence allowances. These were established in 1944 at the rate of $50 for a veteran without dependents and $75 for a veteran with dependents who was engaged in full-time courses of education and training.

The Seventy-ninth Congress thereupon amended the original Readjustment Act with Public Law 265 on December 28, 1945. Among its other changes this law eliminated the 25-year-age presumption on education and training, opening benefits of the Readjustment Act to include all eligible veterans. This amendment likewise increased the rate of subsistence payments to $65 and $90 a month.

In addition to these several changes, Public Law 268 repealed section 1505 of the Readjustment Act, which had previously

provided that the value of benefits received by veterans be deducted from any allowance which might thereafter be voted them in the form of adjusted compensation for their war service.

While these modifications in the original Readjustment Act did not alter the basic philosophy of that law, they did cause confusion in the public's understanding of its objectives. This confusion soon resulted in widespread misunderstanding of the purposes to be served in the payment of subsistence.

The abandonment of the 25-year age limit in establishing the eligibility of veterans for education and training did not also mean the abandonment of the requirements for training as such. And the increase in rates of subsistence allowance did not mean that Congress had discarded its original intent to limit subsistence allowance to a moderate measure of support to veterans in education and training.

Nevertheless, there developed in the minds of many people the erroneous concept that the subsistence allowance had been devised as a form of adjusted compensation. They believed it should be paid to any job-holding veteran as compensation for the time he lost in service. If this view is to hold, there are comparatively few among the 10,700,000 job-holding veterans today who could not qualify for subsistence payments. In most cases, they would be restricted only by their employers' reluctance to designate their jobs as training programs.

Unless the payment of subsistence allowances is limited in on-the-job training to actual courses of training within the meaning of the law, subsistence allowance can be exploited as a bonus.

Early in 1946 a definite trend developed wherein full-time gainful jobs were being labeled courses of training in order to enable veterans to receive subsistence-allowance payments. In some instances, veterans exerted pressure on their employers to establish training courses which would permit the payment of subsistence. In other cases, employers themselves devised training courses to create higher income inducements for qualified veteran employees.

Our effort to prevent the development of this trend was complicated by the Federal-State relationship that exists in enforcement of the job-training program. When Congress drafted the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, it specified that the approval and supervision of institutions selected for the education and training of veterans on Federal funds be left to the 48 separate States without the further establishment of training standards.

In this connection the law says:

"8. No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out the provisions of this part, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational or training institution."

At that time, there was no indication of the astonishing present-day growth of "other training on-the-job." Within 1 year, from July 1945 to July 1946, while veteran enrollment in schools and colleges increased 32 times, veteran enrollment in job-training courses increased 200 times. There is nothing in the legislative history of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act which anticipated the problems soon to confront us in the administration and control of this job-training program.

Similarly, there is nothing in the legislative history of Public Law 268 which suggests that the effect of the repeal of age restrictions on "other job-training courses" could have been anticipated.

States which readily fulfilled their approval and supervisory duties in institutions and apprenticeship courses under the Readjustment Act found themselves hard pressed to discharge their responsibilities adequately in rapidly mushrooming job-training courses. Inadequate staffs and insufficient funds often resulted in cursory review and automatic approval of these training programs. Forbidden by law to interfere in this prerogative of the States, the Veterans' Administration could resort only to offers of aid.

Supervision of the veteran himself could not have remedied the situation that developed. The supervision permitted us under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is confined to the progress and attendance of the veteran in a course already designated as a course of training by the State approval authority. The Veterans' Administration was given no authority under the law to determine whether a course of training already approved by the State agency was actually bona fide.

Shortly before the close of the Seventy-ninth session of Congress, a bill, S. 2144, thereafter incorporated in Public Law 679, was introduced in the Senate. This bill proposed reimbursement to the States of funds required in the approval and supervision of education and training courses to be provided veterans under the Readjustment Act. After coordination with the Bureau of the Budget for clearance with the program of the President, a report was duly made to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

We were already convinced, on the basis of our experience, that the lack of funds and the lack of adequate standards in many of the States had already caused the job-training program to suffer greatly.

Recognizing that the annual cost of this job-training program would run from a minimum of $350,000,000 to a maximum in excess of $1,000,000,000 in any one year, we agreed that the Federal Government could not logically take the position that the matter was entirely outside its jurisdiction simply because of the phraseology of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

The two basic shortcomings that conspired to weaken control of on-the-job training were the lack of sufficient funds and the lack of adequate training standards. Although S. 2144 sought to remedy the first, it offered no solution for the latter.

Accordingly, we submitted our report on the Senate bill with amendments to the original proposal for the reimbursement of funds to the States. One change established an acceptable Nation-wide table of standards for other job-training courses. This included a 2-year limitation on job-training courses other than those ordinarily recognizable or otherwise approved by the Veterans' Administration as being apprenticeable in character. Another established a ceiling on the contributions to be made by the Government in subsistence allowances paid to job-holding veterans whether training in schools or on the job. This amendment made it possible for a student to receive subsistence allowance even though employed in a full-time job not a part of his educational course.

I believe that in their establishment of the educational and training program of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, the American people have not only sought to repair the damage caused by war to the lives, careers, and the job security of numberless thousands of veterans, but I hold they have also prescribed a new and daring charter for human welfare that cannot only repair but enrich beyond measure the lives of these young men. For by creating opportunities for education and the restoration of useful job skills, the American people have granted the veteran his right to share fairly in the wealth of this Nation by honest reward for productive labor.

In on-the-job training, we are administering a program specifically designed to help the veteran help himself by acquiring useful and marketable job skills. We have a double-edged responsibility both to the veteran as a recipient of these benefits and to the veteran as part of the tax-paying public. To benefit the veteran permanently and to assist him in offsetting the economic penalties of his service, we must carry out these provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act aggressively and with sufficient imagination to accomplish its objectives. Education and training opportunities have been provided by Congress not simply as rewards but as tools that will enable veterans to achieve their own vocational and economic self-sufficiency.

At the same time, in fairness to the more than 10,000,000 job-holding veterans whose circumstances do not permit or require the use of these training benefits, and in fairness to all the American people who must eventually pay for their cost, it is our responsibility to safeguard the integrity of this program and make certain that it shall not be diverted from its sound economic objectives.

Shortly after adoption of the job-training standards specified in Public Law 679, it was alleged that the Veterans' Administration possessed the necessary machinery for proper control of this program without resorting to the principle of a statutory ceiling on the payment of subsistence.

With the facts at my disposal, I cannot concur in this conclusion. I cannot, because in exercising any authority given me to limit the payment of subsistence, I felt that I would be preempting the responsibility of Congress in the establishment of national policy.

Without attempting to adjudge the adequacy of existing statutory ceiling payments, I believe the principle of the ceiling is necessary to establish national policy on the payment of subsistence in the job-training program. If we accept the theory of subsistence as a moderate contribution to the support of the veteran in training, we must likewise accept the principle that there is some point at which Government subsistence is no longer morally warranted in the veteran's economic readjustment. For I believe it was the intent of Congress and the American people that these provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act be used as a tool to accomplish this economic readjustment and render the veteran self-supporting.

Without a statutory ceiling limit in the payment of subsistence, there is nothing in the standards prescribed for on-the-job training courses that would deny Government contributions to veterans in training courses in the higher income brackets. I sincerely question whether we can justifiably condone the payment of such subsistence as a measure of support when we remember that the great majority of wage-earning veterans are participating in no way whatsoever in benefits of the job-training program. To sanction comparatively high-income training courses would simply encourage the duplication of those courses throughout the country.

Ceilings on the payment of subsistence were devised, therefore, as one instrument of control in the job-training program. They were devised not to restrict operation of the Readjustment Act, but to channel tax moneys into sound and useful job-training programs that would honestly benefit veterans seeking wage-earning skills. It is only by guaranteeing that veterans receive useful job skills in the expenditure of their eligibility that we can hope to steer them toward a well-adjusted state of self-sufficiency. This I believe to be the eventual objective of the Readjustment Act.

The allegation was made before this committee that the ceiling imposed on subsistence payments by Public Law 679 is, in fact,

an actual ceiling on the earnings of veterans. That statement is not true. A ceiling on the payment of subsistence does not limit the amount of money that a veteran may earn. It simply fixes a point on his wage scale above which the Federal Government no longer considers it necessary to furnish assistance. If Congress elects to retain the principle of a ceiling, the level at which it should be set will depend upon that reasonable and minimum point at which it considers the veteran in training to be decently self-supporting.

The allegation was also made that application of subsistence payment ceilings would wreck the job-training program. As of July 31, 1946, 8 days before the ceilings became law, there were 400,527 veterans enrolled in apprenticeship courses and other training on the job. By January 31, 1947, this enrollment had increased to 632,000 veterans.

If the Eightieth Congress elects to repeal the principle of a ceiling, the Veterans' Administration will be left without any legislative guide to determine at what point it should exercise its power to reduce the payment of subsistence in job-training courses. As I indicated to you earlier in this statement, the decision is a critical one of national policy, too important and too far-reaching to be entrusted to the judgment of a single man.

If the principle of the ceiling is repealed or if the statutory ceiling is too materially increased, I venture to predict that employers will be subjected to great pressure to convert their production jobs into courses of training. This pressure in turn would be exerted on State approving agencies to encourage approval of such training programs.

Based on the training programs now in operation, the estimated cost of repeal of the ceiling for the first year is $161,352,000. If the law were amended prior to the beginning of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1947 there would be an additional cost of $43,766,000. It is not possible for us to estimate the additional cost of new training programs that might be established if ceilings are removed or materially increased.

Much of the opposition directed against a ceiling on the payment of subsistence is aimed not at the principle of a ceiling but rather at the existing statutory ceiling levels.

As the law now stands, a veteran may receive subsistence allowance only when he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training. He may earn as much as he can. But when the trainee with no dependents earns $175 or more per month the Government ceases to contribute subsistence on the theory that a moderate measure of support is no longer needed. When earnings of the trainee with dependents exceed $200 or more per month the Government likewise withdraws its partial contribution to his support.

Where the veteran's earnings are less the Federal Government will pay him subsistence but not to exceed $65 or $90 a month. Where the veteran is receiving compensation for productive labor performed as part of his apprenticeship or other training on the job the amount of his subsistence when added to his current monthly salary or wage, based upon the standard workweek and exclusive of overtime, shall not be in excess of the standard beginning salary or wage payable to a journeyman workman or a trained employee in the occupation or trade for which the training is being provided. Here, too, the rate of such allowances when added to the compensation received for productive labor shall not exceed $175 or $200 per month.

When the Veterans' Administration first considered the principle of a ceiling as an adjunct to the job-training standards submitted in its report on S. 2144, Seventy-ninth Congress, I was not inclined to suggest a specific ceiling level. I felt then—as I do now—that this determination is properly the legislative responsibility of Congress as a matter of national policy.

Because this ceiling level is of direct personal importance to the living standards of thousands of veterans, I believe that it should be fixed by statute rather than by the decision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

However, the Veterans' Administration suggested the existing statutory ceiling limits of $175 and $200 in the proposed bill attached to the letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee on July 19, 1946.

In reaching this conclusion, the Veterans' Administration considered the following three factors:

1. The $100 limitation placed in the law affecting the payment of self-employed allowances.

2. The $138 a month compensation paid to totally disabled veterans.

3. The average earnings of all workers, including those in agricultural occupations.

There are now before your committee seven bills in addition to the basic H. R. 870, Eightieth Congress, providing for ceiling levels that reach from $250 to $350 per month for a veteran without dependents, and from $300 to $400 per month for a veteran with dependents.

Here again, if Congress elects to retain the principle of a ceiling in the control of on-the-job training, it must determine at what point the veteran in training can be presumed to be independent of government aid in the maintenance of a decent standard of living.

It is estimated, on the basis of enrollment in the present program, that the total increased cost for the upward revision in ceiling levels proposed as a change in law by H. R. 870 would amount to $156,492,000 for the first year—assuming that current subsistence allowances remain as they are. If the law became effective before the beginning of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1947, there would be an additional cost of $42,448,000. Again it is not possible to estimate the additional cost of the training programs that might be established if ceilings were materially increased.

Section 2 of H. R. 488, one of the basic bills under discussion, would repeal that provision of Public Law 679 establishing a limitation of 2 years on full-time training on the job.

The 2-year limitation prescribed for on-the-job training in the amended Readjustment Act does not apply to apprenticeship courses. Nor does it necessarily apply to those courses of training which ordinarily are not recognized by State agencies responsible for the approval of apprentice training programs. The Veterans' Administration under its instruction 8, dated August 27, 1946, provides that courses not ordinarily recognized and approved as apprenticeships can be so recognized and approved by the State authority or by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs where they possess the common attributes of apprenticeships. This regulation has the effect of extending to additional bona fide training courses exemption from the limitation of 2 years.

In other courses which presumably are not apprenticeable in character, the 2-year limitation would prevent the exploitation of job-training procedures in positions ordinarily considered as part of the normal flow of promotion in business, industry, agriculture, and finance. It would prevent the subsistence allowance from being employed as compensatory adjustment pay for the benefit of comparatively few veterans at the expense of the majority. Experience has shown that the 2-year limitation does not work a hardship on those veterans who did not elect an apprenticeable course of training.

H. R. 870, Eightieth Congress, again one of the basic bills under discussion, would increase subsistence allowances for the 2,232,000 veterans in training under Public Law 346 as of the end of January. By the terms of this bill, subsistence allowances for veterans would be increased from $65 and $90 per month to $100 and $125 with $10 more for each additional dependent.

It is perfectly clear that in most areas the present subsistence allowance is inadequate to cover the over-all living costs of veteran students and their dependents.

The legislative history of Public Law 346, as amended, suggests that it was the original intent of Congress to contribute a moderate measure of support to veterans in education or training. In its theory, this concept did not admit the obligation of Congress for the complete support of those students. The upward revision in subsistance allowance provided by Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress, resulted from the higher cost of living and helped to reduce in part the hardship caused students by rising prices.

The question as to whether Congress shall elect to increase this allowance, as proposed in H. R. 870, will depend on whether Congress is willing to undertake responsibility for defraying a greater portion of the living costs of veterans and their dependents while in training.

At this point, however, I must make this pertinent observation. If justification can be given the need for an increase in subsistence allowance to able-bodied veterans in education or training, I do believe that we are also obligated to resurvey the special needs of totally disabled veterans whose compensation amounts to $138 per month. By the same token, consideration is also due all of the 2,186,000 disabled veterans drawing monthly compensation in varying amounts.

However, I feel that the rate of subsistence allowance to be paid veterans in training is a matter of national policy and is a matter for determination by Congress.

Since the raising of subsistence allowance would affect both Public Law 16 and Public Law 346 trainees, it is estimated that the total costs of the changes in subsistence rates proposed by H. R. 870 would amount to $1,123,638,000 for the first year. If the law became effective before the beginning of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1947, there would be an additional cost of $308,589,000.

If you have any questions, I shall be glad to try and answer them.

Johnson & Johnson's Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Johnson & Johnson's Industrial Peace" by Benjamin L. Masse, which was published in the magazine America for January 25, 1947. The article shows how industry may contribute to industrial peace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON & JOHNSON'S INDUSTRIAL PEACE

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

Practically everybody knows and uses some of the products of Johnson & Johnson—Red

Cross cotton and bandages, Tek toothbrushes, the handy and invaluable Band-Aids. The world's largest manufacturer of surgical dressings, Johnson & Johnson is accepted everywhere as synonymous with quality where quality may mean the difference between life and death.

But if Johnson & Johnson is known to doctors and nurses, and even to the general public, it is no less well known to students of industrial relations. New Brunswick, N. J., where the home plant of Johnson & Johnson is located, has long been a place of pilgrimage for those seeking the last word in the manufacture of sutures or adhesive plaster or baby products. It is now becoming a magnet which attracts personnel directors, labor leaders, professors, writers, and vice presidents in charge of industrial relations. For at a time when industrial strife has reached such a bitter stage that men shake their heads and wonder whether warfare after all, as Karl Marx said a century ago, is endemic to an industrial society based on private property, Johnson & Johnson is an oasis of harmony and peace.

And so it happened not long ago that the writer went to New Brunswick to find out what made industrial relations at Johnson & Johnson tick. I spent the better part of 2 days there visiting the main plant and several of the subsidiaries, talking with workers and managers, watching the operation of the system on the spot. It was an encouraging and worthwhile experience and I came away feeling that if Johnson & Johnson has not found all the answers to the problems of industrial relations, it has discovered enough of them to make life reasonably pleasant and profitable for the 10,000 people it employs. "Are you satisfied here?" I asked one young lady who was working on sutures, and she replied: "If one has to work, this is the best place I know of." For an employe who probably had her heart set on marriage and a home and who looked upon all factory work as a necessary evil, this was high praise, indeed.

Successful industrial relations are the product of both tangible and intangible factors, and since it is easier to get your teeth into the tangible factors, let us start there.

First of all, most of the Johnson & Johnson employees in New Brunswick are represented by the Textile Workers of America, CIO. In a foreword to the last collective-bargaining agreement signed by the union and the company this paragraph occurs:

"The company approves of collective bargaining and believes the TWUA is an honest and well-conducted organization and joins the union in urging every affected employe to study this agreement and to be familiar with its contents."

Strange as it may seem to some industrialists, Johnson & Johnson really believes that, and skeptics who have their doubts about collective bargaining ought to sit down some time with Brig. Gen. Robert Wood Johnson, chairman of the board, or Richard Mulligan, who handles industrial relations for the main plant in New Brunswick, or Robert Dixson, who has the same responsibility for the company's Chicopee cotton mills. These men will tell you that the union has helped the company as much as it has helped the employees, and they mean it. Put down whole-hearted acceptance of the union by management as an essential part of good industrial relations at Johnson & Johnson.

It is no accident that the union contract is always called the agreement at Johnson & Johnson. Agreement connotes a meeting of hearts and minds, contract suggests hardness and legalism; and General Johnson believes in a meeting of hearts and minds and is allergic to hardness and legalism. For this reason, also, the agreement is printed in two parts: the first is the contract itself replete with legalisms; the second, entitled "Here's How To Use the Labor Agreement," is a down-to-the-earth paraphrase of part I which any employee can read and understand.

Because it regards the agreement as the basis of its industrial-relations program, Johnson & Johnson goes to unusual and perhaps unique lengths to make sure it is understood. Other employers take special pains to explain the labor-management contract to their foremen, but the present writer knows of no other case where the explanation as well as the making of the contract is a joint labor-management enterprise. After the contract has been signed at Johnson & Johnson, the company's supervisors sit down with the union's stewards and discuss together its meaning and interpretation. These sessions are held on the company's time with top union and management officials available in case their help is needed. The result is better understanding of the agreement on both sides, more interest in it, and smoother working of the grievance machinery.

The second tangible factor in harmonious industrial relations is the traditional trinity: wages, hours, and working conditions. In all these respects the workers at Johnson & Johnson seem satisfied. The 40-hour week is in force, of course, with time and one-half for all work done on Saturday and double time for work on Sunday. There are six paid holidays a year, and paid vacations of 2 weeks for all employees who have been with the company more than 3 years. For those with less seniority there is a 1-week vacation with pay.

The minimum hiring rate for women is 81 cents an hour; for men 95 cents. Wages are paid on both an hourly and a piecework basis, and exceptional pains are taken in setting up job procedures and making time studies. The union has access at all times to the company's time studies and in case of dispute is free to bring in its own engineer to study the job in question. Wages at Johnson & Johnson are above the average in both the community and the industry for similar skills. At the present time the company and union are working on a plan for severance pay for workers laid off on account of physical incapacity or technological improvements, and are exploring the possibility of guaranteed employment.

But wages are only part of the material compensation paid to Johnson & Johnson employees. Every employee has the following insurance paid for by the company: A $500 life insurance policy, a $500 accidental death and dismemberment policy, an accident and health plan with weekly benefits ranging from a minimum of $12 to a maximum of $30, a hospitalization plan with daily benefits of $4, maternity benefits of $148 minimum and $256 maximum, and surgical benefits up to $150.

Under the slogan "All work and no play is not the way at Johnson & Johnson," the company provides a recreation program planned jointly by the employees and the personnel department. Members of the Raritan Athletic Association—membership $4 a year—can engage in the following sports without further expense: Archery, basketball, bowling, fishing, golf, ping pong, rifle, soft ball, and tennis. If the employees want to indulge in horseback riding or swimming, the company, through the association, will pay half the fee.

Without in any way deprecating the importance of these tangible factors—and some have been omitted for lack of space—I do not believe that they are the real explanation for the success of Johnson & Johnson personnel policies. Other corporations pay good wages, provide various kinds of insurance, sponsor recreational programs, even recognize the union and still know nothing better than a truce in industrial warfare. It is the spirit which gives life to dead matter, and if we would seek the explanation for the fine state of affairs at Johnson & Johnson, we must look behind the tangible factors for the intangibles which animate them. And this brings us to Robert Wood Johnson, chairman of the board, and the center around which all the corporation's far-flung activities revolve.

In big-business circles General Johnson is something of a controversial figure. (The commission was earned during the war as Army procurement officer for the New York area and later as Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.) If business orthodoxy is determined by the National Association of Manufacturers and other reactionary organizations, then the trim, kindly but blunt-spoken head of Johnson & Johnson is quite simply a heretic. This itself would not be very extraordinary, since there are more heretics roaming around the business world than the average citizen might suspect. But these heretics are mostly silent, for very understandable reasons, and hence do not attract attention. General Johnson is a vocal heretic, and that's the trouble.

When the National Association of Manufacturers was busy last year opposing an increase in minimum wages under the Fair Labor Standards Act to 75 cents an hour, Johnson & Johnson's chairman of the board was just as busy supporting it. He actually dared to testify before the Senate Labor Committee, which was holding hearings on the proposed amendment, and as usual he said exactly what was on his mind. Here is an excerpt:

"There have always been more underpaid employed than unemployed. I suppose it would be fair to estimate that, given six to eight million unemployed, we would in the past expect fifteen to twenty million underpaid.

"I suggest that this committee should take the position that the average American workman cannot keep body and soul together on less than $30 per week anywhere in the United States."

Not long after this performance, General Johnson addressed some candid words to a meeting of the American Management Association in New York. This is what the startled industrialists heard:

"The first real opportunity organized business ever had to cure the ills of underpayment was under the NRA, the hated NRA. We could then have tried to establish a reasonable minimum. But what do the records still in the vaults reveal? American business went to Washington and plunked for the lowest wages and the longest hours it could whittle out of Hugh Johnson. That is the record of American management at that point.

"In the years that followed, one good way to put a bill through Congress was to be sure that the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, as then constituted, were opposed to it. That was the greatest lobby of all, since it was absolutely automatic. And it worked just as well in reverse; anything those organizations supported was automatically opposed."

Now that is the sort of thing which business standpatters find it hard to forgive. Like some of Eric Johnston's pronouncements and Charles Luckman's challenging talk last November in Chicago, it smacks of downright treachery.

It is important to understand that in setting his face against certain aspects of so-called business "orthodoxy" General Johnson is not seeking publicity. Only a man addicted to heroics would want that sort of publicity anyhow, and Robert Wood Johnson is not addicted to heroics. I imagine that this essentially modest man braves the wrath of his brother industrialists because he has formed certain convictions about industrial relations which he thinks are true and which he regards as important enough to fight for. That is all there is to it.

Anyhow it is these convictions which give life to industrial relations at Johnson &

Johnson. As I understand them they are: (1) A belief that the moral law of God governs business as well as everything else in life, and that good morals are necessarily good business; (2) a belief in the dignity of every human being; (3) a belief in the "Golden Rule" as the guiding principle of industrial relations.

Admittedly this is an idealistic approach to business, but the disconcerting thing about General Johnson—to some of his associates of lesser faith as well as to outsiders—is that to him this idealism is hardheaded realism. And the doubly disconcerting thing is that the record of Johnson & Johnson bears the man out. Few American corporations are more efficiently managed than this one, and few have been more consistently profitable.

One of the first things a prospective employe of Johnson & Johnson sees on entering the main plant in New Brunswick is a framed copy of General Johnson's industrial credo. It is worth printing here:

We believe that our first responsibility is to our customers.

Our products must always be good, and we must strive to make them better at lower costs.

Our orders must be promptly and accurately filled.

Our dealers must make a fair profit.

Our second responsibility is to those who work with us—the men and women in our factories and offices.

They must have a sense of security in their jobs.

Wages must be fair and adequate, management just, hours short, and working conditions clean and orderly.

Workers should have an organized system for suggestions and complaints.

Foremen and department heads must be qualified and fair-minded.

There must be opportunity for advancement—for those qualified—and each person must be considered an individual standing on his own dignity and merit.

Our third responsibility is to our management.

Our executives must be persons of talent, education, experience, and ability.

They must be persons of common sense and full understanding.

Our fourth and last responsibility is to our owners and stockholders.

Business must make a sound profit.

Reserves must be created.

Research must be carried on, adventurous programs developed, and mistakes made and paid for.

Bad times must be provided for, high taxes paid, new machines purchased, new factories built, new products launched, and new sales plans developed.

We must experiment with new ideas.

When these things have been done, the owners and the stockholders should receive a fair profit.

We are determined, with the help of God's grace, to fulfill these obligations to the best of our ability.

To those who know the set-up at Johnson & Johnson, that credo explains why the corporation has matched its technological achievements with something approaching a triumph of human engineering. No one at Johnson & Johnson, from the chairman of the board down, is satisfied with the progress that has been made. Far from being complacent, they are looking everywhere for new answers to old questions, carrying on experiments every day. But in emphasizing the human and normal side of industrial relations, they feel they are on the right track. "A business is made up of persons, not buildings, machines, and money in the bank," says General Johnson. "These are only the tools."

Perhaps the trouble in a lot of companies is that the persons are only tools, too.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pertinent Questions," published in the Boston Herald of February 18, 1947. The editorial deals with the subject of universal military training.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERTINENT QUESTIONS

Senator LODGE has put some questions before the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training which might also be pondered by the new congressional budget-makers before they finally slaughter our national defense. Dr. Karl T. Compton, chairman of the committee, responded enthusiastically to the Senator's suggestion that the committee include them in the scope of its inquiry.

"You have raised so many interesting points that I am bringing your letter up for special consideration by our Commission as it lays plans for future hearings and study," Dr. Compton replied.

What the American people want to know, said Senator LODGE, is "whether compulsory military training is necessary at all." To answer this basic question, the Senator said it would be necessary first to answer a number of others, including the following:

"Is the Government of the United States, acting through its legislative and executive branches, organizing the total human and material resources of the Nation to provide national security against total war?

"Does the Government of the United States possess conclusions which are at one and the same time authoritative, impartial, comprehensive, and up to date regarding the effect of modern science on national security in the light of the facts of the world situation and of the capacity of our economy?

"Are these conclusions sufficiently firm to enable the American people to tell what are the just demands to be made on their money and their manpower?

"What is the present ability of the United States—

"(a) To hold strategic air, ground, and sea bases?

"(b) To provide immediate defense against air and surface attacks?

"(c) To undertake counteroffensive action of all types?

"(d) To discharge our immediate responsibilities, viz, the occupation of Germany and Japan, the provision of military forces for the United Nations, the support of American foreign policy in North China and Trieste, and the maintenance of communication to overseas bases?

"(e) To mobilize rapidly?

"(f) To eliminate efficiently the deadwood in the personnel of the regular air, ground, and sea services?

"(g) To get quick decisions on matters affecting the air, ground, and sea services?

"What is the present degree of American supremacy in scientific research and development?"

These are pertinent questions. Until they are answered it will be impossible either to know whether we require universal training or to what extent we can afford to pare down the budget for national defense.

Is America Headed for Illiteracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, America is facing a new crisis so serious, so far-reaching in its effects upon the future of this Nation, that the Congress of the United States can no longer ignore it as a problem belonging entirely to the States alone.

We have in America today a shortage of teachers that is growing daily at an alarming rate. Low salaries and the rising cost of living have driven competent men and women in the teaching profession to seek other jobs where the remuneration is greater. Low salaries have discouraged young people from choosing teaching as a career. Since 1939 more than 350,000 men and women have quit the teaching profession, approximately one-third of all the teachers in America.

At the same time our schools and universities are taxed beyond their capacity to educate the youth of the Nation and the returning veterans.

The results of this crisis in our educational system will be evident when these young men and women assume the responsibility of the Government unless we study the problem now and find a solution to the difficulties within our educational system.

We do not want an illiterate nation. In a scientific age, our future, in fact our survival as a nation, may well depend upon adequate education for our youth.

Graham Patterson has written an article on this subject which appeared in the Pathfinder on February 12, 1947. I recommend it to the attention of every Member of the House at this time. Mr. Patterson's article is as follows:

IS AMERICA HEADED FOR ILLITERACY?

America's public-school system is today facing a serious situation.

The teachers, to whom we look for the proper education of our children, are disappearing from the classrooms. More than 350,000 have quit the profession since 1939. That is approximately one-third of all the teachers in America. Emergency measures to meet the situation have compelled many States to issue emergency certificates to young men and women lacking the usual qualifications, including even some who have not been to high school. Even with these radical measures, however, there were 60,000 teachers' jobs unfilled last year.

To make the situation worse, fewer persons are entering teachers' schools. In 1920, one-fourth of the college students enrolled at teachers' colleges; by 1930 only 1 out of 6 embraced a teaching career; last year, the number of students planning to be teachers was only 1 out of 14. A dire outlook, indeed, for our children and grandchildren.

In many cities throughout the country teachers are going on strike. In St. Paul, Minn., a teachers' strike lasting 35 days involved 1,160 teachers and 30,000 pupils. Similar teachers' strikes have occurred in Norwalk, Conn., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Portsmouth, Ohio, Paterson, N. J., and others are threatened in many other cities.

That teachers have a just grievance, any fair-minded person will concede when he weighs the investment in time, study, and effort required of teachers to qualify them for their profession against the inadequate compensation they receive for their services. They are caught between the jaws of a fixed and already low income and steadily rising living costs. In 1941 the national average teacher's salary was only $1,470 a year. That is the national average; there are 11 States in which salaries run as low as $500 a year. In Mississippi, 50 percent of the teachers earn less than $900 a year; in Arkansas, more than half are paid less than $1,000; the largest proportion of teachers in Missouri, New Hampshire, Kentucky, Iowa, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Virginia are paid less than $1,500 annually.

To make ends meet, many teachers are utilizing their spare time to earn money in factories, even night clubs, as salesmen, truck drivers, carpenters, and in one case as a bartender. A man entrusted with the molding of young minds tending bar. The New Jersey Educational Review reports that teachers' outside jobs range from hotel chambermaids to tool-and-die work.

In a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, one of the 350,000 teachers who have quit explained why: "Because today teaching is the most underpaid and unappreciated of the learned professions." In many cities a man can earn as much and even more at tending bar or driving a truck as he can by utilizing his knowledge, training, and abilities to educate the young. In most cities a woman teacher can start as a telephone operator at as much as she can earn in a classroom. And the telephone operator can look forward to increased pay with experience; the school teacher's salary is usually frozen by law.

Last month, the National Education Association, with a membership of nearly 775,000 teachers, outlined a program calling for "higher minimum salaries, with regular increases leading to a professional salary level for experienced teachers ranging from $4,000 to $6,000." Efforts are being made to establish minimum-pay laws; in one State the goal is $2,200; in nine others, $2,400.

We are now spending six times as much on our peacetime Army and Navy as we are for our education bill; we allot to the education of our children only half as much as is spent each year for liquor. Isn't it high time we recognized our responsibilities to our children, and in turn to the teachers to whom we look to help make them good citizens, and literate citizens?

Missouri River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is committed to a program of the development of the Missouri River and its tributaries. The work on this large project has already begun. It is the duty of this Congress to carry through until it reaches its final completion.

The area of continental America drained by the Missouri River and its tributaries is possessed of some of the most productive of all the lands in the Nation. There are many areas, however, in this region that are subject to recurring droughts. The development of this river as proposed under laws enacted by this Congress means that the peoples in these areas will be self-supporting because the plans provide for the use of the waters of these streams.

This Congress has, on occasions in the past, been called upon to make enormous appropriations to the drought-ridden areas of this continent. Those days will occur again. As we stop today to ponder on the question of reducing budgets and curbing of spending, let us not forget that as a Nation we will be confronted again with the need of appropriations for areas that suffer from the tragedy of drought. This can be corrected by the use of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries by fortifying the people in these areas with irrigation tracts by which they can produce forage crops to carry the herds of cattle over these dry periods.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following House Concurrent Resolution P unanimously passed by the North Dakota Legislative Assembly at a very recent date:

House Concurrent Resolution P

Concurrent resolution expressing the support of the people of North Dakota for the development of the Missouri River and its tributaries and petitioning Congress to continue its support

Whereas the several departments of the United States Government have prepared and adopted a unified plan for the development of the physical resources of the Missouri River Basin; and

Whereas that plan was approved and authorized for construction by the Congress of the United States in the Flood Control Act of 1944; and

Whereas appropriations for such development have already been made by the Congress of the United States and such works are now under way; and

Whereas successful completion of said unified plan will bring untold benefits to the people of the Missouri Basin and to the people of the United States as a whole by increasing industrial, agricultural, and economic opportunity and by stabilizing the business, industry, and agriculture now existent in the Missouri Basin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring), That we hereby express the support of the people of North Dakota for this development of the Missouri River and its tributaries and that we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to continue its support of this development and to make the necessary appropriation to carry on this work without delay, and that the secretary of state be authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to Senators YOUNG and LANGER and to Congressmen ROBERTSON and LEMKE at Washington, D. C.

The Wagner Act in an Industrial Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Wagner Act in an Industrial Democracy, delivered by James J. Reynolds, Jr., member of the National Labor Relations Board, before the Atlanta Junior Chamber of Commerce, at the Henry Grady Hotel, Atlanta, Ga., January 23, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I trust you will be indulgent if the first very brief portion of my remarks appears to be concerned with a recitation of rather personal history. Not many years ago I came to your neighboring State of Alabama and took employment as an iron-foundry laborer in the city of Bessemer, which, as you know, is to the south of the richly endowed industrial area of Birmingham. I came not only from the North, I came from the pseudo-sophisticated atmosphere of New York's financial district, which represents the antithesis of everything into which I was making my way. And I must confess that I brought with me certain preconceived ideas as to the character of the people among whom I was to live and of the community which was for a time to be my home. Whatever concern I had as to the treatment to be accorded a "damned Yankee" moving into a close-knit Southern industrial community was soon dissipated. Where I might very well have met resentment at the intrusion of a stranger, I met only kindness and welcome; where I had expected prejudice, I found only understanding and tolerance; where I expected indifference, there was a helping hand and thoughtfulness on every side. I have not forgotten those days, nor will I ever.

I think I came to know something of your splendid southern workingman during the years which followed. Not only did I share his toil and his problems as a fellow worker, but as time went by and I passed over that mysterious dividing line which separates the ranks of worker from those of management, I came to appreciate to an even greater extent what a really decent and loyal employee he is. For the most part, a first-generation industrial worker, still close enough to the earth and the plow to be possessed of very fundamental concepts as to the eternal truth and goodness of the Golden Rule, he is to me a grand American—there is none better. He is the sort of man you like to have around when there is a job to be done, a fight to be fought, or a laugh to be had.

And now once again I return to the Southland, for which I shall always have a profound and abiding affection, and this time I do not come to toil in a foundry, nor do I come to share the responsibilities of management; I come as a Government official entrusted with the task of sharing with my two colleagues the responsibilities of administering the most controversial piece of legislation since the eighteenth amendment. I used to think that getting up each morning at 5:15 and walking through the empty predawn dark to work a long day in the heat and noise and grime of a foundry was tough; I often felt discouraged and frustrated when I wrestled with the problems of industrial management; but, gentlemen, those days were sheer heaven compared with this.

And yet, to be quite honest about it all, I must admit that no one forced me into this job; it was my privilege to decline when the President did me the honor of asking me to become a member of the National Labor Relations Board. The simple truth of the matter is that (1) I firmly believe that all men to whom the opportunity of public service is presented should gladly serve for a reasonable period of their useful lives, and (2) my experience as a worker and a member of the managerial family have given me the firm conviction that, despite all criticism, despite all abuses and excesses of those whose conduct should be its greatest affirmation, and

despite the human failings of its administration of which I must share the blame when blame is due, the National Labor Relations Act stands as one of the greatest pieces of liberal legislation ever enacted in this or any other country.

I believe that a free and self-disciplined labor movement is essential to the preservation of our free-enterprise system. The National Labor Relations Act, when thoroughly understood, is clearly consistent with this purpose and tradition. It must be kept in mind that the act neither presumes to fix wages nor determine prices. It has a very simple and fundamental purpose, and that is the establishment of a basic industrial liberty—namely, the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. All of its details are devoted to the purpose of either defining those practices which interfere with this fundamental right or are concerned with establishing procedures for preventing any interference with that right.

There can be no doubt that whether we approve or disapprove of the purposes of the act, it has had a tremendous impact upon American industry. Largely due to the provision which enables the Board to obtain judicial enforcement of its orders, one anti-union stronghold after another has been forced to yield to its provisions. Since its passage some 11 years ago, trade-union membership has increased from 3,000,000 to over 14,000,000. It is now an accepted fact that wages and other working conditions in the great mining, manufacturing, and transportation industries are largely determined by collective agreement. Whatever its faults may be, there can be no doubt that the civil rights and the economic status of the average worker have been greatly strengthened through its administration.

If the industrial democracy which has been created under the benevolent protection of the act is to endure, those labor organizations which are chosen to represent American labor must themselves be democratically minded. If power is to continue to flow from those represented up to the representatives, then responsibility must flow from the leadership down to the rank and file. Unfortunately, as we who live in this democracy know all too well, the right to choose representatives is also the right to make mistakes. All that the act can do is to create those conditions favorable to democratic functioning; it cannot step into the election processes and guarantee certain results; that is up to the electorate.

However, there can be no doubt that the character of representation chosen by labor and the type of conduct in which unions indulge is in a very real sense a matter over which an intelligent employer can exercise considerable influence. Making due allowance for the obvious gradations of human nature, whether in the ranks of capital or labor, I believe that the employer who adopts a friendly attitude toward unions will, in the long run, be rewarded by the experience of dealing with the more enlightened type of labor leader. In this connection I urge upon you not to permit the distressing news stories of recent months which reflect the intemperate conduct of a few men in positions of power within the union movement make you unmindful of the fact that within the labor movement of this country there are some of the soundest and most responsible individuals of our day. As contrasted with an enlightened employer fully conscious and respectful of the rights of his employees, the hard-shelled antiunion employer will inevitably be faced with a hard-bitten union man as negotiator for his employees. How could it be otherwise? Let's suppose that you and I and all our fellow workers in a particular plant decide that we can best protect our economic interests by organizing. Suppose that immediately upon engaging in lawful activity in the pursuance of this desire, we are rebuffed by an employer who eases our leaders out of their jobs in the plant and refuses to sit down with us to discuss problems of mutual concern. I think it is reasonable to expect that our reaction would be to choose as our leader that individual who can best beat the employer at his own game, and who will be continually alert to discover ways of injuring him so that he may ultimately, through force, bring him to the goal of reason. The employer who starts his relations with organized labor on the basis of reason and fair play is far less likely to see them end in a resort to force. When the employer is reasonable and understanding, there is no incentive for the union to send around a top sergeant to bring him to terms. Like begets like in the factory as in every department of human life. The employer who seeks by espionage, illegal discharge of workers, and the imposition of company unions to break down budding self-organization among his employees is inviting a reaction. This reaction, due to set in sooner or later, will lose nothing of its final devasting quality when measured in terms of economic strife or bad morale in the plant.

The relentless progress of the union movement under the protection of the National Labor Relations Act has reached into practically every phase of our industrial life. Its new frontier is reflected in the resurgence of organizing efforts here in the southern section of the country. Into this great area of superb manpower and great natural resources has come a force which can leave its mark in a constructive way upon southern industry for years to come, or it can mean discord and industrial strife such as marked the campaigns to organize some of the major industries in the great industrial centers of the North. It seems to me that the intelligent, far-sighted approach for management to take would be that which gives full recognition to the law of the land under which employee rights are protected and which directs its efforts to make of the new force in the industrial community a power for good and stability.

For it is a fact that a byproduct of this great union movement is the impetus which it gives to the interest of our people in democratic institutions. Through union meetings and ample education programs set up by unions, countless Americans are receiving an education and experience in the principles and practices of self-government which seems to me to be more valuable to the country than any other type of adult education. There they discuss their problems, commend or criticize their leaders, give expression to their aspirations, and learn that in management-labor relations compromise is often a more commendable trait than belligerency. Their education in self-government is carried on under the most realistic conditions since they are participating in the solution of their own most vital problems.

Many thousands of new labor agreements have been arrived at by collective bargaining between employers and labor organizations. Each of these agreements represents peace, stability, and mutual respect, and most of them represent economic progress. I won't burden you with statistics and analysis of the collective-bargaining agreements that are in existence today. We need not resort to statistics to be sure of this minimum: through many applications of the Wagner Act collective bargaining has resulted. Collective bargaining has led to stabilizing agreements—in some industries where the employer heretofore was the all-powerful and unquestioned economic sovereign. These agreements have reduced the individual worker's economic helplessness and feeling of insecurity. Beyond this his chosen representative has contributed to the determination of wages, seniority practices, and grievance procedures. In short, the collective-bargaining agreement has introduced a measure of self-determination, a measure of democratic give-and-take in place of industrial absolutism.

These collective-bargaining agreements mean more than stability and economic betterment. In essence they embody real representative government in industry. This participation of the worker in the industrial government has meant that freedom of speech, press, and assembly are enjoyed in greater degree and in more communities in America than ever before. It has also meant that workers have more understanding of their Government and its several branches than they have ever had before. And, if we should, in any way whatsoever, stifle or retard this development, it is likely that the masses of the people will be denied that training in self-determination, that feeling of stature, and that sense of security which are necessary for the development of stable and efficient government. In short, if we affirmatively support the operation of the Labor Relations Act and its underlying principles, in my opinion, we are reinforcing the bulwarks of our American society.

These gains which I recite seem to me to be substantial and important in themselves, both spiritually and materially. But their chief importance, I am convinced, lies in this particular lesson: in the many tests which we will face—and I mean both labor and management—we must, under no conditions, give in to any alluring short-cuts which will hamper the fostering and maintenance of free collective bargaining.

My own belief is that employers will most satisfactorily further their relations with trade-unions if they cease to think in terms of legal restraints which they may exercise against them. Successful dealing with trade-unions depends on the growth of mutual confidence between the employer and his workers' representatives. Such confidence is never assisted by the fact that one party to negotiations sits with a lawyer at his elbow and his inward glance firmly directed at statutes and courts, seeking not for points of accommodation but for some means by which he can embarrass and frustrate the party of the second part.

Trade-unions for their own selfish interests must be responsible under contracts. They have shown themselves to be eminently so in those industries in which collective bargaining has gone on over any considerable period of time. The contract is the most precious possession of the trade-union and its members. Every force of constructive leadership within the union demands that the contract be carefully observed. The growth of such constructive leadership is the surest guaranty of protection for the employer in his relations with the union. It is far surer than the legal supports which he attempts to erect. The latter may seriously damage the natural evolution of a course of dealing which automatically creates obligations and responsibilities by both sides, based on the lessons of experience.

When all is said and done, laws are not panaceas for troubled labor relations. They are made, of course, to define fairly rights and duties. But the greatest need is for an earnest desire for fair play and justice. When all the facts are made available, an enlightened self-interest should guarantee a proper give and take.

After all, in the field of industrial relations, as in the realm of responsible government, peace rests upon freedom, not restraint; upon equality, not subservience; upon cooperation, not domination.

Having been shown the responsibility and sphere for self-government, it is now up to both management and labor to measure up to their duties and responsibilities. Both parties should be careful lest—either through ignorance, anxiety to do away with strikes, or to put one over on the other team—they surrender irreplaceable and basic liberties.

Editorial Comment on Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, at Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last Wednesday evening the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] delivered an address before 1,200 members of the Lincoln Club of the city of Louisville, Ky. His address was received with great enthusiasm by that club and by the members. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Thought, New Action Proposed to Republicans," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 14, 1947, dealing with the address.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW THOUGHT, NEW ACTION PROPOSED TO REPUBLICANS

Lincoln Day oratory and the Fourth of July brand usually have much in common. When the bombast is stripped off, the thought content commonly is revealed as weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable. There was a welcome freshness, however, about much that was said by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., before the Lincoln Club of Louisville.

His speech contained two elements rarely displayed on these occasions: humility and responsibility. There was a minimum of tub-thumping about Republican prospects for 1948, and in its place a healthy admission that the Republican Party is on probation. There was a sound analysis of motives in last November's elections (many people did not vote for us so much as they voted against the things they did not like), and a statement that the people's mandate was for action, not reaction.

Senator LODGE acknowledged with the best of grace his party's responsibility for continuing a foreign policy that knows no partisanship. That line was explored still further by Harold E. Stassen, also a Lincoln Day orator in New York. The Minnesota aspirant to the Presidency selected the hardest aspect of a bipartisan foreign policy, the issue of low tariffs and reciprocal-trade agreements. His speech was a strong plea for reversal of a moss-bound tradition of Republicanism, and he drove home his reasons with powerful logic.

This is wonderfully clear speaking for a candidate. He draws a parable that anybody can understand: "If we had insisted that each of the States of the Union should raise its own wheat, mill its own flour, make its own shoes, build its own automobiles, tailor its own clothing, the result would be that the people in none of the States would be enjoying the standard of living they enjoy today. We have now reached the point where the counterpoint of this basic fact is upon us on a world level."

A third orator, Senator TAFT, spoke more in the tones of the Republican past than the others. He was less specific on fiscal policy than Senator LODGE, who asserted point blank that a balanced budget should come first, reduced taxes afterward. Even the gentleman from Ohio, however, came out in opposition to a return to congressional tariff-making with its inevitable log rolling.

There are historic shibboleths that block fresh thinking in both parties, and the Republicans in the main have been tenacious clingers to tradition. There is hope for the country, however, in evidences of a fresh approach by leaders of the dominant party in Congress. It would be cause for rejoicing if the party would take to heart Senator LODGE's happily chosen slogan from Abraham Lincoln: "Think anew and act anew."

Controlling the Harvests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of February 17, 1947, entitled "Controlling the Harvests." It deals with the experience of the Federal Government during the past decade in its tinkering with the law of supply and demand, with particular reference to the support pricing policy on farm products, pointing out how the present policy has failed to induce farmers to make shifts in production.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROLLING THE HARVESTS

For 20 years our people have allowed their Government to indulge its pretty whimsy that one or several of its bureaus can do a better job of setting prices on farm products than the commercial markets do. When markets are free they are places where all producers and all consumers of a given thing, through their agents, meet to trade. The prices they ask or bid and the quantities they offer or call for express their varying experiences and opinions as to production costs, consumer needs, available supplies, and fair or obtainable profits. For 20 years this method of determining prices has been more or less suspended—sometimes less but usually more—in favor of the principle that any government worth its salt can make everything lovely for everybody.

Now comes the National Planning Association to say that this situation must be changed because it isn't working well for anybody. The association proposes to change it by making it more the same thing than it ever was. An NPA pamphlet, according to press reports, says that present and past Government farm programs have failed and still fail to induce farmers to make the shifts in production necessary to meet changing demand-supply conditions.

So the association proposes a commodity-pricing board, which would determine the right price well ahead of planting time. That price would become the Government's support price for the coming marketing year. The board would set forward prices for the various crops and animal products which would insure production of just enough of each to meet the season's demand, which, of course, the board would already have ascertained, also a year in advance.

The association does not say how many members should sit on the pricing board. We are inclined to think one would be sufficient, provided he were such a crystal gazer as never lived on land or sea. It might be even better to have just a board without anybody sitting on it.

Address By Governor Dewey Before Canadian Society of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, on February 9, 1947, at the fiftieth anniversary dinner of the Canadian Society of New York at the Hotel Biltmore.

Mr. Dewey said some very important things. I call attention particularly to his statement as to the esteem in which, for many reasons, we hold the Canadian people and their Government, and the emphasis which he laid on the service they rendered to the world and the example of courage they set by exposing the subterranean methods adopted by certain people in their effort to undermine the cause of free men.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to take part in welcoming on this distinguished occasion the illustrious soldier whom His Majesty King George VI has chosen for his personal representative in the great Dominion of Canada. It is indeed a pleasure to congratulate our close friends and neighbors to the north upon having for their Governor General a man whose name has already achieved heroic stature. It is a name which belongs in that grand roster which includes Wolfe, Wellington, Wolseley, Kitchener, and Roberts. To us in the United States his name has a particular significance since so many of our own sons and brothers fought under his command.

Few commanding generals have had so much to overcome and few have had so many difficult tasks thrust upon them. In the terrible war just concluded, whenever there was an operation that seemed hopeless he was selected to command it. After the lightning thrust of the Nazis to the English Channel, after they had swept triumphantly across France and the Low Countries, the brave British Expeditionary Force was doomed. At least the whole world thought it was doomed. But as always, through the centuries, Britain had up her sleeve not an ace but a man. The commander in chief of that expeditionary

force had been recalled to England. It was left to the indomitable general whom we are honoring tonight to do the best he could. In an operation which thrilled the whole world he saved more than 330,000 British, French, and Belgian soldiers from apparently inevitable disaster. Those 330,000 lived to fight again to final victory. And their commanding general was the last man out of Dunkirk.

Early in 1942 another crisis threatened the cause of freedom. The Japanese had poured into Burma with a speed almost equal to that of the Nazis in Europe. That operation actually threatened the safety of India. The first battle of Burma was already lost and another British force seemed doomed to be sacrificed. Another hopeless job was there, so they picked the man who had done the impossible and saved those 330,000 at Dunkirk. He did not arrive in Rangoon until the enemy's victory was already assured. So he inherited the most heartbreaking command in warfare, a rearguard action through jungles and over mountains, against vastly superior forces. Once again he saved his men, brought 80 percent of his troops through alive and safe after a delaying action and retreat which was the admiration even of the enemy. He not only saved his men, he preserved India as a base for Allied counteroffensive.

Only a few months later they found him another desperate problem. North of the Mediterranean the Germans and Italians were streaming through the Balkans with almost nothing to stop them. In Africa Rommel was pushing closer and closer to the life line of the British Empire which now had become the life line of the Allied defense. Rommel had to be stopped at all costs. Again a man was needed to do the impossible, to reorganize the British forces and save the Middle East. Again they called upon the man who had saved the day at Dunkirk and who had saved India. And it was he who organized the counteroffensive in northern Africa successfully executed by Montgomery of El Alamein.

Today we know that this was the turning point of the war. It was the beginning of final victory in Europe. Under the man who had brought it about, Americans and British fought side by side, clearing all North Africa of Germans.

After all this, one might have thought that this man who had pulled so many victims out of so many fires was entitled to an easy job for a change. So what did they do for him? They gave him command of the Allied forces in Italy, one of the most difficult operations ever planned. Maybe he prefers that kind of a command. We do know that in the teeth of almost insuperable obstacles, against the cream of the German Army, in the face of the most elaborately planned defenses considerably helped by nature and geography, he advanced up the peninsula, captured Rome, and finally accepted the unconditional surrender of all the German forces south of the Alps.

We think pretty highly of our own generals. They and the men who fought under them have a claim upon our gratitude and affection we shall never forget. We are proud of them, but we are also proud that many of our men fought under the command of the splendid British soldier who time and again wrought the impossible, the man whom tonight we are deeply happy to greet as His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, Field Marshal the Viscount Alexander of Tunis and Errigal.

We are happy to greet him as a great soldier whose achievements were not only military, but were high in the realm of statesmanship in the critical period in which the liberties and the very lives of all of us were hanging in the balance. We are happy to greet him as one who deserves the respect and gratitude not only of the world but of history. We are most happy to greet him as one who commanded our sons and our brothers in a dreadful conflict which welded us all closer together. We are proud to welcome him as a new resident of the North American Continent in which are still burning fiercely the fires of human liberty to which he contributed so richly of his courage and his genius.

It is rare in world history that the Governor General of a great nation should be welcomed by the people of another great nation with such a sense of affection and fraternity and such a sense of unity and of partnership.

Our respect and regard for the people of Canada have, if possible, been increased during recent years by the gallant part which the Canadian people have played in the maintenance of a free world. Without hesitation, Canada threw in its lot with Britain when the cause of freedom was menaced in Europe by the Nazi totalitarian terror. When Japan attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor, Canada did not hesitate to declare war on Japan forthwith, and side by side at all risks and at all costs we marched together on the battlefields of the world until the last of our enemies had surrendered and the cause of freedom had triumphed once again.

And at least to our friends to the north some of the lessons of history have not always been immediately forgotten. The Canadian people and their government know that the struggle for freedom is a struggle which never ends. They know that it is not permanently won by military victories alone. The price of freedom today, as always, is eternal vigilance.

The Canadian Government has exercised that vigilance in a manner which provides an example which might well be followed by other free nations.

I am referring now to the Report of the Royal Commission of February 5, 1946, made to the Committee of the Privy Council in which it is said: "that it has been ascertained that secret and confidential information has been communicated directly or indirectly by public officials and other persons in positions of trust to the agents of a Foreign Power to the prejudice of the safety and interests of Canada."

That report is a most shocking document. It demonstrated step by step and act by act the most skillfully organized espionage system ever exposed in our time. It demonstrated specific acts within our country and indicated beyond question the most widespread similar activities both here and in other nations. It reported upon an organized set-up on behalf of a foreign government which was, and I quote the report:

"The result of a long preparation by trained and experienced men, who have come here for the express purpose of carrying on spying activities, and who have employed all the resources at their disposal with or without corruption, to fulfill the tasks assigned to them."

The act of the Canadian Government in publishing to the world last year (June 27, 1946) the full facts developed by its inquiry, was a wise act. Also, it was a brave act, for Canada was left to act alone. I am sure we all share an admiration and respect for the courage, the diligence, and the intelligence of our friends to the north who unhesitatingly exposed and took action upon this matter of mutual importance though they have a total population smaller than that of the State of New York.

It will take equal courage and honesty, and I may say equal bluntness of speech and action, if we are to preserve our freedom and build for a peaceful world.

We North Americans have a tradition of action and of frankness. It has paid the richest of dividends in peace and prosperity and sets a pattern which might well be of greater application elsewhere in the world. Here on this continent we have demonstrated that peoples of differing national loyalties can nonetheless live in peace and mutual respect and warm regard.

Between Canada and the United States there exists a bond which is unique in the annals of history. Our nations have lived at peace side by side with 3,000 miles of undefended border for nearly a century and a half. We have had peace for so long that on both sides of the border it is taken for ganted. It is taken for granted as much as peace is assumed between the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania.

The significant thing of this bond of peace lies in the lesson it teaches as an outstanding demonstration of the solid and reliable way of achieving a durable peace. It must be clear to all by now that peace is not obtained by proclaiming it in words or in treaties. The nations of the world renounced war as an instrument of national policy in the Kellogg-Briand Pact. But within a few short years that renunciation was followed by the greatest and most destructive war of all time.

True peace is a state of mind, of understanding, and of active human relationship. The true path toward achieving peace is the development of human relations of such a kind that war is psychologically unthinkable. The tie that binds nations is one of mutual understanding, of respect, and tolerance of differences. Peace is a web of cultural and economic relations, each strand of which is fragile, but when added together they make a bond so strong that no one could tear it and a bond so precious that no one wants to tear it by the brutal act of war.

Those who today are seeking a formula for peace, can do well to study the formula of peace which has developed between our two great nations. Then they will pay less attention to the words which they write in treaties and more attention to the development of natural forces which tie men together with bonds of fraternity, common interest, and respect.

We have achieved this solid bond of peace because there have been no secrets between us, no haggling, no struggle for power. There has been no effort by either to aggrandize itself territorially or economically at the expense of the other.

We carry on joint ventures together such as the International Joint Commission and we freely navigate the great St. Lawrence River under joint control. We share peaceably the use of our great joint water-power resources and I hope we shall enjoy the use of still more of them in the years to come.

Most important of all, our people move freely across that great border. They do business together every day. They visit each other for a holiday, for a week end, or even for a steak dinner, a card game, or a movie. We know each other—so we like and trust each other.

Equally important is the fact that information flows freely across one border and the free press serving both our countries keeps our people fully informed so they have the kind of faith and respect for each other which has created the greatest association of two free nations in history. May it long continue in the interest of the people of both countries and as a daily object lesson to all the world in the building of a lasting peace.

Address of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, Before Lithuanian Group, Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to include therein my remarks before a Lithuanian group in Lyra Hall, Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 16, 1947:

This day—February 16—is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians.

Twenty-nine years ago was the day when Lithuanian independence was proclaimed. One hundred and fifty years of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule were over. Lithuania stood forth as an independent and democratic republic.

We Americans rejoiced on that day. We looked forward confidently to her future. We knew that with this incentive, her ancient culture would flower again and develop in ways that would bring honor to Lithuania and contribute to the civilization of the world.

But on this February 16, in the year 1947, we meet to observe an independence which has been lost.

The bright star of her freedom has been clouded over by the storm of tyranny which has been sweeping the world.

Caught like other small nations between two powerful and ruthless enemies, she has been swallowed up by the victor.

As a sovereign nation, Lithuania has ceased to exist. And in that tragic event, is a lesson for the freedom-hungry peoples of this earth. Free nations must stand together, helping one another, or go down separately. Tyranny always waits in ambush for that unguarded moment when democracies are slow to awake to their peril and then it strikes. And for the sin of complacency, free men must die by the millions. They must expend billions in treasure which took years of patient effort to build up. In saving freedom for some countries, they must watch it destroyed in others, helpless to do otherwise.

We in the United States must bear some responsibility for this sin of complacency. During the years preceding 1939, when we might have joined with other peace-loving nations to build up a system of world law to outlaw aggression, we stood idly by. We tried to excuse ourselves by saying that what happened in Europe or elsewhere was no concern of ours.

But what a price we had to pay to learn the facts of life. Over a quarter of a million of our young men crucified by our neglect, a million more crippled for life, and a debt of over $260,000,000,000 to burden us and our descendants for generations to come.

All this and more we paid to learn that no nation can live in selfish isolation. Because we shut our eyes to the storm warnings of the 1930's, we had to fight for our national existence. We survived, but sister democracies like Lithuania were crushed.

Today America is the last true democracy on earth. This coming year we will spend to maintain our armed forces alone the staggering sum of $11,000,000,000, a sum greater than the total cost of the Federal Government before the war.

We must spend, and go on spending, until we and other nations build a system of world security which will save all nations from the fate which befell Lithuania.

What we could have done with ease before, we must now do the hard way, because of our forgetfulness.

As friends of Lithuania, we come not to mourn her passing as a nation, though it grieves us to see her present enslavement. For, looking back through her history, we find grounds for believing that she will win her independence again. In the words of her ancient motto: "Be what may, Lithuania will always stay."

This is not the first time that she has been conquered by giant neighbors. Yet, even during centuries of oppression, she never lost sight of her goal. Deep in the heart of every Lithuanian, is that passion for liberty which never dies. Sooner or later the material power of aggression weakens. It cannot forever enslave people who are determined to be free.

A dozen times through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can wait out the temporary triumphs of gangster nations. The Christian faith which, in 1399, hurled back the invasion of the Tartars, and saved all of Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship and win through to the inevitable victory of right over might.

All over the world Lithuanians are gathering to renew their vows to work for the independence of their homeland. Nourishing themselves with the remembrance of her proud and valiant past, they draw new strength to face the job ahead.

The robes of her nationhood are gone, but in time they can and will be replaced and then Lithuania will be numbered with the honored peoples who consistently fought for and won through to the goal of peace on earth, good will toward men.

In the meantime, the mind and heart and spirit of Lithuania live on. Through observances such as these, you keep the faith. You are proud of your religion, your language, and your culture, as you have every reason to be. I say to you, Keep them alive and flourishing in this God-given land of ours whose greatest wealth is what you and other peoples bring to it. Your ardent faith in and support of the cause of Lithuanian independence is also needed here in the United States. For it is giving to our democracy a vitality which will enable us to conquer whatever trials may lie ahead.

In your churches, your homes, and societies, do honor to the cherished customs and traditions of that land on the shores of the Baltic. To the youngsters in your homes, tell the stories of Lithuania's greatness, so that they may carry with them this priceless heritage for their own enrichment and that of mankind.

Take confidence this day in the knowledge that millions of your fellow Americans join with you in heart's desire for the liberation of your homeland.

In the past we have slept on our responsibilities. From now on we must be vigilant.

With this spirit I am confident that we shall meet on some other February the 16th to honor in fact as well as in faith the goal of Lithuanian independence, complete and secure for the rest of time.

Lincoln's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at the annual Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club, at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City, on the evening of February 12, 1947:

Ladies and gentlemen, so short a time have I allotted myself for remarks that, with your indulgence, I shall proceed forthwith, thus omitting to express adequately to the distinguished guests seated with me here on the dais and the many fine Republicans assembled at this beautiful occasion tonight the privilege and the honor that it is for me to address them. We are met tonight upon this historic annual occasion of the National Republican Club, with our party resuming its power in many States, and more especially in the branch of the Federal Government at Washington where I am just commencing my term. Dinners in commemoration of the birthday of the founder of our party, on the increase the past few years, have spread all over the country greater in number tonight than ever before. The example that has been set by this dinner of ours which has always been the outstanding annual Republican event, first at the old Waldorf and more recently here at the new, and held regularly through the long bleak period when conditions were against us, has evidently borne fruit. They say that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

While in no wise wishing to diminish or disparage the glorious victory that gave our party a substantial majority in the House of Representatives and also a narrow margin in the United States Senate, I must sound a note of warning against overconfidence. To paraphrase Wordsworth we are entitled to enjoy the cheerful yesterdays of last November and may be confident, but we should not be overconfident of our tomorrows. Too, I want to emphasize the necessity for carrying out our party's pledges in the interpretation through legislation of what the voters clearly indicated last election in throwing overboard as they did the New Deal and all its works. Particularly in this great State of New York, without which Presidential success is never assured, we have had an administration that has commanded the support of our people in increasing numbers. It is coming to be generally recognized that this fortunate result for our party has been due in large measure to a man who is a great humanitarian, a great patriot, an administrator and statesman of a very high order. To fit this distinction it seems hardly necessary to mention the name of Thomas E. Dewey, who supplies in abundance what we might well term election insurance for our party.

Aware that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country, I shall not attempt to prophesy, but I will say that, without the slightest doubt in my mind, if the Democratic Convention were to be held presently the nominees for President and Vice President would be, respectively, President Harry S. Truman and Gen. George C. Marshall. The extremely careful build-up for the general trends unmistakably, without questioning anyone's integrity, as leading to that ulterior purpose. It is, of course, true that the latter is the first high-ranking military man to hold the office of the United States Secretary of State. He has a difficult task in reconciling the psychology of the soldier with that of the diplomat. We will await with interest, and without too much confidence, the outcome of efforts at such reconciliation.

What Lincoln might have been able to do had he been spared, would undoubtedly have contributed to a speedier resolvement of the war-torn internecine hatreds of his day. More of his firm purpose in the right is needed now to salve and assuage the wounds of the conflict so much broader in scope from which we are scarcely yet emerging. May God give to this Nation men of broad vision and stature like unto the martyr President and grant that we as a solid Republican Party may give to them our united backing to the end so fervently sought.

George Peabody's Contribution to World Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, today is being observed by the student body, the faculty, and the alumni of the South's greatest teacher-training institution, George Peabody College of Nashville, Tenn., as Founders' Day. Among those being honored is one of the world's wisest benefactors, George Peabody, whose philanthropies extended to millions in Europe as well as in America. His constructive service for the South in endowing a great teachers' college has meant much to the cause of education. That the life of generosity and self-effacement has endeared George Peabody's memory to the people of another country as well as our own is demonstrated by a beautiful tribute to his memory by the British Ambassador to the United States. The statement follows:

To honor the memory of George Peabody is to pay tribute to one of the greatest of Americans and to one of the greatest promoters of friendship and understanding between the English-speaking peoples.

We may seek in vain, even among my own countrymen, past or present, for any one man who has contributed so much to the welfare of the working classes in England as did George Peabody.

We may recall that Queen Victoria was so moved by what she described as his princely munificence that when she gave him her portrait she had inscribed on the frame the words, "Presented by the Queen to George Peabody, the benefactor of the poor of London."

I am impressed by the fact that all he touched with his philanthropic hand has prospered and grown. The high standard of education, not only in the South but throughout America, is in large measure due to his far-sighted endowment of your college; while in the Peabody houses in London, which were the core of his great model housing projects in England, there live today over 20,000 of the poor of London in some 8,000 separate dwellings.

In thinking back upon George Peabody, we find not only the philanthropist but a man of honor and integrity, who gave to the world in good will and fellowships gifts far more precious than all his princely munificence. Let us take that spirit of brotherhood, which your founder infused into all those about him, as the basis of understanding between peoples today, for without it we shall fail in our task as surely as he succeeded in his.

Bureaucracy Beats a Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by the Honorable Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, at the Tieton Pay-Off Celebration held in Yakima, Wash., February 14, 1947, on the subject Bureaucracy Beats a Retreat:

I came here from Washington to thank you Yakima Valley farmers for a check in the amount of $15,643.60. When this check has been deposited in the United States Treasury, the farmers of the Tieton Division will have paid the last penny of their debt of more than $3,500,000; the amount spent by the Bureau of Reclamation 37 years ago in building the irrigation system that waters your lands.

Nowadays a $15,000 check arriving at the Treasury's receiving window does not cause any eyebrows to lift, and an expenditure of $3,500,000 on a Federal project does not seem especially large. The significance of this occasion is in what has been accomplished with that $3,500,000 investment.

Some of you were here in 1910 when the Tieton area was a sagebrush desert about to receive its first water from the new canals. You have seen the Federal Government, through the conservation and use of the precious water resources here in the Yakima Valley expand the national production, create $150,000,000 of new wealth, and provide homes for more than 1,000 families on 25,000 acres of land that formerly was not even good sheep pasture.

Last year these Tieton lands produced crops of an average value of $750 per acre. Since they were first irrigated, each acre of this former desert has pumped new purchasing power of more than $5,000 into the arteries of our national commerce.

Uncle Sam put his money into this venture under a wise law that was the keystone of the conservation program of Theodore Roosevelt. The reclamation law has been supported by every administration since that time. It is not a partisan matter. Here on the Tieton Division, Uncle Sam has now got his money back, dollar for dollar. In the meantime, the Treasury has sent its tax collectors to these former sagebrush mesas that are now dotted with apple and peach orchards. While the exact figures are not at hand, it is clear that the Federal income taxes paid by farmers and businessmen who have earned their livelihood from these lands have greatly exceeded the cost of the entire irrigation project—the cost that has, in addition, separately been repaid in full by direct payments from water users.

The picture I am trying to paint might be better seen through a comparison. What has been done by irrigation here is as though in 1910 a barren island had been purchased by the United States for $3,500,000. Settled by our citizens, this island since then has supported a thousand families in comfort and prosperity on farms, and even a greater number in the towns and villages that have grown up among them. It does not stretch the imagination to compare an irrigation project with an island, since these irrigation projects are the only islands of intensive farming in vast unproductive expanses of the West which make up nearly half of all the land within the United States. These projects stand out in the sagebrush desert much as islands dot the sea.

You men and women on the Tieton farms should be especially proud. This check for $15,000 is your final payment. Yours was one of the first irrigation districts established under the reclamation law and you have now carried out in full the contract made 37 years ago. This is the first final payment by any irrigation district.

You have changed the desert to verdant fields and orchards. Through the years, out of your earnings from the watered land, you have provided funds by your payments which the Department of the Interior has re-invested in other irrigation projects in the West. Several of these new islands of production which have been helped by the fulfillment of your contract are already the homes of new pioneer settlers who, in turn, are beginning to repay their contractual obligations and thus recreate and increase the reclamation fund for other new developments.

I take pride in turning over this project to you—to your own elected officials, in order that it may continue to irrigate your farms under your direct control. Uncle Sam built the project. You have repaid his cost and this irrigation system is now yours to operate and take care of. The Bureau of Reclamation will always stand ready to assist if you require help, but here is bureaucracy beating a retreat as planned. Here is the Federal Government, having extended a helping hand to its citizens, bidding them God-speed and withdrawing. Here is democracy creating vital projects which work for the people, and then, when the task is done, leaving the people, strengthened and self-reliant, to carry on. That was Jefferson's way, expressed in his words, "He governs best who governs least."

Reclamation has worked here in the Yakima Valley and it has worked in similar valleys through the West.

Four million acres of irrigated land have produced $5,000,000,000 in new American wealth. That partner of irrigation, hydroelectric power, created as a by-product, serves industries, towns, cities, and farms with electric energy to improve living conditions for millions of people. The Congress wisely has authorized the expansion of the reclamation program so that it will reach twice the population now served. New irrigated lands and more power are to be made available in the years ahead in every State from the Missouri River and the Rio Grande to the Pacific.

I agree with the western people who feel that true economy can best be achieved by completing these authorized projects speedily so that production will start paying back the Government's investment. Veterans are clamoring for a chance to clear the sagebrush and to farm these lands. They need living space now and a hungry world needs food.

Among the projects authorized and under construction is the gigantic Grand Coulee Dam power and irrigation project just across the Columbia River from the Yakima Valley, which will develop an area about the size of Delaware. On these lands, now for the most part sagebrush, new farm homes and great new towns and cities will develop within as many years as have passed since the Tieton ranches were settled. It will be like the addition of another State to the Union, like a gradual reopening of the western frontier.

There will be difficulties surely, but there will be fewer heartbreaks and failures than have ever been experienced in the opening of a new land area. It won't be like Daniel Boone leading the hopeful into unmapped territory. More than 40 agencies have cooperated with the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare the plans for development of these new farms and communities. Your experience here in Tieton and throughout the Yakima Valley—the agencies of the State of Washington, the Department of Agriculture, and all bureaus of the Department of the Interior, your State college at Pullman, and the State experiment station at Prosser right here in your own valley, each played an important and coordinate part.

Carrying forward its program in the Pacific Northwest, the Department of the Interior has just completed a comprehensive report for the full use of water and other resources of the Columbia River Basin through a development yet to be authorized.

This report shows that no other section of the United States is so favored with undeveloped hydroelectric power, with irrigable lands that can be reached by diversions from rivers with abundant water.

The addition of nearly 4,000,000 acres of new land and of millions in kilowatts of new generating capacity will more than double the present irrigated area in the basin and increase the hydroelectric power installations here fivefold. Truly multiple purpose—the plan provides for the delivery of needed supplemental water to 40 percent of the area now irrigated—provides for flood control, navigation, recreation, fish and wildlife, silt control, and pollution abatement. The irrigation, drainage, and diking developments will support a new farm and city population of about 750,000. Low-cost power will bring new industries—develop mineral resources now untouched—foster a more efficient and fuller use of agriculture and forest resources—and through the new private business undertakings create the basic opportunities that should double the population of the Pacific Northwest.

This new power, these new farms and industrial and trade opportunities for this new population will be made possible only if we treat the whole Columbia River Basin as a unit—a unit in its water resource and in the financing of its full development. We must refrain from dividing the basin into provinces and principalities. It is one basin with one common water resource.

Power from Grand Coulee Dam, generated because of heavy snows on the Continental Divide, is transmitted throughout the basin. Full irrigation development in western Montana, Idaho, western Wyoming, Oregon, and Washington can be had only by being joined with the downstream dams which transform into power the entire flow of the river, regardless of its source.

The Interior Department proposes to achieve the financial stability for full basin development by pooling the costs of all the works and all the revenues by which these costs are repaid. When this is done, it should be clearly apparent to Congress and to the country that this is, even in the banker's sense, an investment which will pay out.

In 1910 there were scoffers who said that the desert could not be beaten back and that the Tieton project would be a dismal failure. In 1947 the cynics who are the direct descendants of those same scoffers probably will contend that this new program for the Columbia River Basin will not pay out. They were doubtful that the power from Grand Coulee Dam would ever find a market. When the war came along and used this power, they said it would go begging when peace returned. But it hasn't; the tremendous demands being made on the Bonneville Power Administration which sells the power from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams conclusively proves that. The wartime peaks were surpassed in the fall of 1946, and now the demands are hitting new highs almost every week.

What has been done through the construction of the great dams on the Columbia River toward the development of the Pacific Northwest, what you have done here in the Yakima Valley through the irrigation of the lands that were once desert will be done again and again in communities yet to be established from the remotest creek at the Continental Divide to the mouth of the Columbia River at Astoria.

The day will come when the final check of repayment will be delivered to the United States Treasury for all the developments on the Columbia River system. In that day and time, the Columbia River Basin will no longer be an area of undeveloped resources. It will have new millions in population. It will have great new factories and industries, and its agriculture, like the Yakima apple, will be famous throughout the world.

1946 Operating Loss of Pennsylvania Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article appearing in today's New York Times.

This newspaper story covers the statement made by Mr. Martin W. Clement, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., as he filed the 1946 annual report of the company. Mr. Clement announced that for the first time in its 100-year history, this, the largest railroad in America, operated at a loss, despite excellent management. Mr. President, I ask the people of the United States to take notice of this statement and to look across the water to England where, along with many other industries, the railroads have been nationalized. This statement could be a milestone on the road of approach to socialism here in our country, if the pressures Government regulations have brought to bear upon the railroads are not relieved.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PENNSYLVANIA'S FIRST LOSS IN HISTORY LAID TO UNITED STATES CURBS—CLEMENT REPORTS RECORD PEACETIME FREIGHT, PASSENGER LOAD IN 1946 BROUGHT DEFICIT OF $8,530,317—SCORES RATE RISE

PHILADELPHIA, February 18.—Blaming Government regulation, the Pennsylvania Railroad announced today that in 1946, for the first time in its 100-year history, it operated at a loss. At the same time, America's largest railroad in its annual statement reported it transported more freight and passengers than in any previous peacetime year.

Martin W. Clement, president, said that "with the volume of business handled, the company should have had a substantial net income, which, after taxes, would have provided for a normal dividend as well as a sum equal thereto to be spent on the property.

"This would have been good for the country, for the company, for the employees, and for the stockholders.

"The unsatisfactory results for the year were due very largely to the impact of the forces of Government regulation."

The report declared that the increase in freight rates of about 17.6 percent, authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission, effective on last January 1, is wholly inadequate to meet increased costs imposed upon railroads if the industry is to be sustained in a healthy and progressive condition.

"Financially sound railroads," Mr. Clement asserted, "are the backbone of an economically and socially sound nation. From the standpoint of the public as a whole, it is much better that rates be raised high enough for the carriers so to advance the art of transportation that economies will be produced in order that over a period of time reductions in the cost of transportation will result, rather than to hold the rates to such a low point that proper expenditures cannot be made to produce economies."

The deficit for 1946 was $8,530,317, in contrast to a net income of $49,008,238 in 1945. To the deficit was added $2,320,199 of construction expenditures and advances to leased and affiliated companies, borne by the Pennsylvania. This brought the total loss to $10,850,516.

Operating revenues for the year, at $822,007,585, were down $114,445,826, due, the road said, to the decline in war traffic and strikes in major industries. Operating expenses were $745,676,400.

The road said that net railway operating income—operating revenues less operating expenses, taxes and equipment and joint facility rents—represented a return of less than 1 percent on the investment in road and equipment, lowest figure in the company's history. The 1945 return was 3.09 percent.

Mr. Clement, referring to the wear and tear on the railroads aggravated by intensive use during the war, asserted it is important that needs for new plant and equipment be met and not further deferred if rail transportation is to advance as it should.

The statement noted that during the year 37 steam locomotives and tenders were received, completing an order placed during 1945 for 50 high-speed passenger locomotives with 6,500 horsepower.

The Pennsylvania said that it has on order 49 Diesel electric locomotives. This fleet, the statement said, will haul through passenger trains between Harrisburg, Chicago, St. Louis, Detroit and Cincinnati.

In 1946, the statement added, the road experimentally established the first regular daily through sleeping-car service from coast to coast.

The Budget and Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, there is a universal demand that Congress and the President act promptly to set our financial house in order. The American people, without regard to political considerations, insist that the budget of thirty-seven and five-tenths billions submitted by the President is perfectly fantastic and out of all reason. The American people cannot understand why the President should ask for a budget four times as large as the largest Roosevelt peacetime budget for the fiscal year 1948, which will be 3 years after VJ-day. They have seen the wastefulness of Government spending in all parts of the country, the duplication in services, the padded pay rolls, and they are now demanding in language that cannot be misunderstood that spending be pared to the bone.

Mr. Speaker, I think that a recent editorial in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune pictures the sentiment throughout the country very well. It is entitled "The Will To Cut Budget Is the Important Thing," and reads as follows:

THE WILL TO CUT BUDGET IS THE IMPORTANT THING

Every time the question of the Federal pay roll comes up, there is a flurry of excitement in Washington and charges are made

that those who are interested in Government economy actually are interested in crippling Government operations.

A Washington columnist views with great alarm the latest suggestions that the Federal pay roll be reduced. The talk of pay-roll economy, he says, is demoralizing the staffs of Government offices. And other defenders of the public pay rolls raise the old question of "where are you going to start?"

The latter question was pretty well answered by Attorney General Clark when he appeared last week before the Senate Civil Service Committee to tell about the 25,000 people who work under him in the Justice Department.

"I have been in the Justice Department now for 10 years," Clark said. "And the thing that impresses me in the Government is the fact that a fellow always likes to have as many people working under him as he can."

THE SORE POINT OF UNITED STATES PAY ROLL

Then Clark put his finger on the sore point of Federal pay rolls. The Government, he explained, sets a worker's salary on the basis of the number of employees he has working for him. In Government, unlike business, the more workers an employee has under him, the higher his salary. This leads to competition between department and bureau chiefs which results in a sort of inflation of the Federal pay rolls.

Clark's suggestion as to how the Government could cut the padding out of Federal pay rolls was so simple it was amazing. He suggested simply that Congress issue a statement of policy saying that the number of stenographers a Government worker had will bear no relationship to his salary.

Thirteen years of heavy, if not careless, spending have left few people in Washington with any first-hand experience with a Government that honestly tried to cut expenses. Government personnel, from the experts on down, is rather heavily indoctrinated with the idea that to cut Federal spending is to commit an offense against the public in favor of a few demagogues.

This Congress has more control and better organized control of fiscal affairs than its predecessors. For the first time it has the services of an over-all budget committee—which means that appropriations and revenues can be considered as the two sides of a single proposition. The recently increased authority of the controller general, constrained and subverted during the Roosevelt administration, gives Congress a better check on Executive expenditures. The many Government corporations finally have been brought under legislative jurisdiction.

The effectiveness with which Congress uses its new tools to eliminate extravagance and the fashion of extravagance depends upon the insistence of the country. The immediate figure of such cuts is less important than a real demonstration of a determination to begin cutting. And the beginning, in turn, is less important than a public-supported determination to carry it through.

Mr. Speaker, in order to prove to the House that the demand for economy and tax reduction is not confined to any one party or section of the country, I ask to also have inserted an editorial from the Tampa (Fla.) Times of February 11. It is entitled "Deceptive Propaganda in Budget, Tax Controversy," which I hope that every Member of the House will read:

DECEPTIVE PROPAGANDA IN BUDGET, TAX CONTROVERSY

Several marked deceptions are being practiced in the controversy over tax reduction and the Federal budget for the next fiscal year. The practitioners are the left wingers and those Truman administration supporters who are crying crocodile tears over the fate of the little taxpayer if the Republicans give a blanket 20-percent tax reduction.

Americans who conscientiously want to know where the fault lies, can get enlightenment on the entire subject by studying statistics gleaned from official United States Treasury figures. Such an approach to the problem was undertaken by Phelps Adams, a special writer for the New York Sun, and the high lights of what he found are glaring commentaries on the propaganda emanating from Washington.

To begin with, the chief fiscal difficulties stem from President Truman's insistence that the Government will need $37,500,000,000 to operate in the next fiscal year. That is an incomprehensible sum—even more than the Government succeeded in spending in its busiest wartime year—1942. That year, going at full blast, actual Federal expenditures were only $32,400,000,000, according to figures dug up by Mr. Adams—five billion less than Mr. Truman wants for next year.

The prodigality of Mr. Truman and his liberal friends who urge him to stick to such vast spending can be cast into even more ridiculous proportions when compared to the Federal Government's total expenditures from the date when the Government was founded in 1789 until 1917, when it was half way through the First World War. During that period of 129 years Federal expenditures amounted to $28,700,000,000, and that included paying off debts incurred in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, and the Spanish-American War. Yet Mr. Truman would spend the equal of that in the first 9 months of the new fiscal year beginning July 1.

Briefly that gives an idea of the excessive burden the spenders want to place on this country.

Now, what of the little taxpayer? Can he be materially relieved? The same propagandists that insist on the big budget likewise would have the voting masses think reductions can be made to relieve the little fellow and make the taxpayers with large incomes pay the biggest part.

On that point Mr. Adams has uncovered some more interesting facts. He found that, if all incomes amounting to more than $5,000 per year were taxed 100 percent, not leaving a penny to these taxpayers on which to live, the total revenue to the Government would be only $15,000,000,000. Under Mr. Truman's more-than-$37,000,000,000 budget proposal, $22,500,000,000 would still have to come out of the so-called little fellow. In other words, if tremendous budgets are going to be continued, the little fellow cannot possibly escape taxation in one form or another, direct or hidden, no matter what fairy tales the left wingers, CIO, and liberals of every stripe dream up to confuse the American people.

Further study of the 1942 Treasury income-tax returns by Mr. Adams shows that 96 percent of all the income-tax payers in the Nation are in the brackets below $5,000, and that fewer than one-quarter of 1 percent earn over $25,000. More than 81 percent of all the net income of all the income-tax payers put together is received by persons earning less than $5,000 a year and less than 6 percent of it goes to persons in the $25,000 brackets or above. Of all the taxes collected in 1942, he says, only 25 percent came from those earning more than $25,000 a year, the other 75 percent had to be taken out of the incomes of the lower and middle-class brackets if it was to be collected at all.

What is more, it must be kept in mind by all those low-income families who do not file income-tax returns because of sufficient exemptions, that nevertheless they pay many Federal taxes. These are the hidden taxes, consisting of manufacturers' taxes, excise taxes on liquor and cigarettes, so-called luxury taxes, and even the cost of corporation income taxes are reflected in the prices of goods which the small income earner must pay for the necessities of life. In short, taxes in one form or another are inescapable by the little fellow in order to make up $22,500,000,000 portion of the budget he must furnish.

The salvation of the little taxpayer is not and cannot ever be found in shifting the burden to the rich, as long as astronomical budgets are planned by the administration. The Republican-promised economy drive must be carried through to reduce costs of government. The padded Federal pay rolls must be slashed unmercifully and the cradle-to-the-grave paternalism of the last decade must be curtailed to the limits of reason.

Unless the American people are willing to return to the basic truth that the Government cannot create something out of nothing and that an honest day's toil must be given for a fair day's pay without constant dependence upon the Government to subsidize the standard of living, a solid foundation for productive industrial enterprise cannot be restored.

Cutting the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial which appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch, St. Paul, Minn., on February 15, 1947:

CUTTING THE BUDGET

The alarm of military officials over the decision of the congressional budget committee to make six billions the goal of Federal expense cutting is premature.

This decision in part reflects the necessity felt by most Republican Members of Congress to get President Truman's budget down where some substantial tax cutting and debt payment will be possible. It also reflects a belief, based on preliminary studies, that there is a great deal of waste and duplication and other unnecessary expense concealed in the thirty-seven and one-half billion dollar estimate for next fiscal year.

What Congress actually appropriates, however, will be another matter. If no material cut of the $11,200,000,000 estimate for the Army and Navy is possible without actually endangering national defense, that fact presumably can be proved by the experts of the armed forces.

The vote of 50 to 22 on the $6,000,000,000 reduction goal shows that a considerable doubt exists on this point. If these doubts become certainties, the cut will be less than six billion. But in the meantime, Federal department and bureau chiefs are put on notice that the budget is going to be reduced, and the wisdom with which it is done will depend in no small degree on whether they give their cooperation or not. Each one has his little or big bureaucratic empire. Protecting those empires is not necessarily in the public interest. The job in hand is to deflate them to the minimum required by public interest and bureau chiefs are the ones who can do this best if they are minded to cooperate.

Cooperatives or Free Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the rapid growth of cooperatives in this country during the last few years, and their immunity and exemption from the payment of certain taxes, have been the subject of widespread discussion. I have read an article by Mr. Walter Biscup, of the Tulsa Daily World editorial staff, published in the Tulsa Sunday World of February 2, 1947, which I think is most illuminating. This article contains a fund of valuable information and statistical data which should be studied by the Members of Congress.

Therefore, I have asked and obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the entire article by Mr. Biscup, entitled "Cooperatives or Free Enterprise?" The article follows:

COOPERATIVES OR FREE ENTERPRISE?

(The Consumers Cooperative Association's glossed brochure says: "Today, world cooperation in petroleum is here. Tomorrow, or the day after, a world oil cooperative."

(By Walter Biscup)

The United States of America can become the center of world socialism unless Congress immediately curbs the sweeping advances of the cooperative movement.

Our economic necromancers, both official and private, have not only nurtured and encouraged this process in our way of living and doing, but have incited it to today's astounding proportions.

Consumer cooperatives in this country are doing an annual $12,000,000,000 business tax-free.

More than 1,700,000 members belong to these 4,646 consumer cooperatives and the number is increasing daily. All this in addition to various other forms of cooperative enterprises.

As recipients of special favors from the Federal Government, United States cooperatives are collectively becoming the keystone in a gigantic economic arch which is spanning the globe—from continent to continent and ocean to ocean.

Cooperatives were and are inspired by the dogma of socialism. Theirs is an economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership and democratic management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods.

They aim to replace competition by cooperation and profit seeking by social service.

What began as a slow evolutionary transformation of capitalist into socialist society is now cascading into a vortex which threatens to engulf the entire stream of free enterprise.

Cooperatives can, and do, cater to your wants from the cradle to the grave—with airplane trips in between. They manufacture 32 different lines of goods and offer you an equal variety and amount of special services, all tax-free.

The complacency of business toward cooperatives is startling.

At the current rate of progress there could well be a day in the coming generation when the cooperatives and the Federal Government would operate all business in this country.

The forbearance of the petroleum industry to this menace is equally discouraging.

Present plans are being formulated for a world oil cartel.

And it will be the cooperatives manipulating this gigantic sinew of peace and war. They openly say so. Like Soviet Russia the cooperatives also have their 5-year plan and they call it that.

The oil cartel is not preposterous. It is immediate. Dangerous. Threatening. Take the word of Howard A. Cowden, of Kansas City, Mo., president of the Consumers Cooperative Association, the largest in the petroleum field. Last November he reported on a trip to Zurich, Switzerland, where a program was outlined at an international cooperatives meeting to launch a world-wide petroleum cooperative. The authorized capital of this cooperative will be $15,000,000. Cowden then told his fellow-workers:

"It (the cartel) will start modestly as a broker of petroleum products, moving gradually into every phase of the industry."

Cooperatives have had more than a century of training and experience in the field and strategy of infiltration.

There was nothing bombastic in Cowden's report. His background and record prove him an executive of singular ability. Certainly in the cooperative field, because, within 17 years and beginning with a mere $3,000 in capital, he pioneered and built up the largest oil cooperative in the United States, one which today is capable of and does deal in multi millions.

Cooperatives today are undoubtedly the most disputive chapter in our book of economics.

The history of cooperatives, here and abroad, as well as the history of our tax legislation, must necessarily be taken into consideration before a proper evaluation can be made of this all-important subject.

Cooperation, in its widest sense, has probably existed since the beginning of mankind. In some countries, such as China, Yugoslavia and Russia, primitive forms of cooperatives are known to have been carried on as far back as history goes. One Russian authority states in that country cooperatives are at least 1,000 years old. In the early days in Yugoslavia, family and village life was all organized on the "Zadruga" or cooperative basis.

Even in the modern form, the consumers cooperative movement is already 100 years old and celebrated its centenary in 1944. The first cooperative store was open only in the evening and had as its sole inventory a small amount of butter, sugar, flour, tea, and oatmeal purchased with the shillings painfully saved by its poverty-stricken members—28 cotton weavers in the town of Rochdale, England. This origial store of the Rochdale Pioneers, in Toad Lane, now restored to its initial architecture, is a museum and the mecca for cooperative travelers.

In the 100-year interval, the idea that animated the Pioneers spread all over the world. Today there is hardly a country without some sort of cooperative. In Europe this association is the predominating type. In Asia and the Far East, credit cooperatives have usually predominated. In agricultural countries, farmers have banded together in cooperatives.

The last official census, before European hostilities began in 1939, showed more than 800,000 cooperatives of various types in that continent, with a membership of 145,000,000 persons.

In the United States the first instance of consumers cooperatives occurred in 1845 when a Boston tailor, whose name has been lost in antiquity, induced the members of his labor union to undertake joint buying of their household supplies and distribute them at the weekly meetings of the union. Another labor organization, the Knights of Labor, actually fostered cooperatives as part of its economic program during the early 1880's.

United States consumer cooperatives today provide the following goods:

Groceries, meats, clothing, shoes, dry goods, furniture, bakery products, coal and wood, dairy products, electrical appliances, hardware and other household supplies, books, students and office supplies, occupational supplies, drugs, cosmetics, luggage, gasoline, other fuels (kerosene, etc.), motor oil, grease, tires, tubes, batteries and other automotive accessories, paint, lumber and building materials, flour, feed and seeds, fertilizer, farm supplies, automobiles and trucks, sports goods, caskets and funeral supplies and miscellaneous supplies.

Services rendered by cooperatives include:

Automobile repair, barber, cold storage, beauty parlor, educational courses and facilities, funerals, funeral contracts, laundry and dry cleaning, houses and apartments, insurance agencies, medical care, medical care contracts, passenger transportation, meals, shoe repair, study clubs, printing and publishing, automobile storage, rooms, social and recreational facilities, tailoring, auditing and accounting, water for family use, parking lots, greasing and tire repair, steam heat, credit facilities, electrical contracting, trucking, facilities for airplane flying, and services not otherwise classified.

Minnesota is the hotbed of the cooperative movement with 419 units. Oklahoma has 74.

The United States Department of Labor's directory of consumer cooperatives shows the following:

Alabama, 30; Alaska, 5; Arizona, 16; Arkansas, 30; California, 105; Colorado, 59; Connecticut, 33; Delaware, 1; District of Columbia, 14; Florida, 33; Georgia, 18; Idaho, 48; Illinois, 342; Indiana, 125; Iowa, 249; Kansas, 306; Kentucky, 12; Louisiana, 11; Maine, 22; Maryland, 34; Massachusetts, 71; Michigan, 304; Minnesota, 419; Mississippi, 13; Missouri, 193; Montana, 125; Nebraska, 284; Nevada, 53; New Hampshire, 10; New Jersey, 62; New Mexico, 6.

New York, 183; North Carolina, 21; North Dakota, 172; Ohio, 150; Oklahoma, 74; Oregon, 74; Pennsylvania, 162; Rhode Island, 5; South Carolina, 11; South Dakota, 143; Tennessee, 13; Texas, 119; Utah, 12; Vermont, 9; Virginia, 37; Washington, 115; West Virginia, 6; Wisconsin, 342; Wyoming, 18.

Tulsa has no consumer cooperative.

In Oklahoma they are located at Altus, Alva, Apache, Bartlesville, Bessie, Billings, Bison, Blackwell, Boise, Buffalo, Burlington, Carmen, Carnegie, Cashion, Cherrokee, Cleveland, Clinton, Cushing, Custer, Cyril, Dacoma, Douglas, Elk City, El Reno, Fargo, Fort Cobb, Freedom.

Garber, Goltry, Griggs, Hillsdale, Hinton, Hobart, Hollis, Hooker, Imro, Jet, Kremlin, Laverne, Lawton, Lexington, Lone Wolf, Manchester, Medford, Moorland, Morrison, Mountain View, Mulhall, Nash, Newkirk, Norman, Okarche, Okeene, Oklahoma City, Perkins, Perry, Pond Creek, Putnam, Ralston, Redrock, Rocky, Snyder, Stillwater, Thomas, Tonkawa, Vici, Wakita, Waynoka, and Weatherford.

Cooperative organizations, wherever they have taken root, have had certain characteristics which set them apart from all other forms of business activity. These are (1), open membership, (2) one vote per member, (3) return of surplus earnings to members in proportion to the amount of their patronage of the cooperative enterprise, (4) limited return on members' investments, (5) political and religious neutrality, (6) transactions of business on cash basis only and at current prices, and, (7) promotion of education in the cooperative philosophy.

This philosophy says the essence of cooperative development is that it is the voluntary achievement of free people, working on a democratic basis for the attainment of definite social and economic ends.

In this respect it is a twin, as well as a strong supporter of labor unionism.

It should be remembered that such dividends as the cooperative consumer gets are based upon the amount of purchases he makes. Supposing he buys $100 worth of merchandise in 1 year from a co-op grocery, his dividend return (normally about one-half of the earnings) would be based upon the amount of his purchases. The other half is held for educational purposes (to further the spread of the gospel of cooperation.)

Income taxation was first proposed in the United States in 1812 as a means of financing the war with England, but the proposal was not adopted. Again the exigency of war, this time the Civil War, brought forward another movement to tax incomes. The Direct Property Act of August 5, 1861, imposed a modest 3 percent tax on the excess of all incomes over $800. This tax, however, was not collected and the law was repealed by the act of July 1, 1862. The new law levied at 3 percent on certain incomes and 5 percent on higher incomes. Income taxation continued in effect until 1871 when this act expired and was not reenacted. Then there was a lapse of 23 years before another income tax became effective August 28, 1894. This act was declared unconstitutional.

Fifteen years elapsed before the enactment of a corporation excise tax in 1909. The acts of 1909 and 1913 both exempted certain types of nonprofit concerns from income taxation, including agricultural organizations.

In succeeding revenue acts, the exemption provisions were gradually augmented and clarified. Each revision broadened the range of exemption eligibility for agricultural organizations. In 1926 Congress practically rewrote the entire section concerning the exemption of farmers' cooperatives. With but one slight addition made in 1934, it so stands today as section 101 (12), Internal Revenue Code, Revenue Act of 1941.

This section, this code, this act, and this law furnish the cooperatives with the legal leverage to pry themselves loose from income taxes.

This act, however, has 19 different sections granting exemption to a variety of organizations. In addition to farmers' cooperatives, these include such activities as fraternal beneficiary societies, labor unions, building and loan associations, charitable and religious organizations and corporations, educational institutions, hospitals, business leagues, clubs, certain mutual companies, etc.

The United States Treasury Department reports more than 300,000 such organizations have secured exemptions.

Congress, it is assumed, saw fit to grant exemption to the foregoing type of organization, when they operate in a prescribed manner, probably for the reason that their existence is considered beneficial to the general public welfare.

Specifically section 101 allows tax exemption to farmers, fruit growers, or like associations organized, and operated on a cooperative basis (a), for the purpose of marketing the product of members or other producers, and turning back to them the proceeds of sales, less the necessary marketing expenses, on the basis of either the quantity or the value of the products furnished by them, (b) for the purpose of purchasing supplies and equipment for the use of members and other persons and turning over such supplies and equipment to them at actual cost, plus necessary expenses.

The reader may well ask how a cooperative can compete directly with a private company in the oil industry without paying taxes.

Federal statutes do not give agricultural products a sufficiently broad definition to include petroleum products. The term is not defined in applicable Federal legislation or law. But the United States Treasury Department has held that petroleum comes under the definitive classification of agricultural products.

The perplexing question relating to the petroleum industry is just as relevant to all other lines of business.

For the current fiscal year the National Budget is $39,800,000,000.

Profits of private corporations, according to the National Tax Equality Association, are taxed twice. The corporations pay Federal income taxes on their profits, and stockholders pay individual income taxes on dividends they receive, which are added to their income in their tax returns.

The cooperatives correspond in form of organization to private corporations. The members are the cooperative stockholders, receiving their dividends as "earnings" or "savings." But the cooperative corporation or organization pays no profit tax. The only tax the Government may collect is on the incomes of individual members. In most instances the savings are actually paid to the member but are retained by the cooperative for expansion purposes.

This exemption from Federal income taxes has resulted in scores of industries—unable to compete with tax-free cooperatives—selling out to the cooperatives or becoming cooperatives themselves. And why not?

Petroleum cooperatives attained their industrial majority shortly before World War II, utilizing tax-free, swollen profits and promoted by governmental favors and special privileges. They have rapidly expanded their activities into the fields of production and refinery operation. The many unequal competitive advantages enjoyed over privately owned oil companies have in truth and fact made them formidable competitors in the petroleum industry.

Cooperatives are influenced by the same economic factors as private enterprise, but they have prospered disproportionately as a result of the artificial stimulants applied by a benevolent Government. Exemption from income and excess-profits taxes and business regulatory laws, together with governmental credit and special privileges, have enabled them to absorb many independent distributors and refiners.

Oil men, in Tulsa and elsewhere, paid little or no attention in 1929 when six local cooperative associations in Missouri, Kansas, and Colorado decided by pooling their orders for petroleum products and other farm supplies they could get lower prices and be in a better position to insist on quality of product. This cooperative had $3,000 capital. At the end of the first year it had done a business volume of $309,890.70 and had made net savings of $5,221.44. This gave no indication of things to come.

The Consumers Co-operative Association of North Kansas City Mo., then began compounding lubricating oil, manufacturing grease and also established a paint factory. Then it built in 1942 and placed in operation at Phillipsburg, Kans., the first petroleum refinery (3,500 barrels) and the first crude oil gathering pipe line (70 miles) ever owned by a cooperative in the United States.

On October 11, 1940, it became the first cooperative ever to drill an oil well. This successful well was brought in near Laton, Kans. A year later the CCA purchased a 1,500-barrel refinery at Scottsbluff, Nebr. In July 1943, the CCA and four other regional cooperatives bought a 17,500-barrel refinery at McPherson, Kans., and its 229-mile pipe line to Council Bluffs, Iowa. January 1, 1944, the CCA bought the 13,500-barrel refinery at Coffeyville, Kans., which had in connection with it a lubricating oil refinery that produced more than 20,000,000 gallons of motor oil in 1945–46. In the meantime it kept on moving into larger quarters in North Kansas City and finally acquired and occupied a five-story, with basement, building in Kansas City. After only 2 years occupancy this building has become congested.

The CCA paid $800,000 for a controlling interest of the Bridgeport Oil Co., of Wichita, Kans., last December 16. On January 1 this cooperative paid several million dollars for the Coralena Oil Co., of Tulsa. This firm owned 162 wells in western Kansas, 27 in Osage County, Okla., and 20,000 acres of developed and undeveloped leases in Ellis and Russell Counties, Kans. The Bridgeport Co. owned 99 wells in central Kansas, two rotary drilling rigs and 65,000 acres of oil leases, with wells, principally in Barton County, Kans.

Prior to this the CCA and its subsidiaries had acquired four refineries, 867 miles of pipe lines and 289 producing oil wells.

So successful were the operations of the CCA that James P. Warbasse, president emeritus of the Cooperative League of the United States, speaking at the annual meeting in 1941 stated:

"The oil business in the United States is destined to be taken over by the Government, or it is destined to be run by coooperatives. * * * you are the people who are taking the only step that makes it possible to put petroleum business in the private possession of the people."

There is nothing modest about the CCA's 5-year plan. The goals include:

Fifteen hundred member associations, serving half a million families in 3,000 communities—doubling the present number of families.

At least 100 communities in which all farm and home supplies will be furnished by CCA.

A weekly co-op newspaper with 300,000 circulation; regular radio broadcasts; a school of cooperative leadership, with buildings and faculty; job training for managers; summer camps for youth.

One hundred and four million dollar volume of business—four times last year's $26,000,000, and $30,000,000 of capital from deferred-patronage dividends, patrons' equity reserves, and sale of preferred stock.

At least 70 percent of all goods handled to be produced or processed in CCA's own or jointly owned co-op plants—including tires, batteries, roofing, cement, and fertilizer.

CCA's published financial statement showed net earnings for 1944–45 of $1,665,298.82 after deduction of $96,899.29 losses on cannery, lumber-mill, and pipe-line operations. Refineries showed biggest profits—$1,124,726. Net worth amounted to $9,550,264.84. Total assets were listed as $16,453,161.21.

No payment of Federal income tax is shown, though a taxpaying corporation that made $1,665,298 would be paying $632,000 at the present rate of 38 percent.

Cooperatives have found that the greatest profits in the petroleum industry accrue from productive rather than distributive activities. Since their private competitors could not expand or establish reserves for future expansion because of the high tax burden, they were able to purchase huge productive enterprises and pay for them out of nontaxed profits from petroleum and other business activities in a relatively short time.

Because dollars saved through tax exemption represent much of the investment in new facilities of cooperative enterprise, it is reasonable to conclude that cooperative ownership is indirectly paid for by all taxpayers, and that the individual cooperative members who profit thereby are being unduly enriched at the public's expense.

An illustration of this effect is provided by the record of 14 major cooperatives, which had combined earnings of $10,383,177 during their fiscal year ending in 1942. They would have paid approximately $6,582,943 in Federal income and excess-profits tax if they

had been taxed at the average rate paid by private industry (63.4 percent). Instead, this and additional funds, amounting to $7,285,073, were retained in the capital structure and, therefore, were available for expansion. The rest of the nontaxed net earnings, $3,098,104, was returned to the patrons in the form of cash dividends and stock.

The superpetroleum cooperative was preceded by large regional cooperative wholesales, initially organized to supply petroleum and other products to the local petroleum associations. The wholesale associations enabled the local co-ops to capture the economies resulting from large-scale purchases. At first these organizations were little more than brokerage agencies, but they were successful and soon extended their operations back to the sources of supply, i. e., crude production and refinery operations.

The organization of cooperative wholesale associations followed very closely the growth of the retail associations. The first association was incorporated in Minnesota in 1926. It was the first co-op wholesale association in the United States organized primarily to engage in the distribution of petroleum products.

The importance of the wholesale associations is reflected in the dollar volume of sales figures compiled by the Farm Credit Administration for 17 major wholesale cooperatives during 1942. Total sales amounted to $287,960,907, and of this amount petroleum products represented an aggregate of $47,966,314.

The big move into the field of production (petroleum) developed simultaneously with the huge increase in corporate income and excess-profits taxes brought on by the war. While private business had to shelve its plans for expansion, co-ops were able to pyramid their capital structure by retaining their tax-free, war-inflated profits.

Since Federal income taxes take up to 80 percent of corporate income, it can readily be seen that tax free co-ops' profits had in effect multiplied fivefold. This tremendous advantage was further supplemented by the extension of easy Government credit and preferential treatment to the cooperative associations.

The banks for the cooperatives, supervised by the Farm Credit Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture, extend credit to the co-ops at 3½ percent on loan to acquire facilities. These loans, by law, may be made in an amount up to 60 percent of the appraised value of the facilities required. As a result, the cooperatives in some instances have been able to finance the entire cost of their purchases by virtue of purchasing at a price decidedly lower than the appraised valuation.

There is no disputing the fact that these huge productive co-op enterprises are being paid for out of profits which largely would be absorbed by Federal income and excess profits taxes were they privately owned. This means cooperative ownership is subsidized and that cooperative enterprise is indirectly paid for by all taxpayers. The records bear this out.

Fourteen major cooperative wholesalers, which distributed petroleum products or, in some cases, engaged in production and refinery operation, earned $10,383,177 during their fiscal year of 1942. They were able by devious means to retain $7,285,073 or 70.2 percent of the tax-free profits in their capital structure. Since private business paid 63.4 percent of their profits in Federal income taxes in 1942, it readily can be seen that tax exemption is presently subsidizing cooperative expansion.

The amount and distribution of the combined savings for the 14 associations shows: Cash patronage dividends, $2,636,085 or 25.4 percent; patronage dividends in capital stock and certificates of equity, $3,799,212 or 36.6 percent; retained in reserves, $3,485,861 or 33.6 percent; cash dividends on stock, $462,-019 or 4.4 percent.

The share capital of the 14 organizations in 1942 amounted to $26,347,100. This represented an increase of $7,767,391 over the share capital of $18,579,709 for the preceding year. The increase in share capital is almost entirely accounted for by the amount of profits retained. Profits retained amounted to $7,285,073, or $482,324 less than the increase in share capital. If the $482,324 represents capital derived from the sale of stock on the open market or to the membership, then only about 6 percent of the capital increase came from sources other than profits.

In practically all cases the capital of regional cooperative wholesalers has been built from earnings, rather than by additional investment by member associations.

What is the reason for the growth of local petroleum cooperatives?

They began to appear in numbers in 1924, simultaneously with the widespread use of power-driven farm machinery. Prior to then farmers secured their supply of fuel exclusively from private companies.

With the advent of widespread mechanization of the farm the cooperative principles which had proved successful in marketing the farmers' produce were applied to the purchasing of gasoline, kerosene, lubricating oils, grease, and other related products.

From the very first petroleum products were found to be especially adaptable to cooperative distribution. Such products could be distributed in bulk quantities and, therefore, did not require expensive facilities for handling. Inventory problems were negligible. Like other cooperatives, the petroleum associations also were immune from Federal income and excess-profits taxes.

These factors combined enabled farmers to organize their cooperative associations with little initial capital and to finance them out of the profits (now labeled savings) of the organization. Many such associations thus paid for their capital structure within 1 or 2 years, and thereafter stimulated their sales volume by the payment of substantial amounts of patronage dividends in the form of cash.

Many existing marketing and purchasing cooperatives then dealing in various kinds of commodities seized the opportunity to handle petroleum products as a side line. This was particularly true of the cooperative elevators and farm supply associations.

In general, the petroleum cooperatives may be classed into two groups on the basis of their purchasing arrangement. The group handling the largest volume of products is that affiliated with cooperative wholesale organizations. The other group relies on the major and independent oil companies for their supplies.

The most recent available report from the United States Department of Labor shows 2,327 local cooperative associations in the United States engaged in the distribution of petroleum products.

There were no associations listed for Florida, Nevada, and Rhode Island. Although most of the associations handled all the major petroleum products, some engaged in the distribution of only one or two items. Gasoline was distributed by 2,026 co-ops. Motor oil was retailed by 2,248 associations and grease by 2,092 associations.

By States and numbers: Alabama, 3; Alaska, 1; Arizona, 7; Arkansas, 13; California, 25; Colorado, 38; Connecticut, 14; Delaware, 1; District of Columbia, 1; Florida, 0; Georgia, 2; Idaho, 36; Illinois, 100; Indiana, 92; Iowa, 131; Kansas, 195; Kentucky, 2; Louisiana, 1; Maine, 7; Maryland, 8; Massachusetts, 27; Michigan, 99; Minnesota, 249; Mississippi, 2; Missouri, 83; Montana, 95; Nebraska, 184; Nevada, 0; New Hampshire, 3; New Jersey, 23; New Mexico, 5; New York, 42; North Carolina, 7; North Dakota, 122; Ohio, 109; Oklahoma, 40; Oregon, 39; Pennsylvania, 54; Rhode Island, 0; South Carolina, 3; South Dakota, 76; Tennessee, 1; Texas, 66; Utah, 7; Vermont, 6; Virginia, 7; Washington, 76; West Virginia, 5; Wisconsin, 207; Wyoming, 13.

Too large a segment of petroleum-industry executives have refused to become concerned over the competition offered by the co-ops. Their complacency to a large degree has been based on the false belief that the cooperatives would not be able to overcome the many practical difficulties that would develop from an expansion into the fields of production and refinery operation.

Further, they have mistakenly assumed that the competitive importance of the cooperative in the retail field eventually would decline. These beliefs, unfortunately, were well expressed by Warren C. Platt, of Cleveland, Ohio, president of the National Petroleum News, speaking before the annual meeting of the American Petroleum Institute at Dallas, Tex., November 12, 1934. He said:

"I do not mean to predict that the farm oil co-ops will go out of business entirely but that they probably will decline greatly in competitive importance."

The fact that the local cooperatives since that time have continued to expand and began to exploit the urban market has apparently not resulted in any noticeable change in this attitude of lassitude. Today the co-ops have spread so far and so deeply into the fields of production and refining that they stand as the primary threat to private ownership in the oil industry.

The practical difficulties preventing cooperative expansion, held insurmountable by the oil industry, were predicated on the assumptions that the co-ops would be unable to obtain skilled and trained personnel; sufficient capital, cooperation, and patronage; and adequate oil reserves, which they considered necessary to the cooperatives' success. As a matter of fact, experience has shown that few of these factors have had any deterring effect upon the growth of the movement.

The most important difficulty that has faced the co-ops in their expansion program has been the lack of competent management and personnel. But cooperatives have overcome this factor by the simple expedient of taking over the personnel of the refineries which they have purchased and paying wage rates comparable to those paid by private industry. If any incentive for cooperative executives is lacking because of low salaries, it is more than compensated by a fanatical zeal and interest in the movement and this characterizes most of its executives.

One thing remains certain.

Petroleum cooperatives will continue their expansion in the fields of crude production and refinery operation until they have sufficient capacity to service the demands of their consumer market.

In the words of the co-op leaders, "cooperative wholesales, being service organizations, are seeking, through the purchase of additional refining facilities, to meet the refined fuel needs of their members 100 percent."

The cooperators declare that their consumer market ultimately will embrace the entire world market for petroleum products.

The four-step program to cooperative dominance of the international business as well as petroleum world is based upon, (1) the establishment of local markets through the formation of local cooperative associations, (2) the formation of regional wholesale associations to capture the economies

of large-scale purchasing, (3) the organization of national "super-cooperatives" to produce and manufacture, and (4) the creation of international cooperative cartels to dominate world markets and to obtain complete control of all sources of supply.

The Consumers Cooperative Association is interested in more than petroleum.

It has an electrically operated mill at Swisshome, Oreg., working at capacity to serve 240 co-op lumber yards. It produces a minimum of 25,000,000 feet of lumber a year.

The CCA also can provide you with paint, building supplies, food products, a cannery, markets, wholesale groceries, feed mill, soybean mill, alfalfa dehydration plant, farm machinery, transports, automobile accessories, auditing service, insurance agency, and printing supplies. That's all—for the time being.

"The Consumers Cooperative Association is an ideal enshrined in the hearts of the people. It is not the externals that give the organization stature—not the oil wells, the pipe lines, the refineries, the buildings of steel, brick, and mortar.

"These are but outward tokens of inner strength. These men are but symbols of power; the power itself is in the people who nourish the cooperative idea with patronage, and who otherwise give devoted loyalty to it." (From the CCA prospectus.)

A Scalpel Is Needed, Not a Meat Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo., on February 15, 1947.

All Members of Congress and particularly those majority party leaders who are advocating a $6,000,000,000 reduction in the budget should read this editorial. The editorial policy of the Rocky Mountain News has been that of an independent, although its position in the election of 1946 was strongly in favor of a Republican Congress. Here, then, is a friendly voice urging majority leaders to proceed with caution and to act with wisdom.

RECKLESS ECONOMY TALK

Congress had better heed the warnings of Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal and Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur against proposed cuts in military appropriations.

These men know what they're talking about when they say that such reductions as Republican leaders are advocating would invite disaster.

We can understand the Republicans' eagerness to find some way of saving enough money to let them make good on their promises of lower taxes. And certainly there is room for some safe paring in the Army, Navy, and Air Force budgets submitted by President Truman.

But that operation ought to be performed with a scalpel, not a meat ax. This is no time to risk crippling the services which still are our best insurance of national security and world peace.

Congress has not yet done the careful work necessary to determine how far or in what respects military expenditures can be cut without danger. What the Republican leaders are proposing is only a guess. And congressional guessing on that subject is, itself, perilous.

Coming on the eve of the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in Moscow, it impairs our bargaining position. It gives other nations reason to hope or fear that America is about to dissipate the armed strength essential, under present conditions, to support a firm foreign policy.

The American people want Congress to end waste and extravagance in every branch of the Government, including the Army and Navy. But we believe a vast majority would rather have no tax cut this year than see the military services weakened by a reckless and uninformed stab at economy.

The Veteran's Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Southington (Conn.) News on Saturday, February 15, 1947:

THE VETERAN'S PROBLEM

"Let's get those veterans off the street. Stop them from sounding off on street corners, loitering in front of drug stores, strutting around like heroes. Heroes were all right when the war was on. But the war's been over 18 months. Let's stop coddling those parasites and put 'em to work."

So the argument runs. It comes out of the same mouth that spoke only yesterday of the "noble sacrifice" and "doing something for the boys who are doing so much for us." It comes from the same mind that laid out elaborate schemes for understanding the boys and making it easier for them to readjust when they came home.

Well, most of the boys have been home now from a year to 18 months. Getting home was a great dream come true, a dream that seemed incredibly beautiful because of the nightmare that inspired it. Home, of course, never could be in reality the wonderful thing it seemed to be in a place 3,000 or 6,000 miles away from home.

But the veteran could reasonably expect home to mean more than a noisy welcome evaporating into a cold silence that conveyed indifference if not hostility. Home ought to have meant at least an opportunity to work or get some schooling and to live in decent surroundings.

The GI bill of rights was supposed to guarantee those things.

It didn't. And the veteran is bitter and resentful.

The civilian is puzzled and a little scared by the veteran's insistence that he be accepted once more at home, not as a hero but as an equal participant in society.

The gulf between veteran and civilian widens, causing one of the most dangerous situations in the Nation today. But the two groups cannot be brought together on a basis of real understanding until the civilian, who has the power to solve the problem, helps carry out the intent of the GI bill.

The first need is a more liberal interpretation of the loan provision. Few loans for homes and still fewer loans for business are being made under the GI bill. It is difficult for the veteran to understand why private lending agencies and the Veterans' Administration consider him a poor risk when the Nation staked its very existence on him during the war.

It is even more difficult for the veteran to understand the prevailing concepts of security and interest in credit deals. The veteran was willing to put up the most precious of all assets, life itself, without any guarantee that his family would be protected if everything had to be sacrificed.

The veteran has his own idea of interest rates. If he went into service at 20 and came out at 24 without a scratch, he still gave up 4 good years—or better than 16 percent of his life. The country owes him something for his time, time that ordinarily would have been spent in schooling or apprenticeship for a trade.

The GI bill sets a maximum of $65 a month for the single veteran, $90 a month for the married veteran, as an allowance for schooling. The allowance was fair when the bill became law but living costs have gone up since, and the allowance should go up accordingly.

The bill sets a maximum of $175 a month for the single veteran, $200 a month for the married veteran, who enters into on-the-job training. In view of increased living costs, this maximum should be raised.

Veterans' housing is an even more serious problem and should be tackled with all the resources private agencies and the State and Federal governments can muster. Men who sacrificed comfort for 3 or 4 years cannot be expected to give it up forever and to rely for shelter on callous landlords who are in the game for all the traffic will bear. A recent survey shows that in some sections of the country two of every five veterans share living quarters with others; 6.3 percent live in attics or basements and only 50 percent have a private bath or shower. The survey brings out that 87 percent of the veterans want to own their own homes.

It is not unreasonable for the veteran to want more schooling or a job and a decent place to live. The veterans' problem will disappear in no time when those fundamental needs are provided.

Amendment of Civil Service Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, which bill will credit all persons who have served at least 90 days and have been honorably discharged from the military and naval service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, with an additional 5 years toward retirement, upon payment of the amount of contributions that would have been required of them had they remained under the provision of the Civil Service Act at the rate of pay received by them immediately prior to joining the service.

It is my sincere belief that the veterans are entitled to this consideration, for they served our country honorably when they were called upon and did a good job in winning the war. It is only proper that we should give them all the help we can in establishing them in civilian life and in planning for their future. I trust this measure will receive the full attention of the committee.

Memorandum on Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the President of the Puerto Rican Senate, Hon. Luis Munoz-Marin, has sent me a very interesting and enlightening memorandum on the economic and political realities in Puerto Rico. Because the contents of the memorandum are of importance, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of President Munoz-Marin:

MEMORANDUM ON PUERTO RICO

The over-all picture of realities in Puerto Rico is as follows:

THE ECONOMIC PICTURE

The island of Puerto Rico is approximately 95 by 35 miles, or about 3,400 square miles. It has now a population of 2,100,000 inhabitants, more than double what it had at the beginning of the century. The population is increasing even faster now than formerly due to the fact that we have made enough progress to reduce the death rate from 30 to 13 per thousand, but not enough to reduce the birth rate which has continued throughout the century at around 40 per thousand. This large and increasing population has to live on what is mainly an agricultural economy. In no place in the world can 630 persons per square mile subsist, except at very low levels, on an agricultural economy. It is for this basic reason that the Federal Government has been called upon to give increasing aid to Puerto Rico.

This aid should be continued and improved; but it should be increasingly guided by a policy of helping Puerto Ricans to help themselves rather than of sustaining them by relief.

The present legislature of Puerto Rico, which was elected on the basis of universal suffrage by a two-to-one majority, is trying to deal with the economic problem of Puerto Rico along the following lines: Puerto Rico must increase its production, through improved agriculture, and, mainly, through industrialization, fast enough to take up the chronic lag of unemployment; and still faster to keep up with the rapidly increasing population; and still faster looking towards a time in which the fair-minded Federal aid provided shall cease to be essential to its survival and civilization; and still faster to improve the standard of living of the common man to the point where, through educational and other factors, the birth rate begins to decrease. (In this connection it should be pointed out that the size of Puerto Rican families is smaller above the $800-a-year level of income than below that level. But 70 percent of Puerto Rican families are far below that level still.)

This difficult, but by no means impossible, economic objective is being pursued by the present government of Puerto Rico, not only by extending education and health services, but by taking the initiative, insofar as necessary under Puerto Rican conditions, in agricultural and industrial development. The Industrial Development Co., a public corporation, helps private investors to establish new industries, or establishes them itself, as a guide, example, and stimulus to private investors. The Agricultural Development Co. develops new crops as a guide, example, and stimulus to farmers in developing a more diversified agriculture of high yield. The Development Bank, which has the approval of the private banks of the island—some of the managers of which serve on the Development Bank's board—has been established to make long-term investment loans that the private banks of Puerto Rico do not extend. These institutions, it should be noted, have not been established because of an abstract theory, but to meet the pressing specific needs of Puerto Rico. Private investment has been stimulated to go into new fields by government pioneering, and in doing so has had the government's aid and support.

It is along this line that we expect to accomplish the hard task of developing our production to the point where 3,000,000 Puerto Ricans—the probable figure—can by 1960 support themselves without other aid than their own effort, without a lag of chronic unemployment and at a level, modest but sufficiently decent, to bring about a decrease in the birth rate. All necessary aid given the Puerto Ricans to attain this objective is not only a matter of justice in extending a helping hand to fellow citizens that are gallantly trying to work out a very tough problem, but it is also in the long run the only way of saving money by helping Puerto Rico to become self-supporting and to cope with its population problem.

THE POLITICAL PICTURE

Puerto Rico was a colony of Spain for 400 years. Then it came under the jurisdiction of the United States, as a result of the Spanish-American War in 1898. The population is mainly of Spanish descent. According to the census of 1940, about 30 percent of the population was colored and 70 percent white. Toward the end of the Spanish regime Puerto Rico had had a brief experience in self-government under a type of relationship to Spain similar to the relationship of Canada or Australia to Great Britain.

Although the United States began its regime in Puerto Rico by cutting down Puerto Rico's political liberties, living in association with democratic American institutions has given Puerto Ricans great experience in the democratic way. The late President Roosevelt recognized publicly several years ago that the Puerto Rican people were politically mature and ready for a full measure of self-government.

It is contrary to the whole American way of life that a community of American citizens should have less than complete local self-government. It is equally contrary to the world commitments of the United States Government that any politically able people anywhere should be kept in any form of political subjection. On the basis of these realities, opinion in Puerto Rico is divided among those who favor independence, in a spirit of friendship with the United States similar to that under which Philippine independence has been established, those who favor statehood, and those who favor full local self-government based on rights and not on special favor.

The Puerto Rican people are asking for a chance to vote freely on their own future in such a manner that they may be properly advised when they vote on what economic relationship they can expect with the United States, with a view to making themselves fully self-supporting, under the different forms of political status upon which they may be consulted in a referendum. (It should be borne in mind that the Puerto Rican voters could not make an intelligent and responsible reply to such consultation without being adequately apprised of the economics involved in each political status, as the mere name of a political status does not convey its economic corollaries.) One thing, however, seems to be beyond question, either by responsible American citizens of the continent or by responsible American citizens of Puerto Rico, and that is that no community, and especially no American community, should be longer deprived of full local self-government.

Rapid action on the Puerto Rican political problem would not only discourage extreme views from gaining a foothold in Puerto Rico but would also clear the decks completely for the wise peace-seeking bipartisan policy of the United States Government with relation to peoples still politically dependent in all areas of the world.

Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, February 15, 1947, Lincoln Day dinner, Winston-Salem, N. C.:

Thank you, people of Winston-Salem and Republicans of North Carolina. Thank you very much. In asking me to speak tonight you have paid me a singular honor. No; a double honor. No; a triple honor.

First, I am honored to be here as a private citizen. You are very generous with the party's time. I am just another constituent. A mere taxpayer. If the word "mere" can be used about anything the size of present-day taxes.

Secondly, I am honored to stand on a platform with our new Speaker of the House, Mr. JOSEPH MARTIN. The papers say that Joe's force and effectiveness in that high office are astounding Washington. They come as no surprise to those Republican Representatives who worked with him in the past. JOE MARTIN has had plenty of schooling in political adversity. That's a mild way to describe 16 years of New Dealism. His keen qualities of leadership were forged on the anvil of opposition through four terms of Democratic administration and maladministration. In the crucial years ahead, the whole Nation will come to know the Speaker's character as we knew it when he was our minority leader. He is candid, patient, flexible, determined, and liberal in his judgments. Now that our party is in power, some Republicans are bound to try to turn the clock back to 1932. JOE MARTIN won't try that. Few men are so well aware that there is no going back. His motto is: Let's turn neither to the right nor the left. Let us go forward.

But the third reason why I am so greatly honored is that you have picked me to speak on this occasion, so dear to the hearts of all Americans, but dearest of all to the hearts of Republicans—the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln's political tradition is our unique party inheritance. But a political inheritance, like a material one, must be constantly and prudently reinvested in fruitful political projects if it is not to diminish rapidly. It is not enough for us Republicans to talk Lincoln; we must act Lincoln, and do Lincoln, if we are not to waste our inheritance. We must go forward in Lincoln's tradition. We must, as the party coming into power, be reborn in the spirit of Lincoln. Nothing less will safeguard our party fortunes. Anything less will endanger the peace and prosperity of America.

But what is the Lincoln tradition? What does it mean, not only to Americans, but to all peoples? When we know that, we will know the secret of his deathless leadership. What is the spirit of Lincoln which must infuse our party if it is to reach the heights of leadership for which our age is crying? When we know that we will know the secret of how we Republicans should govern the Nation.

To begin with, Abraham Lincoln's spirit was fundamentally religious. Lincoln believed, with a passion that resisted and overcame all political temptations, in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. All the rest of his political beliefs derived from this rocklike credo. Lincoln never talked about Negro rights against white rights, or southern rights against northern rights, or the rights of the property holder against those of the propertyless, or even the rights of one nation against the rights of another. Lincoln knew that there are no rights but human rights, and that all human rights stem from man's membership in the whole human family, each member of which is a child of God. Lincoln held that every man, regardless of creed, color, race, nationality, or condition of birth, has the divine right to refuse to subject himself to his equal or his inferior. He has a sovereign personality, individual dignity, and personal responsibility in society. Because Lincoln believed in man as a child of God, he never ran into any trouble defining what he meant by democracy.

"As I would not be a slave, so I would not be master. This," said Lincoln, "expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy."

Lincoln realized that the genius, the strength, and the glory of America lay in preserving, perfecting, and projecting democracy, without masters or slaves in it.

Lincoln loved peace. But he was not a pacifist. He knew that all good government must strive to keep peace between men and nations. Peace is the bedrock policy of national prosperity. But he also knew that war is better than any peace which surrenders our human rights to the slave master, the tyrant, and the dictator. He tried, with heartbreaking patience, to dissuade the slave masters from their trade with cold logic, with sound reason. When democratic arguments failed, Lincoln did not draw back from using force. He cut the hideous institution of slavery out of our political system by violence. The man who loved his fellow Americans more than any other American who ever lived laid a sword between them. But the sword was the sword of justice, wielded in the name of every man's freedom.

And Lincoln saw as clearly as a prophet that for Americans to betray freedom at home would mean in the end the betrayal of freedom throughout the whole world.

Lincoln was not an isolationist. He knew the power of ideas—or what we call today ideologies. He saw that ideas pack more force than money or cannons. He knew that ideas can invade and conquer nations, no matter how wide the oceans or high the mountains which protect them.

It is fashionable for modern politicians to talk about "one world." To hear them you would think that "one world" had come into being when we invented the radio and the airplane. Lincoln always knew that this was "one world," because we are all members of one human society. He knew that the human heart at all times, and everywhere, desires freedom. And that freemen most everywhere make common cause with one another, in self-defense.

"In giving freedom to the slaves," he said, "we assure freedom to the free."

Lincoln had never heard about a League of Nations, or a United Nations' organization. But reason told him that the survival of freedom in America rested on our staying in league with the lovers of freedom throughout the world.

Lincoln was very sensitive to free world opinion. He had a sense of responsibility and a wish to join hands with free peoples of Europe which would put to shame some of our modern so-called liberals. Listen to these words spoken at Peoria, Ill., 5 years before the outbreak of the war. He said:

"Already the liberal party throughout the world expresses the apprehension that the one retrograde institution (slavery) in America is undermining the principles of progress, and fatally violating the noblest political system the world ever saw! This is not the taunt of enemies, but the warning of friends. * * * In our greedy chase to make profit of the Negro, let us beware lest we 'cancel and tear in pieces' even the white man's charter of freedom. * * * Let North and South—let all Americans—let all lovers of liberty everywhere join in the great and good work. If we do this we shall not only have saved the Union, but millions of free happy people, the world over, shall rise up and call us blessed."

Twice since 1861 this Nation made the Lincolnian decision. In 1918 and again in 1941, we decided that it was nobler to suffer wounds than to let our brothers wear chains. We decided that in freeing the peoples enslaved by the German and Japanese dictators, we assured freedom to all free governments. And once again, with victory there came the hope of a rebirth of world freedom.

But today, over wide areas of the world, freedom is still no more than a hope.

No nation, Lincoln said in the days of flintlock and cannon, can long endure half slave and half free. The world has grown small. The radio, the telephone, the airplane, and other rapid means of communication have made it smaller than Lincoln's America. And yet in this shrunken world the issue between slavery and freedom is not yet settled. It is more acute and terrible than it has ever been since the dawn of man's history. Never before has our democratic concept of the individual dignity, worth, and responsibility borne such vicious attack. Never before have whole nations numbering millions upon millions of people been forced or persuaded to wear the fetters of political slavery. A fierce ideological conflict rages today in a world half free and half slave. Must it be resolved, as it had to be in Lincoln's day, by war? O God, forbid! The weapons men would use in such a war would be the weapons of mass extermination. An atomic superblitz could turn our land from coast to coast into a shambles. Germ warfare could blight our widest harvest fields and glut our hospitals with stricken women and children.

This can happen here in the next 20 years. But it can happen only on one condition—that we let the forces of tyranny that are at work so hard in Europe and Asia overtake the valiant defenses of freemen there.

There is, of course, one other thing America could do instead of helping the democrats of Europe and Asia. We could scrap the firm Vandenberg-Byrnes policy. We could appease totalitarianism abroad and we could encourage it at home. We could begin to behave like a bunch of frightened colonials. Now, you might sell that idea to a small group of New Deal isolationists, say, on Henry Wallace's birthday. But you can't sell it to the American people—not on Abraham Lincoln's birthday.

The supreme challenge which faces a Republican Party coming into power is twofold. First, we must seek quickly to widen the areas of freedom abroad by every means at hand to a rich, powerful, peace-loving country. We are the only strong arsenal of democracy left on five continents. We are today, as in Lincoln's time, the last best hope of freemen on earth.

Second, we must look to our own defenses. The social revolution in Europe has gathered terrible momentum. In spite of all our peaceful efforts, these areas of freedom abroad may continue to shrink. If we lose our allies among the freemen of other lands, war will surely come to meet us. We are our own last best hope, too.

So, let us Republicans support to the hilt all economic and diplomatic measures for the relief, rehabilitation, and comfort of free European and Asiatic governments. Let us use, for all it is worth, the machinery of UN to settle international frictions. Let us give UN every chance to bring about world disarmament and atomic control. Meanwhile, let's keep the bomb. For one reason only: we are the least likely nation in the world to use it unexpectedly. Let us be generous and firm in building our foreign propaganda and intelligence programs. Let us keep our armed forces strong. All these things will cost money. Plenty. Taxes are hard to bear. But bombs or chains would be harder.

No one who understands the basic concepts of Lincoln's democracy doubts where he would stand today on the Russian question. He would try to be friends with the Russian people. And he wouldn't be at all afraid of Russia. He would note, as any sane man must, America's tremendous physical and material power in the world. Physically the Soviet Union is a welterweight compared with Uncle Sam. Unless Russia could get together with many other nations she could never deliver a knock-out blow to us. Alone she couldn't even compete with us in world markets, no less throttle our free world trade. But Lincoln would clearly see that many nations might soon be gotten together under the leadership of Soviet Russia. His generous heart and his keen mind would tell Lincoln at once that the starving and despairful peoples of the world—and our own underprivileged classes at home—will surely turn to communism and, therefore, toward Russia, if no aid comes to them from those who rule the democracies.

At home or abroad, a man can't eat our Bill of Rights. He can't pay the rent with our Constitution or the Magna Carta. He can't build a house for his loved ones out of a ballot box, however free or secret. And if he is a colored man, or a colonial subject, he can't "plant no taters" or grow any rice in the Atlantic Charter. Certainly not in what is left of it.

A man must have not only liberty, he must have bread. The goal of Lincolnian democracy was to secure to every citizen the most of both. That is the fullness of freedom.

The proper goal of man is to make the most he can out of himself. Or, to put it another way, his purpose in living is to perfect his own nature. But a man cannot perfect his will without political liberty. He cannot perfect his mind without education. He cannot perfect his body without proper food, clothes, exercise, rest, and medical care. He cannot perfect his whole personality without a certain amount of private property which he can do with as he wants. He cer-

tainly cannot perfect his heart and soul without free access to the truths about God. He cannot, in short, perfect himself as a democratic citizen without the basic guaranties of political, economical, physical, and spiritual liberty.

To deny this fullness of freedom to men is to encourage imperfect citizens who will be most apt and eager to embrace communism. No one can dispute that we do, in this country, for example, deny the fullness of freedom to our colored citizens and other minority or underprivileged groups. Economic monopolists and political monopolists, the business bosses, and the labor bullies, are still hard at work in this country to deny it to our workingmen.

And it is precisely among those who are denied the fullness of freedom that communism takes root and flourishes. If communism can succeed on the rich soil of America, how much more must it succeed in devastated Europe? Lincoln would not blame Soviet Russia for her successes in Europe or America. He would blame the failure of democrats to be democratic.

Yes; Abe Lincoln would be the first to tell his great and beloved party that the best way to destroy communism at home and abroad is to practice democracy here and to bring aid to those who would practice it abroad.

One suspects that if Abe were politicking for high office in the year of our Lord 1947, he would make quite a point of the fact that America, 2 years after its greatest military victory, is still shaking at its knees about its own, and the world's, future. He would demand to know why this Nation, which today stands at the apex of its world material power, has lost so much moral prestige throughout the world, and at home so much confidence in its own system. I expect he'd lay a lot of the blame for that on some of the corrupt or addle-brained New Deal foreign and domestic politics of the past 14 years. And he would use pretty salty language. He'd have to, to get elected. Anyone who thinks a candidate ever has, or ever can conduct, a simon-pure, nonpartisan campaign is wallowing in sheer sentimentalism, or indulging in simon-pure partisanship.

But once Abe won office, we feel that he would say again, as he did during the Civil War: "I shall do nothing in malice. What I deal with is too vast for malicious dealing."

In this spirit, Republicans who are coming into power today will do well to forget the New Deal past, and past masters. With malice toward none and charity toward all, let us get on with our own job. Our job is to restore our badly damaged prosperity at home and prestige abroad.

Said Lincoln: "We can succeed only by concert. It is not, can any of us imagine better? but can we all do better?"

We Republicans can. And we must. And we will.

And now one last word about Abe. As we have noted, Lincoln did not get his ideas concerning the rights of man by consulting any Gallup poll. He tells us himself that he got them on his knees. He knew that a man who does not fall on his knees before his Creator is often driven to them by a dictator.

Said Chauncey Depew on an occasion much like this: "Lincoln's supreme reliance was on prayer. He was one of the very few gifted souls in the story of mankind who have had their confidence in God rewarded by revelations from God."

If Lincoln were President today, maybe the first thing he would do would be to reissue a very short proclamation he made on the 30th day of March 1863, at the city of Washington. Let us read it in closing. It contains the whole answer to why the world is in its present melancholy mess. And it reveals the only way we may all expect to get out of it.

"BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

"Whereas it is the duty of nations as well as of men to owe their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon, and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord; and, insomuch as we know that by His divine law nations, like individuals, are subjected to punishments and chastisements * * * may we not justly fear that the awful calamity of * * * war * * * may be but a punishment inflicted upon us for our presumptuous sins, to the needful end of our national reformation as a whole people? We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. * * * Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

"It behooves us then to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness. * * *

"All this being done in sincerity and truth, let us then rest humbly in the hope authorized by the divine teachings that the united cry of the Nation will be heard on high and answered with blessings, no less than the pardon of our national sins and the restoration of our * * * country to its former happy condition of unity and peace.

"In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

"ABRAHAM LINCOLN."

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, our veterans, with the cooperation of the American people and their Government, were able to fight through from Guadalcanal to Tokyo and from north Africa to Berlin, but now, day by day, they are being pinned down, disheartened, and, in too many instances, defeated by the bitter home-front battle for a decent place for their wives and children to live in.

Housing is our No. 1 problem. And, within that problem, veterans' housing is No. 1–AAA.

These veterans fell behind in the competition for what housing there is. That was not their fault. They were absent on other business, the business of saving our freedom.

Now that they are back from the foxholes, the real-estate lobby offers them hand-me-down houses—maybe, if, and when high-priced houses are built for those who can afford to pay.

Is this keeping faith with the veterans? I say it is not. I say it is an attempt at betrayal that must not succeed. We have a compact with the veterans that they shall have decent housing, and quickly.

They should have it as part of the comprehensive Wagner - Taft - Ellender housing bill. Every day's delay on that bill spells tragedy for thousands of low-income families, veterans, and others. As part of that program, I have proposed, in H. R. 1750, a $1,000,000,000 veterans' housing program to provide low-cost decent rental housing for veterans, $200,000,000 to supplement rents of not more than $50 a month, $800,000,000 in loans to local housing agencies when private building cannot meet the need for such housing.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to bring to the attention of the House evidence of the need for immediate action to meet the veterans' housing needs. Today, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune showing the dire need of veterans in that city, a need that is matched in thousands of communities throughout the Nation.

Republican Members will note that Governor Dewey is credited in the article with a State veterans' housing program that is supplying about $2,150,000 for New York City. This is fine, and shows that one Republican leader has not forgotten the veterans' housing needs. But it is a drop in the bucket compared to the needs.

It will provide only about 3,900 temporary apartments and 425 dormitory quarters for veterans, to meet a shortage estimated by Mayor O'Dwyer of 150,000 housing units, nearly all required by veterans and their families.

The article referred to follows:

LETTERS OF HOMELESS VETERANS SHOW NEED FOR HOUSING AT ONCE — DESCRIBE PLIGHT AS DESPERATE AND UNENDURABLE, AND STRAIN ON FAMILY TIES REVEALS LACK OF PRIVACY, QUARRELS, IN-LAW INTERFERENCE

(By Helen Straus)

Renewed hope and encouragement were offered to homeless ex-servicemen and their families, who describe their plight as "desperate" and "unendurable," with the announcement last week by Governor Dewey of a $2,150,000 program for veterans' housing in New York City.

The morale-building news comes at a time when 300 applications a week from city veterans are still pouring into the offices of Commissioner Herman T. Stichman, of the New York State Division of Housing, 270 Broadway.

Interviewed at her office there, Mrs. Helen Tiffany, supervisor of applications, said that her 14 case workers and assistants who work with the registrants were only too aware of the fact that the problem of housing went beyond mere shelter.

"The strains on marital and family ties are revealed again and again in letters," Mrs. Tiffany said. "'Lack of privacy,' 'unsanitary conditions,' 'constant quarreling,' 'in-law interference,' 'disruptive influences,' 'spoiling our children' are phrases which appear over and over."

Mrs. Tiffany termed "typical" a letter which lay on the top of the day's mail on her desk. It read:

"I am a veteran of the United States Marines. My wife and I live in a furnished

room. My wife gave birth to a son on January 8. We are not allowed to have the baby in my room. No facilities for the baby. It is against the law. Boarders to the right and left of me. Fortunately by the grace of God I found a very great person to take care of our baby. She only can take care of our son until March 1. After that God only knows what's to become of him."

From her files Mrs. Tiffany pulled at random other letters which she considered representative of the 50,000 applications received during the last 3 years.

One wife described her despair in a few words. "Can't you please do something for me, as I am at a point where I am actually desperate and sick of conditions here. As you can see from my husband's application, we are not staying together due to the shortage of space. My children keep getting sick constantly, due to the closeness and lack of space."

"We are eight people living in one small, crowded four-room apartment," an ex-Marine wrote. "There are two other veterans in the family besides myself. One brother-in-law with a service disability is nervous, due to his ailment, and ill both in mind and spirits. My mother-in-law has a heart ailment and her condition has been seriously aggravated due to worry and distraction over our affairs. My father-in-law is partially paralyzed.

"My wife and I are expecting a child of our own in approximately 3 months." * * *

One mother, deeply concerned about her daughter's marriage, sent in a letter which said in part: "I am not a healthy woman, and I have a heart condition. At the present time my home is not really only overcrowded, but there is never a peaceful moment. My son-in-law and I never seem to agree, and we always have a difference of opinion on even the slightest matter. Because of the above circumstances, I feel that my daughter's happiness is not complete." Attached to this letter was a physician's report verifying the fact that the mother was suffering from a heart condition.

Commissioner Stichman, who is keenly aware of the human relations problems involved in housing and the urgency of the individual's plea, said: "The families we are taking care of include cases where parents were forced to live separately from their children and husbands apart from their wives because of the lack of housing. We have also provided for hundreds who lived under unsanitary conditions."

The Closed Shop Is Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council, from the December 1945 issue of the Manufacturers Record:

THE CLOSED SHOP IS SLAVERY

(By Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council)

The people of the South are familiar with slavery. They suffered defeat in a war fought some 80 years ago over this question. That slavery was open and aboveboard. It was known for what it was—the ownership by purchase of members of a backward race brought from Africa. It was slavery that was doomed to eventual condemnation by all right-thinking persons and it was tragic that it had to be settled by force.

There are also other forms of slavery. Anything that denies a man his individual freedom, his right to act of his own free will and accord, his right to plan his own career, and provide for the welfare—present and future—of himself and his family, is a form of slavery. Such slavery is not so readily apparent as outright ownership, but it is, nevertheless, just as real and even more dangerous. Just such a form of insidious slavery has sprung up in this country—it is known as the closed shop.

When this Nation was established some 150 years ago, it was recognized by its founders that every individual in it had certain inalienable rights. No condition was attached to these rights, for when conditions are attached to them, then they no longer exist. These rights are violated by the closed shop. When the individual is forced by labor bosses to pay union dues before he can secure a job with which to make a livelihood for himself and his family, then he no longer has the individual freedom guaranteed to him under the American Constitution. He is in effect paying taxes which he had no voice in levying—the very thing for which the Colonies fought for their independence from England when this Nation was founded.

The closed shop is even more dangerous to the worker than to the employer. It is a form of slavery more insidious but just as real as outright slavery by ownership. If freedom in a democratic country means anything, it means that a man has the freedom to join a union if he so desires, but it also means that he cannot be forced to join a union before he can get a job and make a living for himself and his family.

Freedom of contract or freedom of action is a necessary part of the individual freedom upon which this Government of ours is based. Ours is a Government that belongs to the people and accordingly is supposed to be conducted in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the people. If the majority of the people, therefore, have a chance to voice their opinion and vote for such things as the closed shop rather than the open shop or centralized planning rather than local control or bureaucratic government by decree rather than legislative government by law, then that is the kind of government we would have.

Such things, however, are contrary to all principles of freedom for which man has striven throughout history, and certainly they are repugnant to the American people as a whole. Even if the majority of the people voted in favor of these things, it should be remembered that we would then no longer be living under the constitutional democracy which our forefathers founded for us. The founders of this Government realized that man has some inalienable rights which even a majority vote should not take away from him. It is not to be believed that the majority of the American people would ever vote their approval of such practices. We may be sure the people of the South do not believe in them. Why, then, should small organized minority groups, taking advantage of particular situations, be allowed to force their will on the free individual citizen of America?

The slavery produced by the closed shop is a type to which no man who believes in free democratic government can submit. If the worker can have his rights taken away from him in this manner by labor bosses with the sanction of bureaucratic government, then he had just as well live under a dictatorship or a communistic form of government, neither of which does more than deny him the same rights.

The American people cannot submit to the closed shop and have their country remain America as they have known it.

Establishing Ceiling for Expenditures for Fiscal Year 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said today as to whether we can or cannot safely set a ceiling on Federal expenditures for the coming year, reducing the President's Budget by $6,000,000,000, which would give much needed relief to the taxpayers, balance the Budget, and have enough left to make a substantial payment of a few billion dollars on the national debt.

On the first vote today on the rule, I should like to point out that practically every speech and every vote in opposition to this reduction of expense came from the Democratic Members. They argued that the President's Budget of $37,500,000,000 cannot be substantially reduced. They talked for economy and the reduction of governmental expenses when they were candidates in November. They are now talking and voting against economy and the reduction of governmental expenses. They still believe in the philosophy of spending which they have followed for the past 14 years. They want to continue it. Their waste and extravagance of the taxpayers' money was so flagrant that the taxpayers finally caught up with them last November. The people, the taxpayers, revolted against their policies and elected a Republican Congress and it is now our duty to follow the wishes of the people, clean up the mess, and bring about economy in Government through the reduction of governmental expenses. The Republicans during the campaign told the people they would try to do this. They are today keeping that pledge.

The Republicans, on the first test today voted solidly to adopt the rule making it possible for us to vote a slash of $6,000,000,000 in governmental expense. I predict when the roll is called later today, when a record vote is taken, that every Republican, without the loss of a single Member, will vote to slash this Federal Budget by $6,000,000,000. We today, by so voting, will send a message to the people of the United States that we are keeping our word given to them last November.

Mr. Speaker, we propose throughout this session to keep up a continuous fight to reduce governmental expense. We propose to take less money out of the pockets of the laboring men, the farmers, and the businessmen through taxes. We cannot do this unless we cut governmental expense. In fact, we propose to make our word good which was given to the American people last November.

They cry out that we will endanger national defense in making such drastic cuts. The Republican Members of the House are just as wise and just as patriotic as the Democratic Members who

make this charge. We will not endanger national defense.

The administration leaders and their sympathizers have thrown up every possible smoke screen to deceive the people as to our good intentions, the whole purpose being to exert such pressure on the Members of Congress as will permit them to destroy our efforts for economy. They will not succeed. We are determined to do our duty and are unafraid of the consequences.

And, may I repeat, we are just as deeply interested in maintaining the proper national defense as are any other group of people in America. We will not endanger national defense but we will most likely reduce the appropriations requested in the Budget for the Army and Navy. But we will make those reductions where there is reckless waste. There is now employed by the Army and Navy almost a million civilian employees. That number is entirely too much during peacetime. There have been waste and extravagance in the Army and Navy throughout the years. We propose to stop that waste and extravagance, which is unnecessary in keeping a sufficient military force ready to defend this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the millions of people who demanded economy by their vote last November represent a majority of the people of this Nation who, in fact, are the Government. They have cried out for relief and continue to do so. Their voices are being heard and answered today by the Republican Members of Congress, who will vote uanimously on this next roll call to give them the relief they seek through a reduction of governmental expense.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Use St. Lawrence Power, Cut Last Barrier to Sea," published in the Malone Evening Telegram of February 17, 1947:

USE ST. LAWRENCE POWER, CUT LAST BARRIER TO SEA

Britain's severe coal crisis reminds us that the United States is not immune from serious stoppages in supply of this major fuel.

Last year nearly 2 months' production was lost. And wage adjustments sufficient to satisfy John L. Lewis imply continued rise in the price of coal.

This makes early development of hydroelectric power from the St. Lawrence increasingly desirable.

When such development comes the State of New York will get the power. The original agreement with the Federal Government contemplated a charge-back of about $90,000,000 to this State for cost of dams and equipment capable of furnishing 1,100,000 horsepower and turning it into electrical energy.

That was cheap power then. It will still be cheap power, even if the cost to the State is increased somewhat. For any increase will be less, from the power-production viewpoint, than the increase in cost of coal since the original estimate was made.

Also to be considered is development of industries which depend upon low-cost electricity, such as aluminum plants, certain types of chemical plants, etc.

Why should New York lose out to Western States when a large potential source of cheap power exists on its northern border? That New York's taxpayers finance 15 percent of Federal outlay for these western projects gives added point to the query.

New York's Governors, from Al Smith to Mr. Dewey, have consistently backed the St. Lawrence project. Unfortunately the same cannot be said for our representatives in the United States Senate. It is to be hoped Senator IVES will take a different position from his predecessor, Mr. Mead.

Some persons distrust the St. Lawrence project because it involves another country. But that country is our good neighbor, Canada. Canada sells us a lot of goods, mainly raw materials which we need. But it buys even more from us.

Under the agreement, Canada will pay for all development wholly within her territory. She has already built an essential seaway link, the new Welland Canal, with a 27-foot depth.

Altogether Canada would pay almost as much as the United States, though her trade on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence seaway can be only a fraction of ours.

What about the seaway aspect of the project?

The first thing to note is that what is planned is simply a last but vital link.

Enormous traffic has developed on the Great Lakes, with continual improvement of connecting channels and the St. Mary's locks.

Canada has steadily improved the channel from Montreal to deep water on the St. Lawrence, which treaties dating as far back as 1876 throw open to United States shipping.

The last barrier between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic should be removed, along with development of St. Lawrence power.

Establishing a Ceiling for Expenditures for Fiscal Year 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to vote to cut a budget or to save money. There is nothing romantic or inspiring about it. The pleasant course would be to yield to the blandishments and, in most cases, the vigorous and sincere arguments of the various pressure groups who have been pouring in on all of us since the 3d day of January, in person, by telegram, and by letter.

But we owe it to our party, to our country, to the present generation, and those to come to stand firm. I am convinced that the great inarticulate body of Americans expects this Congress—indeed, demands that this Congress reduce drastically the expenses of Government, balance the budget, provide for a payment on the huge national debt, and give relief to the harassed taxpayer, who is painfully reminded every day he draws his pay of the burdensome, yes, and, if we fail to act, the mounting cost of running the Government.

I yield second place to none in my desire and insistence that we maintain a strong Army and Navy, capable at all times of adequately defending this great country.

Before taking a final position in this matter, I sought out, and received, assurances from those of my colleagues who have been studying this problem and living with it day in and day out since the middle of last November that a favorable vote on this bill will not mean in the slightest degree an impairment of our national security.

Many of us here in this body, and certainly most of the American people, simply have no idea to what extent some of our colleagues here have burned the midnight oil, thumbed over and over the pages of this Budget, which is the size of the New York City telephone book, and interviewed hundreds of Government representatives in all departments, before arriving at the recommendation they have made to us. They are convinced that some reductions in the Army and Navy budgets can be made without imperiling the safety of our country. They do not express a view, nor will they do so until more detailed studies have been made of the budgets of all the Government departments, as to how much of a cut can and should be made. Whether the Army or Navy budget can, and should be, cut 1, 5, 10, or 20 percent, or the State Department, or Interior Department, or any other department, 1, 5, 10, or 20 percent, or more, is a matter which will remain to be decided after extensive investigation and hearings, and reported to the House for consideration from time to time in detailed appropriation bills.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 sets a deadline of February 15 as the time when the report of the Joint Senate and House Budget Committee shall file its report of the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for the next fiscal year and its recommendation as to the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditures. This figure of $31,500,000,000 contained in the concurrent resolution now before us for consideration is a goal, a target—a target, however, which I am satisfied can, will, and must be achieved. That is not to say, however, if detailed studies of the needs for our national defense should later satisfy us that either this goal must be sacrificed or our Nation imperiled, that our hands are tied. What we do today, if we become convinced we have acted unwisely, we can later undo, if a great national emergency confronts us. But let us take this step today, a step which I am sincerely convinced we will not have to retrace. Let us show the American people today that we meant what we said when we told them that we would balance the Budget for the first time in over 15 years, start in paying our debts, and at long last reducing rather than continually increasing the amount which almost every family in this land is forced,

through taxation, direct and indirect, to contribute to the expense of running our country.

Our people in our districts did not send us down here to be good fellows or to be prodigal with the public purse, which must be filled only by the labor and sweat of our own constituents. They sent us here to be firm and resolute; to reverse the upward swing of governmental spending; to help build a strong America which can assume her proper role in the building of a strong world. We face today the acid test. Let us neither waver nor flinch. Our mandate is clear. Our duty is clear. Our country waits expectantly. Our responsibility is great. Our opportunity is challenging. With courage and with firm resolve, let us face it.

A United Nations Government Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the village of New Palestine, Ind., which is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, Mr. T. M. Sample resides. He is practically blind. His general health is poor. However, he has many people to read to him, and, strange to say, with very little sight he uses a typewriter, and he writes his views to many people throughout the country. I have just received a short article from Mr. Sample, which he has written, in which he makes certain suggestions relating to a just, a lasting, and a permanent peace in the world. This article was written by Mr. Sample upon his typewriter, which was quite a task for a man approximately 90 years of age, and by one who has practically entirely lost the sight of both eyes. It is a high privilege to place this brief article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so all may read his views upon this highly important subject.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the article which was written by Mr. T. M. Sample, of New Palestine, Ind., which is as follows:

A UNITED NATIONS GOVERNMENT SUGGESTION

Writers and poets have, for a long time, written of the possibility of a world parliament. The time has come for this prophecy to become true by establishing a United Nations government, with a federal constitution, patterned after the Federal Constitution of the United States.

It is my firm belief that the officials of the United Nations should write and adopt a constitution which provides for a purely representative government, giving to each member nation complete autonomy in all affairs and further providing that the people of each nation shall adopt and maintain the kind and type of government they desire. It is further my suggestion that when two-thirds of the nations agree to become members, it shall then be the duty of those to acquire a site for the establishment of the place this government shall function. As a suggested site for this government, I would prefer Palestine, because it is a center of world population. The Arabs could be expelled, after proper financial arrangements were made, and the Jews would thus become the owners of the land to which they are rightfully entitled.

This would, I am certain, solve the Palestine problem. Thus, Palestine would become the home of the United Nations, as the District of Columbia is now the seat of our National Government. It is further my belief that all governmental functions should be vested in a parliament, and without the people of Palestine having any voice therein.

May I say that the main purpose of the United Nations, as herein proposed, will be to insure a lasting and a permanent peace, to prevent strong or possible aggressor nations from disturbing the weak and smaller nations, to insure a free intercourse of trade and commerce among the member nations, and to create good will and friendship among the people of those nations. In my opinion, such a government would aid materially in settling the unrest and the many disputes and the uncertainty which now maintains among many of the nations of the world.

The acts passed by the parliament would, and should, have the full force and effect of international law, to be enforced by the all-powerful governments participating, rather than to be based upon treaties and commitments made by individual nations, and which are quite frequently violated.

I am confident that all nations would ultimately become member nations and that the United Nations government would ultimately become the pride and joy of all of the people.

When the United States of America joined free states to form a union, and the greatest government on the face of the earth, a United Nations government was not then idealized or contemplated. The improvement of the governments of the world have been very slow. As the people became enlightened, they have been striving to make better their government in the interest of the people. Wendell Willkie made a great contribution to world thinking in his book, entitled "One World." To my way of thinking, we are now ready for the United Nations government. It is true that the ambitious, the greedy, and those seeking self-aggrandizement or world power will seek to hinder and delay this accomplishment. It is the duty of all true liberty-loving people to rise to the task which lies before us, to do those things which will insure peace to the people of the world, and to safeguard the heritage which has been bequeathed to us by our forefathers. Let us have peace, and let us prepare for the Prince of Peace when He returns.

T. M. SAMPLE.

NEW PALESTINE, IND.

Allen T. Treadway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein my statement on the late Congressman Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts.

Allen Towner Treadway, Republican, represented the First Massachusetts District in Congress from 1913 to 1945.

On Sunday, February 16, 1947, at the age of 79, he died in the city where he had labored so long and so untiringly as a lawmaker of the United States.

Through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which reported, on so many occasions, his sound criticism and constructive advice, it is appropriate that we pay tribute to his memory.

Allen Treadway was born in a house on the site of the present Red Lion Inn at Stockbridge, Mass., on September 16, 1867. His parents were the late William Denton and Harriet Heaton Treadway. He came from a long line of innkeepers, and in later years came to own both the Red Lion Inn and Heaton Hall.

Mr. Treadway was educated in the Stockbridge public schools and at Amherst College, from which he was graduated with the class of 1886. He entered public life as chairman of the town committee of Stockbridge. In 1904 he was advanced to the Massachusetts House of Representatives. He served in the State senate from 1908 to 1911. In 1909 he became the senate president. He went to Washington with the Sixty-third Congress in 1913.

Congressman Treadway was a close friend of the man who was to become a President of the United States. He and Calvin Coolidge had much in common. They knew the meaning of hard work, and they believed in thrifty government. In the birthplace of our democracy, the New England town meeting, they learned the lessons of responsibility. A position on any public issue, once tested by mind and conscience, was never surrendered to the high-pressure campaigns of lobbyists. Both men possessed unwavering integrity, and they fought for the principle rather than applause. It was this steadfast quality of mind and heart which distinguished their careers, whether their party was in power or not.

In Congress, Mr. Treadway led the fight to win reduced prices on anthracite coal for New England consumers. He called for congressional investigation of the Pennsylvania anthracite industry and for Government regulation of the industry to save the public from exorbitant prices.

He was conspicuous in his opposition to the New Deal and the policies of the late President Roosevelt. In 1936 Mr. Treadway called for the impeachment of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Agriculture after Wallace had termed a Supreme Court decision abolishing the AAA a legalized steal. He fought against Wallace's agricultural theories and he criticized the Roosevelt Brain Trust.

Though we on the Democratic side of the aisle often opposed Mr. Treadway's viewpoint, we could not help but acknowledge the independent judgment, the courage, the high probity which he brought to his career as a public servant.

Had he not been forced to retire in 1945, because of ill-health, he would even now be chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, one of the most important posts in the Government, an honor which he merited by his long and distinguished service for the Nation and for his party.

During his business career he was trustee of the Lee Savings Bank and director of the New England Fire Insurance Co.

and the Berkshire Life Insurance Co. He was a thirty-third degree Mason, an Elk, a Granger, and a member of Alpha Delta Phi. He received a doctor of laws degree from Amherst in 1934. Mr. Treadway was a member of the Episcopal church.

His wife, the former Sylvia Shares, of New Haven, Conn., whom he married in 1893, died in 1943. He leaves a son, Heaton I. Treadway, of Stockbridge, who was in Florida at the time of his father's death.

For nearly a third of a century he served uninterruptedly as a Member of the Congress. In that time he witnessed World War I, boom, bust, World War II, and the emergence of his country as the strongest Nation on earth, respected for its moral as well as its material power.

Step by step he grew up with the Congress and helped it to develop from a part-time debating society to become the most influential body in the country today.

We miss the intelligence and character which he brought to its councils. But even though his physical presence has departed from us, he left behind him a high standard of service which those of us who knew him shall remember and seek to emulate.

Allen Treadway's spirit lives on in the Congress to which he dedicated the best years of his life.

The Trade-Agreements Program and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1947

WHO DOUBLE-CROSSED WHOM?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in a campaign address delivered by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, when he was a candidate for President the first time—that is, at Baltimore on October 25, 1932—he gave this assurance to the American people:

> Of course, it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff rates on farm products. I know of no excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived.

Shortly after the enactment of the so-called Trade Agreements Act of 1934, redubbed by the State Department for political effect "the reciprocal trade agreement program," the then President, to allay the fears of the agriculturists of the country, wrote, on June 15, 1934, the following letter to the then Congressman Frank Buck, of the Third District of California, as follows:

> MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCK: I am somewhat surprised and a little amused at the fears you say have been aroused in California because of the enactment and the possible administration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.
>
> Certainly it is not the purpose of the administration to "sacrifice the farmers and fruit growers of California in pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of foreign markets," as published reports would make believe.
>
> I trust that no Californian will have any further concern or fear that anything damaging to the fruit growers of that State, or of any other State, will result from this legislation.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
>
> FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

But in spite of these Presidential assurances, sincerely made, no doubt, the international New Dealers down at the State Department, those who had been entrusted with the administration of this measure, continue to throw agriculture to the wolves, to cut and slash agricultural tariff rates with a gay indifference of this to the following result:

First, the protective tariff schedules on 324 agricultural products have been cut, slashed, as the record reveals, to an average of 40 percent of the tariff schedules established by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

Second, absolutely no tariffs on agricultural products have been raised, though the Trade Agreements Act authorizes it in appropriate cases.

Third, on 95 crop and livestock products the Smoot-Hawley tariff rates have been frozen, that is, they cannot be raised by Congress during the period of the agreements, without resorting to the drastic but short-of-war action of denouncing the agreement or by the exercise of an escape clause which has been inserted in a few of the more recent trade treaties.

Fourth, 77 agricultural items that were on the free list of the Smoot-Hawley tariff law have been frozen in that status; that is, the State Department, in its 29 trade agreements, has effectively and morally tied the hands of Congress, and, by the same device, has rendered itself utterly impotent to protect the people from the consequence of their own folly.

And, now, Mr. Speaker, with this shocking record of repeated defiances of their late Chief of State, the former President of the United States, the boys down at the State Department now announce, with a gay nonchalance that is indeed intriguing, a new list of several hundred agricultural items, all crop and livestock products, which it intends to slash an additional 50 percent in trade agreements now under negotiation, many of which have already been cut to the limit previously allowed by the Trade Agreements Act as originally enacted.

So I arise to inquire, Mr. Speaker, just who double-crossed whom?

Archbishop Stepinac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by Providence Council, No. 95, Knights of Columbus, at a meeting held in Providence, R. I., on February 10, 1947:

> Whereas the Government of Yugoslavia has recently sentenced Archbishop Stepinac to a long term of imprisonment after a trial that was a travesty on justice and offensive to the democratic ideals of freedom and fair play; and
>
> Whereas the only effective method of preventing another such outrage lies in a strong and united protest from the nations which still cherish fairness and guarantee a fair trial for all accused persons: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That Providence Council, No. 95, of the Knights of Columbus, does hereby condemn the actions of Tito and his government in the unfair trial and cruel sentencing of Archbishop Stepinac, and calls upon all freedom-loving people to join in this protest; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island for appropriate action.
>
> LOUIS DECROSTA,
> *Grand Knight.*
>
> Attest:
> [SEAL] FRANCIS L. PALMER,
> *Recorder.*

Bulgaria Seeks Power and Strength Through Slavic Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, to include an article, written by Mr. Soterios Nicholson, of Washington, D. C., on the subject Bulgaria Seeks Power and Strength Through Slavic Federation, which follows:

BULGARIA SEEKS POWER AND STRENGTH THROUGH SLAVIC FEDERATION

(By Soterios Nicholson)

Two noteworthy events of keen international interest that have taken place in recent weeks are, first, the announcement by Alexander Obbov, vice premier of Bulgaria, that his nation and Premier Tito's Yugoslavia are working toward unification of their two countries into one large state linking the Black and the Adriatic Seas, and, second, the sensational identification of Gerhart Eisler, accused by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of being the No. 1 United States Communist. Washington authorities interpret both these events as an indication of the unflagging Moscow attempt to throw a Red net over independent democratic countries, including Greece, and thus live up to its original aim to encircle the world with the Communist ideology and way of life.

Vice Premier Obbov's announcement about the eventual federation of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia into a single Slav state comes as no surprise, in view of the earlier announcement of the customs union between Albania and Yugoslavia, and the many other sly plots carried out by Russia to gain ports on the Aegean Sea, as well as to gain control of small neighboring nations, such as Greece,

and thus build a solid, unified front against the western powers.

According to Mr. Obbov, a federation already exists between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, morally speaking. Formally, however, the Sofia government is delaying all action toward their desired goal of unification until such time as their peace treaty is ratified, after which they plan to take three main steps toward federation with Tito's Red government. First, Bulgaria, like Albania before it, hopes to work for a customs union with Yugoslavia, which is paramount to abolishing the economic frontier between the two countries. Secondly, Bulgaria plans to set up a formal alliance with Yugoslavia, followed by a similar agreement with Albania. Complete union with Yugoslavia remains the final aspiration of Bulgaria. It is generally felt in diplomatic circles that this Bulgarian move to amass joint strength with neighboring Slav sisters is motivated, in large part, by the desire to overpower her traditional enemy, non-Slavic, democratic Greece by either (1) forcing the Hellenes into Russia's totalitarian fold, or (2) failing this, grabbing the rich Grecian granary which lies south of Bulgaria, as well as her many desirable warm-water ports.

It is interesting to note Mr. Obbov's statement to the effect that one big stumbling block in Bulgaria's plan for a Balkan federation is the present situation in Greece. To quote Mr. Obbov, "Bulgaria cannot hope for amiable relations with Greece until she has a 'democratic government.'" Washington officials are practically unanimous in interpreting Mr. Obbov's term "democratic government" in the accepted communistic sense—i. e., a communistic, dictatorial, totalitarian government. Thus, Bulgaria, and Russia with her, are painfully aware that they must either win over traditionally democratic Greece to their extreme leftist viewpoint now, or else eventually clash with the Hellenes at the final show-down between eastern and western powers.

Mr. Obbov concluded his statement on the planned Balkan federation with Yugoslavia by making known what the Sofia government's demands from Greece would be, if and when Greece becomes democratic—demands which, in the traditional Red manner, are weighted so heavily in Bulgaria's favor as to offer little inducement to clear-thinking Hellenes. Specifically, Mr. Obbov said: "If and when a new regime comes in, we would like bilateral arrangements helping us. First of all, we would like to increase the period for the payment of reparations levied against us to 15 or 20 years instead of 8 as now fixed. Second, we would like to obtain free economic passage to Kavalla and Dede Agatch, and to see the construction of a really big Aegean port at Kavalla to facilitate our foreign trade, including the construction of new and more direct railways."

Fighters of Fate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the people of Jersey City are justly proud of the many splendid institutions constructed and maintained by them which minister to human needs. In the main these are the result of the social vision, the compassionate nature, the untiring energy, and fine administrative ability of the city's long-time mayor, Hon. Frank Hague.

One such institution is the A. Harry Moore School, which was established to provide education and training for children burdened with severe physical handicaps. It is the first school of its kind to have been constructed on the continent. It takes its name from New Jersey's only three-time governor, whose lifelong interest in the welfare of underprivileged persons of all kinds has endeared him to the people of our State.

At its recent commencement exercises, its graduates were addressed by one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, Mr. George E. Stringfellow. As a mining and metallurgical engineer, a member of the board of governors of the American Mining Congress, a director in several large commercial corporations, and as vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., Mr. Stringfellow is widely known and favorably regarded in the business and industrial world. He is not less active, however, in civic affairs and in activities designed to improve the lot of his fellowmen, and to establish better relationships among various segments of society. He has been the recipient of awards on not a few occasions for his notable work in these and allied fields.

The address he delivered at the exercises mentioned above was a source of encouragement to the graduates and a practical incentive to them in their struggle for success. It is appended herewith, as follows:

Many of you probably know the story of the current popular motion picture, The Best Years of Our Lives, which depicts the victory of a disabled serviceman over his handicaps. The story of Harold Russell, who lost both of his hands in the service of his country, is the story of a courageous American youth.

Hundreds of similarly courageous stories are being enacted every day. Many of you have accomplished even greater victories by courage and determination than Harold Russell.

I do not intend to conduct a history lesson or to preach a sermon, but I think I can best develop the thoughts I have in mind by referring to history.

First, however, this is graduation day—a day for congratulations. I congratulate you on having completed the course of work and study provided in this fine American school. I congratulate you and your city for establishing and maintaining this A. Harry Moore School, which as you undoubtedly know, was the first of this type in the United States and is outstanding among its kind in the Nation.

Finally, I congratulate you on your victory over handicaps.

There are two ways of looking at a handicap. One is the defeatist way of weeping over one's imagined fate, of sitting idly by, and doing nothing about it. That, I know, is not your way.

There is another kind of handicap. The kind used in sports and athletics. It is imposed upon those believed to be superior in performance to their rivals. That's a good way to look at a handicap, isn't it? Not as a liability but as an "equalizer."

That's the way Thomas A. Edison looked at his deafness. That's the way Helen Keller must look upon her inability to see or hear. Charles Steinmetz was terribly crippled, but he became an electrical genius and world character. John Milton was blind, but he became a great poet. Ludwig Beethoven, perhaps the greatest writer of symphonic music the world has ever known, was deaf, and never heard his own music.

Prof. J. Arthur Myers, of the University of Minnesota, wrote a book titled "Fighters of Fate," in which he told the stories of many who had overcome handicaps to fight onward to real success.

Listen to these familiar great names: Elizabeth Barrett Browning, the poetess; Frederic Chopin, the composer; Cecil John Rhodes, who carried the British imperial flag to the diamond fields of South Africa; Christy Mathewson, the great baseball pitcher; Roger W. Babson, the famous business statistician; Will Irwin and Eugene O'Neill, the great writers. It is a long list, this list of fighters of fate.

There are fighters of fate here in this room today. You have learned that the first thing you must have is an incentive. You have learned that self-pity will hold you back. You have learned that handicaps are simply challenges to be conquered and overcome.

As a member of the Fraternal Order of the Mystic Shrine, I have often been in contact with the 17 hospitals for crippled children maintained by Shriners in various parts of the country. I have been greatly impressed by the high courage shown by these boys and girls. And, with all Shriners, I was proud of those former patients who distinguished themselves on the battlefields during World War II. They had found the incentive.

There is one thing I hope you will always do when you go into the world to make your way in competition with others. I hope as you look upon other people who are winners that you will ask yourself, "What handicaps have they overcome?" Keep ever before you the fact that almost everyone has one or more, and that there are many handicaps for which you would not exchange yours.

The more we study the lives of great men and women the more we are forced to the conclusion that the great things are accomplished by men and women who found ways to handle their handicaps successfully.

Those successful men and women must have looked upon their handicaps, not as liabilities but as equalizers—given them by nature to make the race of life more equal for their less fortunate, although apparently less handicapped, fellow men.

There is another priceless ingredient of success, necessary for us all. That is personal integrity.

Think back to the list of men and women I gave you a few moments ago. There, in these "fighters of fate," are honest men and women. They are the essence of integrity and courage. With those two attributes, success can be yours.

The greatest asset of our Nation is the character of its citizens. Let our people lose their fundamental honesty, and business will collapse overnight; let them lose their sense of decency, and no one will be safe anywhere; let them lose their sense of liberty, and tyrants will spring into power immediately. Thinking people know there is no substitute for integrity.

The history of human progress is the record of men who could be trusted and who could trust themselves; men who put righteousness, truth, justice, and freedom above personal gain, above personal power—yes; above life itself.

Lasting success, which we all seek, like integrity, is not to be had without effort and self-discipline. You have learned that if you can control yourself you can accomplish great things. How great these accomplishments may be when you leave your school and enter the race of life depends entirely upon you.

We are entitled to what we can earn, and our earning power is set, not solely by our physical and mental abilities, but by the way

we apply them. Wealth is a measure of effort intelligently applied, and no salary or wage is too high when it is earned. You have started life with the same fundamental assets of imagination, industry, determination, and integrity. You can earn your way, not despite a handicap but because of it.

For those who possess that priceless attribute—integrity—and a willingness to work, the future was never brighter.

During your studies you have happily learned that accomplishment is there for all who seek it. These years of study and work have been good years. They have opened for you a new and greater vista of life.

Again I congratulate you. You—the 1947 "fighters of fate"—have learned how to fight the good fight. You have learned how success can be attained. It remains for you to put into action what you have learned.

In closing, I want to leave with you this one thought: "Keep high your integrity and your courage."

If you do that, the coming years will, indeed, be the best years of your life.

Statement of Principles of Kodiak, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The Kodiak Chamber of Commerce, assembled in regular meeting the 9th day of January 1947, confirms the principles adopted by the conference of Alaska Chamber of Commerce organizations, meeting in Anchorage the 14th and 15th of December 1946, to wit:

1. Private operation of vessels is preferred to Government operation.

2. Competition in the Alaska trade should be encouraged, and any tendency toward monopoly resisted.

3. Federal legislation, similar to the Railway Mediation Act, should be enacted which, while protecting the rights of labor, would provide a suitable means of settling maritime disputes without causing interruption of service and hardship to the public which is dependent, as are all the people of Alaska, upon water transportation.

4. In considering the reasonableness of rates to Alaska, the Maritime Commission should insist on honest, economical, and efficient operation by the companies before accepting their costs as a basis for rate making. Included in the concept of economical and efficient operation should be a consideration of the age and condition of ships and of their suitability to use in Alaska trade. There should also be considered the diligence of management in resisting unreasonable demands by labor and in seeing that labor lives up to its agreements.

5. The excesses of maritime labor, including slow-downs and "feather bedding" practices which contribute toward high transportation costs, should be curbed.

6. The people of Alaska, through their Territorial offices, including the attorney general and the Alaska Development Board, should be vigilant in resisting rate increases and in seeing that the public's case is presented effectively in proceedings pending, or which may be brought before the Maritime Commission.

7. No exclusive arrangement between the Alaska Railroad and any ocean carrier for joint through service to the Alaska rail belt should be tolerated, but other carriers should be encouraged to operate on the water portion of this haul, under joint tariff arrangements to be concluded with the Alaska Railroad.

8. The proposal of the Alaska Steamship Co. and Northland Transportation Co. dated November 19, 1946, covering the interim operation in the Alaska trade, should be rejected as tending toward monopoly and because its proposed over-all rate increases cannot be borne by Alaska residents without doing grave damage to the Territory's economy.

9. Section 27 of the Jones Act should be amended to remove the discriminatory provisions affecting Alaska.

10. Lighterage rates and terminal rates, because they also are definitely part of the costs of transportation to Alaska, should be scrutinized carefully by the Maritime Commission as to their reasonableness.

V. G. ELLIS,
President, Kodiak Chamber of Commerce.

Statement of Steuben Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and at the specific request of the Steuben Society of America, I include the following paper in the RECORD:

NATIONAL COUNCIL,
STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y.

We hold these truths to be self-evident:

1. That a national organism which has been created and integrated in centuries of careful endeavor, by trial and by error, cannot be torn asunder by decrees without doing irreparable harm to the world organism. A political vacuum in the heart of Europe must, sooner or later, cause the disintegration of all of Europe; and transform the cradle of western civilization into a geographical term—the outer regions of Eurasia. The German member-states never tended toward centralization as long as there was no pressure from beyond the borders. Only foreign intervention and the bitter experience of 250 years of history when Germany was the battleground of European power politics in the north (as a weak and powerless Italy was the battleground in the south) forced the Germans to unite, economically and politically. They did only what the French and British had done centuries earlier. If oppression, dire need and hopelessness—all results of the 1919 peace dictates—had not been visited upon Germany and Austria, if the peacemakers had been wiser and less rapacious, such extreme centralization as finally took place, as the result of bitter necessity, could have been avoided. Prosperity and personal well-being are the best, in fact the only safeguards against centralized government authority. We Americans, always anxious to preserve the authority of our 48 States, should not yet have forgotten the lessons of only a few years ago when a centralization of power of unheard-of dimensions took place in our own country as the logical result of depression, unemployment and Nation-wide economic disruption. If we split up the components of the Reich by force they will strive to the utmost to reunite. If, however, we gave the Germans an opportunity to work, to produce and to become equal members of the family of nations then, by their very nature they will tend to guard their distinct characteristics and special rights and to shy away from centralization. But, Germany must be preserved as a national, political entity.

AN ECONOMIC ENTITY

2. That Germany must be treated as an economic entity and that the economic clauses of the Potsdam agreement must be strictly enforced until such a time when Germany shall have gained her full sovereignty. We question the feasibility of certain proposals to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe, including Germany. Furthermore, in view of much evidence to the contrary, these proposals should have made it abundantly clear that all of Germany was meant, and not just the American, British, and French zones. The Germans, in these three zones, for the sake of perhaps temporary relief, will not leave their brothers and sisters in the Russian zone to their miserable fate. They recognize, if all too many influential Americans do not, that the fate of Europe is in the balance; that the borders of Asia have been pushed to the Elbe and into the heart of Thuringia; that however, notwithstanding all these inroads, the Germany east of the Elbe and the Germany west of the Elbe are one which no power on earth can tear asunder. If those who wish to sacrifice millions of people in eastern Germany, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, etc., to the despotism of Asia because they hope to make the Ruhr the factory for an economically strong western Europe as a counterpoise to Soviet Asia, they and whoever endorse their proposals in this country, will be fought bitterly by all those millions of Americans who are beginning to wake up and take stock of what happened at Yalta, Tehran, and at other places. They all realize that only an economically strong and healthy and a politically united Germany is a safe rampart against the aspirations of an alien despotism which is far more dangerous to Europe and America than nazism and fascism could ever have been.

TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY

3. That Germany must be preserved in her territorial integrity, not only in accordance with the sacred pledges embodied in the Atlantic Charter, but also as a matter of an enlightened American self-interest. The Saar is as German as Vermont and Missouri are American. The people of the Saar, notwithstanding a cleverly disseminated propaganda campaign, are German, feel German, and want to remain German. They gave proof of their unswerving loyalty when in 1935, under strict international supervision, they voted by an overwhelming majority to return to Germany. If France is permitted to detach the Saar as war booty, the seed for another conflict will have been sown. The eternal French outbursts about "security" and "aggression," broadcast by willing helpers in this country, are nothing but a cover-up for designs of aggrandizement. In the course of history, France has been the aggressor at least as many times as the Reich, and to the German, notwithstanding all attempts at reorientation, France was the aggressor on September 3, 1939. Do the American people intend to send our young boys abroad again and again in order to be slaughtered and maimed for the defense of a cause that is unjust and utterly alien to American principles? Will they be expected to suppress, with planes and guns, the thoughts, the hopes, the justified aspirations of those on both sides of an artificial border who will want to be reunited and who will, eventually, strive to right a wrong? The same sane counsel must prevail as far as strips of Germany along her western and

northern borders, but especially as far as Pomerania, Silesia, East Prussia, and the rest of eastern Germany are concerned. They may be lost for the time being. They have been usurped with the tacit approval of the American Government, and, with their German population driven from their ancestral homes, they have become the western ramparts of Soviet Asia. For the German, wherever he is now, they will remain sacred German soil and for the millions of Americans of German descent whose birth places these despoiled cities and villages were, they will remain German, too. It should not be forgotten that the German-Polish war of 1939 became a world war because the western democracies had "guaranteed" the territorial integrity of Poland. They entered the conflict to defend that integrity and, a few years later, they capitulated, completely and miserably, when they tacitly approved the rape committed by Hitler and Stalin, in 1939, as far as the latter is concerned. In order to salve their conscience, the Western Powers compensated Russia's new satrap by handing over to this new Poland an enormous tract of German territory to which Poland never had any claim whatsoever. The American citizens of Germanic descent hereby protest against this theft of old and hallowed German territory.

GERMANS TO SOLVE THEIR OWN PROBLEMS

4. That Germany will become a heavier and heavier burden upon the taxpayers of the United States unless economic strictures are lessened and the Germans are permitted to solve their problems of reconstruction in their own way, not handicapped by artificial borders erected by the four occupying powers. With her "bread basket" in the east delivered to a Soviet-dominated Poland, in which democracy is trampled underfoot; with millions of expellees from the eastern provinces, from the Sudetenland, from Hungary and Rumania within her borders, Germany—a nation half the size of Texas and with more than half the population of the entire United States—will be less able than ever before to take care of her people. Only by giving the industriousness and inventiveness of her population a full outlet for their energies; only by permitting Germany to reenter foreign markets; only by permitting German ships and commercial planes to ply their trade abroad, will Germany be saved from utter ruin and the Old World from ultimate catastrophe.

NO WAR REPARATIONS

5. That war reparations, in money or in kind, have proven a miserable failure after the last war, just as costly to the victorious nations as they were to the defeated countries. Germany has not only lost her rich trade with South America which, most decidedly, antedated the Hitler regime by several decades, but also her globe-encircling shipping and air lines. She has lost innumerable industrial and commercial assets in every nation and on every continent. Many factories have been taken from her soil and transported to other countries. Millions of patents, the results of inventive genius, have found their way into the draft rooms and industrial plants of Europe, America, and Asia. There is nothing left that the Germans may call their own. They have been examined, purged, and left naked with a thoroughness which has no equal in human experience. They have paid in blood, in goods, and in all the things deemed sacred. For the sake of a rapid recuperation of all of Europe, the United States of America will have to stand on the inflexible determination that no more reparations be exacted from Germany and Austria. If the Western Powers give in to the huge claims of Asia-dominated Poland and Yugoslavia, they will, in due time, have become their own gravediggers.

PRISONERS OF WAR TO BE RETURNED

6. That no durable peace will come to Europe unless the millions of German and Austrian prisoners of war detained in western Europe, and especially in Soviet Russia, and employed as slave labor in violation of the terms of the Geneva Convention, are returned speedily and immediately to their home countries. The United States, which has become involved in such practices by handing over our prisoners of war to France and other nations, should demand such a repatriation not only for reasons of humaneness, but much more for reasons of an enlightened self-interest. These prisoners of war, broken in spirit, ill and full of rancor, unless led back into gainful employment as quickly as possible may well join with the unemployed, with the young desperadoes who have never known peace and work, with the small, miserable partyman who has been branded as an outcast by a short-sighted American occupation policy, and with all the other discontented people roaming the countryside and the devastated cities of Germany to form a new army of nihilism.

AMERICA'S GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY

In conclusion, we believe that it is not the atom bomb which is the gravest potential danger with which we will have to contend. Nor does Germany constitute the weightiest problem which has to be solved.

The gravest responsibility of this Nation during the Moscow negotiations lies in the protection of a weakened and confused Europe which lacks farsighted statesmanship, from the encroachments of an alien ideology which can be stopped successfully only if all of Europe, including all of Germany, finds itself united in the sacred pledge to defend a common cultural heritage of which America is a part, against the negativism of Soviet Asia and her satellites.

This demands leadership and strong convictions. Europe is desperately sick; Europe is shrinking in size, and we are not blameless.

Will later generations say that America was found wanting in Moscow because she chose cheap expediency instead of standing up for eternal principles?

Will we be accused by posterity of being guilty of the destruction of Europe because we destroyed Europe's eastern bulwark, whose historical task it has always been to protect the West from the onrushing surge of the Asiatic tide?

Respectfully submitted.

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA.

Jobs for Ex-Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 504, a bill to make ex-Presidents Senators at Large. On February 1, 1947, the New York Daily News endorsed this bill in the following editorial:

JOBS FOR EX-PRESIDENTS

Ex-President Herbert Hoover's European trip to survey the German food troubles of the United States taxpayer is a good peg on which to hang some remarks favoring a bill recently introduced in Congress by Representative GORDON CANFIELD, Republican, of New Jersey.

The Canfield proposal is that any person who has served as President be eligible afterward, for the rest of his life, to a position as Senator at Large in the United States Senate.

These Senators at Large would have all the privileges, pay, and mileage allowances of regular Senators, except that they would not be able to vote on measures before the Senate. To permit them to vote, of course, would give them too much power under certain circumstances.

The main objects would be to give the people the benefit of what wisdom and experience an ex-President had gained in the White House, and to give the ex-President a dignified official forum in which to speak his views.

A secondary object would be to provide in an appropriate way for any Chief Executive who might, on leaving the White House, be financially broke or badly bent. Not that Mr. Hoover, our only living ex-President just now, is that way; but plenty of our ex-Presidents have been poor men. Three of them were Jefferson, Monroe, and Grant.

Now that Congress has a pension system for its Members—and rightly so, we believe—we hope it will turn into law this proposal to make ex-Presidents Senators at Large.

Presentation of a Citation to the College of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., in presentation of a citation to the College of the City of New York, Wednesday, February 12, 1947, at an alumni luncheon at the Hotel Astor, New York City:

The year of 1847, which has been so often referred to as the pioneer year in the expansion of our country—when the great push across the Mississippi and the opening of the West took place—saw an unusual example of the pioneer spirit right here in New York when City College opened. Here for the first time, as far as I know, was established a college where the will to learn was the only standard of admission. No one questioned the applicant's religion nor the locality from which he came, for men of every race, every national background were welcomed; it was one place where equality of opportunity was not just preached; it was offered to all who sought it.

City College may well be proud of its contribution to the life of our city and to the Nation. We cannot name a field of human endeavor in which we do not find a distinguished alumnus of the College of the City of New York. The roster is long, and the time allotted to me today is short, but I must mention a few names—Dr. Duggan, General Goethals, Justice Frankfurter, Senator Wagner, and a man who may well be called a leading American citizen, Bernard M. Baruch; all graduates of City College.

I am going to take advantage of this opportunity given me today to address this gathering, associated with one of our greatest colleges in New York City, and one which is most highly regarded academically, by bring-

ing to your attention what I feel is a most important responsibility now resting upon our institutions of learning.

Every day we read in the press of those who would incite to class conflict, substitute foreign ideologies for our American way of life, outlaw God and inject atheism, banish free enterprise, and establish totalitarianism.

We hear, with alarm, protests of discrimination by certain universities in admission to postgraduate and professional schools on religious and racial grounds. Movements are on foot to abate these practices. But restrictive measures alone will not work a cure. The causes, if any there be and wherever they be, must be removed. Our colleges owe a duty to assist, by eliminating from their teaching body, those who by precept or suggestions point the way, or give encouragement, to the spreading of subversive and anti-God propaganda. In the classroom there must be taught the greatness, glory, and beneficence of our Declaration of Independence, our Bill of Rights, our economic system of free enterprise and unbounded individual freedom and opportunity, and devout belief in the guidance and wisdom of Almighty God. I hope sincerely, from my heart, that you who are listening to my few words will mark well what I say to you.

On the letterhead of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, this line appears: "For justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews."

The conference seeks to promote that ideal. City College has pioneered in a comparable ideal. Its long life of a hundred years proves the worthiness, the success, and the truth of the ideal.

It is, therefore, on behalf of the National Conference, an honor to confer upon the College of the City of New York this citation. It is a great and personal privilege for me to present this award to Dr. Harry N. Wright, president of City College.

Elimination of Unfair Discrimination Based on Sex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill on Monday, February 17, to eliminate unfair discrimination based on sex, which is in line with the declaration in the United Nations Charter.

The General Assembly of the United Nations, to which I was privileged to be a member, passed a resolution last December reaffirming this purpose. I placed the text of the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD February 6.

I have in my hand a statement by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, a United States delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, in support of the bill introduced today which establishes a policy for the United States on the status of women, and empowers the President to appoint a commission to make further recommendations to us..

Mrs. Roosevelt's statement is as follows:

I am very much interested in the new bill which is being presented in the Congress and which declares the policy of the United States as to distinctions based on sex.

I have never been in favor of a constitutional amendment because I felt it would be far easier to attack, State by State, the laws which discriminate against women unwisely, and retain such labor laws as are still needed for the protection of women in industry. That does not mean, however, that I am not anxious to remove all possible legislation which hampers women on account of their sex. This law will provide for a comprehensive evaluation of the status of women by a commission to be appointed by the President. The commission would study the economic, civil, and social and political status of women and make recommendations for such legislation as may seem to them necessary.

This bill also provides for immediate action by all agencies of Government to wipe out practices discriminating on the basis of sex to the extent permitted by existing legislation. It asks the States to follow the lead of the Federal Government and, of course, it is in the States in many cases where action is most necessary.

It is perfectly clear that for biological reasons, women are different from men. In many ways this does not require any consideration in the economic field, but in some ways it does for the good of the Nation. These things should be recognized but not used as a reason for making life harder for the woman who must earn her own living.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

FEBRUARY 14, 1947.

Resolution of Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, Tuesday, February 11, 1947:

IN RE COASTWISE AND INTERCOASTAL WATER FREIGHT SERVICES

Resolution requesting Congress to take firm and immediate action in insuring continuance by extending authority of Maritime Commission of United States

Whereas the ports of the cities of Los Angeles and Long Beach are of the utmost economic importance to the citizens of the county of Los Angeles; and

Whereas the taxpayers of this county have expended millions of dollars in the development of these ports; and

Whereas thousands of residents of this county are dependent upon a continuing and prosperous harbor activity for their earnings; and

Whereas, the thousands of manufacturing plants in Los Angeles County are dependent on coastal and intercoastal water commerce for their raw materials and as a means to gain access to other markets with their finished products; and

Whereas, the United States Maritime Commission has, on February 5, 1947, issued orders to domestic water carriers directing them to cease advertising sailings and making bookings for voyages commencing March 1, and this action will mean the end of coastwise, intercoastal, and some territorial steam services as of midnight, February 28, 1947; and

Whereas this action by the Maritime Commission of the United States was made necessary because Congress has thus far failed to act in extending the authority of the Maritime Commission so that our merchant marine may become reestablished following total mobilization for war; and

Whereas the President of the United States did on January 21, 1947, state to Congress of the United States that "the national economy and interest will be seriously prejudiced unless shipping operations continue and unless the Commission is given additional time to dispose of the merchant ships left under its jurisdiction"; and

Whereas the cessation or reduction of coastwise and intercoastal shipping operations is certain to seriously cripple the economy of this community by cutting manufacturers' lines of supply and by placing thousands of people in a state of unemployment: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County go on record as requesting the Congress of the United States to take firm and immediate action in insuring the continuance of uninterrupted coastwise and intercoastal water-freight services by extending the authority of the Maritime Commission of the United States in this regard to a period beyond March 1, 1947, such period being as sufficient to permit the domestic water-freight services to become fully reestablished in their conversion from a war to a peace economy; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, with appropriate messages be forthwith transmitted to all California Members of the House of Representatives of the United States and of the Senate of the United States.

Establishing Ceiling for Expenditures for Fiscal Year 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, this day, with snow falling outdoors, while we debate House Concurrent Resolution 20, there is a significant comparison. I liken the falling snow to the falling of items from the astronomical budget submitted by the administration. These items being the padding, the extras, the unnecessaries to efficient government, which will be discovered when justification for them will be asked by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses.

In accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1946, the report of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget had to be submitted by February 15. The instant resolution is the outgrowth of said report, and, as I understand it, set a goal of desired limitation on the budget submitted by the President. This limitation is not a legal but a moral mandate of an over-all objective and its realization depends entirely upon the final action of the Congress upon budget estimates, individually and collectively.

Because it gives notice that we aim to restore economic health to our Nation, I shall vote for the resolution. This is possible only by a fiscal policy that will eliminate waste, duplication, and unnecessary expenditures. And this is possible without affecting the efficiency of our armed forces or impairing our national defense.

An Antidote for Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the pages of our periodicals are largely taken up with discussions of the problems which arise due to the wide prevalence of juvenile delinquency. Social workers, professors, clergymen, magistrates, and even grand juries pour forth daily an avalanche of words relating the dangers which it holds not only for our youth but for our country.

Many years ago Jersey City undertook to do something about the problem. The system set up by Mayor Hague has proved eminently successful. It has practically eliminated the problem in that city. Mayor Hague has had full cooperation from his associates in the city commission in the execution of his plan to forestall delinquency among youth. Commissioner Frank H. Eggers, the city's director of parks and public property, has been especially zealous in combatting this evil.

The following editorial from the Jersey Journal describes some of the praiseworthy results of the work of Mr. Eggers and his staff:

RECREATIONAL ANTIDOTE FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SPREADS OVER STATE

Fourteen public schoolhouses in Jersey City that heretofore have stood closed, dark, and gloomy at night are now lit up. Lights in many rooms remind passersby that Jersey City at last is getting real money's worth out of the millions invested by the taxpayers in these school buildings.

The reason for this is that after the teachers finish their task of instructing the pupils in the three R's and other studies the buildings, beginning at 3:30 p. m., are thrown open to the highly commendable recreation program that City Commissioner Frank H. Eggers, in conjunction with the public school department and the parks and buildings department, is carrying out as an antidote and a most effective remedy for juvenile delinquency.

Parents, citizens, and taxpayers who do not know all that is going on ought to take an hour off, wander into these schoolhouses, and get there in the merry laughter of boys and girls and best medicine for the blues, for pessimism and for grouches.

All is not gloom in this confused world after all.

In these schoolhouses fathers, mothers, and other adults will find not only 3,000 or more boys and girls who have suddenly been provided with fine, wholesome amusement, and worth-while recreation to while away the evening hours up to 10 o'clock, but they will find city officials working long after regular hours to give their time, energies, and talents without extra cost to the magnificent task of helping save the youths of our city from early error and missteps.

In these schoolhouses the public will see boys in many school gymnasiums engaged in the healthful exercise of basketball, competing nicely in many rival teams. They will see boys and men having their boxing, fencing, and gymnastic hours. They will see girls and young women enjoying instruction in dressmaking and getting first lessons in sewing. Then there are the school tanks, with the boys in healthful swimming lessons, while in other schools the aquatic program is open to the girls.

In another school you will come across young folks being taught dramatics, as teachers here and there note talents that warrant prophecies regarding coming actors and actresses.

The hilarious antics in another school are partly due to fine exhibitions in tap dancing and new gymnastics.

Then there is the instrumental music in which scores of youths are being instructed. Orchestras are being formed overnight. Needlecraft and handicraft are not neglected.

Commissioner Eggers' right-hand men—Frank Deisler, Arthur G. Humphrey, and R. Dudley Meiers, of the department of physical education, and Louis Lepis, of the department of recreation—are some of those who are busy day and night keeping this most notable city venture in successful operation.

Happy Jersey City youths, in spacious schools, having joyous times at night, are a sight to bring good cheer to the most callous.

Nor is the Eggers' idea of catering to the youths confined to Jersey City. Other municipalities are catching the impetus.

School superintendents and officials come to Jersey City at night to see for themselves how Commissioner Eggers' experiment is working out. Then they go back home and introduce the idea in their own bailiwicks, first on a small scale, then on a larger scale, as flaming youth rates the idea a success and happy parents give it their vigorous support.

The State's attitude toward buoyant youth is suddenly changing. The public is waking up to the truth of the old Roman proverb: "Times change and we change with them."

Birthday of Thomas Alva Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the memory of one of America's greatest sons was honored when the Nation, from coast to coast and Lakes to Gulf, combined in a spontaneous observance of February 11, 1947, as the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of the late Thomas Alva Edison.

Edison's genius, which gave the world the electric light, the phonograph, the motion picture, and numerous greater inventions, was memorialized throughout the Nation and by persons from all walks of life.

President Harry S. Truman sent to the inventor's widow, Mrs. Mina Miller Edison, of West Orange, N. J., the following message:

The world in which we live would be a poorer place without the heritage which the genius of Thomas Alva Edison gave us, a permanent contribution to our daily comfort and convenience. Through all the years that he labored, from youth to fruitful old age, his eyes were ever to the future. Always before him was the vision of a better and happier world, to the fulfillment of which he made such notable contributions. It is an honor and a privilege to pay homage to his widow on the centenary of his birth.

The United States Post Office Department joined the observance by issuing a special commemorative stamp carrying Edison's portrait. At appropriate ceremonies this stamp was placed on sale for the first time on February 11, 1947, at Milan, Ohio, the inventor's birthplace.

The United States Army illuminated the skies over New York City and Baltimore with giant, war-developed searchlights on the night of the centennial anniversary in honor of the man who made such electrical displays possible.

The United States Navy paid tribute to the man who founded the Navy's research facilities in numerous ways, including a radio broadcast by the United States Navy Band and special Edison exhibitions at its research centers and in museums, such as the Museum of Science and Industry in New York City.

Plans for a documentary motion picture dealing with Edison's career and achievements were announced by the United States Department of State. The film will be distributed through our embassies and consulates throughout the world as part of an international goodwill program.

In cities and towns in every State ceremonies of varying nature marked the centennial date. Civic dinners or luncheons honoring Edison were held in New York, Washington, Chicago, Detroit, Boston, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Kansas City, and in many other cities and towns.

The Nation's youth of high-school age was reacquainted with Edison's inspirational life through a series of educational posters distributed by the Thomas A. Edison Centennial Committee. Henry Ford is honorary chairman of this committee and Mrs. Thomas A. Edison and a son, Charles Edison, former Secretary of the Navy and former Governor of New Jersey, are honorary members. Charles F. Kettering is national chairman, Frank M. Tait is national vice chairman, and the following outstanding scientists, educators, public servants, and industrialists complete its membership: Winthrop Aldrich, George Baekeland, Alex D. Bailey, Thomas H. Beck, Col. H. S. Bennion, James B. Black, H. C. Blackwell, Vice Adm. H. G. Bowen, George H. Bucher, L. Ray Buckendale, Dr. Oliver E. Buckley, W. Gibson Carey, Jr., Louis S. Cates, Dr. Harry Woodburn Chase, Dr. Robert C. Clothier, Dr. Karl T. Compton, Dr. James Byrant Conant, Dr. William D. Coolidge, D. A. Crawford, Stuart M. Crocker, Dr. Allan R. Cullimore, C. E. Davies, Dr. Harvey N. Davis, Watson Davis, George V. Denny, Jr., Harry

L. Derby, Edison Dick, Dr. Harold W. Dodds, Lewis W. Douglas, Willard H. Dow, Gano Dunn, Joseph L. Egan, Charles Engelhard, Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., W. W. Freeman, Walter Geist, William Francis Gibbs, Walter S. Gifford, T. M. Girdler, David M. Goodrich, A. S. Goss, Eugene C. Grace, James G. Harbord, T. J. Hargrave, A. L. Holme, Charles R. Hook, Hon. Herbert Hoover, W. W. Horner, Frank A. Howard, Dr. Hubert S. Howe, D. E. Hyndman, Dr. Frank B. Jewett, Eric A. Johnston, Dr. Waldemar Kaempffert, Cornelius F. Kelley, C. W. Kellogg, H. Donn Keresey, Ray E. Larsen, Clarence L. Law, F. B. Llewellyn, Henry R. Luce, James H. McGraw, Jr., J. H. McNabb, F. W. Magin, Dr. Carl S. Marvel, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, Dr. F. R. Moulton, Malcolm Muir, W. C. Mullendore, William S. Newell, Edward A. O'Neal, J. W. Parker, Walter E. Poor, John Lee Pratt, Gwilym A. Price, Edgar Monsanto Queeny, Martin J. Quigley, Terry Ramsaye, Philip D. Reed, A. W. Robertson, David Sarnoff, F. L. Schlagle, Dr. Charles Seymour, Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., John W. Studebaker, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Ralph H. Tapscott, Edwin Vennard, Capt. A. F. Wagner, A. F. Wakefield, Arthur Walsh, Thomas J. Watson, George Whitney, R. L. White, Dr. William E. Wickenden, S. B. Williams, Charles E. Wilson Robert B. Wypers, Robert D. Yarnall, Victor Young.

Edison's unparalleled contributions to civilization were extolled in the news and editorial columns in the Nation's press, both large and small, from the New York Times and other great journals to the small-town weekly newspaper. The Nation's radio networks and independent stations joined in the tribute to Edison, as did the newsreels, magazines, and television broadcasters.

Edison Pioneers, an organization of men who were associated with Edison during his lifetime, accepted the responsibility of coordinating the activities, and did so by creating the Thomas A. Edison Centennial Committee and designating the historian of Edison Pioneers, John C. F. Coakley, to serve in a liaison capacity between all interested individuals and groups and the national committee.

This demonstration of America's love for her honored great bore witness to the fact that Edison's genius enriched mankind.

Establishing Ceiling for Expenditures for Fiscal Year 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, all my life I have been compelled to practice rigid personal economy. Having from necessity been forced to economize, I have learned to seek to apply rules of economy to public agencies.

There can be no question but that in order to balance our budget we must eliminate every possible unnecessary expenditure. There is, however, such a thing as false economy. It is my purpose to vote for the elimination of every useless or nonessential agency and/or person. I will not, however, vote to jeopardize our national military strength at this crucial period of world history.

It is to be regretted that those in control of the Congress, to wit, the majority party, have not furnished us with a bill of particulars so that we may know where the ax of economy is to be applied.

Until the peace is won we must look to and rely upon our armed forces. Our military advisers, including the Secretaries of War and Navy, as well as our distinguished Secretary of State, seriously advise against the proposed measure reducing our National Budget by a lump sum of $6,000,000,000. At the proper time and in regular order, I am very hopeful and feel confident that we will effect substantial reductions in our National Budget, but not in this thoughtless and arbitrary manner.

There are agencies that should be continued but from every indication will be completely eliminated if this drastic cut is applied with no thought to what agencies will be affected.

It appears that our Republican friends feel that if an error is to be made here today it should be made on the side of economy. Mr. Speaker, I submit that if our national security is in jeopardy then economy avails us little. If I am in error today in casting my vote against this measure I can feel confident that I have erred on the side of national security. We are the only Nation to emerge unscathed from the great war. That was because of our strength. That strength must be maintained until such time as peace and security return to the world. Since the end of the war our armed forces have been reduced 90 percent—to a strength of 1,070,000 men. Russia has an army of 5,500,000 men.

My vote against this measure is not to be construed as indicating my failure to recognize the fact we must reduce improper expenditures. I am simply unwilling to jeopardize our national-defense program in this manner.

Rent Control and Sugar Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I voted against the deficiency appropriation bill. The following is a letter from Mr. Max McCullough, Commissioner of the Office of Price Administration.

In it are the facts of the results of Tuesday's action. Here are the reasons why I voted against the deficiency appropriation bill.

The majority party has again today asked us to vote a blind cut in the President's budget. Mystery has surrounded the Republican cuts. No one knows what they are.

The action on Tuesday throws some light on what we expect to develop out of today's mystery.

The letter follows:

OFFICE OF TEMPORARY CONTROLS,
OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1947.

The Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: Thank you very much for telephoning and expressing an interest in our present financial situation.

I should like to answer your questions as directly as possible.

A recission of $9,000,000 will kill rent control and sugar rationing immediately. The more than 50,000,000 people living in rented accommodations would face immediate and drastic increases in their rent bills; nor would they have any protection from eviction save that provided by local and State laws.

You expressed particular interest in the effect the rescission action would have on veterans. First of all, they would be affected by the inevitable rent increases which would follow this action. As you know, veterans constitute the largest single group in the country in present need of rental housing accommodations. As rents increased, millions of veterans with limited incomes would be forced into less and less desirable housing accommodations. In areas of greatest pressure, this would mean that many of our veterans, along with the aged and others living on annuities, would be forced into substandard dwellings.

In addition to that, this agency is charged with the responsibility of enforcing sales prices of houses built for veterans under housing regulations. This responsibility was delegated to OPA largely because of its field organization, and it would be difficult for any other agency to effectively enforce.

Even though immediate liquidation were undertaken, a rescission of $9,000,000 would not permit the agency to carry out its legal obligations with respect to records and property disposal and the payment of leave legally due employees. The immediate and total liquidation of OPA required by the proposed rescission would cause the Government to lose millions of dollars in subsidy payments which are being saved as a result of audits made by OPA. In addition, the Government has claims against price violators amounting to more than $75,000,000 at single damages—claims which could not be perfected unless funds for such work are made available.

The financial condition of the agency on March 1 will be as follows:

Original appropriation	$101,000,000
Less obligations, June 30, 1946, to Feb. 28, 1947	85,606,000
Balance available Mar. 1, 1947	15,394,000
Less rescission in H. R. 1968	9,000,000
Available for operations, Mar. 1 to June 30, 1947	6,394,000
Less lump-sum leave payments	7,411,000
Deficit based on H. R. 1968	−1,017,000

Concerning the need for a supplemental appropriation, I should like to point out that no program of curtailment, however drastic, begun at this time will enable OPA to continue rent control and sugar rationing through the fiscal year on its present appropriation if lump-sum leave payments are made from these funds.

In the absence of a supplemental appropriation, all programs would have to be immediately curtailed, and the reduction in force would be of such a magnitude that programs would have to be terminated March 15 and full liquidation undertaken.

To continue rent control, sugar price control and rationing, to complete subsidy audits and carry on necessary litigation, and to continue enforcement action under the Veterans' Housing Program, OPA needs a supplemental appropriation of $5,950,000.

Again, thank you for your interest. If there is any further information I can give you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

MAX MCCULLOUGH,
Commissioner.

Platform and Program of the Steuben Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform and program of the Steuben Society of America:

PLATFORM AND PROGRAM OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA

PREAMBLE

Whereas we recognize the tremendous problems confronting these our United States, we pledge ourselves to stand unflinchingly for government by due process of law and denounce in the strongest terms any groups—open or secret—that attempt to take the law into their own hands, and we will oppose any organization whose activities are based on prejudice or discrimination against any citizen or class of citizens for reasons of race, color, creed, or political belief.

1. GOVERNMENT SYSTEM

(a) We believe in the system of government as provided for in our Constitution, viz: the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary.

(b) We believe that, if our existing system of government is to be changed, it shall be done not by indirection, but by the orderly process of amending the Constitution.

(c) We believe in limiting the terms of President and Vice President to one term of 6 years, or to two terms of 4 years each.

(d) We advocate the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution known as the Norris plan, which will more equitably express the will of the people in the choice of the President.

The effect of this amendment is to give to each candidate a proportionate number of the electors to which the State is entitled. Each candidate in the final count shall receive the sum total proportion of the electoral votes of every State as received by him.

(e) We advocate a constitutional amendment limiting the power of the President of the United States to appoint Justices of the United States Supreme Court to not more than three Justices during his tenure of office of whatever length of term. It is further advocated that if more than three vacancies shall occur during such tenure of office, then the additional vacancies should be filled for the interim by the United States Senate and House of Representatives until the election of a new President of the United States.

(f) We oppose any legislation which has for its purpose the abrogation of the standing rule calling for a two-thirds majority of the Senate to accept a peace treaty.

(g) We recommend the submission of proposed constitutional amendments directly to the qualified voters of each State. Until three-fourths of the States shall have ratified such amendments, or until more than one-fourth of the States shall have rejected the same, any State may change its vote. Whenever more than one-fourth of the States shall have rejected an amendment the rejection shall be final, and there shall be no further consideration of such amendment by the States. Proposed amendments shall not become operative unless ratified within 7 years from the date of their submission.

2. NATIONAL DEFENSE

(a) We advocate adequate preparation for the defense of our country. For that purpose all the resources of the country as well as its manpower shall be made available under such regulations as the Congress shall prescribe.

(b) We believe in a 1-year universal military training program, such training to begin at the age of 18 on a voluntary basis, but to become compulsory at the age of 21 without any post-training service remuneration.

(c) We advocate the retention of all island bases that we may need for our protection in the Pacific, and the retention or the acquisition of such bases in the Atlantic located in the Western Hemisphere, these to be acquired by negotiation, in lieu of lend-lease and credits extended during and after the war.

3. VETERANS

We believe in the GI Bill of Rights.

4. PEACE

(a) We advocate the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms in all countries—everywhere.

(b) Whereas it is becoming more and more evident that serious differences have arisen in carrying out the provisions of the Tripartite Conference of Berlin as released under date of August 2, 1945 (known as the Potsdam Conference), and whereas, we believe that certain provisions of said conference pertaining to the determination of new boundaries are contrary to the spirit of the Atlantic Charter as outlined therein under principle No. 3, as well as being contrary to historic and ethnic facts, and we refer specifically to article VI, article IX, subdivision B, and article X of the Potsdam agreement, namely the city of Koenigsberg and adjacent territory, the suggested western frontiers of Poland and the South Tyrol, we advocate that the provisions of the Tripartite Conference of Berlin, known as the Potsdam Conference, be reconsidered and revised along the lines of historical and ethnical facts, and not along the lines of revenge and territorial aggrandizement.

(c) Inasmuch as it is impossible for our occupational Army to furnish the number of calories even necessary for maintaining life, and whereas the relief given by the agencies established under Cralog are insufficient, we recommend that the activities and scope of the UNRRA, or any succeeding relief organization now existent or hereafter created, be extended so as to include the peoples of our former enemy countries, and that all restrictions on food and clothing shipments be removed immediately.

(d) We believe that the release and repatriation of prisoners of war should be carried out in the spirit of the Geneva Conference as promulgated by the United States Government in the Official United States Statutes at Large.

5. TAXATION

We advocate:

(a) There shall be no tax exemption on any classes of securities hereafter issued.

(b) To the National and State Governments that a national survey of tax problems and sources of possible taxation be undertaken by the National Government to include Federal, State, and municipal tax questions, for the purpose of formulating a uniform, intelligent, and nonconflicting system of taxation throughout the country for the purpose of avoiding the pitfalls of invisible taxes and duplication of taxes by the Nation, States, and municipalities.

(c) We advocate the adoption of a constitutional amendment to the effect that the power of Congress to impose taxes—gift, estate, and income taxes—shall be limited to a maximum of 25 percent, except in the case of a war creating a grave national emergency, when the limitation may be temporarily suspended by a three-fourths vote of both Houses of Congress.

(d) We advocate that rates on individual incomes should be revised substantially downward.

(e) We advocate reduction in present corporate normal taxes by graduated stages. Congress thereby would encourage individuals to save and provide for their own security and for that flow of new capital which an expanding economy will need in order to provide full employment of all employable workers.

(f) We advocate that the 65 years of age requirement of the applicant for old-age benefits of said law be reduced to 60 years of age, and that the recipient of such old-age benefits be entitled to collect the same, whether he has other salary income or not, just as long as he or she shall have reached the age of 60 years, and shall otherwise be entitled to said benefits pursuant to the provisions of said social-security law.

6. GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYMENT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

(a) The employment of any person by the Government under civil service jurisdiction shall not be based on his or her political affiliations, nor shall employment in the civil service be based on any qualifications other than merit.

(b) We believe that public service should be fostered as a career.

7. BUSINESS, CAPITAL, AND LABOR

(a) We believe in the competitive system, protection of independent business, and the strict enforcement of the antitrust and monopoly laws.

(b) We believe that individual initiative and enterprise should be encouraged.

(c) We believe that capital and business management should not be interested solely in profit, but that it must also assure the welfare of labor and the public from whom it receives that profit.

(d) We believe that labor has the inherent right to organize for self-protection and for the betterment of conditions, but we also believe that labor must interest itself in the question of wages with due and careful consideration of the ability of business as to how much it can pay without undermining the stability and common welfare of the Nation, State, and community.

(e) We believe that labor unions should be subject to the same laws and regulations as applied to business corporations.

(f) We believe that neither management nor labor shall cause work stoppage of affected public interests. We further believe and advocate that there should be created a Federal court for management and labor disputes, such Federal court to have final decision, enforcible by law, after all arbitration has failed.

(g) We believe that, whenever a labor union, or any affiliate thereof, engages in political activities, tax exemption as now provided for under section 101–1 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be revoked, thereby placing any labor union or affiliate thereof in the same category as any organization, club, or society which engages in political affairs. This would in no way interfere with or abrogate the right of any labor union or affiliate thereof to engage in political activities.

8. CONSERVATION

We are in favor of the conservation, development and effective National or State control of our country's water power and natural resources, and the supervision and regulation of public utilities using them.

We heartily condemn any subsidies for nonproduction of any natural resources, including agricultural or farming processes, or any destruction of God's gifts to mankind.

9. EDUCATION

(a) In a democracy the safety of the state depends upon the intelligence of the citizen, and an intolerable condition now confronts large parts of the country which deprives thousands of children of even the rudiments of education.

We urge upon the Federal Government the need of helping the several States in maintaining proper standards of instruction, housing, and teacher training through grants of money or through loans; but deprecate any attempt on the part of the Federal Government to establish control over the educational systems of any State.

(b) A knowledge of foreign languages has been found absolutely necessary for scientific study, and is a prerequisite for entrance to scientific courses in most of our educational institutions and military, naval, and merchant marine academies. We believe that every citizen should understand and correctly use the language of our country; however, we realize that the knowledge of foreign languages enriches the social, cultural, political, and commercial life of the community.

We, therefore, urge that the study of foreign languages be more effectively promoted in the educational system of our country.

(c) We believe that school books treating with historical and cultural subjects should be based upon careful research and should not deviate from established historical truth.

(d) We condemn the improper attempt to use educational institutions for the furtherance of private interests.

(e) We condemn the attempt to use our educational institutions for the propagation of ideas subversive to our form of government.

Rent Stabilization and Transit Fares in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an address made by me on February 10 last before the board of estimate of the city of New York. The hearing was called by the mayor of the city, Gen. William O'Dwyer, to determine whether an increased fare would benefit the financial structure of the city. My appearance before the distinguished members of the Board of Estimate as president of the Monroe Democratic Club and as the Member of Congress from the Twenty-third Congressional District of my State, was in opposition to any increase in fare in the city-owned transportation lines on the ground that any such increase was an indirect rent increase to the tenants of New York City. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee in 1942, I worked for and voted for the Price Control Act under which we have present rent controls. I am in favor of the continuance of rent controls as is until adequate and sufficient housing is available. I am in accord with the democratic program that rent controls should remain until the supply of dwelling units approximates the demand, and if there is any deviation from that program the people of Bronx County—and we have three Democratic and one Republican Member of Congress from the county—will know that the change has been effected by the Republican Congress.

I am definitely opposed, and the Democratic Party of Bronx County of which I am proud to say I am a member is definitely opposed, to an over-all increase in rents or any modification of the present OPA regulations that would directly or indirectly permit an over-all increase in rents.

My address on this all-important issue to New Yorkers of increased fares on city-owned transit lines follows:

Mr. Mayor, I appear here as president of the Monroe Democratic Club of the First Assembly District, Bronx County, in opposition to an increased fare on the city-owned transit lines. As the Member of Congress from the Twenty-third Congressional District, I can assure you that I know, from the scores of letters I receive, from the many tenant delegations with whom I have met, and my own personal contacts with the people of my district, that they are as one against rent increases, and let me say, that this proposed 10-cent fare is an indirect rent increase. My district roughly is all that area between the Bronx Kills and the Harlem River on the south, the Harlem River on the west, Tremont Avenue on the north, and on the east Third Avenue down to One Hundred and Forty-ninth Street and thence down St. Ann's Avenue to the waterfront. The area, which has a population of approximately 350,000 persons, is served principally by the Eighth Avenue subway, the Seventh Avenue subway, the Lexington Avenue subway, and the Third Avenue elevated. When I tell you that two of the proposed city housing projects are to be constructed in the district, you will readily appreciate that the people are, for the most part, in the low-income groups and view with apprehension the efforts to increase transportation rates.

It seems to me that it is important to determine whether this is a bona fide plan to aid the city's finances or a cute little scheme, so oft and persistently repeated, of relieving real estate of any part of the necessary increase in the operation of the city, even though our debt service costs are included in the real estate levy and are steadily increasing. Personally I cannot see where through any such increased fare the financial structure of the city will be appreciably improved. If my analysis is correct, the only difference involved is a shifting of the burden of transit costs from the landowner to the subway riding public, who for the most part are tenants. From 1934, when the real estate tax levy amounted to 84.2 of the total tax budget, there has been a steady downward trend to 60 percent in 1946–47 and a further estimated decline to 59.1 in the fiscal year 1947–48. The most striking feature of the whole situation is that from the beginning of the war years to the present time the real estate tax levies have been reduced almost $42,500,000, and that in a time when apartments were 100 percent filled, when rent concessions were in the remote and distant past, when painting and elevator and other services were faint memories and where commercial properties had increased their rents in many instances more than 50 percent.

It is a sound economic principle of taxation that taxes should be levied against those best able to pay. Real-estate interests are best able to pay today and in fact they are so well able to pay that while only 5 years ago they were storming Washington to have Federal agencies established here, today they are asking for the removal of these agencies from New York. The location of these Federal agencies in New York gave the realty interests here substantial profits during the war years. The request for their departure means that higher rents and more profits could be obtained from private business. So you see, it is not a question of real estate operating at a loss—it is a question of more and greater profit.

I read this morning the statement of Chairman Gross, of the board of transportation favoring the 10-cent fare. I think that General Gross has established that there is no magic in a 10-cent fare—that a 10-cent fare in and of itself will not provide sufficient funds for rehabilitation or for the construction of new lines and further extensions of our present lines. I quote from the chairman's statement:

"It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the increased revenue from an increased fare will do little, of itself, to provide improvements for the passenger. It will go primarily to pay for the present costs of the ride. The small remainder between a return of $222,000,000 and expenses of $208,500,000 plus $1,000,000 plus interest on rehabilitation debt cannot accomplish much. The direct benefit, as indicated above, will be felt in the city's expense budget.

SEEKS BENEFITS FOR RIDERS

"Improvement for the passenger will come almost wholly from the expenditure of capital funds released by a fare truly self-sustaining, that will convert presently non-exempt city debt to the exempt status. If the fare is set lower than 10 cents, if wide extension of free transfers is forced, so that present debt charges cannot be fully met, no capital funds will result; and the passenger will get no benefit as a rider, even though he may from other city services. Furthermore, even if the fare is made truly self-sustaining, the passenger will benefit as a rider only to the extent that capital funds released are allocated for transit improvements. Their diversion to other purposes will better his lot in other fields but not in that of transit."

Mr. Mayor, taking the figures of General Gross on the increased fare, what do we have? A return of $222,000,000 as against a total of $208,500,000 for operating expenses and present debt service, plus another $1,000,000 for increased wages of administrative personnel, plus $12,500,000 for further debt service on the rehabilitation cost, or a grand total of expense amounting to $222,000,000, leaving exactly nothing for extension or construction of new lines.

I again call your attention to that part of General Gross' statement which reads:

"Furthermore, even if the fare is made truly self-sustaining the passenger will benefit as a rider only to the extent that capital funds released are allocated for transit improvements. Their diversion to other purposes will better his lot in other fields but not in that of transit."

I cannot help but state at this time that my experience on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives convinces me that the same interests that are advocating the increased fare will be here vigorously opposing any allocation of capital funds and demanding instead a reduction in the real estate tax levy. Mr. Mayor, the realty interests who are here advocating a 10-cent fare are here for one reason only—it is not primarily for subway improvement; it is not for the comfort and safety of riders on the city transit lines; it is to reduce real

estate taxes and enhance their own profits. They remind me of a banker friend of mine who met me on lower Broadway last Friday and told me that we were right in continuing the war excise taxes generally, but we should have repealed the tax on safe deposit boxes.

Mr. Mayor, I desire to refer to another part of General Gross' statement, which I consider most forthright and illuminating. I rather think that many of our citizens, who believe that those who use the subways should pay the toll, are of the opinion that the 10-cent fare will solve the financial problem of the city for all time. They will be disillusioned by the frankness of the distinguished Chairman of the Board of Transportation who says:

"The increased fares of 10 cents on rapid transit and 7 cents on surface lines, granting some stability of present wage rates, would therefore be self-sustaining for a period until, say, 1952–54, when the charges on new construction costs would have to be met from other than operating revenues."

Mr. Mayor, that means that the 10-cent fare is not a permanent cure; it is only a sedative that will quiet our financial jitters for the next 5 or 7 years, provided that there is no substantial increase of wages in the transit system. What happens 5 to 7 years hence? We must look to other sources of revenue to meet the increased charges on new construction—or we must again raise the fare. Mr. Mayor, with the help of God and the Democratic party, you and your colleagues will be here five years hence and if the 10-cent fare goes through now, you will be bedeviled by a 15- or 20-cent fare before your second term of office is over.

As I see the picture, the additional revenue of $83,000,000 derived from a 10-cent fare would simply mean the removal of $75,000,000 from the city budget and undoubtedly would be used to reduce real estate taxes a corresponding amount, leaving $9,000,000 for transit rehabilitation. In other words, for the city to get $8,000,000 free money, the plan is to lower realty taxes $75,000,000, and recoup the $75,000,000 through a 10-cent fare which would yield $83,000,000. While you would be thus reducing the real estate tax, you would, in effect, be indirectly adding every month approximately $2.00 to the family rent for each worker in the family using rapid transit and $2.00 per month for 9 months for each high school child using rapid transit.

I think that everyone would prefer to see our transit system self-sustaining, but we must remember that our underground highways—our subways—are as much a part of our city service as are our streets and avenues. If a 5-cent fare is too little from Pelham Bay Park to Nostrand Avenue—and I venture to say there are few who daily make that trip—a 10-cent fare is too much from Mott Haven to One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street or Forty-second Street; and thousands make that trip daily. Even a 10-cent fare is a recognition of the fact that rapid transit is a public service rendered by the city for the common benefit of the community.

We are today facing the possibility of the repeal or drastic revision of rent controls, which would add another 10 or 15 percent to the rent now being paid for living quarters. With that possibility—I will say with that probability—confronting the people, the city should not permit the indirect raising of rents by this shifting of the tax burden from the landlord to the tenant.

May I say in conclusion that I am thoroughly in accord with the program of the city administration to obtain a greater share in the revenue collected in the city by the State. I think it fair and equitable. May I also suggest that consideration be given to the recoupment of the $100,000,000 invested in Idlewild. That is a headache which you have inherited. The concept of Idlewild showed imagination, but it also displayed overenthusiasm and overextension. The construction of an airport is no more the city's business than the construction of a railroad terminal. In my opinion, it would, as a defense measure, be within the proper sphere of the Federal Government to maintain terminal airports along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts for possible military use in time of war, but which could be used for commercial purposes in time of peace. I leave the thought with you with the assurance that the New York congressional delegation would be happy to cooperate with you.

A Teacher Looks at His Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry G. Borchardt:

A TEACHER LOOKS AT HIS JOB—TEACHING, WORST PAID PROFESSION IN THE UNITED STATES, NO LONGER ATTRACTS GOOD MEN—RESULTS: SCHOOLS ARE BEING FEMINIZED, DISCIPLINE IS LAX

(By Henry G. Borchardt)

Several years ago my son and I were having a serious discussion about his choice of a future career, and at one point in the conversation he said he thought it would be nice to follow in my footsteps and enter the teaching profession.

"Heaven forbid," I told him. "You can be a plumber or a taxi driver if you like, but whatever you do, don't aim at being a teacher—at least, not in the public schools."

This may have been shameful advice—indeed it was shameful—but it was given conscientiously, and I am positive that 99 out of 100 teacher-fathers would tell their sons the same thing.

I have been a public-school teacher for nearly 30 years, an experience which includes rural and small-town teaching, teaching in middle-sized communities of 30,000 or thereabouts, and finally in Chicago high schools. During this period I have encountered all, or nearly all, the abuses and indignities which the present school system inflicts on teachers at every level. I understand very well why the supposedly honored profession of teaching today is nearly without honor, and why it is attracting fewer and fewer capable young men as careerists. Life's recent editorial, Teacher Troubles, failed to differentiate between male and female teachers, but there is an important point to be made here.

The fact is that school teaching already is a preponderantly feminine calling and rapidly is becoming almost exclusively the domain of women. In the Chicago schools, with a current enrollment of about a third of a million pupils, there are close to 13,000 women teachers and only 2,000 men. Much the same ratio prevails throughout the country, and the scales are going more and more off balance in favor of women. To be quite accurate I should not say "in favor of women" but "by default of men." For while teaching fails to offer sufficient rewards and incentives to attract the intelligent and ambitious males who should be entering the school system, it does provide a congenial short- or long-term haven for certain groups of women. One consists of recent girl college graduates marking time and saving money until they get married. Another is composed of married women glad to swell the family budget with their teaching pay checks. A third is a group of irreconcilable spinsters who have hied themselves to the classroom as to a nunnery.

I have no animus against women teachers as such, and I certainly intend no slur on their abilities. In the lower schools women are as capable of dealing with younger children as the majority of male teachers would be, and at all school levels there obviously are certain subjects—domestic science, for example—which they are far better able to teach. But formal teaching is only part of the job. An equally important part of it is discipline; not discipline in the Prussian sense but the total discipline of intellect and democratic behavior. In this sphere the woman high-school teacher is at a terrific disadvantage. It is difficult enough for the male teacher to maintain simple order among several dozen of the restless and often rebellious youngsters in the urban high-school population; for the woman teacher it is frequently impossible. For instance, because of the 25 percent drop in the number of male teachers during the last few years, more and more young women in their early twenties have entered the Chicago high schools as substitute instructors in various courses. Among their pupils are precocious and irreverent lads of 18 and 19 who in the corridors between classes salute these substitutes with the wolf-calls and comments usually heard from the street-corner gang. Even mature and experienced women teachers are subjected to embarrassment and on occasion have been heckled out of their own classrooms by rowdies of both sexes who regard them as fair game. Possibly this might have comic potentialities in a movie, but in a real school it is tragic because it represents a serious weakening of morale. In the big school, as in the Army, morale is the force which gives the group purpose and unity, and in both cases it depends largely on the prestige of the leaders. In the case of the Army these are the officers, and in the case of the schools, the teachers.

During the war the morale situation was particularly bad. In the high schools there was nearly a complete break-down because almost anyone could get a night job or part-time job in a factory. Most of the pupils in my school took such jobs, and in some cases earned more than my yearly salary in 4 or 5 months of part-time work. I remember one 17-year-old girl who arrived at class one morning wearing a handsome new fur coat—and promptly fell asleep at her desk. She had been working on the night shift in a machine-tool plant for weeks and was exhausted. I told her afterward that this routine was much too strenuous for her and that she would have to give up school or give up the job. When she said that she would stop school I tried to reason with her, pointing out that in the long run her education would be more valuable than high pay in a temporary war job. "Gee, I might as well get the money while I can," she replied. "Look at this fur coat, and I have a savings account, too. Besides, what good is an education anyway? It seems to me the more you know the less you make." She refrained from adding, as she might have, "Look at you teachers."

Since the end of the war my pupils have become more interested, more serious, and better behaved. They are smart enough to realize that the easy days are coming to an end, and they have been sobered by the return of older brothers and sisters from the services. But the fact that the current high-school generation is more serious-minded and more eager to learn than the boys and girls of the war crop only points up the main question: How well are we prepared to educate them?

EDUCATION BY WOMEN

What chiefly concerns me, in looking ahead, is the small number of young men teachers. Quite apart from the psychological factors involved in school discipline, I wonder whether the present and oncoming generations of public-school pupils will be particularly benefited by the increasing feminism of the teaching staffs. While I do not agree altogether with Mr. Philip Wylie's outbursts against "mom" and "momism," there is no question that a matriarchy is developing in the United States. It will come full circle in a few years when education is handed over almost entirely to women.

The rapid decline in the total number of male teachers is bad enough—12 men to 68 women in one high school I know of—but that is only part of the story. All but a handful of the existing male teachers are old veterans like myself, carrying on for the last few years until we are pensioned off. Many of my former colleagues failed to return to teaching after their service in the Army or Navy. They had discovered that others with equal or inferior abilities and educational attainments were commanding much more respect and remuneration than they were. Practically no new men are coming along to take our places, and when we disappear the women will inherit the schools almost completely.

Why has this come about? What are the current conditions which make men avoid the teaching profession? Why do so many young men quit after a few years in the classroom?

It is such an old and familiar complaint that I hate to mention it again, but one fundamental trouble is that teachers always have been and no doubt always will be underpaid. No one enters the field expecting to get rich. He must be motivated by a genuine love for youth and must find his chief rewards and satisfactions in the job itself—a job which is always exacting and which often is mentally and physically exhausting. I don't say that all male teachers are pure idealists, or anything of the sort, but to be successful they must be dedicated to the service of youth rather than to their pay checks, and I believe that most of them are.

SAME PAY FOR 20 YEARS

But the point has been reached where such dedication is no longer possible except for a very few men with private resources. For instance, while the cost of living steadily rises, the pay of Chicago high-school teachers stays almost exactly where it was in 1929. A teacher gets $2,350 his first year. Small annual increases bring his salary to $3,150 by the end of his fifth year. He is then eligible to take an examination and, if he passes, the annual increases continue until he makes $3,950. This is the maximum he can ever earn unless he is promoted to some other job, and I know many men who today are receiving the same money they got 20 years ago. Meanwhile they have been unmercifully squeezed by the cost of living. I might add that the teacher is in somewhat the same position as the young doctor—no matter how poor he is, the community expects him to put up a certain front. For instance the teacher is supposed to set an example by being neatly dressed. He would not dare show up in school wearing the work clothes of a truckman, even though the truckman's earnings greatly exceed the teacher's. And so it goes through many other departments of living. Unless the male teacher is a bachelor, it is virtually impossible for him to get along on his salary in high school, to say nothing of the lower schools where the pay is worse. Yet in only a very few places (notably New York City) is a teacher's pay higher than in Chicago. No wonder that in schools all over the country the male teacher is joining the dodo.

As a matter of practical necessity, nearly all of us are forced to take on extra jobs in order to get by, and at present I do not know a single male teacher who is not doing this. I happen to teach in night school after my regular day's work is over, but in other years I have gone far afield in order to earn a supplementary income. One summer I worked as a helper on a beverage delivery truck, and at various times I have been a private policeman in a packing plant, a shoe clerk, shipping clerk, railroad brakeman, timekeeper, and crew hand on a tugboat. Some of my colleagues have built up very profitable sideline businesses. One owns a neighborhood tavern; another has a contracting concern; others are spare-time lawyers, accountants, architects, real-estate operators, illustrators, magazine writers, and publishers of vocational textbooks. I have even known teachers who served as strikebreakers or in even more dubious capacities. In a number of cases the teacher's outside employment brings in as much as he earns at school, and teaching becomes a mere avocation to which he gives lip service but little more.

The only reason many of these men continue teaching is to keep their pension rights, although a few do so out of a sense of duty. In Chicago, teachers are eligible for pensions of $800 a year after 25 years of service but may stay on until the automatic retirement age of 65, when a larger pension is granted. Although pensions have always been paid in the past, there may come a time when such will not be the case. When municipal finances are disrupted, teachers are among the first to suffer. I well remember a time many years ago when a salary check due me before Christmas was not issued until late in January. Tax warrants, too, had to be cashed at a 15-percent discount in order to buy coal and other necessities because the city's credit was so bad. Our salary and pension expectations are only as good as the balance in the town treasury, and the teacher's alleged "security" is apt to go glimmering at any time.

A JOB ON THE SIDE

What is the effect of the double-job system which has become commonplace today among male teachers? To be blunt, it is highway robbery of our children. Certainly all teachers should have outside interests and activities to keep them mentally refreshed and prevent them from succumbing to the dry rot of pedagogy. A creative part-time job which does not intrude on classroom work and which does not drain a teacher's energy may indirectly contribute to his pupils' education. However, it should be an avocation rather than a necessity. But as matters stand, in many cases the outside job becomes the mainstay while the teaching job suffers. In the classroom the teacher's mind is often distracted by thoughts of his business activities (if he does not actually carry on some of them, such as correspondence, during school hours) and when the last bell rings he dashes to his other job. He has no time or inclination for unpaid extra work with gifted of backward children, no chance to organize or participate in discussion groups, athletics, social organizations, or other extracurricular affairs which in the total development of his students may be more important than formal book learning. Furthermore, after working a full day at school and then at another job, the teacher certainly is not able to give his best to his boys and girls; in short he cannot do what he is hired to do. Is this the teacher's fault? If so, how can he help it? "If the board can't or won't pay us a living wage, it forces us to take outside jobs," one teacher told a school principal. "We will teach as well as we can, but don't expect us to give the children as much as we could if we were only teachers. They surely deserve it, but after working half the night we just don't have the energy."

I wish I could say that the teacher's grievances spring entirely from his economic situation, but unfortunately this is far from the truth. One of the most serious defects of the system is the deadening of initiative through the removal of incentives. I mentioned before that after 5 years' probation, the Chicago teacher receives a permanent appointment with a salary fixed for life. It makes no difference how much extra time he puts in or how much extra attention he gives his pupils; there is no recognition—monetary or otherwise—for his efforts. A successful hog slaughterer in a packing house will get a bonus check, a testimonial dinner, and a gold watch from the company president when his retirement date rolls around, but for the teacher there is no word of thanks or praise from anyone.

His only chance for getting ahead lies in being promoted to an assistant principalship or some other job above the teacher level. As a young man he may steam along in the belief that hard work and ability will earn him such promotion, but he soon loses this naive idea. One of my earliest teaching jobs was in a small western city. After a couple of years of successful apprenticeship I went to the superintendent and asked him for a raise. He said he would think it over, and a week later I had my answer—dismissal. I learned slowly that the main function of the small-town school superintendent is to keep costs as low as possible, regardless of how much extravagance there may be in other directions. One of the favorite devices is to slough off an ambitious teacher as soon as he requests more money and replace him with a beginner.

POLITICS VERSUS EDUCATION

I also learned enough to fill several books about the vindictiveness of local school boards and the way personal whims and prejudices of the gentry on the boards determine whether the teacher keeps his job. In one instance I was dismissed from a school because I refused to give the daughter of a board member a special examination after she had failed the regular tests. The big-city teacher is immune from petty persecutions of this kind, but in too many cases his progress depends on his family, personal, or political connections. The idealistic teacher hesitates to strive for success on this basis. He becomes cynical and disgruntled when he sees others succeed by methods he would not use. When administrations change, the friends of the victorious party are given the key positions. The idealistic teacher who doesn't keep his fences mended still remains in the classroom.

Finally, the teacher forever encounters a most disheartening public attitude. People seem to be inwardly contemptuous of teachers because they don't make much money and visibly uneasy with them because they are supposed to know more than the average man. So when I am introduced to a new group I try to conceal the fact of my profession as long as I can. Otherwise there is a great backing away and in a few minutes I am left standing by myself. Granted that a teacher may be as big a bore as the next man, I don't think that there is anything in the job itself which makes that inevitable. But the fact remains that it is amazingly difficult for a teacher to establish normal social contacts outside his own professional circle. I once was blackballed by a men's club while principal of a school which several members' children attended. Reason? Several of the men were afraid that I would correct their grammar and be shocked at their swearing. Another said, "Aw, he'd just be a wet blanket on everything." In other words, I might be good enough for their children but too goody-goody for them.

ARE TEACHERS PEOPLE?

Can anything be done about the situation? Is it possible to reform and transform the

system so that I might advise young men: Go into teaching by all means; while you won't make a fortune, you will have rewards beyond price and you will be doing one of the most important jobs in the world.

Frankly I have no idea how to change the general notion that teachers are social poison. Nor do I have a ready prescription for divorcing the schools and teachers from political domination. That must come from the voters and quickly, if our public education system is not to disintegrate. But I have a few positive suggestions which might be applied immediately. For one thing, to replace the present fixed salary arrangement, I would propose 3-year or 4-year contracts with graduated raises. I would adjust salaries so that no teacher had to take outside work, and I would limit any outside jobs to approved ones which did not hamper classroom performance. In addition, I would insist that teachers use their summer vacations constructively—one season in travel, another in advanced study, a third in practical work and a fourth in relaxation. The salary would be on a 12-month basis. It seems to me that a program somewhat along these lines would provide incentives now altogether lacking; eliminate the economic insecurity which defeats the teacher and defrauds the taxpayer; prevent the mental stagnation which is the inevitable result of a routine existence.

Is it important? Judge that for yourself. Dr. Robert Hutchins recently predicted that if the United States was not wiped out by the atomic bomb within a few years, it would die of boredom. Education is about the only defense we have against either of these fates, and education means teachers. Without them the schools are empty shells.

Labor Legislation: Mediation Board Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, over the Columbia Broadcasting System network on February 15, 1947. The address was on the subject Labor Legislation: Mediation Board Proposals, and is of interest because of the many proposals on this subject which are now pending before the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the 18 months since VJ-day the American people carried out the most tremendous job of military and industrial demobilization in our history. There were setbacks and disappointments, including many serious and costly labor disputes. Despite that fact, however, American production in 1946 exceeded all previous peacetime levels.

I cannot predict what will happen during this next year in the field of industrial relations. But I do know that both labor and management now have a much more constructive attitude today than during the first troubled months that followed VJ-day.

The Congress of the United States now has before it a number of bills designed to prevent a recurrence of last year's industrial strife. There is one particular proposal that I would like to discuss rather fully. This proposal takes two forms: One would set up a mediation board outside the Department of Labor; the other would set up a mediation board within the Department, but would make the board practically independent and transfer to it the work of conciliation and mediation now being carried on by the Labor Department. From past experience I feel sure that such a board would be in the Department for housekeeping purposes only.

Some advocates of this procedure contend that the Labor Department and its Secretary cannot act impartially, because we have a mandate from Congress to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States."

The best answer to this argument would be a full review of the record and policies of the United States Conciliation Service. I cannot undertake that in the time at my disposal. But I would like to quote four character witnesses, if I may call them that. Four groups who have a vital stake in collective bargaining and the American way of life. They are: the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Necessarily, these groups have had a great deal of experience with the Conciliation Service. They are in a position to judge the work of the Conciliation Service because they take part in it. Day in and day out they watch negotiations being carried on with the friendly, impartial help of our Commissioners of Conciliation. Let me remind you that during the last year, the Commissioners, under the capable direction of Edgar L. Warren, aided in the peaceful settlement of 13,000 industrial disputes. Moreover, in 90 percent of the disputes where Commissioners were called in before work had halted, no stoppage occurred.

Last year we also aided in settling 3,400 strikes. Of these, nearly two-thirds had begun before either of the parties called for the services of a conciliator.

Equally important, all of these settlements were reached by voluntary methods of conciliation and mediation.

Knowing that record, the NAM, the AFL, the Chamber of Commerce, and the CIO are unanimously opposed to the creation of a mediation board. Let me quote the Chamber's board of directors:

"The establishment of a Federal mediation board, or any similar body by another name, would interfere with and disrupt voluntary collective bargaining. There would be a tendency to refer important issues to such a board, which would undermine voluntary agreement."

My own experience as Secretary of Labor fully supports that view. During the war we could see this perfectly natural tendency at work. Time and time again the parties to a dispute were so eager to have "their case" settled by the National War Labor Board that the preliminary negotiations were little more than shadow boxing, a warm-up for the big show in Washington. Consequently, the Board found itself heavily burdened with a huge backlog of cases.

But after VJ-day, when numerous wartime controls were lifted, the War Labor Board quite properly began to turn its case load back to the parties for settlement. As a result, about 3,000 cases were left to collective bargaining, and the overwhelming majority were settled peacefully—even during the troubled months of reconversion, when labor and management faced a host of unfamiliar problems.

Without attempting to gloss over the fact that labor disputes did retard the rate of reconversion, I want to remind you that we now have more than 14,000,000 workers who are covered by some 50,000 union contracts. Yet even during the worst period of labor unrest in our history 45,000 of these contracts were renewed or renegotiated peacefully—not to mention the successful handling of countless grievances that are bound to arise wherever men work together.

To me, and to many others who are close to the labor scene, this indicates a much greater area of basic agreement than most people realize. Can we afford to move in on this large area with Government mandates or a supermediation board? The answer is: Not unless we are prepared to follow up with further controls and increasing Government participation in collective bargaining.

Here again our wartime experience is revealing. In the fiscal year 1943, the Conciliation Service handled more than 14,000 disputes, but 31 percent of these were referred either to the National War Labor Board or the National Labor Relations Board for final action. In 1944 the Service closed nearly 22,000 disputes, and, of these, 32 percent were referred to one of the two boards. In 1945 an all-time high was reached when the Conciliation Service handled over 23,000 disputes and referrals reached 33 percent.

Today the story is very different. Labor and management are again learning to use the collective bargaining process. As we entered the new year 1947, work stoppages were the lowest since VJ-day. Not only were there fewer strikes but the number of workers involved and idleness were also well below those early months of 1946. As of January 1, 1947, our conciliators were attempting to mediate 111 stoppages involving only 35,000 employees. A year ago they were handling 145 strikes involving 10 times as many employees.

Quite apart from its effect on the Conciliation Service, there is another reason why I am convinced that a mediation board would impede industrial peace. My own experience has convinced me that the job is not one to be done by a board, because the solution of labor disputes requires great flexibility. Solutions cannot be reached in an ivory tower. Every case is different; the issues are different; the personalities are different. It requires different types of individuals to handle different cases.

During the last year and a half we in the Department have acquired an intimate knowledge of the current problem of each industry and the various companies within the industry. We know the background and the mental attitude of the negotiators on both sides. No super-duper board can handle such a many-sided and complicated task—regardless of the character, ability, and experience of the men who might be appointed to such a board. With the best will in the world, a board would find itself delayed by technical problems which might prove a fatal handicap to successful collective bargaining.

The general public may not be aware of these facts, but labor and management know them well enough. They know, too, what steps have been taken to develop and strengthen the Conciliation Service. I am particularly proud that what has been done was an outgrowth of a unanimous recommendation by the President's labor-management conference in November 1945. Everyone in the conference agreed to the report, which recommended that the Conciliation Service remain within the Department of Labor and that it operate with the advice of an advisory board consisting of representatives of both management and labor. This advisory board takes its work seriously, and the results have been very gratifying to all concerned.

Again, time does not permit me to review these changes in detail. But I can tell you that the Conciliation Service today is better equipped than ever before to aid both unions and employers at the bargaining table. For example, all of the arbitrators now on the roster of the Service were passed upon by the regional labor-management

advisory committees, thus insuring competent and impartial arbitrators who have been approved by leading labor and management represenatives in their respective areas.

The same can be said of Conciliation's Technical Division, which assists the parties in disputes where highly technical problems arise, such as incentive plans, job evaluations, merit rating systems, workload studies, and related questions.

Beyond these regular methods which the Conciliation Service offers, we have developed several other means of promoting industrial peace. Fact finding is one of them. During the last year I appointed nine fact-finding or special inquiry boards. In each instance their investigations led to a satisfactory settlement of the controversy. The public has not heard much of this success, but I believe it can be repeated in the future, provided that certain basic principles are followed.

These principles include the full and voluntary cooperation of both parties, the selection of board members who are thoroughly familiar with the industry concerned, and, of course, a clear understanding that a board's recommendations will not be forced upon the parties. Rather, I send each side a copy of the report and tell them that, in my opinion, it should be used and considered in further negotiation. In other words, I do not convert the board from a mere fact-finding function into an arbitration function.

I have tried to outline for you some of the things the Labor Department is doing in the field of industrial relations. Equally important are the fundamental objectives behind this work. Unless I am very much mistaken, our goal is the same as yours. We in America want full, sustained production and fair distribution—the kind of distribution that will reward incentive and preserve the freedoms we hold dear.

Free collective bargaining does impose serious responsibilities on both labor and management. Recent developments in steel and autos and in the vast construction industry show how different the industrial climate is today from 1 year ago. Unless I misjudge the caliber and democratic purpose of labor and management, they will meet their joint responsibility—without coercion or compulsion from our Government.

Christian Race Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the appendix of the RECORD a reprint from the Southern Presbyterian Journal with respect to the harmonious relations that exist between the whites and the Negroes in Tazewell, Va.

This article was written by the Reverend William F. Junkin, who was a missionary to China from the Southern Presbyterian Church for many years. He is now retired and is living in Tazewell. He is a grandson of George Junkin, who was at one time president of Washington and Lee University.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Several weeks ago there was held in the Presbyterian Church, in Tazewell, Va., a very inspiring, helpful, and exemplary service.

A Mr. Holley, a Negro barber, held in high regard by all people of the community, white and black, had died. The buildings of the several Negro churches are small. The officers of the Presbyterian Church offered the use of their beautiful building for the funeral service. The main auditorium was crowded with Negroes. The large Sunday-school assembly room, thrown open to the main auditorium, was about two-thirds full of white people. The service was conducted by Negro and white pastors. Mr. Freeman, pastor of the Presbyterian Church, read a very beautiful summary of the life and character of Mr. Holley. The choir was composed of members of the different white churches. A Negro woman sang a solo.

The impression on the community was profound. One man of an old Tazewell family said to me: "This is an example of the best of the South."

The relation between the whites and Negroes in this town is unusually fine. One notes this cordial relationship in the pleasant greetings between white and black as they meet on the streets. We never hear of interracial trouble. Every summer, in addition to the daily vacation bible schools for white children, there is a daily vacation bible school for Negro children held in the educational building of the Presbyterian church, with an attendance of more than a hundred.

If this kind of Christian recognition and regard were more real and exemplified here and all over our Southland, there would be less talk of that kind of mixing of the races which is not to be desired by right-thinking people of either race.

The Editor Is Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Marshfield Mail of February 13, 1947, published in Marshfield, Mo. The editor of the Marshfield Mail is Mr. T. Ballard Watters, a capable journalist, who a few years ago served as president of the Missouri Republican Editorial Association. I think this editorial is well worth the reading by every Member of this House. It follows:

THE EDITOR IS THINKING

(By T. B. W.)

Most all Webster County people will want to endorse legislation introduced in the Missouri State Legislature to outlaw the closed shop in this State. The new bill, introduced by Representative J. W. Wagner, Polk County, provides that "the right of people to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

No one should have to pay tribute to some labor boss in order to get or hold a job.

England is facing a crisis due to the shortage of coal. The mines in England were socialized this last year and already the industry is bogged down.

Socialism, communism, and new dealism have been tried in many lands and in many different ages in the history of the world and never have they been successful. Any ism that takes away the incentive to work and produce has been, and always will be, a failure. All wealth is the result of production. When people quit working or cut down on production by short hours, or regulation, people are going to suffer the resulting shortages.

We hope the Republican Congress has enough sense to reject the proposed additional social-security legislation just presented by the head of the Social Security Bureau.

What most people want is to be let alone. A lot of us want no part of social security or to be bothered by the professional do-gooders. We don't need any socialized medicine or forced health insurance either.

We are tired of being pushed around and being spoon-fed by the bureaucrats. We believe that true Americans prefer to look after themselves instead of adopting more of the ideas of government held by the Hitlers, Roosevelts, Stalins, and so forth, in which the state controls the people instead of the people controlling the government.

And the country is just plain fed up with the liberals—defined liberal with the other fellow's money—and the politicians who think up all the schemes to tax and tax and spend and spend.

Seventy-ninth Anniversary Charity Dinner of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at the seventy-ninth anniversary charity dinner of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Lodge No. 1, Commodore Hotel, New York City, February 15, 1947:

A few days ago groups of men and women throughout the land met to pay tribute to the memory of one of the greatest of Americans, the man whose courage and vision saw beyond the clouds of war, and the barriers of internal strife, the rising of a great Nation, with one flag, all lines of sectional demarcation swept away, and one ideal—human liberty. As you know, I speak of Abraham Lincoln.

In just a few days from now the Nation will pause to honor the memory of another great American, a man who came, not like Lincoln, from the humble folks, the toilers, but from a long line of aristocrats, a man of wealth and position, and yet so imbued was he with the spirit of liberty, the aspirations of Colonial America to be free, that he renounced all that held him to the past, jeopardized his very birthright, and led the Army of the Revolution to ultimate victory, and gave to the world the first nation founded upon people's rights rather than the privileges of monarchy. This was Gen. George Washington.

In between the dates of these illustrious birthdays comes that of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. Like Lincoln, the order had a humble beginning. As you know, it was founded by a few men of the theatrical profession for the purpose of mutual assistance in times of stress and trouble. It ministered to the sick and needy in strict conformity with the principal tenet of the order "practice charity without ostentation,"

and adopted as the order's foundation and ground work the divine admonition: "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you."

I think it can be truthfully said that no fraternal organization in the United States during the period of its existence has contributed more generously to worth-while charitable causes than has the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and New York lodge in its lifetime has been in the forefront in that activity—it has done its work at all times in true observance of the order's precepts.

As the order grew with such rapidity and it soon became apparent that men following the nomadic theatrical profession could not give the time and attention necessary to its growth and development, the theatrical barriers were lowered and the membership opened to broad-minded men in other walks of life who sympathized with its ideals and who would carry on in the spirit of the founders.

Shortly after the organization of the grand lodge was completed, and the order became national in scope, citizenship was made a requirement of membership and the Elks became a truly distinctive American fraternity.

How the order has carried on as a patriotic force is written in the records of two wars. In World War I it gave financial, physical, and moral support to our Government. Seventy-five thousand Elks served in the armed forces in that war. The Elks were among the first to send medical units overseas, to build a reconstruction hospital for the wounded coming home. The order also erected a community house for the use of relatives visiting soldiers at Camp Sherman, Ohio. It gave substantial financial cooperation to the Government's vocational training program, and established a revolving loan fund for returning veterans, and the Salvation Army publicly acknowledged that its great work could not have been carried on without the financial assistance rendered by the Elks. This is but a brief sketch of the service rendered by our fraternity in a war in which 1,000 Elks gave their lives.

When Hitler started his march on Poland it was evident that World War II was on its way, and the subversive elements here in America let loose a flood of propaganda against national preparedness which was aided and abetted by short-sighted isolationists who could not, or would not, see that sooner or later America would be forced into the fight. At this time the Order of Elks rendered one of its greatest services to the national cause. The grand lodge created a national defense and public relations commission and launched an intensive campaign to awaken our people to the necessity for preparedness. Public meetings throughout the land were held for the purpose of stimulating patriotism; prizes offered to high school students for the best essays on preparedness, and schools to qualify young men for the Government aviation training course were only a part of the aggressive battle waged by the Elks to prepare our country for its inevitable entry into war.

When the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor the Elks' war commission went into action on all fronts. The memory of its activities are too recent to require recital here. We all remember the "Write 'em a letter" campaign, to bring letters from home to the men and women at the front; its recruiting service rendered both the Army and Navy; the chain of fraternal centers ranging from coast to coast, which served millions of members of the armed forces on their way to and from the front. We also know that millions were invested in war bonds by Elk lodges, and hundreds of their homes were turned over for Red Cross and other community purposes.

The fighting phase of the war is over. The record of the Elks' contribution to victory is written in the pages of history. What we all must remember now is that the price of our victory is eternal vigilance.

There is just as much need for a militant Order of Elks now, as in the darkest days of the war. Peace, when it comes, must be an enduring peace. It is the duty of this generation to see that the next generation is not required to fight another war. A war, which if it comes, will mean the end of civilization. War weakens the moral fiber and if it ever comes again what the atom bomb leaves will come crashing down in complete disintegration of humankind.

We must have a strong America, we must never let down our defense and tempt an enemy to rush out and try for a quick knockout. We must have a brave America, qualified for world leadership and courageous enough to lead along the path of right. We must have a citizenry working harmoniously under the greatest Constitution ever devised for a country where tolerance and good will shall be their guide.

Let us not forget that America has her enemies at home and abroad. Crackbrained theorists are quite willing that our structure of government should be destroyed in order that their schemes for a "better life" might be tried. Communism is not dead. It is eagerly watching for a breach in our walls to swarm in and overwhelm our Government. Intolerance is far from extinct. It is attempting to crawl out of the hole into which it was driven during the war. This is indicated by spasmodic stirrings of the Ku Klux Klan. It is a movement that will not happen in the State of Wisconsin, the home of Grand Exalted Ruler Charles R. Broughton, of the Order of Elks, for he went into the courts and succeeded in having the charter of the Klan revoked. That is militant Elkdom.

An organization of more than 800,000 American citizens pledged to uphold the Constitution, to respect the rights of their fellows, to be tolerant to all men, must generate a moral force that can be used against the enemies of America. It has the power, strength, and will to stand firmly against any encroachment on the Constitution, or the rights of Americans of every race, creed, and color to enjoy freedom guaranteed by our Constitution and laws. The right "to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" is inherited from our forefathers, and it was purchased by their blood. It must not be destroyed by ruthless seekers for world power from abroad, or by the purveyors of moral hatred and religious intolerance at home.

In World War I 1,000 Elks died in the hope that they had purchased a free world with their blood. More than 1,800 died in World War II, hoping that they finished the task begun by their brothers of World War I. The question "have they died in vain" must be answered by you and me, and every loyal citizen of America, and it must be "no."

One of the world's most beautiful memorials stands in the city of Chicago. It is a building of unsurpassed architectural richness of design. It was built by the members of the Order of Elks as a tribute to their brothers who died in two world wars.

Let us with all our hearts, souls, and minds, with every fiber of our being, pray that this memorial to our heroic dead will never be destroyed by enemy bombs.

Bankrupt Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1947:

BANKRUPT LEADERSHIP

If nothing else will persuade them, the remarks of Republican Senator MORSE, whose sympathy with unions is not open to question, should convince men like William Green and Philip Murray that they are providing their followers with a very dubious quality of leadership.

Senator MORSE, after listening to Messrs. Murray and Green tell the Senate Labor Committee they were opposed to all of the proposed labor bills, warned them that some kind of legislation is going to be enacted. Expressing the hope that he would be able to vote for good legislation, Senator MORSE added, however, that if the choice were between no legislation and legislation that goes too far, he would vote for the latter. And he went on to ask: "What are you people in labor doing? You're giving us no help at all."

This happens to be the fact. Presumably fearing that if they endorse sound legislation they will be opening the door to that which is unsound, the top labor leaders have fallen back on the old technique of opposing anything. Furthermore, except for the somewhat patronizing proposal by Mr. Murray that the committee arrange a meeting between himself and "Willie" Green to discuss remedies for jurisdictional strikes, these men offer no solutions of their own.

Instead, they talk of banding together to fight labor legislation and try to whip up their members by alarmist warnings of plots to destroy the labor movement. This is nonsense, but it has worked before and the presumption is that Mr. Green and Mr. Murray are riding on the hope that it will work again. That, however, is where their leadership falls down, for in all human probability some labor legislation is going to be enacted at this session of Congress.

Undoubtedly there are some men in both House and Senate who would like to destroy unions. The same thing is true of some people throughout the country. But in each instance these are minority elements. The majority, in and out of Congress, are determined to have legislation dealing with abuses, but they do not want to destroy unions and they recognize the futility of trying to do so. Because of this, it is unfortunate that men like Mr. Green and Mr. Murray insist on pursuing a course which plays into the hands of the extremists. If they were wise leaders they would take the initiative in this matter and come forward with legislative proposals of their own—proposals adequate to deal with the abuses which are as obvious to them as to anyone else.

A Time for Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of contention, argument, and debate, which everyone daily encounters in a modern world and to which we, in this body, are peculiarly subjected, it seems altogether fitting to pause for a moment to call attention to the fact that this is Brotherhood Week. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star on this timely subject:

A TIME FOR BROTHERHOOD

Every normal person will say he is in favor of brotherhood and the Golden Rule. The trouble is that we do not consistently live up to what we favor. Prejudice, bigotry, narrowness of mind, and meanness of spirit are part of the human make-up. They have plagued mankind from the beginning, and they probably will be with us always. But they can be moderated. They can be bridled. They can be educated out of our system to a point where they will cease being a threat to the happiness and safety of our national and world society.

This is the theme of the Brotherhood Week now being observed here and throughout America under the sponsorship of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It affirms that we all belong to one family living in one world under the fatherhood of one God. It affirms, as a practical rule of existence, that we should do to others as we would have others do to us. It affirms what is most needed to promote a decent and enduring peace—the simple, common-sense principles that are universally endorsed but not practiced nearly enough.

It is good to devote a week to soul-searching on this subject. America is a place made up of diverse racial strains and religious beliefs. It is a place where brotherhood and the Golden Rule, if practiced more faithfully than in the past, could work wonders. The sooner we ourselves improve in this respect, the sooner will there be similar improvement abroad, and improvement all around is vitally necessary. In the atomic age, in our own land and the world at large, we are either going to cultivate the art of human relations and exalt the brotherly spirit or we are going to gamble with the survival of civilization. This is an excellent time for everyone to give thought to that and look into his heart for the dark things that may be there to be cut out.

The Budget Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, from the New York Times of February 21, 1947:

Every old soldier enjoys a reunion with his former outfit. It is with particular pleasure and pride, as an ex-doughboy in the Seventy-seventh Division, that I am attending this activation of the Seventy-seventh Division and its associated units of the Organized Reserve, under command of Gen. Julius Adler.

This is not the time for you and me to swap stories about the wartime exploits of the Seventy-seventh Division. The division's deeds stand bright on the Nation's military records in two wars, from the Vesle to Ormac Bay, from the Argonne to Okinawa. As for me—well, General Adler and I served together in the Three Hundred and Sixth Infantry Regiment in those days of 1918–19, when our only point of difference was whether F Company or H Company was the best company in the regiment. I proved over and over again that F Company was, but he was stubborn and I could never convince him. Any tall tales that I might tell about those days, General Adler (Captain Adler to me) can top, I am sure.

In this war my military concerns were different, but I always found time to follow the career of the Seventy-seventh Infantry Division in the Pacific, and to keep track of what the Twenty-second Corps Artillery was doing in Europe. It was my fortune to be in Japan a year ago, shortly before the Seventy-seventh was mustered out, and to talk to General Bruce, who commanded the division, and the men from my old company who were kind enough to take the trouble to come from quite a distance to greet me.

I do not propose to dwell on the exploits of the Seventy-seventh and of the Twenty-second Corps Artillery in battle. Instead, I want to refer to a noncombat incident of the campaign that recovered Guam from the Japanese. The incident involved Company L, Three Hundred and Seventh Infantry, but the reaction of those men to the situation was, I am sure, that of any true American. It was near Asinan that patrols of Company L, in mopping up the Japanese, came upon a concentration camp where 2,000 Chamorros had been held prisoners.

KNEW AMERICANS WOULD COME

Loyal to the core, carrying tiny American flags which they had hidden from the Japanese, the Chamorros told their rescuers, "We wait long time for you come." Their voices and attitude expressed full confidence that the Americans would come. In the words of the official history of the campaign, our soldiers, "watching the tiny children who carried huge baskets, and the women who trudged along with their household possessions on their backs * * * realized the meaning of freedom for these enslaved people.

It is worth remembering that this great American Nation kept its word and protected the little people under our flag. Yes, it is worth remembering—but it is not the complete picture. Those Chamorros who were killed in the Japanese attack on Guam in December 1941, those who died in the Japanese concentration camps, died because we in the United States in 1941 were not in a position to fulfill our commitment to protect those people against foreign aggression and conquest.

Big-hearted, generous America had promised that it could produce, simply and solely because we did not prepare in time for the emergency that history and events of the past decade had warned us would come. Yes, we did come back—but that was cold comfort to the Chamorros who died in slavery while they waited, or to the American soldiers and marines who suffered severe losses in routing the Japanese out of an island where the American flag had flown for more than 40 years.

That was a long, hard, bitter war. It cost the United States 400,000 lives, $350,000,000,000 in money. Those losses are a heavy burden for the people of this country to bear, a huge mortgage against our future prosperity. Yet it is a moral certainty that there would have been no World War II if we had had a first-rate Army in 1939, prior to the outbreak of war in Europe, instead of an ineffective little Army of 175,000, with obsolete guns and obsolete airplanes. Hitler and the Japanese warlords would never have dared to launch their drive for world rule, would never have gone on the rampage, if the United States had had readily available military strength. The whole situation came about because they were armed and we were disarmed.

OUR WORDS WERE IGNORED

Twice within the last 30 years we have been drawn into world wars, simply because we were disarmed, helpless in a military way, utterly lacking in power to control world events and make our influence felt in the direction of peace. Our diplomats wrote magnificent documents in favor of peace. We were eloquent in words but words were not enough. Nobody paid any attention to our words.

Today the question is whether this Nation is going to close its eyes to the facts of the world we live in, a world where power counts, whether we are going to make the same mistake a third time. If we rush to disarm while nations overseas maintain their armaments, we will be asking for World War III, with all the sorrow and anguish that goes with war, with the ruinous losses, with the risk of defeat, with the people who put their trust in us doomed once more to wait a long time for us to come.

A strong defense is our best security. It is at the same time the best means of supporting the work of our statesmen to bring about world organization for peace under the auspices of the United Nations. If we have a strong defense, you may rest assured that it will deter any future aggressor from starting a war. But a strong defense, in an era of long-range weapons and planes with a 10,000-mile radius, cannot be potential strength alone, available for use after months or years of mobilization. It must be ready strength, available immediately.

I should like to explain, as briefly and as clearly as I can, the importance of the part which you as Reservists are to take in maintenance of a strong defense.

The planned strength of the Regular Army as of July 1 is 1,070,000 men—400,000 in the Air Force, 670,000 in the Ground Force and supporting services. More than one-half of the effectives are overseas, chiefly in the areas assigned to us in Germany, Japan, and Korea. Those soldiers are the outposts of our national security. The vital importance of the work they are doing, in preventing the recurrence of war in those overseas areas, inhabited as they are by 100,000,000 Germans and Japanese, makes it imperative that the strength of those forces should not be cut down.

Of the troops left in this country the greater part are engaged in activities that sustain the forces overseas—in ports of embarkation, in hospitals, in training centers, in transportation and supply. With the bulk of our effective forces committed, directly or indirectly, to the task of occupation, scattered far and wide, the number of Regular Army troops available and uncommitted, in readiness for emergency, is too small to be effective.

Present prospects are that no more than 2 divisions in the Ground Forces (30,000 men) and 18 air groups (48,000 men) will be available in this country as tactical forces. Yet, it does not take much of an expert to know that an army is not strong unless it has a considerable portion of its troops available to meet any emergencies that may come up.

TRAINED CIVILIANS NEEDED

American tradition and American economy will not accept a great standing Army. The alternatives, unless we are to stand defenseless, with commitments unredeemed and our national security at the mercy of any aggressor, is to rely for mobile tactical forces in case of emergency on a strong force made up of trained civilians—the National Guard and the Organized Reserves.

There is no way in which this action can have available in time of peace the number of trained men needed for a balanced force in the National Guard and Organized Reserves without universal military training, the plan for which would include a short period of basic training and a further required period of service in the National Guard, Organized Reserves, or equivalent service. Without such a system, the National Guard units and Organized Reserve units that exist on paper cannot be expected to obtain their allotted strength. And without universal military training there will be no pool of trained men for replacements and possible expansion.

You can be counted on to explain to the people of America the necessity for an adequate military defense and the soundness of universal military training as a program to fill that need.

The time to begin is now. We cannot begin too soon to give the United States the

strength required by our place in the world. An army on a blueprint is a poor asset for security.

Another phase of the national defense program that needs your support is recruiting for the Regular Army. We must keep the Regular Army up to strength. Not only are the Regulars the backbone of any military plan, but they are indispensable for training the other components of the Army. No other source can provide the professional soldiers who can test strategy, tactics, weapons, and equipment, and who can pass on to the National Guard and Organized Reserves the benefit of their experience.

There is a third indispensable for a strong defense, just as important as universal military training and men for the Regular Army, and that is an adequate appropriation of money. There is not enough time to go into the subject thoroughly at this moment. Let me say, however, that the War Department is well aware of the need for economy in Government expenditures.

We learned in the last war the military value of the Nation's productive capacity, and we know well enough that a high level of productive capacity cannot be retained unless the economic condition of the country is sound and solvent. Full account of the need for retrenchment in expenditures was taken when the War Department budget for the coming fiscal year was made up. We reduced our preliminary estimates of expenditures by 40 percent, cutting wherever it was possible. For one thing, much to our regret, we reduced the Army Air Forces from 70 groups to 55 groups.

WHAT BUDGET CUT WOULD MEAN

If the proposed further cut of $1,000,000,000 is made from the military budget, it will mean a reduction in effective strength of 200,000 soldiers, one-fifth of the Army, and that will mean an army too weak to carry out the duties assigned to it; it will mean a cut of 50 percent in the program for the National Guard and Organized Reserves; it will mean a further reduction in the program for scientific research and development; it will mean an Air Force reduced to 38 groups, only 6 of them in this country—a second-rate air force, equipped with planes soon to be obsolete.

In the matter of paring down appropriations we should bear in mind General Marshall's appraisal of the condition of the Army in 1939: "Continuous paring of appropriations had reduced the Army virtually to the status of that of a third-rate power."

If the additional cut of half a billion dollars is made, as proposed, in the appropriation for the civil functions of the War Department, the half billion must come, wholly or in great part, from the funds requested to prevent famine in the areas of Germany and Japan occupied by our troops. Famine in those areas would render impossible the continuance of occupation.

Your presence here at this activation ceremony shows that you have made a good start toward solving the problems that lie ahead of you and the Army. I have the utmost confidence in your success. As combat men during the war, you bore the brunt of the struggle for victory. You took everything the Japanese and Germans could throw at you, and gave the enemy more than he could take. I know that you who fought, you who saw your comrades fall in freedom's cause, will do your part to defend that cause from further peril, in a world where military power still has such importance in international relations.

Because I realize full well that the difficulties you may encounter in your peacetime service will act only as incentives, not as barriers, I repeat to you General Bruce's brief comment on the Seventy-seventh Division's solution of a battle problem in the Philippines:

"The book would say it can't be done, but it was done—it had to be."

Higher Wages From Lower Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article in today's Collier's, written by James D. Mooney, president of the Willys-Overland Co., of Toledo, Ohio. It is a most constructive opinion from a man who has spent years completely forgetting himself working for the public good. This article, which has been wrought out after a great deal of research and study, presents the conclusion of this outstanding citizen on how a reduction in taxes will bring about an increase in Federal income. It follows:

HIGHER WAGES FROM LOWER TAXES

(By James D. Mooney, president, Willys-Overland Motors, Inc.)

Business and industrial men know that the surest way to cut volume and profits is to raise their prices so high that people stop buying—to overprice their markets. But somehow or other this fact of life seems to have escaped the men who decide what Federal taxes will be. I believe we have reached the point where Uncle Sam has actually overpriced the tax market.

The Federal tax rate of 38 percent on corporate income, as an example, is so high that it is gradually drying up corporate income. Business is being slowly starved to death. Large and small companies in greater number every year are having to go to the banks and insurance companies for working capital. I believe that this 38-percent tax is actually operating to reduce the Federal revenue. I submit that if the corporate income-tax rate were cut from 38 percent to 20 percent, the Government would actually get more money—just as in business you get more profits in dollars if the profit per unit is lowered to the point where vastly more sales are made.

When you talk about corporate income taxes you are likely to leave people pretty cold. It sounds kind of abstract anyway. And why worry about taxes on somebody else—especially a corporation?

That might be all right too—if that is the way it really is. But actually you—the consumer—pay all corporate taxes in the end.

All business costs must come out of the income the business gets through sales of its products. All taxes are part of these costs—and they are part of the price of everything you purchase.

As a consumer and user of everything from bread to locomotives you are the one who finally pays all the costs and all the taxes.

And today things have gotten to the point where you are paying a great many taxes you may never even have heard about.

In 1945 the total national income equaled $152,604,000,000, and the total taxes collected equaled $51,432,000,000. What this all comes down to is that about $15 out of every $45 you earn goes down the chute marked "taxes."

When you buy a $1,200 car, for example, you are actually getting only about $900 worth of automobile and approximately $300 in taxes. Two hundred and six separate unseen tax levies are plastered on the various units of a $900 car from the time production on it starts until the time you take it off the dealer's floor.

After you get the car and start using it, the tax bite is put on you regularly mile by mile. The Federal gasoline tax of 1½ cents a gallon is one. Oil, tires, parts, and accessories are on the tax list too, and each of them comes to you bearing a Federal excise tax.

This sort of tax burden does not hit just in automobiles; it covers everything. You've read a lot about the housing problem. What would you think of a house advertisement like this?

"Ten thousand dollars gets you a $7,500 house with $2,500 taxes as special hidden features."

That's about the way it is. So don't let yourself get lulled into complacency on this tax business, for it's the No. 1 item on any shopping list.

The cost of living is obviously high, but it certainly would do no harm to start talking about the need for a little economy in our Federal housekeeping.

Let's take a look at some Government payroll figures. In 1935 there were just under 720,000 civilian employees on the Federal pay rolls. Today there are nearly 3,000,000.

What do they all do? Are they all necessary? Have you ever stopped to think that everyone of those nearly 3,000,000 employees is living at your expense?

GROWTH OF FEDERAL "TAKE"

In 1935 the average Federal tax was about $25 per person per year. In 1946 the average is about $300. That's quite a jump in anybody's money—and don't forget it is, or rather was, your money. Yet a cut in tax rates can increase real wages, increase profits, and increase Federal income, all at the same time. That sounds like a self-contradictory statement, doesn't it? But let's analyze it for a minute.

Suppose Government taxes were cut in half. Suppose that instead of $15 out of every $45 you earned, taxes were reduced to $7.50 out of every $45. That would, in effect, increase your take-home pay from $30 to $37.50, by cutting down the price of everything you had to buy. For instance it would make that $1,200 car cost you only $1,050, because the tax burden would have been cut from $300 to $150.

Now, it does not take any crystal-ball gazing to see that if automobiles could be cut from $1,200 to $1,050 there would be a lot more cars sold and a lot more people would be working in the factories that make the cars, in the service stations, and in all the supplier factories as well. More steel would be needed—more jobs in the steel mills. More freight traffic would create jobs for more workers on the railroads and so on, all down the line.

Here is one subject that management and labor ought to get together on. Both management and labor are likely to overlook one all-important fact, namely, that they are all consumers and that in the end it is as consumers that high tax rates hit them. Every workman, whether he knows it or not, is working about 6 hours a week for taxes and for nothing else.

If labor and management ever really got together on that one, they would bring the tax facts home to every man, woman, and child in America in such a way that no Congress would resist. Any way you look at it, such a combined fight against waste in government would be the most constructive economic crusade which labor or management has ever undertaken. And it would be a crusade in which everybody would be a winner.

Every 3 months, come drought or rain, every business in America, large or small, has to step up and plank down 38 percent of its income in taxes.

Have you ever stopped to figure out just how much of a burden this is? You know from experience in running your own affairs, that it is hard to build up enough cash sur-

plus, or savings, to take care of repairs on the house, doctor bills, insurance and the hundred and one other items that make up your operating budget.

No home and no business can escape the necessity for providing for such expenses. Ordinarily, the first duty of any industrial manager is to keep his working capital intact. He is supposed to set aside enough out of current income to keep the business in shape to pay his bills. That was a tough enough job under any circumstances, but today, with the tax collector coming around every 3 months and asking for a 38-percent cut of net income, more and more businesses are finding it necessary to borrow the money to pay the tax bill.

BORROWING AND INSOLVENCY

That can't go on too long, because sooner or later there won't be anyone left who will be willing to make the loan. By any rule of business arithmetic no business can be considered solvent if it has to borrow money every quarter to pay its tax bill.

Generally, a business is considered well managed if it is able to earn 7 percent on its working capital over a period of years. As a matter of historic fact, most of them do not earn that much every year. In the past they have been able to lay aside enough in the fat years to carry them through the lean years, at least for a time—not all of them, mind you, only the better-managed ones. But now with the tax rate of 38 percent coming up and hitting them every 3 months, it is a mighty lucky company that doesn't have to hit the banks for a loan just to pay the tax bill.

The tax structure cries aloud for a comprehensive analysis and reorganization. Piecemeal adjustments and makeshift rearrangements will not meet the needs.

The new Congress can render the Nation no greater service than to overhaul the tax structure and streamline it to provide relief for industry and business, higher real wages for workers, and sufficient revenue for good government.

If at the same time it cleans out waste and eliminates unnecessary bureaus and employees and gets the governmental machinery oiled up for efficiency and economy, it will win the plaudits of a grateful nation.

California Gives Uncle Sam Big Insurance Dividend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, last year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the fine showing made by the California State insurance fund in its coverage of Government projects during the war.

I am in receipt of a letter from Hon. Paul Scharrenberg, director of industrial relations for the State of California, in which he states that the California State fund has made an additional return to the United States Maritime Commission on its insurance premium for workmen's compensation coverage at the shipyards of Marinship Corp., Sausalito, Calif.

Mr. Scharrenberg's letter follows:

Reference is made to your extension of remarks, read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-ninth Congress, on July 1, 1946, titled "California State Insurance Fund Saves Money for Uncle Sam."

At that time, speaking of workmen's compensation insurance for Marinship Corp., Sausalito, Calif., you cited an insurance premium saving of $391,657.19 to the United States Maritime Commission, which was made possible by the nonprofit plan of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California.

I know you will be interested in the attached copy of February 4, 1947, letter addressed to the United States Maritime Commission. A further premium adjustment has made it possible for our State fund to return the additional sum of $64,301.92 to the Maritime Commission, making a total saving to date of $455,959.11, or 39 percent of the $1,169,125.93 premium paid by Marinship during the one year the State fund was permitted to carry the insurance. This is in accordance with the State Fund's agreement to adjust the premium on January 31, 1947, and again on January 31, 1948, based on a revaluation of incurred losses, taking into consideration the final termination and actual cost of numerous serious injury claims not heretofore completed. It is quite possible that still further savings will accrue to the United States Maritime Commission when final premium adjustment is made in 1948.

You will recall our recital of the difficulties encountered by the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California, as well as other competitive State funds throughout the Nation, in the attempt to secure a fair share of the insurance covering war projects conducted at Government expense on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. Had not the war projects rating plan, or "package" deal, been concocted by Government insurance men, the competitive State funds would not have been subject to serious discrimination and practical boycott. Rather, they would have been privileged to save untold millions of dollars for the war effort, as exemplified by the outstanding performance of the State fund of California in connection with the Marinship Corp.—United States Maritime Commission policy during 1944–45.

While it is the fervent hope of every one of us that we shall not become engaged in another world conflict, we should highly resolve to profit from past experiences and to never again permit our Treasury to be raided by self-seeking partisans. It must be remembered that the State funds of America have given distinguished service to industry and to labor for nearly 35 years. They have earned the right to participate with equality in the affairs of our Nation, either in peace or in war, and it is our obligation to give that right the fullest measure of protection.

Mr. Speaker, for the additional information of Members of Congress I am also appending the text of a letter sent to the Maritime Commission from the California State Insurance Fund, in which was enclosed a check for $64,301.92, dated February 4, 1947, and representing an additional dividend settlement on the Marinship Corporation policy. That letter reads as follows:

We are enclosing our check for $64,301.92, additional dividend settlement on the subject policy. This payment is in accordance with "Agreement regarding dividend adjustment" negotiated in May 1946, wherein the amount of incurred losses is to be revalued as of January 31, 1947, and January 31, 1948, and the dividends to be adjusted at the time of each such revaluation.

The current adjustment represents a further dividend of 5.5 percent on $1,169,125.93 earned premium, based on indicated incurred losses totaling $623,997, a loss ratio of 53.5 percent. This payment of $64,301.92, plus $391,657.19 previously paid, represents a total saving to date of $455,959.11, or 39 percent of the premium paid under the policy.

Admission of Jews Into Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter which I wrote yesterday to the Secretary of State on the vital matter of admitting 100,000 Jewish displaced persons into Palestine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
February 20, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Knowing of your countless and pressing duties, may I nevertheless bring to your attention my earnest recommendation on a subject which I feel calls for immediate and definitive American action.

May I respectfully recommend to you that the Department of State use its good offices in making its strongest representations to the British Government for the immediate admission into Palestine of 100,000 Jewish displaced persons.

You are, of course, familiar with the long history of American support and sympathy with this objective and with the long record of the British Government in barring the doors of Palestine to immigration of the people of Israel. There has been more empty talk and broken promises upon this subject than perhaps on almost any other in the whole field of foreign relations. The need for admitting the 100,000 Jews into Palestine demands fulfillment at this time rather than further delaying tactics, vague promises, or further investigation.

May I point out to you just a few facts which seem to me irrefutably to reinforce my recommendation.

1. President Truman's repeated recommendation, based originally on the Harrison Report of September 1945, for the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine is a year and one-half old, and still there has been no action along this line.

2. The recommendation for admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine made by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on April 28, 1946, has also been gathering dust.

3. It is 2 years since VE-day, and there are still some 225,000 stateless Jews in Europe, more than 90 percent of whom have signified their fervent desire to emigrate to the Holy Land.

4. The Congress on many occasions, most recently through its Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, urged the free entry of Jews into Palestine to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities (which are still very vast), toward the goal of upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home.

5. The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations in 1939 declared

the English white paper invalid and contrary to the Balfour Declaration for the establishment of the Jewish national home in Zion.

6. The League of Nations' Palestine mandate to the British Government says that Britain is to "facilitate Jewish immigration." That mandate, endorsed by 52 nations, still stands until it is superseded by any other covenant. It is embodied in the Anglo-American Convention of 1924. The mandate power must fulfill its obligations and cannot alter any of the terms of the mandate without the consent of the other signatory powers.

7. To further delay the matter of immigration will mean a tortuous wait until perhaps September when the United Nations Assembly will meet. The needs of the displaced persons cannot wait until that time.

May I, therefore, in the light of these and countless other incontrovertible facts, respectfully recommend that you take action in order that the humanitarian objective of Jewish immigration may be realized, and in order that the good word of the United States may be fulfilled.

With kindest personal regards and assurances of my high esteem, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Apology to Author of "Pearl Harbor"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I had printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Times entitled "Pearl Harbor." In the editorial, comment was made upon a book of the same title, written by George Morgenstern. In fairness to Mr. Morgenstern, the Times has written a subsequent editorial entitled "Apology to an Author." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APOLOGY TO AN AUTHOR

We have received a letter from George Morgenstern, author of the recently published book Pearl Harbor. He says, in part:

"You say, 'What Morgenstern didn't mention was that two of the four Republican members of the committee, Representatives BERTRAND GEARHART, of California, and FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, signed the majority report.' In the foreword, page X, the members of the congressional committee are listed, with their party affiliations. Also in the foreword, page XI, you would have found, if you had looked, the following paragraph: The committee reports, submitted July 20, 1946, constituted three separate statements of opinion. The majority report was signed by all six Democrats and was adhered to without express qualification by Representative GEARHART. The minority report was submited by Senators FERGUSON and BREWSTER. Representative KEEFE, although signing with the majority, filed a supplementary statement which, in essential respects, placed him with the minority.'"

Our apology to Mr. Morgenstern for skimming over his foreword, where this information appeared. We had expected to find such vital facts in the body of the book.

The fact remains that Representatives GEARHART and KEEFE did sign the majority report. Mr. KEEFE's separate report was in the nature of a straddle. Three months of hearings and more than 10,000,000 words of evidence failed to convince anyone but Senators BREWSTER and FERGUSON that the finger of blame should have pointed to high Washington officials. And their minds were made up before the hearings ever started.

Address of Hon. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made to the New Canaan Republican Town Committee at their Lincoln Day victory dinner on Saturday, February 15, 1947, at the New Canaan Country Club:

My friends of New Canaan, it is always a delight for me to be back in New Canaan. I have a very special feeling for you here for it was in New Canaan on Memorial Day last year that I was accorded a reception which I shall never forget. The fine citizens of this community encouraged me to go into politics and assisted me in many ways during the campaign victoriously concluded on November 5.

Repeatedly in the past you have shown in this New England town a sense of civic responsibility and the sort of intelligent interest in public affairs which is essential to the preservation of our system of government. This is vital particularly today when this system is held up for reexamination and attack, when those things for which we recently fought a war are still very much in jeopardy.

I am very much honored to be here with you this evening to talk to you at this Lincoln Day celebration. It was approximately fourscore and seven years ago that Lincoln came into national prominence, and it was fourscore and seven years before that, that our Nation was born. Accordingly it is appropriate that we should think deeply about this man whose one hundred and thirty-eighth anniversary we are clebrating. It is appropriate—nay, it is vital—that we should give more than mere lip service to the attitudes for which he lived and died. It is vital because if we fail to understand the portentous implications of our present predicament, we may in the end forfeit those very things which Lincoln apostrophised in his speeches and which he defended with his life. We who are Republicans can rightfully claim Abraham Lincoln as our guiding spirit and as the founder of our party. We can claim this while recognizing that Abraham Lincoln, because of his philosophy, belongs to all parties, all races, all creeds—and, indeed—all nations. In recognizing this, we should rededicate ourselves to those principles for which he stood, and thus vindicate our great inheritance.

What were some of these principles? Abraham Lincoln said: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is not democracy." In saying this Abraham Lincoln admirably stated what is in fact the great challenge of our system. It requires at all times a nice balance not only between the three branches of our Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—but also between the Government and the people. In recent years we have witnessed a gradual departure from this thesis. As Abraham Lincoln said: "The legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere." In other words, it is the function of Government to regulate, but not to control and to remain at all times the servant and not the master of the people. In my opinion three main factors have contributed to the extension of the executive power: First, the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution which has been interpreted so loosely that elevator operators in buildings in which certain interstate businesses were housed have been held to be subject to Federal regulation; secondly, the general welfare clause of the Constitution has been given such a wide latitude that the Federal Government has come increasingly to do for the people that which they can do better for themselves; and third, the sixteenth amendment in 1913 which gave the Federal Government the power to collect income taxes and by so doing enlarged its power over the people. To be sure this power was placed in the hands of Congress. However, since the money once appropriated is spent by the executive department, it contributed to its growth.

I believe it was Lord Acton who said that "All power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely." We should do well to bear this in mind, especially today, when because of the suffering and depredations of the recent war people all over the world have come to lose faith in popular government. We must restore that faith in order to survive; we cannot restore that faith unless we live by it within our own borders; we must believe in our system; we must believe in individual responsibility rather than Government responsibility. If men use their freedoms simply in their own interests, then we are well on our way back to human bondage. Our system depends on a high sense of public morality and mutual trust for its continuance. These qualities Abraham Lincoln personified for all Americans. If we can really live according to his precepts, then we need have no fear for the future, for we shall build in this country a civilization which will match in deep spiritual purpose the unprecedented might of our industrial and military machine. There is no escaping the central truth that men can go no further than their own moral fiber will carry them. Conflict exists between those who believe in group progress and those who recognize that all progress must be individual in order for the group to benefit.

It is this respect for the individual which distinguishes our system from the others. It is the function of our Government to safeguard minority interests while protecting the majority from minority control.

When majority rule is thwarted, the individual is gradually reduced to serfdom. Lincoln said: "A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority as a permanent arrangement is wholly inadmissible. So that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left." (First inaugural address, March 4, 1861.)

We who believe passionately in our system, believe that the people should often unite but that they must never be fused.

In a constitutional democracy, a republic such as ours, people are protected by rules and regulations rather than by men. If the people of this country are to continue to be immune from the whims of public officials or the vengeance of irresponsible groups, then must we indeed live according to the ideas which we so loudly proclaim. If we are to be safe from the arbitrary interferences of government, then it is urgent that we should play the part in our Government to which our franchise entitles us. It is not enough to indulge in lazy complaints; it will get us nowhere to hurl bitter invectives at the Congress, at the Supreme Court, or at the executive department, if we are not ready to do our share in peace as most of us did it in war.

We are living in a period of continuing conflict, and we cannot afford to grow tired at this time.

There has been a tendency in some quarters to expect the Eightieth Congress to eliminate overnight the wastefulness and extravagance and duplication of the New Deal. This we cannot do. It is easy for the various agencies of our Government to find plausible reasons for their perpetuation. Cleaning house is a difficult proposition and becomes more difficult as the unwieldy weight of our Government increases. I am very much opposed to curtailing our Military Establishment in any way which threatens our national safety or which makes it impossible for us to discharge our national commitments. We must pay the interest on the national debt, and it would be highly dangerous for us to reduce this interest. We must not jeopardize the Government holdings of millions of Americans; we must not diminish the confidence of the people in their Government. It is unlikely that we can diminish the expense of our Veterans' Administration, and there is no question that we must to some extent give assistance to people outside our borders who face the future with a despair born of acute physical suffering.

Having said all this, however, we can still cut the budget. I believe that we can cut the budget, balance it, make payments on the national debt, and reduce personal income taxes, and I believe that this should be done as expeditiously as possible. I believe further that a reduction in tax rates will, as in the past, bring an increase in tax revenues. It will do so if we reduce the penalties on thrift which have curtailed men's ambitions in recent years; it will do so if we provide relief for those millions of Americans of fixed income who have suffered from the inflationary pressures of the postwar period; it will do so if we diminish the tax burden of the millions of workers on whose productive capacities many millions of people depend.

If we can provide a substantial measure of relief along these lines we will not only do much to restore the Government to the people, but we will also have made an important step toward solving the urgent problems with which labor management relations have been fraught. In this connection I hasten to add that we must approach without animosity the questions which have arisen in recent years with respect to our Nation's economy, bearing in mind that it is not the function of Government to take sides in these conflicts. The Government is not properly a biased referee changing its allegiance with shifts of public opinion. The Government must hold itself aloof from these passing passions in order to provide the steady guidance needed to restore balance to our economy. Just as we must restore balance among the separate branches of our Government, so must we in the interest of the national welfare of all the people achieve an economic balance. I reject the battle lines between labor and management which were drawn up during the past few years by the New Deal Government. I reject them as false and pernicious. The real battle has been between the Government and the customer—in other words, between the Government and the people. This balance cannot be restored until the Government withdraws the dead and heavy hand of mediocrity from the life of the Nation. It cannot be restored until the ban on initiative has been removed.

We in the Republican Party believe with Abraham Lincoln that "Property is the fruit of labor * * * property is desirable as a positive good in the world * * * that some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise." This attitude is as valid today as it was at the time it was uttered. Almost 100 years ago Lincoln said: "To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy subject of any good government." How can this be done if the Government arrogates to itself more and more control over the lives of the people? How can this be done if morbid and predatory bureaucracy takes the place of adequate incentives for outstanding achievement?

Again to quote Lincoln: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. * * * When all Government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington, it will become venal and oppressive."

This is the main job which lies before the Eightieth Congress: To rise above the pressures of the moment, above personal political safety; above the expediencies of the hour in order to achieve a return to the concept of individual freedom personified by Abraham Lincoln. The Government can provide no open sesame to an earthly paradise; neither can it reduce taxes while continuing the high level of appropriations. There is a field for Government to act in, but that field must be limited to those aspects of life where the individual is unable to act effectively.

Now, what did Abraham Lincoln think about our foreign relations? He said: "In our intercourse with other nations, it behooves us to be at once compromising and stern. If international understanding can be perpetuated by giving a little more and taking a little less, why, then, let us give a little more and take a little less. But never must we do all the giving. Rather in the case of a long and threatening misunderstanding let us prepare for the worst and work for the best." I think we can safely use these wise counsels as our criteria of conduct at this perilous time. We know from bitter experience, both before and after the recent war, that a policy of appeasement encourages aggressiveness. Our greatest strength lies in our ability to give a vigorous demonstration that our private property competitive incentive system of free workmen can continue to provide more benefits for more people than any system in the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a decisive hour. These are days in which our vision is sometimes impaired by the conflicting influences to which we are constantly exposed. The storms of controversy and the passions of special interests which swirl about our Government create a difficult climate for impartial judgments. There is nothing new in this. We know that Abraham Lincoln faced turmoil and vindictive criticism during the entire term of his Presidency. It has always been so. Man was born to struggle, and struggle he must if he is to survive.

It behooves those of us who have been elected by the people to serve them in high office to approach these problems in a spirit of calm deliberation. We must attempt to make our decisions from source material and on the most complete information available. We must weigh these vital issues on the sales of the general welfare and then move to rapid and effective action, certain in the knowledge that our decisions will not meet with unanimous approval. We must do this in the same spirit of high service as that in which the war was fought. This we can achieve if we will carry with us into the arena of our peacetime conflicts an abiding sense of those principles which we regard today as truly Lincolnian. These principles, if they are adhered to, can preserve for us the best of the past and prepare us to meet the tremendous challenge of the future.

Republicans Hailed for Budget Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

REPUBLICANS HAILED FOR BUDGET COURAGE—CAPITAL ATMOSPHERE SURCHARGED WITH NEW DEAL SPENDING SPIRIT

(By David Lawrence)

The Republicans in Congress are entitled to the applause of the whole country for their political courage.

For when politicians who could get votes by giving the public's money away to special groups or blocs apply restraints to themselves and actually try to cut down the Government's expenses and save money for all the people, the action is so rare that it merits attention.

So surcharged is the Washington atmosphere with the New Deal habit of spending and spending that the National Capital still seems to be dominated by critics from the Democratic side who are horror struck at the idea of a general cutting of the budget.

It may take a long while to rid official Washington of the spending complex it has had since 1933—that money is something turned out by printing presses and that debt is just a thing that can be piled up indefinitely.

COMMENTS ARE AMAZING

It is amazing to read the comments that are going forth these days about the determination of the Republicans to cut the Truman budget by several billions. One would think that $37,000,000,000 budgets are normal and that anyone who attempts to cut them is destroying the Government. Indeed, the cry of calamity if the budget is cut is a familiar one as it comes from bureaucratic circles. Only a few Democrats, like Senator BYRD, of Virginia, have been pleading for economy during the last decade, and now the Virginia Senator joins with the Republicans in demanding a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget.

Whether the budget can or cannot be cut exactly by any such figure is less important than the formidable opposition to any budget cutting which is coming from most of the Democrats and from President Truman. Just how Chairman Hannegan expects to reelect Mr. Truman—when he has sent a budget of $37,500,000,000 to Congress and only last month predicted a deficit for the current fiscal year, and there is already a cash surplus of more than $2,000,000,000 visible for next month—will remain somewhat of a mystery.

The Democrats generally are lining themselves up with the spenders. They are not helping in the budget-cutting process. Only the Republicans are carrying the ball on that issue, and they are doing it despite the sniping from the left wingers who, of course, want more and more spending and their vested interest in bureaucracy to continue.

The decision of the Joint Budget Committee of Congress to cut $6,000,000,000 from the Truman budget has been favorably received by the House of Representatives, where a large number of conservative Democrats are joining with the Republicans to cut down waste in Government. In the Senate, some Republicans here and there are weakening but a coalition may order a cut anywhere from $4,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000.

ECONOMIES STARTED

The details, to be sure, are not yet available, but already it is apparent that the determination to cut is having its effect throughout the Government departments. Economies that should long ago have been made are now being put into effect, especially in the Veterans' Bureau. As long as the psychology is one of increasing rather than diminishing expense, there can be no progress made. This is the tide that Republican policy is now reversing.

When it is considered that Mr. Truman wants to spend more than $37,000,000,000 a year and can't see any substantial cuts immediately—notwithstanding the fact that the budget he submitted for the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1948, will be covering Government operations fully 3 years after the war ended in Europe and almost 3 years from VJ-day—indicates how far away the administration is from recognizing that the people of America want to get back to a peacetime basis.

The difficulty, of course, is that the Democratic Party is still a New Deal party and is still wedded to the philosophy of getting votes by spending money. The Republicans, too, played that game many years ago but fortunately today they are trying to benefit the maximum number of people by cutting the budget and stabilizing the value of the dollar.

Hats Off to Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, State governors, mayors of cities, and many others throughout the Nation, have requested Congress to balance the budget and stop deficit spending. Few of these governors or mayors or others ever stopped to think that in order to enable Congress to stop deficit spending, they must stop deficit begging.

I am glad to note, however, that the Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Indiana passed House Concurrent Resolution 2. This resolution reads as follows:

Indiana needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington, will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States.

So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the senate concurring), That we respectfully petition and urge Indiana's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county court house and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come home.

Resolved further, That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us, and we with them to restore the American Republic and our 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

Indiana is to be congratulated as the first State in the Union to realize that they cannot pull themselves up by their own bootstraps by accepting Federal aid. The first State to realize that if the Federal budget is to be balanced, and deficit spending is to be stopped, the States and their political subdivisions must stop deficit begging.

We are just beginning to realize that as a people we have been sleeping at the switch. We have allowed a large part of our form of government to slip away from us. We asked our Uncle Sam for donations, relief, and aid for all kinds of projects. These he has given us, but the price he exacted—government by bureaucracy—has come too high. In our desire to get something for nothing, we forgot that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the luncheon opening the 1947 campaign of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., the Astor Gallery of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y., January 24, 1947:

We are gathered here today to open the 1947 campaign of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America. This organization, which, in the past, received most of its funds from the National War Fund, now embarks under its own power in search of aid from friends sympathetic to its cause.

This cause is not new or unusual. The aftermath of war has left millions of innocent war stricken men, women and children impoverished and unable to help themselves. Among them, and in great numbers, are the Lithuanians in Europe.

For centuries, this nation waged many battles for its freedom and heroically resisted all foreign attempts of occupation and oppression. It fought and defeated the Teutonic Knights. It resisted all attempts of denationalization by the Russians during their 120 years of occupation of Lithuania. Finally, the end of the first World War saw the return of complete independence to Lithuania and for 22 years it firmly established itself in the family of nations. It proved without doubt that Lithuanians, as free men, under a democratic system of government, rightfully deserved their hard-earned freedom.

The Second World War inflicted furious and unsparing havoc on this small nation. In proportion, it was one of the most afflicted. It suffered carnage of its population, destruction of its land and property and, worst of all, foreign military occupation.

A large percentage of its population was deported to slavery in strange and unfriendly lands. Others, seeking fundamental freedoms and human rights, left their homeland, and sought temporary refuge where they could.

To aid all these distressed Lithuanians is the chief aim of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America. During the past 3 years, this humanitarian agency extended all the relief and aid it could summon and assemble. It drew upon the generosity of the American people with vigor and appeal and when distribution was made abroad it was always done in the name of the American people who so generously responded.

Want knows no religious, racial, or physical boundaries. Under similar conditions, it affects all in equal degree and manner. Lithuanians in Europe share this common fate, a common fate of general want, of despair and uncertainty.

It is generally recognized and accepted that the people of Europe, and especially the refugees and the displaced persons, still need aid. To this end, international and voluntary relief agencies have worked unceasingly with force and sacrifice. However, international relief organizations alone cannot successfully meet this great and complex problem. Voluntary agencies, therefore, have been invited into this field to supply not only supplementary requirements and services, but also to provide the items of aid not coming within the scope of international bodies.

We are fully aware that lack of all things material is prevalent throughout Europe. This lack is all the more acute among the displaced persons. And what is most deplorable is the fact that these poor unfortunates have to depend on others for their food, clothing, and medical supplies. None of these essentials are available to them in adequate amounts. They can only share in what we Americans can and do spare.

The plight of the Lithuanians, suffering the terrible consequences of the war, deserves the attention, the sympathetic understanding, and support of every charity-minded American. Without this support, there is no other hope for their survival.

If, however, they do receive the help which the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America has obligated itself to provide them during 1947, their faith in true democracy will be further strengthened. The realization of this fact, too, shall bring them solace and consolation in their misery and want.

But material aid alone is not sufficient. The Lithuanian refugees, like the homeless of other countries who cannot return to their native lands, are seeking refuge in free lands of opportunity. They are sick to death of dependence upon others. They languish only in the hope of again living in freedom and self-sustenance. Let us not "close or narrow our gates" to them. They, like their relatives and friends here before them, will prove themselves worthy of our rich American heritage and prosperity, and become useful and valuable Americans.

A Tribute to George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a translation by Dr. Glen Levin Swiggett of the Spanish sonnet to Washington by Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda.

Dr. Swiggett is recognized as one of the most eminent writers of sonnets, and translator of those written in other languages, and it is apropros of the day and the occasion that this translation be included in this day's RECORD. It follows:

TO WASHINGTON

(By Glen Levin Swiggett from the Spanish of Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, 1816–1873)

No pattern in the past for your virtue!
No future copy history will give,
Nor other's memory in greatness live
In coming centuries equal to you.
Europe has seen her soil all bloodstained through
War's conquering evil genius combative;
But that the genius of Good God should give
Was to America the glory due.
Whilst making of the world wastelands dreary,
Let proud victor joy o'er his art of hate
And enslaved subjects command boastingly;
But in their hearts the peoples know, prostrate,
That only he is strong who rules them free,
That he alone who makes them great is great.

What Economy Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 19, 1947.

In the House on last Tuesday I spoke on the same subject. The views expressed in the Post-Dispatch editorial are greatly in line with my own thoughts on this important matter.

WHAT ECONOMY MEANS

Now that the fight for adequate military appropriations is going to the floor of Congress, the debate should be freed from all the hysteria about economy. Ruthless slashing of our defense budget cannot be itemized in terms of guns and planes alone. It means that we will have to butcher our foreign policy as well.

President Truman and the Army and Navy commanders have described the issue in terms of an "ineffective" Army, a "second rate" Air Force, and an "immobile" Navy. This picture is deadly serious. But it does not represent altogether what military weakness can mean.

Feeble arms mean feeble diplomacy. More than a century ago Clausewitz stated an unfortunate principle, when he said war was the logical extension of diplomacy. War comes when negotiation fails, and negotiation fails when a nation has no strength to support it. If the United States has to reduce its arms, which part of its foreign policy will it surrender?

Would we, for instance, be willing to retreat from Europe? A New York Times writer has stated that "the balance of power was restored roughly along the Stettin-Trieste line not because of the eloquence of Mr. Byrnes, but because of the power of the United States Army in Germany and in Trieste." Our withdrawal now would leave western Europe to fascism, nationalist expansion, or chaos.

Or should we pull our fleet out of the Mediterranean? Its presence there forestalled Russian pressure on Turkey and helped keep the Dardanelles open to world trade. The mere presence of American warships has protected the free flow of Arabian oil, which we need desperately for defense reserves.

And could we hoist anchor in the Far East? That would leave the Philippines defenseless, Japan neither safe nor democratic, and north China a void open to expanding Soviet power.

If we do not abandon parts of our foreign policy, then reduced appropriations will mean inevitable reduction of military defenses closer home. Would we abolish parts of our Reserves and National Guard? Or would we eliminate those three vast belts of bases which stretch from the Aleutians to Iceland in the north, from Japan through the South Pacific islands in the west, and from Iceland past the Canal Zone in the east? They are meant to keep any war far from the homeland.

Those are the objectives which depend upon America's military strength. Both have been balanced carefully in the defense budget by such men as General Marshall. As Secretary of State and former Chief of Staff, he understands both our commitments and the power needed to support them.

Which part of our foreign policy would the economy-minded Congressmen destroy? That is the issue before Congress. It should be met squarely, not in terms of dollars and cents, but with an earnest regard for American security and the peace of the world.

Address of Hon. Harold E. Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, at the annual Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club of New York, February 12, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Republicans, I have a very vivid recollection of the first Lincoln Day dinner that I attended. As I recall, it was a quarter century ago on February 12, 1922. As a lad of 14, I had accompanied my father, who was a Republican leader of our home rural county of Minnesota, to this annual observation of the birth date of the great humanitarian. The dinner was held in the capital city of St. Paul. At that time in the wake of World War I, a speaker eloquently discussed Abraham Lincoln's outlook toward the problems of reconstruction in the wake of war. He emphasized the sweep of Lincoln's vision, the depth and nobility of Lincoln's thinking, and the frankness and firmness of Lincoln's position. He referred to Lincoln's discussion of the controversy over his Emancipation Proclamation and the numerous conflicting proposals for the postwar policy and quoted directly from Lincoln's humble but immovable statement, "If the people should, by whatever mode or means, make it an executive duty to reenslave such persons, another, and not I, must be their instrument to perform it."

To me this statement and the circumstances under which it was delivered are representative in a superb degree of much that I have always admired in Lincoln. In it he recognizes that the will of the people shall govern. But at the same time makes it clear that he will not yield his personal basic convictions to those of others and he indicates clearly that he places principle above public office.

We meet tonight to honor the memory of Lincoln. We meet at an hour of rising strength for our Republican Party. On last November 5, the people of our country named our Republican Party as once again, after 16 years, the majority party of these United States. They indicated that decision by their free ballots by electing a clear Republican majority in both the Senate and the House, and a Republican majority of the Governors, including the able and outstanding chief executive of this State of New York, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey. It is also worthy of particular note that an unusually large and able group of young veterans of World War II were elected as new Republican Members of the House and Senate. It is clear that the young veterans, moved by their experiences in the years of war, are entering political activity to an increased degree, even as more than a century ago the young veteran Lincoln returned from his service as a captain of a company of volunteers in the Blackhawk Indian Wars and promptly entered the campaign for the Illinois Legislature, supported by the men of his generation who served with him.

It is well that we do meet as Republicans tonight to honor Lincoln. For any student of history must agree that it is to his humanitarian policies, his forthright, humble, courageous leadership, that we owe a heavy measure of the remarkable success of our party in the 86 years since he led it to its first national victory.

It is my view that our Republican Party can best honor Lincoln today, and best serve the people, by facing in a very frank and forthright manner the great issues of our time. Chief among these is our world economic policy. This is not an easy policy to establish. It involves a very broad reappraisal of the facts of our position now in the world and a major adjustment of Republican policy to meet these new facts.

We have attained an amazing productive ability. Through the fundamentals of our free economy, with free labor, private capital, individual management, and independent agriculture, we have reached the point where one-sixteenth of the world's people within our borders are producing more than one-fourth of all the world's goods and services. By the grace of God, and the stalwart fighting of our armed forces and those of our allies, our homeland is untouched by war. We are now the great creditor nation of the world. But elsewhere in the world large areas of the homelands of every other major nation have been ravaged by the scourge of war. Production has been destroyed and distribution systems disrupted. To countless millions of peoples scarcity is a tragic, cruel word. Hungry, they cry for more food but there is no more food. Homeless, they seek better

shelter but there is no better shelter. Shivering they reach for warmer clothing and for coal but it is not to be had. Every other continent seethes with social and political unrest. We review these facts with humility, as we seek to think through what this means in terms of policies which we must follow. We seek for answers on the basis of these truths.

I do not claim to have the answers. But I do have a deep conviction that we must find the answers on the moral basis of Lincoln's depth of humanitarian vision and the nobility of his compassion as in the closing days of his life he faced the reconstruction of this Nation, its people, and its battlefields in our only parallel of national experience with the devastation of war. And I do recall to you the tragedy and the hatreds and the economic loss within our country by other policies after his sudden death.

I do further believe that men of good will within our party and without can find answers on such a moral basis which will in fact prove to also be the best answers economically and politically. I seek not to impose details of position, but rather to stimulate the search for answers by exposing precise views.

We do desire for the future a continued high standard of living, with jobs to be had for all who wish to work, with abundant production and wide distribution of goods and services, with ample profits, and with an excellent parity income for agriculture, all with the maintenance of individual freedom for our citizens in a world at peace.

We wish to see the peoples in other lands emerge from the ruins of tragic battle and progress toward higher standards of living, with more and better food and clothing and shelter, with an increased measure of individual freedom, and to share with us in a world at peace.

Can these high objectives be met? Without minimizing the obstacles, I am optimistic that they can be met to a remarkable degree if we have faith in our fundamentals and intelligence and determination in following through.

How can we have the best hope of attaining these high objectives? It is my view frankly that we have the best hope of attaining these objectives if our Republican Party, after careful thought and study, definitely leaves behind all remnants of a policy of economic isolation and moves forward in the leadership of America in a new policy of world-wide economic participation. In plain language this means that we directly say that our Republican Party recognizes that a high tariff policy no longer suits America and that we believe in the increased flow of goods and materials and services and travel around the globe.

Obviously this requires a considerable readjustment in our thinking, and happily it is a readjustment required by our own attainment of great productive strength and strong credit position rather than by the sudden treacherous blow of an enemy as at Pearl Harbor. But the need of readjusted economic thinking is just as great as the need of readjusted military and political thinking that arose at the time of Pearl Harbor.

Let me make my position very clear. I do not open up the question of Republican tariff policy in former years. I do not begin a debate of Smoot-Hawley or any other tariff. I do not raise an issue of any previous votes on trade policy.

But I do directly open up for searching study, frank discussion, and ultimate party decision, what I consider to be one of the overshadowing issues of our time. In the light of the new facts now in the wake of World War II what shall be the Republican position on America's world economic and trade policy?

I open it squarely and welcome others in our party joining thoughtfully in the study and frankly in the discussion because the facts have changed and it will take time to search through. Meanwhile the world economic situation will not stand still. In fact even the silence of our party, in view of its earlier policy, would in and of itself have an adverse effect upon the thinking and the trend of policies in the other nations of the world.

Let us examine in some specific detail what such a new world economic policy will entail and why it is so needed. I recognize full well that there are a substantial number of people in our party who still follow the old party position and who still applaud the old slogans, which by changed conditions have become half truths, such as, "We cannot compete with Coolie Labor," "American Markets for America", "Protect Our Own," and others of that kind.

But I am convinced that if we begin now to frankly think this through, to face the facts, to talk it over, by the time we reach the 1948 platform, our Republican Party will take a new position for vigorous American participation and increased trade throughout the world.

There are four important factors that make this position essential to the future welfare of the people of America.

First of these is the tremendous increase in our productivity. With the skill of our workmen, the ability of our management, and the vigor of our private capital, we have reached the stage that clearly and definitely in the years ahead, in many lines, we must produce for world markets rather than only American markets, or we will find our economy snubbed in, first glutted and then withering with unemployment and deflation.

Second, we have developed tremendous capital resources and have become the great creditor nation of the world, so that we need high investment of capital at home and world-wide sources of investment as well, else our capital becomes stagnant and idle and reflects, in turn, in idle men and economic turmoil.

Third, with the extensive drains on our natural resources through war and peace, we are becoming increasingly dependent on raw-material sources elsewhere in the world for the sound long-term future of our economy.

Fourth, and above all, it is crystal clear to all of us that in this modern one world we can enjoy that precious peace with justice only in a world at peace, and this world cannot remain at peace unless there be that slow but steady improvement of standards of living of other peoples everywhere. This can only come, in turn, through an increased flow of trade and higher world production and increased individual rights and freedoms, which will never develop if America turns back to economic isolation.

Among those of our products for which we need world markets in the years ahead are wheat and cotton and dried fruits and machinery and automobiles and machine tools. Among the raw materials for which we need to look to the world in the years ahead are not only tin and crude rubber but also lead and copper and zinc.

By reason of this combination of circumstances, the United States of America has attained a position of preeminent world economic leadership. We must either broadly, intelligently, and fairly administer that leadership or by narrow, blind, repressive action abdicate that leadership. The result of abdication would be chaotic conditions in world economy, a withering domestic economy, with unemployment and bankruptcies, and less chance of lasting peace for all.

During this interim period, while the discussions of our future trade policies proceeds within the Republican Party, leading to a decision in the platform of 1948, it is of grave importance that we do not obstruct the existing trade program, while we share the responsibility of our national administration, with Republican majorities in the Senate and the House, and an opposition party President and executive branch.

A Republican Secretary of State, the Honorable James G. Blaine, under Presidents Garfield and Harrison, first initiated with substantial support the reciprocal-trade principle. Currently and realistically, when our national administration is divided between legislative and executive branches, Republican and Democrat, it is the only program under which our world economic policy can be advanced. It is not a perfect program. Improvements in the methods of negotiating the agreements should be developed as Senators Vandenberg and Millikin have ably pointed out. But the alternative is either to go forward now with the reciprocal trade agreements, or to slide backward in economic isolation. I consider it to be of tremendous importance, therefore, that our Republican Party follow through with interim support of the reciprocal trade program. The impending negotiations between 18 nations at Geneva to open in April should be held, and extensive agreements should be negotiated. Representatives of American industry and American labor and American agriculture and of our Republican Party should be present as observers during those negotiations.

Recognizing the difficulties in world trade presented by state-dominated trading agencies and bilateralism and discrimination, we should make it clear that while we intend to move forward on a world-trade program we will at the same time not be blind to discriminating obstruction of world trade by others. We will maintain saving clauses to prevent the dumping of goods. We will be interested, not only in the reciprocal relationships of other nations toward us, but in their nondiscriminatory relations to each other, as only by an increasing multilateralism of trade, fair and equal toward each other, can the peoples of all nations hope to restore and develop their standards of living

Likewise in looking to our future Republican trade policy, we must make it clear that we recognize that adjustments must be gradual, that we must safeguard American industry and labor and agriculture against sudden and extreme dumping of goods, and maintain quota limitations on any one product. Further we must see to it that our exports and imports maintain a balanced percentage between agriculture and industry and between industry of various sections of the country. In other words, our total trade policies must be equitable so that increased imports of agricultural products be met by increased exports of other efficiently produced agricultural products, and not by substitution of industrial products.

Likewise our extension of credit in other parts of the world, our investments, private and public, must be on a sound basis to be represented and reflected in sound development of resources in other lands, and of restoration of economic systems, and not be representative merely of political maneuvering.

One of the reasons why tariff and trade policy is most difficult to understand, is because any individual producer or manufacturer is prone to feel that if he could reduce the competition for his product he could have a greater margin and a better profit. And, of course, if all else remained the same at home and abroad and one single product was given an increased tariff, this would be substantially true. But the obvious fact is that no single product can be handled alone, and a program of special protection rapidly expands to many products at home and reflects in other lands, with the result that in fact, the total markets around the world for all products are reduced. The total demands for all products declines. The total jobs in the world are cut down. The total profits in the world decline. The standard of living of the people becomes lower.

The choice is clearly this. Do you wish to share in an expanding market with rising standards of living around the world, or do you wish to hold exclusively a shrinking market with increased unemployment and lowering standards of living. Do you wish to sell 80 percent of a large and expanding domestic market or do you wish to sell 100 percent of a small and shrinking domestic market. It is only natural that many would wish that they could do both. They would wish that they could hold exclusively a market which was also rising and expanding. But the plain laws of world economics in this modern world point out definitely that this is not possible. Just as an attempt to be narrow and restrictive between our States at an earlier day failed, so would an attempt to separate the nations of the world in an economic sense in this modern world fail.

There is need, however, for each industry and for each section of our economy to be alert so that it is fairly treated in relationship to the rest of the economy.

Another basis of much of the misunderstanding of the effect of world trade arises from the assumption that world consumption remains the same, while production rises to meet export opportunities. The fact of the matter, of course, is that producers are consumers, that wage earners are buyers, that profit makers need products. And so it is around the world. As activity increases, more goods are produced, and demand increased, and purchasing power rises, and in this process the total standard of living moves upward. Only when pools of capital are held stagnant or excessive governmental regulation straight-jackets developments, or artificial barriers interfere with the flow of goods, do we find repressive developments. Otherwise, the continuous urge of man is to produce and to consume more and more of goods and services.

It is, of course, also true that such an expanding developing world situation will require constant adjustments and readjustments in the industry and production of every nation. But these reconversions and adjustments would not be one particle as difficult as were the reconversions of war and then for peace at the end of the war.

Clearly the whole world is as close together now, industrially, scientifically, and in travel and communication, as the States of our Union were a century ago. It is equally clear that if we had insisted that each of the States of the Union should raise its own wheat, mill its own flour, make its own shoes, build its own automobiles, tailor its own clothing, the result would be that the peoples in none of the States would be enjoying the standard of living they enjoy today. We have now reached the point where the counterpart of this basic fact is upon us on a world level. We cannot abruptly change patterns of trade and of industry developed for a century on that world level. Nor are tariffs the only obstacles. The state-controlled trade, bilateralism, quotas, embargoes, are even more restrictive to trade. The adjustment must be gradual, they must be carefully worked out, they must be met by similar adjustments in all parts of the world. But the direction we must travel is clear. It is the direction of increased flow of trade and of travel and of capital, for the benefit of all people everywhere. Along that path, if coupled with sound domestic economic policies, fair and balanced national labor policies, the maintenance of our individual freedom of capital and of labor and of agriculture, with alert and dynamic and humanitarian government, lies a future of jobs and freedom and high standards of living for the American people. It is a path that will turn other people increasingly in the direction of individual freedom and away from dictatorial concepts, economic, social, political, or religious. Above all it is a path which keeps faith, through our fundamental concept of the individual dignity of man, with men and women and little children around the world. This is the challenge to our Republican Party and our Nation in the years ahead. I am confident that Lincoln's party and our America will meet that challenge.

Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the Washington Times-Herald of date February 21, 1947, as follows:

RED ARMY BUDGET TOPS OURS BY MERE FOUR BILLIONS

Moscow radio, monitored by the Associated Press, said last night Russia's military expenditures during 1947 will amount to $13,400,000,000—nearly $4,000,000,000 more than the sum Congress is expected to authorize for United States defense in the United States budget now being considered.

Arseni Zverev, Soviet Finance Minister, who submitted the new Russian budget of $74,280,000,000 to the Supreme Soviet for approval, said the thirteen-billion figure for national defense represented a decrease of $1,120,000,000 from the 1946 military total.

Under President Truman's proposed $37,500,000,000 budget, $11,200,000,000 would be earmarked for national defense. The $6,000,000,000 slash approved yesterday by the House is understood to include a cut of $1,750,000,000 in the United States military appropriation.

Thus, should the reduction be approved by the Senate, only $9,450,000,000 would be granted the American War and Navy Departments for the new fiscal year. This means that the United States arms budget is approximately 29 percent less than the amount Moscow will spend for armed might.

George Washington's Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include George Washington's Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation:

RULES OF CIVILITY AND DECENT BEHAVIOR IN COMPANY AND CONVERSATION

From a paper found among the early writings of George Washington copied from the original with literal exactness and edited with notes by J. M. Toner, M. D., 1888.

The text following is an exact copy from the original manuscript, having been carefully compared with the corrected therefrom, even when errors or omissions are obvious.

This book has been knawed by mice. Rule 12 and all at bottom of any of the pages had been nearly destroyed. Every word and letter remaining has been copied and are here given:

"1. Every Action done in Company, ought to be with Some Sign of Respect, to those that are present.

"2. When in Company, put not your Hands to any Part of the Body, not usually Discovered.

"3. Shew Nothing to your Friend that may affright him.

"4. In the Presence of Others sing not to yourself with a humming Noise, nor Drum, with your Fingers or Feet.

"5. If you Cough, Sneeze, Sigh, or Yawn, do it not Loud, but Privately; and Speak not in your Yawning, but put Your handkerchief or Hand before your face and turn aside.

"6. Sleep not when others Speak, Sit not when others stand, Speak not when you Should hold your Peace, walk not on when others Stop.

"7. Put not off your Cloths in the presence of Others, nor go out your Chamber half Drest.

"8. At play and at Fire its Good manners to give Place to the last comer, and affect not to Speak Louder than ordenary.

"9. Spit not in the Fire, nor Stoop low before it neither Put your Hands into the Flames to warm them, nor Set your Feet upon the Fire especially if there be meat before it.

"10. When you Sit down, Keep your Feet firm and Even, without putting one on the other or Crossing them.

"11. Shift not your self in the Sight of others nor Gnaw your nails.

"12. Shake not the head, Feet, or Legs, rowl not the Eys, lift not one eyebrow higher than the other, wry not the mouth, and bedew no mans face with your Spittle, by appr * * * r him * * * you Speak.

"13. Kill no Vermin as Fleas, lice ticks &c in the Sight of Others, if you See any filth or thick Spittle put your foot Dexteriously upon it, if it be upon the Cloths of your Companions, Put it off privately, and if it be upon your own Cloths return Thanks to him who puts it off.

"14. Turn not your Back to others especially in Speaking, Jog not the Table or Desk on which Another reads or writes, lean not upon any one.

"15. Keep your Nails clean and Short, also your Hands and Teeth Clean, yet without Shewing any great Concern for them.

"16. Do not Puff up the Cheeks, Loll not out the tongue rub the Hands, or beard, thrust out the lips, or bite them or keep the Lips too open or too Close.

"17. Be no Flatterer, neither Play with any that delights not to be Play'd Withal.

"18. Read no Letters, Books, or Papers in Company but when there is a Necessity for the doing of it you must ask leave: come not near the Books or Writings of Another so as to read them unless desired or give your opinion of them unask'd also look not nigh when another is writing a Letter.

"19. let your Countenance be pleasant but in Serious Matters Somewhat grave

"20. The Gestures of the Body must be Suited to the discourse you are upon

"21. Reproach none for the Infirmities of Nature nor Delight to Put them that have in mind thereof.

"22. Shew not yourself glad at the Misfortune of another though he were your enemy.

"23. When you see a Crime punished, you may be inwardly Pleased; but always shew Pity to the Suffering Offender.

"* * * too much at any Publick * * *

"25. Superfluous Complements and all Affectation of Ceremonie are to be avoided yet where due they are not to be Neglected.

"26. In pulling off your Hat to Persons of Distinction, as Noblemen, Justices, Churchmen &c make a Reverence, bowing more or

less according to the Custom of the Better Bred, and Quality of the Persons Amongst your equals expect not always that they Should begin with you first, but to Pull off the Hat when there is no need is Affectation, in the Manner of Saluting and resaluting in words keep to the most usual Custom.

"27. Tis ill manners to bid one more eminent than yourself be covered as well as not to do it to whom it's due Likewise he that makes to much haste to Put on his hat does not well, yet he ought to Put it on at the first, or at most the Second time of being ask'd; now what is herein Spoken, of Qualification in behaviour in Saluting, ought also to be observed in taking of Place, and Sitting down for ceremonies without Bounds is troublesome.

"28. If any one comes to Speak to you while you are Sitting Stand up tho he be your Inferiour, and when you Present Seats let it be to every one according to his Degree.

"29. When you meet with one of Greater Quality than yourself, Stop, and retire especially if it be at a Door or any Straight place to give way for him to Pass

"30. In walking the highest Place in most Countrys Seems to be on the right hand therefore Place yourself on the left of him whom you desire to Honour; but if three walk together the middle Place is the most Honourable the wall is usually given to the most worthy if two walk together.

"31. If any one far Surpasses others, either in age, Estate, or Merit, * * * would give Place to a meaner than himself * * * the one ought not to except it, So * * * it above once or twice.

"32. To one that is your equal, or not much inferior you are to give the chief Place in your Lodging and he to who 'tis offered ought at the first to refuse it but at the Second to accept though not without acknowledging his own unworthiness

"33. They that are in Dignity or in office have in all places Preceedency but whilst they are Young they ought to respect those that are their equals in Birth or other Qualitys, though they have no Publick charge.

"34. It is good Manners to prefer them to whom we speak before ourselves especially if they be above us with whom in no Sort we ought to begin.

"35. Let your Discourse with Men of Business be Short and Comprehensive.

"36. Artificers & Persons of low Degree ought not to use many ceremonies to Lords, or Others of high Degree but Respect and highly Honour them, and those of high Degree ought to treat them with affibility & Courtesie, without Arrogancy.

"37. In Speaking to men of Quality do not lean nor Lock them full in the Face, nor approach too near them at lest Keep a full Pace from them.

"38. In visiting the Sick, do not Presently play the Physician if you be not Knowing therein.

"39. In writing or Speaking, give to every Person his due Title According to his Degree & the Custom of the Place.

"40. Strive not with your Superiors in argument, but always Submit your Judgment to others with Modesty.

"41. Undertake not to Teach your equal in the art himself Professes; it flavours of arrogancy.

"* * * courtesie be proper to the * * * Dignity of his place * * * t yr. same with a * * * Clown and a Prince.

"43. Do not express Joy before one sick or in pain for that contrary Passion will aggravate his Misery.

"44 When a man does all he can though it Succeeds not well blame not him that did it.

"45. Being to advise or reprehend any one, consider whether it ought to be in Publick or in Private; presently, or at Some other time in what terms to do it & in reproving Shew no Signs of Cholar but do it with all Sweetness and Mildness.

"46. Take all Admonitions thankfully in what Time or Place Soever given but afterwards not being culpable take a Time or Place Convenient to let him know it that gave them.

"47. Mock not nor Jest at anything of Importance break no Jest that are Sharp Biting and if you Deliver anything witty and Pleasent abstain from Laughing thereat yourself.

"48. Wherein Wherein you reprove Another be unblameable yourself; for example is more prevalent than Precepts.

"49. Use no Reproachfull Language against any one neither Curse nor Revile.

"50. Be not hasty to believe flying Reports to the Disparagement of any.

"51. Wear not your Cloths, foul, unript or Dusty but See they be Brush'd once every day at least and take heed that you approach not to any Uncleaness.

"52. In your Apparel be Modest and endeavour to accomodate Nature, rather than to procure Admiration keep to the Fashion of your equals, Such as are Civil and orderly with respect to Times and Places.

"53. Run not in the Streets, neither go too slowly nor with Mouth open go not Shaking Yr. Arms * * * not upon the toes, nor in a Dancing * * *

"54. Play not the Peacock, looking everywhere about you, to See if you be well Deck't, if your Shoes fit well if your Stockings Sit neatly, and Cloths handsomely.

"55. Eat not in the Streets, nor in ye House, out of Season.

"56. Associate yourself with Men of good Quality if you Esteem your own Reputation; for 'tis better to be alone than in bad Company.

"57. In walking up and Down in a House, only with One in Company, if he be Greater than yourself, at the first give him the Right hand and Stop not till he does and be not the first that turns, and when you do turn let it be with your face towards him, if he be a Man of Great Quality, walk not with him Cheek by Jowl but Somewhat behind him; but yet in Such a Manner that he may easily Speak to you.

"58. Let your Conversation be without Malice or Envy, for 'tis a Sign of a Tractable and Commendable Nature, & in all Causes of Passion admit Reason to Govern.

"59. Never express anything unbecoming, nor Act ag'tt ye Rules of Moral before your inferiours

"60. Be not immodest in urging your Friends to Discover a Secret.

"61. Utter not base and frivilous things amongst grave and Learn'd Men nor very Difficult Questions or Subjects, amongst the Ignorant or things hard to be believed, Stuff not your Discourse with Sentences amongst your Betters nor Equals.

"62. Speak not of doleful Things in a Time of Mirth or at the Table; Speak not of Melancholy Things at Death and Wounds, and if others Mention them Change if you can the Discourse tell not your Dreams, but to your intimate Friend.

"63. A man ought not to value himself of his Atchievements or rare Qual * * * les Virtue or Kindred * * *

"64. Break not a Jest where none take pleasure in mirth Laugh not aloud, nor at all without Occasion, deride no man's Misfortune, tho' there seem to be Some cause.

"65. Speak not injurious Words neither in Jest nor Earnest Scoff at none although they give Occasion.

"66. Be not forward but friendly and Courteous; the first to Salute hear and answer & be not Pensive when It's a time to converse.

"67. Detract not from others neither be excessive in Commanding.

"68. Go not thither, where you know not, whether you Shall be Welcome or not. Give not Advice whth being Ask'd & when desired do it briefly.

"69. If two contend together take not the part of either unconstrained, and be not obstinate in your Opinion, in Things indiferent be of the Major side.

"70. Reprehend not the imperfections of others for that belongs to Parents Masters and Superiours.

"71. Gaze not on the marks or blemishes of Others and ask not how they came. What you may Speak in Secret to your Friend deliver not before others.

"72. Speak not in an unknown Tongue in Company but in your own Language and that as those of Quality do and not as ye Vulgar; Sublime matters treat Seriously.

"73. Think before you Speak pronounce not imperfectly nor bring out your Words too hastily but orderly and Distinctly.

"74. When Another Speaks be attentive your Self and disturb not the Auduence if any hesitate in his Words help him not nor Prompt him without desired, Interrupt him not, nor Answer him till his Speech be ended.

"75. In the midst of Discourse ask * * * but if you Perceive any Stop because of * * * to Proceed: If a Person of Quality comes in while your Conversing its handsome to Repeat what was said before.

"76. While you are talking, Point not with your Finger at him of Whom you Discourse nor Approach too near him to whom you talk especially to his face.

"77. Treat with men at fit Times about Business & Whisper not in the Company of Others.

"78. Make no Comparisons and if any of the Company be Commended for any brave act of Virtue, commend not another for the Same.

"79. Be not apt to relate News, if you know not the truth thereof. In Discoursing of things you Have heard Name not your Author always A Secret Discover not.

"80. Be not Tedius in Discourse or in reading unless you find the Company pleased therewith.

"81. Be not Curious to Know the Affairs of Others neither approach to those that Speak in Private

"82. Undertake not what you cannot Perform but be Carefull to keep your Promise

"83. When you deliver a matter do it without Passion & with Discretion, however mean ye Person be you do it too

"84. When your Superiors talk to any Body hearken not neither Speak nor Laugh

"85. In Company of these Higher Quality than yourself Speak not till you are ask'd a Question then Stand upright put of your Hat & Answer in few words

"86. In Disputes, be not so Desirous to Overcome as not to give Liberty to each one to deliver his Opinion and Submit to ye Judgment of ye Major Part especially if they are Judges of the Dispute.

"87. * * * as becomes a Man Grave * * * Settled and attentive * * * dict not at every turn what others Say.

"88. Be not tedius in Discourse, make not many Digressions, nor repeat often the Same manner of Discourse

"89. Speak not Evil of the absent for it is unjust

"90. Being Set at meat Scratch not neither Spit Cough or blow your Nose except there's a Necessity for it.

"91. Make no Shew of taking great Delight in your Victuals, Feed not With Greediness; cut your Bread with a Knife, lean not on the Table neither find fault with what you Eat

"92. Take no Salt or cut Bread with your Knife Greasy.

"93. Entertaining any one at table it is decent to present him wt meat. Undertake not to help others undesired by ye Master.

"94. If you Soak bread in the Sauce let it be no more than what you put in your Mouth at a time and blow not your broth at Table but Stay till Cools of it Self

"95. Put not your meat to your Mouth with your Knife in your hand neither Spit forth the Stones of any fruit Pye upon a Dish nor emt anything under the table

"96. It's unbecoming to Stoop much to ones Meat Keep your Fingers clean & when foul wipe them on a Corner of your Table Napkin.

"97. Put not another bit into your Mouth til the former be Swallowed let not your Morsels be too big for the jowls

"98. Drink not nor talk with your mouth full neither Gaze about you while you are a Drinking

"99. Drink not too leisurely nor yet too hastily. Before and after Drinking wipe your Lips breath not then or Ever with too Great a Noise, for its uncivil.

"100. Cleanse not your teeth with the Table Cloth Napkin Fork or Knife but if Others do it let it be done wt a Pick Tooth

"101. Rince not your Mouth in the Presence of Others

"102. It is out of use to call upon the Company often to Eat nor need you Drink to others every Time you Drink.

"103. In Company of your Betters be not * * * than they are lay not your Arm but ar.

"104. It belongs to ye Chiefest in Company to unfold his Napkin and fall to Meat first, But he ought then to Begin in time and to Dispatch with Dexterity that ye Slowest may have time allowed him

"105. Be not Angry at Table whatever happens & if you have reason to be so, Shew it not but on a Chearfull Countenance especially if there be Strangers for good Humour make one Dish of Meat a Feast.

"106. Set not yourself at ye upper * * * of ye Table but if it be your Due or that ye Master of ye house will have it so, Contend not lest you Should Trouble ye company.

"107. If others talk at Table be attentive but talk not with Meat in your Mouth

"108. When you Speak of God or his Attributes, let it be Seriously & * * * Reverence. Honour & obey your Natural Parents altho they be Poor

"109. Let your Recreations be Manfull not Sinfull.

"110. Labour to keep alive in your Breast that Little Spark of Celestial fire called Conscience."

A New Horizon for American Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address by Virginia's junior Senator, Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, before the annual banquet of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, at Norfolk, Va., February 18, 1947:

In justification of a war against a weaker neighbor to the south over the annexation of Texas, a New York Irishman coined the phrase "manifest destiny." I have selected as the theme for my discussion tonight the future of American shipping, because in the current conflict between democracy and alien ideologies, when all that we hold dear is at stake, it is my firm conviction that the furnishing of world leadership is our manifest destiny. Without a strong Navy and a strong merchant marine we cannot hope to meet that challenge.

In fact, even from the standpoint of self-preservation we came closer than we care to admit to losing World War II because of a deliberate policy of isolationism, that discounted the importance to our security as well as our prosperity of mastery of the sea. The two factors, mechanized farming and the secret of mass production in industry, which contributed so vitally to our national prosperity were major elements in obscuring the fact that we had started out as a maritime nation and had given hostages to fortune when we abandoned that objective in 1920.

Though most of my life has been lived west of our majestic Blue Ridge Mountains, I give thanks for your celebration of the three-hundredth anniversary of the Jamestown settlement which brought me to your splendid city in the summer of 1907. During the intervening 40 years, I have been no stranger to your duck marshes, your fishing lakes, and your bathing beaches. I have enjoyed your recreational opportunities, rivaling those of Florida and California, and the warm and open-hearted hospitality of a people who richly merit the sobriquet of cavalier. But I never visit this cradle of our Republic without sharing the sentiments of Daniel Webster, who, at the laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument, said of the first settlers of Massachusetts and Virginia:

"We are justly proud of being descended from men who have set the world an example of founding civil institutions on the great and united principles of human freedom and human knowledge. To us, their children, the story of their labors and sufferings can never be without interest. We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth, while the sea continues to wash it; nor will our brethren in another early and ancient Colony forget the place of its first establishment, till their river shall cease to flow by it. No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood, will lead the Nation to forget the spots where its infancy was cradled and defended."

Last fall, for the first time since I was chairman of the State game commission, I traveled through all sections of our great State, and in the light of 10 years of intimate study of taxes and tariffs, gained a clearer conception than I ever had before of why the production of 600,000,000 tons per year of bituminous coal spells prosperity for Virginia from Norton to Norfolk. So intertwined in our economy have become full employment in industry, good prices for farm products and the movement through our ports of goods in foreign commerce, that the transportation of coal is a fair barometer of our State and national prosperity.

I covet the opportunity which I enjoy tonight to publicly thank, on behalf of Virginia and the Nation, this able, farsighted, and patriotic group for what it did to make the ports of Hampton Roads equal to the tasks of two world wars and a major potentiality in our current program of winning the peace.

This Maritime Association, representing a cross section of the entire business interests of the area, has been active through the years in securing for Hampton Roads its proper recognition as one of the greatest natural harbors in the world. In 1945, 22,000,000 tons of commerce moved through its ports, and for the full period of World War II they handled more commerce than any Atlantic port except New York. From 1942 to 1945, 224 convoys, comprising 6,725 ships, sailed from Hampton Roads.

To improve its terminal facilities at Lambert's Point, the Norfolk & Western Railway has secured building permits for $3,800,000 worth of construction in connection with its plans for a total expenditure of $6,000,000. The Atlantic Coast Line has also contracted for extensive repairs at its terminals.

The Corps of Army Engineers advises me that further additions are planned to the already great natural and man-made advantages of the Hampton Roads Harbor area.

Work still to be done on the Norfolk project includes dredging the East Branch channel to a point opposite the Imperial Tobacco Co., widening the channel between the Norfolk & Western Railway bridge and the Campostella bridge, dredging a turning basin in the southern branch above the railway bridge, completion of three additional anchorage areas south of the present Craney Island anchorage and construction of a disposal area and rehandling facilities north of Craney Island.

To complete the Hampton Creek project the engineers will dredge a 12-foot channel in Herbert Creek.

The Congress also has authorized a channel, turning basin, and anchorage in Newport News Creek.

Some time will be required for the engineers to complete a study they are making in consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of proposals to improve Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay and connecting waters to promote production of shellfish, provide a harbor of refuge for pleasure craft, and develop a charter-boat fishing industry.

Another study is being made to determine the feasibility of increasing channel depths in the South Branch of the Elizabeth River to give access to additional docking space. In connection with this study I have been assured that the Senate Committee on Public Works will pass a resolution authorizing a reconsideration of that report with a view to including Norfolk Creek, as advocated by your association.

The engineers also are making a preliminary examination and survey report for Salters Creek and are reviewing reports on improvements for the Lafayette and Nansemond Rivers.

Knowing your interest in your great Norfolk naval shipyard, I am happy to be able to tell you that before leaving Washington I was assured by the Chief of Naval Operations that within the allowable ceiling of personnel for the Norfolk shipyard, that shipyard will have all the work it can handle for an indefinite period.

In a word, the ports of Hampton Roads are equipped to handle a large volume of commerce. But those of you who share my love for duck hunting know that good duck hunting involves something more than a good blind. By the same token the finest harbor and dock facilities in the world are useless without ships and cargo.

Therein is posed for us one of the most serious of our postwar problems. The United States emerged from the war in a position of unquestioned leadership among the major powers of the world. The extent to which we will accept the opportunities and discharge the responsibilities of that position will depend largely upon the manner of our participation in international trade.

There is no question about our playing some role in foreign commerce. The United States is not self-contained. Imports and exports are both vital to our economy. We can abandon the reciprocal-trade agreements program, go back to the prohibitive rates of the Hawley-Smoot tariff and reduce our foreign commerce from the more than twenty billions of 1946 to the three billions plus of 1933. Or through a live-and-let-live program of mutually beneficial international trade we can sustain a $20,000,000,000 program. That is the new horizon for American shipping. But the children of Israel who lost faith in their manifest destiny perished in the wilderness.

In the handling of our foreign commerce, instead of shipping in foreign vessels, as in the past, we should develop and maintain a strong merchant marine under our own flag.

Twice in our time, in the hard school of experience, we have been taught the meaning of neglect of our maritime interests. World War I and World War II taught us that the United States is not an isolated Nation, economically, politically, or strategically. When we needed ships to transport troops and war cargoes (5 tons for each soldier plus 1 ton per month to support him in the field in the last war) we did not have them and had to rely upon our allies until we could organize shipbuilding programs to meet our needs. Most of the ships constructed at the time of World War I were not completed until the war was over.

In World War II our shipyards, including the two great ones in this area, did the job in time, making a contribution to victory not adequately recognized by the public. But let us not forget that those shipyards operated beyond the reach of enemy bombers, and that shortly before the end of the war the Germans perfected a submarine far more deadly than those which in the early period of the war were sinking ships faster than we could build them.

If we are to assert ourselves as a powerful force in world affairs through international trade, we must do so with a merchant marine fully adequate for both trade and defense. We cannot give our trade to foreign flag lines to carry and expect to keep a merchant marine strong enough for our national security in time of emergency.

To operate profitably, our merchant marine must have a certain amount of government assistance in meeting foreign competition.

American ships are the best in the world and our seamen are the best treated and highest paid. But other countries can build ships cheaper and run them cheaper. Therefore, our Government authorized, through the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as amended, the payment of subsidies to offset higher building and operating costs to our shipyards and shipping lines.

Closely regulated, and with provision for recapture of excess profits by the Government, these subsidies are the price we pay to keep alive an industry which is an important instrument of international relations and a vital arm of the national defense. Experience has shown that it is not a very big price.

The recapture provisions of the operating subsidies allow the operator to make 10 percent profit on the capital necessarily employed in his business. At the end of a 10-year period the operator must return to the Government a half of all profits made during that period in excess of the 10 percent, unless the total amount of the refund would exceed the total amount of the subsidy payments.

The first 10-year period under this arrangement is almost ended and the amount to be recaptured by the Maritime Commission is now more than half of the total subsidy payments of approximately $49,000,000. This favorable position to the Government exists in spite of the fact that operating subsidy contracts were suspended during the war period. It means that actual outlay of Government funds in operating subsidies over the 10-year period amounts to less than $3,000,000 a year.

Public interest and support, particularly on the part of shippers in both domestic and foreign trade, will largely determine the future of the merchant marine.

When the war ended this country was in possession of about 50,000,000 deadweight tons of shipping—the largest fleet ever under the flag of one nation in the history of the world. The existence of that tonnage does not provide the answer to our merchant-marine problem, however, because many of the ships were war-built under a program which stressed speed of construction and standardized types. Almost half of the fleet consists of Liberty ships, which are relatively slow and lacking in features that make for competitive advantage in normal peacetime trade.

Some of the ships can be used by our merchant marine and are being sold to American operators under the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Nearly half of the 400 war-built vessels sold or in process of sale are fast, modern, cargo liners which can successfully compete with foreign ships in international trade.

Some of the war surplus ships are being sold to foreign lines but most of them not required by our own citizens will be held in reserve against a future national emergency.

The shipping policy of the United States is based upon two objectives—trade and defense. The Merchant Marine Act calls for a fleet sufficient to carry all of our water-borne domestic commerce and a substantial portion of our foreign commerce. It also prescribes a merchant marine "capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency."

It has been estimated that the United States can economically employ during the next few years about 7,000,000 deadweight tons of dry cargo shipping, including 4,000,000 tons ear-marked for foreign trade, and about 4,000,000 deadweight in tankers. This privately owned ocean-going fleet of about 1,000 vessels will be more efficient and faster than the prewar fleet of about the same tonnage made up of 1,400 smaller vessels.

Supplementing this operating fleet will be from 25,000,000 to 35,000,000 deadweight tons in the national defense reserve fleet owned by the Government and maintained in a state of readiness for use in the event of war or national emergency.

The shortage of fast passenger liners and fast passenger cargo ships is a most serious condition, both from the standpoint of commercial operation and particularly from the standpoint of national defense. New construction in the next 2 years probably will be limited to three 22-knot passenger ships and 6 improved C–3 cargo ships, unless the Maritime Commission's 1948 budget is increased and the revolving fund for shipbuilding is again made available to provide construction differential subsidies for purchasers of new ships.

When we thought Hitler's program of exporting solidiers and importing booty was going to include us, we built a great Navy—the most powerful in the history of the world. I do not minimize the potential value for world peace of United Nations, nor the desirability of international disarmament, when I say that until conditions are more settled and an international police force has been created, competent to safeguard our interests, we should keep our Navy and our Air Forces on a strong and efficient basis.

The nonpartisan and patriotic position taken last week by two Senate leaders—VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN—will no doubt make it possible for the State Department to proceed with its plans to negotiate in Geneva reciprocal trade agreements with a group of democratic nations which control the bulk of the foreign commerce of the world and which have it in their power to furnish cargoes for the ships we want to see moving in and out of Hampton Roads.

The significance of that program was aptly and tersely defined in the leading editorial of the New York Times of January 29th, in which it was said:

"The plan is strongly supported, on the basis of experience, by many of our most important, and certainly our most far-sighted business, financial, and farm interests. Its advantages are many-sided. It opens markets for American products. It brings foreign products within reach of the American consumer, who is precisely the same person as the American producer, and thereby serves as a check on an inflationary rise of prices. It strengthens the economy of these nations which believe with us in the merits of the free-enterprise system. It strengthens the free-enterprise system here at home, because it encourages the expansion of production, and the alternative to an expansion of production, as we have seen from fairly recent experience, is curtailment of crops and industrial output on the Government's initiative (AAA and NRA) and an inevitable increase of that very 'governmental regimentation' which the Republicans, themselves, profess to abhor. Finally, this Hull program corresponds with the realities of our creditor position as a Nation."

I have secured, but will not on this occasion have time to use, the figures on how even a brief trial of the Hull trade program stepped up the exports and imports that moved through these ports. The passage of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act strangled our foreign commerce. The export trade of the ports of Hampton Roads dropped from $172,000,000 in 1929 to $68,000,000 in 1932. Exports originating in Virginia dropped from $101,000,000 to $45,000,000.

Concessions obtained through trade agreements on Virginia products moving through Hampton Roads included leaf tobacco, tobacco manufactures, wood and paper products, raw cotton, cotton yarns, cotton piece goods, cotton shirts, other cotton manufactures, silk hosiery, fresh apples, canned or dried fruits, vegetables and vegetable preparations, and rayon manufactures.

Before normal trade was ended by war there was a substantial increase in the shipment of all of these items. Export markets for Virginia tobacco have always been vital to our State. With a demonstrated capacity of American farmers to produce many items far in excess of domestic needs, export outlets for surplus production will be vital to every farmer in the Nation.

In the last quarter of 1946, 58,000,000 workers, principally in industry, were producing at the rate of $205,000,000,000 per year. Even though our national income stays at the unprecedented figure of $165,000,000,000 per year (and I don't think it will), it stands to reason that we can't permanently absorb what we are now capable of producing. Last-year shipments abroad totaled 11 percent of our national income, but it was a very vital 11 percent.

If we are to continue to ship abroad we must be willing to buy from abroad. And there's the rub. More than our domestic prosperity is involved in the solution of that problem. International economic cooperation is the heart of our peace program. In behalf of a voluntary good-neighbor program, Mr. Hull said, in 1934, that international trade was the lifeblood of nations. But that was before the atomic bomb, the V-rocket, and the supersonic plane, any one of which can now give to even a small nation the death sting of an adder.

Even if we could keep from others the secret of the atomic bomb, humanity needs something more than that super-sanction in our peaceful hands to protect it from the measureless misery and slaughter of another war.

Trade wars have been the forerunners of shooting wars, and peace has never survived economic chaos. Economic cooperation with the war-torn nations of the world who share our belief in God and our faith in the efficacy of democratic institutions is bound to be the rock on which we should build our Ebenezer. We have the choice of building a new world on the foundation of human understanding and mutual cooperation, or of seeing the broken and dishonored fragments of an old world sink in the vortex of a third world war.

In this critical period, when the cherished institutions of democracy are being challenged both here and abroad by the anti-God ideology of communism, may we have the vision to realize that moral, as well as material, leadership in world affairs is our manifest destiny.

"Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide.
Then it is the brave man chooses
While the coward stands aside,
Till the multitude makes virtue
Of the faith they had denied."

Mr. Truman and His Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Columbia (S. C.) Record, entitled "Mr. Truman and His Mother."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN AND HIS MOTHER

Mr. Truman sets the people of this country, and of the world, a good example in attention to his mother.

He is a busy man—he is President of the United States—and his tenure is during one of the world's most trying times, but he is never too engaged in Washington to show his aged mother the honor that is due her; and do for her personally, not through others, the little and the big things that will show her his love and his concern.

Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that the State Department plans to barter away our market to foreign interests, it is about time that the National Grange and other farm organizations should become vocal in opposition to the plan. I recall an occasion under a Democratic low-tariff bill when the eastern farmers and the western cattle men were made bankrupt. Their earnings of a lifetime were destroyed by foreign imports.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington correspondent for the National Grange:

TRADE AGREEMENTS—CONGRESSIONAL BATTLE LOOMS OVER THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO SLASH TARIFF RATES

(By Fred Brenckman)

There is every indication that the plans announced by President Truman and the Department of State to further slash existing tariff rates in negotiating trade agreements with 18 countries of the world will encounter stout opposition both in Congress and on the part of many groups of producers throughout the country.

The plans in this connection were announced last November, when the State Department signified its intention to negotiate trade agreements with the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom.

We already have agreements with many of these countries, but the plan is to enter into new agreements, with a view to making further tariff concessions. Authority to reduce existing tariff rates another 50 percent was granted to the President and the State Department when the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was extended by the last Congress.

The closing date for the filing of briefs in these proceedings was December 21, and on January 13 the Committee on Reciprocity Information began to hear oral arguments at Washington.

FARM ITEMS LISTED

The State Department has listed an imposing array of items upon which it is willing to consider tariff reductions, providing suitable concessions can be secured in return. About 1,000 items are included in this list, with agricultural products being prominently featured.

Here are just a few of the more important agricultural products that are on the list: cattle, meat and meat products; poultry, eggs, lard, and its substitutes; milk and cream, condensed, evaporated, and dried; butter, cheese; barley, buckwheat, oats, and rye; wheat and wheat flour; dry and ripe beans, limas, peas, and lentils; apples, berries, raisins, apricots, prunes, and peaches; broken nuts and nut products; cottonseed and other vegetable oils and fats; honey; tobacco and tobacco manufactures; peanuts and various preparations made therefrom; peas, green and ripe, and chickpeas; onions; white or Irish potatoes; tomatoes in their natural state; rutabagas, turnips, eggplant, cucumbers, squash, celery, lettuce, cabbage, and all other vegetables not specifically provided for.

SOUTH PROTESTS

One of the most outspoken protests against reducing the tariff on agricultural commodities is the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture. Through its secretary, Col. C. C. Hanson, this association filed an exhaustive brief with the Committee on Reciprocity Information, declaring that a downward revision of the tariff on agricultural commodities at this time was "unthinkable" to any sound agricultural economist.

Among other things, this brief pointed out that during the next 2 years the Government is obligated under the Steagall amendment to support agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity, and the question was raised as to whether the Government intended to support the prices of imported farm products as well as those produced domestically. Reference was made to the fact that during the past year the Government paid out $80,000,000 to support the price of potatoes, because the crop was so large that no profitable use could be made of tens of millions of bushels, even after the potato starch factories were loaded down to capacity.

TAPIOCA AND POTATOES

Another item mentioned in the brief of the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture was starch. During the years before the war we imported approximately half a billion pounds of tapioca duty free. Most of this came from the Dutch East Indies, where it was produced by what practically amounted to slave labor, receiving from 12 to 25 cents for a day of 12 hours. This tapioca, which was imported in the form of flour, came into direct competition with our domestically produced corn and potato starch. These imports were equal to all the starch that could be made from half a million acres of corn.

It was brought to the attention of the State Department at various times that the United States was dealing more generously with the Dutch East Indies in this matter than was the mother country, the Netherlands, which imposed a tariff on imports of tapioca for the benefit of the potato growers of that country.

Tapioca was put on the free list in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill on the theory that it was a noncompetitive commodity that some people liked to have for breakfast. But it developed that 80 percent of the imports were used industrially, bringing this item into competition with domestically produced corn and potato starch. Tapioca was frozen on the free list when the original treaty with the Netherlands was made. At that time the manufacturers of potato starch in Maine declared that they had a 2-year supply of starch on hand for which they could not find a market.

The cotton growers of the South look with concern upon the proposal to reduce the tariff on cotton manufactures, rayon, wearing apparel, hosiery, laces, handkerchiefs, embroideries, ribbons, and other manufactures. They point out that under the cotton-control program they lost most of their export market, and now, with domestic production cut in half, they are afraid of losing a considerable part of the home market if tariff rates of cotton manufactures are reduced.

Of course, the proposal to cut agricultural tariffs does not meet with the approval of the dairy interests, the fruit and vegetable growers, and the livestock and grain growers. They are uniformly against taking such a step.

During the war years the farmers of the United States increased their production by roughly one-third, and it is reasoned that before the lapse of 2 years there will be large agricultural surpluses in this country, with all their price-depressing effects. So the question is asked as to why we should make it easier for other nations to export to us commodities that we do not need.

SOUND BASIS FOR TRADE

The National Grange has always taken the position that in our trade relations with other countries we should take from them the things that we need and which are not produced domestically, and in so doing find an export market for some of our own surpluses. We want all the export trade we can get under proper conditions, but there is manifestly no advantage in foreign trade merely for the sake of trade.

When the Trade Agreements Act was passed, more than a dozen years ago, the President, or the State Department, was authorized to raise or lower tariff rates to the extent of 50 percent, when it was found as a fact that the then existing rates were burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States. Of course, it would be a hindrance and not a help in negotiating a trade agreement to raise tariff rates. So the grant that Congress bestowed upon the President was to reduce tariff rates.

The State Department signed its thirty-second separate agreement under the act with Paraguay last September. These pacts cover 29 different countries. In some instances more than one agreement was made with the same country.

The average slash in tariff rates thus far has been 31 percent, although in many instances duties were reduced the full 50 percent allowed by law. When the Trade Agreements Act was renewed for the fourth time in 1945, the President was given authority to reduce the rates then in effect 50 percent. Another reduction of 50 percent on items previously reduced to that extent would mean a slash of 75 percent in the Hawley-Smoot rates.

In negotiating these agreements we always acted on the unconditional most-favored-nation principle. Under this arrangement, when we reduced the tariff to

the country with which we made an agreement, we reduced it to every other country that was not discriminating against our commerce, even though we received concessions only from the country with which the agreement was made. That left us with less bargaining power with each agreement into which we entered. This never appealed to the late George Peek, who served for a time as foreign-trade adviser to President Roosevelt, nor did it appeal to the majority of the farmers of the country. In the end Mr. Peek resigned and the farmers lost the services of a good friend.

CONGRESS IS IGNORED

In all but a few instances trade agreements have been subject to parliamentary ratification in the countries with which we have dealt. But here in the United States—the greatest republic in the world—Congress has had no opportunity whatever to pass judgment on the matter. The Constitution provides that all treaties shall be subject to the approval of the Senate by a two-thirds vote. But by calling these treaties executive agreements, this provision of the Constitution has been dispensed with. Granted that it would be difficult to get a two-thirds majority in the Senate for many of these agreements, those who look upon the present arrangement as a debasement and a denial of the fundamental principles of the American system of government feel that the trade agreements should at least be subject to ratification by a majority vote of each House of Congress before becoming effective. There is a special reason why the House should be consulted in the matter because the Constitution provides that all revenue legislation must originate in the House. It cannot be denied that tariff rates affect the revenues of the country. In earlier times, before there was a Federal income tax, a considerable portion of the revenues of the Government were derived from tariff duties on imports.

The internationalists have always held that our tariff rates have been too high. That may have been true of the rates on certain manufactured articles. But it is very doubtful if this has been the case with reference to the rates on farm commodities. In any event, even under the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, two-thirds of all our imports were on the free list. Many people do not know that the United States has the biggest free list of any country in the world.

INCREASED COSTS

In considering the wisdom of further reducing our tariff rates, it would be well to keep in mind the fact that when our last tariff act was passed in 1930, wages and prices were on a much lower level than at present. The rates that were written into the Hawley-Smoot bill were intended to equalize the cost of production between this country and the other nations of the world, rather than to build a Chinese wall around the United States. The question is whether the rates that are now in effect are adequate to give proper protection to many of the industries of the country, including agriculture. It should also be kept in mind that in addition to the higher wages that prevail in this country now, as compared with 16 years ago, many other things have been done to add to our costs of production.

Social-security legislation has been enacted and large groups of workers receive annual vacations with pay; we have the 40-hour week, with pay at the rate of time and one-half for overtime, together with a minimum wage law. Without debating the desirability of all this, it cannot be denied that these various factors must be taken into account in arriving at the costs of production.

It is certainly true that if we continue to raise wages and prices in this country, while lowering our tariff rates at the same time, when the rest of the world gets back to full production, we will in many instances be run out of our own markets. And it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the American market is worth more to us than all the other markets of the world combined. In normal times only about 5 percent of our total trade is in the foreign field.

Many congressional leaders are considering the idea of forcing a postponement of a conference on international trade which is scheduled to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, next April.

At this proposed meeting our State Department is slated to discuss further tariff reductions at the same time that a United Nations preparatory committee will be in session to consider the permanent charter for a projected International Trade Organization.

Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following quotation from the Father of our Country, George Washington, which I think is still a good admonition to our country, namely:

To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

The Coming Moscow Conference—The German and Austrian Peace Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the Steuben Society of America is one of the oldest patriotic organizations in the Nation. Among its first presidents was Lafayette, and a number of Presidents of the United States. The members of that organization have rendered, through the entire history of our Nation, patriotic and valuable service.

Some of its members have fought in every war and on virtually every battlefield. They have given their lives, their limbs, and their health for their country. It is but natural that they should be interested in bringing about a permanent and just peace. They realize that a peace founded upon revenge and hatred cannot long endure.

I here quote a resolution recently passed by that society, which speaks for itself:

Whereas peace is indivisible, the victorious nations, as bitter experience should have taught us, cannot have both peace and revenge; and

Whereas a severely shaken western civilization will be unable to withstand another onslaught unless millions of slaves in the heart of Europe are set free and enabled to work, to eat, and to live out their existence in a sovereign state; and

Whereas the cancerous growth of hatred, created by forced labor, by suppression, unemployment, poverty, and despair, will destroy the already weakened body politic of the entire Old World, with disastrous effects upon this Nation and upon all humanity; and

Whereas vengeful peace dictates and the lame renunciation of high principles for the sake of expediency, "general agreement," and "peace at any price" have again created numerous danger spots in Europe which no international police force will be able to control or to isolate because the spirit is mightier than the sword and eternal rights cannot be suppressed by tanks and machine guns; and

Whereas the noble principles for which the late war was allegedly fought, such as the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," the sacred pledge that the victor nations would neither seek territorial aggrandizement nor would they destroy their enemies, seem to have been inundated by a raging sea of lust for revenge, plunder, famine, rape, distortion, and lies whose equal is not to be found in history; and

Whereas the western standards of democracy will never take root in the souls of men and women who wanted freedom but instead got abject slavery, who wanted bread and hope but instead received draconic laws, national nonexistence, and the mockery of an attempted re-education; and

Whereas the truism must be recognized that the brutal and despotic movements which were crushed by the late war are not a cause in themselves, created out of nothingness, but were begotten, born, and nursed by the violent social and political upheavals following the First World War and thereby are the effect of the peace dictates of stupid politicians who destroyed high hopes for a better life, for more gainful employment, and a more even distribution of the riches of this earth by a narrow-mindedness and cupidity that brought inflation, bread-lines, hunger, strife, and bitter despair to millions of industrious, decent, and proud people who, finally, at the brink of disaster, were forced to embrace a nihilistic movement; and

Whereas there are neither good nor bad nations and the shoddy terminology of militarism and aggression, so dear to the heart of the professional rabble-rouser, will wither in the cold light of true historical research, because there exist good and sufficient reasons why in the course of Europe's history, all nations, during one period or another, have been guilty—and are guilty—of unilateral acts, of militarism, and aggression; and

Whereas, an entire people cannot be indicted for the misdeeds of a few who owed their existence to multiform and manifold sins of omission and commission by those very people who refused to be their brother's keeper and thought only of their own personal gain and enrichment, utterly oblivious of those laws of an enlightened self-interest which are the one and only basis for just and durable peace; and

Whereas the forthcoming negotiations between the victorious powers to be held in Moscow will decide not only the future of Germany and Austria, but the future welfare of all of Europe; and

Whereas all of Europe will, if the heart of Europe is to be kept in slavery, and if lust for revenge is given full sway, sooner or later become a victim of those alien forces which already have forced a wedge into places of the most vital importance; and

Whereas all of Europe will recover and continue to function as that miraculous and seemingly indestructible germ cell of Western man, if the people in the heart of Europe are given bread and hope and if they are permitted to regain their national self-respect:

Therefore, the Steuben Society of America, a national organization of American citizens of Germanic descent, proud of the achievements of this, our Nation, and of the many contributions of the American citizens of Germanic extraction toward its greatness, steps before the bar of American justice and

asks the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States, as the guardians of our relations with foreign powers, for a truly just and lasting peace on behalf of the many millions of our blood relations and friends abroad whom we are unwilling to abjure, and on behalf of all Germans and Austrians who have no one in the world to plead their case.

Respectfully submitted.

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

OPA

Die-hard foes of OPA in the House are doing the country no service in their attempt to end rent control and sugar rationing by withholding funds for enforcement. Not only has the House refused to grant a requested deficiency appropriation of $5,900,000 to carry OPA through June 30, but it also has demanded that OPA return nearly nine million dollars of its remaining funds. If this action is upheld by the Senate, the OPA will be forced to start liquidation immediately. We hope that the Senate will have no truck with this sort of legislation by denial.

Were the OPA allowed to wither at the present time, as House Members apparently wish, the result would be to leave the country with rent-control and sugar-rationing laws but with no means of enforcement. It is fatuous to talk, as some Congressmen have talked, about the residual rights of individual citizens to appeal to the courts for damages. It is the police power which has made rent control and sugar rationing a success. Were matters left to the courts alone those bodies would soon bog down in a chaotic snarl.

What the current move amounts to is an attempt to kill the remaining controls without facing the issue honestly on its merits. In this the House Appropriations Committee has invaded the province of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has been considering the future of rent control, and the Judiciary Committee, which is charged with sugar-rationing legislation. Very possibly Congress will want to make some changes in the scope and administration of controls after June 30. It will want to weigh seriously, for instance, the justice of a 10-percent rent increase. But this is a matter for deliberate judgment rather than the hasty, backstage approach that has developed in the House.

Former New Dealers Lobby for Arabian Oil Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article headed, "Former New Dealers lobbyists for Arabian oil interests," which appeared in the publication Labor February 15:

FORMER NEW DEALERS LOBBYISTS FOR ARABIAN OIL INTERESTS

Under a law passed last year, lobbyists are required to report to Congress, telling whom they represent and how much they are paid. One of the reports made public this week gives a glimpse of the way "Big Business" operates in Washington.

The report names four men as the new lobbyists for the Arabian-American Oil Co. It, as recently reported in Labor, manages fabulous oil concessions in Saudi Arabia for four big American oil companies, three of them Standard Oil concerns.

Arabian-American is the company which one of its former lobbyists, James A. Moffett, is suing for $6,000,000, on the ground that it owes him that huge sum for arranging a $30,000,000 gift by the United States Government to the king of Saudi Arabia, where the oil concessions are.

The four new lobbyists are named as Newell W. Ellison, Donald Hiss, John O'Brien, and Paul Shorb.

All, of course, have "good connections" with Congress and Government agencies which can help the oil company in international politics.

For example, Hiss, like Moffett, is a former "new dealer." Records show he came to the lobby from the "Office of the Secretary of State."

As a matter of fact, the Department of State operates practically as a branch of the oil lobby.

The same records list John O'Brien as a former "legislative counsel" of the House of Representatives.

All four lobbyists reported that the size of their "fees" from Arabian-American has "not yet been determined." The international oil men can afford to pay them well. Billions of dollars—and perhaps another world war!—are at stake in Saudi Arabia and the rest of the Middle East.

Britain and Russia face each other there and the oil men are dragging in Uncle Sam.

Restore Lithuania's Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution passed at a mass meeting of Lithuanians, in my home city of Worcester, Mass., February 16, 1947, at which meeting I had the honor of speaking, as well as a newspaper clipping, which appeared in the Worcester Telegram, February 17, 1947.

The people of our country are fast coming to the conclusion that those gallant, but weaker, nations, under the sphere of Soviet influence, are presently the victims of as bold and cynical a diplomatic campaign as any big nation has ever waged against smaller, honorable neighbors.

Quite recently, the Under Secretary of State, appearing before the Senate Atomic Committee, took official notice that the present Soviet foreign policy is "aggressive and expanding."

A short while ago, our State Department declared that the United States Government firmly intends to maintain their interest in the welfare of smaller nations in the world.

Let us hope that this attitude carries the full meaning that practical measures, when necessary, will be undertaken by this Government to insure that the Soviet Nation, in cooperation with the United Nations, will be called upon to meet the full moral and humanitarian responsibility contained in the principle of political independence for all states enunciated in the declaration by United Nations and the Atlantic Charter.

It is evident by the aggressive and expanding present Soviet foreign policy that this principle in practicality is today a hollow mockery.

Whereas Russia, by force of arms and in utter violation of all legal and moral laws, continues to occupy the Republic of Lithuania, to deport and imprison Lithuania's nationals, to commit atrocities against the government and civilian population of Lithuania, to systematically destroy Lithuania's democratic form of government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful, by force of arms, occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, against Russia's deportation and imprisonment of Lithuania's nationals, against Russia's commitment of atrocities against the government and civilian population of Lithuania, against Russia's systematic destruction of Lithuania's democratic form of government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do hereby most fervently petition Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America, to the end that, all Russian military forces and government be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania, and that Lithuania and her people be liberated and Lithuania be restored as a free and independent republic among the nations of the world according to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter.

CONSTANTINE A. VASYS.
IRENE C. KERSIS.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of February 17, 1947]

LITHUANIA LIVES

(By Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, Clark University)

Yesterday, the twenty-ninth anniversary of the attainment of Lithuanian independence, every Lithuanian, wherever his domicile, whatever his condition, recalled the happy period of his people's liberty and reconsecrated himself to the cause of restoration of Lithuania's freedom and sovereignty over its own peoples and autonomy in its own jurisdiction and ancestral territory. He pledged himself, as every patriot should, to the task of regaining for Lithuania her just and proper place in the world's family of nations, a place that is hers by right of centuries of cultural adjustment to the attributes of a land that is rightfully hers, and by right of long and honorable participation in the affairs of Eastern and Central Europe. His heart will not again beat hopefully and peacefully until his beloved Lithuania may be restored to her people.

For Lithuania, for the time being, there is no longer any of the four freedoms, the freedoms for which the true democracies of the world struggled so long and so patiently during the last war, and for which their thousands of heroes died, or endured agonies worse than death. There is no freedom from dearth, or dread or despotism in Lithuania. There is no free conscience, no free speech, no free worship, no free enterprise in Lithuania. The Lithuanians may not sing their folksongs, enjoy their folk dances, tell their

folk tales, till their soil, sail their boats on their streams or lakes, worship in their churches as a free people may. They may not fly their flag, nor recount the deeds of their great men.

They are deported by the hundreds of thousands to Siberia and other wilderness frontiers to work in the mines and forests and public projects there, enslaved and debased, with no hope of return to their native acres, no hope of living again among their beloved hamlets and villages, no hope of solace in sickness or nearing death, no hope of decent burial when they succumb. Those that are left must serve the dictates of a tyranny as utterly absolute and ruthless as any that Egypt or Syracuse or Rome ever endured, and the whims of officials as base and bestial as the worst in history.

But Lithuania lives. Lithuania lives in the hearts of her sons and daughters who survive. Lithuania lives in the hearts of liberty-loving folk the world over. Lithuania lives in her great literature, her splendid history and great traditions, her songs and dances, the deep religious faith of her people, in their burning devotion to the land of their ancestry. Lithuania will not perish as long as ideals of freedom and justice and righteousness prevail. Lithuania cannot be destroyed by perfidy and brutality and tyranny. There will always be a Lithuania—a Lithuania in the hearts of men, a Lithuania in the culture of the peoples, a Lithuania in the history of the world's struggle for freedom, and in due time a Lithuania at the conference table of the world's great family of nations.

For cruel enslavement of a people as devoted to freedom as the Lithuanians, as true to their faith as they, as implacable in their will to escape tyranny as they, is finally impossible. Even so great a despotism as Russia will fall of its own evil ways, its dependence upon force and injustice for its power and rule. The mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small, and however coarse and base the grist, the meal will be justice and truth and honor.

Lithuania lives. Under the brutal tyranny of her alien conquerors Lithuania suffers a living death, but lives. Lithuania lives, and no power can destroy her. Lithuania lives, as freedom and justice live. Lithuania lives in her Christian faith and high cultural ideals. Lithuania lives.

Not a Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Providence (R. I.) Bulletin of February 18, which upholds the position taken by the Democratic Members of Congress in insisting upon having knowledge as to how and where cuts in the legislative budget are to be made in order to reduce the budget by $6,000,000,000:

NOT A BUDGET

When the congressional joint committee ended its consideration of the Truman budget, it had neither a budget nor an agreement on the total amount that should be spent in the next fiscal year. It is a poor precedent to establish on the first attempt to frame a legislative budget.

The reason for the failure is plain. There was not enough time between presentation of the Truman budget last month and the mid-February dead line for the joint committee to reach an intelligent decision. The result is in itself a strong argument for fixing a date much later in the legislative year for submitting the kind of a report the joint committee is supposed to furnish if it is to serve a useful purpose.

To slash the President's budget by six billions or four and a half billions or even one billion is a meaningless operation unless it is accompanied by specifications. So far as the public knows, and apparently so far as Members of Congress are aware, there is no clear idea where $6,000,000,000, or any less amount, can be extracted from the Truman budget.

Certainly no bill of particulars was furnished by the joint committee showing what effect an over-all cut of six billions would have on national defense and our present foreign commitments. Yet, as Secretary Marshall indicates, these are categories of expenditure that, in the present situation, do not permit blind reductions on a blanket basis.

There must be exact knowledge of actual needs, with the amount of spending fixed accordingly. Referring, for instance, to food needs in occupied territory, Secretary Marshall said: "If the Army is deprived of adequate funds to provide food for those people who are so sorely in need, a practically impossible condition is created for our troops and our Government's position in its international commitments."

The fact that the joint committee has not met the minimum standard of rational budgeting does not mean, of course, that Mr. Truman's budget should not be reduced. No Presidential budget should be beyond modification.

One congressional committee, in fact, which has made exhaustive studies of Federal spending—the Byrd committee—recently filed a new report on Federal personnel. "These figures," it said, "offer convincing proof that our Government is still needlessly overmanned; that our country is still needlessly overgoverned; that our taxpayers are still needlessly overburdened."

Representative CANNON, Democrat, from Missouri, who from 1942 to 1947 was chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, declared on the floor of the House a few days ago that the President's figures are merely an over-all ceiling above which Congress is not expected to go. We have every year cut the President's budget and cut it materially. He expects it to be cut as much as the situation will permit and as deeply as changing conditions and further study will justify.

But the fact that the Truman budget can be reduced substantially does not absolve any Member of Congress, especially members of the joint committee, from knowing where cuts can be prudently made. Particularly it does not excuse any Member from knowing the consequences of whatever reductions are made. These conditions obviously are not met when an unitemized slash of several billions is proposed. In fact, an undocumented plan for cutting the Truman budget by billions does not make sense.

Cutting Appropriations for the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert herewith for what it is worth and as it may appeal to your sound judgment, the following statement by Harley L. Lutz, professor of public finance, Princeton University, which came to my office February 19. Permit me to suggest that this statement be given consideration:

PRINCETON, N. J., *February 18, 1947.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: An undue disturbance of the public mind has been produced by the comments on the action of the joint congressional committee in recommending a $6,000,000,000 cut in the President's budget for 1948. The committee's report contains no details, but a general impression has gone abroad that the reduction has been heavily concentrated upon the defense services. There is danger of grave disservice to the cause of economy and efficiency in the Federal expenditures by giving credence, at this juncture, to the rumors about how or where the cuts are to be made.

It is evidently the judgment of a substantial majority of the joint legislative committee that the budget can be reduced by $6,000,000,000 without impairing essential Federal services. The Committee on Postwar Tax Policy has also indicated, in its recent report, that the 1948 budget can safely be reduced to $31,500,000,000. We may assume that the Members of Congress who gave their approval to a budget reduction of $6,000,000,000 had no intention of hamstringing the Federal Government, or of undermining our defense establishment.

Some unofficial statements about the joint committee action have intimated that the cut in the defense services is to be $1,750,000,000. Editorial comment has seen in this reported figure a rule of thumb procedure, on the part of the joint committee, involving a 30 percent slash everywhere, since defense is about 30 percent of the budget total, and $1,750,000,000 is so nearly 30 percent of $6,000,000,000.

The Committee on Postwar Tax Policy, after careful study, proposed a defense total of $10,000,000,000, which would be a reduction of $1,200,000,000 below the net budget total. The underlying logic of this proposal was, first, that the President's budget really proposed spending only about $10,000,000,000 on the actual operations of 1948, and second, that the bulk of the difference between $10,000,000,000 and $11,200,000,000 is accounted for by meeting, in 1948, unliquidated obligations of prior years. In other words, we are to pay, in 1948, bills that had been previously incurred. The budget message makes it clear that no contract settlements or other contract obligations from the war period are involved.

A thorough examination of the budget details reveals an itemization of prior obligations to be carried into 1948 amounting to $547,000,000, including $250,000,000 of terminal leave pay. The balance is not explained, and we may assume that it was not sufficiently clearly visualized at the time of budget writing (around January 1, 1947) to be set down. This writer's view is that much of it is unreal, improper, merely a means of grabbing extra funds from prior appropriations by all manner of informal earmarking.

We have no information now, as to the validity of the reported $1,750,000,000 cut, or as to its apportionment between defense proper and the civil functions of the War Department. The budget total for these civil functions in 1948 is $1,023,000,000, including nearly $300,000,000 for rivers and harbors, and flood control, and $725,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas.

As to rivers and harbors, the story of such expenditures over the past 50 years suggests that some pruning is always in order. Until Mr. Herbert Hoover makes his report, we shall lack the basis for a sound judgment on the European relief situation. The occupied areas everywhere will have the benefit of a full crop year, however, before much spending can occur out of the 1948 appropriation.

It is possible that less will be needed than is now budgeted. Hence it is possible to assume that some reduction can be made in the total for the civil functions of the War Department.

If we grant a total of $10,000,000,000 for defense in 1948, which is really all that is asked for aside from the carry-over of earmarked obligations, it is likely that enough wasteful spending can be combed out of the estimates to offset the amounts set up validly as unliquidated obligations. Here are two small examples of what such combing would produce:

(1) The Quartermaster Corps estimates include the following expenditures for laundry and dry-cleaning plant:

1946 (actual)	$33,757,859
1947 (estimated)	23,794,256
1948 (estimated)	23,145,000

The Army charges the commissioned grades of personnel for laundry and dry-cleaning services. Its collections for these services, reported as miscellaneous receipts, are given as follows:

1946 (actual)	$22,421,266
1947 (estimated)	12,040,000
1948 (estimated)	10,040,000

My point is that the Army, having already acquired enough equipment to do a gross business of $22,421,000 in 1946, at the low rates charged for laundry and dry-cleaning service for the commissioned personnel of an army of eight to nine million, it is extremely doubtful if a case can be made for buying now, and continuing to buy, through 1948, further large quantities of equipment in order to perform these services for a much smaller number of officer personnel.

(2) The ordnance department figures for 1948 contain the following items:

Procurement of ammunition	$20,800,000
Procurement of artillery	3,400,000
Procurement of small arms	3,600,000
Procurement of tanks and combat vehicles	8,900,000
Procurement of other motor vehicles	3,300,000
Total procurement	40,000,000
Preservation of ordnance matériel	80,000,000
Preservation of ammunition	30,000,000
Total for care of material on hand	110,000,000

In other words, the Army wants to spend $40,000,000 for new ammunition, artillery, small arms, tanks, and other motor vehicles, while also spending $110,000,000 for the preservation of ammunition and other matériel (including, no doubt, artillery, small arms, tanks, and other motor vehicles) already in hand. The new purchases evidently are not in the line of research and development, for there is another $40,000,000 set down for this purpose.

Another example is Vice Admiral Sherman's statement about Navy fuel, as reported in the New York Times of February 15, 1947. According to this statement, the 1948 budget figure for fuel will allow only 3 days' operation per month. The 1948 figure for navy fuel is $40,000,000. The 1947 figure is $45,000,000. Admiral Sherman made no complaint against the 1947 figure, but he emphasized the budget cut and the rise of oil prices is his dark picture of 1948. It is not easy to see how fuel-oil prices can rise so greatly as to convert an apparently satisfactory allowance for 1947 into a wholly unsatisfactory one for 1948, when there is a difference of only $5,000,000 between the 2 years.

No one wants to undermine or impair our national defense. The real problem is to distinguish between the true defense needs and the loud cries of the military heads. We should all bear in mind Admiral Nimitz' frank admission in his testimony on the naval bill for 1947. He said that no naval or military man is ever satisfied with what is made available.

Two interesting foreign items have recently been reported. They have a definite bearing on our immediate defense problem.

The first item is a detail from the British budget for 1948, as summarized in the New York Times of February 15, 1947. The British defense program calls for a total personnel of 1,087,000 and an expenditure of £899,000,000—equivalent to about $3,600,000,000. The white paper containing this information stated that the aim of British policy must be "to deter aggression while at the same time safeguarding British interests against attack."

Surely, England has as great a stake in national existence and security as we have. Even after allowing for differences in standards of pay, equipment, and operations, it is hard to explain why we should be spending, in a year of peace, some $6,800 per man as against England's $3,500.

The second item, published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 6, 1947, indicated that Russia had ordered demobilization of virtually all military personnel above the age of 22. This is smart tactics. The able young men of Russia are needed on the farms and in the factories, which is where Russian capital resources are also needed.

Let us get wise to realities. We can reduce the 1948 budget to $31,500,000,000 and still allow $10,000,000,000 for bona fide defense objectives. We should not be dragooned into sinful waste of our resources and our manpower by bureaucratic propaganda.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY L. LUTZ,
Professor of Public Finance, Princeton University.

The Voice of Alexander Hamilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 19, 1947, expressing the views of Alexander Hamilton on the tenure in office of Presidents:

THE VOICE OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON

Smiting at the ghost of Franklin D. Roosevelt the GOP majority in Congress is trying to submit a constitutional amendment limiting Presidential tenure to 8 years. The Republicans might very well pause to consider what Alexander Hamilton, the founding father of the Republican Party, had to say on the subject. Hamilton wrote in the Federalist that the President "is to be elected for 4 years; and is to be eligible as often as the people of the United States shall think him worthy of their confidence." Hamilton also said:

"There is no nation which has not, at one period or another, experienced an absolute necessity of the services of particular men, in particular situations, perhaps it would not be too strong to say, to the preservation of its political existence. How unwise, therefore, must be every self-denying ordinance, as serves to prohibit a nation from making use of its own citizens, in the manner best suited to its exigencies and circumstances."

Is the GOP refusing its own voice of revelation?

Washington's Birthday Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Washington's Birthday address delivered by me at the annual Drew University Alumni Association banquet at Madison, N. J., February 22, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WASHINGTON HOMECOMING

It is a pleasure to be among you to celebrate your homecoming to this splendid university.

I am honored to serve in the place of your distinguished junior Senator, the Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH, who unfortunately cannot be with you this evening.

SENATORS SMITH AND HAWKES

It has been my pleasure to work with Senator SMITH at very close hand in the Senate. He is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and in that group, as well as on the floor of the Senate, I have seen his conscientious, painstaking contribution to your State and to our Nation. You have all heard and read of his yeoman work, too, on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

May I add, too, my word of congratulations to you as citizens of this great State on your senior Senator, the Honorable ALBERT HAWKES, whom I know very intimately and who similarly is doing a grand job in our Nation's Capital. While I do not serve with him on either the Interstate Commerce Committee, the Senate Policy Steering Committee, or the Finance Committee, his worthy efforts in those groups and on the Senate floor are well known to myself and all of his colleagues. It is no mere courtesy for me to remark thusly, for New Jersey may indeed be proud of its senatorial delegation.

APPROPRIATENESS OF OCCASION

It seems very fitting that we are gathered here on this particular day in this particular place. Yes, we are here in a town which bears the name of that great President and statesman of early American history, James Madison, who was but 36 years of age when he attended the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

Over that assembly there presided the man whose birthday we celebrate today, the man who was later to be first President of the United States, George Washington. Adding to the appropriateness of this occasion is the fact that we are in this particular State which made such inspiring contributions to the success of the struggles of the Thirteen Colonies and within whose confines so many important battles were fought by the ragged Colonials of George Washington.

And, too, we remember the fact that the century which witnessed the unforgettable deeds of Washington and Madison also saw the lasting spiritual work of John Wesley. Yes, tonight in this university which, as we all know, was founded originally as a Methodist institution, we do honor to him and to his fellow leading lights of another continent—Washington and Madison.

It is a serious but happy occasion, indeed, when auld acquaintances are not forgot,

and when old friends of yore clasp one another's hands again in reunion. I remember one poet once wisely said:

"Of all the heavenly gifts that mortal man commend
What trusty treasure in the world can countervail a friend?"

We recall the words of another poet:

"Friends given by God in mercy and in love;
My counselors, my comforters, and guides;
My joy in grief, my second bliss in joy;
Companions of my young desires; in doubt
My oracles; my wings in high pursuit."

And so I trust that an occasion like this will not be just an ordinary meeting, but something "of light and flame," as a poet might say; something of great and enduring purpose and meaning. You will recall that the poet Browning said:

"Life has meaning, and to find its meaning is my meat and drink."

WASHINGTON'S LIFE

I have mentioned that this is, of course, the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country, the man who:

"Simple and brave, his faith awoke
Ploughman to struggle with their fate;
Armies won battles when he spoke,
And out of chaos sprang the state."

No review is necessary, of course, of the life of this immortal American. We are all well familiar with his birth in 1732, his early life in Virginia, his young manhood as a surveyor, his entry into military life, his role in the French and Indian Wars, and then his many pleasant years on the Virginia tobacco plantation. We recall, too, how he was selected as commander in chief of the inadequate military forces of the Thirteen Colonies and then of his brilliant campaigns through the years, his perseverance in the face of overwhelming odds, his triumph over the intrigues against him by those who doubted him and feared him, and then finally of his victory at Yorktown.

There comes to mind, too, his role in the Constitutional Convention which I previously mentioned, and then the wise selection by the people of the new Union of him as first President of the United States. No one can forget that during those 8 years of his administration, he brought order out of chaos. He utilized the conflicting but powerful personalities of Thomas Jefferson, as Secretary of State; Alexander Hamilton, as Secretary of the Treasury; Henry Knox, as Secretary of War; and Edmund Randolph, as Attorney General.

We recall how he acted with vigor and speed in suppressing the Whisky Rebellion in 1794. We recall his efforts to establish the financial house of the new Nation on a sound and stable basis and the foreign relations of the new land on an independent and secure basis. Yes, we recall, too, his retirement and his unforgettable Farewell Message; then, at last, his lamented passing in 1799.

These are the elementary facts of his life and on them there is little need for comment.

We remember that his great fellow American, the sixteenth President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we have celebrated but a short week ago, said:

"Washington is the mightiest name of earth—long since mightiest in the cause of civil liberty, still mightiest in moral reformation. On that name no eulogy is expected. It cannot be. To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name and in its naked deathless splendor leaving it shining on."

LESSONS FROM WASHINGTON'S LIFE

Why this wondrous eulogy in itself from Abraham Lincoln? Why do we revere the name of George Washington so well and so deeply. It is not merely because of his political and military contributions to our country, but because of what he exemplified as a human being. What did he exemplify, and what is its meaning to the America of 1947?

1. He exemplified the spiritual man triumphant.

2. He exemplified the man of peace who was prepared for and adequate to war when it came.

3. He exemplified the realist in world affairs.

4. He exemplified the man of honesty who practiced honesty in government.

5. He exemplified the man of cooperation who reconciled contending groups into a harmonious whole.

THE SPIRITUAL MAN

Yes, first of all, this immortal whom John Marshall well called, "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen," was a spiritual being triumphant.

Washington, like Lincoln, sought guidance from the Infinite Source of all power. Hence, he was free from mental indolence, from moral complacency, prejudice, and ill will. He sensed life was a thing of purpose. His was a faith that rose above confusion.

We recall his words:

"When you speak of God or his attributes, let it be sincerely, in reverence. Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience."

And, too:

"I shall always strive to be a faithful and impartial patron of genuine religion."

And:

"It is impossible to reason without arriving at a Supreme Being."

It behooves us all today to have that faith in us which was in George Washington, that faith in the all-knowing, all-seeing, all-present Eternal God. Then, we will remove the mountains of confusion and evil works with our faith and works, even as he did.

THE MAN OF PEACE

Now, second, I have said that Washington, the man of peace, was, nevertheless, adequate to war when it came.

In 1790, in an address to Congress, he said:

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

How can we apply that great precept today?

Well, I, for one, have made some suggestions recently in an open letter to the President. I suggested that time exists no more; that we are living in an atomic age, with guided missiles, bacteriological warfare, jet-propelled planes.

I asked: "What would happen if an atomic bomb in one flash smashed Washington, D. C., and wiped out the President and Congress?" What do you gentlemen think would happen? The answer is chaos and conquest by an enemy power.

To meet this threat, I have suggested that we make immediate push-button plans for the push-button warfare that will come unless the nations of earth will otherwise, and particularly unless the Big Five will create an international organization that will do away with all warfare. The hope of humanity is that the United Nations will perform that function.

Let us lay plans for Government and legislation by television, if need be. Let us have procedure for immediate succession of authority and continuity of Government if we in Congress and if the President and his officers are killed by atomic attack. All this must be done now, for there will be no time in the next war.

A many-pointed program goes hand in hand with these suggestions. That program included decentralization of factories and housing, stockpiling of vital materials, modernization of military and naval training, assurance of adequate military and naval appropriations, encouragement of research, laying of governmental plans for streamlined emergency wartime agencies, unification of military and naval supply programs.

It is through measures such as these that I believe that we can come home to Washington's concept of adequate preparedness.

THE WORLD AFFAIRS REALIST

Third, I have said that George Washington was a realist in world affairs.

He warned his countrymen to beware of the insidious wiles of foreign influence. Applying this precept today, he would warn us against foreignisms, foreign subversive forces. He would warn us to keep America and the Republic strong, a mighty bulwark of freedom in a world of dictatorship.

We remember that in his day the world was huge; it took months to cross the ocean. Were he alive today, I think we would find that Washington would be the first to realize that we are living in a new day, in a new contracted world, and that the inventive genius of man and America's preeminence in the world has changed our obligation so that it is incumbent upon us to do everything humanly possible to see if the United Nations can be made to work.

I am sure he would say we must go ahead and do the impossible, if necessary, to bring the races of men to where they will live in peace. I am sure that with the practical common sense which Washington always evidenced, he would tell us to keep our powder dry and not lose our perspective. We cannot forget that after the First World War the League of Nations came into being and we even abolished war with the Kellogg-Briand pact. But war came. And yet, with one Apostle Paul, we know that God is not the author of confusion, but of peace. And only as mankind follows in His way will the millenium be achieved.

THE HONEST LEADER

Fourth, what would Washington do about his Government today? It was he who said:

"I hope I shall always possess firmness and virtue enough to maintain what I consider the most enviable of all titles, the character of a 'honest man'."

Thus, Washington, the honest leader, being the practical, efficient man he was, would, I am sure, insist on the pruning knife being applied to excess expenses and overhead in government. He saw the need for balancing the budget, for making the bonds of this country and of the States gilt-edged. Yes, the bonds in which educational institutions such as this, have invested their resources, must be absolutely safeguarded.

Washington had no time for laxity of any kind in government. I am sure he would approve the continuance of the so-called Truman Investigating Committee as a necessity not only to recapture money that belongs to the Government because of fraud and waste, but for the further reason that Government itself must learn the lessons of the past so as better to go forward in the future.

WASHINGTON, THE COOPERATOR

Fifth and last, what would Washington do about securing more cooperation in our land today as he did so successfully in his time?

Washington, I feel, would insist that peace at home is vital; that the public interest demands that labor and capital get together and cease their destructive internecine warfare. I am sure, as evidenced in the Pennsylvania Whisky Rebellion, he would say that strikes against the Government were not legal and would not be tolerated; that jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts must cease; that unions must be made responsible for breach of contract the same as employers; that labor racketeerism must go.

He would see the need for free collective bargaining as a two-way street. He would see that there was need for high wages to be paid in order that the national income would be

sufficient to meet the charges on it. But he would insist that wages should not be paid unless there is an equivalent in production.

Washington would conciliate, but he would not adopt any mere day-to-day expedients. In speaking of the Constitutional Convention, he said:

"My wish is that the Convention may adopt no temporizing expedients but probe the defects of the Constitution to the bottom and provide a radical cure."

So, too, we need a radical, meaning a fundamental, cure, to our labor crisis today, not a Red cure or a Fascist cure, but an American cure which will protect the paramount rights of our public.

CONCLUSIONS

And so, my friends, we have seen the pattern that Washington sets for us to follow in our times. We have seen him as a spiritual man triumphant, as a man of peace who was adequate to war, as a realist in world affairs, as an honest leader who practiced honesty in government, as a cooperator, who could bring opposing factions together.

Washington's message is the American message of today—to fulfill the Constitution for which he and the founding fathers so ably laid the foundations. In doing so, we will experience a real Washington homecoming, we will come home to his principles, to the principles for which the Colonial patriots shed their blood in this great State itself, to the principles on which this very university is founded—principles of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

Let us on this blessed continent, as Washington said:

"Raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God."

Communism in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 14 there appeared in the News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C., a paid political advertisement covering approximately three-fourths of a page, signed by one Sam Hall, of Winston-Salem, as chairman of the Carolina District Communistic Party, U. S. A. This ad is titled "A Program To Win a Better Life for the People of North Carolina."

Already my distinguished colleague and fellow North Carolinian, HERBERT BONNER, has made reference to this advertisement and introduced it in the RECORD. I hope every Member of Congress took the time to read it.

In the center of the ad is a picture of a large man whose arms are clutched tightly by a huge monster who is indicated by the author as being the comforting hands of the CIO and the A. F. of L. Under the picture is capitalized the words "United Labor Action—Or Else."

The language of this ad condemns the Legislature of North Carolina and the Congress of the United States. It would have one believe that it has the blessings of these labor organizations of North Carolina. It advocates that labor unions, including railroad brotherhoods and all, harken to its cause of fostering a program of socialism—when the people, led by the workers, will own the factories, the mines, the banks, and so forth, and produce for the use of all instead of the profits of a few. In other words, it advocates here in America, where live the greatest people on earth, the strongest and the freest Nation to survive the storms of the past, that we give up the principles of our founders, abolish liberty and freedom, dissolve our democratic form of government and foment hate among our people and adopt an unconstitutional program of sovietized communism and follow it through until the people own the factories, the mines, the banks, and so forth.

This program of socialism and communism is so vicious and so un-American that the recent State-wide meeting of the Elks Club of North Carolina, of which I am a member, took note of these assertions by condemning the advertisement as an attempt to promote civil strife and array class against class.

The CIO and the A. F. of L. and a large group of Negro citizens of North Carolina also joined in the denunciation and issued statements protesting the use of their names by inference or otherwise in this Communistic movement.

While I can understand from a psychological viewpoint why the labor unions of North Carolina and the Negroes issued a condemnation of these activities, I am sure that no North Carolinian believes that the heads of unions in North Carolina or the leadership of the Negro race in that State has any sympathy for such a movement. I know some of the labor leaders of North Carolina, and particularly Mr. C. A. Fink, of the A. F. of L., whom I regard as one of North Carolina's finest citizens and one who believes in the principles of a democratic government.

I should like to say also that North Carolina yields to no State in this Nation in its type of Negro citizenship. The Negroes of North Carolina have made great progress in business and educational undertakings. We have more Negroes in North Carolina who are school teachers than some States have of the Negro population. We have Negroes who are bankers, doctors, lawyers, and at no time have I ever heard of any of them expressing any sympathy for the Communists.

I do not know one Sam Hall, chairman of the Carolina district Communist Party, United States of America, of Winston-Salem, N. C. I think I should like to get acquainted with him under certain conditions, and the principal purpose for which I rise is to suggest that the Committee on Un-American Activities subpena Sam Hall to appear before the committee in order that he may be examined about his communistic activities in America. It is possible that in him we will find another Gerhart Eisler. In fact, he may have more aliases following his career and name than did Eisler. It may be also that he would refuse to answer questions propounded by the committee. He might even be as contemptuous as was his fellow traveler.

No doubt Sam Hall did not write the advertisement to which I referred, nor did he pay for it out of his personal funds. It was probably written and paid for by a type of communistic organization, one of whose members were recently found guilty of contempt by the Members of this House. I think our committee would be on another hot trail if it will pursue Sam Hall.

Perhaps we can find out through Chairman Hall the name and address of other members of his committee and organization. I understand that he is very reluctant to give out this information.

I believe the people of North Carolina are interested in knowing more about this Communist, Sam Hall. I know they are interested in ridding our State of all communistic elements. I know they believe, as I do, that communism today is America's enemy No. 1. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the very efficient Committee on Un-American Activities find out and let the people of North Carolina and the United States know more about Sam Hall.

Wool

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time and to include this letter because in this letter we find the commodity known as wool included in the suggestion by the Secretary of Agriculture. I realize that the wool situation is rather serious. The Government has some 517,000,000 pounds on hand, and I am sure that there are many Members in the House who are interested in just exactly what we are going to do about it. We do not have too many weeks to straighten out the wool situation. I trust that every one who is interested in wool will read this letter of transmittal that went with the proposed legislation from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Speaker, and referred by the Speaker to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. HOPE. If you are interested in this legislation, the number of the bill is H. R. 1825.

The letter referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is enclosed a copy of a proposed bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (49 Stat. 774). This legislation would carry into effect the recommendations made in the message of the President to the Congress on September 6, 1945, in that it would strengthen price support program for American agricultural commodities.

Section 22 provides that when the President, after investigation, determines that any one or more articles are being, or are practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to render or tend to

render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, or section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, he shall impose fees or limitations on the total quantities of any such article or articles which may be entered or withdrawn from a warehouse for consumption in the United States.

Fees or limitations may be imposed under section 22 only when it is found necessary in order that the entry of such articles will not render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken or will not reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation under the specific statutes set forth. A limitation on the total quantity of any article which may be imported from any country may not be imposed which reduces such permissible total quantity to less than 50 percent of the average annual quantity of such article which was imported from such country during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933. Fees in excess of 50 percent ad valorem may not be imposed.

The field within which the authority granted by section 22 may be exercised is so limited that the authority cannot be of much aid to the Department of Agriculture in discharging its price-support obligations in this period of adjustment. If a program of the Department is not undertaken pursuant to one of the three stautes referred to in section 22, the authority conferred by that section may not be utilized to control the importation of an article the importation of which is materially interfering with the successful operation of the program by the Department. Virtually all price-support programs of the Department are carried out by the Commodity Credit Corporation and are not undertaken pursuant to the statutes specifically referred to in section 22.

Among the important commodities for which the Department has undertaken price-support programs, but for which no program is in operation under the statutes named in section 22, are flaxseed, soybeans, eggs, wool, oats, barley, grain sorghums, and dry edible beans. If any of these commodities should be imported into the United States in quantities greatly in excess of normal importations, the operation of the price-support program for the domestic commodity would be interfered with and the effectiveness of the program seriously impaired. Larger-than-normal importations of some of these commodities seem practically certain to occur as the facilities for international commodity movements are restored. The amendment to section 22 proposed herein would provide a means for dealing effectively with this problem.

The period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933, specified in section 22 as the measure of previous normal imports, was a recent period when originally enacted. In the course of time it may become out of date for many commodities. The amendment proposed herein would provide instead for a representative period to be determined by the President whenever he limits imports of a commodity under section 22.

Certain articles imported from abroad are not competitive with American-produced commodities for certain uses. An example of this is harsh and rough cotton from India and China which is used in the manufacture of blankets. This cotton has properties which do not permit its replacement by American-grown cotton in a product which is to have the same desirable qualities as the blankets in which the harsh and rough imported cotton is used. However, this cotton does compete with low-grade American cotton in numerous other uses. The authority to describe articles designated in a proclamation upon a basis of use, which is specifically granted by the second proviso in the proposed subsection (b), would make it clearly possible to permit the importation of harsh and rough cotton for use in the manufacture of blankets, thus permitting unlimited utilization of the imported growth for the use as to which it is not competitive with American growths, but place such cotton under quota and fee limitations when imported for uses which are competitive with the use of American cotton.

Certain limitations on the scope of action permitted under section 22 are involved in the agreements with foreign countries concluded under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Thus, all but one of our reciprocal trade agreements prohibit the levying of new fees, duties, or other charges connected with imports against products included in the agreements; and most of the agreements require consultation with the other country, except under exceptional circumstances, prior to the imposition of quotas on products given duty concessions in the agreements. The exercise of the authority granted under section 22 has not in the past conflicted with any of our international undertakings, and presumably this will also be the case in the future. It would, however, be of advantage to the United States in the conduct of its foreign policy if this were to be specifically required by section 22. Accordingly, the proposed amendment would prohibit any enforcement of a proclamation under section 22 that would be in contravention of the international obligations of the United States.

In view of the need for broadening the applicability of section 22 to furnish the protection to programs of the Department of Agriculture which the Congress apparently intended, it is respectfully requested that consideration be given to amending that section as proposed in the enclosed draft. It is believed that the amendment is urgently needed and that its enactment will be a definite contribution to the welfare of American agriculture.

The changes contemplated by means of insertions and deletions in the present provisions of section 22 would necessarily result in rather unreadable language; therefore, it is proposed that the present text be replaced by the new one submitted herewith. The only substantial changes effected by substitution of the new text are:

1. Extension of the granted authority so as to cover not only agricultural commodities but also products thereof;

2. Extension of the granted authority so as to cover articles the import of which affects any loan, purchase, or other programs or operations undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof;

3. The restriction of quantitative limitation to 50 percent would be applied to the total quantity of an article imported during a representative period as determined by the President, rather than to each country's average annual quantity of the article imported during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933, as now provided;

4. A clarification by a specific grant of authority to the President to describe designated articles by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such bases as he determines;

5. A clarification of the intention that, while fees are to be considered duties for some purposes, as now provided, they shall not be considered duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States, as, for example, our duty preference arrangements with Cuba; and

6. Prohibition of any enforcement of a proclamation under Section 22 that would be in contravention of the international obligations of the United States.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Bureaucrats Hamstring Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 21, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the evidence keeps piling up that Government agencies—once their period of usefulness is over—create unemployment and actually deter full production. The latest example proving this statement may be seen in the newspaper reports which reveal that the pig-iron controls of the Civilian Production Administration, now a part of the Office of Temporary Controls, threaten to stall the production of automobiles and other essential items.

This is no news to me or to Michigan manufacturers who make other things besides automobiles. A good friend of mine who runs the Midwest Foundry in my congressional district told me 10 days ago that he had been notified by Republic Steel Corp. that the CPA had taken 87 percent of their Buffalo merchant pig production for February for shipment to the southern stove- and cast-iron pipe industry.

This meant, in effect, that this foundry, which had received only 200 tons of pig iron since last November, would receive no more pig iron for a certain amount of time.

My foundryman friend asked me to do what I could to "stop once and for all bureaucratic regimentation and the power that makes possible an individual or a board closing any industry or group of industries in favor of others, regardless of political expediency." This I have tried to do and this I will continue to try to do. The trouble right now is that the Republicans control only the legislative branch of the Government, while the Democrats, who still believe in keeping ironclad control over industry despite their propaganda to the contrary, still control the executive branch.

Let me read to the Members a newspaper article which appeared throughout the country Wednesday:

DETROIT, February 20.—The Automobile Manufacturers Association warned yesterday that the auto industry faces lay-offs and production cut-backs during the second quarter of 1947 because of excessive allocations of pig iron for housing.

I break in at this point to make this statement, Mr. Speaker. The bureaucrats are using housing as the only convenient excuse possible for them to find

so that they can continue allocation control. President Truman could take all controls off housing, if he desired to do so, but the truth is the bureaucrats do not want to lose the power to hamstring industry. That is because this gives them the power to help one industry at the expense of another.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot upset the foundry industry without upsetting the housing industry and all other industries. We should get all controls off so that our economy could shake down and both prices and materials would find their correct relationship. The longer we put it off, the longer we postpone the time when this adjustment will take place.

The truth is, I have given the CPA a chance to explain their rules and regulations on pig iron that have caused a "snafu" in industry generally, but I have not even received a reply from Mr. J. A. Claussen, head of the Steel Branch, Metals and Minerals Division, Office of Temporary Controls. I wrote him on February 11 to furnish me an explanation, if he has one, for the record. I sent a copy of this letter to Maj. Gen. Philip Fleming, Administrator of OTC, but have had no reply.

As I see it, too much pig iron is being allocated to industries which are supposed to be servicing contractors who are supposed to be building homes. But much of this pig iron is finding its way into the black market. It is going into the hands of scrap dealers and other metal brokers who then raise the price drastically to other manufacturers who need the pig iron to stay in business.

One pig-iron manufacturer has told his long-time friends privately that 45 percent of all pig-iron production now is going to only 8 percent of the users.

I continue reading from the newspaper report:

George W. Mason, AMA president, wrote to Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls, urging immediate termination of Government allocation and priority controls.

He said the "best information from the foundries" indicated the threatened cutbacks would run through the entire second quarter and would "not be from a full-production level, but from the much restricted basis of operations now prevailing in the industry."

He added that first effects of the shortage may be expected in March or April.

"All the evidence we have is that the key to the pig-iron shortage is the allocation to housing purposes, which seem to exceed present realistic housing completion schedules," Mason wrote.

"We are fully aware of other conditions limiting pig-iron supply, and it is because of these that we maintain it is absolutely necessary to avoid tying up valuable tonnage where it will not be put to immediate use."

Mason said the AMA felt creation of a free market through immediate scrapping of Government controls will most quickly accomplish an equitable and productive distribution of available materials.

"The Government should make this possible without delay," he said. "Failing to do so, it should face the fact that it is carrying the responsibility for curtailing employment and output of needed goods."

Mason cited the example of the Midwest Foundry Co., of Coldwater, Mich., which advised the Warner gear division of Borg-Warner Corp., at Muncie, Ind., that it no longer could fill subcontracts from Warner gear for auto castings.

Borg-Warner supplies the Ford Motor Co. and most of the other large automotive concerns.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done about this situation—and now. This Congress should take immediate steps to scrap Government controls that are hamstringing industry.

Lincoln the Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able Lincoln Day address entitled "Lincoln the Republican," delivered over the radio on February 12, 1947, by one of North Dakota's most outstanding citizens, the Honorable Clyde Duffy, of Devils Lake, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is very fitting that in this hour of success, the leaders of the Republican Party should emulate the sober-mindedness and humility of Lincoln. When that great exemplar of Republican principles came to Washington, he came not as a conquering hero but with sadness and humility in the face of the terrible task confronting him. In his remarks to the home folks before starting his journey to the National Capitol, Lincoln said:

"I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell."

Even in the hour of triumph, when he had been returned to office by an overwhelming vote and he could foresee the successful conclusion of the War Between the States, at his second inaugural he uttered these words, so appropriate today:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

Lincoln came to his office in the darkest days of the Republic. The people stood divided—then section against section. A vacillating, ineffective Democratic administration had stood idle while the Southern States seceded from the Union and planned for war. He faced an empty Treasury. Even in the North, the people were divided. Some would have declared a bloody crusade to abolish slavery. Others would have permitted the Southern States to go their way. Lincoln took the middle course, knowing full well that it would bring down upon his head the condemnation of the extremists on both sides. In his first inaugural address he declared that under the Constitution he had no right to interfere with the institution of slavery in any State and he did not propose to do so, but that under the Constitution it was his duty to see that the laws of the Nation were enforced and this he proposed to do.

Today the Republican Party has been recalled to take charge of the legislative branch of the Government and it is generally agreed that as soon as the people shall have the opportunity, that party will be called to take over the executive branch as well. But again we find the Nation divided—not along sectional lines, but rather upon economic lines. We find our Nation bankrupt, with an indebtedness beyond the wildest dream of the greatest spenders of all ages. We find ourselves the object of hate and jealousy at the hands of those who owe their very existence to our help. We find a world seething with unrest. The hour is almost as black as it was when the Republican Party, under Lincoln, was first called to take the helm.

Has the Republican Party today those qualities necessary to meet the challenge as it did under Lincoln? I believe that it has. It is still the party of Lincoln. Its outstanding characteristic is that it is conservative in action and liberal in thought. Like Lincoln, it goes down the middle of the road, heedless of the taunts and threats of the extremists to the right or to the left. It holds fast to the landmarks of the past while striving forward to new goals. It is neither Fascist nor Communist—it is purely American.

Lincoln's moderation, his common sense, his repudiation of extremists are seen in his spoken words on many occasions. While he abhorred slavery, he recognized the fact that it was protected under the Constitution. When agitation over slavery led to mob violence, he deplored "the increasing disregard for law, the substitution of wild and furious passions in lieu of the sober judgment of the courts, the worse than savage mobs rather than the officers of the law." He was opposed to hasty changes in the Constitution and on many occasions he urged reverence for the Constitution and the laws of the land. To the radical, ever ready to tear down, he gave warning not to destroy the home of the rich man, but rather to go and build himself a house, knowing then that it, too, would be protected. This characteristic of Lincoln is portrayed in the essay of James Russell Lowell:

"His slow, but singularly masculine intelligence taught him that precedent is only another name for embodied experience, and that it counts for even more in the guidance of communities of men than in that of the individual life. He was not a man who held it good public economy to pull down on the mere chance of rebuilding better."

The Republican Party has not forgotten the prophetic words of Lincoln when he said:

"Towering genius (and he is speaking of Alexander, Caeser, and Napoleon) disdains a beaten path. It sees no distinction in adding story to story upon the monuments of fame erected to the memory of others. It scorns to tread in the footsteps of any predecessor, however illustrious. Such genius burns for distinction; and, if possible, it will have it whether at the expense of emancipating slaves or enslaving freemen. Sometime a man of the loftiest genius will spring up among us; and, when he does, it will require an intelligent and united people, devoted to the Government and laws, to successfully frustrate his designs."

Lincoln did not hesitate to walk the beaten path—he gloried in building another story upon the monument erected by Washington. He did not burn for distinction, but sought only to perform the task that lay before him and to help build the edifice of the Nation just a little better. He was a conservative.

And in that sense the Republican Party today is and always has been conservative in action. It believes in the Constitution and holds that it can be amended only in the way prescribed by that Constitution and that it cannot be amended by Executive decree or judicial mutilation. The Republican Party believes in the natural rights of man as a human being. Archbishop Ireland expressed the thought when he said "America is the land of human dignity and of human liberty" and, therefore, the Republican Party would never make that man the slave of industry, the pawn of the state, nor the tool of labor racketeers.

The Republican Party believes in private enterprise. The economic growth and development of this country has been based upon individual initiative and enterprise. The philosophy of human liberty and human dignity requires this. The constitutional guaranty of life, liberty, and property is a guaranty that the individual may work out his own destiny.

Individual initiative and enterprise does not mean individual license. Too often men have combined to secure privileges for themselves and to oppress their fellows in the race for achievement. It is the function of government to prevent monopolistic practices. And let us not forget that the antitrust law of this Nation bears the name of that Ohio Republican, John Sherman. But some timid souls who have failed in the race would socialize industry. They forget that selfish, domineering men can be more oppressive in government than in private industry. When the poet wrote that man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn, he was not referring to any class. An all-powerful government, dominating not only our political life, but our means of livelihood as well, would be an unbearable tyranny. The founding fathers knew from experience the dangers of too-powerful government, and they place definite checks upon it in the Constitution. The Republican Party has not forgotten their ideals.

The theory of the Republican Party, the theory upon which this Nation has grown great, is that every man has equal rights, that every man should be allowed to develop his own powers and his own ability, and that every man should be permitted to achieve such success as he may honorably win. In the race for that achievement it is not the function of government to hold back the swift so that the slow, the halt, and the lame may keep pace. That is not the equality demanded by the Constitution. It is the function of government to see that the swift and the strong do not foul the weaker competitor nor take unfair advantage of the lame and the halt. The function of government is to prescribe fair rules for the race and then to see that those rules are fearlessly enforced.

"The point to be aimed at," says Theodore Roosevelt, "is the protection of the individual against wrong, not the attempt to limit and hamper the acquisition and output of wealth."

The Republican Party believes in Government economy and efficiency. It views with grave alarm a national debt of nearly $300,000,000,000. It does not believe that a nation, any more than an individual, can long prosper by spending more than it takes in. Nor does it believe that industry can be fostered or jobs created by confiscatory taxation. It believes in thrift and frugality—those ancient virtues which our Democratic friends would banish to the limbo of forgotten superstitions.

The Republican Party is liberal in thought in the true sense of that term. It has little to do with political philosophy but represents rather a state of mind. It means broad-minded, open-minded, free from bigotry. No word in our language has been more abused. It has been claimed by the extremists who have not the slightest conception of its true meaning. The Communists and their fellow travelers have prated of their liberalism, but where can you find less open-mindedness than in communism? In Russia freedom of thought and freedom of speech are unknown. The man who dares to deviate one jot or tittle from the Communist Party line is expelled, and where they have power he may pay with his life. No man can be more bigoted than the extremist, whether he be of the right or of the left.

Of course, there are thousands of liberal Democrats, but they do not control the destinies of their party, notwithstanding that the party has sought to appropriate the term "liberal" to its own use. Its only justification for that claim has been its "liberality" with the taxpayers' money. The party is dominated by two factions—bitterly opposed to each other and both bitterly opposed to liberal thought.

Today some of our columnists and commentators are fearing collapse of our Government because the Republican Members of Congress are not in complete agreement on every issue. Good heavens, have they become so accustomed to a party dictatorship during the past 14 years that they do not recognize a liberty party in action? Of course, there are differences of opinion. A Republican claims the right to think for himself—but he concedes the same right to his neighbor. That is the essence of liberalism. During Lincoln's administration there were wide differences of opinion among the Republican Members of Congress; there were wide differences of opinion in his Cabinet.

The Republican Party has no party line which its members must blindly follow. It sets up no party dictator surrounded by yes men. Out of the honest differences of its members will come compromise and agreement. Its policies will be tested and refined in free discussion. And, thus, in the tradition of Lincoln, the Republican Party will preserve a government for free men.

Action Needed on Monopoly Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which I wrote for the Progressive magazine of February 17, 1947. The article is as follows:

HOW TO STOP MONOPOLY

President Truman in his recent Budget Message to Congress placed himself firmly on record as concerned with the enormous increase in economic concentration that has followed in the wake of the war. The President not only listed the need for greater antitrust enforcement activities high on his agenda of recommendations, but made specific recommendations for an amendment to the Clayton Act. This represented probably the first time that the Chief Executive has made a specific legislative recommendation in the field of monopoly control. Unquestionably, there is a growing feeling of the dangers of increasing economic concentration to our American enterprise system on the part of both legislative and executive branches of the Government.

The dangers to the American system involved in the growth of monopoly and economic concentration are well known to every American, and there is hardly a man in public life who has not at some time given lip service to this threat. However, there has been a lack of concrete action taken on this front. The real test of sincerity must rest upon the specific action program as sponsored and followed through to completion by our legislators, and by the departments charged with enforcement.

While the war was being fought many people winced at the fact that a few giant corporations were receiving most of the war contracts. In an effort to divide the work among small businessmen, a special agency, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, was set up, and during its existtnce it endeavored to secure subcontracts for small firms and to meet their wartime financial needs. Valiant as that agency's efforts have been, it is conclusive that the war brought a further growth in the power of big business, as testified by the financial report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, Economic Concentration and World War II.

Stimulated by the findings of the SWPC report, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, appointed a Special Subcommittee on Monopoly, of which I was chairman, to investigate the effectiveness of the various governmental agencies in combating economic concentration and to see what could be done about not only halting the upward trend but reversing it. The committee staff worked valiantly and in a short time pulled together a substantial report on what has been done, and, more particularly, what has not been done, to prevent and reduce economic concentration.

Here, briefly, are some of the facts the committee brought to light:

There has been a steady upward growth in the concentration of economic power since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act. At the end of World War II only 200 of the largest nonfinancial corporations owned over one-half of the assets of all the nonfinancial corporations in the United States.

During the war 100 corporate giants secured 75 percent of the war contracts and operated 75 percent of Government-built facilities and 68 of these corporations handled 66 percent of all the Government-sponsored scientific research products.

While a few big trusts—such as oil and tobacco—were, many years ago, attacked vigorously by the Antitrust Division, until recently, beginning with the time Thurman Arnold became head of the Antitrust Division, the enforcement of the Sherman Act was largely a matter of a policeman looking the other way.

The Federal Trade Commission has failed to prevent the growth of concentration through preventing monopolistic mergers because section 7 of the Clayton Act has always been a dead letter. The Commission did little to enforce the act prior to 1926, when the Supreme Court made it ineffective by ruling that acquisitions of assets were not covered in its prohibitions.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act prohibited one corporation from purchasing the capital stock of another where the result would create a monopoly. Smart corporation lawyers devised the plan of purchasing the assets and not the capital stock of their competitors. The result was the same—the corporations were merged. But the Supreme Court by a series of 5-to-4 decisions said no law had been violated.

There has been a serious lack of an overall governmental policy in the executive branch regarding concentration. Some agencies showed a lack of interest, while their policies actually promoted concentration—a charge particularly true of the War Assets Administration, the Civilian Production Administration, and the War and Navy Departments. There has never been a systematic follow-up to determine the results of antitrust activities.

Appropriations for antitrust enforcement have been pitiably small relative to the magnitude of the problem. The Bureau of the Budget has consistently under-cut efforts of the antitrust agencies to build up their organizations to a point where antitrust enforcement could be more than a symbol.

So much for the record. What can we do about it now?

The President's recommendation for an immediate amendment of section 7 of the Clayton Act to plug the loophole is in my opinion the first order of business. An enormous wave of mergers has set in since the conclusion of the war which has further accelerated the trend toward economic concentration, and the Government has no power at present to check this movement.

It should be recalled that following the conclusion of the First World War there was a sharp increase in merger activity which produced some of the biggest corporate combinations which dominate a large segment of the American scene. It will be recalled that it was through enormous war profits that these corporations were enabled to expand their economic power. History is again repeating itself.

Last year, when this trend in mergers had just got under way, Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and I proposed that this amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act be passed by the Congress. At that time the Federal Trade Commission documented the growth of concentration through the merger route in hearings before the House Judiciary Committee.

Unfortunately, Congressmen do not always read the hearings of committees. Therefore, it is hoped that the Federal Trade Commission will follow the President's lead and submit a special report to the Congress stressing the importance of the amendment to the Clayton Act. This would bring forcibly to the attention of Members of both the Senate and the House the urgency of the problem.

The attack on monopoly has always been a bipartisan project. There is no reason why party politics should muddy any discussion of the ways and means of developing an action program at this time.

An important piece of antimonopoly legislation—the so-called omnibus monopoly bill (S. 72)—has been introduced in the Senate by a bipartisan group including Senators MORSE, AIKEN, LANGER, YOUNG, Republicans; and Senators MURRAY, TAYLOR, and KILGORE, Democrats. This measure would go a long way in correcting the deficiencies in the present legislation. Furthermore, it would put the Government on record as being seriously interested in restoring a free enterprise economy in America.

This bill would prohibit participation of American corporations in international cartels. It would eliminate some of the greatest abuses of the patent system. It would prevent discrimination in freight rates.

Another source of action against monopoly may be found in the new joint committee to implement recommendations of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. This committee is composed of a group of enlightened men of both parties who are intensely interested in maintaining a free competitive system of American business enterprise.

Undoubtedly they will be interested in following through the President's recommendation in regard to economic concentration. Another concrete step Congress should take would be to increase the appropriations for antitrust activity above those contained in the President's Budget message. While this recommendation would appear to run counter to all the current thinking in terms of Budget cuts, in my opinion, it is necessary if the enforcement agencies are going to fight monopolistic combinations on anything like even terms.

I suggest that both the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission should each have an appropriation of $6,000,000, as compared with the approximately $2,000,000 contained in the recommendations of the Budget Bureau. In the absence of such an appropriation this year, it would be July 1, 1948, before any additional money could be provided to the agencies. That is a long time to wait before making a start toward reversing the upward trend toward economic concentration.

Money spent to fight monopolies and break up concentrations pays big dividends. This is true even if we consider only the immediate material savings of the consuming public. The Small Business Committee found, for example, that one company deliberately reduced the life of electric light bulbs. The introduction of fluorescent light bulbs was delayed because they would reduce the consumption of electricity. Monopoly agreements with foreign cartels have interfered with United States trade and kept the price high on several products.

We were willing to expend hundreds of billions of dollars to protect our American way of life from the threat from without. Why shouldn't we spend a few millions to prevent the threat from within?

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

FEBRUARY 19, 1947.

Mr. MAX MCCULLOUGH,
Administrator, OPA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCULLOUGH: According to the news reports this morning, you are quoted as declaring that if the Budget cut contemplated by H. R. 1968 should go into effect, OPA rent control could last only three more days.

I questioned the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the floor when he was presenting this measure, to the following effect:

"Mr. JAVITS. We are in no position obviously, in looking over this set-up, not having been in the hearings, to know what these people are doing. I happen to be one who is convinced that we have to have rent control, and I do not feel we can have rent control by hobbling the OPA so that it does a bad job of administration. Therefore, I ask the gentleman this question: Is the gentleman convinced, as a result of the hearings, that the OPA will be able to carry on its rent-control functions until June 30, 1947, yet give landlords who have true hardship cases adequate and rapid enough satisfaction so that we will not have the unnecessary pressure from them to do away with the OPA and rent control, which the people in my district are about 95 percent for?

"Mr. TABER. My own idea was, after very careful and extensive hearings on this subject, that we could rescind about $12,500,000. The judgment of the committee is $9,000,000. My own idea was to allow every dollar that I could legitimately allow for an honest administration of this rent activity. I cannot see any sense in allowing a great lot of money for them to carry on their pay roll a lot of generals and other personnel that they do not need and that they have no useful function for.

"Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, do I understand the gentleman then to assure us—and the gentleman knows that I have very high regard for his assurance—that he is convinced that OPA can do the rent-control job with the funds which will be available to it after the passage of this bill?

"Mr. TABER. I believe they can, if they do it honestly."

Further, there appears to be a material difference between your figures and those given us by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, as shown by the following question and answer in the course of the discussion on the bill:

"Mr. COLE of Missouri. How much does this leave the OPA after rescission of the $9,000,000?

"Mr. TABER. About $18,000,000, as I remember it."

In reliance upon these assurances of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I voted for the bill.

Therefore, I am very much interested in having now the exact implication of your program as reported and would appreciate your letting me have the same.

Very truly yours,

J. K. JAVITS,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 19, 1947.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: I appreciate your letter of inquiry concerning the effect of the rescission on OPA.

Let me answer your questions as directly as possible.

A rescission of $9,000,000 and no supplemental appropriation will kill rent control and sugar rationing. The disastrous effect of such an action can hardly be exaggerated. The more than 50,000,000 people living in rented accommodations would face immediate and drastic increases in their rent bills. Nor would they have any protection from eviction save that provided by local or State law.

It has been suggested that even though funds were not available to continue an administrative agency to handle rent control the rent provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act would still be in effect. While this is theoretically true, I think you will recognize that violations of the rental regulation would quickly spring up all over the country; rents would be increased contrary to law and without the protection from evictions, which require an administrative agency to administer. Tenants would be at the mercy of landlords, either as to the rent they would be charged, or forced to rely on such protection as local eviction laws provide. Our experience with the eviction problem has made it perfectly clear that there is no rent control without the protection from evictions afforded tenants through the effective administration of the rent regulations.

You also ask for information as to the effect of a congressional action which permitted OPA to use its present appropriations without rescission but which denied to the agency additional funds for this fiscal year.

To the best of our ability to analyze that possibility, it would appear that we would have to discontinue sugar rationing entirely or discontinue rent control entirely. If we discontinued sugar rationing, it would still be necessary, assuming that we follow present Government policies with respect to liquidation and employee separation, to end rent control in more than 600 rent areas in the country, leaving rent control effective

in perhaps the 19 or 20 largest metropolitan areas. This would mean that two-thirds of the rental units presently under rent control would be decontrolled and that some thirty-five to forty million citizens now protected by rent controls would be denied such protection. The discrimination of such a course of action is clearly apparent.

You will recall that Congress appropriated $101,000,000 to OPA for the fiscal year 1947. The report of the House Appropriations Committee recognized that a supplemental appropriation request probably would be necessary by February 15. The Appropriations Act language placed responsibility on the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to determine the rate of expenditure necessary for the conduct of programs administered by OPA. It was specifically provided that obligations could be incurred at a rate not to exceed $142,200,000 on an annual basis, excluding liquidation expenses and costs arising from the Federal Employees Pay Act.

Although the original appropriation did not contemplate that increased cost arising from the Federal Employees Pay Act would be paid from the amount appropriated, nonetheless the agency has absorbed approximately $10,140,361 for this purpose. This absorption makes necessary the requested deficiency appropriation of $5,950,000. Instead of receiving such needed supplemental appropriation, H. R. 1968 would rescind $9,000,000. The effect of such action is to reduce the agency's required funds by the sum of these two figures, or by $14,950,000.

It has been suggested that an unwarranted increase in our rate of expenditure occurred during the months of December and January. These facts are pertinent. The total expenditures of the agency in December and in January did increase sharply over previous months by reason of the fact that the agency liquidated all of its local war price and rationing boards and district offices throughout the country and separated from the pay roll 16,719 employees during the month of December—to all of whom their terminal leave had to be paid as provided by law. Of the $16,378,742 obligated for December, $7,452,150 was for the terminal leave of these employees. This left a total for operating expenses of $8,926,592, which, in spite of other heavy liquidating expenses, represented the smallest operating cost of any month of this fiscal year to that date.

With respect to expenditures in January, our operating cost actually shows further reduction and amounted to $5,643,580. However, we were still separating employees from the pay roll in our retrenchment program and the terminal leave during this month amounted to $939,200. During January we also transferred $177,000 to other Federal agencies in connection with the transfer of certain functions in accordance with Executive Order 9809, which made the cost of the agency's operations in January total $6,759,780.

We should be glad to submit further figures which will show a steady decrease in operating costs from the date of the first decontrol actions in October to date. The increases referred to for December, therefore, resulted in main from payment of terminal leave accrued over the past 4 years to employees leaving the agency.

It seems extremely important to bear in mind that, although the Congress did not intend to require that either lump-sum leave payments or pay-act increased costs be paid from the appropriation of $101,000,000 if these funds were needed for operating purposes, we have, nonetheless, paid from these funds in excess of $18,600,000 for these two objects. Clearly then, it is only by the absorption of these extraordinary expenses, over which we have had no control, that we are now compelled to ask the Congress for a supplemental appropriation.

For the sake of complete clarity, I should like to state our appropriation problem in another manner: The present funds available to us, out of the appropriation of $101,000,000, prior to any reduction by virtue of the pending rescission bill, would permit us to operate effective programs to approximately June 1. However, at that time it would be necessary to have additional funds to carry the agency's operations through the month of June and, of course, liquidation costs would be required in the next fiscal year. What we have requested then is enough money to carry forward an effective rent-control and rationing program through this fiscal year, with the major part of liquidation costs (except for those already paid) deferred until fiscal year 1948.

I agree that you are entirely correct in stating that I failed to make our problem sufficiently clear to the House Appropriations Committee when I had an opportunity to testify to that body. Certainly, this was not from any desire to withhold any fact, or distort any fact or figure. I believed at that time that I had presented our problem adequately to the committee, but upon reading the record of the hearing I can see quite clearly that I should have stated possible consequences of a rescission action in more concrete terms.

Should a further opportunity be presented to discuss our problem before an appropriate committee of the Congress, we will, of course, be glad to supply all of the information desired and volunteer any information that would appear to assist the committee in its consideration of our problem.

I am attaching a table showing our obligations to date and the effect of the rescission action; and also a table showing our obligations month-by-month through February, and end of the month balances through February, the last month being estimated.

Again, may I thank you for your interest in this critical matter and for the opportunity of laying these facts before you.

Sincerely yours,

MAX MCCULLOUGH, *Commissioner.*

Condition of OPA funds Feb. 1, 1947

Original appropriation	$101,000,000
Less obligations June 30, 1946 to Feb. 28, 1947	85,606,000
Balance available Mar. 1, 1947	15,394,000
Less rescission in H. R. 1968	9,000,000
Available for operations Mar. 1 to June 30, 1947	6,394,000
Less lump-sum leave payments	7,411,000
Deficit based on H. R. 1968	−1,017,000

Obligations—month by month

	Operating rate exclusive of terminal leave	Unobligated balance of $101,000,000 end of month (after payment of terminal leave to date)
July	$10,840,691	$89,730,303
August	11,082,001	78,643,899
September	11,020,879	67,616,015
October	12,494,083	55,074,447
November	10,059,506	44,028,364
December	8,926,592	27,649,622
January	5,643,580	[1]20,889,842
February	5,307,305	15,394,247

[1] Unobligated balance is reduced in this month through posting of appropriation transferred to FTC and OWMR in amounts of $125,000 and $52,000, respectively.

United States Can Hasten End of Unconquered Scourges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of February 21, 1947:

UNITED STATES CAN HASTEN END OF UNCONQUERED SCOURGES

The new Congress has witnessed the introduction of an avalanche of bills proposing legislation ranging all the way from the sublime to the ridiculous. Fortunately, a majority of these measures will be killed off in committee, or relegated to pigeonholes, from whence they never will emerge.

After separating wheat from the chaff in preliminary deliberations, congressional committees will report out good bills from time to time for action by the Congress. In the category of good bills is the measure sponsored by Representative STEVENSON, of Wisconsin, which provides for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the cause and cure of cancer, poliomyelitis, and other degenerative diseases. Under the terms of the Stevenson bill, Congress would set up an independent agency to be known as the National Medical Research Foundation, under the executive branch of the Government. Research of the Foundation would be under the direction of a four-man board consisting of the Surgeon General of the United States, and representatives of the American Medical Association, American Cancer Society, and the American Heart Association. All would serve without compensation. The bill further provides for the appropriation of $10,000,000 to finance the work of the Foundation.

In submitting the bill, Representative STEVENSON said: "Private research suffers from the crippling restrictions of lack of sufficient funds and scientific equipment. With groups of scientists working together and with many such groups stationed in a number of centers throughout the country and supplied with the best and most advanced instruments and equipment, the cooperation of these brains and scientific equipment, with their consequent exchange of ideas and plans, will advance research immeasurably."

Representative STEVENSON'S bill is an enlightened approach to an important phase of national health problems. If the Nation is to progress rapidly toward a solution of the problems inherent in the deadly diseases which hitherto have defined science and exact a terrifying toll in human lives and suffering, it is essential that the Government lend its support to scientific research. Unless the resources of the Government, which are the resources of the people, are thrown into the scientific war against disease, many years will elapse before privately supported science can find the answer to cancer and other deadly scourges which cut down millions of Americans annually.

If America could afford $2,000,000,000 to develop the atom bomb for the destruction of war it well can spare a few million dollars to combat cancer and the degenerative diseases so far unconquered.

Out of Government aid to science, for the purposes of war primarily, have emerged

many discoveries, which have or will become a boon to mankind. From nuclear fission, which slaughtered tens of thousands of Japanese civilians at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, eventually will come atomic energy for peace, creating new comforts and advantages for millions of Americans.

To meet the exigencies of war, the Government made possible the mass production of penicillin. Today this wonder drug is available in sufficient quantities to guarantee millions protection against premature death from microbes that were hitherto resistant to other medications. And so the story goes on ad infinitum.

The American Cancer Society estimates that 17,000,000 people, or one out of every eight now living, eventually will die of cancer. If each of these 17,000,000 deaths involves a financial expense of $200, (actually the cost reaches a far higher average), the total will reach the staggering sum of $3,400,000,000. These are lifeless figures. Who can evaluate the human suffering involved in 17,000,000 cancer deaths?

The Stevenson bill ought to pass from every humanitarian and economic standpoint.

Need for Census of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a copy of the resolution passed by the board of directors of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, at a regular meeting on Friday, February 21, 1947. Business is dependent upon figures published by the Bureau of Census, published in 1940 based on 1939 figures. It is well known that since 1939 there has been a tremendous migration of industry and population throughout the United States. Business people are interested in knowing the extent of this migration. They do not have the facilities to make this determination and depend upon the Bureau of Census to provide this information.

The resolution to which I refer reads as follows:

Whereas during the war the ordinary work of the United States Bureau of the Census was greatly curtailed, and the work of that Bureau directed principally to the services of war agencies; and

Whereas since the war the Bureau of the Census has not been provided with funds which would enable it to reengage in the important work which it did for the civilian economy prior to the war; and

Whereas without the data developed by the Bureau the Nation has been without satisfactory basic statistics concerning its population, production, wholesale and retail sales, and without certain important information on labor force, foreign trade and agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in view of these facts and with due regard for the desirability of economy in national expenditures, this Board goes on record as favoring the restoration of the census functions as they existed prior to the war, and that this position be made known to all officials who are properly concerned with this matter.

Address of Hon. Edgar L. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by Hon. Edgar L. Warren, Director of United States Conciliation Service, Department of Labor, before the Institute on Industrial Relations, National Association of Manufacturers, Boca Raton, Fla., on January 7, 1947. The address reviews the work of the Conciliation Service during the last year and should be read by all who are interested in the subject of labor relations.

My position has been that the Conciliation Service should be strengthened and expanded by ample funds. This is one agency that can aid materially in settling labor disputes and, to me, is the answer to our difficulties rather than restrictive labor legislation.

The address follows:

You gentlemen represent the leaders of the free-enterprise system. I am not telling you anything new when I say that free collective bargaining is an essential part of the free-enterprise system. Employers have just as great a stake as the unions in free collective bargaining. Ira Mosher has said that on several occasions. The industrial-relations report to the Fifty-first Congress of American Industry last month at the Waldorf-Astoria put it in these words:

"The preservation of free collective bargaining demands that Government intervention in labor disputes be reduced to an absolute minimum. The full extent of Government participation in labor disputes should be to make available competent and impartial conciliators. Compulsory arbitration, in particular, is inconsistent with American ideals of individual freedom and is bound to destroy genuine collective bargaining."

That sound policy was reflected in the unanimous statement issued subsequently by the labor-management advisory committee of the Conciliation Service. That eight-man committeee, which includes four labor members and four management members, the latter appointed on the recommendation of the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce, went one step further. Our advisory committee also took an unequivocal position opposing compulsory arbitration or supermachinery for the disposition of industrial disputes. They went on to say:

"With collective bargaining freed from all wartime controls, we believe that American industry and American labor can and will assume their individual and joint responsibilities for the production of the goods and services so necessary to a prosperous peacetime America."

Today, under President Truman, your Government's labor policy is one of free, collective bargaining. Nowhere in Government is there a bureau or an agency that can order you or any employer to write a particular clause or a particular condition into any contract with a union. The Government's role at the bargaining table is limited to that of conciliation.

This policy has imposed grave responsibilities on our conciliators. But it has imposed an even greater responsibility upon management and labor. Today, no interruption of work can be blamed on the Government. Today, the full responsibility for continuous production rests wholly with employers and unions. They are the men who determine whether or not work shall be interrupted.

From here on, whether collective bargaining remains free depends on the ability of both management and labor to do their negotiating without seriously disrupting the Nation's economy or interfering in the lives of their neighbors.

If work stoppages continue to interfere with our economy, I am afraid the Congress is going to consider seriously some form of compulsory arbitration. That, of course, will be the first step to many other compulsions. Once the Government is permanently in the business of deciding the wage increase every year, in peace as it did in war, then inevitably the Government will have to make other decisions on prices and production schedules.

I wish I could say at this point that the Conciliation Service is your complete protection from that sort of regulation. It is not. Only labor and management settling their differences peacefully can guarantee such protection. Employers cannot do it alone. Neither can unions. Both must sit down and work this out unless they want the Government to work it out for them.

The Conciliation Service can help you in this effort if you will let us. Although we cannot guarantee you complete freedom from strikes, we can help you to conclude your negotiations peacefully. Before I go into the services we can render, I would like to examine some of the criticisms of our conciliators heard most often from employers or from those who speak for them. Many businessmen have been saying that our Service favors the union side as against the employer. I am not going to stand up here today and tell you that each of our 275 conciliators is perfect. But I would like to say that we are doing everything that is humanly possible to see that each one of our conciliators understands his responsibility to act impartially in the public interest.

One of the frequent observations is that we cannot be impartial because some of our conciliators have come to us after serving as union officers or business agents. Some have. That raises the question: Can a man once having been a union officer ever again maintain an objective interest in a negotiating session? Can he discharge his responsibilities as a representative of all the people or is he foreever disqualified from Government service of this nature? In that respect, we must then ask the same question of the men who come to us with management background.

I think we can assume that the same common denominator in human behavior motivates the men of management as well as the men from the shops. Then we must admit that it is possible for either a management or a union man to take a new job and to discharge it honestly and faithfully.

About 22 percent of our conciliators came to us with management experience. About 34 percent with labor union experience. It is not easy to attract men from management to Government jobs at Government salaries—as you know. And, many of our men are enticed away from us by employers. In the last 3 years, we have lost more than 10 percent of our staff—30 men in 3 years—to the industrial relations departments of corporations. Incidentally, at least half of our present staff have had job offers at higher pay from management.

Personally, I believe that a man with a union background, a man who knows the technique of negotiations and who understands union values, is one of the most effective mediators. Certainly, union tactics will not confuse him. There are some employers who recognize the advantages of a

conciliator with a labor background and I do have calls from management specifically requesting such conciliators.

We have done a lot in the Conciliation Service during the last year to make sure that our conciliators act impartially in the public interest. If you have any specific complaints, I will be glad to hear them later today or tomorrow. Or, if you prefer, remember that you have four management representatives on our Labor-Management Advisory Committee who will speak for you. Let them know about your complaints. Conciliation is too important to you and your business for you to accept a partisan conciliator. At the same time, conciliation is important enough so that you should examine any prejudice you may have and discover whether it is based on fact or on hearsay.

In the year since the President's Labor-Management Conference on Industrial Relations met in Washington and recommended an expansion of the Conciliation Service, we have been working hard to create a mediation agency in which both unions and employers can have confidence. I believe we have come a long way on that path in 12 months. I would like to say that in this effort we have had some able assistance from Carrol French, the industrial relations director of the NAM.

We need other types of help from employers and union officers. We depend on your judgment to bring conciliators into disputes at the right moment. A conciliator is needed in negotiations only if and when it begins to appear that the employer and union are approaching a deadlock. But, if he is expected to postpone a strike deadline and avert a stoppage, the conciliator must be brought into negotiations while there is still some time left. You can help us not only by timing the call to the Conciliation Service properly, but by seeing that our conciliator arrives under the proper circumstances.

In the present state of public uneasiness about stoppages and threats of stoppages, I believe that many employers could perform a valuable public relations job by taking the initiative in calling conciliators whenever it appears that they may have trouble. I have observed that public citizens of the community interpret a call for a conciliator as an extra effort by the company to settle its negotiations peacefully without community disturbance. I think you are missing a bet when you let the union put in the call to the conciliator.

Part of the failure of employers to take the initiative in calling for a conciliator is, I believe, a misconception of what a mediator can and cannot do.

Our conciliator has no forms for you to fill out. He makes no inspections. He has no authority to order you to do a single thing you don't want to do. He cannot force you to open your books. He cannot take you to court. He is forbidden by order of the Secretary of Labor from ever testifying in court or in Government hearings on any details of any dispute in which he acted as mediator. In this respect, he has the immunities of a doctor or a lawyer. His reports are confidential.

The conciliator's only power is the power of persuasion and the cold eye and clear head that an impartial third party can contribute in a crisis. He represents the public interest in a peaceful settlement. However, he will not make any public statements against you—or the union. Twice during the last year—to my knowledge—conciliators have issued public statements criticizing parties to a dispute. In both instances, the conciliator was immediately withdrawn from the dispute. Under our policy, a conciliator may attempt to persuade either party privately to modify his position. But, he may not attempt to pressure either party by public statements.

You will find that the conciliator frequently can furnish the fresh information and fresh viewpoint that helps to get negotiations off dead center. During this past year, we have launched an intensive training program for our conciliators. We have periodic problems conferences in Washington and in every one of our seven regions. Part of our effort has been to bring to our staff the viewpoints of labor and management. For example, we have had a representative of either the National Association of Manufacturers or the chamber of commerce as a speaker in every one of these training sessions.

There are other services which we can furnish. At the recommendation of our Labor-Management Advisory Committee, I have just completed the appointment of 26 special conciliators, men of outstanding reputations in this field who will be available for occasional mediation assignments in key disputes. Through the device of this panel, we have recruited the occasional services of men whom we could not attract to Government service on a permanent, full-time basis. And, if we could attract them, we could not afford them.

When disputes arise over wage incentive plans, work load, job evaluation, or similar technical matters, our technical division is available on joint request to make impartial studies of the facts in dispute.

If an employer and a union have decided to submit their differences to an outside umpire, the Conciliation Service has available a new panel of qualified impartial arbitrators. All the men on this panel have been screened by the Regional Labor-Management Advisory Committee in the area in which they work. These seven regional advisory committees are composed of men recommended by the NAM, the chamber of commerce, the AFL, and the CIO. When an employer and union are unable to agree on their own arbitrator, we will, on joint request, appoint as arbitrator for them from this same panel of qualified men.

Occasionally, in disputes involving the public safety, a conciliator may recommend to employer and to union that the dispute be submitted to an emergency board of inquiry. If both parties agree to this procedure, but only if both parties agree, the emergency board will conduct hearings and make recommendations on the evidence. Their recommendations are not binding but are intended as a basis for further negotiations.

These are the major services we can offer you. We have made many changes in the Conciliation Service during the last year. It is performing efficiently and impartially. During the last year, our conciliators aided, to a greater or lesser degree, in the peaceful settlement of 13,000 industrial disputes. Our records show that in 90 percent of the disputes in which we were called before work had halted, no stoppage occurred.

Last year, we aided in the settlement of 3,400 strikes. Of those, 64 percent—almost two out of every three—had begun before either of the parties called for the services of a conciliator. We believe this record proves that conciliators are useful.

The Conciliation Service can play a useful role in your bargaining. It cannot succeed unless you use it. The more you use it, the less you need fear that the Government will alter its policy of free, collective bargaining. We are an essential part of the free-enterprise system. But, in the final analysis, the best conciliator in the world cannot bring about a peaceful settlement unless the employer and the union have the will to settle.

Labor Union Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, when is a liberal liberal? For many years Members of Congress have listened to the charges made, especially by masquerading liberals, that they thought more about their election than they did the service of their country. Again and again we have heard the large employer condemned because of his reactionary tendencies. He was satisfied with the status quo. He was doing well enough for himself.

In the latter case, no doubt, too many large capital structure groups have insisted on the status quo and refused to look forward to a changing world. Much of labor leadership has posed before the world as the ideals of new liberal thought and action in the Nation. If you showed any disposition in Congress not to go all the way with labor, you were condemned to death. All Members of Congress will remember that Phil Murray served notice through his Political Action Committee to defeat a hundred Congressmen and elect progressive liberal Members that would represent the people, not the vested interests.

Today in this great battle that is shaping up in the Congress on labor legislation, I ask this simple question—where is the liberalism in the labor unions today? There can be no doubt that there is much liberalism within the ranks of labor, but there is little liberalism within the leadership of labor. They, too, are content with the status quo as has been the case with their capitalistic brothers. At a time when the leadership of labor can come forward and offer a solution for a distressing condition—a condition made distressed because of their action, because of their lack of liberalism and vision—they now abdicate their leadership, they refuse to listen to the demands of the common people, whom they have so frequently made reference to in their oratory of the past. Whatever may be the condition in the world today as regards labor and the rest of the people, it has been brought about by the leadership of labor. There is evidence at every hand that there is need for correction, and if the leadership of labor is liberal, as it has so long claimed to be, now is the time to come forward with corrective measures to correct the abuses that have grown up under their direction. In other words, to come forward and serve the demands of the people of the Nation. That, in my judgment, is true liberalism.

We are receiving no such cooperative effort on the part of the leadership of large labor unions. Rather, they are indicating that the status quo is good enough, and anything that is done as a result of the demands of the people will be taking from labor its long-won gains.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial taken from the Washington Post entitled "Abdicating Leadership":

ABDICATING LEADERSHIP

President Green, of the AFL, and President Murray, of the CIO, are in accord for once—both profess to be satisfied with the legislative status quo. Called before the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare, both witnesses spent their time in negative criticism of various proposals to curb abuses of union power, without offering any constructive suggestions. Mr. Murray did concede that there is no moral justification for jurisdictional disputes, and he suggested that the committee invite President Green and himself to work out a method of banning such disputes. But since jurisdictional disputes involve conflicts not only between AFL and CIO unions but also between unions within the same fold, and since neither Mr. Green nor Mr. Murray have been able to prevent interunion clashes among their own following, as indicated by the jurisdictional dispute that is holding up work on the new Georgetown Hospital, the suggested remedy can hardly be taken seriously.

We fail to understand the lack of statesmanship revealed by the stand-pat attitude of both these labor leaders. They surely have read the handwriting on the wall and must realize that, with or without their cooperation, Congress is going to pass laws to restrict in some measure by some means the activities of organized labor. The really difficult question confronting our legislators is how to protect the public against abuses of labor power without unduly hampering labor in the pursuit of its legitimate objectives. Messrs. Green and Murray cannot be ignorant of the existence of numerous abuses that call for correction. Not only jurisdictional strikes but secondary boycotts, irresponsible breaking of contracts solemnly entered into under collective-bargaining agreements, work stoppages that paralyze industry, such as the coal and railway strikes, and a host of unfair union practices designed to give certain unions monopolistic powers at public expense cry aloud for legislative action.

Not the public alone but organized labor itself needs to be protected against such abuses of power. The longer legislative action is delayed the greater the danger of passage of punitive measures aimed at suppression of unions instead of reasonable restrictions. By their ostrich-like refusal to admit the existence of abuses, the heads of the AFL and CIO have forfeited an opportunity to make their influence felt in the framing of legislation that would strike at evils without calling for unwise prohibitions calculated to produce the industrial confusion and strife that both wish to avoid.

Friends as well as foes of organized labor realize that the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act are in need of amendment, and that stronger mediation machinery is required to deal with certain types of industrial disputes. To take the position that the existing body of law is adequate in all respects is to deny the validity of an unassailable mass of evidence to the contrary—evidence supplied by a series of recent major industrial disputes and countless lesser disturbances that have resulted in losses to employers and employees and to the public at large.

No less inimical to the public welfare, though more difficult to assess, are the losses resulting from all sorts of antisocial union practices designed to outlaw the use of labor-saving devices, to compel employers to hire unneeded labor and to coerce rival unions. Abuses of this sort are not going to be corrected by the unions themselves. They can only be extirpated by their legislative outlawry and by punishment of those union members who indulge in such practices. Studied ignoring of the existence of such abuses and refusal of union leaders to cooperate in framing a legislative program to cope with them only strengthens the conviction that reform from within the ranks of organized labor cannot be relied upon as a substitute for remedial legislation.

Employment by Russia of German Atomic Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press Dispatches from Goettingen, Germany, indicating that the Soviets are importing German scientists for work on atomic energy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET'S OFFER TO GERMAN ATOMIC SCIENTISTS ACCEPTED BY THREE, NOW AT WORK IN RUSSIA

GOETTINGEN, GERMANY, February 23.—Dr. Werner Heisenberg, foremost German atomic scientist, disclosed today that Russia had made a standing offer of 6,000 rubles a month to any German atomic expert who would engage in research for the Soviet Government.

The Nobel Prize winner in physics for 1932 said three Germans already were known to have accepted the offer, equivalent to $500 monthly at the diplomatic exchange rate.

Heisenberg observed the production of atom bombs "is no longer a problem of science in any country, but a problem of engineering."

He said Germany possessed a uranium pile in the last phase of the war and that American agents spirited it away from the territory that was to be occupied by France.

FRENCH REPORTED "IRKED"

"Germany's uranium pile, which I was building up to create energy for machines and not for bombs, was located at Haigerloch, 40 miles south of Stuttgart," the cheerful little man with bushy brows and receding sandy hair said in an interview.

"It consisted of 2 tons of uranium, 2 tons of heavy water and 10 tons of graphite. As the world now knows, the explosive plutonium is produced in such a uranium pile.

"Haigerloch was within the zone which the French Army was in the process of occupying early in 1945. But the French didn't get the uranium pile. All of it was transported off by an American (scientific intelligence) force before, apparently, the French knew what was happening. I heard that the French were very irked when they found out."

Dr. Heisenberg, 45, and six of his associates whom he directed in uranium research sponsored by the Nazi Government, are now pursuing research in the cosmic ray here under British control.

(Other German scientists have been reported doing research in the United States for the U. S. Government.)

Dr. Heisenberg said the scientists who now were "somewhere in Russia" after accepting the Soviet offer were:

"Prof. Gustav Hertz, who built Germany's cyclotron for smashing the atom and who is an authority on the separation of the explosive isotope U-235 from uranium;

"Dr. Robert Doepel, the Leipzig scientist, and Dr. Ludwig Bevilogua, my assistant during the war."

Heisenberg said an authorized German from the Russian zone approached him last September on behalf of the Russian Government with an invitation to join his colleagues.

"The prevailing salary, I was told, was 6,000 rubles a month," he said. "I was promised in addition 50 pounds of fresh meat month, a ration of 3,500 calories of food a day for each of my six young children, and a comfortable, well-furnished house with many amenities.

"I rejected the offer because I wish to keep on living in my own country. I don't want to do bomb research for anybody."

READ SMYTH REPORT

"My three associates went to Russia very soon after the end of the war. Dr. Bevilogua, for a while, was working in the Crimea. Then he was suddenly moved. I am not certain of the whereabouts of any of them now, but I would guess the vicinity of the Urals."

Heisenberg said he rejected an invitation from Dr. Enrico Fermi, the Italian scientist who is now an American citizen, to join the "Chicago group."

"I'd like very much to lecture for a little time in the United States, as I did before the war, but I simply don't want any part of bomb making," he said.

(In Rockford, Ill., Dr. Fermi said he had "never advised Dr. Heisenberg to come to Chicago." Fermi did not elaborate other than to describe Heisenberg as the "foremost German physicist.")

(More than 1,000 topflight German scientists are being brought to the United States to work on United States defense and industrial needs. Some 270 are already in this country, including the brilliant men who developed the V-2 rockets and jet fighters. A half million documents and 5,000 tons of German scientific equipment have been brought to this country, in what is called Army Operation "Paperclip."

(On February 6, the Washington Post revealed that Dr. Heisenberg was among 10 topflight German experts on nuclear physics who were barred from the United States. Security officials decided the Germans might return to Europe to divulge atom secrets they learned here, so they were detained in England temporarily, then returned to Germany.)

As director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Physics Institute, Heisenberg supervised all of Germany's atomic research during the war. He asserted that German achievements equaled those of the United States until June of 1942.

"On June 6 at a decisive meeting, we reported to Armaments Minister Albert Speer that atomic explosives could be produced in two ways, either by separation of the isotope from uranium or by building a uranium pile," he said.

"But Mr. Hitler was a madly impatient man. We were asked how soon it would be possible to extract the explosive plutonium, and we replied 2 years or longer. Hitler refused to consider any military measure that would take more than 6 months. At that time, he was dreaming of winning the Caucasus oil fields and the Suez Canal—the old blitzkrieg dream.

"Germany, in any case, did not have the huge industrial capacity which the United States had to divert to the separation of the isotope, from which the bomb used on Hiroshima was made. We went ahead with the uranium pile, having committed ourselves to nothing more than research into energies for machines.

"Seven days after the meeting with Speer, American atomic scientists had a similar meeting with their Government at which they got the go-ahead signal and, I understand, some $2,000,000,000. Then they outmatched us at least 1,000 to 1 in money, men, and material.

"As a moral issue to a scientist," he continued, "it must be remembered that every tool invented by man since the first ax has been used to slay his neighbor. Yet the development of tools is essential for the development of mankind. They are what distinguishes man from the animals. I pray that the politicians will be clever enough to save us from the evil misuse of science."

SMYTH REPORT REVEALED METHOD, SCIENTIST SAYS

GOETTINGEN, GERMANY, February 23.—Dr. Werner Heisenberg, German atom scientist, said today that the Smyth report on the American development of the atomic bomb had told him "exactly what was done, except for some small technical details."

The report had been criticized in the United States for allegedly betraying military secrets.

"I estimate on the basis of the Smyth report, that the bomb is about a 20-pound sphere of plutonium, say the size of a volley ball," he said. "It is separated in two halves. Each is completely harmless and can even be safely put into a stove. But bringing them together in a few millionths of a second created the greatest lethal explosion in the world."

Rural Electrification Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue its appropriations in support of the rural electrification program and to refrain from enacting any legislation adverse thereto:

Whereas the rural population of the State of Minnesota is vitally interested in the benefits and conveniences afforded by the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas there should be sufficient appropriations of the Rural Electrification Administration as approximately only 55 percent of the rural population of Minnesota is served by this program; and

Whereas the rural population of Minnesota is anticipating the time when rural Minnesota will be 100 percent electrified; and

Whereas rural electrification has proved a good investment to the Government by reason of the fact that it has met its obligations, both principal and interest, in advance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States shall continue to provide funds for the expansion of rural electrification where such construction is economically feasible and likewise to refrain from passing any legislation adverse to the rural electrification program; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Minnesota.

LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives, the 4th day of February 1947.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Adopted by the Senate, the 6th day of February 1947.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

New Agriculture Horizons Through Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the following address I delivered before the first annual convention of the Virginia State Feed Dealers Association in Richmond, Va., on February 20, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Virginia State Feed Dealers Association, the great struggle of man over the ages has been to provide sufficient food and fiber to properly feed and clothe himself.

His inability to unlock the food and fiber storehouse of nature has caused more suffering and misery, and engendered more wars, than all other causes combined.

For centuries he stood at nature's food and fiber door shivering and hungry, knocking, and plaintively crying, "Open the door, Richard." Seemingly he never thought of making a key to open the door, of doing a little research.

At last, after centuries of struggle, we begin to see the horizon of a new and better day. With our present knowledge I confidently believe that it is now possible to produce enough food and fiber to properly feed and clothe every man, woman, and child in the world.

What, you ask, has made this possible? The same thing that has made America the greatest industrial production machine the world has ever known—research. My friends, if you forget every other thing I say tonight I want you to carry this thought with you, the future hope of agriculture lies in research.

And, may I digress right here in the beginning of my remarks to observe that the fact that we have progressed far enough to provide food and fiber to feed and clothe the peoples of the world makes it possible, and for the first time, to bring about world peace. This is no rhetorical statement. Remember this: you cannot make a peaceful world out of a hungry and naked world.

The food and fiber struggle has been long and hard. At intervals—interminable intervals of hunger and distress—haphazard intervals in which no systematic effort was made—we have, chiefly through luck, forged keys that would unlock this or the other compartment in nature's storehouse of food and fiber. If rightly conserved, in that storehouse, commonly known as the land, is stored away, not only an inexhaustible supply of food and fiber, but many other useful industrial commodities to lighten the load and make life a little sweeter. Ours is the job of keeping on forging keys, not in a haphazard way, but by systematic study and research, until we can unlock every compartment in nature's great storehouse and thus bring to man the enjoyment of those things a just, righteous, and bounteous God provided for him.

And there is another job for us that is equally as important. The job of putting back as much, at least, in the storehouse as we take out, the job of systematic, scientific conservation of our natural resources, so as to insure an inexhaustible supply.

As I said, the food and fiber struggle has been long and hard. Although centuries had come and gone when our forefathers came to this country, very little progress had been made in food and fiber production. Let me briefly recount the struggle here in America. At first the American family had a hard time producing enough food and fiber for its own use. Then by working long hours—in most cases from before the sun came up until after the sun went down—with horses and oxen, iron-shod wooden plows, scattering seed by hand, harvesting with the sickle, and thrashing with the flail, four farm families were able to provide enough for their own use and one other family. In other words, four out of every five American families had to engage in farming in order to supply our people with food and fiber. Not until the early thirties, when one of our own Virginians, Cyrus McCormick, invented the reaper, and John Deere the scouring plow, was further appreciable progress made. These two pieces of farm machinery revolutionized farming, and by 1850 one farm family could produce enough food and fiber for itself and one other family. From then on until the present generation very little further progress was made. This generation, and solely because it commenced to tackle the problem in a systematic and scientific way, through soil conservation, irrigation, improved seed, pest control, mechanized farm machinery, and better and more fertilizer, has seen more progress made in production of food and fiber than all the generations preceding us put together, and today the prediction is made that in the near future 10 percent of our people can produce enough food to feed and clothe themselves and the other 90 percent.

We are slowly beginning to realize that farming is a business, the biggest and most important business in the world, and at long last are beginning to apply business principles and practices to agriculture. It was this realization that prompted me in introducing in the last Congress H. R. 6932, commonly known as the agricultural research bill.

Briefly stated, this legislation, which was passed by unanimous vote, through research, attempts to give all phases of agriculture the opportunity of growing and developing along the line that has made industry in America so efficient and succesful. We have realized for years that the dynamo back of our great industrial empire is industrial research. The research legislation is an attempt to put the same kind of dynamo back of agriculture. And let me hasten to state that research, as used in the legislation, is not restricted to the laboratory where scientists prove that two plus two equals four, but is used in its broadest sense, and includes every activity in connection with agriculture from the soil in which products grow until the products of the soil, whether in their original or processed state, reach the consumer.

In order for you to appreciate the scope of this legislation, let me say that title one of the bill includes research relating to conservation and the development of land, forests, and water resources; research relating to the design, development, and more efficient use of farm homes, buildings, and machinery; research relating to improved methods of production; research relating to

pest control; research into the problems of human nutrition; research relating to the development of present, new, and extended uses of farm crops, with particular emphasis on those crops and plants which may be adapted to utilization in chemical and manufacturing industries; and research to encourage the discovery, introduction, and breeding of new and useful agricultural crops and animals, both foreign and native.

Title two of the bill relates to research in marketing. Our farm marketing system has been so sadly neglected that we thought special treatment should be given to the subject.

Now, permit me to briefly discuss some of the research projects that need our immediate attention.

I. SOIL, WATER, AND FOREST RESEARCH

We have, of course, made some progress in conserving our soil, water, and forest resources.

As to the soil: First on the list I would place soil improvement and soil care. Why? Because farmers can no more produce food abundantly and cheaply on impoverished and worn-out land than can the manufacturers produce goods, wares, and merchandise abundantly and cheaply in run-down plants equipped with worn-out and outmoded machinery.

Let me quote from a speech I made on soil conservation some time ago:

"Now, soil improvement and conservation are far more than farm problems; they are national problems. They are impressed with more than a public interest. They are impressed with a public duty. The very strength of this Nation depends upon the strength of our soil. As we improve the soil, we strengthen our Nation; and, conversely, as we deplete the soil we weaken our Nation. I make this bold statement, the strength of every nation in the world today can be measured by the strength of the topsoil of that nation.

"While, due to the vastness of our farm lands, we, as a Nation, have not reached the danger point as yet, we are, to say the least, skating on mighty thin ice.

"(a) Soil erosion has affected in some degree more than 1,000,000,000 acres of land in America. This is more than one-half of the Nation's land.

"(b) Approximately 50,000,000 acres of once-productive cropland have been already ruined for any further immediate cultivation; another 50,000,000 acres are in a condition almost as bad; and half to all the fertile topsoil has been removed from another 100,000,000 acres.

"(c) Of the present American cropland of 415,000,000 acres, only about 342,000,000 acres can be classed as really good land. Of the 342,000,000 acres of good land, only about 62,000,000 acres are nonerodible, and the other 280,000,000 acres of good land is losing soil with every hard wind and rain.

"(d) Three billion tons of top soil go down the streams and rivers every year.

"(e) The annual loss of soil minerals by erosion is twenty times the amount of soil minerals annually used by plant life.

"(f) We are annually mining out five times the soil minerals that we annually put back into the soil.

"(g) Erosion alone is costing the Nation approximately $3,844,000,000 annually.

"(h) In the short span of our existence we have whittled down our top farmland soil from an average thickness of about 9 inches to a present average thickness of about 6 inches. This is a statement of deep significance when we realize that American civilization is resting upon such a thin foundation. Yes, when we begin to visualize that our Republic and all it stands for rests upon such a thin foundation, we begin to realize the importance of keeping the foundation in good repair.

"Having realized that soil improvement and care are national problems affecting the welfare of every man, woman, and child in America, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not tackle the problem from the national point of view. We are justified in such an approach not only from the standpoint that in so doing we are insuring to the generations yet unborn an ample food supply, and thus insuring the perpetuity of our national existence, but upon the ground that we are insuring consumers, present and future, cheaper food. It is axiomatic that when we increase production we decrease production costs and make it possible to give the consumers cheaper food."

Oh, do I hear someone say that by improving our soil we improve our production capacity and in turn bring about ruinous surpluses. Well, get this straight, the world has never produced a surplus food crop. America has never produced a surplus food crop. It is true that due to our distribution system, which I will touch on later, we have on more than one occasion piled up ruinous surpluses. During the depression, for instance, we heard a lot about surpluses. The fact is we did not have a surplus food supply at that time, but did have a surplus of many million hungry men, women, and children.

Controlling production is not the answer to our agricultural problem. The answer lies in a wider distribution plus new uses.

Careful study leads to the conclusion that in conjunction with a sane, sound, sensible export program, we can use all the food and fiber the American farmers can produce for years to come if scientific skill is applied to food and fiber utilization and distribution.

As for me, I shall never subscribe to a program of scarcity as long as millions are starving, other millions living on a starvation diet, at least one-third of our own people undernourished, and two-thirds suffering dietary deficiencies.

As to our timber: When it comes to timber, we have been a prodigal nation. We have treated our timber in much the same manner we have treated our soil, and, as a matter of fact, much of our soil erosion is directly attributable to the unwise and indiscriminate cutting of our timber. One of the best ways, in my opinion, to stop soil erosion is by putting on an intense campaign of reforestation.

Let me give you a few high lights on our timber problem so you will at least begin to realize the seriousness of the problem.

In 1909 our total stand of saw timber was 2,826,000,000,000 board feet. In 1945 the estimate was 1,601,000,000,000 board feet. This indicates that in 36 years we have reduced our saw timber 44 percent.

At present we are making terrific drains on our saw timber. Last year we cut or destroyed 53,900,000,000 board feet of saw timber and against this the estimated growth of saw timber amounted to only 35,300,000,000 board feet. Thus it will be seen we overdrew our saw-timber account by 18,600,000,000 board feet.

Now, we cannot afford, as a Nation, to travel the timber road of the past, because that road leads to destruction. Our self-preservation demands that we pay more attention to protecting our forests from forest fires, insects, and diseases; that we put on an intensive campaign of reforestation; that we eliminate the waste that occurs not only in cutting, but in manufacturing; and that we immediately put into operation better forest practices.

Research, my friends, will play an important part in saving our forests.

Our water resource: God has peculiarly blessed America with wonderful rivers and streams. If our water resources are properly harnessed we can reclaim millions of acres of arid land, bring cheap electric power to every home and factory, and save millions of tons of topsoil that usually go downstream with every tide.

Research will play an important part in conserving and developing our water power.

II. DISTRIBUTION OR MARKETING RESEARCH

One of the great problems connected with agriculture, probably at this time the most pressing, is distribution.

That our system of distribution or marketing in the field of agriculture has been woefully neglected is beyond cavil. When we engaged in our marketing study of agricultural products we found that practically no work had been done by the Federal Government in the field of agricultural marketing. We also found that because our advancement in production had far outstripped our progress in distribution that frequently in the past we had the paradox of simultaneous so-called overproduction of food and fiber, while millions, many of them right here in our own country, were hungry and undernourished and ill-clad. And we found, too, that for every dollar the farmer receives for a product the consumer has to pay from two to three dollars for the same product. The more the marketing committee, of which I had the honor of being chairman, wrestled with the problem the more thoroughly we became convinced that we would not only have to harness but coordinate all our agencies directly or indirectly connected with marketing—Federal, State, and private—and that we would have to approach the problem from a scientific rather than a haphazard angle. Title II of the research bill, I am persuaded, if rightfully administered, will make it possible to market all the food and fiber we can grow upon a profitable basis to the farmer.

The great problem in agricultural marketing, of course, is to bring the farmer and consumer closer together—to narrow the spread between the field and table. If this can be done literally millions will be saved, not only by the farmers, but by the consumers as well, and the consumption of food, due to a lower cost, will be greatly increased. Most of the industries in America have worked out such a system and the time is long overdue for such a system to be worked out by the farmers. I have said before, and I repeat it, no industry in America could stay in business if it had to operate under a marketing system similar to the system the farmers of America have operated under over the years.

While I cannot go into detail as to our agricultural marketing problems, let me list some of them for your consideration.

(a) Reducing the spread between the farm and table by more direct marketing and efficient handling.

(b) Building up our marketing news service so the farmers will be daily advised as to price and market conditions. The diversion of a few shipments, in many cases, will prevent a glut on some particular market.

(c) Build up our foreign trade in agricultural products. Many parts of the world, not only today, but for centuries past, have been crying for food. Surely there is some way to channel off that part of our food and fiber production not needed for home consumption and use to these hungry millions. The reciprocal-trade agreements is a step in the right direction. Another step in the right direction was taken by the Food and Agricultural Organization at its meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark, last fall. At the Copenhagen meeting it was agreed that international action had to be taken to handle world hunger. The idea is to set up a World Food Board to handle an ever-normal world grainery in order to utilize any surpluses that any country might have in those places where people are starving.

(d) New and better uses is another channel through which to market farm products. Here the possibilities, with proper research, are, it would seem, unlimited.

Just a word on new and better uses: Prior to the war we had found a few uses for

farm products other than for human and animal food and clothing. For instance, I cite the miracles in new uses wrought by Dr. Carver, the eminent Negro scientist, with the lowly peanut and sweetpotato. However, it was the necessities of war that really demonstrated in a big way the possibilities of diverting farm crops to new uses. Faced with shortages, our scientists turned to the farm and through the use of millions of bushels of grain and beans and peanuts supplemented our dwindling stock with millions of gallons of industrial alcohol and vegetable oil and millions of pounds of starches and rubber.

Let me take cotton to illustrate better uses of farm products. The rayon industry has spent millions of dollars in research, and as a result we find that the rayon industry is making not only serious, but alarming, inroads on cotton. Rayon, a product of the laboratory, has rapidly been overtaking and supplementing many of the former uses of cotton. It has made such enormous strides, it now seriously threatens to supplant some of the major outlets for cotton. This increased use of rayon over cotton is not due solely to any inherent qualities or advantages rayon has over cotton. In fact, the converse appears to be true, namely, that cotton inherently has many advantages over rayon. Rayon's advancement and expended use has been due primarily to research—research which developed its qualities, and adapted it to an increasing number of new uses. It is safe to say that if one-hundredth of the amount spent by the rayon industry in research had been spent on cotton research that the rayon industry would never have made inroads into cotton, and the cotton-grower today would have a market for thousands of additional bales of cotton.

Let me take rubber to illustrate the possibilities there are for new uses for grain. One bushel of grain will make 2¾ gallons of alcohol; 2¾ gallons of alcohol will make 6 pounds of butadiene; 6 pounds of butadiene will make 6 pounds of rubber; 6 pounds of rubber makes one ordinary automobile tire.

America is the greatest user of rubber in the world. Our prewar consumption was around 600,000 tons annually, and we relied upon foreign rubber entirely, which had to be shipped half way round the world to reach us. During the war our supply of rubber was cut off, and we had to turn to synthetic rubber, and it cost us millions of dollars to build the necessary plants. It would be a crime to dismantle these plants. We should, at least, run some of them, and the rest should be kept intact to guard against another emergency.

But let me get back to the possibilities in rubber from an agricultural standpoint. To produce 600,000 tons of rubber would require 200,000,000 bushels of grain. Now, in making rubber we only use the starches in the grain, and starch is made from sunshine, air, and water. Hence, after the starch is extracted from the grain in the form of alcohol, there remains in the residue all the food value, such as protein and minerals, that was in the original grain, and as a result of further research we now recover from the residue of each bushel of grain 20 pounds of high-protein feed, which all adds up to this: We can extract enough alcohol from 1 bushel of grain to make an automobile tire without impairing the food value of the bushel of grain. Sounds kinder Munchauseny, doesn't it? Well, chemistry, you know, is the science of converting fantastic dreams into realities.

III. NUTRITION RESEARCH

Nutrition should be given a No. 1 priority in research. What we are, as strange as it may seem, depends largely on what we eat.

Now the whole problem of nutrition stems back to the soil. We are beginning to learn that it is impossible to produce nutritious grain, vegetables, and fruit on land where the soil minerals have been mined out. We are beginning to learn that it is impossible to produce nutritious beef on pastures where the soil minerals have been mined out. We are beginning to realize that the health of the people living in soil-depleted areas is nothing like as good as the health of the people living in those areas where the land has not been mined of its soil minerals. The war, through the selective service, brought this fact sharply to our attention. It showed, for instance, that in one Southern State where the soil had been largely depleted of its minerals 70 out of every 100 inductees were rejected, whereas in one Western State where mineral depletion had been less 70 out of every 100 inductees were accepted.

The most important medical discovery that has been made in recent years, I believe, is the fact that almost any disease can be produced experimentally by faulty food. Heart disease, diabetes, arthritis, cancer, anemia, and many other diseases are on the increase. We will, I believe, in a few years discover that the increase has been brought about largely by malnutrition, by the eating of food produced on land where the soil minerals have been mined out.

Let me recount a few of the things that we have already discovered, through research, with respect to nutrition.

A genius living down in Kentucky, Savage by name, has been experimenting for some years with mineralized vegetables. Many sick people fed on his vegetables have achieved nearly miraculous cures.

A farmer down in my district, W. P. Buchanan by name, has been experimenting for years with alfalfa through soil improvement. He has now developed alfalfa that shows a protein content of 25 percent. Can you think of a better dairy feed than some of Buchanan's alfalfa supplemented by a small amount of grain?

Another farmer down in my district, Wheeler Kesterson, has been experimenting through soil improvement with grass on a 40-acre bluegrass field that, when he commenced the experiment, would only carry 20 head of cattle during the grazing season. In the course of a few years he has brought the carrying capacity of the field up to 50 head of cattle, extended the grazing season some 3 weeks, and the 50 head of cattle put on more weight per head during the grazing season than the 20 put on per head when the experiment was commenced.

It has been shown that the iron content of milk has been increased from 21 to 55 parts per million by the proper feeding of the soil on which the cows grazed.

After adding a pinch of manganese in the soil of a tomato field, a food processor discovered that his tomatoes had triple the vitamin C content.

A little boron around the apple trees in an apple orchard in the Northwest doubled the vitamin A content of the apples.

Lambs fed mineral-rich hay from treated soil made nearly three times as much gain in weight as other lambs from the same flock fed the same amount of hay from mineral-poor soil.

I know you men will be interested in this test which is the last one I will give. When rabbits were fed in their diet a mineral-deficient hay in a few weeks the males would not look at the lady rabbits. Other rabbits fed on a mineral-rich hay from treated soils were regular wolves. By changing the diet, the rabbit wolves became lady-shy, and the tame, depressed, impotent rabbits became wolves. Just contemplating the possibilities of this test brings new hope to the aged!

I rarely ever make a prediction. I am going to make one tonight. It is this: The time will come when the price of farm products and livestock will be based, and based entirely, upon the nutritive value of the products and livestock.

The greatest challenge to research, at this moment, is to find out the proper soil-restoring minerals, and to train our farmers in their use. Only in this way can we restore our national health. A properly mineral-rich diet predisposes a man to health and normal functioning. And the healthier we are, the better able we are to resist diseases.

In my opinion the best health program we can put on is to put on a program to improve the nutritive value of our food.

We have got to get away from our thinking that the Lord only put a little lime, phosphate, and nitrogen in the soil, and find out just what minerals it is necessary for us to put back into the soil in order to produce a nutritious diet for man and livestock. Soil gets sick, just as man gets sick, and two adjoining fields may be suffering from entirely different diseases. I hope the day is not far distant when it will be possible to wheel a soil laboratory into every farm, and let the soil chemist go from field to field and make a soil analysis and write for the farmer a prescription for each field, and that in every agricultural county there will be set up an agricultural drug store where the farmer can go and get the prescription filled.

My friends, I am grateful for the opportunity of addressing you this evening. I have enjoyed being with you. Just this parting thought. I am optimistic about agriculture's future. We have the greatest area of productive land in the world; we have the best farm equipment in the world; and we have the most resourceful and successful farmers in the world. And, at last, we are becoming soil-conscious, nutrition-conscious, marketing-conscious, research-conscious, and conscious of the possibilities of new uses for agricultural products. The agricultural horizon never looked brighter. Not even Tennyson, when he looked "into the future, far as human eye could see," had vision enough to encompass the possibilities of agriculture.

The crying need of the world today is for an agricultural leadership composed of men of vision. Such men could do more to straighten out the ills of the world than all the diplomats from Washington to Moscow.

The field is ripe for such leadership. May God give us the men.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein upon request some very forceful views on the subject of rent control by my old friend, Mr. Ralph E. McGrath, of Fitchburg, Mass., as follows:

I want to call to your attention the injustice of continued rent control.

I purchased a block last June in this city and in the same terrace that I live in and to this date have been unable to occupy it. However, that is not the worst of it.

The two tenants each pay $28 per month and have for that rental a private way of street width, with parking privileges and no restrictions; one has seven rooms and the other six with a reception hall. Each has hot water, bath, large cellars, steam heat, storage spaces, and hardwood polished floors throughout, even to the pantries.

Following are my payments for the courage of being a landlord:

I have a mortgage of $6,000 and an equity of $2,000, making a total cost of $8,000.

Payable to the Worcester North Bank monthly (interest)	$24.40
Principal	21.06
Taxes	18.00
Total to bank per month	63.46
Interest on my equity at 5 percent per month	8.35
Water rates per month (average)	2.50
Insurance (tornado and fire only), average	2.00
Minor repairs (average), per month	5.00
Total	81.31
Return on rents	56.00
Loss to my family and me per month	25.31

The sad part of this matter, and others are in the same boat, is that this property paid $40 each a month before the depression and before taxes increased and both you and I know that taxes will not decrease for many years to come.

The bad thing about control, as I see it, is that it answers nothing, and we are farther away from the solution each date that it continues.

The only solution that I see is to get rid of controls in order that building may take place, and as far as my own case is concerned I would like to make apartments and relieve the situation, but this I cannot do because of the continued loss on my property, and I speak for others also.

Please read this on the floor of Congress.

Kind personal regards.

RALPH E. MCGRATH.

P. S.—Bear in mind also that these controls are not in line with wage increases.

Communism Should Be Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for definite action by the Congress to legally define communism in clear, concise terms. Newspapers editorialize about communism, men in public life are attacked as adherents to communistic philosophies, but in spite of all these discussions few people can define communism or give any coherent explanation of their understanding of the term.

Informed Americans know that a Communist menace does exist in the United States, a dangerous force which threatens our future. There is evidence proving that an organized attempt is being made to establish communistic methods, policies, and political ideologies within this Nation. The number of workers in this movement who understand its true purpose may be few. But unfortunately, they are highly trained men and women like Gerhart Eisler, so subtle in their methods that they enlist the active aid of thousands of loyal Americans who are sympathetic and are misled by deliberate confusing of issues, subversion of facts, and deceit.

We must take steps to protect the innocent and expose the guilty. We do not want to brand loyal Americans, misguided though they may be, with the label of communism when they had no intention of furthering the Communist cause. We do want to seek out the Communists who burrow from within to destroy everything we cherish, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of enterprise. We want to expose them, reveal them as enemies of the United States and deal with them accordingly. But first we must define "communism." Without a legal definition of that term our law enforcement agencies are helpless in many cases and even the courts are at a loss how to act with conviction.

Recently the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in Illinois was called upon to decide a case in which the defendant was accused of libeling the plaintiff through the use of the term "Communist" applied to the plaintiff in a syndicated column of political commentary written by the defendant. A district court dismissed the suit on the ground that no cause for action had been established since the word "communism" had no definite meaning.

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the prior ruling, and ordered the case to trial stating:

> It is libelous per se (of itself) to write of a man or corporation that they are Communists or communistic sympathizers.

It continued:

> The label of Communist today in the minds of many average and respectable persons places the accused beyond the pale of respectability and makes him a symbol of public hatred, contrary to the statutes.

During the arguments before the court of appeals in this case, it was definitely established that the word "Communist" has no definite meaning, but that its appearance as a characterization in a newspaper political editorial is sufficient to destroy a person's presumably good reputation with the public.

In every argument in the House concerning communism or Communists we see further evidence of the need for clarification of the use of these terms. Champions of persons accused of Communistic activity argue that no man can be guilty of Communistic activity unless he has engaged in actively supporting action for the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States.

Before the development of the fifth column technique in Europe this may have constituted a liberal definition of communism. But today, with the record of the infiltration of nazism in the countries of Europe before the war and rise of quislings within European governments, we know that organized communism can use these methods, which overthrow without violence, and communism has adopted them.

Communism crawls through this Nation with the subtlety of the serpent, bent upon the destruction of all religion, the abolition of all private property, and the complete subordination of the individual to the state. Its weapons are deceit, conspiracy, confusion, propaganda, and revolution. Its goal is the overthrow of democratic government by peaceful means, or by force and violence if necessary.

It is obvious that an untenable situation exists. We can correct it by passing legislation that will clearly define the term "communism." At the same time we will take constructive action toward the elimination of the communist menace. I have introduced House Resolution 99 for the purpose of defining communism. I urge the Members of the House to support its passage in the near future.

Cherish Public Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, February 22 was George Washington's birthday. In the Farewell Address of the First President, which is read to both House and Senate every year, appears this sentence:

> As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit.

That admonition comes at the opening of the paragraph which Washington devoted to a discussion of "a proper defense" and the cost of wars. In it he also urged "reduction of the public debt" in time of peace rather than "ungenerous" saddling of all costs of a war to a succeeding generation.

CONGRESS HEEDS

To both admonitions, the House of Representatives gave heed, during the past week. First, we called back into the Federal Treasury over $700,000,000 which had been previously appropriated. Next, we voted a $7,000,000,000 slash in the expenditures which the President's Budget had proposed for fiscal 1948.

And with the recommendation for the tighter ceiling, we recommended that "a portion of the excess of receipts over expenditures" be applied to the national debt.

In the meeting of the Joint Budget Committee there were three schools of thought. Some wanted to apply all of the savings to the debt. Some wanted to apply all of the savings to reducing taxes. And some favored both tax reduction and debt reduction.

Personally, I supported the moves which sought to apply not less than three billion to reduction of the debt and to apply a portion of the savings to tax reduction.

SHOULD ANY CUTS BE MADE?

In round figures, the census people say we have 140,000,000 people in the country. Estimates are that about 58,000,000 are gainfully employed. How much is $37,500,000,000, President Truman's Budget, divided among them? Representative WIGGLESWORTH has figured it out.

His answer: $55 per wage earner per month.

Your Federal income-tax payments may not figure that much—or may figure more. To trace it all down, you will want to remember that the Federal tax on cigarettes is part of it, that taxes are

paid in railroad freight, the price of automobiles, telephone and electric light bills, theater admissions, etc.

Oh, yes, and besides the Federal expenditures, there is the bill for local school, county, town, and State taxes.

How much of your time do you work for yourself anyway?

THE ARMY AND NAVY?

They will get what the Congress, after detailed hearings on their estimates, decides we should spend in prudence. Figure before the Appropriations Committee show that these services could have over $14,000,000,000 for actual spending in the coming year, including carry-over funds.

Hearings began last Monday on the Army's needs. I am again a member of the subcommittee which examines the War Department's estimates. We meet every day. The hearings begin at 10 in the morning and close at 5 in the afternoon. They will run until about the 24th of March on the Military Establishment and then go into the civil functions of the War Department, flood control, government of occupied areas overseas, and so forth.

No one can say in advance what the outcome will be in dollars. General Eisenhower, however, in his opening statement said to us: "We recognize the constitutional responsibility of Congress to determine what the Nation should spend on its armed services. Whatever your decision, we will abide by it."

OPA AFTER VJ-DAY

Last July, almost a year after VJ-day, OPA's rent control had 5,700 employees. In November, most of OPA was abolished by Executive order. But February 1, OPA's rent-control staff had increased to over 6,500 people. The increase was largely due to transfers from the abolished jobs.

So OPA asked for an extra $6,000,000 to run to July 1. The Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies, of which I became a member this session, not only said "No," but took back nine million of the twenty-seven million not yet spent out of the one hundred and one million appropriated last year. Our idea was that as we get further away from the war, wartime agencies should shrink, not grow.

As I said during the debate on the bill, "You can tell the folks back home that we are set upon reducing the Federal pay roll. We are out to cut the cost of government. We are on our way."

Lincoln's Common-Sense Republicanism Would Be Workable Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a copy of an address which I delivered on February 12 before a large assemblage of the people of Miami and Dade County, Fla.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a great pleasure for me to come to Florida, the land of flowers, fruit, fish, and flamingos. From the looks of the crowds I see around on your streets, it would seem that a great many other people feel as I do and have come to visit you again.

I have been coming to Florida nearly every year for more than 20 years and have seen tremendous growth and improvements in that time. I feel that your State has a wonderful future. You will always have your fine sunshine and fine climate, and you cannot improve upon that. You will also have your fine strategic, commercial, and maritime locations upon which you can build great improvements. Already you have one of the country's greatest airports and its possibilities are almost unlimited. Likewise you can extend your production of citrus fruits and vegetables to much greater volume and to finer quality. Your sugar industry can be developed greatly.

I have always been strong for Miami. I have seen it grow in population by leaps and bounds. Its real estate expansion has, I dare say, not been surpassed any place in the country. Its improvement in this respect has been steady and substantial. Those in charge of the municipal government of Miami and of Dade County should be forward looking because there is no doubt that Miami is destined to become a great city.

Your politics also can be improved very much. I dare say that if a census were taken of the people actually present in Florida, that in the wintertime three-fourths of the people in Florida, would be Republicans and that in the summertime more than half of them would be Republicans. While I am probably not competent to advise the people of Florida on what is best for them economically, I am going to take a chance at suggesting that I might be competent to advise them what is best for them politically. At any rate, I think anyone could make a good argument to the effect that the two-party system would be advantageous to most of the South, especially to Florida. You people in Florida are now badly in need of one or two Republican Congressmen and a Senator that would pay more attention to local and national affairs and less attention to foreign affairs.

I want to compliment the Republicans in Dade County for the remarkable progress they have made under the able leadership of my good friend Wesley Garrison. I can remember when there were only 1,200 or 1,500 registered Republicans in Dade County. I am glad to know that nearly 35,000 Republicans voted in the election of 1946. There is no question but that the cause of republicanism has made a magnificent growth in the last 10 years. From all indications, the Republican Party in Florida will continue to grow. I hope that in the next election you may elect a large number of Republicans to municipal and State positions and that in the next general election Florida will send some Republican Congressmen to Washington.

Every audience in Florida at this time of the year is made up predominantly of people who came from somewhere else. In this audience tonight are a large number that I know are here only temporarily and have come down to enjoy your sunshine and to play on your beaches and golf courses. Those of you who expect to make Florida your permanent home, and who expect to own property here and to engage in business, should always keep in mind the State's principal business, which will always be to entertain tourists in search of sunshine and health and pleasure.

All over the Nation, Republicans are holding Lincoln Day celebrations at this time of the year. Edwin M. Stanton, a great Ohioan, who was a member of Lincoln's Cabinet, and who sat with him when he passed away, said, "Lincoln now belongs to the ages." His statement has been fully justified, for Lincoln's influence is greater in the United States and in the whole world today than it ever has been, and he is now known all over the world as the great apostle of human liberty. It shall not be my purpose to attempt a eulogy on him because no eulogy that I could make would do justice to his name or memory. As Lincoln said of Washington, so I can say of Lincoln, "To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Lincoln is alike impossible."

In addition to the fine qualities of mind and heart which nature gave him, his great influence in the world can, I think, be traced to his firm anchorage in three great documents. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He recognized the Declaration of Independence as a document "proclaiming liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof." He recognized the Constitution as a sacred bond that held the States in an indissoluble union. And he recognized the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the greatest moral force in the world.

Lincoln lived in a very critical period in the life of our Nation. Henry Clay, with his numerous compromises, had delayed the joining of issues on the question of slavery.

Daniel Webster had done his best to preserve the Union when he said, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable!" The political parties were uncertain in their policies and in their strategy. The people were floundering both politically and economically. The churches were fervently engaged in defending public morals. The Government was weak and uncertain. Lincoln came along and put life into the then struggling Republican Party. In his famous lost speech of 1856 he gave it issues upon which to stand. He put the forces of honesty and common sense into motion. He carried the people back to the standards of thought and purpose that had actuated the people when they put forth the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. He told them that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

The Republicans of today can well afford to give heed to the admonitions and common sense pronouncements of Lincoln. For the last 16 years our country has gone through the worst possible attack upon the very foundations of the Republic. I hope that I may not affront anyone, but I was in Washington long before the New Deal came into power. Although it was hard living, still I am glad to say that I lived through the New Deal, and I hope that I have lived clear through it. While everything about the New Deal was not wrong and improper, it carried about as much of a threat to the perpetuity of the Republic as the conditions in Lincoln's time which prompted him to say in his Gettysburg Address, "That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

There is no question but that the real aim and purpose of the New Deal was to change our form of government. An open declaration of their purpose to spend, spend, spend; elect, elect, elect, could not possibly have been in consonance with the spirit of the Constitution of our country. I cannot see how anyone could claim that he was doing his full duty toward his country when he was purposely advocating scarcity as against plenty, idleness as against industry, profligate spending as against thrifty economy, and Government control of property and business and the regimentation of the people in what they did and what they consumed. Their bold and practically successful attempt to control the judiciary of the Nation by packing the Supreme Court will eternally

raise a doubt as to their complete loyalty to our form of government.

I therefore say that we have in the last 16 years come through a worse crisis than that which preceded and followed the Civil War. As the Republican Party saved the Nation then, so the Republican Party must save it now, and we must do it with malice toward none and with charity for all, and we must do it by binding up the Nation's wounds and by stepping out and up to new and higher and more healthy political and economic grounds.

The American people demonstrated in the November election of 1946 that they had had enough. No political party was ever so completely repudiated as the New Deal party in the last election. The responsibility of the Republican Party is great. The people are expecting great things of us. The people want the Republican Party to succeed. They are not expecting the impossible. The strongest position the Republican Party could take today would be to recognize as its three cardinal principles: adherence to the pronouncements of the Declaration of Independence, compliance with all of the provisions of the Constitution, and allegiance to the gospel of Christianity. In other words defend the liberty which we achieved through the Revolution, support the Constitution which is our political and economic charter, and practice Christianity, which is the greatest moral force in the world.

Lincoln's strength was in his common sense and his accurate appraisal of what the people were thinking about and what their best interests demanded. He presented these issues in a masterful fashion. To my mind that is exactly what we must do through our press and through our pulpits and through our legislative debates and enactments. In other words the duty of the Republican Party is simply to do what should be done as measured by the rules of common decency and common honesty.

In the early history of the world, military might was the determining factor in forming the destinies of nations. And while we showed in the late war that we had all of the military might that was necessary, still our problem now is not one of military might. It is one of appraising properly the needs of the people and proceeding courageously to secure them.

The people by reason of the press and radio are better posted on public events than they were in the days of Lincoln. The people are looking to Washington more now than they ever have done. Congress is more inclined to listen to the voice of the people now than it ever has been. I think this is as it should be. There are several very important issues before the American people at this time and the people are looking for Congress to solve them.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Several of the important issues before us today spring from the fact that the country is now carrying the most terrific national debt that any nation ever attempted to carry in the history of the world. I can remember that after the first World War we thought it was a terrible load to carry a national debt of $27,000,000,000. The conscience of the Nation at that time did not approve national extravagance. We should have heeded the chiding of our national conscience.

The Republicans reduced that debt for 10 years at the rate of a billion dollars a year. When the New Deal came to power the debt was about $20,000,000,000. I remember that it was with great temerity that we increased the debt limit to $35,000,000,000 and then to $45,000,000,000 and then to $60,000,000,000 and then to $125,000,000,000 and then to $210,000,000,000, then to $260,000,000,000 and finally to $300,000,000,000. Now the debt is $259,000,000,000.

This terrific debt has great weight in determining whether and how much we shall reduce taxes and how we should apply the revenues which the Government collects.

Most of this terrific debt was contracted in the past few years. Our Government spent more than twice as much money in the 5 years 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 than it spent in all of the days from George Washington down to the beginning of 1941. The total cost of the Government from the days of George Washington to the end of 1940 was less than $175,000,000,000. The total cost of Government in the 5 years from 1941 to 1945, inclusive, was more than $350,000,000,000.

In not one single year of the 16 years of New Deal administration was the Government able to meet its expenses. Terrific deficits were piled up in every year. The New Deal never did balance its budget. This year the Republican Congress is determined to balance the Budget and to pay something on this large debt. Personally, I hope we can keep the Budget to thirty-one billion and that we can reduce taxes substantially and have three or four billion to apply on our national debt.

There are three ways by which the national debt can be discharged. The first might be by repudiation, which no loyal American citizen would favor. If we refuse to pay our honest debts then we can not operate under our Constitution. The other method would be by inflation. No country has ever paid its debts by inflation and survived. We could not do so. The remaining method by which the debt could be paid is by the old method of taxation. In other words, we must pay this debt ourselves since it is our own debt. I know that Franklin D. Roosevelt advocated that we should not worry about the national debt since we "owed it to ourselves." It is not so important that we owe it to ourselves as it is that we contracted it ourselves and it is cowardly for us to carelessly pass it on to future generations. It is little short of a national disgrace for us to take the position that we cannot pay this debt for at least a hundred years. We must do it in less time. We might amortize the debt over a period of years and obligate ourselves to pay in yearly installments, but even then it would take a long time. But it must be paid.

We must again publicly advocate that thrift is a virtue and should be practiced by the Government and by the individual. Repeatedly on the floor of the House have I challenged anyone to produce any statement by Franklin D. Roosevelt advocating thrift.

The motto of his administration was to spend and spend and elect and elect. Now the time has come when we must begin to pay. We must pay by taxation and by economizing.

The Republicans in Congress have determined to economize. This must be done in every proper way. They have determined to separate from the Government service many thousands of persons who probably were never needed and who now are surely not needed. A great saving could be accomplished in that respect. Likewise a general policy of economy and thrift must be practiced in the making of appropriations by Congress.

As you know, the President has recommended that the Budget for the coming year be fixed at $37,500,000,000. The Federal revenue comes largely from taxation. No great savings can be effected unless the Budget is reduced very materially below $37,500,000,000. A committee from the House and Senate have now been working on this for several days. They must conclude their work and report to Congress by the 15th of February. The Republican Members are determined to keep the Budget below $32,000,000,000. Personally, I think it can be reduced as low as $31,000,000,000. In a few days we shall know the result of the work of the Budget Committee. The report of the committee must be approved by Congress.

Fixing of the Budget is a very important matter. It is the first must matter to be done by Congress in this session, but it would be very fortunate for the country if we could just know what the national income will be for the coming year. But this is not possible by February 15. If our country continues to maintain a high national income, we can naturally carry a higher Budget. What the national income will be depends largely on what the economic conditions will be and what will be the production of the Nation. As you know all wealth comes from the ground plus production by the hands and brains of the people. If the relationship between the employer and the employee should be friendly, cordial, and cooperative for the next year our national income would stay up. If on the other hand the relationship between the producing forces is strained and production is kept down, then our national income will no doubt come down. I think that there is a finer feeling of conciliation between industry and the employees now than there has been for years. I hope this will manifest itself with the result that production will be maintained at the highest possible rate.

As soon as the Budget is fixed, then we can proceed logically to determine where and how savings are to be effected. The more saving that can be effected the more taxes can be remitted. If we cannot reduce expenses, then we cannot hope for a reduction in taxes.

We read frequently in the press that the Republican Party is committed to a 20-percent-across-the-board reduction in taxes. I have never felt that I have been committed to a reduction of taxes in any special amount. I have refrained from committing myself, because as I have already stated, the reduction of taxes must depend upon other factors. Of course I hope that we will be able to reduce taxes and to reduce them very substantially. I know that it will be the purpose of the Republicans in Congress to make as great reduction as is consistent with good business. That will be my purpose. I am sure you would like to know what is the feeling of the Republican Members of Congress with reference to their responsibility toward the American people. Not since I have been in Congress has there been a stronger feeling among the membership to do what is best for the Nation. I hope that we will be able to so demean ourselves as to win the approbation of the American people for having done conscientious and constructive work.

The Government under the New Deal has been expanded in so many ways that the expense of operating the Government has increased greatly. Before the last war the total operating expenses of the Government were about six billion. At the present time it takes six billion to pay the interest on the debt. It also takes about six billion to pay the veterans' claims. This would make a total of $12,000,000,000. And there must be a terrific increase in the cost of maintaining the Army and Navy. Formerly the Army consisted of less than 300,000 men. The Army now must contain about a million men. The same is true also of the Navy. Our foreign commitments are much heavier than they were formerly. President Truman says he should have $37,500,000,000 next year in order to meet expenses. I think the Republicans will decide that he must get along on less than $32,000,000,000. If we are successful in this respect we can reduce taxes about $3,000,000,000 and still have about $4,000,000,000 to appy on the national debt.

My friends, I would not leave with you a dismal picture. Personally, I feel very hopeful that the Republican Congress will be able to do most of the things that the people expect us to do. I know that the Congress is alert and wants to do for the country what it knows the people are expecting. I

feel that the Republican Congress has the right spirit and that it will accomplish great things.

The House of Representatives has already passed legislation calling for an amendment to the Constitution restricting the holding of the office of President by any person to two terms of 4 years each. This was done only after many ardent New Dealers in Congress had protested. However, many of them voted for the measure. I hope this amendment is finally adopted.

The House has also passed legislation extending the law providing for the collection of the excise taxes. This legislation would continue the collection of $1,300,000,000 in excise taxes.

I am hopeful that the Republican Congress will courageously undertake the solution of the labor problem and will reduce taxes and pay on the debt and that it will repeal the many laws giving special power to the Executive over the property and rights of industry and the people of our country.

I also hope that the Republican Congress will remove all vestiges of the OPA as soon as possible consistent with good government. The OPA was the one program that showed how far the New Dealers would go in their fallacious policies and arrogant parctices in an effort to socialize our country and to supplant republicanism with socialism and statelism.

The people on November 5 showed that they had finally properly appraised the New Deal and they repudiated it completely. As a Republican Congressman speaking to Republicans I am hoping that our own party will for the good of the country and the world demean itself in such a manner that future generations may proudly say that ours is a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Lincoln's Philosophy, Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address entitled "Lincoln's Philosophy, Then and Now," delivered by me before the Middlesex Club, Boston, Mass., on Wednesday, February 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a high honor for me to come to Boston to join you in celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Out in Nebraska we have the views of the Great Plains. Our country is young. We do appreciate the traditions of your background which you enjoy here in New England. But, as you cherish the traditions of the Middlesex Club, we have a fondness for experimenting with things new. Nevertheless, we do have many principles in common.

One of those principles is a tremendous faith in opportunity.

America is history's greatest demonstration of achievement by a free people; and Lincoln stands before the whole world as the symbol of that American freedom.

His example is the inspiration for American leadership, indeed, for the leadership of the world.

America today needs another Abraham Lincoln.

It was his wise leadership in our land of opportunity, combined with the lessons of experience and his new vision, that strengthened the roots of our new-found liberties.

Down the vista of the years, the spiritual figure of Abraham Lincoln grows. Lincoln now has a timeless quality, and a moral dignity and grandeur all his own. We see him now, not only as a political figure, but as one of the great spiritual leaders of mankind.

To all Republicans, Lincoln's birthday has a profound significance.

He was the founder of our party, and

Our party, the rank and file, and its leadership, come together on this day reverently to rededicate themselves to those larger purposes, to which he gave such a full measure of devotion.

THE FORCES IN MOTION

What forces led to Lincoln's nomination for the Presidency and how do they correspond to the forces that work within the country today?

During the weak, vacillating administration of President Buchanan the momentous issues were beginning to crystallize which culminated in the campaign of 1860.

The issue then raised was the extension of slavery into the new territories seized or opened up by the Federal Government.

Fearful of open conflict that threatened, most national leaders of the time urged compromise.

Horace Greeley proposed the nomination of Stephen A. Douglas, then a towering figure in the United States Senate, author of the doctrine of "Popular Sovereignty" which sought to accomplish the impossible feat of compromising the power of the Union with extension of slavery—trying to face both ways at the same time.

Hasn't that kind of double talk a familiar ring?

WHAT QUALITIES OF LINCOLN MET THESE FORCES?

What qualities singled out this angular, unknown frontier lawyer from New Salem, Ill., for national leadership, when the young Republic was confronted with the first serious threat to its continued existence?

It was the outstanding figure, Stephen Douglas, whom the young unknown lawyer, Abraham Lincoln, challenged in a series of debates which were to become historic.

Lincoln saw more clearly than did most men that the great issue of preserving the Union admitted of no compromise. To those who urged softness or fusion, Lincoln wrote: I quote.

1. "There are good, patriotic and able statesmen—whom I would gladly support, if they would now place themselves on Republican ground—but I am against letting down the Republican standard a hair's breadth."

Lincoln's unswerving philosophy was there can be no compromise with any force which would undermine or destroy the Union. That was the Lincoln approach and that is exactly the kind of Republicanism we need today.

The voters last November 5 decreed that there be no compromise with the forces bent upon undermining the Union. They said by their vote, they wanted an end to Federal encroachment on their liberties.

During the last 14 years, bureaucracy has grown by leaps and bounds. From March 14, 1936, to November 5, 1945, there have been 107,136 Executive orders, directives, grants, permissions, and prohibitions issued by the bureaucrats in Washington. To print these orders required more than 62,000 pages and 93,000,000 words. Female steers, mules, steam pipe, and threads.

President Truman last Thursday asked the Congress to extend the Second War Powers Act, the authority under which such orders and prohibitions are issued.

If we are to confine the Federal Government to the functions it should perform as a government of laws we must take back those war powers Congress has delegated to the Executive and when the Second War Powers Act terminates on March 31, I, for one, will vote and work against its extension.

If there are any controls that should be continued let the administration come to the Congress and ask for specific legislation in each case.

We must also cut down, and cut out, a multitude of bureaus no longer needed in Government. To that end, I joined with Senators WILLIAMS, of Delaware, and WATKINS, of Utah, to end on April 30 the Office of Price Administration.

If there is any further need to control prices, let the administration come before the Congress, and justify special legislation to meet each specific need.

The Congress, in the House, has met its first test on another issue which involves a most dangerous threat to our American system of liberty. On last Thursday they overwhelmingly voted for a constitutional amendment to limit the Presidential tenure to two terms. Every Republican in the House voted for this amendment.

No political monopoly or personal autocracy should ever again be permitted to exercise such power as to perpetuate its control over the people, by a multiplicity of terms in the White House.

The "no third term" tradition is based upon one of the soundest principles of American freedom. Your own Calvin Coolidge kept faith with that time honored and sacred tradition.

Fourteen years of misgovernment, because of the centralization of power, have left us with an array of unprecedented problems, which the Republican Congress is now called upon to solve.

A secure, sound, and solvent America depends upon a balanced national economy. Our task is to balance our national economy in the face of a staggering debt of nearly $260,000,000,000.

1. The budget must be balanced—make no mistake about that. Yet, it is only one of several factors in the problem of balancing our national economy.

2. Our national debt must be serviced and reduced, and at the same time, we must reduce taxes.

3. We are faced with the worst housing shortage in the history of the country. And yet to meet this situation no relief is offered except through a veterans' housing program which is completely bogged down.

4. Federal-aid appeals still flood Congress, from municipalities and States, for the same old kind of financial hand-outs.

5. We are under terrific pressure to increase wages. The administration insists, all these increases should be made without any corresponding rise in prices. That's the Wallace theory.

Inseparably connected with these factors is the stabilization of the American dollar. How is the dollar to be stabilized?

(a) By sound administrative practices in Government.

(b) By increased production of goods and services which, through competition in free markets will assure reasonable prices and good quality.

It was for precisely that reason that I introduced a resolution and fought on the floor of the Senate to continue the Small Business Committee. Small business is indispensable to the welfare of America.

The family-sized farm, the home industries, the small home-town newspaper, the corner grocery, the village blacksmith, and the family doctor around which a flourishing community is built, are the foundations of a sound national economy.

For the security of all, we must lick inflation. Nowhere was this brought home

to me more clearly than last November when I visited France and Germany. I saw at a farm sale in France, a 2-year-old colt bring 132,000 francs, or about $1,300 in American money. And in Germany, a package of cigarettes would buy more goods or services than a pocketbook full of marks. A cigarette was worth 80 cents in American money.

These instances were the results of scarcity. I said, in Boston a year ago, that the way to halt inflation is by increased production. We can get full production only when we stabilize relationships between management and labor.

There must be an end to the epidemic of strikes, such as swept the country last year.

If one thing is clear, it is the absolute inadequacy of the Wagner Labor Act, either to bring about or to maintain industrial peace. The record during the past 11 years is tragic.

Last year, for example, there was established an all-time high both as to the number of workers involved in strikes and the number of man-days lost. There were 4,700 work stoppages during the year involving 4,650,000 employees which resulted in 113,000,000 man-days of idleness during a period when the American people faced acute shortages of goods.

Who suffered the most, lost the most, and paid the most? The working people.

What the Nation needs most of all is to write a new labor policy in the light of our past experience.

Congress is confronted with the duty of protecting labor, agriculture, management, and the Government itself—against any undue hostility, or unreasoning hatred.

Collective bargaining is a necessity in our American economy. It is essential to our National well-being that the Congress preserve opportunity for labor. But, as opportunity is preserved legislation must be enacted which will assure every man the right to work for whom he pleases—and protect him against being required to pay tribute to any union for that right.

The right to work is a vital part of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In union there is strength but there must be no despotism or tyranny.

These are only a few of the domestic problems that have literally been dumped in the lap of the Eightieth Congress.

It is now obvious to all of us that it is most difficult to heal the ills of a Nation that have been 14 years in accumulating and still escape scot-free from their consequences.

If we are to use the Lincoln approach the settlement of these problems can no longer be delayed and the principles cannot be compromised. It will have to be done by a militant Congress willing to assume the leadership necessary to remove the uncertainties that threaten our high production level, restore those incentives which unlock the energies of men and, build the foundations for a permanent, prosperous America.

It has not been done, and cannot be done, by a feeble, hesitant, or divided leadership.

FOREIGN POLICY

The settlement of these domestic issues is further complicated by world-wide commitments made by the State Department over the past 14 years, frequently without the prior knowledge of Congress.

The practice of making domestic policies subservient to our foreign policy as administered by the State Department is something new, and is the outgrowth of authority used by the State Department without congressional review.

Traditionally our foreign policy was molded within the framework of a strong, virile, free domestic economy. But today, because of foreign commitments, our situation has been reversed and our domestic policy is now being shaped to fit the pattern of our foreign policy.

The United Nations was set up to bring lasting peace to the world and all people hoped and prayed it might be accomplished.

To implement the United Nations organization and the other international agreements America has poured out billions and billions of taxpayers' dollars. Now we find that the money has been used largely to finance the very forces alining themselves against us around the world.

It takes no prophet to predict that within the next 12 months many of these organizations and nations will again be knocking at the door of our Treasury for more American billions.

If we are to prevent the use of the American taxpayers' dollars for the financing of alien forces working against us throughout the world then the time has come for Congress to take back the policy-making powers exercised today by the State Department without even a semblance of senatorial review.

I refer specifically to the power to negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements and tariff reductions and, the power to shape American food controls and foreign export regulations in which the State Department presently has a dominant voice. Also the disproportionately large measure of authority the State Department now exercises in shaping our national defense and related programs.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion I think it is well for us to recall that the founding fathers (and wise men they were) created a government to be composed of three independent coordinate branches each checking the others in order to preserve wide-open opportunity for the individual citizen. That opportunity we must continue to preserve.

America grew great, and we as a people achieved the highest living levels, greatest freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly; the highest wages, the most luxuries of life because of individual opportunity, which was a constant invitation to individual talent and initiative.

Unless we are, as Lincoln said, meanly to lose all of this through our own indifference, then we must prepare to face whatever pain and inconvenience may be occasioned by these necessary readjustments to get back from a government by bureaus and regulations, to a government of, by, and for the people in which opportunity, under the Bill of Rights, is the chief foundation stone.

To do that we must set our faces sternly and unyieldingly against any move within this country either to destroy our American system of free constitutional government, free economy, and free society, or to lead our people away from their ideals and their faith in God.

As we leave this banquet hall tonight I call upon all of you party workers to rededicate your lives, to fight for the principles for which Lincoln gave his life. May we keep the faith with the immortal Lincoln? Yes; may we keep the faith of the teachings of the Almighty God.

The Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 22, 1947:

PROGRESS IN CONGRESS

(By Mark Sullivan)

BUDGET AGREEMENT SIGNIFICANT

In accounts of the new Congress, 7 weeks after it came into existence, appear occasionally the words "muddle" and "confusion," especially in connection with the budget. Citizens who might be anxious about this condition if it existed, may get assurance from considering the essential facts, which point to a contrary conclusion. The new Congress has made a remarkable record of speed and competence.

This is not merely a new Congress. Nor is it merely a Congress in which one party took over from the other, nor merely a Congress controlled by one party while the Presidency and the executive machinery are in the hands of the other. In addition to these conditions, which make difficulty at all times, the new Congress faced a novel and extraordinary difficulty.

There had been enacted, last year, a law, the La Follette-Monroney bill, which completely reorganized the machinery of Congress, and which took effect with the opening of the present Congress. This law, among other things, revolutionized the committees of Congress as they had been for a century. Many of the old committees were abolished, others combined, duties of many committees transferred to others, the total reduced to a manageable number.

And this drastic reorganization of committees is not the whole of the story—essentially it is only the beginning. Upon the committees, as newly set up, are placed greatly enlarged functions and responsibilities. The La Follette-Monroney bill contemplated an assumption by Congress of enlarged control over the machinery of Government as a whole, a reassertion by Congress of control over departments and agencies of government which, over a period of years had weakened or lapsed. This enlarged control by Congress was to be exercised mainly by the committee as newly set up.

That this revolution in the congressional machinery made organization of the new Congress especially onerous goes without saying. That it has been accomplished—that the new committees are organized and functioning, that their staffs have been appointed and are at work—is prime testimony of the speed and competence of the new Congress. Add that another and traditional difficulty has been surprisingly minimized. Between the new Congress, controlled by one party, and a President belonging to the other is a degree of cooperation not achieved in previous times when the conditions existed.

The prompt working of the new congressional committee system is illustrated by what has been done about the budget. In the new system, and very important in it, there is set up a joint committee of the Senate and House, the Joint Congressional Committee. This committee is directed by the new law to make and recommend an estimate of Government expenditures for the year ahead, and to announce it by February 15. The new committee did this, on the day specified.

The joint committee took as a starting point an estimate made by the President, that expenditures should be $37,500,000,000. This the committee reduced by $6,000,000,000, and so recommended to Congress. This $6,000,000,000 recommendation has been accepted by House Republicans; Senate Republicans have proposed a smaller figure, four and one-half billions. Controversy between six and four and one-half, within the parties and within Congress, provides most of the current news about the budget.

What is really important is not the controversy between four and one-half and six,

but the acceptance by both groups of contenders that there shall be a ceiling to expenditures, the ceiling to be less than the President's recommendation of thirty-seven and one-half billions. That there shall be a ceiling on expenditures, and that the ceiling shall be fixed by Congress, is all that Congress is so far called on to do. The difference of opinion about the ceiling figure, a one and one-half billion difference in judgment about a total which in any event is over thirty billions, far from occasion for concern, is an extraordinary degree of agreement.

So far as concern is justified at all, it is whether Congress actually restrains itself to the ceiling it sets. This is for the future, when Congress makes the appropriations which compose the total of Government expenditures. As a matter of fact, apprehension is hardly justified. There is hardly the faintest doubt that after Congress has made the various separate appropriations the total will conform to what Senator TAFT has said: "The Republicans propose to reduce * * * this year and more next year." That purpose is held by Democrats as firmly as by Republicans.

Address of Louis E. Starr, Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of Commander in Chief Louis E. Starr, Veterans of Foreign Wars, before the Women's Patriotic Conference, Washington, D. C., January 24, 1947. It is a speech on the matters of defense worthy of the consideration of every American. It follows:

THE WOMAN PATRIOT

is a special pleasure to address the Women's Patriotic Conference. The aims and ideals of my organization are in general the same as yours. The wording of our charters may vary, yet there is a similarity of phrase and in our activities an identity of purpose.

Some of our objectives concern themselves with veterans' affairs almost exclusively. In a larger sense, however, we are interested in other and wider objectives. It is in these we find our common ground:

To maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; and to preserve and defend the United States against all their enemies whomsoever—these are the ideals I shall discuss, relating them to the subject I have selected as the keynote for this conference, The Patriot Woman.

Through the ages men have set the pattern for what is generally accepted as patriotic service. Perhaps they established themselves as the defenders of the hearth—and of tribal rights—at the dawn of human history—when women, hampered by the necessity of protecting their children, remained hidden in caves or behind rocky escarpments. Whatever the origin, it has been men—the fathers and sons—who have distinguished themselves around the council fires, in battle, and in those parleys in which the destinies of nations have been determined.

Because women have traditionally been the homemakers, or speaking less idealistically, because they have been the vessels through whose sons property and titles descend, they have been guarded as any valuable chattel would be from exposure to war, danger and predatory males.

I do not argue the right or wrong of this procedure—of the historical restriction of the field of women's patriotic endeavor. I only know that men have set the precedents for aggressive patriotism—and women, rather than attempting to ape them—have, happily, distinguished themselves in related fields of endeavor.

It has been women, like yourselves, who have inspired and taught fidelity to the Constitution and its laws, true patriotism and the extenson of the institutions of American freedom.

Despite the handicap of an inferior political, economic and social position, women have achieved unique distinction in the customary observances and symbolism of our country. In an earlier day the United States was often represented by a womanly figure, Columbia. She was depicted as a Junoesque type in a pose not unlike that associated with the Statute of Liberty. Columbia, the Gem of the Ocean, was a popular symbol, celebrated in song and poetry. Liberty, long the guardian of our eastern portals—The Lady to millions of servicemen who have sailed past her—is a noble representation of a woman. Justice, blind but invested with rectitude, honor, faith and probity, is always a woman of ineffable beauty.

It is significant that literature records only one army of women, the battling and fearless Amazons of the ancients. It has been men who have perfected the mechanics of war—women who became skilled in the arts of peace. As a symbol, the patriot woman is an heroic figure. In reality she is a creature of our imagination, ofttimes expressed through the medium of each of you.

The patriot woman is she who recognizes the needs of her country and within the limitations of her genius, actively does something about them—not all her country's needs—no one, man or woman, can act with wisdom in all matters simultaneously. She elects the things she best can do and does them with all her heart and strength—with vision, with determination and with skill. Often she works only in her own family or in her own community.

Ages past women learned a lesson that men are only beginning to accept as a principle of world order. Women long ago recognized that they could reconcile the divergent personalities of a family. Johnny may be a fiery, black-haired crusader and Jane may be a blond bombshell, but mother somehow manages to teach them to understand each other, to subscribe to a common ideal of action in the home—to the end that they live together comfortably and for mutual good.

The ideal of the United Nations, reduced to its fundamental expression, is really nothing more than an extension of the principle of family relationships. It follows, therefore, that women can do much in teaching us how to live in a world community.

But before you women can teach us how to live together you must recognize and understand the problems we face together. The needs of the world community of nations are great. The needs of our own country are even greater. By serving the latter well—you serve the former better. Our country needs—the world needs—a rebirth of the ideal of freedom, a rededication to the principles of our Constitution, and a reevaluation of our individual responsibilities as citizens.

The patriot woman, answering the call of her country, dreams in terms of service, not of self. She constantly asks herself, "What can I, a single individual in my modest home in my small town—what can I do?"

There is no formula for service. Not the degree of talent, but the depth of desire will decide what patriotic service is for each of you. "Not the dark place but the dim eye that hinders." So it is with the will to serve your country. There is no lack of work to do—no village, no rural lane, but opportunity is there. Too often it is not the dark place but the dim eye of disinterest that obscures patriotic needs.

Early in the nineteenth century there lived in New York a beautiful and wealthy young woman with red golden hair. At 16 this high-spirited young heiress found it so difficult to keep her giddy mind on her studies that, to coerce herself into the task, it is said she had the maid tie her to her chair. Service to her country seemed never to have entered her bright young head.

She married a reformer 20 years her senior and continued her studies. She wrote several books of conventional verse bearing such modest titles as "Words for the Hours" to which no one paid much attention. She bore three children, wrote nursery rhymes for them, applauded politely her husband's activities in the Abolition movement, and one day a mature woman, awakened to discover within herself a burning desire to help in her country's hour of need—the Civil War.

There seemed little enough a second-rate poet could do, especially a female poet. She busied herself, not in rolling bandages as so many of you did in the recent war years (in the work rooms of the American Red Cross) but in a comparable task, scraping lint for surgical dressings.

This was not enough. There must be, she reasoned, some way in which her small talent for versification could be magnified to serve her country. If only her tiny note of music might become a swelling anthem!

One day she came to Washington to witness a review of troops. I do not know where her carriage halted when the ceremony was done. I only know the regiments swung by, delaying all carriage traffic. Company after company marched past until the rhythmic pounding of feet echoed and re-echoed in her heart. To pass the time her party began singing the rousing song, John Brown's Body.

Turning to the red-headed woman, Janes Freeman Clark said, "Julia, why don't you write some really worthy words to that stirring tune?"

"Really worthy words?" Not John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the ground. Not that—but something better. The troops vanished in the distance. Julia went home. Inspired but inarticulate, that night she fell asleep. In the gray dawn she awakened. Quietly she lay, suddenly aware of a great exultation. The words marched from her heart in sonorous dignity. "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord," she whispered in the silence of the dawn, "His truth is marching on!"

Line by line the swelling anthem rolled from her lips. The Battle Hymn of the Republic! Her little talent, spontaneously, suddenly in full fruition. Worthy words for a stirring tune? The marching song of a nation! Millions sang it then. Millions sing it today. It echoes from the country school and from convention halls. Julia Ward Howe dedicated herself to her country. She gave the best and the full-flowering of her talent, a song that—like truth—still marches on.

Within her limitations, whatever they are, despite handicaps, the patriot woman finds opportunity to serve—simply and naturally in her own heart she finds the way.

There is in these United States today a blue-eyed, gray-haired woman who loves her country, perhaps more because she cannot see it. She is quite blind. She is stone deaf. Not so long ago she volunteered to spend a

day, as she often does, visiting a great Army general hospital. The officials worried a little. She asked to visit the wards. What, they thought, could a speechless woman, blind these many years, and deaf—what could she do for hospitalized soldiers?

Knowing how often youth disguises emotion by boisterous talk, they feared she might sense their turbulence. "How shall we introduce her?" they asked. Her interpreter advised them to avoid such formalities. "She needs no introduction," she smiled. So they led the blind woman to the wards.

Unerringly, sure of welcome, she approached the beds. Her searching fingers read the story of each pain-wracked face. Sightless but loving, the lively blue eyes answered their unspoken questions. To the texture and color of skin she was blind. She recognized no race, no color, no creed.

From corridor to corridor they led her through the long hours of the day, and as she departed peace lay sweetly over the wards. Doomed to speechless darkness, her eloquence had penetrated soul after soul as she expounded equality and brotherly love with her fingertips.

"You are a good soldier," she said as she touched each cheek lightly. And not a broken body but would have risen to fight again for freedom as she passed. That woman was Helen Keller, patriot woman.

Julia Ward Howe, Helen Keller, Lucretia Mott, Molly Pitcher, Jane Addams, and Mary Antin—all women patriots, all great names in history. But what of you today? Let us examine your responsibilities.

The last 40 years have witnessed three parallel and opposing developments in the social and economic status of women. One, founded on a complete level and equality with men and offered by Lenin, has attained a stature of world significance. Another, chosen by Mussolini and later espoused by Hitler, was best described by the latter when he declared, "Man is the organizer, woman the organ for carrying out his plan," and "Woman has her battlefield. With each child that she brings to the nation, she fights her fight for the nation."

The ultimate in pragmatism, declared socially good because it worked to produce the manpower so greatly coveted by Fascist nations, this philosophy degraded women to the level of productive beasts.

The third, that of free choice in her relationships with men, has found its greatest development in the democracies. In the United States we have grown to expect that a woman will choose of her own free will how she will live and work with men.

These three avenues of development are still open to women. Which American women will choose, which they will call "patriotic," will depend to a large degree upon what you women here—what your organizations—do within the next few years. Not only your membership in your own organization, but your membership in other women's organizations—an interlocking of interest—bestows upon you a large share of influence. Tremendous power is yours. Guard it well.

Just how powerful are women today? No one knows. Devices for measuring total woman power, world woman power, have not been perfected. Even the most skilled and learned sociologist cannot estimate the present power of women, nor predict with any degree of accuracy, the weight of influence they are destined to embody in the economic and social affairs of the proposed community of nations.

However, it is safe to predict that there will devolve upon women heavy obligations for patriotic service to the state and to the world. If for no other reason, because women in the leading nations far outnumber men.

In Russia, the Communist state where equality is the law, women outnumber men by 10,000,000. In Great Britain, whose standards for women may be said to parallel ours, there are 3,000,000 more women than men. In Germany the proportion is five women to three men. In the United States women outnumber men by 1,000,000. Taking into account the war losses in Japan, it would appear that women outnumber men about 700,000. In China alone do the men outnumber the women.

What does this preponderance of women really mean?

First, for your immediate planning, it means that your responsibility to your country and to the community of nations is proportionately great. Traditionally, women have assumed the duty of training and inspiring youth in the ideals of the Republic. You will continue to discharge that obligation. But you must do more. As a shifting in the balance of power between men and women occurs, you must of necessity accept the mantle of statesmanship as and if it is relinquished.

Your responsibility to your country and your obligation to the world community of nations is in direct proportion to your numbers. Unless some accident of fate decimates women, or some inordinate skill in planning is developed, it is not inconceivable that the future world state may be one of which the ancient Amazons were prophetic. You women, your sisters and daughters may be, all unconsciously, the pioneers in a predominantly feminine world.

During the war years, women, blessed by society and commended by Government, left their homes by thousands. They became riveters and welders and grease monkeys and pilots. They drove trucks and busses and enlisted in the WACS, WAVES, SPARS, and Marines. They followed the troops to the fighting fronts. In the world's largest mass exodus from the home they evolved a new economic and social design for women. For several years the woman we have so long considered typical—the woman in the home—was scarcely more than a graciously remembered symbol.

Those too young to enlist or to work on the production front or those who were training for a trade or profession deemed necessary continued in school. With 10,000,000 men withdrawn from normal duties women took over many unusual jobs. They also took over the schools and colleges. The ranks of professional women and white-collar girls grew by leaps and bounds. The graduates of the war years, miles ahead of their masculine contemporaries, form in the aggregate a bloc of no inconsiderable power.

Numerically you are already great. How great is your patriotism? Is it great enough to answer the major challenge—the challenge to which it may be that women must give the final answer. Has the human capacity for working together and living together in peace and prosperity diminished through the years? Have we as nations, as a society, lost the knack of living together that you women have so painstakingly developed through the ages? This is the question asked of you and of all nations in which women predominate.

Material efficiency has increased amazingly. You need only consider the working tools of your grandmother's household to see how much easier life has been made for the homemaker by increased material efficiency. On a larger scale we have perfected the machinery that produces almost every conceivable comfort and luxury. Yet at the same time we have devised an engine of destruction that is incomparably more horrifying than our wildest conception of hell—the atom bomb that can destroy us all.

You may say that we have in the past faced many international crises and domestic turmoil. We have. We have faced revolt, rebellion and foreign war and brought them all to a successful conclusion. But it is not enough that driven by hate and fear we should, through sheer ingeniousness, contrive to defeat our enemies. It is not enough that under pressure we can produce dramatically for the effective chaos demanded by war. We must learn the secret of such efficiency for war and put it to work for peace.

We must manage somehow to avert war and to circumvent depression. We must learn to recognize these twin evils, to diagnose their symptoms and to perfect preventive not curative medicine for them. As science has produced serums for diphtheria, yellow fever, smallpox, and other virulent diseases, so must civilization discover the hidden reasons for war and depression and attack them at the source. We must search them out and destroy them before they detonate us into oblivion.

We have relied too much and too long upon the punishment of the guilty or the irresponsible as a cure for war and a panacea for depression. It is not enough that the sinister Nazis hang at Nuremberg or that Japanese war lords die. They must never again be permitted to thrive.

The innumerable phases of a program of prevention can furnish your organizations with material for endless plans for public education. Whether or not we embrace a world community of understanding and mutual respect, at the same time maintaining our national individuality and integrity, or invite chaos, lies with you women of the patriotic orders.

For chaos is not a factor outside ourselves or outside our national borders. It lies within our minds and hearts. Destruction and oblivion can come only to a country that invites them.

The miserable sneak who seeks to infiltrate subversive propaganda with a daring so bold it can be mistaken for courage must find you alert to recognize his cunning. Take time to analyze the persuasive platitudes and generalities with which these purveyors of treason attempt to disarm and divide us. They would set us one against the other until the noise of discord deafens us to the call of patriotic service.

Patriotism can be cultivated. It can be taught as surely as loyalty and obedience. You, as leaders of patriotic organizations, must take the lead in teaching and exemplifying loyalty and voluntary cooperation as a means of national prosperity and international good will.

Rather than permitting the fear of destruction to drive us, let us stand fast and freely dedicate ourselves and our children to the knowledge of ourselves and our neighbors to the end that we may peacefully live together.

During the war we fought an ideal to which ours was opposed. Since peace has come it is important that we reevaluate our own philosophy and hold fast to it. In opposing another ideal, surely we must have more clearly defined our own. Now, precisely what is our ideal and how are we going to preserve it or adapt it to world organization?

To you women it should not seem difficult to define, nor to use. For, as I previously stated, the ideal of the United Nations is an international application of the principles that have so long governed the activities of women in the home and of women's patriotic organizations; that is, unity of purpose but diversity of activity.

You may ask, how much can I do? You can do much. Go back and set your own small house in order, for it is there that patriotic service begins, there that international understanding originates. Education for peace can become as effective as training for war. Indeed they should go hand in hand. Military strength and international peace are not antitheses. They can be reconciled, for peace is the other face of war. Like Janus, the two-faced God of the Romans, peace and preparedness are two aspects of the same thing.

For that reason, during the trying years of international growing pains ahead, while nations learn to live together without aggression, you should vigorously support a program of military strength—a controlled, disciplined, adequate military strength, not

only to protect ourselves, but to protect those little people of other lands who cannot protect themeselves.

Go back to your homes determined to put into patriotic action the ideals of the United Nations. In this way you can best serve your country. Go home determined that understanding will replace distrust and fear, for these lead to misery in the home and terror among nations.

Go home rededicating yourself to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States, to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom and the teaching and interpreting of them to your neighbors at home and abroad. Then will you become a true patriot.

No monument will be raised to you or to the patriot woman I have described. She exists only in our conception of her and lives only in your hearts as you exemplify her virtues. You will not pass her on the street nor see her in the markets. Yet in the tangle of city traffic you may glimpse her greatness, in the clamor of the legislative halls you may catch the brief music of her voice. In the living room of your own home you may—ever so fleetingly—feel her elusive charm. In the church you may sense the graciousness of her presence.

Her responsibility is heavy. Yours is equally great. It will become greater. There is work for you, no matter how small your talents, no matter what your handicaps. If you fail now, woman may be forever shamed. How powerful you are no one knows. But it is safe to say that if every female in the United Nations dedicated herself to the patriotic service of her own country and to the understanding of others, the present economic and social evolution could be, overnight, world revolution for peace.

Protect American Shrimp Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, a great industry that means a livelihood for many thousands of our citizens in Louisiana and other States along the Gulf Coast is in grave danger. I refer to the shrimp production and packing industry which is imperiled by the steadily increasing importations of this very wholesome and delicious seafood into this country, particularly from Mexico.

Reliable reports show that very large quantities of shrimp are being brought into the United States and placed on the Chicago and possibly other markets in competition with our own product. These imported shrimp can be sold at a lower figure than those taken from American waters, because of the cheapness of Mexican labor. Whereas common labor in the packing plants along the Gulf coast receives around $40 a week, similar workers in the principal competing country get less than half that sum. As a further advantage, Mexico is producing from new and what would seem practically limitless shrimp areas that can supply at a rate many times our own. These and other factors serve to create a situation that can and will, unless curtailed, soon wreck an American business that has taken long years of toil, courage, and sacrifice to develop to its present importance.

I believe in the so-called good-neighbor policy, but I do not believe in fostering it at the expense of our own citizens. Our shrimp fishermen and packers are hard-working people who struggled through depression years, slowly, but with never-ending perseverance, building up their industry. They have been aided by the days when the Nation's pocketbook has been better filled, increasing the demand for their product. This era of prosperity cannot be expected, however, to go on forever. It is only a question of time before those engaged in shrimping must face weakened markets and reduced prices. If they are properly protected by their own Government they will still be in a position to make a good living. If not, they can easily face bankruptcy.

The Government owes these thousands of loyal, devoted Americans this protection, not only from an economic standpoint, but likewise because of their very valuable and patriotic contribution to the war food program, under dangerous and difficult conditions. We owe it to them for the fact that in addition to the hazards connected with their own work they rescued nearly 300 merchant seamen who faced death when enemy submarines attacked Allied ships during World War II.

There is one solution for the problem now confronting the American shrimp industry. That is to limit the importation of shrimp into the United States, and as a means of eliminating the principal danger at this time I am today introducing a bill to restrict such importation from Mexico. My measure provides that the total importation of fresh, iced, canned, and processed shrimp into this country from Mexico in any one calendar year, beginning with 1947, shall not exceed the largest total quantity of such shrimp that was imported into the United States from Mexico during any one calendar year within the period of January 1, 1942, to December 31, 1945, both dates inclusive. As used in this legislation the term "United States" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

This is a matter which concerns the welfare of so many individuals and involves so many millions of dollars invested in shrimp boats and shore installations in seven coastal States, that it calls for prompt, decisive and favorable action by Congress. Unless we protect the rights of our fellow citizens affected in this instance, how can we expect other industries in this country to look to us for the establishment and maintenance of those principles that guarantee fair trade practices and wholesome, just competition? If we fail in such a clear duty at this time we must expect that the confidence of business will be shaken, in its dependence upon us.

No doubt in view of the efforts of our Government to promote world trade we should not seek a tariff on shrimp, since other nations might regard that course as one of discrimination. But I believe that properly limiting imports is sufficient to maintain this industry on a safe and profitable basis. It seems to be the wisest, fairest, and most practical step to follow.

Danger Signs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Sun of San Bernardino, Calif.:

DANGER SIGNS

It is time for our Nation to pause and take stock of its position in the world. It may be later than we think.

Congress may be about to order further disarmament in the quest for the money savings to make good an alleged Republican promise to cut taxes 20 percent.

For several weeks the Nation's military leaders have been warning that further reductions in appropriations will dangerously cripple the efficiency of the Army and Navy.

The people can recall that on other occasions Congress declined to heed similar warnings from the men who had been hired to prepare the defenses of the country. They certainly have not forgotten that this country went right up to actual war without taking notice of the danger signs that were visible throughout the world. This country not only did that once, but twice. History reveals that two great wars into which we were drawn, were started because men who thought they could rule the world gambled on the inability of the United States to arm in time to successfully defend itself.

Are the signs that are again visible danger signs?

What is the real meaning of the feverish activity of Russia in the spread of communistic activity throughout the world?

What is the real reason for Russia's iron curtain?

Why does Russia refuse the simple proposition that the United Nations outlaw the atomic bomb and take over the supervision and inspection of all activities relating to the atomic bomb?

Why does Russia insist upon extending its domination over other peoples of Europe who are opposed to living under the Russian system?

There is no satisfactory answer.

And since there is no satisfactory answer, what is the course of wisdom for the people of the United States?

That answer is not or should not be difficult. This country should continue its determination to be able to defend itself.

We do not think war with Russia is impending. We do not think Russia desires a war that would be disastrous to Russia—even though it might also be disastrous to the United States and civilization.

But history proves that too many men and women, who on two other occasions thought war involving the United States was impossible or improbable, were exactly wrong.

Silence on the diplomatic clash between the United States and Russia is no longer

wise. There is a clash, a very deep and determined clash. There is not the slightest indication that this country can be persuaded to accept the Russian view, nor that Russia can be persuaded to accept the American view.

The United States will not surrender the atomic bomb unless Russia agrees that it will submit, along with every other country in the world, to the right of inspection of all activities relating to atomic power. The United States will not retreat from its position that security for all nations should come through the United Nations organization. The United States will not retreat from its position that until there is agreement on the responsibilities and power of the United Nations it will not disarm. Nor will the United States relax its opposition to the policy of Russia in extending its power into other nations which do not want to be dominated by the Soviet.

The official foreign policy of this country calls for patience, in the hope that Russia will eventually reach the conclusion it does not desire to force its political dictatorship upon the rest of the world.

The Republican and Democratic parties are united upon such foreign policy.

But the Republican Party may be the party that will weaken such a determined foreign policy, if the Republican Congress takes leadership in forcing a reduction of military appropriations. The Democratic Party must accept history's indictment for failure to prepare this country for both World Wars, for it was in power during the danger years. It wanted the votes that went with the slogan "He Kept Us Out of War."

Just why the Republicans would be anxious to duplicate the previous role of the Democrats is difficult to understand. Instead of looking for reward in 1948 because we are the boys who cut your taxes 20 percent, the GOP should look more intently upon the danger signals that again fly in this world.

The world-wide fear of the atomic bomb may be sufficient to prevent its use. Hitler had the poison gas that could have knocked Britain out of the war. He didn't use it because he knew retaliation in kind would be certain and swift.

This country's determination that the nations of the world shall disarm together or we will not disarm at all is clear. But pending the decision of the world, it would be foolhardy for the United States to deny the Army and the Navy the money they need to do the job we expect.

For once Congress should listen to the advice of the men the country hires to defend it.

Duplication and Inefficiency in Government Bureaus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DUNLAP & CO., INC.,
Columbus, Ind., February 21, 1947.

Representative EARL WILSON,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In one recent mail delivery we received six duplicate notices in six separate envelopes from War Assets Administration, Cincinnati, Ohio. We enclose notices and envelopes as evidence of typical duplication and inefficiency in Government bureaus. Many preceding notices, etc., have been received in an equal degree of duplication.

Yours very truly,

DUNLAP & CO., INC.
ALVIN W. MUNDT.

Extension of Reclamation Act to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior recommending legislation extending the Reclamation Act to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, I have today introduced a bill to extend the provisions of the Reclamation Act to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The importance of these outposts of our Government to national defense has taken on a new significance since Pearl Harbor. It is more necessary than ever that every possible step be taken to develop the economy and well-being of the American citizens residing in these Territories and insular possessions.

In recommending this legislation, the Acting Secretary of the Interior submitted the following communication to the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

I enclose for the consideration of the Congress a draft of a bill to extend the Reclamation Act to certain Territories and possessions of the United States.

From time to time during the past several years it has been brought to the attention of this Department that investigations and projects looking to the conservation and development of the water resources of our Territories and possessions are urgently needed. If such activities had been undertaken and the necessary construction accomplished, the problem of transporting foodstuffs to Hawaii, in the early part of World War II, would not have been as acute. Reclamation development in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would have lightened the economic distress resulting from droughts and the shortage of fertile land, and would have increased employment opportunities. Impetus would have been given to the settlement of Alaska by the wise development of irrigation and incidental power projects.

In the Hawaiian Islands there is extremely heavy rainfall in areas almost adjacent to areas in which arid conditions prevail. The agricultural economy of the islands has been based largely on sugar and pineapple crops raised on a large scale by corporate farming methods. Staple foods have been almost wholly imported. The Territory's experience during the war clearly indicates the necessity for increasing staple food production locally, to alleviate hardships and diet dislocations in times when water transportation is difficult or impossible, and as a means of better balancing the local economy. The need for suitable homesteading land has also increased; as the population has steadily risen, new markets have been created. Only through better geographic and seasonal distribution of water, through irrigation, will it be possible to increase the amount of locally grown staple foodstuffs and to insure the success of a homesteading program.

Studies of Caribbean conditions, notably in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, have reached the conclusion that soil and water conservation and the intelligent use of water resources are essential to any effective program for stabilizing the economy and broadening opportunities for employment. In Puerto Rico, the highest peaks and the northern and eastern sides of the mountain ranges which bisect the island from east to west receive the greatest rainfall, while the remaining areas, with the greatest need for water, receive the least. The average annual rainfall varies from about 30 inches on the south coast to more than 100 inches in the mountain areas. High evaporation combined with high temperatures, low relative humidity, and constant winds tend to cause semi-arid conditions even where the average annual rainfall is 45 inches. As a consequence of the unbalanced distribution of rainfall, the development of agriculture, Puerto Rico's principal industry, has been subject to marked limitations in addition to the handicap caused by the fact that only one-half of the land is arable while the population density is almost 600 persons per square mile. Extension of the Reclamation Act would make a most important contribution to a solution of Puerto Rico's economic problem. Many excellent dam sites for hydroelectric plants may be found along the rapid, flat-bottom mountain streams; it is estimated that Puerto Rico's water power could be tripled under the reclamation program. Of even more value, however, would be the addition to the total amount of arable land.

The Virgin Islands are in roughly the same situation as Puerto Rico. The population of 30,000 is severely handicapped by too little precipitation, poorly distributed for productive cultivation, excessive run-off of the water, soil erosion and the lowering of the water table, the latter particularly in St. Croix, the agricultural center of the islands. Recurrent droughts, soil depletion, and improper use of land have reduced the quantity and impaired the quality of crops, milk, livestock, and poultry and have affected the health and wealth of the people. A reclamation program can do much to improve the situation.

In Alaska, there are various areas which, from time to time, have been developed for agricultural pursuits. The Matanuska area, which, after an unsuccessful start, is becoming an eminently worth-while undertaking, is an example of the kind of colonization that might be encouraged in the Territory. In connection with the agricultural and colonization programs, and perhaps even more important to the development of Alaska because of its potentialities in bringing industry to the Territory, is hydroelectric power. The strategic value of Alaska as an outpost of economic expansion and of national defense has become startlingly apparent in the last few years. Works of the type the Bureau of Reclamation is equipped to build will play a major role in the future of the Territory and can contribute much to the economy of the United States as a whole.

For more than 44 years the Bureau of Reclamation of this Department has engaged in the investigation of, the planning for, and the construction, operation, and maintenance of projects for the conservation of the water resources of the West. The investigations and construction in the territorial areas should unquestionably be entrusted to that agency which has demonstrated its competence.

The bill submitted herewith would make possible the realization in Alaska, Hawaii,

Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands of the many benefits to which reference has already been made. In extending the Reclamation Act to the Territorial areas, however, provision has been made that the special public-land laws which the Congress has provided for Alaska and Hawaii will not be affected. Thus, the bill provides that the disposal of public lands in those Territories will continue subject to the Territorial organic acts.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has informed me that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

FEBRUARY 19, 1947.

On Tuesday, February 18, two members of the House Committee on Public Lands left California to visit Hawaii with the Secretary of Interior in order to gain a first-hand knowledge, on the scene, of the conditions existing there as a first step toward the consideration of legislation. They were Hon. NORRIS POULSON and Hon. CLAIR ENGLE.

On the same day ten other members of the House Committee on Public Lands, together with five Senators from the same committee of the Senate, left for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for the same purpose.

The problems with reference to Puerto Rico which Congress must consider are much more serious by reason of the fact that when we took over Puerto Rico at the Treaty of Paris in 1899 the island contained less than a million population, while now the population is listed as more than two million. It is one of the most densely populated areas in the world, being less than 100 miles long and 40 miles wide. The economy of these people has been primarily based upon one single commodity—sugar. This great increase in population has further complicated social problems, the solution of which are as important as the economic problems.

It is particularly commendable that Members of Congress will take time from their arduous work here in Washington to study a situation of this kind at first hand. They could sit between the four walls of a committee room for weeks on end and not gain the intimate knowledge they have been able to acquire in just a few days' visit to these islands. The 10 members of the House Committee on Public Lands who made this trip to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were: Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD, chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions; Hon. DEAN P. TAYLOR, Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART, Hon. CHARLES H. RUSSELL, Hon. JOHN SANBORN, Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON, Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON, Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, Hon. E. H. HEDRICK, and Commissioner ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN.

It is my earnest hope that in the not-too-distant future more members of the committee will be able to visit all of the important areas, including not only Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands but also those sections of the United States where governmental operations come under the legislative jurisdiction of the Public Lands Committee. By so doing, they can more intelligently consider legislation contributing to the general public welfare.

Homes for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, housing for veterans is our No. 1 problem inside the over-all No. 1 problem of housing. I am sure that many Members of the House are concerned about it. I am convinced that every one of us had better become not only concerned about it, but do something about it, and fast.

By that I do not mean, of course, to make bad matters worse by depriving OPA of funds for enforcement of rent and price ceilings on new housing being built with veterans' priorities and by the rest of the blind, stupid, reckless decontrol program which passed this House under the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, every day's delay in enacting the Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill is costly in terms of national health, strength, and welfare, so far as millions of badly housed, overcrowded, and overcharged families are concerned. Veterans are worst hit because they were absent on official business—at our request—when our present inadequate housing was filled up.

I have proposed, in H. R. 1750, which fits in with the over-all Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, a $1,000,000,000 loan and subsidy housing program for veterans and their families to be administered by local housing agencies. Most of that money would be repaid. All of it will pay great, high dividends in national strength, health, and unity.

What are we waiting for?

I call the Members' attention to an article from the Shreveport (La.) Times stating that two out of five married white veterans in that area are compelled to double up and that half of the married Negro veterans are compelled to do likewise.

Is this the best that our Nation can do for the men who saved freedom for us all?

The article from the Shreveport Times follows:

TWO-FIFTHS OF WHITE VETS DOUBLE UP, RENT ROOMS

Approximately two-fifths of the 5,610 married white veterans of World War II and one-half of the 1,500 married Negro veterans in the Shreveport area are doubling up with relatives or friends or living in rented rooms, trailers, or tourist cabins, according to the result of a recent sample survey released yesterday by Director J. C. Capt, Bureau of the Census.

The survey, made at the request of the National Housing Agency for the veterans' emergency housing program, further showed that one-tenth of the married white veterans and nearly three-fifths of the married Negro veterans lived in dwelling units which need major repairs or lack one or more standard plumbing facilities.

The survey is based on findings during a sample survey in August and supplemented in October and November for additional information in the Shreveport and Bossier City areas.

It showed that at the present time there are 33,139 private and public dwelling units in the area, with all but 1 percent of the total number occupied. Of this number, the owners still lived in 40 percent of them, while the other 50 percent are tenant-occupied entirely.

The survey, covering the housing plans of all veterans for the next 12 months, showed that if housing would be available during the next year at present prices and quality, 17 percent of the white veterans said they would be in the housing market, 11 percent would buy or build a house and 6 percent would move and rent. Of the Negro veterans, 13 percent would be in the housing market, 8 percent would buy or build, and 5 percent would move or rent.

An additional 18 percent of the white veterans and 14 percent of the Negro veterans would be drawn into the housing market if they could find houses at the price, size, and quality they desire. Under such conditions, a total of 30 percent of the white veterans and 23 percent of the Negro veterans would buy or build a house within the next 12 months; and 5 percent of the white and 4 percent of the Negro veterans would move and rent.

Among the white veterans who would buy or build if houses or materials are available at the price and quality they desire, the average price they reported they would be able to pay for a house was $6,000, and the average gross monthly payment they would be able to make was $45, the survey showed. Their average weekly income from all sources was $54. The average size house they desired was five rooms.

Among the veterans who would move and rent other quarters if they could get what they wanted, the average gross monthly rental they would be able to pay was $40, their average weekly income was $48, and the average size unit they desired was four rooms.

Of the estimated 11,000 veterans living in the Shreveport area at the time of the survey, one-fifth were newcomers to the locality since they entered the service. Eighty-nine percent plan to remain in Shreveport and Bossier City. If housing is available during the year at present prices and quality, 11 out of every 100 white veterans plan to buy or build in the locality, 6 plan to move and rent, 71 plan to remain in their present quarters, and the other 12 plan to move into rented rooms.

Of the total number of veterans living in the area, 8,500 are white and 2,500 are Negroes. About two-thirds of the white veterans are married and one-third are single, widowed, or divorced. Among Negro veterans, three-fifths are married.

Reciprocal Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the so-called reciprocal trade agreements are a misnomer, and I want to include an editorial of Spencer Canary, editor of the Sentinel Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio:

TARIFF AND RECIPROCITY

As heretofore stated in these columns, the question of reciprocity treaties is bothering Members of Congress.

Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN, recognizing how interwoven with world peace are

such treaties and yet cognizant of how vital to our country's economy is the idea of protection of home industries, are seeking an agreement with President Truman that he will exercise protective discretion in making such treaties. At present he has authority until June 12, 1947, to cut import duties one-half in securing "favored nation" treaties with other countries. Many such reciprocal treaties are to be discussed soon in Switzerland.

As the writer told a Republican women's group 2 years ago, when the United Nations Charter was being formulated, our ideas of protective tariffs would arise under it. It is arising now. The purpose of reciprocity treaties is to promote economic peace; and the latter serves to prevent war. Here in America it was necessary to protect infant industries in order that they might be firmly established. England sought to keep the American colonies as largely an agricultural people as possible in order that it could sell manufactured goods here in return for raw products; and it has done the same thing with India. The latter, in consequence, has become a poor nation instead of one of the richest as it was in the eighteenth century; but American ingenuity and efficiency have made this Nation strong industrially under a protective tariff.

Just how far the American people are willing to go in regard to reciprocal trade treaties remains to be seen. At the present time we are lending money to other nations to buy our goods or to rebuild themselves. That is like a storekeeper handing $5 to a would-be customer and then asking, "Now, what do you wish to buy?" William Howard Taft failed to be reelected President probably because he advocated reciprocal tariffs in his speech at Winona, Wis., about 1911. Strongly protective Republicans were alienated by the speech and this helped Teddy Roosevelt to organize the Bull Moose Party. So we got a Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, in 1912.

It is hardly likely that reciprocal treaties may be made that will not enable some other nation to compete for business of our citizens with some of our own industries. Manufacturers and some labor leaders see that now and don't like the idea. How far should we go in that regard in order to prevent war in the future as to make the United Nations Charter a substantial one for peace?

We will have to compare the cost of one with the cost and desire for the other.

The Red Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

COMMUNIST WINDOW DRESSING

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of the Communist infiltration into the United States the Communists used effective strategy to innoculate innocent, unsuspecting Americans with their Communist doctrine. They formed organizations with fine, high-sounding names, such as the League Against War and Fascism and its successor, the League for Peace and Democracy, so literally millions of good Americans joined these organizations, and other organizations like them, because they believed in the objectives suggested by the names of these Communist-front organizations. Many quite prominent, well-intentioned Americans, taken in by this device, became dupes or tools for the Communists and helped spread Communist doctrine in America by lending their names and influence to build up these Communist-front organizations. The so-called Dies committee did an excellent piece of work in exposing these Communist-front organizations and their founders, who carried on their nefarious activities behind the window dressing set up as a screen for their real objectives. Most of these organizations went underground during the war.

Today we see the same Communist strategy cropping up again in the win-the-peace conference that met recently in Washington. This win-the-peace conference was sponsored by Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, 20 Members of Congress, and leading Communists of America, representing some 90 organizations that have been investigated and branded by the FBI as Communist-front organizations. The object of the win-the-peace conference was to further appease Russia. We also see the same Communist influence in our State Department's attitude toward the present Government of Spain. Can it be that good old Uncle Sam is now to become Communist window dressing behind which Stalin will work his will or have his way in Spain? (Weekly News Letter, April 15, 1946.)

COMMUNISM IN EUROPE

Mr. Speaker, it is most disturbing to note that our Government, through its State Department, recently joined in an effort with other nations to give aid and comfort to the Communists in Spain. I hope the President and the State Department will cease and desist from joining in an effort to overthrow the Government of Spain—one of the few Christian nations remaining on the Continent of Europe. Certainly Spain, at the present time, does not offer a threat to world peace. Should we help to destroy that Government and enthrone communism there, it would be a great threat to the United States and her allies who are working for world peace, because the western entrance into the Mediterranean—Gibraltar—would doubtless fall into the hands of a Communist Spain backed by communistic Russia. From a moral and Christian viewpoint, this Nation should not become a party in helping to strike down Christian Spain, and turn it over to communism, anarchy, plunder, the destruction of churches, the murder and liquidation of the clergy—all of which has been the plan and purpose of Russia, as declared by Lenin, who founded the communistic government in Russia. (By Congressman VURSELL, of Illinois.)

OCTOPUS OR BEAR, WHICH?

Mr. Speaker, the Encyclopedia Britannica says:

> The octopus or devilfish confuses its enemies and protects itself by squirting out a quantity of inky fluid when under attack, darkening the surrounding water so that the octopus can either hide or escape.

Soviet diplomacy these days has adopted the tactics of the octopus. Whenever Stalin is annoyed or called to account by foreign diplomats concerning his expansionist policies, he proceeds to raise a countercharge to obscure or becloud the real issue, and he is not particular about the validity of his countercharge. This octopus diplomacy has been resorted to time and again. When England protested against Russia's attitude in Iran, Russia brought countercharges concerning Britain's conduct in Greece and in Indonesia. When the United States sent a note to Bulgaria urging her to include in her Communist regime two representatives of the opposition parties, Stalin immediately charged the United States with taking unilateral action. Has the Russian bear, under the influence of communism, changed into an octopus or devilfish? What is Stalin up to? (Weekly News Letter, April 22, 1946.)

Mr. Speaker, the following two articles are taken verbatim from Communist propaganda booklets now being circulated throughout Europe. They form a blueprint showing both the aims and the strategy of Communists. What should real Americans do about it?

CREED OF COMMUNISM

1. All Communists know that to bolshevize means to liberate humanity from the slavery created by centuries of Christian barbarities; to free humanity from the concept of religion; to free humanity from the concept of national authority; and to free humanity from the concept of private property.

2. All Communists must remember that our purpose is to bolshevize the world, no matter how much the cost or in what way.

3. The task of each individual Communist is to bolshevize your own surrounding group.

4. Each such individual knows that his or her task necessarily has to be limited for the moment.

5. It is the duty of each Communist to give the working man and woman the illusion that only Communists are free and that only Communist membership and action can free him and her. (Weekly News Letter, April 22, 1946.)

COMMANDMENTS OF COMMUNISM

1. Do not manifest the purpose of communism to immature companions.

2. Struggle against those—especially the hypocritical priests, ministers, and rabbis—who say what is more or less true about communism, by denying emphatically that we are opposed to religion, family, and private property.

3. Show with jokes, sarcasm, cynicism, and with a more pleased and happier show of conduct how you are freer without the impediments of religion, * * * making it understood that we who live without religion live better and do more freely what we wish to do.

4. Destroy morals, teaching the inexperienced; create a milieu (environment) satiated with that which the clergy of all sects calls immorality.

5. Always remove your companions farther from their religion by any and all means, but especially by putting priests, ministers, and rabbis in as bad a light as possible.

6. Destroy the family—especially the Christian family—by planting ideas about freedom in marriage, showing divorce as a more human way of life, and encouraging your people to love, love freely, free love.

7. Educate workers, especially the young ones, to be intolerant of any and all authority, especially police authority.

8. Encourage workers to participate in disorders, to use brute force, to revenge, and not to have a fear of bloodshed.

9. Be at the forefront in rendering small services to workers; speak loudly and make yourself heard in their behalf; impose yourself into their midst; hide the good which others do for them and make it appear as if you did it; and, to enlist such workers in your cause, be in the forefront of all labor movements and organized opposition to parliamentary proceedings.

10. Struggle constantly against all priests, ministers, and rabbis, against their religions, the morals of all religions, and against their religious organizations and institutions. (Weekly News Letter, April 22, 1946.)

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH VERSUS COMMUNISM

The strongest defense today against the spread of communism in Europe is the Catholic Church. It has never been deceived concerning the real objectives of the disciples of Karl Marx. It has not forgotten the Marx statement, "Religion is the opiate of the peoples." The Catholic Church realizes that if communism succeeds in mastering Europe there will be no church in Europe. Already in Yugoslavia a Catholic archbishop has been seized, tried, and condemned by the Red rowdies on the trumped-up charge of collaboration with Hitler.

The Catholic Church knows what the Communists stand for. By the same token the Communists know that the Catholic Church is the most unyielding enemy they have to their program of violence and ungodliness.

Having served 6 years on the Dies committee, I know at first hand about the "enemies within our gates" who are working night and day to undermine and destroy our American form of government. I believe every patriotic American, regardless of creed, should enlist in the war to root out and destroy the Communists that have infiltrated our Government, our labor organizations, our schools, and, in some cases, even our churches. (Weekly News Letter, November 4, 1946.)

Sny Valley, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pike County (Ill.) Republican of February 19, 1947:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS

The Pike County (Ill.) Republican appears here as a pleader in what it believes to be a just cause.

The cause is that of the people of the great Sny Valley, a fertile agricultural region of 110,000 acres in western Illinois, lying in the broad Mississippi Basin.

This valley begins in Adams County below Quincy, extends along the entire western side of Pike County, and ends in Calhoun County to the south.

It is a valley of fertile farmsteads and happy homes. It is a valley reclaimed from the river three-quarters of a century ago by the thriftiness of a great people reaching back into a pioneer period.

This valley is being drowned.

The story of the valley is a proud one. Private initiative claimed it for agriculture. A great levee, the largest levee above Vicksburg, shut out the river. This levee is 52 miles long. Planning for it began in 1870. It was constructed in 1872–74. It cost about $650,000.

In late years, Government, to make a deep waterway in the Mississippi, placed dams in the river. People of the valley are agreed that these dams have backed up the water, thereby interfering with the natural drainage of the valley by the Sny Channel, which traverses its entire length, and raising the water in the valley.

This valley is being drowned.

Only those who have traveled the rim of this great valley and who have looked out across it in the ripening season of the year can conceive of the luxuriance of its crops.

It has contributed greatly to the agricultural economy of this section of Illinois.

This valley is being drowned.

A sort of creeping paralysis is upon the valley. Productive acres are being turned into nonproducing acres. Already, according to reports of the War Department's engineers, 22,000 acres have been put out of production.

There is a remedy. The Congress has that remedy within its hands. Congress can save this valley.

What is the record?

The Federal engineers made a study of the valley. They made certain recommendations for saving the valley and redeeming it for agriculture. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurred generally with the reporting officers that the improvement proposed by the engineers is economically justified.

The Congress of the United States (the 79th Cong.) approved the plan of the engineers for saving this drowning valley. The President of the United States signed the approving legislation. Approval by the Congress is contained in the flood control bill, H. R. 6597, enacted July 24, 1946 (Public Law No. 526, 79th Cong.). This act included an item to authorize flood protection in the Sny Basin by diversion of several of the Sny tributaries into the Mississippi River as recommended by the chief of engineers in his report dated April 17, 1946.

To date, no funds have been appropriated by Congress to undertake the flood control improvements in the Sny Basin which were authorized by the 1946 Flood Control Act.

So it is that the fate of the Sny Valley rests with this Eightieth Congress. The Corps of Engineers sincerely appreciates the importance of providing the flood protection for residents of the Sny Basin authorized by the 1946 Flood Control Act, and we are assured that it is prepared to undertake the necessary planning and construction work for the authorized improvements in that basin when the necessary funds for those purposes are appropriated by Congress, and the local authorities have furnished the required assurance of local cooperation.

And let this be understood.

We are wholly in sympathy with the proposals of the present Congress to cut Government expenses. But we would point out that there is a difference between projects that can wait and projects that cannot wait.

We are dealing here with a drowning valley.

Both Government and private interests have a huge investment in this valley. Total costs to the United States have been approximately $1,022,000. Local interests had sometime ago expended approximately $3,739,000 and cost of restoring drainage systems has been running some $70,000 annually. Annual flood damage in the valley is estimated by the engineers at $450,000, of which $193,200 is to crops, $18,400 to property, $70,000 to annual cost of restoration of drainage systems, $3,000 to indirect damages, and $165,000 to loss of income from lands rendered unproductive by silt depositions.

We beg to suggest that failure to protect the huge investments already in the valley cannot possibly be justified in the name of retrenchment.

And here in this Sny Basin we beg to point out that not only material values are at stake, but human values as well.

The economy of a great people is in issue.

Additional Federal Generating Capacity in the Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon:

House Joint Memorial 6

We, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully request and petition as follows, to wit:

Whereas Oregon and the Pacific Northwest with the aid of low-cost power took rapid strides toward industrial development before and during the war and have retained and expanded those advances during the postwar period; and

Whereas the only source of low-cost power in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest in quantities adequate for their development is the energy in our rivers which can be converted to hydroelectric power; and

Whereas the Federal Government, by numerous acts of Congress, has assumed the responsibility for development of this hydroelectric power through the construction of an integrated system of Federal multiple-purpose projects on the Columbia River and its tributaries; and

Whereas your memorialists are advised that Congress has under consideration not only curtailment of the construction program for Federal multiple-purpose projects in the Columbia Basin, but also an increase in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration on the grounds that those rates are inadequate to meet the repayments of construction costs required by law; and

Whereas existing generating capacity in the Pacific Northwest is now fully utilized and reliable estimates of future power requirements of the States of Oregon and Washington indicate that installation within the next 7 years of about 1,500,000 kw of new Federal generating capacity over and above that now ordered is essential to maintain continued industrial, agricultural, and utility development; and

Whereas official reports of the Bonneville Power Administration and independent audits of its operations by certified public accountants show conclusively that power revenues under existing rate schedules are more than sufficient to meet all repayment obligations required by law in connection with the Bonneville Dam project and the Columbia Basin project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That your memorialists hereby respectfully petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to make on an annual and continuing basis the appropriations necessary for providing urgently needed additional Federal generating capacity in the Columbia Basin and not to require any increase in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration which would destroy the key of low cost hydro-

electric power needed to unlock other natural resources in Oregan and the great Pacific Northwest, permitting the development of new opportunities and new jobs and the creation of new taxable wealth; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be authorized, and is hereby directed, to forward immediately certified copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Members of the congressional delegation from the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, and the presiding officers of the legislative bodies of the last three named States.

Adopted by House February 4, 1947.

JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the Senate February 7, 1947.

M. E. CORNETT,
President of the Senate.

Washington and Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following address delivered by me before the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia on February 22, 1947:

While the month of February is the shortest in the year, yet it marks the birthday of two of the greatest men in history. First, Washington, who did more than any other individual to establish our independence and form the Government of the United States under the Constitution. Second, Lincoln, who did more than any other person to preserve the Government established by Washington, and whose words are probably quoted more often than any other man's outside of Holy Writ.

It is most fitting and proper that we commemorate the birthdays of our two greatest Presidents. It is the two hundred and fifteenth anniversary of the birth of Washington, and it is the one hundred and thirty-eighth anniversary of the birth of Lincoln. Regardless of the critical hour in the life of our Republic, established and preserved for us by them, we are unanimous in the hope that 200 years hence men and women will gather round the banquet table, as we have done here today, to pay tribute to Washington and Lincoln for their service and contribution to the establishment and preservation of a government on this earth founded on justice and freedom.

In many ways these two great men were different, the one from the other. In many other ways, they were very much alike.

1. Both Washington and Lincoln were intellectual giants.

2. Both Washington and Lincoln were physical giants. Washington stood 6 feet 2 inches. Lincoln stood 6 feet 4 inches. Both men in their early years became excellent and accurate surveyors—Washington in Virginia, Lincoln in Illinois.

3. Both Washington and Lincoln were men who possessed moral and physical courage.

4. Both Washington and Lincoln were men of the outdoors. They were nature lovers. Both loved trees. On one occasion Lincoln said, "Now, trees are something I know about; I like the trees better in winter than in summer because the shape can more readily be seen." We may rest assured that his hands knew the feel of the ax handle, which had to do with the cutting down of the trees in the forest and the making of a home. We know that Washington planted 6 varieties of cherry trees at Mount Vernon, the peach, the apricot, and 13 varieties of the pear tree. He also planted the plum and 4 varieties of apple trees, 8 kinds of nut trees, and 33 kinds of native trees, together with a cherry walk.

5. Both men were influenced by the rural environment of their early lives. Through life both stood with their feet planted firmly on the ground. Both learned lessons from Mother Earth. Both went to the root of things, and both sought the substance rather than the form.

6. Both Washington and Lincoln could attribute some of their great qualities to their mothers. While Lincoln's mother died early in his youth, he said of her in later life, "All I am or ever hope to be I owe to my angel mother." Washington was influenced more by his mother than Lincoln because Lincoln's mother died early in his youth. Washington's mother influenced him not to become a sailor, but she was greatly displeased because he took up a military career and often regretted that her son had turned against the British throne.

7. Both Washington and Lincoln had a profound faith in the ultimate good judgment of the people if given the truth. They had faith in the patriotism of the people, and they both had faith in the ability of the people to govern themselves wisely.

8. Both men were tolerant of criticism, even when that criticism was unfair; and both were responsive to suggestions or constructive criticism well founded.

9. They were men of such breadth of mind and character that they were willing to retain in the service of the Nation subordinates whom they knew were critical of both their personal qualities and official policies. No better example of this could be given than the selection of Lincoln's Cabinet. It is well known that he chose men for his Cabinet everyone of whom thought they were greater than the President himself. Among these were Salmon P. Chase, who undertook to supplant him; and William H. Seward, who asked that the running of the Government be turned over to him. Stanton, his Secretary of War, referred to him more than once as "a fool." All of them lived to see the day when they revered his memory and acknowledged that he was the greatest of them all.

10. Both Washington and Lincoln were men who preferred associates who would be frank rather than subordinate to them.

11. Both Washington and Lincoln were big enough and courageous enough to admit mistakes when they made them.

12. Both Washington and Lincoln had a profound faith in divine providence and in the efficacy of prayer. Both accepted the Christian faith and both men were noble models for human conduct.

13. Both Washington and Lincoln conducted a war. Washington as the commander of the Army; Lincoln as commander in chief. Washington to create the Nation; Lincoln to preserve the Republic.

14. Both men had military experience before entering the Presidency. Washington with Braddock in the French and Indian war; Lincoln as captain in the Black Hawk war. Both Washington and Lincoln had to create an army and both learned many lessons from the suffering in campaign and battle.

15. Both men made the greatest contribution to the cause of freedom—the one establishing it, and the other preserving it.

16. Both men were intense lovers. Some of Lincoln's love affairs caused him many heartaches, much mental anguish, some embarrassment, and no little despondency. Washington, it is said, had four Marys and one Martha in 10 years. From what little we know of his early life, his voyages into the realm of womanly charms were less violent and painful that those of Lincoln. It is quite possible that without an invitation to dinner extended from an unexpected meeting with a Mr. Chamberlain, whom Washington met on a ferryboat, Washington would not have met the charming widow Custis. Her husband had died 3 years before, leaving $225,000 in money and a large landed estate. Washington, undoubtedly, discovered it was as easy to love a widow with money as it was one without, even though she had two children, Nellie Custis and John Parke Custis, 4 and 6 years of age. Later in life Washington wrote a letter from Mount Vernon saying, "I am now, I believe, fixed in this seat, with an agreeable partner for life, and I hope to build more happiness in retirement than ever experienced in the wide and bustling world."

Had it not been for a step-mother in a Kentucky home, it is quite probable that Lincoln would not have met Mary Todd. Both Washington and Lincoln were influenced and their career and course affected by the companions they had chosen for their homes.

17. Both men were born leaders. Perhaps no other man could have held together the troops and the colonies in the dark and uncertain days of the Revolution as Washington did. It is likewise improbable that anyone but Lincoln could have held together the conflicting elements of the North through the tragic days of 1861–65.

18. Washington lived to view his task performed—the creation of a new nation and a new concept of government. Lincoln, at the very pinnacle of his fame and the accomplishment of his life, was snatched away from the opportunity to realize his ambition and his task fully performed.

These two men were also dissimilar in many respects. The one was born an aristocrat; the other was born with abject poverty in one hand and an obscure name in the other. Washington had the advantage of education, while Lincoln never saw the inside of a grammar school, a high school, a college, or university as a student. His son remarked to me that his father never had anything to start with and hardly went to school at all. We do know, however, that Lincoln went to school in a little log building four terms of less than 3 months each, or not quite 1 year in all.

While there was similarity in the lives of both Washington and Lincoln, as I said, there is more than one divergency. The inventory of Washington's estate made by himself and attached to his will, after deducting $250,000 in bequests, placed a value of $530,000 on the residue or balance of his estate, making a total of $780,000, or more than three quarters of a million. In the days of Washington that was indeed a monumental sum. Lincoln, at the time of his election, which occurred 61 years after the death of Washington, was 52 years of age. He estimated his earthly goods at a meager $15,000. This consisted of the only home he ever owned, the one which he purchased from the minister who married him, the Rev. Charles W. Draper, for the sum of $1,500; 40 acres of land in the State of Iowa, which was given to him for his services in the Black Hawk War; a vacant lot in the town of Lincoln, Ill., which he received in compensation for his service in laying out the town as a surveyor; a little money in the bank; a few promissory notes, all drawing 10 percent interest and amounting to about $9,000, and the household furniture in his home.

I recently conferred with the former private secretary of Robert Todd Lincoln in reference to the amount of Lincoln's estate at the time of his death. I learned it was about $83,000. You will note that during the 4 years his estate increased from $15,000 to $83,000. The

salary of the President at that time was $25,000 per year. He invested 61 percent of his salary in Government bonds, thereby setting an example for the rest of us for patriotism and loyalty to our country. He invested his savings in a government which he did not know would long endure.

Washington, a businessman, left a will. Lincoln, a lawyer, left no will.

It has been said of Washington that he "was the greatest of good men and the best of great men," while it has been said of Lincoln that he was one of the gentlest memories of our world. Lincoln had humor and wit, Washington the profoundness of kings.

These marked similarities and divergencies which I have pointed out in the character, temperament, and policies of these two immortal Americans are all the more striking because Washington was the scion of aristocracy; he was a son of the culture of his day; he was of the landed gentry; he was a man of wealth; he was a man whose whole training from birth would ordinarily have drawn him away from the common people. Lincoln, on the contrary, was a product of the log cabin. He was a son of the common people. His heredity, his environment, and his experience up to the time he came to the White House was that of a man of the common people. His environment and early training ordinarily would have tended to alienate him from the class to which Washington belonged.

The secret of the strength of both of these immortal Americans, I believe, rests in the fact that they loved their fellow men, they believed in the principle of the Declaration of Independence, and they believed that human values transcended all others, but that property rights need not be sacrificed to a fanatical adherence of an unreal or exaggerated sense of human values.

Their stature grows larger as their day and deeds recede from us. We can appropriately and truthfully say of both of them what Lincoln said of Washington.

"To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington and Lincoln is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In their naked, deathless splendor leave them shining on."

A Most Tentative Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
A MOST TENTATIVE BUDGET

Those who happened to read an article of mine which was published a week ago may recall that I criticized Senator TAFT because in his Lincoln day speech he neglected to mention the effect on economic stability of uninvested and unspent savings. I now have a letter from Mr. TAFT which shows that the omission of this crucial factor was unintentional—the result of a typographical error in the text of his speech as it came from his office to the newspapers.

"I have read with interest your article this morning in the Washington Post. The word 'wages' in my Charleston speech was a misprint which I did not catch until I reached Charleston. As delivered in Charleston, the third balance was between 'savings and consumption.' While I think there has been some overemphasis on the excess of savings, I have always felt that the 1929 depression was caused in part by the fact that savings became so excessive that money was directed into investment and speculation instead of being spent for consumers' goods."

I may add that in the text of the speech as printed after delivery in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the error has been corrected. Therefore, it cannot be said that Mr. TAFT is unaware that there is a problem of savings. That may make a lot of difference as the search for the solution of that extraordinarily difficult problem proceeds.

Though the question of the budget now before Congress is not unrelated to it, there are other considerations which have to be taken into account more immediately.

The controversy which has risen over the President's budget arises from the fact that under the law, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the four money committees of the two Houses are required jointly to report a legislative budget of the estimated overall Federal receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year beginning July 1947. This report was due February 15. The report, when adopted by the two Houses, is supposed to fix the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditures.

The administration wishes to fix that amount at the President's figure, namely, thirty-seven and one-half billions. The Republican majority, with some Democratic support, wishes to fix it at thirty-one and one-half billions. Senator TAFT and a number of others are proposing to fix it somewhere between thirty-two and thirty-three billions.

Congress is in a difficult position because the law requiring this decision is new, and the machinery for operating it efficiently has not yet been set up. Another year the situation will be different. But this year Congress has no evidence before it by which it can decide intelligently what the total appropriations ought to be. Yet the law compels it to decide. So it must either take the President's figure, approving it without knowing why, or fix its own figure, not knowing why. If the legislators accept the President's figure, the Republican majority will have reneged, without knowing whether they had to, on their campaign promises to reduce expenditures. If they cut the President's figure blindly, and that is the only way they can now cut it, they may cause serious injury to the national interest.

The dilemma, though embarrassing, is not so serious as it looks. For while the law requires a decision, and then an honest effort to abide by it, it is not, as Senator BRIDGES pointed out, an irrevocable action and, disclosed need could modify it in either direction. Senator MILLIKIN confirmed this view, saying that under the Reorganization Act "we have no alternative but to reach a result based on, let us call it, rough judgment." This is also the position of Senator TAFT, who made it quite clear, for example, that while he wishes now to act as if the item for foreign relief can be cut in half, he knows that he is acting on the pious hope that the crops in Europe will be sufficiently good next summer and through next winter, and that if they are not, the money he is proposing to cut now may have to be restored when all the evidence is in.

What this all adds up to is that in fixing a ceiling on appropriations now, Congress is placing the burden of proof on the administration in the hearings which will be held by the appropriation committees. But the ablest and most influential leaders are not saying that they will not listen to proof that more money needs to be appropriated.

My own guess is that while in the end Congress will insist on many reductions in services that reflect the expansion of government under the New Deal, the total national expenditures in the year beginning July may be as great, and perhaps even greater, than the President's budget. We may spend more money than the President asked for, but the allocation of the money may be different.

For the next 18 months—the period Congress is now considering—will be highly critical. There is, at least, an even chance that the coming conference at Moscow may show that in the existing balance of forces in the world, no general settlement can be reached. If that happens, we shall have to spend a lot more money than even the President is asking for.

But even if things go better at Moscow than we can anticipate reasonably now, it is still as certain as anything can be in advance, that the position in Britain and the British Empire, and in western Europe and the empires of western Europe, will become highly critical in the fairly near future.

The liquidation of the British Empire, its galloping political and financial insolvency, the developments in the British Isles, in India, in Palestine, in Egypt, and in parts of Africa, are approaching a condition where they threaten to become uncontrollable. If they do, an emergency of grand proportions will exist which will make heavy demands upon us, and all our present estimates will have to be revised radically. Nothing, therefore, can now be certain except that all our estimates are in the highest degree tentative.

Current Status of Aviation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the last meeting of the American Bar Association held at Atlantic City, N. J., there was created a committee which has presented to that body a very valuable and very elucidating document entitled "Current Status of Aviation Law," a progress report to the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association by the Committee on Aeronautical Law. The document is so comprehensive, yet brief, that I think it highly advisable to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have secured an estimate of cost, which is $236.67. I ask unanimous consent that the document may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT STATUS OF AVIATION LAW
(Introduction)

President Carl Rix has charged this committee with the carrying out of the Nationwide educational program on the principles of aviation law. This program is to be carried out in such a way as to bring these principles to the attention of members of the bar and students in law schools. Your committee has accordingly prepared a summary outline of the major topics in the field of civil aviation law as a start toward a determination of the task which must be undertaken.

One of the great retarding influences in the field of aviation today is the lag of law and legislation behind the great technical achievements of the war. This situation is one which calls for united effort by lawyers

who are aware of the problems which exist. This outline is designed to serve the double purpose of indicating the work which has been done on law and legislation in the aviation field and of indicating the work which needs to be done as shown by experience to date. It is readily apparent that every field of aviation laws is in a state of current and almost constant change. Members of the bar have a most difficult but challenging task to perform in formulating the legal principles best suited to the air age in which we now live.

I. INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION

1. The sovereignty of nations over airspace above all territory under their jurisdiction

Settled principles of international law now give each nation absolute sovereignty over the airspace above the territory under its jurisdiction.[1] The very first article of chapter I of the Chicago International Aviation Convention relates this principle. This means, for example, that Russia, Yugoslavia, England, or the United States may exclude all foreign aircraft, or these nations may prescribe the terms and conditions under which foreign aircraft may land on their territory, or fly over such territory, for any purpose. This absolute sovereignty must be kept in mind in all relations in the international aviation field, for it definitely limits every phase. The Chicago International Aviation Convention mentioned below and the several similar conventions which preceded it, all have as their purpose the opening up of airspace over nations to aircraft of other nations.[2] If a foreign aircraft attempts to cross a nation's territory without permission, there is no doubt under international law of the right of the aggrieved nation to force such aircraft to land or to shoot such aircraft down if necessary.

2. Legal rules for international aviation as developed by international convention, treaty and agreements

In addition to the Chicago International Aviation Convention of 1944, which is outlined below, there are international aviation conventions covering air mail,[3] sanitary and quarantine measures to guard against introduction of communicable diseases by aircraft,[4] and bipartite treaties or agreements in this field covering a wide variety of subjects.[5] There are many bipartite agreements covering operation of noncommercial civil aircraft, the recognition of pilots' licenses, airworthiness certificates for exported aircraft, reciprocal air-transport operations, and other international aviation subjects.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 governs permits to foreign air carriers coming into the United States, and gives the CAB control over routes of United States air carriers to foreign nations. Unfortunately, the act does not give CAB any control over rates charged by United States air carriers in international air transportation, and that is one of the suggested amendments to the act now pending before the Congress in Senator McCarran's bill, S. 1, Eightieth Congress. Perhaps the chief thing to remember in connection with agreements for entry of our aircraft to another nation is that any rights obtained by the United States must be on a reciprocal basis. If we are to fly to or over England, Russia, Turkey, or any other nation we must be prepared to grant them like rights to fly to or over the United States.

3. The Warsaw Convention and its presumptions and limitations on recovery of damages

The United States is a party to a convention which establishes a presumption of liability for death or injury in international air transportation and which limits recovery for such death or injury to 125,000 gold francs, or $8,291.87 in United States currency, unless the claimant can prove "willful misconduct."[6] The convention also limits recovery for property damage. With proof of the cause of most aircraft accidents almost impossible, the affirmative proof of either negligence, on the one hand, or of "willful misconduct" on the other, is a burden which is difficult if not impossible to meet in most cases. Under the convention there is a presumption of liability up to the $8,291.87 in death or personal injury cases, and to escape such liability the air carrier must prove that the injury or death was not caused by its negligence. This shifting of the burden of proof is similar to the res ipsa loquitur doctrine sometimes relied upon in domestic aviation accidents. The important question is, Do the advantages of such a shift in the burden of proof compensate for the limitation on liability?

This convention was adhered to by the United States on June 27, 1934.[7] It is technically known as the convention for the unification of certain rules relating to International Transportation by Air and popularly known as the Warsaw Convention. Twenty-nine nations are now parties to this convention. In 1934 International Air Transportation was minor in character so the adherence of the United States to this convention was relatively unnoticed. With international air transportation now a major industry, and with all air lines engaged in such transportation issuing tickets subject to the Warsaw Convention it seems to be time to give this matter serious attention, and your committee is giving it thorough study at this time.

The committee which drafted the Warsaw Convention, the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts, usually referred to as the CITEJA, is in the process of transferring its functions to PICAO, and the views of the American Bar Association on this $8,291.87 limitation will undoubtedly prove quite helpful to PICAO in carrying forward the work CITEJA has started on amendments to this convention. Definite recommendations on this subject will be made at the annual convention if your committee's further study reveals the need for such recommendations.

In addition to the liability limitation referred to above, the Warsaw Convention covers the form and legal effect of passenger tickets, baggage checks, and aerial waybills, a limitation on liability of the air carrier for damage to baggage or goods, jurisdiction and procedure of courts in handling claims, a 2-year time limit on filing of suits and other provisions to carry the foregoing into effect.

4. The Chicago International Aviation Convention

From November 1 to December 7, 1944, representatives of 54 nations attended the international civil aviation conference in Chicago. The conference adopted an interim agreement setting up the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization (PICAO), with an interim council and interim assembly, with headquarters in Montreal. PICAO is to coordinate and guide international aviation until a permanent organization can be set up. The United States and 45 other nations signed this agreement. PICAO has made remarkable progress in the technical phases of international air transportation. Emphasis has been chiefly on safety, research, and development of air-navigation facilities, as, for example, the PICAO agreement to speed up immigration and customs requirements, to which this association gave its approval in Atlantic City last October. Under the interim agreement and the permanent convention little power is given over the economic phases of international air transportation.

At the first interim assembly of PICAO, held in Montreal from May 21 to June 6, 1946, a resolution was adopted calling for the deposit simultaneously by March 1, 1947, of the formal ratifications of all ratifying nations in addition to the 9 who had theretofore deposited their ratifications.[8] Five have since deposited ratifications and 12 more are necessary to complete the 26 ratifications required so that the permanent convention will be brought into effect 30 days later, under the terms of the convention. The United States ratified the permanent convention last year. The permanent organization, to be known as the International Civil Aviation Organization, or ICAO, will convene its first general assembly on May 4, 1947.

The Permanent Convention sets forth principles in international air navigation and air transport which ratifying or adhering nations are to follow. It is impossible to summarize such a comprehensive document[9] so your Committee merely indicates here in brief that it covers sovereignty of nations over airspace above their territory, flight over territory of contracting states by "aircraft not engaged in scheduled international air services," nationality of aircraft, measures to facilitate air navigation, the conditions which aircraft of member nations engaged in international air transportation must meet in the way of documents, licenses, etc., adoption of international standards and recommended practices on communications systems, ground marking, airports, rules of the air, traffic control, licensing of personnel and other technical matters. Certain disputes between members nations are to be decided by the Council created by the Convention and they may be appealed to the Permanent Court of International Justice. As appendices to the Convention, but not a part of it, there are the "two freedoms" and "five freedoms" agreements which are optional for member nations. The so-called "two freedoms" International Air Services Transit Agreement gives the nations signing it the right to fly over the territory of other signatories without landing and the right to land for nontraffic purposes. The United States is a party to this agreement. The so-called "five freedoms" International Air Transport Agreement grants each contracting nation the privileges just named in the "two freedoms" agreement and in addition the privilege to put down and take on passengers, mail and cargo destined from or to the nation whose nationality the aircraft possesses, and passengers, mail or cargo destined to or from any other contracting Nation. When the United States ratified the Convention it withdrew from this agreement.[10]

Up to the present time, PICAO has had no organizational relationship to the United Nations. However, a proposed agreement designed to govern the relationship between the permanent International Civil Aviation Organization, or ICAO, to be established when the Convention becomes effective and the

[1] 69 A. B. A. R. 228 (1944). See Pogue, What Is Freedom of the Air? Nation's Business, June 1943.

[2] See Hotchkiss, Law of Aviation, p. 4 et seq.; Hudson, Aviation and International Law (1930), 1 Air L. Rev. 183; and Gibson, Development of International Air Law to 1919 (1931), 5 Temple L. Q., 161.

[3] See text of Universal Postal Convention of Buenos Aires (United States Government Printing Office, 1940).

[4] International Sanitary Convention (1933), United States Treaty Series 901.

[5] See Gibson, Bi-Partite Agreements on Aerial Navigation, 6 Temple L. Q., 57.

[6] Orr, The Warsaw Convention (1945), 31 Va. L. Rev. 423.

[7] 49 Stat. 3000; United States Treaty Series No. 876; Hudson, International Legislation No. 235; 1934 United States Av. R. 239, 246.

[8] American Aviation, January 15, 1947, p. 8.

[9] See Rhyne, Legal Rules for International Aviation (1945), 31 Va. L. Rev. 267, 305-315.

[10] State Dept., Press Release No. 510, July 25, 1946; 1946 U. S. Av. R. 378.

United Nations organization has been prepared, approved by the PICAO Council, by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, by the United Nations General Assembly, subject to the condition that Spain shall not be a member of ICAO, and now awaits only similar approval by the Assembly of ICAO, which has its next meeting in May 1947. If this agreement becomes effective, it will not place ICAO under the supervision and direction of the United Nations, but will establish a consultative arrangement between the two organizations and will recognize ICAO as the specialized agency of the United Nations in the field of aviation.

II. FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER CIVIL AVIATION

1. Safety powers very broad under Civil Aeronautics Act

Under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 Federal jurisdiction over safety in the air is based on the very broad definition of "air commerce" in that act which includes (1) interstate, overseas, and foreign air commerce; (2) the transportation of mail by aircraft; (3) any operation or navigation of aircraft within the limits of any civil airways; (4) any operations or navigation of aircraft which directly affects interstate, overseas, or foreign air commerce; and (5) any operation or navigation of aircraft which may endanger safety in interstate, overseas or foreign air commerce.

Under this broad definition of "air commerce" the Civil Aeronautics Board has promulated regulations requiring Federal certificates for all aircraft and all airmen regardless of whether either or both are engaged in interstate or intrastate commerce, regardless of whether the flight is of a commercial or noncommercial nature, and regardless of whether the flight takes place on or traverses a civil airway. In other words, any airman or aircraft engaged in flying of any sort in the airspace overlying the United States is required pursuant to the Safety Regulations to have a Federal license.[11] Intrastate flights are covered.[12]

2. Federal economic regulatory powers are limited under Civil Aeronautics Act

While the constitutional power of Congress over interstate and foreign commerce is just as broad with respect to economic regulatory jurisdiction as it is to safety regulatory jurisdiction, Congress did not see fit in passing the Civil Aeronautics Act to exercise the commerce power as comprehensively with respect to Federal economic regulation as it did with respect to Federal safety regulation. As has been stated above, all aircraft and all airmen are subject to the safety requirements. No parallel provision is made in the so-called economic sections of the act. Rather, the act applies its economic sections only to carriers engaged in air transportation, which term, by a series of definitions in the act, means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a "common carrier" for compensation or hire in interstate commerce or the carriage of mail. Consequently, economic regulations under the act do not extend to contract carriers by aircraft, regardless of whether or not such carriers are engaged in interstate, overseas or foreign commerce. That Congress has power to regulate any carrier, whether common or contract, engaging in interstate commerce admits of no doubt; why Congress excluded contract carriers from the terms of the act poses an interesting, if speculative, problem. Senator McCARRAN's pending proposed bill (S. 1, 80th Cong.) rewrites the Civil Aeronautics Act so as to, among other things, regulate contract carriers by air.

3. The problem of nonscheduled air carriers

At the present time there is much in the press about the safety and economic phases of nonscheduled air carriers and the CAB is currently engaged in rewriting all the safety and economic regulations it had promulgated for this type of air carrier. As stated above in discussing economic jurisdiction, the Civil Aeronautics Act gives CAB jurisdiction over all "common carriers" by air. Whether all nonscheduled air carriers come within this definition or whether many of them are contract carriers is one of the legal problems yet to be decided in this field.[13] Since the war, availability of surplus aircraft has caused the number of nonscheduled air carriers to increase by the hundred, and cargo and passenger carriers in this classification are seemingly determined to compete with the scheduled air lines for such business as they can obtain. Many new legal regulations must be written to cover this type of air carrier.

4. Should Federal jurisdiction be exclusive over both safety and economic phases of civil aviation?

There is much discussion at the present time as to whether or not Federal jurisdiction should be exclusive over both safety and economic phases of civil aviation.[14] Your committee has pointed out that Federal jurisdiction under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in the safety field is broad enough to cover all flight by civil aircraft, and that the economic powers given to the CAB under that act are more limited in scope. The problem is merely pointed out for consideration as it is impossible to discuss the various arguments on this subject in this summary.

5. How should the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 be amended to meet the needs of civil aviation?

Civil aviation has made great strides in this country since the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was adopted. The extent of Federal safety and economic powers as discussed above indicate certain improvements which might be covered in amendments to this act. The problem of nonscheduled air carriers is certainly one that may call for more legislation. Senator McCARRAN, the acknowledged congressional expert in the field of aviation law and author of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, has prepared a comprehensive bill, S. 1, Eightieth Congress, in which he has rewritten all Federal legislation on the subject of civil aviation. In this he has, in a comprehensive way, covered such subjects as contract carriers, the matter of rates in the international field, and many other defects of the existing law. He has proposed in his bill that the Civil Aeronautics Authority be re-created as an independent agency and that an independent Air Safety Board be created. Senator McCARRAN has now introduced the provisions of his bill creating the Air Safety Board (title VII of S. 1) as a separate bill (S. 269) and the latter bill is currently the subject of hearings before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. These hearings are directed toward an investigation of the causes of recent aviation accidents.

III. STATE JURISDICTION OVER CIVIL AVIATION

1. Air safety jurisdiction of the States

All of the States have legislation covering various phases of air-safety regulations. Forty States require that all aircraft and all pilots have Federal certificates. Of the eight States which have no such requirement, six require either a State or Federal certificate, and two require only a State certificate for both aircraft and pilots. Virginia requires both a State and Federal certificate for aircraft and pilots. Eleven States have adopted air-traffic rules substantially identical with the Federal Air Traffic Rules, 23 have air-traffic regulations which make no reference to the Federal rules but which are usually based in part upon them, and 14 have no provision on this subject.[15]

The most recent activity in connection with Federal-State cooperation in the field of air-safety enforcement is a model State statute supported by CAA proposing among other things that the States punish reckless flying and that Federal aviation statutes and regulations be used as prima facie evidence of what constitutes reckless flying. CAA has pointed out that it does not have sufficient personnel to police the airways and that it would welcome State aid in the enforcement field. Previous reports of your committee have pointed out the constitutional questions involved where States adopt Federal regulations by reference, so this new statute attempts to avoid these problems. It is planned to extend this enforcement idea to local police as well as State police by urging adoption of local ordinances similar in character to the model State act. Undoubtedly as civil aviation continues to grow there will be many other ways in which States can aid in increasing the safety of air navigation.

2. Economic regulations of air carriers by the States

In discussing Federal jurisdiction over civil aviation above, your committee has posed the question as to whether Federal jurisdiction should be exclusive over both safety and economic phases of civil aviation. In footnote 14 recent articles on this subject have been cited as a starting point for those interested in the subject.

While 15 States have statutes authorizing economic regulations applicable to air transportation, no State has taken any action in this field of any consequence. There has been recent agitation in this field due to the activity of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners in sponsoring the uniform State air-commerce bill. This bill purports to give States jurisdiction over intrastate operations of all air carriers. In 1944 Virginia enacted rather comprehensive legislation to provide for economic regulation of air carriers and Rhode Island amended her statute to strengthen its regulatory provisions. In 1945 Alabama, Arkansas and Vermont adopted economic regulatory statutes based upon the uniform bill just referred to. It is to be noted, however, that in the latter three States the legislatures deleted the provisions of the uniform bill relating to regulation of intrastate business of interstate air carriers.

3. State taxation of civil aviation

State and local taxes on commercial air lines are almost exclusively of the following types: (1) Real property taxes; (2) personal property taxes; (3) net income taxes; (4) capital-stock taxes; (5) gross-earning taxes; (6) pay-roll taxes; (7) gasoline taxes; (8) aircraft-registration fees; and (9) pilot-license fees.

In the only aviation tax case of national import the Supreme Court of the United

---

[11] This regulation was upheld in *Rosenhan v. United States* (131 Fed. (2d) 932 (C. C. A. 10th, 1942)). (Certiorari denied 318 U. S. 790.)

[12] The court so held in *United States v. Drumm* (55 Fed. Supp. 151 (U. S. D. C. Nev., 1944)).

[13] See Neal, the Status of Nonscheduled Operations Under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (1946), 11 Law & Contemp. Prob. 508.

[14] See Ryan, Economic Regulation of Air Commerce by the States (1945), 31 Va. Law Rev. 479; and Hamley, Appropriate Areas of State Economic Regulation (1946), 11 Law & Contemp. Prob. 488.

[15] For names of States in each category see Rhyne, Federal, State, and Local Jurisdiction Over Civil Aviation (1946), 11 Law & Contemp. Prob., 459 at 467.

States has held that Minnesota could tax all of the planes of Northwest Airlines where that air line used Minnesota as its "home port."[16] This decision has brought about a very exhaustive study and report to Congress on taxation of air lines by the CAB pursuant to a resolution of the Congress.[17] Though bills have been introduced,[18] no congressional action has yet been taken on the legislation proposed in the report to eliminate multiple taxation of air commerce. The National Association of Tax Administrators has recommended adoption by the States of legislation employing a uniform formula for allocation of aviation taxes among the States. Each State's portion of these taxes is determined according to its share of aircraft arrivals and departures, revenue-tons handled, and revenues originating inside its boundaries.

4. Model State legislation now under consideration

With 44 of the 48 State legislatures now in session, there are a number of so-called model aviation bills before them. There is a model airports act designed to give cities and counties adequate powers to establish and operate airports as well as to receive Federal aid for such purposes. The model airport zoning act which has been adopted with some changes by nearly 40 States, is referred to below in discussing the subject of airport zoning under section IV of this summary on airport development. The uniform State air commerce act has been referred to in discussing State economic regulation over air carriers. The model statute on reckness flying has been referred to in discussing State air-safety jurisdiction and has just been made a part of another model bill called the State aeronautics commission or department act which is sponsored by the National Association of State Aviation Officials. A still further model bill sponsored by the Council of State Governments would require the channeling of all Federal airport funds through State agencies, eliminating direct Federal-city relations under the Federal airport program. The model act on State taxation of air lines is discussed, supra, in the section on State taxation of civil aviation.

IV. AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

1. Power to acquire, develop, and operate

There have now been 55 decisions by 26 State supreme courts holding that publicly owned airports are a public purpose upon which local governments may spend tax funds. The courts have also held that public airports are a public use for which property may be condemned under the power of eminent domain by public agencies. In one instance an air line has been allowed to invoke the power of eminent domain to acquire necessary property for terminal facilities. Airport leases have created many legal problems, as have regulations governing the use of airports. Taxation of public airports and damage claims against both privately owned and publicly owned airports have likewise created legal problems for the courts.[19]

With the Federal Government, the States and cities embarking upon a $1,000,000,000 national airport program under the Federal Airport Act of 1946, many of the above problems will be most important in the next few years and many new legal problems will undoubtedly arise.

[16] *Northwest Airlines* v. *Minnesota*, 322 U. S. 292 (1944).

[17] Multiple Taxation of Air Commerce, H. Doc. No. 141, Seventy-ninth Congress, 1945.

[18] See H. R. 1241 Eightieth Congress, introduced by Representative BULWINKLE.

[19] For a starting point on research on any of the subjects mentioned above, see Rhyne, Airports and the Courts (1944). All court decisions, books, and law-review articles on these subjects are cited.

2. Alleged nuisances or trespasses from low flights at or near airports

The common-law maxim "cujus est solum ejus est usque ad coelum et ad inferos" meaning "he who owns the soil owns everything above and below, from heaven to hell" has been held inapplicable to air transportation by the Supreme Court of the United States.[20] Other courts have reached similar conclusions. The Supreme Court decision held that a person who was damaged by low flights over his property, by federally owned planes which were taking off and landing at an adjacent airport, was entitled to recover for the damage so suffered. The decision was not unanimous and there is much disagreement in other court decisions as to the legal rules which apply in this type of case.[21] With civil airplanes increasing by the thousands, claims of this character based on low flying, noise, depreciation of property adjacent to airports, dust, fright and similar factors can be expected to multiply greatly. Much confusion had been caused in this field of law by the "Uniform State Law for Aeronautics" of 1922, endorsed by the association in 1922,[22] and adopted by 25 States,[23] and the American Law Institute's Restatement of the Law of Torts, section 194,[24] both of which contain the old ad coelum theory. Section 4 of the 1922 act subjects air space to a right of flight where the owner's use is not interfered with but much confusion in interpretation has resulted from attempts to reconcile these two sections. In 1931 this committee attempted to work out a draft of a uniform regulatory act which would eliminate the ad coelum theory but conflict of opinion prevented agreement on the language which would accomplish this purpose.[25]

The Commissioners on Uniform State Laws then attempted a similar objective in their proposed "Uniform Aeronautical Code." Your committee and a committee representing the American Law Institute worked on this project from 1933 up to 1939 when your committee recommended that further work on the proposed Uniform State Aeronautical Code be suspended pending a study by CAA of whether the entire field of regulation cannot and should not be covered by Federal Law.[26] Your committee was authorized by the association in 1939[27] to accept an invitation to cooperate with CAA in this study and to suspend further work on the proposed State code. The President's Reorganization Plan of 1940 came along and CAB inherited this broad study, but the only part ever released was the study on tort liability discussed under the section on aviation accident law, infra. In 1941 this association voted to suspend its recommendation of the Uniform State Regulatory Act on this committee's recommendation that Federal regulation rather than State regulation was best suited to this field.[28] The advent of war and more pressing problems diverted CAB attention elsewhere, and in 1943 this association adopted a resolution stating as follows:[29]

"That the American Bar Association endorse the principle that—

"(a) Maximum development of the air commerce of the Nation is in the public interest.

"(b) Uniformity of law and regulation of such air commerce, including its economic and safety regulation, control, and the certification of aircraft and airmen, is necessary to bring about its maximum development.

"(c) Such uniform regulation and control can only be accomplished through Federal legislation.

"(d) The declarations of principles and policies stated in H. R. 1012 (committee print No. 2, dated May 26, 1943) of Federal control of all air commerce to the exclusion of State control of a contrary, duplicating, or otherwise burdensome nature are in accord with the announced policies of the American Bar Association."

This resolution ended association interest in all parts of the then pending uniform State Aeronautical Code except the part devoted to tort liability. This leaves the Uniform Airports Act[30] and the 1922 uniform State law for aeronautics as the only proposed State legislation bearing the association's endorsement. Your committee is making a study as to the advisability of a recommendation that the association suspend its endorsement of both of these uniform acts as the development of aviation has made them out of date in many of their provisions, and the Uniform Airports Act has been superseded by a more recent Model Airports Act referred to in discussing model State legislation, supra.

Without further elaboration of the many difficult legal and legislative problems in this field as illustrated by the court decisions and legislation herein discussed, it can be seen that this is one branch of aviation law where much work must be done to clarify the legal rights of landowners, airplane operators and others.

3. Airport zoning

Airport zoning to prohibit obstructions in the approach zones of airports is a subject which is receiving much attention at present because one of the conditions of Federal aid under the Federal Airport Act is prevention of such obstructions by zoning or other means.[31] With airports of the transport class costing from four to one hundred million dollars, this entire investment can be wiped out overnight if some landowner can erect a tall building or other structure in one of the approach zones of such an airport. Airport zoning is designed to prevent such obstructions by limiting the heights of all structures, and objects of natural growth, in the approach zones to public airports. Some 40 States now authorize local governments to enact airport-zoning ordinances. The legal basis of such zoning is the principle enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States years ago in the Euclid[32] case that zoning is a valid exercise of the police power and that an individual can be required, without compensation, to give up a part of his property rights for the benefit of the community as a whole. Airport zoning cannot be used to force removal of existing structures since that would be confiscation without compensation, but it is directed toward prevention of future obstructions. In the few cases on this subject which have reached the courts, the decisions have pointed out that airport zoning cannot be used to confiscate property immediately adjacent to airports by so limiting the height of structures on such

[20] *Cousby* v. *United States* (66 Sup. Ct. 1062 (1945)). See Hunter, The Conflicting Interests of Airport Owner and Nearby Property Owner (1946), 11 Law & Contemp. Prob. 538.

[21] See Rhyne, Airports, and the Courts (1944) pp. 82–161.

[22] A. B. A. Rep. (1922), 97, 413.

[23] 1944 U. S. Av. R. 129.

[24] See Pogue, Aviation as a Law Molding Force (1943). 21 Nebr. L. Rev. 53; and Wherry and Condon, Aerial Trespass Under the Restatement of Torts (1935), 6 Air. L. Rev. 113.

[25] 56 A. B. A. R. (1931) 69, 317.

[26] 64 A. B. A. R. 171.

[27] 64 A. B. A. R. 100–101.

[28] 66 A. B. A. R. 148, 221–223.

[29] 68 A. B. A. R. 143, 196 (1943).

[30] 60 A. B. A. R. 119 (1935).

[31] Public Law No. 337, 79th Cong., sec. 11 (3).

[32] *Village of Euclid* v. *Ambler Realty Co.* (272 U. S. 365 (1926)); McQuillin Municipal Corporations (2d Ed.) § 1027.

property as to make it useless.[33] The controlling legal principles in this field of aviation law are yet to be written by the courts as no court of last resort has yet passed squarely upon airport zoning under adequate State legislation and local ordinance. There is a model State statute on airport zoning which is jointly sponsored by the CAA, the National Institute of municipal law officers, the National Association of State Aviation Officials, and the Council of State Governments.

V. AVIATION ACCIDENT LAW

1. Aviation-accident liabilities

There is now a large number of cases covering many points of law involving aviation-accident liabilities. The distinction between common and private carriers has been made by the courts in describing the degree of care required of aircraft operators. In quite a number of States there are statutory provisions applicable to aircraft operator accident liability. It will be recalled that the uniform State law for aeronautics referred to above, in discussing alleged nuisances from low flights at or near airports, also contains a provision stating the rule of absolute liability for damage by aircraft to persons or property on land or sea unless the injury is caused in whole or in part by the person injured. Twenty-three States have adopted this uniform law, but some of them have removed the absolute-liability provision and have based liability on the rules of torts applicable to accidents on land. In 1937 your committee, the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, and the American Law Institute, through a joint committee, attempted to draft a uniform aviation liability act.[34] Many differences of opinion arose, and finally your committee and the American Law Institute withdrew from participation in the work on the proposed uniform act.[35] The executive committee of the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws voted to withhold promulgation of this act until the Civil Aeronautics Authority completed a study they were making of aviation-liability legislation. When the reorganization order of the President reorganized the Civil Aeronautics Authority in 1940 the study went along with the functions of the new CAB. The study was completed in 1941,[36] but the war and its emergencies have caused CAB to delay action upon recommendations made therein. These recommendations call for a Federal act to cover most aviation tort liability.

In 1939 the association authorized this committee to accept a CAA invitation to cooperate in this study[37] of tort liability, and your committee is hoping that this project can be revitalized within the next few weeks. No action approving the CAB's recommendations has yet been taken by the association or the committee, and the committee is giving serious consideration to the CAB recommendations so that it can make proper recommendations for action by the association on this subject.

2. Workmen's compensation

Workmen's compensation problems of a unique character have been created by air transportation primarily because of its long distance interstate character. Most State laws have been interpreted as applying to all phases of civil aviation, but numerous interpretation of the situs of the employment of air-line employees is required. It has been suggested that the Federal Government assert complete jurisdiction in this field to eliminate some of the problems which have arisen.[38]

3. Aviation exclusion clauses in insurance contracts and the trend toward court interpretations which nullify these restrictions on air travel

Up until recent years insurance companies included in all accident and life policies a provision that the insured was not to be covered by the policy if injured while "engaging in" or "participating in" aviation. Some of these exclusion provisions relate to the double-indemnity payments only. Almost from the beginning the courts held that a mere passenger was not "engaging in" aviation or aeronautics, but the earliest cases held that a passenger in an airplane was "participating in" aviation or aeronautics. There was then a change in judicial construction of "participating in" which held that this phrase should be given an occupational connotation so that only pilots and those actually directing airplane flights should be regarded as "participating in" or "engaging in" aviation or aeronautics. Some insurance companies then added the word "operations" to "participating" or "engaging," but the courts held that the addition of "operations" did not cover passengers, so the insurance companies then added to "engaging" or "participating" the phrase "as a passenger or otherwise." The courts at first held that the addition of "as a passenger or otherwise" clearly excluded liability under an insurance policy for the death of a passenger who was killed in an airplane accident, but recent cases have now given an occupational connotation to this exclusion clause and have held that a mere passenger on a regularly scheduled flight over an established air route is not within the meaning of the exclusion clause.

The foregoing has been recited to indicate that the courts have gradually changed their construction of aviation exclusion clauses in insurance policies to conform to the development of air transportation. In the beginning the courts considered aviation as an experiment and any person who took a flight in an airplane, even as a passenger, was considered as engaging in or participating in aviation. When air transportation began to be accepted as an ordinary mode of travel, the courts, as indicated above, reversed these earlier decisions.[39] A recent survey of life-insurance companies reveals that 98 percent of these companies now issue policies at standard rates to air-line passengers, with 84 percent imposing no limits whatever on the insured's use of scheduled air lines. Only 14 percent make such restrictions as limiting flights to 40,000 miles per year or limiting the size of the policy.[40]

Respectfully submitted.

SUEL O. ARNOLD,
WILLIAM P. MACCRACKEN,
W. PERCY MCDONALD,
L. WELCH POGUE,
CHARLES S. RHYNE,
Chairman.

[33] *Mutual Chemical Co.* v. *City Council of Baltimore* (235 C. C. H. § 1813 (Cir. Ct. Balt. Co. 1939)); *Yara Engineering Co.* v. *City of Newark* (235 C. C. H. § 1989 (N. J. Sup. Ct. 1945)). Cases upholding airport zoning are *United States* v. *357.25 Acres of Land* (235 C. C. H. § 1972 (U. S. D. C. W. D. La. 1944)) and by dictum *Burnham* v. *Beverly Airways, Inc.* (311 Mass. 628, 42 N. E. (2d) 575 (1942)).

[34] Report of the Standing Committee on Aeronautical Law (1937), 66 A. B. A. R. 221.

[35] Report of the Standing Committee on Aeronautical Law (1942), 67 A. B. A. R. 186.

[36] See Sweeney, Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board of a Study of Proposed Aviation Liability Legislation (1941).

[37] 64 A. B. A. R. 100–101 (1939).

[38] See 68 A. B. A. R. (1943) and Pillsbury, Application of Federal Compensation Acts to Aviation (1933), 4 Air L. Rev. 38; Hearings on H. R. 1012, 78th Cong., 1st sess., at pp. 240–249.

[39] See, for example, the recent decision in which the New York Court of Appeals reversed itself: *Hartol Products Corp.* v. *Prudential Insurance Co.* (290 N. Y. 44, 47 N. E. (2d) 687, 1943 U. S. Av. R. 44 (1943)).

[40] New York Times, Jan. 29, 1947, p. 13.

A Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, distressed by the treatment their fellow countrymen are receiving at the hands of the Russian-dominated Communist regime now in control of the Government of Lithuania, American Lithuanians of Rhode Island gathered at a meeting to commemorate the twenty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence on February 16, 1947, and adopted a resolution which, in my opinion, merits our serious consideration. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this resolution with the urgent request that every Member of Congress read it and give their support to the pleas for relief of this oppressed nation.

Resolution unanimously adopted by the Lithuanians of Providence, R. I., at their mass meeting held at St. Casimir's Parish Hall, on February 16, 1947

Whereas over 20 months passed since the end of hostilities in Europe and Lithuania is still held under the occupation of the Soviet Russian Army;

Whereas the Russian Government has illegally formed in Lithuania a Communist regime, which is forcing upon the people a Soviet system of government, abhorrent and alien to their convictions; and

Whereas the Communist administration, supported by the Russian Army and police, has deprived the Lithuanian people of all their individual and political rights and liberties, is cruelly persecuting them, arresting them, and subjecting them to long terms in prison and deporting them into the Soviet Union, while their properties are being turned over to colonists brought in from Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting, gathered to commemorate the twenty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, register an emphatic protest against the illegal, arbitrary, and cruel Soviet conduct in Lithuania; and be it

Resolved, That this meeting of Lithuanian Americans of Providence appeals to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to demand, through diplomatic channels and international conferences, that Russia immediately withdraw her armed forces and secret police from Lithuanian territory and permit the Lithuanian people to choose their own government in a free and unfettered election; and further be it

Resolved, That this mass meeting appeals to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations at Lake Success, N. Y., through its chairman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, to protect the innocently suffering people of Lithuania from the terror and persecution by the Russians and their henchmen, and draw its attention to the horrible conditions described by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation in a statement submitted to the United Nations by the Lithuanian Minister in Washington; and finally be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Rhode Island and published in the press.

EDWARD CIOCYS,
Chairman.
B. STRAZNICKAS,
Secretary.

Was Marshall Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a provocative article by George E. Sokolsky, well-known newspaperman, who discusses quite objectively the strategy employed by the late President Roosevelt and Gen. George Marshall, then Chief of Staff of the American Army:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When Gen. George Marshall was Chief of Staff of the Army, Congress and the American people accepted his judgment without question. It is now clear that his particular judgment concerning the invasion of Europe was wrong, has resulted in a political tragedy of a magnitude not often witnessed in history, and that the United States, because of it, faces the interminable debate with Soviet Russia.

Winston Churchill had proposed that the Allies attack the Germans through the Balkans, a historic entry into Europe from the Mediterranean and the east.

That would have brought British and American forces into those areas which are now generically, if somewhat inaccurately, described as behind the iron curtain.

This plan Franklin D. Roosevelt and George C. Marshall opposed, on grounds which may, in their judgment, at the time, have found reasonable justification. They supported the invasion through France.

Churchill was defeated, but time has proved him to have been correct. For the sum total of the European war has proved to be that Russia is the sole victor, that for German hegemony over Europe has been substituted Russian hegemony, that for the autocratic will of Hitler has been substituted the autocratic will of Stalin, that a just peace has become impossible, and that two years after the war came to a military end, the world is still at war politically with no end in sight.

I recall these incidents not in criticism of General Marshall, for history and the course of events are taking care of that, but rather as a protest against the assumption that any Secretary of State, whoever he may be, is a sacred cow.

In a free country, such as ours, no holder of a public office should be beyond scrutiny and criticism.

General Marshall may have made two blunders of a serious nature already. One appears to be his petulant assumption that because he failed in an impossible task in China, the United States must withdraw its support from Chiang Kai-shek.

If the United States assumes the role of the defender of free peoples, then it must define what a "free people" is. If by a "free people," the United States actually means one that is governed by a government of the people's free and unfettered choosing, then we have no part to play, for among the peoples who need defense, there are no such governments.

If, on the other hand, by "free people" we mean those who are not controlled, fettered, mastered and enslaved by one of the great powers, and these days, principally by Soviet Russia, then nearly all European countries and China come within our scope.

George Marshall, then, as Secretary of State, has to decide whether China deserves our support in the form of recognition of Chiang Kai-shek's struggle against a Russian hegemony or not. His original theory, on which he spent more than a year in China, that unity was possible between the Kuomintang, as represented by Chiang, and the Chinese Communists, representing Soviet Russia, was historically untenable and from the standpoint of American interests undesirable because it would have resulted in a Russian hegemony over China. Chiang had to resist that as he resisted Japan's conquest of China and for the same reasons.

Secondly, the American acceptance of the Russian limitations of press representation at the Moscow Conference is a basic error. Byrnes asked for and received a promise that Moscow would have the same coverage as all other international conferences have had since the war ended. The Russians have now reduced the number, which involves a selectivity of coverage by Russia. Thus far no radio coverage is announced.

The United States should have declined to permit any news coverage unless the news and radio coverage was altogether free. In fact, the American delegation could decline to attend a conference at which the news and radio coverage was limited by a foreign country.

We have never, for any reason, limited Russian news coverage at any conference held in this country and if the Russians sent few correspondents, cameramen, and broadcasters, that was their choice.

The State Department has no business permitting the Russians to make that choice for the United States.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include below a copy of a resolution which I am today sending to the Secretary of State with the request that he advise what action is taken as the result of this protest. Free elections should be the right and heritage of a free people.

The resolution follows:

Resolution unanimously adopted by Lithuanian fraternal societies and cultural organizations which constitute the Rochester (N. Y.) Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council, at their mass meeting held at St. George's Hall on February 16, 1947

Whereas over 20 months have passed since the end of hostilities in Europe and Lithuania is still held under the occupation of the Soviet Russian Army;

Whereas the Russian Government has illegally formed in Lithuania a Communist regime, which is forcing upon the people a Soviet system of government, abhorrent and alien to their convictions;

Whereas the Communist administration, supported by the Russian Army and police, has deprived the Lithuanian people of all their individual and political rights and liberties, is cruelly persecuting them, arresting them and subjecting them to long terms in prison and deporting them into the Soviet Union, while their properties are being turned over to colonists brought in from Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting, gathered to commemorate the twenty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, register an emphatic protest against the illegal, arbitrary, and cruel Soviet conduct in Lithuania; and be it

Resolved, That this meeting of Lithuanian Americans of Rochester, N. Y., appeals to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, to demand, through diplomatic channels and international conferences, that Russia immediately withdraw her armed forces and secret police from Lithuanian territory, and permit the Lithuanian people to choose their own government in a free and unfettered election; and further be it

Resolved, That this mass meeting appeals to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations at Lake Success, N. Y., through its chairman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, to protect the innocently suffering people of Lithuania from the terror and persecution by the Russians and their henchmen, and draw its attention to the horrible conditions described by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation, in a statement submitted to the United Nations by the Lithuanian Minister in Washington; and finally, be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senator and Representatives of the State of New York and published in the press.

PETER NORKELUNAS,
Chairman.
VINCENT APTON,
Secretary.

House Stands by Its Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of February 22, 1947:

HOUSE STANDS BY ITS GUNS

By an apparently unanimous vote, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives have backed up their proposal that President Truman's budget be cut at least $6,000,000,000.

The reaffirming by the House Republicans of their insistence on drastic spending cuts came after the Republicans in the Senate, by the narrow margin of 22 to 19, had held out for smaller reductions—totalling only $4,500,000,000.

This difference of opinion, in the basic question of Government spending and hence of taxation, presents many interesting questions.

One of them, of course, is purely political. That is the division between schools of Republican thought. It is striking that the House is solidly behind a program in which the Senate is so uncertain and badly split. A developing tug-of-war is bound to result, in the course of which many Presidential hopefuls may receive painful scars.

Another also has its political phases. The House Republicans have clear command of the lower Chamber, so long as they stand shoulder to shoulder. They could even spare a few defections and still keep their control. But in the Senate the situation is different. The margin is close at best, and a split in

the Republican membership throws the balance of power to the Democratic faction.

Here, again, the result is most interesting. Many Democrats, followers of Senator BYRD, of Virginia, are just as insistent on rigid economy as any Republicans. There is a distinct possibility that a program solidly backed by the House Republicans might be carried in the Senate only by a fusion of Republicans and southern Democrats, against the votes of many Republican Members.

In its broader aspects, the situation may be said to be one in which the House has rather the best of the argument.

The Congressmen are, unquestionably, closer to public opinion than are the Senators—a Senator measures his constituents in millions, a Congressman only in thousands. Moreover, Congressmen, having to run at 2-year intervals instead of six, keep their ears closer to the ground.

At any given time, when such difference is developing, it is a pretty fair bet that a strong sentiment in the House more accurately reflects the public's point of view than a divided opinion in the Senate.

Moreover, under the Constitution, it appears to have been the intention to give the lower House the whip hand in money matters, since it is provided that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur in amendments as on other bills."

Obviously, if the House were to stand firm and refuse to pass tax bills going beyond the limits it has in mind, there is nothing the Senate could do, in the long run, to make it change its mind.

The basic difference of opinion about the budget figures, as interpreted by the two Houses, seems to revolve around the question of military appropriations. In other fields there is substantial agreement.

The prevailing argument in the Senate is that the international situation is too dangerous for them to be willing to take chances on cutting the funds for the armed forces. They don't put it quite this way—but obviously they would prefer to take a chance on waste rather than risk being blamed for a break-down in military strength.

In the House, the thinking runs along different lines. There is a definite conviction that the military requests are full of water—that upwards of $2,000,000,000 can be squeezed out without real harm to the defense program.

As a practical matter, the House Republicans are backing the judgment of one of their Members, JOHN TABER, of New York, who is chairman of the Joint Budget Committee.

Congressman TABER has made a careful study of the nature of the military appropriations, and has been emphatic in his verdict that a large share of them are nothing but pork—that they are wasteful, and in some cases have nothing to do with military security.

If half of what the other Congressmen have heard is true, concerning TABER's specific discoveries about some of these necessary military requests, he is prepared to blow the lid off one of these days when resistance to his proposed reductions gets too strong.

That this may very well be the fact, and that the leaders of the armed forces may have asked for extravagantly large appropriations, is a possibility which the public in general is apt to agree with, on the strength of its own experiences and observations.

Former servicemen can, almost without exception, tell the most appalling stories of military waste they witnessed. They are fond of saying: "There are three ways to do things: the right way, the wrong way, and the army way."

Ever since the defense program began back in 1940, there have been well-substantiated stories of gross and willful waste by military outfits. Much of the black-market gas formerly on sale was reported to have been smuggled out of military installations. Again and again it was reported by first-hand observers that, during the peak of the gasoline shortage, Army-contracted gas was dumped because the storage tanks were full and the staff didn't wnat to turn it back.

At some war plants, millions of feet of excellent wood, received as crates and boxes, were burned during the midst of a serious lumber shortage.

For that matter, gigantic war plants were built, out of scarce materials, with whole villages of new houses surrounding them—and never put to the intended use. The wastefulness of the armed services was a seething scandal. Testimony of the most outrageous laxity was taken concerning one large depot in Pennsylvania, near the capital—and then the whole matter hushed up and forgotten.

Much of this, of course, is perfectly well known to President Truman—since as head of the Truman committee during the war he complained bitterly about it.

If the House has in its possession evidence that the requested appropriations contained in the President's budget are as unnecessary and as loosely guarded as were similar appropriations during the war, then in the showdown those who are protesting that "we mustn't cut the military" are going to be made to look pretty silly.

Congress and the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Long Beach Independent of February 19, 1947.

CONGRESS AND THE BUDGET

As the House of Representatives and Senate vote on cutting from $4,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 out of the President's budget, an effort is being made to label economy-minded Congressmen and Senators as isolationists. The suggestion is that $1,700,000,000 be cut from the $11,200,000,000 asked for in the budget by the armed forces. It is doubtful if any such cut will be made because public opinion is unwilling to take chances on a weakened military force. Every veteran knows the wastefulness of the armed forces and knows the budget is padded. But for the present chances cannot be taken on cutting the military budget.

Those seeking to discredit economy-minded officials have tried to use the armed forces budget as an example of why the President's budget should not be cut. They gave little or no arguments concerning the other $4,000,000,000 cut that is projected. They fail to explain why OPA continues to have half as many employees on the Washington pay roll as it did when about everything was under OPA control. Today only rent and sugar is controlled. But in Washington OPA has 914 executives each drawing over $4,000 a year. In all there are 15,000 OPA employees in Washington alone. There are many more thousands scattered throughout the country.

In the budget is $2,000,000,000 for public works that can and should be delayed until cost of public works is less and when such projects are needed—when unemployment becomes a problem. Throughout the President's budget every department in the Government sets up the figures it claims to need for the year's operation. There is no apparent effort shown to cut down the number of employees from the staggering 2,400,000 now on the taxpayers' pay roll. This is almost three times as many as we had in 1939.

Every public body that passes upon budgets of department heads knows that most budgets are padded because the department head figures his estimate will be cut anyhow, so he pads it to be safe after it is cut. For the past 15 years the emphasis has been on more and more public spending because it was thought it was the road to full employment and prosperity.

For the war years we had no choice but to spend, regardless of from where the money came. But now we are at a point where the public debt and high taxes are a danger to full employment and prosperity. Unless there are enough economy-minded Congressmen and Senators with enough courage to trim expenses we are in for serious trouble. Public money sucked out of taxpayers' pockets cannot purchase the products of industry.

We have no confidence that the armed forces are any less wasteful of materials and personnel than they were during the war. But we cannot take chances on tampering with national defense as long as world conditions remain as uncertain as at present. There is, however, no reason for assuming any of the departments expected to receive what was asked for. For that reason the economy-minded officials deserve the support of those who are interested in cutting down the cost of government.

The Man on Horseback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy:

THE MAN ON HORSEBACK

The Army and Navy have become so accustomed during war days to spending billions they have acquired the billionaire complex. The Chicago Sun asks a question in the mind of every taxpayer: "Why do we have to spend $11,200,000,000 next year for military purposes?" The correct answer would be "because the Army and Navy wishes to keep the expensive habit." There is no other true answer. The Dallas News calls for "greater efficiency in Army and Navy spending," and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat urges "more economies in the outlay for the armed services."

In war days there was reason for spending millions for public relations, but there was no justification for spending $5,715,690, exclusive of pay and allowances of 51 officers, for publicity experts in Washington and publicity staffs with generals all over the world. What is the chief occupation of the publicity relations in peace? It is to spread propaganda for big appropriations and securing a

continuance of drafting men for the Army in time of peace.

Here are some examples of demands by the Army and Navy: The Navy wishes to spend $344,000,000 on new ships that are not needed, since we have the greatest Navy in the world; the Navy asks for $815,000,000 for the air force, which is more than the entire Navy Department got before the war; it wants $110,000,000 for training Navy Reservists as against $8,500,000 before the war; the Army asks for billions above the needs of 1941, wanting double for West Point and all other agencies.

If the requests of the Army and Navy are granted we will be going toward the time when every citizen will go to work carrying a soldier on his back. Do we wish to adopt the Nazi idea of the man on horseback?

Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WELLSBORO, PA., *February 20, 1947.*
Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: This is another dissertation on sugar. I know that you do not need to be reminded of these things but I know that controls should be taken off sugar. Can you give me the names of Congressmen to whom I could send letters like this with the idea of getting their support?

In the February monthly Letter of the National City Bank of New York, on page 16, I read, "Because of this continued high rate of spending, the Government finds itself in the unhappy position of scarcely being able to balance the budget, despite a tax structure practically at the wartime high (except for elimination of the corporate excess-profits tax) and boom conditions in industry, trade, and employment. If we cannot, under these favorable conditions, generate enough of a Treasury surplus to pay off debt and reduce taxes, when can we hope to do so?" I think that it would be admitted that we are now at the peak of employment and so the Government is taking in the maximum amount of money in taxes. If we are unable to save enough to reduce the enormous debt now, what will become of us if we have a depression? Will we receive help from the rest of the world? The answer is no. Then, is it not a matter of self-preservation to prepare for a slump while we have the opportunity? One of the ways to do this is to give the housewife sugar so she can have her shelves filled with canned fruit, jams, and jellies.

You will find enclosed a clipping taken from this morning's Patriot. We, the International Emergency Food Council, allocated sugar to Czechoslovakia. Were they given so much sugar that they have an excess from which they can send sugar to sugar-starved families in the United States?

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 880, I read, "Whereas in 1946 the sugar under direct control of the United States increased by more than 500,000 tons and no portion of this increase was made available to the American people." I maintain that the New Dealers will always find an excuse for rationing sugar. Take off all controls now and the world would soon produce enough sugar for everyone.

In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A481, under remarks of Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan, I read: "Sugar rationing continues in the United States with promise of only a miscroscopic increase in allowances, yet Canada recently declared a sugar dividend of 3 pounds per person to her household consumers. This dividend has been reported in the press as being justified by increased supplies of sugar. Canada is producing only 65 percent of its beet-sugar plant capacity, with the largest beet-sugar plant in Ontario standing idle for the past 5 years."

Will any nation produce sugar to any extent when they can get it through the International Emergency Food Council at less than it cost them to produce it? Of course they will not, and unless we get rid of the IEFC control of sugar we will always have a shortage of sugar in this country.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 992, Hon. DANIEL A. REED, of New York, says: "It would be interesting to know if the sugar which the administration is shipping abroad is a part of the candy which we are importing from foreign countries. The figures on importations of candy from abroad are quite startling. For example, in 1941, 1,100,000 pounds of candy were imported; in 1945, 65,575,000 pounds were imported."

And yet last week Frank J. Loftus, OPA administrator in Philadelphia, said that there would be no sugar for canning this year. Are the New Dealers going to continue to ship our sugar to other countries and then have them return it to us as candy, and thus put our own candy makers out of work?

I am enclosing a couple of sheets from the United States News dated February 14. This shows that as a result of using our natural resources without stint during the war, it now appears that we are getting short on some of our vital resources. Without considering this, the New Dealers apparently want to still further lower our economic position in the world by withholding canning sugar so millions of dollars' worth of our fruit will rot.

In the Iron Age of February 6 I read: "Dr. Clyde Williams, director of Battelle Institute and president-elect of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, warned that the United States and Canada should view with concern the depletion of their formerly rich mineral resources. He says, 'As a result of the depletion of our mineral resources, which, of course, has taken toll of most of the highest grade deposits, there has arisen for the first time a discussion of the question of whether the United States has now become a have-not nation.' Again he says, 'The tremendous wartime production of steel cut into American deposits of high-grade iron ore severely and greatly increased our dependence on lower-grade ores.' Let us look to the future and husband our resources or, at least, not waste them. Let's not be complacent as we were when Hitler was rearming and threatening the peace of Europe. Let's get rid of the IEFC and the OPA control on sugar."

Yours sincerely,

(W. E.) BILL HILL.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, another one of the very baneful effects of the reorganization bill, which up to this time has hamstrung the Congress in its legislative program, is the requirement that general budgetary recommendations be submitted by February 15 of each year. Hence the presence of this bill at the present time. Obviously any recommendation concerning the budget must, of necessity, be premature when it is submitted before the Members of this body have had the opportunity to make detailed comprehensive study.

Even the members of the Appropriations Committee, who give special attention to fiscal matters, have not had for the most part adequate opportunity to study the massive quantity of data and material incidental to the Federal budget. No effort has been made to hold general hearings. If it were not for slavish, drudging work on the part of a few of the members on this important committee, at this early date, Congress would not have any information whatever available for the debate of this sweeping recommendation to cut $6,000,000,000 from the Federal budget. So much for the cumbersome organizational difficulties and arbitrary requirements deposited by the reorganization bill which have precipitated this unfortunate situation in which we are called upon to act without adequate information and deliberation.

Now let me deal briefly with the merits of this particular resolution. I am as intent as any Member here upon achieving maximum economy, efficiency, and tax relief for all classes of our citizens which will not endanger the national security or cripple essential functions of the Government. I am fully convinced that the rank and file of our people are entitled to every possible relief from present heavy tax burdens. I am fully persuaded on the proposition that if individual incentive is to be preserved, general business, including small business, and also investment and venture capital, must be relieved and protected from onerous, confiscatory taxes which are stifling initiative and undermining business prosperity. I would like to join in efforts to help our small-income groups to secure reductions in present taxes which are taking a larger portion than they can afford to disperse from their hard-earned weekly pay envelope. The middle-class groups, embracing small businessmen and women, professional people, farmers, and other independent businessmen are also hampered by heavy taxation. In the higher brackets the rates are staggering, onerous, and confiscatory to a degree that could be justified only during periods of emergency. Clearly, remedial measures are in order to effect the relief of our people from such burdens of taxation, if we are to go forward as a dynamic expanding economy, capable of providing full employment. I am, therefore, prepared to support every sound reduction in taxes that can be effected.

The important question is: How much can we cut the budget without weakening the national defense during this time of ominous world crisis, without impairing Government securities held so widely by our people and without further disturbing our national stability.

Clearly the Government has huge annual fixed obligations which cannot be avoided. Interest on the staggering debt which is now reaching toward the $300,000,000,000 mark, an astronomical sum which will fasten great burdens on our people for many generations to come, appropriate reduction of this huge debt, the imperative, inescapable needs of the armed services, adequate hospital facilities, care, treatment, as well as other decent provisions for our veterans, constitute virtually mandatory requirements in any sound, well-considered, all-inclusive budget. There are also ordinary civil functions which must be maintained.

I am most eager to support and sustain a policy of strict economy, efficiency, and prudent management of the Government's affairs, but these salutary ends must be carried out in ways which are consistent with the national safety and welfare. I could never bring myself in conscience blindly and without full consideration of the facts involved, without study and scrutiny of the figures, to slash appropriations for the Army and Navy and other vital activities.

I want to vote for a reduced budget and tax reduction if it is at all possible, but I insist upon voting intelligently and discriminately. First, I must have the facts on which to base my decisions. I cannot cast my vote in the dark. I cannot make a blind stab at some over-all figure which is more or less arbitrarily fixed and the various component elements of which, if indeed they are known at all, as has been asserted here in debate, to some members of the Joint Budget and Appropriations Committee have never been published or made available to all Members of the House. Before I act upon this important matter of budget and tax reduction I insist upon having full information, not only as to the over-all figures but also the details as to where, what, and how much, these reductions will be, the departments they will involve, the particular items they will curb and curtail, the special activities and functions they will eliminate or restrict.

There is undoubtedly room for cutting and reducing the size of the national budget. I personally know places where that can be accomplished, but I think that as a Member of this body I am entitled to have complete and detailed information and not be in a position where I would have to act blindly in matters of such great import to the Nation. It is purely idle, to my way of thinking, to seek to cut and balance the budget by mere expressions. I do not feel bound by the inane provision of the reorganization bill which requires Congress to strike a figure for the national budget even before it has been fully organized. The manifest way to effect the economy and tax reduction which most of us seek and urgently desire is to cut specific items. When we know what these items are and what activities they affect, I will be prepared to act. When regular appropriation bills are presented to this body, I will be prepared to vote for economy, curtailment, and retrenchment, but I want to know what I am doing. I want the facts and the figures, and I do not propose to vote for any budgetary reductions if the cuts proposed are demonstrated to weaken the national defense, impair our bartering position at the so-called peace tables, or jeopardize the soundness and stability of the Federal Treasury.

The Lilienthal Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Providence Visitor of February 20, 1947:

WHEAT AND CHAFF—A DIGEST OF CURRENT EVENTS

The nomination of David E. Lilienthal to serve as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, made by President Truman on the basis of Lilienthal's outstanding public service with the Tennessee Valley Authority, has developed a division of sentiment among Members of the Senate, reminiscent of the protracted fight which was waged against the appointment of Louis D. Brandeis to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Perhaps the powers lurking behind the scenes are not unlike those which fought Brandeis, for many of the transparent charges being hurled at Lilienthal—that he is a Communist, that he believes in socialism—are cut out of the same cloth as those which were used to smear Brandeis. They failed of their purpose at that time, and history has proved the value of the Brandeis service on our highest Court.

There is some substance to the argument which Gov. Ernest W. Gibson, of Vermont, raised here in Providence last week. He counseled the American people to recognize the implications of having the civilian branches of our National Government dominated by those who have been schooled in the undemocratic processes of the military forces. He was pleading, quite sanely and quite wisely, for dominance of the civilian over the military, especially in our national thinking. He could have applied this argument, with some logic, to the quiet opposition which has developed to Lilienthal's appointment from those in the military forces. They would like to control atomic energy, not for any public purpose or civilian good, but for the value it would have in military and war purposes. The people of this Nation would do well to realize that atomic energy must be peacefully developed, lest the world be the victim of its own scientific inventions.

Of course, Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, of Tennessee is against Lilienthal because, as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Lilienthal managed that vast public power project in the interest of the common welfare. Since its major operations were located in MCKELLAR'S State, the veteran Senator, on the grounds of pure politics, thought he had a natural right to share the patronage in this development. Lilienthal resisted this intrusion of a single State Senator into a project which is owned by all the people, and which, to continue its superior value to the Nation, especially as a yardstick on power rates, must be maintained in the public interest. MCKELLAR has got out the mud, tried to smear Lilienthal with it, and, as is evident, has drawn to his side those who perhaps, for other reasons, say they back MCKELLAR for the reasons he advances.

The people of this Nation must realize that the best law which man can conceive can be defeated, in its operation, by operation, by improper administration. Lilienthal has established his ability as a great public administrator, and, of course, to MCKELLAR, that is treason. We prefer to believe that the vast majority of the American people stand behind Lilienthal for his insistence upon devotion to the public service. It was perfectly logical and natural for President Truman, in seeking a tried and true public servant to head the Atomic Energy Commission, to draft Lilienthal for this vitally important administrative position. Since atomic energy, as developed by the United States, belongs to the people, it becomes extremely important to make sure that it is retained in public possession. And to retain it in public possession means to have administrators who, even though in public office, do not submit to the views of private interests.

We have been told that atomic energy, properly controlled in the public interests, will be a great boon to the public welfare. It may well supplant coal and oil as the fuel for electric energy. It means that the time is coming, in the not too distant future, when energy for industrial and domestic purposes can be developed in any region without too much difficulty. The possibilities are so great that private interests are not overlooking their value. In fact, the battle the power trust has waged against such public-power developments as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Columbia River Authority may pale into comparative insignificance with the fight private interests will wage against public control of atomic energy. This may be the major battle of our time, between public and private interests.

Of course, on the surface, some attractive arguments will be raised by the jingoists, by those who are military-minded to have the military rather than the civilian authority control atomic energy. We have noted signs of this line of attack. Many times, the antagonists to public control charge that Lilienthal is a New Dealer, and for that reason he should not be confirmed by the United States Senate. Memories may be short, too short, but we cannot forget that the administration of the TVA, during World War II, was on such a high plane of public service that our war-production machine became so gigantic that we were able to shorten the war, and save millions of lives. TVA needs no defenders, on the record of public service. What TVA needs is defenders from those who now want to turn over control of great projects, involving public energy and the future welfare of this Nation, to those whose record belies their fundamental devotion to the public welfare.

The American people cannot afford to surrender control of their welfare to either private interests or to those of a military mind, who, as Governor Gibson so ably pointed out, have been schooled in the undemocratic processes of the military forces. Millions of Americans who served in the armed forces, even though devoted to their oath and to their constitutional duty to defend their country in time of peril, know that the goose-step discipline of the Army and of the Navy do not make for democracy. We cannot afford to weaken our devotion to that most fundamental principle of all principles—that the civilian authority shall ever remain dominant in this country of ours. It is no accident that the military, in most instances, has opposed public power projects. That is why it is no coincidence that the military and the private-power interests look with longing on control of atomic energy. President Truman, even though a military veteran himself, realizes his supreme obligation to the American people, and to their welfare. He has made a selection which, aside from the understanding opposition of those who

have thus far come out into the open against him, is adequate proof that the President is looking to the future. Peace can be achieved only through civilian processes. The military must remain subordinate. We cannot allow it to be otherwise.

Balkan Situation Disturbing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Sumner Welles has again placed his finger on a troubled situation in Europe. It appears that peace will never come to the Balkan Peninsula and that, if so, perhaps because of rival positions by the great powers in that area. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Mr. Welles which appeared in the Washington Post on February 19, 1947:

BALKAN INVESTIGATION

(By Sumner Welles)

INTERVENTION VERSUS SOVEREIGNTY

The resolution which the Security Council adopted on February 10, in response to the inquiry addressed to it by the Balkan investigation commission, involves a question of major significance.

Impelled by motives which were ostensibly humanitarian, the commission had requested the Greek Government to postpone the execution of a number of Greeks condemned to death for alleged treason. These had been convicted of trying to overthrow the present constitutional government that a majority of the Greek people had elected a few months ago. They were charged with complicity in a plot to bring about a civil war for the purpose of establishing a Communist-dominated regime.

The Greek Government reacted vigorously to the request of the Balkan investigation commission. It flatly charged the commission with unauthorized intervention in the internal affairs of the Greek people.

The Security Council had sent the investigation commission to the Balkans in order to ascertain whether the recent uprisings in Greece had been instigated by foreign governments, and particularly by Communist organizations in Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The technical point upon which the Council now had to pass was whether the action taken by the commission was within the authority granted it when it was appointed. But the basic issue at stake was of far greater importance than any technicality.

The resolution finally adopted by the Council declared that the investigation commission was "not empowered to request the appropriate authority of Greece, Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to postpone the execution of any persons sentenced to death, unless the commission has reason to believe that the examination of any such person as a witness would assist the commission in its work, and makes its request on this ground."

The delegate of the Soviet Union and of Poland disagreed with the majority of the Council that reached this decision. The real crux of the problem was brought out in the course of the debate.

Mr. Gromyko there insisted that the political conditions in Greece must be taken into account. He complained bitterly that, unless the Council approved of the action of its investigation commission, "heads are to fall of persons who have been condemned to death for defending their elementary democratic rights and liberties."

This is a further illustration of how, in accordance with Moscow's present strategy, the representatives of the Soviet Union and of the latter's satellites persistently try, through constant repetition, to convince public opinion in the democracies that any Communist seeking to overthrow by violence a fairly elected and democratic government is in reality an exponent of democratic rights and liberties. Yet it is of course notorious that in all of the Balkan states, except Greece, the democratic rights and liberties of the majorities are wholly disregarded by the Communist governments imposed upon them. The heads that are falling in those unhappy countries are the heads of the democratic individuals who are attempting to defend their rights and liberties against Communist dictatorship.

It is the Soviet Government that rejected the request of the United States and Great Britain for international supervision of the elections in the countries of eastern Europe whose peoples had been promised free and unfettered elections through which, in accordance with the terms of the Yalta agreement, they could secure representative government. The request was rejected on the ground that such supervision would constitute interference in the domestic affairs of those countries. Yet in the case of Greece, whose government is the only government, except for that of Czechoslovakia, in all of eastern Europe which has been elected by a majority of its people, the Soviet Government demands that an investigation commission of the United Nations be given blanket authority to intervene in questions of internal policy which can only legitimately be decided by the constituted authorities.

The first chapter of its Charter specifically denies the United Nations the right to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. If commissions of investigation appointed by the Security Council were to assume, in the name of the United Nations, the authority to intervene in the domestic concerns of the countries to which they have been sent, the Security Council would speedily become a means of arousing, rather than of composing, international controversies.

Because of our traditional repugnance here in the United States to the imposition of capital punishment upon political offenders, the underlying principles involved in the question thus presented to the Security Council have been generally disregarded. But the resolution which the Council adopted by a vote of 9 to 2 is destined to become of lasting benefit. The precedent established is altogether salutary. It implies that, in accordance with the categorical prohibition contained in the first chapter of the Charter, the United Nations is not going to undertake to interfere in the internal affairs of any sovereign state. Because of this precedent it will be more likely that the just rights of the smaller members of the United Nations will in the future be respected and safeguarded.

Civilian Production Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon:

House Joint Memorial 5

To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the Congress, in furtherance of the prosecution of World War II, enacted the War Powers Act granting to the President of the United States extraordinary powers, which powers are wholly unwarranted in peacetime; and

Whereas the said War Powers Act among other things provided that the President of the United States might by Executive order transfer the duties of Government agencies from one to another, but expressly provided that the powers granted therein could be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the war; and

Whereas the President of the United States on January 16, 1942, promulgated Executive Order No. 9024 whereby there was created a Government agency known as the War Production Board; and

Whereas by Executive Order No. 9040, promulgated on January 24, 1942, the primary duty of the said War Production Board was to "exercise general direction over the war procurement and production program," and said order further provided that the chairman of said board may exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by such order and in such manner as he might determine, and that his decisions are final; and

Whereas on October 4, 1945, long after the unconditional surrender of our enemies, the President of the United States promulgated Executive Order No. 9638 whereby he abolished the said War Production Board, and created another Government agency designated as the Civilian Production Administration, and conferred upon it all the extraordinary war emergency powers theretofore possessed by the said War Production Board; and

Whereas the said Civilian Production Administration has since purported and is now purporting to exercise power and authority over every person and corporation throughout the United States who undertake to erect or repair a building or structure at a cost of even a nominal sum, and among other things has decreed all such construction to be unlawful unless first authorized by such Civilian Productior Administration; and

Whereas government by such executive fiat is wholly contrary to the American system of constitutional government, and is not within the powers delegated to the Federal Government by the several States of the Union, and such exercise of authority by a Federal agency over the lives of the people of this State has not increased housing facilities, but on the contrary has created more chaos and confusion, and the assertion of such authority by said agency, and the exercise of such extraordinary powers by the President of the United States should be promptly terminated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized and requested, and this Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon does hereby petition that honorable body, to abolish the said Civilian Production Administration, and to promptly terminate all the functions and activities assumed by said agency pursuant to the aforesaid executive order, or any other order or statute; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to each Senator and Representative therein representing the people of the State of Oregon.

Adopted by house February 6, 1947.

JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate February 14, 1947.

M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.

Statement of Eastern Massachusetts District of Polish-American Congress, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a statement by the Polish-American Congress, Inc., eastern Massachusetts district, at a mass meeting held Sunday, February 9, 1947, at the Bradford Hotel, Boston, Mass.:

Several thousand public-spirited Americans assembled in the historic city of Boston, where so often the clarion call of liberty resounded, raise our voice in solemn indignation and protest against the outrages perpetrated upon the liberty-loving people of Poland, upon that great heroic nation, champion for democratic principles since time immemorial.

The Provisional Government of National Unity in Poland, as a condition to its recognition, solemnly pledged to the holding of free and unfettered election to enable the Polish Nation to set up a government truly representative of its own exclusive and independent national will in the best tradition of true democratic principles, deliberately postponed the time of such election to suppress and thwart the rational will of the Polish people, and to impose upon Poland an alien ideology and to set up a government in the interest of a foreign power at the expense of Poland itself.

International peace is based on justice. The struggle for freedom and independence of Poland is not the concern of the Polish Nation alone. All humanity demands justice and freedom for Poland to assure the peace and security for all nations. The sacrifice of Pulaski, the service rendered by the immortal Kosciusko, and the contribution of more than a million of our sons bind us together here in America in the cause of freedom. Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we are about to observe, inspires us with added courage in our fight against tyranny and enslavement.

Therefore, we propose that new elections be held in Poland; that such elections be free, secret, and truly representative of the majority national will.

We further propose that such elections be held under the direct supervision of the United Nations.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
EASTERN MASSACHUSETTS DISTRICT,
Rev. L. O. SIKORA, *President.*
MARY C. RIKAR, *Secretary.*

Address of Hon. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE to the members of the Faetano Society at a dinner at the Stratfield Hotel in Bridgeport, Conn., on Sunday, February 23:

My friends of the Faetano Society, I have been looking forward to this occasion for some time because it gives me an opportunity to combine business with pleasure. It is a great pleasure to be with you here to celebrate the thirty-eighth anniversary of the founding of your worthy society. It is a pleasure which cannot fail to remind us of the manyfold blessings which we enjoy in America. It is a pleasure also because I feel that, although this is the day after Washington's birthday, this dinner can, nevertheless, be regarded, in a sense, as a celebration of the birthday of this great man.

I appear before you here tonight after a week of hard work in Washington—a week in which, among other matters, the House of Representatives was called upon to consider the legislative budget.

The resolution by which this legislative budget was adopted was passed by a vote of 239 against 159. It was passed after 4 hours of debate. It provided for a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the Presidential budget for the fiscal year 1948, or a reduction from thirty-seven and one-half billions to thirty-one and one-half billions. This figure may be reduced when the question comes up for passage by the Senate.

There is no question in my mind that the American people want a reduction in Federal expenditures in order that tax relief may be granted and payments made on the national debt. I agree wholeheartedly with this desire, provided it does not impair the national safety or prevent us from discharging our international commitments.

Much attention was given during the debate to the question of national defense. Before voting for the passage of this resolution I satisfied myself by personal conversations with the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, the chairman, and other members of the Appropriations Committee that there was no question of jeopardizing the national safety.

The fact is that the Legislative Budget Committee made its report and recommendation in accordance with the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and that the report was made after joint meetings of the Appropriations Committee of both Houses, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, the Committee on Finance of the Senate. It was obligatory upon the Congress under this new act, to make a report and recommendation and it was obligatory upon the Republican Party, as a result of the mandate which we received from the people last November, to attempt to relieve the people from a substantial part of the burden of taxation which they have been carrying for several years.

I cannot, in the small compass of this address, discuss the many aspects of this complex question. But I will say that had we not been assured by our leaders that the national defense was not to be tampered with, the Republicans would not have voted as they did on this measure. They would not have voted as they did because, ladies and gentlemen, there were many veterans of World War I and II who voted for it. You may be sure that we have a primary interest in maintaining a strong America.

There is no question that our Army and Navy are only as strong as the economy upon which they depend. There is no question that our economy will be much more productive if the people are relieved of a part of the heavy tax load. It is the people of this country who have made America great. We in the Republican Party believe that the Government should be given back to the people.

Moreover, a reduction in tax rates in the past has meant an increase in tax revenues because of the stimulus which such reductions provide for production. Accordingly, it is reasonable to assume that if we are able to reduce taxes there will be more revenues available to bolster our national defense, if this should become necessary or advisable. We shall be able to determine this more easily after the Moscow conference.

Furthermore, though I yield to no one in my determination to maintain an adequate Army and Navy, I know, and many other veterans know, that there is some waste and extravagance which could very well be eliminated with a resulting reduction in taxation and an improved morale in the services.

In addition, there are a number of items in the Army and Navy budget which do not properly belong there and which could be eliminated, reduced, or transferred to other departments without in any way affecting the national safety. However all this may be, the point is that I shall have the opportunity to pass on these matters when they come before the House. All that we indicated last week was our desire to make a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the Presidential budget.

Now, I want to talk to you for a moment about the Italian peace treaty. This treaty is one of four treaties which will come before the Senate for ratification in the near future.

I start by telling you that I believe very strongly that ratification of this, and the treaties concerning Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, should be withheld at least until all the treaties containing the European settlement have been negotiated and presented to the Senate and the American people.

It has been said by some that the Senate's refusal to ratify these treaties would be widely interpreted in Europe as constituting a withdrawal from European affairs and therefore as an isolationist move. I submit that the contrary is true. The United States is now irrevocably enveloped in the European situation. If the result of these treaties is bad, as I believe it will be, then the blame will rest on those who made the treaty, and particularly on the United States. Accordingly, we should be most circumspect in our approach to this problem and postpone a final determination until the complete picture is available. If we rush headlong into these engagements on the theory so often advanced that the United States must accept any settlement rather than none, we can justly be accused of isolationism for our unwillingness to involve ourselves further in this troublesome problem.

As Adolph Berle, Jr., former Under Secretary of State, has said "treaties based on battlefield conditions, temporary occupations, and disturbances following a huge war, are rarely enduring." President Truman and former Secretary Byrnes have been frank enough to declare that the treaty is unsatisfactory in some respects. They con-

tend that it is the best obtainable under the circumstances. In fact, the terms of the present Italian treaty satisfy no one.

Now what are the principal terms of the treaty?

Italy is deprived of Venezia Giulia and Trieste is set up as a free territory guaranteed by the United Nations. She is substantially disarmed on land and on sea, and it is required that within 1 year any defenses which Italy has on the new frontiers be demolished. Thus she is rendered helpless to strike a blow in her own defense.

She is required to pay $365,000,000 in reparations.

She is required to cede her African colonies to the United Nations organization, and to make other cessions of territory.

These are the bare bones of the treaty.

The first question which arises is whether this treaty can benefit the United States. The answer is "No." As a result of the devastating military campaign fought on Italian territory, and as a result of Fascist and Nazi domination, the entire economy of Italy has been seriously impaired. There is widespread destruction and suffering. Much time must pass before the Italian economy can be restored to a point where adequate employment for the Italian public can be provided. This impoverished country is required by the treaty in question to pay reparations, on the basis of gold which it does not possess, as follows:

One hundred million dollars to the Soviet Union.

One hundred and twenty-five million dollars to Yugoslavia.

One hundred and five million dollars to Greece.

Twenty-five million dollars to Ethiopia.

Five million dollars to Albania.

Now the Italian people cannot even take care of their current needs. They have barely subsisted since the end of the war in spite of UNRRA, American supplies, American loans, and the considerable personal sacrifices of thousands of Americans who from their own resources send food and clothing to their Italian relations and friends. Under the treaty, this condition will not only be prolonged, but accentuated by the huge burden of reparations. Accordingly, it constitutes in effect a levy upon the taxpayers of this country to make payments principally to the Governments of the Soviet Union and of Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia.

The next question arising is whether the provisions of this treaty will promote political tranquillity in the area concerned.

The answer to this question is also "No." The territorial changes stipulated in this treaty, particularly those along the Italian-Yugoslavian frontier, violate both commonsense and humanity, and provide a most fragile basis for concord in this troubled area. It would appear that we had already forgotten the bitter lesson of the past 30 years. In spite of our tragic experience with the Danzig Corridor between the conflicting sovereignties of Poland and Germany, it is now proposed to set up a sort of Trieste Corridor between the conflicting states of Italy and Yugoslavia. The international port of Trieste can easily be the Danzig of the future.

Moreover, this treaty makes no provisions of security for the Italian population of Trieste. Until the Austrian treaty has been negotiated, and it can be determined whether or not Austria will be a free and friendly power or an armed satellite of Soviet Russia, it is impossible to know what use will be made of this port as an outlet for Austria. Those who are familiar with the problems of this area realize that it will be a powder-keg and that in fact no real concession has been made to the American view. I realize full well under what difficulties Mr. Byrnes labored, and I give him credit for slowing down the onward march of Soviet imperialism. But I feel that we now have an opportunity to judge these conditions again in the clear, empty light of reason. We can make full use of the flexibility of our system. The Senate is our second line of diplomatic defense. The services rendered by Secretary Byrnes and Senators Vandenberg and Connally and their colleagues did not even, according to them, provide solutions. They did give us a breathing spell.

Surely it will solve nothing to uproot scores of thousands of Italians and add them to the displaced Europeans now crowded into artificial "national enclosures" throughout the continent. The practical effect of such herding of peoples on the basis of their ancestral origins is to create a system of physical and mental ghettos not only for Jews but for all of the displaced persons of the smaller nations. It is not only ill-advised, it is indecent.

Far from promoting political tranquillity, such a practice and program will inevitably produce political explosions as a result of the rivalries engendered by so intolerable a violation of moral law.

Will the provisions of the proposed treaty improve the economic condition of the various peoples in the area?

The answer to this question is also "No." The economic effects on the Italian people will be cataclysmic. Viewed realistically, its effect will be to reduce them to beggary. In fact it is to be wondered whether this may not have been the purpose of some of the powers participating in these agreements. Under their terms the Soviets will have what amounts to a mortgage on Italian labor and will have the power so to manipulate the economic clauses of the treaty as to perpetuate this condition. In other words the Soviets can prolong the responsibility of this country and other countries to assist the Italian people in discharging its reparations obligations to the two Soviet powers.

Furthermore, the reparations payable to Yugoslavia will not benefit the Serbian, Croatian, or Slovenian peoples who are Marshall Tito's subjects. There is overwhelming evidence that people of any kind who come under the control of this regime are used for one purpose only; to bolster the political and military power of Marshal Tito and his Communists in exactly the same manner as supplies and moneys entering Germany after 1934 were used to bolster the political and military power of Hitler and his Nazis.

The people of Yugoslavia will not benefit economically from the ruin of the Italian people. On the contrary, the Yugoslavs will receive guns instead of butter, bombs instead of clothing, tanks instead of houses, and in the end will be driven by sheer want to sovietize other peoples.

There will be others not directly included in the terms of the treaty who will also be its victims. The unlimited power of growth given to Yugoslavia by the treaty will cut off from all access to the sea Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and southwestern Germany.

The question as to an increase or decrease of American responsibility in the Italo-Balkan area by reason of this treaty must also be answered. It will not decrease our responsibility unless we cut them off with an iron curtain of our own, and, retiring into isolation, try to erase the memory of those millions of people to whose desolation and degradation we shall have contributed.

Failing this ignoble and unacceptable solution, it is plain that we shall have agreed to a great increase of responsibility, moral, financial, material, and perhaps eventually military. Let us remember the 1930's when our surplus raw materials—our surplus money—helped the Germans and the Japanese to build up their war machines.

Marshal Tito has a standing army of 600,000 men, well equipped, well uniformed, and with a considerable quantity of mechanized transport and armament. Yet in nearly every district of Yugoslavia there is lack of food, clothing, and proper shelter. Should our tax-burdened people help to support Tito's army? Should Americans work and save to build a war machine which may destroy the very things for which World War II was fought? Are we so confused in our frantic desire for peace that we shall continue at considerable sacrifice to finance and abet what we have pledged ourselves to oppose? Will the judgment of history be that the United States relied so blindly on the power of appeasement that it sacrificed moral principle in order to commit national suicide?

We in America know how much it costs to maintain a large military establishment. Apparently both the Yugoslavs and the Russians can afford such expenditures, yet they cannot adequately feed, clothe, and house their own people.

Our good intentions will avail us little when we are faced with overwhelming power which we have helped to build.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us think again and deeply before we consign Italy to the same fate as Poland. We cannot afford to participate in another betrayal. The Government of the United States gave its pledge that it would assure the preservation of the essential nationhood of Italy. This pledge, backed by the Atlantic Charter and our frequent declaration of war aims, entitles the Italian people to maintain themselves as a nation and to resume the position on the European scene to which she is entitled by her attainments. This is a result devoutly to be wished. It is an opportunity richly deserved by a nation which for many months fought gallantly at our side. This treaty should guarantee that this will be made possible. Instead it constitutes virtually a death sentence of Italy, as a nation.

It is stipulated that Italy is to disarm, and that Allied forces are to withdraw. Does anyone seriously imagine that we are in this manner guaranteeing the nationhood of Italy when Tito has 600,000 armed men across the border? Are we not instead creating another power vacuum to be invaded and brought under control at an appropriate time by those very forces with whom we are in continual disagreement?

Ladies and gentlemen, there is every indication that ratification of the Italian treaty by the United States will be widely viewed as a capitulation to the totalitarian forces; that it will be regarded as an admission by us that virtually all of Europe is to be a Communist province. And so, under the guise of participation in international affairs, we shall under this treaty, return to isolation. We shall cease to have a voice, though we shall pay for our weakness by assuming a large share of the burden we shall have imposed on others.

Responsibility and power will be vested in the creditor nations, principally Soviet Russia, and Italy's next-door neighbor—Yugoslavia.

Ladies and gentlemen—America is still the best hope of the world. We can still salvage at least some of the blood-soaked principles which we so recently fought to maintain. We have another God-given opportunity to redeem our pledges—to demonstrate to a desperate world that we can and will exercise the leadership which Divine Providence has thrust into our hands; that America is not only a land of military and industrial power, but of moral power as well.

General Marshall in a speech at Princeton University the other day vigorously called

attention to the great crisis in which we are living. He asked for the same unity of purpose which brought victory to our arms. My friends, this is no time to grow tired—this is the time for greatness.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by George E. Sokolsky, appearing in the February 14 issue of the Kingston Daily Freeman.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sokolsky's article sets forth, in the layman's language, the labor situation in this country. Here we have the attitude of the better rank and file of the union worker who can quietly vote without jeopardizing his present union position. Members of Congress must not forget the mandate given to us last November 5. The power presently in the hands of radical labor leaders must be curbed. It is only natural for these leaders, drunk with power, to bellow against all kinds of labor legislation. Of course, they must be heard and their views before the Committee on Education and Labor must receive fair and just consideration, but I believe the rank and file of American labor is actually crying in despair to be unshackled from the present labor heirarchy.

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)
A WORKER SPEAKS

I received this letter from a worker in Pittsburgh whose name and address I am withholding for his safety, for should he be expelled from his union he could not exercise his right to work at his trade:

"I have often wondered just how much you big well-known writers were interested, really and truly interested, in the plight of an unknown individual who wants to work daily, every working day, from whistle to whistle. So let us take my case. I think it is typical because I know hundreds of men with whom I work and we are all in the same boat. I am unknown. I am a nobody. I work in one of the mills belonging to the United States Steel Corp. I have worked there for years. I know my job and I do it to the satisfaction of all concerned. I am a union man and attend nearly all the meetings of my local. I hold no office.

"Just about a year ago Phil Murray called us out on strike. My hourly rate then, before the strike, was 92½ cents. As you recall, the company offered a raise of 15½ cents an hour. But that did not suit Mr. Phil Murray, so out we went. I lost nearly 5 weeks of work. I did my share of picket duty. There was no money of any kind for picket duty, strike pay, or anything. We went back to work. The strike was settled for a raise of 18½ cents per hour. Actually, we were striking for a difference of 3 cents an hour, 24 cents a day, $1.20 a week, or a total of $6 for the 5 weeks. Silly, wasn't it?

"We used to discuss it while doing picket duty. I went back to work February 20, 1947. From then on it has been 'in and out.' The coal strike and the Pittsburgh power strike caused more shutdowns. In all I lost 63 working days last year due to labor trouble. My total earnings in 1945 were $2,305.98. My total earnings in 1946 were $1,729.73. My raise cost me $576.25. That is what this union labor racket cost me. Were you in my place, how would you feel? I cannot afford another raise. I speak only for myself but I do know how many more feel about this. How do you suppose I voted November 5, 1946? How do you suppose hundreds of thousands of my fellow workers voted? We had enough! Yes sir, enough!

"Now the question is: What is the Congress going to do about it? Are the 'master minds' in Washington going to continue to listen to Phil Murray, Bill Green, John L. Lewis and the rest of the social parasites? Or are they going to be guided by the results of November 5, 1946, and do something about it? Are they going to bust up this labor monopoly and labor dictatorship and restore the rights of an American citizen to a person who must work in order to live? Fire is a good servant but a poor master. That goes for labor unions, too.

"There is one simple little thing which, if done, will clear up this labor situation in not more than 90 days. Make illegal the closed shop, the check-off, and the maintenance-of-membership clause in all contracts. You need not worry about anything else. The voluntary membership of the unions would soon clean house. Make labor unions subject to the same laws as corporations—combinations in restraint of trade—income taxes—publish financial statements—campaign contributions, etc. Of course Phil and Bill and John will not like this but millions of other Americans will.

"And that, Mr. Sokolsky, is how I feel. I not only hope but I pray that something is done. I do not want to put in another year similar to last year. That was bad. That was bad for everyone except those in on the labor racket.

"Now what do you think?"

This letter tells the story better than I have seen it anywhere else by any "big well-known writer."

Address of Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, before the Chamber of Commerce, Henderson, N. C., on January 31, 1947:

I want to talk tonight about one aspect of the peace that has followed World War II. That war was the greatest in history and our victory over the Axis was complete. We should not lose sight of the real value of that conflict, or forget what would have been the fate of America if totalitarianism of the German and Japanese brand had ruled the world, as appeared at least possible only five short years ago.

But the war, though saving us from a worse fate, has still left its scars—in the loss of the lives of many of our best young men—in the burden of a truly incomprehensible national debt—and in the problems of a troubled world and in some respects a troubled nation.

It is time to take stock of the resources of America which are available to heal those scars as far as possible and to meet the problems which confront us. We have a great country in expanse and in natural products, but we are neither the largest country of the world nor the richest in the capacity of our farms or mines. And if we were, this would not solve our problems.

Men, more than materials, make a nation. A pound of iron ore imbedded deep within the earth is worth only a fraction of a cent, but if brought to the surface by human effort, converted and refined into steel by the work and ability of men, and machined with mechanical skill into delicate instruments of precision, it is worth many thousands of dollars.

The future of America depends upon its people, depends upon their physical health and mental alertness, their education and training, their willingness to work, their character and patriotism.

I would examine an important human asset of America today—the more than 10,000,000 young men from 20 to 30 and younger who served in uniform in World War II.

I have said many times, and said with emphasis, that the recent war was an all-American war in which every citizen—in uniform and out—played an integral and a necesary part. The problems of peace are no less all-American. So it is with no disparagement of other citizens that I direct my attention tonight to the young men who played the most direct part in the recent conflict.

These young veterans include the larger part—more than 75 percent of America's young manhood. They, with their older brothers in arms and their fellow veterans of World War I, number 18,000,000—two out of every five adult American men. They touch Henderson as they touch every part of America. And this group will be, and must be, the leaders of our Nation in this and the next generation. Upon them will rest the primary responsibility for preserving our future.

You have been reading and hearing stories about these young men; some of them true stories, and some the products of malcontents, sensationalists and Mrs. Grundys. Perhaps a few are worried about this new generation. But whether you are worried or not, I am sure you would be interested in some facts about them.

They entered the service of their country as a true cross-section of American youth. They included many men of character and some of no character. They included untried youths and those of proven merit, and a few with criminal records or criminal tendencies. They included workers and idlers, successes and failures.

They have now largely returned to old tasks or have entered upon new and sometimes strange ones. A few are worse men than when they entered, others—and I am emboldened to believe many others—are better men. If there had been no war some would have gone forward and some backward. To make a fair appraisal we must look at averages and judge the influence of military service quality by quality.

What was the physical result of such service? While the time-consuming job of a complete medical record of the war has not been completed, it is already indisputably proven that life in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps increased the physical strength, the stamina, the life expectancy, and the general health of the men who served and who came out alive and unwounded. In fact, even including the wounded, the average physical improvement of all living veterans is on the credit side of the ledger.

The fact that the American soldier and sailor and marine were the best fed in the world, that they kept regular hours, that they were well clothed and well housed, that they had open-air exercise and recreational facilities—these facts paid splendid

dividends in making our military youth the healthiest group of men—not only in the world today—but the healthiest in world history.

The death rate from disease of men in the service was about one-third that of civilians of comparable age, and many veterans will carry with them into civilian life health and food habits and training in preventative precautions which will safeguard them and prolong their lives.

But the benefits were not merely physical. They were also intellectual. The American Army and Navy were a well-read Army and Navy. Many boys who but for the war might have scoffed at literature, learned to enjoy good books. Many with no original interest in the world or its history, had their curiosity aroused by visits to strange lands and avidly read of these and other nations of the world.

Through newspapers and magazines and radio service the American soldiers and sailors were afforded an opportunity—which most of them seized upon—to become—and to keep—informed about current events.

The armed forces conducted during the war the largest mass educational program ever known—conducted it all up and down the line. Illiterates were taught to read and write. High school and junior high school courses were afforded those who needed them. Specialized training was given in mechanics, aeronautics, radio, electronics, and other fields.

And, finally, nearly 1,500,000 service men and women enrolled in the Armed Forces Institute, and made their selections from 250 correspondence courses prepared by 83 American colleges. Off-duty classes along the same general line attracted 1,750,000 service personnel. College credit was allowed for most of the completed work.

Perhaps the best indication of the war's educational effect is the avidity with which war veterans have seized upon the educational rights given by the GI bill. Our colleges are more crowded than ever before, and informed authorities believe that this increase in students is permanent—at least for the present college generation. The young men who served their country in uniform now make up—and will continue to make up—America's most highly educated generation, academically and technically.

That is not all. The American servicemen surprised the military authorities—and surprised the cultural and entertainment fraternity itself—by their widespread appreciation not only for clean humor and amusement but also for good music and good drama. I never will forget the thousands of American boys—boys from every section of the country, from rural and from urban districts—who in Italy and in the Middle East flocked—and sometimes pushed and crowded and fought—to hear Lily Pons sing.

As for the character of our veterans, despite the wide publicity given some notorious cases and the conclusions hastily drawn therefrom, the American soldiers and sailors and marines have returned to civilian life more law-abiding, more orderly and with better principles and morals than the average civilian youth of America had before the war or during the war.

The records of the FBI show that from 1943 to 1945 approximately 3½ percent of the civilian population of America was involved in one way or another in the commission of crime. During these same years only three-tenth of 1 percent of the Army's men were involved in similar crimes. And even if we include military offenses which have no civilian counterpart—such as absence without leave—there were still four times the percentage of civilian criminals as there were Army criminals.

You have heard a great deal about the venereal rate in the Army. It is too high, particularly overseas, and every effort is still being made to reduce it. But, despite the lax morals and prevalent disease of many countries where American boys have served, the venereal rate of the Army in the 1941–46 period was not disproportionate when compared with the estimated rate of the civilian population in America. And a vast majority of chaplains—as well as other qualified observers—will bear testimony to the fact that in the Army and Navy the percentage of good, moral boys greatly exceeded the civilian percentage.

And the young serviceman learned other things during this war—learned, for example, to save money as never before and to improve the financial security of himself and his family while developing at the same time a valuable trait for his future life.

In the Army alone, the voluntary allotments made by the soldiers for bonds or for deposit in banks or for transmission to relatives—largely for savings purposes or for inclusion in soldiers' deposits—totaled, during the war years, the enormous sum of $1,500,000,000, in addition to $5,500,000,000 allotted for national life insurance and the $6,500,000,000 of statutory family allowances. Compare the totals with all the bank deposits in North Carolina or in the whole Southeast and you will get some idea of the size.

Some of the gains which the youthful veterans have attained involve the subtler aspects of human character and qualities. They have broadened their horizons mentally and spiritually. Ingrained provincialism has tended to disappear. They can see their own personal problems and those of their businesses or occupations in a truer perspective, realizing that the rest of the Nation and even the rest of the world will play an important part in their personal successes or failures.

Many have acquired—perhaps the hard way—a self-confidence and an assurance which might never have been theirs. They have learned the value of self-discipline. Under the stress of necessity—or of personal danger—they have found how important it is to work as a part of a team, have discovered that the coordinated effort of a few will often accomplish more than the separate and unrelated efforts of the many.

They were thrown in daily contact with men of all occupations and all backgrounds and all religions, and the rough edges of prejudice and ignorant misunderstanding were rubbed away in the contact. They have developed a true sense of patriotism which cannot be concealed even under the veneer of petty complaint and criticism, so typical of youth in and out of the Army. They have acquired a commendable impatience at the selfishness of groups at home who had put their own welfare above that of the fighting men and of the Nation itself.

And believe it or not, the young American veteran is not regimented. Army discipline did not break his spirit or deprive him of the independence which is such an asset in war and in peace. Hard as it was at first, he learned to see military life in its perspective by ever looking forward to the day when temporary distinctions of rank would disappear. He pictured himself as once more a free agent, and today he is enjoying and asserting that freedom.

I recently had my attention called to a study made of 199 veterans attending Princeton University. This is a small group, statistically speaking, but I believe the findings are typical. Eighty percent of them responded to a questionnaire by stating that as a result of their war experience they felt more independent and better able to make their own decisions. For those with combat experience, the percentage was even higher—85½ percent.

Another significant index of the high opinion most veterans have for the Army in which they served is the large number—about 135,000 to date—who have applied for commissions as officers in the postwar Regular Army. This is more than five times the number of places to be filled—that is, the 25,000 additional officers authorized by Congress last year.

To sum it up—the average young veteran of World War II is a better man physically, mentally, and morally because of his service. And that is only another way of saying that he is better qualified to serve his employer, his associates, his community, his State and his Nation. This then is the asset which is in the hands of America for future progress and development—an asset in the form of a better and stronger youth with real ability to meet any problems which confront them or confront the rest of us.

But the value of this asset depends in large part upon the use that the rest of our Nation makes of it. If ignored it may well be dissipated—or at least greatly reduced in value.

The Nation has shown its gratitude to these boys who served—shown it in a material and a substantial way. Under the able administration of General Bradley we are spending at the rate of more than $7,000,000,000 per year on our veterans for care and rehabilitation of the disabled—for continued education and training of the ablebodied—and in many other ways.

Much of this assistance continues to add to the qualification of the veteran; to make him a better citizen and a more competent one. But this contribution of the Government does not relieve its citizens of their responsibilities. It does not answer the fundamental wish of the average veteran, the wish to be taken into the life of the community in which he lives, to become an integral part of that life, and to be given an opportunity to work and to progress in accordance with his abilities.

The greatest service that you men of Henderson, or the citizens of our State and Nation, can render to our young veterans, is to give them a chance to develop their talents as integral parts of their communities. And once given this opportunity, I have no doubt that on the whole this youthful group will move rapidly to the forefront in the business and civic affairs of every part of America; that the group will take the leadership to which its ability and experience and training entitle it.

And to give the young veterans this opportunity is not to ask for any real unselfishness and sacrifice; is not to beg or plead for any sentimental preference. The country needs these veterans and their ability and needs to utilize them to the fullest. For upon such use and upon the success of this group of young men in measuring up to the responsibilities given them lies the principal hopes of America and of North Carolina during the coming generation.

To be specific, if every nonveteran employer here tonight—if every man who needs an associate or a partner in business— would look over first the available disabled veterans and then the able-bodied veterans and give them full and fair consideration, you would not only be adding value to a great human resource of our country but you would also find, and sometimes be surprised to find, how well qualified, physically and mentally, these young men are and how well trained they are for the job or occupation for which they are selected. Making a place for the qualified veteran is not merely a manfestation of patriotism. More often than not it will prove to be a sound investment.

Naturally, there will be some exceptions—some boys who never had and never will have the right stuff—some professional veterans who want to ride the Government or spend the rest of their lives living on genuine or simulated military accomplishments. But these are few and far between and you can usually spot them. They merely prove the rule that the average young veteran is earnest, serious, determined, and possessed of energy and good ability.

And do not forget the young professional man who served in the war. I am thinking, for example, of the young doctors who contributed to the glorious medical record of World War II, in which war almost 96 out of 100 hospitalized men recovered, as compared with about 94 out of 100 in World War I and about 93 in the Spanish-American War. The return of these doctors to civilian life presages better medical care for the whole Nation.

And a word for the lawyers in the Army. Most of them did not serve in a legal capacity. But they had a remarkable record for leadership and devotion to duty in the line and behind the line. You will find them as a whole earnest, hard-working, sincere, efficient, courageous, and single-minded in the interest of their clients. They are good enough for my money. And so it goes with other professions—ministers, educators, engineers, scientists, and all the rest.

There are about 400,000 veterans in North Carolina, a large majority of them the young men of whom I speak. The efforts to integrate them into our normal civilian life and to give them the maximum of support and the greatest chance for service is, and must be, a continuing concern of our State.

Over the course of years after the First World War I was impressed by the fact that North Carolina moved more slowly than most States—perhaps more slowly than any State—in pushing forward the veterans of that war—more slowly in giving him business or civic opportunities. Of course, this group eventually forged to the front, because they comprised the most vigorous and capable class of men of their generation. But they would have been better off—and the State would have been better off—if they had been given wider and earlier opportunities in business and commerce and manufacture—in civic service and in every activity of the State.

I do not believe that this error will be repeated again. I am confident that the State will realize, more clearly than it did before, the peacetime value of the military service of its young men. The impact of numbers would almost compel the realization that the new young veterans are a major factor in the future of the State. In 1919 the 4,000,000 ex-servicemen of the country were a small proportion even of the Nation's youth. But 14,000,000 new veterans, fully supported by the old, present a different picture in relation to America and its States and communities.

And the veteran himself has a responsibility. It is not a one-way street. If he is given an opportunity he must measure up to it or suffer the consequences. Millions of able-bodied men cannot remain wards of the State; with few exceptions, they do not want to. If a veteran has a job he must perform it. If he is entrusted with civic leadership he must serve his community and his State well.

I have no fear but that the young ex-servicemen will do their full part. The generation that gave the lie to Axis sneers of softness and decadence has been further refined in the crucible of war. These young men, victors in the greatest and most complex war of history, will, I am certain, prove themselves no less invincible in overcoming the problems of peace.

Among other things, they know and intensely feel that we must not have another war. They realize—particularly those who have served abroad—how much the other democratic nations of the world look to and depend upon the United States for strength and leadership in making permanent the peace that we have won.

They know that a strong America—not only strong in military potential but strong in industry and in production of farms and mines—and strong in physically and mentally qualified citizenship—that a Nation with such strength is necessary to preserve the peace of the world and to bring prosperity to our own homeland.

Unveiling of Portrait of James F. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of the proceedings at the unveiling of a portrait to James F. Byrnes at Columbia, S. C., on February 19, 1947.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF JAMES F. BYRNES

The president was presiding.

Proceedings were opened with prayer by the Rt. Rev. John J. Gravatt, Episcopal bishop of upper South Carolina.

The senate and guests stood and were led by Mrs. W. J. Gooding, Jr., with Mrs. Curran Jones at the piano singing "America."

The president read the following telegram:

"Hon. GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, Jr.,
"President of the South Carolina Senate,
"Columbia, S. C.:

"I send hearty greetings to you and through you to the members of the senate on the happy occasion of the placing in the senate chamber of the portrait of South Carolina's distinguished son, James F. Byrnes. He has rendered high service to his State, to the Nation, and to the cause of world peace, and it is particularly fitting that his portrait should be placed with the portraits of statesmen of other generations in whom South Carolinians have such rightful pride.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

Mr. MAYBANK read the following letters:

FEBRUARY 15, 1947.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I have been advised that the State Senate of South Carolina has provided for the unveiling of a portrait of the Honorable James F. Byrnes on Wednesday, the 19th of February, in the senate chamber at Columbia.

It would give me the keenest pleasure to be present on this occasion, if circumstances would permit such a visit. Please be assured of my sincere regret that I cannot personally attend.

When I came to the House of Representatives in 1917, "Jimmie" Byrnes had been a Member of that body for some years. He was an able and efficient Member of the House of Representatives. I have known him constantly since that time and there always existed between us the most cordial and warm friendship.

He has had an unusually distinguished career. When he came to the United States Senate in 1931, I was also a Member of that body, and served with him many years. He performed his duties with great ability, energy, and enthusiasm.

President Roosevelt nominated him to the Supreme Court and he was promptly confirmed. While his tenure in that great post was only for a short period, he left his imprint upon the records of that Court. Later, he was drafted by the President and filled with honor two very high positions in the stabilization and economic fields.

President Truman appointed him Secretary of State, to succeed the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. In this lofty station, he rendered outstanding service to the Government of the United States and, in a large way, to the peoples of the earth, in contributing toward the peace of the world.

As a member of the Council of Foreign Ministers, he had a vital part in the negotiation of the peace treaties of Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary. He was a compelling influence in the Council of Foreign Ministers.

Secretary Byrnes preserved the finest traditions of the State Department. He had a wide grasp of the international relations of the United States, and stood firmly for the rights of his country in these conferences.

"Jimmie" Byrnes has been a great public servant. He has given much to his State, to his Nation, and the world. I congratulate the Senate of the State of South Carolina in providing for his portrait. How greatly I wish that I might be present at these auspicious ceremonies.

With cordial good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

TOM CONNALLY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 13, 1947.

Hon. B. R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I deeply appreciate South Carolina's invitation to be present next week at the unveiling of the portrait of her distinguished son, James F. Byrnes. Nothing but imperative public duties here in Washington could prevent my presence upon this historic occasion. It will always be a joy to me to embrace any opportunity, any time, anywhere, to register my unreserved conviction that your great citizen has richly earned the total gratitude of all the American people. He has ably served them in many capacities—always with high honor, always with complete integrity, always with intelligent efficiency, and always with advantage to the common weal. I happen to know intimately about his most recent assignment in the peace councils of the world. It was my rare privilege to be associated with him in a subordinate role in these grave responsibilities. He was a Secretary of State in the finest American tradition. He served his difficult and burdensome task with relentless and courageous loyalty to our proud American ideals. Through it all, he has remained the simple, modest, kindly Jimmy Byrnes whose precious friendship is a benediction upon all who come within his touch.

I congratulate South Carolina upon her privilege in acknowledging the genius of her great son, and in making a partial payment on our national debt to a great and brave American. I deeply regret my inability to be present in person to present my affectionate compliments to him and to his State.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,

Cordially and faithfully,

A. H. VANDENBERG.

The president presented the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch and his daughter, Miss Belle Baruch; the Honorable Richard S. Whaley, Chief Justice of the Court of Claims; Hon. A. L. M. Wiggins, Under Secretary of the Treasury; Senator Johnston; Hon. Donald Russell and Mrs. Russell, who later unveiled the portrait; and other distinguished South Carolinians and others.

PRESENTATION OF GRACE ANNETTE DU PRE

The PRESIDENT. We are assembled on this occasion to unveil a portrait of one of South Carolina's most illustrious sons, the Honorable James F. Byrnes.

The artist who painted this portrait is a native of Spartanburg, S. C., where Mr. Byrnes now resides, the daughter of David Allston DuPre, who was professor of science at Wofford College, and a kinswoman of Washington Allston, a South Carolinian

who gained fame as a painter during the early days of the Republic.

She is an artist who has established an enviable reputation as a portrait painter. The senate was most fortunate in its selection of her to paint the portrait of Mr. Byrnes.

It is my pleasure to welcome her back to the State of her nativity and to present her to the people of South Carolina.

Ladies and gentlemen—Grace Annette DuPre.

ADDRESS BY MR. BROWN

The PRESIDENT. The senate has selected one of its distinguished members, and one with a long record of service in the general assembly, to present the portrait of the Honorable James F. Byrnes to the people of South Carolina.

He has served as member and as presiding officer in each house in the general assembly; and, he is now president pro tempore and chairman of the finance committee of the senate

He has been active for years in Democratic party councils, as a member and as chairman of the State committee of the Democratic Party of South Carolina and as delegate to many National Democratic conventions where he served on important committees.

It is now my privilege to present the Honorable Edgar A. Brown, senator from Barnwell, who will present the portrait to the people of South Carolina.

Mr. BROWN. This State in its long proud history has contributed much to the greatness of this Nation but in my opinion its most priceless gifts have been in distinguished sons who dedicated their lives to the common good. The fields of endeavor enriched by these contributions have not been limited. Whether it be as statesmen,soldiers, scientists, or scholars her sons have left the imprint of achievement imbedded in the life of the Nation

Rutledge, author of much of the Constitution, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and first and only President of the Republic of South Carolina; Pinckney, soldier, statesman, and diplomat, leader of the Federalist Party and their candidate for the presidency; Calhoun, Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of War, and champion of the rights of the States; George McDuffie, William C. Preston, Robert Y. Hayne, great orators and statesmen. The immortal Hampton, soldier, statesman, and benefactor of mankind. Such as these have been the gifts of the State to the Republic.

A Roman mother once said that her brightest jewels were her children. Our State can say the same but in so doing must acclaim the son we today honor as the brightest of all her jewels, for it can be truly said of him that in his life of service and achievement is to be found a recapitulation of the services and achievements of those who have gone before.

In both Halls of Congress he attained a preeminence of position reached by few statesmen of his generation. From thence he was called to a place upon the Supreme Court, to leave it only to become the advisor and assistant to the President. In the most critical period of world history he was drafted from his retirement to head the Department of State. As such he carried into all of the great capitals of the world the hopes and prayers of oppressed people everywhere. Whether in Paris or in London, whether in Moscow or New York the eyes of the world were upon him as he went forth bearing aloft the sacred torch of freedom. For days, for weeks, for long drawn weary months, he matched his wisdom and patience against every conceivable scheme of wrong and aggression and these in the end he frustrated or defeated. The British lion ceased to roar and the Russian bear became contained.

The Herculean labors of this remarkable man have now borne fruit and for the first time in history this country has a positive, a definite, and a well-established foreign policy—a policy understood and respected throughout the world. Behind this policy stands a united people. Whether they may be Democrat or Republican it is their policy, their country's policy.

As the result of a foreign policy thus wisely built by this great and good man, definite world leadership has finally come to this Nation and in this scheme of things even the defeated people of Germany, Italy, and Japan look to it to show them back to ways of peace and national respectability.

We are today the privileged witnesses to a just recognition of his many achievements and services to mankind, a recognition which has come while he yet lives and which has not been postponed to the future judgment of world history.

Some time ago a great artist was commissioned to paint a portrait of him in whose honor these services are held, in order that his likeness might be handed down to posterity. This work has been finished and now on behalf of the senate and to the State he loves so well, I present this portrait.

Mrs. Donald Russell then unveiled the portrait.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE CECIL C. WYCHE

The PRESIDENT. To accept the portrait of the Honorable James F. Byrnes for the people of South Carolina, a distinguished son of South Carolina, an intimate friend and a professional associate of this illustrious South Carolinian, has been selected.

He was a soldier in the First World War and he has served in the general assembly of this State.

While still a young man, he was appointed United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina.

He served in that capacity until he was elevated to the Federal bench where he has served and is serving with eminent ability and great distinction.

It is my honor to present the Honorable Cecil C. Wyche, United States judge for the western district of South Carolina, who will accept the portrait or behalf of the people of South Carolina.

Judge WYCHE. Mr. President, members of the senate, and distinguished guests, this is not an occasion to evaluate the life and work of the man we honor today. The time has not yet come to appraise properly a career so unusual and so far reaching in its influence. It is impossible for me, in so short a time, to do justice to a man with so full a life. I can, therefore, do no more than allude, in a general way, to some of his achievements in his more than 40 years of public service.

James Francis Byrnes was reared by his widowed mother, who, like mothers of so many men of eminence, was a woman of more than ordinary intellect, and possessed a force of character which was felt by all who knew her. She was kind, quiet, gentle, and dignified, and her son inherited from her his gracious and charming manners; the success attained by him may well be traced in part to her early teaching and wise guidance.

In 1900 Mr. Byrnes was appointed stenographer for the second judicial circuit. While serving in this position he studied law under Judge James Aldrich, and in the office of the late Dan S. Henderson, an able and distinguished lawyer of Aiken, S. C., and was admitted to the practice of law in 1903.

It was in Aiken that he met and married Maude Perkins Busch. This marriage gave him a helpful partner, who has sustained and fortified him throughout his long career.

In 1908 he was elected Solicitor of the Second Judicial Circuit. In that office he won national recognition as a fearless and able prosecutor.

In 1910 he was elected to Congress and served for 14 years, 8 of which were during the progressive and momentous administration of President Woodrow Wilson. Congressman Byrnes took an active part in drafting the bill for Federal aid for the improvement of public roads; he assisted in the framing of the Federal Reserve Act, especially the section providing for the rediscount of notes secured by agricultural products; he advocated measures of preparedness, and when we entered World War I, he rendered valuable services to his country as a member of the important Committee on Appropriations.

After an unsuccessful campaign for the United States Senate in 1924, he accepted an invitation to become a member of the law firm of Nicholls & Wyche at Spartanburg, S. C. As a member of the new firm, Mr. Byrnes took a prominent part in the trial of many important cases, both criminal and civil, and handled successfully quite a number of complicated tax cases before the Treasury Department in Washington. He was especially skilled in cross examining witnesses, and was very effective and successful before the court, as well as before the jury. This partnership was blessed with two excellent trial lawyers, the late Sam J. Nicholls, and James F. Byrnes, who, as trial lawyers, mutually excelled each other.

In 1930, he was elected to the United States Senate. He was reelected in 1936 by a majority of more than two hundred and fifty thousand votes.

When Senator Byrnes arrived in the Senate on March 4, 1931, he was no stranger. His 14 years of service in the House of Representatives had made for him close personal friendships which were in later years to prove most valuable. Waiting to welcome him in the Senate were such old friends and colleagues as Joe Robinson, Pat Harrison, Carter Glass, Key Pittman, Alben Barkley, Cordell Hull, Carl Hayden, and other Democratic stalwarts. But these friendships and personal associations, upon which life itself so often turns, were not confined to the Democratic side of the Senate; sitting on the Republican side were his old friends, George Norris, William E. Borah, Hiram Johnson, Charles McNary, Jim Watson, and George Moses

At the very beginning of his term Senator Byrnes was assigned a place on the all-powerful Committee on Appropriations.

Senator Byrnes took a prominent part in the national conventions of the Democratic Party and in the national elections. In Chicago in 1932 he took a leading part in swinging the necessary two-thirds majority to Franklin D. Roosevelt for the Democratic nomination for President, and contributed in a large measure to his subsequent election.

After the election in 1932, and before and after his inauguration, Roosevelt kept in close contact with Senator Byrnes and conferred with him frequently regarding the program of the new administration

It was inevitable that certain jealousies should develop in a first-term Senator having the ear of the new President, but by staying in the background and moving cautiously Senator Byrnes maintained his position and kept his friends. Had he not understood human nature so completely, had he not been versed so fully in the customs and jealousies of the Senate, had he not cataloged so completely the likes and dislikes of individual Senators, Senator Byrnes' influence and prestige as the unofficial spokesman and leader for Roosevelt would have been destroyed. Instead of winning headlines by getting out in front to carry the torch, Senator Byrnes recognized the Members of Congress who by position should sponsor the various legislative measure desired by the Roosevelt administration, and took pains to keep in constant touch with such congressional leaders.

Senator Byrnes believed that the place to fight party battles and argue against proposals of Roosevelt which he did not like was within the party caucus. He did not always agree with, and sometimes vigorously opposed, some of the proposed legislation

However, he worked on the premise that legislation was the result of compromise, and it was his ability to bring together divergent schools of thought which enabled him to obtain many successful results.

Another characteristic which made Senator Byrnes so effective was the fact that he never allowed himself to display anger. Senator Byrnes seldom raised his voice, and never in a Senate debate became personal, or said anything offensive that would cause an opponent to harbor a grudge against him. Regardless of the fierceness of the battle, when the vote was counted, Senator Byrnes had left no darts of venom. Better than any other Senator of his time, he realized that today a Senator might be against him on a certin bill, but tomorrow, the same Senator might be with him, on another bill, and because of this trait, time and time again, his opponent of today became his supporter of tomorrow.

As we look back, it seems that Senator Byrnes had a remarkable intuition which led him to membership on committees and subcommittees which were destined to handle important legislation and investigations. Of course everyone knows the importance of the Committee on Appropriations. But when Senator Byrnes went on the Banking and Currency Committee some of us in South Carolina wondered why. When this committee began its investigation of the House of Morgan and Wall Street, and began reporting out such banking and security reforms as guarantee of bank deposits, the Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Housing Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, we understood why Senator Byrnes was there.

When there was a widespread demand to end unemployment, we find Senator Byrnes chairman of a special Senate committee dealing with the subject.

When the cry came up for more efficiency in Government, we find Senator Byrnes chairman of a committee on governmental reorganization.

A man of world travel, Senator Byrnes, long before many of his colleagues, saw the war cloud gathering on the horizon. As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, Senator Byrnes piloted through legislation to strengthen the American Navy which had been crippled after the First World War in accordance with the terms of the Disarmament Conference. Unprepared as we were at Pearl Harbor, the Japs might have had an open sea to America had it not been for Senator Byrnes' efforts in rebuilding our Navy.

When the new Congress met in January 1941, Senator Byrnes was assigned to the Foreign Relations Committee. He could see around the corner and knew that certain legislation which grew out of our isolation policy after the First World War, had to be repealed. We find the junion Senator from South Carolina on this committee handling this important legislation.

In peace and war, in good times and bad, James F. Byrnes as a Senator was always where he could be most effective and useful and could render the greatest service to his country, to his State, and to his party. What he did for South Carolina we here know and appreciate. But his greatest service was to the Nation as a whole.

In 1941 James Francis Byrnes was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Soon after his appointment he earned the friendship, confidence, and admiration of every member of that Court. His first opinion was rendered in the case of *Edwards* v. *California*. In that opinion he demonstrated that he possessed judicial ability of a high quality. The foundation for his success as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court was laid in his varied and successful work as a practicing attorney in the State and Federal courts, together with his wide knowledge of public affairs, which he had gathered while serving in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. He was a harmonizing influence upon the Court. He felt that nothing should happen to weaken its influence or reduce the traditional respect for it. He respected the views of his colleagues however far removed from his own. His opinions were well-reasoned and supported by the weight of authority and were couched in simple and clear language calculated to clarify and convince. He was happy as a member of the Court and enjoyed the work immensely. When a sense of duty impelled him to resign from the Supreme Court to accept another appointment the remaining eight members expressed their regret in the following letter to him: "We learn of your resignation with a deep sense of the loss which it brings to the Court and to all of us personally. In the all too brief period or our association since your appointment to the Court we have come to value highly your contribution to its deliberations, drawn from the wide knowledge of affairs which you have gained in the course of a long and eminent public service. We cherish the happy personal relationship which that association has established. All of us part with you reluctantly and with regret. We are reconciled to your going only by the realization that you are moved by a sense of duty to render a needed service of public importance in a time of great national emergency. We wish you all success in this new and arduous undertaking, and that you may find in it that durable satisfaction which is the true reward for a great task greatly performed."

When Mr. Byrnes took the oath of office as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, President Roosevelt said: "I wish it were possible to cut Jimmy Byrnes into two parts. If this were possible, I would keep one part in the Senate and put the other part on the Court."

After Pearl Harbor the President, disregarding custom and tradition, turned for help to those he trusted and who he knew could make a contribution in those dark days when none of us was too sure the Axis powers could be defeated.

The President wanted Justice Byrnes in his official family but he hesitated to ask him to give up the security of the Supreme Court. Finally, one night, the President asked Justice Byrnes to come to his study at the White House for a talk. After discussing the problems at hand, the President turned to Justice Byrnes and said: "Jimmy, how about your taking leave of absence from the Supreme Court and coming down here to help me?"

Justice Byrnes did not hesitate or ask to sleep over the matter. He promptly replied:

"Mr. President, there is no such thing as leave of absence from the Supreme Court. I do not believe that any man while serving as a Justice of the Court should perform duties requiring decisions of a political nature.

"If you think, however, in this crisis I can be of service to you, as Commander in Chief, then you do not have to draft me. I want to make whatever contribution I can in helping win this war. I will resign, but the resignation must be without reservations."

Justice Byrnes asked for paper and pen and then and there submitted his resignation as Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

The President then offered to leave unfilled the vacancy created by Mr. Byrnes' resignation, but Mr. Byrnes declined to agree to that course, because of his belief that it would affect the administration of the Court, and be unfair to the other members.

The next day the President made the announcement, and before the sun was down former Justice Byrnes moved his offices to the east wing of the White House and assumed his duties as Director of Economic Stabilization.

One of the paramount problems confronting the Nation at this time was inflation. Some bold stroke had to be made. Under the broad powers given the President and the Director of Economic Stabilization, Director Eyrnes prepared the famous hold-the-line order which froze wages and prices. The order brought down upon Director Byrnes and the White House every conceivable pressure, but day by day, and month by month, Director Byrnes, instead of permitting the order to be weakened, strengthened it. With the backing of the President, Director Byrnes enforced that order and subsequent orders to stabilize economic affairs, and in so doing saved this country from the ravages of inflation.

When Director Byrnes took up his White House duties, great confusion existed in the Government at Washington. The President had delegated various powers to different people and there was general confusion and dissatisfaction. The President was so occupied with his pressing duties as Commander in Chief that he did not have time to see people who needed to be seen and to make the decisions necessary if the domestic front were to produce for victory at the battle front.

Stepping down from the Supreme Court gave Director Byrnes great prestige. Also, when the President placed Director Byrnes in the White House he gave him absolute authority. Therefore, it was only a short time before high officials, unable to see the President, were coming to Director Byrnes for decisions. Director Eyrnes had free access to the President. Decisions began rolling out of the White House and order was brought out of chaos. No one questioned these decisions and not once did the President fail to back up decisions made by his Assistant President.

Another problem Director Byrnes inherited was the terrific battle between the War Production Board and the War and Navy Departments. This controversy over how much of our production would go to the military service, and how much would be retained for civilian use was a continuous threat to the mobilization problem.

Realizing this, the President created an 11-man over-all Board of War Mobilization on which were the President and the various department heads concerned with the problem. Director Byrnes was made Director of the Office of War Mobilization with full power to direct.

History alone will reveal the tremendous contribution Director Byrnes made in helping to win the war by mobilizing the home front. His political, legislative, and judicial background, together with the absolute trust and confidence which the President had in him, enabled Director Byrnes to perform duties at the White House with dispatch, success, and satisfaction.

No man in peacetime or wartime, except the President, has ever carried the load which Director Byrnes did while at the White House. He put his duty to country above everything else, and at times with a heavy heart and keen disappointment, carried on like a good soldier.

With the War Mobilization program well under way, the President asked Director Byrnes to accompany him to the Yalta Conference. There the decisions were made which sealed the doom of the Axis powers, and there definite planning for the postwar period was begun. Production on the home front was the basis of many of these decisions. But at Yalta, Director Byrnes was gaining background and knowledge which were to serve him well in a different and wider field.

Director Byrnes returned from Yalta convinced that the end of the European war

was in sight. His mind was made up. He would continue until it was certain the war in Europe was over; then he would retire, having no intention to stay in office for the job of demobilization. By this time Congress had passed the Mobilization and Demobilization Act. Director Byrnes had the task of continuing mobilization at full pace, and at the same time preparing plans for demobilization. This he did. But he had determined that whoever was to succeed him should take charge before the German surrender so that person could participate in framing the postwar policies he would have to administer. He made his resignation effective April 1, and returned to Spartanburg April 2, 1945.

Upon the death of President Roosevelt 10 days later, President Truman immediately called Mr. Byrnes to Washington, and after a conference, President Truman determined to appoint Mr. Byrnes Secretary of State as soon as the United Nations meeting in San Francisco came to an end.

When President Roosevelt insisted upon Director Byrnes accompanying him to the Yalta Conference, he may not have realized it, but he rendered a great service to the cause of peace. It enabled Mr. Byrnes to hear the conversations preceding the Yalta agreements which have been discussed ever since by the Foreign Ministers. It was the South Carolinian's first international conference, but as Director of War Mobilization he was almost daily in conference with President Roosevelt as to the various phases of the war effort. He was a Congressman during the First World War and was a stanch supporter of Woodrow Wilson and of the League of Nations. He was in Paris when the armistice was signed in 1918, and had an opportunity to see how big politics were played to the detriment of a lasting peace; he witnessed the pitfalls into which President Wilson fell which wrecked his dream for world peace. This experience enabled him to be an informed negotiator. It is certain that the unfortunate experience of President Wilson influenced Secretary Byrnes to establish his bipartisan policy.

Ten days after taking office, Secretary Byrnes accompanied President Truman to the Potsdam Conference. He furnished the President a transcript of the shorthand notes he had made at Yalta, which helped the President to pick up the threads of the peace negotiations.

At Potsdam it seemed there would be no agreement, the Big Three being unable to settle their differences as to German reparations, the Balkan problems, and the Spanish problem. Drawing heavily from his long experience around the conference table in the Congress, Secretary Byrnes worked night and day to prevent the failure of the conference. Finally, as a result of private talks by the Secretary with Stalin and Molotov complete agreement was reached. At the last meeting Stalin asked for recognition, and to the surprise of those present, said he wished to attribute to the Secretary of State the success of the conference because, to use Stalin's words, "Mr. Byrnes brought us together."

At Potsdam many momentous decisions were made, but none were more important than the decision to use the atomic bomb. Secretary Byrnes was one of the few men who during the war knew of the development of the atomic bomb. When President Truman was advised by the scientists that they believed the problem had been solved, the President appointed Mr. Byrnes as his representative upon a committee which worked in secret for weeks providing for the test in New Mexico and discussing the possible use of the bomb. At Potsdam he participated in the conferences which led to the decision to use the bomb in order to save the lives they knew would be lost in the planned effort to invade Japan. The Secretary returned from Potsdam just in time to exchange communications with the Japanese Government as to the surrender.

Shortly thereafter he was in London at the first meeting of the Conference of Foreign Ministers. There he set the pattern for his policy of patience and firmness with Russia. During the war there was no difficulty in reaching agreements with Russia, because she needed our assistance. With the cessation of hostilities there was no more lend-lease to promise, and Russia could not well ask for any more territory from the enemy states. Agreement became difficult. The Soviet representatives differed with the other representatives on every issue. Secretary Byrnes declined to agree to give to Russia one of the Italian colonies which they desired for a naval base in the Mediterranean. He insisted that they live up to their pledges as to the Balkan States. He refused to agree to excess reparations against Italy and to the cession of territory urged by the Soviets, declaring that a cruel peace would not be a lasting peace. He urged the calling of a peace conference so that all the nations that fought the war might participate in making the peace. When the Soviets refused this last proposal the Secretary adjourned the conference, declaring that he could not sacrifice a principle of this kind merely for the sake of agreement. This decision required courage. He realized that he would be criticized for the failure to agree at his first conference with the foreign ministers, but he had faith in the people. When he returned and informed the people that the issue was whether the peace should be dictated by the big powers to all of the United Nations without giving them a chance to do more than sign on the dotted line, the people rallied to his support. He became the champion of the smaller states.

Two months later he suggested a meeting in Moscow. Real progress was made. The peace conference which the Soviets would not agree to at London, they finally agreed to at Moscow. He also induced the Soviets to join the United States in sponsoring the resolution providing for international control of atomic energy.

In January the Secretary went to London and succeeded in having the General Assembly of United Nations unanimously agree to the atomic energy resolution first suggested by the United States. It soon became apparent that the Soviets had adopted a policy of expansion. They were not satisfied with puppet governments in the Balkans and with the control of the Baltic States. They refused to withdraw troops from Iran and conducted a war of nerves with Turkey. Secretary Byrnes resorted to open diplomacy and in a series of speeches he made plain that the United States meant business when it pledged its support to the United Nations, and to prevent aggression by any state. The Soviet policy caused great unrest throughout the world, but particularly in Europe. The situation continued until late summer. Secretary Byrnes, realizing apparently that the Soviets were endeavoring to win the favor of the defeated and disheartened Germans, and that they were advising the Germans that the Americans would return to a policy of isolation, went to Stuttgart to declare our German program. It was heartening to the Germans who wanted, in any event, to know their fate. At the same time the Secretary gave notice that we would not return to isolation as we had after the First World War; he gave notice to all concerned that as long as there was an army of occupation in Germany, the Army of the United States would be in Germany; he gave courage to France, to Turkey and other countries, where the Soviets were conducting a war of nerves.

In New York, at the end of the year, he saw his policy pay dividends. For 3 weeks the Soviets refused to agree to any of the proposals recommended by two-thirds of the governments that attended the peace conference in Paris. They demanded more concessions. Secretary Byrnes refused their demands. Finally they concluded that he said what he meant, and meant what he said. Their attitude changed. They agreed to all of the recommendations of the peace conference; they adopted a conciliatory attitude in the United Nations; they abandoned their threats against Iran, the relations of the Allies were placed on a sounder basis, and the prospect for permanent peace became brighter than at any time since VJ-day.

The opinion of the people in many countries was well expressed by the London Observer in an editorial stating: "It must therefore be reckoned among the year's major events that 1946 has * * * produced the beginnings of a recognizable nonparty and long-term American foreign policy. This is the work of Mr. Byrnes, easily the most considerable Secretary of State America has had in this century."

As Secretary of State he gave the necessary impetus to get the United Nations Organization well along its way to success. In a year and a half he made seven trips across the ocean. It was a terrible strain, but had he not done it he could not have kept in touch with the problems of the State Department that constantly demanded attention. He sponsored the Foreign Service Act of 1946. His relations with the Congress contributed to the passage of the bill. The bill has given heart to Uncle Sam's sentinels throughout the world and its beneficial effects will be evident in the days to come.

He established for the first time broad-range policy statements for every country in the world, so that the Army, the Navy, and our Ambassadors in the field have a written statement of the policy of the United States, which policy is revised as necessity requires.

Secretary Byrnes' last official act was the signing of the treaties he labored so successfully to achieve, and which so magnificently chart the road back to peace.

The cause of world peace to Secretary Byrnes was far and beyond person or party. Encouraged by President Truman and enthusiastically supported by Senator VANDENBERG and Senator CONNALLY, he has bequeathed to the American people a concept of American foreign policy that transcends partisanship and is the unquestioned voice of America in the council halls of the world. It should ever be the prayer of a peace-loving America that this ideal of a nonpartisan foreign policy, so boldly conceived and so carefully nurtured by him, may never be departed from and that the storms of partisan strife may never again darken or obscure American foreign policy.

The division of the world among the great powers under the disarming slogan of "spheres of influence" the inevitable breeders of future wars, he rejected as violative of the whole concept of the United Nations. On the contrary, he accepted for America the role of the unyielding guardian of international justice and right. Speaking for America, he became the outspoken champion of the weak against the powerful, of the small against the large, of the just against the strong. He declared relentless war on aggression, whether by friend or by foe.

Never has an American Secretary of State so openly stated and so bravely upheld American foreign policy as he did, in the meetings of the United Nations and in the peace conferences. He bravely removed the cloak of mystic secrecy from diplomacy and enlisted public opinion and the endorsement of the nations of the world for his program. He truly gave refreshing reality to the Wilsonian doctrine of "open covenants openly arrived at."

No period in our national history has been fraught with so many momentous problems as that during which James F. Byrnes served in the National House of Representatives, the United States Senate, as Director of War Mobilization, and as Secretary of State. By reason of his service and achievements he has already taken his place in the moving stream of history as a great American, and

is entitled to rank along with John Rutledge, John C. Calhoun, and Benjamin R. Tillman as South Carolina's most outstanding statesmen. It is, therefore, fitting and appropriate that the Senate of South Carolina should place his portrait in the senate chamber to remind future generations of his many and varied achievements in the service of his State and his country, and to inspire future sons of South Carolina to noble efforts of service.

To the artist, Grace Annette DuPré, I say, You have produced a wonderful likeness, and an excellent piece of art.

I am glad to have the honor to accept it on behalf of the people of South Carolina.

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

The PRESIDENT. Ladies and gentlemen, we now come to the highlight of this occasion—the presentation of South Carolina's most distinguished statesman and eminent jurist, and best beloved citizen, the Honorable James F. Byrnes.

Mr. BYRNES. Several weeks ago, I advised a member of the senate committee that while I deeply appreciated the invitation to attend these exercises, that I really thought I should not be present to hear myself eulogized. He insisted, and my presence indicates that my sense of appreciation is greater than my sense of modesty.

However, I am modest enough to be quite embarrassed by the words of praise that have been showered upon me by my good friend, Edgar Brown, by the lieutenant governor, and particularly by my friend, Judge Wyche. On an occasion of this kind, the speaker is expected to be eloquent and he is expected to show a reasonable disregard of facts. Judge Wyche has fulfilled both expectations.

His reference to my political career prompts me to say a few words about public office. In my opinion, no man should become a candidate for public office for financial reward or even for the honor of the office. In either event his motive is a selfish one. A man who plans a public career should do so only if he honestly believes he can render a service to the people, and he is truly anxious to render such a service.

Those of us with long political experience would say to such a man that the only real compensation he would ever receive is the knowledge that he has been able to accomplish something helpful for the people, and the knowledge that his efforts are appreciated by those people.

That knowledge is a source of great satisfaction to a man in public life. If in my public career, I have made any contribution to good government; if as Director of the Office of War Mobilization I have contributed in any degree to the successful prosecution of the war; and particularly if as Secretary of State I have contributed any toward the laying of a firm foundation on which there can be built a structure of just and lasting peace; then, happy will I be in all the days ahead of me. That happiness must be shared by the people of South Carolina, for after all it is you who gave me the opportunity to render this service.

Your confidence and your support have been comforting to me through all the years, but never more so than in the last year and a half during the period I spent most of my time overseas attending international conferences. In such conferences no man can succeed unless he has the support of the vast majority of the people at home. There were times when I was not certain of that support, and in that period, in those trying days for me, it was comforting to hear from South Carolina; for whenever I heard I learned that whatever doubts others might have, the people of South Carolina still retained their confidence in me.

Fortunately for me, things changed, and in the last 6 or 8 months I have been made happy and humble, too, by the evidences of good will and support that have come to me from people in all walks of life, residing in all sections of the Nation. Today, I know those good friends will not take exception when I speak the truth and say that much as I appreciate their confidence and good will, still more do I appreciate the confidence and good will of the people of South Carolina, my native State.

You people of South Carolina have been kind to me, much kinder than necessary. I can never repay you, but I can and will pray that God will bless and will keep you always.

The Labor Relations Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able speech on the subject of labor relations problems, delivered by Mr. Sid Woodbury, of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, before the Medford (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce on January 18, 1947. I think it is particularly apropos that this speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the legislation that is now pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce, ladies, and gentlemen, Mrs. Woodbury and I are very happy that we were invited to attend this memorable dedication of the Rogue Elk Forest and tonight's meeting of the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce. It has been instructive for us, and most inspirational as well. Please remember that our latchstring in Portland also is always out.

May I congratulate all concerned in the reforestation program, of which today's dedication is a forerunner of many to follow. Its import is epochal, because in no other way can you provide lumber needs for future generations. The challenge to this age is inescapable, and you are proving your birthright as American citizens by accepting it. No other part of our country is as favored as the Pacific coast by nature for quickly repairing the ravages of a spendthrift industry.

Up in our part of the woods, or, rather, what once was our woods, we also are concerned with reforestation. The great stands of timber in the Columbia River and Tillamook and Grays Harbor areas, once considered inexhaustible, are a mere shadow of their former magnificence. Our more forward-looking companies, whose future depends on forest products in their different uses, are now cutting on a selective basis and repairing, so far as possible, by tree planting, the inexcusable waste of the past 50 years.

Now, speaking as the newly elected president of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Portland, I should like to say I am beginning to sort out the main from the minor objectives of the job, and it is apparent to me that presidents of all chambers of commerce in our State could well serve their members by spending a major portion of their time this year on two prime objectives.

One is to visit as many chambers of commerce in the Oregon country as we possibly can, and to encourage officers, directors, and members of other chambers, to visit us. We have much to learn from each other, and can be of great practical assistance to one another.

The second objective, and perhaps of its immediate necessity, the more important, is to do our part in the institution of equitable labor-management relations in the State of Oregon. Right at this moment, when nationally, certain irresponsible persons and groups are jittery, while others are deliberately misinterpreting the results of our November election by reading into it a public mandate that is not there, grave danger exists that the vigorous and healthy labor tone that has been built up in Oregon in the past decade particularly, might be strained or thrown out of balance. To know how workable and harmonious it is at present, we have but to compare it with the sour notes heard in other cities of similar size and industrial potential.

During the past hectic war years, conditions could not help but create extraordinary wage ceilings, and many unbalanced work standards. All of us recognized that not all of these were compensatory or sound, or even intended to be permanent, but now reason and calm thinking must correct the inequities without rancor or too much speed. In other words, the public as well as management, labor, and the Government, should clearly understand the basic and moral issues involved before advocating drastic change.

If the general premise I have just given is fair, no one should have any objection if we tried to localize it, and in Portland we are going to do just that.

We are blessed with an understanding, sensible, and cooperative labor group, which springs from a home-owning, intelligent citizenship, and we do not look for any precipitous action, or wild swinging, that will disrupt our present harmonious relationship. In fact, we look for quite the opposite effect—a more binding and closer cooperation, for the reason that management and labor have increased confidence in each other because of mutually satisfactory performance in the war years. Both realize that sentiment in some quarters nationally has been aroused to belligerence, and they do not intend that it spread to Oregon. Both employee and employer realiz that they are natural partners in a free capitalistic system that requires the deep and continuous earnest effort of everyone concerned. Both realize that certain adjustments and corrections must and will be made, but with as little friction as possible, and without unfair restraint to any interest.

I hope none of you are hopeful that I am prepared to now suggest a cure-all solution for industrial peace. I wish I was the seventh son or a seventh son so I could pull it out of the hat.

I do, however, have the benefit of witnessing for the past several years the profitable and harmonious relations existing in the labor-management committee which has been functioning in the city of Portland. Within the framework of this committee, labor and management have served to promote industrial peace for the past 5 or 6 years. Throughout this period the committee dedicated itself and its activities to these main objectives which made for prosperity in the Portland area.

First. The promotion of industrial peace by mutual cooperation. I need not amplify this statement except to say that in the Columbia River area, there were no strikes during the entire war. The location of new industry into our section of the State was greatly enhanced because it became a recognized conclusion that strikes were not prevalent in our area. Governmental and private plants came freely to Portland, and in preference to other locations, because they knew that production of strategic war materials would not be hampered by disrupting work stop-

pages. Portland had one of the finest, if not the outstanding record, of the larger metropolitan areas of our Nation. The second objective was the promotion of additional job and business opportunities, which was accomplished by the establishment of new industry, in addition to the expansion of practically all of the enterprises then in operation.

In this phase of their activities, the committee, with the assistance of congressional delegations, congressional committees, and top Government officials, received favorable action on such projects as the unfreezing of flood-control moneys, congressional appropriations and authorizations of many kinds; the reestablishment of freight rates; the development of sane power projects, housing developments, ship-scrapping projects, etc. Our congressional delegation from Oregon respects, and in many cases relies, on the information and recommendations of a unanimous labor-and-management group meeting together to unite in action for the common good. Recommendations, when made, must benefit from a community standpoint and must contain the necessary attributes of integrity, honesty, and sincerity of purpose.

Oregon can always be counted upon to lead in any movement when a state of emergency exists that has to do with State and National welfare. Our citizens likewise feel that we have the same responsibility in times of peace, and we sense an emergency for leadership in one of the most important issues before the American people at this time.

This thinking in metropolitan Portland, a city of 500,000 inhabitants, has been resolved just last Friday, in a decision to continue the Labor-Management Bureau as a permanent peacetime organization. The program, decisions and recommendations will be made by equal representation of labor and management. Labor and industry will bear equally the expense of the Bureau, which will be managed by Lee C. Stoll, who so successfully and impartially guided the same committee under governmental sponsorship during the trying war years.

Actuated by singleness of main purpose, guided by the best thought of employee and employer, and motivated by the same desire to serve the public and our country, and to make Oregon the best State in the Union in which to work as well as to live, the plan cannot fail.

I feel proud that organized labor and industrialists in our city wish to recognize the important function of chambers of commerce in representing all interests—labor, management, the Government, and the public—by giving me permission to be the first to announce this most sensible and practical arrangement at this meeting of the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce. Let us hope it might steady the thinking of other communities.

Thank you for listening.

Lilienthal: A Stabilizing Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel and the Memphis Press-Scimitar February 25, 1947. The editorial is written by Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. Mr. Meeman is one of the country's finest journalists. His opinion is entitled to great weight. The editorial is as follows:

TVA PROGRAM IS PROOF LILIENTHAL IS STRONG INFLUENCE AGAINST COMMUNISM, SAYS EDITOR

Significant was the letter which Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a leader in the development of the atomic bomb, sent to Senator VANDENBERG.

Dr. Compton said that scientists would quit en masse and the atomic energy program would become "a hollow shell" if political and special interests won their fight against David E. Lilienthal.

Already scientists have quit their jobs at the atomic projects at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and at Oak Ridge, he said.

This points up a situation which it is important to understand. Instead of being a Red, as his critics say, Mr. Lilienthal is one of the strongest influences against communism in this country.

Communism has a strong appeal to disillusioned idealists. Seeing inconsistencies in the free, democratic society, they fall for communism's siren promises to solve all problems and establish a utopia. In fact, communism does not solve the problems, and the Communist social order, instead of being a utopia, is a hell of poverty, of propaganda and lies, and secret-police terror. But the wholesale promises nevertheless do appeal to many idealists, especially to scientists. An example of this is the Canadian scientists, one of them wealthy, who gave their country's military secrets to spies of Soviet Russia.

David Lilienthal has a philosophy and a personality which counteract this trend. An idealist himself as well as a superb business executive, he appeals to idealists. He shows how we can build a better order under democracy. He has shown how Government operation can be free of patronage and bureaucracy through the merit system and decentralization.

At the same time he is an ardent believer in the virtues of free enterprise. Free enterprise has thrived in the Tennessee Valley under stimulation of the TVA as directed by Mr. Lilienthal. Businessmen in the valley do not think TVA is a threat to them, but a friend and helper. It is a demonstration of the value both of Government ownership in its right place and of private enterprise in its right place.

This writer believes that our free order at its worst is better than totalitarian communism at its best. Nevertheless, we will not keep this free order if we do not make our idealists and scientists feel at home in it and give them an opportunity to work in confidence that their efforts are building a better social order. David Lilienthal has a unique ability to inspire that confidence, and TVA is a living proof that there can be a great progress without sacrifice of individualism.

Therefore Mr. Lilienthal is actually a stabilizing influence. Conservatives, who want to preserve our system of individualism, as well as liberals, should support him.

O'Dwyer's Labor Plan Hailed as Model

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, February 21, 1947:

CITY'S LABOR PLAN HAILED AS MODEL—O'DWYER VIEWS ON INDUSTRIAL PEACE SENT TO BUSINESS AND STATES' LEADERS

In the hope that the methods that have helped minimize labor strife in New York City will prove beneficial in other parts of the country, 32 jurists, industrialists, and labor leaders joined yesterday in sponsoring publication of a 16-page brochure entitled "The O'Dwyer Plan for Industrial Peace."

Thousands of copies of the pamphlet, which bears on its cover an olive branch superimposed on New York's industrial skyline, will be sent to Members of Congress, the State legislature, governors, mayors, chambers of commerce, labor unions, publishers, commentators, and other persons from Maine to California.

The sponsors of the brochure are all members of panels appointed by the mayor to settle labor disputes ranging from the general trucking strike of last fall to the metal lathers' strike, which was settled at city hall Tuesday night.

In making copies public yesterday morning, Thomas J. Shanahan, president of the Federation Bank & Trust Co., said that the panel members were so impressed by the simplicity and effectiveness of the plan evolved by the mayor and his labor relations director, Edward C. Maguire, that they wanted the whole country to know about it.

"We hope it will serve as a model for the country," Mr. Shanahan said. "We think it's that good."

POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE SEEN

However, the wide circulation given the pamphlet and the emphasis put in it on the mayor's personal philosophy of labor relations stirred speculation that some of his friends saw in the success of the O'Dwyer plan an opportunity for heralding the mayor's availability for higher political office on a State or national level.

Such thoughts were disavowed by members of the sponsoring group and by the mayor's personal staff, who said the pamphlet was entirely nonpolitical, but Mr. Shanahan acknowledged that the copy had been written in Mr. Maguire's office and that the mailing list was being made up there. The banker, a close personal friend of Mr. O'Dwyer said he was acting as "work horse for the mayor" on distribution of the booklet.

The essence of the O'Dwyer plan, as outlined in the pamphlet, is the appointment of tripartite committees made up of representatives of the public, industry, and labor, to help adjust industrial conflicts that threaten vital city services. Reliance is put on voluntary agreement by the disputing parties rather than on settlements imposed through force.

"The O'Dwyer plan committee members are chosen because of their skill, knowledge, and standing within their special fields," the booklet says, "but committee members act as a team using their combined skills, knowledge, and prestige on behalf of the whole community."

NO "SIMPLE, EASY PANACEA"

The text stresses that neither the mayor nor his associates believe that the plan is "a simple, easy panacea which will end all industrial strife."

"They know," the booklet says, "that it is not a quick cure-all that will bring magic results if applied according to simple directions. They do know that for and in New York City the plan has worked, has saved untold millions for workers, employers, and the New York City business community. They also know it has worked because Mayor O'Dwyer, the men of the division of labor relations, and the many citizens he called upon for help have put their best

thought, judgment, untiring energy into making it work."

The mayor's philosophy for settling labor disputes is summed up in two points:

"First, men and women, employers and workers alike, are inherently decent, want to get along and work with each other; and, second, every threatened strike is preventable."

OTHER SPONSORS OF PAMPHLET

In addition to Mr. Shanahan, who served as chairman of the panel appointed by the mayor in the general trucking strike, the pamphlet's sponsors include Edward Anker, B. R. Armour, John A. Coleman, William C. Collins, Joseph Curran, Louis Donato, former Presiding Justice Edward R. Finch, of the appellate division, and Reginald E. Gillmor.

Also, Bernard F. Gimbel, Norman S. Goetz, Basil Harris, Brig. Gen. John Reed Kilpatrick, Martin T. Lacey, former Presiding Justice Edward Lazansky, of the appellate division in Brooklyn; Brig. Gen. Arthur V. McDermott, Edward F. McGrady, George V. McLaughlin, and Supreme Court Justice James B. M. McNally.

Also, William Mapel, Thomas A. Murray, John J. O'Rourke, Jacob S. Potofsky, James C. Quinn, Victor S. Riesenfeld, Hugh S. Robertson, Moses Rosen, Commerce Commissioner George Sanders, Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, David L. Tilly, Supreme Court Justice Henry L. Ughetta, and former Justice Isidor Wasservogel, of the appellate division.

Acheson-Lilienthal Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by representatives of a group of national organizations dealing with the Acheson-Lilienthal group.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1947.

As representatives of the following national organizations, which have endorsed the principles of the Acheson-Lilienthal report, we are deeply concerned by the recent attacks on these principles in connection with the hearings before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

We point out that these principles are the bases of the official United States proposals to the United Nations, that they are a fundamental part of the nonpartisan foreign policy agreed upon by Republicans and Democrats, and that as such they offer our best hope of achieving lasting security and peace.

We firmly believe that to repudiate these principles would perilously weaken the hand of Warren R. Austin, United States representative in the international negotiations now in progress.

Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, United States of America; Rev. Paul Poling.

United Council of Church Women; Mrs. Harper A. Sibley, president.

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Dr. Samuel M. Cavert, executive secretary.

American Association for the United Nations; Clark Eichelberger, director.

Federation of American Scientists; W. A. Higinbotham, executive secretary.

Americans United for World Government; Raymond Swing, chairman of the board.

National Council of Jewish Women; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, president.

National Farmers Union; James G. Patton, president.

Friends Committee on National Legislation; Mr. E. Raymond Wilson, executive secretary.

Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches; Rev. Ray Gibbons, director.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Leslie S. Perry.

American Veterans Committee; Charles Bolte, president.

National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education; Dr. Donald Dushane, executive secretary.

National League of Women Voters; Anna Lord Strauss, president.

Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace; Mrs. Norman DeR. Whitehouse, president.

American Unitarian Association; Rev. A. Powell Davies.

Council on Christian Social Progress of the Northern Baptist Convention; Dr. William G. Mather, chairman.

Tri-State Conference of Scientists, Educators, and Religious Leaders on Atomic Energy and Related Problems; Dr. Norman Dawes, president.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, secretary, Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church.

National Women's Trade Union League of America; Elizabeth Christman, secretary-treasurer.

American Association of University Women; Dr. Helen Dwight Reid, associate in international education.

Do Lobbyists Serve the Public Interest?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. A. J. SABATH over Station WTOP, Columbia Broadcasting System, February 24, 1947:

In the last session of Congress I introduced a resolution calling for a sweeping investigation of lobbies, lobbyists, and propagandists.

Unfortunately the Congress did not act on my resolution, but instead the Committee on the Reorganization of Congress inserted in the Congressional Reorganization Act a section which requires lobbyists to register and state their duties, their salary, and their employer, and which does not cover those lobbyists and propagandists whose work is with the executive agencies.

Now, the United States Chamber of Commerce, which by registration of its representatives admitted that it is a business lobby, wants to have all Federal employees fingerprinted and to require them to affirm their loyalty.

I am of the opinion that that would be a very good thing for lobbyists.

I think, in addition, that all lobbyists should be required to furnish a photograph and to swear that they receive no secret pay not reported when they register.

Then the list, with photographs attached, could be furnished to all Members of Congress and Government executives.

But I am of the firm opinion that not even such steps would put a stop to all the various objectionable activities and methods of lobbyists.

When I first came to Congress 40 years ago I found the ever-present railroad lobby, the banking lobby, the shipping lobby, and, most vicious of all, the power lobby, and others too numerous to mention.

Not only are all those lobbies still operating, but scores more have joined the battle of pressures, until today 544 lobbyists are registered under the law.

They have not grown less vicious with increase in numbers.

On the other hand, they are more experienced, and they have perfected their techniques.

Now they not only operate through personal contact, but they also use every tool of propaganda—inspired campaigns of letters and telegrams, pamphlets, and every other kind of printed matter, and, yes, they even assault our ears by radio.

These lobbyists study every Member of Congress, probing his background, and searching for his weaknesses, if any, and for avenues of approach.

Many of the lobbyists deliberately misrepresent their influence and friendship with Congressmen, claiming to be able to deliver the votes of Members with whom they actually have not the slightest acquaintance.

Nevertheless, they extort big fees on the strength of their misrepresentations. You can find these hucksters of pressure and of influence hanging around the leading hotels, entertaining both civilian and military officials.

In late years many of the lobbies have merged activities in such Nation-wide pressure groups as the National Association of Manufacturers. All of the big business lobbies have learned to work together smoothly and with deadly effect.

In the last few years we have seen that deadly efficiency used effectively and destructively against organized labor, housing, rent control, OPA, and against the public interest generally.

The well-heeled, high-pressure big-business lobbies have worked together and right now are still working together to destroy administration safeguards against inflation, and your own pocketbook tells you that prices have jumped 33½ percent in just the last 6 months.

Bankers, industrialists, and war profiteers through their lobbies succeeded in persuading Congress first to force through the Rumi tax plan with its $6,000,000,000 tax forgiveness for business and then later to give these always profit-hungry corporations more billions by repealing the excess-profits tax.

Now they are lobbying for a straight 20-percent tax cut, which would save millions upon millions for millionaires but only pennies for the little people.

Selfish private-interest lobbies have cost the Government and the American people not millions but billions of dollars, and even human lives have been sacrificed to their greed.

It was only 10 years ago that Hopson's electric-power empire alone spent more than $2,000,000 in the fake-telegram campaign against the holding-company legislation.

Yet, today the shameless and unembarrassed power lobby and its big-business allies are engaged in a smear campaign against Lilienthal, although 85 percent of our newspapers and of the American people support Lilienthal and denounce the smears.

These vicious lobbyists know that at least a little mud always sticks.

Our present lobby law does not reach the shrewd unscrupulous lobbyist or propagandist who operates from behind a fine-sounding name of an institute or foundation, leading the public to believe it is an independent patriotic research or educa-

tional project, when it is actually a lobby in disguise.

Neither does it reach the social lobbyists, who are frequently women of wealth and position, who do their lethal work at parties, receptions, and dinners.

The detrimental effect on the country of all these skilled and ruthless private-interest pressure groups has forced veterans, consumers, labor, women, and even religious groups to appoint their own legislative representatives to counteract these other poisonous influences and work for the public interest.

To sum up, the law now, instead of outlawing lobbyists, has given them legal standing, and they are bolder than ever.

Therefore, it is my aim to strengthen the law and put an end to the unrestrained activities of vicious pressure and propaganda lobbies against the best interests of the American people, which have all too often reflected unfairly against Members of Congress.

We can remember in the past how these private-vested interests, through their lobbyists and hired propagandists, assailed, attacked, impugned, and browbeat every Senate and House investigating committee which dared to penetrate the darkness of their private transactions and to bring to light some of their vicious activities.

I recollect how they attacked Senator Walsh from the start when he uncovered the unsavory Teapot Dome oil scandals. When Senator Wheeler exposed the monopolistic practices of railroads he was similarly attacked.

Senator Nye drew venomous criticism for his investigation of the munitions industry, and Senator (now Mr. Justice) Black and former Senator Sherman Minton are still being persecuted for their part in the Senate investigation of lobbies.

Whenever the practices of any business or industry, whether it is privately owned power or public utilities companies, insurance companies, cartels, monopolies, petroleum, coal—wherever there is profit in private dealings which are of doubtful value or actually dangerous to the public interest—the whole vast juggernaut of propaganda and publicity is set in motion to overwhelm the investigators and to disparage the facts found by belittling the investigators.

Even Senator Gillette drew criticism for exposing scurrilous campaign literature.

I say this, notwithstanding the fact that Col. John Thomas Taylor, who preceded me as speaker, and who says he is proud to be a lobbyist and defends the profession, himself severely criticized present-day lobbyists who "use unethical means to attain unethical ends" and denounced the false propaganda being put out to mislead the American people.

He and I can agree on that, even though we might disagree in our judgment of what is bad propaganda.

I myself listened to the shrewd radio talk last Saturday afternoon sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, who, in conjunction with real-estate operators and builders demanded abolition of the last remaining controls on new building construction and of all ceilings on rents and on new houses.

In my opinion, this propaganda has been largely responsible for the delays in getting new homes built for our veterans and our citizens.

This terrific barrage of propaganda brought about the removal of price ceilings which in turn resulted in heavy increases in the cost of living. I have already referred to the 33½ percent rise in the wholesale cost of food in the last 6 months, which retail prices have gone up practically 50 percent. The profits of all those interests have nearly doubled, all to the disadvantage of the American consumer.

Prices are still going up and up and up.

They are having their free enterprise—free of every restraint, including that of sound business practice and civic decency.

I am of the opinion that the time has come for another investigation to show who is really putting on these huge and expensive propaganda campaigns and trying to stampede Congress into unfair and ill-considered legislation for the benefit of powerful private interests.

Therefore, it is my intention to again introduce a resolution for the investigation of lobbies and of lobbyists and propagandists.

The Lost People of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject The Lost People of Europe, delivered by Ira A. Hirschmann on Saturday, January 11, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOST PEOPLE OF EUROPE

Just a few short weeks ago I was in Warsaw, Poland. It is not a pleasant place to live in just now. Berlin and Vienna, which have been partially wrecked by the war, look normal compared to this once-proud capital. While the facades of buildings still remain in other war-torn capitals, great areas in Warsaw have been leveled.

The war and the problems of its aftermath blunt our sensitivities and memories. Most of us have forgotten that Warsaw was under fire from all sides and from within.

Yet one is greeted with a surprising spirit of vitality among the Polish people. The temperature, which hovered around 15 degrees below zero, served only to quicken the pace of the citizens. People were running instead of walking. Lack of fuel limited transportation and light to several hours a day. Yet the Polish Government seemed to be doing a heroic job against great odds. This government, which seemed to be firmly in the saddle and composed of members of various parties, was making every effort to reconstitute the life of a nation, hoping for less outside interference. While the Communist element in the government was certainly influential, what I saw and heard gave me reason to believe that they, along with the majority of the people, were fired only by their urge for independence; that the Polish Government was for Poland first and no one else.

My reason for going to Poland was to study the results of the return of the thousands of displaced Polish people who had been living in the camps in Germany. The people in the United States have a false impression of the displaced persons problem. It is not a Jewish problem. Last June when I made my first inspection of the camps in Germany there were 422,000 Poles, 187,000 Balts, 23,000 Yugoslavs, and 104,000 Jews. Obviously the major number and problem concerned itself with the Polish people. Director General LaGuardia realized this and came up with a plan to offer 60-day rations to Polish people who would return to their homeland.

Why this inducement, you may ask? A great deal of confusion existed in the minds of the Polish people in the camps. The so-called London Poles, led by the notorious General Anders, had succeeded in placing his representatives in many of the Polish camps. They had no right to be there. Wherever possible we threw them out, but they had succeeded through clever propaganda, newspapers, personal contact, etc., in misinforming the Polish people about conditions in their own country. They had told them that they would be shot, punished, or otherwise coerced if they returned to Poland; that there was no food or means of sustenance there; that the government was under the complete domination of Russia, none of which is true.

As a result of the LaGuardia plan, it was reported that some 80,000 Polish people had voluntarily returned to Poland. In my meeting with the Polish Prime Minister in Warsaw, I was informed that this figure reached as high as 140,000. This means that 140,000 Polish citizens who were charges of the United Nations have now returned to help rebuild their homeland and live with their families. This is as it should be. Let me make it plain that no efforts were made to coerce or press these Polish people to go home. The truth about conditions—not rosy by any means—was revealed to them and they were given 60-day free rations.

I checked the movements of numbers of a cross section of these Polish people and the records of many others in Poland. In no single case did I find any evidence that even one who had returned to his homeland was unhappy or wished to leave. The Polish Prime Minister and his associates were warm in their gratitude and commendation of LaGuardia and the UNRRA leadership for this constructive piece of work, and begged for its continuance. They stated categorically that without UNRRA Poland could not have survived.

This fiery, nationalistic, and vital people have at last broken the vise of the feudal barons which kept them in servitude for centuries. Now they are struggling gallantly to reconstitute themselves, but are faced with an underground of a different nature from that of the war—an underground inspired by other nations who would like to break up this present government. They deserve the chance to build a new nation. We ought to give it to them.

Many people have asked me about anti-Semitism in Poland. Obviously this dread scourge, which was part of the poisoned roots of fascism and feudalism, cannot be uprooted in a few short months by any government. I was convinced by the statements and actions of the government leaders that every possible means available is being taken to stamp it out wherever it rears its head.

In Silesia a constructive new life is being developed for the Polish people and the Jews. Many small artisans, ranging from coal miners to shoemakers, are finding it a fruitful and safe place for normal life and business. Some 1,200 Jewish farmers resettled in that area are productively at work.

One of my next stops was in Vienna, Austria. I will not dwell upon conditions in that century-old capital. It is a war-battered city. The refugees there constitute a sore problem. General Clark's staff was deeply concerned about it. There are 32,000 United Nations displaced persons, 142,000 ex-enemy displaced persons, and about 35,000 Jewish displaced persons and refugees in the United States Zone in Austria.

A plan was being submitted by the Army authorities recommending that these displaced persons be transferred to Germany before the peace treaty is signed this spring. But there is no place for them in Germany. I will come to the German situation later.

Italy, which has never been able to care for its large population, faces a crisis also connected with the refugee population. Some 400,000 have found safe haven there. UNRRA's deep concern was with those people in this shining country. I say "shining" because the spirit and mood of the people were open, forward-looking, with an impatient

desire to support a strong democratic government, and to be left alone by the Allied Powers. Today the government and the people are dominated by Britain. When the peace treaty is signed, and it is hoped that it will be this spring, the Italians will be faced with the job of feeding and caring for the 400,000 refugees, or expelling them. Of this number only some 25,000 are displaced persons. I pleaded with the government heads not to evict any of these lost people—especially the displaced—during this difficult period. UNRRA's care will cease on July 1. It is hoped by that time that the new International Refugee Organization will have been organized and ready to take up the burden. This is conjectural. In view of the present IRO budget, which will provide only 45 cents a day for a DP instead of $1.30 a day which it now costs in Italy, funds must be found to keep this population alive. I submitted a formula to the Italian Government which we hope will be workable.

Czechoslovakia has a displaced persons problem in reverse. It is begging for artisans, laborers, and others who will replace some of the 2,000,000 Sudetens who have been expelled. Surrounded on all sides by restless, broken nations, this newly formed country is demonstrating to the world that democracy can work, can live, can succeed, even in the midst of war-torn Europe.

The spirit of the Czechs was like a fresh breeze. All is vital, affirmative, and constructive there. I found this government also completely independent. And it is the one place in Europe where I had the satisfaction of seeing the Germans treated as they should be. They want no part of the German people and they are not quick to forget the savagery and brutality heaped upon their innocent citizens. Their memories are not as short as ours or that of the British. Persons caught speaking the German language are dealt with not too pleasantly by the Czech citizens. I was warned to speak any language but German.

The Czech Government is considering opening its doors to some of the lost people from the German displaced persons camps. What an opportunity for leadership. Imagine this little nation pointing the way by opening its doors to those who are begging to become free and constructive citizens of the new world.

Before making a tour through the capitals of Europe I inspected a number of the camps in the American zone in Germany. Winter had set in. The snow and frost surrounded these camps with a bleakness and gray sorrow. The spring and summer sunlight of hope with Palestine, the United States, South America, and other countries as possible havens had turned to cold disappointment and tragic aimlessness among the people. The aching, cold cement floors of the former Luftwaffe barracks, the unheated rooms in many of the camps, offered a setting which was grim and despairing.

What could tomorrow bring? When and where would these lost people—caught in the vise of the aftermath of the war, betrayed by the victorious governments who promised them not the fruits of conquerors, but the simple decencies of security and home—where would they find a normal life? People pulled at my coat as I walked through some of the dark, lightless rooms. "What will you offer us? You cannot leave us here in these wretched conditions. What about our children? Our futures? Do we not deserve a place in the world?" I had no answer.

Let there be no mistake. The United States Army occupation forces with the indispensable aid of the UNRRA team workers have on the whole done a heroic job with these lost people. But this is merely temporary aid. These people cannot be rooted into the German society. They do not belong there. At the close of the war they rushed back to Germany, where their families had been massacred, for the protection which our victorious armies had promised them. No one had any intention that they should remain to live within the sight of their own graveyards. But, there they are, the problem children of our new era, with no place to go and no government apparently aware of its first obligation—to humanity.

Can't we once and for all understand that a civilization, whether in the United States of America, Europe, Palestine, the Far East, or anywhere, cannot live part slave and part free; that when some one group must remain concentrated in abnormal camps, without homes, without security, without a future, none of us is really free?

I was informed in Germany that the British had recommended that the displaced persons' population in the British zone in Germany be reduced in their rations to the level of the German population. I will say for General McNarney when I spoke with him that he would not hear of such a plan for the American zone.

The Germans are living largely off our bounty—from our appropriations—from your taxes. They look rather well on the whole—certainly better than the displaced persons who were told that they had won the war. These Germans find ways of securing extra rations from indigenous supplies. To put the displaced persons on the same level with the Germans, who lost the war, would be tantamount to reducing the displaced persons below the level of the Germans. This is an alarming possibility, as you will see.

A remnant of a people survived the intended massacre of the Germans; they find themselves betrayed in victory, and they have lost faith in the sorry promises of the democracies.

I say, therefore, that there in Germany democracy is receiving its severest test. Will these people become political pawns? Today they are the stepchildren of the world. Our people in the United States will live to regret the policy of the closed door. We who built our Nation on the sinews of Europe's stalwart men and women who crossed from the Old to the New World can yet maintain this as the New World rather than the closed world—rather than the world hermetically sealed to the sorrows, the yearnings, the hopes, the faith in the people of America. Even our present immigration laws which provide for a minimum of entrants have been thwarted. Few of those who were promised a foothold on our shores have been permitted to make the journey to add to the zest and glory of a free people. Let us not, in the preoccupation with our own domestic problems, lose sight of our hard-won world position of leadership and responsibility. Let us not refer glibly to the iron curtain of the East as we slam the steel door of the West, to what was once our promised land in the faces of the lost people.

Support of Churches and Benevolent Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rich Man's Mite," published in the Northern Virginia Daily of February 24, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICH MAN'S MITE

Americans should think long and seriously over a recent charge by a veteran newspaperman that they tend to spend freely for luxuries and to be miserly in their support of churches and benevolent institutions. James Wright Brown, president of Editor and Publisher, said in a public address that a survey by the National Stewardship Institute showed a 1-percent decrease in contributions to churches and related benevolences in the 13-year period of 1933–45 as compared with the preceding 13 years. For luxuries, however, the Nation spent $58,000,000 more than in the earlier period.

From the $67,500,000,000 the people of this country had at their command in 1941 after taxes and living expenses were met, Brown said, "we chose to give a scant billion dollars to churches and character-building agencies. Nearly twice as much was spent on tobacco, 3 times as much for movies and recreation, 7 times as much for alcoholic beverages, and nearly 10 times as much for jewelry, furs, and other luxuries. Apparently the social conscience is stronger when we are having hard times than when the money is rolling in, if we are to judge by the way we spend our money."

Mr. Brown said further that the institute report showed the percentage of gifts to churches and church philanthropies, as compared with the national income in 1944, was 73 percent lower than it was during the depression year of 1932. There are several factors—among the wartime giving to special campaigns—which might be offered to soften this comparison, though we doubt that wartime giving affected the general result to any great extent. As a matter of fact, the essential truth of Mr. Brown's argument is well known to those familiar with church and benevolent financing.

The great majority of us use dollars to provide ourselves with the luxuries which we have come to think of as necessities, and we support the church and character-building agencies with nickels and pennies. True, there are those who give freely for these purposes, but their attitude only emphasizes the much greater number who give little or nothing. The story of the widow's mite holds eternal truth. There are many today whose giving is in that pattern. But there are far too many of us, even though we are not wealthy, whose giving could better be compared with the rich man's mite.

Battle for Solvency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Battle for Solvency," published in the Winchester, Va., Evening Star of February 25, 1947. The editorial was written by Harry F. Byrd, Jr., editor, who is the worthy son of a very distinguished father. The editorial contains words of wisdom which the American people may well ponder.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE FOR SOLVENCY—PART II

As able, thoughtful Senator HAWKES, of New Jersey, declared on the floor of the

United States Senate last Friday, "There are two ways by which the United States of America can become a socialistic or totalitarian state. One is * * * to be conquered in war * * * the second * * * is to dissipate our substance * * *."

Like Lincoln, this newspaper believes that if ever we are destroyed it will be from within, and as a result of our own stubborn refusal to put our domestic house in order and reduce waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in Government. Since 1930 public indebtedness has increased from $16,000,000,000 until today we have a debt of $265,000,000,000; our budget has not been in balance for 17 years; our tax rate is approaching a point beyond which socialism will take the place of democracy; the expenditures recommended by the President for the third peacetime year are four times as much as those in the year before the war; and the expenditures for this peacetime year exceed the total cost of World War I.

If our Congressmen and Senators are not now willing to fight—not just talk—but fight and vote for substantial budget reductions, then when in heaven's name will a determined effort be made to restore our Nation to fiscal sanity? It cannot be attained by wishful thinking. Cutting expenses is one of the hardest things a Congress ever does. But if it is not done now, in time of prosperity, certainly it will not be accomplished should a depression develop. We need to conserve our substance to combat unforeseen emergencies.

And another vital point which we must remember:

Within the past 25 years we fought and won magnificent victories in two world wars. But let it be remembered we had an adequate financial structure. Lack of funds can render a free people impotent. All history tells us that not a single democracy has ever been able to outlive financial insolvency.

We must not join that parade.

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me and signed by Dr. Frank Oppenheimer, Dr. E. S. Loeffler, Dr. R. L. Meier, and Dr. Norman Morse, of the Northern California Association of Scientists, dealing with the Lilienthal appointment, as well as an editorial entitled "The Lilienthal Case," published in the San Francisco Chronicle of February 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS,
Berkeley, Calif., February 14, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The unfortunate personal and political opposition to David Lilienthal's appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission has aroused the deep concern of scientists. Mr. Lilienthal has gained our sincere respect for his outstanding contribution to international atomic energy control. As coauthor of the Acheson-Lilienthal report, which was the basis for the American proposals to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, he has become the symbol of the constructive efforts of the United States toward control of atomic armaments.

In our opinion, the present attacks against Mr. Lilienthal are directed not only against him personally but against the very idea that international atomic disarmement is a desirable goal. His repudiation by the Senate might be construed by other nations as a repudiation of the United States' proposals. This would be a serious, if not fatal, set-back to the international negotiations now in progress.

We believe this is the main issue. As builders of the first atomic weapon, we must assume leadership in its control. We, therefore, urge you to demonstrate your patriotic and nonpartisan support by a vote to confirm Mr. Lilienthal's appointment.

We further sincerely believe that Mr. Lilienthal's record and achievements make him a person exceptionally qualified for the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission.

We are taking this opportunity to call to your attention a recent editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle, which calls for bipartisan support of Mr. Lilienthal's appointment.

Very truly yours,

FRANK OPPENHEIMER,
E. S. LOEFFLER,
R. L. MEIER,
NORMAN MORSE,
For the Executive Committee.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of February 12, 1947]

THE LILIENTHAL CASE

Among the ammunition his Senate opponents, headed by the Crump machine's Senator MCKELLAR, are shooting at David E. Lilienthal is the charge that he favors government ownership.

Whether true or untrue, no accusation could have less point than this one.

Lilienthal is up for confirmation as Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Under the law he is to administer everything connected with atomic energy is a Government monopoly. By the nature of the thing, the Government has to own atomic energy, all its sources, all the processes of fission, all the plants, and all the end product. Practically every American endorses this and would have it no other way. Certainly industry—and emphatically the leading chemical industries which worked on splitting the atom—endorse it.

So it comes down to this, that if Lilienthal does believe in government ownership, as alleged, his ideas are going to have full and proper play in the work he has been appointed to do.

The Senate should handle this affair with less partisanship and with more attention to the relevant merits of the appointment. The Chronicle believes Lilienthal should be given bipartisan confirmation.

Seventeenth Birthday of Radio Station WSPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Charles R. Denny, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, relating to the seventeenth birthday of radio station WSPA, and an address by Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, on the occasion of the celebration held in Spartanburg, S. C.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS CHIEF CONGRATULATES WSPA

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington 25, D. C., February 12, 1947.

Mr. WALTER BROWN,
Vice President and General Manager,
Radio Stations WSPA—WSPA-FM,
Spartanburg, S. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Congratulations t WSPA on its seventeenth birthday. Th seventeenth birthday is a particularly au picious occasion because it signaliz the beginning of an all-out effort bring the blessings of frequency mod lation to a greatly expanded audienc The increase of power from 250 watts t 3,000 watts will enable WSPA-FM to reac many thousands of additional listeners and will give them the benefit of this great technological improvement in radio broadcasting: freedom from static, freedom from fading, freedom from interference from other stations, high fidelity with full tonal range.

Radio broadcasting at this particular time in our history has a greater responsibility and opportunity than ever before to inform our citizens of all sides of public questions so that they may act intelligently, to provide them with educational and cultural programs and with wholesome entertainment.

American radio stations are licensed to operate in the public interest and we know that WSPA and WSPA-FM will continue to be faithful to that trust. Please accept the best wishes of the Commission for many more years of public service to the people of South Carolina.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. DENNY, *Chairman.*

ADDRESS BY GOV. J. STROM THURMOND, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

I come to Spartanburg tonight delighted to perform three things, all of which to me are extremely important.

Naturally, I like to be among friends, and I feel that here in Spartanburg I am with the type of people who believe, with me, that South Carolina can be improved through the cooperation of all classes of people who are eager to work for the benefit of our State. The support that I have received from Spartanburg and the wholehearted cooperation that I am continuing to get from your representatives emphasize that we can advance if our leadership is unselfish and is determined to work for the improvement of our people and our institutions.

And I want to congratulate Spartanburg on recapturing Mr. James F. Byrnes. I know that you love him and that you realize that he is a man of great ability and of tremendous accomplishments. But I sometimes wonder whether you and the other people of South Carolina understand just how great Mr. Byrnes' accomplishments have been. He has served this State and this country in more important ways than any other man in the history of the United States. He has reached these heights by force of his ability, his integrity, and by his persistence to see a job to its completion.

I am sure that this man, whose life has not been without its disappointments, but who carried on without complaining in the face of personal discouragement, would still be in public service if he had not been forced

by his physician to slow down and become less active than his duties as Secretary of State would permit. It is fitting that he has returned to Spartanburg to enjoy the rest that is rightfully his. I hope that he will stay here in South Carolina with us, unless the demands of his country become so pressing that he is forced to forego his present plans in order to serve the world again as it strives for peace.

To Mr. Byrnes all of us owe a great debt. You can do your share of paying that debt by seeing that his life in Spartanburg is full of pleasantries and enjoyable living among friends. Our sympathy goes out to him now in his bereavement, and we regret he is not with us tonight.

And my third mission here is to congratulate the ownership, the management, and personnel of radio station WSPA on account of its seventeenth anniversary and on the occasion of its starting frequency modulation operation with 3,000 watts power. Both events are important.

In the 17 years since the far-sighted individuals began the operation of Station WSPA in 1929, many events of tremendous importance have taken place in this State. Our people have become better informed on problems of the day and on the importance of active citizenship. I am sure that the services rendered by WSPA and the other active and beneficial stations of this State have done much to help lift our citizenship to higher levels.

The public-service features of radio broadcasting are obligations that most stations meet willingly, and I know that all of you will agree that WSPA in Spartanburg has been a leader in acceptance of these responsibilities. If South Carolina is to grow—and it must grow in prosperity and in enlightened people in order to survive—our media for the dissemination of public information must continue to serve the people of our State. Not for a day can they sit idly by and allow public opinion to suffer because that public is not properly informed.

It is really a trust, and I know public opinion will recognize that fact and will continue to serve beneficially the people of South Carolina.

I believe our radio stations have been placed in too much of a strait-jacket with reference to taking a stand on public questions which affect the people they serve. Certainly, radio stations must be fair and impartial in presenting controversial questions. But I do feel that radio stations could and should have programs for the social and economic betterment for the communities and sections they serve. Radio stations should be free to editorialize in promoting these programs designed to improve the community life and promote good government.

WSPA and the new station we are dedicating tonight, WSPA–FM, serve a great section of the Carolinas.

Speaking here in the heart of the Piedmont, I want to reiterate what I have said before. The industrial growth of this section was no accident. It came about because you possess people of energy, of conviction, and of practical dreams. It came about because your people are good workers and good managers.

What impresses me more as I travel over this section is the fine balance here between industry and agriculture and within industry and agriculture. I want to commend the farmers of this area who have done so much in getting your agriculture away from a one-way-crop system. They have truly diversified. The very fact that Spartanburg County last year shipped more fresh peaches than any other county in the world speaks for the vision and efficiency of your peach growers. With Spartanburg County setting the pace, South Carolina has become the dominating peach-growing State. I am glad the farmers here are taking care of the land because without its continued and improved fertility no agricultural economy will remain sound.

Already you have a well-balanced agriculture, but there is still room for greater diversification. Much of the milk people of Spartanburg drank today was shipped in here from Tennessee and other States. Produce more milk, raise more livestock, develop your pastures, keep your peach and cotton lands fertile by proper rotation and planting of legumes, and the agriculture of the Piedmont will continue to grow larger and larger.

Your industries also are diversified. You have timber treating, textile machinery, and various plants other than your wonderful textile mills. There is room for more diversification. The garment industries are on the move. You need more of these small industries and I urge you to go out after them.

Some of you will recall that I came to Spartanburg before I was sworn in as governor and went to Washington with a committee to keep Camp Croft. I regret we were unsuccessful. But this city and this section must not permit this great plant to be junked. The lands can be utilized for farm purposes and the cantonment area will furnish ideal sites for new industries. Also, some of the barracks should be converted as veterans' housing.

I hope the Spartanburg County Foundation will acquire Camp Croft. If I can help this splendid organization in this undertaking I want to do it. You cannot afford to permit this camp with all of its utilities and improvements to be junked and wasted away as was old Camp Wadsworth. The forward-looking people of Spartanburg, I am confident, will see to it that some arrangement is made to acquire Camp Croft for Spartanburg.

I could go on paying tribute to this fine section, but I will be talking here again soon at the annual dinner of the chamber of commerce and I will have more to say.

I want to talk some more about radio, because this is a subject that fascinates me. We are tonight marking a new venture in radio broadcasting in South Carolina. WSPA was the first standard broadcasting station in South Carolina and it is indeed fitting that this company should be the first to provide frequency-modulation broadcasting in our State. The service that will come from the FM broadcasts will be far more enjoyable than that presented by our present system of broadcasting.

I am told that frequency modulation soon will be the primary means of radio presentations and that the public will be so pleased with the results that they will quickly forget the previous standards, even though they may have seemed high several years ago. Spartanburg, which has been first in so many important developments in South Carolina, should receive wide acclaim for the service that will come from the operation of the new station.

Radio can mean much of value and entertainment to the people of this State. We still are a rural State and by means of the radio—and especially by means of frequency modulation—many people away from centers of population can be reached and kept informed with good radio service both day and night.

Personally, I have had so much experience with radio and I have come to the conclusion that it is a tremendous force for good. The management of WSPA has demonstrated it realizes how important radio is for the good of the people it serves, and over WSPA-FM I am confident it will present entertaining, educational, and religious programs to the people of the Piedmont area.

And so my friends, I admonish you to listen to the programs of this new station and I call upon the station itself to be careful in its presentations so that the very greatest number of people will be benefited by the programs and the entertainment that are offered. Station WSPA-FM can—and I am sure will—help tremendously in carrying out my ideas for the betterment of South Carolina. Now, on this inaugural program, it takes upon itself a trust—a public trust. I am sure that it will carry out that trust faithfully and eagerly.

In my inaugural address last month, I made the specific recommendation that radio be widely used in our educational program. I said—and here I quote—"We should consider the prompt establishment of a frequency modulation educational radio station, as has been planned in 21 other States. Later, additional stations can be added to form a State-wide network of such stations. There is strong sentiment favoring a suitable memorial to World War II veterans. Could a more fitting memorial to the veterans be established than a State-wide system of radio for educational purposes?

I repeat that recommendation now. All of you have seen how radio not only helps your enjoyment of living but brings to you many benefits. The new system of frequency modulation, with its static-free reception and with its fidelity of tone, will bring to its listeners improved quality and heightened pleasure. The natural sounds that will come from your FM sets will mean that music, for example, can be presented properly to many additional thousands. The fidelity of reception will mean a fuller understanding of music, of diction, of literature, and of many of the other fine things of life.

I hope that the schools of this area will quickly secure sets for FM reception. I know that pupils who receive these additional benefits and who share in this adjunct to normal education will be better citizens thereby.

Spartanburg has the first FM station in South Carolina. I know that it will not be the last. As a matter of fact, I understand that Anderson, Greenville, and other cities have stations now in the process of construction, and I hope that other communities will follow because we will need numerous FM stations to cover adequately all of South Carolina. The idea that has now started in Spartanburg should spread. All of our educational institutions should take advantage of the quality presentations that are to come from their FM sets. And perhaps soon we will have sufficient sets and sufficient stations in South Carolina to serve all of our people.

Once again I want to congratulate the management of WSPA for the progressive manner in which they are increasing their section and for the example of service to the people of the Piedmont area, and also for the leadership that has been set for all of South Carolina. I would also like personally to congratulate my friend, Walter Brown, who is progressive and always in the forefront in matters pertaining to the welfare of his State and Nation.

Thomas Alva Edison—One Hundredth Anniversary of Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Assemblyman John P. Morrissey to the members of the New York State Assembly on Tuesday, February 11,

1947—the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison:

Thomas Alva Edison was one of America's most illustrious sons. He was the foremost inventive genius of our age and one of the leading benefactors of mankind. By the force of his matchless genius, aided by his tireless energy, he struck the shackles of drudgery from untold millions of human beings and lifted the world into the light of a new civilization, the like of which humanity had scarcely dreamed.

Although 100 years have passed since Edison's birth, he seems to be as much a part of the present as even you and I. He lives with us today through his fabulous inventions and discoveries. He seems close to us because it is just a short 16 years since this great inventive genius died and took with him one of the greatest productive minds in history. Throughout his 84 years Edison remained an untiring worker and he was the inventive leader for a space of two generations.

Edison's place in history ranks high among the leaders of men of genius of all time—Homer, Galileo, Michaelangelo, Rembrandt, Mozart, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Columbus, Jefferson, Newton, and Marconi. Towering amid that brilliant group, the immortal figure of the Wizard of Menlo Park rises in glorified silhouette against the horizon of ages, sending a glow of radiance down the centuries to come to stir the hopes and fire the imaginations of toilers of the future who struggle for the betterment of mankind.

Any attempt to magnify his virtues or to clothe him with the qualities he did not have would add little to the stature of Edison. All that is necessary to commend him to the minds and hearts of peoples of all climes is the simple story of this earnest, patient man, toiling through the silent hours of the night to make the world a better place in which to live.

He was the greatest public servant of his day; yet he founded no political party, he advanced no new political creeds, he held no political office. Therefore, no array of illustrious speakers volunteer to sing his praises or use his name as a sounding board to further selfish gains.

The kindly Edison was one of the mightiest conquerors this world has ever seen; yet he waged no wars of human destruction, he fought no bloody battles, he stirred no fires of human hate. But he conquered the elements, as it were, and gave to humanity the greatest ascendency over the forces of nature the world has ever known. He brought the dawn of a new civilization—the electric age.

It may seem ironical that no memorial has ever been erected to him in his country's Capital, no monument dedicated to his name, no blazing epitaph to proclaim his services to the world.

Do we really appreciate the services of men of genius? They scale the heights and blaze the way to those sublime achievements that make the milestones in the progress of the race, while men of talent dig in, solidify, and hold the gains and enjoy the progress that genius makes.

But on this one hundredth anniversary of his birth we find a significant monument to Thomas A. Edison. His monument is in every home in the world—in every building that has an electric switch. His epitaph is written on every heart that beats in gratitude for the services he gave. He needs no pompous memorial to commemorate his life. He needs no monument save the eternal and indestructible substance of his own greatness to commend him to the consideration of all coming ages. His name will live and his fame will reach to the remotest times in which civilized men shall dwell upon the earth.

Although Edison belongs to the world, the United States takes pride in the thought that his rise from humble beginnings and his unceasing struggle to overcome all obstacles on the road to success illustrate the spirit of our country. We are happy to share his achievements as our contribution for progress. Thomas Alva Edison represents the finest traditions of our citizenship.

Peace for Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, at a dinner conference on Hebrew liberation, sponsored by the American League for a Free Palestine, at Hotel Astor, Saturday, February 8, 1947:

I am personally interested in the program that Senator Gillette is so valiantly leading for the American League for a Free Palestine, and I want it known that I am in complete support of the American league's program.

The cause is just, and the Hebrew right will triumph today, as in the past all legitimate fights for freedom and independence have triumphed.

I pride myself that had I been alive in 1776, I would have, without hesitation, taken the side of the colonial patriots in their fight for freedom, out of whose courage has come this great Nation. But perhaps an even greater challenge is, How do we react today to an equally just fight against oppression? In the fight of the Irish, I took my stand for an Irish Nation, and an Irish Government. Today, I take my stand for the rights of Hebrews to have a government of their own, and to be recognized as a nation. As I look upon Palestine tonight, with all the terrible tensions that are there tonight, I see the very same situation that existed not so many decades ago right here in America, and not so many years ago in Ireland.

Remember this—and this is a truth that the oppressor always fails to conquer—all territories on the face of the earth are created by God Almighty to give people of the world—all the people of the world—a chance to live decently and in peace. And certainly the Hebrews have the right to live in peace and in decency in Palestine—the legal and moral right.

As a Member of the Congress I am more aware, perhaps, than the average layman, of the need and power of a government to protect its people. The Hebrew people must have their own government if there is to be any protection and safeguard for Hebrews today and in the future. Had there been such a government in the past terrible war years, there undoubtedly would have been many millions of Hebrews saved from death at the hands of the Nazis. I believe it essential that in constituting a government in Palestine for the Hebrews, provision must be made to include the displaced Hebrews of Europe who live even today without protection for themselves, their families, their properties—that is, what is left of their properties.

It is because I know that this Conference on Hebrew Liberation, sponsored by the American league, is working so courageously to bring about such a solution for the dreadful situation in which Hebrews now find themselves in their efforts to constitute a nation and a government in Palestine—that I am happy to take part. I am proud to add my voice to the many voices at this conference, who are working out a nonsectarian plan of action for America that will bring peace and sanity to Palestine.

Amortization of the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the eminent mathematicians of this country, Prof. Charles W. Watkeys of the University of Rochester, has sent me some interesting figures on the amortization of the national debt.

With proper mathematical humility I am happy to share these computations with my colleagues. Even though we may not be able to follow Professor Watkeys in the steps he takes, we certainly will be interested in the final conclusions at which he arrives.

Someone has truly said "there is no substitute for facts." In approaching the fiscal problems which confront our country and in planning its financial future, it is important for us to have before us such data as set forth below.

Professor Watkeys' computations follow:

AMORTIZATION OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Assumptions:

1. National debt is $275,000,000,000.
2. Interest rate, 2 percent compounded semiannually, constant throughout period.

Question. How much is required annually to remove the debt in 25 years?

Formula used:

$$A = R\left(\frac{1-\left(\frac{1+i}{2}\right)^{-2n}}{\frac{i}{2}}\right)$$

Where A is the amount of the debt
R the semiannual payment
i the interest rate
n the number of years

$$275{,}000{,}000{,}000 = R\left(\frac{1-(1.01)^{-50}}{.01}\right)$$

$$= R\left(\frac{0.3905}{.01}\right) \quad (1.01)^{-50} = \frac{1}{(1.01)^{50}}$$

$$= R\ 39.05$$

log. 1 = 1.0000−1
−50 log. 1.01 = .2150
log. $(1.01)^{-50}$ = 0.7850−1
$(1.01)^{-50}$ = 0.6095
$1-(1.01)^{-50} = 1-0.6095 = 0.3905$

$$R = \frac{275{,}000{,}000{,}000}{39.05}$$

= 7,040,000,000 semiannual payment
2
14,080,000,000 annual payment

log. 275,000,000,000 = 11.4393
−log. 39.05 = 1.5917
9.8476

Annual payment to reduce the national debt to one-third its present figure in 25 years:

⅔ of 275,000,000,000 = 183,300,000,000

$$183{,}300{,}000{,}000 = R\left(\frac{1-(1.01)^{-50}}{.01}\right) = R\ 39.05$$

$$R = \frac{183{,}300{,}000{,}000}{39.05}$$

log. 183,300,000,000 = 11.2632
log. 39.05 = 1.5917
log. R = 9.6715

= 4,693,000,000 semiannual amortization payments
916,700,000 interest on unpaid part
5,609,700,000
2
11,219,400,000 total annual payment

⅓ (275,000,000,000) = 91,670,000,000
Semiannual interest on part not being amortized 916,700,000

Amortization of the national debt

Amount amortized	Annual payment				Annual interest on part not amortized
	In 25-year period	In 50 years	In 75 years	In 100 years	
$275,000,000,000 (all of debt paid)	$14,080,000,000	$8,750,000,000	$7,110,000,000	$6,384,000,000	0
$183,300,000,000 (⅔ of debt paid)	11,220,000,000	7,765,400,000	5,740,000,000	4,256,000,000	$1,834,000,000
$137,500,000,000 (½ of debt paid)	9,724,000,000	7,126,000,000	5,556,000,000	3,192,000,000	2,750,000,000
$91,670,000,000 (⅓ of debt paid)	4,694,000,000	2,918,000,000	2,370,000,000	2,128,000,000	3,666,000,000
$68,750,000,000 (¼ of debt paid)	3,520,000,000	2,188,000,000	1,777,600,000	1,596,400,000	4,125,000,000
Zero—No payments on amortization					5,500,000,000

Letters From John H. Bunzel to the Daily Princetonian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters from John H. Bunzel, president of the Princeton Liberal Union, a student at Princeton University, addressed to the editor of the Daily Princetonian.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRINCETON LIBERAL UNION

To the EDITOR OF THE DAILY PRINCETONIAN:

On November 14 the Committee on Extra-Curricular Non-Athletic Organizations granted a charter to the Princeton Liberal Union.

PROMOTE LIBERAL IDEAS

The Princeton Liberal Union is a society formed, as its constitution states, "for the express purpose of bringing together people of liberal viewpoints for their mutual pleasure and profit in exchanging ideas and enlarging the scope of their genuine understanding through scientific observation and sympathetic interpretation of human problems. It is further the intention of the society to foster and promote these liberal ideas and viewpoints on the university campus and wherever these ideas are of particular and vital concern to students, to work to have them put into practice." To make liberal ideas familiar in the university, the Princeton Liberal Union intends to conduct forums and other public meetings on the campus.

The Princeton Liberal Union is young and small. It is still in an organizational stage. But already there are many undergraduates and faculty members who have endorsed the aims of the union. But what, it is asked, constitutes a liberal? Who may join the liberal union?

This entire question is now being considered by the governing council of the union. Certainly "liberal," as a word, can mean anything one wants it to mean. Philosophy has taught us that definitions are just agreements or resolutions to use words in a certain way. A more practical question, the liberal union feels, is how can one readily distinguish Mr. Smith from Mr. Jones by calling one a "liberal"? In other words, how should the word be used?

Broadly speaking, the Liberal Union supports the ideas of Franklin Roosevelt, supports the interests of labor, will fight for racial equality, for better and cheaper health, for public education, for science, for civil rights. It is felt it is easier to denote liberals, that is, point to them, than say what they are.

Is there a need for such an organization at Princeton? The Liberal Union feels strongly that there is. Recently a member of the faculty said privately, "You know, Princeton is a conservative place. In fact," he went on with a smile, "there used to be a time when there were two subjects almost forbidden here: Harvard and Franklin Roosevelt."

FORMED LAST SPRING

Applied strictly to the general attitude of undergraduates toward the times and events of today, this statement by itself is an exaggeration. Yet last spring a small group of individuals shared the feeling that there was a genuine need for an element of liberal thinking at Princeton. This feeling stemmed from a belief that there is a lack of social consciousness at Princeton, an attitude of political apathy to the world outside the ivy-covered walls of Old Nassau, an atmosphere of lethargy and listlessness. Are Princeton's high academic standards being reflected materially outside the classroom, where ultimately the fruits of a real and good education are tested? Or are there evidences of sinking into a social pattern portending more disaster than the light-hearted exhibitionism of the "roaring twenties"?

DO WE KID OURSELVES?

The Princeton Liberal Union feels that while these questions on the surface may appear dramatic and high-sounding, there is a basic element of truth and fact in them. It sees this same unconcern, this same indifference permeating the entire country, where there is not even the spirited antinomian attitudes of the twenties. There is too often an immature selfishness, even a self-pitying confusion. The Liberal Union wonders if Mr. Hutchins was not right when he said recently, "Americans are boring themselves to death." Their boredom has become a mass soporific, a clinging to fun-making to avoid facing even their most material needs like getting a house to live in, securing their employment future and preventing the atomic destruction of the world. Is the average American citizen today contributing as much to his political life as he should? Some one said the other day that the average Soviet citizen contributed more to his political life than the average American, and some one else was quick to point out what is true, namely, that the Russian believes a lot of things which are not so in doing it. But equally true is that Americans believe a lot of things that are not so in not doing it. How often do we kid ourselves into thinking that because we are legally free to change our society the way we want to, that our society is the way we want?

The Princeton Liberal Union feels that these kinds of thoughts and ideas and queries are important.

Another member of the faculty, upon hearing that the university had granted a charter to the Princeton Liberal Union, said, "It isn't surprising that there is a liberal union now at Princeton. What is surprising is that Princeton didn't have one long ago."

JOHN H. BUNZEL '46.

DISCLAIMS AFFILIATIONS

To the Editor of the Daily Princetonian:

The Princeton Liberal Union is an independent organization with no affiliations of any kind with either a national organization or with some other university group or organization. At no time has the Liberal Union entertained either the thought of, or the desire for affiliating itself with any other group, activity or organization. The Liberal Union is a Princeton society formed to foster and promote liberal ideas and viewpoints on the university campus, "and wherever these ideas are of particular and vital concern to students, to work to have them put into practice."

At the meeting of the Liberal Union held Tuesday, December 10, with a quorum present, the following statement was presented to the membership for adoption. It was unanimously accepted, and it was further agreed that it become the platform of the Princeton Liberal Union. A copy of this platform is attached herewith and is presented in full.

JOHN H. BUNZEL,
President.
CHARLES R. SCHWAB,
Vice president.
T. KENT DUPRE,
Secretary.
OTIS BENSON DAVIS,
Treasurer.
HENRY H. HERSCH,
ROBERT M. BROWN,
MARK ETHERIDGE, Jr.

"LIBERAL UNION PLATFORM

"The Liberal Union believes that it is the responsibility of students at Princeton to concern themselves with problems of their university, of students generally, of their community, and of their country.

"1. The Liberal Union stands opposed to racial and religious discrimination. In particular, on the campus it shall support and work for a policy on the part of the university administration of accepting applicants on an equal basis regardless of race, creed, or color. This necessitates the open encouragement of admission of minority groups which perhaps have felt in the past a policy of discrimination was being practiced against them, and the acceptance of responsibility on the part of undergraduates to help in their proper assimilation in the college community. Furthermore, we recognize our responsibility to cooperate with groups in the community active in combatting such discrimination. We shall also endorse National, State, and local legislation designed to insure equal political and economic rights to all persons regardless of race or creed; and shall oppose all forms of segregation and other discriminatory practices wherever they exist.

"Advocate assistance

"2. In the field of education the Liberal Union believes that opportunities for higher education should be made possible to all who are qualified by aptitude and intelligence. We advocate increased assistance to those who, otherwise qualified, are limited by financial need. We do not believe that all universities are fulfilling their responsibilities in this connection, and therefore support increased help in the form of State and Federal aid, along with greater financial assistance from the institution concerned.

"3. The Liberal Union believes in the necessity of providing for a decent standard of living and health protection for all. The attainment of genuine economic security must be based on the establishment of certain fundamental guarantees among which are steady employment, a minimum-wage level and adequate low-cost health insurance. An approach of this nature, it is felt, comes closer to the roots of present economic strife than

efforts to pass harsh or punitive legislation in the field of labor-management relations.

"4. The Liberal Union recognizes that there is no problem of greater importance or worthy of more urgent attention than achieving international unity and lasting world peace. We see as a serious obstacle to peace all tendencies on the part of one group or nation to consider the protection of their particular institutions and values more important than the larger considerations requisite to any workable plan for international accord. We strongly advocate international control of atomic power to prevent its use for military purposes, and to insure its use for the progress and welfare of the world.

"5. The Liberal Union especially defends the free expression of ideas within any undergraduate body, and in particular believes that increased participation and interest on the part of students in undergraduate organs of public opinion, in student-faculty relations, and in student government should be furthered. The Princeton Liberal Union was founded on these premises. The Princeton Liberal Union shall act on them."

No Place to Whittle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Place to Whittle," published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of February 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO PLACE TO WHITTLE

However much Congress may want to whittle on the President's budget, solons find new difficulty each day in locating a place where a nice splinter may be shaved without striking a knot.

Temporarily discouraged in attempts to pare the military side of the budget, Congressmen turned with hope and determination to the agricultural section. If any section of the budget should stand a judicious paring, this was it, thought some of them.

But they reckoned prematurely. The farm-bloc Senators lost no time putting themselves on record for the sanctity of agricultural appropriations. Like the appropriations asked for by the Army and Navy, the agricultural section of the budget is untouchable. A roll call of Republicans opposed to slashing agricultural funds is enough to deter the most stout-hearted ax-wielding Senator.

Congressmen have maneuvered themselves into a spot that may prove acutely embarrassing. Apparently a good many Members of both Houses believed the Truman budget could be cut sharply without harm to the national stability. Campaign promises left no alternative but to cut, yet Congress in quest of a place to whittle finds itself blocked at every turn.

As the search continues from one section of the budget to another, Congressmen may find that President Truman calculated better than they thought. Any major reduction is bound to entail restricted operation of those agencies of Government involved, and any curtailment of governmental service will evoke loud protests from those who get the shortened services.

It may be that Mr. Truman padded the budget outrageously as Chairman Reece has charged. But if he did, Congress is not quick about locating the excessive padding that may be removed.

Justice for Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Frank D. Joseph, Jr., dealing with the situation in Korea, together with a brief statement by the Korean-American council.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This letter was written by Mr. Frank D. Joseph, Jr., and mailed to the following list: The Honorable George Marshall, Secretary of State; Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg; Senator Tom Connally; Senator Wayne Morse; Senator Robert A. Taft; Senator John W. Bricker; Senator William F. Knowland; and Senator Owen Brewster.

Mr. Joseph is the holder of many medals and citations, including the Distinguished Service Cross, the French Croix de Guerre, and the Belgian Croix de Guerre.

Write to your Congressmen and Senators today. "It is later than you think."

THE KOREAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Ashland, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: The reason for my writing this letter is that the other night I had the privilege of hearing a young Korean patriot, Dr. James Shinn, pleading the cause of his country's liberation with frankness, simplicity, and sincerity.

During our latest World War, I, too, fought. I was decorated six times by three countries, and now I feel that it is my duty to fight again.

We have fought for our freedom and our fellow man's, for without his freedom ours was not and is not secure. Are we to continue to sacrifice the highly idealistic concepts at the altar of expediencies; making the same old mistakes over and over again ad infinitum; allowing the hydrahead of tyranny to rise again?

I was willing to give my life for those noble principles that our country has stood for. Why are you, as a great statesman, permitting the Communists and pro-Communists in our State Department to liquidate those very principles for which many of our dear friends died in the far-flung battlefields of the world?

Somewhere in my befuddled mind rings the slogan, "Justice based upon international law." Then what about Korea? When is that little country with a great heart for America going to get its freedom? After fighting 40 years for everything that we have stood for, are we going to sell her down the river to communistic Russia? When did Russia fight 40 minutes for our principles? When are we going to stop saying "Yes, Russia," "Yes, Uncle Joe," and say instead, "Yes, America"?

Fascism brought about the Pearl Harbor attack that Korea has been warning of for 40 years. Are we going to have the second Pearl Harbor by another ism?

Thanking you for what you may do to combat the greatest menace of mankind—communism.

Very respectfully yours,
FRANK D. JOSEPH, Jr.

The Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Reorganization of Congress," prepared by Franklin L. Burdette, associate professor of government and politics of the University of Maryland, and editor of publications for the National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

(By Franklin L. Burdette, associate professor of government and politics at the University of Maryland and editor of publications for the National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship)

The action, on February 14, by the new Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, which then recommended reductions of $6,000,000,000 in the President's estimates, is a significant reassertion of congressional authority. But this illustration of the constitutional importance of the Reorganization Act of 1946 does not mean that the place of the legislature in the American system of government is as yet wholly clear.

The first paragraph of the Constitution, after the preamble, provides that: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Does this language mean that Congress should not delegate lawmaking power to administrative agencies? Or does it merely mean that an agency like OPA or NLRB must be subject ultimately to congressional control? The issue has never been fully resolved.

The doctrine that legislatures ought to confine themselves to ultimate responsibility is expressed by men who would trust the experience and policy-continuity of a strong executive. It is not a new doctrine, having been clearly stated by John Stuart Mill in his Considerations on Representative Government (1861). He asserted, as our early national experience had taught, that representative assemblies cannot properly execute the law. "But it is equally true," Mill wrote, "though only of late and slowly beginning to be acknowledged, that a numerous assembly is as little fitted for the direct business of legislation as for that of administration."

In Mill's opinion laws should be drafted by a small commission appointed by the executive. The legislature, while authorized to suggest bills, would have only the power to enact, reject, or remit for further consideration. "The proper office of a representative assembly," he thought, "is to watch and control the Government."

Members of Congress, regardless of political viewpoint, have usually feared rather than

applauded the rapid progress of Mill's argument. In testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, Representative Jerry Voorhis, of California (defeated for reelection in 1946), said:

"I doubt that more than a mere handful of Americans would favor such a course for our country's Government. It means a gradual growth of a type of government which the whole tradition of our country is against * * * Congress has to a considerable extent permitted itself to become absorbed in * * * routine matters and has thus largely abdicated its most essential function, namely, that of devising on its own motion long-range legislative programs geared to the necessities of the times."

Representative E. E. Cox, of Georgia, replied:

"You have been classified as an ultra-progressive and I as a mossback reactionary, and still there is not the slightest difference between my views and the statement you make."

II

Both Woodrow Wilson and Lord Bryce, more than a half-century ago, pointed out that the internal organization of Congress is peculiarly designed to discourage the formulation of broad, coordinated governmental policies. Congress is charged with wider duties, and is more distinctly separated from the Executive, than any other major legislature in the world.

Relying heavily upon its own resources, Congress has divided its labors among standing committees in each House. Important legislatures abroad, depending on guidance from the executive—indeed, making what we call the administration virtually a committee of parliament—have never utilized standing committees to the degree known in America.

The committee system, developed early in the past century, has tended to destroy the unity of Congress. Conflicting jurisdictions of committees—little legislatures as they have been called—have time and again prevented general plans for national policy.

Passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act, under the leadership of Senator La Follette and Representative MONRONEY, was an indication of the concern in Congress over this dilemma. Faced with an undeniable need for broad plans, at a time when the administration was more than ready to provide them, Congress could either act or reconcile itself to a permanent decline in prestige. It chose to act.

The new law reduces committees in the House from 48 to 19 and in the Senate from 33 to 15. It defines their jurisdictions, limits the number on which Members may serve, authorizes larger staffs, and adds to their investigatory powers. Revenue and appropriations committees are directed to cooperate in analyzing the Federal budget before adoption. The currently proposed reduction of six billions is a result of that cooperation.

The act provides for expansion of legislative reference and bill-drafting services. It requires the registration of lobbyists. Congress is relieved of much detail by the substitution of administrative or judicial procedures for private bills concerning pensions, tort claims, bridges, or correction of military or naval records. Congressional salaries are increased and Members are made eligible for an exceptionally generous contributory retirement system.

III

Congress does not merely make laws. It also supervises administration and controls expenditure. The power to investigate, to obtain information from many sources, is indispensable to all three functions.

As it passed the Senate, the Reorganization Act prohibited special committees, contemplating investigations only by the standing committees to which legislation is regularly referred. The leadership of the House insisted on eliminating this restrictive provision.

The Senate position was based on the view that special investigations duplicate the work of standing committees, which must hold hearings again if specific remedial legislation is proposed. It was further argued that the efficiency of legislators and administrators is alike impaired by frequent and repetitious hearings; and that more dependable information could be obtained by standing committees with the increased powers and larger staffs provided by the reorganization.

In reestablishing two special Senate committees in the Eightieth Congress (to investigate the national defense program and to study the problems of small business), Republican leaders insisted in face of opposition that the earlier Senate attitude on the subject should not prevent continuation of these investigations in their original manner.

Special investigations have had great advantages in the past, and not all of those advantages are preserved in the recent strengthening of standing committees. The special committee has been able to cut across the jurisdictional limits of the standing committees. More important, it is possible to obtain information by special investigation when standing committees through partisanship or inertia are reluctant to act. Moreover, men competent to ferret out carefully concealed conditions are not always assigned to the appropriate standing committees.

A suggestion by Senator TYDINGS (Democrat, Maryland) has merit in tending to combine the advantages of special and standing committees in investigations. Legislators not members of a particular standing committee might be given special, nonvoting status in the committee for the purpose of advocating and perhaps conducting an investigation.

Freedom of debate in the Senate is a factor in investigations which is not to be overlooked. The privilege of any Member to express his views at length may well force a majority to permit investigation which a few Senators regard as essential. The advantages in freedom of debate can be retained without permitting extended filibusters.

IV

The Legislative Reorganization Act, as now in effect, is an important beginning in congressional self-examination and improvement. The new law does not deal with the troublesome question of committee assignments by seniority, a practice more easily condemned than improved.

The Senate version of the bill contemplated majority and minority policy committees in each House. Moreover, a joint legislative-executive council was planned, to consist of the majority policy committees (with the minority invited on some occasions), the President, and Cabinet. These provisions were rejected by the House leadership.

Development of a truly cooperative relationship between Congress and the administration is the crux of the problem of long-range legislative reorganization. The legislative-executive council, firmly institutionalized and adequately staffed, offers inspiring possibilities for lifting Congress above the compartmentalization which has been the byproduct of its committee system. It is noteworthy that the principle of such a council is now employed in one form or another in 12 States.

From the point of view of the executive, such a council would afford a regular, rather than intermittent, flow of advice and information from sources both elective and appointive. The actions of the council would of course be only recommendations for congressional consideration. But they would carry the weight and prestige of majority participation.

While representative government thrives on discussion, it makes progress by means of intelligent organization. The future role of legislatures hangs more critically in the balance than the more firmly settled places of the executive and judiciary. Students of Mein Kampf are well aware that Hitler's first attack was on parliamentary incompetence. The vitality of legislatures is the barometer which measures the strength of democracy or the rise of dictatorship.

Tariff Concession on Linen Fire Hose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the following statement from the Department of State and the accompanying Presidential proclamation withdrawing the tariff concession on linen fire hose granted in the trade agreement with Canada illustrates the flexibility of the trade-agreements program:

[No. 145]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
February 25, 1947.

The President has issued a proclamation withdrawing the tariff concession on linen fire hose granted in the trade agreement with Canada, the Department of State announced today. The duty on this product will accordingly return to the rate provided for in the Tariff Act of 1930.

This action was taken to alleviate injury threatening a domestic industry because of unforeseen and increased competition resulting from extension of the concession to countries other than Canada. The proclamation was issued under article XIV of the Canadian agreement, which provides that either Government has the right, after consultation with the other, to withdraw or modify a given concession if it is found that third countries are receiving major benefits from the concession, and that imports are increased to such an extent as to threaten serious injury to domestic producers of the article in question. There are similar provisions in some other trade agreements.

After informal conferences and investigations held by the Committee for Reciprocity Information, the United States Government announced on January 10, 1947, that imports of linen fire hose were entering the country principally from countries other than Canada and were considerably higher in volume than they had been before the granting of the concession. It was also stated at the same time that this Government proposed to withdraw the concession unless convincing reasons for not doing so were presented to the Committee for Reciprocity Information before January 30. No such reasons were offered. The Canadian Government has been consulted and has offered no objection to withdrawal of the concession.

The President's proclamation, issued today, withdraws the tariff concession on "hose, suitable for conducting liquids or gasses, wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber," granted in section 1007 of schedule II of the trade agreement with Canada, signed November 17, 1938. Under the trade agreement, the duty had been reduced to 10 cents per pound plus 7½ percent ad valorem. The duty on this product will now return to 19½ cents

per pound plus 15 percent ad valorem, which is the rate provided for in the Tariff Act of 1930. Imports entering the United States under this item are almost entirely of linen fire hose.

The text of the proclamation follows:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas, pursuant to the authority conferred by section 350 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the act of June 12, 1934, entitled "An act to amend the tariff act of 1930" (48 Stat. 943), the period within which such authority may be exercised having been extended by joint resolution approved March 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 24), the President of the United States of America, through his duly empowered plenipotentiary, entered into a trade agreement on November 17, 1938 (53 Stat. 2350), with His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada, through his duly empowered plenipotentiary, which trade agreement was proclaimed by the President on November 25, 1938 (53 Stat. 2348), and June 17, 1939 (53 Stat. 2394), acting pursuant to the authority conferred by the said section 350 (a);

Whereas article VII of the said agreement provides as follows (53 Stat. 2352):

"1. Articles the growth, produce or manufacture of Canada enumerated and described in schedule II annexed to this agreement shall, on their importation into the United States of America, be exempt from ordinary customs duties in excess of those set forth and provided for in the said schedule, subject to the conditions therein set out. The said articles shall also be exempt from all other duties, taxes, fees, charges, or exactions, imposed on or in connection with importation, in excess of those imposed on the day of the signature of this agreement or required to be imposed thereafter under laws of the United States of America in force on the day of the signature of this agreement.

"2. Schedule II shall have full force and effect as an integral part of this agreement."

Whereas item 1007 of schedule II annexed to the said agreement provides as follows (53 Stat. 2388):

U. S. Tariff Act of 1930, par.—	Description of article	Rate of duty
1007	Hose, suitable for conducting liquids or gases, wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber.	10 cents per pound and 7½ percent ad valorem.

Whereas article XIV of the said agreement provides as follows (53 Stat. 2354):

"The Government of each country reserves the right to withdraw or to modify the concession granted on any article under this agreement, or to impose quantitative regulations on the importation of any such article if, as the result of the extension of such concession to other foreign countries, such countries obtain the major benefit of the concession, and if in consequence imports of the article concerned increase to such an extent as to threaten serious injury to domestic producers: *Provided*, That before any action authorized by the foregoing reservation is taken, the Government proposing to take such action shall give notice in writing to the other Government of its intention to do so, and shall afford such other Government an opportunity within 30 days after receipt of such notice to consult with it in respect of the proposed action";

Whereas as a result of the extension to other foreign countries of the concession on hose enumerated and described in the said item 1007 of schedule II annexed to the said agreement, such countries have obtained the major benefit of the concession on the hose enumerated and described in the said item, and in consequence imports of said hose have increased to such an extent as to threaten serious injury to domestic producers;

Whereas notice in writing has been given, and an opportunity for consultation afforded, to the Government of Canada by the Government of the United States of America regarding its intention to withdraw the concession on the said articles;

Whereas the Government of Canada has signified its agreement with respect to such withdrawal;

And whereas the final sentence of said section 350 (a) authorizes the President of the United States of America to terminate in whole or in part the proclamation of the trade agreement entered into and proclaimed under said section 350 (a);

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority conferred by the said section 350 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, do hereby proclaim that the proclamations of November 25, 1938, and June 17, 1939, insofar as they relate to hose enumerated and described in item 1007 of schedule II of the said agreement, shall not be in effect after March 31, 1947, and that the provisions of paragraph 1007 of section 1 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (46 Stat. 644), shall be in effect on and after April 1, 1947.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at Washington this 23d day of February A. D. 1947, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred seventy-first.

Conscientious Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles dealing with conscientious objectors, one by Dorothy Thompson published in the New York Post of December 23, 1946, and one by Paul Jones published in the Saturday Evening Post of November 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post of December 23, 1946]

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Amnesty the CO's

Now that the second postwar Christmas is here, would it not be fitting to free American conscientious objectors from prison?

The Allied Governments went to war against war. In Nuremberg they have tried German Nazis for the crime of resorting to aggressive war as an instrument of national policy. The speeches made in the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly have repeated, over and over, charges and counter charges that this or that nation or regime is a "threat to the peace." In all the world there is no statesman who would dare praise war. All agree, or pretend to agree, that war is the world's greatest evil.

Then why do we keep locked up in jail or deprived of civil liberties some 6,000 Americans who have proved, more decisively than any others, that they agree with this "conscience of mankind?"

These men even did not believe in going to war against war, or that peace can be promoted by, what to their minds, is organized murder. They refused to serve in the American as others refused to serve in the British and French forces. I did not agree with them. I never have believed that individual pacifism will stop war.

Yet I am glad they exist. I did not find it unjust to constrain them during war. For if one believes in anything as passionately as they, it is right and fitting that they should suffer for their belief as the brave young men, who idealistically offered their lives on the field of battle, suffered for theirs. It is well they exist. For no one can deny that if statesmen and leaders everywhere believed as they do, all war would end—international war, industrial war, civil war.

The conscientious objector is a peculiar phenomenon of free societies. Their attitude toward him, however, reluctant, is one of concession to something in their own consciences. In time of conflict conscientious objectors are profoundly embarrassing and in war's routine are pushed aside, shut up, in one way or another. But they are not shot as traitors, nor treated as totalitarian states treat objectors to anything. Free social orders are free precisely because they do not totally claim the bodies, minds, and souls of their people. Even in a life and death struggle to which an entire nation is committed, free men recognize that this or that one of them who says, "No, I will have no part in this thing," may, conceivably prove right on longer view; and though he becomes temporarily outcast, something still whispers: His time may yet come.

Just why, however, in time of peace, and praise of peace, those who believe in peace at any price should still be treated as prisoners of war, is confounding. I should think it would be a good idea to pull them out of their prisons, everywhere, and send them to make the peace. For they actually believe that all the swords should be beaten into ploughshares. They would not talk of limitations of armament, but of universal total disarmament.

This is, of course, fantastic and it will not be done because states, who must make and maintain peace, are, by their origin and nature, instruments of force. Peace, too, rests on force and peace and war are but two faces of the same humanity and dilemma.

But humanity, being what it is, cannot afford to exclude from itself those who represent—whether humanity acknowledges it or not—that spirit which it secretly worships and openly affronts.

To understand the paradoxical attitude toward peace would perhaps lead us into a research on the question of why western man, the greatest beast of prey ever let loose on this globe, worships Jesus of Nazareth. The great split in the western mind is that while it has produced the warrior as a type and ideal in social and economic life as well as in international relations; while it can only imagine supplanting war between states by war between classes, it still celebrates in its loftiest moments Him who prophesied that the meek would inherit the earth.

Perhaps what grace we possess is in that never triumphant inner voice of conscience, that never-realized and barely striven-for ideal that in the most warring moments whisper restraint. Conscientious objectors become such restraining voices in the most hate-infested times. They carry on for the vast majority their temporarily abandoned tender-mindedness. In a profound sense

they represent us all—as the warriors fighting for righteousness represents them, too, though they would deny it.

But it is preposterous and hypocritical that they should continue in prison during peace. They never wanted to help win—or lose—a war. They endured the obloquy of their fellows to win peace. Isn't that what we are all, now, supposed to be up to?

And isn't it Christmas?

[From the Saturday Evening Post of November 23, 1946]

SHOULD THE CO'S GO FREE?

(By Paul Jones)

Last fall General MacArthur ordered the release of nearly 1,000,000 political prisoners in Japan, including pacifists. In July of this year General Clay announced an amnesty for about 1,000,000 German political offenders under the age of 27. Canada has ended her draft-registration system and written off the cases of some 14,000 deserters, including 8,000 conscripts who took to the woods rather than report for induction. Only 13 conscientious objectors remain in British jails.

In this country, President Truman has proclaimed a general amnesty for all men convicted for any reason under Federal law who later served meritoriously in the armed forces during World War II. But our conscientious objectors remain in prison or do what amounts to forced labor for little or no pay in the Civilian Public Service camp and unit system, supervised by Selective Service.

Under the act of 1940 establishing the draft, 32,248,038 citizens between the ages of 18 and 65 were required to register, up to October 1, 1945. Of these, approximately 15,000,000 passed through the armed services. During the same time the FBI investigated a total of 519,864 complaints of selective-service violations, of which about 30,000 were worth taking to trial.

Only a minority of these cases were concerned with conscientious objectors. Some 6,000 conscientious objectors drew prison terms, about 60 percent for failing to report for induction and 27.9 percent for failing to report for civilian public service when given that choice. The number of conscientious objectors jailed for active obstruction, counseling or aiding evasion was only 28, a microscopic fraction either of the total called up or of the conscientious-objector group itself.

Objectors differed among themselves on the extent and application of their individual or group principles. Some who objected to the use of force served with credit in medical or noncombatant detachments, and one earned a Medal of Honor for conspicuous bravery beyond the call of duty. But others were unable to reconcile their beliefs with any participation in war. About 1,500 of these men are still in prison. The 4,500 who have been released have lost their civil rights and can regain them only through an amnesty.

More than 70 percent of those sentenced to imprisonment belonged to Jehovah's Witnesses, a stiff-necked and peculiar people who took no stand on the war itself, but claimed that each and every member of their church was ipso facto a minister of religion, and therefore entitled to absolute exemption. Failing this concession, they would do nothing. In general, they drew stiffer sentences than other CO's, but they were definitely conscientious objectors by religious belief.

Congress, in the original draft act, set just and reasonable terms on which a man conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form might substitute work of national importance under civilian direction. Pay for such service in CPS camps or projects was not to exceed Army scales. But in practice selective service by administrative regulation put CO's to work in Government camps without pay, without family allotments, and without insurance or accident compensation. They got nothing but a pin-money allowance of $2.50 a month. Where church groups managed CPS camps, they were compelled to pay $35 a month for the support of each CO. These impossible conditions, in apparent contradiction to the intent of Congress, drove many CO's to desert the camps, with consequent prison sentences.

Local draft boards made their decisions on the good or bad faith of asserted conscientious scruples as best they could, according to their lights. Some refused to believe that a Methodist or a Catholic or anybody not a member of the historic peace churches like the Friends could possibly be a sincere CO. Reviewing authorities were not much clearer on many points, and the courts up to the Supreme Court—Justice Murphy dissenting—agreed that no judicial relief was possible unless and until the individual obeyed the induction order. This, of course, was what many CO's felt was against their deepest convictions.

Sentences imposed by the courts on convicted offenders varied very widely. The average was 30.6 months, higher than the punishment given to dope peddlers, white slavers, or mail swindlers. But in Vermont, during the year ending June 30, 1943, the average was 1.1 months; in South Dakota during the same period it was 55.7 months. Everything depended on the Federal judge hearing the case.

Today, in the Northwest, CO's are let off or given a suspended sentence. In the East an over-age objecter—31—who has been in Civilian Public Service since June 1942, when he was drafted, recently received a 6 months' term in prison for walking out of a mental hospital where he had been assigned to work as an attendant. During his more than 3 years in CPS he had volunteered as an experimental guinea pig in important vitamin and cerebral-blood-flow tests.

The picture is confusing, as it always is when the ideal of individual liberties comes in conflict with the necessities of total war. In all civilized, democratic countries freedom of conscience is one of the most jealously guarded human rights. But when the national existence is deemed to be at stake and when the law requires all male citizens of certain ages to serve, the conscientious objector must suffer for his belief. Generally, the climate of war being what it is, he suffers rather more than he should.

But in all free, civilized countries, it is also true that when the danger is ended and the emergency over, governments of that kind restore as quickly as possible the normal state of affairs. To extend an amnesty now to conscientious objectors could do no possible harm, and would follow a sound American tradition recognized by such widely different Presidents as Washington, Lincoln, and Coolidge.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Jones is a member of the editorial staff of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Clarence J. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD A. COFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, chairman of the executive committee of the Republican National Committee, delivered before the National Republican Club of New York, February 12, 1947:

Mr. Rager, Governor Stassen, Congressman Macy, Dr. Peale, my fellow Americans of the National Republican Club, your guests, and the radio audience, I deem it a great honor and a rare privilege to be invited to address your patriotic Republican organization tonight on this anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln—the man of destiny given to the Nation in an hour of crisis by Divine Providence.

As Republicans and good Americans we meet here to pay tribute to Abraham Lincoln, the man, the President, and the true founder of the Republican Party, who gave his life in martyrdom that the Nation he loved might survive.

Lincoln not only saved the Union, but he also led the world into a new era of human freedom.

Lincoln was a true liberal, and it is the Lincoln type of liberalism which I would like to discuss with you for a while tonight.

Of course, in this day and age, everybody calls himself a liberal. It seems to be the fashion. But when it comes to definitions of the word "liberal," there are thousands of them. There are as many varieties of liberals as there are kinds of breakfast foods advertised over the radio. Each variety has its own brand and its own label. There are Republican liberals, Democrat liberals, Socialist liberals, and Communist liberals.

Frankly, as I look them over and listen to their preachments, it seems to me they cannot all be liberals. In fact, they do not agree among themselves as to who is or who is not liberal, as well as on anything else.

It used to be, in the days of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, a liberal was a person who believed so much in human liberty that he wanted to share it with all mankind. His greatest desire was to increase human liberty for every human being.

Abraham Lincoln once said—"The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people just now are in need of one." Were Mr. Lincoln with us here tonight he would probably say the same thing about liberalism. In his amazingly homey manner he would undoubtedly point out that everybody wants to be known as a liberal but refuses to answer why. No doubt there are many different reasons why so many people want to be called liberal. From my own experience in Congress I am convinced that the activities and desires of many so-called liberals are limited to being liberal with other people's money—but there is certainly nothing truly liberal about that.

Now I do not want anyone to misunderstand me. I certainly do not believe—nor do I want you to think—that the Republican Party is either illiberal or reactionary. Instead, ours is a party which believes in the great fundamental of American civilization; that the Government was created by the people, in their common interest, to perform those tasks which they desire and need to perform in common—to do those things which the common weal requires to be done through a common effort.

No true Republican can possibly believe that the Government of the United States rules its people, or that the people are but hostages of government. Rather, we believe that the inalienable rights of the people cannot be weakened or lessened, whittled away or legislated out of existence, in a free country, such as ours is—and must always remain.

The so-called liberals of the New Deal differ on that. They believe the Government is the master. This was evidenced by the words of the leader of the New Deal, who

once said, "We have forged new instruments of power."

As Republicans and true liberals we deny that any individual, any party, or any group of men within our Nation, can forge new instruments of power. To believe otherwise would be a total negation of true Americanism which holds that all power is vested in the people, and that all public officials—whether elected or appointed—are but instruments of the people.

If that thought describes liberalism, I am for it.

If anything else is liberalism, I am against it.

I speak of this tonight because it has become fashionable in this country, not only for all kinds of diverse persons to call themselves liberals, but for all such folks to look away from their own country and toward the failures of Europe, the foreign experiments which missed fire, the alien trickeries and obscurities that brought to millions of human beings nothing but hunger, misery, and death. Why such people think the political and economic systems and theories of the Old World are so much better than our own is hard to understand.

If our form of government, our type of free economy and our way of life are all such poor ones, why is it that we alone, of all the peoples of the world, are able—after two great wars and a depression that lasted 10 long years—to feed ourselves and as much of the rest of the world as we are permitted to enter? Why is it that we have been able to contribute more than 70 percent of the cost of all the operations of UNRRA, in addition to the charitable work of our armed forces and our welfare agencies among both conquered and liberated peoples? Why is it that we have been able to carry the greatest burden of taxation and the heaviest load of debt ever known in the history of man without impoverishing our own people?

Why, may I ask, have we, among all the peoples of the earth, been strong enough to safeguard the liberties of man, to preserve his civil rights, and to protect him from the tyranny of government which elsewhere has enslaved him?

Certainly our American system must have real virtue to have accomplished all of these things. It must have real value if, in an era when opposition is being ruthlessly trampled under foot by those in power, the people of this country could, in a free election, choose and give to the opposition party a majority in the Congress, while leaving the new minority party in control of the executive department. It must have real worth, when these two political parties, without compromising their positions, can cooperate fully and patriotically in forming and supporting a national foreign policy.

It is free men who can, with dignity and high principle, choose their own pathways and walk them without fear. And, if the necessities of national welfare require that these paths converge and meet, that, too, is accomplished—not in terror and in trembling—but in the true spirit of free men who unite in love of country without in any way sacrificing the individuality of their convictions.

If that is liberalism, I am for it.

But any system or theory which involves compulsion of mind and spirit, as it does in many lands, and as some would have it here, cannot properly be called liberalism, and I desire a more accurately descriptive label.

You have undoubtedly noted that after the election of last November 5 the New Deal liberals broke up into many groups. One group is called ADA, as was announced at a meeting in Washington. Another is called PCA, which seems to be PAC somewhat twisted. That group was organized in New York. These ancient so-called liberals now designate themselves as Progressives, but they hate each other.

The ADA group say they refuse to associate with known Communists. The PCA folks are not so particular. One group is headed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; the other by Henry Wallace. It appears as though the object of each is the defeat of the Democratic Party in 1948 on the theory that if they and their New Deal friends cannot own the Democratic Party, then they will smash it.

If that be liberalism, I say, let them smash away.

Ladies and gentleman, I am convinced that the people of America are sick and tired of slogans, catch-phrases, and tricky words. I feel certain they are weary of charm without substance, of prose without philosophy. They are fed up with the schemers, the clever manipulators and the poll followers.

What the people of the United States seek today is honest political leadership based upon homespun American principles. They want a government that serves but does not master them. They want public officials who, adhering to the ideals of this Nation, apply practical common sense to its management. They desire a President who is frank, outspoken, honest, fearless—one who says what he means and means what he says without regard to the momentary flurries of popularity. Most of all they want to be permitted to attend to their own affairs; to provide for their own families by their own labors; to determine and supervise the education of their own children; and to take an active part in restoring friendly relations among differing human beings, each of whom is endowed with certain inalienable rights by the Creator in whom all Americans believe.

Those of us who belong to the Republican Party, differing from those who prate so loudly of their liberalism, recognize the imperfections of man and are able to refrain from attributing to ourselves the qualities of omniscience which only the Deity can possess. We appreciate that the people may not always be right, or always act wisely, but that out of necessity they have the right of choice—the right to decide for themselves—as to the pattern their own lives shall follow.

No Republican desires to control the life or acts of others.

As Abraham Lincoln so wisely put it: "Human nature will not change. In any future great national trial, compared with the men of this war, we shall have those who are as weak and as strong, as silly and as wise, as bad and as good."

There are 140,000,000 of us who are like that today. We have our weaknesses and our strength. We have our foolishness and our wisdom. We are both bad and good. But together we have produced the freest, happiest, most prosperous country on earth—the envy of all the world.

Let us keep America great, happy, and prosperous, but even more, let us keep her free.

Brooklyn Newspaper Praised House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am calling attention herewith to an editorial published in the Brooklyn Tablet, published in Brooklyn, N. Y. The editorial deals with the procedures and policies of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New Jersey, J. PARNELL THOMAS.

The Brooklyn Tablet is one of those papers which is courageously waging a campaign to enlighten its readers and its community on the evils and excesses of the Communist conspiracy in this country. It is helping to put the spotlight of public opinion upon the party members and the fellow travelers of the Communist Party in America. It is aiding in the exposure of the many front organizations which are infiltrated with Communists. It is consequently with pleasure that I observe the high words of praise which this patriotic paper has written about the current program of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

WELL DONE

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is proceeding with its investigation in a manner which deserves the approval of the American people. The charge has been made repeatedly by Louis J. Budenz, one-time Communist and managing editor of the Daily Worker, that the Communist Party in the United States is an effective fifth column for Soviet Russia, definitely engaged in a conspiracy to destroy our American form of government and to substitute the Soviet form in its place. The report of J. Edgar Hoover on the activities of Gerhard Eisler, whom Budenz named as the No. 1 man of the Soviets in the United States, indicates a wide field for the investigation of the House committee to uncover the extent of the Communist conspiracy and of Soviet espionage.

The House committee is definitely on the right track and is proceeding with a carefulness and a dignity that will allow no basis for the charge that it is indulging in Red baiting or engaging in a "witch hunt." Thus far the House committee has more than justified its existence both in the facts which it has brought to light and in the manner with which its proceedings have been conducted. In the more recent past subversive activities have been carried on, while much of the worth-while efforts of those interested in uncovering these activities were wasted amid the confusion of side issues and "red herrings" drawn across the trail of investigation. Collaboration between the FBI and the House committee should bring the results which the American people want in ferreting out the real conspirators and the men behind the scenes in subversive activity. For what the House committee has accomplished thus far it deserves a "Well done" from the American people.

United States Eyes Boston Vets' Job School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, by Bill Cunningham, from the Boston Sunday Herald of February 23, 1947:

UNITED STATES EYES BOSTON VETS' JOB SCHOOL—SESSIONS HELP EX-GI SCAN FIELD, SIZE UP HIMSELF, CONVINCE EMPLOYER

(By Bill Cunningham)

Official governmental endorsement and national recognition is about to be extended to a Boston idea as well as to the Bostonian who evolved the idea. The idea is Boston's own plan for helping veterans find jobs. The Bostonian is Roland Darling, whose title is director of the School for Jobs of the Greater Boston Veterans' Service Center, a red-feather service.

Don't tune us out at this point, under the misapprehension that this is only another article about veterans, about job hunting, or even about Roland Darling, a gentleman who is by no means a stranger to this space. There'll be sundry ingredients in this particular thesis. First of all there's some news.

The news is that Darling's public-service academy for teaching ex-GI's how to look for work has been secretly sized up, tested, officially approved, and is now about to be cited as a model to every city in the United States. Darling himself has been asked by Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, Retraining and Reemployment Administrator of the United States Labor Department, to come to Washington next month and address a meeting of the directors of veterans' centers who will be assembled there from all parts of the country.

Further than that the Labor Department, within 2 weeks, will issue a booklet describing in full the Boston School for Jobs procedures and processes and distribute it through the Nation as the officially endorsed program for this type of activity.

All this came as a complete surprise to Mr. Darling, and to the gentlemen who assist him and who might be called his faculty. It seems that Major General Erskine heard of the work in Washington, and in order to check on it sent a couple of his own men to pose as vets and take the course.

These visitors returned to Washington such enthusiastic alumni that their report brought the Director himself on for an official visit last December. From that report, that visit, and a survey of similar needs over the rest of the Nation came the official endorsement and recommendation.

REALLY A SCHOOL FOR JOB FINDING

This "School for Jobs" is a war translation of the late and unlamented depression's "40-Plus Club," which was likewise founded by Mr. Darling and which has been widely publicized. Now under the mothering wing of the Community Fund the School for Jobs is really a School for Job Finding. It offers no jobs and has no jobs to offer, but it concerns itself with teaching the veteran how to size up the field, size up himself, and then go about selling himself to an employer.

A man can attend as many times as he desires, but "the course" is really so arranged that he can get what it has to offer in two fairly lengthy sessions. The first of these provides him with information about how to approach employers. The second schools him in what to say and do and ask during an interview.

That's the school part, but there is really a lot more. Each "pupil" receives, for instance, a manual which was written with the help of 50 Boston employers and employment managers. He gets occupational information about the fields in which there are supposed to be openings available to veterans. He gets individual job counseling if he needs it or wants it. There's a weekly bull session on job hunting in which he can sit in, swapping information and tips with men such as himself. Out of these, jobs frequently come as some unsuccessful applicant explains what he lacked or what some job lacked to make a perfect fit.

Along with all this Mr. Darling, with the cooperation of local radio stations, broadcasts a regular series of job forums. This serves to keep public interest kindled and the hope always is to interest the local employer.

COST TO VETERAN IS NOTHING

The cost of this to the veteran is nothing. The Community Fund pays the expenses. The school is operated by Darling and a research assistant. The job counseling is done by trained job counselors at the Greater Boston Veterans' Service Center. The weekly schedule of meetings for any veterans who may be interested is as follows:

Tuesday evening at 7 o'clock, first session at the Boston YMCA, Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock, first session at Radio Station WEEI. Wednesday evening at 7 o'clock, first session at the Hickox Secretarial School. Wednesday evening at 7 o'clock, second session at Hickox Secretarial School. Local employers and employment managers cooperate fully with the undertaking. In 5 months a total of 257 of these have participated in the school's program.

The school has no accurate record of what happens to its alumni. Operating as a free service on Red Feather funds, and with such things as mimeographing and necessary personnel donated, it naturally keeps its budget as low as it can. It hasn't the office force necessary to handle records and paper work and there's no particular reason why postgraduate records should be kept anyhow.

Men who get jobs are asked to report their success. Those who don't are invited to come back with their failures. Some do. Some don't. It is known however that hundreds who have taken the course have found jobs and are working. How much of the credit belongs to the school and how much to the fact that this has been a hiring market up to here, anyhow, might be hard to tell. Nobody's trying to tell. The idea is to help the veteran find a job, and none at least has had his chances lessened by taking this short but expertly administered briefing in how to look and what to say.

NOW WILL SERVE AS NATIONAL MODEL

That, in brief, is the outline and the service to date of the Boston School for Jobs now to serve as the national model. That, however, is not all the story there is in this particular subject. Veterans are veterans, and some of them will always be hard to place. There's the case, for example, of the veteran 31 years of age who had 4 years of war and before that 8 years in the CCC. He never, up to here, has had a job in his life. He has a wife and three children. Where can he be placed in a job that will support them all?

But granting all the problem cases and the general unsettlement, a very real idea of the Nation's progress in reconversion can be had from watching how these young men do or do not slip easily into employment. Other things can be read—the effects of strikes for instance. Mr. Darling, at the moment, is concerned. He's concerned because his student body is increasing and because he sees in it a recognizable number of repeaters. A certain percentage of men who got jobs 3 or 4 months ago are back. Through the October-November-December period, the average of his school ran something over 800. Today it's 1,200 and as above, it's the second time around for quite a number.

But who are these men? Where have they been? What do they know? What can they do?

STATISTICS OF AN AVERAGE GROUP

Last Wednesday, at the request of your correspondent, Mr. Darling checked without preliminary announcement and taking simply those who came, and as they came, a group that reported for the regular job class session. The following statistics resulted:

The average age was 26 years, 11 months; 72 percent were unmarried, 18 percent were married and fathers, 10 percent were married but childless. The average time since discharge was 11 months. One man, however, has been out 3 years. Another was on terminal leave. In terms of work experience, 64 percent had jobs before the war and have also worked since their discharge; 20 percent never worked before going into uniform and have been unable to find jobs since; 6 percent had prewar jobs, but have not been employed since discharge; 10 percent went into service directly from school and have not as yet found a job.

In terms of compensation, 70 percent had collected their $20 a week under the GI bill in some period, but only 4 percent had taken it all. The average man in the group had taken his $20 for 14 weeks. In terms of physical fitness that might have bearing on occupational availability, 22 percent reported service-connected disabilities, but all were looking for work.

In educational background 4 percent had only a grade-school education; 25 percent were high school graduates, but went no farther; 18 percent had started college, but failed to finish; 8 percent were college graduates. Ten percent started, but did not finish high school, but every man in this particular group had taken a commercial or trade-school course. Thirty percent of the entire group had improved their educational status since discharge with the help of the GI bill of rights. Another 25 percent had been unable to get into the schools or colleges to which they applied for further education.

EDUCATION SEEMS TO EASE CONFUSION

Of this entire group, 22 percent said they didn't know what sort of jobs to seek, and 60 percent of these have had jobs since discharge, but had lost them.

A generality seemed to be that the men with the least education were the most confused in the matter of their job objectives. Several of the younger seemed confused because they went into uniform from jobs in war work that paid much more than anything offered today. One 22-year-old veteran said he earned $90 a week before going into uniform. For 10 months, he's been loafing on his $20 a week, without even taking any courses. He said he didn't have any idea of what sort of job to look for. His educational equipment is three years of high school.

A large percentage of those who had been employed and had lost their jobs said they had been laid off within the last 60 days along with other employees of the same concerns. It was this last item that started Mr. Darling talking.

"I want to make it plain," he said, "that I am not an economist and that it is no part of my business to report upon the industrial scene. Our concern here is to take a confused young fellow, help him figure out what he thinks he can do, and then try to help him walk in to an employment manager and tell his story the most intelligent way. We have no jobs here to offer and no authority to comment upon why more jobs are or are not available.

"We are, however, quickly conscious of these lay-offs because they generally send men back to us. Strikes, holding up critical materials, have been and are just now being responsible for many of these. The electronics field, for instance, was expected to be terrific in this postwar period. Instead, it isn't hiring. In fact, it's laying off. Lack of critical materials is the reason. It can't work. The stuff isn't coming through.

"The same is true in the field of electrical refrigeration. Many a GI who saw that as a promising career, and who used his GI bill of rights to take courses in it, is stalled at present, because it is stalled. Instead of hiring, it's laying off.

"That's a factor, and a big one, but I think, too, there's a possibility that the public is in

danger of thinking itself into the muchly advertised 'rescession.' Practically everybody has predicted that a recession is coming. Nobody ever explained why one had to come, but the word has gone around. If it keeps going around a recession can't avoid arriving. From what we see here, many employers, instead of driving full tilt to make one impossible, listen to the bear stories, lay off men, and batten their hatches against the possibility of having to ride one out. That may or may not be a way to survive one, but it's a certain way to help bring one. We get that here on our end.

EMPLOYERS MAY HAVE WRONG IDEA

"Those are things, however, that are a little out of my sphere. But something else isn't. That's a word to employers about the type of veteran now looking for work. I'm afraid the average employer may get the false idea that the men calling on him now represent the bottom of the barrel. Especially if a veteran has had a job and has lost it, I'm afraid a prospective employer will think he isn't any good.

"That isn't the way it is. As these statistics show, many of these men weren't laid off because they couldn't do the job. They went out in a general lay-off, a shut-down, when old help as well as new was let out. But there's another type. That's the young fellow who overmatched himself, or who allowed some employer to overmatch him. He deliberately tried for something he wasn't certain he could do, or some boss, figuring he was a veteran and entitled to a break, gave him a job that was a little beyond him on the chance that maybe he could handle it. Whichever way it was, it didn't work out, and the young fellow's back where he started.

"That's nothing against him. He just tried for the wrong job, possibly conscious of the fact that he was taking a chance. I can't, and don't want to, try to pose as an expert upon why there aren't more jobs and shouldn't be more all the time, but I can, and do, urge employers who do have jobs, not to jump at conclusions about veterans who have had a chance and have lost it. In as many cases as not, it isn't the veteran's fault. If the employer has any doubts, let him give us the chance to talk with him. We know the story here and we'll be glad for the sake of him, the veteran, the community, and the Nation, to show him the true picture before he makes his decision. That's our job and we're trying to do it."

The Coming Moscow Conference—Statement on Poland's Recovered Territories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I called upon the State Department, and I submitted the following statement to the Secretary of State:

As the crucial Moscow conference of Foreign Ministers approaches, proposals are being made that Germany should be given back her territories which, as a result of the Potsdam Agreement, were placed under Poland's administration. The constituents of my district—largely populated by Americans of Polish descent—are alarmed by this attitude. They cannot understand why we should want to reward those responsible for World War II at the expense of our allies, the Polish people. Indeed, the entire Polish-American community—6,000,000 strong—is united in its belief that for the sake of the future peace and security of America and the world, Poland should retain her recovered territories.

From whatever angle one examines this question it becomes apparent that the Potsdam Agreement was just and correct in taking these areas away from Germany and placing them under Poland's control.

For the past one thousand years, Germany has followed a policy of brutal aggrandizement against all of its neighbors and particularly against the Polish nation and the Polish people. The territory east of the Oder and the Neisse Rivers is ancient Polish land which was taken away from them by German military power. It is time to declare an end forever to the German policy of "Drang nach osten." Under the Potsdam Agreement the Polish nation is not being rewarded with 1 inch of German lands. The policy is one of restoring to the Polish people lands that had been previously taken from them by German military power.

For years these territories have been the lair of Prussian militarism. The large Junker estates provided the base from which the Prussian militarists prepared their wars of conquest, including World War II. Silesia was used as an arsenal of war.

By returning these territories to Poland, the great powers at Potsdam provided safeguards that would prevent the Nazi and Junker remnants from playing a dominant role in future German policy. Today, under Poland's administration, the Junker caste has been rooted out of these territories. If these lands are wrested from Poland, we will sow the seeds for a revived Prussianism and provide Germany with a base for future aggression.

America's future security to a great extent depends upon Germany being unable to commit acts of aggression against its neighbors. Germany's bordering nations must be given sound strategic frontiers. Poland, a direct neighbor of Germany, has been over the centuries an easy victim of German expansion. This was due to the absence of a defensible border which rendered her vulnerable to attack by Germany. Poland is now guaranteed a protective border along the Baltic and the Oder and Neisse Rivers. This not only means greater security for the European nations, but also, for America.

Since Potsdam, Poland has realized many economic, social, and cultural achievements in these territories. Despite grave shortages in transportation, communication, supplies, etc., over 4,000,000 Poles have been resettled and approximately 500,000 Germans remain. Devastated areas have been rebuilt, fallow fields resown, transportation and communication lines repaired, factories resurrected from the ruins, and thousands of schools and hundreds of libraries started. In short, the basis for a fuller and richer life has been laid. If these territories are taken away from Poland, all the good that has been accomplished will be undone.

While under German control, some of these industries and agricultural lands never developed to their fullest extent. This was due to the Junkers who, in order to perpetuate their own feudal power, purposely kept their lands agricultural and distant from the central German markets.

Now, for the first time in its history, the Polish Nation has an opportunity to develop a healthy industrial economy. The return of Stettin and Pomerania, and its control of the Oder River, insures Poland rapid expansion of the Silesian industries and the possibility for increased foreign trade. Poland particularly needs heavy machinery for her reconstruction program in the recovered territories. America can supply this much-needed industrial product. American independent businessmen will profit by the trade possibilities with Poland's recovered territories.

But, without the recovered territories, Poland's 3-year plan for economic reconstruction would be severely wrecked. The five or six million Poles who in 3 years will have resettled in these areas would have to live in a much smaller area. Without these areas, Poland would have overpopulation, low consumption, and a lower standard of living. The effect this would have on world trade is obvious.

As if these considerations were not sufficient to warrant Poland's retention of these territories, some industrialists, columnists, and politicians are posing specious and untenable arguments to show why certain areas, Pomerania and Brandenburg in particular, should be given back to Germany. They argue that these areas were the peacetime granary of Germany, and that if they are not given back to the Germans, America will have to bear the burden of supplying them with necessary foodstuffs.

This is the same tune that was sung by the German delegation at Versailles. Then, just as today, the stanch defenders of German interests claimed that these areas were economically indispensable to the rest of Germany. But many German scholars have proven conclusively that Pomerania and Brandenburg are no more indispensable to Germany today than they were after World War I.

In the light of the foregoing facts, Americans of Polish descent feel that the Potsdam decision revising the Polish-German frontier, and placing 39,000 square miles of territory under Poland's administration, was correct and timely. Any deviations from this policy will do irreparable harm to the cause of world peace. The American people above all want an enduring peace, security, and a more fruitful life. They hope that our representatives at the Moscow Conference will recognize these desires by supporting a program of preventing Germany from ever again becoming a threat to world peace. One of the essentials of such a program is for Poland to retain her ancient territories.

The Function of Congress Is To Legislate and Not To Bargain

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the President issued a formal statement discussing a purported agreement between the executive branch and legislative branch of the Government with reference to reciprocal trade agreements.

I have never known of the executive department and the legislative department of Government entering into any agreements of any kind. Under our constitutional government the legislative branch cannot speak except through legislative enactments made according to law and according to the rules of the two legislative bodies. The President has no authority to legislate. The President's statement is to the effect that he and his State Department made an agreement with reference to reciprocal trade agreements with certain Republican leaders in one of the legislative departments of the Government.

The rules of the House of Representatives do not permit me to be more specific, but it is generally known to whom and what I refer. The President says in effect that he has made this agreement and that he is carrying out his part of the agreement and that he is glad that from all indications the other gentlemen will carry out their part of the agreement and that as a result the proposed conference which is to be held in Geneva on April 10 will be permitted to be carried on with apparent accord of the executive and legislative branches of our Government. According to the President's statement this agreement resulted from conversations between two members of the State Department and two members of one of the legislative branches of the Government.

I wish to protest most vigorously against any such action. I think that every Congressman and every Senator who does not feel that he has given his consent to be bound by any such agreement should also join with me in expressing our resentment against any such attempted action. I maintain that we as Members of the legislative branch of the Government are sent here to legislate in an orderly fashion where every Member of the House and every Member of the Senate has a chance to publicly state his position with reference to the matters presented. The agreements of one or two individuals surely cannot commit the entire legislative body, both the House and Senate. This would be clearly inconsistent with our theory of government.

The Constitution provides that all legislation for the raising of revenue should be initiated by the House of Representatives. The Constitution goes further and makes it a duty and responsibility of the House of Representatives to assume this important function. This is in effect the control of the purse strings of the Nation, which the founding fathers expressly delegated to the House of Representatives.

All legislation dealing with the setting up of the agencies by which the reciprocal trade agreements are made originated with the House of Representatives upon the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee of that body.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has pending before it legislation dealing with the matter of reciprocal trade agreements. That committee has been diligent and has indicated through its chairman that it expects at an early date to give thorough consideration to all of these matters pending before it and which deal with exactly the same matters which the President claims he has settled by compromise with certain individual legislators.

The common courtesy which has existed between the various branches of the Government from the beginning would strongly recommend that if the President wished to have any communication with the legislative branch of the Government with reference to this matter that he should communicate with that branch of the Congress constitutionally having charge of the matter.

While bills have been introduced seeking to repeal reciprocal trade agreement laws, it is not likely that they will be given immediate consideration by the Ways and Means Committee or the Republican leadership of the House. The Ways and Means Committee, however, has indicated that it will give immediate consideration to legislation which seeks to relieve the conditions against which many industries and labor organizations have bitterly complained.

On January 16, 1947, I introduced a resolution in the House known as House Resolution 52. By this resolution, I attempt to bring legislative relief to the complainants. More goods were imported into the United States in 1946 than in any year in our history. These importations have been increasing gradually until they now threaten the existence of many producing industries in our own country. This resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the President and all agencies of the Federal Government are hereby requested to postpone any action seeking the further adjustment of duties under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act), as amended, until sufficient time has elapsed to permit a scientific study of the necessity for further action under the reciprocal trade agreements policy. The United States Tariff Commission is hereby directed to make such scientific study and report its findings to the Congress.

The resolution seeks to accomplish two purposes:

First. It requests the President to postpone any further reduction of duties until sufficient time has been given to have a scientific study of the necessity for making such reductions.

Second. It requests that the United States Tariff Commission be directed to make these studies and to report its findings to the Congress.

This resolution does not in any way seek to repeal any portion of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This resolution has been approved by many industries in the country and also by the labor organizations representing the employees of such industries. It has also been approved by many Members of Congress, who have shown their approval in communications which they have sent to the President or the State Department, which administers the reciprocal trade agreement laws.

Not until this proposed legislation was so vigorously supported did the President or the State Department show any inclination to improve the conditions against which so many complained. Negotiations were then begun by the State Department with some members of the legislative branches of the Government by which the State Department promised to change its method of dealing with the American public in its enforcement of these trade-agreement laws. In due time these overtures were communicated to some members of the Ways and Means Committee and were rejected on the ground that practically everything the State Department promised to do it was already bound to do under the law. The State Department was now offering, in response to public demand, to do the things which it should have done in the past.

It is little wonder, then, that the President so proudly boasts that he has effected this agreement to which I have referred. All the President does and promises by his Executive order is the things that should have been done previously.

As proof of this, how could the President now do and order done anything different than what he had a right to do previously? This Congress has enacted no additional legislation of any kind and has given the President and the Secretary of State no additonal authority. The President does nothing more than to admit the failure of his State Department to do what it should have done. He admits that the complaints of the American businessmen and the laboring men are well founded, and that he and his State Department have deliberately ignored the rights of these people under the law.

In his statement he discusses escape clauses to be a part of the new agreements. Every contract entered into since the first contract of 1935 provides escape clauses which would have been adequate if the State Department had not arrogantly refused to give any consideration to the complaints of aggrieved parties. His promise that future agreements should contain more adequate clauses because it is well recognized that since the Mexican agreement was made all future agreements shall contain adequate escape clauses.

One of the fundamental bases of all reciprocal trade agreements is the difference between the cost of production in a foreign country as against the cost in our country. There is no question but that the Tariff Commission, whose duty it is to seek this information with reference to cost of production, has been unable to do so and that the State Department does not now possess adequate knowledge and information with reference to foreign costs to enable the State Department to properly deal with other countries so as to protect American interests. There are instances where commodities have been imported into our country during the last few months when the State Department authorities and the Tariff Commission knew or should have known that the same were brought into the country at a price much below our cost of production.

Every trade agreement heretofore entered into has resulted in a reduction of duty on commodities coming into the United States. While the State Department authorities have a right to increase as well as to reduce, the records fail to disclose that any increased rates have ever been agreed upon.

The President and the State Department have condescended to make these concessions which they have been bound to make under the law from the beginning simply because of the protest made by American industry and American labor and by the introduction of House Resolution 52 and other bills dealing with the same subject.

The House of Representatives should proceed in an orderly way to deal with this subject regardless of any horse-trading tactics by any other departments of the Government. This is an important matter that should be handled as the law provides. We should not permit the prerogatives of the House of Representatives to be usurped. We owe a duty to the American people to conduct legislative matters according to law and the rules of our duly elected and duly constituted legislative bodies.

Federal Grants-in-Aid

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a speech on February 10, I called the attention of the House to the startling growth in recent years of Federal grants-in-aid to the various States and Territories. I pointed out that the Federal Government had usurped the position of the State and local units of government as the greatest spender of the taxpayer's dollar, and that while the States as a whole remain relatively solvent, the Federal Government's financial position has become admittedly precarious. In view of these facts, I suggested that the whole system of aids and grants should be thoroughly reexamined, saying:

In connection with this reexamination I think we might well ask three questions in connection with every aid and grant that is made. First, if it is absolutely essential to the welfare of the Nation; second, if it is not historically and constitutionally a more proper function of the State and local governments; and, three, if the individual States in view of their present financial condition are not better able to assume the entire responsibility for some of these functions.

When this had been done, I suggested that those functions which were found to be within the proper jurisdiction of the Federal Government be reviewed and scrutinized carefully for waste, confusion, and duplication with services offered by the various subordinate units of government. I called the attention of the House to a resolution adopted by the board of managers of the Council of State Governments at Miami Beach, Fla., on December 4, 1946, which said in part:

These systems (grants-in-aid) * * * have developed separately and independently without relation to each other, with the result that there is a different policy, different program, and different administrative procedure with respect to almost every activity. The net result has been and is overlapping, duplication, and confusion which not only result in waste of public funds but also make it extremely difficult for the States to establish and maintain a constructive and economic over-all budget system.

So that the Congress may have all the facts in order to eliminate Federal grants where possible and to place them where necessary upon an efficient and productive basis, I have today introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of existing programs to provide aid to States and territories by grants-in-aid, by payments in lieu of taxes, by matched payments, and by other means, with the view of recommending which of such programs, if any, should be continued and of recommending the policies that should be adopted and procedures that should be followed with respect to such programs in order to limit expenditures to the lowest amount necessary for the efficient performance of essential services and to eliminate duplications and overlappings of, and conflicts between, Federal and State agencies.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) on or before the tenth day following the date on which the second session of the Eightieth Congress begins the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memmoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution will go far, I believe, to place us upon a sounder financial basis by clarifying and streamlining the whole system of Federal grants-in-aid. I urge its early consideration and passage.

Waste Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, from all parts of the country letters are pouring in to Congressmen urging economy in government and expressing approval of the action of the House in its efforts to reduce the Federal budget by a substantial amount. An editorial on this subject appeared in the Ottumwa (Iowa) Courier on February 18 which is worthy of having the attention of all Members of the House. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial from the pen of John Huston, who is editor of the Ottumwa Daily Courier:

WASTE CONTINUES

The country is honeycombed with Federal offices which had nothing or little to do with the prosecution of the war.

The number has been increased since the war ended. As means of reducing expenses of government this wasteful set-up seems to be ignored.

One diligent worker on economy in government is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, who is assisted by a joint committee from the two Houses of Congress. The major object of this group is to reduce nonessential Federal expenses with reference to the number of principal units in the executive branch.

It has found that in December 1946 there were 1,039 principal component parts of that branch of the Government. Exclusive of the Office for Emergency Management units, which dealt with war and postwar problems, the number last December was greater than it was at the height of the war.

In the rush of the emergency it was but natural that innumerable agencies, commissions, and boards should spring up. While even then their efforts overlapped, the situation was accepted as probably necessary to carry on the war effort.

All that is past now and what happens? Instead of being sliced down appreciably the number of such boards and commissions has increased. Cessation of hotilities has brought little reduction anywhere along the line in the tremendous war expansion of the Government.

As the Byrd committee observes, it is inconceivable that the departments and old-line agencies, expanded to 777 principal component parts at the height of the war, should now need to expand still further to require 920 principal component parts.

The conditions do more than that. They add weight to the repeatedly pointed out fact that the Government, with the exception of the War and Navy Departments and the war agencies, is constantly increasing. The VJ-day total of 957,683 employees has grown to 1,251,942 at the first of this year.

There is no justification for having in addition to the 1,039 component parts, 1,200 Federal offices in New York, 1,000 in Chicago, and more than 500 each in Philadelphia and Los Angeles, to mention only a few.

It is not enough that war agency offices be closed. This general hodgepodge collection of branch offices, field offices, regional offices, State, county, area, and district offices is an apparent attempt of the establishments of the executive branch of the Government to perpetuate themselves and their tax-draining personnel.

All this takes place in the face of constant demands on the part of Congress and the citizens as a whole to curtail expenditures.

Riley in the Box Struck Out Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following copyrighted article from the Arizona Daily Sun of January 29, 1947, by James Patrick McGovern, entitled "Riley in the Box Struck Out Casey," which should stir the blood of all who love the grand old American game of baseball:

RILEY IN THE BOX STRUCK OUT CASEY

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 29, 1947.—At a birthday dinner given me on January 24 in the National Press Club by some old friends, including Arizona's former United States Senator, Henry Fountain Ashurst, the talk drifted to baseball—past world series, featured players, and the like. Suddenly one of the guests participating in the round-table after-dinner discussion asked Ashurst, "Senator, as one so well informed on sports, can you tell us the name of the pitcher who struck out Casey?" With hardly a moment's hesitation the versatile Arizonian paid a tribute in verse to "Riley in the box, the man who struck out the mighty Casey," adding that "we should be spreading his fame instead of boosting the guy that lost that game." I scribbled down the lines as he proceeded and polished the rough edges a bit, with the following results:

RILEY IN THE BOX

"Who cares about this Casey who used to slam the ball
So far the fielders gasped to watch it clear the wall,
While roars of all the bleachers swept from stand to stand
With echoes that resounded from Mudville through the land?

"Who cares about this Casey now he has lost his crown?
The winner, not the loser, is the talk of every town.
Great Casey's star has fallen, while Riley's awes each tongue,
And this is how the saga by every fan is sung:

"In that tense ninth, with bases packed and two already out,
When Casey was expected to make his home-run clout,
All cheered the slugger Casey at bat to win the fray—
What chance had pitcher Riley's inshoot and fadeaway?

"It then was unknown Riley who proved his skill and grit,
He fired the ball like lightning into his catcher's mitt.
'Strike one,' the umpire shouted, while Casey at the plate
Thought that he might have swung, but he thought just too late.

"Again the obscure Riley wound up and shot the ball;
Again the bleachers waited, but saw no swing at all.
'Strike two,' the umpire bellowed, for Casey in blind pride
Judged the pitch an inshoot, but it cut the corner outside.

"Riley knew that Casey, now set to make a kill,
Would blast the cover—unless he missed—right off the pill;
And so he twirled a floater, slow and straight and square;
'Strike three.' Too soon great Casey madly struck—the air.

"Then Riley rode the shoulders of gleeful mates that day,
While Casey and all Mudville fled in shame away;
This Riley was so modest; that Casey had such gall.
Silent hero Riley—was not acclaimed at all.

"It's Riley in the box, not Casey at the bat,
A Mathewson of pitchers, not a Ruth of swat,
Whom fans now hold in wonder and reverence in name,
The greatest of the idols in baseball's hall of fame."

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Free Enterprise Versus Planned Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article from the New York Times of February 16, 1947:

"PLANLESS" ECONOMY HERE OUTWORKS ORDERED RIVALS—AMERICAN CRISES CALLED THOSE OF ABUNDANCE, AGAINST SCARCITIES, SHORTAGES ABROAD

(By Russell Porter)

A great paradox seems to be developing in the postwar economic world. The "planless" economy of the United States, which was expected to collapse in a major depression—at least as predicted by advocates of planned economy—thereby endangering the stability of the rest of the world, is still going right ahead, overcoming its own obstacles one after another and shipping abroad goods for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and for private relief as it sent lend-lease during the war, while the planned economies of Europe and Asia, despite all the aid that we have given them, are running into one economic crisis after another.

The coal shortage in Great Britain, despite its possession of some of the world's finest coal deposits, has furnished the most dramatic news of the week, threatening British industry with paralysis and the population with freezing, but difficulties have been reported elsewhere also. There are wheat crises in parts of Soviet Russia, threatening starvation in a land of almost unlimited agricultural resources; there are inflationary crises in France and China, threatening poverty and misery.

In America the immediate reaction has been traditionally humanitarian, as shown by President Truman's offer to divert coal shipments to England. There has been little or no gloating or smugness by the believers in free enterprise. Whatever ill-natured comment has come from the extreme right has been more than matched from the extreme left, notably in demands of the Communist press that Britain Socialists abandon the attempt to make nationalization conform to democracy and adopt the coercive methods of communism.

There has been wide agreement that Americans would be wise to study these foreign crises against the economic background of the countries in which they are taking place, with a view to learning whatever lessons may be applicable to our own economic future.

In this background two things seem particularly pertinent:

1. The crises of foreign countries under socialism and communism continue to be crises of scarcity, of shortages of food, clothing, and shelter, the necessities of life, which grind down the people; whereas the crises of free enterprise in the United States have been crises of abundance.

2. Foreign countries in general have never known free enterprise in the American sense—that is, individual competition protected by antitrust laws as well as private capitalism—but have allowed private capitalism to degenerate into private monopoly, which finally has become governmental monopoly in varying forms of socialism, communism, or fascism. Russia went directly from the monopoly of feudalism into the monopoly of communism; Britain, by way of domestic monopolies and international cartels under private management, into Socialist monopoly.

Some of the lessons which Americans seem to be drawing at least tentatively from world events today seem to be somewhat as follows:

1. Neither communism nor socialism can be depended upon to free the world automatically of militarism, imperialism, or poverty, despite all the claims of propagandists and all the dreams of utopians. In fact, these evils of monopoly capitalism seem to have been accentuated by Government monopoly, with the rivalry of Communist Russia and Socialist Britain keeping the world an armed camp nearly 2 years after the end of the war in Europe. With all the sympathy in the world for the people of the war-devastated areas, it is recognized that their governments still are keeping under arms men who might better be digging coal in Britain and growing wheat in Russia, and are forcing us to maintain a huge and costly Military Establishment.

2. Under any economic system, hard work and productivity remain the keys to individual and social well-being. Coal cannot be dug with socialistic tracts, nor wheat grown in Communist manifestoes.

3. The opportunities and incentives of free enterprise have given the American economic system a dynamic quality which has stimulated production and an ever-rising standard of living over the years, and have enabled it to save the world with its industrial machine in time of war and to feed and clothe it during peacetime emergencies.

4. So far communism and socialism have proved themselves as economically static as monarchy or private monopoly. Instead of goods for the people, they seem to produce an overabundance of sterile intellectualism or pseudo intellectualism, just as monarchy produced a shallow aristocracy, and private monopoly, an idle rich.

5. The great enemy of the people is monopoly, either private or governmental, because it restricts production, raises prices, lowers real wages and the standard of living, and exploits workers and consumers in the interests of a privileged class. But government monopoly is the worst, because, backed by military power and secret police, it is the hardest to get rid of. Legislation and public opinion can curb business and union monopolies, but only a revolution can free a people from a government monopoly that wants to perpetuate itself in power.

In view of such considerations, plus the first-hand reports of conditions abroad brought home by several million GI travelers, the American people seem to have made up their mind that free enterprise has proved itself both as an essential element of democracy and also as an economic asset.

United Automobile Workers, an Affiliate of World Federation of Trade Unions, Communist Dominated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD copy of a radio address which I made over Detroit's powerful radio station WJR, on February 8, 1947, showing that the United Automobile

Workers of America (CIO) is an affiliate of and subordinate to the World Federation of Trade Unions, which in turn is controlled by the Communist commissars in Moscow:

Fellow citizens of Detroit, tonight I wish to deal with a problem which is of grave concern to the many thousands of men and women in the automobile industry, to the people of Detroit, and to the Nation as a whole. I propose to show the full significance to all of us of the fact that the United Automobile Workers of America (CIO), which includes hundreds of thousands of men and women in this area, is an affiliate of and subordinate to an organization known as the World Federation of Trade Unions, which is controlled lock, stock, and barrel by the Communist commissars in Moscow. This organization is moving heaven and earth in its implacable hostility to the United States in every part of the world.

Let me make certain things plain at the outset, however. I am a full believer in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. I am a firm believer in the principle of labor-management cooperation for a better America. Labor and management must cooperate or they will both be doomed to Soviet slavery and destruction. But I am just as strongly opposed to any entanglements whereby American labor may become the pawn of a foreign power. I believe every loyal member of the United Automobile Workers agrees with me on this.

Therefore I question whether the commitment of the United Automobile Workers with the Soviet-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions was ever discussed in all its import with the rank and file of the union. Certainly no referendum of the members was ever taken on this all-important question. Since no one else has taken the initiative in telling the truth on this matter, I propose to do so today.

During the war there was some reasonable ground for an alinement with the Soviet trade unions in order to further the production of war materials and accomplish the speedy defeat of Adolf Hitler. In carrying out this task, the workers of Detroit did their full share and they are justly proud of it.

What sense is there to the affiliation of the auto workers with the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions today? A misleading pamphlet issued by the CIO recently attempts to show that no one country controls the organization. How can they overlook or deny the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Federation represents a Communist bloc of unions from the following countries: Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Italy, France, Latin America, and other lands? Why should any group of American workers subordinate itself to this set-up?

And let me ask what is the chief purpose of the World Federation of Trade Unions now that the war is over. I will tell you. Its purpose is to maneuver American labor against American industry and against the American Government, through politically inspired strikes and general strikes, motivated not by any desire to improve wages and working conditions for the American workers, but solely to further the imperialist designs of the Soviet Government. In the face of the fact that the United States has not sought any territorial aggrandizement from the recent war and in the face of the aggressive expansionism of the Soviet Union, the spokesmen of the World Federation of Trade Unions are actively propagating the idea that the United States is fomenting war against the Soviet Union.

"The choice before the workers of Europe and the workers of the world," said the Indian delegate to the September 1945 conference of the World Federation of Trade Unions in Paris, "is between the finance capital of the United States on the one hand and the social economic order which is represented by Soviet Russia alone on the other."

The French adherents of the World Federation of Trade Unions have called a boycott of American films, which may result in unemployment for American workers in the film industry. They may decide a similar movement against American automobiles next.

The Polish affiliates of the World Federation of Trade Unions adopted a resolution on September 7, 1946, which reads as follows: "Mr. Byrnes' speech constitutes a great danger, a danger of diverging from the road of general peace followed by the United Nations during the war, which road they promised to follow after the war."

William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, USA, has been even more outspoken about Communist aims in his statement of April 21, 1946, when he declared:

"It is imperative that the world's workers, through the World Federation of Trade Unions, should intervene in the proceedings of the United Nations in order to defeat the imperialists who are now active in that body and are threatening the peace of the world. . . . It should ring with protest against the war-mongering course now being followed by the American delegation in the United Nations. It should let Truman and Byrnes know that they are violating the peace will of the American people."

I am supremely confident that loyal American trade unionists do not want their organizations used to weaken the hands of the spokesmen of this country and that they are wholeheartedly in accord with a policy of firmness toward Soviet expansionism.

The World Federation of Trade Unions has appointed numerous investigating commissions to examine conditions in American occupation zones in Germany, Korea, Japan, and other areas. It has demanded independence for Puerto Rico. On no occasion, however, has it ventured to send investigators to the slave-labor camps in Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, and other Soviet-controlled areas. Nor has it demanded independence for any of the Soviet puppet states or free elections for any of these policed states. On the contrary, when a delegation of the World Federation, including Mr. R. J. Thomas, of the United Automobile Workers Union, visited the Soviet Union, it brought back a glowing report despite the deplorable living conditions, the abject standard of living, forced labor, the Stakhanoff speed-up system, and the absence of free trade unions.

In its desire to secure control of the entrance to the Mediterranean, the Soviet Union is conducting a world-wide agitation against the Spanish dictator, Franco. Unions affiliated with the World Federation of Trade Unions are being pressured to take strike action on an international scale toward this end and this goes for the auto workers of Detroit.

The Communist-ruled Latin-American Federation of Labor headed by one (Vincent Lombardo) Toledano, affiliated with the World Federation of Trade Unions, has denounced so-called American imperialism in Japan, Korea, the Philippines, China, and throughout Latin-America. It has condemned Present Truman's inter-American defense plan as "big stick" diplomacy. This inter-American position has been approved by the CIO News of January 6, 1947. Has this policy, reminiscent of the Communist line during the Stalin-Hitler pact, ever been approved by the membership of the CIO?

The WFTU affiliates in Iceland, Cuba, and Ecuador have opposed granting air bases to the United States for mutual defense purposes.

From these few examples it will be clear what V. V. Kuznetsov, delegate of the Soviet Government-sponsored trade unions, meant when he declared in Paris in September 1945 that the World Federation of Trade Unions "has various means at its disposal to compel governments and employers to reckon with it." Of course, he did not mean the Soviet Government, as a subject of such compulsion.

Clear too will be warning of the British trade union leader, Arthur Deakin, when he declared at the Paris WFTU conference, "We are asking for extra-constitutional recognition of a world organization providing that approach which goes beyond our internal affairs and may involve us in very serious commitments." Here and now I ask whether the working men and women of Detroit have been appraised of these commitments and whether they have been asked to approve of them.

The (Communist) Daily Worker of November 4, 1945, has described the World Federation of Trade Unions as "the result of efforts which began 25 years ago" with the Red International of Labor Unions with headquarters in Moscow. It was therefore singularly appropriate that the meeting of the executive committee of the WFTU held in Moscow in June 1946 was greeted by none other than A. Lozovsky, former head of the Red International of Labor Unions and member of the executive committee of the Communist International. Present at the meeting was Mr. R. J. Thomas, vice president of the United Automobile Workers, whom the Worker of October 8, 1944, has described as "fighting side by side" with the Communists. He was the only trade-union leader who graced the reception in honor of the Russian revolution at the Soviet Embassy in Washington on November 7, 1946.

Who is this A. Lozovsky? Michigan has good reason to remember him. Under the alias of Brooks he served as the representative of the Communist International at the secret Communist convention held at Bridgman, Mich., in the summer of 1922. The convention was raided by the Government and its delegates were charged with criminal syndicalism.

Mr. Lozovsky, now a prominent Soviet official, has been very frank in his exposition of the functions of trade unions. He has laid down very clearly the line now being followed by the Communist leaders of the World Federation of Trade Unions. As head of the Red International of Labor Unions he opposed the idea of the "defense of 'our' country" and advocated the "necessity of war for the defense of ou own proletariat state," meaning the Soviet Union, of course.

In his book on Marx and the Trade Unions, Lozovsky outlined his conception of the trade unions as pawns in the class struggle for the establishment of a Soviet dictatorship. He said, "Marx knew that the economic strike was an important weapon in the hands of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, since everything that deals a blow to the capitalist deals a blow also to the capitalist system." "Our main aim," declared Lozovsky, "is to defend and strengthen the Russian revolution." He considered the unions as "schools for communism."

Louis Saillant is the big boss and general secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions. He has been cited by the dependable New York Times for his sympathies with the Communist Party and has addressed important Communist meetings in France.

On a number of occasions the Communists have demonstrated that it is their purpose to utilize the World Federation of Trade Unions to involve American labor organizations in politically motivated international strikes. Such international strike action was planned in support of the Committee for Maritime Unity, headed by Harry Bridges. The New

Masses, Communist weekly magazine, declared exultingly at the time of the threatened maritime strike in June 1946, "For the first time in history the newly formed WFTU, with 60,000,000 members, will throw its earth-encircling weight behind an American strike."

If you want to know one reason why there is little sugar on your table, ask Harry Bridges, who in cooperation with WFTU leaders in Cuba and over the head of Philip Murray, has been conducting a series of international strikes which have tended to cripple the American sugar industry.

Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, prominent military authority, wrote as follows in the New York Times of January 9, 1947, on the danger to our national security of Communist activity in the maritime field:

"Complete control of these unions by the Communists could hog-tie America at a time of international crisis . . . The Congress must make impossible a repetition of last summer's catastrophic blow to Alaska and the Aleutians, a geographical area of tremendous strategic importance. Any shipping strikes that virtually strangle Alaska as the recent strikes did, and that also imperil an adequate defense in the Hawaiian Islands, cannot be tolerated."

If and when the Soviet Union should decide to expand its aggressive designs from Europe to the American continent, it hopes to strike at the vital part of the American war machine, at important industrial centers like Detroit, through its hold upon the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Having witnessed the loyalty, the devotion, and self-sacrifice of the auto workers of Detroit during the last war, I am confident that they will spurn with indignation and contempt any such attempt to inveigle them into a conspiracy against their own Government and their own interests. The American worker knows that he enjoys the highest standard of living in the world. He knows that he enjoys a democratic freedom which is not surpassed anywhere. He knows that the so-called workers' paradise in the Soviet Union is characterized by slave labor camps in which millions of workers toil under inhuman conditions, substandard living conditions, a cruel speed-up system, and the absence of any vestige of civil rights. He is realistic enough to understand the relative superiority of conditions in this country despite some inequities. He knows that under our system they can be corrected. He does not live in any fool's paradise.

Let the rank and file of the workers of Detroit demand the discussion of the issues I have raised. Let them demand an all-American union, free of foreign entanglements inspired by insidious Communist conspirators. Let us all work unitedly, both labor and management, for a better America and a better world for all of us.

Warsaw Invites the Signers of the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a very timely and appropriate article written by Dr. Oscar Lange, former Polish Ambassador and now Polish delegate to the United Nations Security Council, which appeared in the monthly bulletin Poland of Today, for the month of February. I think that every one of us will agree that Warsaw is the proper place for the signing of the peace treaty with Germany. Warsaw is the best example of Nazi brutality and bestiality. The article follows:

WARSAW INVITES THE SIGNERS OF THE PEACE

(By Dr. Oscar Lange, Polish delegate to the UN Security Council)

One of the most important political events in 1947 will be the preparation and completion of a peace treaty with Germany. Germany was the center and the leader of the Axis engaged in a war of aggression against the countries which later banded together as the United Nations in a common effort to win the war and to establish a permanent peace. Consequently, the peace treaty with Germany will be the most important step in the liquidation of the war and in the changing over to a new and stable international order.

The Polish Government will propose that the peace treaty with Germany be signed in Warsaw. There are several reasons which prompt us to make such a proposal. World War II was started by Germany's aggression against Poland. It is true that the war had earlier origins, running through the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, the Italian invasion of Ethiopia, the Italian and German intervention against the Spanish Republic, the annexation of Austria by Germany, the destruction of Czechoslovakia, the annexation of Albania by Italy. But it was the invasion of Poland and Poland's armed resistance to further Axis expansion that started the chain of resistance which led to World War II and to the subsequent destruction of the Fascist Axis.

Poland is the country which has suffered most from the war and from the horrors of German occupation. Suffice it to mention that 6,000,000 citizens of Poland have died at the hands of the Nazis. This alone shows the enormity of German crimes in Poland. In addition, however, Poland was chosen by the Nazi leaders as the place for the extermination of peoples other than Poles. In addition to the millions of Poles and Polish Jews who have died in the extermination camps of Majdanek, Tremblinka, and Oswiecim, millions of others were brought from all over Europe to these camps, established on Polish soil, to meet their death in gas chambers and furnaces.

Nothing is as illustrative of the destruction which Poland has suffered under the German occupation as the fate of Warsaw. Three times the people of Warsaw have waged a heroic resistance against the Germans. In September of 1939, when the Polish Army was defeated, when the Government and administration had already disintegrated, the people of Warsaw, under the leadership of their mayor, Stanislaw Starzynski, took up arms, and, with the aid of parts of the Polish Army who found themselves in or near Warsaw, defended their city for five whole weeks. For five whole weeks the people of Warsaw withstood the punishment of bombings and artillery, of fighting in the streets and suburbs, and behind its barricades kept alive the spirit of Polish freedom and independence. Only lack of ammunition and hunger forced them to capitulate.

The spring of 1943 witnessed the great uprising in the Warsaw ghetto. The Nazis had put all the Jewish population of Warsaw into a ghetto where they were forced to live in segregation from the rest of the people. The Jewish population was being systematically deported from the ghetto. For a long time the Jews of Warsaw did not know about the destination of the deportees. Finally, however, the horrible truth came out. The deportees were being taken to extermination camps and put to death. When this information spread through the ghetto such Jews as remained decided to defend themselves by force of arms. In this action they received the support of the Christian population of Warsaw and of the Polish underground, which supplied them with arms. The Germans stormed the ghetto street by street, house by house. It took several weeks for the great German Army to conquer the Warsaw ghetto. When the battle was over only a heap of ruins remained where once had been the most densely populated part of Warsaw.

In August of 1944, when the Red Army was approaching, the people of Warsaw once more took up arms to oust the Germans by their own effort, and thus to contribute with their own hands toward their liberation. In a magnificent effort Warsaw was cleared of Germans and the Polish flag waved on all the buildings of Poland's capital, which had liberated itself by its own effort.

For 8 weeks the Germans were kept out of Warsaw. They had to reconquer Poland's proud capital street by street, block by block, and house by house. The lack of ammunition and of food, and the temporary setback of the Red Army on the other side of the Vistula, finally caused Warsaw to fall. During this insurrection 250,000 people lost their lives.

The German authorities took a horrible vengeance on Warsaw, whose people had dared to rise against their rule. Hitler odered the destruction of Warsaw. The remaining population was removed from the city and a large part of it was sent as slave labor to Germany. Meantime house after house was ransacked, looted, and then either dynamited or burned down.

A visitor to Warsaw cannot help being astonished at the huge effort which the Germans put into the systematic destruction of the capital, for it takes a great effort to destroy a city deliberately house by house. Today Warsaw has the appearance of a ghost town. Its ruined houses, churches, and monuments are the most visible evidence of the crimes perpetrated by the Nazis throughout Europe. One has to see Warsaw to know what Nazi cruelty meant. One has to see Warsaw to know what a German victory would have meant for the whole world.

And yet in these ruins a new life is being born. Half a million people have returned and are rebuilding the capital of Poland. Factories, workshops, stores, and Government offices are being opened in increasing numbers. Streetcars and busses and other vehicles are once again running. One illustration of the ability of the people to survive can be seen in the fate of Warsaw's churches. Most of them—and among them were many old historic pieces of architecture—were destroyed by the Germans along with all other buildings. Yet, on Sunday mornings crowds gather in the basements or undestroyed parts of these churches at services which are suggestive of those in the old Christian catacombs. These services, too, reflect the irresistible spirit of the Polish nation. Amid the ruins a new and busy life is hustling and bustling, the life of a new and free Poland which no amount of Nazi cruelty, terror, and destruction was able to subdue.

It is thus befitting that the peace treaty with Germany be signed in the place where the Nazis committed their greatest crimes and where such strong spirit of resistance and such great ability to survive the German attempts at extermination were shown. The choice of Warsaw as a place to sign the peace treaty with Germany will serve as a demonstration of the triumph of justice and as a warning that the crime of aggressive war does not pay. It will also serve to demonstrate that wherever people truly love freedom and are ready to make sacrifices for freedom's sake, their efforts shall not be in vain.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Are a Menace to American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the effect of reciprocal trade agreements on the industries in my congressional district is alarming. Almost daily I am receiving information from various industries citing the menace created by the State Department's program of reciprocal trade agreements.

Since 1934, when the present program was inaugurated, a large number of items of trade imported to the United States have been removed from the customs list, while over 1,200 items have been granted decreases in the amount of duty charges.

The State Department is now considering granting a further decrease of 50 percent in the present duty rates. It is said that the purpose of such a policy is to secure the friendship of other nations. The premium paid for such good will will be the wrecking of American industry, and that is too great a price in return for such a rosy promise.

The State Department, acting through the Committee on Reciprocity Information, has been receiving appeals from American industry to halt the unbridled passion of caring for the rest of the world and leaving this Nation facing certain peril to its domestic economy.

It is expected that at the Geneva conference to be held in April the State Department will put in effect further reductions in duty on hundreds of items that have already been reduced as much as 50 percent in duty rates. Such action will not only indicate that a deaf ear has been turned to the pleas of American industry but it is certain to stifle our production and result in unemployment and financial chaos in our industrial life.

If we desire to play the role of world benefactor we should not forget the age-old truism that charity should not be practiced at the expense of the well-being of our Nation and its people.

Goods manufactured in foreign nations at wages comparable to that paid to slave labor will glut our domestic markets and usher in an era of financial failure that will spell economic ruin to American industry and American workmen.

In my own congressional district we have factories and mills that are a monument to free enterprise and a tribute to American industrial genius and the skill of American labor. Some of these enterprises represent generations of toil and sacrifice. Their employees represent families whose forebears settled these communities.

Employees in these industries and their families are greatly worried over the encroaching policies of reciprocal trade. They see the threat of unemployment and the misery and suffering that is certain to follow.

If you have any doubt concerning the dire effects of reciprocal trade agreements to American industry let me cite the paper and pulp industry in Pennsylvania as one of the many examples of the menace to our domestic economy. The importance of the paper and pulp industry in Pennsylvania is evidenced by the fact that there are 53 paper mills and 10 pulp mills in Pennsylvania, representing a capital investment of $226,499,000, or $19,000 per worker. They employ 11,921 workers with annual wages of $27,275,312. The sales of these mills amount to $220,000,000, paying $13,200,000 in Federal taxes and $3,200,000 in State and local taxes.

Paper and pulp mills not only operate as manufacturing establishments but are a market for farmers in their respective areas for the sale of pulpwood, which affords such farmers an opportunity to earn money in the seasons when normal farm operations are at a minimum.

The great importance of the industry to Pennsylvania is not shown only by the above figures. Out of sales come not only wages and taxes but also supplies, raw materials, power, machinery, transportation, and so forth.

These paper and pulp mills are located largely in communities dependent on these plants for their prosperity. The communities in Pennsylvania which are estimated to be 50 percent or more dependent on these mills for their entire business life are as follows: Austin, Barto, Betzwood, Buck Run, Chesterville, Downingtown, Durh, Johnsonburg, Lock Haven, Minisink Hills, Miquon, Mount Holly Springs, Ransom, Riegelsville, Roaring Spring, Spring Grove, West Conshohocken, Williamsburg, and York.

In the event that paper and pulp production became unprofitable, these communities could have the same fate as Wilder and Fitzdale in Vermont, also, Raymondville and Feltsmills in New York State. They became ghost towns through placing newsprint on the free list. Additional communities in the State would be affected to varying degrees.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act authorizes reductions of tariffs up to 50 percent of the rate in existence on January 1. The State Department has invited 18 nations to negotiate trade agreements with us and each other for the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers.

It is alarming to realize the effect of the reciprocal trade agreements on the newsprint industry. In 1913 there were 72 newsprint mills in the United States. In that year a reciprocal trade agreement placed newsprint on the free list. Today there are only 7 companies making newsprint in the United States. The annual consumption gained 2,231,264 tons while United States production dropped with 442,623 tons less per year.

Production and consumption figures for 1909, the latest available figures prior to placing newsprint on the free list, are contrasted with those for 1945, the latest available. This clearly illustrates the blow to the industry.

Production, 1909, 1,168,098 tons of newsprint.

Production, 1945, 725,475 tons of newsprint.

A loss of 442,623 tons in annual production.

Consumption, 1909, 1,119,358 tons of newsprint.

Consumption, 1945, 3,350,622 tons of newsprint.

A gain of 2,231,264 tons in annual consumption.

Canadian newsprint exports to United States, 1909, none; 1945, 2,668,798 tons.

This shift of newsprint production from the United States to Canada represents a huge lost opportunity for American capital and labor.

Every ton of paper imported is equivalent to three potential lost days of work for American workers. Imports of newsprint in 1945 amounted to 2,668,798 tons. This equals a loss of 8,006,394 days of employment to American workers for this year.

Newsprint is not the only loser. A similar course is being followed as a result of trade agreements already in effect on other grades of paper. Printing and wrapping are excellent examples of current developments extending throughout the industry.

Mr. Speaker, this condition cannot exist much longer if American industry is to survive. As Representative of the Twenty-second District of Pennsylvania I want to join the many Members of the House who are insisting that some definite action be taken by the Eightieth Congress to curb what may be properly termed the ruthless destroyer of thousands of jobs of American workmen.

Washington Birthday Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address that I made before the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, following addresses by Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, United States Army, commanding general, Headquarters First Army, and Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, Commander, Eastern Sea Frontier, and to include the remarks and introduction by Col. William M. Chadbourne, president of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, at their annual dinner celebration of Washington's Birthday, at the Waldorf-Astoria on the evening of February 22, 1947, at 7:30 o'clock.

Colonel Chadbourne's introduction is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, may I, as president of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, express my personal appreciation. We, who revere the memory of the founders of the Republic, have gathered together to commemorate the two hundred and fifteenth anniversary of the birthday of Gen. George Washington.

In those immortal documents, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, the

founders of the Republic, in order to insure to us life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, bestowed upon the American people four great freedoms—the freedoms of speech, of religion, of the press, and of assembly. For nearly a century and three-quarters, these freedoms have been commonplace amongst us, so much so that we are accustomed to take them for granted. For the earlier part of that period, the tendency throughout the world was to extend the area in which these freedoms might in more or less degree be enjoyed. We were, however, hardly in the twentieth century before the new ideologies of communism, fascism, and nazism began like a pestilence to sweep across the world. Since these ideologies could not prevail where the four freedoms flourished, the dictators who preached these ideologies began to cut down the freedoms. In one country after another, the onward sweep of the dictators recalled to mind the drive of the hordes which threatened in the eighth century to overrun Christendom until these hordes were checked at Tours, in France, by Charles Martel and under the walls of Vienna by John Sobieski, King of Poland.

Today, the areas of freedom in the world have become small indeed, while the areas of darkness seem to grow greater each day. If the hordes of totalitarianism are to be thrust back and enslaved peoples again made free, must not the driving force to achieve this come from America, incomparably the most powerful country in the world and the land where freedom is cherished most? Other freedom-loving lands are weakened by war and party strife and cannot without our aid stand up against the powers of darkness. Must not the Charles Martels and the John Sobieskis of the twentieth century, and the forces that they marshal, be found in America?

Is it not, therefore, our duty as the descendants of these who gave us the "four freedoms" to do our part in seeing to it that our Nation becomes strong and to that end to take an active part in the political party of our choice so that our Government may be the force for freedom in the world which our people wish it to be?

This is not partisan doctrine. Not long ago Mr. Charles E. Murphy, corporation counsel of the city of New York, a devout Democrat, made such an appeal, and the distinguished speaker whom I am about to present to you and who is a devout Republican, will now make a similar appeal.

If I were to tell you of the good and patriotic movements in which our speaker has taken part, my tale would be as long as Homer's Catalogue of Ships. Hence I shall merely say that he, single-handed, brought about the creation by the New York Legislature of the Seabury committee, which did so much for the people of this city. He has been State senator, a member of the 1938 Constitutional Convention, and is now a regent of the University of the State of New York, and the courageous Representative in Congress from the First New York District.

May I present to you the Honorable W. KINGSLAND MACY, of Islip, N. Y.

I spoke as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Colonel Chadbourne, unusually distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of this fine, patriotic association, as this is an after-dinner speech, I presume I may be indulged for making a little preliminary comment. It was Benjamin Franklin who helped make the peace with Great Britain who said: "There never was a good war or a bad peace." We do not agree with Benjamin Franklin. We think the Revolutionary War was a good war that was justified by every moral, political, and patriotic consideration, and we do not agree with the late William Lyon Phelps, the brilliant essayist and lecturer, when he said that the only war of which he ever approved was the Trojan War because it was fought over a woman and the men knew what they were fighting for.

Our convocation here today to do honor to the memory of our first President testifies to our prideful awareness of our national heritage and to that vigilant corollary of awareness—concern. Our very act of gathering affirms our belief in the American constitutional system, demonstrates our confidence in its workability, and gives quiet warning that that which we cherish we will keep unimpaired.

Washington helped evolve and institute the American system. Under it we have grown into the greatest of nations. Under it we have freedom. Our forefathers fought a revolution to win that freedom. But as each generation of men must woo to possess, so must each make freedom its own. Freedom, like a living, breathing thing, must be renewed in perpetuity for while the cold and glittering firmament belongs eternally to all men, freedom remains the possession only of those who tirelessly resist slavery. It is not imperishable, it is ever assailable, and it is seriously threatened today, not violently, but insidiously, incipiently; and, if it dies, it will not be of a great wound but of a slow paralysis.

Our freedom today is threatened by the mounting economic pyramid of developing industrial civilization. Built on the broad base of American free enterprise, this pyramid is ever narrowing. As it grows it is limited, tier by tier, by monopoly and specialization. When its apex is reached, free enterprise will be done for and freedom will be gone.

Just as economic factors, eventually injurious to the great majority, kept the British villagers off their commons, the mechanized civilization we have built will circumscribe us with constraints unless we are watchful. Freedom shall be a small thing dwarfed by security.

Unless we concern ourselves passionately with freedom, how shall we place it comparatively? Unless we are enamored of it, how shall we say it is not to be superseded? What was a conviction with Washington and the creators of America will be a mere historical footnote of an era's aspiration if our desire for easy living distorts our sense of proportion so that we erroneously diminish the great. America, meshed in economic complexity, can only retain its place untrammeled in the forefront of free men if it improves its social structure with emphasis on economic independence and not on social security.

When I talk of social security I do not refer to the old-age pension system, a thing for which I fought in the New York State Legislature when it was exceedingly unpopular with the leaders of my own party. Then, as now, I considered it a sad commentary on the involved financial structure controlling our great wealth that men need cry out to the State for aid in sickness or old age, believing as I do that through education, scholastic and civic, without sacrifice of the primary concept of freedom, the time could eventually come when there would be no underprivileged.

When I talk of social security and the desire manifested for it, I talk in a larger way of the eagerness for creature comforts and convenience, the ready concessions to expedience to obtain it in lieu of the intangible but real thing we call freedom, and the small sacrifices being made along a road that can lead only to loss. When America shall no longer have freedom, she shall no longer have in her the elements of greatness that have made her unique and invincible.

The one important question before America today is how to align our political creed and faith with modern-day economics. This is the key to our future, the determinant of our policy, both domestic and foreign.

To enlarge upon this, I ask your permission to read to you from a Memorial Day address of mine which was extended into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therein I said: "Modern civilization is industrialized to a point where it is dependent upon smooth uninterrupted functioning. This machine-age complexity is a threat to our free institutions and will destroy them unless we bring them both into harmony. * * * The day of economic self-sufficiency for the individual is done, and we must evaluate our rights and privileges if we are to maintain a mutually beneficial society under our constitutional form of government. * * * The greatest problem confronting America today is that of balancing our concept of personal freedom with the minimum basic demands of our economic superstructure."

The battle of "the forefathers" of today is on the civic front. The enemy we must fight is not a red-coated soldier, but the regulation, the restraining order, the directive, the extracurricular legislation designed simply to facilitate the functioning of our economic machine. Whether these controls favor labor or management is of no moment. If, without the fullest deliberation and consent of the people, they curtail rights we have considered as our own, they are dangerous.

Directive precision is possible only under statism, and admittedly a society as huge as ours must be regulated if we are to live in well-being together. But it must be regulated jealously and with legislative nicety if we are to remain a democracy. America has resiliency and is geared to change, but countless little concessions in liberty can eviscerate the fundamental concept of America by making the individual less important than the mass.

America, vigilant against outward threat, values its freedom sufficiently to defend it, and we have just won a war to keep it and our liberty. We are not a warlike people, but, as you who are members of an organization founded to commemorate the spirit of our fighting men well know, there is a magnificence in the way America rises to fight a war, steel in its sinews and steel in its spirit, generous of its sweat and unstinting of its blood. War itself has no grandeur but, as Washington thrilled to learn, there is in it the composite of grandeur when countless little men grow big defending a principle or fighting a cause. America, as we proved in 1776 and again when called upon in succeeding crises, has a splendor singularly its own when its people, made cohesive by national interest, merge into a unified force.

Today, however, awareness of that spirit, almost like unto a physical presence, has been largely dissipated. Once again without national oneness, America is an aggregate of many-minded persons concerned only with the small-in-perspective but great-in-proportion problems of peacetime living. The war is over and we are busy mending our civic fences.

This is a work in which we should all take part. Historically informed organizations like yours well know that as the poet Robert Frost says: "Good fences make good neighbors." Never before has America had greater need for deliberate public-spirited men with a passion for fair evaluation than she has in this day when the atomic bomb controls the political reflexes of all nations. Never before has there been greater necessity for thoughtful patriots, who concede the duties of citizenship and comprehend more than the ballot box or the shouldering of arms, to enter into the working field of politics. America cannot be greater than its politicians, for no democracy can be other than what its duly elected representatives make it. Free elections do not assure good government. Nothing but a high-principled and enlightened electorate can do that—an electorate

that knows that as America's fate was once determined in the cold fields about Valley Forge, its future will be shaped in the chambers of its legislative bodies.

Full participation by the electorate is incumbent upon us if, in the words of Washington at his first inaugural, we believe "* * * the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, as deeply, perhaps as finally staked, on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

An important factor of this participation is the expression of opinion—considered opinion. Every one of our great metropolitan dailies and many of our weekly papers carry columns, syndicated or exclusive, in which name writers set forth their opinions. Many of them are overlarded with prejudice and bias, either their publisher's or their own, sometimes with both. Objectivity is not a columnist's credo. Like the essayist, he writes of what interests him, but whereas the output of the thoughtful essayist is a gem worked over by some lapidary in words, the columnist, facing a deadline for a date-conscious public, often fills his alloted space with what is little better than snap judgment. The danger of this is that interspersed with one man's opinion are factual bits that lend credence to the whole. These impress and influence the reading public as much, if not more, than editorials inserted frankly as opinion after careful deliberation.

Another important factor in securing unto ourselves a successful government is courage. It is not enough that our soldiers in the time of war have courage. Our elected officials must have it, too. A year ago today when I had the pleasure of addressing a chapter of your organization in Troy, a tugboat strike had paralyzed the city. The city's supplies of food and fuel were threatened although there were hundreds of idle Army trucks nearby which could have transported food and fuel from up-State New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and nearby States. Then, too, the inactive tugboats might readily have been operated by others than their regular crews, but as I said at that time, the political danger of being considered a strike-breaker, however the public was suffering from the strike, was not to be dared. Appeasement was considered wiser and safer politically, than opposition.

In this connection I think I may assert with confidence that George Washington would have considered anyone to be completely insane who predicted that the day would come when this great Nation, which Washington did so much to establish and organize, would be so swayed and influenced as to be practically ruled by pressure groups and organized minorities instead of by practical applications of the old-fashioned theory of majority rule.

There is only one pressure group in the United States of America today which has the right to act individually on behalf of the whole. That pressure group is the American electorate.

Here this evening on the day the entire Nation honors the father of our country, I would not have you accuse me of the presumption of assuming there is necessity for me to so reiteratively urge upon you the fullest participation in citizenship. I am sure that you are as familiar as woodsmen with the trail we have blazed through history. Before us, however, is not the forest primeval but a modern mountain range as yet unscaled. All we have of balance and skill will be needed to safely surmount it, all we have of sweat and power must go to build a modern road through this century as once in the seventeen hundreds our forefathers made trails and widened them triumphantly into the wagon paths of freedom.

The failure to have a true meeting of the minds is responsible in large measure for many of our current civic difficulties. Militant labor, in the opinion of the public, earned long since the right to strike under certain conditions. When, however, our teachers unite to march en masse upon our State capitol, it is well to pause and consider not only the words of Calvin Coolidge, "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anytime, anywhere," but to wonder how deeply these custodians of our formative young think and how truly sympathetic they are to the idea of government for the people and by the people.

One, and not the least important, of our political subdivisions is the school district which is governed by publicly elected officials who make up a board of education. With those boards our teachers enter into contracts; to those boards our teachers have recourse. I believe, in the best interests of democracy, our teachers, many concededly underpaid, should have presented their cases with the request that the school boards ask that State aid earmarked specifically for salary increases be legislated to the district as is State aid for general school purposes.

However, and to the great concern of parents agitated by the trend, our teachers chose to "gang up" and make threatening demands on behalf of one of the professions instead of working as individuals through the channels set up by the law.

The New York City rabble-rousers which, 1,000 strong, marched upon Albany on Tuesday for the purpose of invading the legislative halls, the Legislature being then in session, to demand housing and rent-control legislation, was one of the most sinister demonstrations which has for many years been witnessed in the United States of America; and which, but for the strength and firmness of executive and legislative officials in Albany, might have developed into a riot with bloodshed and many casualties.

Because the births of Washington and Lincoln occurred in the same month and their anniversaries are celebrated within 10 days of each other, and they were both great statesmen, patriots, and Presidents, it has become the fashion of essayists and editorial writers to compare the qualities and characteristics of the two men. So I will not undertake to do this tonight. They were born, doubtless, under the same zodiacal sign. The fact is, the anniversaries of the births might be celebrated more nearly together than they are, as Washington was actually born on February 11, 1732, and not on February 22. We celebrate Lincoln's birthday, of course on February 12th. If you challenge this statement concerning Washington, I will explain by saying that when Washington was twenty-one years old the calendar was advanced eleven days by act of the British Parliament. Lincoln's birthday was not dislocated by this method, because Lincoln was born after and not before the calendar change, which took place in 1753.

In addition to the anniversary of the birth of Washington, the February season, if it may be so termed, is rich in its historic and patriotic anniversaries. I will not enumerate them, further than to say that the *Maine* was sunk in Havana Harbor in February 1898, forty-nine years ago last Saturday; peace was ratified with Spain in February 1899, or forty-eight years ago February 6; and February 11, this year, the actual date of the birth of Washington was the anniversary of the Yalta Conference of which little was then known, but of which much has recently been said and much more remains to be known and much more remains to be said.

However, I am inclined to believe that by common consent, the anniversary of the birth of Washington is, to a greater extent than any other anniversary, observed uniformly and reverently and fervently throughout the land. Doubtless, the anniversary of Lincoln's birth arouses somewhat similar sentiments, but the Nation was divided under Lincoln, and in bringing it together and preserving its unity, deep and acute sectional animosities were aroused. In spite of Lincoln's great influence and tolerance and sense of justice, these animosities could not be soon or fully reconciled. Perhaps they have not been wholly, even as of today.

Washington was the leader of a united and victorious nation, achieving its independence in a war against an enemy across seas, by reason of which posterity has inherited a tradition of a warmer gratitude and a more profound admiration of Washington than for any other figure in the history of the Nation.

The fact is, though Washington's Birthday is a legal or public holiday in every State, Territory and colonial possession of the United States, there are nineteen States in which Lincoln's Birthday is not a legal holiday. Nor are these nineteen States all Southern States, for the States in which Lincoln's Birthday is not a legal or public holiday include Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

So we may all say tonight that Washington not only won the war, but, as we all know, he also won the peace, having been not only chairman of the Constitutional Convention which adopted the United States Constitution in 1787, but he later served as our first President for two-four-year terms.

I make this latter statement conscious of the fact that certain historical precisionists claim that the first President of the United States was the first President of and elected by the Continental Congress, held after the adoption of the Articles of Confederation, which for the first time gave to the Thirteen Colonies the name United States of America.

It was unnecessary for me to state at the beginning of these brief and informal remarks that I would not undertake in my references to the most outstanding character in American history to enter into competition with the eulogies which the most brilliant orators of the Nation have on these anniversaries for generations past lavished upon the character and career of George Washington.

At the present one may not, even in a lifetime of effort and research, discover anything about Washington or say anything about him not already said or known, nor say the known things half so well as they have already been said.

I will confirm this observation by quoting, in conclusion of my remarks today, from the famous speech, delivered in 1858, of the celebrated statesman, author, and orator, Edward Everett of Massachusetts, when he said:

"The character, the counsels, and example of Washington will guide us through any doubts and difficulties that may beset us; they will guide our children and our children's children in the paths of peace, while America shall hold her place in the family of nations."

I thank you.

Veterans Service Center for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it worth while to pay brief tribute to the tremendous, yet efficient, job that has been done, and is being done every day, by the Veterans' Service Center for the District of Columbia. Approximately 400 veterans each day go

to the center at 1400 Pennsylvania Avenue for service and information. Col. Waldron E. Leonard, the director, and his staff have made the center a symbol of courtesy, consideration, and service. Sam Stavisky wrote in the Washington Post of December 15, 1946, an article commending the center and its personnel. In order that every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may see this well-earned commendation, I am inserting it herewith:

WELL-EARNED SERVICE STRIPE IS PINNED ON D. C. VETERANS' CENTER

(By Sam Stavisky)

The other day the District Commissioners officially renamed the Veterans' Information Center the Veterans' Service Center. The action formalized what 120,000 veterans have already learned to their satisfaction.

The center, in Post Square at Fourteenth Street and the Avenue, has demonstrated that the Nation's Capital is prepared to offer all veterans a helping hand.

Approximately one-third of the former GI's who've turned to the center for a lift were not District residents. But residents and outlanders alike, all come back for more—probably the most genuine tribute that could be paid ebullient "Col." Waldron E. Leonard and his staff.

In its first year of activity—the anniversary date is December 17—Washington's center has become one of the best in the country. Maj. Gen. Graves Erskine, Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, is authority for that evaluation, and Erskine has helped establish hundreds of such centers throughout the country.

POWERFUL SUPPORT

Behind that success of the center are definite factors: Support by the District Commissioners, a forward-looking citizens' advisory committee, a $75,000 appropriation, cooperation by Federal and local agencies and organizations. But, given all these, the key still lies in the sympathetic hearts and willing hands of "Colonel" Leonard and his crew.

"It's not a question of dealing with the veterans' problems," says Leonard. "It's simply a matter of dealing with the personal and usually temporary problems of individual servicemen readjusting themselves to civilian life."

The center has a paid permanent staff of 21 and a dozen or more full-time specialists from Federal and local agencies and organizations.

A veteran can obtain virtually any information pertaining to his welfare at the center. He can obtain counsel and help. If he can't be taken care of on the spot the center sends him on to someone who can help, but the center staffer follows through to see that he gets it.

JOBS OR JEEPS

The center staff includes a United States Employment Service representative and two from Civil Service. Veterans' Administration has three contact specialists there, and the District of Columbia insurance underwriters maintain a full-time expert. A Red Cross worker deals with social-welfare problems.

A veteran can't buy surplus property at the center, but he can get up-to-date information from a War Assets Administration agent. There's an attorney to help with legal tangles, and take the case to court if necessary, with the District Bar Association prepared to assist. There are two educational and one vocational advisers and a panel of businessmen is available to veterans seeking to try their own luck.

When the terminal leave pay bill was passed, Leonard obtained a $4,000 Community Chest allotment for materials and started photostating discharge papers. The photostat crew worked many a night overtime without pay to keep up with the demand.

Four typists punch out official papers for veterans, and three staff members offer free notarization.

During the tax-paying season two Internal Revenue Bureau consultants sat in. And for a long time the American Women's Voluntary Services provided tax service for veterans having to visit other agencies. Today the AWVS is concentrating on the adjacent housing center, soliciting living quarters for the families of veterans and servicemen.

EIGHT HUNDRED RARE JEWELS

For obvious reasons the fact was not given wide publicity, but in the past year Leonard, with the cooperation of many District dealers, has obtained superpriorities on cars for 800 disabled veterans. A current backlog of 300 applications prevents acceptance of new requests.

A World War I doughboy, the 48-year-old center director spends most of his day quietly working or heatedly fighting for things he thinks the veteran needs.

Although housing was not his beat, the colonel organized veterans' groups into a one-day lobby which obtained a $250,000 congressional appropriation for 2,500 temporary units here. When a citizen appeared to protest that the veterans would become permanent squatters, Leonard got so hot under the collar he pushed the citizen around physically. Shortly after this display of ardor, Leonard was also appointed director of the housing center.

Leonard's inflammable collar also gets him into scraps with housing and employment officials who don't like to be pressured. A vigorous foe of red tape and business-as-usual tactics, he influences people, but he doesn't always make friends.

NARY A BRICKBAT

But the veterans, organized and unorganized, consider Leonard a friend. Not one of the District's veterans' groups has even questioned center policy or operations. And this writer, as a reporter on veterans' affairs, can testify that not a single complaint against the center has come across his desk.

The "Colonel"—the title is an honorary one from Texas—talks the language of the enlisted man. A good example of this occurred last March when a caravan of Chicago veterans roared into the Capital to demand that the Government break the taxi monopoly there.

Leonard escorted them to Camp Simms, put them up in the old armory and, through the Red Cross, arranged for their feeding. (How differently the bonus marchers were treated 15 years ago.) There were no "incidents" during the veterans' visit.

COMPLICATIONS AHEAD

The "Colonel" is looking ahead. He plans to bring in a specially trained adviser for former servicemen whose problems are complicated by general nonrecognition of their being veterans.

Looking ahead, too, Leonard recognizes that in the past year of demobilization the demands on the center were chiefly simple—such as photostating discharge papers. The individual veteran problems ahead will be more complex, more personal.

There's the veteran who can't seem to keep a job. The veteran who's used up his 52 weeks of GI bill jobless pay. The veteran who's having trouble with his wife. The veteran who needs a steadying hand.

The District Commissioners also are looking ahead. A subcommittee of the center's advisory committee is studying the need for expanding family-welfare and psychiatric-care services through the center.

It's a good omen when the folks who initiated the center and the folks who are running it both think it can be improved. It means that veterans will continue to get a genuine "key to the city."

Necessary Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Labor Committee for the past 8 years, I wish to discuss at this time the important matter of labor-management relations and what I believe are necessary amendments to prevent strikes. It is the duty of Congress to remove the evils and racketeering in the field of labor-management relations and still protect labors' rights. Following are amendments I believe should be adopted by both Houses of Congress.

First. Jurisdictional strike: This means a strike growing out of a dispute between two or more representatives of employees. This strike must be outlawed because innocent employers should not be penalized because unions force a strike to settle difficulties between unions. The mine or factory should continue operating during jurisdictional disputes between unions.

Second. Breach of contract or wildcat strikes: Unions that sign contracts should be liable for violation of such collective-bargaining contracts if the right of collective bargaining and the right to strike mean anything.

Third. Employers' right of free speech: One of the most important amendments to the Wagner Act is the employers' right of free speech. In the first place there was no intention of Congress to deny this right to anyone because the right of free speech is guaranteed to all of our citizens in the first amendment of the Constitution.

Fourth. Secondary boycotts: Secondary boycotts engaged in by labor unions to force a third party, not a party to a primary labor dispute, to force that party to cease using the products of the employer engaged in the primary dispute is an activity which should be made illegal. Secondary boycotts have had the effect of throwing a great many innocent people out of work. As a result of these secondary boycotts many of our citizens have been deprived of the deliveries of milk, bread, meat, and other essentials of life. These boycotts have cost the Nation millions of dollars worth of foodstuffs.

Fifth. Strike vote: In order to give the rank and file of labor a right to participate in collective bargaining, they should have the right of the secret ballot—State election laws—to vote on the final proposal arrived at by collective bargaining before a strike is called.

Sixth. Equalize collective bargaining: In order to have successful bargaining it will be necessary to require that both management and labor participate in collective bargaining.

Seventh. Picketing should be limited to the members of the local union involved in a strike. There is a provision in the Wagner Act which gives workers a right to join a union or not to join. Employees have the right under the act to

petition the National Labor Relations Board for an election to decide if they want to join a union and name the particular union with which they wish to be affiliated. Mass picketing must be abolished.

Eighth. The employer should have the right to petition for an election to determine a question of collective-bargaining representation.

Ninth. No foreman or supervisor selected by management should be forced to belong to a labor union. He should be given the right to join or not to join any labor union he chooses.

Tenth. No laboring man should be forced to join a labor union to gain a livelihood.

Eleventh. An improved method of mediation and voluntary arbitration of disputes.

Twelfth. A 30-day collective-bargaining period, prior to the expiration of a contract, is essential. Of course, both the employers and employees should be required to bargain collectively during this period.

Thirteenth. No subversive individual should be allowed to hold an office in a labor union or corporation.

Fourteenth. A new Federal labor court should be set up to judge cases such as wildcat strikes.

Fifteenth. A Federal law is necessary to stop violence and destruction of property.

Sixteenth. Some form of Federal seizure is necessary to prevent strikes in industry-wide plants which affect public health and safety.

Mr. Speaker, labor leaders will probably call these harsh and punitive measures, but these amendments will be necessary to create better labor and management relations and eliminate labor racketeering. Labor still has the right to strike but the rank and file of labor will have the right of a secret ballot to accept or reject any compromise measure made by management in a labor dispute. Labor will still have the right to bargain on a local-plant level or on an industry-wide basis. They will still have the right to the check-off from members through collective bargaining. Wages, safety measures, welfare, and so forth will be left to collective bargaining.

No one should condone jurisdictional and wildcat strikes, secondary boycotts, and violence and destruction of property. The first amendment of the Constitution guarantees everyone the right of free speech. If we are allowed to take this right away from one group, there may come a time when an administration in power would want to take this right away from all groups.

No one would surely deny a person the right to work or even force him to buy a certificate in order to work. No one would surely deny the rank and file of the workers the privilege of a secret strike ballot. The rank and file of labor are anxious to remove subversive leaders from their organizations.

Our big job is to protect the public from unions who have misused their power but we must be careful not to restore the abuses of the past on the part of the employers.

We Took Those Islands, Now Keep Them!—A Washington Times-Herald Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the House joint resolutions which I introduced day before yesterday—House Joint Resolutions 136, 137, and 138—measures purposed to promote a more secure United States through the acquisition of Iceland, by invitation; of the Japanese mandated islands, by conquest; and of Greenland and certain other foreign-owned islands in the Caribbean and the Pacific, by purchase, I, under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely and most convincing editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Times-Herald.

This very timely editorial expression which its author has entitled "We Took Those Islands, Now Keep Them!" is, Mr. Speaker, the following:

WE TOOK THOSE ISLANDS, NOW KEEP THEM

The matter of the Pacific bases and who is to control them is coming up again, with presentation by the United States to the UN of a request for exclusive custody of the area enclosed by the broken line on the accompanying map.

These were the islands mandated after World War I to Japan by the old League of Nations. Japan solemnly promised not to fortify them, then broke its word.

Our men took them in World War II, at great and tragic cost, and with practically no help from any of our allies.

Yet ever since the shooting stopped, Russia, Great Britain, and Australia have been raising objections off and on to sole U. S. control of these islands. There has been and is a lot of vague talk about joint trusteeship.

From Russia, there has come much clearer talk about how the Soviet Union cannot feel at ease with another power maintaining bases on its Pacific flank. And from some of Russia's lovers in this country has come the suggestion that we give up the islands to the UN to save ourselves from the temptation to use them some day as take-off points for an attack on Russia.

This kind of talk is baloney.

Joint trusteeship would mean joint high commissioners on these little islands, plus military forces from two or more nations. In an emergency, this divided command could be expected to do us the gravest damage.

If Russia can't feel at ease with our forces on the islands, that is just too bad. Neither can western Europe feel at ease with Russia in possession of the Baltic states and in control of most of the Balkans.

The contention of our Russia-lovers that we may some day attack Russia is merely ridiculous. We have no motive for that. But we do have urgent need of far-Pacific defense points in case Russia ever attacks us, as Russia well may.

Of course, the late Roosevelt could have averted this Pacific base trouble by squeezing a sole U. S.-ownership agreement out of our allies during the war, when they were dependent on us to save them from defeat. As a bargainer, however, Roosevelt was a good piccolo player.

But we still have those bases, and up to now Truman's position is that we will keep them, UN or no UN. We don't think the majority of Americans would forgive Truman if he should back down an inch from that stand.

Import Quota on Long Staple Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the United States Tariff Commission on February 18, 1947, in opposition to an increase in the import quota on cotton of a staple of 1⅛ inches and more in length:

Mr. Chairman, I appear here representing long-staple cotton growers in the great alluvial Delta area of the State of Arkansas. These growers are largely small farmers who live on the land and work in the sun for a livelihood. The Arkansas Delta is highly adapted to the production of long-staple cotton. This is shown by the great quantities of this type cotton that has been grown there, especially prior to the year 1946. The farmers that I represent bitterly oppose increasing the quota on cotton imports whether on a short- or long-term basis.

I am fully aware of the great amount of pressure that is being applied by certain interests to permit the importation of large stocks of Egyptian cotton. It is obviously to the advantage of these groups to obtain this cotton, which can be bought at a greatly reduced price over that which is asked for the domestic cotton of like staple and grade. On the other hand, I submit that we should first protect American producers who are engaged in an industry vital to the well-being of all.

We find that the American producer has been encouraged in the husbandry of the long-staple cotton growing industry by the Department of Agriculture, and this agency still insists that we continue to produce these long staples. This action on the part of the Department is commendable. We need to keep our production of these varieties of cotton intact if we are to be a self-sustaining country. We should not be dependent on any other country in procuring a commodity which we can produce in sufficient quantities to meet our own needs.

In order to keep this industry intact, the farmer who grows long-staple cotton must get a premium price over that paid for average-length cotton. Long-staple cotton is much more expensive to produce, the gin out-turn is 30 percent less than on the shorter staples, and it has to be carefully picked in order to assure that the grade is high. Hired pickers from outside the Cotton Belt could not be expected to pick this cotton with the proper care, so that all in all the cost of producing these staples is considerably more than that for the shorter varieties.

The fact that during 1945 and 1946 the producers of long-staple cotton in America have failed to realize adequate premiums is, in my judgment, the cause for the inordinate slump in the amount of acreage planted to these crops. Heretofore, long staple domestic cotton has enjoyed a premium of from 70 to 100 percent of the base price. During both the

1945 and 1946 seasons, however, the abnormally cheap Egyptian price has borne directly against our longest Wilds varieties, and these in turn, have depressed succeeding staple premiums to the vanishing point. In the fall of 1946, when prices on average cotton rose considerably for a time, Delta long staples actually sold at a cheaper price than during the harvest season of 1945. This was due to the impact of Egyptian cotton that poured into this country when the new annual quota became available in September. Even after the cotton market broke last fall, shorter varieties sold for a minimum increase of at least 5 cents a pound over the price received during the preceding fall. The Egyptian competition has caused the premium on our longest staple Delta cotton to decline by at least $50 per bale. This is a great loss in the purchasing power in the long staple production area. Prices of other cotton are adversely affected when the long staple varieties go down in price. All premiums suffer from this downward pressure, and when the entire cotton industry is affected, adversely, we are handicapping the largest production group in America. There are 2,000,000 families, not individuals, but families who are employed in the cotton industry in this country. More people are engaged in the various phases of cotton than in any other commodity in the United States. If they do not realize a profit from their work, they will turn to new fields of endeavor. Should they do this, new problems will be created, and new competition will be felt in other lines of agriculture, such as cattle raising, dairying, wheat, and corn growing, etc. Only we in America can be responsible for assisting our own people. We cannot, and do not wish to, compete with peon and coolie labor, because our aim is ever to lift higher the standard of living of our people. For this reason, we must protect the market for the crops they grow. Should the quota on Egyptian cotton be increased, we can only expect the rapid destruction of American earning power.

I challenge the statement that there is not an adequate supply of domestic long staple cotton available for use by the mills in this country. It has been testified before this Commission that domestic long-staple varieties are inadequate to meet the demands of spinners. There was a carry-over on August 1, 1946, on staples of 1 3/16, 1 7/32, and 1 1/4 inches in length and longer, totaling 157,000 bales. Ginning through November 16, 1946, of these lengths total 40,000 bales, making a total available supply of 197,000 bales of cotton, only a fraction of which has been consumed by the spinners. This does not include the additional ginnings after November 16 to the present date.

In this connection, I would like to read a letter dated October 7, 1946, which shows that the same staple cotton grown in this country was stored in the warehouses without buyers:

"WILLIAMS COTTON CO.,
"*Memphis, Tenn.*

"GENTLEMEN: As I have advised you before, we still have on hand the following types purchased from you mostly in 1944:

"Strict Middling 1 3/8 inches	807 B/C
"Strict Middling 1 5/16 inches	1,324 B/C
"Middling 1 5/16 inches	200 B/C

"We have been reserving these lots for future use, but in view of the extreme differential between Egyptian and this type of cotton, we, naturally, purchased the Egyptian.

"There is a possibility that we might want to resell the above lots and would appreciate your writing us giving us your advice about reselling, also approximate idea of the prices we might get for them at this time.

"Awaiting your reply, we remain,
"Yours very truly."

Mr. Chairman, I trust that your Commission will not see fit to increase the present quota of Egyptian and other foreign cotton imports.

Palestine Crisis Calls for United States Action—Formula for Troubled Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Vernon McKay, which appeared in the Foreign Policy Bulletin of February 14, 1947, entitled "Palestine Crisis Calls for United States Action," and an article by Julian Louis Meltzer, which appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times on Sunday, February 16, 1947, entitled "Formula for Troubled Palestine."

The articles follow:

[From the Foreign Policy Bulletin, New York, N. Y., of February 14, 1947]

PALESTINE CRISIS CALLS FOR UNITED STATES ACTION

(By Vernon McKay)

Palestine's war of nerves reached a new peak last week at a moment when a rapid succession of events in Jerusalem and London created the deceptive impression that the problem was at last approaching a solution. In Jerusalem the crisis was precipitated by the death sentence of a 33-year-old Hungarian-born Jew, Dov Bela Gruner, a former lance corporal in the British Army, who was to be hanged on January 28 for participation in a terrorist raid on the Ramat Gan police station last April. The kidnaping of two British civilians as hostages for Gruner led to British threats of martial law. On February 3 Jewish officials in Palestine were asked by the British authorities "to state categorically and at once" whether they were "prepared within 7 days to call upon the Jewish community to lend their aid to the Government by cooperation with the police and armed forces in bringing to justice the members of terrorist groups." The Vaad Leumi, or Jewish National Organization, decided 2 days later to reject this ultimatum, refusing to ask the Jewish people to act as informers. Terrorists of the Irgun Zvai Leumi (National Military Organization), who had kidnaped the two British hostages, asserted they would "fight to the last breath" against British authority.

MORE TALK IN LONDON

In London, meanwhile, the latest in the long series of Palestine conferences was being held. Only the Arabs were officially present, but British leaders were talking on the side with Jewish representatives. The British cabinet was apparently divided between the point of view of Colonial Secretary Creech Jones, who favored the creation of separate Jewish and Arab provinces with no ceiling on immigration in the Jewish zone, and the point of view of Foreign Secretary Bevin who wanted greater restrictions both on Jewish immigration and on the size of the Jewish province. Bevin's view prevailed. The resulting British proposal, made public on February 10, falls so far short of the hopes of Jewish leaders that they are reported to have totally rejected it. Arab spokesmen have also repudiated the new scheme.

Since neither Arabs nor Jews will yield, it is likely that any British plan would have to be imposed by force. Yet Bevin is reported to have declared, in a letter accompanying his suggestions, that no attempt would be made to force their acceptance. Under the circumstances it is difficult to see what the British can gain by their current military activities. So far the only evident result is the consolidation of the Jewish community and the consequent strengthening of the terrorists in the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern Gang (a small faction which broke away from the Irgun in 1940).

A MANY-SIDED PROBLEM

The Palestine issue is a complex of many closely related problems. The strategic problem is to satisfy Britain's security interests, which are just as legitimate as those of the United States in the Pacific islands. The humanitarian problem is to find refuge for persecuted Jews displaced by the war. The political problem is to reconcile conflicting Jewish and Arab claims for an independent state. The latter two problems are closely related because the Zionists, in effect, are using the humanitarian appeal to win the political objective of a Jewish state, a fact of which the Arabs are keenly aware. Zionists believe that a Jewish state is an essential part of a humanitarian approach to the needs of world Jewry.

The immediate need, however, is to do something about the tragic fate of the several hundred thousand Jewish refugees who a year and a half after the end of the war are still seeking a haven. The postwar record indicates that Britain is unwilling to take the risk of imposing a solution favorable to either Jews or Arabs, or of even adopting the recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry that Palestine shall be neither a Jewish state nor an Arab state. Moreover, many Britishers recognize that London does not have the moral authority in Palestine to carry out a policy. Under the circumstances, many observers believe it is time to look elsewhere for an attempted solution, and the logical place to turn to is the United Nations. Britain might agree to accept a trusteeship agreement for Palestine (drawn up by the Trusteeship Council and approved by the necessary two-thirds vote in the General Assembly) on one condition—that Britain should be granted a strategic base in part of Palestine. Since the formulation of a political decision in the United Nations would doubtless prove long and difficult, the humanitarian problem might be tackled at once by Anglo-American cooperation in sending 100,000 Jews to Palestine at the rate of 10,000 a month which, according to the Jewish agency, the country can absorb. Should such a plan be undertaken, it should be made clear that the 100,000 are to go in on schedule, but that any further immigration will depend on the decision of the United Nations.

AMERICAN INTERESTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The United States, as the strongest power in the world, has the greatest responsibility for helping to solve the refugee and other world problems. At Frankfort-am-Main in the American occupation zone in Germany, Gen. Joseph T. McNarney on February 6 told a press conference that "the only feasible solution" for the future of 125,000 Polish Jews in the American zone was settlement in Palestine. Increased American interest in Middle Eastern oil also forces us to share responsibility for problems of that region. Only 4 percent of the world's oil production to date has come from the Middle East, but it is estimated that the area contains 42 percent of the world's proved oil resources. A special Senate committee to investigate this country's petroleum resources reported on January 31 that our continental reserves were insufficient to meet our needs in case of another world war. Finally, Washington has a special obligation, because Jewish citizens of the United States are taking an active part in Palestine affairs. Mr. Mortimer May, vice president of the Zionist Organization of America declared on January 25: "We are going to have to realize now that for the first

time leadership in world Jewry and world Zionism has passed to the United States." The 1,600 delegates who heard Mr. May make this statement to the National Mobilization Conference of the Zionist Organization of America voted to raise a special $1,000,000 fund for Zionist propaganda in the United States.

The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry estimated that "as many as 500,000 (Jews) may wish or be impelled to emigrate from Europe." The United States could contribute to the settlement of one of the world's most acute problems by (1) opening its doors to 200,000 Jewish refugees; (2) urging other nations to absorb another 200,000 immigrants; (3) strengthening its insistence on immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine; (4) putting strong pressure on Britain to turn the mandate over to the United Nations; (5) and furnishing financial, technical, and even military aid to insure the transfer and safety of the 100,000 immigrants until the United Nations assumes this task.

[From the New York Times Magazine of February 16, 1947]

FORMULA FOR TROUBLED PALESTINE

DR. JUDAH LEON MAGNES ADVOCATES AN INDEPENDENT, BINATIONAL STATE WITH JEWS AND ARABS SHARING ALL THE RESPONSIBILITIES

(By Julian Louis Meltzer)

JERUSALEM.—The one constant factor in Palestine's long-standing perplexities is that its Jewish and Arab populations must continue to live together, no matter what ultimate political solution is hammered out. Whatever new constitution is framed, there will still be two peoples domiciled alongside each other in a land whose very smallness makes cooperative existence necessary and indeed inescapable in the long run. Zionist and Arab leaders claim that they are ready to prescribe democratic provisions to safeguard the minority rights of each other in their respective proposals for a Jewish state and an Arab state. But neither appears to trust the other's promises.

Like a voice crying in the wilderness, but a voice which is gradually growing in volume and gaining a hearing, Dr. Judah Leon Magnes, former rabbi of the largest Jewish congregation in America and head of Hebrew University in Jerusalem since its formation in 1924, has over the past 30 years maintained in speeches and writings that the sole equitable solution of the conflict between the two exclusive nationalisms is the formation of a binational state. This means ultimately an independent Palestinian state with two nationalities on an equal footing, politically and numerically.

The Zionists assert that Dr. Magnes' proposals are fair and give adequate place to unrestricted Jewish immigration, but they take issue with his views because they want a Jewish nationalist state into which Jews from all parts of the world could enter at any time as a right, and could ultimately become the numerical majority, ruling under a democratic constitution.

The Arabs feel that Dr. Magnes' plea for political parity, irrespective of numerical considerations, is tantamount to asking them to yield their present superior advantage of numbers. They fear that concessions given now will result eventually in their being swamped and dominated by a Jewish majority and in the stultification of their natural growth toward national independence.

Dr. Magnes, however, declares that Palestine as a land of three monotheistic religions is no place for an exclusively nationalist state. He is a fervent opponent of any kind of chauvinism.

Zionist and Arab leaders and the rank and file assert that he talks without benefit of suffrage and holds no elected position. The Ihud (Union) Association of Palestine, which is under Dr. Magnes' leadership, agrees that he is not an elected politician in the professional sense, but claims that his essential disinterestedness in party dogmas and alinements places his proposals for Arab-Jewish cooperation wholly above vested political interests.

The Ihud Association came into being in 1942 as a successor to the B'rith Shalom (Alliance of Peace) which Dr. Magnes, together with some friends founded in 1930 after the 1929 civil disturbances. B'rith Shalom and Ihud took as their principal plank a firm belief in the feasibility and practicability of Arab-Jewish cooperation in Palestine.

Dr. Magnes became the central figure of the Ihud group. It is not a political party but includes a number of outstanding members from different parties and, though its membership is small, its ideas have penetrated various Arab circles.

There is no doubt that Judah Leon Magnes has been a stormy petrel throughout his active life. But he has always been courageous and it is because he has expressed his views with such clarity and force that he has provoked so much discussion.

A few rainy days ago I was riding in a taxicab along a tree-lined Jerusalem avenue when I saw a tall, familiar figure of athletic build striding briskly along the windswept sidewalk with an easy, almost boyish gait. The skies were leaden and the other pedestrians hugged shelter, but he seemed to revel in the wet weather.

"Taxi, sir?" I called through the window, asking the driver to draw alongside the curb.

Standing there without an umbrella, his snap-brim Stetson worn jauntily, he declined my invitation smilingly. "Why, no, thanks. I like walking in the rain in Palestine. It reminds me of my youth in California."

It is hard to realize that this 6-foot, rangy Californian, whom many regard as being among the greatest Jews of the present century, will be 70 years old on July 5. Dr. Magnes is beginning to get gray-haired, but he still looks as if he were in his fifties. He was once a great baseball player and fond of tennis, which he played until he was 55. His only exercise nowadays is walking. "I like to walk nighttimes, but that seems inadvisable now, not only because of the political violence," he said whimsically, "but also because of the police and military operations."

Dr. Magnes was born in San Francisco and educated in the public schools of Oakland, the University of Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College in New York, and the University of Heidelberg in Germany, where he received his doctor's degree. He taught at Hebrew Union College for 2 years, and from 1905 to 1908 was secretary of the Federation of American Zionists, now called the Zionist Organization of America. In this office he succeeded the late Jacob De Haas, who was the first secretary of the organization.

From 1906 to 1910 Dr. Magnes was rabbi at Temple Emanu-El in New York. In 1907 he organized the Jewish Community of New York, of which he was the first and only chairman, holding the position until 1922. By the time America was entering the First World War this community already had become the largest Jewish organization in the world and gave promise of being a great constructive force in American Judaism. But when the United States declared war in April 1917 Dr. Magnes gave vigorous public expression to his pacifism and it was owing to this that the New York community organization began to decline, both in numbers and in influence. With his departure in 1922 to settle in Palestine, the organization almost ceased to exist.

"Thus, what I built with my own hands I unhappily destroyed," he declares sadly today.

In 1939, however, his advocacy of war against Hitler was voiced in a widely quoted address at Hebrew University, which republished it recently in a small volume entitled, "In the Perplexity of the Times."

The Hebrew University carries on both academic work and scientific research. Many of its 700 alumni and 70 doctors of philosophy who have received degrees since the first class was graduated are now teachers and researchers, either in Palestine or abroad.

The university opens its doors to Arabs, but only three Moslems are now enrolled. The political situation makes it difficult for Arabs to consider studying at a Jewish institution. Moreover, according to Dr. Magnes, few young Arabs attain secondary school educations which meet university standards. But inquiries have been received from many Arabs who wish to enter the medical school, which is to open 2 years hence.

At 70 Dr. Magnes has a full day's schedule. He rises at 6 o'clock in the morning and is occupied until 10 at night. As president of Hebrew University, he is particularly interested in the university's institute of Jewish studies and its school of oriental studies; in the Hebrew University Press Association for the creation of which he was mainly responsible in 1926, and in the medical school, the joint creation of Hebrew University and Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America. In this connection he is chairman of the Hadassah Council in Palestine. He also is chairman of the middle east advisory committee of the American-Jewish joint distribution committee.

"I have been trying for years to withdraw from various activities," said Dr. Magnes, "and I feel that the time has come when I should cease to be a chairman with a capital 'C,' although perhaps I may remain as chairman of some committees with a small 'c'."

As I sat talking with him in the study of his home the other day, there were three books lying on his desk. He said he was reading all three at the same time. They were a volume by an Oxford don, T. D. Weldon, States and Morals; a book by an Arab publicist, Edward Atiyah, An Arab Tells His Story; and Solomon Schechter's Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, which he is rereading carefully because he says he would like the Hebrew University Press Association to translate and publish it in Hebrew. He is similarly interested in having the best books written by the Mount Scopus scholars translated and published in English.

What has always impressed me about Dr. Magnes in our long acquaintance has been his humanness and his way of shunning the limelight. His humor is a synthesis of both qualities and often runs to a delight in incongruous situations, to which he is very much alive.

One memory I cherish is of seeing Dr. Magnes many years ago walking down a main thoroughfare of Jerusalem on a summer's day in the company of one of his three sons. Father and son carried ice-cream cones, which they were gravely licking. As a postscript, he chuckles today: "I still like ice cream."

Dr. Magnes is thinking a great deal these days, he tells me, about the problems explicit in the theme, The Uniqueness of Israel, that is, combination in Judaism of the highest universalist principles and the religious nationalism of the Jewish people.

"It is, I think, one of the most essential tasks of Jewish scholarship today to clarify this paradox," he said. "I am convinced that such a clarification would give Judaism a practical program, both in its relation to the outside world and to the distraught Jewish people itself."

Dr. Magnes' views on the feasibility of establishing a unified binational Palestine state have deeply impressed the Arab intelligentsia—among the Arab peasantry there is real daily cooperation with their Jewish

neighbors—and it is true that, of the Jews living in Palestine, Dr. Magnes probably is among the few whom Arabs of all classes feel to be completely and dispassionately sincere about the concept of Semitic racial cooperation. If there is any misgiving among thinking Arabs, it is that Dr. Magnes' views are not popular among his own people and that he has little following.

"My unconquerable conviction that the Jews and Arabs must and can live together," said Dr. Magnes, "stems from two elements of my training: First, the study of the Hebrew prophets and the Bible since my youth; second, my education as a liberal and my early life in what was at that time more or less an American frontier State—California."

Dr. Magnes and his friends feel that a partition of Palestine, with the creation of separate Arab and Jewish states, will keep both peoples permanently apart on either side of two unsatisfactory boundaries and will set up extremist irredentae, which in time will lead to armed conflict between the two races. Moreover, they assert that the partitions issue may provoke internecine strife among the Jews of Palestine themselves.

Their proposal calls for an undivided binational Palestine in which Jews and Aarabs would live and work in unison, having an equal share in the development, progress, and administration of the Holy Land.

One of their postulates is that this state of cooperative Arab-Jewish existence is possible, and it is formed from the testimony on every hand of actual amiable racial contacts of the present day.

"What I consider distressing," said Dr. Magnes, "is that many persons in authority have admitted that the binational idea is the most reasonable and practical compromise of all the solutions put forward. Yet they add that it is unfortunately impractical because the intransigeance of the Zionist and Arab leaders has produced an emotional state among their followers almost bordering on hysteria, and this makes it difficult to talk in terms of moderate and feasible compromise."

In addition to this intransigeance, another chief reason that stands in the way, he says, is the absence of a definite, systematic day-by-day policy on the part of the British Government looking toward Jewish-Arab cooperation.

"I have an unshakable conviction that agreement is possible between the Jews and Arabs," Dr. Magnes said. "Not only can they live together; they do live together, despite the tensions created by their leadership. I can give one striking example of present-day cooperation, the municipality of Haifa. This is governed by an equal number of Jewish and Arab councilors. When the Moslem Mayor died, the Jewish Deputy Mayor succeeded him. The Jewish Mayor, Shabbatai Levy, is held in respect by all sections of the community and the Haifa Municipal Council proceeds with its business without disturbance or interruption."

Dr. Magnes insists that the Arabs will acquiesce in the development of a unitary Palestine, with self-government and independence as its objectives, and that the Jews will also agree, if they are assured an opportunity for immigration and settlement and a chance for working out their future together with their Semite cousins, living in Palestine and adjoining territories.

Dr. Magnes and his associates in the Ihud Association have formulated a program which they believe is fair and practical. He says it can be implemented without delay by the mandatory power under the terms of the Palestine Mandate and without seeking any new authority, such as may be required for establishing two independent sovereign states. Moreover, he asserts that this plan will obviate the bickering and conflict that is usually fomented when new boundaries are demarcated.

These proposals are:

1. As many as possible of the 100,000 immigration permits recommended by last year's Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry should be issued for the immediate transfer of Jewish refugees from camps in Europe to Palestine and further immigration should be subject to the country's economic absorptive capacity. This capacity is to be expanded through a development plan for the benefit of all inhabitants, irrespective of nationality or creed. The United States Government has been noted as being ready to help finance such a plan.

2. Land-sales restrictions should be canceled and Jews and Arabs should be free to purchase land in all parts of the country, with legislation protecting the farmers and peasants against the dangers of buying land which won't support them.

3. Jews and Arabs to be appointed in equal numbers to the high executive government posts and in the judiciary, so that there will be parity among them and the Britons in such offices. A constitution committee, with equal numbers fo Jewish, Arab, and British members to be appointed, and when it completes its work, a constituent assembly convened with parallel Jewish and Arab membership to adopt a constitution.

4. A policy announcement should provide that after perhaps 7 years a binational Palestine based upon two equal nationalities would become independent. This would give time for a large Jewish immigration and for all authority to be vested in a binational state. A Jewish-Arab legislature would then determine if and how Palestine could join a union of the middle-east countries.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER,
Nashville, Tenn., February 20, 1947.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Congressman, United States
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I feel it necessary to call to your attention the seriousness of the situation confronting the public schools of Tennessee relating to the school-lunch program.

According to encumbrance records for the 1,832 approved schools, Tennessee will need approximately $2,300,000 in order to carry on the program to the end of the present school year. The total allocation for food assistance to Tennessee according to appropriations made available through the National School Lunch Act is $1,770,000. This leaves a deficiency of approximately $600,000 necessary to operate our present program through this year. Unless more Federal assistance can be made available, the 1,832 schools getting assistance through the National School Lunch Act will be forced to close in March.

Tennessee will spend, this year, approximately $6,000,000 from State and local funds to support the school-lunch program. This expenditure includes the items of food, labor, equipment, and operating expenses. At the beginning of the year when we began to approve schools for participation, we felt that the appropriation would fall far short of the amount needed to carry on a program even only in the schools approved. Acceptance of all applications were discontinued in January, although many schools applied later. In order to extend the funds as far as possible, many schools were actually discouraged from making application. To go even farther, schools with an enrollment of 250 or more were reduced in the rates of reimbursement per child.

I am pointing these things out in an effort to show that a program which should be available on the basis of need is not meeting these needs, due to the fact that adequate finances are not available. I am of the opinion that no program is more worthy of support and assistance than the school-lunch program. The popularity of this program is attested to by the records which show the increase in the number of schools applying for assistance each year. Only the limited amount of funds available has prevented greater participation.

I feel it urgent that you give any support at your command toward obtaining supplementary funds to be administered under the National School Lunch Act for the current school year. This support will be appreciated by the thousands of parents and children in Tennessee.

Very truly yours,

BURGIN E. DOSSETT,
Commissioner.

Centennial of the Founding of the State University of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

We, the Members of Congress from the State of Iowa, take great pleasure in calling to the attention of Congress and the people of the United States the celebration by the University of Iowa of its centennial, February 25.

The occasion called forth the passage of the following concurrent resolution by the Iowa State Legislature:

"Whereas one of the earliest acts of the first general assembly, signed in the old capitol at Iowa City, created the State University of Iowa on February 25, 1847; and

"Whereas this day, February 25, 1947, marks the completion of 100 years in the development and growth of the university: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this, the Fifty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa, records the appreciation of the people of Iowa for the loyalty of their State university in the training of the young people of this State and this Nation, for the development of its great areas of research dedicated to the well-being of mankind, and for its manifold and greatly expanding services to the Commonwealth."

We join with the Iowa State Legislature and the people of Iowa in extending our thanks and appreciation to the State university for outstanding service to our State and Nation throughout the century of service so well done, and we extend also our best wishes

for the continuation and expansion of this service to our State and Nation.

GEORGE A. WILSON,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Senators from Iowa.
THOMAS E. MARTIN,
First District,
HENRY O. TALLE,
Second District,
JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Third District,
KARL M. LECOMPTE,
Fourth District,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Fifth District,
JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
Sixth District,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Seventh District,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Eighth District,
Representatives from Iowa.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT NODAR, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. NODAR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Representative JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, at the Labor Lyceum, Brooklyn, N. Y., on Lithuanian Independence Day, February 16, 1947:

February 16, 1947, is celebrated as the twenty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence. A student of Lithuanian history might say that we are celebrating the five hundred and eighteenth anniversary of Lithuanian independence, going back to the first Lithuanian statute or constitution of 1529. Other students of Lithuanian history might choose even earlier dates. Lithuania has won, and lost, her independence many times during past centuries. There are those who say that she has again lost her independence, but the United States Government does not. The United States Government has not recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and continues to recognize the representative of an independent Lithuania accredited to this country. The celebration of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence is an event which is of significance, not only to Americans of Lithuanian decent but to all Americans. Shall the United States continue to support the rights of small nations to self-determination, the right to free and unfederate elections, the right to liberty and representative government? I do not have a drop of Lithuanian blood in my veins, but as an American I want my country to uphold these principles throughout the world, for these principles are fundamental to permanent peace and security of the United States itself.

No people have a stronger claim to the right of self-government and independence than do the 3,000,000 people of Lithuania. From the earliest times the Lithuanian people had developed their own language similar to the ancient Sanskrit, their own culture and traditions, their own government, their own nation. They are not related to the Russians or to any of the other Slavic peoples, but descended from an ancient people of a distinct nationality. It is therefore not surprising that they desire to retain independence and self-government as a means by which to preserve the ideals near and dear to them, their culture, language; in short, their way of life.

During its day of independence since the First World War, Lithuania demonstrated that it had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. By its progress in its economic and cultural life it demonstrated that its people were qualified to assume and discharge the responsibilities of independence. It is apparent that on the basis of justice and right—on the basis of principles announced in the Atlantic Charter—no one should question Lithuania's right to independence. And yet, though everyone agrees that the rights of small nations must be protected in the postwar world, still there is hesitation on the part of certain American leaders to voice their public support of these principles as to the Republic of Lithuania. They say that Russia intends to and has in fact already incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union; therefore it is anti-Russian to maintain that Lithuania should be independent, and will hamper the peace program to touch on this question. Furthermore, they say, Lithuania was a part of Russia before the year 1918. Lithuania, they say, was torn away from Russia in the closing days of the last war when Russia was helpless because of internal revolution, and should therefore be returned to Russia.

Well, of course, it is not true that Lithuania belongs to Russia; any student of history knows that Lithuania's independence dates back to the fifteenth century when Lithuania was a nation with borders from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea. Some of Russia was then a part of Lithuania. It should not be a question of which was a part of what. The important consideration is that the Lithuanian people are a distinct people with a history, culture, language, and ideals, not related to that of other nations. Furthermore, it is not anti-Russian to maintain that Lithuania deserves to be an independent nation because Russia has itself said so, at a time when Russia was strong and completely free from internal or external pressure. Russia has heretofore solemnly agreed and covenanted that it would respect the sovereignty of the Republic of Lithuania.

Those agreements and treaties, I repeat, were made not at the time when Russia was helpless because of internal revolution but in the years when the Soviet Union had a strong government. On September 28, 1926, a nonaggression treaty, which is still in effect, was entered into between the Republic of Lithuania and Soviet Russia. The language of the following articles of said pact provided:

"ART. 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other.

"ART. 3. Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party.

"ART. 5. Should a conflict arise, and if impossible to liquidate it in a diplomatic way, both contracting parties agree in such case to nominate conciliatory commission."

This treaty was by its terms to be in effect until December 31, 1945.

On October 10, 1939, Lithuania and Russia entered into a mutual assistance pact; article 7 reads:

"The realization of this Treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments, and altogether the principles of nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of another state."

Along with this pact Soviet Russia demanded the right to Russian Army garrisons in Lithuania. Many political observers interpreted this Russian demand as the first step to sovietize Lithuania. On October 31, 1939, Mr. Molotov dismissed these speculations in the following words:

"We stand for the conscientious and exact observation of the treaties concluded, on the principle of entire reciprocity, and declare the idle talk about the sovietization of the Baltic states to be profitable only to our common enemies and to all kinds of anti-Soviet provocateurs."

However, in June of 1940 Soviet Russia did occupy Lithuania—deposed its government, and under the supervision of the Russian Army, an election was held with ballots containing only one set of names. The United States denounced the Soviet occupation and elections as being "devious processes" and "predatory activities to deliberately annihilate the independence of the Baltic republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania."

On June 30, 1940, Mr. Molotov explained the Russian position as follows:

"It would be unpardonable if the Soviet Union did not seize this opportunity, which may never recur. The leaders of the Soviet Union have decided to incorporate the Baltic states into the family of Soviet republics."

The United States has never officially acceded to these Soviet claims. The State Department of the United States has continued to recognize and still recognizes the Lithuanian Minister of the United States. Its position in the matter is that Lithuania should be an independent nation.

As recently as October 19, 1945, United States Supreme Court Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson reaffirmed the policy of the United States in a communication to the Government of Soviet Russia wherein he stated:

"In the indictment of German war criminals signed today, reference is made to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and certain other territories as being within the area of the U. S. S. R.

"This language is proposed by Russia and is accepted to avoid delay which would be occasioned by insistence on an alteration in the text. The indictment is signed subject to this reservation and understanding.

"I have no authority either to admit or challenge on behalf of the United States Soviet claims to sovereignty over such territories.

"Nothing, therefore, in this indictment is to be construed as a recognition by the United States of such sovereignty or as indicating any attitude either on the part of the United States or on the part of the undersigned toward any claim to redisposition of such sovereignty."

In our preoccupation with other questions, let us not forget that the actual lives of men and women and children are involved in the Lithuanian question. There has been so much suffering, bloodshed, and destruction in the last few years that there is a tendency to take for granted what has occurred. I am told that Lithuania's people have undergone and are undergoing such suffering as come to few people in the world. First, the Russian Army marched across their country. Then the Nazis battled on their soil to drive out the Russians. Then back came the Russians to fight the Nazis and expel them. Each time, Lithuania's people were in the middle of the terrible cross fire of invasion and battle—forced to serve the conqueror as prizes in victory and tortured by the vanquished in defeat. Thousands of Lithuanians perished in battles which would bring their country nothing but terror and subjugation regardless of who won. And now that the tides of battle which flowed and ebbed in Lithuanian blood have ceased, the survivors look once more to their only hope—establishment of the democratic principles pledged to them and all peoples of the world by the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The Soviet Union contributed immensely to the military defeat of the forces of fascism which were determined to undermine these very principles of nonaggression and self-determination. Now that the military victory has been won, it is a sacred obligation of the Soviet Union actively to embrace the very principles which the Allies fought to uphold. It is true that the conduct of the Soviet Union toward Lithuania has not been consistent with these principles or with the treaties entered into between these two nations. But now that the war is over and Russia's security from the west is no longer threatened, no further reason exists for the Soviet Union to occupy Lithuania. And again, it is now apparent that with the advent of the atomic bomb, Lithuania is no longer important to the Soviet Union as a buffer state to protect it from attack.

Thus there is no reason either in principle or expediency why the Soviet Union should not now be willing to permit the people of Lithuania freely to elect their own government from candidates of democratic parties without outside influence or pressure. It is certainly better policy for the nations of the world to discuss these matters frankly and openly now, rather than to permit grievances of aggression and oppression to ferment into causes of future strife. The cause of Lithuania's independence should be supported by our country because it is based upon American principles of representative government. The peoples of Europe who respect these principles and ideals should be given the opportunity to embrace them and shape their way of life and choose their own form of government. The case of Lithuania is a symbol of one of the most important phases of American policy in striving to establish a sound and enduring peace for all peoples of the world.

The statement of policy and principle by our Government in 1940 concerning Lithuania, applies to all the world.

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the twenty-one sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

Why Not a Superior Court Labor Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able and most timely article from the competent pen of the Honorable Thomas Hart Kennedy, of the San Francisco bar, an article which, I am quite convinced, should be called to the attention of the Congress and the country.

This momentous expression from this widely known civic leader and outstanding legal authority, the article to which I have just referred, is, Mr. Speaker, the following:

[From the Recorder of December 3, 1946]

WHY NOT A SUPERIOR COURT LABOR LAW?

(By Thomas Hart Kennedy, of the San Francisco Bar)

A historian of our troubled times chronicling the progress of twentieth-century Americans toward social gains may, one day, write: "The milestones on the road toward revolution are clearly discernible. For example, on November 20, 1946, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit described a 5-year-old conflict between an Illinois railroad and its union employees as approaching the magnitude of civil war. It ordered the lower court to abate the nuisance that had become a stench in the nostrils trils of patriotic citizens of Illinois' by 'due process of law.' *Farmers Grain Co.* v. *T. P. & W. R. R.*, 158 (F 2d), 109, 117, 118."

Let us hope that the above speculation remains just that, but we who are living in this history can ourselves discern some of the forest through the trees, witness: "Bombings in Hollywood" (banner headline, San Francisco News, November 13, 1946); "Water-front strike, costing millions to labor and industry * * * lasted 54 days * * * longshore and maritime workers lost $17,500,000. * * * The cargo held up by the strike * * * was valued at an estimated $350,000,000 (The Call Bulletin, November 27, 1946): *"People of the United States* v. *John L. Lewis"* (San Francisco News, November 21, 1946); and "Popular government in the United States, however many shades of economic belief it contains, does not approve of the centralized and absolute controls necessary to realization of the Communist program." (Editorial, San Francisco Chronicle, November 27, 1946).

The time has come for the eradication of the causes of anarchy—that evil word used by Judge Goldsborough in the District of Columbia court the other day. The new Congress meeting in January will act and it is probable that this assured "Operation Labor" will eliminate or so change the Wagner Act—"Labor's Magna Carta," more properly described as a "Bill of Rights to Wreck the United States"—that the States will be free to regulate labor relations. Already several commonwealths below the Mason and Dixon line have enacted labor legislation only to meet with a Wagner Act cloud on their right to occupy this field imposed by the Supreme Court. See *Thomas* v. *Collons* (1945) 323 U. S. 516 (Texas Statute); *Hill* v. *Florida* (1945), 325 U. S. 538 (Florida Statute); *Alabama State Federation of Labor* v. *McAdory* (1946), 325 U. S. 450 (Alabama Statute); *A. F. of L.* v *Watson* (1946), 327 U. S 582, 90 L. ed. (Adv.) 715 (Florida Statute). We can understand that many southern Members of Congress, albeit Democrats, are not highly pleased with this diminution of their State's sovereign powers. On November 5 the people of Arizona, Scuth Dakota, and Nebraska enacted labor laws at the polls. It is not too much to expect a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans strong enough to remove federal interference with State control of labor relations.

California as we all know has no effectual statutory machinery for the settlement of labor disputes. But the Wagner Act notwithstanding, the States do have some power in this field if they choose to exercise it. In *Allen Bradley* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* (1942), 315 U. S. 740, the Supreme Court sustained an order of the Wisconsin board although the employer involved was subject to the National Labor Relations Board. The Court pointed out that as the State board's order did not conflict with any order of the national board, it was a valid exercise of the State's police power.

In our State most employees would be subject to similar regulation if we had such a State law and with the expected weakening of federal occupation of the field of regulation, California should get ready to act. If our state government can prevent work stoppages resulting from labor disputes and thereby insure continuous production, lowering of costs of goods and services, the increase of purchasing power, and divert depression it is certainly the duty of our legislators to pass all laws necessary to accomplish these ends. The people expect the 1947 legislature to protect the public peace and welfare.

Among the many grave matters for consideration at Sacramento next month, labor peace ranks high if not first. Senator Dillinger, Placerville, is quoted in the Sacramento Bee, November 13, 1946, as follows: "The No. 1 problem before us now is better labor management relations—how to control strikes." He has announced that he will introduce a bill importing into our law the Minnesota Labor Relations Act. This statute sets up a new State bureau headed by a conciliator.

Lawyers are sworn to uphold the law. They must, by the very nature of their office, support due process against anarchy, civil war or trial by battle. It is fundamental that if a system of due process can be devised that will secure to all parties to a labor dispute substantial justice, this system will command the support of the legal profession. Can this ideal of justice under the law be more nearly approached through a new state-wide bureaucracy than through the operation of our constitutional courts? See "Minority Report" to Report of Committee on Administrative Agencies and Tribunals, Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting, State Bar of California, Yosemite, September 1941, pages 331-333.

As an alternative to Senator Dillinger's proposal it is suggested that the legislature can empower the Superior Court to adjudicate labor disputes and establish and enforce the rights of employees, unions, employers, and the public. It is also proposed that such Superior Court control is infinitely preferable to expanding our already much overgrown bureaucracy.

If the present state of affairs has approached or amounted to civil war or anarchy, certainly the legislature may declare the causes thereof, to wit, strikes, lockouts, slowdowns, failure to bargain in good faith, employment discriminations, unpeaceful picketing, false statements in labor disputes, organizational picketing, boycotts, "hot cargo," violations of minimum wage, maximum hours, and other labor standards it fixes, to be nuisances. See *Carse* v. *Marsh* (1922), 189 Calif. 743, 744, 210 P. 257; *People* v. *Lim* (1941), 18 Calif. (2d) 872, 879, 880, 118 P. (2d) 472; *Spreckles* v. *Hawaiian* (1897), 117 Calif. 377, 381, 49 P. 353. The Superior Court has the power derived from the constitution to abate such nuisances. *Carse* v. *Marsh*, supra; *In re Brambini* (1923), 192 Calif. 19, 39, 218 P. 569.

The legislature can implement its presently declared public policy to promote and foster collective bargaining (Labor Code, sec. 923) and the equity jurisdiction of the Superior Court to abate and forestall the legislatively declared nuisances by enlarging the authority of the court to appoint referees

to take evidence on an issue of a proper unit for collective bargaining and to conduct secret-ballot elections to determine the representatives of employees for collective bargaining. The court would thereafter order the parties to bargain in good faith.

The nuisance of refusal to bargain in good faith could be forestalled and the public policy of peaceful settlement of labor disputes fostered by providing that if the parties failed to agree to a collective-bargaining contract in whole or in part within a specified number of days from and after designation of bargaining representative, the court should take evidence or cause evidence to be taken before a referee to determine the "gaps" in the agreement. The court should thereafter order the hours, rates of pay, and working conditions in the unit, based upon the record of the proceedings measured by standards fixed by the legislature. Of course, the referee should be a lawyer and his compensation should more closely approximate that for judges than the $5 per diem allowed under section 1023 C. C. P.

Violations of court orders would, as always, be punishable as contempt of court. The legislature could add other sanctions, for example, withdrawal of employment, unemployment compensation rights, or other benefits conferred by the law. In general the court should be armed with all powers necessary to secure obedience to its orders.

The collective bargaining process, with resort to the court when necessary, should be available to the parties once each year. Whereas the underlying principle of this plan is the protection of the public interest the district attorney should be a party to all court proceedings, and he should point out to the court any proposal of any party that would operate against the public. For example, employers and unions have been known to conspire to violate our anti-trust laws. The district attorney should be alert to such attempts and nip them in the bud.

The Superior Court may be clothed with all the above-described functions in aid of its equity jurisdiction. The touchstone is whether or not the procedure prescribed by the legislature is necessary and helpful in connection with the performance of some function properly belonging to the court. See: Rode, Comment, 25 California Law Review 694, 702, note 65 and cases cited; McGovney, "Administrative Decisions and Court Review Thereof in California," 29 California Law Review 110, 122, 150; *Whitten* v. *California State Board* (1937, 8 Calif. (2d) 444, 446, 65 P. (2d) 1296; *McDonough* v. *Goodcell* (1939), 13 Calif. (2d) 741, 753, 91 P. (2d) 1035.

The Superior Court Labor Law should stop strikes and provide a fair tribunal where all concerned might adjudicate by due process of law any differences arising between employers and unions. This plan would reverse the un-American trend toward centralization and bureaucracy. It would put government where it belongs—at home. Rank and file union members should not fear this substitute for the right to strike. Continuous employment is also important to them and Superior Court judges are elective officials, subject to recall. If the majority of the citizens of any county are convinced that any judge, district attorney, or other peace officer is not doing his duty, the incumbent will be retired. All citizens could be expected to take a greater interest in the caliber and performance of their elected representatives in public office and with such home rule anarchy and strikes would become a thing of the past. We could have production, due process of law, and prosperity.

Do California lawyers want more centralized bureaucracy or will they bestir themselves and take action so that the preservation of the peace and dignity of the people of this State will be committed to our constitutional courts?

Sugar Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from an outstanding lawyer of Atlanta, Ga., containing some rather surprising information concerning sugar rationing. Mr. Buchanan, the writer of the letter, felt that as his Representative in Congress, I should have this information. It should be of interest to every Member of Congress and to the public generally. I am, therefore, requesting that Mr. Buchanan's letter to me be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

ATLANTA, GA., *February 12, 1947.*
Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I have just completed the trial of an OPA conspiracy case in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. The case resulted in a mistrial, because of the illness of a juror, then of a defendant, and finally of another juror.

I learned some facts about sugar rationing in this trial that shocked me. I think you should know what I learned.

Any person who represents himself to be a canner of fruit can apply for sugar, getting an allotment; then at the end of the season he can report how many cases of fruit he canned, and how much sugar he has left over, and he can transfer to other canners or grocers who apply for it the left-over sugar. Absolutely no check is made to see whether the canner did can the fruit which he reports

I want to give you an analysis of the testimony of two bona fide Georgia canners.

The Russell & Decker Co., of Monticello, Ga., canned peaches. In 1945 this company got an allotment of 328,000 pounds of sugar. They reported using 240,000 pounds. They transferred 20,000 pounds to one canning company and 68,700 pounds to another canning company, which was done on order of OPA. This canning company had on hand throughout the canning season and until September 88,700 pounds more sugar than it needed; 60,000 pounds represents a large carload.

The Southern States Canning Co., of Fort Valley, Ga., in 1945 received an allotment of 674,000 pounds. This was more than 10 carloads of sugar. This company actually received 280,000 pounds of sugar, which was the equivalent of 4 carloads of 60,000 pounds each, plus 40,000 pounds more, or a small carload. During the season it actually used 147,800 pounds. It transferred to other users during the canning season 152,200 pounds, which is practically 3 carloads of sugar.

The J. C. LaRue Co., which leased from the Chairman of the Security Administration the canning plant at Pine Mountain Valley, Ga., which had been established upon the insistence of either Mr. or Mrs. Roosevelt, and which was being liquidated in 1945 after an unsuccessful career, applied for 1,993,600 pounds of sugar. The superintendent estimated he would put up 445,000 cases of peaches, using 4.8 pounds of sugar per case. This concern was given a sugar certificate for 80,000 pounds on the 15th of June. It made efforts to obtain sugar in its home town, Madisonville, Ky., New Orleans, La., Mobile, Ala., Savannah, Ga., Columbia, Ga., Louisville, Ky., and Indianapolis, Ind. This concern never obtained any sugar, and returned its check on October 15. Instead of putting up 445,000 cases of peaches, they actually canned 11,000 cases.

The above facts appear from the transcript of evidence in the case of the *United States* v. *Theodore T. Smith et al.*, in which case I represented Robert W. Nelson.

I am convinced that anyone in the canning business can obtain sugar by the carload, whereas the ordinary citizen such as I, can barely obtain a lump of sugar to put in his coffee. The evidence also indicated that bakers, bottlers, and other industrial users who are bona fide engaged in business, and two or three who were not bona fide engaged, can obtain sugar by the carload. In fact, the case developed that one man represented he was in the canning business, and got about 200,000 pounds of sugar, and never did even begin construction of his peach-freezing plant.

I am convinced that sugar rationing is a farce, except when it gets down to the consumer, and with him it is a real tragedy.

I will appreciate it if you will give me the name of the chairman of the committee which is now considering the question of extending sugar rationing. I hope you will do all you can to have it terminated. I feel sure we will have the same result that we now have with reference to meat.

With regards,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. BUCHANAN.

Releasing Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therewith an article appearing in the Washington Post, of date December 25, 1946, which is as follows:

RELEASING OBJECTORS

Conscience sometimes makes men behave very unreasonably. It led members of the religious sect known as Jehovah's Witnesses to refuse not only military service but even service in the Civilian Public Service Camps provided by Congress as an alternative for men whose scruples forbade them to perform any sort of military duty. The Jehovah's Witnesses defied a law of the land in conformity with which millions of young Americans were called from their homes and their peaceful pursuits to bear arms in defense of their country. To punish them for this defiance—especially in view of the honorable alternative to military duty offered to them by Congress—cannot in any sense we think, be considered an impairment of religious freedom. The majesty of the Government required that the law be enforced.

But vindictiveness in dealing with these men and with other genuine conscience cases would contribute nothing to the Government's majesty. It was found necessary during the war years to send to prison some 6,000 to 7,000 persons, either because, like the Jehovah's Witnesses, they refused to work in Civilian Public Service Camps or because their local draft boards refused to consider them genuine conscience cases and assign them to CPS Camps. The law was rigidly

narrow in its application, and draft boards were sometimes reluctant to acknowledge the claims of conscience. Moreover, the treatment accorded the men who went to CPS Camps was so senselessly punitive and so wasteful of their skills that some of them quite understandably rebelled against it and went to prison instead.

It is reported that the President will release on parole at Christmas one-third of the Jehovah's Witnesses remaining in prison. These men will have served a year of their three-year terms. We think, considering the fact that the war is over and that other Americans are not now risking their lives in a service these men refused to render, that this leniency is wise and just, in no way diminishing the majesty of the Government. We hope that the President will grant release as well to the 300 Jehovah's Witnesses and the 25 other conscientious objectors expected to remain in prison after Christmas. Indeed, we should like to see him go beyond this and grant a general amnesty to all the conscience cases relieving them of the onerous obligations of parole. They have been punished enough; and certainly in time of peace they are no danger to society.

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) News of February 24, 1947:

LET'S GUARD OURSELVES AGAINST NATIONAL SUICIDE BY SENTIMENTAL SELF-DELUSION

At the first sign of any real militancy against Communists there invariably goes up the outraged howl of "witch hunt."

Some of the howling has come from people who should know a great deal better than to raise their voices in a parroting of that standard cry of the subversive under fire.

The charge of Red baiting by the Red who finds his machinations encountering opposition is a cliché so threadbare that it is difficult to understand how it still finds an audience, much less individuals willing to echo it.

The fact stands that the Communist Party is actively hostile toward the existence and evolution of democracy. It would stamp it out overnight if it had the power to do so, substituting the totalitarianism of Soviet Russia, and of erstwhile Nazi Germany. So far as their impact upon the ordinary man is concerned, they are indistinguishable.

Moscow has declared all the rest of the world except Russia to be Fascist, and that fascism is the eternal enemy of the Communist. So the Communists have set themselves the task of destroying American democracy along with all the other shadings of political ideology not their own.

In their war to be waged by subversion, no holds are barred. Every kind of trickery and any sort of lie is a legitimate weapon. Civil turmoil, the confusing of issues and false accusation are tools of the subversive's trade. He is schooled to use them, and is expert in their handling.

When those who desire to see democracy perpetuated for themselves and their children inveigh against communism they are not endeavoring to suppress any spontaneous tide. They are trying to fight a diabolically clever, unprincipled little minority which by its discipline and its knowledge of disrupting, obstructing tactics is a danger to the great mass of Americans.

Today, America is not concerned with witches or any other figments of superstitious folklore. It is confronted with the well-advanced infiltration of an organized, directed force dedicated to our undoing as a democratic nation.

Its agents have crept in everywhere—into unions, into faculties, into government itself. To defend them is to defend men and women who, though their methods are different and more subtle, are in nowise different from the Bundists who paraded before December 7, 1941, in their designs on the United States.

To give them their way on the theory that this is a free country constitutes national suicide by sentimental self-delusion.

If these Communists, imported and home grown, were to stand before us openly, arguing for their cause and winning converts by persuasion until Americans could be induced to vote away their democracy in favor of servitude to the state, there might be much less ground for declaring them political outlaws.

But the Communist doesn't work that way because he can't. He couldn't win. His methods must be sly, surreptitious. He cannot convert and lead any Americans except a few who live in a peculiar state of delusion. His technique must be to seize power and control.

There are few Communist organizations in this Nation. Writers who watch their words seldom refer to groups as Communists. What we do have is a growing and insufferable array of Communist-dominated organizations—groups whose control has been seized by Communists and in which the rank and file are relegated to the role of sheep to be herded in whatever direction Moscow finds most convenient at the moment.

It is perhaps to be regretted that Voltaire ever wrote in his letter to Madam du Deffand, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

No one who loves freedom will refuse to subscribe to Voltaire's splendid statement of what must be a precept of all democracy.

The trouble is that too many politicians, editors, preachers, pedagogs, and pleaders of causes have acquired the distorted notion that Voltaire got his applause for saying that he would defend the right of another person to plot for his abuse, betrayal, and enslavement.

That is not what Voltaire said or meant.

The People's Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 24, 1947

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under privilege granted by the House to revise and extend my remarks, I include two articles appearing in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer under the heading, "The People's Forum," which are in reply to what was purported to be political advertising that appeared in several North Carolina newspapers some time ago, and which I included in my remarks during the consideration here on the floor of the House of the contempt citation brought by the Un-American Activities Committee against Gerhart Eisler on Tuesday, February 18, 1947.

I highly commend the writers of these two articles.

THE PEOPLE'S FORUM

ANY SCHOOL CHILD CAN ANSWER

To the Editor: I am a veteran of World War II and was overseas a couple of years, during which time I found that war makes strange bedfellows as well as politics. The expediency with which we finish the war to a victorious conclusion was made possible in no small part by the fighting aid given us by our communistic ally, Russia. We, veterans and civilians alike, have given Russia credit for her part in this conflict, but, being a marriage of convenience, this coalition of these two great countries, the United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, had to come to an end.

Now, in our sovereign State of North Carolina we are, because of our freedom of speech, forced to read advertisements, political advertisements, of the Communist Party, the one and only political party in Russia.

If I, as a veteran, can get a bonus from either the State of North Carolina or the United States of America through the Communist Party, then I think that I should at once withdraw from all organizations loyal to the United States of America. I consider it an insult to all veterans and all other citizens of this country that the Communist Party is trying to use the veterans, Negroes, and labor to undermine our democratic way of life. What would happen to anyone inserting an ad like the one we had to read a few days ago if it were inserted in a paper published in a communistic country and the ad was signed by the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, or some other party that stands for freedom? Any school child can answer that.

I am not blaming the News and Observer for the ad as I know that paid political ads must be accepted by the papers.

FRED T. RILEY.

RALEIGH.

"SURPRISED"

To the Editor: I was surprised, or rather disgusted, with the paid political advertisement in the News and Observer. The first statement could and should be true: "The people of North Carolina are uneasy about the future."

Why shouldn't they be uneasy when such termites as the Communists are trying to undermine their Government? As for bringing up the dead hand of the slave past, the descendants of the slaves that were in this country never think of it. They are too busy enjoying the freedom of the good old United States of America.

It might be well to mention that America's slaves came here as slaves, and America made them free. Not so with Czarist Russia; she made slaves of her own people, and the Communist Russia continues to make and send more of them to Siberia.

Why doesn't this propagandist tell the whole story with his United States Department of Commerce figures? It's because he deals in half truths. More of the truth would show that North Carolina's income per person is $732, compared to $1,290 for all States because North Carolina, as a State, doesn't earn enough in dollars to even out the difference.

Because of the sweat that has fallen, and continues to fall, from other brows the man that wrote that advertisement enjoys the best bread and the greatest freedom that the world has ever given. And what does he give in return? He seeks in every manner to discredit our way of government. The question is, Why should these Communists be tolerated any more so than Nazis or Fascists? They are worse than either. They come out with half truths to support their lies toward revolution. Frankly, they put forth their propaganda openly, and for the

world to see, apparently, but remember, North Carolinians, they are termites with the way of termites. The little sign they make aboveboard is not comparable with the damage they do underneath.

Now, News and Observer, you can publish this or throw it in the wastebasket, but if you throw it into the wastebasket you are pink—and deep pink at that.

S. C. CARTY.

WASHINGTON, N. C.

A Boondoggling Rebuke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee, composed of 20 members, I voted to reduce the Federal budget to $31,500,000,000, or a cut of $6,000,000,000 below the amount recommended by President Truman for 1948.

When the Budget Committee, composed of 102 members, met I again voted for a $6,000,000,000 cut below the amount asked for by the President. The motion to make this cut was carried by a substantial vote.

The resolution to approve the action of the Budget Committee came to the floor of the House of Representatives for consideration, and after full debate the resolution to fix the ceiling at $31,500,000,000 was approved by a decisive vote. Thus, by the action of the House of Representatives the budget of President Truman has been cut $6,000,000,000.

During the debate the New Deal spenders made vociferous appeals against the proposed cut of $6,000,000,000 in the President's budget of $37,500,000. The New Deal opposition to the $6,000,000,000 cut took the form of "picking the figure out of thin air," "destroying our national security," "crystal-ball gazing," and "legislative hypocrisy."

It was quite evident that the New Deal spenders, boondogglers, and wasters, in their frenzy to preserve what many of them regarded as a vested interest in access to the Federal Treasury, failed to recall the findings of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning. This committee was appointed in the early part of 1944 pursuant to House Resolution 408, which provided that it should be the duty of the committee to investigate and report to Congress upon "all matters relating to postwar economic policy and problems to the end that Congress may be in a position to formulate solutions with respect to them which will result in the greatest contribution by the Congress to the achievement of a stable economy and a just peace."

It is difficult to understand how the New Deal leadership could repudiate the findings of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, the personnel of which was selected with great care as to individual ability and character for so important a task.

The membership of this committee is as follows: Hon. William M. Colmer; Hon. Jere Cooper; Hon Francis E. Walter; Hon. Orville Zimmerman; Hon. John R. Murdock; Hon. Walter A. Lynch; Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien; Hon. John E. Fogarty; Hon. Eugene Worley; Hon. Charles L. Clifford; Hon. B. Carroll Reece; Hon. Richard J. Welch; Hon. Charles A. Wolverton; Hon. Clifford R. Hope; Hon. Jesse P. Wolcott; Hon. Jay LaFevre; Hon. Sid Simpson.

It is seldom that a special committee of Congress has at its command such a formidable and able staff of assistants. It is enough to mention the names of the economists and consultants to establish the high order of talent selected to aid the committee. The membership of this committee staff is as follows: Marion B. Folsom, director of staff; Henry B. Arthur, economist; A. D. H. Kaplan, economist; William Y. Elliott, consultant; Edwin B. George, consultant; Robinson Newcomb, consultant; Theodore W. Schultz, consultant; Vergil D. Reed, consultant; C. A. Sienkiewicz, consultant; Lloyd A. Metzler, consultant; and Robert J. Landry, consultant.

Such a staff does not make findings from figures picked out of thin air, neither do they resort to a crystal ball, nor do they connive at legislative hypocrisy.

The Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee, at pages 68 and 69 of its final report, made the following recommendations, which I am, under leave to extend, inserting in the RECORD at this point:

With the Federal budget at the $41,000,000,000 level, the cost of the Federal Government per family of four is $1,130. If the cost of State and local governments were added, it would bring the burden up to $1,430 per family. The serious effects of such a burden should be obvious. The committee wishes to reiterate more strongly than ever the necessity of reducing expenditures substantially. It realizes that we cannot reach the $20,000,000,000 level during the next fiscal year. It would, however, urge serious consideration to reducing expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, to $30,000,000,000, with further substantial reduction during the following year, but with the objective of a $20,000,000,000 budget at an early date.

BUDGET FOR 1948

It can be seen from the above 1947 budget that there are several substantial nonrecurring items. Terminal-leave pay, mustering-out pay, payments on account of UNRRA and lend-lease, refunds, and international finance all represent items which will either not recur in the 1948 budget or in greatly reduced amount. It is estimated that there should be a reduction of at least $7,000,000,000 in these items alone. While the committee realizes the necessity of continuing heavy expenditures for strong national defense, it seriously questions whether it is necessary to spend over 12 times the amount which was spent in 1939. It would urge upon the officials of the War and Navy Departments that they should realize the effects which such heavy expenditures have upon the economy of the country and that the greatest effort be made to reduce these expenditures; that each item in the budget be scrutinized to see if it is absolutely necessary; and that projects which are not immediately needed be postponed.

The committee feels that a budget of $30,000,000,000 is a realistic budget and that expenditures can be reduced to this level without interfering with national defense or other normal functions of the Government. At this level the cost to the Federal Government per family of four would be over $850 per year.

Why all this hue and cry from the New Dealers when the Republicans, after full and complete investigation as to possible savings in the governmental expenditures, almost agreed with but did not go quite so far in their ceiling recommendations as did the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee?

I am inserting under unanimous consent heretofore granted a letter on this subject from Dr. Harley L. Lutz, professor of public finance at Princeton University:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: An undue disturbance of the public mind has been produced by the comments on the action of the joint congressional committee in recommending a $6,000,000,000 cut in the President's budget for 1948. The committee's report contains no details, but a general impression has gone abroad that the reduction has been heavily concentrated upon the defense services. There is danger of grave disservice to the cause of economy and efficiency in the Federal expenditures by giving credence, at this juncture, to the rumors about how or where the cuts are to be made.

It is evidently the judgment of a substantial majority of the Joint Legislative Committee that the budget can be reduced by $6,000,000,000 without impairing essential Federal services. The Committee on Postwar Tax Policy has also indicated, in its recent report, that the 1948 budget can be safely reduced to $31,500,000,000. We may assume that the Members of Congress who gave their approval to a budget reduction of $6,000,000,000 had no intention of hamstringing the Federal Government, or of undermining our defense establishment.

Some unofficial statements about the joint committee action have intimated that the cut in the defense services is to be $1,750,000,000. Editorial comment has seen in this reported figure a rule-of-thumb procedure, on the part of the joint committee, involving a 30-percent slash everywhere, since defense is about 30 percent of the budget total, and $1,750,000,000 is so nearly 30 percent of $6,000,000,000.

The Committee on Postwar Tax Policy, after careful study, proposed a defense total of $10,000,000,000, which would be a reduction of $1,200,000,000 below the net budget total. The underlying logic of this proposal was, first, that the President's budget really proposed spending only about $10,000,000,000 on the actual operations of 1948, and, second, that the bulk of the differences between $10,000,000,000 and $11,200,000,000 is accounted for by meeting, in 1948, unliquidated obligations of prior years. In other words, we are to pay, in 1948, bills that had been previously incurred. The budget message makes it clear that no contract settlements or other contract obligations from the war period are involved.

A thorough examination of the budget details reveals an itemization of prior obligations to be carried into 1948 amounting to $547,000,000, including $250,000,000 of terminal-leave pay. The balance is not explained, and we may assume that it was not sufficiently clearly visualized at the time of budget writing (around January 1, 1947) to be set down. This writer's view is that much of it is unreal, improper, merely a means of grabbing extra funds from prior appropriations by all manner of informal earmarking.

We have no information now as to the validity of the reported $1,750,000,000 cut, or as to its apportionment between defense proper and the civil functions of the War

Department. The budget total for these civil functions in 1948 is $1,023,000,000, including nearly $300 million for rivers and harbors, and flood control, and $725,000,000 for Government and relief in occupied areas.

As to rivers and harbors, the story of such expenditures over the past 50 years suggests that some pruning is always in order. Until Mr. Herbert Hoover makes his report, we shall lack the basis for a sound judgment on the European relief situation. The occupied areas everywhere will have the benefit of a full crop year, however, before much spending can occur out of the 1948 appropriation. It is possible that less will be needed than is now budgeted. Hence it is possible to assume that some reduction can be made in the total for the civil functions of the War Department.

If we grant a total of $10,000,000,000 for defense in 1948, which is really all that is asked for aside from the carry-over of earmarked obligations, it is likely that enough wasteful spending can be combed out of the estimates to offset the amount set up validly as unliquidated obligations. Here are two small examples of what such combing would produce:

1. The Quartermaster Corps estimates include the following expenditures for laundry and dry-cleaning plant:

1946 (actual)	$33,757,859
1947 (estimated)	23,794,256
1948 (estimated)	23,145,000

The Army charges the commissioned grades of personnel for laundry and dry-cleaning services. Its collections for these services, reported as miscellaneous receipts, are given as follows:

1946 (actual)	$22,421,266
1947 (estimated)	12,040,000
1948 (estimated)	10,040,000

My point is that the Army, having already acquired enough equipment to do a gross business of $22,421,000 in 1946, at the low rates charged for laundry and dry-cleaning services for the commissioned personnel of an Army of eight to nine million, it is extremely doubtful if a case can be made for buying now, and continuing to buy, through 1948, further large quantities of equipment in order to perform these services for a much smaller number of officer personnel.

2. The Ordnance Department figures for 1948 contain the following items:

Procurement of ammunition	$20,800,000
Procurement of artillery	3,400,000
Procurement of small arms	3,600,000
Procurement of tanks and combat vehicles	8,900,000
Procurement of other motor vehicles	3,300,000
Total procurement	40,000,000
Preservation of ordnance matériel	80,000,000
Preservation of ammunition	30,000,000
Total for care of material on hand	110,000,000

In other words, the Army wants to spend $40,000,000 for new ammunition, artillery, small arms, tanks, and other motor vehicles, while also spending $110,000,000 for the preservation of ammunition and other matériel (including, no doubt, artillery, small arms, tanks, and other motor vehicles) already in hand. The new purchases evidently are not in the line of research and development, for there is another $40,000,000 set down for this purpose.

Another example is Vice Admiral Sherman's statement about Navy fuel, as reported in the New York Times of February 15, 1947. According to this statement, the 1948 budget figure for fuel will allow only 3 days' operation per month. The 1948 figure for Navy fuel is $40,000,000. The 1947 figure is $45,000,000. Admiral Sherman made no complaint against the 1947 figure, but he emphasized the budget cut and the rise of oil prices in his dark picture of 1948. It is not easy to see how fuel-oil prices can rise so greatly as to convert an apparently satisfactory allowance for 1947 into a wholly unsatisfactory one for 1948, when there is a difference of only $5,000,000 between the 2 years.

No one wants to undermine or impair our national defense. The real problem is to distinguish between the true defense needs and the loud cries of the military heads. We should all bear in mind Admiral Nimitz' frank admission in his testimony on the naval bill for 1947. He said that no naval or military man is ever satisfied with what is made available.

Two interesting foreign items have recently been reported. They have a definite bearing on our immediate defense problem.

The first item is a detail from the British budget for 1948, as summarized in the New York Times of February 15, 1947. The British defense program calls for a total personnel of 1,087,000, and an expenditure of £899,000,000, equivalent to about $3,600,000,000. The white paper containing this information stated that the aim of British policy must be "to deter aggression while at the same time safeguarding British interests against attack."

Surely England has as great a stake in national existence and security as we have. Even after allowing for differences in standards of pay, equipment, and operations, it is hard to explain why we should be spending, in a year of peace, some $6,800 per man as against England's $3,500.

The second item, published in the New York Herald-Tribune of February 6, 1947, indicated that Russia had ordered demobilization of virtually all military personnel above the age of 22. This is smart tactics. The able young men of Russia are needed on the farms and in the factories, which is where Russian capital resources are also needed.

Let us get wise to realities. We can reduce the 1948 budget to $31,500,000,000 and still allow $10,000,000,000 for bona fide defense objectives. We should not be dragooned into sinful waste of our resources and our manpower by bureaucratic propaganda.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY L. LUTZ,
Professor of Public Finance, Princeton University.

Amnesty for the CO's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therewith an editorial appearing in the New York Times, which is as follows:

AMNESTY FOR THE CO'S

A committee of American writers, under the chairmanship of Dorothy Canfield Fisher, has appealed to President Truman to grant amnesty to "imprisoned conscientious objectors, including Jehovah's Witnesses, and to those others who, though they have completed their sentences, continue to suffer for their fidelity to conscience by the loss of important civil rights." It is not easy to decide what is just treatment of conscientious objectors in time of war. Some of them accepted arduous and even dangerous noncombatant service, and made the decision simple. Others, no matter how conscientious, did not make the sacrifices that were required of the front-line fighter. Their scruples brought them out alive and whole, which was not the fact with about a million Americans who had no such scruples.

Nevertheless, we do have to play fair with citizens who honestly believe that it is wrong to take up arms or to aid others in doing so. Where the honesty has been established by positions taken in time of peace prison sentences are both futile and unjust. The freedom of the private conscience is the very soul of democracy. We believe that the Writers' Committee for Amnesty, whose members show a wide spread of political opinion, has a good case. We cannot consistently free political prisoners in Germany and Japan and continue to penalize them here.

Third-Term Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 24, 1947, as follows:

THIRD-TERM BAN

The drive for a constitutional amendment limiting future Presidents to two terms has about it an atmosphere of political immaturity—a suggestion that the inheritors of the best political system in the world lack confidence in the essential foundation of their political structure.

It is probably true that, in the absence of unusual circumstances, the best interests of the country are served when a President does not serve more than two terms. There is nothing magical, of course, about two terms, and it is worth noting that the Senators and Representatives who are supporting the proposed amendment apparently see no inconsistency in having themselves reelected to as many successive terms as possible. Still, in the absence of exceptional conditions, an excellent argument can be made for the proposition that a President should serve two terms at most, and then turn the job over to someone else.

Implicit in this, however, is recognition of the fact that in some future grave emergency the national interests might be served best by continuing a President in office for more than two terms, and the trouble with the proposed amendment is that it would make this virtually impossible. There are those who say that the amendment, if adopted, could always be repealed, but this is an argument which overlooks two things—first, the time element, and, second, the very important fact that a constitutional amendment, once adopted, cannot be repealed except by vote of two-thirds of the States. Thus a decision which might be vital to all of the people could be controlled by the whims or the procrastination of 17 States.

The question which should be posed to the sponsors of the amendment is this: Why should we of this generation undertake to tie the hands of our children in any and all circumstances, none of which can be foreseen now? Surely, on the record of our own performance, we have no valid claim to the requisite wisdom. Why not permit them to make their own free decision in the light of conditions which they will have to face and which we cannot possibly anticipate? That is the essence of the democratic process, and

we would pay ourselves a highly dubious compliment in undertaking to short-circuit it. This amendment is one which should not pass, and the Star hopes that it will never be written into the Constitution.

Resolution of the Lawrence Chapter of Lithuanian-American Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution that I have received from Mr. Matthew M. Stakionis, secretary, Lawrence Chapter of Lithuanian-American Council, 29 Monmouth Street, Lawrence, Mass.:

Resolution unanimously adopted by Lithuanian fraternal societies and cultural organizations which constitute the Lawrence Chapter of the Lithuanian-American Council, at their mass meeting held at the Lyra Hall, on February 16, 1947

Whereas over 20 months passed since the end of hostilities in Europe and Lithuania is still under the occupation of the Soviet Russian Army; and

Whereas the Russian Government has illegally formed in Lithuania a Communist regime, which is forcing upon the people a Soviet system of government, abhorrent and alien to their convictions; and

Whereas the Communist administration, supported by the Russian Army and police, has deprived the Lithuanian peoples of all their individual and political rights and liberties, is cruelly persecuting them, arresting them and subjecting them to long terms in prison and deporting them into the Soviet Union, while their properties are being turned over to colonists brought in from Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting, gathered to commemorate the twenty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, register an emphatic protest against the illegal, arbitrary, and cruel Soviet conduct in Lithuania; and be it

Resolved, That this meeting of Lithuanian-Americans of Lawrence, appeals to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, to demand, through diplomatic channels and international conferences, that Russia immediately withdraw her armed forces and secret police from Lithuanian territory, and permit the Lithuanian people to choose their own government in a free and unfettered election; and further be it

Resolved, That this mass meeting appeals to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations at Lake Success, N. Y., through its Chairman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, to protect the innocently suffering people of Lithuania from the terror and persecution by the Russians and their henchmen, and draw its attention to the horrible conditions described by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation, in a statement submitted to the United Nations by the Lithuanian Minister in Washington; and finally, be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives of Congress and published in the press.

ANTHONY SAURIS,
Chairman.
MATTHEW STAKIONIS,
Secretary.

February, Month of Great Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a very able and most timely editorial from the February 14 issue of the Argonaut, California's most famous and most highly regarded weekly magazine, an article entirely worthy of permanent recordation in the archives of the Republic.

This editorial, which its author has entitled "February, Month of Great Americans," is, Mr. Speaker, the following:

FEBRUARY, MONTH OF GREAT AMERICANS

The people of the United States observe in February two national holidays, the birthday of Abraham Lincoln on February 12, and that of George Washington on February 22. Both of these men are freely acknowledged as the greatest that this Nation has produced; others have been suggested, but none yet unanimously accepted, to stand beside them.

The greatness of Washington and Lincoln may be ascribed to two causes: To the greatness of their times, and to the essential simplicity of each. Both were charged with responsibility for the Union in a period of crisis; the fate of it hung, to a larger measure even perhaps than we realize, on them as individuals. Yet neither feared the burden, nor assumed undue responsibility for it; each simply did the best that he knew in the place to which God had called him. The phrase has been theirs; both were God-fearing men.

It has been generally admitted that the times create a leader of sufficient stature to cope with them. Both periods, that of the establishment of a workable democracy, and that of its preservation, when threatened by all the forces of reaction, at home and abroad, were historically momentous. George Bancroft has said, in his oration on the death of Lincoln, "The individual, even in the greatness of military glory, sinks into insignificance before the resistless movement of ideas in the history of man." It is probable that both Washington and Lincoln, instinctively and consciously, knew this, and were content that it should be so. If they had been concerned with the increase of their individual greatness, they could not have given to their chosen cause that single-minded devotion which eventuated in success.

Neither, personally, ever attempted to be other than he was. Washington, it is true, died a man of wealth and property. Although he began life with very little, he came from land-owning squires, and he married a rich wife. His personal life, though it became comfortable, even elegant, remained simple and tasteful. Mount Vernon, his country home on the banks of the Potomac, with its matchless prospect of river and woodland, was also, in his day, a profitable farm. The man who could rally the wretched remnants of a defeated army, in the grip of a bitter winter, and lacking adequate supplies of food, clothing, shelter, or arms, could turn the disintegrating forces of misery and disillusion into a signal and unique victory over established powers, was more than content to retire eventually to that privacy of life and enterprise which the earlier founders of the Republic had so ringingly declared as the inalienable right of a free people.

Lincoln sprang from simpler and rougher forebears, out of that West which was even then lustily developing. Though he came, gradually, to occupy positions of highest honor, he never became rich nor an ornament of society, as that word is lightly used. He was the child of pioneers; rail-splitter, school-teacher, storekeeper, country lawyer, and finally politician, in the best sense of the word. He never attempted to cut himself off from his origins, but met worldly grandeur with a dignity and self-respect which prevented any unthinking imposition. Privilege and power could not impinge upon him, because he kept vital contacts with those origins. The Washington legend is tinged with gallantry and style; the Lincoln legend has all to do with a man lonely in his greatness, whose heart was always open to the need of those poor or friendless or in trouble. Yet he had a country wit; it comes out often in his early speeches, where some of the arguments are as ingenious as those with which Portia confounded Shylock. In his second inaugural address, this does not appear; the burden of hopes and fears for the Union was then heavy, the moment tense. This speech gives evidence of that developing power in simplicity that culminated in the Gettysburg Address, which in its brevity, sincerity, and flawless wording so deeply moved his hearers, and so exasperated his so-called intellectual peers.

In short, neither Washington nor Lincoln were devious men, though they understood those who were, and were not above taking a certain wholesome enjoyment in outwitting them. This has always been true of the ablest and best Americans. Both were rugged individualists, characters done in strong outlines and warm colors; yet without distortion, any perversion of that integrity which enabled them to hew a line and follow it, to win the triumph of a just and selfless cause. Washington died peacefully, full of years and honor. Of Lincoln, whose assassination at the height of his career has earned him the title of the Martyr President, George Bancroft has said: "He was happy in his life, for he was the restorer of the republic; he was happy in his death, for his martyrdom will plead forever for the Union of the States and the freedom of man."

GOP Take Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Providence (R. I.) Bulletin of February 22, 1947. It speaks for itself.

PLANLESS ACTION

When the House voted to cancel an existing OPA appropriation of $9,000,000, it showed the same type of irresponsible legislating that characterized its decision to slash the Truman budget $6,000,000,000 without knowledge of how it will be done. Neither of these planless actions is calculated to increase public confidence in Republican competence to handle national problems wisely.

Wiping out OPA's funds without notice is a petty performance. Its only immediate consequence is to embarrass Mr. Truman and worry the rent-paying public. Republican leaders are well aware that rent control cannot be summarily ended. When it is terminated, it must be in an orderly manner.

It will be time to scrap the existing system of rent control when the Republicans have provided a satisfactory alternative. In this particular matter, all they have produced thus far is confusion.

The Boxcar Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years much has been said about the boxcar shortage. Possibly because of war conditions as much as possible was done about it. The acute car shortage for the past several years was disturbing. Today the situation has become alarming. This is causing slashes in manufacturing output and employment. According to one Associated Press article it has brought rationing of space in many daily newspapers. Some flour mills are reported to have closed, production being down as much as 40 percent. This naturally takes many people out of employment. In central Illinois, country grain elevators are facing the possibility of closing because of the boxcar shortage. We are told that about 3,000 new cars a month are being produced while in the same period 5,000 wornout ones must be withdrawn from service. At this rate of production and withdrawal what is a boxcar shortage today promises to become about the time of next season's harvest a disastrous car famine. It is generally believed that railroad equipment because of war conditions has been overworked.

It is also known that modern motorized farm machinery and new methods of harvesting have caused grain to be moved to the elevators in a few days' time where 10 years ago it took a month or more for the same operation. Today a wheat, bean, corn, or oat crop can be combined, trucked from the fields to the elevators in a few days. The shortage of grain cars and the small elevators' storage capacity—apparently adequate at the time they were built—has contributed to the congestion at this level and the car shortages. Newspapers have reported low earnings for the long haul trunk line railroads. As evidence of this the ICC has recently granted an average rate increase of 17 percent. Newspapers have also reported the laying off of many railroad employees. According to the press not long ago one big railroad reduced personnel to the extent of 7,000 people.

It may be readily assumed that other railroads perhaps will follow this example unless they have already done so. This road which laid off 7,000 men stated the move was made necessary by a threatened financial disaster to the company unless drastic reductions in operating expenses were made at once. It seems unlikely that any railroad has heretofore retained in service surplus or unneeded employees. It would seem, if in just a few weeks after a 17-percent rate increase had been granted the railroads that the public must still face and bear inadequate transportation machinery and the railroads themselves face a threat of insolvency, there must be something basically wrong with the manner in which the public through regulatory bodies unduly restricts railroad income or with the railroad structure itself. If poor service gives rise to inefficient utilization of cars there is no effective cure for the situation in the mere addition of new units to the existing supply. Prompt service on the other hand might bring an immediate increase in the car supply. A review of the situation whereby the railroads requested a 25-percent increase in rates and received 17 percent might also help the situation although rates seem rather high as they now stand. If the railroads honestly feel that employees should be laid off possibly their request for a 25-percent increase was justified.

We do know there is a car shortage which has today reached a climax. Possibly the following information, which was revealing to me, can throw some partial light on the car shortage. If the following situation is national in scope it should be corrected either by railroad employees being returned to their work or a further rate increase granted or both. Again what is the answer?

A casual check of some 75 loaded freight cars arriving in the Nation's Capital during the month of January reveals a surprising record of delays encountered during their movements from points of origin. Nineteen of these cars that should have consumed a total of 68 days en route, had they received normal scheduled service, actually were 194 days en route. This definitely shows an avoidable consumption of 126 days in this 19-car load movement, an average detention of 6 days per car. A history of the 19 cars mentioned is as follows:

From points of origin in northern New York and Massachusetts, six cars, the normal and route time of which should have been 4 days, took 11, 10, 13, 27, 21, and 6 days respectively. On three cars from central Wisconsin, which should have taken normal time of 5 days, these three cars took 13, 11, and 10 days.

From Northern New Jersey, 2 cars requiring the normal time of 2 days took 6 and 9 days. From Southern Michigan, 3 cars, normal time 4 days, took 8, 9, and 10 days. From Central Ohio, 4 cars which should normally take 3 days, took 6 days each. From Philadelphia, Pa., a car which should take 1 day to reach Washington, was 6 days en route. This means 19 cars were 194 days en route when the normal time should have been 68 days. It might be enlightening to reveal that from Central Texas it took 2 cars only 8 days each to reach Washington, 1,600 miles.

From this information you can readily see that these 19 cars were idle approximately two-thirds of the time. Again, if this Washington situation on these 19 cars holds true over the entire country and a freight car going through on the scheduled time as it should do if the railroad was making a proper return and had a proper number of employees. Again, while it is only 1 car which I have information on, it arrived in Washington on Saturday night and was not spotted until the following Wednesday morning. This means additional idleness of Monday and Tuesday or 2 days on this particular car. It is a well-known fact that railroad employees are not on a 5-day week. If those who unload freight cars at terminals are on the 5-day week, some arrangement should be made whereby at least during this car shortage cars would be unloaded on Saturday thereby gaining an additional day for those boxcars. This should be done, in my opinion, even on an overtime pay basis. I rather doubt that these situations existed during the war, and it is reasonably certain that they did not.

Our Ex-Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times editorially approves the purposes of my bill, H. R. 504, providing that ex-Presidents be made Senators at Large. Stating that the country would benefit from its adoption, the Times last Monday said:

OUR EX-PRESIDENTS

An interesting bill which merits careful examination has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman CANFIELD. It provides that henceforth all ex-Presidents be made Senators at Large with corresponding rights, privileges, salaries, and allowances, but without a vote. As such they would assume in the Senate positions analogous to those of the Delegates in the House representing Territories like Alaska and Hawaii, who also enjoy similar rights and remuneration but are likewise without a vote. In other words, the bill would not create new Senators, which could be done only by a constitutional amendment, but merely a new office, and this, it is argued, can be done, as in the case of the Territorial Delegates, by an act of Congress alone.

The purpose of the bill is twofold. One is to provide an assured livelihood and a field of responsible activity for our ex-Presidents. Few Presidents have been rich; many have been forced to scratch for a living after having held the highest office in the land; many have died in poverty, to illustrate the proverbial ingratitude of republics. At the same time, most former Presidents, suddenly removed from the public scene, have chafed at their enforced inactivity.

The other and more important purpose of the bill is to keep the unique experience and the outstanding qualities and abilities of men who have risen to become Presidents of the United States available to the country in an established position of continued usefulness. That is no new idea, but one which has been advanced for decades. Fifty years ago James Bryce, the astute judge of the American political scene, remarked upon the strange failure of the American people to take advantage of the abilities of their ex-Presidents, saying that Rome had managed things better by gathering into the Roman Senate all the fame and experience, all the wisdom and skill, of all those who had ruled or fought for the country at home or abroad. Charles Francis Adams proposed putting ex-Presidents into the Senate as early as 1906. And Governor Dewey has proposed the idea of creating Senators at Large by constitu-

tional amendment. Whether Mr. CANFIELD's bill is the best method of realizing this idea is subject to further consideration. But the idea itself is sound, and we believe that the country would benefit from its adoption.

Aviation Facilities at the United States Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House that Senate bill 230 authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to construct aviation facilities at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., including the necessary buildings, quarters, collateral public works facilities and equipment, and the acquisition of the necessary land, at a cost not to exceed $12,000,000.

Naval Academy officials have let it be understood that the proposed airfield must be at Sandy Point, about 9 miles from the Naval Academy, where the Chesapeake Bay is at its narrowest, where all the traffic of the great port of Baltimore passes, and where, in addition, the State of Maryland is about to build a bay bridge. Such a hazard to the water-borne commerce of the port of Baltimore is unthinkable.

Furthermore, I have been advised that Mr. Grover Loening, one of the leading aviation experts of the world, has condemned the Sandy Point site as utterly unsuitable for an airfield. He has pointed out that another danger exists in the immense radio towers just a short distance from Sandy Point. In addition, he says the land is unsuitable for three important developments of the aviation of the future. These are: First, the control and operation of air missiles; second, the operation of very fast, possibly supersonic aircraft; and, third, ground control approach techniques.

The Navy itself admits that not a single flier will be produced by the Sandy Point airfield. The midshipmen will merely be "indoctrinated," but not in such a manner as to cut down the period of training necessary to produce aviators.

The Navy has likewise revealed that it plans to use this highly developed water front for land-based planes. It has stated that seaplanes are obsolete. The admission that this most valuable territory is to be used for boating and recreational facilities for naval personnel perhaps explains why the Navy insists upon a water-front development for land-based planes. Maps which have been seen by various residents in the area show elaborate arrangements for officers' residences and clubs in the show places which exist nearby. Thousands of less precious homes will be ruined if the airport is located at Sandy Point.

Although the Navy requests only $12,000,000 at the present time, an Annapolis paper, virtually the spokesman for the Naval Academy, refers to $40,000,000 of construction. Capt. Robert Pirie, head of the Department of Aviation at the Academy, has mentioned $50,000,000 as the cost. Academy officials have not denied that $60,000,000 is ultimately to be spent. Indeed, the prediction that the final cost will be $80,000,000 to $100,000,000 was made in an article in the Baltimore papers, the author of which began his article by quoting Captain Pirie.

Meanwhile the Pungo airport near Norfolk has been advertised as being for sale. The Webster airfield, adjacent to the Cedar Point airfield farther down the Chesapeake, has been abandoned. Activities are also sharply reduced at the naval training fields at Jacksonville, Pensacola, and Corpus Christi. These were chosen because of ideal year-round flying conditions which do not prevail at Sandy Point.

Finally, the Naval Academy insists that the indoctrination, which is so essential, is to take place during the midshipmen's spare time. And it is seriously asserted that during their spare time they will travel 9 miles to the airfield, examine planes, and then return to the Academy. Such indoctrination is described as essential during the 4-year course at Annapolis, where not one capital ship can enter the harbor. All of the midshipmen's actual training in seamanship is carried on away from Annapolis. Aviation training to be effective must likewise be given on a full-time basis at ideal weather fields especially built for that all-important purpose.

BALTIMORE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Baltimore, February 17, 1947.

Whereas it has come to our attention that the Navy Department plans to erect an air base at Sandy Point; and

Whereas an airport at this location would bring a large number of aircraft in dangerous proximity to vessels plying to and from the port of Baltimore; and

Whereas Sandy Point is at or near the point of greatest congestion in the Chesapeake Bay; and

Whereas such unpredictable air activity at the narrowest point in the Chesapeake Bay, where bay traffic assembles at the mouth of Craighill Channel, and where necessary adjusting and proving areas have been established for deep water vessels using the facilities of our port, would expose navigation to severe hazards not now existing, and would ultimately result in casualties adversely affecting future business of the port; and

Whereas a harbor obstruction such as is hereby presented would ultimately result in increased insurance and charter rates, and since many of the larger industrial establishments were placed on our water front to take advantage of the more economical operational costs enjoyed here, such increases would materially favor neighboring ports to the disadvantage of Baltimore, Therefore be it

Resolved by the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, That it unanimously expresses its opposition to the proposed location of this installation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce be, and he is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Navy, the Maryland Senators and Representatives in Congress, and also to the press of Baltimore City.

A. HEEB, Jr.,
President.
H. G. DISNEY,
Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL
LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Baltimore, Md., February 14, 1947.

On behalf of the International Longshoremen's Association in the port of Baltimore representing 10,000 members whose livelihood depends upon the uninterrupted flow of sea traffic into the port, are vitally concerned with the proposed erection of the naval air training base at Sandy Point and hereby serve notice of their protest against the erection of the base at this particular site for the following reasons:

1. It is the narrowest part of the bay which ships must navigate. If an accident would occur in this part of the channel through a collision with a plane and the ship is sunk, it would tie up the port until the wreckage could be salvaged 1 to 3 months.

2. If too many of these accidents would occur, the steamship industry would abandon the port as a whole. Therefore, we urge our Representatives in Congress to work for the defeat of this project.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST IDZIK,
International Vice President.
JEFFERSON DAVIS,
Vice President Atlantic Coast District.

MAGOTHY RIVER ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Pasadena, Md., February 22, 1947.

Organizations vigorously opposing proposed naval air training field on Sandy Point:

Magothy River Association, Anne Arundel Antiairport Association, Anne Arundel County Farm Bureau, Mayo Watermen's League, Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, Longshoremen's League (10,000 strong), Talbot County Garden Club, Federated Garden Clubs of Maryland, Mount Vernon Association, Southern Maryland Times, St. Marys Gazette, Highlandtown Improvement Association, Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore, 50 percent of board of Arundel County county commissioners including president and three members, Gibson Island Corp., Gibson Island Club.

Following community associations: St. Margarets, Whitehall Beach, Tydings on the Bay, Bayhead, Persimmon Point, Riverbay Community, Ulmstead Point, Broadwater Beach, Mago Vista, Peninsular Farms, Dividing Creek, Manhattan Beach, Cypress Creek, Arundel Beach, Riverdale, Royal Beach, Sunset Knoll, Old Man Creek, Beechwood Forrest, Magothy Beach, Chelsea Beach, Cockeys Creek, Steedmans Point, Swan Cove, North Ferry Point, Blackhole Creek, Broad Creek, North Shore, Boulevard Park, Greys Creek, Sillery Bay, Hickory Point, Lake Shore, Long Point, Hidden Point, Mountain Road, Gibson Island, Hacketts Point, Beacon Hill, Grachur Club, Skidmore, Yorktown, Shore Acres, Pleasant Plains, Fair Acres, Deep Creek.

Resolution of Lithuanian Alliance of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from Lithuanian Alliance of America, district 7, Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties, Pa.:

Whereas representatives of democratic nations will meet delegates of Soviet Russia at Moscow in March 1947 to discuss peace terms for the world; and

Whereas the Secretary of State, Gen. George Marshall, will represent the United States of America at this conference; and

Whereas as an exponent of democracy, we beseech the United States representatives to espouse the cause of freedom of all nations, large and small; and

Whereas the United States, Great Britain, and Russia gave to the world the Atlantic Charter but have failed to carry out the principles embodied therein: Therefore

We pray that the democratic representatives take up the cause of enslaved nations, the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; that they demand and cause the removal of foreign armies from their soil; that persecution of their peoples cease; exile and enslavement be stopped and full independence be restored to these countries: Therefore be it

Resolved and it is hereby resolved, That this resolution be adopted and copies sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Committees of Foreign Affairs, United States Senators from Pennsylvania, and to the Congressman from Luzerne County, Pa.

Signed this 23d day of February 1947.

MICHAEL KROPSNIC,
President.

JOSEPH MACEINA,
Secretary.

WILKES-BARRE, PA.

Washington's Birthday, Saturday, February 22, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WLAW at Lawrence, Mass., on the subject of George Washington:

The name Washington brings up many associations in the mind of the average American. He thinks of the resourceful general who led a citizen army to final victory over the professional soldiers of a foreign power. He thinks of that terrible winter at Valley Forge when faith in this leader alone inspired the ill-clothed and underfed Revolutionary soldiers to stick it out and thereby save the cause of freedom. He thinks of Washington crossing the Delaware by night to attack the British, routing them by this surprise maneuver.

The name Washington may bring to mind the father of our country, or the Capital of the Nation which is dedicated to his memory, or the sublime monument bearing his name which rises above the Potomac skyline.

Of all these familiar associations, let us dwell for a moment on the Washington Monument.

It is not only the tallest in the world, but the most perfect. It lifts the eyes up to its shining summit, 550 feet above the ground.

Nearly 99 years ago, the cornerstone was laid. Year after year it rose higher and higher. Most prophetic of all the facts concerned with its development is the one which tells us that over 200 of the blocks inside the shaft are inscribed as gifts of the people of this Nation and of foreign governments who were proud to honor George Washington. Greece gave a stone taken from the ancient Parthenon. The Turkish stone displays an ode upon Washington written by the sultan's court poet. America's States and towns, schools, and lodges gave stones as large as those from the King of Siam and the Emperor of Brazil. Into its making went the tribute of the world.

It speaks to us of Washington's high hopes for the country which he set free. It is as simple and clear as his faith and his courage. It is as upright as the man who could not be swerved from his unselfish purpose by any adversity.

This great standard in stone has truly been a pillar of strength to worried Presidents since it was completed in 1884. Grover Cleveland, surrounded by slander and intrigue, said that he drew courage and faith from its serenity.

In a reverential tone, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to this country during World War I, called it "George Washington's finger pointing to the sky."

It is this—above all the recollections which come to mind on Washington's Birthday—that we should keep uppermost in our thoughts. Custom says that we should speak of Washington's life and what he said in regard to the issues of his time. It is more appropriate to consider what Washington would have said and done had he been living now. In reality, his finger would be pointing to the sky, whence comes the faith that triumphs over all. And with that faith, Washington would have led us to victory over the many problems which confront us today.

I feel sure that he would handle the question of the atomic bomb as we are doing, refusing to divulge our secret until we are sure of international controls which will protect all nations from this deadliest weapon.

Washington had experience with postwar problems. The year 1787 was the low-water mark in American fortunes. There was Shay's rebellion here in Massachusetts. There were uprisings in Vermont, New York, and Pennsylvania. We had no navy to protect our shipping from the Barbary pirates. Britain was still hostile, refusing to withdraw her garrisons from the West. Spain threatened to choke off our frontier settlements by closing the mouth of the Mississippi. We no longer had a real army with which to meet these threats.

At home, the States were quarreling among themselves. There was no national currency. Inflation brought severe suffering to the people. Foreign observers were betting that we would defeat ourselves. The Duke of Gloucester said, and I quote: "As to the future grandeur of America, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived. A disunited people to the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths or principalities according to their natural boundaries."

The truth is, we were not a nation.

Washington was one of the few who saw the remedy. He insisted that the only hope was a real union under a single Federal Government. Washington knew that the people must be willing to sacrifice some of their local interests to the common welfare. The prestige, the patience, and the wise counsels of Washington finally prevailed. The Constitution was adopted. The Nation was born.

If Washington were alive today, what would he say to the civil war between labor and management? He would remind us of the forgotten fact that the Constitution begins with the words, "We the people!" And he would not let us forget that fact again.

I have an idea that the Russians would respect George Washington just as I believe they will heed the words of another great general, George Marshall.

On the home front, however, there is one problem that would surprise and anger Washington, and I mean George, not the city of Washington, and that is our failure to provide adequate housing for the men and women who fought and won the recent war for us.

I am certain that he would do something for the veterans he once led, and see to it that a grateful nation did not stop with good intentions. Because a man has been in battle is no reason to expect that he will be satisfied with Valley Forge accommodations when he gets back home.

We hear a lot of sounding-off about communism these days, as if speeches alone could save our freedom from the whiplash of dictatorial power. To my mind, deeds and not words are the only effective answer to Communist propaganda. If we work unremittingly to provide jobs for all of our people at good wages and make sure that every man can work for and get a decent home for his family, the Communist issue in America will cease to exist.

Any man who has a steady job and a home of his own will never be a Communist. We have the jobs, and we haven't got the homes.

We must work to realize this objective with the single-minded fidelity of purpose that was George Washington's.

It is not enough for us to oppose the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, as many do, unless we can give ourselves in support of a better plan. Mere negation accomplishes nothing.

Housing is a matter of immediate and personal concern to each man and his family. We cannot, however, make much progress toward the solution of the over-all problem on a strictly personal basis. The problem is too big and urgent and depends on so many factors beyond the control of the individual that we can only tackle it effectively by group action.

I submit that we must do this, not only for the veteran and his wife but for the children who must have a decent environment if they are to develop as worthy citizens of this Republic. J. Edgar Hoover has termed juvenile delinquency as the No. 1 social problem confronting the Nation today. The overcrowded slums in every city in the United States are a contributing factor in the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency.

It is not my province to tell you what your community should do in this emergency, because conditions vary from city to city, and you know best the problems of your individual communities. But I do say that this is a public issue for which all of us must share responsibility toward its solution.

George Washington said that peace has its victories to win, no less great than those of war.

If he were here with us today, I am sure that he would inspire us with the need for unity in fighting to win over this civic problem.

He would not only point the way, he would lead us by his example of public spirit to do something about it.

The finest tribute we can pay to him is not to look backward in memory but to measure up to what he expected of us who are living today. Matching his faith with our faith, there is no battle that we cannot win.

In this sense we must build America.

Battle of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 24, 1947:

BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

With the House already on record in favor of a $6,000,000,000 cut in the Federal budget,

the Senate debate on this question should command the earnest attention of every citizen. For the decision to be taken, if it is to be a meaningful one, will profoundly affect the future of all of us.

The Republicans have come into power on Capitol Hill committed to a 20-percent tax reduction and entrusted with what they regard as a mandate to effect very substantial cuts in Federal spending. This is an alluring and also a dangerous combination.

The essential facts are these: President Truman believes that he has submitted a rock-bottom budget of $37,500,000,000—that it cannot be reduced without injury to the national welfare. The House, ably supported by Senator BYRD of Virginia, has plumped for a $6,000,000,000 cut. But the thinking of the Senate, as expressed by such Members as Senators VANDENBERG and TYDINGS, runs toward a reduction of around $4,500,000,000, and they have made it clear that this is a goal rather than a commitment. Since it may be taken for granted that Congress will settle on some over-all figure for budget reduction—though it should be remembered that it is easier to promise economy than it is to make the actual cuts—the important question is where the line shall be drawn.

Senator BYRD has argued persuasively for a $6,000,000,000 reduction, and his record in behalf of sound fiscal policies is such as to command respect. Yet the plans for a $6,000,000,000 cut contemplate taking $2,225,000,000 out of the military budget, and Senators VANDENBERG and TYDINGS argue earnestly and convincingly that this can only be done on the basis of a reckless gamble with the Nation's security.

No sensible person will want to take that risk. If there is any lesson which the experience of two wars teaches it is that economy at the expense of an adequate military establishment is not economy at all, but a singularly wasteful process. World War II is over only in the sense that the shooting has stopped. The primary objective for which we fought—our own national security—has not been attained. Far from it. Whether we want to face the fact or not, the truth is that the two great powers, our own Nation and the Soviet Union, are maneuvering for position today throughout the world. And this process is going on, not under idealistic concepts but in conformity with the realities of power. Force remains the supreme arbiter, and while we can look forward hopefully to a day when this will no longer be the case, it would be courting disaster to neglect our power until that day is at hand.

This does not mean, of course, that no budget cut is feasible. But it does most emphatically mean that there should be no cut which would impair our national strength, military or otherwise, and the people should insist that their representatives in Congress approach the pruning process with this point clearly in mind.

As we draw ever closer to the time when an enemy would be capable of wiping out our major cities in the course of an hour or so, we cannot afford, in the words of Senator TYDINGS, to "live in a dream world, still watering the flowers of sweet innocence in the peaceful garden of yesterday."

Buena Vista: Good View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial entitled "Buena Vista—Good View," appearing in one of Delaware's finest newspapers, the Sunday Star, of Wilmington, Del., on February 23, 1947.

I call attention to the fact that this editorial relates to one of the historic mansions in the State of Delaware, now the home of the distinguished senior United States Senator from the State of Delaware, the Honorable CLAYTON DOUGLASS BUCK.

BUENA VISTA—GOOD VIEW

Just 100 years ago today, a trifle south of the Rio Grande and near a hacienda known as Buena Vista or Good View, 4,759 American officers and men decisively defeated more than 20,000 Mexicans in martial array. General Zachary Taylor commanded the Americans, while the luckless Santa Anna was chief of the Mexicans.

The battle, begun on a small scale on Washington's Birthday, 1847, but with the heavy fighting on the following day, was not so much a test of superiority of courage on the part of Taylor's men as of superiority of artillery. In fact, the Mexican cavalry charged full tilt against the Yankee big guns and were mowed down like sheep. Their casualties were almost 2,000; those of the Americans were 673.

Among those killed was Lt. Col. Henry Clay, Jr., favorite son of the famous statesman, and one who in oratory and personal charm most nearly resembled his father.

At least one Delaware man was killed, Sgt. Benjamin S. Hagany, son of John Hagany, local minister at Asbury Church.

On April 12, 1847, at a public meeting in this city, resolutions were adopted honoring the victories of General Taylor at Buena Vista and General Scott at Vera Cruz, and 3 days later, a grand demonstration and parade was held, with a salute of 100 guns fired at Fourth and Washington Streets by Artillery Company A. At night, the city hall and public places were illuminated, and the words "honor" and "fame" were reflected on canvas in front of the city hall.

It was thus our ancestors celebrated our war victories just 100 years ago. So enthusiastic was Delaware's famous son, John M. Clayton, over the victory of General Taylor that he named his newly-built mansion near State Road "Buena Vista," a name it continues to this day. It is now the home of United States Senator CLAYTON DOUGLASS BUCK, a great-nephew of John M. Clayton, who became President Taylor's Secretary of State.

Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the discharge of our responsibilities as Members of the House, we find ourselves required to take a broad view of events and measures. We come from legislative districts, yet the interests of our own constituents extend far beyond the borders of our districts and our States. We assemble in the Capitol of our Nation, yet the problems on which we must legislate are broader even than the forty-eight States and the Territories and dependencies of this Union.

Our attention these days is engaged to a large extent by the budget for the next fiscal year. We have expressed our determination to slash that budget to the lowest practical extent. We are trying to save the American taxpayer every dollar we can by cutting needless expenditures to the bone. Yet we find that no matter how deeply we manage to slash the budgetary estimates that have been presented to us by the administration, the national budget for next year will be at least three or four times what it was in prewar years.

The United States has learned the hard lesson that not all of our own policies are determined in the Congress or in the executive branch of the Government. Not all of them are determined by the people of the United States. To a very serious extent our policies are vitally affected by events taking place very far from our own shores.

Our present national debt, amounting to some $1,800 for every man, woman, and child in the country, was incurred in large part because of the activities of a former paperhanger in Germany and a military clique in Japan. You and I may think as we please and vote as we please, but our burden of debt and our burden of taxation were actually determined more largely by decisions made and actions initiated in Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo than by the free-will determination of the elected representatives of the American people. This is a sobering fact. It deserves a central place in our thinking as responsible legislators.

In this year of 1947 our thinking cannot be limited by the bounds of our congressional district. It cannot be limited even by the boundaries of the United States. Our judgment must be based upon a world view and our decisions must be made in the fullest possible understanding of the realities of world affairs.

My attention has lately been forcefully drawn to a portion of the world where events are occurring that may have a profound effect upon the future of this country. This area is the distant and relatively unknown country of Korea.

Korea is one of the four countries in the world where American military government is in operation. By some secret agreement which has never been announced, the ancient nation of Korea was divided into two parts, along the thirty-eighth parallel. Russian troops occupy the northern half, and American troops the southern half.

Korea has been promised its independence, in the Cairo and Potsdam Conferences. But thus far events beyond our control have prevented that promise from being kept. The negotiations between Russia and the United States, looking toward the joint withdrawal of our forces from Korea, have broken down. We hope they may be soon resumed. In the meantime we are faced by the consideration of the question as to what to do in the part of Korea under our control.

Eighteen months have passed since the defeat of Japan. Southern Korea, occupied by the American forces, does not yet have an independent government of

its own. Its currency is not allowed to circulate in the international exchange. It is not permitted to trade with the outside world. Reports from Korea indicate that inflation is rapidly mounting and that both the economic and political problems are becoming acute.

I am not an expert student of Asiatic affairs. I have not been in Korea and do not know conditions there at first hand. But I do know that the simple principles of justice and American democracy ought to apply there as well as they do here. From what I have heard of the situation in Korea there is reason to doubt whether American principles have followed the American flag into that unhappy land.

Why is Korean trade still prohibited with the outside world?

Why are Korean assets still completely frozen by the expedient of not permitting its currency to circulate on the international exchange?

Why are the 20,000,000 Koreans in the American-occupied zone not permitted to have an official representative to state their own case?

When the Koreans were permitted last November to establish an interim legislative body, why were 50 percent of the members appointed by the commander of American forces in Korea?

When will the State Department admit to its council on the Korean question a regularly qualified official representative of the Korean people?

Mr. Speaker, consultations on our future policies in Korea are right now going on over in the Department of State. Decisions are being formulated that will vitally affect the welfare of the Korean people. To me it does not seem fair that the Korean people are barred out completely from those consultations. It does not seem sensible or wise from our own point of view. Surely we want to know what the Koreans are thinking and to find out what they want. Yet our State Department is acting as though it did not care.

A few days ago Gen. John R. Hodge arrived in this country to make his report and to present his recommendations of how southern Korea should be governed. A few months ago, on December 8, Dr. Syngman Rhee, the leader of the Korean nationalist parties, also arrived in this country to consult with State Department officials. Dr. Rhee came because he did not like the way affairs are being run in Korea. He came because he did not like the appointment by General Hodge of 50 percent of the Korean interim legislature. There is a vast difference in the way General Hodge and Dr. Rhee view Korean affairs.

Yet General Hodge is taken into the inner circles of consultation, where the decisions are being made, and Dr. Rhee is held on the outside with no opportunity to represent either the Korean people or himself. This does not appeal to my sense of Americanism. It does not sound like fair play. It does not sound like good sense. I should feel much better about the Korean situation if the people of Korea were allowed a full and fair opportunity to speak up on their own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, the nationalist groups in Korea have prepared a brief setting forth their reasons for favoring the immediate establishment of an interim independent government in the American-occupied zone. This brief was written by Dr. Emery J. Woodall, who served as the chief legal adviser to the military governor in Korea from September 1945, to July 1946. Dr. Woodall was in a position to know the facts on the situation existing there. I believe this brief merits the earnest consideration of every Member of Congress and of the Department of State.

A SOLUTION OF THE KOREAN PROBLEM

(By Dr. Syngman Rhee)

Russian and American forces now occupy Korea, according to a secret agreement the nature of which has never been fully revealed. Since Korea lies in the heart of the vital strategic triangle of north Asia, bordered by the Siberian maritime province, China, and Japan, Korea should not be controlled by any one or combination of them, or by any other outside power, without grave danger to the others and to the peace of the Orient. For this reason, as well as for justice to Korea, negotiations must be renewed between Russia and the United States to get their armies out of Korea and to live up to the Cairo Declaration promising Korean independence. We Koreans do not wish to do anything to impede these essential negotiations. We should like to speed them in every way possible.

At the same time there are inalienable and basic rights that we, as a people, must have. We present the following program for immediate implementation by the United States in southern Korea. This program represents the indispensable minimum steps by which we can commence the rehabilitation of our nation, and build a sound democratic basis for the future:

1. An interim government should be elected for southern Korea, to serve until the two halves of Korea can be reunited and a general election held immediately thereafter;

2. Without disturbing direct Russian-American consultations on Korea, this interim government should be allowed to negotiate directly with Russia and the United States concerning the occupation of Korea, and on other outstanding questions;

3. Korean claims for reparations from Japan should be given early consideration, to aid in the rehabilitation of Korean economy;

4. Full commercial rights should be granted to Korea, on a basis of equality with other nations, and with no favoritism extended to any nation;

5. Korean currency should be stabilized and established on the international exchange; and

6. United States troops should remain in southern Korea until the two foreign armies of occupation simultaneously withdraw.

Address of Louis E. Starr, Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Before National Association of Home Builders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Louis E. Starr, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, before the National Association of Home Builders, Chicago, Ill., February 27, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Association of Home Builders, and guests, as spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an organization of some 2,000,000 combat veterans, I feel honored by the invitation to address you today.

I feel that the efforts of my organization to spur the construction of homes for the millions of veterans who shed uniforms during the past year and a half and returned to home communities, resulted in this invitation.

I have only one purpose in appearing before you today. It is to present you, the home builders of the Nation, with as clear a picture of veterans' housing needs as possible. Your own national association works much the same as we do. Your officers keep in touch with the national picture and national problems concerning your industry. My organization views the national scene pertaining to the problems of veterans, their families, their needs and desires.

Housing tops the list of veteran problems. Through the offices of the VFW national organization and the State Department, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has undertaken a Nation-wide survey of veterans housing needs and other pertinent information. Analyzing one State, a typical and average one, we found that 39 percent of the veterans share living quarters with other families; 6 percent live in basements or attics; only 50 percent have a private bath or shower; 20 percent have ice boxes; and 59 percent have refrigerators.

These figures are authentic. They are not prejudiced to any degree; they're our own. Over 88 percent of the veterans want to own their own homes and only 12 percent want to rent on a permanent basis.

Over 81 percent of the veterans canvassed plan to remain in their home communities. It seems to me that the Nation and yourselves should take heed of these figures and make sure their own stay at home—housed, employed, and reasonably content.

More than 75 percent of them plan to remain in the same business or employment. These figures should interest you and all employers because they point to a more stable future in employment.

In a cooperative way, 32 percent would consider owning their own unit in a cooperative housing project. And here are sad figures, and while low, are yet too high—over 7 percent have been evicted from dwellings since their return to civilian life. Another 6 percent have been served notices of eviction.

The average income was $2,148 a year. The age of veterans ranged from 20 to 71 years.

A recapitulation of the survey in the one State showed conclusively that rents were too high in relation to income; houses too expensive. There is need for more rental housing. All need more room. Those building or planning to build are waiting for materials. All want a lower rate of interest on home financing.

The fight the national and local organizations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has made for swift, adequate, and reasonable housing has been clean, honest, and sincere. We have tried not to protect any faction or interest but rather to clear out some of the strangling underbrush which blocks building in America.

Let me say that in all of our conferences with labor people, the construction industry and home builders, and Government people, one fact stands out. It is that no one has the complete answer to the housing problem of the Nation, a problem which reached serious emergency proportions as millions of veterans returned to civilian life.

The housing crisis now upon us demands a successful solution. The inadequacies of America's housing are not new innovations or problems.

In cooperative housing, now being undertaken by desperate veterans throughout the Nation, the United States is far behind other countries. In Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, Norway, and Sweden great progress has been made. In Germany, between the years 1914 and 1927, cooperative housing societies tripled from 1,342 to 4,128.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not anxious to consider any other nation's problem other than America's, nor any other nation's ideas or plans. We know the struggle Great Britain is experiencing now in her housing program. We know that even in Russia, where the state is supreme, housing conditions are not alleviated with the dispatch demanded by homeless people.

Our Nation's early history reveals housing problems. Housing is a fundamental right of any man. Food, shelter, clothing, heat in winter, water, and sunshine are essentials. And because they are essentials, because the demand is stationary and needs no stimulation, we have in our struggle for existence clamped restrictions, handicaps, and bottlenecks on the paths that lead to plenty.

And so I think it is a sad commentary to say that in meeting the housing needs of our people, and particularly of our veterans, this great productive, inventive, ingenious Nation consistently fails to meet its housing needs.

As American veterans and citizens, we sat on the side lines hoping that out of all the controversy, plans, and programs there would come the simple home which we all want, and must have.

In this great controversy the American people can see signs of socialization in the homebuilding industry. And since we are a self-reliant people, independent and jealous of our inherited rights, we will have none of the paternalistic measures used as opiates for the peoples of other nations.

However, there is much proof and evidence that the dominant mood in Washington is that the Government should enter into housing only in an effort to take the risk out of home construction in favor of the builders. So we find that what may undermine the independence of the man who wants a home and is willing to assume the risks of construction and finance does not always work the same way among those who would build for buyers, but who would allow the Government and the taxpayers to assume the risk, assure profits, and eliminate private builders' losses.

Somewhere there must be a reasonable, workable answer. Government hobbles round the feet of the construction industry are being removed. The amount of commercial construction permitted under Government regulation is being increased. The new Congress is asked to write housing legislation again. The housing legislation which drew such public fire during the seventy-ninth session of Congress may be reintroduced. There are indications that we may have submitted a new housing bill, perhaps better suited to the views of the veterans, the industry, and the people at large.

I am recommending housing legislation. We have a staff to study what occurs in Congress; to be ready to supplement and complement legislation proposed, an action which might lessen the emergency facing too many millions of veterans and other citizens.

I can see no further justification for a national debate and controversy over a situation that demands action. I favor the adoption of an industry-labor-Government program which, in the ensuing years, will house our people in a manner which they not only deserve but which they must have.

I have been encouraged by the plans and methods through which the manufacture of industrial and prefabricated homes may form part of the answer to tomorrow's housing problems. Remember that your children and mine and their children, too, will face life with the same desires for homes which have inspired us and carried us to a better life.

Today in this Nation, we must deal with practical thoughts and tools. The controversy over economics, politics, and programs in home construction is worthless to the man who must have shelter.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is stepping into the housing picture with eyes open and heads cool. A Nation-wide effort is being made to have building codes and regulations simplified and standardized so that manufacturers, builders, and buyers can proceed in an orderly manner to house the Nation and themselves.

Recently, a subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee held hearings in Washington. I will remark, after seeing a copy of the committee's report, that veterans' organizations have done in some parts of the Nation what even Government could not accomplish. In York, Pa., a citizens-veteran committee was established which brought together builders, bankers, labor, buyers, real-estate people, and others interested, and reached agreements whereby building materials available to the community were channeled into homes for veterans.

In Fresno, Calif., another such committee went to the city commission and demanded that building permits be limited only to those commercial projects which had the sanction of the Civilian Production Administration. Black markets were thus wiped out—simply and fast.

The national housing committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars met here in Chicago last month. We drew the membership of that committee from all sections of the United States. We were honored by the presence of your officials. Government housing experts also spent several hours with us, discussing the various aspects of the housing emergency.

Our suggestions, devised by the national housing committee, contain certain musts if the builders and the Nation are to meet their obligations to the war veterans. I am reminded of the statement made by General Eisenhower before a group of American financiers in New York recently. The general pointed out, that any nation which could afford to win the last global war could afford to house the men who made victory possible.

The musts, as veterans view them, are:

1. Direction and channeling of building materials and labor into the housing field.

2. Curtailment of nonhousing construction to the fullest possible extent, it being understood, however, that a reasonable industrial and commercial expansion is necessary to the economic development of our country. This will to some extent result in additional employment for veterans.

3. Erection of multiple units must be encouraged by the elimination of legislation, regulations, and restrictions which are presently discouraging the erection of this type of rental unit.

4. Encourage investors in rental-unit projects by providing long-term, low-interest-rate money for financing. We place the interest rate at 2 percent over a 40- 50-year period.

Another "must," agreed upon by the national housing committee of our organization, was congressional approval of the Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Act of 1947. This legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives JESSE WOLCOTT, Republican, Michigan, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee; B. W. KEARNEY, Republican, New York; JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican, Pennsylvania; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, Massachusetts, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee; ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee; and BRENT SPENCE, Democrat, Kentucky, former chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Among the many worth-while and sound undertakings which could be accomplished by this bill, popularly known as the veterans' RFC, none could be more basic than a stimulus to the housing situation. Under such legislation, local communities, counties, and States could participate in the loan features and solve their own problems in housing. Builders and developers would be assisted. Under the provisions for a revolving fund, the controversy between Government and private-enterprise housing people would be eliminated. Private enterprise requires financing to develop large or small long-range projects of the types needed.

In the prefabricated and industrial housing fields, such an act would provide help.

I suggest your great organization study this legislation. In a recent weekly national news magazine, one of the Nation's more sound and leading economists and financial advisers stated that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, established by President Hoover in 1932, and the parent model for the veterans' RFC, was—and I quote—"One of the most important public institutions ever created. In general, it has been one of the most successful."

In his recent budget message to the Congress, President Truman indicated the veterans' benefit and readjustment program was complete, except for certain assistance which would allow the veterans to make further contributions to their Nation. In the establishing of a self-liquidating, self-helping agency, much could be saved monetarily. Profits from such an agency would revert to the Treasury as credits against our huge national debt.

In establishing the parent RFC, President Hoover said that its purpose—and I again quote—"was to furnish, during the period of depression, credits otherwise unobtainable under existing circumstances, in order to give confidence to agriculture, industry, and labor against further paralyzing influences." The Veterans of Foreign Wars submit that our 15,000,000 veterans warrant the same kind of consideration in housing and in any future employment crisis.

I am cognizant of your organization's distaste for any more legislation which interferes with your industry. I am also mindful, as are you, of the great future which lies before your industry. It is in your power now to set the economic pace for the Nation in the future. It is a noble undertaking but one with great responsibilities.

We know that the building industry virtually collapsed in 1926—3 years before the "big crash" hit the rest of the Nation. The reasons are understandable to all. People did not have the money to finance the construction of desired homes.

Reliable statistics indicate now that not more than 50 percent of our people can afford their own homes. Before the war years, over 8,000,000 families could afford only $15 a month rent. Six million homes were substandard; at present 20 percent of our people live in substandard shelter.

The temptations are great when a market exists in any product. But if the temptations in price and quality are allowed to run rampant, the market is soon exhausted and the Nation suffers, as does the individual or corporation.

That temptation is running rampant throughout the veterans' housing program is evident to us. Our national offices receive daily delegations of veterans who have been duped into signing contracts, agreeing to purchase at set prices, only to learn later that more and more money is required before they have a roof. Thousands of them have deposited comparatively large amounts of money with builders who fail to complete projects or who become entangled with the laws.

Uncertain labor and material costs make for uncertain prices and completions of

homes. I recall a project at Front Royal, Va., sponsored by the Textile Workers of America, where homes were to be available for a little over $5,000. The actual cost of the homes today is around $8,200.

I do not know how long either the American people or the veterans who must have homes are going to remain patient. We know that construction and real-estate interests raised a mighty voice in November 1945 to have order L41 lifted—allowing commercial and industrial construction to grab the greater share of material and building-trades labor. I assume it was part of the industry fight to get the Government out of the construction business. That fight has been carried forward by the industry with increasing energy until now, the latest so-called veterans' emergency housing program has been freed of many of the restrictions imposed by the Federal Government.

Very recently, the President announced an agreement between the Associated Contractors and the building-trades department of the American Federation of Labor which promises to outlaw strikes in the construction industry. This agreement we all hail, as a constructive step forward. It should spur the completion of homes and step-up the tempo of the entire industry. However, if this agreement cements two components of the construction industry together as a wall against the lower costs of homes or the use of new materials and the erection of good, precut, prefabricated or industrial houses, then we, as veterans, say it's spinach and to hell with it.

I am acquainted with the problems of one small builder in Virginia whose story of materials and labor costs amazes me. I was surprised to learn that this builder must pay the income and social security taxes of those who work for him. He assures me other employers do the same thing. He is paying common labor $10 a day and on top of that, he must pay, out of his own pocket, the withholding tax. His skilled workers, of course, make about twice as much, and, their tax he also pays.

I do not pretend to be an expert in your industry. I am somewhat of an expert in veterans' problems. I cannot see a veteran audibly or secretly upholding for long what we know as private or free enterprise when the system fails to provide him with one of the very essentials of life on earth. Shelter is as necessary in our society as air and water and clothes, and I am prepared to warn this industry, or any other, that many veterans do not care how things are made or by whom they are constructed as long as he is given a freeman's chance to own a house, rent a house, or wear a suit of clothes.

I am not sure that you men, or the Nation, understand the things a veteran has learned. He fought in a team and found that the rugged individualist or selfish man exposed himself to needless and unnecessary risk. Many did not return. The veteran learned that he could be clothed, housed, fed, transported, hospitalized—he learned it could be done en masse. Isn't it logical for him to question why it cannot be done outside the confines of Government—especially when all he asks is a chance to work, live, and proceed through life in the normal American way?

I urge you as the Nation's builders to comply with the regulations imposed by the veterans' emergency housing program. I believe it's good business for you. Builders are under obligation to file sales reports with the rent-control offices and the Compliance Division of the OPA. The Nation's veterans warrant these safeguards. They have earned decent consideration and honorable contracts.

I urge you to see that the small fraction of builders who persist in wild schemes, aimed at milking veterans of long-cherished funds for homes, are kept under control. While the present housing market may appear to be another Klondike in gold, or a Signal Hill in oil, the human equation in home building is paramount. Upon the homes and home life of the Nation, hinges the future of America, her strength, the solution of her child-delinquency problems, respect for law and order and, above all, a healthy people, morally armed at all times, strong enough to hold the American line against ideologies and forces pressuring from all points around the world.

A year ago, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, anticipating construction problems, endeavored to help. We wrote the industry, the labor unions, and Government officials in an effort to untangle many of the problems as they affected veterans. We were assured that progress was being made; that building requirements would be met. We were assured that apprentice training would be stepped up sufficiently to care for the great demand for additional construction workers. Today, the shortage of building employees threatens again to slow down home construction. Again I remind you that veterans as uniformed fighters and workers for their country have learned that great programs and plans can be accomplished through rigid planning and operations.

As home builders, you are vitally interested in employment, taxation, national income, home financing, and the welfare of the Nation in general. When times are good, you have customers.

Our future is entwined and dependent upon the welfare of the Nation as a whole, and since the veteran population and those directly related to veterans for the first time in our history, constitute a majority of our people, it is only right that your organization and mine insure that veteran welfare is more than promises and words.

Britain Issues White Paper on Palestine Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article by John Chabot Smith, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 21, 1947:

BRITAIN ISSUES WHITE PAPER ON PALESTINE CRISIS—IT CONTAINS BEVIN, MORRISON, AND ARAB PLANS BUT HAS LITTLE NEW MATERIAL

(By John Chabot Smith)

LONDON, February 20.—A new white paper on Palestine was issued by the British Government today, containing what have been called the Morrison plan, the Arab plan, and the Bevin plan.

The pamphlet, designated "Cmd. 7044," price 4 pence, is the latest addition to the monumental heap of documents which Britain intends to lay before the United Nations. An official source said today that every white paper, committee of inquiry report, and other official documents dating back to the Balfour declaration of 1917 will be included.

Today's release contained little new material, since the Bevin plan had already been unofficially circulated, and the other two officially published. Significant, however, was Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin's summation of Britain's 25 years as mandatory ruler of Palestine. His concluding paragraph follows:

"Throughout the period of mandatory rule in Palestine it has been the object of His Majesty's Government to lay the foundations for an independent Palestinian state, in which Arabs and Jews would enjoy equal rights. The state of tension between the two peoples which has existed thereto has continually thwarted the attempts of the mandatory power to progress toward this end. * * * The proposals contained in the present memorandum are designed to give the two peoples an opportunity of demonstrating their ability to work together for the good of Palestine as a whole, and so providing a stable foundation for an independent state."

Curiously enough, this statement is not exactly what the League of Nations mandate said the mandatory power was supposed to do. Whether Bevin's words mean the same as the words used in the mandate is arguable; indeed, Arabs and Jews have argued the point for 25 years and the argument has contributed toward the tension Bevin referred to. The words used in this connection in the mandate are:

"Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have also agreed that the Mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the (Balfour) declaration * * * in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country; and

"Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their National Home in that country. * * *

"The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion."

Bevin told the House of Commons on Tuesday that the mandate had proved unworkable; the new white paper does not settle the old argument of whether Britain ever tried to make it work.

The text of the Bevin plan, as released today, confirms in every important detail the versions of it which circulated unofficially as soon as the foreign secretary submitted it to the Arab delegations and the Jewish Agency representatives on February 7. The principal difference is that the text is tricky and ambiguous.

The Morrison plan consists of an extract from a speech made by Herbert Morrison in the House of Commons on July 31, 1946.

The Arab plan submitted by the Arab delegations to the Palestine conference on September 30, 1946, was made public at that time.

The white paper also releases for the first time the official explanatory map attached to the Morrison plan. This shows exactly what unofficial versions of the map portrayed—a small Z-shaped Jewish area, embracing part of the coast from Haifa, southward in the hills around Galilee; an Arab enclave at Jaffa; the Jerusalem district and the Negeb desert under British rule; and the rest, almost half the country, designated "Arab Province."

By a curious accident of the map maker's art, the boundary of the Negeb in the Morrison plan neatly divides the name Palestine into the British-ruled "Pale" and the Jewish and Arab provinces of "Stine." Britain has long used to word "pale" to distinguish a district which has a special law and government from the surrounding territory. There was an English "pale" in Ireland, until Queen Elizabeth conquered the whole island, from which comes the expression "beyond the pale." The Russian Czars maintained a pale for the Jews in Russia.

The map shows scattered Jewish settlements in the Arab provinces of the "Stine," but a detour of the boundary excludes the southernmost Jews from the "Pale." The map is dated July 1, 1946; since then the Jewish settlements have been extended southward deep into this area.

No map accompanies the Bevin plan in the published white paper, but an official said the requisite map has been prepared. It shows at least 20 different Jewish and Arab zones, the unit of local administration being the municipality instead of the province, he said.

Select Committee To Investigate Newsprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support House Resolution 58. Throughout the country many small papers and, in fact, many large papers have been confronted with the serious problem of obtaining newsprint. The same can be said of many other types of paper, including wrapping paper and paper products used by other business concerns. It is imperative that the Congress establish this committee to make these studies.

In order that the country may know the reasons for this shortage, and the ever-increasing demand for paper and paper supplies in the United States, this study and investigation is necessary. Unless we can find a correction for this difficulty, it is probable that many of the small newspapers will have to discontinue publication.

Living Costs and Wage Levels

REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the rapid advance in the cost of living and particularly in view of the price increases in some meats and other foodstuffs, it is my belief that the Congress is under an imperative duty to explore the reasons for these increases and seek to provide relief for the distressed American consumer.

In the main, we have two alternatives. We can permit this situation to continue without taking any action to alleviate it, permit the cost of living to bound sharply upward, and in that event be confronted with renewed, determined wage demands, strikes, and labor disputes, and possibly be faced also with demands for the return of drastic economic controls over our economy, or, on the other hand, we can move now, speedily and efficiently to uncover the causes, practices, and basic conditions that lie behind the rapid rises in the cost of living and if we are painstaking in the matter be in a position where we can take specific action to stop these alarming trends and stabilize the wage-price relationship at reasonable levels.

Believing as I do that this Government and our free-enterprise system of conducting business will have to find satisfactory answers to the great pending question of the increased cost of living in the very near future, I am today introducing a resolution to investigate every phase of this problem and hope for its early adoption.

The resolution follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a select committee (hereafter referred to as the "committee") to study the prices of necessaries of life and problems facing the purchasing public as the result of price advances, to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee—

(a) To make a full and complete study and investigation of the problems facing American consumers with regard to the purchase of necessities of life in the markets of this country at reasonable prices and in adequate quantities, the basic reasons for the advance in the cost of living, and practices, factors, and conditions which bear on or contribute to cause high price levels.

(b) To make recommendations to Congress at the earliest practicable date with respect to remedial action looking toward increased production, efficient distribution, lower prices for consumer goods, and increase in consumer purchasing power.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee shall have power to appoint subcommittees to assist the committee in its work. The members of the committee shall serve without additional compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the exercise of the functions vested in the committee.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

Nebraska's Eightieth Anniversary

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1867 a terrible War Between the States had only recently ended. The martyred Lincoln was still fresh in the memory of every living man. Secretary Seward was to conclude the purchase of Russia's only possession in the Western Hemisphere—Alaska—and would be wincing under the barbed words of the press which would call what he was to do Seward's Folly and the "Secretary's Ice Box." Archduke Maximilian had failed to make Mexico a European colony. It was against this brilliant background of world-shaking events that President Andrew Johnson affixed his signature to a proclamation on March 1, 1867, making the State of Nebraska one of these United States.

There are not many alive today who remember the Nebraska of 1867. Yet few out of the 140,000,000 Americans today are unaware of what they owe to Nebraska. During the late war Nebraska men and women, Nebraska factories, and Nebraska farms contributed far beyond the line of duty to the attainment of our common victory. What Nebraska farmers did for victory is typical of the fighting spirit of present-day Nebraska. Although most of Nebraska's farm population which came within the limits of the draft age could have claimed occupational deferment, 31 percent of that age group waived such immunity and went into the armed services. More than 15 percent of that age group left their farms to work in war factories. Thus, with only about half of the normal farm workers and with makeshift machinery hung together by baling wire and a prayer, Nebraska's remaining farmers tackled the most challenging task which has yet come their way—that of feeding the armed services, of feeding our allies, and of feeding the American people. How well they did this tremendous job is now proud history. Truly they made bricks without straw. During the war years Nebraska farms produced grain and meat crops 10 to 40 percent in excess of the highest yield of peacetime years.

What were the factors behind this monumental accomplishment?

There were two such factors—the land and the people.

Early travelers through what is now Nebraska saw few trees and concluded that land which was not suitable for trees was not suitable for agriculture. Maj. Stephen H. Long was one of these tale bearers. After visiting this region in 1819 he drew a map of his travels on which he called the entire area between the Platte River and the Red River in Texas "the Great Desert." In his official report he said that—

It—

Nebraska—

is almost wholly unfit for cultivation and, of course, uninhabitable for people depending upon agriculture for their subsistence.

But George Catlin—one of America's great artists and the first painter of Nebraska scenery—held a far different opinion. After being in Nebraska in 1832 he wrote:

There is no more beautiful prairie country in the world than that which is to be seen here. The surface of the country is gracefully • • • undulating like the swells of the ocean after a heavy storm, and everywhere covered with beautiful green turf and with occasional patches of trees. The soil

in this region is also rich and capable of making it one of the most * * * productive countries in the world.

Nebraska's 80 years of statehood have proved that artist Catlin—not Major Long—was the true prophet.

The people who settled this fertile State were home builders. They had no desire to wrest what riches they could from Nebraska soil and spend their gains elsewhere. These people came to Nebraska to live. They built homes, churches, and schools. These were their primary interests. In fact, Nebraska produced the first homesteader in the entire United States. In the early hours after midnight on January 2, 1862, Daniel Freeman was the first to take advantage of the Homestead Act. He claimed 160 acres on Cub Creek near Beatrice. Since that time, over 1,000,000 homesteaders have received more than 120,000,000 acres from our Government. Of these homesteaders, considerably over 100,000 have lived in Nebraska.

Whence came these people who sought Nebraska as home? From New England and New York, from Michigan and Illinois, from the war-torn States of the South. More and more settlers came from far across the seas. The Irish settled Holt County in 1874 and Greeley County in 1877. Germans settled Madison, Stanton, and Thayer Counties between 1867–70. Swedes settled in Polk and Saunders Counties about 1870 and in Phelps and Burt Counties about 1880. Bohemians founded communities in Knox, Colfax, Saunders, and Saline Counties about 1870. A group of Hollanders settled in the south of Lancaster County between 1868–70. Eastern Germans began to settle Jefferson County about 1875 and extended their settlements into Clay and Hamilton Counties. Danish, Swedish, Bohemian, and Polish communities were founded in Howard and Valley Counties. French settlements were made in Richardson, Nemaha, Antelope, and other counties. The seeds of greatness of Nebraska's people were brought in from a score of different States and from a dozen different foreign countries; but, once these seeds took root in Nebraska soil, the product which grew from them became Nebraska's most valuable asset—courageous, hard-working, law-abiding American citizens.

Nebraska is not today—and it was not 80 years ago—a land for the man who thinks the world owes him a living without blood, sweat, and tears. It is a land for the patriot; a home for the producer. Nebraskans have weathered blizzards in winter, watched their seedlings perish in a spring drought, faced a plague of grasshoppers in the summer, and fought prairie fires in the fall. Nebraska pioneers, alive today, have seen their loved ones fall under Indian tomahawks. The land that is theirs they paid for—not in gold, but in gore; not in silver, but in suffering.

Is it any wonder that the sons and daughters of these veterans of the last frontier had the strength, the courage, the endurance to patch up overworked farm equipment and, in spite of the wartime lack of farm workers, to break all records in farm production?

Nebraska was home to one of the greatest of the prairie scouts, W. F.—Buffalo Bill—Cody. It was also home to J. Sterling Morton, who will always be remembered as the father of Arbor Day, a day which was first observed in Nebraska—before being celebrated by any other State—on April 10, 1872. Charles G. Dawes, former Vice President of the United States lived in Nebraska, as did William Jennings Bryan, who attained world-wide fame as the boy orator of the Platte. General of the Army John J. Pershing lived for several years in Nebraska. John G. Neihardt wrote the history of Nebraska in deathless poetry in his Song of Hugh Glass. Willa Cather, Bess Streeter Aldrich, Caroline Renfrew, Howard Erickson, Leonard Stromberg, and Alvin Johnson are among the score of able writers who have immortalized Nebraska in prose. Nebraska's Thurlow Lieurance composed By the Waters of Minnetonka. Howard Hanson, of Wahoo, Nebr., has written symphonies and choral works as well as a well-known opera, Merry Mount. Nor can we here forget that Frederick Remington, who was with the Army in 1890–1900 in Nebraska, told the story of our frontier in his justly famous paintings.

Yes; Nebraska has had more than her share of great men and women in agriculture, in industry, in commerce, in transportation, in religion, in education, in art, in science and in literature. They are and they always will be assets to our great State. Yet, the greatest of all assets will be those unnamed heroes and heroines, who endured torch and tomahawk, prairie fire and blinding blizzard, that their land might produce and that the people of their country and the peoples of the world might be fed. Their heritage of abiding faith and matchless courage is by far a greater gift to their sons and daughters than even the firm, rich soil itself.

Without intending it, the ablest portrayal of Nebraska before or since made is contained in a paragraph describing the great seal of Nebraska, passed by the Nebraska State Legislature in 1867.

I quote:

> The eastern part of the circle to be represented by a steamboat ascending the Missouri River; the mechanic arts to be represented by a smith with hammer and anvil; in the foreground, agriculture to be represented by a settler's cabin, sheaves of wheat, and stalks of growing corn; in the background a train of cars heading toward the Rocky Mountains, and on the extreme west, the Rocky Mountains to be plainly in view; around the top of this circle, to be in capital letters, the motto, "Equality Before the Law," and the circle to be surrounded by the words, "Great Seal of the State of Nebraska, March 1, 1867."

"Equality before the law," "Honesty before men," "Reverence before God"—these are the precepts that have made Nebraska great during her 80 years as a State; these are the precepts which will continue to keep Nebraska great as long as our free Nation, under the Constitution, endures.

Retirement Pay of Certain Members of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2226, for which I desire to solicit the support of the House.

The purpose of this bill is to resolve certain inequalities in retirement pay for those members of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps who were promoted from enlisted status and given temporary commissions in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps during the war.

Under the law as existing at the beginning of the war and as amended since that time—Public Law 305, Seventy-ninth Congress—enlisted personnel of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps who had served sufficient time to make them eligible for retirement benefits were transferred to what is known as the Fleet Reserve if physically qualified. This constitutes a pool of trained men to be called upon in an emergency and is administered and supervised by the Navy Department. The status of these men corresponds to that of the members of the Naval Reserve who are on inactive duty. In order to be eligible for maximum retirement pay, the law requires that enlisted personnel who retire after 20 years' service join the Fleet Reserve. Later, after a specified period of years, they are actually retired and are no longer subject to recall to active duty.

As originally constituted, the Fleet Reserve was only for enlisted personnel and the law in that respect has never been changed.

A temporary commission for these ex-enlisted men lapses after termination of the emergency or upon transfer to the Fleet Reserve prior to actual retirement. Under the present law it is necessary that these temporary officers transfer to the Fleet Reserve and draw pay while in the Fleet Reserve at the scale of the highest enlisted rating held by them during their tour of active duty. This bill seeks to make these temporary officers eligible to draw pay in the Fleet Reserve at the scale of the highest commissioned rank held while on active duty and so amends the present law.

The second part of this bill is concerned with former enlisted men who received a permanent, as distinguished from a temporary, commission in the Regular Navy. These officers will not revert to enlisted status.

Under the present law these officers are not eligible for retirement benefits as officers until they have served a specified number of years in commissioned rank. In many instances these men were well up in years when they were commissioned as officers and they may not therefore be able to complete the required number of years of commissioned

service before they are forced by age, illness, or reduced appropriations to resign. The second part of this bill seeks to correct this situation and to put these officers on an equality with other permanently commissioned officers of the Regular Navy.

Mr. Speaker, as one who served as a Reserve officer in the Navy during the war, I am in a position to know that no more loyal or valuable service was rendered to the cause by any group of officers than was rendered by these former enlisted men who are familiarly known in the service as "Mustangs." I think it only fair that we express our gratitude for their long years of loyal service in the ranks by putting them on an equality with other Regular Navy officers who spent their entire careers in a commissioned status.

National Defense

REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call attention to three resolutions introducted by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART.]

The first resolution, House Joint Resolution 136, deals with a request for negotiations with Denmark for the acquisition of Greenland; the second, House Joint Resolution 137, purports to enter into negotiations for the acquisition of certain islands in the Atlantic, the Pacific, and Caribbean sea; and the last one, House Joint Resolution 138, and to do with an invitation to the people of Iceland to become a State of the Union.

This matter is important because it is a part of the national-defense program, or if it is not at the present time, it ought to be, and I think that the Members of this House should get behind these resolutions. I have today addressed a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. EATON, asking for consideration of the resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of my letter and the three resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The letter and resolutions are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 27, 1947.*
Hon. CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, D. C.
Re: House Joint Resolutions 136, 137, and 138.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am respectfully urging reasonably prompt hearings on the above resolutions introduced by our colleague, Representative GEARHART, of California. If you will examine these resolutions, you will note that the first directs that negotiations be entered into with Denmark for the acquisition of Greenland. House Joint Resolution 137 requests that negotiations be entered into for the acquisition of certain lands in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Caribbean Sea. Resolution 138 provides for the issuance of a letter of invitation to the Government and people of Iceland to become a State in the Union of the United States of America.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we are all intensely interested in hemispheric defense. We have already indicated our willingness in the Treaty of Chapultepec to work for the establishment of a complete system of defenses, including the Western Hemisphere. The import of the resolutions offered by the gentleman from California constitutes, in my opinion, an integral part of these defenses. Now is the time to act. I feel sure that the people of our country are greatly interested in seeing that the objectives of the resolutions are accomplished.

Respectfully submitted.

LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

House Joint Resolution 136

Joint resolution requesting that negotiations be entered into with Denmark for the acquisition of Greenland

Resolved, etc., That the President is requested to enter into negotiations with Denmark for the acquisition by purchase of Greenland.

House Joint Resolution 137

Joint resolution requesting that negotiations be entered into for the acquisition of certain islands in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and in the Caribbean Sea

Resolved, etc., That the President is requested to enter into negotiations with—

(1) The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Republic of France for the acquisition by purchase of all islands of the United Kingdom and of the Republic of France situate off the Atlantic Coast of the United States and in the Caribbean Sea;

(2) The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Republic of France, and such other countries as may be necessary for the acquisition of all islands in the Pacific Ocean deemed essential to the defense of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, or of the Philippine Islands; and

(3) Such countries as may be necessary to acquire ownership and control of the islands mandated to the Empire of Japan after the First World War and such other islands of the Empire of Japan as the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy find essential for the purpose of maintaining peace in the Pacific Ocean areas.

House Joint Resolution 138

Joint resolution providing for the issuance of a letter of invitation to the Government and people of Iceland to become a State in the Union of the United States of America

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized and directed to issue a letter of invitation to the Government and people of Iceland to apply for admission into the Union of the United States of America. Any such application shall be addressed to the Congress and the President and shall contain an assent to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States of America and a copy of the State constitution adopted to apply if such application for statehood is accepted by the Congress.

Select Committee on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragedies of this Nation is the conclusive fact that small business is daily being pushed aside by concentrated capital. It would seem to me that we are destroying the very cornerstone of our American system of free enterprise.

I enthusiastically endorse House Resolution 18 which sets up again the select committee of the House of Representatives to study the conditions surrounding small business.

Mr. Speaker, most of the large businesses of our generation at one time were small businesses. They have grown to their present proportions almost within the lifetime of the majority of the Members of this Congress. With the trend of events favoring the larger business concerns, the beginning and development of new smaller businesses grows more difficult daily.

The field before this committee is of far-reaching importance. We must determine at an early date whether or not we will abandon once and for all the open doorway that has made possible the great business enterprise enjoyed today in the United States of America. Two forces are at work in this country—one is a system of monopoly against which too little is being done by our Government. This force is rapidly crushing small business and depriving the individual of the opportunity to operate a business for himself.

Another equally dangerous situation, perhaps not monopolistic, but much of the same character, prevails, and that is the consolidation of businesses with large capital structures.

The people of the Nation, and the Members of Congress, must at some date not too far in the future recognize once and for all what the future policy of this Nation is to be. I, for one, would deplore the day, if it arrives, when small business is moved aside by either monopolistic powers or large capital groups.

It is frequently argued that a greater efficiency is to be found in the large business enterprise. And yet we go back to the very fact that most of our present large businesses were once very small. They have grown to their present proportions due to good management, and perhaps due to consolidations, and as a result of advantages that have been accorded by the Government.

Small business needs the protection of the Government of the United States. This committee can well study these problems and recommend to this Congress methods that can be put forth in the form of laws that will preserve permanently a place in America for the small businesses of this day and those which are still to come.

Select Committee To Investigate Newsprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 58, which would create a select committee to conduct a study and investigation with respect to present and future supplies of newsprint is most timely. During the war period a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce assisted in bringing about a rather fair distribution of the available newsprint, and now that controls have been lifted the industry has been struggling along in an attempt to carry on under a voluntary cooperative agreement plan.

Although we are producing more newsprint in America than before, the demand for paper and paper products has increased by leaps and bounds and, as a result, there is a great shortage. This shortage is particularly prevalent among the small newspapers of the country, and at the present time many of them are faced with the danger of suspension. Consequently, almost every press and publishers' association, including the small newspaper associations, has earnestly requested that the Committee To Investigate Newsprint Shortages be continued.

The objectives of the committee will be to procure a fair distribution of the present available supply of newsprint and paper and to deal with the problem of getting increased paper production. Those of us from the Midwest who are interested in agriculture are particularly interested in the experiments that have been going on at several Midwest colleges and universities including Iowa State College, seeking ways and means to manufacture paper out of farm waste such as cornstalks, oat hulls, straw, corncobs, and so forth. If it is found that we can make paper from these byproducts of agriculture, we will go a long way in helping agriculture remain prosperous.

I am heartily in accord with this resolution and urge its adoption.

Select Committee To Investigate Newsprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, there are nearly 80 newspapers published in the 15 counties comprising the Sixth Iowa Congressional District. Of that number, there are five daily papers and other weeklies published in county-seat towns. Numerous weekly papers are published also in the smaller communities. These newspapers provide a comprehensive news coverage for the people of that area.

I know and recognize the great importance of these publications. They provide the local, national, and international news to their readers. No doubt there are many homes in Iowa who rely more implicity on their local newspaper than on any other medium of public information. No other periodical receives such careful perusal by the members of the household as the local paper. The editor and publisher are the friends and acquaintances of their readers. They merit and have the confidence of their subscribers and advertisers. The "country press" exercises a greater degree of influence, proportionately, than the gigantic metropolitan newspapers on the public with whom they come in contact.

Therefore, I join heartily in the effort of the House of Representatives to provide adequate sources of newsprint to these papers. Perhaps no other problem has so beset the smaller newspaper publisher as this shortage of printing paper.

Furthermore, this committee's work may have an important bearing on the industrial use of farm wastes. Iowa farmers produce considerable supplies of the basic material of cellulose, such as cornstalks, which may eventually be used for newsprint, or otherwise commercially. This committee can, and I am sure will, contribute valuable information and impetus to enlarging the market for farm wastes of many kinds.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore give my vote and unqualified support to this resolution, establishing, as it does, a select committee of the House of Representatives to deal with the newsprint shortage.

Too Drastic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 25 relative to the deplorable conditions existing in the field of labor because of faulty legislation and setting forth the urgent need for corrective legislation:

TOO DRASTIC

In recent days there has come before the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives a parade of witnesses whose testimony adds up to an almost incredible story of intimidation and arrogance perpetrated on helpless individuals by labor unions. In each case the law-enforcement agencies were either helpless or unwilling to act.

There is not space here to give even the major details of the story, but perhaps one statement credited to a union leader in a court proceeding will epitomize the attitude from which this violence sprung. He asserts:

"Contracts don't mean anything to us. We don't have to recognize them unless we want to. That's the law."

Technically that statement may be faulty. Practically it is no exaggeration. The terms of the law are such that this man and his kind have ample reason to believe that they occupy a privileged position wherein they can tear their solemn promises to bits and flaunt their immunity before the courts of the land. Practically that is the position they occupy.

Federal laws—principally the Norris-La Guardia and the Wagner Acts—have made available to union leaders a field of power where they could operate uncurbed by the rules that other citizens must mind.

When that field was opened two things were inevitable. One was that it would be occupied. The other was that the successful occupants would be those capable of the most ruthless methods.

No one expects that men like Mr. Green and Mr. Murray, who are its beneficiaries, will acknowledge this situation or do anything except to try to hold their privileges. But it is puzzling when a great many conscientious lawmakers either do not see the situation or are unwilling to take action that is adequate. And certainly the legislative proposals that seem to gather the most support do indicate either blindness or timidity.

A union imports its strong-arm squad into a small Connecticut village, overturns the trucks of a family-owned dairy, and beats up employees. What makes a Congressman think that men who do that will become sweetly reasonable if legislation creates a Federal mediation board? Or that it will be checked by a provision of law that says such actions will result in a withdrawal of bargaining rights? For what possible evidence is there that such a union means to do anything that could seriously be called bargaining?

Another reform proposed is that employers shall have the right of free speech, and what does that mean to a union officer who informs an employer that he can resume business only after he gets to his knees and apologizes for a personal remark?

The fact is that the measures on which congressional sentiment seems to be crystallizing merely skirt the edges of this problem. They insist on treating symptoms and even those not very boldly. When it is suggested that this Congress undo the grant of special privilege which another Congress legislated, leaders—even so good a man as Senator TAFT—speak warnings about "drastic" action. What is there drastic about penalizing men who disregard their contracts? What is drastic about the withdrawal of the legal right of a union of teamsters demanding tribute from girl clerks in a food market? And what about a law which allows the same union to say when an employer shall attend to his own business in his own shop? What a travesty to talk of "cooling off" periods changing the course of men who have deliberately organized armies skilled in arson and mayhem.

The conditions from which these things result were created by legislation. They can be corrected by legislation. Unless that is done, something which is indeed "drastic" will happen, and it is only necessary to point out that in one case told to the House committee only the good sense of the bedeviled employer prevented members of his community taking matters into their own hands.

Ships From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Ship Sales, Charters, and Lay-Ups of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, covering the Ship Sales Act enacted by Congress, has been holding hearings covering the matter of the return of our merchant ships from England and other countries, including Russia. In the course of the hearings there has been a refusal to disclose to the committee and Congress certain communications, and today I have caused a subpoena to issue for the Honorable George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, to appear before the committee and there to testify on matters concerning this transaction and bring with him all books, papers, and communications covering some 100 merchant ships belonging to the United States and now in the possession of Russia which have not been returned to this country.

The Assistant Secretary of State, William Clayton, at a former hearing stated there had been a communication directed to Russia and that some considerable time ago a reply was received. He further stated the answer was unsatisfactory but refused to disclose to the committee and to the Congress the contents of the reply, saying it was not for the committee. Since that time the Russians have issued a statement that the United States and Great Britain divided 470,000 tons of merchant shipping taken from the Germans. Up to this time the committee has no information of the United States receiving any such tonnage. What connection could there be with reference to this statement and the Russians keeping our ships?

Since the refusal to disclose the contents of the correspondence covering these ships with Russia, I am informed the Department of State has disclosed communications from countries in the Western Hemisphere. Could it be that Russia is the sacred cow of the State Department?

Who Laughs Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of February 19, 1947:

WHO LAUGHS LAST

At long last a noticeable percentage of the people in the land are awakening with a shock to find that the dry rot of Communist infiltration has progressed here to a dangerous stage.

A lot of citizens won't believe there is any such thing as fire until they find a blaze on their own roofs; they refuse to take communism seriously until they find that a network of Red spies, under the leadership of a German alien, has honeycombed the country for months, perhaps years.

We wonder what a certain Indiana educator named William Albert Wirt might say today if he were alive.

We wonder how many people even remember the name of this Gary school superintendent who was mercilessly pilloried by the crackpots and revolutionaries, the stupid intelligentsia, and the know-nothings of 13 years ago.

It was on the morning of March 24, 1934, that William A. Wirt's letter, which he had sent to a few close friends and a few newspapers, broke into print. There is no need to go into details, but the letter related how he, Wirt, had attended a party during a trip to Washington, and had heard the guests planning how the Communists were eventually to take over the United States.

Their thesis, he said, was that Roosevelt was merely the "Kerensky of this revolution," and their scheme was to "keep him in the middle of the stream," drunk on his own power, until the strong man was ready to take over.

Seldom in our history has a man been so vilified, so ridiculed as was Mr. Wirt when the charges were published.

Representative Foulkes, of Hartford, Mich., harangued the Congress on "intellectual jackasses." ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, North Carolina's Representative in the lower House, said, "We've had two great discoveries: Dr. Cook, who discovered the North Pole, and Dr. Wirt, who discovered Communists in the United States Government."

The left-wing New Deal pay-rollers joined Pravda, the Communist daily, in hooting at the Gary educator and his charges; Ickes called him a sorehead; Richberg called him a "cuttlefish squirt"; Adolph Berle called him a "credulous old duffer"; Mrs. Roosevelt, with her inimitable wit, compared his story to Alice in Wonderland.

Wise boy cartoonists across the country joined in the fun. Herblock, of NEA, pictured Dr. Wirt leaving Washington, his own face having been discovered "the reddest part of the investigation." Duffy, in the Baltimore Sun, showed him as a naive Little Lord Fauntleroy, reading Das Kapital. Talburt, in the Washington Daily News, pictured a miniature cat escaping from the "red plot" bag. So it went. Everybody had a good laugh. Everybody, that is, who didn't know any better.

It is a source of some gratification, though no particular pleasure, to recall that on March 27, 1934, 3 days after Dr. Wirt made his statement, the News-Sentinel said, editorially: "It will be a serious mistake for anybody to attempt light dismissal of the charges brought by Superintendent Wirt. * * * Indeed, there is more of the Stalin than of the Kerensky type of government already manifesting itself in Washington. * * * There should be a deep-searching probe." The cartoon by the late Harry Larimer, News-Sentinel cartoonist, urged that the charges be "smoked out" for a thorough investigation.

Of course, there was no thorough investigation or, as we had urged, a deep-searching probe. The investigation was deliberately turned into a three-ring circus, with Dr. Wirt depicted as the leading clown.

Let us check back to see what the famed educator's charges were.

The Communists and fellow travelers at the party, he said, had outlined the following plan:

To keep Communists in key positions in the Government.

To substitute decrees by executive departments and agencies for organic law.

To replace private industry and commerce with a planned economy.

To decentralize cities and redistribute industry and population through housing projects.

To end private lending agencies and control borrowers by Federal monopoly of long-term commercial loans.

To dictate policies of newspapers, magazines, and other avenues of public opinion.

To corral the farm vote through subsidies.

To quiet business and labor by doles to make them dependent on the Government.

To chill the spine of business by public investigations.

To discredit financiers by picturing them as crooks.

To call political opponents traitors and use the police power of the State to crack down on them.

To keep President Roosevelt, as the Kerensky of the revolution, in the middle of a swift stream and intoxicated with his decisions until he could be replaced by a determined dictator.

These were the charges; this was the plan Dr. Wirt exposed, and for his pains he was smeared and ridiculed by some of the very people who today are just emerging from their stupor to find that communism is flourishing in the United States.

One may check over all the 12 points of the Communist pattern of 1934, and see for himself whether the New Deal did not, by one method or another, try them all and with considerable success.

Only in a figurative manner did Mr. Roosevelt develop as the Kerensky of the Red revolution in America. But it was Mr. Roosevelt and the New Dealers who laid the groundwork for the Communist infiltration which now menaces this Nation.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago, throughout America, the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, that great President, was marked by a series of banquets as well as patriotic meetings and essay contests.

A pupil of St. Patrick's Parochial School, Valley Falls, R. I., in my district, Miss Esther M. Powers, 12-year-old daughter of the Honorable William E. Powers, State representative and Democratic deputy floor leader in the Rhode Island General Assembly, was awarded the Thomas Leighton Memorial Fund prize for her essay on Abraham Lincoln.

This essay is so well done that under leave already granted to me, I include it herewith as a part of my remarks.

It follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The year 1809 gave to the world a baby who was to grow up to be one of the greatest

and best-loved men in American history. As a boy Abraham Lincoln had little school training, but his mother both encouraged and helped him in his studies. His desire to read, always present, somehow seemed to quench an unknown longing.

His many virtues made this man, even as a boy, well liked. Simplicity, honesty, kindness, and humor were just a few of his outstanding characteristics. Take his humorous nature, for example. His appearance alone was unusual and somewhat comical. This, added to his droll way of telling a story, could keep his listeners on the edge of their seats or shaking with laughter. This was as a boy. Later he could still tell a funny story, but his witty sayings, however frequent, were scarcely ever without a point.

People frequently misunderstood his stories. Sometimes they felt hurt. For example, once when something he found did not prove to be as valuable as he had hoped, he said it reminded him of a blacksmith. This blacksmith found a piece of iron on the floor in the corner and thought it would make a good hammerhead. When melted, though, it was smaller than he had expected and although no good for a hammerhead it would still make an excellent screwdriver. But it still proved small after some hammering. Holding it over the flame for a second melting he reflected it at least would make a nail. After some shaping, however, he decided it would make absolutely nothing. Suddenly, as an inspiration struck him, he took the white-hot metal and threw it into a puddle. Then with a malicious smile he said, "At least, I know it will make a good sizzle."

Abraham Lincoln delighted in explaining what he had read. He said in this manner others would gain new knowledge and he himself would more clearly understand it. Dennis Hanks once said, "There's suthin peculiarsome about Abe." Often after reading a book, questions would pop up in his mind no other reader experienced.

When asked to write a letter, he would ask, "What do you want to say? Are you sure you want to say it that way? There might be some way that is better than we can think of."

When Lincoln became the sixteenth President of the United States he didn't stop being a lovable, good-natured man. Even his face looked a picture of kindness. Many were the occasions when he had a special investigation sponsored for some innocent or even guilty man. One story of this great kindness and one which proves his character is "The Soldier's Reprieve," by Mrs. R. D. C. Robbins.

When Lincoln's assassin, John Wilkes Booth, shot and fatally wounded him in Ford's Theater in Washington he was absorbed in the play, "Our American Cousin." What a blow it was to the country. It sent the United States into chaos. Everyone mourned this great personage. The following lines sum up the greatness of his character:

"He built the rail-pile as he built the state,
Pouring his splendid strength through every blow,
The conscience of him testing every stroke,
To make his deed the measure of a man."
—*Markham.*

Viewing Handicaps as a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the address recently delivered by Mr. George E. Stringfellow to the graduates of the A. Harry Moore School in Jersey City, I include in this extension of remarks an editorial comment upon the thoughts expressed in that address which appeared in the Orange (N. J.) Transcript, under date of February 13, 1947. The editorial follows:

VIEWING HANDICAPS AS A CHALLENGE

Our Government has been very thoughtful about the sensibilities of its citizens. We haven't been allowed to see the wounded and broken men who came back from the wars. For the most part they have been hidden away in the Middle West or in isolated spots in the East. During the war the explanation for this was that it wouldn't do the home-front morale any good, and, besides, the wounded man preferred to be alone with his hurts or at least among others who were battered like himself.

Cold reality reveals to us that there are thousands upon thousands of these veterans without an arm or a leg, or with damaged faces, or without eyes or hearing. There are thousands upon thousands of these men who have never been able to shake off the thought that for them life is over. This problem offers to the rest of us a supreme challenge which we will some day have to face.

Speaking at a home for disabled soldiers recently, George E. Stringfellow offered a possible lift to the men with the idea that there are two ways of looking at a handicap. One is the defeatist way of weeping over one's imagined fate, of sitting idly by and doing nothing about it. Then there is the second way of looking upon a handicap. The kind used in sports. It is imposed upon those believed to be superior in performance to their rivals. In other words, the handicap is not a liability but an equalizer.

That's the way Thomas A. Edison looked at his deafness. He realized that he had so many other natural requisites that other men didn't possess that he could easily spot them such a thing as hearing and still become the outstanding inventive genius of our times.

We will find ourselves meeting this problem more each day. Gradually our hospitals are fitting our wounded with artificial arms and legs and sending them back into the world. It is up to us not to pamper these veterans, but to deal with them as completely whole men. This could be our greatest help and kindness to them. This could be the solution of our problems with the physically handicapped whom we will meet.

Some Unsolved Problems in Marketing and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at the National Farm Institute at Des Moines, Iowa, on February 14, 1947:

The great success of the National Farm Institute vindicates the vision of those who conceived the idea a few years ago. Perhaps the best evidence of the real service which its meetings have rendered the Nation and its agriculture is the large number of similar organizations which have grown up throughout the country on a local, State, or regional basis. I consider it not only an honor but a privilege to have a place on your program.

The meeting this year is particularly important and significant because it comes at a time when we are entering upon a new era for the Nation and for agriculture. We have behind us the great problems which arose during the war—problems which imposed a serious strain upon American agriculture and which farmers met in a magnificent way.

Now we are on the threshold of new problems—national and international—which in some respects dwarf those which confronted us during the war. Our domestic industry has now made its transition from war to peacetime production. In the wake of this adjustment, however, we have before us great domestic problems such as labor-management relations, atomic energy, national defense, and fiscal policies, to mention only a few. In the international field we are confronted with the fact that most of the real questions arising out of the war have not been settled, nor does it appear that satisfactory settlements are likely to be brought about in the near future.

Whether we like it or not, this country must assume constantly greater responsibilities in international leadership. If we are to successfully carry such responsibilities, it means that our Nation must be strong morally, industrially, and militarily. It requires not only sound, strong international policies but a wise and constructive disposition of our industrial and economic problems here at home. This conference, dealing as it does with the economic and social problems of agriculture, can well be expected to contribute much that is helpful and constructive.

I have been given the subject of "Some unsolved problems in marketing and distribution." Preliminary, however, to discussing that subject I want, by way of background, to briefly review the problems now confronting agriculture and the adjustments which must be made in the years ahead.

While industry has made its conversion from war to peace, that is not true of agriculture. Up to the present moment farmers are confronted with practically the same problems which faced them during the war. It was then a question of expanding production to the very limit. That is still the program, and for 1947 the over-all acreage goals called for by the Department of Agriculture are greater than the acreage planted during any year of the war. Shortages of labor, fertilizer, machinery, and transportation which plagued farmers in the war years still exist.

Our agricultural production during the war increased one-third. It, together with accumulated surpluses, was all consumed and today our supplies, with few exceptions, are at a low point. The question is: How long can consumption continue at this rate?

It goes without saying that farmers are disturbed over the prospect. They have built up a productive capacity far in excess of prewar consumption. During the years immediately preceding the war, with a much smaller production, we found ourselves with vast surpluses of some agricultural commodities, and farm prices in most cases far below parity. This, notwithstanding the fact that production and marketing controls were in effect on most of the basic commodities. With the war in the background, increased supplies of farm implements, labor, fertilizer, and transportation which we can confidently expect within a reasonable period may expand productive capacity beyond what it was during the war.

Theoretically, under the Steagall amendment, we have a breathing spell of 2 years to work out our postwar policies, during which time farmers may make such production adjustments as they may be able to do. In practical effect, however, since over-all production goals this year are at about the same level as during the war, there really will be only a 1-year adjustment period.

The present Congress must consider what kind of a farm program we will have following the expiration of the Steagall amendment. This is not the time or the place to discuss that program, but it is in order, I think, to say that the House Committee on Agriculture expects to conduct extensive hearings on this question, beginning in April. It is the hope that there will be wide participation in these hearings on the part of farmers, farm organizations, and all others who are interested in working out a sound and adequate farm program.

It is the further hope that the ideas and proposals which may be advanced at that time will be given wide publicity by the agricultural press, the radio, farm organizations, and Members of Congress with a view of crystallizing sentiment on a program which will best serve the interests of the Nation and its farmers. Then, after this thorough consideration on the part of Members of Congress, farmers, farm organizations, and the public, it is hoped that when Congress reconvenes in January, legislation can be quickly enacted.

But everything has not been left for this Congress to do. The last Congress, recognizing that productive capacity had outstripped probable consumption of agricultural products, passed the Research and Marketing Act. This act, while not neglecting production research, made it clear that Congress wanted to emphasize the importance of research in the fields of utilization and marketing. It was an express recognition of the marvelous strides heretofore made in the expansion of agricultural production and a finding that from now on equal progress was needed in expanding consumption.

Agricultural research has been recognized as a proper function of Government for many years. It was implicit in the legislation passed in 1862, setting up the bureau which later became the Department of Agriculture. It was given express recognition by the passage of the Hatch Act in 1887, as well as in subsequent legislation. It was natural that in the beginning emphasis should have been placed upon research in production because at that time most of our production was for use on the farm or in nearby communities. But now our system of Nation-wide transportation and distribution of agricultural products has made the problem of marketing tremendously important, and our huge productive capacity makes it necessary to call upon applied science to bring about new methods of utilization.

This at last brings me to the topic which has been assigned me. I am not a marketing expert. I do not pretend to be informed in the technical aspects of marketing agricultural products. That fact is well known to those who prepared this program. I assume therefore that I have been assigned this subject because of my interest in the Research and Marketing Act which, for the first time, makes it possible for the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States and in some instances with private industry, to carry out research on an adequate scale in the fields of utilization and marketing and distribution. This act was passed because Congress recognized the fact that there were many unsolved problems in this field. As an indication of what Congress had in mind in passing this act, it might be of interest for me to point out some of the things which led Congress to feel that such legislation was necessary.

Back in the Seventy-eighth Congress, the late Hampton P. Fulmer, of South Carolina, then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, introduced a resolution providing for an investigation of the marketing system for agricultural products. Mr. Fulmer didn't introduce that resolution just because some one told him there ought to be an investigation. He was speaking from experience as a farmer in South Carolina producing fresh vegetables among other things. He was somewhat mystified, as well as indignant, shall we say, that sweetpotatoes that he sold for a cent a pound in South Carolina turned up in retail markets in Washington at from 8 to 10 cents a pound, with a comparable spread existing as to other perishables.

Mr. Fulmer wanted to get at a practical situation. The House of Representatives authorized the Commitee on Agriculture to make the proposed investigation. However, it was late in the session. Mr. Fulmer was not in good health, and no active work on the matter was done in the Seventy-eighth Congress. At the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress, JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., of Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, introduced and secured the adoption of a similar resolution. Notwithstanding the fact that marketing conditions were not normal during the war period and that there was difficulty in securing a staff, the committee did considerable work in investigating the marketing of fresh fruit and vegetables, livestock, and other farm commodities. The experience of the committe in making this investigation convinced it that there were tremendous problems in the field of marketing, and that there was great need for practical study and research.

Practically coincident in point of time was the work of the Pace subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, which was appointed in 1944 to study the problems of cotton. This subcommittee conducted extensive hearings in December 1944 and, upon its reappointment in the Seventy-ninth Congress, did much further work on cotton. One conclusion reached was that if cotton were to meet the competition of paper and rayon and other synthetic fibers, it would be necessary to conduct systematic research in utilization. The committee found that one great advantage which synthetics and fibers had over cotton was the fact that extensive research in industry had enabled those products to be developed as to form, texture, and quality in such a way as to meet consumptive demand.

During this same period the Republican Food Study Committee, consisting of a group of Republican Members of Congress appointed by Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, was making an active study of war-food problems. This committee, like the others just mentioned, became convinced of the great need for study in the field of marketing, distribution, and processing of food products. As a result of this committee study, I introduced a bill on March 28, 1946, which, after considerable revamping, finally became title II of the Research and Marketing Act.

I mention these things to show that although the Research and Marketing Act passed Congress without opposition and in record time, it was not the result of hurried and spontaneous action but rather the product of study and consideration, going back months and years. Nor do I want to leave the impression that all of the activity in this connection was limited to Congress, because the legislation as finally enacted was the result of work by many agencies—the land-grant colleges, the Department of Agriculture, the Cotton Council, and all of the major farm organizations, as well as numerous individuals interested in a sound and prosperous agriculture.

Now that the law is on the books, what are some of the problems awaiting solution? What processes and what program should be followed in order to get the most from the money expended? I think any one who has looked into the matter will agree that there will be no lack of projects. The act covers such a wide scope that there are hundreds, yes, thousands, of projects which can and no doubt will be proposed. Therein I think lies a great danger. Unless care and good judgment are exercised in determining policies and in selecting worthwhile and important projects for study, the funds appropriated could be frittered away with little really accomplished.

Another mistake which must be avoided is expecting too much in the way of early results. Our accomplishments in production research are the result of patient and painstaking work covering a period of years and years. Research in distribution and utilization will likewise take time to bring results, but in the end there will be results just as far-reaching and important as in the field of production.

Now, getting down to cases, what are some of the problems ripe for study? Many have been suggested to the Committee on Agriculture, not only in the hearings on the Research and Marketing Act, but in the course of its previous studies as well. Time will permit me to refer only to examples of the kinds of problems which I feel merit research and study. One of the first things which should be undertaken is an over-all study, from a national standpoint, of the whole field of distribution of agricultural commodities. In a statement made before the Committee on Agriculture last year, in connection with its marketing investigation, Mr. C. W. Kitchen, at that time an official of the Department of Agriculture, who had been connected with marketing activities in the Department for 34 years, made this statement:

"There is comparatively little information of the costs, wastes, and inefficiencies of marketing, item by item, through the channels of distribution. Such information is fundamental in any thorough study of our marketing system. It would focus attention on weak spots and indicate steps for improvement which might be taken by all concerned, Government and private business.

"A group of well-trained people, familiar with the marketing system and working closely with farm and trade organizations and State institutions, could produce significant results, not only as to possible improvements which might grow out of such studies, but to provide information to the public regarding marketing costs and what makes up the margins between what the producer receives and what the consumer pays. * * * It means having people who know or can be trained to know the actual problems and methods of marketing and who work at those problems just as the scientists have laboriously worked out better ways of increasing the efficiency of production and whose findings have been put into use by gradual adoption and without the force of law."

Certainly, from a national standpoint, we should have a program to make available the type of information suggested by Mr. Kitchen. It should include not only marketing, distribution, and processing, but transportation as well, because in these times that is perhaps the most important single element which enters into the marketing of agricultural products.

Have you ever thought of the part which the refrigerator car has played in the field of agricultural marketing? The fact is, no technological development of our times has made greater changes in agriculture than modern refrigeration. It has worked a revolution in the geography of agricultural production as well as in the field of human nutrition. What would become of agriculture in States like California and Florida if refrigerator transportation were suddenly eliminated? What would become of our livestock and meat industry and the distribution of fresh milk and other dairy products if it were no longer available? How might the health of people living in our great cities be affected if they were no longer able to get the perishable food products to which they have become accustomed? Yet there are surely improvements to be made in refrigerated transportation if research is applied to the problem as intensively as it has been to agricultural production.

In the first place, valuable as they are, most present day refrigerator cars are inefficient and expensive to operate. They must be iced frequently during a railroad journey. However, a new refrigerating unit has recently been developed which uses an oil burner in much the same manner as household gas refrigerators operate. Those who have developed this new method believe it will be cheaper, better, and more satisfactory than existing icing systems, and that it will keep refrigerator car temperatures low enough to handle frozen meats which present methods do not take care of satisfactorily.

Of course, thorough tests must be made to determine whether the claims of those who have developed this new method can be borne out. No doubt, further research might develop even more satisfactory improvements. Certainly, it is a field ripe for development.

Another possible source of research in connection with refrigerator transportation is that of preventing the losses which are now suffered in the shipment of perishable commodities. A recent study by the Department of Agriculture discloses that in 1944 the direct losses of shipping fresh fruits and vegetables in that year amounted to $11,000,000. This was the direct loss—the amount of damage for broken crates and other obvious wastage for which claims were paid by the railroads and other shippers. There is no way to estimate the indirect loss—that resulting from fruits and vegetables which were not visibly damaged but which were bruised or which suffered other deterioration in quality or price. Who pays for these millions of dollars of loss and wastage? The railroads settle the claims, but, of course, the bills are actually paid by farmers in lower prices for their products and by consumers in higher prices at the market place.

We need also further studies in the field of refrigerated transportation on the public highways. Private industry has done and will do more work along this line, but the only way that such studies can be conducted and coordinated on a national basis is by the Federal Government—in many cases working with private industry as provided under the Research and Marketing Act.

Nor does waste and inefficiency in transportation stop with long-distance hauls. It is stated on good authority that in New York City 50 cents out of every dollar the housewife pays for fresh produce goes to get that produce from the city limits to her kitchen. All the costs that have been incurred before, including what the farmer received for growing the product, total no more than the amount needed to bring the food from the terminal in Jersey City to the family kitchen. Certainly, here is a research problem worthy of our attention.

At the other end of the line, we know that in many parts of the country the facilities for collecting, grading, and shipping farmers' products are as antiquated and inefficient as city wholesale marketing practices. Without suitable collection, grading, crating, and shipping facilities in the country the farmer not only receives less for what he sells, but, in many areas, it is impossible for him to engage in diversified production because he has no satisfactory means of marketing what he grows.

Still referring to the question of transportation, one field in which research might very well be undertaken is in the construction of farm-to-market roads. Congress has recently made large appropriations for this type of road. Yet the designs for such roads worked out by the engineers in the Bureau of Public Roads are in many cases costly and impractical, resulting not only in the wrong type of roads but in roads so costly that the funds appropriated will not provide anything like the mileage needed.

Another field in which more extensive research is needed is that of the direct marketing of livestock. This has been a controversial matter in the Midwest for the last 25 years. It has been the subject of proposed legislation. One of the first bills I introduced when I came to Congress 20 years ago dealt with this question. Nothing has been done about it yet. I have even stopped introducing bills. Some studies have been made of the question, but, as far as I have been able to learn, there has been no real satisfactory research on a national scale which goes to the bottom of the matter. That is, there has been no clear-cut determination of whether direct marketing is a good thing or a bad thing for the producer.

The hearings before the Committee on Agriculture on the Research and Marketing Act were filled with suggestions for research in the field of distribution and processing, including packaging, compression, quick-freezing, and dehydration. These suggestions dealt with a large number of agricultural commodities. During the war, because we were forced to do it, great advances were made in the fields of dehydration and compression. Private industry has made great strides in the distribution of frozen foods, but there is no one who pretends that perfection has been reached through any method now in use. We need research with reference to the effects on marketing and consumption, resulting from the construction of frozen locker plants throughout the rural sections of the country. Also, what changes will come about as home freezing units become more numerous.

Distributors of milk are interested in new proposals for the handling of that product, including drying, powdering, and reconstitution. In talking the other day with a Member of Congress who had recently returned from Mexico City, I learned that a substantial part of the milk consumption there consists of reconstituted milk shipped from the northern dairy States of this country. I understand some of the same situation prevails in the urban areas of our own South. Furthermore, there are interesting possibilities ahead in the further utilization of dairy products. The uses to which skim milk might be put are in no way as yet fully explored. During the war, alcohol was made of whey coming from cheese factories in Wisconsin.

The committee hearings contain some very interesting discussions on the question of utilization in connection with cotton. The Pace Cotton Committee found that one of the principal reasons rayon was supplanting cotton was that research on the part of rayon manufacturers had resulted in a product which met the specifications of spinners and other users much more nearly than it had been possible to do with cotton. It was brought out that the processes of spinning and weaving cotton have undergone few if any fundamental changes in the last 150 years. While cotton was standing still, the laboratories of this country have been turning out synthetic products which have now become serious competitors. Those who know say that cotton is a better fiber than any of its rivals, and that with proper research in both production and utilization it can compete with them. The chemical industry is said to spend 2 percent of its gross revenues on research, much of it on synthetic fibers. Practically nothing has been spent up to date on research in the utilization of cotton.

Then there is the field of nutrition. What a lot we have to learn there. Nutritionists say we are on the threshold of great discoveries. From the standpoint of marketing farm products, what we need to do more than any other is to make the results of nutritional research available to the public. Therein lies the great opportunity of inducing people to spend a greater proportion of their income for agricultural products. It is a matter of such common knowledge that it hardly bears repeating that we know far more about feeding our hogs and our chickens than we do human beings, or, at least, we apply that knowledge better. As a nation, we have been deeply humiliated by the fact that about 40 percent of those who were called up for military service during the war were rejected physically. A large proportion of those defects were due to malnutrition and resulting diseases. One significant thing which has been disclosed by nutrition studies is that malnutrition exists, in a very large degree, among people who have ample funds to spend for food but who have never been taught anything about food or nutritional values. During the war, people spent on an average of 21 percent of their incomes for food. Certainly this is a small amount to spend for such an important item, and yet there is danger that in the next few years this percentage may be reduced, because opportunities for spending in other lines will be increased. Research and education in nutrition should counteract this tendency. Certainly, when we are currently spending something like $7,000,000,000 annually for alcoholic drinks and another $4,000,000,00 for tea, coffee, and soft drinks, there is room for expansion in the consumption of nourishing food.

The typical projects which I have mentioned serve to illustrate the opportunities which exist in marketing and utilization. They could be multiplied many times.

This is the age of the test tube and the laboratory. Our generation has witnessed the greatest industrial development the world has ever known. It was possible because we have learned how to make practical application of science in industry. In the field of agriculture, we now know that this country can produce the food and the fiber to make possible a constant improvement in our standard of living. The great problem is a proper utilization and distribution of what we have learned to produce. In this we have lagged behind. Through the research and marketing program we have the opportunity, if we will use it, to bring about an era of agricultural progress which will not only mean better times for American farmers but a living standard for all our people higher than ever before known in the history of mankind.

Teaching Is No Longer a Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the impending break-down of our educational system is alarming to many of us who believe that an educated electorate is the foundation of democratic processes.

A very thoughtful and challenging article appeared recently—February 24, 1947—in the Los Angeles School Journal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHING IS NO LONGER A PROFESSION—IT IS A PROCESSION FROM THE CLASSROOM

What would you say was the greatest hazard to constructive change in any program which involves people? Ignorance? No! Stupidity? No! These certainly play a part. But, more destructive than either of these is indifference.

What better example of this could be found than the reaction of educators to the present crisis in education. Too many

of the people, free from the pressures of the classroom, whose duty it is to safeguard this profession, follow the idiotical and familiar technique of declaring pontifically that everything is satisfactory and that we have as usual, "The finest school system in the United States."

Everyone within the ranks who dares to point out that the best system, wherever it may be, is not good enough; who tries to spotlight weaknesses and suggest lines of improvement is immediately labeled a "crackpot," a "trouble-maker," and is subjected to a personal attack which becomes the perfect proof of an inability to refute arguments.

You would expect the public to be the last group to wake up to this crisis. Significantly enough, the reverse is true. It is the laymen who are campaigning in this emergency—in magazines, on the radio, in the press. It is the noncertificated commentators—Drew Pearson, Walter Winchell, Cecil Brown—the usually nonserious Bob Hope and Bing Crosby who take time out on their unbelievably expensive radio shows to issue a warning, to make a plea to the people to do something now to avert the threatened break-down in their educational system.

Most of the emphasis is placed on the low salaries as the reason for the exodus. Gradually, however, they are beginning to seek the answer in job conditions. They are getting "warm." Presently, we predict, the people entrusted with the safeguarding are going to have to take their heads out of the sand and run like mad. Even though the ostrich has long legs, he is an awkward bird.

Stop and realize the significance of this present phenomena: For the first time in history the people are becoming conscious of their responsibility toward education. They begin to see what this break-down would mean. Even big business, usually so antagonistic toward any tax increase, begins to suspect that an educated public makes the best market—particularly when they are shown figures which prove it.

The public, at the moment, believes low salaries to be the cause. It certainly is a part of the picture. (The take-home pay for a beginning teacher in Los Angeles averages $35 for the 52 weeks in the year. Nice going!) Now is the time to utilize this unusual interest on the part of the people to make a definite, practical, and possible suggestion.

The Los Angeles School Journal with this issue makes such a suggestion and launches a campaign to put it over. As this issue rolls off the presses telegrams go out from this office to key people all over the United States.

THE PLAN

That Congress pass a law exempting from Federal income tax all persons employed in the public educational system, this law to be made retroactive to January 1946 and so cancel the payments due for the past year due in March 1947; that this exemption be made permanent.

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. The increase in teachers' pay must be made quickly to prevent further exodus and to encourage university students to train for this profession. District, county, and State machinery is cumbersome and involves too much time. This tax exemption would equal a 20-percent increase in pay and would affect every teacher in every State.

2. There has been a growing feeling for some years that part of the financial burden of education should be assumed by the Federal Government. The fear that a Federal grant might result in Federal control has caused the present impasse. This tax-exemption plan would result in a substantial boost in the teachers' take-home pay with no possible threat of Federal domination. It would be financial aid at the spot where it is most needed—with no chance of previous dissipation.

3. There is a precedent established. Until 1939 teachers were exempt from this tax—as were other public employees.

4. Even without precedent of previous exemption it has long been the policy of our Government to subsidize private enterprise engaged in public service. The railroads, steamship companies, and air lines have received such help. Never has their need been as great, nor the implications in their failure as tragic as in this present emergency in education.

5. By exempting everyone employed in the public educational system we would increase the pay of our noncertificated helpers and so secure and hold better qualified workers. The burden of inefficiency in this field eventually falls on the teachers. At the moment we cannot compete with private industry in pay and so our selection is necessarily made from their rejections.

6. Local boards should welcome this help. It should make it easier for them to offer a decent wage to secure and keep their school personnel.

7. The public should welcome this help. It would offer immediate relief and broaden the base of financial support.

8. It would afford a tangible proof that the teaching job has a special significance and importance—a bit of morale boosting that is sadly needed by the profession.

REFUTATION OF POSSIBLE ARGUMENTS

Why exempt teachers and not other public employees?

1. Because teachers are the lowest paid of all public employees when you consider the training requirements for their job.

2. They are entrusted with the job upon which rests the future fate of the Government and the people.

3. No other agency of the Government is threatened with a collapse due to an exodus of workers and a rapidly diminishing replacement reserve.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, delivered at the annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, on Tuesday evening, February 25, 1947:

Mr. President and my fellow Americans. Americans must know more about their Government and take a greater interest in it if it is to endure and to give Americans the opportunities we have always enjoyed. The great weakness of ou Government is not the form of the government, but the little the voter knows about it and the small part he takes to preserve it. The example set by the patriotic and venerable founder of this nationally known organization, Senator Grundy, should spur all of us to a greater interest in governmental affairs.

It is about some phases of that government that I would like to talk tonight. You are businessmen. You operate your own firms, or you are officers and directors of corporations, with all the headaches and heartache and responsibility that your positions call for.

But you've nothing on me. Even the biggest of you, connected with some of the largest industries in the Nation, are in small business compared with the business in which I am engaged. I sit on the board of directors of the largest corporation in the world and our board has recently received from the President of our corporation a budget calling for the spending of $37,500,000,000 during our next fiscal year.

That, gentlemen, is really big business. The rest of you are in small business.

Unlike you men, we don't manufacture anything. We are a sort of service trade for 140,000,000 people and the proposition which our board of directors inclines toward now is twofold: to cut out some of the services which we are not well set up to handle and which we operate at an unnecessary loss; and, second, to start getting out of the red. Our business has been deeply in it for so long, that it has become home to many in Washington's high places.

In fact our President and the other officers of our corporation have gotten so deeply into the habit of spending what they haven't got, that the board of directors is facing a stiff battle to save a penny here and there for 140,000,000 stockholder customers.

And now I'd like to report some facts of our finances.

The Government's estimate of tax income for the next fiscal year is approximately $39,000,000,000. This, however, is based on the premise that the national income—the income of all the people and all the businesses of the United States—will amount to an unprecedented $167,000,000,000. Let me say that again, $167,000,000,000.

In 1946, he all-time-record year, the national income, according to United States Department of Commerce figures, amounted to one hundred and sixty-five billions, so that in order to get the estimated taxes, national income has to climb even higher than last year.

Now I am no prophet of doom and I don't know what is going to happen, but I have read the predictions of leading economists that somewhere along the line we are going to have a recession.

Well, suppose we recede just a little bit. Suppose we recede so little that the estimated national income should drop from one hundred and sixty-seven billions to one hundred and sixty billions. That is still a lot of income and we would not be at all badly off. But this is what it would do to Federal tax collection.

Instead of producing an estimated thirty-nine billions, the present high and numerous taxes would produce for Uncle Sam only thirty-four billion five hundred million. That, you say, is a lot of Federal taxes and what in the world am I worried about? Well, you see, the President of our corporation, President Truman, sent us a budget calling for expenditures of thirty-seven billion five hundred million. In other words, more than 2 years after the war is over, if there is even a very mild recession, we are liable to wind up a fat $3,000,000,000 in the red.

And suppose in this next year the national income should fall to one hundred and fifty billions. That is a lot of money, too. I'll tell you how much. In the year 1941, the most prosperous prewar year, national income was less than $97,000,000,000. And in the great boom year of 1929 it was only a little bit over $83,000,000,000.

So one hundred and fifty billions is a lot of money. Yet if the national income should decline only that far, Uncle Sam's tax income would dwindle to $32,000,000,000 from all sources—even with the present high tax rates—even if your personal income-tax rates, or your corporate tax rates, or your excise-tax rates are not reduced by as little as one-hundredth of 1 percent. And remember, the President asks a budget $5,500,000,000 more than that figure.

If national income should dwindle to one hundred and forty billions, still much greater than anything in our prewar history, Federal tax collection would be only twenty-nine billions. And so on down the line.

Knowing all of these things—certainly the Government must know them—for I can assure you the Republican Senators don't have an exclusive "pipe line" to these official estimates—nor do Republican Senators claim a monopoly on knowing that things sometimes get a little worse and not always a little better—knowing all of these things, the administration still dares to come out with an unprecedented peacetime budget of $37,500,000,000. The administration still refuses to admit that economy can be more than a word in the dictionary. It still claims it must have more and more and more. It still—may I emphasize—refuses to permit business to become properly stabilized. And there is not the faintest doubt in the world that if we are going to achieve a $167,000,000,000 national income or anything close to it, it will be only because business operates at high speed and keeps people employed.

Do you know what we have in this country today? We have stark economic warfare which can hurt us almost as much as a shooting war if we lose it. We are engaged in the extremely delicate task of easing our economy from the war to the peace pitch. We are engaged in the battle to prevent further increase in the national debt and to make a start upon decreasing it. That is tough, deadly fighting; with the enemies of economy engaged in every type of guerrilla warfare in the book—and a few new ones besides.

I want to say here that I have taken my stand in Congress alongside of, and in the front ranks of, those who believe that the budget can be cut by a full $6,000,000,000. I make no retreat from that line even though some members of my party have done so. I am also proud of our Pennsylvania delegation in the House of Representatives. They too stood up and were counted among those favoring the $6,000,000,000 reduction.

This stand is important for Pennsylvania. Our State is heavily industrialized, the kind of State which gets hit worst and whose people suffer the most, in depression. That is one reason why I am so insistent that the Federal budget must be cut, must have the oozing lard sliced away—down to the last ounce. We need that $6,000,000,000 for two purposes even if business stays good. We need it to help reduce the $260,000,000,000 national debt, and we need it to cut taxes so that our people have money to spend and money to invest in the days ahead to keep the wheels of business turning and to protect their futures. Finally, just in case the possibilities I mentioned earlier occur—a drop of seven billions or fifteen billions or more in the national income, we need to cut out expenses to prevent another year of Federal deficit.

There are very few things in our budget which cannot be reduced. I would say they are:

First, the $5,000,000,000 to service the national debt. Our Government's bonds are widely held among all the people. Their value must be maintained.

Second, whatever is required to take care of our disabled war veterans and the dependents of those who laid down their lives that we might remain free.

Third, the $2,000,000,000 for estimated tax refunds as provided under the law.

And fourth, whatever is necessary for national defense in order to show the world that America intends to have peace.

Beyond that, I say, let's sharpen the knife and go to work. The future of America depends upon our doing a real—and not a token—job.

A great howl is going up against cut in the budget for the armed forces.

You know my military background. Do you think for one moment I would do anything to weaken this Nation's defenses?

I would never vote for a cut in the budget for the armed services if I thought for a moment our national defense would be weakened. I do say, however, that Congress has a right to know exactly how the money is to be spent and to eliminate the waste. If after going over the whole situation thoroughly they can satisfy the Members of Congress that the amount requested is needed for the armed services, I venture to say not a single Member would turn down the request. This can be done at the appropriate time, even though we fix the budgetary limit at $31,500,000,000 as a goal for the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

I am confident that this goal can be attained without impairing in any way whatsoever the defense of our country.

One of the most important sources of cutting should be the over-all Federal civilian employee lists. They are loaded and overloaded. There are still 2,300,000 of them. That is the too many by from half a million to eight hundred thousand. There's a lot of money to be saved there and a lot of efficiency to be picked up simultaneously. I'm for it. Why, do you know that there are now in Philadelphia, according to the Byrd committee, over 500 separate Federal offices. And do you know that, outside of the armed forces, the Federal Government has actually increased the number of its employees since the close of the war by more than 300,000.

And I am for stopping the Federal Government from competing with the lower levels of government and private industry for employees.

And I am also for stopping the Federal Government from engaging in business in competition with private enterprise.

And finally, many of our budgetary difficulties are due to our efforts to get what we want in the world by handouts, appeasements, and by loans that never come back.

Recently, a prominent Turk speaking in America said:

"The whole world in distress is insisting, almost as a sacred right, that Uncle Sam should keep on acting as Santa Claus. We cannot expect anything of that sort from the United States. If America falls into a deficient state by exaggerated charity and becomes in the end merely interested in its own immediate survival, all hopes of improvement in our common destinies are doomed to fail. Therefore, it is in the interest of everybody that America should follow a reasonable course of mutual profit in its outside economic activities."

That, I may say, is much better Americanism that I've heard from some of my own countrymen. It is the kind of advice we should follow.

America must be sound economically. This is the strong arm in defense. America must be sound also in having people whose objectives are peace and good will. We want honest, healthy, God-fearing people.

And we want an honest, healthy, God-fearing Government with the same high standard of morals we expect from our individual citizens.

Address of Hon. E. Wallace Chadwick to the Members of Post No. 214, American Legion, February 22, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. WALLACE CHADWICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before Post No. 214, American Legion, in Upper Darby, Pa., on February 22, 1947:

Under any circumstances it would be a pleasure to be a guest of this great post of the American Legion; it is a privilege to come to you as your congressional representative, and a great honor to be invited to address you as a speaker on your program, particularly on Washington's birthday. I have always had a profound admiration for the American Legion; I have observed it grow in importance and prestige throughout the Nation; it is one of the great foundations on which our citizenship is based. I have also observed its growth as a great stabilizing and energizing force in the life of our people.

Always having been interested in the so-called service clubs, such as Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Optimist, and Exchange, with their high ideals and their great contributions to the communities of which they are a part, I realized long ago that the Legion also is truly a service group, not merely because it is made up of men who have seen military service, but of men who have come to learn that service, in the other sense, is one of the great duties and should be one of the most rewarding parts of the life of every American citizen.

The word service has so many implications that it would be vain to try to define it. It ranges from the simple devotion of plain men to the conspicuous contributions of national leaders; from the simple expression of religious devotion of the Salvation Army to the more eloquent and influential expressions of the great leaders of religion; from the boy who volunteers his services or is called to duty as a buck private or a gob, to the tremendous responsibilities of men like Eisenhower, MacArthur, and Nimitz. But from the highest to the lowest levels those who serve have at least this in common, that they all desire, each in his own way, and to the limit of his opportunity, to sustain their country, to make their lives count for something toward the betterment of their home community, their own nation, and, if their vision is far enough, to serve the whole human race in its aspiration toward a better world.

In these causes, all right-thinking men and women should and do enlist themselves; but just as the individual opportunities of some are greater than those of others, so the opportunities of some groups are greater than those of others. We can do so much more collectively than we can individually; Americans are almost unique in their natural aptitude for such cooperation. We get together in scores and hundreds of organizations, almost all patriotically and generously intended in an effort to further our natural aspiration to contribute as much as we possibly can. You who are members of the American Legion are among the fortunate ones because you are banded together on the basis of a common tie; you all responded to the call of your country for military service in time of crisis. I suspect that this is perhaps the very firmest ground that any such organization could have, that it is made up of men who have proven their willingness to fight for, and if necessary to die for, their country and for the preservation of human freedom in the world.

I remember back in 1942 addressing a group of youngsters who made up one of the thousands of such groups who were about to go to camp, in response to the summons of their country, through the operation of their draft boards. I told them that on the next day they were going to be initiated into the oldest, the greatest, and the most honorable of all fraternities, the fraternity of arms. The average boy doesn't think of it that way, but the fact is that when he dons the uniform he has joined a host which ranges back in history far beyond the days of Napoleon, or of Julius Caesar, or of Alex-

ander the Great. Not all wars have been worthy wars; not all soldiers have been worthy soldiers, but the spirit which made the Spartans under Leonidas hold the Pass of Thermopylae against the invading Persians is exactly the same spirit which made the boys from Delaware County hold the little village of Fismette on the far bank of the Vesle in 1918, and which steadied the line in the Battle of the Bulge in 1945; the spirit which won the Battle of Trafalgar for the British under Admiral Nelson is exactly the same spirit which made history in the Battle of the Coral Sea.

But now this tradition of courage has had to take to the air, and our new generations of warriors have learned to fight wars not only in the stratosphere, but in the cold loneliness of the depths of the sea. But the motivation is still the same, the love of country, devotion to a cause, and self-sacrificing courage which has motivated all the soldiers and all the sailors from the beginning of the human race.

This is one of the great traditions of our race. Perhaps the fact that I never shared this service makes it more appropriate that I should acclaim it. But if I did not share it in person, I have at least been able to share it in spirit, because I have been blessed with enough imagination to be able to follow with some sympathy and understanding the blood and sweat which are the lot of the soldier.

It is certainly not necessary, in such a group as this, with a background like yours, on such a day as this, to talk to you about duty; but it may not be out of place for us to remind ourselves that duty still calls. Indeed, it lays upon every one of us a compelling hand, and it points a directing finger to new problems, new conflicts, and more service. In this world, the more we do and the more we give the more is expected of us. This is rightfully so, else how could we hope to meet new and ever increasing problems? The brave man cannot be permitted to rest on his laurels; the intelligent man cannot close his mind to new problems; the man who has sacrificed, must sacrifice more, if we are to make any progress in a world of constant change. We must, whether we will it or not. The human race is forever moving; the problem is to keep it moving ahead.

I wish I had time to talk to you in more detail about some of these tremendously urgent problems of today. I do not have to tell the American Legion that our very way of life, the ideals which have made America unique for 160 years, are under attack. I do not have to tell you that the enemy is no longer abroad; he is among us at home; and that, for the first time in our history, we are subject to the infiltration of a well-organized, diabolically resourceful, and unsleeping enemy, proposing a basic and revolutionary change in our American institutions, a change contemplating the abandonment and destruction of everything every right-thinking American has held dear since the days of our forefathers; since the day of George Washington, whose birth you celebrate.

There are unfortunately many in America who still believe that this is an idle threat, and that we can temporize with these foreign ideologies; but the number is vastly fewer now than it was 5 years ago, fewer even than it was 2 years ago.

What a change we have seen in Washington. Last year 65 Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress voted against a proposal to pursue with punishment a flagrant example of communistic arrogance and contempt for our institutions. But last week only one voice was raised in the lower House of the Eightieth Congress in protest against the effort to castigate another conspicuous Communist agitator. Of those 65 men and women who were uncertain about the threat of communism during the last Congress, half were defeated by their constituents at the recent election; and let me tell you that the other half have seen the light.

But this is one of the easier ways in which we can show our devotion to our American ideals. The real question is, Do we have the brains, the courage, and the devotion to insist that in other and less dramatic fields we will stand true to America.

It took some courage last Thursday for the Republican majority in the lower House of Congress to pledge themselves to a program of real economy in American governmental expenditures, in the hope that we might restore our country as promptly as possible to a course which leads to financial solvency, rather than extravagance and waste, inflation, and finally to a disaster as real as the destruction that the Communists are planning for us.

We believe, those of us in the lower House of Congress, that such economy can be effected without sacrifice of our military security and without the abandonment of any essential part of our national defense. Frankly, we believe that the era of extravagance which has marked this country in late years is not solely restricted to the civilian activities of the Government. We believe that the leaders of the Army and the Navy can, if they will, introduce reforms in their spending programs which would result in tremendous savings of the taxpayers' money, without sacrificing the essentials of their responsibility. You fellows who have served can judge better than I whether this is true. You know it is true; must we deny its truth?

We are not crying over spilt milk; we do not criticize the wastefulness which is an unavoidable attribute of war; war is itself a waste; and it breeds extravagance among soldiers. Men whose lives are in danger have no time to worry about money. But is it thought that this sort of thing is to be encouraged and practiced indefinitely? Do you want us to spend a billion and a half more of your dollars next year, merely to have it said that there is no limit to which we will not go to demonstrate that we intend to be militarily strong? Personally, I do not think we fool the Russians in any such way. It is part of their planning to see that democracy shall fail. Shall we contribute to its failure merely as a gesture of defiance to them? Personally, I do not think so. I would rather that we were truly strong than that we make a show of strength; America wins wars not because of bluster, but because it has resources of human courage, backed up by its unique industrial system, which in turn is based on a solvent and strong economy. If we spend ourselves into weakness before another emergency occurs, that emergency may prove to be the last for Americans and their way of life.

I sincerely hope that the American Legion will not be misled. Without their support, and the support of all of the right-thinking people of the country, their Congress cannot accomplish much for them. In the long run, it is public opinion, and not the votes in Washington, which control the destiny of America. You have honored me by making me your Representative; let me report back to you that there is nothing that I or any man in the Congress can hope to accomplish, except as we do it with your support. We have no ends of our own to serve; our authority is gained from you; our honest purpose is to serve you as best we can. If we are right, we have a right to your support; if we are wrong, you will be quick to tell us; but always remember that lesser things must be sacrificed to the greater ones if we are to keep America strong and ready for greater service to humanity and the best interests of this great Nation.

The Roosevelt-New Deal Brave New World Pay-Off—Double Talk and Double Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including Dorothy Thompson's column from the Washington Evening Star of February 26, 1947.

In reading this soul-sinking exposé of the moral collapse of the victors of World War II, I recalled my attempt in this House 2 years ago to end the ruthless stupidity of unconditional surrender.

After reading Miss Thompson's report, this passage from my remarks then looks somewhat prophetic:

For it was Hitler who boasted that regardless of what happened to Germany, the Nazi concepts of militarism and ruthless might would be victorious throughout the world. The consequences of the lack of a peace formula and continued use of the purely military phrase "unconditional surrender" may fulfill Hitler's boast. Unless America's political leadership has the courage to turn away from this error, we may be yet mocked by the Roman victory, described by St. Augustine, wherein the conquerors became more and more like those they had conquered.

Miss Thompson's column follows:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The crisis in which the world finds itself today—a crisis unparalleled in the history of the white race and western civilization—is a moral crisis. It is marked by the almost universal break-down of morality and law. The war has not been won and it is impossible to make peace because the moral crisis, which, we thought, culminated in the murderous regime of Adolf Hitler, has not been resolved. We are in a state of progressive moral anarchy, and add to our confusion by calling progressive disintegration "progress."

In Nuremberg a Herr Sauckel was condemned and hanged because he brought foreign workers to Germany and impressed them into slave labor. Slave labor is labor performed against consent and without free contract.

In sentencing Herr Sauckel the Allies departed from a time-honored principle of western law—that a crime is not a crime unless it has been previously so defined in law. The moral justification for branding as a crime an act justified as "wartime necessity" and clearly not defined and subject to legal sanctions in international law was that it was, in fact, a crime before the conscience of mankind. The test of such justification is, however, that the prosecutors, as guardians of that conscience, should henceforth recognize it as a crime—whenever and by whomever committed—subject to the same conscience and the same sanctions.

There is no law except that which its codifiers, prosecutors, and judges agree to live under themselves.

However, on the day following the execution of Herr Sauckel, newspapers reported that Russia had repulsed German protests against the exportation of Germans for labor in Russia on the ground that the Germans had unconditionally surrendered and therefore had no voice in the matter. No conscience of mankind was involved. A certain American major in Munich, who directed a

German paper, had previously expressed a similar opinion regarding the forced deportations of Germans from the east. Since then a Soviet newspaper in Irkutsk has stated that 5,000,000 prisoners of war are being retained in Siberia for labor on railroads, in mines, and on public-works projects.

The Soviet Union is not the only country who thus, nearly 2 years after the end of hostilities, is employing what was defined at Nuremberg as slave labor. The Soviet Union was never a signatory to the Geneva Convention respecting prisoners of war. But the United States and France were. The United States held to that convention during war, when American prisoners of war were in the hands of the Germans. But when our own and French prisoners were released, so that there was no possibility of reprisals, the United States turned over German prisoners of war to France. That country, thereafter, with our consent and connivance and in defiance of the Geneva Convention, has been employing them ever since as slave labor under the same definition of slave labor as that used against Herr Sauckel in Nuremberg.

The general attitude of the public in Allied countries is that it serves the Germans right. Few care to recall that President Roosevelt, in his foreign-policy speech of September 1944, gave a specific pledge to the German people: "The Allies do not traffic in human slavery."

Whoever raises his voice today in behalf of the application of the new Nuremberg law to all, including ourselves, is promptly castigated as pro-German.

But do only a handful of people see that we are therewith deepening the moral anarchy which is developing into physical anarchy?

Do only a handful of people see that we cannot possibly achieve universal peace unless we can put universal foundations under our political life?

Do only a handful of people see that if, having defeated Germany, we accept for ourselves Hitler's standards and Hitler's methods, Hitler has conquered?

The only way peoples and governments can establish moral foundations under their national and international life is by the acceptance and application of the Golden Rule. It is to do to no one what you would not want done to yourself under similar circumstances. That is the essence of justice—the capacity to put oneself, one's nation, one's class, one's race, one's society in the dock on the charges preferred against another, and ask: Were I in this position—I, my nation, class, or race—would I accept this judgment as just?

That question is the basis of morality and law. And until we accept this foundation, we shall have neither international peace, social peace, nor peace of mind. We shall simply go on going crazy, in a split-personality division between our avowed moral standards and our actual behavior.

Should Foremen Be Compelled To Join Labor Unions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under unanimous consent, heretofore obtained, the following article entitled "Should Foremen Be Compelled To Join Labor Unions?" by Lawrence Sullivan:

SHOULD FOREMEN BE COMPELLED TO JOIN LABOR UNIONS?—CONFLICTING RULINGS BY THE NLRB SINCE 1942 PRESENT AN URGENT PROBLEM FOR CONGRESS

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

WASHINGTON.—The high-pressure CIO campaign to force shop foremen and supervisors into collective-bargaining units threatens to disrupt the entire American industrial system, say opponents of the new union offensive. They urge a provision in the forthcoming labor amendments to exempt foremen and supervisors from the scope of the Wagner Act.

Foremen are the agents and spokesmen of management in every phase of production, industry contends. Once forced to join a union, supervisors cease to be a part of management and tend to become advocates and defenders of the union's programs and policies. Soon the day-to-day decisions of management pass from the plant managers to the union boss. For all practical purposes, the union becomes management.

The CIO, on the other hand, presents its arguments in a 30-page educational pamphlet titled "Should Labor Have a Direct Share in Management?" Here President Philip Murray sounds the introductory keynote: "It is a mistake to assume that an employer needs no aid from his employees in managing his enterprise."

Congress sought last year to protect foremen from such unionization drives by incorporating in the Case bill (later vetoed by President Truman) a section specifically excluding supervisors from the scope of the Wagner Act. The Senate vote on this amendment, jointly sponsored by Senators ELLENDER, BYRD, HATCH, LUCAS, BALL, TAFT, HAWKES, and FERGUSON, on May 25, 1946, was 48 to 30, with 18 not voting. New Senators elected last November change the alinement on this issue today to 71 against unionized foremen and only 25 supporting, according to recent testimony before the Senate Labor Committee.

The issue also is before the Supreme Court, where Packard Motor Car Co. seeks a verdict against compulsory collective bargaining with the Foreman's Association of America. Arguments in the Packard case were heard on January 9, 1947.

It was never the intention of Congress in 1935 to place foremen and supervisors under the Wagner Act. This matter of legislative intent once was noted by the NLRB in a 1943 ruling.

"There is nothing," the Labor Board majority observed, "in the committee reports or in the debates in the House and Senate which would indicate that this specific problem was ever considered in Congress. * * * It was traditionally recognized by all parties that the interests of foremen lay predominantly with the management groups."

Not until June 15, 1942, almost 7 years after approval of the Wagner Act, did the NLRB hold a supervisors' union to be an appropriate collective-bargaining unit. By that decision, against the Union Collieries Co., of Oakmont, Pa., mine foremen and supervisors gradually were incorporated into the United Mine Workers of America.

About a year later, on May 11, 1943, the Labor Board reversed itself on foremen, holding in the Maryland Drydock case that organizations of supervisory workers were not appropriate bargaining units.

These conflicting decisions are the seat of today's great difficulties. Since 1943, hundreds of disputes involving the issue of foremen's unions have clogged the dockets of both the NLRB and the Federal courts. Several major industries have been crippled by intensive union campaigns among their foremen—each dispute fired to white heat by the conflicting decisions of the Labor Board, one holding for and one against the unionization of management functions.

On March 26, 1945, the NLRB handed down yet another ruling, in the Packard case, holding a foremen's union to be an appropriate bargaining unit. But, basing its resistance on the Maryland Drydock ruling, the Packard management refused to bargain with the Foreman's Association of America. It is this case which now is before the Supreme Court.

On March 6, 1946, NLRB held that supervisors in the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.'s coal mines made a suitable bargaining unit; and in the Krug-Lewis strike-settlement agreement of May 29, 1946, the Government bound itself on all questions touching foremen and supervisors "to be guided by the decisions and procedures laid down by the NLRB."

It is this unhappy state of conflict and confusion which Congress now is urged to clarify.

Several long-established national associations of foremen or professional workers resist the NLRB rulings which tend to drive them into labor unions. The National Society of Professional Engineers told the Senate Labor Committee that since adoption of the Wagner Act in many cases the professional employee has been required to become a union member as a condition of employment.

The National Association of Foremen, which boasts more than 23,000 members in 135 cities and 33 States, reports that a Nation-wide public-opinion poll found only 13 percent of the working foremen either belonged to a union or were interested in joining a union.

Similarly, the Foremen's League for Education and Association insists that foremen are a part of management, and that relation is destroyed if the individual foreman loses his identity and becomes a member of a union, thereby dividing his responsibility and loyalty.

Farm organizations likewise oppose the unionization of management. Testifying before the Senate Labor Committee on February 7, Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Association, said:

"When a union reaches out to take control of management, or to control farmer producers, it acquires such a scope of power that the notion of collective bargaining becomes a mockery. The public is open to ruthless exploitation."

Management characterizes the campaign to unionize foremen as revolutionary. In the words of H. Parker Sharp, general counsel of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., before the Senate committee on January 31: "Supervisory employees are management, and only a person desiring to change the American way of doing business would promote such a revolutionary undertaking."

C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors, told the committee: "To make collective bargaining work the status of management employees must be clearly defined by placing them on the management side of the bargaining table."

In the same vein Clarence E. Bleicher, president of De Soto Motors, told the committee: "Foremen are managers. What can we look forward to if, added to rank-and-file union factionalism, foremen go over to the other side and we also have foreman factionalism mixed up with rank-and-file factionalism?"

Free foremen are the hub of the American mass-production system. Unionized foremen turn the shop into a soviet.

New Jersey's Fight Against Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject How New Jersey Raises Funds and Fights Cancer, delivered by George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society and member of the board of directors and the executive committee of the American Cancer Society, at the national campaign meeting, Coronado Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., February 7, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In organizing for the battle against cancer, we recognize that the lives of thousands of our citizens depended on what we did and how we did it.

We were faced with an increasing death rate from cancer.

Our job was to devise and set up a program that would coordinate the thinking and action of the people of the State into a well-geared unit of human machinery; one that would function smoothly, effectively, and with determination to achieve the objective—find the cause and then the cure of cancer.

Any structure we built, if it was to remain permanent, must be erected on the four cardinal pillars of management which are: Plan, organize, delegate, and supervise.

We planned to organize local chapters, self-governing, within the limitations prescribed by our national and State constitutions, bylaws, policies, and regulations. We planned each chapter would write its own bylaws, elect its own officers and board of managers, and also to elect one lay and one medical delegate to the State board of trustees. The State board was to be the policy-making body for the State division. Every county therefore would have an equal voice in its decisions.

Laymen were to be responsible for raising funds and for the business administration of the chapters' affairs. The medical profession would devise and prepare projects for the expenditure of funds. Laymen would be presidents, secretaries, treasurers, and chairmen of the finance, campaign, publicity, and education committees. Medical officers would control the local and State, medical and service committees. The chairman of the chapter executive committee would be a medical doctor. The cancer advisory committee of the County Medical Society would be the medical committee of the county chapter.

We realized that the only way to avoid misunderstanding is to have a definite understanding at the outset, so that the laymen and the medical men will not consciously trespass on each other's responsibility and authority. Very often, the laymen and the medical men speak a different language, but they usually talk about the same things. Those who criticize the medical men when they oppose certain projects, in effect, promote socialized medicine. In such cases, I support the medical men, for I am as much opposed to socialized medicine as I am socialized industry. With our cooperative plan decided upon and approved, both by the laymen and the State medical society, whose cooperation was pledged, we proceeded with our planning and organization.

We also discussed our plans with newspaper editors and publishers and radio people. Their approval and willingness to cooperate was quickly assured. We were now ready to organize.

Because no chapter had been organized to spend money for medical and service or educational projects prior to the Nation-wide appeal for funds in April 1946, our early efforts at organization were developed mainly for campaign purposes. By April 1, 1946, we had organized fund-raising units in 17 of the State's 21 counties.

Great care was used in selecting the volunteer supervisory personnel of these groups. Each person chosen for participation in the campaign was eager to work and enthusiastic over the program.

This interest was clearly reflected in the results of our organized appeal. Against a quota of $471,600 assigned to New Jersey, the amount contributed by the people in the 17 out of 21 counties of our State was $716,904.

New Jersey, although ninth in wealth among the States, was third in total funds raised per State; although ninth in wealth, New Jersey was first in funds raised per million dollars of her wealth; although sixth in income per capita, New Jersey was first in funds raised per capita.

At this point, I want to say a word about the field army. For many years this noble group of women has given outstanding service to the American Cancer Society. In the development, first, of our campaign units in the counties, and later in the development of the service and education committees of the chapters, the field army, now an integral part of the State and local organizations, has continued its fine service to humanity. The cancer-control program owes much to the field army.

With the fund-raising campaign over, we turned to organization of county chapters. By the end of September 1946 each of the 17 counties organized for the April campaign had formed chapters. The four remaining were organized later—two in December and two in January of this year. Every one of our 21 counties in New Jersey now has a chapter of the New Jersey division.

Since the formation of our chapters, their medical committees have lost no time in developing projects for the expenditure of funds contributed by the public for the control of cancer.

With the guidance of our medical director and the approval of the medical men at county and State levels, medical projects have been fully approved in 30 hospitals of 11 counties. Funds totaling $321,339.62 have been made available for these clinic projects. The funds will be expended for purchase of deep X-ray therapy machines, radium, gold radon seeds which are being established in county-wide pools, instruments, and other equipment needed by the clinics for diagnosis and treatment of cancer, for payment for service of medical secretaries, nurses, follow-up workers, and technicians in the clinics and in certain areas to stimulate and improve bedside nursing care in the homes of cancer patients.

We also have set up a State-wide tissue diagnostic service. Through our statistical research program we are providing vital information on cancer mortality and incidence to the medical profession, welfare agencies, hospitals, and the lay public.

Other county projects now are being considered. Before the end of our fiscal year, August 31, 1947, it is anticipated that all of the available funds from the 1946 campaign will have been expended or earmarked for expenditure.

We are now organizing for our campaign appeal which is less than 3 months away. One general meeting of chapter presidents, campaign managers, and publicity chairmen from each county was held last November. At that time our complete campaign plans, which had been prepared in advance for their consideration, were discussed.

Three regional precampaign meetings for final review of campaign plans have been scheduled in different parts of the State. The first, for the northern counties, was held in Newark on Wednesday night. The second will be in Trenton on February 11 and the third in Camden on February 18.

One of the points I have emphasized to all of our workers is the necessity for conducting our business and our plans for the expenditure of public contributions in a manner that I call operating in a goldfish bowl. I insist that the affairs of the society be conducted in a manner that would reflect to our credit if everything we do should appear on the front pages of the press of the State and over all of our radio stations. The public contributes the money. Therefore the public is entitled to know what is done with it, down to the last penny.

For this reason I have asked that before the campaign each county make public the purposes for which the 1946 contributions have been used and, at the same time, present a budget for expenditures in 1947 and 1948 on the basis of which they propose to solicit contributions in April. That is keeping faith, and it is only by keeping faith that public confidence and support can be retained and expanded.

As a means of coordination and supervision of the machinery we have built in New Jersey for the control of cancer, there has been set up at State level a service department. That unit takes the place of what is generally known as a State headquarters staff, and to its personnel and to the volunteer personnel of the chapter has been delegated the authority to act.

The department is exactly what the name indicates it to be—a service department. The time and skill of its personnel is at all times at the service of each of the State's 21 county chapters, the medical profession, the cancer patients, and the general public.

Comprising this service department are a manager, who in our State also serves as director of public relations and publicity; a medical director, who acts as liaison between the medical profession and the laymen and guides in formation of cancer projects; a State field army commander, who guides the field army activities throughout the State; and a field director, who supervises organizational activities and is State campaign manager.

In addition, we have retained the services of a statistical research consultant, who is directing this important phase of our program. We also retain a certified public accountant, who advises us on financial procedures and supervises the accounting—all of which is done by our central office. County funds are restricted for use to the counties in which they are collected, and disbursements are made by the central office upon approval by the county chapter and the State division officers.

Thus, we carry out the four principles of management—plan, organize, delegate, and supervise.

With a sound plan—a cause as worthy as ours is—we had little difficulty in attracting the type of men and women needed for a successful program. We then delegated authority to them and the matter of supervision was relatively unimportant. To an organization of high-type citizens willing and accustomed to discharge responsibility

has been delegated the authority to act in our great movement, and so a reasonable amount of success has attended our first year of organized effort.

It has been a great pleasure to be with you today and I am most appreciative for the privilege of discussing with you the manner in which we organized and how we function in the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society.

Ammonium Nitrate Borrowed by the Army Should Be Made Available to American Farmers for Oats and Other Crops

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, American farmers are dependent upon the Tennessee Valley Authority, Lion Oil Co., and Spencer Chemical Cc., with a combined monthly production of approximately 41,000 tons for ammonium nitrate. Under the operations of the International Emergency Food Council, and, as I understand, by priorities of the Civilian Production Administration, from June until December 1946, the Army borrowed approximately one-third of said production, or 90,000 tons, to be returned for domestic growers out of the production of Army plants in 1947. The amount borrowed by the Army was shipped to occupied areas overseas. In November 1946, by priorities of Civilian Production Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Lion Oil Co., and Spencer Chemical Co. were directed to ship the said approximately 90,000 tons as returned by the Army overseas to Allied governments, and, in addition thereto, by priorities, were requested to make available from 15 to 20 percent of their production from January until June 1947 for shipment overseas, including shipments to Puerto Rico. With the known shortage of nitrates, the Civilian Production Administration made a mistake in requesting the loan to the Army, but in directing priorities for the shipment overseas when returned by the Army and for additional exports January–June 1947, the American farmer, desperately in need for oats and other crops, is being discriminated against.

The Army has reactivated 11 plants. Their January production was approximately 34,000 tons, their February production 40,000 tons, and the capacity of 65,000 tons is expected to be reached by the Army in March 1947. The Army production is being shipped to occupied areas. In addition to the Army borrowing the said 90,000 tons in 1946, the Army borrowed, to be returned, from War Supplies, Ltd., Canada, 20,000 tons of ammonium nitrate, which would have otherwise been available to American growers. War plants operated by the Army are to ship overseas in 1947, with a capacity of almost double the combined production of Tennessee Valley Authority, Lion Oil Co., and Spencer Chemical Co., some 600,000 tons of ammonium nitrate. With a desperate shortage and with American farmers pleading for ammonium nitrate, with delays in the importation of Chilean nitrates, with strikes in steel plants, to correct a mistake made, the Civilian Production Administration and those responsible for its operation should immediately cancel the requirements for shipment overseas of the ammonium nitrate, as returned by the Army, and should relieve the Tennessee Valley Authority, Spencer Chemical Co., and Lion Oil Co. from overseas commitments for January–June 1947, and certainly until June 1947. The supply would still be short, but the least that can be done is for the production of these three plants, including the amount borrowed by the Army, to be made available to the farmers who are desperately in need of nitrates for oats and grains generally, and other crops at the present time. This is especially true when the war plants will be producing, commencing in March, as I am advised, for shipment to occupied countries approximately 65,000 tons monthly, against the said total production of Tennessee Valley Authority, Lion Oil Co., and Spencer Chemical Co., of approximately 41,000 tons monthly, which is the only source available to American growers.

The Department of Agriculture handled satisfactorily the production and distribution of ammonium nitrates for the 1946 crops. Mr. C. C. Smith, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, rendered most exellent service, but he is no longer in charge of nitrates. It is said that the Department of Agriculture, Civilian Production Administration, and other Federal agencies now have no control over the allocation and distribution of ammonium nitrates. This is but half the fact and is only partially true. Civilian Production Administration, until its authority expires March 31, 1947, is exercising priorities to the detriment of American growers who are sympathetic with the needs of fertilizer overseas and who contribute taxes to the operation of the war plants for supplying occupied areas. American growers are pleading with Congress for ammonium nitrate. The loan of one-third of said production in the fall of 1946, to be returned by the Army, and the policy of diverting as the Army is now returning, to Allied countries, has resulted in the American growers being deprived of approximately one-third of the production of the said three plants in the fall of 1946 and approximately one-fifth of their production in 1947. The distribution of ammonium nitrate is being hampered by priorities to the discrimination of American growers. The best that can be said of the handling by Civilian Production Administration, the Department of Agriculture agencies, and other governmental agencies in 1947 is that all Members of Congress have been able to obtain for 4 months is statistics that are confusing and an alleged program that is ineffective if not inefficient.

The time is long past to correct the discrimination. Ammonium nitrate under priorities for overseas shipment should be immediately made available to American farmers for oats and other crops.

The Budget and Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, entitled "The Budget and Taxation," by the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, delivered at the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association meeting at Philadelphia on Tuesday, February 25, 1947:

Gentlemen, I appreciate the courtesy of your organization in inviting me to address you this afternoon on a subject of the utmost importance to our national life—the Budget and Taxation. You will, I hope, pardon an admission on my part of inability to adequately discuss this subject in 20 minutes. Hundreds of specialists, thousands of business and union officials, and millions of our citizen are now, and will continue, discussing the budget and taxation for months to come, as experts. In the hodge-podge of laws that is our Revenue Code there are found ample questionable laws, rules, and regulations to justify any amount of discussion.

I would be sadly remiss in addressing you of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, who provide substantially the jobs for other workers in industrial Pennsylvania, if I failed to compliment you on a job wonderfully well done throughout and since the close of the war. Under most difficult and uncertain conditions, you—literally not knowing from one day to the next what new regulations and restrictions would be foisted on you by the bureaucrats in Washington—have carried on, hoping for a better day after the war's end. You look forward to once again having the opportunity to run your business as you know it should be run, for the good of your country, your State, your employees, and your owners.

The educational work done in that campaign for our citizens bore fruit. The average Pennsylvanian recognized: 1. That in our form of government he had something worth while to save. 2. That no sacrifice was too great to save America. 3. That his job depended upon the private enterprise system—that is, a private employer. 4. That what is good for business is good for all. 5. That no nation can borrow itself rich. 6. That we must have good housekeeping in Washington if we don't want bankruptcy.

The average Pennsylvanian spoke, and has charged the Republicans in Congress to bring order out of chaos. We shall do that.

Yes; the average American citizen is today more than casually interested in taxation and the budget. The age of innocence is past. We know now that our country, just as ourselves, cannot spend more than it earns for a long period of time without bankruptcy. The American citizen wants to know now who spends his tax dollars, why it is spent, and for what it is spent. This is a healthy condition.

Closely associated with taxation is the budget. The budget sets forth the number of your dollars Congress will take from you and spend for what it deems your business.

Historically we have had but one budget in Washington, the one prepared by the President through his Bureau of the Budget. This Bureau, because it reflects the President's control and desires is known as the President's right arm. The President's budget is the budget of the spending agencies, the group which, unfortunately, strives ever to

grow bigger and bigger, and feeding upon itself grows larger year after year.

Starting this year with the Eightieth Congress, something new has been added to our legislative procedure in Washington. It is the legislative budget—a budget prepared by those who are charged directly by the people with making appropriations and levying taxes. It sets forth the amount of money your Congress believes will be collected in taxes and the amount your Congress thinks will cover all appropriations for the ensuing year. It is the budget of the taxpayers as contrasted with the budget of the spenders.

Now, at best a budget is a guess or estimate of governmental receipts and expenditures for a year to come. Consequently, and in view of grave uncertainties in seeking to peer into the future, it cannot be binding on Congress It may be decreased or exceeded if circumstances permit or demand.

The important consideration for those interested in good government is that the legislative budget will be viewed as a maximum, the amount above which the Congress will not (save in an emergency) make appropriations. Thus, by the adoption of a legislative budget, the full Congress strengthens the hands of its appropriation committees as they strive to keep spending within the budget. In the same way, it guides the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate in their taxing duties, so that they may, with reasonable certainty, know the financial requirements of the Government for the ensuing year. And at the same time, it serves as a warning to the bureaucrats of government that they must cut their cloth to fit.

The Eightieth Congress is now adopting its legislative budget for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1947. The House of Representatives has already voted a legislative budget of $6,000,000,000 less than that requested by the President's budget, setting a ceiling on appropriations of $31,500,000,000. It will permit the discharge of hundreds of thousands of unnecessary employees, the elimination of dozens of wasteful Government agencies, and the curtailment of others; it will insure more adequate funds for national defense, for the veteran, and for our fixed interest charges.

There is nothing which threatens our national defense program, our obligations to our veterans, our bondholders and workers more than does our continued extravagant Government policies with their resulting annual deficit. Those who pretend that dollars—mere printed pieces of paper—circulated by a government continually in the red help our national defense and economy do a disservice to our country. Pieces of paper, whether dollar bills or not, never won a war or built a nation's defense. It is work and sweat, a balanced budget, a nation not burdened with debt or taxes, a nation with stable and good money, with a citizenry willing to fight for a good land which is our real national defense.

My colleagues of the Republican Party in Congress and all the Republican candidates in Pennsylvania covered this State and the Nation last fall announcing our determination to bring saneness once again into Government in Washington. We said the situtation was serious, and we were going to stop the waste. With the American people behind us, the Republican Party, seeing the right, will not fail them in this hour.

Our first step is the adoption of this legislative budget—billions less than the spenders seek. It will serve as a guide for our spending, to be decreased, if possible, and increased only if dire necessity demands.

TAXATION

It will bear repetition to say once again that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." Your Congress has that power today within constitutional limits which, unhappily, cannot be defined with certainty.

The Federal tax collector takes today 25 cents of every dollar in our national income of $160,000,000,000. Hence, for the Federal Government alone, you and all your employees work 3 months of the year, whether rich or poor, to pay that tax. It may be paid directly as income or excise taxes or indirectly through hidden taxes.

In addition, you work another month or two each year in order to pay your State and local taxes.

Certainly with from a quarter to a half of your effort going to pay taxes to buy the services of government, many of which you don't want, you are interested in getting that service, if desirable, as cheaply as possible. Just as in buying a suit of clothes, you want the best for the money; you don't want to pay extra for a lot of unnecessary and undesirable gadgets.

So, whoever you are, it is safe to assume you want Government expenses and taxes lowered. If we don't reduce them, they will go up and up until you work 8 months, then 10, then 12 months a year to pay your taxes, which in effect is what they do in Russia today.

Most people think of taxes as a means to an end: that of collecting money to pay Government expenses. That, of course, is a most important function of the tax collector.

There is another purpose evidenced particularly in recent years—that of using the taxing authority to accomplish what are called social changes. Many of these proposals are drastic, and do indirectly what the American people will not do directly.

For example, the proposal of a few years ago to limit salaries to $25,000 must have been designed, not to secure revenue, but to break down private initiative by making it unprofitable for a man of ability to exert himself. That this was the true purpose is evident when you recall that the man living on a "spendthrift trust" and basking in the Florida sunshine could, without working at all, continue to loaf on an unearned income of over $25,000. Yet our revenue laws today through high taxes accomplish in effect this social change and they remove the reward incentive essential for full effort toward business expansion.

Likewise, the misguided undistributed profits tax passed by the New Deal in 1936 was especially designed to force poor business practices by requiring business under penalty of heavy taxes to pay out its earnings, even though good judgment required that the money be reinvested in expansion or repair. Here, too, the social purpose was to break down the private enterprise and corporate structure of business, presumably so that the Government might take over all private business. This tax caused the so-called recession of 1937, with its millions of unemployed. Shortly thereafter, a hundred new Republican faces appeared in the House of Representatives and the New Dealers were forced to repeal that law.

However, it must be noted that under section 102 of the revenue law, the principle of taxing undistributed profits remains in the law. Anytime the Administrator determines to enforce this provision, on his own findings, he may collect a tax on profit which is not distributed as dividends. I add that in our anticipated revision of the Revenue Code the Congress will do well to include an investigation into section 102.

There are many proponents of this theory of using taxes to effect social changes in the Government's service and Congress today.

Taxes are a charge against production. They retard production through increasing its cost. They help our overseas competitors in low-cost producing areas. They favor methods and manners of doing business not subjected to the particular tax in question.

Our anticipated Federal-tax income, based on a national income of $165,000,000,000 and our present tax structure, for fiscal 1947 is thirty-nine and one-tenth billions. Should our national income decrease by as little as 10 percent, our anticipated tax receipts would decrease by almost $5,000,000,000.

You readily see how important it is to keep our national income high and to cut our expenditures as low as possible as an insurance factor. Note this, a 10-percent reduction in the national income would cause a deficit of about $3,000,000,000 on the basis of the President's budget. On the basis of the legislative budget passed by the House of Representatives, there would be no deficit if the national income falls off by 10 percent.

Our efforts must be devoted to keeping our national income high. Otherwise, with a narrowing base against which our taxes will be applied, our tax receipts will fall, nothing will be paid on our debt, and our budget, however carefuly scrutinized, will be out of balance. To the extent our taxing laws retard expansion of business which provides the source of the national income, the tax laws should be changed. We learned in the 1920's, following World War I, that wise reduction of taxes and rates led to both increased business and increased tax revenues.

Your Congress, through the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, are now and will continue to examine our tax structure, intending to eliminate from the Revenue Code tax inequalities and taxes which retard business and employment.

There is a black-out of the money an expanding industry needs today. Risk capital, that which the investor, big or little, puts into a business in the hope of large returns cannot be found. It can't be found, first, because the tax collector has taken it in high corporate and personal income taxes, and, second, because the risk incident to investment in a new business or industry today is too hazardous.

Even if the new business "clicked," the tax collector takes from one-half to 80 percent of the profit.

So, the prospective investor with funds available takes the easy and safe course. He puts his money in Government bonds and lives on the interest and the worker loses millions of jobs so badly needed.

We are going to need many new industries if gainful employment is to be assured to all. New industries mean more jobs, and an expanded market for raw materials. Without risk capital we will not get new industries.

Consider Henry Ford as an example. At the turn of the century he developed an idea for a horseless carriage. The banks and Wall Street would not finance him, for they deemed his idea visionary and unsound—certainly risky. But his friends did raise $40,000 which the tax collector in that day permitted them to keep. They took the risk and with this $40,000 we had the beginnings of the giant industry which now gives employment directly and indirectly to nearly 2,000,000 families. The automotive industry today is the fruit of the private enterprise system.

The national income must be kept high, thus providing the tax base necessary for our taxes, without which we will not have the money to pay on the national debt and to balance the budget. It is proposed, after assuring a balanced budget and a payment on the national debt, to reduce personal income taxes by 20 percent this year. I believe that this reduction in taxes, coupled with the balanced budget, will contribute greatly toward maintaining and increasing the national income.

Under the proposed plan substantially all taxpayers will have the same percentage of reduction, and to a large measure the money formerly taken by the Government for inefficient and wasteful spending will be available for business expansion. Likewise, and this is most important, the lower tax rate

will lend encouragement to those risking their capital for profit.

As business expands, more and more jobs will be available, there will be certainty of employment, and every income-tax payer will profit more through business and work opportunities than directly through the tax reduction.

It is important to note that without the present wide base for income-taxing purposes the budget will be hopelessly out of balance. The total personal income-tax collections in 1946 were $18,700,000,000. Of this, 38 percent, or $7,100,000,000, was paid by the 43 million taxpayers with incomes under $3,000. Fifty-eight percent, or $10,800,000,000, was paid by the 47,000,000 taxpayers with incomes under $5,000. In all, there are 50,000,000 personal income-tax payers, leaving 4 percent, or about 2,500,000 taxpayers, with incomes over $5,000 paying $8,000,000,000.

It is obvious that the tax base must be very wide in these times of vast spending and astronomical budgets. Let us consider for a moment some of the suggested changes in our revenue laws which will benefit the taxpayer by lowering his taxes, or equalizing them with his competitors, will serve to spur industry to greater effort, will revive the personal incentive to work, and will insure an expanding economy so essential to our Nation's welfare.

Taxes imposed by the Government on businesses should substantially apply equally on competitive manners and methods of conducting a business. Where the tax in one manner of doing business is considerably greater without compensating advantages, business will shift into the tax-free method, and the Government's tax-revenue base will be decreased. Thus, today more and more business is being conducted in the cooperative manner, free of certain taxes imposed against business conducting the same enterprises as individuals, partnerships, or corporations. The resulting loss of revenue to Government is great, and the Congress must adjust our laws to provide that the cooperative manner of doing business pays its just share of business taxation.

Our Federal taxes should apply equally to all persons within a given class in every State of the Union. Yet, in the so-called community-property States, where, by State law, earnings of either spouse are divided equally between them and so taxed, the resulting tax payment is substantially less than a married couple pays in the non-community-property States. Obviously, this is unfair and must be equalized. One suggested method is that the revenue law for taxing purposes require each man and wife to file an individual return for one-half of the couple's aggregate taxable income. Thus, the taxpayer would be subjected to the lower surtax rate. This suggested change would cost the Treasury $900,000,000, and doubtless would require an adjustment upward of the surtax rate, but would equalize tax payments.

Investors and businessmen generally complain, with reason, that our Federal policy of double taxation as applied to corporate earnings is a substantial drag against business expansion. We tax, first, the corporation's earnings and then tax again these same earnings in the hands of the individual who receives them as dividends. Double taxation is wrong, it savors of a capital levy. As the law stands today, the net return to an investor, big or little, from dividends, after a payment of the corporate tax and personal-income tax is so low that it frequently is unprofitable for the investor to put his money in corporate ownership. He is more apt to place his money in mortgage securities, and avoid the risk incident to ownership and management of business. Again, we lose risk capital.

There are many more items the taxing committees must study in any general revision of the Internal Revenue Code. As we seek tax revenue, we will be guided by a determination to make the taxes apply equitably and with a minimum of burden to the taxpayer and the investing public, in the interest of an expanding economy. Some of the items requiring consideration at this time include: (a) The excise taxes. (b) Credit for earned income. (In a recent survey I conducted of 6,600 businessmen in the United States, 67 percent of those replying believed that earned income should not be taxed as heavily as other income.) (c) Increased initial allowance for depreciation. (d) Changes to encourage new and small businesses with special treatment. (e) Increasing exemptions. (f) Changes in the capital-gains law to encourage investment. (g) Corporation taxes. (h) Permission to businesses to report as operating charges funds used for stream purification.

All these subjects and many more will be studied in the proposed general revision of the Revenue Code expected this year.

You will think it a far cry as I jump, now, from the taxing and appropriating committees of Congress into your back yard. I do so because your responsibilities are not ended with the election, in which you took so important a part.

Pennsylvania's 28 Republican Members of the House of Representatives and our distinguished United States Senator and former Governor are in Washington now seeking to carry out the voters' major demands as expressed in the last election; to return the Government to the people and to restore its financial stability. We are a united group, but we cannot fight this thing alone.

The executive branch of the Government is still controlled by the New Dealers with their thousands of propaganda outlets. They are and will continue to decry every attempt of our party to stop waste and reduce expenditures.

You must support your Congress as it tries to bring order out of chaos.

Don't expect miracles. Don't expect the Republican Party to correct overnight the inequities of the New Deal, which was 14 years in sinking its fangs into Government and which even yet controls the executive branch.

Don't urge appropriations of your Congressman for any but the most urgent needs. Don't be misled by Government agencies sending representatives around to tell you that unless Congress appropriates millions for their continuation their services to you will end. Thank your lucky stars that you have a man in Washington who is doing his best to break up this bureaucracy. Write your Congressman your encouragement from time to time and thus counteract the letters he gets daily from the spenders.

And, finally, know that you have a delegation in Washington working in closest cooperation with our great Senator, EDWARD MARTIN, determined as always to contribute more than Pennsylvania's share in our fight today for a solvent America.

The Gwynne Bill Destroys Labor's Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am against the Gwynne bill, and I wish to point out a few of its obvious and dangerous implications. Under the guise of attacking the problem of portal-to-portal pay, the proponents of this bill are seeking to invalidate the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. They are attempting to use the hysteria, confusion, and misunderstanding whipped up by irresponsible newspapers and selfish interests regarding the portal-to-portal pay question to cover up the true purposes of this bill.

I have four major objections to the bill, namely, the 1-year statute of limitations, the waiver and compromise clause, the part which makes reliance upon administrative interpretation and lower-court decisions an employer defense, and its customs and practice provision as a definition of work. The court in the Mount Clemens Pottery case has already determined the portal-to-portal question in a most adequate manner through application of the de minimis doctrine.

Let me examine the custom and practice provisions of the bill briefly. Section 3 reads as follows:

> No action or proceeding of any kind whether or not commenced prior to the effective date of this act, shall be maintained to the extent that such action is based upon failure of an employer to pay an employee for activities heretofore or hereafter engaged in by such employee other than those activities which at the time of such failure were required to be paid for either by custom or practice of such employer at the plant or other place of employment of such employee or by express agreement at the time in effect between such employer and such employee or his collective-bargaining representative.

A considered judgment of the provisions of this section of the bill must convince any thinking person that its passage would revive and perpetuate the worst practices which have ever prevailed in the most backward occupations, in sweatshops, in unorganized industries with the lowest labor standards, in direct contradiction to the Fair Labor Standards Act, which was designed to set up certain minimum standards below which no labor conditions should be allowed to exist.

This bill, as now worded, would legalize the practices of individual employers by substituting their customs and practices for the decision of the Supreme Court—Tennessee Coal, Iron & R. R. Company against Muscoda Local No. 123—with respect to the meaning of work as meaning "physical and mental exertion (whether burdensome or not) controlled or required by the employer and pursued necessarily and primarily for the benefit of the employer and his business." Do you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle disagree with this decision of the court?

Some unscrupulous employers have maintained in the past, and under this act, could institute again, a multitude of oppressive and unfair practices, and employers who desire to maintain decent working conditions in their plants would again be at the mercy of these unfair competitors. In the garment industry in the past, many workers have not been paid for time spent in delivering finished work to jobber's establishments, for time lost because of machine break-downs and power shut-offs, for cleaning and repairing machines, for making samples, and even for sweeping and cleaning shops. They were retained in the shops for hours without pay, awaiting orders which might possibly

come in. In tobacco warehouses some employers kept workers waiting for hours, without pay, for farmers to bring in produce. In other industries some employers have not paid workers for time spent in loading and unloading trucks, waiting for machine setters when the type of work was changed, going from one job to another or from one work station to another, or for time lost due to break-downs in machinery and belt systems. Workers have been ordered to report for work at a specified time, and then kept waiting, without pay, for several hours before being given work. Others have been required to remain on call for emergency duty for many hours without pay.

For example, miners on the Iron Range in Minnesota were at one time required to report to the dry house, receive their orders for the day, were issued their tools, and were then required to report to the lift and be carried to the various levels within the mine and from there walk an average of three blocks before the miner's pay time began—an average of over 30 minutes of unpaid make-ready work per day. Such violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act have been corrected in some Minnesota mines through court decision, but still continue to exist in other mines. This bill, with its custom and practices clause as a definition of work, would make it impossible to correct these injustices still suffered by many miners in my district and would discriminate against those mining companies who do abide by the law's provisions.

Again, in the lumber camps in my district, timber workers were required to report to the boss at 6 a. m., travel half to three-quarters of an hour to their work, cutters had to sharpen their tools, and winchmen and cat drivers oiled their machinery on their own time; in many camps this make-ready work averaged as much as 2 hours per day. Here, again, these practices have been corrected in some camps by the courts, but the adopting of this bill would prevent the correction of future abuses.

If we pass an act to protect an employer from court action for nonpayment of wages for activities hereafter as well as heretofore engaged in, for which it was not the individual employer's practice to pay at the time of such failure to pay, what is to stop an unscrupulous employer from instituting some practices again?

It may be true that the practices mentioned here were perpetrated by a relatively small minority of employers, and that the majority of honest employers did not treat their employees so unfairly. Thus, in 1928, when the National Industrial Conference Board made its study of systems of wage payments, it found that less than 20 percent of reporting plants did not pay their workers for lost time due to causes beyond the control of the workers. But it is this minority which would gain a competitive advantage over employers who try to maintain higher standards. This would force these employers, too, to lower standards, thus depressing labor standards in all industry, causing commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce to spread and perpetuate substandard labor conditions.

In other words, the custom-and-practices clause of this proposal is objectionable for two reasons: One, it will have the effect of creating unfair competition for business; and two, it undermines legally established work standards for labor.

But this provision is only one of a number of objectionable features of the Gwynne bill. It also proposes a 1-year statute of limitations on actions for unpaid wages arising out of violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Many workers, especially the unorganized, are not always fully informed of their rights, and hence do not discover violations of the wages-and-hours law until months after it occurs; often workers are afraid to start action against their employer until after they cease working for the company. The result is that it is often several years before a worker is in a position to start action for recovery of wages. The 1-year statute of limitations would prevent many of these suits, and thus cripple the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as well as the Walsh-Healey Act and the Bacon-Davis Act.

Another part of the bill allows employers to free themselves of any liability by the plea of good faith consistent with a lower-court decision or administrative opinion. This is entirely contrary to our common-law system in that it virtually takes away appellate jurisdiction from the higher courts. In other words, an employee's natural right of appeal is being violated if a lower court has the final say affecting his claims for back pay. This is a judicial procedure which exists nowhere in our entire legal system.

Finally, I object to that part of the bill which allows employees to enter into agreements or waivers whereby they sign away their rights under the Fair Labor Standards Act, or permit the compromise of employer liability. Any law which allows private parties to enter into agreements which violate its provisions is a bad law. The waiver and compromise sections of this bill would mean that many unorganized workers especially, out of fear, would be forced to sign away their rights under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

These are the grounds that force me to oppose the Gwynne bill. In my opinion, this bill would have the effect of virtually destroying that humanitarian and progressive piece of legislation, the Fair Labor Standards Act.

During these first few weeks which I have spent as a Member of this honorable body, I have heard a great deal spoken about the rights of business and have seen many tears shed over the plight of big business. This is occurring at the very time that business profits are at the highest point in American history. Corporate profits, after taxes, for 1946, have been estimated to total eleven and eight-tenths billions, or over three times the volume of profit in 1939. It has been estimated that corporate profits for 1947 will be still greater.

Is it not about time that we start thinking about the interests of the people, of the veteran who cannot find a house to live in, of the farmer who may soon be faced with a slump in farm prices, with the small businessman who is in danger of being crushed by the corporations and chain stores, and of the laborer who is faced with falling standards of living as a result of higher living costs and reductions in take-home pay? If the House was interested in the welfare of the people, they would today be considering a housing program, social security, the REA, health insurance, and other measures designed to raise the living standards and provide for the security of the people, instead of attempting to destroy by the enactment of measures like this Gwynne bill, aimed at destroying the Fair Labor Standards Act—an act designed to help provide millions of workers a better life.

Farm Loans for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress letters from two American Legion posts in my district relative to the appropriation for financing farm loans for veterans. I hope the appropriate committees will give this matter immediate attention.

The letters follow:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
FRANK KING POST, No. 249,
Wellington, Tex., February 10, 1947.

HON. EUGENE WORLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The farm veterans of this county have found that there is no source through which they may secure credit to finance their farming operations with the exception of the Farmers Home Administration. However, in checking this Administration, it has been found that the FHA is out of adequate funds for such financing. Since it is now time for these boys to purchase their equipment and to start farming, they would like very much to have something done about this.

We, Frank King Post, No. 249, American Legion, of Collingsworth County, Tex., appeal to you as our spokesman in Washington to see that adequate appropriations be made immediately to the Farmers Home Administration in order that the farm boys of this county can start their farm operations at once.

Yours very truly,
FRANK KING POST, No. 249,
J. W. WELLS, *Adjutant.*

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
WILLIAMS-GRAVES POST, No. 402,
Silverton, Tex.

Be it remembered that on February 4, 1947, there was held a regular meeting of Williams-Graves Post, No. 402, of the American Legion. There being a quorum present the following motion was voted and carried in favor of, to-wit:

"That this post of the American Legion urge Congress to immediately appropriate funds for the making of Farmers Home Administration loans as provided under the provisions of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act."

This being chiefly a farming community and realizing the importance of this act to the farmers of this community as well as in other communities, we, the members of American Legion Post, No. 402, of Silverton, Briscoe County, Tex., have voted and believe there is a dire need for the appropriation of the funds to carry on this important act.

Since many of the farmers in this community are returned veterans and have not had the opportunity to make financial gains to the extent that they can carry on their farming without help from some source, we feel that this is not the proper time to terminate said loans.

Thanking you for your immediate attention to this, we are,

Respectfully,

WARE FOGERSON,
Commander.
T. C. BOMAR,
First Vice Commander.
CHARLES C. ALEXANDER,
Adjutant.

Conspiracy or Blunder?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, we in the House of Representatives do not have the responsibility of passing on the fitness for office of nominees made by the Executive for various high offices. But I am sure that every Member of the House follows the debates for and against such nominees carefully and that all of us run into information that proves to be of interest to many persons.

In connection with the appointment of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, there has been published in Plain Talk a highly enlightening article entitled "Conspiracy or Blunder—Our Atomic UNRRA." In the course of this article, Mr. Lilienthal's fitness for office is discussed, along with other facts that should be brought to the attention of all Americans.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in full in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSPIRACY OR BLUNDER?—OUR ATOMIC UNRRA

(By Isaac Don Levine)

Behind the rise of the most powerful commission in the history of the United States, the Lilienthal Atomic Energy Commission, is the still-untold story of our puzzling atomic policy. It is a story with many features of a vast conspiracy woven of the triple webs of atomic espionage, atomic propaganda, and atomic diplomacy.

As the five civilian members of the Atomic Energy Commission, appointed by President Truman under strange circumstances in the confusion of the last days preceding the recent election, face confirmation at the hands of the United States Senate, many questions press for answers. And although some of the pieces necessary to solve the riddle why we set out to establish a kind of atomic UNRRA are not yet available, enough has become known to make a shocking pattern.

When did we first promise the Soviet Government to put the atomic bomb under international control? This is where the mystery begins. Did it occur at Potsdam, in July 1945, 3 weeks before Hiroshima, when President Truman told Stalin of our magic secret weapon?

If, so, was it intended by international control to turn over the atomic discovery to the United Nations Security Council under the existing power of veto, which would allow an aggressor to escape punishment? This enigma was also the crux of the conflict between the Bernard Baruch and Henry Wallace schools of atomic politics.

And was Bernard Baruch's sudden and demonstrative resignation as America's atomic representative to the United Nations caused by his fear that the newly created Commission under David E. Lilienthal, an adherent of the Wallace school, might, by easy stages, turn over the atomic power to Soviet Russia?

Topping these is the crucial question: Who will protect the bomb now? Is the world's mightiest weapon, upon which depends the security of the Nation and of free civilization, safe in the hands of a purely civilian body dominated by political innocents?

How did it happen that President Truman had failed to consult either Bernard Baruch or Secretary of State Byrnes in his selection of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission?

It is true that Under Secretary Dean Acheson picked the members of the Commission behind the backs of Byrnes and Baruch, the same Mr. Acheson who, with Lilienthal, had sponsored the State Department's report on the International Control of Atomic Energy which bypassed the issue of the veto and of penalties?

What significance are we to attach to the fact that the majority of the five members of the Lilienthal Commission may be described as Wallace liberals, who might be inclined out of lofty humanitarian motives to let Stalin have atomic power as well as the nullifying power of the veto, i. e., without effective safeguards?

Unequivocal answers to all of these questions would enable the people of the United States to formulate a sober atomic policy in accord with the best interests of our national defense. It must be a policy which would eliminate any possibility of the weapon of world mastery falling into the hands of a tyranny capable of enslaving all humanity.

Three weeks before the A-bomb burst upon the world with all its incalculable force, President Truman went to Potsdam in the belief that he was bearing with him the secret of the ages. This was the beginning of our incredible adventure in atomic diplomacy. Stalin was to be taken by surprise and in an overwhelmed condition be led meekly into the family circle.

It can now be told that when the President broke the great news to Stalin, the Soviet dictator hardly batted an eye. He received the intelligence in such a casual manner, displaying so little interest in the subject, that both the President and Secretary Byrnes were discomfited and decided that Stalin simply did not appreciate the immensity of the atomic discovery. To this day there are personages in Washington who are convinced that Stalin had no previous knowledge of the A-bomb and regarded it as just Yankee big talk.

President Truman, on the other hand, did not know then that for more than 2 years Soviet espionage had been dogging the steps of our atomic projects, that at least 100 scientific workers in the atomic laboratories and plants in the United States and Canada had during that period conveyed information to Soviet agents, that samples of uranium-235 had been smuggled to Russia, and that Stalin probably knew more about our atomic achievements than the newly installed President of the United States.

From this moment on Stalin had the initiative at Potsdam. He seized an opportunity later to reproach the United States and Great Britain for violating the wartime agreement which provided for an exchange by the Allies of information on weapons. When Stalin wanted to know why Washington had withheld from Soviet Russia the secret atomic weapon our spokesmen did not counter by a blunt recital of the numerous Soviet failures during the war to share with the western allies the facts and means vital to the conduct of military operations. Instead a vague offer was made to put the atomic bomb under the international control of the United Nations, which was tantamount to giving the A-bomb to Stalin. It must be remembered that Truman and Byrnes had gone to Potsdam—and not Stalin to Washington—after the abject surrenders at Tehran and Yalta, a journey which by its very nature could only spell further appeasement.

This was implemented by the formal declaration of November 15, 1945, by President Truman, Prime Ministers Clement Attlee and Mackenzie King, of Great Britain and Canada, in which the A-bomb was offered to the United Nations after "appropriate controls" were set up. Stalin has interpreted it to mean that such controls would be devised under the Charter of the United Nations without abolishing the right of veto.

Six weeks later came the Moscow Conference. It was on December 27, 1945, that the Moscow agreement was announced under the terms of which Secretary Byrnes had committed the United States to the establishment of a United Nations Commission for Atomic Energy Control. In the months which had elapsed since Potsdam several other highly significant developments occurred, all seemingly unrelated to the unquenchable Soviet curiosity about the atomic discovery.

First came the publication by our War Department of the now famous Smyth report, which assembled in one neat volume the widely scattered labors of many years and countries, giving away something like 97 percent of atomic knowledge. Since Great Britain and Canada shared it with us, anyway, was the publication intended for the only other major nation that did not have it—Soviet Russia?

Strangely enough, there soon came an announcement by a group of atomic scientists that the United States had no "enduring monopoly" on the A-bomb. It was followed by Senator MCMAHON's advocacy of civilian control of atomic energy—later translated into the law through the creation of the Atomic Energy Commission. Senator MCMAHON has since confessed that he had been motivated by the belief "that Russia and the world should get the secrets of atomic energy in time." The campaign centering around the McMahon bill was echoed by the inexplicable rise of national committees of atomic scientists, run by professional propagandists, who proceeded to agitate public opinion in the direction of Soviet interests.

To cap it all came the Molotov warning of November 7, 1945, which was true to the well-established practice of the professional thieves who are the first to raise the cry, "Stop thief!" Molotov warned the western powers against "atomic diplomacy"—a warning designed to bludgeon our leadership into a policy of submission to Moscow.

The circumstances surrounding the appearance of David E. Lilienthal, of TVA fame, in the atomic picture and the behind-the-scenes influences which led to the State Department's creation of its own atomic committee under the chairmanship of Dean Acheson may very well merit investigation by the Senate before it confirms the newly established Atomic Energy Commission.

The Acheson committee served merely as a front. All the work was done by a board of consultants under Mr. Lilienthal. This board consisted of five members and a secretary, Mr. Carroll L. Wilson, but actually there was a seventh member, a former aid to Mr.

Lilienthal at TVA, who was now serving as legislative assistant to Under Secretary Acheson in the State Department. His name was Herbert S. Marks.

Although officially it was a board of five, Mr. Marks left for posterity an unforgettable account of its deliberations under the Arabian Nights title of "Seven Men on a Problem." Fittingly enough, this account appeared in the New Yorker of August 17, 1946, filling 16 columns and describing in detail the labors of the seven superplanners over a period of 2 months. From this uninhibited interview it is clear that Mr. Marks, if the reporter is to be believed, had a major share in formulating the Acheson-Lilienthal report which laid the foundation for American atomic policy.

The essential feature of this basic plan released as a State Department document on March 28, 1946, was its total omission of any punitive provisions for violators of our priceless atomic power. It proposed an international atomic corporation on the assumption that the whole planet was as free, as open, as peace-loving, and as devoted to civil rights and to democratic processes as the United States, Canada, Switzerland, or Sweden. At best, the plan fashioned under the hammering of ideological crusaders was Utopian. A less charitable view might raise the question as to the way the State Department proposals dovetailed with the drive behind the McMahon bill for purely civilian control of atomic energy and the equally powerful drive on the atomic propaganda front to share the colossal power with Soviet Russia.

No wonder that Henry A. Wallace, our arch-utopian, told a meeting of the Political Action Committee at New York City on April 12, 1946, that President Roosevelt would have approved and supported the Acheson-Lilienthal proposals on atomic energy.

The appointment of Bernard M. Baruch, however, as United States representative on the United Nations Atomic Commission, led to unforeseen consequences. No doubt the revelations of the vast Soviet espionage ring in Canada, as reported by the Royal Commission, had their effect upon Mr. Baruch and his associates. When the latter group had finished with the Acheson-Lilienthal plan and had it drastically revised for submission to the United Nations in June 1946, the American proposal had a set of teeth in it. Not that, in the view of this writer, there can be any effective set of teeth put into any paper agreement with the Soviet Government. But the Baruch committee made the utmost of an inherently bad situation.

What was this situation? For some unaccountable reason, America was hell-bent upon sharing the atomic weapon with the Soviet dictatorship, and at the very time when Moscow was violating treaties, raping independent countries, launching aggressive moves in various strategic zones, and heaping insult and injury upon the United States. By the time Mr. Baruch took up his assignment we had committed ourselves to international control of atomic energy and to its civilian control at home. We had developed a guilt complex under the corrupting influence of insidious Soviet propaganda. We were clearly determined to share the atomic discovery, regardless of the patent fact that no moral or political or purely selfish basis for such sharing existed.

The Baruch plan proposed an international treaty as a prerequisite for the setting up of the Atomic Development Authority, which, according to the Acheson-Lilienthal draft, was to be built on UNRRA lines. It provides that the United States is to develop and install atomic power plants for civilian use throughout the world, including Soviet Russia. The Baruch plan provided for various safeguards, the major one of which was the abolition of the veto power in matters relating to atomic energy by the signatories of the atomic treaty, i. e., by the recipients of our atomic gift.

It is no longer a secret that the Baruch plan met with terrific opposition. Only part of the story has been given to the American people. Thus, it became known only in September that Wallace had addressed a long and confidential letter to President Truman on July 23, in which he assailed the Baruch proposals and distorted them so as to argue in favor of the Soviet view of the issue. But it was not generally known that Under Secretary Acheson spearheaded the inside forces against the Baruch plan. "I state categorically—and the truth can only be provided by congressional investigation," declared George E. Sokolsky in his syndicated column after the resignation of Baruch, "that Dean Acheson never personally approved of Baruch's rejection of the veto."

The unsolicited and secret Wallace advice to President Truman was strangely followed 1 day later, on July 24, by the summary rejection by Soviet representative Gromyko of the Baruch proposals, "either as a whole or in separate parts." A congressional inquiry might profitably look into the real authorship of the pretentious communication from the then Secretary of Commerce to the President.

President Truman himself never faced the issue raised by his representative to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and never gave him his unqualified support. The election campaign was on and the pro-Soviet forces were most active. While Baruch was pressing his fight for the acceptance of his plan, the Acheson-Lilienthal group was organizing behind the scenes to take over the coming Atomic Energy Commission. Even before the adoption of the McMahon bill, Clare Boothe Luce, who incidentally voted for it, had declared on July 17 in the House that David Lilienthal was according to rumor slated to be one of the five atomic Commissioners.

The conflict between Baruch and Wallace burst into the open after the release on September 17 by the latter of his secret letter to the President. It will be recalled that Mr. Baruch requested a retraction of various misrepresentations made by Mr. Wallace, that such a retraction was promised but never delivered.

Toward the end of September at a conference in Chicago of the CIO Political Action Committee, the independent citizens committee of the arts, sciences, and professions and the national citizens political action committee, this pro-Soviet bloc joined the fray on the side of Mr. Wallace. The Chicago meeting adopted a platform in which the Baruch plan was assailed on the basis of the misrepresentations which Mr. Wallace had originally submitted to the President.

While the Baruch-Wallace controversy was holding the stage, the Atomic Energy Commission was being formed without benefit of publicity. It has been established that President Truman did ask Mr. Baruch in the course of two calls made by the latter at the White House, to suggest his candidates to head the Atomic Energy Commission. One of these conferences took place in the presence of Secretary Byrnes. Mr. Baruch proposed President Karl Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, or President James B. Conant, of Harvard. These nominees refused to take the post.

About this time a large American concern which had manufactured precision machinery used in the making of the A-bomb, received an order from the Soviet Purchasing Commission for approximately $1,500,000 worth of equipment, accompanied by specifications and blueprints which could only have been stolen in the United States or Canada. This shocking revelation is known to have been brought to the attention of Mr. Baruch and his associates. It is no longer a secret that Mr. Baruch used his influence to stop the execution of this order, which made him the special target of the Soviet diplomats as well as the pro-Soviet elements in our midst.

Late in October the make-up of the new Atomic Energy Commission became known to a source who had it directly from the White House. The information was conveyed to Bernard Baruch who could not believe it. The President had not consulted him about any of his selections. Secretary Byrnes was too preoccupied with the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers to keep in touch with the matter.

On the morning of October 28, at the height of the preelection excitement, the Boston Post published an exclusive story by its Washington correspondent, Robert L. Norton, announcing President Truman's selection of Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and correctly naming the other members, with one exception.

"None of the members of the Commission are well-known national figures," reported Mr. Norton. "Whether or not these appointments would be approved by the Senate is problematical. It is stated here that Bernard M. Baruch, who is responsible for the American plan for control of the atomic bomb, was not consulted on the appointments."

Secretary Byrnes was informed that morning of the composition of the Commission. At first he would not believe it, as he, too, had not been consulted by the President. Yet his own Under Secretary, Dean Acheson, was the architect of this Commission.

When assured of the authenticity of the information, Secretary Byrnes called the White House for an appointment to see the President. The conference was set for the noon hour that day. At 11 o'clock President Truman received the press and announced to the country his appointment to the Atomic Commission.

Secretary Byrnes did not call on the President that noon.

So well prepared was Mr. Lilienthal for his new duties, which he was to assume only on January 1, 1947, that on the day following his appointment he announced from Washington that the Atomic Energy Commission would take over the Army's atomic project. And as his first step Mr. Lilienthal named a temporary staff, which included Herbert S. Marks, Acheson's assistant, and Carroll L. Wilson, both of whom had served on the original Acheson-Lilienthal board.

Simultaneously, Mr. Lilienthal came out in a public address with strong and well-taken criticisms of the Baruch plan, arguing that an international treaty would not provide the needed security. He went on to contend with considerable force that inspection as a sole safeguard would be quite unworkable. And then, strangely enough, Mr. Lilienthal went back to his original visionary scheme of a world corporation under an international authority composed of "the elite of the scientific world." That such a class would also be the elite of political innocents, ideally misfitted to cope with totalitarian chicanery, Mr. Lilienthal omitted to state.

Whether it was due to the American refusal to fulfill the Soviet order for atomic instruments or to the outcome of the November elections or to the victory of the Acheson-Lilienthal combine resulting in a commission which was believed to favor sharing the atomic secrets with Russia, there followed late in November an apparent about-face on the part of the Kremlin. Mr. Molotov unexpectedly came out for international "inspection" and made one of his famous equivocal statements on the veto, which was hailed by our gullible commentators as a reversal of the Soviet policy of the previous July.

In the meantime, the United Nations Atomic Commission, which had before it the

Baruch plan, was to finish its tenure on December 31 and to be reconstituted on the rotation system in 1947. Mr. Baruch pressed for action in the face of dogged Soviet resistance, which he finally achieved on December 30. His plan, with Russia abstaining, was finally reported out to the Security Council. This really terminated Mr. Baruch's ambassadorship to the United Nations, unless President Truman had offered to reappoint him as deputy on atomic affairs to serve with Mr. Warren Austin, United States delegate on the Security Council.

President Truman made no such offer. Mr. Baruch then called the President. The conversation which ensued would make a gem in the story of our atomic politics. Mr. Baruch informed the President of his strange status, indicating that the question of disarmament was scheduled for early discussion before the Security Council. The President listened and said nothing. Mr. Baruch then asked what the President wanted him to do, pointing out that he had no intention of passing out of the atomic picture quietly. Still the President made no response. When Mr. Baruch declared that he would have to make his resignation public and wanted to know what to do about it, the President replied that he, Baruch, knew best what to do. On January 4 Mr. Baruch presented his resignation to the White House. As was generally reported, the President was in, but he did not receive his atomic envoy. Baruch then handed in his resignation to Secretary Byrnes.

On January 1, 1947, the fabulous $2,000,000,000 atomic empire, extending over 18 States, including a number of great plants with a total personnel of 43,700, was transferred from the War Department to the civilian Atomic Energy Commission. A new chapter in the most revolutionary discovery in history was about to open, a chapter which promised to lead to an atomic crisis.

Had Henry Wallace been President of the United States, the character of the Atomic Energy Commission, with one possible exception, could hardly have been any different. In fact, this is revealed by the reception given to the Truman appointments by the New Republic in the very issue in which Henry A. Wallace announced, as editor-elect, that he wanted the New Republic to be a window on the future * * * always in terms of action.

Anticipating this assignment of serving as a "window on the future," the editors of our leading organ of innocent confusion hailed the Truman appointments as a triumph. "The men whom Truman chose, in a moment of good judgment, guarantee that the victory is solid and complete," crowed Wallace's associates. No doubt as to the completeness of the victory, but whose victory? And as to Truman's "good judgment," how strange that the real architect of the Commission, Dean Acheson, received no credit at all for the feat.

Regarding the appointment of David E. Lilienthal as chairman of the Atomic Commission, the New Republic could find no other words than to say "the only possible adjective applicable to this choice is perfect." It went on to add that "for the other two members, Sumner Pike and William W. Waymack, the drama critics' word 'adequate' is woefully insufficient." About the one scientist on the Commission, Dr. Robert E. Bacher, the mouthpiece which Wallace elected to make his own went out of the way to "praise God" for "the integrity of his social philosophy." It should be stated in all fairness that it also bestowed its blessings upon the one conservative member of the Commission, Rear Adm. Lewis L. Strauss.

In its exultation, the New Republic, true to its tradition of gullibility in international affairs, pointed to the inner nub of the whole matter. "By an intelligent policy for making scientific information available," it wrote, "the Commission * * * can make known to scientists of other nations those basic facts which, once understood, lead with the inevitability of a geometric proposition to one conclusion, the one which Acheson and Lilienthal were constrained to reach 7 months ago."

The Acheson-Lilienthal conclusion, as given in the State Department report, dealt with the disclosure of information as an essential of international action. It proposed the division of "our secret information into three categories," and their release by easy stages.

"When the plan is in full operation there will no longer be secrets about atomic energy," are the concluding words of the Acheson-Lilienthal report. "We believe that this is the firmest basis of security; for in the long term there can be no international control and no international cooperation which does not presuppose international community of knowledge."

The plan, it cannot be too strongly emphasized, provided no punishment for violators of the peace, for no abolition or modification of the veto power. If Moscow had secretly devised and prepared a plan for making the United States set up an atomic UNRRA, with the idea of foisting it upon a gullible America through its innumerable fronts, it could hardly have differed in this respect from the Acheson-Lilienthal plan.

Now who are the men entrusted with the secret of the atomic bomb and with our development of atomic energy the world over? Are they mostly persons representing the Baruch school standing for the abolition of the veto, i. e., for penalties, in international control of atomic power? Or are they largely of the school believing that Stalin's dictatorship is a new kind of democracy, and that we should share with it the almost unlimited riches of atomic energy?

Although Dean Acheson has no official connection with the Atomic Energy Commission, he remains one of the spiritual parents of our atomic UNRRA. Moreover, as Under Secretary he will be in charge of international atomic relations. Where does Mr. Acheson stand? Like Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman, he has learned from bitter experience the true nature of the Soviet dictatorship and the impossibility of dealing with it on a give-and-take basis. But he has yet to acquire a real insight into the Soviet fifth column in our midst and in his own official environment in Washington.

David E. Lilienthal, the chairman of the Atomic Commission, who has been called by Harold Ickes the busiest propagandist the United States has ever produced, is a man whose loyalty to this country could not be questioned and whose ability as an executive is widely and justly recognized. Yet Mr. Lilienthal has a record as an innocent in the world-wide jungles of Soviet policies which has been matched by many eminent leaders, such as that of the late Neville Chamberlain in the diplomatic jungle of Ribbentrop and Hitler and that of the astute Churchill himself in the dark Tito-Stalin woods.

The record shows, and an entire volume of hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, as well as more recent testimony corroborates it, that right under the nose of Director Lilienthal of the TVA widespread Communist activities had been carried on for years. Mr. Lilienthal himself was sufficiently innocent to act as sponsor and speaker for the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, known as a Communist front. His daughter Nancy, an employee of the Department of Labor and a member of the United Public Workers, a Communist-dominated union, only recently displayed her strong pro-Soviet attitude. At the beginning of December 1946, at a meeting of her local, a proposal had been made to endorse the resolution of the Atlantic City CIO convention condemning communism. The fight against the endorsement was led, with success, by Nancy Lilienthal. It may be that Nancy's outlook had been conditioned not by her father, but by her mother. For Mrs. Lilienthal is reliably reported to have belonged in the middle thirties to several front organizations.

Mr. William Wesley Waymack, who had acquired distinction as the editor of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, is one of those liberals who represents a cross between the late Wendell Willkie and Henry A. Wallace. He is a natural believer in the goodness of man, even the men in the Kremlin. It was the owner of his paper, Mike Cowles, who accompanied Willkie on his one-world voyage, originally designed as Soviet propaganda, to promote Stalin's campaign for a second front, and whose magazine sponsored Elliott Roosevelt's more recent flight into Stalin's dizzying political stratosphere. Mr. Waymack's incurable innocence in matters pertaining to Moscow is typical. He joined organizations, such as the Russian War Relief, the Committee for Medical Aid to Russia, the Institute of Pacific Relations, and that strange outfit fathered by Louis Dolivet, first under the name of Free World and lately as Americans United for World Organization.

Mr. Sumner Pike, ecstatically described by Jerome Frank in the New Republic as a Republican businessman who is a good poker player possessing infinite charm, and who had served as an assistant to Harry Hopkins after making a fortune in Wall Street, is a man without a record on Soviet issues, although he has made his pilgrimage to Soviet Russia. Perhaps that is what the New Republic had in mind when it said of Messrs. Waymack and Pike that they are "precisely the types with precisely the backgrounds for a job of such overwhelming importance," and that would also go for the social philosophy of the young Dr. Robert E. Bacher, who as a physicist ranks among the foremost in the United States.

Dominated by innocents of the Wallace stripe, the Atomic Energy Commission is bound to attract a personnel raised in the same pseudo-liberal school of thought on international questions. One of the keymen in the new Commission is Herbert S. Marks, who had been attached to the Acheson-Lilienthal board. Mr. Marks, a native of Pennsylvania and honor graduate from Harvard, had served for 5 years as counsel to the TVA under Lilienthal.

While in the State Department Mr. Marks is known to have held "liberal" views on the subject of Soviet Russia, similar to the ones which his chief, Dean Acheson, tried to promulgate at first in our foreign relations. No one has ever impugned the loyalty or patriotism of Mr. Marks, but one witness before the Un-American Activities Committee did link him with alleged pro-Communist activities. The witness was Mrs. Muriel S. Williams, of Chattanooga, Tenn., a clerk in the TVA and a self-admitted member of the Communist Party. Mrs. Williams testified on July 6, 1940, in the course of an interrogation on various persons identified with pro-Communist activities, as follows:

"Mr. BARKER. And Herbert Marks, you know Herbert Marks?

"Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

"Mr. BARKER. And you attended meetings with Herbert Marks?

"Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, you see when you say this meeting business—yes."

Mr. Marks has also been a member of the National Lawyers Guild, which is controlled by Communists and from which Adolph A. Berle, Jr., Robert Jackson, Ferdinand Pecora, and other eminent jurists had resigned in protest.

Three days after the Atomic Commission began to function a general advisory committee of scientists was set up. In his absense J. R. Oppenheimer was elected to be chairman of this group. Now, Dr. Oppenheimer is recognized as one of the discoverers of atomic power and builders of the A-bomb. He had served as one of the members of the

board of consultants in the preparation of the Acheson-Lilienthal report.

Politically, Dr. Oppenheimer is an innocent of innocents. As far back as April 1940, he had joined a Communist-front committee which defended New York City public-school teachers charged with Communist activities. He was a member of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, one of the most notorious fronts. He was reported to be a subscriber to People's World, the California counterpart of the Daily Worker, an official Communist publication.

The report of the Canadian Royal Commission, which lifted a corner of the curtain hiding the enormous network of Soviet atomic espionage, should be made compulsory reading for all atomic scientists, from Albert Einstein to the student in physics or chemistry. It reveals the incredible political naïveté of our best scientific minds. It also shows a frightening moral degeneracy among idealists fallen under the spell of totalitarian propaganda.

That our own atomic scientists, including some identified with the Lilienthal commission, have been either victims of or innocent participants in the pro-Soviet atomic propaganda campaign waged in this country is beyond dispute. The role played by such propaganda in the shaping of our blundering atomic policy may properly be the subject of a separate investigation. It is part of that over-all design which would surrender to the world's leading despotism the key to global domination.

The American people have a right to know the stark truth about the politics of the atom. They have a right to demand of Congress that it turn the searchlight upon the influences which shaped our atomic behavior. The dark links between the Canadian spy ring and its American partners must be exposed. The pro-Soviet propaganda brigade which ensnared our atomic scientists must be investigated. Above all, the American people should get an answer to the $2,000,000,000 question:

What is to prevent the Soviet Government and its puppets from expelling our inspectors and technicians—under the UNRRA precedents already set by Tito—after we have developed and installed atomic energy plants in their countries?

Final Address to the People's Court by Archbishop Stepinac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, there has come into my possession a pamphlet entitled "My Conscience Is Clear; I Am Ready To Die." It is the English translation of the final address to the people's court made by Archbishop Stepinac at his trial in Zagreb.

It states in the archbishop's own words the terrible religious persecution to which he and the Christian churches are being subjected by the puppet rulers of Yugoslavia.

I commend it to the reading of my fellow countrymen, and for that purpose ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MY CONSCIENCE IS CLEAR; I AM READY TO DIE"

Following is the complete text of the final address to the people's court, in Zagreb, Croatia, made by Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, of Zagreb, before he was sentenced to 16 years imprisonment at hard labor. The translation from the Croatian language was made by the fathers of the Croatian Franciscan Commissariat of the Holy Family, in Chicago. The fathers received the text from an absolutely reliable source in Zagreb. The official English translation was distributed in the United States by the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service.

The text:

"To all charges brought forth against me here, I answer that my conscience in every way is clear (even though the public ridicule this), and I do not seek to defend myself against, nor appeal against the verdict.

"For my convictions I am able to bear not only ridicule, hatred, and humiliations, but—because my conscience is clear—I am ready at any moment to die.

"Hundreds of times here I have been called 'the accused Stepinac.' There is no one so naïve as not to know that with 'the accused Stepinac' here on the defendant's bench sits the Archbishop of Zagreb, the Metropolitan of Zagreb, and the head of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia.

"You yourselves have many times appealed to the accused priests here present to acknowledge that only Stepinac is guilty for theirs, the people's, and the clergy's stand. The ordinary Stepinac cannot have such influence, only Archbishop Stepinac.

"For 17 months there has been waged a campaign against me, publicly and in the press; furthermore, for 12 months I have borne actual internment in the Archbishop's palace.

"The guilt of the rebaptism of Serbs is ascribed to me. That is incorrect terminology, for he who is once baptized, need not be rebaptized. The question concerns change of religions, and of this I shall not speak in detail, except to state that my conscience is clear and that history shall one day render its judgment in this matter.

"It is a fact that I had to remove pastors, for they stood in danger of death from the Orthodox. The Serbs wanted to kill these priests because they refused them entrance into the church. It is a fact that during the war the church had to traverse through difficulties like a snake—and that for the sake of the Serbian people and with the aim of aiding them as far as it was at all possible.

"The honorable judge has produced a document showing that I sought an abandoned Orthodox monastery (once belonging to our own Pauline Fathers) in Orahovica in order to fill it with Trappists whom the Germans had driven away from Reichburg. I hold that it was my sacred duty to aid my brother Slovenes, whom the Hitlerites had banished, to find temporary shelter.

"Because I was the military ordinary, grave criminality is imputed to me. This honorable judge asked me if I did not consider myself a traitor to Yugoslavia because in this matter I sought an understanding with the independent State of Croatia.

"I was the military ordinary for the former Yugoslavia. I labored during those 8 to 9 years to bring this matter to a definite and solid solution. This question was finally solved through the Yugoslav Concordat, which was accomplished after great difficulties, solemnly ratified in the parliament, but then left to dissolve in the streets.

"When the war between Yugoslavia and Germany neared its end, I had to extend spiritual aid to the Catholic soldiers of the former Yugoslav Army and of the newly created independent State of Croatia. If, therefore, the state had fallen, but the soldiers still remained, then I had to concern myself with this situation.

"I was not persona grata to either the Germans or the Ustashi; nor was I an Ustasha, nor did I take their oath as did your clerks here present. The Croatian Nation unanimously declared itself for the Croatian State and I would have been a blackguard had I not recognized and acknowledged this desire of the Croatian Nation, which in the former Yugoslavia had been enslaved.

"I have said and declared that Croatians were not allowed to advance in the army or to enter the diplomatic corps unless they changed their religion or married a nonbeliever. That is the factual basis and background of my pastorals and sermons.

"Whatever I have said of the right of the Croatian Nation to its freedom and independence is in complete accord with the basic principles enunciated by the Allies at Yalta and in the Atlantic Charter.

"If, according to these principles, every nation has the right to independence, then why should it be denied to the Croatian Nation? The Holy See has declared that both small nations and national minorities have a right to freedom. Must, then, a Catholic bishop and metropolitan not be allowed to even whisper of this? If fall we must, then we fall because we have done our duty.

"Do not think that the Croatian Nation is pleased with this trial, or that if you give them an opportunity to express themselves I, as a result, shall suffer. I have honored and respected the will of my people, and I shall continue to do so.

"You accuse me as an enemy of the state and the people's authority. I today acknowledge your authority. Who was my authority? I must repeat again: You were my authority from May 8, 1945, and not before that. Where is it possible in the world to obey two authorities; you in the woods, or they in Zagreb?

"Should I have submitted to the authority of the illegal Somovic, or—as you say, 'exiled'—government in London, or of that in Cairo, or yours in the woods, or theirs in Zagreb? Is it at all possible to serve two masters? That cannot be, according to Catholic morals, the laws of nations and common sense. We could not ignore the authority here, even if it were Ustasha. It was here. You have a right to call me to account only from May 8, 1945.

"As to my so-called acts of terrorism, you have no proof, nor will anyone believe you. If Lisak, Lela Sofijanec and others came to me under assumed names, and if I received a letter which I never read, then if it be a crime because men came to me, I shall accept the verdict with equanimity.

"It does not trouble my conscience for issuing a certificate of free movement to the Reverend Maric, for I did not do so with the purpose of creating disorder, and for such guilt I would go to the other world with my soul at peace.

"Whether you believe me or not, matters not. The accused Archbishop of Zagreb knows not only how to suffer but also to die for his convictions.

"President Bakaric (of Croatia) himself acknowledged to the Reverend Milanovic: 'We are convinced that the archbishop stands behind these acts, but we have no proof.' That, for me, is sufficient acknowledgment.

"And now, what is the core of the controversy and our vicissitudes, and why has not a peaceful solution been reached? The state prosecutor has many times affirmed that nowhere else is there such freedom of conscience as in this state. I am free to bring out some facts showing the contrary.

"Before all, I again affirm: 260 to 270 priests have been killed by the National Liberation Movement. In not one civilized

state in the world would so many priests be thus punished for such crimes, as have been imputed to them. Thus, for example, the pastor of Slatina, the Reverend Burger, as a member of the Kultur bund, should have been sentenced, say, to 8 years' imprisonment; but no, you killed him because he, in fulfillment of his sacred duty as dean, had saved the sacred vessels of a national shrine.

"The Reverend Povoljnpak was, without benefit of trial, murdered like a dog in the streets. And the same has been the fate of accused sisters. In no other civilized state would death have been meted out—only at the very most a prison sentence.

"You have made a fatal mistake in murdering priests. The people shall not forgive you for that. Such is your 'freedom.'

"Our Catholic schools, built at the cost of great sacrifices, have been taken away from us. If I had not received seven carloads of foodstuffs from America, we could not have done anything, and that for the children of our poor peasant folk.

"With force you took away all the seminary property. You have done nothing less than what the gestapo did in seizing the seminary at Mokrica. We are not against agarian reforms—the Holy See has issued many encyclicals on social reforms—but they should have been carried out in agreement with the Holy See.

"Our orphanages have been useless. Destroyed are our printing establishments, and I do not know if one still exists. We have no more our publications; which have so often here been attacked.

"Is it not manifestly scandalous to uphold that nowhere does the church enjoy freedom as here?

"The Dominicans gave a spiritual book, which was translated by me from the French, to be printed at a cost of 75,000 dinars. But they never received these books. How much damage was sustained. Is that freedom of the press?

"The St. Jerome Society has ceased to exist. It is a grave offense against the people thus to treat their greatest and oldest cultural institution. You have reproached me for the work of my 'Caritas.' But I say to you here: 'Caritas' has performed untold services for our people and your children.

"Then there is the question of religious instruction in the schools. You have laid down the rule: in the higher grades of the secondary schools religious instruction is forbidden, and in the lower grades it is according to choice.

"How can you give to children the right to determine for themselves when they have not grown up, while those in the higher grades who have the right to vote are not allowed freedom of choice in this regard.

"Our nursing Sisters in the Catholic hospitals must bear untold miseries and hardships.

"Against the overwhelming opposition of the people you have introduced civil marriages. Why did you not interpret this freedom in accordance with the mentality of our people in America—where rules a wise Republic—where one is free to choose either civil or religious marriage?

"We do not deny to you some control over marriage. But it grievously pains our people when they must first of all enter a civil before a religious marriage. If you had turned to us, we would have given you suggestions on this matter.

"Buildings of some of the religious in Backa have been confiscated. Some churches in Split (I do not know whether it is still the case), have been converted into warehouses. Church lands have been seized without any agreement with the Holy See. You have seen that the people, because of your agrarian reforms, refuse to take that land.

"No, the material question is the least of our problems. The sad thing is this: not one priest or bishop is today certain of his life day or night. Bishop Srebrnic was attacked in Susak by youngsters at the instigation of influential persons. For 3 hours they tormented him and even penetrated his room while your police and militia merely looked on.

"And I myself experienced the same in Zapresica when I was attacked with rocks and revolvers. Bishop Lach, when he was on a confirmation assignment across the Drave, and even though they knew his purpose, was sent back and held the whole night in the prison at Koprivnica. In fact, your own men who were in the woods came to me and declared: 'This is unbecoming conduct. We shall protest to the authorities.'

"Rocks were hurled through the windows of the house where Bishop Buric was staying while on a confirmation tour. Bishop Pusic, as I heard, was recently the object of rotten apples, eggs, etc.

"Such freedom we hold to be an illusion. And we do not want to exist like outlawed slaves. We shall fight, with all just means, for our rights—and right here in this state.

"Here are—so that you may understand why we fight—some three or four more examples of your freedom. In the classrooms it is officially affirmed—in defiance of all historical proofs—that Jesus Christ never existed. Know you then: Jesus Christ is God. For Him we are ready to die. And today, it is your teaching that He never actually lived. If a teacher dared to teach the contrary, it would be certain that he would be cast out.

"I tell you, Mr. Prosecutor, that under such conditions the church is not free, but will be annihilated in a short time.

"Christ is the foundation of Christianity. You have concern for the orthodox Serbs. I ask you: How can you conceive of orthodoxy without Christ? How can you conceive of the Catholic Church without Christ? That is an utter absurdity.

"In the school books it is stated that the mother of God is an adulteress. Don't you know that both for Catholics and orthodox the mother of God is the holiest of thoughts and affections?

"You have ordained, as the official doctrines, that men originated from the apes. Perhaps, some may have that ambition. But why order that as an official theory when today no scholar of world renown holds to it?

"According to your understanding, materialism is the only worth-while system. And that means erasure of God and Christianity. If there is nothing but matter—then thank you for your freedom.

"One of your men of higher influence once boasted: 'There is no one in this state whom we could not bring to court and sentence.'

"To these outrageous charges whereby you place us among murderers and friends of terrorists, I say to you that not all the evil deeds in the former independent state of Croatia were perpetrated by the Demobrani and the Ustashi.

"It was not easy for the church, and many difficulties had to be overcome.

"Let no one think I want war. Let the present authorities come to an understanding with the Holy See. The church does not recognize dictatorship, but she is not against honest understandings. If that could be achieved, then the bishops will know what is their duty and there will be no need to seek our priests to point out their (the bishops') guilt, as was done here.

"Finally, I want to say a few words to the Communist Party, which in reality, is my accuser. If you think I have taken the present stand because of material things, you are wrong, for we have remained firm, even after you have made us poor.

"We are not against workers realizing greater rights in the factories, for this is in the spirit of papal encyclicals. Nor are we against reforms.

"But let the leaders of communism allow us to say: If there shall be freedom to spread materialism, then let us have the right to confess and propagate our principles; Catholics have died and will die for that right.

"I conclude: With good will, an understanding can come about. The initiative lies with the present authorities. Neither I nor the Episcopate are the ones to enter this basic agreement. That is a matter between the state and the Holy See.

"As to myself and as to the verdict, I seek no mercy. My conscience is clear."

Grazing Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very well-written and well-considered article recently published in the Denver Post dealing with the problem of the so-called land grab of Government-held grazing lands.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVESTOCK LAND GRAB IS DENIED—MOVE CALLED REVERSAL OF FEDERAL OWNERSHIP TREND

(By Frederick P. Champ, chairman, subcommittee on public land policies of United States Chamber of Commerce)

Much has been said recently by well-meaning conservationists and some who have less constructive motives relative to the so-called "land grab" which the stock growers and other interests concerned with the economic development of the West are reported to be attempting to perpetrate on the West and the country at large. Since the crux of the argument centers around the aspiration of the stockmen to own the land upon which they operate, it seems to me that an objective study of the aim or ultimate private ownership of the public lands, which can thus be put to their highest use, is in order.

As a starter let's consider for a moment the historical background of the public lands question. But first of all, let's get straight the objectives which all conscientious students of the problem, whether for or against private ownership, are working for. In the first place, let's state for the record that there is no gainsaying the assertion that our natural resources, including the resources of the public lands, must be used and preserved for the benefit of future as well as living generations; that grass and natural cover constitute a great natural resource which can only be processed by the livestock industry; that erosion has been going on since long before the coming of man; that since settlement we have noted that soil displacement, whether on the farm or the range, is followed by human displacement; and that every good citizen is concerned with attaining the highest use of the vast area of public lands (some 140,000,000 acres) involved in this controversy. We might add the self-evident fact that the grazing of livestock is and has been a basic western industry, contributing substantially to the economy of the western public-land States, the areas of which are still substantially half in Federal ownership, and that its functioning is essential to the food supply of the Nation as well as to the maintenance of our national income.

WANTED TO SELL LAND

At one time we thought in terms of disposition of our public lands. Our first predominant public-land policy was sale for revenue purposes. The second was the homestead or settlement policy, under which most of

the area between the Missouri River and the Rocky Mountains and many of the mountain valleys were settled. The more recent policy has been one of withdrawal, classification, and development by the Federal Government or under its supervision, with which has been associated an acceleration in Federal land acquisition until the Federal Government now owns, exclusive of its Alaska holdings, approximately one-fifth of the land area of the continental United States.

It is apparent that the Federal public land policy of today, as administered by the departments concerned, contemplates permanent Federal ownership and management. While we may agree to the application of this policy to some lands and some resources, we must grant that the productive use of the balance of the Federal public domain is necessary if the populated areas of the West are to prosper. The question is how best in the public interest can we achieve the highest and permanently most productive use of those lands.

DIVERSE VIEWS

As has been recently well said, "The West is suffering from an omnipresence of the public interest." To some the public interest is inseparably linked with public ownership. To others the public interest is best achieved through the operation of private initiative under a program which lends incentive and stability under a minimum of governmental regulation and control. The people have spoken unmistakably in their demand for a restoration of local government and State sovereignty. I believe that the people, as they will always do when they have the facts, have spoken wisely, and that the stockmen and others allied with them in their demand for an opportunity to graduate from tenantry are simply advancing in a specific way that part of the over-all program with which their industry is concerned.

Beyond this, the western livestock men, as citizens of the public-land States, are asking for a partial fulfillment of the historic promise of State or private ownership of their areas which was made under the Constitution to the States which were carved out of the lands remaining or acquired after the creation of the original 13 States. Even the Supreme Court of the United States has, in effect, held that the enabling acts under which these public-land States were admitted to the Union do not foreclose their right to own the Federal public lands within their borders.

There is a strange inconsistency in assuming that the original States and those which under the Constitution were permitted to retain their lands should attain full economic development under one policy, and that the States which have thus far been deprived of this privilege of statehood should be expected to achieve it under another. There is similar inconsistency in pointing to the economic strength, stability, and productive capacity of the Eastern States, which from the start have been State or privately owned, as compared with relative economic subservience of the Western States, and in the same breath call for continued public ownership of more than half of the latter as the means of best achieving their full destiny.

Unless we deny these fundamental facts and admit that the American citizen is not capable of private ownership, we must look for a means of reversing the trend of Federal encroachment previously noted and provide a conservative means of passing into private ownership those public lands which can be put to their highest use in private hands, with due consideration, of course, to the preservation of watersheds, mineral resources, wildlife, and scenic wonders. Let us, therefore, examine briefly the proposal of the joint livestock committee on public lands which has been referred to by alarmists as a plan to despoil the public domain.

PROPOSAL OUTLINED

In essence, the proposal is a plan to permit the established user of these lands to acquire them over a period of years at a price to be determined by the Government when he is able and disposed to assume the burden of investment, improvement and taxation which private ownership entails. The plan as proposed applies only to those remaining lands not heretofore selected for or considered adaptable to settlement or cultivation and which, being without water and dependent for their use and productivity upon privately owned base lands or ranches, are now being administered under the Taylor Grazing Act, which was enacted more than 12 years ago as a temporary measure "to promote the highest use of the public lands pending their final disposition." There is no provision of implication that the forests, parks, or other public lands are included.

What is the basis for the alarm being sounded over such a proposal unless those who protest are permanently dedicated to the principle of public ownership or are interested in perpetuating and expanding the Federal bureaus and agencies involved? Since the enactment of the Taylor Grazing Act the Federal agency concerned has been continuously engaged in making adjustments in leases and permits to see that these lands are so allocated as to promote their highest use in conformity with the act. The transfer of these lands, if and when made, will conform to this allocation.

LAW OF ECONOMICS

To deny this proposed right of transfer in the name of conservation would be to assume that the American citizen who makes an investment in land and assumes the financial obligations of ownership will forthwith proceed to destroy and not improve the property he purchases. Such a position would likewise deny the fact that, on a grazing basis, overgrazing is an economic impossibility because the operator must produce 290 pounds of beef or a comparable value of wool and mutton per unit or the law of economics will wipe him out long before he has done serious damage to the range. On the other hand, if he does operate on this basis he will give his land better care than the Federal Government has done. To oppose this suggestion is also to deny the fact, established by surveys, that grazing lands generally increase substantially in value when they pass from public to private ownership, in addition to contributing their share to the tax revenues of the local governmental unit.

For the foregoing and other reasons which space will not permit enumerating, we should, it seems to me, give unprejudiced consideration to the merits of this proposal for restoring the historic policy of Federal land disposal—the first in recent years which has the general support of the users of the range and others who are concerned with the orderly progress and ultimate sovereignty of the western public-land States.

Editorial Comment on Lincoln Day Address by Governor Green, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An American Program for the Republican Party," published in the February 26, 1947, issue of the Chicago Herald American, dealing with a very able address delivered on Lincoln Day in Washington by Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN PROGRAM FOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Lincoln Day speech delivered by Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, under the auspices of Republican Members of Congress was a forceful and forthright declaration of the patriotic duties of the Republican Party, and of the national policies which must be initiated by the Republican Party in order to perform those duties.

The people of the United States are reassured by this fine American speech that the object they sought to obtain by restoring the Republican Party to power in national affairs will be obtained—this object being the reestablishment of patriotic integrity in government as a means of preserving the peace and the security and the free institutions of the country.

A government of integrity, as Governor Green admonished the leadership of the Republican Party, is not one which is neglectful of national defense or niggardly or shortsighted in providing the essential instruments of national safety.

"When we mention the preservation of every military and economic resource of our national strength and pledge their maintenance," he said, "we mean full development of atomic weapons until the world has reached a condition of security far beyond what confronts us today.

"We mean the prompt acquisition and full equipment of every essential naval and air base, and maintenance of American air supremacy."

A government of integrity, he further warned his party leaders, is not one which resorts only to half measures or no measures at all to eradicate the poisonous infection of Red fascism from the administrative and executive branches of government which affect every phase of the national life.

"The Republican Party," he challenged, "has no more important task ahead than to stop the spread of communism in America.

"We must be unrelenting in our efforts to drive the Communists from every hiding place in our National Government.

"We must drive their ideology out of our schools, our colleges, and our daily life."

A Government of integrity, he particularly urged the Republican Party to constantly bear in mind, is not one which appeases foreign aggressors and condones their despotism and thus becomes a party to their crimes against international justice and human dignity.

"When we give secret or tacit consent to the permanent enslavement of prisoners of war, when we subscribe to the abolition of national freedom, suppression, and persecution of religion, to mass exile and starvation as in Poland and other countries overrun by agents of the Red Empire," he charged, "we throw out of the window the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

Governor Green's Lincoln Day speech was true to the American precepts of the beloved and immortal man the occasion honored.

It was a ringing challenge and charge to the Republican Party to be worthy of the confidence placed in it by the American people.

A Jersey Adventure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Jersey Adventure," dealing with the subject of cancer, published in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of February 16, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JERSEY ADVENTURE

What can be done about cancer? Can it be held in check? Is it curable? Is it preventable?

The question can be answered hopefully but not complacently. Much effort has been made and much reward has been gained. Results have been good enough to warrant the greatest concentration of effort, and incomplete enough to demand further concentration of effort.

The public has become vaguely familiar with an annual drive for funds by the American Cancer Society. Is that effort worth while? It should be examined critically.

The cancer campaign does not come in the form of a slot machine into which the public pours contributions for the purpose of extracting standard packages of cancer progress.

The problem is relatively unexplored, and the work of the American Cancer Society is in the nature of a great movement in which laymen and scientists join forces in an organized manner to make the most effective possible use of existing knowledge and facilities while research continues.

The fight against cancer has something of the drama and the philosophy of our wartime crusade for atomic energy. In both instances men and women by the scores of thousands, individually incapable of the necessary accomplishment, are achieving wonders almost beyond their imaginations. The only difference is that the secrecy of the search for atomic energy becomes a publicized process in the search for an answer to cancer.

It is an actual fact, however, that a clubwoman or businessman can without troubling his lay mind with scientific perplexities, contribute knowledge to the great campaign of research against cancer.

Gratifyingly, New Jersey holds first place in the Nation for achievement in this respect. The New Jersey Cancer Society is a grassroots organization, with active chapters in every county. Laymen act with medical men on the local level, making certain that local hospitals pool whatever equipment can be made available and that local research goes into the vast world pool of research.

It is not an unexciting business, this great crusade for well-being. Just as scores of thousands of scientists and laymen were assembled in the highly speculative search for the atom bomb, so laymen and doctors are being assembled in local, self-governing units throughout New Jersey and the Nation in an adventurous campaign to free the human race from a terrible scourge.

Money is the least of the concerns of this organization. New Jersey oversubscribed its quota last year with ease. What is the subject of intense local pride is the fact that New Jersey ranks first in the Nation, not only in per capita contributions, but in the quality and relative number of its local, self-governing cancer societies.

Every one of New Jersey's 21 counties has an active cancer society contributing to local welfare, as well as to the general cause. Medical projects of immediate aid to local residents have been launched, as a result, in 30 hospitals in 11 counties.

This State his naturally attracted national attention, but it is to be expected that New Jersey will blaze the trail of progress still further in the 1947 campaign.

Definition of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD an excerpt from an editorial published in a recent issue of Life magazine dealing with definitions of democracy up to date. It is a very excellent editorial and I should like to have it printed in the RECORD so my fellow Senators may read it.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMON CAUSE DEFINITION

There is definite value in keeping our definitions of democracy up to date, provided each new definition affords room for growth. That is the useful thing about the definition given recently by a movement called common cause. A dozen educators and experts in public affairs worked on this for 2 years. Here is a summary:

"Democracy means personal worth: Every human being is precious in his own right and is always to be regarded as an end, never as a means merely. * * * The state is made for man, not man for the state. Here is the foundation of all humane conceptions of life and the ultimate source of the other articles of our faith.

"Democracy means freedom: All men should participate actively in selecting leaders, in shaping the laws and in discharging the responsibilities of government. Every man should be free to think and speak, to write and create, to approve and criticize, to assemble and organize, to choose an occupation, to move from place to place, to improve his condition, to worship God as he chooses, to follow the dictates of his conscience, to pursue in his own way truth and happiness. * * * Freedom is the ancient, eternal, and implacable foe of totalitarianism and every form of tyranny over the bodies and minds of men.

"Democracy means equality * * * recognizes no races, castes, or orders commissioned by God or qualified by their own attributes to exploit, govern, or enslave their fellow human beings.

"Democracy means rule of law: The structure and functions of government should be clearly defined in constitutional provisions; the entire political process of elections, legislation, administration, and judicial decisions should be conducted according to rules and principles freely established by the people. All individuals and minorities should be protected in their rights and liberties against the passion of mobs, the vengeance of party, the power of privilege, the tyranny of police, the caprice of officials, the ambitions of madmen, and the arbitrary invasions of government.

"Democracy means public morality: It means elementary standards of decency in the conduct of all public affairs. * * * Without mutual trust and charity society itself must fall into decay and dissolution.

"Democracy means individual opportunity: It means a mobile and progressive society in which any man can make his way according to his own talents, inclinations and beliefs—a society which makes available to all an abundance of opportunity in work, in health, in education, in social relationships, in human enlightenment, in all the arts and sciences of life.

"Democracy means individual responsibility: All men should be disciplined by a sense of common brotherhood, a devotion to the general welfare and a love of truth and justice. If (men) employ their liberties merely to further their own selfish interest, if they are callous to wrongs and inequalities, if they are indifferent to the public good, they will surely sink back into bondage. Democracy surpasses all other social systems in its demands on the time and energy, as well as the virtue and understanding of the citizen."

OUR JOB

Well, there we are. Certainly it is not a definition having geographical boundaries. It is offered for universal application from the New World where the fortuitous coming together of men seeking religious freedom, political liberty and economic opportunity, has resulted in our present accomplishment. Yet many reading this definition will realize that it is not an exact statement of what we have. It is, in large measure, a revelation of our present aspirations. We shall survive and history shall judge us on how well we fulfill these applications. Let us look to it.

Mr. Truman Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune for today:

MR. TRUMAN GROWS

This newspaper has already expressed its congratulations to Mr. Lewis W. Douglas on his nomination as Ambassador to Great Britain. It is not amiss, it seems to us, to express our congratulations to President Truman as well, on his ability to recognize Mr. Douglas' qualities and to summon them to the public service. This one appointment will further add to Mr. Truman's standing, which has unquestionably been growing measurably in recent weeks from the low point which is reached in the course of the distressful summer and fall.

"Ding's" cartoon, appearing in an adjoining column, reflects a certainly widespread sense that Mr. Truman has dug up from under the rubbish of New Dealism a certain long-forgotten simplicity and honesty which people can understand and to which they are inclined to give their confidence. Mr. Truman himself has tended to develop under adversity. He is no longer the provincial politician, confined to the horizons of the Missouri gang; and his successful encounter with the formidable John L. Lewis in

early December indicated a greater sureness of touch in difficult moments than had been apparent earlier. And he is no longer merely a lieutenant for the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; new problems are producing new, and characteristically Truman policies. All of these tendencies are symbolized to some extent in the Douglas appointment, and they all point to the probability that Mr. Truman will be much more a factor to be reckoned with in 1948 than seemed likely on the morrow of the Republican sweep of the congressional elections.

This newspaper, for one, is glad of it. The illusion that the Republicans could elect a dog catcher to the Presidency next year was benefiting neither the country nor the party. To have a man of stature in the White House during the coming difficult months is not only essential to the national interest; it will also demand of the Republican Party that it must develop a man of stature to oppose him and develop policies of consistency and coherence to replace those of the crumbling Democratic coalition over which he presides. The abler the President shows himself, the better the quality of men and statesmanship which the Republicans must offer. That will be good for the country; and it will be particularly good for the Republicans.

More Tariff Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of February 25, 1947:

MORE TARIFF TROUBLE

A perfect illustration of what is wrong with the present tariff set-up at Washington is contained in the Supplemental Bargaining List now bing circulated by the United States State Department.

Under the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as extended by the New Deal Congress in 1945, the State Department dropped a bombshell on industry just after the election last November.

Out of a clear sky at that time it listed a long and complicated list of items on which it was proposed to reduce the tariffs another 50 percent.

Since many of these materials already had suffered a 50-percent cut under the trade agreements, and since many domestic manufacturers were already gravely worried whether they would be able to meet foreign competition under existing rates, the announcement came as a sharp and unhappy jolt to industries already plagued with labor, tax, and reconversion problems.

The suggested reductions were presented as a sort of emergency program, necessary at once to prevent a break-down in our diplomatic and trade relations with the rest of the world.

Of course the fact of the matter is that the State Department had started to put the cuts into effect months early, but delayed doing so for the purely political reason that it feared its tariff monkeying might grow into a political issue, and boomerang in the November elections.

The New Dealers lost the election anyway, so they decided to jam the tariff slashes down the Nation's throat regardless of consequences.

Quite aside from the matter of shattered morale, at a time when industrial confidence in this land was none too good at best, what the State Department announcement meant was that every manufacturer in the country had to drop his other activities long enough to trace the effects which tariff cuts in this complicated list would have on his own business.

This is no simple task. Many of the items concerned are obscure. Any one of them might have a direct effect upon an industry which, at first glance, would seem wholly unrelated. Then the material had to be assembled and put in form, and in most cases, attorneys and Washington representatives consulted, in order to present the industry's case before the Washington bureaucrats—who, in the past, have thought they were doing industry quite a favor merely to listen to these protests.

All this served to reawaken an issue which many citizens believed was, if not dead, at least thoroughly asleep—that of the protective tariff a historical part of the Republican doctrine.

A Republican group in Congress began moving to strip away from the President and the State Department the arbitrary power to play world power with the welfare of American industry—and hence with the earnings, job-security and standards of living of American working people.

For a time it looked as though the Republican majorities in the two Houses of Congress might lock horns with the State Department and revamp the whole program.

Then there was brought forward a "compromise," on the strength of which a temporary truce has been in effect. This "compromise" is a rather ingenious proposition. In effect, the State Department promises to do what most experts felt it was the intention of the law to make them do—think occasionally of the effect on American industry and labor of the tariff "presents" they were giving foreign nations with such lavish hands.

The concession which the State Department promised was, in effect, that it would deal a little more gently with industry, would give more adequate notice, would listen more closely to protests. Of course this was what the law itself intended—but when a law like this one is so drawn as to prevent court appeal by injured parties, then those who enforce it don't have to pay much heed to its provisions.

How little attention the State Department really expects to pay to this "new policy of sympathy with industry" is well shown in the fact that a new, and fairly complicated, list of commodities has suddenly been added to the previous list of those considered for tariff reductions.

The first word in the list, "eucalyptol," well illustrates the difficulties which manufacturers face in dealing with such a piece of "second-guessing" by their State Department. What is it? What industrial processes are affected by its price fluctuations? And does it enter into the making of essential parts of manufacturing lines?

The dictionary is not very helpful. It says eucalyptol is the same as cineol, and cineol is closely related to terpin. Is this double-talk? Of course it is to the layman, but the experts know the difference. Having just finished one bout with statisticians, industrial consultants and lawyers, the industrial chiefs can go right out and do it over again. They have until March 18.

Farmers, who may have thought they were getting the go-by from the State Department because the first list didn't hit them hard, will be interested to learn that they are not overlooked in the supplement.

Cuban corn tariffs are to be further slashed. So are rates on grass and other forage seeds, on grapes; and on dried peaches and pears. All these reductions will put a damper on cost-of-production prices on the American farm.

The watch industry, largely demoralized because of the State Department's persistence in giving Switzerland all the best of it, may have thought it had convinced its national leaders that it was already unprotected—but it is down for new competition with across the board tariff reductions in virtually everything which goes into the making of watches and clocks, as well as all precision instruments.

Lenses, plywood, tapestries, silk fabrics, imitation pearls, handmade or imitation handmade paper—these are significant items included in this "added-starter" list.

Even fishhooks aren't forgotten. But the main fishhook in the whole proposition is the autocratic and arbitrary authority of white-collar bureaucrats in "our" State Department to play world politics with America's industrial security.

H. R. 2157

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I wish to say that, in my opinion, H. R. 2157 is hasty and punitive legislation. There seems to be violent disagreement on it among the members of the House Judiciary Committee which had the responsibility of bringing this legislation to the floor of the House.

In the first place, I think that the proposed legislation should properly have gone to the Committee on Education and Labor, since it involves a controversy between management and labor and since the Committee on Education and Labor has under consideration other legislation dealing with these problems. Secondly, I do not think that any hasty legislation involving labor and management problems should be enacted.

The reason is that these problems which concern labor and management are deep-seated. They involve intricate social and economic factors which should not be passed over hurriedly or overlooked. No legislation can be enacted unless an exhaustive study is made of conditions surrounding employer and employee relationships. Early this year I introduced House Joint Resolution 83 which was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor. Nothing has been done about it as yet. This resolution calls for a joint commission of the House and Senate and three public members to begin an exhaustive study and investigation of the underlying causes of disputes, including union and employer policies and practices, economic and other factors, methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process, Government policies, present and proposed legislation affecting such disputes, and the measures by which such disputes may be eliminated in order to safeguard the public interest, particularly cooperative measures between labor and management

which can be promoted by the Federal Government.

The scope of the study and investigation would encompass the problem of Nation-wide strikes in essential industries affecting the public interest and many other problems that are involved in the management-labor picture. This commission was to report on or before June 1, 1947, so that there could not be any serious delay in enacting any legislation that might be recommended. The time, however, is growing short and unless something is done in this respect very soon, there will not be sufficient time to do the job.

This very problem of portal-to-portal pay belongs in such a comprehensive study, as it undoubtedly concerns labor and management, and there is no good purpose served by passing legislation such as was passed today or any other legislation that might be enacted in haste. I do not believe the American people want that sort of legislation, for what inevitably happens in such instances is that when the law is put into practice more problems arise from it. This is very much to be avoided. Drawing from the experience in the past with such legislation, it is a wonder to me that any Member of Congress would be rushed into such action. The famous Smith-Connolly Act was designed and enacted in great haste to forestall certain labor difficulties, and what did it do? Nothing in that respect. There have been more labor disputes and labor unrest since its enactment than before.

I am not unmindful of the position that many employers are in on this portal-to-portal controversy, but I do not believe that the solution lies in this sort of legislation. Certainly where suits have been brought the courts are going to be just in the matter, and these exorbitant figures that have been set up are not going to be granted.

The whole subject deserves more careful investigation and deliberation than has been given it.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that some attention will be paid to a thorough and complete study and investigation of these problems. Not until this is done can we hope to eliminate the causes of the unrest and achieve peaceful labor and management relations.

Waste Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I include the following editorial from the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune:

WASTE CONTINUES

The country is honeycombed with Federal officers which had nothing or little to do with the prosecution of the war.

The number has been increased since the war ended. As means of reducing expenses of government this wasteful set-up seems to be ignored.

One diligent worker on economy in government is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, who is assisted by a joint committee from the two Houses of Congress The major object of this group is to reduce nonessential Federal expenses with reference to the number of principal units in the executive branch.

It has found that in December 1946 there were 1,039 principal component parts of that branch of the Government. Exclusive of the Office of Emergency Management units, which dealt with war and postwar problems, the number last December was greater than it was at the height of the war.

In the rush of the emergency it was but natural that innumerable agencies, commissions, and boards should spring up. While even then their efforts overlapped, the situation was accepted as probably necessary to carry on the war effort.

All that is past now and what happens? Instead of being sliced down appreciably the number of such boards and commissions has increased. Cessation of hostilities has brought little reduction anywhere along the line in the tremendous war expansion of the Government.

As the Byrd committee observes, it is inconceivable that the departments and old-line agencies, expanded to 777 principal component parts at the height of the war, should now need to expand still further to require 920 principal component parts.

The conditions do more than that. They add weight to the repeatedly pointed out fact that the Government, with the exception of the War and Navy Departments and the war agencies, is constantly increasing. The VJ-day total of 957,683 employees has grown to 1,251,942 at the first of this year.

There is no justification for having in addition to the 1,039 component parts, 1,200 Federal offices in New York, 1,000 in Chicago, and more than 500 each in Philadelphia and Los Angeles, to mention only a few.

It is not enough that war-agency offices be closed. This general hodgepodge collection of branch offices, field offices, regional offices, State, county, area, and district offices is an apparent attempt of the establishment of the executive branch of the Government to perpetuate themselves and their tax-draining personnel.

All this takes place in the face of constant demands on the part of Congress and the citizens as a whole to curtail expenditures.

Portal-to-Portal Pay Suits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I think that the salvation of the country lies in all Congressmen voting for those measures which they think are for the best interest of all the people. It is undemocratic and un-American to represent here in the Congress only a special interest—be it big business, small business, agriculture, veterans, or labor.

I am opposed to the general principles upon which the many portal-to-portal suits were based and would vote without reservation for a clean bill which embodied provision which remedied that condition. However, I am voting for this present bill with some reservations. I believe in the principles of the wage-and-hour law, as well as those of the Walsh Healey Act. I will not knowingly vote for any bill which is designed to take away the just and lawful rights of labor or which may be punitive or retaliatory toward labor. It has been represented that this bill—H. R. 2157—upon which we are voting today will in no way interfere with the rights of labor, other than to eliminate the basis of unjustified portal-to-portal suits. I feel that when this bill is considered by the joint committee of the Senate and House some of the loose ends which now appear in the bill will be removed and that substantial justice will be done.

Amendment of United States Housing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution, at the request of Mayor O'Dwyer, of the city of New York, which would amend the United States Housing Act by exempting certain contracts from cost limitations. I include a memorandum explaining the resolution:

CONGRESSIONAL JOINT RESOLUTION AMENDING THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937 BY EXEMPTING CERTAIN CONTRACTS FROM COST LIMITATIONS

This bill is recommended by the city of New York and the New York City Housing Authority. It proposes to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 (hereinafter referred to as the act) by exempting certain contracts for the construction of low-rent housing projects from the cost limitations established by the act.

Subsection (5) of section 15 of the act provides that no contract for any loan, annual contribution or capital grant made pursuant to the act shall be entered into with respect to any project costing more than $4,000 per family-dwelling unit or more than $1,000 per room, except that in any city exceeding 500,000 in population the limit shall be $5,000 per family-dwelling-unit or $1,250 per room, if in the opinion of the Federal authority such higher costs are justified. These cost limitations exclude the cost of land, demolition and nondwelling facilities.

The construction of numerous low-rent housing projects throughout the country, commenced under contracts entered into between the Federal authority and local housing authorities, was suspended by reason of the war emergency. Orders suspending construction were lifted with the termination of the war. The urgent need for rehousing returning veterans of every income group demanded speedy and effective action. Post-war high construction costs have rendered it and continue to render it impossible in many instances to proceed with construction of low-rent housing projects to accommodate veteran and other families of low income, because of the cost limitations fixed by the act.

The alternative of having localities take over the burden of financing these projects

and thereby completing construction, places a heavy, difficult, and in many instances, impossible burden upon such localities. Federal funds were initially made available for construction of low-rent housing projects, contracts were entered into by the Federal Government for loans and subsidies to local housing authorities for this purpose, and the Federal Government should now carry this program through.

To cite an example, the assistance contract for Jacob Riis Houses, project NY-5-8, was entered into on March 29, 1941. When this contract was entered into, construction of the project in compliance with the cost limitations of the act was feasible. Although construction standards are the same as originally contemplated, it is now impossible to proceed with construction of this project within the cost limitations imposed by the act.

The cost limits of the act reflect cost conditions of 1937, when the act was passed, and are unrealistic in the present market. It is imperative, if monies already advanced and spent in connection with project development are not to be lost, and if urgently needed housing accommodations are to be provided, that these cost limitations be eliminated with respect to contracts under which construction of projects was suspended during the war, which projects cannot now be completed because of increased costs.

It is to meet these conditions that the congressional joint resolution has been prepared. Exemption from the cost limitations is, under the bill, contingent upon a finding that the project will not be of elaborate or expensive design or materials, and that the average construction cost will not be greater than the cost of dwelling units currently produced by private enterprise, which is a reaffirmation of the conditions contained in subsection (5) of section 15 of the act.

Statement of Hon. Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Herbert Hoover, February 28, 1947:

To this proposed appropriation of $350,000,000 must be added large sums for areas under the American flag in Germany and Japan and Korea. In addition, two other important funds are in the offing to which our Government is expected to contribute. Those are the United Nations Refugee Organization, to look after the displaced persons in Europe, and the United Nations child-feeding program. I suggest to the committee that, although other congressional committees may be dealing with these other relief programs, you should, at least, have all the proposals before you.

I have made no personal inquiry into the relief programs proposed except that of Germany and Austria and the children's fund. I have brought the committee a copy of my report on German agriculture and food requirements and should be able to furnish such information on Austria in a few days.

In view of the world shortage of food and the great strain upon the American taxpayer, I have thought it necessary to recommend that we hold the German and Austrian programs to the very minimum under which health and work can be sustained. I suggest to the committee that relief to other countries cannot, in view of these same considerations, be put at any higher levels than those I have recommended for Germany and Austria.

I strongly favor aid to the UN project for special feeding of subnormal children. This fund, however, would take some part of the relief load off the countries it is proposed to serve with this $350,000,000 appropriation and, as I am including child feeding in the German and Austrian program, that would in turn take some of the load off the UN children's fund.

The total of all these claims upon the generosity of the United States comes to a very large sum. And we must not forget that they are supplemental to the five to six billions we have already spent on civilian relief since the war and of our own resources. Charitable relief by government is today a double tax upon most of our people. It is not only a direct burden upon the taxpayer but these unremunerative and unbalanced exports keep up prices and the cost of living. In their miseries the peoples abroad believe our possibilities of giving are unlimited. They do not realize that our taxes, Federal and local, are now, 2 years after the war, still taking about 35 percent of the national income. It is in the interest not only of ourselves but of the whole world that we stop, look, and listen.

America, even with all our burdens, never has, and, I hope, never will, cease to do its utmost to prevent starvation in any country.

However, we should bring governmental relief to an end as soon as is possible, encouraging the assumption of the burden by well-equipped private organizations. Moreover, I believe we should begin to secure repayment of these sums and have the full right to demand efficiency and economy in the use of public funds for relief, and we have the further right to see that they contribute to that productivity and peace which will alone end these burdens.

I would, therefore, like to suggest to the committee some policies or methods that should be placed administratively or legally under this proposed appropriation. These suggestions are not made in criticism of the proposed legislation but in the hope that they will be helpful in accomplishing the ends we all desire.

1. No relief other than food, medicine, seed, and fertilizers should be furnished under these relief appropriations. In some cases limited supplies of clothing might be included.

2. Relief from our contribution to these funds should be limited to United States products and to transportation. We should not use American dollars to purchase elsewhere.

3. None of this fund should be used for countries which are able to pay in cash or to secure credit or supplies through other channels.

4. A further careful estimate of need and costs of this relief should be made after full examination on the ground by specialists appointed by the United States Department of Agriculture and the United States Public Health Service and the International Emergency Food Council.

These estimates (except for Austria) should include only the period from the end of UNRRA operation to the 1947 harvest. At that time the whole relief problem should be taken up afresh in the light of the situation then.

In view of short world supplies and the needs of our own taxpayers, any further governmental relief program should, as I have said, be calculated upon no higher bases than that we have proposed for Germany.

5. The distribution should be continuously under supervision of, and satisfactory to, specialists from the agencies named.

6. No obligation or promise should be entered into with any country for any specific amount of relief; the distribution must be a month-to-month program terminable at any time.

There are many reasons for such action implied in its emergency nature. Moreover, difficult policy questions arise in connection with relief to peoples whose governments are said by our Government not to have kept their promises or agreements with the United States Another such difficult situation is that of the governments of small countries which are maintaining military forces far beyond any necessity for police purposes, say, a number not more than one-half of 1 percent of the population. This mobilization keeps men from producing food or making things that could be exported to pay for food

We have no desire to fail to do our full part in alleviating the starvation of women and children merely because of actions by their officials. But at some point American patience and humane action is likely to become exhausted.

7. No food from relief or domestic production in any relief country should be used for political pressure and there should be no racial or other discrimination.

8. No relief should be given where either commodities or cash are going out of that country for reparations or the purchase of arms. Such commodities or cash should be used to pay for food.

9. In my view, any nation receiving relief should obligate itself to pay the cost thereof, either to the United States and other donors or preferably to a fund to be established by the United Nations for future famine relief.

The nations receiving reparations from relief countries should be asked to defer reparations until these relief costs are repaid. The justice of this proposal lies in the fact that this relief obviously serves to preserve the manpower productivity and therefore the ability to pay reparations.

Both the nations under reparations and those who are not should agree to assure repayment, by a tax of, say, 5 or 10 percent, upon all exports from the debtor country to be paid in the currencies of the countries receiving such exports. Such payments to begin in 2 or 3 years.

In conclusion, such methods as those would give some protection to the American taxpayer yet would deprive no needy people of relief if their governments are willing to cooperate with the United States in securing efficiency and economy in the use of relief; in the restoration of productivity and the promotion of freedom and peace.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, since introducing House Resolution 73, a resolution urging the President, the Secretary of State, and the United States delegate to the United Nations to work for an international agreement to eliminate compulsory military training in all nations, I have received hundreds of letters, wires, and petitions from individuals and various businesses and organizations from all parts of the country voicing their approval of the measure and expressing their desire that it be favorably considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs where it is pending. I have written to the chairman of said committee

urging that this resolution be considered and reported to the House at the earliest possible date. I am convinced that the adoption of this resolution would be a definite step toward world peace.

The text of House Resolution 73 follows, together with excerpts taken from communications, which I have chosen at random, received from parties interested in the adoption of the resolution.

House Resolution 73

Whereas the first concern of every American is the security of the Nation; and

Whereas the American people are determined that their Government shall henceforth make proper provision for the continuous maintenance of such security; and

Whereas, in accordance with this firm determination, it has become necessary to consider a system of compulsory military service in the United States as a permanent part of our insurance against unpreparedness in the event of sudden war; and

Whereas compulsory military service would result in greater restrictions over the lives and activities of our people, would impose heavy burdens on them, causing greater taxes and profound changes in their way of life; and

Whereas compulsory military service has long been customary in many European states and elsewhere, but has been contrary to American tradition since the founding of our Republic; and

Whereas compulsory military service has never prevented war in Europe or elsewhere, but, on the contrary, causes suspicion and fears to grow between nations and inclines the rulers of men to war rather than to peace; and

Whereas most of the nations of the world have expressed their desire for peace, and resolved to make greater efforts than ever before to abate the fear and likelihood of war in the years to come; and

Whereas the United States has become a member of the United Nations and all the people of the United States desire our President to take a leading part in fulfilling the great purposes for which the United Nations organization was formed; and

Whereas there will never be a better time than the present period following the cessation of hostilities in World War II to secure international agreement looking to permanent peace; and

Whereas an agreement between the nations of the world to eliminate systems of compulsory military service would itself be greatly conducive to that restoration of peace which is so profoundly desired by all the plain peoples of the world, and would release their energies and resources for rebuilding their war-devastated countries; and

Whereas world-wide abolition of compulsory military service in no way precludes the maintenance of national or international military forces adequate for safeguarding national or collective security: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, before the United States adopts compulsory military service, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States Delegate to the United Nations organization, Warren R. Austin, be, and hereby are, urged to work unceasingly for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be wholly eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

As a representative of the Philadelphia Youth Council to Oppose Conscription, I would like to take this opportunity of advising you of our wholehearted support of your resolution (H. Res. 73) advocating an international abolition of conscription.

MADISON, WIS.

I was greatly interested in news dispatches reporting your comments on the need for striving for international abandonment of conscription prior to action on the proposal for peacetime conscription in this country. This is the position the Progressive has taken for several years, and we were delighted to find you expressing that viewpoint so ably.

ESCALON, CALIF.

We wish to commend you for your effort in favor of international abolition of conscription. We earnestly pray that you and many others may be guided by the Eternal Spirit, that all of us may live in an atmosphere of love and brotherhood of man.

SHREVEPORT, LA.

Hats off to you, sir! Way down here in Dixie land we are for you and your resolution. Push it! You and JOE MARTIN are 100 percent right on this anticonscription in peacetime—and we are Democrats too. But we love America and our way of living and our boys too well to see this thing foisted upon us.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

We wish to congratulate and thank you on the stand you are taking against military conscription. We are heartily in accord with you, and have been writing our various representatives urging them to take a similar stand.

OSKALOOSA, IOWA.

I would like to congratulate you on your sound and internationally constructive approach to the conscription problem in calling for its world-wide abolition rather than our own submission to it.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

With the United Nations working on world-wide disarmament, I feel strongly that the policy of conscription should be abolished in this country. It seems to me to be inconsistent to be proposing disarmament through the United Nations, while at the same time we adopt universal training in our own country.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you for introducing your resolution calling for the world-wide abolition of compulsory military training. This is especially timely, for the best energies of this Nation and of other great nations are all needed to work out arrangements to handle mutual problems and to erect machinery necessary to prevent future war. International cooperation cannot be successful if nations are independently diverting their greatest attention to building up their own military strengths.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Would appreciate your sending special delivery copy your resolution to eliminate compulsory military training. Congratulations on your stand.

CLINTON, CONN.

We are heartily in favor of your resolution for an international ban on compulsory military training. Let us spend as much to prevent war as we do for weapons and education for war, and the goal will be a peaceful world and not a devastated one.

HUTCHINSON, KANS.

You are certainly on the right track in introducing your resolution against peacetime conscription. Do not relax your efforts until conscription is defeated in the United States of America and finally throughout the world.

ELGIN, ILL.

I would like to commend you for the proposal to Congress to go on record for an international agreement to remove compulsory military training from the policies and practices of all nations. In such a proposal we could put our hopes for the future.

TERRE HAUTE, IND.

It was a great joy to me to see in our local paper that you are sponsoring a resolution to ban compulsory military training from the policies and practices of all nations. To my mind this is one of the most constructive measures to be introduced and seems to me to be the answer to the question of compulsory military training.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.

I am firmly convinced your resolution is a move in the right direction, and hope it will get the support it really deserves. I shall write my Congressman to give it support.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

Congratulations on your resolution that the United States take the leadership for world abolition of military training. In this way we can impart the American dream of peace to a troubled world. Be assured of general support for this measure.

NORTH MANCHESTER, IND.

I want to commend you most heartily in this move. I believe national security lies only in this direction. It is to be hoped that your colleagues will rally to your support and place a large majority behind your excellent resolution.

WATERTOWN, MASS.

Peacetime conscription is incompatible with the American way of life, the way which I am sure both you and I are anxious to preserve. The European system of peacetime military conscription has left nothing but tragedy and destruction in its wake. Its abolition in Europe would free the peoples of many nations from the military yoke which has oppressed them for decades. As a veteran of the recent war, and as a thinking man, I want above all to avert the unthinkable catastrophe of another war of which we now so glibly speak. Your resolution is certainly a step in the right direction for peace.

WAYNESVILLE, N. C.

Such a resolution on the part of the Congress would do much to dissipate the general feeling that the United States Government is not sincere in its support of the disarmament proposals now before the United Nations Security Council. What you say with respect to conscription never having in history prevented war is most true.

GEORGE, IOWA.

After reading of your sound attitude toward military conscription, I wish to assure you that many of your constituents as well as others throughout the United States support your resolution.

WOOSTER, OHIO.

Your resolution would be consistent with efforts in the United Nations to achieve world-wide disarmament and international control of atomic energy.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Aside from disastrous effects upon our democratic educational system and the personal development of the boys themselves,

I believe that such a step as compulsory military training by the United States at this time would rightly be taken by the other nations as a complete denial of our intention to seek a just and durable peace, based upon mutual confidence.

RICHMOND, IND.

I wish to register my hearty approval of the resolution you submitted January 27 calling for the international abolition of conscription. I hope that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will not bury it.

The Late Honorable Clinton Egbert, of Hamilton, Ohio, and the late Honorable Daniel C. Brower, of Dayton, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND H. BURKE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, in the last few hours I have learned of the passing of two prominent Americans.

On Wednesday evening, I was advised of the sudden death of the Honorable Clinton Egbert, Hamilton, Ohio, Republican county chairman of Butler County. Mr. Egbert was an accomplished trial lawyer and a prominent member of the Butler County Bar Association. He was interested in all community and civic affairs. He was a lover of his country and placed its welfare first in his political philosophy. He was active in the councils of the Republican Party and attended the various national conventions as a delegate, as well as State and county conventions. He was enthusiastic and always worked hard for the success of his party. His guidance and political poise will be missed.

This morning, Friday, came the news of the passing of the Honorable Daniel C. Brower, Dayton, Ohio, Republican county chairman of Montgomery County. Mr. Brower was a successful insurance representative of many great companies. He had been a leader of the Republican Party in his county for more than 30 years. He, too, could always be counted upon to place the well-being of his country above his party. He spent long hours and time no end in promoting the success of Republican principles. He loved the work, and no one could be more enthusiastic. He was a delegate to many national and State conventions and was prominent nationally as well as locally.

The State of Ohio has lost two fine Americans in the passing of these leaders of the Third Congressional District of Ohio; the Nation has lost two real and valiant Americans; and for myself, personally, I have suddenly lost two good personal friends. The world is better off for their having lived.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] in his tribute to two great Americans. Clinton Egbert and Daniel C. Brower were two of my close personal friends. We had worked together in Republican Party affairs for more than 30 years. Each was a man of honor. Each made great contributions to the welfare of his community and State. As party leaders, they supported the principles of the Republican Party, but as Americans the welfare of their country always came first. In their passing, I have lost two warm personal friends. Our State has lost two fine citizens; the Republican Party has lost two great leaders; and the Nation has lost two true Americans.

Grand Coulee Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., February 27, 1947:

GRAND COULEE PAYS OFF — GOVERNMENT'S $185,000,000 INVESTMENT RETURNS DIVIDENDS IN WAR AND IN PEACE

Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River, in the State of Washington, has cost the American people $185,382,000 to date. The 2,700,000-horsepower rating of Grand Coulee's generating plant tops Boulder Dam's 1,835,000 horsepower and the 746,000 horsepower of Russia's Dnieprostroy Dam, partially destroyed by the Germans during World War II.

Some 7,000 men, the daily maximum, toiled during 6 years at the erection of the dam until it was officially turned over to the Department of the Interior in 1942.

It has taken the experts nearly 5 years to gather sufficient data to give the American public an exact idea of the return on their investment.

In his 1946 annual report to the Secretary of the Interior, Dr. Paul Raver, head of the Bonneville Power Administration, which markets Grand Coulee electricity, says officially that the return from the sale of the big dam's power will fully cover all operation and maintenance expenses, and all reimbursable construction costs will be returned to the United States Treasury within 50 years. The Government will also receive 2½ percent interest on its invested money.

ONLY SIX GENERATORS INSTALLED

In round figures, Grand Coulee Dam electricity to date has been sold wholesale by Dr. Raver for approximately $44,000,000, although only 6 of the 18 generators have been installed. The big dam has paid into the Treasury about one-quarter of the original cost of the dam and power plant. This is the gross return.

However, Dr. Raver says in his 1945 annual report that 37 cents out of every revenue dollar he received were available as surplus. That would then make the net return so far from the sale of Grand Coulee Dam electricity at least $15,000,000.

When one studies what Grand Coulee Dam did for the war effort, this alone, without counting financial return, seems to justify the great barrier's construction.

According to Dr. Raver's 1946 report, the aluminum produced in Northwest plants during the war was sufficient to turn out 10,000 B-29s or 150,000 fighter planes. And without Columbia River sources of electric power the large Northwest aluminum plants would never have been started.

Grand Coulee Dam also made possible the erection of the immense half-billion-dollar Hanford Engineering Works near Pasco, Wash., where ingredients of the atomic bomb are manufactured.

CONTRIBUTION TO WAR EFFORT

Dr. Raver further states that approximately 65 percent of the electricity generated at Grand Coulee Dam from 1942 to 1945 went into the war effort. For instance, Northwest shipyards needed immense quantities of electricity. During one year alone these Northwest yards turned out 181 ships.

Now that World War II is over Grand Coulee Dam seems destined to aid Northwest peacetime jobs.

From 1941 through July 1946, Grand Coulee Dam generated 18,814,936 megawatt (1,000 kw.) hours. If it were possible to put this power into a giant storage battery and place it in the vicinity of Washington, it would supply this city and parts of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties through 1957. New York City would get enough power out of the battery so that all its electrical needs would be amply supplied for over two years.

Grand Coulee Dam has produced since 1942 the equal of about 1 percent of the total power generated in the United States in all years prior to 1941.

Certainly Grand Coulee Dam is no financial flop. Plenty of figures prove that. Nor as a defense measure has the big barrier's worth been negligible. And it is apparent that Grand Coulee Dam will serve the Nation well in its peacetime efforts.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Washington:

Senate Joint Memorial 1

To the President of the United States and the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Washington, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the water-power resources of the State of Washington constitute the only adequate source of low-cost fuel for industrial development; and

Whereas the State of Washington has achieved a marked industrial growth, the existence and extension of which depends primarily upon a dependable supply of inexpensive hydroelectric power; and

Whereas low-cost electric energy from the Federal projects on the Columbia River has made feasible electrification of rural farms and homes in sparsely populated areas; and

Whereas the program for reclaiming large bodies of arid land in the Pacific Northwest is primarily dependent upon the sale of large blocks of surplus hydroelectric energy, which can be marketed to basic industries only at the prevailing low rates; and

Whereas a retention of existing wholesale power rates is essential to the further development of the natural resources of the

State, the creation of new opportunities, employment, and taxable wealth; and

Whereas Congress is being urged to seek an increase in power rates for energy from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and other projects to be constructed on the Columbia River, because of the unfounded contention that prevailing rates are not sufficient to amortize the Federal investment within a reasonable period of time; and

Whereas independent commercial audits for the operation of the Columbia River power system clearly indicates that electric power revenues have not only been sufficient to meet all costs of power operation, but have provided a net surplus of $16,326,047 dollars as of June 30, 1946; and

Whereas a comprehensive survey of existing and potential power markets, made by the Department of the Interior, indicates that existing power rates will provide adequate revenues to repay not only all costs allocated to power, but also to reimburse the Federal Government in excess of $200,000,000 of construction costs allocated to irrigation, and further to provide a substantial surplus: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That your memorialists hereby respectfully petition and memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to take no action that would lead to an increase in the wholesale power rates for energy generated at the Federal projects on the Columbia River; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Washington is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the members of the congressional delegation from the State of Washington.

Passed the senate January 30, 1947.

VICTOR A. MEYERS,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house February 12, 1947.

HERBERT M. HAMBLIN,
Speaker of the House.

Fishing an Important Connecticut Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Connecticut Progress for February 1947:

FISHING IMPORTANT CONNECTICUT INDUSTRY

Deep-sea fishing on a commercial scale usually brings to mind such well-known fishing ports as Gloucester. Even Connecticut residents may not be aware of the fact that there are also important fishing ports on our own shores, and that daily shipments from the Connecticut shore form an important part of the fish supply to the famous Fulton Market in New York City.

The total value of fish and fish products brought into Connecticut ports is more than a million dollars per year, according to the latest published figures of the State Board of Fisheries and Game. This represents the return to fishermen, not the final price. Aside from oysters and other shellfish, most of this catch comes into ports in the eastern part of the State, near the entrance to Long Island Sound. One of the most important of these ports is Stonington, where there is a large fleet of draggers. This dragger fleet is one of the largest fishing fleets between Boston and New York, and the largest supplying the New York City market.

Because this Connecticut industry is confined to a relatively few communities along the shore and is little known even to Connecticut people who vacation nearby, Connecticut Progress is devoting this issue to a description, in words and pictures, of the year-around operations of the Stonington fishing fleet.

It is interesting to note in this connection that a large proportion of the fresh fish available for Connecticut families is caught by Connecticut crews operating in boats owned almost entirely by Connecticut people. Fish constitutes one of the few food products in which Connecticut is not only self-sufficient but has an exportable surplus.

Progress is indebted for much of the information in this issue to Mr. John B. Bindloss, of Stonington, proprietor of the Bindloss dock and other enterprises connected with the fishing industry in Stonington, and a member of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

The Chicago Tribune Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of Wednesday, February 26, 1947:

REPUBLICANS ON TRIAL

Too many members of the Republican majority in Congress continue to putter, falter, and evade their campaign promises. Evidently the will to keep faith was not strong enough to move the Senate, in particular, and a large, lethargic group in the House, as well, to prompt action.

A third of the Senators and all the Representatives will have to face their constituents in the primaries next year. The members of the congressional majority cannot be unaware that they have disappointed their supporters. If some of the honorables do not pay with their political scalps it will be surprising.

The voters who elected Republicans wanted action. The citizens who cast their ballots for New Deal candidates wanted to keep the status quo. Many of them had a selfish personal interest in the tremendous waste of Federal funds. If they were dissatisfied with their income-tax bills they were at least not so disgruntled that they were willing to see a reduction in expenditures essential to any tax cut. These New Deal voters were in favor of Federal controls and interference in every phase of the citizen's life. They wanted no interference with the abuse of power by labor organizations. They were satisfied with the betrayal of American interests abroad, the waste of American money, and the endorsement of bestiality and slavery implicit in the Truman-Vandenberg foreign policy.

In the course of nearly 2 months the Republican majority in Congress has passed virtually none of the legislation desired by its friends or opposed by its enemies. Mr. Truman, in his vain effort to win the election, relaxed more Government controls than Congress has since it met. If the Republicans think that by these tactics they can placate and convert the New Deal voters they are a crowd of ninnies.

The people who voted against Republicans last fall will vote against them again in the fall of 1948. If they continue their present tactics the people who voted for them will, in large measure, become so disgusted that they won't even go to the polls. If the party doesn't do better, and especially if, for lack of a positive program, it lets the Democrats control the Republican national convention, as they controlled the conventions of 1940 and 1944, the Republicans will lose the Presidential election and control of the House with it.

Part of the responsibility for the Republican inaction appears to lie in the failure to throw off the pay rolls of Congress itself its Democratic political attachés. Fifteen years ago the Democrats didn't let friendship stand in the way of installing their own payrollers wherever they found an opportunity. In failing to do the same thing the Republicans are extremely stupid.

The political patronage involved is not important. What is important is that, by keeping Democratic deadwood in various committee jobs, the party organization has stifled the activities of those committees through unsympathetic staffs. The holdover payrollers should be fired and replaced with vigorous young Republicans who will work for the legislative ends of the majority.

If the Senators and Congressmen want to be reelected they had better assert their republicanism. Instead of converting the opposition, the present tactics serve only to alienate their own supporters.

Food Requirements of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the Hoover mission's findings on the food requirements of Germany:

TEXT OF THE HOOVER MISSION'S FINDINGS ON THE FOOD REQUIREMENTS OF GERMANY

(Herbert Hoover's report to President Truman on conditions in the British-American Zone of occupied Germany follows:)

FEBRUARY 26, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have now completed the economic mission to Germany and Austria which I undertook at your request.

I enclose herewith a memorandum on the economic conditions affecting food supplies for the newly combined American and British Zones, together with estimates of supplies and costs involved in deficiency appropriations for the last half of the fiscal year 1946–47 and appropriations for the fiscal year 1947–48. I shall submit detailed annexes to this memorandum as soon as they are completed.

I shall report separately on Austria, and at a later date I shall have some further report on other economic and health problems in these areas.

In this examination of food questions in the combined zones I have had the invaluable service of Dr. Dennis A. FitzGerald in food questions and that of Dr. William H. Sebrell, Jr., in nutritional and health ques-

tions, together with the able assistance in other economic questions of Mr. Hugh Gibson, Mr. Louis Lochner, Mr. Frank Mason, and Dr. Gustav Stolper. I have received the full cooperation of Generals McNarney, Clay, and Draper, Colonel Hester, and their able staff, as well as General Robertson, Sir Cecil Weir, and Mr. T. F. Griffin, and their able staff on the British side.

My thanks are also due to the devoted service of Mr. Tracy S. Voorhees, Special Assistant to the Secretary of War, and to the Air Transport Command for their cooperation and skill.

Faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD REQUIREMENTS

Introduction

At the time of her surrender Germany had exhausted all of her reserves and most of her stocks of consumer goods and raw materials. We now know that, driven back into her own borders, she would have blown up in chaos within a short time without further military action.

Promptly after the surrender her liquid resources from which she could have been provided with supplies were seized and divided as reparations. The population thus became largely dependent for its life upon the armies of occupation.

It is hardly necessary to repeat that parts of Germany were annexed to Poland and Russia and that the shrunken territory was divided into four military occupation zones between the Russians, French, British, and Americans. The American and British zones have now been administratively combined, each nation bearing one-half the expense, and this report relates to that area only.

Changes in population and manpower

The changes which have taken place in population profoundly affect all economic problems. The population of the combined zones in 1939 was about 34,200,000. The Germans expelled from the Russian and Polish annexations, together with those from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Austria, have raised the population in the American and British zones to about 41,700,000. It is estimated that an additional 1,000,000 will come into this area by December 1947. There are also about 400,000 British and American military and civil personnel. Thus, the two zones will have to accommodate about 43,000,000 people, bringing the population approximately 9,000,000 above that in 1939.

The skilled manpower and the ratio of working males in the population have been greatly affected by the war. For the whole of Germany, it is estimated that 5,700,000 were killed or permanently injured. It is also estimated that over 3,000,000 prisoners of war are held in work camps in Russia, 750,000 in France, 400,000 in Britain, and 40,000 in Belgium. The detention of large numbers of skilled Sudeten German workmen in Czechoslovakia bears on this problem.

As applied to the American and British zones, this represents a present subtraction of over 6,000,000 of the most vital and most skilled workers in the population. Likewise, the 90,000 Nazis held in concentration camps and the 1,900,000 others under sanctions by which they can only engage in manual labor naturally comprise a considerable part of the former technical and administrative skill of the country, and the restrictions upon them, however necessary, add to administrative and industrial problems.

One consequence of these distortions is that in the age groups between 20 and 40 there are 6 men to 10 women, and in the age group between 40 and 60, about 7 men to 10 women. Thus, there are in these groups between six and seven million more women than men. The results upon productive power are bad enough, but the consequences to morals are appalling.

Housing

The housing situation in the two zones is the worst that modern civilization has ever seen. About 25 percent of the urban housing was destroyed by the war. Therefore 25 percent of the urban population must find roofs from among the remaining 75 percent, in addition to all the destitute expellees and other groups brought in. There has been little repair of damaged houses, due to lack of materials and transportation. The result of all this is that multitudes are living in rubble and basements. The average space among tens of millions is equivalent to between three and four people to a 12-by-12-foot room. Nor is the overcrowding confined to urban areas, for the "expellees" have been settled into every farmhouse. One consequence is the rapid spread of tuberculosis and other potentially communicable diseases.

Coal

The shortage of coal is, next to food, the most serious immediate bottleneck to both living and the revival of exports to pay for food. The Ruhr, which is now almost the sole coal supply of the Anglo-American zones, is, due to lack of skilled men and physical vitality in labor, producing only 230,000 tons per day, as against a former 450,000 tons per day. Of the present production, a considerable amount must be exported to surrounding nations which are also suffering. The shortage leaves the two zones without sufficient coal for transport, household, and other dominant services, with little upon which to start exports in the industry.

The coal famine all over western Europe and the unprecedented severity of the winter have produced everywhere the most acute suffering. As an example in Germany, no household coal has been issued in Hamburg since October. Other German cities have been but little better off.

Agricultural production

It must be borne in mind that about 25 percent of the German prewar food production came from the areas taken over by Russia and Poland. Moreover, the Russian military zone in Germany was a large part of the bread basket of Germany. Some millions of tons formerly flowed into the American and British zones from these areas. These sources now contribute nothing.

The British and American armies and civilians are entirely fed from home. The large Russian army is fed upon their zone.

Due to a lack of fertilizers, good seed, farm implements, and skilled labor, the 1946 agricultural production in the American and British zones was about 65 percent of prewar. A generalized appraisal indicates that in the American zone the harvest of 1946 yielded a supply, beyond the needs of the farmers (self-suppliers), equal to about 1,100 calories per day for the non-self-suppliers. The similar supply in the British zone was about 900 calories per day average to the non-self-suppliers. These amounts contrast with 3,000 calories of the prewar normal German consumption.

With the efforts being made to improve agricultural production there is an expected small increase from the harvest of 1947, especially in potatoes (if better seed is provided in time). The steps which I recommend, however, should show greater production from the 1948 harvest.

Food distribution

This terrible winter, with frozen canals and impeded railway traffic, has rendered it impossible to maintain even the present low basis of rationing in many localities. The coal shortage and the consequent lack of heat, even for cooking, has added a multitude of hardships. The conclusions in this report as to the food situation are, however, not based upon the effect of this temporary dislocation, but upon the basic conditions, to which the winter has added many difficulties.

From the food point of view, the population of the combined zones has been divided as below, based upon the German census undertaken last autumn. The table must not be regarded as precise for the different groups, as the Berlin sector was not distributed on the same basis as others. It is, however, accurate enough for food-computation purposes.

Self-suppliers, i. e., farmers and their families	7,640,000
Non-self-suppliers, i. e., urban population:	
Prospective and nursing mothers	660,000
Children, 0–6 years of age	3,070,000
Children, 6–15 years of age	4,495,000
Adolescents, 15–20 years of age	2,100,000
Normal consumers, 20 years up	17,910,000
Moderate hard workers	2,500,000
Heavy workers	1,910,000
Extra heavy workers	720,000
Displaced persons	680,000
Total	34,045,000
Total population, 2 zones	41,685,000

The base ration is 1,550 calories per person per day to the normal-consumer group, with priorities and supplements, as the situation requires or permits, for other groups. For instance, milk and fats are given in priority to nursing mothers and children up to 6 years of age; more food, including more meat, is given in supplement to hard workers, etc.

This basic ration for the normal consumer compares with the minimum temporary maintenance food intake recommended for normal consumers by eminent nutritionists, as follows:

	Present German	Recommended minimum	Present deficiency
			Percent
Carbohydrates..grams..	283	335	16
Fats.....do....	24	45	47
Protein.....do....	52	65	20
Calories.....	1,550	2,000	24

Thus with the deficiency in quantity and in fats, protein and other nutrients, the 1,550 ration is wholly incapable of supporting health of the groups, which do not have supplements.

Nutritional condition of the population

The nutritional condition of the above different groups, irrespective of the immediate consequences of the hard winter, are:

(a) The 7,640,000 self-suppliers are, naturally, in good condition.

(b) The supplements and priorities in special foods given to 3,730,000 prospective and nursing mothers, and children under 6 years of age, appear to be enough to keep them in good condition.

(c) Over half of the 6,595,000 children and adolescents, especially in the lower-income groups, are in a deplorable condition. Their situation is better in limited localities where school feeding has been undertaken but outside these limits stunted growth and delayed development is widespread. In some areas famine edema (actual starvation) is appearing in the children. A study of groups of boys between the ages 9 and 16 years showed 5.5 pounds under minimum standard weights, with girls 5.1 pounds below such standard. Other groups studied showed even worse conditions.

(d) A considerable part of the "normal consumer" group of 17,910,000 is likewise in deplorable condition.

This group comprises the light physical workers and is in large majority women, and many are aged. Some portion of this group are able to supplement the 1,550 calorie ration by purchase of some supplies from the black market, from the free markets in the

vegetable seasons and from package remittances. Some part of this group are too poor to purchase even the 1,550-calorie ration.

In any event, a large part of the group shows a steady loss of weight, vitality, and ability to work. A study in the British zone shows urban adult males over 19 pounds and females nearly 5 pounds under proper weight. A study in the American zone showed from 5 to 20 pounds under proper weight. Famine edema is showing in thousands of cases, stated to be 10,000 in Hamburg alone. The increased death roll among the aged is appalling. In persons over 70 in 3 months last autumn the increase was 40 percent.

(e) While the workers' rations, due to supplements, are perhaps high enough in themselves, yet the universal tendency is for the worker to share his supplement with his wife and children, and therefore it does not have its full effect in supplying energy for the worker himself.

(f) The 680,000 displaced persons are about one-third in the British zone and two-thirds in the United States zone. In the British zone they receive the German ration only. In the United States zone they receive supplements which amount to 700 calories per day, so there can be no doubt as to their adequate supply in that area. In fact, the American ration is above the "normal ration" of the other nations on the continent, except the former neutrals.

These nutritional conclusions are based upon surveys made by Dr. William H. Sebrell, Jr., of the United States Public Health Service, who was a member of my mission. At my request, he also visited Italy, France, Belgium, Holland, and Britain to study the comparative nutritional situations of these countries with that of Germany. He reports that the nutritional condition in those countries is nearly prewar normal, while the special German groups that I have mentioned are not only far below the other nations but disastrously so.

A new program

The Anglo-American bizonal agreement of last autumn calls for an increase of rations by 250 calories per day at some undetermined date. Such an increase is highly desirable. However, the world shortage in cereals, evidenced by the early reduction of bread rations in several other nations, renders such an increase impossible until after the harvest of 1947. Such a program also implies increased import supplies, which, in terms of grain, would add 1,260,000 tons and $136,000,000 annually to costs, above the already huge burden upon the taxpayers of our two nations.

As the present base of 1,550 calories for normal consumers is not enough to maintain health in many children or health and working energy in many adults, I propose a different program. This new approach is to repair the weakest spots in the nutritional situation. I believe that this method will accomplish the major purpose of the proposed general increase in ration as nearly as can be accomplished within the limits of available supplies and finances for the remainder of the fiscal year 1946–47.

In many ways I believe it is a better program, and if this method proves a successful remedy during the next few months, it may modify the necessity of so large an increase in imports in the fiscal year 1947–48 as has been proposed under the bizonal agreement.

There are two groups to which this repair of weakness should be given quickly:

First are the children over 6 years of age and the adolescents. The number of this group who are undernourished is estimated to be about 3,500,000, or more than 50 percent. To cover this group and assure that the food reaches the child, the British in their zone, aided by the Swedish and other charities, are giving a small ration in certain schools. There is no systematic school feeding in the American zone. A system of soup kitchens to provide a hot meal of appropriate body-building foods (meat, fats, milk, etc.) of at least 350 calories daily is imperative for the children in the worst areas of the combined zones if a future Germany of wholesome character is to be created.

In order to start this system at once I recommend using the Army surplus 10-in-1 rations, now en route, and certain excess stocks not adapted to Army feeding and now in control of the American Occupation Forces. These resources can form the major base of this system for a considerable period. This is the more possible as it is proposed to slaughter during 1947 over 5,000,000 head of cattle, hogs, and sheep in order to lessen the animal consumption of ground crops, and a portion of these meats and fats can be applied to this program. These various supplies, together with some minor cereal allotments, should carry the program for 6 months.

The second group demanding immediate relief is the "normal consumer" group of about 17,910,000 persons, now receiving 1,550 calories per day. I strongly recommend several lines of action. (a) A certain portion of them should be advanced to the group of moderate heavy workers and receive the supplement applicable to that category. (b) An emergency supply of cereals should be allotted to the German welfare organizations with which to provide a supplement to families in need and the soup kitchens. (c) I recommend that the aged in the "normal consumers" group, and others where medically certified be issued tickets upon the soup kitchens for the meal of 350 calories per day during the school week, to be consumed either at these kitchens or taken home. These supplemental measures will substantially improve and will at least carry over the most needy part of this group.

By aid to the children and adolescents some pressure will be removed from the "normal consumer" group, who naturally tend to cut their own food to help their children.

In support of the above program for children and "normal rations" I have included in the recommended deficiency appropriation an emergency supply of 65,000 tons of cereals. These measures, as I have said, are in substitution for the great increase otherwise necessary to import for the proposed program of a lift in the whole ration system by 250 calories.

In addition to these measures I have included in the sums given below, which I recommend to be appropriated for the balance of this fiscal year 1946–47, an amount necessary for the shipment of 400,000 tons of surplus potatoes from the United States. The object is twofold.

Due to spoilage during this unprecedented winter and other causes, there are not enough potatoes by 250,000 tons to cover that portion of the minimum 1,550-calorie ration until the next harvest. Certainly we cannot allow the ration to fall below its already dangerous levels.

Of even more importance, most of the potato seed of our zones normally comes from the Polish-annexed area and the Russian zone, and is not available. If we can forward 200,000 to 250,000 tons of good potato seed, with some already in hand, we should be able to assure a yield from the 1947 harvest of 5,000,000 tons and thereby effect some savings in overseas food imports for the fiscal year 1947–48.

Necessary imports and finance

The supply and finance of food and collateral relief imports and the development of exports with which ultimately to pay for these imports has been organized upon the basis of dividing foreign trade into two categories:

Category A covers imports of food, fertilizers, and petroleum products for the civil population. This category is to be paid for by appropriations, and thus one-half by the taxpayers each of the United States and the United Kingdom. It has not been determined whether seeds fall in this group. In my opinion they should be and I have included them in my estimates of supply and cost which appear below.

Category B is under the Joint Export-Import Agency, who regulate the importation of raw materials and the export of coal, some other raw materials and manufactured products. The organization started with a certain working capital and all exports of coal and other commodities are credited to this fund until the exports exceed the raw material imports when the surplus will be applied to the cost of category A. It is hoped that the export surplus will begin to contribute to category A in the last half of 1948 and cover virtually all the cost in the calendar year 1950.

Therefore, the cost of category A for the balance of the 1947 fiscal year, in which a deficiency appropriation is involved, and the whole of the 1948 fiscal year, will fall upon the taxpayers of America and Britain.

Cost and supplies of category A imports for the last half of fiscal year 1946–47

The program of supplies and costs to cover category A for the 6 months from January 1 to July 1, 1947, will appear large compared to the program given later for the whole fiscal year 1947–48. The reasons are that imports were unduly low during the last 6 months of 1946 and the drain on indigenous food unduly large. Also, it is necessary to include the cost of purchases and shipments prior to July 1 so as to provide in June for arrivals in Germany during the period July 1 to August 15, for which appropriations for the 1947–48 fiscal year cannot be available until after July 1. This works to lessen the burden on the fiscal year following that date. I have, as said, included the allotment of 65,000 tons of cereals to support the normal ration group and the potato imports.

The following is the estimated cost for both zones; for the 6 months January 1 to July 1, 1947, in which are included the supplies already shipped for this period:

Cereals (wheat equivalent) 2,505,000 tons	$288,000,000
Other foods, 720,000 tons	54,000,000
Fertilizers	17,500,000
Seeds	12,500,000
Petroleum products (civil population)	12,000,000
Total	384,000,000

The United States contribution of one-half of this is $192,000,000.

What portion of these expenditures are already covered by appropriations and what portion must need be covered by deficiency appropriations is not known to me.

Supplies and costs for fiscal year 1947–48

In considering the supplies and cost of category A for the fiscal year 1947–48, the supplemental supports I have proposed to strengthen the children, adolescents, and "normal ration" group, should undoubtedly carry through these groups until October, especially with the spring and summer produce. Therefore, it will not, in any event, be necessary to increase the general ration by the 250 calories provided in the bizonal agreement until that date. It is my hope that the revised methods by which the weak places in the system are strengthened may partially or wholly avoid this necessity after that date. I have, however, provided in the estimates an item of $62,300,000 for such an increase after October. I have also included in these estimates an enlarged fertilizer and seed program. It is my belief that these latter meas-

ures will greatly lighten the burden on our taxpayers in the fiscal year 1948–49.

The following is my estimate of the supplies and costs needed for the fiscal year 1947–48 covering category A:

Cereals (in terms of wheat) for 1,550 calories level, 2,785,000 tons	$278,500,000
Cereals for "normal consumers" emergency supplemental feeding, 192,000 tons	19,200,000
Child-feeding program (includes special foods), 130,000 tons	35,000,000
Other foods, 450,000 tons	75,000,000
Fertilizers (available)	45,000,000
Seeds	27,000,000
Petroleum products for civil population	25,000,000
	504,700,000
Cost of ration increase to 1,800 calories on or about October 1947	62,300,000
Total	567,000,000

of which the United States share of 50 percent amounts to $283,500,000.

Due to these changes in method, the above program is different from that submitted by the War Department for the fiscal year 1947–48, but the total cost is no greater.

It is my conviction that these appropriations for category A for both the 1946–47 and the 1947–48 fiscal years should have first consideration, even in priority to appropriations for military purposes. The occupational forces cannot be reduced without these assurances of minimum food supply. From the point of view only of maintaining order, the need for these forces is not great if we can meet the food needs. Their size will depend upon other considerations.

Further savings to the taxpayers that can be made

There are ways by which these costs could be reduced, although they are not certain enough to be deducted in advance against appropriations which must now be determined.

1. If these changes in rationing program render the general calory lift unnecessary, there would be a saving of $62,000,000.

2. If through the 1947 deficiency appropriation the seeds are provided in time, there should be substantial additions to the German potato harvest, in relief of 1947–48 expenditures. If the fertilizer and seed recommendations for the fiscal year 1947–48 are accepted, there should be savings by increased indigenous production in the year 1948–49.

3. There would be savings if prices proved lower and if climatic conditions for the indigenous crops turned out exceptionally favorable.

4. The Potsdam Declaration results in Germany having no consequential overseas shipping. If we could effect some temporary operation by German crews of, say 75 Liberty ships, now laid up, to transport food and raw materials, all of the expense could be paid by the Germans in marks, except for fuel, and thus save a very large amount of dollars otherwise coming from the American and British taxpayers. This would probably amount to $40,000,000 per annum.

5. A further saving of possibly several million dollars could be made for the taxpayers if the large American Army return equipment, now being transported at high ocean rates, were sent home on the return voyages of these Liberty ships.

6. There are food surpluses in the control of other nations than ourselves and the British. They comprise possible increased catches of fish in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, which otherwise are little likely to find a market, and some surpluses possible from the South American states. It would seem to me that some supplies could well be furnished by these nations, being repaid as indicated below, pari passu with the British and ourselves.

7. The Germans lost a considerable part of their deep-sea fishing fleet. If more such boats could be found and leased from American surplus small shipping, the fish supply could be greatly increased. The fishing grounds in the Baltic and North Seas are being limited against German fishing. As there are ample supplies of fish in these seas, it seems a pity that, with this food available, British and American taxpayers are called upon to furnish food in substitution for fish the Germans could catch for themselves.

Fish is particularly needed, as the present diet is sadly lacking in protein content.

8. A still further saving to British and American taxpayers is possible if maximum expedition could be made of exports of German manufacture. The Joint Export-Import Agency is doing its best, but such exports are hampered by the lack of coal for manufacture, by trading-with-the-enemy acts, and restrictions on free communication, together with limitations on dealings between buyers and sellers. The restoration of trade is inevitable, and every day's delay in removing these barriers is simply adding to the burden of our taxpayers for relief that could otherwise be paid for in goods. No one can say that in her utterly shattered state Germany is a present economic menace to the world.

Should there be such good fortune as to realize all these possibilities, we could not only increase the food supply to health levels but also lessen the joint costs by $150,000,000 during the fiscal year 1947–48. However, as I have said, I am convinced that the larger sum should be provided for.

German repayment for these outlays

The great sums hitherto spent on relief of the German civilian population from outside Germany's borders, together with those in the future, should not be an irrecoverable expenditure to our two Governments.

I have, therefore, urged upon the American and British authorities that it be announced as a policy and stipulated in all peace arrangements that these expenditures for the relief of the civil population (Category A), past and future, should be made a first charge upon the economy of Germany and repaid from any future net exports from Germany before any payments to other nations of any kind.

At my instance all Allied nations in the First World War agreed that German civilian relief expenditures at that time should be repaid from any liquid assets and ranked ahead of any reparation claims. They were so repaid. The grounds which I advanced at that time are no less valid today. By these relief expenditures we are rebuilding the economy of the German people so that other payments can be made by them. These costs should be a sort of receiver's certificate. If this policy be pursued, these appropriations for relief asked from the Congress and the Parliament can become a recoverable expenditure and not a charity loaded onto our taxpayers. It would seem that a tax upon exports of some percent, to be paid in dollars after July 1, 1949, might be an effective implementation of such a provision.

Organization

I have made certain recommendations to the joint military governments of the two zones as to organization matters, which I believe will improve administration now that bizonal operation, under larger German responsibility, has been undertaken.

Conclusion

It may come as a great shock to American taxpayers that, having won the war over Germany, we are now faced for some years with large expenditures for relief for these people. Indeed, it is something new in human history for the conqueror to undertake.

Whatever the policies might have been that would have avoided this expense, we now are faced with it. And we are faced with it until the export industries of Germany can be sufficiently revived to pay for their food. The first necessity for such a revival is sufficient food upon which to maintain vitality to work.

Entirely aside from any humanitarian feelings for this mass of people, if we want peace, if we want to preserve the safety and health of our army of occupation, if we want to save the expense of even larger military forces to preserve order, if we want to reduce the size and expense of our army of occupation—I can see no other course but to meet the burdens I have here outlined.

Our determination is to establish such a regime in Germany as will prevent forever again the rise of militarism and aggression within these people. But those who believe in vengeance and the punishment of a great mass of Germans not concerned in the Nazi conspiracy can now have no misgivings for all of them—in food, warmth, and shelter—have been sunk to the lowest level known in a hundred years of Western history.

If Western civilization is to survive in Europe it must also survive in Germany. And it must be built into a cooperative member of that civilization. That, indeed, is the hope of any lasting peace.

After all, our flag flies over these people. That flag means something besides military power.

Third-Term Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 28, 1947:

THIRD-TERM BAN

The drive for a constitutional amendment limiting future Presidents to two terms has about it an atmosphere of political immaturity—a suggestion that the inheritors of the best political system in the world lack confidence in the essential foundation of their political structure.

It is probably true that, in the absence of unusual circumstances, the best interests of the country are served when a President does not serve more than two terms. There is nothing magical, of course, about two terms, and it is worth noting that the Senators and Representatives who are supporting the proposed amendment apparently see no inconsistency in having themselves reelected to as many successive terms as possible. Still, in the absence of exceptional conditions, an excellent argument can be made for the proposition that a President should serve two terms at most, and then turn the job over to someone else.

Implicit in this, however, is recognition of the fact that in some future grave emergency the national interests might be served best by continuing a President in office for more than two terms, and the trouble with the proposed amendment is that it would make this virtually impossible. There are those who say that the amendment, if adopted, could always be repealed, but this is an argument which overlooks two things—first the time element, and second the very important fact that a constitutional amendment, once adopted, cannot be repealed except by vote of two-thirds of the States.

Thus a decision which might be vital to all of the people could be controlled by the whims or the procrastination of seventeen States.

The question which should be posed to the sponsors of the amendment is this: Why should we of this generation undertake to tie the hands of our children in any and all circumstances, none of which can be foreseen now? Surely, on the record of our own performance, we have no valid claim to the requisite wisdom. Why not permit them to make their own free decision in the light of conditions which they will have to face and which we cannot possibly anticipate? That is the essence of the democratic process, and we would pay ourselves a highly dubious compliment in undertaking to short-circuit it. This amendment is one which should not pass, and the Star hopes that it will never be written into the Constitution.

Residencies in Naval Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme satisfaction that I learn of a report recently rendered by the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association by the distinguished Dr. M. G. Westmoreland, of the American Medical Association.

The report referred to cites the splendid accomplishment of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy concerning residencies in naval hospitals. The report, among other things, states as follows:

It is clearly evident that more constructive effort has been made by the Navy toward the creation of acceptable residencies than any Federal agency.

I place this report in the RECORD without reflecting on any other agency of the Federal Government. My satisfaction is so pronounced because of the fact that I have been a long time friend of the present Surgeon General of the Navy, Admiral Clifford A. Swanson, and because it is his desire to maintain a splendid standard for his organization and it is his constant effort to improve medicine and surgery in all of its phases throughout the Navy.

In this endeavor, I know he will have the unlimited backing of the Congress.

RESIDENCIES IN NAVAL HOSPITALS

It is clearly evident that more constructive effort has been made by the Navy toward the creation of acceptable residencies than any Federal agency. This new adventure has resulted from the full-time assignment of the Chairman of the Advisory Board of Medical Specialties to organize the details of residency training. The "essentials" of these training programs have been submitted to the entire council staff for criticism and closely parallels the council's essentials. Other full-time assignments to activate this program have included a naval officer who is a diplomate of the Board of Internal Medicine. A group of civilian consultants representing approximately 19 specialties include a dean of a medical school, several members of specialty boards, a consultant from the council, and outstanding diplomates. This group has met several times for guidance and control of the residency program in naval hospitals. In addition, the training branch is in more or less constant correspondence with members of the Board of Consultants for advice.

Local civilian consultants have been appointed before the training program has been activated in a hospital. These local consultants are not limited to officers in the Naval Reserves, but include board members, professors, and local teachers of proven value. The major services will have several local consultants whose duty is to visit the hospital regularly for ward rounds to give organized instruction to the house staff and to guide the Department in the over-all training program. In fact, it is the custom of several of these consultants to take the residents in naval hospitals to their civilian teaching centers for additional rounds, conferences, and other types of specialty instruction. In these major services, such as internal medicine, there are a sufficient number of consultants so that an average of one civilian teacher will be present each weekday for a minimum of 2 hours.

Only a few hospitals will be used for residency training. There are nine major centers where several residency programs will be activated. All but one is located in the same community where a strong medical school is found. A total of six other hospitals will be used for one or a few of the major residencies. To date there are only six of the principal centers that have been activated. Emphasis has been placed on obtaining a sufficient amount of consultation and guidance to guarantee a program that exceeds the essentials and to complete the detail of arrangements for local civilian consultants. Changes in policy are no longer common because of the various items mentioned.

Inspections of 30 of the naval hospitals have been made by the council's staff. Reports are typed and indicate that a wealth of clinical material is available. Conservative recommendations for approval have resulted in acceptance of 70 residencies by both the council and the respective specialty board. In addition, one limited and one principal center remains to be inspected. Changes in the chief of a department and an increase in the quality of teaching material at some of the principal centers will result in additional facilities that can be approved. Thirty-seven residencies in the principal teaching centers have been recommended by the council staff, but have not been cleared by the board. Forty-six residencies in these same centers have been approved by both the council and the respective specialty board.

All of the residency training for naval officers will not be limited to the centers mentioned above. An active interest in outstanding civilian teaching centers has resulted in arrangements for 12-month and shorter courses. Last July there were over 40 commitments for one or more naval officers to receive 12 months of training in designated specialties at such locations as Massachusetts General Hospital, Lahey Clinic, Harvard University, New York Hospital, Memorial Hospital, Bellevue Hospital, University of Pennsylvania, Jefferson Hospital, Johns Hopkins University, Duke University, Northwestern University, Washington University, University of Iowa, Mayo Clinic, University of California, and several others. Additional commitments have been made since July by equally outstanding civilian teaching centers; also, a variety of civilian short courses of less than 12 months have designated that enrollments will be kept open for naval officers. More than 85 medical officers are currently enrolled in 6- to 12-montl. courses in renowned civilian centers.

Several of the other hospitals that have been inspected will be used for a short period to furnish refresher instruction. Appointments to duty under instruction in this fashion will not carry board credit but like the short courses in civilian centers can act as a buffer for physicians who are selected for residency training but must be assigned until a vacancy occurs in an activated and approved program.

Variety of teaching material is also distinctive of Navy hospitals. In addition to the service-connected disabilities and the common ailments of such a large number of personnel there is a huge volume of teaching material derived from veterans of previous wars. Shipyard workers and other employees furnish a variety of degenerative disease and industrial medicine for a broader educational program. Apparently the Navy hospitals are the only Federal units where a sufficient volume of teaching material is found in pediatrics, gynecology, and obstetrics to justify separate residencies in these specialties. Medical officers on other services will gain experience in differential diagnosis and in the care of these patients throughout consultation and referrals as is common in large civilian hospitals.

The items mentioned in this report are distinctive of the Navy program. Other agencies have either not developed along these lines or have done so only recently and are still in a stage of flux wherein changes of policy are both common and sudden. The progressive improvements and the enormous amount of on-the-scene consultation coupled with the fact that a stabilized program has evolved are highly commendable and should be considered favorably.

IMPORTANT FACTS CHARACTERISTIC OF NAVAL RESIDENCIES

Principal teaching centers: Bethesda, Md.; Chelsea, Mass.; Great Lakes, Ill.; Houston, Tex.; Long Beach, Calif.; Oakland, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa.; St. Albans, N. Y.; and San Diego, Calif.

Limited residency instruction will be activated at Annapolis, Md. (obstetrics-gynecology); Corona, Calif. (tuberculosis, medical surgery, obstetrics-gynecology); Norfolk, Va. (obstetrics-gynecology); Portsmouth, Va. (medical surgery, obstetrics-gynecology); and Brooklyn, N. Y. (pathology, obstetrics-gynecology, surgery, medicine).

Residencies have begun at Philadelphia, St. Albans, Chelsea, and Oakland, while at Long Beach and Bethesda problems are being solved which will insure good residency training.

Examples of local consultants (internal medicine is used for these examples): Philadelphia, Drs. Kern, Crane, Pote, Crellin, and Willard. Jefferson Medical School will be used for basic science instruction. St. Albans, Lrs. Messinger, Block, and Douglas; New York University for basic sciences. Chelsea, Drs. Sprague, Brailey, Burrage, McGuinn, Hogt, and Norcross. Oakland, Drs. Kinsell, Rosenbloom, and Crenshaw. Additional appointments are contemplated. Eleven other local appointments have already been made at other teaching centers, even though the residency program has not yet been activated. These include deans, professors, and outstanding specialists.

National consultants representing all specialties and the council have met several times to guide the policies on residency training. Essentials for residency training in the Navy closely follow the essentials for the council. Total of 202 residents will be trained in all specialties each year; only 145 have been appointed this year. Forty-six residences in the principal centers have been approved by the council and the boards. Thirty-seven other recommendations have been made by the council.

The scope of teaching material includes all age groups. (Pediatric residences have been recommended for approval after they were investigated, and the large number of veterans from World War I insures adequate

teaching material in the older groups.) Both sexes are represented. Several obstetrics and gynecology programs have been accepted by both the board and council.

M. G. WESTMORELAND, M. D.

Address of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, before the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, in Philadelphia, on Tuesday, February 25. The Speaker, in one of the most excellent addresses of his career outlined a legislative program for this, the Eightieth Congress, and expressed his confidence that this Congress would make history by passing legislation which would put the United States of America on its feet again.

Mr. Chairman, Governor Duff, Mayor Samuels, Senator Martin, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, I am glad to share the speaking program with your splendid, able, and progressive Governor Duff and your distinguished Senator MARTIN, who in a few brief weeks has made a fine impression upon his colleagues for his ability and good common sense. I am pleased to see here this fine big delegation of Republican Congressmen from Pennsylvania, who through their sturdy support of sound Americanism are making a notable contribution to putting America back on the right track.

I am pleased to be able to bring a message from the National House of Representatives which I believe will give you courage and strength in helping to put America on the track to happier and better days. A united Republican membership is determined that it will keep faith with the American people and restore sanity, honesty, and sincerity in our National Government.

Our program for the session is an ambitious one. We shall take the government out of the peoples' hair by striking off the shackles of bureaucracy which hold the American people in bondage and restricts the freedom of action which is necessary if we are to have an expanding economy. It is our purpose to return America to solvency and sanity in government.

We face in this Nation today certain conditions which we must examine very closely.

We are now in our thirteenth year of a desperate drive by subversionists to destroy our American system of economy and of government. They would set up a centralized government, with a false form of constitutionality, and the heart and purpose of a communistic or fascistic despotism.

This drive to destroy our American system of government, economy, and society is still under way.

Many well-meaning people are misled by the communistic propaganda. They take part in attacks on the Congress and unwittingly aid the effort to destroy the confidence of the people in the stability and efficiency of our American Government.

The Eightieth Congress is less than 2 months old.

It was organized, for the first time in our history, under a reorganization plan. You know the outlines of that plan. Necessity and wisdom required the organization to proceed with care.

Notwithstanding these handicaps, we have done a good job of reorganization and are now ready to act expeditiously upon the legislative program.

Yet before committees were organized, some people were demanding the Congress lay down an exact, detailed blueprint of where the Congress will reduce appropriations; of how much, and where, it will reduce taxes; exactly what kind of labor legislation it will pass; what changes will be made in foreign policy, and so on. These attacks, for the most part, were politically inspired by those who do not wish us to succeed. They are headed for disappointment. We will succeed in our program, and it will be a program which the people will like.

The election of a Republican Congress did not automatically solve every problem. There are no push-button solutions.

Any leadership attempting such rash, ill-advised legislative action as demanded by those trying to needle the Eightieth Congress, would not be worthy of the confidence of this Nation.

The very people making these demands for haphazard haste would be the first to criticize the Eightieth Congress if it attempted to legislate with any such speed as they demand.

The Eightieth Congress is going to legislate with all speed possible; but it will not be stampeded into legislating rashly, and blindly. We shall try to legislate wisely and well.

The United States of America is today an island in the rising sea of terrorism. There is a dangerous trend toward statism everywhere.

The most reactionary doctrine ever promulgated is the political cult of a ruling class. Whether it is called a dictatorship of the proletariat, fascism, or socialism, it is still part and parcel of the ancient practice of despotism, which does not set men free, but enslaves them.

This spirit of despotism is a cold, ruthless, cunning, determined movement to deceive and enslave the people of the world. It is engineered and managed by men of evil intent. They are moved by an insatiable lust for power over their fellow men. They are willing to sink civilization into the pits of ignorance and terrorism to satisfy their lust for power.

This evil spirit of dictatorship operated through the most clever misrepresentation, and false promises, ever devised by any group of men.

For 13 years the promoters of state socialism have had the opportunity to snarl up our Federal Government and tangle the affairs of the American people. It will take more than a few weeks to undo what they have done. It will require wisdom, patience, and restraint.

Only a fearless, determined spirit of freedom can defeat the spread of compulsory government which threatens to enslave the peoples of the world.

Those who defame our American system falsify every fact of history. They do not want to admit the miracles of progress in peace and defense in war which we have accomplished in our American way.

Those who seek to destroy America use many techniques.

They try to concentrate power in the hands of the Federal Government and to enable their wreckers in the bureaus to strangle, first, the small community industries and businesses, and second, the bigger business, through a multiplicity of controls. They almost succeeded. I do not have to remind you how they crippled industry, and agriculture, and the retail establishments of this Nation with those regulations. Indeed, I hesitate to recall to you the painful memories of those days in which beef producers were advised from Washington not to slaughter any more "female steers." And that sage advice that farmers take the shoes off their horses each night to save wear—or perhaps it was to change the shoes on the horse's feet from time to time to even up the wear like automobile tires.

Another approach to cripple business was a drive to destroy all rights vested in patents.

Our patent system was devised by the founding fathers to encourage inventive diligence to create more and better things for the people—all the people.

Every home in America including the poorest—has numerous comforts provided by the inventive diligence and the productive capacity of our Nation.

If the Communists and their fellow-travelers could have the Government take over patents and divest inventors of the fruits of their eager and arduous labors, then the inspiration for inventive talent and effort to produce would be destroyed.

There have also been determined attempts to destroy scientific research rights. Every individual in this Nation is the beneficiary, in both necessities and luxuries, of long, expensive scientific research. Such research must be carried on by aggregations of capital, not possible for individuals or small companies. Scientific formulas and trade-marks must be properly protected.

Still another method by which supervisionists try to strangle business initiative is in striving to destroy vested interests in national brands.

Manufacturers of ability and foresight put fine quality into their products. By skillful management of production they reduce prices to the minimum and secure markets which will absorb their brands of goods year after year. If the enemies of our free economy could kill special brands, and standardize all labels, they could destroy all the benefits reaped by the people from these efforts of industry to excel in quality, and in economy of production and lower prices.

All of these moves are to freeze all incentive for venture capital to go into the business of production. No sensible man or woman would put money into business without hope of getting it back, or of getting a reasonable profit.

Right here are also involved deficit spending; governmental waste; staggering national debt; high taxes; and the constant anvil chorus over the radio, and in certain sections of the press, to defame business.

If the national debt can be increased; if governmental extravagances can be multiplied by the bureaucrats; and if taxes can be kept heavy enough to destroy the chance of a fair profit return on investments, venture capital will not enter the field of experimentation, research, and production.

In such case, the Government would have to finance all business, big and little. That is exactly what the enemies of our American system want.

The small community industry feels the impact of such a hostile policy first. The scheme of the Communists and their associates is to destroy the independence of small business; the small press; small agriculture; and of labor. They would then proceed to make a mass assault on bigger business and wreck it quickly.

If the Government financed business it would have to control business. It would have to impress into economic servitude all workers; all professions; everybody—under governmental decrees.

The American people—farmers—industrial workers—white collar workers—professional people—all want to remain free. They will not tolerate being told by an arrogant political bureaucracy at Washington where to

work, what to produce, what pay they may receive, where and how to live, think and vote.

The young men and women of America want no such Governmental control of business. Those who braved the horrors of the front lines, and those who labored on the home front, want a chance to develop their own opportunities. Those who are gifted for scientific research, or for business careers, or who seek better jobs at better wages, prefer to take their chances of succeeding under the American system. They know that under totalitarian Government they have no chance at all except to do what some bureaucrat overlord might order them to do. Free Americans want no Government bosses under political paternalism. They want freedom of action in a fair field—and that we propose to give them. We must not close the door to opportunity for American youth.

For 13 years, and more, those who would destroy and then loot this grand Nation of ours have shouted that success was something to be condemned. Success is to be desired. Failure has been held up as some kind of a virtue. Failure is not desirable.

Reasonable profits are the fair wages of venture capital invested in production.

Management's salaries are the reasonable wages of men and women who know how to manage plants and market products.

Plant and tools are the means by which the wage earners produce. But we must not forget, wage earners, farmers, professional people, management, and people with capital, all are consumers.

Another method by which this country could be wrecked is by fomenting irresponsible strikes resulting in stoppages of production. Some of the communistic schemers and their unwitting allies have actually gone to the point of asserting the right to strike against the Government itself in time of war. There exists no right to strike against the Government by anybody at any time. It cannot be tolerated.

Jurisdictional strikes, wildcat strikes, strikes based upon utterly unreasonable demands cannot be tolerated. This is especially true in essential industries and services where the welfare of whole communities or the entire Nation is put in jeopardy. These operations must continue while disputes are being settled. The right of collective bargaining is essential. It must also be fair and responsible on both sides. The right to strike is essential—but it must not be distorted into license to endanger entire cities, or the Nation.

Farmers and wage earners should and must receive every dollar of revenue and wages possible, consistent with a sound and prosperous economy. Farmers and wage earners cannot exist in any other kind of an economy, except as paupers.

Production and more production, lower prices and still lower prices, better quality, and still better quality, are the guideposts on our highroad back to national peacetime prosperity.

More production, lower prices and better quality, increase all real income. They benefit every man, woman, and child in the Nation without penalizing anyone.

It is to that end we intend to stop bureaucratic squandering of the peoples' money; to balance the budget; to reduce taxes; and to reduce the national debt.

It is to that end we intend to demand sound foreign policies not detrimental to our domestic welfare.

We know the welfare of America rests upon a sound and prosperous agriculture, a sound and prosperous industry, and a prosperous and satisfied citizenry.

World conditions today require America to maintain an invincible national defense. That national defense rests not alone upon armies and navies. Our armed forces must be equipped with the most modern, powerful, offensive and defensive weapons known. But equally as important is a home line of defense composed of citizens who so love liberty, who are so thoroughly satisfied with their American way of life, and with their Government they will rise up and defeat any enemy, from without or within, who tries to change their way of life or wreck their Government.

Contented citizens never revolt.

Good plants, good tools, good transportation, good communication, good business management, good labor leadership, good wages, are the invincible weapons of the defense lines on the home front.

In 160 years our American system has proved to be far and away the finest system of government, economy, and society ever devised by man.

Nowhere in the world do people live so well, so securely, and so happily as in the United States.

People all over the the Nation are looking to Washington for action. I promise you that action. The Congress knows the problems of every American citizen have been complicated beyond reason by follies of the Federal Government.

Some of the problems we intend to solve are:

1. To stop communism or fascism and restore Americanism.
2. To stimulate greatly increased production at lower prices.
3. To encourage healthy business activity free from constant political attack.
4. To achieve a basis for industrial harmony under fair laws requiring equal responsibility between labor and management.
5. To effect economies and reduce waste in the Federal Government.
6. To begin a program of debt retirement.
7. To free the individual from excessive taxation and governmental interference.

There are other pressing problems. These I have enumerated are well out in front of our program for real Americanism.

The House of Representatives last week voted as an earnest of its effort to put our governmental finances in order a goal to cut the budget of President Truman by $6,000,000,000. This is a worth-while effort. We must save every possible dollar if we are to keep America solvent.

If this country cannot make an important stride to readjust its finances now, it is a serious question if it can ever be done. Today we have a large volume of income; employment is good. To say that we cannot drastically reduce the swollen peacetime budget presented by the administration would be a confession that we do not have the courage to do the job which must be done to keep America solvent. An America which could win the World War must have the courage to win the war to keep this country the land of opportunity.

Business, large and small, must be free to serve. It is the intention of the Eightieth Congress to make that possible. But business will not be free to serve unless we first recognize that business includes in its scope the activities of most of the American people. Government policy must be framed accordingly.

Business is not a privileged few. It includes the farmer. It includes the professional man and woman. It includes the specialist, and the skilled worker. It includes the managers even though they be listed as employees. It includes all white-collar workers. It includes the holder of a life-insurance policy, or a share of stock, or a bond, or a mortgage, or a piece of property. Business is the activity of living, and of filling human needs. Business is serving. Business is investing. Business is insuring, and saving, and providing for the future. The rewards of business are the rewards of the people, and must not be subject to constant attack and depletion by government.

Business people are great moulders of public opinion in their respective fields. You can make a great contribution to your Nation's welfare by taking the offensive and striking from the shoulder against these Communists and Fascists who seek to destroy our American system.

While you do that in your home communities, the Eightieth Congress at Washington will see to it waste is decreased, and efficiency increased, in your Government; the budget will be balanced; deficit spending will be stopped; taxes will be reduced in the way to render the greatest good to the Nation.

Governor Duff has wisely stressed the need of returning many activities from the Nation to the State and from the States to the municipalities. I say if this can be done the people could look forward to greater tax reduction.

America must be kept safe, sound, solvent and secure. This can be done. With the support of the millions of true Americans who believe in our principles and who want America to continue to be the beacon of hope and freedom for all mankind—it will be done. We in Congress plead for the cooperation of all who believe in America to help us in our efforts.

Repeal Also Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the country was astounded to learn from the testimony recently taken before the Committee on the District of Columbia regarding the drinking of alcoholic beverages here in the city.

As a part of my remarks I include herein a recent editorial from my home town newspaper which ought to arouse the entire country on the temperance question:

REPEAL ALSO FAILS

Part of the hue and cry that brought the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the end of prohibition was that it would reduce drinking.

For the past 13 years we have been giving that claim a test, and it is not holding.

All figures now available show that there is far more drinking now than during the prohibition era and that the rate of consumption is increasing.

According to the American Businessmen's Research Foundation, the consumption per capita in 1945 was 20.25 gallons as against 7.93 gallons per capita in 1930, when the dry amendment was in effect.

In 1934, 1 year after repeal, the amount of liquor drunk per capita was up to 10.53 gallons; in 1935 it was 12.05, and, as we've just said, it reached 20.25 in 1945. Figures for 1946, not yet available, indicate even greater consumption.

In other words, there has been an increase in drinking since 1934 of 81.5 percent.

Another claim that ardent repealists made in urging the restoration of legal liquor was that there would be no saloons. Today there are more than 400,000, many of which are politely called taverns. Such spots, as far as offering places for crime breeding, are the same as saloons.

FBI figures reveal an increase in the number of arrests for drunkenness. The number of accidents, especially highway, due to liquor, is far greater.

It was also claimed that legalizing liquor would reduce taxes. The facts refute that, according to the foundation which sets forth that in addition to a heavier burden in taxes, entirely aside from war-bred increases, for each $1 of levy on liquor there has been a diversion of some $5 from legitimate and productive business.

The repealists, in fighting prohibition, loudly asserted that the dry amendment had not solved the matter.

The Nation's drys can now say with equal right that repeal has also failed to solve it and go further to show that conditions are even worse.

American Lithuanian Council, Lake County, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have called the attention of Congress to the unfortunate situation involving self-government for small European countries.

The people of Lithuanian descent in the great Calumet region of Indiana, along with the Americans who are familiar with the true situation, are justly protesting the present domination of Lithuania by outside influences. The principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" which were the great incentive for our fighting men are denied the people of Lithuania.

I wish to incorporate in my remarks a letter received from Albert G. Vinick and George M. Dubickas, chairman and secretary of the American Lithuanian Council of Lake County, which further elaborates upon the present position of that unfortunate country. Our Government should act through the United Nations organization to rectify this injustice.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
Lake County, Ind., February 20, 1947.
The Honorable RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Lithuanians of Lake County, Ind., gathered at the observance of the twenty-ninth anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, held at St. Casimir's Parish Auditorium on Sunday February 16, 1947, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council, of Lake County, Ind., after due deliberations regarding the international situation prevailing in Europe after the military victory, take note of the following:

The Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" held out the promise of freedom, happiness, and justice to the peoples of Nazi-enslaved Europe. This promise was eagerly accepted as a binding contract by the enslaved peoples. Anti-Nazi resistance movements were formed, and the instructions by the radio voice of America were scrupulously followed and carried out by the underground, including the exceptionally well-coordinated supreme Lithuanian committee of liberation.

These principles were written into the initial Declaration of United Nations of January 1942. Several declarations to liberated European peoples made jointly by the heads of state of the Big Three Powers seemed to carry out these promises.

Following the military victory, however, the Asiatic peoples of the Philippines, India, Indonesia, Burma, Indochina, Syria, Lebanon, and Korea are the only beneficiaries of the Atlantic Charter which was originally intended for European peoples. The "liberated" peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania are, in fact, subjected to systematic mass extermination and deportations of the indigenous Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian populations.

At the same time, masses of political refugees from the Baltic states and Poland are subjected to a regime of moral and physical terror and oppression at the hands of the UNRRA with the assistance of the American occupation forces, which are left unguided in consequence of the uncertainty, wavering, and continual confusion created by conflicting directives. While Russian and Russian satellite delegates to the United Nations debate and deride human rights, the victorious democracies lack the courage to look squarely at the facts and to demand the restoration of freedom of the Baltic peoples. Of all the war-ravaged countries, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were and are alone denied any and all relief and rehabilitation assistance by UNRRA, which is paid for by the people of the United States. The principles of justice and the Atlantic Charter are absent from the so-called peace treaties dictated by Russia.

Lithuania, the immediate neighbor of Germany, and Latvia, and Estonia, likewise vitally interested in the settlement of peace for Germany, were thus far excluded from the preliminary negotiations regarding the peace treaty for Germany. The forthcoming Moscow Conference on Germany likewise excludes any and all representation for the Baltic peoples, although both the Democratic administration and the Republican Party are committed to the defense of the restoration of the political sovereignty and freedom for the Baltic states.

Wherefore, we demand that the President and the Secretary of State guide the foreign policy of this country back to the principles of justice and the Atlantic Charter;

That the Moscow conference be limited to preliminary discussions with no commitments binding the United States;

That the United States demand forthwith the withdrawal of the Russian occupation armies, NKVD-MVD terrorist police, and Communist Party forces from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and lend assistance to the peoples of the Baltic states, if requested by the accredited legitimate diplomatic agents of those countries, in restoring the political sovereignty and interim regimes of those countries.

Furthermore, take note of the 1-day hunger strike by Baltic political refugees on the opening day of the Moscow conference. We will join them on March 10, 1947, in a day of fasting and prayers and will remind the hardened consciences of today's masters of the world of their grave moral responsibility.

Finally, we ask the United States Senate to deny ratification of the Russian-dictated oppressive peace treaties signed in Paris on February 10, 1947, and to refuse to join the proposed international refugee organization, which embodies oppressive constitutional provisions. Baltic and Polish refugee communities are fully qualified to administer their affairs without the aid of any intermediary agency infested with the agents of the Russian NKVD, and that aid by the American army of occupation in Germany may be rendered directly to the refugee communities.

ALBERT G. VUNICK,
Chairman.
GEORGE M. DUBICKAS,
Secretary.

Resistance to the Budget Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, handicapped by the Reorganization Act, has made a greater progress since it met on January 3, 1947, than any other Congress for more than a quarter of a century. It has not only been hindered by the detailed requirements of the Reorganization Act, but it has had every obstruction possible from the minority, which has been so long inoculated with the spending and waste virus, and also has been confronted with departmental resistance to the cutting of any of their expenses, thus making the task a monumental one.

Mr. George E. Sokolsky has developed some figures which are very interesting and applicable to the point under discussion. I am inserting under unanimous consent as part of my remarks his figures which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of February 28, 1947:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

It seems to be generally assumed that the estimated cut in the budget of $6,000,000,000 or of $4,500,000,000 means something. Those are tentative figures required by the Reorganization Act but which are binding upon nobody, not even as an estimate or a promise.

Obviously, no Congress could pass a budget between January 3 and February 15 unless it accepted the Presidential estimate as is. The Presidential estimate is based upon departmental estimates as passed by the Budget Bureau and are inevitably high.

Most departments ask for much more than they will get to bulwark their actual requirements. This process is as old as the hills and every son has tried it on his old man.

Therefore, it should surprise no one that the departments, bureaus, and offices try to work it on Congress.

In an older and saner period of our history, Congress often sought to please everybody by spending other people's money and the President was the conservative grandfather who watched the Treasury. As Mr. Roosevelt was by nature profligate with public funds and as he had adopted the Hopkins theory that a nation can spend itself into prosperity, the roles were reversed and Congress showed some regard for Providence and thrift—but not too much.

The national budgetary expenditures of the American people rose in an amazing spiral:

Expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts	
1932	$4,947,000,000
1936	9,068,000,000
1940	9,127,000,000
1941	12,774,000,000
1942	32,491,000,000
1945	100,404,000,000
1947	[1] 37,500,000,000

[1] Presidential estimate.

It is interesting but not significant to compare these figures, say, with the expenditures for—

1912	$689,881,000
1922	3,795,000,000

I should like to present another important and significant figure:

In 1929, the total national income was $83,326,000,000; the expenditures of the Federal Government amounted to $3,848,000,000, or more than 4.6 percent. In 1940, before we went to war, the total national income was $77,574,000,000 while the expenditures of Government vere $9,127,000,000, or more than 11.7 percent. In 1945, a war year, the national income was $160,983,000,000 and the expenditures were $100,404,000,000, or more than 62 percent.

Similarly, the public debt rose. In 1929, the Federal debt was $17,500,000,000; in 1940, it was $53,500,000,000; in 1945, it has risen to $280,800,000,000.

It is only natural and usual for every department of government to demand as much money as it received the year before, if not more. Bureaucrats and politicians do not vote themselves out of jobs. Rare, indeed, is the man who is prepared to say, "My work is done. Abolish my office." The Army and Navy always face prospective enemies, as they should, to keep in trim, and they always want more money.

Few Government agencies, including the Army and Navy, are efficient. Few of them demand that an employee do a day's work for a day's pay.

Few of them are provident in the expenditures for supplies. Few of them can justify the expenditure of every dollar they receive by approved methods of accountancy.

We could afford profligacy in Government when we were a rich country, that is, when the ratio between national income and Government expenditures was such that the citizen found taxes not burdensome and could save, out of his earnings, sufficient for his own improvement. That is no longer true. The Government is loaded down with debt which is a burden upon the people; the individual citizen is loaded down with taxes which are an impediment to national efficiency and productivity.

This is a time for economy, where economy will not interfere with effective national defense and the essential services of Government. Waste is neither effective nor essential. Waste knows no justification. Waste is an insult to the intelligence of the taxpayer and an admission of incompetence by the wastrel.

If the present Congress eliminates waste, abolishes the useless, kills off the obsolescent, cuts out the inefficient, and makes Government a competent rather than a profligate agency of the people, the budget can be cut by many billions. Congress has until July 1 to do that job and ought to do it drastically.

Freedom, Progress, and the Preservation of the American Way of Life Must Be Our Objectives

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, at a Lincoln Day gathering of North Carolina Republicans held at Winston-Salem, on Saturday, February 15, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to come to this splendid gathering of men and women who are loyally supporting the Republican program of putting this country back on the American track. I am pleased to share the speaking program with my good friend, the former Congresswoman from Connecticut, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce. Her voluntary retirement from Congress was a great loss to our party and to our country. It is gratifying to see she is still active in helping America solve the many difficult problems of national and world-wide importance.

As we gather here tonight to pay honor to the memory of one of America's immortal sons—Abraham Lincoln—we are saddened by the passing of former Gov. O. Max Gardner, one of North Carolina's great political leaders and one whom I was privileged to call a personal friend. He was struck down on the eve of his sailing to his new post as American Ambassador at the Court of St. James's, where it was expected he would render a high service to the Nation.

Max Gardner was an outstanding American; a man who devoted many years of his life to public service. Had he remained among us he would have gone on to still greater honors in his career of public service. May he find peace and rest.

Abraham Lincoln had two outstanding traits of character which grew broader and deeper until they became the most notable of his qualities: They were his profound faith in the power of right and his patience and firmness when beset by grave and pressing problems.

Lincoln always refused to be stampeded into action before he had studied his problem through; and he never yielded to any personal impulse of resentment, or the urging of some of his advisers to act in malice. His policies were always directed toward the welfare of his country and never to advance himself. His goals were the common good and never narrow partisan advantage.

The bitterness and strife which in his day divided this Nation have—thank God—long been healed. The sons of the South, fighting shoulder to shoulder with the sons of the North, have in more than one war laid down their lives, or borne wounds and suffering, in the cause of their common ideals and their beloved country.

Today we are one people—a Nation undivided—of free men and women. The greatest contribution the South can make, not only to its own welfare but to the national good as well, would be to have two strong political parties. The South has long been retarded because of its one-party monopoly. You of North Carolina have a rare opportunity to lead the movement to lift the South to greater influence in the Nation.

Abraham Lincoln was the founder of the Republican Party. The inspiration of his life and character belongs to the whole Nation.

Lincoln felt his ideals; he lived his principles. In the plain, simple language of the people, he stated them profoundly and persuasively. His homely phrases probably have done more to keep before us the basic principles of free government—"of the people, by the people, for the people"—than all the books on the theory of government ever written.

Lincoln firmly believed our Government's proper and constitutional function is to preserve the liberties of its citizens—not to pander to the selfish wants of any single group, or be a brake on the Nation's economic life.

At Gettysburg in '63 Lincoln declared we were testing whether our Nation, or any nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to freedom could long endure.

Again today, at the end of the most terrible war in history, we are testing in America whether our Nation, conceived in liberty, and equality of opportunity, can long endure.

Our solutions of our problems will have world-wide effect. They will determine whether liberty or tyranny is finally to follow the heroic sacrifices of our own—and of those of other countries—who, through the years, have laid their all upon the altar of freedom.

Upon the new Republican Congress has devolved a grave responsibility to correct errors which, if not checked, will surely destroy our system of free government.

The tendency inherent in all governments is constantly to encroach upon the liberties of the people. Governments seek more and more power for themselves. They impose higher and higher taxes with which to pay for their extravagances and to maintain themselves in power. When governments in the past have gone too far in depriving the people of their liberties, or have imposed taxes too great for them to bear, the people moved to remedy the situation—even though the only remedy available to them was rebellion. The Eightieth Congress will secure this relief for our people the easier way—by legislation. That is one of the great blessings of our American system.

I think this is an appropriate occasion for me to make some observations concerning the Congress and the problems it faces.

Our opponents spent more than 14 years getting the country into the fix it is in, and now they insist that we must lay down an exact blueprint of detailed remedies in less than 6 weeks. Well—that is an unintentional compliment to our Republican governmental capacity, perhaps, but we don't intend to be stampeded into unwise or ill-considered action. We intend to move as fast as possible consistent with wise and well-considered legislation.

We promised a reduction in Government spending. There is going to be a reduction—a big reduction in Government spending. It will be cut to the bone in every activity. Just where, in what of the scores of different departments, bureaus, and commissions these cuts are to be made is being developed by investigations into the functions and activities of those agencies which have for so long been screened from the view of the taxpayers. Committees of the House and the Senate are at work on those problems now.

An essential part of the program of the Eightieth Congress is the balancing of the budget. To achieve a balanced budget the first step is to cut out all useless spending, big sums and the many little wastes which go to make up the big sums. The whole problem is, of course, the task of the proper committees of the House and the Senate. It is a problem requiring weeks of intensive study, long hearings, and carefully calculated conclusions. No reasonable person expects otherwise.

The Republican Congress is pledged to the paramount and undeviating purposes of cutting the budget to the last possible dollar, by forcing efficiency to replace waste and extravagance; of balancing the budget; of beginning payments on the national debt; and of reducing taxes. The Republicans have not the slightest intention of turning away from these firm purposes.

We intend to begin payments on our enormous national debt. We must—and we will—reverse the trend of the last decade and a half of going deeper and deeper into debt, and begin to pull the Nation out of debt. That can be done by greater economy in every department of the Government by maintaining a high national income, while, at the same time we can reduce taxes, and attain full production to bring down prices and improve quality.

This program is entirely feasible in our Nation. What we need most is the will to do it.

Taxes will be reduced. They will be reduced in such ways as will be most beneficial to the Nation, to all the people, and most powerfully to promote the earliest return to peacetime prosperity.

Our tax burdens must not continue to grow unchecked, as they have the past several

years. We must not permit the Government to feed on excessive taxes, continue to expand its powers, and impose more and more costly controls upon us.

Fortunately, we now have a Congress firmly determined to relieve the taxpayers of some of their tremendous burden—the greatest tax burden in our history. We have a Congress determined to eliminate unnecessary functions in the Government, and to demand efficiency and economy in administration.

Let us consider for a moment why our taxes are so high. The national debt is many times what it was a few years ago. The cost of the war was terrific, but you will remember taxes were high and the national debt was mounting skyward long before we were plunged into the war. Why?

The answer is simple. The implications are profound. Taxes rose and the debt mounted beyond all reason because the Nation abandoned, for a time, a fundamental principle laid down by the men who founded our Republic—the principle that this should be a government of laws, and not a government by men.

For more than a dozen years, the Congress surrendered much of its power to the Executive. In large part Congress delegated its constitutional duties to the executive departments. Our Federal Government, therefore, became all too much a government by men—the men in the administration—and ceased to be a government of laws enacted by the people's representatives. Over those years more than 76,000 departmental regulations having the force and effect of laws were issued by the bureaucrats. Many of them are still in effect—how many we do not know. We mean to find out. There was, during those years, little inclination on the part of the party in power to check the tendency of the Executive to add new functions—therefore new agencies and bureaus—therefore higher taxes to maintain them.

We face today a national debt of $259,000,000,000—more than $1,800 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Figure that out for a minute. Every single man and woman in this Nation owes, as an individual share of the Federal debt—beside all other personal obligations the sum of $1,800. Every family of four is in debt through the spending of your Federal Government the sum of $7,200. And remember, that figure does not include any part of the State, county, or municipal debts.

Is it any wonder taxes are crushing—that we meet them in prices, in income, everywhere?

One of the most important obligations facing the new Republican Congress, therefore, is to give the country relief from its tremendous burden of taxation by cutting expenditures. And Congress is going to do that. We shall carefully, intelligently, examine the entire Federal Government and determine what of its functions are useful, and what are not worth their cost to the country. We mean to find what functions or powers can be done better and cheaper by the States, by counties, or by municipalities, and to return those functions and powers to them. Yes, and what can be done better by private business, and private groups, or individuals, will be returned to them. Every Federal Government activity will at last have to prove it is worth its keep.

The Federal Government has got to learn to live within its budget.

The money so saved in Government operations will help everyone. It will help reduce personal income taxes; to give relief to business where heavy taxes are slowing up production and keeping business from making jobs for the people; to reduce the national debt; and leave us more money for national defense.

The exact details of those tax reductions will be worked out by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the corresponding committee in the Senate. That is what those committees are for. The plan for tax reduction will be a studied, scientific, carefully considered plan which will give the best and broadest results.

The only way to raise our standards of living is to produce more of the things we want and need. Heavy taxes are a brake upon production. But taxes are not the only brake. There are others. Chief among them is the present confused state of management-labor relationships. We must find better ways of dealing with those industrial disputes which retard or stop production and injure our whole economy.

The Nation was promised legislative action to promote better labor-management relations, and to protect the innocent public from unmerited and unnecessary hardships. There will be such legislative action. It is being worked out carefully and with full hearings and investigations by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

We shall enact intelligent legislation to hold both labor and management to full responsibility for their contracts and agreements.

Light, heat, water, power, communications, transportation—each is vitally essential to our orderly economy. To be deprived of one for even a short while results in discomfort, if not danger and suffering, to the innocent public, and injures every businessman and every worker wherever he may be.

We can have a vastly increased output of goods and services if both the men of management and the men of labor, working in harmony, give their individual and collective best to their jobs.

Industry and labor, for mutual advantage, utilizing modern methods, can increase production and reduce costs without increasing the hours of work or reducing wages.

A stable economy requires labor and agriculture to have the highest wages and revenues possible under sound practice. Business should have reasonable profits. The public must have minimum prices and maximum quality. All this is entirely possible in America. Free competition—in a free market—with full production will rapidly reduce prices to proper levels and at the same time give us more in goods and services of better quality for every dollar we spend.

There are great readjustments which have to be made both in Government and in industry. But with determination, with energy, with the American know-how to get things done, we shall succeed in again putting our country on the high road to prosperity and plenty.

The Nation was promised the confusion, secrecy and conniving in our foreign relations would be remedied. They will be remedied. We intend the American people shall know what is going on; to what they have been committed in the secret conferences which were held.

We in America cannot—we dare not—tolerate the forces which are working for the overthrow of our American system of constitutional government, free enterprise, and free society. Don't let anyone tell you that such subversionists are not active in America. They are very busy in this country as J. Edgar Hoover, and the Un-American Activities Committee have revealed, and they have penetrated into the State Department and other branches of the Government. We intend they shall be rooted out of their governmental berths, and they shall not be permitted to bring about the revolution which they seek.

The danger to which we must be alert is that of subversionists—an organized and cunning minority—trying to seize the machinery of the government by subterfuge and suppress any efforts of the people to defend their liberties. There is no place in the United States of America for those who would overthrow our free United States of America.

The country must have an adequate, economical, and complete national defense so far as humanly possible to attain. That will be done—and done carefully and thoroughly. It requires study—intensive study—by the Defense committees of the two Houses of the Congress because it is one of the most important problems of our continued national existence and our personal liberties.

After the thunder and horrors of war comes the drudgery of clearing up the wreckage. A shattered world must rebuild itself. Shattered ideals must be reestablished in a welter of cynicism and a reaction of recklessness. Shattered economies must be reconstructed by peoples almost too war-weary, frustrated, and discouraged to make the effort. Out of chaos and ruin must be forged new hope, new energy, and new endeavor.

We in America—all creeds, all races, all parties, all as Americans—must consecrate ourselves anew to the task, under God, of preserving the freedom and progress hallowed by the brave men and women who have struggled, and who still struggle, against the evil tyranny, brutality, and ruthless lust for power which would extinguish in suffering and slavery the light of hope for all mankind.

The price of liberty has been lives which were priceless, and human agony so vast and deep no words can be found to express it. Millions have died for peace. We must learn; we must learn, under the banner of Christianity, to live for peace.

This world-wide task must be accomplished in day-by-day living, day-by-day sacrifices, day-by-day progress to better conditions. These tasks may be undramatic, but upon the fidelity with which the people perform them rest the liberty and progress of all the world.

In America peace and progress will be found in full production; full employment; lower prices; better quality; lower taxes; more home rule and less Washington rule; more individual opportunity and initiative and less bureaucratic dictatorship and regimentation.

America has led the world in human liberty and progress. We must continue to do so. The reason we have excelled in human liberty and progress is because we have achieved all our blessings, under the Bill of Rights—through devotion to God, country, and freedom. Only in that way—our American way—can human progress and liberty continue.

All the world will note, and forever remember, what we in America do in this continuing battle for liberty and progress.

We may let our hearts be lifted up by hope. We may with courage and faith raise our eyes and our aims to new heights of human happiness and achievement. The America which accomplished such a marvel as winning two wars without losing liberty may with certainty look forward to winning peace and plenty in freedom.

Japan planned and worked for war for 40 years. Mussolini spent 20 years arming for the struggle; Hitler spent 12 years.

We in America started practically from scratch when we were attacked. Yet in 3 years we were on the road to victory. We were able to equip and train vast armies for the European and African fronts. We sent billions upon billions in war supplies to our allies across the Atlantic. And, on top of all that, we were able to win the war in the Pacific practically unaided.

A nation which under God can do that is a strong Nation, a determined Nation. It is a Nation which has yet to reach its full stature, which has yet great promise for the future; a Nation whose prosperity and progress in peace are as certain and assured as was its invincibility in war.

Dulles at Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star for Wednesday, February 26:

DULLES' LONG TRAINING TO AID UNITED STATES AT MOSCOW—CHOICE AS ADVISER WILL ASSURE BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

Selection of John Foster Dulles to go to the Moscow Conference as an adviser to the United States delegation and to Secretary of State Marshall insures a continuance of the bipartisan course that has been guiding foreign policy. Mr. Dulles is not only a Republican but a man of wide influence in the party.

The purpose in sending Mr. Dulles, however, happens only to be in part related to the fact that he is a prominent Republican. The truth is, he is one of the best advisers on foreign affairs in this country. His experience dates from the days when he accompanied the American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference at the close of World War I.

Mr. Dulles was one of the principal advisers to Secretary of State Stettinius and the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference which wrote the United Nations Charter. He attended the Big Four meeting in London with Secretary of State Byrnes.

For many years Mr. Dulles has been active in the affairs of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, being the head of a commission which has been concerning itself with declarations on peacemaking. He is widely respected for his endeavor to apply Christian principles to the making of public policy in the world generally and probably has given more time and thought to international law and ethics than any other man alive today.

FAMILIAR WITH WORLD PROBLEMS

Mr. Dulles has, indeed, spent his adult life in the study of foreign policy and matters of law. In private practice he has been concerned with questions of world trade and is thoroughly familiar with the economic as well as the political background of world problems today. The American Government is, indeed, fortunate that Mr. Dulles has sacrificed his private interests for the greater part of the last 2 years to serve the State Department.

The connection of Mr. Dulles with domestic politics lies in the fact that he has the confidence of Governor Dewey of New York. It was reported before the 1944 election that, if Mr. Dewey were successful, Mr. Dulles would become Secretary of State.

Mr. Dulles has the confidence of Republican Members of the Senate, particularly Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, with whom he worked closely at San Francisco. Before accepting the Moscow post Mr. Dulles was in Washington and had a conference with the Michigan Senator. It appears, however, that Mr. Dulles does not go as a substitute for Mr. VANDENBERG or any other Senator. The Senator from Michigan announced this because it is quite possible that a situation may arise requiring his presence at the side of Secretary Marshall for a brief interval.

SENATORS WANT TO STAY HOME

None of the Members of the Senate is anxious to go to Moscow because the pressure of work is such that they want to be at Capitol Hill. The help of Senator VANDENBERG, in particular, is vital in steering through the Senate some of the proposed treaties which were negotiated by Secretary Byrnes. There are other questions of foreign policy and matters relating to economic aid to Europe which will need stanch champions in the Senate, so Mr. VANDENBERG's decision to stay here will assist the bipartisan program very decidedly.

It is quite possible, too, that, with Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY remaining here, they may be able to make speeches of comment on what's going on in Moscow and help to mobilize world opinion behind Secretary Marshall if issues or cleavages develop which require such public discussion to aid in arriving at a settlement.

The whole world situation is growing increasingly critical and the hope here is that the Russian Government has at last come to realize that one of the things that is delaying recovery in Europe and Asia is the constant bickering over relatively unimportant issues. Once there can be a clearing of the air and a settlement reached on how to govern Germany, it is likely that the whole picture will change for the better. To keep Europe in an unsettled state while Russia argues with the other powers of the world does no more than to give lawless forces, like the German underground, a chance to flourish—something which merely adds to the occupation costs that have to be borne by the American and British taxpayers and something which piles up more worries for the Soviet. It is against Russia that much of the fermentation inside Germany is bound to be directed.

Sensible Interpretation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 27, 1947:

SENSIBLE INTERPRETATION

Chief Justice Laws of district court, in denying a motion for a new trial in a robbery case, has made a forthright and promising attempt to clear away much of the confusion still prevalent in law enforcement circles as the result of the Supreme Court's muddled reasoning in the now famous McNabb case. The Laws ruling, if sustained in the higher courts, will remove the shackles which the McNabb decision placed on the police in their efforts to bring some criminals to justice.

The McNabb opinion, handed down in 1943, invalidated confessions, however voluntary, if they were made prior to a prompt arraignment of the prisoner. This has been interpreted locally as meaning that the prisoner must be brought before a committing officer immediately after arrest. The court of appeals indicated, moreover, in the recent Akowski case, that police should take an arrested person direct to the commissioner's office instead of to police headquarters for the usual preliminary fingerprinting and booking.

But, as Justice Laws pointed out in a carefully worded written opinion in the current Horace U. Boone appeal, the requirement for immediate arraignment gravely handicaps the police in their proper duties of clearing suspects who may be innocent and of identifying prisoners who are guilty of a crime. "After the arrest of one accused of a crime," he asserted, "police officers should have opportunity to make further investigations of facts beyond those made before the arrest. Such investigations may be as decidedly in the interests of an innocent person who has been arrested as in the interests of efficient law enforcement."

The Chief Justice, commenting on the McNabb and Mitchell rulings of the Supreme Court and the Akowski opinion of the Court of Appeals, concludes that they go no further than to require reasonable promptness in arraigning a suspect. The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure use the phrase "without unnecessary delay." Chief Justice Laws holds that "certain procedures customarily followed by police in the District of Columbia for many years," including booking at a police station, fingerprinting, searching, and questioning, are not unreasonable and do not constitute "unnecessary delay." This is a sensible and realistic view of police authority and responsibility—one that was lacking in the Supreme Court's original McNabb decision.

The Laws view is subject to revision or reversal in the higher courts, however. Indeed, the confusion over the McNabb case is likely to continue until Congress enacts the pending Hobbs bill, just passed by the House. This six-line measure would legalize any prearraignment confessions or other evidence, provided they are otherwise admissible in court. The Senate can do its bit toward strengthening law enforcement by enacting this bill into law without delay.

Statement of Views of Progressive Mine Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by John McCann, president, International Union, Progressive Mine Workers of America, sent as a letter to the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare, and represents the views of the Progressive Mine Workers of America:

The Progressive Mine Workers, representing upward of 30,000 independent coal miners in several States and their families, transmit this statement to your honorable committee to become a part of your official labor hearing record.

We believe that the 15,000,000 organized workers and their families, through the last half century of industrial progress, have earned the respect of industry and of the Nation through their tremendous improvement in our industrial and national economy. Their free enterprise, their development of industry which has enabled this Nation to prosper out of all proportion to that of all other nations, has earned for labor the right to deep consideration of their own problems,

aside fom the criticism which may be heaped on labor by virtue of incapacity or misdirection on the part of a few of its already discredited leaders.

We urge your honorable committee to review the achievements of organized labor throughout the crisis of World War II when labor permitted its own aspirations and its own interests to lie dormant while pouring out the billions upon billions of dollars of necessary war materials to rescue the world from the kind of Hitlerism which many now seek to impose on labor.

We urge your honorable committee to recognize as well that while labor itself admits it has faults, these faults are not to be corrected by hamstringing labor nor by restricting it so that its future growth is curtailed beyond all hope of future accomplishment. For more than half a century economists have admitted that the future well-being of labor presages the future well-being of the Nation as a whole, and we feel that what benefits labor, benefits the Nation. Conversely, what damages labor must necessarily damage the Nation as a whole.

Labor has earned respect and recognition by its mass achievements, and the high economic level which America enjoys today is the direct result of the struggle for this high economic level waged unceasingly for more than 60 years by organized labor.

Our school system has developed to its present state of excellence through the diligence of labor, and, in fact, there is no single important economic factor which does not owe much of its development, if not all, to labor.

We urge your honorable committee to permit these facts to be thoroughly blazoned before your committee so that the dismal picture antilaborites constantly paint for public consumption may not prevail as a true picture, but that it may be shown in its true light of distortion and intentional misrepresentation.

Labor has in the past, and labor will in the future, serve as its own stabilizing influence, and any legislation enacted which tends to circumscribe labor must by its very nature eventually serve to circumscribe the growth of our Greater America.

We trust that your honorable committee will also remember this exceptionally vital point. Whereas it required millions upon millions of valuable man-hours to train our Army of untrained young men and young women for combat and other duties throughout the world, our trained army of 15,000,000 unionists was ready at the first sign of need—already trained, already informed on their jobs, through free unionism, so they could begin at once the production of the essential items to feed and clothe and arm ourselves and our allies.

This trained Army must not be crippled or rendered ineffective for the equally essential fight to win the peace as it stood trained and ready to win the war.

Republicans Hailed for Budget Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks, I include, first, an excellent article by David Lawrence, and, secondly, an editorial, both of which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Friday, February 21, 1947:

REPUBLICANS HAILED FOR BUDGET COURAGE—CAPITAL ATMOSPHERE SURCHARGED WITH NEW DEAL SPENDING SPIRIT

(By David Lawrence)

The Republicans in Congress are entitled to the applause of the whole country for their political courage.

For when politicians who could get votes by giving the public's money away to special groups or blocs apply restraints to themselves and actually try to cut down the Government's expenses and save money for all the people, the action is so rare that it merits attention.

So surcharged is the Washington atmosphere with the New Deal habit of spending and spending that the National Capital still seems to be dominated by critics from the Democratic side who are horrorstruck at the idea of a general cutting of the budget.

It may take a long while to rid official Washington of the spending complex it has had since 1933—that money is something turned out by printing presses and that debt is just a thing that can be piled up indefinitely.

COMMENTS ARE AMAZING

It is amazing to read the comments that are going forth these days about the determination of the Republicans to cut the Truman budget by several billions. One would think that $37,000,000,000 budgets are normal and that anyone who attempts to cut them is destroying the Government. Indeed, the cry of calamity if the budget is cut is a familiar one as it comes from bureaucratic circles. Only a few Democrats, like Senator BYRD, of Virginia, have been pleading for economy during the last decade, and now the Virginia Senator joins with the Republicans in demanding a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget.

Whether the budget can or cannot be cut exactly by any such figure is less important than the formidable opposition to any budget cutting which is coming from most of the Democrats and from President Truman. Just how Chairman Hannegan expects to reelect Mr. Truman—when he has sent a budget of $37,500,000,000 to Congress and only last month predicted a deficit for the current fiscal year, and there is already a cash surplus of more than $2,000,000,000 visible for next month—will remain somewhat of a mystery.

The Democrats generally are lining themselves up with the spenders. They are not helping in the budget-cutting process. Only the Republicans are carrying the ball on that issue, and they are doing it despite the sniping from the "left wingers," who, of course, want more and more spending and their vested interest in bureaucracy to continue.

The decision of the Joint Budget Committee of Congress to cut $6,000,000,000 from the Truman budget has been favorably received by the House of Representatives, where a large number of conservative Democrats are joining with the Republicans to cut down waste in Government. In the Senate, some Republicans here and there are weakening, but a coalition may order a cut anywhere from four and a half to six billion dollars.

ECONOMIES STARTED

The details, to be sure, are not yet available, but already it is apparent that the determination to cut is having its effect throughout the Government departments. Economies that should long ago have been made are now being put into effect, especially in the Veterans' Bureau. As long as the psychology is one of increasing rather than diminishing expense, there can be no progress made. This is the tide that Republican policy is now reversing.

When it is considered that Mr. Truman wants to spend more than $37,000,000,000 a year and can't see any substantial cuts immediately—notwithstanding the fact that the budget he submitted for the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1948, will be covering Government operations fully 3 years after the war ended in Europe and almost 3 years from VJ-day—indicates how far away the administration is from recognizing that the people of America want to get back to a peacetime basis.

The difficulty, of course, is that the Democratic Party is still a New Deal party and is still wedded to the philosophy of getting votes by spending money. The Republicans, too, played that game many years ago, but fortunately today they are trying to benefit the maximum number of people by cutting the budget and stabilizing the value of the dollar.

KEEP THE LID ON

Veterans' Administrator Bradley has presented to Congress a convincing case against the removal of ceilings on job-training benefits to war veterans. If the Treasury is to contribute subsistence allowances not only to veterans in real need of this aid but to those who are willing to take it whether they need it or not, the whole veterans' aid program will be placed in peril.

There has been a growing tendency among veterans to regard the subsistence program as a form of adjusted compensation—a bonus, in other words. But it is nothing of the sort. It was intended to aid the veteran whose opportunities for education and job training were interrupted by war service. It was not intended as extra compensation for employed veterans who, although earning good salaries, may consider themselves in training for better jobs.

General Bradley correctly points out that unless a ceiling is maintained on subsistence payments there is grave danger that the money appropriated for sound and useful job-training programs will go far afield. Veterans urgently in need of training will be the chief sufferers from this diversion of part of the funds to those who neither need the money nor the training.

There may be some merit to the contention of many of the veterans that the existing ceilings are too low, in view of rising living costs. A trainee with no dependents now may not claim subsistence if he earns $175 or more a month. If he has dependents he may earn up to $200 a month without losing the allowance. If his earnings in each case are under these ceilings, he may receive up to $65 if single, or $90 a month if he has dependents. In no case may earnings and allowance combined exceed the $175 and $200 ceilings.

There are half a dozen bills before Congress providing for higher ceilings and for increased subsistence payments. They call for ceilings varying from $250 to $350 a month for single veterans and from $300 to $400 a month for those with dependents. If the provisions for higher ceilings and larger payments in one of the principal bills under consideration should be enacted, the total additional cost would amount to more than a billion dollars the first year. That is not the end of it, either. For if able-bodied trainees are entitled to these higher benefits, how about the totally disabled veterans who draw only $138 a month? And how about the lesser payments to the more than 2,000,000 other disabled veterans?

Obviously, the lid on veterans' appropriations must be put on at some reasonable level and held there against the pressure which is developing for new and bigger veterans' benefits. Otherwise all hope of balancing the budget in the foreseeable future will go glimmering.

Where Is Our Copper Supply To Keep Men Employed in Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the devious ways and clever devices by which the State Department officials and the internationalists have sought to deceive the public have been obscured by their adroit and misleading propaganda. I want to point out the present effect on our economy resulting from the shipment of war materials to our enemies in an effort to make our citizens believe in and give support to the fake export program of the State Department.

Are our industries short of copper right now?

Is our stock pile of this indispensable metal close to the vanishing point?

Where is our copper stock pile?

It may be of interest to our citizens, especially to our working men and women, to know that, through a program of conniving to pad exports by the free trade group, there were exported to Japan alone during a 5-year period 717,247,918 pounds, or 358,623.95 tons, of copper. The desperation of the trade agreement advocates to increase exports is shown by the year-by-year increase in the export of copper to Japan. Here are the figures:

	Pounds
1936	5,355,471
1937	10,838,709
1938	217,879,738
1939	249,277,000
1940	233,897,000
Total	717,247,918

This does not include the tons lost at sea. Neither does it include the shipments of copper to Germany and Italy. The fake export of essential war material to a nation which has refused to cooperate with the United States since the close of hostilities is still in operation. It would seem that Russia, after receiving $11,260,000,000 through lend-lease, would cease to throw every hindrance possible in the way of post-war peace plans, yet it has been arrogant and noncooperative. Russia knows full well that she can rely upon her communistic friends who hold key positions in the United States Government to tip the scales in her favor when her vital interests are at stake. The present plan of the State Department's Reds to send $35,000,000 worth of American industrial equipment without requiring actual payment of shipping charges as stipulated by Congress is a continuation of the program of fraud and subterfuge.

I wonder how many American lives will eventually have to be sacrificed before this program of arming our potential enemies will cease. This danger will continue as long as the fifth column of Communists is suffered and permitted to infest our Federal departments, especially our State Department.

It is the function of Congress, if the Chief Executive refuses to act, to clean out this nest of communistic vipers.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, today we have fresh proof that the policy of the majority leadership, as far as veterans are concerned, is "hand-me-down houses for heroes to live in."

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD at the close of my remarks an article from the Washington News of February 27 setting forth the features of a so-called housing bill to be sponsored by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

This bill was unveiled not here in Congress but at the National Association of Home Builders, meeting in Chicago. This is the organization that advocates the trickle-down theory of housing—let the well-to-do have the new houses, at whatever price or rent the market will bear, and hand down the old houses to those with lower incomes. That means that veterans and their families, most of whom can pay less than $50 a month, will get second-, third-, fourth-, and fifth-hand housing when they get any at all. They grew up in the fox holes; they can now raise their families in the slums of this, the richest country on earth. What a confession of failure, Mr. Speaker; what a shameful breach of faith with those who fought to save our way of life.

What would the Wolcott bill do:

First. Take off the $10,000 sales ceilings on homes for which veterans' priorities were granted. A barefaced run-out on the veterans.

Second. Take off all rent ceiling on new homes.

Third. Lift all restrictions on commercial and industrial construction.

Fourth. Do away with the 1,500-square-foot limitation on new homes—luxury for the few; overcrowding for millions.

Fifth. Do away with regulations channeling raw materials to building-products manufacturers.

Sixth. Abolish the Office of Housing Expediter.

Mr. Speaker, I protest this shameless reneging on the millions of the veterans and their families who today lack decent housing. In the last Congress, by passing the Veterans Emergency Housing Act, we made certain commitments. The Wolcott bill would run out on those commitments. I think we should stop and consider. We should oppose this bill and keep our pledges.

We should do more. We should act at once to provide more veterans' housing at rents they can afford to pay and do so by advancing $1,000,000,000 in loans and rental subsidies as proposed in my bill, H. R. 1750, now before the Banking and Currency Committee.

The article from the Washington News follows:

WOLCOTT TO OFFER BILL SCRAPPING MOST OF VETERANS' HOUSING ACT

(By Ned Brooks)

CHICAGO, February 27.—Tottering Government controls over home building received a fresh blow today from a high-ranking Republican who moved for repeal by Congress of all but two provisions of the Veterans' Housing Act.

Chairman JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, of the House Banking and Currency Committee, said he would sponsor a bill retaining only the preference given veterans in buying or renting new homes and the system of liberalized financial aids.

ENDORSEMENT EXPECTED

Representative WOLCOTT revealed his plan before the National Association of Home Builders, ending its annual convention late today. The association was expected to endorse the Wolcott program.

The measure, assured of strong GOP backing, would:

Eliminate all rent ceilings on newly built homes.

Remove the $10,000 sales ceiling on homes for which veterans' priorities were granted. This system was discontinued in December, but outstanding priorities still have been subject to the $10,000 price limit.

Lift all restrictions on commercial and industrial construction, now limited to $50,000,000 a week.

Eliminate the 1,500-square-foot limit on new homes, thus permitting the building of luxury dwellings.

Discontinue regulations under which raw materials are channeled to building-products manufacturers.

Abolish the Office of Housing Expediter, now headed by Frank R. Creedon.

Representative WOLCOTT said the period of veterans' preferences for renting or buying new homes would be substantially reduced in his bill. If other veterans' organizations join the American Legion in favoring elimination of the preference rule, it may be done, he said. Veterans now have first choice for 60 days on units offered for sale and 30 days on those built for rent.

The financing aids which Representative WOLCOTT proposes to retain allow lenders to insure mortgages on low-cost homes up to 90 percent of their value at 4 percent interest.

Disagreeing with a Senate bill which proposes a 10-percent across-the-board increase in rents on existing properties, Representative WOLCOTT proposed a 9-month extension of rent control beyond June 30 with no increase. This would continue present ceilings until March 31, 1948.

His bill would abolish what remains of OPA, transferring its rent-control, rationing, and price-control functions to other agencies.

Surplus Shudders Sign of Sick Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the February issue of the Nation's Agriculture, appears an article by George W.

Barr, of the University of Arizona, under the title above—"Surplus Shudders Sign of Sick Society." This gentleman is recognized in Arizona and throughout the Southwest as an outstanding authority on agricultural matters. He speaks with authority, and whenever he deals with a controversial matter, one feels confident that he is on firm ground and offering right solutions. Under leave to extend my own remarks and include this item, I herewith submit his thought-provoking article.

One of the chief arguments which the proponents of reclamation encounter is the contention on the part of eastern farmers that bringing in new lands will only increase the danger of agricultural surpluses which so aroused the fears and harmed the economy of American farmers in years passed. The following article refutes that argument and allays that fear. The article is as follows:

SURPLUS SHUDDERS SIGN OF SICK SOCIETY

(By George W. Barr)

With 9 out of 10 people in the world lacking adequate food and clothes and shelter, Americans are worrying about surpluses. Bricklayers fear that workmen will lay too many bricks. Plumbers greatly restrict apprenticeship for fear there will be too many plumbers. Barbers seek ways to limit the number of men qualifying to cut hair. Farmers feel sorry for the people who are not getting meat in the city but fear a surplus of too much meat in 2 or 3 years. Government agencies are talking of reviving the practice of limiting acreages of cotton and corn and potatoes to avoid surpluses.

An article in the American Farm Bureau Federation organ, the Nation's Agriculture, for September 1946 red-lines the title, "More Agricultural Surpluses?—Sure!" Here the writer refers to the expansion of irrigation in the 17 Western States, pointing out that the irrigated area has increased 10 percent in 20 years, or one-half percent per year. He did not mention the fact that the population in these same States increased 18 percent in the last 15 years, or 1.2 percent per year. In the three Pacific Coast States and Arizona, where most of the irrigation development has occurred, the population increase was 47 percent in 15 years.

Considerable could be said about this fear that additional irrigated land will add to surpluses. The irrigated land is being developed in that part of America where the population is growing most rapidly and where the influx of new people requires production close at hand of such commodities as fluid milk, vegetables, and fruits. Mountain States that formerly shipped much of their agricultural output eastward in competition with midwestern and eastern farmers are now routing an ever-larger portion of this output westward. More and more Idaho potatoes, Colorado beef, Nevada and Arizona hay are used to meet the needs of people in growing Pacific-coast cities. A decade ago Arizona shipped 70 percent of its lambs to Kansas City for an eastern market. In the last few years more than 80 percent of these lambs have gone to the Pacific coast.

Much of the irrigation development proposed is for the purpose of supporting and making permanent irrigated areas already developed but for which insufficient water is available. The stabilization and preservation of irrigated areas already developed should, in fact, be a major objective of reclamation planners in the immediate years ahead, or at least until such time as unemployment threatens to become rampant. At such a time the use of America's manpower and machines to develop still other areas may be readily justified.

Again, this land developed for irrigation in the past half century has only in small part replaced the extensive areas in America depleted and worn out by long cropping. Much more land could be developed for irrigation without fully replacing the productivity that has been lost through soils wearing out and subsequent abandonment of farms.

Foreign competition is a far greater hazard to the American farmer than are surpluses. Only an America that seeks out and develops its natural resources to the fullest extent possible can compete with the low-cost productivity of new frontiers in South America, the South Pacific, and Asia. Old and worn-out lands will let America down. Farming must be shifting to new and fertile lands. Every opportunity for irrigation expansion that can be justified by a dollar-and-cent balance should be explored and developed if we are to have a greater America, agriculturally speaking. For America to compete successfully with other countries may mean that costly water must be used on new land where young men are stirring virgin soil.

WAA: Bilious Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be no limit to the ingenuity of those who devise fantastic methods of wasting the taxpayers' money. Of course, the wasters do not want a budget ceiling which will in the slightest degree prevent their free access to the taxpayers' pocket book.

I insert, under leave to extend my remarks, an article which appeared in the Pathfinder under date of February 26, 1947, entitled "WAA: Bilious Billions," as follows:

WAA: BILIOUS BILLIONS

(By Pope Haley)

Almost any American over thirty-five can still raise a chuckle over the delightful childhood experience of reading George Barr McCutcheon's fantastic fiction Brewster's Millions, in which the hero was charged with the nerve-shattering job of squandering a million dollars in 12 months.

BRAIN STRAIN

But even McCutcheon's imagination could never have stood the strain of reading the facts on the operation of the War Assets Administration, which can take care of Brewster's problem almost any afternoon after lunch.

Much of the story has been told. Two Congressional committees have worn out the dictionary looking for words to indict the agency for its fumbling business practices, inconsistencies, delays, lack of records, and general "abysmal chaos." But nobody yet has given the final answer on the all-important question: "Why?"

A critical analysis of the record at least sets up a few signposts.

WAA is custodian of some $20,000,000,000 worth of surplus Government property, with approximately $10,000,000,000 yet to be declared. By law, WAA must dispose of it at the best possible recovery value for the protection of taxpayers.

When the earlier investigations were finished, a special committee of the old Congress practically whitewashed Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn, present WAA Administrator, blamed his predecessors at both WAA and the old Surplus Property Board.

BRASS-BOUND

WAA, as presently constituted, was set up in March 1946. When General Littlejohn took over as Administrator in July, one of his first moves was to put high-ranking Army and Navy officers into every key position. Every subsequent vacancy in policy position has been filled by a uniform. Some 150 military and naval officers are "on call" for assignment to WAA.

In June 1946, just prior to Littlejohn's appointment, WAA sales reached a peak of $711,000,000. Immediately afterward, (1) sales dropped; (2) percentage recovery on what was sold dropped; and (3) operating expenses skyrocketed; all of which add up to hundreds of millions of dollars in losses for taxpayers.

Had sales continued at the June level, the total for the rest of the year would have been $1,460,000,000 higher than it was.

Percentage recovery on all surplus property disposed of by WAA dropped from 39 percent in June to 33.2 percent in December, including real estate, electronics, and aircraft and aircraft parts.

Under the heading of general products (items for which there was popular demand), the drop was more startling—from 42.1 percent in June to 29.5 percent in December, at a time when consumers were crying for supplies and prices were rising in most fields. Loss on recovery value on general sales during the last 6 months of 1946 totaled about $125,000,000.

THE COST

At the same time, operating costs shot up. During the first half of the fiscal year 1946 (July–December), they topped $278,000,000. Projected for the full year on the same basis, the total will reach some $567,000,000—as against $435,000,000 Congress appropriated. During the same period, personnel rolls jumped from 36,510 to 58,795, boosting salaries alone by $72,400,000 a year.

These three items add up to losses—which the taxpayers ultimately will have to pay—of some $500,000,000.

Thus, circumstantial evidence at least indicates that blame for the slump in results since July can be tacked on the military's mismanagement. Analysis of policies shows five major blunders.

The first of these occurred when field offices were haphazardly consolidated and reorganized. Inventory records were broken up, and dumped without warning on ill-equipped offices.

While groggy clerks battled for months to sort out and match records, surplus declarations, sales, withdrawals and transfers of property continued. In a short time it became physically impossible to reconcile records and inventories, and still is in many offices. Cash became separated from sales documents, so that in one office (Chicago) as much as $10,000,000 gathered moss with no record of where it came from.

PANACEA

Secondly, with sales dropping and chaos in inventories, WAA adopted as a "quickie" cure a proposal by Vice Administrator Maj. Gen. Clinton F. Robinson for "site-sales." Under this plan, assets were frozen wherever they happened to be at the time and offered for sale "as is, where is." Despite internal protests, plans were laid for 1,000 such "site-sales." This prevented deliveries through regular sales channels, and added more faces to the pay roll. About 600 of these "site-sales" were actually undertaken before the plan fizzled out.

Then, on October 1, WAA ordered all regional offices to sell any or all property on a competitive bidding basis. Immediately this knocked the props from beneath the Commodity Sales Division in Washington, charged with determining the most advantageous type of sale for any individual asset.

It also ran head-on into the fixed-price method of selling specialized commodities; and sandbagged national sales programs previously set up.

About this time, WAA made a $150,000 contract ($7,000 a week) with a management firm, one of whose partners was General Robinson's wartime right-hand man, to survey WAA. This was a move to ease out Frank Creedon, civilian in charge of sales, who had frequently clashed with Robinson. Creedon resigned and later was named United States Housing Expediter.

"ATTACK AT MIDNIGHT"

With WAA now in the hands of the military, General Robinson conceived a brand-new "operational program" filled with Army-talk like "fire power" and "target dates." "The objectives": To speed up the lagging disposal rate, get rid of 75 percent of current inventory by February 1. But the "target dates" had already passed before the "communiqués" reached some offices, and with less than $6,000,000,000 in sales during the past 12 months, it was manifestly impossible to dispose of 75 percent of the remaining $14,000,000,000 in 90 days.

Finally, the ball was fumbled in the letter to all regional managers authorizing them to cut prices of slow-moving property 5 percent on their own initiative, plus another 10 percent if approved by the brass hats in zone offices. Such a plan obviously would torpedo any fixed price program, would wreck price structures generally, and pave the way to "under-the-counter" deals. That order was later modified: Authorizations for reductions must be in writing over the signature of the authorizing official, with reasons.

Latest in the series of trial devices is the "consumer service" plan of setting up retail outlets, similar to big mail-order houses, across the Nation. With only a handful of the number planned already established, costs are running into the millions. The answer would seem to be to start over before it is too late, and put experienced merchandise men, instead of uninformed amateurs, in charge.

Address by Secretary of State Marshall at Princeton University Bicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, at Princeton University's bicentennial celebration, on February 22, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following is text of Secretary of State Marshall's address Saturday, February 22, 1947, at Princeton University's bicentennial observances (during which he received honorary degree of doctor of laws):

"I had an engagement with your distinguished president to attend this ceremony exactly 1 year ago. Instead, I celebrated Washington's Birthday in China. Now, a year later, I am glad that it is at last possible for me to keep my engagement.

"I do not wish at this time to engage in a discussion of specific international questions. But I would like to talk to you about the home front as it relates to international affairs, and about your personal interests as American citizens. I might say I am talking to the students more than I am to the alumni and their guests.

"As you all must recognize, we are living today in a most difficult period. The war years were critical, at times alarmingly so. But I think that the present period is, in many respects, even more critical. The problems are different but no less vital to the national security than those during the days of active fighting. But the more serious aspect is the fact that we no longer display that intensity, that unity of purpose, with which we concentrated upon the war task and achieved the victory.

"Now that an immediate peril is not plainly visible, there is a natural tendency to relax and to return to business as usual, politics as usual, pleasure as usual. Many of our people have become indifferent to what I might term the long-time dangers to the national security.

"It is natural and necessary that there should be a relaxation of wartime tensions. But I feel that we are seriously failing in our attitude toward the international problems whose solution will largely determine our future. The public appears generally in the attitude of a spectator—interested, yes, but whose serious thinking is directed to local immediate matters. Spectators of life are not those who will retain their liberties, nor are they likely to contribute to their country's security.

"There are many who deplore, but few who are willing to act directly or to influence political action. Action depends upon conviction, and conviction in turn depends upon understanding—a general understanding both of the history of man on this globe and an understanding that action is a basic necessity of man's nature. Justice Holmes said: 'Man is born to act. To act is to affirm the worth of an end, and to affirm the worth of an end is to create an ideal.' So I say to you as earnestly as I can that the attitude of the spectator is the culminating frustration of man's nature.

"We have had a cessation of hostilities, but we have no genuine peace. Here at home we are in a state of transition between a war and peace economy. In Europe and Asia fear and famine still prevail. Power relationships are in a state of flux. Order has yet to be brought out of confusion. Peace has yet to be secured. And how this is accomplished will depend very much upon the American people.

"Most of the other countries of the world find themselves exhausted economically, financially and physically. If the world is to get on its feet, if the productive facilities of the world are to be restored, if democratic processes in many countries are to resume their functioning, a strong lead and definite assistance from the United States will be necessary.

"What are we going to do about it? That is the critical problem with regard to which I have a heavy responsibility.

"We do not lack for knowledge of what to do for our future security. The lessons of history provide plain guidance. But can we tear our thoughts sufficiently away from the personal and local problems of the moment to see the world picture and our relation to it in proper perspective? We should think now in long terms of years rather than in terms of months and their immediate political issues.

"Twenty-five years ago the people of this country, and of the world, for that matter, had the opportunity to make vital decisions regarding their future welfare. I think we must agree that the negative course of action followed by the United States after the First World War did not achieve order or security and that it had a direct bearing upon the recent war and its endless tragedies.

"There were people in those days who understood the lessons of history, who knew well what should be done in order to minimize the danger of another world disaster, but their combined voice was a feeble one, and their proposals were ignored. Now this, in my opinion, is where you come in.

"In order to take a full part in the life which is before you, I think you must in effect relive the past so that you may turn to the present with deep convictions and an understanding of what manner of country this is for which men for many generations have laid down their lives. Therefore, a deep understanding of history is necessary—not merely recent history which concerns itself with the trivia surrounding conspicuous men and events, but an understanding of that history which records the main currents of the past activities of men and which leads to an understanding of what has created and what has destroyed great civilizations.

"You should have an understanding of what course of action has created power and security, and of the mistakes which have undermined the power and security of many nations, and above all a clear understanding of the situations upon which human liberty and individual freedom have depended, and the struggles to gain and maintain them.

"It has been said that one should be interested in the past only as a guide to the future. I do not fully concur with this. One usually emerges from an intimate understanding of the past, with its lessons and its wisdom, with convictions which put fire in the soul. I doubt seriously whether a man can think with full wisdom and with deep convictions regarding certain of the basic international issues today who has not at least reviewed in his mind the period of the Peloponnesian War and the fall of Athens.

"I am therefore greatly concerned that the young men and women of this country, men like yourselves and the students in every university, college, and high school in the United States, shall acquire a genuine understanding of lessons of history as they relate to governments and the characteristics of the peoples, and as to the causes of the wars which have destroyed so much of human life and progress. You should fully understand the special position that the United States now occupies in the world, geographically, financially, militarily, and scientifically, and the implications involved. The development of a sense of responsibility for world order and security, the development of a sense of overwhelming importance of this country's acts, the failures to act, in relation to world order and security—these, in my opinion, are great 'musts' for your generation.

"It is rather bromidic to say that there is little new in the world or that the world is a very small place. But I think we seldom realize our own ignorance of what has happened in the past except by way of chronological sequence of events with the related dates. There have been wars and revolutions; there have been republics, kingdoms, and empires; there have been tribal rule and various experiments in government till it would seem that there is small possibility of any new departure. But the important thing is to understand the true significance, the lessons of these historic events and periods.

"There is another consideration in connection with the course to be followed by the young people of this country today to which I personally attach great importance. And that is that young men and women should take an active part as workers in one of the political parties so that they will get the feel of government, so that they will

become intimately aware of the influence of political organization upon the government of the home town, of the State and the Nation.

"We have had two wonderful examples of this course in the lives of Theodore and Franklin D. Roosevelt—members of opposing political parties, great Americans who rendered magnificent services to their country. You can do no better in starting your active life as citizens than by emulating their example."

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, to Yale Alumni

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me to Yale alumni in New Haven, Conn., February 22, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great privilege for me to address the alumni of Yale University for the first time in many years. I have tried to represent the views of the alumni on the Yale corporation for the last 10 years, and I don't believe that any association in my life has been more pleasant and interesting than that which you have made possible by your two ballots. I can tell you now that there is no university board of trustees which takes more interest in the affairs of the university or has more to say about the basic policies of the university than that of Yale. That is in accord with Yale tradition and it has given the alumni a real voice in the conduct of the alma mater. Matters may not always be decided the way you would like to see them decided, but you may be certain that someone is there arguing.

I have listened this morning with interest to the plans of the university to cross-fertilize the sciences with the humanistic studies. Certainly every graduate of Yale ought to have both a broad perception of human affairs, and also a clear insight into the significance of science. However, I rather think most of us achieved something of both of these results even 37 years ago when the class of 1910 was dominating the affairs of the college by the force of its intellect and its athletic ability.

A university, of course, is an institution to spread knowledge and correct knowledge—lux et veritas; and I suppose a bit of cross-fertilization may improve the breed. But Yale has always emphasized, even more, the development of good citizenship. For that purpose the university succeeds if it does two things—if it teaches men how to think and analyze facts, and if it teaches them the fundamental principles of the American Republic, its origin, its Constitution, and its governmental philosophy, "a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Liberty and equal justice under law.

There has never been a time when these two accomplishments were more important or more difficult. The American people seem to be doing less and less thinking for themselves and they seem to have less and less knowledge of the history and basic principles of the American Republic.

I have to be concerned constantly with public opinion and the reaction of large groups of people to the issues which happen to be uppermost throughout the Nation. One thousand letters and telegrams a day pour into my office. Opinion is voluble on all sides and perhaps the 1 percent who write are not a fair cross section of the 99 percent who do not. But it seems to me that people have come to form their opinions, not from facts and their own thinking, but from the thinking and opinions of others. Perhaps it is due to the development of motion pictures and radio. To listen to either requires only the slightest mental effort. They are a kind of education or recreation which gives knowledge without much thought. A large number of the men and women who write me seem to accept their views in capsule form from a favorite columnist or radio commentator or some organization which asks them to write.

It is essential to the success of both commentators and columnists, apparently, that they shall appear to the public to have examined all the facts about which they are writing, and to have analyzed these facts from a purely objective point of view. The truth is that there is hardly one of them who has not a strong bias for one philosophy or another, for one party or another, for one man or another. This they attempt to conceal, and the unthinking are likely to take them at their own estimate of their impartiality. No man could examine the facts on all the subjects with which they attempt to deal, and so their opinion is often based on much less information than we Congressmen get in hearings.

The radio is a peculiarly plausible instrument, more so than the written word. Voices are made to sound sincere. Most listeners seem to feel that a man would not stand up and make a statement unless he completely believed it. The forums have provided a real service in giving both sides an opportunity to present views, but many commentators are unanswered and only provide the facts which support their own views.

People seem to be more skeptical about the written word, even in the case of impartial news dispatches. But even the news today in many newspapers is given a strong slant in the direction of the paper's policy.

The mental attitude of millions who accept without thought what is presented to them makes the American people today a fertile field for propaganda. And we developed the art of advertising goods and then of advertising facts and ideas, and supposed facts and false ideas, far beyond anything that existed 25 years ago. Propaganda for some proposal, for some program or some bill gets well started and reaches millions of people before opposition has had a chance to form. Public opinion is formed without any real knowledge or analysis of the facts or the issues.

At the present moment there is a tremendous furor regarding the cutting of the President's budget. I receive many letters from one school of thought insisting that six billion must be cut from the budget or the Republicans are spineless pork-barrel spenders. Another school insists that the country is left without defense if any cut at all is made in the Army and Navy. As a matter of fact, none of these people has the slightest idea what the problem is, what activities the cut will affect, whether it is feasible to cut six billion or not feasible. No one today seems to be interested in facts.

As a matter of fact, the budget question is largely one of degree. A very large part of the budget cannot be cut at all. Most of us agree that by rigid economy and cutting out or cutting down a lot of popular projects we can take out from 3½ to 4 billion dollars without touching the armed forces. I have felt that a further 10-percent cut in the armed forces after the very large reduction already made from the expenses in the current year was the wisest solution. I believe any military or naval organizations spending as much as $11,000,000,000 can cut out 10 percent without impairing its efficiency. On the other hand I hesitate to take 25 percent, because I don't believe it can be done without eliminating entirely some military and naval projects and some services which I believe the American people really wish to have continued under present world conditions. No matter which figure is set, it will be possible to achieve a 20-percent cut in the personal income tax and still reduce the debt by several billion dollars. But it has interested me to see the violent views on both sides of the question without the slightest knowledge or analysis of the budget facts.

Labor legislation offers another example. A large majority of the people believe, and correctly so, that legislation is required to correct a good many abuses which have arisen through the excessive powers given to labor leaders. Very few have analyzed the actual causes of strikes, or the effect of the different proposals which are now before us and occupy the headlines. They do not hesitate to be violently for every measure which in any way limits the power of labor. But they are not very helpful in solving the most complex problem in America today. They accept their thinking from the overwhelming condemnation of strikes in the press.

On the other side we are flooded with telegrams from every labor union in the United States, and many others inspired by them, opposing every suggestion which has been made. The labor leaders who have appeared before us during the past week have opposed every bill and made no suggestion of their own.

I hope in a very short time we may present a constructive program fitted to cure the abuses which have arisen, without impairing the effectiveness or just rights of labor unions. But we are hardly assisted in our task by violent opinions, formed without thought.

Yale can perform no more useful service than to teach people to think for themselves and reach conclusions only on facts that are available to them. Great public issues can then better be determined on the basis of an informed public opinion, rather than by a relative strength of propaganda, acknowledged and concealed. The influence of prejudice and bias can be steadily decreased.

The second job which Yale has always done better than other universities is the teaching of the fundamentals of American government. It is a task which has been poorly performed for many years throughout the United States. The neglect of American history in our educational system is notorious. In the days of Abraham Lincoln, every boy learned how this country was formed and why, and accepted the principles of liberty and equality as the basis for all action. Perhaps he acquired a rather flamboyant picture of the American Revolution, but it did not obscure the true spirit which created this Nation. Today, according to a recent poll, only 17 percent of the people know what the Bill of Rights is. Only a small percentage understand the principles of the Constitution and the functions of the States and local governments. Only a limited number realize that the true purpose of this country was to achieve freedom of thought, freedom of government and freedom of opportunity. Our tremendous growth in standards of living and productive ability were only incidents of these freedoms.

Today the interest of the people has come to center entirely in the field of economics. The be-all and end-all of political action is apparently to improve the economic and

material welfare of the citizens. Programs are judged on the question of whether they give men or money, more bathtubs, more automobiles, and less time to work. Certainly no one can be against these economic objectives, but it is wrong to subordinate to them the need for greater morality, greater liberty of thought, and greater liberty of action. I believe that opportunity and not security is still the goal of the American people if they think about it, but they don't think about it and material welfare has been substituted for nearly every intellectual and moral purpose.

This makes an easy field for Communist propaganda and for the philosophy which proposes to divide up material things. It has led us into a number of Government programs which regulate and regiment and send Federal inspectors into every home and every farm in America in the name of improving the condition of the farmer or the workman or the businessman. These programs have good objectives in nearly every case. Those objectives, I believe, can be obtained, often through Federal or State action, but they should be sought with an over-all insistence that they do not violate the principles of liberty and justice.

Both liberty and justice have been forgotten. If any problem arises, the only solution has been to assign all the money and power available to some administrative board and give it the right to develop whatever program seems wise to it. In effect, it is made the lawmaking body and issues regulations in its discretion having the force of law. No adequate hearing is given. Courts are deprived of the right to review the arbitrary discretion of the boards.

One of the essentials of liberty in a country the size of the United States is local self-government, the right of every community to make its own decisions and administer its own affairs in accordance with the will of its people. If the powers are all transferred to Washington, the people really have nothing to say about 90 percent of the action there taken. But programs now proposed, including that of national compulsory health insurance, center everything in an all-powerful state. The attitude of most Federal bureaus gradually comes to be that the people are too dumb to understand. The little clique which controls the bureau believes completely in its infallibility. All of that result comes from the complete disregard and often lack of knowledge of the real principles of American Government.

I believe that programs for health, welfare, education, and housing can be worked out, leaving complete freedom to every community to administer the program and determine its character. Progress has been made for 150 years under American principles. It can be resumed, but it will not be resumed unless our educational system, and in particular our universities, are prepared to teach the people the principles on which this Government was founded.

The whole world has drifted toward the philosophy of totalitarian government. That philosophy has infiltrated into the thinking of radicals and conservatives alike in the United States. Men who talk of free enterprise rush to Washington to cure all the troubles which concern them personally. We are faced with a real danger that every important decision will be centered in an all-powerful state in order to improve the economic condition of the people. History does not show that any such state can solve even the economic problems.

We have solved our problems here better than anywhere in the world by adhering to the principles of individual freedom. They offer the means by which economic progress also can best ultimately be achieved. It is up to our universities and our schools to see that our people never forget again the eternal principles on which alone true progress can be made.

Address by Mr. Justice Frankfurter at Willkie Award Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Justice Frankfurter at the Willkie award dinner at Washington, D. C., on February 28, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The unfolding of America's destiny may be said to fall thus far into five stages. There was the founding of our Nation. Washington's character was indispensable to keep the Thirteen Colonies together for achieving independence. After the military victory, his character was equally indispensable to fuse the 13 independent States into a nation.

Jefferson gave the Nation its democratic mission. His claims on posterity summarize the three indispensable aims in the unceasing effort to realize democracy: the Declaration of Independence symbolizes political freedom; the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom sought to put an end to tyranny over the inner life of man; the founding of the University of Virginia expressed the realization that neither political nor religious freedom can long be enjoyed without the continuous systematic pursuit of truth through free inquiry.

Lincoln saw that freedom within a Nation must be indivisible and his compassionate nature did not flinch even from the awfulness of war in order to establish that the Republic cannot survive half free and half slave.

Fifty years later it became clear that the country's inner strength is not sufficient safeguard for our great democratic experiment—that we are part of the world and that the world must be safe for our democracy.

But even that turned out not to have been enough. And so, within less than another quarter century, war came again for millions of Americans scattered all over the globe, on land, in the air and on sea, because the Nation had come to realize that totalitarian regimes imperiled our democracy. This does not mean, of course, that other nations must copy our form of Government, or that there is no such thing as a long and painful historic process, or that overnight we can turn democratic formulas into a working civilization. It does mean that democratic aims must be pursued with passion and pertinacity.

Democracy is neither a mystical abstraction nor a mechanical gadget. It is the teaching of experience, and is vindicated by Nature herself. Nature plants gifts and graces in ways that defy all the little artifices of man, and in the long course of human history democracy has proven itself beyond any other form of social arrangement that which evokes these gifts in the largest measure. All the devices of political machinery—votes and parties and platforms—are merely instruments to enable men to live with one another under conditions which bring forth the maximum gifts of each for the fullest enjoyment of all. The kind of civilization we cherish is the society which was launched by the Declaration of Independence, which was to move within the spacious framework of the Constitution, which was rededicated by Lincoln at Gettysburg and in his second inaugural. It is a society in which the dignity of every individual is central, regardless of the accidents of antecedents; a society in which there is no unimportant people; a society in which institutions are progressively to be shaped so as to bring to maximum fruition the potentialities of men. One does not have to think too well of what our civilization has thus far achieved to refuse to destroy its good together with its evil in arrogant and humorless hope of writing in the future nothing but good on a clean slate. The answer to the defects of our society is not denial of the democratic faith. The answer is more loyal practice of that faith. If one faith can be said to unite a great people, surely the ideal which holds us together beyond any other is our belief in the moral worth of the individual, whatever his race, color or religion. And the glare of war revealed fissures in our spiritual structure, deeper ones than we had heretofore realized.

Until recently men did not talk much about these great simple themes. The pace of material development preoccupied the energies of men; it too often overawed their thoughts. The deficiencies of democracy became a favorite jibe of the worldly wise, and the promise of democracy was too romantically conceived. We are desperately in need not of new truths but of passionate devotion to old truths. Not so long ago we used to hear a great deal about a new plateau of commercial values, and almost imperceptibly it was assumed that we were also being elevated to a new plateau of moral values. The law of political and economic institutions is the law of change. But there are eternal verities—those conditions without which freedom is outraged and faith replaced by cynicism. Ultimately, there can be no freedom for self unless it is vouchsafed for others; there can be no security where there is fear; and a democratic society presupposes confidence and candor in the relations of men with one another and active collaboration for the common ends of life.

For we are enlisted in a common enterprise—the bold experiment of freedom. It involves the most exacting collaborative effort. It demands the exercise of reason on the largest scale and self-discipline of the highest order. For its ultimate reliance in achieving the common good is the responsibility of the individual. No office in our land is more important than that of being a citizen.

We are, in short, engaged in the most difficult of all arts—the art of living together in a gracious society. For this it is not enough to be literate; it is not even enough to be literary. While mankind is literate as never before, environment for reason is least congenial. Thus, while the conditions for a good life have not changed, they now operate in a much more complicated setting. We talk glibly about the annihilation of distance. Speed of communication has, of course, brought many gains, but these triumphs of science have brought in their train far-reaching and subtle problems which we have not solved because we have hardly begun to face them. The mobility of words too often brings in its train immobility of reflection.

In our jealous regard for freedom of the press we pay little heed to the vast change of circumstances in which that freedom operates. It touches uncritical sensibilities even to recognize the potential opportunities for arousing prejudices, confusing judgment, and regimenting opinion represented by chain newspapers, syndicated articles, headline exploitation, the movies, the radio and private polls. Moreover, we now know better than did the Eighteenth Century, in which the modern democratic faith was born, how slender a reed is reason—how recent its emergence in men, how deep the counterveiling instincts and passions, indeed how treacherous the whole rational process. Moreover the whole temper of our society is hurried; its

atmosphere and appurtenances are hostile to reflection. Thus, while mankind is literate as never before, reason is asked to flourish when the conditions for it are least favorable. And yet democracy beyond any other form of society is dependent on reason.

Without respect for freedom of inquiry and freedom of opinion there is no democracy. But no less indispensable is the assurance of the means by which opinion really remains free. Modern instruments of dissemination may unwittingly make the public the victims either of gullibility or of cynicism or of both. But only critically disciplined readers and listeners can generate that healthy public opinion which a democratic government expresses. Informed opinion and free activity cannot issue without an atmosphere in which free and informed thoughts are dominant.

Future of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Russell Porter appearing in the New York Times of Monday, March 3, 1947, entitled "Future of Free Enterprise in World Found Uncertain." I might say, Mr. President, that following this article there are other interesting and important statements with reference to the matter. I appreciate the fact that it would be rather expensive to have all of them placed in the RECORD, but I do desire to have printed the article by Russell Porter to which I have referred, for the reason that I have always believed that much of our free enterprise and trade are based on free enterprise and trade in the rest of the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE OF FREE ENTERPRISE IN WORLD FOUND UNCERTAIN—TIMES' SURVEY SHOWS NATIONALIZATION TREND GROWING OUTSIDE WESTERN HEMISPHERE, MIXED ECONOMY IN MANY LANDS

(By Russell Porter)

Of 19 nations surveyed by correspondents of the New York Times, Canada appears to be the only one in which private enterprise can be said to be functioning today with anything like the freedom from Government controls that obtains in the United States.

The prospects for the survival of the competitive free enterprise system outside the Western Hemisphere seem covered with uncertainty in view of the growth of nationalization under various forms of socialism and communism.

The tendency is apparently toward moderate exercise of Government controls in Britain, the western areas of the continent and the Pacific and toward extreme application of Government control in the Soviet Union and its satellites in eastern Europe.

Since the end of the war, Canadian business and industry have been restored to virtually their prewar condition, without fundamental changes; price controls have been removed from everything but food and rent.

Britain's nationalization program is planned to leave 90 percent of the economic system in private hands but hedged about with government restrictions, especially on the use of raw materials and credits and the right to hire and fire.

France has had a mixed economy since the end of the war. Nationalization is written into the new constitution, but the government is going slow on the elimination of free enterprise.

The trend is away from private enterprise toward some form of state control in Italy. The Spanish Government's declared policy is to encourage private enterprise, but the tendency for 8 years has been increasingly toward controls.

Sweden is following a program of slow but sure absorption of the bulk of big business and industry despite strong opposition from bankers, industrialists and the cooperative movement. Private enterprise is still active in Belgium, but there are many government restrictions. Holland has more and stricter restrictions.

The situation in Germany is in a state of flux because of the occupation, the lack of economic unification and the nation's uncertain future.

In Russia private enterprise is, of course, outlawed except for some unimportant activities on the fringe of the totalitarian economy. It is reported to be on the way out in Hungary. In Poland, it has recently been emphasized that limited private industries are officially welcome, but whether this toleration is a stopgap until the nationalization of basic industries is made to work satisfactorily is not clear.

For the time being, private enterprise retains considerable position in Czechoslovakia, although industry is 70 percent nationalized, but the Communist-headed government is opposed to indefinite continuation of the present mixed system.

Although nationalization laws went into effect in Austria last September, the prospects seem better there for the survival of private enterprise than in the rest of southeastern Europe.

In the Balkan countries of the Russian sphere—Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania—industry is being completely nationalized; private enterprise is fighting a losing battle there.

Greek businessmen hope for a revival of private enterprise when the country becomes more settled.

The Australian Labor Government owns and controls many major industries. Since the end of the war political pressures have been growing for more socialization.

In Japan the government opposes nationalization but is increasing controls over production. Although private enterprise there is in a shaky condition, it is expected to survive during the occupation.

Civilian Employees Outside of Continental United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the conferees of the House meet with the Members representing the other body to discuss the extent of the cut in the President's budget, we know that they will carry out the wishes of the House which are really the wishes of the people. I merely wish to call their attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Saturday, March 1, which brings out the fact that the United States has almost 300,000 civilian employees on the pay roll outside of continental United States. I include the article as part of my remarks. The article goes on to point out that there is almost one civilian employee for every soldier abroad. Something is wrong with this picture.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WORKING OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

(By Walter Trohan)

The Federal Government has a vast army of almost 300,000 civilian employees outside continental United States.

There is almost one civilian employee for every soldier abroad. The Army has some 400,000 troops abroad, the bulk of them in occupation forces in Germany and Japan. The War Department alone has 189,971 civilians overseas.

ALIENS ON PAY ROLL

These civilian employees include thousands upon thousands of aliens who are supported by American taxpayers. Almost half of the State Department employees in foreign lands are aliens.

The army of civilian Federal employees outside the United States has increased tenfold since the war. It was estimated that the number of such employees was less than 30,000 in 1939.

The 300,000 pay rollers outside the country constitute more than 10 percent of the total Federal pay roll of 2,276,856 persons. Included in the 300,000 total are employees in the Panama Canal Zone, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and other American possessions.

These employees share more than $1,000,000,000 in salaries and travel and allowances, it was estimated. Special commissaries are maintained for employees in destitute nations, which adds to the total cost.

WOULD CUT EMPLOYEES

Under President Truman's $37,500,000,000 budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1 this army would be further increased and the cost of maintenance would rise proportionately.

The House has voted to cut $6,000,000,000 from the budget and the Senate has voted to cut $4,500,000,000. Economy-bent Republicans agree that there should be heavy cuts in the ranks of foreign civilian employees.

Americans abroad should be brought home and foreigners on American pay rolls should be fired, many Republicans are convinced. They hold that the pay roll outside continental United States should be cut back to prewar levels.

Hon. William Randolph Hearst

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an illustrious former Member of the Congress of the United States who today observes his sixtieth anniversary as a newspaper publisher.

He is William Randolph Hearst.

If ever the term "public service" requires a synonym, I believe it will be Hearst.

From the morning of the 4th of March 1887, when the San Francisco Examiner made its first appearance under the direction of William Randolph Hearst, his name has been inseparably identified with a better, happier, more universally prosperous nation and world.

To review, even briefly, Mr. Hearst's accomplishments and contributions would be to write a complete and most inspiring history of the past six decades.

In the time allotted to me I can mention only a few of the things which are illustrative and characteristic of his goodness and greatness.

As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I naturally think of Mr. Hearst as a provenly loyal and always helpful friend of the men who fought and won our country's battles.

My thoughts go back to the First World War and the utter disillusionment of those who came home expecting decent treatment but finding in its stead carelessness, callousness, and, sometimes, calumny.

To Mr. Hearst and his newspapers, stretching from coast to coast, these veterans were not bonus grabbers, treasury raiders, or peacetime liabilities; they were the most deserving of all Americans.

He stood with them and by them and for them through all the ensuing years, and never relinquished his campaign until hospitals were built, civil-service-preference laws were passed, and the adjusted-compensation law was enacted.

When the Second World War came, despite the efforts of Mr. Hearst and other far-sighted Americans to preserve peace, he demanded proper training for all recruits, collected huge funds for Christmas gifts to servicemen and wounded veterans, and sponsored recreational facilities, of which the internationally famous Buddies Club in Boston is an example.

The moment it became apparent that the heartlessness of the First World War might be repeated, Mr. Hearst personally directed a Nation-wide appeal for a just and adequate mustering-out pay bill. When the amount voted by the Congress proved paltry and niggardly, Mr. Hearst sent some of his best writers to Washington to work with the American Legion and interested Senators and Representatives for a GI bill of rights.

The effort was eminently successful and, because of it, millions of our veterans are recovering their health in hospitals; completing their education in schools and colleges; resuming their employment in business, industry, and government; and training for better jobs and increased usefulness.

The same sympathetic understanding of other persons' needs which made William Randolph Hearst a dauntless friend of the Nation's defenders caused him to support woman's suffrage at a time when Susan B. Anthony and the other pioneers in the movement were ridiculed and vilified.

It was a long, hard fight, as history shows, but the Hearst newspapers never abandoned it until the vote for women became a reality in all the States and the National Government.

They say the best way to know a man is to hear his own words and that, I believe, is particularly true in Mr. Hearst's case. Therefore, as I salute him and all his newspapers and magazines on this happy sixtieth birthday, I should like to place in the record this editorial written by him on April 21, 1935:

The Hearst papers are American papers published for the American people.

They support the American system of government, the American Constitution, American institutions, and American ideals.

They labor to maintain the American standard of living.

They are opposed to the various forms of tyranny which our American forefathers came to this country to avoid.

They are in favor of American independence, American rights and liberties, free speech, free assembly, freedom of thought and action, and freedom of the press.

They are advocates of rugged individualism, and of the industrial independence and enterprise which have made our country the richest and greatest in the world.

They are opposed to paternalism in government.

They believe with Thomas Jefferson that the least governed country is the best governed country, particularly in view of recent political experiments, which have done nothing but prove that the most governed country is the worst governed country.

They are opposed to communism, fascism, or any form of despotism.

They are opposed to intolerance, as well as to fanaticism.

They are opposed to race prejudice and to class conflict.

They believe in opportunity for all and equality before the law.

They believe in the capitalistic system, so-called, which is the only practical economic system of proven worth and with adequate reward for merit.

They believe in compensation in proportion to service rendered, and in no limit to the extent of the compensation if the extent of the service is equally great.

They believe in the creation of wealth through industry and the distribution of wealth in wages.

They believe that the attempt to distribute wealth through theft is not only disastrous morally but economically, and means the ruination of industry and the destruction of all possible prosperity.

They are opposed to any form of politics and economics which endeavors to grade down the most prosperous to the level of the lowest; and they believe ardently in the American system of politics and economics which for a century and a half has successfully raised the lower strata to a nearer level with the upper.

They believe in deportation of alien cranks and criminals, particularly those who came to this country to find freedom of speech and remain to abuse it; who came to this country to gain the liberties which they are unable intelligently to understand and enjoy; who came to this country to find prosperity and who are trying to create in this country the conditions which have brought adversity to other lands.

They are opposed to government by any clique or class.

They believe in genuine democracy, the rule of the majority.

They believe that America should be for Americans and that Americans should be for America.

Those who do not approve of these policies would better not take these papers, because these are the policies which will be adhered to as long as these papers are published.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

Justice Assured for Trainees Under the On-the-Job Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation deserves the commendation of every veteran in the United States for favorably reporting House Resolution 246, introduced by Hon. BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, of New York.

"PAT" KEARNEY, as a former commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, brought to Congress the experience and ability necessary to understand the veterans' problems. With such a fine background he has diligently applied himself in an effort to improve conditions for veterans by sponsoring numerous bills designed to remedy evils in existing legislation or to inaugurate benefits that are sorely needed.

House Resolution 246 which is certain to be approved by Congress, will prove a monument to the untiring zeal and sincere devotion of "PAT" KEARNEY. Commander Tyrrell Krum, editor of Veterans' Affairs of the Washington Times-Herald has lauded "PAT" KEARNEY in the following article which appeared in the Times-Herald February 26, 1947, and I join with veterans in paying this deserved tribute to "PAT" because he is one of the outstanding veterans' leaders in the United States and a comrade with whom I have enjoyed a strong bond of friendship since the termination of the First World War:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Tyrrell Krum)

Hats off to members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Congress of the United States. They had the courage of their convictions in moving forward at top speed to right the terrible wrong done hundreds of thousands of veterans of the Second World War engaged in job-training programs under the GI bill of rights.

In voting unanimously late yesterday to report out for final passage on the House floor Resolution 246 which would materially increase the strangling limitations placed on the amount of subsistence job-trainees might receive, the committee members acted with a courage and fortitude seldom seen in the Halls of Congress.

It should be remembered that less than 8 months ago, General Bradley and members of his Veterans' Administration "palace guard" went before the Veterans' Committee, then controlled by Democrats, and sandbagged through the infamous Public Law 679, without even so much as a whisper being heard by anyone outside the star-chamber sessions.

And let us say here and now, that millions of veterans of this war have, in that committee, a real friend who can be looked upon to stand guard against the encroachments of the VA—without doubt the most bloated bureaucracy of all those ever established in the American processes of Government.

And while "thanks and much obliged" are being passed around, all you veterans affected by the Public Law 679 stranglehold on your

earnings should give an especially hearty salute to Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, the committee chairman, and BERNARD W. "PAT" KEARNEY, who led the fight to get the ceilings raised.

A week ago we came out in endorsement of General KEARNEY's measure as the best in the whole unprecedented heap—there were 22 to be exact—dropped into the legislative hopper then resting with the committee. Yesterday it was reported out.

Mrs. ROGERS, "PAT" KEARNEY, and the entire committee membership have performed a great service for all our war veterans over and above the considerations involved in the immediate legislation—they have shown the plain ordinary ex-servicemen that on Capitol Hill is a friend to whom they can turn whenever the VA starts its bullying tactics again.

Because in repealing the old subsistence ceilings they challenged the great personal popularity of General Bradley and they squared off against the VA "palace guard" in full array—the most resourceful group of bureaucrats found anywhere.

We've backed the Kearney bill (as it now becomes known) for many a long day. We're glad to see it clear the first hurdle. Now it's up to the House Rules Committee to give it special handling and then for the House to pass it.

Let's don't hesitate. Hundreds of thousands of veterans are living on a shoestring with all their subsistence cut off by the VA "palace guard." They need the dough.

Thanks again, Gen. "PAT" KEARNEY.

North Dakota Legislative Assembly Asks for 30-Cent Wheat Bonus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith House Concurrent Resolution D as passed by the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota.

The concurrent resolution memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide funds for the payment of the 30-cent bonus on all wheat produced in 1945 on which a 30-cent bonus has not been paid. It follows:

House Concurrent Resolution D

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funds for the payment of a 30-cent bonus on all wheat produced in 1945, on which a 30-cent bonus has not been paid.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein):

Whereas the United States Government paid a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat marketed between April 19, 1946, and May 25, 1946, on so-called famine relief wheat; and

Whereas the payment of this bonus was unfair and unjust to all those farmers who had marketed their wheat prior to the declaration of the bonus, in that:

1. Government news releases and reports issued during the fall of 1945 and the winter of 1946 indicated that the effective ceiling prices on wheat would be maintained and that there would be no benefit to the farmer in holding his wheat.

2. The farmers were repeatedly urged by the United States Government, its agencies and representatives to market their wheat so as to make it available for starving foreign peoples.

3. The price ceilings maintained during the time that the farmers were so urged to market their wheat were below parity as defined by Congress.

4. The bonus payments on wheat were made to those farmers who needed the bonus the least and those farmers who had to sell their wheat to live and maintain themselves and their families and pay debts received no bonus.

5. The farmers who sold their wheat prior to the bonus either because they had to or were induced to do so by propaganda must help pay for the cost of the 30-cent bonuses already paid through taxation.

6. Large subsidy payments were made to industry during the war in the form of cost-plus contracts, and contracts based on noncompetitive costs of production.

7. Industry in this period of rising prices obtained bonuses by the simple method of holding their products off the market and creating shortages.

8. Retroactive bonuses were granted to labor.

9. What is in substance retroactive bonuses was granted to industry by the Rumi plan of income-tax payments and the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota respectfully memorialize Congress to provide Federal funds for the payment of a 30-cent bonus on all wheat produced during the year of 1945; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

VERNON M. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
W. J. TROUT,
Secretary of the Senate.

Our Unhappy Experiment in False Realism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by the distinguished columnist, Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

OUR UNHAPPY EXPERIMENT IN FALSE REALISM

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Moscow's sudden acceptance of the recent American claim to a strategic (exclusive) trusteeship over all the ex-Jap mandated islands of the Pacific was a diplomatic masterpiece.

I cannot say that I have had much occasion in the last few years to admire Russian policy. This time, purely as a student of international affairs, I feel I ought to send six bright red roses to the Kremlin.

For with their bland acquiescence in the United States demand they have put President Truman on one of the hottest spots even he ever found himself on.

By accepting almost unconditionally the American demand for islands that until recently were all but juridically Japanese real estate, the Russians have staked out the strongest possible claim for acquiring the largest parcel of ex-German, Chinese, Polish, Rumanian, etc., real estate.

By basing their acceptance on the gracious recognition that in the Pacific war United States forces "played a decisive role in the victory" and "bore incomparably greater sacrifices than other Allied Nations," the Russians have greatly bolstered their own case for whatever they happen to want in Europe where Soviet forces "played a decisive role in the victory" and "bore incomparably greater sacrifices than the other Allied Nations."

Finally, by encouraging the United States in the nationalist rather than in the internationalist pattern of behavior, the Soviet diplomats have gone some way toward forcing a recognition of their own persistent desire for a world permanently parceled out among and ruled by three great powers.

In the process the United States has once more been nicely diddled.

Control of Europe is, from any viewpoint, vastly more valuable to the Soviet Union than occupation, even strategic, of Pacific islands can be to the United States. Ignoring the difference in economic values between the two, Europe means not only landscapes and bases; it means people, first-class soldiers, and many of them trained technicians, probably the dominant factor in any future fights.

In the second place, if playing a decisive role in victory and making bigger sacrifices is going to be the accepted criterion of the right to extend a nation's power, then Soviet annexations can legitimately be pushed far beyond anything even mentioned to date. No less an authority than Walter Lippmann has recently bolstered the Soviet opinion that, by themselves, Britain and the United States never had big enough armies to beat the Germans.

Finally, the United States has no interest in seeing power concentrated and every interest in seeing it distributed as widely as possible. For in a world, most of whose lesser peoples trust the U. S. A. and distrust the U. S. S. R., the more these lesser peoples can be deprived of influence the greater the influence of Moscow, the less the influence of Washington.

All this was, of course, obvious from the beginning. Back at Lake Success last November, when the American trusteeship plan for the ex-Jap-mandated islands was first announced, I noted that grins for the first time appeared upon the faces of the Russians and their friends. And I suggested that the smartest thing Moscow might do would be to accept the American plan. Now, on the eve of the Moscow Conference to settle the future of Germany, they have done just that.

No wonder that our State Department is confused and dismayed by Moscow's skillful move. For, to the honor of the State Department be it said, civilian diplomats did not approve the American demand for a strategic mandate that amounted almost to outright possession. They wanted the international side stressed more. Above all, they wanted it explained immediately that the American claim could and would be modified along with the achievement of real collective security.

Responsibility for this latest blunder does not lie with the Department. It lies elsewhere.

President Truman has seen fit to surround himself with generals and admirals to a greater extent than any previous President. What is more, he trusts their judgment over that of civilians.

It is the generals and admirals who finally persuaded the President that the United States must be "realistic" and demand the Pacific islands regardless of the international

consequences of such a departure from the United Nations spirit. It was, to an overwhelming extent, the generals and admirals who during the war committed us to political policies in Europe the disastrous results of which have now become evident to everyone.

No particular blame lies on them. It is natural that our military people should prefer the national-controlled, physical force in which they (successfully) deal rather than those international politics and ideas in which they are unlettered.

The trouble is, the whole American people will be asked to pay for the mistakes.

In formulating a successful United States foreign policy, any realism that believes that bombs, rockets, armed forces, and national ultimatums can substitute for collective action and obtaining the greatest number of potential allies is unrealism. Though force is essential, our fate is far more likely to be decided on the ideological than on the military field.

Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter received on February 25, 1947, from one of my constituents in New Haven with reference to the inequality in Federal income-tax levies which is brought about due to the community-property law in nine States of the Union.

Should not the Federal income-tax law be uniform in application and exact the same tax from all taxpayers similarly situated regardless of their State of residence?

The letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1947.

Hon. E. B. FOOTE,
Member, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FOOTE: Recent radio and press releases give assurance that the Members of the incoming Congress propose to give serious consideration to a reduction in individual income taxes. I desire in this letter to invite your attention to a situation now existing which, in my opinion, requires consideration in connection with any proposed reduction in individual income taxes or tax rates.

The Federal income-tax law is intended to be one of uniform application and to exact the same amount of tax from all taxpayers similarly situated regardless of their State of residence. It was not intended that a resident of one State should be subjected to either more or less tax than a resident of another State upon the same amount of income derived from an identical source, yet such is the result of the law as presently interpreted and applied.

In any one of the nine States (Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Washington) recognizing community property between husband and wife, the husband and wife are permitted to divide the income earned by either and report this income for Federal income-tax purposes in equal amounts upon their respective tax returns. In this manner, the income is placed in lower surtax brackets and taxed at correspondingly lower rates. In the remaining 39 States, no such division of income between husband and wife is permitted for Federal income-tax purposes and the income is taxed to the spouse who earns it at increased surtax rates. Accordingly, the husband and wife residing in any one of the non-community-property States pay more tax upon their income than the husband and wife residing in the community-property State and deriving the same amount of income from an identical source. I am listing on the next page a comparison of the present income taxes on a husband and wife where the income is earned by only one spouse in community and noncommunity States.

United States income tax table for 1946

Taxable income	Income taxes in States that are not community-property States	Income taxes in States that are community-property States	Savings in taxes for man and wife living in community-property States	Percent of savings in taxes for man and wife living in community-property States
$3,000	$589	$570	$19	0.032
$4,000	798	760	38	.047
$5,000	1,045	979	76	.072
$10,000	2,508	2,090	418	.166
$12,000	3,230	2,584	646	.200
$16,000	4,940	3,724	1,216	.246
$24,000	9,082	6,470	2,622	.288
$30,000	12,559	8,987	3,752	.283
$50,000	25,579	19,285	6,194	.243
$100,000	63,954	50,958	12,996	.203
$200,000	148,979	127,908	21,071	.141

I am of the opinion that the proper approach by Congress to the problem of tax reduction is to first correct this apparent discrimination by permitting the husband and wife residing in noncommunity States to divide their total income for income-tax purposes in the manner now permitted residents in community-property States. This would reduce the income tax of most married couples living in noncommunity States 3 to 28 percent. In fairness to a man and wife with taxable income below $12,000, Congress should make a reduction in rates in addition to privileges of dividing income so that their total tax reduction will exceed 20 percent. If after these adjustments are made, and it is the opinion of Congress that an additional reduction can be made, then individual tax rates could be reduced for all States.

It will be apparent that no general reduction in income-tax rates can correct the discrimination permitted above. While a general reduction in rates will relieve taxpayers, the husband and wife residing in a non-community-property State would still pay more tax upon the same income than the residents of the community-property State.

I am confident that you will recognize the merit and importance of this suggestion, and I look forward to your reply stating that you will work for this needed change in our income-tax laws.

Yours very truly,
FEAT & VOIGT SERVICE.
LOUIS F. VOIGT.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, to indicate the interest of the people of Minnesota in the rural-electrification program, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the following concurrent resolution passed by the State Legislature of Minnesota:

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue its appropriations in support of the rural-electrification program and to refrain from enacting any legislation adverse thereto

Whereas the rural population of the State of Minnesota is vitally interested in the benefits and conveniences afforded by the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas there should be sufficient appropriations of the Rural Electrification Administration as approximately only 55 percent of the rural population of Minnesota is served by this program; and

Whereas the rural population of Minnesota is anticipating the time when rural Minnesota will be 100 percent electrified; and

Whereas rural electrification has proved a good investment to the Government by reason of the fact that it has met its obligations, both principal and interest, in advance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States shall continue to provide funds for the expansion of rural electrification where such construction is economically feasible and likewise to refrain from passing any legislation adverse to the rural electrification program; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Minnesota.

LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 4th day of February 1947.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 6th day of February 1947.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's a Long Story But Very Interesting," published in today's Washington Times-Herald. The editorial deals with the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S A LONG STORY, BUT VERY INTERESTING

We may as well go on record now as saying we don't know whether David E. Lilienthal is going to be confirmed by the Senate as Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, but we hope not.

That hope not has led this writer to read some 19 volumes of testimony before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, which has the momentous job of recommending to the Senate whether to O. K. Lilienthal and his fellow nominees to the AEC.

PROBLEM OF LILIENTHAL

We rise from that reading slightly cross-eyed by the strain of it all, but with freshened respect for the processes of government in our country that have brought such a congressional committee into being. The record shows a conscientious effort to be fair and let all sides be heard, and that is in the best American tradition.

And with two exceptions, Senators McMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut, and VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, we would say that the committee members have scrupulously kept the record clean of their private judgments on the evidence so far heard.

Incidentally, we also learned the committee has no directive to investigate the nominees on its own, but sits primarily as a jury on data brought it by others.

UNITED PRESS PULLS A BONER

Our squawk for today, therefore, is aimed at various high-collared journalists and editors who profess in general to report the news impartially and give the folks a square shake even on the editorial page.

If all congressional proceedings are as badly reported and as calculatedly misrepresented as this vitally important atomic-energy hearing, we'd say the editors and publishers of the U. S. A. had better get back to work and find out what's going on down where the news is made.

For instance, on February 24, the United Press sent out a story to all its clients saying that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had made a "loyalty investigation" that O. K.'d Lilienthal and his fellow nominees.

Couple of hours later, the United Press swallowed its gum and came through with the following:

"A spokesman for the Federal Bureau of Investigation said today that the FBI had never investigated David E. Lilienthal or any other member of the Atomic Energy Commission."

Well, we all make mistakes. But time was in the newspaper business that such news would have set a hundred reporters on the trail to find out why, why not, etc.

Here are five men appointed by the President of the United States to a collective job even bigger than his own, yet without having been subjected to the kind of active investigation you'd think normal precaution for any kind of government post of trust above that of filing clerk.

How come? What's the news behind that news?

Or take another case, that of Lilienthal against McKELLAR, popularly represented these days as good versus evil, pure government versus patronage swilling, etc.

But what does the record show? It may amaze you to learn that some 30 years ago while David Lilienthal and most other Americans now alive were in the knee-pants-and-doll-buggy stage, Senator K. D. McKELLAR, of Tennessee, was working to put the torrential Tennessee River into harness by dams and flood control means.

THE STORY OF TVA

McKELLAR is now 78. In the record of the hearings above mentioned stands his testimony of struggle to get the money for the Tennessee Valley Authority, a project of great controversy as to the philosophy of government underlying but in which any American can have pride for its engineering achievements.

The record of those hearings also discloses that David E. Lilienthal conceded under oath that McKELLAR has never asked him for patronage jobs—contrary to the widely distributed propaganda line.

McKELLAR represents those who believe TVA's books should be audited by the General Accounting Office as all other Government books should be audited and that its operations should be under the constant eye of Congress as Government operations usually are.

Lilienthal represents those who think TVA should be given the go-ahead money by Congress and left to go its independent way. There are honest men on both sides of that argument. The point here is that in the stories coming out of the atomic-energy hearings, Lilienthal's side of the TVA record has been represented as pure and noble and McKELLAR's side as low and ignoble.

That's unfair to the public, for there is every reason to think that if he gets hold of atomic energy Lilienthal will be the same man he was in TVA.

And on the evidence before the committee aforesaid, we find for instance that in TVA there developed a very definite, nasty, and disruptive Communist outfit under Lilienthal's nose that he admits he didn't know about until exposed by outside investigators.

That's a bad omen, for if the Communists fooled him once they can do it again, and if they do while he has the atom bomb in his pocket that's going to be just too bad.

MAN OF CONTENTION

The record also shows Lilienthal as a very able lawyer who rouses in some people passionate devotion but in others passionate animosity. That's a bad omen, too. For the master of the atom bomb should be above that.

On the record, Lilienthal ain't. So why doesn't the New Deal propaganda gang shut up and let the country hear the facts about him? A thorough investigation by the FBI with details laid on the line at a public hearing before the joint committee ought to do just that. And why not?

There will never be another Presidential appointment half as important to all mankind.

Global Spending Schemes Are Hiking the Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, do you wonder why grain and other commodity prices have been spiraling upward?

Are you surprised that the Dow-Jones futures index went above 130 last week, the highest figure since its compilation was started in October 1933?

What will happen to the current labor peace if food prices follow commodity prices upward?

The headaches that these questions imply will quickly be on the doorstep of Congress unless we stick by our guns and reduce Truman's inflationary budget by at least $6,000,000,000.

You may ask, What has happened to create this inflationary rise in prices? Well, here are a few of the causes:

First. From February 1 to 27, the public debt increased by $1,515,000,000.

Second. On February 26, $1,794,725,000 was paid out of the Treasury stabilization fund into the International Monetary Fund.

Third. During February, $158,750,000 was paid into the International Bank by the Treasury.

Fourth. During February another $100,000,000 was advanced to Great Britain, making a total hand-out to date on the gift loan of $900,000,000.

Fifth. During the first 27 days of February, $96,342,000 was paid into UNRRA.

Sixth. With funds obtained from an Export-Import Bank loan, the Colombian Government will construct dams at Sisga and Siecha to irrigate 65,000 hectares—March 1 bulletin of the Andrux Press.

Seventh. The Ecuador Government is negotiating a $30,000,000 loan from the United States to consolidate its foreign debt, pay its dues to the International Bank and the Monetary Fund and build highways—March 1 bulletin of the Andrus Press.

Eighth. Truman asks $350,000,000 more to supplement UNRRA relief when that hand-out is exhausted.

Ninth. Hoover reports need for $475,500,000 for American relief in Germany, the necessities of Austria yet to come.

Tenth. United States to prop up Greece with $250,000,000 hand-out—news item.

The foregoing is a hasty and incomplete list of actual and proposed inflationary actions taken by the administration during February. Desirable or essential as these items may be, they all add to the fires of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, these inflationary policies of the Truman administration are giving humble people a brutal beating in the pocketbook.

On July 3, 1946, I tried to warn this House of the danger that now confronts us in these words:

Mr. Speaker, * * * the people of America cannot keep prices down long if the administration continues to dilute our currency by deficit spending.

The people can treat the effects of inflation—higher prices. But only the administration and Congress can stop the outpouring of paper currency that causes higher prices.

If the British loan is passed and other inflationary hand-outs continue, prices will go up, despite the patriotism and self-restraint of the people.

The radicals who demanded the OPA veto must not get away with any effort now to shift the blame for 14 years of Roosevelt-Truman New Deal inflationary spending. That wild spending—and not prices—is the cause of the rise in the cost of living.

OPA WAS FAKE WEAPON AGAINST INFLATION

The noise and furore about continuing OPA to stop inflation is futile and useless as long as only effects of inflation and not inflation itself are attacked.

The genuine remedies to high prices are to cut expenses of Government, reduce the national debt during this prosperous period, reenact one-half the wartime excess-profits tax, keep OPA and subsidies dead, and return purse strings of Government to Congress.

Unless these steps are taken, the current magnificent fight by the people against a heart-breaking rise in the cost of living will eventually be lost. (Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, pt. 3, p. A3888.)

Mr. Speaker, the primary task of Congress is to get our own house in order.

Unless America now reestablishes financial solvency, we cannot long help others in their fight against communism.

If we exhaust ourselves in the impossible task of attempting to carry the burdens of the world, the lights of western Christian civilization will go out everywhere. We dare not shut our eyes to this danger.

Battle of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from a recent issue of the Washington Post expresses the opinion that every avenue of savings open to the Army and Navy have not been explored. It professes difficulty in understanding why the cost of maintaining a 1948 peacetime establishment is almost as high on the average as it was when the Nation was at war.

In addition, the observation is made that the heads of civilian departments and agencies, like military men, are reluctant to agree that there is a possibility of practicing economy by operating with smaller appropriations.

Since the views of this editorial are of timely significance, I sincerely hope that Members of Congress will take time to carefully read it, and with that object in view, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

Congress and the administration have become embroiled in a verbal contest over budget paring that leaves the public utterly bewildered. Nor nobody outside the Government is in a position to say just how much the President's estimates of 1948 expenditures can be cut without imperiling our national defense and impairing other essential functions of Government. Consequently, the people who have to pay the bill of costs must perforce look on helplessly while the Executive budget makers and the legislators battle it out.

Although detailed information showing where the proposed $6,000,000,000 budget cuts are to be made is not available, it is obvious that such a drastic over-all reduction would entail heavy cuts in the defense budget. That inference is supported by horrific warnings of disaster uttered by the Secretaries of War and Navy and top-ranking officers. However, we do not believe that every avenue of savings open to the Army and the Navy has been explored. The President himself has admitted that unification of the armed services could effect substantial economies, although the kind of unification that has just been proposed is not calculated to save money.

The extraordinarily high cost of the peacetime defense establishment suggests that even under the existing wasteful set-up there is considerable room for economy without weakening of our defenses. The Committee on Postwar Tax Policy points out, for example, that the average expenditure per man by the War and Navy Departments for 1948 is estimated at $6,790, compared with $6,960 in 1945. It is hard to see why the cost per man of maintaining a 1948 peacetime establishment should be almost as high on the average as it was when the Nation was at war. Indeed, for the Army alone the cost is expected to exceed the 1945 average. We agree with the committee that the burden of proof must be assumed by those who insist upon the need of spending on the scale indicated by these figures.

Heads of civilian departments and agencies, like military men, are seldom willing to admit that they can get along with smaller appropriations. They, too, should be compelled to show cause why they cannot do so. Certainly there is abundant evidence of an unofficial nature testifying to a surplusage of employees in some civilian departments. Unless Congress administers the punch that will force officials to weed out their staffs, we shall go on paying more than we should for all sorts of Government services.

Ordinary prudence requires that expenditures should not be reduced without a searching preliminary investigation of the probable effects. Unfortunately, there has not been time for a thoroughgoing study of the President's budget recommendations. That, of course, is not the fault of the Legislative Budget Committee, since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 compels members of the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Senate Finance Committee to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress to frame a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including estimates of over-all Federal receipts and expenditures.

In a normal year these conferences would probably insure a comprehensive survey of the fiscal outlook as a guide to legislative procedure without violently upsetting the Executive budget plan. Under present conditions, which are far from normal, legislative budget making of this kind is likely to prove a stumbling block to systematic economy for the simple reason that too little time has been allowed for acquiring pertinent information and studying reduction proposals. The advocates of economy have weakened their case by snap judgments that put them on the defensive. Under the circumstances, the best that can be hoped for is an eventual compromise that will receive some reductions in the President's spending estimates while falling considerably below the $6,000,000,000 reduction approved by the Legislative Budget Committee. The committee's recommendations are merely advisory, and as its report states, realization of the over-all objective "depends entirely upon the final action of the Congress upon budget estimates, individually and collectively."

Whatever the outcome may be, it will at least have focused attention on the necessity of reducing expenditures as rapidly as possible to a level at which the budget can be balanced without overtaxing the people. Taxes are now so high that they hamper production by discouraging individual initiative and industrial risk-taking. Because the will and the ability to produce are the primal source of our success in defending ourselves against armed aggressors, tax reduction may properly be regarded as a means of strengthening our national defenses.

Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a very cogent editorial on the subject of the drive for a constitutional amendment to limit the choice of the American people in electing a President. The editorial appeared in the Evening Star of Washington on Monday, February 24.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD-TERM BAN

The drive for a constitutional amendment limiting future Presidents to two terms has about it an atmosphere of political immaturity—a suggestion that the inheritors of the best political system in the world lack confidence in the essential foundation of their political structure.

It is probably true that, in the absence of unusual circumstances, the best interests of the country are served when a President does not serve more than two terms. There is nothing magical, of course, about two terms, and it is worth noting that the Senators and Representatives who are supporting the proposed amendment apparently see no inconsistency in having themselves reelected to as many successive terms as possible. Still, in the absence of exceptional conditions, an excellent argument can be made for the proposition that a President should serve two terms at most, and then turn the job over to someone else.

Implicit in this, however, is recognition of the fact that in some future grave emergency the national interests might be served best by continuing a President in office for more than two terms, and the trouble with the proposed amendment is that it would make this virtually impossible. There are those who say that the amendment, if adopted, could always be repealed, but this is an argument which overlooks two things—first the time element, and second the very important fact that a constitutional amendment, once adopted, cannot be repealed except by vote of two-thirds of the States. Thus a decision which might be vital to all of the people could be controlled by the whims or the procrastination of seventeen States.

The question which should be posed to the sponsors of the amendment is this: Why should we of this generation undertake to tie the hands of our children in any and all circumstances, none of which can be foreseen now? Surely, on the record of our own performance, we have no valid claim to the requisite wisdom. Why not permit them to make their own free decision in the light of conditions which they will have to face and which we cannot possibly anticipate? That is the essence of the democratic process, and we would pay ourselves a highly dubious compliment in undertaking to short-circuit it. This amendment is one which should not pass, and the Star hopes that it will never be written into the Constitution.

Mr. Marshall, the American People Are Not Slackers; They Are the Good Samaritans of All the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the February 25 edition of the Omaha World-Herald:

THEY ARE NOT SLACKERS

We, the people of the United States, aren't doing our duty by the people of more unfortunate countries.

General Marshall, our Secretary of State, hurls that charge.

What the world needs from us, he says, is "a strong lead and definite assistance" for the preservation of democracy. And we must "lend our aid" if the productive facilities of the world are to be restored.

But, regrettably, having won the war, we are showing a "natural tendency to relax." Many of us are "becoming indifferent" to the long-term danger of world disorder. In fact, "we are seriously failing in our attitude toward the international problem."

That, anyhow, is what Secretary and General Marshall says.

With due regard for a great soldier and highly respected man, he is talking worse than nonsense.

In the same paper and in an adjoining column to that reporting Secretary Marshall another report appeared.

Credited to an unpublicized report prepared "from State Department and Foreign Liquidation records," covering loans, surplus goods, and UNRRA aid, it says that "more than $30,000,000,000 in aid and relief has been given to foreign countries since the end of the war." In this, seven and one-half billions was in the form of surplus property, the full value of which to the recipients is open to serious question. Making due allowance for that fact, there is represented an enormous outpouring of our national treasure and credit for the aid of stricken peoples.

Has Secretary Marshall considered that fact?

If so, does he regard this continuing flow of billions, in peace the same as in war, as evidence that we are "relaxing," "becoming indifferent," "seriously failing"?

Certainly he cannot.

He must mean then that we are failing in some other respect. A bill of particulars would be helpful.

Surely our Government, of which Secretary Marshall is a part, is not showing indifference. A very large part of its time and energy and activity is constantly given to the international problem. Never before has an American administration shown such keen concern in the affairs of other nations, great and small, or participated so actively in dealing with their problems.

There is no indifference on the part of the press. Daily, column upon column, often page after page, are given to foreign news, to its interpretation, comment, and discussion.

The people themselves? They are reading that news and comment. They are listening to it over the radio. They are attending lectures to hear more. They are thinking and worrying about it all. They are joining in all kinds of organizations and movements to lend aid and to give definite assistance. In fact, the international situation that has cost them so much is still for them a black cloud by day and a pillar of flame at night—a horror they cannot banish from their thoughts.

If Secretary Marshall doesn't know this, then he doesn't know the American people, and is living and acting in ignorance of what they are doing and thinking and feeling.

The people of the United States are not boasting of their generosity, their neighborliness, their righteousness. Braggarts though they may be in some other respects, it is not their habit to boast of such qualities as these.

But they are entitled to a word of disapproval when those who lead them in the far and fearful fields of international disorder appear to understand them so little. They are the good Samaritans of all the ages. They do not deserve to be branded from their State Department as indifferent slackers.

Twenty-ninth Anniversary, Republic of Lithuania Independence Day, February 16, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an address delivered by me on the twenty-ninth anniversary of the Republic of Lithuanian Independence Day:

LITHUANIAN LEGATION,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1947.

The Honorable THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: I am grateful to you for inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, 1947, the resolution passed at a meeting held under the auspices of the Lithuanian Societies in Baltimore on the occasion of the twenty-ninth anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

I have heard about the encouraging and inspiring address which you delivered at this meeting, and of the deep impression it had made on your audience. It would be very much appreciated by every friend of Lithuania if your kind and sympathetic understanding of the sufferings of the Lithuanian people, as expressed by you at this meeting, could also be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With my very best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

P. ZADEIKIS,
Minister of Lithuania.

Assembled here this evening is a representative group of Lithuanian-American people who believe that the freedom of small nations shall be retained—nations which, because of their size and location, have been and are now being used as buffer nations for the protection of warring nations.

Today the atomic bomb has indeed made obsolete the whole consideration of the buffer state. For no nation can be used as a protection against another in the atomic age and the only certain guaranty of peace is a general, firm, and fast agreement among the nations to keep the peace—a peace based on the fundamental rights of man.

Knowing the Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know no greater patriotic group of Americans, whether this be the land of their birth or the land of their adoption, who have steadfastly fought for independence.

No man can know a Lithuanian without discovering that a never-dying passion for the independence of his country is eating into his soul.

Out of the depths there comes a cry from this nation which for centuries has been forced to be inarticulate.

It is not a demand for privilege, for territory to which it might have only a historical claim; it is a cry for life, and if we really believe in our own profession, if the traditions of 1776 have not been effaced, if the definition of self-determination with which President Wilson sought to change the evil systems of lust and avarice in Europe and the rest of the world after the First World War, we Americans must listen to this cry from the core of the hearts of the Lithuanians.

We cannot close our ears to it.

It is argued that small nations are not able to develop a sound economy and a decent standard of living within the framework of national independence. A look at Lithuania's record of 20 years of postwar independence will prove the contrary. Lithuania organized a successful agricultural economy on a sound cooperative basis. Her budget was uniformly balanced. There was no unemployment.

The people are convinced that the restoration of national independence is the only adequate compensation for the suffering of the people and the only sure remedy to raise Lithuania from the ruins left by war and aggression. The Lithuanian people reject the Moscow-made liberations. They demand the termination of the present Soviet domination and they pray for the restoration of their country's independence. Lithuania bases her hopes for a happier future on moral law; she tenaciously clings to the idea that, after all, right and not might alone will rule the destinies of mankind.

I hope the day is not far away when Lithuania and the other smaller nations will find their place in the sun along with the leading nations of the world.

God bless America. God bless Lithuania.

H. R. 496

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of F. Joseph Donohue, counsel for Washington Retail Liquor Dealers, Inc., before a Subcommittee of the House District Committee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am F. Joseph Donohue and I am here to present the views of the Washington Retail Liquor Dealers, Inc., on H. R. 496. My client is an association of some 50 retail liquor dealers, each of whom operates a store where all classes of alcoholic beverages may be purchased for consumption at home. Each operates under a retailer's license, class A, issued to him by our local Alcoholic Beverage Control Board under the authority of the act of Congress of January 24, 1934. Each has been found to be a person of good moral character, and his place of business found to be in accordance with the wishes of the persons residing or owning property within the neighborhood of such location as is required by the terms of the act of Congress referred to a moment ago.

Collectively, they, as well as the other persons who are licensed under that act, constitute a group of businessmen who are contributing their part to the commercial life of this community. They are family men. Many are property owners. All are employers of labor. Some are fathers of one or more veterans. Some were themselves members of the armed services in World War I and in World War II.

Individually, and as an industry, they have assumed at least their fair share of community responsibilities. In the purchase of war bonds, in support of the Community Chest, the American Red Cross, the Metropolitan Police Boys Clubs, and all other calls for community service, they have given and do give generously of their time and of their substance.

Men such as they are not unmindful of their responsibility to the community in the sale of alcoholic beverages. As members of the community they are as interested in seeking the cause and finding the cure of the compulsive drinker as is any other good citizen. As the licensed handler of alcoholic beverages they are more immediately concerned with this problem than is any other person. In that latter position they are doing all that they can to keep such beverages from the chronic drinker. Their effort in this direction would be aided immeasurably by the cooperation of the families and friends of such drinkers.

To be more specific on this point, let me call attention to the fact that existing law prohibits the sale, service, or delivery of beverages to any intoxicated person, or to any person of notoriously intemperate habits. There isn't a licensed dealer in Washington who has not on many occasions refused to sell persons who were reported to them as being alcoholics. There isn't a beverage dealer in Washington who will not cooperate to the fullest in seeing that the letter and the spirit of this provision of the law is carried out. To accomplish the purpose of the act the cooperation of the public is needed and is eagerly sought.

It is regrettable that a stigma attaches to the alcoholic. The modern concept of the alcoholics as one suffering from a disease and needing sympathetic, medical treatment may in time remove that stigma. It is equally to be deplored that those who sell alcoholic beverages under our licensed system are too often subjected to the same stigma. If the figures of the experts are correct, and but 1½ percent of the 50,000,000 who do in some measure use alcoholic beverages are problem drinkers, surely you can understand that the business of the 1½ percent is not wanted and any measure to discourage it will be welcomed.

H. R. 496 has a lofty purpose. I am certain that Mr. HÉBERT in sponsoring the measure is conscientiously seeking to curb the growth of alcoholism and to bring relief to those who now suffer from this disease. No one of us can be certain that the method provided in this bill will prove to be the correct solution. My clients feel that should but one alcoholic be cured, or but a single person be deterred from becoming an alcoholic, by the method provided in this bill, it will have justified its enactment, whatever may be its cost.

I am sorry that the framer of this bill has deemed it necessary, in section 1, to charge to the abusive use of alcoholic beverages social ills, to a degree which seems to be negatived by such analytical research as I have seen. To do so is to bring onus on those who carry on a lawful business in a lawful manner under the authority of Congress, acting in the interest of a substantial majority of the people, and to make it increasingly difficult for the alcoholic who seeks to be cured to view his condition as that of one suffering from a disease rather than of one who is guilty of a criminal act.

By the same token we view the language of section 15 as an unjustifiable penalty imposed on those who are in the business of disposing alcoholic beverages. The language of section 15 is vague and indefinite. But its purpose is clear. The moderate drinker is to be made to pay for the dereliction of that small but important percentage of chronic alcoholics.

I think we should view this measure wholly in the light of its purpose to bring statutory recognition to the plight of the alcoholic as a diseased person requiring care and treatment and to provide for his treatment as a public responsibility. This laudable purpose should not be obscured by incautious criticism of the effects of alcoholic consumption nor by unnecessary and uneconomic use of the tax power as a medium for punishment.

If the alcoholic be a community responsibility as the modern thinkers believe him to be, his care and treatment and the cost therefor should be a charge against the whole community. The licensed beverage dealer will bear his fair share of both, the responsibility and the cost. By direct tax and license fee the beverage industry is paying more than $3,000,000 of the cost of local government. If we were to add the property tax paid on the places of business where such beverages are sold, many of which were long vacant before the repeal of prohibition, and the tax on incomes paid by those who own such businesses to the District of Columbia, the tax contribution of this industry and of its several thousand owners and many thousands of employees would appear a very considerable sum. In the belief that a doubled tax will return a doubled income, it is now proposed to double the present tax rate on alcoholic beverages. Whether the rate of tax be increased or remain constant, the present tax contribution of this industry is surely adequate to justify the position that the relatively small sum needed to carry out the purposes of this bill be charged against the general tax fund of the District of Columbia.

Today the moderate drinker pays a direct tax of $2.37½ a quart, $1.90 a fifth for 100 proof distilled spirits. Insofar as a tax is proposed to regulate or discourage consumption, it would seem that this tax has reached its peak and for purpose of revenue it may have approached the point of diminishing returns. Whatever be the tax, it surely serves no purpose as a deterrent to the compulsive drinker. The very nature of his compulsion negatives such a possibility. Therefore, to add any special tax as provided in this bill will be a deterrent, if at all, to the moderate and not to the compulsive drinker.

A recent article in the Washington Post tells the story of the successful operation of two clinics for alcoholics by the Bureau of Mental Hygiene of the District Health Department. Seventy percent of the 616 cases handled during the first year were of voluntary patients. Many patients were successfully treated as out-patients and without hospitalization. I am quite sure that this experience will be studied. I am equally sure these clinics were operated on a minimum of expenditure. Perhaps these facilities can be increased. It is quite likely that since their patients who did require hospitalization were dependent upon the limited facilities of the Gallinger Hospital that the announced intention of the new George Washington University Hospital to provide facilities for the treatment of alcoholism will add sufficient opportunity for exploring the ability of medicine and science to meet the challenge of the alcoholic.

It would seem an unwise policy to raise a sum, perhaps considerably in excess of $1,000,000, surely in excess of any rational amount needed to accomplish the purpose of this bill, just for the added purpose of imposing an additional tax burden on the sale of alcoholic beverages. Would it not be a wiser policy to develop the existing and immediately potential facilities available and to make a reasonable allocation of money out of the general tax fund for that purpose? A year or two later, from the experience gained, we can speak with assurance. We will know then if we are making progress and we can more certainly estimate the cost of the ultimate goal in dollars and cents. That cost will be met, not, I hope, as a penalty, but as recognized and accepted public responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Retail Liquor Dealers, Inc., are wholeheartedly in favor of this bill in its purpose to make available the finest clinical treatment for the chronic alcoholic. We believe its cost should be defrayed out of the general tax fund. To that fund it makes substantial contribution. If we realize only a part of the benefits which we hope from this bill, a saving to the general fund will accrue far greater than its original cost. If the general fund is inadequate to finance this most desirable public enterprise, and its support is thrown upon the charity of the public, this association will quickly and generously be in the forefront of those who will support it. A public responsibility ought not to be relegated to the charity of a few, nor ought the cost of its assumption be avoided by any part of that public whose responsibility it is.

Wanted: Another Horace Mann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on glancing through the February issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, I came on an article entitled "Wanted: Another Horace Mann," by Edward M. Tuttle. Being a member of that educational fraternity myself, and having been a school man most of my mature life, I read this article with care and appreciation. I must compliment the author on the selection of that title as well as upon the content of the article. Under leave to print, I want to offer this informative item to my colleagues.

One reason why I personally appreciate the title is that I have often thought it myself; that is, that America needs again the stirring voice of Horace Mann. I think today the need is greater than at any time previously, and certainly in my lifetime, for we are in the educational doldrums greater than those of 100 years ago. Somewhat the same causes are at work to produce that condition now as were at work in the forties of the last century.

Horace Mann, a little over 100 years ago, dedicated his life and his great talents to fighting the battles for American public education. He realized that financial support of public schools is the first requisite. Therefore he adopted the policy of getting the money where the money is and spending it for education where the children are. That came to be recognized as sound democratic policy. So firmly did he establish the principle of tax-supported, free, public schools that for a long time we took them for granted, and now it seems that this battle must be fought all over again.

Because of the unequaled distribution of wealth throughout this great country of ours there is great variey and difference in standards and quality of public education. There are educational high grounds and low grounds in America, but in this age of motor travel the citizen who spends his life in Chicago, Detroit, or New York may have gotten his early schooling—and too little of it—in Mississippi, South Carolina, or Louisiana. Very few of us perceive to what extent every community in America is now interested in the kind of schooling that every other community affords its children. There are those who cry out for greater finan-

cial support, a broadening of the tax base, and an equalizing of educational opportunity for all the children of the land, but such voices are not adequately heard or heeded. Certainly America needs another Horace Mann. The magazine article follows:

WANTED: ANOTHER HORACE MANN

(By Edward M. Tuttle)

Education in America has fallen on evil days—not evil in the wicked sense, but evil in the sense of lost prestige and impotence to do the job it is supposed to do.

The plight of our schools is not the fault of any particular group either within or without the teaching profession. It is the fault of every American citizen. As a people we are not really concerned about education, at the moment. Why aren't we?

It may be claimed that the present situation is the product of the times through which we are passing. This might be an explanation, but it is not an excuse. There can be no excuse for our blindness and indifference to so vital a factor in our national life.

We Americans have grown up with a smug idea that we have the best schools in the world. Maybe we have had in the past, though the claim might be open to argument. But our schools are losing ground now. What good is it to set the pace for a brief stretch if we lost the race in the end?

We are told that more than $2,000,000,000 are spent on education in the United States every year. That seems like a lot of money and we are generally opposed to any increase in school budgets and their resulting taxes. Warnings from here and there that our schools deteriorated during the war years and are in desperate need of stronger support fall for the most part on deaf or unwilling ears. Even a United States Chamber of Commerce investigation finds it difficult to dent the public consciousness with the report that there is a direct relation between the quality of education in a community and its economic prosperity.

Who will rouse us from our lethargy? Who will undertake the task of again selling the American people on the importance of education as Horace Mann sold it to his public 100 years ago? The light of his torch burned brightly for decades after his death in 1859, but now it has grown dim. Generations which knew him not have lost the sense of his message. Newer times and newer problems call for a modern crusade under a leader with the same persuasive and convincing power.

Someone must rise in this Nation who can open our eyes to the fact that $2,000,000,000 is not much when considered as a percentage of our national income. Actually it is less than 2 percent—far too small an investment for a great nation to make in its future.

Each year we spend less for education than we do for amusement, for tobacco, for liquor, or for beauty aids. But these things are indulgences, not investments. They have no significance for the future. They do not help equip our children for the responsibilities to be met in years to come. Why are we so self-indulgent on the one hand and so shortsighted on the other?

News comes to us that Great Britain has inaugurated an enlarged program of public education which will require 6 to 7 percent of its annual national income. At the same time it is said that Russia is planning to spend from 17 to 20 percent of its national income on all phases of education. Grant that they need it more right now. But look ahead 10, 25, or 50 years on such a basis. Then what will be our relative position to countries spending from 3 to 10 times as much of their wealth on their youth as we are willing to spend?

Suppose, however, that we disregard what other countries are doing or may do, and think only of ourselves. Who will drive home to all of us the truth that the only hope for the future lies in giving each succeeding generation superior training? How can we be led to understand that we ought to use the leaders of our generation as the teachers of the generation to follow? Or to realize that we cannot do this without a far larger measure of support than we have been accustomed to give?

Someone must be able to dramatize for us the fact that no matter how much a good teacher is paid it can never be enough, while anything paid to a poor teacher is too much. For teachers, unlike all other artisans or artists, are working with developing minds and personalities. The impress that they leave, for good or ill, is never erased. Human lives are enlarged, inspired, made more capable and strong, or they are left stunted, warped, aimless, and ineffective by the teachers of their early years.

Today, teaching is at the lowest level on the scale of the professions. It is so poorly paid and so hemmed in by taboos that it does not attract the men and women who should be guiding our youth. Our teacher-training institutions are all but empty of students preparing to be teachers because they can see no future in such a choice. The real teachers still left in our schools are there because they love to watch boys and girls grow and flower under their guidance. Material rewards are secondary in their eyes. But there are too few such teachers, and we ought to be ashamed of ourselves to treat them as we do.

Yes, education in America is in the doldrums. Nor is this just an interesting phenomenon to excite the curious. It is a crisis in our national existence, the effects of which will touch every man, woman, and child among us. We must wake up and act before irreparable damage is done. More than all else we need a leader to stimulate and focus our educational renaissance. We need a twentieth century Horace Mann.

A GOP Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of March 1, 1947:

A GOP PLATFORM

It would be impossible to overemphasize the importance of the various political messages delivered before the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association this week.

Coming as they do, at a time when the National Republican Party is at one of its most critical crossroads, they served to throw terrific weight in favor of a definite line of Republican action.

Broadly speaking, the choice faced by the party's national leadership is whether to fight or compromise on a series of issues. These include budget balancing, tax reductions, the labor problem, and, eventually, the future foreign policy of the Nation.

The speakers at the manufacturers' association were in complete harmony on how to meet these issues.

They demanded a reduction in the President's spending program of a full $6,000,000,000. They called for sharp cuts in Federal taxes. They insisted that the strike wave must be broken—that labor unions must be responsible for their acts, must be made to live up to their contracts; that the national officers of Government must stop playing favorites with labor bosses to curry political support.

Moreover, back of all their remarks were a series of convictions:

That this Nation is on the verge of communism.

That it could be forced over the edge into dictatorship either by a continuing breakdown in the enforcement of the laws, or by an economic collapse resulting from overtaxation and overspending.

That now, if ever, is the time to balance the budget and start retiring the top-heavy national debt.

That present Federal taxes are so high as to be a deterrent to industrial expansion.

That centralization of power in the hands of the executive branch of government has proceeded to a dangerous stage, and must be reversed—again, now if ever.

Foreign policy was not discussed in detail, but there were enough references to show agreement on certain fundamentals in that field. Among these are:

That virtually all the world powers outside the United States of America are so far committed to Communistic doctrines as to be enemies of our American system of economy.

That this Nation's sole hope of being of help to the rest of the world is to maintain its own economic strength.

That the only sound form of economy is that of free enterprise.

That, while a strong Army and Navy are necessary, they are not our main reliance in foreign affairs—that something more idealistic and just must be sought.

All of these several points may be considered as forming a restatement of Republican position—as a sort of revised political platform, distinctive from most largely in being issued after and not before the election.

The importance which it is judged to play in the national situation depends upon the weight which Pennsylvania herself exerts in the country's and the Republican Party's affairs, as well as upon the influence which these various spokesmen themselves have in the policies of party and government.

As for Pennsylvania, this State is a keystone in more than name alone. It is one of the largest industrial centers of the world. It is one of the Nation's principal taxpayers. Moreover, with its diversified interests—one-third agricultural—it is substantially a reproduction in miniature of the whole Nation.

In recent elections, it has largely been true that as Pennsylvania goes, so goes the United States.

Politically, it long enjoyed a reputation of being a Gibraltar of Republican doctrine, but followed the rest of the Nation into the New Deal column in the early thirties.

But it promptly became a major battlefield of the basic conflict between New Dealism and Constitutionalism—between the made-over Democratic Party and the historic Republican doctrines.

Here the tide of national politics was turned in 1938, and the bulk of the Republican resurgence in the Nation's affairs may be said to have been initiated in the Pennsylvania campaign of that year to oust the "little new deal" from Harrisburg.

That campaign marked the first smashing defeat which the New Deal suffered with itself as the issue. In general, it may be stated that all campaigns in which the Republican Party adopted elsewhere the line of faith for which it went to bat here in 1938, have

been consistently successful. The party victories, when, as has happened, its spokesmen have supported other convictions, have been few and far between.

What this means is that Pennsylvania, itself a large and important factor in national affairs, showed great capacity for leadership and inspiration in the recent past—and may easily do so again.

As for the identity of the Republican leaders who set forth their views, they represent about as powerful and outstanding a group of party chiefs as could possibly be assembled.

Among them were a past and the present Republican Governors of this Republican State, one of them a man who has just recaptured a United States Senate seat from a wheelhorse New Dealer.

Present also, as speakers, were the State's Republican national committeeman; the chairman of the powerful Pennsylvania Republican delegation in Congress (a bloc of 28 votes, largest single delegation except that of New York, with which it ties); the Republican leader on the floor of the State senate; the Republican chairman of the all-important House Labor Committee, which will initiate legislation in one of the most urgent single fields, that of corrective labor laws; and the Republican Speaker of the House—a position usually ranked as second in national importance only to that of the Presidency itself.

At least two of these men already are being spoken of as possibilities for the Republican nomination for President—both of them named Martin, incidentally. One is Pennsylvania's Gen. EDWARD MARTIN, who is almost certain to be the State's "favorite son" in the next convention, and the other is Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts.

When a group such as this unites in outlining a platform for the Republican Party, that platform becomes as nearly authoritative as is possible at this period.

Republicans from other parts of the Nation will do well to give it the attention it deserves.

Wages-and-Hours Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to note an article in the New York Times, dated February 28, in which a very able lawyer, the Honorable Walter Gellhorn, of the New York bar, points out with great clarity the weaknesses of the so-called Gwynne bill, H. R. 2157, which was passed by this body on February 28, 1947. The reason and logic set forth in Mr. Gellhorn's article is so compelling that it should create a doubt in the minds of those who voted for this bill and should reassure those who voted against it that they acted properly.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith Mr. Gellhorn's letter as it appeared in the New York Times:

WAGE-AND-HOUR LAW—GWYNNE BILL TO AMEND IT CRITICIZED AS WEAKENING LAW

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The House of Representatives is about to consider a bill which, if enacted, will drastically weaken and perhaps even destroy the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Federal wage-and-hour law. The bill in question is the Gwynne bill, H. R. 584, which has been favorably reported by the House Judiciary Committee. This proposal purportedly deals with the so-called portal-to-portal or walking-time lawsuits which, in recent months, have produced many spectacular headlines though, so far as I am informed, not a single judgment against an employer.

If the bill were, in fact, limited to its ostensible purpose, public examination of its terms might be unnecessary. But since, in truth, the measure will expose honorable employers to unfair competition and will remove from needy employees the fundamental protections of present law, the Gwynne bill should receive more critical attention than has yet been accorded it. Among the major deficiencies of the proposal are these:

BARRED AFTER A YEAR

1. All claims arising out of violations of the wage-and-hour law would be barred after 1 year. Nearly 10 000,000 workers covered by the act do not belong to unions. As a rule, they do not have enough resources, information, or confidence to protect themselves against overreaching employers Steps to secure redress against underpayment of prescribed wages are rarely taken until after Government investigators have uncovered the violations. The job of inspecting 600,000 business establishments is a tremendous one which can never be completed in a single year. If this bill were to pass, many just claims would be outlawed.

It is significant that every State which has large-scale employment has a much longer period of limitations for wage claims than the Gwynne bill advocates.

2. The Gwynne bill would absolve an employer from all liability for any violation of law which was not marked actively by "bad faith." It would also relieve him of liability for nonpayment of wages for an employee's activities in the employer's behalf, unless payment was required by an express contract or by the employer's own past practice.

In other words, before a violator of the law could be required to make good to his underpaid employees it would be necessary to prove that the violation had not been in good faith—an extremely difficult task. Moreover, if it had not been the employer's practice to pay for this or that sort of work, he would be absolved from the necessity of doing so in the future. For example, if he did not pay his plant guards for inspection or drilling time, he could continue to ignore his obligation to do so even though all his competitors throughout the industry were paying their employees for like services.

Thus the Gwynne bill would legalize unfair competitive advantages in interstate commerce which it was the very purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act to eliminate.

WAIVER OF CLAIMS

3. The Gwynne bill would permit the waiver or release by an employee of his just claims under the wage-and-hour law. The Supreme Court has solemnly warned (*Brooklyn Savings Bank* v. *O'Neil* (324 U. S. 697)) that this would "tend to nullify" the force of the statute. And all the leading State minimum-wage laws recognize that needy workers can be easily beguiled into surrendering claims for back wages for a mere fraction of their true value.

But the Gwynne bill goes a step further in discouraging effective enforcement of the wage-and-hour law. The bill also forbids employees to assign their claims to anyone else, but instead requires each one to sue individually on his claim. Since individual claims, no matter how meritorious, may be for relatively small amounts which would not justify individual litigation, this prohibition against the pooling of claims will make it yet easier for an unscrupulous employer to escape his responsibilities.

4. The Gwynne bill undertakes to absolve a person from all liability for acts done in good faith in conformity with any administrative interpretation, ruling, or policy. On the surface this seems fair. In fact, however, it would permit the positive terms of the law to be set aside whenever an individual correctly or incorrectly applied any one of the literally thousands of informal advisory rulings which Government officials make annually by way of expressing tentative opinions in response to inquiries.

OPINIONS HELPFUL

These informal opinions are usually given on incomplete statements of fact and without hearing both sides. They are intended to be and are helpful, but they are not authoritative. If Congress wants to permit absolute reliance on them, it should empower the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to apply the statute and to make determinations of fact which will be binding on all parties until set aside in appropriate proceedings.

An administrative determination that an employer does owe his employees back pay should have the same effect as an administrative determination that he owes them nothing. But the Gwynne bill does not produce this equality. Instead, it says that if any official, no matter how obscure or ill-trained, expresses an opinion favorable to an employer, the employer can rely on it absolutely to bar the liabilities the law imposes on him. But if the opinion is unfavorable to the employer, and even if it is formally expressed by the highest officials, it is given no binding quality.

The evils which Congress struck at in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 have not been wholly eliminated by the passage of time. Excessive hours and inadequate pay produce a blight which affects not only the workers immediately involved but also the communities in which the workers live and all the ethical employers who must compete against substandard producers.

The present law advances the interests of the public at large. Congress, if it chooses to deal with the probably overemphasized issue of the portal-pay suits, should avoid at the same time eviscerating a statute which has long proved its worth. The National Consumers League and other nonpartisan, nonlabor organizations oppose the Gwynne bill because it will do just that.

WALTER GELLHORN.

NEW YORK, *February 25, 1947.*

The Closed Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD one of the best editorials on the closed shop I have read. The editorial to which I refer was published in a great newspaper of my State, the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg.; and it sets forth the reasons why the editor of that newspaper thinks an anti-closed-shop bill would be unsound legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CLOSED SHOP

It would be pleasant and easy if anyone who has given the subject considerable thought could state flatly either that the closed shop is all wrong or the closed shop is all right.

But it isn't that easy.

It is possible to say that jurisdictional strikes, organizational strikes, secondary boycotts, collusion between an employer and a union to wreck a competitor, goonism, mass picketing are all wrong, and should be prohibited.

The closed- or union-shop question, however, deals with contracts, individual and group rights, labor-relations stability. It is something Congress should analyze carefully before passing any prohibiting laws. Punitive and unreasonable laws incapable of enforcement are not good laws.

There are a large number of union practices and contracts that usually are lumped together loosely under the name of closed shop.

Under one form of contract the employer hires anyone he wants, but after a set period the employee must join the union and remain in good standing. This, actually, is the union shop, but often is incorrectly called closed shop.

In the closed-shop contract the employer hires only union men through the union, and the union is charged with keeping a competent supply of skilled workers available. One of the worst abuses of this type of contract is the closed shop-closed union practice, in which the union does not fulfill its obligation of keeping an ample supply of skilled workmen available and forces the employer to use available men at overtime rates, sending production costs soaring and shutting the door in the face of young men who want to get in the craft. Actually, this is an out-and-out labor monopoly and should be treated as such by the law.

But how about the case of a union and an employer who agreed on a closed-shop contract, and that contract has worked out satisfactorily to both parties? Many such contracts have been in existence for decades, and have stabilized labor relations in many industries.

Should all those be wiped out through a general outlawing of the closed shop? If such contracts are made illegal, are contracts similar in context between non-labor associations, groups, and corporations also to be made illegal?

Much has been made of the statement that the closed shop takes from the individual his constitutional right to work or not to work where he chooses.

Although that is a catchy statement, it isn't true. The Constitution does not guarantee that. Economics, ability, ambition, relatives, and many imponderables usually determine where and when you work.

It is true that closed shops have limited the number of openings in many crafts. But one of the reasons some of those jobs seem so desirable now is because the closed shops have so greatly raised the standards of those jobs, just as have the standards set by medical schools and associations, law schools and associations made those professions more financially and socially profitable.

Some employers claim that union leaders have rammed closed-shop contracts down their throats, and later the union leaders have not been able to control the union membership, which showed no sense of contractual responsibility. That is true, and perhaps setting some financial responsibility would promote more moral responsibility.

There's no doubt at all that many of the abuses of the closed shop can be corrected through well-thought-out laws, but it is difficult to see now how a general outlawing of the closed shop is going to help toward the goal of fair, workable, stable labor relations and sound collective bargaining.

Labor relations should not be thrown into a chaotic condition through the passage of hasty, prejudicial laws. There's been enough chaos. What is needed is a little more order.

A Country Editor Speaks on Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, our country's gigantic public debt and the effort on the part of Congress to economize is attracting Nation-wide attention. An excellent editorial on this subject was recently written by one of the outstanding country editors of Nebraska, Mr. W. H. Plourd, publisher of the Nance County Journal, Fullerton, Nebr. I include it in my extension of remarks for the information of the Members of the House:

The young person who is advised not to live beyond his means must wonder sometimes about the soundness of this advice when he contemplates that his own country is head over heels in debt.

Debt is of two kinds: Under one head is honest debt—the debt that results from misfortune or the debt that comes from undertaking a thrifty investment that will pay out through the debtor's industry and management. The other kind is the debt that comes from extravagant living and thriftlessness.

The United States national debt embraces both kinds of indebtedness. The war cost a great deal of money. That is an honest debt. But there are billions of other indebtedness that was incurred, and is still being incurred, by the Government living beyond its means, paying too much for things, and spending money for things that are unnecessary.

A group in Congress, composed of both Republicans and Democrats, after much agitation from the people, is determined that the debt must be reduced by cutting the new estimate of Government expenditures. A certain amount of this cut is scheduled to come from the funds for the armed forces, and a lot more from extravagant and unnecessary services now being carried on by the Government. A huge howl has gone up from the spenders, charging that this cut in the President's budget would hamstring the Army and Navy and threaten the national security. What they are really afraid of is that a lot of bureaus and bureaucrats will be cut off the pay roll.

A prominent defender of the President's $37,500,000,000 budget (18 years ago the Federal budget was only about $4,000,000,000) thunders that it is impossible to cut a single dime from this amount without inviting chaos. Anybody with a lick of sense knows he is talking through his hat, and he knows it himself. There is scarcely anyone who can't point out where savings can be made in Federal spending.

When dead beats collect unemployment benefits along with the deserving, when bureaus fight for the chance to do things for the people that they would rather do for themselves, when millions are spent for a "screwball" art exhibit to be sent on a tour of the world to "show the people of other nations what American art is like," well, anybody who couldn't find ways to save public money today couldn't find a goat in a telephone booth.

Nebraskans pay over $362,000,000 a year in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments. This amounts to about $3.50 a day as the proportionate share of the average taxpayer with a wife and two children.

The citizen has to gage his spending to fit his income. The country is made up of its citizens. The country itself must sooner or later do with its Government spending what the citizen is forced to do with his private spending—keep it within the bounds of income. It has got to be done sooner or later. Right now would be a wonderful time to start.

Game Preservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following speech I delivered before the State Wildlife Bureau at Florence, S. C.:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the South Carolina wildlife organization, and distinguished guests, nothing is closer to my heart than the preservation of our wild game resources in this country. We have been extremely negligent in this great country of ours in taking steps to preserve our natural resources. In these United States we have over 2,000,000,000 acres of land and water. A little over 1,000,000,000 acres of this area is privately owned farms or grazing land. More than half of this lies in the Mississippi Valley and east to the Atlantic Ocean. About 50 percent of the people of the United States live in this territory and as our population increases there is a tendency to clear more forest land and develop our property to the extent that certain species of our wild game is becoming extinct. Wildlife is fast being pushed into different environments and is unable to find sufficient food and shelter for protection. It is rather hard to understand why the individual person in this country and also our Federal and State Governments have failed until recently to recognize the great asset we have in wild-game resources. We have approximately 130,000,000 people in this country and it is estimated that 20,000,000 people depend on fishing and hunting for recreation. This means that one person out of every seven people living in the United States participates in the sport of hunting or fishing at some time. It is also estimated that the value of fish and wildlife recreation assets run in the neighborhood of $2,000,000 a year in the turn-over of equipment and money spent for hunting and fishing trips.

The term "wildlife" embraces fish, birds, mammals, and the related associations of fields, forests, and waters. In South Carolina we have three large game preserves, namely, Cape Romane Refuge, located in Charleston County, Carolina Sandhill Refuge, in Chester County, and the Santee Refuge, located in Clarendon and Berkeley Counties. Thousands of birds and all types of wild animals find their refuge on these preserves, where hunting is not permitted.

It is my opinion that what we need in South Carolina and throughout the United States is a general educational program on the subject of wildlife. Every student in school should be required to take at least one course on this subject since 20,000,000 of our people depend on wildlife sports for recreation. We should certainly impress this more now than ever since so many thousands of our young men who were drafted during the recent war were rejected

on account of physical disabilities. I understand from authoritative sources that the majority of these disabilities could have been corrected if the young men had properly developed themselves by entering into normal sports such as fishing, hunting, and other popular outdoor exercises. We cannot take a chance on fighting another war with the prospect of having one-third of our young men rejected from service on account of physical disabilities.

If our schools would teach our children to be good sportsmen and not destroy the natural resources that we have at our disposal, so many of our choice animals and birds would not be diminishing to the extent that within the next ten years they will be extinct. I personally know of bird hunters here in our own midst that will make a desperate effort to kill every bird in the covey when they should be sportsmen enough to kill only three or four birds out of a covey. I have seen hunters go into the woods and kill more than 100 squirrels in 1 day when they could not possibly use one-half dozen for food purposes. This is an absurd waste of our game and such hunters should be outlawed from hunting by the good sportsmen of the country.

During the year 1940 I introduced a bill calling for an appropriation of $50,000 to create a wild turkey preserve in the lower part of Marion and Florence Counties. I am advised by the Director of the Bureau of Wildlife that the only pure strain of wild turkeys left in the United States are located in the coastal section of South Carolina. This bill was before the Agricultural Committee on the House when war was declared in 1941; hence no appropriation was made for this purpose. I expect to reintroduce my bill this year since the war is now over, in an effort to protect the last remaining few pure bred wild turkeys we have in this country.

First. Wildlife is dependent upon its environment for food, shelter, and a place to breed and rear its young. Soil and water conservation, erosion and flood control, reforestation and other forest programs, planting of shelter crops, the improvement of ranges and other similar activities are undertaken for the benefit of man's own living and working conditions. However, these improvements are of extreme value to the wildlife restoration program. As stated above, we must install a sound educational program for the preservation of wildlife in this country or the most choice wild game will soon become extinct.

Second. By wise manipulation to so manage the environment that wildlife protection and utilization may be controlled and maintained at certain levels. We must learn that it will be impossible to keep our wild game if we continue to destroy more than is raised.

During the past 10 years the Congress of the United States has at last become interested in this subject and has continuously increased appropriations for the preservation of wild game in the United States. I hope that every citizen in this country, and especially our sportsmen, can be taught to realize that we do not have an unlimited supply of wild game in this country and will not unnecessarily destroy same. We should use our game for sporting purposes and not try to see how many birds or how many fish could be destroyed on a single hunting or fishing trip.

The members of the South Carolina Wildlife Association can always feel free to call on me when I can be of assistance to them in promoting or supporting legislation that will assist in carrying out our wildlife program here in this State or in the United States.

Again let me thank the members of the wildlife association for extending me an invitation to attend this meeting, and trust that you will give me an opportunity to meet with you again in future years.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Lewis Merrill, president, United Office of Professional Workers of America, CIO, on legislation pending before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My organization, the United Office and Professional Workers, a union of some 70,000 men and women employed in insurance, banking, engineering, social service and other white collar fields, is deeply concerned with the labor bills now being studied by your committee.

We subscribe fully to the viewpoint presented by CIO President Philip Murray, particularly his statement that "These measures are forerunners of a serious depression involving all Americans."

There are serious economic storms ahead. The large profits of business, secured through the increasing concentration of economic power by the big corporations and their deliberate inflationary policies, are shrinking the domestic market. Labor's activity in raising living standards and creating a larger body of active consumers is vital to the interests of the Nation.

The constant decline in the real income of salaried employees is already having the gravest personal consequences to these 12,000,000 Americans. They are in no position to absorb today's high prices. Even a minor economic crisis would reduce millions of white-collar workers to poverty.

The national interest in the year 1947 is that the large productive facilities created during the war be used to raise the living standards of the people. It requires that every section of the working population, including the white collar workers, be free to organize to achieve their needs.

The white-collar workers need a strong labor movement and a strong Wagner Act. Their need for organization is so great that no force can finally prevent it. If legislation is passed which compels constant strife and turmoil in establishing their right to organize, the white-collar workers will meet the opposition as staunchly as manual workers have done in building their unions. But such bitter and costly struggle should not be imposed on them by their Government.

A large number of the members of my union are employed as insurance agents by such powerful corporations as the Metropolitan, Prudential, John Hancock, Boston Mutual, and other insurance companies. Their organization in 1936 met with vicious resistance. Should Congress adopt measures to weaken the Wagner Act, some of these companies will consider it an invitation to bust the union. They will not succeed, but much costly turmoil will take place. Have not these employees the right to demand of their Government that they should not again be required to prove their right to belong to a union?

Another group of our members are the technical employees—engineers, chemists, draftsmen, and others. It is the aim of too many corporations to take from these skilled men and women the products of their intelligence and genius, at salaries inadequate to provide them with decent living standards, and then, after picking their brains clean, to discard them at will. Only unionization can protect them. Their freedom to organize and right to strike contributes to a better science and technology by resulting in more adequately compensated and better satisfied technicians.

Another important group of UOPWA members is the social-service workers—a group of people who devote themselves to the welfare problems of people in the community. The Social Planning Council of St. Louis found that approximately one-third of the employees of community-chest agencies in that city receive less than $100 per month, while 75 percent were paid less than $2,000 a year.

Numerous prominent social workers, such as Charlotte Carr, executive director of the Citizens' Committee on Children and formerly director of Hull House in Chicago, advocate the strengthening of organized labor not only because of their concern for the employees of social agencies but because they recognize that unless workers generally organize to improve living standards, the social agencies of the country will be flooded with applicants for relief and service.

Take the case of the financial employees. It is not without cause that Wall Street has become a symbol of greed and exploitation. Bank employees have been among the worst paid in the Nation. Salaries of $20 and $25 per week for young women clerks and $40 for tellers have been typical for this group of workers who are expected to be above temptation.

Even with the existence of the Wagner Act, the giant Wall Street firms are resorting to intimidation and terror to prevent their employees from free-collective bargaining. At the Irving Trust Co. in New York, detectives have been employed in large numbers to spy on employees. While professing horror at the thought of strikes in banks, the banks have refused to accept arbitration.

Any restriction of the right to organize, bargain collectively, and strike means condemning the 300,000 bank employees of the Nation to a permanent low standard of living.

Millions of pious words have been uttered about the plight of white-collar workers. Yet we do not see representatives of business coming forth with proposals to establish higher minimum wages, extend social security or in other ways improve the status of white-collar workers. Instead by measures to weaken the labor movement, designed to increase profits and strengthen their control over our economy, they propose to interfere with the efforts of white-collar workers to improve their own conditions.

This can be seen most clearly through an examination of some of the specific measures proposed, such as:

Proposals to amend the Wagner Act advanced under the sham slogan of granting equality to employers, which would, in fact, encourage employers in their attempts to halt, intimidate, and interfere with white-collar workers who are exercising their rights to organize and bargain collectively.

Proposals to curb strikes, which are open invitations to employers to refrain from coming to an agreement.

Proposals to outlaw union security, which deny the experience of hundreds of unions and employers, including those in our field, where agreements providing for union security have created a stability of relationship beneficial to all. It is not true to say that workers are coerced. Our experience shows that where workers are given the choice of joining the union or paying the equivalent of union dues to charity they have almost without exception joined the union.

Proposals to limit or illegalize industry-wide collective bargaining, which deny to workers and their unions the right exercised

by management of American industry to make judgments on economic adjustments in the light of the facts prevailing in an entire industry. Industry-wide bargaining in the white-collar fields would, in fact, seriously curb the haphazard salary scales, capricious use of white-collar labor and heavy turnover which are detrimental to business and the people it serves as well as to the workers.

Proposals to exclude supervisory employees, which would leave at the mercy of management the many employees in commercial offices such as head tellers and head bookkeepers who are termed supervisory but who are in reality low-paid employees whose interests are harmonious with those of other employees.

Proposals to deny deductions from employees' pay, such as welfare funds, which in fact deny the individual employee the right to decide how part of his compensation should be administered.

CONCLUSION

It is our conclusion that all bills aimed at weakening labor should be rejected. The Republican Party, if it sponsors such measures, will not be reading the election results correctly. White-collar workers in the last election voted against inflationary policies and not for the destruction of social legislation benefiting working people.

Instead of adopting antilabor measures, this Congress should take steps to raise the living standards of the people, including the white-collar workers, to curb inflation and forestall severe economic dislocations through such measures as rent control, higher minimum wages, tax exemptions for low-income groups, adequate housing, and social security.

Why Is Conscience a Crime?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Christian Century, of date November 27, 1946. The article is as follows:

WHY IS CONSCIENCE A CRIME?

(By Josephine Johnson)

One purpose of government is to protect the consciences of men from oppression. That at least was the view of George Washington, who said in 1785: "Governments being, among other purposes, instituted to protect the consciences of men from oppression, it certainly is the duty of rulers not only to abstain from it themselves, but according to their stations to prevent it in others." Measured by that standard, our Government must be set down as a failure.

TREATED AS FELONS

Today, more than a year after the end of the Second World War, it is keeping in prison a thousand men whose only crime is that they obeyed their consciences rather than the state in the recent war. Thousands more who have been released live on with their civil status impaired by the brand of felony, being treated as society treats convicted murderers and thieves who have been released. Under the strange code of this civilization the man who kills and the man who refuses to kill stand together outside the common pale in a pariah caste. Men accused of wartime sedition have gone free without a trial. Ex-convicts who entered the Army from prison were granted amnesty. Men and women convicted of election frauds which undermine the whole basis of democratic government have been pardoned. But amnesty is denied to men who acted from the deepest conviction in behalf of a lasting peace and a true democracy.

Like those young soldiers who fought in the war believing that they took the one course possible to put an end to murder and oppression, the young men who would not fight made their choice also. They chose prison and social ostracism, believing that they took the one course possible to prevent murder and oppression from growing and spreading down the centuries. They foresaw some end to the killing, if not for those who died heroically in this war at least for the generations of young men after them. In some far day, they hoped, the nations would hear, as Abraham heard, the voice of God above the fire, and cease offering up their sons, but turn instead and find the ram in the bushes—the ram with the golden horns—and make the real and acceptable sacrifice.

A REBUKE TO AMERICA

"It is inconsistent with the spirit of our laws and Constitution to force tender consciences," wrote Thomas Jefferson in a proclamation concerning paroles. But we have not only forced the "tender conscience" (a debatable adjective since it has such iron integrity); we have levied on the young men of belief far longer sentences in prison than on persons convicted of traffic in white slaves or the peddling of narcotics. Some sentences do not expire until 1951, and even then the convicted man comes out without his civil rights and in some States cannot vote, hold office, or get professional jobs.

The reasons for the radical step taken by the conscientious objectors were varied. Besides the religious pacifists, there were Negro objectors to army jimcrow, Puerto Ricans, Moslems, Hopi Indians, and Asiatics. Some objected on political grounds, some on moral and humanitarian grounds. Yet they all share "the peace above all earthly dignities—a still and quiet conscience." That peace the conscience of the Nation and its lawmakers cannot share so long as we condone the hypocrisy of universal lip service to freedom and tolerance while penalizing those who attempt to practice these things. The millions of written words and thousands of speeches on freedom and tolerance, combined with our complacent belief that more freedom and tolerance are enjoyed here than in other countries, rise up to rebuke us. The fact is that in these less enlightened lands, both enemy and allied, political prisoners, and conscientious objectors have been released. The prison doors in Japan are open to free, among others, those once convicted of seditious thoughts. Canada has granted amnesty to 14,000 men; England has only 26 left behind her bars; and those men of conscience whom Hitler imprisoned, if they are still alive, are free.

THE RECORD OF CO'S

The record of conscientious objectors has been noteworthy during these years for service rendered in one way or another to others and to the national life. Having once taken what appeared to most people a negative and quiescent stand, they have turned that negativeness into a force for good and constructive action for their fellow men. They have voluntarily starved, frozen, contracted diseases and been bitten by lice in scientific experiments. They have voluntarily undergone worse treatment in prisons and gone on hunger strikes to end racial discrimination and other abuses. They have fought for reforms in mental hospitals, and have been directly instrumental in exposing and correcting our medieval heritage in the treatment of the insane.

There are many reasons why amnesty should be granted these men and a Presidential pardon given those in prison, with restoration of civil rights to them and to all who have been released. These reasons range from the overly sentimental to the coldly historical. They include the notable social contributions of the conscientious objectors and reasons which may be considered only religious ones by people who think of religion as a segmental rather than an integral part of life. But it is a fact, very terribly true, that when the state imprisons men for conscience' sake, when men are classed as criminals and deprived of civil rights for refusal to commit what they consider crime, then that society, that state or nation, may no longer declare itself free and democratic, but has begun the long invisible descent into fascism, the slow freezing into the iron image of the master state. No sacrifice in all the war was made for this.

Views of Columbia Typographical Union on Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from a labor leader, Jesse B. Manbeck, president of the Columbia Typographical Union, in which he sets forth some of his views regarding the labor legislation pending before us.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1947.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Noticing your published comment upon the testimony thus far by representatives of labor before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, permit me to add my contribution as the executive head of the oldest labor union in America, if not the world, in continuous existence, and because of our 132 years of labor history behind us, our organization has a greater depth of experience in labor work.

I am in agreement with that part of your comment which condemns the negative approach thus far evidenced by labor representatives upon proposed legislation.

As one labor representative, though strictly a local one, but representing one of the largest and highest-paid organized groups of skilled craftsmen in the Nation's Capital, and the one labor organization responsible, in large part, for both the formation of the American Federation of Labor as well as originating the closed-shop idea here in Washington in 1842, my more than 31 years' membership in the International Typographical Union has given me a few ideas that may be of interest:

1. Just as there are different laws for different types of banking, and fire-insurance laws are not the same as life-insurance laws, so should labor laws be enacted according to at

least the two types of labor—seasonal, such as the building trades, etc., and tenure or year-round labor.

2. That all labor unions should be required to elect all their officials through referendum elections of members at least once every 2 years, and not at conventions through delegates, etc.

3. Members of labor unions should be able to impeach their own elected officials—national or local—upon proper charges without jeopardizing their own membership or without being subjected to arbitrary punitive actions by the very officials they seek to impeach.

4. The International Typographical Union requires a three-fourths vote by secret ballot by members who have been in good standing in the local union for at least the preceding 6 months, and all members must be notified when any union meeting is called to vote upon a strike. (See p. 75, art XIX, ITU 1947 Book of Laws). It requires only a majority vote by secret ballot to call off an ITU strike. Surely such a democratic procedure already in effect for 84,000 union printers would not be objectionable.

5. Since 1815 this local union has required foremen, or anyone with the authority to give working orders to our members, to belong to our union, and in 132 years there have been no adverse effects or objections by management. Our union laws recognize only one foreman in a shop, with authority to hire and fire, but nothing is permitted to interfere with the giving of instructions by others for the proper execution of work.

6. A legal prohibition of the closed shop would be impossible of enforcement, at least insofar as the skilled crafts are concerned. Take our union—an apprenticeship of 6 years or equivalent experience is one of the minimum requirements for membership. It is hardly likely that members accepted upon such minimum standards are going to permit an anti-closed-shop law to undermine the standards they were required to have.

Again, an anti-closed-shop law would be giving preferred status to the nonunion member—the "hitch-hiker." Statistics recently publicized state that 70 percent of the manufacturing industries of America are operated under closed-shop contracts. Would it be fair to give preferential treatment to the 30 percent?

The United States Government Printing Office here in Washington, D. C., employs the largest number of union printers in the entire country—some 1,600, but less than one-half of 1 percent of these printers are not members of the union. Even the United States Government, operating on an open-shop principle, finds that it has to depend upon a labor union for its supply of printers to produce the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Federal Register, and all Federal printing requirements.

An anti-closed-shop law would result in an intensification of union organizational work so that the labor supply would be enrolled in the various unions. Members of labor unions are subject to disciplinary restrictions, and as has been done by our union in those States which have passed anti-closed-shop laws, "conditions of employment" have been prescribed, and union members violating same are subject to disciplinary action by the union of which they are members.

Certainly labor legislation should be constructive if it is to be remedial. Substituting preferential protection or treatment for the unorganized as against the organized has the appearance of substituting one alleged discrimination for another. Making chicken salad by using one horse and one chicken doesn't necessarily make the two component parts equal just because there's one of each.

In conclusion, as one local labor leader, it is my opinion that Congress could do a real job on labor legislation by legislating to—

1. Require referendum elections for local and national unions' officers at least once every 2 years, with union legislative machinery available so that the membership could impeach officers, if necessary.

2. Require at least a majority vote on strikes by members who have been on the books of the union for 90 or more days prior to the vote, and all members to be notified in writing before a strike vote could be taken by secret ballot.

3. Require foremen or similar administrators to belong to rank-and-file unions, with full voting rights, so that management can thus have a voice and vote, if desired, in the affairs of the unions.

4. Require mandatory grievance arbitration under the terms of the contract, but leave contract terminal arbitration upon a voluntary basis.

5. Put a statutory limit within which jurisdictional disputes should be settled, or mandatory arbitration could be invoked by either party or parties to the dispute.

6. Make it mandatory for management to deal upon a local level with labor unions, with the national unions, or representatives only assisting the local unions, but never usurping the prerogatives of the local union.

Very truly yours,

JESSE B. MANBECK,
President.

Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 I addressed the House on the subject of the Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport. On that occasion I included in my remarks a report of the St. Louis Airport Commission, explaining the vicious merry-go-round of various Government departments in which the city had found itself after many months, while attempting to regain its airport. There is no need of my again stating the St. Louis case, except that on that occasion I extended into the RECORD a copy of my letter to the President.

I am happy now to announce that a very satisfactory and just agreement has been reached between the Government agencies and the city of St. Louis. In expressing my thanks to the President and to the various departments, I feel that it is likewise my duty to express my thanks to this House. The following is the letter which I addressed to the President on February 26.

This closes the matter at this time, insofar as the House of Representatives is concerned.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1947.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On January 7, 1947, after months of fruitless negotiations, I wrote you concerning the difficulty the city of St. Louis was having in regaining the Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport. This is to express my appreciation of your action in bringing together the various Government agencies and the officials of the city of St. Louis into discussions at the White House. As you well know, these discussions bore fruit.

In addition, I want to express my appreciation to Mr. Clark Clifford who acted in your behalf. His arrangement of the conferences, and the few minutes he was able to spend with us were most helpful.

Only after months of dealing, which proved that the Federal agencies failed to comprehend the equities in the dispute, did I bother you with the subject. It then took 2 weeks and 1 day of conferences to get an agreement which brought a just settlement.

One newspaper headline stated that St. Louis had regained its airport dirt cheap, and another newspaper editorially seemed to think of it as a successful military coup on the part of the city officials. Neither is fact, nor was it at any time my purpose. All that I wanted was justice for St. Louis, the proper balance of equities.

If the city of St. Louis had paid more, it may have proved profitable to do so. If the city had just claims it might have foregone them without too great a loss, but such a bargain would have lacked equity. If at times I exhibited an excessive amount of Missouri stubbornness, it was only because I believed implicitly in the city's position.

The deal might have been settled in 2 days and been a good bargain for the city, but not an equitable settlement. We were not out to get something for nothing. We were out to get prompt justice. I think it has been attained through your cooperation.

I do not want St. Louisans to think of my part in the airport matter as getting something for nothing for the city. I prefer them to think of it as getting something that rightfully belongs to St. Louis—nothing more or nothing less.

May I say that the cooperation received during the conferences from Mr. Arthur Manley and Mr. Edward Bridges, of War Assets Administration; Mr. Linus Kelly, of Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Mr. George Borsari, of Civil Aeronautics Administration; and Captain Pihl, of the Navy, is deeply appreciated by me.

Warm personal regards,
Sincerely yours.

Memorial of Oregon Legislature Favoring Increase in Payments to Veterans Receiving On-the-Job Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following House joint memorial of the Oregon Legislature:

House Joint Memorial 10

Whereas the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, provides, among other things, for the readjustment of war veterans of World War II by a plan of education and training which makes available to men who are attending school or receiving on-the-job training a payment from the Federal Government of $65 a month to single men and $90 a month to married men; and

Whereas Public Law 679, which amended the original act, became effective in August 1946 and placed a limit on the gross earnings, including the payment from the Government, of a veteran receiving this benefit

in the amount of $175 for single men and $200 for married men; and

Whereas this benefit, especially as it pertained to men receiving on-the-job training and apprentices, was intended to supply a total payment somewhat approaching a journeyman's pay during the training period; and

Whereas the amounts thus provided are inadequate considering living costs and the reduction has created hardships for those involved in the program; and

Whereas while a reasonable ceiling should be placed on gross earnings, those as established are too low: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be urged to increase the limit to $250 for single trainees and apprentices and $300 for married trainees and apprentices.

Adopted by house February 20, 1947.

JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate February 22, 1947.

M. E. CORNETT.
President of Senate.

Allen T. Treadway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, Allen T. Treadway was one of New England's most distinguished sons. A native of Massachusetts and a graduate of Amherst College, a member of the Massachusetts house, and president of the State senate, he came to Congress back in 1914, while my father was then a Member.

When I was elected to Congress and when the first roll call to which I answered was completed, Mr. Treadway and a half-dozen others—old-timers from both sides of the aisle—came down into the well of the House to greet the son of the man with whom they had served. That was some group. And to that distinguished group I owe much, because of their advice and good counsel, invaluable to me as of the early days of my experience in Congress.

I know of no man more conscientious in the discharge of his duties than was Allen Treadway, or more capable in their performance.

The war years tired him. They taxed his strength unremittingly, for his love of country was paramount to party or policy.

Allen Treadway's career in Congress was marked and permeated by his strong convictions and his unquestioned integrity. His life was in itself his monument, dedicated as it was to a notable service, not only to his immediate constituents, but to all people everywhere.

His was a life rich in rare honesty of purpose, strengthened by, indomitable courage to fight for the right as he saw it. This courage was balanced and abetted by brains and an uncanny ability to use them.

Allen Treadway consecrated himself to the service of the people, who now mourn his passing. They realize and appreciate the fact that his sole intent and purpose was to serve them. No man can have a more lasting monument than that inscribed in the hearts of those whose confidence in him was never betrayed. Such a monument is Allen T. Treadway's.

H. R. 496

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement before the Miller subcommittee of the House District Committee, on H. R. 496, by Milton S. Kronheim, president of Milton S. Kronheim & Son, Inc., Washington, D. C.:

Gentlemen, my name is Milton Kronheim I am a wholesale licensee under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia and have been since the prohibition law was repealed 13 years ago. I feel that I have not only a right as a citizen to appear before your committee and discuss this bill but I have a duty to do so because of the fact that I have had extensive experience with confirmed alcoholics as well as sensible drinkers.

I was in the alcoholic beverage business prior to prohibition as was my father before me. I learned much of the human element entering into the sale of alcoholic beverages at that time. During the period of prohibition I was in the bail-bonding business in the District of Columbia. In that business I learned probably more than ever before about the pitiful wrecks who turn up in our police court and who appear in places where they would least be expected. At first hand I learned the heart-rending conditions of these people—people from the lowest gutter type to those still clinging to some thread of respectability. The horror of their condition impressed me deeply.

Although I returned to the alcoholic beverage business upon repeal, the horror remains with me. I know it impresses others. Truly, these derelicts deserve our sympathy and they must have every ounce of intelligent help which we can give them.

I, and those associated with me in the beverage business have not neglected to study the best means of aiding these unfortunate people. Many of us have found that the most effective assistance we could give was to the individual from the individual. However, we have for some years been engaged in a study of the problem which it is proposed to deal with in Representative HÉBERT's bill now before you.

I want to be perfectly frank in my discussion of this proposal. I, therefore will at the outset say unequivocally that I find the bill unsatisfactory. I have so told Mr. HÉBERT.

I do not, however, want you to think that I or my associates stop merely with our objection to this bill. We have gone further and before concluding my testimony, it is my hope, that I shall be able to outline proposals which might well serve as a substitute for the Hébert bill, and which might better bring about a solution of the problem which Mr. HÉBERT and I certainly want solved.

While I do not wish to appear antagonistic, I find, and believe that you will find, upon study, that section 1 of the bill, which outlines its purposes, is far from being fair to those who consume alcoholic beverages, as well as to those who dispense them. This section places upon the beverage industry the blame for many things which we do not accept, while at the same time it fails to mention many of the beneficial aspects of our business—a business which, let me remind you, is conducted under the Constitution, the laws of this Congress, and at the wish and will of the people. Specifically, the section makes generalizations which cannot be proven and which I do not believe to be the fact.

As one illustration, I will read the following paragraph from the first paragraph of section 1: "The purpose of this act is to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance and provide for the medical, psychiatric, and other scientific treatment of chronic alcoholics, to minimize the deleterious effects of excessive drinking on those who pass through the courts of the District of Columbia; to reduce the financial burden imposed upon the people of the District of Columbia by the abusive use of alcoholic beverages as is reflected in mounting accident rates, decreased personal efficiency, growing absenteeism, and a general increase in the amount and seriousness of crime in the District of Columbia and to substitute for jail sentences for drunkenness medical and other scientific methods of treatment which will benefit the individual involved and more fully protect the public."

There is no proof that this bill would reduce the existing heavy financial burden imposed upon the people of the District of Columbia. In fact, there is little in the bill to indicate it would do so. When I come to a discussion of the financial aspects of the measure I expect to show to all clear-minded men that it probably would not do so. Moreover, there is no proof, and I do not believe that any agency in the community could prove, that the abusive use of alcoholic beverages is reflected in accident rates, personal efficiency, absenteeism, and the amount and seriousness of crime in the District of Columbia.

It is easy to say that these things exist, and it might be easy to say that existing they are attributable to abuse of alcoholic beverages. But the facts and figures do not from any study I have been able to make prove them to be true.

The same paragraph authorizes the courts, in order to accomplish these purposes—which as I say are not proven—to take judicial notice of the fact that a chronic alcoholic is a sick man. This is a revolutionary authorization to give to the courts. There is constant friction not only as to what constitutes a chronic alcoholic but over the simple—relatively—question of whether a man is intoxicated or not. There are general bills designed to consider this relatively simple problem, yet none of them is acceptable to the legal profession in its entirety nor to the medical profession. Yet there is a sweeping provision in this bill which strikes out all doubt as to the really difficult question of what constitutes chronic alcoholism.

I turn now to page 3, section 2, which attempts to define the term "chronic alcoholic." The definition does not seem to me to define a chronic alcoholic, and entirely leaves out those persons who are chronic alcoholics. I mean those who drink "smoke" and antifreeze, 14 of whom have died in the community since the first of the year, 2 of them in a District penal institution.

Section 3 directs the Commissioners to establish and equip a clinic in connection either with some existing hospital or with

some correctional institution for the "classification, hospitalization, confinement, treatment, and study of persons who are found to be chronic alcoholics." It places the supervision and direction of the clinic under the Department of Corrections. Omitting for the moment a discussion of the vagueness of the directions given to the Commissioners, I point out that if the chronic alcoholic is a diseased person and is to be treated in a hospital, certainly the clinic in which he is placed should not be under the direction of the Department of Corrections but under either the Department of Health or the Board of Public Welfare.

Section 4 directs the judge of a court before whom a chronic alcoholic may be found guilty of any offense, to send the chronic alcoholic to the clinic but it limits the time which he may be sent there to 90 days. I do not think that even the able Dr. MILLER, chairman of this committee, can say that if the chronic alcoholic is a diseased person his treatment can be standardized, or that a chronic alcoholic could be cured in 90 days.

While section 3 places the clinic under supervision of the Director of the Department of Corrections, section 5, for some strange reason, authorizes a representative of the Board of Public Welfare to set active procedures in motion to commit the so-called alcoholic.

And again, strangely enough, while other sections limit the treatment to 90 days, section 6 which provides for voluntary admission to the clinic of a person believing himself to be a chronic alcoholic, provides that when the patient registers at the clinic the Commissioners—not the courts—but the Commissioners, shall admit the chronic alcoholic "for such period of time as is estimated by the Director as necessary to effect a cure." The contradiction in these provisions is obvious and confusing. The courts are limited to 90 days. The Commissioners, not a judicial body, are unlimited.

Section 7 gives the Director of the clinic, whose qualifications are not set forth in the bill, great power. It provides that he shall first send a person committed to the clinic to a classification and diagnostic center. After the person has been committed as a chronic alcoholic it seems to me to be a little late to start diagnosing his condition.

Section 11 reads as follows: "No chronic alcoholic or offender shall be committed under the terms of this act until the District Commissioner shall certify to the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia the extent to which proper and adequate treatment facilities and personnel have been provided to carry out the purposes of this act." To me this appears slightly ridiculous, but it is a relief to know that no one could be committed until the District Commissioners certify that there is a proper place to which to commit them.

Under section 12, "The Commissioners of the District of Columbia may contract with any appropriate agency not under its control for the custody, care, subsistence, treatment, and training of offenders committed to the alcoholic clinic herein authorized."

I take it that under this provision no such clinic need ever be established and the Commissioners could start tomorrow to send those admitted to be chronic alcoholics to any place they thought suitable. This might mean any institution now caring for intoxicated persons. It might mean Gallinger Hospital. It might mean the George Washington Hospital, which, in its new building now under construction, will have one floor reserved for the care of alcoholics. On the other hand, it might mean that the Commissioners could resort to the old and well-known Keely cure at any one of a number of establishments in the States operating for the care of intoxicated persons. Frankly, I question the wisdom or the necessity of this section.

Section 13 authorizes and directs the Commissioners to appoint a totally unlimited number of employees to carry out the purposes of the act. The very vagueness of this section as to the number, type, and quality of those to be employed is indicative of the vagueness with which we are approaching a very definite, delicate, and difficult problem.

Section 14 reads as follows: "The director of the clinic shall from time to time submit to the Commissioners such recommendations as will further the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics, prevent the excessive and abusive use of alcoholic beverages, promote temperance, and he shall also gather and publish as complete and accurate data as is possible relating to the physiological, psychological, economic, and social effects of the abusive use of alcoholic beverages, and shall prepare and publish materials, data, and information to be used in a program of public education in the District of Columbia directed toward the prevention and use of alcoholic beverages excessively and abusively."

All of the reports and recommendations called for in this section 14 should be available now to the Commissioners. Some of them are required to be submitted by the Police Department. Some of them are required to be used by the board of education in instructing school children to prevent the excessive use of intoxicants, and some are required or have been given by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board. I should like to see the Control Board make more extensive reports and more extensive studies. The Board formerly did so, and I hope it will continue to do so in the future. Nevertheless, it is a fact that data information called for and the program of public education outlined in section 14 now are, or should be, available to the District Commissioners. Furthermore, the information should be used.

Section 15 sets up a special tax, rather vaguely estimated, for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of the act.

Let me be personal for a moment in discussing this section. Throughout my life I have been a total abstainer from the use of alcoholic beverages. If a way could be devised to prohibit anyone from drinking alcoholic beverages I would be the first to close the doors of my warehouse.

We have tried prohibition. Various States have tried other forms of control. I think we have found in the operation of the Control Act of the District of Columbia probably the best method of curbing the excessive use of alcohol. I should be distressed to see the system disturbed unless there were set up a program which we knew would accomplish the highly desirable purpose in the minds of so many.

However, the prohibition law was repealed by the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States. A recent poll of the people of the District of Columbia conducted by the Washington Post showed that 78 percent of our people are in favor of retaining the existing system of control. I do not think that under those conditions we should needlessly and without a firm foundation throw away the experiences of 13 years.

Now, briefly I wish to outline to the committee some of the things the industry is trying to do to meet a problem which we know must be solved, namely, the abuse of the product which the public wants and will have.

For many years I have been among those supporting a national organization making a study of this identical problem. We have worked with those at Yale University and we are now working with those at Cornell University.

It was only recently that Cornell University was brought into the subject and at that time a number of individual firms made a total grant in aid to Cornell to finance research on the problem which we are attempting to solve here today. This has not been done through any organization because organizations dissolve. The pledges have been made by individual firms. They amount in total to $250,000 a year. The pledges are made by substantial firms in the industry.

It is our hope that out of these researches will come some definite material which we can bring to you gentlemen in Congress and say to you, "Here is the best scientific study that can be made; here are the recommendations of those well qualified to speak."

Pending that, I recommend to the committee that the committee itself as a part of its conduct of the District government make a definite study of the matter. Let us call in our outstanding citizens and those who handle alcoholic beverages and find out from them what their best thoughts are. There should be no offhand thinking, nor thinking based on prejudice or bias, because we have this problem with us and it is going to remain with us.

As to the matter of a special tax for this proposed clinic, frankly I oppose it.

It is my theory, supported by many other businessmen, that special-tax funds are not sound for city financing. The alcoholic-beverage industry collects now some $3,000,000 a year which goes into the general fund of the District. Whatever additional taxes it is asked to raise should likewise go into the general funds.

You Members of the House all know that recently the Congress with very little consideration extended the Federal wartime excise taxes which, it had been fully expected, would be repealed. I am not complaining about this. The District Commissioners are preparing a tax bill which would double the taxes on alcoholic beverages in the District. I hope to appear in opposition to the manner in which the bill is being drawn.

Let me remind you that this is a legal business established by act of Congress. Let me further remind you that it is a highly competitive business—that the least unbalancing of taxes in one jurisdiction destroys the business in that jurisdiction and sends it into another community.

I repeat my sympathy for the chronic alcoholics who continually appear in the police court. I pledge you that I would willingly do anything possible to aid them, and I believe that anyone in the trade would do the same. But this bill will not do it.

Agricultural Marketing Research at Earliest Possible Date Asked by Oregon Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following house joint memorial of the Oregon Legislature:

House Joint Memorial 7

Whereas Oregon agriculture again faces the possibilities of an agricultural depression caused by surplus production; and

Whereas a program of planned scarcity is neither an economic nor sensible solution to the problem; and

Whereas increased consumption of agricultural products is the sound method of

meeting the problem of surplus production of agricultural products; and

Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress enacted the Hope-Flannagan Act, Public Law 733, which provides for a marketing-research program to develop new and greater markets for agricultural products; and

Whereas the act authorizes substantial annual appropriations for marketing research; and

Whereas marketing research is of special interest to the State of Oregon because of the large variety of specialty crops it produces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be urged to appropriate the funds authorized by the Hope-Flannagan bill for agricultural marketing research at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be authorized and directed to forward immediately certified copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Members of the Oregon congressional delegation, and the chairmen of House and Senate Agricultural Committees.

Adopted by house February 12, 1947.

JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate February 21, 1947.

M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.

Inside Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article from the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., dated Friday, February 28, 1947, and entitled "Inside Labor":

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

It's a benevolent Congress we have. It spends millions keeping wildlife, itinerant birds, fish, seals, and sea otters happy. I didn't get any information from a mermaid. I got it from the national budget.

This Government of ours, operating strangely in those block-square, multiwindowed Federal fortresses along Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, spends $1,500,000 a year to keep fish alive—yet some congressional busybodies are planning to cut the funds which will keep coal diggers from dying a gasping, flaming death in some caved-in pit.

We spend $819,307 yearly to protect seals and sea otters so the befurred Pribilof Island natives won't be unhappy. But up on the Hill here Congressmen with spyglasses plan to slash the funds which might save some 12-year-old kid from sunstroke in fields and exhaustion in canning plants where he (or she) is working illegally for a few dollars a day.

This country spends $6,000,000 each year to prevent white pine trees from getting blisters. We pour out $725,000 to learn why fish die. We dish out $2,000,000 for the well-being of migratory birds. We're so concerned with the good humor of mammals and birds that we hand out $853,000 to keep them in their native haunts. We disburse $125,000 so that the fishing crowd can have a Government fishery news publication.

If you're tired of fish and game and rodents—$1,000,000 for the rats, incidentally—you might like to know we pay $320,000 so strong-lunged chaps can shout "Oyez, oyez" in Federal courts each year. And under Private Law 438 this Government paid $4,500 for two medals for an admiral and a general.

I've got nothing against the birds and the bees and white pine trees—but it's five-star stupidity to put sea otters and wild ducks before men, women—yes, and children—who toil for their daily bread. And that's just what Congress is doing.

Millions are going for tribute to wildlife—and virtually nothing for defense of the average employer and the average Joe in the average factory.

Penny-picking Congressmen, for example, want to slash almost in half the United States Labor Department's operating budget of $32,000,000 (less than what we pay to care for wild trees). This would force the Labor Department to fire almost half its 7,000 employes and operate a major department with only 3,500 persons.

And what will the penny-pickers save?

They'll keep $400,000 from the Labor Department by slashing the Conciliation Service. Who wins on that one? No one. The Nation's employers lose—and heavily. Last year the Conciliation Division settled 13,000 labor-management feuds and threatened strikes without losing a single man-hour in stoppages. Yet Congress wants to cripple the Division by depriving it of less than half the amount it takes to protect otters in some frozen sea.

What else will the penny-pickers save?

They want to drop $2,000,000 from the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics—a division which does everything from service employers on details of labor agreements to set the index for alimony payments. All that to save $2,000,000—just about the amount the Government spends to keep migratory birds good natured.

In all, the penny-pickers proposed slash of Labor Department funds comes to about $15,000,000 of the Department's $32,000,000 current operating expense. That $15,000,000 will provide a heyday for chiselers. The slash will cripple codes for training of GI apprentices and Federal inspection of factory and mine safety measures (more than 2,000,000 workers were injured in 1946, 16,500 of them fatally).

Their injuries cost management and labor $3,500,000,000 (that's right, billions). The division which keeps kids out of factories until they've had a chance to get some life into them; and the bureau which studies problems of women in industry will disappear like a ball off Hank Greenberg's bat.

I think birds are wonderful. But I like people better than anybody. Congress should ease up on wildlife and spend its dollars to keep us humans in our natural habitat.

The Right to Work: Who Will Protect It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "The Right To Work: Who Will Protect It?" by David Lawrence:

THE RIGHT TO WORK: WHO WILL PROTECT IT?

(By David Lawrence)

(Closed-shop monopoly is contrary to fundamental principles of democracy—individual right to work supersedes group right to strike—duty of Congress is to protect interest of all the people.)

The right to strike is considered by trade-union leaders to be inviolate.

Let any legislator venture to propose that it be restricted and that the community be safeguarded against general strikes or work stoppages which interfere with the supply of food and necessities—and what do we hear in protest?

From labor-union leaders of prominence comes a chorus of denunciation. Why, this is involuntary servitude. Who dares to consider the interests of the community to be above that of a union—as, for example, the United Mine Workers of America?

When the great Government of the United States sought by simple injunction to enjoin a closed-shop labor-union monopoly from starving the Nation, the legal staffs of the AFL and the CIO went into action in defense against the common enemy—the vast majority of citizens who were being injured by the strike.

Why, it was asserted, the very idea of assuming that the Government of the United States can use the injunctive process to stop a strike. Didn't Congress deliberately deprive the Government of the power to protect itself when the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed to abolish injunctions or restraining orders against labor unions? Wasn't the Government itself barred from applying the law of self-preservation—the law that is higher than statute law?

The mere posing of that question revealed the plight into which the relation of the Government to human society in America had fallen.

RIGHT TO WORK IS FUNDAMENTAL

It was, in effect, seriously argued that Congress, by a simple statute, could take away fundamental rights from the citizens—rights inherent in the Constitution itself.

For what is more fundamental than the right of every citizen to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"? What civil liberty is of greater import than the simple right to work?

The labor-union leaders and many of the so-called liberals are quick to cry out against any discrimination by an employer who relates the test of job qualification to the question of race, creed or color, or politics.

Yet the job test in many industries in America today actually is whether the worker will pay tribute to a union oligarchy, whether he will yield his convictions and swear allegiance to a union—a wholly separate system of government which owes its chief support to a special privilege granted by the Government itself.

How can anybody with the slightest respect for the word "liberalism" defend the principle of the "closed shop"? Under what theory of government can it be urged that the right to work in America must be ruled upon by a union board of directors and that the employer must be bound thereby?

CLOSED SHOP RARELY VOLUNTARY

It alleviates the situation not a bit to say that the closed-shop contract is a private matter as between the employer and the union. It does not alter fundamentals one iota to say that the contracts are voluntary and hence legal, as the Wagner Act, with transparent dishonesty, avers. For everyone who wasn't born yesterday knows that closed-shop contracts have rarely been signed voluntarily. They have been signed only as a result of a strike threat or a strike. Closed-shop contracts are about as voluntary as the

arrangement between the hold-up man and the victim who hands over his money at the point of a gun.

There are those who rationalize the case for the closed shop. They say the nonunion minority should not be privileged to reap the benefits of the negotiations carried on by the majority, who pay the dues and pay for the work of the negotiators. This is plausible on its face but, after all, isn't this a matter for the individual worker to decide? Why must it be a matter of discipline enforced by the employer at the behest of a union? Is trade-unionism so weak in its advantages and doctrines that it cannot hope to persuade the minority to join the union and pay dues, but instead must use employer coercion to club them into submission?

The real reason, of course, is not to cover the minority into membership to get their relatively small contributions in dues or initiation fees. The real purpose is to get control of the whole shop so that nobody can be hired who doesn't join and nobody can stay in his job who incurs the ire of the union officers.

Any kind of closed shop—sometimes called a union shop or maintenance of membership—is contrary to the fundamental principles of freedom-loving citizens who have been raised under a democracy.

For a closed shop is a form of totalitarianism. It is utterly incompatible with democracy.

To grant to any group of citizens the right to say who shall or shall not work is a scheme analogous to that which was set up under the NRA when a code authority was formed to manage each industry. That smacked of the corporate state and was promptly repudiated in 1935 by a unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, with liberals like Justices Brandeis, Cardozo, and Stone concurring.

The Court said that Congress could not delegate to any group of citizens the right to run American business or industry and to make laws therefor.

The principle is just the same with respect to the closed shop. If the closed shop were proper for union groups, it would be proper for management groups, and we should drift into the vicious cartel system which is the foundation of fascism.

The trouble with present-day union leaders is that they have been infected with collectivist doctrine. They do not see that the individual is the key to democracy and to the success of a free-enterprise system and that, if any regulating in the common interest has to be done to protect the state against the excesses of the individual, it is the government of all the people which must exercise the power to legislate.

UNIONS CONTROL WORKERS' LIVELIHOOD

The national unions have become a system of government. They have laws and rules which are more powerful in affecting the opportunity to earn a livelihood or operate a business than any provision of the Wagner Act or wage-and-hour law.

For nothing is more germane to the opportunity of an individual than the right to work.

The right to work is more sacred than the right to strike in a body. The right to work and the right of an individual to quit work are on the same level in a fundamental sense. But the right to strike as applied and exercised today is the right of a few individuals to order tens of thousands of other citizens to quit work, even though they do not wish to do so. The penalty is the permanent loss of a job in the one trade in which a worker may be qualified. The closed shop gives to an oligarchy the right to force work stoppages. That oligarchy operates in totalitarian fashion. On this page last week we printed a frank statement by a former member of the international executive board of the CIO Steelworkers Union telling how little democracy there is inside unions nowadays and how much the whole thing resembles the totalitarian state.

DEMOCRACY IMPERILED BY MONOPOLY

True liberalism demands the abolition of any such restraint or monopoly power. To contend that the closed shop has been here a long time and should be accepted as custom or that labor unions will be indignant and will dare to strike if Congress acts is to say that the Government has already become powerless.

Whenever any group of citizens becomes bigger than the Government, it is the duty of all the people to put such groups in their place, no matter how loud the cries of pain or indignation that come from those who are reluctant to give up special privileges.

It is a stern duty of the Congress to protect the right to work by removing from the Wagner Act the sanction written therein which gives legislative protection to the closed-shop monopoly. It has no more right on the statute books than would an amendment to the antitrust laws giving a group of steel companies the right to determine whether a new competitor shall be admitted to the steel business or whether a company member of the group shall be penalized if it refuses to abide by the rules and regulations laid down by the board of directors of the trade association.

The right to work is inviolate. No other labor-union rights are on a par with it and until the right of the individual to work is assured, superseding the collectivist right to engage in strikes or lock-outs, democracy in America is in peril.

H. R. 2157

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that the people of these United States have been led to believe that the Gwynne bill, H. R. 2157, which passed the House last Friday, is a bill only to correct the situation arising from the so-called portal-to-portal suits. It is much more than that. It is, as its title properly indicates, a bill to limit the jurisdiction of the courts, and goes so far that the Judiciary Committee, after holding hearings, reported this bill to the House and found itself divided into five groups.

Eighteen members were represented by the committee report, five members joined in a minority report, two members presented joint minority views, and two other members presented their individual views. Imagine having four minority reports on the one bill.

All of us are agreed that of the many portal-to-portal suits filed a large number would not stand up in court. There are pending, however, some valid suits, involving chiseling by unscrupulous employers. These should be determined on their merit. They should be decided by the courts and their determination should not be barred by legislation.

The bill goes further, however, and restricts to 1 year the time within which an employee may file claim against his employer for wages to which he is entitled. The statutes of limitations governing other classes of suits to recover money due run, on the average, to 3 years. That being the case, I fail to see the justice of placing a 1-year limit on suits to recover wages earned.

Section 2 (f) of this bill permits compromising claims for back wages due under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. While in the ordinary case compromises of strictly private rights of individuals are favored by the courts, the United States Supreme Court has held that claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act are of a different category and cannot be compromised. The reason is obvious.

Claims due under the act are not merely private rights of individuals but are a matter involving public rights and interest. The purpose of the act was to create a uniform Nation-wide policy of guaranteeing every worker entitled to the benefits of the act a basic minimum wage and payment of overtime and to prevent chiselers from gaining an unfair competitive advantage by paying sweat-shop wages. If claims can be settled for less than the minimum requirements of the act, it would mean that the honest employers will be paying the full statutory amount while the chiseler who is a good bargainer will not. As a result the act would be meaningless and the sole yardstick for paying wages will be how good a bargainer the employer is.

The employee who needs the protection of the act the most is the lowest paid and financially defenseless. Most of these are unorganized and do not know what their rights under the statute are. When an employer offers them an amount as full settlement of their claims, which by itself is a considerable sum, many will accept the compromise even though, unknown to them, it is only a fraction of what is due.

Even when these employees know that the employer is settling for less than the full amount required, they are not in a position to object. The low-paid breadwinner with a wife and children depending on his day-to-day wages cannot afford to stand up against his employer and assert his rights. To him a half a loaf is better than none even though the Congress of the United States has determined that he is due a whole loaf. The only employer who will benefit by this provision is the chiseler who thinks that it is smart business to exploit the American worker. Any compromise he will offer will be no more than a take-it-or-leave-it proposition with no attempt to reach a mutually satisfactory settlement.

Under the present law a worker forced to resort to the courts to collect wages rightfully his under the law, recovers not only those wages but an equal additional amount as damages. A worker who has been deprived of his just wages until he actually recovers them after a time-consuming lawsuit has clearly sustained real damages. Surely the employer who has withheld the wages lawfully due and thereby gained competitive advantage over the law-abiding employer should be required to pay for the damage done. But the committee's bill penalizes the honest employer, penalizes the already

underpaid employee—and rewards the chiselers—for it requires the employee to prove that the employer acted in bad faith, and even then leaves the award of damages entirely to the discretion of the trial court. Thus the enforcement of supposedly national standards would vary in each and every court in the land and employers would be encouraged to disregard the statute's standards, secure that even if they got caught they would pay no more than they should have paid in the first place. Moreover, if they can get away with it for one short year, they are safe—the employee has no redress and the law-abiding employer is under a handicap.

These provisions of the bill defeat the beneficent purposes of the act—and by no stretch of the imagination have any real bearing on the portal-to-portal question.

I agree with the conclusion of the minority report that this bill will accomplish a virtual destruction of any standards in labor practices. I think many of the provisions of this bill might accomplish this destruction, and I invite your attention to what I consider a particularly vicious provision, that is, section 2 (g) which makes the award of damages for violation of the law a matter wholly within the discretion of the individual courts. Can anyone conceive of any degree of uniformity in the enforcement of this law, which is supposed to establish national minimum labor standards, if each and every State or Federal court in which an action is brought may decide in each case what underpaid employees shall recover? I can hardly conceive of a more effective way of promoting unfair competition at the expense of low-paid workers and of insuring a complete break-down in enforcement of the act.

Archbishop Stepinac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in January, at the request of the Holy Redeemer Athletic Association, of Rochester, N. Y., I protested to the Secretary of State regarding the grave injustice done to Archbishop Stepinac by the present Yugoslav Government in sentencing him to imprisonment at hard labor for a period of 16 years.

Now I have received from the commander of the Streb-Lappan-Klem American Legion Post, of Rochester, a forceful denunciation of this example of godless tyranny. Enclosed in the letter are the stirring words of the Archbishop of Zagreb, uttered in his own defense, at the travesty of justice called a trial.

As one of the Protestant faith, I commend in the highest terms the Catholic organizations and the American Legion posts who have taken up the fight to assure that, even if the release of Archbishop Stepinac cannot be effected because of the unwillingness of our Department of State to inject itself into what is considered the internal administration of a foreign power, at least the sacrifices of this courageous man of God will not have been in vain.

The treatment he has received has shocked the conscience of the Christian world. Those responsible, who know not the meaning of justice under law, should be made to understand that Archbishop Stepinac is to the American people a symbol of courageous godliness in the face of tyrannical abuses and excesses with few parallels in history.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter which I have mentioned from the American Legion post. I had intended also to include the full text of the inspiring defense address of Archbishop Stepinac but will not duplicate the action just taken by my colleague from New York.

STREB-LAPPAN-KLEM
AMERICAN LEGION POST, 1591,
Rochester, N. Y., February 22, 1947.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We are presenting herewith a man's statement which deserves a just hearing. It is a true copy of the words of Aloysius Stepinac, archbishop of Zagreb, Yugoslavia, at his recent trial. Despite this forthright defense, the Partisan court sentenced him to 16 years' imprisonment at hard labor.

This American Legion post is named in memory of three men who lost their lives in World War II, men who went to war inspired by the four freedoms, the Atlantic Charter, and the desire to bring these basic human rights to their fellowmen. We respectfully call your attention to the shocking violation of human rights in this case, an example, we believe, of Tito tyranny.

As our Congressman, we think you cannot be indifferent to this injustice. The present Yugoslav Government owes its existence to the diplomatic and military support of this Government. Its survival has been made possible by our continued diplomatic recognition and generous financial support. This case is a clear one of religious persecution. The state flagrantly violates the civil and religious rights of one of its own subjects.

We strongly recommend the reading of this noble defense in the Halls of Congress in order that appropriate action may be taken.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN M. HEDGES,
Commander.

World Role for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following interesting but challenging article written by Hanson W. Baldwin, and appearing in the New York Times of March 2, 1947:

WORLD ROLE FOR UNITED STATES—SURVIVAL OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION IS HELD TO DEPEND ON OUR ACTIONS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Heavy are the responsibilities of power, and never heavier than in this age of dissolution and decay of old values and the emergence from the dust of dead empires of a new world order.

Today, the torrent of history is seeking a new channel. The forces of the surging waters are conflicting and convulsive, roiled and troubled; they tear at the dam of the past and undermine the ramparts of tradition.

They will not be stayed but they can be guided. The United States today lies squarely in the stream of history; it can guide that stream or be swept away by it. The new is inevitable; change is certain, but that change can be either malevolent or salutary. The United States, far more than any other single factor, is the key to the destiny of tomorrow; we alone may be able to avert the decline of western civilization, and a reversion to nihilism and the Dark Ages.

Today's situation was neither unexpected nor unforetold. Plague and pestilence, suffering and disaster, famine and hardship, and the complete economic and political dislocation of the world we had known was certain to follow World War II. Titanic convulsions were the inevitable consequence of the titanic eruption of history's greatest war.

CONVULSIONS IN EUROPE

We are today in the midst of those convulsions. Germany is divided and broken, slowly starving, a cancerous growth in the heart of western Europe, a breeding place for the dark philosophy of Nietzsche. There festers in her ruins the poison of fascism, the virus of communism; either totalitarianism flourishes in decadence and destruction.

In the Netherlands, the wealth of the Indies no longer build stately mansions; scores of thousands of Dutch want to emigrate from a broken Europe.

Belgium is scarred by old wounds and ancient animosities, and France—still politically bankrupt and ethically and intellectually confused—lies weak and torn and divided. Communism is strong in France, in the labor unions, in the Army, in the Air Force, in the Government, in the underground; it could precipitate civil war at any time.

More than 20,000 irregulars, remnants of the Spanish republican forces, and French Communists form a rag-tag, bobtailed army, owing no allegiance to France, which is scattered in southern France opposite the Spanish frontier, and is supplied intermittently with arms and equipment by Russia.

Communism is strong in Italy; the still secret peace treaty terms dealing with the disposition of ships of the Italian Fleet may—when published—strengthen the left.

All eastern Europe lies behind the iron curtain, and Greece, riven by strife, is the new frontier. The Palestine issue is still unsettled, and in China the civil war is increasing in tempo.

EMPIRE IN LIQUIDATION

But most important to the course of history is the plight of Britain. Winston Churchill said he did not intend to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire, but that is what is occurring today. The world's "Pax Brittanica" was kept in decades past by the power of the British pound and the power of the British Fleet, supplemented by allies and a small but efficient Regular Army scattered over half the world.

Today the power of the British pound has lost its magic, and the British peoples, stripped of the wealth of empire and bowed under a crushing burden of taxation, are trying—in an economic sense—to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

This means that the British pound will no longer be available in Greece and in other areas of the earth to back up the forces of western civilization; this means, inevitably in time, the reduction in size of the British Army, the British Navy, the British Air Force, with consequent creations, unless we fill them, of power vacuums in many unstable regions of the earth.

Nature and communism abhor vacuums. And there can now be no doubt; indeed, there has never been serious doubt of the aggressive and expanding policy of the Soviet Government. Communism, as practiced in the world today, is a doctrine of fanatical virulence; its disciples justify and preach the pernicious philosophy that the ends justify any means. As long as such a government holds power in Moscow there can be no real or lasting compromise with the values which western civilization has held high for 2,000 years.

Yet Russia today is far weaker than the United States, and may, indeed, long remain so, unless the heart and soul and spirit and will of the American people succumb to decay. The Russians do not yet have the atomic bomb, and many of their key industries—despite public assertions to the contrary—are considerably more concentrated and vulnerable than are ours.

The frantic Russian search for second-rate and third-rate atomic scientists and engineers in the countries bordering their frontiers indicate that the Soviet is still some distance from achieving the atomic bomb, although one recent estimate—criticized by some as pessimistic—indicates that Russia may have the bomb and a fleet of perhaps 500 to 1,200 very long-range heavy bombers to carry it by 1950.

The Russians have virtually no Navy; their immediate attempt to compensate for our superiority at sea is confined largely to submarine development and construction, based on German designs.

But the United States has a clear and major lead in the air and, so far as can be learned, a smaller technological advantage in missiles and other new weapons, an advantage greatly aided by the superiority of our industry. But our land forces are weak, indeed, compared even with the demobilized Army of Russia.

RUSSIA AVERSE TO WAR

Russia is economically weak; she is experiencing severe shortages, particularly of food, and certainly wants no major war in the near future. But there is no doubt that her Government will take advantage of every weakness and will move into any power vacuum.

All this means that today the United States and Russia are face to face in a struggle for the world, a conflict short of war, but a struggle, nevertheless, that will alter world history. The weakness of Britain and France, and the virtual dissolution of the rest of western Europe means that the United States, and only the United States, is capable of sustaining western civilization. Yet it is the inherent tragedy of our times that few of the American people seem to have a sense of historical responsibility, of their own personal responsibility for the future of history, of the national responsibility that inevitably goes with the power and the glory.

Today we have in real truth no finished, over-all military policy; our fighting forces are handicapped not only by demands for economy but by lack of legislation, and by piecemeal legislation. There is no rounded and complete policy to guide them in organization or development of our post-war forces.

The formulation of a sound and well-rounded military policy, which will provide effective support for our foreign policy, and promote efficiency and reasonable economy is probably the most important job of this session of Congress.

Urges System of Payments in Lieu of Taxes Based on Fair Value of Forest Lands and Other Real Property of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Oregon Legislature:

House Joint Memorial 9

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas there are now pending in the Congress of the United States of America certain measures designed to abolish the present method of making in lieu tax payments to States and their local taxing subdivisions on account of national forest lands and other real property owned by the United States, and to substitute therefor a system of annual payments based on equitable percentages of the fair value of such lands; and

Whereas such payments in lieu of taxes under existing Federal statutes are based on varying percentages of the receipts, if any, derived from the administration of such property, which receipts vary greatly from year to year and provide a very uncertain source of revenue which the local taxing subdivisions of the State of Oregon are unable to anticipate or forecast with any degree of accuracy in order that they may be included in their budgets in conformity with local constitutional and statutory requirements; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is, memorialized, and this Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon does hereby petition that honorable body to enact such remedial legislation and to place in operation a system of payments in lieu of taxes based on the fair value of national forest lands and other real property of the United States as soon as circumstances will permit; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative therein, representing the people of the State or Oregon.

Adopted by house February 14, 1947.
JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.
Adopted by senate February 21, 1947.
M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.

Address of Attorney General Tom C. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, before the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C. Saturday, February 22, 1947:

Commander Starr, Colonel Brunsicker, and fellow veterans, the honor I feel on being invited to address you is wholesomely tempered by the knowledge that I am the only no-star "general" present.

I am proud to say, however, that I, too, am a veteran of our country's armed forces, war before last.

More important, I share with you, as only one who has been a top sergeant himself can share it, the resolve that for our sons and daughters, there will be no next war.

And as we had our problems back in 1918–19, the memory of those disturbed times gives us a better understanding and a fuller sympathy with the present generation on their long, long trail to battlefields overseas, and home again.

In World War II, you know, there was a bit of advice that gained currency among the boys in the Army. It went like this:

If it moves, salute it.
If it doesn't move, pick it up.
If you can't pick it up, paint it.

Today, with those boys back with their families, new problems confront them. And that advice has been changed to fit the occasion. Now it goes:

If it cries, change it.
If it's on wheels, buy it.
If it's vacant, rent it.

Since the time of George Washington, whose memory we honor on this day, the two hundred and fifteenth anniversary of his birth, the domestic problems that grow out of war, the economic upheavals, the difficulties of readjustment, the growls and the gripes, have been pretty much the same in every war our country has fought.

So much has been said and written about Washington that from this distance down the long road of history, we are sometimes in danger of missing the truth for the cherry trees. But if you dig back into the history of those formative days of our Nation, you will find there the same war frauds, the same profiteers, the same rent gougers, the troubles when the boys came home—counterparts of almost every situation we have faced in the aftermath of this greatest war of all.

I say almost every situation. But this time there is one exception. And it is important—so important that for the world of our children, it means the making or the breaking.

The difference this time is that we have had our last war for civilization. We cannot win another war. If there is a next war the only winners will be the moles, the bats, and the carrion things that crawl a broken, silent earth.

This we know. We have had it demonstrated to us—most fearfully. And nobody disagrees.

The astonishing thing, the shocking thing, is that with this knowledge before them as clearly and as certainly as night follows day, there can be so many among us who

are doing their utmost to bring on just such a war.

History shows us that there are several very effective, tried-and-true ways to bring on war in the world.

One is to crawl into our shell and tell ourselves that the rest of the world can go hang. Every time we have tried that we have found ourselves faced with Ben Franklin's off-quoted alternative—of hanging together or hanging separately.

Another way to bring on war, also historically tested and found practically sure fire, is for a nation to squeeze its neighbors in the vice of its own greed—to insist on selling to them without buying from them; to build tariff walls over which they cannot deliver their product, thereby creating such economic chaos that the whole world becomes engulfed in war.

And a third way—perhaps the most dangerous way of all to risk a war—is to ask for it by being unprepared to fight.

This was as true in the day of Washington as it is now. I can think of no better authority to cite than the Father of our Country, George Washington, who said:

"If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace—one of the powerful instruments of our rising prosperity—it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Again and again, Washington repeated his warning against the kind of "economy" that we have been hearing of late.

In his first annual message to Congress in 1790, he said:

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

In a letter to Elbridge Gerry, he said:

"There is nothing so likely to produce peace as to be well prepared to meet an enemy."

Of course it costs to be well prepared to meet an enemy. Even after sifting out the gold braid, the frills, and the fruit salad from the real essentials of national defense and cutting to the bone—the figure is high—some $11,000,000,000.

A big sum? Of course it's big. So big that you and I can't see around it in one look. But so is the explosion of an atom bomb big. So big that you and I couldn't even look at it—not twice anyway—for once makes you permanently blind. Little wars aren't fought any more—not when we are drawn into them. We can't come out second. Another Texan, Gen. Ira Eaker, put it right when he said: "A second-best army is like a second-best poker hand—and it brings the same result."

Well, some folks have sat themselves down, taken out their pencils, and begun to figure. Some seem to think they know better than the men of the high command who led our armed forces to victory in World War II. They must think that men like General Eisenhower and General Marshall and Admiral Nimitz and Admiral Leahy didn't know their business.

And just to show you how little Eisenhower and Marshall and Nimitz and Leahy knew about it, these people, with their little pencils, attempt to prove that the armed forces should have only $6,000,000,000. Yes, sir, almost in half. Marshall and Eisenhower and Nimitz and Leahy on those figures would be off by almost 50 percent!

Now if you do believe that, then you must agree that we ought to fire Eisenhower, Marshall, Nimitz, and Leahy. We ought to combine the armed forces—both tanks, both ships, and all three guns—and make these pencil pushers the generalissimos. If we are to have any such 2-cent army, they deserve the high command, for they certainly exhibit penny wisdom.

The wisdom of George Washington has been proved time and again, but never was it more applicable than at this moment. Secretary of State George Marshall is about to meet the spokesmen for the leading powers that were allied with us in winning the war.

The American people are, at this moment, friends with the world. There is no war in the offing. But friendly nations, engaging in the give-and-take that we call diplomacy, seldom see the world and its problems eye to eye. They seek meeting grounds somewhere between original viewpoints that may be far apart.

That is the case today. Our Secretary of State is undertaking to reach an agreement with the other powers on one of the most important of all postwar problems—the problem of Germany. History, perhaps destiny itself, is in the making in this hour.

But our neighbor nations, peace-seeking though they may be, will deal with us realistically. If we approach them as the most powerful nation on earth, they will deal with us in one way. But make no mistake about this, my friends—if we approach them as a third-rate power, they will deal with us in quite another way.

Yes; we are strong. But our strength as of this moment is not what counts. If we adopt a course now that points in the direction of a third-rate status for America, our neighbors will not be ignorant of that fact. They will know. And they will anticipate. And our spokesmen will very soon discover that America's opinion, America's hope, America's will, has lost weight in the world.

When we contrast the world of Washington's day with the world as we find it, there is no escaping the fact that the responsibilities and the perils of the United States of America are now immeasurably more vast. You who have served with our forces overseas know that not only is the world today a smaller one in every sense than it was in 1776, but that our stake in peace and prosperity throughout the world is tremendously greater. The oceans on either side of us are, in comparison, but lakes. And, of course, the pathways of the air not only invite the universal spread of trade and commerce, but are pathways for the new weapons which man has created. Our first emphasis in this new world must be upon extending the benefits of trade and commerce, so that the conditions upon which peace and amicable relationships rest can exist throughout the entire globe.

Yet, at the same time, the responsibilities which the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world impose upon this Nation, and upon the other members of the United Nations, deserve a place of equal prominence. The preservation of peace, through the United Nations, imposes a continuing duty upon us. In the interest of peace itself, we must remain strong.

President Truman is also studying the problem of universal training for the youth of this country. We all know the path which we have followed in the past of preparing for war after war had descended upon us. We all know the disasters and tragedies that have resulted from that policy. In an atomic age we cannot afford to gamble with fate. We must take steps to insure preparedness on the part of the men who will be called upon as citizen soldiers to share in our defense if war comes—we cannot afford to rely solely upon a small standing army. The details of the President's program are now being formulated. I believe he plans to send a message to the Congress on that subject in the near future. But I am sure that one of the keystones of the President's view of universal training is the training it will give, not solely in military science, but in the broad factors of character building. By this I mean those factors which will come from emphasis upon citizenship, physical fitness, cooperation and teamwork.

As you know, I have been greatly concerned for the past 2 years over the problem of juvenile delinquency. The postwar world is a harsh one. It has produced a vast number of problems for the youth of America. I have tried to do my part in extending a helping hand to young men and women who have fallen prey to its temptations. I think real progress is being made by the many State and local organizations that are working on this problem. At the same time, I think that one of the great contributions the Federal Government can make along this line is to provide a system of universal training which will provide real and substantial benefits for the young men participating in it.

It was George Washington who, when the war had been won, told the Governors of the States:

"I will speak to your Excellencies the language of freedom and of security without disguise—there are four things which I humbly conceive are essential to the well being, I may even venture to say, to the existence, of the United States, as an independent power:

"First, an indissoluble union of the States under one Federal head.

"Second, a regard of public justice.

"Third, the adoption of a proper peace establishment; and

"Fourth, the prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies; to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity; and in some instances to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community."

Indeed we do have an indissoluble Union. We gave much of our blood to achieve this in the battle between the States.

As to public justice, Washington's second essential, I have much to do with that.

We now face two great menaces in America—fascism and communism. Both are totalitarian, antireligious, and materialistic. In fact, they wear the same cloak. Both are the opposite to the American way of life. If other folks want communism, let them have it. But it has no place here with us in America.

You met the Hitler and Mussolini brands of Fascism and defeated them on the battlefield. We must arise and focus the spotlight of public opinion upon Red and Black fascism and build up barriers of common decency through which it cannot penetrate.

You defeated dictatorship with bullets—and we can defeat Red and Black communism with brains. Like crime, we cannot permit America to become infested with its malignant growth. I count on you to help.

And now for the fourth and last essential as outlined by Washington. We must, indeed, cast aside our prejudices and hatreds. There is no place here for intolerance and bigotry. America is made up of all nationalities.

As Washington so aptly put it, we must sacrifice our individual advantages to the interest of the community. Our country cannot be divided by individual greed. We must act and we shall act for the best interest of all the people.

I pray God that in this fateful hour the will and the wisdom of George Washington will prevail.

Shall We Save $6,000,000,000?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address

by the distinguished former Member of the House, "The Gentleman From Indiana," Mr. Pettengill:

SHALL WE SAVE $6,000,000,000?

Last Thursday the House of Representatives voted to reduce spending next year by $6,000,000,000. They did this to avoid serious trouble.

One of the two or three largest banks in America says:

"The national budget is out of control unless Congress, with the backing of the public, can reestablish control over expenditures and put us on the sound road of paying off debt and lightening the tax load. * * * We are heading for serious trouble."

Mind you, they do not say we will have trouble. They say we will have trouble unless. The problem, the bank says, "is to arouse the people to the danger that they may demand and support action by Congress." There you have it—unless you demand action.

President Truman declares: "There is no justification now for tax reduction." Let's see about that. Let's compare some of Mr. Truman's demands for your money with the last peacetime year under Mr. Roosevelt. That was the year 1939, when there were still 8,000,000 unemployed to be helped, whereas now the Nation is at work.

In 1939 the Federal Government spent $9,000,000,000. This coming year Mr. Truman demands $37,500,000,000.

This is four times as much as Mr. Roosevelt spent. It will average $1,000 in taxes for every family in the United States of America.

Mr. Truman demands three times as much as Mr. Roosevelt for running the White House and its staff. Do you think some tiny bit of that might be saved?

VAST LABOR DEPARTMENT FUND

Mr. Truman demands four times as much as Mr. Roosevelt for running the Department of Labor. What has that Department done this past year on the matter of preventing strikes—to justify striking us now for four times as much as in 1939?

Mr. Truman demands 13 times as much as Mr. Roosevelt for running the Department of Commerce. That, you will recall, was once Harry Hopkins' and Henry Wallace's Department. Do you think the Department of Commerce might get along next year by taking out of your pockets just a little something less than 13 times as much as Harry Hopkins spent running it?

Mr. Truman demands 13 times as much as Mr. Roosevelt for public housing and other community facilities. Do you think they might possibly squeeze by with less than 13 times what was spent on the various Tugwell towns of the Roosevelt era?

Now, if I were comparing Mr. Truman with what was spent by Calvin Coolidge or Grover Cleveland, Mr. Truman might have an argument. But the comparison is with Mr. Roosevelt who, without a war, was the greatest spender of public funds the world has ever known and who, in 4 years as Governor of New York, and 12 years as President, ran in the red every one of those 16 years.

RAT HOLES AND YOUR MONEY

Well, those are just a few of the rat holes your money is going to be thrown into unless you wake up. For some Members of the Congress you elected last fall are showing signs of playing ball with the bureaucrats—and not with you.

Here's a juicy little item given us by Congressman TABER, who is the HARRY BYRD of the Republican Party. TABER is chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and is fighting like a bulldog to do what you elected the Congress to do. TABER tells us that the Washington office of the OPA has more employees getting $4,000 a year and up than it has getting less than $4,000. "More generals than privates," as he puts it.

They have 122 economists, 147 accountants, 168 lawyers, and 6 historians, in the Washington office.

Six historians. One historian, Woodrow Wilson, wrote an eight-volume history of the whole United States—from Christopher Columbus on down. One historian, Gibbon, wrote the monumental History of the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire, covering 500 years.

But OPA has six historians. Washington is running out of the ears with historians. Yet Mr. Truman tells us that we can't cut taxes a single dime.

WAKE UP TO THE FACTS

I told you 2 weeks ago that you have got to wake up to the fact that your Federal Government has become a huge racket, padding pay rolls just as Tammany and Frank Hague, and the Hinky Dinks and the Bathhouse Johns padded their pay rolls, and for the same reason—to keep themselves in power. Here is proof on that point. Attorney General Clark told a congressional committee the other day that whenever a bureau chief wants a promotion—and that, of course, is all the time—he hires a bigger staff so as to look important.

Well, of course, everybody who has been in Washington a month knows that is true, but it is mighty refreshing for one Cabinet officer to admit it, and I commend Mr. Clark for his frankness and honesty. He is turning out to be the best Attorney General we have had in blue moon. The way he intervened, no doubt with President Truman's approval, in the portal-to-portal racket, and stood up to John L. Lewis in the coal strike deserves a vote of thanks.

But to return to what happens to your money—your pay envelope. We are leaking money all over this globe.

Now, I know, a lot of people go around on tiptoe and say, "We can disagree on domestic policy, but we've got to be united on foreign policy." I say, "Why? And on what subjects? Foreign policy costs money just the same as domestic policy." Now, listen to this:

Italy is asking $100,000,000 from us. That is the very same amount Russia is extracting from Italy. We pay Italy $100,000,000. Italy turns it over to Russia. Not only that, but Italy must pay $125,000,000 additional to Yugoslavia, which is run by Stalin's stooge, Tito, who shot down our airmen.

All told, we have contributed $1,000,000,000 in goods and services to Italy since she quit fighting. A quarter of that billion Italy must pay over to build up communism in Europe under treaties which we are a party to.

ARMING A PROSPECTIVE FOE?

Having done that to build up Communist Russia, we next demand universal military conscription of American youth and $11,000,000,000 for national defense, when the only nation we may need to defend against for a long time is Communist Russia.

Does that make any sense to you?

When anybody in Washington says that all the workingmen and farmers and school ma'ams in America who pay and pay and pay, must hush their mouths on foreign policy, I say—Nuts.

I claim that the little homes all over Americ who furnish the boys who do the dying in foreign wars, have the right to know what is going on in foreign policy and pass judgmen on it, and don't deserve to be given the "hush-hush" by anybody—Democrat or Republican.

As a matter of fact, you could save some taxes by demanding that every Communist, and near-Communist, in the State Department and in all other departments be kicked out before another week goes by.

There is a strong argument for spending billions of dollars next year for military appropriations to keep Communist Russia from sweeping over the world. But if that is so, why should we spend money paying the salaries of Communist termites and stooges right in our own Government buildings? That we are doing that, you have the word of former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin.

Well, here's another sweet morsel—the Post Office Department. It's running in the red, too. President Truman demands that postal rates be increased. He is absolutely right on that if the deficit is not due to inefficiency and waste. But here's the point:

POST OFFICE IN THE RED

American Socialists point to the Post Office Department as exihibit A in favor of Government ownership of business, and the political management of business.

Let's look at exhibit A:

Do you know that during the past 120 years the post office has operated at a profit only 7 percent of the time and at a loss 93 percent of the time?

Do you know that in second- and third-class mail, in parcel post, money orders, registered mail, insured mail, special delivery, and c. o. d. service, the Government is losing money in every one of them? And this, when the postal business is on the boom?

Do you know that first-class letter mail is the only branch of the post office that pays its way, and that it does so only because it is a monopoly by statute, as the law forbids any private enterprise to compete with it in carrying first-class mail? Well, that is the fact. But if the post office is a shining example of socialism in action, I'll take vanilla.

When John Wanamaker was Postmaster General he said the Government could save several hundred million dollars a year if it turned the mail business over to private enterprise, which can't charge its losses to you and therefore has to keep the leaks plugged up. But, of course, if we did that we'd have to get someone else to hand out the political plums beside the Postmaster General.

SOME EXCELLENT TESTIMONY

Can we run the country for $6,000,000,000 less? Here are four men who ought to know. Every one of them served as Under Secretary of the Treasury, and three of them in the Roosevelt administration. They know the inside of Government finance; they know how the bureaucrats pad their estimates with a big margin to spare. These four men are Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, Arthur Ballantine, John W. Hanes, and Roswell Magill. They join in saying that a $6,000,000,000 cut leaves "more than enough to run the Federal Government."

What is $6,000,000,000? Look at it this way: If a man earns $1 an hour, 40 hours a week, and has steady work for 50 years from the time he is 20 until he becomes 3 score and 10, he will earn $100,000.

This shows that $1,000,000,000 represents the uninterrupted lifetime work of 10,000 men. Six billion dollars are the life earnings of 60,000 men. So, instead of talking about saving $6,000,000,000, let us ask whether we want to save the lifetime toil of 60,000 men. In fact, as they would need at least 80 percent of what they earned to live on, and could pay no more than 20 percent in withholding taxes, you would need 300,000 men.

THINK ABOUT THIS SENTENCE!

Wouldn't you think a long time before sentencing 300,000 young men to a life sentence to support 1 year's waste in Washington?

So it all come down to this: How much of what you make are you willing to turn over to the Government to spend, or to waste? That is up to you. Don't think you are helpless in this matter. Tell your Congressman what you want him to do. Tell him in words of one syllable. Tell him, "Stop waste. Reduce the debt. Cut my taxes." Join or organize taxpayers' committees. Discuss this matter in labor union meetings—all kinds of meetings. Write letters to your local paper.

Remember this. Every tax cut amounts to a wage increase for you. Every waste of Government money is deducted from your pay envelope.

General Eisenhower's Address in St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in St. Louis on February 24:

Through this historic city flowed the pioneer energy that expanded the Nation beyond the plains and mountains to the Pacific. Our national history, short in years, rich in manifold development and growth, has been 17 decades crammed with achievement. Men and women, inspired by faith in man's dignity, goaded by conviction in man's responsibility, labored that this land might be a better home for those who followed them.

Because every American generation attacked its problems with fresh vigor, we have peopled a continent, subdued its prairies and wilderness, tamed its rivers, and devoted its resources to the betterment of those who dwell in it. The concepts of government, designed by our forefathers to assure all men freedom, justice, and equality before the law, have been sustained and amplified in this land of vast resources so that the United States is today the world's most prominent citadel of human rights and the greatest provider of human opportunity.

From the days of the fur trade and the settlers' wagon trains St. Louis has funneled and fed our epic westward growth. Throughout its colorful history, this city and the Army were in closest association. Here was Fort Bellefontaine, our first Army post west of the Mississippi. This was the operating base for the soldiers who explored the West and later harnessed its rivers. Here lived and served great military leaders—Grant, in the dark days of Hardscrabble Farm; Lee, as river engineer and cavalry commander at Jefferson Barracks. Not far away were born and reared two of our modern military great—Pershing and Bradley—and the Army's Commander in Chief, the President. To every soldier St. Louis brings memories of those who served before him; to every American St. Louis symbolizes the spirit and will that built a great Nation.

GOALS OF THE FUTURE

Today the future holds for us goals that exceed our past accomplishments and it imposes responsibilities weighty beyond those we have borne.

Twice in our generation we have had to defend our heritage by resort to arms. The time approaches, however, when resort to arms may leave the wilderness as the only conqueror. But the certainty is also here that if we can eliminate wars from the face of the earth this country and all the world can reach new heights of prosperity and happiness, exceeding even the most sanguine dreams of our forebears.

Between us and the attainment of all the hopes represented in a permanently peaceful world runs a tortuous and even dangerous path; its successful negotiation will demand all we have of faith in ourselves and in democracy; all the labor of our hearts and minds and bodies; all our moral and material strength. Should we falter in our forward march or shirk our duty we jeopardize not only world peace but our very existence.

A soldier's hopes for the dawn of eternal peace are possibly more vivid than those of men who have not lived through the nightmare of the battlefield. Moreover, the soldier, like all others, realizes that security, in the absolute sense, cannot be achieved by force. Its perfect state can never be attained by any nation until it is enjoyed by all, which will mean that armed forces, beyond policing elements, will be forever gone. But until a truly effective organization can be fully trusted our own relative security must rest firmly in our own hands. There is no bright future for the slack or the fatuously complacent among nations. There is no security for those who shy at its burden. Security is the reason for the Army's existence.

In the early days of the West the Army was a neighborly force that intimately served the people. It protected them daily and assisted in many fields. Its strength and composition, based on the needs of the growing nation, were relatively easy to compute. On our coasts were a limited number of vital points exposed to destruction or capture, requiring a definite number of men and guns for their defense. Against Indian forays a measurable number of posts and soldiers were needed. There was, then, no possibility of lightning attack that could obliterate a city, cripple an army, or shatter a fleet.

It is still the same Army, a protective cloak for the people it serves, designed and tailored for their security requirements. But it grows increasingly difficult to state, at a given time, exactly what constitutes adequate defense. Every changing factor in the global situation—the mood of an international conference, the outcome of a test-tube experiment, the discovery of a mineral lode, even the abundance of an annual harvest—each of these has its impact on our security in a world where isolation is impossible.

One example is at your very door. Today hunger stalks many sections of the earth, and when men are themselves starving and see before their eyes their families and loved ones wasting away it is idle to talk of peace and freedom and the rule of right. No excess, no act that we nominally class as crime will balk man, either individually or collectively, from attempts to satisfy this basic need.

Here, virtually at the confluence of the three great river valleys that produce a significant portion of the world's food, you are widely insulated by distance from direct contact with these hungry areas. Nevertheless, there is a clear and inescapable relationship between the Missouri farm, world stability, and your Army's responsibilities.

QUESTION OF ARMED SECURITY

No sane American, aware of the world's need for our stabilizing influence, denies the essential role of armed strength for our own security and for the maintenance of peace. The important question is how much, for likewise no one denies the crying need for economy. Neither of these conflicting requirements can be ignored; in every military activity and project they must be considered together.

Economy, insofar as it confines expenditures to essentials and requires thrifty and careful administration, is always necessary, whether we are concerned with the management of a household or city or army. For example, a profusion of military posts, once necessary for the protection of pioneers, should now be consolidated in the interests of economical administration and professional efficiency. Every Army activity should be held under a critical eye to determine that satisfaction of national needs does not provide excuse for indulgence in careless spending. There is no risk or danger in such economy. Quite the contrary; but neither is there any economy in military nakedness. Time and again we have proved the staggering extravagance of penny-wise policies.

Strength, however, even military strength in its narrowest sense, does not spring solely from money invested in tanks and planes and ships. It comes from the integrated purposes, effort and resources of a whole nation. In war it was unity of purpose that provided the Nation's power to execute its aims; it was the cooperation of industry, Government and the armed services of labor, capital, and management; of scientists, farmers, and fighters that produced the mighty instrument of victory.

In peace, it is only as we achieve coordination between the professional duties of the armed services and the concerted brains and skills of science and of all industry that we can be reasonably able to protect ourselves. Moreover, only through continuing public interest can we achieve effective defense at minimum expense. These things are your business as much as mine; all of us pay for them and are protected by them.

By wise governmental policy we are definitely committed to the temporary control of the nations which brought on the recent cataclysm, eradicating for the foreseeable future, not only the capacity but the will for aggression. These are heavy commitments in terms of men and money, and they have been carefully and economically calculated. Although successful accomplishment bears mightily on future world stability and, therefore, on our own long-term security, these tasks are essentially police in character and contribute only to a limited extent to the immediate protection of this country, rich and tempting target that it is.

For reasonable security we require air, ground, and sea establishments, efficiently organized into a force capable of holding the key outer bases on the periphery of defense; ready at all times to intercept or set up immediate defense against air surface attack; potentially powerful enough either to seize or to destroy the sources of attack. A necessary part of this force is a trained and strong National Guard and Reserve, annually revitalized by trained reinforcements. The functions of these components are increasingly important, as capabilities of weapons and possibilities of sudden destructive attack continue to mount.

MUCH DEPENDS ON SCIENTISTS

Policies, under which we are at present operating, are not sufficiently broad and far-reaching to encompass all the requirements of the Nation's defense, and supplemental measures will soon be considered by the Congress. In such matters the professional soldier can advise, but only the American people can decide how much they will pay for their safety. Too much would be wasteful extravagance; but in any future emergency too little would, almost certainly and finally, be too late.

We are all acutely conscious of the awesome developments in the field of military weapons. To a far larger degree than ever before, our security depends on the efforts of our scientists. We must, to the limit, assist and encourage them to lead the field in every technological phase of our defenses Should there be another war, it may be won in the laboratory before the issues that cause it rise to the surface.

Our scientists already have astounded the world by their mastery of the universe's hidden power. However, I decry loose and sometimes gloating talk about the degree of security implicit in a weapon that might destroy millions overnight. Those who measure security solely in term of offensive capacity distort its meaning and mislead those who pay them heed. No modern nation has ever equalled, prior to the outbreak of war, the crushing offensive power attained by the German war machine in 1939. No modern nation has been broken and smashed as was Germany 6 years later.

So in the long-term view, I do not stress alone the material aspects of our defense, the arms and the services that use them. They constitute an essential shield, our outer protection. In them we want efficiency and sufficiency—no more. But in themselves they are shells that require inner quality and spiritual strength if they are not to collapse under the pressure of war.

On the solid foundation of human rights established by our forefathers has been built a mighty structure which stands before the world as a stronghold of freedom and democracy. Its girders are the pioneer traits of initiative, resourcefulness, self-reliance, and pride in achievement. These were the factors that made the trained American the formidable giant of the battlefield, who conquered the armies of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Those traits distinguished also our men in mines, factories, and farms as well as in planes, ships, foxholes, and laboratories. In seeking to maintain a secure United States the same qualities are the core of our future.

If our youth and the generations to come clearly understand the relationship between individual effort and common good; if they perceive that our privileges and advantages in this great country, won by toil and sacrifice of generations before them, can be retained only by a comparable expenditure on their part; if they appreciate that a corollary to our promise of man's dignity is his individual responsibility to maintain it against any threat; then the future of our country is secure.

And in broader fields, a vibrant, purposeful America will be the greatest single factor in progress toward world order. Leadership for peace cannot be attained by armed strength alone, any more than it can merely by lofty words. But with a clear moral probity evident in all our international dealings, a unified, productive nation can demonstrate the manifest advantages of cooperation over coercion. If we will it, this land shall remain proof and example to all the world that men, of themselves, for themselves, may build in concord a better dwelling place, whether it be city or continent or globe.

Joint Memorial Urging Congress To Set Aside Tracts in the Boundaries of Vancouver Barracks as a National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following House joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon:

House Joint Memorial 11

Joint Memorial memorializing Congress to set aside certain tracts, within the present boundaries of Vancouver Barracks, as a national monument under the direction of the National Park Service

To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas Vancouver, Wash., is one of the oldest cities of the western part of the United States having been established by the Hudson's Bay Co. in the year 1825, with Fort Vancouver thereafter becoming the center of all business, government, agriculture, commerce, education, culture and civilization on the Pacific slope of these United States; and

Whereas Vancouver Barracks, presently a United States Military Reservation located in Vancouver, Wash., contains the site of this historic landmark; and

Whereas the restoration of old Fort Vancouver is now mandatory in order to preserve for present and future generations this shrine of early American history, ranking equally in historical importance with those already perpetuated by the Nation on the Atlantic coast of the United States; and

Whereas the preservation of this historic shrine transcends local interest and concern and is of historic value and essence to each and every citizen of the United States of America; and

Whereas the probable cost of the restoration of this landmark is beyond the financial means of local, state and regional government and rightfully should be borne by all of the citizens of this Nation, they being joint inheritors of the history and civilization here begun; and

Whereas failure to keep and preserve for all time this historical site would constitute incalculable loss to all citizens of this Republic; and

Whereas Vancouver Barracks is now surplus to needs of the War Department and is to be disposed of as surplus property, thereby making immediate and effective action imperative: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, that the following tracts within the present boundaries of Vancouver Barracks be forever set aside as a national monument under direction of the National Park Service.

(1) That area south of what is known as Officers' Row to East Fifth Street and from the present eastern boundary of Vancouver Barracks Military Reservation to McLoughlin Road; and

(2) That area within 200 feet of what is known as the First Apple Tree now enclosed within a chain fence; and

(3) The building known as General Grant's Quarters, and

(4) The military cemetery; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be placed in the hands of the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the Members of Congress, and in those of all persons, corporations, groups, or agencies interested in the preservation for posterity of this their rightful heritage.

Adopted by house February 20, 1947.
JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.
Adopted by senate February 22, 1947.
M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include there a resolution adopted by the Warwick (R. I.) City Council, protesting against the withholding of Federal funds for the school-lunch program. The resolution follows:

Resolution 1584

Whereas Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, has forcibly brought to the attention of the public that there is a serious danger that Federal funds for the school-lunch program throughout the country may be drastically curtailed or eliminated entirely by the Congress; and

Whereas this council believes that low-cost lunches tend to promote the health and well-being of our children and increase their efficiency in school work; and

Whereas though this city council is in accord with any measure to produce economy in the Federal Government, it does not believe that the Government should economize at the expense of the school children of the country and that it should continue the appropriation of Federal funds for the maintenance of low-cost-lunch programs in our public schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this city council respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to permit the continuation of the low-cost-luncheon program in the schools of the country; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, with the respectful request that they lend their aid and assistance to secure favorable action by the Congress on this request.

Labor's Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Daily Reporter, of Independence, Kans., I wish to state that recently when William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor he was quoted by the press as making the following statement:

The majority of the American people oppose the proposed new curbs on labor unions, and if Congressmen want to be reelected they had better vote against every retroactive labor bill offered so far.

I am not clear, Mr. Speaker, as to what Mr. Green means by "retroactive." But I do know that labor legislation being considered by the Senate and House is remedial legislation to put industry and labor in balance and to safeguard the welfare of the public.

I know, too, that the insistence of Mr. Green and other labor leaders that no such remedial legislation is necessary, and their refusal to offer constructive suggestions is hurtful to the cause of labor. I might also add that his threat of reprisals at the polls is a disservice to labor and merely serves to stimulate the intent of Congress to enact such remedial legislation.

It is in confirmation of these comments of mine, Mr. Speaker, that I include the following editorial from the Independence Daily Reporter which reflects the viewpoint of the grassroots of the country:

LABOR'S OPPORTUNITY

As hearings progress before congressional committees, approval of some proposed changes in labor laws is beginning to be heard from a few men in the ranks of unions. But the top men in unionism still hold a stiff-necked attitude of opposition to any

change whatever. They warn that what they call restrictive labor legislation will unloose a wave of strikes.

This manner of standpatism coupled with threats of strikes has worked ever since the passage of the Wagner Act and, unlike the Supreme Court, the labor magnates do not seem to read the election returns.

When William L. Green, AFL president, appeared before the Senate committee a new Senator gave him something new to think about.

Senator IRVING IVES, a New Yorker with a record in his State's legislature favorable to organized labor, told Green, "Bear in mind that the public is demanding that something be done. The problem is what to do. You just can't sit there and say this or that won't work."

There was a time when a Congressman would not have had the nerve to talk like that to a union big shot. The Congressmen, however, have not only read the election returns, but many of them are in Congress now over the opposition of labor leaders.

So Green and others would do their own cause more good if they would drop their threats and blind opposition and heed what Senator ELLENDER of Louisiana told Green, "We want your help. We don't want a negative attitude."

There are going to be some changes made without a doubt. How much better the union chieftains would serve their cause and their members if they would cooperate to see that the changes are intelligently worked out.

The main object of Congress is, and of both union and management organizations should be, to protect the public welfare against excesses by either side in labor strife. Cooperation by labor leaders would enhance their cause.

Rivers and Harbors Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, I invited Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, War Department, to appear before the committee and present to the committee the procedure of the Corps of Army Engineers in the consideration of projects for river and harbor development which are presented to the Army engineers by the Congress for consideration. Under leave heretofore granted, I include herewith the following statement by Lieutenant General Wheeler in response to the invitation:

STATEMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON PUBIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY LT. GEN. R. A. WHEELER, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, WAR DEPARTMENT

1. Federal policy: The control by the Federal Government over rivers and harbors is derived from the third clause of the eighth section of article I of the Constitution which provides that the Congress shall have power "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

The policy with respect to Federal improvements of rivers and harbors in the interest of navigation has been formulated through laws enacted by Congress over a span of many years. Following the decision of Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, decided in 1824, it was generally recognized that the lifting of a snag, the removal of a sand bar, or the building of a breakwater, is a national work, with a national character and a national consequence, and a proper subject of national appropriation. This policy, limited in scope at first, has grown and broadened from year to year with the advance of population, the increasing needs of commerce, and navigation. The first distinct act of Congress for improving navigation was that of May 24, 1824, which appropriated funds for removing sand bars from the Ohio River, and planters, sawyers, and snags from the Mississippi. Since that date the functions and responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers have been clarified and expanded by succeeding acts of Congress. Some of the more significant of these acts will be discussed in detail later.

2. Process of project development: It is believed important at this point, even at the risk of repeating facts already well known to the members of the committee, to describe the process by which a project develops from its initial conception to the ultimate provision by Congress of authority and funds for its execution. The authorization of a river-and-harbor or a flood-control project follows a definitely prescribed democratic course of action. It is based upon the activation of the desires of local interests, the people who are most vitally interested. Local interests, as individuals or groups through the action of their Representatives in Congress, make request for an item to be included in a river-and-harbor or flood-control bill which will authorize a study by the Corps of Engineers for the purpose of determining the feasibility and the economic soundness of doing the work desired. In case such an investigation has been made previously, then formal action by means of a River and Harbor or Flood-Control Act is not necessary and instead a study can be authorized by the adoption of a review resolution by the Public Works Committee of the House or the Public Works Committee of the Senate, formerly the River and Harbor or the Flood Control Committee of the House or the Committee on Commerce of the Senate.

Preliminary examination: The Chief of Engineers then assigns the duty of making a preliminary investigation to the district engineer in charge of the district in which the project will fall. The district engineer, mindful of the need for developing all public opinion, holds an open public hearing at which not only the views of those interests that are active in obtaining the authorization of the proposed work, but also all other views, are obtained and encouraged. Having thus developed the desires and feelings of the local citizens, the district engineer makes a study. Many of the projects eventually are found not feasible, hence the first type of study is a preliminary investigation which is not costly. The results of that investigation are then sent forward to the Chief of Engineers, who in turn refers them to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for study and recommendation as to whether sufficient merit exists in the project to warrant a more costly survey.

In case the project is not deemed feasible from the standpoint of either engineering or economics, an unfavorable report is sent to Congress with a recommendation that no further action be taken. It is interesting to note that about 50 percent of all projects covered by preliminary investigations and surveys are found not justified.

Detailed survey: If the preliminary investigation indicates that further study is warranted, the duty of making the survey is assigned to the district engineer, who at that time goes into an exacting analysis and study of the various details of the project in an endeavor to set up a practical engineering solution and determines the cost involved. At this stage he may, if necessary, again hold public hearings in order to obtain the current views of the citizens. He correlates his work with other Federal agencies involved. He obtains the views of the local and State governments. Finally, the results of his survey are sent to the Chief of Engineers in Washington and are again referred to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. There, if necessary, an additional public hearing may be held. The board, after consideration of all the factors involved, makes its recommendation to the Chief of Engineers. At that time the chief sends the report, together with his proposed recommendations, to the governors of the States involved in order that their views will be obtained and made a permanent part of the record. The formal views of other Federal agencies interested are also obtained at this time, as well as a statement from the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of the project to the program of the President.

Authorization: Finally, the report is submitted to Congress to be considered by the appropriate committees. At this stage, additional hearings are held by the committees. The report then usually is included in an omnibus river and harbor or flood-control bill and is subsequently enacted into law.

Appropriation: After the project is authorized by act of Congress, funds for its execution may be included in budget estimates. After consideration and possible revisions by the Bureau of the Budget, these estimates are submitted to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress and, with such modifications as may be made by Congress, are included in appropriation acts.

3. Coordination with other agencies: Section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, and section 1 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, provide for close cooperation with the Department of the Interior on projects having irrigation benefits and for equally close cooperation with State agencies. Section 1 of these acts declared it to be the policy of the Congress:

"That in connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the rivers of the Nation through the construction of works of improvement, for navigation or flood control, as herein authorized, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as herein authorized to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes, of the waters of the Nation's rivers; to facilitate the consideration of projects on a basis of comprehensive and coordinated development; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users."

The 1938 Flood Control Act provides for cooperation with the Federal Power Commission on multiple-purpose projects having power benefits. A Federal Inter-Agency Basin Committee was created in 1943 by joint agreement of the four agencies primarily concerned with water resources, the Federal Power Commission, Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, and War Department. Recently the Commerce Department, which has the Weather Bureau and other functions related to our work, became the fifth member of the committee. There are a number of subcommittees of staff level collaborating on technical matters such as benefits and costs, sedimentation, hydrologic data, and power. In addition, two regional committees have been created which include representatives of the States as well as of the Federal agencies. These are the Columbia

and Missouri Inter-Agency Basin Committees. The objectives of the interagency basin committee as set forth in the joint agreement of 1943 are to cooperate more completely in the preparation of reports on multiple-purpose projects and to correlate the results to the greatest practicable extent. Conferences are held in Washington at least once each month between the Chief of Engineers, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Land Use Coordinator, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and the representative of the Department of Commerce.

Conservation of Wildlife Act approved August 14, 1946: This act amended the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," and provides for cooperation with the States and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with a view to preventing loss of and damage to wildlife resources in connection with projects of the War Department as well as of other agencies.

4. Significant acts of Congress: It was stated at the beginning of this conference that certain particularly significant acts of Congress with respect to the duties of the Corps of Engineers in waterway development, especially in the river and harbor field, would be discussed. These include the following:

Three hundred and eight studies: The River and Harbor Act approved January 21, 1927, authorized comprehensive studies of the principal river basins as recommended in House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, and as supplemented by that act and the Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928. In its House Document No. 308, the Sixty-ninth Congress recognized the importance to a great and growing Nation of comprehensive, coordinated data covering the still undeveloped wealth of national resources in our river basins. This recognition took the form of the above-mentioned authorization for a comprehensive study by the Corps of Engineers to determine the needs and possibilities of developing the river basins for flood control, navigation, and related water uses such as irrigation and power. The wealth of information gathered by the resulting so-called 308 Reports form the backbone of the succeeding detailed studies on which our present and prospective work is based.

Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944: This act contained two especially important provisions. One of these authorized the Corps of Engineers to construct, maintain, and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir areas under the control of the War Department, to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities, and to cooperate fully with Federal and local agencies in developing plans for realizing the benefits to recreation and to fish and wildlife conservation. The second provision of major importance, specifying that the Corps of Engineers will turn over all generated hydroelectric power to the Department of the Interior for marketing, is contained in section 5, which is quoted as follows:

"SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies. All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Recreational boating (Fletcher Act): Public Law 16, Seventy-second Congress, approved February 10, 1932, provides that the term "commerce" shall include the use of waterways by seasonal passenger craft, yachts, houseboats, fishing boats, motorboats, and other similar water craft, whether or not operated for hire.

Policy on terminals (River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1919): Section 1 of this act sets forth the following policy on terminal facilities:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that water terminals are essential at all cities and towns located upon harbors or navigable waterways and that at least one public terminal should exist, constructed, owned, and regulated by the municipality, or other public agency of the State, and open to the use of all on equal terms."

Public roads over dams: The Highway Act, approved July 29, 1946, amends and supplements prior Federal Aid Road Acts to provide for the design and construction of dams under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency so that they will serve as foundations for highway bridges, to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across such dams, and for other purposes, provided that the highway department of the State in which such dam shall be located jointly with the United States Commissioner of Public Roads shall first determine and certify that such bridge is economically desirable and needed and shall agree to reimburse the agency having jurisdiction over the dam for any additional costs which it may be required to incur in connection therewith.

5. Miscellaneous civil works are varied in character and include the administration of the Federal laws enacted for the protection and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States. These laws include sections 9 to 20, inclusive, of River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1899; section 7 of River and Harbor Act of March 4, 1915; section 5 of River and Harbor Act of August 18, 1894; section 7 of River and Harbor Act of August 8, 1917; Railroad Bridge Act of June 21, 1940, and General Bridge Act, title V, of Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946. Such laws govern the following: Granting of permits for structures or operations in navigable waters; approval of the location and plans of bridges, dams, dikes, or causeways; alteration of obstructive bridges; investigation and removal of sunken vessels or other obstructions endangering navigation; establishment of regulations for the use, administration, and navigation of navigable waters, including drawbridge regulations; establishment of anchorage grounds, special anchorage areas, danger zones, dumping grounds, restricted areas, fishing areas, and harbor lines; investigations of the discharge or deposit of refuse matter of any kind in navigable waters; prevention of pollution of coastal navigable waters by oil; determination of the heads of navigation and the extent to which the laws shall apply to specific streams; supervision of the harbor of New York to prevent obstructive or injurious deposits in the tidal waters thereof, including the waters of Long Island Sound; establishment of reasonable rates of toll for transit across bridges over navigable waters; granting of permits for the occupation and use of Federal works under control of the Corps of Engineers; construction of Anacostia Park and the reclamation and development of Anacostia River and Flats, D. C.; maintenance and repair of the Washington Aqueduct, and increasing the water supply of the city of Washington surveys and charting of the northern and northwestern lakes, including the Lake of the Woods; studies for the preservation of Niagara Falls and the supervision of power companies diverting water therefrom; reports of international boards on operations affecting international boundary waters; and issuance of instruments authorizing the occupation of Government-owned land under the jurisdiction of the Department.

The Railroad Bridge Act of June 21, 1940 (Truman-Hobbs Act), provides for the apportionment of the cost of alteration of bridges used for carrying railroad traffic or both railroad and highway traffic over navigable waters of the United States. Under this act the Secretary of War is authorized to issue and cause to be served upon the parties concerned an order requiring such alterations of such bridge as he finds, after holding a hearing, to be reasonably necessary in order to render navigation through or under it reasonably free, easy, and unobstructed, having due regard also for the necessities of rail or highway traffic thereover.

The General Bridge Act approved August 2, 1946 (title V of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946) grants the general consent of Congress for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges over the navigable waters of the United States. Accordingly, a separate act granting consent for an individual interstate bridge is no longer necessary. Authorization for construction of an international bridge still requires a specific act of Congress as heretofore.

6. Statistics of water-borne commerce, as collected and compiled by the Corps of Engineers and published in part II of the Annual Reports of the Chief of Engineers, are highly important in determining the need for and justification of the improvement and maintenance of rivers and harbors for commerce and navigation. Such data are also of value to commercial and shipping concerns, various Federal and local agencies, and others interested in transportation. The collection and compilation of these statistics has been undertaken continuously since the enactment of the River and Harbor Act approved June 23, 1866, section 2 of which provided that the annual report shall state "what amount of commerce and navigation would be benefited by the completion of each particular work." The Congress has since supplemented this legislation and strengthened the law to require navigation interests to report the movement of water-borne commerce. To achieve the utmost in economy and efficiency, to assure accuracy and speed in their collection, and to provide uniformity in their presentation, statistics are now being collected by prescribed report forms and processed by machine method at centrally located offices in the major regions of the United States and the office of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington.

Under the provisions of section 500 of the Transportation Act approved February 28, 1920, the Corps of Engineers prepares and publishes a series of reports on port and terminal facilities in cooperation with the Maritime Commission and reports on transportation lines, port and terminal charges, water transportation in general, and related shipping matters.

7. Related functions and activities: The Congress has by law created certain boards and commissions which are charged with specific duties related to the Corps of Engineers civil works activities. These bodies include:

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created by the River and Harbor Act approved June 13, 1902, and assigned primarily the duty of reviewing and submitting of recommendations on reports of examinations and surveys called for by Congress covering proposed improvements for navigation, flood control and allied purposes. This board, which has seven members, all senior officers of the Corps of Engineers, has a permanent office and staff in Washington.

The Beach Erosion Board was created by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, section 2 of which assigned to it the duty of assisting the Chief of Engineers in the conduct of studies of beach erosion problems and the review of reports thereon. This board has seven members, four of whom are engineer officers and three are civil engineers, representatives of the cooperating State agencies. The studies of beach erosion are made in cooperation with State agencies, in accordance with the provisions and the above-mentioned section 2, with local interests bearing 50 percent of the cost.

California Debris Commission was created by act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, and has jurisdiction over the drainage area of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, Calif., for the following purposes: First, to regulate hydraulic mining in such a way as to permit its resumption and continuance under such restrictions as to prevent the resulting debris from being carried into navigable waters or otherwise causing damage. Second, to study and report upon general hydraulic and hydraulic-mining conditions and matters affecting or affected by them and to make surveys, mature and adopt plans for the purpose of improving the navigability, deepening the channels, and protecting the banks of the rivers, and affording relief from flood damages.

Mississippi River Commission, created by act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, is charged with the prosecution of improvements in the interest of navigation on the Mississippi River above Baton Rouge, La., to Cairo, Ill., and of improvements for flood control of the Mississippi River and its tributaries and outlets so far as they are affected by backwater between Head of Passes, La., and Cape Giradeau, Mo.

International boards and commissions have been created in connection with the regulation and control of the international boundary waters. These include the International Joint Commission, the St. Croix River Board of Control, the Lake Champlain Board of Control, the Niagara Control Board, and Lake Superior Board of Control.

Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation: By an act approved June 28, 1902, and subsequent acts, the Congress has appropriated funds for the support and maintenance of this Commission which is also supported by member nations. Its object is the promotion of inland and maritime navigation by means of organized congresses, and the publication of pertinent information. Its headquarters is in Brussels, Belgium, but the congresses are held (except during war periods) in various countries.

In addition to the foregoing, the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers include:

Work for other agencies: In accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved June 20, 1938, stating that Federal improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways shall be prosecuted by the War Department, the Corps of Engineers performs work for other agencies from time to time of a river and harbor nature not previously authorized by Congress with funds transferred to the Chief of Engineers by those agencies, which include the Navy Department and War Shipping Administration.

Detail of engineer officers: From time to time officers and civilian engineers of the Corps of Engineers are detailed to administer or perform certain civil activities for other Federal agencies and foreign governments. Also, officers of the corps are detailed to administer and supervise the maintenance and care of the Panama Canal, which is under the direction of the Secretary of War and the Governor of the Panama Canal, the latter being an engineer officer.

8. Summation: As indicated above, all civil-works activities of the Corps of Engineers are carried out in accordance with specific directives of Congress. In the development of a river and harbor project, there are three principal stages, each of which requires the specific authorization of Congress, namely:

(a) Field survey and development of general plans, authorized in the form of a preliminary examination and survey in a River and Harbor Act.

(b) Authorization of the project in a subsequent River and Harbor Act based upon recommendations in reports submitted to Congress upon completion of stage (a) above.

(c) Appropriation of funds with which to undertake construction and maintenance of the completed work is contained in the annual War Department Civil Appropriations Acts subsequent to authorization, stage (b) above.

The prosecution of a project from its inception, when it is first advocated by local interests, to and including its completion, operation, and maintenance, is carried out in close cooperation with all Federal, State, and local interests concerned.

No project is recommended for construction unless the average annual benefits to accrue therefrom are determined, after careful and thorough study, to be greater than the average annual charges for construction, amortization, and maintenance.

In general, local interests are required to participate in the project by contributing funds, providing adequate terminal and other shore facilities, furnishing necessary lands and releasing the United States from claims for damages that may result from the Federal work of improvement.

After authorization of a project, its construction is carried out as soon as may be consistent with budgetary limitations.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the remarks yesterday of my good friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN, and the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, who in a very emphatic manner suggested it was about time that we give consideration and protection to these great United States, and start to look after our own backyard and Uncle Sam's interests.

Everything in Washington now is international; international this and international that, and if you are not international in your thinking you are out of step.

I hold in my hand a booklet entitled "Products on Which Possible Tariff Concessions Will Be Considered in Reciprocal Trade Agreement Negotiations." I understand these agreements are to be considered sometime in April at a conference to be held in Geneva. Why not hold it in the United States? Maybe we could make some better trades; at least we would know what kind of trading was going on.

It would be interesting for the Members to secure a copy of this booklet from the State Department and ascertain just what branches of the industrial and economic life of their districts are to be affected in this proposed list of products which are up for trading.

We have before the Ways and Means Committee, House Resolution No. 52, requesting that these reciprocal trade agreements be held in abeyance until such a time as Congress has an opportunity to explore the situation further.

The Members of Congress should be given an opportunity to be recorded on this resolution.

Panel discussions are being held by various branches of the Government on this matter at this time and I am in receipt of a letter from the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, W. L. Clayton, in which he states, and I quote:

> No decision as to what, if any, concession may be offered can be reached until all views submitted to the trade-agreements organization through the Committee for Reciprocity Information have been digested and studied along with other information available to the Government. An interdepartmental committee will then consider each item listed before any decision is made to recommend a concession.

So it becomes evident the program is well under way.

The trade-negotiations conference will be held in Geneva in April and I am of the opinion there will be plenty of concessions granted by Uncle Sam which will work a hardship on various branches of our economic and industrial life. When the bars are let down and cheaply produced foreign products flood the markets and industries fold up, the American people will demand to know why the Congress did not do something about it.

Recently I had this matter up with the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor and I have been advised by James L. McDevitt, president of the Pennsylvania Federation, that they are highly in accord with the objectives sought in the Jenkins resolution, No. 52, and suggests the postponing of any hasty action on this very important matter.

This indicates to me that labor too is greatly concerned over the coming international trade negotiations to be held in the near future and what it will do to American pay rolls.

The Congress should take action on the Jenkins resolution.

I. How Much Food Can the United States Supply?

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as a preface please allow me to state that I am not opposing or proposing

additional food shipments. I do feel that I should try to get the facts in order to approach this serious problem. With the large world demands for food, it appears to be the appropriate time to get the facts as to the world's food supply. First, we must keep in mind that from 1925 to 1942, and in the year of 1944, even, the United States did not feed itself and that the United States was not allowed to be agriculturally self-sufficient. If anyone now states that the United States can feed the world, he must have some facts to show that it can be done. The argument is not whether or not it should be done. The problem is how can we approach the objective of helping feed a hungry world.

With a depletion of the food reserves of the United States, the American consumer faces two situations: One is a direct assessment in the form of taxes to provide the money to purchase the food for relief purposes. Two, the consumer is faced with higher domestic prices for his foods, as a result of channeling larger quantities of food normally consumed in the United States to world relief channels. How far on this road can we travel without disturbing our whole economic set-up in regard to wages? How far on this road can we travel without jeopardizing the health, the nutrition, and well-being of the American people or at least a large segment of our peoples? I shall include today a 1946 report on exports and imports of agricultural products from Holland which is as follows:

Holland: United States exports of principal agricultural commodities to Holland, 1946 [1]

Commodity	Unit	Quantity	Value
Wheat (60 pounds per bushel)	Bu	11,001,572	23,783,619
Raw cotton	Bale	98,906	15,972,546
Tobacco, leaf	Lb	20,049,940	12,162,704
Beef and veal, fresh or frozen	Lb	33,266,264	7,697,013
Wheat flour	Cwt	1,466,216	7,121,058
Lard	Lb	12,260,635	2,051,238
Cattle hides	Piece	175,457	1,698,004
Soybean oil	Lb	7,855,997	1,493,951
Oats (32 pounds per bushel)	Bu	1,329,701	1,349,882
Evaporated, unsweetened milk	Lb	10,669,716	1,181,453
Soybeans, except canned	Lb	21,458,040	907,156
Pork, except canned	Lb	3,575,029	764,809
Sausage, bologna and frankfurters, canned	Lb	1,890,250	695,492
Fruits, dried	Lb	4,141,591	678,443
Dried skim milk	Lb	3,698,575	584,997
Fruits, fresh or frozen (60 pounds per box)	Box	122,706	575,232
Cheese	Lb	1,288,064	505,651
Malt (34 pounds per bushel)	Bu	219,417	503,134
Soybean flour, edible	Lb	7,033,200	500,440
Pork, canned	Lb	1,622,651	478,087
Expressed oils, nonessential	Lb	1,577,654	434,097
Dried whole milk	Lb	951,091	332,118
Grass seeds	Lb	1,334,035	331,217
Vegetable seeds	Lb	756,469	252,243
Sausage casings	Lb	107,206	251,980
Horse meat (all kinds)	Lb	1,654,741	230,965
Clover seed	Lb	547,504	217,519
Fruits, canned	Lb	1,446,136	200,659
Field seeds, n. e. s	Lb	2,134,100	197,513
Essential oils	Lb	46,958	188,420
Hops	Lb	197,955	185,664
Cereal foods	Lb	762,649	180,363
Barley (48 pounds per bushel)	Bu	96,501	174,829
Buckwheat (48 pounds per bushel)	Bu	69,819	130,052
Eggs in shell	Doz	313,488	110,010
All other			846,694
Total			84,969,249

[1] Preliminary, subject to change.

Source: Compiled from records in the offices of the Secretary of Commerce.

In looking over these 1946 agricultural exports to Holland, we find:

First, that of our exports about 20 percent were for livestock products.

Second, that about 40 percent of the exports were for wheat and wheat and soybean flour.

Third, that many of these exports were dairy products that under normal conditions are imported into the United States.

Holland: United States imports for consumption from Holland,[1] by principal commodities for 1946 [2]

Commodity	Unit	Quantity	Value
Tulip bulbs	No	70,159,621	$3,474,169
Narcissus bulbs	No	31,931,149	1,551,543
Hyacinth bulbs	No	17,527,378	1,384,228
Bulbs, roots, clumps, etc	No	77,448,393	956,307
Flax [3]	Ton	314	373,329
Lily bulbs	No	1,841,446	339,268
Spinach	Lb	1,726,650	303,322
Malt liquors (beer, stout, ale, etc.)	Gal	503,372	304,684
Caraway seed	Lb	1,191,657	250,424
Grafted or budded plants, cuttings, etc., n. s. p. f.	No	612,837	192,385
Poppy seed	Lb	856,248	189,730
Crocus corms bulbs	No	21,919,148	186,016
Starch, potato	Lb	1,959,296	168,628
Flower seeds	Lb	47,771	119,523
Cocoa, unsweetened	Lb	374,400	114,205
Orchid plants	No	9,199	109,334
Mustard seed, whole	Lb	547,089	98,903
Chocolate sweetened	Lb	155,880	82,382
Rape seed	Lb	428,385	48,421
Rose plants	No	108,248	46,815
Cucumber pickles	Lb	316,417	33,566
Feathers	Lb	24,476	30,417
Caraway oil	Lb	4,358	25,725
Cauliflower	Lb	1,884	19,684
Rose seedlings and cuttings of rose stock 3 years old or less	No	768,550	17,965
Cut flowers, fresh, dried, prepared, or preserved			14,747
Drugs of animal origin, n. e. s	Lb	11	13,250
Hide cuttings, raw, with or without hair	Lb	79,910	12,488
Wool, scoured, Donskoi, Smyrna, etc	Lb	11,301	11,659
Onions, pickled or packed in brine	Lb	36,532	11,122
Lime oil	Lb	720	11,007
Edam or Gouda cheese	Lb	119	52
All other			104,899
Total			10,600,203

[1] Imports of principal agricultural commodities.
[2] Preliminary, subject to change.
[3] Includes "Hackled and not hackled."

In reviewing the imports, it should be noted that the agricultural items are largely nonfood items. You will note the 1,959,000 pounds potato starch imports, the $304,000 malt-liquor import, the $11,000 wool import, the $11,000 onion import.

None of these agricultural imports are of any large magnitude within themselves. One cannot, however, refrain from wondering why the food imported into the United States could not or was not channeled to European relief needs. The question once more arises as to how the available foods of the world can be channeled to the areas of the greatest need.

The total United States agricultural exports following World War II are much smaller than the 1919 total agricultural exports. The post-World War II exports of food, however, are much greater than the food exports following World War I. The present agricultural exports, in other words, are apparently made from the viewpoint of supplying foods rather than of general agricultural products.

It is also apparent that with this world food situation to face, we should not tolerate a set-up that allows 80,000,000 bushels of potatoes to be used for nonfood purposes or wasted, and entails an $80,000,000 loss to be paid by the taxpayers of the United States.

Natural Gas Shortage in Western Pennsylvania Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district is among the many districts in western Pennsylvania affected by the shortage of natural gas. During the past several weeks some of our key industries in Pennsylvania found it necessary to close down because of the shortage of natural gas.

In an effort to solve this perplexing problem I contacted gas-company officials in Pennsylvania and also Mr. Nelson Lee Smith, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The consensus of opinion is that the increased use of natural gas with the depletion of the supply in the fields of western Pennsylvania created a natural shortage in the first place. To meet this condition it was necessary to transport gas from the Southwest via pipe lines. However, the critical shortage of steel pipe proved a barrier and contributed to the inability to transport a greater supply of gas from the Southwest.

There has been a marked increase during the past several years in the number of domestic and industrial users of natural gas. In reply to my inquiries I received an interesting letter from Mr. Nelson Lee Smith, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, which I wish to read at this time as it contains factual information that I am certain will be of interest to all Members, especially those of us representing districts in western Pennsylvania.

Chairman Smith's letter is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, February 27, 1947.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of February 11, 1947, in which you requested information relative to the cause of the current natural-gas shortage in western Pennsylvania.

A shortage of natural gas exists, not only in western Pennsylvania but throughout the entire northern region of the country where natural gas is being distributed, extending from Colorado to the eastern seaboard. The principal factors contributing to this undesirable situation, particularly in the Appalachian area, are the inability of gas produced in local fields to meet exceptionally large increased demands and the difficulty of obtaining steel pipe for the construction of new pipe lines from the highly productive gas fields of the Southwest.

Depletion of local fields, particularly in the so-called Appalachian area of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky, was accelerated during the war by heavy withdrawals to meet requirements of war industries. At the height of the war effort the steady drain on local supplies began to take effect and make necessary a special allocation of steel pipe to Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. for the construction and operation of a new pipe line extending from Texas to West Virginia for the purpose of making additional supplies of gas available to the Appalachian area. In addition, priorities on critical materials were issued to Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. to increase the capacity of its existing system for the purpose of delivering 100,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas from Texas and Kansas into Ohio. The Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. line was completed in the latter part of 1944, with a sales capacity of approximately 205,000,000 cubic feet of gas per day. This was subsequently increased to 263,000,000 cubic feet per day by the end of the war.

This volume of gas transported into the area for war purposes did not satisfy the needs of the postwar markets because industrial demands for natural gas continued without recession at the wartime rate and there developed tremendous demands for gas for house heating by domestic consumers. Reports submitted to the Commission show that during the past year thousands of consumers have installed gas-fired heating equipment because of shortages of other fuels and because increased costs of other fuels, particularly coal, have made gas little, if any, more expensive for house heating than coal. During the war the increase in use of gas for house heating was controlled by war agencies and lack of equipment; in addition, few new homes were built. Upon release of restrictions, demands pent-up during the war came upon all companies simultaneously and created the unprecedented increase in demand. As a result of these large domestic requirements, most companies have had to order complete shut-downs of industrial service during cold spells this winter to protect domestic service to the fullest extent possible. Even with these drastic measures, thousands of domestic consumers were at times without gas during recent cold spells.

To meet such increased demands additional volumes of natural gas from the Southwest are required. In July 1946 the Commission authorized Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. to construct additional facilities for the purpose of increasing its sales capacity by approximately 118,000,000 cubic feet per day to a total of 381,000,000 cubic feet per day. Due to the critical shortage of steel pipe, the company has been able to complete construction sufficient to add only 18,000,000 cubic feet per day to its capacity and the outlook is uncertain as to when pipe will be available to complete the remaining 100,000,000 cubic feet per day capacity. A further increase in capacity to 600,000,000 cubic feet per day is now proposed by Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co., but completion is dependent upon the availability of steel pipe. The date of completion of this and such other projects as may be found to be required is conjectural.

According to statistics of the American Iron and Steel Institute, steel pipe takes approximately 8 percent of the total steel production. The major part of the steel pipe is used for oil operations, leaving a very small amount available for gas pipe-line construction. For economic and technical advantage, it is the current practice to construct long-distance high-pressure gas lines of 26-inch diameter pipe. There are only two pipe mills in the country capable of rolling 26-inch diameter pipe, thereby further increasing the disadvantages operating against the companies seeking materials to construct such lines.

During the past year, gas company officials testifying before the Commission have emphasized their inability to obtain large-diameter steel pipe because the tremendous demand for such pipe by oil companies, for domestic and foreign operations, and by gas companies has far exceeded the capacity of pipe-fabricating mills. The situation is aggravated by the inability of pipe fabricators to secure an adequate supply of the necessary steel plate because demands for steel for all purposes exceed the supply. It is understood that pipe fabricators cannot fill orders on hand for several years.

In December 1946, the Commission authorized the emergency operation of the Big Inch lines for the transportation of natural gas to Ohio and western Pennsylvania. With the assistance of an Industry Advisory Committee composed of gas company representatives, delivery of gas through the Big Inch lines is being allocated in proportion to the requirements of the several companies requesting such gas. We are inclosing a tabulation showing the natural gas requirements and shortages on the systems obtaining gas from the Big Inch lines on January 21 and 22, 1947, and estimates submitted by these companies as to their requirements and shortages during their February peak day. These data show the seriousness of the gas supply situation in this area.

We appreciate the opportunity to submit this information to you and trust it will prove helpful in answering the numerous inquiries you have received pertaining to the current gas shortages. We shall be happy to furnish any further information you may require.

Sincerely yours,

NELSON LEE SMITH,
Chairman.

TABLE A-1.—*Major natural gas companies in Appalachian area—Actual deliveries and deficiencies of gas companies receiving gas from Big Inch pipe lines on Jan. 21, 1947*

[All figures are volumes of gas in thousands of cubic feet]

Company	Domestic and commercial	Industrial	Other utilities	Lost and company use	Total deliveries	Deficiency	Total requirements
Columbia Gas & Electric Co	595,400	210,100	[1] 291,986	127,000	1,224,486	75,086	1,299,572
Hope Natural Gas Co	53,106	33,496	[2] 9,587	16,573	112,762		112,762
The East Ohio Gas Co	386,468	70,023		4,000	460,491	65,964	525,455
New York State Natural Gas Corp			[2] 78,337	131	78,468		78,468
The Peoples Natural Gas Co	91,672	71,085	1,450	3,709	167,916	18,788	186,704
United Natural Gas Co	32,400	4,200	[3] 3,200	3,200	43,100	12,275	55,375
Iroquois Gas Corp	106,300	4,600	4,100	1,000	116,000	4,100	120,100
Pennsylvania Gas Co	42,500	2,600	700	1,200	47,000	1,600	48,600
Equitable Gas Co	99,500	46,700		13,400	159,600	3,145	162,745
Louisville Gas & Electric Co	49,000	8,000	2,800	4,000	63,800		63,800
Carnegie Natural Gas Co	2,800	52,800		500	56,500	14,000	70,500
Total requirements	1,459,146	503,604	392,260	175,113	2,530,123	194,958	2,725,081

[1] After deducting wholesale sales by Pittsburgh division to eliminate duplication in Carnegie and United Fuel data.
[2] After deducting wholesale sales to East Ohio, Peoples Natural, New York Natural, and Manufacturers Light & Heat to eliminate duplication.
[3] After deducting wholesale sales to United Natural Gas Co. to eliminate duplication.
[4] After deducting wholesale sales to Iroquois Gas and Penn Gas Co. to eliminate duplication.

TABLE A-2.—*Major natural gas companies in Appalachian area—Actual deliveries and deficiencies of gas companies receiving gas from Big Inch pipe lines on Jan. 22, 1947*

[All figures are volumes of gas in thousands of cubic feet]

Company	Domestic and commercial	Industrial	Other utilities	Lost and company use	Total deliveries	Deficiency	Total requirements
Columbia Gas & Electric Co	628,700	230,400	[1] 288,736	125,500	1,273,336	172,536	1,445,872
Hope Natural Gas Co	59,338	24,376	[2] 10,362	15,917	109,993	9,102	119,095
The East Ohio Gas Co	429,575	11,780		4,000	445,355	172,207	617,562
New York State Natural Gas Corp			[2] 79,651	131	79,782	1,363	81,145
The Peoples Natural Gas Co	107,533	50,107	1,338	3,709	162,687	39,062	201,749
United Natural Gas Co	39,300	1,300	[3] 3,500	3,000	47,100	30,480	77,580
Iroquois Gas Corp	116,300	4,600	4,100	1,000	126,000	10,000	136,000
Pennsylvania Gas Co	44,400	200	700	1,200	46,500	5,600	52,100
Equitable Gas Co	121,300	36,600		17,500	175,400	17,023	192,423
Louisville Gas & Electric Co	49,450	8,100	3,700	3,750	65,000		65,000
Carnegie Natural Gas Co	2,800	52,800		900	56,500	14,000	70,500
Total requirements	1,598,696	420,263	392,087	176,607	2,587,653	471,373	3,059,026

[1] After deducting wholesale sales by Pittsburgh division to eliminate duplication in Carnegie and United Fuel data.
[2] After deducting wholesale sales to East Ohio, Peoples Natural, New York Natural, and Manufacturers Light & Heat to eliminate duplication.
[3] After deducting wholesale sales to United Natural Gas Co. to eliminate duplication.
[4] After deducting wholesale sales to Iroquois Gas and Penn Gas Co. to eliminate duplication.

TABLE A-3.—*Major natural gas companies in Appalachian area—Estimated requirements of gas companies receiving gas from Big Inch pipe lines, peak day, February 1947*

[All figures are volumes of gas in thousands of cubic feet]

Company	Domestic and commercial	Industrial	Other utilities	Lost and company use	Total deliveries	Deficiency	Total requirements
Columbia Gas & Electric Co.	659,892	240,559	[1] 305,566	126,288	1,332,305	318,305	1,650,610
Hope Natural Gas Co.	31,800	30,500	[2] 3,575		65,875		65,875
The East Ohio Gas Co.	487,000	110,000		4,000	601,000	168,500	769,500
New York State Natural Gas Corp.			[2] 91,360	210	91,570		91,570
The Peoples Natural Gas Co.	107,500	90,000		4,000	201,500		201,500
United Natural Gas Co.	53,100	7,000	[4] 2,800	3,200	66,100	68,600	134,700
Iroquois Gas Corp.	122,100	10,800	4,100	1,000	138,000	[5]	138,000
Pennsylvania Gas Co.	49,300	3,400	800	1,500	55,000	3,000	58,000
Equitable Gas Co.	135,100	51,500		10,000	196,600	15,100	211,700
Louisville Gas & Electric Co.	50,000	8,100	3,000	3,750	64,850		64,850
Carnegie Natural Gas Co.	2,500	52,800		900	56,200		56,200
Total requirements	1,698,292	604,659	411,201	154,848	2,869,000	573,505	3,442,505

[1] After deducting wholesale sales by Pittsburgh division to eliminate duplication in Carnegie and United Fuel data.
[2] After deducting wholesale sales to East Ohio, Peoples Natural, New York Natural, and Manufacturers Light & Heat to eliminate duplication.
[3] After deducting wholesale sales to United Natural Gas Co. to eliminate duplication.
[4] After deducting wholesale sales to Iroquois Gas and Penn Gas Co. to eliminate duplication.
[5] Deficiency included in deficiency of United Natural Gas Co.

Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, former Member of Congress from Indiana:

BIG BUSINESS

We talk a lot about big business—its good points and bad. Today, I am going to speak about the biggest business in the world. It is the United States Government.

It proposes to spend $37,500,000,000 this coming year. How big is a $37,500,000,000 business?

It almost equals the entire income of the American people in 1932. It is almost half as much as they made in 1939. It is bigger by $4,000,000,000 than the income of all Americans living in the 23 States west of the Mississippi River (with the exception of California). It is $8,000,000,000 more than the United States Government spent in the 128 years from the founding of the Republic until 1917.

TOPS FIRST WORLD WAR COST

It is more than we spent in the 3 years of 1917, 1918, and 1919, during World War I. It is more than we spent in the 4 years before Pearl Harbor when we were arming for war.

Even in 1942, when we were fighting with our backs to the wall in the Pacific and pouring vast cargoes of munitions across the Atlantic, we spent $5,000,000,000 less than Mr. Truman proposes to spend in a peacetime year.

If next year, 32,000,000 of our people turned over their entire earnings to the Government, and were themselves able to live on nothing, their combined income would not pay the bills of the biggest business in the world.

While war costs are whittled down, this budget proposes to increase the peacetime spending of the Government in 1948 by $9,000,000,000 more than it spent for those purposes in 1946. This increase alone is equal to the entire amount spent by the Government in any year from 1930 to 1940. Yet, Mr. Truman says taxes cannot be reduced.

FEDERAL PAY ROLL STILL LOADED

Federal civilian employees still number 2,300,000 as compared with 900,000 in 1939, or 500,000 in 1933 when Mr. Roosevelt said, "Government costs too much."

According to Senator BYRD, we should discharge 1,000,000 of them costing us $3,500,000,000. This saving would permit a 20 percent tax cut clear across the board without impairing a single essential service.

And this is the Federal Government alone.

Add to that $12,000,000,000 more for State and local governments, and you have a total of $50,000,000,000 to pay the bills of the big business of Government.

Fifty billion dollars is more than the entire income of all the people in the richest country in the world in either 1932, 1933, or 1934. Have we gone completely nuts? Have the bureaucrats and spenders and wasters become our masters?

Suppose the national, State, and local governments levied a tax against all the farmers in the United States by compelling them to deliver free of charge to the Government all their farm crops—wheat, cotton, tobacco, sugar, everything that is grown in the ground—all their livestock—hogs, cattle, sheep—wool, milk, poultry, eggs, etc. The cash value of all these crops and livestock would run the Government just 5 months.

If the Government then seized all the coal that is mined, all the metals dug out of the earth, all the timber cut in the forests, and all the sea food caught in the water, it still would pay for the cost of Government for only 10 or 11 months. Such is the tribute levied against us.

BIGGEST HOLD-UP IN HISTORY

This is the most colossal hold-up in modern history. For anything similar, you would have to go back to Bible times to read of the decree that went out from Augustus Caesar that "all the world should be taxed." Caesar was a piker.

Big government is the curse of every civilization since the world began, whether under the Pharaohs of Egypt, the Caesars of Rome, or the Hitlers of the twentieth century. Big government is the harbinger of certain disaster to every nation that long tolerates it. As a great historian said, "The civilization of ancient Rome was not destroyed by barbarians but by the imperial tax gatherers" (Ferrero).

The blight of high taxes, spending, and debt drowns ambition, discourages thrift, skyrockets prices, and makes the citizen a bootlicker of the spenders.

Increasing debt and taxes finally submerge nations under the inflation flood, as we have twice witnessed in Europe in a single generation.

WHY EXPECT UNITED STATES TO BE IMMUNE?

Why do we think we are immune to a plague no free people has ever survived?

In 1776 there were enough brave men to break away from big government. They put its taxes, rationing, price fixing, and arbitrary controls behind them. For a century and a half we were freemen. Government was small, its tax burden was easy, and its debt insignificant. For a century and a half the individual American was the master and government was his servant. For a century and a half government did not confuse itself with God. For a century and a half we adhered to the faith that that government is best which governs least.

Now, we have foresworn the creed of the greatest political philosopher of all times, Thomas Jefferson, and embraced the Old World doctrines of Karl Marx, Bismarck, and Caesar. Now, once again, the dark eclipse of big government is sweeping over America. Will it be said that this glorious century and a half was nothing but a happy interlude in the age-old struggle between the world's parasites and the world's producers?

BUREAUCRATS ON OUR BACKS

It was said of Russia under the czars that every peasant carried a soldier on his back. That truly great Russian, Count Tolstoi, pictured the parasites of imperial Russia as saying:

"I sit on a man's back, choking him, and making him carry me and yet telling him that I am very sorry for him and wish to ease his lot by all possible means—except to get off his back."

Here in America we have a similar lot of bureaucrats, these "troublesome insects of the hour," as Edmund Burke would call them, telling us how much they want to do for us, and how helpless we are without them. Yet, as in Russia under the czar, our bureaucrats never suggest that they get off our backs.

We have got to recognize that government in America has become a big new racket and lifetime career of making jobs at the public trough. The corrupt pay-roll padding that goes on under the big city machines has become a national profession. And the plan is to make big government even bigger.

AVALANCHE OF NEW CONTROL BILLS

Senator O'MAHONEY tells us that despite the election, 200 bills have already been introduced in Congress to extend Federal control and pay rolls.

More billions are to be poured down new and bigger rat holes.

Social security, so-called, but which should be called its right name, the "workingman's income tax" is to be broadened in scope to tax still more millions and tax them at still higher rates.

With the Government constantly going deeper into debt, social security is in the process of becoming a colossal fraud. For, after the social-security taxes have been spent for other purposes, all it amounts to is a promise that some future politicians will tax the people a second time to pay its claims, and that the people will be able to pay.

Only a completely solvent government that is paying off its debt, instead of adding to it has any moral right to talk about social security.

Under this $37,000,000,000 budget, the pious hope is expressed that a small sum may be paid on the Nation's debt. At the rate proposed, it would take 1,300 years to pay off the debt.

And I'll bet you a dollar against the hole in a doughnut that not even this payment will be made in the seventeenth year of continuous deficits, unless you taxpayers rise in wrath from coast to coast and tell your newly elected Congressmen that they will serve just one term unless they make good on the promises they made you last fall.

Already we see signs that the new Congress is beginning to hem and haw. The bureaucrats are at work on them. The social welfare crowd is at work on them. And to their everlasting shame and disgrace, there are plenty of businessmen and governors and mayors who are lobbying for more billions from the gravy train.

The Northwestern National Life Insurance Co. estimates that inflation is costing the average family $1,000 a year in the increased prices of what they buy.

CAUSED BY GOVERNMENT SPENDING

What causes this burden? It is Government spending, taxes, and debt. The people never cause inflation in the cost of living. That is always caused by government.

Isn't it time for government to stop telling us the beautiful things it is going to do for us and to get off our backs?

In the light of taxes, inflation, and strikes aren't you getting fed up with the talk of "social gains" by the professional Pecksniffs who cram Government offices from coast to coast?

They would cure the selfishness of the individual by substituting the greed of the group. And group greed is more ruthless and cruel than individual selfishness. For there are few men to whom God has not given a conscience to put some limit on their selfishness. But the group, the mob, the pressure bloc have no conscience whatever.

CONGRESS UNDER CONSTANT THREAT

A man who would never think of sticking a gun in my ribs to force me to give him my pocketbook, when he becomes a member of a mob or a pressure bloc has no more scruples than a wolf in a pack, in threatening a Congressman with political death unless he throws open the doors of the treasury to the mob.

That is what we have been doing to this great free government of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

We are turning it over to be sacked and plundered by pressure blocs, as the vandals once sacked Rome. And all under the beautiful banner of humanitarianism and the social gospel.

This Republic will either follow bankrupt England and busted France into the twilight sleep of socialism, or into the red dawn of communism, or someone in our public life will seize "freedom's holy flag" and crusade once more for the principles that made America the land of opportunity and the envy of the world.

I'm an optimist. I believe if such a man comes forth, the tens of millions whose veins are still warm with the blood of our forebears will make him the next President of the United States.

I have that faith.

Missouri River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress passed Public Law 254, under date of December 22, 1944, it provided for a comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin. Much of this work has already been done, particularly has the main unit, the Garrison Dam, been started. This dam is located in the main stem of the Missouri River at Garrison, N. Dak.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith House Concurrent Resolution E, passed by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota:

House Concurrent Resolution E

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress for Federal appropriations for immediate construction of the Heart River project, including the Heart Butte and Dickinson Reservoirs, the Sheyenne Dam, and other portions of the Missouri-Souris project, all integral parts of the coordinated plan for Missouri Basin Development, as authorized by the Congress in Public Law 254

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein):

Whereas the Congress of the United States in the Flood Control Act passed December 22, 1944, provided for a comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin; and

Whereas one of the large reservoirs in connection therewith is located in the State of North Dakota, justifiable primarily for navigation, power, and flood control; and

Whereas said act provides for the diversion of Missouri River waters from the Fort Peck Reservoir into western, central, and eastern North Dakota for irrigation and reclamation; and

Whereas such diversion is desperately needed for rehabilitation of Devils Lake and providing for the domestic and commercial needs of such cities, among others, as Jamestown, Valley City, Enderlin, Fargo, Moorhead, Grand Forks, and East Grand Forks; and

Whereas surveys and other necessary preliminary work have been completed on both the Dickinson and Heart Butte Reservoirs to justify letting of construction contracts on said projects; and

Whereas the Sheyenne Dam is a part of said basin development plan and necessary both to effect such conversion and reclamation and to permit of the irrigation of large acreage in eastern Montana and northwestern and central North Dakota; and

Whereas $200,000,000 have been authorized for initial stages of construction in connection with said Missouri Basin Development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That Congress and the Federal agencies having said development in hand be and hereby are memorialized and petitioned to provide or make available the necessary funds for immediate construction of the Dickinson and Heart Butte Dams and such portions of the Missouri-Souris project as have reached construction stage and in particular the Sheyenne Dam, this being the regulatory reservoir effecting diversion to the Devils Lake Basin and the restoration of Devils Lake and the James, Sheyenne, and Red River of the north where water is sorely needed for human consumption and industrial development, especially in the cities hereinbefore referred to; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War, the Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers for this district, and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as the chairmen of the Appropriations, Irrigation, and Rivers and Harbors Committees of the House and Senate of the United States. That copies be likewise sent to the secretary of the National Reclamation Association and to North Dakota's delegation in Congress.

VERNON M. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
W. J. TROUT,
Secretary of the Senate.

Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution passed by the Texas House of Representatives.

Last session I introduced a bill seeking to aid the types of unfortunate people mentioned in the resolution. Other bills of a kindred nature were introduced last session. My same bill, as well as other bills, has been introduced this session. I sincerely hope the Congress will give immediate attention to this important problem.

The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Whereas during the recent World War II the enemy countries, especially Germany and Japan, violated almost every rule of civilized warfare and inflicted unspeakable punishment and horrible tortures upon prisoners of war, as well as civilians who were so unfortunate as to fall into the hands of said enemies; and

Whereas many unfortunate prisoners succumbed to said inhuman treatment and many others suffered bodily injuries and loss of health from which they may never recover; and

Whereas, in all justice, those who have suffered in the hands of said enemy countries are entitled to damages for such injuries under the well-established rules of international law; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States should without delay enact such enabling legislation as may be necessary

to enable those who have suffered bodily injuries as well as loss of property at the hands of said enemy countries to assert their claims and have the same allowed and paid by the guilty enemy countries who may be found to have been responsible for such injuries, damages, and loss of property, and that suitable provision be made in such legislation for the recovery by the heirs of those who did not return, both civilians and those who were in the armed forces: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Texas (the Senate concurring) memorialize the Congress of the United States to promptly enact the necessary legislation to provide for a mixed claims commission to receive and adjudicate claims of American nationals who were internees or prisoners of war of Japan or Germany or any other enemy country with power to fix the amount of compensation to be awarded and paid for such claims and with the further power to require the payment by the guilty enemy country for property losses and personal injuries resulting from and that may be attributed to the conduct of said enemy's armed forces, with particular reference to maltreatment of prisoners of war in contravention of the laws and customs of civilized warfare and of the Geneva Convention. And in this connection we respectfully memorialize the Congress to enact legislation along the lines of Senate bill 2497 and House bill 4217, and House bill 7228 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be so memorialized to enact at the earliest date possible legislation to authorize the promotion of the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who were prisoners of war, and the payment to said personnel of the subsistence allowance at the rate of 70 cents per day during such period as he or she was a prisoner of war, and Senate bill 421, Calendar 179, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and Senate bill 1805, Union Calendar No. 623, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, are especially commended for the consideration of the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas send copies of this resolution under the seal of the house to the Senators and each Member of the House of Representatives in Congress from Texas; also to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, Senator from New Mexico; the Honorable CARL A. HATCH, Senator from New Mexico; the Honorable THOMAS C. HART, Senator from Connecticut; the honorable chairmen of the combined Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Representative from Massachusetts; the Honorable A. N. FERNANDEZ, Representative from New Mexico; the Honorable Ed. V. Izac, Representative from California; the Bataan Relief Organization of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; and Claims Committee, Liberated Military Personnel, 901 American Building, Washington, D. C., with our expression of thanks for the splendid work they have done in the past in connection with this legislation.

Reed, Abington, Atkinson, Aynesworth, Barber, Bean, Bell of DeWitt, Bell of Bexar, Berry, Blankenship, Blount, Bracewell, Brooks, Callaway, Cannon, Celaya, Chapman, Clifton, Collie, Colson, Conner, Cowen, Cox, Craig, Crawford, Crosthwait, Davis, Edwards, Elliott, Etheredge, Evans, Fant, Fertsch, Flanagan, Fleming, Fly, Ford, Gandy, Gardner, Gathings, Gilmer, Godard, Green, Gregory, Guffey, Hanna, Heatly, Heflin, Heideke, Helpinstill, Henderson, Holstein, Holt, Horany, Hughes, Hydrick, Isaacks, Jackson, James, Jameson, Johnson, Jones of Bosque, Jones of Hunt, Jones of Travis, Kazen, Kennington, Kilgore, King, Kirkpatrick, Lanier, Latimer, Lee, Lehman, Lewis, Lightfoot, Lock, Luedemann, McClain, McDaniel, McFarland, McLellan, McVey, Mahan, Manford, Mangum, Markle, Martin, Miller, Moore of Harris, Moore of Val Verde, Moore of Red River, Moore of Brazos, Murphy, Nokes, Oltorf, Overton, Parkhouse, Pearson, Peters, Pyle, Rampy, Read, Reams, Richards, Ridgeway, Sadler, Sallas, Sellers, Senterfitt, Shackelford, Shannon, Sharp, Slimp, Smith of Hays, Smith of Jack, Smith of Lubbock, South, Spacek, Sparks, Spencer, Still, Stockard, Storey, Stump, Suiter, Svadlenak, Swanson, Teague, Templeton, Thomas, Timmons, Tippen, Turner, Wagonseller, Walker, Wallace, Ward, Watson, Whitworth, Williams of Bexar, Williams of Scurry, Williamson, Willis of Tarrant, Willis of Kaufman, Wilson, Wiseman, Wood, Wright, Yezak, Zivley.

ALLAN SHRINER,
President of the Senate.
W. O. REED,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 8 was adopted by the house on February 11, 1947.

CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 8 was adopted by the senate on February 19, 1947.

CLAUDE ISBELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

United Nations To Be Asked To Consider Future Status of Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the vexing problem of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, a key area in Africa, with all its ramifications, will be laid before the United Nations shortly in New York. Yesterday in Cairo the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Egypt issued a formal statement on the subject, indicating the determination of his country to bring the matter to the attention of the world organization.

This statement was printed in the New York Times of today, March 4, and I desire to have printed here the full text of the pronouncement:

EGYPT WILL APPEAL BRITISH CASE TO UNITED NATIONS—PREMIER SAYS NO AGREEMENT HAS BEEN REACHED ON SUDAN OR EVACUATION OF TROOPS

(By Gene Currivan)

CAIRO, EGYPT, March 3.—Mahmoud Fahmy Nokrashy Pasha, the Egyptian Premier, announced today his Government's decision to appeal to the United Nations Security Council on the issues of Egyptian sovereignty over the Sudan and the evacuation of British troops from Egypt. He also demanded the immediate withdrawal of British troops from the entire country.

The Premier said that Egypt had earnestly tried to reach an agreement with Britain but that the decision to put the dispute into the hands of the United Nations had received the enthusiastic endorsement of the entire Egyptian people.

The Egyptian Government accused Britain of inciting the Sudanese and pledged its confidence in the United Nations to straighten out the whole complicated problem.

REACHED END OF ROAD

This statement by Nokrashy Pasha indicated that Egypt had reached the end of the road, just as Britain had, as far as Anglo-Egyptian negotiations were concerned. There is nothing left to bargain about, he said in substance.

Egypt asked, first of all, the evacuation of British troops. An agreement was almost reached on this point, but Britain asked for time because of the immensity of the undertaking and the fact that highly technical installations could not be turned over to the Egyptians without considerable preparation and much training.

The British are moving from Cairo and have moved from Alexandria. The British Army has pulled up its stakes and is establishing itself in the Suez area near the canal.

But today Nokrashy Pasha said that one of the two points on which no agreement had been reached was "evacuation of British troops from Egypt; this evacuation must be immediate and not conditioned by treaty."

That statement can mean only that the Egyptians are not satisfied to have the British move out of the capital city and settle in the desert until the United Nations decide the matter but want them right out of the country.

"The unity of Egypt and the Sudan is the will of both Egyptians and Sudanese alike," the statement declared, "whereas British policy is directed toward inciting the Sudanese to secede from Egypt.

"As for self-government, had Egypt not been forcibly deprived of her rights in the administration of the Sudan, the preparation of the Sudanese for self-government would not be so delayed. Egypt is in a better position and more anxious than Great Britain to prepare for the self-government of people of the same race, the same language, the same religion and dependent for this way of existence on the same Nile."

SUDANESE DRAW THEM OUT

Comment from the Opposition tonight was that Egypt had been forcibly deprived of her rights by the Sudanese themselves on two occasions. The Egyptians were driven out in 1885 during a religious war and again in 1923, when the Sudanese decided that they could get along without the Egyptians. Since that time Britain has virtually administered the country, although its government is known technically as a condominium.

Nokrashy Pasha also said that Egypt wanted British troops evacuated from the Sudan. He held that the Sudanese could not express their views freely while the country was occupied by the British. This view has not been advanced before and indicates that Egypt desires Britain to withdraw from both ends of the Nile before the United Nations makes any decision concerning Egypt and the Sudan.

Nokrashy Pasha declared that Egypt had abiding faith in the United Nations and was confident that justice will be accorded a small nation that has always firmly upheld the principles of the supremacy of international law.

NO OBJECTION FROM BRITISH

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., March 3.—The British delegation to the United Nations said today that it would raise no objections against an Egyptian move to lay the Anglo-Egyptian differences before the Security Council.

The British indicated, however, that the question to be threshed out here would not be confined to the future of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

Patrick Mann Estes—The Nation Loses a Valuable Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in a tragic accident in Nashville, Tenn., February 17, the life of Patrick Mann Estes and four other prominent Nashvillians were taken. P. M. Estes, over a course of many years, was known and highly respected by not only the Members of the Tennessee delegation but by numerous Members of the Senate and House from other States. These Members join his countless friends and admirers in mourning his passing.

Mr. Estes was eminently successful in his own business of law and insurance. However, he devoted the larger part of his life in a diligent and unselfish effort to improve and build up his country, and especially the land of the South to which he was so devoted. We find inspiration and encouragement in his many deeds, and it is for that reason I take this occasion of payin, respect to his life, character, and accomplishments.

Over a course of more than 50 years Mr. Estes stood at the forefront in the various campaigns to protect the American way of life and to give the people of the South an even chance in our national development. He was a pioneer in motor transportation facilities and he did much to foster the building of good highways in Tennessee and throughout the Nation. He helped to organize the Tennessee Good Roads Association and he later became its president. He fostered the organization of the Natchez Trace Association and through his untiring efforts he was able to get much accomplished toward building of the Natchez Trace. His devotion to this project knew no limits. He was always willing to accept responsibility. At one time he was a member of the Tennessee State Legislature. He was a vice president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. He was the national president of the Phi Kappa Sigma fraternity and his efforts and generosity are some of the reasons for the success of this national organization.

During his active and useful years, Mr. Estes kept well informed on Federal legislation and was quick to analyze the results of such legislation on the national economy. Frequently, as a private citizen, he would journey to Washington to discuss legislative bills with his friends in Congress. His viewpoint was always that which would be of the most benefit for the Nation, the independent businessman, and the average citizen. He was persuasive and vigorous in presenting his position even though it might conflict with his own personal interests. An example of this laudable characteristic can be found in his interest and work in strengthening the antitrust laws and in securing their more forceful execution. From a selfish viewpoint he probably would have benefited by the monopolistic trend but his interest in the future of America and the small businessman caused him to be one of the most effective advocates of the strengthening of the Nation's antitrust program. In this connection he felt that the one immediate need was for Congress to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act so as to prevent one corporation from acquiring the assets of another when the result would be to create a monopoly. The original Clayton Act had prevented the acquisition of capital stock where a monopoly would result but monopolistic interests avoided this prohibition by simply acquiring the assets of their competitors. Mr. Estes in letters to me relative to the necessity of this amendment wrote:

> I regard this amendment as of extreme importance. I see no advantage in the United States Government spending large sums of money to establish small business, when they will be gobbled up by the trusts as soon as they begin to make their weight felt. In the meantime consolidations have been going on steadily. You will notice in Time one of the most recent was the sale of the large California steel plant to United States Steel.
>
> Unless these matters are checked our form of government must necessarily be changed, which I would greatly regret.
>
> These monopolists are very shortsighted in their course, for they constantly contrive by their greed for power and size to bring about a Government restriction, etc., of which they so greatly complain. But after all, it might be a wise policy from their standpoint for the reason that they can exist under restrictions, or mold them so as not too greatly hamper them, whereas they would be utterly destructive of the little man, and thus eliminate competition.

Mr. Estes in addition to his private business and his public interest was the scion of his family. He kept in close touch by personal visits and through correspondence with his many relatives throughout the country and he was always happy to give them friendly counsel or material assistance. He was indeed a lovable, capable, and useful man. The good things he did will leave a worthwhile imprint on the lives of many people and of many institutions in the generations to come.

One of the loveliest tributes to him was written in the form of a poem by a gracious relative, Mrs. May Folk Webb, of New York City. It is as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO PATRICK MANN ESTES, JANUARY 27, 1872–FEBRUARY 16, 1947

He lives in the hearts of his fellow men,
By thoughts which he constantly gave to all,
In forgetting self to help others' needs,
And for faithful service to duty's call.

Those who knew him had words of praise and love,
For his quiet and gentle-mannered ways
Of lifting sorrow and of bringing cheer,
To brighten hours of dark laden days.

His deeds have built a monument so high,
That its lofty height is seen far and wide,
Shining with the tender love of his life,
Given in trust to those on the roadside.

Memory can never forget his life,
For it is deeply woven among friends,
And kindness to his family and kin,
Are written where gratitude never ends.

Yes, Patrick Mann Estes will ever live,
In affectionate heart of everyone,
To whom he brought blessings of happiness,
Through his great soul in tune with God's own son.

This is a feeble expression for one so honored and beloved by thousands of friends.

—*May Folk Webb.*

FEBRUARY 25, 1947.

Amendment of Civil Service Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend section 12 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act. Under this law, as now worded, an employee who retires from service after having served less than 5 years is entitled to have returned to him the deductions which have been made from his pay, with 4 percent compound interest. But if he has served more than 5 years, he cannot withdraw a penny under any circumstances, and must wait until he reaches 62 years of age, when he becomes entitled to an annuity. In computing his years of service, any time served in the Army or Navy is counted.

The injustice of this law and hardship which it may entail is well illustrated by the case presented by one of my constituents. This man served in the Navy for 4 years. Then two years and a half after his discharge, he took a job as a civilian employee in one of the Government departments. He served in that capacity for four and a half years. Finally, in the middle of 1946 he left the employ of the Government, as he writes me, "because of lack of work and disgust with padding worksheets." He held the highest efficiency which it was possible to obtain and left the Government employ with an excellent record, and, if I may be permitted to add, with entirely justifiable, indeed laudatory, motives.

He got a job in my home city and bought a little place in a nearby town, expecting to use the funds which he thought were on deposit with the civil-service people subject to withdrawal at any time as the down payment on the purchase of his home. He knew that there would be a certain amount of red tape in drawing out his money, because he had been a bureaucrat himself for nearly 5 years. He applied to two old ladies for a loan to tide him over temporarily until he could get this money of his which was being held by the Government, and he gave the ladies his promissory note for the amount they loaned him to make the down payment on the house.

Unfortunately, a month later both these ladies died and now their heirs, naturally, want this note paid. Then comes the crowning blow, when he finds that he will not be permitted to draw

out from the fund, which he has created for himself by the payments he has made into it, the necessary amount to pay off this obligation.

Under the civil-service rules, although he only worked in a Government department for 4½ years, they add on to that the 4 years which he served in the Navy, making a total of 8½ years. That brings him over the 5-year period, which is the limit of time an employee may have served without being forever barred from getting out his money until he reaches age 62.

Many times an annuity at age 62 is, of course, a very desirable factor in permitting a former Government employee to spend the evening hours of his life in a degree of comfort which might not otherwise be permitted him. This constituent of mine, however, is not now worried about what happens at age 62. He needs now this money which belongs to him. He is faced by a suit for this amount he owes and probable loss of his home as a result. He is thinking about a roof over the head of his wife and family today, not 20 years from now. This is the time when, if he had put his money in a savings bank, he would draw it out to meet such an emergency. But instead of having done that, he has turned over his money to the United States Government, which now tells him, with characteristic bureaucratic heartlessness, that the rules do not permit him to have any of his money before he reaches 62 years of age.

Another friend of mine has recently been separated from service in another Government department. He has served a little over 5 years and has about a thousand dollars coming from the Government, representing not a gratuity but the deductions that have been made from his own pay. He is out of a job; he needs the money now; he cannot use this governmental promise to pay him some 15 years from now to pay the grocery bill or the rent.

These situations, in my opinion, deserve immediate corrective treatment. An employee who is separated from governmental service after having paid in money to the retirement fund should have an election either to take the annuity beginning at age 62 or to take out in cash what he has coming to him. This is the purpose sought to be achieved by the bill which I have today introduced. I hope it may have early consideration by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and favorable treatment by the House.

Steel Pipe for Building Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 28, 1947.*

Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS,
Washington, D. C.:

Withdrawal from the Chicago market of all but a couple of steel pipe manufacturers has made it practically impossible for plumbing and heating contractors to obtain steel pipe in sizes from one-half inch to 2 inches, necessary for residential building, and seriously impeding building construction throughout Illinois, particularly causing homes already started to remain uncompleted. Withdrawal reportedly due to reluctance of mills in Pittsburgh area to use Gary as base due to freight-rate differential. They ship their product to other territories where freight rates are favorable. Imperative that immediate action be taken by Congress or other proper Government agency to relieve this situation if home-building construction is to proceed normally in accordance with the Government's home-building program.

ILLINOIS MASTER PLUMBERS' ASSOCIATION,
ALVIN G. FIELDS,
East St. Louis, Ill., President.
WM. R. BROOKMAN,
Chicago, Ill., Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, the Plumbing Contractors' Association of Chicago makes similar complaints.

President Truman's Address at Mexico City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of President Truman's address in Mexico City.

My presence here today as the guest of the great Republic of Mexico is one of the truly happy occasions of my career. I am deeply moved to be here again, among my friends and neighbors. I have wanted to return to Mexico ever since November 1939, when I visited this city and enjoyed the memorable hospitality of the Mexican Congress. To my good friend, President Miguel Aleman, and to all the people of Mexico, I say from the bottom of my heart: Thank you for your gracious welcome.

It is a common failing of many people to complain of hardships and overlook their good fortune. In the international sphere, many people emphasize the disagreements that separate nations and forget the large areas of agreement that bring nations together in mutual understanding. I would be foolish to pretend that fundamental differences in political philosophies do not exist. The task of achieving permanent peace and security for all mankind is not easy, but I am certain that permanent peace and security are the goal of all peoples everywhere, whatever their language, or nationality, race or creed. Because of my belief that the peoples of the world have peace as a common objective, I refuse to be discouraged by apparent difficulties. Difficulties are a challenge to men of determination.

If a realistic view of the world takes full account of the differences that separate nations, it must also take full account of the common beliefs that unite nations. Nowhere is this element of unity—unity of heart and mind—more evident than in the neighborly community of the American Republics. Here we recognize clearly that, as you have stated so concisely and eloquently, Mr. President, "together we must live and together we must prosper."

Here we have already achieved in substantial measure what the world as a whole must achieve. Through what we call our inter-American system, which has become steadily stronger for half a century, we have learned to work together and to solve our problems by friendly cooperation and mutual respect.

We have a good-neighbor policy in common and, as a result of the sincere application of that policy, we form a good neighborhood. Our example has a salutary effect on the whole world. The success of our cherished inter-American system is a source of inspiration for the developing system of the United Nations, of which we are all members.

We are united by more than the common procedures and agencies of inter-American cooperation. All our peoples have a common belief which we call democracy. Democracy has a spiritual foundation because it is based upon the brotherhood of man. We believe in the dignity of the individual. We believe that the function of the state is to preserve and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms. We believe that the state exists for the benefit of man, not that man exists for the benefit of the state. Everything else that we mean by the word "democracy" arises from this fundamental conviction. We believe that each individual must have as much liberty for the conduct of his life as is compatible with the rights of others. To put this belief into practice is the essential purpose of our laws.

We know that the maximum freedom and dignity of the individual cannot be attained under a dictatorship. Freedom and dignity of the individual can be attained only under a system of law which protects the rights of individuals, and through a government made up of freely elected representatives of the people. When we have this, we have a democratic government—one that is suited to a democratic way of life.

This is a simple, fundamental truth.

The good-neighbor policy, which guides the course of our inter-American relations, is equally simple. It is the application of democracy to international affairs. It is the application of the Golden Rule.

The good-neighbor policy applies to international relations the same standards of conduct that prevail among self-respecting individuals within a democratic community. It is based on mutual respect among nations, the respect that each accords to the rights of others, without distinction of size, wealth, or power. It is an expression of that bond of common belief which we call democracy. It is the only road into the future that will lead us to our goal of universal peace and security. Along that road we shall persevere.

The good-neighbor policy specifically includes the doctrine of nonintervention. This assures each nation freedom for its own development. My country, in common with all the American republics, pledged itself at the Conference of Montevideo in 1933 and the Conference of Buenos Aires in 1936 to observe the doctrine of nonintervention. What it means is that a strong nation does not have the right to impose its will, by reason of its strength, on a weaker nation. The wholehearted acceptance of this doctrine by all of us is the keynote of the inter-American system. Without it we could not exist as a community of good neighbors. It is a binding commitment under the good-neighbor

policy. It is part of the basic international law recognized by all the American republics. My own country will be faithful to the letter and to the spirit of the law.

Nonintervention does not and cannot mean indifference to what goes on beyond our own borders. Events in one country may have a profound effect in other countries. The community of nations feels concern at the violation of accepted principles of national behavior by any one of its members. The lawlessness of one nation may threaten the very existence of the law on which all nations depend.

In our domestic civil life we long ago recognized that the alternative to the rule of the strong was law established by the community. For some years now we have been seeking, with increasing success, to apply this basic concept to international relations. It is no coincidence that the effort to achieve collective world security has been concurrent with the growing acceptance of the doctrine of nonintervention. It is inspiring to note the progress we have made toward establishing a community of nations with authority to enforce the law on delinquents. The Charter of the United Nations specifically invests the world community of nations with a measure of such authority. Within the good-neighbor community of the 21 American Republics we have witnessed and are witnessing a similar constructive development, beginning at Buenos Aires in 1936 with unanimous acceptance of the principle of consultation. The development of the inter-American system was accelerated by the great work done in this city at the 1945 conference on problems of war and peace, where the plan of a reorganized and strengthened system was created.

International relations have traditionally been compared to a chess game in which each nation tries to outwit and checkmate the other. I cannot accept that comparison with respect to relations between your country and mine, Mr. President. The United States and Mexico are working together for the mutual benefit of their peoples and the peace of the world. You have made me feel, which I could not have doubted in any case, that I stand here, in the midst of the great people of Mexico, as a trusted friend and a welcome guest.

To you and to the people of Mexico I bring a message of friendship and trust from the people of the United States. Though the road be long and wearisome that leads to a good neighborhood as wide as the world, we shall travel it together.

Our two countries will not fail each other.

United States Needs Rededication to Religious Principles of Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently my fellow citizens in Owosso, Mich., gave a testimonial dinner in honor of the Reverend John J. Cavanaugh, C. S. C., president of the University of Notre Dame, who is one of our native sons. Father Cavanaugh was born in one of the rural communities in Shiawassee County and while he was still a boy, his family moved to Owosso where he attended St. Paul's School from which he later graduated. After finishing his high school he secured employment and later, desiring to go on with his education, he enrolled in the University of Notre Dame where he graduated in business administration. After graduation he became associated with one of the large automobile corporations and reached the post of assistant sales manager of the corporation when he decided to change his life's work. Being of a particularly religious nature he came to the decision that the church was his chosen field of activity instead of business, although he was apparently destined for a successful career in business life. So he quit his position with Studebaker Corp. and went back to Notre Dame and enrolled in training for a priest. He was ordained into the priesthood in the Catholic church in Owosso where he preached his first sermon.

He has been associated with Notre Dame since that time, first in the teaching end and later on in the administrative. He had an active interest in athletics and headed up the athletic department. Then he was made vice president of the university and last August, upon the retirement of Rev. J. Hugh O'Donnell as president, he was elevated to the head of the university.

It was a pleasure to join my constituents at this testimonial dinner honoring Father Cavanaugh, and I was very much impressed with what he had to say in his remarks on that occasion and under the unanimous consent granted me earlier today by this House, I am pleased to submit his address as follows:

A few days ago when I was giving some serious thought to what I might say tonight, I tried to bring to mind this distinguished gathering including the governor of the State and a former governor, members of the hierarchy, my own religious superior, the presidents of several institutions of higher learning including two of my distinguished predecessors, as well as many other clergy and civil dignitaries. I think you will understand when I say that the prospect was awesome for a home-town boy to face. Then I began to realize that it was not so awesome, that it should be decidedly pleasant, that all were here because of a great, generous friendship that they wished to express and that, like a soothing song, the line began to run through my head: "Sweetest of all are the friendly smiles at home, where all hearts are to one another kind and sure." I remembered the many familiar faces of my youth—faces that I came to know in the classrooms of old St. Paul's School, on the playgrounds, out hitching sleigh rides, or older faces that I met morning after morning at the doors of houses here in Owosso where I delivered groceries and peddled newspapers. I wish that all of these faces could be here this evening, and particularly, I wish that one, the dearest of all, could proudly smile upon this evening; for she meant during many trying years to my sister and brothers and me all of the love and protection that we enjoyed in our little home.

I cannot begin to thank adequately the local committee, the many distinguished guests, and our able toastmaster for this memorable evening. I feel, of course, that it is a Notre Dame occasion, a testimonial not to me primarily, but to a great university whose representative I am proud and privileged to be. It is an expression of your respect and friendship for Notre Dame, of your faith in her present worth, and of your high and justifiable hopes for her future.

I am perfectly aware that Notre Dame friends are legion, that some of them have never seen the campus and have only the sketchiest knowledge of the university's academic side. I know that thousands of these friends have been more attracted to the university by the news of flashy, swivel-hipped halfbacks than by the accounts of our work in nuclear physics, in chemistry and bacteriology, and in the discovery of synthetic rubber. I know that too often the inference is made by the public at large that because an institution gets 15 times more publicity for sports than for any other reason that that institution must necessarily place a corresponding emphasis upon sports. I think you will understand, then, that we at Notre Dame, while not by any means repudiating the greatness of our athletic reputation, want the world to know the Notre Dame that we who have been reared in her shadows deeply love and respect.

Notre Dame, an institution of higher learning with an enrollment of 4,500 students, is composed of a graduate school that offers advanced degrees in 18 departments and of an undergraduate school of 5 colleges. The university trains men in the sciences and arts, in law, engineering, and commerce, but this training, as we see it, is only part of our responsibility. I might go so far as to say it is the lesser part. We believe that a university worthy of the name must teach men not only how to make a living, but also how to live as responsible, moral citizens of a complicated world and as dependable leaders in this American Nation. Never in the world's history were such men so badly needed as today.

If any thoughtful man takes up the morning newspaper or listens to his favorite news broadcast, he must derive precious little comfort from the conditions facing him either at home or abroad. The conclusion must force itself into his consciousness that we are a long, long way from establishing the political, economic, and social equilibrium that we thought would come about almost automatically once the war was over. If one looks back for a few moments with some reflection he sees that Americans have been guilty of wishful thinking that may prove mischievous. The fall of Berlin and the blasting of Hiroshima brought relief. The suspense was over. There were no more casualty lists. We could beat our swords into ploughshares and return to peaceful pursuits. Right had won over wrong and we preened ourselves on the realization that we had been the agents of righteousness. All that remained was to build a new and, of course, a much better civilization on the principles that Allied leaders had told us again and again—or should I say "again and again and again"—were the ideals for which we were fighting.

But has it all happened? The events that took place just before the surrender of the Japanese were dramatic, even startling and frightening. They brought a kind of external peace; but they also sowed internally in the hearts of men the seeds of apprehension and discord. When the so-called United Nations had no longer a common enemy, they no longer had a common purpose. The spirit of teamwork gave way to the spirit of every man for himself. The victors began to think of strengthening themselves against both friend and foe, almost before the dust of battle had settled. And there was a significant difference between the postwar period of 1918 and that of 1945. Man had made tremendous technological advances and released natural forces that made international boundaries as obsolete as the great wall of China. The welfare of all men had become almost completely dependent upon that undependable factor known as the good will of men. Today the atomic bomb, the supersonic plane, the guided destructive missile, the possibilities of bacteriological warfare, make the world a powder keg with the

fuze lit and growing shorter day by day. The hand of one diabolical ruler may turn the switch that will reduce the world to a shambles that even blood and sweat and tears may never restore.

The picture is certainly not pleasant, and with it in mind, I would call your attention to a brief and significant quotation:

"Nothing is more necessary for the stability of the world, if it is not to perish completely, than some rededication of minds. Universal harmony and peace must be obtained for the whole human race. By peace and harmony, however, I do not mean the external peace between rulers and peoples among themselves, but an internal peace of minds inspired by a system of ideas and feelings. If this could be obtained, the human race would have a possession of great promise."

These words are so apt, so modern, so wistful, that they might have been written yesterday. Actually they were written by John Amos Comenius, a Moravian bishop and educator, sometimes called the Teacher of Nations. He died in 1670, but he lived at a time much like our own, when new sciences and scientific methods were making dazzling but false promises. History does repeat itself. In Comenius' day, as in our own, man was bedeviled by a persistent question, Is spiritual and intellectual advancement keeping pace with the giant strides in science and technology? Is man learning to control himself while he learns how to control nature? Or is he, like Frankenstein, busy with a monster that will destroy him in the end?

To be sure, world stability calls for a rededication of minds, but to what principles shall minds be rededicated? What can be done to prevent the misuse of the tremendous powers of aircraft and atoms, projectiles, and poisons? How can we achieve in human relationships a progress that is far more urgent than the greatest inventions of science? We have only one choice. Either we find a common ground upon which the nations and peoples of the world can meet, or our experience will count for nothing, and "all our yesterdays will have lighted fools the way to dusty death."

A quick answer to the search for a common ground is to suggest world government. The answer, it seems to me, is too quick and too superficial. Before there is a superstructure, there has to be a foundation and the foundations suggested so far—military might or preponderance of population—haven't even a suggestion of internal harmony that is acceptable to individual men and to nations. And without such harmony, any government, from the government of Owosso to that of the nations of the world, is going to break down.

I have been trying to suggest to you, in one way or another, that to avert another and almost suicidal war some sort of workable world order must be devised and prior to this order there must be a rededication of the hearts and minds of men.

Now let me turn your attention for a moment to the situation within our own borders. This community in which you live is a microcosm—a little world in itself. Here you know and feel, in more or less degree, the same sources of tension that are troubling other communities large and small in America and throughout the world. The tensions that you feel here are the ones that may lead to the terrible destruction that I have hinted at. I know that the sources of tension among men are many, but three seem to me to be outstanding: One is economic, another is racial, a third is religious. We might as well forget altogether about permanent peace and order and harmony until these tensions are relieved. On what basis, let us ask, then, can there be a reconciliation between capital and labor? The man who does a decent day's work must receive a wage determined in justice and equity that will permit him to support his family in decency and comfort while putting aside something for his old age. The man who invests an honest dollar and provides the tools of production must receive a fair return on his investment. And the public at large—now more or less crushed between capital and labor—must receive consideration. This, roughly stated, is the economic problem that faces us.

And what of racial ill-feeling? Why do I shy from a man because his ethnic origin is different from mine? Why do I mistreat him simply because his skin is black or brown or yellow, instead of white?

And what, finally, shall I say of the age-old religious tensions? Why should I ridicule or persecute those who do not worship at the same altar as I? Why do I pillory a man because he is a Protestant, Catholic, or Jew?

Are not these three—economic, racial, and religious tensions, the major causes of disunity and unrest in this country and in the world at large?

I sincerely think there is a remedy to suggest. I think that the founding fathers of America knew the remedy and made it the basis, the cornerstone, of this great American Republic. Ten years before the writing of the Constitution of the United States, the founders declared in unmistakable terms what the ends and objects of American Government were to be. They determined the important why of government before working out the how. These ends and objects of American Government they set forth in the famous Declaration of Independence, which is really the birth certificate of the American Republic. You remember how the Declaration of Independence opens up:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The founders of this country held these bases of government to be self-evident, to be beyond dispute. These three were to be the roots from which the Constitution of the United States would draw its vitality. It seems clear to me from the Declaration of Independence that the first of these three suppositions is the acknowledgment of God as the Creator of man. The founding fathers seem to see that without God as the basis of things there can be no foundation for a true, functioning morality, because without a God to whom man is somehow answerable there is no real meaning to the words "right" and "wrong." If there were no Supreme Being, no God, man would be answerable to society alone, and society would be answerable to no one. It seems to me that the patriots who wrote the Declaration of Independence must have foreseen the consequences of such a treacherous principle, that if society were the supreme arbiter of right and wrong, then in the years to come there could easily be a Nazi society, which might morally destroy the old and feeble and herd and mistreat hundreds of thousands of prisoners into concentration camps, torture them, kill them, simply because they didn't fit in with the arbitrary ends and objects that the Nazi society wanted to achieve. May I ask you, then, if society is supreme unto itself, what was wrong with Hitler, Goering, and Himmler, and on what basis of right and wrong were these three arch criminals cheated out of canonization as Germany's national saints?

I think it is obvious that the founding fathers meant to say in the Declaration of Independence that every man is endowed with certain rights and duties which all men and all governments, however powerful, are obliged to respect. I think that this possession of rights and these obligations of duties were to constitute the basis of freedom and of human dignity and to mark man off sharply from the baboon. I think that this balancing of rights and duties was to make man, unlike the baboon, capable of forming into real societies and not into mere groups and herds.

I think the founding fathers obviously said, in the third place, in the Declaration of Independence, that governments are not masters of the governed but are the instruments by which the rights of the governed are to be secured. I think it is all-important that these three presuppositions of community order, of harmony, and of government itself are irrevocably bound together. If there is no God, and man emerged from some dark, prehistoric, chaotic puddle, as some of our evolutionists would have us think, then all talk about moral rights and duties is so much nonsense. Man becomes only, in his mere material being, a grain of sand, to be trampled upon or mutilated or destroyed as some powerful and efficient dictator may direct.

I think we are all equally proud of the good things that are to be guarded here in America. There is industry, the most powerful and ingenious the world has ever known, and a system of free enterprise based on the right of private property, which has helped to make this country prosperous. There are millions of well-painted, modern, comfortable homes with spacious green lawns and gardens about them which make up our farms and our towns. There are plenty of playgrounds and happy boys and girls in this country who want to be more skillful in athletics than at drilling and firing guns. There are churches and schools and genuine freedom of conscience, freedom of expression, freedom from fear and want in a larger sense than in any other country of the world. It is your duty and mine to defend this Nation rich in spiritual background, one in which the condition of a man's rise to eminence is determined not by his family's titles but almost exclusively by his own spirit and abilities. We must never let anyone tell us as Americans that any other nation in the world enjoys these blessings as lavishly as we enjoy them. We must never let anyone suggest that these benefits just happened to spring up here in America. They didn't happen to spring up in Canada, or in Latin America, or in China, or Russia, and all of these lands are potentially as rich or richer than our country. The American advantages have been produced chiefly because we are blessed with the most successful form of government that has ever been devised.

I think what is needed more than anything else in America is a rededication of all peoples—of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—to the religious principles of the Declaration of Independence. American thinking must fearlessly get back where it belongs, to its roots. Our world leaders seem to be casting about for the sources of order. They need not look further than to this immortal American document that has been the source and inspiration of a government unsurpassed in the history of man. This document in itself is a mere piece of paper. It must be energized. It must be made to live in all our dealings in both private and public life, in government, in business, in the professions, in our plans for the future. We must show in our dealings with one another that the Creator of us all sees and cares about the falling of the sparrow as well as about the gigantic movements of men. As Benjamin Franklin said at a crucial moment in the Constitutional Convention, when he urged the delegates to pray for success, "* * * If a sparrow cannot fall without God's knowledge, how can a nation be raised without His aid?" We must not be too proud to fall on our knees and to pray to this God, for the world faces a crisis in human relations, the like of which it has never known before.

When labor and capital recognize fully and practically this God and the rights and duties

with which He has endowed all men, there will be economic peace. When men of all colors and all beliefs acknowlege humbly that they stand equal before this Creator, with equal rights and duties, there will be racial and religious peace. Then to our brothers in Russia and Japan and Germany we shall set America forth as the new vital force in the world today, as it was in 1776, the model of order and peace, and we shall assume a vital leadership toward world harmony because we shall be true to our rich inheritance that has made this country the most favored on the face of the earth.

Letter of Field Service Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, Yellville, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter which I have received from the Production and Marketing Administration, Field Service Branch, Yellville, Ark.:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Yellville, Ark., February 20, 1947.

Mr. J. W. TRIMBLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: On your visit back home last summer, you will recall a meeting at Berryville with a group of farmer committeemen representing all counties of your district. This committee of the Field Service Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, was unanimous in its praise for your attitude with respect to support of our farmers' program.

No doubt you are aware of the accomplishments of the county agricultural conservation associations and the benefits brought to farmers and city folks alike. We feel that in preserving our soils the whole national economy is strengthened. Your past efforts are deeply appreciated by all farmers, and especially by us committeemen, who are elected by the farmers for the purpose of representing them in the administration of the program.

The record of our farmers during the late war does not need to be called to your attention, however a great deal of this tremendous production was, as you no doubt know, brought about by soil-conservation practices immediately preceding and during the conflict. As a result of this heavy production many of our soils have become depleted despite all the conservation measures employed. We farmers feel that not only the farmers of this district will be benefited by a continuation of this AAA assistance, but people from all walks of life. Most of our educational leaders and dietitians, for instance, recognize the necessity of mineralizing our soils from a health standpoint.

To accomplish these aims it is necessary that more funds be made available for administrating the program so that committeemen can maintain sufficient office personnel and make greater use of committeemen in taking the program to farmers on the farm.

With reference to the President's budget message, in which he recommended a $100,000,000 reduction in appropriations to make payments to farmers in the 1948 program year, we are of the opinion that he had not been supplied with the proper information when he made the statement that because of the farmer's strong position in American agriculture that they would carry out needed practices without assistance from the United States Treasury. After discussing this matter with various farmers, it is our conviction that a decided drop in participation would occur, due to the increased cash outlay that would be required by the producer. We feel sure that we can speak for all farmers in the Third Congressional District in soliciting your assistance in making an effort to get this proposed cut restored.

In conclusion, we wish to again express our appreciation of your past efforts on behalf of our program, and we feel sure that we can count on your continued support.

Yours very truly,
M. C. CAMPBELL,
W. H. DASHIER,
GUY MCCRACKEN,
Marion County PMA, Field Service Branch, Conservation Committee.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I desire to insert in the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial from the Eden Valley (Minn.) Journal on the need for tax reduction. The editorial follows:

WHY TAXES NEED REDUCING

Federal taxes, like the woman who puts her best chin forward, need reducing. The need is apparent to every taxpayer, large and small alike, yet our Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON is having difficulty in getting his colleagues to agree with his plan for tax reduction.

The administration's argument for retention of present high tax rates is that continued high governmental income is necessary for balancing the budget and paying off a small part of the national debt. They do not consider for a moment that it might save money if they'd drop a few of the country's 3,000,000 civilian employees from the pay roll.

But even if present expenditures continued to be necessary, which they won't, a reduction of taxes in some quarters would serve to increase the Federal income. This is pointed out by James D. Mooney, president of a large auto concern, in a recent magazine article. Says he: "The Federal tax rate of 38 percent on corporate income * * * is gradually drying up corporate income. Business is being slowly starved to death. * * * If the corporate income-tax rate were cut from 38 percent to 20 percent, the Government would actually get more money—just as in business you get more profits in dollars if the profit per unit is lowered to the point where vastly more sales are made."

The actual facts of the matter are that each of us is paying about $15 out of each $45 we earn into the Federal Treasury and the pockets of Federal employees. Three hundred dollars of the purchase price of a new car is taxes, $2,500 of the cost of a $10,000 house goes for taxes.

Says Collier's: "We have reached the point where the Government would actually take in more money if taxes were reduced. And everyone would get dividends in a lower cost of living."

More power to Mr. KNUTSON and the men who are working with him to bring America's taxes back to a sane ratio with the income of its citizens.

Labor Relations Policies of California State Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following carefully thought-out policy for insuring future labor-management peace in this country:

CALIFORNIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LABOR RELATIONS POLICIES AS REVISED FEBRUARY 14, 1947

The following 16 policies on labor relations are advocated by the California State Chamber of Commerce, agriculture and industry, to maintain industrial peace, and to assure future progress and prosperity in California.

These policies result from extensive study and represent the thought of a cross-section of business and industrial leadership.

We believe they constitute a Magna Carta of labor relations which protects the rights of individuals, the public, employee organizations, and business. We commend these policies to your careful study.

1. RIGHT TO WORK

No employer should discriminate against or in favor of any employee or applicant for employment because of membership or nonmembership in a union.

No employee or prospective employee should be required to join or to refrain from joining a union, or to maintain or withdraw his membership in a union, as a condition of employment. Compulsory union membership and interference with voluntary union membership should be prohibited by law.

2. FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Where a union is seeking to represent the employees of an employer, the employer should be permitted to express himself freely to his employees, provided that he does not discriminate or threaten to discriminate against an employee or employees because of joining a union

Where an employer is engaging in collective bargaining with a union, the employer should be permitted to inform his employees what has taken place during the collective-bargaining negotiations, including the various proposals and counter proposals and the reasons and arguments therefor.

3. DETERMINATION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING REPRESENTATION

Amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that employers, as well as unions, should be entitled to have a determination of representation disputes, by the appropriate governmental agency, and that the determination of the agency, if finally sustained by the courts, should be binding and enforceable by court order upon unions as well as employers.

When a union claims the right, which is questioned by the employer, to represent the employees of the employer, the union should be required to establish this right by certification by the appropriate governmental agency and should be forbidden by law to

take economic action against the employer or his employees where it fails to secure such certification. In such cases the union should be required to obtain the affirmative vote of a majority of all of the employees in the appropriate unit by secret ballot election under governmental supervision.

4. STRIKE VOTES

When collective bargaining negotiations fail to result in agreements for a new contract or renewal of the existing contract and the employees elect to strike, the striking employees shall lose employee status and the union, if it countenances or participates in such strike, shall lose representation rights under the law unless the majority of employees in the bargaining unit, before engaging in such strike action have, by secret ballot under impartial supervision, voted for a strike in preference to acceptance of the latest offer of the employer. The same procedure should be followed for the consideration of offers for settlement or termination of the strike. Employees and employers shou'd both be protected in their right to express their respective positions.

5. COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Oppose a system of compulsory arbitration or labor courts or so-called fact-finding commissions for the settlement and determination of terms and conditions of new contracts and advocate means of curing excesses or abuses in the collective-bargaining process rather than abandoning collective bargaining for compulsory arbitration.

However, all collective-bargaining contracts should provide for a final determination of any unsettled grievances or disputes involving the interpretation or application of the agreement by the process of arbitration.

6. ENFORCEABILITY OF COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING CONTRACTS

Collective-bargaining contracts should be enforceable at law or in equity. Any attempt to cause, induce, or compel a violation of a collective-bargaining agreement should be unlawful.

Violation of these principles should be subject to action at law or in equity and should result in loss of employee status and loss of representation rights by unions under the law.

7. STRIKES AGAINST PUBLIC INTEREST

Strikes occur, the scope and nature of which threaten the security of government and imperil the public welfare. Legislative investigation should be undertaken to define strikes of such character and to recommend the necessary safeguards.

8. IMPARTIAL APPLICATION OF LAWS TO INDUSTRY AND ORGANIZED LABOR

Laws prohibiting monopolistic practices and contributions for political purposes should apply equally to industry and organized labor and should be strictly enforced. Every legal effort should be made to prevent circumvention of such laws by subterfuge. Labor unions should not be exempt from antiracketeering laws.

9. HOT CARGO AND SECONDARY BOYCOTT

Favor State and national legislation outlawing secondary boycotts and sympathetic strikes.

10. JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES INVOLVING THE CLAIM OF UNIONS TO PERFORM PARTICULAR WORK ON THE JOB

Make it unlawful for any union to take economic action against an employer or his employees to enforce its claim to perform any particular work. The union's recourse under such circumstances should be directed to governmental agencies established for such determinations.

11. PICKETING

While the right of a labor organization to publicize the facts of a labor dispute is unquestioned, picketing in such a manner as to obstruct the entrance to any place of business or to intimidate or molest any person desiring to enter or leave the premises should be unlawful.

12. SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES

Favor legislation specifically declaring that employers are not required to bargain collectively with supervisory employees or other managerial personnel.

13. FEATHER-BEDDING AND MAKE-WORK LEGISLATION

Favor legislation outlawing make-work and feather-bedding rules, the employment of stand-by crews and other artificial practices that curtail production.

14. STATE WAGNER ACT, WAGE AND HOUR LAW, AND ANTI-INJUNCTION LAW

Oppose any legislation designed to establish a California Labor Relations Act similar to the Wagner Act or a State wage and hour law, or a State anti-injunction law.

15. ANTIDISCRIMINATION

Endorsement of the principle that there should be no discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, but that hiring and retention of employment should be based solely on the applicant's qualifications for the job. The elimination of discriminatory practices should be approached by cooperative educational efforts on the part of labor, management, and the Government and not through the medium of compulsory legislation.

16. FULL EMPLOYMENT

Opposition to the basic principle involved in measures seeking so-called full employment, namely that Government should guarantee employment for anyone.

Trial and Conviction of Archbishop Stepinac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the contents of a letter sent by me to Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, on March 3, 1947:

MARCH 3, 1947.

Gen. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The trial and conviction of Archbishop Stepinac affrights the conscience of every citizen of the United States who believes in justice and freedom. The court proceedings were a crime against democracy. The sentence imposed was an attempt to crush religious freedom in Yugoslavia. The imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac symbolizes despotism in its extreme operation.

I view with sorrow this violation of the pledge made by the Government of Yugoslavia to the United States that it would respect the natural rights and fundamental freedoms of man.

Our national responsibility in the cause of world peace demands formal protest against the partisan persecution of Archbishop Stepinac.

Under date of October 3, 1946, the Acting Secretary of State advised me by letter in part:

"While the United States is naturally, on humanitarian grounds, following the case with attention, Yugoslavia, in its capacity as a sovereign state, has full jurisdiction over its citizens and their actions. In addition, it is a recognized principle of relations between states that one government should not interfere in the internal affairs of another state. In these circumstances, means through which the United States Government could take action in this matter are exceedingly limited."

This statement of the Acting Secretary of State indicates that some action, even though limited, can be taken by our Government. Indeed, the history of our foreign relations contains ample precedent for our State Department to intercede on behalf of the nationals of another country who are victims of religious persecution.

In 1923 the Government of the United States protested to Russia when Soviet leaders sentenced Archbishop Cepliak, Monsignor Budiewicz, and numerous priests to death for treason. The then Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, officially expressed disapproval of the action of the Russian Government in a note transmitted to the Soviet Government through the United States Embassy in Berlin.

On May 18, 1900, the United States Minister at Peking lodged a protest at the Chinese Foreign Office against religious persecution of Christians.

In 1857 Secretary of State William H. Seward protested to the Government of Japan on behalf of nationals of a country other than our own against their persecution because of their religion. In 1866 Secretary of State Seward protested the execution of Roman Catholic clergy when religious persecution broke out in Korea.

Many similar examples could be found in the files of the United States Department of State, evidencing that our Government has not hesitated to protest religious persecution abroad, insisting not only on the protection of its own nationals but also intervening on behalf of the natives of the country involved.

I, therefore, respectfully request that you, as Secretary of State, in accordance with our established national policy of condemning acts of persecution based on political, racial, or religious grounds as crimes against humanity wherever committed, express on behalf of the Government of the United States to the Government of Yugoslavia the deep humanitarian interest of the American people and their earnest hope for the immediate liberation of Archbishop Stepinac and the cessation of religious persecution in Yugoslavia.

Very respectfully yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Member of Congress.

Date of Birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 4, 1947.*

Congressman THOMAS S. GORDON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Because some people have begun to send out press releases giving wrong date of birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, to prevent you being misled, wish to call your attention to fact that Encyclopedia Britannica, Dictionary of American Biography, International Encyclopedia, World Book, Americana Encyclopedia, and Catholic Encyclopedia all are unanimous on March 4, 1748, as date of his

birth. Archives of our Government at the time Pulaski appeared to fight under George Washington, and all reliable historians, fixed 1748 as year of his birth. Thus two hundredth anniversary is next year, as was originally brought to your attention.

ANTHONY CZARNECKI.

American Home and Redevelopment Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently at the request of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation I submitted H. R. 2025, known as the American Home and Redevelopment Act of 1947. Mr. O. J. Dekom, director of research of that foundation, has issued a report covering this proposed legislation, and I herewith submit it under the unanimous consent given me by the House:

(By O. J. Dekom, director of research, National Home and Property Owners Foundation)

Representative FRED CRAWFORD, of Michigan, has just introduced a bill in Congress to make it possible for private enterprise to clear our cities of slums and other blighted areas. For 14 years, the Roosevelt and Truman administrations have been telling Congress that private industry could not do the job and that it was necessary, therefore, that the Federal Government build socialized public housing.

Last year Mr. Truman urged Congress to pass the Wagner-Ellender-Taft public-housing bill, which included an appropriation of about $5,000,000,000 in tax money for Government housing. The WET bill was passed by the Senate but the House of Representatives wisely refused to approve it. Efforts to revive the WET bill are being made, and Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, has introduced it in the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD's proposed American Home and Redevelopment Act of 1947 is the answer of free enterprise to the WET bill. If passed, it will assure the redevelopment of run-down sections of our communities and will encourage the construction of a large supply of low-rent housing.

Under the bill, local housing authorities would be set up with power to take over blighted areas of a community at a fair price for the land and its existing improvements. This land would be cleared and then offered for sale to private concerns on condition that they rebuild the area according to an approved redevelopment plan. Since the original cost of the land with its improvements would generally be greater than the sale price after the land is cleared, the city would have to absorb the loss temporarily. In time, the cost to the community would be made up by the increased taxes from the redeveloped section. Here is the basic difference between socialized public housing and private construction. Public-housing projects are built at the taxpayers' expense and, being tax free, are maintained at the taxpayers' expense. Housing constructed under the Crawford bill would be paid for by private investors, and the cities would receive taxes.

In case a community cannot finance the purchase and clearing of land for redevelopment purposes out of current revenues, the bill proposes to set up a system of Federal loan insurance similar to that now available to individual home owners under the FHA plan. The Federal Government would not actually lend money to a city, but would only guarantee the loans so that the lender will not be afraid of losing his money.

In order to prevent the growth of future slums, the Crawford bill requires that municipalities asking for Federal loan insurance must have and enforce sound sanitary and safety laws. One of the most important reasons for the development of blighted areas has been the fact that cities did not strictly enforce their sanitary and safety laws, thereby permitting properties to deteriorate to slum conditions.

As protection to all citizens against unwise or hasty action of the local authorities, the bill requires that full and free public hearings be held before any final decision on redevelopment projects is made. The hearings must be advertised in advance and interested parties must be notified of the hearing date.

In addition, the Crawford bill proposes to set up a housing research council consisting of representatives of government and the building industry. The council would undertake all kinds of research in the housing field and would develop new construction methods and test building materials.

Rental housing would be encouraged under the Crawford bill by Federal mortgage insurance. Loans to private concerns that wish to build homes for rent would be guaranteed in the same manner as loans to communities for redevelopment.

The battle between free enterprise and socialized housing is on. Attempts are being made to label the WET bill a "veteran's" housing bill. Already several leading Senators, including ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, have aligned themselves with the public housers. The Crawford bill will face much opposition because it does not propose to set up any additional government bureaus or put money into the hands of government officials for spending.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me over Station WNBF on March 1, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, this week I am pressing my demands once again for more sugar to every American housewife.

Today is March 1. There will be no more sugar stamps available, I'm told, until at least the 1st of April.

At that rate, my family of six children have just 10 pounds of sugar on hand to take us through that time. How are we going to make out?

That strikes mighty close to home, and I'm sure the Hall family situation is no different than the vast majority of other homes all over the country. Are you satisfied with the way this sugar question is being handled?

If I didn't think there is enough sugar to supply the American people with more than they're receiving now through rationing, I wouldn't be kicking. We've all seen plenty in the stores, with the grocers anxious to sell, but nobody can buy it.

To those who pooh-pooh my contention that more sugar ought to be distributed to our citizens, let me say I am still receiving as many letters from home complaining about this shortage as I have on almost any other subject.

People generally think there is enough sugar in the country to go around and all the propaganda you throw at them won't change their minds. They think—and rightly so—that the rank and file of America ought to be considered. They are sick of making sacrifices and they are sick of being pushed around. You see, it's their country, too, and they have quite a stake in it.

Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, I don't have the right contacts some might to buy more sugar to meet my family needs. I'm in the same boat most of you folks are in. We have to eat our meals without sugar; we have to forget about canning things we'll need for the future. We'll have to put aside the hope of saving a little money by preserving fruits or vegetables or meats which we'd like on hand for a rainy day.

You and I will have to forego these pleasures and necessities while a few, a very few, may be enjoying the advantages of being on the inside of the sugar tragedy and getting all they want. I say, and I have said, to Congress and to the Secretary of Agriculture: "Open up. Let's have some sugar. Don't make the American people suffer through selfishness. Let every housewife have a bonus of 25 pounds of sugar for her family. If this seems unfair for the individual, then make the allotment per person a lot bigger than has already been proposed. Give us all relief from the present shortage and we'll be satisfied."

During the past few weeks great stress has been laid upon the desire of many groups of our citizens to see a new airport for Broome County at Mount Ettrick. I, for one, have been impressed by the strong, positive stand taken by the leaders of our section for this considerable project.

This week I was especially honored by a visit from County Attorney Charlie O'Brien and several distinguished members of the Broome County Board of Supervisors, who dropped in my Washington office and mentioned their interest in hearings on proposed airport funds before the Senate Commerce Committee.

I offered these gentlemen my complete cooperation in doing whatever I could to make their trip informative and productive, and I believe they felt the trip down here was worth while.

Anything that will help the workers of the Triple Cities, I am absolutely for. Anything that will help our great industries, I'm for. Anything that will put Broome County on the map, and give our section the high place it so richly deserves in the Nation as a whole, I'm for.

As I told a good friend who urged my support of the Mount Ettrick project, I've been under terrific pressure here in the Capitol from official duties since election day, and I may not have been in as close touch with this important matter of local interest as I should.

But the Mount Ettrick airport plan looks good to me. Why shouldn't we have the best? Why shouldn't we put Broome County on the map? Why shouldn't we give everybody in this section the chance to enjoy first-class air transportation?

I don't know how far Congress is willing to go on spending money on airports this year. You know the purse strings are drawn tight. But the Federal Government ought to lighten any heavy burden which might fall on our local people as the result of the Mount Ettrick construction being approved. You folks can count on my going to bat at this end after you decide on the policy.

Personally, I would not hesitate. We must go along with progress. The valley of fair play deserves the best, and it's up to us to put it on the map.

Thank you.

Portal-to-Portal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of House Resolution 2157, popularly known as the portal-to-portal bill, although it was not my idea of the ideal measure to deal with this problem.

In particular, I favored a 3-year rather than a 1-year statute of limitations. I favored the longer period principally because the only cases coming within the statute are those where the employer has wilfully and in bad faith violated the Fair Labor Standards Act. The employee may frequently not know within 1 year of the existence of his right. Moreover, his right involves a public interest and under the law the United States Government is subject to the 1-year limitation and is therefore weakened in its ability to enforce the wage-hour law. In addition, the 1-year period would, I think, encourage the unethical employer to violate the Fair Labor Standards Act. Furthermore, the 9,000,000 unorganized workers coming under this act would under the 1-year statute have more difficulty than the organized worker in ascertaining his or her claim. And finally the 1-year statute would tend to decrease the voluntary negotiation of the disputes and increase litigation. These are some of the reasons why I favored the 3-year statute.

It is rare that a Congressman has the opportunity to vote on what he considers the best possible bill. His choice is usually between voting down a bill in its entirety or voting for a bill which to some extent falls short of his ideas.

I voted in favor of this legislation for the following reasons:

First. To protect the millions of working people of this country against the unemployment and uncertain conditions of employment which would result if these portal-to-portal suits were allowed. The working people of America should not be priced out of a market because of the reckless actions of a small minority, actions which bear no relation to the original declared intentions of labor and management as expressed in their agreements or by custom and practice.

Second. To protect the millions of people of this country against the increased taxes which might very well result if these suits were allowed. It will readily be seen that the amounts recovered in these suits would be deductible by the employers for income-tax purposes and would therefore deprive the Federal Government of considerable revenue. Furthermore, it would open the door to large portal-to-portal claims against the Government, and it would also increase the cost to the Government of goods and services in the future. In this fashion, there would be serious interference with the development of sound fiscal policies, the stabilization of the currency, and the maintenance of the national credit.

Third. To protect the millions of Americans who own the businesses of this country against the failure of these businesses, due to the allowance of these claims.

Fourth. To protect the United States Government against the financial burdens hereinabove mentioned and also against uncertainty with respect to future contractual obligations of the Government.

Fifth. To protect the American people, customers from whom in the end all income is derived, against a complete dislocation of industry which ultimately would result in benefits to no one.

Sixth. To protect our chances for world peace by preventing disturbances in our economy which might not only vitally interfere with national defense, but also seriously curtail our ability to render the relief and economic assistance so vital to its maintenance.

Elimination of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, American business, both large and small, is on trial. The constantly rising prices of most all commodities is placing American business in an uncomfortable position before the American people. Practically all American businessmen regardless of their size demanded the elimination of price control. It is the responsibility of business to prove to the country that they can hold the line against inflation without the aid of Government and its controls.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith an article from the New York Times written by Russell Porter on the subject entitled "New Relations With Workers and Customers Seen Necessitated by Price Outlook":

NEW RELATIONS WITH WORKERS AND CUSTOMERS SEEN NECESSITATED BY PRICE OUTLOOK

(By Russell Porter)

In the grand ballroom of a big hotel in Chicago last week various speakers warned a meeting of the American Management Association that the future of the free-enterprise system depended upon business and industry improving their human relations with the public—that is, with their workers and their consumers as human beings. Top management was held to be fumbling the ball in this most important and difficult field.

In the lobbies of the same hotel and in the nearby business offices and streets of Chicago's famous Loop, the nerve center of the great Midwest industrial and agricultural regions which come together there, this reporter found strong support for such a view of the current public relations of the American economic system.

Chicago's newspapers were headlining $30 hogs, highest on record; predicting $1-a-pound pork chops in a few days, so that what has been traditionally the poor man's meat has become a luxury product, and reporting March wheat at the highest price since 1920. Prices of clothing were also on the climb.

Businessmen and economists in the middle-income brackets were complaining about being priced out of the market themselves for new homes, automobiles, and other manufactured articles which the economists call durable consumer goods.

And everybody, rich, poor, or in between, was talking about the huge profits being reported and the fat dividend melons being cut by many of the country's large corporations.

Obviously, here is a problem in public relations which reaches right down to the grass roots of what people as individual human beings, not as statistics in an official report or lines on a chart, have to pay for what they eat, wear, live in or otherwise use in their daily lives, what they can afford to buy, how long they can remain customers or potential customers, except for the barest necessities, of the products of American industry, and how all this will affect their confidence in the American system as a whole.

The time is getting close when industry must find an answer to this problem that will satisfy the public. In the next 60 or 90 days management will have to deal with the postponed wage demands in the coal, steel, automobile, telephone, electrical, railroad, and other strategic industries.

It had been hoped that the cost-of-living decline that began in December would continue and spread sufficiently to limit the extent of second-round wage increases necessary to satisfy the workers and prevent another wave of major strikes in 1947.

Then, it had been expected, uninterrupted mass production and increased productivity due to a more cooperative attitude on the part of rank-and-file labor since election day, an improved flow of materials since the end of price controls, and post-war technological improvements would gradually provide a tremendous flow of goods at reduced production costs.

This, it was believed, might ease the country down to a lower price level without a depression and mass unemployment, and set the stage for a sustained period of prosperity supported by high-level production and employment and a better balanced wage-price-profit relationship from the standpoint of both consumer purchasing power and savings for investment in new production and employment.

But the new upsurge of commodity prices has disturbed these expectations. If it is not checked, and if rent ceilings are raised suddenly and indiscriminately, the effect on the coming cost-of-living wage negotiations may be very bad.

Another big inflationary spurt, pricing more and more buyers out of the market, it is held, may eventually result in huge unsalable surpluses, which might have to be dumped on the market at a terrific loss, causing business failures, mass lay-offs, and depression.

Many businessmen concede privately that prices are too high and should be reduced voluntarily and gradually now in order to stop the inflationary spiral and forestall the deflationary one that might follow a forced and sharp break in prices later. But, with a few exceptions everybody seems to be waiting for the other fellow's prices to be cut first.

National leadership appears to be required, but so far has been lacking, either to reduce prices or explain convincingly why this cannot be done. Of course, neither the Government nor a private organization like the National Association of Manufacturers has the power to compel any businessman to reduce prices, but each has a great deal of moral authority, and an appeal from either, coming on the eve of major wage negotiations, would be hard to ignore.

At its annual meeting last December the NAM acknowledged its responsibility for putting forward positive and constructive proposals in the public interest for the solution

of national problems affecting the economic and social welfare of the people. Subsequently, it sponsored a meeting of public-relations executives for business and industry, at which the keynote was expressed that good public relations for American free enterprise rest upon two foundations: (1) Action in the public interest; (2) full public information.

This is a new policy for the NAM, which has admitted its error in failure to offer anything more than mere opposition to New Deal proposals for changes in the public interest between 1932 and 1946.

The British Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of March 3, 1947:

TWILIGHT OF BRITAIN

The break-up of Britain continues to be one of the most dramatic news stories of the century.

The fact that many papers and commentators pay little attention to it doesn't matter—historians for hundreds of years will devote space enough to make up for that.

The collapse has been dramatized for the American people by the Greek episode. Our Government has been notified that Great Britain can't afford to continue trying to stabilize Greece, and has offered to let us take over the job.

Stabilizing Greece is a term which translates, really, into something a little different—protecting Greece from the Russian Communists.

What England wants us to do is pay the bills and hold the bag.

The decision on Uncle Sam's role is momentous. If we stand clear and refuse to help, it will be only a matter of time until Stalin will have achieved that great Russian objective—a tight grip on the eastern Mediterranean.

If we take over responsibility in Greece, however, whether with armies or finance, we then will be committed irretrievably to a course of blocking Russia in one of her major objectives. World conditions being what they are, this would be virtually a commitment to a third world war, with Russia on one side and the United States on the other.

The Greek question has assumed an unduly large part of the whole British picture.

Events have been moving so rapidly that a review is necessary to indicate the immense importance of what has happened.

Only a few years ago Britain was proud of the title of "Mistress of the Seas," happy to boast that the sun never set on the Union Jack. She was the financial center of the world; her Empire sprawled around the globe. Moreover, she was a citadel of freedom, with every man's home his castle.

She came through the war with flying colors. Her losses were heavy, but not crushing. Her debts were large, but her credit was good and her creditors patient. Her people were steadfast, brave, optimistic.

And then she tried socialism.

The Labor Party threw out the war leader, Winston Churchill, and embarked on a program of state ownership of industry. Our Government advanced a loan of more than $3,000,000,000. The British Labor Government promptly adopted a budget which was shortchanged by about the same amount, extended the grants it pays to nonproducing citizens, issued paper to buy up the Bank of England, mines, steel, railways, etc.

But the blizzards came. They merely dramatized the economic storm beating upon the unhappy British experiment. The British workers, well paid by their government in times of unemployment, refused to exert themselves; they like the state no better as boss than private ownership.

The export-or-die program reached less than half its objective. In fuel, far from being able to create a surplus for export, British miners have fallen below what the island itself needs. Food, clothing, fuel, shelter—all these are desperately low.

The American loan, which was to have unlocked the blocked sterling, has been used for nothing of the sort. It has gone, mainly, exactly for what its critics said it would go for—to finance socialization of the Empire. A fourth of it has been spent virtually for current expenses—40 percent, Parliament was told, for tobacco and movies.

What this vast crisis will mean to the British Government itself remains to be seen. The king and his family scooted on to South Africa, 4,000 miles away. Churchill has suspended his fire for the time—perhaps no better able than anyone else to tell the British people how to get out of the pit they have dug for themselves; his idea was to stay out in the first place.

But the effect upon the British Empire, which is a political entity far more important than the fate of the people who crowd the "tight little island" itself, is all too clear.

A year or so ago London notified Uncle Sam that she could not afford to support what had been agreed as her share of the occupation of Germany; we have been taking over a progressively larger part of this burden.

A few months ago England watched Russia move into command of the Persian oil fields which are part of the British life line—command in the sense that Russia now can grab them whenever she wishes. The Labor Government decided it would be unfriendly to Russia to protest.

More recently England has thrown her east Asian and most of her Pacific outposts to the wolves. The plan to abandon India is the most conspicuous of this withdrawal.

In the eastern Mediterranean, she already has thrown up her hands over the Palestine situation, and demanded that the United Nations take over; now she is about to withdraw from Greece.

As to her Dominions, Australia and New Zealand nearly broke away because of British decision not to attempt to resist Japanese encroachments in their direction in the early days of the war; and the one-time bond has never been fully resumed, despite the fact that this early piece of military strategy was hastily reversed.

Canada, to those who read between the lines, considers herself largely independent of the Empire. The most significant breach between our northern neighbor and the Empire to which she technically belongs is in the field of finance. There has been a sharp currency war going on between the two, in which the Canadian dollar has been inching upward in close ratio to the slow falling-off of the British pound.

The decline and fall of the Roman Empire is usually considered to have taken some 400 years for its accomplishment.

The speed of the British break-down, now rapidly reaching the approximate extent of that of the Romans, can be visualized by remembering that it is only about a year and a half ago that the British Socialists came to power and the debacle began.

Address by Hon. J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio, to the Veterans of Foreign Wars Annual Banquet at Philadelphia, Pa., February 22, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

I join with the action taken at your national convention held in Boston last summer, when your national body took a definite stand against communism and advocated an unrelenting drive against Red forces operating in this country. I pledge, as a veteran and an American, my whole and untiring support to this program.

A drive to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States is now gathering momentum, largely due to the initiative taken by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other veteran organizations, in meeting the Red menace head-on. I understand that a resolution calling for an injunction against American Reds is being backed by expressions of support from all over the Nation and that this resolution is being adopted by many local posts. According to the press, evidence to support the case against communism and prove conclusively that the Communist Party, from its inception, has sought the overthrow of our Republic through armed insurrection is in the hands of important officials of your organization.

In resorting to legal means to force the dissolution of the Communist Party, your national body is setting a precedent that appears to me to be a sensible as well as an effective course of action. In the District of Columbia the local VFW organization also has turned its guns on the Daily Worker, official Communist Party organ, published in New York City. America's vaunted tolerance has been taken advantage of by avowed enemies of our Government to build up a huge propaganda network for the purpose of confusing and dividing our people, and there comes a time when something has to be done. That time has come, ladies and gentlemen, and the united efforts of your organization should serve to wake up millions of Americans who hitherto have been either unaware or indifferent toward the communistic conspiracy that in this atomic age is more to be feared than ever before in our Nation's history.

I not only commend the VFW and every patriotic member of this great organization from your national commander in chief, Lewis Starr, down through the ranks, but I also urge you not to let up for a minute in the drive you are undertaking to make America safe for Americans. We have no place in America for those who do not believe in our American form of government.

I am inclined to believe that the war against the largely invisible forces of communism will be in many respects a harder war than any we have faced before. It is one thing to march into battle against foes who can be seen and eliminated. It is another thing to engage our subversive enemies in complicated legal proceedings and a battle of wits, for with them there are no Ten Commandments, no Marquis of Queensbury rules, no Geneva Code, no holds barred. The Communist is a fanatic who follows the Marxian philosophy that the ends justify

the means. Gerhart Eisler, allegedly the top Communist in this country, consistently falsified immigration records and passports in an attempt to cover up his trail in this country, going by innumerable aliases such as Edwards, Hans Berger, Julius Eisman, and others, and when cornered by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, you remember, refused to be sworn and testify before the committee. If the sun was shining brightly, Eisler would probably insist it was raining, and one investigator has commented that he has yet to discover a single honest statement ever made by Eisler. Obviously it is not easy to deal with trained Communist agents, and that's a job for our Army and Navy intelligence people and the FBI, but every American can, nevertheless, help in the struggle against Communist infiltration and plotting.

The battle against communism should be waged by all Americans, regardless of party, race, creed, or color. Only a handful of people stand to gain anything from a successful Communist revolution in this country, and it appears doubtful that the Communists would be generous in handing out patronage to Americans just because they were passive, or gullible, or even cooperative. A quisling wins the respect of neither the people he betrays, nor the invaders whom he joins. And yet, I regret to say, there are some folks in our country who fail so far to appreciate the blessings of freedom and the advantages of our free enterprise system that they scoff at the dangers from communistic doctrine, and may add that, well, if communism does come to America, they'll be smart enough to be commissars. Surely, they cannot know the import of their words and the price of appeasement.

I repeat that resistance to communism in our beloved land is a nonpartisan matter. In the present House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats alike are resolved, with few exceptions, to protect the interests of this Republic. In the last election, the voters took care of several Members of the House of Representatives whose records indicated that they were sympathetic with Reds and Red causes.

On February 8, Speaker MARTIN pledged House Republicans to a drive to remove the Red menace from America. He declared that the party will cooperate fully with the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its campaign against what Chairman THOMAS called a Communist conspiracy.

MARTIN'S statement, as reported by the press, was short but to the point. He said, "We are behind the objective of the committee to remove the Red menace from America and drive it out of the Government."

Speaker MARTIN also reiterated his belief, expressed in an earlier speech, that "a powerful and strategically placed minority has set out to destroy the American system and replace it with communism. They are the enemy within our gates. They have wormed their way into posts of power from which they try to shape Government policies and influence public opinion."

Mr. THOMAS has told the American people that his committee's encounter with Gerhart Eisler was "only the first chapter in the committee's drive to unmask a Communist conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States." The conspiracy to overthrow the Government, he declared, "already has a good start and must be stopped."

In accepting the distinguished service medal of the American Legion at San Francisco, September 30, 1946, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, devoted his entire address to the growing menace of communism in the United States. It will pay us to think tonight about some of the things Mr. Hoover said last fall. "During the past 5 years," he stated, "American Communists have made their deepest inroads upon our national life."

Veterans organizations, Mr. Hoover recognized, represent a force which holds within its power the ability to expose the hypocrisy and ruthlessness of this foreign "ism" which has crept into our national life—an "ism" built and supported by dishonor, deceit, tyranny, and a deliberate policy of falsehood. It is a matter of self-preservation. The veteran who fought for America will be among the first to suffer if the Communists succeed in carrying out their diabolical plots to wreck the American way of life. The divide and conquer tactics did not die with Hitler—they are being employed with greater skill today by American Communists with their boring from within strategy. Our first great President, George Washington, whose memory we honor today believed that public officials were servants of the people, and that government should serve the people—and not the people serve the government—and that each individual should be given opportunities as prescribed in our Constitution. Communist propaganda, skillfully designed and adroitly executed, has been projected into practically every phase of our national life. The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims some 100,000 members has lulled many Americans into a feeling of false complacency.

"The Communists themselves boast that for every party member there are 10 others ready to do the party's work. These include their satellites, their fellow travelers, and their so-called progressive and phony liberal allies. They have maneuvered themselves into positions where a few Communists control the destinies of hundreds who are either willing to be led or have been duped into obeying the dictates of others."

Mr. Hoover continued in his challenging speech, in many ways as outstanding in this generation as Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" oration was in colonial times: "The average American workingman is loyal, patriotic, and law abiding. He wants security for his family and himself. But in some unions the rank and file find themselves between a Communist pincers, manipulated by a few leaders who have hoodwinked and browbeaten them into a state of submission. Communist labor leaders have sparred for time in their labor deliberations to refer matters of policy to Communist Party headquarters for clearance. In fact, resolutions have been delayed pending such approval and contemplated strikes have been postponed until adequate Communist support and backing were available."

This reference by Mr. Hoover to communism in the labor movement brings to mind that only recently Chairman THOMAS, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, charged that the portal-to-portal pay suits which threatened to demoralize American industry and wreck our economy were conceived and initiated by a pair of Communist sympathizers whose records are well documented. Nobody knows just how many strikes during and since the war were engineered by Communists, but the number must have been considerable. Certainly the solution to labor-management strife in this country, if it is to be realistic, must take into account the studied efforts of red leaders to keep labor and management at swords' points in order to weaken us economically for peace or war. Workers themselves are waking up to such facts, and it is not now uncommon for union workers to pass anti-Communist resolutions, seek to disbar Communists from membership, or secede from Communist-dominated unions.

And now I would like to return to Mr. Hoover's analysis of the situation. He tells us that "the Communist influence has projected itself into some newspapers, magazines, books, radio, and the screen. Some churches, schools, colleges, and even fraternal orders have been penetrated, not with the approval of the rank and file but in spite of them."

"We are rapidly reaching the time," he warned, "when loyal Americans must be willing to stand up and be counted. The American Communist Party, despite its claims, is not truly a political party. The Communist Party in this country is not working for the general welfare of all our people—it is working against our people. It is not interested in providing for the common defense. It has for its purpose the shackling of America and its conversion to the godless, Communist way of life. If it were a political party, its adherents could be appealed to by reason. Instead, it is a system of intrigue, actuated by fanaticism. It knows no rules of decency. Its unprincipled converts would sell America short if it would help their cause of furthering an alien way of life conceived in darkness and motivated by greed for power whose ultimate aim is the destruction of our cherished freedom. Let us no longer be misled by their sly propaganda and false preachments on civil liberty. They want civil license to do as they please and, if they get control, liberty for Americans will be but a haunted memory. For those who seek to provoke prejudice and stir up the public mind to angry resentment against our form of government are a menace to the very powers of law and order which guarantee and safeguard popular rights."

I tell you that there is more to fear from the Communists because in their desperation to retrieve lost power they will work and scheme all the harder, and possibly do their dirty work underground and in the dark to a greater extent.

How well I remember the mobs of Communists that descended upon Washington during various congressional debates, and no doubt you recall some of the dire predictions that were made by Communists and some well-meaning citizens of how this country would take a toboggan slide into depression if, for example, OPA were to be discontinued. It is the Communist plan to squeeze American businessmen between two pincers, as a means of weakening our capitalistic free enterprise system and depriving the people of goods. Anyone who dared to oppose the plot last summer, however, was subjected to a barrage of smear propaganda, burned in effigy, or otherwise attacked by the smearers.

Activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities during the coming year will be concentrated in four fertile fields. They are government, labor unions, Hollywood, and our educational institutions. The public's investment in this committee from the standpoint of the meager funds appropriated to its work have more than paid off since the opening of the Eightieth Congress through the sensational disclosures of the role of Gerhart Eisler and the indications that a spy ring is operating in this country for the purpose of stealing our atomic secrets.

In congressional hearings last year, it was reported that the files contained more than 100,000 names. No information has been disclosed as to how many of the suspected cases are in the Federal service. In the recent debate on the floor of the House of Representatives concerning the deliberate refusal of Gerhart Eisler to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities, Congressman THOMAS of New Jersey, chairman of the committee, pointed out he believed it is important that we know in the case of the old Dies committee in one instance they sent over six cases to the Attorney General and it took 6 years before they even brought up the first case. This committee has only the power to investigate and it is up to the people of the United States to demand of the administration that appropriate action be taken to rid our institutions of all disloyal

elements. Those who do not believe in our form of government should be immediately removed from this land. I hope Attorney General Clark will put this program into effect and I challenge him to obey his oath of office.

Recently Carl Aldo Marzani, former State Department employee was indicted for fraudulently denying he was a Communist, but the fact is, according to Representative JONKMAN, of Michigan, that the State Department knew as early as last July that Italian-born Marzani was a Communist, but nevertheless kept him on its pay roll for 5 months—or until December 20.

Cardinal Spellman, who traveled 140,000 miles during the war and saw first-hand conditions across the seas, warns: "America is no safer from mastery by communism than was any European country. There we witnessed the killing and enslavement of whole peoples by Communists who, with the shedding of blood, have become as if drunken with it. In this atomic age of discord with nations not alone divided against one another but against themselves, where men make mockery of the meaning of majesty of faith, America must continue to stand as the symbol and sanctuary of liberty, secure in the strength of her unity. Again and again our sons have been called upon to spend their youth, their dreams, their blood, their lives in war to preserve our liberties and bring freedom to imperiled peoples of the earth—to make the world itself free."

He declares: "If we want to protect America against the invasion of communism, we must act wisely and promptly to check its poison of propaganda through the antitoxin of truth and patriotism."

Our President wants the doors of America thrown wide open to admit multitudes of displaced persons and refugees. It is possible for a displaced person or refugee to be a Communist. Gerhart Eisler, the Comintern agent who may be involved in espionage in this country, claims to be a German refugee. He managed to move around this country at will and shuttle back and forth between this country and the Soviet Union on false passports issued to him by our State Department. So what guarantee will the President give the American people that all the immigrants he wants to bring in would have the desire or the ability to become good American citizens? It has been charged by some Members of Congress that there are about a million aliens illegally entering this country every year, but the trouble with checking that figure is that the Government agencies who should know the answers refuse to furnish them to Members of Congress, the press, or anybody. One is forced to believe that the administration is fearful of letting the American people know the truth about immigration into this country, legally and illegally.

The American people have never been lacking in neighborliness and a general spirit toward foreign nations in distress, as our role in UNRRA would indicate. The American taxpayers have contributed two billions, seven hundred millions of dollars for the UNRRA hand-outs, footing about 70 percent of the bill. Where have the bulk of the supplies gone? To the Soviet Union, Tito's Yugoslavia and countries behind the Iron Curtain, of course. It was predicted in Congress in 1944 that UNRRA would enable Stalin to become dictator of Europe, and this prediction was certainly not far from the truth if not entirely accurate. Communists employed by UNRRA exert such influence that you all remember, for example, how an attempt was made to divert 50,000 tons of steel rail from China to Yugoslavia, and only a congressional exposé prevented the completion of the transfer. American interests must be protected by our national leaders, or they will some day be called to account by the American people.

Before an important battle, Washington said, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight." If he were alive today, he would say "Put none but Americans in our Government today."

I say to you that Americans must be vigilant. Americans must raise their voices to protect their own interests as often and as loudly as the Communists raise their voices to gain their ends. It is unthinkable that any minority such as the Communists should continue to dictate affairs of this Government, domestic and foreign; control labor unions; influence our people through Hollywood propaganda films, or teach our children in the schools and colleges doctrines that we as American parents neither believe nor sanction.

The old French saying, "Cherchez la femme," suggests an admonition to patriotic Americans today, and that is: "Look out for the Red." I am not saying that there is a Red under every bed, but it is worth while looking under a hundred beds if necessary to find one Communist hiding there. A nation that could wage successful wars against the military might of the Nazis and of the Japs, should be able to rout the Communist menace from its own shores if it will only take the job seriously. The mania of Americans for mystery novels and for mystery films, as well as radio mysteries, is well known. It would be a good idea for Americans to study this Communist underground and seek to light it up. The one thing that Communists cannot stand is full exposure to the glare of publicity. They can be pretty bold up to the time that they are disclosed for what they really are. Americans rub elbows with them every day. There are Communist headquarters in practically every important American city. The Communists frequently run candidates for public office. The files of the FBI and Committee on Un-American Activities of Congress are filled with their names and their ugly histories. Something can be done about communism in the United States, and the best way to get it done is for you and you and you, and every veteran especially, to make it your personal business to demand that it be done and help to do it. Every American has a stake in the future of this country.

"America has furnished to the world the character of Washington," said Daniel Webster; "and if our American institutions have done nothing else, that alone would have entitled them to the respect of mankind."

George Washington, the Father of Our Country, whose birthday we celebrate, offers an example of patriotism, wisdom, and sacrifice that Americans should emulate. Consider what Washington has meant to the cause of freedom in the world and then compare his life and counsel to his fellow countrymen with the lives and teachings of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and such American Communists as Browder, Foster, and others, and you will wonder how any man brought up in this land could forsake Washington to throw in his lot with the promoters of Red fascism, or communism, call it what you will. Let us see to it that our schools do not slight Washington while extolling the virtues of Soviet heroes. You might be surprised to find out what your youngsters are being taught in their little red schoolhouses in this generation.

To paraphrase the words of J. Edgar Hoover, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, "ordained to bring together the veterans of our foreign wars to perpetuate the associations made on foreign soil, is being expanded by the influx of veterans of World War II, who likewise fought that America might live. To allow America to become infected with the malignant growth of communism or to be infested by crime is a breach of our trust to those who gave their lives for American principles. Let us gird ourselves with the determination that those basic freedoms and spiritual ideals for which so many have sacrificed so much shall not be destroyed from within. Let us be steadfast for America, work and live for America, and eternally be on guard to defend our Constitution and our way of life against the virulent poison of communistic ideology."

I beg of you to familiarize yourselves with the communistic trend in your local community—your local issues—your schools—your churches. Then pray to God to give you strength, and to give strength to your officials of Government to remove from our Nation this termite which is attempting to destroy our form of government.

If you will do this, the Great Architect of the Universe, whom the sun, moon, and stars obey, will give us strength so that the state of our Nation will be sound, the heart of our Nation will be good, the spirit of our Nation will be strong, and the faith of our Nation will be eternal.

Basis for Levying Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have received from the Charleston Chamber of Commerce. This letter urges that income tax throughout the United States be levied on the same basis as now prevails in the community-property States. The author of this letter is Hon. Charles E. Hodges, a former president of the West Virginia State Senate and now managing director of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce. It follows:

The board of directors of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce has unanimously gone on record endorsing, and requesting, your earnest and aggressive support of legislation in the Federal Congress which will, as a part of the general tax reduction program now being considered, give Federal income taxpayers in non-community-property States, such as West Virginia, the privilege of making their personal income tax returns in the same manner as the residents of the nine States which are community-property States.

It is our understanding that the Treasury Department itself has recommended this change in the Federal statutes governing the payment of income taxes as a part of the tax reduction being planned. Up until this time the Treasury Department has opposed such a statutory change on the ground that it would result in a serious loss of revenue.

The position of our board of directors is that if a substantial reduction in taxes is to be made by Congress, a part of it should be made by this device so as to remove the heavy discrimination against Federal income taxpapers who live in the 39 non-community-property States, in favor of income taxpayers who live in the 9 community-property States.

I am sure you understand fully what is meant by the above position of the board. In the nine community-property States the net earnings of a man are permitted, by Federal statute, to be divided equally between his wife and himself. The effect of this is that, if a man has an income of $10,000 per year, he may return it for income-tax purposes as a $5,000 income for himself, and a $5,000 income for his wife. You can appreciate what this difference means, because of the surtax brackets, as the net income figure rises.

In the example I have cited above a man with a $10,000 income, if he resides in a non-community-property State, pays an income tax of $2,508. If he resides in a community-property State, his Federal income tax is only $2,090.

We believe that all the citizens of the United States should be treated equally with respect to the application of Federal laws, as was fully the intention of Congress. This change which we are recommending would have been made long ago but for the reluctance of the Government to give up the income-tax revenue which it would lose from the other 39 States.

Now that a tax-reduction program is in sight, we believe that a part of that program should be accomplished by the method indicated here. In other words, if Congress is going to effect the 20-percent reduction in individual income taxes, we believe that one of the first steps in this direction should be this removal between the discrimination against income-tax payers in your own State.

Betting Britons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that Britain will need another loan from the United States to carry on her gambling racket. I know that our internationalists would not wish to deprive their British cousins of sufficient money with which to gamble on horses, dogs, soccer, and racing hares, surely not so long as the American taxpayers can foot the bill. If our taxpayers should refuse to make further loans to Britain, it might force her to tax the gambling gains of her citizens, which would be cruel, indeed.

The propaganda, the social lobby, the secret meetings, the promised trips abroad for our internationalists at our taxpayers' expense preliminary to another gambling loan to Britain are now under way.

Inasmuch as Britain's gambling bill is estimated to be about $4,000,000,000 this year, our taxpayers will again have to tighten their belts to meet this international demand. Much of the opposition to a tax-reduction program and to the cutting of expenditures comes from the internationalists who insist that our first duty is to the world at large, exclusive, of course, of our own citizens.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article by John D. Leonard, staff correspondent of the Wall Street Journal, which appeared in the issue of March 4, 1947:

BETTING BRITONS—THEY GAMBLED A RECORD $2,400,000,000 LAST YEAR; SEE BIGGER FLING IN 1947—PUT MONEY ON HORSES, DOGS, SOCCER, EVEN RACING HARES; WINNINGS ARE TAX-FREE—WAGES HIGH; NOTHING TO BUY

(By John D. Leonard)

LONDON.—Gambling is one of many weeds that thrive in the formal garden of Britain's planned economy.

Austerity-weary Britons well-heeled with high wages but with nothing to spend them on played the dogs, the horses, football (soccer) pools and other forms of organized gambling to the tune of an estimated $2,400,000,000 to $2,800,000,000 last year. That's a new high in British betting—and it's headed still higher.

At present 1 in every 2 British adults plays the football pools, 1 in every 7 bets on the horses and 1 in every 12 risks his money on the dogs. That's what question-askers found in a recent survey by the British Institute of Public Opinion.

The present fuel crisis has forced the Government to ban greyhound racing which is mainly an evening event that drains heavily on electric power. But dog racing fans expect the ban to be lifted as soon the fuel situation eases.

REVEREND JOB MAKES A PREDICTION

"This year gambling expenditure may run in the neighborhood of $4,000,000,000," says the Reverend Allen Job, Australian-born secretary of the Churches Committee on Gambling.

Mr. Job should know. His committee—the avowed enemy of organized gambling here—is one of the best informed sources on games of chance. Headquarters of the committee, which represents the social-service agencies of the British churches, are in a cold, gloomy little office just across the street from Westminster Abbey. Nattily attired in black coat and striped trousers, Mr. Job sits at an ancient roll-top busily turning a mass of statistical data into ammunition for his committee's tireless crusade. The bulk of his information is culled from a nation-wide network of eager but amateur operatives—mostly clergymen and church secretaries—who collect it from public records and other on-the-spot sources.

Many Britons—and Mr. Job is one of them—attribute the present wave of gambling fever to the nation's economic headaches. Bottlenecked production and shortages of most consumer goods leave little on store shelves for the average Briton to spend his record-high wages on.

William Predeth, a London apartment porter, sums up the situation:

"There are lots of things my missus and I would like if we could buy them," he said. "But since we can't find them in the shops we have enough money in our pockets each week to do the football pools and have an occasional flutter on the horses."

Heavy income taxes here have added another allure to betting, since gambling winnings are tax-free. Often they are astonishingly high for an outlay of a small stake. John Davies, a Yorkshire miner, recently pocketed a cool, tax-free $180,000—a record win—on a football pool at a cost of only a few cents.

A LITTLE EXCITEMENT FOR WAR-WEARY BRITONS

Finally, many Britons fed up with such wartime austerity as food and clothes rationing, are seeking a bit of excitement to brighten their drab existence. They found an outlet in gambling.

"After all you've got to have something to do in the way of amusement these days," said Mr. Predeth, the porter.

Gambling also intrigues Chancelor of the Exchequer Hugh Dalton but for a different reason. Mr. Dalton and his treasury cohorts view it as a tempting source of revenue which might help to offset any losses the Government may sustain if it whittles down the income tax in the April budget.

At the moment, Mr. Dalton is toying with the possibility of a betting tax. Last tried in 1926, by the then Chancelor Winston Churchill, it was quickly repealed because of the widespread evasion. The Government found it was getting less than half the $80,000,000 annual yield anticipated for it.

Those who favor the proposed tax claim it would raise considerable revenue for an impoverished nation and at the same time tend to minimize gambling as a social and economic evil. Opponents contend the tax would only result in large scale evasion which couldn't be controlled. The churches are against the tax because they believe it would bestow Government blessing on a social evil and provide the state with a vested interest in the gambling industry's prosperity. Even Mr. Dalton is said to doubt whether the tax would raise enough revenue to make it worth while.

DRAIN ON INDUSTRY MANPOWER

The gambling boom has created a drain on Britain's woefully weak manpower resources. It provides employment for an estimated 300,000 to 400,000 Britons.

"Girls in the football pool firms could easily be used in the dressmaking and hosiery trades and the textile industry," Mr. Job pointed out. "So could those who keep an eye on the pin-ball machines. And industry could easily use the mechanics who keep them running."

Horse racing took the biggest share of Britain's gambling expenditure last year. Betting Britons spent between $1,100,000,000 and $1,300,000,000 on the horses. But less than 5 percent of this—$59,100,000—went through the "tote" machines. The rest went to off- and on-the-course bookmakers and illegal street betting. But last year's "tote" figure is a good indication of the boom in the horses. It was more than 50 percent above the $36,000,000 "tote" of the peak prewar year of 1938.

Horse racing was severely curtailed during the war. Only one or two races were held every two weeks instead of each day. "Tote" receipts dropped to a record low of $5,600,000 in 1940.

Most Britons have a "flutter" on major horse races such as the Grand National at Aintree and the Derby at Epsom Downs. Bets run anywhere from about 20 cents to hundreds of thousands of dollars. But average betters like William Predeth, the London porter, usually risk about 60 cents each way on these events.

"I don't play the horses regularly," said Mr. Predeth, "but I like to put some down on the big events. It provides a little excitement and sometimes a little extra cash, like last year when I won $25 on the Derby on a 60-cent bet."

COMPETITION FROM THE DOGS

Greyhound racing is giving the horses brisk competition. Dog-racing bets took an estimated $1,000,000,000 to $1,100,000,000 out of British pockets last year when the dogs were freed of wartime restrictions. Some 20 to 30 more races were held on each track than in 1945 when the total take approached $1,000,000,000. In 1945 only $550,000,000 of the dog betting went through the "totes." Bookmakers got the rest. That $550,000,000, however, was almost four times the $148,000,000 that went through the machines in the peak prewar year of 1938.

Football pools—favorite risk of the British working class—are based on the major professional soccer games that are held weekly throughout the country. In the middle of each week millions of Britons receive from the pool promoters "coupons" listing the games to be played the following Saturday. The "punters," as pool-playing Britons are called, try to forecast results of the games.

The pools vary in type from the simplest "eight results" with its large number of small winnings, to the complicated but most popular "penny points" pool which pays gigantic dividends to the few successful punters. The coupons are filled in and returned to the pool promoters before game time. Winners are informed on the Monday following the games, and are paid promptly.

Hardly a week goes by without a report of a huge dividend paid out to some successful punter. A 53-year-old government worker, Thomas F. Land, recently won $85,000 on a "penny points" pool for an outlay of only a few cents.

When Mr. Land heard of his good fortune, he said: "I am psychic and have pre-

viously had proof of this in many ways." He thereupon received a letter from a woman asking him to use his psychic powers to find her a house.

CLAIM THEY KNOW THE ANSWERS

Some punters like Mr. and Mrs. Smith, of Coventry, claim to have found sure-fire systems for predicting the soccer game results. The Smiths have won about £75,000 in four consecutive weeks with their system which they studiously keep to themselves.

The football pools accounted for an estimated $240,000,000 to $280,000,000 of last year's total spending on gambling. This compares with the prewar high of $200,000,000 in the 1938–39 season. During the war soccer games kept going with government blessing on the grounds that they helped bolster British morale. Some of the major pool promoters merged their operations and established what was called unity pools. Others like Littlewoods, biggest pool firm in Britain, went to war producing shells, parachutes, and barrage balloons.

To overcome the wartime paper shortage, "coupons" for pools were printed in the newspapers. But this came to an abrupt halt when a British clergyman, the Rev. John Bretherton, secured a court judgment which made it illegal to conduct pools in or through the newspapers. Mr. Bretherton's action embarrassed the government which, already hard pressed for paper, had to make an allocation for printing coupons. Since then coupons have been printed on a paper-allocation basis and distributed through the mails.

Pool promoters gave their boom another 18 months. After that, they think there will probably be less money in circulation. Nevertheless they believe their pools will still do a big business.

The gambling fever has hit Britons in a number of other forms. Pin-ball machines last year took in an estimated $40,000,000 to $80,000,000. Briton also bet—how much is unknown—on such sports events as fly casting, where bookmakers take bets on various teams, hound trailing and "coursing" (hare racing). The gambling wave even spread to children's foot races in northern England where bookmakers found a brisk business.

"Meet Me in Missouri—Hurry!"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and at the request of Earl L. Bitechel, St. Louis manager of Business Week, I desire you to include the following:

Commending editorials to the effect that Missouri "needs a song as rare and beautiful as—well, for instance, Missouri," having long endeavored to be of service along correlative lines, more recently trying to help toward a practical, helpful, all-nations' "get together" and fair here in this central, strategic city of St. Louis with many advantages, may I humbly submit below a few lines hurriedly written, which no doubt can be improved upon, at least to start beneficial competition.

Many no doubt, too, with some ability to compose possibly a more suitable, better lyric may also submit a better suggestion, but in the meantime I believe even the old but appealing, lilting tune of "Meet Me in St. Louis" might be used, too, for these following words—and one or more suitable paragraphs, more applicable specifically to St. Louis, might be added at the beginning after the proposed fair gets better organized (to be used also, with such additions, to help toward the fair):

"Meet me in Missouri—hurry!
Happiness is there!
Ozark hills and lakes, a' calling!
Beauties, wonders: perennial fair!

"Meet me in Missouri—hurry!
'America's heart' is there!
Nature's masterpiece, a' yearning!
And opportunities to share!

"Meet me in Missouri—hurry!
Everything is there!
Sport, culture, art, music blending!
Works, farms, rivers beyond compare!

"Meet me in Missouri—hurry!
Central blessings fruitful bear!
Best, where North, South, East meet West!
Come, everyone! Everywhere!"

The Threat to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of March 3, 1947:

THE THREAT TO WORLD PEACE

Britain's urgent request that the United States assume a substantial part of her financial obligations in Greece directs attention to a situation which threatens the peace of the world.

The Greeks must have outside financial support if they are to survive as a nation. It is a reasonable assumption, too, that, because of their own grave economic crisis, the British cannot continue to underwrite Greek independence

But money alone will not save Greece from disaster. Nor will it prevent that country from becoming the scene of another "Spanish" civil war.

The Greeks, sorely wounded by war and revolution, remain in dire financial straits because of the undeclared guerrilla war being conducted against them by Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Rumania. They are too weak to stand alone against that alliance, backed as it is by the powerful Soviet Union. In recognition of these facts, Britain has kept a token military force in Greece. That may have prevented an all-out military invasion by the Pan-Slavic alliance, but border warfare has paralyzed the Greek economy.

This situation demands the attention of the United Nations.

The world's peace-loving nations should join in telling Russia to call off her war dogs. Had Hitler been told that before it was too late, World War II might have been avoided. The Soviets today are pursuing the same reckless course of conquest by intimidation and intrigue that Nazi Germany pursued in the late 1930's.

Greece is not an isolated case. A somewhat similar and intimately related civil war rages in China. Soviet intrigues in Korea and Manchuria have been widely publicized. The tactics by which the Russians became masters of Poland and the Balkans followed much the same pattern.

Our own position in the world-wide conflict is high-lighted by the anti-American campaign the Communists are carrying on against us in South America, and the daily attacks on us by the Moscow press and radio.

The British tried to combat this dynamic challenge for world leadership by half measures, and have failed. We can exhaust ourselves, too, by pouring money into a bottomless hole and doing nothing to remedy conditions that are producing economic stagnation.

We should ask the United Nations to guarantee Greece's political independence and integrity, and insist upon a showdown. We should do that wherever any other nation is threatened by foreign aggression. It would be wishful thinking to assume that this of itself will at once arrest the world-wide campaign of Soviet expansion. But if the public opinion of all peaceful nations can be mobilized on that issue, it should be possible gradually to restore a respect for law and order in the world.

American Farm Machinery in Occupied Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a copy of a letter received by a farm equipment manufacturing concern from one of its agents in Poland who tells an interesting story as to just what is occurring with our American machinery as it is used by people who have no knowledge of this kind of equipment. It appears to be a total loss.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. ———: I hope that you will excuse my delay in writing, but I have been traveling around Poland most of the time that I have been here and it is impossible to send mail out unless it comes out through the United States Embassy mail bag here at Warsaw, so that I am unable to mail letters while out of here.

In my travels I have had a very good chance to find out conditions here in Poland and to find out facts about tractors and other farm implements. There are about 4,300 American- and English-built tractors here at the present time, of which about 800 are English Fordsons, the rest being Case, Farmall, John Deere, and Ford-Fergusons, and as yet I am the only tractor and farm machinery man, so I really am kept busy.

As you no doubt know, UNRRA delivers the equipment to the governments of the different countries in which it operates and then it is distributed by the government of the respective countries. In the case of Poland there is no organization here capable of a job of that kind so everything is in a chaotic condition. The tractors, machinery, and spare parts are now distributed over about three-fourths of the country without any consideration as to size of plows and tractors, so we find the larger tractors with two-bottom plows and small tractors with three-bottom plows and Ferguson tractor-mounted equipment where there are no Ferguson tractors, also repairs in every place except where they are needed most. Then, too, we do not have but very few parts catalogs and no one acquainted with parts who can identify them, resulting in much confusion of repair parts.

I found them using Russian oil in American-made tractors, which was too heavy to go

through the oil screens into the oil pump, resulting in bearing trouble and much wear of pistons, rings, and sleeves, but believe that I now have them convinced to use only oil supplied to UNRRA. Also, the tractors are too fast for the operators resulting in a lot of accidents by collision and also hitting trees and other obstacles. So there are quite a number of tractors laid up with broken rear axle housings and pedestals. However, this is true of all makes of tractors over here, regardless whether Case, John Deere, Farmall, or others.

Then, too, the operators know absolutely nothing about the implements that they are using with the tractors, and they do not seem to have anyone here in Poland who is able to tell them, so now we are trying to organize a school of instruction for the use of farm machinery, which we hope will do a lot of good.

We also have submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture a report on conditions as we found them and have suggested very strongly that they make some major changes in their organization handling farm equipment, and hope for some changes for the best in the very near future.

I will try and write you from time to time and keep you informed of results and further developments.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

The Gwynne Bill Needs Amending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 28, 1947, when the Gwynne bill was under consideration in the House, leave was granted Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD within 5 days thereafter. Because that was the only bill reported out by the Judiciary Committee to bar unwarranted portal-to-portal pay suits, I urged passage of it but with certain important amendments which I supported on the floor. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post, March 1, 1947, which discusses these amendments fairly:

GWYNNE BILL

The Gwynne bill outlawing portal-to-portal pay suits passed the House by an overwhelming majority because a great many Members believe that the Fair Labor Standards Act had been misinterpreted by the Supreme Court. The House could find no wholly satisfactory way out of the dilemma thus created. So it voted to disbar all suits for back pay unless the employer had been required either by custom or practice or by express agreement to make such payments. That, we admit, is a crude remedy, but apparently essential in the circumstances. Certainly we do not agree with the minority members of the House Judiciary Committee who maintain that the problem of the existing portal-to-portal pay liabilities should be left to the courts, on the assumption that by following the de minimis doctrine most of those liabilities will be eliminated.

Of chief concern at the moment, however, are the objections to the provisions of the Gwynne bill in respect of future claims—objections which appear to be well founded. The 1-year Federal Statute of Limitations, which it sets up for action in future claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, is unduly restrictive and unfair to workers who may learn belatedly of their rights under the law. The bill would also enable an employer to free himself from civil liability for failure to comply with the law if he acted in accordance with any administrative regulation, order, or ruling. This provision, according to the minority members of the House Judiciary Committee, could mean that employees would find their rights to collection barred simply by the willingness of a minor regional official to express his personal opinions as to an employer's liability. We agree that if administrative rulings are to be a defense against employee claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the administrator should be given specific powers to issue rulings having legal effect and Congress should carefully define the extent of his authority and set standards for his guidance.

Another objectionable provision of the Gwynne bill would permit employees to compromise or waive their claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Many unorganized workers would be in no position to resist compromise offers of settlement that might be grossly unjust to them. Furthermore, in suits brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act damages would be recoverable only on proof that the employer acted in bad faith and without reasonable ground. Since it is difficult to prove bad faith, the effect might be, as the minority report on the bill points out, "a substantial lessening of the enforcement value of the civil action provisions of the act."

It is quite evident from these criticisms that the Gwynne bill in its present form would effect extensive changes in existing protective labor legislation of an undesirable character. We trust, therefore, that in correcting distortion of the Fair Labor Standards Act the Senate will exercise greater care than the House has done so as to avoid weakening its legitimate protective processes.

Letter Signed by Members of Paralyzed Veterans Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 28, 1947.

Representative HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr.

DEAR SIR: I am a member of the Paralyzed Veterans Association of America. Recently our organization held a national convention in Chicago. One of the resolutions passed by the delegates concerns Public Law 663 (cars for amputees bill). I would like to acquaint you with the text of this resolution.

"It is the position of this, the first convention of the Paralyzed Veterans Association of America, that Public Law 663 works a severe hardship upon the paraplegia veteran. It is further the position of this convention that the amount of $1,600 now provided by the law is insufficient for a paraplegia veteran to purchase an automobile which will meet his needs; that the failure of Public Law 663 to provide automobiles for the quadriplegia veteran is unfair and inequitable; that the time limitation of said law threatens to deprive qualified men of the benefits of the law.

"We are, therefore, resolved that the Congress of the United States enact legislation to permit the paraplegia veteran to pay any additional cost on an automobile in excess of the $1,600 now provided under said law.

"We are further resolved that the provision of Public Law 663 pertaining to licensing as a requirement for receiving an automobile from the Veterans' Administrator be amended to permit otherwise qualified veterans (but who are unable to drive said vehicle) to receive automobiles under said law.

"We are further resolved that the time element in the present law be amended and that the law permit the $30,000,000 now appropriated to be kept available for purchase of said automobiles until such a time as said appropriation is completely expended."

Very truly yours,

MARTIN PYSZ.
JAMES DOYLE.
WILLIAM MARTIN.
CARL SOKIN.
JOE LA POINTE.

The Effect of Atomic Energy on Our National Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting address made at the cultural session of the Ursuline Academy in Wilmington, Del., on March 3, 1947, by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON, Representative of the Fifth Connecticut District.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the effect of the dropping of the first atom bomb on Hiroshima on August 5, 1945, has been greater than merely finding a new weapon with which to wage war.

The manner of waging war has always been of primary concern to our military leaders and scientists rather than the normal populace of the Nation. While we are vitally interested in this phase of national security, our major dislocation is seen in the fact that the American people must now begin to think in terms once foreign to them. The question: What over-all changes will be effected in our economy and mode of living as a result of the successful splitting of the atom? The answer: Who would deign to say what the future holds for us in this respect?

That the dawn of the atomic era has opened new vistas for commercial usage of this tremendous force, as well as forecasting the day of push-button warfare, is now apparent as witnessed by news releases from industrial leaders to the effect that atomic energy has been harnessed for some commercial uses. That this use will be evidenced by much greater expansion in the industrial field is beyond question. This field of operations in atomic energy might well be left to those most vitally concerned and most fully qualified to pass upon such changes and improvements; the scientist and industrialist.

Along with industrial uses which may be contemplated in the foreseeable future are the social uses which will benefit all mankind through research in medicine and biology. The radioactivity of uranium, which is the element subjected to nuclear fission to pro-

duce the energy, has already demonstrated its usefulness in both these fields. Radioactivation of materials in common use has pointed out possible cures for certain types of cancer and the use of tracers proved invaluable to the biologist in ascertaining the relationship of the ordinary functions of humans and plants to the biological result. Through this method can be found the answer to the usefulness of our bodily organs by tracing the flow of food from its original state to its manufacture of bodily energy.

The uses in these fields open the vistas of health and happiness to all the world if only we will be intelligent enough to restrict it to such channels.

While these benefits are not immediately before us, they can be attained through diligence and proper application.

Now, not later, but now, the average American as an individual must consider in terms of individual and collective security what bearing atomic energy will have on his life.

Does this mysterious and tremendous force mean an end to standing armies, large, well-prepared navies, an integrated air force? Certainly not. However, it does necessitate a change in our manner of thinking as regards these forces of security.

Will an army of 10,000,000 soldiers trained to march and fight by hand-to-hand or machine-to-machine combat ever again be necessary? Most certainly not. Our army of the future should be one composed of technicians in the art of atomic war on the one hand and a separate force for occupation duty on the other. New training methods must be developed by the War Department to consummate these changes. Eighteen-year-old boys recently graduated from high schools in this country are not desirable for policing the government and morals of a foreign populace.

Will our Navy as now constituted be sufficient guard against atomic aggression? Again the question precludes the answer as naval strength has never been computed on the basis of the ability to wage or resist atomic warfare. The navy of the future, and we most certainly must maintain one, should be a compact, mobile force capable of speedy retaliation and long staying power. Our Navy must be able to live for extended periods far removed from gigantic drydocks and naval bases. Such large naval yards would be primary targets for the enemy of the future. Their usefulness would not extend beyond 10 minutes of the instigation of hostilities. While it is unthinkable to consider scrapping our Navy or demobilizing its personnel, preparation must be made for concentration of effort to construct vessels and train personnel in the art of atomic warfare.

Our present air forces constitute the branch of our military services least likely to be affected by the change in the method of waging or combatting future wars. The new developments in plane structure and the use of electronic equipment has brought our air forces more nearly abreast of atomic developments. The primary functions of the air forces would remain as originally set up; to deliver to the enemy the destructive force of our weapons and repel enemy air forces attempting to retaliate. Undoubtedly, the use of rockets launched from stationary, fixed ground positions will obviate the necessity for as large air forces as have been contemplated for present methods of combat.

The military and naval services cited in preceding paragraphs are vital and necessary. Their functions are important, their place cannot be filled by other agencies. Nevertheless, these services I consider to be our second line of defense.

We in America, always pushing forward, always in the forefront in the matter of scientific development, whether for war or peace, have neglected entirely the first line of defense in warfare, whether ancient or that of the future, an adequate intelligence system. Our British neighbors have for years maintained a system of military intelligence which has no superiors. Without it, this tight little isle with its far-flung dominions could not have weathered the storm of war and rebellion through the years. We, the greatest Nation in the world, with our linguists, geographers, cartographers, and host of citizens familiar with the peoples of the world, their habits, speech, and problems, have not progressed in our system of intelligence one iota. The Office of Strategic Services, with whom I was proud to serve during World War II, performed heroically under the handicaps confronting it. It was hastily formed and mobilized to do a job which requires years of background and study.

Under these conditions the thousands of men and women recruited from all walks of life performed nobly under the stress of war. Immediately upon cessation of hostilities this organization was demobilized and its functions assumed by the Central Intelligence Group founded by Executive order. This group, composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, and State, with advisers from the military services, is inadequate to perform the task allotted to it. All intelligence information gathered by agents is submitted to the board for review and consideration of action. This necessitates delay in transmittal and in action taken upon such information.

What is needed is a separate, independent intelligence agency with a civilian director responsible only to the President of the United States. Such an agency could procure and disseminate information without delay and without divided authority or friction.

An independent intelligence system would be our first line of defense in the future.

Atomic warfare would not be conducted through exploratory raids and massing of troops preparatory to a declaration of war. The effects of the atom bomb would be known to the defending nation minutes after a decision to wage war was reached by the aggressor.

It is vital that we know the intent of other nations and the scope of their activities in the field of potential military aggression. It is necessary that the heads of our Government are made aware of these intentions beforehand so that proper precautions can be taken either by defensive or retaliatory measures.

Every responsible person connected with the harnessing of atomic energy is agreed that there is no defense against atomic bombs, nor is there likely to be one. The best defensive measures of the last war were 90 percent effective which, while high, would mean certain disaster in atomic warfare. Defense through decentralization of industry and population, while partially effective, would take years and completely dislocate our economy. It is not feasible to advocate such a course.

The sensible solution seems to lie in effective international control through the abolition of atomic weapons by international agreements. Even the peacetime use potential must be subordinated to this aim.

Agreements outlawing the use of atomic weapons as legitimate are not enough. There must be a system of rigid supervision through inspection to make certain that no nation is clandestinely engaged in the manufacture of these weapons while other nations in good faith are abiding by the agreement. Hand in hand with this must go a system of enforcement so that penalties may be applied to those who, with nefarious intent, are violating the covenant.

Supervision or control must take into consideration three factors—those of raw materials, personnel, and production. If sources of supply of the materials necessary to produce atom bombs are known and carefully and continuously scrutinized, there can be no clandestine use of such material. Through registration and restriction of construction, the plants necessary to process the materials may be kept under control. No project of great magnitude could be undertaken without the collaboration of many scientists well known by their contemporaries for their accomplishments and abilities; their whereabouts and experimentations must always be known. These methods of supervision would effectively prevent clandestine manufacture, if agreed upon by the nations of the world.

The tone of this address would indicate that I believe war to be imminent. That is not so. The people of America who have seen two generations of men marching off to battle within 25 years want neither expanded power nor additional territory—the main cause of past wars. I am certain that the other nations of the world, impoverished, fatigued, cold, and hungry, have neither the capacity nor the desire for war. We, the United Nations, who valiantly fought side by side to deter aggression shall certainly fight side by side to maintain peace. I fervently pray that the United Nations structure will be strengthened by the plea of all mankind to cease this horrible game of devastating one another's country and killing one another's children.

War is neither imminent nor inevitable if all the people of the world will devote their efforts toward peace in the same manner they devoted them for war. With a basic foundation in the United Nations organization to assure peaceful settlement of disputes between nations, and adequate safeguards over atomic energy, there need never be war.

We, who have developed the atomic bomb in conjunction with Canada and Great Britain, should make certain that the secret of atomic fission shall not become international property until all nations have demonstrated their willingness to submit to inspection measures guaranteeing that no nation shall manufacture these lethal weapons.

Then, and only then, can we put aside thoughts of defense or offense for war and arouse ourselves to plan the use of this great force to insure things for better living in a better world. We need, in these troublous times, brotherhood of man seeking to better the welfare of all peoples of the world.

I personally believe that the people of the United States have definitely arrived at an unanimous decision that national security can only be guaranteed by adopting a method of control which will prevent future wars. Also such an authority or control, call it what you may, must have the inherent power bestowed upon it through a strong and comprehensive international system of control and inspection set up by a sound and workable treaty. Such a control or authority, in my estimation, should be delegated with the unquestionable power to carry out its duties and able to operate without any individual power of veto. Their responsibility is to forestall the use of atomic energy for devastating purposes and for hard and fast control to the point where atomic energy could only be used for peaceful achievements.

Again, I feel that once atomic energy has been harnessed under permanent and effective world control, it will lose its dread and fear which is so prevalent at this very moment, and become a means of prosperity and progress. According to many of our renowned scientists, atomic energy can improve the health and well-being and can act as a messenger of mercy instead of a fiery-eyed monster of devastation and destruction, worshipped by the gods of war. So, in conclusion, I advocate that atomic energy must be man's servant and not his master.

If we are to survive to participate in a wondrous future, this must be our creed.

Thank you.

Failure To Pass H. R. 2102 Might Easily Cost the Housewives of America in Grocery Bills the Sum of $200,000,000 Annually

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the debate on this bill, and the argument in favor of its passage seems to me to be overwhelming.

However, there are two points that I think could have been stressed more than they were. The first one is this: The need for this labor is very critical in certain areas in California and other Western States and in some Southern States. There can be no question of this. The result is that if this labor is not obtained to harvest the critical perishable crops of my State, the result would inevitably be a short crop.

As an indication of what could happen I might state that in 1945 the total crop of canned fruits and vegetables amounted to 55,000,000 cases. In each one of these cases there are 24 cans, or, if the cans are larger, sometimes there are a lesser number. The result of a short crop could easily be to raise the price of each can of fruit or vegetables the sum of 4 cents or roughly $1 per case. If the crop of canned fruits or vegetables in our State should drop to 40,000,000 cases, instead of 55,000,000 cases or more which was the case in 1946, the result would be that the price could easily increase $1 per case, which would be the equivalent of $40,000,000 increased prices for canned goods for 1 year's crop from California alone. It appeared in the argument that sugar would be affected, and, with the tremendous volume of sugar bought by American housewives, this could add many millions more. The result of all this would be that the ones who would really lose would not be primarily the farmers and processors but the consumers of the United States, the great bulk of whom live in the great cities of this country. So the very ones who are trying to save $10,000,000 in the handling of this problem could easily lose $200,000,000 by increased living costs. We are trying desperately hard to hold the cost of living steady and if possible to reduce it. The only way that this can be done is by increased production. The committee has made it clear and convincing that the passage of this bill would help maintain the high level of production which we have set out to accomplish in the crop year 1947. The failure of this bill or the cutting it down and terminating it on July 1, 1947, could have exactly that result by failing to provide the necessary labor to harvest these crops.

The second point which I think could have been stressed more is this. We are now in the program. Whether we terminate it on July 1, 1947, or January 1, 1948, our producers will bring this labor into America. If it is terminated on July 1 they will gamble that there is some way in which they can get the labor which this program provides. If they do not—and I believe they will not—if the program is terminated on July 1, the inevitable result will be that we will have a short crop. However, the cost whether carried out for 6 months or for 12 months will be approximately the same. The reason is that the bulk of the cost comes from providing transportation for the laborers from Mexico and other points outside the country and whether we handle it for 6 months or 12 months, this cost will remain about the same. Since we have committed ourselves to this cost why not get for our $200 or $250 per laborer a full year's work instead of only a half year's work.

The reasons seem to me overwhelmingly in favor of the passage of the law and the continuation of the program until the end of the year 1947.

Resolutions of Connecticut State Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

CONNECTICUT STATE GRANGE,
February 23, 1947.

Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SEELY-BROWN: The following resolution was adopted at the sixty-second annual session of the Connecticut State Grange:

"Whereas the National Grange opposes peacetime military conscription; and

"Whereas the National Grange is in favor of an adequate defense secured by voluntary means through adequate compensation and training conditions: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Connecticut State Grange go on record as favoring the position of the National Grange."

Fraternally yours,
ELLSWORTH L. COVELL,
Secretary.

"Whereas there is a movement on foot in the United States Congress to reduce our Federal income tax: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Connecticut State Grange favor a reduction in our Federal income tax, but we feel that, because of the increase in the cost of living, the exemption for each person should be increased from $500 to $750."

Resolution adopted at the sixty-second session of the Connecticut State Grange.

Attest:

ELLSWORTH L. COVELL,
Secretary.

"Whereas strikes, lock-outs, and other unnecessary shut-downs of industry injure agricultural operators and employees as well as a great many other innocent parties: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Connecticut State Grange go on record as favoring such action by our United States Congress as will tend to stop strikes and lock-outs, and make such laws as will be fair to both labor and capital and will also take into consideration the rights of the general public."

Adopted at the sixty-second annual session of the Connecticut State Grange.

Attest:

ELLSWORTH L. COVELL,
Secretary.

"Whereas the burden of taxes imposed upon us by the large expenditures necessary to win the war and with the national debt so large that it will take several generations to pay it off; and

"Whereas the only way to reduce taxes is to reduce Government spending: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Connecticut State Grange favor reduced expenditures by our Federal Government by cutting out all unnecessary bureaus and by reducing the size of departments and turning back to the States all possible jobs taken over during the war."

The above resolution adopted at the sixty-second annual session of the Connecticut State Grange.

Attest:

ELLSWORTH L. COVELL,
Secretary.

Address of Hon. Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan, Before the National Association of Home Builders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before the National Association of Home Builders of the United States. I wish I might have participated in all of your proceedings. I know I would have greatly profited by attendance at the general sessions and panel discussions. In them you have discussed just about every conceivable problem that confronts the Government and the builders in the field of home and commercial construction. I am somewhat fearful that anything I might have to say tonight may be mere anticlimax, but there are certain problems of mutual interest to you as home builders and to the Congress of the United States which I would like to discuss. Even if they have been considered fully in your sessions, too much emphasis cannot be placed upon them. They are fundamental and in the solution of them we probably will find the answer to whether it is desirable to perpetuate the American way of life.

We are living in troublous times. As an aftermath of the war we find the world in social, economic, and political chaos. The doubt and uncertainty incident to our attempts to build a solid foundation for world peace and security have, I fear, caused many of our citizens to develop an inferiority complex in respect to our capabilities to effectively administer the new responsibilities which we have assumed. How senseless it is to doubt the strength of American purpose; how unsound to contend that the people of the United States are incapable of solving any problem, domestic or world-wide. Is there any doubt of our ability to understand these problems? If not, there should be no doubt

of our ability to solve them. The American people throughout the 158 years of the existence of the United States as a nation, have always been able eventually to solve each and every problem when they have had an understanding of them. The present generation of Americans will not admit that they are any less capable in these respects than were their forefathers.

Notwithstanding the gloomy utterances of defeatists and others who would make it appear that our Government is as outmoded as the horse and buggy, or the clatter of the "pinks" and fellow travelers of statism and socialism, there is nothing basically wrong with the American system of government. I like always to have in mind the perfect answer to those who contend that the American way of life is wrong, that capitalism has failed; that under the free-enterprise system there can be no social and economic security.

I like to remind those who advocate communism, socialism, fascism, or any other form of collectivism, that the United States is the greatest Nation that ever existed on this earth; that because of, and not in spite of, the American form of government, we here in the United States normally produce and consume more than 50 percent of all the goods which are produced in the world. I like to stress the fact that the American system of government is a free-enterprise system where each person should be entitled to his constitutional right to develop his own mental and physical resources as he chooses, and to whatever extent may be justified by his abilities, without the controls and restraints by government which have prevented the people of other countries from fully employing their faculties to the attainment of comparable standards of living. Adam Smith, in his Wealth of Nations, published in 1776, asserted that every man "so long as he does not violate the laws of justice, should be left perfectly free to pursue his own interest in his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man, or order of men." This is the foundation of the American system, and nothing is so important if we are to continue to prosper, as a continuation of these ideals.

We get a great deal of satisfaction from the fact that under our form of government it has been made possible to acclaim the truth that less than 6 percent of the world's population consume more than 50 percent of the goods and services produced in the world, and that these people produce more than 50 percent of the goods and services consumed in the world. No other nation in the world's history has ever approached such a record, and no other nation will ever match the accomplishments of the American people, unless the restraints and controls exercised by their governments are removed.

To the extent that these controls have been nonexistent in America; to the same extent we in the Congress are determined to remove them in order that men may again be free, to the end that free competitive enterprise may be restored, and that Government shall be restricted to its proper place—an instrumentality for the encouragement of an ever-expanding agriculture, industry, and commerce, but never the means by which individual effort is regimented or controlled.

There are many ways in which the Federal Government can cooperate with private business to remove the bottlenecks of current production. By way of example: Building materials are now or shortly will be produced in adequate quantities; therefore the major obstacles to adequate home construction lie in (1) a possible shortage of labor, and (2) a probable shortage of transportation facilities, especially freight cars.

1. It is expected that management-labor disputes, resulting in production slow-ups or stoppages, will diminish in proportion as the supply of producer and consumer goods catches up with demand. In the meantime, the Government can redefine the standards under which these disputes are to be settled. Effective labor-management legislation may be expected at this session of the Congress, not of a vindictive character, but which will recognize the basic problem, and by the judicious use of existing and new governmental machinery for the settlement of disputes, should result in the prevention of strikes.

2. Investigations are now being made in respect to freight-car shortages. Everything possible will be done to help the railroads get enough cars to move materials. Transportation is recognized as one of the bases of our industrial and agricultural existence. Distribution is as essential as production. We will have to expand our transportation facilities in proportion as we wish to expand our production.

Due to the war we gladly subordinated our very lives to the common purpose—the total defeat of our enemies. During the war, when the Government was about the only customer our farmers and industrialists had, controls were not only expected but undoubtedly desirable. Since VJ-day it has been proven that government is an utter failure as a manager of our economy.

Many of us in Congress have, on many occasions, successfully fought attempts to socialize our economy. You, as home builders, know the power that goes along with control of finance. You perhaps recall the attempts in 1935 to socialize credit, the lifeblood of any capitalistic system. Attempts were made at that time, if you will recall, to force every savings and commercial bank into a banking system capable of being controlled by a single individual at Washington. Our banks would have been forced into the Federal Reserve System. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve would have been politicalized by being made subject to removal at will and without cause, by the President of the United States. No bank could have had its deposits insured were it not a member of this system. It could not withdraw at will without risking the chance of utter ruin. Attempts were made through this system to socialize banking and credit. Those who were advocating the socialization of banking and credit were taking full advantage of the hysteria which was then prevalent, a result of the bank closings in 1933. Although little has been said or written about it, the House and Senate Committees on Banking and Currency defeated these attempts to socialize the banks and our credit system. However, it had to be done over a period of years, and it was not until 1940 that the danger was completely eliminated.

Again in 1939 an attempt was made to socialize banking and credit by the bill H. R. 6971, Seventy-sixth Congress, which in effect would have compelled every savings bank in the United States to have converted to a Federal establishment under the political control of a Federal bureaucracy, or go out of business, to the very apparent detriment if not total destruction of the American free-enterprise system. Again these attempts were frustrated, and I commend for your serious reading the minority report on that bill, which, as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I had the privilege of drafting. Again the Congress of the United States had saved the American way of life from dangers to it which would have been as effective by stealth and indirection as the Constitution had been directly and regularly amended. This bill was held up for more than a year in the Rules Committee, and it was only after the proponents accepted amendments eliminating the objectionable features that it was ever brought to the floor for consideration.

At about this same time you recall the attempts to socialize home building, under the so-called Slum Clearance Act, ideal in its purposes, but if it had been allowed to expand as proposed, it would have been most effectual in the control by government of all home-building activity.

You recall also the attempts to socialize industry and agriculture and medicine. It is to the everlasting credit of the Congress of the United States that these attempts have either been frustrated or by limitations on the activities, both as to time and the standards set up in administration, they have been kept under such control that they either have or can be completely eliminated.

The danger of too much power in Washington over our financial institutions is clearly set forth in a report of the House Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies. This report severely condemns the Home Loan Bank Administration for the methods used in appointing a conservator for a perfectly solvent loan association without notice or hearing.

I have referred to these attempts to socialize the different segments of our economy, only to show that we in the Congress are cognizant of the dangers which confront the American people; that we are determined again to give the American free-enterprise system a chance to function untrammeled by Government control, with the hope and the expectancy that American industry and business, if given a reasonable opportunity, will see to it that the United States is perpetuated as the greatest nation in the world.

Economic, financial, and social stability from now on must be the watchword. What happens if we do not stabilize our economy? Let me call your attention to how serious this is. The United States Government sponsored the International Fund and the International Bank created by the Bretton Woods agreement. Thirty-eight nations, all of the leading nations except Soviet Russia, are now participating in the Fund. The Fund was set up to stabilize world currencies. The currencies of 37 nations are very closely related to the American dollar. Gold and the American dollar are practically synonymous terms. The value of currencies of participating countries are considered in relation to gold and the American dollar. Therefore, fluctuations in the value of the American dollar are reflected in the value of currencies of 37 leading nations of the world. An unstable American dollar will cause instability in the British pound sterling, the French franc, the Dutch guilder, the Mexican peso, and so on, among 37 countries. During the last 6 months of 1946 the American dollar dropped in value from 74 cents to 69 cents. Embarrassing questions were asked by the representatives of foreign countries: "When may we expect a stabilization of the American dollar? When may we expect stability in the American economy? It is our only hope for world financial economic stability."

So we must realize that we have undertaken, whether we like it or not, an obligation to stabilize world finances and economies. If we succeed, we justify confidence in our leadership. The result will be good will and peace throughout the world. Should we fail, righteous indignation will result, to the prejudice of our own position and world peace. Economic instability begets commercial strife. Commercial strife begets expansion policies, perhaps of economic necessity. These in turn beget war. World economic instability usually begets world wars. Therefore, the hope for world peace lies primarily in American financial and economic stability. To this end we must restore the value of the American dollar. The American businessman, the American farmer, the American industrialist, the home builder, must all assume their full share of this responsibility. They must be encouraged to produce, because only by production can the American dollar be stabilized.

If there is economic chaos in America today it surely is not the fault of the American system. The reason for it lies perhaps in the manner in which our American system

has been mismanaged by a politically-minded bureaucracy. It seems to me that the answer lies in freeing the American economy of political and bureaucratic controls as rapidly as possible.

It became very evident upon the adoption of the steel-wage-price formula in early 1946 that there could be no effective stabilization of prices (prices reflect the value of our money) through the medium of price controls. Production costs would be inevitably pyramided upon prices, prices upon production costs, ad infinitum. The line was broken at a most inopportune time. The alternative to price control is production and more production. This is as true in home building as in anything else. Congress realizing this developed a formula in the OPA extension bill of last June, under which prices could be prevented from going unreasonably high, but at the same time assuring such adjustments in prices as to guarantee full and adequate production. The formula was sensible and workable. It provided in substance that no maximum price should be set upon any commodity, of course including building materials, which did not reflect to the producer the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Had this formula been enacted, today we would not be concerned as much as we are with the shortage of building materials at reasonable prices. Through production and competition, the price of an American home would now be within reach of the average citizen. The President in his wisdom vetoed this bill. I have often wondered since then whether he would have done so had he had it to do over again. The OPA bill which was finally enacted was one under which prices could not be controlled; it was a bill to control production, not prices. The very attempt to administer it was bound to result in chaos. It was only when, because of these controls, the American economy was collapsing, that many of the controls were removed by Executive order. The bill which the President vetoed would have resulted in gradual decontrols, with little or no shock to our economy. It was very obvious that the bill which he attempted to administer could result in nothing but disaster.

Let me call attention again to the fact that during the period in which this comedy of errors was operating, the American dollar dropped in value from 74 cents to 69 cents, and has undoubtedly been a deterrent to the restoration of world peace and prosperity. We can profit by these experiences. They are valuable only in the academic sense that a study of them will prevent a recurrence of the mistakes made at that time.

I know that you are interested primarily in what the Congress might do at this session to help you build sufficient homes to adequately house millions of our citizens who do not now have desirable shelters.

I cannot speak for the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman. We have as yet had no hearings. We expect to start hearings at an early date, perhaps within the next 3 weeks. It is expected that the committee will consider a bill dealing with both housing and rents.

In discussing what the bill should contain, I speak only for myself. Some of the suggestions I know will meet with your approval. Others may not. I know that you appreciate the seriousness of the problem, how necessary it is that we proceed cautiously; how disastrous it might be if major mistakes are made.

It is my purpose to introduce legislation which will repeal, with two exceptions, the provisions of Public Law 388 (79th Cong.) sometimes referred to as the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946. I believe that section 10 of the act, which continues construction under title 6 of the National Housing Act, should be retained.

It also might be found desirable to continue some provision for veterans' priorities for purchase or rental, but the time in which the priority must be exercised might well be substantially reduced.

It is not contemplated that any authority to allocate building materials under the Second War Powers Act should be continued.

Of course the bill will remove any authority to set maximum prices on new construction. This has been one of the most serious deterrents to home construction and was ill conceived. It was reasonable to presume that builders would not build houses under a system by which materials were not controlled, where the price of the finished house was under very rigid control. The average builder gambles enough without being expected to assume the obvious risks incident to this practice.

It has been suggested that the Government continue to control the allocation of materials to the extent that a certain percentage would be allocated to commercial building, and a certain percentage to home building. We have had many conferences about this, and I have concluded that it cannot be effectively done without seriously interfering with the free movement of materials which might prevent maximum production, the stock piling of building materials and substantial increases in inventories which are decidedly advisable as aids to the lowering of prices.

In addition to the suggestions which I have made, it also seems desirable to include in the bill a provision for the removal of rent controls on new construction. This can be accomplished without serious dislocations, and should encourage such an expansion in the building of rental properties as to make it possible to remove rent controls on all properties within a reasonably short time.

The continuance of rent controls on existing properties has given us no little concern. It was thought at one time that the administration might take the initiative in this respect, but the President has advised the Congress that it must take full responsibility for any general rent increases on existing property. The Congress will accept that responsibility. It is my suggestion that rent controls be continued on existing properties until March 31, 1948, with any clarification of the law that may be necessary to define the power of the President to remove any or all controls before March 31, 1948, in any area if the need for continuing such controls is no longer required due to sufficient construction of new homes, or when the demand has been reasonably met otherwise.

There is another phase of this problem which is giving us in Congress a great deal of concern. It is in the field of appraisals. Frankly, we are becoming somewhat alarmed about the contingent liability of the United States Government resulting from financing of home construction at inflated values. We have not found an answer to it yet. I think your association can give us a great deal of help. It perhaps lies in the reduction of building costs of homes wherever it can possibly be done and where it will not prejudice maximum production.

I think we should be realistic about this. We are all taxpayers—we all realize the consequences of increasingly large contingent liabilities which might add materially to the national debt if and when real-estate values decline. It is not doing the veteran any service to encourage him to purchase homes beyond his means. Rental housing is the primary need of veterans at this time.

It is likewise very bad practice for the Federal Government to make loans or insure mortgages on properties which, if they are liquidated before the equities are increased sufficiently to offset the value depreciation, will result in prejudice to the national economy by an increase in the national debt. The Government can get its money to cover these losses only by issuing bonds. Increases in the national debt may well offset in currency depreciation all reductions in the expense of running the Federal Government, or efforts to reduce the debt and taxes. Having in view this major problem of economic and financial stability, the home builders, more than any other class, must take the initiative in removing the probabilities that our attempts to stabilize through the medium of curtailing Government expenses be offset by having to meet with actual cash a huge contingent liability.

In conclusion, let me summarize our objectives. They are:

First. To free American industry from the shackles of Government control.

Second. To encourage maximum production with full confidence that America's capacity to produce is so great that free private enterprise may succeed in solving our economic problems, whereas the Government has failed to solve them through the control of our production and through the management of our economy.

Third. That we realize our full responsibility as American producers, to prove to the world that under our form of government we can effectuate financial, economic, and social stability.

Fourth. That by our example we will encourage other countries to emulate our free-enterprise system, to the end that the causes of world wars shall be removed and world peace shall be everlasting.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], in the March issue of Sign magazine, has presented a very brief and intelligent reappraisal of the act which bears his name. Before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the House Education and Labor Committee report a bill on labor relations, I hope the members of these committees will afford themselves an opportunity to digest this rare bit of wisdom on this vital problem.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the editors of Sign magazine for the splendid public service and social good they are performing by publishing articles of such character.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAGNER ACT—A REAPPRAISAL

(By Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER)

Congress is currently engaged in reviewing our national labor policy. If this examination is to be fruitful, we in Congress and the public generally must guard against being sucked into the swirling pools of misleading propaganda which have surrounded so fundamental a measure as the National Labor Relations Act. In a democracy, where the ultimate sanction of any public policy depends upon public acceptance, an informed public opinion is of crucial importance. Yet, a recent Gallup poll disclosed that only 10

percent of the people claim to know what the National Labor Relations Act provides.

If we are to look about us for the blueprints of a postwar labor policy, it is well that we examine critically the operation of our present policy. Not, mind you, to appropriate the divine prerogative of looking upon our work and calling it good. But before we determine whither we go, it is well that we know whence we come and where we are.

We may begin with a single fact: organized labor has grown in membership from about 3,000,000 when the National Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935 to about 15,000,000 in 1946. This is a simple fact, but of elemental significance. It shows that as soon as the obstacle of employer interference was removed, American workers eagerly sought to exercise their right of self-organization.

Moreover, all the propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding, the phenomenal growth of labor organization has taken place without any diminution of the employers' constitutional right to free speech in labor relations. The talk of restoring free speech to the employer is a polite way of reintroducing employer interference, economic retaliation, and other insidious means of discouraging union membership and union activity, thereby greatly diminishing and restricting the exercise of free speech and free choice by the working men and women of America. No constitutional principle can support this, nor would a just labor-relations policy result from it. The National Labor Relations Board under the supervision of the courts (whose chief duty is to uphold the Constitution) should continue to accommodate the right of the workers to organize and the employers' right to free speech in the context of the circumstances of specific cases.

Organization is the spirit of the times. I therefore consider as an attempt to turn the clock back any proposal which would completely eliminate any group of American workers from the protection of the act, whether by contracting the coverage of the statute or by excluding foremen and supervisors. The industrial "middle class" should not be denied the protected right to organize which has been exercised by both rank and file workers and their employers. To do so would be to invite industrial strife and to undermine the already precarious economic position of an important sector of the middle class, one of the mainstays of a democratic society.

The grave forebodings now so widely broadcast concerning the consequences of foremen's collective bargaining are contradicted by actual situations where such bargaining does exist, and will prove as groundless against the experience of the next decade as the equally dire prophecies of a decade ago concerning the effect of collective bargaining generally. I am not among those who are frightened by the stresses and strains incident to the adjustment of conflicting interests. The orderly accommodation of conflicting interests is the peculiar genius of democracy.

It is well to recall these dire prophecies now that collective bargaining has become accepted as our industrial way of life, as is evidenced by pronouncements of all political parties and business organizations.

As collective bargaining grows in maturity, labor-management cooperation—to increase efficiency, reduce waste, and improve products—grows apace. This is evidenced by contract provisions to that effect and by day-to-day industrial relations. Organized labor realizes that its share of the industrial income depends ultimately upon industrial productivity. Labor's increasing interest in the operation and conduct of industry carries with it responsibility for results. Even in the few exceptional crafts and industries where make-work schemes, generally known as featherbedding, are practiced, labor's interest in productivity would prevail were the fear of unemployment banished.

Ill-advised as these practices are, their effect on our economy is insignificant compared to capital monopoly and cartel restrictions of production and price-fixing. The ultimate solution for the elimination of make-work schemes lies in providing full employment and adequate social security. By enhancing the worker's security through elimination of seasonal fluctuations of employment, welfare funds, and through guaranteed annual wage plans, collective bargaining can do a great deal more than it has already done to remove obstacles to industrial efficiency. But collective bargaining alone is inadequate to provide for full employment and adequate social insurance in our complex society. That responsibility rests upon the Government. This has been recognized by our social-security laws and the Full Employment Act of 1946. Our system of free enterprise and political liberty cannot survive without economic security for the mass of our people.

Labor problems cannot be treated in isolation. They must be handled within the broad framework of our whole economy. Nevertheless, collective bargaining must remain the chief means of working out the delicate adjustment between the demands of industrial efficiency and the workers' welfare and security.

Cooperation between labor and management to promote industrial efficiency and employee security would be abruptly cut short by the incredible proposals to prohibit industry-wide bargaining. This type of bargaining, as in Great Britain and Sweden, has characterized maturity in labor relations in the United States. Stabilization of business practices and the elimination of sweatshop wages and working conditions in the needle trades and other industries have gone hand in hand with the establishment of industry-wide bargaining. Industrial strife, chaos, and ruin would follow the outlawing of industry-wide bargaining. It would bring back the cycle of wage and price cutting which was characteristic of the coal industry and other industries in the twenties and early thirties, precisely because there was no Nation-wide organization and collective bargaining.

To apply the antitrust laws to business encourages competition in prices and is economically desirable. To apply the antitrust laws, however, to break up unions would promote competition to reduce wages and the purchasing power of the workers. The way to industrial peace is not through rendering unions impotent to raise and protect the standard of living and the purchasing power of the mass of consumers. That is the route to ruin, not only for labor but for business as well.

In still another sector of labor-management relations, collective bargaining can show a rich and varied experience. Grievance procedures to settle disputes that inevitably arise under collective agreements have become commonplace. Under impetus of directives of the National War Labor Board, voluntary arbitration as the terminal point of grievance machinery is more and more coming in favor as a means of avoiding deadlocks that might lead to strikes or lock-outs during the life of a contract. The President's national labor-management conference of November 1945 included voluntary arbitration as a final step in grievance adjustment among its recommendations.

Giving point and emphasis to procedure for the settlement of disputes under collective agreements are remedies, sanctions, and penalties which are provided in case of contract violation by either party. Company security has become as accepted in labor relations vocabulary as union security.

In case of an unauthorized strike, in violation of the contract, sanctions and penalties are provided against those who are responsible or who participate in it, including the union, union leaders, and the employees. Under the National Labor Relations Act, employees may be and have been discharged for violation of an agreement.

I personally believe that as employers, union leaders, and employees gain maturity in the process of collective bargaining, the unauthorized strike will have gone out of existence irrespective of the presence or absence of sanctions in the trade agreement. But I welcome, nevertheless, the variety of practices that are being tested by the parties themselves to achieve mutual responsibility. I would not call a halt to this salutary development as would those who want to throw the settlement of labor disputes into the courts. Even now unions may be sued as entities in the Federal courts and in many of the States. Contrary to expectations, employers would suffer most from court litigation because there are many more grievances of employees against employers than vice versa.

More important, the courts lack the time, expertness, and informed sympathy to be the proper forum for the settlements of labor disputes. This conclusion is abundantly demonstrated in the record of the courts in labor injunctions. Compliance with contract terms must ultimately depend upon the parties themselves, supplemented by expert and impartial arbitration. Collective bargaining, somewhat like marriage, is a social relationship which depends upon continuity. It is a living together which cannot be safely interrupted while the bones of contention are being rattled in the courts.

It is in the give and take of collective bargaining that frequently conflicting demands are made to serve common purposes. Thus it came to be recognized that it is only under a union shop or maintenance of membership that union leaders can most effectively maintain union discipline, which is so essential to avoidance of unauthorized strikes. Union security is not opposed to but, on the contrary, strengthens company security. Through impartial arbitration, provided for by contract, employers find that they can protect their work force against possible arbitrary expulsion from the union.

Protection of the individual members against discriminating action by the union is not left entirely to collective agreements. A favorite and oft-repeated charge is that the National Labor Relations Act is one-sided because it imposes obligations on the employer without imposing corresponding duties on the unions, particularly for the protection of the individual union member against arbitrary union leadership. This claim ignores a whole body of case law by the National Labor Relations Board and the courts, which constitutes an ever-growing system of union regulation having as its purpose responsibility by the union to the rank and file.

The Supreme Court itself has declared that Federal protection of collective bargaining has imposed upon unions obligations analogous to those of a legislature to protect equally those they represent. Unions may not discriminate against nonmembers whom they represent. They may not use closed-shop contracts to eliminate those who were formerly affiliated with a rival union. Collective agreements may not provide for job discrimination on account of race or religion. Nor will the National Labor Relations Board recognize a bargaining unit organized along racial lines or certify a union which does not equally represent all workers irrespective of race. It may be inferred that political minorities would be held to be equally protected against discrimination by unions.

Our constitutional system does not consist solely of the few pages of the written document but of the whole living framework

of laws, court decisions, and political practices. Similarly, the National Labor Relations Act, as interpreted and applied by the NLRB and the courts, has, through the inner logic of its relationships, become a bill of rights for the protection of individual and minority rights. I welcome the deepening of this trend.

Together with my fellow Americans I am, however, deeply disturbed at the rash of strikes which have occurred during reconversion from war to peace. It would be well, though, that in examining proposals dealing with this problem we should not mistake hysteria for statesmanship.

The recent headline strikes have not been organization strikes but those arising out of differences over conditions of employment, chiefly wages. The National Labor Relations Act has proved successful in its purpose of reducing to a minimum strikes arising over union recognition which in the past loomed largest and were the most difficult to handle. In 1937 only 76 percent of strike idleness was due to organizational strikes, while in 1945 such strike idleness declined to 29 percent of the total.

It wouldn't do to take refuge in irrelevant issues such as the proposals made in regard to picketing. The current wave of strikes, with a few minor exceptions, has been as free from violence as a Sunday-school picnic. The elimination of the labor spy, saboteur, and strikebreaker and the thorough organization of labor have eliminated violence and the sit-down as strike factors.

There is little evidence that local authorities are unable to deal with picket-line violence. The attempt to revive the labor injunction might hamstring labor and result in bloodshed, but would contribute not an iota to reducing the number of strikes.

Similarly lacking in reality are proposals that would make strike votes mandatory. The strikers are those who sustain greatest economic loss and risk losing employment through being displaced in strikes. Despite this, strike leaders have had the unbroken support of the rank and file, in many cases the strike pressure coming from below.

More in point are proposals dealing with the settlement of labor disputes and limitations on the right to strike. Here it must be emphasized that to the extent that we limit or eliminate the right to strike we must substitute for private collective bargaining the decision of a third party or the Government, for otherwise the terms of employment would be determined unilaterally by the employer.

The proposal for strike limitation calling for the "cooling-off" period has been discredited by our war experience as a solvent of labor disputes. The incidence of strikes was greater after the passage of the War Labor Disputes Act than before, even though it contained a strike notice provision.

Prohibition of the right to strike can be effective only in dictatorships under a system of industrial serfdom. Compulsory arbitration has not been successful in eliminating strikes where it has been tried in democratic countries such as Australia and New Zealand.

There is no short-cut panacea for the solution of the strike problem within the framework of a democratic system. Ultimate reliance in industrial democracy, as in its political counterpart, must be placed, not on suppression, but on the willingness of the parties involved to resolve their differences by mutual accord.

There has come to public notice significant evidence that labor and management are relearning the art of collective bargaining neglected during the war. The United Steelworkers Union and United States Steel have extended their contract for a few months while negotiations are proceeding for a new contract, thus in effect establishing a "cooling-off" period by voluntary agreement. In the building industry a labor-management agreement was just made for establishment of machinery for the voluntary settlement of disputes arising out of the interpretation of contracts as well as the making of new contracts.

The wave of postwar strikes appears to have subsided as the reconversion period comes to its end. With the end of war fatigue and the quieting of war nerves, with the dissipation of inflationary pressures by full production, and with the bridging of the gulf between wages and the cost of living, we can expect more maturity in collective bargaining—if it is given a chance. With this will come an era of industrial peace and harmonious labor-management relations, fulfilling the objectives of the act of which I am very proud to be the author.

Insuring Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAN GURNEY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on Tuesday, March 4, 1947, before the Overseas Press Club, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am honored to have the privilege of talking to you members of the Overseas Press Club tonight. During the war you reported directly from the battle fronts. Now your millions of readers are eagerly seeking accurate information from the peace fronts. Yours is the rare opportunity to doubly serve.

You have seen the horrors of conflict at first hand. You possess that hatred of war which is seared in the minds of those who have witnessed destruction, carnage, and human misery on a wholesale scale. The words you write and the words you speak are words of authority. Thus, it is a privilege to be here outlining my ideas on what can and must be done to insure our national security.

To best describe in one word the feeling of peoples all over the globe in this year of 1947, I would select the one word "fear." There is fear of war, fear of starvation, fear of the spread of tyrannical government. The world is stumbling through black clouds of fear for the future, generally.

To disperse these fears the United Nations Organization was created. It was kindled from man's innate desire for peace. True, it is as yet only a pale, white flame which often flickers, fitfully, under the pressure of unhealthy compromise and departure from principle. Still it is the only light in these fear clouds which engulf us.

Our Nation alone can keep that light burning. Why the United States alone? The answer comes naturally. Because we have as a nation the will for peace as contrasted with an aggressive will elsewhere. Also we have that rare combination—industrial capacity, natural resources, technical skill, a healthy free government and a large, strong, eager citizenry to maintain it. Ours is the responsibility. The fact that it is our responsibility is underlined by events of the past few days. Great Britain's international influence and power is waning rapidly. Let's make the United Nations work. We can only exercise that responsibility if we are alert and strong. This, I feel, is our role in the world today. And it is not a role to be played by flinging from us our sword and shield and leaving ourselves standing impotent and foolish in a world in which the forces of power are still at work.

We cannot ask the nations of the world to follow the leadership of a military midget, an aerial ostrich, and a naval minnow.

We followed such a course after World War I. We disowned the League of Nations, scuttled our Navy, and disbanded our Army. What international highway did we thus design and where did it lead us? We designed the highway down which three power-mad dictators drove their panzer divisions, through the crossroads of Manchuria, Munich, and Pearl Harbor, into the blood bath of World War II.

Le us for a moment take a look at the world conditions today which form the backdrop for the efforts to build a lasting peace. We are painfully reminded, first of all, that no major peace treaties have yet been signed. We know the embers of war smoulder in China. We know that Russia maintains a juggernaut of at least 4,000,000 soldiers which could overrun all of Europe. We know that mass starvation—historically a breeder of wars—is prevalent in many parts of the world. We are also mindful of the fact that scientists everywhere are working feverishly to find the key which will unlock the secrets of atomic power. We know that our military forces are now pulled tight—like a thin coverlet of asbestos—over the inflammable areas of the world.

Against that panorama of uncertainty, fear, and suspicion, our national security would be jeopardized by disarmament. Tragic consequences for ourselves and for all peace-loving people of the world would ensue.

The prodigious power and prestige of the United States is vital to the achievement of the United Nations' objectives.

Our challenge today is simply that we must maintain a strength sufficient to preserve the peace until such time as the United Nations can shoulder the burden. I beg your belief in my absolute sincerity and conviction when I say that that challenge is every bit as alarming in its implications, as the challenge presented by the late dictators.

Now, I am not thinking of strength solely in terms of military and naval might, measured by mere numbers of ships, guns, planes, or men. I am thinking in terms of a united people 140,000,000 strong. I am thinking of the spirit of self-sacrifice displayed by these people in the days and months following Pearl Harbor. I am thinking of the courage and determination which pervaded the production lines, the farms, and the firesides. I am thinking of the force which transmitted itself to our fighting men, and enabled them to crush the military strength of Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini. It was not the Army and Navy alone who won World War II—it was American resources and the stamina and unity of the American people. Our strength lay in our unity of purpose.

Today we are fast losing that unity. We seem unwilling to face facts. We want national security, but we won't pay for it. We want production, but we won't work. We want statesmanship, but we settle for politics.

No; I fear that in our precipitous dash to a nebulous normalcy we are fleeing from a challenge as great, or greater, than we faced in December 1941.

To me there is a heart-sickening parallel between our present national conduct and that which followed the First World War. We should have learned then the lesson that the luxury of continued peace cannot be had without effort, without plan, and without sacrifice. There is little today to indicate that we did learn that lesson.

We must take stock right now. We must reestimate the world situation in the light of winning the peace. We must revalue the

means at our disposal for maintaining the peace. We must weld a national determination to win and keep the peace, just as we welded a national determination to win the war.

Perhaps you feel my formula too pat—my posing of the question oversimplified for easy answer. There are ramifications. I certainly am aware of the danger of bankrupting ourselves. I am aware of the danger of a military strangle hold on Government. No gain if either of these were to occur. But I am certain that we can be potent without becoming slaves to our military.

It will cost us money—year after year—but it will cost us as nothing compared to the loss of lives and substance and liberty which we will inevitably suffer if we fail to adopt and maintain a security program.

What is the blueprint for American security? It is simple in outline and practical in detail.

In drafting the specifications for such a program, we must accept the possibility of a future war. Should it come—and God forbid—it will be total. It will come with devastating swiftness. It will strike at our centers of population, at our key industries, at our vital communications, at the nerve centers of Government. Neither the planning nor the execution of national security measures adequate to combat this threat are tasks for our armed forces alone. We must be prepared to convert our total economy quickly to an all-out war effort.

Therefore there must be a permanent agency of Government—a national security agency—above the level of our present War and Navy Departments—to integrate the military and foreign policy of the United States with plans for complete mobilization of our scientific, industrial, and manpower resources. This is the first necessity of a comprehensive security program.

The program must also include a world-wide intelligence system, a comprehensive plan for economic preparedness, supremacy in scientific research and development, and a properly unified Army and Navy.

What then? Our National Guard, of course at least three times as large as it used to be, with a guaranteed plan for full strength through enlistments and a proper training program faithfully carried out, this for quick mobilization on danger day along with our organized and volunteer reserves.

Now comes the test. Will our people support the organization necessary to maintain these forces and back them up? If they will, then they must accept universal military training. Without it, our citizens' army will not be in a state of preparedness. From the citizens training camps must come the annual increments to keep Uncle Sam's muscles strong.

Let us look at it this way. The strength of our defense forces can be measured in terms of actual and potential. Today our actual defense establishment is but a fragile shell. And with each passing month, as World War II recedes into history and our veterans of that conflict grow older, our potential fighting strength dwindles accordingly. We simply must reinforce that fragile shell with an underpinning of young, vigorous, trained personnel who will be ready on a moment's notice to man their stations.

It would be suicidal to assume that in future wars as in past there will be time to train our men after the conflict starts. The Pearl Harbor of the future will be a fusillade of atomic bombs screeching earthward from planes traveling at supersonic speeds. We found, in the last war, that our recruits required 17 weeks of basic training. Can anyone imagine that in a full scale atomic war an aggressor would allow us 17 weeks, or even 17 days, or 17 hours, to prepare and train a force capable of counterattack? It is foolish.

We considered our preparation for the last war feverish and frantic. In the event of any future struggle, history will record that it was leisurely and deliberate. We simply cannot depend on covered-wagon methods in a jet-propelled world.

Opponents of universal military training have confused public thinking by taking up side issues and attacking individual phases of the program. What they overlook, it seems to me, is the tremendous fact that a program of universal military training is a stark military necessity. That's all there is to it. That it is a stark military necessity can be reduced to a simple and unavoidable mathematical certainty. Consider these stubborn facts:

The United Nations cannot now guarantee our security. If there is to be another war it will begin by a surprise attack on the resources of the United States. Atomic warfare would demand large numbers of highly-trained men; therefore they must be trained in peacetime, starting now. We will not maintain a standing Army of sufficient size. Therefore, we must have compulsory peacetime training.

I feel that our Congress tends to lag behind the people on this vital issue. Every Gallup poll over a period of years has shown a majority of more than 70 percent of the people squarely behind a proper citizens' military training program.

It must be borne in mind, of course, that universal military training is only a part of the over-all national security program. This comprehensive program requires not only the sacrifice of time and effort on the part of our young men, but will require sacrifices of industry in diverting part of its peacetime efforts to industrial preparedness. The same is true of science.

In fact, we must all be willing to sacrifice a part of our national income—of our standard of living—in order to guarantee to ourselves and our children the priceless liberties which are typical of America.

We simply cannot remain an island of well-being in an ocean of misery, and expect to be both weak and unmolested.

We consider it sound business to insure against fire, against theft, against floods and tornadoes, against recessions and inflation. We make a great study of these factors and invest against their risk. But do we realistically evaluate the risk of war? If not, why not? It is the one catastrophe which has occurred with greater regularity than any other. It is high time we face that fact and resolve to do something about it.

In next year's budget, 48 cents out of every dollar will go to pay for the cost of prior wars. We simply cannot afford another war.

If we are unwilling to sacrifice a part of our money and a part of our energies until the United Nations can guarantee our safety, we are deliberately inviting the loss of all that we hold sacred. Those sacrifices—if it is proper to call them sacrifices—are trivial, alongside the fearful stakes for which we play. If these pittances can preserve a peace for us and for all the world, we should thank God that it has been so cheaply bought.

And I am not alone in this feeling. The men who fought the last war agree with me. They prefer adequate defense appropriations—with the necessary high taxes—to the sickening prospect of again giving up their civilian pursuits and going off to war.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is a cogent argument for the plan which I have outlined here tonight. The boys who slept in foxholes and swayed in life rafts—the boys who saw their buddies blown to bits—have a better sense of real values than we have.

I say that we can't let these GI's down. They fought valiantly on the battlefield to protect our country. Now the stewardship is ours. We must fight just as valiantly in the halls of Congress, on our farms, in our offices and at our work benches, to protect the peace which they have given us.

This year the course of action which we, as a nation, embark upon can well decide the fate of the United Nations and the peace of the world. The American people will wholeheartedly back any practical program for the defense of our Nation—if they are given the facts necessary to understand it.

You members of the Overseas Press Club have an unprecedented opportunity to bring home to your readers and listeners the facts of life in the world today. If you can somehow push through your typewriters and into the hearts of Americans the feeling that our country must remain vigorous, alert and prepared for any eventuality, then you will have made a monumental contribution to all mankind.

Involvement of the United States in International Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Feet Deeper Into the International Mire" from the Enid (Okla.) News of March 2, last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FEET DEEPER INTO THE INTERNATIONAL MIRE

Once more the United States is asked to get its feet deeper into the international mire, to take over the commitments and obligations of the rapidly disintegrating British Empire, and inject itself further into the maelstrom of seething power politics. Unless we immediately meet the British demand that we aid her in Greece with money and troops, and give Turkey the military and economic assistance which Britain grandiosely promised her, then, we are told, Greece will fall to the Communists, Turkey will be unable to resist Red pressures and we may expect Russia to extend her power throughout the Mediterranean area and eastward to Asia. According to "sources close to General Marshall," Secretary of State, unless the United States does come to pull Britain's chestnuts out of this latest fire, then "with Greece under Soviet domination like her Balkan neighbors, Turkey and the oil-rich Middle East would be helpless to oppose Russian diplomatic and military pressure."

Nobody seems to know exactly the extent of British "commitments" to either Greece or Turkey, but in the former it involves the maintenance of an extensive army to keep the present Greek Government in power, and a minimum of "$250,000,000 in aid to prevent an upheaval that might have dire consequences for the western democracies." Or so the President told an extremely hush-hush conference this week, in which it is reported General Marshall asked for assured congressional backing in anything he might encounter in the forthcoming Moscow conference. The $250,000,000 would be in addition to the $60,000,000 we gave-loaned to Greece last summer; would only be a single year's installment on maintaining Greece for British rule; would be in addition to a new $10,000,000 credit in our surplus commodities overseas, plus the $45,000,000 credit already granted, and in addition to our turning over to the Greek government vast quantities of small arms and other military equipment without obligation.

Thus do our international statesmen continue to push us into the tangled and strangling affairs of a Europe steeped in age-old hatreds and jealousies. Thus are we being led away from the admonitions of George Washington to—

"Have with them (European governments) as little political connection as possible" because "it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations, collisions of her friendships or enemies," for "there can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard."

Certainly our experience should have cured us of serving as the world Santa Claus, of hoping that we can buy European friendship or even European agreement to peaceful procedure; and while it would be well for General Marshall, the one-worlders, and the Wall Street State Department boys generally to read more of the Farewell Address of Washington quoted above, there is every evidence that the administration is determined to push us still further into the morass of European entanglements. From that, there soon can be no turning back, but only further suction finally to drag us down and eventually destroy us along with Britain and the whole of the European Continent.

Republican Dilly-Dallying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Republican Dilly-Dallying," from the Worcester Telegram of February 17 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN DILLY-DALLYING

It is high time an aroused public opinion again reminded the Republican Party why it was chosen at the polls last November to take over the legislative branch of the United States Government. In an atmosphere of political pussyfooting and sidestepping, the Republicans have been eyeing 1948 with more attention than they have paid to the meaning of the 1946 election. If they misinterpret or ignore the 1946 election, and continue trying to be a pale carbon copy of the New Deal, they will correct none of the Democratic failures and will probably lose the Presidency next year.

For it is certainly no exaggeration to state bluntly that if the Republicans do not stick fairly closely to their campaign promises and the election mandate, then they will lose the 1948 election—and justly so. An aroused public demand that the GOP hew to the line on its preelection pledges is plainly called for. Only if the Republican Party itself recognizes that the American voters meant business, and were not fooling when they voted against Democratic high taxes, intrenched bureaucracy, abuses of power by some leaders of organized labor groups, pressure and petty politics, will it justify public confidence.

It was no perfunctory move when Postmaster General Hannegan chose February 6—a week before the Republican Lincoln Day dinners—to throw Mr. Truman's hat into the ring for 1948. Mr. Hannegan spoke as a growing disillusionment with Republican promises was beginning to take form in the country. Republican leaders, talking on every issue at once, had begun to backtrack on such vital matters as tax reduction, the firing of arrogant bureaucrats, and the framing of adequate labor laws to give both labor and management an equality before the law to prevent a repetition of last year's disastrous round of strikes. Ralph Coolidge Mulligan, Telegram Washington correspondent, reported a week ago that some Republicans are engaging in the standard patter of officeholders and officeseekers, in trying to vie with the Democrats in promises. Mr. Hannegan knew this, and knew also that Mr. Truman's popularity in the Gallup survey has been rising recently, probably partly due to Republican ineptitude.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, in a speech at Los Angeles on Lincoln's Birthday, gave a correct interpretation of the meaning of last November 5 when he said the election showed the people "want government out of our homes, out of our businesses. The voters said in landslide terms that they wanted less bureaucracy, less restrictions and red tape coming into their homes and interfering with their personal lives. We want to cut down some of the more than 1,039 Federal agencies that make up our Federal bureaucracy."

The people did speak loudly and plainly for these things last fall. They have been disappointed at the fumbling going on in the Republican ranks in Congress. The people want the action they voted for. They don't want politics as usual. The Republicans can't afford to throw away their big opportunity.

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal—Analysis of Evidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Washington Post this morning there was printed a very fine and fair review of the testimony which has been adduced in connection with the confirmation of Mr. David E. Lilienthal, together with a list of the witnesses who have appeared for him and against him. I believe it would be well worth while to have this review in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix. I am informed by the Public Printer that this matter will occupy six pages of the RECORD and that the cost will be approximately $426.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE IN THE LILIENTHAL CONFIRMATION HEARINGS

INTRODUCTION

The hearings commenced January 27, 1947. There have been 22 sessions of the committee. Of the 55 witnesses called 25 have favored confirmation and 7 have opposed. (See list at end of speech.) Other witnesses have expressed no opinion. The entire record comprises, 1,825 pages.

Testimony in opposition to Mr. Lilienthal has been developed almost entirely by Senator MCKELLAR who, while not a member of the Committee on Atomic Energy, has under the rules of the Senate attended the proceedings, caused subpenas to be issued for witnesses and documents, and examined witnesses frequently at length. Of the entire record approximately 20 percent is devoted to examination conducted by Senator MCKELLAR. The record shows that Senator MCKELLAR has in the past attacked Mr. Lilienthal personally in speeches from the floor of the Senate.

The hearings have been concerned with the nominations for all members of the commission and for the general manager. Only evidence concerning Mr. Lilienthal is reviewed here. The following analysis first presents Mr. Lilienthal's own testimony on the issues raised during the hearings. Consideration is then given to testimony of other witnesses bearing either way on these same issues. This approach will permit the reader to ascertain Mr. Lilienthal's position on the various questions at the outset and then to test the other evidence developed to determine whether it supports or refutes his statements.

EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS OF MR. DAVID LILIENTHAL

Born, Morton, Ill., July 8, 1899; graduated from DePauw University 1930; Law School of Harvard University, LL. D. 1923.

Practiced law in Chicago from 1923 to 1931.

Appointed a member of the Public Service Commission of the State of Wisconsin, 1931. Served until 1933.

June 1933, appointed and confirmed for 3-year term as Director of Tennessee Valley Authority; reappointed and confirmed for 9-year term in May 1936; appointed Chairman 1941; reappointed and confirmed by the Senate for a second 9-year term in May 1945.

As head of the TVA, Mr. Lilienthal was responsible for the administration of a Federal corporation of great magnitude and complexity. During Mr. Lilienthal's incumbency the TVA carried on an extensive construction program, particularly during the war years, one of the largest projects of design, construction, and operation in American history; it designed and operated a chemical plant and laboratories at Muscle Shoals, conducted research and development of natural resources, and conducted the largest integrated electric power generating system in the country.

January 1945, named by the Secretary of State as a member and chairman of a Board of Consultants to the Secretary of State's Committee on Atomic Energy. This Board made a study of the technical problems involved in the international control of atomic energy, visited facilities of the Manhattan district, and prepared a report which was useful in the development of the American proposals for atomic energy control of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, commonly referred to as the Acheson-Lilienthal Report.

November 1, 1946, appointed Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission (R. 5, 6).

MR. LILIENTHAL'S OWN STATEMENT

The functions and operation of the Atomic Energy Commission: Mr. Lilienthal has served on an interim appointment basis as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission since November 1, 1946 (R. 6). On January 1, 1947, the entire atomic energy program in the United States was transferred to the Commission from the Manhattan District by Executive Order (R. 20). Consequently Mr. Lilienthal was able to describe policies already established and in operation. The following is largely taken by direct quotation from his testimony.

The manner in which the Commission will be administered:

"The Commission has adopted a fixed policy * * * that the work will not be divided as to administration between members of the Commission and its chairman. We will act as a body to plan and evaluate programs, to determine upon policies, and to provide a means of execution through a general manager" (R. 62).

The discussions, Mr. Lilienthal states, should be, and have been, informal, ideas can be suggested and criticized, and "decisions are reached without formal motions and seconds, but by realizing that one has come to a kind of sense of the meeting" (R. 63).

He added:

"Without that, and without the agreement that all execution, without exception, shall be carried on through a general manager * * * I do not see how this vast business undertaking can be carried out" (R. 63).

The general manager is a Presidential appointee, "an extraordinarily wise provision" because he thereby has "dignity and prestige equal to the members of the Commission and its chairman" (R. 63). He will have a small staff (R. 63). The "divisions" created by the statute will be "in effect staff divisions to the general manager," "so that the planning of this undertaking shall be carried on by a small group of men close to the general manager, execution carried on as nearly decentralized as possible" (R. 64). "We want to avoid a large Washington force" (R. 64).

Relations with the Military Liaison Committee

The statute itself states that the Commission's functions should be "subject at all times to the paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security." Mr. Lilienthal stated that he approves of this and thinks "the statute is admirably adapted to that purpose" (R. 14). The Commission, among its first acts, conferred with General Groves, and has had "the benefit of a good many consultations" (R. 25) with him and with his deputy, Colonel Nichols (R. 25).

There is no restriction on the ability of the Military Liaison Committee to acquaint itself fully with everything the Commission is doing (R. 29). "The Military Liaison Committee should be informed with respect to the entire operation from mine to active material" (R. 30). "It is up to the Military Liaison Committee to decide what it regards as an appropriate military field" (R. 30).

They are not in attendance at all sessions of the Commission, and that is not contemplated (R. 31). The Military Liaison Committee should have complete freedom of access to all information, and as to what they want, "it is to be their judgment which is final" (R. 54). On the administrative question of how to maintain liaison and still permit the commission to operate, to make urgent decisions, and the like, it is important not to weigh the managerial set-up down with any avoidable paraphernalia (R. 55). "It would present a very great problem if we had so to formalize our meetings" (R. 56).

Relations with the joint congressional committee

Asked as to his personal attitude, Mr. Lilienthal stated:

"I, and I think almost any normal person, vested with this kind of a quite terrible responsibility, would be very disappointed if the joint committee function become perfunctory or was not exercised regularly" (R. 17).

Several times Mr. Lilienthal reiterated the need for, and desirability of, frequent, periodic discussions with the Joint Congressional Committee to coordinate administrative and legislative development (R. 69–70, 17, 20); he "would welcome the closest liaison and working relationships with the joint committee" (R. 18).

The uses of atomic energy

Mr. Lilienthal stated: "In the present state of international affairs, to in any way disregard this direction of policy of the Congress that common defense and security should be paramount, would be foolhardy * * * It is my personal view and deep conviction." (R. 14). However, the statute also has as an objective the development of peacetime uses. On this, Mr. Lilienthal stated:

"By setting up a military liaison committee and by providing for a division of military application, headed by an active officer of the armed forces, and by thus directing that the common defense and security of the country come first, and still directing the Commission to pursue vigorously a program for the beneficent use of atomic energy, we have as nearly a solution of this two-phased discovery as possible" (R. 14). "I feel * * * that there are very great opportunities for the great development of the beneficent uses of atomic energy. * * * That it might be used for human welfare, it seems to me, is just as clear as that it may be used for destruction. That requires a great research program, and it is that to which we have directed a great deal of our attention" (R. 15).

The development of private enterprise in the atomic-energy field

Mr. Lilienthal was questioned directly on his temperamental suitability to restore the extraordinary grant of power, both operating power and patent power, to private enterprise when it can be done consistently with national security (R. 38). He expressed his own belief in his fitness to do so (R. 38), and continued: "Somehow we must see to it, in respect of atomic energy that, to use a colloquialism, 'There will be something in it for industry.' We must see to it that there will be the same kind of incentive-to-development that has developed the automobile and many other things" (R. 28–39).

Referring to the discussions in the Board of State Department consultants, Mr. Lilienthal indicated that he had stubbornly insisted that the whole matter need not be a permanent material monopoly (R. 41). In terms of a philosophy, Mr. Lilienthal stated: "The purpose shall be, as soon as a field of activities is no longer dangerous in terms of the common defense and security, or health hazard, let us say, or some other thing we cannot foresee, just that quickly the Congress ought to provide that then shall become an appropriate field for private undertaking" (R. 42–43). Senator MILLIKIN asked: "Are we in agreement that it is the intent of Congress that these monopolistic features shall be returned to private enterprise as rapidly as is consistent with the public welfare and with safety?" Mr. Lilienthal replied: "I understand that to be the law." The Senator continued: "And are you in sympathy with it?" Mr. Lilienthal answered: "I am in sympathy with it (R. 43–44). He also stated: "The reason I am so sure that this is right is that the story of TVA, the story of the development of the Tennessee Valley, is the story of the encouragement and stimulation of more and more private activity, with the help of Government, and especially the technical help of Government" (R. 41).

The international control of atomic energy

On this issue Mr. Lilienthal stated: "I am in full, complete, and 100-percent agreement with the American proposal now known as the Baruch-Austin proposal" (R. 44). He also stated that, in his view, having in mind the paramount concern for common defense and security, "The statute is admirably adapted to that purpose" (R. 14).

Mr. Lilienthal's political views

Mr. Lilienthal was questioned at length by Senator MCKELLAR on his political philosophy. He stated that he was not a Democrat, not a Republican, not a Communist, not affiliated with any political party, "I am an independent voter" (R. 242). At Senator MCKELLAR's request, Mr. Lilienthal made a full statement of his views (R. 325–327). He said: "Traditionally, democracy has been an affirmative doctrine rather than merely a negative one.

"I believe in—and I conceive the Constitution of the United States to rest upon, as does religion—the fundamental proposition of the integrity of the individual; and that all Government and all private institutions must be designed to promote and protect and defend the integrity and the dignity of the individual. * * *

"Any form of government, therefore, and any other institutions, which make men means rather than ends, which exalt the state or any other institutions above the importance of men, which place arbitrary power over men as a fundamental tenet of government, or any other institutions, are contrary to this conception; and therefore I am deeply opposed to them.

"The communistic philosophy, as well as the communistic form of government, fall within this category, for its fundamental tenet is quite to the contrary. The fundamental tenet of communism is that the state is an end in itself, and that therefore the powers which the state exercises over the individual are without any ethical standards to limit them. That I deeply disbelieve.

"* * * It is important to believe those things which provide a satisfactory and effective alternative. Democracy is that satisfying affirmative alternative. * * *

"One of the tenets of democracy that has grown out of this central core of a belief that the individual comes first, that all men are the children of God and their personalities are therefore sacred, carried with it a great belief in civil liberties and their protection and a repugnance to anyone who would steal from a human being that which is most precious to him, his good name; either by imputing things to him, by innuendo, or by insinuation.

* * * * *

"I deeply believe in the capacity of democracy to surmount any trials that may lie ahead provided only we practice it in our daily lives."

Questioned by Senator MCKELLAR on whether he believed in a government of law, Mr. Lilienthal stated:

"I think we must have a government by law rather than by hearsay and suspicion and innuendo and rumor, but that we also must rely upon men; I think there is a major fallacy in the aphorism that this is a government of laws and not of men, implying that by passing good laws, and not having men of integrity and judgment to administer them, we have thereby achieved sound government" (R. 213–214).

THE TESTIMONY AS TO MR. LILIENTHAL'S ADMINISTRATIVE ABILITY

Statements as to Mr. Lilienthal's administrative ability fairly representing the position of the witnesses testifying on that issue are:

Dr. Vannevar Bush: "He has demonstrated a skill in public affairs and a skill in management" (R. 446).

Harry A. Winnie: "I understand it has been alleged that he is domineering and difficult to work with. As I say, my only experience in working with him was on this board of consultants. There he was far from domineering or difficult to work with. I believe he is an able organizer and administrator, and I believe that his TVA experience will be of great value as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission" (R. 1349, 1350).

Charles A. Thomas: "Certainly he never tried to impress his views or arguments on any of us, and he, at the same time, was very cooperative and impressed by views contrary to his own on these matters of the control of atomic energy" (R. 1412).

William L. Batt: "I want to testify to the very high opinion which the businessmen in the War Production Board formed of Lilienthal's ability. We found him a man of excellent management perception" (R. 1796).

Former Congressman J. Starnes: "Secondly, as a public official I regard him as an able administrator, a good executive, conscientious in the performance of his duties, and a man with vision and character, energy and realism" (R. 453).

Dr. Karl Taylor Compton: "Mr. Lilienthal I came to know slightly during the operation of the Science Advisory Board, back in 1933 and 1934. I was very much impressed with his ability and energy, his efficiency. I didn't know enough about that organization and its problems to have any opinion other than that which I have stated.

"As far as I knew the situation, my opinion of Mr. Lilienthal was entirely favorable. And for a short time before his appointment as Chairman of this Atomic Energy Commission I have heard a good deal of discussion of Mr. Lilienthal. As you probably know, every little group of people interested in this thing over the country was busy selecting its own commission, and I saw a lot of those amateur selections, and Mr. Lilienthal was some place on every list that I saw.

"I have been very much impressed with the policies for the operation of this commission, as I have heard them briefly outlined on one occasion by Mr. Lilienthal. They seemed to me to be very sound; particularly his policy of keeping the Commission together as a unit, so that they will continually work as a team on problems, rather than subdividing them up into a series of individual responsibilities that might lead to eventual conflict between the group" (R. 533, 534).

Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, in response to an inquiry from the chairman whether he had "any difficulties either with the TVA management or with Mr. Lilienthal as chairman of TVA * * * during the war," replied:

"No difficulties at all. We had fairly frequent contacts during the war, on account of war work carried on down in the TVA area. I cannot recall any friction at all. I always had excellent cooperation" (R. 786).

Bernard M. Baruch: "The chairman of the Commission, Mr. Lilienthal, I have known for some time, and I think he is a well-qualified man. He is a man of prodigious energy, of driving force. I think sometimes that in his conception of his duty he drives exceedingly hard; and sometimes he perhaps makes enemies or creates misunderstandings. He never had any with me. * * * Mr. Lilienthal is thoroughly qualified, a good manager, knows his subject. * * * He has as full knowledge of atomic energy and its prospects in future, I suppose, as anybody else. I would say he is a man of integrity and a man of ability, and I think a fine public servant" (R. 257, 258, 278).

Owen D. Young: "I wish to say that he is a man of clear vision, of executive ability, of firmness and unquestionable loyalty, and in a unique position to serve effectively in the position for which the President has nominated him" (R. 1814).

John M. Hancock: "I have seen a good mental capacity, and ability to get hold of difficult problems. So far as his dealings with us have been concerned, he has been very open-minded and very fair-minded" (R. 206).

L. J. Wilhoite: "After 14 years' experience as chairman of the Power Board, as a native of the Tennessee Valley, as a businessman representing eastern capital in the Tennessee Valley, I can say that I regard him as one of the finest, one of the best, and one of the most capable administrators it has ever been my privilege to know" (R. 1511).

Fred C. Schlemmer: "He in my judgment, is a leader and administrator, a coordinator of the effort of others, of the uppermost flight. He can and has furnished inspiration to others to do things thought to be impossible. He is a practical individual who approaches and solves problems in a practical manner. He assembles the facts, evaluates them, and then acts with confidence, determination, and intestinal fortitude" (R. 1493).

A. E. Walthall: "Mr. Lilienthal is a very capable businessman" (R. 1528).

S. R. Finley: "My observation is that he has at all times been honestly and sincerely devoted to carrying out the policies of Congress as he conceived them to be laid down in the act creating the TVA. He has at all times been most approachable and willing to sit down and discuss thoroughly points upon which there might be differences of opinion" (R. 1532).

Joseph H. Lane: "I think he is an extremely capable administrator, because I believe the TVA has been well run within the limits of what a Government agency can do; and it has limitations" (R. 1485).

Three witnesses took a contrary position, Dr. A. E. Morgan, former TVA chairman, who admitted he had prejudiced feelings (R. 953). Mr. L. B. Bolt, Jr., a former employee on the legal staff of TVA from 1935 to 1946, who had been dismissed on the excuse that a veteran was returning (R. 556), and Frank M. Farris, president, Third National Bank, Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. Morgan: "As I worked with Mr. Lilienthal I found him to have very excellent abilities in some ways. He had quick intelligence, and in handling business matters or matters of administration, where his personal interests or desires were not involved, he was quick to get to the point at issue, to brush aside nonessentials, and I should say was an exceptionally suitable person for administrative relationships—where he had no contrary purposes. * * * The difficulty that I found in dealing with Mr. Lilienthal—the difficulties—were of two kinds. One arose out of his personal desire to be irresponsibly in power. I think I could have gotten along, so far as that was concerned. But I was known to the world as chairman of the TVA, and representations were made to the public by the TVA as the TVA, which I considered to be, to use a short word, dishonest" (R. 801, 802, 803).

Dr. Morgan stated that his specific charges had all been presented before a joint committee of the Congress at the time of his dismissal (R. 834, 855). These charges were not supported by the findings of the joint committee (R. 855, 856). Mr. Lilienthal was thereafter confirmed by the Senate to appointment on the TVA Board (R. 6).

Mr. Bolt: "He was not accepted by Tennesseans. He made a strenuous effort, in other words, to get around. Tennesseans had never accepted David Lilienthal. He immediately became a recluse. He saw no one except a very few people in the organization * * * he made a very pretty speech before this committee the other day about democratic principles and fair play and due process. It was an excellent statement. But to my knowledge, Mr. Lilienthal does not practice what he preaches" (R. 545, 546).

Frank M. Farris: "I believe that the general attitude of business and industry as I know it will agree that Mr. Lilienthal is not the sort of man who could best serve the interests of the United States as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Such feeling is based primarily on Mr. Lilienthal's general reputation for contentiousness and arbitrariness in his administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority, on the record of the TVA as a harbor for Communists and Communist sympathizers, and as an agency that tends to ride roughshod over local sentiment of the people brought under its control.

"I believe that if the primary purpose of the TVA under Mr. Lilienthal's management had been to serve rather than to regulate, a far better relationship would have existed between the people of the region and the Authority" (R. 1074, 1075).

THE TESTIMONY AS TO MR. LILIENTHAL'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The question was raised whether Mr. Lilienthal will foster private enterprise in the field of atomic energy in the manner suggested by the statute. This point was not explored to any great extent in the hearings. In addition to Mr. Lilienthal's own testimony, statements were made by some witnesses on the subject which are fairly represented by the following excerpts:

Charles A. Thomas: "Certainly he never tried to impress his views or arguments on any of us and he, at the same time, was very cooperative and impressed by views contrary to his own on these matters of the control of atomic energy.

"I give my judgment on my whole acquaintance with the man, his statements, his attitude entirely. I think I can illustrate that point, because in our report we made it, I think, very clear to a careful reader that there must be an opportunity for industry to have a role in this new development, because we feel that with industry, universities and Government together, we will have a three-horse team.

"Now, Mr. Lilienthal subscribed to that point of view repeatedly. Therefore, I answer your last question by saying that in my opinion of him, my opinion is based not only upon his verbiage, but his attitude and his conduct" (R. 413).

Harry A. Winne: "I believe it has been argued that the United States proposal involves too much interference with our normal economy. We recognized the danger of this and did our best, and when I say 'our best' that includes Mr. Lilienthal, because he was in entire accordance with us every step of the way through this report: To keep this influence to a minimum" (R. 1345).

Joseph H. Lane: "I think that everything that has been done there has been done with an attempt to foster private industry, and I think they have been most cooperative with the Valley" (R. 1481).

L. J. Wilhoite: "Further, as a businessman I have found him extremely understanding and sympathetic with the struggles of private enterprise, with the efforts of men and women in their business ventures to succeed" (R. 1511).

Mr. Bolt stated that Mr. Lilienthal sang a "hymn of hate" against the private power companies (R. 545). This was the only testimony to the contrary.

THE TESTIMONY AS TO MR. LILIENTHAL'S LOYALTY

Statements of witnesses on the question of Mr. Lilienthal's loyalty are set forth below:

Congressman Starnes: "There was not one scintilla of legal or credible testimony that would support a statement or a charge that Mr. Lilienthal was a member of the Communist Party, active in its councils, or sympathetic with its program" (R. 462).

Dr. Conant stated he had not the slightest "doubt of Mr. Lilienthal's loyalty" (R. 293).

Dr. Vannevar Bush: "Mr. Lilienthal I have known for about 15 years. I regard him as a great American, and I am proud that he is my friend. * * * He has ably demonstrated that he is a great American and a loyal one. * * * I have absolutely no qualification in my belief in this man's sincerity, his integrity of character, and his patriotism and loyalty to the United States of America and its institutions and public" (R. 447, 446, 504).

The Reverend Thomas E. O'Connell: "The Catholic Committee of the South believes that the eminent qualifications of Mr. Lilienthal which brought such great success to the TVA and such a bright new outlook to so many people of the South are exactly those needed by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission" (R. 1069, 1070).

Bishop E. H. Hughes: "As for this communistic business, I know of nothing in what David Lilienthal has written or said that can with fairness be interpreted as an offense against our country's theory of democracy * * * when President Truman announced his commission, I felt that he was acting wisely and broadly; and when I knew that David E. Lilienthal had been nominated as chairman, my nonpartisan and noncommunistic mind and heart rejoiced" (R. 1239, 1240).

Bernard Baruch: "I would not say that he was friendly to the communistic cause, Senator, from what I have seen of him" (R. 278).

Owen D. Young: "I wish to say that he is a man of clear vision, of executive ability, of firmness and unquestionable loyalty" (R. 1814).

Harry A. Winne: "I understand Lilienthal is accused of communistic leanings. Certainly I saw nothing in his conduct in our work on this committee that gave any indication at all of any liking for communism or anything approaching it" (R. 1349).

Charles A. Thomas: "During that 3-month period I came to admire the man. And I feel that as far as the charges are concerned that have been made against him as to Communist leanings, I saw nothing of that at all. On the contrary, I think Mr. Lilienthal's views as to the dignity of the individual are quite contrary to any arguments that he is a Communist, or has communistic leanings" (R. 1412, 1413).

Fred C. Schlemmer: "He has no glorified concepts of fanciful uplift. He is not a 'do-gooder', nor is he a Socialist, as I understand socialism to be. He believes inherently in the individual. To say that he is an appeaser of any foreign country is beyond my imagination to believe. I have heard too many expressions from him indicating his high degree of Americanism and his belief of the principles of our Republic to believe any such innuendo" (R. 1493).

Henry Fowler: "I unqualifiedly would support the observations that have been made before this committee: That he is an extremely able and in my judgment an extremely loyal American" (R. 781).

The only statement directly implicating Mr. Lilienthal to the contrary is found in a letter of Judge Asa K. Owen introduced by Senator McKellar.

The letter in part stated: "When we had him here in Wisconsin, I, for one, became convinced of his Red leanings. I never met him, and never had any dealings with him but so frequently read of his views, expressed in the State press, that I was convinced that he was unsound and unsafe" (R. 212).

Mrs. Worrell, of the Woman's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, stated: "We are here to oppose the appointment of David E. Lilienthal to the Atomic Energy Commission and of any other man against whom the finger of suspicion has been or can be pointed" (R. 1766).

OTHER EVIDENCE BEARING INDIRECTLY ON MR. LILIENTHAL'S LOYALTY

No witnesses were produced who testified that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist, nor were any excerpts from his voluminous writings introduced to support such a suggestion. All of the testimony bearing on this issue elicited from people who have known and worked with Mr. Lilienthal was expressly to the contrary as was his own categorical denial.

Senator McKellar, however, sought to show that the TVA under Mr. Lilienthal employed Communists who had a strong influence in the personnel and other policies of that agency and that Mr. Lilienthal was sympathetic to Russia and Communist dominated groups. This charge was never seriously urged in all the prior congressional hearings involving the administration of the TVA, its appropriations, or Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation to positions in the TVA. Such testimony bears only indirectly on the issue of Mr. Lilienthal's own beliefs. It will now be considered.

Attitude toward Russia

The charge was made again by Senator McKellar that Mr. Lilienthal is friendly to Russia, the inference being that he will give atomic secrets to Russia. Direct testimony on this issue follows:

"Senator McKellar. As a matter of fact you feel exceedingly friendly to Russia, do you not?

"Mr. Lilienthal. I have the greatest feeling of sympathy for the Russian people, and not in order to be confirmed to this post or any other would I utter irresponsible expressions of hatred against the people of Russia.

"I say 'sympathy for them,' because I think they are going down a road of governmental institutions which is the road, the historical road, of tyranny. And I have nothing but the most profound sympathy for those people who are caught in that web of tyranny.

"Senator McKellar. Well, do you admire the Russian Government, the present form of the Russian Government?

"Mr. Lilienthal. I have already expressed my profound disagreement with the fundamental human principles of that form of government.

"Senator McKellar. Agreement, did you say?

"Mr. Lilienthal. Disagreement.

"Senator McKellar. I misunderstood you" (R. 348).

Mr. Lilienthal's statement is supported by other testimony concerning his beliefs already reviewed and by a significant conversation which he had prior to his nomination as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission with Chester I. Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. and member of the State Department's Board of Consultants on Control of Atomic Energy. Mr. Barnard testified to a conversation which took place in January 1946, as follows:

"I then said to Mr. Lilienthal: 'What I am afraid of is that the atomic bomb will destroy the liberties of the American people; that it cannot be controlled except by a totalitarian regime.' He then said to me, with the utmost vehemence, 'If it requires a totalitarian regime to control atomic energy and the atomic bomb, I hope one drops on me and my family. I do not want to live, and I want no descendants of mine to live, in a totalitarian society' " (R. 1009).

The record also shows that Mr. Lilienthal was never in Russia (R. 303), has never had correspondence with Premier Stalin or any Russian commissar (R. 346). The evidence does show that certain Russian movies, the nature of which were not disclosed, were exhibited at TVA (R. 1083) and that on one occasion during the war Mr. Lilienthal had some contact with the Soviet Purchasing Commission in connection with the transmittal of engineering data to Russia, acting at the direction of Mr. Stettinius, Lend-Lease Administrator (R. 343). As far as the international atomic energy policy is concerned, the record discloses that Russia opposes the Acheson-Lilienthal Report on Atomic Energy (R. 736, 747) and that Mr. Lilienthal endorses the political implementation of the report represented by Mr. Baruch's provisions for maintaining the veto. In this connection Mr. Lilienthal testified: "I am in full, complete, and 100-percent agreement with the American proposal, now known as the Baruch-Austin proposal" (R. 44).

THE EMPLOYMENT OF COMMUNISTS IN TVA

Southern Conference for Human Welfare

It was established that Mr. Lilienthal along with several hundred other persons, including William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, sponsored a convention of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare held at Chattanooga, Tenn., in 1940 (R. 375).

An unsuccessful effort was made to establish that this organization was a Communist front organization. The record shows that the conference was promoted by Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina and Mr. L. J. Wilhoite, a Chattanooga ice cream manufacturer (R. 376).

Congressman Starnes, former vice chairman of the Dies committee stated that that committee never officially found the organization to be a Communist front organization (R. 469). He further testified:

"Unquestionably there were Communists in that movement. There is no doubt about that. But at the same time there were many of the finest citizens of your section of the country and mine and all over the country, who took an active part at one time whom we can't question as to their Americanism" (R. 469).

The record establishes that Mr. Lilienthal never attended any meeting of the organization (R. 377).

Senator McKellar asserted throughout the hearings that there were from 55 to 65 Communists employed in the TVA. This charge was never substantiated.

The record shows that a thorough investigation of TVA personnel was conducted by the Dies committee in 1940. An undercover investigator for that committee was sent to the TVA area and after he had gathered evidence, hearings were held at Chattanooga and in Washington.

Congressman Starnes, vice chairman of the Dies committee was responsible for this inquiry. His investigation established that there were approximately 55 Communists residing in the Tennessee Valley area but only a few of these persons were employed by the TVA. Congressman Starnes testified that "legal and credible testimony" established that there were three Communists employed by TVA at the time of the investigation (R. 459) in 1940. Two of these were clerks and the other a stenographer (R. 460). The Dies committee seized written reports prepared by the secretary of the Communist Party in the Tennessee Valley area. The secretary's most optimistic reports indicated that there were seven members of the Communist Party employed by the TVA 3 years prior to the investigation in 1937 (R. 460). Mr. Starnes further testified: "With all the emphasis at my command I want to say that at no time during the course of this investigation was there a charge that Mr. Lilienthal was a member of the Communist Party, had participated in its activities, or was sympathetic with its program. The same can be said of * * * every other man in high responsible, administrative, or policy-making positions" (R. 462). On the basis of this testimony there is reason to believe that Senator McKellar based his accusations upon evidence relating to the number of Communists in the entire Tennessee Valley area, overlooking the fact that only three of these Communists in 1940 were employed by the TVA.

As far as Mr. Lilienthal's responsibility for employment of Communists in TVA is concerned, the evidence shows that TVA regularly had from 13,000 to 18,000 persons on its staff (R. 329), and that during the period that Mr. Lilienthal was a member of the Board of Directors of the TVA there were literally hundreds of thousands of persons employed by reason of personnel turn-over (R. 991). As a member of the TVA Board of Directors, Mr. Lilienthal was not generally consulted concerning employment, particularly

of clerical and steongraphic personnel (R. 396). This was left to subordinate officers. Mr. Lilienthal was interested in the employment of certain key personnel (R. 11). No key employee is shown to have been a Communist or sympathetic to communism (R. 462).

When the findings of the Dies committee were brought to the attention of the TVA Board, hearings were held with respect to the three individuals named by the committee as Communists. One resigned, one was dismissed for disloyalty and the third employee, a Mr. Hart, was retained on the TVA pay roll (R. 463). The evidence shows that Mr. Hart joined the Communist Party at the age of 19 and voluntarily resigned at the age of 21, 6 months prior to the Dies investigation when he became disillusioned at the time of the Russian Pact with Hitler (PWR. 49). Mr. Hart occupied a minor clerical position. His father was a professor at Vanderbilt University (PWR. 39). It was decided by Mr. Clapp, chief of TVA personnel, that Mr. Hart should be retained, that he was a "fuzzy, idealistic youngster" (R. 331). Mr. Lilienthal does not recall this decision having brought to his attention but it may have come to the TVA Board (R. 331). Mr. Hart subsequently was drafted into the armed forces and is no longer with the TVA (R. 1162).

In addition to the three TVA Communists specified by the Dies committee, Senator McKellar sought to prove that other TVA employees were, at different times, members of the Communist Party or fellow travelers.

Two of the witnesses called for this purpose—Messrs. Smith and Bolt—based their testimony upon the information contained in the Hart letter, discussed below (R. 915, 916; R. 619, 620). Their testimony consequently has no more probative value than the letter itself.

The other witnesses—Mrs. Parris, Mrs. Williams and Mr. Comer—named various TVA employees whom they considered Communists (R. 1628; R. 1771; R. 562). The witnesses did not agree among themselves on who were and who were not Communists. None of the witnesses implicated Mr. Lilienthal in any way; one specifically stated that Mr. Lilienthal had no knowledge of the activities of such Communists as they believed there were in TVA (R. 1775). In general, the testimony of these witnesses corresponded with the testimony which they gave before the Dies committee in 1940, as a result of which that committee concluded that only the three employees already mentioned were members of the Communist Party. Characterizing their testimony at the Dies committee hearing, former Congressman Starnes stated at this hearing:

"Much of the testimony was wholly hearsay. A lot of it, it was apparent to the most casual observer, was hearsay and based upon wounded and piqued feelings, on the one hand, and strife between the two labor organizations on the other" (R. 459). The testimony before the Atomic Energy Commission was not substantially different.

Considerable testimony was taken concerning the loyalty of one former TVA employee, Mr. Herbert Marks, now general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission and a friend of Mr. Lilienthal. In view of his present position it should be noted that the evidence wholly fails to support the charge that he is a Communist or has Communist sympathies. His loyalty is certified in the strongest terms by Under Secretary of State Acheson, Hon. John Lord O'Brian, Col. Walker Cisler, with all of whom he worked on close terms, and by Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of General Electric; Donald Nelson, president Society Independent Motion Picture Producers; William L. Batt, president, SKF Industries; Ernest Kanzler, formerly vice president Ford Motor Co.; C. H. Matthiessen, jr., vice president, Hawaiian Pineapple Co.; Amory Houghton, president of Corning Glass Co., and others familiar with his work and beliefs (R. 699, 759, 762, 763).

Other evidence introduced by Senator McKellar pointing to communistic activities in the TVA consisted of a statement by a Dies committee investigator that copies of the Daily Worker were distributed to certain TVA employees. This was based upon his observation through field glasses from a room across the street from TVA offices (R. 1118). There was also evidence that Russian motion pictures were shown in the TVA auditorium (R. 1083). Finally, there is the evidence represented by the so-called Hart letter. The facts as to this letter are in sharp dispute and will be reviewed separately.

THE HART LETTER

The so-called Hart letter is a mimeographed copy of a missing photostat of a missing original that is represented to have been a letter dated January 31, 1939, written by Henry C. Hart, then a clerical employee of the TVA, to Robert Hall, identified secretary of the Communist Party in Birmingham, Ala. (letter appears at R. 367). The letter describes a successful Communist plot to oust James L. Smith from his position as chief of the TVA central files. Smith was dismissed from his position after a hearing on complaint of a TVA union shop committee (PWR 59). The work of various minor TVA employees, who are called comrades, is described in the letter and the letter mentions the cooperation of another comrade whose name will not be mentioned because of the high position he occupies.

Two questions are presented: First, is the letter genuine; and, second, are the facts recited in the letter true or false? Mr. Hart has readily admitted he had been a Communist earlier (R. 1173, 1200), but has categorically and consistently denied writing or signing the letter (R. 1185). Substantial evidence was presented indicating that the facts recited in the letter, whatever its authenticity, are inaccurate (R. 166 et seq., 1193 et seq., PWR 49). Testimony concerning the genuineness of the letter will be considered here. It should be noted, however, that there is no evidence from any witness identifying the name of the comrade in high position mentioned in the letter, and that there is no evidence establishing that Mr. Lilienthal had knowledge of the Communist plot described (assuming it to have existed), participated in it, or gave it support and assistance. Mr. Lilienthal does not recall ever having seen the Hart letter (R. 367).

The genuineness of the Hart letter is sharply disputed and complete proof that Hart wrote such a letter was completely lacking. The testimony of witnesses supporting the letter was in several respects discredited.

Mr. Barker testified that he discovered the letter on April 9, 1940, when, in his capacity as an investigator of the Dies committee, he made a raid with a Birmingham police detective named Ollie Osborne on the Communist Party headquarters in that city (R. 960). Barker arrived in Birmingham on April 9 and got the keys to the Communist headquarters from Osborne, who had taken them from the person of a man who had been found by Osborne in the party offices to which he forced entry, and who was then placed in the Birmingham jail when he refused to answer Barker's and Osborne's questions (R. 1091–96, 960). Barker was conducting an investigation into TVA personnel for the Dies committee (R. 1088). He testified that he personally found the letter in the files at the Communist Party headquarters; that he caused two photostat copies of the letter to be made along with a number of other documents, and returned the originals to the Communist Party files (R. 1096). Osborne confirmed this testimony (R. 960).

The original of the Hart letter was not produced at the confirmation hearings and its absence is not accounted for. It was not subpenaed. The only copy of the Hart letter made available at the hearings was what purported to be a mimeographed copy of one of the photostats prepared under the circumstances noted above. Neither of the photostat copies was produced before the confirmation hearings, and the absence of the photostats was not accounted for. Thus the Hart letter purports to be a mimeographed copy of a photostat of an original, and neither the photostat nor the original was produced. There is no explanation as to why mimeographed copies of the letter were prepared, by whom they were prepared, or how they got into the Dies committee files.

The mimeographed copy, of course, contains only a typewritten signature. There was no proof of any kind as to the genuineness of the signature on the original or the photostat from which the mimeographed copy purported to have been made. Barker testified that he never compared the signature on the original or the photostat with Hart's signature (R. 1110). There is some discrepancy in the evidence as to whether the signature on the letter was Henry C. Hart or Thomas E. Hart, Jr., the former being Hart's true name, the latter being the name of an unidentified person (R. 975, 1192).

Barker testified that one photostat copy of the Hart letter was given to Osborne at the time the letter was seized (PWR. 560, 561, 579; R. 1100, 1140), but this Osborne denies (R. 963). Barker stated that the other copy was delivered to Congressman Dies and that he discussed it with him (R. 1101). Congressman Dies does not recall ever having seen the letter (R. 1735), and Mr. Stripling, technically in charge of evidence in the Dies committee files, testified that he never saw the letter in original or photostat form (R. 998). Osborne's testimony that he subsequently talked to Dies and Stripling about the letter when they were together in a Birmingham hotel (R. 965), is denied by Stripling, who stated he was never in Birmingham with Congressman Dies (R. 997).

Barker was engaged upon an investigation of Communist activities in the TVA and the letter, if genuine, is incriminating. It was never produced at the subsequent hearings involving TVA personnel (R. 488, 1110, 1132). Its existence was not known to Congressman Starnes, conducting the investigation, and none of the witnesses, including Hart or the other individuals mentioned in the letter, were ever questioned concerning it (R. 465, 495, 488, 1193). Barker explained that this resulted from the fact that the letter had been illegally seized and that Congressman Dies did not wish it used or even disclosed to other members of the committee (R. 1106–9, 1144). It would have been possible to question witnesses concerning the substance of the letter without revealing its illegal seizure, but this was not done (PWR 3). Congressman Dies' denial that he ever saw the letter is not consistent with Barker's statement. A witness also testified that Mr. Dies told him that the fact the letter was seized illegally "would have no bearing on using it, because half the stuff we had used was gotten illegally" (R. 1756).

The letter was first made public by the Knoxville Journal on June 27, 1943 (R. 1187). Barker testified that he did not give a copy of the letter to the Knoxville Journal (R. 1159–60). Two representatives of the Knoxville Journal state that Barker gave them a mimeographed copy of the letter from which the article was prepared (R. 1751). It was established that Barker was in Knoxville shortly before the letter was made public and that he had the Dies committee files with him (R. 1158, 1751). Sometime later another paper in Tennessee published the text of the letter stating that its existence had been established in Washington through Mr. Stripling, of the Dies committee (R. 1189).

Mr. Stripling states he did not authorize the publication of the letter or admit its existence, and that he was out of town at the time he was supposed to have talked by telephone from Washington with the newspaper in question (PWR 1000).

When the letter was first made public in the Knoxville Journal, Hart, who was then an employee of the TVA, submitted through TVA channels to Congressman Dies a detailed affidavit which stated, among other things, "I never wrote or signed such a letter. If such a letter does exist signed with my name, it is a forgery." (R1167-1191). In the affidavit and in subsequent testimony, Hart disclosed a number of circumstances tending to indicate that he could not have written the letter in question. His statements under this heading are plausible and supported by testimony of Mr. Clapp and others concerned in the Smith case who point to other reasons for Smith's dismissal (PWR 59). Smith never referred to the alleged Communist plot against him in any of the protracted hearings before the TVA preceding his dismissal (PWR 357). The testimony of the post-office box holder for the box given as the return address on the letter denied that Hart had access to the box or used it for correspondence, and Hart denied knowing the owner of the box (R. 1185). There is no evidence that Hart wrote any letters to Hall. Hart further stated that by January 1939 he had resigned from the Communist Party (R. 1181). A Mrs. Partis, of a Fountain City garbage disposal company, testified that Hart was still a member of the party at this time. Her testimony does not indicate on what basis this assertion is made (R. 1628).

WITNESSES TESTIFYING IN SUPPORT OF CONFIRMATION

(In the order in which they appeared before the committee)

John M. Hancock, New York, N. Y. Partner, Lehman Bros.; director, various large corporations; associated with B. M. Baruch on atomic-energy plans.

Bernard M. Baruch, New York, N. Y. Industrialist and financier; United States representative to United Nations on atomic-energy control.

Dr. James Bryan Conant, Cambridge, Mass. President, Harvard University; special consultant on Manhattan district project.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, Washington, D. C. President, Carnegie Institute of Washington; director, Office of Scientific Research and Development; chairman, Joint Research and Development Board of the Army and Navy.

Congressman Joe Starnes, Guntersville, Ala., former Member of Congress, Fifth Congressional District, Alabama; member throughout its existence, Special House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Dr. Karl Taylor Compton, Cambridge, Mass. President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff Evaluation Board, atomic-bomb tests.

Henry H. Fowler, Washington, D. C. Practicing attorney, former attorney, TVA staff.

Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Washington, D. C., Secretary of War.

Chester I. Barnard, Newark, N. J., President, New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; member, State Department Board of Consultants on Atomic Energy.

Rev. Thomas E. O'Connell, Richmond, Va. Past president, Catholic Committee of the South.

Bishop E. H. Hughes, Chevy Chase, Md. Senior bishop, Methodist Church; formerly president, De Pauw University.

Harry A. Winne, Schenectady, N. Y. Vice president in charge of engineering policy, General Electric Co.; member, Board of Consultants, State Department Committee on Atomic Energy.

Charles A. Thomas, St. Louis, Mo. Vice president in charge of research and development, Monsanto Chemical Co.; member, State Department Board of Consultants on Atomic Energy.

Barrett C. Shelton, Decatur, Ala. Publisher, Decatur Daily News.

R. W. Bishop, Guntersville, Ala.

Louis A. Eckl, Florence, Ala. Editor, Florence (Ala.) Times and Tri-Cities Daily.

H. E. Monroe, Huntsville, Ala. President, Chamber of Commerce.

Thomas McCroskey, Knoxville, Tenn. Retired farmer.

Joseph H. Lane, Chattanooga, Tenn. President, Cavalier Corp.

Fred C. Schlemmer, Chattanooga, Tenn. Peerless Wooley Mills.

L. J. Wilhoite, Chattanooga, Tenn. Southern Dairies, Inc.

George H. Wright, Sweetwater, Tenn. Vice president, Tennessee Retail Hardware Dealers Association.

A. E. Walthall, Athens, Tenn. Athens Rolling Mill and Taylor Implement Manufacturing Co.

S. R. Finley, Chattanooga, Tenn. General superintendent, Electric Power Board of Chattanooga.

William L. Batt, Philadelphia, Pa. President, SKF Industries, former Vice Chairman, WPB.

WITNESSES TESTIFYING IN OPPOSITION TO CONFIRMATION

(In the order in which they appeared before the committee)

L. T. Bolt, Jr., Knoxville, Tenn. Practicing attorney, formerly attorney, TVA staff.

Jack Comer, Knoxville, Tenn. Practicing attorney, former TVA mimeograph operator.

Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, Yellow Springs, Ohio. Former chairman, TVA, retired.

Agnes Waters, Washington, D. C. Housewife.

James L. Smith, Knoxville, Tenn. Former Chief, TVA Central Files Section.

Frank M. Farris, Nashville, Tenn. President, Third National Bank.

Mrs. Margaret Hopkins Worrell, Washington, D. C. Woman's Patriotic Conference on National Defense.

The Budget Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Budget Mystery," from the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET MYSTERY

The Senate has now voted to cut the President's budget by four and a half billion dollars. The House of Representatives holds out for its own proposed cut of six billion. The matter now goes to conference. But the most remarkable thing about the whole congressional handling of this important question is that there has been no authoritative public statement thus far from any quarter as to how either the four and a half billion cut or the six billion cut would be achieved. By how much, if at all, is it proposed to cut expenditures for national defense? How about the so-called international budget? Is anything coming off the President's estimates for veterans' relief? For public works? For conservation? For law enforcement? The public does not know the answers to these questions. Neither does the great majority of Members of Congress. And if the budget committees themselves know the answers, they have thus far kept them secret.

The new rules under which the budget committees are now operating (as the result of reforms in congressional procedure which were adopted at the last session) direct these committees "to meet at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year."

Despite these explicit instructions, all we have had thus far has been the over-all figures, and not the legislative budget on which these figures are, or should be, based. There has been no legislative budget. So far as the public record is concerned, a blindfolded Congress is picking figures from a hat.

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very timely editorial entitled "A Question of Confidence," from the Christian Science Monitor of March 3, having to do with the Lilienthal appointment, be printed in the RECORD. The editorial contains much food for thought, and I commend it to my fellow Senators as they approach consideration of Mr. Lilienthal's nomination.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A QUESTION OF CONFIDENCE

We hear from several sides opponents of the Lilienthal appointment saying that the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission should go to somebody else who can command the confidence of everybody. United public support for any nominee to such an important office is highly desirable. But it is not the only question to be considered. And it is something some of the best public servants have had to win after they took office.

That has been true of course with several Presidents, and some did not even have a popular majority. It was true of Chief Justice Hughes—if strong opposition in the Senate is to be taken as indicating lack of confidence. He was confirmed in 1930 only after a bitter fight and with 26 votes against him. The Senate battle over nomination of Louis D. Brandeis to the Supreme Court was similar.

Moreover, this business of confidence cuts both ways. How far should Congress go in destroying public confidence? William L. Batt, able and respected business leader, made a pertinent point when he declared that such attacks as have been heaped on Mr. Lilienthal threaten to undermine the morale of the civil service. He spoke of "great numbers of public servants who literally have had their hearts broken" and

have retired because of the abuse and obstacles encountered in Government work.

Along the same line is the statement of Dr. Karl T. Compton, who reports a "universal feeling of disillusionment and disgust" among nuclear scientists over the attacks on Mr. Lilienthal. He declares that there is a shortage of competent men to carry on atomic development, that most of those who have stayed in Government service have done so from a sense of duty and will either quit or lose heart if the anti-Lilienthal campaign succeeds.

That there has been such a campaign is evident from the fact that when he was last nominated as head of TVA he was quickly confirmed in the Senate by a voice vote. And when President Truman named him for the work he has been conducting for some months as Chief of the Atomic Energy Commission there was general acclaim. His conduct of the office is not the basis for present opposition. Most of it seems to come from a calculated effort to destroy public confidence in an able and loyal official. How far can America go in that direction and maintain an effective public service?

Government Spending and Dairy Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials from the Daily Oklahoman, the first entitled "Spending Imaginary Money"; the second, "A Strange Inconsistency"; and, the third, "Monkeying With Dairy Prices."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPENDING IMAGINARY MONEY

Will the United States have a total national income of $167,000,000,000 in 1948? Nobody knows for sure, but Patrick Henry spoke wisely when he said that past experience is the best lamp whereby footsteps may be guided. So let's look at the record.

Quoting Senator BYRD's official report, the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council points out that President Truman's estimate of $28,800,000,000 tax receipts for 1948 is based upon a hypothetical $167,000,000,000 national income. The President asks for $37,500,000,000 for the budget, and apparently his request is based more upon what he thinks the people can pay by squeezing out every possible cent, rather than upon actual needs of government.

Senator BYRD further points out that if the national income should shrink to $150,000,000,000, the tax collections would amount to only $32,000,000,000, so, in the face of what would still be considered prosperity, and with people taxed to the bled-white limit for peacetime government, we would still have a deficit of $5,500,000,000 for that year.

However, the more ominous question is: Can we be reasonably certain of having a national income of even as much as $150,000,000,000 in 1948?

In 1929, the biggest boom year after the First World War, the total national income was $83,283,000,000. We have no more productive land than in 1929—in fact soil erosion has washed away several billion dollars' worth of soil since then, and that is our basic wealth. Our mineral wealth, according to New Dealer Harold Ickes, has been tremendously depleted since 1929.

In 1931 the national income slumped to $54,431,000,000, and in 1933 to $42,280,000,000, or about one-fourth of the figure upon which Mr. Truman bases his optimistic imaginings. In 1938, when things began to look comparatively healthy again, the national income was only $64,134,000,000. In 1940, when the European war was on in full fury and our industrial production was called upon for munitions and supplies in vast volume, the national income was only $77,185,000,000. In that year we really had a boom. Not a healthy one, because war booms are never healthy, but a boom nevertheless. Yet the figure was less than half of what Mr. Truman is talking about.

Even if we disregard the foregoing figures, which we cannot safely do, we must recognize that heavy taxation is an instrument producing poverty. It is a dead drag on all industry and prosperity. There is no logic, common sense, or precedent that justifies the enormous budget.

A STRANGE INCONSISTENCY

In a general and yet definite way, the element in the national government which insists upon a huge governmental spending program is the same element that is continually removing large sections of our taxing base from the tax rolls.

This is noticeably true with regard to TVA and similar power projects, which are granted large immunities from taxation, in competition with private enterprise, and also with regard to certain cooperatives, which call themselves "farmers' organizations" to get under the law.

The two classes of industry, which make it more and more difficult for private enterprise to carry its share of the general tax load, are favored by the lavish spenders. So the matter of Federal solvency is being cut down from both ends—by extravagant spending and by reducing the tax base.

MONKEYING WITH DAIRY PRICES

Price supports for dairy products are a headache to the Government. Already a support for dry milk powder has been announced, and next will probably be a floor under butter. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson fears a milk shortage.

Undoubtedly the milk producers have had a hard time making both ends meet, but indications are that Government monkeying with the law of supply and demand on many fronts is at the bottom of the whole difficulty. Under such monkeying, no economic problem ever stays solved.

Eight Hundred Thousand DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Eight Hundred Thousand DP's" by Daniel A. Poling, from the Philadelphia Bulletin of March 3, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS ALL

EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND DP'S

(By Daniel A Poling)

England's labor shortage, her idle coal mines, and silent industries again remind us that in the DP camps of Europe are hundreds of thousands of eager workers waiting to go to work

In a remarkable letter, Jacob Billikopf calls attention to the fact that 800,000 men, women, and children are now confined in these camps. It may surprise you, as it did me, to know that nearly 600,000 of these are Christians. Right now France refuses to return 600,000 war prisoners that the American Army captured, because France needs the manpower. Our own Department of Labor reports crucial shortages of agricultural and construction workers, as well as domestic help. The Department tells us that the shortage in the West is severe enough to vacate farms.

Dr. Earl G. Harrison, former Commissioner of Immigration, one of the wisest of our public servants, has opened a campaign to permit 400,000 of the displaced to enter the United States during the next 4 years. Even this number would not fill the regular unused quotas of war years but Dr. Harrison affirms that they would relieve the shortage of farm labor and domestic help. Equally important is the fact that admitting them would relieve a social pressure as dangerous to us as to Europe—and surely there is something more.

Here is a human problem so poignant that the heart of the world can hardly contain it. But while the innocent cry to heaven, thus far only heaven seems to have heard. The hands of the Nazis are red with blood but regarding the fate of these 800,000 our hands are idle. We have given bread and shelter (behind wire and barricades) but unless we do more we shall pass on to our children a sin of neglect that will hinder and hurt unborn generations.

Role of United States in Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials from the Christian Science Monitor of February 28, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 28, 1947]

HOW FAR IN A GENERATION?

Have you read The Troubled Outlook of the Hour in a neighboring column? Does it sound both familiar and timely? It was written 27 years ago by the late Prof. Stephen Leacock, an able scholar in the field of political economy (although more widely known through his spare-time humorous writings). The passage comes from the first chapter

of his book, The Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice. And that title should be as challenging today as it was in 1920.

Looking back over the intervening years, it is interesting to note that Professor Leacock thought then that the choice lay between socialism and capitalism; that through socialism (he envisioned the Marxist, Russian kind) runs the path to slavery; that the only workable solution in the world today lies in a social-minded—not a socialistic—free-enterprise democracy. It is encouraging to realize that considerable progress has been made.

But, having taken this much into account, we are back where we began: The picture Professor Leacock sketched a generation ago applies specifically, disturbingly, accusingly today.

What has America done and failed to do that history should seem to come full circle back to the riddles and frustrations of a quarter century past? Why should strike again be following upon strike? Why should the wage-price, price-wage spiral have us asking again. Is it wealth or is it poverty? Why should the gulf between the palace and the slum still yawn so omniously when the capacity to produce since Professor Leacock wrote has probably more than doubled? What could America have been doing in the years since 1920 so that it might not now be seeing fierce eyes over the rim of the Russian horizon?"

History does not repeat itself—completely, absolutely. But when a Nation can see so close a parallel between the pressing problems—and the background of those problems—of its present and its past, it is time to do some heart-searching.

America still has democracy—in some ways, more. America still has free enterprise—tainted somewhat with giantism and monopoly, to be sure, but not with outright socialism. How much social-mindedness is it practicing? How much is it willing to temper acquisitiveness and drive with more awareness of one community and one world? Perhaps in these last two questions lies the key.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 28, 1947]

FIGHTING FOR AND WINNING THE PEACE

DOWN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD

(By Erwin D. Canham)

It's good to be back in the United States after 5 weeks in the Orient. I want to tell you the most significant thing I saw on the trip. It was not in Tokyo, nor in Korea, nor in China, nor in the Philippines. It was last Monday afternoon, at the Fairfield Airport, in California. It was a sign, reading: "Washington, D. C., 2,400 air miles."

The fact that between the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts there is a Nation spanning over 2,400 miles—a nation with a standard of living and an economic and political power and civilization and a way of life and an outlook on the world which is ours—that was the most significant fact I observed.

The richness and luxury and comfort of America compared to the Orient are, of course, very striking. But these things are not very important—not a very good guaranty of permanent values. It's well to remember that the Orient had such richness and luxury long before we had it. In Japan and China they produced glowing silks and delicate lacquers and exquisite china and carvings when America was a howling wilderness and our ancestors in the Brtish Isles or northern Europe were in the dripping forests painting themselves blue. Yet these rich elements of civilization passed away.

It is important that we preserve what lies in those 2,400 miles between Fairfield and Washington. It is important that what lies in those 2,400 miles does its part to extend and to preserve civilization in the world. The world cannot long exist both slave and free. America has a great historic opportunity to save itself by saving its fellow man.

I do not return to tell you that Uncle Sam must always be Uncle Santa. I simply point out that our welfare is inseparable from the welfare of others, and that beyond our borders tonight are millions upon millions of our brothers, men and women and children, who do not enjoy what we have in these 2,400 miles and whose standards and outlook must be brought to share in what is right and good and sound in what we have. We must not seek to impose our pattern rigidly upon others. What we must share is the opportunity to achieve a pattern for these nations and peoples. In that way we will fulfill and safeguard our own destiny.

The needs of our brother men are very urgent tonight. Herbert Hoover returned to the White House today and told President Truman that conditions all over Europe are the worst in 50 years. "Everybody is cold in northern and central Europe," the former President said. "Germany must be permitted to develop manufacturing industries for exports," said Mr. Hoover. When he was asked if the development of such industry might not involve imperialistic dangers Mr. Hoover said: "There is no imperialism left there now."

He added that the proposals for developing manufacturing would deal with light industries to help Germany to become self-supporting. He said American taxpayers are now footing the relief bill and indicated they still will have to carry the burden until Germany is put on a more self-sustaining basis. Mr. Hoover said Americans and British in their respective occupation zones are working amiably together and doing a good job. He added that if people here could see them working in rooms at near-zero temperatures their efforts would be appreciated more.

In Washington, the Federal tax structure continues to hang in the balance. The Senate's cut in the House sponsored economy from $6,000,000,000 to $4,500,000,000 was delayed while freshman Senator KNOWLAND's proposal to earmark $3,000,000,000 of the saving for payments on the national debt was considered. Senator KNOWLAND's plan puts added pressure on the House, which went all out for cuts in taxation without much provision for debt reduction or a balanced budget. However, the Senate's action seems to indicate that a compromise is certain—a compromise, it is likely, that will not cut so deeply into national-defense expenditures as the House bill threatened to do.

Having just seen a great deal of national-defense activities in the Pacific, I can welcome the Senate desires not to cut too deeply. Nevertheless, there are many ways in which the armed services could save money. There are still a great many duplicated facilities. I flew to Korea and back on the Army's Air Transport Command. Almost an identical service is maintained by Naval Air Transport. Sometimes we landed on the same small island, on parallel fields a few hundred yards apart, yet with identical and superfluous facilities. This may be an extreme instance of duplication, but anybody who knows Army and Navy knows that a good deal of economy can be attained if there is a strong enough desire to do it.

Having said this much, I revert to my former conclusion that only reasoned economies, not much below the $11,000,000,000 allocated by President Truman, should go for national defense. Particularly there should be no serious cuts in occupation costs, either in Japan or Germany. These occupation costs are among the best investments for insurance—insurance against future wars, insurance in democracy. I can assure you that these investments are paying good dividends in Japan. According to the evidence, the return will be longer in coming in Germany, but the investment is just as essential. America must keep right on fighting for the peace—and winning the peace.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 28, 1947]

THE TROUBLED OUTLOOK OF THE HOUR

These are troubled times. As the echoes of the war die away, the sound of a new conflict rises on our ears. All the world is filled with industrial unrest. Strike follows upon strike.

The laborer will not work because the pay is too low and the hours are too long. The producer cannot employ him because the wage is too high and the hours are too short. If the high wage is paid and the short hours are granted, then the price of the thing made, so it seems, rises higher still. Even the high wages will not buy it. The process apparently moves in a circle, with no cessation to it. The increased wages seem only to aggravate the increasing prices.

What is the meaning of it? Is it wealth or is it poverty?

Worse portents appear. Over the rim of the Russian horizon are seen the fierce eyes and the unshorn face of the real and undoubted Bolshevik, waving his red flag. Vast areas of what was a fertile populated world are overwhelmed in chaos. Over Russia there lies a great darkness, spreading ominously westward into central Europe.

All over the world the just claims of organized labor are intermingled with the underground conspiracy of social revolution. The public mind is confused. To some minds the demand for law and order overwhelms all other thoughts. To others the fierce desire for social justice obliterates all fear of a general catastrophe.

Riches and poverty jostle one another on our streets. The palace is the neighbor of the slum. An acquired indifference to the ills of others is the price at which we live. We feed well while others starve. We make fast the doors of our lighted houses against the indigent and the hungry. What else can we do? If we shelter one, what is that? And if we try to shelter all, we are ourselves shelterless.

The essential contrast lies between the vastly increased power of production and its apparent inability to satisfy for all humanity the most elementary human wants.

But the contrast thus presented is one that has acquired a new meaning in the age in which we live. The poverty of earlier days was the outcome of the insufficiency of human labor to meet the primal needs of human kind. It is not so now. We live in an age that is at best about a century and a half old—the age of machinery and power.

Never was there a moment in which there was greater need for sane and serious thought. If we do not mend the machine, there are forces moving in the world that will break it.

While admitting all the shortcomings and the injustices of the regime under which we have lived, I am not one of those who are able to see a short and single remedy. Many people when presented with the arguments above would settle it at once with the word "socialism." Here, they say, is the immediate and natural remedy. I confess at the outset, and shall develop later, that I cannot view it so. Socialism is a mere beautiful dream, possible only for the angels. The attempt to establish it would hurl us over the abyss. Our present lot is sad, but the frying pan is at least better than the fire. (Stephen Leacock, in the Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice, 1920.)

Executive-Legislative Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the present confusing situation which seems to exist in the Congress, many people are puzzled. They do not understand it. I wish to call attention to an article entitled "Executive-Legislative Statement," by Marquis Childs, appearing in the Washington Post of this morning. One paragraph of the article reads as follows:

Mr Truman is doing the very best he can. But under the division of powers, he is threatened with defeat on almost every issue. And his defeat is our defeat, since the end is inaction and delay at a time when sure, swift decisions are absolutely imperative.

I ask that the entire article by printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE STALEMATE

Underlying nine-tenths of the confusion and conflict in Washington today is one central, paramount fact that almost no one speaks about or thinks about. It is almost as though a deliberate conspiracy existed to prevent us from considering it.

When the two corollary powers, executive and legislative, are divided between opposing parties, the machine of Government stalls. This has happened again and again and again. Yet we register a kind of puzzled and hurt surprise that all is not harmony and progress on the Potomac.

In the landslide of last November the Republicans won majorities in both Houses of Congress. If the Presidency had been at issue, a Republican would be in the White House today.

Mr. Truman is doing the very best he can. But under the division of powers, he is threatened with defeat on almost every issue. And his defeat is our defeat, since the end is inaction and delay at a time when sure, swift decisions are absolutely imperative.

The controversy over the confirmation of David Lilienthal is only one example of what the division means. It happens, for a variety of reasons, to be a conspicuous example. No one has raised any serious question about Lilienthal's ability or his efficiency. Ignoring the savage personal animus of aged Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, you cannot escape the conclusion that the opposition to Lilienthal is almost wholly political.

It is intended to embarrass the President. But at the same time it is embarrassing the whole Nation. And as the atomic scientists have made abundantly clear, the whole atomic energy project is rapidly deteriorating for want of leadership and direction.

With a Republican in the White House—either Gov. Thomas E. Dewey or Senator Robert A. Taft, to name two obvious possibilities—Lilienthal would never have been appointed Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. A Republican President would have appointed a man acceptable to the Republican majorities, and after a routine inquiry, the nominee would have been confirmed.

This is not a matter of the wickedness of one party or the other. The situation was reversed in 1931 and 1932. Then Herbert Hoover was Chief Executive and the Democrats had captured control of the House. That, too, was a time for swift and sure decisions. The Democrats, however, were out to make political capital at Mr. Hoover's expense. They used the tactics of a matador with a bull.

Mr. Hoover never developed a comprehensive program for checking the headlong depression. He clung to the belief that it must somehow cure itself with as little Government intervention as possible. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to shore up the banks and the railroads, was about the extent of Mr. Hoover's willingness to resort to Government intervention.

But it is obvious that if he had had the most perfect program in the world, handed down from heaven on tablets of gold, the Democratic House would have riddled it or thrown it out entirely. They didn't want the Republican President to succeed. Because they wanted to come to power after a long, lean period out of office, they set out to destroy Mr. Hoover and they very nearly succeeded.

Those were 2 years the locusts consumed. Industry slowly ground to a standstill. The toll of suffering, fear, insecurity, was incalculable. Finally it was too late for the moderate measures that might have checked the decline toward disaster.

Americans today have a clearer understanding of the importance of the decisions taken by government. They are likely to be less patient with the tactics of obstructionism. If the Republicans persist in those tactics, they can throw away the victory that seemed so surely in their grasp last November. While it seemed inconceivable on November 6, it is not impossible for Mr. Truman to be reelected.

But that will be no solution for the stalemates that have occurred, on the average, in 1 out of every 3 years. There can be no solution so long as most of us seem to prefer to ignore the source of the trouble. It lies in the rigidity of our system of fixed elections, and the irony is that the only measure with a chance of passage at this session of Congress would make it more rigid—limiting the Presidency to two terms.

The Government machine needs a thorough overhauling to bring it up to date with the power age. Meanwhile, the men in the engineer's cab who are contending for authority get the blame.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement dated July 23, 1940, entitled "The Basic Policy Declaration of the Government of the United States" regarding Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; a statement, under date of October 12, 1946, by the Honorable Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, which was the basis of a statement by myself at that time; and a further statement by the Honorable Carroll Reece, under date of February 12, 1947, dealing with Lithuania.

There being no objection, the declaration of policy and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Department of State Bulletin of July 27, 1940]

THE BASIC POLICY DECLARATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 23, 1940.

During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independent and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

The policy of this Government is universally known.

The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force.

They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.

STATEMENT BY CARROLL REECE, CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 12, 1946.

As chairman of the Republican National Committee, I believe that peace to be permanent must be based on the principles of justice and right enunciated in the Atlantic Charter and proclaimed by ag eement of the Allies, including the Soviet, in a joint declaration of the United Nations.

Enslavement of small nations by large nations is not conducive to a permanent peace. The situation now prevailing in eastern and central Europe is actually endangering the peace, in that three sovereign, peace-loving, and law-abiding nations, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and their helpless people, have been enslaved by the Soviet Union. Aggressive and predatory acts against these small nations by any dominating power should be condemned, particularly if those acts have been banned by treaties with those nations.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia should be restored to their former status of freedom and independence. The Soviet Army and the Soviet police occupying these countries should leave. Refugees of those countries should have the opportunity to be repatriated without fear of Soviet persecution and thereafter should have the right of a free and unfettered election.

The Republican Party believes in fulfilling to the greatest possible degree its war pledges to small nations that they shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live and that sovereign rights and self-government shall be re-

stored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. The party would deplore any desertion of these stated principles.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

On February 16, 1947, Americans of Lithuanian origin throughout the United States commemorate the twenty-ninth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

This anniversary is not a happy one, because today Lithuania is not a free country. It is a victim of the devastation of World War II. Lithuania's people have undergone and are now undergoing such suffering as comes to few people in the world.

First, in the year 1940 the Russian Army marched across their country, then in 1941 the Nazis battled on their soil to drive out the Russians. Then back came the Russians to fight the Nazis and expel them. Each time Lithuania's people were in the middle of the terrible cross-fire of invasion and battle—forced to serve the conqueror as prizes in victory and tortured by the vanquished in defeat.

Through all this terror under the rule of two military dictatorships the people of Lithuania have remained loyal to the principles of representative government in their hopes for the restoration of the independence of Lithuania.

There is special significance in this anniversary to all Americans, because the hope for independence of Lithuania is based on the same principles of justice and right which are close to the hearts of every freedom-loving American—principles which involve the rights of all peoples to liberty and their own way of life and the rights of all nations to self-determination.

We Republicans support these principles, not only because they would bring happiness, security, and freedom to the peoples of Europe, but because American security would be strengthened if American ideals of representative government are upheld throughout the world.

In this light it is appropriate that all Republicans join with Americans of Lithuanian origin in the commemoration of Lithuania's Independence Day.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senate Aid for Services," from the Philadelphia Bulletin for February 28 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE AID FOR SERVICES

The Senate has deserved well of the country by restricting the cut in the Presidential budget to $4,500,000,000. The difference between this and the House figure of $6,000,000,000 would have been taken out of the $11,500,000,000 allotment for the armed services.

Such a course was strongly opposed by Secretary Marshall, General Eisenhower, and all who realized the blow which would have been dealt to this country's safety, influence, and interests by a marked diminution of its forces at this critical time.

It is just quibbling to assert that some cuts might safely be made in the allotment for the services. Such trimming as the budget could safely have stood would be inconsequential in comparison with the sum which those who wanted to put the ax to the allotment intended and needed to accomplish a $6,000,000,000 reduction from the Presidential budget figure of $37,500,000,000. The $6,000,000,000 really would have had to be taken out of the $32,500,000,000, since the untouchable allotment for interest on the public debt runs to $5,000,000,000.

It is not creditable to the Republican Party, and it is mortifying to its Senate leaders, that a majority of the GOP Members, 24, voted for the greater slash. It was thwarted by a bipartisan coalition to which the Republicans contributed 21 votes. The majority showed an irresponsibility that is disturbing at this juncture of international affairs.

Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the Eightieth Congress I introduced H. R. 16 which is a bill the purpose of which is to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal retirement insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

The following Members of the House are sponsors of this bill:

HOMER D. ANGELL, Third District, Oregon.

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Thirty-seventh District, New York.

HOMER A. RAMEY, Ninth District, Ohio.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Seventeenth District, Ohio.

CLAIR ENGLE, Second District, California.

WALTER E. BREHM, Eleventh District, Ohio.

GEORGE H. BENDER, Representative at Large, Ohio.

ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, Tenth District, California.

WILLIAM S. HILL, Second District, Colorado.

FRANK A. BARRETT, Representative at Large, Wyoming.

JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Second District, Minnesota.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Nineteenth District, Ohio.

GEORGE W. GILLIE, Fourth District, Indiana.

MARION T. BENNETT, Sixth District, Missouri.

WILLIAM LEMKE, Representative at Large, North Dakota.

GEORGE P. MILLER, Sixth District, California.

GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Fifteenth District, California.

RICHARD J. WELCH, Fifth District, California.

FRANCK R. HAVENNER, Fourth District, California.

JOHN PHILLIPS, Twenty-second District, California.

HAROLD C. HAGEN, Ninth District, Minnesota.

NOBLE J. JOHNSON, Sixth District, Indiana.

CHET HOLIFIELD, Nineteenth District, California.

EMORY H. PRICE, Second District, Florida.

J. HARDIN PETERSON, First District, Florida.

GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Fourth District, Florida.

BERTRAND W. GEARHART, Ninth District, California.

HENDERSON H. CARSON, Sixteenth District, Ohio.

TOBY MORRIS, Sixth District, Oklahoma.

RAY J. MADDEN, First District, Indiana.

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Third District, Florida.

JOE HENDRICKS, Fifth District, Florida.

CHARLES R. CLASON, Second District, Massachusetts.

RAYMOND H. BURKE, Third District, Ohio.

WALTER B. HUBER, Fourteenth District, Ohio.

CHESTER H. GROSS, Twenty-first District, Pennsylvania.

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Twenty-second District, Pennsylvania.

THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Sixth District, Washington.

ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Tenth District, Wisconsin.

EARL WILSON, Ninth District, Indiana.

DWIGHT L. ROGERS, Sixth District, Florida.

W. M. (DON) WHEELER, Eighth District, Georgia.

CECIL R. KING, Seventeenth District, California.

JOHN A. CARROLL, First District, Colorado.

BARTEL J. JONKMAN, Fifth District, Michigan.

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., Third District, Maryland.

JAMES H. MORRISON, Sixth District, Louisiana.

JOHN R. MURDOCK, Representative at Large, Arizona.

PAUL W. SHAFER, Third District, Michigan.

GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, First District, Michigan.

P. W. GRIFFITHS, Fifteenth District, Ohio.

On February 28 I called a meeting of the sponsors of this legislation and other Members who are interested in old-age security. At this meeting the merits of the bill were discussed and a program outlined for its consideration. Attention

was called to the great interest throughout the Nation for the enactment of old-age security legislation. A recent poll taken disclosed that this program was approved by 39,432 of those polled with only 1,912 in the negative.

At this meeting I called attention to the great contribution that has been made by Dr. Francis E. Townsend, founder of the Townsend program, to the advancement of social security for old people in America and in recognition of his service I proposed the following resolution, which was adopted unanimously:

Inasmuch as there was no such thing as a Federal old-age pension law 14 years ago when Dr. Francis E. Townsend startled the Nation with the first draft of his Townsend plan; and inasmuch as since that date, with the friends and workers for the Townsend plan constantly keeping their objectives before the Congress, the first Social Security Act was enacted and amendments in two other Congresses have liberalized its provisions—it seems fitting that this group of congressional friends of the Townsend plan here and now go on record as complimenting the 80-year-old father of old-age pensions in America, Dr. Townsend, for his activity and integrity and continuing fight in the cause of America's senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the basic principles underlying the Townsend national recovery program in the main have been approved by the Social Security Board. On July 16, 1946, the functions of the Social Security Board and its chairman were transferred to the Federal Security Administrator, under the President's reorganization plan No. 2, and on the same date the Social Security Administration was set up as a branch of the Federal Security Agency. In a final report the Board, which was the policy-making body, made a number of far reaching recommendations which, if adopted, would put into force in our social-security program many of the provisions of the Townsend national recovery program. During the war many social-security programs were put into operation as emergency measures to alleviate distress and provide social security for the families of America. We find, however, that in the postwar period, although we are at peace with high levels of employment and earnings, many of our people are in distress, particularly those in the old-age groups. It has come to be realized by all forward-looking citizens that disability and old age, as well as unemployment, are hazards in our modern society against which provision must be made. The Social Security Board in its final report, to which I have referred, made the following recommendations:

A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The Social Security Board recommends the establishment of a comprehensive basic national system of contributory social insurance, covering all major risks to economic independence and all workers and their dependents threatened by such risks. The program would include insurance against wage loss in periods of disability and against costs of medical care, for which no general provision now exists in the United States, as well as old-age and survivors insurance and unemployment insurance, with benefits related to past earnings and with provision for additional benefits for dependents. It would be designed to close existing gaps in the coverage of both persons and risks, to remove present inequities in the protection of workers and the financial burdens of employers, and to provide a consistent relationship among insurance provisions for the various risks and between provisions of the basic system and of supplementary special systems for particular groups. As compared with separate programs to meet particular risks, such a system would reduce administrative cost and reporting burdens and simplify arrangements as they affect workers, employers, and public agencies.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

The Social Security Board recommends:

Coverage of all gainful workers, including agricultural and domestic employees, public employees and employees of nonprofit organizations, railroad employees, and self-employed persons, including farmers and small businessmen.

Legislation to prevent servicemen from losing the protection of the old-age and survivors insurance system because of service in the armed forces.

Reduction of the qualifying age for all women beneficiaries from 65 to 60 years.

Changes in the average monthly wage and benefit formula to increase benefit amounts, particularly for low-paid workers.

Increase from $3,000 to $3,600 a year in the maximum amount of earnings which are subject to contribution and counted in computation of benefits.

Increase in the amount of earnings a beneficiary may receive in covered employment without suspension of benefits.

Greater uniformity in defining, for purposes of the insurance system, family relations and conditions of dependency that qualify members of a worker's family for benefits.

Benefits during periods of extended or permanent disability, like those for old-age retirement.

Provision for insuring uniformity in coverage decisions relating to liability for contributions and eligibility for benefits, which are based on identical language in the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code but are made by two separate Federal agencies—the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Board.

Adoption of a long-range plan for financing old-age and survivors insurance which looks toward an eventual tripartite division of costs among employers, employees, and the Government.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Deletion of the Federal matching maximums for individual payments of aid to dependent children, and deletion or increase of such maximums for old-age assistance and aid to the blind.

Abolition of State residence and citizenship requirements as a condition of eligibility for assistance under State plans approved under the Social Security Act.

Elimination, as a condition of Federal grants, of State requirements for transferring title or control of property by an applicant or recipient to the State or locality. This action would not preclude any agency from claiming from the estate of a deceased recipient recovery of assistance formerly paid.

The Board in discussing social security in a democracy said:

In the opinion of the Board, no time should be lost in taking every feasible step to extend the present protection of the social-security program to all households in the United States, and to wipe out limitations and inequities that can no longer be justified by logic or necessity. For a people, as for an individual, it is prudent to provide in good times against adversities that almost surely will arise sooner or later.

An examination of this comprehensive report of the Social Security Board and the recommendations made by it discloses that the advanced steps in social security recommended are in keeping with much of the program of the Townsend old-age security plan. At the beginning of the 1946 nearly half of all civilian jobs were excluded from coverage under social security, and two in five of all persons employed were neither fully nor currently insured. At best the social-security law we now have is a haphazard program which, in effect, is largely financed by the public generally, but the benefits of which are shared in by only a few selected groups. It encourages inflation by collecting a huge fund currently used for deficit spending. These difficulties would be overcome by the adoption of H. R. 16, which would cover all citizens falling within its provisions and the obligations and benefits of the program would likewise be shared by all. It would be all-inclusive in its provisions and therefore would obviate the necessity of continuing many social-security laws now in existence and would for the first time set up in our country an old-age security program which would insure all of our elderly citizens 60 years of age or over against the hazards of old age. It would build up no reservoir for deficit spending, but the moneys collected would go back into the channels of trade each month, providing local markets for American production and buying power for aged citizens. I respectfully urge that all of my colleagues interested in a solution of the old-age security program join with us in urging early consideration of H. R. 16.

Tribute to Hon. John Sparkman, of Alabama, by the Montgomery Advertiser

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser for March 4, 1947, appears an editorial entitled "Honor to a Statesman." The editorial is a very fine and deserved tribute to my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and I ask that it

be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONOR TO A STATESMAN

Alabama's Senator JOHN SPARKMAN in a speech in Chicago Friday night said that the United States must assume world-wide moral, economic, and political responsibilities if American boys and girls are to be spared the fighting of another war.

SPARKMAN spoke before the Pi Kappa Committee on Distinguished Achievement Award, at which time he was honored by selection as the outstanding member of the Pi Kappa Alpha Fraternity for 1946. The award was made on the basis of Senator SPARKMAN's achievements as majority whip of the House, his record as a member of the House Military Affairs Committee, his active support of legislation for Federal aid to education, the physically handicapped, and veterans, and his election to the United States Senate.

In his Chicago speech SPARKMAN pointed to all the suffering in the world today due to hunger, fear, and cold. In Europe and in Asia a whole generation has been stunted and maimed in mind and body, he said, yet armed conflicts still prevail and the world remains heavily armed.

One way to assume the responsibility of world leadership, he pointed out, is to continue a trade policy that will enable goods to move freely from nation to nation. If we hope to sell our agricultural and manufactured goods to other peoples of the world we will need to buy their products so that they can pay for what we sell them. We can't sell our surplus to bankrupt nations.

Another way to prove our willingness and desire to help rehabilitate the world is to do all in our power to strengthen and perfect the United Nations, Senator SPARKMAN said. We cannot follow a policy of isolation and at the same time maintain the position of world leadership thrust upon us. If we permit the peoples of the world to exist on insufficient food, and to see their children die of malnutrition and disease, they will turn to other places for leadership.

SPARKMAN emphasized also that until world peace is assured we must maintain a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Federal budget, he stoutly maintained, must carry adequate funds for this purpose.

Alabama may well congratulate Pi Kappa Alpha on having a member so distinguished, and Senator SPARKMAN on another of his statesmanlike utterances which are a credit to the State and Nation.

Radio Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I think the Members of Congress should be interested in a brilliant article on radio regulation, by John Crosby, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 6 and 7, 1947. I ask unanimous consent to insert excerpts from this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO IN REVIEW

(By John Crosby)

THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS AND THE FCC

About a year ago (March 7, 1946), the Federal Communications Commission issued a report on the public service responsibility of the broadcasters, a document which almost immediately became known as the Blue Book. The Blue Book clearly showed how radio had become increasingly commercial in the 5 years of war and went on to remind the broadcasters they had made specific promises in their applications for licenses. When the time came to renew those licenses, the Federal Communications Commission warned that the promises would be compared with the actual performance.

The Blue Book made public a great many things not generally known outside the trade. Among other things, it listed the promises made by broadcasters to devote a specified number of hours to the broadcasting of news, good music, discussion of public issues, and to live local talent. These unprofitable programs were the price the broadcaster agreed to pay in exchange for a lease on a chunk of public air, which belongs not to the broadcaster or to the Government but to you and me—the listeners.

The performances listed side by side with these promises were unappetizing. Instead of the church programs, the discussion of public issues, the live local talent, the stations presented hour after hour of recorded Bing Crosby, interspersed with appeals from the Bon Ton department store and manufacturers of headache powders.

In the Blue Book the FCC showed its muscles for the first time and threatened to use them. It gave the broadcasters a bad case of the jitters from which they have not yet fully recovered. Listeners, even those who were not entirely happy about Government interference in radio, were heartened at the idea that some of radio's worst excesses might be curbed. Well, a year has passed and it is high time to inquire into the effects of the Blue Book on radio programming.

Unhappily, there haven't been any effects. The FCC has not followed any of the policies it enunciated in the Blue Book, and the prospects of these policies ever being carried out are dimmer than ever. The Commission has continued with the routine business of renewing licenses as if it never heard of its own document. Not a single license has failed to be renewed. Among the radio stations whose licenses to broadcast were renewed were two, one in Los Angeles, the other in San Antonio, Tex., both of which had been cited in the Blue Book as particularly horrible examples. Though their broadcast log was an almost uninterrupted succession of recordings and spot commercial announcements, they were relicensed.

If the FCC has not dared enforce its policies by now, the chances of their ever being enforced are almost nonexistent. The Commission's relations with Congress have never been too happy. From the new Republican Congress the Commission may expect outright hostility. At the time the Blue Book was issued, Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, said that the FCC was attempting to tamper with the right of free speech on the air. Several other Republicans rumbled along the same lines. This distant thunder was not particularly ominous at the time, since the Republicans were then the minority party.

Well, times have changed, and the present position of the FCC is precarious. There are several movements afoot in Congress to clip the wings of the Commission. No matter which one succeeds, it is almost certain that the FCC's supervisory powers will be limited considerably.

The air waves are as much a piece of public property as the Mississippi River, and provide far fewer channels than that body of water. Admittedly, it is harder to lay down rules on programming than it is to establish regulations supervising, let us say, a railroad. Radio programs consist variously of news, music, culture, and entertainment, none of which is susceptible to hard and fast regulations. However, the Commission has never attempted any specific control, or, for that matter, any control at all. Its powers have been useful chiefly as a threat to remind broadcasters they operate in the public domain and, in return for this air grant, owe the public as well as the advertisers a certain amount of service.

Legislation depriving the Government of any control over what goes on the air comes dangerously close to an abdication of Federal responsibility. Col. Robert Rutherford McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune, has expressed the opinion that radio frequencies should be private property of the broadcasters now using them, just like the land on which the broadcasting stations stand. If this is the opinion of the public and of Congress, then the FCC certainly should be shorn of most of its authority. But, so long as the air remains public property, the Government has not only the right but the duty to exercise some supervision over it.

German Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "German Food," by Eleanor Roosevelt, published in the Philadelphia Bulletin on March 3, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DAY

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

GERMAN FOOD

I hope that everyone will read with extreme care Herbert Hoover's report on Germany, because the basic effects of the war are set forth there very simply. In the First World War, Germany did not suffer in this way, but other countries in Europe did suffer in exactly the same way at the end of that war.

France has twice been sapped of one generation, among them some of her finest young men. Great Britain has gone through the same thing twice. Russia did not suffer so much in the First World War, but has suffered in full measure in this last one. And the small nations have all suffered in similar fashion.

Germany is experiencing this drastic loss of manpower for the first time, and the figures given by Mr. Hoover are illuminating. In the age group between 30 and 40, there are 6 men to 10 women, and in the group from 40 to 60, about 7 men to 10 women. This means a very profound effect not only on the nation's economy at the present time, but on what will happen to Germany 20 to 30 years from now.

Mr. Hoover notes the shortage of housing and of coal, and the changes made in food production by the alterations in Germany's boundary line and the consequent shifts of population.

Nobody has questioned that the food ration is low, and Mr. Hoover points out very accurately where the deficiencies hit hardest. The self-suppliers, for farmers, are naturally in good condition, and it is satisfactory to know that the prospective and nursing mothers and the children under 6 have had sufficient supplemental diet to keep them in good condition. But beyond that, the report is exactly what one would expect.

The people's physical condition shows undernourishment. In a country where great physical endurance will be needed to rebuild it, the population is probably not only unfit to do hard work, but unfit to meet the strain spiritually and mentally.

Mr. Hoover bases this part of his report on surveys made by Dr. William H. Sebrell, Jr., of the United States Public Health Service, who was a member of his mission. Dr. Sebrell also visited Italy, France, Belgium, Holland, and Britain, and found that the people in those countries were very nearly in the nutritional condition that existed in the prewar period.

The recommendations made by Mr. Hoover to increase as quickly as possible the rations for children over 6 years of age and for adolescents seem wise, as this would cover about 3,500,000 people in Germany, or 50 percent of those in need of extra nutrition. In the American zone, a systematic distribution of school lunches, which we can accomplish with available Army ration resources, would achieve this result.

The main suggestion, which will strike most of our farmers as sensible, is that we ship 400,000 tons of surplus potatoes to Germany. I am wondering if there is some way of dehydrating these potatoes and thereby using much less space for shipment. Of course, if they are to be used for seed potatoes, that would not be possible, but when they are to be used for food, this might increase shipping space.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Hearings on Labor Measures," by Westbrook Pegler, published in the New York Journal and American of March 1, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS PEGLER SEES IT

CONGRESS HEARINGS ON LABOR MEASURES

(By Westbrook Pegler)

It is pathetic that at this late date two committees of Congress, one of each House, should have to waste time proving the obvious and conceded fact that the conduct of unions toward the individual worker has been brutal and degrading and commonly includes collusion between vicious unioneers and equally wicked employers. On this latter point the conduct of certain opulent and heavy-handed contractors who build aqueducts, airports, and tunnels, in the Joe Fay case, has been a spectacular illustration.

They are rich and ruthless, most of them politicians, and as low as the gangsters whom they subsidized to terrorize the citizens who worked on the jobs. Some perjured themselves in two trials, one in New York, the other in Newark, in the interests of their accomplice in the dirty work. Of course, they are strongly prounion and praise the Wagner Act, which permits them to deal with a crooked unioneer and ignore the workers.

The Senate and House committees needn't summon such people to convince themselves of this enormous conspiracy against labor with a capital L, against the administration of justice and against the integrity of government. The records of the New York and Newark trials of Joe Fay already have proved the case, but Frank S. Hogan, the New York district attorney who convicted Fay, doubtless would be delighted to take his turn as a witness and clarify any points that may seem obscure.

Not even the American Federation of Labor, which once kicked Fay out but let him back in as a union racketeer, would enter so much as a technical denial. Yet, again, we find congressional committees laboring the obvious in tiny detail.

These incidents occur daily in many communities. Few of them attract notice because they are as commonplace as hubscrapes in traffic. They are the routine experience of Americans.

In Kansas City, a young man of 24 parades before struck premises in a picket line. The AP reports in a little novelty item that he wears a sign reading "I am a heel; I crossed a picket line." The story relates that this citizen is a cab driver who called at a store to inquire about the development of a roll of film. The place was picketed. He was given his choice of paying a $50 fine or picketing for two 8-hour shifts wearing the sign.

The Utica, N. Y., Press carried a picture of a young woman holding an ice pack on her nose. She says she quit the union in the plant where she works and thereafter was persecuted.

"They" whistled at her and called her names until finally she couldn't stand it any more and "sort of swung my boots."

This seems to mean that a young girl took the conservative course of trying to kick men who were tormenting her, when she should have bought a shotgun and blown their heads off. "Then," she said, one gallant guardian of labor's gains "hit me in my face and my nose and this other fellow hit me, too."

We had a charming and typical incident of the same kind in New York. The night bell rang at an undertaker's shop and the proprietor being ill, his wife, an elderly woman, put on a robe and went down to the office. Two men said a friend had died and as she bent over the desk writing the data she was hit on the head. Reviving later, she crawled up the stairs and the cops were called. She was seriously injured. A note was found on the desk reading, "Don't buy Boyertown." This referred to Boyertown caskets, which were hot cargo at the time.

In New York, George Wall, a laborer, a veteran of the First World War, died of cancer, leaving a widow and five children. During his illness of 14 months all the family's savings went. His American Legion post petitioned Joe Moreschi, the presiden of the hod carriers and common laborers union, to grant Mrs. Wall the death benefit.

The rascality practiced in many locals of this notorious union is now common knowledge. The pay rolls have become a refuge of relatives of the big bosses, including Moreschi's, and the looting by shake-downs and other familiar practices is comparable to the worst in Fay's union. Yet Moreschi turned down the petition on the ground that the dying man was automatically suspended after he fell 2 months in arrears in his dues during the time that he was helpless. Moreschi's letter was written from Miami, which has been adopted by the hod carriers, the teamsters, and the A. F. of L. itself as the scene of its winter conferences.

Most insurance contracts protect the death benefits in such circumstances on the wise assumption that a worker living on earnings will be unable to pay during a long, fatal illness.

In New York, a local of the bartenders union requires the employers to pay to the union, not the individual, a pay-roll tax of 5 percent. The Federal Government's social security tax on the worker is only 1 percent. The contract says this 5 percent "may be spent in any way the union sees fit for the benefit of the membership."

In the case of the teamsters the national bosses decided that it would be for the benefit of the membership to buy, furnish, and maintain a winter palace for President Dan Tobin. The bartenders could decide that the interest of the members would be served through preservation of the health of the local bosses by means of winter vacations among that element of the Miami clientele whom J. Edgar Hoover described as the criminal scum. Their local boss there is Al Capone's brother-in-law.

In New York, Joe Ryan's union of longshoremen of the A. F. of L. charges an initiation fee of $500 for checkers on the docks. Ryan is president for life at $20,000 a year, and war veterans, among others, find themselves in the position of helpless, voiceless subjects of union plutocrats. It is none of their business what these parasites do with their money, but Ryan is a dignitary and a stalwart defender of the American way against Harry Bridges and the invasion of the Communists.

Or, again, we find a Westchester County milk wagon driver fined $525 and the fine solemnly upheld on a petty and doubtful charge. That is $525, not $5.25, and this capsuled account must ignore the political muscling that set up for persecution and the economic death penalty a small group of industrious, respectable citizens whose actual offense was that they tried to buck the mob that took over a union which they helped to form. The idea here is not to collect the fines but to drive out the opposition.

Congress need hold no more hearings on perversions of unionism which have set up over American citizens a rule strikingly like Hitler's and reduced them to fear and subjugation. The proof has been on record for years.

Regulating the Recovery of Portal-to-Portal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position clear with regard to the pending bill, H. R. 2157, and make the reason for my opposition clear and understandable. In the first instance, the report on this bill titled "Regulating the Recovery of Portal-to-Portal Pay, and for other purposes" covers far more than the mere question of unjustified claims upon industry. If it covered only the question of portal-to-portal pay, made an issue by the decision of the Supreme Court, I could well have supported the outlawing of such claims within the minimus rule laid down by the Court, but inasmuch as this resolution goes far and beyond the issue created by the court,

transgresses upon the fundamental rights of the working man, does violence to his constitutional right of being treated equally with business and industry, and deprives him of not only making legitimate claims for overtime pay in the performance of labor ordered by the employer, but it also specifies that such work as has been performed under compulsion by the employer and for his benefit can only be made the issue in a lawsuit and subject to recovery provided that the work is productive and covered by a collective-bargaining contract. An unfair 1-year limitation is being put into the statute even in such cases as mentioned above, regardless of how long the abuse has been going on. No penalties are being provided as originally were included in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 for exceeding the minimum workweek. The 1 year statutory limitation does not apply alone to the filing period for claims involving back pay but actually prescribes that the maximum claim cannot exceed the unpaid overtime of 52 weeks. If the bill provided the same limitations as applied to other legal claims of industry and of business, it could be justified. We permit business and industry to press claims for indebtedness against the worker depending on the State law anywhere from 3 to 6, and in some instances possibly as high as 8 years. We have repeatedly made liberal provisions for filing tax claims against the Government by corporations and have even gone so far as to extend the law after the expiration of the basic provision limiting filing of such claims.

In the carry-back and carry-over provisions of existing tax law, as my memory serves me, corporations are permitted to go back for 2 or 3 years and forward for a period of about two additional years, making a maximum total of about 5 years within which to obtain tax refunds for the purpose of wiping out current year's tax losses. This item so far as the Treasury of the United States is concerned will amount to at least $4,000,000,000 and maybe more. Why treat the inert corporate structure more generously and affectionately than we do the human element which makes industry and profits possible. Then, too, may I ask, Mr. Speaker, why single out only such claims as are covered by agreement in union contracts for such limited consideration while ignoring the unorganized worker or the individual worker claimant.

It seems that the present Republican majority in the House feels that it will yield, and only partially so, where there is organization and power as in corporations united through the National Association of Manufacturers and to a lesser degree recognizing the power of organized labor as expressed through the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the railway brotherhoods. I am sure organized labor does not want to be treated as a separate and distinct entity. I am sure they are not claiming any special privileges under any law which might be enacted. I feel safe in saying that labor's view is my view, that the worker whether he is organized or unorganized should have a right to make his claim upon his employer for such accrued overtime as might be compensable under the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is generally understood that industry under this proposed act can write its own prescription starting out with a formula or custom as to what services shall be paid for. Any and all work performed outside of what has been covered by an agreement or performed by some custom or previous practice of the employer, whether just or unjust, legitimate or illegitimate, would not be compensable and could not be made the substance of a law suit for recovery and a worker would, therefore, have no recourse. This proposal submitted here by the majority party for which they shall be responsible does not seem to have the unanimous support of the committee itself.

The report indicates a division of views along five different paths, something unheard of in parliamentary practice and new to my long experience in Congress. The chairman and the loyal Republican guard for the most part stand rigid in support of the bill without regard to its stringency and unfairness, while four distinct minorities submit reports of varying degrees of difference in opinion. The largest and most important group might be said to be diametrically opposed to the majority, while the views of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] add much confusion to those of us who were not privileged to listen to witnesses appearing before the Judiciary Committee. The additional views of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT] make a strong case against the bill and the views of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] add further difficulty for anyone to make a decision that would be fair and honest. Seemingly this bill is intended to operate against the worker and to discriminate against him. It is class legislation of the rankest kind. It not only caters to but definitely favors unscrupulous and willful violators of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

As time goes on you will learn that a serious mistake has been made in a move which was obviously intended to rectify an injustice and which was aimed to wipe out unsupported and exaggerated claims never intended by the Congress for compensation.

Labor leadership, might I say, Mr. Speaker, is not altogether without fault, and in some instances is culpable of instituting suits on behalf of workers that did not have a shred of substance to sustain claims. It appeared to be a move predicated upon the advice of lawyers who did not carefully enough calculate the consequences. I realize that in view of the clamor by the industrialists and the large segment of the public that there will not be enough of us who will dare stand up on this issue, but my position is clear. This is not a move to relieve industry of unfair and unsupported claims but rather a veiled means of nullifying the Fair Labor Standards Act.

There are a score or more other and lesser reasons, important in themselves, included in the bill which I shall not take the time to discuss but which make the bill even more objectionable. This bill will not settle the issue. It will create other and more far-reaching problems.

I hope that the Senate will make some corrections which might make the bill acceptable and effective. In its present form I cannot support the bill, and therefore shall vote against it.

Our Country—Highways and History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last night I read one of the most interesting and thought-provoking addresses on our national idea that it has been my privilege to see in a long time. It was given by our colleague, the Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM, of Iowa, before the American Association of Highway Officials in Los Angeles, Calif., December 17, 1946, and appears in the January number of American Highways. Under permission granted by the House, I offer it for the RECORD at this time:

OUR COUNTRY—HIGHWAYS AND HISTORY

(By the Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Congressman from Iowa, member House Committee on Roads, before the American Association of State Highway Officials, Los Angeles, Calif., December 17, 1946)

In appearing before you this afternoon, I feel somewhat like the student who, for the first time, addresses an audience in which sits his favorite teacher.

I am referring, of course, to Congressman Robinson, who has been chairman of the Roads Committee of the House during most of the years I have been privileged to serve on that committee.

I never served under a finer chairman. I never served under a harder working chairman. I never saw a chairman who was fairer or more courteous to members of his committee and to witnesses appearing before the committee.

The development of America has gone hand in hand with the development of its transportation facilities, first, river transportation from the flat boat to the steamboat, and second, its land transportation from trail blazer and ox cart to the more modern horse-drawn vehicle to the railroad and lastly the automobile. The third is transportation by air.

The steamboat or river transportation; transportation by land whether by rail or automobile and transportation by air never could have been developed to its present peak without good highways. This is obvious, for what value would all these kinds of transportation be if the people and the goods did not have adequate highways to get to the depots and terminal ports? It is important to 140,000,000 people that the Nation's roads and streets are made suitable for present needs and future progress.

Highway development of the future must be equal to or greater than its development in the past. A sound government is dependent upon a prosperous, contented, and happy people. People cannot be contented, happy, and prosperous without adequate means of transportation for goods and material as well as adequate transportation for social intercourse.

To attain all this a highway program must be developed in keeping with the needs of America along those lines. Those of our citizens who do not comprehend the need must be sold on the idea. Each time I travel

the Pennsylvania Turnpike I think, "If every person in the United States could traverse it once, no further selling of the road program of the future would be necessary." However, since this is not possible, other means of making the people realize the necessity of an enlarged road program must be found. One excellent way is in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944. Through it the farmer will get more and better farm-to-market roads. As these come to his door he will no longer object to or resent the building of super or express transcontinental highways, but until and unless he receives proper transportation facilities for his products we have no right to expect his support for the enlarged program. Proper cooperation between you and the county supervisors or commissioners of each State in the locating and in the building of farm-to-market roads will greatly aid the over-all program.

Bottlenecks should be eliminated as rapidly as possible. What profit it a man to gain 3 hours' time in flying from one city to another and lose it all in congested highway traffic to and from the airport? You are experienced highway and road men. It is not for me to tell you how. It would be no more fitting for me to attempt to tell you how than for a Brooklyn lad to tell an Iowa lad how to raise corn. But it is for me as a member of the Roads Committee of the House to do my part to see that you get the necessary tools in the way of legislation to do the job, i. e., insofar as the Federal Government shall or ought to have a part in the program. I realize that much of the support and cooperation must come from the State legislature.

Good highways mean a good America—a good government. Those interested in building more and better highways are interested in a good government and a good country. In short, they are good people—our best people.

Nothing has contributed to the advancement thus far more than our form of government, and since those interested in good highways are interested in good government, I now want to talk with you about our form of government, how we got it, what it is, and the importance of keeping it if we are to go forward with a sound road-building program for the future.

You know that it was about 285 years from the time Columbus set foot on San Salvador until the signing of the Declaration of Independence, just about twice as long as we have existed as a free America since that date, and some 170 years from the founding of Jamestown in 1607 to the signing of that immortal paper about 15 years longer than we have lived as a free America, and from the landing of the Pilgrim fathers at Plymouth Rock until 1776, a period of about 5 years longer than we have lived as a free United States of America.

Now, what happened to the form of government as administered upon the colonists or the citizens of the Thirteen Colonies prior to the Revolutionary War, that made or caused it to become so iniquitous that our forefathers and foremothers preferred rebellion and death rather than continue under it, when those people were not by nature rebellious. At least, I would hate to think my ancestors who participated in that war were revolutionists. They were loyal to the mother country as long as they dared or could be loyal to it. We were taught in school that the Revolutionary War was caused because of taxation without representation. That was not the real cause. The real cause was the form of government as administered upon the 13 colonies by the mother country that made it possible for the King of England to tax the colonists without their being represented in Parliament. That is what I want to talk about now. Why was it possible for the King of England to tax the colonists without being given representation? The answer is because of totalitarianism, or authoritarianism, or dictatorship. The King of England and his advisers were supreme insofar as the colonists were concerned. They made the laws—the tax laws, the charters, and the stamp acts. They were made in England largely and sent over here to be administered upon the colonists. They were not bad laws when you compare them today with some of the laws passed in our Congress and State legislatures. The colonists did not rebel only because of taxes. The king and his advisers not only made the laws, but once they were made they sent the king's soldiers and Army across the water to see that those laws were enforced upon the colonists. So they had the same man or same group of men not only making the laws but enforcing the laws.

That wasn't all. If the colonists disobeyed, they were tried in the courts presided over by an appointee of the King. For major offenses they were transported across the water and tried in the King's court without the benefit of a jury. So, we had prior to the Revolutionary War insofar as the Thirteen Colonies were concerned, one-man rule. One man made the laws, administered the laws, and judged the people under the laws. That is what caused the Revolutionary War.

Now, the Revolution is over and it was successful. I do not wish to take your time talking about it, but I do want to tell you what happened afterward. Following the Revolution, the colonists first tried to bind themselves together by articles of confederation, which defined themselves merely as a league of friendship. They did not work, and soon the responsible people in the Thirteen Colonies realized that something more must be done or we would have 13 separate kingdoms or countries along the Atlantic seaboard. So, these colonists sent their representative men of that day to a little town then known as Philadelphia to get together and see if they could agree upon a plan of government for the colonists collectively to govern themselves under in the future.

They did so meet for some 13 or more weeks, and they drew up an agreement on three pages of parchment or sheepskin. I know not which. The interesting thing is that it was drawn on three pages. I want to tell you about that agreement, page by page.

On page No. 1 they created a body of men, and they defined these men's duties. They said to this body of men, "You will have one job and one job only. Once each year you will repair to the seat of government whether New York, Philadelphia, or wherever it may be, and while there in proper assembly, you will enact the necessary bylaws that in your opinion you believe should be enacted for the well-being of the colonists, and when you have completed your work you will adjourn and go back home to either following the plow, preaching the Gospel, teaching school, attending the forge, or whatever your vocation has been, and so long as you belong on page No. 1, and are a lawmaker, you will have nothing to do with the duties imposed upon the men we are going to create on pages 2 and 3. You will be a lawmaker and a lawmaker only. You will not be a law enforcer, and not be a judge."

They then drew up page 2 of the agreement and created another body of men and said to this group, "You will have one job and one job only, and that will be to administer the laws made by the men on page 1. See that they are justly and equitably enforced upon the colonists, and as long as you are law enforcers you will not be permitted to make any of the laws that you enforce. The making of those laws will be left entirely to the body of men created on page 1." The head, of course, of page 2, will be a President, and he in turn will have a Cabinet and be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He will have the power to see that the laws made by the men on page 1 are properly enforced. Then they drew up page 3 of the agreement and created a third body of men, and said to this group of men, "You will have one job and one job only. You will sit as the judges of our courts to determine whether or not the bylaws to this agreement, made by the men on page 1, are in accord with the agreement, and also whether or not the method of enforcement employed by the men on page 2 is just and equitable and in accordance with the terms of this agreement. As long as you remain on page 3 and sit as a judge on our courts, you cannot make a law, under which you will judge the people, nor will you be able to enforce a law that you are judging the colonists under."

When they had completed the three pages they decided they must have a title or a beginning, just as in Congress or the State legislatures today, the title is agreed to after the body of the bill or legislation is completed, so these men agreed upon a title that ran something like this:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

Much has been said about that document. So much has been written about it that most people believe it is a document beyond comprehension, one that would require a lawyer, and sometimes they refer to a "Philadelphia lawyer" to figure it out. That is not true. Its greatness is in its simplicity, and its simplicity is the division of power into three branches or three groups. Take that division away and put one page upon the other, or a portion upon another, and you are taking the initial step back to what we fought a revolutionary war to get away from. Once one page is on top of the other, it is easy to get two pages on top—it is easy to bring the third over. When you get the third on top of the other two, you are right back to what we fought to get away from—totalitarianism. Once there is a dictator of the government, he not only makes the laws, but enforces them and judges the people under them.

They had quite a fight in that Philadelphia Convention. They fought over more than just what I told you. Before going further, I should refer to the amendments of the Constitution. They are simply clarifying amendments, and the rest of the wording of it is simply setting forth in more or less detail exactly the duties or powers of the groups on each page. Take away the three pages and put them together, and the whole Constitution is gone. The whole of government is gone. That is all there is to it. One of the fights they had was whether or not they should draw a line through the center of page 1, and divide it into two parts. One group led by George Washington believed that should be done. They believed in two Houses of Congress. The other group led by Hamilton believed in the unicameral. The first group led by George Washington believed there should be a lower House and an upper House, one the Senate, the upper House, and one the Congress, the lower House. That is known, of course, as the bicameral system. The unicameral men believed in only one House instead of two. The debate raged on. It was fierce for several days.

Finally Washington settled it when he was having lunch with Hamilton. He said to Hamilton, "Why, Alec, I notice by the way you eat your lunch that you favor the two House system of Congress." Alec said, "I do not. What do you mean?" George said, "I noticed that before you drank your tea you poured it into a saucer to cool." The cooling off process in legislative assemblies as well as in Congress is one of the greatest safety

valves for the American people. It is much better to have no new legislation than to have bad or ill-advised, or hurriedly conceived legislation.

The permitting of it to go through the two houses or rather the making of it necessary to go through the two houses gives plenty of time and opportunity to find out the bad features and eliminate them from the proposed legislation. Let us look for a moment how far this three-division plan, or three-page plan, has become a part of our system or form of government. We have 48 States, and each of the 48 States has a constitution, modeled after the Federal Constitution. You have the State general assembly or the State legislature which corresponds to page 1. The governor, the attorney general, the adjutant general and other executive offices are page 2. The supreme court of the State is page 3.

Go down to the county and you have the board of supervisors, corresponding to page 1. You have the county sheriff and other county officials corresponding to page 2. The county judges of the county courts correspond to page 3.

Go down to the city and what do you have—you have the city council corresponding to page 1. You have the police and fire departments corresponding to page 2. The municipal court corresponds to page 3. It is even out in the townships. It has become a part of us.

In order to get rid of that, or rather, in order to change our form of government, we first have to get rid of the division of powers into the three branches, and much has gone over the dam already in getting rid of it. There has been much transferring of power from one page or branch to the other. One of our States has even gone so far as to adopt the unicameral legislative system, and has abolished the bicameral system. Every once in awhile you hear mentioned by someone over the air, or some writer in the press will say, "We would be better off if we had a unicameral Congress." That is not a new idea. It was fought over by men wiser than we are, more than 150 years ago. We should follow their wisdom, because it has been so good in so many respects.

What is causing our people today to forget this form of government to follow other schemes and "isms," who are normally patriotic people? They are people who should know better. They are people who are best educated. Why do they follow new ideas to get rid of or away from the form of government which we have been blessed under? Personally, I think it is the depression or hard times, or lack of employment, and that is where highway officials come into the picture for the future welfare of America.

Possibly I can illustrate that by a story which is supposed to have happened back in Iowa, when Fred White, the State engineer, was a boy. One of his neighbors had been prosperous in the farming business. He owned one farm, and his son got married, and he wanted to set him up on an adjacent farm. He went to his neighbor, and after some dickering bargained to buy the farm for his son for $16,000. They designated the following Saturday to meet in town to pay off the money and get the deed and abstract. That morning the farmer went to town with his wife. He carried the money in a bucket. In the lawyer's office in town, when the deed and abstract were ready, he started to count out the money. When he got to the bottom of the bucket, he only had $14,000. He looked up at his neighbor and the lawyer, and he was embarrassed and chagrined. He said, "I am terribly sorry; I can't buy the farm. I thought there was $16,000 in this bucket, but there is only $14,000. I am very, very sorry." He then looked at his wife, who said, "John, dear, you brought the wrong bucket."

I tell that story because of the anxiety of the people of America when we have a little hard sledding to take a short-cut and get back to the days of the wrong bucket, back to the time when it was possible for a farmer to make so much money that he couldn't remember how many buckets he had it in, and in our anxiety to get there by shorter methods than are normally required, we are willing to surrender our birthright for a mess of pottage.

Did you ever receive a ticket for speeding? Of course, no one in this audience ever had a ticket for speeding or overparking or any other offense. But if you did, the man before whom you appeared in court the next morning was not the same man who gave you the ticket. If it was, you wouldn't have had a chance. You would have been prejudged by him. He believed you guilty, or he wouldn't have given you the ticket. Why is he a different man? He belongs on page 2. The man you appeared before is on page 3. This is a guaranty given to us by our forefathers in the Constitution.

If you have a property right, a marital right, or some other right to be determined, you realize the judge before whom you appear to have determined your property right or whatever right you may have, did not enact the law he determines your right under, and if he had made the law, you wouldn't have a chance.

Let us look at what happened in Washington between Goldsborough and John L. Lewis. Goldsborough did not enact the laws under which he determined the rights of Lewis and his miners. They were laws made by the people on page 1, the Congress of the United States. What chance would one party or the other have in his court if he had made the laws as well as being the judge to enforce them?

To this audience, I am sure I need go no further on that part of my talk. Did we ever have this kind of government in the history of the world before? Yes, once to our knowledge—maybe oftener—and only once clearly. Some 4,000 years ago, after the children of Israel came out of Egypt, it was necessary for a form of government to be set up for them, and it was through Moses and his communion with the Lord that this government was set up. First, we had the Ten Commandments which probably correspond to that agreement. If you will read the early books of the Bible, you will find that one group was set apart to make the bylaws and rules and regulations for the tribesmen. They were legal and just in every way, so long as they did not encroach upon or violate the original document of the Ten Commandments. What do we find next? We find a group of sheriffs to see that the laws were enforced. And we find the judges as set forth in the book of Judges. They had that plan for centuries, and then they became dissatisfied. They became like the people of America who want to get back to the days of the wrong bucket. They wanted shortcuts. They wanted somebody to look up to in the world as a dictator. They wanted an iron hand. They got lazy. They wanted authoritarianism. They didn't know what to call it. They went to Samuel. They took the matter up with him. He was so perplexed that he took the matter to the Lord. He received this answer, "Samuel, if the children of Israel want kings, give them kings." So, he called out King Saul and set him over them. Overnight they went from self-rule under a constitutional representative form of government, which we call a republic here, to complete totalitarianism or a dictatorship. What happened? They went into captivity. From then to oblivion and to this day they have not been heard from, except the descendants of one tribe. Why? Because they threw away a republic for totalitarianism, which today could be defined as communism or socialism, nazism, Hitlerism, Francoism, or any other "ism." Fundamentally, they are all the same. There is no fundamental difference between socialism, communism, nazism, Hitlerism, Francoism, or any of the "isms." One-man rule is the thing we must fight against. It is one man rule or one group ruling, because whenever one group takes over, there is always a strong man of that group who is the chairman, and he becomes the dictator.

Our forefathers were wise enough to see the dangers of it in giving to us this beautiful plan of government. Where did they get it? If you will read the discussions that took place, what we know about what happened in Philadelphia in 1789, when the document was drawn up, came from men who had a knowledge of the form of government that the children of Israel so prospered under. That is where it came from, and that is why we have become the greatest Nation in the world, with the highest standard of living, the highest wages, the best road system, and the best people, because we have had the best form of government.

Now, in order that I will not be accused of playing politics, since I have mentioned the term "republic" once or twice, I wish to call your attention to the fact that there is no more similarity between the Republican Party and a republican form of government than there is between Democratic Party and democracy. The republic was founded long before the Republican Party was thought of, and democracy was conceived, or thought of, long before the present Democratic Party was heard of. There is nothing political about it.

In conclusion I want to emphasize that we get our blessings under a republic and not under a democracy. We have all the blessings of a democracy and none of its detriments. Why do I say this is a republic? Did you ever pledge allegiance to that flag and "to the republic for which it stands"? Why isn't it, "to the democracy for which it stands"? We are not a democracy? Why are we a republic? It is because of the three pages—the separation of powers of the Government.

Did you ever sing the Battle Hymn of the Republic? Why is it the Battle Hymn of the Republic? Why isn't it the Battle Hymn of the Democracy? We are not a democracy. We are a republic where the people rule themselves under a Constitution through their own representatives. If you follow the stuff coming over the air today on certain programs, read certain things in magazines and the press, you will detect a subtle movement on the part of those who have the know-how to destroy us in attacking their legislators in the States and in the Congress. They know that in order to destroy this form of government and take control, they first have to destroy that branch of the Government that is composed of the people's representatives, and that is why they are constantly attacking the Congress of the United States. I am not defending the Congress because I am one of them. I am defending it as a citizen of the United States, and I have that right to defend it. I detect in them their subtle purpose. They know what they are doing. They never sleep—we do. We must start thinking a little more instead of sleeping so much, if we would preserve this form of government and this great country of ours.

You will not as highway officials and those interested in road building allow a good, usable highway to be torn up and destroyed until you see the blueprint for a better one. You will not permit the house in which you live to be torn down until you see the blueprint for a better one. Why then should we stand by and see the governmental roof that has been so carefully built torn down until someone presents the blueprint for a better plan. All these people who are finding so much fault with our form of government have no other plan to offer, except to go back from whence we came, and for what we fought the Revolutionary War to get away from.

You, as State highway officials, are in an enviable position to help to get better highways. You also are in an enviable position to help preserve our Government. Let us, therefore, resolve to work and fight perpetually for future generations the work thus far so well and so nobly advanced by the men to whom I am now speaking.

Sugar Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on behalf of the thousands of farm people and other home users of sugar in my district, in regard to the new sugar quotas that were announced Tuesday of last week jointly by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Office of Temporary Controls.

There are many angles to the sugar issue but I shall confine these remarks solely to the new quotas. From the point of view of the farm resident and home consumer, the quotas are an improvement but by no means a sufficient solution. I want to make that point clear, for there is far too little understanding of how seriously the sugar shortage has affected many rural areas.

The new allotment order says all institutional and industrial users of sugar will be granted increases of varying percentages for the balance of 1947, averaging from 15 to 20 percent at least. It says the home user will get an added 5 pounds per coupon, or a total of 10 pounds per ration book holder on April 1, July 1, and again on October 1, 1947. Last week's order also says the Government "does not plan to allow extra sugar for home canning this year." I stress this last statement because I know that thousands of housewives may be expecting some sort of home-canning sugar allotment over and above the regular sugar-stamp amounts. But last week's announcement makes it clear no extra home-canning sugar is contemplated by the Government allotters as of this date.

There was the 5-pound stamp on January 1 and there will be the three 10-pound stamps on April 1, July 1, and October 1. According to the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Temporary Controls, that is it. The home user will, if these quotas stand, get 35 pounds per person in 1947. According to official calculations, this same home user got a total of 25 pounds in 1946—three 5-pound sugar stamps—one every 4 months in 1946—plus two special 5-pound stamps for canning purposes. Thus it is now planned to give an added 10 pounds over all, or a 40-percent improvement over 1946.

The percentage of improvement is misleading. It is a fact that the home user, particularly the bona fide home canner and home baker, is the one who has been penalized most by the sugar shortage—she and the growers who are dependent on her as a market for their fruits and vegetables. While a 10-pound increase does add up to a 40-percent improvement, it is a lot like giving a hungry person a dime instead of a nickel when what he really needs is 50 cents for a meal. You originally intended giving him a nickel, but boost it to a dime—a 100-percent improvement. Yet it is still quite a ways from meeting his real needs. It is the same with the new sugar allotments insofar as rural residents and many others are concerned.

I want to comment again on this sugar problem as it arises in my district. I am certain it is similar in a majority of other districts. In one respect there is a difference. My district, comprising 11 counties in northwestern Michigan, is one of the leading fruit-producing areas in the country. Its annual yield of sour cherries is the largest in the Nation. To a lesser extent it is the same in its harvest of apples, peaches, pears, and so forth. Sugar is the biggest present item in the successful marketing of these crops.

Many thousands of pounds of these crops go to the fresh-fruit market. Home canning is the big factor in whether or not this fruit can be moved, and sugar is the big factor in home canning. Last year I saw thousands of bushels of the most beautiful peaches in the country go to waste simply because so little home canning was possible. Acres of peach orchards were not picked. Those peaches that were picked in some instances went below cost and in some instances merely rotted in the baskets or warehouses. This was a pitiful waste, all the direct result of the sugar shortage.

Too many people think of the sugar shortage as, at worst, an inconvenience to the householder. In my district it has been an economic tragedy, costing thousands of dollars in wasted fruit of the highest grade.

Like everybody else, I want to see increases for all users. But I think the housewife is entitled to first consideration. She got an average of 72 pounds per capita last year, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. Yet she herself had control of only 25 pounds per person last year, and the rest she got if and as she bought store products in which sugar was used.

There is still another angle that the big-city resident seldom considers. It is clear the allotment officials have done nothing about it. The average farm wife and the average housewife in a small town accepts home canning and home baking as the necessary and customary way of life. They have no bakeries available to them merely by going a block or two down the street or by stepping to a telephone and placing an order. Similarly, in rural areas they have no groceries immediately at hand at which they can conveniently buy canned fruits, vegetables, and so forth. In fact, most of these people would not buy these things in stores even if they did have the big-city-store conveniences. At least, they would prefer not to. They want to can their own. They always have. It is their way of life. Thousands of pounds of our farm produce and fresh fruits are marketed and consumed in that way.

I want to emphasize again and again that last week's quota statement is not sufficient to prevent continued financial loss. In effect, it says to the fruit farmer that for still another harvest he may have to let a portion of his peaches and apples glut the market or rot on the ground; that in still another highly prosperous year he may stand to lose thousands of dollars, not because there is no money to buy the fine fruit he grows, but solely because somebody in Washington has allotted the sugar elsewhere.

In short, I do not want our Government allotters to get self-satisfied with their generosity to date. If necessary, there should be consideration of a special increase for bona fide rural residents. In the face of the facts, I do not think big-city people would seriously raise the cry of discrimination. Ten added pounds in the city, with stores and bakeries all around, is one thing; 10 added pounds in the country is less than adequate.

Our real goal is to get the Government all the way out of this sugar situation before many months, just as soon as it can be assured that the supply, at a fair price, will be there for the little user as well as the big one. That day cannot come too soon to suit me.

This sugar problem for the average sugar consumer is, by no means, merely one of sentiment or inconvenience. It has been a matter of huge financial loss to fruit and vegetable growers, and of sizable increases in living costs for the thousands of families who rely on home canning—the home canning that cannot be done on 25 or 35 pounds of sugar per person per year for all home needs.

I want to inform the Government alloters in the most emphatic language I can put in print that what the people of my district want is more sugar in their own hands, under their own control, so they can continue the home canning and home baking that mean more food, better nutrition, greater convenience, and thrift for them, plus successful marketing of the things they grow. I intend to continue to do everything I can to see that they, the home users, get the sugar to which they are entitled. I hope every other Member of the House, particularly those from farm areas, will take similar action.

Underwriting Britain

REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain has finally decided that she cannot protect her interests in the Mediterranean, in Greece, and in Turkey any longer, and is calling upon Uncle Sam to take over the responsibility of keeping open her life line for her, and of protecting her interests in the Mediterranean area. As I see it she wants to unload her responsibilities, her obligations, her commitments, upon Uncle Sam, but retain all her interests, her commercial advantages, and her trade in that area.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], in an extension of remarks in Tuesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, called our attention to Britain's gambling bill of $4,000,000,000 per year, a gambling bill that goes untaxed in Great Britain, and points out that the 400,000 Britons engaged in the "gambling racket" might be better employed in the mines or factories of Great Britain producing the badly needed goods to keep her economy. Congressman REED's remarks should be read by every Member of this House in view of the requests that will be made to the Congress to help Great Britain.

As a part of my remarks today I am including an editorial from the Chicago Tribune analyzing the proposal to underwrite Great Britain's future in addition to what we have already done for her. I recommend it also as "must" reading:

UNDERWRITING BRITAIN

No step ever contemplated by an American administration, save possibly the decisions which took the United States into war in 1917 and 1941, has been fraught with graver consequences than President Truman's intention to intervene in Greece. If he is not restrained by Congress, the United States will find itself permanently entangled in European power politics. It will have forsaken for good and all the traditional outlook that the destiny of Americans lies in America.

The proposal that the United States should underwrite Britain's management of the Greek Nation as a bulwark against Soviet expansion into the Mediterranean came from London. Since the end of the war Britain has maintained troops in Greece and has had the practical management of all of the important government posts. This has cost money, and Britain contends that after March 31 it will be unable to continue financial and economic assistance.

The British plan for America to step in and assume the burden constitutes a form of refined blackmail. The British say that if their ascendancy is lost in Greece the country will go to Russia by default. Leftist elements in Greece are already conducting what corresponds to a civil war. Unless the rightist regime under King George is supported by both troops and capital, it is argued, communism will win out.

Britain is currently finding the plea of impoverishment very useful in bringing influence to bear upon the United States. The British domestic economy is so shot under the Socialist Government that a parliamentary mission has arrived in Washington to inform congressional leaders that the $3,750,000,000 present of a year ago will not suffice. Another huge cash credit is demanded at once, one member of Parliament going so far as to say that America is now "married" to Britain and must meet its responsibilities.

The effect of Britain's program is to invite the United States to become the conservator of the British Empire. It is to pay the bills for Socialist experimentation at home and guarantee the sway of imperial rule abroad. There are no indications that this is to be a temporary arrangement. Rather, it is one which must necessarily endure for the predictable future, or until America goes down under the cumulative weight of the enormous responsibilities it is asked voluntarily to assume.

Although the British represent their difficulties in Greece as something which can be overcome by American financial aid, the United States inevitably would find that the Army, Navy, and Air Force were quite as fully committed as the Treasury. The cost alone—an estimated $320,000,000 in the next 2 years—would be enough to give a less foolhardy administration pause, but the consequences would not end there. In time, under any arrangement requiring the United States to underwrite the status quo, we should find that what we have really acquired in Greece is a beachhead in another war.

If we jump into this adventure there will logically be no reason why we should not next be called to bolster British rule in Italy, Palestine, Gibraltar, the former Italian colonies of North Africa, Egypt, Aden, Singapore, Hong Kong, or wherever else Britain has installed herself. She will be as impotent everywhere else as she professes to be in Greece.

We shall find that each of these places is as much a focus of malignant infection as every other. We will be called upon to expend vast amounts of money to prop up colonial economies and the British home economy. We shall have to provide the force to keep restive populations in line. And at every turn we shall be exposed to the threat of war. We are to do this knowing that no American interest is involved, and no American benefit can be expected.

It is a measure of the confusion of Truman and the State Department that while they talk about finding a workable formula by which capitalism and communism can exist in the same world, they are willing to undertake the protection of Britain against Russia. They do so as if no hazards were entailed. No nation has ever prepared to walk the plank in a more carefree spirit.

The crowning lunacy of this scheme is that, while America is to supply the money and force, Britain is to retain full power over all policies and decisions. The political and economic structure which we are to underwrite in Greece is of British creation. It won't be changed by American intervention. We can pay the bills and act the role of bouncer but the British are to remain in the driver's seat.

If we were to go into Greece offering political and personal liberty in the light of the Bill of Rights, there might be a grain of sense in the project, if only a grain. We could at least hope in these circumstances to make converts and friends of Greeks. But that is not the way of the State Department. It has proved in the occupation of Germany that American concepts of the freedom and dignity of the individual are not considered fit for export. In Greece we should be merely valets to the arrogant exponents of a decaying imperialism. That course is suicidal. It will lead us to exhausting wars and to bankruptcy.

School-Lunch Program

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, legislative action sometimes is partisan, sometimes it is sectional. I desire to discuss an important matter now pending before this Congress which is neither partisan nor sectional, but is vital alike to Democrat and Republican, to North and South, and to East and West.

March 31, which is a little more than 3 weeks away, will bring an end to Federal aid for the school-lunch program, unless the necessary deficiency appropriation is made to continue it for the remainder of the school year. The amount needed is pitifully small when considered in the light of the billions of dollars we are scattering with lavish hand to every nook, cranny, and corner of the world.

This is not a project or program which is wholly paid for by the Federal Government. The Federal Government only pays a part of the expense. The States pay the remainder of that portion of the program which is publicly financed. In addition to that part of the program which is publicly financed, the patrons of the schools, the parents of the pupils, pay a substantial part of the lunch expense. It is only in exceptional cases, where the pupil is unable to pay at all, that the total cost of the lunch is paid for with Federal and State funds. In the schools in my home district the average pupil pays 20 cents for his lunch.

The sum required for the entire year's program is one of the smallest worthwhile items in the whole Federal budget. In the fiscal year 1944–45 the Federal Government's appropriation to the school-lunch program was $50,000,000. For the year 1945–46 it was $57,500,000. For the year 1946–47 it was $75,000,000, a sum which is less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the Federal budget. If this is cut out of the budget, the taxpayers will not feel it. It is such a small item of expense that it will not show up in the taxpayer's receipt. But if the school-lunch program is dropped, the effects of that action will show up in malnutrition and in the health and physical condition of something like 5,000,000 school children who are now enjoying the benefits of nutritious lunches, which are only partially paid for by public funds.

The superintendent of schools in my home State, Dr. M. D. Collins, says that since the program began, the general health and well-being of school children have been raised materially, that the children are making better grades, and that school attendance has noticeably improved. In our State approximately 275,000 children attending 1,437 schools, are benefiting from the program.

I said at the outset that this is not a partisan or sectional matter. Its benefits are shared by those of all political parties and all sections. While Georgia benefits from its provisions, every other section of the Nation likewise benefits, some a great deal more than Georgia. I would like to call attention to the fact that while in Georgia only 1,437 schools and 275,000 children participate, in Illinois 2,844 schools and 358,000 children participate, and these figures from Illinois are furnished to me by citizens of that State who want the program continued. They say that Illinois, like Georgia, has many more schools which want to apply for participation in the school-lunch program, and will apply, if the program is continued. If the program is discontinued, the health of Illinois school children will suffer, just as those of every other participating State will suffer, but more will be affected in Illinois than will be affected in Georgia.

To look at the program in other sections of the country: In New York 2,419 schools and 480,000 children participate, and in California 2,069 schools and 422,000 children participate. I am not talking for Georgia alone. I am told that nearly 50,000 schools in the United States

participate in this program, and of that number only 1,437 are located in Georgia.

I concur in the statement that there has been no mandate from the people to Congress to save money—this amount of money—at the expense of the health of school children of the Nation.

I cannot bring myself to believe that a nation which is sending hundreds of millions of dollars to dozens of other nations all over the world, and in some instances billions of dollars, has this year become so poor that this program must be dropped 3 months before the school year ends.

I cannot bring myself to believe that a government whose budget for the year is $37,000,000,000, or even $30,000,000,000, must find it necessary at the end of March to discontinue this program which is benefiting every part and section of the country.

There are many ways in which money can be saved by this Congress. I expect to vote for heavy reductions in expenditures in many directions. I expect to vote for substantial tax reductions, and for reduction of the national debt. But I earnestly submit that this is a worthy program, and one which all sections and parties can and should unite to support.

Maladministration of Rent Control in St. Joseph, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter and factual information sent to me by Mr. Don Houseworth, city editor of the St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette, regarding the maladministration of rent control in St. Joseph, Mo., as follows:

ST. JOSEPH GAZETTE,
St. Joseph, Mo., February 26, 1947.

WILLIAM C. COLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: Something drastic must be done about rent control. It is slowly but surely creating a sizable group of embittered citizens who will find some way, either at the polls or through financial influence, to strike back at the despotic set-up that has placed the landowners at the mercy of tenants.

It is not enough that a 10-percent increase in rents be put on the dog's plate—the system must be abolished and you men in Washington who represent us will earn no thanks through the handing out of a pittance.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which was submitted to the St. Joseph rent-control office by Jack Miller, State editor of the Gazette, and myself, as owners of a small apartment house. This was in reply to a threat to reduce rents.

We showed a heavy loss on this property, backed by receipts for expenditures. We were given no consideration. A 10-percent cut was ordered and so we go further into the red.

Mr. Miller and I bought this property in order to obtain a roof over our heads. If we had any place to go we'd give the damn house away and forget our loss. It's one hell of a situation when men and women who invest their money in real estate cannot even break even on rentals because some element of the public must be sacrificed for political reasons. I don't wonder that communism and socialism has made some progress in this country. I marvel that the 'sms have not taken over.

Sincerely,

DON HOUSEWORTH,
City Editor, the Gazette.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *January 20, 1947.*

Mr. WILLIAM B. NORRIS,
Director-Attorney, Rent Control Offices,
St. Joseph, Mo.

DEAR SIR: We submit attached statements and receipts as evidence in our opposition to your proposal to reduce rents at 612 and 612½ North Twelfth Street as indicated in a notice received by us January 19, 1947, and identified as Docket No. 1-6097 and 1-6098.

Previous communications to you have related the history of this property since last summer when we acquired it but for purposes of the present proposal we desire to review the facts.

The property at 610, 610½, 612, and 612½ is a residence of brick construction on a large lot, only six blocks from Eighth and Felix Streets and, therefore, a desirable rental location. It is one and one-half blocks from three Frederick Avenue bus lines; two blocks from the Grand Avenue bus line.

This property was purchased in July for $6,000 and Mr. Miller and myself occupy the apartments at 610 and 610½, leaving two other apartments of similar size as rental properties.

The rental properties consist of four living rooms each, with front and rear entrances. Occupants of these apartments share a concreted basement laundry room, with hot- and cold-water connections and sewerage They likewise share a bath. Each is provided with a concrete garage on a paved alley. The tenants, in turn, subrent the garages to nontenants and retain the rents collected.

The tenants have had exclusive use of the north half of the front and rear yards, this half-plot measuring 150 by 60 feet, in which they have cultivated a garden of considerable size.

We are required, under present records in the rent-control offices, to supply these tenants an unlimited amount of electricity, water, and gas, as well as hot water and heat, for which there is a separate furnace. Attached evidence indicates that the tenants have taken full advantage of these services, since their winter bills have been higher than those for the apartments of the owners.

Last fall we protested against continued supply of some of the facilities mentioned above because the records in the rent-control offices at that time did not state that the tenants were entitled to so many services. We failed to gain relief at that time, and, in our presence, the records were changed to cover all the services and facilities enumerated above. These changes in the records were made in red crayon by Mr. Willis.

It will be noted that the accompanying statement shows that the apartments in question return a rental of $25 each per month.

The statement shows that the cost of utilities, heat, interest, taxes, and insurance total almost as much as the income. The operating expense disregards principal payment on the mortgage, repairs, and depreciation, which, if added to monthly overhead, results in the simple truth that the loss on these apartments at this time cannot be borne by us indefinitely.

To propose that the rents be reduced 10 percent can only mean authorization for these tenants to dig deeper into our wages to meet part of their living expenses. We have made every effort to live within the spirit of the rent-control set-up, but such a proposal, in view of generally higher rents for less facilities in our neighborhood, cannot be accepted as a fair treatment of our problems as landlords.

We are submitting a copy of this letter and statements to the Empire Trust Co., which holds the mortgage on this property.

Two months ago we obtained required priorities for materials with which to remodel the apartments in question in order to accommodate a larger number of families and upon our petition for possession of the premises we were informed that our request had been granted. The tenants have not indicated that they received notices to vacate, but we presume that such notices were served upon them through your office. At any rate, they still have some 4 months before eviction action can be started in State court.

We protest against the proposal to reduce these rents on the basis of the housing regulation pertaining to "substantial deterioration * * * other than ordinary wear and tear," as stated in the notice. There have been no specific complaints to the landlords by the tenants at any time, save in the matter of plumbing, and in such instances repairs have been made without delay. The general condition of the apartments, inasmuch as there has been no effort whatever on the part of the tenants to do anything for themselves, is considered good by the landlords. Very probably the use of soap and a scrub brush would improve some corners of the apartments.

We are willing to begin work at once on our remodeling program by enameling the woodwork in these apartments if the tenants will give us access to the apartments during the afternoons.

Very truly yours,

DON HOUSEWORTH,
JACK MILLER,
St. Joseph Gazette.

Income and expenditures for 612 and 612½ North Twelfth

	Rents	Power	Water	Gas	Interest, taxes, insurance	Coal	Total overhead	Gain	Loss
July	$37.50	$3.98	$3.68	$3.71	$17.08		$27.85	$9.65	
August	50.00	4.23		3.47	17.08		24.78	25.22	
September	50.00	3.98	6.01	4.28	17.08	$8.00	39.35	10.65	
October	50.00	4.51		4.23	17.08	17.08	42.90	7.10	
November	50.00	5.10	6.83	4.95	17.08	22.53	56.49		$6.49
December	50.00	5.76		5.30	17.08	13.83	41.97	8.03	
Jan. 1 to 17	25.76	2.88	3.42	6.38	8.54	14.22	35.44		9.68
	313.26	30.44	19.34	32.32	111.02	75.66	268.78	60.65	16.17
								−16.17	
								44.48	

Repairs and other itemized expenses	$204.50
	92.88
	297.38
	−44.48
Expenditures over total income	252.90

The above figures do not take into consideration any depreciation on this property.

New Cabinet Line-up Gives Control to Socialist Party in Polish Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Wednesday, March 5, 1947.

It is a deeply interesting article, written without bias and free from propaganda for one side or the other of the political factions involved.

It is truly informative and the Christian Science Monitor should be complimented on doing a high-class job of factual newspaper reporting.

The article follows:

NEW CABINET LINE-UP GIVES CONTROL TO SOCIALIST PARTY IN POLISH REGIME

WARSAW.—Poland has a new Government, a new Parliament, and a new president elected for a period of 7 years. Although the Government is called new, the changes are but slight.

But there are two cardinal differences which in due time are bound to have an important effect on Poland's internal and external policy, including its relations with the United States and Great Britain.

The first difference is that the Polish Socialist Party has for the first time, not without struggle, been able to reassert itself to the extent of equality with the Communists, who, in the Provisional Government, predominated. In the present cabinet, the Socialists, in addition to the Premier, have six cabinet seats, the Communists have five.

It is true that the Communists command the important portfolios of foreign affairs, education, and, above all, security police. The last one is today probably the most influential for it lays down the rules of behavior for all citizens and it is enough for the minister of security to declare any measure indispensable for the welfare of the state to make this measure binding on everyone, including cabinet ministers.

HANDS TIED

It was well known that not even the Prime Minister would interfere in matters relating to security, even when his friends or close collaborators were arrested. A few weeks before the elections the former Prime Minister, Mr. Osobka-Morawski, refused to intervene on the excuse that no one must interfere with the security police.

President Bierut and Marshal Rola-Zymierski, both termed "nonparty," are known to have had a Communist past. Undoubtedly they will tend to support the Communists, although so far as Mr. Bierut is concerned he has of late developed a very welcome impartiality which has won him popularity even among the opposition parties. It was no accident that even Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Peasant Party leader, felt it necessary to visit him, wishing him success in the new office of President, although he did not vote for Mr. Bierut in the Sejm, or Diet.

Taking all things into consideration, it may be assumed that the Socialists and Communists are now equal partners in the Government and that, therefore, the Socialists will for the first time be able to exercise much greater influence than they have been able to till now.

WESTERN IN OUTLOOK

The Polish Socialist Party is essentially western in outlook and tradition, and the young new Premier, Jozef Cyrankiewicz, has consistently stood for a parliamentary system on lines, if not similar, at least not very much different from those in the West. If the Socialists have their way the new Sejm may eventually become the real representative of the Polish people and not, as is the custom in Russia, be a mere council summoned to endorse the decisions of the party leaders and Government.

This is the second cardinal difference in the new make-up. What Poland needs is that the people be given a real chance, a chance they have never had before, of taking part in the Government of their country. When Poland rewon her independence after the first war, Parliament became all powerful and the constitution then drafted left all sovereign power in the hands of the people.

But this lasted only for a very short time Marshal Pilsudski in 1926 put an end to parliamentary rule in Poland appointing himself dictator. This lasted after his passing in 1934 until the war broke out.

The Provisional Government appointed as the result of the Yalta agreement could hardly have offered the Polish people any opportunity to participate in the administration of their country. It is now that they have this chance, and if the Socialists prevail there is reasonable hope that the parliamentary system in Poland has come to stay.

UNITY PLEA SIGNIFICANT

It is significant that President Bierut in his manifesto on the day of his election laid emphasis on the need for unity, and in most patriotic phrases invited the nation to share in the responsibility of ruling the new Poland. His speech has made a very deep impression on the country as a whole, and has added considerably to the esteem in which he was held when he was only chairman of the national council.

President Bierut is a man of the people. The son of a landless peasant he has gone through poverty and hunger, and has suffered for his ideals. He started life as a water carrier in Lublin where he later became the main organizer of the cooperative movement, secretly working for the liberation of his country. Arrested by the Pilsudski regime for his Communist principles he was sentenced first to 6 months in jail and then to 7 years, 5 of which he served in Poland, managing later to escape abroad.

The war found him in eastern Poland and later in White Russia from where he returned in 1942 to organize the underground, which, unlike that following the London government was to cooperate with Russia. From this movement later sprang the National Council and the People's Army which in contrast to the Home Army cooperated with the Soviet forces and later was included in the Polish Army formed in Soviet Russia under General Berling, who refused to accompany General Anders out of the Soviet Union.

Vice Premier Gomulka is the son of a worker and himself started to earn a living at the age of 10. The second Vice Premier, Antoni Korzycki is the son of a poor farmer. Marshal Rola-Zymierski was born in the home of a railway worker and Zygmunt Modzelewski, Foreign Minister, is the son of a laborer.

How are these changes going to affect Poland's foreign policy? In the attitude to Russia no change can be expected. Neither this nor any other government, if it had any sense of realism, as this Government certainly has, would ever dare to alter its policy in respect to the Soviet Union.

Many of Poland's troubles have been brought about by the failure to realize the necessity for friendship with Russia. Today this need is understood by all and although there are millions who dislike Russia, and thousands who would be prepared even today to fight, they all admit that there is no hope for Poland unless it can work out a common policy with its eastern neighbor.

But in their attitude to the western powers, mainly toward the United States and Great Britain, considerable differences of opinion prevail. The Communists are hostile and although they realize that Poland to accomplish its 3-year economic plan must seek aid from the western democracies, they nevertheless would prefer even to go without that aid than tie themselves in any bond of friendship with the capitalist countries. If they do so they will invariably follow the advice of the Kremlin.

But in the Socialists the western powers have real and sincere friends as they have in the Democrats and Peasants who command two-fifths of the seats in the Diet and similarly in the new Cabinet.

UP TO BRITAIN AND UNITED STATES

If Great Britain and the United States are wise enough to avail themselves of the reservoir of good will that still exists in Poland there is no reason why relations between the new Poland and the western countries should not be friendlier than they have been.

With the departure of the British and American Ambassadors, Mr. Cavendish-Bentinck and Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, both of whom are reported here to have been recalled, a new chapter can be and should be opened. Poland should be made the arena of cooperation instead of friction as it has been till now, for it must not be forgotten that to an appreciable extent, Russia judges the attitude of the western powers to itself by the policy those powers adopt toward Poland.

Warsaw is the testing stone of relations between Washington, London, and Moscow, and any improvement in these relations will invariably lead to an improvement in the relations between the big powers generally.

Introducing the new Cabinet to the Diet, Josef Cyrankiewicz, the Premier, declared that although the maintenance of friendship with Russia and the Slav nations generally is first on the list of his government's policy, he is very anxious to see Poland in friendly cooperation with the United States and Great Britain. He put the United States first because in Warsaw as in Moscow the tendency is to be to lay greater stress on the need for friendship with Washington than with London.

There is a feeling that, despite Bevin's insistency, that His Majesty's government follows an independent policy, it is the United States that is responsible for the main principles on which western policy toward Russia, and also toward Poland, is formulated; and that once the United States could be won over to friendship, Britain would follow without much ado.

In addition, there is also the realization here that as far as material aid goes both Russia and Poland have for many years to come to look to the United States and not to the United Kingdom. Taking all things into consideration, it is safe to say that the new Polish Government will be inclined even more than its predecessor to develop friendly relations with both America and Britain in the hope that at the Moscow Conference they will refrain from causing any special trouble over Poland's western frontiers.

A Look at Harry Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, President Harry Truman is to

be commended for his understanding of peoples, his courage, and his honesty. No man could have taken over the helm of the ship of state at a more disadvantageous time than he, and yet, on the record, he has performed the duties of his office remarkably well and accomplished much. In my opinion, we are indeed fortunate to have a man of his stature in the White House in these troublous times.

His shedding of war powers, his appointments to high office, all attest to his honesty and integrity. His latest act in placing a wreath at the shrine of the boy heroes of Chapultepec is only another indication of his understanding of peoples. While this incident, in itself, was small, in its effect the results will be great because out of it will come a deeper understanding between two great nations of North America. This in turn will reinforce hemispheric solidarity and bring home more forcibly to all the peoples of the Americas that we are neighbors and friends, in fact as well as in words.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including with these remarks an article by Richard Neuberger on President Truman which appeared in the Progressive of March 3, 1947:

A LOOK AT HARRY TRUMAN

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

PORTLAND, OREG.—A stocky little man from Missouri has been President of the United States for nearly 2 years now. Next month will bring the second anniversary of the ascendancy of Harry S. Truman to the highest constitutional office on earth.

However history will judge him, none of us can fail to admit that the man who was once Missouri's junior Senator has demonstrated that our democracy is ever capable of producing a leader in a crisis.

Mr. Truman is not as spectacular as his immediate predecessor, the colorful Franklin D. Roosevelt. A former haberdasher and small-time county judge, he lacks the education of a Woodrow Wilson, the aristocratic "to-the-manor-born" behavior of a T. R. He fails to equal the profound knowledge of William Taft, the vast international experience of Herbert Hoover.

And yet Harry Truman has been a good President, in my opinion. Perhaps not a great one, but how many Presidents are? Do not the school children study the lives of only three or four?

Democracy is a resilient institution when from Harry Truman's humble origins it can call forth a man to weather all the crises that have confronted F. D. R.'s successor.

Look back on those crises now—the bellicosity of Soviet Russia, the railroad strike, and later the coal strike, the ending of price control, the many show-downs in the United Nations, a mid-term election lost by the party in power, the decision on atomic energy.

Unquestionably Mr. Truman muffed some of those situations. What President hasn't bungled? I greatly admired F. D. R., but remember the London conference fiasco of 1933. Lincoln himself, the noble emancipator who is immortal, straddled the slavery issue for many months and was quoted on both sides of the most critical question of his time.

When we look at an incumbent President, we forget that past Presidents were human beings, too. T. R. made mistakes in the Sino-Russian crisis of his time, and Harry Truman bobbled the ending of the railroad strike. Maybe Andrew Jackson hesitated too long in coming to grips with Nicholas Biddle, and perhaps Harry Truman vacillated at Potsdam.

Yet what about the other side of the ledger?

With Russia attempting to fasten its own type of tyranny on eastern Europe, Harry Truman, the haberdasher from Missouri, has refused to recognize satellite states thus won over. His first Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, stood firm against Soviet hegemony in Europe, and it is likely that his second, Gen. George C. Marshall, will follow a similar course.

The vast new power of atomic energy may change the history of mankind. Harry Truman has refused to yield to the pro-Communist elements who would share the atomic secret, willy nilly, with the Soviet Union. And he has refused to yield to the bigots and Tories who see atomic energy as only another resource to be exploited by big business. Many a President less humble than Harry Truman might have hesitated to nominate as controversial and progressive a figure as David Lilienthal to head the Atomic Energy Commission.

Last fall Harry Truman's party suffered a terrific setback at the polls. It was one of the worst beatings ever inflicted on a party in power. The President might have assumed a stiff-necked belligerence, or he could have succumbed completely to the ostensible mandate as given at the polls. Not his severest critics can say that his conduct since election has been other than dignified, intelligent, and resourceful. His Government has refused to acquiesce in the silly talk of reducing taxes with a debt of $250,000,000,000 still to pay, and it also has not concurred in the loose talk that organized labor must be shorn of its basic rights.

If someone says that Mr. Truman's administration is not spectacular, I agree. If another adds that it lacks the flair for the dramatic I also agree. If still a third claims it is not sufficiently liberal, I will agree with that, too.

And yet there have been far worse administrations. It is easy to assail the Cabinet as weak, but Lewis Schwellenbach was a first-class Senator from Washington, and agricultural secretaries within memory have blundered more than Clinton Anderson.

We Americans criticize with ease. I love it as much as anyone else. It is one of our favorite parlor sports. The President is a particularly choice target. If we are dissatisfied with railroad service or think taxes are too high, why doesn't the President do something about it? In my home town, the politicians think the President should furnish the money to reopen the kindergartens. The President is far away. It is easier to criticize him than the banker or the labor racketeer or the real-estate agent right at home.

The greatest commentator on our American political life was the Frenchman, Alexis De Tocqueville. In 1834 he wrote that the American Congress "watches the conduct of the President more than it directs it." A hundred years later this is prophetic. Look at all the men in House and Senate who know precisely what the President should do on portal-to-portal pay suits, on tax reduction, on relations with Russia, on every mortal issue from amalgamation of the armed forces to what to serve at White House suppers.

Some of the men in House and Senate are finding it easier to criticize Harry Truman than to do something constructive themselves. One of our local politicians who insisted that the President reduce taxes isn't doing so much talking right at this moment, especially because the politician has introduced a bill to increase veterans' benefits. "Tax reduction and higher appropriations" seems to be the lexicon of many of the men watching Mr. Truman's conduct.

I hope I can make it clear that I do not consider Harry Truman a great President. Yet I think he has risen greatly to many occasions. Little was expected of him, and in some instances he has done much. He has spoken out for religious tolerance, he has struck at bigots at home and at tyrants abroad. His utterances may not ring down the corridors of time, but they are in plain language and the man in the street can understand them.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt died at Warm Springs, many Americans shuddered for the future. A haberdasher and his family would live in the White House, a creation of Boss Pendergast occupying the noble residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue! Many cringed in horror.

Yet not a breath of scandal has attached to Mr. Truman's administration. If there are shortages in the financial statements of the Democratic Sergeant at Arms of the House, that far antedates Mr. Truman's incumbency. As the occupant of the White House, Harry Truman has been dignified and friendly. His family has behaved with grace. The President has shown courage—perhaps somewhat recklessly in flying everywhere he goes. Yet, I think the American people like a leader who is not personally afraid, who can look at the skies and fly with the men who must brave the elements daily to carry mail and military cargoes.

As the second anniversary of Mr. Truman's oath of office approaches, I want to say these few words in his behalf. I know that many who read them will not support him in 1948. Perhaps I will not support him myself, although I have only one thin vote. But in a time of crisis for democracy throughout the world, Harry Truman has been a symbol of democracy and of that symbol we need not be ashamed. I like to think of him bestowing the Congressional Medal of Honor on an heroic soldier. "I'd rather have this medal than be President!" said Harry Truman. I am sure he meant that, and I like him for it. I believe the American people do, too.

The Wool Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement by Mr. Sylvan J. Pauly, of Montana, president of the National Wool Growers Association, before the Agriculture Committee. Mr. Pauly discusses the wool situation as follows:

The National Wool Growers Association is a voluntary and unincorporated organization of wool growers founded in 1865 for the purposes, first, to secure for the business of wool growing equal encouragement and protection with the other great industrial interests of our country; second, to protect the interests of sheepmen in the framing of a protective tariff on wool and lambs.

This association, at the present time, is comprised of the following affiliated State associations: Arizona Wool Growers Association, California Wool Growers Association, Colorado Wool Growers Association, Idaho Wool Growers Association, Montana Wool Growers Association, Nevada Wool Growers Association, New Mexico Wool Growers Association, Oregon Wool Growers Association, Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association, Utah Wool Growers Association, Washington Wool Growers Association, Western South Dakota Sheep Growers Association, and the Wyoming Wool Growers Association.

The memberships of these 13 State associations are composed of wool and lamb producers.

More than 71 percent (23,198,000) of the stock sheep in the United States are owned by 112,000 operators in these 13 States.

In the other 35 States, 472,000 farmers are owners of 29 percent (9,344,000) of the stock sheep in the United States. These owners are but slightly organized; some of them are members of our association. We speak for the whole domestic industry. There is no other organization that assumes this task in whole, or in part, and we express the views of more than a majority of the 584,000 wool growers of this country.

We estimate that 100,000 men, besides owners, are employed in the keeping of sheep in the 13 principal sheep-raising States. This does not in any way cover employment in connection with transportation, marketing, processing, or distribution.

ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF SHEEP INDUSTRY

Approximately 95 percent of the western range lands occupied by this industry is adapted only to the raising of livestock. Also, a large percentage of the remaining land is used in raising feed for livestock. Except for the livestock industry, this land would be nonproducing and nontaxable, and the whole region would be of little value except for the mineral deposits—and oil—but these resources are expendable and are being expended at a rapid rate; they are not replaceable. Livestock utilizes the annual resources of this country and over the years to come will be the principal source of wealth.

The economic importance of the sheep industry to the 12 States and Texas is shown in the table below. This table shows the cash income received from the most important agricultural products produced in these States for the year 1945. It will be noted that the sheep industry produced $270,432,000 compared with a cash income in 1943 of $289,589,000. The relative high cash income for 1945 of $270,432,000 is due, in large measure, to the disposal of breeding stock. While increasing the cash income for 1945, the sale of this breeding stock will actually mean a reduction in future income, which will not only affect the individual producer but the community in which he lives, and the local, State, and Federal governments in the loss of taxes which results.

Cash income of various agricultural products and relative importance in 12 Western States and Texas for the year 1945

Product	Cash income	Percentage of total	Rank of importance
Cattle and calves	2014, 265, 000	22	1
Vegetable crops	695, 521, 000	17	2
Fruit and nut crops	604, 014, 000	15	3
Food grains	590, 819, 000	15	4
Dairy products	529, 861, 000	13	5
Sheep, lambs, and wool	270, 432, 000	7	6
Hogs	198, 483, 000	5	7
Turkeys	105, 022, 000	2	8
Chickens	98, 857, 000	2	9
Sugar beets	79, 149, 000	2	10
Total		100	

Total livestock and wool	$1, 283, 180, 000
Dairy products	529, 861, 000
Other agricultural products	2, 179, 382, 000
Total cash income	4, 092, 423, 000

STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF WOOL

The recent World War furnished all the evidence necessary that neither this Nation nor any other nation can wage a war successfully without an ample supply of wool.

As evidence of this, it is only necessary to recall the almost frenzied efforts put forth at the outbreak of the war to assemble in this country a stock pile of wool that would insure the United States and our allies a sufficient supply to meet uniform requirements in the widely spread fighting terrains.

Despite the desperate needs of our European allies for armaments, munitions, and food, we sent fleets of precious and scarce vessels to Australia and South Africa to concentrate in this country the greatest stock pile of wool ever assembled here. This Nation not only endeavored to anticipate its own military requirements, but paid the freight, insurance, and storage on behalf of the British Government on 500,000,000 pounds of wool held in this country. The joint domestic and foreign stock pile of wool in 1945 approximated 800,000,000 pounds.

Fortunately, during the war the sea lanes in the Pacific remained open. As a result, this country was enabled to provide its fighting forces with the most healthful and most expertly designed uniforms of any in history. It was also able to meet the desperate requirements for uniforms of our allies, including China, France, and Russia.

The Axis Powers, particularly Germany, were not so fortunate in their wool supplies. It is the consensus of advised military opinion that the lack of wool in World War I, was a fundamental factor in the defeat of the Axis. Military observers agree, more German troops died from cold and exposure than from Russian bullets. Even as early as January 1942, the situation of the German Army, resulting from lack of sufficient wool, was so acute that Maj. Gen. E. L. Corbin, Director of Procurement, Office of the Quartermaster General, speaking before the National Wool Growers Association at Salt Lake City, Utah, stated in part:

"A large part of the suffering of the German armies in the current Russian campaign results from * * * enforced use of substitutes for wool. In addition there was a seriously inadequate supply of clothing (even if made of all wool), for the rigors of a winter campaign in European Russia. Both of these factors are as important to Hitler today as ammunition. There is no doubt that Old Man Winter and the lack of wool in Germany is causing as many casualties in the German Army as is powder and ammunition. When a man is more or less continuously half frozen, his military effectiveness is seriously lowered."

The Army and Navy Munitions Board declared that wool is a strategic and critical material.

DOMESTIC SHEEP INDUSTRY LIQUIDATES

The official figures of the Department of Agriculture show that the numbers of stock sheep have declined 35 percent from January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1947. This has, of course, decreased the production of domestic wool, now designated a strategic and critical commodity by the United States Army. A clear picture is shown of this liquidation, both in the numbers of stock sheep and pounds of wool produced, by the following table:

Stock sheep on farms and the production of domestic wool in the United States

Year	Number of head of stock sheep on farms, as of Jan. 1, per 1,000 head	Production of domestic wool in grease-pounds, per 1,000 pounds
1940	46, 588	428, 216
1941	47, 804	455, 368
1942	49, 807	453, 073
1943	48, 796	442, 578
1944	45, 232	418, 094
1945	40, 922	387, 017
1946	37, 517	[1]358, 000
1947	32, 542	[2]300, 000

[1] Estimated by the U. S. Department of Agriculture.
[2] Our estimated domestic production in 1947.

This constant and continuing liquidation of the domestic industry has many causes. One of the factors among these causes for liquidation is the uncertainty of the future. This uncertainty is caused by:

1. Lack of a long term Government wool policy.

2. Little increase in the price for domestic wool.

3. Increased costs of production and lack of efficient labor.

4. Dumping of foreign wool on the American market.

The only market we had for domestic wool in 1941, 1942, and 1943 was for defense purposes. Domestic wool was given preference over the use of foreign wool by the armed forces, particularly the Army. When the Army requirements decreased in 1944, 1945, and 1946 much less domestic wool was used.

In order to keep up production the Commodity Credit Corporation in April 1943, entered into the wool-purchase program with the growers. This program has been continued from time to time and has been continuous since the inception for the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. The Secretary of Agriculture has now declared, however, that the program will end as of April 15, 1947, unless Congress directs otherwise. There is need for quick action on the part of Congress to stabilize the domestic sheep industry.

It is interesting to contrast the domestic wool program with the action taken by the British Government respecting the wool industry of its dominions.

At the outbreak of World War II, the British Government purchased all of the wools in the wool-growing dominions of the Empire, comprising principally Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. These wools comprise two-thirds of the total world's supply. Prices were established which would insure their maximum movement into the United States, the most important remaining wool consuming country in the world, and in fact one of the few financially stable world markets.

The British Government took over the wool of their dominions at a price which would reflect a profit to the grower. This price to the producer has been increased twice to compensate for the increases in the cost of production. In contrast, the price of domestic wool was frozen on December 9, 1941, and permanent ceilings were established in February 1942 at the same level as on December 9, 1941, and there has been no increase.

Under an arrangement agreed to in July 1945, a joint wool selling corporation, known as the JO (Joint Organization), comprising the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa was established, to replace the United Kingdom as the sole purchaser and seller of British Empire wools. This wool-selling program is to continue until the present stock pile of approximately 1,968,000,000 pounds is consumed.

The first sales of British wools under this Government monopoly were held in the latter months of 1946. They were characterized by their proponents as a return to "free and competitive selling." Under the regulations governing these sales, a given quantity of wools of different types comprising percentages of stock-pile wools, and of the current clip, are offered. A floor price is established for each lot, and the Government monopoly reserves the right to return any of the wools to the stock pile if the prices paid are not satisfactory.

The domestic wool industry has not enjoyed the increase in price that has been permitted agricultural commodities. Wool was the first commodity to receive price-control action. As stated before, the price of wool was frozen on December 9, 1941.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture shows that the index number of prices, interest, and taxes paid by farmers as a group increased from 138 as of September 1941, to 207 on September 1946, an increase of 45 percent. The index number of farm wages for the same period rose from 165 to 389, or an increase of 136 percent. For example, in 1940 the average monthly wage for sheepherders

was approximately $60 per month and board. In 1946 the average monthly sheepherder wage was $160, or more than twice as much as in 1940.

The tremendous increase in wage rates, the scarcity of dependable labor, together with other increased costs, and comparatively small price increases for products of the industry are additional causes for the liquidation of the domestic sheep industry.

The index number of prices received by farmers on all farm products rose from 139 as of September 1941 to 243 on September 1946, or an increase of 75 percent, but for products of the sheep industry, wool prices, which amount normally to approximately 50 percent of the income, increased only 13.2 percent; sheep, 43.6 percent, and lambs, 60.6 percent. Of 24 important agricultural commodities, the average increase was 91 percent. It will be noted in the table below that wool received the least percentage price increase of the entire 24 important commodities; sheep ranked twenty-first, and lambs nineteenth as to the percentage of price increase:

Average prices received by farmers in the United States, Sept. 15, 1941, compared to Sept. 15, 1946—24 principal products

Product (in order of price increase)	Sept. 15, 1941	Sept. 15, 1946	Percent rise
1. Rye, per bushel	$0.573	$1.91	233.3
2. Apples, per bushel	.85	2.37	178.8
3. Corn, per bushel	.708	1.73	144.4
4. Rice, per bushel	.891	1.88	111.0
5. Flaxseed, per bushel	1.85	3.77	103.8
6. Beans, dry, edible, per hundredweight	4.18	8.49	103.1
7. Cotton, per pound	.1753	.3530	101.4
8. Peanuts, per pound	.0449	.0898	100.0
9. Potatoes, per bushel	.644	1.28	98.8
10. Oranges, per box	1.53	3.01	96.7
11. Hay, per ton	7.94	15.40	94.0
12. Butter, per pound	.327	.634	93.9
13. Oats, per bushel	.399	.747	87.2
14. Wheat, per bushel	.958	1.79	86.8
15. Tobacco, per pound	.265	.488	84.2
16. Milk, wholesale, per hundredweight	2.41	4.37	81.3
17. Chickens, live, per pound	.163	.293	79.8
18. Beef cattle, per hundredweight	9.36	15.20	62.4
19. Lambs, per hundredweight	9.84	15.80	60.6
20. Eggs, per dozen	.303	.445	46.9
21. Sheep, per hundredweight	5.25	7.54	43.6
22. Hogs, per hundredweight	11.10	15.70	41.4
23. Veal calves, per hundredweight	11.26	15.50	37.7
24. Wool, per pound	.363	.411	13.2
Average rise, 24 commodities			91.0

The price paid for wool in 1946 was 8 cents lower than the comparable price as of January 1947. (The comparable price is determined by the U. S. Department of Agriculture; is not now official, but admitted by them to reflect an equitable price relationship to the basic agriculture commodities.) The price paid for wool in 1946 is approximately 3 cents less than 90 percent of the comparable price. The Government is supporting the basic agriculture commodities and other agriculture commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity or the comparable price. Wool is certainly entitled to the same treatment.

One of the principal reasons for the decline in numbers of stock sheep, which, of course, affects the production of wool and lambs, is the lack of profit. The United States Tariff Commission bears out this statement in its study of estimated costs of production of wool, sheep, and lambs in 1945 and 1946 compared with data for the period 1940–44, released February 1947. This study shows that the sheep business has been unprofitable for the years 1943, a loss of 12 cents per head of sheep; 1944, a loss of $1.22 per head; 1945, a loss of $1.51 per head; and 1946, a loss of $1.18 per head of sheep. The reason for the smaller loss in 1946 over 1945 is because of the increase in the price received for lambs and three-tenths of a pound increase in the fleece weight. The loss on wool alone, according to the study, per head of sheep in 1943–44–45–46 amounted to 23 cents, 80 cents, 96 cents, and 79 cents respectively. The loss per pound of wool produced during the 4-year period amounted to 3 cents, 10.8 cents, 12 cents, and 9.5 cents, respectively. These losses have occurred in spite of the Commodity Credit Corporation's support of domestic wool prices at the December 9, 1941 price level.

The reason for this is, of course, that the support price is not sufficiently high to meet the increasing costs of production. This problem is only a part of the picture of the uncertainty for the future.

The importation of foreign wool into this country in the peacetime year of 1946 has been the greatest in the history of the country. The dumping of foreign wool into the United States has been made possible by the monopolistic control of the price of wool by the British Government. For example, when the selling price of domestic wool was reduced, the British Government, within 48 hours after the price reduction, reduced the price of their wool to United States importers. As the JO (Joint Organization) controls 85 percent of the wool of the world, they also control the wool market. The following table shows the impressive picture of foreign wool importation:

Apparel wool imports into the United States for consumption, less reexports

	Thousands of pounds
1936	110,712
1937	150,160
1938	30,812
1939	98,194
1940	222,983
1941	613,566
1942	782,647
1943	642,887
1944	582,168
1945	704,034
1946	819,253

The total foreign wool imports into the United States in 1946 amounted to 1,062,024,000 grease pounds. Of this amount 242,771,000 pounds were nondutiable carpet wools and are not included in the 1946 figure shown in the table above.

It will be noted from the above table that the average importation of apparel-class wool for the years 1936 through 1940, inclusive, amounted to 122,572,000 grease pounds, the 5-year period just prior to our entrance into World War II. Foreign wool imports in 1946 were 819,253,000 grease pounds, or over six times the average importation from 1936 to 1940, inclusive.

The consumption of wool in 1946 in the United States was the highest for any peacetime year. It is estimated that over 1,000,000,000 pounds was processed for consumption. The table below shows the figures now available:

United States mill consumption of apparel wool, domestic and foreign

Year	United States mill consumption, domestic apparel wool, 1,000 pounds	United States mill consumption, foreign apparel wool, 1,000 pounds	United States total mill consumption, apparel wool, 1,000 pounds	Percent domestic consumption is of total percent
1936	557,110	109,290	666,400	83.6
1937	421,297	158,203	579,500	72.7
1938	475,358	38,542	513,900	92.5
1939	593,032	80,868	673,900	88.0
1940	526,824	156,476	683,300	77.1
1941	533,223	488,277	1,021,500	52.2
1942	576,147	546,947	1,123,094	51.3
1943	464,730	644,410	1,109,140	41.9
1944	344,614	706,037	1,050,651	32.8
1945	277,114	776,552	1,053,666	26.3
1946 [1]	142,764	594,425	737,189	19.4

[1] First 8 months.

It should be noted that normal consumption prior to the war years was approximately 600,000,000 pounds of wool per year. During these years domestic wool moved at a price competitive with foreign wool, regardless of whether this price was remunerative to the domestic wool grower or not. However, the domestic wool was consumed.

During the years just prior to the war domestic wool represented from 72.7 percent of United States apparel wool consumption to a high of 92.5 percent. During the war years the percentage of domestic wool decreased, which was to be expected with greatly increased consumption. But the percentage decrease in domestic wool consumption was much more than it should have been. In 1945 the percentage of domestic wool consumed was only 26.3 percent, and for the first 8 months of 1946 only 19.4 percent of the total, according to the United States Departments of Agriculture and Commerce.

We favor even greater increased consumption of wool. Even though domestic production has rarely equaled consumption in the United States, the domestic producers support the American Wool Council, whose only function is to promote the increased use of wool and to find new uses for wool.

The problem, however, is this: The dumping of foreign wools into the United States brought about by lower costs of production in foreign countries and subsidies being paid the producers in foreign countries has hindered the sale of domestic wool. At a time when consumption of wool in the United States is the greatest in history a stock pile of domestic wool has been built up due to the fact that foreign wools, controlled by a government monopoly, were imported into this country, duty-paid, at prices below the cost of production of domestic wool and below the support price offered growers by the Government. The following table is a statement showing the size of the Government stock pile of domestic wool on November 9, 1946, and this amount is very near the present figure. The figure, 517,600,000 pounds, represents approximately one and one-half times the 1946 estimated production of domestic wool:

Commodity Credit Corporation purchases and sales of domestic wool and estimated stocks on hand, Nov. 9, 1946

[Millions of pounds, actual weight]

Year	Purchases	Sales	Balance unsold Nov. 9, 1946
1946 (through Nov. 9)	264.4	70.8	193.6
1945	368.1	182.6	185.5
1944	342.6	246.0	96.6
1943	271.1	229.2	41.9
Total CCC stock-pile unsold, Nov. 1, 1946			517.6

REMEDIES

There is one proper solution of the situation confronting the domestic sheep industry, whose production is below the needs of domestic consumers and whose products are essential for the protection of the Nation, that is proper tariff protection to compensate for the difference in the cost of production here and abroad.

Until a proper tariff protection is secured, an alternative within the framework of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would be to retain the present tariff on wool and provide for an import quota. The establishment of quotas on raw wool and products processed from wool would give protection against the unrestricted dumping of foreign wools on the domestic market from lower-cost producing countries.

It is essential that we have an increase in tariff or a limitation on the importation of wool and wool products through the estab-

lishment of import quotas. One or the other is needed now.

In addition and in the meantime to care for the present situation, it is essential that legislation be passed embodying:

1. The establishment of a comparable price for wool and lambs;

2. The declaration of a support price for wool at not less than 90 percent of the comparable price until December 31, 1948;

3. The permission for the CCC to sell domestic wool at less than the parity or comparable price and in competition with foreign imported wool.

Immediate action is necessary because the present wool purchase program ends April 15, 1947, about 40 days from today. The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that the program will not be continued unless the Congress so directs.

1947 Holds No Fears for Ohio Utopia Where All Share Pottery's Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1939, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the title "How Scio Licked Hard Times," a story of a remarkable man, Mr. L. P. Reese, of Scio, Ohio—a man with an idea, a community with the vision to help him—and how unemployment gave way to prosperity in this little Ohio town.

I wish now to call your attention to a sequel to that story which is one of continued success, community welfare, and progress in the little Harrison County town of Scio, described in the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of Sunday, December 29, 1946:

1947 HOLDS NO FEARS FOR OHIO UTOPIA, WHERE ALL SHARE POTTERY'S PROSPERITY—SCIO'S UNIQUE INDUSTRIAL HISTORY CLIMAXED BY BONUS FOR EMPLOYEES

(By William Jacobs)

SCIO, OHIO, December 28.—This little Harrison County town today looked forward to 1947 without a worry in the world.

Prosperity, full employment, labor-management peace—all utopian ideals which have been sought for years in the Nation's great industrial centers—have been achieved here.

The situation here, of course, is unique. Conditions exist that probably would be impossible elsewhere:

There is a "one big happy family" spirit in this town of 1,400.

There is well-paid and steady work at the Scio-Ohio Pottery Co.

There is the biggest part of a $705,000 bonus the pottery paid to its employees Friday before Christmas. The bonus was computed on a sliding scale based on length of service. Eighty people got $3,500 apiece. A man who went to work only the day before received at least $10. It was paid from profits accumulated for several years.

But, more important, there is L. P. "Lou" Reese, the astonishing president-owner of the pottery.

The high esteem in which Mr. Reese is held in this community is something approaching adoration on the part of the plain, homey folk who have lived and worked with him since 1932, when he took over an idle pottery and began a long struggle to put it on its feet.

Even the children feel it.

Four-year-old George Shawver, whose father, John, received a $3,500 check as his slice of the $705,000 melon, remarked slyly that he guessed "Santa Claus is all right, but Mr. Reese does more for us." His father has bought a new home.

Scio's "Santa Claus" seemingly has assured the town's future.

His huge bonus to his 525 employees has made it possible for them to face 1947 free of mortgages and debts with which many have been struggling for years.

Take the case of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Crall. They moved to Scio some time ago and bought a farm 4 miles from town. They could not keep up the payments and were faced with the threat that they and their 11 children would be evicted.

But last Friday their combined bonus checks totaled more than $500. Now they can continue to pay off their mortgage.

Some of the older residents of the town have found security in the bonus, too.

Mrs. Wilde Shawver, 65, oldest female employee at Scio, and little Georgie's grandmother, also got a $3,500 check. Though she plans to work until Mr. Reese "tells me I am too old," she put all but $2.31 in Government savings bonds.

BIG PLANS AHEAD

With its future now safe, the town has big plans, according to Jay Spiker, cashier of the Scio Banking Co., who watches over Mr. Reese's cash.

Top priority will go to erecting an apartment building which will cost "at least $100,000," something that none of Scio's natives have ever dreamed of. This will furnish a place to live for out-of-towners who want to come to Scio to work in its pottery.

Mr. Spiker and William Hughes, his assistant and chief clipping collector and Reese booster of Scio, have figures to show that the company's employees did not go on a wild spending spree when the astounding bonus was showered down among them.

Savings deposits at the bank leaped $111,490 at once. Loans on real estate were reduced by $11,663 and other loans cut down $12,567. Thousands of dollars went into bonds and other debts were wiped out.

OTHER KIND ACTS

The bonus was not the only kindness that Mr. Reese has done Scio. When the town ran out of funds in the middle of a street improvement, Mr. Reese donated $2,000 to finish the job. When the American Legion wanted a new home, but didn't have the cash to pay for it, Mr. Reese gave it to them.

But, more important, Lou Reese saved Scio from becoming a ghost town.

Scio is an old town, but it always has had something to support its people. For a while there was a small college; then an oil boom; then the Albright China Co., but it failed in 1927.

Things looked pretty black, but then along came Lou Reese.

Unlike the popular version of this story, Lou Reese was not a bum, and he was not on relief. He had a job as the superintendent of a pottery company not far away. He and a few friends were hunting rabbits when they chanced upon the idle buildings of the Albright China Co.

IDEAS BORE FRUIT

The idle factory aroused his curiosity. He had some ideas on how to make pottery, which people said never would work and which never had been tried.

He went home, sold his car, mortgaged his house, borrowed some money from his employer, and talked some of his associates into taking a fling at making pottery with him.

He paid the back taxes and bid in the outstanding bonds of the old company—$85,000 worth—at $5 for each $100 bond. This all has been repaid.

With 15 employees, he went to work, but he could not meet his first two pay rolls. Mr. Reese persuaded a customer to pay his bill in advance, and 20 residents put up $100 each to help over the rough spot. His first pay roll was $990.93. Now it runs more than $60,000 for each 2-week period. Then he had to go out and hunt orders, but now he pays a sales manager a big salary just to sit in his office and turn them down. Scio pottery is rationed to buyers.

JUST A PLAIN MAN

Mr. Reese worked for a long time on a salary of $150 per month. Now he pays himself $50,000 per year, owns a home on Scio's main street—cost $1,700—and drives a Cadillac to work.

His comportment and dress would shock most $50,000-per-year business executives, but it goes over big with his employees and the townspeople.

One visitor to the pottery who asked to see Mr. Reese was told "he's up fixing the roof." His business attire is a crisp white shirt, at least two buttons open at the neck, sleeves rolled above the elbows, unpressed trousers, and a pair of muddy shoes.

He lunches with his employees at his own cafeteria, where you can get a T-bone steak, cooked to order, with all the trimmings, for 65 cents.

His secretary complains that he is hardly ever in his office and that he becomes positively jittery in a room where the door is closed. "I have no secrets from any of my employees," Mr. Reese explained.

His hobby is hunting—big or little game. He bagged the second biggest grizzly ever to be taken out of Canada. He has many other trophies to his credit. His ambition: to go to Alaska and shoot polar bear.

Mr. Reese maintains a museum at the factory in which he displays his stuffed trophies. An added feature is the lifelike body of Yocub, famous St. Bernard dog which belonged to Eddie Kapphan, of Pittsburgh. Yocub, weighing 200 pounds, was thought to have been the Nation's largest dog. It died several years ago.

NEUTRAL ON UNION ISSUE

On the union question Mr. Reese, former president of a local union, is, as the law says all good bosses should be, strictly neutral. His employees are not, as a recent incident indicates.

A union sent a man to organize Mr. Reese's nonunion, nonaggrieved employees. He stayed 3 or 4 days. When he left he had three paid up members and a black eye. "He was disturbing the peace," a worker said.

Mr. Reese did say, however, in a recent letter to his employees, that he was proud to be able to say that they could work without paying "tribute to a single individual or organization."

His solution to the present labor-management difficulties is the advice, to both parties, summed up in two words, "Be human."

He also favors less Government controls.

This year's bonus was not the first Mr. Reese has paid. He once gave each employee a 39-cent box of candy. But the next bonus was $22,000. Last year it was a 15-percent raise and $75,000.

The huge bonus that Mr. Reese paid this year was made possible by the accumulation of profits since the Wage Stabilization Board froze wages several years ago. Mr. Reese said he had been unable to pay his employees "what I thought they had coming to them then, so I decided that now, with controls lifted, I would go ahead and do it."

FOOLS SKEPTICS

With this year's 20-cent-per-hour raise the minimum rate became $1 per hour. Many workers make as high as $3 per hour.

Skeptics say: "He can't keep that up."

Scioans say: "You don't know Lou Reese."

Skeptics told Mr. Reese that his Rube Goldberg gadgets and his unorthodox clay formula would not make pottery. But now he makes it faster and cheaper than any other pottery in the country—nearly 90,000,000 pieces per year.

Master Miners and Master Manufacturers of Mining Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, some months ago Mr. W. H. McWilliams, a newspaper columnist of eastern Ohio in the coal-mining region, who writes under the pen name of Hi Waters, conceived the idea that since it has become a common practice to choose master farmers it should also be in order to choose master coal miners. This he proceeded to do, choosing men who have served for many years in the coal mines without serious accident.

Coal mining, Mr. Speaker, is considered to be a very hazardous occupation. The men who work in the mines and the coal-mining companies are continually striving to make the industry as safe as possible, holding safety meets and stressing the necessity of care for the safety of the men. This is also stressed continually by the manufacturers of coal-mining equipment who strive to make their machines and other equipment as safe as possible. In view of these facts, Hi Waters proceeded to select 15 coal miners who have had remarkable safety records through the years and gave them much publicity in his daily newspaper column in the Martins Ferry Times and other newspapers in eastern Ohio that carry his columns. He also proceeded to name 15 master manufacturers of coal-mining equipment who were given publicity through his columns.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor these men who have been selected as the 15 master coal miners of eastern Ohio as well as the 15 master manufacturers of mining equipment who have done so much to aid in the campaign for safety in the coal mines, and I wish to make a part of my remarks the column of Hi Waters setting forth his purposes in naming the master miners and master manufacturers of mining equipment. His column is as follows:

FIFTEEN MASTER MINERS NAMED—THEIR CAREERS ACCIDENT-FREE—COLUMNIST HI WATERS PICKS MINING CHAMPS FROM MEN WHO WORKED 750 YEARS WITHOUT A MISHAP

The most neglected profession in the world is that of coal mining.

The public goes crazy over a prize fighter, a radio crooner, a home-run hitter, a speedboat driver, and posts the pictures of politicians all over the side of the house—but have you heard of anybody even noddin' his head to a coal miner?

The only time America recognizes that a coal miner exists is when the fuel shortage hits in zero weather or during a strike when some one or another gets pinched and his pile of fuel peters away.

As far as I know, no one bothered to shake the hands of the coal miner when he produced 600,000,000 tons of coal a year during the war and has, since Washington crossed the Delaware after the Hessians on Christmas Eve, kept the teeth of the Nation from chattering and the hearth of industry glowing red with power.

Of course, the owners of the mines have long ago recognized talent when they see it and have a neighborly interest with the men of the mines, but from the public in general, the coal miner has been hidden in the rear ranks of society and told to sit in the kitchen while the other professions dine in style and state in the drawing rooms of the select.

Why isn't the American coal miner recognized as "one of the boys" the same as the rest of the economic family? That's difficult to explain, but the fact remains that his press agent has done a terribly bad job and, even when he does hit a home run with the bases loaded—as he did during the war—he only rates a small dab on the back page while the other professions hog the front cover and get mentioned in dispatches with praise and laudation.

I guess the coal miner is naturally bashful and backward and thinks if someone else doesn't appreciate him he will think no more of it.

But from now on, we're going to change all that. The talents of the coal miner are going to be recognized even if it is nothing more than a pat on the back and a hearty "Nice goin', Bill" from his next door neighbor.

Even a bullfrog down in the marshes likes to be recognized—why else does he croak and crackle at twilight until the whole community rumbles from his self-made praises? But, of course, a coal miner is not that way, and year in and year out he features in the top-notch performance of the Nation in comparative silence waiting patiently for somebody to recognize his worth in the economics of the world.

And I am not talking now about his commercial worth; I'll let the operators and the miners work that out themselves, because they know more about it than I. But I am talking about the American coal miner being told publicly: "John, you've done a darned good job; you are a credit to yourself, your family, your State, and your Nation; boy, I'm proud of you."

And why not?

The coal miner is a skilled, a scientific, and a clever workman who has, down through the ages, warmed the shinbones of his country and powered the wheels of industry in a competent and a masterly manner. He is a proficient craftsman and an accomplished technician. He deserves, not a casual stare of indifference from Mr. and Mrs. America, but a nod of recognition for what he is worth to humanity, and a clasp of friendship from the hand of man.

There is no better place in which to start than right here amid the hills and the valleys of eastern Ohio where the East meets the West and where the chill of northern winters melt at the sunny warmth of the South—here in eastern Ohio where the good Lord cast his most gracious glance and underlaid the landscape with the coal of the ages—coal enough to heat the parlors of the gods until night shall have turned into celestial day.

Because the great eastern Ohio coal fields is a replica of all other fields everywhere, it is a goodly sample of the people, of their homes, of their hobbies, and of their joys and heartaches. Hence, I will recognize the American coal miner everywhere by recognizing him here. It is a token gesture to include them all.

Coal mining is a hazardous occupation, you hear everybody say. That's right. But so is farming a hazardous occupation. So is making steel, working on the railroad, in an auto plant, or even in the kitchen of our homes.

It can be a lot more hazardous or a lot less hazardous, depending on the skill of the individual miner and the equipment with which he works. A sloppy workman—and a sloppy piece of equipment—creates a sloppy situation that can, and does, lead to many accidents.

That's one of the reasons I am selecting my 15 master coal miners of eastern Ohio—because every one of them has spent his lifetime, to date, in the mines of eastern Ohio and never even scratched his finger.

I am selecting, from random, 15 men who know coal mining from one end of the mine to another; men who are skilled in the art of producing coal from underground, careful to the point where they are an inspiration to their fellow workers and to the point where they have, collectively, worked for 700 years and never had a lost-time accident.

I doubt if there is a factory or a plant in the land which can duplicate that feat, and I'll almost include the homes of eastern Ohio as well. Take yourself—have you lived all your life without even getting a scratch? Well, these miners have worked 150,000 days in a profession thought to be the most hazardous, and not a one of them even had a bump.

And so I am here selecting the 15 coal miners of eastern Ohio whom I regard as the best and whom I am listing as master miners. I am at the same time selecting the 15 outstanding mining concerns who I regard as having done outstanding and distinguished service to the coal industry of America by supplying equipment, services, or products for the advancement, the progress, and the safety of the profession.

The selections I made are employed at mines and by companies where safety is emphasized and where progressive trends make safe working easier brought about. But regardless of where they would work, a master miner is a master miner—he is—like a star football player, ready for emergencies anytime, anywhere and meets them successfully.

In making this recognition feature a success, I wish to thank Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America; Hon. Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; Dr. R. R. Sayer, Director of the United States Bureau of Mines; the Honorable Robert A. Taft, United States Senator from Ohio; the Honorable Frank Lausche, governor of Ohio; and Mr. Ezra Vanhorne, of the Operators' Association; and the 15 business concerns who are master manufacturers for their help, assistance, and personal statements in recognizing the men of the mines.

The 15 master miners are:

John Stillmak, 73, Barton. Employed Barton mine Y & O Coal Co. Worked 54 years without an accident.

Ralph Dematte, 53, Newtown. Employed at Dun Glen mine, Hanna Coal Co. Worked 40 years without an accident.

Albert Dorsey, 68, Martins Ferry. Employed at Stanley mine, Lorain Coal & Dock Coal Co. Worked 50 years without a serious accident.

Serrafino Bizzarri, 55, Lafferty. Employed at Virginia Hill mine, Monaco Coal Mining Co. Worked 40 years without an accident.

John McNally, 64, Kirkwood Heights. Employed Florence mine, Y & O Coal Co. Worked 53 years without an accident.

Frank Kasprowski, 58, Neffs. Employed Willow Grove mine, Hanna Coal Co. Worked 42 years without an accident.

Dan Sakey, 63, Powhatan. Employed at No. 1 mine of the Powhatan Coal Co. Worked 44 years without an accident.

Rudy Vucelich, 60, Deep Run. Employed at No. 3 mine, Rail & River Coal Co. Worked 44 years without an accident.

Frank Makros, Sr., 71, Shadyside. Employed at Webb mine of Cambria Collieries Co. Worked 56 years without an accident.

Robert Hilton, 46, Wolf Run. Employed at Wolf Run mine of Warner Collieries Co. Worked 33 years without an accident.

William Schultz, 57, Amsterdam, Ohio. Employed Wolf Run mine, Warner Collieries Coal Co. Worked 46 years without an accident.

John Kumbera, 61, Blaine, Ohio. Employed at the Blaine mine of Lorain Coal & Dock Co. Worked 46 years without a serious accident.

William Johnson, 56, Bellaire. Employed at No. 6 mine, Rail & River Coal Co. Worked 44 years without an accident.

George Chamberlain, 76, Dillonvale. Employed at Piney Fork mine of Hanna Coal Co. Worked 65 years without an accident.

Chris Johnson, 57, Powhatan. Employed at No. 1 mine, Powhatan Coal Co. Employed 40 years without an accident.

The 15 master manufacturers are:

Goodman Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill. Service through the years: "Time tested and thorough, the master miners have our sincere and highest regard. We feel sure they return those regards because of our own time tested line of modern machinery designed to meet every mine condition and capacity requirement. Modern mines everywhere are 'going Goodman.'"

Joy Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.: "Seconds, minutes, hours, years could be saved with Joy machines * * * and they are designed to enable the operators of them to work more safely than with those of yesteryear. The Joy Manufacturing Co.'s merger with Sullivan Machine Co. and La-Del Conveyor & Manufacturing Co. puts under one management the world's most complete line of coal-mining equipment. Might we serve you too?"

Wood Preserving Corp., Marietta, Ohio: "Preserving youth. The giant trees of the forest are disappearing fast as time comes and goes * * * but their years may be lengthened and supply made more lasting by exacting preservation. Countless ties and timbers and lumber of our mines have been made more lasting and efficient by our method of wood preservation. Thus do we force the hand of time backward—making young for countless years, the lumber in America's mines."

Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.:

"The backbone of the mines. Steel rails upon which last year 600,000,000 tons of coal rolled from the dark interior of America's mines to the blaze of the industrial plants and the warmth of the family hearth. Steel timbers and ties to hold the working places of the miners, and the steel of tipple are, really, the backbone of the mines. Steel is the substance upon which King Coal has built his imperishable empire."

Du Pont, Wilmington, Del.:

"We chained the 'master helper.' Whether Roger Bacon, Schwartz, or who first invented gunpowder or whether Edward III first shot off a cannon or some other monarch, the fact remains that explosives represent the leading agency in war and peace. Du Pont has kept ahead of the requirements for explosives in peace and, through skilled scientists and chemists, has led the way for safe use of man's most powerful ally. Better things for better living—through chemistry."

Link-Belt, Chicago, Ill.:

"Through the front door. Back when coal mining first started, the tipple was only a front door to coal's dark interior, but now it has changed. The tipple is the preparation plant of an exacting industry where coal is cleaned, prepared, and sized for the markets of the world. Almost as precise as a delicate watch, the modern preparation plant makes coal mining a success. We are proud of our contribution in showing the way to better plants everywhere."

The Jeffrey Manufacturing Co., Columbus, Ohio:

"Their first day underground. These men could have seen Jeffrey mining equipment already aged in efficient operation. Established in 1877, Jeffrey locomotives, loaders, cutters, drills and machines, conveyors, fans, and blowers have been leaders in mechanical mining, increased in efficiency as the years roll by."

Cardox Corp., Chicago, Ill.: "Mine years equals mining knowledge. Mining knowledge equals Cardox. The logical answer to higher lump and lower slack. Cardox Hardscog drilling equipment is designed to give you the maximum in drilling efficiency. Increases in realization and marketing range made possible by Cardox, the nonexplosive mining method."

Westinghouse: "The old timers remember complete electrification by Westinghouse. They have seen the industry and Westinghouse work side by side up the efficiency ladder toward cleaner coal at lower cost. Westinghouse offers: 1. Undivided responsibility. 2. Supervised installation. 3. Fast repair and maintenance service."

Gunite Construction Co., Bellaire, Ohio: "'That, we did.' Maybe we did not accomplish as much as Atlas when he held up the world on shoulders of brawn * * * but we have held up a thousand miles of roof in countless American coal mines with Gunite and brought to the industry the greatest safety innovation since electricity. We make them secure and safe."

Tri-State Asphalt Co., Martins Ferry, Ohio: "Mile posts of progress. Lack of roads and highways kept the coal mines of eastern Ohio in the 'horse and buggy days' for many years. But thanks to our method of fast, economical road building, all regions have been brought out to America's Main Street. Miners now live in villages and cities far away from the rumble and the noise of industry * * * but, via modern roads, they are only a few moments away. Thus have we too, contributed to the progress and the safety of the mines."

Mine Safety Appliances Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.: "We, too, are master miners. Paraphrasing that adage of the years, eternal vigilance is the price of safety, may we point with pride to the vigilance we have shown throughout the mining industry * * * vigilance in keeping the industry and employees safer. America's most popular electric cap lamp, the Edison; rock-dusting machines; safety hats and safety shoes; mine-rescue apparatus; gas-detecting instruments; respirators; first-aid equipment. Everything for mine and industrial safety."

The Tool Steel Gear & Pinion Co., Cincinnati, Ohio: "For 37 years we have been manufacturing tool steel process, hardened gearing exclusively. Pioneers in the field of hardened gearing, it has been our constant aim to improve the quality of gearing used in mining machinery to the end that hazardous and costly break-downs due to gear failures are minimized."

The Watt Wheel Car & Wheel Co., Barnesville, Ohio: "'On wheels of safety.' We linked safety with production and rolled the coal industry years in advance on wheels of perfection; modern mine cars, all steel, automatic coupling, ball bearing parts, and other features have taken the sloppiness out of haulage and created instead, a modern miracle of transportation. Modern, progressive and safe mining requires our modern, progressive, and safe equipment. Visit a modern mine and see Watt cars and equipment in operation."

MacWhyte Co., Kenosha, Wis.: "Strands of strength—'the ties that bind' * * * and, in a way, that has been the path of wire rope down through the years that coal mining has been a key industry. And wire rope has been supplied wherever coal mining has prospered by the MacWhyte Co., whose famous mining rope is as familiar as the dinner bucket, man trips and rumbling cars of coal. Safety, service, economy."

Nationally known men commend selection, as follows:

Dr. R. R. Sayers, Director of the United States Bureau of Mines:

"DEAR HI: Coal mining is generally reputed to be one of the most hazardous of the basic industries, and the opinion of some seems to be that numerous accidents are to be expected and that it is more or less a waste of time to make any serious effort to prevent them. As a result of this attitude, many needless deaths and injuries have been caused each year. There are others who do not agree with this theory, and it has been disproved time and again by safety-conscious miners, who by their constant vigilance have managed to work for 15, 20, or even more years without having a lost-time accident.

"Such commendable records are not attained by sheer luck. They are the result that can be expected only when miners are ever alert to the potential hazards surrounding them and follow the known safe mining practices. The accident toll in American coal mines has shown a very favorable reduction during the past several years despite the many adverse conditions presented during the war years. The coal-mining industry should not be satisfied until its accidents are reduced to an irreducible minimum.

"I wish to commend you for your efforts in behalf of the safety of the miner and it is sincerely hoped that the audience reached through the media of press and radio will prove responsive and that deaths and injuries from accidents may be further reduced.

"Very truly yours,

"R. R. SAYERS, *Director*."

Ezra Vanhorne, executive vice president, Ohio Coal Association:

"DEAR MAC: It is with pleasure that I congratulate your 15 master miners for the accomplishment of working their entire lives without having an accident. It brings credit to the industry—what they have done, others can do. With the assistance and cooperation of all people engaged in the industry, miners, operators, the public, and our lawmakers, we can make great strides in keeping the mines ever safer.

"Sincerely,

"EZ."

Frank J. Lausche, Governor of Ohio:

"DEAR HI: With the appalling loss of lives and injuries to our people through accidents, it is encouraging to learn of the extraordinary record of the 15 men whom you are honoring on the basis of their safety record as coal miners of Ohio.

"Their achievement is not merely the result of good fortune. It undoubtedly is accompanied by careful conduct in the performance of their daily work.

"Sincerely,

"FRANK."

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT, Senator from Ohio:

"DEAR HI: I congratulate each and all of your 15 master miners for winning their award resulting from the fact that they have worked for more than 40 years without a lost-time accident. A great deal can still be done by the Government and the State to make mine work safer, but the important thing of all is for men like the master miners to give constant thought and effort to protecting the safety of others as well as themselves. With best wishes,

"Sincerely yours,

"BOB."

John L. Lewis, president, United Mine Workers of America:

"DEAR MR. MCWILLIAMS: Adequate mine safety requires constant vigilance. The cardinal principle of the United Mine Workers of America is safety."

R. W. Morse, vice president, Ohio Industrial Commission:

"DEAR HI: The State of Ohio stands firmly behind her coal miners and any constructive effort to eliminate accidents from the coal industry. Accidents have fallen off notably in the past decade of Ohio mining * * * and much of the credit for the improvement goes to the individual initiative and careful working practices of such men as are represented by the 15 master miners which you have selected."

J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior:

"I wish to congratulate the 15 coal miners of the eastern Ohio district who have worked more than 30 years each without a lost-time accident and who have contributed substantially toward making coal mining a safer occupation. They deserve the thanks and appreciation of their fellow workers and of their employers for this splendid record.

"As in all industries, there are many hazards in coal mining. No matter how many elaborate safeguards are provided, accidents will occur if individual workers are careless and if they disregard the common-sense rules of safety. These men have demonstrated that they realize the truth of this statement, and that they have done more than their part to minimize the human element as a contributing factor in mine accidents.

"For many years the safety engineers and instructors in the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior have preached safety in coal mining and have taught thousands of miners and officials the principles of first aid, accident prevention, and mine rescue. In all of their teachings and in their inspection reports, the plea for safety consciousness on the part of individual workers is predominant. I am sure that each of these 15 Ohio miners could well serve as a model for the Bureau in this respect, and that their example is an inspiration for other coal miners and officials."

Automobiles for Amputees, Retroactive Terminal-Leave Pay for Enlisted Men, Etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a preliminary program of legislation on veterans' affairs supported by the American Veterans Committee and adopted at the constitutional convention of the American Veterans Committee, at Des Moines, Iowa, June 1946, relating to specially equipped automobiles for amputees and retroactive terminal-leave pay for enlisted men, and so forth.

There being no objection, the preliminary program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM OF LEGISLATION ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS SUPPORTED BY THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE PROPOSED TO THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS (INCORPORATING RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE AT DES MOINES, IOWA, JUNE 1946)

Because of the fact that the American Veterans Committee convention was held prior to the termination of the Seventy-ninth Congress certain measures which were proposed were subsequently enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress, such as the outright granting of specially equipped automobiles for amputees and immediate granting of retroactive terminal-leave pay for enlisted men.

1. Revise the present statutes governing GI loans for homes so that advance loans can be made on approved prefabricated homes.

2. Amend Public Law 679 by raising present income ceilings, provided that in no event shall the rate of such allowance, plus the compensation received, exceed $300 per month for a veteran without a dependent or $325 per month for a veteran with one dependent, plus an additional $10 per month for each additional dependent.

3. Eliminate time limitations for on-the-job training, with provision that training be governed by the practice of the industry.

4. Increase subsistence allowances for veterans receiving education or training to $100 for single men and $125 a month for married men, with $10 additional for each child.

5. Abolish the distinction between officers and enlisted men in the granting of retirement pay for service-connected disability.

6. Liberalize the procedures and terms for loans to veterans for the purchase of homes and the establishment of businesses. (A commendable proposal advanced in this field appears to be the "Veterans RFC," proposed by the Honorable B. W. KEARNEY.)

7. Amend terminal-leave bill to:

(a) Allow credit for enlisted service in the WAAC.

(b) Eliminate provision requiring all leave be taken while on active duty.

8. Eliminate title V, section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which denies unemployment compensation to those unemployed due to a work stoppage.

9. Amend the Mustering-Out Pay Act to include veterans demobilized for the purpose of returning to essential occupations or training.

10. Change the present national service life-insurance table to the most modern table now in use.

11. Establish a decentralized disbursement system for the payment of subsistence checks to veterans receiving education.

Being cognizant of the fact that veterans' legislation is one of the most complicated fields in contemporary American administration, the American Veterans' Committee is presently engaged in the study of veterans' proposals advanced by all the major veterans' organizations with the view to support, modify, or oppose legislation which will be considered by the Eightieth Congress. At the same time, AVC will work to initiate new legislation where no proposals at present are available.

Within the next month the AVC hopes to provide each veteran member of Congress, as well as those Members concerned with veterans' legislation, with a booklet embodying its recommendations on current veterans' legislation. These recommendations will be accompanied by proposed bills designed to carry out the recommendations.

Because the slogan of the AVC is "Citizens first, veterans second," the AVC, perforce, has vital interest in contemporary national and international problems. The AVC feels that the veteran cannot be separated from the rest of the community, and that, above all, he should not be pitted against the nonveteran. AVC firmly believes what is good for the country as a whole is good for the veteran. The achievement of thorough social and economic security for all through the cooperation of business, labor, agriculture, and government under a system of private enterprise, rather than special grants and favors to veterans, is basic AVC philosophy.

York, Pa.

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House and the country to a good kind of town to live in, York, Pa., a town that with its sound management and diversified interests cushions capital and labor against economic tides. It is the place where the York plan was born during the war which received world-wide recognition. It is such communities as this that make the Nation stable. If anyone in another community of the Nation that is distressed will come to York, Pa., and spend a week among these conservative, thrifty people, learn their ways, look over their agriculture and their industry, he can go back home filled with hope and confidence and plan for the redemption of his own community, and thus make a real contribution to the country.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following article entitled "A Good Kind of Town To Live In" from Kiplinger's magazine:

A GOOD KIND OF TOWN TO LIVE IN—DIVERSIFIED YORK, PA., CUSHIONS CAPITAL AND LABOR AGAINST ECONOMIC TIDES

The humming little community of York, in southeast Pennsylvania, is an example of what the experts mean when they say the best place to do business in the United States today is the small city with a diversified economy.

Such cities are commanding more and more attention from analysts looking into the relation between kinds of cities and the impact of slumps; between economic robustness and too much or too little development. Last year a panel of experts from the now defunct Smaller War Plants Corporation, in a report submitted to Congress after a study of American cities, reemphasized the depression-resistant qualities of the small, diversified city.

York, in fact, has enjoyed a thriving stability for many years. With its nice balance of industry, commerce, and agriculture, it can reasonably look forward to a future of full employment and production. So far as any community can be insulated against depressions, York—and places like it—enjoy comparative safety.

In the years since 1741, when it was laid out by a surveyor for the Penn family, York has grown steadily. Today, with a population of about 57,000 (metropolitan-area population 92,000), it has some 245 separate manufacturing industries crammed into its 4.1 square miles. They turn out 275 different products.

Some of York's industries are the biggest of their kind in the country—perhaps in the world—yet none dominates the community. York now employs 39,000 workers in industry but the largest plant has no more than 3,000 employees. Thus, when the local hosiery mills are idle, for example, the shutdown has little impact upon general business.

After the bank holiday in 1933 not one of York's seven banks failed to reopen. And while most of its business firms felt the pinch, none closed completely.

"We operated kind of inefficiently to do it," one stolid York industrialist explained half

apologetically. "You know, when a big absentee-controlled business hits a bad slump, some efficiency expert in New York takes a look at the balance sheet, picks up the phone and tells the plant manager to lay off 500 or 1,000 employees. There's no emotionalism or sentiment involved. Just cold-blooded efficiency. Here in York, however, our people met the situation by cutting down the operating time of their plants—working every one only 6 hours a day, instead of 8. That way, everybody was hit some, but everybody kept working."

Just how well-cushioned a small, diversely industrialized city is against national or world-wide depression can be found in York's unemployment figures. In 1933, York's worst year, the county (no figures available for the city) had just 4,134 relief cases while Allegheny County—with big, hard-hit Pittsburgh—registered 62,912 persons on relief. Allegheny County has seven times the population of York County, but Allegheny's direct relief load was more than 15 times greater.

And in 1942, with business comparatively booming, York had only 963 cases compared to Allegheny's 31,984.

Because its highly versatile industry was easily adapted to war needs, York now is untroubled by the problems confronting "war baby" communities. Its nationally publicized war production job was accomplished with the city's prewar plant. Under the so-called "York plan," the city pooled its machine tools, equipment, and manpower and through intensive subcontracting attained maximum use of facilities.

Thus, York's candy caramel industry turned to the production of winch parts. Her artificial teeth manufacturers, while continuing to produce 75 percent of the world's store teeth, also made a variety of gages, jigs, and aircraft parts. The ladies' hosiery industry made boat shafts, tank bushings, powder press parts, and elements of antiaircraft guns.

Another factor which has helped York avoid widespread unemployment is the interchangeability of its workers. An unusually large proportion of them are machinists. Thus when seasonal slumps hit the tire chain companies—which have peak activity in winter—workers merely shift to another plant using similar skills.

Also, because York is located in the center of a fine agricultural area, half of the county people are small farm workers who seasonally double in the city's manufacturing plants. This fine balance between industry and agriculture is a stabilizing influence on York economy.

Such cities as York will stand as models for congressional leaders now pondering the problem of the Nation's underdeveloped areas to determine what the Federal Government can or should do to assist the proper industrialization of such areas.

From the purely economic standpoint, what is needed is country-wide establishment of many small industries which would fill local needs as well as compete in the broader markets. Ideally, there should not be a preponderance of either heavy durable goods plants or consumer goods industries.

National prosperity stems from regional prosperity and the latter can best be attained in communities like York, with a wide variety of small businesses and balance between industry and agriculture.

THE CASE FOR THE SMALL CITY

In a survey of American cities, the Smaller War Plants Corporation found these specific reasons why the small cities with well-diversified industry are safest and soundest in hard times and good:

They foster more even income distribution and are backboned by a steady, independent middle class.

Their local industries tend to be locally owned and controlled.

They retain their "bright young men." After college, most boys go home to take part in civic affairs.

Housing conditions are clearly superior and the proportion of homes owned by occupants is larger.

The chance that a baby will die within a year of birth is less than in larger cities—sometimes as much as 50 percent less.

Retail stores in small-business cities are more efficiently managed, more attractive, and offer greater variety.

Small-business cities spend more per capita on cultural and recreational facilities.

Punishing Contempt of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McDOWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Sun of March 5, 1947:

PUNISHING CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

Under a bill introduced by Representative JOHN MCDOWELL, of Pennsylvania, contempt of Congress would be made a felony instead of a misdemeanor. The author of the measure says that its introduction grew out of his belief that Gerhart Eisler deliberately courted a contempt citation as an alternative to possibly more serious charges which might have been made had he answered truthfully questions which he suspected he might be asked. At present a conviction for contempt carries with it a fine of not more than $1,000 or less than $100 and imprisonment of not less than 1 month or more than 12 months. The new law would increase both fine and imprisonment so that the minimum would be a $500 fine and 6 months' imprisonment, with the added impairment of civil rights involved in a felony conviction.

In support of the measure, Representative MCDOWELL argues that contempt of Congress should be treated much more seriously than contempt of court. Contempt of court, he contends, often results from sudden emotional impulse when a judge, under particular strain, is tempted to cite the person who has taxed his patience. Conviction of contempt of Congress does not hinge upon the attitude of one man or of any small group of men. It requires a majority vote of all the Members after debate and deliberation. If, when tempers thus have had a chance to cool, Congress decides that it has been treated contemptuously in the proper performance of its functions, the penalties should be substantial.

Meddling in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we have helped every nation of the world with goods and the blood of young Americans, but is it necessary that we boss the world and attempt to tell everyone how he should live. I believe that America should help the suffering nations so that they might help themselves, and I want to include a point of view by Spencer A. Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel Tribune of Bowling Green, Ohio.

MEDDLING IN GREECE

The taxpayers of the United States are about to be catapulted into an imperialistic career, if the request of the British Government is granted that we take over its self-imposed management of Greek affairs.

Running the affairs of the world is a pretty big task to undertake by our country—one-ninth or one-tenth of the world population telling the other nine-tenths what sort of government each must have. A Biblical quotation might be changed to read: "What profiteth it American to gain the whole world and lose its own soul?"

Its soul is the belief that the people of every land should have the right to choose their own form of government—self-determination, President Woodrow Wilson called it 30 years ago. It was for that our forefathers fought in 1775 and in 1812. It was for that they suffered privations comparable to those Europe is suffering now.

We are warned of the futility of attempting to run the world by the collapse of ancient nations, of the Roman Empire, of that of Charlemagne, of France under Napoleon, of Bohemia, of Germany beginning with the Kaiser in 1914, and now with the British Empire itself.

There comes a time when the grandiose ambitions of a few men cause such a heavy burden on taxpayers that they can no longer be supported. "The harvest is ripe but the laborers are few." Are we citizens just to pay taxes that others impose?

It is all very fine for America to be altruistic and generous to nations that are suffering and to help them to help themselves; but to step into Greece and tell its people they must settle down and live in peace with one another is another matter. Shall we as a Nation say to the many Greeks who did not want King George to resume his job as ruler that they must accept him; or shall we tell those who favor him that he must get out? Shall we dethrone him? Shall we meddle in this mess of Mediterranean Sea sovereignty? The answers are that we shall get our fingers badly burnt, if we do.

To be sure, if we stay out, there is real danger of civil war in Greece. There is such there now. There is danger that Turkey will lose control of the Dardanelles to Russia and let its Black Sea ships have free access to the British pond (the Mediterranean Sea). But what does that matter to the American taxpayer? Do those who plan America's intervention in Greek affairs foresee our American warships passing through the Dardanelles and landing American boys to fight another Crimean War?

Let us not rush into such imperialism. That is un-American. Let us be helpful but not arrogant. We have had too many instances of ingratitude for what we have done to help without ulterior motives, to expect that coercion will get us anything but hatreds and headaches. Let us not get more entangled than we are now.

Let us give more energy to making the United Nations a living factor and keep out of specific disputes ourselves. But in the meantime let us be ready to meet aggression and to overcome it. Let us be a big brother to nations without bullying them; but, if they choose to fight among themselves, let us not be the innocent bystander who gets in the way of being hurt.

We Have a Duty To Perform; We Must Let the American People Know Who Is Responsible for These Rising Prices

REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I stood on this floor and asked that somebody introduce a resolution to investigate the ever-increasing price of foodstuffs. So far as I have been able to ascertain no Member has done so. I am, therefore, introducing it myself.

At a time when every effort is being made to kill the remaining hope of millions for any semblance of price control on the necessities of life—the OPA at least protects consumers against high prices on sugar and rents—we have a duty to perform.

On February 25 the Dun & Bradstreet index of the prices of 31 food items reached the highest point in all history.

At the same time, the Dun & Bradstreet commodity index reached its highest point.

The Dun & Bradstreet figures were confirmed by every other private and official index of the cost of living, and bitterly confirmed by every American housewife when she went to the store.

Prices are still rising. Farm prices have, for the first time in history, reached 120 percent of parity.

We are now told blandly by the packers' lobby, which 6 months ago was shouting that the way to get the meat we wanted at prices we wanted to pay was to wreck the price-control act, that current record high prices on the wholesale market will not reach consumers for 2 or 3 weeks.

Eight months ago the National Association of Manufacturers and other powerful producers' and merchandisers' lobbies ran full page ads to tell the American people, at $2,000 a page and more in hundreds of newspapers, that the American housewife would be her own best price-control law. But people must eat. Consumers cannot strike. But the packers and some other big industries did destroy price control, create scarcities, and run up prices to their great profit.

Under such a propaganda battle of distortion, misrepresentation, and half-truths as we have seldom seen in America, the administration lifted virtually all price controls.

The meat packing trust called off its strike against the public, and such marketable livestock as had not been slaughtered in July and August was rushed to market. We know what happened. There was plenty of meat for a little while—but oh, at what prices.

Of course, the market broke under staggering livestock receipts, and dirt farmers who couldn't guess ahead of the market riggers got what they usually get from the livestock commission men and the packers—enough to cover their costs and transportation and a few dollars left over to keep them hoping and working.

The big packers cleaned up. Retail meat prices scarcely faltered.

Now a new propaganda war is underway—against consumers—to kill the last remaining controls on rents, sugar, and rice.

There never was a time when so many people were at work, when the national income and production rates were so high, and so many people are able to buy so many things.

Yet this Republican Congress is filled with pity for the poor little rich boys with their hands in the consumers' pockets. Crocodile tears wash away campaign promises.

I think it is time the American public should learn the facts. I think it is time that the unending raid on the public should be exposed for what it is.

I am, therefore, offering the following resolution directing the Committee on Agriculture to inquire into the cause of the rise in prices:

Whereas prices of foodstuffs have increased more than 50 percent since June 30, 1946, and all standard indexes for cost-of-living commodities have reached the highest points in all history; and

Whereas the upward trend in all cost-of-living prices became most pronounced with the temporary suspension of price controls on June 30, 1946, and was immediately accelerated with the virtual surrender of all price controls in October 1946, so that legal prices now have reached levels even above so-called black market prices made possible by manipulations in certain industries; and

Whereas the steady and rapid rise of prices has made it virtually impossible for American citizens and homemakers of fixed incomes, whether workers, clerks, professionals, annuitants, or pensioners, to maintain a living at levels of decency; and

Whereas every standard index shows greater profits in every business and industry, with the ratio of increased prices to increased costs in many industries running from 25 percent to more than 400 percent; and

Whereas there is a tremendous pressure campaign for removal of the last remaining price controls which would inevitably cause prices to rise rapidly with consequent hardship on consumers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to investigate the basic causes for increases in the prices of foodstuffs, with special reference to meats, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables, and to report to the House within 60 days from the date of the enactment of this resolution and to make such interim reports and recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpena shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Statement of the Egyptian Prime Minister With Relation to the Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I take this means of calling to the attention of Congress the following letter, which I received today from the Egyptian Ambassador together with the statement which accompanied the Ambassador's letter:

ROYAL EGYPTIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1947.
The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am deeply appreciative of your interest in the Egyptian question, and I have noted with interest the insertion of the report of the New York Times from its correspondent in Cairo in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1947. However, it is stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"This statement was printed in the New York Times of today, March 4, and I desire to have printed here the full text of the pronouncement."

Since the report of the Times correspondent is not the text of the declaration of the Prime Minister, which I take pleasure in enclosing herewith, but merely a report of that correspondent, which does not correspond to the actual text, I should appreciate it deeply if you would kindly find your way clear, for the sake of precision, to have the actual text inserted in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in advance for your courtesy,

Yours very sincerely,

I. HASSAN,
Egyptian Ambassador.

STATEMENT MADE TO THE PRESS TODAY BY THE EGYPTIAN PRIME MINISTER

The negotiations between Egypt and Great Britain began in April 1946 and lasted 10 months during which the Egyptian side earnestly tried in every way to come to an agreement. This was clearly demonstrated by the journey undertaken by the Egyptian Prime Minister to London for the purpose of personally contacting Mr. Bevin. The final breaking off of these arduous negotiations may be attributed only to the inability of Egypt to obtain satisfaction on the two essential points which are unanimously claimed by the Egyptian people. These two points are the following: (1) Evacuation of British troops from Egypt. This evacuation must be immediate, complete, and not conditioned by a treaty. (2) Maintenance of the unity of Egypt and the Sudan self-government for the Sudanese and restoration to Egypt of her rights in the administration of the Sudan in order to further the preparation of the Sudanese for self-government. The unity of Egypt and the Sudan is the will of both Egyptians and Sudanese alike, whereas the British policy is directed toward inciting the Sudanese to secede from Egypt. As for self-government, had Egypt not been forcibly deprived of her rights in the administration of the Sudan, the preparation of the Sudanese for self-government would not be so delayed. Egypt is in a better position and is more anxious than Great Britain to prepare for self-government a people of the same race, the same language, the same religion,

and dependent for their very existence on the same Nile. Egypt wants the Sudanese to be able as soon as possible to express their views freely which can be accomplished only when British troops have evacuated the Sudan. The two preceding points are fair application of the principles of the UNO Charter. For that reason, after exceptionally prolonged negotiations, the Egyptian Government, regretfully convinced that direct discussions held no hope of success, decided to appeal to the Security Council. This decision has received the enthusiastic endorsement of the entire Egyptian people. Egypt has abiding faith in the United Nations Organization and is absolutely confident that justice will be accorded to a small nation which has always firmly upheld the principles of the supremacy of international law.

CAIRO, *March 3, 1947.*

English as the Global Language—Letter by Former Senator Robert L. Owen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 13, 1947

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House to the splendid letter of former Senator Robert L. Owen, more fully explaining the global alphabet which he has perfected after many years of difficult work. The importance of this work in making it possible for the world to be able to read, write, and understand English in a very short and simple process by use of the global alphabet is fully outlined by Senator Owen in the letter herewith.

Senator Owen's letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1947.*
Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Laubach's article, Wanted, a Global Language, was timely and convincing. He advocated making English the world language. Published in the Journal of the National Education Association, representing the teachers of the United States, makes the public service of Laubach and the NEA the more important. It makes important your service of January 23, 1947, in putting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Laubach article, page A252.

Every intelligent man knows the supreme importance of making English a world language.

In 1944 the Ministers of Education of Europe at London advocated a world language, preferably English. Making English a world language would open the doors of modern knowledge to the whole world and result in abolishing illiteracy, ignorance, and poverty.

Enclosed please find the Global Alphabet Guide Book, which was invented and developed for the purpose of enabling the world, at high speed, not only to read, write, and speak English within 10 to 20 weeks, but to read, write, and speak any other modern language within the same time by the same process of bilingual books.

The global alphabet of the World Language Foundation, now presented to you, fully explains the whole system, and is the only system by which this can be done. Laubach, in his demand for a world language, said that the global alphabet is perfect and the best he has ever seen. On October 30, 1945, he wrote me, "It grows more certain every day that we must have one world language if we are to have one world at all." On July 26, 1945, Laubach wrote me, "About once a day I pray the Lord that Senator Owen may succeed."

I have prayed for his success and for the success of the 123 foreign mission societies in teaching the doctrines of Christ to the illiterate nations of the earth. Laubach himself has not only served as director and representative of the Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, organized by the foreign mission societies of the United States, but he has gone in person to over 83 different nationalities and taught them to read and write their own language with short phonetic alphabets.

The Holy Bible was written in Hebrew with 23 letters, which are sufficient today for writing Hebrew. Laubach taught the Moros to write their language with 16 letters; the Samoans use 14 letters; the Hawaiians only 12 letters. The English language is the most complex. Webster uses only 42 sounds to pronounce over 600,000 English words. I found that 5 of Webster's phonetic sounds were duplications, to wit: The letters c, q, w, x, y. Therefore, 37 symbols were sufficient to pronounce with approximate precision every word in Webster's Dictionary.

Every global letter has the simplest individual form possible. No global letter has more than one form. No global letter has more than one sound. No global letter is ever silent. The name of each global letter is its sound. The global alphabet is not a language like Esperanto, but strictly an alphabet. It is not a stenographic system, although adapted to high-speed writing since each letter begins and ends in the center of the writing space.

I had constructed standard global typewriters, with which any language in the world can be phonetically typed at high speed without shift of the 37 letters on the keyboard, and with which the Global Alphabet Guide Book was prepared.

This Guide Book contains within its pages a plan by which the English language, as currently printed in books and papers, can be read intelligently by a child of 8 years of age within a very short time, not exceeding a few weeks.

You will find in this book a list of all the words necessary to read, write, and speak English fluently—1,200 in number—determined by frequency. These are the only words required. The book is offered by the World Language Foundation at 50 cents each.

Mr. Congressman, there is no competitor. Am I not justified in asking you and your colleagues to give this matter the attention its importance deserves? On pages 13 to 15 you will find the dedication of the global alphabet to the United Nations and to the teachers of the world.

The mechanism submitted to you herewith speaks for itself, and is a means by which Laubach's demand can be made effective.

Faithfully your friend,
ROBERT L. OWEN.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN D. JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Hon. Roy J. Turner, Governor of Oklahoma, addressed to me, and copy of a telegram from Governor Turner addressed to the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, both relating to the school-lunch program in the State of Oklahoma, I desire to call to the attention of the House the critical situation existing in the school-lunch program in the State of Oklahoma.

The school-lunch program is operating in each of its 77 counties, and through it 150,000 children, in approximately 1,800 schools are being fed daily. Unless something is done immediately, this program will have to be closed down on March 31, 1947, for the lack of funds. I wish to state here that I shall support a deficiency appropriation seeking to correct this situation in keeping with the spirit and letter of the two communications received from Governor Turner. Those communications are as follows:

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Oklahoma City, March 4, 1947.
Hon GLEN D. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GLEN: Your attention is invited to the enclosed copy of a telegram, which is self-explanatory, addressed to the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, relative to the school-lunch program under the State board of public welfare.

Any assistance on your part to insure that additional funds are made available with which to complete the present school year will be appreciated by me.

Sincerely yours,
ROY J. TURNER.

MARCH 3, 1947.
Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Have just been advised that United States Department of Agriculture allocation to Oklahoma for the operation of the school-lunch program will be exhausted not later than March 31 1947. For your information, program is operating in all 77 counties, approximately 1,800 schools and feeding 150,000 children daily. On behalf of school administrators, PTA groups, public officials, and civic organizations, want you to know this program is one of the most popular and best received of any joint program operated by the State and Federal Governments and I strongly urge you to do everything in your power to make additional Federal funds available to keep this program in operation throughout the school year. Your office here working with State welfare board handling program and schools are being notified today that program will close unless additional funds received, therefore, earnestly solicit your cooperation and advice. Am also requesting assistance of Oklahoma congressional delegation and asking them to discuss this with you and to support a deficiency appropriation, which I understand has been introduced in the National Congress, in the event such action is necessary to keep program in operation to the end of this fiscal year. In order that necessary plans can be formulated, request your early attention and reply.

ROY J. TURNER,
Governor of Oklahoma.

The Copper Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my thanks to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, particularly my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman KNUTSON, and the gentleman from New York, Congressman REED, the two ranking Republican members, for the very prompt and energetic manner in which they have met the emergency situation created by the acute copper shortage.

Bureaucrats who feel they must act only according to hard-and-fast rules and can never deviate therefrom, no matter how urgent the need, please take note.

The Committee on Ways and Means, perhaps our busiest committee, beset with problems of gigantic importance, working night and day, every one of them, in the national interest, had scheduled hearings and work which completely consumed all their time, and more.

Less than a week ago, however, upon the urgent representations of several of my constituents, I took up this matter with the chairman and several members of this committee. I pointed out to them that a number of plants, both large and small, in my home city of Rochester, N. Y., might be shut down completely very shortly unless they could obtain additional copper for their manufacturing needs. This would throw thousands of people out of work and, at a time when increased production is so vitally needed, would continue to deprive the public of the opportunity to purchase many items, unavailable during the war and now in such short supply. In addition to that, the acquisition of the world's copper supplies by countries other than our own in these times of great world unrest would present a serious national problem. A company allied with one of the domestic copper companies which would normally be expected to oppose the importation of copper from other countries had wired me that the extremely short supply might force them to a final shut-down in operations some time in March or April unless immediate relief was forthcoming.

Even though all of us realize that this committee has before it the arduous and tremendously important task, with first priority, of conducting hearings and preparing a bill to relieve the harassed taxpayers of this country and give the workingman an increase in his take-home pay, so long overdue, they recognized the acute emergency created by this copper shortage. They went into action immediately.

I am informed that a bill "to provide adequate supplies of copper" will shortly be reported to the House, where I sincerely trust it will have prompt and favorable attention.

On behalf of the industries in my district who will benefit from this speedy and sound action, and on behalf of the thousands of working people employed by them who might otherwise shortly be walking the streets for want of a job, I cannot express in too extravagant terms the appreciation of the people of the Fortieth New York District, which I have the honor to represent.

Down to Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members of Congress have heard from their constituents urging prompt and decisive action by this Congress. The difficulty is that the people do not know what a colossal undertaking faces us. However, the information is gradually reaching the people, and I am happy to note that one of the large newspapers of my section of the country has a thorough understanding and a proper diagnosis of the situation, and has voluntarily sought to explain it to its readers.

I quote with pleasure the following editorial from a recent issue of the Tulsa Daily World:

DOWN TO CASES

Many reports of cuts and restorations and compromises on the National Budget have come and gone, but there is no certainty what the result will be when both Houses have had their innings. That is typical of pretty much the whole congressional situation. The big talk is about over and the time for final work on the vital measures is practically at hand.

It is likely people fool themselves about what Congress is doing or is likely to do. Few committee reports, except on routine matters, are ever conclusive. About the first of the year, and even immediately after the election, a great many people followed the vociferous politicians in declamations to the effect that price curbs would go off right away, spending would be reduced, a million Government employees would be fired, labor legislation would be passed right away to prevent strikes and hold-ups, the budget would be balanced, and so forth. All that was assumed; the campaign was not quite over when all these bright remarks were made.

Right now Congress is situated this way: There is a broad, general plan to cut expenditures, and upon that cut depends the size of the Army and Navy appropriations; the reduction of the national debt, if any; the cost of the Veterans' Administration; the maintenance or demolition of OPA and all controls. Talk of these subjects has been on all at once; now the items must be taken up separately. Ordinarily, major legislation is not passed by a new Congress until its third month; that month is soon to open. It is for these reasons we say people fool themselves or are fooled by loud talk.

Possibly the severest headache of all is UNRRA, or world relief. The Hoover report put a damper upon Congress and stopped such talk of less expenditures. The contrivance of world relief on the scale suggested amounts to policy. This policy interferes with the school-lunch program at home, the demolition of controls, the appropriations for defense and almost everything else. This interlocking makes the task of Congress hard and complicated. Therefore, it is rather poor statesmanship and poorer politics to be shouting so long before getting out of the woods. The people expected too much of this Congress, which also expected too much of itself. It is entirely too early to blow up and say that Congress is a failure, that it isn't doing anything, that it has reneged on its promises, etc. All the big affairs are still in the mill, and the mill works on schedule, not directly upon popular dictation or wishful thinking. By May 1 it will be safe to predict and to apportion considerable blame or praise. The new Congress is getting down to cases.

The Case Against the Admirals Is Subsidized Tirade Against the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress recently received a book written by William Bradford Huie, titled "The Case Against the Admirals."

The Navy Club of the United States of America, after an investigation, insists that the distribution of the book to Members of Congress was financed by a group of 20 or more American Air Force officers.

Obviously, this subsidized propaganda was meant to influence Congress against those who had the courage to disagree with the proposed merger of our armed forces and which involves establishing the Army Air Force as a separate entity.

It is interesting to note that the investigation conducted by the Navy Club of the United States of America reveals that William Bradford Huie, author of The Case Against the Admirals, made application for discharge as a commissioned officer in the United States Navy in October 1944 before the war ended on the grounds that he had no technical or military experience. His application for discharge was changed to a request for inactive duty which was approved January 1945. In his request for discharge William Bradford Huie publicly confessed his ignorance of technical or military knowledge thus refuting his claim that he is an expert on such matters.

The Navy Club of the United States of America, after due investigation, has released the following information that clearly indicates that William Bradford Huie was talking through his hat and in Navy parlance—he is all wet.

The letter I received from Earl Lawson, commandant of the Navy Club of the United States, with a statement de-

nying Huie's allegations, are herewith submitted:

NAVY CLUB OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Rockford, Ill.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: As commandant, Navy Club, United States of America, the book, The Case Against the Admirals, by William Bradford Huie, published by E. P. Dutton & Co., has aroused my unfavorable interest, as well as that of every shipmate who has read the book. NCUSA members have, I believe, recognized the book for what it is: An obviously subsidized tirade against the Navy, based upon a handful of partial facts and misrepresentations.

When I assumed office I asked some of my shipmates to undertake an investigation of public facts to find out the truth of the allegations contained in the book. Our organization—composed of personnel who have served, or are now serving, in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—has no huge bankroll, and the work has been voluntary. As a result it has taken a long time to complete. We have, I believe, found enough discrepancies in the book, variations from straight truth, if you will, to clearly refute everything in the book. A copy of our findings is enclosed.

Congressman HOFFMAN, of Michigan, according to news dispatches, recently questioned the sending of a copy of this book to each Member of Congress and wondered whether public money had financed this distribution. Mr. Huie was subsequently quoted in the press as saying he and his publisher were responsible for this wholesale distribution. Our investigation reveals that the distribution was financed by a group of about twenty or so former AAF officers, now civilians, and not by either the War Department, or Mr. Huie and his publishers.

Mr. Huie is an old hand at writing tirades based upon incomplete, or entirely erroneous information. In 1941 there appeared an article by him in Collier's, entitled "How to Keep Football Stars in College." It was primarily an indictment of University of Alabama. In the Collier's editorial column of its issue dated April 5, 1941, the magazine apologized for publishing the Huie article, saying it had done so "on the basis of information which was considered reliable." Collier's, the statement said "accepted and published the article in good faith. Searching inquiry," said Collier's, "did not confirm Mr. Huie's statements * * *. Collier's is convinced that a serious injustice was done the University of Alabama, its faculty, its athletic coaches, its students, and its alumni by publication of the article referred to, and for this reason we sincerely regret its publication and are happy to make this statement."

We believe this offers sound basis for questioning both the facts and conclusions drawn by Mr. Huie.

Further, it is interesting to note that in all the publicity about the book, no qualifications setting Mr. Huie up as an expert were given, beyond reference to his naval service. Mr. Huie enlisted in the Navy to write about the Seabees in April 1943. He was commissioned a junior grade lieutenant the following January. In October of the same year he submitted a letter of resignation, saying he had no technical or military experience. The letter was later changed to a request for inactive duty, which was granted in January 1945.

Why did Mr. Huie, who in October 1944, believe he had insufficient technical or military experience to discharge the duties of a junior grade lieutenant, believe he had, about a year later, sufficient experience to write this book?

Sincerely,

EARL LAWSON,
Commandant, Navy Club, U. S. A.

In chapter 1, the author, William Bradford Huie, opens his so-called case against the Navy by dealing at length with the conclusions of the "Baker board," and "blaming" the Navy for those conclusions. The "Baker board" (War Department special committee on Army Air Corps) was, as its official name implies, a War Department board. Its chairman was Newton D. Baker, a former Secretary of War. It was composed of Army officers and civilians. The Navy was in no way concerned with the board and was not represented on it.

On page 29, the statement is made, "The B-29's knocked Japan out of the war." On the face of it, this statement is silly. Japan was knocked out of the war as a result of the combined pressure exerted by all the forces under command of General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz. Alone, the B-29 could not have operated against Japan. With an effective combat radius of about 1,500 miles, the B-29's could not operate until bases in the Marianas and Iwo Jima were taken by forces under Admiral Nimitz, at a total cost of 46,700 casualties suffered by Marines, the Navy, and other Army units. The friendly base at Iwo plus the Japanese air units knocked out over the homeland by naval air 5,216 planes during 1945 enabled the B-29 to lower their bombing altitude from 30,000 feet to eight to ten thousand feet. Published statements by General LeMay, when he assumed command of the Twentieth Air Force at Saipan indicate that the high level attacks were not militarily successful.

The B-29's couldn't have operated without the combined assistance of the ground forces, the Navy and Marine Corps. As to whether they knocked out Japan, consider the 4,900,000 tons of Japanese merchant shipping—60 percent of the total—sunk by submarines. This, according to Japanese testimony, strangled Japanese industry. Vice Admiral Ozawa, who commanded the Japanese Third Fleet, testified that even before the Marianas campaign, the shortage of fuel was keenly felt. This was before the B-29 campaign began. A book—many volumes—remain to be written totaling the efforts of all branches against Japan, but this should give the lie to the flat statement that the B-29's knocked Japan out.

On page 40 appears this statement, "Admiral King insisted that Army flights stop at the shoreline. At last, in 1935, the Navy grudgingly permitted Army planes to fly 300 miles to sea."

The author in this book makes reference to a previous book, highly successful, The Fight for Air Power, in which he made virtually the same statement. He sent a copy to Admiral King, then Commander in Chief, United States Fleet, who wrote Huie, under date of February 1, 1943, and said, "It is obvious that you are ill-informed—or have been ill-advised (by our sponsors?)—as to my aviation experience. * * * Further, you have attributed to me remarks which I can assure you I have never made, no matter from what source you may have taken them."

Far from restricting the range of Army planes to 300 miles, the Navy in 1938 was engaged in preparing war plans predicated on the hope that Army aircraft could assist in a war effort to the maximum radius of their aircraft. In 1938 this radius, as reported by the Army, was 587 nautical miles, which figures were accented as the planning figure at that time.

On page 41-42 is this statement: "Navy would permit no Army Air Force bases to be set up along the shoreline, etc." There follows considerable discussion of the air bases in Washington, D. C., Anacostia and Boiling.

During World War I a sincere effort was made to set up joint air bases. The Navy desired to push its shore stations as close to the sea as possible, while the Army sought to locate them close to the cities it was expected to protect. One joint site was developed—North Island—but the Army moved out when the station became overcrowded. The Army also moved out of Anacostia and established Boiling when Anacostia became overcrowded. The Army has subsequently built Andrews Field, a few short miles away, but still operates Boiling. In the Pacific both services built and maintained island air fields, but none who fought in the Pacific ever said there was too much of anything. At no place where there were two fields would one have been sufficient.

On page 66: "In 1946, with the Navy committed to a test of the efficiency of atomic weapons against surface ships, the American people should be on guard. Efforts may be made to rig the test or to suppress or falsify the results."

Operations Crossroads was directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a test rather than a contest. While joint Task Force No. 1, charged with carrying out the mission, was commanded by Vice Adm. William H. P. Blandy, a Navy man, an Army officer was second in command, and Army officers directed air communications, Ground Forces, Air Forces, logistics, intelligence and invitations to nonmilitary observers. Competent and unbiased civilian observers were present, as well as a personal representative of the President. How then could the tests be rigged or results be falsified.

Page 92: The discussions of the Martin-Bellinger plan for the employment of bombardment aviation in the defense of Oahu.

Allegations that the Navy hierarchy tossed this plan aside are without foundation, according to the records. The Martin-Bellinger plan, resulting from an estimate of the situation for the defense of Hawaii, provided that long-range air search should be performed by the Navy, since protection of sea approaches is a naval task. It also provided that Army planes would be used should the number of naval aircraft be too few. The plan was adopted in March 1941, and remained in effect on December 7, 1941. The fact remains there were insufficient planes, either Army or Navy, to do the job properly.

Page 106: "But because the admirals and old ground generals would not admit the premise, would not admit that land-based planes either would or should be a factor in the 'high seas' engagement * * *."

In February 1939, the Chief of Naval Operations directed all subordinate commanders to engage in joint air exercises.

BATTLE OF MIDWAY

Huie has made many erroneous statements in this section. While in pointing out and correcting these errors it may appear so, no intent to detract from the gallant efforts of the Army Air Forces is contained herein. Full reports of Midway—corroborated by captured enemy documents and by testimony collected after the close of hostilities—indicate that no hits were made in this battle by high-level bombers and that Navy and Marine Corps dive bombers inflicted all damage.

Page 113: "The argument whether Army, Navy or Marine fliers sank the most ships."

Although the Army Air Forces contributed greatly to breaking up the enemy formation, their high-level bombers scored no hits—according to enemy survival reports. Eleven B-17's returning to Midway reported dropping 20 thousand-pound bombs on a cruiser "which sank in 15 seconds." The "cruiser" was the United States submarine *Grayling*, which submerged, undamaged, after failing

to establish its identity with the Army pilots. At Midway there were 243 carrier aircraft, 62 Marine planes and 36 Navy planes based on Midway, and 21 Army planes (4 B–26 torpedoes and 17 B–17's).

Page 113: "The men who flew Helldivers."

The Helldiver (SB2C) did not appear in combat until November 1943, 17 months after Midway.

Page 117: "Why didn't our carrier planes operate off the land base?"

Six TBF's (carrier type torpedoes) did operate from Midway.

Page 117: " * * * the Jap bombers would have no target but the unsinkable islands * * *."

More land-based planes (there was no room for more) would have given Jap bombers additional targets, since not all could have been flown off on short notice. While islands are unsinkable, they are also unmaneuverable, therefore destructible, as naval aircraft and surface ships demonstrated at Tarawa, Kwajalein, Wotje, Wake, Guam, Saipan, Tinian, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa.

Page 118: "Why were there no long-range, land-based torpedo planes * * *?"

There were. One Army flight of four B–26's, torpedo, was undertaken. No hits were scored. Two planes were lost. Moreover, hindsight, as reported by Admiral R. A. Ofstie, Navy representative on the strategic bombing survey, indicates that the efficiency of the torpedo plane—Navy or Army—was overrated. The dive bomber and masthead level bomber were most effective in the Pacific.

Page 119: "Why were these Marine torpedo planes equipped with floats?"

There were no Marine floatplanes or seaplanes.

Page 126: "Early in September a gold-braided representative of the Navy Department called on the Sperry Co. and delivered an ultimatum." Huie here is alleging that Navy pressure forced the dismissal of then Col. Hugh Knerr as assistant to the president of Sperry. R. E. Gillmor wrote Rear Adm. H. B. Miller, as follows:

"I was president of the company of question at the time. No factual basis exists for the statements and implications made by Mr. Huie * * *. It has long been the policy of the company to require that its employees refrain from criticizing the Government departments which the company serves. General Knerr felt that he was unable to accord with that policy and consequently voluntarily left the company."

Page 136: "The Normandy landing is convincing proof that battleships are of little use in a landing operation."

Rear Adm. Otto Schultz, German Navy, in an essay, said:

"It is interesting to note that we were taken by surprise by the effect of the naval guns of the invasion fleet, both by their multiplicity and by their accuracy at extreme ranges. The firing technique of naval guns developed in order to support the Army during the invasion certainly justified itself and was responsible for a great part of the success."

Page 141: "And of men of five-star rank the Navy got four, the Army three, the Air Force one."

The Congress authorized five-star rank, providing four each for the Army and the Navy. The Army apportioned one to the Air Forces. The Navy commissioned three officers to this rank—Admirals King, Nimitz, and Leahy. Admiral Halsey was elevated to five stars when he retired.

Page 141–2: "But Emmons (General Delos C.) was only a three-star general, so the Navy managed to get four stars for Nimitz, who was replacing a two-starred Admiral Kimmel."

The job of Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, is a four-star job; Admiral Kimmel held four-star rank as CinCPac; Admiral Nimitz assumed it when he assumed the duties as CinCPac.

Page 144: "The Navy began competing with the Air Force in the manufacture and purchases of B–24 bombers. The same planes which the admirals had tried to prevent the Air Force from developing, the admirals now began snatching for themselves."

The Navy snatched no aircraft. It obtained all aircraft, of whatever type, from the Joint (Army-Navy) Aircraft Committee and the Joint Munitions Assignment Board.

Page 146: "Guadalcanal was the Navy command's first shot, not only against the Japanese, but also against the MacArthur threat to Navy supreme command ambitions in the Pacific."

Guadalcanal was planned and ordered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, consisting of Generals Marshall and Arnold, Admirals King and Leahy.

Page 148: "Of 16 warships and transports, every single ship was sunk and 40,000 Japanese soldiers and sailors were slaughtered" (Battle of Bismarck Sea).

United States Strategic Bombing Survey reports give an entirely different tally. Eight cargo and troop-carrying ships and four destroyers were lost, and between 3,000 and 4,000 personnel. Two destroyers got away. General Kenney, in his testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, claimed 22 ships sunk, including 3 cruisers. The Strategic Bombing Survey reports say no cruisers were present and cut General Kenney's estimates to half.

Page 150: "Of all the battles in the Pacific offensive this one (Battle of Leyte Gulf, October 1944) came nearest to being an American disaster."

It is generally felt that sinking 26 Japanese ships and lossing 8 of our own may be considered a victory.

Page 151: "Japanese had little or no land-based power—130 planes."

Over 320 land-based planes were destroyed in the air during the Leyte Gulf battle, many more destroyed on the ground. Additionally, ships' antiaircraft fire downed many kamikazes (first appearance) which are land-based.

Page 152: "American planes did 95 percent of the fighting, they were the guns that sunk all but two of the Japanese ships."

Final tallies credit aircraft with sinking 12 enemy ships, surface ships and submarines with sinking 14. Many of the 12 credited to air had been previously damaged by surface ships or submarines; many of 14 credited to surface ships and submarines had been damaged by aircraft.

Page 168: "Charges of duplication by Naval Air Transport and Air Transport Command."

In the main they operated to different destinations but of necessity used the same routes and the identical facilities over the approaches. The traffic was such that had there been but a single service there would have been no fewer planes, no fewer facilities.

Sugar Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith the petition of William H. Emerine, of Alvada, Ohio, and other Ohio residents, concerning the rationing of sugar:

STAMSOGAR

A conspiracy intent on controlling all peoples of the earth by controlling the availability of these nine basic products:

1. Steel.
2. Tungsten carbide.
3. Aluminum.
4. Magnesium.
5. Sugar.
6. Oil.
7. Gas.
8. Alcohol.
9. Rubber.

Whereas in this day and age all mankind cannot for very long do without any or all of these basic products; and

Whereas it is now known that 23 powerfully rich men of earth are bent on gaining control of these basic products; and

Whereas those 23 men are determined to control the people of all earth by controlling these nine basic products; and

Whereas sugar affects all of us directly through our diet; and

Whereas sugar is necessary to our diet: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, ask that you, ALVIN F. WEICHEL, introduce a resolution in Congress to remove sugar from all rationing and to investigate as to why not sufficient sugar is being imported into the United States from sugar-producing countries.

William H. Emerine, Minni B. Frees, C. Snorrbusbick, Carl W. Trimbo, A. E. Porter, Mrs. Helen Rickard, Lila Caterman, Miriam Sterling, Mildred Dick, Alda Reese, Mrs. A. Whitacre, Mrs. J. G. Phillips, Mrs. Sy Ackerman, Frank W. Davis, Florence Schmidt, Mrs. Ross Dewyer, Mrs. Marvin Dewyer, Mrs. Wilbur Spence, Mrs. J. C. Harkinson, Mrs. N. H. Plassman, H. C. Stephenson, Mrs. H. G. Snyder, Mrs. O. S. Ervin, Mrs. Claudia Hartman, Mrs. W. A. Muir, Mrs. T. H. Rhotin, Mrs. I. W. Baird, Mrs. K. W. Householder, Mrs. I. F. Rolfes, Mrs. R. E. Ronor, Mrs. William Meyer, Mrs. Levi Warner, Del E. Phillip, Vera Garris, Martha Howe, Winifred Wickard, Kenneth Dean, Mrs. Ray Wickard, Mrs. Alice Gogal, Mrs. Lottie M. Swope, Emma Palmerton, Lessor Palmerton, John Shaw, Mrs. Harold Rubel, Dale Spackey, Mrs. Dale Spackey, Guy Swope, Mrs. Doyle Phillips, Mrs. Odna Pierce, Mrs. Byron Simmons, L. A. Miller, G. Sadler, R. V. Easley, Mrs. H. J. Grimm, Ida Buckingham, Mrs. Edith Smith, Mrs. Martha Brandebary, Mrs. A. J. Smalley, A. J. Smalley, George Road, Harry L. Teeple, Mary Crawford, Orville Crawford, Alton Crawford, Mrs. Helen Hampshire, Mrs. Carol Harvey, Mrs. Frank Waltz, Mrs. Joseph Krassou, Mrs. William Ault, Mrs. Roy Hamman, Mrs. Alton Harmon, Mrs. John Coakley, Mrs. Ray Swartz, Mrs. Earl Dick, Mrs. Perry E. Hamman, Mrs. W. S. Hamman, Mrs. S. Z. Bhair, S. Z. Bhair, C. J. Witherall, Roy Kiger, Ruth Kiger, Bert H. Kiger, E. P. Bevelhymer, Patricia Bevelhymer, Pete Bevelhymer, Karl Matuski, Mr. and Mrs. James L. Shane, Mr. and Mrs. C. F. Snow, Mr. and Mrs. Claron Bishop, Mr. and Mrs. Woodrow Bishop, Mr. and Mrs. H. W. Mandell, Mr. and Mrs. Elias Momsmith, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Heller, Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Lamey, Mrs. Loma Mc-

Garvey, B. L. McGarvey, Mrs. D. C. Coopes, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Solarik, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Sam B. Huff, Gladys Morrison, Mrs. R. M. Hummel, Mrs. Kenneth Jones, Mrs. Pearl Vankirk, J. W. Snyder, Mrs. W. C. Hollaway, Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Arend, Mr. and Mrs. George Insley, Mr. and Mrs. Don Roth, Mr. and Mrs. Perry Donaldson, Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Sterling, Mr. and Mrs. John Wittenmeyer, Mr. and Mrs. Ford Simon, Mrs. D. C. Credicott, Mrs. Alvin Rose, Mrs. Anthony Valenti, W. L. Clark, Jim Thompson, Ray Thies, Andrew Simon, S. T. Briggs, Steve Gywegi, Perry Wollam, Shirley Rice, Roy Rice, Kathryn Hamlin, Alice Dick, S. W. Kuney, Mrs. William Balz, Clarence Gouser, L. F. Ulch, Mrs. Kate Hartigan, Mrs. Leo Curtis, Fred Hamlin, Mrs. John Mallon, Mrs. A. B. Longfellow, Mrs. W. L. Hewirtt, Mrs. Frank Reese, Mrs. John M. Doyle, Mrs. William C. Lahey, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Adams, Mrs. Ivan Snyder, G. A. Taylor, M. J. Blechinger, Mrs. Scott Reese, Mrs. Carrie Shane, Joseph E. Girard, Mrs. Ray Kinney, Mrs. John Mathias, Mrs. L. R. Miller, Mrs. Richard Curtis, Mrs. Minnie Campbell, Mrs. Howard Stubbins.

Poland's Red Chains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, every son of Poland should read from cover to cover, again and again, the new book by former Polish Ambassador to Washington, Jan Ciechanowski, Defeat in Victory.

In cold print he will find there the answer to his bewilderment, his tragic disillusionment in his hopes of yesterday that were built upon the promise of a restored and free Poland.

Why is Poland still in the chains of defeat, pillaged and robbed both spiritually and materially, though she suffered first, longest, and most for the cause of all humanity?

Can those of us who are jealous of the future and freedom of Poland—and of any oppressed people—be sure that the Communist chains of Poland's present oppressor were not forged here in America? And more, were not the sons of Poland betrayed into serving those who even now sit at the same table with the oppressor?

Let this book give answer.

If we find there the betrayal of Poland by our American leaders, and, unwittingly, by our own hands, then we must, even to the last of our days, strive to erase this shame.

Every American of Polish descent must get to the bottom of this betrayal, for he knows betrayal there was.

Every freedom-loving Pole must repudiate every person who had a hand in this shameful treatment of the Allies' first fallen warrior.

If we are guilty ourselves, however unintentional our actions may have been, then in atonement we must bring to account every single person and organization who deceived us.

What are the facts in Ambassador Ciechanowski's book?

First, the New Deal Democrat administration sold out Poland at Tehran in 1943, under the personal supervision of the New Deal leadership.

This was in secret—as were most of the subsequent conferences for the reason that the White House and the palace guard were oversensitive that 1944 was a political year.

There at Tehran in 1943, in secret, President Roosevelt handed Poland over to the beast of Red fascism—Russia.

Did the Polish-American vote help in the elections of 1944?

The Ambassador says in his book:

> From my friends among the political bosses in the Democratic Party I heard triumphant exultation concerning the so-called Polish vote which had so fully responded to the President's assurance given to the chairman of the Polish-American Congress on the Presidential train on October 28, 1944, that he would use all his mighty influence to assure the restoration of Poland's full independence. I was told that these assurances had caused the Americans of Polish descent to vote overwhelmingly for Roosevelt.

This word was passed down through Democrat political ranks—eagerly repeated and reprinted by the city bosses of the New Deal political machines in Chicago, in Cleveland, in Detroit, in Jersey City, in New York City.

From the betrayal at Tehran in 1943 until after the elections of 1944, it was easy to keep secret the betrayal of Poland with the cooperation of the New Deal city politicians. To these leaders, the Polish people were so much sheep to be herded behind their leaders.

But the saddest, most tragic fact was that the Polish people in America helped blindly to betray their own motherland.

Americans of Polish descent, therefore, helped to dig the grave of immortal Poland. Americans of Polish descent elected city officials in Chicago, Jersey City, Detroit, Cleveland, and elsewhere. This made possible the continued betrayal of Poland to this very hour. It was possible because of the blind faith of Americans of Polish descent in the New Deal's big city bosses.

> I was frequently asked by various campaign managers and especially by election agents of the New Deal, what I thought would be the most appropriate way to obtain the support of what they called "the Polish vote" for the Democratic machine—

Reports the former Ambassador's book—

> Those questions show how anxiously the vote of the Americans of Polish descent was being watched and nursed.

Did the city bosses want the Tehran agreements withdrawn? Did they raise even a whisper in behalf of their Polish voters? No. The Polish voters were given empty promises while their motherland was being bound in Red chains.

You will find in detail in this revealing book how, in 1943—the year of the Tehran betrayal—orders were privately given to the Office of War Information in Washington direct from the White House to pump out pro-Russian and anti-Polish propaganda, while publicly the politicians in Washington and the Democrat bosses of the big city machines were carrying out a deliberately deceitful policy of "stringing along the Polish vote" with empty talk and vacuous promises of deep concern for Poland's cause.

No person who reads the well-named book, Defeat in Victory, can fail to see how utterly ruthless and disinterested the Democrat leadership was in the Polish cause. So long as they had "the Polish vote" sewed up by the Democrat city bosses, the machine was perfectly content, and after the successful election the New Dealers compounded the infamy of Tehran with another sell-out at Yalta.

If there can be any doubt about this, let us find the answer to these questions:

First. In Poland's trying years of 1943 and 1944, did the Democrat New Deal President ever seek the advice and help of any honorable Americans of Polish descent?

Not once did he do so.

Second. Whose help did he seek?

He conferred with men like Oscar Lange—Poland's No. 1 Quisling. He sought the advice of his New Deal city bosses in Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Jersey City, and New York—but this was only to deliver the Polish vote to the New Deal.

Now, this unusual book by the former Ambassador covers a significant period. It opens when he presented his credentials to the President on March 4, 1941, as the envoy of Poland to the United States. It closes with the withdrawal of those credentials as the first official act of James F. Byrnes as President Truman's Secretary of State on July 5, 1945.

President Truman has followed the New Deal pattern in foreign affairs with regard to Poland: He deposed Ambassador Ciechanowski, who is the author of Defeat in Victory. He acquiesced at Potsdam to the sell-out of Poland at Tehran and Yalta. Then Mr. Truman affirmed the credentials of the present vassals of Russia who now rule Poland. This is the undisputed record.

So what of the future of Americans of Polish descent? They have only begun to fight. In the elections of last November they began to settle the score with their betrayers. They already have repudiated the false leadership and the big city bosses.

City elections will take place soon. Again they shall have the opportunity to repudiate the city bosses. They are determined to perform this civic service for humanity, for freedom, for the Polish motherland—and for their own America. They will watch the Communists, will know for whom they vote.

As Americans they know that betrayal does not square with America—especially this treacherous betrayal of our most gallant and loyal ally, Poland.

And if these sons of Poland blindly were led to betray the motherland by city bosses in America, then surely that freedom can be reborn. Here and now they have begun to cut the Red chains.

The sons of Poland will be vassals to no one. One day they will be free—both in America and in Poland.

Once they were blind. Now they see.

Estimate 1947 Hay Sales at $12,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I invite attention of the membership to the following article from the Artesia News, of Artesia, Calif.:

ESTIMATE 1947 HAY SALES AT $12,000,000

As a rule, $12,000,000 ain't hay, but in this case it is.

That Artesia is destined to replace Hynes as the hay center of the world became apparent this week following a survey in which it was disclosed that approximately $12,000,000 worth of hay will be purchased by dairymen in this area during the present year.

Hay marketing, next to dairying, is this community's most important and profitable industry, and is contingent upon continued successes by dairy operators. In recent years dairies have grown in size and number until Artesia now is recognized as the hub of Los Angeles County's milkshed industry.

A number of hay dealers from surrounding areas have announced their intentions of setting up stations in this community and conservative estimates predict double the amount of hay markets here within the next 2 months, which will bring the total to approximately 15.

New hay will make its appearance here in quantities starting the second week in April when incoming loads are expected to average 100 a day. With 15 tons as an average load, and $32 as an average price, this means 1,500 tons of hay, or $48,000 worth daily.

Hay market operators say that hay will continue to come into this area at that rate for 6 months, which means that the total tonnage will hit 273,000. Multiply that figure by $32 and you get $8,736,000.

During the off-season, incoming hay is expected to drop off to 50 or perhaps as low as 25 loads per day. Still being conservative, hay dealers say that over 100,000 tons of hay will be brought into this area during the off-season, which is $3,200,000 worth of feed for dairy cattle, bringing the total year's figure to nearly $12,000,000.

Reason behind the movement of hay markets to this area is pointed out as the steady, almost booming, growth of Artesia as the principal dairying area in the southland.

Hay-market operators, to save time and money and at the same time offer better service to the largest number of dairymen, are endeavoring to centralize their markets here.

Heretofore, if located in El Monte, Hynes, or Bellflower, they have had to haul their hay from the regions in which it is grown to their markets there and then transport it to this area. By locating their markets here, where a greater percentage of their sales are made, they can eliminate extra long trips.

Dairies are being pushed eastward to the Orange County line by continued homebuilding and development of subdivisions in Los Angeles County. By actual count there are nearly 40,000 dairy cows in the Artesia area, more than at any other time in history, and hay markets are following in the wake of the eastward movement of the dairies.

Tax Revision Can Make or Break American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following article by James H. McGraw, Jr., president of McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., which I consider most illuminating:

TAX REVISION CAN MAKE OR BREAK AMERICAN BUSINESS

Is the American way of life—progress by private initiative—going to get a fair chance to demonstrate its superiority over all the challenging varieties of collectivism?

That's the real question before Congress as it confronts the long labor of remodeling the Federal tax structure. What Congress does about taxes will come pretty close to making or breaking the United States of America.

Today the tax colossus that sprawls across the national economy is unguided by any central nervous system. Its crushing weight comes down first here, then there, as the giant wobbles around, unguided by any central purpose except to grab as much as it can.

The central purpose of a tax system is simple. It should raise the necessary revenue without placing unnecessary fetters on enterprise.

As recently as 1929 Federal taxes took only $1 out of every twenty of national income. A loose-jointed and inconsistent tax structure was a nuisance then. But it wasn't serious.

Today the Federal tax burden is the dominant element in the Nation's economy.

Even if Congress succeeds in cutting $6,000,000,000 out of President Truman's $37,500,000,000 budget, Federal taxes still will take about $1 out of every five of the national income. And few Congressmen are hopeful enough to think that they can get the tax load below $25,000,000,000 for any year that is in sight.

DRASTIC BUDGET CUTS REQUIRED

Indeed, to get the tax load down to $25,000,000,000, Congress will have to stop treating expenditures, like those for military purposes and veterans, as politically sacrosanct. Congress must scrutinize every item in the budget. Economy must go along with tax cutting or we shall end in bankruptcy.

Suppose that expenditures are slashed to the bone. Our taxes still will be so heavy that the way they are loaded on the Nation's back will make a big difference in how well the Nation gets along. That's something which the postwar boom has tended to obscure. It will become much clearer as this boom wears off. Then a remodeling of the Federal tax system to remove its manifold obstructions to private enterprise will be of transcendent and obvious importance to everybody.

TAX EXPERTS AGREE

The remodeling will require political courage plus tax wisdom. Congress must supply its own political courage. But it can lean on tax experts for tax wisdom. Fortunately, tax experts now agree on the necessary reforms—especially on those that will remove obstructions to business. How well the tax experts agree is shown in the charts on this page, summarizing answers to a questionnaire on possible Federal tax reform. The questions were asked by the department of economics of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. The answers came from a broad cross-section of tax experts, including the authors of a considerable crop of books on postwar Federal taxes and what to do about them.

The experts agree that double taxation of corporate dividends should stop.

They agree that the tax rate on corporate income (now 38 percent) should be reduced as rapidly as possible to the initial rate on individual income (now 20 percent).

And they agree overwhelmingly that it is desirable to let net losses be subtracted from net profits over a 5-to-6-year period in computing business income for tax purposes.

All three changes would stimulate corporate initiative and hence make jobs. Averaging business incomes would make new ventures attractive even though these ventures might result in early losses. Reduction of the corporate income tax would have the same effect. So, too, would the elimination of the highly discriminatory provision whereby corporate dividends are taxed first as corporate profits, and again when received as income by individuals.

PENALTIES ON INCENTIVES

Beyond these changes, there must be an end to tax penalties on individual initiative. Consider the enterprising businessman whose income fluctuates markedly from year to year. Because of his enterprise he may pay, on the same income, twice as much Federal income tax as the man who plays it safe for a steady income. That's because he can't average his personal income over several years for tax purposes. He can count on heavy taxation of his good-year profits with no chance for offsetting against them his bad-year losses. It is a case of heads you lose, tails the tax collector wins. Eighty-six percent of the experts agree that an income-averaging allowance for individuals is desirable.

Three-quarters of them also agree that tax rates at the top end of the individual income scale (now running up almost to 90 percent) should come down. In my judgment, the total tax should not amount to more than 50 percent to encourage businessmen to venture for high stakes.

Advocating tax relief for men in the higher income brackets—and particularly for management men—has been considered political suicide for more than a decade. Some Members of Congress still hold that view. A Democratic Congressman from Michigan told an Illinois colleague who advocated cutting upper bracket taxes, "If you put that idea forward at home, you won't come back."

The Congressman has an even better chance of not going back if our economy bogs down. One of the best ways to bog it down is to keep the taxes that destroy business incentives and block enterprise—for example, the confiscatory rates which drive high-bracket people away from risk-taking.

To give the American system of individual enterprise a fair chance was clearly the mandate of November's election. To give it that chance, enterprising businessmen must have a chance to make large rewards—as well as the always-present chance to lose their shirts. Under present tax rates, they don't get a break.

Prevailing Federal taxation throttles bold business enterprise in other ways. It fails, for example, to encourage research and rapid industrial modernization. It tends to siphon investment away from private enterprise—driving it into tax-exempt State and local securities. (The experts agree almost to a man that such tax exemption must be eliminated.) The list of obstacles could be amplified.

HIT-AND-RUN REVISION DISASTROUS

Most of the reforms needed to prevent the Federal tax system from smothering enterprise would lower Federal revenues—at least, temporarily. Elimination of the double taxation of corporate dividends might lop off $800,000,000. Dropping the corporate income

tax from 38 percent to 20 percent might cut away as much as $4,000,000,000.

Because we cannot avoid enormous Federal expenses in the years immediately ahead, all badly needed reforms of the type to which this article is confined obviously can't be made at once; also, there are other tax reforms bearing on consumption which obviously should be weighed in an over-all program of tax revision.

But this is equally obvious: We should have a general design for tax revision which would line up all the necessary steps. Then we could get ahead with tax reductions as rapidly—and as sensibly—as revenue requirements and political courage would permit. Tax cutting may come piecemeal, but tax planning must not.

Through such a design we might discover that some decidedly beneficial improvements in the Federal tax structure can be made at relatively slight cost. But today there is no way to be sure. No one in Washington with access to the information has even undertaken to make the necessary estimates.

Instead, Federal tax revision continues to be a hit-and-run business—and a short-run political business. Take, for example, the proposal of a 20-percent tax reduction across the board. There are virtues in such a proposal. But how they stack up beside many other extremely urgent needs for tax reform remains a mystery.

Congress must dispel such mysteries. Only in that way will it do the job of converting our present jerry-built tax structure into a moderately safe abode for the American system of private initiative, sparked by adequate incentives.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

PERCENT OF TAX EXPERTS FAVORING THE PROPOSED CHANGE

Tax experts think we should:

1. Eliminate double taxation of corporation dividends which are now taxed as corporate profit and then again as individuals' income, 92 percent.

2. Reduce corporation income-tax rate (now 38 percent) as rapidly as budget needs permit until it equals the initial rate for individual incomes (now 20 percent), 73 percent.

3. Provide for averaging business' taxable incomes over a period of about 6 years to allow for losses in bad years, 97 percent.

4. Provide for averaging individuals' taxable incomes over a period of a few years so as to treat fairly those whose incomes fluctuate, 86 percent.

5. Reduce upper-bracket individual income-tax rates to a maximum of 50 percent in the $100,000 bracket and 75 percent in the million and over bracket, 76 percent.

6. Treat capital gains, now taxed at a lower rate, like other income but provide full allowances for losses, 64 percent.

7. Remove the privilege of tax exemption from all future issues of State and local government bonds, 92 percent.

Has Congress the Courage To Stop Senseless Waste?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the greatest issue before Congress today is, Shall the Congress furnish the money to continue the outrageous, wasteful, extravagant, and ruinous spending spree we have been on during the past 15 years, or has the Congress the courage to call a halt and place this Nation once more on a sound, sane, and safe fiscal basis? Upon the determination of this issue depends tax relief for every taxpayer whether a $12 a week scrubwoman who may pay 12 cents a week in pay-roll deduction or some other individual in the higher bracket who contributes thousands of dollars to the Federal Treasury. Jobs, rates of pay, return on capital, whether in the corner grocery store or in some large industry, in fact the very existence of our form of Government depends upon the question, Has Congress the courage to stop this waste of the taxpayers' money? Bankruptcy or prosperity are the two alternatives. It is up to us to make the choice. If this third year after the close of the war is not the stopping place, just where is it that we are going to stop this senseless spending? Is it to be the fourth, fifth, or sixth year? Just where is the stopping place?

These problems are not so difficult if we will pause a moment and ask ourselves, "What would you and I do if it were our business and our money we were spending?" It is extremely difficult for some of us who were reared in the country to realize just what a billion, a half billion, or fifty billion dollars is.

In 1939 in trying to realize just what was happening to this country of ours, I wrote to every State in the Union and obtained the assessed valuation of that State as placed upon the assessment rolls by the thousands of local supervisors and assessing officers. I put the totals on the adding machine and found that the assessed valuation of all the real and personal property in America placed upon the assessment rolls by the local assessing officers of the various townships, cities, and villages amounted to a total of $150,000,000,000.

If you and I owned and operated a business and our manager asked us for a certain amount of money to operate with during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the first question we would ask him is "How much money will you have available if we give you what you ask for?" And "Can you get along with less?" That is just plain, common, ordinary horse sense.

In examining the budget carefully I find that if Congress gives President Truman and the Democratic administration everything they are asking for, and tremendous pressure is being brought upon Congress to do so, President Truman and his administration will have available for expenditure for all purposes during the third year after the close of the war at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1948, from 1948 and prior years' appropriations, the tremendous sum of $46,200,000,000 or almost one-third the assessed valuation of all the property in America placed upon the assessment rolls by the local assessing officers of the various townships, cities, and villages in 1939.

I am on the Budget Committee and supported the action of that committee in trying to reduce the expenditure $6,000,000,000. I said then and I say now that if President Truman and his administration cannot operate this Government with less than $46,000,000,000 available for expenditures in one year, in fact if they cannot take a $6,000,000,000 cut and operate it with $40,200,000,000 available for expenditure during the third year following the close of the war and give us adequate national defense without wrecking the Air Corps and scuttling the Navy, the President and his Democratic administration should get out and let somebody else do the job.

New Long-Range Plan of Social-Security Bureaucrats Labeled Deception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a very concise statement of what one of the leading citizens of my district thinks of the new proposed long-range plan purported to have been suggested recently by a Federal social-security bureaucrat, which my constituent considers a deception. I quote the letter from my constituent:

I note, via Associated Press dispatch, that the Federal social-securfty bureaucrats are now proposing a long-range plan under which old-age-insurance costs would be divided among employers, workers, and Government. Such fallacious argument, if not downright deceit, is sickening. Whence does the Government derive its powers—and funds—except from those same employers and workers. That argument sounds like Hitler and Mussolini. Maybe the social-security bureaucrats are practicing what these two "fine men" knew—that if you tell a lie long enough it becomes accepted as truth. Why doesn't somebody in Congress pull the beard off this sort of deception?

Resolution of American Lithuanian Society of Amsterdam, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Committee of Amsterdam Lithuanian Organizations assembled at their mass meeting held at the American Lithuanian Hall in the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., on February 23, 1947:

Whereas by the use of devious processes of treachery and overwhelming military power in furtherance of predatory policies of Communist aggression, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has succeeded, against the

will of the people of Lithuania, in establishing its armed forces and administration in the territory of Lithuania; and

Whereas over 20 months passed since the end of hostilities in Europe, and Lithuania is still held under the occupation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Army; and

Whereas the Communist administration, supported by the Russian Army, has deprived the Lithuanian people of their government, individual and political rights and liberties, is cruelly persecuting the Lithuanian people, arresting them and subjecting them to long terms in prison and deporting others into the Soviet Union, while the properties of the Lithuanians are being confiscated and transferred to colonists brought in from Russia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this gathering to commemorate the twenty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, register an emphatic protest against the illegal, arbitrary, and cruel Soviet conduct in Lithuania; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting of Amsterdam Lithuanian Americans, appeals to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, to demand, through diplomatic channels and international conferences, that Soviet Russia immediately withdraw her armed forces and secret police from Lithuanian territory, and permit the Lithuanian people to choose and select their own form of government in a free, just, and democratic election; and be it further

Resolved, That this mass meeting is an appeal to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations at Lake Success, N. Y., through its chairman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, to protect the innocently suffering people of Lithuania from the terror and persecution by Soviet Russia and their henchmen; its faithless masters and oppressors; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives of the State of New York, and published in the press.

AMSTERDAM LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATIONS,
B. H. KROUP, *Chairman*.
ANNE BILLIS, *Secretary*.

Belated Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that a man of the prominence of Mr. Westbrook Pegler has seen fit to bring to the attention of the public the injustice that has been done to Mr. Herbert Hoover by the ruthless, unscrupulous smear crew which for years now have been assassins of character and destroyers of faith in representative government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the column of Mr. Westbrook Pegler which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of March 4, 1947:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

Herbert Hoover's return from his second dangerous and wearying mission to other continents since Mr. Truman became President is the occasion for a discussion of an act of political nastiness now in process of redress. Senator ALBERT W. HAWKES, of New Jersey, has introduced a bill to restore Mr. Hoover's name to the dam on the Colorado River, originally known as the Hoover Dam, but designated Boulder Dam by Harold Ickes.

The contrast between the character of Mr. Hoover and those who attempted to degrade him has been plain in all incidents, reflecting his morality and theirs, which provide a basis for comparison. His worst fault during his Presidency was his obduracy on the subject of prohibition and popular anger was directed at him, individually.

He was the target of a great popular uprising of indignation. He had been booed by the crowd who shouted "we want beer" at a World Series game in Philadelphia. A more ominous note than we who heard it realized at the time.

From election day on to March 4, 1933, when Roosevelt was first inaugurated, Roosevelt and his "brain trust" flippantly refused to cooperate with Hoover. During that interim, Hoover being now a lame duck and a man without a mandate, decay and decline were rapid both at home and abroad.

The problems of the Presidency were his "baby," in the language of the ribald adventurers and the calculated purpose was to set him up in the public imagination as a monster who would be finally responsible for any calamities that might befall by inauguration day.

Hoover certainly was hated when he left office and his wise and conscientious counsel went unheard, and his occasional preaching of fundamental morality in public life was sneered away by a people whose heirs may blame them for their susceptibility to phrases and a voice that put them in a spell.

Throughout his term he had scrupulously refrained from exploiting the Presidency for his personal enrichment or the profit of members of his family. He had served without pay, but hadn't said so and the secret was kept until a long time after he had vanished.

Although Mr. Hoover was renowned as a man of great ability in many fields, particularly in problems of the distribution of food, he was ignored throughout the war. Mountebanks drawn to Washington to advertise themselves as administrators, have since descended again to their natural level of greed and vulgarity, scrambling for easy money in the movie industry, in radio, in the modern racket known as labor relations, and in the variations of the PAC.

Jim Farley, too, another excellent executive, was snubbed in favor of draft dodgers, some of whom were adorned with brass to keep them out of danger. Farley wrote Roosevelt on Pearl Harbor Day offering to serve wherever and however he could and, for answer, got a brush-off.

Mr. Hoover has never asked that his name be restored to the dam for which, more than any other man, he was responsible. He is without vanity and so fine are his pride and his dignity that he could not even recognize Ickes who personally changed the name of the dam and wrote to Homer Cummings, then the New Deal Attorney General, in 1935, that reference to Hoover Dam in Government litigation "gives me nothing at all to cheer about."

Mr. Hoover did not name the dam for himself. It was so named by Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, in 1930. The Roosevelt Dam, the Wilson Dam, and the Coolidge Dam all had been named for incumbents, the Roosevelt in this case having been Theodore, and the Norris Dam had been named for Senator Norris while he was in office. The honor to Hoover was particularly appropriate, however, because he had labored faithfully and successfully as Secretary of Commerce in the early twenties to reconcile old, conflicting interests of the States involved and had participated as an engineer.

In support of his bill, Senator HAWKES proves that on three separate occasions Congress designated this work the Hoover Dam.

The change was made, personally, by Ickes in a memorandum in May 1933, when the campaign to degrade Hoover was at its height.

Later, in the correspondence with Cummings, he said he had "gone to great lengths to give Boulder Dam its original and proper name which my predecessor attempted feloniously to take from it, for which praiseworthy and meritorious act I have been roundly condemned by reactionary Republican papers."

Cummings replied that Hoover Dam was the title used by Congress, and in a contract of the Government for its construction, and said, "When I see you I shall extend my commiseration in person."

As to the propriety of naming a public work in honor of a living person, there are other precedents. In New York, Fiorello LaGuardia, who has so much in common with Ickes, rejected the name of General MacArthur for the East River Drive on the ground that history might give a new judgment on MacArthur. MacArthur then was regarded as a political personality by some of the Roosevelt following. It was promptly noted that LaGuardia Field had been named for the mayor.

This name has been accepted as peculiarly fitting inasmuch as the field was built on a city dump, the flashy buildings have cracked and crumbled and the runways have sagged into the water.

Moreover, LaGuardia selected the name of Sara D. Roosevelt, while she was alive, for a series of playgrounds on the East Side of New York on land acquired by Jimmy Walker for low-cost housing. Sara D. Roosevelt had nothing to do with this or with any other beneficial public work.

It was actually built by Robert Moses, another who was ignored by Roosevelt, notwithstanding his fine achievements and reputation, because Mr. Moses caught Roosevelt trying to plant his private political secretary, Louie Howe, on the public pay roll at $5,000 a year when Roosevelt was out of office, and would not let him get away with it.

After Roosevelt's death, President Truman availed himself of Mr. Hoover's abilities. He is now 72 years old and years have passed since he could be regarded as a candidate for any office or honors or for public service except with the most patriotic motives.

It would make little difference to Mr. Hoover that his name were restored, but the people have here a chance to make an amend to a great citizen for a vindictive wrong done in their name by one who rather glories in a title self-bestowed, and well-deserved, curmudgeon.

Ceiling on Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

CEILING ON TRIBUTE

A lot of workingmen are looking for an Abraham Lincoln. Congress, the labor boards, and the courts have delivered them over to absentee landlords. That the workers resent this is shown by the November election in our industrial centers. The adop-

tion of the Barnes bill in heavily industrialized Massachusetts, requiring audits and full publicity for union funds, shows that workingmen have had enough. These union funds should no more be handled in irresponsible secrecy than deposits in a bank or funds of insurance companies. Millions of dollars have been taken from union treasuries, without the members' consent, and spent to organize unions in unrelated trades. A railroad union official has threatened to spend millions of union funds to defeat President Truman next year. Whose money is this, anyway?

Thousands of workers have been ordered to strike without consulting them. No one denies that this is sometimes done to line the pockets of a boss who calls a strike in order to be secretly bribed to call it off. Union funds have been embezzled more often, probably, than anyone knows.

For example, James Bove, A. F. of L. official and lieutenant of Joseph Fay, was sent to prison for conspiring to extort $703,000 from the contractors on a big water works project. He was again convicted for embezzling $64,000 from his own union. He is now indicted, for the third time, on the charge of defrauding the Government of $194,000 of income which he said nothing about. That ain't hay.

The closed shop plays into the hands of racketeers and Communists. It forces men to join a union against their will, and it terrorizes them to keep their traps shut, or lose their jobs.

All unions not affiliated with either the CIO or the A. F. of L. get the cold shoulder from Government agencies.

A poll taken among coal miners shows that 65 percent of the miners want the right to vote by secret ballot on whether to strike or stay at work. Why not? Is this a democracy or what?

In some unions, dues and assessments are so high that many are unable to join. Entrance fees run as high as $1,500. This strengthens the labor monopoly by limiting its membership. Those who do pay have to force wages up to recover their investment in the right to work. This makes the high cost of living go higher. It helps to put homes for veterans beyond their reach.

The Government owes workingmen some sort of a bill of rights. It must either make unions democratic so the men themselves can run them, or it must go into the business of regulating unions to protect their members from extortion. If it does the latter, it would seem that the Government should put a ceiling on dues and assessments. It should say that any union which charges more than so much for the right to work shall lose its bargaining powers under Federal laws. Many independent unions, honestly run, have found they need no more than 25 cents or 50 cents a month. So long as the Government supports labor monopolists with special privileges such as the closed shop, it must protect workers against extortion of excessive dues.

These seem to be the alternative courses of action for any Government that commands 300,000 young men to die to force democracy on foreigners.

I don't advocate the Government regulating unions as it does freight rates or bills for gas or electricity. Instead, Government should free workers from the autocracy of their bosses and then let the men run their own unions on democratic lines like the New England town meeting.

The Government should issue an emancipation proclamation to white men as well as black, or else admit that we have lost the war for democracy at home.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Republicans Open Attack on Labor's Basic Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if H. R. 2157, which passed the House Friday, openly sought to repeal the minimum wage of 40 cents an hour, how many of us, in this time of ever-increasing living costs, would dare go on record as favoring it? Yet a measure which maintains the wage rate but for practical purposes repeals the act which creates it, was passed by the House. It is the first step in undermining the great progressive program of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The 1-year statute of limitations would make the remedy ineffective and thus destroy the act. Many of the employees affected by this legislation are unorganized. They do not know their rights. Time elapses before they find out that they have a claim. Frequently the discovery is made after there has been an inspection by the Wage and Hour Division. After that the employee is placed in a dilemma and must answer the question, "Shall I keep my job and forget about my claim, or shall I sue and lose my source of income?"

If a businessman lends money to his employee or sells him goods he usually has from 3 to 6 years in which to sue his employee. If the employee wishes to sue his employer for minimum wages or overtime compensation, even though the employer may have falsified his records or failed to keep records in open defiance of the statute, the employee must act within a year. This is so even though the employer's misconduct has made it difficult for the employee to prove his claim.

Why such solicitude for such an employer? Why such discrimination against the employee? There can only be one answer. There are some members who are still against a worker receiving 40 cents an hour. There are some who are still against overtime compensation. Those of us who favor a minimum wage and overtime must see that the legislation is workable. Such beneficent legislation should not be nullified by adopting a discriminatory statute and a statute which is calculated to defeat the rights which have heretofore justly been created.

If H. R. 2157 is finally enacted into law it will result either in an almost complete break-down in the observance of the Fair Labor Standards Act or in the creation of a vast bureaucracy. To enforce the Fair Labor Standards Act under a 1-year statute of limitations will require the Wage and Hour Administrator to increase his staff materially. He has personnel at present sufficient to inspect one-tenth of the businesses subject to the act each year. Such a staff would be entirely inadequate to uncover violations within 1 year of their occurrence, much less to put legal machinery into motion within 1 year of a violation. Does Congress want to harass employers by constant inspection by the Government? If not, the 1-year statute of limitations should not become law. Or does Congress wish to allow most criminal violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act to go unpunished? If these are not the purposes of this provision it will certainly be its consequences.

One other provision of the bill deserves special comment. That is the provision which gives the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division or any other administrative official the most uncontrolled power to dispose of legal rights ever given to any person. He can do that even though his acts are entirely unauthorized by Congress, completely capricious and without rational basis. Under this bill employees' rights can be entirely destroyed by such an action. The act provides that an employer can cheat his employees to his heart's content so long as he can point to some administrative official's statement supposedly upholding such a practice and nothing the employee can do can prevent it. Never before has Congress given away authority so recklessly. Our constitutional system provides for a government of laws, not of men. Yet the sponsors of this bill would give complete power to men to alter a law of the land at their pleasure. Such a power is abhorrent to democracy.

This bill contains a statute of limitations of so short a period as to result in depriving of protection the unorganized, low-paid employees who are most in need of it and for whose benefit the act was primarily enacted. It is common knowledge that these low-paid unorganized workers are for the most part too uninformed as to their rights under existing laws or too afraid of being discriminated against to assert their rights against their employers. Experience shows that rare is the suit by such an employee unless his employment has been previously terminated. It is not the normal and natural thing for such an employee to assert his claim promptly. Even if such a workers is aware of his rights, he will proceed most cautiously before suing his employer. The effect of the 1-year statute of limitations is to discriminate against unorganized workers most likely to receive subminimum wages. I agree that there should be a uniform statute of limitations but it should be a reasonable statute of at least 3 years, such as is provided in the Federal Employees Liability Act.

Control and Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include Senate Joint Memorial 3 of the Colorado Senate petitioning the Congress to pass appropriate legislation to control and eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease affecting livestock in the Republic of Mexico:

Senate Joint Memorial 3

Joint memorial memorializing and petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation to control and eradicate and prevent from entrance into this country of the disease of animals known as foot-and-mouth disease now present among animals of several states of the Republic of Mexico; and petitioning the President of the United States for his support of the petitions herein set forth

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture has been advised by the United States Embassy in Mexico City that the livestock disease which recently appeared in the vicinity of Vera Cruz has been diagnosed as foot-and-mouth disease by both Mexican and United States Government veterinarians who have made extensive field investigations; and

Whereas the disease now recognized by the Republic of Mexico as foot-and-mouth disease affecting cattle, sheep, swine, and goats has spread from the original point of infection in the Republic of Mexico to no less than eight Mexican States, and reports of United States veterinarians now in the infected territory indicate it is spreading rapidly and is not being controlled; and

Whereas there have been seven outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States since 1920, completely eradicated at an estimated total cost of $200,000,000, and the infection or virus causing the disease came here directly or indirectly from foreign countries where the disease existed; and

Whereas the 1914 outbreak spread from the original premises where the first infection was found in cattle to 22 States and the District of Columbia, and in order to eradicate this infectious and contagious disease, it was necessary to slaughter 172,222 head of livestock, including 77,000 cattle; and

Whereas the California outbreak in 1924 quickly spread to cattle and other livestock in 16 counties, and in order to completely eradicate the disease it was necessary to slaughter 59,991 head of cattle, 28,382 head of sheep, 21,795 head of swine, 1,391 head of goats, and 22,214 deer; and

Whereas there are in Colorado today cattle, swine, sheep, and goats, of a total value estimated at $167,000,000, including approximately 1,900,000 head of cattle now in pastures, on ranches and farms or in feed lots: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That it respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary by legislation or otherwise to:

1. Appropriate adequate funds to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry to prevent, control, and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in this country;

2. Provide assistance to the Republic of Mexico in locating, diagnosing, and eradicating foot-and-mouth disease in that country to the fullest extent permitted and requested by the appropriate officials of that country;

3. Create a joint United States-Mexico commission empowered to deal with this problem and to control, eradicate, and prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in each of said countries;

4. Close the United States-Mexico border, in addition to the present quarantine regulations, to all importations or traffic of whatever kind or nature that may carry the infection of foot-and-mouth disease into the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, so as to urge their vigorous support in accomplishing the petitions of this memorial.

HOMER L. PEARSON,
President of the Senate.
W. C. BLAIR,
Secretary of the Senate.
WM. ALBIN CARLSON,
Speaker of the House.
V. C. CRAWSHAW,
Chief Clerk.

Should We Execute 16-Year-Olds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal of March 3, 1947:

SHOULD WE EXECUTE 16-YEAR-OLDS?

One hundred and eighty-five years ago this month Jean Calas, a French merchant, was broken on the wheel by court order because his son had committed suicide. The father was held responsible because the boy had been made despondent by parental objection to certain of his desires.

Breaking on the wheel was a form of execution in use in France and Germany until about a century ago. The victim was placed on a wheel, his legs and arms stretched out and his bones broken one by one with an iron bar as the wheel turned.

The story of the execution of Jean Calas is shocking to our 1947 minds. But is it any more shocking than the sentence of death in the electric chair imposed on a 16-year-old boy by an Ohio court at Youngstown the other day? A companion, also 16, was sentenced to life imprisonment.

They had killed a salesman with whom they had hitchhiked a ride in an attempt to steal his car.

The evidence offered in the trial showed that parental neglect, as well as neglect by society generally, helped put these boys on the road to prison and the electric chair. Yet, they alone are being required to pay the penalty.

There is no condoning the action of these two boys. They should be required to pay a just penalty for their crime.

The courts have been guilty of much sloppy sentimentalism toward the criminal. Sometimes there appeared to be more concern over the wrongdoer than for his victim. Juvenile criminals especially have got off too easily. A reversal of this attitude is overdue. But is it right that a couple of 16-year-olds should be among the first to feel the full weight of a sterner, tougher, less emotional brand of justice?

Statement to Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by the American Institute of Architects on March 4, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, because architects are representatives of professional men who direct much commercial activity, partly themselves, partly through subordinates; because many of these subordinates have been approached by union organizers; because a few so-called unions, actually societies or groups already formed by their employees have been solicited by national union organizations with a view to application which would eventually lead to their representation by nonprofessional officers of the unions it seems important to extend in the RECORD testimony given before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the senior body March 4, 1947, by an official representative of the American Institute of Architects.

The statement follows:

The American Institute of Architects is the only national organization representing the profession of architecture. It includes within its organization 77 chapters, 11 State associations, and 6 State organizations, representing every part of the United States and its possessions. It is therefore competent to express the opinion of the profession as a whole. We are honored to appear before your committee with representatives of the engineering professions.

We would like to make some observations on the nature of the architect and of his services. Architecture is a profession. Its sole product is professional service. The same is true of other professions. This service with architects takes the tangible forms of drawings and specifications, which frequently are erroneously termed "blueprints."

The average architectural office is conducted on a basis not customarily found in business or commercial enterprises. The architect principal generally engages younger men whom he trains and who, in normal times, stay with him over a period of years, increasing their earning power and assuming a continually more responsible position in the employer's office. Many of them become architects or principals themselves. Personal understanding and freedom from restraint are characteristic of the relationship between employer and employee in the offices.

In order to continue to render an ever-increasing service to the general economy, the architect's activities have expanded, and, with the increasing of governmental acts and regulations covering all fields of endeavor, professional men find themselves coming within the scope of some of the characteristics of a commercial enterprise. However, the basic patterns of professional service, characteristic of both employer and employee, do not lend themselves altogether to the same formula or standards which maintain in commercial and industrial enterprises.

For instance, the work of the architect and office employee cannot be governed on a quantitative basis. The standards that ap-

ply to the production of materials cannot be adopted for use in the professional office. No standard could be established as to the number of drawings a draftsman should produce each day or of the number of pages of specifications he should write, or the number of items he should supervise in the field. Service rendered by the employee is like that of the employer, essentially intellectual and varied in character. Creative ability, originality, and individual talent are important in nearly every individual in the architectural profession and cannot be measured on a quantitative basis. Regimentation of those qualities is impossible.

It is also found that the daily work and duties of the employer and employee overlap. An employer, for instance, may often work beside his own men, doing the same work as they do. He often requires the employee to take over some of his duties such as, conferences with clients and supervision of construction. An assignment of definite duties is not practical. Only the individual office can determine for itself how it can best render its particular service to the client.

You may question why we are appearing before your committee. You may wonder if we, as professional men, are facing the problems which we know many of your other witnesses have reviewed for you. We assure you that, in a sense, we are facing many of those problems, both directly and indirectly. We have a comprehensive interest in the matter before your committee. This interest takes on two general aspects. The first might be called "indirect interest."

We, as architects, are an element of the construction industry, which industry in itself constitutes some 12 percent of the total national economy. In that industry, our profession is, numerically speaking, small. Our importance in the industry is not proportionate to our relatively small number. It is due to our study and our solution of building problems that our country takes on the appearance which it constantly assumes. Through the initiative of the design element, projects often receive their first incentive.

We are interested in seeing the plans which we engage upon result in finished products. We are interested in promoting general welfare and progress. We plan for the realization of that objective. We are, therefore, affected by any labor disturbances in the construction industry. As the industry itself rises and falls so do our activities, and so does the welfare of those who are employed by us. We feel we have a very great interest in the proper solution of labor problems in the construction field.

The other phase of our interest may be cited as "direct interest"; and this, in turn, resolves itself into two aspects. The first of these is our consideration for those members of our profession who may themselves be members of units organized for the purpose of collective bargaining. We doubt if there are many architects found in this category. However, regardless of the number of our men who may find themselves in unions, the principle remains the same, and our concern is as great. There are some architects on salaries in corporations, and we may assume that a number of them are members of collective bargaining units. There are also many architects in direct Government employ, not only Federal, but also State and municipal as well. Probably many of these architects belong to collective bargaining units made up of governmental employees. For these men who are members of our profession, we wish to see established three conditions affecting their lives and their welfare.

Let us observe at this point that we recognize the right of any group of citizens of the United States to form themselves into units for the purpose of collective bargaining. We do not seek to deny the right to do so. We do not seek to make the assertion of that right cause for discrimination.

We urge, first of all, that no professional employee should be forced, against his desire, to join a labor organization as a condition of employment. It seems to us that the foregoing is a simple corollary of the established right of organizing for collective bargaining.

As a second condition, we ask that no professional collective-bargaining group ever, at any time, be forced to affiliate itself with a nonprofessional labor organization. The determination of affiliation should be left entirely with the professional group. We know, by the very nature of the architects, that they would not willingly lend themselves to direction by nonprofessional organizers or officers. We hesitate to make the following assertion, which is that anyone who is engaged in architectural work is generally found to be of a progressive and of an intellectual turn of mind. However, it must be admitted that initiative, talent, and natural inclination are all factors which contribute to individual advancement, and are also factors which lead to the adoption of certain careers which tend to set apart those who embark upon them. The practice of architecture is one of those careers. We feel and we assert that only those who are engaged in such a career are qualified to determine the inward policies for the welfare of that career.

And, thirdly, we urge that any organization of architectural employees must have the right of designating its own representatives in discussing matters with employers. Usurpation of this right of representative designation by people outside of the architectural field would serve to prejudice any case against collective bargaining in the eyes of the employers. We cannot conceive how anyone without the architectural ranks would have the knowledge and experience necessary to represent intelligently a professional collective-bargaining unit.

The second aspect of our direct interest in the questions before your committee relates to the unionization of the employees of the architects themselves. Here, again, you may question our concern; and it may be truthfully said that so far the unionization of the employees of the architects has made little progress, and what there has been is sporadic and isolated. We do not seek to discourage such unionization, as here again the same principle applies. If the employees of the architects wish to form themselves into units for collective bargaining, such is their privilege.

When it comes to a consideration of unionization of the employees of the architect, it is our opinion that the same precepts should apply as we have cited before in our argument with respect to those members of our profession who may now be in collective bargaining units. At the risk of repetition, we again cite them.

First, no employee in a professional office should be forced, against his desire, to join a labor organization as a condition of employment.

Second, should a collective bargaining group be formed in the professional offices, it must not be forced to affiliate itself with a nonprofessional labor organization.

Third, the right of the employees in those units to designate their own representatives must be strictly observed.

We ask for the observance of those three principles in any appropriate legislation which is being considered by this Congress.

There Are Lobbyists and Lobbyists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26, 1947, one of our colleagues, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON, extended his remarks, including an address by another colleague, Hon. A. J. SABATH, over Station WTOP, Columbia Broadcasting System, on February 24, 1947, on the subject of lobbyists.

On the same program and subject, Col. John Thomas Taylor, national legislative director for the American Legion, also spoke.

Colonel Taylor's address is such a fine answer to the views of Hon. A. J. SABATH that the Members of the House should have the opportunity to read it.

The address of Colonel Taylor follows:

I am a lobbyist and I am proud of it.

As the American Legion's national legislative director, I am the lobbyist for 18,000,000 American war veterans.

The question is: Do lobbyists serve the public interest? The answer is spelled out clearly in the Constitution of the United States.

The urge to live by laws of their own making inspired the framers of the Constitution to form this Government. The right of every citizen to play a personal part in the creation and administration of those laws remains the basic factor in our democratic structure.

It follows, then, that the greater and more personal the participation by individual citizens, the nearer we advance in reality to the ideal of American democracy.

But physical limitations enter in. Obviously, it is impossible for 140,000,000 Americans to meet personally with their elected lawmakers in Washington.

To overcome these barriers of time and distance, organizations like the American Legion employ representatives to keep the Congress informed of their will and opinion on matters of national import. Every legitimate lobbyist performs this function. He is the personal agent of the citizens who absorbs their expressed desires, condenses them into one parliamentary package, and registers them with the Congress.

I submit that this is a valuable service to the public.

No less valuable is his service to the Members of Congress themselves—a fact which the majority of Congressmen enthusiastically sustain.

And why shouldn't they? It is common knowledge that Congressmen today labor under an incredible barrage of distractions. Claimants upon their time and attention render proper discharge of their duties difficult and tedious. How much more trying if not impossible their job would be were it not for those who sign, seal, and deliver the assembled petitions of multitudes of their constituents in digestible form.

The American Legion is composed of 3,500,000 veterans of two World Wars. United in an organization pledged to service to God and country, it is only natural that they should seek fulfillment of that pledge through specific courses of action. These courses are charted at our annual national

conventions and semiannual meetings of our national executive committee. They embody the will of Legionnaires organized in 16,000 posts in every State of the Nation. There are two ways in which American Legion members could present their opinions to the Congress.

First. Each of the 3,500,000 could mail, telephone, or deliver his expressions to his Representatives and Senators in Washington.

Second. He could entrust delivery of the expression to his own organization's legislative officials, who testify upon invitation at congressional committee hearings.

The American Legion—and I'm sure the American public as well—prefers the latter procedure. When it is realized that the alternative would subject the Nation's lawmakers to such a torrent of attention that they must inevitably founder in utter confusion then I say the American Legion lobby serves the people.

Unfortunately all the lobbies operating on Capitol Hill today do not measure up to Legion standards. The legitimacy of some is, at best, questionable. Their motives and means are as contemptible and farcical as the principle of lobbying is exemplary and sound. With the questionable activities of certain groups the American Legion has no patience.

These groups are easily recognized. They claim to represent a membership of great size whose only existence is fictional. They employ unethical means to achieve unethical ends. And they remain active today because the Lobbying Act, with which the Seventy-ninth Congress sought to snare them, is too weak.

However, these groups are in the minority. To say that they outlaw the profession of lobbying is to say the presence of Communists impugns the American way of government.

I am confident the American people subscribe to no such measurement. Performance always has been the yardstick for judgment in America.

To the skeptics and political hucksters who hold that lobbying is misapplied I say look to the record.

In the years following the First Great War the American Legion created a structure of veterans' benefits which enabled disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans to live decently by human standards.

When this structure was demolished by the infamous Economy Act of 1933, the Legion won its resurrection over two Presidential vetoes. And the righteous anger of Americans everywhere, appalled at the forced impoverishment of those who had given limbs and lives for their country, supported the Legion's fight.

The American Legion not only conceived but nourished the network of veterans' hospitals which today afford protection and care to veterans who are not able to adequately protect themselves.

The GI bill of rights, which recognizes the readjustment and rehabilitation needs of World War II veterans, is an American Legion bill.

Establishment of the Veterans' Administration itself was a Legion proposal.

These are a few of the hundreds of measures on which the American Legion has petitioned and won congressional action. Mark them well. Each has contributed materially to the welfare not of veterans alone but of the entire American citizenry who cherish justice and fair play.

If this generation of Americans believes yet, as Lincoln believed, in government by and for, as well as of the people, if the principle of personal participation in that government still prevails, then the American Legion legislative staff serves the public interest.

Address of Gov. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Gov. James H. Duff before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, Philadelphia, Pa., Tuesday, February 25, 1947:

My friends and fellow Pennsylvanians, on Washington's Birthday, at Princeton, for the second time in less than a month, Secretary of State Marshall found it expedient to forcibly remind the American people that the world is in a perilous situation—a situation dangerous to our national welfare. Not one of us would believe for an instant that a sound, able, far-seeing man like General Marshall would make pronouncements of such character unless he felt that a vital awakening notice to the American people was imperative. His repeated references to the "long-time dangers to the Nation's security," and his assertion that "we are seriously failing in our attitude toward national problems whose solution will largely determine our future," logically and inevitably point to the necessity of reexamining as well our attitudes on vital problems of the home front. During the war we learned, by repeated experiences, that in this new world of rapid access and communication the domestic front and the foreign front were more often than not inextricably interwoven.

Manifestly, therefore, we cannot make the same mistake on the home front after World War II that we did after World War I without unpredictable consequences.

You will recall after World War I that President Harding became famous for a new word, the word "normalcy." He repeatedly referred to the time "when everything gets back to normalcy." From the record we now know that everything never did get back to normalcy. The probabilities are that we will not get back to normalcy in our time, because there is no norm in a revolutionary period, and, whether we realize it or not, we are definitely in a revolutionary period.

In appraising our duties, dangers, responsibilities, and opportunities for service in this tremendously changing world it is well for us not to be too greatly perturbed over the mere fact that this is a revolutionary epoch. Because it was our own Revolution in 1776 that started a new ferment and a new leaven in the world that has more fundamentally changed and bettered the course of civilization than any other event in the long course of history since the close of the Middle Ages.

In the light of our national experience, therefore, the disturbing situation to us should not be that there is revolution and change in the world. The sobering and activating thoughts and inquiries should be that we stand alone; why we stand alone; and whether we can continue to stand alone in a world constantly narrowing about us and hedging us in.

Of all the great nations of the world, we are alone in believing that the kind of government established here in 1776 and the free-enterprise system and American way of life that have been fostered and developed here under that Government are the best.

However, the fact that, of the great nations of the world, we are now alone in our way of life, should certainly convince even the most skeptical among us that our American way of life is in a fierce battle for survival. Let us not realize too late the real character of this life-and-death struggle, otherwise we may arouse ourselves to the seriousness of the situation when the issue has already been determined.

The aim of the society visioned by our American Constitution and Bill of Rights was a society where the chief end and emphasis was placed upon the freedom of the individual and the dignity of the individual man.

The political philosophy to which such a large part of the world has now succumbed is the very opposite of our own. It is the philosophy of Karl Marx, which emphasizes the satisfaction of material wants of the individual and the physical and economic security of the individual, rather than the freedom of the individual, as the aim of its society.

Yet under our form of government and our American way of life the average man, in addition to the blessings of liberty, has enjoyed more material advantages and has had a better condition of well-being and economic security in the United States than the average man anywhere under any form of government in the whole history of civilization.

Nevertheless it must now be clear to all of us that if we are to evaluate our future on the basis of sober judgment, whatever our own appraisal of our American way of life, we can no longer assume that it is safe or that it stands unchallenged in the world of today.

In determining our future course we should analyze both the form and substance of the government and of the way of life that have made America the best place in the world.

In evaluating our chances for survival we must not forget that the government established here in America in 1776 was established on the basis of a rural and agrarian economy, while the vast and complex problems of today arise out of an economy that has become in the main both urban and industrial. Then we had a small population of only a few million along the eastern seaboard. Today we have spread out over a vast continent and have multiplied to a great people of more than 140,000,000.

One of the distinguishing features of our Government, known the world over as the American type of government, was the policy of responsibility at the local level. In other words, government by home rule. In such government the benefit and ability of all the able men in every community and the various States and commonwealths are available to the people instead of merely the few at the top in a centralized government.

The early determination in America of establishing responsibility in government at the local level has been adhered to strictly until recent years. But since the great depression there has been a noticeable and disturbing change, a tendency to be more dependent upon the central government to do things for the local communities. In all the various capitals of the States and commonwealths, as well as at the Federal Capital at Washington, various groups keep coming to the Central Government to request aid from the Central Government to make the local government work; especially that there may be funds provided by the Central Government in order to eliminate the necessity for taxation in the local districts for certain essential local functions. It is clear that if local levels of government insist on coming to the Central Government every

time they need additional funds it is only reasonable to expect that the Central Government, in furnishing those funds, will insist upon a constantly wider and larger measure of control of the local situation.

This process in effect channels everything to the top, thereby making it easier, if the time should come, for the central government to make a set-up controlling the whole situation, both at the state and local levels. That is the exact antithesis of what ought to be the tendency and policy if we are to maintain the American way of life at a time when it is challenged everywhere in the world.

There are, of course, certain functions that of necessity ought to be performed by the central government. But in the various crises affecting local communities those problems ought to be solved in the greatest degree possible on the basis of local community action, and by local levels of government rather than by developing and strengthening the central authority in government.

There are so many things that would be done differently if all the people in the local community knew about them. When services are performed by the Central Government, the local community knows nothing of the details, method of their accomplishment, or their cost.

In this period of challenge and threat, I feel that it will also be generally accepted that we cannot continue in America to maintain our historic attitude with respect to the maintenance of our national defense. We have been fortunate that we have never lost a war. In the past we have been impressed by the ability and the iron might of the average citizen to rise in arms whenever danger threatened and repel any character of invasion. That attitude was in part justified by the fact that we were bounded by two oceans and by two friendly and nonmilitary neighbors on our other borders.

But in this age of atomic energy, when one bomb may destroy a city, our future policy must be based on a long period of preparation. Nor can we longer rely upon a great buffer nation to rise between us and our enemy before we are put to the test. In World War I we had the French. Thereafter the French nation had so deteriorated, as the result of the tremendous impact of that struggle, that it was scarcely an obstacle in the path of Germany in the last war. In other words they were exhausted because they had been the buffer in World War I.

In World War II England occupied the position that France did in World War I. England was the buffer against the onslaught in the last war until the rest of the world aroused itself to the fact that it was their struggle as well as England's.

England's situation today is somewhat similar to that of France after World War I: they exhausted their manpower and economy in the tremendous sacrifices and difficulties of the struggle.

In view of the threat of the tremendous production that is now being realized in Russia, America must accept the challenge of the new events in the world. We must accept the further challenge of the ideological contest between those who believe in security and those who believe in liberty. We must arouse ourselves to the sobering fact that irrespective of what our determination may be, irrespective of what our potential production may be, it will not be our potential production but our actual production that will determine our ability to stand up and survive in the event of a further world-wide struggle.

It is clear, therefore, that it is imperative for us to reorient our thinking: to bring ourselves to the realization that if in America we are to be strong, if we are to be free and independent, if we are to do and stand for the things that we have done and stood for in the past, we must retain and maintain our power of production.

If we are to maintain that production on a scale necessary to preserve our way of life from danger, it can only be maintained on an entirely different basis and on an entirely different understanding between labor and management than what has obtained in the immediate past. There have been times in America when management has engineered the making of laws and made an economic set-up decidedly unfavorable to labor. And there have been times when a like situation has been made effective at the instance of labor. But the time has come in the dangerous situation in which we find ourselves when the various segments of management and labor cannot continuously be at odds. In the existing crisis management, labor, and other parties in the community must join and play on the same team if we are to preserve the American way of life. They must join together with all the other good forces in the community in accepting the challenge and in doing the things that only a united America can do in order to preserve our position.

Management and labor relations must not be a one-way street for either management or labor. The time has come when the security of the Nation demands that we must have two-way traffic on a two-way street.

The mandate of the people at the last election was to take the kinks out of the machinery that interfered with the normal operation of the American way of life. That means mutual give and take, forbearance, and cooperation between all forces in order to make the vitally necessary readjustment from war to peace that has been so unsatisfactorily delayed in this, one of the most critical periods of our history.

Therefore, gentlemen, I feel the time has come when we must accept the responsibility of making some all-important determinations. We must decide whether or not we will build ourselves up to our maximum strength at a time when it may be more important than ever in our history that we be strong; or whether we are willing to go into this battle of survival handicapped by the restrictive influences of those things that have developed in our national life that are not for the common benefit and that are urgently demanding correction.

Therefore, it is up to us who sincerely believe in the American way of life, who vision in it the hope and haven of mankind for the future, to reexamine our way of life in all its functions and attributes to the end that we may correct and eliminate those things that are in need of correction and elimination.

We must be willing to make such sacrifices of our interests, pecuniary or otherwise, as are definitely necessary to be made for the public interest. We must do this just as freely, unselfishly and willingly as did those in the armed forces of our country in times of national crisis, who were willing to give and hazard all they had.

Finally in the determination of all the social and economic phases of what we will be required to do at Harrisburg, and at the various other capitals of the States, and at Washington, we must have a less political and a more American attitude with reference to the solution of these problems, if we are to be able to come to the right conclusion in a struggle that may well prove to be the most important struggle, both domestically and on foreign fields, that the American people have ever been obliged to undertake.

If we approach the solution of these problems, not in the attitude of partisans, but as Americans, and if we approach them patriotically and unselfishly, and only if we do, can we give, with assurance, an answer to the disturbing question: What of tomorrow in America?

Self-Help in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, the recent survey and report of Herbert Hoover upon conditions in Germany, made at the request of the President, presents a sharp challenge to the United States. In the eyes of the rest of the world our stature will be measured by the intelligence and decisiveness with which we approach this critical international problem.

The most penetrating and constructive analysis of the situation which I have read is contained in an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star on February 28. I include it in my remarks at this point and commend it to the thoughtful reading of all Members of the House:

A PLAN FOR SELF-HELP IN GERMANY

Herbert Hoover's report to President Truman on his recent mission to Germany has presented the plight of the German people with photographic clearness. It has also brought sharply home to this country's taxpayers the expensive futility of the present policy of doling out inadequate food supplies to the suffering populations of the British and American zones. And it has offered a constructive plan for eventually making these two areas something other than a permanent slum grudgingly supported by the occupying powers.

The former President's report covers food and agriculture conditions in both the British and American zones since they are now being administered as an economic unit. A total of 41,685,000 persons are listed as living in these two occupied sections. Only about one-fourth of them, comprising farm families, children under 6 years old, and a relatively small group of child-bearing women, were found to be getting enough nourishment. The others either are undernourished and in poor health or are at the fringes of starvation.

Thus the joint effort to sustain human life and health in Germany is considerably short of being effective. And yet Mr. Hoover estimates the United States contribution to this relief program at $192,000,000 for the first 6 months of this year.

Some improvement in Germany's food production is expected this year. Mr. Hoover also points the way to still larger harvests next year if shipments of seed and fertilizer are increased. He recommends that a larger amount of the estimated $283,500,000 to be spent by the United States for Germany's sustenance in the 1947–48 fiscal year be earmarked for growing potatoes and other crops. Over a period of years greater emphasis on rebuilding German agriculture would be almost certain to yield large savings to this country.

Mr. Hoover also recommends that shipping costs be cut down by permitting German crews to operate some of the American- and British-owned ships now carrying food and other supplies to Germany. He also favors using the fish surpluses of Scandinavian countries and making boats available to Germans so they can resume fishing for themselves. Probably the most important recommendation by Mr. Hoover along this line is that maximum use be made of Germany's potential capacity for manufacturing export goods.

Application of the measures urged by Mr. Hoover would mean moving away from the attitude that to prevent future German aggression it is essential that the nation's economy be left in ruins. It would mean helping the former enemy state to start paying for part of its keep. And, according to the Hoover viewpoint, it might enable Germany some day to repay the money now being spent by Americans and the British to keep German citizens alive.

The Hoover plan is a design for giving the people of at least two German zones the strength to work and the ability to feed themselves. Putting it into effect should be possible without impairing the aim of the Allied Nations to prevent for all time the revival of military power and war-making spirit in Germany. It should contribute to prospects for lasting peace instead of weakening them. For starvation and hopelessness are barren grounds for planting the seeds of world peace.

Letter of Lewis H. Oehlert, of Fargo, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I particularly wish to address myself today to the Republican Members of both Houses of Congress and to remind them of the responsibility that rests upon their shoulders resulting from the last election. The people of the United States have returned us to power to do a job. We must not fail them. Otherwise, we cannot expect to remain permanently in control of the Congress.

Perhaps not in many years have men of good repute been inclined to speak so forthrightly as they are doing today on some of the questions that now confront this Congress. Particularly is that true on the question of labor legislation, on the question of destruction of free enterprise by monopolies, and on the important question of balancing the budget and cutting the national expense.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a letter forthrightly written by one of the distinguished attorneys, Mr. Lewis H. Oehlert, of the firm of Nilles, Oehlert & Nilles, Fargo, N. Dak.:

FARGO, N. DAK., *February 28, 1947.*
Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTSON: I take this opportunity to address ou on the proposition of what I call modern despotism in America. I refer to the task of emancipating the workers from the involuntary servitude of the closed-shop contract and the coercion of mass picketing. The Republicans are in control of both Houses of Congress, and I think you fellows in Congress must realize that the main reason you have such majority control is because of the excesses and abuses of labor-union leadership. In other words, the Republicans were returned to authority in Congress primarily because the American people were fed up with the abuses of labor-union leadership. I have great faith in the ordinary working American and the members of unions, but, frankly, I have little, if any, faith in most of the leadership of labor unions. The recent spectacle surrounding the coal strike, as well as the spectacle surrounding the railroad strike should make it apparent to all Americans that labor-union leadership has assumed the same dictatorial methods and monopolistic practices as were engaged in by Hitler and Mussolini, and probably Stalin.

There is for the moment a sort of labor truce in America. There is no doubt in my mind that labor-union leaders are withholding strikes until they can size up the amount of courage there is in the Republican Party in Congress. You may have seen what our own North Dakota Legislature is doing on these labor-union leader abuses. I respectfully submit that you Republicans in Congress should take hold of this situation and write a good, fair, and reasonable piece of legislation which will correct the abuses in the labor-union movement. In that connection we respectfully urge you to read the provisions of H. R. 151 and H. R. 160 presently before our North Dakota Legislature. Both of these bills have already passed the house of representatives and are presently under consideration by the senate, where all of us expect the same to pass.

The American people face a business recession unless prices and wages can be adjusted. I am not against the labor-union movement and the right of the workers to strike and picket where they have an employer that is unreasonable and is not fair to them. The trouble is that today labor-union leadership has become more despotic and monopolistic than the abuses of management ever were, and it is time that the Republicans in Congress take the mandate that was handed to them by the people in the last fall election and do something about it. If you don't, then I submit that you are not fulfilling the duty that the great majority of the Americans expected of the majority of Republicans in Congress. Unless there is some stability in the labor situation, which many of the proposed laws are designed to bring about through removal of impediments to production and abuses of the power of labor-union leadership, the economic situation will grow worse instead of better. So long as mob rule prevails in labor disputes there can be no real plan by management, and the free-enterprise system becomes a mockery, for what we have then is a dictatorship by labor-union leadership who regard themselves as above the law. Congress must meet this challenge or the American people will put other men in Congress who will meet the challenge. This is still America, where the right of the individual is protected from the interests of any selfish well-organized minority.

I trust that you will accept the above comments in the spirit in which they are written, as I thought perhaps you would like to know what some of us fellows in North Dakota are thinking. You well know that I am not a politician, but I am intensely American and I will speak my views to the best of my ability whenever I think something ulterior is striking at the heart of our beloved America.

Yours very sincerely,
LEWIS H. OEHLERT.

Economy Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on Saturday, March 1, 1947:

ECONOMY BEGINS AT HOME

Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Republican, of Ohio, suggests that this is no time for the Government to spend money on new post offices and other Federal building projects that aren't in the emergency class.

He's right about that.

Building costs are high. Building material and labor are scarce, and badly needed for housing. And the Republican Party, of which he is a member, has promised to reduce Federal spending.

Mr. MCGREGOR, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, says he's going to call for a list of proposed projects and attempt to postpone those that don't qualify as emergency.

You couldn't find many Members of Congress, in either party, willing to stand up and defend the proposition that all projected Federal building should go forward right now. But there will be plenty to contend that exceptions should be made for projects in their particular districts or States.

We hope, however, that Mr. MCGREGOR will put up a valiant fight. It will be enlightening to see how many Senators and Representatives who shout for Government economy are willing to practice it on their home grounds.

Protect American Fishermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the so-called reciprocal-trade treaties have produced nothing but a lowering of tariffs, thereby permitting the free flow of cheaply made foreign goods to this country. This is in direct competition with the American workman and would tend to lower his standard of living. In addition to the products made by low-cost foreign labor we are now confronted with the importation of fish from foreign countries. The cost of labor is so low that the American fisherman could not live on the wages paid for the production of foreign fish which are coming into the United States. The tariff is so low and under existing treaties is not raised high enough to protect American workers who are engaged in the fishing industry.

I am including a statement covering the matter of fish tariffs in which it says:

The urgent need for adequate tariff protection against the growing influx of foreign fish importations was conclusively shown by the fishing industry at hearings in Washington on January 28–30 before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Over 150 industry spokesmen and labor-union officials, representing fishermen, boat owners, processors and packers on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, testified at the hearings, which were reported to have had the largest attendance of any industry appearing before the committee. Also present were numerous Senators and Congressmen who went on record in favor of more effective import regulations.

The hearing was called in connection with the forthcoming reciprocal trade-agreement negotiations with 18 foreign countries, including Canada, Norway, and the United

Kingdom. The Reciprocity Committee includes representatives of the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce, War, Navy, and of the Tariff Commission. Under the Trade Agreements Act the President is authorized to reduce or increase tariffs by 50 percent during trade negotiations.

The delegation from New England, which section already is feeling the effects of the growing imports of frozen fillets, voiced its opposition to any reduction in present tariff rates and requested a substantial increase. It was pointed out that even increasing the rate by the allowable 50 percent would not offset the difference in costs between this country and foreign producers of fillets.

Southern crab-meat canners urged continuation of the 22½-percent tariff on imported crab meat to protect their rapidly growing industry. This rate, placed in effect in 1941, is 50 percent over the 1930 duty. Because of wartime restrictions, crab-meat canners have not yet had an opportunity to fully capitalize on the technical knowledge they have gained.

In connection with crab meat, it is interesting to find that the U. S. Commercial Company, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, recently announced that it will sell 31,000 cases of Japanese crab meat on a sealed-bid basis. Fears have been expressed that the sale of this crab meat may demoralize the domestic market. It will be recalled that this country sent a mission of fishery experts to Japan to assist in the rehabilitation of the fisheries to produce food needed for consumption in Japan. Despite the fact that Japan's production is estimated even now to be less than one-half prewar, Japan is exporting crab meat to this country.

Maine sardine canners asked that the present tariff on sardines be continued, stating that any reduction would mean the loss of their business to Canada because of the fact that the Canadian wage scale is only 60 percent of that in Maine.

Total imports of ground fish fillets (cod, hake, haddock, cusk, pollock, and rosefish) from Canada, Newfoundland and Iceland, have grown from 9,426,000 pounds in 1939 to an estimated 52,000,000 pounds in 1946. In 1939, the imports were equivalent to about 10 percent of the New England ground fish fillet output, but by 1945 they had climbed to 32 percent of New England's ground fish fillet production. New England produces 43 percent of this country's production of fish sold fresh or frozen, and practically all of the cod, hake, haddock, pollock, cusk, and rosefish.

Cold-storage holdings of frozen fishery products in the United States reached record quantities during the past year. On January 1, 1947, they totaled 152,000,000 pounds compared to a 5-year average of 109,000,000. In 1939, the highest amount in storage was 92,000,000 pounds. It will be seen that the difference between the present holdings and the 5-year average is nearly equivalent to the 1946 importations of frozen fillets.

The present duties on fresh and frozen ground fish fillets, which have been in effect since 1939, are 1⅞ cents per pound on imports of 15,000,000 pounds or 15 percent of the average annual domestic consumption during the three preceding years, and 2½ cents per pound on imports over this amount.

Last year approximately 20,000,000 pounds of fillets were imported from Canada under the 15 percent quota, dutiable at 1⅞ cents per pound, while the balance of imports totaling approximately 32,000,000 pounds came in at the 2½ cents per pound duty rate, indicating that the present tariff duties are no deterrent against increased imports of frozen fillets.

In 1939, the ad valorem equivalent of the 1⅞ cent tariff rate applying to imports represented 24.7 percent of the value of ground fish fillets f. o. b. country of export. In 1945, the ad valorem equivalents of the 1⅞-cent rate under the quota and the 2½-cent rate above the quota were respectively 9.8 percent and 12.4 percent of the value. While the tariff rate established in the 1939 trade agreement may have been considered fair in relation to the value of ground fish fillets imported at that time, certainly no such relation exists now, and has not since 1943.

In 1939, the average price paid fishermen for ground fish (cod, hake, haddock, cusk, pollock, rosefish) in the United States was 2.104 cents per pound; in Canada, 1.188 cents; in Newfoundland, 1.25 cents; and in Iceland, 0.9257 cents per pound.

The average 1946 price paid for the above species of ground fish at New England ports was 6.038 cents per pound. In Canada, the average 1946 price for ground fish, principally cod and haddock, was 3.50 cents per pound.

Using an average price of 7.25 cents per pound which prevailed for cod and haddock in New England during 1946, and allowing an average yield of fillets from whole fish as landed at 40 percent, in 1946 one pound of rough fillets cost processors in the United States 18.12 cents and in Canada 8.75 cents. These prices do not allow for packaging and freezing.

In 1939, the corresponding costs to processors were 5.264 cents in the United States and 2.97 cents in Canada.

At the 1939 cost of rough fillets, Canadian processors could pay the 1.875 cents duty then applying and have an initial advantage of 0.419 cent per pound, but in 1946 this spread had increased to 7.495 cents.

Up to this time the bulk of frozen fillet imports has consisted of cod fillets, although there is every indication that fillets of other species will be imported in increasing quantities. In 1939 the imports of cod fillets were 5,000,000 pounds, and the domestic production was 19,000,000 pounds. By 1945 the imports had increased to 37,000,000 pounds, but domestic production in that year was only 34,000,000 pounds. In terms of United States consumption of cod fillets, the imports actually supplied 21 percent in 1939 and 52 percent in 1945. In the first 10 months of 1946, the United States production was 10,000,000 pounds, and imports were 38,000,000, or 79 percent of United States consumption.

Through direct lend-lease in some cases and through indirect lend-lease via England, immense fishing, filleting, and freezing industries have been set up in Canada, Newfoundland, and Iceland. These industries have been, or are, in the process of being turned over to private operators. With the aid of their local government subsidies, they are being geared to hurdle all trade barriers. Their ability to flood the American market with cod fillets is the outgrowth of wartime expansion in those fisheries designed to feed England.

Starting with negligible production before the war, the combined production of Canada, Newfoundland, and Iceland now exceeds 140,000,000 pounds of cod fillets. In 1945 they sent 37,000,000 pounds of cod fillets to the United States and 92,000,000 pounds of cod fillets to England, but now England has notified them that she will stop importing because the British fishery, with government aid, is building up a fleet of sufficient size to provide England with all of its needs of cod fillets.

England's trawler fleet is now 25 percent larger than prewar and still building, while Canada has increased its fishing fleets substantially. Iceland has 30 new steam trawlers on order from Great Britain and is building about 100 motor vessels from 35 to 85 tons.

The government of the Province of Quebec operates in the Province 37 cold-storage plants. Storage capacity ranges from 80,000 to 1,000,000 pounds. Until 1943 the government operated these plants as a special service with no direct charge whatever to the fishermen or the packers. Since then there has been a small freezing and storage charge. There are 62 freezers and cold-storage warehouses in Iceland, with a total capacity of over 37,000,000 pounds and a daily production capacity of 1,387,000 pounds. Four new filleting and freezing plants began operating this season, and construction continued on a government-owned plant.

It is expected that Norway will sell 20,000,000 pounds of frozen fillets in the United States in 1947. That country has 12 modern German-built freezing and cold-storage plants and plans to construct 3 more.

Newfoundland has 17 freezing and cold-storage plants operating. The government recently declared its intention to assist in the further development of the frozen-fish industry by an investment of $4,000,000. In 1939, Newfoundland exported only 46,000 pounds of fillets to this country, and Iceland only 12,000 pounds. By 1945, these figures jumped to practically four million and one and one-half million respectively, while Canadian exports to the United States increased 300 percent to thirty-eight million.

Formerly the exports of these countries consisted mainly of salt fish, much of which was sold to Europe. Now these countries are sending the products of their war-developed frozen-fish industry to the United States where they have the advantage of attractive prices and an established market for fillets. Meanwhile European countries are badly in need of food.

With the high living standards and wages which this country has encouraged, and without the benefit of subsidies, we cannot compete with other countries on an equitable basis unless we have tariffs that are sufficiently high to offset the differences in labor and production costs. The evidence presented at the Washington hearing clearly demonstrated the ineffectiveness of the present tariffs on frozen fish, and indicated the need for giving greater protection to our fishing industry.

Los Angeles County and How It Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Los Angeles County today has one of the most critical housing shortages in the United States. Our veterans are unable to find adequate housing, and construction of emergency housing units and other housing facilities has failed to bring more than partial relief.

The increased population in the Los Angeles area has caused this acute housing shortage as well as other serious problems including extreme traffic congestion.

A recent article in the Los Angeles Times provides facts and figures concerning these problems in Los Angeles County, and I want to recommend it to the attention of the Members of the House:

LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND HOW IT GROWS

Two questions usually puzzle visitors to Los Angeles: First, why is the housing shortage so acute here? and, second, what makes the traffic congestion so fearful? To both we now receive some very plain and simple answers.

By April 1, the regional planning commission reports, Los Angeles County will have

a record population of 3,747,962, or almost a million more people than resided here in 1940. They will live in 1,197,398 dwelling units—homes, apartments, trailers, quonset huts, and motels. Seven years ago the 2,785,643 residents of Los Angeles County occupied 961,541 dwelling units. Percentagewise our population has bounded upward about 32 percent. Places of residence have increased less than 25 percent. At the present pace we are growing faster than the rate of dwelling construction, and no one can safely predict when our population will begin to level off.

The State department of motor vehicles supplies the reason for the community's traffic mess. Of the 3,442,051 automobiles registered in California in 1946, more than one-third of them—1,411,831—were in Los Angeles County. This is approximately 25 percent more than in 1940, and it represents a vehicle for about every three people. The national average is one for every four and six-tenths people.

This county is only beginning its tremendous growth. That we must bend to the task of building homes for the new citizens and highways for their automobiles is obvious.

Los Angeles County Flood Control Vitally Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, by April 1, the regional planning commission reports, Los Angeles County will have a record population of 3,747,962 or almost a million more people than resided there in 1940. While population has increased 32 percent, places of residence have increased less than 25 percent. The population is still increasing with no indication that it will begin to level off in the near future, construction of dwellings continues to lag, and the housing shortage remains critical.

As a result of this serious situation, the flood-control problem in Los Angeles County must receive immediate consideration. In the past floods have caused serious damage, disrupting traffic for days, breaking communication lines, inundating homes, and causing needless loss of life.

In some areas flood-control dams have been constructed giving a measure of protection to limited residential and commercial areas. But present flood control is wholly inadequate, and increased population has increased the hazard to densely populated areas.

The Federal flood-control program in Los Angeles County should be continued to completion. Additional flood control would safeguard vast residential areas as well as industrial and commercial areas and port and harbor facilities of Los Angeles which are of national importance. Furthermore, it would open up new areas for development which are badly needed now for the housing of veterans and their families.

I urge the Members of the House to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the Federal flood-control program and to provide that a just and proportionate share of such appropriation be allocated for flood-control improvements in Los Angeles County.

The board of supervisors of Los Angeles County has passed a resolution concerning the urgent need for the completion of the Federal flood-control program as follows:

In re flood control: Resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate funds heretofore authorized for construction work in watersheds of Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and Ballona Creek

On motion of Supervisor Smith, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

"Whereas the Flood Control Act of 1941, known as Public, No. 228, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, approved August 18, 1941, authorized the construction of certain flood-control improvements on the watersheds of the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and Ballona Creek, in Los Angeles County, at an estimated cost to the United States in excess of $163,000,000; and

"Whereas Congress has authorized for appropriation the sum of $75,000,000 to initiate the construction of said improvements; and

"Whereas there is immediate and urgent need for the construction of said improvements at the earliest possible date in order to provide flood protection to life and property in Los Angeles County, and to permit the development of large residential and commercial areas within the county, which development is so badly needed at the present time to properly house our veterans and their families; and

"Whereas recent past appropriations for flood-control improvements in Los Angeles County are far too small to adequately and properly carry on this program and are far from commensurate with the extreme need for flood protection in this county as warranted by the existing hazard to densely populated areas, to industrial and commercial areas, and to port and harbor facilities of national importance; and

"Whereas in order to be effective and to assure the continued prosperity and growth of Los Angeles County, the Federal flood-control program should be immediately prosecuted and consummated within a period of not exceeding 15 years: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County and ex officio the Board of Supervisors of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, That the United States Congress be respectfully urged and requested to:

"1. Provide that a just and proportionate share of all flood-control appropriations be allocated for improvements in Los Angeles County, taking into full consideration the basic need, the population affected, the revenue-producing importance to the Nation, and the existing authorizations:

"2. Appropriate sufficient flood-control funds at this session of Congress that the Los Angeles County flood-control improvements heretofore approved can be immediately resumed and completed in not over 15 years; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be filed with each member of the Los Angeles County congressional delegation, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Flood Control Committee."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles on the 25th day of February 1947.

[SEAL] J. F. MORONEY,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and Ex Officio Clerk of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District.

By RAY E. LEE, *Deputy.*

The Situation in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a true understanding of the epochal decision we are about to make on the role of the United States in bringing about a peaceful and prosperous world requires the deepest study and thought of all Members.

The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 6, 1947, is a significant contribution to such thinking. The destiny of our country is great, not small, and its value to the world lies in usefulness—not in reluctance and prejudice.

STRENGTH MUST BE USED

It is unfortunate that the immediate crisis in Greece as well as the much larger implications which lie behind it have been presented to the American people in a confusing combination of rumors, "leaks" and partial disclosures. As a result, most of the relevant facts are still missing and the emphasis is gravely distorted. What is unquestionably a direct, though long-term challenge to the bases of American policy is being discussed as if it were a question only of "bailing out" the British Empire, of relieving the people of the United Kingdom or even of propping up the somewhat moth-eaten monarchy of Greece. All such considerations are equally beside the point. If there is anything to be "bailed out" here it is not the British Empire; it is simply and solely the foreign policy of the United States—in which we already have an investment of some 300,000 lives and $300,000,000,000 or so. If there is anything to be propped up, it is in the first instance the security, the influence, the adequacy of the American system in the world of today.

The Greek note appealing to the United States for aid—the only document in the interchange which has as yet been made public—puts the immediate issue in a clearer light. An utterly wrecked and ruined nation is asking for the capital goods, for the technical and administrative assistance, for the minima of food, clothing, and seed which will enable it to create the "means for self-support in the future." Its government is asking also for the means of "restoring tranquillity," which may mean arms and might even mean police assistance; but even if such things are temporarily necessary they are still the least and the least worthy part of the real task—and it is an inspiring task—which here presents itself. That is the task of making free-enterprise democracy possible in Greece (without need for either kings or gendarmerie) by giving the country a viable basis on which to stand and from which to supply the human needs of its people.

In itself that would be a moving challenge, a challenge similar (in some ways, but only in some) to that which this country met nearly 50 years ago when, with unbounded confidence and energy, we accepted the task of bringing the best our system could offer to the people of the Philippine Islands. But this is a question neither of nineteenth century romantic imperialism nor of a mere altruistic rescue expedition. Greece is one of the decisive points at which the future shape of the world will be determined. It is a key position, not so much in military as in political and moral strategy. The Soviet Union has a great deal to offer to the peoples of the world. But so has the American Union. Dire poverty, dislocation, uncertainty will take what they can get; they will take the Soviet order and systematization if nothing else is available, but they will take the democratic freedom and productive power if those things are made real and effective in their lives.

Whether or not we can find the confidence and energy to export our freedoms, our skills, our productive power (as Britain once did) will largely determine the next phase of world history and will certainly determine the fate of our own system. The Greek crisis is admittedly only a beginning; a loan of $250,000,000 there would not approach the end of the commitments the times may challenge us to make. But if we lack the courage or foresight even to make the beginning; then the end, for ourselves, will be easily predictable. Strength is given in this world to be used; hoarded, it evaporates.

Reduction of Costs of Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield:

ARMY, NAVY COULD TRIM COSTS BY CUTTING OUT WASTE AND RED TAPE

(By Louis Bromfield)

In the controversy about the cut affecting the War and Navy Departments in President Truman's proposed budget, there is probably a good deal of truth on both sides.

No sensible citizen wishes to cripple our national defenses or weaken our prestige. On the other hand, it is probable that the greater part of the proposed cut could be made up by the overhauling of our armed forces and the introduction of economy, efficiency, and better planning with a corresponding cut in red tape, duplication of effort, and general confusion.

In Washington it is well known that both Army and Navy have always asked for much more than they needed in the hope of getting what they actually wanted.

During the war, when the issue was one of victory, there was no argument, but the war, or at least the active, belligerent part of it, is over, and it is time for Congress and the taxpayer again to impose restraints and ask for accountings.

It is doubtful if there will ever be an accounting of the cost of waste and inefficiency during the war but the senseless extravagance of the War Department in the Trans-American Highway, the Canol project, the wholesale purchase of camp sites and land for arsenal depots, are pretty well established facts.

That monstrosity, the Pentagon Building, headquarters of the Army itself, is a notable example of incredible extravagance conceived largely by General Somervell, an ex-WPA administrator.

In the Nation there are millions of GI's and sailors who could give dozens of examples of maladministration and waste during the war period. Some thousands of officers could contribute their share of testimony.

While it is perhaps useless and unprofitable in general to dig up the past, there are two instances in which investigations would be useful to the Nation: (1) Investigations having to do with criminal grounds for action; (2) inefficiency and extravagance in War and Navy Departments with regard to present budgetary demands.

During the war no real accounting was asked for from either Department but the war is over. Even in so-called peaceful times these two Departments function with far too little surveillance.

From the tone of their demands, one would gather that both Departments are models of efficiency and economy, an assumption which any man in the street knows is not true.

The unification plan concocted by these two Departments and sponsored by President Truman is essentially a phony. The impulse and demand for unification was based upon the assumption of greater economy, more efficient organization, less red tape, and less duplication of effort.

An examination of the proposal reveals that the proposed unification plan does very little toward any of these goals. It serves, like so many bureaucratic New Deal measures in the past, largely to complicate existing conditions and multiply duplications and confusions. It would not create substantial economies; indeed the opposite result might well be expected. Congress, accepting the plan at first glance, quickly discovered its phony qualities and has cooled to freezing temperature.

But beneath all of these facts lies a more important principle—that in a democracy, next to the need of vigilance against enemies, comes the need of vigilance against the extravagance and the hunger for power of its armed forces. Under President Roosevelt, vigilance, particularly in the Navy, was relaxed by the exigencies of war and for personal and sentimental reasons. President Truman suffers from a sentimental attachment to the Army much as President Roosevelt felt for the Navy.

The job of surveillance of both agencies lies properly with Congress as the most direct representative of the people and the controller of the Nation's purse. In this case, a little investigating might uncover any amount of waste, inefficiency, and duplication of effort.

The peril of war to the Nation at the moment is probably much less than the leaders of our armed forces would have us believe.

The only nation which could possibly menace our security is Russia who, it becomes clearer and clearer, each day, is in no condition to make war and probably will not be for years to come.

Occupation troops and research in weapons against the possibilities of the future are vital, but beyond these two elements there is not much evidence of need for vast appropriations in a world where, in fact, the American Navy has no challenge and where atomic energy, aviation development, and industrial production are all overwhelmingly dominated by this Nation.

Nations may be weakened economically and politically from within as well as from without. As a nation we have a three hundred billion debt to service and pay off. We have fantastically high taxes which must be reduced if our economy is to get under way and maintain a level of prosperity.

There is nothing sacrosanct about the Army and the Navy. Both would probably save the greater part of the proposed cuts by better management, by real unification and reorganization, and by a little simple economy.

Perhaps Congress ought to do a little investigating now that the orgy of war spending is over.

Address by the President on Receiving Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered yesterday by the President of the United States on the occasion of his acceptance of the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Baylor University, at Waco, Tex.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed as follows:

TRUMAN'S ADDRESS CALLING FOR REDUCTION OF BARRIERS TO REVIVAL OF WORLD TRADE

It is with a real sense of gratification that I meet with you today on the beautiful campus of Baylor University in Waco. I congratulate you on the outstanding achievements of this great university during the 101 years of its existence. I am sincerely grateful for the degree of doctor of laws that you have bestowed upon me, and I am honored to become a fellow alumnus of the distinguished men and women of this institution who have contributed so much to make our country great.

At this particular time, the whole world is concentrating much of its thought and energy on attaining the objectives of peace and freedom. These objectives are bound up completely with a third objective—re-establishment of world trade. In fact the three—peace, freedom, and world trade—are inseparable. The grave lessons of the past have proved it.

Many of our people, here in America, used to think that we could escape the troubles of the world by simply staying within our own borders. Two wars have shown us how wrong they were. We know today that we cannot find security in isolation. If we are to live at peace, we must join with other nations in a continuing effort to organize the world for peace. Science and invention have left us no alternative.

RECALLS LEAGUE OF NATIONS

After the First World War the United States proposed a League of Nations, an organization to maintain order in the world. But when our proposal was accepted and the League was established, this country failed to become a member.

Can any thoughtful person fail to realize today what that mistake cost this Nation and cost the world?

This time we are taking a different course. Our country has taken a leading part in building the United Nations, in setting up its councils, its committees and commissions, and in putting them to work. We are doing everything within our power to foster international cooperation. We have dedicated ourselves to its success.

This is not, and it must never be, the policy of a single administration or a single party. It is the policy of all the people of

the United States. We, in America, are unanimous in our determination to prevent another war.

But some among us do not fully realize what we must do to carry out this policy. There still are those who seem to believe that we can confine our cooperation with other countries to political relationships; that we need not cooperate where economic questions are involved.

This attitude has sometimes led to the assertion that there should be bipartisan support for the foreign policy of the United States, but that there need not be bipartisan support for the foreign economic policy of the United States.

Such a statement simply does not make sense.

FOREIGN RELATIONS INDIVISIBLE

Our foreign relations, political and economic, are indivisible. We cannot say that we are willing to cooperate in the one field and are unwilling to cooperate in the other. I am glad to note that leaders in both parties have recognized that fact.

The members of the United Nations have renounced aggression as a method of settling their political differences. Instead of putting armies on the march, they have now agreed to sit down around a table and talk things out. In any dispute, each party will present its case. The interests of all will be considered, and a fair and just solution will be found. This is the way of international order. It is the way of a civilized community. It applies, with equal logic, to the settlement of economic differences.

Economic conflict is not spectacular—at least in the early stages. But it is always serious. One nation may take action in behalf of its own producers, without notifying other nations, or consulting them, or even considering how they may be affected. It may cut down its purchases of another country's goods, by raising its tariffs or imposing an embargo or a system of quotas on imports. And when it does this, some producer in the other country will find the door to his market suddenly slammed and bolted in his face.

Or a nation may subsidize its exports, selling its goods abroad below their cost. When this is done, a producer in some other country will find his market flooded with the goods that have been dumped.

In either case, the producer gets angry, just as you or I would get angry if such a thing were done to us. Profits disappear; workers are dismissed. The producer feels that he has been wronged, without warning and without reason. He appeals to his government for action. His government retaliates, and another round of tariff boosts, embargoes, quotas, and subsidies is under way. This is economic war. In such a war nobody wins.

Certainly nobody won the last economic war. As each battle of the economic war of the thirties was fought, the inevitable tragic result became more and more apparent. From the tariff policy of Hawley and Smoot, the world went on to Ottawa and the system of imperial preferences, from Ottawa to the kind of elaborate and detailed restrictions adopted by Nazi Germany. Nations strangled normal trade and discriminated against their neighbors all around the world.

MAJOR CAUSE OF DEPRESSION

Who among their peoples were the gainers? Not the depositors who lost their savings in the failure of the banks. Not the farmers who lost their farms. Not the millions who walked the streets looking for work. I do not mean to say that economic conflict was the sole cause of the depression. But I do say that it was a major cause.

Now, as in the year 1920, we have reached a turning point in history. National economies have been disrupted by the war. The future is uncertain everywhere. Economic policies are in a state of flux. In this atmosphere of doubt and hesitation, the decisive factor will be the type of leadership that the United States gives to the world.

We are the giant of the economic world. Whether we like it or not, the future pattern of economic relations depends upon us. The world is waiting and watching to see what we shall do. The choice is ours. We can lead the nations to economic peace or we can plunge them into economic war.

There must be no question as to our course. We must not go through the thirties again.

There is abundant evidence, I think, that these earlier mistakes will not be repeated. We have already made a good start. Our Government has participated fully in setting up, under the United Nations, agencies of international cooperation for dealing with relief and refugees, with food and agriculture, with shipping and aviation, with loans for reconstruction and development, and with the stabilization of currencies. And now, in order to avoid economic warfare, our Government has proposed, and others have agreed, that there be set up, within the United Nations, another agency to be concerned with problems and policies affecting world trade. This is the international trade organization.

FAIR ECONOMIC DEALING

This organization would apply to commercial relationships the same principle of fair dealing that the United Nations is applying to political affairs. Instead of retaining unlimited freedom to commit acts of economic aggression, its members would adopt a code of economic conduct and agree to live according to its rules. Instead of adopting measures that might be harmful to others, without warning and without consultation, countries would sit down around the table and talk things out. In any dispute, each party would present its case. The interest of all would be considered, and a fair and just solution would be found. In economics, as in international politics, this is the way to peace.

The work of drafting a world-trade charter was begun by the United States. It was carried forward by a preparatory committee of 18 nations meeting in London last fall. It should be completed at a second meeting of this committee in Geneva, beginning on April 10.

The progress that has already been made on this project is one of the most heartening developments since the war.

If the nations can agree to observe a code of good conduct in international trade, they will cooperate more readily in other international affairs. Such agreements will prevent the bitterness that is engendered by an economic war. It will provide an atmosphere congenial to the preservation of the peace.

As a part of this program, we have asked the other nations of the world to join us in reducing barriers to trade. We have not asked them to remove all barriers. Nor have we ourselves offered to do so. But we have proposed negotiations directed toward the reduction of tariffs here and abroad, toward the elimination of other restrictive measures and the abandonment of discrimination. These negotiations are to be undertaken at the meeting which opens in Geneva next month. The success of this program is essential to the establishment of the international trade organization, to the effective operation of the International Bank and the monetary fund, and to the strength of the whole United Nations structure of cooperation in economic and political affairs.

The negotiations at Geneva must not fail.

FREEDOM OF ENTERPRISE

There is one thing that Americans value even more than peace. It is freedom. Freedom of worship—freedom of speech—and freedom of enterprise. It must be true that the first two of these freedoms are related to the third. For, throughout history, freedom of worship and freedom of speech have been most frequently enjoyed in those societies that have accorded a considerable measure of freedom to individual enterprise. Freedom has flourished where power has been dispersed. It has languished where power has been too highly centralized. So our devotion to freedom of enterprise, in the United States, has deeper roots than a desire to protect the profits of ownership. It is part and parcel of what we call American.

The pattern of international trade that is most conducive to freedom of enterprise is one in which the major decisions are made, not by governments, but by private buyers and sellers, under conditions of active competition, and with proper safeguards against the establishment of monopolies and cartels. Under such a system, buyers make their purchases, and sellers make their sales, at whatever time and place and in whatever quantities they choose, relying for guidance on whatever prices the market may afford. Goods move from country to country in response to economic opportunities. Governments may impose tariffs, but they do not dictate the quantity of trade, the sources of imports, or the destination of exports. Individual transactions are a matter of private choice.

This is the essence of free enterprise.

The pattern of trade that is least conducive to freedom of enterprise is one in which decisions are made by governments. Under such a system, the quantity of purchases and sales, the sources of imports and the destination of exports are dictated by public officials. In some cases, trade may be conducted by the state. In others, part or all of it may be left in private hands. But, even so, the trader is not free. Governments make all the important choices and he adjusts himself to them as best he can.

This was the pattern of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Unless we act, and act decisively, it will be the pattern of the next century.

NATIONS UNDER PRESSURE

Everywhere on earth nations are under economic pressure. Countries that were devastated by the war are seeking to reconstruct their industries. Their need to import, in the months that lie ahead, will exceed their capacity to export. And so they feel that imports must be rigidly controlled.

Countries that have lagged in their development are seeking to industrialize. In order that new industries may be established, they, too, feel that competing imports must be rigidly controlled.

Nor is this all. The products of some countries are in great demand. But buyers outside their borders do not hold the money of these countries in quantities large enough to enable them to pay for the goods they want. And they find these moneys difficult to earn. Importing countries, when they make their purchases, therefore seek to discriminate against countries whose currencies they do not possess. Here, again, they feel that imports must be rigidly controlled.

One way to cut down on imports is by curtailing the freedom of traders to use foreign money to pay for imported goods. But recourse to this device is now limited by the terms of the British loan agreement and the rules of the International Monetary Fund. Another way to cut down on imports is by raising tariffs.

But if controls over trade are really to be tight tariffs are not enough. Even more drastic measures can be used. Quotas can be imposed on imports, product by product, country by country, and month by month. Importers can be forbidden to buy abroad without obtaining licenses. Those who buy more than is permitted can be fined or jailed. Everything that comes into a country can be kept within the limits determined by a central plan. This is regimentation. And

this is the direction in which much of the world is headed at the present time.

If this trend is not reversed the Government of the United States will be under pressure, sooner or later, to use these same devices in the fight for markets and for raw materials. And if the Government were to yield to this pressure it would shortly find itself in the business of allocating foreign goods among importers and foreign markets among exporters and telling every trader what he could buy or sell, and how much, and when, and where. This is precisely what we have been trying to get away from, as rapidly as possible, ever since the war. It is not the American way. It is not the way to peace.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION CHARTER

Fortunately, an alternative has been offered to the world in the charter of the international trade organization that is to be considered at Geneva in the coming month. The charter would limit the present freedom of governments to impose detailed administrative regulations on their foreign trade. The international trade organization would require its member nations to confine such controls to exceptional cases, in the immediate future, and to abandon them entirely as soon as they can.

The trade agreement negotiations that will accompany consideration of the charter should enable countries that are now in difficulty to work their way out of it by affording them readier access to the markets of the world. This program is designed to restore and preserve a trading system that is consistent with continuing freedom of enterprise in every country that chooses freedom for its own economy. It is a program that will serve the interests of other nations as well as those of the United States.

If these negotiations are to be successful, we ourselves must make the same commitments that we ask of all the other nations of the world. We must be prepared to make concessions if we are to obtain concessions from others in return. If these negotiations should fail, our hope of an early restoration of an international order in which private trade can flourish would be lost. I say again, they must not fail.

The program that we have been discussing will make our foreign trade larger than it otherwise would be. This means that exports will be larger. It also means that imports will be larger. Many people, it is true, are afraid of imports. They are afraid because they have assumed that we cannot take more products from abroad unless we produce just that much less at home.

Fortunately, this is not the case. The size of our market is not forever fixed. It is smaller when we attempt to isolate ourselves from the other countries of the world. It is larger when we have a thriving foreign trade. Our imports were down to a billion dollars in 1932; they were up to five billion in 1946. But no one would contend that 1932 was a better year than 1946 for selling goods, or making profits, or finding jobs. Business is poor when markets are small. Business is good when markets are big. It is the purpose of the coming negotiations to lower existing barriers to trade so that markets everywhere may grow.

I said to the Congress when it last considered the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, and I now reiterate, that domestic interests will be safeguarded in this process of expanding trade. But there still are those who sincerely fear that the trade-agreement negotiations will prove disastrous to the interests of particular producing groups. I am sure that their misgivings are not well-founded. The situation briefly is this:

1. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been on the books since 1934. It has been administered with painstaking care and strict impartiality. Some 30 agreements with other countries have been made. And trade has grown, to the great benefit of our economy.

2. This Government does not intend, in the coming negotiations, to eliminate tariffs or establish free trade. All that is contemplated is the reduction of tariffs, the removal of discriminations, and the achievement, not of free trade, but of freer trade.

3. In the process of negotiations tariffs will not be cut across the board. Action will be selective; some rates may be cut substantially, others moderately, and others not at all

WILL SEEK CONCESSIONS

4. In return for these concessions we shall seek and obtain concessions from other countries to benefit our export trade.

5. Millions of Americans—on farms, in factories, on the railroads, in export and import businesses in shipping, aviation, banking, and insurance, in wholesale establishments, and in retail stores—depend on foreign trade for some portion of their livelihood. If we are to protect the interests of these people, in their investments and their employment, we must see to it that our trade does not decline. To take one of these groups as an example: We exported in 1946 over $3,000,000,000 worth of agricultural products alone—mostly grain, cotton, tobacco, dairy products, and eggs. If we should lose a substantial part of this foreign market, the incomes of over 6,000,000 farm families would be materially reduced and their buying power for the products of our factories greatly curtailed.

6. There is no intention to sacrifice one group to benefit another group. Negotiations will be directed toward obtaining larger markets, both foreign and domestic, for the benefit of all.

7. No tariff rate will be reduced until an exhaustive study has been made—until every person who wishes a hearing has been heard and careful consideration given to his case.

8. In every future agreement there will be a clause that permits this Government—or any other government—to modify or withdraw a concession if it should result, or threaten to result, in serious injury to a domestic industry. This is now required by the Executive order which I issued on February 25, following extensive conferences between officials in the Department of State and majority leaders in the Senate.

All these points—the history of trade-agreement operations, the way in which negotiations are conducted, the protection afforded by the safeguarding clause—should provide assurance, if assurance is needed, that domestic interests will not be injured.

The policy of reducing barriers to trade is a settled policy of this Government. It is embodied in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, fathered and administered for many years by Cordell Hull. It is reflected in the charter of the international trade organization. It is one of the cornerstones of our plans for peace. It is a policy from which we cannot—and must not—turn aside.

CALLS ISOLATIONISM BANKRUPTCY

To those among us—and there are still a few—who would seek to undermine this policy for partisan advantage and go back to the period of high tariffs and economic isolation, I can say only this: Take care. Times have changed. Our position in the world has changed. The temper of our people has changed. The slogans of 1930 or of 1896 are sadly out of date. Isolationism, after two world wars, is a confession of mental and moral bankruptcy.

Happily, our foreign economic policy does not now rest upon a base of narrow partisanship. Leaders in both parties have expressed their faith in its essential purposes. Here, as elsewhere in our foreign relations, I shall welcome a continuation of bipartisan support.

Our people are united. They have come to a realization of their responsibilities. They are ready to assume their role of leadership. They are determined upon an international order in which peace and freedom shall endure.

Peace and freedom are not easily achieved. They cannot be attained by force. They come from mutual understanding and cooperation, from a willingness to deal fairly with every friendly nation in all matters—political and economic. Let us resolve to continue to do just that, now and in the future. If other nations of the world will do the same, we can reach the goals of permanent peace and world freedom.

Comment on President's Address at Waco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman at Waco," published in the New York Times of March 7, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN AT WACO

Peace and freedom are not easily achieved. They cannot be attained by force. They come from mutual understanding and cooperation, from a willingness to deal fairly with every friendly nation in all matters—political and economic.

These words, taken from its closing lines, formed the underlying theme of President Truman's address at Waco yesterday, an address in which he developed that basic concept as it applied specifically in the field of foreign-trade policy. The term "developed" is used advisedly. For this was no perfunctory speech on the part of the President. Announced in advance as a major address, it measured fully up to that standard. There was a documentary quality in its lack of oratorical flourish, in its sane objectivity and in the challenging logic that marked its closely reasoned passages.

The seeds of economic aggression are to be found in world conditions today to an extent comparable only with that of the early thirties. Countries everywhere are under severe pressure to invoke government intervention in their foreign-trade relations. Countries engaged in postwar reconstruction and rehabilitation find their import needs outrunning their ability to export; countries bent on programs of industrialization find themselves in a similar position, and still other countries find it impossible to obtain the currencies of those nations which have the goods they want to buy. In all these cases the natural temptation is for the government to step in and curtail imports. Such defensive measures lead to retaliation, and as the movement gains momentum, it goes far beyond mere tariff raising. It embraces quotas, import licensing and all the assorted devices associated with isolationism and regimentation.

If this trend, already in evidence, were to continue, the President pointed out, the United States would sooner or later have to resort to these same totalitarian techniques. It would find itself in the position of "allocating foreign goods among importers and

foreign markets among exporters, of telling every trader what he could buy or sell, and how much, and when and where." And this, he added "is not the American way. It is not the way to peace."

What, then, is the alternative? The alternative is to apply in the area of world trade the principles represented in the political field by the UN. That is the purpose for which the International Trade Organization, to be considered at Geneva next month, has been devised. The proposed charter of the ITO strictly limits the area of government intervention in foreign trade. At the same time, the trade agreement negotiations which are to be conducted at the Geneva meeting are designed to restore and preserve a trading system that is consistent with the continuing freedom of enterprise in every country that chooses freedom for its economy.

The case for reciprocity in foreign trade has been argued forcefully on many occasions in the past. But it is doubtful if anyone has brought out more clearly than did Mr. Truman yesterday the basic interdependence of economic peace, on the one hand, and freedom of enterprise, on the other, with all the historic connotation which the latter holds for political and personal freedom.

Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "Air Transportation," delivered by C. Bedell Monro on February 27, 1947, at the twentieth anniversary dinner of Capital Airlines, PCA, at the Statler Hotel.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unquestionably, today's headlines paint a rather bleak picture of the present and future of that phase of aviation which only recently typified the pinnacle of business glamor and romance—a sort of matinee idol, as it were—namely, the air lines of the United States. Those headlines paint us as a sick industry, as a patient so ill that the relatives have been summoned from near and far. Tremulous stockholders are calling for medical doctors, surgeons, and even an odd faith healer or two. Hastily formed clinics are holding forth up and down the land, in Congress, Government offices, and cocktail bars.

* * * * *

Perhaps that is the situation at present. And even at present we should view it with calmer appraisal and without the hysterical exaggeration and panic that appears so prevalent.

The future, however, is another thing entirely, and that is where you and I should take immediate and violent issue with the calamity howlers, the apostles of defeatism, with those who will sell anything short, whether it be our Nation's economy, our Nation's Government, our Nation itself.

* * * * *

There surely is no question but what air transportation is today in the most critical period of its history.

* * * * *

The situation certainly is more far-reaching because of the Nation-wide and world-wide ramifications, plus a tremendous import, of the air-transport system.

In the early days when a crisis came, all we had to deal with was a handful of planes and a few hundred employees and a few thousand dollars. Now our crises are measured by hundreds of planes and thousands of employes and, God help us, millions of dollars.

Yes, air transportation is in the most critical period of its history. Yet, ladies and gentlemen, at no time in its history has it ever shown greater promise—promise of future economic strength, promise of fulfilling its destiny as the most powerful safeguard of peace and the most potent instrumentality of our country's prosperity. To understand that fully, we must look through the right end of the telescope. That is not just a contradiction; it is not wishful thinking; it is not a Pollyanna philosophy. I can say that I have been in this business long enough not to have any Pollyanna philosophy. It is just plain, unadulterated fact.

Why that fact is a fact leads us to another fact. Previously, little recognized or little realized, that fact was made apparent increasingly during the war and made obvious in the somewhat cataclysmic events of the past few months. It is simply this.

No longer does our industry stand alone in its failures or in its successes, in its tribulations or in its victories. By the very nature of what it has come to mean in our national life, it has many partners. And who are they? Each and every one is represented here in this gathering tonight.

You, the Congress of the United States. You, the Government of the United States, as represented by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Post Office. You, the armed services of the United States. You, the aircraft manufacturers of the United States. You, the doctors, the lawyers, the bankers, and the businessmen of the United States.

* * * * *

Let us admit freely that all of us in the commercial airlines made quite a few mistakes in the past few years, particularly in the period following the war. Perhaps one or more of our partners fumbled the ball once or twice and even made one or two mistakes themselves, but the greater fault was ours. Also, many things happened to us that were entirely beyond our control. It would serve no good or constructive purpose to indulge here in this gathering in any recriminatory or apologetic recital of the past. It suffices to state that the war was one of the principal causative factors of our difficulties, in the creation, since 1945, of a public acceptance and a public demand for air travel far beyond either our capabilities or our war-restricted facilities.

* * * * *

Now, I wouldn't be frightened a bit with having just a small trickle or two of that former flood of business at this moment. You can make reservations any time at any place, anywhere, on the next plane going to anywhere in the country or in the world. That is a small plug for our traffic department.

But the truth was that the public came and expected much. It was bitterly disappointed.

Then came another flood, this time of magazine articles, editorials, and radio talks. It became fashionable to take a literary poke at the air lines. Columnists specializing in fashions, medicines, sports, religion, or whatnot, delighted in traveling with us so that they could syndicate their woes—and our deficiencies—from coast to coast.

In a joyful splurge of opportunism other forms of transport intensified their advertisements as to their reliability and comfort and beauty and safety of their form of transportation.

So, public acceptance turned into public suspicion, distrust, and disgust. With a cycle of accidents, though relatively few on the domestic scheduled air lines, came public fear. And now we are paying the price.

What is this partnership of ours doing or planning to do to meet and overcome air transports' crisis, if it may be termed that? What action is being taken or contemplated?

The answer is: Plenty. Constructive action, aggressive action, fast action.

* * * * *

First, we have Congress. And incidentally, ladies and gentlemen, this is probably the first time anything has been said publicly in praise of Congress. Congress has become justly and duly alarmed with air transport's situation and has instituted a searching investigation into the various phases and problems of our industry. Paramount is the question of air safety and the many manifold and complicated problems of equipment, air navigational aids, airports, pilot qualifications and training, our maintenance and operating procedures, and our aspects of reliability and progressive development, and, finally (here is where they are going to have to spend time), our financial troubles.

I have heard some unthinking people carelessly characterize the investigation as a possible witch burning. To those of us who have followed it closely, there appears to be only a sincere, intelligent, and constructive program to help not only in increasing safety, but to help in the correction of what may be aviation's deficiencies.

In close cooperation with Congress are the CAB, CAA, and Air Transport Association, endeavoring to reach the proper solutions in the common cause.

* * * * *

What about some of the other activities of our partnership? In that consideration we come inescapably to the arbiter of air-line destinies, the CAB. As arbiter of our destinies it sets the extent and pattern of our routes and determines the degree of competition. It has the power to regulate rates and fares, and has a lot of other powers, too, though those matters have not yet been brought to the Supreme Court. There are some rumors about that it has power to regulate the color of our ties and the cut of our clothes and, if anybody has been at a meeting of our Air Transport Association, you know that would be a fine power to have them exercise.

Along with those powers it has the concomitant responsibility imposed by law of developing a sound air-transport system "in the interests of the Post Office Department, of national defense, and of the commerce of the United States."

Certainly it is our considered opinion that the Civil Aeronautics Board has sincerely and fully recognized that responsibility and has shouldered its obligation constructively and aggressively in its recognition of the present critical situation in the indusutry. Already it has instituted an investigation of passenger fares as a possible and early remedial measure for certain of our economic ills. It has provided machinery for early emergency relief through temporary mail pay increases, based on where they are needed and where they can be proved justified by the carrier.

Already I can hear the anvil chorus of our surface friends beating out their measured moans of "Subsidy, subsidy, subsidy." Before our ears are deafened, let us hark to the truth.

This is an emergency situation—temporary—and can return all of us who are involved to a compensatory basis as other factors bring permanent improvement. Secondly, we should remember that for years the Post Office Department has received many millions of dollars in air-mail revenue far in excess of amounts paid carriers for serv-

ices rendered. And, finally, we should remember that this is an investment in national security and national defense.

For a longer range, permanent program to insure a sound air-transport system, it seems clear that the Civil Aeronautics Board is thinking and planning along foresighted and constructive lines, as typified in public addresses of its Chairman, Mr. Landis, whom we are very happy to have with us this evening and who said (and I hope he doesn't mind my quoting him) within recent months:

"The domestic route pattern was a DC-3 route pattern and must be rewritten for the newer and faster type of airplanes, such a program requiring surveillance of possible unfair competitive strains which will result if due care is not taken in this job of reordering the route pattern of the United States."

There is no question but what the task that lies ahead of the CAB, not only in these stormy times but in the calmer waters ahead, is not just a Saturday afternoon pastime. In Hollywood terms, it is a supermammoth, supercolossal, and supereverything job.

It requires the highest degree of statesmanship and foresight and sound judgment and fairness. Certainly no one should envy any one of these beleaguered gentlemen who make up the CAB for on their wisdom depends not only the destiny of the industry but, in many respects, the economy of our Nation, the defense of our Nation, and the leadership of the United States in aviation among the nations of the world. With that burden how any of them can possibly sleep peacefully at night is far beyond my comprehension.

Now we come, perhaps, to one of the things we should do that has been left undone or has not been done wisely. It was Abraham Lincoln who once commented that "with public opinion nothing can fail." Conversely, without public opinion, nothing can succeed. Never has an industry had such a great need for public understanding as ours today. The future depends on many things, principally upon an enlightened and favorable public opinion, and during these dark and jittery days of misconception and misunderstanding, we face an enormous job of education.

Although the air-transport industry must depend upon complete and wholehearted cooperation of its other partners, the air transport industry must take the lead. Frankly, at the time when we should have brought all of our public relations ammunition up to the front-line trenches, we were dawdling in shy retirement in the rear.

* * * * *

Where, indeed, were all of us? We were getting splattered, plenty, and we sat in a daze doing nothing much, just making a futile dab or two at a particularly large spot. Instead of a concentrated drive to tell the public of our trials and tribulations, of the real reason for our deficiencies, of what we were doing to correct them; instead of facing the issue squarely and depending upon the American sense of fair play; instead of pointing out many improvements and successes and demonstrating the outstanding job of reconversion, what did we do?

* * * * *

Oh, we had a story to tell, a real story, fresh, vivid news, a saga of accomplishment and a record of reconversion better than that of any other industry. Instead, we apologized weakly, dodged facts, exuded false optimism one moment and became defeatist the next. Only when we were pushed to the wall did we admit to the Nation our really amazing record of safety in scheduled air transportation and then as a defensive anticlimax.

* * * * *

In several instances in these remarks I have alluded to the national defense and the national security aspect of commercial air transportation. I have also alluded to the question of safety. There is another kind of safety, however, which perhaps, in the shortness of our memories, is receiving too little attention these days. That is the safety of our Nation.

Today all of us share a common legacy. It is an inheritance from the harrowing days of Pearl Harbor, the South Pacific, Japan, Africa, Italy, and the continent of Europe. In that legacy there is a mutual obligation to do everything possible to avert such a tragedy again as a nation.

However, as a Nation, perhaps of incurable optimists, we seemed disinclined even to recognize that such a legacy has been left by thousands of young men and their bereaved families, by thousands more for whom the meaning of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is now only a mockery.

One of our great generals, Ira Eaker, recently stated that atomic energy has made air power all important. Air power, he tells us, is the only available present means to strike with the atomic bomb and to protect against misuse of the atomic bomb. And without air superiority we will be helpless, he adds.

I am certain that this outstanding exponent of air power will back me up when I add that the air power he speaks of for your and my protection depends in large part on a strong civil air-transport system, prepared to fulfill its obligation in an hour of national crisis.

Fundamental to our future military and civil strength and preparedness is the intensified and unremitting concentration on a phase of aviation little known generally and its value too little realized. That phase is research and engineering. And it will be in any foreseeable future the very core, the very backbone of progress in the field of aviation, whether commercial or military. Aviation actually is still in almost a primary state of development, as military or civilian technical experts will tell you.

We have many hard nuts to crack and the question is: Who is going to crack them? That is the first question and it is the $64 question. The answer to that $64 question is whether or not the United States will maintain its world leadership.

Military and commercial aviation are closely interwoven, almost inexorably interwoven. What benefits one benefits the other. And only in the research laboratories will those tough mutual problems be solved.

The second question is: When are those technical problems of equipment and operation going to be solved and at what price? In that connection there are just two approaches. One is a preparatory approach which is initially costly, perhaps, but dividend-paying in the long run. The second approach is what may be termed "the after-the-fact approach," which is extravagant of money and of lives and is dangerous to our national security.

* * * * *

All of us know what happened when World War II broke out and when President Roosevelt called for 50,000 planes per year. It was a grand gesture and a necessary one. What was the cost because Uncle Sam was caught with his pants around his knees, because he had neglected for years and years that important preparatory basis of research and aviation and the real encouragement of civil aviation to carry out those problems? The cost in lives and in our Federal debt was incalculable. How insignificant would have been those few extra life-saving millions of Government aid to the air lines, to the military, spent judiciously and effectively over those 4 or 5 years in research and development, prior to the war, according to a fixed national policy, as contrasted with the billions so hastily voted overnight in the hysterical hope of somehow unbottling the aviation research bottleneck. What would the United States have given at the time of Pearl Harbor to have been able to retrieve those valuable but lost years of research and engineering?

This country cannot afford to make this same mistake a second time, because the cost the second time may well include the devastation of our cities and our towns and our countryside, and the destruction of the American way of life and of living.

And so, this partnership of ours—the Congress of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the armed forces, the air lines, the manufacturers—all of us for our own protection must work together and put our shoulders to the wheel to make the United States aviation picture, in all its phases, the envy of the entire world.

I should like this evening to add another voice to that mounting hope that we resort to every possible means, without deviation from an inspired course, to foster the vast peacetime promise of civil aviation, to look upon the subject as something special, requiring special consideration, and that in our thinking we be guided constantly by the inevitable association of civil aviation with national security.

To draw these remarks to a close there is a vital point that should be mentioned and which should be underlined in our thinking in the months and years to come. As Mr. Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, recently stated, "our industry has oversold aviation to the public." There is no question but that many of our ills can be attributed to that overselling.

The public was handed a bill of goods by unthinking optimists who foresaw an impossible, immediate future of perfect reliability, superluxury, and superspeeds. We oversold the public on safety not deliberately but rather by misinformation.

Also there is no question but that this industry has progressed amazingly in what are really only two decades of history. The progress has been measured in technical and business aspects.

So, let's get away from those wild promises, those rosy and unrealistic predictions, those talks of aircraft larger than ocean liners, speeds in everyday commercial travel of 750 to 1,000 miles per hour, of operations that can be continued despite fog and every other known form of weather which prevents the other forms of transportation from completing their schedules. Perhaps those things may come, but now is the time to consolidate our gains, to progress through needed adjustment, to perfect what we have accomplished. The obligation of this partnership (and I exempt military and research and engineering upon which our future depends, and they are going ahead on these forward-looking projects) is to work toward financial strength and stability, to work toward a greater reliability of service, to work toward a greater safety and to work toward a greater quality of service.

We already have in this business of ours a superproduct. Let us use it in the perfection which its qualities demand.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, this is the most critical period of our history, but with the recognition of our errors of omission and commission, with the recognition of our problems, with the recognition of our obligations, with a great partnership of intelligence and foresight and patriotic endeavor, working as a team, there should be no question as to the future.

I, therefore, leave the answer in your hands. Is this not the most promising period in the history of air transportation? I thank you. [Applause.]

Necessity for American Military and Economic Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Collective Security Depends Upon American Military and Economic Strength," delivered by Hon. Warren R. Austin, United States representative at the seat of the United Nations, before the Overseas Press Club at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on March 4, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two world wars in 25 years have demonstrated that the United States cannot isolate itself from the consequences of war anywhere in the world.

The mass destructive power of atomic energy and of other forces unleashed by science has further demonstrated that the great imperative of our times is to prevent a third world war.

The American people believe that these postulates are equally true for all nations. They are as true for the large nations, such as the Soviet Union and the United States, as they are for the small nations.

Facing these sober truths the United States is dedicated to the policy of supporting the United Nations with all the resources that it possesses.

The security of the United States and of every other nation depends upon applying the United Nations Charter and using the institutions of the United Nations to build a system of collective security strong enough to prevent a third world war.

The building of collective security is an immensely difficult undertaking. It is essential that the American people understand the true nature of collective security and the contribution that the United States must make in order to achieve success.

First of all, let us never forget that the United Nations is a means to the end. It is not the end. The mere existence of the United Nations and our participation in it does not establish collective security. The United Nations is a means by which collective security can be achieved.

Also, we must understand that every provision of the Charter and every organ of the United Nations is a necessary part of building collective security. The work of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council—for example—are just as necessary to collective security as the work of the Security Council.

This is because the problem of building collective security is not solely, nor even primarily, a problem of writing out formulas for police action—for enforcement methods. It is primarily a problem of building the substance of agreement for common action—agreement so firmly based that it will acquire the force of law through the will and ability of the member nations to develop and maintain the law.

Reduction and removal of the basic causes of war by using the institutions of the United Nations to relieve political, economic, and social tensions and to raise standards of living is a most important element of collective security and one most frequently overlooked.

The more the nations work together for their mutual welfare, the less will nations try to break the law against war.

Nations where economic and social conditions create instability, suffering, and despair among their people, are in no position to resist aggressors, from either within or without, regardless of treaty commitments. Conversely, nations whose economy and social organization are healthy, strong, and progressive desire peace and have the power to act in support of peace.

The final measure of the strength of collective security is not found in obligations in treaties for collective action. It is to be found in the will and the capacity of the peoples to fulfill their obligations. Collective security can be no stronger than the sum of its separate parts.

Nothing could be more dangerous than to act upon the assumption that a treaty or a voting system would operate automatically.

Let me illustrate the point by a brief reference to the veto. The veto power in the Security Council is widely thought of as a protection to an aggressor nation. Actually the veto would be no protection at all to an aggressor if the other nations should act together in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

If any great nation possessing the veto power should ever embark on a course of aggression in violation of the Charter, it would be committing an act of nullification, an act of rebellion against the United Nations. It would forfeit its position under the Charter.

No veto could protect such a nation from the consequences of its crime. Only the failure of the other nations to act together against it could spare the aggressor from lawful punishment. The heart of the problem of building collective security is the strength and the will of the member nations to carry out their obligations, individually and collectively.

Veto or no veto, the strength of the great nations in relation to one another is such that no one of them can safely go to war in violation of the Charter if it is certain that the others would act together in defense of the Charter.

If the United States demonstrates convincingly that all its great material and moral power would be used in support of collective security under the United Nations, that fact would have far-reaching influence upon the will and capacity of other member nations to act together to maintain peace. On the other hand, if we should falter, if we should dissipate our strength, if we should act in blind or shortsighted selfishness, we would inevitably undermine the whole cause.

The preservation of peace cannot be assured by the United States alone. The will and strength of all the other members of the United Nations—especially the greatest nations—are also necessary.

Nevertheless, because of the great power and influence of the United States, it is true that we can do more than any other nation to decide the outcome.

The central fact, of which Americans must never lose sight, is this: The United States, with half the productive power of the world, has decisive power either to create the conditions of permanent peace or to permit the balance to be tipped in favor of war. What we do or fail to do determines to a large extent whether other nations move rapidly toward political and economic stability and democratic achievement or flounder in the disaster and despair that lead to fanaticism and war.

What, then, are some of the policies the United States must pursue in relation to the United Nations in order to attain the goal of collective security?

First. We must make clear that we are ready at all times to support the law of the charter—by force if necessary—in accordance with our obligations.

Second. We must use to the full and with patience all the processes of conciliation and organized cooperation established by the United Nations. We must seek constantly for better understanding with all our allies. Whatever others do, we must seek always to avoid hysteria and recrimination. We do not need to fear anybody. We must seek by our policies to remove fear in others and replace it by confidence.

Third. We must maintain our own economic strength, and help restore economic strength to those parts of the world left weakened by the war, and, therefore, an easy prey to some future aggressor. This means a businesslike investment of American capital, a firm adherence to the policy of reducing barriers to an expanding world trade, and, for this year at least, continued direct relief to some countries. An enlightened economic foreign policy will increase prosperity in the United States as much as in any other country. Collective security can never be realized without such a policy on our part.

Fourth. We must maintain our military establishment, not for purposes of domination, but in order to be able to back up our commitments in support of collective security under the United Nations. This means that we must not engage in any unilateral disarmament by hasty and ill-considered reductions in our armed forces or in our budget for national defense. It also means establishment of a universal military training system that would provide the necessary reserves of skilled manpower trained in the complicated techniques of modern warfare. If we were ever called upon to join in collective action against a major aggressor, we would not have the 2 years of grace we were given in the last war. We should have to act with decisive force at once and with men already trained. Peacetime universal military training in the United States is not in conflict with the ultimate goal of world disarmament. Nor is the strategic trusteeship proposed by the United States for the former Japanese mandated islands in conflict with the goal of collective security. On the contrary, at the present stage of the development of the United Nations both would contribute to progress toward these goals because both would add to the strength the United States can contribute to collective security and collective control of armaments and armed forces.

Fifth. We must stand firm in support of an effective and enforceable system of international control of atomic energy and of other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction. We must keep trying with patience and firmness to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on this matter. I believe that sooner or later we will reach agreement. It is just as much in the vital interest of the Soviet Union as it is of ourselves to establish a system of control that would fully safeguard complying states from the hazards of violations and evasions. Such a system would require greater delegations of national sovereignty to international authority than either of our nations has previously been willing to give. But without such a system neither one of us would, in the long run, be able to safeguard our independence or our respective ways of life from the destructiveness of another war.

Sixth. We must apply comparable principles of effective international control to the so-called conventional armaments and armed forces so that they, too, can be reduced in such a way as to safeguard all States against violations and evasions.

Seventh. We must press for completion of the special agreements called for by the charter that would provide the Security Council with peace forces to enforce its decisions.

Eighth. We must lend our full support to the development and application of international law, particularly the laws against war which have been for the first

time enforced against individuals by the Nuremberg and far eastern tribunals. The increasing application of international law directly to individuals is of importance to the prevalence of peace.

The problem of building collective security has two inseparable parts.

We have to take every measure that lies within our power to remove the fundamental causes of war and to establish conditions of mutual understanding and confidence and economic well-being.

Simultaneously we must maintain a suitable military posture to support collective action under the charter.

At the present time special hazards to peace call for special effort toward collective security.

Looking forward to the fulfillment of our mission in the United Nations, we are determined to maintain American military and economic strength adequate to meet all our needs and obligations.

Czechoslovak Day—Proclamation by Governor Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, today marks the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the late President of Czechoslovakia. By proclamation of the Governor of the State of New York this day has been set aside in honor of that occasion, as Czechoslovak Day. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the proclamation of Governor Dewey naming this day for that purpose.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For more than 400 years the peoples of Bohemia—the Czechs and Slovaks—fought for their independence. It was finally achieved in 1918 under the brilliant leadership of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. Thanks to his staunchness, unflinching courage and perseverance, the Republic of Czechoslovakia, with the sympathetic encouragement of the United States of America, took its rightful place among the freedom-loving nations of the earth. The people of Czechoslovakia fully vindicated the efforts that had been made on their behalf, the sympathy extended them. Their Republic in a remarkably short time achieved a high degree of prosperity and good government.

Six dreadful years of Nazi tyranny failed to quench the spirit of the people of Czechoslovakia. Under the heel of the oppressor they continued to fight for their freedom. The defeat of the Nazis restored Czechoslovakia as a free and independent nation, a member of the United Nations.

Today in Czechoslovakia the ideals of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk are still in the hearts of the people whom he helped to set free and who are again trying to rebuild their democracy. Friday, March 7, is the anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim Friday, March 7, as Czechoslovak Day and urge all the people of New York to participate in ceremonies honoring the people of the Republic of Czechoslovakia."

George Washington and the National Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able Washington Day address delivered by the Honorable H. Paul Caemmerer, secretary, National Commission of Fine Arts.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We rejoice today in the birthday of one of the greatest benefactors of mankind, George Washington, the father of our country. Well has the poet said of him: "Art to his fame no aid hath lent; his country is his monument."

Many statues, monuments, and memorials have been erected to George Washington in all parts of the world, some of them beautiful works of art, but they stand as tributes to him. Even tomorrow a statue of George Washington, portraying him as a churchman, by the notable sculptor Lee Lawrie, will be dedicated in the Washington Cathedral.

We are indebted to George Washington for many things—for having led a patriot army to victory and independence; for having presided over the convention that gave us the Constitution; for having guided the Government through its first eight critical years; and also for having founded the city of Washington. It may be said to have been his last great gift to the people. No one appreciated this more than President Washington himself, who was most desirous that the Government should have a home of its own, and the story of the founding of the city of Washington has thus become one of the most interesting chapters in the history of the Nation.

During the period of the War of Independence and the subsequent period of the Confederation, Congress had been driven to eight different towns and cities—Philadelphia, Baltimore, Lancaster, York, Princeton, Annapolis, Trenton, and New York, part of the time pursued by the enemy, and after the war by disgruntled soldiers. The Continental Congress was seriously inconvenienced by moving from place to place. To move the records and files was burdensome, and in several of the towns where Congress met the accommodations were inadequate. The subject was discussed for 5 years while numerous cities and towns offered locations. Then the Constitutional Convention of 1787 decided on a Federal district 10 miles square. It left the question of location unsettled and the site on the banks of the Potomac was finally agreed to by compromise between Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. The residence bill became law July 16, 1790.

It is said the loftiest minds in Congress were swayed by the judgment of President Washington when it came to the exact location of the capital. He might has selected any spot 80 miles up the Potomac, from approximately Georgetown to Harpers Ferry. But he was familiar with this locality, and by the fall of 1790 this site at the head of navigation of the Potomac was chosen. The Residence Act was amended March 3, 1791, so that the Federal District would include a convenient part of the Eastern Branch and also the present Arlington County and Alexandria, Va., which was his home town. There one may still see many places associated with the life of George Washington and the founding of this Nation.

Then arose the question of design for the Federal City. President Washington chose for this work Pierre Charles L'Enfant, the artist of the American Revolution and a distinguished officer who was trained in Paris and had come to America to offer his services, like Lafayette, in 1777. L'Enfant had made application for the appointment by letter of September 11, 1789, stating that "the plan should be drawn on such a scale as to leave room for that aggrandizement and embellishment which the increase in the wealth of the Nation will permit it to pursue at any period however remote." His plan has now been the basis of development of the city for a century and a half. He submitted a preliminary sketch on March 30, 1791. On that day President Washington made his celebrated agreement with the 19 original proprietors, under which they agreed to convey without compensation to the United States Government such portions of their farms as were needed for streets and to sell such land as was needed for the Government buildings and public reservations, including parks, at £25, or about $67 per acre. The remaining land was to be laid out in 20,272 building lots, to be apportioned equally between the Federal Government and the proprietors. In this way, without advancing a dollar and at a total cost of $36,000 the Government acquired a tract of about 540 acres in the heart of the proposed city for public buildings and parks; in laying out the streets 3,606 acres were taken. And be it noted by that fee-simple conveyance of land for streets the L'Enfant plan was forever carved into the ground. The 10,136 building lots ultimately yielded $850,000 to the Government.

L'Enfant submitted a revised sketch to President Washington in June and again in August 1791. This sketch was then completed, engraved, and published with explanatory notes, as we see them on the L'Enfant plan today.

On September 8, 1791, it was decided by Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, and James Madison, then a Member of Congress, in conference with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, "to name the streets of the Federal City alphabetically one way and numerically the other from the Capitol, and that the name of the city and territory shall be the city of Washington and the Territory of Columbia." The city was divided into four sections, with the Capitol in the center, intersected by avenues.

L'Enfant's services to the Government ended officially in March 1792, due to difficulties that he encountered. Thus, 1 year after he had begun to prepare his notable plan he terminated his services. Since he had rendered outstanding service in New York City in remodeling Federal Hall in 1789 for the accommodation of the First Congress and the inauguration of President Washington, and had also assisted in fitting up the Halls of Congress in Philadelphia in 1790 it had been thought L'Enfant would also make plans for public buildings in the Federal City. But they never materialized, and, accordingly, Secretary of State Jefferson arranged for a program of competition for public buildings, the first of its kind in America. The competition, dated March 15, 1792, closed on July 15, and called for designs for the President's house and the Capitol. James Hoban, architect of Charleston, S. C., received the award for the President's house. For the Capitol 14 designs were received, none of which was accepted; they may be seen in the archives of the Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore. One architect, Stephen Hallet, was given permission to make further study of his design, and while doing so an application was received from Dr. William Thornton, of Philadelphia, an amateur architect, who had heard of the competition while on a visit to the West Indies. His design was accepted. President Washington

recognized in it "grandeur, simplicity, and convenience"; Jefferson regarded it as being "simple, noble, beautiful, excellently arranged." Elaborate preparations were then made for laying the cornerstone. President Washington was to be the principal figure in the ceremonies of laying the cornerstone of the United States Capitol, which took place on September 18, 1793. It was eloquently referred to by Secretary of State Daniel Webster, orator of the day, on July 4, 1851, at the laying of the cornerstone for enlarging the United States Capitol to its present size, when he said:

"He heads a short procession over naked fields, he crosses yonder stream on a fallen tree, he ascends to the top of this eminence, where original oaks of the forest stood as thick around as if the spot had been devoted to Druidical worship, and here he performed the appointed duty of the day."

In November 1800 the Capital was removed from Philadelphia to the city of Washington, with files and equipment and an office force that then numbered 137 clerks, in 5 departments of the Government—State, Treasury, War, Navy, Justice (then known as the Attorney General's Office); the Post Office was officially designated as a department some years later. When the final session of the Sixth Congress convened on November 21, Congress was addressed the following day by President Adams, with a special message congratulating the people and Congress on the establishment of a home for the United States Government. There were then in Washington 109 brick and 253 frame houses, sheltering a population of approximately 3,000.

The city of Washington grew slowly and haphazardly during its early years, when it was simply a new settlement along the Potomac, a new town in the woods. It was often ridiculed by visitors from abroad. The two leading structures were the Capitol and the President's house. Pennsylvania Avenue, connecting the two buildings, a mile apart, was laid out in 1796, and for years was nothing but a dirt road crossing a swamp covered with elder bushes. Thomas Jefferson, during his administration, from 1801 to 1809, manifested keen interest in the Avenue by improving it and planting on it four rows of poplar trees. At the suggestion of Jefferson, approved by President Washington, the classical style of architecture had been chosen for the first two public buildings, and this style was adhered to by President Andrew Jackson in the design for the Treasury Department (1837), the old Patent Office, and the old Post Office Department buildings. This precedent was again followed in 1850 when the plans of Thomas U. Walter, to enlarge the United States Capitol to its present size, were adopted, again in the plan of 1901.

After the passing of the generation that knew President Washington, the L'Enfant plan seems to have been quite forgotten. The neglect of the plan led to departures and errors evident in the National Capital today, notably in the placing of the Treasury Department directly in the line of Pennsylvania Avenue, which destroys an unobstructed vista from the Capitol to the White House. In 1846 Congress allowed the Virginia portion of the District of Columbia to be ceded back to that State, because the inhabitants in that area claimed they were not receiving improvements due them as residents of the District of Columbia. Since then the District of Columbia comprises 68 square miles on the Maryland side of the river.

In 1900 occurred the centennial celebration of the removal of the seat of Government from Philadelphia to Washington. December 12 was declared a legal holiday and it was a notable event. It gave impulse to a study of the entire District of Columbia on the basis of unity, good order, and elegance, which prevailed in the original plan of 1791, and resulted in the establishment of the McMillan Park Commission of 1901. That Commission revived and restored the L'Enfant plan, and adapted it to the entire District of Columbia, and then published the plans. They have been the basis of the beautiful new projects in the city of Washington these past 46 years. They were sponsored by the National Commission of Fine Arts, established by Congress in 1910, and since 1924 also by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which also plans for the harmonious development of the Metropolitan area of Washington, in cooperation with similar commissions in Maryland and Virginia.

The city of Washington is unique in that it belongs to the people of the country; it is your city and mine, and its future development is thus our responsibility. Ultimate authority rests in our representatives at the Capitol, the Congress of the United States. Many private organizations have made the city their headquarters and have erected beautiful monumental buildings, such as the Headquarters Building of the Daughters of the American Revolution. There is no more beautiful capital city than the city of Washington, combined with its possibilities of further development, and I say this after having seen fully two dozen capital cities in different parts of the world. Though right now our Municipal Government is in desperate need of help from Congress, due to the great burden placed on the city government by the war.

For preserving the history of the city of Washington we are profoundly indebted to the Columbia Historical Society, which in the past 53 years has published 47 volumes, and is at present interested in having restored the old historic home of the author of our national anthem, Francis Scott Key, in Georgetown. What a thrill it is to go into the Betsy Ross House, Philadelphia, where the first flag was made. Likewise, it would thrill us to be in the home of him who wrote the Star-Spangled Banner, as a eulogy to our flag as it waves "over the land of the free and the home of the brave!"

Much can be said of the future of our city of Washington, but time will not permit. Suffice it to say, the recent war has made of the city a world capital, to which the nations of the earth are looking for guidance, several of them for financial support, others for food and clothing. The members of our armed forces fought on 56 fighting fronts and through their valor and sacrifice made known the principles of liberty which we cherish in all parts of the world. Today the city of Washington numbers well over a million inhabitants. Thousands of visitors are here each week to see the city. Each day as many as 100,000 pass in and out of Union Station, a beautiful and monumental gateway to the city, within sight of the dome of the Capitol. They see the city from the top of the noble shaft erected to the Father of our Country, and then proceed in solemn pilgrimage to his home at Mount Vernon; those who have time, linger in old historic Alexandria.

The year 1950 will mark the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of government in the city of Washington. It will undoubtedly be made the occasion of a great celebration, similar to that in 1900, and may indeed take on international significance. When General Lafayette visited the United States in 1824, after an absence of 50 years, he was the special guest of the Nation, and on the occasion of a banquet here gave this toast: "The city of Washington, the central star of the constellation, which enlightens the whole world!" To us, who have seen the city grow and expand, doubling its size in the past 15 years, how much more meaningful that prophesy is today: The city of Washington is the heart of the Nation, the City Beautiful, commemorating the name of the immortal Washington, and spreading its pulsating influence to all parts of our country and to far distant lands in all parts of the earth.

Reorganization of the Executive Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles relating to the joint resolution which I have introduced to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, one by Phelps Adams, published in the New York Sun of January 22, 1947, and the other by Frank C. Waldrop, published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of January 22, 1947]

WOULD TRIM $7,500,000,000 FROM UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE SPENDING—BROWN-LODGE MEASURE WOULD AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STREAMLINE AGENCIES—COULD CUT INCOME TAX 40 TO 60 PERCENT

(By Phelps Adams)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—The entire executive branch of the Federal Government appeared today to be headed for a thorough overhauling which could conceivably save the American taxpayers a sum ranging from $7,500,000,000 to $11,000,000,000 a year, and which would permit a reduction of from 40 to 60 percent in individual income-tax rates.

Although the Republican leadership in Congress has not yet put its official stamp of approval upon the Brown-Lodge executive streamlining bill, enthusiasm for the measure is running so high among the Members on both sides of the Capitol that ultimate passage is regarded as a virtual certainty.

Authored by Representative CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio, and sponsored in the Senate by HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts—both Republicans—the measure simply provides for the creation of a nonpartisan joint Commission to comb every agency of the executive branch, and to report its findings at the opening session of the new Congress which will be elected in November 1948. The principal duty of the Commission would be to recommend the elimination of the governmental deadwood that has accumulated through two world wars and that has never been cleaned out. It would remain, of course, for a Congress which has not yet been elected to put these recommendations into effect.

Similar attempts to streamline the sprawling executive branch in the interests both of economy and efficiency have been made under at least three different administrations in the past quarter century without significant success, but the outstanding fault in these previous efforts has lain in the fact

that the studies in every case were made from within the executive branch itself.

NONPARTISAN TASK

The Brown-Lodge bill seeks to eliminate this fault by giving both the Congress and the public a crack at the job, and by pitching the whole attempt on a thoroughly nonpartisan plane. It provides that the study shall be conducted by a Commission of 12: Four to be appointed by the President, 2 of whom shall be from public office and 2 from private life; 4 to be named by the President pro tempore of the Senate, 2 of whom shall be from the Senate's membership and 2 from private life; and the remaining 4 to be picked by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 being House Members and the other 2 from private life. In each group of 2, not more than 1 could be chosen from each major political party, so that in the end neither the Democratic or Republican Parties would command a clear majority of the committee membership.

The most amazing thing about this bill is the fact that while it is merely one among hundreds of measures which have been dropped into the legislative hopper this session and while—as yet—it has made no legislative progress whatever toward passage it has commanded such widespread attention and interest, both in and out of the Capitol, that Washington is already speculating intently upon the probable membership of the Commission.

Publicly mentioned for posts on this agency have been such men as Justice Learned Hand of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals; ex-Senator Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin; Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal; ex-President Herbert Hoover; Bernard Baruch; C. E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Co., and Chester I. Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.

Congressional enthusiasm for the bill—in the face of previous failures in this field—has been born currently out of both circumstance and necessity.

The circumstance is that for the first time in 16 years, Congress and the Executive are controlled by opposite political parties. It is possible, therefore, for the congressional majority to deal itself an important hand in the reorganization task without stepping on the toes of its own President. At the same time it is evident that no such effort can be undertaken under these conditions without the complete cooperation of President Truman, and therefore, Congress must lay aside all thought of partisan politics as it so clearly has under the terms of Representative BROWN's bill.

The necessity for action arises from the fact that Congress has just completed the job of streamlining itself, and that, under the provisions of its new fiscal set-up, it cannot possibly hope to cope adequately with the complex budget problems within the rigid time limits that have been fixed. The four major fiscal committees of Congress, at this moment have fewer than 4 weeks in which to comb and cut the entire budget and fix an over-all ceiling on appropriations for the coming year. It is obviously impossible for the members of these committees, within this space of time to study the entire governmental structure and to determine intelligently just where economies and efficiency can be wedded, to the lasting satisfaction of the taxpayer. They must slash more or less indiscriminately, and then only where the opportunity for saving—without injury to governmental functions—is clearly apparent.

AID ECONOMY MOVE

Only through the painstaking, 2-year job of research contemplated under the Brown-Lodge bill could the hope of economy be fully realized, it is generally agreed. The tremendous fruits to be born of such an effort have already been indicated by a small-scale study of War Department activities conducted in the office of the Secretary of War and the Adjutant General by expert technicians in this field. These sample studies have indicated a prospective saving of from 20 to 30 percent in the over-all budget of the executive branch.

To understand what this means to taxpayers it is only necessary to note that the 1948 budget calls for total expenditures of $37,528,000,000. All the expenses of the legislative and judicial branches together will amount only to about $46,000,000, leaving $37,482,000,000 to defray the expenses of the executive branch, including the independent agencies, Government corporations, trust funds, etc. Should a saving of 30 percent be realized as a result of the Commission's reorganization proposals, the President's $37,500,000,000 budget would dwindle automatically to $26,250,000,000, and in the unlikely—and perhaps unwise—event that this saving should be used entirely for the relief of individual income-tax payers, the total levy upon them could be reduced by 60 percent.

Only 30 years ago—and well within the memory of many men in Washington today, there were only 160 Federal bureaus, and the total civilian pay roll numbered fewer than 450,000 names. Today—after two wars, one depression, and 16 years of the New Deal—there are 1,150 Federal bureaus and 2,300,000 persons on the Federal pay roll. The opportunity for economy, with increased efficiency, is obviously vast.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 6, 1947]

LODGE'S LOGIC

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The Army and Navy put up several thousand finger bowls and salt shakers for sale the other day as surplus. And at the same time the Army and Navy placed an order for some fresh finger bowls and salt shakers.

Does anybody rise to claim that makes sense?

It doesn't, and because it doesn't our Federal Government costs the taxpayers of the United States between seven and eleven billion dollars a year more than necessary to do the amount of work it does today.

Governmental services are now a fixed part of American life. We hire the Government to grow trees, stock rivers with fish, feed birds, deer, and bears, build roads and dams, run electric-power plants, print books on baby care, collect crop information and forecast weather, catch crooks, fight wars, print and distribute money, guard the public health, mind the stock market, enforce business competition, make general laws, and do thousands upon thousands of other things.

About the only major exception to date is that we have not yet got up the nerve to hire the Government to protect the country from overbearing union bosses, but that, too, will come.

No matter what we say about it, there is no doubt that big Government is here to stay in more or less degree. So the question is how to live with it effectively and not have it break us.

That is what all the economy talk in Congress is all about, and bills have been introduced by the dozens to bring about business-like operation of Government.

The best of these so far discovered by the writer is the one sponsored in the House by Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, and by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Republican, of Massachusetts, on the other side of the Capitol. Senator LODGE has explained their joint project as follows:

"It calls for a study by experts and Members of Congress of the reorganization of our executive branch to report back to Congress in January 1948—just as the Eighty-first Congress is beginning.

"Thus this Commission will have a full year and a half to go through the Government with a fine-tooth comb and to throw light into all the musty old corners.

"The noncongressional Members should be men of stature, like President Compton or President Conant, Justice Roberts, former Senator La Follette, or Secretary Forrestal, who has done pioneer work in introducing modern management methods into the Government. Senator AIKEN has kindly promised me an early hearing for my bill.

"Let me say that there are innumerable precedents for setting up such a Commission. Within my own memory here we have had the temporary national economic committee of 1938, composed of three Senators, three Representatives, and one expert each from the Treasury, Justice, Labor, and Commerce Departments, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Trade Commission.

"Congress has reorganized and streamlined itself. Let the same be done for the executive branch.

"This is not a job which Congress alone, working through congressional committees and using its own staffs, can do. We in Congress have not the time. Our staffs would not have the standing which the members of this Commission would have in their relation to the departments.

"I envisage full-time work for at least a year and a half. All sorts of expert knowledge would be required, possibly including the services of industrial engineers and management experts. It would take time and money.

"I am in no way minimizing the vital importance of setting up proper congressional staffs to probe for waste and extravagance and to scrutinize the budget estimates for next year. They have a vital task to perform. But they are definitely not set up to undertake the great overhauling which I have in mind."

Not another of those typical economy drives, is it? To the contrary, this is a major operation to do for the whole Government the sort of thing intended by the just-agreed-on merger of the armed forces, and the reorganization of congressional procedure.

The Lodge-Brown bill undertakes an overhaul of the executive branch on a scale beyond anything in the history of the country. Is it worth doing? Well, consider these typical examples of the way the executive runs today, as amassed by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, one of the ablest students of government in the world:

1. During the late war the departments and old-line Federal agencies expanded to 777 individual outfits. Now they are proposing not to decrease, but to increase to 820 principal agencies.

2. There were only recently 1,200 Federal offices in New York City, 1,000 in Chicago, and 500 each in Philadelphia and Los Angeles, just to signify the mushrooming and duplication of branch offices.

3. The annual pay roll of the executive branch—that's pay roll, not total expense—is $6,250,000,000, which is a billion and a half more than the total expense of the Government in 1933 for all purposes including debt service.

4. The executive branch employs more people than all the State, county, and city governments of the Nation.

And so it goes. The examples of present confusion multiply at every examination. Yet it is impossible to make a scientific cutting down at present because nobody knows what the Government is doing in all its parts.

The only way to make immediate savings is that of putting a flat ceiling on the budget just as the Republican majority is now proceeding to do. Just tell the executive branch: "This is all you get. Now whack it up the best you can and the hell with the left-over parts."

But admittedly that is a poor way to achieve efficiency. That leaves the field wide open to the smartest conniver and the slickest bureaucratic horse traders. Vital governmental services can well be lost and mere smart aleck outfits saved, because nobody knows the Government operation in full.

The Lodge-Brown Commission could find out that operation and report on it in time for the next Congress to make the right changes for long-run efficiency and economy. That is what we all want and must have if we are to preserve useful Government and not go broke supporting wasteful Government.

The Situation in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Anniston Star, of Anniston, Ala., an editorial entitled "It's Money Now or Bullets Later," a very frank discussion of the present situation in Greece. We may not agree with all the things said in the editorial, because it is quite provocative. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S MONEY NOW OR BULLETS LATER

It may be calamitous for us if there is any undue delay on the part of the United States Government in accepting the proposal of the British Government that we take over the financial responsibilities heretofore shouldered by John Bull in the defense of the Mediterranean Sea against Russian aggression. For if we fail to send our money now to bolster up the shaky ramparts of democracy in that area of the world, we probably will have to send our Army and Navy and Air Forces over there later in self-defense.

The British now are in the midst of what is probably the greatest financial crisis in their history. They were bled white by the war, and what with strikes, storms of almost unprecedented fury, empire troubles all around the world, plus governmental changes at home, they have been unable to get back into peacetime production to an extent that would enable them to restore their prewar foreign trade, upon which the United Kingdom has depended for centuries. Hence, they admit that they will be unable to keep their economic and military commitments to Greece and Turkey after March 31 of this year.

The proposal from Downing Street is said to have been presented to a bipartisan committee of the Congress at the White House last week, when a highly secret conference was held with the President, Secretary of State Marshall and Under Secretary Dean Acheson. Mr. Truman now is said to have the matter under advisement and probably will communicate his decision to Marshall before the latter leaves for the United Nations meeting in Moscow. He is said to have been assured of congressional support in whatever decision he may reach and may deal with the issue in the Texas speech he is to make after his return from Mexico.

It is contended that our acceptance of the British responsibilities in the Mediterranean would constitute a departure in our foreign-relations policy. This, however, is not wholly accurate, as it will be recalled that we sent our ships into the Mediterranean shortly after the War of 1812 to rid those waters of the Barbary-pirate infestation that had been such a menace to the shipping of Britain and France for a considerable period. And did we not recently send the battleship *Missouri* to Turkey to let Russia know that we have interests in the Middle East? Moreover, in World War II we assumed commitments that we now cannot afford to ignore.

The alternative to our intercession in Greece and Turkey would mean not only that Russian influence would become predominant in those countries, but in Italy, France, and Spain as well. Already the Communists are in control in all Balkan states other than Greece, as they are in Albania, which is working hand in hand with Yugoslavia to encompass the overthrow of the conservative government of King George. Czechoslovakia has attained some measure of independence, but is cowed by the shadow of the Russian bear, as are the Scandinavian states, which continue to be badly crippled economically as a result of the war.

Nor is that all. Germany probably will go Communist unless we act upon the recommendation of ex-President Hoover, who has just returned from there, that we feed the people and help to restore their economic productiveness. Poland, of course, is bound hand and foot to the Kremlin, and Holland is fighting for her freedom from Russian control over her far-eastern colonies, upon which she so largely depends. France and Belgium are being attacked in this same indirect way, as well as by direct political action on the home front. Even at best, the fate of France may be decided at the next general election, Communist voting strength there now amounting to 30 percent.

In the Far East it is beyond the question that Japan and Korea would fall within the Russian orbit if we should remove our occupation troops. Manchuria already is largely dominated by Russian influence, and through propaganda and armed support to the Communists in the existing civil war the Kremlin is making a bold stand for control on the Chinese mainland. Let Russia succeed there, gain control of the Dardanelles and the Suez Canal—as she would if Greece, France, Italy, and Turkey came within her orbit—and she then would have access to India by both land and sea.

The Anniston Star does not entertain any great fear of Russian penetration in the United States if we can maintain a stable economy. But we are by way of becoming encircled and forced to live within our own borders, as Russian influence also is making headway in South and Middle America. We are dependent upon practically every country in the world for our industiral and military effectiveness and if we stand by complacently and allow the Russians through their policy of aggression and expansion to come into control of the high seas and the world's natural resources, we could easily become a second-rate power, as England is about to become today.

Heretofore, we have depended upon the British Fleet to protect our interests in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. But that day is no more; we now have got to assume the world responsibilities that Britain once exercised if we are to maintain a dominant influence. For even in the Pacific, with Russia now in possession of warm-water ports in Manchuria and in China proper, with distance being in her favor, we can conceivably be outmatched if we continue to tear down the fighting forces we had during the war and sit back complacently in the belief that we are secure by reason of our possession of the atomic bomb.

But it still is not too late if we will but act with intelligence and dispatch. We are in a position similar to that of France and England when Hitler marched into the Rhineland. Germany was not then ready to fight, and her bluff could easily have been called. Russia is not able to wage a successful major war today, due to her losses in World War II and the war-weariness of her people. We, too, are crippled, but we have a greater resiliency; greater financial and productive capacity. But Russia does have greater resources and could win if we hesitate too long.

War will not be necessary, however, if we will but use the advantages we now possess in a manner that will bespeak confidence, courage, and determination not to be driven to the position in which Britain finds herself today. Our present debt is burdensome, to be sure; but it will be greater if we have to fight later on with military strength than it will if we venture our capital now in the interest of our continuing security and prosperity. We believe, therefore, we should accept the British proposition and in the meantime continue to stand up to Russia in the councils of the United Nations in the interest of an eventual peace through international collaboration.

Activities of Congress Under Republican Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 7 (legislative day of Wedresday, February 19), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there recently appeared in the columns of the press and were heard over the radio misrepresentations with relation to the activities of Congress, and particularly regarding the actions of the majority party. I am happy to say that last night in the Evening Star there appeared two columns, one by Gould Lincoln under the headline "The Political Mill," and another by David Lawrence under the headline "Democratic Recovery Laid to Decontrol," which I think are fair presentations of the existing situation. I ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL
(By Gould Lincoln)

The Republicans, during the campaign of 1946 and after they had won control of the House and Senate, made three major promises. They promised to reduce Federal expenditures, to reduce income taxes, and to pass remedial labor legislation. Because none of these things has yet been accomplished, Congress having been in session 2 months, an open season has been declared by critics of the GOP for ridicule of the Republican leadership. If these critics are to be believed, the Republicans on Capitol Hill are shot to pieces with dissension in the ranks, and none of these objectives will be attained.

That's not the way the Republican leaders regard the situation, however. And it is possible they may have a better angle than their critics. The Republicans say that they

have had to reorganize the entire machinery of Congress, to meet the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act. They point out that the pledges regarding the Federal budget and taxation are interrelated, and that until steps had been taken regarding the budget, the Ways and Means Committee could not move on the matter of tax reduction.

Notwithstanding the charges of delay, considerable has been accomplished. The House voted to fix the legislative budget at $31,500,000,000, which is $6,000,000,000 less than the President's budget. The Senate voted to fix it at $33,000,000,000, a reduction of $4,500,000,000 below the Presidential figure, and to use $2,600,000,000 as payment on the public debt, now about $260,000,000,000, if there is an excess of receipts over expenditures during the next fiscal year. The concurrent resolution fixing the legislative budget is in conference.

The real cuts, if any, in Federal appropriations will be made in the appropriation bills themselves, and the House is about to tackle the first of the regular appropriation bills, that for the Post Office and Treasury Departments. It has already slashed to pieces a deficiency appropriation measure. If this is a criterion, the House Republicans will lop hundreds of millions of dollars from the bills that are now expected to follow with considerable speed.

It would be a mistake to believe that the Republican leadership is backing away from the tasks it has set itself. In fact, Speaker MARTIN and Majority Leader HALLECK are emphatic in their predictions that expenditures and taxes both will be cut. Speaker MARTIN insists that a tax reduction bill will have been reported to the House by April 1, and perhaps passed by that time—certainly within a few days thereafter. Nor does he believe that the House will turn down a tax reduction bill—or the Senate, for that matter, although the Republican margin of control in the Senate is slim. Mr. MARTIN looks for hearings to begin before the Ways and Means Committee within a few days—perhaps even before the conferees on the legislative budget resolution make their report.

The other Republican pledge, to pass legislation amending the Federal labor laws, also is on its way to fulfillment. The Senate Committee on Labor is winding up on Saturday its hearings on the labor bills and will next week get down to the job of drafting a bill for submission to the Senate.

The House Committee on Labor is expecting to conclude its hearings by March 14, although no hard and fast date has been set. This labor legislation will not go as far as some wish it to go, but the expectation is that it will, when completed, contain many much-needed provisions.

The Republican record, therefore, in the present Congress does not appear as lame as it has been made out to be. The Republican leadership had to deal with the reorganization first. Legislation is written in committees in the first instance, and hearings were necessary.

Furthermore, when test votes have been taken in the House and Senate, the Republicans have shown remarkable cohesion. This happened in the House on the budget slash of $6,000,000,000, and in the Senate where only one Republican, MORSE, of Oregon, voted against the $4,500,000,000 cut. It happened in the House when the bill attacking the portal-to-portal pay suit was passed. It happened, too, in the House on the two-term Presidential tenure of office constitutional amendment. The bill dealing with the portal-to-portal pay suits also was part of the program pledged by the Republicans. The time is about ripe for the Republicans to go forward with their program. Speaker MARTIN is confident they will carry it through at least to the White House. He believes Congress can and will adjourn about July 4.

DEMOCRATS' RECOVERY LAID TO DECONTROL—PARTY COME-BACK, SHOWN BY POLL, OCCURRED BEFORE CONGRESS MET

(By David Lawrence)

The latest Gallup poll affords an opportunity for both Republicans and Democrats to do a bit of self-examination. For it shows that the Democrats, if the Presidential election were held today, would get 51 percent of the vote and the Republicans 49.

This shift from last November, when the percentage was 45 Democratic and 55 Republican, is somewhat of a surprise to the Republicans, but it is even more surprising when it is noted that the climb upward occurred almost entirely before the Republicans took control of Congress in January.

Thus, the Democrats had the better of it on a 55-to-45 basis in February 1946 and gradually slumped downward to the low point in November 1946 when they had 45 percent of the vote, according to the poll. Then the Democrats regained their strength almost immediately after the election and by January had reached a 50-percent figure. Only one point has been added since the Republican Congress came into being early in January.

The Democrats may see in this gain prior to January confirmation of the belief of some of their experts that the November election was a negative operation and that it was a vote against governmental controls and especially against restrictions on the sale of meat which affected every householder.

TRUMAN CORRECTED SITUATION

It will be recalled that President Truman, in the middle of the campaign, began lifting controls but didn't get them all lifted soon enough to turn the tide. He kept on removing various controls in November and December, and in this way corrected the situation that was alienating many Democratic votes.

But it is possible also to find another potent reason for the rise in Democratic strength last December. This was the time of the coal strike. President Truman handled the situation with a firm hand and filed court proceedings against John L. Lewis, a step that undoubtedly increased Mr. Truman's popularity. In fact, everything that Mr. Truman has done since the election in November has seemed to favor the conservative rather than the radical side. This may mean that his gains are from the ranks of conservatives. Certainly Mr. Truman has not been giving much comfort to the left wingers either in his policies or his appointments.

The poll is by no means an indication of what may happen in 1948, for, since the Democratic Party dropped from 55 to 45 points in the months between February and November during 1946, there can be equally wide fluctuations in the 21 months between now and the Presidential election.

If there is an economic recession, for example, it will most certainly hurt the Truman cause. This is because the record of Truman encouragement to labor unions to demand the same pay that was paid for regular workweeks plus overtime during wartime as compensation for less working hours in the postwar period, threw the whole economic system into its present imbalance.

TEACHERS' STRIKES A RESULT

"More pay for less work" is an easily understood slogan. The revolt of the teachers and other workers today who are trying to meet with their meager fixed incomes the prices forced by labor-union leaders in 1945 and 1946 is going to be recognized as one of the many effects of our economic imbalance.

The high price level can be traced directly to the impetus given wage increases immediately after VJ-day by President Truman, who urged that prices be held down while wages were increased. The recession or depression, if it comes in 1947, as so many of the economists are predicting, or even early in 1948, unquestionably will lead to a Nation-wide debate as to the responsibility for the downward trend. Undoubtedly there will be some unemployment, too.

The recession can, of course, be avoided. A substantial increase in productivity by labor and a willingness on the part of labor to help write fairness into the labor laws would do much toward creating a new spirit of enterprise in America. It is to everybody's interest to prevent an economic recession and the country is not concerned with what faction benefits politically by avoidance of an economic upset. The Democrats will derive the biggest advantage from such a contingency, but it remains to be seen whether 12 years of Democratic rule in the White House will of itself bring a demand for a change in November 1948.

Congress Kills Rent Controls and What Is Left of the Veterans' Emergency Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, Congress has seen fit to kill rent controls and what is left of the veterans' housing program. In the letter from General Fleming to Senator BRIDGES, which was included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 5, 1947, page 1691, as part of the speech of Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, we have the tragic story spelled out.

April 30 will see the end of rent controls. March 31 will see the end of the limited program we are now operating in the interests of veterans' housing.

Mr. Speaker, what are the Members in this Congress thinking of when they remove rent controls and destroy the veterans' housing program at a time when the housing shortage amounts to a national catastrophe for millions of American families? Certainly not of the people.

Senators and Congressmen can talk about a 15-percent rise in rents, but after the action they have just taken, nothing can prevent rents from rising 50 percent, 75 percent, 100 percent, or 150 percent. The final death blow has been dealt to the budget of the American family.

The unfortunate action taken by this House in the emergency deficiency bill strikes at the whole economic structure of the country. The American family's budget is already bursting at the seams. They cannot stand enormous rent increases and live on what they are making.

The action taken by Congress this week is not conducive to industrial peace, but is an open invitation to strikes.

The same people who killed OPA have killed rent controls and the veterans' housing program.

Visit by President Truman to Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the New York Times of March 5 appeared an article written by Felix Belair, Jr., covering the recent trip of President Truman to Mexico. The article is beautifully written, a wonderful piece of reporting, and since the good-neighbor policy as between this country and Mexico has now been solidified as a result of what the President did on his recent visit, I am sure Senators and the country generally will be interested in Mr. Belair's account of what took place during the President's tour.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO IS TOUCHED AS TRUMAN HONORS HER HEROES OF 1847—PRESIDENT MOVES HEARTS OF PEOPLE IN UNEXPECTED HOMAGE TO YOUTHS WHO FOUGHT UNITED STATES—ALEMÁN BESTOWS A TITLE—CALLS HIM "NEW CHAMPION OF AMERICAN SOLIDARITY"—HUGE FIESTA THRONG HAILS HIM

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

MEXICO CITY, March 4.—President Truman touched the heart strings of the Mexican people today, and before sundown had been hailed by President Miguel Alemán as "the new champion of solidarity and understanding among the American Republics."

It was a short and simple ceremony not included on the program of Presidential activities that endeared Mr. Truman to the Mexican people. He placed a wreath on the monument to the youthful heroes of the Battle of Chapultepec, and thus became the first United States citizen to pay homage at the national shrine.

In the unpredictable aftermath of the Presidential gesture, Mr. Truman was being hailed in the press and elsewhere as the most popular man in Mexico City, not excluding President Alemán. Throughout the day people shouted his name, with the inevitable "viva," wherever the United States citizens appeared on the streets or in cafes.

FANFARE IS LACKING

The scene of what seems likely to become a celebrated incident was the obscure monument to the "niños heroes," or child heroes, at the foot of Chapultepec Heights. The pause there had been added to the Presidential itinerary at the last minute as a brief stop on his way to the national stadium to witness the people's festival.

When Mr. Truman arrived with members of his party, a guard of honor was drawn up facing the monument. There was no fanfare nor playing of national anthems, such as have marked the President's appearances in and around the city. Mr. Truman placed the wreath, turned around, and walked slowly back to his waiting automobile.

Tears of emotion streamed down the faces of the honor guard composed of cadets of the Colegio Militar now housed in Chapultepec Castle and, as the President drove off, old men wiped their eyes. The incident was the more dramatic because it had taken the local press completely by surprise.

The official reception of the President's gesture in decorating the monument was expressed by Foreign Minister Jaime Torres Bodet tonight. He said:

"The highest kind of friendship between men and peoples is that which has the courage to base itself upon a feeling for the truth. President Truman, by rendering homage to the immortal glory of the boy heroes, in a gesture worthy of a gentleman and a friend, spans an abyss of the past by another bridge into the future."

HISTORIC STAND RECALLED

By nightfall, friendly citizens of the capital city were seeking out visitors from the United States to acquaint them with the story of the Niños Heroes. The explanation, which recalled the War with Mexico in 1847, also helped explain why no one from the United States until Mr. Truman had decorated the monument.

The United States forces under Winfield Scott had laid siege to the Fortress of Chapultepec after beating back the volunteer Mexican Army under Santa Ana. The fortress, too, had been hopelessly lost to the United States forces when the student cadets in their gray uniforms and tasseled blue caps entered the lost battle and, according to one United States account, "fought like tigers."

Disillusioned by their country's betrayal and ruin by their elders, the 15-year-old cadets fought until all but seven had been killed by United States gunfire. Six of these stabbed themselves rather than face the dishonor of surrender, and the last boy, after wrapping himself in the flag of his country, jumped from the precipice, shouting "Viva Mexico!"

BACKGROUND OF INCIDENT

The incident at the monument today had its background in President Truman's only major departure from his prepared text at the dinner in his honor at the National Palace last night. President Alemán had referred in his remarks to the "unfortunate and tragic" clash of the two countries at Chapultepec, and Mr. Truman also recalled the incident.

President Truman's newly acquired title of champion of inter-American solidarity and understanding was conferred by president Alemán at a luncheon in the United States Embassy for the Mexican Chief of State and his Cabinet.

At the close, Mr. Truman rose to propose a toast and said, "I can't tell you how very much the hospitality and the spontaneous approval of the people of Mexico have pleased me. This morning's exhibition was the most beautiful I have ever seen and the spontaneous way in which the people greeted the President of Mexico and myself is just beyond compare.

"I told the President yesterday that one of the reasons for my most cordial reception was the fact that I had picked the perfect host."

President Alemán's reply was translated to the luncheon host by Finance Minister Ramón Beteta as follows:

"President Alemán proposes a toast for your personal happiness, for the prosperity of your country and of your administration. He considers you the new champion of American solidarity and understanding. He feels that this trip of yours to Mexico and your attitude are going to promote a better understanding and friendship between our two countries.

"Finally, he wants you to know that all of us here in Mexico appreciate your visit and wish all possible prosperity to yourself and your great Nation."

A FRIENDLY FOUNDATION LAID

It was becoming increasingly apparent through editorial comment and other expressions of popular sentiment that President Truman's visit to Mexico already had amounted to more than a prosaic extension of "hands across the border" and that a foundation for better understanding in United States-Mexican relations was being laid.

Before his visit to the Niños Heroes monument, the President laid a wreath at the Independence Memorial, Mexico's equivalent of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Washington.

Farmer Cooperatives' Views on Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the enclosed broadcast of Arthur Gaeth and Karl D. Loos over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Tuesday, March 4, 1947, in which they presented the Farmer Cooperatives' point of view on the issue of taxation.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A representative of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives is here at the microphone with me today to reply to the charges of Fulton Lewis, Jr., against the "so-called danger from the consumer cooperatives throughout the United States." Mr. Lewis maintains they are a new special privileged group which is mushrooming into a new and highly threatening big-business monopoly by virtue of exemption from income taxes. Mr. Karl D. Loos, counsel for several farmer cooperatives, is also chairman of the legal and tax committee of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. The national council is one of a number of national organizations into which the 10,150 local and regional cooperatives representing about 4,000,000 mostly small farmers are grouped.

Mr. GAETH. Mr. Loos, why have farmers organized cooperatives?

Mr. Loos. Many small farmers, who operating alone would be helpless, get together in a cooperative to give themselves an effective bargaining power in selling the products of their farms and in obtaining their farm production supplies and equipment.

Mr. GAETH. Now, do cooperatives pay taxes?

Mr. Loos. Yes; all cooperatives pay real-estate taxes, social-security taxes, transportation taxes, communication taxes, excise taxes, personal-property taxes, and nearly all other kinds of taxes—local, State, and Federal. The only important exception is that some of them are not required to pay income taxes, although many do.

Mr. GAETH. How many cooperatives pay Federal income taxes?

Mr. Loos. There are cooperatives in many fields, other than agriculture, such as cooperative purchasing associations like the dealer-owned grocery and hardware wholesalers; and there are consumer cooperatives. All of these are subject to Federal income taxes. Of the 10,150 farmer cooperatives, only about one-half have elected to qualify for the tax exemption offered by the present income-tax law. So nearly 5,000 of the farmer cooperatives pay Federal income taxes.

Mr. GAETH. Why have the other cooperatives been exempted?

Mr. Loos. Congress has considered it in the public interest to maintain a financially stable agriculture and one of the means of accomplishing this objective was to bring about the organization of farmer cooperatives—to help farmers help themselves. The tax exemption was granted to encourage

the family-sized farms to organize cooperatively and thereby obtain for themselves a bargaining power that will enable them to cope with the distributing and manufacturing business organizations of the country.

Mr. GAETH. Does that exemption mean a loss of hundreds of millions of dollars to the Federal Treasury?

Mr. LOOS. No, indeed. It would be very little. The returns filed by the exempt farmer cooperatives show a total of only $12,000,000 in dividends paid on capital stock. At the highest prevailing corporate income tax rate, the total tax on that sum would be only $4,500,000. There are no available statistics for estimating the amount of other income that would be subject to tax if the exemption were repealed. I am sure it would be small. Mr. Homer Marsh, the research director of the National Tax Equality Association, a highly vocal antagonist of the cooperatives, is authority for the statement that the repeal of this tax exemption "would add only a drop of revenue to the Treasury."

Mr. GAETH. Is the exemption fair?

Mr. LOOS. I think it is.

It helps to overcome the disadvantageous position of the farmer in obtaining capital. Most farmers are in the debtor class; they do not normally have substantial resources in the form of free capital for investment. The tax exemption helps the farmers to overcome this difficulty of obtaining capital for their marketing and purchasing operations.

Also it simply serves to place the cooperatives on a tax equality with individual proprietorships and partnerships. Numerically most of the business units in the field of distribution, the field in which the farmer cooperatives operate, are individual proprietorships and partnerships. Their incomes pay only a single tax—by the individuals entitled to the distribution of the earnings of those business units. Similarly the incomes of cooperatives, exempt from the corporate tax, pay only a single tax—by the individuals entitled to the distribution of that income.

Mr. GAETH. Mr. Lewis has made quite an issue of patronage refunds—what are they?

Mr. LOOS. Suppose a marketing cooperative makes an assessment of 10 cents a bushel for marketing apples, and at the end of the year finds that its actual cost of marketing has been 8 cents. The difference of 2 cents is refunded to the farmer. That 2 cents is a patronage refund.

Similarly a purchasing cooperative delivers feed to its farmer patrons at $4 per hundred. At the end of the year it finds that the actual cost of the feed plus a pro rata share of operating and distributing costs was $3.90. The difference of 10 cents is refunded to the patron. The 10 cents is a patronage refund.

Mr. GAETH. Now I understand. Does the cooperative pay any income tax on these patronage refunds?

Mr. LOOS. No; it does not, even though the cooperative is not exempt.

Mr. GAETH. Why not? What's the reason for that?

Mr. LOOS. Those patronage refunds do not belong to the cooperative, they belong to the patrons. The cooperative has made a contract with the patron to refund to him the excess above cost. Therefore those patronage refunds are not income or profit to the cooperative. Money received by one person with an obligation to pay it to another is not income to the person who so receives it and who temporarily holds it. That is a well-established rule of law which applies to other corporations as well as to cooperatives.

As I understand his broadcasts, Mr. Lewis himself agrees that the cooperative should not pay a tax on those patronage refunds when they are actually paid to the patrons in cash, as many of them are. He differs with the existing rule only when the distribution of the patronage refunds is in capital stock or some other form of certificate or credit.

Mr. GAETH. How do you justify it when the patronage refunds are not paid in cash?

Mr. LOOS. The justification for this rule is based on the contracts between the cooperative and its patron. First, the agreement of the cooperative to refund to the patron the margins above cost. Second, the agreement of the patron to accept his refund, in whole or in part, in capital stock. Those agreements are expressed in marketing or operating contracts signed by the parties or they may be expressed in the by-laws which constitute a contractual obligation. So when the cooperative distributes the patronage refund by issuing shares of stock the transaction is exactly the same as though the cooperative had paid the refund in cash to the patron and the patron had put the cash back into the cooperative as an investment of capital. No corporation pays an income tax on a contribution of capital received from stockholders.

By this method a large number of small farmers, each making a small individual contribution of capital out of his income, can build up capital adequate to the needs of their cooperative.

Mr. GAETH. Is the privilege of paying patronage refunds in capital stock allowed only to cooperatives?

Mr. LOOS. No. Any corporation has the privilege of operating on a cost basis and paying refunds in this manner in capital stock or other form of certificate or credit.

One of the earliest cases of this kind involving an ordinary proprietary corporation was that of the Paducah & Illinois Railroad Co., decided by the Board of Tax Appeals in 1925 (2 BTA 1001). There several railroads combined in the ownership of a bridge company and under the operating contract any revenues which were paid by the owning lines to the bridge company, in excess of its expenses, were required to be refunded to the owning railroads in the proportion in which each of them had contributed to the revenue of the bridge company. The refund was made in the form of preferred stock of the bridge company. The Board decided that the excess revenues refunded in this manner—in capital stock—by the bridge company to its railroad patrons did not constitute income to the bridge company.

Mr. GAETH. That's interesting. In the last 2 minutes I'd like to tackle another subject.

Mr. LOOS, in his broadcasts Mr. Lewis has asserted that cooperatives are a menace to the profit motive and the free-enterprise system. Do you believe there is any truth in this assertion?

Mr. LOOS. I certainly do not. Nor does the National Association of Manufacturers which expressed itself on this subject only last October. That report said: "A cooperative is a form of business enterprise that enables a group of individuals, partnerships, or corporations, to combine together for the purpose of producing or buying or selling a commodity or service. City consumers have gotten together to buy goods and sell them. Businessmen have formed mutual fire-insurance companies. Individuals join together to buy life insurance through a mutual insurance company or merchandise through a mutual wholesale-purchasing association. People who save money put their funds in a mutual savings bank. Farmers join together to buy the goods they use in production or to sell the things they grow. (And I'm still quoting.) All these are cooperatives. They are also legitimate forms of private enterprise."

Mr. Gaeth, I have always considered the National Association of Manufacturers a thoroughly conservative group of American businessmen who at no time have ever been known to take a position opposed to the profit system or free enterprise. So, may I repeat the last sentence of the above quotation from the National Association of Manufacturers: "Cooperatives are also legitimate forms of private enterprise."

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, itself, at its recent annual convention adopted a resolution saying: "This organization vigorously expresses its deep belief in the profit motive and its free play as being a basic force which can maintain permanently a great and prosperous Nation."

Mr. GAETH. Thank you very much for presenting the cooperative point of view on the issue of taxation. Your speaking for farm groups which across the country have 4,000,000 members—largely small farmers—has indicated how vital a need is supplied by the cooperative. The farmer has always been behind the "eight ball" because he has had to sell at wholesale and buy at retail. Actually you are helping the family-operated farms to survive in a free society? And it's always been interesting to me that your movement has been democratic and away from monopoly.

The Song of the Cardinal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Song of the Cardinal," by the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey, and a statement by Dr. Clarence Poe, editor of the Progressive Farmer, one of the outstanding farm papers of the Nation, in which Senator Bailey's article recently appeared.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BAILEY'S THE SONG OF THE CARDINAL

When the cardinal's high and joyous call breaks the winter's silence in February I think of Shelley's line—"And spring shall blow her clarion o'er the dreaming earth"—and go to work on my hooks, lines, and rods, and am cheered to the heart. The winter is not over and gone, but I have token that spring is on the way, and that the pageant of color and music, of beauty and fragrance, has begun.

FEBRUARY 15–20

Already the first breath of spring is distilling perfume from delicious chalices, and one may discover a dandelion in the grass like a star breaking through clouds. The white throat trills a wistful winter song. The Japanese quince is about to flame forth, a veritable burning bush, before which one might well take off his shoes. One may catch sight of an adventurous bee. Wrens and bluebirds are calling. Frogs are piping in full chorus in the lowlands.

MARCH 1–10

Tomorrow white butterflies will be dancing upon the kindly air. There is green along the willow boughs hard by swelling streams. And now the robins come in flocks and silent, shortly to pair off and sing their love songs before the break of day and far into the dusk. The dove is sounding his wooing call through the forest. There are violets. One may hope to find the elusive arbutus on remote hillsides. The peach and pear trees blossom, and plums give forth fragrance. On the ridge and along the borders the redbud reminds us of its legendary part in the first Easter. Now crocus and lilacs, pansies, hyacinths,

jonquils, and buttercups, tulips, iris, and daffodils appear.

Suddenly the sassafras and silver maples will be tipped with old gold, and the swamp maples with scarlet. Soon the white oaks will be clad in silver and gray, and the tasseling red oaks and elms in garnet.

MARCH 20–25

The aspen also is decked in tassels. New green is on the lawn and in the pine tops, studded with gold. Winter lingers in the birches and beeches. The crabapple burgeons and blossoms and intoxicates the moist air. The mockingbird is singing. The bluebird is nesting. There are lilies in the meadow and laurel on the hillsides, and azaleas in the thickets. We hear the field sparrow's evensong of praise, as simple and true as the prayer of a little child.

MARCH 25–APRIL 10

Wistaria, woven moonlight, drapery of Fairyland, casts a magic spell in yards and gardens. The forests break out in floods of white—it is the dogwood making glad for the return of the sun. Down in the valleys there is woodbine in red, and the amorous jasmine in pure gold filling the air with poignant fragrance. Apple trees take us captive in delicate but irresistible bonds, and the cherry puts on a veil—the bride of the year. The paulonia blows 10,000 purple trumpets.

New-turned furrows apparel the land in color, and the very earth is odorous. The Negro plowboy comes over the hill at nightfall yodeling a harmony of peace and content, the original of which is lost in African centuries.

APRIL 1–15

The vireo comes, then the Carolina chickadee. In the skies swallows are racing and calling in sheer joy. We hear once more the magic flute of the wood robin. The silent kingbird is once again building his nest above the water, ever watchful of the circling fish hawk. The pewee sounds his plaintive note. The heron takes his eastward flight at dawn and into the sunset's rosy depths at dusk. Blackbirds are chattering in the rushes. The family of warblers arrives. Over the ponds purple martins are dipping. Bob White is signaling to his nesting mate that all is well, else challenging any rival to pitched battle. The bass makes a mighty stir in the shallows. The dolorous whippoorwill is calling under the April moon.

APRIL 20–MAY 1

The catbird comes with gentle song and at last the scarlet tanager with summer in his throat. The fields are sweet with clover blooms. The blackberry is out in white. The wild locust is festooned here in pure white and yonder in mauve. Honeysuckle on every roadside breathes forth sweetness and delight. The tall poplars lift aloft their golden-nectared cups. The trees are once again in full leaf. And now the roses, gorgeous and in infinite variety—and fairest of them the wild rose, sweet and fragile, an idyl in bloom.

What with these and myriads of others—worm and insect taking wing, beetle and cricket, billowy clouds and bluer skies, purple horizons, lingering sunsets, long twilights, incense-breathing morns, sunshine and shadow, blasts and breezes, showers and storms, thunders and silences, and the bow once again in the sky—what shall be said?

All is astir upon the earth, in the air above and the waters beneath. It is the pageant of awakening, of return, of revival, of procreation and creation. "Lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; and the time of singing of birds is come."

And the cardinal is prophet, harbinger, and herald thereof, appropriately clad and fittingly equipped in voice and in spirit. He foreknew it all in February, by signs familiar only to him and duly authenticated; and when others would not give voice to hope, he proclaimed it in courage and joy. The forerunner of the pageant, he will participate in all its progress. He will mate and build in his nest, rear his young and see them go their destined ways; day by day he will flash through every vista, calling and singing from morn till night; he will see the trees bring forth their fruit in season, and the corn in serried shocks beneath the harvest moon; he will see the leaves take their passing colors; he will see his feathered fellows go; he will see the roses fall and all the flowers dying, and then be last to say farewell in "his most melodious sigh."

Just after I left the old home farm to begin work on the Progressive Farmer and he and I were very young editors (his was a church paper), the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey and I worked in adjoining offices, regulating the affairs of the universe in our conversations and editorials, while for recreation we togethe: roamed fields and woods, rode horseback and fox hunted (yes, sometimes went to see the same girls), and sometimes fished on land and sea. After he turned to law I kept up horseback riding from my farm, he kept fishing—everywhere.

Not only did he keep up his fishing, but he kept up his interest in all the glorious pageantry of the seasons—especially the singing birds, opening flowers, burgeoning leaves (and returning fish) of spring. And as he heard the first notes of the cardinal or redbird each February, all the colorful and everchanging scenery of the next few weeks and months passed in magical review before him—as will appear in the accompanying article. It is an article he wrote for us years ago and I now take great pleasure in reprinting it as a tribute to his memory and to many a pleasant recollection of other days.

Incidentally, we may note that in this article Senator Bailey mentions by name 23 birds and 45 trees, shrubs, and flowers; why not count up and see how many of these 68 you recognize by sight or sound? And almost I am tempted to add, "Isn't it a pity that a man who could write like this decided to give up writing for the United States Senate?"—Clarence Poe, president and editor.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our Foreign Policy," by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, formerly a Representative from Indiana. This address was broadcast on a coast-to-coast network of the American Broadcasting Co. system on March 9, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Since the start of these broadcasts I have not discussed our foreign policy.

Like many others, I had hoped that those in charge of it might achieve results worthy of our immense sacrifice.

Recent events, however, are so disturbing that one feels justified in bringing before the bar of common judgment and decision some facts long neglected, and others that have been hidden behind our own iron curtain of official censorship.

Conditions in Germany, as revealed by former President Hoover have hit us with tremendous impact, and President Truman deserves credit for sending Mr. Hoover to Germany to bring back the story.

Add to that Russia's refusal to cooperate in outlawing the atom bomb, and the statement by the Under Secretary of State Acheson on February 10: "I am quite aware of the fact that Russia's foreign policy is an aggressive and expanding one."

Add also the request to us by the British Empire to lift the white man's burden from her tired shoulders. The meaning of this action is of staggering importance.

It may mean that something is happening in world history more momentous than anything since the Battle of Waterloo and the Declaration of Independence.

The "hush-hush" and "papa knows best" policy has had a fair trial. Let our people now debate and decide their destiny in the light of facts disclosed, and many more yet unrevealed.

In saying this, I recall that former Secretary of State Cordell Hull said that it is for the people themselves to determine the foreign policy of the United States.

That colossal blunders have been made is becoming all too plain. As one example, in many, it has been estimated that American taxpayers have paid at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a year for the privilege of keeping the Germans and Japanese from going to work.

This point is illustrated by ex-President Hoover's report:

"The fishing grounds in the Baltic and North Sea are being limited against German fishing. As there are ample supplies of fish in these seas, it seems a pity that British and American taxpayers are called upon to furnish food in substitution for fish the Germans could catch for themselves."

This limitation is imposed by Russia.

As another illustration of official blundering, I give you the following:

The American Mercury magazine tells us how UNRRA bolstered Tito.

The article, supported by facts and figures, is by an ex-State Department economist who was in on the ground at Belgrade. Everyone should read it.

The author says: "There can be no doubt that the whole of the Yugoslav army and air force were maintained on our supplies."

We built "twelve completely equipped and up-to-date radio stations."

We furnished 12,000 trucks (diverted in large part, to Tito's army), tractors, and enough food to supply each Yugoslav with 150 pounds of food a year.

At least $400,000,000 worth of UNRRA supplies have gone to build up Tito.

In money, this equals "three full years of Yugoslav national income!"

Most of this was handled by Russian Communist administrators, and a large part of it was sold by Tito to his starving people and the proceeds used to equip his Communist army.

Such are some of the fruits of this "papa-knows-best" conduct of our foreign affairs.

After Hitler broke with Stalin, we began to build up Russian communism as a "democracy," although it was, and is, "a dictatorship as absolute as any dictatorship in the world," as Mr. Roosevelt correctly said in 1940.

Having praised Finland as an honorable people, devoted to "free political institutions," we severed diplomatic relations with her.

We then became not only a witness of, but actually defended, the fifth partition of Poland, an ally—the most shameful act in our history. Power politics.

We agreed to turn Chinese territory over to Russia without even consulting China. Power politics.

To the task of drawing up the United Nations Charter at San Francisco, no invitation was sent to Switzerland, an honorable republic which was chosen as the seat of the League of Nations 20 years ago.

We did not invite Ireland, nor Finland, nor Portugal, nor Sweden nor Spain.

Power politics once more.

The idea seems to be that we recognize as "peace loving" nations only those who go to war, and as "disturbers of the peace," all countries that stay at peace!

Such is the intellectual dishonesty with which we have undertaken to solve the problems of a sick world.

Making full allowance for imperative military necessity, the end result is that we abandoned the principles for which we fought.

The terrible dilemma we face today is due in large part to this fact that we sacrificed American ideals on the altar of power politics.

For a century and a half, our foreign policy was to be friends to those in other lands who struggled to be free, and not get into bed with despots or dictators.

It has been said that every Nation begins to die when it abandons the principles which gave it life.

We fought the war of 1776 for American liberty; we fought the war of 1812 for the freedom of the seas; we fought the Civil War to preserve the Union and to free our slaves; we fought the Spanish American War to free Cuba from the Spanish yoke; we fought World War I "to make the world safe for democracy," by which we meant the right of all men to choose their own form of government.

When the Constitution was written in 1787, Mr. Gouverneur Morris, a member of the Convention, said: "The whole future of the human race will be affected by the proceedings of this Convention."

Never was human prophecy better justified by the passage of time.

Nation after nation modeled their form of government upon our great charter of freedom, which drew its breath from the noble words in our Declaration of Independence.

The most recent of these is Turkey.

It has been estimated that 400 constitutions in our own States, in the provinces of Canada, and in foreign lands were modeled upon our Constitution.

Jefferson, our first Secretary of State said: "The ball of liberty is now so well in motion that it will roll around the world. * * * The holy fire is confided to us by the world, and its sparks will rekindle it in other quarters of the globe."

Such was our dream, such was our hope, and such was our policy.

We welcomed the French Revolution, even as we regretted its horrors.

When the countries of Latin-America won their independence under Simón Bolivar and San Martin, we put the weight of American arms behind them in the Monroe Doctrine, which said they were no longer to be considered as subjects for future European colonization.

We bought Florida, the Louisiana Territory, Alaska, and the Philippines from despotic governments and made them the homes of free men.

We were the friends of Irish freedom.

Our sympathy went to the Boers in South Africa in 1899.

We stamped the word "liberty" on every coin struck from the American mint.

Upon America's most sacred relic, the bell in Independence Hall, we inscribed the words: "Proclaim Liberty Throughout All the Land Unto All the Inhabitants Thereof."

Such was our policy until recent years. It was the policy of freedom. It was not the policy of power.

We made no truck with despots anywhere, although we did not consider it our business to shed American blood in order to settle their domestic affairs.

My friends, we have been on a long detour from the course that made America great at home and loved abroad.

Generous as we are—sometimes to a fault—the time has come to aid only those governments that are friendly to American ideals of liberty.

We should befriend our friends and not aid our open or potential foes.

In following the distorted meaning of the word "security," individual security, pressure bloc security, and world security, we have lost the true significance of those ideals of liberty which have given Americans and people with like governments more actual security than the world has ever known.

In my judgment, nothing could safeguard our own national security more than to again deserve and have the friendship of every friend of liberty throughout the world.

Let me illustrate that thought.

I have mentioned the waste of American treasure in aiding Yugoslavia, whose Tito is a communist stooge, who murdered our airmen on peaceful missions.

On the other hand, there is the Turkish Republic whose recent history is too little known here. Turkey's great statesman, Ataturk, a profound student of Washington, Jefferson, and the other architects of our young Republic, and his elected successor, Inonu, remodeled an Oriental despotism into a modern nation dedicated to American ideals of freedom.

Turkey is the only country which, since World War I, has bucked the world tide toward totalitarian tyranny and risen to freedom.

Modern Turkey in the most reactionary area of the world today remains an island of freedom in a sea of slavery. It has no censorship of press or radio. It has adopted the Roman alphabet. It has the two-party system with universal suffrage. It has emancipated its women, elected them to parliament, and given them an honored place in the professions.

It defends private property and encourages work, thrift, and investment.

In the last 25 years it has quadrupled its tools of production and transport.

It is a free society and, to make her wonder more complete, it has a balanced budget.

We might follow her example to our profit.

When the history of this war is written, Turkey's notable contribution to its winning will be known.

Cooperation with Turkey in building up her trade and commerce, rather than cooperating with men like Tito of Yugoslavia, would apply our traditional policy of friendship to those who want to be free. Her hand and heart are offered to us in friendship.

We may need the friendship of freemen in the days to come.

The choice today is big with destiny. It is the policy of freedom, or the policy of power.

As against the latter, we recall the words:

"For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard,
Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord!"

Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and constructive statement made by Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington correspondent for the National Grange Monthly, with reference to the situation in regard to public education.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Fred Brenckman, Washington correspondent for the National Grange Monthly)

From all sections of the country come almost daily reminders that the public schools are in the midst of a crisis that is without parallel since the close of World War I, 28 years ago, when somewhat similar conditions prevailed.

Since Pearl Harbor, roughly a third of a million teachers have walked out of the school rooms of America, many of them with the firm determination to permanently forsake teaching as a means of earning a livelihood. So great is the scarcity of competent teachers that approximately 100,000 schools are now being taught by instructors with emergency permits who cannot meet regular certification requirements. The morale of the members of the profession is at low ebb. A large proportion of those who remain in the schoolroom do so in the hope that remedial action will soon be forthcoming.

LOW SALARIES TO BLAME

The chief difficulty is that the cost of living has risen out of all proportion to the salaries received by teachers, and they are finding it increasingly difficult to make both ends meet. Financial rewards in the teaching profession have always been low in comparison to the earnings of those in other walks of life when it is remembered that in order to qualify for a teacher's certificate the applicant must spend years in preparation, besides investing a considerable amount of money.

It is plain that if the children attending the public schools are to be taught by competent instructors, the salaries of teachers will have to be raised.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the cost of living as of November 15, 1946, was 51.7 percent higher than the average from 1935 to 1939, both inclusive. While salaries of teachers have been increased to some extent, these increases have fallen far short of keeping pace with the higher cost of living.

A FEW COMPARISONS

During the school year of 1942–43 total expenditures for elementary and secondary education, which includes the grade schools as well as the high schools, in the United States amounted to $2,107,899,000. During that same school year, taking the country as a whole, 2.14 percent of the total income of the people was spent on the public schools.

By way of comparison, the figures of the Department of Commerce show that during 1945 the people of the United States spent $3,000,000,000 for tobacco in its various forms, together with $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages, making a total of $10,770,000,000 for these two items. That was more than five times as much as was spent on the public schools during the school year of 1942–43. Moreover, last year cosmetics and toilet articles cost $875,000,000, while the beauty shops of the country did a business of $1,000,000,000 in round figures.

Our public-school system, which in the older sections of the Nation has been in successful operation for more than a century, is at once the pride of our people and one of the strongest bulwarks of our free institutions of government. Ways and means can be found of giving all the children that which is their birthright, a good common-school education, without working undue hardship on anyone or without asking the teachers to make financial sacrifices to achieve the desired goal.

DISTRIBUTING EDUCATIONAL COSTS

It is true that there are many school districts, particularly in the more sparsely settled sections of the country and those having a relatively small amount of taxable wealth, that could not reasonably be expected to contribute more than they do now to the cause of education. The remedy for this condition lies in more liberal appropriations for schools on the part of the State governments and distributing these funds in a manner calculated to equalize educational opportunity throughout the entire State. In many States this equalizing principle has long been in effect and it has worked satisfactorily. What is needed under present conditions is an expansion of this plan. All but 15 States have a county tax for schools that is intended primarily to equalize educational opportunity within the county.

The percentage of school funds appropriated by the State governments varies widely throughout the country. Delaware contributes the highest percentage, 91.7, leaving only 8.3 percent to be raised locally. In Nebraska the State government contributes only 1 percent, which means that the other 99 percent must be raised by local taxation. Generally speaking, the State governments of the South lead those of other sections of the country in the proportion of school revenues raised on a State-wide basis. In Alabama the percentage is 68; Arkansas, 54; Georgia, 56; Louisiana, 58; Mississippi, 47; North Carolina, 63. As a rule, higher State appropriations are usually accompanied by a greater measure of State control, thereby proportionately lessening local initiative and control in school affairs

The New England States, which have traditionally been strongly in favor of home rule in local affairs depend mostly on local taxation for school purposes. In Maine the State government contributes 21 percent of the cost of the schools. In New Hampshire the percentage is 7.3; Masachusetts, 8.7; Connecticut, 5.9; Rhode Island, 5.4, and Vermont, 13.5.

In Pennsylvania, State appropriations account for 32 percent of the total school revenues. In New York the percentage is the same; Ohio, 44 percent; Illinois, 10.2; Iowa, 19.4; Kansas, 28; Wisconsin, 15. Going to the Pacific coast, the State government of Washington raises 73 percent of the money spent on schools; Oregon, 32, and California, 47 percent.

FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

For many years certain groups have persistently advocated that in order to further equalize educational opportunity throughout the country the Federal Government should make large appropriations for the public schools. Those who have opposed such a course have taken the position that each State is itself a large enough unit to make possible the application of the principle of equalized educational opportunity.

They have expressed fears that Federal appropriations for the common schools might result in Federal control of education and thus destroy local control and initiative in school affairs.

The committee on education at the recent annual convention of the National Grange, which was headed by State Master E. Carroll Bean, of Maine, had this to say on the subject:

GRANGE STATES ITS POSITION

"Your committee does not believe that the remedy for our present difficulties in the field of education is to be found in securing Federal appropriations for the support of the public schools. Our best hope of preserving American democracy lies in preserving the independence and sovereignty of the States. If the States want to remain sovereign and independent, they must perform the functions which naturally fall within their sphere. Education is one of those functions.

"The Grange has always stood for local and State control of our public schools, because in that direction only lies the path of true progress in educational affairs. In the long run, Federal appropriations for the public schools and Federal control would go hand in hand.

"Because we are against bureaucracy and all the evils that go with it, and because we are opposed to Federal control of education and in favor of continued State and local control of our public school system, we must oppose Federal appropriations for elementary and secondary education, except the already existing vocational educational program."

This report was adopted by the convention after full debate on the floor. The committee report made it plain that the Grange is in favor of taking proper steps to meet the emergency which now confronts our public schools. It was pointed out by the committee that with most of the State legislatures scheduled to meet this year, action should be taken to do justice to the teachers, who were classed as being among the most worthy of our public servants.

CALIFORNIA TAKES LEAD

California has taken the lead among the States in making provisions for more adequate salaries for teachers. At the election of last November the voters overwhelmingly approved an amendment to the State constitution making the minimum salary of all regular teachers $2,400 a year. This will add $45,000,000 to the $93,000,000 that the State now appropriates for schools.

In 1940 the average salary of all teachers in the United States was $1,441. It is estimated that the average as of today is about $2,000 a year. As a rule, teachers in the rural districts are paid only half as much as is received by those in cities. Because experienced rural teachers can get higher salaries by going to neighboring towns and cities, the rate of turn-over in the rural schools has been disconcertingly high.

Georgia has recently granted a 50-percent increase in its salary schedule for teachers. This has brought numerous native Georgians back home to teach. Teaching salaries in Texas have been advanced from 25 to 30 percent within the last 3 years but have not kept pace with the cost of living nor with the rise in wages and salaries paid in other walks of life.

To overcome the shortage of qualified teachers which promises to endure for years because of the falling off of enrollments in teachers' colleges, the legislature of Florida is appropriating $400,000 a year for scholarships to 1,000 selected high-school graduates. It is reported that this program has greatly increased enrollment in teacher-training institutions.

Reports from Minnesota indicate that the salaries of rural teachers in that State have practically doubled during the past 5 years. Before the war the average salary was about $75 per month. Now it is $150.

The examples that have been cited show that the States can handle the existing crisis in education where there is a will to do so. Before the final gavel falls in the legislatures that are now in session it is to be hoped that further effective steps will be taken to cope with the situation, thus vindicating the right of the States to be considered as going concerns in the American system of government.

RAISING THE MONEY

Judging from present appearances, it will do the teachers little good to appeal to the Federal Government for help toward increasing their salaries. The national debt is now approximately $265,000,000,000, which is the most colossal debt ever accumulated by any nation in the world. We have a new Congress that is pledged to balance the budget for the first time in 16 years, besides reducing income taxes. If these pledges are to be redeemed it stands to reason that the Federal Government cannot assume any new financial responsibility of the magnitude which is here involved.

On the other hand, the fiscal affairs of most of the States are in good condition. It is to the State governments that the teachers must turn for a solution of their salary problems.

In the meantime, America cannot safely allow any further deterioration in its school system. As James A. Garfield so aptly expressed it:

"A republic without intelligence, even a high degree of intelligence, is a paradox and an impossibility. We must educate or perish."

Color Streamers of Confederate Regiments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Chance for Congress To Make a Graceful Gesture," from this morning's Baltimore Sun. It has to do with the carrying of battle streamers on the colors of regiments.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHANCE FOR CONGRESS TO MAKE A GRACEFUL GESTURE

Senator TYDINGS has reintroduced in the Senate a bill which would permit existing regiments which fought in the Confederate Army during the Civil War to carry with their colors streamers indicating the battles in which they were engaged. That privilege is now reserved for regiments which fought on the Union side.

It has been 82 years, short of a few weeks, since Lee's surrender at Appomattox. In the intervening period men whose fathers or grandfathers wore the gray have served loyally in three wars under the Stars and Stripes. That record should remove any incongruity in carrying with the colors battle streamers indicative of service against, rather than in defense of, the flag.

Of all the various units of which our Army is composed, the regiment thus far has displayed the greatest gift for survival. There were divisions in the Civil War organization, but they lost their identity when it ended. The divisions we know by name today were creations of World War I and World War II. Brigades and corps have had no continuity. On the other hand, there are a few regiments, including our own One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Infantry Regiment of the Eightieth Division, which trace their lineage all the way back to the American Revolution. Battle streamers are, in fact, nothing more than the visible evidence of a regiment's history. When they are not authorized for battles in which a regiment was engaged, the history of the regiment is incomplete.

The underlying purpose of Senator TYDINGS' bill is, of course, not to revive sectional animosities but to build morale by reminding members of a regiment of the deeds performed by the men who served before them. But should any flickering animosity be left, a graceful gesture by Congress would do

much to relieve it. The occasions on which Northern States have returned captured flags to the South have done more to heal wounds than any amount of pious admonitions. Passage of the Tydings bill should have the same effect.

Taxation of Cooperative Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tax Those Giant Co-ops," which appeared in the Arkansas Democrat of February 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX THOSE GIANT CO-OPS

Congress has taken action toward continuing about one and one-half billion dollars of excise taxes which were due to expire June 30. These excises are really Federal sales taxes at a high rate on a wide variety of things. It is argued that the Government must have this revenue so income taxes can be reduced.

If the Government is hard-pressed for revenue, why doesn't Congress plug a huge leak in Federal collections, which Congress itself created by exempting giant cooperative organizations from the income taxes levied on corporations?

The idea in exempting cooperatives from the income tax was that they were service organizations, chiefly for farmers, which actually have no profits to tax. They are supposed to pay their net earnings to members in patronage dividends.

That would be O. K.—few would object to it—if the tax exemption were confined to small, sure-enough cooperatives, which perform a service for farmers not available to them before.

The income tax could well enough be forgiven on a cooperative, which, let us say, is formed by a group of farmers to provide a cannery, or a cheese or butter factory, in a neighborhood lacking such facilities. Their enterprise might logically be thus favored, for the plant would develop new income and employment, from which there would be wide gains.

But when a giant cooperative, with profits running into millions of dollars a year, is excused from the corporation income tax, that's a horse of another color. These cooperatives compete with private business, take away much of their patronage—and often a great deal of their profits is not returned to their members. It is plowed into expansions—used to build greater competition for private business.

And just recently, there was an example of how these enormous cooperatives can operate against the public interest. One of them, the Dairymen's League, in New York State, with 26,000 dairying members, was charged with spending a big sum to manipulate the price of butter upward, as a basis for keeping milk prices higher. There is an ugly name for that sort of thing when a corporation does it.

Many giant cooperatives exist. They have branched into manufacturing, banking, insurance, and practically all business lines. Exempting them from the corporation income tax is all wrong. It is leading some corporations to change to cooperatives, to escape the tax.

That means more of the Federal taxes for other businesses and individuals to pay. Congress should redraft the tax laws, to exempt only real cooperatives, which perform some necessary service—and then only when they are small. Big business of any kind should pay a fair share of the taxes.

Permanent Secretariat

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, March 15, I told the House at some length that I thought it was vitally important for us to have a permanent secretariat, a secretary of Cabinet meetings; someone to sit in and take minutes of the Cabinet meetings and of meetings of the Army and the Navy. I am delighted that one of the first things General Marshall did was to appoint a permanent secretariat of the State Department, to take down minutes of all meetings of the State Department, the War Department, and the Navy Department. I am also very glad that the President has appointed Mr. Clark Clifford as his secretariat of the Cabinet meetings. I am not sure that legislation will be necessary to have that a continuing thing but I believe it may be. I am delighted that both the President and the departments have seen fit to follow the English custom, that has worked very successfully since 1916. That custom has been very helpful in protecting the British Empire. The custom should prove very valuable in protecting America. Last year I said on March 15 in the Congress the following:

SECRETARIAT FOR THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am preparing for introduction in the House a bill that would set up a secretariat for the United States, very much like the secretariat which the British Government at the present time enjoys.

When I think of the fact that there is no record of the Yalta agreement, except that which possibly is in President Roosevelt's papers, and when there is no record for history of many important meetings, it seems to me something like this should be done. In Lincoln's time the only way any information was secured as to what went on in the Cabinet meetings was taken from notes made by one of the members there.

The United States ought to have a record of its Cabinet meetings. We ought to have a record of our foreign agreements. If our President makes commitments for us with foreign nations, we should know and history should know what those commitments are.

In 1916 the British instituted a secretariat, and that secretariat has functioned with great success. At international conferences such as that at Yalta and elsewhere, one or more or all of the British Government's secretariat were present, while apparently our only record is in the late President Roosevelt's papers. The secretariat sits in and takes minutes of all cabinet meetings so there is a permanent and vital record kept of all of Britain's procedure and progress during the most critical days in her history. The record is kept for the present and for all time.

The British secretariat consists of a permanent secretary and secretary of war cabinet and his private secretaries, a military secretary of the war cabinet and his private secretaries; thus under secretaries—senior, assistant, and military—are responsible for the taking of minutes and their preservation. There is an historical section, and in that is the military historian of the war.

The British secretariat can well be copied in this country. It is time the United States woke up to the fact that this vital information is not available to us, and that important records have never been kept for the present and future use of America. It is time the Congress acted.

It is vital for the protection of the country that some such thing be done. If we do not have such a record, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there is great danger of our being in another war whether we want it or not. It is along the line of being able to give to the United States information as to our foreign commitments, as to what is going on in foreign countries today. I remember very well when the so-called neutrality legislation was before our Foreign Affairs Committee, if information was given to the Foreign Affairs Committee and public at that time as to conditions in Germany, as to conditions in Japan, the Congress would not have passed so-called neutrality legislation. I voted against that legislation because I was convinced from my observations and information I had received from people I knew in the State Department and elsewhere that a very unwholesome condition existed in Germany, that Germany was arming as fast as she could, and that Japan was preparing as fast as she could to attack us. Had that information been made public officially, in my opinion, we would not have become involved in war because this country, too, would have prepared—there would have been no World War. With a strong and informed United States, Germany would not have dared to start another world war. Wake up, America, and ask for the record and the facts. Demand a secretariat.

[From the Washington Post of March 9, 1947]

A GOVERNMENT OVERHAUL BEGINS

(By Joseph Alsop)

A significant but little-noticed event occurred in the Senate last week. Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, delivered a well-weighed and carefully thought out speech urging early congressional action to rebuild the Government from top to bottom.

He admitted the gross inefficiency and confusion of the present structure. What is even more important, he admitted the almost total ignorance now prevailing as to the Government's real problems of organization, personnel recruitment, coordination, and administration. And he asked for early approval of the parallel bills offered by himself and Representative CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio, setting up a special commission to ascertain all the facts and propose a complete overhauling of the Government, in structure and in detail.

It showed the way the wind is blowing that such highly divergent Members of the Senate as ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, and CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, joined in approving what LODGE had to say. The truth is that Congress, committed to budget cutting, is gradually awakening to its almost total ignorance of the governmental facts of life. The budget cutters are like blind men

pruning a jungle. There seems to be a good chance, therefore, that the more realistic, long-range approach of LODGE and BROWN will be adopted at this session.

NEW LIAISON MAN

Equally important is the evidence that interest in the governmental facts of life is also growing at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, within the administration. It was extremely significant, for example, that one of George C. Marshall's first acts in his new office was to agree to the appointment of a permanent secretary, who would attend and record the weekly meetings of the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy. This has an interesting background.

The Federal Government is now totally lacking any machinery to coordinate the making and administration of policy by all its many parts, except the person of the President himself. The need for such machinery was first pointed out in a confidential report which the Joint Chiefs of Staff were bold enough to prepare last spring.

During the war, all the chiefs of the American Military Establishment, including General Marshall, had been rather enviously impressed by the British Government's unity of action and purpose. At the suggestion of Navy Secretary Forrestal, the Joint Chiefs, therefore, explored ways and means to achieve the same unity of action and purpose here. They came out with the recommendation that a cabinet or executive secretariat broadly on the British model should be established without delay.

The duties of this secretariat were to be coordination of the whole process of policy-making and administration, from securing studies of a new problem by all the interested governmental parties, through securing approval of an agreed policy on the highest levels, and down to insuring parallel execution of the agreed policy by all agencies concerned. This was to be done, very naturally, under the direct control of the President. It was, in fact, to be a much-needed elaboration of his functions.

BYRNES WAS COOL

The joint chiefs' memorandum got no attention at the time, one reason being Secretary of State Byrnes' doubt as to its value. But Byrnes has now been replaced by one of the originators of the memorandum, and Marshall has already acted to put a part of the memorandum's recommendations into effect.

The weekly meeting of the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy is intended to coordinate foreign and national defense policy. It only lacked a secretariat to meet the whole requirement in this field. It is now to have a secretariat. Presumably, at the same time, steps will be taken to relate this new secretariat to the State-War-Navy coordinating committee, which has the same purpose but is on a lower level.

At the White House, also, progress is being made. The President's legal counsel, Clark Clifford, has informally been given the functions of secretary of the Cabinet. For many reasons, the title has not been accorded to him. Yet in view of the President's increasing habit of using his Cabinet as a genuine operative board of directors of the Government, the fact that Clifford has the functions of secretary of the Cabinet is more significant than his lack of the title. In short, the over-all Executive or Cabinet secretariat which the joint chiefs originally recommended is both growing down from the White House and up from the departments.

NEW YORK PATTERN

There is an enormous job still to do. Part of it is the job indicated by Senator LODGE. No secretariat, no matter how efficient, can truly and fully coordinate the efforts of a government so insanely complex that 29 agencies lend Government funds, 34 buy land, 12 engage in home and community planning, 10 are interested in forestry, and so on.

All reorganization bills of the past have been farces. There must now be honest root and branch reorganization, as complete and ruthless as the brilliant job Alfred E. Smith and Robert Moses did in New York State.

Equally, reorganization and coordination of the Government will be useless until the problem of Government personnel has been solved. A $37,000,000,000 enterprise largely run by clerks is the height of folly and bad economy. But it is at least encouraging that realistic consideration is at last being given to the governmental problem in both interested branches.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

President Truman's Baylor Speech and the Proposed International Trade Organization.

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after making a study and careful analysis of President Truman's Baylor University speech, and a study and careful analysis of the proposed charter for the International Trade Organization, to be adopted at the forthcoming Trade Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, I am forced to conclude that President Truman either has not read the proposed charter of the ITO, and therefore does not know what its provisions are, or he deliberately misrepresented its provisions and objectives in his Baylor University speech. The thesis of the President's speech is absolutely incompatible with, and directly contrary to, the provisions of the proposed ITO charter. The President said that the ITO will protect freedom of enterprise. Quite the contrary, it will destroy freedom of enterprise. The President said:

> The pattern of trade that is least conducive to freedom of enterprise is one in which decisions are made by governments. Under such a system the quantity of purchases and sales, the sources of imports, and the destination of exports are dictated by public officials. In some cases trade may be conducted by the state. In others part or all of it may be left in private hands. But, even so, the trader is not free. Governments make all the important choices, and he adjusts himself to them as best he can.

The program described in those words by the President, which he says is least conducive to freedom of enterprise, is exactly the program that is proposed in the ITO; but an international authority, the ITO, would be given the power to control and regulate world trade instead of the individual governments. If a world economy is planned by an international authority invested with governmental powers, then national economies will have to be planned to conform to the world economy. It cannot work in any other way. So we are simply transferring the planning authority from a national plane to an international plane. National planning does not force world planning; but world planning does force national planning, and therefore does away with freedom of enterprise.

The power to produce, to create surpluses for export, inherent in America's free-enterprise system, is both the envy of the world and the dread of the world, in peacetime. However, in times of war, such as World War I and World War II, America's power to produce becomes the salvation of the world. This was demonstrated in both World Wars.

Mr. Speaker, Will Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, in giving his blessing and O. K. to the proposed ITO, said:

> If the markets of the world are opened more freely to the products of various countries, certain groups in every country, including the United States, may have to work harder, compete more intensively, and perhaps for a while accept smaller profits. But this is, after all, the American way.

What Will Clayton really said, when stated bluntly, is: A planned world economy, administered by an international authority under the UN, will bring about world competition between unequal standards of living; it will mean that we will have to accept a lower standard of living in America in order that other peoples may be able to raise their standards of living. This is an application of New Deal economy on a world scale—a redistribution of the world's wealth in favor of the underprivileged nations, a plan to impose upon the trade of the world a collectivist system. American voters repudiated the New Deal economy for America. Must they—the American farmer, the American laboring man, the American businessman—now accept a program of New Deal economy on a world scale and have their standards of living lowered to fit such a world economy?

The program, outlined in the proposed ITO, to socialize the wealth of the world, is based upon the theory that poverty anywhere in the world endangers prosperity anywhere in the world; therefore prosperity, wherever it may exist, must be shared. Since American prosperity is the only prosperity in the world today, it follows that American prosperity is to be shared and distributed. The price we must pay, if we agree to this international share-the-wealth program, is a lowered standard of living for our people. Do we want to pay the price?

Mr. Speaker, Communist economic doctrine is summed up in the well-known phrase, "from each person according to his ability; to each person according to his needs." It is a high-sounding, Christianlike phrase, a beautiful goal that can only be reached in some future

idealistic, make-believe world. Communism in theory is heaven on earth; communism in practice is hell on earth.

Now comes the proposed ITO and adopts the same well-known Communist economic doctrine but expresses it in a new international phrase, "from each nation according to its ability; to each nation according to its needs."

"Well, what is wrong with that?" you ask.

Our answer is that we did just that during the war—even before we entered the war— in our dealings with our allies. The result was that we shared with our allies our resources, our products, our food, in the amount of over $100,000,000,000; and while doing so mortgaged Uncle Sam to the tune of $280,000,000,000—a greater national debt than the total national debts of all the other countries of the world put together. Shall we now in peacetime continue to hand out to all nations according to their needs, and load upon the backs of our taxpayers additional world burdens? This, in substance, is what President Truman proposes to do. It is the exact program, the purpose, and the objective of the International Trade Organization that President Truman urges us to enter, to become a part of. He says, "The negotiations at Geneva must not fail." I say the negotiations at Geneva must not succeed if the future of America is to be considered and protected.

Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Is Making a Crucial Decision on Russia," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of yesterday. I think the article will be found to be interesting reading by Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES IS MAKING A CRUCIAL DECISION ON RUSSIA—STRONGER STAND IS INDICATED AS RESULT OF IMPORTANT DEVELOPMENTS ABROAD

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—It is always prudent to assume in Washington that things are never so good or so bad as they seem. In general, this goes for the current state of United States-Soviet-British relations over the atomic bomb and Greece.

The situation in Greece was certainly not so good as Congress assumed during the last 5 weeks when it was preoccupied with David E. Lilienthal and the budget. Nor was the condition of Britain so good as the United States assumed when it passed the British loan with the notion that it would fix everything up, and then insisted that Britain pay half the enormous cost of occupying the dual zone in Germany.

CHANGING RELATIONS

But just because the Russians have rejected the United States atomic-bomb plan and the British have told Washington somewhat abruptly that they are going to cut their losses in Greece, it does not follow that the British are through and the Communists are about to take over the Mediterranean and the Empire.

What is happening is what, since the end of the war in Europe, many persons have been predicting and observing and proposing that we deal with. British power is declining, and the United States and Soviet Governments, which do not trust each other as much as they proclaim, are maneuvering to prevent each other from taking over when the British leave.

This is a slow and natural enough process. In the opinion of the less-breathless observers in the capital, it can be dealt with effectively, even by governments inexperienced in world affairs, if the problem is carefully analyzed and adequate measures are taken without fear of provocation.

QUALIFYING FACTORS

To analyze the situation accurately, these observers feel that certain facts must be acknowledged:

First, that the British economic crisis is real. Britain is not just trying to unload her burdens on us. She has to choose between cutting her overseas commitments and cutting the standard of living at home even more than her present subwar standard. She feels that she dare not try to cut the standard at home further.

The British have for years been discussing this economic problem with American officials. No one in our Government questions the seriousness of their plight; no one is surprised that they are cutting down abroad. They gave us the shock treatment on the March 31 fiscal deadline on Greece and American officials resent it, but these officials concede that probably nothing short of a shock would have persuaded Congress to act.

The second point that impresses most of our officials is that the feared Communist menace to an unsupported Greece is real and has wide implications for the entire eastern Mediterranean and Near and Middle East. These officials have all the evidence they want, gathered by American sources, that the Greek Communists are trained in Yugoslavia and backed by Moscow, and the general assumption is that their objective is to take over that country and make it part of a Communist Balkan federation.

There is general agreement here that if that happens through the weakness of the British or the indifference of the United States, Soviet influence in Turkey and in the oil regions of the Middle East will rise and our interests will be affected. This, however, would probably be a slow process.

The situation now, therefore, is merely a little more advanced than it was a year ago. Then, as now, the central fact was that after two wars in two generations, the nations of western Europe were weak and their position of leadership in the world was challenged by the Soviet Union, a totalitarian state with contempt for individual liberty and with a militant anticapitalist philosophy.

ISSUES AT STAKE

The question, therefore, was, and is, not whether we are interested in backing up the British Empire (the British have not asked us to move into Greece; they have merely told us they are withdrawing their economic aid) but whether we feel (a) that the expansion of Soviet influence is really a threat to our security and (b) that we wish to take the chances involved in blocking or ignoring that expansion.

How we answer these questions is entirely up to us. We are free to decide that the Soviet Union is, in our judgment, a threat to our security. If we so decide, we have the power to meet that threat. On the other hand, we are free to decide that Communist expansion is not a threat to us or to freedom, which presumably is still one of our concerns, and let the situation in Greece deteriorate further.

The one thing we cannot do is avoid a decision, for refusing to make a decision in the matter is itself a decision.

The executive branch of the Government has indicated that it thinks the expansion of Communist influence in the world is against our interests and that it wants to take unprecedented action to meet that expansion, but the technique by which the Government has "faced up to the problem," as it is called, is highly instructive.

Placing the problem squarely before the people, with all its implications, has been avoided. No official has gone on record as connecting the Greek problem to the Russian problem. Instead, the State Department arranges talks with the correspondents.

SIGNIFICANCE OF TALKS

The connection with the Russian problem is made clear in these talks, and the Government thus avoids responsibility for explaining the situation or for bringing the Russians into it. These talks have been going on all week. The Russians know nothing about them, of course, except what they read in the papers or gather from their agents in the State Department press room.

The seriousness of the discussions in the Democratic caucus on Thursday on Capitol Hill, the bitterness and finality with which the Soviet delegate rejected the United States atomic-energy plan in the United Nations Security Council on Wednesday, and President Truman's decision to postpone his Caribbean trip all indicate the magnitude of the decision involved in the Greek case.

Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet representative in the Security Council, was not expected to accept the American atomic-energy plan, but his description of it as being based on vicious premises and his sarcastic charges that the United States was seeking to intervene in the internal affairs of other nations contributed to the feeling here that the United States could not afford to take any chances with Soviet expansion in Greece or elsewhere.

RUSSIAN ACTIONS

This feeling has been growing ever since the end of the war, mainly because of the general belief that the Russians broke their promises on Iran, that they broke the spirit and the letter of the Yalta agreement and that they defied the terms of the Potsdam agreement.

What is surprising is that the relations between any two major countries could have degenerated so far and so fast. Despite the two countries' break in diplomatic contact, from the Wilson administration until the Roosevelt administration, Russia and the United States have, with few exceptions, cooperated with each other to some extent through most of the critical events of the last century and a half.

HISTORIC ALINEMENT

When the Continental Congress appealed to Russia for help during the War of Independence, she took up a position of armed

neutrality that assisted our cause. When Britain and France threatened to assist the Confederacy during the Civil War, she dispatched warships to New York and San Francisco to warn London and Paris to stay away.

Similarly, the United States, despite ideological differences before and after the Soviet revolution, usually did not take up a position hostile to Russian aims. Now, however, mainly because of the growing activity and strength of world Communist activities, this Government is solemnly meditating a major decision to use its resources to block Communist expansion not only in Greece but also in every area we consider of primary interest to peace and security.

ON EVE OF CONFERENCE

One of the remarkable aspects of this situation is that such a policy could be under serious consideration on the very eve of a conference in Moscow to discuss peace with Austria and Germany.

An equally surprising fact is that, despite all the public discussion of the problem of Soviet-American relations, the heads of the two states have not yet made any detailed effort to negotiate a general settlement of their outstanding differences on such things as the security of the eastern Mediterranean, the activities of the Comintern and the campaign of recrimination over the Moscow radio.

All possibilities for reaching an accommodation, therefore, have not been exhausted. Secretary of State Marshall may be instructed to make a try at a general settlement direct with Premier Stalin, but if this cannot be arranged, the policy of meeting Soviet power with American power will undoubtedly be expanded and Russia will be confronted with American and British power not only at the Dardanelles, where the British have opposed them for a century, but wherever they seek to enlarge their influence.

Government Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a very excellent analysis prepared by Miss Segrid Arne of the Washington Associated Press staff with respect to the various kinds of subsidies being paid by the Federal Government.

Miss Arne has, in my judgment, used a great deal of ability in a factual and intelligent discussion of this most complicated matter.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BYRD'S COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES GOES ALL OUT IN SUBSIDIES INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, March 8.—President Truman asks for $37,500,000,000 to pay the Government's way through the year starting next July 1 (the fiscal year 1948).

Some in Congress say this can be cut to $31,500,000,000 by eliminating nonessential expenditures. They are giving subsidies to farmers and business special attention.

An attempt to pick subsidies out of the budget is a little like blind flying.

None of the Government departments can agree on what a subsidy is. The Budget Bureau draws sparks out of the Agriculture Department by some of its decisions. The Maritime Commission sends in a report on subsidy operations that doesn't make sense to the Budget Bureau. The Treasury Department bickers with the Bureau.

And they all turn on the committee that Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, is directing, the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures, which is currently trying to sleuth its way to some notion of Federal subsidies.

LIST OF 31 SUBSIDIES

The Budget Bureau, on request from Senator BYRD, has worked out one list of 31 subsidies. But no one agrees with it. To thicken the fog, there's a baker's dozen ways to pay subsidies. Some keep prices up. Some keep them down. Some mail checks directly to people. Some the Federal Government shells out to States and the States in turn shell out to both agencies and people.

BYRD's committee experts have arrived at some over-all figures, but to do it they had to be arbitrary about "what is a subsidy?"

This must be kept straight: Subsidies are not relief in Washington thinking, although both are Government hand-outs. Subsidies go to various financial ventures, whether they are farming or running a shipping company. Relief, of which there has been very little since the war, goes out to keep persons alive and eating.

Incidentally, the outright relief measures of the thirties spent a good deal less than the various subsidies to business in the years 1934–45. All told, relief cost about $8,600,000,000. Subsidies to business totaled $12,000,000,000.

Items in the President's budget that can be identified as subsidies totaled $2,500,000,000 for the 12 months ending last June 30. That figure dropped off to $718,000,000 for the current 12 months, and the budget calls for $442,000,000 in the next 12-month period. Most of that drop is due to the lapse of wartime payments to keep prices on an even keel. What's left is mostly continued benefits to farmers who got most of the subsidy money throughout the thirties as well.

Here's how some subsidies work, and one of the reasons Byrd's investigators feel like Alice in Wonderland:

1. By far the largest subsidy is through the soil-conservation program. Farmers get Government checks for planting less of certain crops and for using modern planting methods. It was devised to balance the farmer's income with the city, while getting him to stop the old soil-wasting methods he used to employ.

The President's budget shows that in fiscal 1946 some $273,000,000 went out for conservation practices, but it took $41,000,000 to administer the plan.

2. Parity payments. Through these the Government makes up the difference when farm prices drop below a set formula.

3. Through the war there was a complicated set of subsidies devised to keep prices down for the housewife, to prevent union restlessness and thus to prevent strikes.

CONDITIONS OUTLINED

Farmers and livestock men complained they couldn't make a profit under some of the ceiling prices. So the Government paid the food processors (mostly canners, packers and cheese makers), certain sums of money that actually made up the difference. It helped them to sell at ceiling prices and yet pay the farmers enough to keep him happy.

Government analysts say this program cost about $1,700,000,000 but that it saved the housewife about $2,300,000,000.

Here's more of the subsidy wilderness:

Through the war livestock men were paid not to rush their cattle and sheep to the market until they had enough weight on them.

Cheddar cheese: The Government bought it at a high price and released it at a lower one to keep prices low.

The same system was used for Cuban and Puerto Rican sugar, peanut oil, prunes, milk, and soybeans.

In the metals field, subsidies were used to keep prices down. The idea was to get all possible mines working. But in some it's cheaper to bring out the ore than in others. So ceiling prices were set to cover average costs. To bring out the higher-costs ore the Government paid the mine owner the difference between ceiling and his costs. That saved millions on the war budget because an "across the board" increase in ceilings would have meant the Government was paying high prices to even the low-cost mining operations.

That type of subsidy continues on copper, lead, zinc, tin, and antimony.

Argument rages here over justification for subsidies. Here are some of the questions:

Is it necessary to pay farmers parity prices? If they can't sell their product at a profit, shouldn't they find some other living? Why should taxes be used to keep farmers on their farms when the Government takes no step to keep the nail manufacturer in his factory?

Why should farmers be paid now for conservation practices? Haven't they learned, after 12 years, it's good business?

Why pay construction subsidies to shipping companies when the United States already has the world's largest merchant marine?

Here are some replies:

The farmer's income must match city income or he won't buy what the city turns out.

The merchant marine is part of our defense system.

And some more questions:

Isn't a tariff a subsidy to the manufacturers which all consumers pay? Don't all of us pay to keep silver mines going by the silver price-support program?

Should the Government bail out the aviation industry with the air-mail contracts?

Why should the Post Office Department set such low rates for publications? Why subsidize certain communities through the millions spent on rivers and harbors, and on highways?

The whole subject is so foggy that no President's budget has ever sorted out subsidy items into a special section. The only available official list was put out by the Budget Bureau because the Byrd committee asked for it.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation—subsidies for losses on purchase and sale of rubber and rubber products and other materials; direct subsidies on butter, coffee, flour, livestock, petroleum, petroleum products, copper, lead, zinc, and other materials. (Subsidies on the food products were dropped recently.)

Commodity Credit Corporation—subsidies (many recently dropped), to dairy production, fluid milk, beef production, sheep and lamb, cheddar cheese, fruits for processing, oilseeds and products, sugar, vegetables for processing, wheat for alcohol, wheat for feed, and other products.

Department of Agriculture—subsidies for conservation and use of agricultural land resources, parity payments, advances by the Secretary of the Treasury for AAA expenditures, sugar act payments, exportation and

domestic consumption of agricultural commodities.

Treasury Department—subsidies through reductions of interest rate on farm mortgages.

Maritime Commission—payments for operating subsidies and for construction cost absorption.

Quotas and Export Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter and official report from the Bureau of Foreign Relations:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF FOREIGN
AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1947.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in answer to your request for a list of foreign-trade restrictions placed on agricultural products by the United States in the past 15 years, other than war measures.

You will find attached a statement outlining the principal acts and agreements under which such measures have been taken, together with a list of the specific quantitative import regulations and of the subsidies granted to promote exports.

Sincerely yours,

L. A. WHEELER,
Director.

STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES IMPORT REGULATIONS AND EXPORT SUBSIDIES ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (EXCLUDING WAR MEASURES)

IMPORT REGULATIONS

The United States has regulated imports by the means of absolute quotas, tariff quotas, and sanitary regulations.

Absolute import quotas

Absolute import quotas (i. e. quotas that limit all imports of a certain kind of product to a certain maximum) have been imposed under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 (as amended), the Sugar Act of 1937, the International Coffee Agreement of 1941, and the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 (see table 1A).

Under the authority of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, absolute quotas have been established on cotton and cotton waste and wheat and wheat flour. This statute provides for the imposition of quotas on imports that interfere with certain programs of the Department of Agriculture. The quotas may not be less than one-half of the average annual quantity of the product imported from any country in the years 1929-33.

The Sugar Act of 1937 established an import-quota system for sugar. In 1942, due to the emergency situation, these quotas were suspended, subject to reinstatement if conditions warranted. The Sugar Act reserves to the United States producers 55.59 percent of the domestic need, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The balance is to be imported on the basis of the following allocation:

Area:	*Percent*
Philippine Islands	34.70
Cuba	64.41
Other countries	.89

Under the International Coffee Agreement of 1941, quotas on coffee were in effect up to 1945. At present, the quota provisions of the agreement are suspended.

The Philippine Trade Act of 1946 guarantees to the Philippine Islands absolute quotas on sugar, hard-fiber cordage, cigars, scrap tobacco, coconut oil, and rice. The act provides that beginning in July 1955 the quotas on cigars, scrap tobacco, and coconut oil will be diminished at 5 percent per annum. These quotas replaced the tariff quotas under the Philippine Independence Act of 1935.

Tariff quotas

Tariff quotas (i. e. quotas that limit imports at a reduced tariff rate but permit unlimited imports at the general rate of duty) have been established in a number of cases by reciprocal trade agreements. (See table 1 B.)

Sanitary regulations

Sanitary regulations have been placed upon imports of certain agricultural products under the Plant and Animal Quarantine Regulations and Federal Seed Act of August 1939. Because of the special nature of these measures, they have not been included in the appended tabular list of import regulations.

EXPORT SUBSIDIES

Subsidies on exports have been authorized under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. This statute makes 30 percent of the gross receipts from import duties available to the Secretary of Agriculture for encouraging the exportation of agricultural commodities and for other purposes. Use was made of this authorization in the instances indicated in table 2. At present, only exports of cotton are being subsidized.

Section 21 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457) authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of agricultural products for export at competitive world prices, even though these prices should be below domestic market prices. Use was made of this authorization in the case of cotton from November 1944 to April 1946.

TABLE 1.—*United States import regulations on agricultural products*

A. ABSOLUTE IMPORT QUOTAS

Commodity	Authority	Date inaugurated	Present status
Cotton and cotton waste (exception 1 1/16-inch cotton)	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 (as amended) sec. 22.	Sept. 5, 1939 (amended Dec. 19, 1940, Mar. 31, 1942, and June 29, 1942).	Continues in effect.
Wheat and wheat flour	do	Apr. 13, 1942 (amended May 28, 1943)	Do.
Sugar	Sugar Act of 1937	Sept. 1, 1937	Suspended Apr. 12, 1942 (may be reinstated under the act).
Coffee	Inter-American coffee agreement, Feb. 3, 1941.	Feb. 3, 1941	Suspended Apr. 11, 1946 (may be reinstated in case of emergency).
Sugar	Philippine Trade Act	Apr. 30, 1946	Continues in effect.
Hard-fiber cordage	do	do	Do.
Cigars	do	do	Do.
Scrap tobacco	do	do	Do.
Coconut oil	do	do	Do.
Rice	do	do	Do.

B. TARIFF QUOTAS

Whole milk, fresh or sour	Trade agreement with Canada	Jan. 1, 1939	Continues in effect.
Cream, fresh or sour	do	do	Do.
Fish: Fresh or frozen, filleted, etc., n. s. p. f. cod, haddock, hake, pollock, cusk, and rosefish.	do	do	Do.
Red-cedar shingles	do	do	Do.
White or Irish potatoes, certified seed and other	do	do	Do.
Cattle:			
Weighing less than 200 pounds each	do	do	Unrestricted entry during the emergency. However, Mexico imposed quota restrictions on exports of livestocker and feeder cattle. Present quarantine of Mexican border because of foot-and-mouth disease outbreak prohibits importation of all livestock.
Weighing 700 pounds or more each	Trade agreement with Mexico	Jan. 30, 1943	Do.
Silver or black fox fur	Trade agreement with Canada	Dec. 20, 1940	Continues in effect.
Molasses and sugar	Trade agreement with United Kingdom.	Jan. 1, 1939	Do.
Filler tobacco	Trade agreement with Cuba	Jan. 5, 1942	Do.

TABLE 2.—*United States export subsidies on agricultural products*

Commodity	Authority	Date inaugurated	Present status
Butter	Agricultural Adjustment Act, 1933 (as amended) sec. 32.	April 1938	August 1939.[1]
Raw cotton (for export to the northern part of the Western Hemisphere, not effective until Sept. 11, 1939).	do	July 27, 1939	Jan. 30, 1940.[1]
Raw cotton, Canadian program	do	Sept. 18, 1941	Mar. 31, 1942.[1]
Raw cotton, general	Surplus Property Act of 1944, sec. 21 (c).	November 1944	Apr. 31, 1946.[1]
Do	Agricultural Adjustment Act, 1933 (as amended) sec. 32.	May 1, 1946	Continues in effect.
Cotton products (for export to northern part of the Western Hemisphere, not effective until Sept. 11, 1939.	do	July 27, 1939	Dec. 19, 1941.[1]
Pecans, unshelled (shelled also subsidized in the later years).	do	1935–36	1938–39.
Prunes (substandard)	do	1935–36	1936–37.[1]
Tobacco	do	1935–36	1938–39.[1]
Walnuts	do	1935–36	1940–41.[1]
Wheat flour:			
To Philippines	do	Mar. 5, 1936	Nov. 2, 1938.[1]
General	do	Sept. 7 1938	March 1946.[1]
To Cuba	do	1944	1945.[1]
Wheat	do	1933	1934.[1]
Do	do	1938–39	April 1943.[1]
Do	do	1944	Jan. 1, 1945.[1]

[1] Date suspended.

After reading these lists one would not think this administration was opposed to quotas and export subsidies. You will note that this very day export subsidies are being paid on cotton. Also note that even tobacco has had its export subsidy program.

Did you ever hear of export subsidies before the New Deal came into power?

Party Status Gains Six Percentage Points Since Recent Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein first, a clipping from the Washington Post of March 5, 1947, setting forth a report of the most recent Gallup poll, disclosing the sharp rise in popularity of the Democratic administration, as follows:

PARTY STATUS GAINS 6 PERCENTAGE POINTS SINCE RECENT LOW

(By George Gallup, Director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 4.—Republican leaders who have been viewing the 1948 Presidential election picture with rose-colored glasses had better take them off.

For the swing of voters' sentiment in recent weeks has been back toward the Democratic Party—sharply.

In fact, if a Presidential election were being held today 51 percent—a majority—say they would prefer to cast their votes for the Democratic Party, 49 percent the Republican Party.

This means that the Democratic Party has regained in Presidential party support, 6 percentage points from its post-Roosevelt low right after the November elections.

A lot will, of course, depend on the candidates, both the Republican and the Democratic, and the question of candidates was not a part of today's survey.

HAS SLIGHT MAJORITY

The facts in today's story are based on a question dealing with party preferences in a Presidential election today—aside from who the candidates may be.

Research experience during the past 11 years indicates that polls of this kind provide the best index of party strength throughout the Nation.

Democratic party strength sagged to its lowest point in a poll by the Institute right after the November elections. At that time 45 percent said they would prefer a Democrat in a Presidential election then.

From that point on Democratic Party strength has been climbing.

These facts are shown in the following table giving replies in periodic surveys on the question:

"If a Presidential election were being held today, which party would you vote for—the Democratic or the Republican?"

Majority party vote

	Percent Democrat	Percent Republican
1944 election	54	46
August 1945	58	42
February 1946	55	45
May	52½	47½
July	49	51
September	50	50
October	47	53
November (postelection)	45	55
December	47	53
January 1947	50	50
Today	51	49

Certainly one of the contributing factors (but not necessarily the primary one) in the Democratic recovery as shown above is the rising popularity of President Truman, who was found at an all-time low in popularity before the November elections.

From a low in October of 32 percent approving the way Mr. Truman was handling his job, the President's rating soared 16 percentage points—to 48 percent. This rise was reported by the institute in early February.

Whether the movement toward the Democratic Party will continue is a question which only the future can answer.

Meanwhile, the Democrats find themselves in a vastly different position today from what they were a few short months ago, when some observers were handing the Presidency to anyone the Republicans might choose to put up.

Readers should be reminded that it is not popular votes but electoral votes which elect Presidents. Because of the peculiar situation which exists in the South, where the overwhelming majority of popular votes go to the Democratic candidate, the Democrats normally need slightly more than 50 percent of the popular vote for the Nation as a whole in order to win enough electoral votes to elect their man.

Also, a clipping from the New York Times under date of February 28, 1947, entitled "Mr. Truman Grows," which clipping follows:

MR. TRUMAN GROWS

This newspaper has already expressed its congratulations to Mr. Lewis W. Douglas on his nomination as Ambassador to Great Britain. It is not amiss, it seems to us, to express our congratulations to President Truman as well on his ability to recognize Mr. Douglas' qualities and to summon them to the public service. This one appointment will further add to Mr. Truman's standing, which has unquestionably been growing measurably in recent weeks from the low point which it reached in the course of the distressful summer and fall.

Ding's cartoon, appearing in an adjoining column, reflects a certainly widespread sense that Mr. Truman has dug up from under the rubbish of new dealism a certain long-forgotten simplicity and honesty which people can understand and to which they are inclined to give their confidence. Mr. Truman himself has tended to develop under adversity. He is no longer the provincial politician, confined to the horizons of the Missouri gang; and his successful encounter with the formidable John L. Lewis in early December indicated a greater sureness of touch in difficult moments than had been apparent earlier. And he is no longer merely a lieutenant for the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; new problems are producing new, and characteristically Truman, policies. All of these tendencies are symbolized to some extent in the Douglas appointment, and they all point to the probability that Mr. Truman will be much more a factor to be reckoned with in 1948 than seemed likely on the morrow of the Republican sweep of the congressional elections.

This newspaper, for one, is glad of it. The illusion that the Republicans could elect a dog catcher to the Presidency next year was benefiting neither the country nor the party. To have a man of stature in the White House during the coming difficult months is not only essential to the national interest; it will also demand of the Republican Party that it must develop a man of stature to oppose him and develop policies of consistency and coherence to replace those of the crumbling Democratic coalition over which he presides. The abler the President shows himself, the better the quality of men and statesmanship which the Republicans must offer. That will be good for the country; and it will be particularly good for the Republicans.

Military Budget Caution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Military Budget Caution," by Hanson W. Baldwin. The article was published in the New York Times of yesterday, and I think it will be of great interest to the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY BUDGET CAUTION—CUTS ARE EXPECTED BUT THE NEED TO PROTECT RESEARCH AND SOUND DEFENSE IS STRESSED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Congress in recent debates has served notice that a considerable cut in the military budget faces the armed services during the 1948 fiscal year.

Reductions in the national budget are not only inevitable politically but advisable economically and militarily but in considering the military budget Congress should hold high the goal of a sound military policy. And a sound military policy—no matter if it should be well formulated and thought out at this session of Congress—cannot be achieved if the budget for one fiscal year is attacked with a meat cleaver instead of a scalpel.

There is undoubtedly some waste in the armed services, and there are consolidations and eliminations that can efficiently be made. But the waste must be excised from the budget—not chopped away—or highly important branches of the services will suffer with a consequent weakening of the country's security.

The combined budget of the military services for the 1948 fiscal year, as submitted to Congress, is $11,256,000,000. The average strength of the armed forces during this next fiscal year is projected as 1,640,786. The average cost per armed man, therefore, will be $6,790, which includes not only clothing, food, shelter, etc., but all arms, equipment, bases, ships, panes, etc.

But the Committee on Postwar Tax Policy, which has recently issued a workmanlike analysis of the budget in a pamphlet entitled "A Tax Program for a Solvent America," finds that this average cost is only slightly lower than the $6,960 average cost per man during the war.

RISE IN ARMY'S COSTS

The Navy costs have dropped from a $10,029 average per man in 1945 to $7,919 in the projected 1948 budget, but the Army costs have actually risen from $5,911 per man to $6,190. Moreover, these costs contrast somewhat startlingly with prewar averages, which stood at $2,240 per man in the Army in 1939 and $4,801 per man in the Navy in the same year.

Food and clothing prices and maintenance costs have risen greatly since then, but, as the tax study points out, of the $6,790 the 1948 budget earmarks for each man in the armed forces, only $3,100 goes for pay, food, clothing, subsistence, travel, medical care, and welfare, and more than $3,600 goes for weapons, ships, planes, etc.

These are significant and important figures, and reasoning from them and from others which it analyzes, the Committee on Postwar Tax Policy believes that "one or two billion dollars can be squeezed out of the (military) budget without real damage to the services."

Senator BYRD is another who believes the service budgets can be cut. The Army and Navy had on December 31, last, more than 1,000,000 civilian employees, as compared to about 222,000 in 1939. Senator BYRD sees in these civilian employees a great field for retrenchment.

DANGER IN GENERALIZATION

There is no doubt that there is basic truth in both the tax study and in Senator BYRD's contentions. But it would be dangerous and harmful to a proper consideration of the budget to generalize. Two statistics indicate why.

Not only food, clothing, and maintenance costs have increased tremendously since 1939—something which the tax study points out—but costs of equipment also have skyrocketed as labor costs have increased.

For instance, it has been estimated by service sources that the average cost of an experimental aircraft (and in time of peace if we are to keep abreast in the technological race there must be many of these) has increased from about $30 per pound of weight before the war to $275 now, while the cost of a proved service plane has increased in the same period from $10 per pound to about $25 per pound. Some new jet aircraft are costing as much as $50 per pound for proved service types.

Moreover Senator BYRD's figures on civilian workers, which show a many-fold increase between 1939 and 1947, must be gaged against the yardstick of the comparable strength of the men in uniform in the Army and Navy in those years. In 1939 there were a total of 334,000 officers and men; at the beginning of this year there were somewhat more than 1,850,000. The ratio of civilian employees to armed personnel is thus smaller now than it was in 1939.

It must be remembered, too, that the services now have relatively greater need for civilian personnel than they did in 1939. During the war great new military laboratories, testing stations, and proving grounds were developed, old ones were greatly extended, and it is these stations that are now the incubators of our technological developments.

The laboratories at Edgewood Arsenal, Wright Field, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Fort Belvoir, Patuxent, and a score of other places are manned and operated partly by military personnel, but chiefly by civilians—technicians, scientists, and other trained research workers who provide a continuity of effort and a skill which few military personnel can match.

Moreover, many of the special posts in the country, like the Navy's Dahlgren Proving Ground, which is staffed by 1,000 civilians as against 59 officers and 110 enlisted men, are operated almost entirely by civilian employees. Wholesale slashes in the number of civilian employees permitted the armed services can cripple these highly important posts, proving grounds, and laboratories.

Research and development is one part of the budget which ought to be approached with the utmost caution. The limiting factor in the amount spent on basic research ought to have no relation whatsoever (in peacetime) to the size of the armed forces; the only rational limiting factor should be the number of good scientists available to expend basic research funds to best advantage.

PRUNING ON RESEARCH FEARED

Moneys up to that limit ought to be appropriated and there should be no cuts. Yet there is considerable reason to fear that basic research funds, as well as funds for development, may be cut. The moneys earmarked for research and development (for both War and Navy Departments) in the 1948 budget total something over $500,000,000 before the congressional pruning knife has been applied; yet service experts believe about $600,000,000, possibly more, should be appropriated each year.

All this is not to suggest that the service budgets ought to be inviolate. On the contrary, they should be cut, for both the Committee on Postwar Tax Policy and Senator BYRD are right; places will be found where cuts can be made without danger to our security.

The proportion of officers to enlisted men—and particularly the large numbers of general and flag officers, colonels, and Navy captains, offers one field for investigation, and there are countless others. The services can and must accept some part of the cut in the national budget. But it must not be a crippling cut and the congressional scalpel rather than the congressional cleaver must be used.

Japanese Peace Treaty

REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House resolution requesting that the Department of State make immediate preparations for an early negotiation of the Japanese peace treaty. I am making this request as a result of a recent conference with General MacArthur in Tokyo, where it was my privilege along with Hon. CLAIR ENGLE and Hon. JOSEPH FARRINGTON, to discuss this matter with him during our recent trip.

General MacArthur was most emphatic in his contention that the Japanese peace treaty should not be held up pending the final settlement of the German peace treaty and offered many convincing arguments in substantiation of this and his belief that there should be immediate negotiations toward the signing of the peace treaty between Japan and the Allies.

He compared the background of Japan to the hereditary hatreds of Europe and stated that Europe is like a man 50 years of age who is not likely to take advice from someone whom he considers knows no more than he, whereas Japan is more like a young person who can take advice from an older person of experience.

He further explained that Europe has had many wars and many and various alinements of allies and the hatreds of Europe are hereditary, whereas the Japanese people have had all of their ideals and hopes shattered and are now living in a vacuum which must be filled.

Their religion and their national life centered around their belief in the infallibility of their Emperor and unless we fill that vacuum soon it will be filled by the philosophy of their neighbor, Russia.

I have asked—

He said—

both Catholics and Protestants to send missionaries and where they now have one, to supplement that one with one thousand—

And he explained that he was asking his Government and people to furnish the

Japanese with the teaching and the support to set up a true democracy.

With Christianity and democracy—

He contends—

Japan can become a bastion against the threats of communism and can accomplish far greater results than all of the armies.

General MacArthur further maintains that we should also have an immediate peace so that these industrious people can become self-sufficient and not be a drain upon the American taxpayer, but that if we wait too long, that industrious trait might be blighted as it has been in other parts of the world.

To me this was a very significant statement since we have found people right here in the United States who have lost their industrious habits and are now looking to the Government as their sole provider.

General MacArthur also expressed his approval for the granting of statehood to Hawaii. He recalled that we kept our word and gave the Philippines their independence which was the only step we could take since the economy of the Philippine Islands was tied up with that of the Orient, but Hawaii, in his opinion, presents an entirely different question since it is definitely a part of the economy of the United States and if Hawaii has met the qualifications of statehood, it should be admitted immediately.

Hawaii, he told us, is not only part of the economy of the United States, but it is definitely one of the key points of our national defense. He feels that we should keep the key islands of the Pacific and the Alaskan areas not from a negative but from a positive standpoint and that it is a "must."

For the logical reasons which he advanced, therefore, I am asking that this House of Representatives go on record as requesting the Department of State to proceed immediately toward the early negotiation of a peace treaty with Japan.

H. R. 2157, Regulating the Recovery of Portal-to-Portal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following minority report on H. R. 2157, regulating the recovery of portal-to-portal pay:

MINORITY REPORT

The bill as reported is a rather poorly drafted mixture of a number of items, all of which will give rise to substantial confusion and unnecessary litigation. In its entire impact the bill as reported will seriously weaken the enforcement of one of the most important pieces of humanitarian legislation on the books of this country; namely, the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is particularly inappropriate that we take action at this time to weaken the Fair Labor Standards Act when there is actually such a crying need for its improvement, for raising the obsolete 40-cent per hour minimum now provided, for extending its protections to many underpaid workers not now covered.

There has been substantial confusion thrown into the discussion of this bill as a result of the so-called portal-to-portal pay issue. It should be remembered that this is not a bill which confines itself to the problem of the presently existing accumulated liabilities, so widely discussed, as a result of the portal-to-portal pay situation. This bill makes very basic changes for the future as well as the past in the general enforcement and operation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Bad cases make bad laws. Some of the so-called portal-to-portal claims should not have been brought into court, but many of the cases are justified. But there has developed a great hysteria over these suits. Some of the adverse criticism against these suits is justified, but much of it is unjustified. There are good and bad employers. All are not lily white. Some of the suits brought against chiseling employers for labor spent in their behalf are eminently sound. The bill reported casts a shadow, if it does not actually prohibit many of these suits honestly and justifiably brought.

In order to proscribe the bad cases, a sweeping remedy is proposed that not only for practical purposes bans portal-to-portal suits, the good and the bad, but also emasculates the Bacon-Davis Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The phrase "portal to portal" is a bad label to designate to all these suits, suits which are for "time worked" as in the following:

(a) Checking machinery.

(b) Adjusting and readjusting safety equipment.

(c) Repairing, oiling, washing machines.

(d) Checking and sharpening tools.

(e) Rest periods after arduous toil.

(f) Taking inventory.

(g) Submitting to a periodic physical examination.

(h) Travel time within the plant or mine, which sometimes consumes as much as a half hour.

(i) Cleaning and washing off the body grease, soot, and toxic matter.

A wide variety of activities which employers have always compensated, not unlike the portal-to-portal claims, occur in the building trades, longshoring, petroleum, newspaper editorial and photographic work. In the American Federation of Labor unions, time spent in traveling from designated bases to the work site, by collective bargaining, is considered worktime and paid for. In carpenters' agreements, tool sharpening is considered worktime during working hours and paid for. In street and bus transportation getting the car ready for servicing and returning it to the barn is considered time worked and paid for.

It is quite apparent that the magnitude of the so-called portal-to-portal claims is overemphasized and exaggerated and it must not provide an excuse for weakening labor laws that have raised the standard of the worker over the years.

Frankly, as a result of the recent decision in the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. case, many, if not most, of the claims will be thrown out. It was held therein that negligible inconsequential time spent is not compensable under the de minimis doctrine.

For clarity in considering our reasons for disagreement with the majority of the committee on the proposed bill we shall separate our discussion by examining briefly in the first place the problems connected with the existing liabilities arising under portal-to-portal problems and, secondly, addressing ourselves to the far more important question of the dangerous effects which this bill carries for the future of the entire Fair Labor Standards Act.

(1) THE PROBLEM OF EXISTING LIABILITIES UNDER PORTAL-TO-PORTAL CLAIMS

During the course of the past few months a substantial number of lawsuits have been filed in the courts of the United States against a number of major corporations. In substance these suits are based on a claim that the employees bringing action have been required by their employers to perform duties or engage in activities prior to the scheduled starting time of their shift and subsequent to the scheduled quitting time. It is the claim of these employees apparently that the hours devoted to this extra work have heretofore not been counted by their employers as part of the workweek, so that actually more than 40 hours has been worked in various weeks with no compensation paid for the overtime work.

The issue arises in the first instance out of the fact that the Fair Labor Standards Act as passed in 1938 did not spell out a full definition of what was to be regarded as "work" and did not give to the Administrator any power by regulation or similar action to develop such a definition with any legal effect.

Since it thus became the duty of the courts to define the term in their decisions, the Supreme Court of the United States over a number of years developed a set of criteria as to what must be regarded as constituting work which must be counted as part of the workweek. The Supreme Court's basic conclusions may be summarized in the following quotation from the decision which it rendered in 1944 in the case of *Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company* v. *Muscoda Local No. 123* (321 U. S. 590):

"But these provisions like the other portions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, are remedial and humanitarian in purpose. We are not here dealing with mere chattels or articles of trade but with the rights of those who toil, of those who sacrifice a full measure of their freedom and talents to the use and profit of others. Those are the rights that Congress has specially legislated to protect. Such a statute must not be interpreted or applied in a narrow, grudging manner. Accordingly, we view section 7 (a), 3 (g), and 3 (j) of the act as necessarily indicative of a congressional intention to guarantee either regular or overtime compensation for all actual work or employment. To hold that an employer may validly compensate his employees for only a fraction of the time consumed in actual labor would be inconsistent with the very purpose and structure of those sections of the act. It is vital, of course, to determine first the extent of the actual workweek. Only after this is done can the minimum-wage and maximum-hour requirements of the act be effectively applied. And, in the absence of a contrary legislative expression, we cannot assume that Congress here was referring to work or employment other than as those words are commonly used—as meaning physical or mental exertion (whether burdensome or not) controlled or required by the employer and pursued necessarily and primarily for the benefit of the employer and his business."

We have not been referred in all of our deliberations to any definition of the word "work." On the contrary, so far as we can determine, the major issues arising under the portal-to-portal pay problem are not based on any demonstrated inadequacy in the definition set forth above. The major problem—and it is a real one worthy of consideration—arises out of the fact that apparently there is a very large number of employers who have permitted a substantial obligation to accumulate until it has seemed to them that the burden of making adequate compensation now will be overwhelming.

This fear has been built, in the main, on the substantial amounts designated in the petitions and complaints filed in courts in

these various suits. On that basis we have been asked to enact legislation calculated retroactively to wipe out the obligations and liabilities presently existing.

Our attention has been directed to a substantial number of opinions issued by the Administrator over the years since 1940 which have given to industry substantial notice that preliminary activities, oiling and adjusting machinery, make-ready time in general, and other similar activities outside of the regularly scheduled shift hours were, in the opinion of the Administrator, work requiring compensation under the law. We have noted court opinions containing similar indications, such as those rendered by the district and circuit courts in the *Tennessee Coal & Iron case* (40 Fed. Supp. 4 and 135 Fed. (2) 320); *Sunshine Mining Co.* v. *Carver* (41 Fed. Supp. 60 (1941); *Travis* v. *Ray* (41 Fed. Supp. 6 (1941)); *Walling* v. *Blue Mountain Logging Co.* (D. C. U. D., Wash., 6 Lab. Cases, par 61, 466 (1942)); *Philpot* v. *Standard Oil Co.* (53 Fed. Supp. 833), and others.

This background gives at least substantial indication that there are many activities involved in the current dispute which should properly be compensated under the law. These are the issues which are now before the courts for decision.

We do not wish, however, to close our eyes to any real threat, if such exists, of substantial disruption to our economy resulting from an overwhelming volume of obligations imposed on American industry. However, we feel that it cannot in good conscience be said that such has been at all demonstrated to be the fact. On the contrary, the Supreme Court in its decision in the much-discussed case of *Anderson* v. *Mount Clemens Pottery Co.* specifically indicated that collection would not be permitted for any claims based on periods of time so slight as to come within the doctrine that the law does not concern itself with trifles—the doctrine known in law as de minimis non curat lex.

Pursuant to this declaration of the Supreme Court, Judge Picard, in his subsequent analysis of the facts in the Mount Clemens case, dismissed in full the claims there involved.

Insofar as legislation is proposed on this subject today, it seeks to do two things, both of which we feel are extremely dangerous.

(a) It undertakes a retroactive reversal of a decision of the Supreme Court; and

(b) It undertakes to decide by legislation issues which are now pending in the Court.

We have grave doubts as to the constitutionality of action along these lines. More importantly, however, we believe that there are very grave issues of policy which should restrain any Congress from taking action along these lines in the absence of the most irrefutable demonstration of pressing national emergency. We feel that it is dangerous for Congress to encourage litigants in existing lawsuits to seek from Congress a decision in their favor on the existing claims involved in the lawsuits.

It is the province of Congress at all times to legislate for the future. It is not appropriate for Congress to legislate for the past, to decide existing lawsuits. There is a danger of a serious infringement upon the province of the judiciary and of a serious undermining of the integrity of the doctrine that lawsuits should be decided by the courts and not in the political arena.

There is every indication that the final decision to be rendered on the scope of the de minimis doctrine will substantially eliminate the major bulk of the current liabilities. It is perfectly clear that the amounts named in the complaints in these lawsuits—no more than in any other type of lawsuit—cannot be accepted as an indication of the true scope of ultimate liability. Problems of proof, coverage, statutes of limitations presently in operation, and many other factors apart from and in addition to the de minimis doctrine will reduce the total collections.

Under these circumstances it is our judgment that the problem of existing liabilities should be left where it belongs, in the hands of the courts, and should not be made the subject of legislative action. The more important and thoroughly legitimate sphere for congressional action is a determination of various issues for the future, and we now turn to that problem.

(2) PROVISIONS AFFECTING FUTURE OPERATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

(a) Statute of limitations

The bill now reported proposes as to past claims a 6-month statute of limitations, and a 1-year statute of limitations as to all future claims and actions under the Fair Labor Standards Act, Bacon-Davis Act, and the Walsh-Healey Act.

We are in favor of the establishment of a uniform Federal statute of limitations for actions under the Fair Labor Standards Act; but we feel that it is extremely inequitable, unwise, and unjustified to place the figure at anything less than 3 years.

A 1-year statute of limitations as contained in the reported bill would be grossly discriminatory against the rights of the workingman. In almost all transactions in which the businessman, the manufacturer, the employer, engages, the governing statutes of limitations range for periods from 3 years upward and most frequently are in the neighborhood of 6 years.

In our Federal jurisprudence almost every statute of limitations is set at 3 years or more. Suits for infringement of patent rights are limited only by a 6-year statute. Suits under the Federal Employers' Liability Act are limited only by a 3-year statute.

The Fair Labor Standards Act is presently governed by those State statutes in each State which are deemed to affect rights most closely analogous to those involved in the act itself. The applicable State statutes, thus representing the judgment of the various States on an appropriate period for the nature of the rights involved, range as high as 6 years in a number of industrial States, and average some 3.7 years. In a number of instances where States attempted to set up special, short periods of limitation, the courts have declared such action invalid, pointing out that such a statute discriminated against a piece of Federal legislation by applying to it a shorter limitation period than is provided in those States for analogous rights under the common law or under other statutes. (*Fullerton* v. *Lamm*, 8 WHR 1175; *Kappler* v. *Republic Pictures Corp.*, 8 WHR 183, 9 WHR 119; *Clarke Lumber Co.* v. *Kurth*, 8 WHR 1214; *Rockton & Rion Railway* v. *Davis*, 6 WH Cases 481.)

Yet in the bill now reported we have the spectacle of a Congress itself being asked to enact such a discrimination.

A 1-year period, moreover, would be extremely harmful to the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act itself. This is peculiarly a law which requires a longer period of limitation. It deals with the rights of working men and women. Many of these workers are not fully informed of their rights under the law. Frequently they have to depend on discovery of violations by the Wage-Hour Administrator before they are aware of their rights. Most workers are unorganized and are not really as informed of their rights as are union workers.

Due to limitations of staff the Wage-Hour Administrator not only is unlikely to get around to any given establishment within 1 year of a violation but, in fact, it is doubtful whether he would be able to make such an inspection within 10 years. It is estimated that there are approximately 550,000 establishments subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Administrator is able to make an average of less than 50,000 investigations each year. This, in fact, does not include the circumstance that approximately 50,000 new enterprises are established each year. Thus the Administrator, with his limited staff is not even able to keep up with the rate at which new enterprises come into being, let alone conduct sufficiently frequent inspections of existing enterprises. It is further a relatively well-established fact that many employees fear to bring suits against their employer because of their apprehension that they may thereby lose their job. They are, however, relieved of this apprehension when they transfer to another employment, and then proceed to assert the rights theretofore violated.

A 1-year statute of limitations, therefore, is outrageously discriminatory against the laboring man. It seriously and adversely affects the right and ability of the laboring man to assert his rights under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Since the civil action for recovery of damages is one of the most effective of the enforcement devices provided in the law, a 1-year statute on such actions seriously endangers the basic enforcement of this vital piece of legislation.

(b) Reliance on administrative decision as a defense

Section 2 (e) of the proposed bill permits an employer to free himself completely from any civil liability for failure to comply with the law if he can claim to have relied on any administrative regulation, order, ruling, and even enforcement policy or practice.

The language permitting full absolution to any employer relying on administrative action is objectionable. It is not even limited to action of the Administrator himself. It refers to any administrative action. This could mean that employees would find their rights to collection barred simply by the willingness of a minor regional official to express his personal opinion as to an employer's liability.

We must remember that the Fair Labor Standards Act as presently written, except in a few specialized connections, does not establish a formal provision for the issuance of interpretations, rulings, or opinions by the Administrator. All of the Administrator's acts in this respect are taken as informal expressions of viewpoint, frequently contained merely in an exchange of correspondence with an employer. There is no provision for hearing. There is no provision for notice to the employees or their representatives. There is no provision for any opportunity for presentation of facts or viewpoint. This is not the fault of the Administrator. There is simply no provision for it in the statute.

Under these circumstances it is grossly unfair to the workingman and it is extremely bad practice and precedent in the administration of the law to say that any and all of these activities of the Administrator or of his staff may constitute a complete defense for the employer and bar the employee from recovery.

The proposal contained in the bill goes even further. It establishes as a complete defense not merely an administrative opinion, ruling, interpretation, regulation, or order but also even something called enforcement policy or practice. These refer to things which are known usually only within the confines of the administrative office. They may or may not become known by public announcement. Frequently an enforcement policy may include a decision not to act in certain types of cases only because of lack of funds or because it is decided that other cases are more urgent. It is at least debatable that the proposed bill would make even such an enforcement policy a complete defense for the employer.

The rights of workingmen under a law of the United States should not be made to depend on things so vague and indefinite as "enforcement policy" or "practice" of an administrative agency. We have heard much discussion of the evils of bureaucracy. We can conceive of nothing which smacks more completely of the true evil of bureaucracy than a system under which rights are determined, not by carefully defined and carefully limited administrative action but by such inchoate things as "enforcement policy" and "practice" of an administrative agency.

If it is desired that the Administrator have certain specific powers to issue opinions, rulings, regulations, and other matters which are to have legal effect, then we should have a specific declaration outlining the exact scope of his authority, the standards which are to guide him, and giving to his acts specific legal effect, binding equally on both parties. That would be the sound, lawyerlike method.

(c) Waiver, compromise, and settlement

A law which declares that private parties may enter into a contract to violate it is not likely to be a very effective law. That is particularly true of the Fair Labor Standards Act—especially so among the large body of unorganized workers for whose protection the act is most important. It is because of these considerations that it has been accepted doctrine that an employer should not be permitted to absolve himself from any legal liability under the act simply because he is able to secure from his employee a signature to a release or reduction of liability.

Even without those elements which could constitute legally proven duress, it is unfortunately true that apprehensions normally present in the mind of an employee could result in the signing of such documents at the request of an employer and under circumstances constituting in effect an agreement to accept violation of the law.

Can we afford to say that an employer may pay his employee 30 cents an hour instead of the legally required 40 cents and then free himself from legal liability for his law violation simply by securing from his underpaid employee a signature on a waiver of release?

Any claim or cause of action for wages or for liquidated damages may be compromised or settled. The liquidated-damages provisions of the act are intended to have the salutary effect of discouraging what otherwise might be a tendency on the part of an employer to resolve all doubtful questions against his employee. Clearly, if the only liability which might ultimately arise would be liability for that which the employer is required in the first place, then even without bad faith an employer would have absolutely no reason for resolving any possible question in any way other than against payment.

A provision permitting compromise of the liquidated-damages portion of the employee's recovery is particularly indefensible when considered in conjunction with the provision in this proposed bill which makes such liquidated damages recoverable only on proof of bad faith. What the bill then says, in effect, is that in order to recover the extra amount provided by the statute in the form of double damages the employee must prove the employer's bad faith. Yet even the product of the employer's bad faith, the proposed bill would permit the employee to compromise away.

(d) Requirement of proof of bad faith for recovery of liquidated damages

Under the present Fair Labor Standards Act an employee deprived of his rights under the law may sue for and recover the amount of his loss plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. The proposed bill would make such liquidated damages recoverable only on proof that the employer acted in bad faith and without reasonable grounds.

The Supreme Court of the United States has pointed out that the liquidated-damages provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act is not intended as a punitive device. Its purpose is not to punish the employer but rather to make more effective the enforcement of the act. Where there is truly willful violation of the law, this statute, like most others, provides criminal penalties.

The liquidated-damages provision as we have already noted is essential for a special reason. If an employer is faced with the consideration that the most that may be recoverable against him will be that which he is required in the first instance to pay, there is absolutely no incentive to induce him to comply with the law wherever he feels there is the slightest possibility of avoidance of the law. It is extremely difficult to prove bad faith in these and in most other circumstances. The net effect, however, will be a substantial lessening of the enforcement value of the civil-action provisions of the act.

If, as we have suggested in another portion of this report, provision were made to permit the Administrator to act with legal effect to render interpretations and rulings, both the employer and the employee would be given adequate safeguards and assistance in the resolving of doubtful questions. Given this assistance, there is absolutely no reason why the employer who does engage in a violation of the act should not be called upon to pay the full compensation now provided in the statute.

(e) Compensation tarred by custom or practice

The bill reported favorably by the majority proposes to bar for the past and the future any action based on the failure of an employer to pay legally required compensation for any specific activities if those activities are not required to be compensated by the "custom or practice" of the employer or by agreement between the employer and his employee or between the employer and a collective-bargaining agent.

In our judgment the proposal to make the law depend on the custom or practice of the employer accomplishes a virtual destruction of any standards under an act which by its title is supposed to set standards, namely, the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The bill proposes that the question of whether certain activities are or are not required to be compensated under the law is to be determined by the custom or practice of the employer. This means that a new employer setting up his business for the first time is free to write the law for himself. He will determine what is his custom or practice and that will determine what is the law as far as he is concerned.

Even among employers already in business, the proposed bill means that instead of setting any uniform or even any minimum standard the law will vary from employer to employer. Those employers who have been more liberal and decent and who have compensated their employees fully for all activities engaged in for the benefit of the employer will be penalized. For them the law will be quite stringent, based on the decent practices they have followed.

On the other hand, the employer who has cut corners, who has given the most restricted possible interpretation to his duties under the law, who has paid his employees as little as possible, who has required his employees to engage in a substantial amount of work without compensation, is to be favored under the proposed bill. He is to be rewarded for his sweatshop conditions. The more vicious his practices have been the more he is rewarded since the law, for him, will set standards as low as those he himself has set.

In our judgment such a proposal is completely indefensible. It hits hardest at those employees who most need the protection of the act—the unorganized. Remember only some 14,000,000 are organized. Most of the workers are not in unions. Among those, it hits hardest at those who most need the setting of standards in the act—those in industries or establishments where the employer has operated under substandard conditions. Those conditions the law would now accept and actually embody in the law itself.

In our judgment, a sound legislative policy requires that we take appropriate action now to establish an appropriate definition of the term "work." But we favor a process of definition, not a process of affirmatively enacting an absence of definition. We favor the establishment of uniform standards for all employers within appropriate classifications. We oppose the enactment of laws which permit employers to write their own ticket, to change the law from year to year, and which reward chiseling and penalize decency.

We would favor a provision writing into the law a definition of "work." Such a provision would require that in order to be deemed compensable under the law activities must be conducted under the control, direction, or requirement of the employer and must be primarily for the benefit of the employer. If it be felt that a uniform definition for all employers in all industries is not desirable, we would favor a provision empowering the Administrator by appropriate procedures, including proper investigation, notice, and hearing, to formulate definitions for various industries and classifications conforming to standards which could be written into the law. Either of these alternative methods of procedure would establish uniform standards, standards supported by considerations of common sense and the realities of industrial operation, standards which would apply equally to all employers within the same classification.

(f) Constitutionality

The reported bill permits employers for all time in the future to continue to refuse compensation for activities which the Supreme Court found to constitute "work" and to be free from any suits for compensation. (See *Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company* v. *Muscoda Local No. 123* (321 U. S. 590, supra).)

Over and beyond that, the bill wipes away retroactively many pending suits and many accrued claims not in suit. Whether Congress can reach back and say, "Although rights have accrued, those rights are now null and void," is open to serious doubt. Can Congress relieve employers of liability for past violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act? That is highly doubtful. If workers' claims can be erased, then let businessmen beware lest Congress thereby gain precedent, permitting it to wipe out their past claims.

An individual may not under due process of law be deprived of previously vested rights. Claims for overtime compensation and liquidated damages under the Fair Labor Standards Act constitute property of which no employee can be deprived without due process of law (*Reid* v. *Solar Corporation* (6 W. H. cases, 508, 518)).

Congress can redefine a day's work or a week's work, but only as to the future. Congress can delimit claims for the future but not for the past.

Under this bill there is taken from the employee the right to compensation for work as authorized by a former act of Congress, the Fair Labor Standards Act. This right can be taken away from the worker by a collective-bargaining agreement or the claim can be compromised with the worker himself. In other words, the employer can compromise his own violation of the law.

Congress can change any act, but it cannot blanket out claims that have accrued. Congress cannot even do this under the guise of

its right to broaden or narrow the judicial process or procedure.

CONCLUSION

Because the bill under consideration says that worktime is that which is governed by collective-bargaining agreements, custom, or practice of the employer or the employer's good faith (i. e., operation of the employer's mind—at best most difficult to prove or disprove) and because all these factors are the guideposts for pay work, the bill repeals provisions in the wages-and-hour law with respect to hours of employment and compensation. This the majority would do under the subtle maneuver of outlawing so-called portal-to-portal suits. By adopting the pending bill Congress destroys the standard of hours and wages set by the Fair Labor Standards Act for public health and safety and substitutes standards set by agreement, custom, and practice. Why do not the proponents of the bill honestly say they want to kill the Fair Labor Standards Act?

EMANUEL CELLER
WILLIAM T. BYRNE
THOMAS J. LANE
MARTIN GORSKI
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

Economical Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal has recently issued a directive to the Navy Department which in my humble opinion is an inspiring and timely document. Instead of screaming to high heaven that the efforts of Congress to reduce the Federal budget will result in scuttling the Navy and sabotaging national defense, he cautions the Navy to spend its every dollar wisely. The attitude expressed by Secretary Forrestal might well be emulated by the heads of all other Government departments and agencies.

As a businessman, the Secretary knows that our country cannot maintain a strong Army and Navy unless our internal economy is strong. Of particular significance is his statement:

The Navy knows that no enemy forces could ever deal the Navy a more serious blow than would result from domestic fiscal and economic instability.

What a pity it is that more of the heads of departments do not view our fiscal policies in the same light.

No Member of Congress is going to deliberately vote this country into a state of impotence. However, we are faced with the very real and practical necessity of eliminating every single unnecessary expenditure in every department, including the War and Navy Departments. In this connection I earnestly commend Secretary Forrestal's directive to my colleagues.

The statement is as follows:

The economic, business, and governmental task which the United States Government faces in the years immediately ahead is one of enormous proportions.

Our national debt exceeds $260,000,000,000. Interest charges of $5,000,000,000 on this debt are a fixed expenditure. So, too, are $7,000,000,000 for the care and benefit of veterans. Eleven and a half billion dollars for the Army and the Navy plus the expenses of running the rest of the Government bring the expenditure total to $37,000,000,000. This is the basis of the budget the President submitted to Congress.

The raising of funds to support such a budget and to provide for some reduction in the national debt is a great burden. All officers and employees of the Federal Government must cooperate with the President and with the Congress in reducing expenditures to a minimum. The Navy knows that no enemy forces could ever deal the Navy a more serious blow than would result from domestic fiscal and economic instability. The Navy must help to forestall such instability by proving itself the most efficient and economically operating organization in America.

No question is pending in the Congress as to the actual need for strong and capable military and naval establishments to insure our national security. Differences of opinion have arisen as to the degree to which our military and naval appropriations can safely be reduced. This constitutes no valid ground for criticism of the efforts of Members of Congress to achieve their broad economy objectives. Only by proving to Congress that we are making every possible effort to spend appropriated funds wisely and carefully can we obtain our minimum requirements.

The entire Naval Establishment—officers enlisted men, and civilian personnel—must accept the responsibility of making every effort to eliminate all unnecessary spending and to achieve administrative efficiency in dealing with the appropriated funds. All hands should bear in mind that examples of waste, carelessness, or inefficient use of public moneys do great damage to the interest of the Navy as a whole. Even a single case of negligence can be used as a powerful argument against the validity of our entire schedule of requests from Congress.

We can best insure obtaining the funds we need for a strong and vigorous Navy by demonstrating our ability to make wise and careful use of every dollar that is entrusted to us.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the men who are now called veterans protected us in the hour of America's greatest danger. Will we now protect them in their hour of need? That is the question now before us.

This letter from a veteran in Los Angeles is an example of what we may expect the country over if what remains of the veterans' emergency housing program is scrapped March 30.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: Congratulations on your strong stand in behalf of better housing program for veterans. I do not believe veterans should be catered to forever, but in such essential things as a home, a job, and an education I believe the veteran should be given all the breaks possible.

I am about to purchase a house built on priorities issued for vets' building and it has a ceiling price on it. The seller will not conclude the deal until the last moment, possibly hoping that the ceiling price will be removed. I am glad there are people such as you representing us and doing their best to protect us on such things.

You have my complete backing—little that it is. Best of luck and good wishes to you.

LARRY HADSELL.

Reciprocity With a Small "r"—Is the Trade Agreement With Argentina of Benefit to the American Users of Linseed Oil?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we hear much these days about world agriculture commerce. The following is from the recent issue of the World Report. Here is an example of reciprocity with a small "r." The chart that accompanied this article showed that the price of linseed oil was 9¾ cents a pound in 1944 and 1945, and up to August 1946 when it was increased to 25 cents a pound. In February 1947 this was again increased to 30 cents per pound. The article is as follows:

HIGH PRICES FIXED BY GOVERNMENT PERIL ARGENTINE LINSEED INDUSTRY—WORLD CONSUMERS OF THE SCARCE OIL ARE DEVELOPING SUBSTITUTES AND INCREASING LOCAL PRODUCTION

Argentina may be pricing herself out of the world market for linseed oil. The Government monopoly in Buenos Aires is setting prices so high that former customers are turning to substitutes and are increasing local production.

Normally, Argentina accounts for 80 percent of world exports of linseed oil—essential in the paint, linoleum, and printing industries.

As the accompanying chart shows, the Argentine monopoly has doubled the price of linseed oil in the last year, although production has climbed steeply at the same time.

United States consumers are likely to feel the pinch in the form of higher prices for paint. Until recently American dealers in linseed oil were deadlocked with the Argentine Government for several months as the Argentines held out for higher prices and a bulk sale. Now, Argentina has agreed to ship 40,000 tons of oil purchased by the United States Commodity Credit Corporation at a stiff increase in price.

Because of the high price, industries in the United States are willing to take only slightly more than half the share of Argentine linseed oil allocated to them by the International Emergency Food Council. Chances are that the United States will buy no more of the oil from Argentina this year after the 40,000 tons have been delivered.

WORLD MARKET

The abnormally high price charged by the Argentine state monopoly is having two effects on the world market that, in time, may deprive Argentina of much of her lucrative trade in linseed oil.

Search for substitutes is being hastened both in the United States and in Europe.

Until quite recently almost no satisfactory substitute for linseed oil existed. But the shortage and high price of the commodity are bringing many other types of oils into increasing use. Improvements are constantly being developed for such substitutes as oiticica, tung, soybean, and fish oils.

As the pinch in linseed oil continues, research laboratories are developing alternative substances that actually are superior to linseed oil for certain types of paint.

Some manufacturers are intensifying the search for a completely synthetic substitute. At least one already has been developed, but it must be blended with natural oil to give satisfactory results.

Competition for Argentine linseed oil is springing up in other countries. World consumers have been treated to a good lesson in the dangers of overdependence on imports of the oil. Now they are urging their governments to encourage a degree of self-sufficiency.

What is happening in the United States is a good example. The United States may become nearly self-sufficient in linseed oil this year as the result of Government efforts to spur domestic production. The Department of Agriculture has set a new floor of $6 a bushel as the price to be paid to United States farmers for linseed. The previous price was $3.60.

The premium price is expected to double output and bring the United States close to independence of Argentine production. Normally, the United States is Argentina's best customers for linseed oil. The United States is the world's largest consumer of the commodity.

The stimulus already is being felt in the flax-growing areas of the United States. In California, for example, some farmers are plowing up land sown to barley and resowing it to flax. This year's crop of linseed in the United States may be as much as 50,000,000 bushels, compared to last year's 23,000,000.

In Argentina, the trend is just the opposite. While the Argentine Government is raising its prices to world consumers, it is cutting prices paid to its own farmers. The Government recently reduced the price it pays to growers from $1.30 a bushel to $1.10. The American farmer, on the other hand, is guaranteed $6 a bushel. Actually, he may get more.

Short-term profits made by the Argentine Government in this way are tremendous. But signs are increasing that President Perón and his financial advisers may be killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

The Vital Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most progressive cities in Nebraska is the city of Ashland. It boasts of one of the most progressive weekly papers in the State, the Ashland Gazette. Mr. M. C. Howe is the owner and publisher of this fine weekly newspaper. He has written an editorial on the matter of freedom. Because this editorial conveys most of the ideas of the freedom-loving people of my State, I include it in the extension of my remarks in order that other Members of the House of Representatives may read it:

To an American, steeped in ideals of liberty, the most appalling trend in the world today is the growth of collectivism. Practically all of the nations of the Old World have turned their backs on freedom and accepted, willingly or otherwise, the cruel ideology of the superstate. Under collectivism the individual is nothing, except insofar as he can be used to serve the purposes of the government. The state is all.

This leaves the United States almost alone as the citadel of a tradition of freedom which goes back to the Magna Carta. And this imposes on the Government and the people of the United States an enormous obligation to prove that the dignity of the individual still lives, that the rights of man are a fact and not a myth, that freedom is a vital force that will not be denied.

This obligation can be discharged in only one way—by resisting every encroachment by the state upon the privileges, the rights, and the prerogatives of individuals. If we permit government to dominate us in our economic life, we will eventually have Government domination of all other facets of existence. Freedom is an absolute; once we temporize with it, we pave the way for its destruction.

Those nations which wish collectivism are entitled to it. But it must never be confused with freedom or allowed a foothold here.

Subsistence Payments to Veterans Receiving "On-the-Job" Training

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to read in the Washington Times-Herald on Friday past, a news article which stated in substance that the bill which raised the ceiling on subsistence payments to veterans who were "on the job training" or in school, was to be pigeonholed by the Republican leadership; because that leadership knew the bill would pass, and if it did, it would upset the GOP economy plans.

Inflated prices are already making a hollow promise of the GI bill of rights, and today a veteran with dependents or a family cannot work and go to school under the present ceiling of $200 per month. My information is that hundreds are now being forced out of school and to give up training.

We can be assured that the men who during the war years sighted down the barrel on this Nation's enemies are today sighting down the barrel on the congressional leadership, observing whether or not that leadership, in an effort to live up to its promise of a 20 percent tax cut, is going to sacrifice the soldiers in order to give millions to millionaires.

Let us hope this newspaper article is unfounded:

PAY INCREASE FOR VETERANS FACES SURE DEFEAT IN HOUSE

The House Republican leadership was reported yesterday to have clamped down on a veterans' bill costing an estimated $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 in an effort to avoid a break in the GOP economy program.

Target of the leaders' opposition was a measure sponsored by Representative KEARNEY (Republican), of New York, raising the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans receiving training on the job.

TO PIGEONHOLE MEASURE

The measure has been reported out by the Veterans' Committee, but must receive the approval of the Rules Committee before the bill can be called up in the House for a vote.

Passage of the measure, whenever it came to a vote, was apparently assured and the leadership was reported to have decided to pigeonhole the bill in the Rules Committee.

The leadership was fearful that if the Kearney bill was permitted to go through, it would be the signal for other Members to push special legislation and the entire GOP economy program might be endangered.

KEARNEY said he had heard of the plan, but declined to say whether he would attempt to force the issue.

The Kearney bill would increase the monthly ceiling for on-the-job training from $175 to $250 for single veterans. The present ceiling of $200 for veterans with dependents would be boosted to $325 for a veteran with one dependent and $350 for a veteran with two or more dependents.

$149,000,000 COST

Veterans' Administrator Bradley has informed the Veterans' Committee that the estimated cost of the increased ceilings, which would include both private compensation and Government subsistence allowances of $65 to $90 monthly, would be $149,688,000 for the 1948 fiscal year beginning July 1, provided there was no increase in the number of trainees, which KEARNEY said totaled about 66,000. Other estimates placed the cost much higher.

Attention, Managers of the Campaign To Sugar-coat Conscription: Here Is a Japanese Trick You Can Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, not being acquainted with the managers of the campaign to sugar-coat conscription, I must use the RECORD to get this message to them. I have watched with interest their clever and energetic efforts to put a heaven-home-and-mother frosting on that European product—conscription.

To confuse the people, the President's Universal Training Commission, a good-name jury for a "fixed verdict" on conscription, was sly propaganda. The much-ballyhooed "umtees" whose chocolate-soda pictures fill the press, are also clever work.

In addition to these, I am wondering if an extremely cute Japanese device might also be used. In the off chance that this Tojo trick has been overlooked, I am including it herewith. No acknowledgment is necessary.

I am sure the managers of the CTSC will agree it does a masterful job of sugar-coating the ugly truth about conscription.

Of course, it must not be used verbatim as I reproduce it. But I am con-

fident the managers of the campaign to sugar-coat conscription can make the changes necessary to adapt it to the CTSC.

Likewise, I am sure the Japs no longer have any use for it.

JAPANESE LETTER SENT TO NEAREST RELATIVE OF MAN TO BE CONSCRIPTED

Greetings to the father and elder brother: We have learned that your son and brother will shortly experience the greatest joy and satisfaction possible to one of our nation by joining soon our second company. We congratulate you.

When your son and brother enters the barracks, the officers of the company will take your place in looking after his welfare. We will be to him as a stern father and a loving mother. We will always be concerned with his two-fold training, body and mind, so that in belonging to the army he may become a good soldier and a loyal subject of the Emperor. We want to be able to teach him in such a way that he may be able to realize the highest hope of a member of our race.

With the company and your home forming a complete circle we wish to cooperate with you to the fullest extent in order to administer his education and guidance along the most rational lines. In order to do this, we wish to learn as much as possible from you with reference to his personal history and character and the environment of his home. This information will be kept in confidence. If you have any misgivings, fear it will be difficult to learn your son's exact condition after his enlistment, or that he will not be able to advance in rank, or any other misunderstandings, rest assured we will be glad to discuss the matter with you. That our efforts to guide the young man will not be hindered, we beg you to fill out the enclosed form with the greatest care and return it to us as soon as possible.

The regiment, however, is not concerned entirely with the past life of your son, but in guiding his development—wishing unselfishly to emphasize his good points and strengthen his weak points—to develop all his powers to the end that he may become a good and faithful soldier, maintain a first-class record in the army, and put his whole heart into fulfilling the mission of the imperial army.

On the day your son enters the barracks, we trust that you will accompany him in order that we may meet you and have an intimate talk with you.

Respectfully yours,

COMMANDING OFFICER,
Imperial Japanese Army.

Removal of Rent Ceilings Will Affect 50,000,000 Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor of February 24, 1947, on the action taken by Congress to destroy rent control.

The Christian Science Monitor suggests that if Congress wants to end rent control why does it not do it in such a way that the 50,000,000 American people whose lives will be affected will know what is going to happen to them before it is too late to make their voices heard.

SIDE DOOR TO INFLATION

If Congress wants to kill the Office of Price Administration finally and wholly, it should do so frankly. If it wants to abolish rent ceilings and sugar rations, it should vote straightforwardly to do so. If it has a hankering for further inflation, it should not slip in the side door but march honestly up the front walk.

As we see it, the move to starve OPA is neither frank, straightforward, nor honest. The vote in the House of Representatives, not merely denying a deficiency appropriation but demanding the return of $9,000,000 already allotted to OPA, appears vindictive and irresponsible. The price controllers have made mistakes and they may have wasted some public money, but there should be other correctives short of destroying rent controls.

There may be some vague plan to transfer rent controls to some other agency, and the House may be confident that between them the Senate and the White House will find ways of preventing the immediate demise which OPA rather excitedly predicts. But on the House's own action rent controls would end without any real debate or any direct vote on the merits of ending or keeping them.

The question deserves frank and full discussion. Landlords all over the Nation have been squeezed between rising costs and frozen rents. Many have had to stop making repairs; some have survived only by obtaining lower interest rates and having their properties fully occupied. The OPA has figures showing that in 63 cities landlords had by such ingenuity gained a 28-percent increase in net revenue over 1939. But many have been in a most unfair position, and about 1,000,000 have had to get adjustments from OPA.

Certainly other hardship cases should have relief, and it should not be delayed. But to remove ceilings at this time would be to squeeze a larger number of tenants—most of them in the low-income or white-collar group which has already been hit hard by rising prices. It would be to incite new wage demands and give a very sharp boost to inflation. If this is to be done it should not be through the side door—by depriving OPA of the funds necessary to keep alive.

Recent Polls on Trade Policy

REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in assuming to express the policy of this House on reciprocal reduction of international trade barriers, some Members of the majority party seem to have lost touch with the views of the folks back home who send them here. The folks back home do not see eye to eye with the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and are several jumps ahead of those who are against reciprocal trade-agreements when it comes to the facts of international trade and its effect on our own economic welfare.

Last November right after the election, the American Press, a newspaper trade journal, took a poll among the country editors of 1,000 weekly papers in as many counties of the United States. It asked for the editors' opinions on various public questions, including foreign relations. One of the questions asked was: Would you favor a return to the high-tariff policy once practiced by the Republicans? Of the editors replying, 69 percent said "No"—and many of them underlined the answer or added an exclamation point. Only 9 percent said "Yes", 4 percent of the editors favored protective tariffs, "but not high enough to fence America in" and the other 18 percent was undecided.

On February 23 of this year the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Denver published the results of a poll on the subject of tariff reduction. Almost three out of four persons interviewed favored reduction of United States tariffs if other countries reduced their barriers against our goods at the same time; the exact percentage was 73. And when it comes to making a statement about the policy of the majority party in the House, it would be well to remember that 72 percent of Republicans favored reciprocal tariff reductions on the basis of the present program, as against 74 for Democrats. Partisan politics did not seem to play much part at the grass roots and policy announcers had better wake up to the fact that they have only 28 percent of their own party back home behind them when they come out against reciprocal trade agreements.

This is not a sudden switch. This trend of opinion at lea t dates back to November 1946 when the same National Opinion Research Center conducted a poll on the basic issue—which is the real issue involved in the controversy over trade agreements—"In general, do you think we need to buy goods from foreign countries in order to sell goods to foreign countries, or isn't it necessary?" From a scientifically stratified cross-section of the Nation came back this answer: "It is necessary," 76 percent; "it is not necessary," 18 percent; "undecided," 6 percent.

On party lines, according to the Chicago Sun (November 3, 1946), there was a slightly higher percentage of Republicans than Democrats who thought we needed to buy in order to sell.

In the same poll it developed that 55 percent of the people questioned felt that increased imports are very important.

The economic foreign policy of the United States is no longer something that a little group of politicans here in the Capitol, meeting behind closed doors can rig up to suit their own ideas, political or economic. It is a matter on which the people of the United States have informed opinions.

The Tobacco-Seed Embargo—Where Is the Good-Neighbor Policy in This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the past 14 years we

have read volumes for and against the Tariff Act of 1930 and the misnamed reciprocal trade treaties.

The facts are that the present administration has erected more severe trade barriers than any administration has ever erected in the history of our country.

The following self-explanatory letter is one of many examples of how the New Dealers talk one way but perform another:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 22, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of January 2, inquiring about the act of Congress prohibiting the exportation of tobacco seed and live plants. This law was enacted to protect the foreign market for American tobacco growers. It was felt that the large quantities of tobacco seed being exported annually to China and other countries which normally imported large quantities of tobacco from our flue-cured districts were contributing to the decrease in these tobacco exports.

The act forbids the exportation of tobacco seed except for experimental purposes, and the officials of the Department concerned with plant breeding stated that one-half ounce of seed is more than ample for planting a regulation-size experimental plot. This, therefore, was adopted as the maximum quantity of seed that could be exported for any one variety. However, under an approval application, a permit may be issued to cover several varieties. Permits are issued only for seed to be used in the course of scientific experiments as conducted by governmental agencies. During the past 4 years the total quantity of seed authorized to be exported has been slightly under 11 pounds. A copy of the regulations governing the administration of this act is enclosed.

Congressman KERR, of North Carolina, was instrumental in securing the enactment of this law, and you may wish to discuss it further with him.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Assistant Secretary.

Who was Secretary of State when this Kerr bill was passed? None other than Mr. Cordell Hull from the tobacco State of Tennessee. If he really believed in good-neighbor policy, why no vocal or written protest from him?

Who was Secretary of Agriculture at that time? None other than Henry A. Wallace. Why no vocal or written protest from Henry?

The American people have been misled if they believe that this administration has carried on a program of reciprocity or that such legislation is favorable to an honest and sincere good-neighbor policy.

Mr. Speaker, the above is by far the most severe trade barrier ever erected by any administration in the history of our country. It is absolutely contrary to a good-neighbor policy, and the worst trade barrier ever erected. The present administration cannot defend this act and cannot cloud the issue by talking about the iniquities of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. The New Dealers vote to give added protection to cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and pretend to be for the reciprocal trade treaties. If one makes an effort to give any similar deserved protection to the livestock and dairy industry, a really large part of American agriculture, he immediately would become an economic isolationist.

China produced nearly a billion pounds of tobacco last year without the benefit of United States seed. There are absolute quotas on cigar and scrap tobacco imports in effect now from the Philippines. There is also a quota on filler tobacco from Cuba.

Help, Help, Uncle Sam, International Fireman: 400,000 Americans Died Answering Last Alarm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the March Catholic World carried a column entitled "Palestine: a Solution," by Father James M. Gillis.

With magnificent skillfulness, Father Gillis reveals the world disaster that has resulted from using the United States as the International Fireman.

In reading this editorial, it is suggested that wherever the word "Palestine" appears, you add the words, "Greece," "Turkey," and so forth. That mental addition will give you a quick understanding of the hellish mess to which the so-called Successful Bipartisan Foreign Policy has brought us.

PALESTINE: A SOLUTION

A month ago in this space appeared the statement that there is no solution for the Palestine problem; none but the confession, impossible and unthinkable on the part of Britain, that she had been guilty of duplicity in promising the Holy Land first to the Jews and then to the Arabs. I am now confronted with the humiliating necessity of apologizing for that apodictic utterance. There is a solution. The reason I did not see it is that I underestimated British diplomacy. I forgot—for the moment—the infinite resourcefulness of the mind of Winston Churchill. How so manifest a phenomenon could have been—even for an instant—obscured from my eyes, I cannot explain.

But the fact is there to confront and confound me. The ex-Prime Minister of Britain has come forward with a suggestion so simple that I have no excuse for not having seen it. Mr. Churchill says, "unless the United States will come in with us on a 50-50 basis on an agreed policy—on all the bloodshed, odium, and trouble, and work, we will lay our mandate at the feet of the International Organization." And he goes on to express the hope that the Government of Britain will, unless the United States comes in, "divest itself of a responsibility which we are failing to discharge and which in the process is covering us with blood and shame."

Now, why didn't we Americans think of that solution, so simple, so equitable, indeed so inevitable? In particular, how could I have been so unwarrantably dogmatic as to declare that there was no solution? Of course there is a solution. There is always a solution. Uncle Sam is the solution. All he needs do is to step into the most impossible situation and bring order out of chaos. See how simply and easily we settled the problem of Poland, and of Yugoslavia. And Austria. And Hungary. And China and Korea. This little Palestine business is a pushover. We can fix it in—well let's see, we can fix it in an afternoon, as some of our admirals in the Pacific said we could settle the the problem of Japan.

INTERNATIONAL FIREMAN

So thanks for the suggestion, Mr. Churchill. We will run right over and attend to the matter at once. As for the bloodshed, odium, trouble, shame, don't mention it. When you promised your own people "nothing but blood and sweat and tears" we insisted upon sharing their sufferings. We did it, before and, encouraged by the results, we will do it again. When we have fixed up Palestine, would you like to have us move on to India and straighten out that little snarl? Okey dokey. That's right down our alley. We are the trouble-shooters of the universe. Don't thank us. Happy to help you. Honored to be asked. Here we come.

Perhaps this matter is really too serious to be treated in a jocular way Of itself and by itself, the notion that we must do for Palestine and for all the Empire what England has found it impossible to do, is one that may ruin us if we accept it and act upon it.

Walter Lippmann wrote in his column on February 11: "A crisis of great dimensions is manifestly in the making which, if it were allowed to run its course, could shake the world, and make our own position highly vulnerable and precariously isolated. There is no mistaking the signs which are the warning of that crisis. They are that the Canadian and American credits which were intended to last until at least 1951, are not going to be sufficient to see the British through the period of reconstruction in the British Isles and of liquidation and reorganization in the vast regions of their imperial commitments in the Mediterranean and southern Asia."

He visualizes "a forced and disorderly liquidation of so many British external commitments * * * in Europe, Asia, and Africa," which with Winston Churchill's statement adds up to this: The maintenance of the whole British Empire depends upon our participation on a 50-50 basis. It would be interesting to know what the American people think of that.

H. R. 601 on Flammable Fabrics a Good Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Sacramento Bee.

The editor speaks of a bill which I introduced and on which hearings have been held before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The committee gave a full and fair hearing on three bills, including H. R. 601, which I introduced. We hope that it will report a bill on the subject of flammable fabrics in order that the public may be protected against dangerous fabrics, which have and will continue to do much damage to innocent purchasers of these fabrics or clothes made of such fabrics. Naturally, I feel that my bill is the best ap-

proach to the problem and will solve the problem because of its simplicity and because it will be administered by the Bureau of Standards.

The editor was kind enough to say that I pioneered legislation in this field, I having introduced two such bills in the Seventy-ninth Congress. The present bill—H. R. 601—is the evolution of my thinking, after my experience with the other bills and all the advice I could obtain on the proper method to safeguard the public against dangerous flammable fabrics. But I wish to state that the editor of the Sacramento Bee, Mr. Walter P. Jones, is the pioneer in requesting legislation on this problem, for it was through his efforts and the editorials of his paper that sufficient interest was aroused in the problem so that California legislated on the subject in 1945. When it was found by experience with that law that the problem was really a national one, the editor suggested that I might try to induce Congress to solve the problem for the whole Nation, and the result finally culminated in H. R. 601, which is now in the hands of the committee above mentioned.

The editorial referred to follows:

STRONG LAW IS NEEDED

Representative LEROY JOHNSON, of the Third (Sacramento) Congressional District, is wholly justified in asking the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to recommend a strong law forbidding the use of inflammable goods in clothing.

JOHNSON pioneered legislation against the manufacture and sale of highly inflammable clothing. However, some who favor a softer statute at the risk of human lives have proposed a rival act permitting the sale of such hazardous materials if they were marked "flammable—dangerous when worn."

In some respects such a law would be worse than no law at all.

The buyers, more often than not, would fail to see the labels. And it cannot be expected the manufacturers would make them conspicuous or that the sellers would call the customers' attention to them.

Thus, this would not protect the public. However, it would be a means of protecting the manufacturers against possible legal actions for damages in the event someone were killed or disfigured.

The Johnson bill, designed to stop the sale of inflammable clothing and providing severe penalties for violations, is the measure which should be passed.

Efforts To Fight Communism With Dollars Seen as Futile Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of yesterday:

EFFORTS TO FIGHT COMMUNISM WITH DOLLARS SEEN AS FUTILE POLICY

Pleas by the Greek Government for substantial assistance to prevent that stricken country's economic collapse should be viewed realistically by the people of the United States.

Sentimentally, our hearts go out to the Greeks, who are torn by civil dissension resulting from Great Britain's insistence that King George II, a listless and near-Fascist ruler, be returned to the throne.

We share also her fears of Russian aggression and sympathize deeply with a gallant people facing up to the inevitable breakdown of an already tottering economy.

Since Great Britain, Greece's traditional protector, has served notice that she can no longer support a substantial army in Greece to preserve order, the problem is thrown squarely in our laps because we are so closely tied to British foreign policy.

The State Department is apparently committed to Greek assistance in the amount of $350,000,000. It is explained publicly that a sum of this size is necessary to purchase food, clothing, and other emergency essentials. Additionally, the Greek note to the United States explained that American technical experts are needed to help the country get to her feet.

What neither the State Department nor the Greek diplomatic dispatch did say, and this is the real issue, is that American money and perhaps her soldiers must be used if we are to prevent the spread of communism throughout the Balkans and the rest of Europe.

The argument, freely used by high officials and military leaders in off-the-record sessions with Washington newspaper correspondents, is fight communism with dollars.

It is a cry that will be heard much more frequently and openly in the months and years to come.

It is an assertion that should be sharply challenged before it becomes, through public inertia and Government propaganda, the pattern for our future foreign policy.

Isn't it high time that we came to grips with the facts?

American dollars failed to resolve the political differences in China between Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek and the Communists. We threw away hundreds of millions in a vain effort to bring order out of chaos and came away with nothing but the bitter taste of another political retreat.

George Weller, of the Chicago Daily News Foreign Service, says that the postwar policy of "pay, preach, and retreat," which has failed on a gigantic scale in China, has failed in the Balkans, too, and it has cost the American people in postwar aid nearly $500,000,000 to lose their political shirts at the "little table" in tiny Greece as at the "big table" in China.

The Free Press favored the British loan as an outright gift with no thought that it would ever be repaid. We believed that the gift of a few billion dollars would prove either that Great Britain could survive as a great power with this assistance or that her economy had disintegrated so badly that it could no longer be propped up even with American financial support.

The British are now back in the market for another loan.

We made a very sizable loan to France, timing it to provide a potent argument for the rightists in the French elections.

Yet France, with no semblance of strong leadership or direction, continues to drift gradually to the left.

In the case of Greece British insistence upon restoration of the monarchy prevented the people from having a government of their own choosing.

We have backed the British experiment in Greece to the hilt and now find ourselves the unhappy legatees of a moral and material bankruptcy.

Can we fight communism with dollars?

The projected $350,000,000 gift to Greece is but another in a series of well-intentioned but utterly futile efforts to buy off the Communists at so much a head.

The history of the world proves that individuals with strong ideological convictions are not for sale at any price, except when it suits their purpose to be cooperative until the money has been spent.

There might be same military justification for the Greek gift if, in return, we obtained a few naval bases in Greece and Turkey.

Financially, it could be justified if Britain agreed to transfer Greek credits frozen in London to the United States so that Greece could buy some of the things it needs with its own money instead of borrowing from us.

It might even be morally justifiable if it meant a thorough political house cleaning in Greece with new elections so that the people might select the type of government they prefer.

But, as George Weller points out, we are in effect only throwing more money into the bottomless kitty of nations who have anti-communism for sale.

Can we fight communism with dollars?

For one, I am convinced that we cannot.

The tragic plight of the Greeks can be alleviated through privately supported groups such as the Greek War Relief Association, which has had years of experience in this field.

Our Government should be ready to ship surpluses of food and supplies and let their distribution be supervised by trained and competent organizations which understand the problem.

But the policy of paying Greece to support a token force of British troops as a bulwark against the vastly superior Russian armies in the northern Balkans is unrealism at its worst.

For once I agree with Senator CLAUDE PEPPER in his suggestion that the Greek question be referred to the United Nations on the theory that it is a global problem vitally affecting the peace of the world.

As time goes on and international difficulties increase, it will be impossible for the United States to patch up the remnants of shaky regimes and empires the world over.

If the United Nations is to refute the rising tide of cynical comment that it is just "another debating society," the Palestine and the Greek problems must have its immediate attention.

At this point someone may well ask: "If we are not to fight communism with dollars, what is the solution?"

Unfortunately, the very simplicity of the question makes the answer more difficult.

There seems to be almost universal agreement that communism is abhorrent to freemen.

But who shall say that the people of any nation may not have communism if that is what they desire?

If the ideological and military conflict with Russia is as inevitable as the wise men of the radio proclaim it to be, another little nation or two gone communistic won't prove to be the deciding factor in an atomic war.

Let them demonstrate whether the communistic system can be successful. Let it be shown that people are happier without free speech, free elections, and freedom of opportunity.

The capitalistic system is under constant attack from disaffected Americans who emphasize its imperfections while enjoying all of its benefits.

Perhaps the communistic system can provide better living conditions, more abundant crops, finer cars, superior household accessories, and greater liberty than we have in America.

Possibly some people could be happier living under the constant scrutiny of the secret police. Even a few of our sons and daughters see considerable merit in the communistic system. Let this be shown. We might all be convinced.

Meanwhile, efforts to combat communism in the Balkans with American dollars are not likely to succeed.

Then, when we have bankrupted ourselves trying to bail out the staggering nations of Europe, communism will have a field day in the United States.

Of course, the capitalistic system will be blamed for the debacle when actually it is being drained so systematically that even today it has considerable less than an even chance to prove its worth.

We have poured forth a golden and seemingly endless stream of American dollars in our policy of "pay, preach, and retreat."

With nothing to show for our immature generosity except more calls for help, the time has come to call a halt before we join our friends in the international breadline.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Removal of Government Controls Over Business

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the period of the war, the American people recognized the fact that Government control of production was necessary. We cheerfully submitted to many unusual and strict regulations, and surrendered much freedom of action and conduct to the Government and its various departments, boards, and bureaus. We did this in order that all the great resources of our country could be exclusively devoted to the task of winning the war.

As a result of this situation, the Government assumed control of many details of business life, which the American people would never have surrendered to the Government except for the war emergency.

The war was ended more than a year and a half ago now, and with the ending of the war also ended the reason for Government control in many details of our business life. It was not intended that freedom of action in business life should be surrendered permanently, nor was it intended that the Government should permanently control American business. The time has come now when the Government should get out of business, and let the American people get back into business.

Since September 1, 1941, there have been in force Federal regulations which restrict credit sales of automobiles, taxicabs, stoves, washing machines, ironing machines, refrigerators, radios, sewing machines, vacuum cleaners, and household furniture of all kinds.

These restrictions were placed in effect by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on September 1, 1941, under authority of Presidential Executive Order No. 8843, dated August 9, 1941. The regulation issued by the Board of Governors is known as regulation W. Regulation W has no ending date or termination date, but will run indefinitely unless affirmative action is taken to end it.

Under this regulation W as it now stands, applies to any person who is engaged in the business of making extensions of installment credit in amounts of $2,000 or less, or discounting or purchasing obligations arising out of such extensions of credit. It applies whether the person is a bank, loan company, or finance company, or a person who is so engaged in connection with any other business, such as by making such extensions of credit as a dealer, retailer, or other person in connection with the selling of consumers' durable goods.

Every merchant and dealer who sells the articles mentioned above, and every bank, finance company, or individual, who lends money to buy these articles, or buys purchase money notes executed for them, must be registered with and have a license from the Federal Government to do business, and may be prosecuted for a violation of the regulations, and punished by a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years, or both.

Regulation W as it now stands, applies to the purchase and sale and lending of money with which to purchase certain listed articles, whether new or used, ranging in value from $50 to $2,000. Under the terms of regulation W, on certain items the purchaser must make a down payment of 33⅓ percent, and must pay the remaining 66⅔ percent in not less than 15 months. These regulations apply among other articles to automobiles, including taxi cabs, cooking stoves and ranges, washing and ironing machines, refrigerators of less than 12 cubic feet capacity, radio sets, phonographs, or combinations, sewing machines and vacuum cleaners. The regulation further requires that on household furniture, a down payment of 20 percent must be made, and the remainder must be paid within 15 months.

As an illustration of how this regulation affects the average citizen, if he buys a new automobile for $1,500, he must make a down payment of $500, and must pay the remaining $1,000 within 15 months. A bank or loan company is not permitted to lend the purchaser any money on the installment plan with which to make all or any part of the down payment. The seller is not permitted to extend credit to the buyer for any part of the down payment and the seller is not allowed to sell the buyer the car if he knows or has reason to know that the buyer has borrowed any portion of the down payment from any other person or company.

These stringent regulations necessarily retard business activity and make it very difficult for many people in the lower salary brackets to buy any kind of automobile, whether new or used, and make it very difficult for many housewives to purchase articles which would materially add to their comfort and convenience, and to the comfort and convenience of their families, such as washing machines, ironing machines, new stoves, new refrigerators, new radios, new vacuum cleaners, and many other items of household and kitchen furniture.

When this regulation was adopted, there was a need for control of the use of installment credit because the manufacture and sale of the articles affected were absorbing resources needed for national defense. Also at that time there was a need for control of installment credit in order to curb unwarranted price advances and profiteering; in restraining inflationary tendencies, and for the further purpose of channeling savings away from the purchase of goods, into our defense program and the purchase of war bonds.

The situation now has entirely changed. Instead of decreasing peacetime production, the need now is to increase peacetime production. If the production of peacetime goods is to increase, of course there must be a market for such goods. The elimination of this regulation W will do much toward the creation of a great safe market for production of these peacetime articles. It is time for the Government to give up control of consumer credit, and I have today introduced a bill to cancel both the Presidential Executive order and regulation W itself.

Regulation W having been inaugurated as a temporary wartime measure, and that emergency having now passed, this regulation is both ineffective and unnecessary in the national economy as an anti-inflation measure.

It is undemocratic in its application. The man who buys a car costing more than $2,000 is not affected by it. Yet the man who buys a lower-priced car is obliged to comply with its strict terms. There are many veterans who want to establish homes, buy furniture, possibly washing machines, refrigerators, and the like, and possibly an automobile, and pay for all these items in regular installments from their salaries. To do this, it will be necessary that he have more liberal installment terms than those now allowed by regulation W.

America reached its place as the greatest producing country in the world through free enterprise. I do not believe we need fear that our banks and the lenders of money are going to engage in unsound or unsafe practices in financing the sales and purchase of these listed items. We are lending and giving billions of dollars all over the world to help citizens of other countries get on their feet. The removal of the restrictions imposed by regulation W will simply help the American people, the American veteran, and the American worker to reestablish their own homes and their own family life by their own work and labor, and on terms which they can afford to comply with. The removal of this regulation will cause markets to expand and production to increase. It will give more work to labor and more investment for capital and will contribute to prosperity for America as a whole.

Children Who Have Known No Childhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an ar-

ticle from the Sunday New York Times of March 9, 1947, a feature story entitled "Children Who Have Known No Childhood," by Gertrude Samuels. This article bears on the situation which appeals so profoundly to the heart of our country—the fate of the unhappy children who were orphaned by the Nazi and Fascist terror. In an effort to deal with this situation I have today introduced a bill to permit such orphans under 14 years of age to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants for adoption:

CHILDREN WHO HAVE KNOWN NO CHILDHOOD—HERE IS A FIRST-HAND REPORT ON THE ORPHANS OF THE NAZI GHETTOS AND SLAVE LABOR CAMPS

(By Gertrude Samuels)

Of all the survivors of the Hitler era in Europe, perhaps the most tragic and the most desperate are the "unaccompanied children"—the orphans of the ghettos, concentration camps and slave-labor forces who lost every precious thing except their lives. In the American zone of Germany, living still within a few kilometers of prison camps which now hold their old torturers, are some 6,200 of them.

I saw these children. In the past few weeks, traveling through Germany to special child centers and displaced persons camps, I have had a glimpse of their past and present lives. I watched the processing of the fit and literate near Frankfort on the Main, Heidelberg, and Munich as wards of the United States Committee for the Care of European Children, which sponsors their passage to America. I witnessed the desperation of those who face an uncertain future because of resettlement restrictions. I talked and ate with them. And I watched 86 of these boys and girls, ranging in age from 3½ to 18 years, carrying their worldly possessions in roped-up valises and satchels, wearing cut-down GI uniforms, coats from Army blankets, and UNRRA issue boots, go silently and wearily up the gangplank of a former troop transport at Bremerhaven to sail for America. I sailed with them—among the first to come to America—sharing their immigrant status to gather their stories at first hand.

Physically, though many are undersized, they look almost normal, a striking contrast to their appearance after liberation 2 years ago when they were found with rickets, third-degree impetigo, hunger edema, spindly legs. Most are in their teens, because few babies or younger children survived the concentration camps.

Psychologically, the scars are plainer. Surviving by their wits for years where adults had failed; sent from decent homes to ghettos, later to as many as nine concentration camps, where they became numbers, or living like animals in the woods to escape certain death by the Nazis and Fascist guards; begging and stealing food; stubbornly groping back by night to centers where their families were last seen in hopes of finding them again, they are children without a childhood.

Burned in their memories is the phrase "went to the left." It signifies the lining up by SS troops of parents and the youngest and oldest brothers and sisters for the gas chambers and crematories, while they, selected children, were marched the other way to forced-labor camps and road gangs. All have stories of unprecedented horror like that of the boy who stoked fires at Dachau while his comrades waited to be cremated. Because of their resilience and courage and also because of the work of some men and women who believe in simple justice, they are learning to live again. Perhaps to trust again.

For though these are not ordinary children, neither are they emotional pariahs. Though they feel a hostility toward the adult world which abused them without cause, though their greatest ally is their own self-reliance, they have known goodness and sympathy from social workers who were for the children. And though their memories are very green, they could smile and laugh, and they did, among friends who had shared common experiences, or with those they grew to like and trust. As one UNRRA welfare officer put it: "They react to that highest type of doctor—human kindness."

Since May 20, 1946, when the first group of adult displaced persons arrived in New York harbor, the United States Committee, whose honorary chairman is Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, has sponsored the immigration of 650 of these orphans. During the war it found temporary havens for children evacuated from Britain and Europe as part of the work of the National War Fund, and in later years repatriated most of those children.

Now, from 140 Cedar Street, New York 6, it is the central sponsoring agency for the war orphans; all leading national welfare groups, from the Quakers, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and American Joint (Jewish) Distribution Committee to the Children's Bureau in Washington, cooperate with it to find foster parents. The committee must raise $800,000 this year to carry on the work for the war orphans. To qualify for its aid the children must pass all the customary immigration tests—physical, literacy, CIC (counter-intelligence)—and prove that they were in the American zone on or before December 22, 1945.

Taken collectively, the children—representing more than 15 nationalities, including Poles, Balts, Rumanians, Czechs, Hungarians, and Ukrainians, and the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant religions—reveal the amazing pattern of Hitler's plan to (1) exterminate inferior peoples. (2) impoverish child populations of neighbor countries, and (3) maintain the German population by child importations for absorption into the Reich. Partly the pattern is supplied by the children themselves; partly it has been turned up by a group of the most self-effacing, industrious workers the peace has produced—UNRRA's Child Search Teams.

For example, at the International Children's Center at Prien near Munich—largest child center in the zone—the 385 children who live, work, and get some schooling in its 12 UNRRA-operated buildings were in German camps or slave labor forces when the Allied Armies conquered the country. After liberation many lived first in DP centers or worked with the Americans as KP, drivers, and medical assistants. Among them was Leopold Willinger, 17-year-old Czech Jew who acted as one of my interpreters on the ship and whose history is typical.

Of medium height, thin and pinched looking, his clothes hanging indifferently on him, his pale blue eyes direct and hard, he told me he was born of a middle-class family in Velky Sevlyus. When he was 11 his father was taken as slave labor and was never heard from again. Two years later he and his mother were taken to Auschwitz concentration camp. A number was branded on his lower left arm—A (for Auschwitz) 13247. Then, "on a day I shall never forget—June 4, 1944—they lined up all the older people of the camp. My mother was among them."

His voice trembled but his eyes, shaded by his soiled, low-slung cap, never changed. "It is enough to say that I saw my mother burned at Auschwitz."

For the next 12 months he was transferred from one camp to another—Gross-Rosen, Dachau, Garmisch. He was beaten and starved; he dug ditches and helped to build roads for the Germans. Finally, at Partenkirchen, his weight down to less than 90 pounds, he was liberated by the Americans.

"It is impossible to describe these experiences," he said, "and impossible for anyone who hasn't lived through it to understand. What has happened has happened. But why? Nobody can tell us why. Or whether it can happen again."

Traveling to Prien, I had stopped to see Dachau, now a sanctuary with arrows pointing to the "old" and "new" crematories, common graves and pistol ranges, a military government sign reading "This area is being retained as a shrine to the 238,000 individuals who were cremated here." Who could answer Leopold's questions?

The 86, sailing on the small Kaiser-built boat, were of 9 nationalities and 3 great religions. Though they were symbolically at the crossroads of 2 worlds, none had a last sentimental look for the world he was leaving. But could they ever forget it? Would their mood change as we left Germany behind? What, if any, were their hopes and expectations? Did they, in their youth and bitter wisdom, still have illusions?

As each wintry wave thudded against the floating DP world of 721 immigrants which plied through the icy River Weser to the English Channel and on into the green Atlantic, the change came slowly but obviously. The children seemed gradually to accept their new surroundings as real. This was what they had been waiting for so long that they had never really believed it could come. It had come. And as gingerly but as surely as their feet tested the rolling and pitching decks, so their mood lifted. While reason apparently compelled them still to weigh and suspect, their emotions were clearly something else, at the surface, stronger than reason, eager for security and friendship. This was shown in group and individual reactions.

If they had appeared subdued at Bremen they were amazed beyond words as they sat down for their meals. To an American it seemed normal enough. To them the white tablecloths, vases of jonquils, plates of white bread, chunks of butter and platters of meat, potatoes and string beans were a miracle. They ate slowly. They looked at the bread before they put it in their mouths; then, remembering, they reached for the butter. The pyramids of apples and oranges on each table were a source of wonder. Back in our cabin, they clustered around and one of them put the question which appeared to be in all minds: "Do we have that each day?"

On the last day of the voyage the children crowded at the ship rails, watched the pilot board the ship to guide her into harbor, waved at the Statue of Liberty, shouted greetings to ferries and launches and took in the Manhattan skyline. Leopold summed up their mood when he said, with a rare smile: "This is not Bremerhaven."

As they poured down the gangway one boy pressed forward to ask an immigration official, "Will I be allowed to keep my letters and pictures?" There were no censors, he was told.

Chartered busses were waiting to take them to a temporary reception home in the Bronx—a 40-room building with small dormitories and a recreation room where they could receive a clothing issue. Few were coming to relatives or friends. Within a week or so the majority would be dispersed to foster or children's homes all over the country, going into many of the 28 States where other war orphans have found homes.

Ultimately, if they and their new foster parents liked the arrangement, they might be adopted. This was for the children, the United States committee and welfare groups, which receive applications for adoption, to decide.

It was Leopold who demonstrated what a little human kindness can reap. When I returned to the Bronx Center a few days after our arrival all the children had a brand-new glowing look. In neat American clothes and good shoes they seemed as normal as any young high-school group. But the biggest change was in Leopold. Gone was the drooping figure, slouched cap, and fixed look. In

his clean shirt and new suit, a warm topcoat, and a gray felt hat, his happy face reflected some inner security which he must have found.

It was hard to say goodby to these children whom one had come to love and respect. How many would find the welcome mat down in their new search for peace? What would happen to the thousands who were waiting for their "break"? I knew that many in their new-found world were turning to the place in their foreign-language prayer books to which they had turned as they packed their bags at Bremen: "Praise to God, the God of the world, who gives the dreams before our eyes."

Leadership Thrust on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of March 5, 1947:

LEADERSHIP THRUST ON US

Britain's admission of inability to maintain her commitments in Greece, together with the probability that she will relinquish her strategic position in the Near East by handing Palestine over to the United Nations, brings the United States face to face with the problem of how far we should go in taking over Britain's role of international peace officer.

Should the United States reverse its traditional role and enter actively with arms, goods, and money into the arenas of Europe and the Near East in order to check the expansion of the Soviet state and the spread of communism? The question is a very serious one. On the one hand we are not sufficiently experienced to assure a successful outcome of such intervention and we are not in any too good shape to stand indefinitely the huge financial sacrifices which such a program will entail; on the other hand we are not disposed to stand idly by and see the result come about which we fought the war to prevent, that is, the domination of Europe and the Near East by one dictatorial power.

If we could be sure of establishing liberal democratic governments where we pleased the problem would be much simpler, but our experience in China and Britain's in Greece indicates that the choice frequently may be between two extremes, a reactionary government and a Communist one.

The cost of our defending against Russian expansion on all fronts by propping up inefficient, corrupt, or unpopular governments with arms and gold may well be prohibitive.

What is the answer? It may lie in reaching an agreement with the Soviet Union at the Moscow Conference limiting intervention in broad areas. Secretary of State Marshall, whose mind has been trained to deal comprehensively with complicated problems, knows that our ends must be adjusted to our means and that Russia's must be also. Like Britain and all other countries which suffered most severely in the war, Russia needs peace for recuperation above all else. Therefore she has halted her territorial expansion and has soft-pedaled threats to Iranian, Grecian, and Turkish territory. But she is communistic as well as a nationalistic state—an anomaly but a fact—and she now threatens internally rather than externally. At least she influences peoples who are down and out and who are willing to risk the experiment; what looks like a threat to us looks like a promise to them.

This is the situation with which Secretary Marshall and his chief counselor, John Foster Dulles, have to deal. Mr. Dulles realizes that communism and democracy are rivals for world leadership, but he also knows that ideas cannot be successfully fought with bullets, and he has said that our free society, if it is to be the leader, must generate "the constructive ideas for which the world stands in wait."

Force is important in stopping external aggression. But if the United States undertakes the leadership of the world, which is being thrust upon it, we shall need wisdom commensurate with our power in order not to wreck the world but to lead it along a narrow and treacherous path to a new day of peace and freedom.

Investing in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 10, 1947, entitled "Investing in the Future":

INVESTING IN THE FUTURE

What President Truman intends to tell the congressional leaders today we naturally do not know. It is believed that he will add requests for aid for Turkey to those which he has already made in behalf of Greece. If so, it will be time enough to discuss the facts and details of the immediate problem when some facts have been made available for discussion. The amounts, the kinds, and the destinations of the proposed assistance must obviously be subjected to careful scrutiny. But it will be impossible to scrutinize them intelligently except against the background of the broad issue which is already plain before us and for which Greece and Turkey are hardly more than the initial symbols.

That is the issue of whether this country is to shape its own world or allow it to be shaped by others. The old British Empire is no longer able to do that for us, as it very largely did throughout most of our national history. During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the British peoples poured out their surpluses of money, energy, brains, and self-confidence to establish their kind of world throughout a great area of the globe. They invested in many ways. Some of their effort went into military power. Some went into the more tawdry pomps of empire. Some was wasted and lost. But some went into American steel mills and Argentine railroads and Malayan rubber plantations. Much went into raising the standards of living and health and education in vast areas of the earth, and much went into stabilizing the nineteenth-century international society and maintaining it, for as long as that was possible, against the shocks which might otherwise much sooner have destroyed it.

That is a function which the old British Empire is no longer able to perform. But it must be performed in some way for the new international society emerging from the two wars. The simple question confronting the United States is whether we are to resign the task to the Soviet Union or whether we are to share in it, to defend a viable area of political democracy and regulated free-enterprise economy in the world and so to demonstrate that our own system possesses the vitality, the courage and the outgoing energies without which it will be doomed to certain extinction.

There is far too much talk about possible war between Russia and the United States and far too little realization of the existing competition between the two systems for men's minds and loyalties. Like Britain in the last century, the Soviet Union has a great deal more to export than bullets. It has energy and enthusiasm; it has order, full employment, the classless society, the end of the grosser forms of social injustice. But the totalitarian subjection and the NKVD inevitably go with them. The United States has for export individual liberty and personal security, it has the highest standard of living, the greatest economic freedom, the best technical skills, the greatest liberty of cultural and political expression known to the world. But do we possess the energy and self-confidence to export, to invest these values?

The confidence was there after the first war, when we poured out our foreign loans and dreamed our visions of empire, but the wisdom was not. We now have greater wisdom; we have the knowledge and many of the requisite agencies to invest soundly in our kind of future. But do we have the self-confidence and the breadth of view? We had better have; for otherwise the future, for all our wealth and power, will go to those who do possess such qualities.

Address of Mrs. L. W. Hughes, President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. L. W. Hughes, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, spoke last week at Atlantic City on The schools are ours, in which she called for a militant and aggressive educational program. She is an outstanding leader in the cause of education, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is my privilege to include that splendid address in order that my colleagues may be able to read it. The address follows:

The obligation to do justice to my topic "The Schools Are Ours" does not rest lightly upon me. I am firmly convinced that the public school is an institution of the people, by the people, and for the people, and that educators can give their best service only when they have the complete understanding of the people they serve. Because I represent an organization of 4,000,000 members made up of a true cross-section of the American people, I feel a responsibility to reflect, to the best of my ability, what these people think about their schools and why.

Today, in the second year of the atomic age, we are again confronted with a major crisis, one unequaled in the history of American education. This crisis might have been averted, but that is now beside the point. What is important is that we must, through our combined energies, ward off the immedi-

ate dangers and build so broad and so firm an educational structure that it will never again be threatened, never again even be vulnerable to attack.

One of our chief objectives, from our earliest beginnings as an organization, has been to familiarize parents and the public in general with the aims, methods, and practices of the American public school system.

FOUR-POINT PROGRAM

One of the points of the National Congress' Four-Point Program, now in full swing is none other than better school education. In this area the four specific objectives toward which 27,000 local PTA's are directing all their initiative and ingenuity are these:

1. To strengthen community support of local and State legislation so as to obtain adequate funds for public schools and equalize educational opportunities within the States and unite all forces to pass current legislation providing Federal aid to the States on the basis of need.

2. To secure community support for establishing a local teachers' salary schedule, beginning with at least $2,400 a year for 4-year college graduates with full professional training and increasing each year thereafter to a level of $5,000–$6,000 for experienced efficient teachers.

3. To work for the establishment of conditions that will make teaching more attractive to talented young people as a life career and that will retain qualified teachers in the schools; and conduct an active teacher-recruitment drive in the community, emphasizing the public-service aspects of teaching as well as its professional advantages.

4. To encourage and give financial support to the elementary schools and high schools in plans to modernize their programs, their equipment, and their facilities so that all children may have the best educational advantages; and advocate more active lay participation in school planning, thereby creating a more effective home-school partnership.

We maintain that the responsibility for education rests where it properly belongs—in the hands of professional educators like yourselves, persons trained to administer our schools. On the other hand, we have never intended that the public should relinquish its particular obligations to public education. But somehow, somewhere along the line—it would be wasteful to stop now for analysis—the people and their schools have drifted apart. Yet if ever there was a time when this country cried aloud for intelligent lay leadership, that time is the present. To whom shall we look for direction if not to you, the guardians of our schools?

I believe to the utmost that you understand our needs and that you want to help build that leadership. I believe, too, that the present educational crisis has awakened all of us to the stern necessity of making the home-school partnership a truly functioning one. To do so, we must know clearly and fully what each expects of the other. I have already given you an account of the ways in which we parent-teacher members are fulfilling our part of our partnership. May I, then, now be so bold as to speak of some of the things we feel that we have a right to expect from you?

WANT TO BE INFORMED

In the first place, we want to be informed about the needs of our schools more immediately and more concretely than we have been in the past. Furthermore, we want to hear about these needs directly from you. We should have known that a crisis was pending in our schools before that crisis broke; the time to meet danger is before it strikes, not afterward. Moreover, we should have been informed at the earliest possible moment by you, not when it was almost too late, by newspaper editorials and magazine articles, important as these channels are for reaching our eyes and our ears.

EXPECT DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

Next, we have a right to expect that those who administer our schools shall, by their own high example, inspire all who work with them to act in accordance with democratic principles. I wish with all my heart that there was no need for me to speak of this. Yet speak I must if I am to keep faith with the many teachers who have confided their hopes and fears to me. My main interest is in the children, for it stands to reason that boys and girls born to freedom can most effectively be educated by those who themselves know the taste of freedom. And they cannot know it if the schools do not reflect, both in structure and in spirit, the essential elements of true democracy. If our children are to learn what democracy is all about, they must sense it and see it in the schoolrooms in which they spend so large a part of their young lives.

Doctors and lawyers realize that much of their success depends on their personalities. But what about our teachers, those persons whose manners of speech, whose very walk and toss of the head may be imitated by millions of impressionable youngsters? What chance has the teacher to develop his personality until it shines like a gleaming shield? Very little, if he belongs to a system in which conformity is absolute and ultimate. Very little if he must bow submissively to a school principal who stopped growing 20 years ago and refuses to tolerate new ideas because new ideas demand fresh energies, fresh hopes. Wherever such stagnation exists, there the torch of learning is easily extinguished. I believe, therefore, that we have every right to expect school teachers to be superbly themselves, to explore their own talents, and thus to fashion their lives into beauty and meaning. In short, the superintendent who wants teachers truly inspired to teach will give them ample opportunity for both professional and personal growth.

Finally, we want a voice in determining the kind of education our children shall be given. By whatever techniques you achieve it, we want our children trained to think aright about their place in the modern world. We want instilled into their hearts and minds a positive attitude toward life—an attitude that will make them unafraid of the challenging future.

KINSHIP WITH OTHERS

Gladly do we leave it to you to determine the best method by which to teach them how to read and write and calculate. What we cannot leave to you is the substance of their thoughts. We could not if we would, for building this ideal citizen is not the task of parents or of educators alone. Nevertheless it is still incumbent upon the schools of America—those citadels of democracy—to do all that education makes possible to build into our children willingness to share in the work of the world—build into them, too, the highest regard for their birthright and the deepest desire to preserve the American dream intact.

We want our children taught self-discipline and self-management. More, we want them emancipated from the domination of those ideas that diminish the love of humanity rather than enlarge it. It takes a quickened imagination and a warmth of feeling to experience a kinship with others. We want the schools to provide situations that will stimulate both.

KNOWLEDGE NOT ENOUGH

I am not depreciating knowledge. Happy is the individual who possesses it. But knowledge in and for itself is not enough. That was proved to us beyond the shadow of a doubt by the highly skilled and highly trained youth of the dictator-ridden countries. What we need is a generation who knows how to use knowledge for the benefit of mankind, not for its destruction. If education is for anything it is to enhance the worth of each and every human being. It is to give him insight into how to build the good life for himself and to help build it for all others like him in body and in soul.

What if there are those who would thwart us? There are, still, more than enough good people, thinking people, in the world to make sure that the kind of education we want shall prevail. If such an education is more expensive, let me assure you that the National Congress of Parents and Teachers is fighting with all its resources to procure Federal aid for our tax-supported public schools, and that we intend to get it. Just because we have never had an all-embracing Federal-aid bill is no reason why we must be afraid of it. The tyranny of the past cannot bind us in this direction any more than in the liberation of outmoded curriculums. What we ask of you is a united front. Together—our efforts fused—we cannot fail.

PTA PLEDGES SUPPORT

In its turn, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers pledges itself anew to build the kind of public opinion that will give the teachers of our land the status and the salaries they so richly deserve. We pledge ourselves to continue creating a public opinion that will not tolerate a half-hearted support of our school system; that will not permit the voice of the politicians to drown out other voices; a public opinion that will, in short, brook no interference with the raising of school standards.

Education has a priority with us. Wherever the scales are tipping you can count on us, your partners in the educative process, to weigh the balance in favor of the kind of education thoughtful Americans want so desperately. All we ask of you is a mere militant leadership, clearer blueprints, stronger, and bolder direction. The outcome will more than justify your efforts.

There are those who tell us we haven't too much time. I, for one, am not disheartened. We didn't have nearly enough time to prepare for the war we have just won. But action for tomorrow begins today, and we are already a few yesterdays behind. And so, I beg of you let's get busy, let's make every moment count. If we act now—and act together—I, for one, am certain we shall win all that the war was worth fighting for—the chance to build, through a truly educated citizenry, the only kind of world that can make possible a lasting and fruitful peace for all mankind.

Portal-to-Portal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce into the RECORD an article by Walter Gellhorn, professor of law, Columbia University, on the Gwynne bill or the so-called portal-to-portal pay bill, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, February 28, 1947.

I spoke and voted against this bill for the reasons so aptly and thoroughly stated by Professor Gellhorn.

CRITICISM OF THE GWYNNE BILL—PROFESSOR GELLHORN BELIEVES PROPOSED MEASURE WOULD WEAKEN WAGE-AND-HOUR LAW

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The House of Representatives is about to consider a bill, which, if enacted, will drastically weaken and perhaps even destroy the

Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Federal wage-and-hour law. The bill in question is the Gwynne bill, H. R. 584, which has been favorably reported by the House Judiciary Committee. This proposal purportedly deals with the so-called portal-to-portal or walking-time lawsuits which in recent months have produced many spectacular headlines though, so far as I am informed, not a single judgment against an employer. If the bill were in fact limited to its ostensible purpose, public examination of its terms might be unnecessary. But since in truth the measure will expose honorable employers to unfair competition and will remove from needy employees the fundamental protections of present law, the Gwynne bill should receive more critical attention than has yet been accorded it. Among the major deficiencies of the proposal are these:

1. All claims arising out of violations of the wage-and-hour law would be barred after 1 year. Nearly 10,000,000 workers covered by the act do not belong to unions. As a rule they do not have enough resources, information, or confidence to protect themselves against overreaching employers. Steps to secure redress against underpayment of prescribed wages are rarely taken until after Government investigators have uncovered the violations. The job of inspecting 600,000 business establishments is a tremendous one which can never be completed in a single year. If this bill were to pass, many just claims would be outlawed, thus harming the most necessitous group of employees and giving the chiseling minority of employers a competitive advantage over the rest of the business community. It is significant that every State which has large-scale employment has a much longer period of limitations for wage claims than the Gwynne bill advocates, ranging from 6 years in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania to 3 years in Ohio and California.

2. The Gwynne bill would absolve an employer from all liability for any violation of law which was not marked actively by bad faith. It would also relieve him of liability for nonpayment of wages for an employee's activities in the employer's behalf, unless payment was required by an express contract or by the employer's own past practice. In other words, before a violator of the law could be required to make good to his underpaid employees, it would be necessary to prove that the violation had not been in good faith—an extremely difficult task. Moreover, if it had not been the employer's practice to pay for this or that sort of work, he would be absolved from the necessity of doing so in the future. For example, if he did not pay his plant guards for inspection or drilling time, he could continue to ignore his obligation to do so even though all his competitors throughout the industry were paying their employees for like services. Thus the Gwynne bill would legalize unfair competitive advantages in interstate commerce which it was the very purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act to eliminate.

3. The Gwynne bill would permit the waiver or release by an employee of his just claims under the wage-and-hour law. The Supreme Court has solemnly warned (*Brooklyn Savings Bank* v. *O'Neill* (324 U. S. 697)) that this would "tend to nullify" the force of the statute. And all the leading State minimum-wage laws recognize that needy workers can be easily beguiled into surrendering claims for back wages for a mere fraction of their true value. The proposed waiver provision ignores Nation-wide experience in the administration of comparable protective legislation. But the Gwynne bill goes a step further in discouraging effective enforcement of the wage-and-hour law. The bill also forbids employees to assign their claims to anyone else, but instead requires each one to sue individually on his claim. Since individual claims, no matter how meritorious, may be for relatively small amounts which would not justify individual litigation, this prohibition against the pooling of claims will make it yet easier for an unscrupulous employer to escape his responsibilities.

4. The Gwynne bill undertakes to absolve a person from all liability for acts done in good faith in conformity with any administrative interpretation, ruling or policy. On the surface this seems fair. In fact, however, it would permit the positive terms of the law to be set aside whenever an individual correctly or incorrectly applied any one of the literally thousands of informal advisory rulings which Government officials make annually, by way of expressing tentative opinions in response to inquiries. These informal opinions are usually given on incomplete statements of fact, and without hearing both sides. They are intended to be and are helpful, but they are not authoritative. If Congress wants to permit absolute reliance on them, it should empower the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to apply the statute and to make determinations of fact which will be binding on all parties until set aside in appropriate proceedings. An administrative determination that an employer does owe his employees back pay should have the same effect as an administrative determination that he owes them nothing. But the Gwynne bill does not produce this equality. Instead, it says that if any official, no matter how obscure or ill-trained, expresses an opinion favorable to an employer, the employer can rely on it absolutely to bar the liabilities the law imposes on him. But if the opinion is unfavorable to the employer, and even if it is formally expressed by the highest officials, it is given no binding quality.

The evils which Congress struck at in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 have not been wholly eliminated by the passage of time. Excessive hours and inadequate pay produce a blight which affects not only the workers immediately involved, but also the communities in which the workers live and all the ethical employers who must compete against substandard producers. The present law advances the interests of the public at large. Congress, if it chooses to deal with the probably overemphasized issue of the portal-pay suits, should avoid at the same time eviscerating a statute which has long proved its worth. The National Consumers League and other nonpartisan, nonlabor organizations oppose the Gwynne bill because it will do just that.

WALTER GELLHORN,
Professor of Law, Columbia University.
NEW YORK, *February 25, 1947.*

E. Kent Swift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a recent most impressive article from the Boston Post outlining the life and achievements of E. Kent Swift, a prominent and outstanding industrial and civic leader of my district. Mr. Swift's illustrious career is a typically American success story which illustrates vividly that the door of opportunity is open to individuals of capacity, character, and generous social impulses, that under our free institutions men of worth and ability can start at the bottom and rise to the top of the ladder of success.

I hope and pray that in time to come the Nation may be blessed with many more humane, forward-looking leaders like Kent Swift, who, as they drive forward our intricate industrial machine, never will forget their own early struggles, nor turn their backs upon the hopes and aspirations of those who toil, and their sons and daughters.

For his noteworthy achievements in business, his outstanding public and civic contributions, for his solid character as a man, I am honored to add my tribute to a great American.

FIRST WORK PAID HIM $1.50 A WEEK—ELIJAH KENT SWIFT STARTED OUT AS BLACKSMITH'S HELPER—NOW HEADS MACHINE FACTORY

(By Lester Allen)

The story properly begins in the forge of a blacksmith named Brunnell in Eau Claire, Wis., where a $1.50-a-week blacksmith's helper in a leather apron several sizes too big for him watched the sparks fly upward from the forge and decided that the fashioning of metals was to be his life work.

GOES TO FLORIDA

Elijah Kent Swift, chairman of the board and treasurer of the Whitin Machine Works in Whitinsville, Mass., was born in Eau Claire, Wis., the son of Elijah and Myra (Evans) Swift, on December 10, 1878. The Swift family is rooted to Falmouth, Mass., on land they settled in 1660, and Mr. Swift still spends his summer there.

The transition from Falmouth to Eau Claire, Wis., came through the disorder of the War Between the States. Having graduated from Harvard in 1852, the elder Swift went to Florida to lumber live oak on the Government account. The gathering storm of the Civil War brought him North to fight on the Union side, and then sent him West to Wisconsin to engage in lumbering there.

His son, Elijah, attended Beloit College Academy and, during school vacations, worked for the local blacksmith in Eau Claire, where horses were shod and wagons with stout axles and rugged wheels were made. He sought to learn about welding, then a new technology. The elder Swift didn't approve of a coeducational college for the training of a young man and, as Beloit had become a coeducational institution, Elijah Kent Swift was sent East to Williams College to enter in the class of 1900.

SUMMER DECIDES

It was in his mind then to become a mining engineer, and his plans were to enter MIT and take a course in mining engineering after he had completed his liberal-arts education at Williams. The summer vacation of 1900 was a deciding factor in Mr. Swift's career.

Visiting after the close of college with the Marston Whitin family at Whitinsville, Mr. Whitin, a cousin of Mr. Swift, invited him to enter the Whitin Machine Works rather than undertake his mining-engineering course at MIT.

"My trunks were packed that September to go to MIT when Mr. Whitin suggested that I might go to work in the plant and learn something about the textile-machinery business," Mr. Swift explained.

MATTER OF POLICY

It was a policy—and still is—that those of the family who went into the business must learn it from the ground up. This was so in 1831 when John C. Whitin founded the business with an improved picker developed in a small ell of the cotton mill operated by his father, and the policy is extant today.

"I went to work in overalls in the shop pushing trucks loaded with castings. It was 60 hours a week, starting at 6:45 o'clock in the morning and finishing at 6 o'clock at night On Saturday we quit at 4:30 in the afternoon."

The other night Mr. Swift sat down at dinner with 57 men who have worked 50 years or more in the shops, 32 of whom are still actively working there One of them has put in 66 years in the machine shop. These active veterans average 71 years of age, and they have worked a total of 1,622 years for the Whitin Machine Works.

GETS POINT OF VIEW

"It was the most valuable experience I ever had when I went through the shops," Mr. Swift said. "Today I am still good friends with the men with whom I worked. I got to understand the point of view of the workmen and how they look at things."

His college education, he feels, had given him the ability to meet, understand, and direct other men. "It was probably as good as an engineering course would have been. All that I had been given was a chance and an opportunity to make good.

He filed burrs off castings and went through the various departments as a fitter and he finally moved on to the experimental room in overalls, before he finally got into the managerial end of the business. The Whitin Machine Works makes a full line of woolen machinery, a full line of cotton machinery, a partial line of worsted, rayon, and nylon working machinery.

Everywhere that fiber is worked into material, a Whitin machine does some part of the work and, from the quiet little valley of the Mumford River, 5,000 workers in a 45-acre plant have contributed, in a large measure, to the clothing of the people of the world.

CAN MEASURE WORTH

It is not an operation encompassing a single generation, nor is it the work of a single man. Mr. Swift explained that it has been company policy for 116 years to train men to take over jobs at all levels of management, to test, try and develop the men who will run the organization before the need arises for the services of that man.

Because the Whitin Machine Works is a self-contained industry, in a self-contained community—a self-contained industrial microcosm containing in addition to other dwellings and businesses 1,000 workers' apartments, boarding houses, and a hotel—engaged in complete fabrication of textile working machinery, everyone knows everybody else in town, and is able to measure the world of every neighbor.

Only men of vision could keep this industrial entity supple, dextrous, and free from the dry rot of traditionalism. The measure of the success of the Whitin company may be found in its war program. Overnight the company converted.

MAKE WAR GOODS

The roving frames for cotton mills gave way to steam engines for Liberty ships. The spinning frames for woolen mills gave way to magnetos for airplane engines.

Carding machines gave way to steam turbines, pumps for fuel, and lubricating oil flanges and bleeder plugs for ships, torpedo parts, projectiles, governors for Diesel engines, ring gears, and other miscellaneous parts.

Not until 1907—after seven gruelling years of working upward through the plant, did Mr. Swift reach the inner council of management. He was then made assistant treasurer. After 14 years he was made general manager in 1914, and after 20 years he was made treasurer as well. After 33 years of work in the plant he became president, treasurer, and general manager, and last year became chairman of the board and treasurer.

At least once a week the workers see the wiry, smiling, and energetic boss making his way through the various departments of the plant, pausing now and again to talk to men he has known all their lives.

His days are crowded, for he is a director or officer in 11 banks, insurance companies, or factories, and president of the Scott Lumber Co. of Burney, Calif., his single connection with the lumbering business in which his father spent a lifetime.

His associates say that the shrewd, humorous eyes, twinkling behind rimless spectacles, miss no detail in the textile-machinery business in which technological changes are always progressing to meet new demands of efficiency, new fibers, new requirements of automatic operation.

He says that he believes very profoundly in the desirability of close contact of top management with any kind of a business enterprise, and he is equally critical of absentee ownership of any productive organization.

HAS HERD OF CATTLE

The mill town, which has had its detractors, might very easily become a minor tyranny, but the success of the Whitin Machine Works in its town, Whitinsville, is to be given a testimonial in a book to be published from a study of Whitinsville made by Harvard Business School.

Mr. Swift lives at 307 Hill Street, Whitinsville, and one of his interests is the Castle Hill Farm, where a herd of 175 Ayershires provides milk and cream for many of the townspeople and milk for milk bars throughout the plant.

In summer Mr. Swift sails a 40-foot cruiser around Falmouth, and he goes in for tennis and golf—not so much of the former now as he did a few years ago.

FROM MANY NATIONS

"The people here are from many nations," Mr. Swift said thoughtfully. "They are all good Americans, working together, living together, industrious, freedom-loving, and raising their children in the American way of life."

When his son, Elijah Kent Swift, Jr., finishes his education at Harvard he will go into the plant in overalls to learn the business as he learned it back in the 1900's, Mr. Swift said.

"Working shoulder to shoulder with the men and women whose livelihood, hopes, and ambitions derive from the successful operation of this industry is the only way to acquire the fundamental knowledge required," said Mr. Swift.

On triple columns soaring above the village, surmounting Corinthian capitals, is a huge eagle, wings upraised, poised over a sphere.

WORKS IN GOOD HANDS

It is a summation of the feeling for the American way of life for which Mr. Swift and the men who came before him, and who will succeed him, have been striving—simple, free, and unchallenged, a memorial to men who gave their lives in the Nation's wars.

When Mr. Swift retires he feels that the Whitin Machine Works will be in good hands, hands trained in the village and wise in the ways of the village, its needs and its progress.

A large percentage of the people who live there depend upon the plant for a living, and the village and the plant are inseparable, thus giving the men at the top a greater responsibility in the preservation of American democracy.

It is no theory with Mr. Swift. He has experienced it all at first hand. "I am satisfied that I can hand the responsibility along to men fit for the task," he said.

Which Way, America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the board, General Motors Corp.:

WHICH WAY, AMERICA?

(By Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the board, General Motors Corp.)

(Good times and peace in which to enjoy them are within our grasp—if we use common sense. A great industrialist outlines the steps we must take.)

On election day last November a wave of common sense swept across the country. Both a political and an economic era were simultaneously completed—eras during which we sought to have more by producing less; to satisfy hunger by destroying food; to preserve our freedoms by limiting economic initiative; to promote free enterprise by creating labor monopolies; to expand employment by increasing costs; to encourage enterprise by largely confiscating profits; to promote enterprise by discrediting its leadership.

Now such things are finished—at least for the time being. But the election verdict should be viewed as a protest against, not an endorsement for. It represents an opportunity, not a victory. It will be a real victory only if we can now embark upon a peacetime program of sound accomplishment for the benefit of all the people. The same problems remain to be solved. The necessity for constructive leadership nationally, and of all economic groups, is accentuated. Those who would change our way of life will look upon the verdict of the electorate, not as a defeat but as a challenge.

As America turns her face to the tasks ahead, let us pause to take stock. Where do we wish to go as a people and as a Nation? What are our objectives, economic, social, and political, at home and abroad? Upon what resources can we base our efforts? What obstacles lie in our way and how shall we set about overcoming them?

As I gage the collective will of the American people, two objectives stand out as of paramount importance. One is domestic, the other world-wide, and both are interlocked. At home we want to preserve and solidify for all time the American way of life and our system of free competitive enterprise. For without that we know that our political as well as our personal freedom sooner or later must cease to exist. Abroad we wish to see established permanent peace and good will among all the nations of the earth.

If we are to achieve the first objective, if our existing order of things is to endure and progress, we must not only maintain but must advance existing living standards. Advancing living standards and economic progress are synonymous. Economic progress is an essential factor in political stability, and both are vital components of social progress—the end purpose of all human effort. Only through economic progress can we abolish want and the waste of human idleness. Only if we move ahead economically can we insure for the future a society in which men are free to pursue their lives according to their own desires, and in which everyone has the opportunity of doing so. Democracy and hunger are incompatible.

Unless we achieve political stability and continuing economic progress at home we can contribute little to the attainment of our other great objective—the establishment of permanent peace throughout the world—to which objective we owe a great responsibility. With our own affairs intelligently directed we can reach out to other lands and contribute by example and know-how to bring order out of existing chaos. We can help the people of these lands to better their living standards by encouraging international trade and world-wide industrial development on the basis of a two-way street.

These, then, are the objectives we seek. As we face them, what are the resources upon which we can count? Only the superlative suffices to measure them. We have the world's greatest and most efficient plant; the most productive agriculture; the greatest pool of skilled workers and technicians; the keenest management brains and know-how; the greatest scientists and laboratories; the largest available supply of raw materials, still abundant though not inexhaustible and requiring intelligent utilization. We have ample supplies of capital ready and anxious to finance our efforts whenever suitable investments are offered with a reasonable expectancy of a return adequate to balance the risk. All this has been demonstrated in peace and dramatized in war.

We have also the highest health standard in the world; the best living standards; the best medical services; the greatest educational system and the world's finest transportation.

Over and above all these we have the courage and initiative to attempt the new and unknown; to assay the big job and persevere in it until achievement is reached.

With all these manifold blessings, why, then, are we in such a state of confusion? Why do we falter and stumble? Why have we wasted and why do we still waste so much time in listening to false prophets and following blind alleys? Why, in the name of common sense, with our objectives so clearly marked and our resources so abundant, do we not put away doubts, suspicion, and fear and proceed confidently on our way?

The fault lies, I believe, in the human element; in the perversity of men, leaders and followers alike, who are unwilling or incapable of seeing the great opportunities available for the benefit of all. Men who lack the willingness to follow the demonstrated paths of progress. Men who disregard policies beneficial to all to pursue narrow, selfish ends of only temporary benefit even to themselves; or other men who, enamored of some economic theory, use their position to pursue it to the uttermost, no matter what damage is done to the cause of freedom—entirely disregarding the lessons of history and failing to recognize the truly amazing accomplishments of a nation that has based its destinies upon unrestricted freedom of individual opportunity.

It is in this failure of the human element that our confusion exists. We have not brought to bear on our problems the political and economic statesmanship which their solution demands. Our failures in the political sphere became accentuated ten or more years ago when, our national leaders, in a time of national stress, fell back upon panaceas and unorthodox schemes, nearly all of which had time and again in history proved ineffective. Not the least consequential aspect was the persistence of error—the continuance of policies which were not only not working but could not work, and the continued application of new schemes pyramided one on top of another into a gigantic mess of rules, regulations, controls, obstacles—and frustrations.

After the necessary regimentation of the war effort, the climax of our economic adventures came on October 30, 1945, on the political front. At that time industry was moving out of war production. It was in the process of reconversion. The adjustments essential to passing from a controlled war economy to a free peace economy were before us. Everything depended upon a sound national policy, courageously and intelligently administered in the interest of the country as a whole. On that day came a pronouncement of national policy. It was in two parts:

1. Wage increases were imperative.

2. We must, above all else, hold the line on prices.

The concept that wages can be raised substantially without affecting prices—unless efficiency also increases—constitutes an amazing misinterpretation of economic law. This is true regardless of time and circumstances, or whether the economy is moving either into a state of inflation or deflation.

There appears to be much confusion in the general thinking on this whole subject. Wages, salaries, and other forms of compensation constitute in the aggregate more than three-fourths of what the consumer pays for goods and services. When wages rise in an important sector of enterprise—and especially as a result of declared national policy—the increase is contagious. It spreads in the course of time and in degree to other sectors. Prices begin to move up. The cost of living increases. Wage rises are stimulated in other areas not previously affected. The end result is that most things cost more.

Some people have more dollars available to pay the higher prices, but they get no more for the money than they did before. Others cannot pay, and still others can pay only in part. Therefore the ability to purchase on a national basis becomes restricted. Production falls and employment declines.

The community cannot gain from a spiral of increasing wages and prices. A real gain in living standards can be achieved for the people as a whole only when efficiency is increased so that goods and services can be sold at lower prices, thus stimulating consumption and encouraging increased production and employment.

The wage component in prices varies greatly from one industry to another and between different producers in the same industry. The prices paid by a producer for his materials, supplies, transportation services are components of the cost of his product; but these prices are determined by the wages paid, in turn, by the suppliers of these goods and services. In other words, the cost of one producer's materials and supplies is based partly on another producer's wages.

Therefore a general wage increase on a national scale must reflect itself finally in a substantially corresponding increase in cost and in the price the consumer pays for goods and services.

The confusion existing today fits exactly the economic pattern just described. It is a logical outcome of ignoring inescapable economic relationships. The two-part program laid down by the Government—one point in direct conflict with the other—served as justification for wage demands on the part of labor. The increase demanded could not be supported by a corresponding increase in productivity; hence there has resulted an unbalancing of prices in relation to wages. A wave of strikes which seriously interfered with the production of both raw materials and finished products further intensified already acute shortages.

The second point in Government policy—holding the line on prices—had a further destructive impact on production by intensifying material shortages even more and interfering with the completion of finished goods. This so-called stabilization policy of the Government failed because it was unsound. In fact, it took us in a direction diametrically opposite to that in which we had to go. Instead of expanding production and encouraging lower prices through the competitive influence of a greater abundance, most of our people have less real wages rather than more. Even those organized groups which achieved extensive increases in wage rates must now realize that they have gained little.

We still face the problem of attaining a sound economic relationship between wages and prices. In many lines costs, and hence selling prices, are moving out of reach of important sectors of their potential markets. The accumulated savings of the war years are being reduced in value by the depreciation of the dollar in terms of these higher prices. Recent demands on the part of labor for still further wage increases threaten to interrupt production again, increasing existing shortages and necessitating another advance in the prices of goods and services.

This is a dangerous course we are following. If we do not turn from it economic law will sooner or later demand an accounting. Unless business and labor leaders quickly recognize their common goal—and peril—and agree to adjust the present out-of-balance wage-price relationship, they may find themselves facing a more rapid adjustment involving a more or less, though temporary, shrinkage of business volume and employment. If so, we can mark it down as the penalty of our own folly.

Perhaps we shall be wise enough, honest enough—and lucky enough—to prevent the serious consequences of our past mistakes. In any event, let us at least resolve to correct the policies which brought about these conditions. Only by so doing can we build a foundation solid enough to support the superstructure of an expanding economy. In accomplishing this objective we have the support of the last election; in fact, already we see an accelerated trend to more intelligent economic policies beginning to take form. We have much more to do. We have to deal on the political front with many problems affecting our economic opportunity. We must face them and deal with them now.

Of paramount importance—probably the most consequential problem of the day—is the need to restore the balance in both privileges and responsibilities between labor and other groups within the economy. We must do this without in any sense infringing on the just rights of labor or limiting its proper progress. The Wagner Act, hailed as a Magna Carta of labor's rights, has operated to deprive workers and others of their rights. If we respect the principle of equal rights for all and special privileges for none, our labor legislation must be drastically overhauled. Let us enumerate a few of the most outstanding inequalities in order that we may chart our course to a better balance, in the form of a 10-point program:

1. The employer is not free to speak to his employees over a loudspeaker during work hours. The union is free to circulate union literature and antimanagement material during work hours, and on the premises. The employer's freedom of speech should be established.

2. Collective bargaining should be defined. Where does it begin and end? What are its responsibilities? If the employer is required to bargain with the union, as now is the case, should not the union be required to bargain with the employer, which now is not the case? Collective bargaining on an industry-wide basis should be prohibited as a monopolistic practice.

3. Bureaucratic decisions, having the effect of law and often not supported by law, are not now subject to review through an appeal to judicial authority. A court review of the decisions of all administrative agencies should be granted. The National Labor Relations Board, if it continues in existence, should not be permitted to act as judge, jury, and prosecutor. Such a practice is contrary both to common sense and to the fundamental principles of justice.

4. Only the employer is responsible now for losses incurred through breach of contract. Unions should be made equally responsible and their responsibility should be enforced by adequate penalties. A contract is valueless, in fact, unless it effectively binds both parties under all circumstances. A strike should be illegal during the term of a contract.

5. Management must be represented throughout all the various steps of production. Otherwise management cannot function effectively. Foremen must be recognized by law as component parts of management and their allegiance must be to management alone.

6. The closed shop is monopolistic. It is a limitation of the right to work and the right to employ. No man should be required to pay for the privilege of working. The closed shop should be outlawed.

7. Such questions as may be required by union procedure to be submitted to its membership for determination, should be passed on by a representative proportion of the entire membership—not by a limited minority consisting largely of union bosses, as is now too frequently the case.

8. Unions should be required to make public their financial operations, including statements of their income and expenses. Unions should be prohibited from making contributions to, and, as unions, from supporting, political activities—a restriction now, and very properly, imposed on business.

9. All forms of violence and coercion should be outlawed with heavy penalties. Workers must not be ruled by fear of union action.

10. Unlimited right to petition for bargaining elections should be granted employers. No such right now exists for the employer unless two or more unions are in conflict.

These inequalities have contributed in part to the situation in which we find ourselves. They have thrown far out of balance the responsibilities and privileges of labor and management in our industrial economy. The problem, as I see it, is not to move the pendulum back in the opposite direction, but to stabilize it at the neutral point. Our aim must be not to reduce the gains of labor but to restore the rights of management.

We face also the problem of strikes and what to do about them. It is a problem which has grown to its present proportions largely because of labor monopolies. Monopolies can and do exist in a democracy such as ours, but as such they must be subjected to complete regulation on all counts. Unregulated monopolies cannot be permitted in an economy of free enterprise, for unrestricted competition is a necessity to insure the essential balances. Years ago, business in some instances was moving toward monopolistic practices both in form and in policy. Something was done about it. Today, labor has become a monopoly, and something must be done about it. Unregulated monopolies lead to dictatorships, and dictatorships cannot be tolerated in a democracy.

To overcome this we must outlaw existing labor monopolies and limit by law the jurisdiction of any one union so that the public interests cannot be substantially prejudiced by strikes.

This can be accomplished in either of two ways: (a) By dissolving existing unions into parts so no one part has the economic power substantially to affect the public interests; or (b) by limiting the power of any one union, as now constituted, to strike so large a part of any one industry as would prejudice substantially the public interests. Under these restrictions, collective bargaining must be allowed to proceed without restriction or interference. It must continue until a settlement is reached, even if it involves a strike and irrespective of the consequences to either contending party.

Thus we must erect a strong and effective barrier against encroachments on the competitive system of free enterprise. Complete freedom in collective bargaining, limited to the degree that a resulting strike could not substantially prejudice the public interests, is that barrier. The Sherman Anti-Trust Act, by outlawing business monopolies, has not destroyed business nor any association of business. Its principles applied to unions will not destroy unions. It is a fair and equitable means of requiring both business and unions to conform to the fundamental principles of the competitive system. It is essential if we wish to preserve that system.

Arbitration, compulsory or otherwise, fact-finding boards, labor courts, and the like as applied to controversies within the free-enterprise area, offer no sound solution for this problem. Those who advocate such courses—and there are many—have not thought the problem through to its final conclusion. Wage rates so adjudicated would involve the appraisal by an outside agency of all the operating phases of the business, such as dividends, profits, operating schedules, future economic trends, distribution policies, and all other problems, economic and otherwise, now the responsibility of business management. There is sure to be injected in such adjudication the question of the ability to pay—one of the most unsound, unrealistic economic philosophies offered as a basis of wage determination, prejudicial to the interests of business, labor, and the ultimate consumer alike.

It is clear that in the final analysis some form of bureaucracy would have to assume the functions of management, hence management would no longer be held responsible. Business would become a creature of the state. We would pass to a regimented economy. It is a dangerous course.

These, then, are some of the obstacles to our two-point objective which we must overcome by political and industrial statesmanship if we are to move ahead. If we can substitute for the human frailities of self-interest and false thinking the equally human qualities of forbearance, reasonableness, and willingness to earn before we get, a concern for the general welfare rather than for individuals or special groups, we can progress into a future whose possibilities are limited only by our imagination.

Science and technology have only scratched the surface. The possibilities of atomic energy await our exploitation. New processes, new products, new discoveries to make life easier, better, healthier, and happier are within our grasp. We have the industrial know-how. We have the resources to realize rapidly on this great opportunity and to create on this earth a virtual paradise for ourselves and to help other peoples do likewise. Such is the only true course to democracy and peace among all peoples.

There is only one real question mark: Have we enough common sense?

Resolution of Philadelphia Sports Writers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we are all vitally concerned with the future of one of the country's largest enterprises, and with a particular mind to the deep-rooted faith and belief of all our youth in the sporting world, I would like to extend in the RECORD at this time a most sincere and timely resolution adopted by the Philadelphia Sports Writers' Association:

Whereas gambling on the outcome of games and the point differential in the final scores of athletic contests has increased alarmingly in the last few years; and

Whereas attempts have been made to prearrange the results of games and/or the point differential of athletic contests in amateur as well as professional sports; and

Whereas two convictions for bribery and attempted bribery of sports participants have been obtained in the courts of the State of New York within the last few years; and

Whereas the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the National Football League, and other sports organizations are now pressing for State and Federal legislation which will make it unlawful to offer or promise a bribe to any participant, official, coach, manager, or anyone connected with sports; and

Whereas at this date New York is the only major State in the Union with an adequate law to protect sports from corruption or attempted corruption by gamblers; and

Whereas several officials of sports organizations and others have stated that the publication of predictions on the results of games and the probable difference in point scoring by participating teams in the editorial and advertising columns of daily newspapers and other publications has contributed to the spread and increase of gambling on athletic contests in America; and

Whereas we believe the integrity of sports has long been and is an important influence for the good on the morals of the country, particularly the youth of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Philadelphia Sports Writers' Association does hereby urge legislators of Pennsylvania and other States and of the Federal Government to push with all speed for antibribery and antigambling laws as related to sports, and does hereby urge newspaper publishers to review their policy of publishing in editorial and advertising columns the predictions of probable scores and point differentials of athletic contests, except in horse racing on which gambling has been legalized in many States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to newspaper publishers and legislators in this and other States and to the Federal Government.

CLAIR HARE,
President, Philadelphia Sports Writers' Association.

Study of Governmental Procedure in High Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I received a most unusual communication last week which I felt would be of equal interest to all Members of Congress. It was a letter from Miss Jeanette Carroway, a seventh-grade student of junior high school in Florence, S. C. She includes with her letter a copy of a bill which her class had introduced in my name considering

itself the Congress of the United States which considered the bill, passed it, signed it by their officers who assumed the names of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is highly commendable of these fine young junior high school students to give their thought and study of governmental procedure and to familiarize themselves by actual experience in their own class in the manner and procedure of enacting legislation by the greatest legislative body in the world, the Congress of the United States. I think it is perhaps a precedent which other high-school students and classes might very well follow, and to my mind deserves the attention of us charged with the responsibility of providing for the needs and welfare of the people of this Nation, and in many ways, the world.

We have heard much about communism in this Congress and indeed throughout the United States. The bill from this class deals with the prevention of communism and the procedure as to the manner in which we should dispose of and punish the enemies of our American democracy. It is encouraging to see these young people at a very tender age concerning themselves with good citizenship. It is by the training of our boys and girls in government and citizenship that gives us the greatest future security that we could hope for, and in view of the unusual character of this communication, as well as of its importance, under unanimous consent, I include in my extension of remarks the letter of Miss Carroway and the bill formulated and passed by the seventh-grade class:

FLORENCE, S. C., *March 2, 1947.*

DEAR MR. HARRIS: I'll bet you will be surprised to find out that I have temporarily assumed the use of your name, but I hope you will not mind.

My seventh-grade class of Florence Junior High has written and passed a bill. Each person had to choose the name of a real Senator or Representative. We went through all the regular procedures, having sessions of both Houses of Congress, committees, etc.

I am enclosing a copy of our bill as passed, and signed by Speaker of the House, President pro tempore of the Senate, and President Truman.

Yours truly,

JEANETTE CARROWAY
(Alias Representative OREN HARRIS).

Whereas communism and its related factions are fast becoming a threat to democracy in these United States;

Whereas in future times, other enemies of democracy may rise, we do hereby propose the following:

Item 1: The enforcement of this bill shall be under the guidance of a special division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Item 2: Any candidate for a position in the United States Government or any employee of the United States Government if so accused, must prove in good faith that he is not a member of, or in sympathy with, any of the aforesaid factions hostile to democracy.

Item 3: Any Government employee charged with treason shall be deported; should the treason be of a serious and highly aggravated nature such as to warrant capital punishment this shall be so inflicted.

Item 4: Treason charges against the aforesaid shall be duly executed in a Federal court of justice; the decision of the court shall be final except in such instances when just cause shall be shown for an appeal to the Supreme Court.

Signed, sealed, and delivered on the 27th day of February 1947.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of House.
ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore of Senate.
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States.

Testimony of Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York, Before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on my National Science Foundation bill, H. R. 942:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in the last session of Congress, the Senate passed and the House of Representatives failed to act upon national science-foundation legislation. It is, therefore, gratifying that the House of Representatives has taken the leadership in this session and that your committee has already begun the formal study of this important legislation.

It is rather anomalous that a nation as great as ours has not even found a cure for the common cold, let alone heart disease and cancer. This points up the need to give impetus to specific scientific and medical research.

It must be made clear at the outset that the setting up of a science foundation in no-wise interferes with the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission which is set up for a specific purpose, namely, development and control of fissionable matter and atomic energy. The purposes of the science foundation are far broader in scope, and in no way impinges upon the purposes and jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission.

National Science Foundation legislation is more urgently needed now than it was last year. It is regrettable that a year has passed without the creation of a National Science Foundation. Our Nation is today the leading industrial and technological country in the world, and it has been amply demonstrated that if we are to maintain this position we cannot depend on philanthropy and purely private resources to promote fundamental science and to provide adequate supply of scientific personnel. Although we are the leaders in applied science, we do not have the same preeminent position in fundamental sciences. In the past we have depended to a very considerable extent on the great fundamental scientific resources of Germany. We cannot and should not do so any longer. If we pass this legislation, we will be providing one of the necessary guarantees that our Nation will always hold a leading place among other nations. If we design the National Science Foundation so that it will serve primarily as a peacetime agency, it will bring to us many advances in health and standard of living comparable to the great advances in armament which science brought to the war effort.

I am appearing today before your committee to urge speedy and favorable action on behalf of legislation creating a National Science Foundation. You have before you two types of bills: H. R. 942, introduced by myself and, as an alternative proposal, H. R. 1830, introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. MILLS. Bills identical with Mr. MILLS' bill have also been introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CASE; Mr. PRIEST, Tennessee; and Mr. HAYES, Arkansas. Before describing briefly the provisions of H. R. 942 and the reasons for adopting legislation of this particular form, I am going to trace the origin of this bill.

As many of you know, the proposals for a National Science Foundation had their origin in the separate studies made by a subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee headed by Senator KILGORE and by the Office of Scientific Research and Development headed by Dr. Vannevar Bush.

In June of 1945 Senator KILGORE introduced a bill which embodied the results of the 3 years' study by his subcommittee on the problems of scientific and technical mobilization. At the same time, Senator MAGNUSON introduced a bill which embodied the specific recommendations made by Dr. Vannevar Bush. Both bills, just as the two types of bills now before you, created a foundation designed to serve as the central scientific agency of the Federal Government. Both bills, just as the two types of bills now before you specifically authorized the foundation to do the following:

1. To support financially and promote research in the fundamental sciences.

2. To support financially and promote research for national defense.

3. To support financially and promote research in medicine and health.

4. To expand the Nation's scientific talent through the granting of scholarships and fellowships.

The original Kilgore and Magnuson bills, although agreeing on these principal functions, differed as to method of administration and several other features. Extensive hearings were held jointly by Senators KILGORE and MAGNUSON, in which over 100 expert witnesses were heard from all walks of life. These hearings were followed by a series of discussions by a bipartisan group of the Senate, representatives of the executive departments, and representatives of interested scientific organizations. Out of this exhaustive study came a bipartisan sponsored bill popularly known as the Kilgore-Magnuson-Saltonstall bill which was favorably reported out by the Senate Military Affairs Committee on April 9. This bill still provided for the four principal functions which both the Kilgore and Magnuson bills each provided but differed very substantially from the original bills in its details. It was considered a perfected bill by virtually all the groups interested in scientific legislation. This bill had the support of outstanding scientific groups in the country in the last session of Congress. When it was debated before the Senate on July 1 to 3, last year, it was passed with only one substantial amendment, namely the amendment which eliminated a division for social sciences.

Having a deep personal interest in science legislation and having followed closely the careful process by which the Kilgore-Magnuson-Saltonstall bill of the last Congress was developed, I have introduced it in the House in the belief that it is a well-perfected piece of legislation which should be speedily enacted. This is the bill H. R. 942 now before you. I have with me copies of the original report submitted by the Senate Military Affairs Committee which describe each of its provisions in considerable detail and also give the reasons for adopting those particular provisions. My bill, H. R. 942, as does also the

Mills bill, H. R. 1830, provides for two functions in addition to the four enumerated above. They are:

5. To promote the development of science through international cooperation.

6. To coordinate the diverse scientific activities now conducted in the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

I believe that all the Members of Congress and representatives of scientific and other groups who have been studying this problem are agreed that the principal functions which the proposed new Foundation should perform are those which have been enumerated from 1 to 6. I had understood that there was a large measure of agreement on details along the lines of H. R. 942, but an alternative has been presented to you in the form of H. R. 1830 and its companion bills. These bills differ chiefly with respect to (a) the administration and organization of the Foundation, (b) the inclusion of social sciences, (c) the provisions for apportionment of research funds on a State quota basis, (d) the provisions which require the results of federally financed research to be fully and freely published.

Let me summarize briefly the reasons for the specific provisions of H. R. 942 with respect to the above four features.

ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FOUNDATION

H. R. 942 provides that the Foundation be headed by a single Administrator appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate and who will be responsible directly to the President and through him to the Congress. Originally many scientists were interested in having the Foundation headed by a board of noncompensated citizens—dollar-a-year men, so to speak. President Truman and many students of Government administration felt that this was a dangerous and undemocratic way to organize a Federal agency, particularly in the case of an agency which would be spending Federal funds. On the other hand, it is recognized that noncompensated experts, particularly leading scientists attached to private organizations, could help the Foundation, the President, and the Congress in advising and inspecting the activities of Federal scientific agencies. H. R. 942 therefore creates a series of advisory boards which will have full access to the work of the Foundation and will be able to make recommendations directly to the President and the Congress.

THE INCLUSION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

I understand that most scientists believe that the Foundation would not function effectively if an attempt were made to draw sharp lines between the different sciences and to exclude the Foundation from supporting social sciences. In this day and age, when the physical sciences are so far ahead of our ability to organize ourselves socially, it is important that the Foundation be given specific authority, as is done in H. R. 942, to support social science through a Division of Social Science.

DISTRIBUTION OF 25 PERCENT OF ALL RESEARCH FUNDS ON THE BASIS OF STATE QUOTAS

All sections of the country will have to finance this new foundation through the Federal Treasury and all sections of the country should participate directly in its work. The largest part of the agricultural research funds have been spent on the basis of a State quota formula and it is universally agreed that this has been a very beneficial experience not only for each of the States but for the Nation as a whole. As representatives of the people, we in Congress should note that this method has prevented the rise of an arbitrary scientific bureaucracy in agricultural research.

While it is true that some States may at the present time be better equipped to use Foundation funds than others, if from the beginning a portion of the Foundation's research funds is distributed on a State quota basis we shall soon find that all States will be able to share effectively in this work.

FULL AND FREE PUBLICATION OF THE RESULTS OF FEDERALLY FINANCED RESEARCH

The wartime experience as well as the prewar experience show that too often the new knowledge and the patents which result from a federally financed research project fall into the hands of private companies or institutions. I do not believe anyone can quarrel with the fundamental principle that wherever the public puts up the money for a research project the results including patents should either be freely available to all users or, if controlled, should be controlled by a public agency. If your committee wants fuller information on the extent to which public funds have been taken advantage of in this respect, I would urge you to examine studies already made on this subject by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and by the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice study, prepared by its Claims Division, is a very exhaustive one. While it has not been publicly released as yet, I am sure that arrangements can be made to secure it for this committee in its study of science legislation.

I would like to point out that section 8 of H. R. 942 which covers the use and dissemination of research findings allows for contractual exceptions to the basic policy of public dedication in those cases where the invention is the result of a substantial investment by the private contractor.

In conclusion, let me urge the committee again that it act speedily and favorably on this legislation. In the past year in the absence of a civilian National Science Foundation the War and Navy Departments have spent great sums—about $100,000,000 for fundamental research—so that our Nation can have a strong scientific foundation. It is a dangerous step to have the military carry on a peacetime function which they themselves recognize should be carried out by a civilian agency.

Divisions Among the Justices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 10, 1947:

AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON
(By Richard L. Strout)
DIVISIONS AMONG THE JUSTICES

WASHINGTON.—The Supreme Court is back in the news again with its split decision in the John L. Lewis contempt case.

The Roosevelt-Truman Supreme Court continues to be divided like older courts, but not over the same issues. Today, the tent of the so-called commerce clause has been stretched so wide that it encompasses about any type of restriction or control that Congress can think up.

What, then, the public asks, does the Court now divide over? One of the issues is a matter which in the past was largely a question of detail. Today, all members affirm the right of Government to intervene in matters of social control unthinkable a short time ago. That fight is settled. The controversy has gone on to new ground.

One difference today is over the conception of judicial function. One observer ascribes to Mr. Justice Black a "leaning toward getting the result in a particular case, as if it were a legislative choice." To Mr. Justice Frankfurter, frequent leader of the opposite side, he ascribes a "leaning to respect the outlines and many of the details of an established legal system."

The Black thesis seems to be that the Court should act as guardian of the people, or groups of people, against the aberrations of democracy. Contrasted to this view, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, often supported by Mr. Justice Jackson, appears to follow the more traditional view that the Court should keep hands off legislation, wise or unwise, except in extreme instances.

Criticism is sometimes directed against the majority group, often led by Mr. Justice Black, on the ground that it is in fact legislating; that it tortures congressional statutes in the course of interpreting them. This has been the contention of occasional Frankfurter-Jackson dissents.

One of the most difficult and controversial recent 5-to-4 decisions involved another matter—the right of a community in New Jersey to pay parochial school bus fares. Back in 1929 the Supreme Court ruled that a State may furnish free textbooks to parochial schools. Does that decision, along with the new one in 1947, mean that all legal barriers that have stood in the way of State aid to church schools are now down? That is the contention of at least one national news magazine in commenting on the matter. Lawyers here who have carefully studied the majority opinion feel differently.

On one side in this case were Justices Black, Vinson, Douglas, Murphy, and Reed. In dissent were Justices Rutledge, Jackson, Frankfurter, and Burton. The Black majority opinion argued that the Court should not prevent the State from extending public-welfare legislation benefits to all citizens without regard to religion. It compared the extension of parochial bus service to the fire and police protection, offered to all churches and schools.

In sharp dissent, Mr. Justice Jackson wrote that at first he had agreed with the majority but on reflection changed his views. "The undertones of (Justice Black's) opinion advocating complete and uncompromising separation of church from state, seem utterly discordant with its conclusion yielding support to their commingling in educational matters."

Mr. Justice Black stated that although in this instance aid to church schools was allowable, this was about as far as the matter should go. Although the law, he specifically said, was "within the state's constitutional power, it approaches the verge of that power."

This limitation did not satisfy the minority.

"The case which irresistibly comes to mind as the most fitting precedent," acidly observed Mr. Justice Jackson, "is that of Julia who, according to Byron's reports, 'whispering "I will ne'er consent"—consented.'"

An Expensive Diplomatic Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons the American taxpayer is called upon and is now being

asked to provide billions of dollars to feed Europe is the way in which Germany was divided between Russia, England, and the United States for occupational purposes. Each nation is under international law, responsible for feeding the people in their occupied areas. In making that division England got the steel and coal of the Ruhr and some agricultural areas; Russia got coal and that part of the bread basket of Germany which was not given to Poland; while the United States got the scenery and the Hartz Mountain canary birds of Bavaria. You cannot export scenery, and who wants to buy canary birds? The result has been that we have had that part of Germany which had the least agriculture and, therefore, required the most funds for feeding people of that area. It was a most expensive blunder at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Here is the score to date for 1947 and 1948, if we give them everything they ask for $1,450,000,000 to feed people of occupied areas, including Germany, Austria, Korea, and Japan; $350,000,000 for a new UNRRA paid for by the United States—we paid 73 percent heretofore; $250,000,000 for Greece, including the arming of the Greek Army. The total of these three items aggregate $2,050,000,000. This is just the beginning. Turkey is already asking substantial aid. Why shouldn't she if Greece is to obtain $250,000,000? Others will follow. Just how far can we go and just what is the cost going to be to the American taxpayer if the United States adopts the British policy of imperialism and tries to tell every country what kind of government she is going to have, equip and support both the civilian and military population, as we are asked to do?

The Defense Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mr. Fred Andrus, an outstanding northwest journalist, on the subject of the defense budget. This was published in a recent issue of the Astorian-Budget, Astoria, Oreg.:

THE DEFENSE BUDGET

Congress is wrestling now with the problem of the high cost of our armed forces, and there is much talk of drastic reductions.

This is a matter which must be approached cautiously by Congress. We do not want to cut military appropriations to the point where our armed forces are not adequate to their big tasks of the postwar world, nor do we want to encourage waste in the Army and Navy.

"Congress must realize," said Senator BYRD, of Virginia, in a speech the other day, "that our military leaders are accustomed to the waste of war, and it is easy to continue such waste, even though it be lesser in degree, in time of peace."

The Senator pointed out that the Army and the Navy have 1,117,000 civilian employees compared to armed personnel of 1,600,000. In 1939 the Army and Navy got along with 222,136 civilian workers.

The average cost per man of the armed forces according to the 1948 budget, Senator BYRD pointed out, is $6,790. The average cost per armed man during the war was $6,960. The reduction in expense is only $170 per man.

Every individual who served in the armed forces in the war is aware that there was tremendous extravagance and waste—some of it inevitable in war, some of it the result of poor planning.

Congress must seek the elimination of this waste, for the Nation cannot afford it in peacetime. The heavy cost of our Military Establishment will militate for some years to come against our efforts to reduce the tremendous national debt, and debt reduction is perhaps as important to the national future as adequate defense.

On the other hand, Congress must be aware that the task of our armed forces is much greater than in prewar days. We have occupation armies to maintain in Japan and Germany and expert observers tell us that we must expect to keep them there for many years.

We are likely to adopt a policy of more adequate defense than we had before the war, perhaps involving universal military service and certainly providing for a bigger Army, a bigger Navy, a bigger National Guard, and for more training.

The Army and Navy have also the job of caring for the vast amount of equipment saved from the war—as, for instance, the Navy is caring for a fleet of amphibious war craft here in Astoria.

All these things make extra expense, and we must be prepared to take care of that expense indefinitely. Experience should have taught us by now we can no longer afford to be unprepared for defending ourselves as we were in 1917 and again in 1941.

Blind, unreasoned budget slashing in Congress will jeopardize and weaken our defenses at a time when we can ill afford it. It will weaken our diplomatic policy, upon which the future of world peace mainly depends.

Another thing the Congress must think about is Government support of financial research because of the importance of this sort of work to national defense.

The atomic bomb is the big example of how research proved of vast military importance. But we cannot rest on the atom bomb alone. Scientific research is at work in other countries on tasks involving radio-guided missiles, jet planes, radar and a hundred and one other new weapons of both defense and offense.

We cannot afford to be behind in research matters, and for that reason the Government must consider subsidizing scientists. It is done in almost every important nation, Russia being outstanding in that respect. The Russians coddle scientists to the utmost.

Government-subsidized science is valuable not only to the defense of the Nation but is certain to have byproducts of value to our peaceful economy that may outweigh the value of the military features.

The Rise in Mergers—Federal Trade Commission Reports on This Threat to Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a report just submitted to Congress by the Federal Trade Commission, entitled "The Present Trend of Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions." The report was prepared under section 6 (f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which provides that the Commission shall "have power to make annual and special reports to the Congress and to submit therewith recommendations for additional legislation."

In presenting this report, the Commission has put its finger on what is probably our No. 1 domestic problem, namely, the growing increase in monopoly and economic concentration. Unless we meet and solve this problem, it will be impossible for us to demonstrate to the world that our free enterprise system really is "free" and actually does promote "enterprise."

We must face the fact, unpleasant though it may be, that economic concentration has risen to perilous heights in this country. The Temporary National Economic Committee provided us with abundant information on the extent of monopoly and economic concentration just before the war; more recently, the Senate Small Business Committee and a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, of which I was chairman, have prepared voluminous documents, showing the increase in economic concentration which took place during the war; and now, with this report of the Federal Trade Commission, the picture is brought up to date.

It is a picture which perhaps all of us would prefer to ignore; but if we really do believe in the free enterprise system, we cannot ignore these economic facts of life. It is a fact that every highly industrialized nation, in which private monopoly has become dominant, has succumbed to one form or another of state control and collectivism. If there is one lesson we can learn from recent history, it is that state collectivism follows private monopoly just as certainly as night follows day.

Consequently, the Federal Trade Commission, by submitting to us this report on the increase in monopoly through mergers, has struck a telling blow for freedom everywhere.

The purpose of the report is twofold: First, it points to the existence of a serious loophole in the law which has made section 7 of the Clayton Act a dead letter. The Commission at the present time is empowered to prevent acquisitions which take the form of purchases of stock, but it can do nothing to prevent acquisitions

of assets. This situation developed out of the historical conditions existing when the Clayton Act was originally passed. The economic background which underlay the passage of that act was the great consolidation movement of 1897–1904, during which period some 200 important consolidations took place involving companies with a capitalization of over $5,000,000,000. Nearly all of these consolidations were brought about by the purchase of stock rather than assets. Therefore, Congress, in passing the Clayton Act several years later, thought that it had created a means of preventing the really important method of consolidations, namely the purchase of stock. Congress simply did not anticipate the fact that the act would subsequently be evaded by a different type of purchase, the acquisition of assets.

The second major purpose of this report is to call to our attention the rapid increase in monopoly power which is now taking place through acquisitions and mergers. Since 1940 more than 1,800 manufacturing and mining companies have been purchased, most of them having been acquired during the last 3 years. That these acquisitions have already had a significant effect upon the structure of the economy is indicated by the fact that the asset value of the concerns acquired amounted to $4,100,000,000, or nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of all manufacturing corporations.

What is perhaps the most dangerous aspect of the current merger movement is its impact upon small business. The pattern of the current movement is that of the purchase by giant corporations—largely financed out of their immense wartime profits—of independent small business. Thus, fully 70 percent of all the firms bought out since 1940 have been small businesses with assets of less than $1,000,000.

The other side of this picture of big business buying up small business is indicated by the fact that nearly three-fourths of the total number of firms acquired during this period have been absorbed by large corporations with assets of over $5,000,000. Eighteen large corporations, alone, have bought up 242 formerly independent companies, or an average of more than 13 firms apiece.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the American Home Products Corp. has bought up no less than 38 different companies since 1940; Burlington Mills has purchased 19; National Distillers 17; Safeway Stores, 16; Borden Co., 14; and so forth.

As may be noted from the name of these concerns, a striking feature of the present drive is the movement into traditional small business industries. More than one-third of the total number of acquisitions were accounted for by only three industries—food, nonelectrical machinery, and textiles and apparel—all predominantly small-business fields. Big business has practically taken over such former strongholds of small business as steel drums, wines and tight cooperage. For example, the giant steel corporations have increased their ownership of steel drum fabricating capacity from less than 10 percent before the war to nearly 90 percent today.

At the same time that the big steel companies have expanded forward into fabricating fields, some of the big metal-using companies have expanded backward into the basic-metals industry, thereby assuring themselves of a supply of these tight materials, but reducing the amount of such materials available for small business. Thus, the General Electric Co., the Borg-Warner Corp., and the International Detrola Corp. have all purchased steel mills, which formerly constituted an important source of supply of steel sheets for small business.

These are only a few of the highlights of this extremely interesting and informative report. I think all members of Congress should join together in expressing gratitude to the Commission for this courageous and forthright presentation of the facts. Without facts, Congress will inevitably operate in a vacuum.

The report closes with this highly significant conclusion:

> If, then, the development of political supergovernment is to be prevented, the rapid growth of private supergovernment in industry must be halted. And the first step to be taken is to halt this alarming increase in mergers and acquisitions. The original purpose of the Clayton Act, as stated by the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on January 22, 1914, was "to arrest the creation of trusts * * * and monopolies in their incipiency."
>
> The Federal Trade Commission recommends that the Clayton Act be amended in order to accomplish this basic objective.

I concur heartily in this recommendation. To achieve it, a bill, H. R. 515, which would plug the loophole in section 7 is now before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, headed by the distinguished and able Representative from Iowa, Representative JOHN GWYNNE. A similar bill was reported out favorably last year by the House Judiciary Committee, but did not receive a rule from the Rules Committee. I might point out, in passing, that the action by the Judiciary Committee last year was nearly unanimous for the simple reason that the arresting of monopoly has never been regarded as a partisan issue. Hearings on the present bill will get under way within the next 2 weeks. It is hoped that all organizations and individuals that are interested in the proposed legislation, and in the problem with which it is intended to deal, will be able to present their views before the committee.

An Amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. Its number is H. R. 2230. The amendment I proposed reads as follows:

> Section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:
>
> "Where an agreement between the employer and the employee or his representative specifies an hourly rate of compensation which is not less than the minimum wage specified in section 6 of this act, such hourly rate shall be considered the regular rate at which the employee is employed and shall not be affected by the receipt of additional compensation from the employer whether such additional compensation is paid pursuant to the agreement as overtime or otherwise."

Despite the protests of those not so well informed, this proposed amendment seeks only to remedy a situation which is unfavorable to both labor and management, to the end that both may know what they are doing and be able to rely thereon and profit thereby.

I agree and insist that two offenses under the Wages-Hours Act as administered have been baffling to everyone concerned.

First is that of the employer who rewards an employee occasionally for doing more than he had to do, paying beyond what was expected or agreed. Likewise with the case of the employer who pays a profit-sharing bonus to a group of employees. There is no way under the rules of the wage-hour people for this to be done without permanently penalizing at least the employer. This is an offense, and the administrator rules that the regular rate of pay has been upset.

The second offense results when an employer and employee agree to a fixed weekly salary for a fluctuating workweek above 40 hours. "The regular rate of pay" may be above the minimum. The time above 40 hours is at least the time-and-a-half rate of pay. Eventually an employee who is on stand-by for 5, 10, 15, or 20 hours of overtime does not work all of it. The Wage-Hour Administrator then threatens suit or even brings suit for the offense of "paying overtime rates for time not worked."

By this triumph of bureaucratic encroachment the time-honored right of agreement between employer and employee is set aside. Stand-by contracts are called "fictitious and illegal." The employer who has a fluctuating workweek above 40 hours must pay a fluctuating weekly wage, or stand suit from the Wage-Hour Administrator. The Belo case of June 1942, in which the Supreme Court by 5 to 4 decision sustained such contracts, has been largely ignored and overridden by the Administrator since then. And the courts have often sustained him. The record shows a series of fanciful interpretations of the meaning of the Wages-Hours Act.

It would appear untimely for business to discuss the guaranteed annual wage when an administrator has power to nullify a guaranteed weekly salary for a workweek of over 40 hours.

The Fair Labor Standards Act prescribes minimum wages and the minimum increase in pay for hours over the

statutory workweek. These requirements are apparently simple and clear. But the courts have found in them implications from which have arisen a complicated system of controls.

Overnight Motor Transportation Co. paid employees, for a fluctuating workweek, wages sufficient to exceed the statutory minimum, with time and a half for overtime. The Supreme Court held that this was not sufficient compliance with the law. Since no hourly rate was fixed, the weekly wage must be divided by the number of hours worked and the quotient would be the regular rate of pay—*Overnight Motor Transportation Co.* v. *Missel* (316 U. S. 572)

Subsequently in *Walling* v. *Stone* (131 Fed. 2d 461) the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit had before it a case where compensation was by a total weekly wage, but the trial court found that the employer and employees intended that the fixed weekly wage would cover both regular and overtime work; and the amount was sufficient to comply with the statutory minimum. But the appellate court disregarded this intention of the parties and held the weekly wages did not include anything of the extra pay required for overtime.

In *Asselta* v. *149 Madison Avenue Corpn.* (65 Fed. Supp. 385) the district court held that the weekly wage included no extra pay for overtime, even though the parties had agreed that the base pay was the weekly wage divided by the sum of (a) hours worked in the regular workweek plus (b) one-half of the number of hours in excess of 40. The parties were in agreement; the wages exceeded the statutory minimum, with the statutory overtime differential; but the court would not recognize the agreement as capable of defining their rights.

In two cases decided in 1945, *Walling* v. *Youngerman Reynolds Hardwood Co., Inc.* (325 U. S. 419), and *Walling* v. *Harnischfeger Corp.* (325 U. S. 427), the court had before it contracts involving piecework. The contracts specified an hourly rate but piecework earnings were higher and were the basis of settlement. The Supreme Court held that the agreement of the parties as to the hourly rate was unavailing. The result was a further impairment of freedom of contract.

THE BELO DECISION

At the same time that the court decided the Overnight case—June 8, 1942—it decided the Belo case, *Walling* v. *A. H. Belo Corp.* (316 U. S. 624), where the employer paid a guaranteed weekly wage for a fluctuating workweek, but there were specific hourly rates agreed upon, with provision for an overtime differential as required by the statute. Only a bare majority of the court joined in the judgment that under the statute employer and employee thus could fix the regular rate of contract. Four of the judges asserted that what the regular rate is "is a legal not a factual conclusion."

Since the Belo case was decided the course of the opinions has been so adverse to this freedom to contract that some circuit courts of appeals have said:

If the Supreme Court has not repudiated its holdings in the Belo case it has come so close as to leave no room for its application except upon an identical state of facts (*Walling* v. *Alaska Pacific Consolidated Mining Co.* (December 1945, C. C. A. 9; 152 Fed. 2d 812, 814); *Walling* v. *Uhlman Grain Co.* (October 1945, C. C. A. 7; 151 Fed. 2d 381, 383); *Walling* v. *Richmond Screw Anchor Co.* (March 1946, C. C. A. 2; 154 Fed. 2d 780, 784)).

By these and many other decisions, the simple barriers expressed in the statute have been used as a basis for evolving—by what is called interpretation—a complex system of wage exactions. There is no longer clarity, safety, or stability above 40 hours per week. This system far outstrips the primary purpose of the act to place a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours to be worked at the regular hourly rate of pay. It exacts wages which much exceed the statutory minimum; wages which the parties never agreed upon; wages which are computed in violation of the express compacts of the parties. Freedom of contract has been substantially destroyed.

Common sense can be restored and freedom of contract can be regained.

So I have introduced a simple amendment, H. R. 2230, to the Fair Labor Standards Act, which will correct the situation I hope.

No Experts on Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 8, 1947:

NO EXPERTS ON EVERYTHING

When CIO Vice President Van A. Bittner told the House Labor Committee in effect that it could not write a good labor bill because it was not made up of labor experts, he touched on one of the most fundamental problems of representative government.

Can the citizens of a republic expect that either their legislators or their judges be experts on everything which may come before them? Obviously, they cannot. The most they can demand is that their public servants have the intellectual ability and the openness of mind to grasp the implications to public policy of what the experts tell them. Does Mr. Bittner, himself a former coal miner and steel worker, qualify as an expert on the shop practices and pay bases of the textile worker and of the teachers—two of the unions which come under his supervision?

The real question lies in the capacity and fair-mindedness of the committee membership, and in the caliber of the witnesses they have called before them. As to the first, the rating so far looks at least good average. As to the second—while lots of irate industrialists have beaten a path to the committee's door, a goodly representation of labor-management authorities and labor leaders have been called too. The latter to their own detriment, and that of the public, have made disappointingly small use of their opportunity.

Mr. Bittner came up the hard way—when and where unionists had a bitter struggle for recognition. For that reason the warmth of his reaction to what he considers antiunion curbs is understandable. But he is also a capable and a moderate man. He should know that neither his indictment of the committee, nor his stronger observation on Congress in general ("It would be a wonderful thing if Congress met every 10 years") makes good sense.

Carrie Chapman Catt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article and editorial from today's New York Times:

CARRIE C. CATT DIES OF HEART ATTACK—WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE PIONEER, LONG AN ADVOCATE OF WORLD PEACE, SUCCUMBS AT 88—URGED SUPPORT OF UN—LEADER IN TOLERANCE DRIVES, ORGANIZED FIGHT FOR VOTE ALONG POLITICAL LINES

Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, pioneer in woman's suffrage and advocate of world peace, died yesterday at 3:30 a. m. in her home at 120 Paine Avenue, New Rochelle, N. Y., of a heart attack suffered in bed. She apparently had been in good health on Saturday. Her age was 88.

Mrs. Catt's last day was spent in customary activities. She had discussed with her biographer, Miss Mary Gray Peck, a collection of photographs that she planned to give to the Susan B. Anthony Memorial in Rochester, N. Y.

Miss Alda Wilson, an architect, who was companion and secretary to Mrs. Catt for the last 19 years, was with her at her death. Mrs. Catt had suffered a heart attack complicated by pneumonia, in May 1944 and was in the New Rochelle Hospital for a month.

SPOKE HERE IN JANUARY

She made her last public appearance on her eighty-eighth birthday, January 9, at a dinner of the American Association for the United Nations, of which she was honorary vice president and a board member when it was founded in 1923 as the League of Nations Association.

At the dinner she urged bolder peace aims, declaring that the present ones would not avert another war, and advocated international disarmament. It was on this occasion that Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, who in 1938 dedicated her book, This Troubled World, to Mrs. Catt, praised her as a leader in peace movements who had helped bring the world to a point where the outlines of peace were visible.

In a radio broadcast on March 8, 1935, Mrs. Roosevelt mentioned Mrs. Catt among 11 American women as "friends and acquaintances who have been and are a constant inspiration and help to me."

Mrs. Catt was a stanch believer in the United Nations. In an interview on the eve of her last birthday she remarked that the best wish she could make for her natal day and the world would be that the "United Nations would make a perfect success and that we never would have another war."

SALUTED RUSSIAN WOMEN

She joined Mrs. Roosevelt and other women, including Dean C. Mildred Thompson of Vassar College, in saluting Russian women and their efforts to build a peaceful world, in recognition of International Women's Day, observed on Friday.

It was largely through Mrs. Catt's political insight and organizing ability that the nineteenth amendment became part of the Constitution in 1920. The suffrage movement had been mainly "wishful thinking" until she started to organize it along political lines, even including assembly districts. The happiest day in her life, she said, was the day she returned from Tennessee, last State in the Union to ratify the amendment.

With this great victory gained after more than 30 years of preaching, crusading, and writing, Mrs. Catt turned her attention to world peace. As head of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, she agitated for disarmament. She had urged the United States to join the League of Nations and the World Court, and had opposed military training in schools and colleges.

Asserting that recognition of women as voters was not enough, but that they should be educated to assume the responsibility of citizenship, Mrs. Catt founded the National League of Women Voters in 1919 and served as honorary president until her death. The group has since become recognized as the leading women's nonpartisan organization for educating all voters.

DENOUNCED SALE OF SCRAP

"It isn't enough for you to vote for your party ticket," she told an audience at a National Council of Women luncheon in 1941, at which she also denounced the sale of scrap iron to Japan.

"You have got to do a little deeper thinking than you have ever done before, and when you have got to the bottom of it, you have got to speak, and speak more boisterously than you do now."

Mrs. Catt and the League of Women Voters were among the opposition to the "Equal Rights" amendment, proposed in 1923 by the National Women's Party. They contended it would repeal protective legislation for women.

"Prejudices will not melt away because the Constitution decrees equal rights," Mrs. Catt declared on one occasion in opposing the proposal.

Although her name was often suggested for political honors, she invariably declined to consider the proposal. During the convention of the National American Woman's Suffrage Association at Chicago in 1920 her name was suggested for the Presidency of the United States by Mrs. Peter Olsen of Minnesota. The newspapers reported the next day that "Mrs. Catt waved the suggestion away with a smile."

In 1936 President Roosevelt received her in the White House. At the same time Mrs. Roosevelt extolled Mrs. Catt's life work before Congress, on the completion of a half-century of public service by Mrs. Catt.

Although an enrolled Republican who had voted for Herbert Hoover for president in 1928, Mrs. Catt expressed her admiration for President Roosevelt in 1934 on the eve of her seventy-fifth birthday. She declared that she was sorry that prohibition had been repealed, for she was an avowed dry, but added that she considered President Roosevelt to be "head and shoulders" above all living men, and hoped he would win a second term.

When the war saw the dissolution of the National Committee of the Cause and Cure of War, which Mrs. Catt helped found in 1925, she became honorary chairman of its successor, the Women's Action Committee for Victory and a Lasting Peace, which was organized in March 1943 to work for full American participation in international organization.

Born in Ripon, Wis., the daughter of Lucius Lane and Maria Clinton Lane, Mrs. Catt attended Iowa State College, where she plunged into the fight for women's rights by obtaining physical education instruction for female students. In 1880 she entered a lawyer's office to study for the bar. A year later she became principal of Mason City (Iowa) High School, and 2 years later she was made the city's first woman superintendent of schools.

In 1884 she was married to Leo Chapman, the owner of the Mason City Republican, and worked on that newspaper until Mr. Chapman's health failed and they moved to San Francisco. Her husband died in 1886, and shortly after that Mrs. Catt became actively interested in the women's suffrage movement. Her first speech on this subject was delivered at a gathering held at Marshalltown, Iowa, in 1887. During the next 2 years she served as State organizer of suffrage clubs in Iowa.

Her real organization work for the cause, however, dates from 1890, when she became State lecturer and organizer of the Iowa State Woman Suffrage Association. In 1892 she entered the service of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, of which she was president from 1900 until 1904 and from 1915 until her death.

HEADED INTERNATIONAL GROUP

It was in 1904 that Mrs. Catt became president of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, and she remained in that post until 1923. During the earlier part of that period she not only worked for woman's emancipation in successful campaigns in nearly all the woman suffrage States, but she attended conferences in Sweden, Austria-Hungary, Germany, and other European countries. She was elected president of the international body at the congress held in Berlin, succeeding the late Susan B. Anthony.

While Mrs. Pankhurst and her daughters were the leading spirits in the suffrage movement in Great Britain, Mrs. Catt occupied a similar position in this country. In 1910 the campaign had become extremely vigorous, although it never became as militant as it did in England.

Mrs. Catt spent 18 months during 1911 and 1912 on a world tour of observation of women's conditions.

Despite financial handicaps, Mrs. Catt worked with remarkable zeal and vigor. This was rewarded in October 1914 when Baroness de Bazus (Mrs. Frank Leslie) left almost $1,500,000 to the suffrage cause and empowered Mrs. Catt to spend it as she saw fit for that purpose.

HONORED BY WOMEN'S CLUBS

The increasing years did not diminish the activities of Mrs. Catt, nor decrease the honors she received. She was voted the first of America's 12 greatest women by the League of Women Voters in 1929, and the next year received the gold medal of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs. A delegate to the Institute of Pacific Relations conference held at Honolulu in 1927, she visited Europe and South America.

In 1933 she announced the formation of the protest committee of non-Jewish women against the persecution of Jews in Germany, reporting that the signatures of 9,000 American women had been affixed to a protest sent to the League of Nations. That same year she received the American Hebrew Medal for the promotion of better understanding between Christians and Jews in the United States.

Mrs. Catt worked in 1934 to aid German refugees, for ratification of the child-labor amendment to the United States Constitution and for international understanding. The same year and the next she urged American adherence to the World Court.

During the recent war she matched her crusade for woman suffrage in impassioned efforts to aid the victims of Nazi aggression. The Finnish Government, through its consul general in New York, conferred upon her in December 1941, the Order of the White Rose for her services to women.

Mrs. Catt was married in 1890 to George William Catt, president of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific Co., engineers and contractors. He died in 1905.

She leaves two nephews, Clarence Lane of Riverside, Calif., and Warren Lane of Charles City, Iowa.

A private funeral will be held at the home tomorrow. Burial will be in Woodlawn Cemetery, the Bronx, beside the grave of a friend and associate in the suffrage movement, Aida Wilson, mother of Mrs. Catt's secretary.

CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

Back in the gay and thoughtless nineties most Americans, if they had heard of her at all, regarded Carrie Chapman Catt as a crusading crank, misled into leadership of the hopeless cause urged by such pioneering feminists as Susan B. Anthony and Anna Howard Shaw. With the turn of the century her vigor and earnestness began to impress a previously indifferent public. Twenty years later, when the nineteenth amendment was ratified, she was the national heroine of a great victory. More than anyone else, she had turned woman suffrage from a dream into a fact.

Mrs. Catt's 30 years' fight was against intolerance, inertia, tradition, and the one-track mind. Her attack was logical, organized, and unanswerable. She was never as militant as Mrs. Pankhurst and the English suffragettes. Under her wise guidance American women petitioned, paraded, demonstrated, and worked with selfless zeal, but few found it necessary to chain themselves to lampposts or barred gateways. Against the complacent slogan "Woman's place is in the home" they hurled their insistent question, "Are women people?" There could be only one answer. No doubt feminine contributions to victory in the First World War and the soul-searching that followed it hastened the day of success. But woman suffrage was an irresistible movement from the days of its feeblest infancy.

The question of whether women have raised the standard of American politics still remains. Mrs. Catt believed that in time they would do so and organized the National League of Women Voters to prove it. It functions today as a powerful lighthouse pointing the way toward better and more intelligent citizenship. Mrs. Catt, however, did not approve the equal-rights amendment proposed by the National Woman's Party. She felt that women still needed the protective legislation they had slowly won. "Prejudice will not melt away," she said, "because the Constitution decrees equal rights."

Mrs. Catt scorned political preferment. She chose to remain what she had been from the beginning of her career—a teacher, a leader, and a prescient thinker. She took her honors easily, though they were among the greatest ever showered on an American woman. At the placid age of 83 her mind was still clear and active. It was no one-track mind. Other causes than that of woman suffrage were close to her heart. She was one of our earliest and most urgent advocates of world peace and an end to warfare. It is characteristic of her farsightedness that the nations of the earth at last are making it their cause.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Post Office at Astoria, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, a celebration was held at Astoria, Oreg., this

past week end commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of a United States post office in that city.

This event, in my opinion, is of great significance in American history, for without the early settlement and continuous maintenance of this community, this country might not have acquired title to the vast domain of the Pacific Northwest. The establishment of this office at Astoria came as the logical conclusion to a series of claims of our country to this territory. It became the keystone of our Government in this entire area. Territorial status and subsequent statehoods followed as a natural and logical sequence.

The initial claims of the United States to the Northwest began with the Lewis and Clark Expedition which established its western terminus near Astoria, Oreg., in 1804. They spent the winter of 1804–5 on the banks of what is now known as the Lewis and Clark River. In 1811 the Astor party settled at Astoria and this became the first American post on the Pacific coast and the Pacific Northwest. This community has remained on that same location since that time. During the War of 1812 it was taken by the British but restored to us in 1818. For a number of years after that date the status of this large segment of our country was in doubt with both Great Britain and ourselves making claims thereto. During these troublous times when "54–40 or fight" became a national battle cry, this settlement stood as a major bulwark of our right and title to the entire area.

In 1846 the United States and Great Britain agreed by treaty to the boundary between the United States and Canada as it now stands and our Government immediately thereafter undertook the establishment of this post office at Astoria as our first official Government post in the Pacific Northwest. This was completed on March 7, 1847, when the new office under John Shively opened for business. The following year the Territory of Oregon consisting of the present State of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming came into being under an act of Congress. The several statehoods followed.

The importance to our country of Astoria as a community and of this post office as our first Northwest keystone of Government has not been fully realized by the rest of the country. If this part of our Nation belonged to another country it is doubtful that we would be the great Nation that we are today. With its great and vital industry, its trans-Pacific ports, its lumber, ores, and agricultural products, it is now one of the most important parts of the United States and without question on the threshold of even greater development.

Let us today give due and just credit to the historical events at Astoria which formed the basis for the Pacific Northwest being a part of our Union and making its great contributions to its well-being and prosperity.

Daylight Saving in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to direct the attention of the House to an excerpt from a broadcast made recently by the very able and alert Lou Brott of radio station WOL on his program District Assignment relative to daylight saving in the District of Columbia.

On that occasion Mr. Brott had the following observation to make:

An overwhelming majority of residents in the District and nearby suburban areas have indicated through various polls they want summer daylight saving time, yet the House turned the measure down because a majority of the Members felt voting for daylight saving time was contrary to the interests of their constituents.

Actually the opposite is true because my information tonight is, that by Congress keeping the District of Columbia on standard time, thousands of citizens all over the country and especially in the smaller communities will be deprived of reading the day's news from Washington in their afternoon and evening newspapers. They will have to wait till the following day to catch up with the news or in some cases miss out entirely on certain items because as you know, there's nothing as dead as yesterday's news headlines.

These readers will miss out because I am told the Washington news wire services are all setting up their wires here on a daylight saving time schedule so as to conform with daylight time schedules in their other offices. Washington INS Bureau Chief Bill Hutchinson tells me all bureaus here will go on a 1:30 p. m. (daylight saving) Washington deadline which actually means 12:30 p. m. standard time. Now we all know that by 12:30 Congress has had little opportunity to transact much of the day's work.

So you see I think the men in the House by not voting for daylight saving have not only ignored the wishes of the District's residents, but have in a sense acted contrary to the interests of their constituents. The men in the House can change their minds by favorably considering Senator HOWARD MCGRATH'S pending daylight saving bill that would permit the District commissioners to establish fast time in the Nation's Capital.

How Words Grow Legs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the extension of my remarks an editorial appearing in the February 18 issue of the Los Angeles Daily News, entitled "How Words Grow Legs." I think the author of this editorial hits the nail squarely on the head. If we are to have a balanced economy and one prepared to meet the future exigencies that may arise affecting the welfare of this country, it must be a decentralized economy.

During the war we spent billions of dollars spreading our heavy industry over the face of the country so that it would not be vulnerable to concentrated attack from without or from saboteurs within.

There are sounder reasons why the steel industry that plays such a vital part in our economy should be decentralized and the great western part of the United States should not be dependent for steel on other sections of the country.

Sometime ago the major steel company in these United States decided upon a plan of decentralization and went so far as to hold a meeting of its board of directors in San Francisco at which time pious mouthings were given to the press to the effect that this company, being national in scope, wanted to disabuse the West of the idea that it was now under the protective umbrella of "Major Steel."

Many of us feel that this proposed plan of decentralization was brought about because an independent potential competitor had developed in the western section of the country. But, as I read the editorial, I have come to the conclusion that this competition has been pretty well blocked out.

The Interstate Commerce Commission can do something about this if it wants to, and it is high time that people west of the Rockies take cognizance of the discrimination in rates that effectually throttle the development of a balanced economy in our section of the country.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Daily News of February 18, 1947]

HOW WORDS GROW LEGS

It's no good making fine phrases about the American way of life and what is socially and economically desirable for a free republic of free, enterprising people unless those phrases grow legs and march from the printed pages and the tongues of politicians into the life of a community as it meets the problems of each living day.

What is happening to western steel surely proves this point. It proves that if the West is to go forward to new markets and new industries and a still higher standard of living for the 16,000,000 Americans of the 11 Western States, it can only go forward by meeting each separate threat to its economic future as that threat arises.

Before the war, and for peacetime uses, the western market consumed approximately 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 tons of steel annually. Of this total, roughly 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 tons were supplied by west coast open hearths, which cooked their fiery mixes exclusively from eastern ore, steel, pig, and scrap. Before Pearl Harbor, the entire region west of the Rockies had no basic steel plant, no blast furnaces producing pig from western ore.

The war, however, brought the West two plants: the Government-built plant at Geneva, Utah (now a United States Steel Corp. property), and the privately built Kaiser plant at Fontana, here in Southern California.

Together, Geneva and Fontana reached and are currently maintaining an annual production capacity of 1,300,000 ingot tons. Basic steel production has thus come to the West, although at present western steel is able to supply only about one-third of the region's pre-war needs. And since (1) economists figure a conservative postwar consumption of not less than 600 pounds of steel per capita and (2) the West's population is growing prodigiously, it's easy to see how the market for locally produced steel will multiply in the immediate years ahead, possibly doubling the prewar demand.

All of which simply means Southern California needs a booming, locally owned basic steel plant if it is to build a solid foundation for its new industrial economy.

But to have a local basic steel plant you have to have conditions under which it can operate successfully. Unfortunately, and despite much fine talk about equity, competition and the dangers of monopoly, these conditions are far from being met. As a matter of fact, what is happening, instead is that inequity in steel manufacture is being compounded and monopoly is being buttressed and strengthened. Here's how:

For overlong the West has suffered a freight-rate "differential" which prescribes higher transportation costs for western products than for those made in the East. On January 1 of this year the Government authorized a Nation-wide rate increase of 17½ percent. At the same time western railroads announced they would grant a 31-percent decrease to the Geneva, Utah (United States Steel) plant. The Kaiser plant at Fontana was thereby blocked behind the eight-ball. Under the guise of "voluntarily adjusting western rates downward" to repair the inequities of the tortured old "differential,' railways granted special privilege to one segment of western industry, and that an exclusively eastern-owned industry, a "share-cropping" branch of a great trust.

Obviously, if it's going to cost Fontana more to ship its materials than it will cost Geneva, Fontana can't compete. Locally owned industry will then have been beaten by eastern-owned industry.

Consequently, the Kaiser interests are asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to prevent the granting of the proposed rate decrease to Geneva and to see to it that freight tariffs are maintained on an equitable basis.

A fundamental, certainly, is at stake. What is involved here is far more than merely the fate of the Fontana plant. What is involved is the economic fate of the West generally. The portents discernible in the freight-rate sleight-of-hand, therefore, need to be understood by every westerner. Citizens of the West must realize their pocketbooks and their future are tied closely to the struggle of interests such as these.

The West is growing rich in people. It must also grow rich in home-owned heavy industries if it is to use and develop its human resources.

And that's why the phrases won't wash unless out of each challenge or issue they're translated into economic reality.

R. E. G. H.

UAW Members Petition Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following petition, which has been sent to me by members of the United Automobile Workers from small shops in Detroit, who are skilled in their trades.

These men and their families are justifiably concerned with the legislation now pending before Congress which imperils their standard of living and their very right to earn that living.

We petition our Michigan Senators and Congressmen to work and vote against all bills that attack labor's rights or that threaten to raise our rents.

Fred Williams, Frank O. Feldt, Paul Dourcuy, Yeat Vistae, James T. Crenshaw, Jr., Wilfred Eird, Paul Peetsck, Barrno Semskoe, Alfred Eckerle, W. H. Squrin, Robert Saltzqive, Thomas Garland, J. L. Cormell, Emmett Melannick, Tom Parry, Edward Chernutsky, Alf Fagerstrom, E. Ereckson, Maxine Burnick, Carl W. Chelstrom, Eltore Bignotti, John M. Parzondek, Helder G. Iregle, Leo Saruw, R. F. Dwidas, John P. Lovett, W. McNally, Joseph A. York, Stuart Hicks, James A. Green, John Brook, Louis Locker, Merrill Bigson, Adam Riebel, Charles Fay, Charles A. Perine, Gilbert Blocker, Gerberd Tepuss, John Pierce, Paul Hillis, R. H. Goyot, Norman J. Walkowski, Leo Kisman, Melvin J. Jones, Ed. Shiputh, Stephen A. Ryan, Nat Ganley, Elva Thomas, J. E. Slater, Saster Budinekz, R. Bernat, Joseph Pesotta, J. Heiuebodt, Teo. Hagan, Robert Dodds, Wm. Chandler, Frank Gabrish, John Cleland, Harold Waring, Fred McCoy, Alex Singel, James A. Gill, Andera Frankinscz, David Harrison, William Lee, T. O. Chatmon, John Duglas, Curt Deolecy, Milles Williams, Frank D. Taylor, Gals Foster, Nick Ocund, Cecil Chesney, Michael J. Schultz, David Coleman, R. Walker, C. Davis, Ellis R. Booker, John Atkins, Floyd Sheridan, Alex Fugott, Lloyd Thomas, James Williams, Gentle Washington, C. K. Armstrong, George E. Suppers, Lauson Allen, Frank Beawm, James Wer, David Cunningham, John H. Neal, James W. Best, B. F. Atkins, T. Gilbert, Robert Thompson, Barbara Karam, Harold Suberlin, F. Sanders, Frank Kanas, Wm. B. McDaniel, Martin Pelker, Will Johnson, E. Canfield, Pvt. R. A. Berdish, Earl Neive, Mack Grayson, Mrs. Emma McComick, William Symark, Michael Nolan, Jack Slarin, Lonnie Johnson, Clarence Brown, Wm. Pauchman, William J. Hall, Myri W. Mergan, Frank Jones, Anderson H. Bryant, Eugen Nonnim, Joe Schligt, L. Rogers, Elizabeth Cowan, Mildred Pollock, Willie B. Hind, Dave Rogers, E. Domkowski, Wiley Hattley, Margaret Anderson, John Gembic, Crafton Cooper, Robert M. Denault, James Penn, Frank J. Martin, Al Waters, I. Saiah, Cunnigan, H. Benson, Harry Boikey, C. A. Muller, Christopher C. Alston, Lewis Cowan, Fred Koster, Kitty L. Koester, William Boeder, Charles C. Mushead, Fulins Genbet, Ann Emjart, Desire Maes, Russell Leach, Hazel McCoy, Joseph Ameskavich, Rudolph Dayga, Jerry Miller, Annie Case, Bethel Hallis, Robert Allison, Phil Horn, George A. E. Davis, Edward Miklanzerski, Reynold Bearce, Elis Marshell, Donald Badd, Mike Szagepanski, Carl Hill, Ruby Long, Joseph Battaglia, Rose Hill, Larry Wallson, Douglas Creech, Eddie Brown, Milton Lanier, Bartin Cousar, M. Verbanic, Webster Brown, Ray M. Schulman, Mike Spruseo, Frank Smolky, Thomas F. Patterson, Fred Koester, Alan Bignotti, E. Bullard, Hodges E. Mason, Walter Hacrel, Tony Can, Willy Bates, Eelix Perez, T. O. Chatman, Robert McKee, Marion Dembek.

No Favors, Please!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, concerning the deficit in the Post Office Department:

NO FAVORS, PLEASE!

With a deficit of more than $350,000,000 forecast for the Post Office Department in the next fiscal year, the plan to reduce the postage on local first class letters from 3 cents to 2 will probably be abandoned. Even so, a deficit of more than $150,000,000 will remain and Postmaster General Hannegan is looking around for more revenue.

He is looking specifically at the rates on second class mailing matter, comprising newspapers, magazines and pamphlets. In fiscal 1945, the last year for which complete figures are available, the department spent $136,000,000 to perform this service, for which it collected only $29,000,000. Results: a second class deficit of $107,000,000.

This is in effect a subsidy to newspapers and magazines. Such deficits were defended in the past on the grounds that this material was educational and served to keep citizens informed of what went on in the country. This is true still, but it is a function which is not exclusive with newspapers and magazines. A radio station could claim an operating subsidy on the same ground.

The press, by and large, is a profitable institution and should pay its own way. It usually attacks subsidies for other industries and should accept none itself. Second class postage rates should be raised to pay for the service rendered.

Mrs. Guy Patterson Gannett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, during the past 6 years, the destinies of the National Federation of Music Clubs have been guided by a woman from my home State, Mrs. Guy Patterson Gannett. The work of this organization has broadened immeasurably in that period and has embraced many new channels of public service. A war-service program of large proportions has brought intimate contact with officials of the Army, Navy, and American Red Cross. An augmented program of international music relations has involved a close association with the State Department. A Nation-wide music-in-hospitals program

is now receiving the support and approval of the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. Gannett, president of the National Federation of Music Clubs, has made a valuable contribution in time and energy, and in view of the public aspect of the work which has been carried forward by this woman, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial published by the Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine, which recognizes this woman and the achievements of the National Federation of Music Clubs:

A MEMORABLE RECORD

During the past 6 years the people of Maine have been kept in unusually close touch with that splendid organization, the National Federation of Music Clubs. Because a Maine woman, a native of Augusta, has been its guiding genius during that period, this seems an appropriate moment to pay tribute to the federation's remarkable war and postwar record and to our fellow townswoman, Mrs. Guy Patterson Gannett, whose vision, courage, and patriotism have inspired the organization to which she belonged to such noteworthy service to her country and to the cause of music.

The story of the wartime accomplishments of the National Federation of Music Clubs can never be adequately told. Cold statistics, such as the contribution of more than two and a half million articles of musical equipment to American fighting forces in this country and abroad, and the inauguration of a music-in-hospitals program in Army, Navy, and veterans hospitals in more than 40 States, convey only the scantiest impression of what really happened. One must have been with the men who fought in Europe, in Africa, and on far Pacific islands to know the solace that was brought by those saxophones and ukuleles, those volumes of records packed with loving care by Federation War Service chairmen. Or one must have visited a veterans' hospital and sat by the bedside of an amputee while a federation teacher reawakened his interest in life by teaching him to tinkle out tuneful melodies on a guitar to know how great is the impact of this friendly service. For the lifetimes of all these men the federation will reap a boundless reward of gratitude for a task well done.

But it is not only in the field of war service that the Federation of Music Clubs has made a noteworthy contribution in the years just passed. It was one of the earliest organizations to wake to a consciousness of what the construction of a globe to one-world proportions would mean to the individual and the Nation. Its acts of neighborliness to other members of the world family have been many. Its reequipment of the Athens Symphony Orchestra with replacement parts was its first large-scale gesture in this direction. Since then it has aided the Netherlands State Symphony, the State Symphony of Bulgaria, and the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. It has contributed to Western Hemisphere cultural solidarity by opening up its young artists' contests to contestants below the Rio Grande and above our northern border.

Yet in an expanding program it has not neglected its original and primary responsibility—that of encouraging and promoting native talent, both creative and performing. Hundreds of queries about American music answered monthly from the federation's information services in New York, encouragement to talented students through scholarships at Interlochen and the Berkshires, contests for young composers, increased performance of American works by major orchestras, and the launching of the monumental symphony by the Virginia composer, John Powell, at the coming biennial convention in Detroit, are milestones pointing the way to a more brilliant musical future for the United States.

We, of Maine, were less familiar with the program of this remarkable organization before a Maine woman became its president, but we know that it had a long and honorable tradition. We believe that we may say with all modesty that impetus to even more outstanding achievement in the years to come has been contributed by a fellow citizen whom we delight to honor.

The Growing Responsibility of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast on our foreign policy on Saturday, March 1, 1947:

ANNOUNCER. Two world wars have put the United States in the position of being the most powerful nation in the world. Those same wars have weakened the position of world leadership held by Great Britain. What responsibilities does this put on us, the people of the United States? To discuss this question we have with us on this broadcast Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, and Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio. Chairman of the discussion is Mr. Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air: Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. Now my first question deals with the fact that it appears Great Britain is being forced to relinquish the position of world leadership that has been hers since the seventeenth century. You would agree that that appears to be the case, wouldn't you, Mrs. BOLTON?

Representative BOLTON. Yes, I would agree to that. It seems very evident that England recognizes her inability to continue that leadership. Somewhat ironical, isn't it, that many of those who have shouted the loudest against her imperialism are now accusing her of abandoning her responsibilities.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I might say, before I try to answer it, Mr. Fisher, always remember that Great Britain has retreated before but has always won the last battle.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, Senator; and there is a great deal in history that points that up. The question I want to get at though is this: The only other countries capable of taking over appear to be Soviet Russia and ourselves. Now, are we justified in taking over responsibilities that previously Great Britain has shouldered? Does that mean we shall become imperialistic? How should we exercise our leadership?

Senator SALTONSTALL. That's an all-inclusive question.

Representative BOLTON. England's withdrawals do throw the United States into the vortex of unwanted assumption of some proportion at least of these same responsibilities. Whichever ones we fail to assume will no doubt be taken over by the Soviet Union.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would prefer to consider this question as one of world responsibility rather than world leadership, Mr. Fisher We have that responsibility regardless of any other nation. We have the responsibility as the strongest Nation in the world to see to it, and to continue to see to it, that we take every and all steps possible for the preservation of peace and the furtherance of understanding among nations. The British note to our Government concerning financial aid to Greece that was in this morning's paper certainly is a case in point.

Representative BOLTON. I have just said that the responsibilities we failed to assume would no doubt go to Russia. Russia is 2½ times as large as the United States; the very weight of her potentialities makes her a formidable competitor in any field to which she turns her attention. But, and I say this in all kindness and with no little understanding, what has she to commend her to the world as a guardian of the well-being of small nations, of peoples still unversed in modern ways of life? Has she made demonstration of desire to see these weaker folk build themselves to the point of self-sufficiency? Is there anything in her record similar to ours with the Philippines?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I should like to point out that, in accepting our responsibility, we should not let imperialism in any form whatever color our relationships with the countries abroad.

Representative BOLTON. It seems to me that our record in the Philippines clears the refutation of the charge against us of imperialism. In comparison the Soviet's present methods appear to indicate her policy to be one of retention of controls rather than of relinquishment. If we are to assume even a partial stewardship of certain areas Britain has heretofore held, we can do so successfully only if we are strong in our own beliefs, certain of our own way. The foreign policy of any country is the reflection and extension of its own essential qualities and fundamental beliefs. The foreign policy must be clearly defined and courageously carried forward.

Mr. FISHER. All right, Mrs. BOLTON, now, concretely what would you say ours should be?

Representative BOLTON. It must be the expression of our certainty that the individual is important. Our determination to find the formula that will give every man, woman, and child opportunity for growth and self-determination, no matter how far we may be from our goal, must form the basis of our attitude to other countries great and small.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I believe, Mr. Fisher, we must assume a forthright policy that we will keep the peace of the world and use our influence to assist nations in improving their economic position in world affairs through the establishment of a sound peace and fair play. In short, we want the safety and security of the United States to be maintained at all costs and be the primary basis of our foreign policy insofar as possible.

Mr. FISHER. Now, I do not think we can continue to discuss this question without taking into account the fact that Great Britain has been a powerful creditor nation. That role she has had, by force of circumstances, to let go. It seems to me that this has been very strong implications for us in the United States. What would you say to that, Senator SALTONSTALL?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Great Britain was a powerful creditor nation through her imperial policy and through her investments throughout the Empire and elsewhere. The return on these investments, plus the need of her maintaining a large export trade, kept England in that position through all the years. We in the United States need nowhere near as large a percentage of our total trade to be export trade as England does.

Mr. FISHER. But at the moment, Senator SALTONSTALL, we are the creditor nation and the loans are coming from us. On what basis should we make these loans?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Fisher, when we are asked to make a loan to a foreign coun-

try, I believe we must carefully consider it, in each instance, on its own merit, after asking ourselves the question: "Is it for our best interests in maintaining the security and safety of our citizens of the United States and our responsibilities for world peace?"

Representative BOLTON. I'd like to interrupt a minute, Senator SALTONSTALL. "We do not need such a large percentage of export trade as does England," some say. I grant that with our vast unused acreage, our untapped resources, we appear to be in a pretty independent position compared to that of England. But is the moment not upon us when we must recognize the fact that unless we do go beyond our own borders for trade, and for investment, there is a very real danger that we shall find that the world has gone on without us?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Yes, Mrs. BOLTON, I think it is.

Representative BOLTON. I agree with you that whatever loans we make must be based upon the principles of ultimate security, but I emphasize the word "ultimate." Because we must look beyond the immediate situation if we are to play a constructive part in the building of tomorrow's world. Mr. Fisher, I would if I may suggest a little different angle of our responsibility to this whole business of borning a new world?

Mr. FISHER. By all means, Representative BOLTON. I wish you would.

Representative BOLTON. You see I feel so very strongly that giving birth is a woman's business and if the world of tomorrow is to be any improvement on the world of yesterday it is going to be necessary to have women in all the councils, adding their woman's knowledge of the fundamentals of living and their concern for and vision of the future to the knowledge that men have.

Mr. FISHER. What you are saying, Mrs. BOLTON, is that you think women could play a larger role?

Representative BOLTON. Indeed, the women of today have had all too litle to say about the kind of a world there must be for the children of the future. The moment is upon us as women when we can no longer permit ourselves to be pushed to one side. When we can no longer accept the limitations that have been put upon us. It has been said by those far wiser than I that there can be no world peace until men and women the world over build together. You men are the positive, aggressive element. We the more passive, filled with a power and a wisdom still untapped, which when recognized and used side by side and in conjunction with your own, can and will build a world where health, sanity, and joy can live in a vividly constructive peace.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I'm not sure, Mrs. BOLTON, what you have said isn't an indictment of men.

Representative BOLTON. No, I don't mean it that way, Senator.

Mr. FISHER. It is at the least provocative, Mrs. BOLTON. I'd like to ask you to go on. Do you think women have done all they can?

Representative BOLTON. I think it is rather unfortunate, Mr. Fisher, that women here in the United States appear to be failing to recognize their individual and collective responsibility in both domestic and world problems. They need to bestir themselves and insist upon sharing the almost insuperable difficulties with which freedom and construction are faced. The world is round and it whirls with terrific speed. What affects the North affects the South, whatever wind blows across the East will eventually blow across the West. It is unfortunate also that there is so little recognition of the vital contribution that must still be made by women, if men and women together are to rebuild a world.

Mr. FISHER. Now, I would like to consider for a moment the question of our standard of living. If we are to maintain it and increase it, economists argue that we must expand our foreign trade. Clearly this means investments abroad. Now it seems to me that that may bring forward the cry against us of dollar diplomacy. Do you think we have to risk this charge, Senator SALTONSTALL?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I believe we may have to risk the charge, Mr. Fisher. I have hopes that gradual overseas investments by American businessmen will not only bolster this country's economy, but will substantially raise the standards of living in other less industrialized countries.

Representative BOLTON. Why should we fear the possible interpretations put upon a policy of increasing our foreign investments and loans. I have always found that efforts to avoid misinterpretations lead into greater difficulties than does a frank and open adoption of action based upon a defined principle. To say that we are aware that economics is one of the foundation stones of peace, and that we propose to assume our share of responsibility in establishing new economic methods, seems to me both important and necessary. I should feel we were in a very bad way indeed if we did not have the courage to take what you suggest might be a risk.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Personally, Mr. Fisher, I want the United Nations to work. I want the leaders of our Government to make every effort patiently, slowly, firmly, courageously, to secure a peace that will be lasting, to see that this organization will help us prevent another world conflict. I don't care necessarily who the men are who lead us in these efforts, but I do want them to be men who understand our thoughts and who will stand firmly on policies that will give us in the United States peace, that will give us security. I want them to work out these policies with firmness where our own security and our own peace are concerned. There are going to be border-line cases. But we must always remember in determining these questions that we, the strongest Nation on the face of the earth, can never again shirk our responsibilities in the society of nations. We must do our share of keeping the peace in countries which are not capable of governing themselves. This may mean that our boys will be overseas for some time to come.

Mr. FISHER. Now it is obvious that a great deal of industrialization is going on now in countries that not so long ago were dependent on outside sources. Our economic power, it seems to me, is bound to give us an important role in this industrialization. It seems to me, again, important to ask ourselves along what lines our participation should develop. In fact, in view of our history as a democracy, what should we want to see develop?

Representative BOLTON. I am afraid I must take issue with you for a moment, Mr. Fisher, on terminology. You use the word "democracy" as if it were an actual form of government. Surely, that is not the case. In any event our form of government is that of a representative republic, and we have prospered mightily because we have been just that. Granted that we believe in a democratic way of life, one that will give the greatest possible opportunity to each individual citizen, but it is our representative government that is our safeguard, that protects the people.

Mr. FISHER. Well Representative BOLTON, I think you do make an important point there about the meaning of democracy, but many people today do, I think, consider democracy as government.

Representative BOLTON. Yes, unfortunately.

Mr. FISHER. Now, how about my question of where we should stand in assisting the industralization of other countries?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I think, Mr. Fisher, that this industrialization is a perfectly natural and logical development. As these countries become more advanced, naturally the capital seeks a profitable outlet. People have gotten too much in the habit of thinking, when they talk about loans in relation to other nations, that these loans must necessarily be made by the Government. With peace and stable conditions throughout the world and greater self-determination among the peoples of the world, I think our businessmen are going to have greater opportunities for trade. England had to seek investments abroad in order to distribute her goods. Meantime we were growing.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, Senator SALTONSTALL, and that means inevitably that Britain's mantle, or some of it at least, falls upon our shoulders. How are we going to wear that mantle?

Representative BOLTON. But Mr. Fisher, if we believe in opportunity for the development of the individual we certainly believe in it for the development of nations, and having developed ourselves and our industrial capacity second to none, it would seem both natural and sound that we should supply at least a proportion of the industrial needs of other countries that they in turn might give greater opportunity for the development to their people.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Many American companies have branches throughout the world today. This is all to the good, and I believe the responsibility of our country is to do its share toward a world at peace so that such investments may once again be profitable. The basic commodity of industry in the development of industry is machine tools. Today we export 50 percent of our machine tool industry. I just give you this one example of how we benefit from industrialization of other countries.

Mr. FISHER. Well, inevitably, Senator SALTONSTALL, our foreign policy is linked to our economic power. Great Britain felt she had to police her investments. If we loan, for industrialization, for instance, how are we to safeguard our money? Are we going to police it?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I feel strongly, Mr. Fisher that such issues, if they require policing, are clearly within the realm of the United Nations.

Representative BOLTON. I would like to feel that we are using our present creditor position with broad vision and great wisdom. I agree that Britain "policed" her economic investments in the world but with an amazing understanding she did so with what can well be called "token" armies. Is it not conceivable also that the United Nations will develop a system of policing that will be the answer?

Senator SALTONSTALL. When the issue of policing abroad is raised we undoubtedly will be told by parents across the country that their boys already are committed to policing duty in half a dozen foreign countries. "We don't want our sons risking their lives in any other trouble areas," they will say. My answer to this whole problem is always the same. We must do our part to stimulate the United Nations into being and to share our responsibilities in making it an effective instrument of peace and security. Solving every international conflict by peaceful means is the job of the United Nations, not of this country alone or any other nation alone.

Mr. FISHER. Well, economic power and investment abroad—this is a pretty big question and it takes a little time to get our teeth into it—if we loan overseas, we expect to be paid back. That means goods produced by other countries entering the United States. Doesn't it?

Representative BOLTON. Yes, of course, we must import if we are to make foreign loans.

Senator SALTONSTALL. On the other hand, I think the people of our country would want to consider awfully carefully any foreign loans of the taxpayer's money today. Yesterday ex-President Hoover discussed before a House Committee the problem of feeding starving people, and the basis on which it should be done. He believes foreign relief should have a "please repay" tag on it.

Representative BOLTON. We know we are going to make foreign loans, and we need to be certain that too great trade barriers do not impede the free flow of goods necessary to the repayment of those loans. Is it so impossible to make adjustments? Do we not need to restudy our own ways on the new basis of world responsibility? In saying this I am not saying that I believe we should launch into a tremendous foreign loan policy for I should have to insist as you did earlier, Senator SALTONSTALL, that all loans be based upon the strengthening of the United States. What I am trying to say is that we are living in a new world, a new age, that will demand tremendous changes in economic methods and I want to see us alert enough to be in the vanguard where we can shape policies and methods rather than among the reluctant laggards.

Mr. FISHER. Now, I have had to come back to the question of policing which we were discussing a moment ago. If we make loans we want stable conditions. Great Britain maintained police forces to insure such conditions. But she has announced that she is preparing to relinquish many of these duties. It seems to me that there are very great implications in this for the United States.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would like to say, Mr. Fisher, as strongly as I am able that if any situations need policing let us turn them over in due course to the United Nations. That is why I, for one, have always backed the United Nations and I am confident that is how most people of this country think these problems should be handled.

Representative BOLTON. I certainly agree with you, Senator. Should such action be required, it should be done by the United Nations.

Mr. FISHER. Now, what worries some people about that point of view, if I may say so, is this: If a situation arose tomorrow requiring policing, where are the forces the United Nations would use for such a job? That, it seems to me, is the crux of the question I put just now. Now I'd like to turn to the Pacific. In that area the prestige of Great Britain has suffered much. There is no question that Asia is watching to see how our foreign policy will develop in that region. I would like to have your opinions as to the responsibilities facing us in the Pacific, first because of Great Britain's decline and, second, because of the presence of Russia, the only other great power besides ourselves.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Fisher, I believe we have the responsibility in the Pacific of seeing to a successful solution every commitment we have made. I have in mind the situation in Japan where we must continue to democratize Japan, a job which General MacArthur has so ably started. To do that successfully we must make it possible for Japanese people to be economically self-sufficient. That is the great unsolved problem.

Representative BOLTON. You say, Senator, that we must continue to democratize Japan and that to be successful we must make it possible for the Japanese people to be economically self-sufficient. I have little if any difference with you over this second statement. But I do not believe we can democratize Japan or Germany. All we can do is to expose them to demonstrations of what we mean by the democratic way of life over a long enough period to give them a feeling of comprehension of the benefits we believe accrue from it. But the ultimate choice must remain in their hands. And—and this is important—are we giving the kind of demonstrations that will build within the hearts of the people of these countries a burning desire to adopt our ways? Oh, yes, our responsibility is great.

Mr. FISHER. Well, obviously, Senator SALTONSTALL, you do not consider Japan our only responsibility in the Pacific?

Senator SALTONSTALL. No; by no means. In the Philippines, until that country's government is politically able to take care of its responsibilities and until the Philippine economy is sufficiently restored to enable its government to function without United States aid, we have a clear responsibility for seeing that peaceful conditions are maintained and that its economy is given an occasional stimulant. This is to our interest because we have outposts and military bases on the islands. And these outposts must be kept up.

Mr. FISHER. Let me ask you both a question that has been worrying many Americans lately. Would you say that it fits the realities of international politics today to say that the main burden of defense of the English-speaking world now rests on the shoulders of the United States? If you do agree, there would appear to be grave implications for our foreign policy.

Representative BOLTON. Mr. Fisher, I do agree and I do not see how we can get away from the reality that with England withdrawing we must of necessity carry more of the burden.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I agree also. I think the main burden does rest on our shoulders. And that means that we must be strong at home, continue our production ability, our system of life, and make it clear to the rest of the world that we are capable of doing this. There is no alternative to the carrying out of this position. We must have confidence in our own ideology. I believe that Russia and other nations of the world consider our position in the world with relation to the strength of our industry and our armed forces. We do not want to maintain an unnecessarily large Army and Navy but we do want the Army and Navy to be ready, to be well trained, and to be equipped with the most modern, scientific weapons.

Representative BOLTON. You have discussed the visible defenses, Senator. But I am inclined to bring up at this point a matter which must be considered more seriously as part of our fundamental structure. In the first place we cannot defend anything unless we are strong and that strength must be both physical and spiritual. We have talked too much and done too little. But if we permit ourselves to be without visible defenses we shall not be able to protect the long road to peace from being overtaken by destructive forces. Guns, tanks, planes, and bombs, however, will be of little avail unless our people believe passionately in the value of the freedom that is theirs. Nor can a country be strong unless its people glory in work well done. Here in these United States we believe that we are building a way of life in which every individual will have opportunity to develop his greatest capacity and to live according to his lights up to the point where his desires interfere with another man's similar lights and desires. At that point there must come conference and compromise, cooperation and law. The same is true of our relations with other countries.

Mr. FISHER. Now, Senator SALTONSTALL, would you agree that the less we assume leadership in world affairs the more the other nations will turn to Russia? In other words, what are the penalties for just allowing events to run their course?

Senator SALTONSTALL. We must demonstrate to the world that we realize at home that we are one of the two strongest nations on the face of the earth and that we are willing to assume the responsibilities that go with that position. If we bury our head in the sand like an ostrich, obviously other nations will look to Russia and any other country where they think they can get assistance when they need it and backing for their own undertakings.

Representative BOLTON. To my way of thinking, Mr. Fisher, we cannot just assume leadership. We can only demonstrate the essential values of our way of life by our accomplishments in giving as much joy of opportunity as possible to our own people, but I repeat that men and women must do this together. Like Senator SALTONSTALL, I prefer the words "assuming responsibility" rather than leadership. If we fail to understand and so fail to meet the needs of the suffering countries, we cannot blame them if they turn elsewhere to some other country that has strength.

Mr. FISHER. Now we have touched on some basic questions of foreign policy, questions inherent in the weakened position of Great Britain and the world. What course will American foreign policy pursue? But it is certain that these questions, some of which we raised on this program, will bear careful thought in the months ahead. I would like to ask you, Senator SALTONSTALL, if, in view of the world situation today, you do not think that a bipartisan foreign policy is essential?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Fisher, there should be no obstacle to a bipartisan foreign policy. There is much to be gained in the general statement that partisan politics stops at our shores. The great problem is to get people to agree to the economics that are involved in our present foreign policy. I would like to quote from an article by Walter Lippmann that I read in Tuesday's paper of this week. I think it expresses better than I can what the people of the United States—our people, you and I—must think about and realize today.

Mr. FISHER. Go ahead, Senator, and give us the quotation.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Here it is: "The responsibility of the United States is growing, is growing more rapidly heavier and greater than any of us—than any of us—supposed it would when the war ended. Nor is there any escape from that responsibility. It is impossible to evade the consequences of history, and there is no way in which the United States can stand safely aside and mind its own internal business and enjoy its own blessings, while all about it the world sinks into disorder and squalor and the violence of a desperate struggle for mere existence." That was what Walter Lippmann said on Tuesday of this week.

Think and Act for America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I quote the following from the Washington Times-Herald of March 10, 1947:

(By John O'Donnell)

Now on Capitol Hill comes the opening of the most important debate since the founding fathers of our Republic met in Philadelphia and heard old Ben Franklin plead with them to sign the Declaration of Independence because:

"It will keep America out of England's wars. * * * No longer will Englishmen be able to drag us after them in all the plundering wars which their desperate circumstances, injustices, and rapacity may prompt them to undertake."

And so today, thanks to the global mess into which the Nation was sucked by Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, we have reached the end of our purely American tether. London tells us that Britain is broke and weak and shutting up shop. As the British Empire they are going out of business. And will we please take over the Empire's bankrupt outfit and assume all cash and military obligations on which the sun never sets?

This idea that our Republic must take over Britain's "white man's burden of empire" is to start with Greece and continue God knows how far. Palestine and Turkey and the rest of the Middle East are surely on the schedule for American suckers and then India and then what have you—or rather what have the British got that they can't hold because they haven't got the strength, or the money or the desire?

Britain has gone isolationist, of course, and pulled back into the Tight Little Isle. Russia is strictly isolationist.

And the most recent military alliance on a strictly two-way basis, signed by France and Britain at Dunkirk, gives a rough idea of how much confidence is lodged in UN by the hard-boiled politicians of Paris and London.

You can expect to see all the one-worlders, all the global do-gooders, and all the fight-for-freedom warmongers—in short all the betrayers of the principles on which this Nation was founded—whooping it up to take over Britain's financial obligations in Greece.

This, of course, means bank-rolling an army to support by force the kind of a government that London wants. And it means that we are trying once again to buy endearing and enduring friendship from foreigners by giving them cash and food.

But today there is this difference: Up on Capitol Hill the boys are squaring away for the 1948 battle for the White House. And come November of next year they wonder how will the voters feel about first sending United States cash—and troops and the flag have been following our cash abroad in recent decades—to take over Britain's "white man's burden."

Important to note is that Ohio's Senator TAFT, one of the present leaders for the Republican Presidential nomination, was invited to the White House conference along with Michigan's GOP VANDENBERG, another White House aspirant who has been going along with the boys who think they can make a nourishing political meal out of the somewhat stale and rancid leavings of the Roosevelt-Hopkins-Frankfurter foreign-policy banquet.

Time was in 1939 when VANDENBERG, like Governor Dewey of New York, was a proclaimed isolationist. But this was back in the 1940 battle for the nomination, and at the Philadelphia GOP convention they lost their nerve when it came to fighting F. D. R.'s third-term bid on an isolationist issue, which would give the voters an honest chance to register their will for war or peace.

In '48 the GOP convention will demand a chance to say: "To hell with this New Deal-Republican bundling on the most important issue, which is foreign policy. Let's have an honest difference of opinion. One guy says he's for this North American Continent and to hell with European headaches. And another guy who says we've got to save the world first before we save America first. And then vote."

Up on Capitol Hill, when this bailing out Britain comes up for argument, somebody is going to raise the blunt issue:

"What business is it of the American citizen what kind of a government the people of Greece have? If they have a Plato's republic, or Stalin's communism, or the monarchy that Britain has installed, thanks to United States lend-lease military equipment and UNRRA food bribes, what of it?"

And then you get the whisper that of course you (that's the people of the United States) have got to stop Stalin now. The same old argument you got about Hitler and Mussolini.

And the answer to that is that today all of Europe and the United States is worse off than it could possibly have been if Roosevelt had not needled Britain into declaring war on Germany, September 3, 1939, and dragging a bewildered, unwilling, and unprepared France along with her—all over an almost forgotten strip of land called the Polish Corridor—and later giving Poland and Finland (thanks to F. D. R.) the most disgraceful and shameful double-cross in diplomatic history.

Communism is different. It's a religion and is exportable and has been exported. So we got ourselves into that mess, swapping one pair of dictators for another, a more powerful Communist regime which suppressed the Christian religion, killed more Jews, wiped out free speech and press, and destroyed the dignity of the individual on a scale never approached by the late and unlamented Fuehrer or Il Duce.

All of which indicates that it might be time for us to take a page from the present British and Moscow program and for once come out of the one-world ether and tell the boys on Capitol Hill they are elected by Americans, draw their dough from the United States Treasury, and might be expected to think and act for America first.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Providence recommending immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine:

Resolved, That—

Whereas the United States has already gone on record, by congressional resolution and Executive statement, as favoring the establishment in Palestine of an independent democratic Jewish commonwealth as set forth in the Balfour Declaration; and

Whereas such a program has been heartily endorsed by both our great political parties in their last national-convention platforms; and

Whereas the recent Anglo-American Commission recommended the immediate admission of 100,000 European Jews into Palestine, which recommendation is favored and approved by President Truman; and

Whereas there are hundreds of thousands of displaced persons in Europe rapidly losing all hope for the future, of which about one-third are Jewish refugees seeking an opportunity to enter Palestine to start life there anew: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council, in recognition of the suffering endured by such refugees and the need for some prompt action, does hereby memorialize, implore, and entreat the Congress, its Members, and the President to take immediate steps to implement the report of said Commission; to act at once, by resolution, diplomatic channels, or otherwise, in the name of justice and humanity to the end that the solemn declaration of the mandatory power be fulfilled, thus permitting the mass entrance of refugee Jews into Palestine and restoring peace in the Holy Land; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the records, and that copies thereof be sent to the President of the United States and to the Rhode Island Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

[SEAL] D. EVERETT WHELAN,
City Clerk.

Memorial of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN D. JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a memorial of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma:

Senate Resolution 6

Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation regulating trading in farm products on commodity exchanges and boards of trade, and to establish a uniform system of grading of farm products

Whereas there was wide and unusual fluctuations in the price of cotton and other farm products on the commodity exchanges and boards of trade during the period between July 1, 1946, and January 1, 1947; and

Whereas there is no apparent reason for the break in the cotton market and the wide variation in the price of other commodities during this period except speculation and possible manipulation of prices which is made possible because of lack of regulation of trading in such commodities on such exchanges and boards of trade; and

Whereas speculation and manipulation is encouraged by the fact that sales of such commodities may be, and are frequently made without delivery of the commodity sold by persons who do not have or own the commodity which they purport to sell; and

Whereas this speculative trading in such commodities has resulted in serious losses to the producers of such commodities who must sell same at or near the time when produced and has further resulted in increased cost to consumers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is requested to enact legislation placing the control of commodity exchanges and boards of trade directly under the supervision of the State Department of Agriculture and to enact laws to regulate the sale of farm products on such exchanges and boards of trade, to protect producers and processors of cotton, grains and other commodities.

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States is further requested to cause a complete investigation to be made of the cotton exchanges and boards of trade throughout the United States by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice working in conjunction with each other for the purpose of making findings of fact, and recommendation as to legislation needed, to correct and eliminate the evils of speculative trade in farm commodities.

SEC. 3. The Congress of the United States is further requested to immediately enact

legislation which will prohibit the sale of cotton and grain on exchanges and boards of trade by any person who does not have actual possession of a warehouse receipt or certificate covering evidence of ownership of the amount of cotton or amount of grain sold by such person; and requiring that every such sale shall be accompanied by the transfer of a warehouse receipt or certificate evidencing title to the commodity sold or transferred, and that the number of bales of cotton or bushels of grain that may be sold by any one person, firm, or corporation during any one day, be limited. It is further recommended that the Congress limit the amount by which the price of cotton or grain may be reduced on any exchange or board of trade in any one day to $2 per bale on cotton and one-half percent per bushel on wheat.

SEC. 4. It is further suggested that the Congress of the United States should enact legislation establishing a uniform system for the grading of cotton and grains by licensed graders, throughout the United States and providing that when any such products are graded, the grade thereby established, subject to appeal therefrom by the producer, shall constitute the final grade of such product which shall be used as the basis for the determination of value in all subsequent sales of such commodities, and that the grade thereof be endorsed on the warehouse receipt at the time that such products are warehoused.

SEC. 5. The President pro tempore of the Senate is directed to send two certified copies of this resolution to the Agricultural Committees of both Houses of Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

Adopted by the senate February 20, 1947.

J. C. NANCE,
President of the Senate.

The Poor Congressman, as Seen by Walter Locke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, a little humor is relished by everyone. Walter Locke, a capable columnist of the Atlanta Journal, indulges his in writing of the plight of the poor Congressman and the career men caught by the rising tide of living costs. He describes their dilemma with wit and realism. Our Government officials wish and want to serve their country but they likewise have a private obligation to provide for their families. It is true man does not live by bread alone but at least he must have half a loaf. There is such a thing as expecting too much of those who guide the destinies of the Nation.

Mr. Locke salutes the career of Wendell Berge who is resigning from the Department of Justice after 17 years of service. He writes:

See the poor Congressman. He is in Washington by vote of the people. Only by getting the people's votes can he stay in Washington, which is a pleasant place to live. Now what will please the people, get their votes?

That is for the poor Congressman, ear to the ground, to discover and decide.

The people do not like to pay taxes. To get their votes, he had to promise to cut their taxes—20 percent at least.

To cut the taxes, the Congressman must cut the budget, the cost of Government.

The people want to be safe against attack. They want a strong Army and Navy. There can't be any cutting there.

The people insist that the post office bring their mail to their doors, and right away. The farmers must have a strong Department of Agriculture, the businessman a strong Department of Commerce, the labor men a strong Department of Labor. The Congressman can't cut there. Then there are the veterans, they and their wives and mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters with pretty much all the votes there are; there can be no cutting there.

The poor Congressman. He can't cut taxes without cutting expenses, and if he cuts expenses he makes everyone sore at him.

DOING VERSUS SAYING

The poor Congressman remembers how he defeated his opponent at the last election, the man who was in Congress then.

That poor Congressman had been called upon to hold down prices for consumers and put prices up for those with things to sell. He must have higher prices for cattle for the cattlemen and lower prices for the beef for the workingman. It couldn't be done; his opponent asked the people: Had enough? And out he went.

Now here is the poor Congressman with nothing to do but reduce taxes and increase the public and private services. Besides, he has promised to pay the national debt.

So easily are great things said! So hardly are the great things done! See the poor Congressman in Washington trying to make it seem that he is cutting the taxes and yet maintaining the public services and paying the debt, and already, looking over his shoulder, he sees his next year's opponent mocking him and saying to the voters: Had enough?

See the happy Congressman in Washington—if you can find one; there are always some.

He is happy because he hasn't promised to cut the taxes and increase the expenses and pay the debt at once. He is trying to do the sensible and possible, let the chips fall where they may. If for that the people throw him out, there's other places than Washington for him to live. (The people do not always throw out the Congressman who shoots straight, despising the bunkum. The people are smarter sometimes, but not always, than their Congressmen take them for.)

The Children of Israel marched seven times around the City of Jericho. Then they shouted and the walls fell down and the town was theirs.

Then here is 44-year-old Wendell Berge, ending 17 years in the Department of Justice in Washington. No man has butted his head against stonier walls than he.

WENDELL BERGE'S BATTLE

Berge carried off the honors wherever he went to school, including the Law School of the University of Michigan. His abilities brought him into one of the great law firms of New York. In 1930 the public service called. He went into the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. That was in President Hoover's time.

He stayed on and on, rising at length to the head of his department, chief prosecutor of the trusts.

A lawyer of such capacity in private practice is limited, as to his income, only by such conscience as he may chance to have. The conscience of Wendell Berge kept him in his public post. His highest salary was $10,000 a year—not much in high-rent Washington. For that, year after year, he butted his head against a wall he insisted must come down—the wall the monopoly men have built.

The prosecutor of trusts has a hard and thankless job. We are against the trusts. Our national conventions make hostile faces at the trusts. We enact tough laws against the trusts. Then we do nothing much to hurt the trusts.

The men who rig up the monopolies are such nice folks. They shine in polite society. They endow colleges and churches and subscribe to the Community Chest. They contribute to the party campaign funds and support the Boy Scouts. All the private virtues they exemplify.

In a land where women send flowers to condemned wife murderers in jail our juries cannot bring themselves to send nice conspirators in restraint of trade to jail. When these happen to be labor leaders they are even protected by the law.

PERIL OF MONOPOLY

The best our trust law enforcement officers can do is attack the monopolists in civil suits or, better still, get them to plead nolo contendere and promise not to offend again.

Congress makes its laws against the trusts, then, in its big heartedness, forgets to appropriate the money needed to enforce the law. A public prosecutor who really attacks monoplies gets howled at as a radical, an enemy of business and probably a Communist.

There was neither glory nor gold in fighting monopolies. Yet for 17 years Wendell Berge stuck to his post, beat his head against the wall; for he knew that liberty is allergic to monopoly; that if America does not suppress its trusts, our freedom vanishes and a totalitarian order, Communist or Fascist, takes its place.

The wall hasn't yet come tumblin' down. There isn't much sign it will. The years creep up on Wendell Berge. It is time he began to make a living. He has resigned. There must be other brilliant young fellows who put service above self to take his place beating against the wall—or else!

WALTER LOCKE.

Vast Flow of United States Aid to World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a large part of the $27,000,000,000 furnished to foreign countries by the American taxpayers in loans, gifts, goods, and relief has gone largely to Britain, France, China, and Italy. These nations are clamoring for more relief. Other nations are now demanding their share from the inexhaustible wealth of the United States.

Is there no limit to our largess short of the insolvency of the United States?

Must we continue the international spending spree until we can neither help other nations nor save ourselves from a ruinous inflation?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article taken from the United States News of February 21, 1947:

VAST FLOW OF UNITED STATES AID TO WORLD—OUTLAY OF $27,000,000,000 AS LOANS, GIFTS, AND BARGAINS IN SURPLUS—TENDENCY TO TIGHTEN RELIEF POLICY IN AN EFFORT TO HELP WAR-HIT LANDS STAND ALONE

All around the world, nations in trouble are looking to the United States for more

help. Britain needs aid. Europe wants more food, other goods, further loans of capital. China is threatened with economic collapse.

Aid in new forms is not being rushed by this country and there is a revival of feeling that maybe the United States has not done all that it should or can do.

Actually, the record of United States aid to the world since the end of the fighting war shows this:

Surplus war property, in food, clothing, machinery, trucks, housing, and other facilities, that cost United States taxpayers nearly $7,500,000,000 has been made available to other nations for $1,678,000,000, of which only $400,000,000 was cash. To replace this material at present prices probably would require $12,000,000,000.

Dollar loans to other nations, already committed, total $10,000,000,000 more, including a $3,750,000,000 loan to Britain. These are dollars that can be spent for goods that are needed.

Direct relief abroad, through UNRRA and through the Army program in Germany, Japan, and Austria, has amounted to more than $3,000,000,000. Vast amounts of food and clothing have been provided free.

Lend-lease pipe lines, filled at the end of the war with food, clothing, machinery, and many other usable goods, were emptied very cheaply. Britain got $6,033,000,000 in United States goods for $650,000,000 that she borrowed from this country to make the payment. Russia got about $290,000,000 in goods, with no agreement to pay anything as yet.

Private aid, large and growing, probably has exceeded $500,000,000 in outright contributions from United States citizens. Americans still are sending large amounts of commodities to relatives and friends, and to people not specifically designated.

Altogether, this country has provided loans, gifts, token-payment goods, and relief amounting to $27,000,000,000 in an effort to get the rest of the world back on its feet. This is not a negligible amount, even in view of the tremendous world need.

Then, an additional $5,925,000,000 has been committed by the United States for loans abroad through the World Bank and the Monetary Fund when they begin operations.

What is happening now is, in effect, an effort to wean the rest of the world away from dependence on United States aid. Government loans and grants abroad are being tightened, are not to exceed $3,809,000,000 in the fiscal year ahead. Relief shipments for other nations are not to be so free and easy. This is bringing hard feelings from some, but others abroad are taking the attitude that they want to get back on their feet and out from under relief from this country.

United States surplus property overseas, 82 percent of it now in the hands of foreign governments and individuals, is to be a big help in building up foreign economies and making them self-supporting. Most of this property is in the form of industrial and transportation equipment, items most needed in the coming recovery of war-torn countries.

Examples of surplus property in the $7,437,000,000 of United States' goods furnished to these nations to date:

Construction equipment and industrial materials to rebuild homes, factories and devastated cities have accounted for 21 percent of the vast overseas surplus stocks.

Transportation equipment, including entire railroads, thousands of trucks and boxcars, and United States aircraft now used on nearly all of the world's air lines, total 33 percent of surpluses sold abroad on credit.

Maritime property, including rebuilt harbors, surplus ships, and hundreds of landing craft now used in interisland and river traffic, accounts for another 11 percent of United States property furnished to foreign governments below cost.

These things, plus consumer goods and spare parts for equipment obtained, are needed more than money by most countries now. For the most part, they have been furnished to nations worst hit by the war—Britain, France, China, and Italy—and they are in a position to help make those nations self-supporting.

That is the record of United States aid abroad thus far. It shows a substantial effort to get the world on an operating basis again, an effort that will be felt more in the period ahead.

Jack Cochran, Masterpiece in Quiet Tones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week one of America's great men passed away in the person of our former colleague, the Honorable John J. Cochran.

Those of us who loved and revered Jack Cochran shall always feel his presence among us in the form of his many contributions to this body. I desire to make part of the RECORD of the House a fitting tribute to this great man of the people from one of America's great newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The Post, too, will miss Jack Cochran. His was the record of public service which this great newspaper has urged upon office seekers of all parties. His tenure in this House can well be used as a measuring rod for Members of Congress in years to come.

MASTERPIECE IN QUIET TONES

It is one good measure of the man that the name, John J. Cochran, sounded stilted. Nine times out of 10 the last name was superfluous. Jack was enough. There was only one Jack to whom St. Louis turned, and then, as the years passed, pretty much the whole of Missouri, for the things they deserved in Washington. As his quiet, prompt, efficient way became known, citizens of Illinois and other States asked the North St. Louis Congressman for information and help. Jack Cochran truly sat in the National House of Representatives.

His works over the two decades would fill this page. He was more of a watchdog of funds than the run of Secretaries of the Treasury; single-handed he turned back hundreds of trumped-up claims which would have cost many millions of dollars. He exposed and stopped rackets such as the toll-bridge fraud. He led in the memorable fight against a Federal sales tax in the Hoover era. He made himself a specialist in the business of Government; much of the spade work on modernization of Federal administration was done by him. He kept his head when others voted to tie up the regulatory agencies. He helped in the establishment of Missouri's national forests, in protection of Ozark streams, in wildlife conservation.

It was a political education to talk with him. He seemed always to know everything afoot in Washington. Due to his deafness, he read daily the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in full. He wasn't long on speeches, but then the House is not a debating chamber. He knew its committee operation intimately from secretarial duties for Stone, Igoe, and Hawes in earlier days.

His democracy was of three kinds. He gave his party criticism as well as allegiance; he was the first prominent Democrat to denounce Missouri's governorship steal. He was a small "d" Democrat, reared in Kerry Patch and a Post-Dispatch office boy 50 years ago. But he was just as plain and approachable as Chairman Cochran or Acting Majority Leader Cochran. And he held a courageous place in the great democracy of human suffering which makes all mankind kin.

Only one man ever defeated Jack Cochran in the 20-year span and that man is now President of the United States. Many still regret that he did not win the senatorial nomination in 1934; yet all in all his post was the right one for him. Representative—representative of the people—he was that in the richest meaning of the term. The Washingtons, Franklins, and Jeffersons founded our democracy. Men like Jack have been its stewards.

Great Britain's Treatment of Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great number of protests from organizations and individuals in the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana, opposing Great Britain's policy of forcing the return of displaced persons to their original countries.

Because of dictatorial and hostile governments now controlling certain smaller nations in Europe, these displaced persons will not enjoy a peaceful existence, but in most cases will be jailed or even executed upon their return to their homeland.

I have on several occasions called the attention of our State Department to this unfortunate situation.

I am herewith incorporating with my remarks a letter from the Serbian Sisters Circle, of Gary, Ind., which is similar to other protests on this unjust policy of Great Britain:

SERBIAN SISTERS' CIRCLE,
Gary, Ind., March 7, 1947.

Hon. RAY L. MADDEN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: The Serbian Sisters' Circle, of Gary, Ind., an organization of mothers who have sent over 300 sons into the armed services of our country in the late World War II, respectfully urge you to take proper Christian and humanitarian action in regard to the question of displaced persons now in Italy, Germany, and other European countries.

We especially protest against the policy of Great Britain which favors the forced return of these displaced people to their original countries. We are most interested in the fate of the Serbs of Yugoslavia, many of whom have been forced to leave British Zones of Occupation, and were forced to return to Yugoslavia, where they were brutally murdered by the terroristic regime now in power there.

These Serbians, the true allies of our great country, are entitled to a better fate, kindness and consideration; for their participation in the great war against the enemy of

democracy has made it possible for more of our own sons to return alive to our homes.

Mr. MADDEN, please use your good offices in behalf of these innocent people of Serbia, victims of former Allied appeasement policies, and save them from further outrage and certain death.

Mrs. KATA VUKOBRATOVICH,
Vice President.
Mrs. J. T. MARICH, *Secretary.*

Former Editor of Communist Daily Worker Reveals In Fact To Be a Camouflaged Organ of the Communist Party—Declares In Fact Editor George Seldes To Be Tool of Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, many of us have wondered for some time just how the propaganda sheet In Fact was financed, why it was published, and whose drums it was pounding. Alert readers have been able to detect the Communist propaganda bias in its columns but less astute readers have frequently been duped into believing that it was simply a legitimate liberal news sheet with a leftish tinge. Now, comes a man of authority to tell one and all the true background of In Fact.

Under permission granted me by the House, I am herewith calling attention to an article appearing in the Washington Daily News on March 6; it is a Scripps-Howard copyrighted story quoting Louis F. Budenz, former editor of the Communist Daily Worker, on the origin and nature of In Fact. The following news story also quotes Eugene Lyons, another former Communist, to show that In Fact is one of the camouflaged Communist journals used by Moscow to dupe gullible Americans and to inject unlabeled propaganda into the libraries of schools and colleges where librarians are too inalert or too indifferent to realize how their credulity is being utilized to pay dividends for communism.

Mr. Speaker, frequently citizens write to their Congressman to inquire what they as private patriots can do to help curtail the growth of communism. The accompanying news story suggest one very practical and positive step that patriotic citizens of every community can take to protect our Christian institutions and our free way of life. They can examine the public libraries of their community and the school and college libraries of their area. If they find that the students of their community are being propagandized by such "front periodicals" as In Fact, they can make certain that these Communist-serving publications are no longer made available in their local libraries.

Indifference and just ordinary laziness on the part of patriotic citizens as well as on the part of supposedly intelligent and alert librarians has resulted in permitting the Communists to flood our schools and colleges with propaganda periodicals such as In Fact. Thus the thinking of our future citizens is perverted and the processes of real education are retarded.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, if a librarian of a public or educational institution desires to squander hard-to-get money by subscribing to left-wing periodicals, I recommend that they display in their libraries the Daily Worker or Political Affairs which admit they are Communist journals and which thus at least put readers on their guard since they know they are reading the writings and pronouncements of the Communists. Such publications are less dangerous and insidious, by far, than a throw-away sheet like In Fact which disavows its Communst support and thus deceives lazy minds into thinking they are not reading Communist propaganda.

The March issue of Plain Talk, monthly magazine published in New York City, carry a complete and detailed exposé of In Fact. This exposure should be read by alert Americans everywhere.

Also, the United States Chamber of Commerce has recently published two highly significant and authoritative booklets telling Americans how to recognize Communist propaganda such as In Fact and its associated "party line" papers and advising citizens on methods to use in preventing the growth of communism in their communities and in their organizations. J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has repeatedly warned that communism is not something to take lightly in America. It is, indeed, a great and growing menace to most of the things we Americans hold dear.

For 50 cents each, any citizen can order from the United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington 6, D. C., either of its two informative and important booklets on communism. One is entitled "Communist Infiltration in the United States"; the other is named, "Communists Within the Government." Both have created much comment in Washington and both should be "must" reading for every young American. A dollar bill will bring both to you, postpaid.

To the question of well-meaning Americans who ask, "What can I as a private citizen do to help curtail the menace of communism?" there is an easy answer. As an individual, or working through your church, your lodge, your service club, or your American Legion or Veterans of Foreign Wars post, you can do the following very important things:

First. Examine your children's textbooks to determine whether your school is one of those being victimized by Communist propagandists who on occasion utilize school books to peddle their poisonous creeds.

Second. Visit the local libraries of your community to determine whether In Fact and other Communist-front papers are being circulated there because some inept librarian has failed to realize that they are purely propagandist in nature.

Third. Purchase a few copies of the chamber of commerce booklets heretofore mentioned and see that they are displayed where people will see them in your local libraries.

Fourth. Ask your local library to secure copies of such books as William C. Bullitt's The Great Globe Itself, and Victor Krevchanko's I Choose Freedom, so that readers may learn exactly what communism has done and is doing to Russia, Yugoslavia, Poland, and other countries where it functions or where it has been imposed.

Mr. Speaker, the Scripps-Howard papers served a great public cause when they exposed to the American public the true nature and the actual sponsorship of In Fact and reveal George Seldes for the dangerous unregistered foreign agent that he is:

BUDENZ BRANDS SELDES' NEWS SHEET AS CAMOUFLAGED COMMUNIST ORGAN

(By Frederick Woltman)

NEW YORK, March 6.—Louis F. Budenz, former Communist, charges that the news letter In Fact, edited by George Seldes, is a camouflaged Communist publication established at the party's national headquarters in 1940.

Through the Seldes sheet, according to a magazine article which contains the Budenz charge, about 160,000 Americans are swallowing weekly doses of Communist party-like propaganda under the impression that they are imbibing liberal and progressive ideas.

TELLS OF REGARD

The article, by Eugene Lyons, appears today in the March issue of Plain Talk.

Mr. Budenz said Mr. Seldes was regarded by the party's leaders as 100 percent reliable.

The so-called news letter is read largely by "teachers, preachers, writers, doctors, and the like—opinion makers and opinion carriers," writes Mr. Lyons.

In Fact has won praise from Harold L. Ickes; Senator James E. Murray, Democrat, Montana; former Senator Joseph F. Guffey, Democrat, Pennsylvania; the Reverend Guy Emery Shipler, editor of the Churchman; Edward G. Robinson, movie star; and A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Last month, Mr. Seldes proudly announced: "Harold E. Stassen, Republican Presidential aspirant, became the latest public figure to obtain an In Fact subscription."

"TEMPORARILY 'CONFUSED'"

During the Hitler-Stalin peace pact, according to Mr. Budenz, Earl Browder, Communist Party chief, offered Mr. Seldes editorship of the Daily Worker.

"Then," continues Mr. Budenz, "I was advised that Seldes felt he should not be associated with such an open Communist publication. The party leaders, too, I was told, now felt that he would be more useful as an ostensibly non-Communist journalist."

On several occasions, according to Mr. Budenz, Mr. Seldes had to be "straightened out" by party officials "when he was temporarily 'confused' on matters of policy."

"I can state that Seldes was one of those men without an open Communist label who was regarded by the Communist leadership as one who would always act in accordance with their wishes," Mr. Budenz was quoted.

Expelled from Russia as a correspondent in 1923, Mr. Seldes turned into a violent anti-Bolshevik, writes Mr. Lyons.

The inexplicably Mr. Seldes became "one of the most energetic Communist fellow travelers in the business," says Mr. Lyons. Week

after week, he hands out "a brew of synthetic scoops, exposés, accusations. * * * His pages overflow with the nefarious plots of big business, attacks on the Vatican, Red baiters, imperialists, and other stock villains of the Muscovite melodrama."

During the last 6 years, according to the Plain Talk article, Seldes has never deviated from the Communist line and "not once * * * found the United States right and Russia wrong in any conflict of views."

Universal Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Journal of March 4, 1947:

TODAY'S GUEST EDITORIAL

UNIVERSAL TRAINING

(By Alfred P. Kelley, veteran of World Wars I and II)

Universal military training in a democracy. Why? Is it the answer to foreign attack? If not, then how does a big, rich nation keep up its fire insurance?

These are the questions that are looking us straight in the eye. There is no sidestepping. Sweet thoughts and sweet talk won't answer these questions. I don't, for one moment, represent that I have the answers and the solutions. However, I feel that experiences and observations have placed me in a position where I am not only entitled to speak but where I have a duty to speak.

It is said that we must judge the future by the past; that history repeats itself. In Ecclesiastes we read: "That which hath been is that which shall be; and that which hath been done is that which shall be done." While we may not agree with all of the implications of this philosophy, we must accept the facts of history which we know to be accurately recorded. Among those facts is the fact that civilization has grown and expanded in the last 2,000 years; that incident to and as a part of that growth and expansion there have been wars.

We do have this consolation, however: No nation ever attacks another nation which is known to be ready, willing and able to successfully defend itself. And how does a big, rich nation make itself ready, willing and able to defend itself? The democratic way of being ready and able is for all to serve; each one to serve in the position best suited. This cannot be accomplished by universal military training alone. It can be accomplished by universal-defense training, which includes military training for those who are physically fit. To give military training to the physically fit alone does not prepare a nation to defend itself in modern and future total warfare. Those who are unable to bear arms must serve and be trained in work for which they are suited, be it welder, bus driver, sanitary service, nurse, or whatsoever.

As to being willing to defend itself: The most important part of universal-defense training starts with the ipstruction of the youth in the moral responsibilities of citizenship in a democracy; the moral responsibilities which one assumes when he becomes a member of the military forces, particularly his responsibility to those who may fall under his charge or command.

This matter of moral responsibility and the question of the moral effect of universal military training upon a nation are probably the two greatest deterrents to a satisfactory national-defense program. Were all our military men of the caliber of Marshall, Eisenhower, Nimitz, MacArthur, Halsey, and Devers, the prejudice against turning our young people over for military training would be much lessened. But until the services demonstrate to the American people that junior officers of those services are trained for and imbued with moral responsibility for the shaping of the lives of 18-year-old boys, I dare say there will be no universal military training.

Universal defense education and training, and in connection therewith universal military training is a part of the responsibility of every citizen of a democracy. I believe the American people are willing to assume that responsibility as soon as it can be demonstrated to them that the officers who are going to handle the universal military training program are capable of handling the moral responsibility that accompanies it.

Gouzenko Summoned Here To Tell of Soviet Spy Network in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Walter from the Washington Times-Herald of March 8, 1947:

GOUZENKO SUMMONED HERE TO TELL OF SOVIET SPY NETWORK IN UNITED STATES—KEYMAN IN CANADA EXPOSÉ TO TESTIFY ON JOSEPHSON LINKS WITH DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTRIGUE

(By James Walter)

Igor Gouzenko, Russian cipher clerk who exposed the Red atom-spy ring in Canada, will be called before the House Un-American Activities Committee to tell how Soviet espionage in America extends from New York cafe society to high Washington diplomatic circles, this newspaper learned last night.

Arrangements for Gouzenko's appearance were being completed yesterday through Robert Forsyth, Canadian Minister of Justice. The Times-Herald was informed that Gouzenko probably will come here in about 2 weeks.

PLAN QUIZ ON JOSEPHSON

Gouzenko will be questioned specifically about Leon Josephson, New York lawyer now facing contempt charges for refusal to testify before the Un-American Activities Committee in the phony passport dealings of Gerhart Eisler, Comintern agent in this country.

Josephson's brother Barney operates Cafe Society Uptown and Downtown, New York nighteries, the liquor licenses for which are listed in the name of Mrs. Lucy Josephson, wife of Leon.

At least one United States counterintelligence agency has determined that the uptown night club was used as a meeting place and message drop for Russian secret agents.

SERVED SPIES IN CANADA

This newspaper was informed that testimony before the Un-American Acivities Committee will link Leon Josephson directly to Col. Nicolai Zabotin, former Soviet military attaché at Ottawa and head of the Russian spy ring in Canada. Josephson acted as a direct "pipe line" through the Russian consulate in New York to Zabotin, it was learned.

Meanwhile, during the time Colonel Zabotin was directing the espionage activities in Canada he kept his 13-year-old son in school in Washington as an excuse for frequent visits to the Capital.

The boy lived with an aide to Maj. Gen. Ilia M. Sarayev, 2700 block of Tilden Street NW., Russian military attaché here at the time. Sarayev was Zabotin's counterpart in Soviet espionage activities in the United States.

KING'S VISIT KEPT SECRET

It was Colonel Zabotin who sent his chief deputy, Lt. Col. Peter S. Motinov, to Russia by air with specimens of uranium 235, basis of the first atom bomb. Three months later Colonel Motinov was assigned to Washington.

Prime Minister Mackenzie King, of Canada, was so alarmed over the extent of Russian espionage in Canada and the United States that he made special trips to London and Washington.

King's visit to the White House was made in November of 1945—just about the time Motinov arrived on duty here Presumably the Canadian Prime Minister came at the insistence of the British Government. However, no public announcement of his visit was ever made.

King's information was based on secret documents taken from the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa by Gouzenko in September of 1945. They were later used in successful prosecution of the A-bomb spy ring in Canada. King apparently knew also about Colonel Zabotin's visits to his son in Washington.

SARAYEV ACTIVE AT PARTIES

During these visits Zabotin would see General Sarayev and Motinov. Sarayev, wearing much gold braid, cut a great figure at embassy parties and dinners, but in his spare time sent such things as an entire machine gun to Moscow by diplomatic pouch.

Although Sarayev is still listed with the protocol division of the State Department, the Soviet Embassy said yesterday that he has not been here for 8 months.

Columbia Basin Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1947, Goodrich W. Lineweaver, director, branch of operation and maintenance, Bureau of Reclamation, delivered a speech before the Chamber of Commerce, Ephrata, Wash., in which he reported to the people in the Columbia Basin area on the progress of irrigation development there and outlined the comprehensive program designed to convert a million acres of sagebrush lands into productive wealth. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the major portion of Mr. Lineweaver's speech for its informative value:

Every time I come to Ephrata, I am inspired by the enthusiasm and vigor with which you tackle your community problems. I note that your streets are constantly being improved, your water and sewer systems are being extended, new homes are going up, and before I come again I am sure the new project headquarters building of the Bureau

of Reclamation will be well under way. This will even more firmly establish Ephrata as the capital of the Columbia Basin irrigation project and will further cement the reclamation relationship with your city.

That relationship has sprung from an enthusiasm that is typical of the Pacific Northwest that fathered the Columbia Basin project. It was an extremely practical enthusiasm that has translated what was once a visionary dream into a reality that is now in the spotlight as one of the last great frontiers of western settlement.

From your advantageous location you can well visualize the ultimate transformation of the sagebrush lands of the Columbia Basin project into a million acres of irrigated land. This will virtually place a new State the size of Delaware in the Pacific Northwest. The production from this land will create new wealth, new purchasing power that will provide the Nation with a domestic market worth a hundred million dollars annually. The 12,000 to 15,000 newly created farms will support a population of a quarter of a million people on the land, and in the cities and towns that will spring up or expand in the wake of this development.

The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to build the irrigation features of this project as rapidly as funds are provided. Settlement opportunities for veterans while they are young and vigorous is our major goal. We want to give them their chance to carve their future out of these fertile lands, go into the business or professions that will be made possible, and participate fully in the establishment of a new empire.

* * * * *

Enthusiasm and the closest cooperation between the Pacific Northwest and the Bureau of Reclamation, acting for the Department of the Interior, brought Grand Coulee Dam into operation in time for its mighty generators to do service for the Nation in time of war. That same degree of enthusiasm and cooperation will bring the irrigation construction and settlement programs to the point where the Columbia Basin project will become a balanced development based on the close partnership of power and irrigation.

* * * * *

The Columbia Basin project is a prime example of the feasibility of this partnership and the West as a whole can take a leaf from the book that is being written here.

The final chapters in that book will appear when the waters impounded in Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake are being diverted to the thirsty acres of the project. But I assure you the Bureau of Reclamation is anxious to speed the day when water will be lifted by the giant pumps at Grand Coulee Dam, into the equalizing reservoir in the Coulee, to thread its way through the network of canals and laterals and other facilities.

* * * * *

The Congress of the United States in the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 authorized and directed the Bureau to carry forward a program to meet that major goal of all Reclamation—service to the people. We pride ourselves on great dams like Grand Coulee with its giant power plants that Reclamation has built; the giant pumping plants, subsidiary reservoirs, canals and other facilities. But the $64 question always is: What are all of these things that will cost half a billion dollars going to do for the people who will settle on the irrigated land or build up the cities, towns and villages of the project area? The human considerations of the Columbia Basin Project are of first importance.

The first step in this direction was the Columbia Basin Joint Investigations, in which more than forty State and Federal agencies cooperated with the Bureau of Reclamation in bringing to bear on this program the best information the State and Nation could mobilize. * * *

Another major step was the formation of the three irrigation districts that have become the repayment contractors for the project farmers.

* * * * *

To be ready for settlement when water fills the canals, the Bureau of Reclamation must place all phases of the project on a sound foundation. The farms will be laid out in units adequate for family-size operations according to variations in soils and other factors. By the time the water is ready, the farm units should be ready for sale to the veterans and others who even now are clamoring for them. Townsites must be surveyed to take care of the needs of the settlers. Development farms must provide practical guidance for the newcomers.

* * * * *

The Columbia Basin project is unique in that it is the only project on which the Bureau of Reclamation is authorized to buy land for resale to settlers. Of course, you know that such purchases are entirely on a voluntary sale basis. Thus far, less than 50,000 acres have been optioned by the Bureau. It is significant that most of this land is in small tracts. Negotiations are under way with the owners of several areas which should boost the total to well over 150,000 acres in the next few months.

Even this acreage would be a comparatively small portion of the land we hope to eventually offer for settlement. The Congress has appropriated funds to start the land purchase program and we are anxious to go ahead more rapidly. Only through Government acquisition can the land be made available on a reasonable and sound economic basis for incoming veterans and other settlers. The land purchase program and its companion, the recordable contract procedure, are essential if we are to keep the deadly specter of inflationary speculation away from the Columbia Basin project. To invite settlers into the middle of a speculative land boom is the surest way to court disaster, for everyone concerned, settlers and businessmen alike, and the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to fight speculation all along the line.

By Government purchase, the lands can be subdivided into the most economic-sized farms for family operations. If they are Government-owned, farms can be laid out most efficiently according to topography and irrigable soil without regard to square-cut sections. The Congress has again, through the Columbia Basin Project Act, put its stamp of approval on the family-size farm, traditional in reclamation.

The question of priority of purchase on resale of project lands is a factor in the land purchase program. Veterans have a preference on the homesteading of public lands and the Bureau believes they are entitled to high consideration in the purchase of Columbia Basin lands.

* * * * *

A preview for the future large-scale irrigation and settlement program on the Columbia Basin will come through the development of the 6,000 acres in the Pasco unit for which water will be available in the summer of 1947. While this acreage is small, it will serve as a "test run" for the greater acreages to be brought under water in later years.

To assist the settlers and provide them with information on irrigated farming, crops, and related subjects, a development farm is being established on the Pasco unit. This farm is one of a group for the Columbia Basin which the Congress endorsed in 1945. They are being developed and will be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture, and the extension service of Washington State College. Similar development farms are being set up in the Quincy area and elsewhere in each of the three irrigation districts.

Now, don't get the wrong idea about these development farms. We are not planning to tell the Columbia Basin project settlers what they must grow, or when or how. We propose, together with these cooperating agencies, to make practical information available to the settlers in understandable terms. We are opposed to spoon-feeding settlers or to regimentation in any form, and our efforts are directed toward paving the way for the settler to succeed under his own steam. That is our primary objective.

* * * * *

In closing, I take the liberty of drawing on my personal observations of the attitude of the Congress toward the Columbia Basin project and other great reclamation developments. I think it is fair to say that the Congress is not interested in and does not appropriate money just to build great engineering works, no matter how marvelous they may be. The Congress wants to know what the project will do for the people. The Columbia Basin project can demonstrate the contribution the big multiple-purpose projects of modern reclamation can make to the general and individual welfare of a substantial segment of the Nation's citizens.

Food Production in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith an editorial which appeared in the Beloit Daily News under date of March 4, which sets forth the figures on food production in Wisconsin. This is a subject that should have congressional attention in view of the present world conditions.

FOOD PRODUCTION IN WISCONSIN

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, of which Ira Inman, Beloit, is chairman, presents in a recent bulletin a comprehensive study of the State's agricultural, industrial, and recreational features.

The publication is primarily concerned with agriculture, especially as it relates to food production during the war.

Wisconsin is a great agricultural State. Just how great it is and how it ranks with other States is not too generally known, even within the borders of the Badger State. The Department of Agriculture bulletin provides this information, and interesting material it is.

These are Wisconsin firsts—milk production; number of silos; corn for silage; number of milk cows; tame hay production; clover and timothy hay; peas for canning; sweet corn for processing; beets for canning; hemp acreage; cheese (about half of the Nation's total output) and condensery products.

The State ranks second in alfalfa acreage; cucumbers for pickles; cabbage for kraut; cranberry production and alsike clover seed.

Wisconsin ranks third in all cattle and calves; creamery butter; red clover seed; cabbage production and casein production. It holds fourth position in production of oats, production of honey, and in green lima beans for processing.

Thus it is graphically seen that the farmers of Wisconsin not only produce an abundance of food for themselves and for urban residents within the State's boundaries, but provide vast quantities for millions of people in other States.

During the war food production on Wisconsin farms played a major role in feeding the men and women in the armed forces as well as the Nation's production workers. Now it is helping to feed hungry people in war stricken countries as well as furnishing food for home consumption.

Statistics are now available on Wisconsin's food production during the war years. Though the number of farms in the State has decreased approximately 12,000 in 10 years to 177,768, the average acres per farm increased from 122.5 in 1940 to 133 in 1945, so actually there was little, if any, decrease in productive land. However, during the 10-year period from 1935 to 1945, the farm population decreased by 18 percent, while production increase 42 percent, nearly three-fourths of which occurred since 1939.

Milk production increased from 12,500,000,000 pounds in 1940 to 15,500,000,000 pounds in 1945, which represents between 14 and 15 percent of all the milk produced in the United States. This volume is reflected in the increases shown in manufactured dairy products. Cheese production climbed from 406,903,000 pounds in 1940 to 515,009,000 pounds in 1945; condensed and evaporated milk from 886,459,000 pounds to 1,183,006,000 pounds; powdered milk from 101,697,000 pounds to 263,002,000 pounds; ice cream from 9,763,000 gallons to 12,035,000 gallon; and malted milk from 15,000,000 pounds to 33,000,000 pounds. And in addition, fluid milk and sweet cream shipped out of the State showed tremendous increases.

Canning factories increased their pack from 12,000,000 cases in 1940 to 26,000,000 in 1945, while egg production practically doubled from 1,667,000,000 eggs to 2,315,000,000. Chickens, a main meat substitute during the war period, jumped from 17,564,000 to 26,160,000. However, meat production, represented by cattle, calves, hogs, and sheep sent to market, increased from 4,231,294 head in 1940 to 5,512,858 in 1944.

And on top of that, Wisconsin farmers increased their forage crops to supply the feed for farm animals.

This volume of food production was made possible because fathers and mothers, wives and sisters and teen-age brothers pitched in and worked in field and barn.

Wisconsin agriculture, according to the bulletin, is looking forward to continued advancement. New processes, new labor-saving machinery, greater efficiency, and wider markets all add up to a belief that Wisconsin farmers will continue to lead the parade in many fields of food production.

Bevin and Bidault See Warsaw on Way to Moscow Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post has an interesting article written by Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr., stating that Foreign Minister Georges Bidault, of France, and British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin traveled by train through Warsaw on their way to the Moscow Conference and had an opportunity to see for themselves the results of Nazi destruction. It is too bad that Secretary of State George Marshall and the American group did not have the benefit of this train ride through Poland to see what the others had seen. It likewise is unfortunate that of the many senatorial and congressional committees that have gone to Europe, only three or four Congressmen were interested enough to visit Poland and to see Warsaw. Oh, yes, every one of them saw Germany and Berlin. The following is taken from the report made by Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr.:

Georges Bidault of France had arrived by train after following the same route through Warsaw and across White Russia which so moved British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin 24 hours earlier. Bidault had seen for hundreds of miles the evidences of German aggression in eastern Europe and he had been stirred by them as any Frenchman would have been.

When British Foreign Secretary Bevin promised Deputy Foreign Minister Vishinsky and other Soviet welcomers yesterday that "We shall spend the next few weeks trying to build a sound peace, to prevent future aggression and to enable all people to live in security again," he had good reason to mention "future aggression."

On his long journey by special train across the snow-covered continent, he had seen with his own eyes, the consequences of German warmaking.

He had seen the ruins of Dunquerque on the shores of the English Channel where he had signed the treaty of Anglo-French alliance. At Hannover and Berlin, Bevin had caught sight, from his train window of the wreckage Hitler had brought to Germany. He had left the train at Warsaw to see acres upon acres of rubble in Warsaw where life somehow goes on in the worst desolation of any city on the European Continent.

Poles had provided a woman interpreter and guide as Bevin's official party was driven through what's left of Poland's capital.

"Now we are entering the ghetto or Jewish quarter," she said, brightly. But there was nothing to see—nothing but mounds of brick and dust covered with fresh white snow.

This was where thousands had lived for generations and then had been bombed, massacred, and burned alive in their crowded homes 4 years ago.

"Now we shall see the medieval part of Warsaw," she said, as the cars moved slowly on. Here for more than a mile were jagged walls of what had been beautiful and historic buildings. Nothing lived there now except a few people plodding through the snow. It seemed as dead as Pompeii, and Bevin looked serious and thoughtful as he saw what German war making had done.

Finally, the procession had moved into central Warsaw, where by some miracle of the human spirit, shops were doing business in the walls of ruined buildings. Crowds were walking briskly along the sidewalks—where there were any—on through mere footpaths where rubble was too thick for traffic. Yet the overwhelming impression was one of blind destruction.

In a sense it was the preparation for peacemaking for Bevin and for all who saw it, including your correspondent, who found it one of the most deeply moving experiences of his life.

The train moved on. It slid past snow-covered fields and forests to Brest-Litovsk, where Germans had tried their own brand of peacemaking with Russia in 1918 and where the scars of two wars were visible.

It glided through bitter cold night to Minsk, capital of White Russia, where wooden huts had sprung up on devastated parts of the city.

In the vast whiteness of the eastern European plains there are few landmarks, but you could tell that the Germans had been there—first a gutted building, then skeletons of burned-out tanks, standing black and stark in the snow all the way to Moscow—or almost all the way—for the Germans were stopped 20 miles from the capital. It was the same story at Borisov, Orsha, Smolensk, and other cities with names that Soviet Russia would long remember.

Wherever the train stopped, crowds of peasants stood patiently in the biting cold. It wasn't clear whether they'd come to see Bevin or just to see the gleaming train the Russians had provided for their official guests. At any rate, their newspapers and radio had told them about the Moscow Conference and they had a stake in it. They, after all, were among the worst victims of Nazism and had endured long years of Nazi occupation.

Sometimes, out in the deep country, long lines of horse-drawn sledges waited in single file, with the endless snowfields and pine forests of White Russia as their background. It was so cold that men and women and children could hardly be distinguished in their thick coats, hoods, and shawls, but they stood as immovable as statues waiting to see the train pass by.

So Bevin came to Moscow this day to start the work of making peace with a beaten Germany.

There were some who thought it a pity that Marshall flew and thus missed seeing what war had meant to the people of Germany's neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well if a large and representative committee of Senators and Congressmen were chosen and sent, not to see just Germany, France, and England, where hundreds have already been, but to see and study conditions in Poland, Ukrainia, and White Russia—countries that so far practically have been unvisited and where suffering is the greatest as a result of the most vicious German destruction. Let us begin to think in terms of aiding these victims of German aggression, and not just in terms of rebuilding poor Germany again.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio report I made over Station WNOE, Sunday, February 23, 1947:

My friends, the Eightieth Congress of the United States has been in session for almost 2 months, but only now is the legislative program getting under way, due principally to the delays occasioned by the reorganization of both Houses of the Congress. As all of you know, the Seventy-ninth Congress in its closing days passed a law which greatly reduced the number of committees, eliminated many of the so-called private bills heretofore considered by the national legislative body, and generally streamlined the

lawmaking procedures. The task of putting these reforms into effect, as well as the usual house moving brought about by a change of party, has greatly delayed the work of the Congress. But now all that is behind us and the new Congress is well under way.

In order that the people of my district may be informed of the activities in the Congress and in our Nation's capital I have accepted the very gracious invitation of radio station WNOE to make bimonthly reports to you. Most of these reports will come to you directly from the radio room in the Capitol in Washington. Tonight, however, I am fortunate enough to be here at home, where I have come for a few days to get Mrs. Boggs and our children so that they may return to Washington with me.

One of my friends with whom I was discussing these radio reports told me, "Well, it's a good idea, but I don't know if many people will listen. It seems to me," he said, "that people are not too interested in national and international affairs. They have had so much of war and rumors of war, so much of emergencies and regulations, of troubles in remote corners of the globe, that they want to get back to being normal and forget about all these things." And, my friends, I guess in a way that he was right. Time magazine commented several weeks ago on the fact that fires, storms, murders, and local affairs were back in the headlines of most of our great newspapers. So I suppose I will impose upon some of you in commenting upon these matters which seem remote and distant and maybe of no immediate concern. But because of the fact that a great deal of our work involves local affairs I shall talk about them too.

In connection with local affairs, I had the pleasure last week of talking with the President of the United States about visiting our city. Early next week he is going to Mexico by air and our citizens, particularly those who have worked so hard to bring about the modern Moisant airport, the splendid international house, and the proposed international trade mart, were anxious for him to spend a few hours here and see a program of international relations in operation and made possible by men of vision from throughout the Mississippi Valley. I told the President all about these activities. He was most interested in the international house and said that he had received excellent reports about its work and its program from the Department of State. He was also pleased about Moisant airport and commented that the last time he landed here he had observed that the runways were too short. Well, to make the story short, he told me that he could not come this time because he is going by way of Kansas City in order that he may again visit his mother who recently suffered an accident. But he did promise me that unless unforeseen events occurred he would visit us for our second international celebration this fall.

Again locally you will be glad to know of two other developments in Washington of this past week. On February 14 I appeared before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and spoke in behalf of legislation to extend the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to operate ships until the end of this June, and on Monday, last, this legislation was unanimously passed in the House. This measure is very important to all of us because it makes possible the reestablishment of our coastwise commerce as well as the continued orderly conversion of the merchant marine to private operation. The port of New Orleans is our lifeblood and this measure is of vital importance to the port. The other development was a very satisfactory conference participated in by Congressman DOMENGEAUX, Congressman LARCADE and myself with Secretary of Agriculture Anderson on pending sugar legislation. We discussed the best way of removing controls from sugar as well as the extension of the Sugar Act. The Secretary was most sympathetic and it is my belief that the Louisiana producers and processors will get a fair break this year. The Secretary was most receptive to the idea that Louisiana quotas be increased by 100,000 tons when quotas are reimposed. Everyone is agreed that rationing and price controls on sugar must be continued for a while until the world supply better equals the tremendous world demand, but we are hopeful that this date will be no later than November 1 of this year.

On the national scene there are two matters which are of prime importance at this time and are consuming most of the time of both the House and the Senate. They are closely related and they have far-reaching significance. I refer to taxes and the budget.

We will talk about taxes first. Because of the fact that this Nation has fought two World Wars within the past 30 years our country is saddled with a national debt of almost $300,000,000,000 and the Federal tax burden is terrific. Someone has compiled statistics to show that each citizen works 1 day in 3 for the Federal Government in order to meet the tax burden and that more than one-third of our national income is now devoted to taxes. Yes; the price of national and international folly is unbelievably high. If we could retrace our steps we might undo 1921 and the death of the League of Nations, we might forget the Republican tariff policies which brought on the phoney prosperity of 1929 and the bleak, stark, despairing depression which soon became world-wide and smothered the new life of the hopeful young democracies of Europe making possible the dictatorships and the war that followed. But we are living in 1947, the Second World War has been fought, thousands of young Americans no longer tread our land, and we must pay for our folly.

Now the Republican Congress says that despite this $300,000,000,000 debt, taxes must be reduced. And how do they propose to do so? By a 20 percent across the board personal income-tax reduction. So unfair is this proposal that a great number of the Republican Members of the House themselves have repudiated it. It is a departure from our time-honored theory of taxation, which is the theory of equality. In practice it results in a tremendous windfall to the large taxpayers and brings about a savings of a few pennies per week to the family living on less than $2,000 per year.

I copied from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of several days ago a few excerpts from the debate on income-tax reduction in which you will be interested.

Representative DINGELL, a Democrat. "What the gentleman advocates is that the man who pays $1 of income tax gets 20 cents reduction."

Representative MASON, a Republican. "That is right."

Representative DINGELL. "The man who pays $100 would get $20 reduction."

Representative MASON. "That is right."

Representative DINGELL. "And the man who pays $100,000 in income taxes gets a rebate of $20,000."

Representative MASON. "That is right."

Representative DINGELL. "And the man who pays a million dollars in income taxes gets a tax cut of $200,000."

Representative MASON. "That is exactly right."

Representative DINGELL. "And the gentleman reasons that 20 cents tax cut to the poor devil who pays $1 is just, equitable and right."

Representative MASON. "I do."

Representative DINGELL. "You think that is just right when it is compared with a man who gets a $200,000 cut on $1,000,000."

Representative MASON. "I do."

Representative MURRAY, a Republican [interposing]. "The best way to meet this problem of communism, of course, is to prevent it. It can be prevented by supporting legislation based on the greatest good for the greatest number, and legislation for the many and not for the few."

There, my friends, in simple words is the issue.

If the tax income is such that relief can be granted; then it should be accomplished by increasing the personal and marital exemptions and by allowing greater credit for dependents. This will be fair and equitable. It will give each taxpayer the same savings and will promote the national good by encouraging families. I have introduced a bill which is now pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means which will increase the personal exemption from $500 to $1,000; the marital exemption from $1,000 to $2,500, and the credit for a dependent from $500 to $800. From many parts of the United States I have received letters favorable to this propcsal. I doubt if the Republican Congress will consider it, but I, for one will not support the 20-percent-across-the-board reduction.

On Thursday last I voted against the Republican proposal to reduce the budget by a flat sum of $6,000,000,000. I am for economy in Government and I believe that the budget can be reduced. But as the representative of 400,000 Americans I want to know what I am doing. Mind you this slash is voted without benefit of hearings, without the essential testimony to determine whether it be wise or unwise and in the face of the gravest warnings from the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy. Frankly, I am not prepared to tell these responsible leaders of this Nation that I believe that $2,225,000,000 can be cut from the appropriations for the Army, Navy, and overseas relief.

The gentlemen in the House who glibly talk about reducing the Army and Navy are the same gentlemen who scorned lend-lease, who nearly defeated the Selective Service System 4 or 5 months before Pearl Harbor, and who voted and campaigned against every constructive measure advanced to prepare and save this Nation from the forces of Hitler. Today Russia occupies a position very close to that occupied by Germany prior to the last world war, and I will not support a new isolationism, a new appeasement. That road leads but to war, and death, and suffering, and communism. I believe in keeping America strong and I believe in America sharing and participating actively in the affairs of this troubled world. Former Speaker RAYBURN warned on Thursday that we "would rue this day" if the strong arm of Marshall was weakened and if we sent him to Moscow with a broken wing. I trust that he is wrong, but the American people must be awake to their responsibilities and they must prevent a return to the sterile, short-sighted policies of the twenties and thirties.

As I told you many times during my recent campaign. I know of no greater honor that can come to an American than the privilege which I have of representing you. I trust that you will continue to call upon me. I can assure you that you have my full time and my sincere desire to represent you ably and conscientiously. These are difficult days, but I believe that as long as we do right or do right as we see it that we need not worry for the future of our Nation. Thank you and good night.

Private Utilities in the Field of Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, in 1935, just as the REA was about to begin operations, Mr. Grover C. Neff, now president of the Edison Electric Institute, and then a member of the Rural Electrification Committee of Privately Owned Utilities, after discussing and praising the work of the private utilities in the field of rural electrification said:

> As a result, there are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm operations that are not now served.

Remember the date—1935.

At that time only 3 percent of the rural homes of Texas had electricity. The power companies said it was impractical to ever provide rural service. Presumably the power companies felt that only 3 percent of the farms of Texas needed electricity. They then said that there was no profit in rural business and that they could not serve rural homes at a loss. Now they complain when someone else offers to provide the service which they refused to give in 1935.

In spite of these doleful predictions the Congress established the REA and authorized it to loan money to farmers to provide their own light and power. The first local electric cooperative in the United States to get into operation was the Bartlett Electric Cooperative, located in the district I represent. The Bartlett Cooperative had to get its power from the small municipal plant of the city of Bartlett, as the private power companies of Texas at that time refused to sell power to any local distributing co-op at less than retail rates. This condition continued until Mr. Carmody, then Administrator of the REA, began negotiations to loan money to the Belfalls Cooperative—also in the Eleventh Texas District—to construct their own power plant near Temple.

After this small threat of competition developed the Texas Power & Light Co. hastened to establish a wholesale rate of 15 mills per kilowatt-hour. This rate became available to all cooperatives in central and north Texas and remained the rate until steps were taken to organize the Brazos River Transmission Electric Co-op in the fall of 1940 and the spring of 1941. As soon as the power company heard of this possible competition, it made three successive cuts in its wholesale rates to cooperatives—none to cities where no competition was threatened—finally bringing the rate down to 6.4 mills. Since that time the war has largely prevented the development of further competition and there has been only a very slight reduction in rates.

In 1946, Mr. Wickard, the present Administrator of REA, finally approved an additional loan to the Brazos River Transmission Electric Co-op for the purpose of completing its transmission system and for the installation of steam generating facilities on the Leon River near Temple. The purpose of this steam plant is to "firm-up" and make more valuable the power which the co-op now controls from Morris Sheppard Dam. At the moment the T. P. & L. is buying this power as the result of an order issued during the war by the War Production Board. This arrangement will end this year, and the Transmission Co-op has indicated that it desires to supply its members with its own power. This has apparently filled the power company with great alarm. It now says that the local electric cooperatives which it sought so hard to destroy are actually very desirable organizations and that they render a real service. Incidentally, they have created a market for a very substantial volume of power most of which is purchased from the very companies which 12 years ago said that rural business was unprofitable. The T. P. & L. now says that it is fine for the farmers to buy T. P. & L. power and distribute it over their own lines, but it is wicked for the farmers to produce any power or to transmit it over their own wires.

Early in December 1946 the T. P. & L. offered to buy either all or the bulk of Brazos Transmission Co-op's facilities and to sell power at a very low rate provided the Transmission Co-op would agree not to build any generating or transmitting facilities. This would have eliminated any possible competition with the power company. Realizing that through all the years the rural people of Texas had never received any expansion of service or reduction of rates without the threat of competition, the directors of the Brazos Co-op declined to accept the offer of the power company but replied that they would welcome an opportunity to interchange power with the company and to make their transmission lines available to the company if the company would likewise make its lines available to the Transmission Co-op. This joint use of all existing facilities would, of course, reduce the investment needed by both systems, but this is not what the power company wants. It is determined to control the supply of power on which the local REA-financed co-op must depend.

When the Brazos Transmission directors refused to sell out, the power company turned to a campaign of abuse, vilification, and misrepresentation. The company first covered the State with a series of practically full-page advertisements. Many, but not all, of the papers carrying these ads also carried in the same issue what purported to be a reprint of an editorial from the Mineral Wells Index. I have not seen this so-called editorial in any paper that did not also carry the large T. P. & L. ad, although I am informed that the company had the "brass" to send it to some papers in my district and ask that it be run. The editorial is a remarkable document. It shows on its face that its author had a much closer connection with the power company than a country newspaper ever would be expected to have. In fact, I feel sure that the article itself will convince any unbiased reader that it was written in the office of the Texas Power & Light Co. and handed to the Mineral Wells paper as copy just like their other ad. To give it the appearance of respectability the company has had this article reprinted together with some bona fide editorials from other papers and has circulated thousands of copies of these reprints throughout my district and possibly throughout other parts of the State although from the fact that this editorial is more of a personal attack on me than anything else, I can only assume that they are now trying to weaken me at home, with the thought that they will be able to get a Representative in my place who will do their bidding.

Mr. Speaker, I am not personally important in this great fight to give the farmers of Texas the electrical service at rates they deserve, but it is important that the people, and not the power companies, control the Eleventh District of Texas; and I am not going to allow a subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share of New York to misrepresent the facts to the people of Texas and go unanswered. I am giving the answer to all who will take time to hear it. It is long, but I am going to print these remarks at my own expense; and I am going to distribute them under the frank because I believe that they are of vital importance to the citizens of Texas, whether they live in largest city or beyond the longest star route.

In fact, this is doubtless the only way whereby many of the people of Texas can ever get the facts. The farmers' co-ops do not have the kind of money that the power companies have, but together with the local cooperatives which make up the Brazos Transmission Co-op, they have paid for a number of answers in papers that carried the power companies' ad Most of the papers have looked upon this as a simple business transaction. They have nothing to sell except space and they properly have sold it to both sides. Unfortunately the farmers' co-ops do not have money enough to meet the Electric Bond & Share on equal terms in this kind of contest.

Nor has the power company confined itself to newspaper advertising. It has sought by every means to influence anyone, anywhere, who it felt could help it obtain its end of destroying the Brazos Transmission Cooperative.

As an example, one of the directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation lives in Indiana. This gentleman, who has long been a supporter of rural electrification, is also well known as a close personal friend of Hon. Claude Wickard, the Rural Electrification Administrator, who is also from Indiana. A vice president of the T. P. & L. made a trip to visit this Indiana official of the Farm Bureau and told him a story in line with some of the stories T. P. & L. has told in Texas. The Farm Bureau official had doubtless listened to power companies before because he called on Hon. Walter

Hammond, the president of the Texas Farm Bureau, who has always been an active friend of REA, for the facts. Mr. Hammond gave him the facts and completely cleared up the T. P. & L. charges. But there are doubtless hundreds of cases where the farmers do not know what slanders have been told about their operations.

Another example of the length to which the power company will go is illustrated by their effort to hoodwink even other big business. The same T. P. & L. official who called on the Indiana farm leader went on to visit officials of the Santa Fe Railroad and gave them a "song and dance" about the wicked farmers who proposed to build a generating plant. The railroad official asked if the proposed plant, which is to be located between Temple and Belton on the Loon River, was not on the Santa Fe lines. He was assured that it was at Waco. Fortunately, the Santa Fe man knew his own lines and knew what was taking place in central Texas. He, too, refused to join the fight against Texas farmers.

The special irony of this situation can only be understood when one remembers that this same Mr. John W. Carpenter, who is the president of the T. P. & L., is also president of an organization which for many years has been seeking direct appropriations of more than a hundred million dollars for the purpose of making the Trinity navigable to Dallas. In his capacity as president of the Trinity River Development Association he is not only willing to borrow Federal money, which as president of the power company he considers a crime, but he is willing, even anxious, to force the Federal Government to give his association the funds. As president of the power company he complains bitterly that the farmers of Texas, who never could get electricity at any price from his company until it was faced with competition, should consider installing competitive facilities. As president of the navigation association he considers it good business to use the public's money to create competition for the railroads and truck lines that run from Dallas and Fort Worth to Houston and Galveston. Everyone knows that the existing transportation systems can carry every pound of freight that ever moved between these points. Clearly it is not a lack of transportation facilities which Mr. Carpenter proposes to remedy.

Possibly the freight rates are too high. I am not questioning that. Nor am I questioning Mr. Carpenter's good judgment in using competition as the most effective method of bringing them down. I have long believed that competition is the best and, indeed, the only effective way of bringing down high rates, including unreasonable utility rates. I only want to point out the utter inconsistency of the head of the T. P. & L. as he tries to refuse Texas farmers the same right of competition which he asks the Federal Treasury to provide for Dallas. Possibly he deserves public support for his efforts to reduce freight rates through publicly provided competition, but if he does, he surely should not complain when Texas farmers ask the privilege of borrowing the money needed to finance competition to his monopolistic electric rates.

In their paid ads and editorials the power company first claims that there is no power shortage or inadequate service in the Southwest as the Brazos Co-op alleges. I am not an electrical engineer, but I have on my desk a copy of a letter, dated January 28, 1947, signed by W. W. Lynch, vice presiden tof the Texas Power & Light Co., in which he states that

> The North Texas Interconnected system—
>
> Electric Bond & Share subsidiaries—
>
> has under construction 60,000 kilowatts of additional capacity, 40,000 kilowatts of which will be in operation this year. In addition, turbines, to provide 70,000 kilowatts of additional capacity, have been contracted for.

This means that the Electric Bond & Share is spending somebody's money to build 130,000 kilowatts of generating capacity in an area where they claim there is no power shortage and where they say that 10,000 kilowatts of generating capacity in the hands of farmers would be a criminal waste of money and material. If it is a criminal waste of money for the farmers of Texas to spend enough to build a 10,000-kilowatt generating plant, might it not be some kind of waste of stockholders' money for the power company to build 13 times that much capacity in the same area?

Of course, the truth is that there is a need for more power and the fact that the power company is spending its money to produce more power is the best proof of the fact. There is no question about the need. It is just a question of who is going to supply it.

Next the company challenges the charge that their system never was designed to serve rural areas and then claims that the Brazos lines are a duplication. Surely the farmers of Texas who lived so long under the T. P. & L. highlines without ever being able to get electricity until the establishment of REA can tell you that the companies' lines have not meant rural service. As a matter of fact, the backbone of the T. P. & L. system is a string of steel towers from Waco north to Dallas and Fort Worth and then north to Dennison. These lines connected the cities whose systems made up the original company. Obviously the lines were laid out to serve cities and not rural areas. In fact, the T. P. & L. did not sell current to rural customers for many years after these lines were erected.

As to the duplication charges, they are equally far from the facts. The main line of the Brazos Transmission Co-op extends from Possum Kingdom to Whitney Dam to the Leon River near Belton at an average distance of about 50 miles west of the T. P. & L. main line. The company finds this to be wasteful duplication, but it has only been a few years since that same company built a much larger line from Royce City to Terrell to Trinidad to Franklin roughly parallel with their own lines and just about as far to the east as the Brazos lines are to the west. How does it happen that the lines to the east are "needed" while the lines to the west are "wasteful duplication." I wonder if ownership does not have more to do with this "waste" than location.

The company's next complaint is that the Brazos Transmission Co-op has refused to either sell out entirely or to continue to sell the peaking power of the Morris Sheppard Dam to the T. P. & L. It is true that this farmers' organization has refused to get out of the picture and restore the absolute monopoly that the power company once held, but it is not true, as the company intimates, that the co-op refuses to work with the power company. As I heretofore pointed out, the Brazos Transmission Co-op has repeatedly offered to interchange power with the company so that both systems might hold their investments at a minimum. I have before me a copy of a letter dated February 18, 1947, from Mr. E. D. H. Farrow, president of the Brazos Co-op, to Mr. W. W. Lynch, vice president of the T. P. & L., in which Mr. Farrow says:

> We pointed out to your company that the cooperative was anxious that the two systems be so coordinated that they would be of mutual advantage in providing adequate service and low-cost power to the rural consumer. We suggested, wherever feasible, to transmit the company's power over the cooperative's lines, and the company transmit the cooperative's power over its lines. We believe this to be in the public interest, and would result in economies both for your company and the cooperative. The cooperative is hopeful that your company will yet be willing to cooperate with us to that end.

What is unfair or unreasonable about this?

The power company also claims that the remarkable rate reductions which it granted to local distribution cooperatives just at the time of the organization of the Brazos Transmission Cooperative have no relationship with the fact that that agency offered the first competition the company ever faced. I would not presume to read the mind of the T. P. & L. officials who made these rate reductions just at that time, but I do repeat that the first general reduction in wholesale rural rates the T. P. & L. ever made was made a few weeks after I and other Members of Congress discussed the organization of this Transmission Co-op with the REA. The second cut was made shortly after the REA announced it would finance a transmission co-op, and the third was made shortly after the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative was chartered by the State of Texas and was actually announced on the morning of the day the directors of the new co-op were meeting with the directors of the Brazos River Conservation and Reclamation District to buy the power at Morris Sheppard Dam. I repeat—within a period of less than 7 months the T. P. & L. reduced its rural wholesale rates by approximately 60 percent. Within the same 7 months it granted no reductions in the cities of Texas. Of course, there was no threat of competition in the cities. I do not think it necessary to further argue the point, the reductions were made, and they helped all rural subscribers in north

and central Texas. The reductions were made when and where the company was threatened with competition. No reductions were made where no competition was threatened. I shall discuss the power company's rate policy in cities a little later.

At the moment, I want to mention the innuendos in the company's ads and the openly false charges in some of the company's editorials, all to the effect that the farmer-owned Brazos Transmission Co-op is a Government agency freely spending the taxpayers' money. As a matter of fact, the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative, Inc., is neither socialized nor tax free. It is chartered by the State of Texas. It is not controlled by the Electric Bond & Share, nor any other New York holding company. It is in fact what the New York controlled power company claims to be: a Texas-owned corporation serving Texans. It is neither Government-owned nor a socialistic scheme. It is owned by 28,000 Texas farmers. It pays taxes to the State of Texas and to each county in which it operates. It has never received the gift of a dollar of Government money like Mr. Carpenter asks for the creation of competition to the railroads. It borrows its money from the REA on the same terms and at the same interest rates that are available in the T. P. & L. and other power companies. Some people do not know, and the power company certainly does not tell them, that REA lends to private companies just as it does to farmer cooperatives. This transmission cooperative has taken no business from the power companies because there was no rural business to take until the farmer-owned cooperatives developed it. The farmers of Texas and of this Nation are today paying for their own electric facilities. They are costing the Government nothing. The farmers pay interest on all they borrow, and they have repaid many millions before it was due. Nor more than one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding loans of REA are delinquent as much as 30 days. This my friends, is a record much better than that of the private power companies and is not the record of any irresponsible or socialistic scheme.

As an illustration of the inexcusably misleading nature of the power company's propaganda, one of the articles they are now circulating states that if Congress would stop appropriations "for new tax-exempt Government-owned power facilities—that alone would save the taxpayers billions." While the Electric Transmission Cooperatives are neither Government-owned nor tax exempt, they are the only agencies that are discussed in the article and obviously it is intended that the public should believe that they are costing billions. Actually, in its entire 11 years of existence, the REA as of the 1st day of February 1947 had only loaned $89,672,589 to all concerns—private utilities as well as cooperatives—that are engaged in either generation or transmission. The amount actually advanced for transmission has been only a small part of this total. These are the kind of reckless statements that the power company has been mailing out all over central Texas.

The company also circulates a story to the effect that I forced the directors of the Brazos River district to sell the power at Morris Sheppard Dam to the transmission cooperative. I appreciate the compliment of suggesting that I have such influence over the Brazos board, but I must confess I have no such power and have never even tried to force that board to do anything. The Brazos River Board is composed of some of the best businessmen of Texas. I count many of them among my closest friends. I know that many of them agree with me that the Brazos project was undertaken, not with the idea of selling power to the highest bidder so as to return dividends to stockholders, but rather with the idea of justifying itself through its all-over benefits to the people as a whole. The rate reductions which have been secured for the rural people of Texas seem to me to fully justify the use to which the power has been put. The only purpose of the company's charges against the Brazos River Board are to try to weaken me politically.

Finally, I want to discuss the over-all rate policy of the power company. A large part of one of the editorials which the company has circulated is a quotation from a letter, written by Mr. John W. Carpenter, president of the T. P. & L., in which he says that the power company has offered to sell the members of the Brazos Transmission Cooperative power at "rates lower than those of the TVA or the LCRA."; these are Mr. Carpenter's words, not mine. Does it not appear that if what Mr. Carpenter says is true, and I do not question it, that the president of the largest subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share in Texas is openly admitting that he and his associates are overcharging the people of Texas $61,651,889 per year. In 1945—the last year for which figures are available—the people of Texas paid $124,533,931 for electricity. Had we been able to buy that electricity at TVA rates, it would have cost only $62,882,042. If the T. P. & L. can afford to sell power to the members of the Brazos Transmission Cooperative at "less than TVA rates," it can surely sell it at TVA rates in Waco, Temple, Cameron, Belton, and all the other Texas cities in the Brazos area. If the T. P. & L. can sell power at these rates, so can its associate companies all over Texas.

One of the power company's apologists says that they are offering power to the Brazos members at less than cost. Doubtless that is true. In fact there is no doubt in the world but what the power company would temporarily give power to any local co-op that they could thereby induce to abandon the fight for all the farmers of Texas. There are always some "weak sisters" who are more interested with the saving of the moment than they are with the long-time program, and I therefore suppose that the company will doubtless be able to lead some co-ops to surrender their independence in return for the promise of power at less than cost at the moment, but if the company does sell any co-op power at less than cost, even for a short time, they must make up their losses by charging the people of the cities of Texas more than a fair rate. Mr. Carpenter said he offered the Brazos Co-op a rate lower than the LCRA rate. Let us see how Mr. Carpenter's rates compare with LCRA rates in towns where the REA cannot offer any competition.

In Belton and Cameron, the T. P. & L. charges $2.18 for 40 kilowatt-hours, but in San Marcos and/or in Lampasas the LCRA charges only 95 cents for this same 40 kilowatt-hours. If you use more current the T. P. & L. will charge you $7.44 for 250 kilowatt-hours in Cameron or Belton, while the LCRA will charge you only $4.25 in San Marcos or Lampasas.

In the larger towns we find the people of Temple still paying the T. P. & L. $2.18 for 40 kilowatt-hours just like the people of Belton, Cameron, or Hillsboro. If they use 250 killowatt-hours, Temple citizens must likewise pay the power company $7.44 just like their smaller neighbors. On the other hand, Luling, with a municipal plant, pays $1.65 for 40 kilowatt-hours or $6.05 for 250 kilowatt-hours, and the people of Vernon pay their municipal system only $1.20 for 40 kilowatt-hours or $7.25 for 250 kilowatt-hours.

When we get into cities of a still larger population bracket, we find that the power company does reduce the rate, but certainly not in the same proportion that municipal plants do. Waco citizens pay $1.91 for the same 40 kilowatt-hours that Austin citizens buy for $1.71 through their municipally owned system from the LCRA, and in addition, the city of Austin received in 1945 $107,500 in lieu of the $63,528.56 taxes that the city of Waco received from the taxpaying T. P. & L.—but do not stop here—in addition to a lower rate, and more money in the city's general fund than Waco got in taxes, the city of Austin was paid an additional $935,000 in net profits for the year's operations. No wonder the power company can give anyone who threatens its monopoly a rate lower than TVA, but is it not plain that the power company gives these rates at the expense of the electrical users of the cities where they do not face any kind of competition?

I here and now call on Mr. Carpenter and the power company to make good on their claim of giving "lower than TVA" rates to all the people of Texas. Make good in Waco, in Temple, in Cameron, and in all the cities of Texas where people are paying two and three times the rates Mr. Carpenter so glibly quotes. As a matter of fact, the rates charged by the T. P. & L. to the citizens of central Texas do not even compare favorably with the rates charged by other private utility companies in the same area. The Federal Power Commission lists all cities of more than 50,000 population in order of cost of residential service for a 100-kilowatt-hour bill. In 1946 Waco stood No. 150—below the cheapest—in a list of 213. Not a single city in central or north Texas of equal size suffered with rates as high as Waco, while in south Texas, Houston, and even Galveston, enjoy residential rates little more than one-half

that of Waco. The smaller cities of central Texas suffer proportionately. Let us, therefore, instead of trying to destroy the one agency that has actually brought low rates to central Texas, concentrate our efforts on reducing the unfair rates in central Texas cities. Mr. Carpenter, why do not you offer the same percent reduction from your 1940 rates to the people of Waco and Temple that you have given to the "co-ops" who are members of the Brazos River Electric Transmission Co-op, Inc.?

Lest I be misunderstood; I do not want to put the private power company out of business. I want them to continue to give the co-ops competition because I think competition is a healthy thing and where it is lacking, service is likely to decline. Co-op boards and managers are only human, even as you and I. They will doubtless do a better job when faced with competition, but so will power companies, as the record so eloquently testifies. Therefore, let us give no one a monopoly, but let us direct our efforts toward supplying electricity for the 200,000 rural homes in Texas which are still unable to enjoy this great servant of better living. Let us work untiringly to bring the cost of electrical energy down to a point where all can pay for it. Let us maintain the spirit of competition which has within the past 12 years taken electricity to more than 140,000 Texas farms.

The resolution of a Republican-controlled Congress to greatly reduce the funds that will be available for loans to the REA; the misrepresentations of the power company as a part of its effort to perpetuate its monopoly; the human tendency of a few weak co-op boards to give up the struggle in return for immediate rate concessions; the widespread difficulty of securing needed material and equipment, all complicate the problem and add to its difficulties, but for my part, I repeat my pledge to the rural people of Texas, "As long as I stay in Congress, I shall continue this fight until every home in the Eleventh District and in Texas has the opportunity to enjoy electricity and at a reasonable rate." To this end, I invite the cooperation of every Texan, including the officials of the power companies.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the New York State Rural Electric Cooperative Association urging the development of the great St. Lawrence seaway project:

Whereas the members of the several cooperatives of the New York State Rural Electric Cooperative Association are largely farmers who have recently obtained electric service pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act, and said farmers are anxious that they may continue to receive an adequate supply of electric power at the lowest cost; and

Whereas being residents of New York State we feel that we have a direct interest in the development of the St. Lawrence power project and that the development of the project will be of great benefit to all the residents of the State of New York and particularly to the consumers of electric power in the rural areas of the State in the furnishing of electric power at lower rates than are now available; and

Whereas there is considerable uncertainty as to the continuous supply of electricity by the means now used to supply the same and it is felt that establishment of the St. Lawrence power project will do much to insure a steady, continuous and adequate supply of electricity to consumers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York State Rural Electric Cooperative Association go on record as approving the development of said project and strongly urging its completion at the earliest possible date; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of the House of Representatives representing these districts, also the Governor of the State.

Understand the Implications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very interesting editorial from the Monroe Evening Times under date of March 5 which deals with the present international crisis. The editor has approached the subject from an intelligent and sane position. It follows:

ECONOMIC HERESY

As Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, put it in a House speech, it is economic heresy for the world to think that 60,000,000 American producers—the wage earners—can carry the world's economic load.

It was his way of giving vent to his feelings on the proposal that the American public should be forced to carry the burden not only in Greece but in much of the rest of the Mediterranean.

Although a great segment of the American populace has thus far refused to recognize it, America really cannot support the world, and there is a big difference between mercy errands to save the starving and complete underwriting of many nations' economics.

It is very much debatable that we are doing a nation any good when we feed it if at the same time its own resources are being removed quite rapidly by some other power—in the case of eastern and central Europe, the Russians.

But among the great fallacies of Americans in the past generation is acceptance of the belief that as long as the Government borrows from its people—for any cause whatsoever—as long as the people, as the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt put it, merely "owe each other" there is no chance for bankruptcy.

And another fallacy, greatest of them all, is the belief generated since 1917 that America's frontiers are on the Elbe or the Danube or the Po or the Nile or the Ganges. The fallacy also is conditioned upon our alliance with certain world powers or face ruin if we do not underwrite their activities.

Best gage of the future is the past. Great empires have risen and fallen and the guiding light in each of them has prospered as long as it maintained a sound economy and failed as quickly as it went off the sound economy

Moreover, for ages past there have been great alliances. They always were the vehicles by which one or more of the allied powers worked in secrecy to destroy one or more other members of the alliance while the latter falsely rested in the knowledge of security through treaty or alliance.

Great Britain's power as a world leader hangs in the balance. It has had to sacrifice much of its Far East empire. Now it sees a chance, even though thin, to remain the No. 1 power. If it can talk the United States into assuming the duty of holding the Dardanelles, Britain may have time to cement its South African and its South Pacific links into a fairly good dominion.

Meanwhile economic decline, though not necessarily ruin, would prevent the United States cementing its Western Hemisphere dominance by regaining economic sanity, and Russia would continue to keep itself in the economic red by expanding holdings south, west, and east.

Truly, the reasoning of the administration is a wondrous thing. It kowtows to Russia because it fears the Kremlin. It proposes to interfere in Greece, Turkey, and the Mediterranean in order to keep Russia from cutting Britain's throat.

Truly the empire maniacs in Washington are on a merry-go-round.

By jumping into Greece in efforts to pull out the British chestnuts, we set a precedent from which there is no retreat. We cannot thereafter back out of assuming the British burden anywhere else on earth—all for the sake of combating the Communist bogeyman.

Empires have their strength in crushing minorities, making slaves of them to produce goods for the mother country far below competitive cost. But while they are thus "gaining," empires at the same time are creating smoldering hatred which has broken out now against the British through its far-flung empire. Weakened economically, Britain no longer can maintain the pace.

With all the vaunted power and terror of the Soviet, it is creating the same kind of a behemoth which one day will turn on the Kremlin and crush it. The conglomerate, polyglot Soviet empire cannot be welded into a world aggressor for simple economic reasons.

The only way the United States can be beaten is in economics. We have approached and almost have jumped into the abyss of financial ruin—but we have done it ourselves. Lately we have started a come-back from the abyss.

Interference in Greece is backsliding of the worst type. It can well mean our finish.

On the Rocky Road to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article which appeared in the Boston

Post, of Boston, Mass., on March 3, 1947, by Robert L. Norton:

ON THE ROCKY ROAD TO MOSCOW

WASHINGTON, March 2.—If the minutes of the solemn and extraordinary conclave held by President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall with leaders of both parties in Congress could be made public, the American people might come to a realization of the tremendous task and enormous responsibilities which lie ahead of this country in the field of foreign relations.

BRITISH EMPIRE DONE

Probably most Americans would suffer a shock if presented with the cold realities of the situation. There is little comprehension of what we are in for and where we are heading if the responsibility of power and world leadership is to be carried out. Possibly, Mr. Truman will find it necessary to take the people into his confidence in his Thursday speech from Texas. If he does, the impact will be jarring, to put it mildly.

Secretary Marshall leaves for Moscow this week for the conference of foreign ministers. It will be a momentous and historical meeting since this country is now facing a showdown with Russia. There will be no clash of military might between the two countries in the appreciable future but the signal fact is that both countries are squared off in a fight for world control. It is war with political and economic weapons and with the threat of power in the background. There can be no escape from such conclusion if the world picture is viewed soberly and with a measure of understanding.

Many great and persuasive factors are operating as we approach the great test over what is to happen in Germany. In its larger aspect this means the fate and destiny of Europe. We must face the tremendous historical fact that the British Empire is in the process of being liquidated. Our principal ally is being stripped of her colonial possessions. She is no longer mistress of the seas and the British pound has lost its dominance in the financial marts of the world to be replaced by the American dollar.

FAIR INSURANCE RISK

Behind the iron curtain of eastern Europe the British are no longer able to maintain their control in Greece, which has become the new frontier in the Middle East, the key to the Dardanelles, the route to India, to control of the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal.

India is to be abandoned. In Greece we must take over, not with armed forces, but with an initial contribution of $350,000,000. It amounts to the same thing, since we substitute economic power for fighting men. There will be mutterings, as always, in Congress against removing the British irons from the fire, but in the end the grave warnings delivered by Mr. Truman and Secretary Marshall will be observed. The new Ambassador to Britain, Lewis Douglas, says that he regards England as a fair insurance risk. The traditional English assurance is being punctured, as witness the declaration of the government-controlled BBC:

"British foreign power is a mixture of pretense and weakness * * * a pretense that we are still a great power on the scale that America is a great power * * * that we can negotiate with America as equals." This is an extraordinary admission to make, but it is indubitably true.

So we face the Moscow Conference with a very much weakened England by our side and other European nations in the west, not included among the Soviet satellites, suffering from economic disruption and looking to this country for aid. Thus the mounting responsibilities of power—with the program of world leadership upon which we are entered. Upon our success or failure at Moscow will rest conceivably the future of the United Nations.

WOULD TIE HANDS

As the American delegation approaches—Moscow hardly daring as yet to attack General Marshall—the Soviet is pursuing its usual sideswiping tactics with propaganda assaults on his two principal advisers, John Foster Dulles and Ambassador Robert Murphy. They are attacked as "imperialists and reactionaries" in their attitude toward Russia.

In this situation there is one sure way of tying the hands of General Marshall: That is for Congress to reduce to impotency our Navy and to weaken the Army by not introducing a system of universal military training. We cannot afford this mushiness at this crucial stage of our history. Moral suasion is regarded with contempt by the Soviet, but it does respect power and force.

Who Won the Case Strike?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID M. POTTS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Tuesday, March 11, 1947, graphically points up the tremendous loss to everybody as the result of strikes, irrespective of who caused them. I should like to make an addition to the editorial. The general public is also the loser in the products greatly needed which are left unmanufactured and consequently removed as tools of production for the ultimate good of the people of the country.

The editorial follows:

WHO WON THE CASE STRIKE?

One of the longest strikes in United States history ended Sunday. We're still trying to figure out who won.

The contestants were the J. I. Case Co., maker of farm machinery, and Local 180, of the United Automobile Workers (CIO). Case has five plants in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin. Its Racine, Wis., plant was the one where this long-drawn-out strike took place. About 3,500 workers were involved.

Failure to negotiate a new contract was what brought on the strike, which began December 26, 1945. The union wanted a pay increase, a closed shop, compulsory check-off by the company of union dues and assessments, and some improved vacation arrangements. The management, which never has been overly fond of unions, disagreed, and the long walk-out began.

Last Sunday, the employees voted to go back to work on the company's terms. These included a pay increase of 25 cents to 26 cents an hour, plus some vacation adjustments. They included nothing about a closed shop, check-off, or maintenance of union membership.

LONG STRUGGLE; ANY WINNERS?

The pay increase was exactly what the company had offered last October. The strikers could have accepted it then instead of waiting till now. Their local union leaders, apparently, were too stubborn and too determined to save their own faces to agree to a settlement until the rank and file forced them to back down. So we can't see that the local union won this strike.

Did the national UAW win it? Well, the UAW, a couple of years ago, had more than $2,000,000 on hand. Within a year it blew almost $2,000,000 to help local unions like the Case outfit fight these strikes. The UAW is now reported virtually broke, and borrowing from Philip Murray's steelworkers' union to pay some of its officers' salaries. So apparently the UAW didn't win the Case strike.

How about the Case Co? For the year ended last October 31, it reported an operating loss of $416,854, though it got some income-tax refunds which gave it a net income of $1,483,145—as contrasted with $3,117,694 for the previous year. Case didn't win this strike, as far as we can make out.

Racine, Wis., a city of some 67,000 population, was hit badly, since Case employed about one-third of all Racine's industrial workers. With the Case pay roll stagnant, Racine businesses of all kinds fell off 25 to 40 percent. How long the recovery will take is anybody's guess. So it seems clear that the city of Racine didn't win the Case strike.

And that's about as far as we've got with our researches up to now. If we ever find out that somebody won the Case strike, and who the somebody was, we'll let you know.

Letter of Circus Fans Association of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have just secured permission from the House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter recently received from the Circus Fans Association of America.

The letter is self-explanatory and seems to confirm what I told the House a few weeks ago in connection with the purchase of so-called specimens of art by our State Department. It follows:

THE CIRCUS FANS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
West Hartford, Conn., February 19, 1947.

The Honorable WILLIAM J. MILLER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MILLER: It has come to my attention that at least two circus paintings, Clown and Ass, also, Circus Girl Resting, are included in a group of paintings to be sent abroad for exhibit by the State Department. These two paintings are definitely not typical of the American circus as we know it. Our association would appreciate any action that you might be able to take to prevent these circus paintings from being sent abroad. A picture of the Circus Girl Resting, is enclosed herewith.

I represent an association of about 700 men and women, with members in practically every State and from many walks of life. The main objective of the association is to do all it can for the circus, that it may be perpetuated for future generations. The association had its organization meeting in Washington, D. C., on May 10, 1926. Since that time our members have given very freely of their time and effort, in many ways, to help the circus.

Faithfully yours,

W. L. (BILL) MONTAGUE,
Publicity Director.

Washington Congress of Parents and Teachers Endorse School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Congress of Parents and Teachers has recently adopted a resolution asking for a continuance of the school-lunch program. This organization has long been active in behalf of this program. The letter and resolution are as follows:

WASHINGTON CONGRESS OF
PARENTS AND TEACHERS, INC.,
Seattle, Wash., March 5, 1947.

Hon. HENRY JACKSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: Always alert to problems concerning the proper care of our children, the Washington Congress of Parents and Teachers, with a membership of 90,000 citizens from every section of the State, is exceedingly worried at this time about the current status of the national school-lunch program.

We know you are interested in the welfare of children and feel certain in this emergency that we can count on your help to obtain adequate Federal funds to insure the functioning of this program for the remainder of this year and on through the next school year.

The enclosed resolution is self-explanatory.

Very truly yours,
HANNAH K. MEAGHER
(Mrs. C. F. Meagher),
Corresponding Secretary.

Whereas the allocation for the current school year to the State of Washington under the terms of the Federal School Lunch Act for food assistance to schools of the State amounted to $368,616; and

Whereas more than 300 school districts, including more than 700 school centers, are under contract with the State to participate in the program as provided in the Federal School Lunch Act; and

Whereas those schools estimated that more than 20,000,000 lunches would be served to school children during the school year; and

Whereas it was necessary to reduce reimbursement rates from 9 cents to 6 cents for the type A lunch, and from 6 cents to 4 cents for the type B lunch; and

Whereas in spite of the drastic reduction in reimbursement rates, the Federal allocation for school-lunch assistance was exhaused in January; and

Whereas no further Federal assistance is now available for school-lunch programs; and

Whereas such discontinuation of Federal assistance is causing a considerable curtailment of many lunch programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Washington Congress of Parents and Teachers, That our Senators, Congressmen, and other proper officials in Washington, D. C., be urged to do everything possible to secure continued and additional financial assistance to the school-lunch programs in our State, administered through the office of the State superintendent of public instruction.

Reduction of Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to reduce income taxes and increase the take-home pay.

This bill approaches the problem from the viewpoint that all taxpayers are entitled to some relief, but that those in the lower income brackets deserve greater consideration. I am opposed to the across-the-board principle. I have not arrived at this conclusion, however, without careful study of the arguments advanced, both by those in favor of a straight percentage reduction for everyone and those who believe the exemptions should be raised.

I share the view that the existing exemptions of $500 for a single man and $1,000 for a married man, in these times, are not realistic minimums. Although I recognize the advantages in maintaining a broad taxing base to the end that nearly everyone will share to some extent in the necessary expense of running the Government, and will thereby become vitally interested in insisting that governmental efficiency and economy be practiced, my feeling is that there is some bare minimum of income beyond which we should not go in imposing a tax to keep the ship of state afloat and riding on an even keel. I should like to see this minimum advanced and hope, by effecting rigid economies, it can be advanced before too long by several hundred dollars.

Investigation at the Bureau of Internal Revenue, however, reveals the rather staggering fact that to raise the exemptions by even $100 would mean a loss of revenue of approximately $1,500,000,000, and to raise them $200 would mean a loss of $3,000,000,000. This appears to me to point up the impracticability of approaching the problem in that way.

Nevertheless, that does not seem to me to require that we retreat from the fundamental principle that the low-income groups deserve the greater consideration and, furthermore, that because of the tremendous purchasing power which will be released by relief in these lower brackets, giving the recipients more money to spend, such a method of approach would be of the greatest benefit to the economy of the country generally.

I hold in my hand a pay envelope of a woman who faithfully works each day to clean the floors in one of the office buildings in my home city. Her pay is $18 a week, and from this amount is deducted $1.30 as withholding tax, so that her take-home pay is reduced to $16.70. I contend that $1.30 is too much to ask this woman to pay toward governmental expense. My bill would save her $23.66 in a year. Only one who has tried to get along on $18 a week can probably realize what such a saving would mean. Also, the information to which I have referred as to the astounding loss in revenue resulting from increasing the exemptions by a mere $100 forcefully emphasizes the fact that there are millions in this country in these low-income groups similarly affected. Their purchasing power for the necessities of life will be greatly increased by this plan of tax reduction. The amount they save in taxes will be released into the channels of trade, resulting in increased business, increased production, increased employment, and better living standards for all.

Furthermore, this reduction in taxes is the equivalent of a wage increase to help everyone meet the increased cost of living. If adopted, I predict with confidence that it will result in forestalling demands for increased wages and assist in establishing in this country a greater measure of industrial harmony. For all these reasons, it seems to me the sound approach to the tax-reduction problem.

The bill which I have introduced reduces the so-called surtax for all income groups by seven percentage points. I am informed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue that the estimated approximate loss in revenue resulting from this approach to the problem would amount to $4,900,000,000. If the House firmly adheres to the position it has taken that the budget can be reduced $6,000,000,000, there is a total of $7,500,000,000 for use in tax reduction and debt reduction, since the estimated receipts are $1,500,000,000 over the estimated expenditures in the President's budget.

Therefore, to adopt the plan I suggest would leave a little over $2,500,000,000 for debt reduction. Of course, if the expected $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget does not materialize and some compromise is accepted at a lower figure, which I sincerely trust will not happen, it might require that this plan be modified by reducing either the amount of debt retirement or by accepting 6, rather than 7, as the number of percentage points by which the surtax can be lowered.

Let me illustrate the effect of this suggested plan at the two ends of the scale. A man with a net income, after deductions, of less than $2,000 today pays a normal tax of 3 percent and a surtax of 17 percent, or a total of 20 percent. If the surtax is reduced 7 points, he will pay the 3-percent normal tax and a 10-percent surtax, or a total of 13 percent. This represents a 35-percent reduction in his tax. The man with an income of over $200,000 pays a normal tax of 3 percent and a surtax of 88 percent, or a total of 91 percent. Under this plan, his total would be reduced to 84 percent, or about 8 percent.

Below is a table showing the approximate percentage reduction for various income groups. It should be borne in mind that everyone gets the benefit of the larger reductions in all the brackets lower than the one applicable to his own income. That is, a man with a net income of $3,000 gets a 35-percent reduction in the tax paid on the first $2,000 and a 32-percent reduction on the next thousand dollars.

Net income:	Percent tax reduction
Not over $2,000	35
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	32
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	27
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	23
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	21
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	18
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	16
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	15
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	14
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	13
Over $20,000 but not over $26,000	12
Over $26,000 but not over $38,000	11
Over $38,000 but not over $50,000	10
Over $50,000 but not over $80,000	9
Over $80,000	8

With all the earnestness at my command, I commend this plan of tax reduction to the favorable consideration of the Committee on Ways and Means and this body.

A Twist of the Tongue Costs Taxpayers Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the cleverest jobs ever perpetrated on the American taxpayer was done by some of the fair-haired boys in the State Department. The United States paid 73 percent of UNRRA. Russia and France paid practically nothing while England paid some. Judging by the number of American soldiers who were killed by Austrian soldiers, Austria was an enemy and therefore an occupied country. As an occupied country the United States was only responsible for feeding that part of Austria which is occupied by us. The State Department by a simple twist of the tongue or pen changed the word "occupied" to "liberated" bringing Austria under UNRRA and thereby threw 73 percent of the cost of feeding Russian-, French-, and British-occupied Austria on the American taxpayer. UNRRA is now out of existence and now these same fair-haired boys find themselves compelled to change Austria back to an occupied country in order that we might pay for caring for the people in our own occupied area. It was an expensive twist of the tongue for the American taxpayer. Another twist of the tongue and England throws the cost of caring for Greece on the American taxpayer.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on March 8, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, for the first time in several weeks I returned home to bring myself up to date with how you folks feel about the current situation. I have been impressed with the interest of all citizens in this great Government of ours. I have talked with many people and am gaining the benefit of their views on all issues.

Thursday evening I visited the Gold Star Wives' organization, which met at the American Legion clubhouse on Main Street, Binghamton. These ladies, you know, lost their husbands in the late war and find themselves faced with the most difficult problem of raising their children alone.

Abraham Lincoln said that the country owed a heavy debt to the deceased veteran and to his widow. He told Congress at the end of the Civil War to look after the loved ones whom the dead soldier left behind him.

With that belief I thoroughly agree. I assured these Gold Star Wives I stand ready to assist them in Congress and in the Veterans' Administration. They should be cared for in the way President Lincoln demanded because their sacrifice has been tremendous.

It was indeed a pleasure to greet the members of Post 80 and the Women's Auxiliary on the same evening. I was honored by an introduction from able Commander Andy Elkins and spoke briefly to the Legionnaires. They are invaluable to me, I told them, in offering suggestions and ideas in connection with veterans' affairs now before Congress.

Last evening I attended a wonderful rally given in my behalf by Victory Townsend Club at 64 Court Street. I was glad to see so many fine friends and was introduced by President Ball and by Townsend National Representative Merlin Casterlin.

During my speech, I tried to make clear my stand on the tax question about to be presented to Congress.

My opinion has never swerved from the premise that low-income groups should be exempt or at least lightened from heavy taxes. Now the war is over, I see no reason why we shouldn't go back to the old exemption bases of $1,500 for single persons and $2,500 for married couples. Children should compel the same amount of exemption they do now.

I have no objection to reducing taxes on larger incomes by 20 percent so long as reasonable exemptions are made in the lower brackets

The question was raised when I announced my stand in favor of low-income exemptions, that the current tax bill could not be paid. I disagree with this in view of the economies Congress is effecting in our Government. I want to give everyone the chance to get on his feet.

For many weeks, sportsmen of Broome County tell me they have been disturbed over the bill introduced by a certain United States Senator providing for the registration of firearms. You will be interested to know that this bill was withdrawn by the Senator a few days ago and the end of a long struggle against such legislation seems in sight. Americans do not like to be told they cannot carry firearms, especially when they go through the proper procedure. Private possession of arms is a right guaranteed in our Constitution and I for one hope the Government never becomes so weak that we have to take measures to protect it from hunters, sportsmen, and persons in remote places who ask only the privilege of defending their homes and firesides with these weapons.

Of course I will remain vigilant to detect any future attempts to deprive our citizens of firearms, but all trial balloons thus far launched on this unpopular subject have so completely burst that I doubt we will hear any more about it for some time to come.

Thank you.

Pink Snow Over Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, after reading the following article many loyal American people will wonder if an old-established American magazine, the Saturday Evening Post, is becoming indoctrinated with the red philosophy of communism.

Edgar Snow, writing in the Saturday Evening Post of recent date, apparently did not let his right hand know what his left hand was doing. Every attempt to appease Russia, and especially by writers of Mr. Snow's position, continues to increase in the Russian mind the impression that our policy toward her is one of weakness. Such a policy is the assassin of justice and righteousness, whether it be among individuals or among nations. The following article appeared in the New Leader of March 8, 1947:

PINK SNOW OVER RUSSIA

(By William Henry Chamberlain)

When some totalitarian liberal announces with an air of profound and cynical wisdom that the press is just as controlled and biased in the United States as it is in the Soviet Union the three articles which Edgar Snow has just published in the Saturday Evening Post would furnish convincing evidence to the contrary. For a predominantly middle-class publication, with a mildly right-of-center editorial policy, has turned over its vast publicity medium to an extremely ardent special pleader for the Soviet cause who is also one of its editors.

Of Mr. Snow's credentials as an advocate of the Soviet case there can be no reasonable question. His writings have marked him as an ardent sympathizer with the Chinese Communists, and he is honest enough to admit that these Chinese Communists are not just misunderstood agrarian democrats. His more recent books show a tendency to take Communist parties and Soviet puppet regimes in eastern Europe pretty much on faith.

I found his first article pedantic and rather dull. It largely revolved around the all-too-obvious point that Soviet and western interpretations of the same words are often profoundly different.

The second article, How It Looks to Ivan Ivanovich, is much more provocative and combative. It begins with the truly hair-raising statement that the facts presented to the Soviet public are usually correct. No one who follows the Soviet press and radio can refrain from entering an emphatic dissent.

Then there is a completely scrambled and garbled version of recent European history which omits the partition of Poland and presents the Soviet Union as the consistent anti-Fascist crusader. In the light of the known facts it might appear almost impossible to try to prove that Britain, shedding as much of its empire as it can as fast as it can, or the United States, emerging from the war with the prospect of a strategic mandate for less than a thousand square miles of coral reefs in the Pacific, are more aggressive than the Soviet Union, with its 25,000,000 forcibly acquired new subjects and its 260,000 square miles of annexed territory. But Snow seriously aims at this goal, using as his weapons false analogies and misplaced sarcasm. As an example, take the following passage:

"Our press holds that it was wicked for Russia to retake Karelia after defeating Finland. But the Muscovite, living in isolation as he does, cannot discern why that action violated the Atlantic Charter, whereas President Truman's unilateral announcement of America's sole trusteeship rights to former Japanese islands upholds the same pact."

There is no valid parallel between these situations. The Soviet Union, after attacking Finland without provocation, wrested from it the Karelian Isthmus, a territory inhabited by several hundred thousand Finns, who almost unanimously left their homes rather than become Soviet citizens. Here was certainly a clear and flagrant breach of Atlantic Charter principles. Japan attacked the United States and in the course of the war lost to America the Caroline, Marshall, and Mariana Islands, which it had held under a mandate from the League of Nations. These islands were in no sense an integral part of Japan. The Atlantic Charter is not involved in the assignment to the United States of a mandate over islands where the native population is too primitive to think in terms of modern nationalism.

Using the same methods of false analogy and distortion of fact, Mr. Snow tries to convince American readers that Germans who are opposed to communism should be "discouraged, no matter how roughly"; that Russia, with armed forces exceeding those of the United States and Britain put together, has reason to feel threatened and "encircled"; that it is wanton aggression for an American naval force to visit Athens and Istanbul, but presumably just good, neighborly fun for the Soviet Union and its Balkan satellites to threaten the dismemberment of Turkey and Greece.

There are crocodile tears for poor Ivan, supposedly scared by the atomic bomb, but there is no suggestion that it lies within the power of his rulers at any moment to banish this fear by accepting the Baruch plan. Mr. Snow's Ivan is supposedly shocked at the poll-tax regulations in some Southern States, although I can think of Soviet Russians who are intelligent enough to reflect that it would take a good deal more than the payment of a poll tax to insure the free exercise of the suffrage in the Soviet Union or in any of the countries it controls.

The last article contains a truly fantastic attempt to palm off as Soviet "concessions" promises which were made only to be broken, as at Yalta, or inherently unsatisfactory arrangements like the creation of the free state of Trieste, or highly nebulous suggestions like the Soviet acceptance "in principle," of international inspection and control, while proposing to cut the heart out of the Baruch plan by retaining the veto power.

Poland is a continual stumbling block for Mr. Snow. He forgets about the Soviet troops in Poland when he says that Red army forces today are found nowhere except in ex-enemy states. And he says that the decision at Yalta to reorganize the Polish Government "constituted a more important compromise for the Russians than was recognized here." Actually, everything that has happened in Poland during the 2 years since Yalta, reaching a climax in the recent fraudulent election, has merely confirmed Communist control of that unfortunate country.

The Saturday Evening Post proved its willingness to let its readers know the other side in the American-Soviet debate that overshadows all other postwar political developments. In doing so, it consciously or unconsciously set up a series of shining targets for readers with some knowledge of recent historical fact and some regard for logical consistency to shoot at. By using the reasoning methods of Mr. Snow, one could prove that Norway and Belgium were a fearful threat to Nazi Germany, that Abyssinia was the aggressor against Italy, and that China was a deadly threat to the existence of Japan. A thick blanket of pink snow has been thrown over the hard facts of Soviet aggression that fit in with a Soviet philosophy of ultimate world domination.

American Veterans' Committee and Its Communist Affiliations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bulletin of North Shore Post, American Legion, Chicago, Ill., for January 1947:

BOLTÉ AND DEROUNIAN

Charles Guy Bolté, chairman of the American Veterans' Committee (Bolté never served with the United States armed forces), has decided as to who his choice is for the 1946 Americanism award. He endorsed his candidate by stating: "If anybody is passing out Americanism awards this year, here's my vote for John Roy Carlson."

John Roy Carlson was born somewhere in Europe, could have been Palestine, as has been reported. He is such a liar we urge you not to believe his statements as to his origin. He insists his real name is A. Derounian, but admits he has been running around the United States all during the war, using the names Pagnanelli, Brady, Alexander, Decker, Renard, Eibers, Correa, and Ahkassian. Maybe the last is his. Left wingers are giving his recent book front-page publicity. Winchell has covered it with orchids.

Just so Americans will know who this fellow is who uses the name John Roy Carlson, we quote the Honorable John P. Barnes, Federal judge, Chicago, September 25, 1946: "I wouldn't believe this author if he was under oath. I think this book was written by a wholly irresponsible person who would write anything for a dollar. I think this book was published by a publisher who would do anything for a dollar." Judge Barnes was referring to John Roy Carlson, Derounian, Ahkassian, after the jury had brought in a verdict of guilty in the libel suit against E. P. Dutton & Co., publishers of Under Cover, lodged by George Washington Robnett, executive secretary of the Church League of America.

Birds of a feather flock together—Bolté can have Derounian.

First Steps in an American Political Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of March 8, 1947:

FIRST STEPS IN AN AMERICAN POLITICAL OFFENSIVE

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

In November 1946 an election was held in Hungary in which the Smallholders party was put in power by an overwhelming majority of the people. The Socialists ran second and the Communists a poor third. Although the Red army was then, as it still is, the sole occupying force, and therefore in complete control of the country, the election was completely free. The well-organized and well-financed Communists, under the able direction of Matyas Rakosi, a leader of the Bela Kun revolution of 1919, who had returned from long service in Moscow as head of the Hungarian branch of the Comintern, made a strong but strikingly unsuccessful campaign.

From the Communist point of view this was only a trial election, as Mr. Rakosi frankly told this correspondent in Budapest as the new government was moving in. "The story is just begun," he said, and his meaning has been unfolding ever since. From the moment of its defeat his party has been demonstrating its capacity to gain power in spite of the popular mandate. All over Europe the Communists don't worry about majorities. What they are interested in is a disciplined and efficient minority at the controls in key spots. This is the best illustration of what they mean by democracy.

In Hungary it was soon apparent that the majority party was elected to powerlessness—economically because the occupying authority has a stranglehold on production, politically because the Communist minority in the coalition government established themselves in ministries that gave them control over communications, social welfare, interior affairs, what's left of the national army and the police. The two representatives of the Smallholders Party who have been successively nominal heads of the Government, Zoltan Tildy and Ferenc Nagy, have bent backward in their efforts to work with the Communists and placate the Russians. Their desire to "play ball" was vain. Rakosi and his associates set out from the beginning to break the strength of the Smallholders and they have pretty well accomplished their purpose.

PRESSURE STEADILY INCREASED

Last April they forced the expulsion of 20 members of the Smallholders from Parliament. The pressure has steadily increased, until now, with the excuse that a plot has been uncovered to overthrow the republic, they have used their police power to conduct a general campaign against their political opponents. The climax came when the Smallholders in a last-ditch show of defiance refused to surrender their former secretary-general and one of the most independent men in Parliament, Bela Kovacs, wanted in connection with the investigation of the conspiracy, and the Russians openly stepped in and arrested Mr. Kovacs.

This is the background of the sharp note sent by Secretary Marshall to the Soviet Government. Former American official complaints were that the people of Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia were not given the opportunity to vote freely which was promised in the Three-Power declaration at Yalta. The charge now is that, after free and untrammeled elections, the popular mandate is nullified by "the efforts of a small group in Hungary to substitute a minority dictatorship for a responsible administration." The note accuses the Soviet high command of unilateral intervention in Hungarian internal affairs on grounds and charges the United States Government believes to be unwarranted.

The distinction between this and former protests is important. For what are free elections worth if the minority elements are supported by a foreign government to coerce the popularly elected majority? "What's the difference how we vote?" Hungarians ask. "The Communists rule us anyway. But we might have had a better deal if we'd voted for them. The police rule we get now is punishment for voting no."

The Communists have ways of killing opposition. They are forbidding the publication of the American note in Hungary. The attacks on the counsel of deputies charged with conspiracy are so violent that the defense lawyers have resigned in a body.

URGENT ACTION REQUIRED

This usurpation of power in Hungary has been going on for a long time and the American démarche may be too late to save the representative government that hapless nation has been struggling to establish. But its purpose goes beyond the Hungarian situation. Dispatched at this time it is significant in the same way that the sudden alarm over Greece is significant. The Greek crisis is not new, either. It has been under discussion in London and Washington for months, together with warnings that the British could not carry the burden alone. If it is all at once recognized as so grave that the President feels obliged to forego his vacation to deal with it, it is not so much because of fresh developments as that urgent action is required and Congress and the American public need to be aroused to take a more serious view of the international outlook as a whole.

Taken together, the protest on Soviet intervention in internal politics in Hungary and the demand for prompt action in Greece signify that the United States is not prepared to recognize that the separation of Europe into zones of influence is a fait accompli. Opening a diplomatic offensive on the eve of the Moscow Conference bears directly on the discussion of Austria and Germany. It is the strongest indication so far given that the United States is moving into the political vacuum created by the shrinking power of the western Allies.

Exemplar for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the December 1946 issue of the National Hibernian, official organ of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, entitled "Exemplar for Peace":

EXEMPLAR FOR PEACE

(This poem was written for the President of the United States. It is Capt. James Patrick McGovern's contribution to the foreign policy of his country. If our foreign policy were shaped by poets, it might well be more effective than it is. "We are the music makers; yet we are the movers and shakers of the world forever, it seems," wrote Arthur O'Shaughnessy. Captain McGovern we should call our poet, if the pronoun could be stripped of possessive connotation. We commend to your attention this sonnet in the difficult Petrarcan manner.)

America, more famed in war than peace
With greater power the body's than the soul's,
Traditionally the pioneer whose goals
To conquer nature's forces never cease.

Let your virile manhood mellow now
By growth of mind and spirit linked with might;
Seek new truth and beauty, learn more light
Of peace and happiness, and then know how
To live and reap the grain that brawn has sown.

Refine the crude, let substance be not all
For which strong hearts are set lest a deep pall
Of vain and selfish strife make them disown
Their heritage of loved democracy
While communism spreads its leprosy.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

American People Are Entitled to All of the Facts in Present International Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Progressive magazine of March 10 contains a most provocative article by the editor, Mr. Morris H. Rubin, which commands the serious and thoughtful consideration of every Member of this House. I include it as a part of my remarks:

THE BLIND LEADING THE BROKE

(By Morris H. Rubin)

It isn't often that the country finds out so quickly what happened at a secret White House conference, but this time the news was so important, the decision so fateful for the future of America that official leaks were arranged at once.

President Truman had hastily summoned to his office Secretary of State Marshall and congressional leaders of both parties. The first half of the news was important only because it was official confirmation of a fact long accepted by anyone who could read or think—at long last the sun was setting on the bankrupt British Empire.

The second half of the news was far more sensational. The United States was being asked to pick up the pieces as Britain dropped them around the world. The United States was being asked to accept direct, military responsibility for the maintenance of status quos outside the Western Hemisphere in areas never before regarded as vital to the preservation of our national or commercial interests.

Greece, of course, was the immediate problem. The British notified the Messrs. Truman and Marshall that they were no longer able to defend their position in Greece, which is the life line to Turkey, which is the life line to Iran, which, in turn, is the life line to India, Burma, and the Orient.

Britain's labor government was right, of course. Its desperate plight at home and its moral imperative to abandon imperialism had combined to make its position in Greece untenable. The crisis at home, with which the labor government has been struggling ably and resourcefully, demanded that "something be done." Britain was critically short of labor, and yet it was maintaining an army of 2,000,000 men, or one-seventh of its manpower, under arms, and was setting aside 27 percent of its total budget for military operations at a time when there weren't enough of the bare necessities of life to go around at home.

But there was more to it than that. If the labor government has the decency and the morality which I, for one, believe it has, it has recognized for many months that it was involved in a hopeless situation in Greece—a situation in which it was supporting with money and force of arms the totally reactionary regime of a Fascist-inclined royalty. It was caught in the middle—between the extreme left of the Communist forces and the extreme right of the royalist crowd—and it had become smart enough to know that it couldn't forever afford the price of civil war.

But where the labor government has fallen down for more than a year, where it fell down again when it handed us a flickering torch last week, was in failing to provide a more adequate alternative to communism than a crown—and a pretty tarnished crown at that.

I think the British Laborites are ashamed of what has happened in Greece, and well they might be, and all of us are familiar with their apology—that it was that or communism.

The apology, however, doesn't stand up in the face of facts. The British have occupied Greece for more than a year, but the situation is not much better today than it was when they took over. Greece is a desperately sick country, but its illness will no more be cured by fascism than by communism.

This is the Greece, and the lifeline to a crumbling empire, which the British now hand us. It isn't only Greece that's involved, or even only Britain. Basic American policy is at stake—and with it world peace.

Should we take over?

Are we prepared to take over?

My answer to both questions is: I don't think so. I can't make it much stronger than that because the whole problem is loaded with countless "if's," and the most important "if" of them all is this: If we don't, will the Russians move in, and if they do, will that hasten the Stalinization of Turkey, Italy, France, and eventually all Europe?

I would feel less reluctant to move into Greece if we in America had a clear-cut, affirmative, democratic foreign policy; if we knew where we were going, and why; if we were going to replace bankrupt British imperialism with the best of a dynamic American democracy. But things being what they are at the moment, for the United States to take over from the British would be to have the blind leading the broke.

It is vital for America, and for all small "d" democrats everywhere, to check Soviet expansion if we are to prevent the spread of the very totalitarianism we thought we had defeated in Germany. The Kremlin has a habit of pouting whenever anyone in this country refers to the Soviet Union as an aggressive, expansionist power, but the official facts cant be sneered away.

As a result of World War II, the Soviets have acquired eastern Poland, Lithuania, eastern Finland, Latvia, Bessarabia, and Bukovina, Estonia, southern Sakhalin, Carpatho-Ukraine, East Prussia, and the Kurile Islands—more than 200,000 square miles of territory inhabited by 25,000,000 persons—and has established political sway over Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Finland, and Czechoslovakia, not to mention the Soviet-occupied areas of Germany, Austria, Korea, and, unofficially, China and Manchuria.

It is this Soviet imperialism that must be stopped, but it won't be stopped by propping up decadent royalty in Greece. It was only

5 years ago that we were being implored to help communism stop fascism. Now, in effect, we are being urged to help fascism stop communism.

Isn't it about time we stopped playing one form of totalitarianism against the other, and asserted, with a moral strength to match our military might, that the only lasting alternative to both forms of totalitarianism is political and economic democracy? With all our shortcomings we have developed two great American principles at home—individual freedom and economic opportunity—and these, too, are most valuable commodities for export.

Rather than accept the thankless and bloody task of maintaining or underwriting order in Greece for King George and his Fascist clique, the United States should exert its influence to secure the establishment of a democratic regime in Greece, backed by the United Nations, and at the same time provide the greatest possible measure of relief. If this modest venture sounds too visionary and hopeless, we might as well know now—before we assume the responsibility for maintaining a regime for which we shall be constantly apologizing, and a regime which might ultimately plunge us into war.

The statesmen, the generals, and the admirals of the world still talk of war, but the people dream of peace. We have erected, in the year and a half since the end of World War II, a vast array of international organizations to guard the peace, but they are not paying off because the men and nations who make them up haven't the moral purpose to want peace urgently enough.

Peace is the only pay-off, and peace will continue to elude us until we strike at the causes of war, which are power politics, imperialism, spheres of influence, armament rivalries, social and economic dislocations, racial and religious intolerance, harsh reparations, and vengeance-minded treaties.

Active American intervention in Greece would strike at none of these causes; actually, it would feed and fatten several of them.

In the last analysis, you can't stop Russian communism with Greek fascism or the remnants of British imperialism, but you can outsell all of them in the markets of world opinion with a virile, affirmative, peace-minded American democracy.

A Peculiar Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial in the Italy News-Herald, of Italy, Tex.:

A PECULIAR DEFENSE

No loyal American, whether a Member of Congress or not, would do anything to weaken our national defense, but all Americans who served in the armed forces during the war know that waste runs rampant in all branches of the service and are not too sympathetic with General Eisenhower's plea that all military items in the budget be retained as is.

All of us have heard stories of returned servicemen regarding the dumping of machinery and supplies on foreign bases since the end of the war. We have all heard the stories of bulldozers piling up barracks, beds, blankets, and all for huge bonfires. Some may be inclined to scoff at these stories, but the News-Herald has no doubt but what they actually took place in the light of some things that came under our observation during and after the war.

As samples take a look at these instances. In late July 1945 on a coral reef off of Lanaii Island we saw case after case of canned goods, two practicaly new typewriters and several thousand gallons of fuel oil dumped into the sea in order to lighten a ship which had gone aground. Salvaging of the oil would have been impossible, but the other items could easily have been brought aboard our ship. In fact, we had been trying for months to obtain two more typewriters for the ship's office, yet we were not allowed to salvage these two. At the same time a large rubber raft used in the salvage operations was allowed to remain on the beach.

On August 12, 1945, we saw a plow steel towing cable, cost $10,000, consigned to the bottom of the Pacific Ocean about 250 miles northwest of Pearl Harbor. This cable was new and had been delivered to our ship the day before. In attempting to wind it on a drum the deck force started the wrong end. A few hours hard work would have been required to correct the error and we had 2 weeks cruise at sea ahead of us with nothing else to do, yet it was ordered that the cable be thrown overboard. These two instances took place aboard the U. S. S. *Atakapa*, ATF 149.

On September 5, 1945, the writer sailed from Adak, Aleutian Islands, aboard the U. S. S. *Rapidan*, a tanker. About 6 p. m. that evening word was passed that there would be no smoking aboard ship all night as they were pumping aviation gasoline overboard. It seems that storage tanks at Adak would not hold all the cargo that had been brought up. As a result the Bering Sea was a red sea that night as thousands of gallons of this precious fuel were poured on the waters.

A week later this same tanker took aboard 35,000 gallons of fuel oil at Kodiak off the coast of Alaska. Two days later it was all pumped into the sea. This ship was en route to Seattle, mind you, and the gasoline and oil could have been returned to the United States without additional expense.

These are just a few specific items which for one reason or another we can peg as to date and place. There are other instances not so fixed in our memory wherein we know of mattresses, sea bags, emergency food rations, and various and sundry other small items being thrown overboard simply because we were found to be overstocked with them.

It has been said that the reason so much material and supplies were destroyed after the war was because the cost of bringing them back to the States was prohibitive, yet there was not a returning ship but what could have carried one or more trucks, cars, or pieces of heavy machinery on its decks. The cost of transporting clothing to war-torn countries has never been questioned, yet surplus military clothing and bedding was destroyed while the people here were being asked to donate their cast-offs.

While calling attention to these few instances of waste in the armed forces, we do not take into account the tremendous amount of personnel with which Army and Navy bases were overflowing during the war, nor the fact that even today the Navy has four men on recruiting service where two were stationed during the war.

There is little doubt in the minds of those who saw what was going on but what the war cost was from one-third to one-half more than was necessary. A part of this unnecessary expense during wartime can be excused because of the emergency nature of every operation, but there is no excuse for a single wasted dollar during peacetime, and if Congress will demand that need be shown for these huge sums rather than simply taking high officers' words for it, then these same officers will see to it that necessary functions are adequately maintained.

Robert Emmet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Irish World of Saturday, March 1, 1947, concerning the one hundred and sixty-ninth anniversary of the birth of Ireland's hero martyr, Robert Emmet:

ROBERT EMMET

People of Irish blood all around the globe will celebrate on Tuesday, March 4, the one hundred and sixty-ninth anniversary of the birth of Ireland's hero martyr, Robert Emmet, who offered up the sacrifice of his life upon the altar of his country's liberties under circumstances so full of sublime heroism mingled with most touching pathos as to cause the memory of the patriot martyr to be enshrined forever in the affections of the Irish people and of lovers of human liberty everywhere.

Some of our readers will recall the cordial response of Irish-Americans all over the United States to the call of the Irish World to commemorate with fitting ceremonies the centenary of Emmet's birth in order that, though the martyr's epitaph be still unwritten, his heroic example and the principles for which he laid down his life were still treasured as sacredly as ever by the scattered children of Ireland. Nor was the privilege of honoring the memory of the patriot confined to those of Irish blood, for representative Americans of various racial extraction have ever considered it an honor to participate in the celebrations and to place on record their admiration for the exalted character, the splendid abilities, and the self-sacrificing devotion to his country which were reflected in the career of Robert Emmet and caused his name to be enrolled among the world's highest exemplars of pure and lofty patriotism.

Often has it been said that Emmet was engaged in an enterprise so hazardous that only his youth and enthusiastic temperament could excuse its undertaking. But "the crime of being a young man" he could defend by his genius as successfully as did his contemporary, William Pitt, who at the age of 25 was the recognized leader of the British Parliament, and whose villainous agent, Lord Castlereagh, was but 30 years old when he engineered the conspiracy to deprive Ireland of her home parliament and fasten her in the manacles of the act of union. Robert Emmet lived in a generation when revolution was winning triumphs on both sides of the Atlantic, and when young men were astonishing the world by their marvelous achievements in the senate and on the field. The immortal Lafayette wore the uniform of a major general as he led the insurgent Americans to victory when he was not yet 21.

Emmet had grown to manhood while these men were decorating the brows of brave and ambitious youth with imperishable renown.

He had seen 3,000,000 patriots in America overcoming the might of England and asserting their independence, and he said: "We are over 4,000,000, and the same France that aided the Americans to win their independence is now ready to aid us in securing ours." Those assurances he had before deciding upon the insurgent movement which was to precipitate the conflict on the larger scale. How skillfully his plans were laid, and how slight the accident which prevented their carrying out, are matters of history, which do not retract from the fame or genius of the young hero, while a heart-melting pathos is imparted to the scene of his trial and execution by the fact that he could have avoided arrest and its subsequences had he not planned to meet his fiance and assuage her grief.

His calm and dignified bearing when arraigned before the tribunal which had already determined upon his death, and his eloquent appeal from the judgment of his executioners to that of posterity in vindication of his character and motives will remain in history as unimpeachable witnesses testifying to his nobility of soul, his immovable firmness of purpose and conviction, his utter absence of fear, his generous sacrifice of all personal ambitions and interests for the sake of his oppressed country, and his comprehensive and commanding abilities, which alone could have conceived so vast and hazardous an enterprise, drawing to its support many of the ablest minds of Ireland and France, and conducted his operations from almost within a stone's throw of Dublin Castle.

Nowhere may the memory of Robert Emmet be more fittingly celebrated than in America. Where the names of Washington, Barry, Lafayette, and Pulaski are loved, here, too, must Robert Emmet be recognized as their heroic comrade in the cause of human liberty.

Pig Iron and Scrap Iron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have been inquiring into the pig-iron shortage, as several industries in my district, involving thousands of jobs, have been critically affected by the existing confusion in the pig-iron situation. I imagine many other Members, with industries needing pig iron, have been similarly occupied.

My efforts have led me, more unmistakably than ever, to the conclusion that the sooner the Government gets all the way out of the priority picture the better it will be for everybody.

At present the Government is partly in and partly out. In some respects the situation is worse than ever. If we learned anything at all from the Government controls during the war it should be that you cannot partly control an industry without causing serious and unpredictable disruption to the majority in that industry.

Take the pig-iron situation. Under the present set-up, priorities are granted only for so-called housing requirements. But the housing uses for pig iron are a small part of the entire pig-iron picture, not more than a third at most.

What happens? Any pig-iron user who can wangle himself into the housing program gets a priority. He is supposed to be furnished his allotted pig iron first, regardless of what happens to the rest of the industry.

If this distortion brought about some real solution for the housing situation, it would be justified. But I believe the pig-iron-industry figures will show that the Government priorities, for all their good intentions, have brought little constructive benefit to anybody, the housing industry included. The chief contribution of the so-called limited-priority program has been to spread the confusion.

Here is another example: The existing extreme shortage of scrap metal is, of course, the basis for much of the present difficulty with pig iron. The scrap shortage has been and is so acute that the price of scrap is considerably higher than the price of pig iron. One result is that, where possible, many foundries are using pig iron in place of scrap. The priority users—those who can claim some relationship to the housing program—come in with priority demands to supply them with extra pig iron, so that, because of the price differential, they can substitute pig iron in place of scrap. Mark you, this goes on at a time when a majority of pig-iron users are not entitled to priorities and when the available pig-iron supply is completely insufficient at best. Even so, certain users under the guise of furthering the housing program are permitted by Government priority to dig still more deeply into the critically short pig-iron supply so they can substitute lower-priced pig iron for higher-priced scrap metal. The majority of pig-iron users, not entitled to priorities, must sit by and watch this exhibition of not so impartial Government helpfulness.

Some of the users report it has even got to a point where a few priority purchasers, with the Government on their side, have been able to obtain supplies in excess of their needs, and have seen fit to deal in pig iron out of the back door on a black-market basis.

I could cite many other examples—all leading to the same conclusion.

A few days ago a manufacturer in my district tried to buy a certain piece of equipment—a punch press. Makers of this type of press told him they had so many Government priority purchasers ahead of him that they could not hope to reach his order for many months. Each maker, in turn, suggested that my friend petition for a priority for himself—that being his only hope. The Government, they said, is still partly in the priority business, so file an application.

But the Government's answer is that it is out of the priority business, except for housing. It is mostly out, but partly in. Qualify under housing and you are in; otherwise you are out. But so many still get in that the manufacturers' order books are clogged and the outsiders, despite the fact they are in a great majority, have not much chance.

It is plain to me that for the welfare of the country as a whole it is time for the Government to get all the way out—to let competitive industry run its own affairs.

I talked to a Civilian Production Administration official—the head of one of these priority sections—a few days ago. I want to commend that gentleman. He was one of the frankest, most honest men I ever met in Government. We were talking about this partly in, partly out priority situation. Suddenly he cleared his throat and asked if I wanted the real solution. I said "Yes"; naturally I would like his opinion. His reply was, "Fire me; get rid of the program." I agree wholeheartedly with that man.

Can We Buy Nations Away From Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow noon President Truman is to address a joint session of Congress on the state of conditions throughout the world and the challenge which they present to this Republic. It is to be hoped that in his address the President will take America fully into his confidence and give us not only a description of conditions as they are today, together with his recommendations as to our future course, but that he will also detail for us the steps by which we have reached the sorry situation in which we now find ourselves.

America has appeased the Communist dictatorship in Russia consistently and ceaselessly since the days of the Cairo Conference, and perhaps before. We have conceded and yielded and appeased and apologized. Now, we are apparently to be told the era of coddling has ended and the time has come for a new approach to the problems of a lasting peace. It is a gross understatement of the case, Mr. Speaker, to say that the time is long overdue when a new approach is essential if we are not eventually to be confronted by a Frankenstein of such dimensions that it will make the threats of nazism, great as they were, seem minor by comparison.

As we face this new decision, it is imperative that we be provided with a full bill of particulars showing in detail the mistakes and the missteps by which we have reached this perilous impasse. If we are to profit by our experiences—sad though they have been—it is clear that we must be shown specifically what those experiences have been, what our commitments have been, and what efforts have been made up to now to avert the onward and outward rush of pagan communism. Certainly, it will not be enough for the President simply to come to Congress with a confession of failure up to now as a prelude for suggestions

for a new course of action. We can have no assurance that the new adventures will prove any more effective than the past appeasements unless we are first told in detail what has precipitated the existing situation.

It is also important, in my opinion, that Congress should survey the entire field of eventualities and possibilities before voting to implement or adopt any specific program involving vast expenditures and risks on the pat theory that America can buy good will, good government, and good relations by the simple expedient of opening our Treasury to all of the countries living on the periphery of Russia. Maybe yes. Maybe no. But we should also consider the possibility that the best way to meet the challenge of communism is to attack the problem in Moscow instead of Timbuktu or Shangri-la. It is conceivable that the development of realistic, understandable, reciprocal, and mutually acceptable relations with Russia by direct conference and by specific proposal might do more to rescue the world from the ravages of communism than all of the billions of dollars which our printing presses can print and which we can recklessly toss overseas to work their unmonitored wonders in areas where freedom from fear is of greater importance to the people than free access to what some people still mistakenly presume to be the bounty of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I desire to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the following thought-provoking editorial from the pen of Fred C. Christopherson, the editor of South Dakota's greatest newspaper, the Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader. It discusses decisions which America must make and which all of us must approach carefully and humbly, since the hazards of deciding wrongly in this atomic age are almost too fearsome to contemplate:

CAN WE BUY NATIONS AWAY FROM COMMUNISM?

Now the cry is generally heard that the United States must pour millions into various foreign countries or they will go communistic.

China, we hear, will fall into Stalin's hands unless great quantities of money are forwarded posthaste.

Greece's imperial government, we also hear, will tumble unless our gold is made immediately available.

And so the story runs. Even England, we are told, must have prompt aid to avoid a further descent into socialism.

Naturally, we don't want these nations to go communistic. We shudder, in fact, at the thought. Something must be done, we assume; and if our dollars should be required, let's relinquish them.

But is this all of the story? Can we buy these nations from communism? And if so, how long must the buying continue?

The circumstances are peculiar and the whole subject warrants more sober reflection than it has received.

We wonder—and do so seriously—about the ability of American dollars to prevent communism in any country. The flow of gold may postpone such action, to be sure, but isn't there a definite possibility that such benevolences may actually hasten rather than retard communism? We base the answer suggested in this question on the fact that our assistance is a crutch and that it creates a tendency to lean on the Government. And that's the beginning of communism or statism. The opposite of that—a government of and by the people—is one in which the people are self-reliant and self-supporting.

WORLD-WIDE WPA?

We saw some of this in the United States in the unlamented days of the WPA. The WPA was to be just a temporary expedient—a period of momentary help to serve while the people were getting on their feet after the reverses of the depression. But it didn't work out that way. As long as the WPA existed, the people were inclined to lean on it and to refrain from shifting for themselves. Bad habits acquired then, in fact, are still in existence.

In consequence, occasion exists for disturbance over the apparent tendency now to fight communism in Europe and elsewhere by the distribution of American gold.

The results may be the opposite of what we have in mind.

No American with a heart can, of course, tolerate the thought of people starving elsewhere while food and clothing are abundant here.

But perhaps our benevolences should be drastically restricted. If we make it too easy for the peoples in other countries to receive food and clothing without work, they are likely to become habitual clients of our relief agencies. It is well to remember that life for many of them even in normal times has meant little more than a bare existence.

WORLD-WIDE POLICE?

Perhaps we shouldn't be too concerned about the types of their governments or, to state it more accurately, perhaps we should realize that we can't dictate their type of government unless we assume control of them—a policy that is abhorrent to the American tradition.

We can be helpful. We should be helpful. But we should be constructively so.

Individuals can be taught to live in idleness and in dependency. So can nations.

It wasn't just yesterday that the war ended. It is now close to 2 years since the fighting in Europe was over. But if we are to judge from current dispatches, virtually no progress has been made in some countries in the task of reconstruction and in the reassertion of independent economic forces. Behind the iron curtain, Russia may be doing well. The Scandinavian countries appear to be recording some progress. That's not true, though, of central and southern Europe and it isn't true of much of Asia.

Americans, it appears, should be doing some serious thinking about the troublesome problems in connection with foreign affairs.

The Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hillsboro Evening Mirror, Hillsboro, Tex., of February 28, 1947:

THE PUBLIC HEALTH

Within the near future, Congress will begin considering a number of proposed measures designed to improve the public health. And when that time comes, certain definite principles should be kept firmly in mind.

First, nothing must be done that will prevent people from choosing their own doctor. This is basic in sound medical practice.

Second, medicine must not be regimented. The doctor must never be dominated by a Government official—required to look to some bureau for his livelihood.

Third, we must avoid the mistake of forcing people to pay for a specified medical service whether they wish it or not. Voluntary prepaid medicine is one thing—compulsory tax payments for a service individuals may not desire is something very different.

Fourth, we must confine federally financed medicine to care for the needy, so far as treatment of the individual is concerned. It is a proper public service for the taxpayers to underwrite medical care for those who honestly cannot pay for it themselves. It is not a proper service to finance it for those who are perfectly able to pay for it.

Fifth, administration must be accomplished at the local, community level—not at the Washington level, with its inevitably wasteful and inefficient bureaucracies.

The goal should be to preserve private medicine—and at the same time to help the indigent. This can be done with a minimum of expense—and without creating still another ever-expanding Federal bureau with an enormous pay roll.

Trade-Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 28, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered before a meeting of the Institute on World Organization on March 10, 1947. The subject of the address was The Reciprocal Trade-Agreements Program, and is as follows:

Without active economic cooperation our hopes of success in the field of international political cooperation, so auspiciously begun, will surely fail. One facet of international economic cooperation is the reciprocal trade-agreements program, which has been an important part of the economic foreign policy of the United States since 1934. That program was initiated at a time when the world was unfortunately engaged in economic warfare and headed toward a shooting war. Some of the harmful effects of the extreme practices of economic warfare were counteracted by progress made under the agreements. Although no one holds trade agreements in themselves will prevent war, the basic philosophy of nondiscrimination and expansion in trade is conducive to peaceful relations among nations.

A strong and positive foreign policy is essential if we are to avoid World War III. We have achieved a genuine bipartisan foreign policy in political matters, but there is some element of uncertainty about full cooperation in our economic foreign policy. There is ample evidence that the great majority of the American people favor mutually beneficial business relations with foreign countries through applying the principles of reciprocity. Doubts which have been expressed in Congress regarding the reciprocal trade policy may seriously impede the work of the American delegation scheduled to take

part in an international trade conference and tariff negotiations at Geneva in April.

The United States has much to gain from such a program since it has about 50 percent of the world's productive capacity, and that capacity, in some of our most productive industries, such as automobiles, machinery, wheat, tobacco, and cotton can produce far more than our domestic market can absorb. We are the world's greatest creditor nation, and need world-wide sources of profitable investment. We cannot, of course, continue to operate or expand our most efficient segments of industry unless other nations are able to produce and to exchange their products with us. For lack of markets some of our most productive industries may have to go on part-time operation if definite steps are not taken to exchange products with foreign countries.

Higher standards of living throughout the world can only come through expanded production and exchange of goods. Without a gradual improvement in living conditions everywhere we cannot hope to have a peaceful world. The economic, as well as political, foreign policy of the United States should be directed toward world peace.

The foreign trade of the United States, because it entails a comparatively small part of our total economy, is sometimes considered of little importance. For example, exports have sometimes been considered as unimportant because they represent, on an average, only from 7 to 10 percent of our national production. In addition to the export industries previously mentioned, machine tools, shoes, fruits, rice, and many others may need foreign markets in the years ahead. On the other hand imports, which have represented only from 3 to 4 percent of our national income, are made to appear as a threat to the whole domestic economy.

Without raw materials imported from every continent of the globe, some of our important manufacturing industries, such as automobiles, shoes, steel, and textiles, giving employment to hundreds of thousands of workers, would have to close down. Instead of threats to employment imports ought to be viewed as aids to full production.

Combining the prewar value of United States imports and exports into an industry of foreign trade, which before the war amounted to some seven or eight billion dollars, we find that in terms of both value and number of workers employed the industry of foreign trade is one of the four or five largest in the United States and employs millions of workers. Such an industry cannot be dismissed as unimportant, even if it is made up of many comparatively small units.

The Honorable Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, once said of this subject:

"No economic falsehood ever deceived as many credulous people as the stock phrase that America only exports about 10 percent of her production and that home consumption of the 90 percent completely controls our economic situation. In the first place, instead of all American industries exporting 10 percent each of their production, a few dozen of our great industries, on the prosperity of which the prosperity of the entire Nation absolutely depends, are obliged to export not 10 percent but a large proportion of their production."

The sale of goods and services abroad in 1946 amounted to some $15,000,000,000. A large part of the $15,000,000,000 went into reconstruction of war-devastated countries. Commercial exports, however, amounted to nearly $8,000,000,000. This segment of our economy certainly played a key role in the maintenance of domestic production, employment, and purchasing power. Our high prices have brought in foreign goods which would not have been exported by other countries except under their extreme need for United States dollar exchange with which to pay for imports from this country. We all realize that if we are to maintain a well-balanced prosperity, in the long run, our foreign trade must be established on a more permanent basis than it was during 1946. We cannot expect to buy as much from abroad as others buy from us during the interim period of reconstruction. The eight-billion-or-so-dollar exports, if we expect to stabilize the foreign trade of the United States, will eventually have to be paid for with imports and services. The imports of less than $5,000,000,000 worth during 1946 left a large deficit, which cannot continue forever. Imports will have to increase or exports decrease.

Eventually, if we are to receive the expected benefits from our foreign loans and investments, and payment for our exports, we will have to take payment largely in goods. Furthermore, we shall continue to need imports which add richness and variety to our standards of living, as well as a means of conserving some of our nonreplaceable strategic materials. We do not need to fear imports if we can maintain high production, employment, and purchasing power. The way to maintain such purchasing power is to give every encouragement, including foreign markets, to our most productive industries which are able to compete throughout the world and to receive payment for their goods in terms of a great variety of imports which are to the advantage of the economy of the country.

Taking the initiative is an important element of success. Experts of the United States Government have accordingly worked out a program which, if fully adopted, will make it possible for world trade and employment to expand and thus create the higher standards of living to which all progressive people aspire. That program was published on December 6, 1945, in Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment, at the time of the signature of the British loan agreement, to which it was closely related. The proposals point out how the United States and other countries should work together in the field of international trade, so that more productive powers may be released to operate for the greater benefit of all humanity. These proposals represent an attempt to place before the world, for frank discussion and action, a basis for international cooperation so that the world's exchange and distribution facilities may parallel the enormous production capacity which has been developed during the war. The basic principles of this plan were built upon the existing trade-agreements philosophy. This program was discussed at London with representatives of 17 other countries in October and November of 1946. It includes the proposals for a charter for an international-trade organization.

Publication of these proposals advertised to the world that this Government's settled policy is to move in the direction of greater cooperation with other nations in order to establish freer and greater international commerce. The proposals suggest that the United States will not pursue a policy of economic nationalism or isolationism. They suggest that we have learned from the experience following World War I, when a different policy was followed.

The proposed reciprocal trade-agreements negotiations at Geneva with 18 other countries and the United Nations Conference to follow are major steps taken by the United States toward world economic recovery. Two other lines in this chain—the International Bank and the Fund—are getting under way; our loans to the British and to other countries are aiding in reconstruction of war-damaged countries.

The formation of an international-trade organization represents a most important step toward establishing a high volume of foreign trade on a sound basis, and it therefore conforms to the Bank and Fund principles. This proposed organization embodies a principle of commercial conduct designed to enlarge the movement of goods. The establishment of a foreign-trade organization is closely tied in with our proposal to negotiate reciprocal tariff agreements with 18 countries, scheduled for April of this year. In the negotiations for tariff concessions we will be able to secure reduction of foreign tariffs and elimination of discriminations against American products which need foreign markets. If it is not possible for the major trading countries of the world to get together in healthy economic relations, it is possible that these countries will increase their trade controls so that there will be a tendency of the world to break up into small trading blocs. Trading blocs are apt to lead to economic warfare among the blocs. One way to avoid this impasse is for the United States to press for a fair share in international trade through the reciprocal reduction of barriers.

As former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes has pointed out, we must learn that prosperity, like freedom, must be shared on the basis of fair and honest exchange of the products of the labor of free men and women. Victory in war has given us an opportunity to live and work for the fruits of peace and freedom. Through some such program seems to lie the hope for creating an enduring peace throughout the world.

Under Secretary Clayton, in a recent letter to Senator BUTLER, epitomized the significance of this aspect of our foreign policy when he said:

"We are fighting for the preservation of the sort of a world in which Americans want to live—a world which holds out some promise for the future of private enterprise, of economic freedom, of raising standards of living, of international cooperation, of security and peace. The trade-agreements program is an instrument whose aid we need if we are to achieve these ends."

As the late President Roosevelt said in one of his last messages to the Congress in 1945, in which he urged the extension of the Trade Agreements Act:

"If the economic foundations of the peace are to be as secure as the political foundations, it is clear that this effort must be continued vigorously and effectively."

Resolution on Independence of Lithuania Adopted by the Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, in compliance with a request, and under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Pa., at a meeting in the Shenandoah High School, March 2, 1947:

Whereas the independence of Lithuania was proclaimed on the 16th day of February 1918, and thereafter, following admission to the League of Nations in 1921, its independence was recognized by the great powers of the world; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania having thus emerged once more as a free and independent country after having been oppressed since the late eighteenth century by the Russian monarchy; and

Whereas the Soviet States of Russia proclaimed to the world in 1920 its belief in freedom and independence and the right of a free people to govern themselves by, inter alia, entering into a treaty with Lithuania wherein we read these binding words, "Relying on the strength of a declaration made by the Federal Soviet Socialist Republic of Russia to the effect that all peoples of every nationality have the right of self-determination and complete separation from the state to which they belonged previously, Russia, without any reservation whatsoever, recognizes Lithuania as a self-governing and independent state with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition and, in a spirit of free and good will, renounces all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian nation and Lithuanian territory which previously belonged to her. The fact that Lithuania for some time was under Russian sovereignty does not impose on the Lithuanian people and their territory any obligations toward Russia"; and

Whereas, having thus had a new birth of freedom, establishing a republican form of government with universal and equal suffrage, Lithuania, as a nation, dedicated itself to the task of peace, industry, commerce, and learning, and thereafter the nation and its people lived in peaceful, free, and harmonious relations in the community of nations of the world; and

Whereas the Government of Lithuania, eager to preserve its freedom and happiness and with prophetic guidance as to the source of danger to its newly acquired independence and freedom, entered into a Lithuanian-Soviet nonaggression pact on September 28, 1926, which, by mutual consent, was to be effective until December 31, 1945, read in part: "Article 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other"; and

Whereas the Government and people of Lithuania have no national, religious, economic, political, or cultural interests similar or akin to the Russian Government or its people, but differ therefrom in every conceivable aspect, yet, nevertheless, the Republic of Lithuania was annexed by Russia in violation of the existing treaties and in violation of international law, by the overpowering force and subterfuge of the Russian Government, whereby through the vehicle of a sham election, controlled and dominated by the communistic government, the Republic of Lithuania was incorporated into the United Soviet States of Russia against the will of all of the Lithuanian inhabitants; and

Whereas the Government of the United States being interested, in accordance with its avowed declaration in the Atlantic Charter, to permit other peoples of the world desiring freedom to remain free and independent; and

Whereas the Government of the United States declared war against Germany and Japan to thwart and prevent aggression and tyranny to spread its evil forces; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, following World War I, emerged as a free and independent nation, and since demonstrated its ability of capable self-government, and now, following World War II, finds itself deprived of its freedom by a communistic Russia, and its people living under a government alien and differing in every respect from the desires of its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, loyal citizens of the United States of Lithuanian birth or descent, meeting at the Shenandoah High School, this 2d day of March A. D. 1947, do hereby express our united voices in urging the President and the State Department of the United States and the agencies of the United States Government to exert fully the courageous efforts of this Government in doing its utmost to restore the freedom and independence of Lithuania; and be it further

Resolved, That we beseech the President of the United States and the State Department to request forthwith the withdrawal of the Russian occupational forces from Lithuanian territory and to further request of the United Soviet States of Russia that the Lithuanian people who have been deported from their country to slave labor camps in Siberia and elsewhere be returned to their homes and families in Lithuania; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the President, the State Department of the United States and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to refrain from signing or ratifying any treaty involving the Baltic region of Europe which fails to embody the free and independent states of Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and to present the pleas and supplications for justice and humaneness contained herein to the proper authorities of the United Nations for appropriate action as may be necessary to effect such results of independence and justice; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President, the State Department, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the Senators of the United States from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to our Representatives in Congress from this district, with a hope and trust that each one, in such manner as he or it may choose, lend every effort toward fostering, aiding, and achieving the independence of a people who wish to be free to govern themselves and loosening them from the shackles of communism.

ANTHONY SEANISKIS,
Chairman.

Attest:

LEONARD J. CHAIKOWSKY,
Secretary.

Treatment of Enlisted Men in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, with this Congress rests the responsibility of appropriating funds for the armed forces of the Nation and the welfare of the men and women who serve in them.

When either the War or Navy Departments approach us with requests for more funds, we, as custodians of the Nation's purse strings, receive assurances again and again that the money will be judiciously spent and accounted for, and that our military units are the best equipped and best fed in the world.

But it has come to my attention that there is many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip—that is between the money that we appropriate and the amount of food and services that our citizens in uniform are receiving.

I am in receipt of a letter from a distraught mother at Springfield, Ill., which I believe should be called to the attention of every Member of this House. For obvious reasons, I will disclose neither her name nor that of her soldier-son, so as to spare him the possibility of reprisal.

The mother writes me as follows:

Two of our sons enlisted and served 4 years in the Army during the war. One was missing in action, later reported as a prisoner of the Germans. This was hard for us to take, knowing our son was suffering from malnutrition, filth, body lice, and disease. This was war. Now the war is won.

Our youngest son enlisted in the Army when he was 18 years old, because he thought he would have to serve his time, and he wanted to get it over with, so he could enter college.

My first letter from him was written on board ship. You can read the letters and then understand why I am writing you. Now he is in Korea. He writes for soap, towels, food. I am just sick thinking of our boys over there, suffering from cold, hunger, and most of all—filth. I can just imagine them with disease, body lice, and suffering from malnutrition. They are all so young. If they were older, they would be wiser, and they would wait till they were drafted. I hate to admit this, but it is true.

Please, Mr. HOWELL, see what you can do about these conditions. This American Army which is supposed to be in the best fed, best clothed, best supplied army in the world is certainly misquoted.

So reads this mother's letter. But what her young son has to say is even more significant. For instance, and I am quoting again from the letters sent back home by this young soldier:

Today makes our fourteenth day on this blue Pacific Ocean, and we still have 5 or 6 more days to go before we get to Korea. When we get there I will then be 8,000 miles away from home. I am sure glad I joined the Army rather than the Navy. For the first week I was really sick. We sleep in the hull of the boat where the bunks are five high, and all you have to lie on is a piece of canvas. There are 360 men in my compartment, and the smell alone is enough to make you sick. We live like pigs, get pushed around like cattle, and eat like birds. For breakfast we get a small box of cereal and a piece of bread. For dinner we get few crackers, bread, a piece of cheese, and an orange or apple. For supper we have stew. I feel like I am in a prison camp. There are 1,800 men on this ship, and they are all hollering about the food. * * *

I think before long there will be mutiny on this ship. I really have never seen such hungry guys in my life. Guys sell apples for a dollar apiece, sandwiches for a dollar and a half, cans of pineapples and peaches for $5, candy bars for 50 cents a bar. * * *

For Christmas Day, all I had to eat was an apple and orange. I was laying on my "piece of canvas" thinking of the Christmas dinner you were eating. By the time I get off this slave ship I will have had more sea duty than a lot of sailors, I bet. Please send me a package of apples, oranges, canned meat; anything that won't spoil. Two years before the mast was nothing compared to this.

In a second letter, the son writes:

Well, today is Sunday, but it isn't any different than any other day. The latest rumors are that we are going to stay on this boat 21 more days. By that time everybody should be sick and well again, so maybe we will be able to go ashore.

A week later, from Korea, he writes:

I am still living in the factory and it gets colder every day. They are supposed to have steam heat in this building but I haven't felt any so far.

I can well appreciate and understand the concern and anguish of a mother who receives such pitiful missives as these from a beloved son. I can also realize the resentment and bitterness that she must feel, and that her son must feel.

These conditions are deplorable, and wholly unnecessary. I believe the War Department should be held responsible, and that steps be taken immediately to correct and eliminate such evils. Circumstances in war by necessity may cause privation and suffering which cannot be avoided. But now the war is over and there is no valid excuse for the continuation of conditions such as have been described here.

Old Highland Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, from Mr. L. V. Hegwood, of Tacoma, Wash., comes a poem which relates to Highland Hall, a very crude structure located in Fayette County, Ind., which was used many years ago as a general meeting place for literary societies, and other social functions. This structure was also used for band practice, an organization which sprang up in that rural community, and for parties and other social functions. Mr. Hegwood was a participant in many of those meetings and debates, and he was ever a worthy foe for any team of debaters. The person, "Finn Gray," referred to in the poem, is no less a personage than the Honorable Finley H. Gray, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who served in this body with honor and distinction. The "Spiffeldinks," to which reference is made, is taken from the book written by Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW, now a Member of Congress, from the Eleventh Congressional District, of the State of Indiana, in which he referred to Senator Solomon Spiffeldink as one of his characters therein. A very enterprising farmer, by the name of Jasper Davis, who is referred to in this contribution by Mr. Hegwood, built this place known as Highland Hall upon a small tract of land, on his farm, and extended the free use of this building for all public purposes, such as are portrayed in the attached poem. This building has come into the possession of other owners, and for many years it has been used as a storage building for farm products and farming implements, but in the minds of those who either participated in those community social functions or who attended them, there remains a treasured memory of those days, long years ago, of the happy hours spent in Highland Hall.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith this poem, written by Mr. L. V. Hegwood, of Tacoma, Wash., but who formerly resided in Fayette County, Ind.:

OLD HIGHLAND HALL

Today as I walked down memory lane
Seeking a place I'd known in the past,
There by the wayside to my surprise,
The object I sought, I found at last.
As my eyes swept o'er this familiar place
I began to recall—the faces I'd seen,
And the laughter I heard;
In this famous Old Highland Hall.

And in the silence of that empty room
Came voices and music from out the gloom.
The thumpin' and bangin' from that old string band
Was the joy and pleasure of all the land.
Jap Davis played fiddle—I played guitar,
Ray Painter played his old harp, fretted with scars.
Doggone, those voices, I hear them, they seem to call,
As I reach and cry for them, in Old Highland Hall.

You—folks remember, I know
Now some fifty years ago—the debates we used to have
About—Church against the school;
And, "Am I my brother's keeper?" against the Golden Rule.
All the Spiffledinks for miles around
Were chosen for their teams;
The oratory would begin to fly,
Each one letting off some steam.

The "Silver Tongues" were waxing strong,
Will Tate said—"There's something wrong."
Finn' Gray remarked, "Tonight I rode here on a mule,
To settle this question about the graded school."
"Ride him in," Tate said—if any—
"Oh, no," retorted Gray, "Two mules in here is 'way too many."
To hear those voices—of long ago—
Those "Silver Tongues"—we miss 'em so.

The listeners whispered, still as death,
With trembling lips and broken breath,
As with one voice—and eyes all wet,
"God"—"God"—"Thank God, they're speaking yet."
These are the voices I heard rise and fall,
The day I entered Old Highland Hall.

—*L. V. Hegwood.*

TACOMA, WASH.

Educational Value of Motion Pictures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. SOMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of a letter which I have written to Mr. Fred J. Schwartz, of the Century Theaters:

Mr. FRED J. SCHWARTZ,
Century Theaters, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SCHWARTZ: During the recent war the motion-picture industry performed splendid services for this country and its allies. Much of the total effort was concentrated in the neighborhood theaters, where millions of dollars' worth of bonds were sold, more millions collected for the Red Cross, United Nations relief, and others, and on the screens of which Government films of an inspirational and informational nature were exhibited.

The neighborhood theater became a fountainhead of considerable community activity, with Century Theaters well up at the top of the list for intelligent, patriotic performance.

It was interesting to read of your visual education experiment which you are now conducting in collaboration with the New York City Board of Education. This is clear indication, to me, that your public-mindedness is not a crisis-inspired phenomenon, but a permanent sense of community responsibility, active in peace as in war.

Century's offer of a large portion of its theater facilities, plus the motion pictures required, without any cost to the board of education is, to the best of my knowledge, unprecedented. There is no question in my mind but that the experiment will produce information on the value of the motion picture as an educational medium when integrated with classroom studies. Anything that abets the education of our youth is of key importance, and if your experiment proves there is educational value in regular commercial films shown in the ideal technical surroundings of the commercial motion-picture theater, Century will have performed a signal service.

It is most gratifying that this experiment, which may conceivably develop national implications in the educational field, originated in my constituency. It is even more conclusive proof that for trail-blazing thinking one would do well to—look to Brooklyn.

I wish to extend my best wishes for the success of your venture and to commend you and Century for your generous gesture.

Very truly yours,

ANDREW L. SOMERS.

Resolution on Displaced Persons and Overseas Relief and Reconstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

THE PROTESTANT COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION,
New York, N. Y., March 6, 1947.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: At its meeting last week, this commission adopted the attached resolution urging migration into this country of 400,000 displaced persons who are now in Europe, during the next 4 years, and recommending appropriation of the $350,000,000 requested by the President for overseas relief.

The commission has instructed me to send you the resolution and urgently request your support of these greatly needed emergency measures.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. SEARLE,
Executive Secretary.

Two great responsibilities of mercy confront the people of the United States today. On each of these issues the words of Jesus Christ present a mandate to the Christian Church which requires of Christians that they do their utmost both as church members and as citizens. These issues challenge the Christian people not only to support

generously their church funds for overseas relief and reconstruction but also to exert their influence that the Nation may meet its full measure of responsibility.

The United States must face realistically its obligations to the starving people of the world and its particular responsibility to the displaced persons of Europe if it is to have any claim to moral leadership.

Today there is an awful contrast between the destitution of Europe and Asia and the unprecedented prosperity of the United States. Generosity should lead us to give liberally and without haggling, but if we lack the spirit of generosity, then our fears for the continuance of democracy and the welfare of our children should impel us to avoid bringing discredit upon democracy and from drawing upon America the hatred of the world.

In addition to the hunger and destitution which grips so much of the world, the Commission is deeply concerned for the plight of the 850,000 displaced persons now held in unproductive idleness. The commission is informed that on the basis of national origin these displaced persons are Poles, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, and Jugoslavs; and that religiously 550,000 are Roman or Greek Catholics, 200,000 are Jews, and 100,000 are Protestants. It is reported that most of these persons are between 20 and 40 years of age and that about 150,000 are under 18 years of age.

The immigration law of 1924 provided for the admission of a total of 153,789 persons each year. In only 1 year since 1931 has more than a third of this number been admitted.

Therefore, the Human Relations Commission urges upon the Congress of the United States the approval of President Truman's request for the appropriation of $350,000,000 for world relief. It considers this amount a pitiful minimum of our moral obligation.

It further recommends to the Congress of the United States favorable action on the request of the President for the enactment of emergency legislation to reopen unused quotas back to 1940 and to permit the transfer of these quotas so that those not used by one country should be made available to others to the end that within the next 4 years 400,000 displaced persons may be admitted to the United States. Those admitted should meet the required standards of health, moral character and the guarantee that they should not become public charges.

We Must Set Our Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith a very timely editorial appearing in the March 8, 1947, issue of the Jackson Daily News, Jackson, Miss., under the caption "We must set our course." The editorial follows:

WE MUST SET OUR COURSE

The problem of what to do about Greece is only one part of the larger question of what kind of world policy the United States proposes for itself during the next quarter century.

We are confronted on the one hand with the unmistakable signs of collapse in British policy and power along the frontiers.

To believe that this is only a temporary situation is to close one's eyes to the true nature of the financial crisis in Britain and to the general stagnation in the world markets which were Britain's source of former strength.

On the other hand, we cannot be insensible to the proposition that the recession of British power or retreat by our own forces, anywhere along the present frontiers, opens the door for the advance of Russia, either directly or by the spread of communism.

What is needed now is that our diplomacy decide which set of risks is preferable and that we set a course according to a view of the problem as a whole, instead of continuing to take piecemeal action. As great as are the dangers to our system from Russian expansion, they must be weighed against the opposition danger that we may bankrupt ourselves in a futile effort to keep Russia confined within her present limits.

We believe that the only sound policy for the United States is to set the line which we are certain we can maintain over the long pull—this regardless of what openings may come to any other power.

The Greek crisis needs to be weighed in this light. It is not a separate question.

What applies there, and is of moment to us, applies just as directly to Palestine, toward which we shrug our shoulders, and to Korea, where we are now starving our own policy.

The possibility of a collapse in Greece weakening Turkey's prospect of resisting Russia at the Straits is a lesser danger to our military position than a British retreat from the east of the Mediterranean. The advance of communism in Greece is at one with the prospect of its final success in Korea.

This Nation cannot continue to prop up democracy with bayonets the world over, because finally we will not have bayonets enough or money enough. Nor is it sound policy for the United States to support financially the arms of another nation in behalf of a common policy unless the cause is so vital to our welfare that finally we would commit our arms there, also.

Women in Today's World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of speaking to the Washington Club. This historic organization is one of the oldest and most active women's clubs in the Nation's Capital. Mrs. Cloyd Heck Marvin is the president, and some of the other officers are Mrs. James Shera Montgomery, vice president; Mrs. Winston Holt, vice president; Miss Emma Strider, treasurer; and Mrs. Mark Eldidge, program chairman.

Under unanimous consent, I include a copy of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WOMEN IN TODAY'S WORLD

(By Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON)

American women were not bystanders of war. They played a vital role in virtually every phase of its prosecution.

War has a curious way of speeding up all historical processes and pushing people and their societies much more rapidly into the future than they would ever move under normal peacetime conditions.

For instance, it speeded up, even more rapidly than did the last war, the revolution in the life of women. We forget that it is not only about 100 years since women were first admitted to any universities in America; that they obtained the franchise only after the last war; and that only during the Second World War were all restrictions on their possible activities lifted, with their admission into the last hitherto exclusively male occupation: the armed forces.

War is inevitably a revolutionary force in the life of women. There are those indeed who, like Max Lerner, go as far as to say that "when the classic work on the history of women comes to be written, the biggest force of change in their lives will turn out to have been war." Whether or not so dramatic a generalization be accepted, there can be no question as to the dynamic effect of war in accentuating trends and accelerating changes in the life of women which otherwise would follow but slowly upon new phases of industrial organization or community need.

Not only in China but in India, the Latin-American countries, in Great Britain, and Australia—everyhere—women have stepped over the threshold into a new era. Many have faced situations straining the utmost strength of mind and spirit—exile, internment, the misery of occupation, the slow starvation of their children.

To the extent that their nations have been involved in the war, women have suffered and toiled to meet the emergency.

Over the radio came the sensational announcement: Women are to replace men in every possible capacity in the nation's industrial, operational, military, and defense fields.

In answer to the call came thousands of women—schoolgirls, store clerks, waitresses, housewives, domestics—ready to produce, to invent, to organize, to administrate—in short, to keep all the wheels of national life turning while all available manpower was drafted in the country's defense.

In my own district, which is the largest textile district in the world and which industry was declared essential to the war, no deferments were allowed to men workers. There was a constant ciphering away of male textile workers which necessitated the return of many women to the plants so as to keep up production. No tribute is too great to pay to our women who left their homes and families to carry on while their menfolk were in the service.

Could women run the country in the case of emergency? Could they take over the factories, railroads, farms, transport, communications, and civilian defense?

The answer to this question was given daily by the crews of competent women mechanics servicing bombers; by girl workers who handled thousands of rivets with speed and precision in the plants; by women swinging heavy picks and shovels on airdrome sites; by girl grease monkeys wielding monkey wrenches on auto and airplane engines. Women's technical, mechanical, and administrative aptitudes constituted one of the greatest surprises of the recent war. "Women lack strength—women lack experience—women lack traditions of craftsmanship," such were the objections of men when they heard that women were to take over their jobs in the defense industries.

But it took only a few short months for girls workers in airplane factories to prove that they could keep up with the tempo of production set by men workers.

The legend of women's frailty has thus been exploded by the manifold activities in which women have distinguished themselves in war. A United States surgeon made an investigation to determine the comparative physical capacities of both men and

women in industry from the surgical point of view.

He discovered that women in railway trades were less subject to injury than men, due to the fact that they were more careful, possessed a superior quickness of action and a keener perception. With regard to industrial accidents, fractures did not occur as readily, because women's bones are denser and more elastic. Women of middle age were less subject to heart strain and their blood vessels were in better condition than in men of the same age.

"Those girls aren't afraid to get their hands dirty," said the president of one great company employing thousands of women. "They aren't afraid to work. They put on overalls and tie up their hair or cut it off. And in 12 weeks, they were making 900 different kinds of tools and making them well."

That comment was made to a group of newspaperwomen who toured American war plants from coast to coast, and reported on the part women were playing in producing war material.

In an aircraft plant on the Pacific coast, the vice president showed them a fuselage assembly. "See that line?" he said. "First all-women assembly line of a major part in the history of aircraft. Look at their fingers go."

Farther on he pointed to a hooded woman with a gas torch. "Hardest job in the place," he murmured. "Aluminum welding. All women doing it. Can't beat them."

A former schoolteacher in another aircraft plant figured out a new way to do a paint job. She saved 8 hours a plane. Women are naturally nimble with their fingers. Once they understand a job, they take to it like a duck to water.

Women who had never worked before found that their natural gift for using their hands was standing them in good stead. A woman down on her knees cutting a sheet of steel with a burner's torch uses the same keen eye required to stitch up a hem on a sewing machine. Ironing out the seams of a life belt uses the same abilities as ironing the family laundry. The woman who used to drive the kids to school ran tractors carrying materials in the biggest plants.

Training classes developed character, too—helping women to prove that they can work steady hours without fatigue or interruptions.

Between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 women were fighters in the war. Their greater place in industry after the war was assured. They had earned it.

An official of a big rubber company went all the way with his enthusiasm. "It's the working women," he said, "who won this war."

Yes, and other women also went to war—mothers and wives, sisters and sweethearts. And the battles they fought required no less courage than was demanded of the men on the battle lines. When we honor our heroes—our fighting men—let us not forget those who never heard a gun or saw a battleship, but who were just as truly heroic.

"The bravest battle that ever was fought,
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not;
It was fought by the mothers of men."

Col. Mary Agnes Brown, top-ranking Wac in the Southwest Pacific command, predicted recently that if there is a war 50 years from now, women will be on an even footing with men. We all hope and pray that the proof of Colonel Brown's prediction will never be known, but you can put it down as a fact that the women have now made a permanent place for themselves in our military services. Congressman E. E. Cox, of Georgia, has even proposed a joint military academy to train young women as officers in the various services—a "West Point for women." Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts, who sponsored the original WAC legislation and is generally regarded as the godmother of the women's services, is certain that there will be a permanent training program. But she thinks that it will take the form of social courses conducted for members of an organized women's reserve.

The women have done almost everything except fight. At one marine base, women took over the whole transportation set-up, from keeping the records to overhauling and driving the cars and trucks. The accident rate went sharply down. At another base the male marines gasped when a truckload of dungaree-clad women drove in. But they gasped even harder when the women went efficiently to work installing a complete electrical system.

Women may do fine work in such fields as plumbing and truck driving; but there they are only pinch-hitters for the men. What's more important is that the Army and Navy learned, as private business learned long ago, that there are fields in which men are only awkward, restless pinch-hitters for women.

That is why 6,000 Wacs were sent to England before the invasion—mostly for administrative and specialized work. It is why 87 percent of the enlisted personnel in marine headquarters in Washington were women, why the Navy assigned more than 1,000 Waves to the postal service.

The fact that women up to now have had little to say about the management of the world's affairs—and, therefore, are not responsible for the conditions that led to the world upheaval—does not, however, preclude their grave responsibility for the future.

Women are in the majority in Europe, and also in the United States. In particular will business and professional women be the shock troops of this onward march. They are the responsible and trained workers in the great army striving for better conditions in a better world.

The women of the United States have everything at stake in our postwar world—their future, the future of their children, the future of their country. As an even better organized and informed phalanx of public opinion, they will be heard and they will have their way if theirs is the right, the unselfish, the progressive way.

Women must renounce for all time the tradition that it is unseemly for a woman to mix in politics or world affairs.

Women are taking an important part in lawmaking and public administration. As all of you know, we have seven women in the Congress this session. Throughout the country there are 178 lady lawmakers in our State legislatures. Unfortunately, most of them are Republicans, but we believe things will improve as time goes on. Important State offices outside the legislature have also fallen to women. Connecticut and South Dakota have female secretaries of state. Idaho has a woman treasurer, and North Dakota has a fair lady working as State auditor. And here in Washington we have Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor, who is now a member of the Civil Service Commission; and Mrs. Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Bureau of the Mint.

Indeed, our ladies have made big names for themselves in virtually every field of human endeavor. In last Sunday's papers I noticed by the Gallup poll that out of the 10 people of the world who are most admired by the American public two of them are women—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Sister Kenny, the great Australian nurse who has done so much toward developing a treatment for infantile paralysis.

Yes, women have proved beyond doubt that they can take their places beside the men in business and industry and government and make a great contribution to the welfare of the world as a whole. And what I am going to say now is in no way a contradiction to what I have just said. It is this: Despite the tremendous contribution that women have made and are now making in the world of affairs, still I am old fashioned enough to believe that the crowning contribution of women throughout the ages has been the bringing of children into the world and training them in Godliness and good citizenship. In all time to come that will be the crowning glory of womanhood. The great wave of juvenile and adult crime which is sweeping our Nation at present is not completely the result of war. It is in great part an indication of the failure of motherhood. Children who have good mothers and fathers and good homes don't usually fall into crime. When our mothers and our homes fail in their responsibilities, crime and social chaos are inevitable.

Statistics show that the so-called better class of people have deemphasized family life and children, whereas the people who are less capable of properly rearing their children are doing more than their share in propagating the race. That of course is an unwholesome situation. An eminent physician has had this to say in that connection: "As men and women become more divorced from natural settings and pursuits, as they become more artificialized, more 'educated,' more 'civilized,' they tend to have smaller and smaller families, and for that reason the race has been and still is dying out at the top. Personally, we doubt if such 'education' is really education, and if such 'civilization' is really civilization in the highest sense, but such is the custom of the times. It is doubtless the reason why many people consider the bearing of children to be common and plebeian."

In conclusion, I would like to quote again from this outstanding doctor and writer: "The woman who has loved her mate frankly and honorably, who has borne and reared his and her children, who has sacrificed everything for her loved ones, who has borne pain for them, who has known the pangs of unutterable dread and fear when they were in danger, who has felt her heart bursting with pride of them, who has smiled when she wanted to cry, who has loved and lived, develops in middle and advanced life a beauty which is the beauty of the Madonna."

That, I believe, is the finest contribution of women to our world of today and tomorrow.

Bretton Woods—Paper Money Heaven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following article entitled "Bretton Woods—Paper Money Heaven" by John E. Kelly, which was carried in the California Mining Journal of March 1947:

BRETTON WOODS—PAPER MONEY HEAVEN
(By John E. Kelly)

In a discussion of the Bretton Woods scheme for an International Monetary Fund (California Mining Journal, November 1946), the point was made:

"The next factor which very materially upsets the deal is the fact that finances of many of the nations desiring to participate in the deal, especially as borrowers, are in

such poor shape that there exists no basis on which to stabilize their currencies."

Unfortunately, it is this very near bankruptcy of many of the signatory nations that supplies the pressure to close the deal and dish out the billions provided by the long-suffering American taxpayer, a pressure apparently welcomed by internationalist-minded officials in Washington. Bretton Woods is a scheme, a poker game wherein one player—guess who?—antes $6,000,000,000, the others put in their I O U's. In any place but Washington a gambler who financed his opponents and invited them to play for keeps would be carted off to the booby-hatch. But on the banks of the Potomac such conduct is statesmanship and "global vision."

RED SATELLITES AWAIT HAND-OUTS

It is true that Russia has so far declined to join the Fund, although the Soviets were one of the originators of the plan; but all of the Red satellite nations of Europe are waiting in line for the cashier's wicket to open. This takes a load off Russia's back, in effect giving Russia a loan without requiring her to guarantee repayment.

UNCLE SAM PUTS UP ALL THE CHIPS

Nations joining the Bretton Woods plan are supposed to subscribe a given percentage of the Fund's total capital, but there are many "outs" and loopholes for everyone except Uncle Sam, who will put in all the real values, but be outvoted in the board of directors. Signatory nations are further supposed to deliver 25 percent of their subscriptions in gold, and it may be merely a coincidence that the amount of gold payable by foreign nations is just about the same as that the New Deal has shipped abroad in the last 3 years. High officials of the administration have boldly proposed that we divide our gold with other nations, making them free gifts, so "that we can all start even and trade will be stimulated." In British Columbia the tribes held an annual potlatch, at which the warriors gave away their possessions. But, lo, the poor Indian was drunk when he did it.

After Upper Slobbovia puts in the gold it got by shipping ores to Uncle Sam during the war while taking mountains of American goods free on lend-lease, it can then borrow American dollars to stimulate trade, and that trade doesn't have to be with this country. The borrowed money can be used to provide cutthroat competition for us, for the plan provides that no conditions may be imposed on where the loan be used. Russia could have all her puppets borrow for her account. Moreover, borrowers can get up to eight times the amount of their gold subscriptions in foreign exchange, which means American dollars, the only currency of world-wide acceptance and sufficient quantity. All the borrower needs to do is to match the face value of the foreign exchange it withdraws, with its own paper money, newly printed for the occasion if desired. As if that were not enough, a majority of the directors can at any time permit the borrower to get not 8, but 10, or 18, or 30 times the amount of its gold subscription. In Hungary recently, a 2,000,000,000,000 pengo note was worth a package of cigarettes, but in the International Fund it could have been cashed for 400,000,000 American dollars, because the Fund must accept the borrower's say-so on the worth of its paper. Hungary was just a little premature with its inflation, but the rest of the little red brothers will be on hand.

GOLD HELD LOW FOR BANKRUPT NATIONS

The Bretton Woods scheme holds the price of gold down, because it is to the interest of the bankrupt, non-gold-producing nations that it be so. Russia stands aloof and sells her gold high in the European black market, or as recently reported in the Canadian press may be preparing to dump gold, temporarily, at a figure below $35 in an endeavor to upset capitalist economy. Whatever price the Soviet sells at, the figure is clear profit, for costs mean nothing in a land where private property is nonexistent and the mines are worked by slave labor. Twenty years ago, when the Red regime was much less powerful, though equally hostile to free enterprise, Moscow did dump gold in an attempt to wreck the gold standard, but the attempt failed. Now with fiat-money advocates strong in Washington and controlling the Bank of England, the tactic might be resorted to again, for whatever confusion would result therefrom. Recent Russian dumping of platinum is credited with breaking the price from $93 to $63 per ounce and Russian silver is appearing in India at bargain prices. A free market for gold is the only safeguard against these socialistic schemes wherein everyone benefits except the United States.

Free World Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article as written by Col. C. Browning Smith, of Greenville, S. C., which I am sure will be read with much interest.

To the EDITOR:

Political domination of one country by another leads to the economic strangulation of the dominated country. This truth was verified when Europe was under Hitler and the conditions existing today in those parts of Europe and Asia under Russian domination.

The foreign policy of the United States has always striven to keep world markets open to American trade, broadly covered by the term "freedom of the seas," when sea power was a dominant factor in war. This likewise has been the policy of the British Empire and her spokesmen are referring to world-wide trading privileges when they speak of the "life lines of empire." Her main concern for over a century has been, not so much to maintain political control over alien peoples, although she has been guilty of this, as to assure herself of friendly governments bordering essential waterways that would not interfere with her trading privileges nor menace her ocean-borne commerce.

It was for this principle that she waged the Napoleonic wars and fought the last two World Wars, and it was for practically the same reason that we were drawn into these same two wars. We fought to maintain our trading rights throughout the world, but said we were fighting to maintain the freedom of the seas. Both wars have been a costly lesson to us that we cannot maintain our national economy without a free world market from which to import tin, rubber, oil, sugar, coffee, and hundreds of other basic commodities, as well as sell our surpluses.

Fundamentally, this is at the basis of our disagreement with Russia. We simply cannot afford, if we are to survive, to permit any nation through political action or war to establish her influence over most of the world's land area and exclude us from those markets—oil from the Middle East, for example.

It is not foreign capital nor the capitalistic system, whether American or British, that exploits more backward peoples so much, as it is the corrupt rulers and politicians that these capitalists have to do business with. I hold no brief for the abuses of capitalism but at least those people living under this system prevailing in truly representative governments can sleep soundly at night without fear of a secret police, firing squads, and concentration camps.

Churchill and Bevin have repeatedly warned us that Britain unaided is no longer able to maintain open world markets. They have not said it in these words, but that is what they have meant and Britain's announced withdrawal from Greece should not have taken us by surprise as it did. If we do not move in with a military force and establish a democratic regime, then Russia will move in, not necessarily with an army, but with political agents and Greece will end up like Yugoslavia. Should this happen Russia will have moved another step forward in forcing Turkey and the Middle East into the orbit of her power and thereby exclude us from this field of trade, as she has already done in those parts of Europe she now occupies.

Like a strangling octopus, the tentacles of Russia reach out, absorbing more and more land power until her heartland beyond the Urals is free from attack by land, air, or sea. Moving eastward through Asia and westward through Europe, where will she stop?

The day of sea power is waning, although still vital as a decisive factor in world affairs, and massed land power, backed by air power, controlling land areas adjacent to strategic waterways, such as the Dardanelles, Suez Canal, Straits of Gibraltar, Dakar, the hump of South America will make the position of the United States as a world power, with access to world markets almost untenable. Sea power alone is not enough. This is the geopolitics of world affairs that American statesmen, backed by an informed public opinion, will have to solve.

C. BROWNING SMITH.

GREENVILLE, S. C.

Arms for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union on Monday, March 10, 1947 entitled "Arms for Greece." I wish to compliment New Hampshire's leading newspaper on this most realistic appraisal of the entire Mediterranean situation. The course of action suggested by the Morning Union should, in my opinion, be followed by the United States. We cannot stand idly by and allow the Mediterranean to become a Russian sea. If Greece comes under Russian domination the Dardanelles, Turkey, Iran, the Middle East, and even Saudi Arabia with its oil may utimately follow. Now is the time for this country to stand firmly against the march of communism. If we fail to do this then our present position of world leadership will be imperiled.

The editorial follows:

ARMS FOR GREECE

Official sources indicate that President Truman will ask Congress for permission to

ship arms and ammunition to the Greek Army in addition to providing economic aid. This request would seem to be imperative in any effort to find a solution of the Greek problem.

Reports show that the Greek Communists do not constitute more than 15 percent of the Greek population at most. But they are given strength out of all proportion to their numbers by supplies of arms and ammunition furnished them by neighboring Communist-controlled countries. Meanwhile the Greek Army is handicapped by a lack of military supplies in its effort to suppress the revolutionary forces.

With Britain now determined to withdraw her 15,000 troops from Greece, the only hope of establishing and maintaining order and stability in that country lies in equipping the Greek Army to take over the policing job effectively. The United States is the only country fitted to supply this equipment today. We can do so out of the surplus left from the war without injury to ourselves.

We have a definite interest in seeing that Greece does not come under Russian domination, which is exactly what will occur if the Greek Communists prevail. The results of such Russian domination are too serious to be ignored. Greece is the keystone today in the line between western and Soviet Russian influence. If Greece falls to the Communists, Russia will expand her influence over the eastern Mediterranean and the Suez Canal. Turkey and Iran will become puppets of Moscow. Communist influence in Italy and France will be strengthened so as to eventually win control in those countries. Spain in turn will fall to communism. Russia will then control the western gateway to the Mediterranean and be master of most of Europe.

We cannot stand idly by and see this series of developments occur. Under such circumstances, military aid to enable the Greek Government to remain master in its own household becomes imperative. Russia will, of course, raise a howl over what she will label as unwarranted American interference in Greece. But this is not important. There is no more reason why Russia should take offense from the United States bolstering the Greek Government to maintain order in that country than there is that the United States should have a grievance over the machinations of Communists to bring Greece under Soviet domination.

The ideal solution would be for both Russia and the United States to leave Greece wholly free to settle her own problem. But the Communists are not doing that. So we must be realistic. The solution of the Greek problem is a question of strategy on which there can be no compromise. The Russians do not hesitate over steps to promote their own interests, and we must be equally definite and practical.

Shall We Relax Our Maritime Safety Standards?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted today to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include certain correspondence, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that House Joint Resolution 76 and H. R. 1240 are scheduled to be called up on this floor for consideration and vote on Thursday.

Both of these pieces of legislation are designed to carry out the President's request for the extension of title V of the Second War Powers Act for 1 year. House Joint Resolution 76 authorizes the Commandant of the Coast Guard to waive certain inspection laws with reference to the safety regulations and crew manning requirements of a presently relatively large fleet of ships engaged in passenger traffic many of which were not specifically designed for that traffic. In our entire merchant marine as of today, we are operating only five ships—the *America* on the North Atlantic, three ships in the South Atlantic, and one in the Pacific—which do not require these waivers. The major portion of our war-built or converted passenger ships are now in drydock being reconverted to passenger service so they can meet our American safety standards, which are by far the highest in the world and on a plane considerably above the international maritime safety standards, to which other nations are supposed to adhere. Evidence before our committee is to the effect that there are no ships operating in the world today—outside of these five—that would meet our high American safety standards.

That does not mean we are operating ships that are totally unsafe by a long ways; and offsetting the risk we continue to take in the operation of these ships is the fact that we have some 40,000 Americans who were stranded overseas when the war broke who are desirous of getting home; there are many thousands of others who have to go overseas for temporary purposes in the interests of our Government or on essential business, and then there are something like 75,000 displaced persons who our armed forces overseas and our State Department want us to transport to South America or elsewhere to become settled in those countries and a certain number of folks from abroad who want to come to our land under our usual immigration quotas. If we do not handle them with what is presently available they will be stranded indefinitely and we will have to clothe and feed them where they are over there. Aside from the mechanical safety features on which waivers are asked, we are also asked to waive certain regulations with respect to the manning of these ships and among others the number of aliens employed thereon.

The unions, by and large, control the manning of our offshore fleet. Many of the steamship operators have closed-shop contracts with the union and, through a rotary hiring system, the unions supply the crews when requested by the operators. During the war, a great many aliens were employed on our ships under the waiver powers contained in title V of the Second War Powers Act. There are those now in command of our unions who not only seek to continue that alien employment, through the continued grant of these waivers, in order that they may continue in turn to receive the dues from these aliens while at the same time denying those job opportunities to loyal American-born citizens.

Under permission to include in my remarks certain correspondence, I add at this point copy of a telegram from Mr. Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, to me as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, dated February 25, copy of his letter to me of same date together with copy of my reply thereto, which I think are self-explanatory. I hope many Members of the House will have an opportunity to read this:

EXHIBIT I

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1947.

MR. PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: I acknowledge and thank you for your wire and letter of February 25, 1947.

The position taken in your telegram is entirely inconsistent, in my opinion. On the one hand, you protest transfer of American ships to foreign registry—which some few American operators tell me they desire, in order to compete with the extremely low standards and low wage rates paid to certain foreign crews, as, for instance, the British with the employment of Chinese and Lascar seamen, etc. In order to compete with them, that is the only possible justification for any loyal American citizens to want to transfer registry to a foreign flag and employ alien crews under lower standards and lower wage scales.

On the other hand, you who ask us to maintain the American merchant marine under the American flag, in order to preserve American wage and safety standards, now approach me with the idea that you want to do so to permit the employment of aliens under American wage standards and under American safety standards. Presumably, of course, those aliens would be required to, and would be delighted to, operate under your union regulations. It would be distinctly to their benefit to do so. On the contrary, I have it on good authority that your union regulations would prevent our own citizen veterans, who sincerely desire to go to sea, to receive employment on these ships unless or until they joined your union and paid your dues.

I have protests from veterans' organizations in this country to that effect. Your own representatives have stated to me that unless we continue to grant these waivers for the employment of your alien membership you are unable to man the American merchant marine with American seamen, namely, those belonging to, and paying tribute to, your own union. As far as I am personally concerned, I want the strongest possible American merchant marine manned by loyal American citizens, regardless of whether they pay dues to your union or not, and as long as there are American boys still on the streets today, seeking to man the American merchant marine, in my opinion, they must, and should, have priority over aliens, regardless whence they come.

House Joint Resolution 76 and H. R. 1240, I understand, are coming up on the floor next week.

When I was asked to introduce these resolutions, I understood they were necessary to take care of the transportation of American citizens and displaced persons through the presently available facilities of the American merchant marine. That is the only reason I introduced the bills and the only justification I have for presenting them to the Congress and supporting them, which I do with some misgivings. Our committee has been informed in no uncertain terms that unless

these two resolutions pass the House practically every passenger ship in the American merchant marine will be tied to the docks as of March 31, or as soon thereafter as they reach the next port, thereby effectively taking the American flag off the high seas.

It is the responsibility of our committee to maintain paramount on the high seas an American merchant marine, manned by our own American citizens. We intend to discharge that responsibility. But I do not conceive it the duty of our committee—and certainly it 's against my own conscience—to man the American merchant marine with alien seamen. We must protect the jobs of Americans; I am against employing aliens on our ships. Therefore, I intend to introduce an amendment to my own bills next week, instructing the Coast Guard in the one case (H. J. Res. 76) and the Army in the other case (H. R. 1240) that henceforth no waiver shall be granted authorizing the employment of alien seamen, except as now provided by law, after June 1, 1946.

I am equally opposed to the admission to American citizenship of what I am told to be between twelve and fourteen thousand alien members of your organization—whether they served on our ships during the war or not. With the shortage of jobs for American seamen becoming greater and greater, I am opposed to granting special privileges of citizenship to these men, who would then compete for the fewer available jobs with Americans, who also served at sea during the war.

H. R. 476 will be considered further just as soon as possible.

We shall be glad to consider all other pertinent legislation to maintain our American flag paramount on the high seas—"with equal justice for all and special favors to none."

Very truly yours,

FRED BRADLEY,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1947.

Hon. FRED BRADLEY,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADLEY: Several thousand noncitizen war service seamen who rendered incalculable service to our cause in the war effort are about to be "rewarded" with deportation. Many of these men would today be bona fide residents or citizens of this Nation had it not been that their services were needed at sea. The State Department promised aid in their behalf after the war, but such aid has not been forthcoming.

Your committee can take two steps to pay our debt to these men. First, I urge that you act favorably and promptly on House Joint Resolution 76, extending the Coast Guard waiver power until January 1, 1948. This action will enable war service noncitizen seamen to find continued employment on our ships and to avoid deportation. Second, I urge that your committee give serious consideration to amendments to H. R. 476, the Merchant Seamen's War Service Act, which will be put before you in testimony of the CIO Maritime Committee. These amendments would provide legal entry for 1 year of war service in danger zones and citizenship for 3 years of such service.

These war-service seamen are few in number, but they have already made a valuable contribution to this Nation. They bring with them a devotion to our principles, skills which we need, and a willingness to undertake the responsibilities of citizenship. This Nation discouraged them from entering the armed forces, where they could have secured citizenship with 3 months of service. They were needed at sea and they stayed with the ships through the greatest of danger. We should pay our debt with the citizenship they have earned.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY, *President.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 25, 1947.*

Hon. FRED BRADLEY,
Chairman, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Future employment opportunities of maritime workers and the American merchant marine declines daily. Transfers of American owned or controlled vessels to Panamanian and Honduran flags become more numerous. These transfers have as their purpose to avoid American labor standards and to avoid American safety standards.

A request of the CIO maritime committee for the criteria on which Maritime Commission approval of such transfers are based has gone unanswered. Your committee is devoted to the maintenance of a strong American merchant marine. Accordingly, I urge that you undertake an immediate investigation of the extent of and reasons for such transfers preparatory to the consideration of legislation to make the American merchant marine second to none.

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I include also a letter received from a typical American citizen seaman who is being crowded out of the American merchant marine through the employment of these aliens and this gentleman speaks for himself in no uncertain terms:

EXHIBIT II

NEWPORT NEWS, VA., *March 10, 1947.*

Hon. FRED BRADLEY.

SIR: I am writing to you as an active member of the merchant marine and as a member of the NMU to let you know my stand and countless thousands of other merchant-marine members, on the issue of granting citizenship to aliens to continue sailing American ships.

I and thousands of others who are not members of the Communist Party, are strictly against granting an extension to alien seamen to sail beyond March 31, for the following reasons:

1. As shown by their attitude and conduct, they are sailing our ships and have sailed them not for patriotism, but for the higher wages and conditions. They all gang up on our offshore ships, according to where it's going, by nationality groups; i. e., if a ship is going to South America, the aliens who originally came from those countries will ship on her. Once aboard, they act as if the American members of the crew are the aliens. And by getting together and speaking only in a foreign tongue, they are able to get the Americans disgusted and quit. That's what they want—they don't want Americans aboard their own ships.

I'll give you one instance: I shipped in Texas not so long ago on a Lykes Bros. freighter, going foreign. She was a new C 3 type freighter, a beautiful ship. Going aboard, I thought I was on a foreign ship. There was only one American on deck—the boatswain. I was put on watch with two men from Spanish Honduras. I saw right away they were out to get rid of me before we sailed. Upon asking them questions, they answered in Spanish and lay in their bunks speaking Spanish to each other at the top of their voices. Needless to say, in the next port, Beaumont, I quit.

2. A good part of these men, including the ones on the ship I was forced to quit, were not even sailing during the war. They had been going to sea on American ships 10 months on the 12–4 watch. The entire watch was Chinese aliens—they couldn't speak a word of English, only "overtime." This endangers both crew and passengers to have men in the crew who do not understand the language of the ship.

3. If we did not allow aliens on our ships, the countless thousands of American youngsters that were trained by the Maritime Service during the war would have continued to sail merchant ships. As it was, after one trip and hearing nothing but a foreign tongue, they got disgusted and quit.

4. Countless thousands of the old-time seamen who quit during the war, would come back to sea if the aliens are removed. I have talked to quite a few. They all say the same thing. They do not want to sail with aliens. So there would be no shortage of seamen as the old-timers would be back.

5. Before the war, we sailed practically the same number of ships we have today with 100 percent citizen crews. Granted that most of the 6,000 merchant seamen who lost their lives in the war were the old-timers—all citizens. We could still man the ships, as a lot of Navy veterans want to join the merchant marine and the men who were trained by the Maritime Service would come back. Then, we American seamen would not have to hang our heads in shame on our own ships as we now do.

6. An extension would be a victory for the Communist Party faction in our union, the NMU, who were responsible for aliens being on our ships and who want them continued as they car tell them they were responsible for them still being on the ships and thus give them a powerful bloc in our union who would vote the way the Communists tell them to. They want to freeze the rest of us American seamen off the ships as we are anti-Communist and do not let anyone lull us to sleep with Red propaganda. They want the ships manned by men who will pay their dues, say nothing, and vote and do as they are told. They don't want Americans with a mind of their own.

7. Most of us Americans are now forced to sail on these coastwise oil tankers and coal boats as only full citizens can sail them. Otherwise they would be packed with aliens. Also, it's a fine pass when American seamen who sailed all during the war, are forced to sail only coastwise ships as aliens have our jobs and force us off our offshore ships.

On this tanker, not one man wants the alien seamen to get an extension as we want to sail on our own ships with our own countrymen—not aliens.

Fraternally yours,

Mr. Speaker, this continued employment of large numbers of aliens—and figures which I have received from the Bureau of Marine Safety in the Coast Guard show that there is an average of 17.5 percent now afloat in the American merchant marine—is a hazard of which they are thoroughly aware and about which they are very much concerned. The fire hazards and the safety hazards on these cargo-passenger ships, which are temporarily employed in carrying passengers, is enough of a hazard in itself but if, as and when we have a serious accident at sea and you put aliens in those lifeboats who do not understand the commands of the officers of the ship, who may not speak their native tongue and who may, therefore, be unable to control them, then you are creating an unspeakable additional hazard the responsibility for which I do not want to assume even though the above mentioned bills carry my name and which I introduced first at the request of the President—which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, page 752, and in the case of H. R. 1240 in a letter from the Secretary of War addressed to the Speaker and referred to me as chairman of our committee.

Above all, as far as I am personally concerned, I am unalterably opposed to this blanketing into citizenship of some 14,000 alien seamen. We are very grateful for their wartime service but I see no justification for blanketing them into citizenship simply because of that service and thereby creating an additional handicap toward native American citizens being given a fair opportunity to exercise their desire to serve in the peacetime, postwar, American merchant marine. Representations have been made by certain union groups that the majority of these aliens are Scandinavians—that is an absolute untruth. Afloat as of today there are on the average less than 8 percent Scandinavians out of the entire alien group. There are on the other hand on the average of 25 percent Latin Americans, 18.6 percent Filipinos, 18.6 percent British and 7.8 percent Orientals.

I hope the House will give very careful consideration to these two bills when they come on the floor Thursday.

Sugar Control and Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the New York Times by Mr. Joseph Abbott, president of the American Sugar Refining Co.:

BIG SUGAR REFINER ENDORSES CONTROL—AMERICAN CO. SAYS IT IS NEEDED THROUGH 1947 TO AVERT "BOOM AND BUST"—FAIR DEAL ASKED FOR CUBA—REPORT SHOWS RISE IN INCOME TO $4,735,278, OR $3.60 A SHARE, LAST YEAR

Reporting on operations last year of the American Sugar Refining Co., Joseph F. Abbott, president, informed stockholders yesterday that while the company opposed Government price and rationing controls as a peacetime measure, the sudden elimination of the present wartime sugar-control program undoubtedly would cause substantial price increases and a scramble for available supplies.

Prompt action is necessary, Mr. Abbott contended, to prevent another "boom and bust" situation such as that after the first World War when prices skyrocketed and then collapsed because of the absence of an orderly decontrol program.

He urged the Government to adopt the following program in the public interest: Provide for the American public substantially more sugar in 1947 than 1946 in line with its promise; continue price and rationing control through 1947; announce without delay the date when controls will end; define its policy on further purchases of sugar crops and its plans to provide sugar to foreign countries.

INDUSTRY'S PROBLEMS SURVEYED

Covering all phases of the company's operations, the report included a survey of the major problems facing the entire sugar industry in the field of domestic controls, legislation, Cuban developments, and trade agreements.

The company's consolidated net income for 1946, after taxes, $500,000 contingencies, and all charges, amounted to $4,735,278—equal to $3.60 a share of common stock. In 1945 the company had a net of $4,539,921, or $3.17 a common share.

Operations of the company's Cuban subsidiaries were an important factor last year. Net income of the Cuban corporations, after taxes and all charges, was $2,389,466, compared with $1,602,188 in 1945. Net income from refining operations, however, fell to $1,679,803 in 1946 from $2,398,553 the year before.

ACTIVITIES OF ALL REFINERS

Deliveries of all cane-sugar refiners in 1946 were 714,000 tons less than in 1945—a reduction of about 15 percent—the report declared. Since deliveries for export in 1946 increased by 112,000 tons over 1945, all refiners' deliveries for domestic civilian and military use were 826,000 tons less than in 1945—a reduction of about 19 percent. Deliveries by beet processors, importers, and mainland cane mills were 408,000 tons greater than the year before. Total deliveries of all primary distributors for domestic civilian and military use were 7 percent less than in 1945, the company said.

"Cuba's 1947 crop is estimated at about 5,600,000 tons," the report said. "It comes at a most opportune time. The public pressure here for more sugar is so great that continuation of sugar control and rationing through 1947 would be impossible if substantially more sugar is not provided for the American public for 1947. This added supply can come only from Cuba's 1947 bumper crop. Cuba will be able also to continue to make a big contribution to the needs of other nations in Europe by shipping them substantial supplies.

"If Congress considers revised sugar legislation this session, it should not neglect Cuba as was done after World War I. Appreciation of Cuba's efforts in coming to our rescue when needed and consideration of her peacetime sugar problems make this course obvious. Security for our raw-sugar needs, both in peacetime and in war, requires it."

Role of America as International Almoner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. J. K. Wells, a resident of Oklahoma City, a letter in which he discusses one phase of our foreign policy. I find myself in agreement with Mr. Wells, and for that reason I ask permission to have his letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *March 8, 1947.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Every country in Europe, with the exception of Russia, Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Switzerland, is on the threshold of economic collapse. They are sustained, in the main today, by direct gifts and bad loans made by the United States Government. When this collapse comes—and I don't think it is over 6 months away—Russia, or the Communists, will take over all of these bankrupt countries without firing a single shot.

The financial status of these countries today is very similar to that which prevailed in the old South in our own country immediately following the Civil War—a devastated country without money and without credit.

England, France, Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, Spain, and the Lowlands are looking to the United States daily for succor and relief. We are implored daily, either by some of our own statesmen (?) or by the paid representatives of some of these countries, to extend to each and every one of them additional loans for continued sustenance.

Surely we are not so foolish as to think we can feed all the peoples of the world and they remain in abject idleness. The sad part of the whole story is that when these countries collapse, the repercussion thereof will shake the foundation of the United States and the whole world—the like of which we have never witnessed before.

In view of this impending danger, don't you think it wise that we begin immediately to put our own house in order—to withstand this Herculean disaster?

We should stop trying to feed and finance the world and begin at once to reduce our national expenditures wherever possible, and to quit making bad loans and unappreciated gifts to foreign countries that know nothing of our democratic way of life—and care less—but only look upon us as a wanton and wasteful Santa Claus. This disaster is inevitable and we could not prevent it even if we loaned them the full limit of our total resources. That would merely delay the disaster that is sure to come.

I think it is high time we quit kidding ourselves and take a more realistic view of the situation and trim our sails for the inevitable storm that will surely envelop us unless we forthwith cease spending foolishly and for political purposes and "dig in" for a siege of economic world chaos.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. K. WELLS.

Democratic World Looks to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Democratic World Looks to United States," written by Sumner Welles, and published recently in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALLEY OF DECISION
DEMOCRATIC WORLD LOOKS TO UNITED STATES
(By Sumner Welles)

The postwar period has now entered its most critical phase. Events are rapidly moving toward an inevitable crisis.

The American people have entered the valley of decision. If the United States makes full use of the opportunity afforded by its position, its power and its resources, it can

determine the destinies of humanity. It can save Western civilization.

The nature of the course we are going to take will be shown by what we decide to do in the case of Greece. Many persons are protesting that, if the United States steps in to help the Greek people maintain their sovereign independence, this country will be merely "pulling British chestnuts out of the fire." What these individuals cannot, or will not, see is that in the world of today, the chestnuts are American as well as British.

The greatest of all wars has brought in its wake the greatest political, social, and economic upheaval of recorded history. The factors which had been determining international relations since the period of the Napoleonic wars have suddenly ceased to exist. The era of the Pax Britannica has ended. Great Britain is no longer able to preserve a balance of power in Europe or to play any considerable part in maintaining international order in the Near East or in Asia.

France has been bled white. The smaller countries of western Europe are exhausted and prostrate. The prospects for a German settlement of a kind which can bring order out of chaos and terminate the mounting fear and uncertainty grow daily less favorable.

Save in the New World, the democratic peoples who have been helping to uphold what we call western civilization have neither the manpower nor the material resources needed to make it possible for them to cooperate in any major struggle for its preservation. If it is to be saved, it will be saved because the American people have decided that their own security and safety of their own free institutions depend upon its survival.

The issue could not be plainer. If the United States acquiesces in an extension of Soviet domination over Greece, Turkey will soon thereafter come within the Soviet orbit. The Levant, the Arab states, and north Africa will then lie open to Soviet expansion. The Mediterranean will be included within the Russian sphere of influence.

Should the starvation and misery with which all of Europe is presently afflicted continue much longer, communism will sweep to the shores of the Atlantic. The strength of communism in western Europe has not yet shown itself openly. It has penetrated far deeper in all of the western democracies than is yet fully recognized. It can only be arrested when peoples have food, employment, and hope for the future. It can only be checked if peoples see that democracy provides security. It can only be overcome when democracy shows itself to be positive rather than pallidly negative.

The decision which the American people confront involves a fundamental change in their policy Should this country refuse to accept the challenge now presented, the Soviet government will automatically assume world leadership. I do not believe that either the Russian people or their Government desire war, or are prepared for war. But if through timidity or indecision the United States today acquiesces in further Soviet expansion, whether political or military, and permits the European democracies to fall, war between the United States and the Soviet Union will ultimately become inevitable.

No more fatal a mistake could be made by the American people at this time than to compel their Government to reduce their armed strength. Any present reduction in the American budget which will result in a decrease in the military or financial power of the United States, and thus prevent it from assuming these new world obligations which are incumbent upon it, is an open invitation to the rulers of the Soviet Union to persist in an expansion policy. Until peace settlements are concluded which can guarantee that the legitimate interests of the United States will be safeguarded, and that a stable international order can at length be established, the American taxpayers must be prepared to assume a heavy burden. But such a sacrifice will be infinitesimal compared to the price which would be exacted of them by a new war or by world anarchy.

Until security is within their grasp, the people of this country must see to it that their Government makes full use of the armed strength of this Nation, as well as of its economic resources, in order to maintain the independence and to insure the survival of the remaining democracies. Only through such a policy of bold and enlightened initiative can the United States hope to prevent war and to bring about the construction of a world in which the United Nations can maintain peace.

Valley of a New Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. OVERTON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Valley of a New Civilization," which appeared in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis on March 9, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALLEY OF A NEW CIVILIZATION

Forty years ago, then President Theodore Roosevelt—a New York Republican—made a steamboat trip from Keokuk, Iowa, to Memphis. He had become interested in a proposal to create a 14-foot channel from the Great Lakes to the Gulf.

What he said at Memphis has probably been forgotten, yet, because his truths are more applicable today than they were then, what amounted to a declaration of national policy should be memorized by every person living in the Mississippi Valley.

In a day of new weapons of fantastic speed and awesome destructive power, they are truths understood far more clearly than when spoken, for the Valley is the relatively safer area, situated between the protective coastal mountain barriers.

His was a prophecy.

The date was October 4, 1907. This is what he said:

"No man can foresee the limit of the possibility of development in the Mississippi Valley. Such being the case, and the Valley being literally the heart of the United States, all that concerns its welfare must concern likewise the whole country. Therefore, the Mississippi River and its tributaries ought, by all means, to be utilized to their utmost possibility.

"The Valley of the Mississippi is politically and commercially more important than any other valley on the face of the globe. Here, more than anywhe.e else, will be determined the future of the United States, and, indeed, of the whole western world; and the type of civilization reached in this Valley will largely fix the type of civilization for the whole Western Hemisphere."

This Valley, as President Theodore Roosevelt envisioned it, was to become the cradle and citadel of a new hemispheric civilization.

Its area of greatest opportunity is that known as the alluvial valley—the vast agricultural and potentially industrial sections lying between Cairo and the Gulf.

The deep channel sought at that time was not attained. It was only a little more than 2 years ago that the Congress authorized deepening the channel between Cairo and Baton Rouge to 12 feet as against its present 9, and the work on that is yet to be started.

For many years after President Roosevelt uttered his prophecy, the alluvial valley permitted its water transportation facilities to deteriorate and completely ignored its industrial opportunities. It was too busy growing cotton and producing lumber. Agriculturally it ignored—and many a time disastrously—equally prophetic warnings to diversify, to get its farmers established on a live-at-home basis.

It lost the vision of Theodore Roosevelt. It wasted its years.

The real awakening began to come within the decade. The South started to shake off its lethargy, and with it, the alluvial valley. The introduction of cotton substitutes, along with educational campaigns, such as the plant-to-prosper program of this newspaper, spurred what is a continuing, growing agricultural transition.

New industries seeking fields of abundant labor supply, water-rail transportation, and a more beneficent climate started to move into the South, and are moving now with ever-accelerating speed. A great deal of it is speed inspired by belief that coastal manufacturing centers must be decentralized for safety's sake.

And with it all the alluvial valley suddenly began to realize that the Mississippi River with its transportation facilities and potentials can be a perpetual asset to unlimited development instead of a periodic curse.

Greenville has one of the finest of the country's inland harbors. Vicksburg has improvements planned which the Congress has authorized. New Orleans is seeking a new water artery to the Gulf, in which the city government plans to make a $30,000,000 initial investment. New Orleans is the seaport of the alluvial valley. More than half of the relief supplies going to Asia and Europe are being moved through that port. Most of it moves through this Valley. If the Congress approves a plan for the standardization of Latin-American military equipment and supplies through American aid, most of that, too, will move through this Valley.

There is tremendous opportunity at hand for Valley-wide development of foreign trade with Latin America.

Opposition to Bill To Permit Monopolistic Practices by Freight Carriers

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe anyone who takes the time to read the minority report on S. 110, and everyone in my opinion ought to read it before he votes, will oppose this proposed legislation. This legislation is indefensible.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the minority report.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

I dissent from the recommendations of a majority of the committee that the bill (S. 110) be passed.

This bill would give the railroad, motor-carrier, water-carrier, pipe-line, and freight-forwarder industries the opportunity of obtaining complete exemption from the antitrust laws. If enacted into law, the proposed legislation would cut the antitrust laws from the heart of our economy—the transportation industry. Such legislation would be an opening wedge in entirely destroying the antitrust laws, designed to guard and preserve the American system of free enterprise.

The obvious purpose of the bill is to deprive the courts of jurisdiction in pending cases instituted by the Department of Justice and the State of Georgia. The Department of Justice, in a suit at Lincoln, Nebr., is seeking to enjoin powerful combinations of railroads, railroad associations, and bankers from violating the antitrust laws, fixing arbitrary and discriminatory freight rates, limiting railroad services, suppressing improvements in railroad equipment and facilities, and preventing the development of modes of transportation competitive with the railroads. The State of Georgia's suit is now being tried in the Supreme Court of the United States and seeks to enjoin combinations in the railroad industry from fixing noncompetitive and discriminatory freight rates. These important cases, brought to enforce basic laws enacted by the Congress, could become moot if this bill is enacted. A dangerous precedent would be set, encouraging other powerful groups to seek legislation immunizing them from established laws and the power of the courts to enforce them.

Cartelization of the transportation industry cannot be isolated from the national economy. Transportation costs are a major element in determining the price of goods in other industries. The power to control the cost of transportation is a power which may be used to dictate whether other businesses shall enjoy competitive success or be stifled to death. Analysis of the bill shows that it would permit the legalization of private controls over the Nation's economy not only by transportation combinations but, under the broad terms of the bill, by industrial and financial combines working in alliance with combinations in the transportation industry. This legislation sets a pattern for supplanting the American system of competitive enterprise and for the cartelization of the Nation's entire economy.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Under the specific provisions of paragraph (2), the transportation industry could set up and perpetuate a private government which could have the power, through concerted action, to determine the rates to be charged and the service to be performed; the time at which trains shall depart and the time they shall arrive at their destinations, from where they shall leave, over which routes they shall run, and the places at which they shall stop; the equipment and facilities to be used, and whether or not improvements thereon shall be made or suppressed; the part of the rate each carrier shall receive; the allowances which shall be granted to shippers; and the basis and extent of settling claims of passengers and shippers against a particular carrier.

The phrase "promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service" is so broad as to authorize concerted action comprehending every activity in the transportation industries. It would include the financing, construction, and utilization of equipment, safety devices, facilities, stations, and terminals. It would include action determining whether spur tracks or other facilities, necessary to meet the requirements of particular shippers, shall be constructed, and whether new types of service necessary to promote an advancing economy shall be instituted.

Approval of agreements permitting the industry to organize into combinations and by joint action to make determinations of such wide scope would constitute a delegation to private groups completely to cartelize transportation.

Competition would be eliminated not merely among the carriers of the same type or class but among the several competitive modes of transportation—the railroads, the water carriers, the freight forwarders, the pipe-line companies. Paragraph (4) would permit agreements between carriers of different classes if the agreements concern matters relating to freight classifications or to transportation under joint rates or over through routes. Since rates to be charged for transporting freight are matters relating to freight classifications, this provision would authorize approval of agreements between groups of carriers in the different spheres of transportation whereby the rates in each sphere could be privately manipulated so as to eliminate competition between the various classes of carriers. Moreover, the words "matters relating to * * * transportation under joint rates or over through routes" are so broad as to permit the approval of agreements between the carriers in all the classes of transportation under which collective action could be taken to curtail services, equipment, and facilities. All these things relate to transportation under joint rates or over through routes and, indeed, are within the term "transportation," as defined in the Interstate Commerce Act. The term is defined in that act to include "locomotives, cars, and other vehicles, vessels, and all instrumentalities and facilities of shipment or carriage, irrespective of ownership or of any contract, express or implied, for the use thereof, and all services in connection with the receipt, delivery, elevation, and transfer in transit, ventilation, refrigeration or icing, storage, and handling of property transported."

It would thus be possible for the railroads, the trucks, the water carriers, the freight forwarders, and the pipe lines to combine into private organizations and to take concerted action determining with immunity the rates to be charged, the quality of services to be performed, and the facilities to be installed in each mode of transportation.

Under paragraph (9)—

"No agreement approved by the Commission under this section, and no conference or joint or concerted action pursuant to and in conformity with such agreement as the same may be conditioned by the Commission, shall be deemed to be a contract, combination, conspiracy, or monopoly in restraint of trade or commerce within the meaning of the antitrust laws."

Thus not only would combinations of carriers participating in agreements for joint and concerted action be immunized from the antitrust laws but their bankers and financiers, manufacturers of railroad and other carrier equipment, and powerful shippers, taking "joint or concerted action pursuant to and in conformity with" the carriers' agreement, would be immunized from the antitrust laws. By these adroit provisions, effectively eliminating the application of the antitrust laws, financial and powerful shipping interests, acting through rate-making and other procedures provided in agreements approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, could ally themselves with the dominant carrier associations to fix transportation rates and limit transportation services so as to stifle new competitors and perpetuate monopoly.

Similarly the bill would permit the reestablishment of old arrangements existing under the illicit "pullman monopoly" recently divested by the courts in an antitrust suit brought by the Government. This monopoly, which had for so long a period of time prevented the introduction and use of modernized and improved equipment, would be restored and the court's mandate nullified.

The approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as envisaged by this bill, is not merely with respect to particular rates or other specific action agreed upon or taken by carriers. Under the scheme of the legislation here proposed, the Commission would approve the basic plan of organization setting up the rules, regulations, and procedures under which the private cartel would regiment and control transportation.

The amendments to paragraph (9), adding two provisos thereto, contain much verbiage but fail utterly to contravene the power of the monopoly group, once its plan of organization is approved by the Commission. The second proviso, that approval of an organization agreement providing for procedures on time schedules, facilities, settlements of claims, and other nonrate matters "shall not be deemed to be approved of any joint or concerted action" on such matters, is meaningless because, under the terms of the bill, exemption from the antitrust laws would apply when concerted action is taken "pursuant to and in conformity with" the approved agreement. Immunity for concerted action flows from approval of the agreement. Concerted action, itself, need not be separately approved. Nor is the first proviso effective in curtailing monopoly power by requiring, in the case of nonrate matters, separate approval of agreements made pursuant to the approved procedures. The power of the monopoly group does not depend on carrier agreements openly arrived at, but on concerted action, effectuated through the coercions and pressures inherent in the organizational structure. Such concerted action, taken through the procedures provided in the association's plans of organizations, would be insulated from attack under the antitrust laws by virtue of previous approval of the plans of organization of, and the procedure in, the associations.

Moreover, even if the amendments to paragraph (9) were effective to deny monopoly the power to control services, the bill, insofar as it provides for the legalization of monopolies in determining prices to be paid for services, is sufficient to stifle competition in the industry.

This bill, which would delegate to the Commission authority to delegate to a private government powers to control every aspect of transportation, could vest in the private government powers greater than those exercised by the Commission itself. As observed by the Commission in its fifty-second annual report (1938):

"There is gross exaggeration in the idea that every act of the railroads is subject to regulation. The railroads have a large degree of initiative in the making of their rates, and have freely made a multitude of reductions to meet competition. We have no power to control their passenger service, and exercise very little control over their freight service. They select and pay their officers without supervision or hindrance. Nor do we undertake to tell them what equipment and supplies they may buy; how they shall operate their shops or maintain their tracks; what rails, ballast, and ties they shall use; what stations or other buildings they shall erect; what construction contracts they shall let; or how they shall manage their affairs in many other ways. The pattern of their regulation is in no way unique but is substantially the same as is now applied generally throughout the country by the States or the Federal Government to other public-utility companies."

But these matters, which the Interstate Commerce Commission declares it has no power to control, could, under this bill, be delegated to a private government to control.

Paragraph (6), purporting to guarantee a party to the agreement the right of independent action, is devoid of such guaranty. The paragraph, upon close examination,

merely protects the right to take independent action after a determination or report is made through such procedure as is provided in the agreement. The bill does not preserve independent action taken prior to the collective determination. In the face of a determination already collectively agreed upon a carrier, desirous of deviating from the action of the association, would at once be confronted with the exercise against it of the coercive power of the entire combination. A carrier who persists in adhering to its own managerial prerogatives and rights and who persists in refusing to yield to the collective determination runs the hazard of ostracism as a nonconformist, who takes the benefits of the combination but refuses to make required sacrifices. The detailed day-by-day operations in the transportation industry are so complex and the relationships between the carriers and the industrial and financial interests are so involved as to afford numerous opportunities for retaliatory action against the nonconformist. Such retaliation may be carried out so subtly as to leave no evidence of the restraints exercised against such carrier. Under these circumstances a stipulated right to act independently is illusory. The danger is accentuated when it is considered that, by various devices, initial determinations or reports concerning proposals unsatisfactory to the dominant interests may, under approved procedures as established in the existing private system of judicature of the rate bureaus and associations, be delayed for long periods of time before acted upon.

Moreover, the prohibition in paragraph (6) against boycott, duress, or intimidation would seem to be applicable only to protect independent action following the determination arrived at through the association's procedures. And, in any event, coercion, other than by means of boycott, duress, or intimidation, is at no time prohibited. Economic pressures, exercised by interlocking financial and industrial powers, is sufficient to coerce carrier management.

The sole purpose of this bill is to remove the legal restraints against monopoly inherent in militant enforcement of the antitrust laws. Yet, while the bill would insulate the transportation monopoly and its allies from the courts (pars. (2) and (9)) and reduce the Attorney General to the status of a private complainant before the Interstate Commerce Commission (par. (7)), it would provide no adequate regulatory safeguards, if they be possible, even to insure compliance with agreements approved by the Commission.

Paragraph (7) in essence limits the power of the Commission to determining whether action taken under an agreement approved by the Commission is in conformity with such approval "and is consistent with the standards" set forth in the bill, and whether its approval should be modified or terminated or additional terms or conditions prescribed "with respect to the particular action complained of." Thus, the Commission may merely prescribe additional admonitions for future conduct in the matters complained of. But neither the Commission, nor any other agency of Government would, under this bill, be given power to impose any penalty for past offenses.

It must be recognized that the adoption of this bill would result in the worst kind of special legislation for special interests. It would constitute a most dangerous precedent which could henceforth be used to justify the exemption of any or all industries from the safeguards of the antitrust laws. The pursuit of such a program inevitably means the extinction of the free and competitive economy of the United States. It is plain, therefore, that this bill should not be enacted into law.

CHARLES W. TOBEY.

David Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the San Francisco News Thursday, March 6, 1947:

DAVE LILIENTHAL IS AN ABLE MAN

(George Carmack, former editor of the Knoxville News-Sentinel, and now editor of the Houston Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, makes the following statement in a signed article in his newspaper.—The Editor.)

(By George Carmack, editor, the Houston Press)

Dave Lilienthal is not a theorist who thrives on controversy.

Dave Lilienthal is one of the ablest men in this country today—and this is said with careful consideration of just what those words mean.

There is no business in this country too big for Dave Lilienthal to head. He could be an able president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. As head of the Pennsylvania Railroad he would be a success. He could fill the shoes of the president of United States Steel.

KEEN POWER OF ANALYSIS

To any of these jobs he would bring a vision, a keen power of analysis, the ability to see problems as they are and not as he would want them to be, a quality that makes people work with him, the knack of picking good executives and getting the best out of their ability.

TVA built more than 20 dams on the Tennessee River—a construction project which, in its entirety, is probably the largest ever undertaken in the United States. Despite high wage rates—the equal or better than union scales—record after record for low cost of construction per cubic foot was made in building these dams.

I have known Dave Lilienthal for many years. Primarily, it was the everyday acquaintanceship that the editor of a newspaper has with the head of the largest public business in the editor's town. But it was more than that. Close personal friendship with Dave Lilienthal for several years can lead only to an unqualified belief that he has no sympathy either with the idea of communism or with the fanatical people who follow the party line.

VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

The people of Knoxville, Tenn., where he has lived for the last 12 years, know him best. We feel sure that if the people of Knoxville were to take a vote of confidence on Dave Lilienthal, he would get 90 percent favorable ballots.

He has no more sincere advocate than the Knoxville Chamber of Commerce. On previous occasions when Senator MCKELLAR has been out to get Lilienthal, the chamber of commerce has publicly made known, by formal endorsement, its belief in Lilienthal and his policies.

This is not to say that there have not been Communists in TVA. I suspect there were Ku Kluxers, and Silver Shirters and almost anything you might want to name among the thousands the Authority hired. And it must be remembered, too, that the United States had a great deal more tolerance for the "Commies" back in those days. Most people considered them somewhat as freaks—harmless nuts. The real menace of communism to the United States is something that all of us have just been waking up to in the last few years.

FOR POLITICAL SPOILS

But to understand the fight on Dave Lilienthal—at least in its beginnings—it is necessary to understand Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee. Senator MCKELLAR is the leading political-patronage advocate in public life. No job is too big, and none too small, to escape the Senator's eye, constantly roving for another bit of political spoils.

The Senator is part of the E. H. Crump political organization in Memphis—and it must be noted a very meek part on the rare occasions that he has incurred Mr. Crump's displeasure. This political organization is built in part on extreme ruthlessness in filling jobs—even a woman holding a nonpaying presidency of a school's Parent-Teacher Association must be on the organization's side of the political fence.

The heart and soul of TVA has been the principle—written into law—that jobs in TVA must be filled on a merit basis and not as political patronage. Senator MCKELLAR was not able to pass out TVA jobs to the politically faithful. Dave Lilienthal saw to that.

A diploma from a fine engineering school and a record as a successful engineer meant a lot more than a telephone call from a Senator's secretary when a young engineer applied for a job working on one of TVA's dams.

WOULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT

Then there were cases when Senator MCKELLAR—even though he had worked hard for many of TVA's appropriations—couldn't have his way. There was one particularly bitter fight over the location of one of TVA's dams.

Senator MCKELLAR cries "communism," but we suspect that if Lilienthal had followed a policy of requiring a letter from Senator MCKELLAR before you could get a job with TVA the cry of "communism" would never have been raised.

Make no mistake about it—Lilienthal is a liberal. But he is a liberal of the old school—a liberal in the fine sense of the word.

He is a liberal in the meaning it used to have—when it meant freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion—when it meant honesty and sincerity—when it meant the dignity of man—when it meant the courage of one's own convictions and not a party line laid down by Moscow via a committee for the advancement of this and that and a press agent with a mimeograph machine turning out ready-made thoughts. He is a liberal of the Senator Norris school rather than the Henry Wallace or Vito Marcantonio or Claude R. Pepper stripe.

Dave Lilienthal is an able man. It will be a sad day if the McKellars and the Tafts—or even the O'Daniels—can drive him from public life.

The Proposed FEPC Bill Dangerous

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out time and time again, the most communistic piece of legislation

with which this Government has ever been threatened is this so-called FEPC bill, so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee.

If you will get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 17, and turn to page 1012, you will find a speech I made analyzing this bill as it is now applied in the State of New York. You will also find that they put it on the ballot in the State of California in the last election and appealed to the people of California to adopt it. The voters of California defeated it by a million majority.

Now, a movement is being made to try to force other States to place this legislation on their statute books without a thorough investigation.

If we are going to adopt a communistic platform, remember this FEPC is the first plank.

I am inserting a statement by Mr. Mason J. Dixon on this subject, which I hope every Member will take time to read:

The matter referred to follows:

Rather, in this article, our purpose is to look into this peculiarly explosive piece of proposed legislation—generally known as FEPC (the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act), which provides severe punishment for employers adjudged to be guilty of practicing racial discrimination in hiring workers. A commission investigates and determines whether employers are guilty of putting race prejudices into practice in the employment offices of their businesses.

During the war, FEPC functioned on a temporary basis. The proposal now is to make it permanent. Strangely and interestingly enough, the most notorious case involving FEPC was precipitated by a labor union, rather than an employer. In Philadelphia, the transit company was directed to hire Negro streetcar conductors. The union went on strike, and a costly transportation tie-up developed in America's third largest city.

A number of important labor unions have, written or unwritten, regulations limiting their membership to the white race. FEPC must be unfair, one-sided, and impractical until it is aimed in application at labor unions as well as employers.

In many cases, employers have no jurisdiction over the choice of employees, since the union dictates the employee. Under the Wagner Act, they are compelled to permit the union to maintain a closed shop; they are obliged to employ the workers dispatched from the union hiring hall.

If the advocates of FEPC are truly interested in eliminating racial discriminations in employment, they will establish the proposed bureaucratic control over both union membership rolls and union hiring halls as well as the employer.

Some time ago, the National Republic carried an article on the subject, Can race prejudice be outlawed? The conclusion reached was that race prejudice must be overcome by the forces of religion and education, working to perfect racial understanding and brotherly love, rather than by granting to socialistic regimenters and communistic bureaucrats the right to throw into jail all Americans suspected—or convicted—of harboring race prejudices which express themselves in employment discriminations.

The new Congress has pressing problems to consider—problems which must be solved in the interests of the general welfare of our people. However, the agitators of the race question are insisting that Congress shall drop everything and devote its major attention to the FEPC. This may mean another "legislative strike." It may mean a long-drawn-out, knock-down, drag-out battle on the floor of the Senate. A stalling of legislative machinery over the FEPC issue could be as costly to the Nation as the recent coal strike. The crying need of our country is for unity and understanding between North and South, between all races and classes and parties. FEPC is the most explosively laden bombshell of disunity, bitterness, and misunderstanding to be detonated in recent years upon the floor of the Senate. It has been an agency of distrust and misunderstanding spread throughout all races and classes of our people.

That is why the Communists, the professional merchandisers of distrust and disunity, are insisting that the splitting of itself over FEPC shall be the first order of business of the new Congress.

No lover of representative government will condone the filibustering methods employed by the southern Senators to halt the passage of FEPC or any other type of legislation. However, as in most cases, wrong is not wholly on one side. The communistic pressure groups behind FEPC have used equally disgraceful tactics in an effort to browbeat Senators into supporting this legislation, which many competent lawyers believe to be plainly and patently unconstitutional and which in the end extends racial contention rather than modifies it.

Employed by a minority, a filibuster obstructs the carrying out of the will of the majority. But a ruthless minority, organized into a high-pressure lobby, is designed to accomplish the same purpose, and it does—in practice—accomplish the same purpose of defeating the principle of majority rule.

With filibustering on one side, and minority pressuring on the other side, the question still remains: Do the American people favor an FEPC?

The last election supplied a very convincing clue to the answer to that question. The proposal for a State FEPC was put on the ballot for a direct and decisive vote of the people of California.

Before the balloting, all sides agreed that this would be a fair test of public sentiment. All the propaganda and mass meeting techniques known were put into play by the proponents. To a considerable degree, California is the melting pot of the Nation. Only a fraction of her population is native-born. The preponderant majority of her people have come from abroad or from the other 47 States.

Communism, the CIO—all left-wing elements—are strong in California, considerably stronger than in the Nation as a whole. This gave to the proponents of the FEPC a decided advantage as the issue was brought to a popular test.

Of course, it must be recognized that one of the strongest objections to a Federal FEPC is that it would provide the Government in Washington with new and far-reaching controls to be imposed upon the people of the 48 States. Many Americans who oppose Federal FEPC as being unconstitutional might actually favor a State FEPC.

The CIO, Communist Party, and other left-wing groups spearheaded the drive to enact FEPC in California. Through their clever propaganda, some church groups were misled into supporting FEPC as a "step toward racial equality and the brotherhood of man."

Yet, when the ballots were counted, FEPC had been rejected by a crushing majority of 2½ to 1. The Republican candidate for the United States Senate won with 54 percent of the votes. But 70 percent of the total votes were cast against the FEPC. This demonstrates that it is no partisan issue. Republicans and Democrats joined in smashing this Communist-sponsored proposal.

The vote was so overwhelming as to convince any political observer that the American people strongly disapproved of such a legislative interference with individual liberty. California has a large and growing Negro population. It also is the home of large representations of other racial minorities—such as Filipinos, Mexicans, Chinese, etc.

The vote would indicate that even these minorities, whom the proponents of the FEPC profess to wish to help, did not vote solidly in favor of it.

On the basis of the California vote, it may be assumed that the American people do not approve of FEPC. Residents of 46 States (New York has an FEPC, enacted by legislation and not by referendum) are not unlike Californians; and, given the opportunity, they undoubtedly would register the same decision.

The FEPC, introduced in the House by the Communists' proponent, MARCANTONIO, ought to be defeated, but not by a filibuster carried on by a minority of Representatives or Senators. It ought to be defeated by the overwhelming majority vote of Republicans and Democrats, who respect the wishes of their constituents, the people of the United States.

In the interest of all races, Congress should kill FEPC. This decision is dictated by the manifest will of the people. It is dictated by the plain provisions of the Constitution of the United States, forbidding such interferences with individual liberties and the rights of the States.

The defeat of FEPC will clear the air in Congress. It will dissipate the gathering storm clouds of misunderstanding, distrust, and disunity in the Senate and throughout the Nation.

In the conception of the communistic promoters of strife in our land, FEPC is regarded as an effective monkey wrench to be cast into the legislative machinery of Congress and into the social and industrial relations of our people.

Congress will render a public service by throwing this made-in-Moscow instrument of sabotage out the window or into the waste basket.

To progress toward better racial relations and understanding in America, we need no bureaucratic system of regimentation; we need no FEPC. We need a spiritual awakening; we need a reviving and reinforcing of the spirit of true religion.

Instead of more power for the Washington bureaucracy to regiment the lives of our people, we need more power for the church of the living God to transform the lives of our people with the redeeming love of Christ for all men, all classes, all races.

Presidential Award for Meritorious Service Rendered During World War II Given to Jack L. Warner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, at March Field, Riverside, Calif., yesterday at 2 p. m., Mr. Jack L. Warner was presented with the Medal for Merit awarded to him by President Harry Truman for his services to the Nation during World War II. This is an honor deserved and earned. The citation which accompanies this award reveals the unselfish service Mr. Warner rendered to the Nation, and reads as follows:

Jack L. Warner, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States from

September 1939 to April 1942 and from November 1942 to September 1945. Mr. Warner, through his 30 years of experience and background in the motion-picture industry, impelled by the finest patriotic motives, and on his own initiative, pointed out to the armed services of the United States the use which could be made of motion pictures in the effective prosecution of the war. He provided producers, directors, technicians, and executives from the industry, indoctrinated them in the needs of the armed services, and established the first Motion Picture Unit of the Air Forces himself. In addition to providing the full use of motion pictures for combat purposes, he produced more than 100 films for the recruitment of personnel, the training of officers and men, and the education of the public in various phases of the war effort. He enabled the armed services to accelerate procurement of personnel and training of men already in the service at a time when mobilization was at a critical stage, and the tremendous conversion of a civilian population into an armed force was being attempted. This contribution was an immeasurable one, and was possible only because of his profound insight into the needs of the services, and his vast knowledge of the potentialities of the motion picture as a medium. He put at the disposal of the United States forces in the overseas theaters thousands of prints of feature motion pictures for entertainment purposes, which contributed substantially to the morale of the men. Throughout his entire relationship with the armed services, his sole thought was the role the motion picture could play in making possible the defeat of the enemy. He contributed vast sums of money and enabled the armed services to conserve great amounts of money in this part of their program. But distinct from any financial consideration, the energy and knowledge he provided, unselfishly and unsparingly, were on a level with that of only a few civilians in the business and industrial worlds during the course of the war. Mr. Warner's conduct and achievements, his devotion to the cause of his country, and his complete disregard of personal gain reflect the highest credit to himself, the Government, and the people of the United States.

HARRY TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Congressional Astrology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congressional Astrology," written by Marquis Childs, and appearing in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

CONGRESSIONAL ASTROLOGY

Twenty Members of Congress are having a pillow fight with imaginary pillows. The contest between 10 Members of the House and 10 Senators over whether the budget will be cut by $6,000,000,000 or by $4,500,000,000 is just about as real as that.

The figure that finally comes out of this pillow fight will be wholly arbitrary, having nothing to do with the obligations both at home and abroad that this Nation must assume It's astrology. It's numerology. It's fortune telling with a little assistance from the ouija board.

The District of Columbia is one of the few jurisdictions in the country that licenses fortunetellers. The fee is $250, and 37 fortunetellers hold licenses. In announcing that he would not vote on the budget ceiling when it was being debated on the floor of the Senate, Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, told his colleagues that they ought to have the decency to take out a license before they voted.

Even while the business was being discussed publicly on the floor, the whole process was made to look foolish. Chairman ARTHUR CAPPER of the Senate Agriculture Committee brought in a bill with the unanimous approval of his committee providing for United States funds to fight the epidemic of hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

CAPPER said it was imperative the bill be passed at once by unanimous consent. No one could very well dispute the need for such action. The plague in Mexico will certainly spread to this country unless it is stopped where it is.

In this respect, it's like the political-military plagues that beset certain areas. If they aren't checked, they will certainly grow and spread. You can measure, however, tangibly and concretely the deadly effect of something like the hoof-and-mouth disease.

But no one in Congress has any idea how much the attack on Mexico's hoof-and-mouth disease will cost. The bill rushed through to available passage—Public Law No. 8—merely says that funds shall be made available to do the job. One witness estimated there were 1,000,000 head of cattle in the infected area in Mexico and the cost of eradicating them would be between fifty million and sixty million dollars.

That is just one item above and beyond the estimates of the experts who drew up President Truman's $37,500,000,000 budget. Until Congress gets down to cases and decides how extensive our obligations will be in the coming year, the argument over cutting the budget is like the medieval argument about how many angels can stand on a needle point.

Take another and more formidable example. Thus far this session 150 bills have been put in, by Republicans and Democrats, covering veterans. Almost without exception they provide for spending money above and beyond the estimates in the budget.

No one either in the Veterans' Administration or in the Veterans' Committee of the House has had the time and the patience to find out what it might cost the Government if even half these bills become law. But it would undoubtedly run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Some of these bills will become law. Certain measures may be essential to correct injustices. The pressure of the professional veterans' lobbies is powerful and unceasing.

An arbitrary budget ceiling adopted by Congress at this time is bound to be punctured. It will be purely and simply a political ceiling.

Those engaged in this sham battle are counting on the fact that people have short memories. At the next session of Congress, the Department of Agriculture will ask for a deficit appropriation to cover the cost of eradicating the hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico. It's a fairly safe bet that no one will remember that this little item was ignored when Congress was contending angrily over a purely fictitious budget ceiling.

You might be safe in betting that few people would ordinarily remember there ever was such a ceiling. But they will be reminded, come the next election campaign. The victors in this battle of the windmills can be counted on to make political capital out of a wholly empty victory.

From the demands growing out of the crisis over Greece, you get some idea of how empty that victory is likely to be. The request for money to sustain Greece was not in the President's budget because no one short of a crystal-gazer could have foreseen that the need would become so desperately urgent just when it did.

The longer the contest goes on over a fictitious budget ceiling, the more foolish it appears, which may be one reason the Democrats are sitting back and looking rather self-satisfied these days.

Greece and Turkey a Job for the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the President today asked Congress to authorize our Government to furnish several hundred million dollars, together with an unspecified number of civilian administrators and troops to stop civil war and the spread of communism in Greece and Turkey. I am led to wonder how it will work there when it failed in China. The President said that the United Nations could not do this job he has in mind but did not say why. On the latter point I commend to attention of the House the following thoughtful article which appeared this morning in the Washington Post:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

The problem of Greece boils down to the following alternatives:

1. Either we throw good money after bad and let the British continue to bungle Greece nearer the brink of civil war and chaos.

2. Or we use our influence to have the United Nations, with its World Bank stabilization fund and world police force, put Greece back on its feet.

3. Or we wipe our hands clean of Greece altogether, in which case Greece goes Russian-Communist.

Since even the Republican isolationists are dead opposed to a Soviet-dominated Greece bottling up the eastern end of the Mediterranean with its Arabian oil now used by the United States Navy, the third alternative probably can be ruled out. Chances are strong that we will do something to help Greece.

The chances are also strong that we will follow the first alternative, and let a British puppet government continue to bungle. Politically, both for Congress and for Truman, this is the easiest way out. Furthermore, it is virtually what we have been doing already.

Actually, it makes little difference whether United States cash is spent by the British or a British-puppet government, or by a new coalition government. As long as British troops dominate Greece the result is likely to be the same; continued turmoil—which plays right into the hands of Soviet agents.

As set forth in this column point by point last week, the British Labor Government is

now paying for Winston Churchill's policy—a policy based on kings, bluster, phrase-making, and lend-lease tanks. Churchill's errors cannot be undone overnight. It will take a surgical operation.

Looking for the remedy, history shows that one of the very successful reconstruction jobs performed by the old League of Nations was in Greek Macedonia, where the trouble-making Turkish population was removed, and where Greeks were taken from Turkish Anatolia and resettled in Macedonia. Previously there had been constant friction between the two countries. After the League performed this surgical operation, Greece and Turkey became good friends.

Today the old League of Nations, feeble and inefficient, is gone. Its place has been taken by a new United Nations, on which millions of people pin their hopes for a future warless world. And the big question now is: Will we circumvent the United Nations until it becomes weak and vitiated, or will we let it perform the peace-paving job for which it was formed and constituted?

UN EQUIPMENT

Today Greece needs money. The United Nations, in turn, has a World Bank with $9,000,000,000 gathering dust in its Treasury. The bank was established for the purpose of helping situations where the security of the world was in the balance—situations similar to Greece.

Greece also needs currency stabilization. The UN has a huge stabilization fund established for the very purpose of stabilizing foreign currencies.

Greece also needs for the moment a certain amount of police protection. Again, the UN has its joint military staffs, its Security Council, its blueprint for an international police force.

The Sol Blooms and others who believe in paying lip service to the United Nations but not relying on it claim that Russia would be able to sabotage a United Nations administration of Greece. Unquestionably, Russia would try.

However, General MacArthur has shown that the veto power works both ways, and that where Anglo-American forces have the upper hand the veto keeps the Russians in their place. The Soviet is represented on MacArthur's governing council in Japan, but he was first on the Japanese scene, and he runs the Japanese show. The same thing can be engineered in Greece.

LATIN-AMERICAN LESSON

One of the great lessons learned from our Pan-American relations is the importance of teamwork. Prior to the good-neighbor policy we worked as an individual Nation. We landed troops in Haiti, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic. We banged Mexico over the head with diplomatic threats and mobilized troops on her border. Result: All Latin America disliked us.

Then Sumner Welles sold Roosevelt the idea of being a good neighbor, of sharing responsibility. So when trouble arose in the Western Hemisphere, the Pan-American nations solved it as a team. Result: Fewer mistakes were made and when they were made Uncle Sam didn't get all the blame.

The British Empire, hitherto, has operated on a unit basis. It didn't worry about teamwork. Result: It is hurriedly liquidating parts of the empire and reaping bitter criticism in Palestine and Greece. Further result: The United States is asked to share the financial responsibilities—and the headaches—in one of those countries without having too much to say about the things that cause the headaches.

If we become the bankers for British headaches, the pain and the blame can extend to Turkey, Italy, north Africa, and all over the world. That's why we should take a leaf from the Pan-American good-neighbor book and let the United Nations get busy in Greece before it is too late.

Republican Leadership in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Gould Lincoln under the heading "The political mill," published in the Washington Star of March 11, 1947. In his article Mr. Lincoln discusses a letter written by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I think the letter ably answers some of the critics of the legislative program and the speed with which it has been proceeding. I realize that there are a few people who think that if a legislative body passes a new bill daily and appropriates a million dollars to carry it out, that is ideal legislative procedure. I also appreciate, however, that we are now dealing not only with an automobile which has been run off the road but with one which has been wrecked, and it is taking considerable time to do the repair work on it. In view of the fact that the letter expresses my own opinion and, I believe, the opinion of most of my colleagues in the Senate, I ask that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Acting President of the Senate VANDENBERG is indignant over what he asserts is deliberate propaganda in and out of Washington to discredit the new Republican Congress. This propaganda is taking two forms. The first is an effort to make it appear that the Republican leadership in Congress is violently divided and falling apart. The second is an effort to show that the Republicans in Congress are soldiering on the job. The propaganda, in the opinion of Senator VANDENBERG, comes particularly from Democratic New Deal sources, and is aided and abetted by writers and commentators who have the New Deal slant.

Senator VANDENBERG, who is himself very much a leader of Republicans in Congress, especially on the problems and issues of foreign relations, says that reports of dissension between him and Senator TAFT, of Ohio, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, are all poppycock. He admits he and Senator TAFT have not seen eye to eye on the appointment of David E. Lilienthal to head the Atomic Energy Commission, he favoring and Senator TAFT opposing Mr. Lilienthal. He contends, however, that disagreement of two Senators over a single appointment to office means nothing at all when it comes to cooperation on the Republican legislative program.

As for the charges that the Republicans have been slow and are lying down on their job, Senator VANDENBERG says that apparently Republicans out in the States are falling, in some cases, for the work of the propagandists. He has drafted a reply which he sends to every letter writer who criticizes the Republicans in Congress for delay. It covers the ground in detail and predicts that soon a mass of remedial legislation will be coming from the congressional mill. The letter follows:

"MY DEAR MR. BLANK: Thanks for your frank letter of March 3. I am happy to answer it in equal candor.

"I do not think there is the slightest justification for any impatience with the speed with which the new Republican majority in Congress is proceeding with its labors. We have been at work just 67 days. Our first necessity was a complete political reorganization for the first time in 15 years. Simultaneously our initial task was to complete the total procedural reorganization of Congress under the Reorganization Act for the first time in 150 years.

"These things had to be done before we could even start to function on our legislative program. In my own opinion, it was little short of a miracle that we were able to conclude these labors and get our factory in operation in 30 days.

"Thereupon our major legislative problems went to the new committees for study and report. Haste makes waste in legislation. Careless, impetuous legislation is one of the curses from which we have suffered for a decade. I have never seen more constant and earnest legislative labors than those of our committees, working night and day.

"You will soon see the results coming off the production line. You will soon see Federal expenditures cut by four or five or six billion dollars. You will see taxes reduced. You will see the portal-to-portal outrage effectively controlled. You will see new and far-reaching statutory protections in connection with labor-management relationships. You will see bureaucracy demobilized to the last possible man. You will see peace treaties ratified. You will see the constitutional tenure of the President limited.

"If a program of such magnitude is completed by next summer, it will be the greatest achievement in modern legislative history. If it isn't completed, you will be entitled to indict the new Republican majority. But I respectfully suggest that no indictment lies at the end of the first 67 days when we had to start from zero."

It is well within the possibilities that from the same sources now attacking the Republicans for delay will come howls of anguish when the legislation Senator VANDENBERG promises begins to roll.

Much has been made, too, of a request by the 16 Republican freshman Members of the Senate for greater participation and more information in the Republican councils. It has been played as a revolt. There is no revolt. There will be no effort at a change in leadership.

Extension of Pennsylvania Turnpike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in yesterday's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, entitled "Bring the Turnpike Here."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed, as follows:

BRING THE TURNPIKE HERE

The desirability of extending the Pennsylvania Turnpike from its present eastern terminus near Carlisle to Philadelphia becomes more evident every day.

The roads from Harrisburg to this city and other points to the east are not able adequately to handle the load of traffic given them.

To dead-end this fine superhighway at the very point where it is needed most is not sound traffic engineering. It should be brought into Philadelphia, and authority for the extension—as well as for that west to the Ohio line—was granted by the legislature before the war.

In the last several years the project fell into the doldrums. It is time it be revived. In this connection the suggestion made to Governor Duff by J. Maxwell Smith, president of the Keystone Automobile Club, is timely and sensible. Mr. Smith urges a legislative appropriation for an immediate survey of a route to be taken by the eastern extension.

Such a survey is an essential preliminary to construction, and it has the added virtue of entailing a relatively small outlay. One objection that has been raised against the proposed road, that it would cut a strip through large areas of richly productive farm lands, should be shown up as not valid by the survey. A route should be adopted that would avoid that particular farm section.

If preliminary action is not taken speedily on this improvement, the anomalous situation of an express highway doubly dead-ended and thus unable to provide the full measure of traffic convenience it is capable of might continue indefinitely. The survey should be made.

Hauling Down Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the subversive preachments of Milton Mayer, a University of Chicago professor, which I reported to the House last week, sentiments of which he unbosomed himself at Syracuse, N. Y., on February 16 last, in the following words:

We must haul down the American flag. And if I wanted to be vulgar and shocking, I would go even further, and say, haul it down, stamp on it, and spit on it.

I offer, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks, a blistering editorial which first appeared in the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal on February 17, 1947.

The editorial to which I have just referred is, Mr. Speaker, the following:

MAYER HARMS WORLD CAUSE

"If full acceptance of world government means hauling down the American flag and denying our patriotism toward the United States, then it's time to stop such fantastic international nonsense right now."

That was a fairly common reaction yesterday as central New Yorkers discussed the sensational remarks made in Syracuse Saturday night by Milton Mayer, of the University of Chicago.

Although Mayer broadcast a confused denial yesterday that he had advocated hauling down, stamping, and spitting on the American flag, the quotation attributed to him by a Post-Standard reporter was substantiated by responsible persons who were in the audience.

Aside from the extreme pacifists who have blindly opposed the United States Government since long before Pearl Harbor, the sincere advocates of world government recognize that Mayer has done their cause almost irreparable damage.

His crackpot theories have even undermined popular support of the United Nations, in the opinion of some loyal and patriotic citizens.

As Norman Thomas and Col. C. A. Edson, head of the Federal Social Security office in Syracuse and organizer of the local world government group, pointed out after Mayer spoke Saturday night, the best way to serve humanity and the broader world cause is not by casting off the established loyalties to home, family, city, State, and Nation.

When such persons as Milton Mayer take the view that the American flag should be reviled as a sign of world loyalty, their infantile opinions turn thinking citizens away from all internationalism, however sound. Loyalties are built on loyalties, not on disloyalty and treason.

If we are not careful, the professional pacifists will head us back on the road toward the narrowest of nationalism—and war.

Christ and Sex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Dr. Peter Marshall, minister, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.:

CHRIST AND SEX

In the midst of the problems of our complicated lives most of us, if we are honest will confess that it is difficult to put into practice the principles of Christ. In the first place, we do not have a clear idea as to what these principles are, because far too many of us have only a hazy notion of what the New Testament teaches. In the second place, Christ Himself is not real to us. He is still only a painted image, a figure in stained glass, an echo from the eastern shores of the Mediterranean long, long ago when the moon was a child's bubble and not the synthetic pearl it is today. Christ is still a stranger to the vast majority of people, even to many who are called Christians, for very few have any personal knowledge of Jesus Christ, have never met Him for themselves and become acquainted with the Presence. Far too many have only heard rumors of Christ's movements in the hearts and lives of their fellows, but again and again they have missed Him, as though He were some romantic figure moving about the pitched tents of an army at night. They have heard stories of Him whispered round the camp fires before which men seek to warm their souls. But it is all rumor and hearsay.

Christ has haunted each successive generation like the lingering sweetness of a Mozart melody. Poets have written about Him; musicians have sung of Him; artists have painted Him, all in an effort to capture His elusive loveliness that nevertheless has remained as evasive as the deepest yearnings of their own hearts, as unimprisoned as the fragrance of a thousand roses at dusk.

Yet here is what the records say about Him. After His death on the cross—and they all saw him die—He appeared alive, in a resurrected body, to His disciples, and to hundreds of His followers. Every last one of them was convinced that His prophecy that He would rise from the dead had been fulfilled, and no Roman threat or Jewish persecution could silence them.

Moreover, He had promised them the Holy Spirit, and He came at Pentecost and poured out His power upon them so that they were enabled to do the things that Christ had commanded them. Christ had sent them out into their world-wide mission with the promise that He would be to them an ever-abiding Presence, and that His help would be theirs in any situation, and sufficient for every need. That was their experience, and their testimony to us. It has been the experience of the saints of all ages, people of every race and color, who have found that the promise is true, and the Presence real.

Most of us who think of Christ at all are inclined to place Him in a sacred niche, to which we will come to pray on Sunday, or when we are ill, or in trouble, and try to avoid on weekdays and as long as things go all right for us. But Christ in the flesh dealt with ordinary life. All his illustrations were taken either from His own experience as a carpenter and a young man growing up in a humble home, living among the peasants of a little enemy-occupied country, or in His observation of the experiences of His friends and neighbors.

Perhaps the church in its worship of Jesus, has tried to keep Him in this sacred niche, and let Him speak only at funerals, at church services, and in lovely Bible stories, to little children at Sunday school. But Christ would have words with the businessman, and the politician, and the housewife, and the student, and O how He yearns to have words with youth—today's young people. He would talk, if they would listen, about the problems that confront them. He would talk of race relations, of war, of careers, and guidance in them. He would talk of the most basic things that trip them up, and He would help them in their difficulties.

One of the areas in which most young people find difficulty and need real help and guidance is in the matter of sex, and the problems it raises in their minds and in their lives. Next to hunger, the most powerful of human instincts is that of sex. You cannot escape from it, for you are made that way. It pulses in your blood, sings in your throat, and shines in your eyes.

Now sex will be either the nicest thing in your life—or it will be the nastiest—depending upon whether you use it or abuse it. Only in nasty minds are there nasty thoughts about sex. There is nothing shameful about the sex urge, but some people let it urge them to do shameful things. We have read about some of them, and the conduct of many of our soldiers, who as part of the army of occupation in Germany were ambassadors of America, has made us ashamed.

The Nazis taught the girls of Germany that it was their highest privilege to give themselves to the sexual gratification of Germany's fighting men, and their highest duty to produce soldiers for the Third Reich. Virginity was made unpatriotic, and purity was tantamount to treason. But the behavior of many of America's soldiers—officers and enlisted men alike—must have made the fraulein wonder if there is much difference between the Nazis and their conquerors. Hunger and misery have driven the youth of the war-devastated countries to submit themselves to revolting humiliations. Bodies have been sold for a few cigarettes, a cake of soap, or a candy bar. Mix lust with alcohol, add a few drugs, in a setting of human squalor and hopelessness, and you have human beings like broken fiddles, the nerves strung tighter and tighter until they snap.

But even before the war, here in our own country we had such vices, organized on a huge scale. It was organized vice in this country that made Al Capone a millionaire,

in his control of brothels and houses of prostitution.

Sex has been exploited and abused to sell almost everything. Scantily dressed girls have been used to advertise all sorts of products—toothpaste, perfume, and even spark plugs. Authors of recent best-sellers have vied with each other in their lurid descriptions of sexual orgies, until millions of readers have filed in the libraries of their imagination pictures that dance obscenely in the half-light of desire and passion.

In Sinclair Lewis' new novel Cass Timberlane, he draws pictures of 15 or 16 marriages where every religious foundation of marriage is left out. I do not know what Mr. Lewis set out to do, but it is very clear what he did do. He has shown with wonderfully vivid and skillful writing a whole mess of marriages without fidelity, or reverence, or religion, and he has shown what they turn into—deadly boredom. His book is a powerful picture of a blasted waste of acrimony, adultery, alimony, and alcohol. When fidelity is gone out of marriage and raw sex takes the place of love, the prop of a real marriage is gone.

A new movie, a spectacular and sexy western, which has been condemned by California branches of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish organizations, by the DAR, the American Legion Auxiliary, the Girl Scouts, and other groups, and threatened with a possible ban by the Legion of Decency, has, according to a national magazine, "reaped the usual reward: a 30 percent rise at the box office." This is a telling commentary on public taste and morals.

Hollywood, Tin Pan Alley, the tabloid press, the burlesque, and the pulp magazines have all contributed their quota to give the youth of America a greatly distorted view of sex.

Now with all these stimuli, and being young and eager and filled with desire, what are today's young people to do? You know as well as I do, that if they go to certain doctors and psychiatrists, they will be told to seek expression for their impulses and satisfaction for their desires. Young people in certain quarters are being told that they should do as they please. For if they deny themselves greater latitude in sexual matters, they will then suffer from things called "inhibitions," "complexes," and so forth. The idea seems to be "back to the jungle in the name of progress."

The old concept of "what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" is regarded as "bourgeois morality." Scruples are wrong and desires are right. Yet the plain fact is that people who live that way are not really happy. Look at them. They are haggard or bitter, torn by an endless search for something just within sight yet never within reach.

Surely the time has come for young people who sincerely want to follow the Christian life to find Christ's answer to the problems of sex. Christianity offers a full life—not the cramping of any God-given impulse or desire. We must keep before us the picture of Christ, and look to Him for the answer to our problem. We may be sure that if we look to Him we shall not receive only a blank stare. We may be sure that we shall be understood, and we shall realize that we are looking no longer at a figure in a stained-glass window; we are looking at a person who lives, and moves, and breathes, and understands, and who must have known and shared the earthly desires which we associate with the word "sex."

The Bible tells us that Christ, while in the flesh, was "tempted in all points like as we are, and yet without sin." If Christ was tempted in all points, then He was tempted at this point, where you and I are tempted. And let me say here that there is no shame or disgrace in being tempted. The shame comes when we yield to temptation. Remember the old Sunday-school hymn, "Yield not to temptation, for yielding is sin." That's the point.

One of the first things we learn about Christ in the Bible is that He was tempted by the devil: "If Thou be the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread." So spoke the Devil to Him in the arid wilderness, when He had been fasting for 40 days. If Christ had not felt the pangs of hunger, there would have been no point in this particular temptation. It was the same during the agony in the garden. Not only had Christ the ordinary man's capacity for feeling pain, but He had the ordinary man's capacity for dreading it. When He made that poignant supplication, "Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup from me * * * nevertheless, Thy will be done." We are told that, as He prayed, "His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground."

Christ was in fact God in human flesh—but the human flesh was whole and complete. Christ could not have had whole and complete humanity did He not know and suffer and conquer the temptations of sex. If you regard this idea with disgust, you had better go back to your painted image, which knows no emotions, which is gilded by a sunlight which it does not feel, and tarnished with a rust of which it is not aware. But as you do so, you must honestly admit what you are saying about Jesus Christ. You are saying that He had every human emotion except the greatest emotion of all. He was hungry, thirsty—yes. He was tired, angry, exalted—yes—but He was untouched by sexual desire. That is what you are saying. I simply do not believe it. For if Christ never knew sexual desire, how can He help us in our sexual difficulties? I do not think that we can speak to Christ in prayer of any emotion which Christ did not understand, and share, and conquer.

You will remember that it was Christ who said: "But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." On this basis, I venture to say that there is not a person here who is not under condemnation. Of course, Christ understands. Of course He was tempted. Desire must have entered into Him, and with a golden gesture have been transformed from the corruptible to the eternal. This golden gesture which Christ made toward sex is called in these days sublimation. And our problem is to discover, with Christ's help, to what extent the average man and woman can practice sublimation, and to what extent it is desirable to do so.

Now, sublimation means a sort of mental elevation, a conscious transmutation of energy into higher channels, and in the case of the sex urge, to elevate it into a creative impulse expressed artistically in redemptive ministry. Psychoanalysis has given it merely a hysterical interpretation. The mind of the amateur psychoanalyst is full of lurid little paragraphs from Jung and Krafft-Ebing concerning elderly governesses who have been removed to padded cells shrieking texts from St. John, because they have not been afforded the dubious satisfaction of physical intercourse. The word "sublimation" conjures up for him a ghostly cohort of pale priests with furtive eyes and fumbling fingers, of frenzied evangelists with high blood pressure and inflamed imaginations, of silly little undergraduates with no girl friends and a crucifix over their mantelpieces.

I believe that Christ knows more about sex than Freud and that we can go to Christ with our problems and find the answer—the only answer that will give true happiness, peace of mind, and the full, rich life that God meant us to live. But there is one misconception that must be cleared up before we proceed further, and that is that falling in love is one of the human rights that belong to every man and woman. Falling in love is not a human right at all, but a God-given privilege. Love, like faith, is a gift of God. No mother has any business assuming that her daughter has the right to be married. It may be that God's will for her is something else.

Very seldom do we find young couples taking into account God's will for their lives as they begin to think of marriage. People fall in love on almost any other basis than God's will. They fall in love on the basis of affinity, proximity, femininity, personality, affability, sociability, financial ability, and almost any other ability on God's earth except God's will. Perhaps one reason why some couples do not together seek God's guidance about their proposed marriage is the fear that He would say "No." But it is clear that the couples who cannot get on without each other are being outnumbered by the couples who cannot get on with each other. Any marriage that is based upon physical attraction alone cannot possibly long endure. Falling in love ought to be a very religious matter, for love is not only within the sphere of religion, but the center of religion. Any man who does not feel drawn nearer to God on falling in love may well ask whether he has fallen into lust instead of love.

Now if Christ's answer to the sex problems of the unmarried is sublimation, just what do we mean by that, and how is it applied to actual life situations? Imagine the instinct of sex as a stream flowing in a certain channel with great power in order to achieve a certain result, namely, the carrying on of the race. If, for various reasons, for certain individuals, marriage is not possible, we must not try to dam up the current, for it will break out somewhere, possibly in an unpleasant way—in unpleasant dreams, lustful imaginings, morbid curiosities, neurotic tendencies, and nervous break-down. It must be sublimated.

As an illustration of the sublimation of another instinct, suppose a boy gets hold of a good gold watch, and tries to see how it works, and stirs up the wheels with a rusty nail, the most helpful and constructive thing to do would be to give him an old broken-down alarm clock and let him try that, so that not only does he learn something about clocks, but the energy of an instinct is used up in a satisfactory way, being not dammed, but diverted. The Boy Scout movement is another good illustration of the diverting of the gang instinct from breaking into houses, stealing automobiles, into learning about nature, learning how to make things, how to work with, play with, and live with other boys and serve a useful function in the community.

The sex urge within each one of us is surely a powder keg—useful, but dangerous. It's not enough for the Christian to realize that he is sitting on a powder keg, and that he must keep the lid on. It's far better to take the lid off, and remove the powder and put it to work in some constructive way, to furnish the explosive drive to some brave new venture. It takes a passion to cure a passion. If we put our sex feelings all in a box deep down in our personality, shut the lid and try to forget there is anything there, we are acting in a way which will lead to trouble. The pent-up energy is as dangerous as boiling water in a kettle, the lid and the spout of which have been sealed.

Sublimation, in the teaching of Christ, will lead one to paths of service and consecration. It will not stifle the urge, but provide for it new and different outlets. For some, these will be found in teaching children, or in nursing. For others, it may be found in community work of some sort. Still others find it in writing, painting, music, or in crafts of various kinds. That there is a close connection between these things and the sex instinct is surely evident in the way we speak of a person being "wedded" to his art, "in love" with his work, of being "passionately" fond of poetry, and so forth.

The history of Christianity proves that multitudes of men and women have lived full and rich lives although they have renounced or been debarred from all sexual experience. They have found a vision and a purpose in life large enough to satisfy the whole of their instincts in the service of God and of their fellows. Only Christ can tell each one of us how to sublimate the unsatisfied sex urges that pulse through us normally and healthily. For the Christian, the answer is: "Ask Christ."

As I say that, I am aware that some of you may think the answer is begging the question. But I repeat that Christ has the answer, and He will reveal it in your case if you ask Him, and ask Him, and are willing to listen until He tells you what to do. In the meantime, when some sex urge pulses and throbs within you, turn it over to Him who understands so well and with sympathy and love will help you—as He has helped so many others.

There was Archdeacon Claude Frollo, the priest in Victor Hugo's Hunchback of Notre Dame, who confessed to Esmeralda that in spite of all his vows he loved her. "My dreams by night, as well as my thoughts by day, are full of thee," he cried. Even when engaged in his most solemn rites, he heard singing, the music of her voice * * * in his reading, the vision of her lovely face came between him and the holy book.

But this is not solely a masculine problem. There are women who have confessed to the same affliction. Here is a queen—Queen Guinevere in King Arthur's Tomb—who confesses:

"And every morn I scarce could pray at all,
For Launcelot's red gold hair would play,
Instead of sunlight on the painted wall,
Mingled with dreams of what the priest did say."

But what to do when thoughts of sex intrude, as they will, in your mind and beckon to your imagination? Why not turn them over to Christ, as they come? Here is one sure way. When these thoughts arise, could you not say to Christ in prayer: "Now, Lord, you know what has just come before me to torment me. All uninvited, these thoughts have come pressing upon my mind. Look upon them, O Lord. Guide me in relation to each of them. Bless me in relation to each of them. Use me in relation to each of them."

Think no shame that these thoughts come. Be ashamed only if you give them welcome and entertain them. Introduce them to Christ. They will either be condemned in His presence and slink away to leave you in peace, or they will be sanctified with His touch and under His guidance, drive you into some new path of service in which He can use you and them to His glory. Never mind about the problem of sex in terms of crowds. All that matters is your own case. If you should be inclined to go away thinking that what I have suggested is impractical or impossible, let me ask you, "Is it impossible for you?"

Anybody can have desire. The point is what shall we do with it? To satisfy desire when it comes, regardless of discipline, control, morals, or conscience, will give you temporary delight in the little dusty paradise of desire, which will suddenly crumble and leave you shivering and lonely. It will bequeath you shrunken husks, and vain echoes, and empty rooms where you cry alone. Our earthly ecstasies die into darkness, as in darkness they are born, and all your music is broken on withered strings.

But the fruits of denial are, by a sublime paradox, infinitely sweeter than the fruits of desire. It is easy to laugh about this, easy to mock, easy to rationalize. But I invite you to try it sometime and see if what I have said is not true. It must begin with you. For Christ's words were never spoken to the man next door. They were spoken to you. And it is in your heart that those words must vibrate in music or in discord, in your soul that the seed must be sown, to bear what fruit you will.

Government Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. E. F. McDonald, Jr., president of the Zenith Radio Corp., Chicago, Ill., in which he outlines his objections to the State Department and the Government of the United States engaging in foreign broadcasts.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZENITH RADIO CORP.,
Chicago.

The Honorable C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BROOKS: Some members of the State Department want to put the United States Government into the broadcasting business. They have advocated a government controlled International Broadcasting Foundation to take over short-wave broadcasting and disseminate American views throughout the world.

Even though the proposal is sugar-coated by a vague suggestion that domestic broadcasting companies and some institutions be represented on the board of trustees, the Government would run the show just as firmly as the British Government runs propaganda through BBC.

The State Department is already up to its neck in the field of international broadcasting, with programs going out in 25 different languages at a cost of more than $8,000,000 per year. The proposed foundation would make continuation of this war-born propaganda activity a permanent part of our Government, with substantial expansion and increase in cost.

In my opinion this is a bad and extremely dangerous proposal.

Here would be another instance of unnecessary Government competition with private enterprise, and in a field where American private enterprise has been notably successful. Imperfect as American broadcasting may be, it leads the world as a provider of entertainment and education, and as a force for influencing popular opinion. Government controlled broadcasting systems in other countries have never approached American commercial broadcasting in popularity—the United States has more broadcasting stations and more privately owned radio receivers than the rest of the world combined.

Long before the war American broadcasting companies, entirely at their own expense and with little prospect for financial return, erected and operated short-wave stations that sent American network programs all over the world. In countries where short-wave receivers were in general use, these American commercial programs were far more popular than the stodgy propaganda broadcasts from Germany, France, England, Italy, Spain, and so forth. They did more to sell American ideals and the American way of life than could any number of pontifical presentations of the unvarnished truth, such as the State Department's much publicized broadcasts to the Soviets.

At the time of Pearl Harbor there were 14 licensed international short-wave stations operating in the United States. All were erected by private capital, all were operated by their owners at a total cost over the years of many millions of dollars. During the war Government funds were used in construction and operation of additional short-wave stations, just as Government money was used to construct and operate munition factories, ship yards, etc. Now that the war is over, these stations should be sold to private operators in the same manner, and for the same reason that other Government-financed properties are passing into private hands.

There is no more reason for the Government to own and operate broadcasting stations than there is for it to publish newspapers and magazines. Nor is there any reason for the Government, which has neither experience nor skill in radio production, to spend millions of dollars developing radio programs.

Fairness and common sense demand that the Government pay for and use privately owned broadcasting facilities for dispatching radio programs, just as it uses railroads for dispatching freight, telegraph, and cable systems for dispatching messages, our newspapers and magazines for publishing advertisements and releasing news, etc. Instead of setting up a system to compete with those who pioneered our international short-wave stations, any Government money used for this purpose should be spent to support those who blazed the trail with their own private funds. Any other procedure would be the rankest kind of injustice, as well as being a stupid refusal to use the world's finest creative talent in the realm of radio.

No matter what our bureaucrats choose to call Government-sponsored international broadcasts of unvarnished truth, listeners in other lands will have just one term for them: Yankee propaganda. Most Americans resent or laugh at foreign propaganda that infiltrates this country, and are highly skeptical of news and radio broadcasts that come through the iron curtain of censorship. To all other peoples of the world we Americans are foreigners; obvious Yankee propaganda will only serve to arouse resentment and skepticism of all things American.

The one basic idea that the United States has to sell to the rest of the world is our American system of free enterprise. What could be more futile and ridiculous than using a bureaucratic broadcasting foundation to tell our story? What profit could there be in prattling the unvarnished truth about free America when the listener knows that the programs he hears are themselves a violation of the basic principles of American free enterprise? Why should we adopt the very practices that we criticize in other governments?

The most effective method of persuasion is by actual demonstration. There could be no better way of demonstrating to other peoples the real meaning of American free enterprise and freedom of speech than by giving them an opportunity to hear the tremendous variety of radio programs that are aired each day over our major networks. What a revelation it would be to countless impoverished millions to hear commercial announcers vying with each other to sell more soap, candy, automobiles, radios, watches, cigarettes, etc. And what a demonstration of democracy in action it would be to have people of the world hear two opposing American Presidential candidates tear into each other over the radio, and then hear the election results, and learn that the loser continued to enjoy life and freedom.

American radio programs, in spite of criticism leveled at them by blue-book writers, have the happy faculty of attracting large audiences. This is true in other countries as well as in the United States. If our daily schedules of network programs were sent out

by powerful short wave, we would soon create an incredible amount of good will and understanding throughout the world. American jazz is popular from the Aritic to Timbucktoo, and there is plenty of that broadcast everyday. Serious music has its lovers wherever there are human beings—they reach for everything from Bach to Gershwin. American networks broadcast many hours of the world's finest music every week. Music is the only international language that needs no translation. Our dramatic programs, variety shows, newscasts, commentaries, etc., have a freshness and freedom found on no other radio-broadcasting system on earth. True enough, some of these programs would require translation for a good part of our audience, but many could go straight, with perhaps explanatory announcements in other languages. It must not be forgotten that in virtually all countries there is a large nucleus of English-speaking people.

If we wish to do a really effective job of international broadcasting, the way to do it is forget all about bureaucratic foundations and send by short wave a selected schedule of network programs, modifying them only as prudent commercial practice dictates. I used the words prudent commercial practice because I believe that the best way, as well as the most American way, of sending our commercial programs overseas is to permit American short-wave stations to sell time to advertisers just as our domestic stations do. That will automatically bring to American international broadcasting the best audience-building brains of the country, and give to the rest of the world the great musical and dramatic talent that has made radio so popular in America. Under the acid spur of commercial results, broadcasters will develop new technics of audience building in foreign lands that will far transcend the best efforts possible for a known Government agency.

Then, if the Government still deems it necessary to enter officially the international war of words, it will find an enormous and receptive audience waiting for its programs from privately owned stations. It will also have available, and should use, the skill developed by free enterprise in radio, just as it found available and used for munition production the industrial skill developed by generations of free enterprise in manufacturing.

Both for the sake of economy and to give the rest of the world a true understanding of America, the State Department should be compelled to cease its present international broadcasting activities, and any proposal that the Government enter the broadcasting business should be defeated. The American broadcasting industry should be given an opportunity to expand in the field of commercial international broadcasting.

Very sincerely,

E. F. McDONALD, Jr.

P. S.—So that there can be no misunderstanding of my position, I assure you that Zenith has no interest, direct or indirect, in any chain or international broadcasting station. The views I have expressed are based entirely on my lifetime experience in radio.

Congress Is Working

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the criticism of the present Congress which has appeared in the press of the country, I wish to insert in the RECORD a column by Lowell Mellett which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday, March 11, 1947.

Lowell Mellett was for many years on the pay roll of the New Deal administration. Since returning to the newspaper field as a columnist, his writings have been almost 100 percent in support of the administration.

This column from the pen of such an ardent supporter of the New Deal cannot be charged with being politically partisan and may, therefore, be accepted at full face value as not presenting the Republicans in Congress in any better light than irrefutable facts warrant.

I commend it to my colleagues in the Congress and to the taxpayers of this Nation.

ON THE OTHER HAND

(By Lowell Mellett)

REGARDS CRITICISM OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AS UNFAIR

In all fairness to the Republican majority in Congress, it is proper to ask whence comes this clamor for more action? A public-opinion poll the other day revealed that the Grand Old Party had slipped politically since the November victory and now commands less than half of the popular vote. Immediately a number of Senators and Representatives, shaking their heads sadly, admitted it could be true. Their mail, they said, indicated that their constituents were becoming impatient, that they had expected more action than they were getting.

Who are these constituents and what did they expect? Did they expect to see a line of messengers carrying new bills up to the White House, each bearing the instruction, "Sign here," and the President duly signing?

Did they really expect to see a million Government workers out on the sidewalk in the January, or even the February, snow and the wheels of the Government whirring with a wholly new efficiency as a result?

Did some of them truly anticipate a tumbling of prices through the removal of controls and the reenactment of the law of supply and demand? Or that houses would begin rising like magic all over the land because of an end of Government "interference"?

It is matters like these that interest average voters, the men and women who make decisions on election day, presumably the same sort of men and women who are recorded in the public opinion polls. But there is reason for doubting that these are the voters who have been complaining to their Congressmen.

The complaints could be coming from another class, from those who have expected Congress to serve their special interests with a little more speed. These would include industrialists who had thought it wouldn't take Congress 10 weeks to slap labor down, the big taxpayers who had looked forward enthusiastically to a 20 percent tax reduction, the landlords who thought they had voted all controls off rents, the railroad owners who expected to be freed from the provisions of the antitrust laws.

Of course, there is still another class. It is composed of simple souls who believed what they heard or read and expected the newsreels to show them the gallant figure of ROBERT A. TAFT standing at the foot of the Capitol steps with one foot on the dead body of a dragon plainly recognizable as the New Deal, his trusty spear buried in its midriff. These are those who don't know what Senator TAFT knows, that the dread New Deal always was nine-tenths plain, ordinary, and necessary government and only one-tenth idealism—or nonsense, depending on the point of view.

So it is only fair to point out that Congress, in the face of every consideration, is doing as well as anybody had a right to expect. The one-tenth of nonsense—housing, health, education, and the like—has been set aside and the Republican majority is working hard at the plain, ordinary, necessary business of government.

Laws cannot be written and passed in a day. The greater part of the job has to be done in committees. And nobody can complain on that score. The committees have been working night and day and their work hasn't been easy. Shaping campaign promises into intelligent legislation, or any kind of legislation, requires the gathering of information and the reconciling of opposing views. It takes toil and sweat and time.

The Republicans are toiling and sweating. Give them time.

The Cotton Exchange Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, when there cease to be livestock markets through which ranchers who grow cattle and sheep and farmers who grow hogs can clear their labor in the form of animals on the hoof which they distribute through the mechanics of livestock markets, we can rest assured there will be less beef, less pork, and less wool, for the use of our people.

In other words, organized livestock markets placed a premium on the growing of such animals because he who devotes his time and his energy and his capital to such an operation knows full well that through the mechanics of a livestock market he can always liquidate his holdings and thereby sell his labor and collect his wage.

In the industrial field we attained our present method of mass production, and our present ownership of buildings, machinery, and machine tools through the corporate enterprise approach. By this I mean to say the program which we have attained could not have been reached through a single proprietorship or the old established partnership arrangement. A new device had to come into operation on a very large scale. This new device we now recognize as a corporate entity—the modern corporation with its hundreds of thousands of stockholders.

The modern corporation brought to us thousands of individual plants of the most modern design. In these plants we have the most intricate machinery and machine tools man has been able to design. Here in the United States we have more buildings, more machinery, and more machine tools than can be found anywhere else on earth.

And, too, here in the United States we have more skilled industrial workers. These workers who are educated in our grade, high schools, colleges, and universities bring their intelligence and individual skill and individual aptitudes and

their individual energy and coordinate all of these favorable factors with the physical existence and design of the buildings, machinery, and machine tools.

There are hundreds of thousands and millions of citizens who live simple lives, who exercise thrift, who accumulate savings. These citizens under our private enterprise system invest those savings in the corporate stock certificates, bonds, and debentures issued by the corporations legally chartered by our State and Federal laws, and in this manner the capital structures of the corporations come into being. And under the corporation management, acting with the consent of the stockholders, funds are invested in these buildings, machinery, and machine tools, as well as in the working inventories and other current assets owned by the corporation.

Millions of citizens invest their savings in corporation stocks, bonds, and debentures primarily by reason of the presence of two forces: First, their belief in the private enterprise system and the way it operates; and, second, because we have corporation stock exchanges where the holder of a corporate stock or bond or debenture may easily and without delay, and upon his own choosing, liquidate his holdings or switch from ownership of equities in one corporation to another corporation.

Therefore, it is as necessary under our economic and industrial system to have exchanges where corporate securities can be traded in without any delay whatsoever as it is to have livestock exchanges where animals on the hoof may be traded in.

Organized labor has now conceived the idea of closing—through the strike and picketing privilege—corporation stock exchanges and the commodity exchanges of this country. Organized labor goes a step further, and is now proposing to organize the employees of the banks of the Nation, with an idea that if certain situations arise the banks may be closed through the machinery of strikes and picketing.

As these further steps are taken by organized labor leaders and their rank and file, more and more of our people are coming to the conclusion that America cannot afford industrial strikes, and that continuing widespread industrial disruption threatens the well-being of all of the people of this country, and places in jeopardy not only the attainment of our domestic goals as represented by high production and employment, but these strikes and mass picketing move in the direction of arresting the flow of all social income, depriving the Government of its revenues required to maintain organized society, and certainly points the way to positive destruction of all of our international objectives.

If we can believe what our President has told us only today, we must accept the proposition that the present eminence in the world economic scene of the United States is such that instability here in our own country means instability throughout the world. If we can believe half of what the President has told us, we are forced to the conclusion that international peace and international prosperity—one and the same—depend substantially upon the achievement of industrial peace and economic prosperity here in the United States.

It may be possible for us to maintain our existence with the automobile industry closing down for a few months, and then for the farm machinery industry to close down for a few weeks by reason of strikes and picketing, and then for the packing houses to close for a few days; but, let me warn you that if our stock exchanges and our banks are to be closed by strikes, picketing, or otherwise, you can rest assured there is no reasonable peace or economic stability for the people of the United States or any other part of the world.

In this general connection I submit an editorial from the New York Journal of Commerce of March 5:

THE COTTON EXCHANGE STRIKE

Commodity and security exchanges provide essential machinery for the conduct of the Nation's business under the private enterprise system. They vastly facilitate the marketing of basic commodities and securities. The services they furnish are as vital to the public welfare as are those of public utilities.

The United Financial Employees Union yesterday closed the New York Cotton Exchange by a strike. For the first time, a labor union has used its power to close down an exchange. When Congress acts on pending proposals for the prevention of strikes in essential industries, walk-outs of this kind should stand high on the list of those subject to statutory curbs. Otherwise, the hedging and liquidity functions performed by the exchange could be shut down at any time by union action.

Even more serious than the precedent established by the strike against the exchange is the union's demand that employees of the exchange shall not be permitted to handle business of a member firm against which the union has called a strike. Were the New York Cotton Exchange to assent to this demand, it would in effect become a strong-arm agency to force member firms not only to recognize the union, even where the latter has few or no adherents among firm employees, but also to accede to whatever demands the union may make upon them in the future. In effect, the union would take over the authority to disbar exchange members from the benefits of membership, a power hitherto exercised only by the exchange itself and by the Commodity Exchange Administration under the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

Unions need no such enforcement agency to secure recognition under the Wagner Act. They should have no such power to enforce demands upon individual employers by withholding exchange service from them.

Commodity and security exchanges are not business enterprises. They are specially chartered institutions set up to enable their members to provide a public service. In more recent years, Federal regulation has regulated their activities in many ways. They must be conducted for the convenience and benefit of the public that uses them, subject to Government regulations, and not to promote trade-unionism.

A public-utility company could not agree to withhold service from customers having disagreements with labor unions. By the same token, a commodity exchange cannot consent to withhold its service from members who may become involved in disputes with the United Financial Employees Union. If unions make such preposterous demands, the exchange should be protected by law from such patently unfair labor practice.

The American Federation of Labor has been proud of its relatively peaceful record last year, when the Nation suffered the worst strike wave in its history. The New York Cotton Exchange walk-out yesterday is a serious blot on that record. The labor leaders concerned evidently do not realize the full implications involved. Congressional committees weighing new labor legislation should give close study to the issues involved in the Cotton Exchange strike, to see what can be done to prevent a recurrence.

That Budget Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial in the Bryan Daily Eagle, Bryan, Tex., on February 24, 1947:

THAT BUDGET CUT

Presidential budget cutting has had the right-of-way on Capitol Hill in the past week or two, and it has become plain that all is not peaceful in the ranks of the GOP-controlled Congress.

The Joint Legislative Budget Committee voted for a $6,000,000,000 cut in the Truman budget, and unquestionably this was done without a close study of the various items it covered. Possibly one reason for this action was that the party had been sold a bill of goods by Representative KNUTSON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who sounded off loudly and often in the campaign to the effect that the GOP, once more in power, would put through a 20 percent across-the-board cut in income taxes.

But it has begun to dawn on some of the more sober-minded in Congress—though perhaps no less politically minded than their Minnesota colleague—that a six billion slash at the budget cannot be taken without probable danger to the national security and welfare.

Such a cut would mean a reduction of approximately $3,000,000,000 in the national defense budget, and with world conditions as unsettled as they are at present—the international situation from the angle of this country has been made worse by weakening developments in Great Britain—some influential Members of Congress have about concluded this would be too heavy a cut, and a cut of $4,000,000,000 or less now appears more likely.

It probably is true that economy has not been the watchword with those in charge of the national defense. They want what they want, when they want it, and several years of preparation for and of fighting the most costly and terrible war in history has caused many to believe they can have their way if they fight hard and long enough. Without much question proper organization and a greater measure of coordination would permit the maintenance on a strong basis of the defense forces and enable a continuation of research and the development of modern weapons at less cost. But while this is a consummation devoutly to be wished, it cannot be secured in a day, and it should be agreed that the national defense should not be permitted to lag or go to pot while plans were being worked out for greater economy in the design and procurement of equipment and all needed supplies.

Next month the Foreign Ministers of the Big Four will meet at Moscow in what likely will be their most important conference, since it is scheduled to decide the future of Germany—and perhaps of all western Europe. With the British Government struggling with what appear to be almost impossible economic and financial problems, this is no time for the United States to be divided on such

an imperative matter as national security when its representatives will be going up against the strong position and will of the leaders of the Soviet Union. Also, because of the uncertainty of the future of Great Britain—whether it is to muddle through and regain its former world position or whether this country will be compelled, for security reasons, to assume and discharge some of the responsibilities the British have handled for so many years—it is no time to become indifferent to the national defense or to limit this in order to play politics with income-tax reductions.

The Senate GOP policy committee has voted, 22 to 19, against the six-billion cut, and the acknowledged leadership of this group is opposed to the cut. And perhaps Senator TAFT, admittedly the strong man of the majority in Congress, gave his colleagues a bit of political salve when he stated last week that regardless of budget reductions there would be cuts in income taxes.

But with world conditions as they are and with the public debt to be considered, cuts in income taxes should be a minor consideration, though if the GOP Members of Congress gave enough study to the Truman budget, item by item, they might make savings of constructive value and make possible, without danger to the national security, the keeping of such campaign pledges as that of the Minnesota solon.

Aid for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times by James Reston:

IMPLICATIONS OF GREEK AID WORRY TRUMAN'S ADVISERS—THEY EXPECT APPROVAL OF THIS LOAN, BUT WONDER ABOUT OTHERS IN UNSEEN FUTURE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—What worries President Truman's advisers at the moment is not the loan to Greece and Turkey now under discussion but the next one. They have few doubts that Congress will agree to the President's appeal tomorrow to block Russian expansion, but, they ask, what about the next tomorrow, the next strategic area threatened by Communist expansion, the next economic retreat by Britain?

President Theodore Roosevelt had a picturesque bit of advice for Congress on dealing with precisely this kind of problem. "Don't shake your fist and then shake your finger," he said. That is what is disturbing Mr. Truman; he is clear about the long-term policy he is introducing and he is convinced it is right and necessary in our interests, but he does not want to get committed and then get "sawed off."

The long-range nature of the problem before Congress now is clearly indicated by the history of Britain and Russia in the nineteenth century. Though the British and the Russians originally collaborated in Greece's fight for independence from the Ottoman Empire, the British fought one war and three times took grave chances of war to prevent the Russians from dominating Turkey and the eastern Mediterranean.

WORLD SECURITY AT STAKE

This process stretched over 50 years, however, and even at the outset of the recent war and today, protection of Turkish independence is still a fundamental of British policy and for the same reason; because it is thought to be effective in prevening a potentially hostile nation from controlling the eastern Mediterranean.

Considerable progress has been made in the last 10 days in making Congress realize that what is at issue here is not merely loans to Greece and Turkey, but a question of establishing a world security system through the employment of American power.

Despite this progress, however, few observers here believe that the full gravity of the decision is understood. The danger of a Communist flood is apparent, but the idea still prevails on Capitol Hill that it can be stopped by putting somebody's thumb in the dike.

In the private conversations one hears in the cloakrooms or the Hill there is a good deal of determination to halt the spread of communism in key areas like Turkey, but the assumption is often made that this can be done with money and that we can spend ourselves to safety without interfering with our plans to balance the budget and cut income taxes.

This, of course, is not a new phenomenon. When Disraeli ordered a naval demonstration in Turkish waters in 1878 to persuade the Russians to let up on Turkey and rewrite the Treaty of San Stefano, popular opinion in England was stirred up for his policy with a famous music hall ditty that went like this:

"We don't want to fight, but, by jingo, if we do,
We've got the ships, we've got the men, we've got the money too."

The difference today is that some Members of Congress would merely change the song to make it go:

"We don't want to fight, but, by jingo, if we do,
We've got the Greeks, we've got the Turks, we've got some money too."

This is the attitude that disturbs the President's advisers. They feel sure that if we take an active role in backing up the Turks and Greeks now, the Russians will merely play a waiting game, and they are frank to admit that patience is not our most prominent national characteristic.

Therefore, they are asking, not whether we should go forward with the policy of blocking Communist expansion in key areas—a course that, they proclaim almost unanimously, is inescapable—but whether the gap can be closed between what the President feels is necessary to do the job and what he feels Congress and the country will approve and support for a long time to come.

A PEACETIME LEND-LEASE

It is stated freely in private, for example, that what is needed in the economic field to do the job right is not two isolated loans but a kind of peacetime lend-lease act that would enable the President to "defend America by aiding the Allies"; and a specific political commitment to protect the integrity of Turkey.

In that way, dependence for stability on weak and undemocratic governments would be minimized and Soviet power would be confronted directly by the one thing it respects most—American power.

These things are not being asked because few officials in the State Department believe Congress would approve them. But this does not keep them from being afraid that we may again go into a difficult situation with too little and lay ourselves open to the charge that Lord Derby made against Disraeli's policy: That he merely "meddled and muddled" until Britain's "menaces are disregarded, its magniloquent language is ridiculed, and its remonstrances are treated with contemptuous indifference."

Address of Robert Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Robert Montgomery at the American Legion legislative dinner, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., March 11, 1947:

Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, when a man is asked to speak to distinguished guests as a veteran, it seems that the customary thing is to begin by stating in very modest tones that he would rather be in action facing the chatter of machine guns and listening to the whine of bullets than to be speaker of the evening. I would like to reverse the procedure and state quite frankly that I am glad to be here.

Whether my pleasure at being given this opportunity to speak to you is in some measure shared by you with the prospect of hearing what I have to say, I seriously doubt. Why, in the name of justice, a group of gentlemen who have spent the day as the targets for a considerable barrage of oratory should gather in the evening to risk the opportunity of being shot at again, I cannot imagine.

In my profession it is always easier to assume a role for getting across a message to entertain, frighten, terrify, or even repel an audience. I want you to bear with me tonight while I play a real part, a part that comes from right out of the heart, that is based on conviction, and in which the lines are written in reality and not in fantasy.

I want to speak not as a veteran of World War II. I want to speak as a veteran of all of the wars that have been fought by the brave men of this country during the 171 years of its life. I want to speak to you from the common heritage of all of our veterans, their sacrifices, their joint ideals, the visions that have bound them together through every decade and in every challenge to national integrity.

I ask you to imagine that there stands here tonight the shade of a man who represents, first, an odd-looking fellow whose feet are ragged, who is clothed in sacks, bleeding, cold, and worn; whose stomach is hungry; whose tricornered hat is beaten and torn; whose smooth-bored musket is ill-provisioned with powder and lead; whose single strength lies in the indomitable resolution of an irresistable vision. This man standing before you suffered hunger, freezing, and death without giving up, for an instant, the vision that he defended. This man fought what should be called the first world war, for, in achieving, in fighting, in suffering, and in his strength he won a world. He won a freedom, an ideal that has nourished and flowered the hope of men in every atmosphere for a century and a half, an ideal that has refused to admit reverse and has arisen again within our lifetime to extinguish the greatest threat to human dignity within a thousand years. This victory was the seedbed of the greatest achievement man has made in his existence.

As this man talks his words sound halting and perhaps even unfamiliar, but his theme is one that we will recognize, for in essence he says to us, "I fought to bring to you a

measure of human dignity; I fought to bring you a measure of freedom; I fought to give you a republic. That was the full measure of my triumph. That was my heritage to you."

Slowly, very slowly, a change is coming over the man as he stands here before you tonight and though the face remains the same, the uniform is changing. He wears tight-fitting white trousers, a faded blue jacket, blue-striped blouse, and straw hat. His heart is filled with the tradition gained from words of John Paul Jones, "Give me a fast ship, for I intend to go in harm's way." The man who stands before you now fought under Commodore Perry: "We have met the enemy and they are ours." May he never meet the enemy but that they are ours. I speak to you through the image of this man, a raw sailor, a man who aimed his cannon and fired his shot more with the zeal of an idea than with the training of an expert. It was a second test within a quarter of a century, a test for the ideal which had first triumphed, but which had, alas, to sustain many more trials.

Picture this sailor who stands beforé you, clad only in light woolen uniform, shivering and raw from icy winds, wounded and unattended at the salvo of shot and shell, as typical of all men who fought once more to save this Nation's freedom. If this man who fought on nerve and brawn and guts could talk, he would undoubtedly say, "I fought to bring to you a fuller measure of human dignity; I fought to bring you a greater measure of freedom; I fought to preserve your Republic. That was my triumph. That was my heritage to you."

Again the scene shifts. Standing before you now is a man whose uniform is indistinguishable in color—the color of the uniform is not important for he is the symbol of the men who tested and solved providentially the division of a nation; he is the symbol of the men who marched, rode, sailed, and bled, and out of their sufferings gave this country a new birth of freedom. And when he speaks to you he says, "I fought to bring you a still greater measure of human dignity; an even fuller measure of freedom. I fought to preserve this Republic. That was my triumph. That was my heritage to you."

Now comes the man who wore the olive drab in foreign fields, not once, but twice; the man who went into battle at the Argonne and Chateau Thierry, and who carried the flag across the Hindenburg line in 1918 and returned to carry it once again across the Siegfried line in 1945; who planted it at Suribachi, and the Solomons, and finally Tokyo; and who fought in India, China, and Leyte Gulf; and made that flag and the country which it represents a living symbol of the deliverance of the human dignity and of the living soul that is man.

So there is a picture of the veteran who might be standing before you tonight—a composite veteran of all the veterans of all the wars that this Nation has fought—1776, 1812, 1861, 1898, 1917, and 1941.

Throughout every war he has been motivated by a very simple principle which impelled him to wage battle and to gamble human existence for benefits which he could not normally hope to enjoy but which meant the difference between life or hell on earth for his fellow men.

Let him speak to you, and listen to what he has to say—

"I fought," he says to you, "to bring freedom to the individual and to man collectively. I fought for the right to choose one's own destiny and one's own method of achieving it.

"I fought finally to preserve the Republic, for having assured its preservation I had more assurance of human dignity and freedom, not only for myself and children but for all mankind.

"I fought to preserve a pattern whose structure was not limited by a country or a continent, but a pattern by which any man, of any nation, or any race, and of any creed could be guided in his fight for freedom."

A man can shed his blood on a battlefield, or gasp out his last breaths in a smother of ocean foam. You men can render this sacrifice miserable, ignorant, worthless, or you can make it the greatest investment for the future that man could offer. You can dignify it and justify it, or you can nullify it completely.

May I suggest to you that you adopt a yardstick in making your personal decisions, in your votes in committees, and in your speeches upon the floor of the House and Senate.

That yardstick can be applied to every act or proposal which comes before you, whether it deals with the domestic affairs of our country or whether it affects our relationship as a nation with other nations.

What is this yardstick?

What is this standard of measure by which you can render worth while the sacrifices that have been made by the veteran?

It is simply this:

Does this proposal, this act, this piece of legislation, bring to the community, the State, the Nation, a fuller sense of the meaning of the word "freedom" as we know it?

Does this proposal, this act, this piece of legislation, bring freedom to more and more and more people throughout the world?

In this time of problems, of extreme trial and perplexity, we need, each one us, to remember the men—each one typical of the other—who took us through other trials no less onerous and no less dangerous. These men won a nation, they defended a nation, they preserved a nation against internal division, and finally they defended it successfully against two deadly assaults from without.

Our task is to dedicate our minds and our hearts to the same task to which these men gave their blood and bone and sinew; to see America in its greatest hope; and to labor with heart and soul and mind to bring the Nation to that degree of human liberty and freedom and opportunity for which they risked everything.

You men who guide the destinies of this Nation, and the future of 140,000,000 of people endowed with a richness of opportunity almost beyond human comprehension, have it within your power to bring this Nation to the pinnacle of opportunity. And when you have brought it there by your efforts, you will have brought the world with it. It will take every ounce of sincerity, of wisdom, of judgment, of temperance, of prayer, of dignity with each one of you. The task you face is staggering in its immensity. But you can meet it. You can meet it and conquer it by dipping deep into the wellsprings of your integrity and sincerity.

If we are not to dedicate ourselves, each one, to the advancement and preservation of these ideals which have perpetuated our national life and our national honor, then mankind has lost forever the dearest vision which ever graced this earth. It is up to you. We have won the victory. The question now is: Will you search your hearts and make it worth while?

Will you as Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives be able to say to the generations to come: Not only did I fight on the land and on the sea and in the air, but, as a representative of our people and of all mankind, I fought to bring you a greater measure of human dignity, a fuller measure of freedom. That was my triumph. That is my heritage to you.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolutions of the Lithuanian Council of Societies, meeting on February 16, 1947, for the observance of the Bill of Rights Week and Lithuanian Independence Day:

Citizens of the city of New York, gathered under the auspices of the Lithuanian-American Council of Societies at Webster Hall on the 16th day of February 1947 for the observance of the Bill of Rights Week and Lithuanian Independence Day, after due deliberation on the international situation prevailing in Europe after the military victory, take note of the following:

"The Atlantic Charter and four freedoms held out the promise of freedom, happiness, and justice to the peoples of Nazi-enslaved Europe. This promise was eagerly accepted as a binding contract by the enslaved peoples. Anti-Nazi resistance movements were formed and the instructions of the radio voice of America were scrupulously followed and carried out by the underground, including the exceptionally well coordinated Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation.

"These principles were written into the initial declaration by the United Nations of January 1942. Several declarations to liberated European peoples made jointly by the heads of state of the Big Three Powers seemed to carry out these promises.

"Following the military victory, however, the Asiatic peoples of the Philippines, India, Indonesia, Burma, Indochina, Syria, Lebanon, and Korea are the only beneficiaries of the Atlantic Charter which was originally intended for European peoples. The 'liberated' peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, and the Ukraine are, in fact, subjected to an enslavement which is more brutal than their former enslavement by Nazi Germany. The peoples of the Baltic states are subjected to systematic mass extermination and deportations of the indigenous Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian populations.

"At the same time, masses of political refugees from the Baltic states and Poland are subjected to a regime of moral and physical terror and oppression at the hands of the UNRRA with the assistance of the American occupation forces which are left unguided in consequence of the uncertainty, wavering, and continual confusion created by conflicting directives.

"While Russian and Russian-satellite delegates to United Nations debate and deride human rights, the victorious democracies lack the courage to look squarely at the facts and to demand the restoration of freedom to the Baltic peoples. Of all the war-ravaged countries, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were and are alone denied any and all relief and rehabilitation assistance by UNRRA which is paid for by the people of the United States. The principles of justice and the Atlantic Charter are absent from the so-called peace treaties dictated by Russia.

"Lithuania, the immediate neighbor of Germany, and Latvia and Estonia, likewise vitally interested in the settlement of peace

for Germany, were thus far excluded from the preliminary negotiations regarding the peace treaty for Germany. The forthcoming Moscow Conference on Germany similarly excludes any and all representation for the Baltic peoples, although both the Democratic administration and the Republican Party are committed to the defense of the restoration of the political sovereignty and freedom for the Baltic states.

"Wherefore, we demand:

"That the President and the Secretary of State guide the foreign policy of this country back to the principles of justice and the Atlantic Charter;

"That the Moscow conference be limited to preliminary discussions with no commitments binding the United States;

"That the American delegation to Moscow and to all other international conferences affecting German settlement include Lithuanian-American experts;

"That the United States demand forthwith the withdrawal of the Russian occupation armies, NKVD-MVD terrorist police, and Communist Party forces from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and lend assistance to the peoples of the Baltic states, if requested by the accredited legitimate diplomatic agents of those countries, in restoring the political sovereignty and interim regimes of those countries.

"Finally, taking note of the 1-day hunger strike by Baltic political refugees on the opening day of the Moscow Conference on March 10, 1947, in order to remind the hardened consciences of today's masters of the world of their grave moral responsibility, we ask the United States Senate

"(a) to deny ratification of the Russian-dictated oppressive peace treaties signed in Paris on February 10, 1947, and

"(b) to refuse to join the proposed International Refugee Organization, which embodies oppressive constitutional provisions. Baltic and Polish refugee communities are fully qualified to administer their affairs without the aid of any intermediary agency infested with the agents of the Russian NKVD–MVD, and the aid by the American army of occupation may be rendered directly to the refugee communities.

"LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF SOCIETIES,
"STEPHEN BREDES, JR., *Chairman.*
"MARY M. KIZIS, *Secretary.*"

District of Columbia Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, early in this session of the Eightieth Congress, in fact on the first day of the session, I introduced H. R. 148 to raise the present gasoline tax in the District of Columbia to 4 cents per gallon. This would adjust it nearer to the average of the several States, which average is 4.6 cents per gallon. The Federal Government also has a tax of 1½ cents per gallon, which would make the total gasoline tax in the District of Columbia 5½ cents per gallon. The gasoline tax in the various States ranges from 4 cents per gallon to 7 cents per gallon, plus the Federal tax of 1½ cents per gallon, which makes the rate in the various States range from 5½ to 8½ cents per gallon. I mention these rates in this connection because some irresponsible businessmen inferred that 5½-cent gasoline tax in the District was far above anything in existence.

A few days ago H. R. 2283 was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It proposes to accomplish the same result which I had in mind, except that this bill would make this 4-cent-per-gallon District tax permanent. I feel that this is the proper and necessary thing to do, and I am in full accord with making this tax permanent. A 4-cent gasoline tax for District purposes has been approved by various citizen groups, the civilian advisory group appointed by the District Commissioners, and others, and is strongly and vigorously supported by the District Commissioners and Captain Whitehurst, of the Highway Department of the District.

This money which an additional 1 cent of gasoline tax will produce for the District of Columbia is urgently needed, and has been earnestly requested by the Highway Department for a number of years. In fact as early as 1941 Captain Whitehurst strongly recommended this additional tax. Highway improvement work is badly needed and much capital highway improvement is necessary. The city is growing and expanding, new streets are being opened and improved, and the need is becoming increasingly critical.

Nevertheless, whenever Congress suggests fair and appropriate action on any subject vital to the District of Columbia, various reactionary and selfish agencies in this city begin a program of misrepresentation and vilification. Of course, by doing so they emphasize their unreliability and unfairness, but as a Member of Congress I am becoming disgusted with this kind of disservice to the District of Columbia, and the confusion such misconduct creates. If these incompetent organizations will investigate the facts they will easily ascertain their own absurdity.

The most comprehensive study ever made of this District of Columbia gasoline-tax subject was that made by a subcommittee of this House under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. This report was the result of extensive hearings, consultations with highway officials of the States of Maryland and Virginia, and the compilation of information secured from the District Commissioners and the highway department of the District of Columbia. It was filed early in 1941. It has never been refuted or disproven by any of the agencies now attacking this proposed gasoline tax of 4 cents per gallon. Nor has it been disproven by anyone else who has made a careful study of this subject.

The city newspapers carried a news story purporting to quote representatives of the Federation of Business Men's Associations and the District Petroleum Industries Committee, both organizations of persons in the District of Columbia, in which they denied the need for any more highway funds in the District of Columbia. Men of this class would be presumed to have more common sense than was exhibited in this instance. If the newspaper quoted them correctly, they demonstrated superlative ignorance of this subject and shocking unfairness in their approach to this subject. These statements were prompted either by ignorance or fraud. They were not based upon a true analysis of this subject, and these men should have known it or have kept still. Their statements do no credit to their intelligence. The trouble with these groups is that they have no desire to be fair or state the truth, and they represent or misrepresent a very small segment of Washington citizenry. I would be keenly disappointed if a very considerable segment of Washington citizens were guilty of this kind of misstatement. I would be convinced of their unfairness where they make such ridiculous statements, on one hand, and, on the other, ask Congress to make a larger contribution to the District of Columbia budget.

Such attitudes as this, backed by such irresponsible statements, has caused the defeat of proper legislation on this subject of congressional responsibility to the District of Columbia in the past, and it will continue to bar such legislation in the future. Congress has a desire to be fair with the District of Columbia when citizens of the District assume an attitude of fairness and honesty with Congress.

For myself—and I believe that I have the same attitude on this subject as many Members of this House—I do not intend to so "supposedly equalize" this Washington tax problem as to make Washington a haven for tax dodgers. There is a constant and ever-present disposition on the part of groups of the kind I am discussing here to "mooch" on the Federal Government in the question of tax adjustment, which probably accounts in a large measure for the lack of action by Congress on the supposed question of tax-burden equalization.

There is broad room for argument as to whether Washington citizens are carrying a share of the tax burden comparable to that of citizens of the various States. The tax burden should be so adjusted as between our constituents and the District citizen that each will carry his fair share of the tax burden of the Nation's Capital. However, the Washington taxpayer is not entitled to pay less than our constituents for the same service. When it comes to road improvement taxes the problem is much simpler, as it is simply a numerical comparison of tax rate per gallon. If we are partners in Washington, then Washington citizens should do as much for their local tax problem as our constituents do for their tax problem. Washington has no right to levy only a 3-cent gasoline tax when it needs 4 cents, or even more than that, and then "weep great tears of begging" for Congress to contribute more to District expense budgets, when their partners in my State pay for all their road and highway improvements with a much higher gasoline tax than the District. Consistency is as

much a tax jewel as it is in any other life relationship.

If this group of disgruntled so-called businessmen do not want to bear their just share of the general tax burden and feel that they can relieve it by so doing, they should move out of Washington. When this bunch of self-righteous figure jugglers do so move out, they will find there is no place they can go where they will pay as low a gasoline tax as they do here. Their next stop will be in a 4-cent gasoline tax State, or from that on up to 7 cents. As for me, I am not going to be a party to a program of contribution to the District of Columbia budget that will result in District residents paying less taxes than my constituents pay. I do not believe that Congress will do that either. Taxes are a painful experience in any event, and should be evenly distributed where that is possible.

After reading these newspaper accounts of these supposed businessmen's groups, I am convinced that they desire and intend to "mooch" all they can from the Federal Government without regard to what is their fair share of the tax burden. That is a desire which manifests itself too frequently in this city, and as a Member of Congress I am becoming disgusted with it.

Congress desires to be fair to the residents of the District of Columbia, but it gets no help from such selfish groups as I am discussing now. So far as I am concerned, what they say will be entirely disregarded by me until they can analyze facts and get nearer to the truth.

Now let us see what are the facts: The Poage report discloses that the highway fund never has been sufficient to meet the street and highway needs of the city of Washington. In fact, this record shows that the highway fund "mooched" on the general fund and the Federal Government to the extent of $42,035,447 from the time this fund was established in 1924 to and including the fiscal year of 1941. The policy of spending more for street improvements than the highway fund produced was discontinued in 1938, and since that time needed work has been delayed until funds are available. This has resulted in much needed street repairs being delayed beyond the time when they are badly needed in many instances. A reference to this report will also disclose that although the population of Washington has practically doubled since 1924, that the highway department has little more funds available per annum now than 20 years ago.

In 1941 the District director of highways requested that the District gasoline tax be increased to 4 cents per gallon and a bill to that effect passed this House. In the meantime, war was declared, and the Senate cut the tax back to 3 cents, where it is now, on the excuse that wartime restrictions would curtail street repairs and capital improvements and the money would not be needed. This is now recognized to be a false economy, as the streets continued to deteriorate and capital improvements piled up on us with no accumulated backlog of highway funds in the District treasury to meet this accumulated need. This condition has been called to the attention of the Congress and the public by District officials so often that it would seem that its truth should be self-evident.

There is another phase of this subject which further reflects the ignorance of these groups. The District of Columbia along with the several States is entitled to share in Federal highway funds to the extent it is able to match dollar for dollar the amount allocated under the terms of the Federal statute. No funds are available except upon a basis of investment of an equal amount by the State or District. The Highway Department of the District of Columbia has repeatedly called attention to the fact that its participation in this fund is being jeopardized by lack of sufficient funds. However, I assume that this danger does not concern these business groups if they can mooch a little more from the Federal Government. I am astounded that irresponsible business groups would be willing to jeopardize the larger program in order to save momentarily.

There is no excuse for the statement that these groups have figures showing that the present gasoline tax income is sufficient to meet the needs of this city. I assume that the city could exist without any gasoline tax and allow the streets to remain as they are, and we could probably travel them in some fashion for considerable time. The proper method is to keep these streets in current repair, and make capital improvements when they are needed rather than to allow these things to accumulate until they become a collosal burden. The old adage might be pertinent to this situation, "figures do not lie, but liars figure."

Leaving all of this argument about gasoline tax income and needed street repairs out of our consideration for the moment, the man in the street knows that when you compare the street requirements of 1924 to 1933 with that of the present time, that the requirements of Washington are or should be much more, if proper consideration is being given to needed improvements and repairs now. This man in the street also knows that when we have a highway tax situation now which provides very little more revenue than was produced in 1924 to 1933, that something is wrong with the conclusions of these pseudo business groups. Either they are grossly ignorant, or they want to bleed the Federal Treasury for every dollar they can get without regard to fairness.

If I were convinced that this is the attitude of any considerable number of the citizens of this District, I would be opposed to any tax relief for them until they changed their minds.

There may be some room for difference of opinion as to what is a fair share of the real or personal tax burden but there can be no room for argument on a gasoline tax. The taxpayers of Indiana pay a 4-cent State gasoline tax, plus a 1½-cent Federal gasoline tax, and that adds up to 5½ cents total gasoline tax as it now is proposed for the District of Columbia. A representative of the Federation of Business Men's Association "bellyaches" about a like tax for the District because it amounts to a 40 percent gross sales tax. Whatever it amounts to it is the same in Indiana and many other States of the Union, and in many of them more up to 7½ cents State and Federal. If the money is needed for good streets and highways, we either levy it or do without the improvements. The people who use and wear out these roads and streets pay this tax and they are willing to pay it out in the States to have good roads. In fact they are willing to pay it everywhere else but here in the desired haven for tax dodgers.

Is a 5½-cent gasoline tax any more burdensome on District residents than on Indiana residents, and that of many other States? Or 6½ cents in Virginia and West Virginia? Or 5½ cents for Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland? Or in some other States 7½ cents? It is no less anywhere than 5½ cents total, Federal and State, so what is the matter with Washington?

The principal thing which these groups have done is to show their ignorance of this subject and demonstrate their prejudice and "mooching" tendencies. In brief, here is their idea of fairness. They are willing for my Indiana taxpayers to pay a gasoline tax of 5½ cents per gallon—that is, 4 cents State and 1½ cents Federal—to keep up Indiana State roads, and they want to pay a less gasoline tax than that and have Congress donate $8,000,000 or more to the District of Columbia budget, and transfer whatever is needed from the general fund of the District to the highway fund of the District, and thus accomplish by indirection the tax fraud of having Indiana taxpayers keep up Washington streets because Washington fails to pay its share as demonstrated by the average of the Nation. If 4.6 cents State tax plus 1½ cents Federal, or 6.1 cents per gallon, is the average, what are these so-called businessmen kicking about? If Congress were asking the District of Columbia motorist to pay more than the lowest figure among the States, these whimpering tax dodgers might have something of which they could complain. The highway fund is now inadequate, and they know it; if they want to be fair, they should not object to a gasoline tax the total of which will be six-tenths cent below the average.

If these said businessmen's groups were considered to be right, then everyone else who has ever studied this problem is wrong. All of the States of this Union, Congress, District Commissioners, citizens' groups are out of step but these small-visioned, selfish business groups. That is why there is so much criticism leveled at groups of this character. They are so blind they can only see their side of the problem. This problem has two sides, that of the taxpayer in my State and other States of this country, and the District taxpayer. When the District taxpayer pays less than his share, the Indiana taxpayer pays more than his share.

The thing Congress tries to do is balance the tax load, but it seems we get very little help from these businessmen's groups. The District taxpayer should not be overloaded, nor should the District taxpayer mooch on the Federal

Government. We may have some difficulty with this balancing problem, but its complexity should not cause us to shrink from our duty. However, the duty to honestly tackle this problem rests alike on the citizens of Washington and Congress. The problem is not solved by such foolish enunciations as came from the groups I have mentioned.

A gasoline tax for road improvement and maintenance of 4 cents District and 1½ cents Federal is no more burdensome in Washington than that same tax in Indiana, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, or the higher gasoline tax in Virginia and 10 other States. The gasoline-tax money is used for no purpose except highway improvement, and right now is badly needed here in Washington. Do you "bellyaching" businessmen want to pay less for roads than the rest of these United States? If you do, you are going to get badly fooled and not only that, you jeopardize your whole problem of equitable tax distribution. If your reasoning is so much in error when plain comparison of numbers is involved, how do you expect Congress to give any weight to your reasoning on complicated real estate and personal property taxes? Possibly what Congress should do is hike your general tax rate, and make you carry the load and like it. No, Congress should not be unfair just because you are unfair. Congress should quickly adjust the District gasoline tax of 4 cents for District use, as the District needs the money for its highway program and necessary maintenance. I respectfully suggest to my colleagues of this Eightieth Congress that we do not permit an unfair burden to remain on our constituents in order to favor selfish groups who desire to evade their share of their just responsibility. I appeal to you to enact H. R. 2283 into law at the earliest possible moment.

More World Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 134, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] proposes to place in President Truman's hands $350,000,000 to be used by him at his discretion for world relief. This amount is to be dispensed in countries devastated by war.

The columnist, George E. Sokolsky, has analyzed the provisions, purposes, and probable results of House Joint Resolution 134, so well that I include his article as a part of my remarks. I am in full accord with Mr. Sokolsky's views as expressed in his article and recommend the same for the attention of my colleagues in the House.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 11, 1947]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The UN proposed a bill which the State Department sent to Congress and which Mr. EATON, of New Jersey, introduced into the House of Representatives as Joint Resolution 134.

This bill provides that during the calendar year 1947, $610,000,000, exclusive of remaining UNRRA shipments and other relief measures, be contributed to Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and probably China, of which amount the United States is to contribute 57 percent, or $350,000,000. Past experience indicates that little or nothing will be contributed by other countries.

The congressional committee in charge of this bill might wisely investigate all the so-called contributions, including those to UN itself, heretofore agreed upon, to see exactly what contributions have been made by other countries.

My own inexact calculations, based upon estimates not including hidden data, would lead to the conclusion that we paid in the neighborhood of 90 percent of such contributions, directly or indirectly.

UNRRA collected 72 percent from the United States and probably, through loans and advances, practically all the costs of its operations.

This bill for $350,000,000 is one of a series, broken up so as not to look so big, which aggregate $1,500,000,000 to which the United States is to commit itself.

Under Secretary of State W. L. Clayton, in advocating this measure of relief, made certain statements which he cannot know to be true, as for instance, that with the possible exception of Austria, "these countries will not need further relief after 1947." How does he know?

Subsequent to that statement by Clayton, Great Britain offered to dump Greece into our lap, which may yet be done, and which places upon us a new burden that may last a generation.

Herbert Hoover has made separate reports on Germany and Austria which indicate altogether a different picture. Italy is on the verge of revolution, the nature of which no man can foretell. Poland requires no relief; to her has gone 25 percent of Germany's normal food supply and actually Poland should by the next harvest be a food-exporting country. Of course, if all her exports go to Soviet Russia, that will not solve any European problems.

Actually, the Eaton resolution does not propose that out of the generosity of our hearts, we feed the needy. It proposes that the President—which means, in this case, Dean Acheson and Will Clayton—may transfer supplies and funds to governments.

In a word, we give them money which they may use as they choose, even for political activities against us, or we supply them machinery which they can sell or give to other countries or which the Russians and French can take from them as reparations, which is a diplomatic word for robbery.

There is a provision in this resolution that no relief assistance shall be given to a government unless it assures the President that it will use the funds as stipulated, that representatives of the American press and radio will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully on what goes on. The President of the United States is to be furnished full reports on request.

Is this being asked today from countries which have broken every promise? What about the free and unfettered election in Poland? What about the American press and radio delegation to Moscow? What about the jailing of 100 American citizens in Poland on the basis of dual nationality? What about the use of UNRRA funds for political purposes in Hungary and Yugoslavia?

And finally there is no provision in this bill for repayment or for a standstill of reparations by countries receiving such relief. Is America to send $350,000,000 to Europe which will only be used to pay reparations?

We have already contributed about $6,500,000,000 for civilian relief in Europe and Asia—and look what has happened!

Herbert Hoover says of this:

"No relief should be given where either commodities or cash are going out of that country for reparations or the purchase of arms. Such commodities or cash should be used to pay for food."

And so it ought to be. If this bill is recalculated on the basis of Hoover's German report, not more than $200,000,000 is needed for the current fiscal year.

Adequate Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I have received from Mrs. Ruth Hundley, a Gold Star Mother, and a resident in my congressional district. Mrs. Hundley, representing the American home, emphasizes so clearly the need for maintaining adequate defense to prevent future global conflicts that I wish others to know of her deep feelings on this important subject. Her letter follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 24, 1947.*
The Honorable C. JASPER BELL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE BELL: I have recently returned from an epochal flight to Ipswich, Australia, where I visited the grave of our only son, Lt. Wyatt Hundley, a bombardier who was killed in action in January 1943. I will always be grateful to my good husband for having encouraged me to make this pilgrimage to this far-distant land for now many of the queries that have continually risen in my mind have been satisfactorily answered and the queries have been replaced with some high resolves.

I shall never forget my first visit to my son's grave—there, kissed by the warm sun of Ipswich, lay a valley studded with more than 1,400 white crosses, and I invite you to walk down an avenue of crosses with me 'til I reach the one that bears my son's name—there it is, Lt. Wyatt Hundley, O726171. He was the youngest officer in the United States Army when he was commissioned in June 1942; he was only 4 days past 19 that day he died, a clean, brilliant, lovable, Christian lad who made this home a heaven on earth. His father and I had taught him that freedom and those high principles upon which America was founded, were worth any price. He has paid a dear price to win this war, along with nearly 400,000 of our worthy youth. Are you still standing beside me, Mr. Congressman, at grave No. 1203 in Ipswich? I covered every inch of his grave that day, Judge BELL, with my two hands and I promised him there on my knees that whatever I could do to save still another generation from war, I would do. It is because of that promise that

day that I write you, Mr. BELL, my Congressman, to continue your good record favoring adequate military preparedness; I have no voice in the shaping of my country's destiny, save through our duly-elected Congressmen.

Even as I write this, men are meeting to determine what America shall do about the islands that may mean so much in the preservation of the peace that has been bought with the lives of so many of our youth and I urge that you do your full share and more to see that America does not relinquish these strategic island air bases. I urge you, too, to insist that the budget be enlarged if need be so that military preparedness will not be curtailed in any branch and I should further like to lay a burden upon your heart to assist wherever it is possible to remove from high places of authority in Washington, those men whose Americanism is questionable. There is a movement on foot among the clergy, particularly among Methodism, my own church, to lessen our preparedness program, particularly as regards the atomic energy research and I beg you in the name of one who has loved an only child only a little less than she has loved her country, to oppose any action in Washington that will make America less strong than she ought to be.

May God forgive any lawmaker in Washington who does less than his very best to keep America great and fine and noble. Surely that is not too much to ask when we who have lost sons tremble lest they have died in vain. America is a great Nation; please help to keep her great and noble and purposeful for my son's sake.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. RUTH (R. A.) HUNDLEY.

Controls of Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from Mr. H. W. Fienemann, assistant manager of the New England Milk Producers' Association, Boston, Mass., also a bill which I introduced on January 14, 1947, to terminate the controls on sugar. Mr. Fienemann's letter gives information on a very critical milk situation in New England.

The New England Milk Producers' Association appealed to the sugar rationing department of OPA for 978,250 pounds of sugar to conserve 7,525,000 pounds of skim milk for the period extending to July 31 of this year. The association has been allotted 86,643 pounds. Unless OPA changes its decision, a large quantity of milk will go to waste. In my opinion, there should be enough sugar granted to the New England Milk Producers' Association to preserve the excess of skim milk. I believe the Congress should end all sugar controls immediately. As far as I am concerned, we could terminate what is left of the OPA without further ceremony. Were this done, organizations such as the New England Milk Producers' Association would be able to obtain an adequate supply of sugar.

NEW ENGLAND MILK
PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,
February 26, 1947.

Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MERROW: We wish to submit the following problem to you for your consideration and assistance:

The New England Milk Producers' Association is a dairy cooperative which markets the milk of some 9,000 dairy farmers in New England. We installed a $25,000 milk condensing pan at our milk plant in Andover, Mass., which began its initial operation on April 27, 1946. This condensing pan was installed by us to prevent waste of the milk solids in the milk produced by our members in excess of that which the Southern New Engand markets can use for fluid consumption. The operation of this condensing pan requires that there be sugar available to make the sweetened condensed which is stored in barrels during April, May, June, and July, and then used the following summer and fall when milk production drops substantially. It was not required of us to put too much milk through this condensing pan in 1946. This year there is a substantial increase in the amount of excess milk. We have appealed to the Sugar Rationing Department of OPA for sufficient sugar, i. e. 978,250 pounds to conserve 7,525,000 pounds of skim milk for the period between now and July 31 of this year. We have been given a total allocation for the calendar year 1947 of but 86,643 pounds of sugar, less than 10 percent of what we will require during the next 5 months. OPA granted us sugar last spring and summer on the basis of a provisional allowance. This year they state that we must be on the historical allowance basis. This seems to be based on an administrative decision within that department.

We are informed that candy as such has been on the free list for several months to export out of the country. It seems most unreasonable to us that enough sugar cannot be allocated to a group of dairy farmers in southern New Hampshire, southern Maine, and Massachusetts to keep from wasting such a valuable product as milk solids when all it requires is the granting of sufficient sugar.

There are no other facilities available in southern New England, except as provided by us, to take care of surplus milk solids this spring. Our organization is the only one which has assumed responsibility for marketing this excess milk and manufacturing it, thereby preventing a loss during the next 5 months of approximately $65,000 to dairy farmers in the above-named States.

For your information we are enclosing copies of letters previously sent to OPA which go into much greater detail on this problem. We trust that you can assist us in prevailing on OPA to grant us sufficient sugar to meet this problem which is immediately in front of us.

Yours very truly,

NEW ENGLAND MILK PRODUCERS'
ASSOCIATION,
H. W. FIENEMANN.

H. R. 979

A bill to terminate price controls and rationing in the case of sugar, to terminate Government sugar operations, to authorize the placing of limitations on the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. As used in this act—

(1) the term "Commission" means the Federal Sugar Commission established by this act;

(2) the term "Government agency" means any department, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, in the executive branch of the Government;

(3) the term "sugar" means (a) any sugars which are principally of crystalline structure and which are to be further refined or improved in quality, and any sugars which are principally not of crystalline structure but which are to be further refined or otherwise improved in quality to produce any sugars principally of crystalline structure, and (b) any sugars which are principally of crystalline structure and which are not to be further refined or otherwise improved in quality;

(4) the term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, means the States, the District of Columbia, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; and

(5) the term "person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group of persons.

TERMINATION OF PRICE CONTROLS AND RATIONING IN CASE OF SUGAR

SEC. 2. (a) After the date of the enactment of this act the authority granted by section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," as amended, may not be exercised for the purpose of allocating or rationing sugar. At 12 o'clock postmeridian on the date of the enactment of this act all regulations or orders under such section 2 (a), insofar as they provide for or relate to the allocation or rationing of sugar, shall cease to be in effect.

(b) After the date of the enactment of this act the authority granted by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or by the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, may not be exercised for the purpose of establishing or maintaining any maximum price in the case of sugar. At 12 o'clock postmeridian on the date of the enactment of this act all regulations, orders, price schedules, or requirements under either of such acts, insofar as they provide for or relate to the establishment or maintenance of any maximum price in the case of sugar, shall cease to be in effect.

LIMITATION ON GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF SUGAR

SEC. 3. Hereafter no Government agency shall purchase any sugar for resale; except that this section shall not prohibit the carrying out of any purchase agreement lawfully entered into prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

ALLOCATION AND DISPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SUGAR

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall allocate on a fair and equitable basis, for sale within the United States, all sugar purchased by Government agencies for resale, whether heretofore or hereafter coming into the possession or under the control of such agencies, which is not needed for purposes of fulfilling contracts of sale entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act.

(b) No sugar which the Commission is directed by subsection (a) to allocate shall be sold or disposed of otherwise than in accordance with allocations made by the Commission pursuant to such subsection (b).

LIMITATIONS ON EXPORTS

SEC. 5. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that exportations of sugar from the United States should be curtailed to such extent as may be necessary in order that domestic needs for sugar may be satisfied at the earliest practicable time.

(b) The Commission shall issue such order or orders, prohibiting or curtailing the exportation of sugar from the United States, as in its judgment may be necessary to carry out the policy declared in subsection (a).

(c) Any person who violates any order of the Commission issued under subsection (b) shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

FEDERAL SUGAR COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established an agency to be known as the Federal Sugar Commission, to be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President. One of the members so appointed shall be representative of wholesalers of sugar, one shall be representative of retailers of sugar, one shall be representative of refiners of sugar, and one shall be representative of producers of sugar. The President shall designate a member to act as chairman of the Commission, and the Commission may elect another of its members as vice chairman who shall act as chairman in the case of absence or incapacity of the chairman. A majority of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. Members of the Commission shall not receive compensation for their services as such members, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the exercise of the functions vested in the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to employ such personnel as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions.

(c) The Commission, in the performance of its functions, is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other Government agency to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the head of such Government agency, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such Government agency.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the threatened abandonment of the school-lunch program has not only disturbed the peace of mind of the parents of school children all over the country, but it has also awakened those citizens who give serious thought to the welfare of our future citizens and is bringing from them urgent pleas that the Congress not scrap what, at the time of its enactment in the last Congress, was supposed to be a long-range school-lunch program.

Under leave already granted me, I include a letter received from the publisher of the Woonsocket Call, of Woonsocket, R. I., together with an editorial which appeared in the Call on March 8, 1947:

THE WOONSOCKET CALL,
Woonsocket, R. I., March 10, 1947.

Hon. AIME J. FORAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FORAND: We who have seen the workings out of the school-lunch program know that it has been well worth while. While we are convinced of the necessity of lessening Government expenditures, it seems to me that appropriations may be tightened up here and there to achieve the same financial results as would be obtained if the school-lunch program were entirely cut out.

It was only last year that the Congress approved what was to be a long-term program along these lines. Now we learn the school-lunch program is likely to be a casualty, and it seems a shame.

I think I speak for most of Woonsocket when I urge that the school-lunch appropriation be given your careful attention.

I know that it will be impossible to continue it here with city funds.

You may be interested in an editorial appearing in Saturday's Woonsocket Call on this subject.

Yours very truly,
BUELL W. HUDSON,
Publisher, the Woonsocket Call.

[From the Woonsocket (R. I.) Call of March 8, 1947]

SAVE THE SCHOOL LUNCH

The announcement that an economy-minded Congress, in its drive to cut Government expenses to the bone, contemplates abandoning the school-lunch program appropriation is a serious blow to progress made in the last few years in improving the health of the Nation's children.

This city, one of the pioneers in the hot lunch and milk program has come to realize the value of the plan, and since it has been so well established here, Woonsocket will feel the loss more than many other cities.

With the appropriation of Federal funds, the old-style school lunch, consisting of dry sandwiches from a lunch box, passed into the realm of the past, and the youngsters were probably the first to appreciate the change.

The general health of school pupils showed improvement, health authorities were pleased, and parents were not long in noting the advantages of paying a few cents a week for prepared, hot meals in preference to preparing lunches each school day.

Now the whole program is endangered less than a year after it became a law. Congress, committed to economy in the interest of paying off our war debts, is aiming the ax indiscriminately, and the lunch appropriation is among those slated for annihilation if Congress has its way.

There should be other places for savings with less harm. It is common knowledge that there are top-heavy bureaus in many branches of the Federal Government, and agencies still existing that outlived their usefulness with the end of the war. There are also appropriations under consideration that will be beneficial to groups in limited areas, but nowhere could the cut of funds adversely affect so many of the younger generation as in the school-lunch fund.

This city has come to regard the school lunch program as its own. The mayor of Woonsocket and Chicago school officials were leaders in the battle that culminated in the approval of the program by the Federal Government, and those same officials may again have to carry the torch to hold what has been gained.

As citizens, we can make our wishes known to our representatives in Congress. Organizations might well endorse continuance of the program.

The proposal that the States supply funds cannot be considered in Rhode Island, where financial affairs have already created a serious problem.

A suggestion that the school districts raise enough money to carry on is also bound to be opposed by taxpayers, already overburdened. A proposal to raise the prices of the lunches would defeat the purpose of the entire program which was designed to supply nutritional meals at a reasonable cost so all might participate.

The only solution is to let the legislators know, in no uncertain terms, that we favor the continuation of the lunch program, even if it means cutting down on appropriations for special pleaders. The lunch program on a Nation-wide basis has popular approval.

Mustering-Out Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, an injustice to enlisted men who were honorably discharged from the service of their country prior to February 3, 1944, has come to my attention, which I feel requires legislative correction.

On that date the so-called Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 became a law, in which it was provided that anyone who had already been discharged and was entitled to mustering-out pay must make his application therefor within 2 years, or be forever barred.

Many enlisted men who were discharged after that date, were fully informed of their rights and advised of the pay which they had coming. I find, however, that many who had already been discharged before that date and were equally entitled to this pay, never learned of their rights until it was too late to take advantage of them.

One such was a constituent of mine who reported for active duty on October 15, 1942, was shipped overseas on December 27, 1942, arrived back in this country on September 10, 1943, and was honorably discharged on October 11, 1943. He did not learn, however, that he had mustering-out pay coming to him until June 1946, when he promptly filed his application for it. This was returned to him with the statement that he was too late to obtain the advantages of this law.

I am informed that there are many others situated similarily among the enlisted men who have honorably served their country.

The bill which I have today introduced would extend the time within which they might make this application for 5 years instead of 2, or until February 3, 1949. It seems only fair to give these men a chance to be paid what Congress has already said they are entitled to receive.

Togas for Ex-Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have presented editorials from the New York Times, from the Chicago Tribune, and the New York Daily News in support of my bill (H. R. 504) to make ex-Presidents Senators at Large. I am pleased at this time to offer

another editorial commending this measure, from the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of February 28:

TOGAS FOR EX-PRESIDENTS

The President of the United States is one person who, it is generally conceded, should be able to concentrate his whole energy on the task at hand without concern for his personal or political future. This is one of several good arguments for limiting Presidential tenure, and it might also be an argument for the liberal pensioning of ex-Presidents. But there is a much better way, fortunately, in which the country can free its Presidents from personal financial concern while at the same time availing itself of their counsel and experience when they retire into the role of elder statesmen.

This is the proposal contained in a bill by Representative CANFIELD, Republican, of New Jersey, to make every retiring President eligible to be a Senator at Large for life. He would have all the senatorial privileges, pay, and perquisites, but would have no vote, for this presumably would necessitate a constitutional amendment. The bill would give ex-Presidents a forum to air their views and a status befitting their dignity. It is a worthy companion measure for the constitutional amendment restricting White House tenure to two 4-year terms.

Quota System on Wool Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. HERTER Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Clinton M. Hester before the Committee on Agriculture:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, my name is Clinton M. Hester. I am an attorney, located in the Shoreham Building at Fifteenth and H Streets NW., this city. I am also a farmer and a wool grower in Virginia. In my capacity as an attorney I am Washington counsel for the National Wool Trade Association and the Boston Wool Trade Association, and have been counsel for these associations for the past 2½ years.

On my right today sits Mr. Herbert K. Webb, of the Philadelphia Wool Textile Association. Mr. Webb and his predecessors have been for many years engaged in the business of buying and selling and manufacturing wool. On my left is Mr. Kenneth W. Marriner, who is a top maker and also a manufacturer. You may recall that during the war Mr. Marriner was Director of the Textile Bureau of the War Production Board.

The National Wool Trade Association is a trade association, national in scope, and comprises among its membership wool merchants located throughout the United States. The Boston Wool Trade Association is a local trade association and comprises among its membership wool merchants who, with some exceptions, are located either in Boston or nearby. The wool merchants not only serve the wool growers but also serve the woolen manufacturing industry, which is the seventh largest industry in the United States.

In 1943 the Federal Government nationalized the wool business. In that year the Department of Agriculture, under the broad charter powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation, transferred the wool business to Washington and inaugurated a program of buying and selling the domestic wool clip.

Last week the Senate Committee on Agriculture held hearings on Senate bill 350, which would continue the Commodity Credit Corporation until June 30 1949. As you know, the Commodity Credit Corporation expires on June 30, 1947, under the statute which authorized its creation and extension and by virtue of its Delaware charter. Under the recent Byrd-Butler Act, it cannot be continued beyond June 30, 1948, without a Federal charter. You will recall the Secretary of Agriculture has announced that he will not continue after April 15, 1947, the program initiated by the Department of Agriculture in 1943 of buying and selling the domestic wool clip unless the Congress of the United States gives the Secretary of Agriculture express authority to continue the program.

During the hearings held last week by the Senate Agriculture Committee on S. 350, representatives of the wool growers and the wool trade appeared before the committee and presented their recommendations with respect to prospective legislation.

The wool growers testified they want comparable price instead of parity for wool and they want wool included in the Steagall amendment. In addition, they want the Government to continue in the business of buying and selling the domestic wool clip even after the expiration of the Steagall amendment until such time as the Congress may provide a quota system limiting imports of foreign wool or other adequate protection to the wool grower. The wool growers also want the Congress to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell domestic wool at competitive prices.

The wool trade believes that the wool grower should be protected by the Government against conditions such as arose in 1931, when the price per pound of wool dropped to 13.6 cents, and in 1932, when it went to 8.6 cents, and that the wool grower should be protected against future fluctuation of wool prices. The wool trade also is of the opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized to sell surplus domestic wool at less than parity. However, the wool trade is opposed to comparable price instead of parity for wool. The wool trade is also opposed to the inclusion of wool in the Steagall amendment, and is strenuously opposed to continuing the Government in the business of buying and selling the domestic wool clip. The wool trade also believes there is no necessity for the establishment of a quota system on imports of foreign wool.

The wool trade is of the opinion that if the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized to make loans or purchases at not in excess of 90 percent of parity until December 31, 1948, this would be adequate protection to the wool grower and the wool trade recommends such legislation to this committee; also that the committee recommend to Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to sell domestic wool at competitive prices.

The wool trade believes that the business of marketing wool is such a complex subject that the Government cannot properly market the domestic wool clip and the record of the Department of Agriculture since the inauguration of this program in 1943 confirms this conclusion.

Under Secretary of Agriculture Dodd in his appearance before the Senate Agriculture Committee last week on S. 350 produced charts which reflected that whereas approximately 2 percent of the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation involve wool, approximately 50 percent of its inventory of all farm commodities consists of wool. With requirements for wool by our domestic manufacturers of 1,000,000,000 pounds annually, the Department of Agriculture could have sold its surplus domestic wool in 1945 and 1946 if it had priced the wool properly. Not until October of 1946 did parity reach a point at which domestic wool could not be sold at competitive prices.

The wool trade is opposed to "comparable price" instead of "parity" for wool. If comparable price had prevailed during the peacetime years from 1921 to 1940, between the two great world wars, the Government would have purchased and sold the domestic wool clip in 13 of the 20 years. (See exhibit A.) If, on the other hand, parity had been in effect the Government would have purchased the domestic wool clip in only 6 of the 20 years. (See exhibit B.) Three of these 6 years were the worst years of the depression and the other 3 years were periods when prices of wool took substantial declines. The wool trade naturally desires to stay in the business in which it has been engaged for over 100 years, but if past figures are any gage and "comparable price" should be adopted it would mean the end of the wool trade. Further, comparable price has been accorded by the Department of Agriculture only to three Steagall commodities, dry field peas, peanuts for oil and soy beans for oil. The basic commodities such as wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts for nuts under the Agricultural Adjustment Act are not accorded comparable price.

It is true that under the Steagall amendment the commodities included in that amendment such as hogs, turkeys, chickens, butterfats, dairy products, peanuts for oil, soybeans for oil, etc., are in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture accorded not less than 90 percent of parity or comparable price. However, as just pointed out, the Secretary of Agriculture has accorded comparable price only to dry field peas, peanuts for oil, and soybeans for oil. Furthermore the Steagall amendment is a war measure enacted for the purpose of encouraging production of scarce farm commodities for war purposes and expires on December 31, 1948. Under the amendment the President could have declared hostilities at an end on December 31, 1945, and had he done so, the Steagall amendment would have expired on December 31, 1947. As an incentive to production for war purposes the Congress provided in the Steagall amendment that the Secretary of Agriculture should be permitted to make loans at not less than 90 percent of parity or comparable price. Obviously the principles embodied in this wartime statute should not now be extended to peacetime farming operations.

The wool trade believes there is no necessity for the establishment of a system of quotas on imports. In fact, the wool trade is very definitely of the opinion that such a system as applied to wool would be impossible of administration. Further, if such a system should be established and the price of domestic wool be maintained at too high a level, it would obviously result in an increased use of synthetic fibers. Likewise, if foreign wool should be prohibited entry to the United States under a quota system, it might well be diverted to other countries, as pointed out by Representative GRANGER on Tuesday, and then might come into this country in the form of woolen fabrics in competition with those manufactured by our domestic manufacturers. Furthermore the establishment of such a system could very easily result in discrimination by the United States as between foreign countries. In addition the creation of quotas on imported wool is nothing short of a Government monopoly in the purchasing and distribution of this important raw material which is the lifeblood of one of the largest industries in this country.

Wool grows on sheep and there is no scientific way of separating its cost from that of the whole sheep operation. The sheep producers curiously are not basing their demand for Government financial assistance on their main product, meat (which is 80 percent by weight and 66 percent by value), but are basing their entire case upon their byproduct wool.

There have been studies made by the United States Tariff Commission of so-called sample producers to learn the cost of production of wool and these have been widely advertised by representatives of the wool growers as proving that wool is facing disaster, but none of these studies is more than guesswork. They charge to wool the percentage of cost that wool brings as income, thus confusing costs with prices received; they assume a 5 percent return on investment as an item of cost; they use an income figure of 45 percent instead of 35 percent. They are definitely not representative of true costs throughout the United States of America.

The Tariff Commission has only within the past few days completed and published a further study indicating that the wool grower is losing money and this study will likewise be widely publicized by the wool grower. However, these studies again are little more than guesswork, since they are based on data secured from records of loans made to wool growers.

On page 6 of the report just issued by the Tariff Commission, dated February 1947, you will note that for the year 1946 the data was secured from only 933 farmers. This is in striking contrast to the fact that there are upwards of 584,000 farmers who grow wool in the United States. Further, all of the 933 farmers had mortgages on their sheep flocks. On the same page you will note that the total income from wool, sheep and lamb for 1946 was $7.68. You will also observe that the wool sold for 0.423 cents per pound, with an average weight of each fleece at 8.3 pounds, making the yield for the wool $3.51. Here it is interesting to note that until last year the wool grower received 130 percent of parity for his wool and today is receiving in excess of parity for his wool. Subtracting the $3.51 from the $7.68 leaves $4.17 which the wool grower received for each sheep or lamb sold. This is amazing when one considers that 1946 was one of the highest years on record for lambs, parity being $12.50 and the average price being well in excess of $20 per 100-pound lamb. Even yesterday lambs were selling as high as $25.50 per 100 pounds. On page 7 you will also observe that the 933 wool growers covered in this report matured only 79 lambs out of every 100 ewes. This is not a good record. So it is obvious that these studies are based on the records of only a few wool growers and particularly the more inefficient ones, and the studies do not contain data on the cost of raising wool obtained from growers who have no mortgages.

In the above connection it is noteworthy that whereas a few years ago most wool growers had mortgages on their sheep flocks, today few wool growers have mortgages on their sheep.

Personally, I have never been able to reconcile my own experience as a wool grower with the contention of the wool grower that he must have the assistance from the Treasury and the taxpayers of this country that is proposed in the bills how before you.

I own several farms in Virginia on which I raise wheat, corn, oats, hay, white-faced Hereford beef cattle, sheep, and hogs. About 80 percent of the farmers in the United States who raise sheep have flocks of less than 100 and raise sheep as an incident to all of their other farming operations. I belong in this class, which raises about 50 percent of the wool produced in the United States. I have paid from $8 to $12 for ewes. For the wool from the ewe I receive on an average of about $2.50 per ewe. On the average a ewe produces one lamb. This past year my lambs brought me $21.50 and I did not sell them when the market was anywhere near its highest point. I am sure that you will agree that this is an unusually good return on the investment.

The wool growers repeatedly point out that sheep numbers in recent years have decreased by approximately 25 percent. This is due, they say, to the fact that the sheep business is no longer a profitable business because of increased costs, particularly labor, and because of the competition of foreign wool. However, wool is only a byproduct of the animal. It represents only a percentage of the total income from the animal as reflected in my own personal experience just related. In recent years lamb prices have been high and in addition the Government has paid a subsidy to the processor of lambs which was passed along to the wool grower. This has caused the wool grower to sell his ewe lambs rather than to retain them to replenish or add to his flocks, as well as his ewes no longer suitable for lambing purposes, and thus this accounts largely for the recent decline in sheep numbers.

In support of their request that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to purchase and sell the domestic wool clip, the representative of the National Wool Marketing Cooperative Association contended at the hearings held by the Senate Agricultural Committee last week on S. 350 that his association, which represents 22 State associations and 73,000 individual wool growers, was making satisfactory profits as an agent of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the sale of its domestic wool; also that individual wool merchants who had accepted agency agreements with the Commodity Credit Corporation were likewise making profits.

In this connection, I would like to point out that none of these cooperative corporations pays any Federal income taxes, as do the wool merchants. It is true that when these corporations return their profits to their members the latter in turn pay individual income taxes, but these taxes are nothing as compared to the income taxes which these corporations would have to pay to the Federal Government if they were not exempt from taxation. If they were not exempt from Federal taxation, they would be in here today with us urging you to require the Government to get out of the business of buying and selling the domestic-wool clip.

As for the individual wool merchant who today is acting as an agent of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the sale of its surplus domestic wool, it suffices to say that few of them are making money. Of those who took on this assignment, most of them did it as a patriotic gesture, and also in order to retain intact their organizations until such time as the Government returned the wool business to private industry and free enterprise. Many of those who did this have just about broken even on their CCC operations. If the Government is to continue in the postwar period the business of buying and selling the domestic-wool clip, it stands to reason that the wool-trade industry will be able to contribute little to the reduction of our enormous national debt.

The wool growers also contend that there is a British wool monopoly which protects all British wool and therefore our Government should continue in the wool business in order to protect our domestic industry. There is no such British monopoly. What the wool growers insist upon labeling as a foreign monopoly is the J. O. or Joint Organization, composed of the wool-growing colonies within the British Empire, and established on July 1, 1946. The J. O. succeeded the British Wool Control Commission which during the war purchased and sold all Empire wools. The J. O. is a price support program and not a monopoly and has the primary function of liquidating the war surpluses of wool without damaging the prices of the current clips and is actually a very constructive influence on United States raw wool prices. It has no authority over current world prices, which are established by free competitive bidding at auctions in the colonies and in London. The J. O. does not purchase the current clips. Free enterprise and competitive bidding prevails in the sale of the current clips at these auctions. By including some of its wartime surplus wool in the auctions, the J. O. is gradually reducing the threatening world surplus and it plans upon taking from 5 to 10 years to accomplish this task in orderly fashion.

The J. O. also provides a floor around approximately 55 cents clean abroad or 33 cents greasy U. S. A. domestic equivalent by having announced its intention of bidding in any new wools at the auctions should prices fall to around that level, the present level at these foreign auctions being around approximately 80 cents or 48 cents greasy U. S. A. equivalent. In other words, the J. O. provides a support floor for wool growers which when translated into our parity represents about 68 percent of our parity.

The J. O. reserves the right to adjust its bidding limits to world conditions of supply and demand, but is in existence for the purpose of supporting world price levels of wool rather than permitting them to be destroyed by disorderly and hasty liquidation of Empire wool surpluses. Incidentally, big wool producing nations such as Argentina and Uraguay are not included in this plan.

At the hearings held by the Senate Agricultural Committee last week on S. 350, Under Secretary of Agriculture Dodd stated very frankly that everyone in the Department of Agriculture, including those immediately in charge of the wool program are very anxious for the Government to get out of the business of buying and selling the domestic wool clip.

The wool trade believes that if the Congress will authorize loans or purchases for wool at not in excess of 90 percent of parity as presently computed this will afford adequate protection to the wool grower. Further, if the demand for wool continues as is expected the wool trade feels quite confident that it can purchase the wool growers wool at or above 90 percent of parity and yet market it at a profit, and in this way eliminate the Government entirely from the domestic wool business. The wool merchants have for over a hundred years been rendering invaluable service to the wool grower. For example, during the peacetime years between 1921 and 1940, the period between the two great world wars, the wool merchants obtained for the wool grower a price for his wool of 96 percent of parity, whereas during that same period all other farm commodities averaged 80 percent of parity. (See exhibit C attached.) At this point I should like to ask leave to insert in the record a chart entitled "Domestic Wool versus Foreign Wool" showing the consumption of domestic wool as against foreign wool during the period of 1921–1940. (See exhibit D.) From this chart you will note that normally not only was the entire domestic production sold and consumed, but that foreign wool was not imported, except in insufficient quantities to make up the deficit. Under free enterprise the private wool merchants did not turn to foreign wools until after the domestic wool clips had been disposed of.

Another interesting factor for your consideration is that in periods of high prices domestic wool production decreases, whereas in periods of low prices wool production increases. Production actually declined despite high Government prices during the war. Of course, wool production is integral with sheep production and as such is subjected primarily to the economic influences of the livestock and other markets. Higher production of wool cannot be assured by increasing wool prices.

We understand that the Comptroller General of the United States has about completed a report to Congress required by the Byrd-Butler Act on the activities of Government corporations and that this report covers the activities of the Commodity Credit Corportation and particularly its wool-purchase program. We recommend respectfully to this

committee that it defer any final action in this matter until it has had an opportunity to receive and review the report of the Comptroller General.

Representative HERTER is today introducing a bill embodying the proposals of the wool trade, copies of which have been distributed to you. We respectfully request that the proposals contained in this bill may have your serious consideration.

I thank you.

EXHIBIT A

Government support at 90 percent of comparable

	Wool price (per pound)	Comparable price	Percentage actual to comparable
	Cents	*Cents*	
1921 [1]	17.3	37.6	46.0
1922 [1]	27.1	37.4	72.5
1923	39.4	38.1	103.5
1924	36.6	38.1	96.2
1925	39.5	38.5	102.5
1926 [1]	34.0	38.3	88.8
1927 [1]	30.3	37.8	80.2
1928	36.2	38.3	94.5
1929 [1]	30.2	38.1	79.3
1930 [1]	19.5	36.5	53.5
1931 [1]	13.6	32.4	42.0
1932 [1]	8.6	28.3	30.2
1933 [1]	20.6	27.4	75.2
1934 [1]	21.9	29.4	74.6
1935 [1]	19.3	29.6	65.2
1936	26.9	29.2	92.2
1937	32.0	30.6	104.5
1938 [1]	19.1	29.0	65.8
1939 [1]	22.3	28.5	78.3
1940	28.3	28.7	98.6
Average per year	26.1	33.6	77.8

Government takes title.

NOTE.—If domestic wool prices had been supported during the 20-year period 1921 to 1940 at 90 percent of comparable, the Government would have taken title 13 years out of the 20.

Figures from Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

EXHIBIT B

Government support at 90 percent of parity

	Wool price (per pound)	Wool parity price (per pound)	Percentage actual price to parity price
	Cents	*Cents*	
1921 [1]	17.3	30.2	57.3
1922	27.1	30.0	90.4
1923	39.4	30.6	128.9
1924	36.6	30.6	119.8
1925	39.5	30.9	127.9
1926	34.0	30.7	110.9
1927	30.3	30.4	99.7
1928	36.2	30.7	117.9
1929	30.2	30.6	98.7
1930 [1]	19.5	29.3	66.6
1931 [1]	13.6	26.0	52.3
1932 [1]	8.6	22.7	37.9
1933	20.6	22.0	93.7
1934	21.9	23.6	92.8
1935 [1]	19.3	23.8	81.1
1936	26.9	23.4	115.1
1937	32.0	24.5	130.8
1938 [1]	19.1	23.2	82.4
1939	22.3	22.9	97.3
1940	28.3	23.1	122.5
Average per year	26.1	27.0	96.2

[1] Government takes title.

NOTE.—If domestic wool prices had been supported during the 20-year period 1921 to 1940 at 90 percent of parity, the Government would have taken title 6 years out of the 20.

Figures from Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

EXHIBIT C

PRICE HISTORY IN TERMS OF PARITY

Question. Did producers of domestic wool receive fair prices, in terms of parity, during the period when the competitive free-enterprise merchants operated the business?

Answer. Yes; in terms of parity for wool, and also in terms of parity for basic commodities. As shown below, producers received 96 percent of parity for wool, in contrast to 77 percent received by producers of the basic commodities. (Basic: Cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, peanuts.)

	Parity index	Prices received for basic commodities (in terms of parity)	Prices received for wool (in terms of parity)	Relationship of wool versus basic commodities
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1921	165.0	68.1	57.3	84.1
1922	164.0	77.8	90.4	116.2
1923	167.0	91.6	128.9	140.5
1924	167.0	94.6	119.8	126.5
1925	169.0	95.4	127.9	134.2
1926	168.0	81.4	110.9	136.3
1927	166.0	79.9	99.7	125.0
1928	168.0	81.2	117.9	145.2
1929	167.0	78.6	98.7	125.6
1930	160.0	67.6	66.6	98.6
1931	142.0	52.4	52.3	99.8
1932	124.0	42.3	37.9	89.7
1933	120.0	57.8	93.7	162.2
1934	129.0	78.3	92.8	118.6
1935	130.0	84.8	81.1	95.7
1936	128.0	86.6	115.1	133.1
1937	134.3	93.4	126.8	140.0
1938	127.0	71.4	82.4	115.4
1939	125.0	68.9	97.3	141.2
1940	126.0	73.3	122.5	167.2
Average per year	147.3	77.1	96.2	124.8

NOTE.—During this period, the average prices obtained by producers of all agricultural commodities were about 80 percent of parity, in contrast to 77 percent for the 6 basic commodities and 96 percent for wool as shown above.

EXHIBIT D

DOMESTIC WOOL VERSUS FOREIGN WOOL

Question. Did domestic wool receive priority in consumption when the competitive free enterprise merchants (prewar) operated the wool business?

Answer. Yes; observe figures below which show that the amount of foreign wool imported was only the minimum quantity needed each year by our mills. Over the period, practically all the domestic wool produced was currently consumed.

	United States consumption greasy basis		Domestic production greasy basis		Foreign imports, greasy basis		Consumption from stocks on hand or unaccounted for, greasy basis	
	M pounds	Percent	M pounds	Percent	M pounds	Percent	M pounds	Percent
1921	597,400	100	318,536	53	217,233	31	61,631	16
1922	640,400	100	296,617	46	189,486	30	154,297	24
1923	603,100	100	299,230	50	243,270	40	60,600	10
1924	518,000	100	309,380	60	105,191	20	103,429	20
1925	525,200	100	329,253	63	180,405	34	15,542	3
1926	524,100	100	349,861	67	172,220	33	2,019	4
1927	551,100	100	370,817	67	112,042	20	68,241	13
1928	511,900	100	399,157	78	89,463	17	23,280	5
1929	554,700	100	416,358	75	102,228	18	36,114	7
1930	447,000	100	453,129	101	71,175	16		
1931	545,200	100	483,655	89	43,566	8	17,979	3
1932	439,800	100	460,236	105	16,485	4		
1933	572,200	100	478,598	84	51,554	9	42,048	7
1934	383,454	100	467,926	122	18,489	5		
1935	719,621	100	471,708	66	35,890	5	211,963	29
1936	622,516	100	468,071	75	118,550	19	35,895	6
1937	522,768	100	473,632	91	171,263	33		
1938	508,586	100	470,049	92	25,407	5	13,130	3
1939	676,535	100	475,436	70	113,574	17	87,525	13
1940	688,869	100	482,663	70	233,256	34		
Total	11,153,349	100	8,274,372	74	2,310,747	21	568,230	5
Average per year	557,667	100	413,718	74	115,537	21	28,412	5

Note that normally not only was the entire domestic production sold and consumed, but that foreign wool was not imported except in insufficient quantities to make up the deficit. Under free enterprise, private merchants did not turn to foreign wools until after the domestic clips were disposed of.

PREWAR FIGURES VERSUS 1946

	1921–40	1946
Domestic stocks on hand Jan. 1, 1935–40 [1]	281,284	586,260
Domestic production	413,718	404,611
United States consumption	557,667	1,130,000
Foreign imports	115,537	956,200
Foreign stocks on hand Jan. 1, 1935–40 [1]	40,716	349,740

[1] Figures not segregated prior to 1935.

Note that in 1946 more than a year's production of domestic was on hand despite a year of record-breaking consumption.

Figures from statistical service of New York Cotton Exchange.

Slave System Insatiable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 12, 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from a recent issue of the Tacoma Labor Advocate. I feel this editorial is of extreme interest at this time because of the new international role America has been forced to assume. I especially recommend this editorial to those certain labor leaders who protest so violently against American imperialism, but say nothing of Soviet enslavement.

SLAVE SYSTEM INSATIABLE

Free labor always has opposed slave labor in any form or under any pretext. Slave labor anywhere in the world adversely affects the standards of free labor everywhere. Moreover, each highly centralized political system based on slavery engenders aggressive policies, since it tends to enslave new populations in order to satisfy its need for an additional supply of forced labor. Furthermore, such a system tends to resort to conquest as a means of acquiring sources of wealth which it cannot create fast enough because of the notoriously low productivity of slave labor.

There really is an irresponsible conflict between free labor and every system of forced labor. To those who excuse the Soviet methods of forced labor on the ground that such practices serve the aims of socialism, the reply can only be that the founders of the Socialist doctrine proclaimed it as a path for workers' liberation and not their enslavement. In discussing the totalitarian system of slavery now represented by the Soviet Union, the problem of socialism, as such, does not enter. In this case the question simply is one of free labor versus slave labor.

The American Federation of Labor has condemned all forms of forced labor and servitude. The AFL, through its bill of rights, appeals to all forces of free labor throughout the world to support it in this crucial struggle.

A Tribute to Gen. William Luther Sibert

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it was my distinct pleasure on Monday evening last to have attended a memorial exercise held by the Panama Canal Society here in Washington. That memorial was to honor one of Alabama's greatest citizens, the honored and beloved Gen. William Luther Sibert.

The Panama Canal Society is composed of the veteran personnel who still remain of that courageous crew of Americans that conquered the dismal swamps on the Isthmus of Panama—they who despite the fear of the dreaded yellow fever and the seemingly insurmountable engineering and construction problems presented in that work, brought to a successful conclusion the most gigantic engineering project ever undertaken by man.

That memorial was a great tribute to a great man.

The principal speaker of the evening was our own beloved colleague, the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Mobile, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that you and the other Members of this House could have heard that speech. Truly inspirational, it will long remain in my memory as one of the finest tributes I ever heard any man pay to the memory of a departed friend.

We who know FRANK BOYKIN know how precious and with what esteem he regards and values his every friend; in fact, in all of life there is no thing which he holds more precious or with greater merit than he does friendship.

His speech was a splendid tribute from one great man to another.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had a copy of that speech. I did manage, however, to get the notes to which FRANK BOYKIN referred and under the leave granted, I am herewith inserting these notes of that great tribute to a friend:

Mr. President, members of the Panama Canal Society, and you, General Sibert, the honored guest, I have not come before you tonight to make a great formal speech. Rather, I have come to join with you veterans who built The Big Ditch at Panama—and in the light of those labors long remembered—relive the happy hours spent with our departed, beloved and nationally revered Gen. William Luther Sibert.

Standing here tonight it seems as if only yesterday, Bill Sibert and I sat together on an old magnolia log lying in the midst of a beautiful azalea garden in our native State of Alabama. I remember his remarking that it seemed to him just beyond that garden was a strand whereupon sat God.

Your friend and mine has now crossed that strand. He must no longer search for explanations, for beauty of nature or for truth. He is today beyond the veil that clothes the answers to things which are mysteries to us, his friends, who still must live.

Good deeds survive the human trail. Good works, kind words—these are things that never die.

For years I knew your commanding officer at Panama. He was my good friend—Gen. William Luther Sibert.

The Siberts are all of them good, yea, even the best of American stock—and this native son of Alabama had inherently within him the finest quality both of his race and his nation.

For generations before him his forebears had been pioneers, frontiersmen, foresters, farmers and planters.

A native of Gadsden, after attending the University of Alabama he was appointed to West Point. His was a long, enviable record of military service and personal achievements. He served his country with distinction not alone in the United States but in the far-off Philippines, in Panama and in China.

In World War I, placed in command of the First Division of the AEF, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for the skill exhibited in organizing the first Chemical Warfare Service of the United States Army.

Not alone at some time or other did he serve in every engineering command in the continental United States, but in addition thereto there was no major public construction project undertaken in the last quarter century of his life upon which he did not leave the impress of endless powers and his remarkable constructive ability.

Chairman of the Boulder Dam Commission; President of the American Port Authority; the Alabama State Docks Commission; the American Society of Engineers; Commander of the Legion of Honor, are accomplishments second only to the work he did in the design as well as construction of Gatun Dam, the Gatun Locks, and the West Breakwater at Colon on the Isthmus of Panama.

But I do not want to talk to you tonight about General Sibert either as a great engineer or as a great soldier. Rather I want to talk about him as a great humanitarian, a great father, a great man, and a great friend.

I like to remember him best for the work he did for the American Red Cross in China when the torrential rivers of that nation in roaring floods had inundated millions of men, women, and children in that far-flung land.

I like to think of him as a huntsman, a sportsman, his love of children, trees, flowers, of horses and dogs. I like to recapture the happy hours I spent with him in hunting and fishing and in walking through the lush soils of our native woodlands—him with his dogs—and better than his, no man in the great Southland ever possessed.

I like to recall the pride he had in the wife he loved, in his home, his children, his love of nature and nature's God.

I remember on the occasion of one deer hunt that after we had bagged our game we sat together on a log at the forks of the creek. It was in the cool of a beautiful evening and as we sat there I questioned how strange it was that Fate so often plays tricks upon the lives of men. I remember so clearly that he urged it upon me to believe that there are many compensating and various gifts which the Almighty God bestows upon men through their children, which we as fathers should teach—they in turn bestow upon their fellows.

Only those who truly knew such a man could value him. Only they can see where, when, and how he cast his bread upon the waters of life and in so doing made all lives seem different and a bit more beautiful than would have been the case had he not passed this way.

My own life has been enriched because I knew him and as I utter these words I am the more than ever conscious of his personality.

Those of you who believe in a love that is strong—in a hope that endures and is patient; those of you who believe in the beauty and strength of human devotion, can see his image reflected not alone in the great structures reared by our departed friend, General Sibert, but can realize the fruition of his life on leaving to his country a progeny equally strong to carry out and onward the work he himself stopped when he went on that journey from whence no man ever returned.

Since General Sibert's passing a great world war has again engulfed our Nation, and again the Siberts of Alabama have rallied to the call of their country. Tonight we have with us but one of two glorious sons of your commander, General Sibert.

It is our pleasure to have with us the distinguished Brig. Gen. E. L. Sibert. The other, his distinguished brother, Maj. Gen. Franklin C. Sibert, was unable to come.

How happy, my friends, would General Sibert be could he but sit across from these two sons—now brother officers in the Army—and of a rank equally high and distinguished with his own.

My friends, there are existent on this earth not one but a score of monuments to the name of your distinguished commander at the Panama Canal. Not only did a grateful Congress bestow distinction upon him as

an officer and soldier, but the Government of the Canal Zone caused a stamp to be issued bearing his likeness to commemorate the memory of the opening of the locks; and this stamp is still in use.

The Army of the United States has also honored him by giving to the Army camp at Gadsden, his birthplace, the name of Camp Sibert. There is also a railroad station on the G. M. & O. Railroad which bears his name.

I want to recall to your memory that the Bankhead Tunnel, one of the greatest pieces of engineering ever to be wrought by man in the great Southland, had its original inception in the mind of General Sibert. That dream, now a reality, is serving the people of our State and in this year alone, has earned and is continuing to earn upwards of $1,000 a day to liquidate the cost of its construction.

Of the material things in life, we in Mobile will always remember General Sibert for his heroic construction, against severest difficulties, the peerless port facilities which now make the city of Mobile one of the greatest shipping ports on all the seven seas.

Above all else General Sibert was a living exemplification of his own philosophy of life. He was stern—but gentle; mellowing his sternness with a kindness that left no sting, but only respect and esteem.

Readily distinguishing between good and bad, he adhered only to that which was good, ever and always placing his country first. His death marked the passing of a great American.

His name will ever rank among the great generals of our Nation, Washington, Lee, Pershing, Eisenhower, and Marshall. With the great engineers, Goethals, Gorgas, Gaillard, and Hoover, and among the great empire builders of our Nation, his is second to none.

His monuments—rooted in the bedrock of the earth—rear their mighty structures into the heavens. They stand as pillars of cloud by day and of fire by night—and as living memorials to his constructive abilities.

I can see him now in the cool of the evening following the hounds, cap pulled down close over his head, and with body erect as he stalked a deer—from my heart of hearts, I repeat the thought then often in my mind: "By God, there walks a man!"

General Sibert, your father's good friend and mine, Mr. Walter Bellingrath, has sent to me an azalea—flower of our Southland—which your father loved so much.

He assured me that it is a specimen of a shoot taken from a certain trail over which your father and I hunted many times. May I present this to you, sir, with my compliments, in the hope that these, his comrades, and yourself, will plant this azalea and its attending ball of his own Alabama clay close to his resting place in the National Cemetery at Arlington?

Mr. President, may I recapture for you and the thinning ranks of your comrades who built the Panama Canal a few lines of tributes paid to General Sibert as well as two other gallant commanders who directed your work in the tropical jungles—General Gaillard and General Gorgas—by M. H. Thatcher. These are taken from the World's Anthology of Verse:

"SIBERT

"Two problems, vast, loomed in that enterprise,
Which, finished, binds the world through junctured seas:
The one lay where Andean outposts rise;
The other, Chagres. Man long had sought the keys
To solve this twofold, grim impediment.
The first, to Gaillard's skillful stroke did yield;
Through Sibert's curb the river's force is spent
In Gatun's inland sea, where floods are sealed
To do man's will, the earth to serve and bless.
Stupendous task our Sibert sought to do.
How well 'twas done, the works themselves express:
The mighty dam, lake, locks, and channels true,
Attest his genius, and shall e'er proclaim
His greatness and his proud, enduring fame."

"GORGAS

"God's own samaritan, intrepid, true;
With Christly sympathy and love for all,
And wisely skilled, he wrote health's page anew,
And lifted from the earth its foulest pall,
Where pestilence and plague took direst toll,
His magic touch brought life and strength and joy;
In isthmian realms, where rival oceans roll,
His blessed arts for good he did employ,
And lo! the link that joins the waters twain
(The way to Ind, through all the ages hid)
Grew into form, and stretched from main to main,
By reason of the deathless work he did:
And more than this—the wondrous deeds he wrought,
The texts became whereby the world is taught."

"GAILLARD

"With soul illumed at duty's altar glow;
Efficient, tireless, in his giant's task;
By trials taxed more than the world could know—
He met his toils just as his heart would ask.
Unto a work—the greatest known to fame—
His all he gave: of life he was bereft
(O martyr of the Ditch): and now his name
Becrowns and honors Isthmia's mighty cleft.
Each ship that sails from sea to mated sea,
Is witness of his worth and usefulness.
His monument is there, and e'er shall be,
To mark the price at which was bought success.
The earth's his debtor: its due it cannot pay,
But never shall his glory pass away."

War Veterans in the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, according to figures compiled with the assistance of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, there is a total of 236 veterans in the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

The Senate has 36 veterans and the period of active service includes the Boer War, Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II.

The House of Representatives has a total of 200 veterans, 4 of whom saw service in the Spanish-American War, 138 in World War I, and 58 in World War II.

The roster of war veterans in the Eightieth Congress follows:

WAR VETERANS IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

I. ROSTER OF WAR VETERANS IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

(Key to symbols: W1—World War I; W2—World War II; S—Spanish American War.)

The letters "A," "M," "N," and "C. G.," designate branches of the service to which a Member belonged: Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Coast Guard.

Senators

BALDWIN, RAYMOND E., Connecticut (W1-N).
BREWSTER, OWEN, Maine (W1-A).
BRICKER, JOHN W., Ohio (W1-A).
BROOKS, C. WAYLAND, Illinois (W1-M).
BUCK, C. DOUGLASS, Delaware (W1-A).
CAIN, HARRY P., Washington (W2-A).
CAPEHART, HOMER E., Indiana (W1-A).
CONNALLY, TOM, Texas (S-A;W1-A).
COOPER, JOHN SHERMAN, Kentucky (W2-A).
CORDON, GUY, Oregon (W1-A)
DWORSHAK, HENRY C., Idaho (W1-A).
ECTON, ZALES N., Montana (W1-A).
ELLENDER, ALLEN J., Louisiana (W1-A).
GREEN, THEODORE FRANCIS, Rhode Island (S-A).
GURNEY, CHAN, South Dakota (W1-A).
HAYDEN, CARL, Arizona (W1-A).
HICKENLOOPER, BOURKE B., Iowa (W1-A).
HILL, LISTER, Alabama (W1-A).
HOLLAND, SPESSARD L., Florida (W1-A).
IVES, IRVING M., New York (W1-A).
JENNER, WILLIAM E., Indiana (W2-A).
JOHNSTON, OLIN D., South Carolina (W1-A).
KEM, JAMES P., Missouri (W1-A).
KILGORE, HARLEY M., West Virginia (W1-A).
KNOWLAND, WILLIAM F., California (W2-A).
LODGE, HENRY CABOT, JR., Massachusetts (W2-A).
LUCAS, SCOTT W., Illinois (W1-A).
MARTIN, EDWARD, Pennsylvania (S, W1, W2-A).
MCCARTHY, JOSEPH R., Wisconsin (W2-M).
MCCLELLAN, JOHN L., Arkansas (W1-A).
MCFARLAND, ERNEST W., Arizona (W1-N).
MILLIKIN, EUGENE D., Colorado (W1-A).
O'CONOR, HERBERT R., Maryland (U. S. Naval Reserve).
PEPPER, CLAUDE, Florida (W1-A).
REVERCOMB, CHAPMAN, West Virginia (W1-A).
ROBERTSON, A. WILLIS, Virginia (W1-A).
ROBERTSON, EDWARD V., Wyoming (Boer War).
RUSSELL, RICHARD B., Georgia (W1-N).
SALTONSTALL, LEVERETT, Massachusetts (W1-A).
SPARKMAN, JOHN J., Alabama (W1-A).
THOMAS, ELBERT D., Utah (W1-N. G. Utah and U. S. Reserves).
THYE, EDWARD J., Minnesota (W1-A).
TYDINGS, MILLARD E., Maryland (W1-A).
UMSTEAD, WILLIAM B., North Carolina (W1-A).
WHERRY, KENNETH S., Nebraska (W1-N).

Representatives

ALBERT, CARL, Third District, Oklahoma (W2-A).
ALLEN, JOHN J., JR., Seventh District, California (W1, W2-N).
ALLEN, LEO E., Thirteenth District, Illinois (W1-A).
ANDERSEN, H. CARL, Seventh District, Minnesota (W1-N).
ANDREWS, GEORGE W., Third District, Alabama (W2-N).
ANDREWS, WALTER G., Forty-second District, New York (W1-A).
ARENDS, LESLIE C., Seventeenth District, Illinois (W1-N).
AUCHINCLOSS, JAMES C., Third District, New Jersey (W1-A).
BAKEWELL, CLAUDE I., Eleventh District, Missouri (W2-N).

BARDEN, GRAHAM A., Third District, North Carolina (W1-N).
BARRETT, FRANK A., at Large, Wyoming (W1-A).
BATTLE, LAURIE C., Ninth District, Alabama (W2-A).
BEALL, J. GLENN, Sixth District, Maryland (W1-A).
BLATNIK, JOHN A., Eighth District, Minnesota (W2-A).
BOGGS, HALE, Second District, Louisiana (W2-N).
BOGGS, J. CALEB, at Large, Delaware W2-A).
BONNER, HERBERT C., First District, North Carolina (W1-A).
BRADLEY, FRED, Eleventh District, Michigan (W1-A).
BRADLEY, WILLIS W., Eighteenth District, California (W1, W2-N).
BREHM, WALTER E., Eleventh District, Ohio (W1-A).
BROOKS, OVERTON, Fourth District, Louisiana (W1-A).
BROPHY, JOHN C., Fourth District, Wisconsin (W1-N).
BRYSON, JOSEPH R., Fourth District, South Carolina (W1-A).
BUCK, ELLSWORTH B., Sixteenth District, New York (W1-N).
BULWINKLE, ALFRED L., Eleventh District, North Carolina (W1-A).
BURLESON, OMAR, Seventeenth District, Texas (W2-N).
CAMP, A. SIDNEY, Fourth District, Georgia (W1-A).
CANFIELD, GORDON, Eighth District, New Jersey (W1-A).
CARROLL, JOHN A., First District, Colorado (W2-A).
CASE, FRANCIS, Second District, South Dakota (W1-M).
CHELF, FRANK L., Fourth District, Kentucky (W2-A).
CHIPERFIELD, ROBERT B., Fifteenth District, Illinois (W1-A).
CHURCH, RALPH E., Tenth District, Illinois (W1-A).
CLASON, CHARLES R., Second District, Massachusetts (W1-A).
CLEMENTS, EARLE C., Second District, Kentucky (W1-A).
COLE, WILLIAM C., Third District, Missouri (W1-N).
COLMER, WILLIAM M., Sixth District, Mississippi (W1-A).
COOLEY, HAROLD D., Fourth District, North Carolina (W1-N).
COOPER, JERE, Ninth District, Tennessee (W1-A).
COUDERT, FREDERIC R., JR., Seventeenth District, New York (W1-A).
COURTNEY, WIRT, Seventh District, Tennessee (W1-A).
CRAVENS, FADJO, Fourth District, Arkansas (W1-N).
CROW, WILLIAM J., Twenty-third District, Pennsylvania (W2-A).
CUNNINGHAM, PAUL, Fifth District, Iowa (W1-A).
DAGUE, PAUL B., Ninth District, Pennsylvania (W1-M).
DAVIS, JAMES C., Fifth District, Georgia (W1-M).
DAWSON, WILLIAM L., First District, Illinois (W1-A).
DEVITT, EDWARD J., Fourth District, Minnesota (W2-N).
DIRKSEN, EVERETT M., Sixteenth District, Illinois (W1-A).
DOLLIVER, JAMES I., Sixth District, Iowa (W1-A).
DOMENGEAUX, JAMES, Third District, Louisiana (W2-A).
DONOHUE, HAROLD D., Fourth District, Massachusetts (W2-N).
DORN, W. J. BRYAN, Third District, South Carolina (W2-A).
DURHAM, CARL T., Sixth District, North Carolina (W1-N).
EBERHARTER, HERMAN P., Thirty-second District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).
ELLIS, HUBERT S., Fourth District, West Virginia (W1-A).
ELLSWORTH, HARRIS, Fourth District, Oregon (W1-A).
ELSTON, CHARLES H., First District, Ohio (W1-A).
ENGEL, ALBERT J., Ninth District, Michigan (W1-A).
EVINS, JOE L., Fifth District, Tennessee (W2-A).
FARRINGTON, JOSEPH R. (Delegate), Hawaii (W1-A).
FENTON, IVOR D., Twelfth District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).
FLETCHER, CHARLES K., Twenty-third District, California (W2-N).
FULLER, HADWEN C., Thirty-fifth District, New York (W1-A).
FULTON, JAMES G., Thirty-first District, Pennsylvania (W2-N).
GARY, J. VAUGHAN, Third District, Virginia (W1-A).
GAVIN, LEON H., Nineteenth District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).
GEARHART, BERTRAND W., Ninth District, California (W1-A).
GOFF, ABE MCGREGOR, First District, Idaho (W1, W2-A).
GORE, ALBERT, Fourth District, Tennessee (W2-A).
GRANGER, WALTER K., First District, Utah (W1-M).
GRANT, GEORGE M., Second District, Alabama (W1-A).
GRIFFITHS, P. W., Fifteenth District, Ohio (W1-N).
GWYNNE, JOHN W., Third District, Iowa (W1-A).
HALE, ROBERT, First District, Maine (W1-A).
HALLECK, CHARLES A., Second District, Indiana (W1-A).
HARNESS, FOREST A., Fifth District, Indiana (W1-A).
HAYS, BROOKS, Fifth District, Arkansas (W1-A).
HEDRICK, E. H., Sixth District, West Virginia (W1-A).
HESELTON, JOHN W., First District, Massachusetts (W1-A).
HESS, WILLIAM E., Second District, Ohio (W1-A).
HINSHAW, CARL, Twentieth District, California (W1-A).
HOEVEN, CHARLES B., Eighth District, Iowa (W1-A).
HOLIFIELD, CHET, Nineteenth District, California (W1-A).
HORAN, WALT, Fifth District, Washington (W1-N).
JACKSON, DONALD L., Sixteenth District, California (W2-M).
JACKSON, HENRY M., Second District, Washington (W2-N).
JARMAN, PETE, Sixth District, Alabama (W1-A).
JAVITS, JACOB K. (JACK), Twenty-first District, New York (W2-A).
JENISON, EDWARD H., Eighteenth District, Illinois (W2-N).
JENKINS, MITCHELL, Eleventh District, Pennsylvania (W1, W2-A).
JENSEN, BEN F., Seventh District, Iowa (W1-A).
JOHNSON, ANTON J., Fourteenth District, Illinois (S-A).
JOHNSON, GLEN D., Fourth District, Oklahoma (W2-A).
JOHNSON, LEROY, Third District, California (W1-A).
JOHNSON, LYNDON B., Tenth District, Texas (W2-N).
JONES, HOMER R., First District, Washington (W1, W2-N).
JUDD, WALTER H., Fifth District, Minnesota (W1-A).
KEARNEY, BERNARD W. (PAT), Thirty-first District, New York (W1-A).
KEATING, KENNETH B., Fortieth District, New York (W1, W2-A).
KENNEDY, JOHN F., Eleventh District, Massachusetts (W2-N).
KERSTEN, CHARLES J., Fifth District, Wisconsin (W2-C. G. (T)).
KILBURN, CLARENCE E., Thirty-fourth District, New York (W1-A).
KING, CECIL R., Seventeenth District, California (W1-A).
KIRWAN, MICHAEL J., Nineteenth District, Ohio (W1-A).
KUNKEL, JOHN C., Eighteenth District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).
LANDIS, GERALD W., Seventh District, Indiana (W1-A).
LANE, THOMAS J., Seventh District, Massachusetts (W1-A).
LARCADE, HENRY D., JR., Seventh District, California (W1-A).
LATHAM, HENRY J., Third District, New York (W2-N).
LECOMPTE, KARL M., Fourth District, Iowa (W1-A).
LEFEVRE, JAY, Thirtieth District, New York (W1-A).
LODGE, JOHN DAVIS, Fourth District, Connecticut (W2-N).
LUCAS, WINGATE H., Twelfth District, Texas (W2-A).
LYLE, JOHN E., Fourteenth District, Texas (W2-A).
MCCORMACK, JOHN W., Twelfth District, Massachusetts (W1-A).
MCGREGOR, J. HARRY, Seventeenth District, Ohio (W1-A).
MCMAHON, GREGORY, Fourth District, New York (W2-N).
MCMILLAN, JOHN L., Sixth District, South Carolina (W1-N).
MACKINNON, GEORGE, Third District, Minnesota (W2-N).
MADDEN, RAY J., First District, Indiana (W1-N).
MANSFIELD, MIKE, First District, Montana (W1-A-M).
MARTIN, THOMAS E., First District, Iowa (W1-A).
MATHEWS, FRANK A., JR., Fourth District, New Jersey (W1, W2-A).
MEADE, HUGH A., Second District, Maryland (W2-N).
MEADE, W. HOWES, Seventh District, Kentucky (W2-N).
MEYER, HERBERT A., Third District, Kansas (W1-A).
MICHNER, EARL C., Second District, Michigan (S-A).
MILLER, A. L., Fourth District, Nebraska (W1-A).
MILLER, EDWARD T., First District, Maryland (W1, W2-A).
MILLER, GEORGE P., Sixth District, California, (W1-A).
MILLER, WILLIAM J., First District, Connecticut (W1-A).
MITCHELL, E. (EDWARD) A., Eighth District, Indiana (W2-N).
MORRIS, TOBY, Sixth District, Oklahoma (W1-A).
MORTON, THURSTON BALLARD, Third District, Kentucky (W2-N).
MUHLENBERG, FREDERICK A., Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania (W1, W2-A).
MURRAY, TOM, Eighth District, Tennessee (W1-A).
NIXON, RICHARD N., Twelfth District, California (W2-N).
NODER, ROBERT, JR., Sixth District, New York (W2-A).
NORBLAD, WALTER, First District, Oregon (W2-A).
NORRELL, W. F., Sixth District, Arkansas (W1-A).
O'HARA, JOSEPH P., Second District, Minnesota (W1-A).
OWENS, THOMAS L., Seventh District, Illinois (W1-A).
PATMAN, WRIGHT, First District, Texas (W1-A).
PATTERSON, JAMES T., Fifth District, Connecticut (W2-M).
PEDEN, PRESTON E., Seventh District, Oklahoma (W2-A).

PETERSON, J. HARDIN, First District, Florida (W1-N).

PHILBIN, PHILIP J., Third District, Massachusetts (W1-N).

PHILLIPS, JOHN, Twenty-second District, California (W1-A).

POAGE, W. R., Eleventh District, Texas (W1-N).

PRESTON, PRINCE H., JR., First District, Georgia (W2-A).

PRICE, MELVIN, Twenty-second District, Illinois (W2-A).

RABIN, BENJAMIN J., Twenty-fourth District, New York (W1-N).

RANKIN, JOHN E., First District, Mississippi (W1-A).

REED, CHAUNCEY W., Eleventh District Illinois (W1-A).

REES, EDWARD H., Fourth District, Kansas (W1-A).

REEVES, ALBERT L., JR., Fifth District, Missouri (W2-A).

RICHARDS, JAMES P., Fifth District, South Carolina (W1-A).

RILEY, JOHN J., Second District, Squth Carolina (W1-N).

SADLAK, ANTONI N.; at large, Connecticut (W2-N).

SARBACHER, GEORGE W., JR., Fifth District, Pennsylvania (W2-M).

SASSCER, LANSDALE G., Fifth District, Maryland (W1-A).

SCOTT, HARDIE, Third District, Pennsylvania (W2-A).

SCOTT, HUGH D., JR., Sixth District, Pennsylvania (W2-A-N-Merchant Marine).

SEELEY-BROWN, HORACE, JR., Second District, Connecticut (W2-N).

SHORT, DEWEY, Seventh District, Missouri (W1-A).

SIKES, ROBERT L. F., Third District, Florida (W2-A).

SIMPSON, RICHARD M., Seventeenth District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).

SIMPSON, SID, Twentieth District, Illinois (W1-A).

SMATHERS, GEORGE A., Fourth District, Florida (W2-M).

SMITH, LAWRENCE H., First District, Wisconsin (W1-A).

SMITH, WINT, Sixth District, Kansas (W2-A).

SOMERS, ANDREW L., Tenth District, New York (W1-N).

SPRINGER, RAYMOND S., Tenth District, Indiana (W1-A).

SNYDER, MELVIN C., Second District, West Virginia (W1, W2-A).

STIGLER, WILLIAM G., Second District, Oklahoma (W1-A).

TALLE, HENRY O., Second District, Iowa (W1-N).

TEAGUE, OLIN E., Sixth District, Texas (W2-A).

THOMAS, ALBERT, Eighth District, Texas (W1-A).

THOMAS, J. PARNELL, Seventh District, New Jersey (W1-A).

TOWE, HARRY L., Ninth District, New Jersey (W1-N).

TRIMBLE, JAMES W., Third District, Arkansas (W1-A).

TWYMAN, ROBERT J., Ninth District, Illinois (W1, W2-N).

VAIL, RICHARD B., Second District, Illinois (W1-A).

VAN ZANDT, JAMES E., Twenty-second District, Pennsylvania (W1, W2-N).

VORYS, JOHN M., Twelfth District, Ohio (W1-N).

WADSWORTH, JAMES W., Forty-first District, New York (S-A).

WALTER, FRANCIS E., Twentieth District, Pennsylvania (W1, W2-N).

WEICHEL, ALVIN F., Thirteenth District, Ohio (W1-A).

WHEELER, W. M. (DON), Eighth District, Georgia (W2-A).

WIGGLESWORTH, RICHARD B., Thirteenth, District, Massachusetts (W1-A).

WILLIAMS, JOHN BELL, Seventh District, Mississippi (W2-A).

WOLCOTT, JESSE P., Seventh District, Michigan (W1-A).

WOOD, JOHN S., Ninth District, Georgia (W1-A).

WOODRUFF, ROY O., Tenth District, Michigan (S, W1-A).

WORLEY, EUGENE, Eighteenth District, Texas (W2-N).

ZIMMERMAN, ORVILLE, Tenth District, Missouri (W1-A).

II. RECAPITULATION

Senate:	
Boer War	1
S-A	1
S, W1-A	1
W1-A	25
W1-N	3
W1-M	0
W2-A	4
W2-N	0
W2-M	1
Total	36
House of Representatives:	
S-A	3
S, W1-A	1
W1-A	96
W1-N	23
W1-M	4
W2-A	27
W2-N	25
W2-M	4
W2-C. G. (T)	1
W1, W2-A	8
W1, W2-N	6
W1, W2-M	0
W1-A-M	1
W2-A-N-M	1
Total	200

Quota System on Wool Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Clinton M. Hester before the Committee on Agriculture:

Mr. Chairman, at the time you recessed the committee yesterday you requested us to be prepared today to state in detail our objections to any proposed quota system. We are glad now to proceed to present our views to the committee in detail.

As we stated in our testimony yesterday we are opposed to a quota system on imports of foreign wool. In our opinion such a system would be absolutely impossible of administration by the Government. For example, here are a few of the reasons why an import quota will not work with respect to wool:

1. In a quota system it is necessary to arrive at the amount of wool which will be consumed for some period of time in the future. If you buy wool in Australia or most any country today, it is at least 3 months before the wool is available for use here, so in a quota system we must anticipate our consumption by 6 months at a minimum. However, this is impossible. During 6 months our consumptive needs frequently change to such an extent that the import quota arrived at at the beginning of the period could be completely obsolete. Unlike sugar and other commodities where consumption and grade are fairly stable, it is impossible in the case of wool to accurately anticipate what future consumption will be because today the consumption may be way up and tomorrow it may be way down. Wool imports were controlled during the war by the War Production Board in order to conserve shipping space, and even under wartime conditions where the Government could make a reasonable estimate as to how much wool in the various grades was needed to fill the military programs, the administrators of this quota system found it almost impossible to accurately estimate quantities that the industry required in any given period, so how could we expect an administrator in peacetime who will not have the advantages of knowing what the demand for wool is likely to be to make any kind of an accurate guess as to the amount of foreign wool and in what grades our great woolen manufacturing industry will require.

2. The administrator will also have the problem of allocating the import quota for wool between some 20 countries who wish to export wool to the United States. This, gentlemen, is going to be most difficult, as each exporting country will want as large a share of this quota as they can get and the very first obstacle confronting the administrator will be the State Department. Add to this style factors which change frequently and require wools of various kinds from particular countries as well as the availability of these wools in the 20 countries.

3. The third allocation problem the administrator will have, assuming he successfully gets over numbers 1 and 2 hurdles, is the problem of fairly allocating import quotas among the importers and manufacturers. It has been suggested that this problem can be overcome by using the historical basis where the importer receives an import quota in proportion to the quantity of wool he imported in a base period. This method was used by the War Production Board and though it proved to be fairly satisfactory under wartime conditions where imports were limited strictly to those people who had previously been in the business and who were filling Government contracts, we wish to point out that under peacetime conditions in our free economy it is unthinkable that any system would be adopted that would give the comparatively few importers of wool the monopoly on wool imports. Therefore, if an import system for wool be adopted it would be necessary that any citizen of the United States receive a quota regardless of whether he was importing wool prior to the establishment of the quota system. Under these circumstances it would be impossible for anyone to administer a quota system on wool.

During the war the cotton manufacturers in the South used cotton and rayon in the manufacture of war materials. Since the end of the war these manufacturers have been making considerable use of wool. Therefore, if the administrator of any quota system should allocate his quota on a historical basis what would he do in the event that these mills should suddenly apply to him for an allocation of wool. The answer is that the administrator would have to reject these applications. Further, if the quota should be allocated by the administrator and then a number of mills who had not previously been using wool applied for an allocation of wool what would the administrator do? The answer is he would have to deny these applications or increase the quota over the amount previously determined.

4. Our fourth point is that if a quota system should be adopted our wool manufacturing industry would be denied the opportunity of purchasing its raw material from the sources of supply that are best suited for each particular manufacturing business. As was pointed out in yesterday's testimony, wool is one of those commodities where at

the present time it is necessary to import twice as much wool as is grown in this country, even assuming that every pound of wool grown in this country is used.

5. Quite apart from the foregoing a quota system is objectionable, for the reason that it would encourage the use of synthetic fibers as a substitute for wool and would create a Government monopoly which is denied to private industry.

6. The quota system is only another form of OPA rationing. If a quota system should be adopted it would result in a rationing of the pay envelope of the textile workers.

7. Finally, gentlemen, if a quota system should be adopted it would be impossible to have free enterprise in a country such as ours, which has become the greatest on earth through free enterprise.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I listened yesterday to a very important message from the President of the United States. In my years of experience, I have listened to many messages from Presidents but none, and I say it advisedly, more important than that to which I listened yesterday. This message to which I refer involves the future of every American and of America itself.

If you want to know what I said to my people in Vermont in response to their request for my comment on the President's message, this is what I told them:

It was a cool, impressive statement, very carefully thought out, and made in an effort to avert a crisis, and yet to recognize an issue which, reduced to its lowest denominator, is, Shall we go to war with Russia or try to avoid it in every way possible? We need not delude ourselves.

Obviously, one way to keep out of a shooting war at present is to assist Greece and Turkey in their attempts to resist being made the pawns of those who threaten their existence. I am not for appeasement. I am for showing our teeth.

Our own stake in this crisis is very great. It is not measured by dollars. Civilization as we know it is at stake.

This is the beginning of a show-down and a contest of ideologies, make no mistake. If we can avoid bullets by spending dollars and establish our own democratic theories of government, there is no second choice. However, the American people should realize that we are at the crossroads. Between now and March 31 almost anything may happen. This is no time to mince words nor try to dodge an issue which is the most important the world has ever known.

No more important message was ever delivered to Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that it is my well-considered judgment that if we are forced to fight again to maintain those principles upon which our Government is founded the sooner we do it the quicker it will be over. I, as one American, do not propose to be bluffed by the ideologies which are so contrary to ours that the two concepts cannot exist together in the world if civilization is to survive.

We should learn something by experience; and if we are as big as we think we are, and if we are ready to assume the burden which is ours, now is the time to accept the responsibility therefor and to pay the price, if we have to do it, although it is not of our choosing.

Exemption of Civil-Service Retirement Annuities From Federal Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a bill, H. R. 291, pending before the Committee on Ways and Means to amend section 18 of the Civil-Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments of pension moneys under such act from Federal taxation.

There is no sensible reason why a retired civil-service employee should have to pay a tax on the small annuity which he has himself earned and paid for after a lifetime of faithful work.

Under the permission granted me I include the following statement of one H. C. Richey, of New Orleans, La., addressed to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, advocating prompt passage of my bill:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *February 28, 1947.*
Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The following statement and plea is submitted in behalf of those retired Federal employees who, when retired, had to sever their connection and withdraw membership from any employee organization in which they were associated, in order to reduce their living expenses to the level of the annuity they were granted by the Govment; therefore they have no connection with any employee organization represented before your committee, and have no such representation, except through this statement, submitted by their representative whose signature is hereinafter affixed.

This statement is presented in favor of bill H. R. 291, now before the Committee on Ways and Means, and request is made that it be laid before the committee and be made a part of any printed record of any hearings held on the bill mentioned. This group of retired employees request the committee to give favorable consideration to this proposed legislation, and recommend it favorably to the House for consideration, and present the following reasons why it should be enacted into law by the Congress:

(a) The civil-service retirement law, as it now stands, provides that (section 18) the annuity shall not "be assignable either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy or attachment, garnishment, or other legal process."

The wording of this section clearly indicates that the Congress which enacted this law intended that the retired employee should receive the full value and benefit of the annuity, without any reduction by any levy or legal process. The word "levy" as defined by Webster's New International Dictionary is "to raise or collect, as by assessment, execution, or other legal process; to execute or impose by authority, as to levy taxes, toll, tribute, or contribution." The wording of the existing law provides that the annuity shall not be subject to levy, and the dictionary says the word "levy" means to "impose by authority, as to levy taxes."

The word "levy" to the layman means taxes, and to date there has been no legal interpretation or decision that the annuities of retired Federal employees should not be free of taxes under the meaning of section 18 of the civil-service retirement law. Taxing the annuities is now done under a decision of the Treasury Department, the agency which collects the tax. That it is unjust to collect a tax on the annuity is shown by the fact that no legal action can be taken, under the law, against the annuity to collect any unpaid taxes. Therefore it would seem that the collection of a tax which cannot be collected by a legal process is an illegal tax and an illegal collection. Bill H. R. 291 should be enacted into law to clarify and make explicit the intent of section 18 of the retirement law and the intent of the Congress which enacted the retirement law.

(b) The Railroad Retirement Act provides that—

"No annuity payment shall be assignable or be subject to any tax or garnishment, attachment, or other legal process under any circumstances."

The Civil-Service Retirement Act provides that—

"None of the moneys mentioned in this act shall be assignable either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, or attachment, or other legal process."

The only material difference in the wording of the same provision of the two different acts is any difference there may be between the meaning of the word "levy" and the word "tax." Webster's New International Dictionary defines the word "tax" as: "A sum imposed or levied upon the members of a society to defray its expenses. A charge or burden, usually pecuniary, laid upon persons or property." Note that the word "levied" has the same meaning as taxed. Comparison of the two sentences quoted from the two different acts clearly indicate that the two words "tax" and "levy" were intended to mean the same thing. However, under the Railroad Act the annuity of the retired railroad employee is not taxed, while the retired Federal civil-service employee, under a ruling of the Treasury Department, has to refund, or kick-back, to the Government, which grants the annuity, a part of that annuity in taxes.

That there has never been a meeting of official minds as to the justification of taxing the annuities is shown by the action of the Civil Service Commission in requesting an opinion from the Treasury Department as to whether the annuity was taxable or not, the Commission being in doubt. Any decision on this point should have been rendered by an uninterested agency and not by the agency which collects the taxes.

(c) The method of computing the annuity to be granted retired civil-service employees was formulated in the act of May 29, 1930, and being based on the cost of living at that time was supposed, and intended, to give the employee a means of livelihood after retirement from active Government service. The dollars making up the annuity are just a medium of exchange for the necessities of life, such as rent, a certain number of bushels of potatoes, a set number of sacks of flour, etc. Since that annuity was set, or agreed upon, it has been automatically reduced by the continual increase in the cost of the necessities of life, so that the dollar of today

will only provide about two-thirds the rent, potatoes, flour, etc., it could be exchanged for in 1930.

Then, in addition to this reduction in purchasing value of the annuity and corresponding lowering of the standard of living of the retired employee, his annuity is further reduced by the imposition of an unwarranted tax. To relieve these retired employees of this unjust taxation and reduction of annuity, bill H. R. 291 should be enacted into law.

(d) Congress has already enacted laws which increased wages in the private commercial and industrial field, and also granted increases in salaries of present Government employees, to meet the rising cost of living, but no consideration has yet been given the retired employee. That loyal employee who gave the working span of life to the Government, at a low salary, found on retirement that he had to lower his standard of living to the level of the annuity he was granted, and now he finds he must further retrench as his annuity is reduced through taxation and cost of living continues to rise. These aged retired employees, physically incapacitated by age or ailment from obtaining further employment to augment their annuity, seek relief by your committee and the Congress through the enactment into law of bill H. R. 291.

As representing the herein-described group of retired Federal employees, I thank the committee for its kind consideration.

Yours very truly,

H. G. RICHEY.

American Library for French People in Paris—A Vermonter, Howard C. Rice, Jr., American Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article on the American library for French people. This is a real United States information library being conducted in Paris, where earnest French citizens gather to seek the truth about the United States.

The following appeared in the Brattleboro (Vt.) Daily Reformer, of date February 4, 1947:

LOCAL MAN HEADS AMERICAN LIBRARY FOR FRENCH PEOPLE

Something new in Paris since the war is the United States information library, where on the Rue Duphot, just around the corner from the Madeleine, earnest French citizens—men, women, and children—gather to read American books and American periodicals, and in general seek the truth about life in the United States.

We Americans who lived in Paris before the war welcome this little American library on French soil, writes Valma Clark in the Kansas City Star. No longer need we bear the brunt of disseminating the true facts about America, answering, often not wisely or well, their strange and laughable questions.

As late as 1940 we were still assuring some Frenchmen that all Americans were not rich, that Buffalo Bill was not a common existing type in the United States, that we ourselves had never been held up at the point of a gun by American gangsters, that Indian chiefs in feathers occurred rarely off Indian reservations, and that Americans did not live exclusively on canned goods.

Often the French were not very credulous of our disillusioning assertions. Today it is a more informed French public. Seeing is believing, and the French men and women who leaf regularly through American books and American picture magazines are not inclined to take issue with the evidence of their own eyes. But there is still spadework to be done.

OFFSHOOT OF THE WAR

The United States information library in Paris is really an outgrowth of the war, when it became so necessary to spread abroad, in the interests of greater international understanding, the American concepts of democracy. It is one of many such libraries in foreign countries throughout the world—part of a modest program, maintained by the State Department with the support of Congress, for international information and cultural exchanges.

Speaking recently in Paris, at the UNESCO conference, William Benton, American Under Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who is directing this program, said with great truth: "You who have lived abroad do not need to be told about the misconceptions and exaggerations that exist concerning America—abouts its lawlessness, luxury, and irresponsibility; its lack of taste and culture and scholarship; its alleged financial imperialism; and its so-called economic disorder. Some of these misconceptions may be harmless or even amusing. Others are dangerous, both to us and to the world."

Howard C. Rice, Jr., American director of the library, said that he and his staff of 7 provide information for some 200 French visitors a day on almost every phase of American life, "from jazz to philosophy and from medicine to poetry." At present the library has some 2,000 books, it takes 375 American periodicals regularly and has a large collection of pamphlets and United States Government documents. It is open every day except Sunday. It can seat 65 comfortably, but on Saturdays—the peak day for attendance—it has not enough space to accommodate the French people.

In reply to a question as to what phases of American life interest French people most, Mr. Rice said that fully one-third of the library's effort is in the scientific, medical, and technical fields. The French people are intensely interested in our industrial engineering, our radios, our plastics, our applied sciences of all kinds.

FOLLOW NEWS OF UNITED STATES

Next in order of interest comes the field of current affairs in the United States. French readers consult American biographies, Who's Who in America, and articles in current periodicals.

The third largest group is interested in architecture and building in the United States.

The fourth group is concerned about American fashions. Mr. Rice says that the fashion books are worn to shreds. This is understandable in view of the fact that fashions are a primary industry in France.

After this, and in this order, avid French readers peruse current American literature, books and articles on American music and American art.

Prospective GI brides come to the library asking for descriptive details of some little village in Florida or South Dakota which is the home town of the American soldier intrenched in their affections. They are trying to visualize the setting of their married life. Really they are asking the librarian to find out for them whether they will be happy in America! Mr. Rice's staff does its best to supply these French girls with descriptive data.

One French father and mother of a girl engaged to a GI sought information about the position and character of this particular boy! This, of course, the library could not supply. But it did furnish the anxious parents with the name and address of his parish priest, from a Catholic register.

A Frenchwoman corresponding with a relief agency in New York—she was writing in French, the agency in English—brought her letter in for translation. They requested her sizes—bust measure, hip measure, etc.—in the American terms of inches and yards, not the French centimeters and meters. Mr. Rice solved this acute problem, to the wholehearted amusement of his entire staff and the woman herself, by taking the required measurements with string and then placing the string against an American ruler.

A French housewife, whose apartment was infested by mice, had heard of the marvelous American DDT powder. Could the library get her some?

Another client came asking for the Macaroni Journal. The staff found this journal existed, but unfortunately it was not on their list of periodicals.

A group of young French people sought information as to how they could get themselves adopted by an American Indian tribe.

FACTS ON KALAMAZOO

A Frenchman came seeking information on Kalamazoo. He had seen the word on the Kalamazoo College Bulletin, which appeared, along with other college bulletins, on the library's window poster featuring American colleges. This Frenchman worked for a firm that had office ledgers bearing this word and he had the strange hobby of collecting Kalamazoo miscellany.

Other odd requests include questions as to the history of the zipper fastener, the American methods of plucking chickens by machine, and details about kudzu, the grass.

Obviously, Mr. Rice's staff cannot satisfy all these curious French seekers for strange information. They tell them so in a circular which reads: "We are not a travel bureau or a shopping service. We cannot supply addresses of great-uncles who died in America 15 or 20 years ago. We cannot tell fair French maidens why their GI boy friends have not written them. We cannot supply addresses of 'Lieutenant Smith, who was here with the American Army in some unit, I forget which, sometime in 1945.' We cannot give information about prospective American sons-in-law to uneasy French parents. We cannot obtain priorities for French travelers wishing to go to America."

In its own true field the library does a small but very effective and continuous job of supplying the French intelligentsia, as well as the ordinary French reader, with missing facts about the United States. A French historian writing about the landings in North Africa was recently able to complete his documentation from American reports supplied by Mr. Rice. The Eisenhower report was distributed in small quantities to French libraries. Forty copies of the large reference volume listing "Scientific, Medical, and Technical Books Published in the United States of America in 1930–44" went to French provincial libraries and others. This latter is a basic tool for French scientists, doctors, and technicians to complete the gaps in their knowledge of what has been done in the United States in these important fields during the years when they were cut off from the world under the German occupation.

France, Great Britain, and Russia have long understood the value of such information programs abroad. The United States is the last of the great powers to enter this field. If, as has been said, peace—like war—begins in the minds of men, then this effort to make America understood abroad is a step toward the great goal of international harmony.

Poland's Plight Recalled on Kosciusko's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Star-Herald, of Kosciusko, Miss., of March 6, 1947, with reference to remarks that I made on the floor of the House of Representatives on the anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko, in whose honor the town of Kosciusko, Miss., was named. The editorial:

POLAND'S PLIGHT RECALLED ON KOSCIUSKO'S BIRTHDAY

Congressman PRICE of Illinois took occasion on the anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko to call the attention of Congress, and of America, to the present plight of that great hero's native land, Poland.

Not only did Kosciusko aid our founding fathers in their struggle for independence, but so did hundreds of other Poles, and we owe them an overwhelming debt of gratitude.

Poland was the first country to accept the challenge of Hitler. Her fight was futile but brave. What is to be her reward for refusing to accept oppression?

Shall Poland be partitioned? Shall her government be made the puppet of a stronger nation whose ideologies are so foreign to the Christian beliefs of the Polish people?

It is the belief of Mr. Price and countless other Americans that we should have the same concern for Poland's welfare that Kosciusko and other Polish patriots had for America's.

He calls attention to the fact that Russia is doing some very questionable things in Poland, in violation of her agreements with her wartime allies, and is spreading the tentacles of sovietism over unprotected and unwilling people. Such methods can never bring peace to Europe.

Our Government has not, and cannot, ignore the attempts of Russia to set up a puppet government but stern and effective measures must be adopted by the United Nations.

The Illinois Congressman closed his address with this inspiring challenge:

"As a nation dedicated to freedom—recognizing the blessings of liberty as we do—America should continue to exhibit the liveliest concern in the welfare of Poland and all small nations who were given such hope by the Atlantic Charter. America's great weight must be thrown behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland."

Parity Versus Comparable Price for Wool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Kenneth W. Marriner, of Boston, Mass., before the Committee on Agriculture:

Mr. Chairman, if parity for wool is increased to comparable and the grower is given a price support program at 90 percent of comparable, this will mean continued Government ownership of the domestic wool clip. I will explain why.

First, it is important to make clear the fact that the price of wool in our free economy is the world price of this raw material plus the duty of 34 cents. For example, today's price of an average grade of imported fine wool is 81 cents per pound plus 34 cents duty or a total of $1.15 per pound, clean, delivered in this country.

Now it is obvious that if the Department of Agriculture buys our domestic clip as it has done during the past 4 years, it must be prepared to sell this domestic wool in competition with imports which today means at $1.15 or less; otherwise, the industry will buy the cheaper foreign wool and the Government will be left holding the bag. This is just what is happening and the reason we have such a large stock pile of domestic wool is due entirely to the selling policy of the Department of Agriculture, which has been to hold its domestic wool purchases at prices higher than the world market for wool.

Now getting back to the reason why a new parity for wool on the comparable level would result in Government ownership, I give you the following example:

FACTS

(a) Cost of imported wool is 81 cents plus 34 cents equals $1.15 clean.

(b) The parity price of fine wool is $1.20 clean.

(c) The comparable price of fine wool is $1.30, clean.

EXAMPLES

(a) Under Congressman HERTER's bill which is supported by the wool trade the grower is given a floor under the price of wool by establishing a loan or purchase program at 90 percent of the present parity. This means Government support at 90 percent of $1.20—$109.20.

Under this plan domestic wool will flow into industry as its price will compete with imports at $1.15.

(b) Under Congressman BARRETT's bill the grower is given a floor under wool by establishing a loan or purchase program at 90 percent of the comparable price. This means Government support at 90 percent of $1.30—$118.30.

Under this plan the Government would become the only buyer of domestic wool and you would be perpetuating the present unsatisfactory situation where manufacturers will buy the lower cost imported wool and more Government-owned wool will be added to the already large stock pile which will eventually have to be sold at a substantial loss to the Government.

You will note that a loan or purchase on the basis of 90 percent of the comparable price would have resulted in the Government owning the domestic clip 13 years out of the 20, whereas if the loan or purchase program had been on 90 percent of parity the Government would have owned the clip only 6 years out of the 20 and these are the 6 years Government support was really needed.

Two Major Mandates to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the following article is a very constructive statement and deserves the attention of every Member of Congress. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, January 5, 1947:

TWO MAJOR MANDATES TO CONGRESS—LABOR LAW CHANGES AND REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONS NEEDED

(By Heptisax)

For some weeks past there has been a good deal of discussion in the press and on the radio of the possibility of a business slump, with each observer quoting his favorite economist or spokesman for this or that Government bureau. These same observers are also taking a lively interest in the public's reluctance to spend money as recklessly as everyone seemed to be spending it in the early autumn months; and rather painful efforts are being made to tie this phenomenon in with prophecies of an impending recession. Many of those who are trying to understand the situation are coming to the conclusion that the new caution with which the American people are now buying everything, from butter to parimutuel tickets, is traceable to a widespread fear of a coming depression.

This is not a problem in economics, which the specialists can solve by quoting market quotations and statistical tables. It is a problem in mass psychology, and to get the answer to it one does better to frequent places where wage earners congregate to relax and discuss the state of the Nation. Anyone who has been doing this for 6 months past will come to a very different conclusion. He will conclude, I think, that the reckless spending of the summer and early autumn was a symptom of fear and that the saner buying and spending of December is inspired by a new confidence in the future.

The professorial speculation on the possibility that a mild or serious depression is somewhere around the corner is scarcely more than a month old. The discussion of it in the streets is at least 6 months old and was probably at its peak in September. It was inspired by price inflation. We all know the causes of price inflation which were familiar to the common man. He knew that it was traceable to the scarcity of nearly everything that everybody wanted to buy. He knew that returning servicemen, bent upon compensating themseves for a thin time at whatever cost, were contributing to price inflation; but he also knew that that would soon cease to have any marked effect on competitive buying. He knew that Government efforts to control distribution and prices were fostering bigger and bigger black markets and that the lavish spending of the racketeers, and of their army of handsomely paid employees, was a contributing factor.

He knew that the only cure for the situation was all-out production; and when he saw strike after strike halting production and the administration unwilling to resort to any legislative remedy and unable to persuade unorganized labor that strikes which aggravated scarcities could not possibly yield the industrial workers increases in real buying power, he became very pessimistic indeed about the future. He foresaw a time when the great masses of the people could afford to buy nothing with their inflated dollars but the barest necessities, and when those industries that had bought temporary peace from organized labor with wage increases would find that their market had shrunk, would curtail production, and would start laying off their high-priced help.

This prospect, which was being freely discussed in the late summer, inspired the common man to get rid of his money as fast as it came in. One might think that the prospect of a depression would prompt wage earners to save. So it would have if they had any faith in the sustained buying power of the dollar. But with run-away price inflation as the likely prelude to depression, it became the ambition of everyone

on a small income to spend every cent he could get his hands on while money would still buy something—if it was only whoopee. The workingman decided that it would be better to enter upon hard times with a house full of things that he wanted than with a bale of worthless paper. Then, as the elections approached, the idea got about that a change in the administration might bring changes of policy which would make all-out production possible; that inflation might be checked; and that the much discussed slump might be forestalled. The common man and his neighbor agreed that it was worth trying.

What happened at the polls is largely a result of that agreement. And by what happened at the polls the common man was persuaded to calm down, to hold on to a higher percentage of his earnings, and to do some watchful waiting. The man and woman on a small income gave the Republican Party a mandate to get steady production going by bringing labor under control; and they are waiting with some confidence—with far greater confidence since John L. Lewis surrendered—to see what the Congress does with this mandate.

This changed attitude of the masses in the low- and middle-income brackets toward their money does not account, of course, for the December buyers' strike against high-priced luxuries. The industrial worker, the office clerk, the small merchant, and the professional man do not buy fantastically priced furs, jewelry, cosmetics, and night-club entertainment. But the customers for such wares are not at all giddy wasters. Plenty of them are men or the wives of men who have come to affluence the hard way and are as intent upon getting their dollar's worth of finery or fun as the thriftiest small merchant. They are moved by the same hopes and fears as everyone else; but the good providers in this class are likelier than the common man to understand Government finance and to take an interest in it. Before the election they, too, had a very lively fear of inflation and its consequences; but they feared currency inflation as well as price inflation. They feared that, if the Democratic Party won the election, the administration would persist in financing an extravagantly expensive Government out of borrowings through the commercial banks and the issue of Federal Reserve paper against bonds, until the wisest of their own kind started bidding against each other for inflation-proof investments.

Then the paper dollar might all of a sudden be too cheap to print. They were gloomily sure that such a financial debacle would shortly follow a Democratic victory in November, and not confident enough of a Republican victory to have much respect for the abundant cash in their pockets. So they too squandered money recklessly until the election returns gave them some reason to hope that the new Congress would put an end to borrowing and deficit financing and insure the stability of the currency by attacking the debt. For whatever their small vote is worth, they gave the Republican Party this mandate, and then they too settled down to do some calm watchful waiting. By the time they started their Christmas spending they were sufficiently hopeful that the dollar was safe, and that labor peace and full production would bring down prices, to have recovered their normal respect for the cash in their pockets and to do their spending with some discretion.

That seems to me to explain the attitude of all classes of our people toward money before and since the elections. Six months ago we had not only labor strikes to curtail production but producers' and dealers' strikes. Scarce goods were hoarded in the belief that Federal bungling of both the labor situation and price control would push prices higher and higher, while all classes of people were paying any prices asked to get rid of their money. Now we have something resembling a buyers' strike, inspired by the hope that the new Congress will force policies upon the administration which will bring full production, competitive selling and those lower prices which, in prospect, make it worth while for a fellow to hoard his loose change.

According to this theory of mine, then, the new Congress has two mandates to execute. One of them comes from all classes of people, from everyone, indeed, but the professional labor leaders of the more cantankerous sort and the various collectivists, who refuse to believe that the people voted for any specific change in November. This first mandate is to put an end to industrial warfare, get production going and keep it going. Since it is certain that no Republican would have been elected from the highly industrialized States without the votes of a majority of working men and women, whether union members or not, it would be nonsense to suggest that the Congress has a mandate to soak labor vindictively.

It is very difficult to learn from any loyal union man what he thinks should be done. He wants certain definite results; but to get them he wants the fewest possible restrictions put upon organized labor. I get the impression that most of them would like to see the legislative program in Congress start modestly and proceed cautiously as conditions dictate. Most of them have their eyes on the CIO unions, and particularly on those dominated by Communists, who are as likely to make trouble for political or destructive purposes as for the welfare of the rank and file.

Whatever is needed to make it impossible for politically minded union chiefs to sabotage American production and transportation the average union man would approve. I have been thinking, talking, and writing about this labor problem for 10 years, and in that time I have said over and over again that the Nation's minimum need is to make labor "respectable and responsible." This, when explained, meets with the workingman's full approval. To make labor respectable its leadership must be respectable; and, to insure this, it must be representative of and accountable to the rank and file at every turn. To achieve this it is probably necessary to incorporate all unions, prescribe "democratic" union government, and to have all their accounts audited and published. This would make union leadership responsible to the workers; and to make the unions responsible to the people and their Government, the first step would be the revision of the discriminatory Wagner Act.

I am inclined to agree with the men that, if we started with these measures and then paused to note the effect on union leadership, we should find that the situation did not call for much further legislative action, and could see how much more had to be done.

The second mandate is, as I have said, from the limited number of persons who understand money and its ways. It is a mandate to reduce Government costs by reducing Government functions (for it cannot be done by firing a bureaucrat supernumerary clerk here and there), until there is such a substantial surplus that a businesslike assault can be made on the debt and particularly upon the enormous mass of inflationary Federal Reserve paper which is a constant menace to the American citizen's dollar.

We Face a Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation today face a decision—a decision as far reaching as any we have had occasion to make in the past.

Ever since the battle of Waterloo, England has occupied a leading position among the nations of the world. She has been criticized by many for her imperialism. She has been charged by many with provoking war. I am not here attempting to defend the sins of England, but I do maintain that over this long period of time England has been a great contributor to the welfare of many of the peoples of this globe. Even the United States has been in many instances the beneficiary of England's leadership.

We now find that in all probability the United Kingdom can never again regain its prewar would prestige. The actions of England in the last few weeks are conclusive that economically she is in bad shape. The British Isles are not self-sufficient; they lack resources. They can no longer control the economy of the Empire. Militarily the British Isles are not defensible against atomic and rocket warfare because of their proximity to continental Europe, and their small population of 45,000,000 people. Great Britain must bow out as the leader among nations. This is a challenge to the United States of America.

Will we answer this challenge? If we are to answer, then we must answer it now. If we fail to answer it the result will be that the leadership of the world will fall into the lap of Russia, and she will thrust upon all the peoples of the world her ideology, which is contrary to our American philosophy.

The decline of Great Britain has produced a vacuum, and the vacuum must be filled. It is necessary that we fill it. Otherwise it will be filled by Russia. It is regrettable that we are brought face to face with this challenge at a time when our Treasury is in such a deplorable condition, and the industrial part of our country is torn by strife, with trouble between management and labor, with constantly recurring strikes. Much of this trouble is chargeable to the bad influences of Russia who stands ready to take over if we fail.

To us, whether we want it or not, now comes the leadership of the world. The great question is this—Is Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen ready to make the sacrifice that will be called for in filling this vacuum? Are the people of this Nation fully informed as to the far-reaching effect of this new responsibility? The President has challenged communism throughout the world. The place to start the fight is within our own country.

I ask unanimous consent to include herewith a very outstanding editorial

taken from the Wall Street Journal of March 10, 1947, which deals specifically with this matter, and in a most intelligent manner. The title of this editorial is "We Face a Decision."

WE FACE A DECISION

A foreign policy is effective only to the degree that it has popular support. Understanding is essential to support. At the moment, this country is in a place where the great necessity for understanding coincides with great difficulties in obtaining understanding.

It is doubtful if the seriousness of the news from Great Britain is even now fully realized in the United States. The reason is that the drama from which that news hangs has very little to do with the tragedy that is revealed. The popular impression seems to be that a highly unfortunate break in the weather has forced Britain to modify some policies.

The real situation is more fundamental. It is foolish to suppose that some blizzards by themselves accomplished in a few days what hostile armies have failed to accomplish in almost as many centuries. This is not a case where spring thaws and a revival of the spirit of Dunkerque will resolve the troubles—not at all. The role of the blizzards has been to reveal that a comparatively trivial thing could upset a nation that was a world power; the snow did not create a hollow shell but it exposed one.

Had a conqueror occupied Britain to dictate terms of peace stripping the Nation of empire and world power, the significance and the impact on the world would be immediately clear. Something very like that has happened. Remembering all that America and western civilization owe Britain, one is reluctant to set that down. But there it is.

The British withdrawal from world affairs leaves vacuums. Vacuums do not remain. They are filled. We see such a situation now typified in Greece. Soon we may see it elsewhere.

Does this Nation wish to fill the vacuums, or does it wish to see them filled by the only other force powerful enough to do so—that is, Soviet Russia?

If this country chooses to fill them, it must assume a world role far beyond anything our extreme internationalists have envisaged. If the country acts otherwise, it will be choosing an isolationism beyond anything our isolationists have visualized.

It would be idle to say that the latter choice cannot be supported. It can be argued validly that the American political forms and social organization are not suited to a nation playing a world role. It is certainly true that such a role is neither the wish nor the tradition of many of the American people. Neither dependence on foreign supplies nor foreign markets absolutely require assumption of the role, as was the case with Britain.

If there were promised only a struggle for power and spoils between states of similar civilization, professing similar ideals, the isolation argument might seem compelling to a majority of Americans just as it did in the 1920's. But it is not just a game of nineteenth-century power politics. It is in addition to that a conflict between two ideas, each of which is basic to a form of social organization; on one side the idea of man as an individual for whose benefit the state exists and the opposite idea that man is a functional organism existing for the benefit of the state. These ideas are in a struggle for domination.

So it will be well, we think, to ponder whether it is possible to isolate one's self from an idea, or, if it is possible, whether it is wise. At some place it will be necessary to meet that idea, and a geographic maneuver will not avoid the necessity.

There will be people who say that they know the answer, in fact have been aware of it for a long time. It is not out of place to suggest that these people be less confident. In the first place, a smug and patronizing attitude is the opposite of a contribution to the calm discussion that is needed. In the second place, these people who claim possession of the right answers might reflect that the foreign policy which they have so largely guided has not been adequate to the situation that now confronts this country.

As a matter of fact, there has been no foresight comparable to the size of the change that is taking place. Washington reports to this newspaper show how inadequate has been even the appreciation of Europe's need for food and other supplies. The depth of the political chaos has been underestimated. The weakness of Britain, which had been the stabilizing influence in many places, was misjudged even by the British.

What all shades of opinion must recognize is, first, that a choice of policies is possible. The choice must be intelligently made. Groping and blundering toward even a right decision may be as harmful as making the wrong decision.

It must be recognized that it is a choice between two extremes. There probably is no middle ground. Thus if the country is to choose that policy commonly called internationalism, halfway measures would be seized as a sign of weakness, an indication of the lack of conviction equivalent to inability to decide. It would be better consciously to take the other road.

And the choice cannot be made in an atmosphere of rowdy recrimination and above all it cannot be made except by a people in possession of all the facts which they can have only from their Government.

Heretofore there may have been explanations for the lack of complete candor. But in the present situation there can be no injury to British susceptibilities by discussing British conditions as they are. There can no longer be lack of frankness about Russia and the ideological gulf; certainly such things are no news to the Russians. Candor requires that the cost to America of an expanded world role be told the American people, for the cost will be very great in gifts, loans, and military expenditures. If that information is withheld there is great danger that the country will rebel at some halfway point. It would be better not to take a course that must be retraced.

There is no one among us who can say that he surely knows the right way. If there were such a one, his prescience would avail nothing unless he could make the country understand and win its support.

Illinois Alumni Commend Veterans' Administration Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I called attention of the House to the fact that the veteran students at the University of Illinois were having a great deal of difficulty in receiving their subsistence checks from the Veterans' Administration.

At that time, a large number of protests were coming to me from the University of Illinois in every mail. As a result of an investigation into this situation by the Veterans' Administration at my request, I am pleased to report that remedial action has been taken.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I herewith include a letter which I have received from the University of Illinois Alumni Association complimenting the Veterans' Administration upon the fine work that it did in correcting the causes of the complaints at the University of Illinois. It is gratifying to note that the Veterans' Administration has demonstrated an earnest desire to correct any defects in its operating procedures wherever confusion exists.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
ALUMNI ASSOCIATION,
Urbana, Ill., March 10, 1947.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: Referring to our telegram to you of January 13, 1947, asking for immediate attention to the correction of delayed payments of subsistence allowance to veterans in attendance at the University of Illinois we wish to express our appreciation of your interest and prompt action.

On January 15, 1947, the Veterans' Administration Branch Office No. 7 sent Mr. Willard M. Rokey, Chief Inspection-Investigation Division, to Urbana accompanied by Mr. R. M. Johnson, Chief Registration and Research Section of the Chicago Regional Office.

These gentlemen were given headquarters space in the Illini Union Building on the campus. They established contact with Mr. Robert G. Hughes and Mr. Arthur W. Tompkins, student veteran representatives on the board of directors of the Alumni Association, these students having made the report resulting in our telegram to you.

A total of 436 veteran students indicated there had been delay in the payment of subsistence allowances. In most cases confusion seemed to exist in a misunderstanding as to the necessity of submitting reports of reentry into training by veterans who had completed the summer term and subsequently entered the fall term.

In many cases the veteran's claim file or his payment record were in other regional offices where the veteran had formerly resided and were therefore not available for prompt action.

Several cases were due to changed addresses. This condition is particularly distressing at the university because of there being two cities, namely Urbana, the home of the university and Champaign, the home of a large percentage of the veteran students. The local post offices are prohibited by law from forwarding Government checks from Champaign to Urbana and vice versa, but must return them to the Treasury Disbursing Office from which they were issued. A request for our exception to this requirement was made by the university but was refused by the Chief Disbursing Officer of the United States Treasury.

Another group failed to submit the report of earnings required by Public Law 679, Seventy-ninth Congress.

In a few cases delay was caused by administrative error by the Veterans' Administration and, in a few cases, to the inadvertent failure of the university to report correct information to the Veterans' Administration.

In some 65 cases the veterans' complaints dealt with correctness of amount and questions of dependency.

In our opinion the Veterans' Administration did a most commendable job in correcting a situation which was causing irritation among a certain segment of the student body.

We are enclosing a copy of a letter received from Mr. Charles G. Beck, Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration Branch Office No. 7, Chicago, Ill.

The officers and directors of the alumni association hope you will visit our offices whenever you are in the vicinity and we urge you to call upon us whenever we can be of service to you.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR CULLIN,
President.

Lt. Col. Julian Killian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, recently quite a few veterans have written to me protesting the proposed promotion of Lt. Col. Julian Killian to the rank of colonel.

While it is true that Members of the House will not have an opportunity to vote on the question of whether or not Lieutenant Colonel Killian should be promoted, I want to make the record quite clear that I am definitely opposed to any promotion for Lieutenant Colonel Killian.

With thousands of well-trained officers, many of whom have had combat experience and who now desire to stay in the Regular Army, I can see no justification for keeping Lieutenant Colonel Killian in the Army with any rank whatsoever.

An officer, like every other citizen, is entitled to an opportunity to live down a mistake that he may have made. I can find no indication whatever that Lieutenant Colonel Killian is at all repentant. He should not be trusted with the lives and well-being of American soldiers.

I hope some way will be found to eliminate him from the rolls of the Army.

Statement Before House Committee on Education and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement which I made last Monday before the House Committee on Education and Labor, in support of House Resolutions 17, 34, 68, 75, and 76:

Representative CASE has presented a complete analysis of these five identical bills and of their objectives. It would be an imposition upon you for me to duplicate that presentation.

May I confine my remarks to one phase of this problem? There can be no dispute about the historical fact that the public health and public safety of this Nation has been endangered by labor disputes which have threatened the cessation or substantial curtailment of transportation, public utility, or communication services, or of the supplies of essential articles or commodities.

We all recall the words of President Truman less than a year ago, on May 25, 1946, at the joint session of the House and Senate, when he described the railroad strike as one which threatened "to paralyze all our industrial, agricultural, commercial, and social life," and added that "food, raw materials, fuel, shipping, housing, the public health, the public safety—all will be dangerously affected."

Irrespective of differences of opinion as to the causes of that dispute or as to the wisdom of the President's proposal of legislation, no reasonable person can question the absolute truth of the President's description of the stark emergency facing the Nation that afternoon. Nor, can any reasonable person differ with the conclusion of our colleague, Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, during debate that afternoon, that lack of action in the emergency then confronting the Nation would have impaired confidence in the Government itself.

I cannot share the confidence of those who oppose any proposal to meet realistically the possibility of a future great national emergency of this character on the ground that it will never happen again. While I believe that these bills make careful and constructive provision for the voluntary settlement of such disputes, the single, vital question remains: What means is to be provided for the people, as a whole, through their Government, to protect themselves in the admittedly few, but crucially important, instances when public health or public safety would be endangered?

We all hope that it would never be necessary to invoke the method here suggested. But, it seems to me, unless we are willing to take the responsibility of leaving public health and public safety in jeopardy, we must provide a definite and effective method of meeting such a national emergency.

We offer this as such a method. If it is not satisfactory, I submit that the burden is upon the opposition to present an alternative. In the absence of any such alternative before the expiration of the War Labor Disputes Act, the people of this country can be left helpless victims in such a crisis and their Government will be impotent to protect them.

H. R. 17

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority given to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including therein a statement made by me before the Committee on Education and Labor on H. R. 17 on March 10, 1947.

H. R. 17 is one of five identical bills introduced by Congressmen HERTER, of Massachusetts; HESELTON, of Massachusetts; HALE, of Maine; and CASE, of New Jersey, and is generally known as Public Rights in Labor Disputes Act.

I understand that the sponsors of these companion bills are placing the statements that they made before the Committee on Labor and Education in the RECORD, and I trust that the Members of Congress will take the opportunity to read them.

The statement follows:

Before considering the details of H. R. 17, it would be well to review to some extent the events which prompted its introduction in the Seventy-ninth Congress on June 28, 1946, by myself and four of my colleagues—Representatives HERTER, of Massachusetts; HESELTON, of Massachusetts; HALE, of Maine; and CASE, of New Jersey.

It will be recalled that on May 25, 1946, the President appeared before a joint session of the House and Senate and made an address requesting emergency legislation to cope with the then threatened railroad strike. After his address, H. R. 6578 was introduced under the suspension of the rules, printed in typewritten form, and, under the limited debate of 40 minutes, was passed by a vote of 306 to 11, 111 not voting. This bill, urged on the Congress by the President of the United States, was about as drastic a piece of labor legislation as has ever been penned by the hand of man.

The bill gave authority to the President of the United States to seize and operate any property where a strike was threatened or in progress and which would interfere with "public health or security." Its main provisions were:

(a) To authorize the institution of injunctive or mandatory proceedings against any union leader, forbidding him to encourage or incite members of the union to leave their work or to refuse to return to work, subjecting him to contempt proceedings for failure to obey any order of the court made in such proceedings.

(b) To deprive workers of their seniority rights who, without good cause, persist in striking against the Government.

(c) To provide criminal penalties against employers and union leaders who violate the provisions of the act.

(d) To provide that any employee who fails or refuses, without the permission of the President, to return to work for 24 hours after the finally effective data of his proclamation shall be inducted for service in the Army of the United States.

(e) To provide that all profits of a corporation seized by the Government shall go to the Treasury of the United States, even if the management is in no wise to blame for the strike.

Everyone interested in the welfare of labor and a progressive and sound union movement would like to forget this proposed legislation, but in this discussion it is well that we do not forget it; rather it should be remembered and we should profit by that incident. I, with a number of others, voted for the measure, because the President stated that a serious emergency existed and claimed that he was powerless to act. This claim of impotency was made in spite of the fact that under section 6 of the War Labor Disputes Act, generally known as the Smith-Connally Act, it is provided that it is unlawful for any person to "coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person to interfere by * * * strike * * * or other interruption with the operation" of any "plant, mine, or facility" in the possession of the United States or to aid any such strike by giving "direction or guidance" in its conduct, or by providing funds for its conduct or direction, or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits; and, gentlemen, this act expires soon.

As a matter of fact, this provision of the law was called to the President's attention in a letter sent to him prior to his appearance before the Congress and signed by 14

Republican Members of the House, of whom I was one.

It was the legislation proposed by the President, H. R. 6578, Seventy-ninth Congress, which prompted the five of us to write a bill which would safeguard, as far as possible, the public interests in labor disputes. Therefore, on June 28, 1946, I and my colleagues introduced identical bills in the Seventy-ninth Congress, which bills were practically the same as those we have introduced in the Eightieth Congress. The drafting of this legislation was entrusted to Mr. Gerald Morgan, who is well and favorably known to many of us as a former member of the drafting service of the House.

At the time of the introduction of this bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress, we sent copies of it with a letter signed by all 5 of us to about 30 leaders of industry and economists throughout the country asking for their views and criticisms; the letter and copies of the bill were not sent to any representatives of labor because they had gone on record as being opposed to any legislation whatever. Replies were received during the summer months from practically all of the men to whom we had written, together with letters from others who had seen articles published in the press about these bills. I think it may be truthfully said that no two of these individuals agreed in their replies and there seemed to be an undercurrent of feeling that nothing should be done to interfere with labor and management in working out their own affairs. Suggestions were made for the alteration of the Wagner Act in various particulars, for the establishment of so-called labor courts and so forth, but our efforts were confined to only one segment of this great industrial problem and our bills affect only disputes where the public health and safety are involved. On July 25, 1946, hearings on this legislation were held by a subcommittee of the Labor Committee but no action was taken by the committee.

The attitude of both labor and management reminded me of the days in the early thirties when legislation was being considered affecting stock exchanges and the security business. I was an active participant in those discussions because at that time I was engaged in the security business in New York City and was a Governor of the New York Stock Exchange. It was the constant plea of the leaders of finance then that they be left alone to correct existing abuses in their own way and apply their own remedies. I did not agree to such a policy then, nor do I agree to such a policy today. Labor unions have become big business, affecting the economic life of the Nation, and the American people are demanding protection from their abuse of power.

The public expects the Congress to do something about it and they would not be satisfied to have its solution left to either management or labor. I may say that it would be refreshing and helpful if the leaders of management and labor would consult together and come forward with some plan which could be accepted as an effort to eliminate the strife and conflict so apparent in management-labor relationships.

Briefly H. R. 17 and its companion bills provide:

1. That when the President of the United States shall declare that a "public emergency exists" because the public health and safety is, or is likely to be, in danger resulting from a labor-management dispute, he should order the parties at interest to cease or avoid all work stoppages and the Attorney General is authorized to enforce the compliance of the President's order through injunction proceedings in the United States district courts.

2. That if collective bargaining and voluntary arbitration have been tried and failed in the settlement of the dispute, then and only then is compulsory arbitration required and is provided for as follows:

(a) A Labor Disputes Conciliation Administration is created which takes over the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, in addition to other duties.

(b) An Advisory Labor-Management Board of 14 members is created, made up of 7 individuals chosen from labor and 7 from industry appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The duty of this Advisory Board is to consult and advise concerning the administration of the act and to recommend to the President names of persons to serve on the arbitration panel.

(c) An arbitration panel is set up which shall consist of not less than 30 members appointed by the President, recommended by the Advisory Labor-Management Board and confirmed by the Senate. Whenever the President shall declare the existence of an emergency, and all other efforts having failed after 30 days, a dispute must be submitted to arbitration. Each party to the dispute shall select an arbitrator from this panel of arbitrators and the two arbitrators thus selected shall select a third arbitrator who may be either a member of the panel or some individual not a member. The act provides that the decision of these arbitrators shall be binding on the parties in dispute for a period of 6 months unless modified by mutual agreement. If any individual does not wish to work under the terms of the arbitration, he does not have to, although the right to strike is taken away.

(d) Either party who does not accept or live up to the award of the arbitrators may be adjudged in contempt, and, if found guilty, be punished in accordance with the law governing contempt.

Representatives of both labor and management have expressed horror at the thought of compulsory arbitration. They look upon it as something un-American and to be avoided at all costs; but no one has yet suggested anything better than compulsory arbitration after all other efforts to settle a dispute have been exhausted. Compulsory arbitration seems to be the only alternative because the welfare of our country will not permit matters to drift any longer as they have in the past, resulting in a wasteful wake of inactivity, curtailment of production, loss of savings, and general demoralization of the workingman which has inevitably followed the strikes of the past year.

If both management and labor are so bitterly opposed to compulsory arbitration as provided in this bill, then the parties in dispute will exert the greatest efforts to reach an agreement before the inevitable final step of compulsory arbitration is taken.

It seems to me that much good is coming from the hearings now being held by this great committee on this problem, because it is becoming more apparent as the days go by that in the final analysis no one gains by a strike. Management, with its loss of business, certainly does not; the workingman, with his income cut off for an indefinite period, does not; and, most of all, the general economy of the country suffers, and this affects every citizen alike, whether he be producer or consumer. However, I have yet to hear of a labor leader who has suffered by reason of his union being on strike; he seems to be the only one who does not lose.

This bill and its companions are properly called the Public Rights in Labor Disputes Act because their entire purpose is to prevent a public disaster resulting from a strike which affects the public health and safety. This bill is simple, direct, and clear in its purpose, and while it may not be perfect in its provisions I am sure that those of us who have introduced this measure are ready to accept any constructive amendments. So far, we believe no one has suggested anything better, and I strongly urge the committee to give these bills favorable consideration.

Anniversary of the Birth of Luther Burbank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, 98 years ago this month Luther Burbank was born at Lancaster, Mass. For many years prior to his death his residence was at Santa Rosa, Calif., where I live and had the pleasure and honor of his friendship.

His contribution to the development of plant life and to the improvement of vegetable and fruit products entitles him to be ranked among the great men of our country of his generation.

Mr. Burbank was not a product of our conventional school or college system. His accomplishments were obtained beyond rather than on account of conventional methods. With an intense devotion to his work and with a patience that few men possess, he carried on with tireless energy and with a happiness that sprang from the love of his work. To his understanding nature revealed her hidden secrets for the blessing of mankind.

I am pleased to know that on Monday evening, March 17, at 8 o'clock eastern standard time, the superb Lionel Barrymore will broadcast over the National Broadcasting System, giving a human-interest story of this great plant wizard. I am sure that those who are fortunate enough to hear will find an inspiration in listening to a brief sketch of the life story of this fascinating character.

Flood Protection Is Vital to Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has recognized the imperative need of flood protection in the vicinity of Kansas City, Mo., by approving a flood control program for the Missouri River at that point. Without such a program the municipal airport and a large industrial area are periodically subjected to the threat of flooding and tremendous damage.

Funds made available for the purpose have been and are being expended to excellent advantage in partial completion of the program. But it is of critical importance that the work be continued without interruption and completed at the earliest possible date.

I urge that the Appropriations Committee include, and that the Congress approve, funds necessary for the orderly and uninterrupted progress of the flood control plan at Kansas City. In this connection I have received from the

Honorable William E. Kemp, mayor of Kansas City, Mo., the following letter and resolution of the city council:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Kansas City, Mo., February 27, 1947.

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REEVES: I am forwarding to you a resolution adopted by the unanimous vote of the city council of Kansas City with respect to the completion of the flood-protection project in the Kansas City area. The urgent need for this protection is universally recognized by everyone familiar with the facts.

Upon the authority of the Army engineers charged with this work, piecemeal construction is far more costly than a continued and uninterrupted prosecution of the work essential to the carrying out of the plan that has, as I understand it, received congressional approval. Until this plan is completed we are faced with the annual recurring threat of a major flood that would do incalculable damage to property, with the strong possibility of destruction of life as well. The engineers have pointed out that the ratio of benefits to costs is approximately four to one for the Kansas Citys.

We sincerely hope, therefore, that you will, in harmony with the enclosed resolution, urge the Congress the importance of making sufficient funds available to permit this flood protection work in this area to go forward in an orderly and economical manner.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. KEMP,
Mayor.

Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to make funds available for the immediate construction of flood protection works for the northeast industrial district of Kansas City, Mo., and the central industrial district of Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans.

Whereas the flood control problem of the Greater Kansas Citys is nationally recognized by the United States Engineers as one of the most critical in the United States. The cyclic occurrence of major floods in this area indicates that a major flood can be expected in any of the next few years, threatening calculable damages from a major flood of at least $60,000,000 in the unprotected areas thus subject to overflow from the Missouri and Kansas Rivers; and

Whereas the flood protection plan developed by the United States Engineers for the Kansas Citys' area, consisting of nine major units with a degree of justification represented by the ratio of potential loss to cost of protection works, of more than three to one, has been approved by the Congress and authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1936, as amended by the Flood Control Act of 1944; and

Whereas local coordination and prosecution of the plan has been carried on for more than 12 years by the Flood Protection Planning Committee of Greater Kansas City at considerable local expense defrayed by contributions and local public funds but the initiation of this work was delayed for many years due to causes beyond the control of the present city government, and no unit has yet been completed, the work having been resumed in 1946 after being interrupted for 5 years, due to the World War; and

Whereas Kansas City, Mo., has provided the rights-of-way for the flood-protection works for the portion of the central industrial district within the city, and said works are partially constructed but cannot be made effective without the completion of the works in Kansas City, Kans., adjacent thereto and an essential part thereof, and Kansas City, Mo., is in process of acquiring rights-of-way for the levees for the protection of the northeast industrial district, and plans for the next series of protective works are ready for advertisement; and

Whereas the slowness in prosecuting these works is uneconomical and is costing the city unnecessary funds in furnishing its part in the cooperative effort, and the progress of Kansas City is being impeded due to such slowness in getting these projects under way, so that many industries desiring to locate in this area have decided to locate in protected areas in other communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Kansas City, Mo., That the council do, and does hereby, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to make funds available sufficient to immediately initiate construction of the levees and flood-protection works for the protection of the northeast industrial district, Kansas City, Mo., and for the completion of the flood-protection works for the central industrial district of Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans.

Reviewed by the city manager.

L. P. COOKINGHAM,
City Manager.

Approved as to form and legality.

BENJ. M. POWERS,
Associate City Counselor.

Authenticated as adopted this February 17, 1947.

WILLIAM E. KEMP,
Mayor.

[SEAL] FLOURNOY QUEST,
City Clerk.

HOMER R. DILLE,
Deputy City Clerk.

Relief of Suffering in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, about 10 days ago I received a letter from one of my constituents. I believe this letter is one of the finest I have had the privilege of receiving since coming to Congress.

I think the lady who wrote this letter is an example of the true American spirit. I feel if there were more people in this world who were fortunate enough to possess the very fine Christian attitude which she has, we would soon be free from the problems of compulsory military training, atom bomb secrets and general distrust throughout the world.

I am indeed honored to count this lady among my constituents.

The letter follows:

EVANSVILLE, IND., *February 26, 1947.*

Representative ED. A. MITCHELL:

Recently from several sources we have been hearing of hunger in Europe even in American occupied territory. I am enclosing one source of information. Isn't there something more we can do to relieve this suffering? Personally I'd rather pay higher taxes than to know that my selfishness had caused suffering to someone else.

Are as many orphans and displaced persons as can be assimilated being sent to America? It would seem to me that many, if not all, healthy orphans under 5 could be placed in American homes for adoption or boarded out.

We have three orphans in our home via Welfare Department. If we were younger and financially able, I believe I'd ask for a couple from Europe. We had five of our own, three in service during the war, one didn't come back.

Sincerely,

RUBY M. PARKHURST
(Mrs. C. W.).

Yenan Cathedral Used by Reds to Store Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by Rev. Patrick O'Connor, S. S. C., special correspondent, National Catholic Welfare Council News Service:

YENAN CATHEDRAL USED BY REDS TO STORE GRAIN—SOLE NATIVE PRIEST RESTRICTED TO TWO SCHOOLROOMS FOR CHURCH, RECTORY; COMMUNISM REIGNS

(By Rev. Patrick O'Connor, S. S. C.)

YENAN, CHINA, March 5.—An armed Communist soldier stands at the gateway leading to the Catholic church on the outskirts of this remote capital of China's Reds. It is the only church in Yenan and was the first building we saw from the plane as we flew down the long valley at the end of a cold, 3-hour flight from Peiping. Apparently few of the correspondents who have visited Yenan have made the dusty 5-mile journey out of Yenan to inspect this church.

I found Red troops occupying all buildings within the church compound except two rooms of the primary school. They are used as a chapel and a living room by the youthful Father Aloysius Liang, who was allowed to return here last May as Yenan's first resident priest in 11 years.

The large church—St. Mary's Cathedral, of the Yenan diocese—is used to store grain by the Communist troops. Millet and corn are heaped up against what were once the side altars. I saw peasants carrying in sacks of grain, their tax for support of the Red Army. Inside Communist soldiers stood around watching me curiously.

The high altar has been torn out. Every window has been broken. Dust and dirt lie thick on the wrecked sanctuary. Shreds of Communist posters adhere to the inner walls. Nothing religious is visible.

Comrade Ma Mu-Min, Communist liaison official, who never left me during my three visits to the church, hastened to explain: "These troops are only passing through. They must store their rations somewhere."

PRIEST IS GAGGED

Father Liang did not reply when I addressed him in Latin. This amazed me, since Chinese priests are noted for their fluency in Latin conversation. But you can't be long in Yenan without guessing the explanation. Here it's unhealthy to speak any language that the Communist listener does not understand. My conversations, therefore, were in my meager Chinese or in English with Mr. Ma translating.

The church has served for various Communist purposes since the priests, Spanish Franciscans and Chinese, were forced to flee in 1935. The Reds used it for a party training school and for Communist meetings. In 1944 the church was reopened briefly for religious purposes when Father Cormac Shanahan, a Passionist priest whom the local Catholics remember gratefully as "Sia Shen-

fu," came to Yenan with a party of inquisitive United States correspondents from Chungking. He was allowed to celebrate Mass twice here.

Last March a French Jesuit, Father Bonningue, visiting Yenan on his way from Peiping, offered mass here. When Father Liang arrived in May the church apparently was made available to him, but in its unrestored condition. In November the Red troops reoccupied it.

The Catholic orphanage building on an adjacent hill is now a Communist medical school. Prior to last November the Reds used the bishop's and the priests' residences for hospital purposes. A Communist art school also used one of the mission buildings.

Father Liang, who is a native of this village, was ordained in 1940 in a neighboring province and made post-graduate studies at the Catholic University of Peiping. He is the only priest in the Red-occupied area of Shenshi Province. There are five parishes here which have been without priests for 11 years. His nearest priest neighbors within this Communist-administered border region are each 8 days' journey from him. One is a South American missionary in Kansu and the other is a Belgian in Ningshia.

WOMEN KEEP FAITH ALIVE

Cecelia and Mary, two black-garbed, privately dedicated religious women, who have served the cause of religion everywhere in China for more than 20 years, came to Yenan from martyr-hallowed Taiyuan to conduct an orphanage. They had cared for more than 400 orphans when the Reds arrived. The orphans were dispersed, but Cecelia and Mary stayed on, living in the village first with one family and then another, keeping a spark of the Faith alight. They were probably instrumental in obtaining permission for Father Liang to come here.

Mao Tze-Tung, Communist chairman, and Gen. Chou En Lai have intervened twice to mitigate the disabilities of Catholics here. Mr. Mao had the two rooms painted for Father Liang and General Chou sent medicines to the religious women.

Through the inescapable Communist interpreter, I talked to a Catholic from another village. "Most of my village used to be Catholic," he said. "We had a priest, a church, and a school. Now we have had no priest since 1934. Some of the Catholic families have moved away. Those who remain are not as fervent as when they had the priest."

His village now has no school of any kind. His son, age 14, has not made his first confession. "There is no priest for the sick and dying," he said. Since his village is not very distant from here, it is clear that Father Liang is not free to circulate in outlying missions.

I offered High Mass in his improvised chapel here on Sunday. Some 70 persons, including, of course, Mrs. Ma, attended. About eight received Holy Communion. Few, if any, teen-age boys and girls were present, but the congregation sang Missa de Angelis excellently.

Study of Civil Government in Schools of Florence, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter and a copy of a bill drafted and enacted into a law by Mr. George McLeod, a student in the Florence, S. C., schools.

Our Government is the only government in the world that is functioning satisfactorily at the present time. We have the finest country in the world, and this is due to a great extent to the type of government we have. I know that it will be gratifying to every Member of Congress and the Senate to learn that the young people in our country are taking a definite interest in our Government. We all realize that the burden of carrying on our Government increases daily, and especially now since we have dedicated ourselves to become a part of a world government.

Every student in the United States should be required to take courses in civil government so that he would be acquainted as to how his Government functions.

I want to congratulate George McLeod and the other students, and also the schools of my city of Florence, S. C., on the interest they have expressed in their Government.

The responsibilities of this Government will rest on the shoulders of the young men and women of this country within the next few years, and I am glad to know that they are getting prepared for this task.

The letter and bill follow:

FLORENCE, S. C., *March 4, 1947.*

DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: I'll bet you will be surprised to find out that I have temporarily assumed the use of your name, and I hope that you will not mind.

My seventh-grade class has just written and passed a bill. Each of us had to choose the name of a real Senator or Representative. We went through all the regular procedures, having sessions of both Houses, committees, etc.

I am enclosing a copy of our bill as passed, and signed by the Speaker of the House, President pro tempore of the Senate, and President Truman.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MCLEOD
(Alias Representative John L. McMillan.)

Whereas communism and its related factions are fast becoming a threat to democracy in these United States;

Whereas in future times, other enemies of democracy may rise, we do hereby propose the following:

Item I: The enforcement of this bill shall be under the guidance of a special division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

Item II: Any candidate for a position in the United States Government or any employee of the United States Government if so accused, must prove in good faith that he is not a member of, or in sympathy with, any of the aforesaid factions hostile to democracy;

Item III: Any Government employee charged with treason shall be deported; should the treason be of a serious and highly aggravated nature such as to warrant capital punishment this shall be so inflicted.

Item IV: Treason charges against the aforesaid shall be duly executed in a Federal court of justice; the decision of the court shall be final except in such instances when just cause shall be shown for an appeal to the Supreme Court.

Signed, sealed, and delivered on the 27th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1947.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of the House.
ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States.

Efforts To Fight Communism With Dollars Seen as Futile Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD A. COFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of March 9, 1947:

EFFORTS TO FIGHT COMMUNISM WITH DOLLARS SEEN AS FUTILE POLICY

Pleas by the Greek Government for substantial assistance to prevent that stricken country's economic collapse should be viewed realistically by the people of the United States.

Sentimentally, our hearts go out to the Greeks, who are torn by civil dissension resulting from Great Britain's insistence that King George II, a listless and near-Fascist ruler, be returned to the throne.

We share also her fears of Russian aggression and sympathize deeply with a gallant people facing up to the inevitable breakdown of an already tottering economy.

Since Great Britain, Greece's traditional protector, has served notice that she can no longer support a substantial army in Greece to preserve order, the problem is thrown squarely in our laps because we are so closely tied to British foreign policy.

The State Department is apparently committed to Greek assitance in the amount of $350,000,000. It is explained publicly that a sum of this size is necessary to purchase food, clothing, and other emergency essentials. Additionally, the Greek note to the United States explained that American technical experts are needed to help the country get to her feet.

What neither the State Department nor the Greek diplomatic dispatch did say—and this is the real issue—is that American money, and perhaps her soldiers, must be used if we are to prevent the spread of communism throughout the Balkans and the rest of Europe.

The argument, freely used by high officials and military leaders in off-the-record sessions with Washington newspaper correspondents, is "fight communism with dollars."

It is a cry that will be heard much more frequently and openly in the months and years to come.

It is an assertion that should be sharply challenged before it becomes, through public inertia and Government propaganda, the pattern for our future foreign policy.

Isn't it high time that we came to grips with the facts?

American dollars failed to resolve the political differences in China between Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists. We threw away hundreds of millions in a vain effort to bring order out of chaos and came away with nothing but the bitter taste of another political retreat.

George Weller, of the Chicago Daily News Foreign Service, says that the postwar policy

of "pay, preach, and retreat," which has failed on a gigantic scale in China, has failed in the Balkans, too, and it has cost the American people in postwar aid nearly $500,000,000 to lose their political shirts at the "little table" in tiny Greece as at the "big table" in China.

The Free Press favored the British loan as an outright gift, with no thought that it would ever be repaid. We believed that the gift of a few billion dollars would prove either that Great Britain could survive as a great power with this assistance or that her economy had disintegrated so badly that it could no longer be propped up, even with American financial support.

The British are now back in the market for another "loan."

We made a very sizable loan to France, timing it to provide a potent argument for the Rightists in the French elections.

Yet France, with no semblance of strong leadership or direction, continues to drift gradually to the left.

In the case of Greece, British insistence upon restoration of the monarchy prevented the people from having a government of their own choosing.

We have backed the British experiment in Greece to the hilt and now find ourselves the unhappy legatees of a moral and material bankruptcy.

Can we fight communism with dollars?

The projected $350,000,000 gift to Greece is but another in a series of well-intentioned but utterly futile efforts to buy off the Communists at so much a head.

The history of the world proves that individuals with strong ideological convictions are not for sale at any price, except when it suits their purpose to be cooperative until the money has been spent.

There might be some military justification for the Greek gift if, in return, we obtained a few naval bases in Greece and Turkey.

Financially, it could be justified if Britain agreed to transfer Greek credits frozen in London to the United States so that Greece could buy some of the things it needs with its own money instead of borrowing from us.

It might even be morally justifiable if it meant a thorough political housecleaning in Greece with new elections so that the people might select the type of government they prefer.

But, as George Weller points out, we are in effect only throwing more money into the bottomless kitty of nations who have anti-communism for sale.

Can we fight communism with dollars?

For one, I am convinced that we cannot.

The tragic plight of the Greeks can be alleviated through privately supported groups such as the Greek War Relief Association, which has had years of experience in this field.

Our Government should be ready to ship surpluses of food and supplies and let their distribution be supervised by trained and competent organizations which understand the problem.

But the policy of paying Greece to support a token force of British troops as a bulwark against the vastly superior Russian armies in the northern Balkans is unrealism at its worst.

For once, I agree with Senator CLAUDE PEPPER in his suggestion that the Greek question be referred to the United Nations on the theory that it is a global problem vitally affecting the peace of the world.

As time goes on and international difficulties increase, it will be impossible for the United States to patch up the remnants of shaky regimes and empires the world over.

If the United Nations is to refute the rising tide of cynical comment that it is just another debating society, the Palestine and Greek problems must have its immediate attention.

At this point, someone may well ask: "If we are not to fight communism with dollars, what is the solution?"

Unfortunately, the very simplicity of the question makes the answer more difficult.

There seems to be almost universal agreement that communism is abhorrent to freemen.

But who shall say that the people of any nation may not have communism if that is what they desire?

If the ideological and military conflict with Russia is as inevitable as the wise men of the radio proclaim it to be, another little nation or two gone communistic won't prove to be the deciding factor in an atomic war.

Let them demonstrate whether the communistic system can be successful. Let it be shown that people are happier without free speech, free elections, and freedom of opportunity.

The capitalistic system is under constant attack from disaffected Americans who emphasize its imperfections while enjoying all of its benefits.

Perhaps the communistic system can provide better living conditions, more abundant crops, finer cars, superior household accessories, and greater liberty than we have in America.

Possibly some people could be happier living under the constant scrutiny of the secret police. Even a few of our sons and daughters see considerable merit in the communistic system. Let this be shown. We might all be convinced.

Meanwhile, efforts to combat communism in the Balkans with American dollars are not likely to succeed.

Then when we have bankrupted ourselves trying to bail out the staggering nations of Europe communism will have a field day in the United States.

Of course, the capitalistic system will be blamed for the debacle when actually it is being drained so systematically that even today it has considerable less than an even chance to prove its worth.

We have poured forth a golden and seemingly endless stream of American dollars in our policy of "pay, preach, and retreat."

With nothing to show for our immature generosity except more calls for help, the time has come to call a halt before we join our friends in the international bread line.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Discriminatory Action of Interstate Commerce Commission Against Pacific Coast Steel Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, the State of California finally obtained the construction of a basic, independent steel-manufacturing plant.

The great steel monopoly corporations opposed the entry of an independent steel company into the Pacific coast market. Every tactic of delay and obstruction was used to prevent its being.

Their opposition was overcome by the genius and persistence of the Henry Kaiser organization. The plant was constructed, but the opposition continues. I submit the following facts for the RECORD:

The ICC held a public hearing at 10 a. m., March 11, regarding a proposed freight-rate reduction granted only to the United States Steel Corp. for shipment of its steel products from its Geneva, Utah, plant to Pacific coast points. This rate was granted by certain railroads to United States Steel even though Kaiser Co., Inc., and other companies for months—since July 1946—had formally requested comparable competitive reductions.

This reduction will benefit only United States Steel and its favored customers. Kaiser Co. is fighting for reduced rates for all and is opposed to this favoritism to United States Steel.

The Kaiser Co. is carrying on the fight directly to the ICC for lower western freight rates for all. As a means of accomplishing these lower rates for all, Kaiser Co. has no alternative but to now contest this discriminatory rate reduction.

This freight-rate question is but one phase of a mighty struggle between the power of huge companies and the economic freedom of the West. The decision on this freight rate matter can well determine whether the West is to be free of monopoly and of the dominance of great corporations.

The Kaiser Co.'s Fontana steel plant is the West's only free, independent, integrated steel plant. It must fight this freight-rate favoritism to United States Steel and this discriminatory rate. The rules and procedures of the Interstate Commerce Commission are such that at this time we can only carry on the fight for equity of freight rates for all by filing a technical protest in the prescribed manner. This we have done. At the hearings before the ICC in Washington on Tuesday, March 11, counsel for Kaiser Co.—Thomas McCarthy, of San Francisco—will appear and protest the reduction of the proposed freight rate to United States Steel alone. It will also be pointed out how prejudicial this reduction is to Fontana, the West's only independent, integrated steel plant.

The following is a brief statement of events and facts pertaining to this matter:

First. Fontana applied to the railroads for lower rates at the same time United States Steel did—July 1946.

Second. The railroad rate bureaus held several hearings on these applications in 1946.

Third. No action was taken in 1946 by the railroad rate bureaus on either Fontana's application or the United States Steel application.

Fourth. While these applications for reduced rates for both Fontana and United States Steel were still pending the ICC in December 1946 authorized a 17.6 percent blanket increase in freight rates for all United States railroads effective January 1, 1947. This increase added $600,000 annually to Fontana's freight bill. The ICC authorized this increase to all United States railroads on a basis of need and necessity.

Fifth. On January 10, 1947, 10 days after the blanket increase became effective, the railroad rate bureau reduced the United States Steel's Geneva, Utah, freight rate to the Pacific coast 31 percent. This reduction would result in a discriminatory advantage of from one to two million dollars a year, depending on the volume of Geneva shipments.

Sixth. Fontana must still pay the higher rate.

Seventh. Fontana believes it and other shippers are entitled to equitable and fair treatment.

Eighth. The only legal way this can be brought to an issue before the ICC is for Fontana and others to protest this discriminatory reduction to United States Steel alone.

Ninth. That is why Kaiser Co. filed a protest with ICC. This is why Kaiser Co. is appearing today before the ICC in this matter. It has no other recourse.

Tenth. The California State Assembly on Friday, March 7, adopted a resolution protesting the discriminatory freight rates in the shipment of steel from the Kaiser Fontana plant as between rates from the United States Steel Geneva, Utah, plant. The resolution requested the ICC to investigate and equalize the rates to eliminate discrimination.

Public Rights in Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement which I submitted on March 10, 1947, to the Committee on Education and Labor in support of the proposed Public Rights in Labor Disputes Act embodied in the following identical bills: H. R. 17, introduced by Representative AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey; H. R. 34, introduced by myself; H. R. 68, introduced by Representative HALE, of Maine; H. R. 75, introduced by Representative HESELTON, of Massachusetts; and H. R. 76, introduced by Representative HERTER, of Massachusetts:

WORK STOPPAGES ENDANGERING THE PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY CANNOT BE PERMITTED—SOME LEGISLATIVE SOLUTION MUST BE PROVIDED

Until quite recently disputes between management and labor were not a matter of great concern to the general public. Our economic system was relatively simple and the great majority of people were comparatively independent economically of one another. Furthermore, labor was weak and in most cases strikes and lockouts were of short duration.

The situation is completely reversed today. Our economic system is complex and highly specialized. The great majority of people are dependent upon the continuous activity of many others for their day-to-day existence. Our food, shelter, light, and heat, and in almost every case our job, depend upon an uninterrupted supply of materials and of power, transportation, and distribution services. At the same time, organized labor has grown in strength and in staying power to the point where it can do battle on at least equal terms with management and work stoppages may result of indefinite duration, depriving the public of the goods and services on which our existence depends. Centralization of control in labor organizations has given a relatively few men, and in some cases a single individual, the ability to bring the entire economy of the country to a standstill.

Work stoppages can no longer be tolerated where the public health and safety are endangered. The wartime powers of the Government, inadequate as they have proved to be, will soon expire. The situation requires that some machinery be provided to take their place. The public also insists that this be done. The Government cannot be left impotent to deal with these situations. The question is no longer whether we should take action, the only question is what sort of action should be taken.

WHAT FORM SHOULD SUCH LEGISLATION TAKE?

Two general lines of approach have been suggested:

(a) To weaken one party or the other to labor disputes so that that party either quickly capitulates or never dares risk a test of strength with its adversary; or

(b) To prohibit by law work stoppages (whether strikes or lock-outs) by which the public health or safety would be endangered and, since no man can be compelled, in our free system, to work for or to employ another upon the latter's terms, to provide some alternative means for the settlement of their dispute.

With all deference to the suggestions made by Senator BALL and others, it is submitted that there is little prospect that the first alternative will be adopted. It appears, therefore, that there is no choice but to adopt the second.

We believe that our bill presents a method for dealing with the situation which would be both reasonable and effective. Before discussing its provisions in some detail, however, I should like to suggest a few general principles which I believe should be followed in deciding what method of approach should be employed:

1. Every dispute which can be settled voluntarily should be so settled, and every possible encouragement and assistance to voluntary settlements should be provided.

2. Where intervention by Government is necessary, State and local governments should have the responsibility and should be permitted by the Federal Government to exercise the responsibility for handling just as many of these situations as it is possible for them to do.

3. Government seizure should not be resorted to in any event.

4. When intervention by the Federal Government is required, the machinery provided should be such as to minimize the danger of regimentation. Thus it seems highly desirable that the adjudicating body should be neither a Government agency nor a permanent agency of any sort. Rather, each dispute should be decided on an individual basis by a group of persons brought together to settle that particular dispute and, as far as possible, selected by the parties themselves.

A SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PUBLIC RIGHTS IN LABOR DISPUTES ACT

Our bill has two broad purposes:

A. The improvement of all labor-industry relations by strengthening the conciliation services of the Federal Government.

Under this heading our bill would create a Labor Disputes Conciliation Administration as an independent Federal agency; the conciliation functions of the Department of Labor would be abolished, and all Federal conciliation functions concentrated in the new independent Conciliation Administration.

The Conciliation Administration would be headed by an Administrator, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, with up to three Assistant Administrators, and such staff and personnel as appropriations permitted.

The duty of the Conciliation Administration would be to offer conciliation services in labor disputes affecting the public interest and to help the parties settle their differences by negotiation and agreement rather than by strikes and lock-outs.

The conciliation Administration would have a labor-management advisory committee, consisting of seven members representing labor and seven representing business management, all appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The committee would meet at least every two months and advise the Administrator on the workings of the act. (The committee would also have another important function hereinafter referred to.)

B. The other broad purpose of our bill is to prevent work stoppages (and provide for their termination if they have already occurred) if the public health and safety would be endangered thereby. The bill would work this way:

(a) The President must find:

1. That a public emergency exists or is imminently threatened by the suspension or substantial curtailment of transportation, public-utility or communication services, or supplies of articles or commodities essential to the public health or safety as a result of a labor dispute affecting interstate or foreign commerce;

2. that the public health or safety is endangered or likely to be endangered; and

3. that local governmental facilities to prevent the work stoppage are not being or cannot be effectively utilized.

(b) Upon making such findings, the President shall issue an order forbidding the work stoppage (or requiring its termination if it has already occurred) and requiring that the status quo be maintained (or that the situation existing before the work stoppage, if one has already occurred, be reestablished and maintained) while the machinery which the bill provides for the settlement of the dispute is in operation.

(c) The settlement machinery is as follows:

1. The parties are given 30 days to reach a voluntary agreement or to submit their dispute to voluntary arbitration.

2. If the parties have not done one thing or the other within 30 days, the President may at once, and after 15 additional days must, direct the submission of the dispute to compulsory arbitration.

3. If compulsory arbitration is necessary it shall be conducted by a board of three arbitrators, one such arbitrator being chosen by each party from a permanent panel of at least 30 provided for by the bill, and the third by the first two—the Administrator to choose an arbitrator for either party if he fails or refuses to select his own.

4. The award of the arbitrators is binding upon both parties for 6 months unless modified by mutual agreement. It may be enforced in the same manner as an award under the United States Arbitration Act.

(d) The members of the permanent panel of arbitrators from which the parties would select the arbitrators for their particular disputes would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill provides that the Labor-Management Advisory Committee, already mentioned, shall suggest names to the President for appointment to this panel and if the President appoints persons other than those suggested by the committee he must give his reasons for doing so.

(e) The President's orders prohibiting, or directing the ending of, work stoppages and requiring maintenance of the status quo would be enforced by injunctions issued by the United States district courts upon application only by the Attorney General of

the United States. In such injunction proceedings the essential provisions of existing law with respect to due process, namely, provisions for verified complaints, hearings in open court before issuance of injunctions (other than temporary restraining orders), and jury trials for contempts are maintained.

(f) The bill contains nothing that could be construed to require any individual to perform labor or services without his consent. Indeed, it explicitly provides that no order of the President shall be construed to require any person unwillingly to perform labor or service. What the bill does prevent, so far as employees are concerned, is concerted action by way of strikes in the very limited situations where work stoppages affecting interstate or foreign commerce would endanger the public health or safety.

(g) To safeguard workers whose right to strike in these essential industries would be taken away the bill provides specifically that the arbitrators shall recognize that such workers should have at least as favorable a status in the matter of the terms and conditions of their employment as that enjoyed by workers in other industries.

A WORKABLE SOLUTION, AVOIDING REGIMENTATION, WITH A MINIMUM OF GOVERNMENTAL INTERVENTION

We believe that our bill meets the tests outlined earlier in this statement.

1. It encourages voluntary settlements. In this connection it should be noted that it makes possible submission by the parties to voluntary arbitration if they prefer that method.

2. It gives local and State governments first opportunity to deal with all disputes within their jurisdiction if they can handle them adequately.

3. It does not involve Government seizure or operation of any business.

4. Finally, we believe that our bill avoids the dangers of regimentation.

(a) It differs completely from proposals which have been made for labor courts or other permanent Government agencies empowered to fix contract terms binding upon the parties to industrial disputes. Such proposals, we believe, would inevitably lead to decisions based upon political considerations, to the establishment of fixed and rigid wage structures and policies, and ultimately to governmental control over prices, allocation of products and services, and indeed all phases of our economic life. Our bill would provide an ad hoc method of settlement for each dispute. No two arbitration boards would be the same, they would in no sense be governmental agencies, no precedents would be established, and no governmental policies would be created. The Government could not in any way intervene in any dispute, nor could it determine the terms of its settlement.

(b) Moreover, the application of our bill would be limited to the very few cases of great national emergency—in our view the remedy should be very sparingly applied or its effectiveness would be lost.

(c) So far as regimentation is concerned, we believe that, unless action is taken by Congress to provide the Government with adequate power to deal with this vital but limited class of cases, there is great danger that the public will insist on some drastic form of regimentation applied on a much wider scale, perhaps to all labor-industry disputes.

The great question, of course, is whether our bill will do the job. The usual argument will be made that "you can't force a man to work."

We admit that under our institutions a man cannot be compelled to work against his will. We don't try to make him by our bill. But, in the restricted situations in which our bill would apply, we can and would make strikes illegal. We believe this is necessary and proper and we are convinced that the great weight of opinion is in accord. Moreover, we make such strikes unnecessary by providing a substitute means of arriving at settlements of labor-industry disputes which we think is adequate and fair. We believe that the overwhelming majority of the public generally and of the people in labor's ranks will agree on this also. Public opinion will not tolerate, much less support, a strike by which the public health or safety is endangered and which it considers both illegal and unnecessary. Without public support no such strike would succeed and, we believe, few are likely to be attempted. If a few reckless and irresponsible individuals should attempt one, it would quickly collapse under the force of public opinion and the sanctions provided by our bill.

The substantial objection to compulsory arbitration on the part of management is based on its fear of regimentation. We recognize the validity of this objection and, as explained above, we believe our bill avoids this danger.

The legitimate objections of labor must also be considered. They are based upon the fear that the right to strike cannot be taken away without depriving them of an essential means of realizing their just demands. Also labor hesitates to concede that the right to strike may properly be denied or limited under any circumstances for fear that a precedent will be established for denying or restricting strikes in all circumstances.

We submit that our bill meets these objections also.

(a) The right to strike in the cases to which our bill applies is not necessary to secure fair treatment for labor. The system of arbitration established by our bill provides ample assurance of such protection. Indeed, we insist that labor's just grievances will have a much better chance of fair hearing and just solution by the boards of arbitration created under our bill than would be the case under machinery improvised after a crisis arises when public sentiment will be aroused and the chances for dispassionate and fair consideration of labor's problems will be much less favorable. Again, attention is called to the provision of our bill which requires that the arbitrators must recognize that labor is being deprived of its economic weapons in the cases where the public health and safety are involved and that any award made in such cases must take that fact into account and leave the employees affected in at least as favorable a situation with respect to the terms of their employment as those in other industries.

(b) Labor's position generally will be much improved and its chances of accomplishing its legitimate objectives enhanced under our bill which would protect responsible leaders and the rank and file of labor against the adverse public reaction to all labor which inevitably results when a few reckless and irresponsible leaders misuse their power to the detriment of the public.

(c) Unless some provision is made for dealing with work stoppages in the limited category of situations where the public health and safety would be endangered, there is great danger that, under pressure of some emergency, public opinion will demand and will obtain legislation far more drastic than our bill, under which the right to strike may be limited or denied in circumstances far beyond those to which our bill has application.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

It is submitted that our bill should, and I believe that unquestionably it would, be held constitutional.

The bill applies only to labor disputes affecting interstate or foreign commerce. Thus it is clearly within the sphere of Federal power under the commerce clause. The due process requirement is satisfied because the provisions of the bill are neither arbitrary nor discriminatory—they are reasonably adapted to meeting a definite, limited objective in which the public interest is clear, and they do so in a manner fair to both sides in any dispute.

It is true that the United States Supreme Court held the Kansas Industrial Court Act unconstitutional insofar as it attempted to give power to a special court to fix wages in the coal mining and food and clothing industries (*Wolff Packing Co.* v. *Court of Industrial Relations* (262 U. S. 522, 267, U. S. 552, 1923 and 1925)). These cases, however, afford no precedent for holding that the provisions of our bill would be unconstitutional, for the following reasons:

1. The decisions involving the Industrial Court Act were clearly based upon the court's view that there was not a sufficient public interest in the continued operation of the plants and industries which that act placed under the jurisdiction of the special court to justify imposing so great a measure of governmental control of the parties in those plants and industries. The court emphasized the small extent of the public inconvenience which would result from such industries ceasing to operate. Our bill, on the other hand, under its own terms, could be invoked only upon a finding by the President that the public health or safety were endangered.

2. The situation in the early 1920's was very different from that prevailing today, in respect of the complexity and interdependence of our economic life and of the strength and extent of union organization and the power of a few union leaders or even a single individual to bring the entire economy of the country to a standstill.

3. The Kansas Industrial Court cases were decided before the Supreme Court's decisions of the last decade vastly expanded the scope of Federal power, and considerably modified early concepts of due process as applied to actions by both Federal and State Governments, for example:

(a) *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation* (301 U. S. 1 (1937)), in which the Court upheld the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Act, with an opinion by Chief Justice Hughes specifically establishing the principle that acts which directly burden or obstruct commerce or its free flow are within the reach of the congressional power and that such acts are not rendered immune because they grow out of labor disputes.

(b) *Nebbia* v. *New York* (291 U. S. 502 (1934)), in which the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the New York Milk Control Act which gave a State board power, among other things, to fix minimum and maximum retail prices of milk. The Court's opinion, written by Mr. Justice Roberts, clearly establishes that there is no closed class or category of businesses affected with a public interest and that the function of the courts in applying the due process provisions of the Constitution is to determine in each case whether in all the circumstances the regulation is a reasonable assertion of governmental authority or is arbitrary or discriminatory. The following language has become classic:

"If the laws passed are seen to have a reasonable relation to a proper legislative purpose, and are neither arbitrary nor discriminatory, the requirements of due process are satisfied * * *. With the wisdom of the policy adopted, with the adequacy or practicability of the law enacted to forward it, the courts are both incompetent and unauthorized to deal."

3. There is a direct precedent for the fixing of wage rates. In *Wilson* v. *New* (243, U. S. 322, 1917), dealing with the Adamson law, the Court held in a Nation-wide dispute over wages between railroad companies and their employees, with a general strike, commercial paralysis, and grave loss and suffering over-

hanging the country, Congress had power to prescribe wages obligatory on both parties to the dispute for a reasonable time. The Adamson law provided, among other things, that for a 7-month period the railroads should pay their operating employees for 8 hours' work a wage not less than the one then established for a standard day, which had been generally 10 hours. Mr. Justice McReynolds' dissent in the Wilson case is interesting in connection with our present discussion. After stating that he could not concur with the majority that it was within the power of Congress to enact the statute, he continued, "But, considering the doctrine now affirmed by the majority of the Court as established, it follows as of course that Congress has power to fix a maximum as well as a minimum wage for trainmen; to require compulsory arbitration of labor disputes which may seriously and directly jeopardize the movement of interstate traffic; and to take measures effectively to protect the free flow of such commerce against any combination, whether of operatives, owners, or strangers."

4. Finally, it is clear that the right to strike is not an absolute right under the Constitution, but that it may be regulated and, in certain circumstances, denied in the public interest. *Truax* v. *Corrigan* (257 U. S. 312, 363 (1921, Brandeis, J.)); *Dorchy* v. *Kansas* (272 U. S. 306, 311 (1926, Brandeis, J.)); *Aikens* v. *Wisconsin* (195 U. S. 194, 204–205); *Carpenters Union* v. *Ritter's Cafe* (315 U. S. 722, 724 (1942, Frankfurter, J.)).

Strikes in hospitals that endanger life and health, in charitable institutions that withhold relief to the needy, and in government and utilities that disrupt the life of a whole community may be regarded as in this category. *Jewish Hospital* v. *John Doe* (252 App. Div. 581 (New York, 1937)); *Elizabeth General Hospital* v. *Employees Local A. A.* (4 labor cases, par. 60, 590); *Western Pennsylvania Hospital* v. *Lichleiter* (340 Pa. 382, 17 Atl. (2d) 206 (1941)); *Arthur* v. *Oakes* (63 Fed. 310 (1894)).

In *Dorchy* v. *Kansas* (1926, supra), Mr. Justice Brandeis said:

"But a strike may be illegal because of its purpose, however orderly the manner in which it is conducted. To collect a stale claim due a fellow member of the union who was formerly employed in the business is not a permissible purpose. In the absence of a valid agreement to the contrary, each party to a disputed claim may insist that it be determined only by a court * * *. To enforce payment by a strike is purely coercion. * * * Neither the common law nor the fourteenth amendment confers the absolute right to strike."

In *Carpenters' Union* v. *Ritter's Cafe* (1942, supra), Mr. Justice Frankfurter said:

"The right of the State to determine whether the common interest is best served by imposing some restrictions upon the use of weapons for inflicting economic injury in the struggle of conflicting industrial forces has not previously been doubted * * *. But the petitioners now claim that there is to be found in the due-process clause of the fourteenth amendment a constitutional command that peaceful picketing must be wholly immune from regulation by the community in order to protect the general interest, that the States must be powerless to confine the use of this industrial weapon within reasonable bounds."

After discussing the precise limitation placed by the Texas court upon the picketing of respondent's restaurant, Mr. Justice Frankfurter then said:

"We hold that the Constitution does not forbid Texas to draw the line which has been drawn here. To hold otherwise would be to transmute vital constitutional liberties into doctrinaire dogma. We must be mindful that the 'rights of employers and employees to conduct their economic affairs and to combat with others for a share in the products of industry are subject to modification or qualification in the interests of the society in which they exist. This is but an instance of the power of the State to set the limitation of permissible contest open to industrial combatants.' *Thornhill* v. *Alabama* (310 U. S. 88, 103–104)."

CONCLUSION

The problem for which we have attempted to suggest a solution is a real, not an imaginary one. The dangers are not past, they are here today, and, in a very few weeks, may be upon us in acute and critical form.

Shall our Government face a telephone strike, for example, without even those powers with which it attempted recently to deal with the coal situation? Can we view with equanimity the possibility of a renewed demand for the dangerous and drastic powers which the President sought under pressure of the railroad crisis less than 10 months ago?

The answer is clear. The question as I said at the outset is no longer whether we should take action. The only question is what action should be taken. The experience which this committee has gained in the long course of its hearings may very well lead it to believe that some or perhaps many changes and improvements can and should be made in the method of attack upon this problem which we have suggested. Naturally we would accept any such changes and improvements wholeheartedly and will be glad to discuss them or any questions which the committee may have with respect to any provisions of our bill whenever it may be convenient for it to do so. We are interested only in assisting in the development of a solution which we believe that the situation demands and which the people of the country are anxiously waiting for this Congress to provide.

American Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 13, 1947:

AMERICAN DESTINY

What the President said to Congress had already been reported to some extent in advance. But this did not mar the massive impact of the message or alloy its grave import. Mr. Truman recommended a clear assumption of the world power which belongs to America. In itself this is nothing new. Since the middle of the war years such a statement has become a ritual in Presidential messages. But this time Mr. Truman spelled out a policy and sought to translate it into preliminary action.

The key sentence is "It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." This is breath-taking in its literal implications. It takes into account and is aimed at countering the new technique of aggression. It is as much a tocsin as a policy, a weapon in itself as much as the threat of a weapon. The application of the policy could not be rigid, but would depend upon the place and the circumstances of the test. As a starter the President asks financial aid for the two countries that are imminently menaced by either armed minorities or outside pressures, viz, Greece and Turkey. Here the need to defend the principle that the President has enunciated is backed by the need to look after our selfish interests as a world power. Congress and the people will now have a chance of sober reflection on the responsibilities to which they have hitherto given lip service but which they are now called upon to shoulder.

There had been some reservations in our approach to the President's declaration of an explicit foreign policy. It had been said it might throw down the gage to Russia in a titanic Russo-American contest for power. This pitfall the President has avoided, in the manner of Metternich, by advancing a universal principle—the principle of freedom—by way of opposing the forces of disruption. The policy is antiaggression, but on its other face it is profreedom. This is its saving grace. For nothing anti will survive in the struggle of ideas that makes the entire world a battlefield.

Moreover Russia is not singled out, nor is communism. In the context of our key policy, the aggression we will oppose is totalitarian, not specifically communism. The distinction is vital. The modern tendency is to think only of communism and Russia as the foe. If we were to take this position, we would be driven to line up with anti-Communists of the same stripe of totalitarianism as the Communists themselves. Fascists are contemptuous of liberty equally with Communists. Against totalitarianism of the right and of the left this new foreign policy is ranged.

Nor does the President wish to make this new foreign policy independent. It was good to hear him uphold the United Nations. Universal organization of free men is the hope of the human race, and any whittling away of it would imperil what remains of civilization. Mr. Truman said he had considered how the United Nations might assist in meeting the Near Eastern crisis, and rejected the idea because "the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required." We take the President's word for it.

However, we hope that our like-minded friends in the United Nations were apprised beforehand of the momentous step upon which we propose to embark. It is entirely in the spirit of the United Nations. The Charter is the authority for all free nations to seek a reign of world law and strive for the protection of human rights. Thus we must build up the United Nations as a necessary complement and instrument of this foreign policy. The warning cannot be stressed sufficiently that we may fall into the habit of operating outside the United Nations. That would be a fatal reaction. Complete independence in the pursuit of our aims might saddle us with the redemption of blank checks presented to us instead of to the United Nations.

Acceptance of the President's credo would imply a high degree of American discipline. No longer dare we legislate, as in the case of our silver policy, without a thought of the effect elsewhere of our actions. Congress, moreover, should hurry up consideration of the bill to integrate the armed forces in a single department topped by the National Security Council and the Resources Board. Finally, there must be a systematic effort to close the gap in our foreign trade so that the world will not be kept forever dollar-poor.

A responsibility likewise falls upon the President. If we intend to "give effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations," then he should see to it that the United Nations is no longer the stepchild in the organizational set-up of the State Department, but is recognized by the appointment of at least an Assistant Secretary of State for UN affairs. First and foremost, however, Greece and Turkey must be shored up against an aggression which, judging from the President's statement, is bound to succeed unless we act.

Industry-Wide Bargaining—Abuses and Cures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, industry-wide bargaining is an invisible guest at every dinner table. It cuts across the lives of every man, woman, and child in America, no matter how humble. It really means that this invisible somebody has his hands in your pockets most of the time.

Now, why is this?

Industry-wide bargaining are just high-toned words for the concentration of power and compulsion—the destruction of freedom on a Nation-wide scale.

Here again, instead of capitalistic monopoly, it is laboristic monopoly at work.

A generation before us saw the barons of finance and industry building up and abusing monopoly power. They raised prices and corrupted Government. Your generation and mine must now deal with a greater, more widespread, more politically corrupt power.

What is industry-wide bargaining? Cutting through the double talk, industry-wide bargaining represents the joining together in one organization of all the employees in all of the companies in one industry or of all of the employees in one particular occupation in all the units of that industry. It goes even further. The steelworkers union not only cover all the steel manufacturers but at least 1,100 of their customers, including makers of everything from mattresses to mandolins. There are more union employees in the little customers of the steel companies than in the steel companies themselves.

The effect of what takes place under these conditions is a pyramiding of power. Finally, one man or a few sit on top. They start or stop everything from the pyramid. These are the real holding company monopolies of today.

So we have a new name for an old device to establish and maintain personal power. But contrary to the belief held by many, industry-wide bargaining did not originate in 1935 under the influence of the Wagner Act any more than class hatred originated at anytime within the last decade. As a matter of fact, from the beginning of unionism in this country, there have been manifestations of industry-wide bargaining. However, these manifestations up to the time of the passage of the Wagner Act had always been held under restraint by law and responsible leadership. Consequently their potential abuses were not generally apparent. They seldom transgressed the public interest.

The Wagner Act was based on the untrue and vicious doctrine that the interests of employer and employee are so antagonistic and irreconcilable that the employee, in order to get equal or balanced bargaining power must have special class legislation administered through deliberate statutory favoritism.

Just as the Wagner Act sprang from this false doctrine, so abuses sprang from the Wagner Act, such as the denial to the employer of the right of free speech, while giving complete license to unions. It resulted in the denial of mens' right to work by price fixing, mass picketing, violence, sit-down strikes, slow-downs, secondary boycotts, jurisdictional disputes and the closed shop monopolies.

Under the antitrust laws, such abuses and combinations of power by industries were made illegal and subject to punishment as crimes.

Thus, the legalizing of this gathering together of one unit of power after another, until hundreds are included, and the reduction of the restraints on the exercise of such power by the Wagner Act, lead to abuses that have finally aroused the public to demand laws to stop these latest of all abuses of power.

FAR-REACHING EFFECTS OF ABUSES

Through the device of so-called industry-wide bargaining, Philip Murray, president of the CIO and of the United Steel Workers, was able to stop the work of more than a half million men in thousands of factories.

Similarly, John L. Lewis was able to call out 400,000 coal miners while he negotiated wages and working conditions for about 600 separate coal-mining companies.

We are now threatened with a Nation-wide strike by 300,000 telephone workers in utter disregard of the public welfare and safety. Such abuses of industry-wide bargaining are well known. What is not so generally realized, however, is their disastrous effect on small businesses.

In a recent report entitled "Future of Independent Business," made by the Senate Small Business Committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator from Montana, appears the following:

> The growing tendency to first seek industry-wide labor contracts and then force their identical terms on small independent firms in the industry wherever they may be located or however much their problems may differ from the giants of industry, is freighted with extreme hazard for independent business.
>
> Many a small firm with a splendid record of labor-management relations is sucked into the maelstrom of a national labor dispute with disastrous results for years afterward because they are not allowed to settle their labor problems in face-to-face relationships with their workers.
>
> At this time * * * it is urged that full consideration be given in any proposals offered for legislation to the peculiar problems in small business and the need for settlement of disputes at their initial stages in their local setting.

This is from the Senator whose party enacted the Wagner Act which harbored death to small business.

Industry-wide bargaining means that you are deprived of the benefits of competition as a factor in determining wages. This is the most powerful price-fixing combination yet developed outside of Government.

For most industries, wages constitute the major part of the cost of production, often as high as 80 percent. Where there is competition in wages and prices there is an automatic limitation upon them which gives you the benefits of improvements in products and wider access to the fruits of our industrial system.

CURES

What can be done? How can the abuses inherent in industry-wide bargaining be checked? How can responsibility and liability for abuses be introduced into the law covering so many labor dictators already entrenched in their power?

The answer should be obvious. Bargaining should be between the only parties concerned, that is, the employer and the employees of his company or plants under one corporate management. All rights and privileges under the new Labor Relations Act should be confined to the employer-employee relations of their own enterprise, such as the corporation, partnership, or individual concern.

And I hasten to add that this does not mean that all of the existing industry-wide bargaining should be wiped out. It means that such industry-wide bargaining as may continue outside of the scope of the new National Labor Relations Act will have no benefits under the act. However, all monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade or to fix prices against the public interest whether by industry or labor should be subject to the antitrust laws.

How a Notorious International Communist Duped Our State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I revealed before this House the activities below the Rio Grande of pro-Communists who intend to destroy the United States of America in one way or another and how the pro-Communists want to break up Western Hemisphere solidarity.

Today I will discuss specific individuals who have been and are employed in our State Department and who have actively participated in the Communist program to destroy our prestige with our neighbors south of the border.

It is unnecessary for me to tell you how successful these foreign agents have been, for it is no longer secret that the Americas to the south are convinced that we have only imperialistic aims and that our interest in those nations is only materialistic.

What I will say to you today is so fantastic, that it will be difficult to believe. If I told you that a man born across the seas, migrated to the United States in May of 1940, and in February of 1943 was appointed Auxiliary Foreign Service Officer in our State Department at Havana, Cuba, was then stationed in Buenos Aires and finally returned to Washington, D. C., at a salary of $8,000 per annum, as Assistant to Assistant Secretary

of State Spruille Braden, you would lend me a courteous ear and not forget the entire affair. Yet, this is precisely what happened. And this is precisely how the United States was knifed out of South America to make way for the Moscow stooges.

Believe it or not in the most trying times in our Nation's history, our State Department picks up an alien—secretly arranges for this alien to become an American citizen in the short period of 6 weeks and appoints him as Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin-American affairs.

If he were a loyal and trusted alien this might have been fine. But this particular alien is one of the world's most notorious Communists, skilled and trained in betrayal by Moscow agents during the Spanish civil war.

Who is this notorious Communist who rose to such heights in our State Department? Who is this notorious Communist who directed Latin American relations? Who is this notorious Communist who has driven American good will out of Latin America and substituted in its place Moscow goodwill? He is none other than Gustavo Duran!

If you were to ask the State Department for the credentials of this notorious Communist—here is the reply you would get:

Gustavo Duran; born Barcelona, Spain, November 14, 1906, high school, Madrid, 1916–20; School of Commerce, Madrid, 1920–23; Madrid University, 1923–27; compulsory military service, Spanish Army, 1928; studied composition and musicology, Paris, 1929–33; employed, Paramount Pictures, Paris office, 1933–34; employed, motion-picture company, Madrid, 1934–36; reactivated in Spanish Army, 1936–39; reached the rank of lieutenant colonel, on combat duty throughout entire campaign; participated with Generals Miaja, Casado, and Menedez in elimination Communist-dominated Negrin government and substitution of non-Communist government under General Miaja; rescued by British Government authorities and taken to England via British cruiser *Galatea* and British hospital ship *Maine*; employed by Film Center, Shel-Mix Petroleum Co., London, 1939–40; migrated to United States, May 1940; director of music department, film library, Museum of Modern Art, April–October 1941; assistant director, music division, Pan American Union, October 1941–January 1943; accepted appointment as auxiliary Foreign Service officer February 1943; stationed at Havana until May 1945; stationed at Buenos Aires, May–September 1945; assigned to State Department October 1945; married December 4, 1939, Bonte Romilly Crompton, of Rye, N. Y., and Wilton, N. H.

This is the personal data which Gustavo Duran furnished the State Department. On the basis of this data, within 6 weeks it was arranged for his becoming an American citizen and appointed as Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin-American relations.

This biographical data sounds convincing until placed under a microscope for examination. When placed under careful scrutiny the true character and past activities burst before your eyes like an atom bomb. The truth therein revealed is blinding.

Because the War Department has another biographical sketch of this notorious Communist. Moscow also has another biographical sketch of Gustavo Duran.

For example, the State Department records fail to state that Gustavo Duran reported to his party—the Communist Party—when the civil war broke out in Spain. The State Department discreetly neglects to mention that he was discharged by the Minister of Defense of the Spanish Loyalist Government, as head of S. I. M.—Madrid Intelligence Bureau—because he had appointed to sensitive positions members of the Communist Party. Nor does the State Department mention that when he was discharged from the S. I. M. that the chief agent of the Russian Government in Spain interviewed the Minister of Defense—Indalecio Prieto—and threatened to withdraw the support of the Soviet Government from the Spanish Loyalist Government, unless Gustavo Duran was returned to his post.

The State Department discreetly states, in its biographical report that Duran aided in the overthrow of the Communist Government. Yet the fact remains after Duran was discharged from his Madrid post he was placed with a field army that was composed of non-Communists. But when the Communist forces during the last days of the struggle broke with the true Spanish Republicans, Duran was jailed by his own troops as a precautionary measure because he was pegged by his own men as one of the most notorious Communists in all Spain.

All of these things are true, gentlemen, and today I intend to show how this individual, a selected protégé of Spruille Braden, aided and abetted the Communist movement in South America to the detriment of the United States. What is worse, he was placed in a high position in our State Department to carry on his dirty work—to the detriment of Latin-American relations.

I will begin this report with the discharge of Gustavo Duran from his post as Chief of the S. I. M. in Madrid. My authority for this dismissal is the report by the Minister of Defense written in Spanish and transcribed by the Legislative Reference Division of the Congressional Library.

To refresh the short and convenient memory of Gustavo Duran, I will quote you from the official report of Idalecio Prieto to his party, when he, Prieto, was Minister of International Defense. I quote verbatim from this report. This report is known to the War Department, but if it is known to the State Department it is discreetly kept secret. I quote:

It is true that I have had certain incidents with the Russians. Certain Russian technicians proposed to me in Valencia, that a service of Military Investigations should be created. This was the Spanish counterpart of the NKVD. I confess that I opposed the project. But because of insistent pressure, I created the S. I. M. I was especially concerned with choosing a chief, until I gave it to an intimate friend of mine, who had just come from France, where he was with his family. In entrusting him with the task, I gave him these instructions:

"You are going to form the S. I. M., carefully, with elements of all groups of the Popular Front. Your only charges will be these two: Do not permit the new organization to be converted into an instrument of the Communists and do not permit Russian technicians to gain control. Listen to the advice of these technicians and follow their orientations, which can be very useful to you, but control must always be in your hands and in that of the Government, and of no one else."

I showed little tact in the selection of that comrade. A Republican named Sayagues came in fact to be the chief of S. I. M. Regional chiefs of the S. I. M. were designated and they proposed to me a certain Gustavo Duran for the Madrid zone. It was not concealed from me that the person proposed was a Communist (Duran). I knew this, but in spite of that, he was appointed by me. In the decree creating the S. I. M. of August of 1937—a decree which I myself drew up, because I did not wish to follow in a slavish manner the project which was handed me—there is an article by virtue of which the appointment of all agents of the S. I. M. rests exclusively with the Minister of National Defense. This was a guarantee which temporarily I wish to establish. No one could be an agent of the S. I. M. who was not in possession of the memorandum book which bore duplicate the signature of the minister. Duran having been appointed chief of the demarcation of the army of the center, of his own accord and without power to do so, appointed the agents who were under his orders, which to the number of some hundreds, were Communists and only four or five were Socialists. I faced an intolerable situation, wherefore alleging, and with reason, that I lacked commanders in the army. I ordered that all military chiefs who were not in particular positions in the army should return to their former positions, and thus Major Duran had to return to his military function. Because of Duran's leaving the S. I. M. I received a visit from a Russian technician, of these services, who said to me:

"RUSSIAN AGENT. I have come to speak to you about the dismissal of Duran. What happened?

"PRIETO. Nothing special, I lacked commanders in the army and ordered Duran to return to it.

"RUSSIAN AGENT. No. You discharged him because he appointed Communists as agents in Madrid.

"PRIETO. That is also sufficient reason, because Duran absolutely lacked authority to make appointments.

"RUSSIAN AGENT. Why did he not have the power to appoint agents?

"PRIETO. Because by virtue of the decree creating the S. I. M. that power is reserved exclusively to the Minister."

I read the decree and before the evidence of my statement my visitor alleged:

"RUSSIAN AGENT. Duran could make temporary appointments.

"PRIETO. Neither actual nor temporary. Here in Spain, moreover, the temporary is converted into the definitive.

"RUSSIAN AGENT. Be that as it may, I come to ask you to immediately restore Major Duran as chief of the S. I. M. in Madrid.

"PRIETO. I am very sorry, but I cannot consent.

"RUSSIAN AGENT. If you do not consent to restore Duran, my relations with you are broken.

"PRIETO. I am sorry, but Major Duran will go to the front of his division and will not return to the S. I. M. Your attitude is unjustified and I cannot yield to it."

I did not yield as a matter of fact, and my relations with the Russian technician, through his own wish, were absolutely cut off. I have not seen him since that scene.

IDALECIO PRIETO,
Minister of Defense.

Gentlemen, this exposé of the associations of Mr. Duran and the high regard in which he was held by the Soviet Government is alarming, when you consider that this very same person is now to a

large degree responsible for our South American debacle and the success of the Soviet Government in creating a feeling of suspicion between the countries in South America and the United States, enabling the Soviet Government to enter into favorable trade negotiations with the Republic of Argentina, again at the expense of the United States.

In fact, it was due to these machinations of our Embassy that Peron was able to coin a winning slogan: "A vote for Peron is a vote against Braden." There is no question that the activities of our own foreign representatives were to a large degree responsible for the temporary overthrow of the Peron regime and the jailing of Juan Peron himself. In fact, our State Department hailed this revolution as a vindication of America's Argentine policy. This "vindication" was short-lived, as it failed to have the support of the people of that Nation, and a few days later a labor front of some 500,000 demanded and secured the release of Peron and his return to power. Our policy proponents in the United States Embassy and the then newly elected Assistant Secretary of State had been so busy in South America in destroying what they called the iron grip of Peron's military Fascist regime that their reports to our State Department failed to reveal that Peron had the full support of the labor front. Action that followed by our State Department was the regretful calling off of the Rio Conference attempting to quarantine the Argentine regime. All of these actions were in complete accord with the Communist press and the over-all Communist policy at that time and in complete accord with the Communist fellow travelers and pink journalists in America and in the State Department.

Now for the Communist-led agitation to have the United States interfere in the affairs of Argentina in order to establish "democratic government" in Buenos Aires on August 31, 1945, Izvestia published a violent attack on Argentina, full of the vitrolic condemnation with which Moscow attacks enemies of "freedom" in countries outside her own borders. However, long before this editorial in Izvestia three of Moscow's leading agents in the Western Hemisphere had already begun to pay special attention to the informal politics of Argentina.

These agents include Lombardo Toledano, who is the key man in the Communist-controlled Latin-American Federation of Labor; Rudolfo Shioldi, the Argentinian Communist Leader; and the Brazilian, Luis Prestes, former member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Since the Communists are past masters in political and international timing, it may well repay the attention of this House to study chronological development of this Communist-inspired campaign for "democratic freedom" in Argentina. Mr. Toledano's efforts go back to 1943, the year when General Ramirez came to power in Argentina. I am now going to dwell upon that very phase of Mr. Toledano's communistic efforts.

In a speech in Mexico City on August 28, 1944, he starts the propaganda line that Argentina is becoming the bridgehead for "world Fascism" in the Western Hemisphere with a view to split the Americas in two parts, which will eventually clash and start a third World War. Even when events showed that if a third World War comes—it is likely to start in regions far removed from South America. Yet the year 1945 saw an ever-increasing and co-ordinated Communist propaganda campaign against Argentina, aided and abetted by our representatives in that country—Duran-Braden. On January 7, 1945, PM attacked Peron, followed by similar attacks. It is symptomatic, however, that it was only after VE-day and VJ-day that the campaign got up steam and became an International Communist Demonstration. In July 1945, the Communist Party of the United States demanded America break with Argentina. On August 31, 1945, Izvestia's attack follows. Two days after South America's notorious Communist, Toledano, had summarized his own efforts in the following statement:

> We have denounced and fought the Argentine tyrant in the resolutions of our Congress, in the great continent-wide solidarity strike of January, in our sponsorship of the Argentina resolution at the London Congress and the documented protests we sent to the Inter-American United Nations Conference.

We next find Communist leader Toledano in Paris in September 1945 at the World Federation of Trade Unions Meeting, where his Latin-American delegation got a strong anti-Argentinian resolution passed. In October the Chilean Copper Workers' Union followed suit, and at the International Labor Conference in November 1945 Toledano took the floor for another speech against Peron. The year 1945 ends by the denunciation of Peron by the Communist Party of Argentina on December 12, 1945. In the interim, a strange Communist tactical move was taking shape in Brazil, a mysterious maneuver which I will return to discuss in a moment.

I must, however, first call the attention of the House to the startling revelation which Toledano's house organ in Mexico City made in its issue of December 3, 1945, where approval was given to Mr. Jacob S. Potofsky's pressure on Assistant Secretary of State, Spruille Braden. Who is Mr. Potofsky? He is the Russian-born assistant general president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. Mr. Potofsky has taken interest in Latin-American affairs because he heads the Committee on Latin-American Affairs of the CIO. In 1932 the same Mr. Potofsky held the position of secretary-treasurer of the Russian-American Industrial Corp. headed by Sidney Hillman. If you will permit, I will transgress for a moment and go back into the early history of Mr. Hillman and this same Potofsky who exerted such a strong influence in our State Department.

In 1922 Hillman traveled to Russia and there gained the support of Lenin, for his Russian-American Industrial Corp. which was established to operate the textile and clothing industry in Russia. Jacob Potofsky, Hillman's closest collaborator, like his superior, was likewise born in Russia. He was assigned the program of soliciting money from labor in the United States to promote the industrial control of the clothing and textile industry in Russia. The evidence clearly indicates that the Russian-American Industrial Corp. had a political as well as a business interest in the Bolshevik revolution. On the corporations' envelopes there was printed in bold type the following declaration: "The key to the stability of the world lies in the economic reconstruction of Russia."

I bring this background to your attention as it is known that Potofsky and Hillman were intimates of Mr. Braden and that our State Department was in frequent communication with the Latin-American Affairs Division of the CIO. In fact, Potofsky was well aware of the Communist background of Mr. Duran and so informed everyone in his circle.

I will now return to the approval of Jacob S. Potofsky's pressure on Spruille Braden, by Toledano, key Communist in the labor movement of South America, to agitate in good old Comintern style for a rupture of political and trade relations between the United States and the Government of Juan Peron.

The executive secretary of this CIO, Latin-American affairs committee is George Michanowsky, and it is a matter of record that this CIO committee on Latin-American affairs went to Mr. Spruille Braden to urge that sanctions be invoked against Argentina. This happened 2 months before the blue book appeared on the arena. Mr. Toledano's news sheet quotes CIO committee leaders as telling Mr. Braden:

> We told Mr. Braden that we believed preference should be given to democracy in Argentina and that the present dictatorship should not be allowed to inject additional poison into her neighbors.

That this Communist-inspired pressure on our State Department was kept up can be gathered from a statement in the January 14, 1946, issue of the Toledano paper:

> The denunciation of Argentine fascism by Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden has aided Argentine democrats, but something more than words is needed.

Gentlemen, get this, quote:

> Something more than words is needed.

Gentlemen, the blue book came on February 12, 1946. The blue book against Peron in Argentina was the "something more than words is needed." The blue book issued by Braden was a CIO-Communist inspired and written document—put out under the seal of our State Department. It may well show itself to have been one of the most tragic documents in the history of American foreign policy. Everything was wrong about that ill-advised publication. It does not contain anything startling, except sheer cheap and shoddy Communist propaganda—CIO inspired. As a matter of fact, according to dispatches to the New York Times on April 7, 1946, Chile asked for proof of the plot charged in this infamous blue book about Argentina trying to foment a revolution in Chile. The Chilean Government, also, asked for specific names of those persons who were supposed to have been active in such activity. The Chilean statement asserts that after investigation by

Spruille Braden, he informed them that the United States had no such proof involving specific persons in Chile. Chile's reply to the questionnaire circulated by our State Department was forwarded to our State Department in March of last year, yet so far as I know this information has not been made known to the public here in the United States. The Government of Lima, Peru, in reply to the blue book, concerning charges of support by the wartime government of Peron to the Axis, merely stated that the election of February 24, 1946, was conducted in a legal manner and that the regime resulting from this election must be considered.

While on the subject of the blue book, let me point out that this document is a poorly done job. Even its typographical make-up is of such mediocre standard that one refuses to believe that such a document was even presented to the Ambassadors and Ministers of the sister nations of this hemisphere. This is truly not a publication which does honor to the solemnity of the Monroe Doctrine, nor to the dignity of the foreign relations of one of the world's great powers. I mention this detail of make-up and appearance because it leads one to believe that the very decision to throw this book at the Argentine elections was as hasty as it has proven to be unfortunate, yes, tragic. It evidences where Braden got his inspiration and advice.

You will note that up until the fall of 1945, the Communists throughout the world and the Communist-infiltrated CIO had carried on a campaign against the Farrell-Peron regime. Now all of a sudden from Moscow came new orders and the picture promptly changes. The Vergas regime of Brazil begins to look with favor upon the Argentine Government and Luis Carlos Prestes, leader of the Communist activity in Brazil, on February 19, 1946—New York Times, page 7—declares:

> The Argentine elections are the business of the Argentine people.

On February 22, 1946, the executive committee of the Brazilian Communist Party warns the world:

> A war of this type, plotted by direct agents of fanatical capital like Braden and others, would undoubtedly be an unjust inter-imperialist war directed against Latin-American people, with the particular objective of annihilating the labor and popular movement in our countries.

Thus in true Marxian style, the Soviet Government turns on its benefactors, Duran and Braden, and in their usual style completes the task of creating dissension in the minds of South Americans against their northern neighbor by sowing seeds of a threatening imperialistic war. So today the Communists of South America are using their own blue book—issued by our own State Department—as a basis to poison the South American people against the United States.

Do we now understand who engineered this clever scheme? First, we have the Toledano-Schioldi-Potofsky-Michanowsky-Duran-Braden crowd of inter-American saboteurs. Together with PM and the official Communist organ, the Daily Worker, they demanded American interference in another sovereign state's internal affairs. They succeeded in their plot and got the United States Department of State to commit an unbelievable blunder. Whereupon the Moscow heroic defenders of democratic freedom turn to a vicious attack upon these United States for trying to start a war to annihilate labor and freedom on this continent. Now the question is, how much of this was due to ignorance, lack of ability, or due to unwise counsel of persons who have in the past been active in the interest of the success of the Communist Party. We know now that when Russia was denouncing Argentina at the San Francisco Conference, their representatives were, at that very moment, engaging in advance trade talks which were culminated in a trade mission being sent to Argentina from Soviet Russia. Again, due to bad judgment or other reasons, the United States is placed in an unfortunate and unfavorable trade bargaining position because of the agitation conducted against a sister republic in the South. It is time that America awoke to the traitors without her own borders, and demanded a foreign policy which is American, not in name only, but in spirit. When will the innocent sentimental Americans who are led by the nose, by fellow travelers, pink journalists, and Communist agents in the labor movement, wake up to the fact that they are contributing to the destruction of Latin-American relations. We abhor any form of fascism, but we are just as deeply filled with the moral hatred of double-crossing atheism—communism. Finally, when will this great free Nation get a State Department which is intelligent and mature enough to work out a specific, clear, and democratic foreign policy? We in the House have bent over backwards in order to lift American foreign policy above party politics. But we learn that those responsible take their direction from Communists or left-wingers who have no interest in the welfare of the United States or good-neighbor relations.

If our State Department knew these facts in 1943, why choose the time of a national election in Argentina to do the greatest conceivable disservice to the cause of a popular leader in Argentina? After this betrayal of South America to Soviet propagandists by persons in our State Department how can we hope the South American Republics to believe that the United States does not want to dominate or coerce or encroach upon the sovereignty of any nation in this hemisphere? This is surely not the way to build good will or unity. Such a short-sighted stupid policy—if it was not intentional—makes mockery of the Monroe Doctrine. But then what can you expect when the responsible persons go to the Communist-infiltrated Government of Spain for trusted advisers in preference to our home-grown Americans.

An interesting side-light of the machinations of Mr. Duran is revealed by the interests which Messrs. Braden and Duran took in four Communist-Socialist labor leaders in Argentina. In the first place, it would be interesting to know who arranged for those four persons to come to America and to travel to Paris where they attended the completely dominated Communist union known as the WFTU. However, more interesting is the fact that when these four persons returned from this Red labor meeting in Paris they stopped off in Washington and spent an entire afternoon in conference with Mr. Braden, Mr. Duran, James M. Wright, and Earl Spaeth, all of the State Department. Other Communist labor leaders attended this meeting. They were Francisco Perez Leiros, of the General Federation of Labor, and the secretary of the municipal workers' union, and a member of the executive committee of the Communist-controlled Cital of South America and Argentina, Ruben Iscaro, former secretary of the General Federation of Labor, and secretary of construction-industry union of Buenos Aires; Gulio Falasco, of the railwaymen's union, trustee of funds, former delegate of Congress of Railway Unions, openly a member of the Communist Party and an old-line anarchist; Antonio E. Cabrera, acting secretary of the construction workers' union, and others. Cabrera is generally known as a Socialist with Communist associations. All of the afore-mentioned belong to unions which come under the domination of Lombardo Toledano, who must be well known to all of you by now.

After this conference the four delegates returned to their hotel with Mr. Duran. Now it happens that a man stood outside the door who is capable of speaking and interpreting Spanish. We learn from this conversation that everyone was addressed in the good old Communist manner of "Comrade." We further learned that they has discussed that afternoon the plan to be used to overthrow the Argentine Government. Actually these Communist agents recently returned from the Red World Union meeting in Paris had no intention of overthrowing the Argentine Government. They were merely setting up a program to get our Government to act against Peron, and then they would gracefully pull out and condemn the action of America as imperialistic. Now whether Mr. Braden became a dupe of these Red machinations I do not know, but the presence of a former Communist of the Spanish Loyalist Army and pet of the Soviet secret police at these meetings makes me wonder. Oh, yes; Mr. Duran and Mr. Braden were later smeared by the Moscow press, but not until Duran and Braden had performed the task of laying the ground work for disunity between South America and the United States. That was the wish and foreign policy of the Communist state known as the U. S. S. R. That is how Duran and Braden did the chores for Moscow in South America. After they completed the chores, of course, the Moscow press had to attack its benefactors to hide the real object and purpose.

It is a famous Moscow trick to attack its benefactors when a certain mission is fulfilled. It was Moscow's mission to break our prestige in South America. It was Moscow's mission, through Duran, to use our own State Department to lay down the seeds for disunity. It was

Moscow's mission to get a foothold in South America. Our State Department's CIO-Duran-Braden blue book gave Moscow that foothold. The infamous blue book today is Moscow's Bible in South America. It is being used to turn South America against us.

This is a true revelation of how a notorious Communist, Gustavo Duran, duped our State Department. For that duping, Duran was paid $8,000 per year by the taxpayers of America—as assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State. This is a story of how the international Communists infiltrated into our State Department and plotted this disruption of Latin-American relations. This is how the Communists with the cooperation of our State Department succeeded in setting back Latin-American relations more than 50 years.

What happened to Duran after this tragic episode? Was he relieved of his post? Only after a long series of protests by honest Americans was he relieved of his post as assistant to Braden. Where is Duran now? In spite of duping his superior, Braden engineered a deal where Gustavo Duran is now a representative to the United Nations Refugee Committee. Gustavo Duran, the man who duped our State Department—the man who engineered the setting back of Latin-American relations 50 years—is now screening refugees and an employee of the United Nations organization, where he can continue his work for good old Soviet Russia.

We are now being told by our State Department that we must stop communism in Greece. To that I answer, How about driving out the Communists' hold on our own State Department first? What good is it to spend millions fighting communism in Greece when Communists use our State Department to strengthen communism in South America. Before we go to Greece, let's first oust the Communist stooges and their dupes in our own State Department. Let's first clean the Communists out of their other high Government positions. Let's first clean the Communists out of America and the Western Hemisphere. What good does it do to spend money and blood to save Greece from communism, only to find that communism strengthened itself right under our very nose—with State Department approval?

To give an idea of how serious the hold of the Communists is on our State Department, I might mention just one instance. For some time now our War Department has been promoting the cause of Western Hemisphere defense. It has been urged by our authorities on defense to strengthen all of the Western Hemisphere by a uniformity of arms. What is holding up the progress of this plan? Believe it or not, it is our State Department. Braden still holds forth and blocks every attempt at Western Hemisphere solidarity. Is Braden serving America in his continual blocking of Latin-American relations? Definitely not. He is still serving the same master he was serving when he issued the infamous blue book. The spirit of Gustavo Duran still guides Braden in his words and actions.

The same person and purpose who is holding up every attempt at Western Hemisphere solidarity is also holding up the long-postponed Rio Conference.

In the name of common sense let us not begin with Greece. Let us begin with certain employees in our State Department. Most of all let us begin with Braden.

No person in all of our history has been so universally despised by Latin-Americans as Spruille Braden. He has caused damage to Latin-American relations beyond repair. Anybody can get elected to any office in South America merely by denouncing Braden. This shows the contempt with which he is held by the friendly people of South America.

To prove my point, I would like to give you a translation from a Socialist paper in Argentina. This paper is anti-Peron. Therefore, its words should carry some weight. Here is the translation:

The more Braden attacks me (Peron), the more evident he becomes. Braden's hatred has a sure origin. In one of our first meetings he told me that the friendship of United States toward Argentina had a price, and, if I was willing to pay it, my government and myself would have the firm and decided support of the American Government.

"May I know, Mr. Ambassador, what that price is?" I asked him.

"Yes, of course; the Argentine merchant fleet, the Argentine air lines, the railways."

I answered him: "Mr. Ambassador, in our country, whoever sells his country, or helps to sell it, is called, and forgive me for saying so, a son of a ———."

The Ambassador turned pale and ran away, forgetting his hat.

Next I sent him his hat with an orderly.

This quotation from a Peron opposition paper is typical of the attitude of South American people toward the man in our State Department who is in charge of Latin-American relations.

Yes; these are critical times. Now, more than ever, the Western Hemisphere must be united. I am more concerned about this solidarity than I am about Greece. I am more interested in keeping communism out of South America than I am about keeping communism out of Greece.

We can take a long step forward if we begin at home right under our very noses. There is no reason or excuse to tolerate the machinations of Spruille Braden any longer. Why do we tolerate it? Do we want Latin-American relations to deteriorate deeper? What good does it do for our President to go to South America to encourage friendly relations and solidarity when right in our State Department a person is in charge who does everything to destroy that friendship and solidarity?

We have a momentous decision to make in this Congress concerning our Nation's future action. Let us prove our sincerity in our action. Let us not go first to Greece. Let us begin right here at home—in our State Department. Let us get rid of Braden and unify and strengthen ourselves at home and among our closest neighbors. This should be our first step to stop communism—if we are sincere.

The Closed Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1947

Mr. GWINN of New York. The American people are coming to grips at last with insidious tyranny and monopoly that lies behind the innocent words "closed shop." This time it is not capitalistic monopoly but laboristic monopoly. The law dealt with the former evil 40 years ago. It must deal with the latter evil now. Through the recent hearings on labor legislation in the Committee on Education and Labor, the American people are getting a true picture of the lawlessness and the unconstitutional and bloody facts of the working of the closed-shop monopoly throughout the land.

What do we find behind the bolted doors of the closed shop? First, an un-American atmosphere of Socialist totalitarianism, personal intimidation, and freedom-killing compulsion. The closed shop means that an American worker is required to become a union member before he can hope to get a job. For the right even to work, he is compelled to pay an initiation fee ranging from $2 to $2,000. I repeat—$2,000.

Next, to keep his job he must pay all his dues, fines, and assessments. He is dependent upon his union boss for his promotion, seniority, and union rights.

From Stalinism our union bosses have learned the trick of denying a worker the right to union vote by denying him membership and giving him instead merely a permit to work. This device keeps down the number who, by their loyal voting, dominate the union and keep the leaders in office year after year. Thus, the noose is drawn around the liberty and dignity of the individual workingman.

We did not realize what was happening to the freedom of the workingman until many of our boys came back from the battlefields and reported that they were expected to bow down at home before labor commissars as rough and tough as those they fought abroad. They had to pay homage for the right to make a living. And this in a Nation which proclaims the policy of the open door in China, Greece, Palestine, and Korea, in the air, on the seas, and in world trade.

When the inalienable rights of free Americans are taken away the whole society loses its freedom; and so it is happening. For example, our carpenters, masons, plumbers, painters, our most respected and most skilled workers in the greatest of all trades—the building trade—have thrown around themselves the closed-shop ring. In a whole State, for example, in the State of New Jersey right now, no industrial building can go on—$34,000,000 is stopped now—and very little home building, because wages range from $17.50 per day of 7 hours to $21.50. That means farmers, veterans,

school teachers, preachers, the white-collar workers, or retired persons cannot afford to build at all. The real low-income groups fall into slum conditions.

Apprentices are prevented from learning the trades. Nonunion men cannot work because of mass picketing and strikes. So the vise is tight. The next and last and inevitable step in such monopoly conditions is threatened, namely, the Government itself takes over.

The cry goes up from all over the country, "We want houses; shame on us that our veterans are without homes."

For the moment, before the Government takes over, as some want, and others do not suspect, labor enjoys a monopoly and high wages. Wages that only a monopoly provides makes labor feel a degree of false power and temporary prosperity. No Government has ever tolerated such private exercise of monopolistic power. To illustrate, the public outcry for houses compels the Government even now to threaten to destroy the union security in favor of the greater public needs for a vaster group whose votes exceed by far those of the closed-shop workers. Government must itself either become that monopoly, or it must free the individual workers and the public from the domination of the closed-shop monopoly. It must make all forms of monopoly illegal for the sake of freedom. There is no other choice.

It is either freedom, the great source of houses, or collectivism, socialism, or communism, if you will, via Government monopoly housing. That is the stake the individual union worker, as well as the nonunion worker and the whole public, has in this legislation.

We can only rejoice that in spite of the cries against restoration of equality before the law for all alike, the American people are rising to demand an end to this new type of tyranny.

A Gallup poll of January 20, 1947, reported that a mere 8 percent of the American public favored the closed shop. Among union members, only 19 percent voted favorably on it.

Again, a recent opinion research poll showed only 7 percent of the public voting for the closed shop, while a poll by Factory Management proved that no less than 70 percent of the union members themselves advocate the outlawing of the closed or union shops. Hundreds of letters and telegrams received by members of the House Labor Committee from the rank and file of various labor unions support these facts.

However, over 4,000,000 jobs have already fallen under control of the dictators of a closed-shop arrangement. Employment opportunities, wages, and prices for food and shelter and services are thus monopolized by the union under the absolute veto of labor bosses and very often with the consent of employers. Even so, these cover but a fraction of our 140,000,000 citizens. Unfortunately, this fraction is able, by the device of the closed shop, to take whatever they want from the other 136,000,000 in higher and higher wages and decreased hours, all the while leading themselves and the rest of us farther from traditional Americanism to Government-directed collectivism. Meantime, food and houses grow more scarce, rent, and farm machinery and automobiles go out of reach for most of us, and for exactly the same reasons—the excessive costs of monopolistic labor.

Let us examine the effect which a system of fear and threat has on the individual, on his capacity to invent and produce. Threats of arbitrary expulsion from a closed shop effectively discourage him from voicing any opposition to union policy or to a union leader.

Under our American system, of freedom and democracy we have always believed that a man is entitled to protest against what he sincerely believes to be wrong. In his heart, the average union member is still a freedom-loving American. He doesn't like to be forced to support union policies which do not express the will of the majority of the members. He does not like to be pushed around. He does not want to be herded into a strike when he does not want to strike; he balks at having to submit to rules which he has had no part in making and has no power to alter. But what does the closed shop do? The closed shop in and of itself tends to make union bosses dictators. These bosses permit no opposition to themselves as commissars. From them there is no effective appeal. For leaders drunk with power are never known to be considerate of their followers' convictions or liberties. Workers become known as "my people."

The closed shop under the one-sided Wagner Act has shackled American labor. It has come close to wrecking the American economic system, as literally hundreds of employers and representatives of public bodies have testified.

The main objections to the closed shop, expressed by these witnesses, are:

First. It deprives management of the opportunity to employ the most competent people available, regardless of their membership or nonmembership in a union.

Second. It compels industry to discharge faithful employees who have served the company long and well, at the mere request of the union, often on trumped-up charges.

Third. It destroys discipline by making the employee more responsive to the wishes of his union officers than to the instructions of his foreman.

Fourth. The closed shop encourages slow and inefficient production.

The combined effects of all these characteristics of the closed shop are to place a premium on inefficiency, to discourage honest service, to encourage insubordination, to decrease production, and to greatly increase the cost of living.

It must now be apparent to all that the primary concern of some labor leaders, particularly in closed shops, is to keep the greatest number of union members employed at the highest possible wages. To achieve this objective, unions have resorted to spread-the-work methods, chief of which have been limitations on output per worker. Under this system, more employees are required to turn out a given volume, with the resultant increase in unit cost. Furthermore, full and efficient production is impossible when a worker has no incentive to excel. Under a closed shop, many workers are satisfied to do only enough to get by because their opportunity for promotion is no longer related to a man's ability, but depends solely on his length of service and his union leaders' favor.

In the long run, it is the great unionized public that pays for the evils of the closed shop. They pay not only in excessive prices, but in cold and hunger. The unorganized part of the public pays in inconvenience, discomfort, and personal loss of income caused by unnecessarily increased prices. They have their milk, fuel, power, transportation, or telephone shut off. We have been forced to witness how a mere handful of men are able to imperil the health and safety of millions and to bring great cities to their knees.

The closed shop by teamsters is being used to prevent farmers from bringing their own produce to market. It is a hold-up weapon used by racketeers who fasten their clutches on a labor union. They fight among themselves, even the best of them, in jurisdictional strikes, the secondary boycott, and industry-wide bargaining. Construction of a whole million-dollar building may be stopped while the carpenters dispute with common labor about who may unload boards from a railroad car. As many as four locals belonging to the same international fight and strike against each other over who shall handle a load of ordinary building material.

The closed shop removes any incentive for union officials to develop understanding among the workers of the legitimate purpose of a union, by making it unnecessary for unions to sell themselves to workers on their merits or services. Present-day closed-shop unions have substituted dictatorial power over the worker for services to the worker.

The right to work at an available job of a man's own choosing and under conditions which he himself considers satisfactory is a precious American human right which Americans have always valued highly. The closed shop of modern unionism has destroyed this right. Any worker should have the clear right to join any union he wants to, as surely as he should also have the legally protected right not to join a union, if this is his desire.

Unions today have full and adequate protection under the law. This protection should and must remain. But the monopolistic and unfair and unjust privileges of the closed shop are not needed, and they must go. To the contrary, employees and the public alike need to be protected against the evil of the closed shop. In the interests of the American public, it is clear that this Congress must act decisively, and at once, to outlaw the closed shop, if the arbitrary power of un-American labor leaders, rooted in the closed shop, is to be prevented from further robbing us as individuals of our freedom.

Address of Hon. Chapman Revercomb, of West Virginia, to the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks I made before the Veterans of Foreign Wars at a meeting held by them in the Department of Commerce Building Auditorium in this city on the evening of March 12 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and veterans, I appreciate very much the honor that you confer upon me in asking me to meet with you here tonight, and I want to say that I am delighted that you of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have now started upon your campaign to combat those insidious forces within our own country which would tear down our established form of government. You have fought in the name of your country; now you are determined that that country shall in truth be a land of independent people under sound laws and that you and your children shall enjoy the opportunities of life that a strong, free America offers. This heritage which has come down to us all brings with it a solemn and a definite duty to protect it.

There is no part of our people to whom I would rather speak and with whom I would rather work in the preservation of the fundamental principles of a government for free people than I would with the veterans who have served in the armed services. You have answered the highest call that can come to the citizen of a sovereign state in bearing arms in combat in behalf of your country. There has been impressed deep into your thoughts and into your very souls a genuine love of your country. That is real patriotism. It is that feeling which brought about the establishment of this Nation when the men of that day determined to be free; and it is that feeling that has made generation after generation since the establishment of this Government rise to defend it.

If the young men of this country can be called upon to bear arms in time of war, certainly they are entitled to be heard in time of peace; and the call now comes to you as veterans of your country to work in unified effort to eradicate from our own land those philosophies that are destructive of our established way of government and of living, and to stop the work of those whose objective is to destroy this country.

Subversive activities have generally been referred to as communism, fascism, and nazism. Basically, the danger in them all is the same. The final objective of each is to seize the Government for group rule and to control all men and women in their lives and activities for the primary benefit of the group in power. That, of course, means destruction of freedom for the public.

That communism is extant in this land of ours cannot be doubted by those who have had contact with any phase of public life. Not only is the objective of communism bad, but the means of operation are subversive, hidden, and underhand. That its objective is bad for America has received official pronouncement in the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States a few years ago when he advised the President that the Communist organization seeks the overthrow of the American Government by force.

Had there ever been any doubt about the underhand and hidden methods of the Communist actors, such doubt would have been dispelled could the people have heard the testimony recently given before a committee of the Senate. Some of this testimony was by persons who admitted prior membership in the Communist Party. In achieving their ends, they are directly instructed to deceive by hiding their identity, by denying affiliation with communism, and even to go under false names in carrying on their work.

That communism is rampant in America, let me quote from an address made by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as recently as September 30, 1946, before the national convention of the American Legion at San Francisco, Calif.:

"During the past 5 years American Communists have made their deepest inroads upon our national life. In our vaunted tolerance for all peoples, the Communist has found our 'Achilles' heel.' The American Legion represents a force which holds within its power the ability to expose the hypocrisy and ruthlessness of this foreign ism which has crept into our national life, an ism built and supported by dishonor, deceit, tyranny, and a deliberate policy of falsehood.

"It is a matter of self-preservation. The veteran who fought for America will be among the first to suffer if the Communists succeed in carrying out their diabolical plots to wreck the American way of life. The divide-and-conquer tactics did not die with Hitler—they are being employed with greater skill today by American Communists with their 'boring from within' strategy. Their propaganda, skillfully designed and adroitly executed, has been projected into practically every phase of our national life. The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims some 100,000 members has lulled many Americans into a feeling of false complacency. I would not be concerned if we were dealing with only 100,000 Communists. The Communists themselves boast that, for every party member, there are 10 others ready to do the party's work. These include their satellites, their fellow travelers, and their so-called progressive and phony liberal allies. They have maneuvered themselves into postions where a few Communists control the destinies of hundreds who are either willing to be led or have been duped into obeying the dictates of others.

"The Communist influence has projected itself into some newspapers, magazines, books, radio, and the screen. Some churches, schools, colleges, and even fraternal orders have been penetrated, not with the approval of the rank and file but in spite of them. I have been pleased to observe that the Communist attempts to penetrate the American Legion have met with failure. Eternal vigilance will continue to keep your ranks free of shifty, double-crossing Communist destructionists.

"We are rapidly reaching the time when loyal Americans must be willing to stand up and be counted. The American Communist Party, despite its claims, is not truly a political party. The Communist Party in this country is not working for the general welfare of all our people—it is working against our people. It is not interested in providing for the common defense. It has for its purpose the shackling of America and its conversion to the godless, Communist way of life. If it were a political party, its adherents could be appealed to by reason. Instead it is a system of intrigue, actuated by fanaticism. It knows no rules of decency. Its unprincipled converts would sell America short if it would help their cause of furthering an alien way of life, conceived in darkness and motivated by greed for power, whose ultimate aim is the destruction of our cherished freedom. Let us no longer be misled by their sly propaganda and false preachments on civil liberty. They want civil license to do as they please, and if they get control liberty for America will be but a haunting memory, for those who seek to provoke prejudice and stir up the public mind to angry resentment against our form of government are a menace to the very powers of law and order which guarantee and safeguard popular rights."

Certainly if anyone would be familiar with the existence of these hidden activities and their purpose it would be Mr. Hoover, whose work is devoted to ferreting out the lurking dangers that are not apparent to the people as they go about their daily lives.

Communist Party membership is a secret, but Life magazine for July 29, 1946, stated:

"The American Communist Party originated in 1919 with the split of left-wing groups from the Second, or Socialist, International, following the Russian Revolution. In 1934 the party claimed 25,000 cardholders; in 1936, 40,000; in 1938, 75,000. The Moscow trials of 1936–38 and the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939 were body blows and the party lost heavily. Earl Browder's wartime policy of subordinating everything to national unity brought membership back to 80,000 in 1944, mostly from the middle class; but William Z. Foster's current radical program has lost many of the Browder adherents. The spring membership drive may have raised the total to about 65,000—far short of the 1946 goal of 100,000."

It is worthy of note, however, that J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, speaks of a Communist Party membership claim of 100,000. However, the effectiveness of the organization is not limited entirely by its membership. They plant what they call "cells" in every phase of life and work. "Cells" are secret workers, and from them flow the ideas that contaminate others around them. In addition to the actual party members are those who accept the Communist line of thought and action. Thus the political disease is spread. The numbers affected and working are unknown.

Further, upon the existence of communism in this country, we need but to resort to the files and records of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. That committee has been maligned in the public press and by certain radio commentators, but I am thankful to know that it continues in existence, and I trust that so long as there is any menace to this Government that it will continue to bring into the light for public sight the activities of those who hide and work and destroy within this land that has given them haven and which they tear down.

One of the gravest questions which confronts your Government today is that of permitting the admission here of a large number of people from the war-torn countries of Europe. There is a great appeal to the feelings of America to help the thousands of unfortunate people who have been uprooted from their homes by the destruction of war. Some of them are doubtless good people who could be accepted into citizenship of this country and become valued members of our national family. Some of the greatest citizens of this land have been immigrants who entered here and who accepted our ideals and traditions with genuineness. In fact, all of us, with the exception of our native Indians, are either immigrants or the children of immigrants, some removed by several generations. I do not speak out against anyone from another land

who has made his home here and who has, in truth and in his heart, accepted the principles of America.

On the other hand, we cannot be so blind and so thoughtless as not to see and to know that there are among those who seek entrance here persons who cannot accept and will not accept American life and who take advantage of the freedom given them here to destroy their benefactors. They have been the principal preachers of communism in this country, and some who have come here have been the prime actors in its growth.

We must and will answer the call of distress anywhere. We will go to the suffering. But indeed is it not better that we aid them to reestablish themselves where they are or near their own native lands rather than to take them into our own household? Some carry political disease that already threatens here.

Let the immigration laws stay fixed under our quotas so that those who enter may be properly tested and that a balanced entrance of people may come from the different nationalities of Europe.

Oh, some may say that America is the great melting pot. Even so, let us take only those whom we can melt into the life of America and not those who cannot, in truth, become a part of us. We must give consideration to the time, to the condition of our own country, and the political thought and feeling of those who seek entrance. Unless we do this, not only will we fail to stop the growth of communism and other destructive ideologies by whatever name they may be called but we will strengthen a force that can destroy us.

So, gentlemen, I am glad that you have started upon your campaign. I urge you to pursue it with fairness so that the innocent may not be injured; that you pursue it with a due respect to the rights of the individual who has become a part of American life; but, also, that you pursue it with a persistence and a vigor that will obtain your purpose of bringing into public view the lurking, hidden threat of communism in this country. No greater service can be rendered this land and your countrymen than a genuine, honest service for this purpose.

We are more concerned in truth with the activities of the Communist in America than we are with his activities in any other land. If they choose to go that way in their own countries that is their problem, but when they come within the bounds of our own country that is very much your problem and mine.

William Z. Foster made a statement sometime ago in his efforts to gain the ear of the workers of this country which rather specifically sets forth the views of communism, and this was his statement:

"The workers of this country and the workers of every country have but one flag—the flag of the revolutionary class, and we owe no allegiance to any other flag."

We, you and I, owe allegiance to another flag. We owe it and we hold it for the flag of the United States of America, and that allegiance to the flag is but a symbol of our allegiance and our devotion to this country. We want our people to continue to live in personal liberty and freedom under laws that are fair. We want every man to have the reward of his work and his ability. We want a freedom where men may maintain their homes and rear their families under their own guidance. We want the pathways of opportunity to be open to every boy and girl in America to rise through their own efforts to high achievements and to lives of service to their fellowmen: Yes, we owe an allegiance to these things and under that allegiance let us now move to make that course of life safe for the people of this beloved land.

Change in the Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by Dr. Douglas S. Freeman, the editor of the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader, regarding the new foreign policy proposed by the President.

Dr. Freeman is one of the most brilliant and distinguished of American writers.

It is imperative that the people of America understand the full implications of the plan proposed in the President's message, and I regard Dr. Freeman's editorial as an outstanding contribution to such an enlightenment.

Whatever may be our ultimate decision, we must have a foreign policy supported by an enlightened public opinion, as otherwise America may reverse itself in later years, and the consequences may then be calamitous.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN ANNOUNCES A NEW POLICY

The President's address to Congress yesterday was in substance an announcement that our Government had abandoned the policy of attempting to conciliate Russia. Instead of pursuing that policy, Mr. Truman proposes that the United States actively resist the spread of communism.

To this change from conciliation to resistance, our Government may have been moving for many months. Evidence of the change has been apparent increasingly since General Marshall became Secretary of State. His experience in China convinced him that the foes of nationalism in China were receiving their orders directly from Moscow. Every move made by General Chou was dictated from the Kremlin. General Marshall concluded that what Russia was doing to establish communism in China she was doing in the Balkans, in central Europe, and in every other country where communism could take root. The new Secretary must have convinced the President that the only way to halt the advance of Russian influence was to oppose it everywhere through every government that was willing to resist.

This is the starting point of any objective treatment of the President's speech. He announced a revolution in foreign policy and he asked Congress to support it.

THE APPLICATION OF THIS POLICY

The President, needless to say, did not state this new policy in cold terms of opposition to Russia. He applied it specifically and positively to Greece and to Turkey, but he laid down this basic principle:

"It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

He made no reservation, and he set no limitation. It is not merely a question of lending Greece the equivalent of $40 for every man, woman, and child of the Greek population, in order that the Government may destroy an uprising by border bandits and troublemakers who number, as he says, "several thousand." Even if this were all, the United States would have to ask whether the Government of Greece has the vigor and the popular support requisite for suppressing an insurrectionary movement which, under one name or another, has existed in Macedonia for at least a generation. That aspect of the question may be considered at a later time. The broader application is to be scrutinized now: Should it be "the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure"?

If we are to support free peoples in Greece, are we not committed to doing the same thing in other countries of the Near East, the Middle East, and the Far East? Do we not thereby set ourselves up to be the judges of what constitutes a free people? Are we not saying, in effect, that we intend to support the existing order, the status quo, wherever we regard a government as free or potentially in the American world? After having protested against the policy by which Russia has supported the radical element in Poland, in the Balkans, and in Hungary, are we not contradicting our own logic by saying, substantially, we, too, shall back to the limit the elements that subscribe to our ideology?

The new foreign policy undoubtedly commits the United States to be the anti-Communist policeman of the world and the guardian of every government that professes itself threatened when we adjudge it free. Mr. Truman calls on us as a nation not only to take the place of Britain as general watchman of the seas but also to assume the task of being shore patrol wherever Communist disorder threatens a government.

WHERE DO THE UNITED NATIONS COME IN?

In the application of this new, world-wide policy, Mr. Truman says no more of UN than this: "We have considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis, but the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required."

How can he justify that statement? Cannot he see that many devoted Americans will ask, Is not this hush-hush policy, this hurry-hurry call, made an excuse for avoiding reference of the issue to the United Nations?

In the strictest sense, the San Francisco Charter may not provide any means for bolstering a disheartened and feeble Government to resist border attacks which it believes of foreign inspiration, but in the largest sense the Charter provides machinery for reviewing conditions that threaten peace. Even if UN officials today agree that Mr. Truman's statement is correct, the country is almost certain to resent the short-circuiting of an organization millions of us labored to create and to strengthen. If America contemptuously disregards the United Nations when it suits her to do so, how can she expect other nations to respect us when their special interests similarly are involved?

CONGRESS WILL ASK MANY QUESTIONS

All these questions and many others will be asked in Congress, and as vigorously in the House as well as in the Senate, because as an appropriation is asked, both Houses have equal rights of debate. Apparently, most of the Republicans to whom the President spoke privately on Monday are ready to support him, though several of them make reservations and express doubts about the wide implications of the President's policy.

We have not the least idea that a majority of both Houses will approve the whole of the underlying policy. It is doubtful whether they make the appropriations, but if they do that, they will hedge the expenditures about

with so many qualifications of policy that the intended warning to Russia will lose its point. The average Member of Congress always is loath to support any policy that looks to intervention or to war even when the danger is near. Prior to December, 1941, it would have been impossible to muster a majority for formal endorsement of the benevolent neutrality Mr. Roosevelt displayed. Congressmen were willing to let him give aid to Britain and, after June, 1941, to Russia, but they would not face the ayes and noes of a roll call that meant open war. Only the incredible stupidity of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor sufficed to bring the United States into the war. After all the hardships and sacrifices of that struggle, the President is demanding more than Congress will allow.

WILL MARSHALL BE LET DOWN?

The one circumstance that will make some Congressmen hesitate to say "No" to the President's proposal is the feeling that if the appeal from the White House is rejected, General Marshall will be let down in Moscow. Americans believe so completely in the integrity and in the wisdom of the general that they view sympathetically any program he advocates.

Even this is not to be a decisive consideration. Members of Congress will realize, of course, that the President's appearance before Congress was timed to strengthen the Secretary in a firm stand at Moscow. The strategy doubtless is that when General Marshall formally offers a four-power nonaggression pact, he inferentially will present vigorous American action in the Near East as an alternative. He is to tell Mr. Molotov, almost in plain words, "Here is your choice: Either we will sign with you a 40-year nonaggression pact to stop propaganda, to preserve the peace, and to keep Germany down militarily, or else we shall resist you everywhere to the limit. Stop your infiltration or expect our complete opposition."

Before that diplomatic strategy was adopted, the President and the Secretary of State should have been sure they could get adequate congressional backing. Both may have miscalculated in one important respect: General Marshall in 1941–45 had a measure of support in Congress such as no man except Roosevelt has enjoyed in this generation; but the general left the country in December 1945 and did not return until the second week in January 1947. During that time, the morale of wartime disintegrated. Control of Congress changed. While respect for General Marshall remains as high as ever it was, his influence with the Nation's lawmakers may have diminished, especially since he has entered a Democratic Cabinet. If, then, the President mistakenly assumed that General Marshall would command full support in Congress, after taking a vigorous stand in Moscow, is Congress to be called upon to support a policy it disapproves simply because the President erred in estimating the influence of General Marshall? More fundamentally, the question is not one of personal prestige but of sound national policy. That should be the basis of the approach Congress makes to this critical issue. It will be bad if General Marshall is discredited at Moscow; it will be infinitely worse if America takes the wrong turn in the road that leads to peace or to war.

EVERY MAN MUST TAKE HIS STAND

Thus far the News-Leader has attempted to review the President's policy in terms of the existing situation without reference to individual opinion. Now that we have reported, so to speak, we must take our stand—as every man must. In our judgment, the President has made a most dangerous mistake. From motives above any possible question, he has approved a course of action that goes beyond the resolution and the resources of the American people. They are not prepared to say for an instant that in the Near East or the Far East or anywhere else they will support without reservation free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure.

In their impoverishment and misery, the economically disadvantaged classes in many countries are listening to the absurdities of communism and are grasping at the hope of betterment through the overthrow of a capitalism that already is dead there. Other classes in those countries are too much weakened in body, in mind, and in resources to resist successfully the infiltration of communism. In our judgment, the entire region east of a line from the mouth of the Oder to the head of the Adriatic might as well be written off, for this generation, as the seat of any true democracy. What will happen in the Far East, none can foresee as yet. Neither there nor in the Near East can the United States determine the result by subsidy, by the sale of arms, or by the support of governments too feeble to maintain themselves. If we make the effort, we shall overextend ourselves and, instead of becoming stronger in the event of another war, we shall be weaker. Financially and politically, America will bankrupt herself in trying to save bankrupts. Such help as we can give, we should devote to France and to the British Commonwealth of Nations. Instead of bypassing the United Nations we should use the organization to the utmost and should seek to upbuild it. Our legislation best will be shaped to future emergency if it is concentrated on peace and on our own defense.

Soviet Cross Section—Review of Book by Richard E. Lauterbach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 9, 1947, of the new book by Richard E. Lauterbach, the brilliant foreign correspondent whose dispatches in Life, Time, Harper's, and other publications we have all read with so much interest.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET CROSS SECTION

(Through Russia's Back Door, by Richard E. Lauterbach)

Two unexpected signs may foreshadow a changing trend in the popular attitude toward Russia. The Saturday Evening Post, pillar of the American middle class, runs a series of articles by Associate Editor Edgar Snow, and Harper publishes Lauterbach's Through Russia's Back Door, both departures from the currently popular treatment of Russia. Snow and Lauterbach suggest that we stop and take stock.

The Russia which Lauterbach pictures through the presentation of vivid, pertinent, and intimate details of his 5,800-mile train trip across that country is one whose people are tired of war, war which so recently took millions of lives, wrecked industries and destroyed agriculture. With 25,000,000 people homeless the Russia Lauterbach saw was in no position to wage war.

We have done so much shrieking of "wolf," says Lauterbach, that we have finally made the Russians the fearful, apprehensive people John Fischer pictured in his recent Harper's articles. But Lauterbach points out that it is aggressive action on America's part which the Russians fear. And with American occupation of Japan, the naval bases in the Pacific, atom bomb tests at Bikini, aid to Chiang in China, support of Fascist factions in Greece, and our Navy partols in the eastern Mediterranean, it is small wonder that apprehension exists in Russia today.

Though factual and informative, Through Russia's Back Door is never heavy. Its characters: Poppa, the ex-ice skater; Ageev, the minor Soviet bureaucrat; Major Sokolov; and the rest are individuals even as they are symbolic.

Lauterbach will please neither American Communists nor American supernationalists. He discloses with too great an impartiality both the poverty, squalor, and cheapness of life in Russia, and her brawn, stamina, her unquenchable spirit, and her considerable attainments.

This much the book tells us: Two years of life exist in the world today; the Communists' and ours. In a showdown fight, a third world war, in the near future, Americans would more than likely win. But the Russians, he says, have no taste for such a struggle.

The book could teach us that if we have a firm faith in the competitive system of free enterprise, the path for us to take is that of building our own ideals and principles into our system, making it what we like to believe it is. It could then defy ideological opposition from any other system. We might then give some validity to the impression we apparently have left with the Russian sailor whom Lauterbach overheard saying, "America is a wonderful place. Everything is wonderful and right; nothing is wrong or bad." When asked whether he would like to be in America, the sailor replied, "Oh, no. I am sometimes both wrong and bad."

R. I. BRIGHAM.

Reorganization and Streamlining of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Complete Overhauling," from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, for March 10, 1947, and an article entitled "Streamlined Government Aim of Senator LODGE," from the Boston (Mass.) Globe, for March 11, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of March 10, 1947]

A COMPLETE OVERHAULING

A proposal to rebuild the Government from top to bottom has been introduced in Congress by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., of Massachusetts, who has advised his colleagues that the present confusion and inefficiency cannot be eliminated unless a complete job is done.

From time to time when glaring weaknesses in the governmental structure have been exposed, hasty efforts have been made to correct conditions. Such discoveries of confusion and inefficiency have been coming with such alarming frequency that many observers, including the alert Senator from Massachusetts, have reached the conclusion that sporadic and isolated attempts to improve the Government are and will be ineffective in the long run.

The people of America have ample evidence of the futility of many branches of their Government, and it is safe to say that were Senator LODGE's proposals put to popular vote, there would be overwhelming support for the complete overhauling. Moreover, there is not too much time to lose.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe of March 11, 1947]

STREAMLINED GOVERNMENT AIM OF SENATOR LODGE

(By John G. Harris)

WASHINGTON.—If Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE's plans are accepted by Congress and the President, there will be no frantic guesswork in the future as to how much Government expenses can be cut.

LODGE would like to do for the sprawling, vast executive branch what Congress did to itself last year—streamline. LODGE would fix responsibility with certainty. He would even have Cabinet officers report monthly to the Congress to make clear an eye was being kept on the outgo of Uncle Sam's money.

LODGE's plans are of extreme interest because of the sort of blind-man's bluff we've been watching on Capitol Hill.

The Congress has passed no appropriation bills. It has not been able yet, because there has not been time to go into the details of the amount of money that will be needed to maintain Federal services.

Yet Republicans in the House and the Senate have tried to settle upon some figure by which they say they will cut appropriations this year. Naturally there has been no agreement because data on which agreement could be reached are not at hand.

The House voted for the popular $6,000,000,000 cut. Some say it could be larger. Beardsley Ruml, father of the present pay-as-you-go income-tax plan, goes as high as $8,000,000,000. Our two Senators, LODGE and SALTONSTALL, went along with $4,500,000,000.

Keep in mind that none of this is an actual cut. It is just what it is hoped can be done.

LODGE referred to the entire business as working in the dark. What he and SALTONSTALL foresaw was that the Nation may yet have to undertake unseen expenditures that would knock out the predicted budget slash.

Developments now on Greece bear out the concern of the Senators. The President, when he goes before Congress, is expected to seek as much as $350,000,000 to back an American foreign policy being shaped to meet the emergency sprung by the financial decline of the British.

What funds may eventually be needed to see this policy through is anybody's guess. But one thing is quite clear. Any budget pledge to cut by an arbitrary figure runs a strong risk of being badly upset by events.

Lodge wants Congress to tackle Government waste with eyes wide open. He wants a 12-member commission, 4 to be appointed by President Truman, to devote until next January to a study of the executive branch.

Despite multiplicity of units the executive branch has not been reorganized since the war. Congressman RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, one of the best-informed men in Washington on these facts, says if you leave out the Army and Navy there are today more Federal employees still on the pay roll than there were VJ-day.

LODGE would have the commission fine-comb departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, etc., to bring expenditures to a minimum, end duplication, consolidate and abolish where necessary.

LODGE emphasizes that Congress must have facts to act effectively. In the past when Congress has decided to cut an appropriation, in many instances it has not been able thereby to cut waste. Instead smart temporary help have been lost. Bureaucrats remain.

"Business management is what is needed," say LODGE. Right now it is hard to affix responsibility because generally control of a department's finances and personnel is divided.

LODGE, working for early action on his plan, says he has been assured the cooperation of Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department.

Income-Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the question of income-tax reductions, written by Peter Edson, and published in the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, March 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUTS TO THE KNUTSON PLAN, SAYS PETE

(By Peter Edson)

This being the week when everybody sweats, bleeds, and cries over his income-tax return, any news about possible reductions for the last half of this year and thereafter should be more welcome than the flowers of spring.

But the sad fact is that the one major tax-cut apple before Congress is full of worms. This is Minnesota Republican Representative HAROLD KNUTSON'S proposal for a flat 20-percent tax cut on all incomes below $303,000. Above this level the cut would become gradually smaller till it reached a minimum cut of 10 percent on incomes above $5,000,000 a year.

TWO MONTHS LATE

Hearings on this tax-cut plan are getting under way before the House Ways and Means Committee, of which KNUTSON is the new chairman. The hearings are only about 2 months late. Tax cutting was going to be the first order of business when the Republicans came into power, so they said. But they never got to it.

KNUTSON has talked about this 20 percent across the board cut ever since way before last November's election. He said it was easiest to administer. And while the flat 20 percent cut at first sounded good, particularly when coupled with the statement that it would reduce the Nation's tax bill by an estimated $3,600,000,000, that's only part of the story. Tax experts who have had time to do some really sharp pencil figuring on this idea have come up with some facts which show what a really vicious proposal it is.

By cutting all taxes 20 percent, instead of on a graduated scale, the fellow or the family with the lowest income gets the least relief. The reason it works out this way is that income tax rates are lower on the low incomes.

HOW IT WORKS OUT

Present tax rate on a $1,000 income is 9.5 percent. On $10,000 it's 18.8 percent. On $1,000,000 it's 63.5 percent. Cut these percentages by 20 percent and naturally the man paying the highest percentage will get the biggest tax reduction.

To get the feel of this, tax experts say that the amount of tax relief which the Knutson plan would give must be measured against the percentage by which take-home pay would be increased. For this purpose, the taxpayer's net income after payment of taxes under present law must be compared with the amount which take-home pay would rise under the Knutson plan.

For an unmarried taxpayer with no dependents, the figures shape up like this:

Net annual income	Present taxes	Tax under Knutson plan	Increased take-home pay	Percentage income increase
$600	$19	$15	$4	0.7
$1,200	95	76	19	2.1
$2,500	380	304	76	3.6
$5,000	922	737	185	4.5
$10,000	2,347	1,878	469	6.1
$25,000	9,362	7,490	1,872	12.0
$50,000	25,137	20,110	5,027	20.2
$100,000	63,541	50,832	12,709	34.9
$303,000	237,500	190,000	47,500	72.6

What this table shows, in brief, is that under the Knutson plan a taxpayer with an average income of say $2,500 a year would have his taxes cut and his take-home pay increased by $76 a year. This would be equivalent to a 3.6-percent raise in pay. At the other end of the scale, a man with a $303,000 income would have his taxes cut and his take-home pay increased by $47,500 a year. This would be equivalent to a 72.6-percent increase in pay.

For a married man with two dependents, the figures are these:

Net annual income	Present taxes	Tax under Knutson plan	Increased take-home pay	Percentage income increase
$2,500	$95	$76	$19	0.8
$5,000	589	471	118	2.7
$10,000	1,862	1,490	372	4.6
$25,000	8,522	6,818	1,704	10.3
$50,000	24,111	19,289	4,822	18.6
$100,000	62,301	49,841	12,460	33.1
$304,000	237,500	190,000	47,500	71.0

With reductions on these cockeyed scales, chances that the Knutson plan will be adopted should be slim. There is plenty of opposition to it even from Republicans, in spite of campaign promises, which weren't carefully thought out before they were uttered.

What will probably get by will be a graduated tax-reduction scale that will give a cut of 20 percent or more to the lower-income groups, but something less than that to the higher brackets.

Old Lamps for New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my friend, James A. Emery, to the annual dinner group of the Los Angeles Realty Board, at the Hotel Ambassador, Los Angeles, on February 21, 1947.

The subject of this great address was "Old Lamps for New." James A. Emery is a great American who has as deep an interest in supporting our form of Government and way of life and as great a desire to preserve it as any American with whom I have ever come in contact.

Americans all would do well to read and ponder his words of wisdom regarding the preservation of individual freedom versus the trading of such freedom for a system of dictatorship which promises much and delivers nothing but misery.

Mr. President, I find that the address will occupy in the RECORD a quarter of a page more than the limit allowed without an estimate. I have received an estimate of cost, which is $159.75.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arising at an hour when guests and graveyards, alike, begin to yawn, I should seek your attention with trepidation, but for the fame of your courtesy and the generous words of your toastmaster.

Moreover, the leaders of a community that brought the ocean to its door, considers Hawaii a suburb, and made the turbulent Colorado a tributary of its household faucets, are little troubled by time or space.

Beneath the sparkling surface of this splendid gathering lie fresh memories of that titanic struggle that made all the world its stage and all mankind participants. Victor and vanquished, alike, confront the awful fruits of triumph and defeat for they cannot avoid the effect upon the minds and relations of men and nations of the most far-reaching social catastrophe in the annals of the human race. Even now, the representatives of fifty nations confer in apprehension, to mold a new international order, harried as never before by the awful prospect that in any future clash of arms, the science of military defense will be the science of mutual annihilation.

Meantime, the agencies and concepts of communism and state socialism are overwhelmingly the proponents of popular government and parliamentary institutions in the struggle for control of reorganized nations, while the mother of parliament is learning whether a labor government can govern labor.

What influence are we to exert in this dangerously intimate neighborhood of nations, and how?

For four long years, the business of life has been the production of death. Twice within a generation, at awful sacrifice of men and treasure, we have supplied the critical balance in unsought war to save the Old World and the New from inevitable defeat. We have mortgaged our future to finance international victory and rehabilitation. But neither short-lived gratitude nor fear of our power has been the source of our influence. From their establishment, it was our political ideas and institutions and their energizing influence expressed in accomplishment that captivated the minds, excited the imagination, and aroused the hopes of mankind. For we made individual freedom a splendid working success in the everyday lives of men. For a century and a half, under principles developed out of natural right and Christian morality, we exemplified their practical advantages when recognized and molded into ordered liberty, struggling, sometimes awkwardly, but always onward and upward to reconcile personal right with social progress, under self-imposed restraint.

If we are to play well the great part assigned by tragic events, our first concern is the retention, unimpaired, of those essential principles and institutions of constitutional government which inspire our growth and influence. "To preserve them," said Washington, "must be as necessary as to institute them."

Standing tonight, by your courtesy, within the shadow of that great and unique American whom you commemorate, I recall the words of a distinguished European philosopher, "The greatest and most far-reaching revolutions in history are not consciously observed at the time of their occurrence." And the admonition of an American jurist, "It is with governments as with religions, the form oft survives the substance of the faith." As a humble but observant member of the only profession taking a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, I believe that for nearly two decades we have lived through a by no means abandoned endeavor to impair or subvert major principles of this Government.

I do not refer to the continuing searching challenge to which many long-held economic theories have been subjected nor to critical reexamination of accepted principles. Washington urged us to revert to them and reflect upon them. He knew they would stand the test and ever be as new as laughter, as old as tears. His solemn words of farewell sound as though they envisioned contemporary events. He urged us not only to "discountenance irregular opposition" to the Government, but to "resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext." He feared "the spirit of encroachment tending to consolidate the powers of all the departments (of government) into one, and then to create, whatever the form of government, a despotism." He warned, "if, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way in which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation." "It is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

I fully recognize the proprieties of this occasion. The things to which I refer infect the bloodstream of the Nation. I have no thought or desire to excite or appeal to partisanship. The issues I suggest transcend it. They have aroused the serious apprehensions of private citizens and public men of all shades of political opinion. Their proponents have pressed some proposals with such intensity as to threaten, and attempt, the political assassination of leading party associates who refused support to their program.

Let us turn to what has been and is being done to some elementary constitutional principles. Time will not permit detailed consideration. I can but cite major examples and illustrate their operating effect.

I submit (1) the vast expansion of executive authority, by deliberate impairment of the tradition of limited tenure of office and the frank, repeated, and often successful invasion and subordination of the legislative and judicial departments. In the former case, by the selection and command for "must" legislation and the insistence that no "reasonable" doubt of its constitutionality must stand in the way of enactment. Further, by the creation of innumerable executive agencies exercising quasi legislative and judicial powers in the execution of social policy through a multiplicity of often unidentifiable, and frequently anonymous, rules regulating with the force of law the most fundamental rights of person and property; usually formulated without notice or hearing to the interested parties, generally impervious to judicial review, and not rarely administered by officials carefully selected for prejudiced devotion to the policies they were appointed both to adjudicate and execute; scornful and bitterly resistant to effective legal control; constituting, in the language of the venerable Dean Pound of Harvard, a movement "nothing short of revolutionary in our American polity" and unhesitatingly acknowledged and praised as such by its sponsors. The similar abuse of administrative law in Great Britain was characterized by Lord Chief Justice Hewart as The New Despotism.

This condition of executive absolutism reached its zenith in 1935, in the "hot oil case." There the Supreme Court found in litigation before it "the persons affected, the prosecuting authorities, and the courts were, alike, ignorant of the fact" that the section of the oil code at issue was repealed before the action began.

At about this time, despite the multiplicity of Executive and administrative orders, we were the only modern Nation without an official gazette for their publication. Five months after the Hot Oil Case (293 U. S. 388), Congress authorized a Federal Register to have custody of and publish Federal proclamations, rules, and regulations. The Act had to be amended and did not become fully effective until 1938, because it was found that from March 4, 1933, to June 1934, some 674 Executive orders, comprising 1,400 pages, in conjunction with 2,988 regulations and orders issued under the National Industrial Recovery Act were to be found only within 5,991 press releases. Not until June 1938 was a codification board enabled to publish nearly 20,000 pages of Executive orders and administrative rules and regulations, embracing 50 titles and affecting the conduct and property of our citizens, and hitherto substantially unknown to the millions for whom they were the law of the land.

A congressional attempt "to regulate the regulators" in 1940 was vetoed. In 1946, a second attempt received Executive approval and awaits its test.

You are familiar with Executive criticism of a disagreeing Supreme Court and the frank and determined effort which followed, like that of King James, to reconstruct a judicial tribunal that would cooperate with the Executive view of what the law ought to be rather than find in the exercise of Executive absolutism and the dispensing power what Justice Cardozo described as "discretion run riot." Repulsed but not defeated, the successful partisan coloring of the judiciary is suggested by the factual summary of the Department of Justice made last October. It revealed that since 1933, there had been appointed to the United States Supreme Court 9 Democrats and 2 Republicans; to the 10 circuit courts, 46 Democrats and 2 Republicans; to the district courts, 146 Democrats and 2 Republicans. All appointments to the Federal courts during that period comprised 223 Democrats and 9 Republicans, the present composition of the Federal judiciary being 191 Democrats and 6 Republicans. I have no desire to suggest that membership in one party rather than another is any test of either learning or integrity, but against a background of determined effort to establish an Executive influence over judicial opinion, it reminds one of the conclusion reached by Mrs. Joe Gargery in Dickens' Great Expectations when, upon inspecting little Pipp, she remarked: "If sitting on the bank of the river was a capital offense, the evidence on the seat of your pants would hang you."

The second step in the impairment of fundamentals, I suggest, is found in what radicals and the most advanced progressives have hitherto consistently denounced as judicial legislation. In a brief period, the present Supreme Court has overturned principles of law as old as Sinai, and constitutional interpretations as old as the Court. Whether we agree or disagree with the wisdom of the result, the fact remains that over

a critical constitutional field, what was held to be valid or lawful has been held to be invalid or unlawful, or the reverse. Moreover, it is the judiciary, not the Congress, which effected the legislative change.

For over a century, a clear distinction had been recognized between the regulation of commerce, which is intercourse in all its forms, and every circumstance of production. Thus, manufacturing, mining, the extraction of oil, construction, agriculture, all were consistently held to be outside the commerce power even though the producer intended to sell in other States, or abroad. The attempt to regulate such activities under the guise of taxation was identified and rejected. It was repeatedly emphasized that the application of the dominant national power over domestic and foreign intercourse to control local activities was justified only where there was a direct and substantial relationship to commerce. Now, the area of Federal control has been indefinitely extended to the most intimate parochial matters by advancing the commerce power and sustaining its application to whatever may affect commerce. It reaches the village cow if, mayhap, any part of her modest milk supply is sold where the dairy of another State delivers. It rules the charwoman, the janitor, the elevator operator, the window cleaner who serves a building the offices of which may be occupied by those actually or prospectively engaged in interstate commerce. So delicate and tenuous are the judicial refinements that Federal control of the employment relations among the tenants of a structure may change with the percentage of those so engaged. Sometimes it must appear to the bewildered layman and his confused lawyer facing the obscurities of shifting and divided opinions, all the way from the courts of original error to those of ultimate conjecture, that the basis of Federal control is often as remote from its subject as the "flea in the hair of the tail of the dog of the child of the wife of the Wild Man of Borneo."

One thing is certain. It extended the domain of Federal power far beyond the uniform conception of any previous court. It now embraces agriculture so completely that the Secretary of Agriculture may fix the quota of crops, amend the penalties by radio, and prohibit the grower from feeding his surplus to his chickens, since that may affect what would otherwise be a necessary purchase in the stream of commerce.

What is far more serious is the fact that in instance after instance, like placing the control of insurance under the commerce power after 75 years of accepted exclusion, or in making it lawful and right for labor combinations to do that which remains unlawful and wrong for any other combination, measured by the standard of purpose, the Court is reversing a fundamental principle of criminal and civil law in contradiction with not only long-standing judicial interpretation, but the obvious refusal of Congress to rewrite the law, as the Court did.

Is this judicial legislation? Hear the dissent of the Chief Justice and Justice Roberts as the Court removed the labor combination from the Antitrust Act: "I venture to say that no court has ever undertaken so radically to legislate where Congress has refused so to do" (312 U. S. 219). You may approve or disapprove the result, but it is the judicial and not the legislative branch of the Government that is amending the statute in the face of a long-standing and accepted construction.

No responsible individual or group in industry, or at the bar, or on the bench, questions the natural right of association or the necessity of giving effective protection by law to the right of labor organizations to promote and safeguard the rights of their members by every lawful means, and through agents of their own free selection. But for more than a decade we have witnessed a determined effort by legislation and judicial interpretation to advance the interest of organized labor by granting to that combination an exclusive and unprecedented privilege to do wrong.

No principle is more firmly fixed in the foundation of our system than that of equality before the law. This is neither the time nor the place to discuss the general labor problem, as old as the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, but it is vital to our institutions to observe that all combinations no longer look alike to the law. We have deliberately exempted the labor combination from the general law of agency unless it specifically ratifies particular acts of its officers and agents before or after their commission, a policy which permits the establishment of criminal or civil liability only in the protective deliberations of afterthought.

In exempting the labor combination from the civil or criminal penalties of the Antitrust Act, the prevailing opinion of the Supreme Court held that, provided there was no collusion with a nonlabor group, the lawfulness or unlawfulness of such combination was not to be determined by its purpose. This not only reversed the established rule which forbade the arbitrary exemption of one group or class from a law which applied to all others under like circumstances, but it abandoned a test of legality for the individual or the combination, as old as the common law and offensive to common sense. Never, before 1941, had any court in the United States, at any time, declared that purpose was of no consequence in determining legality. The Justice who laid down that principle in the Hutchinson case doubtless forgot that his great mentor, Mr. Justice Holmes, had, many years before, enunciated more clearly than perhaps anyone else the accepted doctrine, "No conduct has such an absolute privilege as to justify all possible schemes of which it may be a part. The most innocent and constitutionally protected of acts or omissions may be made a step in a criminal plot, and if it is a step in a plot, neither its innocence nor the Constitution is sufficient to prevent the punishment of the plot by law" (*Aiken* v. *Wisconsin*, 195 U. S. 206).

The common sense of the man on the street accepts purpose as the practical test of morality or legality. Does one use the thoroughfare to move from place to place, or to pick pockets? Does he hire a cab or enter a store for an innocent or a wrongful purpose? The average man has no difficulty in applying this common-sense test and arriving at his conclusion. The inevitable results make it lawful and right for one vast combination to do that which remains unlawful and wrong for any other when measured by the same test. This creates in the minds of many otherwise well-disposed citizens an invincible conviction that they possess a vested right to do wrong in the pursuit of their purposes. This is clearly demonstrated in the reiterated assertion by both public men and labor leaders that the right to strike is absolute. If it is, it is the only absolute right known to our political system. For life itself is held at the call of the Republic. Twelve million men and women have demonstrated that for 4 years. Your liberty, to preserve that on which this Nation was founded, and the Bill of Rights demanded, is restricted in a thousand ways, that the liberty of others may equally be preserved and that we may live in peace and safety. We cannot even pursue our happiness absolutely. The founding fathers never even guaranteed it, although that is now a fashionable political promise. They only assured us we could pursue it. Catching up with it is a matter of individual speed and determination. "Neither the fourteenth amendment, nor the common law, gives the absolute right to strike," said Mr. Justice Brandeis, announcing the undisputed principle for a unanimous court 20 years ago. "A strike may be illegal because of its purpose, however orderly the manner in which it is conducted" (*Dorchey* v. *Kansas* (272 U. S. 311)).

The practical result of the present perversion of law and legislation is not only the reversal of this principle of law and morals, but the practical surrender of the Government to the combination that is now above the law. The Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Edison, responding to a congressional inquiry during a strike at the Bohn Aluminum Co. of Detroit reported that the Navy had sought permission from the picketing union to remove the Navy's plans and blueprints from the struck plant. "The representatives of union local No. 208," wrote Mr. Edison, "were given full access to the files on the Navy contracts and they were informed that the delay in releasing patterns for delivery was seriously jeopardizing the manufacture of airplane engines at the Naval Aircraft Factory.

"At the end of the discussion, the union representatives stated that * * * their answer was emphatically 'No' and that they would not let patterns or inspected castings be removed. No further action was taken by the Navy Department to remove the patterns and castings."

By virtue of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, we have added to the citizen's inability to hold a labor combination liable for any injury it may inflict upon him the further assurance that while the court may prevent irreparable injury in any other controversy, by any other group, it is helpless to do so in a labor dispute.

Under the new dispensation, the law is silent in a labor dispute as in war, or on occasion becomes an ally of one of the parties. The individual is dissolved in collectivism. The hitherto undisputed right of a man to choose and pursue his livelihood without molestation or the consent of any other is disappearing from the American scene. Individual liberty in labor disputes dies by law. The most valuable of many personal and property rights becomes a subject for political barter.

Let us recall tonight, in memory of the great figure whose memory we meet to honor, that the ultimate purpose of those who established the United States was to secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity. They believed the people alone were the source of political power. They sought a freedom more comprehensive than any other people ever contemplated. They recognized and asserted not only the natural rights man derived from his Creator but declared that the varying qualities and energies of men were the creative source of all individual and social progress. They believed with Edmund Burke that liberty was not only a private blessing but the vital spring and energy of the State itself, which has just as much life and vigor as there is liberty in it. They believed with Lincoln that no man is good enough to govern another man without his consent. They believed with Washington that all obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency.

They expressed their philosophy in the declaration. They made it effective through the Constitution. They established a permanent domain of immunity from governmental interference. For they did not seek rights, but sought to compel their recognition and security.

To this end, they surrounded 79 grants of political power with 115 prohibitions and limitations upon its exercise. Every check and balance was shaped from their knowledge of men and history. They wrote into the Bill of Rights, centuries of practical experience with every abuse of Government. They

forbade the things the men of their blood had learned from death and persecution, on battlefield and scaffold, by prison and confiscation, impaired liberty, and destroyed the common man.

We know this system of Government built through the hard racial experience of many centuries has done more to preserve liberty, justice, and opportunity for the individual than any other political plan devised by man in dealing with its future. Are we to forget the amazing experience and permit the impairment and abandonment of all that has so nobly stood the test of time, or set about adopting our institutions and policies to the new conditions of our day, without abandoning any of the political principles that have stimulated our growth and power?

Aladdin found the lamp that satisfied his wishes but it grew old and tarnished, and his ignorant associate was easily seduced into exchanging it for a glittering successor with none of its magic power. "I know no lamp by which to guide my footsteps," said the wiser Patrick Henry, "but the lamp of experience."

The great figure that stands unique beside the cradle of the Republic surrendered power when he could have kept it. He saw, we know from his letters to Madison and Knox, the discordant colonies of the Confederation move from anarchy and confusion into prosperity and tranquillity under the principles of the new Government. His letters to his associates, like his Farewell Address, are filled with the admonitions of his experience. "Revert to your principles and secure them from impairment," he urges again and again. He presided over the Constitutional Convention. He addressed it but once, but what he said might be read with profit by those who compromise and betray principles of government it produced, or advocate their abandonment.

At a critical moment, it looked as though the great effort of the Convention would fail. The conflict between the small States and the large had reached a critical point, the issue between local and national government threatened a destructive dissension. A plan was proposed to save the situation; it seemed to some the only way out; to others, worse than failure. Then, for the first time, and the only time, Washington spoke: "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and just can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

Constitution of AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the constitution of the American Veterans of World War II. Pursuant to the rule, I have secured an estimate from the Public Printer, who states that the cost of printing will be $266.25.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTION OF AMVETS (AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II)

PREAMBLE

We, the American Veterans of World War II, fully realizing our responsibility to our community, to our State, and to our Nation, associate ourselves for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States; to safeguard the principles of freedom, liberty, and justice for all; to promote the cause of peace and good will among nations; to maintain inviolate the freedom of our country; to preserve the fundamentals of democracy; to perpetuate the friendship and associations of the Second World War; and to dedicate ourselves to the cause of mutual assistance, this by the grace of God.

ARTICLE I

The name of this organization shall be AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), and it shall be hereinafter referred to as AMVETS.

ARTICLE II

The aims and purposes of this organization are as follows:

1. To serve our country in peace as in war; to build and maintain the welfare of the United States of America toward lasting prosperity and peace for all its inhabitants.

2. To encourage, in keeping with the policies of our Government, the establishment of a concrete plan to secure permanent international peace, and to assist in the maintenance of international peace.

3. To inspire in our membership a sense of responsibility, and to develop leadership, for the preservation of our American democratic way of life.

4. To help unify divergent groups in the over-all interest of American democracy.

5. To train our youth to become purposeful citizens in a democracy with full knowledge of the responsibilities as well as the privileges of citizenship.

6. To cooperate with all duly recognized existing veteran organizations in the furtherance of the aims of World War II veterans.

7. To insure the orderly return of the veteran to civilian life by protecting his rights as an individual while he is still in uniform.

8. To expedite and assist in the rehabilitation of the veteran by maintenance of employment services, sponsoring educational opportunities, and providing counsel on insurance, housing, recreation, personal problems, hospitalization, and veterans' benefits.

9. To act as a liaison agent between the veteran and the Government.

10. To provide an organization to encourage fellowship among all veterans of World War II.

11. To keep the public forever reminded that the veterans of World War II fought or served to preserve peace, liberty, and democracy for their Nation.

ARTICLE III. ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. AMVETS shall be organized with a national headquarters, located at Washington, D. C., and a department in the District of Columbia and in each State and Territory of the United States. Local posts shall be formed within such departments, and intermediate administrative groups may be created by the national executive committee and the department executive committees, to function within their respective jurisdictions, where such action is deemed advisable.

SEC. 2. The national headquarters shall be composed of the national officers, both elective and appointive, and the members of the national executive committee. It shall be the duty of the national officers to advance the cause of AMVETS, to carry out its aims and purposes and to provide the machinery for realization of the plans and policies established by the mandates of the national convention.

SEC. 3. The United States is divided into the following districts:

District I: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey; subdistrict A: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York; subdistrict B: Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey; subdistrict home offices: New York City and Boston.

District II: Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, District of Columbia; subdistrict A: Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Washington, D. C.; subdistrict B: Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee; subdistrict home offices: Harrisburg, Pa., and Arlington, Va.

District III: South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas; subdistrict A: South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama; subdistrict B: Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma; subdistrict home offices: Miami, Fla., and New Orleans, La.

District IV: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin; subdistrict A: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri; subdistrict B: Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan; subdistrict home offices: Chicago, Ill., and Detroit, Mich.

District V: Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Montana; subdistrict A: Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota; subdistrict B: Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho, Montana; subdistrict home offices: Omaha, Nebr., and Denver, Colo.

District VI: Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, California; subdistrict A: Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah; subdistrict B: California, Nevada, Oregon, Washington; subdistrict home offices: Dallas, Tex., and San Francisco, Calif.

ARTICLE IV. MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Any person who served in the armed forces of the United States of America, or any American citizen who served in the armed forces of an Allied Nation of the United States, on or after September 16, 1940, and before the date of termination of hostilities as established by the Government of the United States, is eligible for regular membership in AMVETS, provided such service when terminated by discharge or release from active duty be by honorable discharge or separation. No person who is a member of, or who advocates the principles of, any organization believing in, or working for, the overthrow of the United States Government by force, and no person who refuses to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, shall be privileged to become, or continue to be, a member of this organization.

SEC. 2. Honorary membership shall be based upon citation from a post, department, the national executive committee, or a national convention, in recognition of outstanding patriotic services rendered to war veterans or to the Nation. Not more than one honorary member shall be cited per year by a post or department. Nothing provided herein shall abrogate existing memberships. Any citing authority may name any number of deceased veterans as honorary members during any year.

ARTICLE V. NATIONAL CONVENTION

SECTION 1. A national convention shall be held annually, prior to October 1, at a time and place fixed by the previous convention, and shall constitute the legislative body of AMVETS.

SEC. 2. The national convention shall comprise the following delegates:

(a) Each local post shall elect one delegate and one alternate.

(b) Each department shall choose one delegate and alternate at its convention, to be held at least 30 days, and not more than 90 days, prior to the national convention.

(c) Each member of the national executive committee shall be entitled to one vote at the national convention, but the national commander shall vote only in case of a tie.

SEC. 3. Each delegate shall be entitled to one vote. Alternates shall have all the rights and privileges of their delegates, except they shall vote only in their delegate's absence.

SEC. 4. No post or department delegates shall be seated at the national convention unless the respective posts or departments which they represent shall be fully paid up in all their accounts with the national headquarters, and their accounts duly audited and membership certified 30 days prior to the national convention.

SEC. 5. Two hundred of the voting delegates registered at the national convention shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 6. This article shall not become effective as amendatory of the original constitution prior to the adjournment of the national convention at which it is adopted. Pending such adjournment, article V of the original constitution shall have full force and effect.

ARTICLE VI. NATIONAL OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The national convention shall elect a national commander, six regional vice commanders, and one vice commander at large, who shall be a woman, finance officer, provost marshal, judge advocate, surgeon general, and a national chaplain. No elected commander or vice commander shall succeed himself in office.

SEC. 2. All the elective national officers shall be members of the national executive committee, but the national commander shall vote only in case of a tie.

SEC. 3. The national commander, with the consent and approval of the national executive committee, shall appoint a service director, a legislative director, a public-relations director, an inspector general, a national historian, a membership director, and an executive director.

SEC. 4. The national commander shall have power to suspend any appointed officer for cause, and appoint an acting officer to perform his duties until the next meeting of the national executive committee. The power of removal from office of any officer for cause is vested in the executive committee.

SEC. 5. A candidate for public office shall resign his national elective office. National officers elected at a national convention shall be installed in office at the same session at which elected. An appointed officer shall not receive salary during the period he is suspended from the performance of his duties.

SEC. 6. In the event of the death, resignation, or disability of the national commander, one of the incumbent vice commanders shall be chosen as his successor by the executive committee, a meeting of which shall be called by the executive director, to convene within 30 days after such death, resignation, or disability. In case a meeting of the executive committee is not convened within 30 days, a meeting date shall be set by the vice chairman of the executive committee to convene within an additional 15 days.

ARTICLE VII. NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. The administrative power between national conventions shall be vested in the national executive committee, which shall be composed of the national commander, the retiring past national commander, the seven vice commanders, all other national elective officers, and one national executive committeeman from each State and Territory, to be elected by the respective departments in annual convention. An alternate shall be elected by each department to serve in the absence or disability of the department committeeman. Each of the above members shall be entitled to one vote, and in case of his absence or disability to participate in the proceedings of the committee, the duly elected alternate may cast his vote.

SEC. 2. Each national executive committeeman shall take office upon the adjournment of the department convention at which he is elected, and serve until his successor is duly elected and qualified.

SEC. 3. Members of the national executive committee shall be delegates to the national convention, each entitled to one vote.

ARTICLE VIII. NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. At its first meeting the national executive committee shall elect from its membership, seven executive committeemen to serve on an interim committee to be known as the national administrative committee, of which the national commander shall be chairman ex officio. The members of this committee, by their assent to serve, obligate themselves to attend substantially all of the meetings of the committee and participate actively in its work. Seven alternates shall also be elected and in the event of the inability of one of the delegates to attend, his alternate shall do so. Five members present shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 2. The national administrative committee shall carry out to the best of its ability all the powers and functions delegated to it by the national executive committee and assume the general responsibility of the executive committee to pronounce AMVET policy on questions of current interest and in cases of emergency arising between meetings of the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. No powers specially delegated to the executive committee by this constitution or the by-laws shall be assumed by the national administrative committee without the specific delegation thereof by the executive committee. A stated meeting of the national administrative committee shall be held at least once in every 60 days, and the office of any member of this committee who shall be absent from three successive meetings thereof, may be declared vacant and a successor be elected by the executive committee from its membership.

ARTICLE IX. DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. Each State or Territorial area of the United States shall constitute a department which shall be organized in a manner similar to the national organization. New departments shall be chartered by the national commander upon the approval of the national executive committee. Each department shall conduct its own convention, to be held not less than 30 nor more than 90 days before the annual national convention, at which time it shall elect a department executive committee, and delegates to the national convention and the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of each department to aid in the organization of local posts, and to carry out the plans and policies delegated to it by the national headquarters in adherence to the provisions of this constitution.

ARTICLE X. POST ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. Local posts may be formed by 10 eligible individuals by making application to their department, and if there be no organized department, by making application directly to the national headquarters. If the department approves, the application shall be forwarded to the national headquarters and a charter shall be issued.

SEC. 2. Posts shall be governed locally by their own officers chosen according to their own constitution and bylaws. They shall be subject and subordinate, however, to the jurisdiction of the national and department headquarters; and any provision of a department or post constitution found to be in conflict or contrary to the provisions of this constitution, shall be null and void.

ARTICLE XI. FINANCES

SECTION 1. All national finances of AMVETS shall be under the control of the national executive committee, which shall delegate sufficient general and specific authority to the finance committee to carry out the usual duties of the office. The finance committee shall make periodic reports at all stated meetings of the national executive committee, and an annual report at the national convention. Revenue shall be derived from annual dues and other sources approved by the executive committee. The regulation of annual dues shall be set out in the bylaws.

SEC. 2. An annual budget shall be submitted for approval at the first annual meeting of the executive committee. It shall be prepared by the retiring finance committee, who shall have received proposed budgets from the retiring heads of national departments, and shall have consolidated the same. In the event that the budget is not approved, a finance committee shall be appointed, consisting of three members of the executive committee, by the new national commander, to prepare such budget for presentation to the executive committee.

SEC. 3. The finance committee shall consist of three members, one of whom shall be appointed by the new national commander, one by the retiring national commander, and the finance officer. The finance officer shall be the chairman of the committee.

ARTICLE XII. DISCIPLINE

SECTION 1. Disciplinary rules relative to local posts shall be prescribed by the departments.

SEC. 2. The national executive committee, after notice and hearing before a subcommittee, may cancel, suspend, or revoke the charter of any department for good and sufficient cause to it appearing. Procedure for such action shall be prescribed by the national judge advocate. In the event of the cancellation, suspension, or revocation of any charter of any department, the suspended body shall have the right of appeal to the next national convention.

SEC. 3. In the event of such action, the national executive committee is empowered to take over the operation of the department whose charter is suspended or revoked until the next department convention, but is bound by the constitution and bylaws thereof. At the next department convention, new department officers must be selected to carry on the work of the department.

ARTICLE XIII. POST TRANSFERS

SECTION 1. Any member in good standing may change his post or department, and may join a new post without repaying the current annual dues.

ARTICLE XIV. AUXILIARIES

SECTION 1. AMVETS recognizes a subsidiary organization known as the AMVETS auxiliary.

SEC. 2. Membership in the auxiliary is limited to mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters of regular members of Amvets; and mothers, widows, daughters, and sisters of deceased veterans who would have been eligible to join AMVETS.

SEC. 3. The auxiliary shall be governed in each department by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the said department and approved by the national executive committee.

SEC. 4. (a) Every auxiliary shall be affiliated with an AMVETS post, and carry the corresponding number of that post.

(b) No auxiliary shall be formed when no post exists.

(c) Wherever auxiliaries presently exist where there are no posts they shall proceed to organize posts as one of their present objectives.

(d) At the time of the next convention, if auxiliaries still exist where there are no posts, they shall be established as branches of an auxiliary to a post, and entitled to representation through that auxiliary so there will be no more delegates from the department than the number of AMVETS posts which have accredited auxiliaries.

ARTICLE XV. SAD SACKS

SECTION 1. AMVETS recognizes a subsidiary organization known as AMVETS Sad Sacks of American Veterans of World War II.

SEC. 2. Membership in Sad Sacks shall be limited to members in good standing of AMVETS.

SEC. 3. Sad Sacks shall be governed by a constitution and by-laws approved by the national executive committee.

ARTICLE XVI. AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1. This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the total authorized delegates present at any AMVET national convention. Proposed amendments for action of a national convention must be submitted by a department convention, department executive committee, or the national executive committee to the national commander, and by him to the several departments and members of the national executive committee, by mail, at least 30 days prior to the convening of the next national convention. This constitution may, however, be amended at any national convention without notice, by unanimous vote.

BY-LAWS OF AMVETS (AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II)

ARTICLE I. NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. In case of death, resignation, or removal by his respective department of any national executive committeeman, or alternate, the successor shall be selected as such department shall determine and shall serve for the remainder of such unexpired term.

SEC. 2. Stated meetings of the national executive committee shall be held (1) within 24 hours after the adjournment of the national convention (2) once each quarter thereafter, (3) immediately preceding the next national convention. Special meetings may be held upon reasonable notice at the call of the national commander. The national commander shall call a meeting of the national executive committee upon the written request of the national executive committeemen from at least 50 percent of the organized departments.

SEC. 3. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum of the national executive committee.

SEC. 4. The national commander shall name such committees as he shall deem advisable, subject to ratification by the national executive committee at its next meeting succeeding the appointment, or by the national administrative committee, if such powers are delegated to it by the national executive committee. Such committees shall serve during the pleasure of the administration appointing them, and shall terminate upon the inauguration of a new national commander. No provision of this article shall be construed to prejudice the reappointment of the national executive committee.

SEC. 5. The national finance committee shall be charged with the preparation of the annual budget, and the handling of funds, subject to the approval of the national executive committee.

SEC. 6. The national executive committee shall approve the appointment and employment of proper officers and employees for the administration of the affairs of AMVETS and prescribe their duties and compensation.

SEC. 7. Any national officer may receive compensation for his authorized activities on behalf of the organization, such compensation to be fixed in amount by the vote of the national executive committee.

SEC. 8. All questions affecting the eligibility for office and conduct of national officers shall be referred to and determined by the national executive committee. All questions affecting the eligibility for office and conduct of the national executive committeemen, department officers, or members of department executive committees may be referred to and determined by the executive committee of the department involved.

ARTICLE II. DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SECTION 1. National commander: The national commander shall be the executive head of AMVETS, with full power to enforce the provisions of the national constitution, the national bylaws, and the will of the national convention. He shall be the chairman of the national convention and the national executive committee. He shall appoint all necessary committees, subject to the ratification of the national executive committee, and shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 2. *National vice commanders:* The national vice commanders shall act as representatives of the national commander in all matters referred to them by him, and shall upon his request preside over the meetings of the national convention or national executive committee, and perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 3. *National executive director:* The national executive director shall be charged with the administration of the policies and mandates of the national convention, the national executive committee, and the national commander. He shall supervise the activities of all divisions at national headquarters, issue such directives as may be necessary to departments and posts, act for the national commander during his absence from national headquarters, and perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office. He shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee.

SEC. 4. *The national finance officer:* The national finance officer shall be custodian of the funds of the national organization. All checks disbursing the funds of the national organization shall be signed by two or more persons as designated by the national executive committee, and the finance officer shall make reports of the condition of the national treasury when called for by the national commander or national executive committee. The national finance officer shall furnish a surety bond as hereinafter prescribed. He shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 5. *National judge advocate:* The national judge advocate shall advise the national officers and the national executive committee and national administrative committee on all legal matters, including the construction and interpretation of the national constitution and by-laws, and shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 6. National service director: The national service director shall be the service and welfare officer of the national organization. He shall be responsible for the proper handling of claims of veterans, and their dependents or survivors, before the Veterans' Administration; employment problems; prosecution of rights under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and Selective Training and Service Act; civil-service questions and other legislation concerning veterans' affairs; and the answering of individual requests for assistance or information from members, posts, and departments. It will be the duty of the national service director to formulate a rehabilitation program and to direct the activities of staff members charged with implementing the program. A part of this program will be the formation of a staff of trained national service officers and their assignment to the various regional offices of the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 7. National legislative director: The national legislative director shall be responsible for preparing the national legislative program in accordance with the mandates of the national convention, the national executive committee, national administrative committee, and the national legislative committee. It is his further responsibility to draft the necessary bills in connection therewith and to cause such bills to be introduced in Congress and actively urge the consideration of legislation thus proposed. He shall at all times be fully informed when hearings are to be held on bills in which AMVETS is interested and be prepared to present testimony before the committee or committees handling such bills. It shall be his duty to maintain close liaison with members of the House and Senate in order to secure the enactment of the AMVET program. He will make every effort to cooperate fully with other groups favoring proposed legislation which is supported by AMVETS, and it shall be his responsibility to maintain adequate legislative information when requested by individual members, posts, or departments of AMVETS. He shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee.

SEC. 8. National public relations director: The national public relations director, under the direction of the national commander, shall be responsible for the planning, formulation and development of a public-relations program, including publicity, organizational publications, etc. He shall be responsible for efficient and proper liaison with all public-relations media, press, radio, newsreels, periodicals, and all forms of advertising. He will be kept currently informed by the other national officers of all matters affecting his department and keep the public constantly advised of declared and established AMVET policy and activities. He shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee.

SEC. 9. National chaplain: The national chaplain shall perform such divine and nonsectarian services as may be necessary, adhering to the appropriate ceremonial rituals, and discharge the other duties incident to the office.

SEC. 10. National historian: The national historian shall compile from year to year all records of historical value and interest for the national headquarters of the AMVETS. He shall also assist department and post historians so as to coordinate and unify the work of these officials, and perform such other duties as the national commander and the national executive committee shall prescribe. He shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee.

SEC. 11. National provost marshal: The national provost marshal shall maintain order at all meetings and conventions. He shall perform such other duties as may be requested by the national commander.

SEC. 12. The surgeon general shall perform such special duties as are assigned by the national commander as well as the usual duties incident to the office.

ARTICLE III. CHARTERS

SECTION 1. A department executive committee may suspend, cancel, or revoke a post charter and such action shall be final and conclusive, unless an appeal is taken to the national executive committee within 30 days from the date of said suspension, cancellation, or revocation. Action taken by the national executive committee upon appeal shall be binding, pending appeal to the next national convention.

A post charter which has been thus suspended may be reinstated by action of the department executive committee if the post purge itself of the offense within 60 days of its suspension. If the delinquency is not cleared to the satisfaction of the depart-

ment executive committee within 60 days, appropriate action shall be taken by that committee to effect revocation or cancellation of the charter.

SEC. 2. Any post failing to meet the obligations imposed upon it by the constitution and bylaws, or ceasing to function for 6 months as a post of the AMVETS or voluntarily ceasing to function as a post, or merging with one or more other posts, or refusing, or failing to pay the department and national per capita dues within 60 days after collection by the post shall, upon order of the department executive committee, surrender its charter.

SEC. 3. Upon revocation, cancellation, or suspension of the charter of a post in any department of AMVETS, said post shall immediately cease operation, and upon revocation or cancellation, shall turn over its charter and assets to its department commander or department executive committee. The department executive committee is authorized, empowered, and directed by and through its duly authorized agent to take possession, custody, and control of all records, property, and assets of said post. So much of the said assets as are required for the purpose shall be applied to any indebtedness of the said post: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed as requiring any department to take over or to assume any financial responsibility of such post. Said department executive committee may provide for the transfer of the members in said post to other posts of their choice, subject to the approval of such other posts.

SEC. 4. The national executive committee shall provide a uniform code of procedure to be followed in the revocation, cancellation, or suspension of post charters, and a method of appeal to the national executive committee.

ARTICLE IV. DISCIPLINE OF POSTS AND POST MEMBERS

SECTION 1. Each post of the AMVETS shall be the judge of its own membership, subject to the provisions of the constitutions and bylaws of the national and department organizations.

SEC. 2. Members may be suspended or expelled by a post, upon a proper showing of cause. Written charges shall be based upon disloyalty, neglect of duty, dishonesty, and conduct unbecoming a member of AMVETS.

SEC. 3. Any member who has been suspended or expelled has the right of appeal to his department executive committee, according to the provisions in the by laws of such department. The decision of the committee shall be final with the right of appeal to the department convention.

SEC. 4. A member whose dues for the fiscal year have not been paid by January 1 shall be classed as delinquent. If his dues are paid on or before April 1, he shall be automatically reinstated. If he is still delinquent after April 1 his membership in AMVETS shall be forfeited.

ARTICLE V. MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Membership in AMVETS constitutes membership in the national organization of AMVETS through post affiliation. Hereafter all AMVETS shall, prior to their acceptance as members, pledge allegiance to the United States of America and its Constitution, and certify that they have read, or have had read to them, the AMVETS declaration of principles, and that they accept and subscribe to the same, and they shall not advocate or belong to any group or organization advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force.

ARTICLE VI. MONEYS AND COLLECTIONS

SECTION 1. All national, department, and post officials handling AMVETS funds, shall be properly bonded with a good and solvent bonding and surety company, acceptable to the United States Treasury, as surety to cover the average amount of AMVETS funds handled by such individuals in a single year. In case of delinquencies in the payment of amounts due department or national headquarters, action shall be taken at once by the proper officials to bring about an immediate and complete settlement. The bonds provided by national officials shall be approved by the national executive committee, and those provided by department and post officials shall be approved by the department executive committee.

SEC. 2. No contracts involving expenditure in excess of $1,000 of national AMVETS funds shall be negotiated without inviting a reasonable number of competitive written bids, and where the required products are of equal quality the contract shall be awarded to the lowest bidder.

SEC. 3. Any contract for solicitation of donations where the amount involved is in excess of $500 shall be subject to approval by the department executive committee and national executive committee or national administrative committee.

SEC. 4. All posts and department accounts shall be kept in accordance with a uniform accounting system established by national headquarters. The accounting system forms are to be provided by national headquarters to the posts and departments at a nominal cost.

SEC. 5. The minimum annual membership dues shall be $4, payable to the post, of which $2 shall be forwarded to the national headquarters, $1 forwarded to the department headquarters, and the remainder retained by the post. University and college posts may be formed on the campus, with dues of $1.50 per year, payable to the post, of which 50 cents shall go to the national headquarters, 50 cents to the department headquarters, and the remainder retained by the post. The method of forwarding dues to national and department headquarters shall be prescribed by the national convention or the national executive committee.

ARTICLE VII. DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. The word "he" wherever it shall appear in either the constitution or by-laws of the AMVETS, shall be construed as referring to both sexes.

ARTICLE VIII. RESTRICTED USE OF ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. AMVETS, or any component part thereof, shall not be used to promote the interest of any individual who is a candidate for public office, or to promote otherwise, any individual, organization, political party, faction, or product. Any violation of this provision shall be sufficient cause for disciplinary action against the offending post or department.

ARTICLE IX. MEETINGS

SECTION 1. All business meetings of this organization shall be conducted under Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE X. NATIONAL FLOWER

SECTION 1. The national flower shall be the four-leaf white clover, meaning "think of me."

ARTICLE XI. DIVISION OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

SECTION 1. There is hereby created a Division of International Affairs of AMVETS. The division shall be composed of three directors, one of whom shall be the executive director and the other two shall be associate directors. The directors shall be appointed by the national commander with the consent of the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. The directors shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the directors to be informed on matters of international affairs, perform research and investigation in such affairs, inform the national executive committee and the membership of the organization of all matters found to affect the peace, and make recommendations thereon, and provide representation at any peace conference, subject to the approval of the national executive committee. Funds shall be provided upon approval of the executive committee for the operation of this division.

ARTICLE XII. ACCOUNTING FOR MONEYS

SECTION 1. All moneys received by this organization shall be strictly and accurately accounted for, and a report shall be made available annually to all members, showing the sources of all such income and the expenditure thereof. All posts, department, and national accounts shall be kept in accordance with a uniform accounting system as established by national headquarters.

ARTICLE XIII. AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1. These bylaws may be amended at any national convention by a majority vote of the total authorized representation thereat, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted through the national executive committee by mailing or delivering the same to it at least 30 days prior to the convening of the next national convention. The said bylaws may also be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of any national convention without prior notice.

SEC. 2. No proposed amendment shall be submitted through the national executive committee or considered by the national convention, as provided in section 1 of this article, unless said proposed amendment shall have been first submitted by a department convention.

The Same Old Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the morning papers, March 8, 1947, display the signs pointing down the same old road to war, at the end of which lies death for a million or more American young men.

Thirty years ago, some who grow rich when wars are fought, others who never fight wars, some so-called internationalists more interested in other people than in America, arguing that Kaiser Wilhelm, with the German military might behind him, would destroy civilization, send the world back to the so-called Dark Ages, got us into war.

Your intelligence exceeds mine. Figure out for yourself what of good that war did for the world, for us, for any nation.

More recently, but before the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and after our Navy had, as we now know, been taking part in the fighting, similar arguments induced us to openly take part in World War II, in which President Roosevelt had already, without our knowledge, involved us.

Again, those who thought they saw a chance to become multimillionaires, those who would surrender a part of our sovereignty, establish a United States of the world and over it run up an international flag in place of the Stars and Stripes, told us first that, unless we went to the aid of England and the British Empire, we would be at the mercy of the German hordes which would destroy us.

Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job," and here the cry went up, "All aid to Britain short of war."

First we sent our dollars; then we sent munitions of war, and then, in spite of the promise of a President, who won his election on the promise that he would never send American men to fight on foreign soil, more than fifteen million women and men, young Americans, enlisted or were drafted into their country's service. They were the deciding factor in that war. Hitler and his armies were destroyed.

What did we or any other nation gain? Instead of establishing the "four freedoms" throughout the world, millions of formerly free men and women are now slave laborers, either in Britain's coal mines, in the industries of France, or within the borders of Russia. Nations have been destroyed. Nowhere, where our armies have fought and our men have died, are the people free to establish a government of their choice.

Here at home, returning veterans are denied the right to work, to earn a livelihood for their wives and their children. They are unable to buy or to build the homes to which they are entitled. And the average American citizen has less of freedom than in any peacetime since the Republic was born.

The internationalists, the world's financial overlords, the do-gooders, the "statesmen of the world", some who think that is the way to peace, and those who never fight but all too often advocate fighting, have had their way and we have an organization known as United Nations. Those who are responsible for its existence admit its ineffectiveness.

Let me repeat. The morning papers tell us the President is calling the ranking politicians to his office, where they will be told, as they already know, that there is civil war in China; that Great Britain is withdrawing from Greece; that the Balkans are boiling, with their people in revolt.

England, whose labor government, after we gave her billions, has seized private industries, destroyed free enterprise, is on the verge of collapse. Great Britain no longer can successfully defend her territory.

So comes the propaganda that the United States of America, with her millions of veterans still in need, with her productive industries periodically tied up by labor unrest, with prices soaring so the average man finds it difficult to get the necessities of life, to save herself, must contribute millions—yes, billions—of dollars to feed and clothe and arm the people of other nations.

And next may come—and do not be deceived—the demand we must again send millions of men abroad to fight on foreign soil.

Shame on those who have so little confidence in the principles laid down in our Constitution, in the ability and the courage of our fighting men, in the productive genius of America, that they believe and act on the theory that this Nation of ours, which has been the decisive factor in two world wars; which, according to Churchill, who ought to know, at the end of this last war, was the strongest, the mightiest, the most militarily powerful nation of any in all the world, is so weak that it cannot defend itself against Russian aggression or the aggression of any or all other nations.

We, with British and Russian aid, overran Germany, impoverished the German people, destroyed the German military power.

President Hoover, who ought to and does know, recently was quoted as saying that the Germans were the one people in all the world who were willing to work for their own rehabilitation. We know now that Britain—yes, and our own leaders—having destroyed German military might, now seek to build it up as a barrier against Russian aggression.

We strengthened and armed Russia. We continue to this day to build her up in her homeland, but we are now told we must fight her on the Greek and Turkish borders.

It is difficult to understand or to follow our international statesmen.

The decision of whether again we fight another world war to save the British Empire—not ourselves, but the British Empire—rests with the American people. They should know the facts, what is in the cards, before the decision is made.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, The Sound Basis for Federal Aid to Education, delivered by me to the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, March 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is unnecessary in such a gathering as this to dwell on the importance of education to the United States and to the Federal Government. It lies at the very basis of all intelligent self-government. This Nation was founded "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Liberty and equal justice under law must be continuously secured if we are to carry out the purposes of the formation of this Republic; but neither liberty nor justice can be secured without a widely diffused education. We cannot preserve the Republic at all unless the people are taught to read and to think so that they may understand its basic principles and the application of such principles to current problems. No man can be free if he does not understand the opportunities which lie before him. No man can have equality of opportunity if he has not the knowledge to understand how to use the rights which are conferred upon him.

Furthermore, education is essential to economic welfare. The principal concern of the people today is apparently to increase the standard of living and the material welfare of our citizens. I believe this goal is being pursued too much to the exclusion of other values, but certainly it dominates our national thinking. Any general economic welfare is impossible without education. Unless men understand to some extent the principles of increased productivity, prosperity can be quickly destroyed. Unless men know what other men have achieved and are educated to a desire for the same improvements, history shows that they remain in perpetual poverty. I have always felt that the misery which depresses the mass of people in India and in China, for instance, is due to the lack of education and understanding of the higher standards which are possible.

Furthermore, education is the only defense of liberty against totalitarianism. It may be that intelligent people will be occasionally misled to vest complete power in the state or in a single individual, but without education dictatorships inevitably arise. And by the same token education may be a dangerous tool in the hands of an all-powerful state. We have seen how Hitler used education to change the whole philosophy of German youth until they came to believe in the doctrine of a superior race and totalitarian government. Such a government, in the end, could only have maintained itself by suppressing freedom of education.

Broadly speaking, this country has done a good job in education. It finally became fully committed to the principle of universal free schooling for every child in the United States. Its system was built up on the basis of the development and control of education by each community, so that the parents in each city, town, and county could determine the manner in which their children should be taught. Naturally, the character of education varied throughout the country and was of many different qualities and types. Experiments in method have been freely made and have failed or succeeded after a fair trail. Men differently taught have developed novel and clashing theories which have finally met in the forum of national debate to be passed upon by the entire people. This very variety has promoted a freedom of thought, and consequently a material progress, greater than that of any other country in the world.

This same localization of education has made it in some respects less effective. Some districts have done their job poorly. That is an inevitable incident to local administration, but we may well remember that when a Federal system develops faults, and it always does, those faults extend throughout the entire country on a universal scale. The adoption of a Federal system looks perfect on paper but in practice it soon develops the inefficiencies of every huge bureaucracy, besides subjecting 25,000,000 children to the particular ideology of a small clique in control in Washington.

The faults of local administration in some districts cannot all be cured, because they are due to the very freedom to make mistakes which is essential to any freedom at all.

But in many districts, the failure in education is due to causes which can well be remedied, and in particular if it is due to the poverty of the district, or of the State in which it lies. While money is not the only requirement of a good school system, as so many of our writers on public-school education seem to think, it is certainly an essential one. There is a wide variation in the wealth of different States and districts. The income per capita ranges from $484 in Mississippi to $1,452 in Connecticut for the year 1943. The differences between districts in the same State are even wider.

The result is that children in some districts receive a poor education or no education at all. This has been clearly shown up by the illiteracy found in the selective service examinations. Rejection rates for educational deficiency averaged nearly 8 percent throughout the Nation as a whole with a much heavier rate in the poorer States. Even in the wealthier States there was a small percentage of rejections for this cause, possibly because of persons who had come from other States. In any event, we have failed to do a complete job of giving American children equal opportunity due, in part, to causes which I think can be corrected.

Without question, the primary obligation to educate children under our constitutional system falls on the States and local districts. But I believe very strongly that the Federal Government has a proper function in the field. We are a great and wealthy Nation. I believe the people of this country feel that our productive ability is so great that we can prevent hardship and poverty and illiteracy in the United States. Perhaps no nation has ever done so, but the American people think it is possible for us to do it. The Federal Government is authorized to levy taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States, and under that constitutional grant has the right to dispense money to the States and local districts for purposes not within the constitutional power of the United States to control or regulate.

Not only are some of the States poor, but States in general have a limited power of taxation. They cannot raise their taxes much above those of other States or their citizens and industries would drift into those other States. The Federal Government's powers of taxation are not unlimited, but we are raising some $35,000,000,000 today, compared to $10,000,000,000 for the States and local districts.

My own belief is that the Federal Government should assist those States desiring to put a floor under essential services in relief, in medical care, in housing, and in education. Apart from the general humanitarian interest in achieving this result, equality of opportunity lies at the basis of this Republic. No child can begin to have equality of opportunity unless he has medical care in his youth, adequate food, decent surroundings, and, above all, effective schooling. It is the concern of the entire Nation to see that the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution are translated into reality.

I believe, therefore, that the Federal Government should undertake a system of extending financial aid to the States with the objective of enabling the States to provide a basic minimum education to every child, to the end that equal opportunity shall not be interfered with by the financial condition of the State or district of the child's residence.

Certain principles, however, seem to me clear.

The administration of education and control of the school system must be completely in the hands of the State and local administrators. I believe that every Federal aid proposal which has been made accepts this principle in theory. It is admitted that local self-government in education is essential to the preservation of liberty in a country the size of the United States.

The matter, however, is not quite so simple as declaring a principle. Our experience has shown that Federal aid to local activities, even though disowning an intention to regulate and control, may easily bring about such a control. If Federal aid depends upon the discretion of some Federal officer who has the power to withhold funds, human nature is such that he is apparently under a constant temptation to tell the recipients of the money how they must run their affairs. The threat is there, sometimes expressed and sometimes implied, that if the State Bureau does not comply with Federal suggestions, the money will not be forthcoming. We have seen an example of this in the control attempted to be exercised by the Children's Bureau during the war. Therefore, I believe that the standards should be clearly established in the law, and that the Federal Government should interest itself in only one question, whether the statutory standard is complied with and the money used only for the purposes of the act. If we can reduce the Federal interference to a matter of audit, we may hope to maintain local independence. Fortunately, the tradition of the Federal Office of Education has been one of noninterference, and the office up to this time has preferred to work through the State departments of education.

I have pointed out that Federal administrative officers are inclined to extend their jurisdiction and interference, but we must also restrain the inclination of Congress to do the same. In any appropriation bill, passed long after a Federal-aid system is established, it is always possible for someone to offer an amendment providing that the funds appropriated shall not be used for some purpose which happens to be unpopular in Congress. Thus an amendment may require that no money shall be used for education which teaches socialism, for instance. The purpose may be a very praiseworthy one, but the moment Congress imposes that kind of a condition, it may soon impose others and we are embarked on a course likely to lead to complete Federal control.

Also, if the Federal funds become a very considerable percentage of the total sum being used, it is almost impossible to prevent some Federal interference, even with every safeguard provided as in the bill we have introduced. I think States which accept Federal funds and come to rely on them are in danger of losing much of their independence. A State which can get on without the Federal money had better exert every effort to do so. I do not regret, therefore, that Ohio is in a position where it can carry on without Federal assistance, and will have to do so under the formula in our bill.

The danger of Federal control of educational policy appears clearly in the controversy now going on regarding private and parochial schools. The advocates of such schools insist that the Federal money be available to such schools regardless of the policy of any State government in refusing to recognize such schools as part of the public school system. On the other hand, the opponents of such schools wish us to declare that no Federal money shall be expended for private or parochial schools, regardless of what the policy of the State may be in dispensing its own funds. If we yielded to either of these arguments, we would clearly be changing the educational policy of the State. This bill is a State-aid bill, and the State should be authorized to use the Federal funds for the same educational purposes for which it uses its own State funds. If the State recognizes private and parochial schools as part of its State educational system, then the bill provides that it may use Federal funds in the same proportion in which its State funds are used for such schools. On the other hand, if the State educational policy is to operate only through public schools, Federal money can only be used for that purpose.

If we cannot maintain the principle of noninterference in State educational systems, I would be opposed to the whole bill. The question has nothing to do with the highly controversial problem whether States should appropriate public funds for parochial schools. One may feel strongly either way on that subject, but it is a matter for each State and the people of each State to determine.

The second principle which I believe must underlie any bill for Federal aid is that the Federal contribution shall be auxiliary and shall not become the principal support of education. I have already pointed out that regardless of safeguards, too much reliance on Federal money would inevitably come to mean Federal control. But even more than that, the Federal Government's primary obligations must take the greater part of the money which can be raised even by Federal taxation. Three national responsibilities, interest on the public debt, support of the armed forces, and payment of veterans' allowances, amount in the present budget to $23,500,000,000, three times the entire prewar budget of the Federal Government. It is not true that the Federal Government can levy all the taxes it may like to levy. The present tax burden seems to me a complete discouragement of the very economic activity from which taxes come. The people today on the average are paying nearly one-third of their income in taxation, working 1 day in 3 for the Government. I believe such a tax system will soon discourage both individual initiative and corporate expansion. The Federal contributions, therefore, to States for matters where States have the primary obligation, like welfare, health, housing, and education, must be in a limited amount.

On the other hand, the State tax systems have been set up in most cases very largely with a view to raising money for education. They should be even more adapted to that purpose, and they should be looked to primarily for the necessary increase in teachers' salaries. I realize the difficulty which even the wealthier States have today to raise the necessary money, but such States can do so, and should.

My own theory is that wage rates per hour have undergone a permanent increase which means a permanent increase in costs. I doubt if the cost of living can at any time be reduced to much less than 150 percent of prewar. I believe we should try to adjust our whole economy to a 50-percent increase in the wage and price level. Since teachers were in most cases underpaid, even before the war, the increase in teachers' salaries over prewar should probably be greater than 50 percent.

I believe the States can and should give such an increase. It is true that it takes some time to adjust a State tax system to the higher level of values, to increase real-estate appraisals and the like, but certainly increased price and wage levels should be reflected in time in a permanent corresponding increase in the State tax receipts. For the present many States have a surplus. Those which have no surplus might provide for a gradual increase over several years. But I feel strongly that the Federal Government with its tremendous burden should not be called upon to solve the financial problems of States having more than the average per

capita income, fully able to give an adequate education to their children.

S. 472 provides that, as a necessary condition of Federal aid, any State must provide for its primary and secondary educational system at least 2.2 percent of the income of its citizens. This is slightly higher than the national average. Furthermore, the allotment to any State is proportionately reduced if it does not levy at least 2½ percent of the income of its citizens.

When I speak of the income of its citizens, the concept is one of a State income similar to what we have come to speak of as "national income," namely, the gross income of all the individuals in the State as determined by the Department of Commerce. I do not suppose this statistical measure is completely accurate, but it is now regarded as substantially so.

The bill then provides that if 1.1 percent of the State income, which would be one-half the total State and local revenue set aside for primary and secondary education, is insufficient to provide $40 for each child from 5 to 17 years of age in the State, then the Federal Government will make up the difference so that one-half of the State revenue plus the Federal contribution will equal $40 for each such child.

It is then required that the State see that every school district in the State receive from Federal, State, and local revenues at least $40 per annum for each pupil in average daily attendance—excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay. If there are separate colored schools, each colored school must receive such amount. You will note that there will remain to the State to be used in its discretion, one-half of its total school revenues, equal at least to 1.1 percent of the income of its people. Undoubtedly, some districts will get a larger proportion of this surplus fund than others, but it should be entirely possible for a State to provide from such funds a higher minimum base than $40 if it chooses to do so. We considered making a requirement of perhaps $60 per child, but we found that while there would be enough money in each State from State, local, and Federal funds to provide such a uniform standard, it would take money now being spent for schools in the wealthier districts in the State to be distributed to the others. Perhaps a State equalization system should do that, but we did not like to compel the reduction of the funds now being spent in any of the wealthier urban districts.

In summary, therefore, the basis of S. 472 is that if a State after making more than the average effort cannot provide $40 per child from half its revenues, the Federal Government will assist the State to see that every child receives at least a $40 education. I realize that this is too low a permanent standard, but it is very much higher than is now being spent for many children in the poorer districts of the United States. It will take some years even to reach the $40 minimum standard, and then we can consider whether to shoot at a higher goal.

There is reason to hope that the disparity in income between the different States may gradually decrease. The very education in the poorer States which we are now promoting ought to increase the progress, prosperity, and income of those States. As they approach the national average, the necessity for aid from the Federal Government will become less. This might well enable us, without increasing the appropriation, to raise the standard.

I quite realize that this bill does not hold out any immediate promise of relief to the teachers in many States. Where the aid does go, probably 80 percent of it will go for increases in teachers' salaries where those salaries are now the lowest. There are some bills providing a general contribution by the Federal Government to all teachers' salaries and proposing very large appropriations for Federal assistance to education. I do not believe that Congress under the present budget condition could possibly adopt any such bills. In fact, even with S. 472 we may have to postpone its first effective year until the Appropriations Committee certifies that the program can be begun within the over-all limitation set by the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney bill. The concern of all should be first to see that all American children have opportunity. That is the proper concern also of the Federal Government.

The principal danger to the present bill rests in the differences between the advocates of Federal education. I feel very strongly that if all of the advocates would unite behind S. 472 it could be passed at this session of Congress. It is based on sound principles. It recognizes the obligation of the National Government to see that each child has an adequate education and recognizes its further obligation. It recognizes and avoids the dangers of Federal control and leaves to the States the responsibility and the power to work out their own salvation. It would be a tremendous step forward in assuring to America the means of striving forward constantly toward the ultimate ideal of complete equality and complete liberty.

How the Communists Estimate Their Strength

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time when we are endeavoring to adjust ourselves to the President's new foreign policy and are hearing a good deal about what communism is, I want to insert in the RECORD a list of Communist strength according to the Communists' own estimate at a London conference. According to the chart, "All parties in this list base themselves on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin."

Let me call your attention to the carefulness of definition. It is not a count of "fellow travelers," but of actual avowed and accepted party members. If you examine the list you will find it interesting to note that certain countries we understand to be under rather dominating Communist influence have very few accredited members of the party, some none at all.

HOW THE COMMUNISTS ESTIMATE THEIR STRENGTH

At a recent Communist conference in London, a chart showing the advance of communism was displayed, giving the Communists' own estimate of their strength. The total world membership claimed was 18,592,300. According to the chart, "All parties in this list base themselves on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin." This is the listing that appeared on the chart:

AMERICA

Country	Party	Members	M.P.'s
Argentina	Communist	30,000	
Brazil	do	130,000	17
Canada	Labor-Progressives	23,000	
Chile	Communist	70,000	20
Colombia	Democrat-Socialist	10,000	2
Costa Rica	Vanguardia Popular	20,000	6
Cuba	Popular Socialist	152,000	12
Ecuador	Communist	2,500	
Haiti	Popular Socialist	500	1
Martinique	Communist		2
Mexico	do	25,000	
Nicaragua	Partido Socialista	500	
Panama	Partido del Pueblo	500	
Paraguay	Communist	8,000	
Peru	do	25,000	5
Puerto Rico	do	1,200	
United States	do	74,000	
Uruguay	do	15,000	5
Santo Domingo	Popular Socialist	2,000	
Venezuela	Communist	20,000	2

ASIA

Burma	Communist	4,000	
Ceylon	do		
China	do	2,000,000	
Cyprus	Akel	4,000	
India	Communist	53,700	
Indonesia	do		
Japan	do	6,000	5
Korea	do	50,000	
Lebanon	do	15,000	
Malaya	do	10,000	
Palestine	do	1,400	
Philippines	do		
Siam	do		
Syria	do	8,000	

AUSTRALIA

Australia	Communist	25,000	1
New Zealand	do	2,000	

EUROPE

USSR	Communist	6,000,000	
Albania	do		
Austria	do	150,000	4
Belgium	do	100,000	23
Britain	do	43,000	2
Bulgaria	Workers' Party	450,000	278
Czechoslovakia	Communist	1,000,000	115
Denmark	do	60,000	18
Finland	do	28,000	41
France	do	1,300,000	
Germany (Soviet)	Socialist Unity	1,575,300	
Germany (western)	Communist	350,000	
Greece	do	400,000	
Hungary	do	650,000	70
Iceland	United Socialist	1,000	10
Ireland (North)	Communist	500	
Italy	do	2,200,000	108
Luxembourg	do	5,000	
Netherlands	do	70,000	15
Norway	do	33,000	11
Poland	Workers' Party	600,000	
Portugal	Communist		
Rumania	do	500,000	68
Slovakia	do	250,000	
Spain	do		
Sweden	do	46,000	
Switzerland	Parti du Travail	21,000	1

AFRICA

Country	Party	Members	M.P.'s
Algeria	Communist		
Eritrea	do	200	
Morocco	do		
South Africa	do		
Tunisia	do		

Luther Burbank

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the House to the broadcast on the program "Cavalcade of America" tonight of the life and work of the famous scientist and horticulturist, Luther Burbank, whose experiments and discoveries in the field of plant life have so greatly benefited humanity. The great American actor, Lionel Barrymore, long an admirer, will enact the role of Burbank in the radio dramatization of his career.

According to Mrs. Esther B. Macdonald, town clerk of Lancaster, Mass., which is situated in my congressional district, Luther Burbank was born in Lancaster, March 7, 1849, the son of Samuel Walton Burbank and Olive Ross Burbank. He was the thirteenth child of his father. Olive Ross, of Shirley, Mass., was the third wife of Samuel Burbank, and Luther was the third of her five children.

Samuel Burbank was a farmer and a maker of brick and pottery. From his mother, Luther apparently inherited his love of nature, and particularly of flowers. He attended the Pine Grove School, a typical New England district school not far from his home on Harvard Street in the northern part of his native town. When he was 15 years of age he entered Lancaster Academy, where he studied for four winters, all the while utilizing the excellent library which even at such an early date the progressive and education-minded people of Lancaster had provided to inculcate and encourage learning in the community. From his work on the farm, Luther early gained a practical knowledge of the life, characteristics, and growth of plants.

Some time after his father's death, he purchased a 17-acre farm in the nearby town of Lunenburg, where he took up the business of market gardening. It was here that this great genius first produced a new plant creation—the Burbank potato. In 1875 he sold his farm and went to California, where his three older brothers resided, taking with him the small capital from the sale of the farm and 10 of his newly created potatoes.

His subsequent experiments and creations covered a very wide range and effected revolutionary changes in plant life and methods of cultivation in orchard, garden, field, and forest. He sought and discovered new ways of choosing and caring for seeds, preparing the soil, planting, disease and pest prevention. He created many new species of berries, fruits, vegetables, and flowers, amazing and unbelievable to botanists and horticulturists. He improved the size and quality of many species. He utilized grafting to promote startling changes in garden, orchard, and forest. I could not begin to enumerate his remarkable accomplishments here but they are epochal and of lasting value. Luther Burbank will always be remembered as a great scientist and a great American.

The house where Luther Burbank was born, a large New England-style brick house with a wooden ell, was razed by the Government when it took over this section of the town to extend Fort Devens during World War II. Mr. Henry Ford had purchased the ell of the house some years before and removed it to Dearborn, Mich. Luther Burbank was born on the second floor in a small room of this ell.

It is interesting to note that at least two of Burbank's former schoolmates still reside in my district—the brothers, Fred W. and Luther Bateman, both prominent and highly respected citizens. Mr. Fred Bateman, who knew Burbank intimately and well, is a famous civil engineer of Massachusetts, who, while he is now a nonagenarian, still continues to work at his profession and is one of the most able, engaging, and finest men I am honored to know.

It is most appropriate that on this evening's occasion the American people who have received lasting benefits from the brilliant research and miraculous achievements of Luther Burkbank should pay tribute to his memory and render appreciation for his magnificent work in behalf of science and humanity. That he should have unquestionably derived so much of his skill and genius, frugal habits, willingness to perform hard work, and tenacious purpose from his rugged New England forebears and the people and environment of a historic and forward-looking American community in the Third Congressional District serves as a lasting inspiration to all those who are privileged to live amidst the eternal hills, fertile valleys, and beautiful countryside of old New England, where American liberty was nurtured and where its spirit still animates the minds and hearts of our people.

I am greatly indebted to Mrs. Macdonald and also Hon. Orra L. Stone, distinguished editor of the Clinton Daily Item, for their kindness in furnishing me with biographical data on Luther Burbank.

Increase of Income-Tax Exemptions

REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for tax reduction through the medium of increasing exemptions on a per capita basis by $200—from $500 to $700.

If we are going to have tax reduction I believe that this method is much fairer than the method proposed in the Knutson bill, which provides for a 20-percent cut across-the-board for all who have incomes not in excess of approximately $304,000 and for those with incomes above that figure, of 10½ percent. Under my proposal every taxpayer, whether in the low- or high-income groups, would be treated alike, because he would have the same exemptions.

So that all may have an opportunity to compare both plans, I am inserting in the RECORD today a copy of my bill and burden tables which have been prepared for me by the Division of Tax Research of the Treasury Department.

The tables are:

First. Comparison of amounts and effective rates of individual income tax under the present law, under H. R. 1—the Knutson bill—and plans to increase per capita exemptions to $600 and to $700, for specified amounts.

Second. Decrease in amounts and effective rates of individual income tax under H. R. 1, and under plans to increase per capita exemptions to $600 and to $700, compared with the present law, and tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability and net income after tax for specified amounts of net income.

Take the case of a married man with two dependents who has a net income before personal exemption of $2,500. Under present law he pays $95 in taxes. Under the Knutson bill he would pay $76, which means he would have his taxes reduced by $19, or by only eight-tenths of 1 percent of his effective rate, while a married man with two dependents whose income is $10,000 and now pays $1,862 would, under the Knutson bill, pay $1,490, a saving of $372, or 3.7 percent of his effective rate.

A married man with two dependents and with an income of $25,000 now pays $8,522, and under the Knutson proposal he would pay $6,818, a reduction of $1,704, or 6.8 percent.

The married man with two dependents and with an income of $100,000 who now pays $62,301 would, under the Knutson plan, pay $49,841, a decrease of $12,460, or 12.5 percent.

Looking at it from the viewpoint of spendable income the same married man with two dependents and whose income is $2,500 would, under the Knutson plan, have his spendable income increased by eight-tenths of 1 percent; the $5,000 taxpayer would have his spendable income increased by 2.7 percent; the $10,000 taxpayer would have his spendable income increased by 4.6 percent; the $25,000 taxpayer by 10.3 percent; the $100,000 taxpayer by 33.1 percent; the $250,000 man by 64 percent; and the $300,000 man by 71 percent.

Under the provisions of my bill the raising of exemptions would provide for an increase in spendable income for the $2,500 man by 4 percent; for the $5,000 man by 3.8 percent; for the $10,000 man by 2.8 percent; for the $25,000 man by 2.7 percent; for the $75,000 man by 1.9 percent; and for the $300,000 man by 1 percent.

If tax relief is to be afforded at this time, I believe it should go where the relief is most needed. That is, in the low-income groups, where practically every penny saved on taxes will be used to purchase the necessities of life, and where the increase in the cost of living is causing the greatest hardship.

Not only would this tax relief help the low-income groups to maintain their

standard of living, but these same dollars would be added to the purchasing power and thus help to maintain our national income at a high figure. Economists advise us that the national income is now running in excess of $166,000,000,000 a year, but many of these same economists have been predicting a recession—they do not like the term "depression"—within a year. Should a recession set in and reduce our national income by as much as $10,000,000,000, we are told that this would affect the Federal revenue by approximately $3,000,000,000. If taxes are to be reduced, I think the cuts should be made so as to provide an increase in the purchasing power in the hope that this would prevent the predicted recession.

The following table shows the savings that would accrue to a married man with two children, based upon a specified income under, first, the Knutson plan and, second, under the Forand plan:

Net income	Knutson plan	Forand plan
$2,500	$19	$95
$3,000	38	152
$4,000	76	152
$5,000	118	167
$10,000	372	228
$15,000	728	327
$25,000	1,704	448
$50,000	4,822	547
$75,000	8,465	616
$100,000	12,460	661
$250,000	38,095	692
$304,396	47,500	692

Comparison of amounts of individual income tax under present law,[1] H. R. 1,[2] and plans to increase per capita exemptions to $700, for specified amounts of net income

MARRIED PERSON [3]—TWO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Present law	H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to $700
$2,500	$95	$76	
$3,000	190	152	$38
$4,000	380	304	228
$5,000	589	471	422
$6,000	798	638	631
$8,000	1,292	1,034	1,094
$10,000	1,862	1,490	1,634
$15,000	3,639	2,911	3,312
$20,000	5,890	4,712	5,310
$25,000	8,522	6,818	8,073
$50,000	24,111	19,289	23,564
$75,000	42,323	33,858	41,707
$100,000	62,301	49,841	61,640
$250,000	190,475	152,380	189,783
$304,396 [5]	237,500	190,000	236,809
$350,000	276,925	225,275	276,233
$500,000	405,600	341,300	405,508
$750,000	622,725	534,675	622,033
$1,000,000	838,850	728,050	838,158
$2,000,000	1,703,350	1,501,550	1,702,658
$3,000,000	[6] 2,565,000	2,275,050	[6] 2,565,000
$4,000,000	[6] 3,420,000	3,048,550	[6] 3,420,000
$5,000,000	[6] 4,275,000	3,822,050	[6] 4,275,000
$6,000,000	[6] 5,130,000	[7] 4,590,000	[6] 5,130,000

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] A bill introduced on Jan. 3, 1947, in the House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.
[3] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.
[4] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[5] Point at which 15-percent reduction of present law tentative tax takes effect under H. R. 1.
[6] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[7] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 76.5 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Jan. 28, 1947.

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the amount of personal exemption for income-tax purposes with respect to the taxpayer and dependents

Be it enacted, etc., That section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(I) Credits: There shall be allowed for the purposes of both the normal tax and the surtax the following credits against net income:

"(A) An exemption of $700 for the taxpayer;

"(B) An exemption of $700 for the spouse of the taxpayer if—

"(i) a joint return is made by the taxpayer and his spouse under section 51, in which case the aggregate exemption of the spouses under subparagraph (A) and this subparagraph shall be $1,400, or

"(ii) a separate return is made by the taxpayer, and his spouse has no gross income for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins and is not the dependent of another taxpayer;

"(C) An exemption of $700 for each dependent whose gross income for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins is less than $700, except that the exemption shall not be allowed in respect of a dependent who has made a joint return with his spouse under section 51 for the taxable year beginning in such calendar year."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect July 1, 1947.

TABLE I.—*Comparison of amounts and effective rates of individual-income tax under present law,[1] H. R. 1,[2] and plans to increase per capita exemptions to $600 and to $700, for specified amounts of net income*

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amounts of tax				Effective rates			
	Present law	H. R. 1 [3]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		Present law	H. R. 1 [3]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—	
			$600	$700			$600	$700
					Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$600	$19	$15			3.2	2.5		
$800	57	46	$38	$19	7.1	5.8	4.8	2.4
$1,000	95	76	76	57	9.5	7.6	7.6	5.7
$1,200	133	106	114	95	11.1	8.9	9.5	7.9
$1,500	190	152	171	152	12.7	10.1	11.4	10.1
$2,000	285	228	266	247	14.3	11.4	13.3	12.4
$2,500	380	304	361	342	15.2	12.2	14.4	13.7
$3,000	485	388	464	443	16.2	12.9	15.5	14.8
$4,000	694	555	673	652	17.3	13.9	16.8	16.3
$5,000	922	737	897	872	18.4	14.7	17.9	17.4
$6,000	1,169	934	1,144	1,119	19.5	15.6	19.1	18.7
$8,000	1,720	1,376	1,691	1,663	21.5	17.2	21.1	20.8
$10,000	2,347	1,878	2,314	2,282	23.5	18.8	23.1	22.8
$15,000	4,270	3,417	4,226	4,181	28.5	22.8	28.2	27.9
$20,000	6,645	5,316	6,595	6,545	33.2	26.6	33.0	32.7
$25,000	9,362	7,490	9,306	9,250	37.5	30.0	37.2	37.0
$50,000	25,137	20,110	25,069	25,000	50.3	40.2	50.1	50.0
$75,000	43,477	34,782	43,400	43,323	58.0	46.4	57.9	57.8
$100,000	$63,541	50,832	$63,458	63,375	63.5	50.8	63.5	63.4
$250,000	191,772	153,417	191,685	191,599	76.7	61.4	76.7	76.6
$302,896 [4]	237,500	190,000	237,414	237,327	78.4	62.7	78.4	78.4
$350,000	278,222	226,435	278,135	278,049	79.5	64.7	79.5	79.4
$500,000	407,897	342,460	407,810	407,724	81.6	68.5	81.6	81.5
$750,000	624,022	535,835	623,935	623,849	83.2	71.4	83.2	83.2
$1,000,000	840,147	729,210	840,060	839,974	84.0	72.9	84.0	84.0
$2,000,000	1,704,647	1,502,710	1,704,560	1,704,474	85.2	75.1	85.2	85.2
$3,000,000	[5] 2,565,000	2,276,210	[5] 2,565,000	[5] 2,565,000	85.5	75.9	85.5	85.5
$4,000,000	[5] 3,420,000	3,049,710	[5] 3,420,000	[5] 3,420,000	85.5	76.2	85.5	85.5
$5,000,000	[5] 4,275,000	3,823,210	[5] 4,275,000	[5] 4,275,000	85.5	76.5	85.5	85.5
$6,000,000	[5] 5,130,000	[6] 4,590,000	[5] 5,130,000	[5] 5,130,000	85.5	76.5	85.5	85.5

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] A bill introduced on Jan. 3, 1947, in the House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.
[3] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[4] Point at which 15-percent reduction of present law tentative tax takes effect under H. R. 1.
[5] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[6] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 76.5 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Jan. 28, 1947.

TABLE II.—*Decrease in amounts and effective rates of individual-income tax under H. R. 1 [1] and under plans to increase per capita exemptions to $600 and to $700, compared with present law,[2] and tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability and net income after tax, for specified amounts of net income*

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Decrease in amounts of tax compared with present law			Percentage-point decrease in effective rates compared with present law			Tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability			Tax decrease as a percentage of net income after tax		
	H. R. 1 [2]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		H. R. 1 [2]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		H. R. 1 [2]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		H. R. 1 [2]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—	
		$600	$700		$600	$700		$600	$700		$600	$700
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$600	$4	$19	$19	0.7	3.2	3.2	20.0	100.0	100.0	0.7	3.3	3.3
$800	11	19	38	1.4	2.4	4.8	20.0	33.3	66.7	1.5	2.6	5.1
$1,000	19	19	38	1.9	1.9	3.8	20.0	20.0	40.0	2.1	2.1	4.2
$1,200	27	19	38	2.2	1.6	3.2	20.0	14.3	28.6	2.5	1.8	3.6
$1,500	38	19	38	2.5	1.3	2.5	20.0	10.0	20.0	2.9	1.5	2.9
$2,000	57	19	38	2.9	1.0	1.9	20.0	6.7	13.3	3.3	1.1	2.2
$2,500	76	19	38	3.0	.8	1.5	20.0	5.0	10.0	3.6	.9	1.8
$3,000	97	21	42	3.2	.7	1.4	20.0	4.3	8.6	3.9	.8	1.7
$4,000	139	21	42	3.5	.5	1.1	20.0	3.0	6.0	4.2	.6	1.3
$5,000	185	25	49	3.7	.5	1.0	20.0	2.7	5.4	4.5	.6	1.2
$6,000	235	25	49	3.9	.4	.8	20.0	2.1	4.2	4.9	.5	1.0
$8,000	344	29	57	4.3	.4	.7	20.0	1.7	3.3	5.5	.5	.9
$10,000	469	32	65	4.7	.3	.7	20.0	1.4	2.8	6.1	.4	.8
$15,000	853	45	89	5.7	.3	.6	20.0	1.1	2.1	8.0	.4	.8
$20,000	1,329	50	100	6.7	.3	.5	20.0	.8	1.5	10.0	.4	.7
$25,000	1,872	56	112	7.5	.2	.5	20.0	.6	1.2	12.0	.4	.7
$50,000	5,027	68	137	10.1	.1	.3	20.0	.3	.5	20.2	.3	.5
$75,000	8,695	77	154	11.6	.1	.2	20.0	.2	.4	27.6	.2	.5
$100,000	12,709	83	165	12.7	.1	.2	20.0	.1	.3	34.9	.2	.5
$250,000	38,355	86	173	15.3	[3]	.1	20.0	[3]	.1	65.9	.1	.3
$302,896 [4]	47,500	86	173	15.7	[3]	.1	20.0	[3]	.1	72.6	.1	.3
$350,000	51,787	86	173	14.8	[3]	[3]	18.6	[3]	.1	72.1	.1	.2
$500,000	65,437	86	173	13.1	[3]	[3]	16.0	[3]	[3]	71.0	.1	.2
$750,000	88,187	86	173	11.8	[3]	[3]	14.1	[3]	[3]	70.0	.1	.1
$1,000,000	110,937	86	173	11.1	[3]	[3]	13.2	[3]	[3]	69.4	.1	.1
$2,000,000	201,937	86	173	10.1	[3]	[3]	11.8	[3]	[3]	68.4	[3]	.1
$3,000,000	288,790	----------	----------	9.6	----------	----------	11.3	----------	----------	66.4	----------	----------
$4,000,000	370,290	----------	----------	9.3	----------	----------	10.8	----------	----------	63.8	----------	----------
$5,000,000	451,790	----------	----------	9.0	----------	----------	10.6	----------	----------	62.3	----------	----------
$6,000,000	540,000	----------	----------	9.0	----------	----------	10.5	----------	----------	62.1	----------	----------

[1] A bill introduced on Jan. 3, 1947, in the House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.
[2] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[3] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[4] Point at which 15-percent reduction in present law tentative tax takes effect under H. R. 1.
[5] Less than 0.05 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Jan. 28, 1947.

TABLE III.—*Comparison of amounts and effective rates of individual-income tax under present law,[1] H. R. 1,[2] and plans to increase per capita exemptions to $600 and to $700, for specified amounts of net income*

MARRIED PERSON [3]—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amounts of tax				Effective rates			
	Present law	H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		Present law	H. R. 1	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—	
			$600	$700			$600	$700
					Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,200	$38	$30	----------	----------	3.2	2.5	----------	----------
$1,500	95	76	$57	$19	6.3	5.1	3.8	1.3
$2,000	190	152	152	114	9.5	7.6	7.6	5.7
$2,500	285	228	247	209	11.4	9.1	9.9	8.4
$3,000	380	304	342	304	12.7	10.1	11.4	10.1
$4,000	589	471	547	505	14.7	11.8	13.7	12.6
$5,000	798	638	756	714	16.0	12.8	15.1	14.3
$6,000	1,045	836	996	946	17.4	13.9	16.6	15.8
$8,000	1,577	1,262	1,520	1,463	19.7	15.8	19.0	18.3
$10,000	2,185	1,748	2,120	2,056	21.9	17.5	21.2	20.6
$15,000	4,047	3,238	3,965	3,884	27.0	21.6	26.4	25.9
$20,000	6,394	5,115	6,293	6,192	32.0	25.6	31.5	31.0
$25,000	9,082	7,266	8,970	8,858	36.3	29.1	35.9	35.4
$50,000	24,795	19,836	24,658	24,521	49.6	39.7	49.3	49.0
$75,000	43,092	34,474	42,938	42,784	57.5	46.0	57.3	57.0
$100,000	63,128	50,502	62,962	62,797	63.1	50.5	63.0	62.8
$250,000	191,340	153,072	191,167	190,994	76.5	61.2	76.5	76.4
$303,396 [5]	237,500	190,000	237,327	237,155	78.3	62.6	78.2	78.2
$350,000	277,790	226,049	277,617	277,444	79.4	64.6	79.3	79.3
$500,000	407,465	342,074	407,292	407,119	81.5	68.4	81.5	81.4
$750,000	623,590	535,449	623,417	623,244	83.2	71.4	83.1	83.1
$1,000,000	839,715	728,824	839,542	839,369	84.0	72.9	84.0	83.9
$2,000,000	1,704,215	1,502,324	1,704,042	1,703,869	85.2	75.1	85.2	85.2
$3,000,000	[6] 2,565,000	2,275,824	[6] 2,565,000	[6] 2,565,000	85.5	75.9	85.5	85.5
$4,000,000	[6] 3,420,000	3,049,324	[6] 3,420,000	[6] 3,420,000	85.5	76.2	85.5	85.5
$5,000,000	[6] 4,275,000	3,822,824	[6] 4,275,000	[6] 4,275,000	85.5	76.5	85.5	85.5
$6,000,000	[6] 5,130,000	[7] 4,590,000	[6] 5,130,000	[6] 5,130,000	85.5	76.5	85.5	85.5

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] A bill introduced on Jan. 3, 1947, in the House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.
[3] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.
[4] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[5] Point at which 15-percent reduction of present law tentative tax takes effect under H. R. 1.
[6] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[7] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 76.5 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Jan. 28, 1947.

TABLE IV.—*Decrease in amounts and effective rates of individual-income tax under H. R. 1 [1] and under plans to increase per capita exemptions to $600 and to $700, compared with present law,[2] and tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability and net income after tax, for specified amounts of net income*

MARRIED PERSON [3]—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Decrease in amounts of tax compared with present law			Percentage-point decrease in effective rates compared with present law			Tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability			Tax decrease as a percentage of net income after tax		
	H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—	
		$600	$700		$600	$700		$600	$700		$600	$700
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,200	$8	$38	$38	0.7	3.2	3.2	20.0	100.0	100.0	0.7	3.3	3.3
$1,500	19	38	76	1.3	2.5	5.1	20.0	40.0	80.0	1.4	2.7	5.4
$2,000	38	38	76	1.9	1.9	3.8	20.0	20.0	40.0	2.1	2.1	4.2
$2,500	57	38	76	2.3	1.5	3.0	20.0	13.3	26.7	2.6	1.7	3.4
$3,000	76	38	76	2.5	1.3	2.5	20.0	10.0	20.0	2.9	1.5	2.9
$4,000	118	42	84	3.0	1.1	2.1	20.0	7.1	14.2	3.5	1.2	2.5
$5,000	160	42	84	3.2	.8	1.7	20.0	5.2	10.5	3.8	1.0	2.0
$6,000	209	49	99	3.5	.8	1.7	20.0	4.7	9.5	4.2	1.0	2.0
$8,000	315	57	114	3.9	.7	1.4	20.0	3.6	7.2	4.9	.9	1.8
$10,000	437	65	129	4.4	.7	1.3	20.0	3.0	5.9	5.6	.8	1.7
$15,000	809	82	163	5.4	.5	1.1	20.0	2.0	4.0	7.4	.7	1.5
$20,000	1,279	101	202	6.4	.5	1.0	20.0	1.6	3.2	9.4	.7	1.5
$25,000	1,816	112	224	7.3	.5	.9	20.0	1.2	2.5	11.4	.7	1.4
$50,000	4,959	137	274	9.9	.3	.6	20.0	.6	1.1	19.7	.5	1.1
$75,000	8,618	154	308	11.5	.2	.4	20.0	.4	.7	27.0	.5	1.0
$100,000	12,626	165	331	12.6	.2	.3	20.0	.3	.5	34.2	.4	.9
$250,000	38,268	173	346	15.3	.1	.1	20.0	.1	.2	65.2	.3	.6
$303,396 [5]	47,500	173	346	15.7	.1	.1	20.0	.1	.1	72.1	.3	.5
$350,000	51,741	173	346	14.8	[6]	.1	18.6	.1	.1	71.7	.2	.5
$500,000	65,391	173	346	13.1	[6]	.1	16.0	[6]	.1	70.7	.2	.4
$750,000	88,141	173	346	11.8	[6]	[6]	14.1	[6]	.1	69.7	.1	.3
$1,000,000	110,891	173	346	11.1	[6]	[6]	13.2	[6]	[6]	69.2	.1	.2
$2,000,000	201,891	173	346	10.1	[6]	[6]	11.8	[6]	[6]	68.3	.1	.1
$3,000,000	289,176			9.6			11.3			66.5		
$4,000,000	370,676			9.3			10.8			63.9		
$5,000,000	452,176			9.0			10.6			62.4		
$6,000,000	540,000			9.0			10.5			62.1		

[1] A bill introduced on Jan. 3, 1947, in the House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.
[2] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[3] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.
[4] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[5] Point at which 15-percent reduction of present law tentative tax takes effect under H. R. 1.
[6] Less than 0.05 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Jan. 28, 1947

TABLE V.—*Comparison of amounts and effective rates of individual-income tax under present law,[1] H. R. 1,[2] and plans to increase per capita exemptions to $600 and to $700, for specified amounts of net income*

MARRIED PERSON [3]—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amounts of tax				Effective rates			
	Present law	H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		Present law	H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—	
			$600	$700			$600	$700
					Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,500	$95	$76	$19		3.8	3.0	0.8	
$3,000	190	152	114	$38	6.3	5.1	3.8	1.3
$4,000	380	304	304	228	9.5	7.6	7.6	5.7
$5,000	589	471	505	422	11.8	9.4	10.1	8.4
$6,000	798	638	714	631	13.3	10.6	11.9	10.5
$8,000	1,292	1,034	1,193	1,094	16.2	12.9	14.9	13.7
$10,000	1,862	1,490	1,748	1,634	18.6	14.9	17.5	16.3
$15,000	3,639	2,911	3,475	3,312	24.3	19.4	23.2	22.1
$20,000	5,890	4,712	5,700	5,510	29.5	23.6	28.5	27.6
$25,000	8,522	6,818	8,297	8,073	34.1	27.3	33.2	32.3
$50,000	24,111	19,289	23,837	23,564	48.2	38.6	47.7	47.1
$75,000	42,323	33,858	42,015	41,707	56.4	45.1	56.0	55.6
$100,000	62,301	49,841	61,970	61,640	62.3	49.8	62.0	61.6
$250,000	190,475	152,380	190,129	189,783	76.2	61.0	76.1	75.9
$304,396 [5]	237,500	190,000	237,155	236,809	78.0	62.4	77.9	77.8
$350,000	276,925	225,275	276,579	276,233	79.1	64.4	79.0	78.9
$500,000	406,600	341,300	406,254	405,908	81.3	68.3	81.3	81.2
$750,000	622,725	534,675	622,379	622,033	83.0	71.3	83.0	82.9
$1,000,000	838,850	728,050	838,504	838,158	83.9	72.8	83.9	83.8
$2,000,000	1,703,350	1,501,550	1,703,004	1,702,658	85.2	75.1	85.2	85.1
$3,000,000	[6] 2,565,000	2,275,050	[6] 2,565,000	[6] 2,565,000	85.5	75.8	85.5	85.5
$4,000,000	[6] 3,420,000	3,048,550	[6] 3,420,000	[6] 3,420,000	85.5	76.2	85.5	85.5
$5,000,000	[6] 4,275,000	3,822,050	[6] 4,275,000	[6] 4,275,000	85.5	76.4	85.5	85.5
$6,000,000	[6] 5,130,000	[7] 4,590,000	[6] 5,130,000	[6] 5,130,000	85.5	76.5	85.5	85.5

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] A bill introduced on Jan. 3, 1947, in the House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.
[3] Assumes only one spouse has income.
[4] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[5] Point at which 15-percent reduction of present law tentative tax takes effect under H. R. 1.
[6] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[7] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 76.5 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Jan. 27, 1947.

TABLE VI.—*Decrease in amounts and effective rates of individual-income tax under H. R. 1[1] and under plans to increase per capita exemptions to $600 and to $700, compared with present law,[2] and tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability and net income after tax, for specified amounts of net income*

MARRIED PERSON [3]—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Decrease in amounts of tax compared with present law			Percentage-point decrease in effective rates compared with present law			Tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability			Tax decrease as a percentage of net income after tax		
	H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—		H. R. 1 [4]	Plans to increase per capita exemptions to—	
		$600	$700		$600	$700		$600	$700		$600	$700
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,500	$19	$76	$95	0.8	3.0	3.8	20.0	80.0	100.0	0.8	3.2	4.0
$3,000	38	76	152	1.3	2.5	5.1	20.0	40.0	80.0	1.4	2.7	5.4
$4,000	76	76	152	.9	1.9	3.8	20.0	20.0	40.0	2.1	2.1	4.2
$5,000	118	84	167	2.4	1.7	3.3	20.0	14.3	28.4	2.7	1.9	3.8
$6,000	160	84	167	2.7	1.4	2.8	20.0	10.5	21.0	3.1	1.6	3.2
$8,000	258	99	198	3.2	1.2	2.5	20.0	.7	15.3	3.8	1.5	3.0
$10,000	372	114	228	3.7	1.1	2.3	20.0	6.1	12.2	4.6	1.4	2.8
$15,000	728	163	327	4.9	1.1	2.2	20.0	4.5	9.0	6.4	1.4	2.9
$20,000	1,178	190	380	5.9	1.0	1.9	20.0	3.2	6.5	8.3	1.3	2.7
$25,000	1,70	224	448	6.8	.9	1.8	20.0	2.6	5.3	10.3	1.4	2.7
$50,000	4,822	274	547	9.6	.5	1.1	20.0	1.1	2.3	18.6	1.1	2.1
$75,000	8,465	308	616	11.3	.4	.8	20.0	.7	1.5	25.9	.9	1.9
$100,000	12,460	331	661	12.5	.3	.7	20.0	.5	1.1	33.1	.9	1.8
$250,000	38,095	346	692	15.2	.1	.3	20.0	.2	.4	64.0	.6	1.2
$304,396 [5]	47,500	346	692	15.6	.1	.2	20.0	.1	.3	71.0	.5	1.0
$350,000	51,650	346	692	14.8	.1	.2	18.7	.1	.2	70.7	.5	.9
$500,000	65,300	346	692	13.1	.1	.1	16.1	.1	.2	69.9	.4	.7
$750,000	88,050	346	692	11.7	[6]	.1	14.1	.1	.1	69.2	.3	.5
$1,000,000	110,800	346	692	11.1	[6]	.1	13.2	[6]	.1	68.8	.2	.4
$2,000,000	201,800	346	692	10.1	[6]	[6]	11.8	[6]	[6]	68.0	.1	.2
$3,000,000	289,950			9.7			11.3			66.7		
$4,000,000	371,450			9.3			10.9			64.0		
$5,000,000	452,150			9.1			10.6			62.5		
$6,000,000	540,000			9.0			10.5			62.1		

[1] A bill introduced on Jan. 3, 1947, in the House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.
[2] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[3] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.
[4] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[5] Point at which 15-percent reduction of present law tentative tax takes effect under H. R. 1.
[6] Less than 0.05 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Jan. 28, 1947.

President Truman's Policy for Greece

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a person can become so international in his thinking that he finally becomes an isolationist. My dictionary defines an isolationist as "one who advocates an isolated condition, especially of a nation or country as regards alliances and relations with others." President Truman proposes that we act alone with reference to Greece and Turkey. The United States was persuaded to join and largely support the United Nations organization, in the belief that just such a situation as the President now desires to correct will be taken care of. The President said, "No other nation is willing and able to provide the necessary support for a democratic Greek Government." Just as other nations are not willing and able to provide the support now, they may not be willing and able to provide the support later and we may find ourselves quite isolated.

I include in my remarks a very excellent editorial by John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News, which appeared on Saturday, March 15, 1947. I recommend that every Member of the House of Representatives read it. I certainly disagree that we should place a lot of our young men in Greece as "sitting ducks" to await a second Pearl Harbor.

The editorial follows:

TRUMAN POLICY FOR GREECE RISKS BANKRUPTCY AND WAR

So that our readers will clearly understand what is in store for them, I quote a paragraph from a New York Times dispatch by James B. Reston, their specialist in international affairs:

"What worries President Truman's advisers at the moment is not this loan to Greece and Turkey but the next one."

In that one sentence Mr. Reston epitomizes our future foreign policy: "Fight communism with dollars."

It is an easy slogan and should go down well with timid Americans who pull the covers over their heads every night just in case the Russians might decide to drop a few atomic bombs in their neighborhood for target practice.

The true meaning of the slogan should frighten them even more, for actually it means, "Fight communism with dollars—and men if necessary."

MORAL POSITION HIGHLY UNTENABLE

The President, influenced by his military advisers, for whom he has a profound respect, has in effect told Russia to keep hands off Greece and Turkey, although we have consistently encouraged Great Britain to rule the Greeks with force through a puppet king.

In view of the idealistic statements made by the leaders of all countries during the early days of the United Nations, our moral position with regard to the Greeks is highly untenable. What we are actually proposing to do, although the vast majority of Americans seemingly are failing to grasp its significance, is to assume the burden of world security with American dollars and troops.

This is a step that goes far beyond our humanitarian desire to aid Greece in her postwar difficulties, the premise upon which many people are blindly accepting the President's recommendations.

With unconscious irony, President Truman's address to Congress was delivered while an 11-nation commission from the United Nations Council is in Greece trying to get the facts.

In bypassing the United Nations so casually, the President has dealt that organization's prestige a serious blow.

Did we not accept the UN as the means to world peace, to security for the small nations? Why, then, should the United States take unto itself the full responsibility for deciding how world peace shall be maintained when the problem had been specifically assigned to the United Nations from the outset?

REMEMBER WHAT WE SAID?

Lest your memories be short, a few quotations from earlier pronouncements by United Nations leaders are in order:

April 26, 1945: "This conference is called upon to consider the problem of setting up an organization to protect the general peace and security of nations after the war. * * * It is obvious that no one wishes to restore a League of Nations which had no rights or power. * * * The Soviet Government is a sincere and firm champion of the establishment of a strong international organization of security. * * * We will fully cooperate in the solution of this great problem with all the other governments which are genuinely devoted to this noble cause."—V. M. Molotov, chairman of the Soviet delegation to the San Francisco Conference.

July 15, 1945: "We all have to recognize—no matter how great our strength—that we must deny ourselves the license to do always as we please. No one nation, no regional group, can, or should, expect any special privilege which harms any other nation • • • that is why we have here resolved that power be used not to wage war, but to keep the world at peace and free from the fear of war."—President Truman at the San Francisco Conference.

June 21, 1945: "Both the Greek Government and the people as a whole look friendly and admiringly at the Soviet Union by whose side they fought for the maintenance of human liberties."—Under Secretary Zakynthinos of the Greek Press and Information Department.

November 23, 1945: "What does it concern Great Britain whether Greece is a monarchy or a republic? It is not for us to decide."—Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin.

February 22, 1945: "The three powers pledged joint action to uphold the right proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they shall live."—Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State.

March 1, 1945: "Vaguely defined spheres of influence are incompatible with the basic principles of international collaboration."—From Franklin D. Roosevelt's report on the Yalta meeting.

June 26, 1945: "Establish a special organization for defense of peace and insurance of security from among the representatives of the peace-loving nations; to place at the disposal of the steering body of this organization the maximum quantity of armed forces sufficient for the suppression of aggression."—A. A. Gromyko, acting chairman, the Soviet delegation at San Francisco.

OUR LEADERS FORESEE WAR

The noble words quoted above are just as noble today. The tragic difference is that they have been so soon forgotten.

Russia is guilty of obstruction and hairsplitting in the councils of the United Nations while practicing a determined isolationism for her own selfish advantage.

Great Britain, facing economic collapse and loss of empire, and living in fear of Russia, has turned once again to the United States for succor.

Our political and military leaders are so sure that we will eventually go to war with Russia that they have determined to call Russia's hand in the Balkans, a course of action that may ignite the first spark of the war they would avoid.

The fallacy of our position is that:

1. We are not supporting a representative government in Greece.

2. The Greek problem is a world problem and not one specifically reserved to the United States and Great Britain.

3. A political loan to Greece further weakens the United Nations.

4. We are inaugurating a change in foreign policy which commits us morally to bailing out every tottering nation in Europe and liquidating its Communists.

5. The constant drain upon our own resources will eventually make it impossible for us to aid anyone.

6. We are asking for a war with Russia.

WHY NOT USE THE UNITED NATIONS FUND?

Granting that Greece needs money, what about the $9,000,000,000 that are gathering dust in the World Bank of the United Nations? What is being done with Greek assets frozen in London? Why can't the stabilization fund of the United Nations proceed to stabilize her currency?

American taxpayers have already poured $480,000,000 into Greece since the end of the war. The Greek army, described by President Truman as "small and ill-equipped," has absorbed about $44,000,000 worth of equipment, some of it second-hand lend-lease.

Do the dreaded Greek guerrillas from the mountains have more?

When we have made the loan advocated by President Truman, what about the 70 percent of Greece's overseas debts that are held by British banks? Will we pay them too?

It was Franklin D. Roosevelt's concessions at Teheran that gave Russia nine-tenths of the Balkans.

Having handed so much to the Communists on a silver platter, we now belatedly determine to save the end piece for Great Britain.

We intend to do it by opposing the guerrillas who fought the Germans under British and American orders.

We intend to do it by backing the Greek Army, which, upon Chicago Daily News correspondent George Weller's authority, is heavily spiked with quisling members and officers of the pro-German security battalions. These are the democratic forces which new American loans will arm in their anti-Communist crusade against the mountaineers who fought the Nazis.

Weller also asks why, if President Truman's claim is true that 85 percent of the Greeks support the royalist government, it should cost so much American money for the British-armed five-sixths of the population to annihilate that sixth man.

I do not believe the American people realize the gravity of the step which President Truman has advocated. It is not a question of sending $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey but rather the assertion of our determination to combat the spread of communism everywhere.

If this policy is carried out to its logical conclusion, it will drain our Treasury while destroying any hope that the United States and Russia can ever work together.

Our decision to appropriate the policing functions of the United Nations is a step fraught with such grave potentials that Congress should not be stampeded into giving blanket approval to the President's proposal.

For, as President Theodore Roosevelt once said, "You can't shake your fist and then shake your finger."

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on Labor in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address which I recently delivered over a number of Wisconsin radio stations on the subject of labor in the atomic age.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN LABOR PROGRAM FOR THE ATOMIC AGE

Fellow Americans, I am very grateful to this station for the opportunity to chat with you on the important subject of labor.

As you know, Congress right now has many labor bills pending before it. I am not a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which has been holding hearings on these bills, but I have, of course, followed the hearings closely. Every public opinion poll shows that our people are following this subject closely, too, because they have given a mandate to Congress to enact constructive labor laws. Those laws must set aright the system of checks and balances in our land which has been damaged by various racketeering abuses.

WISCONSIN'S GREAT LABOR POSSIBILITY

Our own State is deeply concerned about the labor problem, particularly because of certain long-standing strikes that have marred Wisconsin's model industrial peace.

We of the Badger State are, of course, looking forward to our 1948 centennial, to the completion of Wisconsin's first hundred years of statehood, and to all that it promises to labor, to management, and to the public.

We see no reason whatsoever why Wisconsin's next 100 years should not have such industrial peace and productivity as will surpass the finest records of our own and every other State. We want new and expanded industries in the Badger State in the coming period. Through labor peace, we can attract these industries and hold them, and thus achieve new heights of prosperity for all.

ATOMIC AGE POSSIBILITIES

America as a whole in this atomic age wants first and foremost to preserve the Republic. She wants industrial peace and full production for her 58,000,000 workers. She doesn't want a needless depression to occur—a depression from which the Communists alone will profit. All of us want to break out of the rut of the past, the rut of strikes, the rut of labor and management pulling at cross-purposes.

We want an ever higher standard of living for American workers—thicker pay envelopes that will buy more and better goods; we want better housing for our workers and better and safer working conditions. We know that in this atomic age new unheard-of luxuries and comforts are possible for every worker, as well as for every employer, if we but have the vision to secure them—the vision and the cooperation and the strength to take appropriate action.

THE DIGNITY OF LABOR

Labor is entitled to the fruits of the miracles of the atomic age. Yes; to the fruits of its toil. Labor is dignity. "To labor is to pray," reads an old proverb. "Honor lies in honest toil," said Grover Cleveland. "To rejoice in one's labor; this is the gift of God," says the Bible.

How may labor achieve its full dignity? How may we realize the full possibilities of labor in the atomic age?

I am going to make certain suggestions in answer to those questions—suggestions on what America needs. These suggestions are not necessarily complete in themselves, because this subject is a vast one. My listeners will undoubtedly have their own suggestions, and, together, we may arrive at a real solution to our problems.

Remember, we are all workers—we are all one class—Americans. Whether we be called farm hands or mill hands or retailers or salesmen or Congressmen, we earn our bread by the sweat of our brow, and all we ask for is justice in earning our daily bread.

Well, then, in the light of these facts let's first see what America does not need.

AMERICA DOESN'T NEED THESE ITEMS

1. We don't need any foreign "isms" or ideologies in the picture. That means we don't need the phony solutions of communism or fascism. We don't need and don't want their provocation and incitement, their alien spirit of hatred, their venom in setting class against class, race against race.

2. We don't need name calling, bitter prejudices and anger. We need a calm, reasonable, peaceful approach to our problem.

3. We don't need segmented thinking—the sort of thinking that is concerned only about the welfare of one segment of our population. We've got to think about all segments—about the public interest—most of all, the interest of 140,000,000 Americans—labor, management, farmer, housewives—all of us.

4. We don't need backward thinking that would try to make us turn back the clock to the days before there were unions—before there was collective bargaining. Unions and collective bargaining are here to stay, but collective bargaining must become a two-way street. Union busting and antiunionism are not American any more than management busting or antimanagement are American.

WHAT AMERICA NEEDS—IN PRINCIPLE

Well, if this is what America does not need, what does she need? You can summarize what she needs in these few words:

(A) The rule of law—not the rule of racketeering or of violence.

(B) The rule of democracy—not the rule of labor-boss dictatorship or management dictatorship.

(C) The rule of equality—not the rule of inequality of treatment of either labor or management.

(D) The rule of the public welfare—not the rule of special interest.

(E) The rule of self-help—not reliance on Washington, D. C., to legislate the millennium in labor relations.

WHAT AMERICA NEEDS—IN SPECIFIC ACTION

Now, these are just five principles, and they are useless unless we apply them. Let's do just that. Let's list the specific concrete actions which every one of us—labor, management, Congress—must take to realize the fine possibilities of the atomic age.

Here we go:

1. Labor must take steps to clean up its own house. This is labor's most important job—to do for its own good and the good of the Republic. This self-help, this self-reliance can be as important to labor as anything else Congress can do.

Labor must purge itself of the Communist cells and Communist leadership that has taken over so many unions. Labor must eliminate its racketeers—the vermin who want to play the industrial game only for their own profit and only their own way—breaking all rules. Labor must oust the bosses who control crooked union elections. Labor must take an interest in union affairs; it must not cast ballots for union officers who are America-breaking, who do not respect the rights of the public.

2. The primary action for cleansing unions must come from labor itself, but Congress can help by passing legislation to insure secret union elections and for publicizing of union finances.

3. The abuses of the closed shop should be outlawed. We should protect every American's constitutional freedom to work wherever he pleases and under what conditions he pleases, in a union or outside a union. Many folks object, as I do, to a poll-tax on voting which prevents a man from balloting if he doesn't pay a certain fee. These folks say such a tax is unconstitutional. Isn't it then, unconstitutional if a man is required to join a union and pay what the union says in order to get his job and hold his job?

4. Mass picketing, violence at the plant gate and within a plant, threats or other strong-arm tactics must be outlawed.

5. Slow-downs and other limitations on production must be barred.

6. Bona fide supervisory employees are members of management and should therefore not be organized into unions, lest the conflicting loyalties of these foremen between labor and management ruin their effectiveness.

7. Unions should be made liable for damages if they break contracts just as businesses are liable.

8. Jurisdictional strikes between unions should be outlawed, as well as secondary boycotts. In these actions, one union boycotts an employer simply because his products are in part made from or use another union's materials.

9. No union should be allowed to impose a tax levy or royalty on an employer's products. This infringes on the taxing power of the State, it increases cost of the products, impedes commerce and forces private, unregulated monopoly.

10. Employers should be given the right of free speech under the National Labor Relations Act. They should be given the right to petition for union elections just as unions have that right.

11. Machinery for conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration should be strengthened so that collective bargaining can settle disputes peacefully.

12. Where all other efforts fail and wherever the public interest is threatened by a proposed strike in a public utility like electricity, transportation, telephone, gas, or a key Nation-wide industry like coal or steel, Congress should set up means for compulsory arbitration of disputes. This means that the settlement of the dispute should be made by an impartial arbitrator or board of arbitrators which would hand down the decision which would then be binding on both management and labor. Strikes in utilities and key Nation-wide industries must be outlawed. The public welfare must be protected.

13. Congress, labor, and management should take steps to promote industrial safety. Factory accidents last year cost over 16,000 lives and countless more losses of limbs and of working time.

14. Congress should stimulate profit-sharing plans in industry—employees' bonuses and other incentives to encourage full production.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

These are but 14 points. Many more could be added. Their total goal is the same:

To give the laboring man a break.

To give management a break.

Most of all, to give the public a break, so that America can have full production and industrial peace. With full production, the supply of goods can be increased, and when that happens, when supply catches up with demand, the high cost of living will come down.

Production means work, honest work, effective work. There is nothing wrong with this Nation that honest work can't cure.

CONCLUSIONS

Fellow Americans, we have seen the splendid possibilities confronting Wisconsin and America in this atomic age, possibilities for prosperity and an unmatched high standard of living.

We have seen what America does not need to solve her labor problems, and what she does need, generally and specifically, actions for the rule of law, for democracy, for equality, for the public welfare, for self-help.

We have seen that labor must, most important of all, cleanse its own house of Communists, subversive alien-minded saboteurs who almost wrecked American defense before Russia got in the war. And labor must cleanse its house of racketeers and dictatorial bosses. Congress, management, and the public must do their part, too, as partners of labor in understanding labor and helping the Nation to achieve industrial harmony and full production.

Work is the answer to our problems in the atomic age or any other age. There is nothing wrong with America that work and understanding won't cure.

Aid to Greece and Turkey—Interview With Hon. Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an interview over the radio, Station WNAC, Boston, and the Yankee network, by Francis W. Tully, Jr., with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] concerning the President's recent message. It is an excellent interview; it is sound common sense and I think it should be in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. TULLY. Senator FLANDERS, the plan to aid Greece and Turkey represents a major departure from our previous foreign policy. What is your reaction to President Truman's message to Congress?

Senator FLANDERS. I am sure that in some respects the feelings of all of us in listening to the President's message were the same. We realized the gravity of the situation. We realized that unless something was done in Greece and Turkey, chaos and subsequent totalitarianism would continue to spread westward and southward over the world from its European center in eastern Europe.

Mr. TULLY. Are you in favor of the President's recommendations?

Senator FLANDERS. I favor the granting of that request simply because it seems the only thing to be done at a moment when something needs to be done quickly. However, this sudden revelation to us of an emergency indicates one of two things: Either the administration has been off its guard without realizing what has been going on in the world and without any coordinated plan for meeting it; or, its plans have been insufficient or otherwise ill-advised and their failure has required a sudden change of strategy. The time has come when our total foreign interests must be studied as a whole. The extent of our commitments must be studied as a whole. An economy of effort, of expenditure, and of responsibility must be determined upon, not only for the sake of maintaining our internal strength but also for the sake of giving us the maximum of long-range influence in the maintenance of the peace of the world.

Mr. TULLY. The President emphasized in his message that he recommends aid to Greece and Turkey as a means of preventing the spread of totalitarian ideologies. The President made it clear he referred to the spread of communism. Do you agree to that motive?

Senator FLANDERS. I agree with that motive. The nations of central Europe were cynically and cold-bloodedly sold down the river so far as the four freedoms were concerned. It is clearly apparent that the enunciation of these four freedoms was for propaganda purposes only. From the standpoint of our own self-respect, we must make an endeavor to support them in the regions which we have betrayed. This is a moral responsibility, but it fits in with our self-interest as well. We cannot be prosperous and at peace for long in a world in which totalitarianism is spreading.

Mr. TULLY. Do you feel that this is the right way to prevent the spread of communism?

Senator FLANDERS. The proposed action is a temporary means of meeting a critical situation. We must not fool ourselves into believing that it is anything more. Fundamental means of protection must be devised.

Mr. TULLY. We have made a number of commitments for the shipment of goods to Russia. Do you think these promises should be kept by the United States?

Senator FLANDERS. This question raises a second one: Has Russia kept the promises she made in the Yalta and Potsdam agreements? There is no question about the answer. The answer is "No." Meanwhile, the people of this country are deeply concerned over the punctilious way in which we are fulfilling in time of peace our lend-lease agreements to Russia, made under the stress of war. It is incredibly foolish of us to continue the practice. In so doing we are throwing away the immediate means, which lie ready at hand, to compel Russia to do what she has promised. We have no moral responsibility whatever for meeting one side of a group of agreements which must be considered in the light of mutual responsibilities. Feeling as strongly about this as I do, I introduced into the Senate on Friday a joint resolution, which reads as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no further shipments of goods to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, whether by private sale or pursuant to agreements made with that country by the United States, be permitted until that country has fulfilled the commitments made by it under the Yalta and Potsdam agreements."

Mr. TULLY. Specifically, Senator, what controls do you think should be placed in effect against Russia?

Senator FLANDERS. Our present means of bargaining are economic. They are the persuasive arguments which we bring to the council table in requiring of Russia that she keep her agreements and become a willing and cooperative member of the United Nations. Whenever and wherever there is an economic need of Russia's which we can fill, it must be made contingent on her continuing wholehearted cooperation.

Mr. TULLY. In your opinion, Senator FLANDERS, would it be better to build up the economy of Greece and Turkey than to build up their armies?

Senator FLANDERS. The ultimate defense of Greece and Turkey against that particular type of totalitarianism which we call communism does not lie in armies or in any other form of military force which we can bring to bear in their defense. It is unfortunate that in Greece, particularly, armed Communist bands have driven the peasants from their land so that they cannot plant and harvest crops, or protect and feed their flocks and herds. That minimum of armed force required for protecting the food raisers of the country is therefore essential. With this essential taken care of, Greece can, by its own efforts, work its way back to economic self-sufficiency, thereby raising the best defense possible against the spread of communism. I suppose the situation in Turkey is rather more simple. I would expect that the principal danger in that area would come only if Greece collapsed.

Mr. TULLY. Some Members of Congress have been puzzled by the wording of the President's message, in that part which applies to sending military personnel into Greece and Turkey. Do you think he asked for authority just to send military staffs and technical personnel, or whether the request actually includes the authority to send troops?

Senator FLANDERS. I suppose that the President may want to send a few thousands of men and officers, primarily officers both commissioned and noncommissioned. If we have to send a real army, we shall have failed in what we undertook.

Mr. TULLY. Senator FLANDERS, you mentioned earlier that you feel very strongly that the questions of aid to Greece and Turkey are only a part of the entire picture involving our foreign policy. What other matters do you think should be considered along with these questions?

Senator FLANDERS. It seems very clear to me that we have become involved in this whole complicated situation, because the United Nations is not yet prepared to take over a situation of this sort. This must give us serious concern and lead us to consider what the remedies may be.

As one means toward persuading Russia to cooperate, I have suggested our use of economic sanctions. There are other possibilities besides, which should be thoroughly explored.

For instance, why should we not form within the boundaries of the United Nations a group of the free nations? We cannot use the word democratic nations nor can we use the word democracies, because the totalitarian powers have debased the currency of those ancient and honorable words. The impression of the coin remains, but the gold of its meaning has been extracted and worthless metal substituted therefor.

When we speak of a group of free nations, we mean the nations devoted to the principle of rule by the majority, as expressed in free elections. Such a group, working together in the United Nations, can first dramatize the purpose for which the nations were banded together, for international peace can be sought only along those lines. Secondly, such a group would express by its very existence its unalterable opposition to the political principles for which communism now stands, as distinguished from its economic doctrines. There need never be any doubt on the part of Russia as to these principles, or as to their application to any given situation. Beating about the bush would be ended. Open positions would be openly maintained.

A more perfect union of the free nations would thus develop within the United Nations, and entrance to that group would be freely offered with the hope and expectation that it would eventually embrace all the signatory powers.

The Soviet Union has certain understandable aspirations with which we are in sympathy. Those aspirations can be met with the Soviet Union as a cooperative member of the United Nations. They can be met in no other way. Her cooperation should be made easy. We should invite and entice as well as coerce. Only thus can the ultimate best interests of the people of Russia, itself, be served—as well as the best interests of our own country and the rest of the world.

The Sugar Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wheeling News-Register of February 7, 1947, entitled "Our Sugar Supply."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR SUGAR SUPPLY

The estimated Cuban sugar crop for 1947-48 is 5,500,000 tons. This is an increase of some 1,500,000 tons over last year. A House food investigation subcommittee "insists" that the United States take this entire increase for itself. That would give us 3,300,000 tons, and leave 2,200,000 for the other 26 nations in the international sugar pool for whom we buy in Cuba.

This would add 15 pounds to our per capita domestic quota, bringing it up to 40 pounds. Industrial users would get a 33⅓-percent boost in their allocations. And what about the rest of the world?

Representative AUGUST ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, the subcommittee chairman, says that this windfall of sugar to the United States would be offset by an estimated increase of 1,183,000 tons in European production. But he admits that European consumption would still be below ours.

That is undoubtedly true. Europeans will enjoy an estimated increase of a little over a million tons, as against the 1,500,000 which we plan to take for ourselves from Cuba.

Let's see how the various countries fared for sugar last year. The round per capita figures for both home and industrial use show that the United States had 74 pounds; Canada and the United Kingdom, 81 pounds; France, 38; Norway and Belgium, 44; the Netherlands, 51; Switzerland, 41; Finland, 20; Spain, 10; and Germany, 12. Albania, Austria, Greece, Italy and Yugoslavia, lumped together under UNRRA, average out 10 pounds apiece.

So the United States, besides eating better than any of the countries listed, had more sugar than most of them. Only Britain had a large consumption than we, but the rest of her diet was of wartime austerity.

We don't know how many Americans will agree with the sugar refiner who told the subcommittee that this country has been "a mighty good neighbor" and that "we should look to ourselves now." But the whole business seems a little cold-blooded to us, if not downright greedy.

Nowhere in all the debate on the subject could we find any indication of reluctance or compassion. Nobody said anything about millions of sugar-hungry—and blameless—youngsters in Europe. Rather more typical were these remarks, made on the floor of the House by Representative JOHN JENNINGS, of Tennessee.

"Who is it that will comply with that demand of this international set-up that we should take sugar from our people and send it to countries that have not been any too friendly to us within recent months?"

We keep remembering the glowing words about gallant France, gallant Belgium, gallant Norway, that have resounded through the halls of Congress. We keep recalling the expressions of pity and admiration that their citizens evoked from our Congressmen.

But that was back in the days when these gallant people were fighting for their existence, not threatening to rob us of an extra spoon of sugar for our coffee.

Congress Puts an End to Speed of Rubber-Stamp Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

entitled "Congress Puts an End to Speed of Rubber-Stamp Era" delivered by me on March 9, 1947, and broadcast from radio station WIBW at Topeka, Kans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few days ago I received a letter from some fine Kansas women living in Wichita.

This letter sums up several hundred letters I have received in the past weeks. It might be termed a cross section of American home thinking in relation to what home folks believe this Congress should be doing.

I believe I will read to you from this letter, from which I quote as follows:

"We have been watching the Eightieth Congress and are afraid they are not fulfilling their campaign promises as promptly as they should.

"It seems our Kansas men are trying to back these promises and hope they remain loyal to their pledges."

DISCRIMINATION IN THINKING

One little thing which interested me is that these women referred to the "Eightieth Congress."

That reference to the Eightieth Congress to me is very significant. Letter writers used to refer just to the Congress. There was little distinction in public thinking between one Congress and another.

But today an increasing number of Americans distinguish between one Congress—with its life of 2 years—and a succeeding Congress.

A little thing, perhaps, but a hopeful indication that the average citizen is becoming more discriminating, even as he becomes more critical of his Government.

In the same sentence the eight women from Wichita express the fear that the Members of the Eightieth Congress are not fulfilling their campaign promises as promptly—"promptly" is the word used—as they should.

Well, let me say a few words about that.

In the first place, as sensed by the writers of this letter, this Eightieth Congress is distinctly and decidedly different from the five or six—let's make it seven—Congresses immediately preceding the eightieth.

To my mind, it is closer to a free Congress than any which has convened since—well at any time since 1932.

What I mean is just this, and I believe if you look back over the past decade and a half you will admit there is some justification for the statement.

Starting with the Seventy-third Congress, which met in 1933, the Congresses have been more or less agents for carrying out the policies and programs of the Chief Executive.

The man in the street's name for it has been "rubber stamp" Congresses.

DEMAND WAS FOR SPEED AND ACTION

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt came into power on a wave of popular feeling that "something ought to be done." And it ought to be done fast. The country faced an emergency, a crisis.

Government should not deliberate. Congress should act. That was the popular will in 1933.

The country demanded action in 1933—and the country got action.

The country demanded speed in 1933—and the country got speed.

Manifestly, one man can make up his own mind and reach decisions more quickly than can majorities of the 96-Member Senate and the 435-Member House of Representatives.

This is especially true if the one man is inclined to act on impulse; likes to grab an idea on the run and try it out, without risking a headache by trying to think the whole thing through.

So the country got action from its Congresses in the thirties. The White House would send a message to Capitol Hill, recommending a certain line of action.

If the particular crisis was felt by the White House to be supercritically critical, a proposed bill might accompany the message and the matter was labeled "must."

SPEED PREVENTS STUDY AND SCRUTINY

A "must" message, either accompanied or unaccompanied by the bill proposed to be enacted into law, was supposed to—and frequently did—go through Congress almost with the speed of light in the early and middle thirties.

I sometimes felt then, and feel it more strongly now, that programs, which it was feared might not be accepted entirely (or at all) if carefully scrutinized and their aftereffects studied, were labeled "must" just to prevent careful scrutiny and study.

During the first 4 years of the rule of the late President Roosevelt, what I have just outlined was the order of the day. Speed. Speed. Action. Action.

I can remember the time when a Texas Congressman, Maury Maverick, listened to the first few paragraphs of a Presidential message—one of those not accompanied by a bill drafted in the executive department.

This Congressman, in his enthusiasm and his desire for prompt action, obtained a copy of the message, scratched out the introductory clauses, substituted an enacting clause (Be it enacted and so forth), and introduced that as a legislative bill. This was referred to committee, reported out promptly, and passed both Houses, with only such changes in wording as would have informed laymen as well as attorneys that the measure was a recommendation instead of a carefully drawn legal enactment of a legislative body.

That was the hey-dey of prompt congressional action. The "must" type of legislation, which earned for Congresses the derisive term of "rubber-stamp," characterized legislation enacted in 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, particularly. It accounts for the loosely drawn Wagner Act, which allowed the administrators and the courts virtually to write their own labor legislation ever since—or at least until last November 5. Since that date the National Labor Relations Board has shown signs of getting back to the intent of Congress in accepting the White House-written (labor dictated) Wagner Act.

CONGRESS PUT BRAKES ON COURT PACKING

Congress began putting on the brakes in 1937, when the so-called Court-packing bill came up from the White House.

Because the then Supreme Court had not caught the urge to rubber stamp everything that came from the White House, and even went so far as to declare some of the hastily drawn and promptly enacted pieces of legislation unconstitutional, the White House demanded that the Congress allow the President to pack the Court by appointing 16 new Justices, making a total of 25 instead of 9.

The country was shocked into understanding by the Court-packing bill. Congress responded to the shock by refusing to pass the measure.

Then, through 1937, 1938, and into 1939, the Seventy-fifth and the Seventy-sixth Congresses started the return to orderly legislation. Committees studied bills, scrutinized the language, amended bills. Measures were argued and debated and amended on the floors of the two Houses. Preponderant New Deal majorities obtained the enactment of most legislation from the White House, but at least Congress did consider and deliberate instead of passing promptly whatever was suggested.

Then, in 1939, World War II broke. The Executive regained, largely, control of the Congresses through the war period, and promptitude, action, speed again became the order of the day.

During these 14 years of the Seventy-third to the Seventy-ninth Congresses, with exception of the little more than 2 years noted—the people of the United States virtually had one-man rule instead of representative government.

The period was marked by prompt, decisive, speedy action on almost all matters.

SPEED BROUGHT UNBOUNDED SPENDING

But that speed period also was marked by unbounded extravagance in Government. Maybe you remember it—spend and elect and borrow and spend and elect.

That period also was marked by the development of an immense and complicated maze of bureaus, bureaucracy, and bureaucrats.

During that period the public debt was run up from around $20,000,000,000 to $260,000,000,000.

At the beginning of the speed period men had to work only a fraction of an hour a day to meet the Federal tax load.

At the end of the speed period—I devoutly hope it is the end—men work 1 day for the Government for every 3 days they work for themselves. And that will go on for a long time to come.

I have gone into this at some length, because of the letter from these fine women from Wichita, voicing the common feeling that the Eightieth Congress is not fulfilling campaign promises as "promptly as they should," to quote the language of this letter.

From lack of time, I cannot read the rest of the letter in full. But these women of Wichita want economy in Government; they want labor legislation; they want the Army and Navy expenditures reduced toward peacetime sizes; they want to get rid of remaining rent and other controls.

Well, the Eightieth Congress is working along all those lines.

EIGHTIETH IS NOT A "RUBBER-STAMP" CONGRESS

But please remember this is a new Congress. It is not a rubber-stamp Congress. It is not following the dictates of one man outside of Congress, nor of any one man or any small group of leaders in Congress.

Appropriation committees, through subcommittees, are trying to do an intelligent and reasonable job of reducing expenditures.

Senate and House Labor committees are going to bring out labor legislation. The Wagner Act is going to be amended, but only after full and complete hearings and very careful study of the whole subject, and careful scrutiny of the language so that it cannot be too easily misinterpreted by administrators and courts.

Also the Congress is trying to write labor legislation that will be fair to labor, to management, and to the public.

I am confident that this way of considering and enacting legislation will get better results than the "speed" method of O. K.'ing, almost sight unseen, whatever is presented to the Congress for consideration.

So have patience, my friends, and give the Eightieth Congress a chance to function as a legislative body should function in a free, representative government. Measure it by results at the close of the session, rather than by "speed" at the start.

Gentlemen of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the

following editorial from the Pike County (Ill.) Republican:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS

If some foreign invader should attempt to wrest 110,000 acres of Illinois' most fertile land from the Commonwealth, there would be combative action, swift and definite, regardless of cost.

An invader—the Mississippi River—is doing this very thing in the case of the Sny Basin, a marvelous fertile tract of 110,000 acres lying in the counties of Adams, Pike, and Calhoun in western Illinois.

The water level has been raised in this great valley, presumably by dams placed by Government in the Mississippi River pursuant to plans for a deep waterway. Seepage has become a problem in the valley. Silting and filling of the natural drainage channel of the valley—the Sny—restrains this channel from performance of its former natural functions, and the valley has become subject to floods tumbling down from the uplands through the Sny's tributary creeks. Because of the raising of the Sny's bed and the raising of the river level by the new dams therein, the floodwaters cannot get away to the river into which the Sny empties as rapidly as once they did.

There is a remedy for this situation. The great Sny Valley—today a drowning valley—can be saved.

The valley not only can be saved, but, to quote from the report of the engineers of the War Department (report of R. A. Wheeler, lieutenant general, Chief of Engineers, April 17, 1946), the proposed improvement is "economically justified."

The Pike County (Ill.) Republican is published and circulates on the Sny watershed. The Sny watershed comprises 195 square miles of Mississippi River bottom lands, averaging 5 miles in width, and 547 square miles of uplands. The watershed has a population of 22,780 engaged principally in farming and stock raising. Pittsfield and Barry are the principal towns.

The Sny (formerly a bichannel of the Mississippi) meanders for about 60 miles through the valley from a point below Quincy in Adams County to join the main stream at a point in Calhoun County. It traverses the entire western area of Pike County. The Mississippi River flows are diverted from the Sny at its upper end by the main river levee of the Sny Island levee drainage district.

This newspaper fully approves the economy policy of the Congress. It is thoroughly in sympathy with plans to trim Government spending. It believes every proposition involving Government spending should be viewed critically. It invites a critical consideration of this Sny Basin problem.

The Sny Valley is a drowning valley.

The War Department's engineers, after careful study, have a plan to save the valley. That plan is set forth in the report to the War Department by the Chief of Engineers, to which reference has been made. This is the only plan under consideration. It is this plan or nothing.

The district engineer submitted his findings and recommendations following intensive study of the Sny Basin problem. He found the ratio of costs to benefits to be 1.0 to 1.39. He found that the improvement would reduce the frequency of flood damage to about once in 50 years as against the present ratio of a damaging flood about every 2 years (some valley farmers have had crop losses from floods for the past 4 years in succession). He found that the improvement is economically justified.

The division engineer concurred in the views and recommendations of the district engineer.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurred generally with the reporting officers in the view that the improvement is "economically justified." Chief Engineer's Report, April 17, 1946. The Board recommended the improvement subject to the provisions of local cooperation stipulated by the reporting officers.

The Seventy-ninth Congress in its closing days approved the program of the engineers. The flood-control bill, including an item authorizing this proposed flood protection for the Sny Basin, was enacted July 24, 1946 (Public Law No. 526, 79th Cong.). The authorizing enactment was signed by the President.

We believe that a policy of refusing to appropriate for projects not already started cannot be altogether sound. We believe that urgency and prior investment are important economic factors. In fact, it seems to us quite likely that some projects of great urgency should be started rather than accelerate projects already under way for which the urgency is not as great. In short, is it not fair to assume an economy of public funds in applying such funds only to projects of the greatest urgency?

The desperate status of the Sny Valley may be learned from the reports of the engineers.

The Sny Valley is a drowning valley.

Then, too, Government has an investment in this Sny Valley that in any economic way of thinking should be protected.

Between 1888 and 1913, the United States maintained as an aid to navigation on the Mississippi River, the main stem Sny district levee which was originally constructed by local interests. Since 1940, the United States raised and enlarged this levee which was turned over to local interests for maintenance, and has improved and enlarged other levees in the area. Total costs to the United States have been approximately $1,022,000.—Chief of Engineers Report, April 17, 1946. Local interests have constructed and maintained auxiliary levees, straightened and maintained channels of the Sny and major tributaries below the bluff lines, and constructed sedimentation basins at the mouths of some of the major creeks. Expenditures for this work were reported to the engineers as approximately $3,733,000.

So here in this fertile Sny Valley—a drowning valley for which there is an approved and adequate plan of salvation—there is already a huge public investment. Is this investment to be protected or lost?

It seems to us that an economy-minded Congress cannot fail to sense the economy of this situation.

(NOTE.—This is the second of a series of three editorials designed to acquaint Congress with factual issues involved in the Sny Basin proposal.)

Economic Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Times magazine of February 9, 1947, entitled "The Real Test Is the Economic Peace."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL TEST IS THE ECONOMIC PEACE—WE LED IN MAKING THE POLITICAL PEACE; NOW WE MUST PROMOTE ECONOMIC STABILITY IN ALL NATIONS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The premise of this article is that freedom and prosperity in other parts of the world are essential to our own prosperity and to peace; that idle and hungry men are not the allies of democracy but the instruments of tyranny; that the economic peace is inseparable from the political peace; and that while almost everybody agrees with all this in theory, there is considerable opposition to putting it into practice.

There is opposition to putting it into practice for a number of reasons. The economic peace costs money. Unlike the political peace, it means taking specific actions to abolish or do without the things that lead to war. It means loans to other Nations. It means lower tariffs. It means regulation of practices that restrict international trade. And unfortunately, it also means taking actions which run counter to strong private interests, popular political pledges, and even, in some cases, to national tradition.

The economic peace is, nevertheless, the immediate test of our leadership in world affairs. We own over half the gold, shipping, and industrial capacity of the world. What we do or fail to do with our own economy, therefore, influences most of the Nations of the earth. The premise stated above, consequently, is at least worth considering.

1. Freedom and prosperity elsewhere in the world are essential to our own prosperity and to a stable peace.

The facts of our own expanded economy indicate our increased need for foreign markets. Before the war we exported about 10 percent of all the goods produced in this country and imported only about 6 percent of all the goods we consumed. Even though these exports meant the different between profit and loss in many cases, the idea has been frequently expressed that exports and imports were only a small part of our own economy and that they were comparatively unimportant.

Since the late nineteen thirties, however, under the pressure of the war, the industrial capacity of this country has nearly doubled. Current estimates indicate that particularly our heavy industries are expanded beyond our normal capacity to consume their products. For a while, during the present shortage of consumer goods, we can undoubtedly find sufficient markets at home, but steel production, industrial, transport, automotive, and construction equipment, and machine tool capacity will almost certainly be far greater after the present boom than we can consume at home.

The old 10-percent-export figure, therefore, is no longer valid. Even before the war we were exporting about 15 percent of our total production of industrial machinery, automobiles and farm implements, 52 percent of our refined copper, and about 31 percent of our raw cotton and leaf tobacco. Since the war our need to sell these and many other products has greatly increased.

That is our side of the picture: If we want to keep our people employed we must increase our markets abroad. The other side is that unless other nations are more prosperous than they were before this war, they will neither be able to buy our products nor defend their freedom.

Unfortunately, the economic position of most countries is infinitely worse now than it was in 1939. Before the war their factories had not been smashed and their ability to produce and therefore to sell their products was normal. Now, however, their production is low, their supply of dollars is virtually exhausted and most of their United States securities, which were a source of purchasing power in the Nineteen Twenties and Nineteen Thirties, are gone.

The seriousness of this situation can be determined by looking at the importance of foreign trade to countries like Canada, Britain, the Netherlands and Norway. Even more than we, they depend on world trade. In 1937, for example, Norway spent over 60 percent of its national income for imports and earned over 66 percent of that income through its shipping services and other ex-

ports. Similarly, the Netherlands spent 40 percent of its income in that year on imports and earned 37 percent of that income from exports.

The flow of world trade therefore, which is greatly dependent on the economic foreign policy of the United States, will play a decisive part in the role that these and other high exporting and importing countries like Britain, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, and Australia can play in world commerce and world security.

2. Idle and hungry men are not the allies of democracy but the instruments of tyranny.

It is axiomatic that wherever there are severe shortages of the necessities of life there are strict government controls, and the greater the shortages, the stricter the controls.

When men are idle and hungry they do not sit around comparing the views of Hume, Locke, Voltaire, and Jefferson. They go foraging for food to feed their families; they get it by stealing, if necessary, and to control them Governments tighten controls even on the civil liberties, and this is the end of what we call democracy.

Furthermore, men do not adopt a political and economic system just because it happens to work well somewhere else. What men want everywhere in the world is food, jobs, and freedom. The ideal is to have all three, but, despite many noble exceptions, if they have to choose they tend to take the jobs and the food, even if they have to give up freedom and follow tyrants.

3. The economic peace, therefore, is inseparable from the political peace.

The United States took the lead in forming the United Nations; it also assumed leadership in halting the expansion of Soviet influence. In the United Nations Charter, we said that we were "determined * * * to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war * * *; to reaffirm our faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person * * *; to unite our strength and to maintain international peace and security * * *; to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom * * * and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples * * *."

These commitments are not subject to anybody's veto. We have signed our name to these things. We did not say that we would merely try to deal with an aggressor if he broke loose, provided nobody vetoed our doing so. We said we were determined to establish conditions under which justice could be maintained; we didn't say we would try to promote the economic and social advancement of the American people or the people of the hemisphere, but that we were determined to promote the economic advancement of all peoples.

Therefore, in the Charter of the United Nations itself, ratified by the United States Senate, 89 to 2, and now part of the political jargon of both parties, the economic and the political peace are inescapably joined. The Charter obligates us not only to outlaw war and repel it if it comes but to help remove the economic and social conditions that lead to war.

The Charter, however, is only part of our policy. We do not like to talk about power politics and the balance of power, but, whether we like it or not, we have been engaged ever since the end of the war in a vast battle of power politics designed to restore some kind of balance of power in Europe.

This political struggle with the Russians for a just and stable peace, however, would be meaningless unless it was backed up with economic action. The balance of power was restored roughly along the Stettin-Trieste line not because of the eloquence of James F. Byrnes but because of the power of the United States Army in Germany and in Trieste and the presence of United States naval forces in the area from Trieste to Salonika. In short, we have increased our commitments in the world. And for once we have managed to keep our power in balance with those commitments, but this takes vast appropriations without which our diplomacy would be helpless.

4. Almost everybody agrees with this theory that the economic and political peace are inseparable, but there is considerable opposition to putting it into practice.

Senator HUGH BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, for example, voted to ratify the United Nations Charter, but he sees no connection between this and the administration's trade-agreement program. This program is designed to expand employment, prosperity, and freedom here and abroad, but he calls it a hoax and says that what the people were really voting for last November 5 was to kill this kind of program.

Similarly, Representatives KNUTSON of Minnesota, GEARHART of California, REED of New York, and JENKINS of Ohio, all Republicans on the key Ways and Means Committee, do not oppose our adherence to UN Charter but they are carrying on their fight against lower tariffs and loans to foreign countries.

There has been close consultation between the major parties on the formation of the political aspects of our United Nations policy and the political aspects of our Soviet policy, but there has been very little consultation and absolutely no agreement about the economic field, except perhaps the tactics of opposing the extreme protectionists on the Ways and Means Committee.

The division between the parties on the administration's trade agreements program perhaps overemphasizes the difficulties of reaching an American foreign economic policy, but the voting record on this and other foreign economic matters is certainly not reassuring to those who want to see a bipartisan policy in substance as well as in name.

A majority of Republicans voted for several important international economic proposals in the Seventy-ninth Congress. More than half of them approved in both Houses the extension of lend-lease; the appropriations for UNRRA, and United States participation in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Bank and Fund. But occasionally they wavered on some aspects of these.

The voting records on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act in 1945 indicate that while it is popular to say that the tariff is a local rather than a partisan issue, the Republicans on the whole had swung against the act, whereas the Democrats were still for it.

In May of 1943 the Republicans voted in favor of extending the Trade Agreements Act, 18 to 14, in the Senate and 145 of them voted for it and only 52 Republicans were opposed in the House. This was before the bipartisan cooperation on the UN was working effectively.

In 1945, however, after the Republicans and Democrats were working together to secure a bipartisan policy on certain political questions, 15 Republicans in the Senate voted for extending the act to 1948, and 16 of them were against it; in the House only 33 Republicans were for extending it and 140 of them were opposed.

At the present time, admittedly, there is no great flow of goods being held out of the United States by high tariffs. Also, for the time being, it is true that we do not know how the last tariff cuts are going to operate in a more normal world commercial market. But the nations of the world are now trying to buy our goods and they are making up their minds about the commercial policies we are going to pursue in the future.

Any attempt, therefore, at this time to oppose a move by the Truman administration toward freer world trade through reduction of tariffs and creation of an international trade organization would probably be followed by an extension of rigid bilateral trading agreements on the part of other countries. And it would, at the same time, undoubtedly be interpreted as a crippling break in the attempt to form a bipartisan American foreign policy.

In a much larger sense, however, this problem is moral before it is political. It is a test not only of the thinking of a handful of influential Senators and Representatives, but a test of our ability as a people to recognize new and important facts that defy old habits and favorite prejudices.

In the past two decades we were confronted in the political field with a problem of equal gravity and we did not pass it. The power and influence of those countries that wanted peace was greater, we saw, than the power and influence of those that wanted war. We were among those who wanted peace, and we were asked to accept the simple idea—which had been approved time and again in our own national history—that we must gather our strength and combine it quickly with those who also desired peace in opposition to those who wanted war.

It is a fact of some historic importance that though we had all the facts necessary to reach a conclusion in our own national interest on that question, we did not combine with the other peace-loving states soon enough to avoid war.

After two wars we have now apparently learned this lesson or at least part of it. We have not yet recognized the full meaning of former Secretary of State Byrnes' statement that "veto or no veto," we were obligated to use our power against any nation that broke the rule of law. We have, however, made unprecedented progress in the field of political responsibility.

The question now is the economic peace, and again a test of our political maturity, not dissimilar to the question of collective security, is before the country. We have already recognized that the question exists by supporting the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, by assisting the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and by granting the British, French, and Italian loans.

But the problem of trade and employment all over the world is much wider than these. We cannot lend our way to a stable world. We cannot for a long time have absolutely free trade any more than we can have absolute national self-sufficiency. But we can lead the way to a much freer exchange of goods; the world cannot achieve this unless we lower our tariffs considerably and go along.

The United States can do many things, but it cannot attain peace if it demands things that lead to war. It cannot be politically international and economically nationalistic. It cannot make customers out of paupers unless it agrees to let them work and sell in return. It cannot demand to export and refuse to import.

It cannot lead the world successfully as the greatest creditor nation if it retains its old debtor mentality. It cannot end military warfare unless it ends economic warfare. It cannot control the new ideas of an atomic age with the tired and shut minds of the Smoot-Hawley age. And it cannot bring the world together unless it can bring the Republicans and Democrats together on a liberal foreign economic policy.

A Constituent's Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a very discerning constituent of mine, W. Bill Williamson, of Phoenix, Ariz., under date of March 12, this year, sent a message to Members of the United States Congress and of the Arizona State Legislature. As a veteran of the First World War and the father of a veteran of the Second World War, and also as a good citizen, Mr. Williamson is keenly interested in all matters affecting our country. As he looks about he sees much of evil in the commercial and social world and is inclined to attribute some of these unsavory conditions to a lack of wisdom on the part of those who make the laws or by those who enforce the laws. Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith submit Mr. Williamson's advice to a wider reading. The item is as follows:

There is one class of citizens in the United States—the common people—who are not receiving very much consideration by our lawmakers and other elected public officials. You are allowing various minority groups to step in and influence you in legislation detrimental to the general welfare of the Nation.

During the war years we put up with rationing, high prices, and restrictions and made many sacrifices to back up our sons on the battlefields. You taxed us to the limit, taking away a good percentage of our wages and salaries, and we bought bonds with what little savings we were able to make. You were not satisfied with this. You allowed the black-marketeers to reap a rich harvest on scarce and rationed items, and paved the way for an army of selfish war profiteers to amass great fortunes. You have failed to prosecute these profiteers, monopolists, and racketeers, blaming the laboring men who want higher wages, for the high prices. You never have considered that unless they receive higher wages, they cannot eat and feed and clothe their families.

If you will make these profiteers and racketeers pay their just share of the taxes, and allow us common people to make enough to live and feed our loved ones, the $300,000,000,000 war debt can be paid, and America will not become bankrupt. Just think. We must pay the Government taxes on everything over $500. How much will $500 buy now?

Veterans are unable to find houses that they can afford to live in. But war millionaires can afford to pay $50 per day in Florida and Arizona winter resorts and 90 cents for a drink of rum, and the monopolies can build large stores and office buildings, hotels, and pleasure resorts. The veteran, with his limited means, cannot obtain a few boards with which to construct a lean-to to shelter his wife and babies.

There is one court greater than even the United States Supreme Court. That is the court of public opinion, and when this court decides an issue, it will have appalling effects on you and the special interests which you have catered to for so many years. You are making a most fertile field for the spread of communism in this country, and you are undermining the very principles of democracy. Please wake up. Please give the proper consideration to the common man and the common woman of America. They are in the majority—and in self-defense—must vote you out of office—unless you get wise to yourself.

Compel the food racketeers and pricemongers to take a fair profit and a fair profit only. Prosecute and punish the war profiteers and all racketeers to the full limit of the law. Investigate the wasteful and unfair tactics of the Veterans' Administration, and all other departments of Government that has become a racket. For heaven's sake, please wake up—before it is too late.

Five-Year Level-Premium Term Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under authority given to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state the purpose of H. R. 1327 which authorizes holders of 5-year level-premium term policies of United States Government life insurance to renew their policies for a fifth 5-year period, and to give my reasons for supporting this legislation.

Over 37,000 World War I veterans are enjoying the protection of the 5-year level-premium term plan. Nearly 13,000 of these policy holders are in their fourth 5-year period and unless authority is granted to renew their policies at the low premium rate, these individuals and their families will not have this necessary protection.

This legislation was introduced at the request of the American Legion and is endorsed by the other veterans' organizations. I believe that these organizations and Congress would be rendering a great additional service to these veterans by continuing this plan of security for these families.

I sincerely urge veterans of both World Wars to convert their Government insurance to ordinary life or to other permanent insurance plans if they can afford the additional expense. In this way they can gain the advantages of cash, loan, and paid-up values in their insurance policies in the future.

However, in order to take care of those veterans who cannot convert their policies at the present time, the Veterans' Administration should be authorized to accept renewals for a fifth 5-year period of term insurance.

Price and Wage Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, to keep the record straight about who did what to OPA, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert, first, the statement of President Truman of November 9, 1946, directing the immediate abandonment of all control over prices except on sugar and rice; and second, the order of the OPA Administrator, effective November 10, 1946, implementing the President's directive—Federal Register, November 14, 1946, page 13464.

These two documents show who removed the controls and why:

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT DIRECTING ABANDONMENT OF PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

The general control over prices and wages is justifiable only so long as it is an effective instrument against inflation. I am convinced that the time has come when these controls can serve no useful purpose. I am, indeed, convinced that their further continuance would do the Nation's economy more harm than good. Accordingly, I have directed the immediate abandonment of all control over wages and salaries and all control over prices except that necessary to implement the rationing and allocation programs of sugar and rice. Rent control, however, must and will be continued.

On October 14, I reported to the people on the subject of the meat shortage and our general stabilization program. In addition to freeing meat from control I directed that the lifting of other controls be accelerated. As a result, controls have been removed from practically all foods and a long list of other commodities.

The Price Administrator has advised me that, with so much of the economy freed from price controls, clinging to the rest would, in his judgment, lead to distortions in production and diversion of goods to an extent far outweighing any benefit that could be achieved.

There is no virtue in control for control's sake. When it becomes apparent that controls are not furthering the purposes of the stabilization laws but would, on the contrary, tend to defeat these purposes, it becomes the duty of the Government to drop the controls.

The major problem with which we have had to contend is the withholding of goods from the market. As price controls are dropped, one by one, many sellers naturally hold on to their goods in the hope that their turn will come next and that they can obtain a higher price. In addition to those who are holding on to goods merely in expectation of decontrol, there are others whose motive is deliberately to force decontrol by depriving consumers of essential goods or manufacturers of essential materials. This withholding is becoming so serious as to threaten key segments of the economy with paralysis.

The real basis of our difficulty is the unworkable price control law which the Congress gave us to administer. The plain truth is that, under this inadequate law, price control has lost the popular support needed to make it work. At best, the administration of price control is an extraordinarily difficult and complex business and it can work successfully only if the people generally give it their support.

We have now reached the point where many of our shortages have disappeared and in many other areas supply is rapidly approaching demand. In the 15 months since VJ-day the stabilization program has preserved a large measure of general economic stability during a period in which explosive forces would otherwise have produced economic disaster. In fact, the situation is far more favorable for the return to a free economy today than it was when the present badly weakened stabilization law was finally enacted by the Congress.

Nevertheless, some shortages remain and some prices will advance sharply when controls are removed. We have, however, already seen what consumer resistance can do to excessive prices. The consumers of America know that if they refuse to pay exorbitant prices, prices will come down. Wholesalers and retailers alike are aware of the danger of accumulating inventories at prices so high that they cannot be confident of reselling at a profit. Manufacturers, thinking of their future markets, will hesitate to raise prices unreasonably. In short, the law of supply and demand operating in the market place will, from now on, serve the people better than would continued regulation of prices by the Government.

The reasons which impel the lifting of price controls are not applicable to rents. Housing is desperately short and will continue to be short for a long time to come. Tenants are in no position to resist extortionate demands. The fixing of rents by the ordinary processes of bargaining would bring hardship and suffering to our people. It may be that some adjustment of rents will be required, but control of rents and control over evictions must be continued.

I wish that it were possible to keep effective price controls on building materials in furtherance of the veterans' emergency housing program, under which we have seen an unprecedented acceleration both of home-building and of the production of building materials. But price control on building materials alone, with no price control on products competing for the same raw materials, would drive these materials away from housing and defeat the objectives of the program. The removal of price ceilings on building materials will obviously necessitate a change in the approach to some of the problems in the housing program. I am asking the Housing Expediter to report to me promptly in this regard. We must continue an aggressive program of building homes and apartments for veterans.

The removal of price controls leaves no basis or necessity for the continuation of wage controls, which have operated, in most industries, only as an adjunct to price controls. Accordingly, I have issued an Executive order terminating all wage and salary controls under the Stabilization Act of 1942. This does not affect, of course, the statutory provision governing changes in terms and conditions of employment in plants operated by the Government pursuant to the War Labor Disputes Act.

I have asked the Bureau of the Budget, in consultation with the agencies involved, to prepare plans for the reduction of operations resulting from today's action, and to devise the most effective and economical methods for administering the functions which remain.

The lifting of price controls and wage controls results in the return to a free market with free collective bargaining. Industry has sought removal of price controls while labor has pressed for removal of control of wages. Both have insisted that removal of these controls would lead to increased production and fewer work stoppages.

High production removes the hazard of inflation and brings prices within the reach of the mass market. Wage rates not justified by labor productivity and prices not justified by manufacturers' costs may bring the illusion of prosperity. In the long run, however, good wages, full employment, and sound business profits must depend upon management and workers cooperating to produce the maximum volume of goods at the lowest possible price.

Today's action places squarely upon management and labor the responsibility for working out agreements for the adjustment of their differences without interruption of production.

ORDER OF OPA ADMINISTRATOR IMPLEMENTING PRESIDENT'S DIRECTIVE TO ABANDON PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

Chapter XI. Office of Price Administration.
Part 1305. Administration (SO 193).

EXEMPTION FROM PRICE CONTROL OF ALL COMMODITIES EXCEPT SUGAR AND RICE

SECTION 1. Commodities exempt. All commodities (including services) are exempt from price control except:

(a) Sugar and sugar solutions derived from sugar cane or sugar beets, including all grades of edible syrups and molasses, and blackstrap molasses (imported and domestic);

(b) Corn syrup and corn sugar (imported and domestic);

(c) Blended syrups (imported and domestic) which contain at least 20 percent by weight or volume of sugar, sugar solution, corn syrup or corn sugar, either singly or in combination; and

(d) Rice, rough and milled (imported and domestic).

SEC. 2. Preservation of records. Records shall be preserved as provided by Supplementary Order 189.

SEC. 3. Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended. This order does not affect the notice requirements of section 1 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, applicable to common carriers and other public utilities.

This Supplementary Order No. 193 shall become effective as of 12:01 a. m. November 10, 1946.

Issued this 12th day of November 1946.

PAUL A. PORTER,
Administrator.

(F. R. Doc. 46-20381; filed, November 13, 1946; 10:46 a. m.)

Bewildered Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with great interest and considerable concern a very interesting and compelling article by Vincent Sheean on the present situation in Italy. In this article, published in yesterday's Washington Post, the author denounces the treatment accorded an impotent nation now fighting to regain its self-respect. In it he accurately portrays the valuable assistance given the Allies, the many sacrifices made by the Italian people following Mussolini's downfall, their present disillusionment, and strongly urges that Italy be justly returned to the community of nations as an essentially western and democratic power, not as part of a world of pan-Slavic collectivism. Mr. Sheean shows how the terms of the peace treaty for Italy deprive her of self-defense, cripple her with debts for reparations to Communist Russia and the Balkans, and cut off over 70 percent of the coal so vital for her industrial life.

Under the permission granted me, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Sheean's entire article as it appeared in yesterday's Washington Post:

ITALY BEWILDERED

(By Vincent Sheean)

Newspaper readers were recently treated to an episode of considerable wry significance when Molotov and Byrnes disagreed about whether or not Italy and Yugoslavia should have motor torpedo boats for shore patrol and similar duties. After some argument it was settled that 6 motor torpedo boats should be allowed to each under the peace treaty.

Six motor torpedo boats. This is what is left to Italy out a total of hundreds—the motor torpedo boat having been a particularly Italian development. The third largest navy in Europe, the finest submarine engines, some of the best of auxiliary craft, all now are reduced to a token force; and the main part of the Italian sea forces have passed into the hands of the Allies, chiefly the British. Of course the disarmament in the air and on the land is just as complete, but somehow the way in which the Italian navy has become war booty for the victors shows more distinctly than any of these other circumstances how the mighty are fallen.

For Italy had in 1939 a formidable sea power which, according to most judges, was very nearly equal to the modern fleet of the French, the second in Europe. This was supported upon the solid basis of a merchant marine which was first in the Mediterranean, and augmented by a program for air and submarine development which promised to bring the Mussolini dream of "Mare Nostrum" to reality. The British, who themselves used Caproni engines in their submarines and who watched the Italian seaplane development with the most anxious care, were well aware of the bid being made for a Roman sea. The French were even more anxious, and their naval building before the war was occasioned more by the rise of Italian seapower than by any threat from the Germans. Now this has all been swept away as the inevitable result of a war in which Italy made herself the accomplice of Germany in a gamble upon the world's future.

Along with the Italian Navy and merchant marine there has been sacrificed the principal Adriatic naval base, Pola, which goes to Yugoslavia under the treaty, and the principal Adriatic port, Trieste, which is internationalized under a schedule that is bound to bring endless trouble. These Italian cities will unquestionably be subjected to an influx of Yugoslav immigration so as to change the ethnic structure of their population, and it may be expected that most Italians of Venezia Giulia will, in fact, take flight. Some 300,000 of such refugees were expected in northern Italy this winter and early spring.

Apparently the United States and England expect Italy to be the front line for western democracy against a world of pan-Slavic collectivism. This idea is implicit in much of what our men of state say in public, as well as in their acts and minor gestures reported every day in the papers. But at the very same time they are stripping Italy of everything. They are depriving her of self-defense, crippling the country with debts for reparations to Russia and the Balkans, drawing a frontier line which is strategically valueless, and cutting off a large part (over 70 percent) of the very little coal which Italy had for its whole industrial life. It is as if you hired a bodyguard and then bound him hand and foot and left him to starve on your doorstep.

The result, it seems to me, is that before very long Italy may pass the mystic line our statesmen have in mind, and instead of being the vanguard of western democracy against pan-Slavic collectivism, may become the vanguard of collectivism itself against the West.

ITALIANS ARE DISILLUSIONED

Certainly there are very few Italians left who believe that any serious help for their unhappy country will come from the United States or Great Britain. Even UNRRA has ceased, and although there is evident a certain preferential treatment for Italy on food supplies, it is by no means enough to make up for all the other calamities that have befallen the peninsula and its inhabitants. The possibility that Italy might fare better in the Soviet bloc is being put forward with insistence not only by the Italian Communist Party but by sections of the Socialists and even by segments on the left in the Christian Democratic Party itself. Some day this argument—which may be specious but is the one to which we drive the Italians by augmenting their despair—may take over even larger elements of the population and the deed will be done.

When we think back to the days when Mussolini reigned in all his bumptious arrogance, the irony of this downfall is keen. Before the war the Italian Government did not even take the trouble to be polite to the governments which now, between them, enforce the conditions of Italy's ruin. Mussolini used to make the American, British, and French ambassadors await his pleasure. He treated successive Russian ambassadors with the most frigid disdain. Aside from a single trip to the Lausanne Peace Conference in 1922, Mussolini never took the trouble to travel abroad to see any of the foreign potentates with whom he dealt. Hitler alone could bring him out of Italy but was always scrupulous to return the visit. When Mussolini wanted to see people like the British and French prime ministers or foreign ministers, he sent for them and they came to Rome.

Now he is dead and his successors amid the ruins of Italy are men who deem themselves lucky if they get half an hour in a hotel room to state their case to some bored representative of a great allied power. These men, almost all of them, were opponents of fascism; some few were professional diplomats who served under fascism and are serving now under whatever government exists. Power, insofar as there is any in an Italian Government, lies in the hands chiefly of the Socialist, Pietro Nenni, and the Christian Democrat (Catholic), Alcide de Gaspari, who have to plead for an audience with the busy western statesmen.

It may be said, of course, that all this is poetic justice, but the trouble with poetic justice is that it usually falls upon the wrong persons. Why should Nenni and de Gaspari, who spent their lives opposing Mussolini, expiate Mussolini's crimes. That is the trouble with all dictatorial regimes: by the violence of their nature they are in the end killed, and their heirs are most often chosen from among their victims.

It is clear that Italy, as an ex-enemy state, cannot enjoy the privileges of states which were always allied; but some allowance ought to be made for the sacrifices which followed Mussolini's downfall. That was almost two full years before the end of the war, and during that time many Italians gave their lives for the allied cause.

ITALY FOUGHT FOR THE ALLIES

The Italian Navy, almost intact, went into Allied service and showed its prowess and skill in many operations. Italian fighter squadrons supported Allied operations, particularly those across the Adriatic in Yugoslavia. There were two Italian squadrons equipped with Macchi 202 which operated consistently that winter in Yugoslavia in support of Marshal Tito, who is now the most ferocious of Italy's enemies.

I was at that time stationed near Bari, an officer in the headquarters of the Tactical Air Force, and from the beginning I was in favor of making public some of the details about how young Italians came to us offering their services. None of this could be released because our Air Force commander, Air Marshal Cunningham, of the RAF, said: "We don't want to make heroes out of the bloody Eyties."

Never shall I forget some of the Italians who flew in to us that winter from all over northern Italy and Greece. They had to steal airplanes from under the noses of the Germans; they had to shoot Germans or sometimes their own comrades to escape; they were wild-eyed and exalted with the sheer tension of their effort. They came to us hoping for aircraft, or to be dropped behind the lines by parachute, or to engage in the most dangerous sabotage and espionage work, and for most of them all we had was the routine transfer to Marshal Badoglio's stagnant and useless headquarters.

SOME JOINED PARTISAN MOVEMENT

There were, of course, thanks to that energetic outfit, the OSS, some Italians who escaped such a fate. One friend of mine, an Italian air force officer who had stagnated with the best of them under Badoglio, was later on transferred to the OSS and jumped far behind the German lines in the mountains of Piedmont. There he organized and commanded a guerrilla operation for almost two whole years, harassing German communications and supplies so successfully that after a year there were two Nazi divisions assigned to the task of holding down that particular province behind Turin in the Italian Alps.

Another Italian who worked for the OSS left Naples that winter in the dress of a Benedictine monk and made his way through Italy with a radio underneath his monkish robe. There were some who used to pass back and forth through the Germans regularly with messages and information. There were some who rescued allied prisoners of war behind the German lines and ran a sort of underground railway for them into our own territory. Aside from all these were the highly organized Partisans (I Partigiani) of northern Italy who carried on warfare against the Germans for two full years and did far more, in the military sense of damage to be enemy, than the French resistance movement ever did. In fact, one of the astonishing things in the whole war story is the ingratitude with which we treated the Italian people for their remarkable effort at guerrilla warfare, under very adverse conditions (especially in the Alps), while at the same time we have wearied the heavens with our praises for the brief and limited help given our enormous invading armies by a handful of young Frenchmen who served in the resistance movement.

This, of course, is in part explained by the American sentimentality about France, and in part by the fact that every resource of the Supreme Allied Headquarters was bent on making the best of French resistance efforts, while the much greater Italian efforts went on through the dreary 2 years without ever being mentioned. The Italian Partisan movement was a military secret while it was going on; it has become out of date since then; and between these two dicta it is still almost unknown to the American public. We retain, as a people, the astonishment we felt on that day when Italy dared to declare war upon us, and the fact that many thousands of Italians went through tremendous dangers and privations to atone for this has not yet reached our national consciousness.

Sometimes I used to wonder why the Italian Partisans fought at all, since by the war's end it had become evident that they were to have no gratitude from us for it and no credit for all they had done. In the spring of 1945, on the eve of the last offensive, I asked a friend in Rome this exact question: Why were the Partisans fighting for us? She was a lady who had much to do with the Partisan organizations, a daughter of the philosopher Croce and wife of an underground leader. "They are not fighting for rewards," she said proudly. "By now they know what your rewards are like: jail and famine. They are fighting merely to regain their own self-respect."

Well, it may be that self-respect returns under conditions of penury, starvation, and impotence. That was the theory of Marshal Petain, for example, who preached purification through suffering. It has been the doctrine of innumerable religious sects throughout the ages, and it is akin to the oriental doctrines by which every incarnation prepares for the next, and the suffering of one life are compensated by the joys of another.

But it has very little natural root in either the conditions or culture of Italy, where this world has ordinarily been taken as quite sufficient for the happiness of man. Along with the love of beauty which is native to Italians, there goes a practical sense of making the most of things, getting all there is to get out of life: with Italian people the fogs of Nordic idealism—purification through suffering among them—are never fully understood. For these and related reasons I do not believe that any penitential attitude will accompany the present sufferings of the Italian people. What they will feel in 1947 is that if the Allies can give them no better than this, then perhaps they would be well advised to try what the Slav collectivists have to offer.

COLLECTIVISM WOULD CHANGE ITALIAN LIFE

What could that conceivably be? Marshal Tito and his followers are by nature anti-Italian, because the clash of Slovene or Croat with the Italians is ancestral. They will, therefore, not wish to be unduly generous. And the cultural level of Yugoslavia being what it is, they are not disposed to any leniency towards Italy because of its vast contribution to civilization.

But if Italy ever turned toward collectivism, a new attitude would come into being, that of class instead of nation, and the ruthless totalitarianism of Tito would force that radical organization of Italian life which the Allies have so far discouraged. Even the Italian collectivists hesitate because they know that this is the hard way, but they may not hesitate forever.

Such are the conditions of Italy as imposed by the peace treaty completed in New York. The ruin of Germany is no doubt more complete, as the power of Germany for good or evil was greater, but in the case of Italy no such war guilt is imputed, no such damage was suffered by the Allies. All along it has been assumed, particularly by the Americans, that Italy was deluded and misled but not wicked. It has further been assumed that after a period of inevitable suffering Italy could return to the community of nations as an essentially western and democratic power. It is these fundamental assumptions that are now thrown into doubt by the edicts of the Waldorf-Astoria Towers, the treaties arbitrarily imposed on an impotent Italy by the Allies.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials relating to communism. The first is one from the Washington Times-

Herald of yesterday morning entitled "Start at Home," by Frank C. Waldrop.

The second is entitled "Fails To Meet Test," from the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., of March 14.

The third is entitled "America's New World Role," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 14.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of March 16, 1947]

START AT HOME

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Mr. Truman has discovered all of a sudden that the Communists of the world are dangerous people, and so they are.

But why is it the Communists are more dangerous in Greece and Turkey than they are in Washington, D. C.?

Here he comes to Congress and asks approximately half a billion dollars to start an anti-Communist program abroad that says to Russia plain as day, "If you want a war, we're ready."

Yet right now, today, this very Sunday, there are on the pay roll of the taxpayers of the United States Communists who are for Russia first, and have been ever since Mr. Truman came to Washington a freshman Senator from Missouri.

In fact they were in Washington long before him.

They came here with his predecessor in the presidency and laughed at Roosevelt as "the Kerensky of our revolution."

They demonstrated their power in the Roosevelt administration right at the start. Who remembers the late Dr. William Wirt, of Gary, Ind. Dr. Wirt was a distinguished and liberal educator of world renown.

He came to Washington to see what the brand new deal was like. He didn't come as a pay-roll patriot but as a plain patriot, wanting to find out what kind of people had risen to power.

That crack about Roosevelt being the Kerensky of the new American revolution wasn't the kind of thing he was used to in American government and having heard it one night at a New Deal dinner he stuck around to find out more.

What he found out was that the Communists and their fellow travelers had at last, with Roosevelt, got themselves into places of power and importance in our Government. So he gave warning.

Did the newspaper editors and college presidents and members of Congress and other such opinion makers take him seriously? Well does this writer remember how for instance the distinguished Baltimore Sun and New York Times gave out gentlemanly haw haws at Dr. Wirt and how college presidents the country over followed up the cue. As for Congress, it was just as guilty as Roosevelt in those days and it deliberately made Dr. Wirt a laughing stock.

He went to his grave a bitter and frustrated man while the editors of the Baltimore Sun and the New York Times and all such noble-minded heavy thinkers continued to say that we must worry about fascism and naziism abroad but as for communism, why it is not a problem and besides to criticize Communists would be Red baiting and who wants to be a Red baiter?

Meanwhile, the Communists climbed aboard the taxpayers' shoulders. They came in via the NYA, the NRA, the PWA, and the WPA, the CCC, the SEC, the FHA, and all the other early alphabetical trojan horses. They have never left.

For when the war came on they simply shifted over to the OWI, the OSS, the OPA, and so forth. They put the President's wife to work for them. They knocked down the barriers then even in the War and Navy Departments. Communists became officers in our armed forces. And in time they showed their power by fomenting riots, rebellions, and mutiny in our forces abroad. Has it been forgotten already how United States soldiers barely a year and a half ago gathered on the front steps of the United States Army headquarters in Frankfurt, Germany, and booed the commanding general, Joseph T. McNarney? All in plain sight of the conquered Germans.

That, citizens, is a thing to think about if you wonder whether Communists have ever got into the Government of the United States in a significant and serious way.

Well, and when OSS, OPA, etc., began to fade, what happened to our Communists on the Government pay roll?

Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, less than 3 weeks ago admitted to a committee of Congress that the reputation of the once great United States State Department has fallen "very low" since the CSS, OWI, etc., crowd had been blanketed into it by the thousands.

For in with the rest went the Communists, their fellow travelers, sympathizers, dupes, dopes, and tools. Such as these were the ones who enmeshed Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in the Hanns Eisler passport case, of which you will be hearing details before very long.

Hanns Eisler, in case you may have forgotten, is the Hollywood musical composer-brother of Gerhard Eisler, now accused by the House Un-American Activities Committee as a leading Russian spy.

The same committee promises a full public hearing on the queer details of Hanns' own story in a few days, and instructive it will be, too, as a lesson in how things were going around here in the Roosevelt heyday.

And the trouble is that Mr. Truman has not brought a substantial change. He is making ferocious talk at the Communists in Greece, Turkey, Germany, and so forth.

It is the kind of talk that brings on war, as anybody who was alive and reading the papers from 1933 onward can realize.

But what is he doing about the Communists on the pay roll of the United States right here in Washington, D. C.? What is he doing today and what was he doing this time a year ago? The Communists certainly are dangerous people, declared enemies of our constitutional government which it is their aim and purpose to overthrow by force and violence.

Why has Mr. Truman tolerated them, then? They were just as dangerous a year ago as they are today and they were just as dangerous 10 years ago. Yet here they are and here they were, all the time.

How about letting the Federal Bureau of Investigation loose on these beauties? J. Edgar Hoover has been an expert on the Communists for 38 years. He knows more about them than any other American and he has the best record against them of any American. And when he speaks he deals in facts, not oratory.

How about Hoover making a series of detailed addresses to the whole Nation on communism while President and Congress listen to a man who knows his business? And then how about following Hoover's outline to kick the Communists out of our own United States of America before we get tangled up in any more bloody affrays abroad?

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of March 14, 1947]

FAILS TO MEET TEST

The Senate should not overlook the fact that President Truman's message urging aid to nations threatened by Russian aggrandizement has a distinct bearing on the nomination of David E. Lilienthal as chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

The implications in the Truman policy are clear and fateful. Its purpose is to call a halt to aggression, direct or indirect, designed to impose upon Greece and Turkey the totalitarian regime that the Soviet Union has imposed on all other countries in that part of the world. If that policy is to be effectual, this country must not relinquish any advantage it now possesses, least of all the advantage inherent in the knowledge and facilities for the production of atomic bombs.

A stiff attitude toward Russia precludes a soft attitude on the atomic energy issue. Mr. Lilienthal has given indications of softness as shown in his plan which omitted some of the essential safeguards embodied in the Baruch proposal. In both the TVA, and in the Atomic Energy Commission which he now heads provisionally, he has revealed an attitude of tolerance or complacency toward Left Wingers who, if not Communists, can be classed as fellow-travelers, and who are alined with the pro-Russian group identified with the PAC and with Henry Wallace.

Mr. Lilienthal's supporters class him as a sincere liberal. But it will not be forgotten that another "sincere liberal," the British Allan Nunn May, was convicted and sentenced for furnishing secret information about the atomic bomb to Russian agents in Canada. Freely confessing he had done so, he defended his action on the ground that Russia deserved to be informed on this matter. There is nothing to show that Mr. Lilienthal agrees with Professor May, but the position he has taken suggests a danger that the personnel of the American Commission, somewhere along the line, may be exposed to Communist infiltration.

This is precisely what happened in the State Department's Division of Far Eastern Affairs. Leftist "liberals" near the top placed in the Department men more leftist than themselves, and these let in genuine subversives working in the interests of the Chinese Communists. An expose of the situation in 1945 resulted in the arrest of Emmanuel S. Larsen on a charge of a conspiracy to violate the espionage statute through the theft of confidential documents. Later Larsen wrote an article in which he said that there had been a well-organized campaign in the Department to shift American Chinese policy to the pro-Soviet line.

Relations between Russia and the United States have reached a critical stage. A salient factor in the situation is the atomic bomb. The chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission not only must be free from pro-Russia leanings, but must be men whose contrary attitude is so well proved that they will inspire public confidence. As matters stand, Mr. Lilienthal does not fully meet that test. There is no dearth of men who can meet it and who are otherwise qualified for the position. Senators who have been favorable toward confirming Mr. Lilienthal should, in the light of the situation created by Mr. Truman's message, recognize the wisdom of refusing consent to his appointment.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of March 14, 1947.]

AMERICA'S NEW WORLD ROLE

The struggle for world power between the United States and Soviet Russia was brought completely into the open Wednesday by President Truman. For more than a year, the two nations have been conducting an unofficial diplomatic war all over the globe. The President's historic address places the United States in this diplomatic war on an official basis.

Henceforth, all peoples whose national integrity is threatened by communistic encroachment—be that encroachment direct or indirect—may look to the United States for aid. Moscow is put on notice that such aid

will be given. Henceforth, its agents may proceed at their own peril.

Mr. Truman's speech is the toughest statement of American foreign policy since the quarantine speech of President Roosevelt of Oct. 5, 1937, at Chicago. It is even tougher, since it is accompanied by specific requests for funds to implement the policy.

Mr. Truman asks for $400,000,000 to invest in Greece and Turkey for the purpose of protecting those nations from falling under the influence of Soviet Russia. When Congress approves the expenditure, it virtually means that the United States has concluded an informal military alliance with Greece and Turkey. It means that any attempt by the Soviet Union to take over the two countries would have to face the full resistance of this Nation.

To meet Soviet aggression, this country has countered with an attack which carries us to Russia's southern threshold. The power that controls Greece and Turkey holds the key to the Middle East and the Mediterranean, with all their immense strategical importance and their valuable oil deposits.

Overnight, almost, the United States becomes heir to the key bastions in the heart of the world held for hundreds of years by the British Empire. It does so, not in a time of tranquillity, but in the midest of a contest for world supremacy between two differing ideologies.

In a famous statement of the issue between Hitlerism and western democracy, Hamilton Fish Armstrong boiled it down to three words, "We or they." The bodies of the men who died in the last war are hardly cold, yet once again it has become a question of "we or they." "We" means the United States, Britain, and all other nations that represent western civilization, or who have come under the influence or protecting arm of that civilization. "They" means Soviet Russia and its satellites.

Mr. Truman says:

"At the present moment in world history, nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one."

He cites not only Greece and Turkey, but Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Of the latter three nations, he says that the United States Government has made frequent protests against their coercion and intimidation. This coercion and intimidation, of course, has been practiced by the Soviet Union.

As to our future attitude toward such practices by the Soviet Union, no language can be clearer than this:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

The language is somewhat qualified by the President's statement that this support "should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes." But the word "primarily," taken with the whole content of the speech, means that the United States Government will go farther, if necessary, to enforce its policy.

Congress may ponder and debate, but President Truman's address has committed the Nation to all-out diplomatic action, just as a declaration of shooting war must necessarily follow when a President asks for it. The honor and prestige of the Nation are at stake and there is no turning back.

Henceforth, this country is up to its ears in international power politics. It will take all our skill and wisdom to fill the new role in the great American tradition. Already, embarrassments appear, since the urgency of circumstance has allied us with the questionable regime of King George Glucksberg of Greece and Dictator Inonu of Turkey. The issue, therefore, is not so simple as Mr. Truman stated it.

The issue is not simply between democracy and communism, because many of the governments with which we now ally ourselves are not democratic. The issue is rather anticommunism versus communism. If we are to fulfill our world destiny in the spirit of George Washington, Tom Paine, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and the other men in whom the genius of America burned brightly, we must seek constantly to make our new world power conform to our philosophy.

No man can tell the outcome of the President's decision. It may be the most brilliant blow for world peace that has ever been struck. It may eventually mean actual war. But one thing is definitely certain, Moscow has been served with an ultimatum which reads: "Thus far and no farther."

Appreciation of Work of Personnel of Essex County and Newark, N. J., Advisory Boards for Registrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the letter enclosing certificate of commendation addressed to the personnel of the Essex County and Newark, N. J., Advisory Boards for Registrants.

This certificate, issued by Samuel J. Kaufman, general secretary, at the direction of the New Jersey State director of the Selective Service System, was presented to 865 members of both of these boards, made up of 350 members from the Newark Advisory Board and 510 members from the Essex County Board for Registrants, plus the officers and directors.

The members of these boards quietly gave advice and help to the thousands of young men who were called for selective service. They advised them as to their rights as well as their duties, and it is only fitting that the State of New Jersey show its appreciation of the work done under Judge Daniel J. Brennan, general chairman of the Newark Advisory Board, and Judge Richard Hartshorne, general chairman of the Essex County Advisory Board. The certificate being presented to the members of these two boards is signed by the President of the United States, the National Director of the Selective Service System, the Governor of the State of New Jersey, and the director of the Selective Service System for the State of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
NEWARK ADVISORY BOARDS
FOR REGISTRANTS,
Newark, N. J.

To the Personnel of the Essex County and Newark Advisory Boards for Registrants:

The advisory boards for registrants authorized under the selective-service regulations was an important cog in the machinery of the Selective Service System. The work performed by the advisory board members was accomplished by private consultation with individual registrants and often was not observed by the general public. Advisory boards functioned largely without due recognition of their efforts. Nevertheless, the part played by you, as a member of an advisory board for registrants, was just as important as that performed by any other individual in the entire Selective Service System. Your conduct in cooperating with the registrant, in advising him as to his rights and obligations under the Selective Service System and the voluntary giving of your time and efforts, greatly aided in placing our State in the foremost position in the Nation with respect to the efficient operation of the system. The credit for our success in aiding in the fight for peace—a sustaining peace—not alone for our own America, but for peace-loving peoples everywhere, is due largely to your efforts.

In behalf of Judge Daniel J. Brennan, general chairman of the Newark Advisory Board for Registrants, and in behalf of Judge Richard Hartshorne, general chairman of the Essex County Advisory Board for Registrants, may we express our sincere gratitude and appreciation for the prompt and efficient manner in which you have performed your duties as a member of this board. You have been indefatigable in your work and have given of your own time, frequently at great personal sacrifice. Your invaluable aid has invoked the good will of all concerned.

We feel a sense of personal loss in the death of those of our loved ones, at home and abroad, who gave their lives that we at home might continue to enjoy life and happiness. Their thoughts were of us and their memory will always be dear to us all.

Please accept the enclosed certificate of commendation in grateful recognition of the aid and support given by you under the Selective Service System. Your acknowledgment of the receipt thereof to the undersigned, as secretary of your board—is respectfully solicited.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL J. KAUFMAN.

FEBRUARY 15, 1947.

For Greek Freedom First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For Greek Freedom First," published in the Chicago Sun of March 13, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR GREEK FREEDOM FIRST

President Truman made a strong case yesterday for the survival of Greece as a free nation, but he did not show that Greece is in fact free. The point is vital as respects both Greece and Turkey. For unless we reserve our aid for free governments which actually represent their people, the course Mr. Truman proposes is indistinguishable from naked imperialism. We cannot accept such a policy with national self-respect and we cannot make it work.

Mr. Truman asked Congress to put up $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey, part of which would be spent to supply and equip their national armies. He asked authority to dispatch civilian and military personnel to supervise use of the funds and instruct the governments in their duties.

Such a far-reaching program means one thing if applied to getting a free people on its feet, and another if designed to bolster reactionary and semi-Fascist governments which hold their people in bondage. In the latter case, we would occupy the indefensible position of supporting any regime so long as it is anti-Russian, and, worse yet, the position of backing ruthless suppression of popular liberties. In such circumstances all our talk of serving the "free democracies" would be reduced to a tragic burlesque.

Not one word did Mr. Truman have to say about attaching any conditions to our proposed assistance that might guarantee the emergence of a genuinely representative government in Greece. He confined himself to the mild comment that we did not approve everything the Greek Government has done. That is like saying fascism is not nice. For this Greek Government whose Army he proposes to prop and strengthen has attracted to its ranks the same contemptible quislings who served the Nazis during the German occupation. Unless there is a wholesale reform of the Government from top to bottom it is a mockery to call it "democratic."

Mr. Truman says the present Government represents 85 percent of the Parliament which was elected last year; but he does not say that those elections were boycotted by most of the Centrist Liberals, the Socialists, and the E. A. M. (Communists and Agrarians). He says that foreign observers pronounced the elections fair; but he does not say that they were preceded by a rightist reign of terror which is still going on and which can only be emboldened by the prospect of unconditional access to American dollars and military support.

If the Greek Government really represents its people, why is it now in peril of collapse unless rescued by us? For 2 years the rightists have been ruling by persecution of the people and with the unstinted aid of British armed might. Yet guerrilla fighting grows more extensive month by month. To attribute this entirely to an armed minority or to outside coercion (evidence of which has not yet been reported by the United Nations commission of investigation), demands proof rather than mere assertion. Mr. Truman did not bother to prove it.

The President's request should not be granted without adequate conditions which assure that we are really helping a free and democratic Greece and not a Fascist Greece. If the British could not impose a rightist government, we shall not be able to do so either short of undisguised military domination. The American people did not fight the war for that kind of imperialism and they will not support such a policy which, if applied to Greece, must logically be applied clear around the world.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Don C. Matchan, appearing in the Valley City (N. Dak.) Times-Record of March 13, 1947, under the heading "Comments."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS

(By Don C. Matchan)

NOW OR NEVER

My heart is heavy on this 13th day of March 1947.

I have a son, only one, whom I had hoped would be able to live out his life on this planet without being dragged into the curse of a total, obliterative, atomic-bacteriological war.

I like children. This feeling is rarely exhibited toward them, perhaps because of a mistaken idea I'm too busy, but often while walking to work during the noon hour, I stand a few moments and look out over the playgrounds at Ritchie School. They are laughing, playing, completely enjoying themselves at games which vary with the seasons. And up the walk they come, little ones, middle-sized ones, and the preadults. Their eyes, particularly the youngest, do not reflect pain nor cares. They look at one with a trustful glance and somehow, the obligations fall heavier upon him who is willing to accept responsibility.

Those children are playing the same games today that they played yesterday. In their eyes is the same innocence and directness of yesterday.

They don't know, they haven't heard what happened yesterday.

Their young minds did not even register an impression when they heard dad or mom talk about a speech that was made in Congress around noon Wednesday, March 12, in the year of our Lord, 1947.

NOT STRANGE

That's not peculiar, either, because neither dad nor mom fully understood the implications of the awful words which fell from the mouth of a man named Truman who is President of these United States.

He talked about two far-away countries called Greece and Turkey; he talked about communism; about free people; about money and soldiers and guns.

And about the only thing dad and mom remember about Greece is that it once had some philosophers named Plato and Aristotle; that once it was a world power and its armies overran the portion of the world which existed many centuries ago; they remember, perhaps, that Greece suffered tortuously during World War II, that its people starved by the thousands after they were overrun by Axis hordes. And perhaps their idea of a Turk is a man with a cloth wrapped around his head with maybe a knife between his teeth; or they may remember vaguely reading 25 years ago about how the Turks annihilated a lot of people called Armenians. But both of those countries are far away from comfortable, safe Valley City, so why worry?

Yes; they heard something, too, about communism. They've heard enough about it by reading the papers and magazines to know they should be afraid of it, wherever it exists in the world. Beyond that they know nothing about it.

And they heard about a large sum of money—$400,000,000—which the President has asked be made available to the Governments of Greece and Turkey. But $400,000,000 is so much money no human being can visualize it, so we just shrug it off as $400,000,000.

And they heard, too, about soldiers and guns to be sent from America to Greece and Turkey if those countries say they need them to fight communism.

Now, perhaps the only thing that dad and mom can understand about the whole speech is that soldiers are men (in the Army, just a number). And soldiers come from families—in this case, American families. And if enough soldiers are needed, perhaps one of them will come from the household in which dad and mom reign supreme.

Dad and mom could understand that all right; mom could, anyway, because she brought Johnnie into this world. She suffered when he suffered, she laughed when he laughed; and he is part of her. And perhaps, just perhaps, she is going to want to know why he should be trundled off on the Northern Pacific's No. 2 for Fort Snelling: destination—the world.

Mr. Truman has given her the reason he says our Government should be able to commandeer American Johnnies. He has not, of course, explained to mom that what he said yesterday, if supported by the Congress, is the start of another world war.

Even Mr. Truman, if he were to stand on the sidewalk in front of Ritchie School and watch the youngsters at play, yes, even Mr. Truman might have difficulty in justifying his position with his inner self. There must be a small voice, deep inside him, asking, "Did you do right?"

A VAST BETRAYAL

A vast betrayal of people, the world over, is currently being enacted. Primary and moving force in this plot to thrust the world into a new and savage conflict is a mere handful of monopolists—and a tiny group of clerics waging a last-ditch battle for survival as a special-privilege class. These groups have determined the policy, the President and Congress are but the political instrument through which they hope to carry it out.

America is about to be cast in the role of successor to imperialist John Bull. Through its spokesman we have served notice on the world that we shall take over where Great Britain left off. Through its imperialist policies Great Britain won the hatred of subjugated people the world over. It appears that that dubious distinction is now about to pass to America.

It is sort of a dual role, perhaps, that we now find ourselves in. Besides acting as stand-in for British imperialism, we also find our leaders astride a large white horse in a crusade against communism. From 1932 to 1945 another leader occupied that white horse, and another nation was attempting to rally the world against communism. That country was Germany. Remember?

HE SAID

In his message to the Congress Mr. Truman said in part:

"Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in this fateful hour, the effect will be far reaching to the west as well as to the east.

"We must take immediate and resolute action."

He stated he is fully aware of the anti-Russian implications which would follow American assistance to Greece and Turkey, but he regards it as more important to permit free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

YES, MR. PRESIDENT

Yes, Mr. President, your decision will have far-reaching effects to the west and the east. It will affect nearly every home in this confused and sick world.

You are aware, you say, of the anti-Russian implications of your decision, but you regard it as more important to permit "free people to work out their destinies in their own way."

There is a contradiction in that statement which cannot escape the most unseeing eye, Mr. President.

Will your proposal actually permit the people of Greece and Turkey to work out their own destinies in their own way? Or will it not, in fact, force them to work out their destinies in your way?

When have the people of Greece been free? When they attempted to work out their destinies in their own way toward the end of World War II, Mr. John Bull stepped into their country with arms and soldiers and forced them to accept the return of an unwanted king; forced down their throats the status quo.

British bankers have long dominated the economic life of Greece. They have been extracting interest rates on loans ranging from 7.75 percent to 16 percent. And when left groups advocated scaling the interest rates to 5 percent, British bankers objected, prevailed upon their government to send British troops into Greece to "stabilize" conditions.

And now, Mr. President, Britain being unable to carry the occupation load longer, you propose to make American boys the goat in this gigantic tug-of-war.

There is one way, and only one way, for the people of Greece to work out their own destinies in their own way. And that is for all nations to adopt a hands-off policy; the same kind of policy which has been proposed by Secretary Marshall for China.

UNDENIABLE TRUTH

Let the record be clear: It is the United States, not the Soviet Union, that now proposes to enter with economic and military might into the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey.

Had Russia announced that her national conscience could not tolerate the treatment of progressive elements in Greece by the British Gestapo, and was therefore planning to send material and military aid to these people, what would have been the reaction in the United States?

You know, Mr. President, you know, Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen. You know that the newspapers would have screamed aggression, imperialism, expansionism. And you know that it would have meant war unless the United States refused to accept the challenge to an invasion of that sort.

But it was not Russia who suggested a $400,000,000 loan to her neighbors; it was not Russia who proposed sending arms and troops to those nations to stabilize conditions. It is the United States of America which is about to take this step. And it is the United States of America that will pay the awful price which this step must ultimately lead to.

WEASEL WORDS

The President stated that in helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom, the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Those are weasel words. The people of Greece and Turkey are not free and independent. They are held between the jaws of an economic-political vice which strangles their opportunity, which denies them the right to think and act as free men.

Why talk about principles of the United Nations in one breath and in the next breath take the unilateral action which the proposed aid to Greece and Turkey actually is?

Self-determination means selection by the people of a nation of the kind of government and economic system they prefer, without interference from the outside. We are in absolute violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter by following the British lion into Greece and Turkey.

WHAT IT MEANS

The whole issue, of course, is greater than Greece and Turkey. It involves a clash of systems. The United States Government (not all of its people, but its rulers) have determined to arbitrarily impose on other people an economic system known as capitalism. In taking this step it is inviting an atomic and bacteriological war. It is saying, in effect, "We will not tolerate socialism."

Monopoly capitalism is issuing the challenge. Monopoly capitalism has announced that it will not even attempt to live on the same globe with socialism. It has not said, "We'll try," it has said, "We won't."

The provocation, let it be understood and repeated, has come from monopoly capitalism. Three times in the past year the spokesman for the world's largest socialist state—Stalin—has said that socialism and capitalism can live together in peace.

This was pointed out clearly by Dr. Harry F. Ward, professor emeritus of Union Theological Seminary, New York, in the February issue of the Witness, an Episcopalian publication. Dr. Ward wrote: "Stalin's recent assertion to Elliott Roosevelt that capitalism and communism can live together is the third time within a year he has said that to foreign questioners. It is not merely his opinion. It is the collective decision of the Polit-Bureau, the Cabinet, and the philosopher's brain trust which is required to hold conferences on national policies before they are decided.

"This policy is based on the view that the inescapable struggle between declining capitalist and rising socialist society can be prevented from developing into more war, as the struggle between the feudal order and the capitalist order could not.

"The condition is that the democratic elements in capitalist society overcome its imperialist tendencies. That is why the Soviet government is supporting democratic forms of state capitalism in liberated countries and not trying to enforce a socialist economy Out of bitter experience Soviet leaders have gained historical perspective."

It may be that Lenin was right when he said the two systems cannot live side by side. But if he is proved correct in his analyses it will simply be because capitalism refused to exert the necessary effort, as revealed in its most recent decision to enter Greece and Turkey with money and guns.

IMPACT LATER

Life goes on as usual in Valley City, in Los Angeles, in New York, and in Atlanta—today. Few realize the portent of the Truman announcement. Its impact is a thing which will be felt in the future.

We are on the threshold of an undeclared war on the people's movement. An offensive has been launched by American imperialists hiding behind the cloak of democracy.

The consequences of the decision, unless it is repudiated by the massed weight of American public opinion will be war.

Monopoly capitalism, by this most recent declaration, has admitted that it cannot win with ideas, so it will try to win with guns.

Oh, that the people could see this thing before it is too late. Oh, that the leaders would thrust the hypocrisy from their thinking and their deeds.

Don't they understand that this thing which they are attempting can lead only to pulverization of civilization?

The Charlie McCarthys of our Government cannot see that all the guns and all the dollars under the canopy of heaven will not stop the surge of progress.

They cannot win. They can roll into the cauldrons of agony and death new millions of people; they can be responsible for the slaughter of half the earth's population, perhaps more. Yet they cannot stop the inexorable sweep of progress. They are attempting to freeze the status quo; it is as futile as it would be to try to stop the earth from circling the sun once in 24 hours.

Why can't they understand this? Why won't they admit to the truth of a phrase in the Declaration of Independence which holds that "all men are created equal"? Why must the children of today be consigned to the whirlpool of oblivion tomorrow?

IS IT TOO LATE?

It is late, too late I'm afraid, to halt the trend toward war. The conspirators own the avenues of information and they will not give the people the truth. Without the truth people cannot, will not, awaken until this monstrous thing is upon them.

But even if the hour is late, we cannot give up. The mails still are being carried, the wires still are operating. An avalanche of mail pouring into congressional offices might yet turn the tide. But it must be an avalanche, a trickle will not do.

If you want peace, if you want freedom, if you want life for yourself and your children and all the children everywhere, then, please God, write those letters now.

It is—now or never!

Italian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am a great believer in fair play and in seeing all sides of a question well covered. In that spirit, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Ratification Without Revision," published in the March 5 issue of the Progresso Italo-Americano. I think it would be well for all of us to consider the editorial in the light of fair play, and from the standpoint of a desire to know all sides of a question.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO RATIFICATION WITHOUT REVISION

The constituent assembly of the Republic of Italy has adopted an earnest plea to the parliaments of the United Nations emphasizing the hardships caused by the projected peace treaty and urging them to sanction its revision. As Americans, proud of our democratic ideals and institutions, we confidently hope that this plea will be given favorable consideration by the Senate when it acts on the proposed Italian settlement. It is our deep-rooted conviction that the best interests of the American people and international justice demand a fundamental revision of the obnoxious and onerous terms.

When the Senate opens its discussion of the proposed treaty for Italy, it will be doing so in an entirely new world situation. The present international situation is profoundly different from the one which prevailed when the Big Four foreign ministers were haggling and quibbling, bartering and bargaining over how much Italy was to lose and how much Russia and her puppet Tito would be permitted to grab from her. The conditions of 1946 are as out of date as the pages of last year's almanac. There has been a kaleidoscopic shift in the international scene. Great Britain, as a major buttress of western civilization and democracy, is no more. Her empire is falling apart fast these days. Burma, Egypt, India, and even Greece and Palestine are no longer firmly in her sphere of domination. Under these circumstances, vastly increased responsibilities have fallen on the shoulders of the United States in the all-important task of preserving democracy against the hammer-blows of Asiatic totalitarianism.

It is in the light of this totally new world situation that the Senate will have to review, re-examine, and sharply revise the now

completely out-dated foreign ministers' draft treaty. Our country needs every friend it can have and hold under the banner of democracy. With England badly weakened, with France living in mortal fear of Communist domination, with Czechoslovakia and the Balkans as prostrate Soviet satellites, the Italian people are potentially the strongest European bulwark of the democratic way of life. This new overriding factor must be given the first consideration by the Senate. It is indeed fortunate for our country and all mankind that the Italian treaty, which now takes on a new significance, will be considered in a better and cleaner atmosphere than the one which prevailed in the horse-trading sessions of the Big Four foreign ministers.

The Senators speaking for the people who have placed them in their high offices will be serving America best if they refuse to ratify any clause or provision of the treaty which violates any pledge made by our Government to the Italian people or disregards the services rendered by the new Italy as a cobelligerent in the war against the Axis. Surely our Senators realize that it is just as necessary to honor pledges in foreign relations as it is to respect them in domestic affairs. The good name and honor of our country and its representatives abroad are as vital to our national welfare as are the good name and honor of our legislative, judiciary, and executive branches of the government at home.

LINES OF REVISION

It is in America's interest that the 46,000,000 Italian people should live as a democracy and thrive as a peaceful nation. It is clearly in the interest of the American people that Italian economy should not be crippled by unbearable reparations like those demanded in the harsh treaty. Especially with central Europe mangled and the Balkans closed to our trade (except for what we will give the Kremlin's puppets for nothing) is the emergence and maintenance of a healthy Italian economy vital to our national prosperity. Certainly an Italy weakened by brutal violations of its territorial integrity (leading to the loss of 40 percent of her already too meager coal reserves) can never be a prosperous Italy and can never be a strong friend and good customer of the United States. An Italy robbed of Trieste and her pre-World War I overseas possessions, completely disarmed and stripped of her fleet which rendered such magnificent services in the common cause, cannot be the strong and worthy ally of America that she sincerely wants to be and really can be in the defense of democracy and peace.

Not only has democratic Italy earned on the field of battle a far better peace, but America's own ideals and interests demand that our Senate demand a revision of the treaty. The American people will, therefore, be counting on the Senate to vote for no ratification without revision of the proposed iniquitous treaty. The points of revision are as clear as they are just and urgent. The territorial integrity of democratic Italy must be preserved in accord with the principles of the Atlantic Charter solemnly proclaimed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on August 14, 1941, and providing that "no territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned" should be made. In line with this pledged policy of our Government, the Senate should insist on Trieste and western Istria remaining under Italian sovereignty. Then, in recognition of General Eisenhower's declaration of November 10, 1943, that "Italy has a new role in the war—that role is to fight the common enemy, Germany," the Senate should so revise the treaty as to prevent any power from grabbing Italy's pre-Fascist colonies, stripping her of her navy, reducing her armed forces to little more than border and home guards, and imposing crushing reparations on her.

On practical as well as moral grounds, on the basis of America's national as well as international needs, the Senate should vote no ratification without basic revision of the Italian treaty, and should insist on a more just and generous treaty for the democratic Republic of Italy. The present draft makes impossible not only Italian recovery but even Italian survival. Let the world's greatest democratic legislative body—the Senate of the United States—give the lead to the parliaments of the United Nations in voting an Italian treaty conducive to international stability, security, peace, and progress.

Sgt. Harold Russell

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of yesterday had a very fine editorial describing Sgt. Harold Russell, of Massachusetts, the double-hand amputee who appears in the moving picture entitled "The Best Years of Our Lives." It is a well-deserved editorial, and Sergeant Russell is to be commended for his courage and the indomitable will he has displayed in becoming adjusted to the loss of his hands and to the use of the two mechanical working hands. He sets an example to everyone in the country in working against heavy odds and making a success of one's life. He is happily married and going on to even greater things, in my opinion. It shows, Mr. Speaker, that we must do more than we have done thus far in perfecting artificial hands and indeed in perfecting all kinds of prosthesis. Massachusetts takes deep pride in Sergeant Russell.

The editorial is as follows:

HAROLD RUSSELL'S "OSCARS"

Olivia De Haviland and Frederic March received well-earned "Oscars" on Thursday evening from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, but it was a new actor, an avowed one-timer, who walked off with the show. Harold Russell got a regular award for his work in the Best Years of Our Lives, as the best supporting actor of the year in the Samuel Goldwyn film, which was adjudged the best motion picture of the year. Then, to make sure, he was given one of two special awards.

Russell was a paratrooper who lost both hands in an accident in line of duty. In The Best Years, which also won acting honors for Mr. March, writing honors for Robert E. Sherwood, editing honors for Daniell Mandell, directing honors for William Wyler, and scoring honors for Hugo Friedhofer, Russell rose to a superb opportunity. He revealed, as none but a crippled veteran could have done, the spiritual agonies and possible triumphs of the mutilated. He illuminated Sherwood's poignant story with his own courage. He did more. In the film and in personal appearances in service hospitals he put courage into other afflicted men. Finally, he turned out to be a gifted actor. That alone would have justified the awards.

At the moment he is studying advertising and does not plan to go on with a motion-picture career. But for the rest of their lives, the best years and the others, those who saw him in this screen play will remember him. He will represent in their minds a protest against the indignities of war. He will stand also for the valor which has its place in time of peace. May success and happiness follow him.

Report From Athens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article that appeared in the New Republic, written by Constantine Poulos entitled "Report From Athens":

REPORT FROM ATHENS

(By Constantine Poulos)

MARCH 9.—The description of the economic situation of Greece which the Greek Government presented in its note appealing for United States assistance is true. What the Greek Government neglected to mention (and what the State Department in its magnanimous announcement apparently ignored) is that conditions are almost wholly its own fault.

With but brief exceptions, the same crowd of people has been governing Greece for the past 2 years. Their identification with privileged industrial banking and commercial circles—vested interests in the truest form—has been so close and tight that they cannot possibly take the measures necessary for economic or political stabilization of the country without committing suicide.

Since the liberation of Greece, over $850,000,000 worth of goods (including UNRRA supplies) have been brought into the country. Yet Greece's economy is worse off today than before. Thanks to UNRRA, the food situation is an exception.

The government crowd has revealed a remarkable unwillingness and inability to proceed with the country's rehabilitation. It has refused to slap on an effective tax system and today is collecting only 10 percent of what it should, even under the extremely inequitable regressive system in operation.

Recently the United States turned over 100 Liberty ships to the Greek merchant service, the Greek Government guaranteeing three-fourths of the purchase price. It was learned here last week that the Government intends to place a pitiful 15-percent tax on the yearly net profit of each ship up to $100,000 and no tax on any profits over that figure. The United States Maritime Commission conservatively estimates that these Liberty ships, operated under Greek sailing conditions, will net at least $200,000 a year for private owners.

LUXURIES ENCOURAGED

The regime has refused to clamp down on loose inflationary credit policies, which permit extension of credit to those who need it least, and has failed to check on the productive use of that credit. Last year the wool manufacturers forced the Government to lower its prices on UNRRA raw stock by threatening to import raw wool. The manufacturers then borrowed from the National Bank of Greece (i. e., the Government) to pay the Government, meanwhile continuing to

hide and hoard their liquid and unproductive wealth.

The Government crowd has consistently refused even to guide, let alone control, imports and exports. Thus importers were encouraged to bring in luxury items. These ranged from toy balloons and Buicks to 19 tons of combs—enough to last Greece until 1999. Although UNRRA has brought over $35,000,000 worth of clothing and footwear into Greece in the last 2 years, the Greek Government permitted importers to bring in an additional $33,000,000 worth of luxury and semiluxury clothing and footwear from February to December of last year. During the same period, badly needed industrial machinery and spare parts, imported into Greece by private interests, were valued at only $4,000,000.

Profits on private imports, which are financed by Government funds, run from 200 to 800 percent. With these enormous profits, importers, industrialists and brokers buy and hoard gold sovereigns from the Government, further depleting the monetary reserve.

The Government crowd failed to enforce even the limited controls in existence. When the solidly entrenched textile interests violated the agreement under which 80 percent of the material they spun out of UNRRA raw material was to be cheap utility cloth, the Government took no action. The Greek Government dissipated its foreign-exchange assets during 1946 to such an extent that until the announcement of substantial American aid came along, a replacement of those assets during 1947 appeared impossible.

As of the first of the year, Greece faced a deficit of roughly $175,000,000 in her balance of international payments for 1947. This figure is based on an austerity budget providing solely for current consumption and normal replacement. It does not take into consideration any long-term reconstruction and rehabilitation projects which are obviously necessary if Greece's economy is to make any noticeable improvement in the years to come, and of course it does not include any military expenditures.

LOOKING THE GIFT HORSE—

The special American economic mission to Greece, headed by Paul Porter, had been advised before it left Washington to try to keep any recommendation it might make for financial assistance at a $50,000,000 level. Non-Greek observers believe that a loan of $120,000,000 would furnish substantial help—provided the Greek Government imposes import, export, price, production, and credit controls, plus adequate taxation. This sum would allow for the inauguration of a few long-range projects. The Greeks wanted from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000. The Government is naturally thinking about its armed forces, whose current expenditures are running at a yearly rate of about $240,000,000.

Porter's mission was sticking pretty close to its original figure with the idea of recommending on its return to Washington an additional grant to be made later this year if the Greek Government faithfully complied with the commission's suggestions for practical controls.

Faced with climbing expenditures, declining revenues, with expanding industrial and agricultural credits, with a pathetic trade balance and with an UNRRA about to fold up, the Greek Government was pretty much up against the wall. It was prepared to accept odious controls proposed by the Porter mission, UNRRA economists, and Anglo-American currency experts.

PREPARATIONS FOR D-DAY

Then came the unexpected announcement from Washington. It was perfectly timed for the Government crowd. "Porter might as well pack up and go home now," they said. "Fifty million? Why, we'll get at least $250,000,000, and more important, none of Porter's provisions. Marshall is a bigger man than Porter."

Reactions like this started only a matter of hours after Secretary of State Marshall's announcement was issued in Washington. The Greek Prime Minister, attending a previously scheduled session with American and British economists on vitally necessary economic measures, stalled the all-important discussions and then tried to adjourn the meeting.

One by one the American-proposed controls were being jettisoned by the government in Athens last week. The Minister of Finance had previously been convinced of the need of financial censorship of the mails. This would help to prevent a tremendous illegal flow of dollars in and out of the country by big-time operators. He suddenly changed his mind. He also stood firm against any requisitioning of unproductive plants and hoarded stocks, but continued to favor labor conscription.

Fully convinced that an anti-Russian United States was backing them solidly, the Royalist right-wing Government rushed its preparations for what its newspapers call D-day—the start of operations against the Partisans. Within 24 hours after the Washington announcement, the Government announced that it had arrested, sentenced, and deported to island prisons nearly 600 leftists, and a source close to the office of the Minister of Public Security, Napoleon Zervas, told this correspondent that "now it was only a matter of 15 days before the Communists (all non-Royalists) were cleaned out." The American diplomats in Athens were surprised by the deportations, a symptom of their miserable misreading of the Greek situation for the past 3 years.

Subsidization of the present Government will fulfill the earnest desire of the American Embassy in Athens, but it will not solve any of Greece's problems. No government could pull Greece out of her present economic situation without help from the outside. But the regime in power has proved itself absolutely incompetent to utilize effectively any outside help it may receive. It will certainly not use such aid to serve the needs of the Greek people.

It is a government dedicated to complete elimination of the left. Its slogan is, "It is either we or they." So it keeps the most productive age groups in a dispirited army and attempts to beat the people into submissive acceptance of its reactionary policies.

MEN IN THE MOUNTAINS

On the other side is the average Greek worker who is paid 7,000 drachmas a day but needs 10,000 drachmas daily just to buy himself (not his family) 2,500 calories of food. He will not support a government which ignores his needs, imprisons his trade-union leaders, and threatens him with prison, exile, and death if he protests. He will take to the mountains. For the problem of the new Greek partisans is largely an internal one, regardless of Greece's efforts to draw attention away from her own shortcomings and internal weaknesses. Two bitterly full years of the exploitation of men who fought Germans by men who collaborated with Germans have driven more Greeks into the mountains than all the encouragement from the north.

Greek partisans laid down their arms once. This time they won't until they feel they can return to their homes without fear of persecution, imprisonment, and death. At the moment, only a strong central government, headed by a liberal party, can possibly provide such security and begin to find a bloodless solution to the present impasse.

TWO ALTERNATIVES

If the United States is going to decide to supplant Great Britain in Greece, it should do so with its eyes open. The old liberal leader, Themistocles Sofoulis, can pull the country together again. Most of his economic experts are young, moderate leftists who are convinced of the necessity of planning and control. The Communist and Socialist Parties are prepared to accept his leadership. Presumably, this time he will not have to face British intervention in favor of the monarchist right wing.

On the other hand, if the United States gives monetary, moral, and military support to the royalists, it will be bolstering a cruel, selfish gang. Such a policy will lead to more exploitation and larger hoarded profits; to more deportations and deaths. In the end the United States will defeat its own purpose—for such a policy is the surest way to hand over Greece, special delivery, to the Communist sphere.

Need for National Housing Program—Address of Hon. Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the housing problem continues as one of our great domestic issues. Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, along with a bipartisan group in both the House and Senate, is showing vision and leadership in this field. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the excellent address delivered by Senator TOBEY at the National Public Housing Conference in Chicago on March 12, 1947. The address is as follows:

In January of this year, President Truman told the country, "We urgently need about 5,000,000 additional homes—now." A few days after the President's speech, the National Association of Home Builders issued an estimate that 1,400,000 new housing units, provided by the summer of 1947, "would relieve the extreme pressure." In the spread between President's Truman's figure and that of the National Association of Home Builders, there are scarcely any good round numbers that have not been presented as somebody's estimate of the housing shortage.

The cold facts are that the housing industry in this country has at all times failed to provide sufficient housing accommodations for the needs of the people. The sad fact is that housing costs too much.

As presently organized, the house-building industry is tied up by the lack of a regular flow of materials, an absence of centralized managerial direction, and outmoded traditionalism in handicraft methods of production. The result is that ownership of a house has been denied to the average low-income group. The housing industry in the past has catered to the luxury trade. Our main task today is to find some way of producing more houses for the lower-income groups that are now being neglected.

Housing is very important. The home is where a family lives and grows. The home is where the children take root. The home is where good citizenship matures. The home is where the mother and father and sister and brother enjoy the pursuits of happiness. The home is the basic, smallest organism of our democracy, and without these organisms democracy will not long endure.

It is not surprising that in almost every community surveyed by housing authorities, the high death and disease rate grows with the areas of poor housing.

That slums breed juvenile delinquency and crime has long been contended. They provide the physical and encourage the social environment that nourishes growth from truant, to juvenile delinquent, to felon. The prevalence of a high delinquency rate in slum areas has been established by many authorities and studies.

When slums are replaced by healthy environments, not only is a major cause of maladjustment eliminated, but new values are created that relieve the pressure of other harmful influences. Play areas, under proper supervision, go a long way toward reducing delinquency, as well as exposure to contagious disease. Social services rendered in connection with the project help guide the parent in the care of children.

Evidence gathered by the Newark Housing Authority showed the tuberculosis rate among project families to be half that among outside residents of their ward. In 1943 the infant death rate was almost two-thirds lower than in the wards studied, and the rate of communicable diseases less than half that in the wards.

The cost of public services in a slum is shown to be considerably higher than in other neighborhoods.

A 1939 report of the Philadelphia Housing Authority indicated that while the city-wide per capita expenditure for crime was $5.36, the cost for a selected slum area was $14.56. The housing authority of Atlanta, Ga., states that the slum areas of that city contributed 5½ percent of the city's tax revenues from real estate, but cost the city 53 percent of its police, fire, health department, and other service costs.

Here is a challenging condition.

To what extent must we bear the blame, because we have not furnished decent, healthful living quarters to a large segment of our population? I pose that question.

I should like to touch upon one solution for America's housing problem which has already proved itself—mutual home ownership. It has been likened to the REA solution in the field of rural electrification. In both cases the initiative comes from the people themselves. There are right now scattered over the Nation, a number of thriving happy communities, where groups of families have found a way to purchase, and own, their homes through cooperative action. In some cases, loans have been obtained from governmental agencies. In others, the financing has been wholly from private sources, though some form of governmental guaranty of such loans renders the problem much easier.

There are millions of families in the Nation, who may never be able to afford an individually constructed, individually financed, home. Surely, we want as many of these people as possible to be home owners. Surely, we want as few of them as possible to be dependent upon public housing for decent environment for their children.

It has been proved practicable, through the formation of mutual home ownership associations, for groups of 100, 200, 500 families to cooperatively own their homes. Members of these associations first make their membership payments, which, taken together, enable the association to make the necessary down payment. Undesirable structures or establishments cannot arise on mutually owned property.

I am glad to advise you that the new Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, which was passed by the Senate last year but which failed to pass the House, was filed in the Senate Monday. The Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate will soon hold hearings on the changes that have been made in the prior bill. The aim of that bill is to deal with the total long-range housing problem. Its purpose is to stimulate the housing industry, to achieve mass production of houses at much reduced cost. Opponents of this legislation have attempted to smear it by branding it "a step to socialism." The fact is that 90 percent of the program is devoted to encouraging private construction of homes. Only the short-sighted builder will consider it a threat to his established business. The farsighted builder will follow the lead of the labor unions, which have recently come to the support of the bill. These unions realize that mass production of houses, by making available to a greater market more and more houses, will give the housing industry the quality of stability, which it has lacked in the past.

So, friends of the National Public Housing Conference, I share your interest in this far-reaching objective of adequate housing facilities, and will demonstrate that interest in a practical way, by striving for the approval in committee, and passage on the Senate floor, of adequate legislation to implement our common objective.

What Is the Republican Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, since the Republican Party now has a majority in both Houses of Congress for the first time in 16 years it is understandable that many citizens are asking such questions as "What is Republican policy?", "How is Republican policy defined?", and "Who fashions the Republican policy?"

During the long, expensive regime of the New Deal majorities in Congress there was never any uncertainty as to what was New Deal policy because it was always precisely the policy that the President prescribed. Republicans have a different concept of free government. Republicans oppose one-man government. Republicans develop their party policies from the ground up rather than from the throne down. It is important that Americans, generally, come to understand the processes and procedures by which Republican Party policies are formulated.

In the February issue of the Republican, I included some detailed discussion of this subject in an article which I wrote for that magazine. Under leave granted me by the House, I would like to call attention to the extracts from that article which deal with the question of Republican Party policy.

HOW REPUBLICANS FASHION THEIR PARTY POLICIES

(Extracts from an article by Hon. KARL E. MUNDT in the Republican for February 1, 1947)

On taxes, on labor, on tariffs, on social legislation, and on many other problems, many are asking in Washington these days, and across the length and breadth of America, "What is the Republican policy?"

The uninitiated and credulous are too prone to read the newspaper interviews of some prominent Republican, in or out of Congress, on or off the Republican National Committee, and to conclude that because "a Republican said it" it "must be Republican policy." All of us who are Republicans can help in our individual capacities to dispel such illusions and to correct such faulty conclusions.

Republican policy is something which comes about through a voluntary, undriven meeting of minds. It is an attitude or a policy which grows up from the grass roots and registers itself in group action. It is never something simply enunciated by an important Republican—no matter how important or well known or illustrious—and then handed down to the party as a political Mosiac code from a high mountain.

WHAT IS THE GOP POLICY?

The long years of President Roosevelt's regime have tended to befuddle some newspaper writers and many individual Americans about the true nature of what is gradually recognized as Republican policy or the Republican position on important issues. Under F. D. R., the Democratic or New Deal Party did become nothing more than an echoing chorus of collective affirmations on the part of the Members of Congress and even the State governors elected on the ticket which F. D. R. headed. Democratic policy was usually whatever the President said it was. Since Democratic committee chairmen and party leaders seldom voiced an opinion on a controversial issue without first clearing it with the White House, it was usually correct to assume that when a prominent Democratic Party or Government official spoke, he was actually stating Democratic policy. Out of this long era of servility to one-man leadership, a mistaken notion has developed among some that Republican policy will likewise be something which can be identified easily by assuming that it is whatever some Republican leader may declare it to be in public statement. Such is not the case.

HOW IS REPUBLICAN POLICY DEFINED?

We who are Republicans should appreciate the fact that Republican policy is a party responsibility and not a personal pronouncement. Out of party conferences in which not only the leaders but also the rank-and-file Republicans participate this party policy is evolved. It reflects itself in congressional action, not in the acclamation of Members of Congress. It registers itself in our great national convention platforms, not in the pronouncements of candidates for the Presidential nomination or by men of lesser stature. It is the work of many authors, not the declaration of a few individuals even when they speak from high places and in agreement. It may be recognized by the votes of Republican majorities in Congress and in the State legislatures but not by the reports, even of congressional or legislative committees, much less their respective, individual chairman.

It is important, this writer believes, that we Republicans retain this grass-roots philosophy and this broad base in the determination of Republican policy. Individuals should speak freely and forcefully in their own right and in support of their own convictions, but those who hear or read these individual speeches should keep in mind that one-man rule is not a Republican principle and that Republican policy can never be correctly recognized by assuming that a personal pronouncement has the weight of a party policy.

In Republican circles, it does not work that way. Let the Democrats continue, if they must, to be a party whose creed is the voice of its mightiest man. Let us Republicans keep our party the voice of the people.

Mr. Speaker, government of the people, by the people, and for the people is a Republican concept. Let us be certain that it continues to function as the governing formula of the Republican Party.

Tighten Up Your Belt, and Get Ready To Dig Deep Into Your Pocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just as we continued to ship scrap metal to Japan, which later was shot back at your sons, we have continued to send material to Russia which may be used against us if war comes. We saved Russia, gave her military power, now propose to fight her with dollars and men.

The President did not indulge in "double talk." He laid down a policy. Nor did he deny that compliance therewith might, probably would, lead to war.

His demand that we give several hundred millions of dollars to Greece and Turkey was this morning followed by requests from other nations for comparable gifts, and there will be more.

The President's demand is backed by some Republicans in the Upper House, who describe themselves as bipartisans on foreign affairs. They have always insisted upon the establishment of United Nations, an international organization which the President now bypasses; which was brought into being to settle just such disputes as this, but which now proves ineffective.

Neither the President nor his bipartisan supporters, while advocating a course which may involve us in war, have apparently counted either the cost or considered our ability to meet it.

The President did not, nor has any world statesman in the Upper House, given us any estimate as to how many dollars, how many tons of shipping, how many planes, guns, or men and women, may be required to make good our position. Nor has anyone determined whether we can supply the necessary material to raise, equip, and maintain abroad the armies which may be needed.

Do not think that the prospect of a third world war is a figment of someone's imagination. Read and read again these words from the President's message:

> In addition to funds, I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey, at the request of those countries, to assist in the tasks of reconstruction—

And so forth. True, an army is not directly asked by Mr. Truman, but a representative of our country on the ground recently suggested that the first contingent should consist of 100,000 men. As always, armies will follow our dollars.

The morning, March 14, papers carry the announcement that a committee of the Upper House decided to keep the draft files available right where they are. That means just one thing—that soon there may be a move to draft young men to fight another world war.

The productive machinery of this country, without which no war can be won, has not yet been set in order. We are still burdened with an overwhelming public debt. Almost daily come letters from housewives demanding, when compared with the demands which will be made if and when World War III begins, a petty additional 5 pounds of sugar, which they cannot get. They ask for sugar and we give them war.

The factory worker, with his $35 or $40 take-home pay check, because of the rising cost of living, is having difficulty keeping his wife and children fed, clothed, and housed. Because the war took so much of our material, veterans are homeless. Payments to veterans mount into the billions, some $7,000,000,000 for 1947 and 1948. Another war means millions more veterans and their dependents.

Our national income does not yet equal our outgo. We continue to borrow money to pay current bills. The more we borrow and put into circulation, the higher soar the prices of everything that everyone needs.

If we are to make the requested loans or gifts—whichever you prefer to call them—taxpayers might just as well prepare for an increase in taxes. Those in the lower-income brackets might just as well forget their hope that further exemptions from taxation will be made. Everything we eat, wear or use will cost more.

All the individuals and organizations which are asking for additional payments and appropriations for this, that, and the other purpose might just as well save their pencils and paper, their pens and ink; forget their desires for Federal aid.

The young men, if the present indicated policy is continued, might just as well begin to prepare for training camps, embarkation points, service abroad. Parents might just as well begin to make their plans to carry on without the young folks.

You don't like the above. Neither do I. But by just the same sort of propaganda that we are getting today we became involved in World War II. And, if the people of America do not make themselves heard, we will shortly be in World War III. I would be less than honest if I did not do my utmost to point out the possibilities of the present situation.

A well-organized, sustained effort is now being made to put upon the shoulders of our already overburdened taxpayers the load to bail out the British Empire, to finance political minorities and political majorities in many another land.

We spent billions in China. We sent an army there and, in the end, General Marshall, now Secretary of State, after a personal visit and due consideration, told us to get out and come home, that the task was hopeless. There is no reason to believe we can be more successful in Greece, Turkey, the Balkans, or elsewhere in Europe.

Smear propaganda is being hurled at those of us who oppose another war. Now we will be accused of aiding the Communists.

Some of us fought the Communists when Mrs. Roosevelt, without disapproval from the President, and the warmongers were aiding them; when the administration welcomed them to Federal key positions—and some of them are still in positions of trust where they can do incalculable harm. We will continue to fight them. Nor will we be frightened from our efforts to prevent war by a smear campaign.

If the question is, Shall we send supplies to be distributed under our own administration to feed hungry people, then my answer is an emphatic yes—send all we can.

If the policy is to send our money, supplies, and men to aid either a minority or a majority faction to impose our or some other political theory or our choice of a form of government upon their people, then the answer, more emphatically, is no.

We have always insisted that European nations—in fact, all other nations—should stay out of the Western Hemisphere; should not seek to impose their political or economic theories upon nations in North or South America. Long ago, we told the world that, if any nation across the seas attempted to dictate the policy of any South or North American nation, a war would result.

Now, we reverse the doctrine; insist that we will tell Russia that she shall acquire no new territory; that she shall not attempt to convert other people to her political thought and that, if she does, she will meet our armed forces.

We tell the whole world to stay out of, maintain a "hands off" attitude as to North and South America. Then we turn around and say we are going to prescribe the line of conduct which Russia and other nations in Europe shall follow. Does that make sense? Whether it does or whether it does not, can we make good on that policy without destroying ourselves?

My constructive suggestion is that, while extending, as we always have, charitable aid to the utmost of our ability to unfortunate people, we begin to think and to act in the interests of our own country—our own people.

Since the foregoing statements were dictated, one on March 8, prior to the President's appearance before Congress, and the other on the 14th, after he personally gave Congress his policy, to my desk came an editorial from the News-Palladium of March 13—Stanley R. Banyon, editor and publisher—of Benton Harbor, Mich., which so concisely, so clearly and in fewer words expresses my thought, that I incorporate it herein.

The editorial is as follows:

ON THE WRONG COURSE

President Truman's foreign policy address to Congress Wednesday went far beyond even the most pessimistic forecasts.

In effect, what the Chief Executive asks Congress and the American people to do is to forswear the goal of international amity and cooperation and reduce the United Nations ideal to sophistry. The President of the United States proposes, to all intents and purposes, that America embark upon a course of power politics that can, as we see it, lead only to World War III.

Not only did Mr. Truman ask Congress to authorize loans totaling some $400,000,000 to bankrupt Greece and Turkey, but he suggests that American military experts be sent to those countries to train native armies equipped by the American taxpayers.

This course, we are told, is one of humanitarianism. To the American people that will seem a strange world.

Mr. Truman frankly stated that his purpose is to erect barricades against further expansion of communism. He studiously avoided reference to Russia, but he had no other nation in mind.

We do not believe in communism; the vast majority of American people have no use for the communistic theory, but that disbelief in an economic and political creed does not require us to embark upon a world crusade to crush communism—and Russia—from the face of the earth.

As we have said before, and say again, we do not believe it to be the duty, moral or otherwise, of America to attempt to take over management of the world.

We believe that as a people we should practice what we preach, and we preach freedom of thought and independence. We do not believe in the principle of forcing our theories upon other peoples.

We do not believe that the American people want to be made tools of British imperialism, or that the American people will consent to a reversion to colonial status.

We believe that $400,000,000 for veterans' housing would constitute a greater bulwark against communism than $400,000,000 turned over to Greek and Turkish dictatorships.

Mr. Truman's address cannot be contemplated without alarm and the gravest misgivings. We cannot fail to meditate, as we consider the Russians' reaction as well as our own, the distrust and fear we would feel, as a people, should Stalin propose a $200,000,000 or $400,000,000 loan and military advice to Mexico and other Latin-American countries with the implied understanding that it be applied as pressure against the United States. Is the analogy so far-fetched? It is assumed Mr. Truman and his advisers believe Russia will absorb Turkey and Greece if we don't act. We have made no move (except of course diplomatically and economically) to establish a protectorate over Latin-America. But neither has Stalin invaded Greece or Turkey.

New Filipino Attitude Toward American Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a statement by Mr. Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer and economist, of Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. Villamin's statement is entitled "American Capital in Filipino Hands." I believe it gives a new picture of the part that American capital could play in the development of Philippine natural resources. Mr. Villamin presents the opportunity of the Filipinos to undertake the task themselves. That's a great idea.

The American people are interested in seeing that the new independent Philippine nation succeed not only tolerably but magnificently. The Filipino people have able political leaders. They now need economic leaders. I think Mr. Villamin is one of them. He is doing his country a great service by giving his people new economic ideas that tend to make the country greater, richer, and more stable.

The American people do not want the Filipinos, or any people, to be exploited or mistreated. We want to help them. They deserve it. They are our friends. The Filipinos have the capacity to make their country great economically. Mr. Villamin is showing the way. It is up to them to act, and it is up to us to aid.

AMERICAN CAPITAL IN FILIPINO HANDS

(By Vicente Villamin)

When years ago I opposed immediate and absolute Philippine independence, I was supported in public by an overwhelming minority of the Filipino people. I favored a dominion status, which is independence plus instead of independence minus, with vast economic and security advantages thrown in. All that is water over the dam. Independence is here and the minority is no more. All of us are now in the national echelon, headed by the President of the Republic, plugging away to make independence a great success.

In a democracy, an imaginary fence marks the division of opinion on public questions. A two-party government is essential, but it is dangerous for a new nation to let the fence rise too high. Independent Filipinos should try and scale the fence down by offering the public ideas and information on national problems for discussion, thereby arresting the easy resort to personalities, trivialities, and recriminations that do the country nothing but harm. With a background of more than 25 years of economic experiences, I am doing just that with enthusiasm.

Let us discuss American capital, since it is the outstanding issue in the debate on the parity amendment. I wish to present a new concept of American capital; namely, that Filipinos themselves go after it, get it and use it, with the aid of American and foreign managerial and technical help, to expand and diversify their economic activities and to develop the country's natural resources.

Only the exploiter of public ignorance and the promoter of backwardness could be against American capital as an instrument of Philippine progress wielded by Filipino hands. Let us test this assertion in the light of simple actualities and prove that the concept has dynamic possibilities.

Example 1: Supposing a Filipino wants carabaos, plows, seeds, and fertilizers for his farm. He goes to an American bank in Manila—say, the newly opened Bank of America—for a loan of $50,000 and gets it at a fair rate of interest. He then procures his needs, starts to work, raises his crops, sells his product, makes a profit, and after a time starts paying his debt to the bank. There he is using American capital—hiring it to work for him for a reasonable fee. With the bank's aid he created wealth, providing work and wages, enhancing trade and commerce, paying the Government taxes and putting more money in circulation. How could he be against that capital? And who is the patrioteer to tell him to refuse it?

This example represents a goodly portion of capital operations in the field of agriculture. Similar loans may be for a sawmill, a hemp-stripping machine, a copra-drying unit, a rattan furniture factory, a bus line, an office building, and so on.

Example 2: A Filipino wants to purchase an electric-power plant in the United States. It costs $500,000, but he has only half of the price. The enterprise has been investigated and found to be a good credit risk. There are at least two sources of financing open to him in the United States. Either the seller could let him have the plant on a long-term credit with the cooperation of his bank, or, on the seller's application, the Export-Import Bank, a Government institution, might finance the purchase as an export proposition. He gets his power plant, operates it, and in due course meets his obligations and becomes its outright owner. That's American capital employed by him, a Filipino, to build up his industrial enterprise.

Example 3: A group of Filipinos organized into a corporation wants to work a mine, a hydroelectric utility, a lumber concession, or a banana plantation. They want $1,000,000 in the United States. Several sources of capital are available: (1) A bank, especially one with a branch in the Philippines; (2) a private person or persons who have money to invest; (3) an investment trust; (4) the consumer, importer, or distributor who, desiring to assure the supply of a commodity, finances, partially at least, its production; and (5) a bank investment house raising capital for the enterprise by issuing bonds and selling stocks to the public. That, again, is American capital in Filipino hands. Who but a bargain wholesaler of false patriotism would shun that capital?

Example 5: The Export-Import Bank is a great reservoir of credit. It has financed exports of materials and services for a steel plant in Chile, for air, railway, and ocean transport in Brazil, for highways, aviation and electric installations in Mexico, for export of raw cotton and other articles to European countries, for purchase of cargo vessels, coal mining, railway, and generating plants in China, for locomotive and coal cars in Poland, for a line of goods and services to Holland, and many other instances. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, whose organic law is undergoing revision, is also a supplier of credit and capital.

Example 6: The Philippine Government has asked the American Government for a budgetary loan of $400,000,000 for a 5-year period and the Export-Import Bank for $250,000,000 for reconstruction an new construction work. That, of course, is American capital intended to help the Philippines.

The Philippine Rehabilitation Corporation has started operations in Manila. It has $150,000,000 capital, two-thirds of which are from sales of surplus property received as a gift from the American Government. It will make loans for new industries and self-liquidating projects.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development will soon open its doors, offering a source of capital. The Canadian Government, under its Export Credits Insurance Act, is also providing capital to foreign countries at low interest rates for rehabilitation of trade with Canada.

As an object lesson, the development of Korea by Japan partly with American capital suggests a course for the island of Mindanao. The Japanese Government organized the Oriental Development Corp., which obtained an initial working capital of $50,000,000 at 4½-percent interest from the American money market. That was some 25 years ago.

Filipinos mustn't get the idea that getting capital in the United States is as easy as it sounds in the examples here given, but they must know that they have an equal chance, sometimes possibly better, as the Americans themselves to get American capital for use in the Philippines. The Filipino will get it and the American will not if the Filipino has the better credit risk. And that means that the Filipinos must organize and energize themselves and work with the Government in their overseas efforts. Without an iota of doubt, the Filipinos need and want American capital. When even anticapitalist Russia is trying to borrow American money, the Philippines couldn't be the only country in the world that wouldn't hire that money for a charge that would make usury an extinct malady.

The basic interest of the Filipinos is to make the Philippines a good investment field. A business enterprise may be an excellent credit risk, but located in surroundings of unrest, disorder and uncertainty, unconscionably high taxes and excessive Government interference, will induce capital to consider that enterprise as a speculation instead of an investment and it wouldn't venture

there at all, and that would redound to the injury of the people.

The United States has lent capital to countries whose stability is precarious on conditions onerous to the borrower to safeguard it. Those are the cases that have given rise to the hue and cry of capitalistic imperialism, often the alibi of the defaulting borrowers and their springtime leftist friends in the United States. Loans to a friendly country like the Philippines with ideals and standards similar to the American would naturally be liberal in terms and in amounts.

The Philippines have a decided advantage over almost any other country as a prospective employer of American capital, both private and governmental. Several acts of the American Congress connect the new Nation to the United States economically and internationally. Thus the plebiscite on the parity amendment to the Philippine Constitution involves the implementation of the concept of American capital in Filipino hands—the same formula that Americans worked out when they started building their infant nation with British capital, equipment, and technical services.

The Passing of the Honorable Walter S. Goodland, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 12, Governor Walter S. Goodland, Wisconsin's 84-year-old Governor, quietly passed away. Citizens of Wisconsin in all walks of life mourn the departure of their friend and leader. His great courage and independent spirit won for him the respect and admiration of the people of his State and of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., which is a fitting tribute to a great public servant:

WALTER SAMUEL GOODLAND

The death of Gov. Walter Samuel Goodland is a tragic event for Wisconsin. It takes from the State one of the most revered public servants in the State's history. It removes from the present political scene a man in whom the people had deep trust and faith.

But most tragic is the knowledge that the last barrier against the reaction which has engulfed this State is gone. The man who stood as a rugged, unyielding force against those who seek to make the State a minion for the selfish and powerful few no longer stands as the shield of the people.

In recent years the hand of special privilege has seized political control in this State. It dominates the legislature. Our representation in Congress is overwhelmingly reactionary. The statehouse is manned by the men who look backward and not forward in their concept of the social needs of our time.

But the people, under Goodland, had faith in their government because they knew that Walter Goodland was their Governor. He stood ready to use his veto and marshal public opinion against the onslaught of the privileged few. In the past two sessions of the legislature he used his veto power, time after time, to protect the people's interests.

The gamblers and racketeers who were debasing free government in the State felt his whiplash. Attempts to impose secrecy on income-tax returns, to juggle the election laws for advantage, met the stinging rebuke of the "old man" in the east wing. The lobbyists who infest the State capitol for their special interest clients knew his scorn. Rarely did he ever fail to meet an issue head on where the welfare of the people was being challenged.

Walter Goodland's success was due to the fact that he weighed the issues which came to his desk by balancing them against the common good. If they were found wanting, they were vigorously rejected.

Unlike a younger man in his position, he was not moved by political expediency; his decisions were not dictated by considerations of gaining support from special groups. The smart politicians freely predicted that he was committing political suicide by antagonizing powerful and influential groups.

But Walter Goodland was demonstrating something that few politicians seem to know today. He showed that the people will respond to a man who is honest and fearless enough to make his decisions on the basis of what is good for all the people. Because of that the people were for him. They came to regard him as the symbol of honesty in government. They gave him, unreservedly, their trust.

Goodland should stand as an example to other politicians of today who seem to think that pussy-footing and equivocation is the road to political success. We especially commend his record and station in the esteem of the people to Acting Gov. Oscar Rennebohm.

A great and beloved public servant is gone. But another symbol of integrity, courage, and a genuine desire to serve the public has been added to Wisconsin's political traditions. Walter Goodland has won a rightful place among the great political immortals produced by Wisconsin.

We believe that a fitting epitaph for his rich life of service can be found in the motto which he once carried on the masthead of his newspaper: "Independent in all things; neutral in none."

The Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 16, 1947:

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

American public opinion, so far as it can now be measured, has received President Truman's proposals for Greece and Turkey with sober approval. Our mood is anything but war-minded and imperialistic. If we are relieved at the President's statement it is for two reasons: first, because what has been said, unofficially, in low voices and in corners, is now said in the open, for all to hear; second, because we believe that the Truman plan is more likely to prevent than to cause war.

We must not be fatalistically misled by the steps which ended in our being forced into the Second World War. There need be no parallel. We are not saying to Russia that she must end or modify her system. We are not saying that she cannot advocate her system outside her own boundaries. We are not even saying what her boundaries shall be. That is being left to negotiation. We are not trying to dictate the future of the former enemy states of Germany and Austria. Our representatives are discussing these matters across the board in Moscow with the French, British, and Russian delegates.

We are not entering into a campaign against communism. We are quite willing to leave the question of how much of the earth is to be communistic to the processes of peaceful argument. We have confidence in our own system in any such bloodless war of ideas. What we do object to is the spread of communistic imperialism, or any other kind of imperialism, by violent or conspiratorial methods.

President Truman clearly believed that he could do more for peace by stating this position now than by remaining silent. We agree. We believe that the position so taken is in line with the United Nations Charter, which Russia has accepted. We are bound, and Russia is bound, by the rule that members of the United Nations "shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state."

The President does not propose to violate that ordinance in Greece, and if he did so propose the American public would not support him. We are going into Greece for the purpose of protecting the Greeks against external aggression, restoring their economic health, and enabling them to decide for themselves what kind of government and what kind of system they prefer. We do not intend to set up an American system in Greece, in Turkey, or in any country beyond our borders. If any country, in a free election, chooses communism we will raise no objections.

In the case of Greece our intervention must have the momentary effect of strengthening the government of King George. The President pointed out that that government was chosen last year in what 692 American observers considered to be "a fair expression of the views of the Greek people." But those views, let us frankly admit, were colored by the fear that a vote against royalty would be construed as a vote for communism. If this fear were removed the more liberal elements in Greek life would face a different set of alternatives. That they realize this is shown by the expressions of approval President Truman announced yesterday he had received from all Greek parties except the Communists. This newspaper believes that American policy in Greece might well call for a new election when the immediate crisis is over, with every democratic right protected, and that such an election would modify some of the illiberal tendencies of the present government. We are not partisans of Greek royalty. We are partisans only of democracy.

After Secretary Marshall's statement to the Council of Foreign Ministers on Friday the Russians can have no doubt what we mean by democracy. We mean in Germany, and we mean everywhere, civil rights, free and competitive elections, free trade-unions, freedom of press and radio, and freedom of movement for persons and goods. We mean the "basic rights of the individual." And these, manifestly, are not weapons by which unwilling populations can be controlled.

We can trust Secretary Marshall, as opportunity offers, to state our position in detail as clearly and as forcibly as he stated our general principles. Moscow's concept of international morality is not the same as ours. Yet, we believe the men of the Kremlin do have some comon sense. We believe they must realize as much as we do the folly of war with modern weapons, and must realize also that in such a war their own system might go down.

We therefore hold that by being firm and definite at this time we are doing all we can to prevent a war which nobody wants and from which nobody could reap anything but

catastrophe. We offer Russia a peaceful contest between the two systems, without force and on their merits. We make the offer now because a policy of drift might eventually render peaceful processes impossible.

Communists War on Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, in the President's message to the Congress on March 12, he made the following statement:

The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists, who defy the Government's authority at a number or points, particularly along the northern boundaries.

This statement of the President is supported by the following news story which had previously appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Star for February 28, 1947:

UNION OF MACEDONIA WITH YUGOSLAVIA AIM, GREEK RED CONFESSES

SALONIKA, GREECE, February 27.—A Greek Communist testified today before the United Nations Balkan Investigating Committee that the Macedonian autonomist movement was aimed eventually at attaching all of Macedonia to the Yugoslav federation.

Efstathios Vaitadoros, 27, a Salonika railroad man, said the movement had its headquarters in Skopije, Yugoslavia, and that underground traffic moved across the border regularly with the knowledge of Yugoslav frontier guards.

The movement intended, the witness said, not only to "liberate" Greek Macedonia, but also to "free all of Macedonia, including the area lying in Bulgaria, and then attach it to the Yugoslav federated states."

Mark F. Ethridge, American representative on the Security Council Commission, asked if this was to be done by peaceful or "other means."

The movement was instructed to follow a "dynamic policy," the witness said.

What did he mean by dynamic, asked the Yugoslav representative, Josip Djerje.

"Act of war," Vaitadoros replied.

This dispatch was 26 hours in relay from Salonika. In Athens, the Ministry of Telegraph announced today that, because guerrillas were cutting telegraph and telephone lines, communications between Salonika and Athens were being carried principally by wireless, which can handle a maximum of 14,000 words in 24 hours. Communications from the north of Greece, therefore, are delayed.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a serious situation that faces the school-lunch program in our Nation. We are told that unless a deficiency appropriation is made by Congress, the program will expire on March 31 for lack of funds.

The precipitous rise in the cost of living has been clearly reflected in this worth-while program and the money appropriated last year has just not been sufficient to carry it on until the end of the current school year.

I firmly believe that it is very poor economy when we quibble over the expenditure of a few million dollars to be invested in the health and well-being of the school children of our Nation.

No other program sponsored by the Federal Government has met with more wholehearted approval by the people of the Nation, and no program has had less criticism. The amount of money involved is insignificant in proportion to the benefits derived from the school lunch program.

The money spent for this program is an investment in health, happiness, and national security. If we are to be strong as a Nation our children must be healthy; they must be assured of the nutritious foods they require.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, do not want to be guilty of depriving a single child of the food that he needs. But I know that if we fail in our responsibility to appropriate sufficient money to carry this program on, many thousands of children will be deprived of the food they need.

In order that we may have a clear picture of the national school-lunch program, I would like to quote in part from a pamphlet issued by the Department of Agriculture:

The President signed the National School Lunch Act on June 4, 1946. In that act "it is * * * declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school-lunch programs." The United States Department of Agriculture is responsible for carrying out the provisions of the act.

Federal funds will be apportioned among the States according to the number of children enrolled in school and per capita income of the State. The law requires, however, that Federal funds accepted be matched dollar for dollar by the State until 1951. After that year, the State contribution will be increased.

School lunches are a community affair. It's simple to start a school-lunch program. Any group that is interested, such as parent-teacher association, service club, or other civic group, can cooperate with school officials in initiating one and can become a sponsor.

The sponsor is responsible for operating the lunch program in the school. The sponsor provides facilities, equipment, supervision, labor, and additional funds needed for the program. Expenditures for such items may count toward the matching of Federal funds. A reasonable value may be put on goods and services contributed to the program. A small amount may be charged the children for the lunch if they are able to pay. Money derived from these sources may also be counted toward matching Federal funds.

The program must be operated on a nonprofit basis. The lunch must be available to all children regardless of their ability to pay and without discrimination. Application should be made to the State Department of Education or other State agency designated by the governor.

Assistance is in the form of reimbursement after purchases have been made. The total amount which a school may receive depends on the type of lunch served, the amount spent for food, the need for aid, and the number of lunches served to children. There is no reimbursement for meals for adults.

The sponsor enters into an agreement with the State agency. Food is purchased locally by the sponsor's representative and reimbursement is made monthly in keeping with the provisions of the program. There is also help for the purchase of equipment used in storing, preparing, and serving food for school lunches. Prior approval must be obtained from the State agency for each piece of equipment to be paid for out of funds available for this program.

During the 1945–46 school term this program served more than 4,500,000 children, and in this year's program it has been estimated that more than 7,000,000 have been served.

I am convinced that it will be a grave mistake, Mr. Speaker, if we allow this national school-lunch program to go by default.

A concurrent resolution relating to the school-lunch program

Whereas the Federal Government has been offering the States assistance to develop and expand school-lunch programs, and after extended hearing the Seventy-ninth Congress passed the National School Lunch Act, which was signed by the President June 4, 1946, and became Public Law 396; and

Whereas section 2 of this act reads as follows: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children, and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school-lunch program"; and

Whereas South Carolina is meeting its share of the costs as required by law and is complying with other phases of the act; and

Whereas school officials and the public in general consider the school-lunch program one of the most important Federal-aided activities in the State and Nation; and

Whereas the basis for strengthening our Nation is through better nutrition for our school children and a wider market for the products of our farms; and

Whereas nothing is more important in our national life than the welfare of our children, and proper nourishment comes first in attaining this welfare; and

Whereas if Congress should fail to make necessary financial provisions the school-lunch program in South Carolina would come to a close in most of our small and poorer schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the South Carolina delegation in the National Congress are hereby urged to support a deficiency appropriation for carrying the school-lunch program for the current year, and an appropriation for continuing the program for the next year (1947–48); and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the clerk of the senate to Senators and Representatives in Congress from South Carolina, in Washington.

L. Keys, Pullman Porter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Ga.) Progress-Argus of March 6, 1947:

IT'S THIS WAY
(By Doyle Jones, Jr.)

The nobility of man it seems is not determinded by shallow external appearances as wealth, social position, clothes, etc., but rather is built on the bedrock of character deep within a person. Neither, as some choose to believe, is it reserved for any special race, color, or creed, yet few have better exemplified the majesty of man over circumstance as did the humble porter who chose to die that others might live. I imagine today that L. Keys, porter, has a much better job on a railway that most will concede is not run on earthly tracks.

Reprinted herewith is an editorial from the Atlanta Journal of Sunday, March 2:

L. KEYS, PORTER

Sauve qui peut—save himself who can—has been the motto of many a man. It even became the cry of the Old Guard as it fled from the field of Waterloo.

But if it occurred to L. Keys, pullman porter on the Pennsylvania Sunshine Special, Thursday night, he did not heed its blandishment. Instead, in a careening car dashing in mad flight down Cresson mountain, Keys went from passenger to passenger, counseling them to lie on the floor in order best to sustain the crash that would come in a few minutes. Then Keys went to the platform and renewed his desperate efforts to set the emergency brakes. Life was crushed from his body when the car leaped the track and rammed into the mountainside.

L. Keys, pullman porter, probably was a second-class citizen on election days, but he was a first-class man in the car Cascade Mirage when death beckoned to many and he arranged that only he should answer the summons.

St. Patrick's Day Radio Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following radio talk given by Mr. George E. Reedy, over Station WOL, Washington, on March 17, 1947, in honor of St. Patrick's birthday:

I bid you the top of the morning. Today is St. Patrick's Day. All hail to the Irish. All honor and glory to them. Brilliant are the pages of our country's history, with their deeds and courage.

They have fought through the centuries, on a thousand blood-bought battlefields, and have crimsoned the seven seas. The Irish fought gallantly, under George Washington, in the war for independence. They fought, too, for the preservation of the Union, under General Meagher, at the battle of Fredericksburg.

They were at the Alamo, in Texas, and at Custer's last stand, at Little Bighorn, in Montana. And our World War II casualty list is sprinkled with Ireland's martyred sons.

It is delightful to recall that the password adopted by Washington was St. Patrick. John Hancock was the first signer of the Declaration of Independence, John Rutledge was the first to raise his voice in the Continental Congress, Charles Thomson was the first secretary of that historic Congress. John Dunlop printed, and John Nixon was the first to read, our sacred Declaration.

Patrick Henry and Matthew Lyons were the eloquent orators of the colonies. Robert Morris financed the American Revolution, and John Barry was the first Commodore of the United States Navy. It is also refreshing for an Irishman to observe that 11 of Washington's generals and 12 signers of the Declaration of Independence were of Irish lineage.

For that matter, I might also mention that Gen. Douglas MacArthur's ancestors dwelt in the same region of Dumbartonshire which gave birth to Saint Patrick.

Irish blood has flowed in the veins of six Presidents of the United States: James Buchanan, James K. Polk, Andrew Jackson, Chester A. Arthur, William McKinley, and Woodrow Wilson.

I don't think we should forget Robert Fulton and his *Clermont*, Cyrus McCormick and his reaper, John Holland and his submarine, Victor Herbert and his immortal compositions, and John McCormack and his magic voice—and the other great Irish men and women who have enriched and ennobled the life of our Nation.

Who among us has not been thrilled by the Irish lullaby, or those glorious tunes of When Irish Eyes Are Smiling, My Wild Irish Rose, Mother Machree, and Danny Boy?

Throughout this Nation and the world today, wherever Erin's sons and daughters gather, many the heart will be cheered and thrilled to the echoing feet of the marching Irish.

In New York, especially, nearly 40 battalions of marchers composed the parade that passed the reviewers on Fifth Avenue.

The Irish Republican veterans were there, as were the men and women from Tyrone and Cork. They came from Kerry, from Armagh, Sligo, and Tipperary, from County Down and Galway, from County Mayo, and County Clare. And, while this was going on in New York, it was also being repeated in Worcester, Mass., and Saint Patrick, Mo., and thousands of other places in the United States, wherever there are Irishmen.

Ireland, that land where the mist of Killarney's lake is ever present, had a total population, in 1941, of approximately 4,500,000. Eire occupies approximately five-sixths of Ireland, and is the nearest of the British Isles to the United States. The rest of the island is included in Northern Ireland, which is, politically, a member of the United Kingdom.

Its rivers are freighted as much with history and literature as with commerce. They are short in mileage, but long in sentiment, as are the Liffey, which flows into the Irish Sea, at Dublin; the Lee, entering Cork Harbor; and the Boyne.

The biggest river in the British Isles is the Shannon, and many's the song such golden-voiced tenors as Peter Higgins and Morton Downey are always singing about it.

Most famed are the lakes of Killarney, bright, isle-studded mirrors set in the emerald hills of Eire's County Keddy. No snakes live in Ireland, neither do any toads, or toadys. Swans grace the rivers, cows graze on old abbey grounds.

Rural Ireland is a picture-book land. Clean, quiet, green, glimmering with glassy lakes and streams; bright with rambling roses and purple heather.

Above its white-stone cottages swirl the blue smoke of peat fires. White-stone ditches wall its twisting lanes leading to storied hills and dales.

Nowhere is the Irishman far from water. The sea touches him with wet fingers of fog and mist. The wind bears salt on its breath, as it whistles over moor and fen, forcing him to rope down his thatched roof, when it wails with the mournfulness of all the banshees.

Irishmen are as versatile as they are vocal. They are born poets and tale-tellers; are as expert with the harp, as with the shillelagh. They argue and orate; dance and sing; farm and fight as their forebears did. Individualists, all! They demand more than a hundred varieties of spades for farm use.

English, Manx, Scottish, French, and Spanish ways are no strangers to the Irish. The black-hooded cloaks worn by the women of Kinsale are an old Spanish custom.

But Ireland is essentially Irish. The rocky road to Dublin endures in memory. Paddy and his pig survive in commerce. And the persuasive eloquence that put off a queen is perpetuated in blarney.

Irishmen gave Captain Boycott a bad name, and the name still stands for commercial ostracism. Limerick continues as a form of poetry.

From 1820 to 1860, nearly 2,000,000 Irish immigrants came to the United States—and it isn't true that their descendants are all policemen in New York City today, though one of them, an O'Dwyer, is its mayor.

The fact is, those 2,000,000 Irish immigrants were a driving force in the development of new cities, the establishment of new industries, and the opening of areas of empire dimensions. The manpower that pushed the rails westward across this continent was, in large part, Irish.

It was from the Irish regiments in Tunisia in World War II that the Germans learned, to their cost, the meaning of the phrase, "the fighting Irish."

St. Patrick wrote the narrative of his life in the tablets of human hearts. He preached the gospel of Christianity and taught among the hills and dales. He made the highways and byways his pulpit.

Erin's sons and daughters in the United States have woven the shamrock into a garland of glory for the Emerald Isle.

The greatest gift that ever came to the Irish was the lovely spiritual mother. For in her eyes was the light of the day and the warmth of the sun. She was the gold of all smiles and the salt of all tears. From her the Irish have imbibed the richness of soul that has made them equal to the tasks of the world.

May she ever remain enthroned in the hearts of her children.

A Union of 50 States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call to the attention of the House an editorial regarding statehood for Alaska and Hawaii which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle:

A UNION OF 50 STATES

The United States flag should have two more stars, one for Hawaii and one for Alaska.

Both stars are stuffed away in congressional pigeonholes, but it is time for the

Eightieth Congress to fetch them out and go to work, like Betsy Ross, with needle and thread, putting them where they belong.

Statehood for both of these Pacific outposts of the continental United States is due and overdue. Their people want it, by 2 to 1. President Truman has called for it. The American people—who have become perforce a good deal more familiar with both Territories during the past 6 years—want it. To bring the case up to date, Secretary of the Interior Krug said in Long Beach a couple of days ago that he wants it.

The Secretary of the Interior is in nominal charge of Territorial affairs and his Department stands not to gain but to lose by seeing Hawaii and Alaska made States. Nevertheless, he, like his predecessor, Harold L. Ickes, has repeatedly put what pressure he could on Congress to get going on this simple, but profoundly important, structural change in the American political, social, and economic fabric.

It is profoundly important to make these outposts States, because as long as they are kept down as quasi-colonial Territories their development and growth remain frustrated.

Hawaii will have been 50 years under the American flag next year. The Territory's economy is now in a state of flux; it is going to be different during the next half-century from what it has been in the past. There are 519,000 people in the Hawaiian Islands—more than in half a dozen of the mainland States.

There are 73,000 in Alaska, and that's more than Nevada had when it joined the Union. Alaska is twice as big as Texas, and its resources haven't been scratched.

Both Alaska and Hawaii are nearer to the eastern seaboard than any of the Western States were when they were admitted to the Union. This is a point which the let's-go-slow contingent in Congress would do well to wake up to.

So long as these outposts are kept at Territorial arm's length, they will continue to get the cold shoulder, the maddening lack of consideration, the deaf-and-dumb treatment where needed funds and facilities for their welfare and development are concerned.

At this stage of American history we do not want and cannot afford to hold back the development of American territory. Representative WELCH's Public Lands Committee gets down to work on Hawaiian statehood March 7. There should be a prompt and favorable recommendation. The committee should then take up the claim of Alaska, which is also clamoring to get in. The Alaska Senate just yesterday passed a memorial asking Congress for statehood.

There is no excuse for delay. We need these two stars on our flag.

Eightieth Congress Faces Tremendous Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the country is looking with hope and confidence to the Eightieth Congress and I believe is not going to be disappointed. We are going to put through a program of constructive legislation and promptly adjourn early this summer. In spite of the difficulties encountered in reorganizing the Congress under the streamlining bill and other obstacles, the Congress has made splendid progress.

As an example of what is expected of the Eightieth Congress I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a sound editorial from the pen of Mr. Brace Owings in the Chariton (Iowa) Herald-Patriot of March 13:

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS FACES TREMENDOUS RESPONSIBILITY

It is time we were clear in our minds about one thing: the Eightieth Congress, controlled by Republicans, must do infinitely more than fulfill a party's campaign pledges. These pledges are important, but Congress, above all else, must get the Nation back to the fundamental basis of American representative government.

Make no mistake about it, we moved far from our traditional foundation during the years of the New Deal. We abandoned, to a great extent, our historic system of representative government in favor of a strong centralized one, with enormous powers over the political, social, and economic life of the Nation vested in the Executive. For 14 years we witnessed the creation of an enormous bureaucracy by which we were governed for no other purpose than to escape the responsibilities of self-government.

This was done by spending prodigious sums of public money to organize various masses of the population into benefiting and voting groups. Witness the early months of the New Deal for proof: First, its agricultural program, with its Government planning and regimentation, and the billions it required; next, the outlawed NRA, with its rights-of-labor clause in all its codes, forerunner of the Wagner Labor Relations Act. Here was a bold attempt, not using the methods of Europe's rulers to erect a party dictatorship, but adopting the most effective method of all to make a single party dominated by a strong leader, the real government; in other words, to use taxpayers' money to buy mass votes.

This form of crisis government was continued throughout 14 years of the New Deal. Each crisis, every one the product of its predecessor, was made the excuse for demanding and getting new and greater powers for the Executive.

These powers still exist. That they are not being used by the present incumbent of the White House is no satisfaction to those who know our greatest strength lies in a complete return to constitutional government. In the words of their creator, these powers constitute new instruments of public power, which could and might provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

That is why the differences now between the House and the Senate over a $6,000,000,000 cut in the President's budget are important; why labor legislation, as it nears the point of committee action, is significant; why this Republican Congress faces the huge task of repairing the damage done the American system by the New Deal.

Perhaps the Senate Republican Conference on Greek Intervention Will Answer These Questions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from a constituent.

The man who wrote this letter is at the grass roots. All his life he has worked with his hands and lived among honest, God-fearing, laboring people. His statements reflect their thinking.

His letter seems to indicate that if the Republican Party fails to offer organized and full-fledged opposition to Greek intervention the Republican Party is done.

If someone can provide worth-while evidence to the contrary to aid me in answering this letter, I can use it.

The letter follows:

OMAHA, NEBR., *March 12, 1947.*

Hon. HOWARD BUFFETT,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND HOWARD: Well, Howard, it looks to me like the man from Pendergastville has knocked your budget-cutting plans into a cocked hat. I was not at all surprised at the turn events have taken. I was hoping you Republicans would sort of take the bit in your teeth and kinda run things, that's what I and several million other people voted for.

But I guess the Republicans had been away too long. The rules of the game have been changed so much that they don't know how to play it. Those that did stick around during the Roosevelt administration became so indoctrinated with New Deal philosophy that they can no longer think as Republicans.

Here is what I mean, back in the Mark Hanna and Harding days you Republicans (I'm a Democrat) used to kick around a few million bucks and shake a few plum trees and thought you were really handling big money, remember? Then came FDR and the New Deal; cut down the plum trees and planted coconut trees of the super variety; and shook the hell out of them, for the benefit of the chosen.

Instead of millions, the boys got to playing with billions just like you Republicans used to play with millions.

The truth is, as I see it, your boys are not used to these big figures. It is like a kid from the sand lots going into the big league.

No kidding, the figures are just too big. You don't have any money, you know. You are putting it all on the cuff. You just can't get away from that.

Now you are asked to declare an undercover war.

What are you going to finance it with? More cuff. You know there is such a thing as running out of cuff, and then what? I don't pretend to know, I am just asking.

As I see it, as long as you boys are to be constantly confused by requests from the White House for aid to the now defunct British Empire, you are not going to do the job for which you were elected, namely—a little for the home folks.

Tell me pray, just how can you cut the budget and go to war? Why kid us? It simply can't be done. And for what are we going to war? (It was a declaration of war—nothing else.)

Where you send the dollars you will have to send the troops, and he asked for them. Are you willing to gamble the American way of life in the vain hope of saving a few American-British oil investments in the Middle East?

To tell you the truth, the asinine actions of this Government following the dictation from England is making more Communists here in America than is Moscow. I am down at the grass roots and can see what is coming up.

What will we profit by going into another war, and winning it, and at the same time lose our way of life?

Look at it this way. If our way of life is so good, why do we have to go to war every generation to protect it. You know, as well as I, that capitalism has been on the wane since the French Revolution. New ideas in government, new social ideologies being tried by more and more countries until the only

real capitalistic nation left is the U. S. A. I say our way of life is good—for us.

If others choose another way, are we to force our way upon them with a gun? I say no, if they keep out of our country, let them have the kind of government they want.

We don't have a Chinaman's chance in trying to run Europe. The British tried it for 500 years, and what we are faced with today is the result. It looks like when we defeated Germany, we jumped out of the frying pan into the fire.

Again I ask, if our way of life is so good, why do we have to sell it to others at the point of a gun? Why don't they just adopt it and have the happiness and plenty we are supposed to have. In theory, at least. It just doesn't make sense.

I read the article in tonight's World-Herald on your stand on conscription. I agree, but I can't see how we can avoid it if we are going into another war, and we are if Truman has his way. Of course, he doesn't figure these things out. I think someone at 10 Downing Street in London does most of the script writing.

Howard, I hope you will pardon this garbled letter and the poor typing. I was so damned mad when I heard that talk today I just had to get this off my chest.

I know that there are a lot of things you and I would not agree on, but I am sure we agree on this, that we have the best system in the world. We will share it with those that want it. We are willing to live in peace with those that don't want it.

Does that state it? I hope this finds you and yours in good health, and you able to put up the fight of your life to keep us out of another war.

Hopefully yours,

ED.

Admissions to the Press Gallery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include below an editorial from the Washington Evening Star. It is to be hoped that the committee of correspondents will take the action suggested of issuing a temporary card of admission to the press gallery to Mr. Lautier and requesting any alteration of the rules which may be necessary to ensure his continued admission as a matter of right.

I do not know Mr. Lautier. I have never met him. Nor is this comment of mine inspired by any pressure group, nor by any motive, except fundamental fairness and justice in a great democracy.

Newspaper correspondents have been noteworthy, indeed sometimes criticized, for their extreme liberality. They would be less than true, it seems to me, to the fine traditions which they profess and would be viewed in an unfortunate light, if a ruling were permitted to stand which, when all the smoke has cleared away, in the minds of the public is considered as excluding Mr. Lautier from the press galleries because he is a Negro.

The Negro papers in this country are entitled to the coverage which representation in the press galleries would insure. Indeed, it is to the distinct advantage of the maintenance of our American way of life, incomparably the finest to be found anywhere, that all men and women in this country, regardless of color or creed, be fully informed regarding the proceedings in our legislative halls.

An injustice has been done, perhaps necessarily so, under existing rules. It will be to the everlasting credit of the standing committee of correspondents if they take immediate and effective steps to right this wrong. In such action, I am sure they can count on sympathetic cooperation from this Congress.

WHY NOT CHANGE THE RULE?

The Standing Committee of Correspondents, which applies the rules of Congress governing the admission of reporters to the House and Senate press galleries, has been made the target of criticism for refusing to stretch the rule to permit the admission to the galleries of a Negro correspondent, Louis R. Lautier.

The tenor of this criticism, buttressed by a specific accusation from Mr. Lautier, is that he was barred, not because he is ineligible under a fair interpretation of the rules, but because he is a Negro. Whatever the merits or otherwise of this contention—and the question is one which cannot be answered without knowing what was in the minds of the members of the committee—the fact remains that a strict application of the pertinent rule would seem to justify the committee's decision.

Mr. Lautier is a correspondent for both the Atlanta Daily World, one of three daily Negro papers in the country, and the Negro Newspaper Publishers' Association, which services weekly papers. The applicable section of the rule governing admission to the galleries is that the eligible list shall be composed "only of persons whose chief attention is given to telegraphic correspondence for daily newspapers or newspaper associations requiring telegraphic service." A majority of the committee found, and the facts would seem to support them, that, strictly speaking, Mr. Lautier did not meet these requirements.

Having reached that conclusion, however, the committee was not restricted to a choice between rejecting Mr. Lautier's application or stretching the rule in his behalf.

Problems of this sort are not solved to anyone's satisfaction by stretching rules. And the problem is a real one, for there are compelling reasons why the Negro press, no less than the white press, should have adequate access to the sources of news in this country. Consequently, the Star believes that the standing committee, instead of having been content merely to veto the application, should have granted Mr. Lautier a temporary card of admission, and then should have taken the initiative in asking Congress to revise the rules so that Mr. Lautier and others situated like him can be admitted to the galleries as a clear matter of right and not under the shadow of what would appear to be a sort of special dispensation. It is not yet too late to do this, and it is to be hoped that the committee members will be persuaded that this is the wise course and the fair one.

LaGuardia: "Let UN Handle Greek Crisis"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article that appeared in PM, written by Mr. LaGuardia, entitled "Let UN Handle Greek Crisis":

LET UN HANDLE GREEK CRISIS

(By Fiorello H. LaGuardia)

The American people have a great decision to make. President Truman has presented to the Nation a momentous problem of transcending importance. He proposes that the United States take direct action in aiding the Government of Greece and in so doing bypass the United Nations. Therefore, the American people now know exactly what they are called upon to decide.

I say the American people advisedly, because the proposition is one which affects every family in this country. I say the American people, because the issue has not been before them and, therefore, this Congress has no direct mandate. The American people will have to express themselves in such a way as to provide guidance for their chosen representatives in the House and in the Senate.

The President asks for $400,000,000 for assistance to Greece and Turkey, for the period ending June 30, 1948. If $400,000,000 is needed to save the lives of men, women, and children, to prevent mass starvation in any country, anywhere, any time, the American people, in keeping with their fine tradition, will cheerfully provide the money.

In this instance, however, the President frankly states that it is more than food. A previous message from the President to Congress covers the food requirements of needy countries, Greece included, and the President points out that he has "taken into consideration the maximum amount of relief assistance which would be furnished to Greece out of the $350,000,000 * * * recently requested."

The big question is: Are we, in the very infancy of the United Nations, to assume responsibility and to establish a policy of policing other countries without consultation or in disregard of all provisions of the United Nations Charter? It is apparent that the President pulled no punches when he stated that "the Greek Army is small and poorly equipped. It needs supplies and equipment if it is to restore the authority to the Government throughout Greek territory." This indicates that part of the money will be spent for military purposes. He also asked for United States military personnel.

The President informed Congress that the "very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists, who defy the Government's authority at a number of points, particularly along the northern boundaries." This matter has been brought to the attention of the United Nations and a commission appointed by the United Nations Security Council is investigating these conditions. The Commission has not yet reported. The Security Council, however, has acquired jurisdiction.

The President pointed out that one has "only to glance at a map to realize that the survival and integrity of the Greek Nation are of grave importance in a much wider situation. If Greece should fall under the control of an armed minority, the effect upon its neighbor, Turkey, would be immediate and serious. Confusion and disorder might well spread throughout the entire Middle East." This in and of itself is the concern of all nations, not only the United States.

The President adds that "The disappearance of Greece as an independent state would have a profound effect upon those countries in Europe whose peoples are struggling against great difficulties to maintain their freedoms and their independence * * *." If that is so, then the United Nations should know about it and take appropriate action. Such a condition, and the fact that it is recognized by the head of a member nation of

the United Nations, brings the problem squarely within the framework of the United Nations Charter and presents a problem over which the United Nations has jurisdiction and has the machinery for adjudication and settlement and the power of enforcement.

Paragraph 1 of article 1 of the United Nations Charter defines the purposes of the United Nations, among other things, "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means * * * adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

The President, with his frank statement, invites frank comment. He did not mince words, and, therefore, in discussing the problem, words should not be minced. He did not mention Russia. I will, as the President left no doubt. If the U. S. S. R. is encouraging "the terrorist activities * * * led by Communists, who defy the government," then it is violating the terms of the Charter to which it subscribed and is disregarding the rules of the United Nations of which it is a part. The matter, therefore, should be referred immediately to the Security Council of the United Nations. The Security Council, under article 28, is so organized as to be able to function continuously.

It has already been suggested that independent, unilateral action proposed by the President is necessary because immediate, remedial action, if the facts should warrant, would be impossible if Russia exercised its power of veto. That is not so. Russia, in this instance, would have no vote. Paragraph 3 of article 27 of the United Nations Charter provides that: "Decisions of the Security Council * * * shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members: *Provided*, That, in decisions under chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of article 52 a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting."

Paragraph 3 of article 52, by which the party involved, if a member of the Security Council, must abstain from voting, provides that: "The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council."

Article 33 provides the several methods for settlement and adjudication of disputes and gives the Security Council authority, whenever it deems necessary, to call upon the parties to settle their disputes by such means. The President's statement is clearly tantamount to a dispute with the U. S. S. R.

Article 34 gives the Security Council authority to "investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

The creation of the United Nations was the result of centuries of experience. The purpose and principles contained in its Charter, its organization, and its authority are based on present and past history. The very condition described by the President, in which he asks not only for funds but, in addition, authority to "detail American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey," indicates a condition that brings it within all four of the provisions of article 34 and the whole scheme and genius and purpose of the United Nations Charter.

Granted the best of motives, what assurance have we that other nations will give us at least their moral support in the event of friction caused by this intervention or this special assistance to the existing Governments of Greece and Turkey?

Suppose the U. S. S. R. should take the view that it is other groups of terrorists agitating in Greece and proceed to provide aid and assistance to Communist groups. Surely there would be a conflict of interest, a conflict of activities which might well result in a conflict of arms between these two groups. Then what? But if action is taken by any one nation or group of nations, in accordance with a decision and a mandate from the Security Council of the United Nations, then the danger of any such conflict is avoided and, if the ruling of the United Nations is disregarded by any nation, it is then responsible to all the nations of the world, and the danger of a private quarrel between two nations is entirely eliminated.

The situation arises, it is said, because Great Britain is not able to carry out its commitments to Greece. The calendar indicates that at the very same time Great Britain was giving notice of pulling out of Greece and giving the United States the job of bolstering the Greek Army and taking over, it gave assurance of continued friendship and cooperation between Russia and Great Britain through no less an authority than its Foreign Minister, Ernest Bevin. He informed the House of Commons of negotiations to strengthen the alliance and the treaty of mutual defense between the U. S. S. R. and Great Britain. He stressed not only the strengthening of the alliance between Great Britain and the U. S. S. R., but he expressed the hope that the treaty would be extended from 25 to 50 years.

If we rush into the Balkans with military personnel and with a definite, announced plan of protecting the existing dynasty, of keeping the present King on the throne, without the authority of the United Nations and in disregard of our obligations to other nations as a member of the United Nations, could not other nations then charge the United States with interfering or even with menacing the peace of that region of Europe? And while we seek to go to the rescue of Greece, on our own initiative, in its quarrels with the U. S. S. R., might the United States not find itself in the position of the chivalrous gentleman who, seeing a woman being beaten by a man, goes to her defense only to learn, to his sorrow, that it is her own husband and they then both pounce upon him?

The $400,000,000 requested is the least of the undertaking—though additional appropriations will be required year after year. How much of this will go for military purposes and for the support of government itself rather than for food? Suppose the people tire of a king?

The situation is delicate. Nothing should be done to create the impression abroad that the American people are not united in backing our Government in its foreign relations. That would be misunderstood. On the other hand, we must not act impulsively without taking into account the consequences, the time, the cost, the involvements, and the risk.

If we act on our own initiative, if we go it alone, with the very best of motives and intentions, yet disregarding the United Nations, will it not weaken every effort to make the United Nations work? Will it not shatter all hope of its success? If it is Greece today may not some other power move into Spain tomorrow? Where will it all end? Remember, there is something more than food here. Even relief of food should be provided through an international agency, as I pledged with the United Nations only a few months ago. This instance is typical of the best of intentions being construed as power politics, as economic pressure. And there is more coming.

Congress has an opportunity to cooperate with the President in denouncing any interference from any source with the development of democratic institutions in any country. At the same time, we cannot ignore the principles in the Charter of the United Nations and the definite, clear principle in the Atlantic Charter that declares: "The rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

The Congress could well authorize the President to spend such money as may be needed for food relief and direct the State Department to submit the entire situation, as described by the President, to the Security Council of the United Nations, for its immediate action. In addition to that, Congress might well, by resolution, urge the State Department to insist upon prompt consideration and a speedy, final decision on the part of the Security Council to establish a world police force. Then if there were any policing to be done in Greece or anywhere else, it would be by the world police force. The burden would not be entirely ours. What is more, the responsibility would not be solely ours. Such matters must be shared by all nations alike, Great Britain included.

Let us reason this problem out. We cannot afford to make a mistake. Calm, deliberate thought is required. Definite, clear action must be taken.

I would not risk a single doughboy for the best king in the world. I would not escape any responsibility, no matter how great, for the maintenance of peace in the world.

International Voice Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, a few days ago I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Commander McDonald in which he took a position opposing the Government entering the broadcasting business. At the request of Mr. Peter W. Denzer, of Broadcasting magazine, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a statement by Mr. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, in regard to the matter I had inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In his letter to Senator Brooks, Commander McDonald gives voice to many ideas which I held before I joined the Government and found myself responsible for the men handling our international broadcast. Many of my ideas, however, have greatly changed as a result of carrying this responsibility. I believe Commander McDonald's ideas would have changed also if he had been exposed to the operating and other problems involved in international voice broadcasting and which so distinguish it from domestic broadcasting.

I have known for years of Commander McDonald's "lifetime experience in radio." I have supplemented my own experience in private broadcasting by conferring with others who have devoted much of their lives to broadcasting—the broadcasters to whom Commander McDonald refers as "those who pioneered our international shortwave stations." These are the private licensees whose facilities are now under contract to the State Department.

Commander McDonald shows lack of familiarity with certain aspects of the problem when he compares international broadcasting to newspapers and magazines, and states, "There is no more reason for the Government to own and operate broadcasting stations than there is for it to publish newspapers and magazines."

As a matter of fact, the Government does publish one magazine for distribution abroad, the magazine Amerika, in Russian. This is the only magazine from the United States which the Russian Government will allow to circulate in Russia. The other ten or twelve magazines which were published by the OWI and the OIAA I discontinued shortly after I joined the Government.

If I had similarly discontinued international broadcasting by the State Department, there would have been very little international voice broadcasting from the United States—nothing remotely comparable to the needs. The impact of such broadcasting as would have received private support or sponsorship would have been totally inadequate. Commander McDonald will find, if he inquires, that this fact is generally admitted by those who have studied the problem and are best informed about it.

I hope that the State Department will be able shortly to send to Congress the proposal I have developed for a plan which will take the international broadcasting out of the Department. The substance of the plan was approved by Secretary Marshall the day he left for Moscow. The plan is now being reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget. It covers or implicitly answers some of the points raised by Commander McDonald. In my opinion, it is, as developed, the most satisfactory plan possible in the present circumstances. I assume that this proposal will receive detailed consideration by Congress. My hope is that final congressional action will provide a set-up which will give to Commander McDonald and to me and to the radio industry what we are all seeking: a voice of America overseas that is truly representative of our American life, that projects fully and fairly our American culture as well as our American economic system, and that is controlled by distinguished representatives of the American people in the interest of all the people in their deep concern for the peace and security of the world.

WILLIAM BENTON.

Aid to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two very illuminating editorials appearing in the Chicago Daily News.

These are editorials signed by Mr. John S. Knight, the distinguished editor and publisher of the Daily News.

The first one appeared on March 8, entitled, "United States Must Ration Charity Lest We Join Breadline." This was immediately prior to the President's recent speech concerning our policy in Greece.

The second editorial appeared on March 15, entitled, "Truman Policy for Greece Risks Bankruptcy and War." This was printed a few days following the President's speech.

I commend the editorials to the careful attention of every Member of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of March 8, 1947]

UNITED STATES MUST RATION CHARITY LEST WE JOIN BREAD LINE

Pleas by the Greek Government for "substantial" assistance to prevent that stricken country's economic collapse should be viewed realistically by the people of the United States.

Sentimentally, our hearts go out to the Greeks, who are torn by civil dissension resulting from Great Britain's insistence that King George II, a listless and near-Fascist ruler, be returned to the throne.

We share also her fears of Russian aggression and sympathize deeply with a gallant people facing up to the inevitable break-down of an already tottering economy.

Since Great Britain, Greece's traditional protector, has served notice that she can no longer support a substantial army in Greece to preserve order, the problem is thrown squarely in our laps because we are so closely tied to British foreign policy.

The State Department is apparently committed to Greek assistance in the amount of $350,000,000. It is explained publicly that a sum of this size is necessary to purchase food, clothing, and other emergency essentials. Additionally, the Greek note to the United States explained that American technical experts are needed to help the country get to her feet.

What neither the State Department nor the Greek diplomatic dispatch did say, and this is the real issue, is that American money and perhaps her soldiers must be used if we are to prevent the spread of communism throughout the Balkans and the rest of Europe.

FUTILE POLICY CRYSTALLIZING

The argument, freely used by high officials and military leaders in "off-the-record" sessions with Washington newspaper correspondents, is "fight communism with dollars."

It is a cry that will be heard much more frequently and openly in the months and years to come.

It is an assertion that should be sharply challenged before it becomes, through public inertia and Government propaganda, the pattern for our future foreign policy.

Isn't it high time that we came to grips with the facts?

American dollars failed to resolve the political differences in China between Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists. We threw away hundreds of millions in a vain effort to bring order out of chaos and came away with nothing but the bitter taste of another political retreat.

George Weller, of the Chicago Daily News Foreign Service, says that the postwar policy of "pay, preach, and retreat," which has failed on a gigantic scale in China, has failed in the Balkans, too, and it has cost the American people in postwar aid nearly $500,000,000 to lose their political shirts at the "little table" in tiny Greece as at the "big table" in China.

The Daily News favored the British loan as an outright gift, with no thought that it would ever be repaid. We believed that the gift of a few billion dollars would prove either that Great Britain could survive as a great power with this assistance, or that her economy had disintegrated so badly that it could no longer be propped up even with American financial support.

The British are now back in the market for another "loan."

We made a very sizable loan to France, timing it to provide a potent argument for the Rightists in the French elections.

Yet France, with no semblance of strong leadership or direction, continues to drift gradually to the left.

In the case of Greece, British insistence upon restoration of the monarchy prevented the people from having a government of their own choosing.

We have backed the British experiment in Greece to the hilt and now find ourselves the unhappy legatees of a moral and material bankruptcy.

IDEOLOGIES ARE NOT FOR SALE

Can we fight communism with dollars?

The projected $350,000,000 gift to Greece is but another in a series of well-intentioned but utterly futile efforts to buy off the Communists at so much a head.

The history of the world proves that individuals with strong ideological convictions are not for sale at any price, except when it suits their purpose to be cooperative until the money has been spent.

There might be some military justification for the Greek gift if, in return, we obtained a few naval bases in Greece and Turkey.

Financially, it could be justified if Britain agreed to transfer Greek credits frozen in London to the United States, so that Greece could buy some of the things it needs with its own money instead of borrowing from us.

It might even be morally justifiable if it meant a thorough political housecleaning in Greece with new elections, so that the people might select the type of government they prefer.

But, as George Weller points out, we are in effect only throwing more money into the bottomless kitty of nations who have anti-communism for sale.

RELIEF NEEDS SHOULD BE MET

Can we fight communism with dollars?

For one, I am convinced that we cannot.

The tragic plight of the Greeks can be alleviated through privately supported groups such as the Greek War Relief Association, which has had years of experience in this field.

Our Government should be ready to ship surpluses of food and supplies and let their distribution be supervised by trained and competent organizations which understand the problem.

But the policy of paying Greece to support a token force of British troops as a bulwark against the vastly superior Russian armies in the northern Balkans is unrealism at its worst.

For once did I agree with Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, in his suggestion that the Greek question be referred to the United Nations on the theory that it is a global problem vitally affecting the peace of the world.

As time goes on and international difficulties increase, it will be impossible for the United States to patch up the remnants of shaky regimes and empires the world over.

If the United Nations is to refute the rising tide of cynical comment that it is just another debating society, the Palestine and Greek problems must have its immediate attention.

IF THEY WANT COMMUNISM

At this point, someone may well ask: "If we are not to fight communism with dollars, what is the solution?"

Unfortunately, the very simplicity of the question makes the answer more difficult.

There seems to be almost universal agreement that communism is abhorrent to free men.

But who shall say that the people of any nation may not have communism if that is what they desire?

If the ideological and military conflict with Russia is as inevitable as the wise men of

the radio proclaim it to be, another little nation or two gone communistic won't prove to be the deciding factor in an atomic war.

Let them demonstrate whether the communistic system can be successful. Let it be shown that people are happier without free speech, free elections, and freedom of opportunity.

The capitalistic system is under constant attack from disaffected Americans who emphasize its imperfections while enjoying all of its benefits.

Perhaps the communistic system can provide better living conditions, more abundant crops, finer cars, superior household accessories, and greater liberty than we have in America.

Possibly some people could be happier living under the constant scrutiny of the secret police. Even a few of our sons and daughters see considerable merit in the communistic system. Let this be shown. We might all be convinced.

Meanwhile, efforts to combat communism in the Balkans with American dollars are not likely to succeed.

Then, when we have bankrupted ourselves trying to bail out the staggering nations of Europe, communism will have a field day in the United States.

Of course, the capitalistic system will be blamed for the debacle when actually it is being drained so systematically that, even today, it has considerably less than an even chance to prove its worth.

We have poured forth a golden and seemingly endless stream of American dollars in our policy of pay, preach, and retreat.

With nothing to show for our immature generosity except more calls for help, the time has come to call a halt before we join our friends in the international bread line.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

[From the Chicago Daily News of March 15, 1947]

TRUMAN POLICY FOR GREECE RISKS BANKRUPTCY AND WAR

So that our readers will clearly understand what is in store for them, I quote a paragraph from a New York Times dispatch by James B. Reston, their specialist in international affairs:

What worries President Truman's advisers at the moment is not this loan to Greece and Turkey, but the next one.

In that one sentence Mr. Reston epitomizes our future foreign policy: Fight communism with dollars.

It is an easy slogan and should go down well with timid Americans who put the covers over their heads every night just in case the Russians might decide to drop a few atomic bombs in their neighborhood for target practice.

The true meaning of the slogan should frighten them even more, for actually it means: Fight communism with dollars—and men if necessary.

MORAL POSITION HIGHLY UNTENABLE

The President, influenced by his military advisers, for whom he has a profound respect, has in effect told Russia to keep hands off Greece and Turkey although we have consistently encouraged Great Britain to rule the Greeks with force through a puppet king.

In view of the idealistic statements made by the leaders of all countries during the early days of the United Nations, our moral position with regard to the Greeks is highly untenable. What we are actually proposing to do, although the vast majority of Americans seemingly are failing to grasp its significance, is to assume the burden of world security with American dollars and troops.

This is a step that goes far beyond our humanitarian desire to aid Greece in her postwar difficulties, the premise upon which many people are blindly accepting the President's recommendations.

With unconscious irony, President Truman's address to Congress was delivered while an 11-nation commission from the United Nations Council is in Greece trying to get the facts.

In by-passing the United Nations so casually the President has dealt that organization's prestige a serious blow.

Did we not accept the UN as the means to world peace, to security for the small nations? Why, then, should the United States take unto itself the full responsibility for deciding how world peace shall be maintained w' en the problem had been specifically assigned to the United Nations from the outset?

REMEMBER WHAT WE SAID?

Lest your memories be short, a few quotations from earlier pronouncements by United Nations leaders are in order:

April 26, 1945: "This conference is called upon to consider the problem of setting up an organization to protect the general peace and security of nations after the war. * * * It is obvious that no one wishes to restore a League of Nations which had no rights or power. * * * The Soviet Government is a sincere and firm champion of the establishment of a strong international organization of security. * * * We will fully cooperate in the solution of this great problem with all the other governments which are genuinely devoted to this noble cause."—V. M. Molotov, chairman of the Soviet delegation to the San Francisco Conference.

July 15, 1945: "We all have to recognize—no matter how great our strength—that we must deny ourselves the license to do always as we please. No one nation, no regional group can, or should, expect any special privilege which harms any other nation * * * that is why we have here resolved that power be used not to wage war, but to keep the world at peace and free from the fear of war."—President Truman at the San Francisco Conference.

June 21, 1945: "Both the Greek Government and the people as a whole look friendlily and admiringly at the Soviet Union by whose sides they fought for the maintenance of human liberties."—Under Secretary Zakynthinos of the Greek press and information department.

November 23, 1945: "What does it concern Great Britain whether Greece is a monarchy or a republic? It is not for us to decide."—Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin.

February 22, 1945: "The three powers pledged joint action to uphold the right proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they shall live."—Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State.

March 1, 1945: "Vaguely defined spheres of influence are incompatible with the basic principles of international collaboration."—From Franklin D. Roosevelt's report on the Yalta meeting.

June 26, 1945: "Established a special organization for defense of peace and insurance of security from among the representatives of the peace-loving nations; to place at the disposal of the steering body of this organization the maximum quantity of armed forces sufficient for the suppression of aggression."—A. A. Gromyko, acting chairman, the Soviet delegation at San Francisco.

OUR LEADERS FORESEE WAR

The noble words quoted above are just as noble today. The tragic difference is that they have been so soon forgotten.

Russia is guilty of obstruction and hair-splitting in the councils of the UN while practicing a determined isolationism for her own selfish advantage.

Great Britain, facing economic collapse and loss of empire, and living in fear of Russia, has turned once again to the United States for succor.

Our political and military leaders are so sure that we will eventually go to war with Russia that they have determined to call Russia's hand in the Balkans, a course of action that may ignite the first spark of the war they would avoid.

The fallacy of our position is that:

1. We are not supporting a representative government in Greece.

2. The Greek problem is a world problem and not one specifically reserved to the United States and Great Britain.

3. A political loan to Greece further weakens the United Nations.

4. We are inaugurating a change in foreign policy which commits us morally to bailing out every tottering nation in Europe and liquidating its Communists.

5. The constant drain upon our own resources will eventually make it impossible for us to aid anyone.

6. We are asking for a war with Russia.

WHY NOT USE THE UN FUND?

Granting that Greece needs money, what about the $9,000,000,000 that are gathering dust in the world bank of the United Nations? What is being done with Greek assets frozen in London? Why can't the stabilization fund of the United Nations proceed to stabilize her currency?

American taxpayers have already poured $400,000,000 into Greece since the end of the war. The Greek army, described by President Truman as "small and ill-equipped," has absorbed about $44,000,000 worth of equipment, some of it second-hand lend-lease.

Do the dreaded Greek guerrillas from the mountains have more?

When we have made the loan advocated by President Truman, what about the 70 percent of Greece's overseas debts that are held by British banks? Will we pay them too?

It was Franklin D. Roosevelt's concessions at Tehran that gave Russia nine-tenths of the Balkans.

Having handed so much to the Communists on a silver platter, we now belatedly determine to save the eend piece for Great Britain.

We intend to do it by opposing the guerrillas who fought the Germans under British and American orders.

We intend to do it by backing the Greek Army which upon Chicago Daily News correspondent George Weller's authority is "heavily spiked with quisling members and officers of the pro-German security battalions." These are the "democratic forces which new American loans will arm in their anti-Communist crusade against the mountaineers who fought the Nazis."

Weller also asks why, if President Truman's claim is true that 85 percent of the Greeks support the royalist government, it should cost so much American money for the British-armed five-sixths of the population to annihilate that sixth man."

I do not believe the American people realize the gravity of the step which President Truman has advocated. It is not a question of sending $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey but rather the assertion of our determination to combat the spread of communism everywhere.

If this policy is carried out to its logical conclusion, it will drain our Treasury while destroying any hope that the United States and Russia can ever work together.

Our decision to appropriate the policing functions of the United Nations is a step fraught with such grave potentials that Congress should not be stampeded into giving blanket approval to the President's proposal.

For, as President Theodore Roosevelt once said, "You can't shake your fist and then shake your finger."

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Typical War Department Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous rumors of extravagance on the part of the War Department and our armed services generally. The men who served in World War II can tell you of many unnecessary and extravagant expenditures during the days of hostilities. Those who were still in the Army when the shooting ended, can tell you of multiplied instances where waste and extravagance were the direct results of orders from high officials of our armed forces. These observances and experiences are on the lips of thousands of boys who have returned since the war, and they do not like it because they know that, eventually they will have to pay the bill.

The worst feature of this situation is that it continues, and is going on at an inexcusable rate even to this late day. I have received letters from several reliable sources telling me that these conditions are almost unbelievable.

For example, I received a letter from a lawyer friend of mine, a man who has had at least 12 or 15 years' experience in the practice of law, and who was employed by the War Department as a lawyer to go to the Philippine Islands or to Japan, and sailed under his new assignment some time in December 1946. He got as far as Manila, and on February 12, 1947, wrote me at some length, stating that he had been in Manila for over a month and expected to board a ship within a day or so to return to the States because he had been declared surplus. The fact is that I was informed by the War Department, before this man was accepted for this appointment, that lawyers were so badly needed in Manila that they anticipated flying this man across the Pacific to the post of duty to which he was supposed to be assigned in connection with war trials involving the prosecution of those accused of war crimes. Yet, no sooner did he reach his post than he was declared surplus.

Listen to this man's narration of the extravagance of the War Department in this connection. He says:

Here's the story: Two days after our arrival, and before I was allowed to report for duty, I was notified that I, along with the two attorneys who came on the ——— with me, had all been declared "surplus" to the requirements of this command. They also informed us that there were many more defense attorneys already here and engaging in the trials that were not needed and that they expected to declare some six or eight of them excess by the 1st of March. Since learning the foregoing (some 3 weeks ago) every transport has brought additional attorneys until now there are some eight or nine of us here waiting to be repatriated without ever reporting for duty. Just yesterday, the head man at the Personnel Office told me that there were 15 or 16 more en route all of whom would be declared surplus upon their arrival. I cannot for the life of me understand why they persist in hiring these attorneys and sending them on this eight or ten thousand mile trip only to have them arrive here and turn around and go directly back. Furthermore, we are here from a month to 6 weeks before we are able to get boat accommodations back (our group of three have now been here over a month) all at heavy cost to the Government.

To point out my picture and situation which is not at all unusual, but quite typical of the others here, so that you can see the hardship and embarrassment involved in this sort of a thing—I announced in the paper that I was closing my office and was going to Manila under a 2-year contract with the War Department to engage in the Japanese war-crimes trials. I was given a farewell party by a large group of my friends and presented with a Gladstone bag as a going-away present. I leased my office intact and he has even had my name scraped off the doors and windows and his painted thereon. I also purchased a considerable amount of tropical clothing for my stay here. And of course the biggest disappointment of all, the financial return I had envisioned by my 2 years service here. Not that I am necessarily pressed financially, because I am not, but I had made definite future plans with this money I had hoped to receive. Of course there are the many other unsatisfactory angles, like the long hard trip, the absolute waste of 3 or 4 months, the tremendous expenditure by the Government for which it has not received a dime in return, and so forth, and so forth. Frankly, my case is not nearly as bad, bad as it is, as some of the others here waiting to go back.

Mr. Speaker, I am now in receipt of a second letter from this same attorney, dated March 6, 1947, and written and mailed at Manila, in which he says:

Thought I would drop you a line to advise you I am still in Manila but that I am definitely scheduled to board the ———. * * * This is the fourth time I have been set up to leave and I feel that this is surely "it." Most of the other lawyers that were declared "surplus" at the time I was, or around that time, are making this boat. Almost every boat arriving brings in from two to four or five lawyers that are immediately declared "surplus." I don't understand why the War Department continues to send these lawyers only to declare them "surplus" and send them back. However, literally dozens of civilian employees in other categories are declared excess upon arrival. They either find other jobs for them, make jobs for them, or repatriate them to the States. I think you will agree it is all quite confusing. From a waste of money standpoint this situation is really "small potatoes" as the extravagance and waste here is actually beyond comprehension—particularly by the Army officers. There are so many officers over here (about 90 percent seem to have little if anything to do) that it is almost a situation of "all chiefs and no Indians."

Mr. Speaker, in these days when we hear so much about maintaining our national defense and security at a high level, and we receive letters from our constituents requesting that Congress not impair the efficiency of our armed forces—which letters, by the way, are generally inspired by those on the pay roll wanting things to continue as they are—it certainly is a difficult situation to solve. If the public could only begin to realize, and if the taxpayers were only made aware of the typical extravagance of the War Department such as narrated in the letters from my friend, from which I have quoted excerpts, I think the people would change their minds and insist that their Representatives in Congress take steps to eliminate many forms of waste and extravagance now indulged in by the War Department. I am sure there is no Member of the Congress who wants to do anything that will in any way impair or jeopardize our military strength and national security. But when we receive such evidence as I have just quoted, from people in whom we have the utmost confidence, it does make the Members of Congress wonder if there should not be a curtailment of much of the useless waste and extravagance of the War Department.

Furthermore, there are thousands of swivel-chair operators in the Pentagon Building here in Washington and elsewhere scattered over the world, who are not needed at all and who should be dropped from the pay roll voluntarily by the heads of the military organizations of this country. If they are not dropped, and if this waste and extravagance is not eliminated by our armed forces, it is the duty of the Members of the Congress to see that they are eliminated as fast as such conditions come to the attention of the Congress.

Juvenile Delinquency

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, one rarely picks up a newspaper these days without seeing headlines announcing some brutal crime committed by a mere child. The head of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, is making a determined fight throughout the Nation in an effort to curb juvenile delinquency. I heard a broadcast this morning at 7:30 over WOL by Mr. George E. Reedy dealing with that subject, which I conceive to be so entirely worth while that I am including it in this statement. It is as follows:

A United Press story date-lined Albany, N. Y., reveals the confession of a 14-year-old boy to the brutal hanging of an 8-year-old child, in a wooded area on the outskirts of Albany. Rapid-fire developments caught up with the teen-age killer who, District Attorney Julian B. Erway said, "just decided to hang the little fellow." Well, in Washington this morning and every other city that has a morning newspaper, in this Nation of ours, there is disheartening confirmation in today's headlines, that we are paying for the years of neglect of our children. It is in the form of a report, by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and its facts are straight-from-the-shoulder, and unpleasant.

The chief of the G-men tells us that we are in a dark period of crime, where the old gangs are regrouping for major forays. Furthermore, he says the effects of a "spirit of wartime abandon have not run their course."

At first glance there seem to be a few rays of sunshine in Mr. Hoover's report. He tell us that for the first time since the war started teen-agers have fallen from their leading position in crime. The top group in 1946 was the 21-year-old age bracket.

However, after stating that fact, he goes on to warn us that it only reflects the pay-off for the neglect of our children during the war years. To put it bluntly, the teen-age petty thieves of yesterday have gradu-

ated into the adult-hardened criminals of today.

As usual, Mr. Hoover's language is restrained. He states the facts, and says: "The gradual break-down of the American home is beginning to be reflected in the national behavior pattern and is a real cause for alarm."

To put that statement in simpler terms, parents have become so absorbed in other problems that they have let their children run wild. Now that the war is over there has been some improvement, but it is not nearly enough.

As an example of this, arrests of girls under 21 years of age last year declined by one-third from 1945. This would be encouraging if it were not for the fact that the figure is still 40 percent higher than it was in pre-war years.

Furthermore, the percentages do not convey the full shock of the facts of juvenile delinquency. Even though the figure dropped, more than 108,000 teen-age boys and girls were arrested last year.

All of these facts would be more palatable if there was concrete evidence that a full-scale offensive was being launched against juvenile crime. Despite the headlines, however, the United States as a whole still seems to regard the problem with apathy.

Mr. Hoover puts his finger on the major sore spot. It is the lack of persons adequately trained to deal with crime. He does not limit his criticism, of course, to agencies handling juvenile delinquency, but extends it to departments treating crime in all its phases.

The FBI Director has always been a strong advocate of specialists on the police forces of America. He believes that crime is not a simple thing which can be solved by a few simple answers. It is a complicated problem that demands the attention of experts.

This is especially true of teen-age crime. Practically every city has a separate department to handle juvenile delinquents. However, it takes very little investigation to find out that they are usually understaffed, underpaid, and overworked.

As Mr. Hoover points out, we are going to have to take drastic action to remedy these things. If we ignore this report, we are going to wake up some morning and find that we have neglected a cancer that has grown to a point where it can destroy our country.

Gordon Clapp Surveys TVA's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the old maxim of "by their works ye shall know them" is an apt one, and especially true in the case of Gordon Clapp, whose confirmation as TVA Chairman is before the Senate. By all standards Mr. Clapp's record in TVA is a capable and impressive one. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Clapp entitled "The Tennessee Valley Faces the Future." His words, like his deeds, speak for themselves. It follows:

Continuing to help the Tennessee Valley communities appraise and use their resources in the most prudent and dynamic way possible will be the aim of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the future, as it has been in the past. TVA's plans for the future are drawn from the knowledge and experience gleaned in the past from research, experiments, demonstrations, and a close-working partnership with the institutions and agencies of the State and local governments of the region and with citizen groups active in business, industry, labor, and agricultural enterprises.

In the past 13 years TVA has established the tools with which the Tennessee Valley will fashion its economic security. The dams (most of them) have been built to harness the region's abundant rainfall in a far-flung river system for power, navigation, and flood control. In the rehabilitated and modernized chemical plants left from World War I high analysis fertilizers have been developed to conserve and revitalize the soil and thereby make possible a fundamental change from a one-crop system to diversified farming suited to the long growing season with which the region is blessed. Timber owners are entering an expanding program that will reduce the drain on the valley's forests and place them on a self-sustaining basis. Mineral deposits are being inventoried and developed by private industry encouraged in several instances by new or revised technical processes developed by the TVA and the cooperating research and laboratory facilities of the States and their universities. River traffic will continue to grow. Huge shipments of petroleum products are now traversing the entire length of the river for the first time. Automobiles, grains, and other bulk cargoes are moving in substantial quantities and establishing new economic and commercial ties between the great interior regions of the country and the Tennessee Valley.

Intensified protection, restoration, and development of the forests, the lands, and the minerals aided by the water power now available from the TVA system at low rates over an area of 80,000 square miles offer splendid opportunities to establish a diversified and strong economy. The people of the Tennessee Valley know this and are at work in hundreds of communities to maintain the faster pace of development which was well begun before the war.

In rural electrification, for example, the cooperatives and municipalities distributing TVA electricity are expanding and extending their systems to thousands of new rural customers. Present plans call for 35,000 miles of new lines and initial service to 150,000 new customers. Within 5 years it is expected that a total of about 275,000 farms will be served, or nearly 20 times as many as in 1933. What this means for diversified development on the land and in the small communities of the valley is clear—the energy of a fully controlled river is reaching out to the people and the resources of the soil. The people have a new tool with which to fashion a stronger economy flavored with less drudgery and more satisfying daily living.

The communities are learning by the examples among them and aided by research and demonstrations that they will prosper if they take their natural resources into account and build them into properly related agricultural and industrial enterprise. There is growing recognition of the view that the best industries for the community will be the outgrowth and logical result of the best use of the land for production of food and fiber suitable for processing into finished products; that industries must be as diverse as the land uses upon which they will depend. Cotton fields converted to pasture through phosphate and lime lead to livestock—beef and milk—cheese factories, cold-storage and freezer plants; and many other developments follow. Valley minerals, diverse in kind, are found in relatively small deposits, but they are being developed and are supplying expanded and new industries and manufacturing operations.

It is TVA's job, working with established agencies such as State and local planning units, universities and colleges, research staffs, civic bodies, and others, to help the people see the region and its resources as a whole and indentify specific opportunities for development to be exploited prudently by the people themselves.

These cooperative arrangements which TVA has nurtured and stimulated will be intensified in the years ahead. The common purpose of the Valley—strength and economic advance through wise use of its native resources—will continue to unite groups and skills of all kinds in achieving greater human benefit from the applications of science, engineering, and democratic principles of administration and education. Emphasis upon this goal and these methods is TVA's major task.

In 1933 the average per capita income in the Tennessee Valley was 40 percent of the national average. In 1939 it was 44 percent. At the close of the war it is 58 percent. The Valley is moving to close the disparity and to take its full place among the regions of the United States as a region of economic leadership; as an example of greater freedom through voluntary planning; as a demonstration of methods by which the diversity of physical resources and the diversity of human talents and aspirations can be brought together by free choice for more widespread human benefits.

The Tennessee Valley does not underestimate the immensity of its future task. But the TVA has been assured that its methods serve the needs and enhance the dignity of the people and that it is moving toward constantly expanded goals of their own choosing, and with a workable hope. Hard work, intelligent foresight, and continued reliance upon the good judgment and courage of an informed public support will keep the TVA alive to its responsibilities and alert to its opportunities to serve a wider and wider public interest.

Izvestia Editorial Text on Truman Greece and Turkey Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the Izvestia editorial text as it appeared in the Washington Post:

IZVESTIA EDITORIAL TEXT ON TRUMAN GREECE, TURKEY PLAN

On March 12 the United States President Truman addressed a message to Congress in which he asked that $400,000,000 be assigned for giving urgent aid to Greece and Turkey, and asking for permission to send to these countries American civilian and military personnel as well as the securing of the training and instruction of specially picked Greek and Turkish personnel by American personnel.

Giving the grounds for his proposal, Truman stated that Greece was in a desperate economic and political situation. Britain was no longer able to act as trustee for the Greeks. Truman added that Britain is faced with the necessity of reducing or eliminating her obligations in several parts of the world, including Greece.

Turkey, in her turn, requested speedy American aid. True, Turkey, differing from Greece, did not suffer from the Second World War, but she needs the financial aid of Britain and the United States of America, said Truman, to carry out that modernization

which is necessary for the maintenance of her national entity.

And insofar as the British Government, as a result of its own difficulties, in the given case has not the capacity for offering financial or other aid to the Turks, then this aid, in Truman's opinion, must be furnished by the United States.

Thus it is proposed to the American Congress that it sanction two good deeds at once: to save Greece from internal disorders and pay for the cost of modernizing Turkey, upon which allegedly even her further existence depends.

There can be no doubt that the request of the Tsaldaris government to the United States of America with a tearful prayer for help is clear evidence of the bankruptcy of that internal-political regime which has unexpectedly received a flattering evaluation in the President's message to Congress.

But the matter not only, and not so much, lies in the venal Greek monarchists and their allies, who have been pleasantly presented to American Congressmen as direct descendants of the defender of Thermopylae, the legendary King Leonidas. It is well known that the real rulers of Greece up until now have been and are still the British military authorities.

British troops found themselves on Greek territory from 1944. On Churchill's initiative, Britain took upon herself the responsibility for stabilizing political conditions in Greece. The British authorities have not only helped to maintain at the helm reactionary, antidemocratic forces in Greece and demonstrated extreme unscrupulousness in the matter, supporting people who actively and consciously collaborated with the Germans, but also all the political and economic activities of the short-lived Greek governments, made up of the most varied combinations, have been carried on up to the present time under vigilant British control and administration.

Today the result of this policy confronts one—complete bankruptcy. British troops did not bring tortured Greece the peace and quiet she so thoroughly deserved. The Greek people found itself thrust onto a path of fresh suffering, hunger, and poverty. Civil war is not dying down, but is taking on ever fiercer forms.

But has not the presence of foreign troops on Greek territory aided such a sad state of affairs? Does not Britain, who proclaimed herself Greece's guardian, bear responsibility for the bankruptcy of the country of her trusteeship?

The American President's message bypasses these perfectly natural questions. The reasons for such delicacy are fully understandable. The United States does not wish to criticize the British practice since they themselves intend following the British example.

No wonder the London Times warmly greets Truman's statement while the Daily Telegraph notes that his speech fully justifies British policy in Greece.

From Truman's statement it may be understood that the United States does not intend altering the course of the British policy being carried out in Greece. In this case also, then, one cannot expect better results.

The American Government has not the least intention of acting in the Greek question as one might have expected of a member of the United Nations Organization worried about the fate of another of the latter's members. It is obvious that in Washington they do not wish to take into account the obligations accepted by the Government of the United States of America regarding the UNO.

Displaying singular nervousness, Truman did not even consider it necessary to await the results of the work of the Security Council Commission specially sent to Greece to clarify the situation on the spot.

In vain did the American President remember that the United States had taken upon herself a leading role in the creation of the United Nations Organization. In any case there was no point in remembering this and expressing at the same time one's desire to act over the head of the UNO, not taking into account the existence of an international organization and forgetting that a permanent international organ sits continuously in New York—the Security Council.

Truman did not take into account either the international organization or the sovereignty of Greece. In fact, what will remain of Greek sovereignty after American military and civilian personnel have sat on the heads of the Greek leaders and when that personnel begins administering in Greece with the aid of two hundred and fifty American dollars brought into that country?

The sovereignty and independence of Greece will be the first to suffer as a result of such singular defense. The Greek people, which waged an heroic struggle for its independence and liberty, do not deserve such treatment.

If this is what the Messrs. Tsaldaris were after, then so much the worse for the Tsaldarises who have brought Greece to such a pass.

The long-suffering Greek people face the prospect of having one "master," Britain, replaced by another "master," the United States.

Whatever pretexts are used to vindicate American claims to American domination in Greece, these claims cannot be justified by a defense of the freedom and independence of the Greek people.

The American arguments for rendering assistance to Turkey are based upon a threat to the integrity of Turkish territory, though no one and nothing threatens Turkey's integrity. American "assistance" to Turkey is obviously aimed at putting this country also under the United States' control, after which one would not be able to speak of the independence of Turkish home and foreign policy, since this policy would be directly controlled by American imperialism.

Certain American commentators admit this quite openly. Walter Lippmann, for example, frankly points out in the New York Herald Tribune that an American alliance with Turkey would give the United States a strategic position, incomparably more advantageous than any other, from which power could be wielded over the Middle East.

Commenting on Truman's message to Congress, the New York Times, in high-sounding words, proclaims the advent of "the age of American responsibility." The question is, however, what is such monopolistic "American responsibility" but a smoke screen for plans of expansion? Dilations to the effect that the United States "is called upon to save" Greece and Turkey from expansion on the part of the so-called totalitarian states are not new. Hitler also referred to the Bolsheviks when he wanted to open the road to conquests for himself.

Now they try to take Greece and Turkey under their control and, by raising a din about "totalitarian states," attempt to disguise their plans of expansion.

This seems the more attractive in that, while elbowing themselves in, the United States is pushing nontotalitarian Great Britain out of yet another state or two.

Truman's declaration could not but attract the attention of broad public opinion both within and without the United States. One cannot say that it did not meet serious criticism, even in circles of the United States Congress.

A group of 13 American Congressmen tried to dissuade Truman from making his statement. Democratic Senator TAYLOR stated that they received with disgust the proposal to vote for the giving of financial aid to the monarchist government which was persecuting those who fought against Nazism.

Democrat Senator JOHNSON repeated the same thought, that he approved aid in foodstuffs without political aims with all his heart, but that the President had not made a distinction between foodstuffs and bullets which was the reason for his, JOHNSON's, disillusionment. Senator JOHNSON said he did not approve the sending of American military personnel to Greece and Turkey, even as advisers. Military aid to Turkey and Greece could lead to military interference in other parts of the world. He was ready to give millions to aid hungry people but not a single cent to help decayed monarchies.

Democrat Senator PEPPER stated that the recommendations made by Truman, put forward completely without consultation with the United Nations, created a threat for United Nations, and would place upon the United States unknown obligations.

Also characteristic is the comment of the chairman of the Budget Committee of the House of Representatives, Republican KNUTSON, who said that supporters of Truman's program apparently would not be satisfied until the United States was bankrupt.

Henry Wallace and several other leading American figures came out with a sharply negative response to Truman's message.

We witness a fresh intrusion of the United States of America into the affairs of other states. The United States of America claims to leadership in international affairs grow parallel with the growing appetite of the American quarters concerned.

However, the American leaders, acting in the new historical circumstances, fail to reckon with the fact that the old methods of the colonizers and diehard politicians have outlived their time and are doomed to failure. In this lies the chief weakness of Truman's message.

Do Not Ask Too Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. GAVIN: Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of March 12, 1947:

DO NOT ASK TOO MUCH

Five years of war and 15 years of the New Deal have done so much to upset the United States that a Republican Congress cannot be blamed for not correcting everything in a few months. Congress must feel its way and explore every angle before it is sure it is doing the best that can be done.

Last week Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, delivered an address in which he urged early congressional action to rebuild the Government from top to bottom. He found gross inefficiency and confusion in the present structure. He dwelt on the almost total ignorance now prevailing as to the Government's real problems of organization, personnel recruitment, coordination and administration. He wants to see a special commission set up to ascertain all the facts and propose a complete overhauling of the Government in structure and detail.

This does not mean any change in the fundamental arrangement of our Government, but it would make a deep study of the various spending organizations, of the men who direct them, and whether or not they operate for public or private benefit.

Let us take all the labor questions which have arisen. There will be some amendment of the Wagner Act to give employers the right of free speech and to ask elections. To our way of thinking it would be better to repeal the act. Capital and labor can bargain without it.

There will probably be a ban on jurisdictional and sympathy strikes and a limit on secondary boycotts. Government will probably be given the power to use the injunction in strikes affecting the public welfare. Unions will be required to register and publish their finances, and a secret strike vote will be ordered of all workers not just a majority of those voting.

We doubt if there will be any ban on the closed shop or on industry-wide bargaining unions. We think there should. An industry-wide strike could inflict national disaster. What one employer could afford to pay, another could not. Many union workers dislike the closed shop. This means do or pay what the union says or be deprived of the means of earning a livelihood.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act should be repealed. Something should be done about picketing, but this is probably a matter for each State to handle. Labor has the right to organize. It has the right to strike. But it does not have the right to ruin the employer's business or industry.

Congress will have difficulty cutting the budget because it does not know enough about the business of the Government. Senator TAFT has raised his figure from four and one-half billions to five billions. Beardsley Ruml, an expert on tax matters, stated Sunday that a tax reduction of eight billions was feasible, but he proposed that part of this revenue be used for foreign loans and grants beneficial to the American economy.

So there you are. The Government ought to be revamped. We should know where all the money is going. An annual figure should be set up for cutting the public debt. The interest charge on this alone runs over five billions a year. It would take 86 years to wipe out the debt even if it were done at the rate of three billions a year.

Another matter which needs thorough investigation is the subsidy system. There is a wide demand for its abolition. This would amount to a saving of about three and one-half billions a year.

To ask this Republican Congress to immediately correct all the abuses which have crept into this Government during the past 15 years is to ask too much. Congress wants to be sure it is on the right track.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. L. F. Reid, of the Renville Star-Farmer of Renville, Minn., affords much food for thought and it is well worth the time of the Members of Congress to study his letter and editorial, hereafter quoted:

RENVILLE STAR-FARMER,
Renville, Minn., March 1, 1947.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: There has been a lot of talk, in and out of Congress, relating to cutting income taxes 20 percent across the board, at the same time taking four to six billion dollars from the budget in order to make a payment on the national debt.

Both tax reducing and debt paying are commendable objects. Both have been long considered as desirable by many thrifty people. In my estimation, however, there are one or two vital necessities that should be taken care of before cutting the rich man's taxes and start reducing the debt.

The first thing this Nation needs, and must have, is a sound system of national defense. I would say this should include a universal service training program.

After defense is taken care of I believe a lot of consideration should be given to the plight of many of the young people who won the war and literally saved the civilized world from disaster. I refer to the service men and women, thousands of whom, after going through something worse than any hell conceived by the human race, now have no place to rest their heads. I deem it a shame that a great, rich Nation, able and willing to feed the starving millions in other lands, which could pour out close to $200,000,000,000 to win the war, and which, since the fighting stopped, has loaned many other billions to other nations, cannot provide adequate living quarters for the men and women who fought the good fight on many a foreign battlefield. We said in words then that when and if they returned nothing would be too good for those boys and girls. What about now? There are, you know, authenticated cases where GI families live in such close quarters that there is not even a chance for the common decencies. One writer, who has investigated and should know, states that there are over 200,000 such cases or worse in the city of New York alone.

To correct this manifest injustice I would say that the Government, instead of cutting taxes and paying off on the debt at this time, ought to build adequate housing and sell to the veterans at a low rate of interest, with payments on the principal the same as rent. Either that or see to it that the men without homes can borrow the money on the terms as stated in order to build homes for their families.

After these necessary matters have been taken care of I believe it would be then justifiable to cut taxes, at least in the lower brackets, as well as to start paying off the national debt—but not before.

Sincerely yours,

L. F. REID,
Editor.

[From the Renville (Minn.) Star-Farmer]

HOUSING VETERANS

There is a proposal in Congress to cut the national budget by $6,000,000,000, pay about four and a half billions on the national debt, at the same time slicing income taxes 20 percent across the board.

Cutting the national budget by the above amount of money, according to some authorities, means lopping $2,500,000,000 from defense funds. In the meantime, thousands of war veterans have no adequate housing and hospital facilities are not what they should be.

I would suggest, before any such a radical move is made as cutting the budget by six billions or reducing income taxes 20 percent across the board, that certain things be done.

First of all, enough money should be allocated to the armed forces, to not only keep our armies in Germany and Japan but to provide adequate defense for this Nation. After that I believe Congress should appoint a committee to investigate the housing situation. If they find the need to be as great as reported in the press, I suggest that this great Nation, which rightfully went overboard and spent over a hundred and fifty billion dollars for war, could now spend five or six billion dollars to provide decent housing, as well as hospital facilities, for the men and women who made victory possible and sacrificed so much in so doing. I deem it a shame for a nation as potentially rich as America, whose Government lavishly lends and gives away billions of dollars to other nations, to allow a condition to exist whereby the families of many men who went through the hell of war to have to live in a tent or with five or six other people in a three-room apartment.

After proper investigation I believe Congress should allocate as much money as necessary for the building of proper housing for returned veterans. This money should be handled locally by the banks, that any veteran who will work and has a decent record, should be allowed to borrow the money to build on a low rate of interest and with payments the same as rent. The Government would get most of the money back with interest. If it would be more practical the Government could have the houses and apartments built and sell them to the veterans on the same terms as above.

As to cutting income taxes 20 percent across the board, I do not believe we can afford to cut the taxes of the rich, at the same time weaken our national defense and let veterans want for houses and hospital facilities.

The Birth Month of Luther Burbank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, March is the birth month of one of the truly great men of America, Luther Burbank. He was born 98 years ago, on March 7, 1849, in Lancaster, Mass. He spent the latter years of his life, and the most productive years, in California. His fame, however, belongs not alone to Massachusetts nor to California, it belongs to the world. It is only necessary to mention the name, Luther Burbank, and everyone knows at once who he was and what he did.

He was a genius with plants and plant life. It was not a characteristic he acquired, nor something he learned in the schools; he was born with it. He had a love of plants and flowers, similar to the love of animals which other children had and have. He would cry, as a child, when the leaves fell from the trees.

Limited means gave him little opportunity for education, and kept him working early and late, to add to the family income. He began his market gardening and seed-raising experiences in New England, and it was there he produced the potato which bears his name and which, it is estimated, has added at least $20,000,000 to the wealth of agricultural America. It is an interesting side light that Burbank himself received a total money benefit of $150 from the discovery of the potato. That is the price he received for the seeds he sold to a local seedsman.

For reasons of health, Luther Burbank moved to California in 1875. At first he worked in a local nursery. His name and fame became more and more widely known. He always made friends, one of his outstanding characteristics. Later he

saved enough money to start a small nursery of his own in Santa Rosa, the home of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]. As an indication of his developing genius, he filled an order for 20,000 young prune trees in 9 months. The customary period at that time would have been 3 years.

The stories of his life and his personality are as varied as the stories of his discoveries in plant life. It seems almost as if his work was watched over by providence. In the earthquake of 1906, for example, when neighboring properties were destroyed, his were saved, and more than that, the dirt was pulverized and distributed around the growing plants better than it could have been done by the hand of man. Not a single pane of glass was broken. Five hundred or more negatives, invaluable in the progress of his experiments, representing years of work, were not even scratched, although all the other negatives of the photographer in the same building were destroyed. The Burbank negatives were found in the debris unharmed.

The whole world pays tribute to Luther Burbank this month. I am particularly pleased that this evening, at 8 o'clock, eastern standard time, the National Broadcasting System will give time to a human interest story of the life of this plant wizard. Lionel Barrymore, another great American, will broadcast the story.

The Way To Help Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article that appeared in the New Republic, written by Henry Wallace, entitled "The Way To Help Greece":

THE WAY TO HELP GREECE

(By Henry Wallace)

The proposed loan to Greece of $250,000,000 or more presents to the American people a problem of the very highest importance. If the British go through with their plan to withdraw their support on March 31, and the United States does not come to the rescue, Greece will sink into even greater starvation and despair than now afflict her. If the loan is made merely as a continuation of British policy, it will mean that the United States is underwriting the British Empire. It might easily seem to Russia a continuation of a policy of encirclement that is wholly opposed to the idea of peaceful cooperation, and especially cooperation through the United Nations. And it might produce a demand for further, and indeed almost endless, commitments not only in Greece but in many other countries as well.

As Secretary of Commerce, I did all I could to get a loan for Greece last August. The State Department, the Export-Import Bank and the Treasury did not believe in the loan for Greece at that time. They took into account political considerations, and no doubt they were correct in their hesitancy. I know my own feeling was that the Greek people were in trouble and could be helped by self-liquidating projects which would raise their standard of living.

I am convinced that the United States Government would be making a serious mistake to lend any money whatsoever to Greece simply for the chief purpose of maintaining British rule there. Nor should we lend money to Greece to maintain her present government on the theory that if it falls, the Communists will take over. Ordinarily I am against political loans of all kinds. But the misery in Greece is so great that aid to her people is the first concern. The United States must help. It must help the Greek people because they were among the first and the bravest in a fight which was also ours. The United States must give funds to Greece for food and other economic needs.

But our obligation goes much further than the mere giving of money. There is the further responsibility of seeing to it that the money we give is spent on the things for which we give it. For these purposes and for the purposes of democracy and peace there are several prerequisites.

The terrorism of the present Greek Government has been worse than that of Argentina. It has been so repressive that a new and broader government is a first condition of the loan. Secretary Marshall hinted at the need for this in his statement of February 14. He wants Greek to do exactly what he asked China to do. He wants the people to be represented in the government and he wants governmental oppression to cease.

As a prerequisite to the loan, amnesty should be granted to all political opponents, and the different parties, including the EAM, should be represented in a coalition cabinet in proportion to their size. According to the best information available, the EAM does not represent more than 35 percent of the total population, and less than 20 percent of its membership is Communist. They are Communists largely because of extreme misery and have little ideological knowledge of what communism is. Nevertheless, if there is to be real peace in the Balkans, the EAM must have fair representation in the cabinet. The coalition cabinet should be continued until misery, hatred, and tension have lessened sufficiently to permit a free election and the return to party government.

Another sensible prerequisite to a loan to Greece was suggested to me last August by one of the people connected with the Export-Import Bank. This had to do with the Greek system of taxation, which at present discriminates against the poor in favor of the wealthy. It is part of the general maladministration by the present regime. The United States should not be expected to loan money to a government which has not done an efficient job of cleaning itself up. The loopholes for graft, including the possibility of speculation in foreign exchange and the export of capital, should be stopped.

Finally, I don't think we ought to make a loan to Greece unless we know the proceeds will be spent as part of an over-all program of rehabilitation and reconstruction. This means technical aid, economic guidance, and laying the foundation for a self-supporting and democratic Greece. It means that we must have an economic mission in Greece to watch over the spending of the money; we must, whether we like it or not, give political and economic guidance to the Greek people.

I am sure that the American people, even in their present state of excessive fear of Russia, will never sanction a loan to Greece or any other country for the sake of maintaining a Royalist-manned army designed to oppress people whose crime is that they are living in utter want and don't like it and believe that something ought to be done about it.

Greece, the mother of modern civilization, is one of the most poverty-stricken countries in all Europe. Smaller than the State of Iowa, she has far less good land than Iowa. Her average farmer produces less than one-tenth as much as the average Iowa farmer. She needs to learn the science of fertilizing, crop rotation, and control of animal disease. She needs modern agricultural machinery. Modern industry can be started in the cities. Dams could be built to develop the power possibilities of the rivers. But Greece cannot do this alone.

I don't believe in American imperialism, but as a stop-gap I believe that it is enlightened selfishness for the United States to step in now with a well planned, efficiently administered loan. If there were some practical, efficient way to have the British and the Russians join us in the administration of the loan, I would be for it. But clearly it would be impossible to put a loan so supervised through Congress. Theoretically, I would prefer a loan made to Greece by the International Bank for Reconstruction, but the inaction of the bank so far, the confusion arising from its present reorganization, and the conservatism of its leadership all indicate to me that the bank today is incapable of helping the Greek people in their immediate crisis.

The Greek need is a world need and the Greek problem is a world problem. The disintegration and chaos of Greece are a menace to the world and therefore the responsibility of the United Nations. The welfare of the Greek people demands that we make the loan. The safety of all peoples demands that we take the initiative in bringing the Greek issue before the United Nations.

It is our duty to raise this issue without delay before the Security Council. It is our duty to say: This is not an American problem. We are ready to give our help now in the interest of world peace, but we cannot meet the needs of Greece again and again. This is the UN's job, and only insofar as we are a member of the UN family is it America's job. The UN must mend the Greek economy. The UN must mend the Greek political machinery. The UN must assure the Greek people of the protection of their liberties. The UN must do what needs to be done to solve the Greek problem within a permanent framework of world security so as to guarantee the welfare of all the peoples of Europe.

Very clearly there is considerable danger that American intervention in Greece will lead to further Soviet action in southeastern Europe and to protests before the Security Council by Yugoslavia and other nations. The extent of this danger depends entirely upon the way in which our loan is used. If it is to be a first installment in a series of loans to Turkey and other countries, designed to fortify outposts against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, then we may well split the United Nations. When the debate on the loan begins, I trust that no statements will be made on the floor of Congress inciting fear and hatred of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and justifying this loan in terms of economic and political warfare. The entire policy of containing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics within its borders by propping up reactionary regimes is bound to end in failure, in Germany, China, Japan, Greece, and anywhere else this policy is attempted. At a time of bitter suffering and rapid social change, no amount of American economic aid can prevent worldwide progress toward economic and social democracy and the desire to be free of foreign oppression.

To support troops and maintain unrepresentative regimes in buffer states would necessitate an unending amount of American money. This expenditure can accomplish no useful purpose. And within 2 or 3 years the American people, paying heavy taxes out of a reduced income, will become utterly disgusted with a program which finds a solution only in war.

It is not only the bankruptcy of the Greek nation that is at issue. The United States

has now become the receiver for its own inadequate postwar foreign policy. If a vacuum now exists in the Mediterranean, it is because there was nothing in the nature of our policy to fill that vacuum. A vacuum can only be filled by positive and constructive action. Up to now our policy has been negative and piecemeal.

We have been timid when we needed to be bold. We have been static when we needed to be mobile. By supporting corrupt and backward-looking regimes in China and Greece, we defaulted on our moral position before the world. But that policy has now been exposed as a cynical failure in attaining even the doubtful end of surrounding the Soviet Union with a system of defensive bulwarks. At this crucial juncture the United States is bulwarked neither in spirit nor in fact.

When Secretary Marshall was appointed I wrote him that I hoped he would find a way to rekindle the hope among the peoples of the world that the United States was not resisting change merely to preserve the status quo. This hope can be justified by intervention in Greece that is decisive and in behalf of democracy and the principles of the United Nations Charter. We want balance and real peace, based on wholehearted agreement, not a continuous battle over propaganda and political loans, which will break out first in one country and then in another, until the noise of national economies exploding will sound like a bunch of firecrackers going off.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on March 15, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district: Last weekend, I made my first visit home since the new Congress assumed office. It was a most pleasant homecoming and I was welcomed by five large gatherings assembled with various objectives but most patriotic in complexion.

Many people requested me to send them bulletins on gardening and homemaking subjects. I told them to be sure to write and tell me just what they wanted because I have available thousands of these valued booklets with pictures and illustrations on as many different interesting subjects. I also have a few of the brightly colored Flag Books which you will probably like.

Let me know right away if you want any of these books. Remember, although duty compels me to return to Washington, you can reach me at all times by writing me there. Remember, too, that my heart is always at home as well as in Washington even though you elected me to remain in the Nation's Capital during the session. I could not truly represent you if I felt otherwise.

While I was home, I discussed the subject of income taxes with many friends and I came back to Congress with a much clearer view of what you folks want:

You will recall that I expressed myself as being strong for lessening tax burdens in the lower income brackets. I believe this is the only fair way. The high costs of food and rent, of clothing, and other necessities take all the dollars the man on a small salary can possibly scrape together. I don't know how he can raise much of it for anything else and still feed the family.

The argument was made that any exemptions of low incomes from taxes this year would cause the Treasury considerable loss in revenue. To the contrary, I believe that money taken last year for taxes from the man with little income, if used this year to purchase necessities of life, will produce additional taxes, at the same time increase the purchasing power of our entire society.

As I previously stated, I feel that a 20-percent reduction in the upper brackets is all right. But we must let the little fellow live also. We must put more money in his hands so he can buy commodities that our industries manufacture. Otherwise, what will become of free enterprise?

For my part, I am concerned with any recession here in America at this time. We need prosperity now. Our factories ought to be turning out peacetime goods as fast as they turned out weapons of war 5 years ago. Our workers ought to be able to command as much purchasing power today as they did in the war years.

If we were as bent upon winning the peace as we were winning the recent war, there would be no problem of high living costs, of lowering wages, of unemployment, of need. These would not be problems because everybody would be earning enough money by helping produce new cars, new radios, new household conveniences, new homes, and all other things needed for prosperity at a much faster rate than we see them doing now.

Let the small wage earner have more money to spend, increase the value of the consumer's dollar, expand the production line to create more jobs, and you will find the answer. The greater the production of the goods of peace, the surer the peace, the busier and happier the people, and the greater the era of prosperity for America and through the whole world. We must strive, we must work, for such a goal.

Limitation of Presidential Tenure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, I participated in a public-forum discussion over radio station WGN, Chicago, Ill., with Congressman JOHN W. GWYNNE, of Iowa.

I am herewith incorporating as part of the discussion, my opening remarks on the negative side of the question "Should the States Ratify the Amendment To Limit the President to Two Terms?":

On February 6 of this year the National House of Representatives passed a resolution to amend our Constitution. The Constitution of the United States is the greatest document for free government in the history of the world. Any proposal to amend it is of vital interest to every American citizen. Our people should give solemn thought and long deliberation to any legislation calling for change in the charter which is the guarantee of our liberty.

This amendment, if adopted, will restrict future generations from reelecting a President who has already served two terms. It will impose upon Americans yet unborn the mandate to change their Commander in Chief regardless of whatever crisis may confront the Nation at some future time.

Our forefathers, during the long debate in forming our Constitution, wisely avoided limiting the Presidency to two terms. During the last 160 years, over 4,500 attempts have been made to amend our Constitution. Two hundred and ten of those proposals were to affect tenure of the office of the President of the United States; so the present Congress is not attempting anything new or unusual. As the American people, or past Congresses, have already spoken 210 times against amending or limiting the President's tenure of office, I am confident that this proposal will meet the same fate.

It is a remarkable fact that the first piece of important legislation to come before the Eightieth Congress was this constitutional amendment. Could it be that the Republican leadership, who now control Congress, allowed politics to overshadow their good judgment when legislation involving domestic economy and international peace is so urgent right now? Could it be that the Republican national leaders are still disappointed and agitated over the fact that the American people saw fit to reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt in the world war emergency of 1940 and 1944? The sovereign people spoke very emphatically and unmistakenly for their choice of leadership in those trying times. I believe that every veteran of World War II and their loved ones who were at home are thankful that there was not any constitutional prohibition against our late war Commander in Chief to continue his great service to the world and to the Nation. I, for one, maintain that had Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito not been on a campaign of world conquest, Franklin D. Roosevelt would not have been a candidate for a third term.

The Republican politicians in 1940 used the antithird-term tradition as the No. 1 plank in their platform. At that very hour the dictators in Europe and the Far East were on their world rampage. The American people in solemn referendum went to the polls and by a majority of 5,000,000 rejected the antithird-term theory of the Republican platform.

In 1944, at our darkest hour, when world liberty was hanging in the balance, the American people again went to the polls and by a majority of almost 4,000,000 asked that our war commander-in-chief continue to lead the fight, even if it broke a fourth term tradition. That, my friends, is democracy in action. That is an example of a free people exercising their right of franchise.

Let me quote the words of the father of our country, President George Washington, taken from his letter to General Lafayette, commenting on this very subject: "I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the service of any man who in some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public." Could it be that the hand of destiny prompted this statement from our first commander-in-chief and president with the thought in mind of the world conflagration in 1940 and 1944?

I join with my listeners in hoping and trusting that no emergency will ever arise in the future that will make necessary either a third or a fourth Presidential term. However we still live in a sick world. Enduring peace is not yet assured. The secret of the atomic bomb may fall in the hands of potential enemies. If an emergency such as George Washington predicted should ever arise again, I want the President—be he Democratic or Republican—to finish the job if the people decide that he possesses the qualifications of leadership.

We are the inheritors of the best political system in the world. Do our present congressional leaders lack confidence in the foundation of our political structure? It is worth noting that Senators and Representatives who are supporting the proposed amendment apparently see no inconsistency in having themselves reelected to as many successive terms as possible.

There are those who say that should some national emergency arise which would warrant continuing a President beyond the constitutional limit, this amendment could be repealed. We must remember that always in a national crisis, the time element is important; and further, that a constitutional amendment, once adopted, cannot be repealed except by a vote of three-fourths of the States. This might take several years. The prime question involved is, Why should we of today undertake to tie the hands of future generations on any national emergency which cannot be foreseen now? Neither the Eightieth Congress nor the voters of this generation have a valid claim to solve the problems of the future when we are so totally perplexed with present-day questions. Why not permit future Americans to make their own free decisions in the light of conditions which they will have to face and which we cannot possibly anticipate?

Democracy Stands at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of March 13, 1947:

DEMOCRACY STANDS AT THE CROSSROADS

If President Truman's searching message to the Congress yesterday accomplished nothing else, it put the blunt question: "Whither Democracy?" into the open, where it can no longer be ignored, and that is good. The possibility of totalitarian intrusion into democratic Europe is now an officially admitted reality.

In one sense, this country is today in the position in which the signatories of the nine-power pact found themselves when Japan occupied and absorbed Manchuria under the thin guise of striking an alliance with a friendly—meaning puppet—government; in the position in which the League of Nations found itself at Geneva when Haile Selassie pleaded for action against, or at least official recognition of, Mussolini's aggression; in the position of Chamberlain and Daladier at Munich, where Hitler euchred them into selling Czechoslovakia down the river.

Unlike these others, we do not face the alternative of immediate war if we fail to purchase peace now with appeasement in the Balkans. Whatever we do in Turkey and Greece, it will not precipitate armed conflict. But it may indeed prevent a Third World War in days to come by putting aggressors on notice—now—that we do not propose to slumber until aggression can be checked only by another global blood bath.

Today, Greece and Turkey are in much the same case as Czechoslovakia in the dark time of Munich. Alone and unaided, they are as helpless to resist the continuing pressure of and ultimate absorption into the "Soviet orbit," as Czechoslovakia would have been to stand single-handed against the Luftwaffe and the Wehrmacht.

Britain, remembering Munich perhaps, has desperately attempted to strengthen Greece with men and money which would keep it from the impotence that made Czechoslovakia a helpless pawn of alien powers in 1938. But Britain no longer has the physical force for rendering effective aid. Britain threw in the sponge last week and notified us she could no longer go on.

That left three courses open to us:

We could continue to pretend that the plight of Greece posed no international issues, but was merely a humanitarian matter, to be relieved with gifts of money and shipments of food. That is what we have been doing in the past.

We could say—as we finally did in China—"A plague on both your houses" and threaten to wash our hands of all further responsibility or concern.

Or we could say, as President Truman said before the Congress yesterday:

"The seeds of totalitarianism reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died. We must keep that hope alive. * * * The people of a number of countries have already had totalitarian regimes thrust upon them against their will * * * The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened. * * * Greece must have assistance if it is to become a self-supporting democracy. * * * If we falter in our leadership we may endanger the peace of the world, and we shall surely endanger the youth of our Nation."

In other words, unless we stop the spread of totalitarianism now, even in lands as far from direct contact with us as Greece and Turkey, totalitarianism will spread to the point where it can be stopped only by endangering the youth of our Nation. We must stand by Greece and Turkey not merely for their sake but for our own.

We can do this with money and materials. The figure Mr. Truman proposed was $400,000,000—one-tenth of 1 percent of the three hundred forty-one billions we spent in treasure alone to assure a peaceful future for the world of which we are a part. But this is not merely to be dumped into the laps of local authorities already unable to cope with the forces arrayed against them. Full American supervision of its disbursement and American military advisers for the restoration of order are part and parcel of the plan.

The final decision is up to the Congress. The momentous nature of reorienting our foreign policy to admit that our national safety is now closely knit to that of democracy everywhere, even in such countries as Greece and Turkey, is well illustrated in the manner in which congressional reaction to the President's speech trespassed party lines.

The decision now to be made is not a political one. It is not one to be reached with an eye on 1948. It is not a Republican or Democratic Party issue. It is an American problem. If it is considered and decided as such, the people of this country will stand by their representatives because, however the die is cast, the tinsel and papier-mâché trappings of pretense have been stripped away, so that a momentous American problem is at last fully revealed for the thoughtful appraisal and judgment of the American people.

Reduction of the Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial written by Mr. George Rochester, editor of the Long Beach Argus, Long Beach, Calif., and published in that paper under date of March 27, 1947, so accurately expresses my opinion of the present tremendous drive against the efforts of the House to achieve as much economy as possible, in the expenses of the Federal Government, that I take pleasure in inserting it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial is:

JUST SO MUCH HOKUM

All this fight that the budget cannot be reduced back in Washington because it might affect our defense system is just so much hokum. This is the straw that the thousands who have enjoyed the fat jobs they held for the past 16 years are hanging their hat on. We honestly believe that the budget could be cut more than six billion if the dead timber was eliminated. There are thousands of jobs in the hundreds of bureaus created under the New Deal that could be done away with and not hurt the efficiency of our Government. No one desires to do anything that would affect our national defense. So the advocates of not cutting the budget are simply using the military set-up as a blind to hold on to their jobs.

The Tanning Industry Is Vitally Affected by Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we are being constantly told that reciprocal trade agreements are not injurious to American industry and labor and that the welfare of the American people is promoted by such international trade pacts.

In my congressional district there are several tanneries, processing the finest sole leather in the United States. During the war the importance of the tanning industry revealed it as one of our greatest national assets.

It is significant that the United States needs for leather during the war were filled by our domestic production and that in this respect a remarkable record was established. We could not depend upon any foreign producers because of the lack of any guaranty that leather from abroad would be made available for our needs.

It is imperative, from the standpoint of meeting our future national needs, that the tanning industry must be protected from unfair foreign competition which results when subsidized products of other nations threaten American industry.

At this point, I wish to read a letter from Howes Bros. Co., Boston, Mass., owners of several tanneries in the State of Pennsylvania.

The letter is as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *March 7, 1947.*

The Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: Your letter of February 24, addressed to Mr. Artz of the Mount Jewett Tanning Co., has been forwarded to us by Mr. Artz as the Mount Jewett Tanning Co. is one of our subsidiaries, and we sell the leather from this tannery as well as six others.

One of the principal objections to reciprocal-trade agreements is that where the

United States is still conducted on a free-enterprise system, this is not true in many other countries in the world; therefore, the individual American company must compete against some form of a government-controlled arrangement, and the cost of the product is not the determining factor in many of these cases.

We will use Argentina to illustrate our point. This country is the world's largest exporter of raw hides. They now have a plan whereby these hides will be processed into leather and exported as leather, thereby giving added employment to their workers, and they have many methods they can use in order to achieve this objective.

The Central Bank of Argentina can adjust the exchange rate between dollars and pesos so that the export of leather is facilitated or retarded.

The individual producer of hides, leather, and tanning materials is not permitted to sell any of his products for export. Instead he must now sell these products to the Government at a price fixed by the Government, who resells to the foreign buyer. None of these operations can be claimed to be free-market operations and are not necessarily related in any way to world prices or costs. The Government orders the hide producer to sell a certain amount of his hides to the Argentine tanner at a price and to sell the balance to the Government at some other price. The tanner is ordered to sell a certain amount of his leather to the Argentine shoe factory at a definite price and the balance to the Government at another price. Under this plan the Government is able to price its leather for export, if necessary, at no higher than the price they ask for the hides, and as the purpose is to export leather and not hides, it is fair to assume that something on this order may occur. They are now asking 35 cents a pound for a hide weighing 55 pounds or a total of $19.25 per hide. This hide would produce 40 pounds of leather, and if they sold the leather at 48 cents a pound, it would give them $19.25 for the tanned hide, leaving nothing for tanning, labor, and so forth.

Our representative has recently visited England and other European countries in most of which the government is subsidizing the imports of raw materials, food, and so forth, thereby holding down to a substandard level the cost of all manufactured products, and if they had a surplus for export, the price could be far below the American price arrived at on a free, competitive market.

The only method we know of to protect American industry against the above type of commerce is to prohibit the importation of any product which is sold at a price lower than the price of a similar American product.

Very truly yours,

HOWES BROTHERS CO.
J. SCHANZLE.

Truman's Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Providence (R. I.) Journal of March 7, 1947:

TRUMAN'S TRADE POLICY

Mr. Truman's address at Waco had the quality of true statesmanship. He wants to establish freedom of trade in the world on a firm basis. He regards it as an essential part of human freedom, bulwarking such basic liberties as freedom of speech and freedom of worship.

He says specifically, however, that freer trade, not free trade, is the American objective. No tariff concessions will be made haphazardly by this country. There will be no across-the-board reductions. Every affected industry will be given a full and fair hearing before any tariff rate is changed. Any proposal for changes will be suggested by the Government only after "an exhaustive study has been made."

For every concession made by this country, a comparable concession will be required from abroad. Every reciprocal trade agreement henceforth will contain an escape clause, permitting the cancellation of an agreement by us in event that a domestic industry is suffering "serious injury."

Mr. Truman sees in freedom of trade among nations the best chance of preserving and strengthening private enterprise in America. Trade controlled and conducted not by Government directives but by the free choice of individuals is his purpose. That is historic American doctrine.

But the President feels compelled to reassert it now because it is threatened. It is endangered by economic chaos abroad which impels some governments to regulate and curb their foreign commerce. It is menaced at home by some American businessmen who regard imports in quantity as unfair to their own market.

Mr. Truman proposes to meet these menaces by putting the American Government's firm support, on a bipartisan basis, behind the effort to complete an international trade charter at Geneva next month. It represents a purpose to carry forward the international economic cooperation which is implicit in the Bretton Woods agreements.

In the execution of this policy, so far as America is concerned, Mr. Truman intends to use our existing reciprocal-trade-agreements program, subject to the reservations he outlines, to break down trade barriers. Intelligently used, he sees that program, rightly, we believe, furnishing a practical means of promoting world prosperity. Upon such prosperity, in the last analysis, our own prosperity depends.

What is the alternative? Mr. Truman states it clearly. It is to accept, indeed encourage, the throttling of world trade that occurred after World War I. It resulted not only in economic disaster for all nations, including the United States, but eventually in World War II.

We were faced then, as we are now, with a choice. It is economic nationalism with its corollaries of high tariffs, export subsidies, exchange controls, trade quotas, commercial licensing systems, and embargoes—or international economic cooperation with its basic corollary of freedom of trade.

Mr. Truman says flatly that he chooses international economic cooperation. It is a statesmanlike decision. It should be hailed with deep satisfaction from one end of this country to the other. Why? Because, as the President points out, if other countries are driven by their present domestic economic extremity to reerect the barriers to foreign trade that were common after World War I, they will have to resort to increasing governmental regimentation to apply and enforce them. Not only economic freedom but political liberty will be severely restricted. It frustrates peace. It is the road to war.

In such circumstances, the United States, in self-defense, will be driven to adopt countermeasures of the same character. We, too, would be forced to regiment our industry and our commerce. Free enterprise would no longer be free. The Government, not independent business, would decide what we would export and import, in what countries we would buy or sell. It would be a complete denial not only of the American concept of free enterprise but of the very essence of all our liberties.

Naturally Mr. Truman utterly rejects this alternative. Who in his right senses could do less? The President regards economic cooperation in international affairs to be as vitally necessary now as political cooperation. As for American leadership in lifting the world from economic chaos to order and stability—a leadership we cannot shirk because we alone possess the strength and resources—he asks for the same bipartisan effort here at home that has worked so successfully in our political concerns on the international level.

Our steady pursuit of this objective so well outlined by Mr. Truman offers the best hope, in our judgment, of maintaining not only prosperity at home but peace abroad. It turns our face as a Nation as firmly against economic isolation as we have already turned it against political isolation. It sets before a discouraged and bewildered world the American conviction, already supported by our tangible resources, that peace and prosperity will return. The only proviso is that nations must cooperate economically as well as politically. On this course Mr. Truman has wisely set our Nation.

Greece and the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal that we appropriate $400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey, and its possible effect at a time when it is imperative that we curtail our national budget if we are to maintain economic stability, is set forth in an editorial entitled "Greece and the Budget," in the Wall Street Journal of March 14, which I wish to include in the RECORD:

GREECE AND THE BUDGET

Whatever its other consequences may be, the President's message on aid to Greece and Turkey does not in the least degree relieve Congress of the duty of cutting down the Government's expenditures. On the contrary, it renders that duty the more urgent. If Congress is to appropriate $400,000,000—to begin with—for the support of two existing governments in the Near East, the necessity for retrenchment in other parts of the budget will be greater than it was previously judged to be.

Chairman BRIDGES of the Senate Appropriations Committee is quoted as saying of the message that "it knocks budget plans askew." Just what his statement (if he made it in precisely that form) means, we do not know. We trust he does not think this new turn in our foreign relations relieves Congress of its responsibility for budget balance. The fact should be plain that if the United States is to embark on a new or extended program of protecting the independence of weaker nations, at an ultimate cost that cannot now be measured, it is under so much the greater necessity of cutting its other governmental costs to the bone.

That conclusion is inescapable for at least two good reasons. One is that the public debt stands at $260,000,000,000 and must be reduced, not increased, if the Government is to protect its own credit and the integrity of the dollar. A return to deficit financing now would seriously impair the Nation's economic strength for the task which the President asks it to assume.

Another compelling reason why this $400,000,000 should be found by reducing other

budgetary items is that the program of assistance to little nations in their resistance to foreign aggression will be very like another lend-lease operation in that it will write an additional draft on our resources of food, raw materials, and certain categories of manufactured goods. It would be sheer folly if our Government, while taking on an exterior burden which cannot be measured in advance, should at the same time attempt to carry on a variety of public works and social gains.

The inevitable effect of such a double strain upon our resources is obvious. We are already struggling in the toils of a price inflation, due in part to unsound fiscal policies of the past and the present, and in part to war-made scarcities throughout the world. We shall be defeated in that struggle unless Congress insists that aid to Greece and Turkey shall be taken into the budget by displacing other projected expenditures—and only in that way.

So far from knocking budget plans askew, the President's message of Wednesday powerfully supports the House version of the budget, with its $6,000,000,000 reduction of the President's expenditures ceiling for the coming fiscal year. It lays a heavier responsibility than previously rested upon Congress for severely prudent budgeting.

Need for Occupation Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of March 13, 1947:

NEED FOR OCCUPATION FORCES—PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS AFFECTING OUR PERSONNEL IN GERMANY OPPOSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Last September I returned from Germany, where I was attached as attorney to the War Crimes Branch, United States Army, and had the privilege of taking an active part in various war-crime trials, especially the so-called Malmedy trial, conducted at Dachau to punish the killers of American soldiers taken prisoners in the Battle of the Bulge. During my stay over there I had ample opportunity to observe our occupation forces at work and to notice that most of our Military Government offices which I saw were adequately manned, but that none of them was overstaffed.

Since that time conditions have radically changed. True, the total of American wives and children surpasses the total strength of our constabulary, but I doubt that this fact will enhance our military and administrative efficiency. The Seventh and Third Armies have been deactivated. The constabulary, upon whom the Military Government counts to suppress any resistance movements, is without its tanks; our Air Forces are without bombers.

General Clay was compelled to announce several radical personnel cuts, resulting in 30 to 40 percent reduction of MG's personnel by July 1, 1947; doing away with practically all of the liaison detachments in the smaller places of the "Landkreise" and cutting the strength of various administrative departments to the bone—not even to mention the complete lack of personnel for one of the most important tasks, denazification, the handling of which we should have reserved for ourselves.

Moreover, although all these reductions were instituted on the basis of a greatly reduced tentative budget for 1947, the present economy drive in Congress threatens even this budget with further very substantial cuts, which well might make occupation a meaningless gesture and a hollow shell. Already AMG is compelled to cancel running contracts with civilian employees. All personnel with a rating below CAF-8 and P-3, who have their families over there, cannot, pursuant to a notice recently appearing in Stars and Stripes, expect a renewal of their contracts.

RESULT OF CUT

What will happen if the intended six-billion cut, or even the liberal four and one-half billion cut, should become law is only too obvious. While I was still over there, many of the Germans in all walks of life expressed their doubts about the seriousness of our intention to stay and sweat it out in Germany.

But what is our alternative? To turn over the occupation of our zone to the French or the English, who, although they, on their small war-ravaged and impoverished island, certainly do not have the financial resources of this country, now have substantially more troops (200,000) under arms in Germany than we have? Or to continue to occupy Germany with totally inadequate and insufficient forces?

When will we ever learn that power is the only language all of the other countries understand? There cannot be the slightest doubt in anybody's mind that by indiscriminately cutting down our occupation forces (as will be the inevitable result of the intended budget reductions) we will not only "lose face" in the eyes of the German people, who would certainly be the first ones to avail themselves of our weakness, but will also lose the much-needed bargaining power in AMG's dealings with the other occupying governments.

From all I have seen, the Military Government and its military and administrative personnel have done an excellent job. Undoubtedly, mistakes and errors have been made; undoubtedly, people were occasionally placed in positions for which they were not fit and in which they exercised faulty judgment; undoubtedly, a small minority placed good living and personal gains above their tasks. But, on the whole, the Military Government's personnel are efficient, honest, and capable, deeply devoted to their duties; they measure up fully to the forces of any of the other occupying powers, and do not deserve to be let down now by economy measures, however well intended they may be, which would cripple this efficiency beyond repair.

Congress, before cutting the budgets of the War and Navy Departments, should listen to the warning voices of men like Secretaries Marshall, Patterson, and Forrestal, and Generals Eisenhower, MacArthur, McNarney, and Clay, who are certainly no New Dealers, and whose personalities and backgrounds should vouch for the absence of any bias or personal interest.

WARNINGS OF LEADERS

The Secretaries of the War and Navy Departments are civilians themselves. Generals Marshall and Eisenhower are professional military men, who have time and time again in the past placed the interest of the Nation above the gains or interest of any particular group or class. In General Clay we are happy to possess a man who combines, to an otherwise rarely attained degree, the top qualifications of a soldier with the qualifications of a civilian administrator and diplomat. Their warning voices should not be heard in vain.

And it is more than a coincidence that there seem to be not many supporters of the budget cuts among the Republican Members of Congress who have actually been over there, be it as a fighting man, like Senator LODGE, or as an observer, like Senator MORSE. These men know what is at stake.

A substantial cut in income taxes would, no doubt, be welcomed by everybody, but I think much too highly of the patriotism and intelligence of the average American to believe that they would also welcome such cut if it can be achieved only by wielding an ax in a dark room, by the relinquishment of our international obligations, and by paying a price which might not fall due for another 10 or 20 years, but which we one day would have to pay.

We did have money enough to bring dozens of witnesses from everywhere to Washington to testify in the 6 weeks' fight against Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation. Concededly, the amounts needed for the efficient occupation of Germany and Japan are bigger. But bigger things are also at stake, and for these bigger things we ought to, and must, have the money, even if it means a tax reduction of less than 20 percent, or no tax reduction at all.

The Second World War is not yet ended. Hostilities have merely ceased.

HERBERT J. STRONG.

NEW YORK, *March 8, 1947.*

Broadcasts to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Wall Street Journal of March 12, 1947:

PROTESTS BROADCASTS TO RUSSIA

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I protest against the waste of the taxpayers' money by the Department of State in broadcasting propaganda material to Soviet Russia, where there are a large number of languages and dialects in current use. The Moscow dialect, which is the foundation of the literary language, covers only a small area, not even the whole of the Province of Moscow. Aside from this consideration, it is the generally accepted view that our communications are lacking in interest and dignity, and such efforts, to be effective, necessarily must be directed to countries where public opinion is an actual factor in influencing the course of events, and it is well known that this condition does not prevail in Russia.

The compact group of individuals composing the Soviet Government are cognizant of all they wish to know about the United States, and it is vain to suppose that they can be moved unless, perhaps, by our own official representatives. The only result of the indirect approach by propaganda is bound to be one of irritation. The Government of the United States and its citizens, one must admit, react similarly to corresponding attempts by the Soviet Union to spread its information and doctrines in this country.

Heretofore, our diplomatic agents abroad have enjoyed considerable influence because of the fact that, until comparatively recently, they have conducted themselves in a business-like manner. We have now succumbed to methods long employed in Europe and Asia, where they have failed completely. The net consequence of this recourse to processes alien to our traditions is that, when the Secretary of State speaks, his views will be

weighed and considered in the light of the irresponsible emanations from broadcasters professing to be the Voice of America, but over whose emphasis and shades of meaning he will have had slight or, more probably, no control.

I am opposed in principle to any form of organized governmental propaganda, which seems to me to be a worthless and undignified performance, not merely negative in its results but positively harmful to our national interests. After all, the United States of America is a tremendous factor in the world and speaks for itself with a power and eloquence beyond the capacity of professional propagandists to emulate.

CLARENCE B. HEWES.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

If We Assume Britain's Obligations, We Are Entitled to Some of Her Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am only one of perhaps countless thousands of our American citizens who believed and said at the beginning of World War II that we should have demanded that Great Britain deliver the ownership and control of some of her Western Hemisphere properties to the United States in exchange for the untold billions in money and matériels, to say nothing of personnel, that were poured out so unstintingly to her. Many of us thought that the old loan, hangover from World War I, which we made to Great Britain, the fabulous sums in lend-lease, and other contributions which we made to England in World War II, were gifts, at the time, and that since England did not pay nor attempt to pay any of the old indebtedness to us, she should have been at least courteous enough to surrender some of her Western Hemisphere possessions to us before, or at the time, of requesting further assistance. Instead, we played the sucker again and spent millions upon millions of dollars in fortifying and otherwise improving England's Western Hemisphere possessions; and the most we got out of any of them was a lease on some of them.

Then Great Britain asked us for a fresh loan about a year and a half ago of $3,750,000,000, and the New Deal administration insisted that Congress authorize and appropriate such a loan out of the Treasury of the United States. In other words, we had to tax our people more, and continue our deficit spending still further, and increase our inflationary tendency in order to make England a fresh loan of $3,750,000,000. I voted against that loan; but the New Deal majority in Congress passed it. Now we are asked to come to England's aid in Greece and Turkey to the tune of $400,000,000, to start with. No one knows how much will be requested later. We are continuing to be easy and gullible. But do not forget that this affords the New Deal another emergency appeal, and it is likely that Congress will come to England's aid again, as they always have, without any benefits in return.

It is high time that the administration, and, if it fails, the Congress, insist that if England is bankrupt we deal with her somewhat as we would with a private individual who is financially embarrassed or a firm or corporation that has gone broke. The assets of the bankrupt are liquidated and the proceeds are used, as far as they will go, to pay the expenses of the liquidation proceedings, and the remainder is applied upon the indebtedness of the bankrupt individual or concern. Why not apply some such businesslike methods in the present crisis? Apparently more than $220,000,000 in Greek funds and accumulated private credits remain blocked in London banks. This would indicate that England owes Greece and the Greek people that sum of money. Now England asks us to relieve her of the necessity of advancing funds to Greece in order to protect England primarily and to afford some relief to the worthy Greeks.

If we assume Britain's obligations we are entitled to some of her assets.

Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper article by Steffan Andrews, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, with Washington date line of March 11, 1947, taken from the Tulsa Tribune of Tulsa, Okla., explains some things which, apparently, the public has not heretofore known:

BRITAIN HOLDS GREEK FUNDS BUT UNITED STATES PAYS

(By Steffan Andrews)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—While Britain is pleading for United States aid to Greece, more than $220,000,000 in Greek Government funds and accumulated private credits remains blocked in London banks.

The total, amounting to £55,000,000 sterling, was frozen by the British Government during the war. Technically, the money was unfrozen in March 1946, but the agreement was so hedged with restrictions that the Greeks cannot use the funds outside the British Empire sterling area.

Greek Embassy officials in Washington say that, if they had the money, they would spend hundreds of thousands of dollars for food, consumption goods, and industrial machinery in the United States. First Secretary Alexis S. Liatis estimates the Greeks would buy (not borrow) each month $15,000,000 worth of food alone.

But here is the dilemma: The Greeks don't actually have this money. The British have it and they won't let them convert it into dollars. And the only place the Greeks can buy surplus food and supplies is in the United States—a dollar area.

Americans also froze Greek assets in this country during the war. The money has all been freed now, with no strings attached. The total amount freed was $70,000,000.

If Greece gets an additional $350,000,000 grant, as requested by the British, the cost to the United States for Greek aid will total nearly $1,000,000,000. To date, approximately $610,000,000 has been expended for loans, grants, and direct relief.

As compiled by the State Department and Foreign Liquidation Commission, here's the break-down:

Lend-lease, $75,600,000; surplus goods credit, $45,000,000; UNRRA, $334,237,000; Export-Import Bank, $25,000,000; Greek War Relief, $130,000,000.

Greece, incidentally, has a smaller population than New York City and in land area is only slightly larger than North Carolina.

A very intelligent constituent of mine has written me on this subject as follows:

I imagine that the statements contained in the attached clipping from the Tulsa Tribune are true, and if such is the case it seems to me that some food for thought is contained therein.

Maybe this business of taking over all the troubles of Great Britain and the rest of the world is all right, and again it may be that we are about to make an awful mistake. If we continue to assume Britain's obligations we might soon find ourselves in a worse position than she now is without anybody to come to our rescue.

At any rate it is customary down here, as you know, that when we assume all the obligations of a "busted" concern, we also get all of its assets. So if this article speaks the truth and if we must assume all of Britain's obligations, it does seem that in doing so we should get some of the assets involved; and there seem to be some assets available.

I am afraid, George, that we are simply being sucked into a situation from which we cannot ever escape. This country cannot carry the obligations of the entire world.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bay City (Mich.) Times:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Only the willfully blind could fail to recognize the fact that President Truman's message to Congress asking that it vote $400,000,000 in aid to Greece and Turkey has made war with Russia, at any early date, more than a possibility.

The message stated plainly that if the financial assistance asked is granted and it is found not to be enough to save Greece from communism and its neighbor from Soviet coercion, the President has other measures in mind which he hopes will be more effective. "Our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid," he said. The second step could be hardly other than military action.

The President unreservedly laid down a foreign policy which makes the United States guardian of democracy throughout the world, and unequivocally says that the spread of totalitarianism must be halted by us. As the beginning is to be made at the front door of Russia it is not difficult to guess as to what power Mr. Truman was giving due warning.

It now becomes the duty of Congress to examine and pass upon this policy, and particularly its immediate implications and possible consequences. No doubt it will do so with prudence and patriotism.

The immediate gravity of the situation the President has created depends largely upon the spirit in which Moscow receives the message. Only a day in advance of its delivery, perhaps after its contents had been communicated to the Soviet Government, Stalin recalled his Ambassadors from Washington and London for consultation. Whether that had any significance or not remains to be seen. But it can hardly be regarded as a particularly cheerful omen.

The President's course has been described by some as a death blow to the United Nations. That may be too pessimistic a way of looking at it. But at best it is bound to lessen the confidence of the leaders of the movement and put a wet blanket everywhere on hopes for its success. Indeed, announcement of readiness to take independent action above and beyond economic aid by the world's leading power in dealing with a situation such as Greece presents must make millions wonder if it is not practical abandonment of the UN.

It is only reasonable to think that very important considerations aside from those of which the public has been made aware must underlie the President's decision. Congress at least should be made familiar with what they are. And maybe those who must do the paying, and dying if war comes, are entitled to an inkling.

As the probabilities are always against war, even when it is considered near, we need not feel too depressed. But at the same time it is well to remember that if it comes we will have to fight alone. Britain is at the moment a broken reed militarily and economically. She says she is financially unable to maintain an army of even half a division in Greece. And we would have no other ally that could be of much value in a struggle with Russia.

All the millions of Americans will watch developments at Washington and in Europe anxiously, hoping that the threat will evaporate and leave us and the world at peace, but determined to support the President to the hilt if the worst comes, which pray God will not happen.

Sny Flood-Control Project Needs Help of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pike County Democrat-Times, of Pittsfield, Ill.:

SNY FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT NEEDS HELP OF CONGRESS

Unless the present Congress can be convinced of the vital need for flood control in the Sny Basin, there is little chance that the money will be appropriated for the project, which was approved by the last Congress.

The Sny Landowner's Committee is working hard to get the facts before Congress, but they need the help of every landowner. The present status of the project is clearly stated in a letter from Brig. Gen. R. C. Crawford, Acting Chief of Engineers, to Congressman SID SIMPSON. The letter is dated February 10, and we received a copy of the letter from Mr. SIMPSON this week. We quote that letter:

"Reference is made to your letter of February 5, 1947, relative to the improvements in the Sny Island Drainage and Levee District which were authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1946. You state that the citizens affected in Adams, Pike, and Calhoun Counties, Ill., are very anxious that funds for the construction of these authorized improvements be included in the War Department civil-function appropriation bill of the Eightieth Congress and ask about action being taken to accomplish this.

"The Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946, authorized a project for local flood protection on McCraney, Hadley, Kiser, Six-Mile and Bay Creeks in the Sny Basin, Illinois, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in the report dated April 17, 1946. To date, no funds have been appropriated by Congress for the construction of the authorized improvements in the Sny Basin, and the Corps of Engineers is unable to initiate that work until the necessary funds are made available for that purpose. Moreover, the estimated expenditures contained in the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, as recently transmitted to Congress by the President, do not include funds for the construction of the Sny Basin project since no funds have been previously appropriated for that purpose and the appropriations recommended by the President for the fiscal year 1948 for civil works projects of the Corps of Engineers are only for projects partly provided for in previous appropriation acts. No appropriation for starting the construction of additional civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers are included in the recommendations of the President in his budget message for the fiscal year 1948.

"The Corps of Engineers fully recognizes the importance of the authorized project for local flood protection in the Sny Basin and appreciates the benefits that will be realized upon completion of that work. I am pleased to say that Colonel William N. Leaf, our District Engineer at Rock Island, Ill., is now proceeding with the planning of that project. You may be assured, therefore, that the Corps of Engineers will be fully prepared to undertake the authorized construction as soon as the necessary funds are made available for that purpose, subject, of course, to the fulfillment by local interests of the requirements of local cooperation provided for in the authorizing act."

It is plainly evident in this letter that the engineers are ready to start work on the flood control project as soon as Congress appropriates the money. It is also clearly evident that there is little chance of the present Congress appropriating the money unless the Appropriations Committee can be convinced of the vital necessity for starting work on this project as soon as possible. In addition to the fact that money for this project is not included in the President's budget figures, the House has voted to cut the President's figures by $6,000,000,000 and the Senate has voted a $4,500,000,000 cut. This does not mean that Congress will keep appropriations within this limit, but it does mean that it will be difficult to get Congress to include any additional appropriation in the budget.

The Sny Drainage District consists of approximately 110,000 acres of rich farm land. According to the report of the chief engineer urging Congress last year to approve this project, the average annual flood damage is $450,200. In the spring of 1944 the damage was $670,931. This same report states that total costs to the United States for levees and all flood control work in the Sny basin has been approximately $1,022,000. The report further states: "Local interests have constructed and maintained auxiliary levees, straightened and maintained channels of the Sny and major tributaries below the bluff lines, and constructed sedimentation basins at the mouths of McCraney, Hadley, and Kiser Creeks. Expenditures for this work have been reported to approximate $3,733,000."

The engineer's report states that the Sny drainage system has depreciated until 22,000 acres of land have already been made unproductive. If annual flood damage is permitted to continue without any control, many landowners are threatened with losses which will put them out of business. After the landowners spent almost $4,000,000 on the Sny drainage system over the years, the Government built dams in the Mississippi River to improve navigation. Landowners contend that these dams are largely responsible for ruining the Sny drainage system. Therefore, the Government is obligated to remedy these damages by constructing the flood-control project which the Seventy-ninth Congress approved.

The engineer's report estimates the first cost at $5,217,203 of which $4,854,944 is Federal for construction and $362,259 is non-Federal from the lands. It is also estimated that the benefits to this rich farm land will more than pay the cost of the project over a period of years.

There is no question that the rich farm land in the Sny basin is entitled to flood protection. Therefore, in spite of the movement in Congress for economy, we believe that the facts in the case justify the appropriation for the Sny project being included in the appropriations to be made by Congress at its present session.

That Pinch-Penny Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, since January 3, when President Truman sent his message to Congress and submitted his so-called $37,500,000,000 budget, this House, the Senate, and the Nation have redounded with arguments about the necessity of spending that huge sum of money for our governmental operations in the fiscal year of 1948.

However, it is perfectly apparent to those of us who have kept up with other messages that President Truman has sent to Congress that his proposed $37,500,000,000 budget represented his minimum demand for Government expenditure and not his maximum demand.

Since January 3, in addition to his budget proposals, he has sent a total of more than 70 messages to Congress, most of them requesting additional appropriations for Government expenditures. These additional appropriations, including the latest request of Wednesday, March 12, for $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey total more than $40,200,000,000.

Here are some of the requests, Mr. Speaker, that have been sent to Congress since the budget was presented by President Truman last January 3:

Office of Price Administration	$5,959,000
Office of Defense Transportation	143,000
National Mediation Board	82,300
Treasury	3,520,000
Civil Service Commission	738,000
War Department	300,000,000
Interior	2,500,000
Judiciary (2 messages)	1,485,588
Smithsonian Institution	25,100
National Labor Relations Board	695,700
Veterans' Administration	2,169,114,500
National Archives	43,000
Library of Congress	668,020
Railroad Retirement Board	2,204,000
Panama Canal	611,000
War Department (military activities)	489,737,000
Bureau of the Budget	38,000

Treasury (2 messages)	$5,831,900
National Advisory Committee Aeronautics	7,497,000
Post Office	82,223,350
Federal Security Agency	147,916,164
Interior, Indian funds	1,003,469
Agriculture	3,944,000
Soldiers' Home	50,000
Federal Works Agency (2 messages)	22,955,000
District of Columbia	4,242,605
Justice Department	1,064,500
State (3 messages)	17,266,000
Federal Loan Agency	2,640,000
Eighteen different agencies	353,398,633
Claims allowed by General Accounting Office	15,834,780
Judgments, Court of Claims	2,104,796
Commerce	87,532,000
War Assets Administration	75,000,000

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have been doing Mr. Truman a great injustice by attributing to him a pinch-penny budget. He is not going to be a shorthorn and have our taxpayers spend only $37,500,000,000. He is going to spend, if we let him more than $40,000,000,000.

This constant stream of messages from the executive branch of the government is added proof, in my judgment, that the Democratic administration's strategy to win the 1948 elections is clear and simple. That is, their strategy is to propose huge, unconscionable, fantastic sums to be spent, and then hope that the Congress will be stupid enough to acquiese in most of the requests. If we are, the Democrats can then point to us and say that we did not balance the budget, we did not cut peacetime Government expenditures and that the Republicans' promise to restore solvency to this Government was mere campaign verbiage.

It is perfectly clear also that President Truman in making all of these proposals that entail enormous amounts of tax money, is putting Congress on the spot. It is very simple, although highly irresponsible, for him to suggest all of the expenditures he has suggested thus far, plus others that will undoubtedly be forthcoming. He knows that every time he makes a suggestion, or a proposal, to spend additional funds he is winning friends among particular pressure groups which are out beating the woods in an effort to get tax money for their special purposes at all times. In addition, he can address these special groups in 1948 and tell them that he did his best to help them. If we Republicans slap down his requests, as we ought to do, he can blame us because the pressure groups are dissatisfied and have not obtained the regular Government funds they had been used to getting.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, this is shrewd political strategy. But I must say that it is about as cynical and as harmful to the country in the long run as any policy on which the Democratic Party possibly can embark. It means that those groups which have persisted in trying to raid the public Treasury will redouble their efforts to get more public funds to be used for their special private purposes. It will mean, unless we Republicans let the people know the score, confusion among the populace and disillusionment among all lovers of good government. It will mean, in the final analysis, continued inflation in this country and possibly the complete wreckage of our form of government.

The Truman appropriation messages sent to Congress since January 3 have been labeled various ways. Some are requests for supplemental appropriations, and others are for deficiency appropriations. They ask for funds for Government departments both for the coming fiscal year 1948, which begins July 1, and the present fiscal year, which ends on June 30.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that although the law requires a detailed accounting of the reasons for each appropriation requested of Congress, the vast majority of these Presidential messages carry only the following stock formula:

> The foregoing supplemental estimate is required to meet contingencies which have arisen since the transmission of the budget for the fiscal year 1948.

These supplemental requests were made for the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, the National Mediation Board, the Treasury Department, the War Department, the Interior Department, the Civil Service Commission, the Judiciary, the Smithsonian Institute, the National Labor Relations Board, the Veterans' Administration, the National Archives, the Library of Congress, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Panama Canal, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, the Post Office Department, the Federal Security Agency, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Loan Agency, the War Assets Administration, and dozens of other agencies and bureaus.

Note, too, Mr. Speaker, that the Bureau of the Budget itself requested a supplemental appropriation of $38,000 in one of the Presidential messages.

It is discouraging to all persons who desire fiscal clarity that the President should have embarked upon such a course of confusion in asking for his appropriations. Since he has served in the United States Senate, it is apparent that he has not done this in ignorance. He and his campaign advisers for 1948 figured, whether correctly or not, that these additional requests for funds would not be included in the debates that are raging throughout the country relating to the size of next year's budget and that he might get credit for being economy minded while at the same time proposing the most fantastic series of expenditures ever put before an American Congress in peacetime.

The President's latest request for funds—the $400,000,000 to be used in a general effort to spread "democracy" in Greece and Turkey—is in addition to the $350,000,000 which he had requested already that the Congress authorize for the prevention of starvation and suffering in the countries devastated by the war. In other words, we Congressmen ought to consider the Presidential request for funds to be $750,000,000 and not simply $400,000,000, as he and his cohorts will try to use in coming debates on this subject. By using the lower figure, the Democrats know that they will have a better chance of selling this program to the American people. I am for using the correct and the accurate figure of $750,000,000 which, admittedly small compared to the $40,000,000,000 over-all expenditures requested, is certainly not chicken feed.

Federal Tax 37 Times All Other Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a fine letter from Mr. A. W. Robertson, of Pittsburgh, Pa., which speaks for itself:

MARCH 12, 1947.

Dear Mr. SCHWABE: You will be astonished, as I was, that I paid 37 times as much tax to the Federal Government as I paid to all other tax collectors (Federal tax from 1942 through 1946—$746,717; all other taxes for the same period, $20,200). What is still more remarkable, this $20,000 paid for all public-school facilities, all police protection, fire protection, sanitary service, including street cleaning and garbage collection.

While individual tax figures vary, a similar comparison of services could be shown by practically every taxpayer in this country, whether he pays much or little to his national government.

It seems to me that, unless we have embarked openly on a policy of confiscation of property of the citizens in the guise of taking current income from individuals regardless of services rendered in return, Federal taxes must be reduced until they are in line with other taxes.

Cordially yours,

A. W. ROBERTSON.

Teaching of Legislative Procedure in South Carolina Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a copy of a bill drafted by Miss Betty Saunders, a Florence, S. C., student.

It will be gratifying I am certain to every Congressman and Senator to learn that the students in our schools are taking an interest in their Government. The schools of my home town, Florence, are to be congratulated for the interest they are manifesting in their Government by teaching their students how the greatest Government in the world operates.

Democracy is and has been on trial during the past few years. Our democratic form of government here in the United States is the only Government that has weathered the storm and continued to

function. We realize that our Government officials, who have the responsibilities of making our laws and administering them, have a terrible burden on their shoulders.

We have the war-torn world to patch up and try to teach the meaning of democracy. The younger people of our country will be compelled to shoulder this burden within the near future and it is gratifying to learn that our schools are preparing them for this task.

Whereas so many unsafe vehicles cause accidents both to motorists and pedestrians, we do hereby propose that:

Item I: That all motor vehicles in the United States shall be inspected every year.

Item II: Inspected vehicles shall carry in a conspicuous place a sticker so stating.

Item III: The cost of inspection and sticker shall be paid by the Government.

Item IV: Driver's-license tests shall be more rigid.

Item V: A person who has lost by forfeit his driver's license shall be required to stand a driver's-license test before the return of his license.

Item VI: An habitual alcoholic should not be given back his license after it has been revoked.

Signed, sealed, and delivered on this 27th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1947.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of House.
ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore of Senate.
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD editorials from three of the leading Chicago newspapers, Chicago Daily Tribune, Chicago Sun, and Chicago Daily News. All of these editorials appeared on March 13, following President Truman's speech on Wednesday, March 12, 1947:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 13, 1947]

HERE WE GO AGAIN

Mr. Truman made as cold a war speech yesterday against Russia as any President has ever made except on the occasion of going before Congress to ask for a declaration of war. He gave notice that Russian communism is regarded as an enemy force which will be resisted wherever it is encountered, and that, if he has his way, the United States will go out of its way to seek the encounters.

If Mr. Truman's program of supporting the Greek and Turkish regimes is accepted by Congress America will be unable to refrain from adopting the same measures wherever Soviet pressures are exerted. A vast expenditure of American money is in prospect. Wherever the money goes, there, too, will go American military missions, such as are proposed to whip the Greek and Turkish Armies into fighting organizations.

The outcome will inevitably be war. It probably will not come this year or next year, but the issue is already drawn. The declaration of implacable hostility between this country and Russia is one which cannot be tempered or withdrawn. It has been read into the permanent record, to stand for all time. Two worlds and two systems are in opposition. In the nature of things, as Mr. Truman has shaped that nature, they must in the end come to grips.

The United States stands now where it stood after Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech dedicating the Outer Drive Bridge in Chicago on October 5, 1937. If there is a difference, it is that we are now further advanced toward World War III, by Mr. Truman than Mr. Roosevelt in 1937 carried us toward World War II. Mr. Roosevelt talked in generalities about the necessity of quarantining aggressors in general. Mr. Truman talked specifically about quarantining a specific aggressor. When Mr. Truman talked about totalitarianism there was no mistaking what nation he meant.

Mr. Truman did not even indulge the same rhetorical devotion to peace that Mr. Roosevelt affected. Yet in content and spirit the two speeches were strikingly parallel as a promise of war. Mr. Roosevelt talked of nations which invade and violate "the territory of other nations that have done them no real harm and are too weak to protect themselves adequately." Mr. Truman spoke of Greece and Turkey as being too poor and weak to resist Soviet infiltration. He also spoke of Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria as having had "totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will." Mr. Truman, like Mr. Roosevelt, proposes to make these matters America's business, and the end result is as certain in the one situation as it was in the other. We are to have the Commander in Chief back with us again.

Mr. Truman's statement constituted a complete confession of the bankruptcy of American policy as formulated by Mr. Roosevelt and pursued by himself. We have just emerged from a great war which was dedicated to the extinction of the three nations which were as vocally opposed to Russia as Mr. Truman proclaims himself to be now. If communism was the real danger all along, why did Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman adopt Russia as an ally, and why, at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, did they build up Russia's power by making her one concession after another?

The Truman speech also leaves the United Nations as a meaningless relic of mistaken intentions. The world league to insure a lasting peace is a fraud and a sham, so impotent that Mr. Truman proposes that the United States ignore it and seek peace by force and threat of force—the very means which United Nations was intended to exclude in international dealings.

The one hope that is left is Congress, but even its peremptory refusal to follow Truman into his anti-Communist crusade will not wholly undo the damage which the President has already done. His words cannot be unsaid, nor can their effect upon Russia be canceled out. Already, as witness Moscow's recall of the Soviet Ambassador from Washington, the nations are engaging in the usual preliminaries to war.

When the country views the terrible predicament in which it now finds itself, it cannot avoid the conclusion that wisdom at all times counseled the United States to follow Americanism only, to dedicate itself to the pursuit of its own interests, and to let Europe's wars alone. We have fought two of them without avail, and Mr. Truman is calling upon us to fight the third.

We were drawn into these wars primarily at the behest of Britain, and that nation, by dumping the Greek and Turkish problems into Mr. Truman's lap, is summoning us to the struggle again. If the United States can be induced to crush Russia, Britain again will rise to a station of security and comparative eminence, for it will be the only other surviving major nation.

For 10 years the United States has been dominated by alien interests. These interests, primarily financial, have bought up every newspaper, radio station, columnist, and commentator, and every so-called organization of public opinion that could be purchased. It has killed our sons by the hundreds of thousands and brought the nation to bankruptcy. It will use whatever tactics seem best to rush into World War III. It will coerce the timid and fool the stupid.

Congress must cease being a catspaw for this movement and think of America's interest first—even exclusively.

[From the Chicago Sun of March 12, 1947]

FOR GREEK FREEDOM FIRST

President Truman made a strong case yesterday for the survival of Greece as a free nation, but he did not show that Greece is in fact free. The point is vital as respects both Greece and Turkey. For unless we reserve our aid for free governments which actually represent their people, the course Mr. Truman proposes is indistinguishable from naked imperialism. We cannot accept such a policy with national self-respect, and we cannot make it work.

Mr. Truman asked Congress to put up $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey, part of which would be spent to supply and equip their national armies. He asked authority to dispatch civilian and military personnel to supervise use of the funds and instruct the governments in their duties.

Such a far-reaching program means one thing if applied to getting a free people on its feet, and another if designed to bolster reactionary and semi-Fascist governments which hold their people in bondage. In the latter case, we would occupy the indefensible position of supporting any regime so long as it is anti-Russian, and, worse yet, the position of backing ruthless suppression of popular liberties. In such circumstances all our talk of serving the free democracies would be reduced to a tragic burlesque.

Not one word did Mr. Truman have to say about attaching any conditions to our proposed assistance that might guarantee the emergence of a genuinely representative government in Greece. He confined himself to the mild comment that we did not approve everything the Greek Government has done. That is like saying fascism is not nice. For this Greek Government whose army he proposes to prop and strengthen has attracted to its ranks the same contemptible quislings who served the Nazis during the German occupation. Unless there is a wholesale reform of the government from top to bottom it is a mockery to call it democratic.

Mr. Truman says the present government represents 85 percent of the Parliament which was elected last year; but he does not say that those elections were boycotted by most of the Centrist Liberals, the Socialists and the E. A. M. (Communists and Agrarians). He says that foreign observers pronounced the elections fair; but he does not say that they were preceded by a rightist reign of terror which is still going on and which can only be emboldened by the prospect of unconditional access to American dollars and military support.

If the Greek Government really represents its people, why is it now in peril of collapse unless rescued by us? For 2 years the Rightists have been ruling by persecution of the people and with the unstinted aid of British armed might. Yet guerrilla fighting grows more extensive month by month. To attribute this entirely to an armed minority

or to outside coercion (evidence of which has not yet been reported by the United Nations commission of investigation), demands proof rather than mere assertion. Mr. Truman did not bother to prove it.

The President's request should not be granted without adequate conditions which assure that we are really helping a free and democratic Greece and not a Facist Greece. If the British could not impose a Rightist government, we shall not be able to do so either short of undisguised military domination. The American people did not fight the war for that kind of imperialism and they will not support such a policy which, if applied to Greece, must logically be applied clear around the world.

[From the Chicago Daily News of March 12, 1947]

PERILOUS ROAD

President Truman accepted courageously the responsibility for charting a course of militant internationalism for the United States. We wish the wisdom of the course was less dubious.

The boldness of the President's message lay in the extent to which he minimized the needs of Greece and Turkey for food, and emphasized that he wished to embark upon a political adventure.

He said that armed men led by Communists were threatening the existence of the Greek state, and added: "We cannot permit changes of the status quo in violation of the charter of the United Nations by such methods as coercion or by such subterfuges as political infiltration."

He wants to send American military personnel—which presumably means troops—to Turkey and Greece. He wants authority to train Greek and Turkish personnel—which means army—in this country.

The case he makes for these measures is that the Greek Army is unable to cope with the armed minority seeking to overthrow the Government.

That, of course, is nonsense. If a Greek minority is too big for the Army it is probably approaching a majority, and we doubt if even Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden, of Argentine fame, would advocate armed suppression of so large a faction of the Greek people.

Unless President Truman knows more than he is telling the country, what he means is that he proposes to keep the Russians out of Greece and Turkey by force if necessary.

To attempt this by unilateral action, while claiming to be upholding the sanctity of the United Nations, is rank hypocrisy.

Russian domination of Greece and Turkey would mean mounting turmoil throughout the Middle East. The more pessimistic, of whom President Truman would seem to be one, see in this prospect an economic disadvantage for the western democracies, and eventually, probably war.

But it requires no overwrought hysteria to see the possibility of war starting in Greece and Turkey. It is true that the Greeks and Turks have invited our help. Stalin is likely to contend that this request comes from a government which does not represent the Greek people.

The situation is inflammable. We should give the Greeks and the Turks all the material aid that we reasonably can to relieve their economic distress. The matter of suppressing armed infiltration should go to the United Nations, if we really believe it constitutes a threat to world peace and if we really believe in the United Nations.

Then we will at least have a clear-cut issue, and we can then decide whether we are willing to run the risk of war to curb Russian expansion.

Teachers Endorse School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I am including herewith a resolution I have received from the Southeastern Teachers' Association of Oklahoma, endorsing the school-lunch program and urging a deficiency appropriation to carry on for the remainder of the fiscal year. I know the sentiment expressed in this resolution is the sentiment not only of the teachers but of the patrons of southeastern Oklahoma. I strongly endorse this resolution and urge immediate consideration of this very important program.

The resolution follows:

DURANT, OKLA., *March 11, 1947.*

To the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation:

GENTLEMEN: The Southeastern District of the Oklahoma Education Association, in meeting assembled at Durant, Okla., March 11, 1947, hereby request a deficiency appropriation of $20,000,000 to be allocated to the States in such amounts as each require to carry the school-lunch program on for the balance of this school year. We request an appropriation from Congress which will be sufficient to meet the expanding needs of the program for future years.

We further recommend that the acts be amended so as to emphasize the educational phases of the school-lunch program and that the program for schools be administered through established Federal and State educational agencies.

J. H. BELVIN,
Chairman.
W. S. THARP,
Secretary.

Double Talk in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Congress should ask—and get the answers to—a lot of pertinent questions before the President gets $400,000,000 to spend in Greece in an effort to bolster the shaky government of a dissolute king.

As is now well known, President Truman's request entails more than just a request for money to spend in Greece. He requested also the power to send military and civilian advisers to Greece, and in effect, to strike out on an entirely new foreign policy.

This new foreign policy appears to be neither consistent, logical, or well thought out. It is a two-timing policy. It is a policy of double talk. It is a tricky policy that seems to lead neither to war nor to peace, but to continued uneasiness in international affairs. It is, in the final analysis, a policy of frustration.

Notice how contradictory is this new policy when it is considered alongside other elements of our so-called foreign policy toward Russia and totalitarianism today.

First. Consider that only a few days ago, the Republican-controlled Appropriations Committee had to veto an attempt of the executive branch to ship $25,000,000 worth of copper to Russia.

Second. Consider that even at the time the President recommends that we fight totalitarianism with dollars in Greece, and perhaps Turkey, our Secretary of State is in Moscow, likely being wined and dined by the Russians.

Third. Consider that at the very time the President makes his suggestion, the administration is attempting to ship 70,000 tons of tinplate to Russia.

Fourth. Consider that at the time we are being asked, in effect, to declare economic war on Russia in Greece and Turkey, we are allowing thousands of Russian Embassy employees, representatives of Russian missions of various kinds, and 25,000 members of the Communist Party of America—who are, in effect, agents of Russia—to run loose in the United States, ferreting out secrets, dividing the loyalties of our people, and generally propagandizing us on the air and in print.

These are reasons why Congressmen did not react with great enthusiasm toward Truman's half-considered proposals. These facts show that the executive branch of the Government really has no program for stopping Russia, and that it is frantically grasping at one new stratagem or another in an effort to appease both the anti-Russians and the pro-Russians on the domestic front.

If the new proposals included a clear-cut diplomatic break with Russia, an embargo on shipments to and from Soviet-land, new demands that the Russians get out of Korea, China, Rumania, Bulgaria, Turkey, Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, and Greece, the American people then could debate the issue in all its clarity. But Truman's recommendations represent an oblique policy that is neither clear nor decisive.

Our present policy toward Russia reminds most Capitol observers who can remember back beyond yesterday of nothing so much as our shipment of iron ore and steel and other war materials to Japan, year after year, while at the same time getting tougher and tougher and making war with Japan inevitable. If President Truman wants to declare economic war on Russia, or to stop totalitarianism, he easily could say so and could implement his decision first of all by getting unanimity in his own Executive branch for putting the economic squeeze on the Soviet. But it was only 3 weeks ago that the State Department felt morally obligated to ship millions of dollars' worth of additional lend-lease materials to Russia.

In the second place, he could do more than he has done to ferret domestic Communists out of the Government, labor unions, and other powerful posts. But

such consistency hardly is to be expected from the same Democratic administration which has worked both sides of every street—the international and the domestic—for 15 long years.

Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Senate Joint Memorial 2

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas under existing general law all appropriations for the purchase of national forest lands in the several States are provided by the Congress of the United States, and each such acquisition is conditioned upon the consent of the State in which said property to be acquired is situated; and

Whereas in the year 1922 the Congress further provided that the United States forest service, without congressional appropriation or review, has the right to appropriate so much of the annual timber crop from the national forests as it desires to use for the purpose of acquiring additional real property through the method of granting timber cutting rights in the national forests in exchange for deeds to private property of equal value; and

Whereas, by means of such method, the United States of America, acting by and through the forest service, has acquired in the State of Oregon in excess of 1,000,000 acres of land, without the prior approval of the Congress or of the State, which method of expanding the public wealth is not only against the public interest, but is impairing the tax structures of the units of local government in the rural sections of the State, in that every such acquisition defeats the purpose of title 16, U. S. C. A., section 500, which provides that 25 percent of the gross receipts of the several national forests shall be paid to local governmental units in lieu of taxes, and that each such acquisition also reduces the property tax base of one or more units of local government, and consequently increases the taxes necessarily levied by the taxing agencies thereby affected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized and this Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon does hereby petition the Congress to repeal title 16, U. S. C. A., section 485, and so much of title 16 U. S. C. A., section 516, as may be necessary to restrict the acquisition of national forest lands solely to such lands as may be acquired by appropriations of money from the Federal Treasury; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative therein representing the people of the State of Oregon.

Adopted by senate February 20, 1947.
M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.
Concurred in by house March 7, 1947.
JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.

Texas Sympathy Strike Hampers Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a telegram from the Griffin Grocery Co., one of the outstanding wholesale grocery concerns of the Southwest, operating in southeastern Oklahoma and northern Texas, which clearly shows how sympathy strikes affect innocent people and hamper business over wide areas. I quote the telegram as follows:

MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *March 13, 1947.*

Have nice little sympathy telephone strike in Texas this morning. Can't get through to any of our properties. As I understand it, it evolved from some small Texas town where the employees did not like the way their employers distributed Christmas candy and culminated in strike in all the northern part of Texas. How much longer are we who foot the bill going to have to put up with this kind of foolishness? Not only inconveniences, but costs a great deal of money.

GRIFFIN GROCERY CO.

The Prospect for a Decent World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, speaking last evening in Pittsburgh in support of President Truman's recommendations for assistance to Greece, I said that what we do for Greece and for Turkey we are doing primarily for ourselves, for our way of life, and for the future health of a world in which democracy can live.

I added that we must meet the menace, the flood, of expanding communism at the source, and the source is starvation, hunger, and hopelessness. We must meet them wherever they arise as threats to our goal of a decent world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my address of last evening, together with several editorials appearing on the same subject, which have recently been published in various Pennsylvania newspapers.

There being no objection, the address and newspaper articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROSPECTS FOR A DECENT WORLD

I am happy tonight to be in Pittsburgh, this dynamic city of such surging strength you can feel it in the air, you can see it in the sky; strength you cannot measure except by taking the measure of the strength of America.

This city, which did so much toward the winning of World War II, is now in the position, perhaps more so than any other single city in America, of making that victory secure. This city, not by itself, of course, but foremost among all cities, must help rebuild a world in ruins. I want to talk to you for a few minutes tonight about that task, that task of establishing a decent world, a world in which a man can walk upright and in dignity anywhere on this earth.

In discussing such a subject, I am mindful tonight as a St. Patrick's Day visitor to Pittsburgh of an event which occurred here exactly 11 years ago. No one visiting Pittsburgh on St. Patrick's Day could help being reminded of something you who live in Pittsburgh will no doubt never forget, and that is the Pittsburgh of St. Patrick's Day of 1936.

St. Patrick's Day in Pittsburgh in 1936, of course, was the day of the big flood, the worst flood in the history of oft-flooded Pittsburgh, a flood which rolled up over the banks of the Allegheny and the Monongahela and Ohio Rivers—over the banks of Chartiers Creek and Turtle Creek, and the Kiskiminetas and Youghiogheny and Conemaugh and Beaver Rivers—and brought disaster, tragedy, suffering, cold, disease, destruction and death into this valley of power and of strength.

No, you who lived through it, you can never forget St. Patrick's Day of 1936, when irresistible natural forces rolled in triumph over the works of man and the life of a great community.

Pittsburgh survived, of course. The waters receded, the lights went on again, the muck and the filth spewed up by the rivers and the wreckage wrought by the flood were cleaned away, the scars began to heal.

Today, little plaques, often in bronze, mark the high-water mark in homes and in churches, in hotels and stores, in warehouses and garages and police stations and office buildings and shops where the flood waters of 1936 reached their zenith. Those plaques are constant reminders, if Pittsburgh ever needed any, of how the heart of a city, how the Golden Triangle of Pittsburgh, could be devastated by the irresistible force of rivers in flood.

I cite this experience of Pittsburgh 11 years ago not merely as a visitor's polite reference to some local history recalled by an anniversary; I cite it because I think it is in miniature the experience a decade later of the whole world.

As Pittsburgh was 11 years ago, so today is the world itself prostrate and reeling from a devastating blow. And as Pittsburgh recovered, so, too, can the world recover. It took heroism and sacrifice and imagination for Pittsburgh to win its way back to normal, back to a better Pittsburgh, and it will take the same sort of heroism and sacrifice and imagination on a far greater scale for the restoration of the world.

Pittsburgh 11 years ago did more than merely rebuild and repair the damage of a flood. Pittsburgh put to use a lesson it had learned in that flood, a lesson it has never forgotten. It learned that the growing intensity of its periodic floods had finally reached a point beyond which it was unsafe to chance future floods, particularly if something could be done to prevent those floods.

The world, in turn, has learned it cannot chance another war, and for the same reasons.

For 50 years before 1936 Pittsburgh had talked of flood control, of the necessity for protection against these rampaging floods. After the St. Patrick's Day flood of 1936, however, the time for talk had finally ended; it became time for action.

With the aid of Congress, which listened sympathetically to a Pittsburgh galvanized into action by a stupendous disaster and which listened also to other cities similarly battered and tortured with periodic floods,

our Government set up a program for controlling these floods not just at the banks of the rivers as they passed through our cities but at the source, at the headwaters, at the far-off mountains where the causes of floods had their roots and the floods had their origin.

Building the reservoirs to hold in those floodwaters and to protect Pittsburgh and other cities has been expensive. Those reservoirs for Pittsburgh alone—those already constructed and those now building or planned—will have cost millions upon millions of dollars. But I am informed by Army engineers that those reservoirs now in use have already in a few short years saved in dollars, in property, in measurable terms, five-sixths of their entire cost in the floods which have already come to Pittsburgh since 1936.

In years to come these measurable dollar savings will grow. The lives they have saved, the cold and suffering and misery and disease, the panic and fear and dislocations they have prevented are not measurable, but no measure is needed. They were good investments, those reservoirs against floods.

Today, as I said, the whole world is in much the same situation as Pittsburgh found itself 11 years ago. There were parts of Pittsburgh in that flood which were not affected by the high water other than by the inconvenience resulting from the flood in the downtown area. In the outlying high-level areas of the community there were no electric lights, no trolley cars, but there was heat, there was comfort, there was safety.

In a devastated world today, America is the safe, secure, high-and-dry section, and the rest of the world, with few exceptions, lies prostrate.

Eleven years ago the safe, the high-and-dry parts of Pittsburgh opened their hearts to those from Sharpsburg, from the McKees Rocks Bottoms, from the low-lying parts of the north side and the south side, and the other flooded sections, and there was food for all, shelter for all, warmth for all; there was brotherhood and there was concern for one's fellow man; there was religion in dynamic action. Those who were comfortable and safe and untouched by the flood knew that their good fortune was only that—good fortune—and that they owed to their neighbors, less fortunate than they, all the help they could give.

I was not there at the time to see a heroic Allegheny County in action in meeting perhaps the worst disaster in Pittsburgh's history, but the story of that heroism is well known to me and to everyone else in our State.

Now that same heroism is a world-wide necessity. To resurrect a whole world it will take heroism—real heroism—heroism such as was displayed here 11 years ago, heroism which must be extended over the four corners of the earth. It will take sacrifice; it will take dollars; it will take, first and foremost, a conviction among all of us that the job is too important it cannot be neglected.

So that there will be no misunderstanding, I do not want anyone to think that what I advocate tonight is that the United States take our remaining treasure and give it away indiscriminately to whomever might ask and for whatever purpose it might be used.

America cannot feed the world by itself, cannot clothe the world by itself, cannot solve by itself all the problems of all peoples everywhere.

But America, as the strongest, most powerful, richest single Nation left in this world, can, merely by being indifferent and unconcerned, make it difficult, if not impossible, for those of other lands to help feed themselves and to clothe themselves and to solve their problems. We have had thrust upon us, whether we want it or not, the responsibility for guiding the whole wide world into the paths of peace and of decency among men. Are we equal to the obligation?

Let's put it this way: are you, as an individual, willing to accept your share of the responsibility and of the burdens which go with that responsibility?

My question is urgent; it demands an answer. For we cannot drift into a better world; we must plan it and bring it about. To do that, we must know what we want in that world.

I think, primarily, we want freedom for all, so we can be sure of having freedom for ourselves. Freedom, like peace, is indivisible.

We are all much concerned over the spread of a hated philosophy called communism. We in America reject and despise it. We are, I am sure, safe from it insofar as our own country and its economy and its political forms are concerned, certainly for the present and for the foreseeable future. Communism today finds in America soil so infertile as to make its growth impossible. That is because we have here something so much better than the very best that communism in any of its forms could offer that our free people see in communism nothing that is attractive, nothing that is worth the slightest consideration.

It was not ever thus. In 1932 there was in this country of ours a spirit of such complete hopelessness among such a large portion of our population that the siren blandishments of communism made it appear to many to be the only solution. We weathered that storm, thank God, because we developed in this Nation of ours a certain philosophy of Government and of economics—certainly not a new philosophy since it was preached convincingly enough 2,000 years ago and studied so universally since then as to be familiar to all, but a philosophy which nevertheless was new to our Government in our time. It was a philosophy which recognized that the welfare and the well-being of each of us are fundamental responsibilities of all of us.

Disregarding politics—politics has no place in this discussion tonight—disregarding politics because this philosophy of our Government is not now either partisan or controversial but is shared by all thinking Americans regardless of party, I believe sincerely that because of this philosophy the chance which communism had in America in 1932 will never come again. I believe this because I believe America will never experience another 1932.

Just as Pittsburgh, you see, learned something about floods in 1936, and what to do to prevent them, so America as a nation learned something about depressions. We have machinery now to head off these economic disasters, and we must use it when necessary. As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report it is one of my jobs in Congress—one of my most important jobs in Congress—to see to it that we are prepared to head off depressions before the start.

As a result of what we have learned and of the economic machinery we have developed, I think we in America are safe from the forms of communism here at home.

America, however, cannot live unto herself alone. A safe, secure, comfortable America cannot exist isolated and alone in a world of turmoil and of starvation and of want. In such a world we would be a vulnerable economic target, eventually, perhaps, even a military target. We would be the target of the envious, the have-nots. Jealousy and hate are as effective weapons of psychological warfare as can be devised, and we would be the envied, the hated, against whom demagogs could well try to use such sharp-edged weapons. A prosperous America surrounded by a world in tatters and ruins is indeed a vulnerable America.

Communism, therefore, is definitely a force with which we must contend.

When our Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, in a frank statement in answer to a blunt question from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, stated that he and our Government consider Soviet Russia's policy to be expansive and aggressive, I don't think he meant to imply that we think the Soviet Union is now considering embarking on aggressive warfare as such.

But the Soviet Union and its system of collectivism are on trial today in the same way that the United States and our democracy are on trial. We are openly contending with each other not for military advantage—although there may be some inclination on the part of some persons in both nations to think that we are—but rather we are contending for men's minds, for ideological support, for moral backing, for friendship based on common interests and common hopes. Perhaps some day this all may have military connotations; I sincerely hope not. In the meantime, however, we are both courting the world.

Culturally and politically both systems have ideas to contribute to this rivalry now going on. Materially, the Soviet Union has little to contribute right now and we have much.

It is ironic in this situation that communism, as represented by the Soviet Union, with the least to offer materially in the contest of ideas now going on in the world between two divergent philosophies of government, between two clashing concepts of the place of the individual in society, stands to profit the most from the impoverishment of those whom we and they both seek to attract.

Our future approach then becomes increasingly clear:

We must see to it—we must bend our efforts to see to it—by real friendship, by a sincere application of our own principles of democracy and of religion, that the rest of the world recognizes in the United States and in the things we stand for not just a nosey neighbor with words of advice and suggestion, but a real neighbor, a good neighbor.

We are suddenly in America acutely conscious and concerned about Greece. Greece, the birthplace of democracy, is now, we find, on the verge of becoming the newest outpost of communism. We do not want to see that occur, both because we do not believe the Greek people want an armed minority to capture control of their destiny and also because such a victory for communism would represent a defeat for our hope to see democracy spread.

Well, we can make speeches about it; we can pass resolutions; we can condemn communism's infiltration and expansion. We can shake our heads in dismay.

Or we can act.

We can act to see to it that the people of Greece, first and foremost, are rescued from starvation and epidemic; that they have an opportunity to establish an economy in which the Greek peasant and the Greek worker can look forward to at least the very minimum essentials of life. Then, only then, can we hope to rekindle that fierce love of democracy which sprung into being so many hundreds of years ago in that little nation.

I am sure that such a fierce spirit burns even now in the hearts of most Greeks; but, ladies and gentlemen, we know that democracy finds little sustenance in hungry bodies and in hearts bereft of hope.

There is an inclination on the part of some Americans to believe that in going into Greece we are doing nothing more than pulling some new British chestnuts out of the fire, or perhaps just rescuing the throne of a tottering king from collapse.

That is not our purpose What we do today for Greece we are not doing for Great Britain, and certainly not for any king, and we are doing it only incidentally for Greece; we are doing it primarily for ourselves; for our way of life, for the future health of a world in which democracy can live—we are doing it for a decent world.

If Greece were to succumb to communism, and we know that is extremely likely should we refuse to step forward now with food and sustenance and hope, it would

be further warning to other European nations hard-pressed to push their way out of wartime destruction and despair, that the United States has retreated once again to its shell, to its selfish pursuits, to its own business, and left them to their own devices—that our brave words of a new world, of real international cooperation, are words—only words. Contrariwise, aid for Greece will be real psychological help in our hope of winning freedom for those nations now swallowed up by Russia.

Of course, we have already poured out billions in relief and support for other nations. Now, although we are being asked not for billions but for millions, can't we sit back and say we've done our share—done enough? We could—but do we dare?

When the flood of communism begins to roll up over Greece, where does it stop?

We have today an international organization both for keeping the peace and for advancing the cause of peaceful humanity. There has been some concern that the Greek problem was not submitted to the United Nations. Unfortunately, the United Nations was not set up to handle this problem.

In the meantime, however, in the international tribunals of the United Nations we are finding our country and the Soviet Union pitted consistently on opposite sides in a continual clash of ideas and of views. As long as the nations composing the United Nations can guide their own destinies and make their own policies, this clash is not serious; it can be, I think, resolved by patience and firmness.

But the onward march of communism into new lands, taking over additional countries, would be serious, for, by the very nature of communism, it would give the Soviet Union control over the destinies of an increasing number of supposedly sovereign nations composing this international tribunal. We have seen the results of that widening power already, in the actions in the United Nations of Poland, Yugoslavia, and other members supposedly sovereign but actually merely projections of the Soviet Union.

I have too much hope and faith in the United Nations, and I know you do too, to want to see that agency for international good reduced to a few strong voices and a multitude of "me-too" powers, powers powerless to determine their own policies in international affairs.

That is just one serious aspect of this threat to Greece.

My mind goes back to Pittsburgh of 11 years ago, when this city was digging itself out of its worst disaster. The plans laid then were good plans; they have proved their worth. Those plans called for meeting the flood menace not at your front door, not at the outskirts of town, but at the source, at the headwaters, at the mountains where the floods originate. Your dams and reservoirs were built with that idea. And they have worked.

We must similarly meet the menace, the flood, of expanding communism in the same way—at the source. The source is hunger and starvation and hopelessness. We must met them wherever they arise as threats to our goal of a decent world.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of March 17, 1947]

CLEAR DECK FOR GREEK ISSUE

With Paul Porter, President Truman's special representative, on his way home to make his report on conditions in Greece, it is of the utmost importance that Congress clear its decks as quickly as possible for consideration of the administration's program to help Greece and Turkey preserve their freedom.

Mr. Porter, who has been in Greece since early January, should be able to answer questions on the Mediterranean situation about which there are reasonable doubts in the minds not only of Congressmen but of many plain American citizens. The fact that Mr. Porter left Athens so soon after the President's historic declaration of policy suggests the importance of the data he is bringing.

But promptness in getting the facts on Greece to this country will be of no avail if, when Mr. Porter is ready to report in early April, Congress is in such a legislative jam that priceless time will be lost before Mr. Truman's proposals can be brought up.

And, it should be emphasized, the proposals should be thoroughly discussed. It is possible that a good many Americans misunderstand them. They merit frank and full debate.

To prevent a log jam which might hold back the Greece-Turkey issue for many weeks, Congress should now put out unusual effort to set its legislative house in order. Since Congress met more than 2 months ago there has been too much talk and too little action.

Both House and Senate should now speed up unfinished business and get ready to give their most thoughtful attention to the new and difficult tasks which this Nation, in the broad interest of world peace, has been called upon to perform.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of March 13, 1947]

OUR NEAR EAST OBLIGATIONS

President Truman has made it very clear that his proposals of assistance for Greece and Turkey are on a basis very different from the overseas relief projects which this country is likewise backing. In these proposals he says the Nation's foreign policy and its security are involved.

It is that aspect of policy and world security that furnishes the bond between Greece and Turkey, whose situations in other respects have little in common. Turkey has a strong, settled government to which the great mass of the people, united in determination to defend the independence and essential interests of the country against possible aggression, are loyal.

Greece is plagued with inflation, threatened with near famine, shaken by subversive agitation and civil disorders. The agitators have foreign backing and the kingdom's neighbors afford the Greek trouble-makers shelter and bases. On a Communist-led minority is squarely placed by the President much of the responsibility for the country's parlous state.

The President proposes that this country shall supply these two countries with material needs for defense and, in the case of Greece, rehabilitation and also that it shall comply with their requests for American civil and military personnel and undertake the training of Greek and Turkish personnel.

These proposals will be opposed by isolationists and viewed with misgiving by many who are worried to see the country undertake commitments of such grave import. But the policy seems clearly in the national interest and intended to bulwark international security. The United States cannot escape the responsibilities which come with great power. It proposes to throw that power into the international scales to give a balance to the profit of democracy and the rescue of helpless nations from totalitarian regimes.

For many Americans the fact that the policy has strong support of Secretary of State Marshall will be a guaranty that all its implications have been thoroughly weighed and that the course it proposes is sound, practicable, and under the circumstances unavoidable.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette]

HELP FOR GREECE

The course President Truman has recommended that Congress follow in providing assistance for Greece and Turkey represents a basic reversal in traditional American foreign policy. To move into the internal affairs of a European nation will be to practice dollar diplomacy and economic imperialism for political purposes.

When the alternatives to this course are considered, however, one concludes that President Truman has recommended a radical departure in the best interests of the western democracies.

To permit the collapse of Greece, and subsequently Turkey, would be to invite Russian domination of areas vital to our security. The only way to prevent the collapse is to assume the financial burden soon to be put down by Britain. Ours is the only country capable of taking over.

Certain aspects of the proposal are definitely unpalatable.

There is, first, the handicap under which it may put Secretary of State Marshall in his peace efforts at Moscow. While he tries to negotiate with Russia a peace for Germany and Austria his Government moves to halt an aggression the Russians protest does not exist. This is not conducive to a harmonious atmosphere in Moscow.

Again, we are called upon to pour millions of dollars into Greece to prop up the unlovely royalist government for which Mr. Truman adopted an almost apologetic tone in his message to Congress.

We are also called upon to lend companion economic assistance to Turkey, which was not ravaged by war. Assistance to Turkey will be nothing but an obvious effort to strengthen her militarily against Russia.

Once begun, this assistance will have to be followed through. We aren't going to be able to throw Greece a fish, as Stewart Alsop put it recently, and get out. Once committed to economic support, we will have to keep pouring it in until it sticks, until Greece is back upon her feet. To fall short of that goal would simply be to delay the ultimate absorption of Greece into the Soviet sphere of influence. Civilian and military personnel will have to be sent into Greece and Turkey to make sure that funds are used properly.

Finally, Mr. Truman's proposal is another discouraging admission that the United Nations is just a handsome facade behind which the nations are playing the same old game of power politics.

We would much prefer to see this and other issues handled within the United Nations, the agency created for just such a purpose.

But we cannot escape the fact that at present the United Nations is not equal to the situation.

We are left, then, with the choice of doing little, or nothing, through the United Nations or with taking immediate unilateral emergency action in Greece and Turkey.

With so much at stake for what remains of the world's democracies, with the need so urgent to protect our own enormous investment in the victory so recently won, President Truman has pointed to the logical choice for this country. We hope the Congress will accept his recommendations in the nonpartisan spirit in which they were made.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of March 18, 1947]

LEADERSHIP FOR PEACE, NOT CONFLICT

One week ago tomorrow President Truman laid before Congress—and the world—his proposals to aid Greece and Turkey. Unquestionably his pronouncement shattered precedents in American treatment of foreign affairs and problems.

The President's statement has provoked in Russia a reaction of glum and somewhat angry disapproval. This it was bound to do.

What is of more immediate and pressing importance is the condition of mind of the American people regarding Mr. Truman's

projection of a policy of forceful United States leadership in world affairs.

Some of the comment in this country has been excited and occasionally hysterical, particularly among elements with clear Russian sympathies. But there has also been in evidence among many sincere Americans an attitude of puzzlement and even of fear.

They are asking: Will this mean war with Russia? How far will American aid to foreign nations carry us? Why do we have to concern ourselves with their welfare? Why can't we attend to our own troubled affairs at home?

Such questioning is not improper. In fact, it is desirable. And the fact that it is occurring demonstrates that the single statement thus far made by the President, in which he outlined the potentially grave international situation and called for momentous decisions regarding it, should be followed promptly by further enlightenment for all of the people of the United States on the far-reaching role Mr. Truman urges the Nation to assume.

It is essential that all of the American people should be convinced of the wisdom and necessity of that course.

In the first place, it is beyond argument that the United States stands today as the one potent democratic nation in the world. Whether we like it or not, we are forced either to accept or refuse the responsibility this fact imposes.

It is unthinkable that the people of this great country would wish their Government to adopt a position of letting the cause of human liberty outside our borders go hang. That issue is involved in the present problem. If there is no American aid to Greece after that of Britain is withdrawn and if we say, in effect, to Turkey that she is on her own, a new spread of Soviet domination is a certainty.

We agree that our aims and the methods we are to pursue to advance them need further clarification. We agree with Senator LODGE that Congress must lay down requirements before it extends the aid for Greece and Turkey that is asked for.

It seems most desirable to have it better understood, also, that we seek to deal with specific situations in the Middle East, not around the whole world. Greece and Turkey need help. It will not be anything new for America to extend that help. We've done it before with other small nations which needed our aid to keep democracy going and growing.

Our help in the emergency that confronts us is not a case of bypassing the United Nations, but of getting something done in time. We should welcome the day, and work for it, when the UN—now without any organized force to carry out its decisions—will be fully capable of dealing with the problems now imperatively presented to us in Greece and Turkey. It is not our doing that the UN is yet unready.

There is no validity in the apprehension that America's proposed course "means war." It is not to be admitted that any nation should meanly shirk its duty or forsake its destiny because an honorable, firm policy might arouse the displeasure of another nation.

But world tranquillity will never be permanently assured by evasion or weakness on the part of the United States. We must be sure to be just and clear about our purposes. We must then play our part with courage. We must make America's moral leadership so effective that it will promote peace, not conflict.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer]

A FATEFUL TASK WE CANNOT SHIRK

Not a shadow of doubt now remains—at Washington or Moscow or anywhere else—that the Nation stands at a fateful point in its history, after President Truman's speech before Congress yesterday calling for economic aid and military guidance to Greece and Turkey.

There was no attempt on the part of the President to gloss over with nice phrases the grave significance of what he proposes or the stark reasons behind his program.

Our decisions as a people are not concerned with a simple matter of granting a certain number of millions of dollars to a small distant nation struggling amid postwar difficulties.

World leadership Britain has exercised for several centuries is slipping from her failing hands under the shocks of two global wars. An effect of ominous import is imperatively presented to the United States in Greece, from which British economic and military support must almost immediately be withdrawn.

Either America or Soviet Russia will step into Greece in place of Britain. If it is to be Russia, that nation will make a further and probably gigantic move toward world domination, with its limits beyond comprehension.

And if it is Russia, instead of America, which steps in we will not only turn our backs upon the immediate problems in Greece but upon the task which now confronts us of assuming effective world leadership on behalf of democracy as we believe in it.

Mr. Truman asserts that America alone can bolster the present Greek Government and, what is more important, give democracy in that country and elsewhere a chance to survive.

It maintains: "If we falter in our leadership we may endanger the peace of the world and we shall surely endanger the welfare of this Nation."

Why should we embark on a stop Russia policy? Why should we act in Greece or otherwise to stem the tide of communism over the earth?

Mr. Truman points out that we contributed $341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II—"an investment in world freedom and world peace." The investment is not paying off. In spite of victory over Nazi tyranny, totalitarianism is not extinguished.

In the guise of Russian communism it is being thrust resolutely over a large part of Europe. It is moving purposefully in Asia and the Far East. The President notes: "The Government of the United States has made frequent protests against coercion and intimidation, in violation of the Yalta Agreement, in Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria."

He asserts, and voluminous facts support him, that Communists are the leaders of terrorist assaults along the northern boundaries of Greece. It is part of the system of pressure or infiltration that has already subjugated a number of European countries.

Americans should avoid the misconception that Mr. Truman's proposals are "playing a British game." The United States is not called upon to support commitments of the British Empire indiscriminately all around the world and will not do so.

But we are called upon in our own interests to lead the hosts of human freedom and democratic government. There is no other country able to do it. There are many harassed nations in which liberty will soon disappear if we fail them. We must, it is plain, give the material aid the President urges, without which Greece and Turkey will swiftly be enveloped by that darkness.

But we must be careful that our leadership shall not be toward conflict. Serving the cause of real democracy as forcefully as we can, we should seek by every means in our power to bring about real world cooperation under which "we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free of coercion." It is a task we must not shirk.

Communist Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, unity of thought and action is needed now in America as much or more than at any time in our history. Various organizations operating under the guise of social uplift or reform groups are continuously pitting section against section, labor against capital and capital against labor, race against race, in an attempt to create confusion, chaos, and discord among our people, such as was evidenced by their recent interference in a Mississippi primary election, which resulted in the political lynching of Bilbo—and the State of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include in connection herewith an excerpt from a report made by the Committee on Socialism and Communism of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in September 1946, and entitled "Communist Fronts":

COMMUNIST FRONTS

It is impossible to realize the extent of Communist influence in American life without some knowledge of the "front" technique. Except possibly during the war period, everything labeled Communist is suspect to the average citizen. Accordingly, if public opinion is to be influenced, it must be done in an indirect and concealed manner. To do this, the Communists evolved the masterful strategy of the "front" organization. The setting up of a front involves two main steps. The first is the discovery of a proper cause and label. The cause is usually some form of alleged injustice or a proposed reform which will arouse the interest of the public, particularly the group which styles itself liberal. The label is some high-sounding word or phrase, such as "democratic," "peace," and the like.

When the issue is picked and the title decided, the case is presented dramatically to some "innocent," who is both prominent and willing to have his name used for a "good" cause. His name is used as the bait to attract others, until a rather impressive list is obtained. Then the organization is announced publicly, funds are raised, and propaganda and pressure activities are begun. Communists, not generally known as such, do the work for such groups and occupy the active, in contrast to the honorary, offices. They determine policies and direct the front in accord with the party aims. The well-meaning sponsors are usually too busy even to inquire into the activities of the group to which they have given their names.

Some fronts are permanent, particularly those which deal with some constant Communist objective. Thus, for youth, the Communists have the American Youth for Democracy. To win over the Negroes, they have the National Negro Congress. In the field of insurance, particularly among the foreign-born, there is the International Workers Order. Other fronts, by contrast, are temporary. Such is the committee which in 1946 is staging the various win-the-peace rallies throughout the country. Other illustrations could be taken from groups promoting some specific foreign policy. Thus there would be committees for a democratic China, Greece, or Japan.

One of the more prominent and apparently respectable fronts today is the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (ICC). This group has been successful in gaining publicity and support which would never have been accorded to the Communist Party. It has enlisted aid from persons who would not consciously collaborate with Communists. Yet, the party has claimed credit (in its 1945 New York State convention) for founding the ICC. A large number of ICC directors have participated in pro-Soviet activities. Its line on controversial issues is identical with that of the Daily Worker, the national Communist paper. While there have been some resignations because of its leftist leanings, at this writing it is still a powerful influence in the liberal community.

Not to be confused with Communist fronts are the various infiltrated organizations. A front is organized by the party and for the party. An infiltrated group was organized for a legitimate purpose by citizens loyal primarily to the United States. Subsequent to its formation, Communists, by various devices, have obtained some degree of control. At times this control is extensive as with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare or the American Veterans Committee. At other times it is local as is the case with some chapters of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People or some locals of non-Communist labor unions. Infiltration has been discovered in surprising places, even in religious publications and seminaries, among atomic scientists, and in research groups dealing with foreign policy.

The net effect of such activities was well summarized by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in his speech before the American Legion on September 30, 1946:

"The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims some 100,000 members has lulled many Americans into a feeling of false complacency. I would not be concerned if we were dealing with only 100,000 Communists. The Communists themselves boast that for every party member there are 10 others ready to do the party's work. These include their satellites, their fellow travelers and their so-called progressive and phony liberal allies. They have maneuvered themselves into positions where a few Communists control the destinies of hundreds who are either willing to be led or have been duped into obeying the dictates of others."

Red Mouthpiece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Red Mouthpiece," by Eugene Lyons, from the magazine Plain Talk. I have secured an estimate from the Public Printer that the article will take three and a quarter pages of the RECORD, and that the cost will be $230.75.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FACTS BEHIND IN FACT: RED MOUTHPIECE

(By Eugene Lyons)

About 100,000 Americans are swallowing weekly doses of Communist Party-line propaganda under the impression that they are imbibing liberal and progressive ideas. Those of them not on the free list pay for inside dope that is in substance indistinguishable from the official Communist Party-line materials published in the Daily Worker and the New Masses.

Most of these people are not Communists; many of them are no doubt hostile to communism. If the same concoction were offered under a frankly Stalinist label, they would refuse to touch it. But it comes to them under independent and anti-Fascist labels, exuding the scent of moral indignation, and they are taken in.

I refer to the subscribers to In Fact, a four-page newsletter edited by George Seldes, one of the most energetic Communist fellow travelers in the business.

George has an authentic flair for sensation. Week after week he presents a brew of synthetic scoops, exposés, accusations—spiced with those self-righteous liberal clichés certain people find irresistible. His four pages overflow with the nefarious plots of Big Business, attacks on the Vatican, Red-baiters, imperialists, and other stock villains of the Muscovite melodrama. Those of his customers who like baseless scandal and sensationalism probably get their money's worth.

As circulations go in our country, these customers are relatively few. But as many of them are teachers, preachers, writers, doctors, and the like—opinion makers and opinion carriers—an analysis of In Fact, its editor, and its contents is in the interest of public hygiene.

The uninitiated find it hard to believe that so many supposedly nonpartisan publications in America actually and knowingly follow the Communist policy line. Luckily we have the testimony of a qualified witness.

Ruth McKenney is best known for her humorous book My Sister Eileen, but she is in deadly earnest about her advocacy of communism. Writing in the Communist weekly New Masses, for May 31, 1938, she listed some of the official Communist Party mouthpieces and boasted that in addition—

"The party has a hand in the publication of assorted other magazines of various types and kinds. Some of the magazines the party itself publishes. * * * Many others the party helps edit. And many many other magazines are edited by people friendly to the party who come around and ask for advice and direction in getting out their weekly and monthly publications."

These periodicals in which the party has a hand, which the party helps edit, whose editors get party advice and guidance are palmed off on the reading public as independent journals. If their Communist connections are mentioned, they raise the cry of Red baiting—understandably, since the pose of independence is their main propaganda asset. But people and publications familiar with the techniques described by Miss McKenney have not been fooled.

Only recently an editorial in Collier's (November 9, 1946) stated as a self-evident matter that In Fact "generally follows the Communist Party line." A few weeks later a news story in the New York World-Telegram (December 11, 1946) referred just as matter of factly to "the Communist Party-line sheet, In Fact, published by George Seldes."

Seldes' threats of court action whenever his Communist contacts are alluded to in print are a matter of amused notoriety in publishing circles. The circumstances that wealthy and hence vulnerable publications do not hesitate to identify In Fact as a party line sheet suggests that they have no doubts in the matter.

Though he denies for the record that he is a fellow traveler, Seldes does not try too hard to cover his ideological tracks. Indeed, as a conspirator he seems pretty slipshod.

A more discreet fellow, for instance, would not have printed his "independent" weekly in a shop that does the printing for numerous communistic organizations and even for Soviet agencies.

He would not have used so many men and women easily identified as party people on his editorial and business staff—Bruce Minton, Mrs. William Browder, and Henry Geisz, for example.

Above all, a less slovenly operator would have found an excuse now and then for chiding Russia and the Communists, however gently, to bolster the pretense of objectivity. But not once in over 6 years of publishing has Seldes found the United States of America right and Russia wrong in any conflict of views. Not once have his trigger-happy assaults on all other politicians, right and left, at home and abroad, been relieved by a single volley aimed at a Communist in good standing anywhere. Russia and Communists have been 100 percent exempt in 6 years of In Fact's riproaring revelations of the wickedness of men and nations.

This tendency to overplay his hand is not necessarily proof of incompetence in the arts of camouflage. It is evidence, rather, of Seldes' immense contempt for his readers. He has operated on the assumption that the innocents to whom he caters are hopelessly naive. Every issue of his newsletter is a calculated insult to their intelligence. He disdains subtlety in turning the villains of one issue into heroes a few issues later, in changing his editorial views abruptly, as demanded by the shifting party line.

ONCE A CRUSADER AGAINST BOLSHEVISM

Warm advocates of the Soviet-Communist cause who turn into bitter opponents are by now a familiar type. Usually the conversion requires a long sojourn in Russia, during which imported illusions crumble under the impact of unpleasant facts. But the reverse process—a prominent red-baiter turned into a passionate pro-Communist—is rare. Exhibit No. 1 of this believe-it-or-not phenomenon is George Seldes.

For some 13 years—from the time he was expelled from Russia in 1923 to his sudden appearance in the Communist press—Seldes spared no vitriol in his war on Soviet communism. In books and articles he denounced bolshevism as the twin brother of fascism and never tired of warning America against the red world plot directed from Moscow.

His journalistic style was always of the flamboyant kind. His mind runs to conspiracies, intrigues, and the off-the-cuff forecasts. These talents he used continually to bait dictators, red, black, or brown.

Almost any of his writings of that period prove that he earned honestly the abuse he got from the comrades. The keynote of his crusade against bolshevism was struck in a series of letters to his one-time employer, Colonel McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune. Here is an excerpt, as published in the New York Times, June 18, 1923:

"Believe me, if bolshevism ever comes to America, nothing would please me more than a nice corner post on a roof overlooking two main streets and a nice large machine-gun with unlimited belts of ammunition. I am convinced more than ever that Russian bolshevism will never be satisfied until it carries world revolution to other countries, and the country they want is America. I certainly believe it is the duty of every man who cares the least bit for his own liberty, or for the most fundamental rights, to fight the greatest force today of anticivilization."

A typical Seldes book—You Can't Print That! published in 1929—suffices to indicate the heat and the earnestness of his anti-Communist sentiments. It begins with the story of his troubles with censorship, especially his experience in those parallel despotisms, Italy and Russia, and gives major space to as indignant an indictment of the Soviet reality—terror, antireligious outrages, trouble-making abroad, abuse of the common man—as you will find in any library of anti-Soviet literature.

His section on the Third or Communist International, entitled "The Red World Plot," calls it an open-and-shut conspiracy. He tells of Moscow sessions where arrangements are made for money and propaganda via Soviet embassies, legations, consulates, trade missions and other agencies in many lands.

His most passionate denunciations, however, are directed against the terror in Russia, in a chapter originally written as a report for use in a congressional committee. Seldes reports Soviet murder, torture, and ugliness. He tells how the Soviet secret police smothered all liberty of expression * * * cowed the souls of the people.

"Freedom has ceased to exist in Russia. There is no democracy. It is not wanted. Only American apologists for the Soviets have ever pretended that there was democracy in Russia. * * * The terror is in the mind and marrow of the present generation and nothing but generations of freedom and liberty will ever root it out."

Religious persecutions, too, arouse Seldes to wrathful rhetoric. It was the anti-God campaign, indeed, that finally led to his departure. From the outset he had been prepared for the occasion when the big story came for which it would be worth risking expulsion. The arrest and trial of a number of Catholic priests met that test. George smuggled out some truth and took his medicine.

Driven out of Russia, he dedicated himself to demolishing propagandist illusions about the nation in the United States of America. In other countries, on other assignments, he found evidence of the Communist menace and exposed it as he went along. He challenged fellow-Americans to open their eyes to "intrigue according to instructions from Moscow."

If ever a writer earned the accolade of "red-baiter," it was George, so that his subsequent golden reconciliation with communism is wrapped in mystery.

THE STRANGE CONVERSION

For those of us watching the course of Communist infiltration in America, Seldes' sudden emergence as a contributor to the Communist press, as a speaker at Communist meetings, as a sponsor of Communist-inspired enterprises, was a shocker. Against his record of long and wrathful anti-Soviet agitation, his conversion seemed incredible. It seemed cuckoo. We searched for a clue to the mystery. In what burning bush had he received his revelation?

Had Seldes returned to Soviet Russia to discover that his earlier findings were outmoded and unfair? Nothing of the sort. Had far-reaching reforms and improvements in the Soviet domain perhaps allowed him to forgive and forget the ugly past? No one in his right mind would make such a claim. Sovietism in 1923, for all its faults, was certainly more idealistic than Sovietism in 1936 or 1939. No, the key to the riddle of Seldes' transformation cannot be found inside the U. S. S. R.

Personally I sense some hidden tragedy in the conversion. The man who had insisted so eloquently that Fascism and Bolshevism were two of a kind donning the uniform of a fellow-traveling bondage! No one can convince me that there were not some irresistible pressures or temptations.

In any case, the fact of his ignominious surrender around 1936 to the world-plotters whom he had so long fought is beyond doubt. An examination of the Communist press shows him suddenly goose-stepping on the official line; signing party-inspired documents, heading up front organizations, writing for party publications, attending party rallies.

Without prelude or apprenticeship, his name now led all the rest in the annals of the party periphery as detailed in the official Daily Worker. Even his presence at the spring ball of the communist new masses and at the opening of the Soviet Pavilion at the World's Fair now became news for the initiates.

As if to atone for his anti-Soviet career, poor George now seemed in a panicky hurry to pile up maximum party credits in minimum time. In a few years he showed up at least 40 times in connection with Communist-sponsored causes. The by-line nurtured on anti-Soviet writings now embellished such comradely pages as those of the Daily Worker, the New Masses, Soviet Russia Today, Equal Justice, Equality. It graced the sponsor lists and activities of such "front" organizations as American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Conference for Constitution Liberties in America, Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, Friends of the Soviet Union, International Labor Defense, International Workers Order, League of American Writers, National Committee for People's Rights, Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges.

This is not a complete listing, of course. Nor does it indicate the responsible roles in which Seldes, though a newcomer to the cause, was instantly cast. The fullness of his conversion was matched by a confidence of the same order. For instance, he became a vice president of the league of American writers, an organization labeled subversive by Attorney General Biddle. When a party-line movie project was launched in frontier films, Seldes was on its advisory board. He found himself on the executive boards both of the north American Spanish aid committee and the United Spanish aid committee. And he signed the famous round-robin approving the Moscow blood-purge trials. The Seldes who had risked expulsion from Russia to tell the truth about an earlier and milder purge trial was now hurrahing for official murder at the latest purge trial.

On August 14, 1939—9 days before the bombshell of the Moscow-Berlin Pact which forged the brown-and-red axis and touched off World War II—some 400 Americans issued a letter branding as reactionaries and Fascists all those who dared suggest that Russia and Germany had anything in common. Seldes—the same Seldes who for more than a decade had plugged the thesis that fascism and communism were two sides of the same medal—was proudly among the 400 signers. Nine days later Stalin and Ribbentrop turned the letter into a grotesquerie. Some of the signers had the decency to pin "kick me" signs on their backsides. The rest, and Seldes in particular, devoted themselves to the new Nazi-Soviet line for America—to the job of agitating against aid to the Allies, preventing American rearmament, and keeping Uncle Sam out of the wicked "imperialist" war.

The shock of the Stalin-Hitler partnership caused the first great mass desertion of fellow travelers from the American Communist movement. Only comrades of deep faith—or those so deeply fouled that they couldn't extricate themselves from the Communist clutches—stood firm.

Seldes stood firm. Up to that moment he had advocated collective security but now his new isolationist fervor took him into the Committee To Defend America by Keeping Out of War. Soon he was sponsoring a New York peace association, a Greenwich Village mass meeting for peace, an emergency peace mobilization—different party names for the same party campaign for neutrality.

Finally the American Peace Mobilization was set up, under the slogan, "The Yanks are not coming." This was the organization that clamored for nonintervention, defended Communist-led strikes in war industries, agitated against conscription, and maintained a picket line around the White House and the warmonger within. Seldes was on the policy-making national council of this mobilization.

In April 1940, when the first issue of In Fact was already made up, he served as chairman of a self-styled Citizens Defense Committee created by the Communists to help demonstrators arrested outside the French consulate in New York. While France was staggering under Hitler's offensive these demonstrators and the Seldes committee were adding their blows to hasten the collapse.

The whole In Fact enterprise must be seen in the context of its editor's frenzied labors in such Communist-inspired causes.

TESTIMONY OF A COMMUNIST INSIDER

How best to exploit the zeal of the reconditioned Red-baiter, George Seldes, was often discussed in the inner circle of the Communist high command. One of the plans under serious consideration was to make him editor of the Daily Worker, the official party organ. Evidence to that effect is provided by a member of that high command who was directly involved in the plan: Louis F. Budenz.

Budenz was brought to New York from Chicago, installed as managing editor of the paper. In several conferences with Earl Browder, the party boss, he had been offered Seldes as his editor.

Recently Budenz broke with the party. In a blistering farewell message that made headlines, he charged the Communists with disloyalty, chicanery, and subservience to a foreign government. Thus we have the story of that crucial crossroads in the Seldes career from an insider. In a signed statement, Budenz attests as follows:

"In 1940, when I was named president of the corporation publishing the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, the then secretary general, Earl Browder, stated that the political committee of the party was prepared to name George Seldes as editor of the Daily Worker.

"Mr. Browder asked whether, if I were named managing editor and Mr. Seldes was chosen editor, we could work together. I was told then that something had to be done to give Seldes a larger opportunity to function for the cause. Browder said that no move in that direction would be made unless I agreed it was feasible. I conveyed my belief that Seldes and I would be able to get along together.

"Later I was advised that Seldes felt that he should not be associated with such an open Communist publication as the Daily Worker. The party leaders, too, I was told, now felt that he would be more useful as an ostensibly non-Communist journalist."

A more convenient "opportunity to function" soon was provided. Again I quote from Budenz' signed statement:

"As to In Fact, the entire plan for that venture was submitted to me by the ninth floor of the Communist Party—the national headquarters, that is to say—shortly before the publication was launched. I was instructed, since I was busy at the time, to give my opinion of the plan to William Browder, business manager of the Daily Worker, who was in constant touch with Seldes and the others on In Fact. This I did, talking the matter over with him on several occasions. Incidentally, William Browder's wife, Rose, subsequently became business manager of the Seldes publication.

"On two occasions after In Fact was launched I was asked if I would go out to Westchester to confer with Seldes and get him straightened out when he was temporarily confused on matters of policy. This I agreed to do, but pressure of other work prevented my acting fast enough, and meanwhile Seldes had conformed to the party line on the points involved. I assumed that other emissaries had done the job of straightening him out."

The disclosure that the entire plan for that venture was appraised by the party bigwigs fits perfectly into the picture of the camouflaged press drawn by Ruth McKenney 2 years earlier. Curiously, Miss McKenney's

husband, Bruce Minton, a Communist writer, was second in command when the venture got going.

In a recent letter to a national magazine which had denounced In Fact as a party-line sheet, Seldes blandly disclaimed responsibility for Minton, even implying he did not know his partner was a Communist. The disclaimer is a piece of effrontery. Minton had been on the Communist New Masses masthead from October 1935 to October 1939, a few months before he teamed up with Seldes. He was back there in October 1940, soon after he left In Fact. It doesn't call for a Sherlock Holmes to deduce that he had been given a leave of absence from the official magazine for an unofficial chore.

This association with a notorious Communist was hardly smart on Seldes' part. An even worse act of recklessness—uncorrected to this day—was that they had their news letter printed in a shop devoted almost entirely to pro-Communist work. The union labels 209 on In Fact at an early stage and 412 on its later and current issues identify the products of the Prompt Press and the New Union Press respectively. The two firms occupy the same offices at 113–119 Fourth Avenue, New York City, and between them monopolize most of the party and party-front printing.

The same presses that turn out In Fact have also turned out, at various times, the New Masses, the Communist, Science and Society, Equality, and other party-line periodicals. They have done the printing for the League of American Writers, the National Negro Congress, Intourist (Soviet travel bureau), the American League for Peace and Democracy, the American Peace Mobilization, and many other fronts.

The designation of Mrs. William Browder as business manager of In Fact, a post like her husband's on the Daily Worker, was another big gap in the camouflage. She worked as Rose Euler, presumably her maiden name; friends and comrades were under strict instructions not to address her as Mrs. Browder in writing or phoning her at In Fact.

When her brother-in-law, Earl Browder, was ousted as Party chief due to a change in the Moscow line, her husband was also removed from the Daily Worker. But Rose Browder remained on In Fact; her expulsion would have exposed the Party contact with the weekly too glaringly.

Bruce Minton's successors on In Fact have been less prominent in the Communist periphery and hence less vulnerable. Robert Terrall, who followed Minton, had been on the faculty of the School of Democracy, which later merged with the Workers School, a Party institution, to form the present Jefferson School of Social Science, foremost Communist educational outfit in the country.

The current incumbent as second in command is Victor Weingarten, who was one of the leaders of the Communist-inspired strike on the Brooklyn Eagle at the end of 1937. In 1942 he left the Eagle for an editorial post on The Pilot, official organ of the Communist-dominated National Maritime Union.

The formal owners of the In Fact corporation at present are George Seldes, his wife Helen, and Henry Geisz. Geisz has been identified with Communist enterprises at least as far back as 1938; he was then an official of the Council for United States Veterans, lineal descendant of the Party-front Workers Ex-Servicemen's League. He is known to have conferred often with top party leaders.

From his first collaborator to his last, Seldes has thus been consistent. In Fact has remained true to its Communist godparents. The opinion of In Fact's editor held by the Party High Command is summed up by Budenz as follows:

"I can state that Seldes was one of those men without an open Communist label who was regarded by the Communist leadership as one who would always act in accordance with their wishes. That is, the national leaders of the Communist Party regarded him as one who would always act as a Communist would act under any given circumstances."

The columns of the newsletter provide the clinching proofs that this confidence was amply deserved.

SELDES THE ISOLATIONIST

As head of the OWI, Elmer Davis once said that the best test of a Communist stooge is his attitude toward the war before and after Hitler doublecrossed Stalin by invading Russia. In Fact and its editor pass that test summa cum laude.

Seldes, as we have seen, threw himself headlong into the struggle to keep America out of the war. He was particularly displeased with our proally press. "It now becomes imperative to read the Daily Worker and the New Masses," he wrote in March 1940, "to get not only the contrasting angle but the actual truth."

His antidote to our journalistic lack of neutrality was In Fact, a biweekly later turned into a weekly. The sheet was born on May 20, 1940, and the first paper to announce the blessed event was the Daily Worker (May 29).

The views reflected in these publications continued remarkably parallel for the next 5 years. Whether by design or because he was a little slow on the uptake, the Seldes brochure lagged a couple of weeks or months behind the official Party organs on some issues, but invariably it caught up, out of breath but faithful.

Said the Daily Worker, for instance, May 2, 1940: "Taking advantage of the fact that two of its leading rivals, England and Germany, are now locked in war, United States imperialism is reaching out its hands for the grabbing of colonial loot."

Echoed In Fact, August 26, 1940, in condemning conscription: "It makes possible U. S. seizure of the disintegrating British Empire, if Germany defeats England. The United States now considers itself heir to the British Empire."

Said Earl Browder, in a speech on May 3, 1940: "The War Party of the American bourgeoisie is on the march and Roosevelt stands at its head."

Echoed In Fact, June 17, 1940: "There is a party in Washington * * * which is leading us into war * * * and the President of the United States is the leader of this party."

A black headline in the second number of In Fact proclaimed the blacker fact that "the administration chooses war." That marked the start of a vituperative campaign against the President, his personal family, and his official family, that was to keep up for 13 months. They were serving "interests," Seldes charged, intent on dragging the country into the "imperialist" war. They were interfering with labor's right to strike in war plants.

Aid to Britain, conscription, convoys roused the embattled people's tribune to bursts of anger. "There is no evidence of an emergency," he exclaimed (September 23, 1940), and "therefore no necessity whatever for the Burke conscription bill." Moreover, "peacetime conscription is one of the symptoms of fascism." He poured the hot pitch of his fury on editors, officials, professors who were leaping on the war hysteria bandwagon, and on the FBI for its hysterical interest in enemy agents.

"War hysteria is sweeping the country," Seldes wailed on August 12, 1940; fully 87 percent of the press was not telling the awful truth about the draft, to wit:

"1. It encourages the British to continue the fight against Germany. 2. It makes possible United States seizure of the disintegrating British Empire if Germany defeats England. * * * The great commercial powers, big business, have no desire to see Germany grab what they now consider their inheritance. If Britain keeps up the fight, both sides will soon be exhausted. Then a prepared—that is, conscripted, disciplined, regimented, Fascisized—America will step in at the right moment and win the war for itself at the expense of both England and Germany."

Only 2 weeks before Hitler inconsiderately converted the imperialist into an anti-Fascist war for all party-liners, Seldes shed tears for the millions of young Americans who "will risk their arms, their eyes, their lives again to make the world safe for democracy," because "the President, his Cabinet, most of the press, powerful men and forces were conditioning the mind of America—public opinion—to accept war, and eventually to raise hysterical enthusiasm for it." A week later—even closer to the end of the limb on which he was climbing out—Seldes had it from Washington progressives that the United States defense program aims to increase American domination in Latin America and to prepare for military intervention in Europe.

If only poor George had had some premonition of the coming sanctification of the war. But alas, he continued to babble this to the very last moment.

He had promised his readers "to give news, not dope." But on July 15, 1940, he notified his customers that "according to In Fact's reliable informants," the war would be ended within a month. On December 2, 1940, Seldes had inside information that Wendell Willkie had "reassured his bankers and big-business friends that there was no danger that the British Empire will become a socialized state. * * * It is, therefore, O. K. for America to save the British Empire."

A record in dope-peddling, however, was established in the May 12, 1941, issue of the newsletter. It promised "documented facts" proving that "the majority of American citizens who want peace are being intimidated and harassed by J. Edgar Hoover"; that the FBI was framing "progressive unionists"; that the same FBI was breaking strikes; and that "a witch hunt against civil liberties is being instituted."

IN FACT GOES TO WAR

Seldes still owes his readers the "documentation" on these astonishing accusations. For as of June 22, 1941—the day Hitler attacked Russia—all the trite denunciations of warmongers, convoys, lend-lease, selective service, FBI vigilance, big business, and strikebreakers ceased in his columns.

Instead, Seldes suddenly became vastly agitated over failures to implement the arms program he had snarled at for 13 months. Instead, he now sounded the alarm about "bad morale" in the Army, the creation of which he had denounced as a "symptom of fascism." His American Peace Mobilization gave up the ghost and the old chant was changed slightly to read "The Yanks Are Not Coming Too Late."

His new solicitude for the state of our national defenses became truly touching. "The first question of the American people," he now proclaimed, "is the status of the armament program":

"If first Britain and later Russia had not engaged the main forces of Hitlerism, and Hitler had attacked the United States, he would have found nothing but a paper air fleet, tanks on paper, paper guns and ammunition.

"The failure of the first year of the American defense program is due chiefly to the fact that big business ran down the program, that money and industry engaged in the most vicious sit-down in history, and that native Fascist-minded men, appointed by Roosevelt in good faith, sabotaged the program for the benefit of big business" (September 22, 1941).

One must pause to savor such demagogy. Would anyone who missed the first act of the farce guess that this editor had "flayed" the

Roosevelt administration and denounced big business for arming America for imperialist adventures? Would he believe that Seldes had supported sit-down strikes in war plants and barked at the FBI? In Fact now exhorted its readers to write to soldiers in support of the war. "Tell them the truth," Seldes pleaded. * * * "Educate the army in the world-wide war against fascism."

Pearl Harbor, please note, was still in the future. But for In Fact the war was already world-wide. Like the whole pro-Communist crew, Seldes had not changed his mind because America was under attack. That would have made sense. He had changed his mind because Russia was under attack. That made no sense whatsoever—except for the few Americans whose first loyalty is to Russia.

F. D. R. was not the only one, of course, whom Hitler unwittingly restored in Seldes' good graces. Mrs. Roosevelt, too, came in for that windfall of affection. Then there was Dorothy Thompson, who had figured in the newsletter as a British agitator "willing to sacrifice a million American lives to save British imperialism from Hitler imperialism" (August 12, 1940). Now she became for Seldes a soothsayer with an "unequaled" record.

Perhaps the happiest beneficiary of the In Fact amnesty was Wendell Willkie, if only because he had been so brutally mauled before that. For 13 months Seldes had never mentioned him without allusions to his villainy. "Willkie, free-press enemy," "Willkie's Fascist mentality," "Coughlin endorses Willkie," were headlines in a single issue (August 12, 1940). They merely elaborated the thumbnail sketch offered on July 15: "Every newspaperman in Washington knows that the closest thing to a native Fascist is Wendell Willkie."

Such derogation ceased utterly as soon as Hitler's real character, until then obscured from the world, was at last unveiled by his attack on Stalin. In due time, Willkie, having spoken up for a second front, became one of In Fact's heroes.

From June 22, 1941, forward, In Fact's major campaigns ran absolutely parallel to those in the official Communist press, though sometimes a lap behind. This holds true for the great outcry for a second front in defiance of Anglo-American military opinion; the attack on the dangerous theory of victory through air power as presented by Major de Seversky and other aviation experts; the smear campaign against General Mikhailovich; the vilification of the Polish Government-in-exile; the attack on the Chinese Government.

The parallelism has not been marred to date. In Fact, like the uncamouflaged Communist press, has supported every act of Soviet expansion, and abused those who have dared interfere. It has sided with the Chinese Communists against the Chinese Government, with the Greek Communists against the Greek Government, with the Polish and Bulgarian quisling regimes against their respective underground resistance movements. The views of the Daily Worker and In Fact remain indistinguishable.

SELDES' CHARACTER

Six years of such faithful if unacknowledged cooperation cannot be shrugged off as a coincidence. The phenomenon must be studied in the light of Seldes' extensive affiliations with party-line enterprises, the Communists connected with his paper, the direct testimony of people like ex-Communist leader Budenz.

"I do not follow the Communist Party line, I do not know what the phrase means," Seldes assured his clients on January 31, 1943. Coming from a man who had been for many years a notorious fellow-traveler, such a statement gives the measure of his contempt for his readers' intelligence.

One enlightening episode is useful in estimating the value of Seldes' word on any subject. It is one inside story that never appeared in In Fact:

In 1931 Seldes was entrusted with a number of articles in manuscript by Dr. Angelica Balabanoff, well-known socialist writer. These dealt with aspects of the career of Mussolini, whom she had known before he turned Fascist. Seldes agreed to try to place these articles in American magazines. Years passed, and Dr. Balabanoff did not hear from him.

But in 1935 Seldes published a biography of Mussolini, Sawdust Caesar. Included was one of the Balabanoff articles, without permission and without remuneration, but with a footnote statement that she had written it for this book. Dr. Balabanoff was by that time an exile in America. She was horrified by the deceit but did not take legal action.

Seldes, however, proceeded to add insult to the injury. He joined the staff of a new magazine, Ken, and soon an alleged Balabanoff article appeared in its pages, again without her knowledge or consent. Worse than that, he had rewritten and rearranged the manuscript, and revised the sense of many passages, to give it a strong pro-Communist, pro-Stalin ring—this despite the fact that Dr. Balabanoff is violently anti-Communist and anti-Stalin.

This time the lady's patience cracked. She brought suit. "I recognized passages I had written years ago," she charged, "but they had been wrenched out of their context—arbitrarily juggled—and interlarded with matter that was not mine and which, whether mine or not, I consider utterly misleading. I could only stare at my own name over the concoction with a sense of outrage."

Ken apologized and made a cash settlement with Dr. Balabanoff. Seldes confessed all in a letter dated May 3, 1939. He admitted changing the wording, rearranging ideas and paragraphs and misinterpreting the supposed author's thoughts, then publishing the synthetic stuff without consulting Dr. Balabanoff. As the American Mercury summed it up in its article on Seldes:

"In short, he had done a job for the cause. Most newspapermen, after signing such a confession of distorting facts and inventing opinions, would disappear from public life. Seldes brazened it out. More than that, he set himself up through In Fact as a crusader against the 'corrupt press' and a dispenser of unbiased inside news."

Another episode may help in the appraisal of this man. Washington Square Bulletin, the campus paper of Washington Square College, part of New York University, in its May 6, 1943, issue condemned Seldes' smear techniques and irresponsible name calling. Did this tribune of the people smile indulgently at the antics of school children? Far from it. He promptly stigmatized the college paper in print as a semiharlot press, and wrote in a letter to the youthful editors reeking with gutter ideas:

"It is shocking to find perverted journalism in noncommercial papers. Perhaps the editors of the Bulletin are members of the red-light district of journalism merely because they like the life."

The recipients of the letter were in a position to understand what Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS meant when in a speech in Congress he described Seldes as "the ace smear artist of the American Communists" and "unquestionably the most perfidious in his smearing." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 6, 1946.) Perhaps the Congressman overdrew the picture. In a contest for honors in perfidious Communist smearing there would be other worthy entries.

Those who have suffered from his irresponsible party-line angers are legion. They include publications, organizations, individuals as various as the Reader's Digest, the New Leader, the National Geographic; the Book-of-the-Month Club and the American Legion; Franklin D. Roosevelt and Clare Boothe Luce. His hatreds are almost universal in scope. But the telltale fact about these attacks is that in almost every instance they coincided with similar attacks in the open Communist press.

Such is the record of the man and his smear sheet. In full awareness of his propensity to threaten libel proceedings when his Communist connections are exposed, I do not hesitate to charge:

1. That In Fact is a Communist party-line publication;

2. That Seldes has been for at least 10 years a prominent and active fellow traveler of the Communists; and

3. That in concealing these facts from his subscribers he has perpetrated a fraud and imposture upon them, palming off the changing Communist propaganda as his own independent views.

Never Ending National Emergencies

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in what I am about to say now no reference is intended to any person living or dead. The snakes that were reputed to have followed St. Patrick out of Ireland went with no more eagerness or pleasure than that exhibited by certain individuals who, elected on a Republican ticket, now follow the songs which the New Dealers and the internationalists are singing at the present time. Every time Republicans attempt to comply with some promise they made, every time we try to be honest with the people, the minority and the administration comes along with another emergency, one thing of which there is never a scarcity, never will be a scarcity so long as New Dealers want office, so long as One Worlders follow a policy which will in the end destroy American independence. You, on the minority side, can always cook up some crisis, some emergency the effect of which is to deny the taxpayers a tax reduction, the raising of the exemption, some idea which followed will keep us ever bankrupt, ever giving away something. Let me congratulate you. You are past masters of that alluring art. But why Republicans should be soft-headed enough to follow you is beyond me.

Fabrics for Fair Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from American Wool and Cotton Reporter for March 13, 1947:

FABRICS FOR FAIR PROFITS

One of the great and important industrials of the country and a real leader in the

textile industry is the Berkshire Fine Spinning Associates under the very able management of John H. McMahon, president.

Berkshire is a consolidation of long time established New England cotton mills, the name coming from the original, the Berkshire Cotton Mill, of Adams, Mass. That great Berkshire, which for many years as an individual concern gave employment to thousands of operatives, paying millions of dollars of wages and over a term of years many millions of dollars of taxes, was incorporated—the money found for it and equipped and started up coincident with the election of William McKinley as President of the United States—something like a half century ago.

At that time the people of this country had suffered under a free-trade policy and it was very obvious that the temper of the Nation promised a return to a high protective tariff policy and the encouragement of business and industry. So, at that time William B. Plunkett and his associates initiated the Berkshire for the production of fine combed gray goods on the assumption—administrated through many following years as a fact—that with a high protective tariff policy in this country we could manufacture fine cotton goods and meet world-wide competition.

It was only the protective tariff that warranted the investment of the several million dollars in the then new Berkshire, and the maintaining of that economic policy over a long period of following years made possible that long time payment of millions in wages and taxes, the building of great mills, the consumption of hundreds of thousands of bales of fine cotton, the distribution of the resultant cotton mill product and the payment of freight rates and the employment of garment makers all over the United States.

Subsequent to that time Charles Fletcher of Providence, who became one of the great worsted manufacturers of the country, had a woolen mill at Fulton, N. Y. That mill was operated by John W. Nary and Arthur Schwartz, hired executives and manufacturers of Mr. Fletcher's. That mill and all the other woolen and worsted mills of the industry—but right now we are particularizing as to Fulton—ran into the free trade era under the Cleveland Administration. The mill couldn't compete without a protective tariff so Fulton was shut down and John Nary and Arthur Schwartz went to Bradford, England, and manufactured worsted fabrics on English machinery, with English operatives, paying the wages to non-Americans and sent those goods into this country. In that instance and in all similar instances the foreign manufacturer had the advantage because we had gone off the high tariff, our mills were shutting down, they couldn't compete.

Nary and Schwartz stayed at Bradford through the free trade era and then in 1905 returned to the United States, for we had again gone on to a sound economy basis. Those two men found the idle P. K. Wilson Mill in Trenton, N. J., which had gone out during the free trade era—but now tariff protection had been reestablished, and Nary and Schwartz started in that old plant. Then incorporated as the Princeton Worsted Mills, which has become one of the outstanding worsted mills of the world, paying millions and millions of wages and taxes, giving employment steadily with hardly—if as much as—a single day of nonactivity for more than 40 years, an example of the beneficence of sound economics as depicted in our old high tariff policy.

Four or five years ago, when England was suffering under the threat of German invasion, the American Viscose Co., at that time owned in England, was sold to American investors for something like $200,000,000, proving a $200,000,000 activity in this country wholly due to the benign influence of the protective tariff. The American Viscose Co. was initiated in this country by the Courtaulds of England. The big plant with its distribution of hundreds of millions over a course of years was solely possible for us in this country because of our then protective tariff which prevented Courtaulds from making the filament rayon in England and shipping it to us. So we gained that tremendous industry and the employment of thousands of our own American wage earners.

The Duplan Co.—it used to be the Duplan Silk Co.—was initiated in Pennsylvania and New York by the original Duplan of Switzerland. Many years ago Duplan silk fabrics were made in Switzerland and France and distributed in this country through the great primary market—New York. Then a half century ago following the depressions of a non-tariff era the Duplan mills were set up here because of our return to tariff protection. So, here is another instance where the investment of millions of dollars of European money in plant machinery in this country made possible the employment of thousands of American workers.

The American Thread Co. and the Clark Thread plants in the United States are other examples. The American Thread Co.—several hundred thousands of spindles on fine cotton yarns and similarly the Clarks and Coates and Kerr and Chadwick mills—are all English capital, mills built or acquired in the United States because of tariff protection, preventing the English mills with English machinery, wages and taxes producing those fine cotton yarns in the Old World for our domestic markets.

One of the great textile manufacturing corporations in the world—much more than a $100,000,000 organization—is J. P. Stevens & Co. The original Stevens Mill, nucleus around which that great big Stevens group has been consolidated, is the M. T. Stevens plant at North Andover, Mass. The original Nathaniel Stevens, along about 1813, set up and started his first woolen mill because of the conditions concomitant with the war with England in 1812, and the embargo, itself a prohibitive tariff policy which prevented the purchase and use of foreign-made woolens in our own markets. The whole J. P. Stevens organization is largely—except for the personal ability—based on the protective tariff.

One of the best, most successful dyeing and finishing plants in the world is the Bradford Dyeing Association of Bradford, R. I., the American-owned plant of an English dyeing and finishing concern operating in this country because—due to our tariff protective policy it is best economy to process those goods in this country.

Years ago this was a carded woolen market, practically all of our mills were on those fabrics. The combed worsted industry was negligible. Then with the permanency of protective tariff seemingly guaranteed, the great Washington Mills, of Lawrence, and the Arlington and the Cleveland Worsted and the Wanskuck, and all those other big worsted organizations were financed, equipped, and maintained profitable operations because of the protective tariff. About the same time the great German worsted manufacturers, Stoehrs of Leipsig, Germany, for example—to particularize by name—built the Botany and Forstmann and the Gera Mill, and the Garfield, and the N. J. Worsted in and around Passaic, N. J., all of them proof positive of wage paying in this country, rather than the purchase of foreign goods, because of the tariff protection.

Perhaps the book that we will now refer to has been removed from the shelves of the New York public library where we saw it years ago, but it is a fact that there was such a book written by Thomas Barbour, a linen thread manufacturer in Belfast, Ireland—a book praying for free trade policy in the United States written by an Irish (British) linen manufacturer. He wanted to maintain his then big importer position in this country—the sale of Irish manufactured fabrics—the wages and taxes were paid in the old country. But we returned, long after the Cleveland Administration, to the high protective policy and the Barbours came over from Belfast and built their mills in this country and became the great Linen Thread Co., so all of those millions of dollars in wages are paid to wage earners and municipalities. Incidentally the Barbours are now all high tariff men which perhaps accounts for the removal from the New York public library shelves of the free trade booklet written by the late Thomas Barbour 50 or so years ago.

The American Fabrics Co. in Bridgeport, manufacturers of narrow laces, was set up by German money with the work done in this country and the wages paid here instead of in Germany; and the American Fabrics Co. can pay dividends to its shareholders—we, ourselves are one of them—only when we have tariff protection. The Richmond Lace Co. of Rhode Island is in exactly the same situation—we are shareholders in it—the only time we got dividends was in the high tariff period or under an embargo in war years.

A few years prior to this Second World War—as everybody in the industry remembers—Japan was flooding us with cotton goods, gray and finished, and rayon fabrics in the gray and finished, and beginning to disrupt our markets with Japanese woolen and worsted goods. We all remember that a commission from the textile industry of this country went to Japan and pleaded with the Imperial Government and with the Japanese industrialists themselves asking them to "please not ship so much of your goods to our country," that our own industries would be ruined. The pleas seemed to be partially successful, the Japanese did let up on us a little, we thought that we had brought about a personal accomplishment—we did not know at that time that Japan was preparing to jump on us, getting ready for Pearl Harbor and wanted the goods for their own stock piles—but the whole thing did and does prove that only the enforcement of the high protective tariff or a terrible war can preserve us from the ravages of the low-paying wage policy of Asiatic as well as the European manufacturers.

All political and economic arguments of other eras favoring high tariff protection are still sound—but we amplify those arguments by the presentation above of a score or so of actual instances which could be multiplied to a total of hundreds of actual proofs—by names and by dates.

The only way that we can be sure of fabrics for fair profits is by the return to and the maintenance of the high protective tariff policy, looking askance always at any of these so-called reciprocal trade treaties.

A Parliament for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on the New York Herald Tribune Forum on the subject A Parliament for Europe, by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, professor at the New York University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUDENHOVE-KALERGI ENVISIONS UNITED EUROPE AS UNITED STATES BULWARK—NEW YORK UNIVERSITY HISTORY PROFESSOR SAYS POLL OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT IN NATIONS OUTSIDE SOVIET SPHERE SHOWS STRONG SENTIMENT FOR FEDERATION

The address at the second session by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, professor of history at New York University, on a parliament for Europe, follows:

"Last year I spent a few months in Europe. Before returning to New York, I wrote 3,913 letters to members of European parliaments, asking whether they were in favor of the establishment of an European federation within the framework of the United Nations. These letters were sent to all members of freely elected parliaments of unquestionably European states with independent foreign policies: that is, to the parliamentary representatives of the peoples of France, Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, Greece, Switzerland, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark.

"Among the answers I have received up to date are 612 'yes' and only 12 'no.'

"Among the 86 members of the French National Assembly who have answered 'yes' figures first of all the great Socialist, who has meanwhile been elected President of the French Republic, Vincent Auriol; the Catholic Vice Premier, Henry Teitgen; the Minister of War, Paul Coste-Floret; the founder of the M. R. P. Maurice Schumann, and the leader of the De Gaulist Union, Rene Capitant.

"Among the 107 members of the British Parliament who have voted for European federation, 64 belong to the Labor Party and 34 to the conservatives. Among those who belong to neither of these parties is Sir Arthur Salter, the former head of the economic section of the League of Nations and one of Britain's best experts on Europe."

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY-SIX ITALIANS IN FAVOR

"One-third of all members of Italy's National Assembly voted for European federation. Among these 186 Italians are the Catholic leader Guido Gonella, now Minister of Public Instruction; the Socialist leader Guiseppe Saragat, former president of the National Assembly; Matteotti's two sons; the leader of the Common Man Party, Guglielmo Giannini; Ferruccio Parri, the leader of Italy's underground resistance and former Prime Minister, and Count Sforza, now Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"Among the 67 Greeks are three party leaders and former prime ministers, at present members of the government: Gonatas, Papandreou and Venizelos; with Dragoumis, the former foreign minister, they represent a strong majority of the peoples of Greece.

"Time is too short to enumerate all other party leaders, members of governments and of former governments, Socialist and Catholics, liberals, conservatives and Communists, leaders of various nations who have thus voted for European union. But beside these prominent names stand the still unknown names of Europe's leaders of tomorrow, of ardent young men and women elected for the first time after years of fighting and suffering in the resistance movements, in trenches and in prisons. Now they are grimly determined to save Europe from a third world war, and have, therefore, become enthusiastic supporters of the cause of a united Europe."

EUROPEANS FOR UNITY

"This parliamentary Gallup poll on European federation, with its amazing result, 612 "yes" to 12 "no," gives a definite answer to those who still doubt whether the peoples of Europe wish to see their continent divided or united. For all these members of Parliament have soon to face their constituents when asking for reelection. Had they any doubt on the popular feeling toward European union, most of them would not have risked their political future by voting publicly for this cause.

"But they are well aware that the overwhelming majority of the peoples of Europe wish to see a new and united continent emerge from the ruins of the war; a Europe without wars, without starvation, without concentration camps; a Europe peaceful like Switzerland, prosperous like America and free like both.

"If a fair plebiscite were to be held tomorrow on the issue of European federation, men and women of all parties and nations, on both sides of the 'iron curtain' would stream to the polls to give overwhelming support to the cause of peace by union."

CONTINENTAL PARLIAMENT

"This is the reason why I appealed not to the governments but to the people of Europe, through their freely elected representatives. Europe needs a European parliament, as a symbol of its common destiny and an instrument of its growing integration; as a new continental authority, to coordinate its national and social aspirations.

"To prepare the organization of such a continental parliament, I have just asked the 612 pioneers of European federation to constitute nonpartisan committees for European federation in their respective parliaments and to invite all their colleagues who share their views to join them. We may expect that some of the most important of these committees will soon embrace parliamentary majorities, strong enough to compel their governments to go ahead toward union, and to overthrow those who refuse.

"This summer the first Congress of European Members of Parliament will meet at Geneva. Each parliamentary committee will be invited to send delegates in proportion to the total of its national population, one delegate corresponding to 1,000,000 of his countrymen.

"These 185 delegates shall constitute the first preliminary parliament of Europe, entirely free in its program and decisions; free to invite other European parliaments to cooperate. Some of the parliamentary pioneers of European federation insist on the inclusion of the Soviet Union; it will be up to these delegates to present their case, although I have some doubts whether the Soviets would be inclined to respect a European bill of rights or to accept pan-European control of their foreign, economic and military policy.

"The Congress will draft a European charter and submit practical suggestions for Europe's economic and political integration to the interested governments and to the United Nations. It will discuss the problem of a European plebiscite on the issue of union, and elect a European Council as Europe's supreme authority in its struggle for unity.

"All this work of the European congress will aim at a regional union strictly within the framework of the United Nations, according to article 52 of its Charter, which provides for such regional agreements and agencies.

"Pan American has given a great example of how continental solidarity may be made compatible with global unity; pan Europe will follow it."

THIRD PILLAR FOR UN

"Stretching between the Pan American and the Soviet Unions, and in close cordial relation with both the European union will constitute a third solid pillar of the United Nations.

"The old League of Nations collapsed because it attempted vainly to organize a united world around a disunited Europe. We must realize that the future of the United Nations will largely depend on, whether or not Europe will unite.

"The establishment of a European region under the supreme authority of the United Nations and its Security Council will also help to dispel Russia's objections to European union. It will make it possible to coordinate the existing treaties between European states and the Soviet Union within an all-out system of European security.

"Europe's economic integration will precede its political union, because ruined Europe can rise again only through coordinated efforts."

A START IN LOW COUNTRIES

"This great task has been started already by the governments of the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg with their bold attempt to get up a customs union in the heart of western Europe. If they succeed, their union will become the nucleus of a much wider market, breaking down progressively the artificial trade barriers that are now cutting through Europe's lifelines and blocking its reconstruction and recovery.

"In this question of life and death for Europe a new chapter has begun, since some of the world's outstanding statesmen are backing the cause of European federation.

"Winston Churchill, Europe's greatest citizen and inspired statesman, has given a tremendous impetus to the Pan-European movement by his historic Zurich speech last September. And General Smuts, one of the wisest leaders of our age, took up this theme in his address before the Netherlands Parliament. Europe recalls that it was Smuts who organized the Union of South Africa immediately after the Boer War, a war that had devastated his country and apparently plunged South Africa into a sea of irreconcilable hatreds.

"And only 6 weeks ago, from the very place from which I am now speaking, one of America's outstanding statesmen, backed by the Congress majority, brought new hopes for federation to the distressed and desperate people of Europe: John Foster Dulles.

"Those messages of hope and of faith have restored Europe's confidence in its own future. Some time ago many Europeans looked upon the idea of federation as a beautiful dream—but impossible of achievement. Now the promoters of European federation are no longer considered utopians. Suddenly the roles are reversed. Today, since the world's greatest statesmen declare European federation a realistic aim and political program, those must be considered utopians who still dream of the survival of a divided and dismembered Europe.

"After 25 years of uninterrupted struggle, the pan-European movement appeals to postwar Europe more strongly than ever. The people of Europe now realize that the Third Reich and World War No. II could easily have been prevented if Europe's governments had accepted in 1930 Aristide Briand's offer to federate. They recall that President Truman, in a recent interview published by George Creel, gave his blessing to European union, and that Prime Minister Attlee coined the phrase "Europe must federate or perish;" that men like Leon Blum and Edouard Herriot have been for years, and still are, champions of European federation, and that De Gaulle's sympathy for this cause is an open secret."

SPURRED BY WAR

"But the horrors and sufferings of the war did more to convince the peoples of Europe of the necessity of federation than any authorities, arguments, or propaganda could do. Under the snow of war, the seed of European union developed to an irresistible force, springing up everywhere throughout the Continent.

"This rising tide of public opinion can no longer be ignored. It asks for speedy decisions and initiatives. On the eve of the Moscow conference the statesmen of the

world are bound to determine their attitude on European union. For it is impossible to know what to do about Germany without knowing what to do about Europe, and from the outcome of the Moscow talks may depend the future of Europe.

"The German and the European questions are inseparably interwoven. None of Germany's weaker neighbors could accept membership in a European federation around a fourth Reich that is bound to become sooner or later the mouthpiece of pan-Germanism, and a time bomb in the heart of Europe. European reconciliation is possible only if Germany's political structure is radically changed, shifting sovereignty from the Reich to the states, while integrating German production into the general system of a pan-European market."

BARRIER TO GERMANY

"The idea of a United States of Europe is the only force capable of competing successfully with pan-Germanism and with world revolution. Thus, only can the dangerous vacuum in the German soul, resulting from the break-down of old ideals, be filled with the fascinating vision of a new European community based on fraternal ties, on the rock of Christian tradition and of western civilization.

"This great vision of a united Europe rising like a new dawn after the night of war can become reality only with America's help. Even if all of Europe were willing to unite, its federation would be impossible without American support.

"For America alone can break the tragic deadlock resulting from Europe's shameful partition into spheres of influence, by insisting on the loyal fulfillment of the sacred pledge given by the Big Three to the people of eastern Europe for free and unfettered elections; because European freedom is the only peaceful path to union.

"But not only does Europe's future depend on America; America's destiny, too, is linked inseparably to the fate of Europe. If Europe collapses in revolution and anarchy it would be submerged by Asia. In such a world a united Western Hemisphere would become an encircled island, floating in a hostile world."

ATLANTIC BRIDGE

Therefore, Europe's peace is the safest guaranty for America's peace and Europe's prosperity for America's prosperity.

"The Atlantic is no longer a gap separating two worlds, but a huge bridge uniting two sister continents—the Mediterranean of our day, center of one of history's greatest civilizations.

"This vision of a new and united Europe in a new and united world can become true if approached in a new and bold spirit, in the spirit of two great men who saw beyond their days the outlines of things to come, one American, the other European. It was George Washington who wrote the following prediction to General Lafayette: 'We have sowed seeds of liberty and union that will spring up everywhere upon earth. One day, taking its pattern from the United States, there will be founded the United States of Europe.'

"And it was the great French poet Victor Hugo who pronounced, one century ago, this amazing prophecy: 'The day will come when these two huge unions, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, will face and greet each other across the Atlantic; when they will exchange their goods, their commerce, their industry, their art, and their genius—to civilize the globe, to fertilize the deserts, to improve creation under the eyes of the Creator, and to assure the greatest benefit for all by combining these two infinite forces: the brotherhood of man and the might of God.'"

Demonstrating Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, at a time when we are all deeply concerned with foreign relations, it seems to me proper that there should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials dealing with passing events which seem to have relevancy. I ask unanimous consent to publish in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Demonstrating Democracy," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune yesterday morning, March 17. The editorial pays deserved tribute to Secretary Marshall for his splendid statement on democracy in Moscow a few days ago.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMONSTRATING DEMOCRACY

Secretary Marshall's quiet exposition, given to the foreign ministers on Friday, of what the United States considers democracy to mean lacked the immediately sensational aspects of President Truman's message on Greece and Turkey. Yet it may well come to stand as a state paper of equal rank; just as it was clearly an expression of another facet of the same policy. Mr. Marshall not only stated the American understanding of the word "democracy" as it was used in the Potsdam agreement; he declared that this definition is regarded as fundamental by the United States and made it clear that he will press for its implementation in Germany. Mr. Molotov has promised an early reply. It will be one which the Soviet statesmen will unquestionably have to weigh with care.

Disclosures by the State and War Departments of the projected program for Greece—which includes a military mission of no more than 500 men and officers but a corps of highway and transport engineers and of agricultural, health, fiscal and administrative experts, which includes some armaments with which to keep order but also food, seed, clothes, tools with which to give social order, a viable economic basis—show that this is not a military project. It is a project in holding Greece for the West by showing what western democracy can do there, with its immense strengths of capital and technology, for the Greek people. The Truman message calls for a demonstration of the practical values of our system in action. The Marshall statement proclaims for the world the ideological values of the principles on which the system rests, says they have specific meaning, says that we believe in them and says that we are going to stand up for them. In a deeply significant sense, the message and the statement are complementary.

Together they announce the end of the policy of largely verbal, and, as it proved, unworkable, compromise that ran from long before Yalta down to well after Potsdam. Neither we nor the Russians can any longer hide behind the convenient device of calling by the same words purposes, policies, and methods which are basically opposed. Secretary Marshall's five freedoms of individual right, of political association and elections, of trade-union association, of the press and of movement and trade (which differ significantly in their precision from the "four freedoms" of his late Commander in Chief) do not exist in the Soviet zone of Germany. They do not in any real sense exist anywhere in the Soviet Empire, for the simple reason that they are impossible under the system and that the system would be impossible if they appeared within it. In committing our policy to support them in the whole of Germany, Secretary Marshall is exposing the real issue on the ideological level just as the President exposed it on the practical level.

It will not be easy for Mr. Molotov to meet a challenge of this kind, for it exposes him to the necessity of confessing that these freedoms and liberties—which many men still value highly—are not in the gift of Soviet "democracy." It would be a grave mistake for Americans to imagine that the Russians are insincere in their use of the word "democracy" or that the mass "democratic' rights which their totalitarian system guarantees—rights to full employment, to the stability of a police state, to social equality—do not have their appeal to men. But a belief in our own convictions will at least compel the Russians to stand upon the real rather than the fictitious virtues of their one-party state; and a capacity to demonstrate our own economic strength in meeting the basic human needs will put their economic claims to searching test.

All the hysterical talk about war we have heard is beside the point; threats of war would bother the Kremlin far less than the kind of challenge we have now accepted, which puts the contest on a ground not only very difficult for the Russians but likely to be really fruitful in the development of history. For as long as the issue between Russia and the West remained concealed in a series of supposed agreements which each side interpreted as a victory of the other, the issue itself was bound to remain insoluble. With the issue exposed, statesmanship may conceivably begin to consider the possibility of adjusting it.

Report on the Jewish Colony in Sosua, Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the Jewish Colony in Sosua, Dominican Republic, by David Silberman, which I think is of general interest.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THE JEWISH COLONY IN SOSUA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(By David Silberman)

During a business trip to the Dominican Republic I had occasion to visit a Jewish colony located in Sosua. I was accompanied on this trip by Mr. Noel Span, an attorney, Mr. Swain, a tobacco manufacturer, and Mr. Kottle, a wood specialities manufacturer.

I had particular personal interest in making the visit to this colony and frankly, from

all the stories I had heard in the States, I came here very much prejudiced.

I was told that President Trujillo exploited and taxed and took advantage of the people he invited to the country, and then gave them poor land, and that the venture was doomed to failure.

However, because of the situation now existing in Palestine and further because of Secretary Marshall's recent statement, I decided to investigate as thoroughly as I could the actual situation. This is what I saw and this is what I heard, and all this can be confirmed by a visit requested by the President of the Dominicans, at the expense of the Government, by any committee selected by UJA to check.

Mr. David Stern authorizes me to quote him as follows:

"I came here in 1944. This colony was founded in 1940 by Mr. Joseph Rosen. About 500 people came here. These people were the usual type of refugees, most of them who had lost families, fathers, mothers, children because of Hitlerism. They were a disheartened lot. Unfortunately, Mr. Rosen died a year after he arrived, and until I got here in 1944 after his death, there was no planning and no leadership. The settlers did nothing except sit around, because they were supported by the Hadassah from whom they got about $50 or $60 per month and so they felt they did not have to work.

"I attempted to change all that and therefore got a reputation of being a tyrant and a hard man, but it must be understood that this is a great country which however, requires pioneering. The UJA knows my reputation from Palestine as a pioneer. I started planning and putting these people to work. A number of them resented what I was trying to do and left, but before they left, they circulated reports in the United States which were false, condemning the colony and its work.

"Today, we have a wood shop which is self-supporting; we have a creamery; we have a cheese-manufacturing plant; we extract lemon oil from grass which we sell to the United States. We are building new homes; we have a hospital, and we are now starting a poultry farm. Some of these things are cooperative, some are individual. We encourage private enterprise.

"Now despite stories to the contrary, it is because of the assistance and the liberality of President Trujillo that these things are possible. Conditions are good here. There are no political difficulties, no religious or racial discrimination, no excessive taxes, no customs tax for the things we import for our colony, and we have the full cooperation of the President.

"Originally a $500 poverty-bond payment was required for each person who came to this country; now that has been waived. The stories and rumors that our people are being exploited and taxed is false and untrue, and we would be indeed ungrateful if we permit these stories to circulate."

I spoke to a Mr. Schweitzer; Mr. Schweitzer arrived just 2 weeks ago from Shanghai, and told me that after 8 years in Shanghai, he could no longer stay. The antagonism against all whites, including Americans, was so strong that once again, after Germany, he had to be on the move. He happened to read in Shanghai about the Dominican Republic. He wrote directly to President Trujillo and received a personal reply asking him to come, and all arrangements were made for his visa.

Mr. Schweitzer is here only 2 weeks. He came with five children. His wife unfortunately died just before he left. He now lives in a modest three-room bungalow. He already is earning $4 a day over his food and rent, selling farm products. He has all the opportunity to earn more, depending on his ability. Mr. Schweitzer's previous profession was as owner of a merry-go-round in Germany. He will raise his children to be good Dominican citizens.

I spoke to Mr. Blackwood. Mr. Blackwood was born in Maine, U. S. A., but lived until 1940 in the West Indies. Mr. Blackwood is Mr. Stern's right-hand man.

"This colony is the only one in Central or South America that will succeed. The land is good. We have gotten rid almost completely of all the complainants that originally were here. There are a few left. When they go, we will have an ideal colony. We need more families, men with their wives and children, rather than bachelors, because the social problem is important. We would like to have a piano.

"We require two tractors, a station wagon, a dump wagon, a passenger car, and two pick-up wagons. We have ordered these in New York from our own budget, but have not so far gotten delivery. We would appreciate your pushing these for us.

"So far as President Trujillo is concerned, I was one of the original settlers here. This incident I know is true. Recently a young man who had been in the service of your country was being deported and wrote to a friend of the President, and through his intervention, this man not only received his visa, but a loan from the Government and is on his way here. This man is not a Jew and he is not a member of this colony. If this colony had 200 more families, it would be completely self-supporting."

I spoke to Mr. Olshinsky, a cheese manufacturer, who was also one of the first settlers. He processes 80 pounds of cheese daily, selling it to the cooperative at 40 cents per pound, and the cooperative resells it at 50 cents per pound, and profits are divided among the cooperatives. I asked him how he felt about the colony. His answer was that it was heaven to him. His total taxes for which he showed me in receipts, were less than $100 yearly.

We had lunch with my friends at the colony. It was an excellent meal, veal cutlets, soup, orange juice, vegetables, butter, and coffee, one of the best meals I had in Santo Domingo.

In conclusion, Mr. Stern said, "This colony will be successful. I think it is essential that UJA accept the President's invitation and send a committee here. It is only a day's journey. They can see for themselves what is going on in this place and this colony will be successful if New York wants it to be. The budget originally was $400,000 per annum and will be down to $90,000 per annum as each member becomes more self-supporting and contributes to the running of the colony."

As for President Trujillo, he needs no defenders. Aside from the colony, I have ridden with my friends a thousand miles through this territory. I have seen the country which is surrounded by primitive people, and if Trujillo is a dictator, he is an unusual one, because a dictator can command respect and fear, but it is difficult to command love. His people love him. I have spoken to them in the schools, in the factories, and on their farms, and he is doing an excellent job. He is willing to do more.

At the moment he feels, because of the bad press in the United States, that the Jews are ungrateful. This can be remedied. Dominica looks like the United States did 50 years ago. It certainly is clean, it is industrious, and there seems to be a wonderful opportunity for this country as an exporting center to South and Central America.

Trujillo is not limiting his invitation to Jewish settlers only. At the moment his country is negotiating with the Yugoslavian exiles for a thousand families and has gone so far as to agree to provide the ships to bring them over if necessary.

I think the Jews of America should be notified of this situation, in a more favorable light than has previously been presented to them.

America's Educational Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for March 3, 1947, entitled "America's Educational Slums."

In view of the fact that this publication is very independent and conservative and that it has not heretofore committed itself, it seems to me quite significant that it takes the position it does with respect to Federal support for public education.

The article follows:

The two poles of American democracy are freedom and equality. As applied to education, these ideals should ensure for all children equality of educational opportunity in a free public school system—a system free of charges, free of politics, free of any official state philosophy.

As in other spheres of democratic life, the two ideals seem to collide. To provide actual equality of opportunity would necessitate Federal control of education. This in turn would wipe out that freedom of local control which Americans look on as vital to democratic education.

A recent speech, reprinted in an adjoining column, points out that the best American public school systems spend sixty times as much per classroom unit as the poorest systems. This is not the fault of the States with the poor systems. In many cases they expend a greater percentage of their total income on education than wealthier States. They simply haven't the means to keep their schools at a minimum level of adequacy.

These educational "slums" are not the whole of the present crisis. They are only its worst—and intolerable—manifestation. Their evil results are felt in all parts of the country and even find their way into the United States Senate. They belie in the field of education the American ideal of equal opportunity.

Many people who in the past have opposed Federal aid to education are now convinced that the present crisis is so great that something must be done. Senator TAFT, a former opponent of Federal aid who is also committed to Federal economy, has introduced a bill into the Senate on behalf of eight Senators of all political complexions which would make funds available to the poorest States to bring their standards up to a bare minimum.

The chief provisions of this bill (S. 472) are: (1) It absolutely prohibits Federal control of education. (2) It authorizes Federal funds in direct proportion to need and effort and in indirect proportion to the financial ability of the States to support schools. (3) It establishes a minimum sum for the States to spend on the education of every American child.

According to Senator TAFT, it is based on the theory of merely assisting the

States * * * so that the 48 States may remain completely free to conduct their affairs as they wish to conduct them in this field. Conservative church and educational groups are supporting the bill on this basis. Under its provisions no funds would go to parochial schools except where the States make these eligible for State support. Federal aid in such cases could and should properly be withheld, but the present bill does not go so far.

This newspaper has consistently opposed any threat of Federal interference with local control of education. It recognizes, however, that today the whole educational structure of the United States is in a critical condition. It recognizes that democracy itself is jeopardized when the educational system breaks down. And it recognizes that carefully safeguarded Federal aid alone can put a foundation under the most badly sagging parts of public-school education in America.

Under these circumstances it believes that the Taft bill should be supported. The bill does not aim at an ideal equality of opportunity. Its provision that no child shall get an education costing less than $40 a year still guarantees the child less than one-fourth of what some States expend per child.

It aims only at abolishing America's most dangerous educational slums and goes only so far toward equalizing opportunity as it can safely do while maintaining freedom of local control. In common with the country's leading educators, we accept this as the middle-road answer to a situation that threatens the deepest traditions and ideals of American democracy.

Role of United Nations in Greek Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Walter Lippmann entitled "A Golden Opportunity," and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 18, in which Mr. Lippmann takes a position which is very close to my heart, namely, that at this time our action in connection with the Greek and Turkish situation should not be unilateral but should be in connection and in consultation with the United Nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

In addition to its vague globalism, which has already caused much misunderstanding in many parts of the world, a most serious defect of the President's message was the treatment accorded the United Nations. This defect can be corrected. It urgently needs to be corrected. Otherwise the American intervention will be highly vulnerable to criticism at home and abroad, and our task will be more difficult than it needs to be.

The treatment of UN has been explained, for example by Senator VANDENBERG, on the ground that while "we must keep faith with the pledges to the Charter," it is "not practical at the immediate moment" to proceed "within the United Nations" because UN has no relief funds—and it has not yet concluded agreements with member nations for military support.

Now, it is quite true that UN has neither the money nor the power to act. Almost certainly it is also true that if UN had the money and the power, the Soviet Union would veto action by the UN. But that does not release us from our pledges under the Charter. Because the UN is unable to act collectively, it does not follow that we have the right to act unilaterally, or even that if we have the right, that it is wise to exercise it.

The heart of the United Nations Charter and the soul of the whole undertaking is the covenant to consult with the other members, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council, when an issue of international security and peace is raised. Indisputably such an issue is raised here: the President said so in his message. The fact that the UN is not capable of acting swiftly, effectively, or even of acting at all, does not relieve us of the obligation to consult the United Nations before we act.

It is possible, I realize, to argue that the letter of the Charter, if article 103 is strictly and narrowly construed, does not oblige us in this specific case to "consult with one another" with "a view to such joint action on behalf of the organization as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security."

We could argue that the Greek Government has invited us to intervene, that the exact language of article 106 does not fit this case exactly. But if we do, we shall be sacrificing the spirit to the letter. For the obligation to consult is the paramount principle of the United Nations, and we do not have the right, nor is it in our interest, to fail to uphold that principle.

It was—to put it conservatively—an oversight to have discussed our proposed action before the President announced it to the world only with the British Government, and not also with the French, the Chinese, and the Russians. That, however, is water over the dam, and the mistake can be repaired. The policy is not yet adopted. The President has not yet acted. He is still only asking Congress for authority to act. Before he can act the whole proposal will be examined publicly by the committees and it will then be debated in Congress.

If the policy can be explained to Congress, and therefore to the world, it can also be explained to the United Nations. A full explanation, and a willingness to consider objections, would meet the obligation to consult. There are many ways of doing this, and any one of them, or all, would relieve us of the suspicion that we are evading our obligations. We could inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations about our proposals and invite him to take notice of the explanations which will be offered to Congress. Mr. Austin could go before the Security Council and explain the proposals, not waiting until Mr. Gromyko attacks them. We could notify the United Nations that we shall not only explain what we intend to do and why, but also that we shall report to them at regular intervals what we have done and why. We could, moreover, invite the leading interested nations to send official observers to Greece to see for themselves what we are doing.

The great advantage of some such action on our part is that it would at once rehabilitate the moral authority of the United Nations and would not interfere with the efficiency of our action since the whole intervention must, because Congress is a party to it, be conducted without secrecy and in full public view.

But there are many other advantages of acting, as Senator VANDENBERG puts it, "within the United Nations"—even though we do not act through the United Nations. This is the best way to answer the charge that we are doing what we have so often charged others, particularly the Russians, with doing—that we are acting unilaterally and for the purpose of domination and imperial aggrandizement.

Moreover, by going into Greece, we shall set up right on the frontier of the Soviet orbit, a demonstration of how we think a weak country, which is strategically important, should be treated by a great power. We must make the demonstration attractive as well as convincing. We must show not only that we have money and military strength and technical skill but also that we are the willing and eager servants of an international order, within which small nations can obtain assistance and protection without sacrificing their independence or their self-respect.

Not to act within the United Nations, and in accord with a broad affirmation of the spirit of the Charter, would be to aggravate our difficulties and to miss a golden opportunity. Let it not be said of us:

"They rushed to meet the insulting foe.
They took the spear, but left the shield."

For if the spear is our money, our prestige, and our power, the shield is our readiness to be always faithful to the spirit of our pledges to mankind.

Proposed Budget Cuts Affecting Our Personnel in Germany Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith insert the letter of Mr. Herbert J. Strong, published in the March 13 issue of the New York Times, on the need for occupation forces:

LETTERS TO THE TIMES
PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS AFFECTING OUR PERSONNEL IN GERMANY OPPOSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Last September I returned from Germany, where I was attached as attorney to the War Crimes Branch, United States Army, and had the privilege of taking an active part in various war crime trials, especially the so-called Malmedy trial, conducted at Dachau to punish the killers of American soldiers taken prisoners in the Battle of the Bulge. During my stay over there I had ample opportunity to observe our occupation forces at work and to notice that most of our military government offices which I saw were adequately manned, but that none of them was overstaffed.

Since that time conditions have radically changed. True, the total of American wives and children surpasses the total strength of our constabulary, but I doubt that this fact will enhance our military and administrative efficiency. The Seventh and Third Armies have been deactivated. The constabulary, upon whom the military government counts to suppress any resistance movements, is without its tanks; our Air Forces are without bombers.

General Clay was compelled to announce several radical personnel cuts, resulting in 30- to 40-percent reduction of MG's person-

nel by July 1, 1947; doing away with practically all of the liaison detachments in the smaller places of the "Landkreise" and cutting the strength of various administrative departments to the bone—not even to mention the complete lack of personnel for one of the most important tasks, denazification, the handling of which we should have reserved for ourselves.

Moreover, although all these reductions were instituted on the basis of a greatly reduced tentative budget for 1947, the present economy drive in Congress threatens even this budget with further very substantial cuts, which well might make occupation a meaningless gesture and a hollow shell. Already AMG is compelled to cancel running contracts with civilian employees. All personnel with a rating below CAF-8 and P-3, who have their families over there, cannot, pursuant to a notice recently appearing in Stars and Stripes, expect a renewal of their contracts.

Result of cut

What will happen if the intended $6,000,000,000 cut, or even the liberal $4,500,000,000 cut, should become law is only too obvious. While I was still over there, many of the Germans in all walks of life expressed their doubts about the seriousness of our intention "to stay and sweat it out" in Germany.

But what is our alternative? To turn over the occupation of our zone to the French or the English, who, although they on their small war-ravaged and impoverished island certainly do not have the financial resources of this country, now have substantially more troops (300,000) under arms in Germany than we have? Or to continue to occupy Germany with totally inadequate and insufficient forces?

When will we ever learn that power is the only language all of the other countries understand? There cannot be the slightest doubt in anybody's mind that by indiscriminately cutting down our occupation forces (as will be the inevitable result of the intended budget reductions) we will not only lose face in the eyes of the German people, who would certainly be the first ones to avail themselves of our weakness, but will also lose the much-needed bargaining power in AMG's dealings with the other occupying governments.

From all I have seen, the military government and its military and administrative personnel have done an excellent job. Undoubtedly, mistakes and errors have been made; undoubtedly, people were occasionally placed in positions for which they were not fit and in which they exercised faulty judgment; undoubtedly, a small minority placed good living and personal gains above their tasks. But, on the whole, the military government's personnel are efficient, honest, and capable, deeply devoted to their duties; they measure up fully to the forces of any of the other occupying powers, and do not deserve to be let down now by economy measures, however well intended they may be, which would cripple this efficiency beyond repair.

Congress, before cutting the budgets of the War and Navy Departments, should listen to the warning voices of men like Secretaries Marshall, Patterson, and Forrestal, and Generals Eisenhower, MacArthur, McNarney, and Clay, who are certainly no New Dealers, and whose personalities and backgrounds should vouch for the absence of any bias or personal interest.

Warnings of leaders

The Secretaries of the War and Navy Departments are civilians themselves. Generals Marshall and Eisenhower are professional military men, who have time and time again in the past placed the interest of the Nation above the gains or interest of any particular group or class. In General Clay we are happy to possess a man who combines, to an otherwise rarely attained degree, the top qualifications of a soldier with the qualifications of a civilian administrator and diplomat. Their warning voices should not be heard in vain.

And it is more than a coincidence that there seem to be not many supporters of the budget cuts among the Republican Members of Congress who have actually been over there, be it as a fighting man, like Senator LODGE, or as an observer, like Senator MORSE. These men know what is at stake.

A substantial cut in income taxes would, no doubt, be welcomed by everybody, but I think much too highly of the patriotism and intelligence of the average American to believe that they would also welcome such cut if it can be achieved only by "wielding an ax in a dark room," by the relinquishment of our international obligations, and by paying a price which might not fall due for another 10 or 20 years, but which we one day would have to pay.

We did have money enough to bring dozens of witnesses from everywhere to Washington to testify in the 6-week fight against Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation. Concededly, the amounts needed for the efficient occupation of Germany and Japan are bigger. But bigger things are also at stake, and for these bigger things we ought to, and must, have the money, even if it means a tax reduction of less than 20 percent, or no tax reduction at all.

The Second World War is not yet ended. Hostilities have merely ceased.

HERBERT J. STRONG.

NEW YORK, *March 8, 1947.*

Communism

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the United States is to assume responsibility for putting down communism and establishing stable, free governments throughout the world, we should at this time recognize and carefully weigh the implications of such a policy. It would have in part the following probable consequences:

First. Abandonment of the principle of collective security under the United Nations in favor of unilateral action by the United States alone in which we would be called upon to furnish money, food, supplies, munitions, arms, and fighting men in certain eventualities bound to occur.

Second. The early restoration and resumption of the selective-service draft or, in its place, a system of universal military service, otherwise known as the peacetime draft—a permanent system of military regimentation.

Third. Intervention by the United States into every substantial dispute throughout the world which involves the penetration of communism through political action, or unstable social and economic conditions. This will involve the expenditure of vast sums of money, the dissemination of relief on a practically unlimited scale and responsibility for American boys policing vast and remote areas of the world for indefinite periods.

Fourth. Conflict with Communist satellites or puppets in the Mediterranean, in Europe, the Near East, the Persian Gulf region, India, China, or the Dutch East Indies which may well involve our country in World War III.

Fifth. If we should emerge victorious from such a war then we would have to assume on a unilateral basis the task of policing vast conquered areas. This task alone would mean that for an indefinite time in the future young American boys would be required to perform military service in foreign lands far away from their homes, that our Nation would accept guardianship of many foreign nations—a new imperialism differing from the old only in the benevolence of motives and methods.

Sixth. This policy does not consider the tragic plight of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia, Finland, and other small nations, already by agreement heartlessly consigned to Communist domination as an accomplished fact, to which the American people will never accede. Nor does it alter our traditional practice of relieving hunger and starvation wherever we reasonably can.

In any policy there are calculated risks which the Nation will have to assume. However, before we embrace measures which will undoubtedly bring such forcible impact upon our own political, social, and economic institutions as well as the integrity and stability of our own Government the American people should carefully weigh the consequences and fully realize the gravity and implications of their decision.

To us of this generation is entrusted the high privilege of living under free institutions—a privilege that would be eagerly embraced by the oppressed in many other lands. Ours is the duty of preserving these institutions for those who come after us. There must never be any question concerning our unswerving determination to support and sustain the Government, the Constitution, and the free American system of equal opportunity for all. We must maintain and preserve the American standard of living the highest in the world, the highest that any nation in all history has ever enjoyed.

The rights and liberties of American citizenship were not easily won, but they can be easily lost. That is demonstrated by the experience of other nations. We must therefore stanchly fight to protect these great basic truths that underly our free Government, free worship, free speech, free press, free assembly, and freedom of thought, conscience, and action.

In a world permeated with subversive doctrines, in a world where governmental tyranny suppresses freedom in many lands, we must pledge ourselves and gird ourselves to fight incessantly against the inroads into America of communism, fascism, or any other form of despotism over the mind and spirit of man which debases the dignity and worth of the human being and renders men and women and children alike servile to a superstate of commissars.

It is no less important that we uphold the basic principles of our economic system which accords to all the right and

opportunity to reach the top of the ladder of success in every field of endeavor. We must continue to recognize and reward ability, merit, willingness to work, industrious habits under the capitalistic system without allowing selfishness and greed to exploit the worker, the farmer, the small businessman, and those who must struggle and work for a living. We must without hesitation renounce special privileges, monopoly, and exploitation by any class or group. We must accord to every man regardless of origin, race, creed, class, or station in life absolute equality and protection under the law.

We must secure our citizens in the right to pursue honest, gainful occupations, to aim for and achieve leadership and success. We must safeguard the conditions under which our citizens work and remove all unnecessary restraints upon the driving power of their energies and ambitions. We must guarantee that taxes levied on individuals and business enterprises will not unconscionably confiscate private property and in that manner stifle incentive, dry up the well springs of venture capital and thus hinder the full employment of our ordinary citizens and impede the proper development of the Nation. We must generously provide for our veterans who saved the country and who will be its guardians and protectors in the future.

We must give living effect to the principle that hard persevering work is at the foundation of our whole structure and is most frequently the basis for success, that in general the individual, not the Government, is in normal times and under normal conditions responsible for himself and his family and support of his community and his Government and that the Federal Treasury cannot be expected to solve the ordinary financial problems of our citizens who should and must in the main under normal conditions look to private ventures, private employment, and private industry, and not the Government for livelihood, support, and accomplishment.

We must foster personal initiative, ambition, and the spirit of enterprise among our people and militantly resist the efforts of radical reformers to reshape the democratic pattern of American life into a totalitarian form.

Let us reaffirm the time-honored American theory that the sick, the infirm, the handicapped, the unfortunate, and the underprivileged and all those who for any reason are unable to care for themselves can be provided for humanely and justly without destroying our basic democratic institutions, and that we will continue to provide for them.

In this connection we must put our elaborate Federal fiscal system in order, balance the budget, move to the discharge of the huge national debt, and live as a nation within our income and means so that we can respond to the urgent needs of our own people.

We must recognize our obligations to maintain world peace and to seek to preserve the dignity and freedom of man throughout the world. At the same time we must recognize that it is impossible for a nation of 140,000,000 people constituted as we are, as a great democracy, to feed, clothe, support, and sustain large portions of the earth indefinitely without bringing ruin and destructions upon our own Nation. There must be a rule of reasonableness governing our relief expenditures and our military commitments in foreign lands lest abnormally expanded relief and militaristic programs designed to support political stability throughout the world may overburden our own people with debt, taxes, and collapse of our own political and economic institutions. Other nations must cooperate to solve their own problems.

By the same token in the light of unsettled world conditions, in the light of possible threats to our way of life we must maintain a strong mechanized up-to-date national defense embodying the latest atomic weapons, so constituted as an army, navy and air force that it will be large and powerful enough to defend our shores against aggression, carry out our international commitments and furnish adequate support for a strong, militant, pro-American foreign policy which will seek international justice through cooperation with all peoples of good will.

I must re-emphasize a very important part of our American program. We must fight and fight hard against the influence of subversive groups and organized crackpots who are working to establish the totaliterian, Marxist state in this country. There is no place in America for agitators against our institutions who are engaged in fomenting class struggle, overthrow of the Government, strife and antagonism. The tyranny of totalitarianism has already ruined the culture and freedom of many foreign peoples. Let us keep our own Nation safe and secure from the baneful effects of such doctrines. Let us work and live by the American principle that no clique, class, group, or faction shall ever control America, that the only rule to be recognized here is the rule of the majority and by that means we intend to carry out the destiny of the Nation and the heritage of free men.

The foregoing remarks were delivered in substance in a speech by me before the American Legion, Palmer, Mass., March 15, 1947 and before the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Leominster, Mass., March 16, 1947.

Military Justice—Suggested Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I was a member of a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the House which considered the matter of military justice. It considered some factual data collected for us by the investigator of the Military Affairs Committee. After much discussion and consideration we recommended certain changes in the administration of military justice.

The War Department recently obtained the assistance of a committee of the American Bar Association in trying to determine what if any changes should be made in the handling of military justice problems. This committee, composed of eminent lawyers, made a report in which they recommended a number of changes. This report, in many respects, follows the ideas set forth in the report of our subcommittee.

I recently sent the report of the American Bar Association to two California lawyers to obtain their reaction and suggestions with reference to the problem of military justice and what if anything should be done to make it more effective and to render exact justice. These two men are lawyers of much experience, they left their law practice to serve in the Judge Advocate's Department in the war which has just closed. They are thoroughly well trained and ethical practitioners with a good backlog of experience in private practice and considerable experience in the handling of the problems of the Judge Advocate General's Department.

They were kind enough to give me their candid suggestions as to what should be done and I value them most highly. In order that other Members may have the benefit of their reaction and their suggestions, I am asking unanimous consent that the letters which they sent me, with the names deleted, be placed in the Appendix to the RECORD as a part of this statement.

Therefore, the two letters referred to are hereby set forth and I trust that those Members who are interested in this problem may have the time to read them as they give us much food for thought and represent the considered opinion of two very able lawyers. These are the letters:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *March 10, 1947.*
HON. LEROY JOHNSON,
Congressman, Third District of California, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEROY: This will acknowledge your letter enclosing the report of the War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice to the Secretary of War, dated December 13, 1946, with the request for comments by Ben Frantz and me. Ben and I have conferred as requested but have found it difficult to get together for the purpose of drafting a joint reply to you and he has therefore written his separate views and I herewith submit mine.

Conference has been held with eight other former judge advocates or legal officers and many of the following comments are not original but suggestive of my own conclusions.

It should not be lost sight of that in adopting changes there are some basic considerations so fundamental they are obvious and because you are a lawyer they will be immediately recognized by you. First, the best system of justice can be destroyed by an incapable judge (administration) and a good judge may often times work out justice with a poor system of justice. Second, a lawyer trained in the technical requirements for the administration of justice is unqualified to approve or disapprove the technical work of a scientist, surgeon, engineer, or infantry soldier, nor are the latter qualified to approve or disapprove the work of a technically trained lawyer (judge advocate). In addition to those considerations, is it

not significant and indicative of required change that so many men, who like myself were judge advocates, have so many criticisms of the present system of military justice and make so many sweeping recommendations for corrective action? Where, in any civilian structure of courts could be found nearly so many objections or judges and lawyers to make recommendations for changing the structure? It is not believed possible that so many judge advocates can be wrong about something that was so real and close to them as their war service.

The recommendations of the advisory committee are all concurred in by me and are splendid as far as they go. All of the recommendations are considered good. They do not, however, grapple with the basic faults.

The present unsatisfactory system of military justice as written would probably be workable if the administration were good and the pressure of command control absent. The present system of military justice as written contemplates neither poor administration nor pressure from any quarter, including command control, upon the courts.

The fundamental problem, therefore, to correct present evils, involves the development of a system of military justice which will eliminate the two glaring faults of maladministration and command control.

Faulty administration of various activities by the Government, including the Army, has repeatedly demonstrated its failures to properly administer the laws of our country committed to its care. Our history is replete with failures and maladministration under the pressure of armed conflict or national emergency. Look at what happened to claims. In the middle of the recent war the procedure providing for the liability for and settlement of claims so completely broke down by delays that an entirely new law and set of regulations was required. Look at what happened and is still happening to the retirement of civilian personnel from the armed forces. An act of Congress provides that officers retired for physical disability shall receive the same retirement pay and benefits as those of the Regular Army. But civilian officers being retired are believed not to be receiving the same pay and benefits under similar circumstances. Look at the failures involved in the selection of personnel for the armed forces. Men by the thousands, who if properly screened would have been initially rejected, were inducted into the armed forces to be later found entirely unqualified or unfit for the rigors of service in the armed forces with the consequent loss of time, money to the Government, and injustice to those men. Look at what happened to assignment of personnel in the armed forces and how frequent it was the experience of practically all concerned that square pegs in round holes were found to be the rule rather than the exception. The basic law and even the regulations thereunder were not bad, but the administration of them was, under the pressure of war, not good.

The same failures and maladministration under the same pressures resulted in the same kind of administrative failures as to military justice. But quite apart from the objectionable administrative failures which impaired the effectiveness of the military courts, another and equally objectionable influence has its effect.

Command control over military courts and their personnel introduced into the administration of justice what, by all American standards, is considered an intolerable outside influence because it is capable of completely destroying the purpose of justice for which these courts were created.

Line officers of infantry, artillery, and the others are an integral part of command control, and their entire effort is directed toward the actual training and employment of men and matériel for and in combat. Discipline is an essential part of that training and effort and makes the work of those officers possible. Discipline is employed by those line officers to the extent required to obtain compliance with the requirements of their mission. Discipline by them, except in a small fraction of 1 percent of the cases, obtains such compliance. But when discipline fails to obtain such compliance, they look for something beyond their own available disciplinary methods, and in that search they usually go to the military courts. But they are still thinking about discipline, not justice.

In the administration of justice by the military courts, line officers who train and are trained for a lifetime with the imperative need for discipline, comprise the military courts which are expected in the fraction of 1 percent of the cases where ordinary discipline breaks down, to administer justice. Is it not too much to expect that those fine line officers so constituted will not on the courts continue to administer discipline rather than justice?

In short, to provide military courts with acceptable justice for those brought before them, is it not basic that those courts must be under the exclusive control of men in that field as technically qualified as those in the fields of science, surgery, engineering, etc.?

It will be observed that command control by a line officer exercising general court martial jurisdiction making his influence felt either by enforcing his desires upon the court or disapproving or approving the conclusions of the court, is only one of the reasons for the failure of military courts to acceptably administer justice. Another and equally basic reason is the lack of technical training and temperament of the line officers who sit on the courts which unfits them to administer the courts other than arbitrarily.

The recommendations of the War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice can therefore be said to be helpful but will only result in the same problems during the next war. The corrective measures should include:

1. That the Judge Advocate General and his entire corps of officers should be absolutely and completely severed from Army administrative control and this should be accomplished by making the Judge Advocate General's Department an independent department directly under the Secretary of War. So long as any commander has control over his judge advocate we can expect trouble.

2. The judge advocates should serve as judges for all classes of military courts. In special and general courts martial the accused should be given the choice of a trial by the court (that is, the judge advocate) or with the usual officers now comprising those courts sitting not as a court, but as a jury. The judge advocate should be given the same judicial independence and the same if not greater authority as that exercised by civilian judges.

3. For reasons stated above, legislation and regulations should discourage the transfer of line officers to the Judge Advocate General's Department because their previous training, temperament and qualifications will usually unfit them for the proper administration of justice as distinguished from discipline, even though they be lawyers. Judge advocates—that is, judges—should be selected with greatest care and emphasis upon their previous background, training and temperament to qualify for the important work of judge.

4. To assist the Judge Advocate General's Department in the procurement of the desirable personnel from the civilian legal profession of the Nation, the living and other conditions offered to them (including the separate promotion list recommended by the War Department Advisory Committee) should be made desirable for lawyers by according them treatment at least commensurate with that which they as professional men enjoy in civilian life.

5. The Judge Advocate General's Department, which administers not only justice but as well provides the legal services for the Army, should be augmented many times over its present strength as recommended by the War Department Advisory Committee. It is believed that large industrial concerns, such as General Motors, Ford, General Electric, United States Steel, none of whom can be said to have the ramified legal responsibilities or problems as that of the Judge Advocate General's Department for the United States Army, each has a legal staff without any responsibilities for the administration of any justice between individuals in their personal affairs many times the size of that of the Judge Advocate General's Department in either wartime or peacetime.

Assuring you that it has been a pleasure and an honor to present to you my comments on the report of the War Department Advisory Committee, and with kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT E. SHEETS.

MARCH 7, 1947.

DEAR ROY: Examination of the report of Advisory Committee on Military Justice impels me to compliment the committee and those who contributed to its report on a workmanlike job and a real contribution to the advancement of the administration of military justice.

It is my desire to suggest a procedure that is perhaps more advanced than the committee is at this time willing to recommend.

I suggest that the primary function of administering military justice be vested in and made the responsibility of the Judge Advocate General's Department. To this end, the department should be made a separate branch of the Army answerable only to the President of the United States. To each command exercising general court-martial jurisdiction, there should be assigned three officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department: (1) an officer of suitable rank to act as the law member; (2) an officer to act as trial judge advocate; and (3) an officer to act as defense counsel. The law member would preside over the court; and it might be found advisable for the trial judge advocate and defense counsel to change places after every so many trials. The right of the accused to choose his own counsel in addition to or in lieu of the defense counsel should be retained. These three officers would perform no other duties and would provide the nucleus for every general court held within the command. These officers would be entirely removed from any direction by the commander of the command to which they are assigned and would be responsible only to the Judge Advocate General. The other members of the court would be selected by the law member from a panel of available officers submitted by the commander. The commander would order the same pretrial investigation he does now and would order the soldier to trial if he so determined from the investigation; but there his authority would cease. Any evidence that the court's decision was in any way influenced by pressure or suggestion upon any court member by the commander would immediately be reported by the law member to the Judge Advocate General for investigation and would be a ground for ordering a new trial. The judgment would be the free judgment of the members of the court except that it would be subject to a table of maximum punishments and, in a few cases, minimum punishments. The record of the trial would be reviewed by the Judge Advocate General and not by the commander's staff judge advocate. The sentence could be reduced by the Judge Advocate General but not by the commander. When I speak of the Judge Advocate General, I refer, of course, to his authorized

subordinates insofar as taking care of the details is concerned.

There are many details to be completed in the foregoing plan; but it is my purpose only to outline the essentials for your consideration.

Except as the foregoing suggestions are in conflict with the report, I commend it as a realistic approach to a problem that needs a direct and open-minded solution. While there are some recommendations which I do not endorse with enthusiasm, these are in the minority; and, in general, I have great admiration for the report and those responsible for it.

To the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much intrigued by the reading of the following article written by Mr. E. F. Hutton, of New York City, entitled "To the Eightieth Congress":

TO THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES, IT'S NOW UP TO YOU

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS: The vote which elected you was an insistent protest against interference with the lives and liberties of the people.

This interference came from two sources. One was by a vast bureaucracy asserting the power to rule and regulate our lives, often in disregard of statutes passed by the Congress of the United States of America.

The second was by the "invisible government" of irresponsible labor leaders who have been exempt from the law under which all others must live.

We want bureaucrats and labor leaders to be governed by law.

We want social security from strikes.

We want to be sure that our cities shall not be plunged into darkness.

We are tired of all economic wars.

Congress must reclaim and perform its constitutional duties as the Board of Directors of this Nation, responsible to its bondholders.

We demand government by law. We oppose government by men.

We must keep the doors of opportunity open to every American, whether born in a tenement or on a boulevard. That is part of our Constitution and Bill of Rights—that is America.

Return to the check and balance—trial and error—profit and loss and competitive system. Take Government out of business which is conducted with taxpayers' money.

We oppose whittling away our charter of liberty.

We want irresponsible power curbed.

We want representative government to fight monopolistic despotism—whether in Government, business, or labor.

We want to return to constitutional government—"equal justice under law."

We want the Wagner Act reviewed in the light of the abuses which have grown up under it.

We want to know why there have been three times as many strikes since that act was passed.

We want all workers to prosper—because they are all customers. There are no labor gains when the loss of wages from strikes leaves the worker behind the eight-ball for months or years before he can catch up.

There are no labor gains when strikes force wage increases which do not result in increased production and must therefore be paid by all the people through higher prices.

Labor unions have exerted power over the lives of millions. More power than the Government can constitutionally assert. This must be stopped.

No man or group of men has the right to paralyze all business activities and throw millions out of work.

No American should be compelled to pay tribute to anyone for the right to a job. Slavery was supposed to have been abolished 81 years ago.

No American should be compelled to go on strike without a democratic opportunity to voice his opinion.

We want the working people of this Nation to have the freedom and the liberty promised under our Constitution.

Labor is worthy of its hire—capital incentive risk is no longer worthy of its hire. Labor should return for its hire an honest day's work to capital incentive risk.

Representative government should be worthy of its hire. It should return an honest day's work.

I pose the question:

When representative government fails to protect and defend and uphold constitutional liberties, have they given an honest day's work to those who pay their salaries—the taxpayers?

Congress has witnessed the whittling away of the liberties of the American people. It is time for Congress to go to work.

We want waste in Government ended.

Congress must demand a drastic reduction in Federal expenditures so that there may be no further increase in Federal debt, but rather a progressive reduction. It is only a corrupt, stupid government that destroys the value of the people's money, therefore Congress, to maintain the integrity of the dollar, must stop deficit financing and direct an honest basis of meeting debts squarely and living within its income.

This is only one of many public questions on which industry should express its viewpoint.

We want taxes reduced. Too much money is now being poured into Government bureaus and spent without thought or reason. We want this money made available to buy better tools and equipment and thus encourage increased production by human energy and skills. Only in this way will we enjoy lower costs as wages and standards rise.

We want you to encourage the enterprise system which built this country from 13 weak colonies into the No. 1 world power.

We want you to say to every American, "Speak up. Express your opinion. Give your counsel freely on all public questions. Have no fear of retaliation."

We want more men who can create pay checks—more pay checks—bigger pay checks.

Gentlemen, you are the trustees of American liberty, the guardians of American prosperity.

As you face this trust, act upon what is right not who is right. Put aside political expediency. Legislate for America. Cooperate with the President of the United States and let him cooperate with you. Make some sacrifice of opinion for national unity.

You, gentlemen of the Congress, must reunite our people. You must reinstate the incentive to work, the incentive to risk capital in new ventures, free from crushing taxation and crippling red tape.

Your success in this effort will justify the faith of our founding fathers. Your failure may mark the collapse of the last citadel of a free people anywhere on this globe.

Respectfully yours,

E. F. HUTTON.

WESTBURY, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

The Man With Green Fingers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the following entitled "The Man With Green Fingers," the story of Luther Burbank, which was presented at 8 p. m. on the evening of March 17, over the National Broadcasting Co., and starring Lionel Barrymore.

This was one of a long and notable series of weekly dramatizations, familiar to listeners as the Cavalcade of America and sponsored by the du Pont Co., of Wilmington, Del.

To me, it was one of the most impressive.

March 17 is happily associated with "the wearing of the green," symbolic of the Emerald Isle. It is also the last festive occasion before the birth of Spring, when we eagerly look for the first tender shoots of green to push up from the good earth. It is the season of hope and faith and discovery and expectant growth.

On March 17, we honored St. Patrick, the spiritual leader, who brought the glowing belief in a life everlasting to many millions of our people.

In this year of 1947, on the evening of that same day, we also honored one of our fellow-men who employed his God-given talents for the benefit of all humanity. With imagination, industry, and skill, he opened up new horizons in the world about us, and as he experimented with the secrets of nature, he came to know the all-abiding love that spells creation. His love of plants and all growing things reached out to embrace humanity and to glimpse the fundamental truth which is God.

He was "the man with green fingers," the eminent naturalist and horticulturist, Luther Burbank.

As a Congressman from Massachusetts, the State which has given so many ideals and so many great men to the shaping of our lives, I am proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the name of one of her most distinguished sons, Luther Burbank.

He was born at Lancaster, Mass., on March 7, 1849, the son of a farmer, and was brought up in a typical New England home. It is unlikely that Luther would have grown up to mold plant life to the needs of humanity, if he had lived his childhood away from the constant company of trees and flowers, unobservant of earth and sky.

New England is a land of varied and stimulating climate. From the first appearance of the trailing arbutus from beneath the melting snows of March until the purple wild aster goes to sleep in the last full glory of autumn's ending, all plant life is active.

Like all country boys, he had chores to do—bringing in the wood, pulling weeds, feeding the chickens, driving the cows to

pasture, learning the habits of work and self-reliance. He was awakened in the morning by the song of the robin, and the last thing he heard at night before he went to sleep was the chorus of the green-coated frogs. To a boy of so intense a nature, Nature spoke to him in a language rich with meaning.

His father liked to point out to him the habits of ants, birds, and squirrels. Luther saw not only the jay, the robin, and the bluebird, but the life that was in growing flowers.

As his powers of observation developed, he was drawn into the great out-of-doors. He roamed through the fields and along the meadow's streams. In the woodlands he looked for wild roses, columbines, and in the deeper shade, the thickets of laurel. He learned the names and uses of the different roots and herbs, wondering what separated them from one another, his fancy dwelling on new forms that might be born He was a naturalist by birth, reveling in the trees and fields and all the plants that seemed to him as living children of Nature.

The story goes that when little Luther saw a petal fall from a flower, he would try to put it back. His affection for the plant world was like that which other children lavish on their pet animals. From his tender care of them developed that interest and eagerness to understand. His curiosity and love was the first step toward knowledge.

Burbank had little formal schooling. At the age of 15, he entered Lancaster Academy and attended it for several winters. During the summers, he was employed in the Aimes plow works at Worcester, learning the pattern-maker's trade.

Like so many other great men, members of his family and his friends thought he might never be stable and settled in any vocation. He had shown an enthusiasm for so many different lines of investigation—plant life, animals, medicine, literature, the arts and sciences—that it seemed he would never fully concentrate on any one of them. In later years, however, knowledge in these subjects all proved valuable in his plant work.

Writing of this period, he says:

When I was about 19, in 1868, probably the turning point of my career in fixing my life work in the production of new species and varieties of plant life was fixed by the reading of Darwin's Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication, which I obtained from the library at Lancaster, Mass., my old home. I think it is impossible for most people to realize the thrills of joy I had in reading this most wonderful work. The reading of this book was without doubt the turning point in my life work.

At the age of 21 he purchased, with the small amount of money obtained from his father's estate and a mortgage, a small tract of land—17 acres—in the town of Lunenburg.

He at once began market gardening. Original and practical in his methods, he developed a potato which made him world famous. The Burbank potato added $20,000,000 to the wealth of the Nation, which fact is very important when judged by the standards of those times. This discovery averted an imminent potato famine. For this achievement, however, he received only $150, which was the sum paid to him by a local seedsman.

In 1875, he moved to California, locating at Santa Rosa. He established a very successful nursery business and later enlarged his holdings to include extensive experimental grounds, where over a million plants were raised each year for testing.

Through cross-breeding and selection, he developed many new forms of plant life, which gained for him a world-wide reputation. In addition to the Burbank potato, he originated many rapid-growing edible thornless cacti, to give nourishment to men and animals in desert countries. He developed the Santa Rosa, Climax Wickson, Apple, Gold and other plums; a new fruit, the Plumcot; the Giant, Sugar and Stoneless prunes; the Burbank cherry; the Burbank, Santa Rosa and Peachblow roses; Shasta daisies, Giant and Fragrance Callas, and many other new flowers, fruits, vegetables, grasses, ferns, and trees, and nuts. In the field of fruit and flowers which he improved, his work is without a rival.

For over 50 years he worked hand in hand with Nature. As he said:

What a joy life is when you have made a close working partnership with Nature, helping her to produce for the benefit of mankind new forms, size, color and flavor never before seen on this globe, and grains of enormously increased productiveness.

On April 11, 1926, he died, leaving many valuable experiments unfinished. True to his first love, he was laid to rest under the sheltering branches of his favorite tree in the garden of his home at Santa Rosa.

And a world mourned his passing.

Luther Burbank was a benefactor of the human race, but, more than this, a man whose intimate awareness of the secrets of natural life brought him closer to an understanding of God.

With all of his being, he sought communion with creation.

He left to us the inspiration to work, in all ways, for the growth of self in service to others on the road toward Eternal Truth.

Build Warships on Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Thomas A. Rotell, executive secretary of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, San Francisco, Calif., reading as follows:

At the seventh annual convention of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, convened in San Francisco last month and attended by 300 delegates representing thousands of shipyard and metal craftsmen who performed their jobs in an exemplary way during the war period, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas during the past 5 years there has been an urgent demand for warships in order to enable our Nation adequately to fight common enemies, and

"Whereas the workers and employers in the shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast have demonstrated not merely their ability to construct warships but by their numerous production records their excellence and proficiency in this art; and

"Whereas unless the Congress of the United States is immediately and forcefully impressed with the outstanding record of the Pacific coast area, a return to prewar conditions with almost complete construction of all warships in areas other than the Pacific coast will result, and

"Whereas it is a matter of national concern as well as the concern of the workers and employers in the shipbuilding industry to insure that a proportionate amount of warships will continue to be constructed on the Pacific coast: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Shipfitters and Helpers, Local No. 9, go on record at the seventh annual convention of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council that Congress be petitioned to provide that a proportionate number of warships will be built on the Pacific coast."

Alaskan Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN D. JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call to the attention of the House an article quoting me citing the strategic position of the Territory of Alaska, which appeared in the Ketchikan (Alaska) Chronicle on March 14, 1947:

SOLON URGES STRONG ALASKA DEFENSES—OKLAHOMAN CITES STRATEGIC POSITION OF TERRITORY

(By Charles Haslet)

WASHINGTON.—The United States should fortify Alaska and maintain highway, airport, and communication facilities there "so we can remain strong in that area," Representative GLEN D. JOHNSON, Democrat, Oklahoma, said today.

The Oklahoman said: "Alaska commands a strategic position should we become involved at any time in the future with a European nation. It also is in a strategic position in connection with our mandated islands in the Pacific.

"As long as we have a tense situation in China, Korea, and with present unsettled conditions in Europe, we should keep Alaska impregnable."

Congress should provide appropriations necessary to keep open radio, telegraph, and other communication facilities with Alaska and to maintain any airport facilities needed there by the military, he continued.

WANTS ALCAN OPEN

In addition, he said, the United States and Canada should keep open the Alcan Highway as a vital lifeline.

JOHNSON said some suggestions had been made that some displaced persons and refugees should be settled in Alaska.

Expressing his opposition to such a plan, he said that if anyone is going to settle in Alaska, it should be the veterans of World War II.

It Must Be Our Own Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mankato Free Press, of Mankato, Minn., dated March 14, 1947.

IT MUST BE OUR OWN PROGRAM

There is certain to be delay, debate and careful consideration by Congress, before the long-range implications of President Truman's proposal for "taking over" in Greece, are finally decided. That is as it should be. Instead of criticizing the public should welcome and encourage weighty consideration before we commit ourselves irrevocably to such a program, which may and probably will, have worldwide ramifications.

Immediate relief for Greece is necessary, also for Turkey. That should be provided but only with the understanding that it does not commit us to further action until Congress has had the opportunity to hear and weigh all sides of this proposal.

It is true that this country cannot set itself apart, follow a policy of isolation and say that we have no interest in the future of international events. There are few Members of Congress, few citizens the Nation over who still cling to unregenerate isolationism of this kind.

But it is equally true that a great majority of citizens of this Nation are unalterably opposed to taking over Britain's policies of imperialism, as well as her commitments, in bolstering the tottering, so-called democratic regimes in the Mediterranean, in the Orient, in the South Pacific, and elsewhere over the globe.

We cannot afford to have the people of Greece, or of the rest of the world, believe that we are moving into Greece to support the throne occupied by a member of Britain's royal family, if it can be shown that the Greek people do not want him as ruler.

We cannot afford to have it understood that we are placing our wealth, our manpower, and our fighting forces back of England's territorial demands and imperialistic aims in China or Burma, or Africa, or anywhere else.

That is why many Congressmen and Senators have asked the seemingly logical question, "Why are we doing this on our own? Why are we not acting through the United Nations?"

The thing that we want is to give democracy, liberty, and independence a free opportunity to survive throughout the world. We believe that only by such an assurance of freedom for democratic ideals can future peace be assured. On two occasions within the past 30 years we have demonstrated effectively that we are willing to hazard everything that we have or may possess to assure these privileges to other people.

We see in the continued expansion and aggression of Russia a serious threat to these aims and hopes.

That does not mean, however, that we are willing to place our unreserved support back of British imperialism merely to block the designs of communistic aggression.

If we are to carry out, in all of its broad and dangerous implications, the policy which President Truman sketchily outlined in his address to Congress on Wednesday, then we must do it as an American policy, founded on our own democratic ideals and principles of freedom, independence and liberty. It will never win the support, either of the American people or of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, if we proceed otherwise.

To set up and formulate such a policy will take time.

This crisis has dropped on Congress and on the American people with great suddenness. If the administration knew it was coming then most assuredly the President erred in not taking the people into his confidence sooner.

If he did not realize that it was coming, then he should be the first to request careful consideration on the part of Congress and patience and forbearance on the part of the public, before a final decision is rendered.

Such temporary aid as may be necessary should be extended to Greece and to Turkey now but the final decision on long-range commitments toward a general policy of taking over Britain's commitments around the world should be carefully weighed by Congress and should be thoroughly understood by the American public, before the final ticket is written.

In Desperate Need of Jackson Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a most impressive and, in many respects, pertinent and timely editorial in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of March 15, 1947, by Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones, one of the ablest editorial writers in America.

By way of introduction to this editorial, Mr. Jones quotes Andrew Jackson as having said: "One man with courage makes a majority."

I am pleased to quote Mr. Jones' editorial:

IN DESPERATE NEED OF JACKSON TODAY

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Down in old South Carolina Andrew Jackson was born 180 years ago today. What this country needs now is an Andrew Jackson in the White House, a President who has a backbone that Russia will notice. We have played politics for the benefit of courthouse politicians until the country is getting sick and tired of the shilly-shally performances in our National Capital.

Last November the people, in despair, turned to the Republican Party. The Democratic Party had failed the people. It had built up office holding by taxing and buying and electing until we were on the road to complete autocracy. Because the Democratic Party was no longer democratic, the voters turned to the only party available and put a majority of Republicans in Congress.

There are some forthright, sincere, and courageous statesmen on the Republican side of both the Senate and the House, but they are few. There are a lot of petty politicians who should have no place in the Congress of the United States and who only got there because they were registered as Republicans and rode into office on the people's protest to the party in power.

Senator MOORE has put Oklahoma before the public as a State of resolute American principles as it has never been placed before.

The only reason the Republican Party is in control of Congress now is there is no all-out stalwart and uncompromising American-minded party to put there.

We need a Republican Party today with the courage and the character that brought the Republican Party into being, that was the champion of the United States when effort was made to divide the States. No, we do not have that kind of Republican Party today. The best that can be said for it, with all its weakness, it is infinitely more American than the Democratic Party which has concerned itself with spending the people's money to keep 3,000,000 office-holding voters on the public pay roll to vote them. As a party, the Democrats have lost all sense of consecration. Not a statesman among them.

Unless the Republicans in the House and Senate cease to be divided among themselves, quibbling and quarreling over petty patronage and unite to give strength and power to America, there should be and will be a new party born to save our country, as was done before.

There wasn't much talk of a new party in 1856. Only a few country newspapers proclaimed for it. But it happened. And it can happen again. There is more discussion going through the mails now than there was in 1856. There is a growing cry for a party of Americans who do not trim and trade.

Our domestic matters are in a mess, and the majority of our Representatives and Senators of both parties appear to have no idea how to correct our evils. And what is worse, they show no disposition to do so even though they know what should be done. And in international matters, we have just gone soft and sappy to the point that it is not only alarming but it is disgusting.

Think of our State Department spending our money to buy and ship abroad as exhibits of our culture a lot of grotesque paintings that an art teacher wouldn't pin up on a 4th grade classroom wall.

Think of our Department of State spending millions of dollars to broadcast to the few receiving sets there are in Russia such consummate lollypop nonsense as Turkey in the straw and hillbilly guitar songs.

We need an Andrew Jackson in the White House, and not a White House in Jackson County, Mo. We need an Andrew Jackson in the White House who will be smart enough and brave enough to tell the American people that in our national capital there are a lot of social gullibles, as well as political trimmers and hangers-on, who can be bought for a caviar sandwich.

The most sumptuous lay-out of foods and drinks and display of costly dishes, silverware, goldware, and jewelry anywhere in America is in the Russian Embassy at Washington. There the great slave-driver Molotov smiles and entertains the stuffed shirts of Washington who crowd about his buffet board believing they are so "liberal" they can comprehend the Communistic political bill of fare, just as their palates comprehend the delectable eatables with which the Russian masterminds bait them.

Why doesn't the President of the United States name and denounce citizens who fall for this kind of cheap bribery? Andrew Jackson would. Why does not President Truman call the whole country's attention to the fact that out on Long Island the Russians at Moscow have purchased Killenworth, the onetime country home of one of America's richest men said to be the finest house in this country.

It is such a cozy little country cottage that it cost $40,000 to tune up the parlor organ. The President of the United States has no such country retreat to enjoy. But into this kind of a costly castle Molotov invites the gullible American saps who are flattered with his display of extravagance, as well as arrogance. And this while we speak no more of the "four freedoms" and silence the Atlantic Charter.

America needs an American party. America needs an American president. Right now we haven't got either. America needs a moral and spiritual rearmament.

In Lincoln Park in Chicago there is a great giant of a gorilla. When it came to that zoo it was such a baby of a brute, weighing only 38 pounds, that the keeper took him out on the park green to play ball. But the gorilla grew. He grew until it was best not to trust him too much in the open. But the keeper could trust. The gorilla knew his friend.

But one day the gorilla gave the keeper an ugly look, and the man who fed the gorilla got out of the cage and he has never been back again. Molotov is that kind of gorilla. So is Stalin. We fed them with lend-lease. And now we do not dare trust them. But they reverse the Lincoln Park gorilla. They feed us with cakes and champagne that they may rob other peoples of their liberty while we no longer care. The great Russian gorillas who placate us with cookies don't dare let their own soldiers return to find out how bad their homeland now is.

We need an Andrew Jackson, who will put that gorilla in a cage where he will not terrorize this great nation, and force little countries into slavery.

Last Wednesday Truman was admirable in his talk to Congress. But the time has come to talk to Stalin slam-bang, mug up. That beast must be told with an Andrew Jackson emphatic "stop it—period."

Where can we find an Andrew Jackson who will be the field marshal of our integrities, and the master of the gorillas who threaten the peace of all the peoples of the earth?

Let Our Dead Rest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by Mrs. George S. Patton, Jr.:

LET OUR DEAD REST

A LETTER TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FROM MRS. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

Wherever our soldiers are buried overseas, there is America, and American cemeteries mark the triumphal march of our armies through the islands of the Pacific and from Africa, Sicily, and Italy, through France to the borders of Germany. No Americans are buried in any enemy soil.

The crosses, each with its identification tag, stand in long rows guarding the dead, and on my journey overseas last June I saw local people everywhere, both grown-ups and children, putting flowers on the graves of the men they call "our liberators."

I have seen this picture repeated three times, in 1921, 1938, and 1946, and I believe every American who some day visits a grave in one of these cemeteries will come away feeling "it is completely right that he should lie there."

This is the judgment of many of the bereaved of World War I who have talked with me after the first poignancy of their grief subsided.

After the last war I saw the dead brought back. I watched them being put into graves on funeral day at a national cemetery, week after week. Each of those coffins had meant the bereavement of some family when the word of death was received, and in that time of great emotion the relatives had asked to have the bodies returned.

But on the day of burial it was rare to see a family present. Many of them did not come, I think, because the wound of sorrow had begun to heal, the meaning of the burial ceremony had changed for them, and they had begun to realize that the broken bodies brought back in sealed caskets bore no relation to the men they had known and loved.

Our Army graves registration units under the quartermaster general are making incredible efforts in all parts of the world to identify the bodies of lost Americans, thus ending the strain of uncertainty in many homes. Our Government will either bury their bodies in national cemeteries overseas or send them home, according to the decision of their next of kin.

As a specious comfort to the bereaved relatives, sending them home is called "repatriation;" the word is a misnomer, for every American cemetery, wherever it is, is already American soil, owned and cared for by the United States Government.

My husband felt this deeply, and in 1919 he wrote the poem in which he said:

"Our free souls will be far,
Holding the line in Sunny France
Where we died to win the war."

Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair, killed in Normandy, held the same belief. Mrs. McNair wrote:

"Lesley was a soldier and wanted to die a soldier's death. I know he would want to stay where he is, surrounded by the men he trained and with whom he died. He would not want his body moved."

What do most of those graves overseas hold? Parts of men wrapped in blankets or mattress covers, without coffins—gone back to earth because they could no longer serve their purpose.

Will it comfort you to hear that your soldier is being shipped home in a box or an urn to be reburied? What will come home to you isn't what you remember and love.

Will it ease your grief, or make you happier to know that some young soldier, drafted to serve our country overseas, is digging up these bones?

If the family of the fallen soldier would find comfort in a permanent, tangible record near at hand, let them erect a simple monument in the family cemetery plot, inscribed with the man's name and record and the place of his burial overseas. Or this could be added to the list on a family monument already established.

Thus there would be a lasting memorial at home where it could be seen, without the gruesome performance of moving the remains.

And what would your man himself say if he could speak?

Every good soldier I have ever known wanted to be buried where he fell.

Mine did.

Our dead have earned the right to rest in peace.

Another Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column, Round Our Town, edited by C. H. Russell, in the Mankato Free Press, of Mankato, Minn.:

ROUND OUR TOWN

(By C. H. R.)

It was a good deal like putting a record on the machine and playing it over again, to experience the tension around the newsroom yesterday noon.

The President was before Congress, both Houses were listening to him in joint session; the Russian ambassador had been ordered home from Washington; the Soviet ambassador in London had been ordered home also; the entire world hung in eager anticipation on the words of the President as he started to speak—not so much on what he said but for an interpretation of what he meant, of all of the vast implications that may lie behind his words.

"What do you think—does it mean we are going to war again?"

Citizens called to ask that question over the telephone; pedestrians voiced it as they stopped to read the bulletins on the board; linotypers repeated it as they set the copy and printers as they tossed up headlines.

"What does it mean—what do you think?"

It brought home so poignantly again the inevitable conclusion that the little people everywhere, who fight our wars, make the sacrifices, and shoulder the burdens, know so little about it all, why it starts, or what it means, or where such a fatal decision eventually may lead.

You wonder if the men who make these decisions know, either.

There was that fateful morning back in early September of 1939—the AP calling in the wee small hours of a chill, foggy autumn dawn. The die was cast. Hitler's gray legions were rolling across the borders of Poland. You turned on the radio and Hitler's guttural, impossible but still electrifying German came pouring over the ether waves. The world was at war again.

It brought memories of Lord Grey's prophetic words in 1914—"The lights of the world are slowly going out, one by one."

And then on the following Sunday there was that broadcast from London, when the British accepted the challenge. Haltingly but clearly King George made that typical pledge. "England will not fail in her duty."

Today England is bankrupt, and we are asked to fulfill that duty—whatever it means. And what does it mean?

The war went on, the clouds darkened, France fell and Churchill gave his people and the world that impassioned promise, "We will fight on the beaches, we will fight in the fields" and to his people the grim warning, nothing but "blood and tears and sweat."

There has been victory since then, it is true, still little more than blood and tears and sweat, for all of us.

Still another part of the record—the clear, vigorous, furious voice of President Roosevelt, branding the Pearl Harbor attack "a day in infamy."

Congress again in joint session—the President again speaking from the House rostrum—tension and fears and uncertainty. Still again the question, "What does it mean—why did it happen?"

We were in it then, actively rather than passively. The lights of the world seemed to burn very low for a couple of years, then brightened slowly, then to come on full and gloriously.

But with that victory came still another message—words equally firm, equally vigorous, and passionately prophetic; not the words of a president or ruler; not the words of a diplomat or statesman as such—instead the words of a man who had lived the life and built the career of a great warrior, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, speaking from the deck of the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay as

the Japanese envoys signed the articles of surrender:

"This is your last chance."

He was warning all the world against the folly of another war.

The world would do well to pause and ponder those words today.

Yesterday again the joint session of Congress, again the tension, again the questioning and anxiety.

President Truman on the rostrum this time and he speaks of "this fateful hour." The Republican whip of the House, introducing him, refers to his speech as "tantamount to a declaration of war against aggression."

What does it mean, why is it happening, and where is it all leading us?

Certainly somewhere there is and there should be an answer to this question that the little people everywhere are asking. In the secrecy of their hearts, and in the privacy of their homes, where they dare speak their innermost thoughts and fears, husband to wife and father to son, the people of Russia are asking this question, even as we are voicing it more publicly here in a nation where there are no fears of the secret police.

For more than 30 years now this thing has been going on, with only brief breathing spells between crises, with virtually no breaks at all for the past 10 years. It is time that somewhere in the world there arose a people and a leadership strong enough to give us the answer. What does it all mean?

As we weigh that question the very fate of our western civilization hangs in the balance. This is our last chance. If peace fails now the light of the western world may go out completely.

C. H. R.

Some Sound Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from a constituent of mine who voluntarily expresses what I believe is representative of some of the best thinking and clearest reasoning we have witnessed in some time. Without further comment, I quote:

I write for the purpose of urging you to use every effort in support of the action of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee in setting a ceiling of $31,500,000,000 on Federal expenditures for the next fiscal year.

There appears to be a good deal of pressure aimed at a much higher figure. The dangers incident to cutting military expenditures have been urged, and the possibility of war with Russia is cited. While a substantial reduction in our military strength would not be a good thing, I feel sure that the Army and Navy could save many millions of dollars without seriously reducing their strength, by adopting economies and following more efficient and businesslike practices. Furthermore, there does not appear to be real danger of war with Russia for a generation. There are many reasons in support of this conclusion, the chief of which is that Russia is too exhausted economically and physically to fight a major war.

In the words of a great Oklahoman, we should stop spending money we don't have for things we don't need. In particular, I urge you to give careful consideration to cutting Federal moneys spent for subsidy purposes For the most part, if a business cannot stand on its own feet, it should not be kept alive by public funds.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, before arriving at a final conclusion regarding the recommendations of President Truman for aid to Greece and Turkey, a decision fraught with such far-reaching implications, I shall want to study with care the legislation submitted to implement this enunciation of foreign policy.

There are many questions which need to be answered by the President, the State Department, and others, before we take this momentous step.

There is no doubt in my mind, however, that our final decision must rest primarily upon a determination as to the most effective method of meeting the Communist threat, both in this country and abroad.

I am an implacable foe of communism and all that it stands for. Any attempt by the Soviet Union to extend the influence of this ideology so as to take control of the governments of free and independent countries must be checked before it is too late. The best course to follow to accomplish that objective requires mature deliberation, prayerful consideration, and statesmanship of a high order.

My attention has been called by a number of my constituents to the words of a great American from my district, Mr. Frank E. Gannett, of Rochester, N. Y., uttered the morning after the President told us of the critical decision which our country faces.

Under leave to extend my remarks, as requested by these constituents, I include Mr. Gannett's stirring and thought-provoking editorial, from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle.

We have not always seen eye to eye on every issue, nor is it to be expected that we will in the future. I salute, however, the words of a true patriot.

COMMUNIST ISSUE NOW IN OPEN, SAYS GANNETT

Every American should understand the full significance of all that President Truman said yesterday to the Members of the Congress.

He asked for aid for Greece and for Turkey and pointed out that we must come to the assistance of these two countries if they are to be saved from domination by a totalitarian state. He did not mention the Soviet Government by name, but the implication was as plain as it would have been had the words been spelled out.

The intense, solemn attitude of those who heard him indicated that they realized that his address was momentous. It was the declaration of a foreign policy that may, if carried out, decide not only our future but the future of the whole world. It might conceivably mean ultimately war with the Soviets; a final decision whether we and other nations on the earth shall be dominated by a dictator, be subjects and slaves of oppressive government or whether we and our fellow men shall be free and be masters of government.

Yes, the issue as I have said again and again is squarely before us. Today it is out in the open where all may see it and understand its tremendous significance. It is out in the open so that the American people can decide what shall be done about it, decide our fate.

What will be Russia's reaction to this declaration of policy? Stalin and the Soviet party leaders know full well what President Truman meant when he said, "We must save Greece and Turkey from totalitarianism." Will they find that the "coat fits" and defiantly resent the implications or will they keep quiet and apparently ignore the great issue involved until they are ready for it? That remains to be seen.

For my part, I believe we must check the spread of communism and the totalitarian government that agressively has been fostering it. It is terribly important to all Europe that Greece and Turkey be supported in resisting this great threat to all freedom and liberty We should advance the money needed immediately. We then shall see whether or not Russia will raise serious objection to our humanitarian effort. If she does protest vigorously and say that we are making a war move, we shall know that we are surely in for real trouble with Stalin's government.

War to all of us is unthinkable and yet eternal slavery to a state and unbearable tyranny can be worse even than war. We have just fought and won a terrible war to ward off the dangers of an all-powerful dictatorship. All the frightful losses that we suffered, all the terrible costs in lives and property, must not be in vain. We must follow up and make secure our victory.

This tremendous question that has been raised can be met only by a strong, powerful America. This issue should have been settled immediately after VE-day while we and Great Britain had great strength and were in position to dictate terms. We have allowed matters to drift so that today we are weak and Great Britain in a state of collapse.

Yes, America must awake. We must drive out into the open those who here in our land are subtly trying to weaken our country and trying to undermine our form of government. We should give to traitorous Communists the punishment they deserve.

And we should not only help check the spread of communism in Europe, but also in South America and in the Far East.

If we are doomed to a life or death fight with communism, if we must decide whether or not we want communism to dominate us, let's begin now to build up our strength for the conflict.

Russia doesn't want war now. She is not ready for it. Let's make America invincible—so powerful in every respect that no one will ever dare attack us.

FRANK GANNETT.

Aid to Veterans by Local Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the splendid work done in Naperville, outside of Chicago, in aid of the veteran. The example set by

Naperville should be followed in the communities throughout the length and breadth of the land.

General Eisenhower has drawn my attention to an article on this subject which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD:

VETERANS BUILD HOMES IN NAPERVILLE

Naperville is an average American town of about 6,000 except that it is suburban to Chicago, just 28 miles west. It is largely a residential community, with but one factory. About 1,150 veterans were to come back to Naperville and the surrounding area—if they all wished to come back to the home town. About 50 percent of the contractors in town are unionized, most of the plumbers and electricians. The community is zoned with the stated minimum restriction of $5,000 in most areas. Availability of lots, reasonably priced ($800) were, before we started, fairly limited.

During the war our USO was called the Naperville Service Organization and functioned as such. As the end of the war approached the veterans' committee began to work on plans to help GI Joe get back in step. It was this committee which chose the high-school counseling office as headquarters for the veterans' counseling and referral center. As part of the counselor's function is also to be interested in solutions, I began to work on that end too. After 20 years of service as a teacher and counselor in the local high school, it was natural that I would know and be interested in the men and the boys who went to war. During the course of the war I wrote to many of them and naturally began to discuss the process of getting home. So I have worked as counselor, gratuitously during the school year and for a small sum in the summer months. I have been busy around the clock, I assure you. I find that Fort Sheridan even recognizes us as a Veterans' Administration office. Having earned the title as a community trouble shooter for the vets, I obviously couldn't let the housing problem go unsolved. Something tangible had to be done and without delay.

Talk of State housing, county housing, apartment houses, and barracks all blew up and we faced a dismal dead end. I maintained that the same thing that won the war could lick this, too—and that was the mobilization of community effort behind the synchronized drive and energy of the veterans themselves. What could be more of an American solution than that? I was interested in tonight's paper to see Eisenhower maintaining the very same thesis. As a student and teacher in international relations and vitally interested in the peace, I maintained that peace had to begin in the human heart and that was where I was going to begin. Why more people can't see that, is more than I know.

So, one day the last of June 1946, a local Navy veteran and a machine technician, James Goetsch, and I went in to see the head of a concern producing prefabricated houses. On the way in we agreed we had to have a sales talk, and so, between the two of us, we cooked up the idea. A college veteran had already begun to build his prefabricated houses, so we had an exhibit A to begin with. Before I went in I asked the local bank cashier to visit that house that day if such was possible. When we told the business manager of the company our plans, he agreed that we definitely had something and he would cooperate 100 percent, even though we had no local dealer.

That night we had an emergency meeting of a few veterans, a few interested community leaders, including two representatives of the local bank. We got their enthusiastic support, and by phone the next day called an emergency meeting of as many veterans as could be contacted. And so, within 28 hours of the birth of the idea, we had bank approval, a skeletal organization, and 13 veteran home builders signed up. Possibly we succeeded because of the tempo of the idea, our enthusiasm, the need, and our ignorance of the obstacles ahead. No one could have really stopped us after that Friday night meeting.

As the plan unfolded it worked in much this fashion:

1. The veteran was to first spot an available lot. Appraisal on the $800 lot for the completed home was given at $6,200, so we would clear on the $5,000 zoning restrictions. However, we warned against building in areas where contrasts would be too great and opposition might be aroused. We agreed from the beginning that we would avoid concentration of houses and rowing them up. Homes were to be built according to the veterans' choice but the availability of the prefabricated houses made us concentrate on them for our cooperative project. Later on the bank refused to grant loans if, in their opinion, too many houses were being built in a given area. Remember that we have no community of prefabs, but rather prefabs within the community.

2. A lot once spotted, the veteran went to the bank with his official envelope. The lot number was sent to the title company with promise of speed up on clearance. Papers for negotiation of the loan were completed at the bank. At the beginning the veteran didn't even have to show a bank balance, but later on $300 minimum was asked. It was estimated that the project would cost about $5,500, including the lot so that usually the veteran borrowed $5,000 on a 20-year mortgage, which would make a monthly payment of $30.30. As expenses went up and unforeseen incidentals appeared, the last fellows usually borrowed $6,000. The bank absorbed a good deal of extra banking business in officially clearing delivery of the houses, making payment therefor, etc. Much credit must be given to the loyal support and enthusiasm of Louis H. Clemens, then cashier of the Naperville National Bank, now deceased. Without his help the project would never have succeeded. He died just a week before he was to have appeared at the National American Legion Convention to tell about our project.

3. With title cleared, excavation was done by a World War II veteran who had the necessary equipment and did the job for $50 per hole, rather than the usual $80. The bank insisted that every house must have a full basement, which was wise.

4. Then a local Legionnaire (World War I) proved our greatest help in the foundation work on cement blocks, cost about $500. He worked most of the time on wages, without contractor's fees.

5. Foundation ready and the first carload of five houses arrived. If you have never seen a boxcar with five houses in it, including furnaces, plumbing, etc.—you should have watched the fellows unload after their own working hours. I was present when the seal was officially broken and we were under way. Trucks were loaned by local lumber dealers, as well as storehouse facilities. It was a terrific job and we learned to have only one house delivered by a nearby dealer on the lot where it was to be erected.

6. The first five fellows built each other's houses from basement to roof. The company sent out two men to assist. The first five acted as an advisory committee for the other builders—working in crews of five as their houses arrived. The second five gave some time helping the first five in order to learn on the job. After the roof was on cooperative effort ceased, except for cooperation in getting scarcities such as tile, cement, paint etc. Some of our fellows went as far as 400 miles away for tile.

Some of the fellows found that they could not take enough time off their regular jobs to complete the task of building five houses. One fellow wanted to save his off time for a honeymoon, etc. I got five unmarried vets who could work until college started in the fall to agree to work for 75 cents an hour (to be paid by the veteran who used him as a substitute). This crew proudly boasted by the end of the season that they could put up the outside shell of the house from basement to roof in 99 man-hours.

7. The house we used (Home-Ola) came with plumbing, wiring, and heating units. We found some conflict with local ordinances but finally most of them were waived with the understanding that there would be an inspection at the end of 5 years. Because of opposition by plumbers and electricians, there was some delay until they began to realize the power that our veteran group held in the community and then we got the action that we demanded.

8. While we had commendation from a local construction engineer and several carpenters and offers to help, actually the veterans worked their own problems out cooperatively. Many local citizens found opportunity to work along on the job in the evening hours, some helped out with the purchase of scarcities, and so forth. Work went on by artificial light, especially as the days became shorter. One night about 10 I saw a whole family, including mom, dad, two sisters, wife, and veteran, all shoveling as though their lives depended upon it. I wished for an action picture of it. It was action, cooperative action, on into the night.

9. Our delay came in waiting for electricians, plumbers, for cement for the basement floor so that the furnace could be put in, for the masons to get the chimney in, and so forth. Then when daylight hours shortened we were slowed up some. Wives helped a lot on the interior finishing. The whole family is going to love every nook and cranny of the house, because they literally saw the whole anatomy of the house and saw it come to life.

Thirty-eight different veterans—we originally estimated 40 in need—signed up for houses, but 12 found other solutions or decided to wait until spring. Some of those are living in the 10 trailers we brought in for emergency housing. Nineteen are now occupied, five soon should be, and one is still in the basement stage, held up for title clearance. Oh, they aren't completely furnished, but they don't need to be to be home. Some of the interiors are being built around the family, but that is often much better than living in crowded, strained conditions. One Sunday afternoon a veteran called me up and said: "We've been in half an hour, and we're thrilled pink. Come on over." Believe you me I wasted no time getting over, and the dividends I collected right there paid for all of the hours I had put into the project. The little girl took me upstairs and showed me where her dresses could finally hang, where her toys could be kept, and the wife showed me where she could finally put her wedding presents for the first time for use. Dreams had come true, finally. One guy said to me as he proudly showed me his home: "I dreamed all of this in a fox hole, but I never thought I would actually have it this quick." Most important, he believes in himself, and he has established himself as the head of the house.

Need I say what it meant to me at Christmas time to see the lighted Christmas trees begin to appear in each home? This was the first Christmas for the family unit to be together and begin family traditions. Any part I have had in the project is negligible. The veteran himself has done it within the framework of a cooperative project which has added but more cement to the wartime comradeship. I consider it a great privilege to have been a part of such a project.

The American simplicity of the idea is what makes it workable. What could be more American than to have the owner build

his own home with the same cooperative spirit found on the American frontier when from surrounding areas the neighbors helped with "barn raising," etc. Of course, community support must be given, but why shouldn't it be given in the same wholehearted fashion that won the war? Why can't we push aside greed and selfishness when peace is at stake? That is the lesson we still must learn. Pray God, that it does not take another war to learn it.

It has been a constant source of amazement to me to see the publicity given the project. Newspapers from all over the country, six national magazines, and even the November 11 issue of a paper issued by the First Infantry in Korea ran publicity on it. The February issue of Woman's Home Companion has a short article on it now. Letters have come in from coast to coast. The mayor and the local Legion have been contacted many, many times—I know because they give me the job of answering the letters. One day a man came in from Massachusetts—expenses paid by the Legion—he was a contractor. He left approving of the plan. Always, over and over again, it is—"we face a desperate situation, and we wonder how you did it."

I admit and the fellows do that without me as their coordinator and trouble shooter perhaps the project wouldn't have held together. Surely every community has someone who thinks people are important, families are important, and therefore homes, not mere houses, are important. They won't get paid in cash, but my payment has been in something that is nonnegotiable and will last a lifetime. I honestly feel that I have contributed to my version of a lasting peace.

We haven't been unmindful that veterans from other communities may desperately need help also. In fact, there are five who have chosen to live in Naperville because they could build here and they liked us. Every community can do what we have done, I know. Eisenhower said, "Take housing to your hearts. See what you can do about it without waiting for Washington to do it." If you work with your heart it will become contagious and the cooperative spirit will again function as it should in every American community.

Just realized a cost statement isn't included: lot, $800 average; title, $65; foundation, $500; excavation, $50; house, $3,500; chimney, $100; incidentals, $500; total, $5,500 plus.

I am sorry this is so long. Obviously I could say more and more. In closing I want to say that all of the credit should be given where all of the credit belongs, to the grandest bunch of veterans in the world, my working gang here in Naperville. Branch of the service, period of service, previous training and rank were all forgotten, as the gang worked together as a team, and what a team!

ANGELINE GALE,
Veterans' Counselor.

NAPERVILLE, ILL.

The United States and Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Astorian-Budget, written by the very capable Mr. Fred Andrus:

THE UNITED STATES AND GREECE

The matter of a United States loan to Greece will come before Congress tomorrow, with press reports stating that President Truman has already discussed it privately with congressional leaders of both parties.

This is an important question involving our acceptance of a part of the British imperial burden and our alinement, at least in part, with the British on their foreign policy. It also involves plain humanitarianism, an effort to get one of our allies in the recent war back on its economic feet.

American concern with Greek troubles is nothing new. President James Monroe publicly expressed sympathy with Greece's original struggle for independence from Turkey in 1822. Daniel Webster and Henry Clay led the debate in favor of a resolution the following year to recognize the provisional Greek Government set-up while the war of independence was still raging.

Greece finally won independence in 1829 with the assistance of British, Russian, and French Fleets. The United States, however, had in the meanwhile promulgated the Monroe doctrine and we kept our hands strictly off the situation, limiting ourselves to the resolution recognizing the Greek Government and kept our Mediterranean naval squadron out of the fighting with the Turks.

Since then the United States has sympathized with Greece in its many troubles, but we have never involved ourselves directly with Greek affairs.

We followed President Monroe's policy of assuming that the Monroe Doctrine bound us to stay out of European affairs, just as we expected European nations to stay out of affairs that concerned only the Americas.

Thus the proposal that we involve ourselves now in a loan to preserve the present Greek Government calls for something of a departure from a historic policy of more than a century's standing.

It is a question not to be settled lightly. We are considering assuming Great Britain's burden, a load that Britain carried principally for preservation of control of the Mediterranean Sea.

One thing Congress should insist on—should it consider the loan favorably—we must insist on reform and true democratic processes in Greece. We do not want ourselves in the position of supporting a dictatorial government—which apparently the Greek Government now is.

Congress Gets Tax Counsel From a Couple of Men Who Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun on March 17, 1947:

CONGRESS GETS TAX COUNSEL FROM A COUPLE OF MEN WHO KNOW

The country will have to sit up and take notice when two former Under Secretaries of the (post-1933) Treasury advocate an across-the-board tax cut. And it will have to pay special attention to former Under Secretary Hanes' defense of such a reduction proposal.

Mr. Hanes says that the steeply progressive taxation of the present schedules means that "the incentive in working and assuming great responsibility is gone * * *. What I protest is not a tax on wealth or income but a tax on brains—a stupid levy against the know-how and the managerial experience that are the Nation's greatest assets."

What Mr. Hanes is asking, to put it another way, is that we accept the implications of our unanimous defense of the free enterprise and profit system. Washington is full of people who are for free enterprise and the profit motive except that they want to control enterprise and extirpate profit. They have had a disproportionate part in drafting recent tax legislation. The effect is apparent in the schedules applying to corporate income. It shows up particularly in the rates on individual income, as is indicated by a recent study of the National City Bank of New York.

This study shows that under the present law (which reduces but little the emergency rates appropriate only to wartime) a married man with two dependents making $8,000 a year can keep only 75 cents of an extra dollar if he makes it. At $16,000 a year he can keep only 59 cents if he makes an extra dollar. And if he is making around $22,000 a year, he can keep only 50 cents of an additional dollar.

Plainly there will be less push for him to make the extra dollar when it will mean only a half dollar in actual return to him. And above the $22,000 level the Treasury's share of the extra dollar earned increases rapidly until the larger-income man finds himself working for the Treasury almost altogether. With what result? With the natural result described by Mr. Hanes—"the incentive in working and assuming great responsibility is gone."

But the present time is one in which our industrialism must produce more abundantly than ever in the past. The foreign-policy crisis, far from reducing the need for economy and stimulative tax cuts, has increased that need. It has always been clear that a sound postwar fiscal policy would require budget balance, firm maintenance of the military services, debt reduction, and tax cuts, about in that order. The order ought to stand, but recent unexpected gains in tax yields make it more than ever imperative that attention be paid to valid tax-cut proposals.

It would be cynical nonsense, of course, to overlook the need for relief in all sections of the income-tax pyramid. The great numbers of moderate-income men merit aid as much as the smaller groups farther up the ladder. But it is the push and drive of the latter groups, their willingness to invest and risk that sparks the whole productive system. An income-tax schedule which dampens that spark is, to quote Mr. Hanes again, stupid.

The Radiance of a Genius Personality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, former business associate of Thomas Alva Edison, and at

present vice president of Edison Industries, before the Methodist Church in Orange, N. J., February 9, 1947:

Today I have the honor of speaking to you of Thomas Alva Edison, in the radiance of whose genius personality I lived a significant part of my life. It was a divine blessing to be associated with the great benefactor of the human race.

Any success which I may have attained is due, in large part, to the influence of this relationship. It has been my sincere effort, since he passed on to his great reward, to perpetuate his ideals, his philosophy, and his memory.

Light and understanding—these were Edison's gifts to humanity. He made light a social force and, through his inventions, the luxury of the kings of the past became the household accommodation of all of us.

His contributions to the sciences of communication developed better understanding throughout the world. The phonograph, one of the most original inventions in the annals of history, brought the world's greatest artists into the humblest of homes.

The wonders of his inventions which made possible the moving picture industry, the telephone, the telegraph, and the radio all helped greatly to make the United States a Nation of humanity and brotherhood.

Edison believed in America. He felt that here in the United States we have the opportunity of improving life for everyone and setting a constructive example for the rest of the world.

It has been said—indeed charged—by collectivists that Edison was an individualist. Indeed he was. So were Washington, Jefferson, Marshall, Lincoln, Brandeis, Holmes, and all other benefactors of the human race. They, like Edison, glorified and liberated the individual. It was their belief that the state exists for the people. Such collectivists as Hitler, Mussolini, and their counterpart, Stalin, who enslave human beings, contend that the people exist for the state.

Fundamental in Edison's philosophy was his hope that more human beings would think of local, state, national and world problems, and thus provide a broader base of thought and a better understanding among the peoples of the world.

His associates were always mindful of the forceful saying of Sir Joshua Reynolds, which Edison had on the wall of his office and to which he often referred: "There is no expedient to which a man will not resort to avoid the real labor of thinking."

Edison believed thoroughly in our system of profits and competition. His thoughts on the subject were admirably expressed in the following statement made by him in a business conference: "It is the competitive system, as much as any other thing, that has made us a great Nation. We must depend on competition for the development of more and better products, and for better services at lower costs and thus increase our living standards. I need competition to keep me on my toes. So does my management. Competition is good for business." "Competition," he continued, "develops resourcefulness in our citizens. Competition is good for the individual." And then, with a twinkle in his bright blue eyes, Edison concluded: "Although at times, it is a bit uncomfortable."

Edison learned early in life that difficulties are challenges which develop latent resources in man.

Failure and disaster never discouraged him. After inventing the electric light, he perfected a process for the separation of low-grade iron ore. He put 10 years into this project and spent millions of dollars in experiments. Then a freak of fortune laid bare a great field of rich bessemer ore and obsoleted all of his work. The experiment had to be abandoned. Turning to one of his associates, Edison asked, "Well, what next?"

Then he set out to invent a new type of storage battery. When he had conducted more than 45,000 experiments, without any apparent measure of success, an associate asked, "Are you not discouraged?" "Certainly not," responded the inventor, "I have learned 45,000 ways the job cannot be done, and I am therefore 45,000 ways nearer my goal."

At the age of 65, when most men are thinking of retiring, his factory was destroyed by fire. Before the ashes had cooled, Edison was laying plans to build a new factory.

Perhaps no man ever lived who was more industrious than he. There were times when he would not leave the laboratory for a week or more. He and his many assistants were inspired by the hope of achieving great ends. Often he worked for long periods with only 4 hours of sleep a day.

When Edison was 82 years old, the world celebrated the 50th anniversary of his invention of the incandescent lamp. President Hoover and a host of other notables from all parts of the world came to do him honor. The next day Edison was back at work.

Indeed, the day that fatal illness overtook him, the 84-year-old genius was busily engaged in the problem of extracting rubber from the common goldenrod.

There was a burning torch in this man Edison. From early youth, his mind was filled with new ideas. The list of his inventions is staggering. He was granted more than 1,150 patents.

Like the prophets of Israel, like Christ Himself, like every true artist and every great scientist, Edison was motivated by a burning desire to create.

What was the driving power behind Edison's enthusiasm and energy? It was, of course, a keen interest in mastering problems which retard and stymie the progress of mankind.

In the face of this and other glorious examples of how to succeed in life, it is difficult to understand why a large segment of our people still practice the crazy theory that one can have more by producing less.

I like to think of Edison as exemplifying that faithful servant in the parable of the talents, related by the gentle Carpenter of Nazareth, as He and His disciples sat together on the Mount of Olives.

You have read the story in St. Matthew's gospel: how the Master, before going to a far country, called His servants to Him. To one He gave five talents, to another two, and to another one. How the one servant buried his one talent in the ground; but he that had two gained still another two; and he that had five gained still another five. Wherefore, when the Master returned, He was well pleased with the stewardship of the two servants who had made the most of their gifts, and because they had been faithful over a few things, He set them over many.

Edison was indeed a faithful servant. Vision, imagination, genius, industry, and character were the potentialities with which he was endowed. By the wise use of the talents committed to his care, the world has been a thousandfold enriched.

May we, whether we be given one, two, or five talents, use them to advance humanity as the great genius of Menlo Park used his.

May we devote our gifts to the well-being of our fellow men in the same measure as Edison dedicated his.

May we, when we render the account of our stewardship, deserve to hear from our Master, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Aid for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Washington Daily News:

BETTER GREEK PLAN?

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Almost overnight the world has seen the creation of an international crisis over Greece.

A bit dazed, we have watched the dizzy drama, starting with that hush-hush powwow at the White House. It was attractively labeled very secret for the sort of publicity build-up familiar to Hollywood and our National Capital. The usual leaks provided long authoritative dispatches to whet the appetite, and we learned suddenly that Britain was pulling out of Greece in a matter of a month, and something must be done by us quickly.

A few days of this set the stage properly for President Truman's entrance before a special joint session of Congress with a message that left much to the imagination, except no mistaking that military personnel was included with economic aid. Meanwhile, State Secretary Marshall had arrived in Moscow in time to have all this burst upon the Russian capital and the world with opening of the Foreign Ministers' conference.

Some method in all this, perhaps? It has been observed that international politics, in method and manner, is little different from that played at home, much as we might like to see it otherwise in this dangerous day of the atomic bomb.

After watching this spectacle and wondering, some began to ask why this problem of the Greek-Turkish frontier wasn't a job for the United Nations—a logical question. The answer, and President Truman gave it officially, was that the UN wasn't ready to handle it. It was learned about the same time that the State Department had known the seriousness of the Greek situation for a long time, some 8 months, and others around here had heard of it, though not much was let out to the people and a Congress that revealed its own ignorance by the shock with which it received the President's message.

It now turns out not only that there was plenty of information about Greece's desperate plight, but that as long as 6 months ago a plan for the rehabilitation of Greece had been prepared, after exhaustive investigation on the ground beginning nearly a year ago. This was done by a mission sent out by a UN adjunct, the Food and Agricultural Organization. Franklin S. Harris, president of the Utah State College of Agriculture, headed the mission, which included representatives of the United States, Britain, and France.

The principal findings and recommendations were presented in a preliminary report to the Copenhagen FAO Conference last September, and the full report was approved when the mission met here last November. This is revealed in the complete report of nearly 200 pages just released here.

The report fixed $100,000,000 as sufficient to start rehabilitation and carry it forward during 1947 and 1948. The amount was to be provided by a loan from the International

Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Worth noting here is that, since $100,000,000 is regarded sufficient for economic rehabilitation, then presumably more than half of the $250,000,000 of the proposed advance to Greece for this same initial period is for military purposes. Previously it had been indicated that about half was to be for military purposes.

The report is based on the theory that the major effort of reconstruction must come from the Greek people themselves, making it less of a supervised enterprise than our plan seems to contemplate.

But, perhaps most important, the report recommends that the UN support the Greek Government in its rehabilitation program through an advisory mission for Greece to include representatives of FAO, the International Bank, International Monetary Fund, and other cooperating international agencies.

Why isn't this still the proper course?

General Marshall Raises the Ideological Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edwin L. James, from the New York Times of March 16, 1947:

GENERAL MARSHALL RAISES THE IDEOLOGICAL ISSUE—HE TELLS MOSCOW CONFERENCE HOW WE FEEL ABOUT INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND BASIC HUMAN PRIVILEGES—CLARIFIES A WORLD DEBATE

(By Edwin L. James)

When, on Friday, General Marshall told the Moscow Conference what his country meant when it talked about democracy, he was speaking, on the record, about the kind of government which should be set up in Germany. But his words had a far wider scope than that, because he brought right out in the open the ideological contest between regimes which recognize human rights and regimes which are totalitarian. In one the state exists to serve the individual; in the other the individual exists to serve the state. That is just what it is all about.

Now, our Secretary of State was talking in a capital where once the word "democracy" was taboo; it was something outside of the Marxian world. Things have changed now and vociferously, if belatedly, the Russian regime has found that it is the world's best form of democracy. But the change is one of semantics and not one of government. Since the Russians have called their regime a democracy, a good many people, including apologists for the Kremlin, have tried to make the point that the United States does not have a democracy in the Greek sense of rule by the people but rather has a representative form of republic. Maybe so, but it is still difficult to see how therein lies any analogy which proves anything about the Russian Government, where the Communist Party, numbering 5,500,000 persons, or 3 percent of the population, runs the country. There is always the story of how a Russian can, if he likes, vote against the Communist ticket, but it remains true that it is not of record that any members of the Politburo are other than good party members.

THE UNITED STATES SPEAKS

General Marshall began by recalling that at the Potsdam Conference instructions were given to reestablish Germany on a democratic basis. He added that apparently the instructions were not specific enough. He said that he realized that different interpretations were being placed on the word "democracy," and then, for the record, he added:

"To the American Government and citizens it has a basic meaning. We believe that human beings have certain inalienable rights—that is, rights which may not be given or taken away.

"They include the right of every individual to develop his mind and his soul in the way of his own choice, free of fear and coercion—provided only that he does not interfere with the rights of others. To us a society is not democratic if men who respect the rights of their fellow men are not free to express their own belief and convictions without fear that they may be snatched away from their home or family."

That, said General Marshall, was the kind of democracy we wanted in Germany. He sought a regime which would "assure such rights to every individual and effectively prevent any government or group, however powerful or however numerous, from taking such rights away from or imposing any such fears on any individuals, however weak or however few."

FIVE THINGS LACKING

The General then said he found five faults in political reorganization in Germany.

1. There was insignificant guaranty of human rights in all zones.
2. There was no uniform protection of the rights of political parties.
3. There was no uniform guarantee of the rights of labor unions.
4. There was no general guarantee of the freedom of the press and radio.
5. There was too much interference with free travel in Germany.

He laid special emphasis on the need for a free press and free information of all kinds in Germany if the Germans were to be won away from Nazi doctrines.

In addition to the wider purpose of letting the Russians know what we mean when we say "democracy," the speech of the Secretary of State is important for the procedure of the conference because it lays down a line of thought which is bound to be heard again when the meeting gets around to the task of organizing a government in the Reich. It will surely be taken as a demand by the Americans that things be changed in the Russian zone of occupation and that all parties should be given a fair run in any and all zones of occupation in Germany.

ISSUE OF FREE PRESS

The issue of a free press is bound to come up. Foreign Minister Molotov said after hearing General Marshall that there was much worth weighing in what he said but did not think the press should be free to preach fascism. Now that might look reasonable until one scratches the surface by reading what the Government-controlled press has been saying about the United States. Over here, according to Pravda and Izvestia, Fascist bankers in Wall Street are preparing a new war; President Truman has taken sides with the Fascists of Greece; our foreign policy is one directed toward imperialist expansion and against democracy. If that is the basis of Mr. Molotov's judgment, it can be seen that his kind of free press is not going to be what General Marshall says should exist in Germany.

As a matter of fact, the difference lies deeper. It is the American idea that a free press should inform the people in the belief that the people will then come to a good conclusion. It is the Russian theory that the press should be used as a weapon of the Communist Party. M. Kuzmichev in Problems of Journalism states the Russian position as follows:

"The aim of information does not consist in commercializing news but in educating the great mass of the workers, in organizing them under the exclusive direction of the party for clearly defined tasks. This aim will not be attained by objective reporting of events. Liberty and objectivity of the press—these are fictions. Information is the means of class struggle, not a mirror to reflect events objectively."

CLEARING THE ATMOSPHERE

The statement by General Marshall should be helpful. It serves to bring into the open the discussion of what is democracy and the general has said what we think it is. Of course, the Russians think it is something else because they say the Russians have a democracy and it is plain that their government is not what the Americans regard as a democracy. Our Secretary of State has spelled it out, so far as we are concerned. It is a good guess that Mr. Molotov will attack parts of his address and if the Russian Foreign Minister should spell out his ideas on democracy, the issue would be joined in a manner which should remove some of the diplomatic fog which has existed whenever, at a conference, there is talk of democracy.

It is not that General Marshall is trying to tell the Russians what sort of government they should have. That is not our business. Our interest begins when Russia tries to export her form of government into regions where we have a legitimate interest that we take the liberty of questioning the tag it bears. There is not only Germany. There are also Poland, Hungary, Austria, Bulgaria, Rumania, and perhaps Greece. And maybe other countries. That is where the argument lies.

Immediate Action Necessary To Save Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, during the last year the American people have been told by the enemies of price and rent controls that the elimination of Government controls would not cause inflation. During the congressional debates on price control last summer, the National Association of Manufacturers argued that if price controls were removed, production would be immediately stepped up, the market would be flooded with goods, and prices would be forced down. But what happened when controls were relaxed with respect to food, clothing, and other consumer goods? The cost of living is over 50 percent higher today than it was 8 months ago, and it is still rising. The elimination of price controls has not meant more goods and lower prices, but only higher prices.

Now the same lobby groups who opposed price controls are telling us that if rent controls are removed the building industry will be stimulated, more houses will be built, and rents will shortly fall. Experience proves, however, that these predictions of false prophets are not valid, and the destruction of the rent-control program will mean only higher rents for 50,000,000 people in America.

I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the March 6, 1947, issue of

the Floodwood Forum at Floodwood, Minn. In my opinion this editorial reflects the attitudes of many of the American people.

PRICES CONTINUE UPWARD DESPITE PREDICTIONS

Those people who pumped for removal of price controls must swallow more words this week as prices on most commodity indexes hit a new high.

Critics of OPA said that after a temporary soaring of prices, competition would bring prices down. That is not happening yet. And it's been a long time already for those who must pay for their living out of wages which do not rise with every increase in price.

The trend of prices upward despite the supposedly (fictitious) law of supply and demand is further evidence of the effect of monopoly control in the United States.

During the past 3 weeks, food prices have increased more than 7 percent and we now hear about $1 per pound pork chops being just around the corner.

The price of foodstuffs to the consumer has risen faster than farm prices, indicating that the profit is not going to the farmer but that huge profits are being reaped between the time the produce leaves the farmer and its arrival in the consumer's market basket.

True, prices may come down sometime. But the longer it takes and the higher prices go, the bigger chunk is chopped from consumer savings, current wages buy less goods and buyers must forego many durable goods coming on the market in order to keep even with more living costs.

As people stop buying durable goods, inventories in those lines accumulate, bankers have to make more loans for business to carry those excessive inventories—and the closer the country gets to an economic break-down.

Price manipulators are taking a larger and larger volume from the cap of the pyramid representing buying power in the country. The longer this goes on, the more consumer savings are depleted and the more of the Nation's purchasing power transfers into the hands of the top-dogs who already control too large a percentage of the life blood of our economic system.

THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED IN 1929—IT MIGHT HAPPEN AGAIN

And in spite of these trends, Congress prepared to bury what is left of OPA, leaving the way open to ditching of rent controls. Soaring rents will only add fuel to the fire and make prices soar higher.

In the name of common sense, how can any former critic of the OPA now look anyone in the eye and say that it was sound economic policy to remove price controls formerly preserved by OPA?

Any reputable business magazine or forecast will bear out the facts we have cited above.

We have sown a breeze and are now reaping a whirlwind.

Medicine's Changing Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have been charged with the responsibility of taking the leadership in connection with the health program. I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Medicine's Changing Order," appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, and paying a very worthy tribute to a report which has just been issued by the New York Academy of Medicine after 4 years of study of the changing situation in medicine throughout the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICINE'S CHANGING ORDER

The report of a 4-year study made by the Committee on Medicine and the Changing Order has been issued in conjunction with the centennial of the New York Academy of Medicine. The distinguished lay and medical authorities on the committee, headed by Dr. Malcolm Goodridge, have painstakingly and open-mindedly addressed themselves to the problem of how to make adequate medical care available to more people. Their report, in our opinion, represents the best thought on that topic to date.

The committee agrees "that medical service should eventually provide everything that science can offer toward the preservation and the cure of disease and that it should make available these benefits to the entire population." It agrees also that the profession is not now "optimally" organized to meet that goal and that medical insurance is one of the "essential requirements" in solving the problem. Though the report covers many more, and as important, topics, public interest centers on the controversial issue of compulsory versus voluntary insurance. The committee concludes against "compulsory health insurance at the present time." But the corollary conclusion is "that everything should be done * * * to hasten the growth of voluntary medical insurance."

Those who see the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill as the final answer may be tempted to dismiss this committee's findings as merely what was to be expected of any study under medical auspices. Any such dismissal would be a grave error. The study uses the historical approach to point the vast gap in experience which must be bridged before any final reorganization of medical practice is made. The only experience there is to draw on with compulsory insurance, chiefly European, indicates that "national compulsory medical insurance would not and could not realize the promises made for it and would inevitably create new and formidable evils of its own."

The committee sees voluntary insurance as an essential experiment in prepayment as the only way to acquire requisite knowledge, both actuarial and in terms of what constitutes adequate medical care. It bespeaks Government aid at all levels to hasten such plans, preferring that Federal assistance take the form of grants-in-aid allowing for local administration and experiment. Suggesting how little our experience, even with voluntary plans, has crystallized, the committee refrains from recommending any one type of plan, preferring that even the method of paying doctors be the subject of continuing experiment.

The American tendency is to look for immediate action, usually in the form of cover-all legislation, to correct any such inadequacy as is now recognized in the field of health and medical care. In this case hasty legislation, the committee points out, is "a leap in the dark; the results are at best uncertain, may even be disastrous and, in any event, are irrevocable." No citizen who is sincerely interested in wider distribution of good medical care, either from an individual or from a social and humanitarian viewpoint, can afford to dismiss the academy committee's report.

The Knutson Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Inept Tax Bill" which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 16, 1947:

INEPT TAX BILL

Chairman Knutson's prediction that the Ways and Means Committee will act next Thursday to report out his bill calling for an immediate 20 percent across-the-board reduction in personal income taxes, after only 2 days of hearings, warrants Democratic charges of steam-roller tactics. The bill stands condemned because of the indecent haste with which it is being rushed through the committee. The House and Senate have not yet agreed as to the amount of over-all reductions in expenditures that is to be their goal. And when they do, the figure will be highly tentative. For, as Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has testified, it is "impossible to foresee what the requirements of peacetime public expenditures will be." The outlook is even more uncertain as regards our defense expenditures, including recommended unbudgeted outlays for Greece and Turkey. To try to rush a tax-reduction bill through the House in these circumstances discredits its sponsors.

This is no time for tax cutting. With the economic outlook promising and the national income at a high level, existing taxes can be borne with much less hardship to individuals and to business than would normally be the case. If we ever intend to reduce our huge national debt, now is the time to begin. If the debt is reduced as rapidly as possible in good years, there will be less reason to feel concerned if debt retirement is suspended in some future less prosperous year.

The Knutson bill is not only ill-timed; it is also open to criticism for offering a flat 20-percent reduction of income taxes paid by persons with net income below $300,000. For the 1,100 income-tax payers above this dividing line, tax cuts would be graduated down to a minimum of 10.5 percent. Exemptions for taxpayers over 65 years of age would also be raised by $500, regardless of the size of the incomes of these aged persons. Concerning the latter extraordinary proposal, Secretary Snyder stated emphatically that it would be unfair to increase exemptions for this particular group without giving relief to many other special groups with low incomes. Many aged persons are very well off, indeed, and in no need of special dispensations.

Although believing that substantial tax relief for upper-income groups is imperative to stimulate the spirit of enterprise essential to economic progress, we think Secretary Snyder is right in saying that the Knutson tax bill "gives too little reduction to lower incomes and relatively too much to higher incomes." For instance, a married person with no dependents and a net income of $1,200, now paying a tax of $32, would be taxed $30 under the Knutson bill. A married man with a $50,000 income, on the other hand, would have his $24,795 tax reduced to $19,836, and the tax on a $100,000 income would be cut from $63,128 to $50,502.

In view of recent sharp declines in the purchasing power of the dollar, the case for tax relief of individuals in the low-income brackets has been greatly strengthened. Effective reductions in tax rates for

the low-income groups could be made without cutting them off the tax rolls.

A final strong objection to the Knutson bill is that it deals only with a part of the tax system. When the time is ripe for tax reduction, a comprehensive revision of the tax system should be undertaken, covering excises, corporate, and other taxes as well as the individual income tax. That is the only way in which we can hope to work out a well-balanced tax system that will give due weight to rival claims for tax reduction.

St. Patrick's Day Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following speech I delivered before Division 14, Ancient Order of Hibernians, Haverhill, Mass., at their communion breakfast at GAR Hall, Sunday, March 16, 1947:

We of Irish descent are not the largest group in the United States, but we come close to being the most influential. And I am not thinking in terms of politics when I say this. Our fellow-Americans of Italian, French, Polish, Jewish, and other origins have their special days when we honor with them. However, I do not believe I exaggerate when I say that St. Patrick's day has a unique sentiment that cannot help but charm others who are not privileged to trace their lienage to the Emerald Isle.

It warms our hearts to hear the cheerful greetings of those who do not look Irish, but who certainly enter into the spirit of this day. The radio is full of Irish songs and melodies that have been taken to heart by all and have indeed become a part of America.

In the pride and happiness and music of this day which so many of us take for granted, we seldom inquire into the mainsprings of our emotions. Who was this St. Patrick whose name is being spoken by tens of millions? Surely, it is but right that we devote a few minutes of our time to the life of a man who by his deeds, won the rare crown of sainthood.

St. Patrick was born about A. D. 389, the son of a small land-owner who lived at a place called Banna-nuenta. He was brought up as a shepherd and tended the flocks of a chieftain by the name of Milchu on the green hills of County Antrim. At the young age of 16, while tending the sheep, he was set upon by bandits. They took the young shepherd and his drove of sheep into Connaught and kept him captive there for 6 years. At the end of that time he made his escape on a ship used for exporting fierce Irish wolf hounds. He landed on the cost of Gaul and eventually made his way to a monastery where he lived for several years and studied the principles of Christianity.

While in the monastery, he saw in a dream a man named Victorious, bearing many epistles in his hands. On one of these, St. Patrick read the words, "The Voice of the Irish," and imagined he heard his people say: "We pray thee, holy youth, come and walk among us as before." This vision inspired him to return to Ireland as a missionary. He spent about 14 years preparing himself for his mission and, after being ordained a deacon, went back to teach his people.

At first the Irish were ready to stone him for attempting an innovation in the religion of their ancestors. He obtained a hearing, however, and to explain his point picked up a shamrock from the roadside, using the tree leaves on one stem to illustrate the principle of the Holy Trinity. This simple comparison so greatly impressed his hearers that they allowed themselves to be baptized there and then.

For, as St. Patrick said: "Is it any more strange that these persons should be united in one God than it is for three leaves of clover to grow upon one stalk?"

This faith which St. Patrick taught the Irish, and which we practice today, has been the strength and inspiration of the Irish people through centuries of toil and hunger and suffering under the yoke of an alien rule. The faith of Irishmen in Christianity could never be shaken. It has not only been a consolation to them in time of trouble, but it has enabled them to face the trials of this life with grace and beauty and an abundant heart for their fellowmen—thanks to their spiritual leader, St. Patrick.

During his long ministry, he founded many churches, and the story of his good works spread through the land, and his was the name that brought spiritual unity to the people. With the inspiration of their true faith, the Irish blossomed forth with a culture and a zest for learning that became the model for European civilization.

After reaching a ripe old age, St. Patrick died at Saul, County Down, on March 17, and was buried in a shroud made by St. Brigid. Each of Ireland's counties was then ruled by a chieftain, and it was within the dun, or fort, of the Down Chieftain, that the blessed patriarch was buried. To St. Patrick's funeral came, from all parts, bishops, priests, and people of all ranks, who gathered in prayerful reverence around the tomb of the father of their faith. Nearly 1,500 years have gone since that memorable day. The same spirit of reverencing the anniversary has survived in the hearts of all true Irishmen. We rejoice in the true faith which he brought to us, knowing that it gives strength and meaning to our mortal life and prepares us for our just reward in the life to come.

St. Patrick was preeminent]y the spiritual leader of the Irish people. But the Christian doctrine which he preached, had in it the seeds of liberty and independence which have left an indelible impression on the Irish character. This belief in the dignity of human personality, as made in the image of God, has been a prominent factor in the development of our American democracy, which all of our great men have recognized.

On the night of March 16, 1776, George Washington issued special orders permitting liberty to all of his soldiers wishing to make merry on the 17th. "Boston"—by Washington's command—if spoken to an officer of the guard, immediately gave the individual soldier permission to leave camp for the day, the words "St. Patrick" being the countersign. Washington understood the meaning of this observance for so many who fought under him. As a consequence, he selected as Brigadier General of the day, Gen. John Sullivan, who played such an important role in the siege of Boston.

The Irish personality is blessed with many gifts and so, on this day, we experience many emotions. First, we give thanks to God for the supreme gift of faith. And then, in song and story, we express our happiness. The Irish are a witty people and imaginative too. And from the folklore of the race, we draw upon a rich store of fancy, particularly the one which tells of St. Patrick driving the snakes out of Ireland. True enough, there are none of these evil creatures in the land of our forefathers. For St. Patrick "drove them into the bogs, and banished all the vermin."

From which, if I may be permitted, I would like to draw a parable. Just as Ireland is one of the very few countries in which there are no snakes, by the same token it is one of the few that are not menaced by the poisonous bite of communism.

There are two, and only two systems in the world of today, which are powerful enough to attract the political allegiance of the confused human race. One is the Christial Democracy in which we live. The other is the modern form of slavery called communism, in which man is promised the material comforts of this life, if he will forfeit his independence of mind and spirit to the all-powerful State.

Let us not underestimate the strength of this atheistic creed which is spreading over the world. In the short span of 30 years, more than one fifth of the world's land mass has passed under its influence. Even here, in our own country, they are busy boring from within, setting class against class, skillfully plying their destructive technique, and getting ready for the day when they hope to seize power out of chaos.

Some of you may scoff at this statement, saying: "The Communists in the United States are few in number, so few that they are difficult to find."

To which I reply: "You are right as far as you go, but don't stop there." Remember that an organized few, knowing where they are going and inspired by a fanatical zeal, are more effective than the many who are not aware of what is happening until it is too late.

And remember that there are many sincere, though gullible Americans whose opinions are close to the Communist line, even though they don't realize it.

Let us face the issue squarely. All the peoples of this world, in these tempestuous times, are desperately seeking security. We in the United States, with tragic memories of boom and bust and depression and war, are striving to win freedom from fear and want. But to win that goal we must not, and shall not, surrender our faith in God and in the democracy which comes closer to fulfilling His divine law.

Whatever the problems which crowd the American scene—and we frankly acknowledge them—they will not be solved by plans alone. For man is not a mere cog in the wheel of a machine. He is a creature made in the image of God, with the spirit in him to rise above his weaknesses through prayer and constant Christian effort to live up to the moral law.

Since the beginning of this century, when man was dazzled by the scientific toys which he had invented, he began to think that in science he would find all the answers to the mystery of life. Carried away by his own ego, he turned his back on God.

And now he faces here on this earth the grim possibility of a day of reckoning. He has invented a Frankenstein which threatens to destroy him. Before the awesome power of atomic energy he stands worried and helpless. There is no scientific answer to the control of this tremendous force. A few men in positions of responsibility have the fate of civilization in their hands. You and I and hundreds of millions of others are appalled by the fact that a few men could destroy us, a few men seized by a sudden and overmastering human weakness.

We are thankful that this secret is presently known only to a few leaders of our country who have been reared in the God-fearing tradition. Burdened by this responsibility, they are working mightily to perfect a system of international controls for the protection of all nations and all men, so that this power may be employed for the advancement of man and not for his destruction.

But other nations, lustful for the enjoyment of power at the expense of moral law, may be on the verge of knowing this secret before international controls are established.

Then what?

In our prayers let us ask that God's grace may come to those who have turned their backs on Him, and whose only law is victory at any price, not alone that of property and life but of all the spiritual truths which man has come to know through ages of trial.

And in our daily living let us work to make America strong in body and in soul. The vicious doctrines creeping over the world are reaching toward us. Somewhere we must stand up and say "Stop," and I fear the time for that is near at hand.

All of us deplore war, but recent experience should have taught us that appeasement is the surest road to war. Better for ourselves and our children that we be clear and firm about this now, than pay a frightful price for our weakness later on.

Communism is spreading and gaining power. It is aggressive because it believes that Americans have turned back to personal living, closing their eyes to the reality of the world outside the borders of their country.

There are only two big powers in the world of today—Russia and the United States. A fateful decision is shaping up at Washington, a decision which you, the people, should help to make, and that is, What shall be America's foreign policy on the global scale? We cannot sit idly by and allow communism to extend its control over the rest of the world, for then we shall stand pitifully alone.

Fanatic Communist Parties are active all over Europe and in many parts of Asia and South America, and communism is the foe of democracy and religion.

We would be disloyal to our Christian faith, which is the heart of our American life, if we refused to face this fact.

We, of Irish extraction, are a sentimental people. On St. Patrick's Day, we like to recall the ancient glories, and it is well that we do. The dauntless faith and love of freedom, so characteristic of all Irishmen, must be nourished at the fountain of the past, to strengthen us for the duties which we must meet today and tomorrow.

By the grace of Holy Communion we have cleansed our hearts before God.

Tomorrow, the happy 17th, we shall rekindle memories of the great saint whose vision and courage banished paganism from the land our ancestors came from.

Following the cross of Christ in which our American democracy has faith, we, in this year of 1947, cannot falter in our step.

A new paganism is challenging the world and all the truths that we hold dear.

True to St. Patrick and the shining example which he gave us, we, in whom the freedom-loving blood of the Irish flows, will be alert to our danger.

In common with our fellow Americans, and the oppressed of all lands who look to us for moral leadership, we shall be firm in the right, as God gives us to see the right, and be vigilant in defense of our liberties.

Before the rock of our faith the evil tide of communism will press in vain.

Two Views of the Greek-Turkey Loan, Both Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has requested that the foreign policy of the United States be revised and that American money be used as a political weapon to defeat the inroads of communism abroad. The responsibility for a decision on this proposal, the effects of which may change the destiny of our Nation, lies with the Eightieth Congress, and no issue of more momentous import has ever been placed before the representatives of the people of the United States.

Two recent articles by established political commentators present careful studied reviews of the issues involved and two different approaches to the Communist problem.

The first article, entitled "Start at Home," by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, presents the position that I personally supported by the introduction of my bill, House Resolution 99, which would legally define communism and open the way for legal action through the Department of Justice against active Communists who are exerting every effort to undermine our Government and abolish our established freedoms through the substitution of communistic principles and policies. Mr. Waldrop advises us to halt communistic activity at home before we undertake a global purge of communism. He believes it is important to drive communism from the United States before we appropriate money for an attempt to evict communism from Greece and other foreign territory.

The second article is written by Mr. George Sokolsky. It attacks the problem of stemming the Communist wave from an international perspective, and points up the need for a firm unyielding stand by the United States to halt communism abroad. Mr. Sokolsky draws a verbal blueprint of the Communist movement in the world to date and underlines the attendant dangers to our Nation, if a halt is not called now.

The decision rests with the Congress. I believe we must give this problem serious study and consider it from every angle. Our decision will set the foreign policy of the United States. Once the decision has been made, there can be no turning back.

I bring these two articles representing differing viewpoints on this issue to your attention. I urge you to read them carefully and weigh the facts before the vote is cast:

START AT HOME

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Mr. Truman has discovered all of a sudden that the Communists of the world are dangerous people, and so they are.

But why is it the Communists are more dangerous in Greece and Turkey than they are in Washington, D. C.?

Here he comes to Congress and asks approximately half a billion dollars to start an anti-Communist program abroad that says to Russia plain as day, "If you want a war, we're ready."

Yet right now, today, this very Sunday, there are on the pay roll of the taxpayers of the United States Communists who are for Russia first, and have been ever since Mr. Truman came to Washington a freshman Senator from Missouri.

In fact they were in Washington long before him.

They came here with his predecessor in the Presidency and laughed at Roosevelt as the Kerensky of our revolution.

They demonstrated their power in the Roosevelt administration right at the start. Who remembers the late Dr. William Wirt, of Gary, Ind.? Dr. Wirt was a distinguished and liberal educator of world renown.

He came to Washington to see what the brand New Deal was like. He didn't come as a pay-roll patriot but as a plain patriot, wanting to find out what kind of people had risen to power.

That crack about Roosevelt being the Kerensky of the new American revolution wasn't the kind of thing he was used to in American government and, having heard it one night at a New Deal dinner, he stuck around to find out more.

What he found out was that the Communists and their fellow travelers had at last, with Roosevelt, got themselves into places of power and importance in our Government. So he gave warning.

Did the newspaper editors and college presidents and Members of Congress and other such opinion makers take him seriously? Well does this writer remember how, for instance, the distinguished Baltimore Sun and New York Times gave out gentlemanly hawhaws at Dr. Wirt and how college presidents the country over followed up the cue. As for Congress, it was just as guilty as Roosevelt in those days, and it deliberately made Dr. Wirt a laughing stock.

He went to his grave a bitter and frustrated man while the editors of the Baltimore Sun and the New York Times and all such noble-minded heavy thinkers continued to say that we must worry about fascism and nazism abroad, but as for communism, why it is not a problem, and besides to criticize Communists would be Red-baiting, and who wants to be a Red baiter?

Meanwhile the Communists climbed aboard the taxpayers' shoulders. They came in via the NYA, the NRA, the PWA, and the WPA, the CCC, the SEC, the FHA, and all the other early alphabetical Trojan horses. They have never left.

For when the war came on they simply shifted over to the OWI, the OSS, the OPA, and so forth. They put the President's wife to work for them. They knocked down the barriers then even in the War and Navy Departments. Communists became officers in our armed forces. And in time they showed their power by fomenting riots, rebellions, and mutiny in our forces abroad. Has it been forgotten already how United States soldiers barely a year and a half ago gathered on the front steps of the United States Army headquarters in Frankfurt, Germany, and booed the commanding general, Joseph T. McNarney? All in plain sight of the conquered Germans.

That, citizens, is a thing to think about if you wonder whether Communists have ever got into the Government of the United States in a significant and serious way.

Well, and when OSS, OPA, etc., began to fade, what happened to our Communists on the Government pay roll?

Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, less than 3 weeks ago, admitted to a committee of Congress that the reputation of the once great United States State Department has fallen "very low," since the OSS, OWI, etc., crowd had been blanketed into it by the thousands.

For in with the rest, went the Communists, their fellow travelers, sympathizers, dupes, dopes and tools. Such as these were the ones who enmeshed Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in the Hanns Eisler passport case, of which you will be hearing details before very long.

Hanns Eisler, in case you may have forgotten, is the Hollywood musical composer-brother of Gerhard Eisler, now accused by the House Un-American Activities Committee as a leading Russian spy.

The same committee promises a full public hearing on the queer details of Hann's own story in a few days, and instructive it will be, too, as a lesson in how things were going around here in the Roosevelt heydey.

And the trouble is that Mr. Truman has not brought a substantial change. He is making ferocious talk at the Communists in Greece, Turkey, Germany and so forth.

It is the kind of talk that brings on war, as anybody who was alive and reading the papers from 1933 onward can realize.

But what is he doing about the Communists on the pay roll of the United States right here in Washington, D. C.? What is he doing today and what was he doing this time a year ago? The Communists certainly are dangerous people, declared enemies of our constitutional government which it is their aim and purpose to overthrow by force and violence.

Why has Mr. Truman tolerated them, then? They were just as dangerous a year ago as they are today and they were just as dangerous 10 years ago. Yet here they are and here they were, all the time.

How about letting the Federal Bureau of Investigation loose on these beauties? J. Edgar Hoover has been an expert on the Communists for 38 years. He knows more about them than any other American and he has the best record against them of any American. And when he speaks he deals in facts, not oratory.

How about Hoover making a series of detailed addresses to the whole Nation on communism while President and Congress listen to a man who knows his business? And then how about following Hoover's outline to kick the Communists out of our own United States of America before we get tangled up in any more bloody affrays abroad?

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Admittedly, President Truman's speech was a sharp, tough, undiplomatic bill of particulars, charging Soviet Russia with crimes and misdemeanors and announcing that the United States was sick and tired of being played for a sentimental sucker. Admittedly, in other times, such a speech might have been regarded as a declaration of war. Even so, the Russian bluff had to be called sooner or later and had it been called at the Tehran Conference, it would have cost less.

But this must be recognized: The Russians forced the issue. I do not suppose that there is an instance in history which parallels the abuse, the badgering, the umbrage that this country has taken at the hands of the Russians since VJ-day.

It is beyond belief that any powerful and proud nation could be so publicly humiliated—and accept the humiliation, even giving the appearance of liking it.

Take, for instance, the atom bomb. Including all the fear propaganda of the hysterical scientists, the facts are that the United States first produced and used the atom bomb. Others nearly made one, but we did make bombs and no one else has made them. At Potsdam, our delegation agreed to release our knowledge. The Acheson-Lilienthal report was a gesture of unnecessary and unwise nobility of purpose. The Smyth report put the principal data on the table for anyone to see.

Then Bernard Baruch went into UN with a proposal that was excessively generous. This country would turn what was its own over to UN on condition of universal control and inspection. The Russians have been kicking that proposal around as though we owed them something. They have been arrogant, impudent, outrageous in their attitude and conduct. Under other circumstances, this Nation would not have taken such insults as it has even smilingly taken from Gromyko. But patience does wear.

Or take the instance of the implementation of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. The liberated nations were to have free and unfettered elections and to select governments of their own choosing.

The Russians have forced Communist governments upon the liberated nations and have even forced most of them to become abject Soviet satellites, controlled by officials appointed by the Kremlin. Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and even Austria and Hungary, have suffered from this vicious betrayal of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements by Russia.

And when the United States protested Russian misconduct, the Russians resorted to a propaganda of abuse, even utilizing their own agency in the United States, the Communist Party and its various front organizations, to defame the United States, to lie about this country, to create disorders. Imagine a nation that permits a government owned, operated, and edited press to say that our contributions to the war were trivial, that Soviet Russia won the war without us, even in the Far East where Russia was neutral until 5 or 6 days before the war was ended.

Or take the abuse of American charity and benevolence, this country having contributed 72 percent of the cost of UNRRA and Soviet Russia and her satellites getting the principal benefits, up to nearly 80 percent. Soviet Russia contributed practically nothing to UNRRA. Yet because UNRRA was operating on territory controlled by Soviet Russia, food and other goods were used politically to strengthen the Soviet control of the peoples whom we were saving from starvation and death. This became such a scandal that UNRRA had to be abandoned and Herbert Hoover was sent on his two trips to discover what we ought to do to feed the needy who were being betrayed.

Finally, we know beyond question that what Soviet Russia is attempting to do in Greece she is also trying to do out of Cuba and Mexico, namely to foment Communist revolutions to keep the world in disorder, to prevent the liquidation of the war.

And even here in the United States, serious strikes in crucial industries have been Communist in origin, designed to prevent the United States from achieving full recovery.

A halt had to be called sooner or later to the conquest of the world by abuse and political infiltration. Harry Truman did not act too soon. It had to come.

Limitations of UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, since the President's message of March 12 dealing with Greece and Turkey there has been much discussion of the role of the United Nations in this matter. Mr. James Reston, a most respected member of that distinguished group of New York Times' experts on foreign affairs, has written an exceedingly enlightening article on that subject this morning and points out clearly the limitations of the United Nations in the present crisis and the reasons therefor. I think it of sufficient interest to call to the attention of all Members of Congress:

UN HELD A POOR SCAPEGOAT IN DEBATING NEW UNITED STATES POLICY—ORGANIZATION LACKS FUNDS, TROOPS, AUTHORITY—SOVIET BREAKING OF COMMITMENTS CITED

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 17.—Whenever the United States is faced with a difficult decision, as it now is over the loans to Greece and Turkey, the popular tendency is to evade the decision if possible, and if not possible to toss it to some amenable scapegoat.

That is where we are now in Washington. We are in the middle of a hunt for scapegoats. First on the list, of course, are the British. Until a month ago they were blamed for being in Greece; now they are blamed for proposing to get out.

The Congress blames the Administration for raising the questions so quickly and the Administration quietly blames the Congress for not dealing with the question sooner; for example, at the time of the British loan debate.

Another popular candidate is the United Nations. Why doesn't the United Nations deal with this? it is asked. Wasn't it supposed to maintain peace and security.

SOME PERTINENT ANSWERS

These questions about the United Nations are asked not only by those on Capitol Hill who want to find an excuse for doing nothing or very little about President Truman's proposals but also by some persons who are sincerely worried that the Truman doctrine sabotages the new security organization. It therefore may be useful to record the answers that are given here to the United Nations questions.

The first answer is that the United Nations cannot deal with the broad problem of postwar economic reconstruction because it has no money. It received authority to study economic problems and make recommendations on how to deal with them, but it cannot even get enough money out of the members to do its recommending job properly, let alone get money to reconstruct Europe and Asia.

Secondly, the United Nations cannot deal with the fighting along the Greek-Yugoslav border because it has no troops at its disposal. It can send commissions of inquiry to the region, as it has done, and it can focus public opinion on the activities of the Communists and Royalists there, but both the Communists and Royalists are singularly indifferent to argument, and even the United Nations commission of inquiry in Greece has not been able to halt the border skirmishes.

Thirdly, the United Nations cannot halt the expansion of communism even when it does get the forces and facilities that were supposed to be allocated to the Security Council long ago. It cannot do so because it was not designed to punish the big nations and it could not get authority to send its troops to an area to maintain order unless it can get the approval of all the big states including the Soviet Union.

SOVIET ACTIONS CITED

Those who wish to see the United Nations deal with the military aspects of the problem, therefore, need merely look at the reasons why the United Nations does not have any forces behind it, and ask themselves whether they honestly believe that the Soviet Union would vote to send United Nations troops to Greece if there were any United Nations troops.

For 6 months after the Military Staff Committee of the Security Council started operating in New York last spring, the Soviet Union not only refused to come forward with a suggestion about how the United Nations forces should be established, but even refused to discuss the principles that should govern the creation of the United Nations forces.

Now the Russians have agreed to discuss the principles of establishing such a force, but there is no agreement on these principles, and there is little likelihood that there will be such agreement in the near future. This, therefore, blocks military action by the United Nations, even if we assume that the Soviet Union would agree to allow United Nations contingents to police the Greek Communists.

The central point about the United Nations and the two problems raised by President

Truman last week—the problem of economic reconstruction and the problem of aggressive communism—is that neither problem would have arisen if the Soviet Union had lived up to its commitments under the United Nations Charter.

THREE BASIC PREMISES

This charter was based on one fundamental belief and two basic assumptions. The belief—it would be more accurate to call it a promise—was that the five major powers—United States, U. S. S. R., Great Britain, France, and China—would and could achieve unity among themselves.

The two assumptions on which this promise rested were, first, that all the nations really wanted peace and were prepared to cooperate with each other to achieve it, and, second, that they would "fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter."

The obligations they assumed under the charter were quite specific. They said they would "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state."

They said they would "settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

They said they would "develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

They said they would exhaust all means of reaching agreement before bringing their cases to the United Nations, and that they would use the new organization as a "center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

STALIN'S VIEWS RECALLED

Because the big states said they would do these things, and because they made clear that they would not join the organization unless the other nations took them at their word, what was established was not an organization to police or punish the big states but an association of independent states to police and, if necessary, to punish everybody but the big states.

Unfortunately, however, the promise was not kept by the Soviet Union in Iran, Greece, Poland, Bulgaria, or Rumania. Unity was not achieved. Political sovereignty was not respected. If the promise had been kept, the United Nations would have been able to deal with the security aspects of the Greek question because these aspects of it would not have arisen.

Premier Stalin agreed that the British should go into Greece and organize the reconstruction there in the first place. When they did go in, a civil war, fomented mainly by the Communists, broke out, despite the fact that the Communists at the time were part of the Greek Government.

At Yalta, despite the anti-British propaganda on the Soviet radio, Premier Stalin expressed his "complete confidence" in the British policy in Greece. Later, on July 31, 1945, Foreign Minister Molotov, after complaining at Potsdam about the British policy in Greece, reviewed a memorandum by former Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden on the subject and again agreed to drop the subject.

The Soviet attacks, however, went on and two attempts were made to solve it through debates in the United Nations. But the problem continued because the principles of the United Nations Charter were not respected, and the problem continues today.

There are many criticisms that can be made of United States policy in dealing with the Greek-Turkish problem and the world economic reconstruction problem in the past, and many more that can be made about the way in which it is being dealt with now.

But the United Nations is a poor scapegoat. It cannot be blamed for failing to deal with problems it never was designed to solve. And its principles are not invalid just because the Soviet Union will not abide by them.

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the schools of Minnesota and of the Nation are facing a serious problem because of the exhaustion of Federal funds to carry out obligations entered into under the National School Lunch Act of 1946. This was one of the best and most useful measures passed by the last Congress, and has contributed a great deal to the health and well-being of our children especially in rural areas.

I appeal to the distinguished members of the Committee on Appropriations to act quickly on a request from the Secretary of Agriculture for additional funds for this program. This request for funds I am advised should come to the committee at an early date, and I hope that an appropriation for the school-lunch program will be included in the next urgent deficiency bill.

The letter which follows sets forth better than I can the usefulness and real need for this program in the State of Minnesota:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, February 26, 1947.

Hon. JOHN BLATNIK,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BLATNIK: At a meeting held at Chicago, February 20, of representatives of nine State agencies administering the school-lunch program—including Minnesota—the attached resolution was adopted and transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture setting forth the serious condition confronting our several States because of the inadequacy of the appropriation for this fiscal year to carry the program to June 1947.

In Minnesota there are 1,275 schools serving lunches to some 150,000 children daily, and the present allotment of Federal funds will assist in carrying the program to only the last week in March.

The rural school children, particularly, because of school consolidations, the transportation problem, and the long day away from home are receiving benefits through this hot-plate lunch with milk from the standpoint of health and enhancement of scholastic status that are outstanding.

In the small town and rural schools because of increased food and labor costs it has been necessary to increase the charge to the youngster on an average to 15 cents per meal from the 10 cents previously paid. I am afraid a further increase would be demoralizing so far as participation is concerned. The children, the communities, and the school boards in Minnesota are matching better than $3 for $1 expenditure of Federal funds. Unless further grants in aid are made available to Minnesota, Federal assistance will be cut off the last week in March. Approximately 12 percent may be able to continue without Federal aid.

Federal allotment for Minnesota to date is $1,079,106.02. This State will require approximately $345,000 additional Federal aid to satisfy present contracts with the school boards.

The school lunch lends itself admirably as an outlet for farm products. To illustrate: We will use over 19,000,000 half pints of milk in the schools this year.

May I respectfully request that this matter receive your immediate and serious consideration, particularly in fulfillment of the obligation to the schools for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Yours very truly,
DEAN M. SCHWEICKHARD,
Commissioner of Education.

The Big Question: What Will Our World Role Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Reston, from the New York Times of March 16, 1947:

THE BIG QUESTION: WHAT WILL OUR WORLD ROLE BE?—INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STABILITY DEPEND ON ANSWER

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—When President Truman decided to present his new foreign policy to Congress, he is understood to have considered these alternatives:

1. He could emphasize that the purpose of the policy was the creation of world security through the use of American economic power and political influence and assert that this was an extremely expensive but necessary operation that would cost us, if it were to be effective, more than $5,000,000,000 a year; or

2. He could merely identify the goal of creating a world order of free nations and emphasize instead the narrow, immediate problem of getting $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey.

The argument for the first plan was that it would be a more complete appraisal of the true cost of attaining the President's long-range objective, and it might destroy the illusion, which is still prevalent on Capitol Hill, that there is a cheap way to block Communist expansion and create a democratic world order.

The disadvantages of this course, however, were obvious. Since there is usually a gap between what is necessary and what is obtainable, the President was confronted with the fact that to ask for so large an immediate appropriation was to run the risk of being repudiated altogether.

The fear of this drove him to the second plan. He adopted the traditional one-step-at-a-time technique. He merely identified the goal and emphasized the immediate need in Greece and Turkey.

THE LARGER QUESTION

This plan, too, however, has fundamental disadvantages. By concentrating on Greece and Turkey, the much larger and much more important question of whether we are ready to create political and economic stability in the world is being minimized. The President can always say—and his speech will bear him out—that Greece and Turkey were only one aspect of the problem, and that for our own security we had to help not only

Greece and Turkey but, as he said, "all free peoples" who "are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures."

In spite of these sentences in the speech, however, the fact remains that, in the preliminaries of the congressional debate the main question raised by the speech is in danger of again being evaded. The issue is not whether we want to help Greece and Turkey; vital as this question is, it is merely the immediate problem that discloses the larger issue. The basic point is whether the United States is willing to pay the price of creating world economic and political stability, which is threatened by the decline of British power and the rise of Soviet power.

The President's analysis of what the Congress would or would not approve was undoubtedly correct. Even his stanchest supporters on Capitol Hill are inclined to admit that he would not have been able to get from an economy-minded Congress, during income-tax week, support for the broader program.

The central fact is that after a vast civil war within the capitalist world, starting in 1914 and not yet finished, the nations which maintained what stability there was in the nineteenth-century world have fought and bled each other into a state of physical exhaustion and economic bankruptcy.

At the same time the Soviet state, center of a world movement bent on creating a Communist federation, has risen to challenge not only the independence of weak sovereign states but to defy the very essence of our belief in individual liberty.

This Soviet state and system are concerned to take over wherever they can without getting into a fight. We do not have to oppose them. We can let them fill the vacuums in Greece and Turkey. We can abandon the Near and Middle East to a contest between a retreating Britain and an advancing communism. This will not require any appropriations now.

It is a seductive philosophy that we should give them their head and let them shoulder the responsibilities of running Europe and Asia. Joseph P. Kennedy argues that they should be allowed to overrun Europe if necessary, and he concludes that they will fail and the peoples of these areas will get tired of them and throw them out.

EVIDENCE OF HISTORY

Unfortunately, there is no evidence in history that any people who ever were taken over completely by the Communists were ever able to throw them out and choose another form of government. Also, unfortunately, history does not support the thesis that nations can preserve their own freedom by bartering the freedom of others. Moreover, nobody who has watched the Soviet block system working in the United Nations or observed the Soviet system of closed state monopoly trading with other nations is clear about how we would keep our own people working when our world markets were nibbled by a Communist federation.

Therefore, even if the question were debated in terms of dollars alone (which would be skipping a lot of pretty important things), it is questionable which is the more expensive system, facing up to the tremendously expensive and admittedly dangerous business of blocking Communist expansion and helping rebuild a community of free democratic states, or postponing the decision and following the equally dangerous assumption that the Soviet Union will be indifferent or inefficient about establishing a Communist world system.

The Congress has repeatedly emphasized that while the shooting war may be over, we are still engaged in a kind of ideological, political, and even military war of maneuver. At the same time, however, the Congress assumes that it can fight this war with peacetime financing.

AWARE OF DILEMMA

Mr. Truman and his advisers are aware of this dilemma at home and within our own Government. They wanted to state the positive side of the Truman doctrine, namely, that communism could be fought effectively with money, in the west of Europe, for example. But they accepted the conclusion that the Congress would not face up to the kind of fundamental, long-range, expensive program necessary to achieve the positive objective and had to be nursed along a step at a time.

There is nothing new in this. The most successful way to introduce a foreign policy in Congress is to oversell it piecemeal in an atmosphere of crisis. The tendency was to present the United Nations as a straight antidote for war and power politics. The tendency was to claim, in the height of the legislative battle, that the British loan would solve Britain's problems and the Bretton Woods agreements would end world economic chaos.

The same technique of overstatement in time of crisis is being applied on Capitol Hill on the Greek and Turkish loan. Even those in Congress who are in favor not only of the Turkish and Greek aspects of the problem, but of the fundamental long-range objectives as well, frankly are afraid to stress the fundamental question lest the military aspects of the Greek and Turkish loans be rejected.

The fundamental question, however, keeps bobbing to the surface.

All the implications of the British economic decline were evident at the time of the debate on the British loan. At that time, endless private conversations were held on the political aspects of the problem and proposals were made that the broad question of world economic reconstruction be raised and debated out.

In the last analysis, however, it was drafted like a banker's loan to a dubious client and political and economic claims were made for it that were justified neither by the terms of the loan nor the facts of the world economic and political crisis.

The question, therefore, before the Congress is whether they are going to deal with the basic question of what it takes to oppose Soviet expansion and to create the kind of world in which we can have jobs and freedom, or whether we are going to refuse to face it, as we refused to face the Greek crisis a year ago, and the British economic crisis eighteen months ago.

It cannot be said that the British did not warn us that their economic situation was desperate and that the Greek situation was critical. Never in the history of nations has so much information been exchanged about an economic problem as has been exchanged between Whitehall and Pennsylvania Avenue in the last two years. We did not, however, deal with the problem when we had time, and now the argument is that we do not have time to deal with it effectively.

DIRECT CHALLENGE

It is probably true that the decision on Greece and Turkey cannot wait. The President has challenged the Soviet Union in one of the most direct public statements ever issued by the head of a major state. The Congress cannot even amend his proposals without encouraging the elements Mr. Truman asked them to oppose and hurting the people he asked them to help.

But once this is out of the way, it is generally admitted, the major question of what this country can and will do to create a peaceful world will be even more urgent because it will be assumed that acceptance of the loan program indicates support of the entire program.

At that time, it is hoped, the United States will undertake a series of direct conversations: first, with the British to determine how much they are compelled by necessity to contract their overseas commitments; second, with the Russians to discover how far they are determined to expand or cooperate; and, third, and most important, with ourselves, to find out whether we are going to pay the price of leadership or the price of indifference.

Four Songs We Sing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the songs a people sing reflect the soul of the Nation. At public gatherings during the war I was repeatedly impressed by the fervor with which Americans of all ages sang four songs: My Country 'Tis of Thee—America, God Bless America, America the Beautiful, and the Star-Spangled Banner.

Believing that a little information on the background and writing of each one will be of public value in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have assembled such information with the assistance of the Congressional Library and present it at this time:

MY COUNTRY 'TIS OF THEE—AMERICA

The circumstances surrounding the writing of My Country 'Tis of Thee were described in later life by the author, Samuel Francis Smith (1808–1895), and his story is quoted by John Tasker Howard in Our American Music: [1]

"The origin of my hymn, My Country 'Tis of Thee, is briefly told. In the year 1831, Mr. William C. Woodbridge returned from Europe, bringing a quantity of German music books which he passed over to Lowell Mason. Mr. Mason, with whom I was on terms of friendship, one day turned them over to me, knowing that I was in the habit of reading German works, saying, 'Here, I can't read these, but they contain good music, which I should be glad to use. Turn over the leaves, and if you find anything particularly good, give me a translation or imitation of it, or write a wholly original song—anything, so I can use it.'

"Accordingly, one leisure afternoon, I was looking over the books, and fell in with the tune of 'God Save the King,' and at once took up my pen and wrote the piece in question. It was struck out at a sitting, without the slightest idea that it would ever attain the popularity it has since enjoyed. I think it was first written in the town of Andover, Mass., in February 1832.

"The first time it was sung publicly was at a children's celebration of American independence, at the Park Street Church, Boston, I think, July 4, 1832. If I had anticipated the future of it, doubtless I would have taken more pains with it. Such as it is, I am glad to have contributed this mite to the cause of American freedom."

Howard goes on to point out that Smith's memory played him false on two points, for surviving programs and newspaper accounts make it clear that Woodbridge returned from Europe in 1829, not 1831, and that the first

[1] Third edition published by Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1946, cf. pp. 127–128.

performance was Independence Day, 1831, not 1832.

Curiously enough, Smith claimed in later life that he had not realized at the time that the tune to which he wrote his words was that of the British national anthem.

Various theories about the origin of this tune have been advanced, but Howard concludes that "It is probable that it was really written by Henry Carey (1685?–1743), the English composer of Sally in Our Alley. Carey sang the song, with the words 'God Save Great George Our King,' at a tavern in Cornhill in 1740 on the occasion of a dinner party held to celebrate Admiral Vernon's capture of Porto Bello. He announced that the words and music were his own, and it is probable that they were, for he would have had a hard time escaping detection had he stolen so striking a melody."

Whatever the origin of the air, Samuel Francis Smith deserves credit for having given undying expression to the concept of freedom which is at the heart of the American idea. Each stanza contains some reference to liberty or freedom.

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

Like My Country 'Tis of Thee, America the Beautiful was originally written with no thought of its becoming a national air. Katharine Lee Bates (1859–1929) was a teacher of English literature at Wellesley College (Massachusetts) who added to her teacher's income by writing poetry, travel books, commentaries on English classics, and stories of all kinds. In the summer of 1893 she made her first trip west and was profoundly impressed by the variegated splendor of western scenery, especially by the vast panorama glimpsed in a brief trip to the top of Pike's Peak.

The ascent was made, she later said,[2] "by the only method then available for people who were not vigorous enough to achieve the climb on foot, nor sufficiently adventurous for burro riding. Prairie wagons, their tailboards emblazoned with the traditional slogan, 'Pike's Peak or Bust,' were pulled by horses up to the halfway house, where the horses were relieved by mules. We were hoping for half an hour on the summit, but two of our party became so faint in the rarefied air that we were bundled into the wagons again and started on our downward plunge so speedily that our sojourn on the peak remains in memory hardly more than one ecstatic gaze.

"It was then and there, as I was looking out over the sealike expanse of fertile country spreading away so far under those ample skies, that the opening lines of the hymn floated into my mind. When we left Colorado Springs the four stanzas were pencilled in my notebook, together with other memoranda, in verse and prose, of the trip."

The four stanzas remained in Miss Bates' notebook until 2 years later, when she copied them out and sent them to the Congregationalist, which printed them in its Independence Day issue, 1895.

The reaction was immediate and widespread. So many were the requests for the poem's republication, and so numerous were the tunes to which it was set, that the author decided to rewrite it, simplifying the language somewhat in an effort to make her message appeal as widely and directly as possible.

It is this revised version which was copyrighted (in 1904) and which is almost invariably used today.

Although many original musical settings have been composed for Miss Bates' poem, the music to which it is usually sung nowadays is the hymn-tune Materna, written by Samuel Augustus Ward (1848–1903) and frequently sung to the words "O mother dear, Jerusalem." Undoubtedly this setting enhances the quiet dignity and idealism of the poem.

The newest of America's patriotic hymns, America the Beautiful, is neither warlike nor frivolous in character and has also the virtue of belonging wholly to America. Its popularity, the author herself said not long before her death, "is clearly due to the fact that Americans are at heart idealists, with a fundamental faith in human brotherhood."

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

The exact origins of the tune for the national anthem are still surrounded by controversy. It has been ascribed to Samuel Arnold, the director of the orchestra of the Anacreontic Society, and to John Stafford Smith, who published an "harmonization" of the melody in 1799.

Although it may very probably go back to some earlier incarnation, it makes its first appearance as the constitutional song of the Anacreontic Society in London during the 1770's. The president of the society, Ralph Tomlinson, wrote the words in 1775 or 1776. These words were first printed separately in 1778, and shortly thereafter, the London publisher, Longman & Broderip, brought out the first edition with music.

Contact between England and America was so close in publishing matters at this time, that the tune probably reached these shores almost immediately thereafter, although the first definite evidence of this is the publication in the New York newspapers of a parody to be sung to the tune in 1793. Shortly afterward, the words, To Anacreon in Heaven, appear in the songs of the period, and the melody gradually becomes one of the most popular vehicles for parodies written for all sorts of patriotic occasions—Washington's birthday and Fourth of July banquets leading the list.

Over a hundred such parodies are known dating from before 1814, one of which was written by Francis Scott Key himself in 1806 for a dinner celebrating the return of Decatur from his engagements in the Mediterranean. This earlier parody is important in that it includes certain anticipations of Key's later poem written to be sung to the same tune, notably the line: "By the light of the star-spangled flag of our Nation," and the repeated rhyme of the final couplet—wave, brave.

The origin of the words of our national anthem can be more fully documented.

The British fleet that had been blockading Chesapeake Bay received reinforcements during the late spring and summer of 1814 which were supposed to enable it to attack and take New Orleans. Before leaving the bay, however, the British decided to attack Washington. Since the Capitol was defended almost entirely by completely untrained militia, the attack was so successful that on returning to their boats in the bay, the British decided to teach another "lesson" of the same sort to Baltimore.

In the meantime, Dr. Beanes, an elderly physician of Upper Marlboro, had entertained the British rather lavishly on their way to Washington, but turned his coat again a little too rapidly for them before their retreat had been accomplished, and consequently the British picked him up and took him back to the fleet. Dr. Beanes' friends were unable to obtain his release, and they therefore approached Key, since he was a prominent lawyer of Washington with political connections.

Key obtained the necessary letters, and left on September 2 for Baltimore, where he found Col. John S. Skinner, the Government's cartel officer for the exchange of prisoners, prepared for a trip to the British fleet in a sloop, owned by John Ferguson but otherwise unidentified. They came up to the fleet on September 7 opposite the mouth of the Potomac, persuaded the British to release Beanes eventually, but were told that the whole party would have to stay on board the British boats until after the attack on Baltimore for fear that they would bear news of the impending attack to Baltimore.

The British arrived off Baltimore on Sunday, the 11th. The main attack was to have been made by land along North Point, the flat spine of land bounding the northern shore of the outlet of the Patapsco River and leading directly to the city of Baltimore. A group of smaller vessels was moved up the bay for a frontal attack on Fort McHenry. Key and Skinner were allowed to return to their own sloop under guard, but were ordered to anchor near the mouth of the river During the night of the 11th, the British landed a force on North Point under the command of General Ross. Fairly early the next morning, while proceeding slowly up the strip of land, General Ross was picked off by an American sniper before any actual engagement had taken place. The loss of their general did not stop the advance, but the British—both men and officers—were considerably demoralized by it.

The success of the British attack on Washington, particularly their burning of the Capitol, had so electrified all the large cities along the eastern coast that the citizens, from beggars to bankers, had pitched in to build fortifications and trenches surrounding their cities.

General Smith, who was in command of the American forces, had had the fortifications constructed just outside of the city, and quite obviously had no intention of making a serious effort to stop the British on their advance up the point until they reached the trenches. In order not to reveal this strategy too clearly, two feints against the British were made during the day, but in such insufficient strength that it hardly delayed their advance.

When they arrived at the fortifications late that afternoon, however, the British suddenly discovered that they were up against a great deal more than they had expected. Their only hope was to take the fortifications in the confusion of a surprise night attack, and a messenger was sent to the fleet off Fort McHenry to arrange for a counter-disturbance by water.

Admiral Cochrane, in charge of the fleet, had only recently arrived from England with orders to proceed against New Orleans, and when he learned what the real situation was, he disliked risking his fleet and any substantial body of men in an unauthorized attack which gave every appearance of being difficult to accomplish and which might easily jeopardize his later success at New Orleans. In addition, his attack on Fort McHenry had revealed no weakness in this direction. The guns on the fort were small and the shots would not carry for more than a mile. It was a simple matter for the British ships to stay outside of this range and lob bombs and rockets into the star-shaped fort at will.

Nonetheless, about three that afternoon, when some of the British ships had floated too close, the Fort opened up and the ships had to withdraw. Cochrane therefore sent word back to the land detachment, saying that he could not mount a full scale sea attack, giving the impression likewise that he felt it would be wise for the land forces to withdraw without pressing the matter to an issue. Since it was too late for an additional exchange of messages, however, he agreed to stage the desired distraction in the bay at 1 o'clock that night, in case the land forces wished to take advantage of it.

This promise was carried out by a few small boats which slipped past the fort. They were soon discovered, but managed to send up some blue lights as the distraction

[2] Quoted by C. A. Browne, The Story of Our National Ballads, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1931 (rev. ed.), pp. 270–274.

before they were driven off. The army took no advantage of them, however, since they were already retreating down the point under cover of darkness, and the following day returned to the ships at the mouth of the harbor.

Key had watched the bombardment of the fort during the day of the 13th and all during the following evening.

After the distraction, however, the bombardment ceased, and there was no way of telling in the dark whether the attack had been successful or the British had decided to withdraw. Tension on the cartel ship increased as the night advanced, and Key and Skinner paced the deck most of the night. There were light, intermittent rains, and visibility was poor when dawn finally came. At last, through the mists of the deep, they made out the flag still flying on Fort McHenry.

In the excitement produced by this release from tension, Key began composing his poem, jotting down notes and important lines on the back of an envelope he found in his pocket. That evening, on returning to shore, he wrote out a clean draft of the full poem in his room at the hotel.

The following morning, Colonel Skinner came to see him, and the two men took the draft of the poem to the offices of the Baltimore American, where it was set up and printed in broadside form. On the 20th and 21st, it was run in two Baltimore newspapers—the Patriot and the American—and from there on the fame of the song spread rapidly.

GOD BLESS AMERICA

Although many songs have achieved popularity only after an uphill fight against public indifference, God Bless America remained unknown for over 20 years because of the composer's own indifference. It was written by Pvt. Irving Berlin (then of Camp Upton, N. Y.) in 1917, as part of Yip! Yip! Yaphank! the This Is the Army of World War I.

Apparently the composer felt the song unworthy to stand alongside of Gee, How I Hate To Get Up in the Morning and other hits of his earlier show, for by opening night God Bless America had been cast aside. Soon after the armistice, Irving Berlin founded his own music-publishing house and continued to turn out hit after hit, but God Bless America was not among them.

Only in 1938, when Kate Smith wanted a new and different patriotic song for her Amistice Day broadcast, did Berlin bring forth the discarded manuscript and allow it to be performed for the first time in public.

That performance, 21 years late though it was, proved to be something of a sensation.

In the beginning, only Kate Smith was allowed to sing the song, but it was published in 1939 (by Irving Berlin, Inc., New York City), and for a period gained steadily in popularity. A National Committee for Music Appreciation, Mme. Olga Samaroff-Stokowski, chairman, awarded the author-composer a prize for having written (in 1917) the best composition of 1940.

The American people themselves awarded the song's creator some $50,000 in royalties during its first 2 years in print, though Berlin appointed a board of trustees to assume charge of the royalties and spend them on behalf of the Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts of America.

An honor of another sort was accorded the song during the presidential campaign of 1940, when both major parties appropriated the tune, sometimes adapting to it words of their own devising.

These four songs offer a variety in range and in musical appeal. Through all of them, however, run the basic love of country and freedom which stir the emotions of patriotism and inspire nobility of conduct. So may it ever be.

A Public Welfare Crusader Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial entitled "A Public Welfare Crusader Retires," which appeared in the Standard-Star, published in New Rochelle, N. Y., on February 24, 1947:

A PUBLIC WELFARE CRUSADER RETIRES

Homer Folks, of Yonkers, has been such a prominent part of the social welfare front in this State and Nation that it appears unthinkable that—at this day—it is possible for him suddenly not to be a part of it.

The announcement is made that, after over a half century of service as its executive officer, Mr. Folks is retiring from the State Charities Aid Association. He has occupied that post since February 1, 1893, except for a term of office as New York City's Welfare Commissioner and for the periods he served abroad during and after World War I.

This Yonkers neighbor of ours, whom we have known as a No. 1 friend and supporter of everything affecting our social and economic life, is regarded as a virtual giant beyond our borders—in public welfare, in public health, in child conservation, in tuberculosis elimination. He has been a powerhouse of imaginative planning and vigorous application in the oldest fields of relief among unfortunates and among the newest, like modern mental hygiene.

When he was selected in 1940 to receive the Roosevelt Distinguished Service Medal, granted to few Americans, the Roosevelt Memorial Association described him as "a student, a dreamer, a crusader, and, at the same time, a man of action and executive force."

We know him, as he enters his 80th year, as a distinguished pioneer in poverty-prevention, as an explorer into the nature and causes of poverty, as a researcher in the realm of social economics with an amazing talent to come up with problem-solutions.

Mr. Folks was entitled to his retirement some years ago, and he had then contemplated severing his active connections with the association, but the war drew away many social workers and staff members, and he was prevailed upon to stay on. We're glad he did. For he has probably done more than any other man in Westchester, perhaps more than any other man in America, to demonstrate for the community and for the people at large the high value of our social workers.

Unfortunately, not enough of us realize the down-to-earth, far-reaching value of tuberculosis control, of mental hygiene, of child welfare, of public welfare, and of the other fields in which Mr. Folks pioneered—and in which, because of him to a large degree, Westchester also pioneered.

Homer Folks may be terminating his daily treks into the association's offices on East Twenty-second Street in New York, but his heart still will be in the welfare service to which he has given so generously and so richly during a most productive lifetime.

He may be "retired" in a physical sense, beginning to enjoy the leisurely relaxation which belonged to him years ago, but his contributions to a better city, county, State and Nation are bound to flow on.

So constituted is Mr. Folks that not even he could halt that fountain of public service into which he has fashioned his life since earliest manhood.

Should Congress Approve the President's Proposed Loans to Greece and Turkey?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System last Friday evening:

Ladies and gentlemen, one of the main reasons you elected a Republican Congress last fall was because you had been designedly maneuvered into World War II by the New Deal. After we were in it, your patriotism prompted you to go along with that party until the war was won. Then you spoke your true sentiment.

President Truman's message to Congress amounts to an urgent request that Congress declare the existence of a national emergency, which, if complied with, more likely than not, foreshadows World War III.

The same insidious pattern President Roosevelt followed to put you into World War II is now being pursued to inveigle you into World War III.

Surely everyone remembers the steps that were taken before the United States actually declared war on Japan and Germany. First it was "Repeal neutrality." Next, "Repeal arms embargo." Then "cash and carry" of munitions for certain countries at war. Then transfer of battleships, followed by lend-lease, and so forth, until the country was "right" for actually declaring war. Now we are starting right off with guns and ships to Turkey and Greece.

If the President's request is granted, another global lend-lease program appears to be in sight, and the United States probably again will become the arsenal for what—heaven only knows.

Since the President's message other countries, including Yugoslavia—one of Russia's principal satellites—have indicated that they may be interested in obtaining financial aid from us. Others likely would appear upon our doorsteps until the whole category of nations that received lend-lease had their wants fulfilled. Outright involvement of the American people in war would be inevitable.

President Truman said this program had to be undertaken to stop communism. Are the American people to believe that you can buy or bribe a person or a nation from going Communist? Are we supposed to believe that communism can be stopped by war? Modern wars are the principal cause of communism. The only thing we can be sure was accomplished in the last war was the creation of more communism than had theretofore existed. Your sons and daughters suffered and died in the last war to completely communize Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Norway, Yugoslavia, Manchukuo, and Albania; and to put the remainder of Europe and a good portion of the rest of the world well on the way to communism.

It will take only one more war to make communism universal throughout the world, not excepting the United States. If another war comes, you and your neighbor will be completely regimented. You will then see controls over your daily lives that will make those you experienced in the last war seem mild indeed, and you will not get rid of them after the war. They will stay with you and generations to come.

Certainly liquidation of the British Empire would have serious repercussions upon the United States, but for us to save the Empire would mean that the United States would have to set itself up as conqueror of a great portion of the rest of the world and hold it by military force. Under no circumstances could we do this long without levying heavily upon the conquered nations. It is not in the nature of the United States to assume the powers of imperialism.

The United States is physically and financially incapable of undertaking this task. It is sheer madness to believe that we can or should. That would be too much for the United States in any event. But now this Nation is in a greatly weakened condition financially, economically, and morally, and to put upon us the strain that would be involved if we engaged in the task Truman's proposal foreshadows would bring a complete break-down of our economy and Government, followed by the same internal strife, warfare, and military dictatorship that has bedevilled Europe for the last thousand years.

It would not be merely a matter of the cost in maimed lives and other resources to prosecute World War III, but the terrible burden that would fall upon us following the war.

The United States will have to stop somewhere. We cannot support economically and financially the whole world. The cult of internationalism has already committed our Nation to more than it can deliver and endure. It must be stopped before it is too late.

The United States could do something to dampen the fires of communism that are raging in Europe and elsewhere by simply discontinuing the ill-advised policy of pouring out financial and other aid to the peoples involved. When we stop pampering them they will go to work and start on the way to sanity.

Let it not be forgotten that the New Deal officially recognized Communist Russia in 1933 and made it a full-fledged member of the Society of Nations. That act caused the infiltration of a horde of Russian citizens into our country who, with the pampering of the New Deal, spread their communistic ideology throughout the land. The New Deal has been as powerful a force in creating and spreading communism in our country and throughout the world as the Soviet Union. It comes with poor grace now for the New Deal to set itself up as protector of liberty.

Justice to Our Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, according to the Pathfinder of March 12, 1947, Secretary of State George Marshall is quoted as follows:

The American soldier in Japan costs the American taxpayer an average of $1,000 a month.

Apparently we are not disturbed at this expense. However, there is some sentiment in opposition to the increase of allowance to our returned veterans. A large number of those attending colleges in the United States are unable to complete their education to which they are entitled for having given so many years of service to their country. A speedy return of American soldiers, unnecessarily detained in Japan and other countries, and especially civilian personnel and ghost writers, would more than finance the Rogers bill, H. R. 870.

The essence of justice for our returned heroes is gratitude. When our boys and girls started out we said, "This country will never forget." Even now some are objecting to increasing this allowance of $65 per month for single men and $90 per month for married men in order that they may continue to prepare for their life's work.

Let us use a well-balanced and unbiased judgment here, coupled with courage and gratitude.

Why We Must Have Tax Relief Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 17, 1947:

WHY WE MUST HAVE TAX RELIEF NOW

When two such foremost public finance experts as Roswell Magill and John W. Hanes join in urging an immediate substantial slashing of income taxes all along the line, not much room for argument is left to the Democratic opposition or the few Republicans in Congress who have been so obstinately running counter to their party's policy.

Certainly it would be the height of folly for the Democrats to try to make political capital out of the issue of tax relief by attempting to stave off this reform until after next year's election.

Opponents' accusation that the tax relief move is a Republican game falls to the ground when it is considered that Mr. Magill and Mr. Hanes served as Under Secretaries of the Treasury in New Deal administrations and are speaking out so forthrightly now because they believe and know that the country's welfare is at stake.

Secretary Snyder has asserted that tax reduction should be postponed on the ground that the Government needs the money. But it has been clearly shown that the Government doesn't need nearly so much money as called for in Mr. Truman's swollen budget.

Mr. Magill and Mr. Hanes speak with authority when they warn that it would be positively dangerous to delay tax reduction. Their reasons for action now, not next year or the year after, are convincing.

Both perceive signs of a coming business recession which might spell serious trouble. This is the time to prepare against it. Means must be provided to enable business and industry to withstand a slackening of demands for their products and to maintain pay rolls and full employment.

The public's buying power must be sustained and strengthened. That power has been steadily shrinking under the burden of oppressive taxes.

Money taken from the pockets of the people by the Government doesn't go into productive enterprises. Every dollar of taxes not actually required for essential governmental expenses is worse than wasted.

This applies equally to the weakening of the buying power of consumers in the lower brackets, who need every dollar they can obtain for the necessaries of life, and to the heavy toll taken from the larger and the top incomes, which deprives industry of capital it must have to keep the wheels turning.

Tax reduction opponents can't get away from these facts, but they have now seized upon a new argument. It is that granting President Truman's request for $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey to support democracy against outside aggression will put tax cuts out of the question.

That would be a small item in a Federal budget of $31,500,000,000 or $33,000,000,000 which offers opportunity for still further cutting. If savings in other budget items are needed they must be made, but there isn't the shadow of an excuse for bypassing tax reduction.

On the direct contrary, tax reduction is made all the more necessary because of its powerful contribution to the increased industrial production demanded by our fresh responsibilities and commitments.

It is too much to expect individuals, whether they be managers or employers, to work harder and produce more if an exorbitant share of their increased earnings is to be taken away by an extravagant Government.

Mr. Hanes uses an apt expression in protesting against "a tax on brains, a stupid levy against the know-how and the managerial experience that are the Nation's greatest assets."

The full and efficient functioning of the country's economic machine, for our own sake and that of others, depends on releasing the tax brakes that have threatened to slow it to a standstill. Here is the case for the 20 percent measure of tax relief which now, more than ever, demands quick action.

Better Minds for Better Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article by Dean Arthur T. Vanderbilt, of New York University Law School, appearing in the New York Times magazine section of March 8, 1947. This is a timely discussion of the need of training our young men for more active participation in public affairs. His recommendations carried into effect would mean more efficient government so essential in the conduct of our highly complicated national and international affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER MINDS FOR BETTER POLITICS

DEAN VANDERBILT SAYS WE MUST TRAIN OUR YOUNG MEN TO TAKE A MORE ACTIVE ROLE IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

(By Arthur T. Vanderbilt)

In a country given to striking contrasts, the strangest of all, in view of our national history, is that disclosed by our tremendous capacity for patriotism in time of war and our general indifference to public affairs in

peace. In an emergency we do not hesitate to sacrifice our greatest treasure—the younger generation—and to mortgage our financial future for decades to come in almost prodigal expenditures for our national defense. Even in wartime, however, we are not really concerned with public affairs at home. We are too busy or too careless to attend to the first duty of a citizen in a democracy—voting.

In 1938, 38,000,000 people cast their ballots for Members of Congress. Four years later, in 1942, 11 months after Pearl Harbor, at a time when we knew we were in for the fight of our lives, only 28,000,000 people voted for Members of the war Congress. A bare 54 percent of the eligible voters were concerned as to who was to represent them in the body which would play a large part in the prosecution of a world-wide war and perhaps in the making of the peace. In 4 years there had been a sheer drop of 10,000,000 votes.

Complete statistics on the election of 1946 are not yet available, although estimates reflect an increase of about 6,500,000 over 1942. The vote was, nevertheless, about 3,500,000 short of 1938, notwithstanding the fact that the American people were obviously indulging in one of their favorite political pastimes—"kicking the rascals out." In primary elections, devoted to the vital task of choosing candidates for the political parties, it is notorious that a mere fraction of the vote cast at general elections comes out to the polls.

Most of our citizens do not even know the names of many of the officials they have elected to office. I make this assertion rather confidently from personal experience in a test made in ideal circumstances. One night during a campaign I was pressed into service to hold an audience in Montclair pending the arrival of a distinguished candidate. I suggested to an audience of two or three hundred, made up largely of county committee men and women, election board members, officers of political clubs, and public officeholders generally—all interested rather actively in politics—that we play a little game. Everyone would raise his hand and then drop it when a question was asked that he couldn't answer.

To insure fair play I announced at the end of the game I would quiz the winners. I then called for the names of the President, the Vice President (a few hands fell), the two United States Senators (more hands went down), their Congressman (not any Congressman from the county but the Congressman for their district—many more hands fell down), the State senator, the assemblymen, the sheriff, the county clerk, the surrogate, the county register, the county supervisor, the chosen freeholders (hands were falling like leaves in a hurricane), and the town commissioners.

I didn't have the heart to inquire as to the coroners and the justices of the peace. In this city of Montclair, "the Athens of America," rated by Prof. Edward L. Thorndike in his Your City as the second best city in America in which to live, only 2 percent of these practical politicians had survived the ordeal. What would be the rating of an ordinary audience in such a test?

I should not advise any reader of Dale Carnegie to play this game, but to any earnest seeker of the truth as to the political age of the American public in any particular community the test is sure to be illuminating. If we don't know even the names of our elected public officers, how slight must be our knowledge of their character and associations, their ability and policies? And if we don't know about our officials, both elective and appointed, how can we be said to know our Government, or be good citizens?

In a national poll conducted recently there was submitted the question, "Would you be willing to have your son enter politics?" Sixty-seven percent of the people responded that they would not. To a second question, "Do you believe a man can go into politics and remain honest?" 50 percent responded that they did not believe it was possible. Now, I do not believe that 50 percent of our politicians are dishonest, but I do submit that the fact that 50 percent of our people think so and that 67 percent of them are unwilling to have their sons enter politics, is cause for grave concern.

Lest we smugly think that our educated classes have higher civic standards than the average citizen, let me refer to a study made by Fortune a few years ago of the alumni of 12 of our most distinguished preparatory schools. Out of their 67,000 graduates these schools have produced but 27 United States Senators, one Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and one President.

Shortly after this study appeared the head of a prominent New England college in a speech at one of the very schools in question attempted to justify this deplorable lack of interest in public life by saying that politics in the United States was such a dirty game that no gentleman could afford to become mired in it. He neglected to mention the only alternative to what he called a dirty game—a world-wide cataclysm every quarter-century involving the sacrifice of our best blood and the undermining of our civilization.

The result of this neglect of responsibility for government by our educated citizens is strikingly reflected in a study made by Dean William E. Mosher, of Syracuse University, not so long ago of the membership of the county committees of the two great political parties in 18 of the larger cities of New York State, New York City being excluded by reason of its peculiar problems.

In these 18 cities 55 percent of the district leaders had not gone beyond grammar school. Only 12 percent were college men and women—and college men and women were defined for the purposes of this survey as including anyone who ever went to college, whether he was graduated or not and whether the institution was a college of liberal arts or a veterinary school. Of the collegians, two-fifths were lawyers. I am not disparaging the leaders who never went beyond grammar school. Many of them, I am sure, are honest and capable. I am simply pointing out that our college graduates as a class have not been sustaining the burden of public leadership, either at the top or at the bottom of the political ladder.

Such evidence of lack of interest in public affairs and of ignorance of our political leaders must make us consider how long our increasingly complicated system of government, which depends so largely on wise public opinion and active citizen participation, can retain its traditional character of encouraging the maximum of personal freedom and individual initiative consistent with the general welfare. Surely nobody doubts that a democratic, representative form of government is superior to any brand of totalitarianism. Surely everyone knows that no government, especially our own, is automatic.

True, in times of crisis, we are willing to give all, but why must patriotism be exclusively a wartime virtue? Why should we be willing to die or send our own to death to preserve our Nation and yet still be unwilling to give a very small fraction of our time and thought to preventing war by wise and effective government dominated by sound public opinion? Has history no meaning for us?

The causes of our lack of interest as citizens in our Government and for our failure to participate actively in politics are many. We live in an age of automatic machinery and we thoughtlessly liken government to a machine, which we fondly hope will work automatically, though we know when we stop to think about it that every liberty we enjoy has had to be fought for on the field of battle, in the legislative halls, or in the courts.

We know, or should know, that the fight for freedom is not completely won; eternal vigilance and a willingness to fight again and yet again are, indeed, the price of liberty. Freedom is our birthright, but only because our forebears were prepared to fight for it in peace as in war. Nor can we hand it on to succeeding generations, if we lack their proud spirit.

Vast numbers of citizens are preoccupied with personal affairs. Many of them contemplate public service—at some more convenient season. If they ever get around to it they are likely to find themselves out of touch with the spirit of the times, eager to be helpful but unable to adjust themselves to the differences between things they thought they knew and things as they actually are.

Politics is an art as well as a science, and it takes time as well as practice to acquire an art. Many natural leaders of public affairs, too, are engaged in industries where participation in politics is taboo. As the field of government expands and more institutions are subjected to public regulation, the number of men of ability who will be deemed ineligible for public success will unfortunately multiply greatly. The percentage of natural leaders of public affairs thus withdrawn from the arena of politics is much greater than one may at first imagine.

Another deterrent to political activity is the fact that government today is so complicated that participation in politics is not only time-consuming, but calls for a high degree of intellectual ability. There are relatively few men who can even pretend to be acquainted with the government of their city or county or State, not to mention the National Government.

Indeed, it may be doubted that the Government even knows itself. There is one Federal agency, the Office of Dependency Benefits, that a year ago aided 11,500,000 dependents of 6,000,000 soldiers by issuing 59,000,000 checks of the face value of $3,380,000,000, but it was not listed in the United States Government Manual or the Congressional Directory for at least 3 years.

Truly ours is a Government nobody knows. The very magnitude of the task of becoming acquainted with government is not only staggering, it is likely to create a sense of the futility of individual efforts.

The greatest obstacle to active participation in politics, however, is the attitude of people generally toward their government and the men who run it. "Politics is a dirty game," said the college president. "I don't want my son to enter politics," say 67 percent of the fathers and mothers. Anyone who enters politics is suspect.

Even though experts, such as Luther Gulick, president of the Institute of Public Administration, assure us that there is less direct dishonesty in politics than in business, the average citizen is still more suspicious of politicians and inclined to look down his nose at them. Certain it is that the politician may expect to be misrepresented in partisan attacks, to be misquoted, to be libeled and slandered. He will often recall with a sigh Shakespeare's words, "The greatest treasure mortal times afford is spotless reputation."

The ordinary man flinches at the thought of having his actions, his motives, his character misunderstood in the family circle, by his friends or the public, but the genuine citizen will wisely conclude that the pinpricks of partisanship are a small price to pay compared with what the citizen-soldier has been called upon to endure in war—especially with war still being waged in various parts of the world, and with the thought of war never far from the public mind these days.

What can be done to encourage men to be good citizens, to enter politics? The Navy is planning to take approximately 5 percent of the boys entering college and train them in science for the Navy. The Army is planning to take four times that number for the same purpose. The threat to civilian research is

the subject of grave concern today in educational and college circles. Nobody seems at all troubled, however, as to where our political leaders are to come from or where they are to be trained. Yet who can doubt that there is a greater premium today on political intelligence than on any other type of brains?

True, everyone who can read his daily newspaper must see that we are obviously living in an age of politics (much as we dislike the thought) in which accurate information and wise interpretation of it and skill in its use both in respect to foreign countries and our own are essential to the preservation of the peace and to the safeguarding of the highways of progress. But what do we know of Russia? Of China? Of South America? Of the National Government? Of our State government? Of our country? Or town or city? Or ward? Or even our own election district?

Everyone knows, too, that our knowledge and use of the physical sciences have outstripped our progress in the social sciences. The same genius which has remade American civilization, through science and technology, has also given us the atomic bomb, the rocket, and the undisclosed terrors of bacterial and chemical warfare with which to destroy our civilization.

These statements have become commonplace, but what is not commonplace is that our vast education system—on which the American people have pinned their faith—is again falling down on its primary job of training citizens for their duties of leading public opinion and of developing wise, efficient political leaders.

I say again, because there can be no doubt in the light of the history of the twentieth century, that the warning of World War I was lost on the educational world. I say again, because there is no evidence of any conviction reflected in the many addresses, reports, and books on higher education which have flooded the country in the past 5 years that the colleges are aware that it is their primary responsibility to train citizens and that in the world emergency of today that primary responsibility transcends all other obligations.

To be specific, the obligation rests on college presidents, faculties, and boards of trustees, on superintendents of schools, teachers, and curriculum makers generally. The colleges and universities in particular owe the country the obligation of undertaking the work of simplifying and streamlining our complex system of government and of bringing it in line with the needs of the times.

The law schools, too, must play their part in the gigantic task of molding the law to meet new conditions. The gap between theory and practice—or, to be specific, between the academician and the man of public affairs—must be bridged. This will not be done, I fear, until an aroused public make itself felt in the ivory towers through the press, the radio, and by direct assault.

The most constructive force in this field is the great and ever-increasing interest of students in the social sciences. Their instinct is sound. Unfortunately, much of the force of this constructive impulse is lost in part in some colleges through uninformed and uninspired teaching, in part for the reasons we have been discussing, but chiefly because there is no readily accessible road to political activity.

If a young college graduate is seeking a place for religious worship, church doors by the dozen are open to him. If his aim is further education or entertainment, there are scores of opportunities in every city. But if he is seeking to do his duty as a citizen by participating actively in politics, it will be a matter of sheer good luck if he finds his way about.

The need of an agency to guide young men and women in the ways of active citizenship has long been felt by educators and by members of the legal profession. To meet this need a citizenship clearing house has been proposed. It would be manned by college instructors in government and would endeavor to introduce young graduates to honest and intelligent leaders of their own party, each in his or her own town. If no such leaders were available, it would try to bring groups of young people of each party together.

Next, it would aid these young people in organizing local discussion groups to debate—regardless of party—local, State, national, and international problems of current interest. It would also publish a small, informal magazine recording their successes and failures, and without taking sides on any issue would endeavor to point out sound and honest methods of citizenship organization. It would emphasize what the individual can do to improve government. Finally, when technical advice in local or State government is desired it would put them in touch with outstanding experts.

Such a citizenship clearing house is being planned by New York University School of Law, through its legal research bureau. Committees from the American Political Science Association are studying the project with a view to cooperating, and a committee from the Junior Bar Conference of the American Bar Association has been appointed to lend its aid. It is hoped that the Citizenship Clearing House may be the spark to fire the native political aspirations of our best young college graduates.

Our New Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able address on our new foreign policy delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, on Wednesday, March 19, at Wichita, Kans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I opposed the prewar foreign policies of President Roosevelt on two grounds.

1. They were so "patty-cake" worded that they led the aggressor dictators to believe the American people would not fight.

2. By the same token they were deceiving the American people into war.

The President's epoch message to the Congress on the Grecian and Turkish loans is not open to the same basic criticisms. But some of his Cabinet—the Secretary of the Navy—are having difficulty facing up to our problems as a whole. In a speech a few days later saying that military aid only means four or five officers, Secretary Forrestal continued the evasive and equivocal approach so characteristic of the New Deal.

I have opposed our postwar foreign policies on the ground that they were an attempt to build a super structure for peace without any foundation. It is late, but there is another angle—other than our own security—to our foreign policies that we must consider. That is respect for treaties and agreements we are a party to.

The biggest lesson the American people have to learn in foreign affairs is the ultimate end of their commitments. It is time we recognize where internationalism of the "hallelujah" brand brings us.

We have created our present situation by acting weak and foolish instead of wise and strong in our foreign affairs. Our foreign policy in recent years has been a thing bent quickly to solve each momentary crisis or a political campaign at home. We need some plain, simple guideposts.

At a time when the United States had reached an unprecedented position as a world power, and possessed of every means of asserting its moral leadership, we made practically no use of our incomparable strength. We allowed ourselves to become a party to promoting a world-peace settlement, based on power domination and the virtual enslavement by Russia of formerly free and sovereign European nations.

The new world order emerging from this compromise, cannot be regarded as stable or permanently secure. Its precarious status can only be maintained by force and political police methods. Apart from the moral degradation which it demonstrates, it lacks the elements of mutual confidence among nations, essential to normal political and economic international relations.

What is even more serious, further development of the present world situation, by encouraging the creation of centers of Communist revolution on the fertile soil created by famine, destitution, and despair, threatens the very existence of Western civilization.

We have been on the wrong track. We have been running away from reality by crying, "Let the United Nations do it." Not only is United Nations only in its infancy, but our policy has been infantile. We lent Tito $650,000,000 to make the Balkans safe for communism; now we are loaning Turkey and Greece $400,000,000 to save the Balkans from communism. We sold our own ally, Poland, the first to fight Germany, into the hands of Stalin. Now we are desperately trying to stop what we helped start—the spread of communism in Europe. Only gross inept handling of foreign affairs could have brought us into our present position, and that is exactly what we have had to date. It is the sad result of a decade of patty-cake foreign policy and now we have reached the point where the chips are down. It is now beyond partisanship; it is a matter of patriotism.

President Truman not only brought the issue out into the open. He recommended more—much more—than a mere financial or humanitarian policy. He did not make a bellicose speech. At the same time he was extending to Russia our hand through Secretary of State Marshall at Moscow—if she chooses to accept it. But he did throw down the gauntlet to the imperialist and aggressive policies of Russia.

The President announced that not only were we anti-Comintern—but that we proposed to do something about it. Here is what we are doing.

In effect, we are forming a western bloc with Britain, et al., in the Mediterranean to stop Soviet expansion.

Of course, it naturally follows that we will be forced to a similar course of forming an eastern bloc with China, Australia, etc., in the Orient.

Despite political or wishful protestation—it is the old balance-of-power game. And we might as well face an additional fact—it bypasses the United Nations. It is Marshallian militaristic realism versus one-worldian star gazing. In short, we are in European power politics up to our necks, and in it to stay—right out in the open.

I believe it is imperative that the American people should know what they are doing. Mr. Truman and Mr. Marshall should place their cards face up on the table at all times.

As I see it—we may be at this moment deciding for war with Russia—just as much as we decided for war with Germany, when lend-lease was passed.

People ought to understand that this decision is being made and, if they want, express themselves on the subject.

But listen, if we had asserted ourselves when Hitler went into Czechoslovakia or Japan into Manchuria, there would have been no Dunkerque or Pearl Harbor.

Furthermore, let us not forget that President Cleveland's stout-hearted Venezuelian message brought Great Britain around so from that time on her policy was one of friendship for the United States.

Russia is already vigorously carrying on acts of aggression in Cuba, Mexico, Canada—in fact, all the countries of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States.

Furthermore, everywhere communism only rules as a minority dominating the majority by force. The conflict is not economic. It is more the age-old attempt of Asia to conquer Europe—of paganism against Christianity. Witness the murder by Russia of the three Polish Socialist labor leaders—and leaders of the underground against Hitler.

The military dictatorship of Russia is not content to demonstrate in one country the workings of communism by the trial and error method. But has reverted to original Marxism and is undertaking to impose it on the whole world by force.

The Soviet high command would shoot Norman Thomas as quickly as they would the president of the National Association of Manufacturers.

1. President Truman's request for authority to block Russian aggression also means the end of the old give a yard and gain an inch—of our tragic comedy billed as the firm but friendly policy with Russia.

It means the end of attempting to conceal—from the world by pompous statements in deathless prose—the complete lack of success in the meetings of foreign ministers.

Under the firm but friendly policy Russia was striding forward and the United States either retreating or so confused that we were losing prestige and the respect of the world at a dangerous rate.

2. It means if we are to save Europe from communism that we must break flatly and finally with the infamous Morgenthau plan. We must reshape our policy in Germany. That is consuming time, money, and manpower which can be used to a better advantage. Furthermore, it actually is not accomplishing anything.

Germany is the heart of Europe. We have been destroying Europe by our policies. We must help them rebuild. We cannot rule them indefinitely. Europe is like a patient with coronary thrombosis. We have got to treat the heart instead of massaging the feet and the hands, which are Greece and Turkey.

3. We will have to change not only our entire German policy, but Italian as well. The Trieste Treaty must be rejected. From every angle it is bad.

4. On the Western Hemisphere we must return to the good-neighbor policy which was damaged so badly at the hands of Secretary of State Byrnes.

5. It means keeping our Army and Navy at their highest efficiency. But that does not mean that the Congress should accept unquestionably the budget estimates of habitually wasteful Army and Navy heads. A sound fiscal policy is essential to national security.

6. It means that we must stop wasting our substance all over the world as we have been in this postwar period by scattering our resources through so many different agencies. It means a reduction in the services government can give at home.

The more we protest that the new Turko-Grecian policy is not pressure on Russia—the more we destroy its benefits to us and the world.

Only by frankly and boldly proving that we are through with concessions and that our purpose is to put a stop to Russian imperialism and expansion—can the loans accomplish the ends desired by the liberty loving democracies of the world.

The way our new policy is followed through is of the utmost importance in unifying the peace-loving peoples of the world.

We are flush up to the plowing season—either we perform now—or we are likely to follow the time-worn paths of procrastination, right into another war—10, 15, or 20 years from now.

The British Empire is all but completely out of action. Either we openly intervene in Europe or Russia will take over. Britain undoubtedly will come back when she gets her belly full of economic planning. But how far and how soon is the question. She is bankrupt politically and economically, today, but the British are a tough, resilient people. I predict that they, even as we survived the New Deal, will survive socialism. Yet it is extremely doubtful if Britain will ever regain her old position.

Let us not make the mistake of thinking that we are going to take the historic role of Britain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Then, Great Britain was a first call power in a world of first-class powers. Today, mass murder—private torture—terrorists methods—are used by Communist fifth columns all over Europe to establish control over their fellow countrymen who, surprising though it may seem, actually outnumbers the Communists 10 to 1. That creates fratricidal hate and cruelty. Frenchmen are straining to fly at Frenchmen's throats.

Today we are the only first-class power in the world. Britain is exhausted, Germany and Japan are destroyed and France—France is France. What few Americans realize is that Russia is as weak—if not even weaker—than Britain. Only the iron curtain withholds from the world generally, what our statesmen have known specifically—that internal conditions in Russia are chaotic. Yet the ridiculous part of our whole foreign policy is the way we have let Russia win pot after pot with a pair of deuces, while we laid down four of a kind.

I sometimes wonder how Americans think Russia performed as brilliantly as she did in the war. Was it a triumph of Communist organization and planning? Or was it because the United States, which Russia now scornfully denounces as a 'decadent democracy," saved their hides?

Let's take a look at the record.

The fact is that the United States waged a war so colossal, so stupendously greater than that by any other nations that it is beyond our comprehension.

Where Russia fought on a 2,000-mile front and a mere pond called the Baltic Sea—where Britain guarded a coast of 800 miles and a life line through the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean 10,000 miles long—the United States waged war on seven oceans, every sea, and on scores of fronts that totaled not two, but tens of thousands of miles. Our invasions of Jap-held islands alone were military feats heretofore never dreamed of. The invasion of Europe by British and American forces combined was a titanic operation which even the military mind still has difficulty grasping. The world has never seen the equal of the military achievements and military resources of our great and glorious Republic.

From a production standpoint the job done by American industry singlehandedly, almost defies the imagination. Consider: Between 1940 and 1945 this country produced 294,000 fighting planes, including approximately 100,000 bombers—a plane production that far outstripped the production of all other nations of the world combined, enemy or allied. In approximately the same period this Nation, which had only 7,695 ships in its Navy in 1941, had 100,000 fighting and auxiliary ships when the war ended in 1945. In fact, by the time the war was over, we actually had more ships in the United States Navy than we had men in its personnel in 1939. Today we have a Navy that far outstrips the dream of any admiral in history, and dwarfs all other navies of the world combined.

Our construction of merchant ships was actually hair raising. In approximately 5 years we built 7,100 seagoing ships in the merchant class with the result that when the war ended, America, not Britannia, ruled the waves, with the American flag flying on twice as many ships as all the other merchant fleets of the world combined.

In 5 years, American industry produced 6,000,000 rifles, 5,000,000 carbines, 2,500,000 machine guns, and 2,000,000 submachine guns. In the same period our factories turned out 37,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition to supply those same guns with fire power. We produced 85,000 tank guns, 55,000 units of field artillery, 71,000 mortars, 770,000 trucks, 2,000,000 tons of high explosive TNT, and 2,000,000 tons of smokeless powder.

Those are figures that not even the mathematical mind can cope with, but I am not through. I want to offer you some figures which will give you a better perspective on the might of the Soviet Union's Red army. Listen:

In a little over 3 years—during the very time when we were hearing how Russia was winning the war almost unaided—we sent the Soviet Union by air or in our own ships and under our own escort through the treacherous Arctic and Persian Gulf routes, 14,450 fighting planes, including 9,700 pursuit ships and 3,800 bombers, 7,000 tanks, 3,200 armored scout cars, 2,200 ordnance service vehicles, 52,000 jeeps, 363,000 trucks, 35,000 motorcycles, 8,200 antiaircraft guns, 135,000 submachine guns, 343,000 tons of explosives, 105 submarine chasers, 195 torpedo boats, 7,600 marine Diesel engines, $320,000,000 worth of machine tools, $35,000,000 worth of metal-cutting tools, $43,000,000 worth of petroleum-refining equipment, $171,000,000 worth of electric generators, 810,000 tons of nonferrous metals, 17,600 tons of ferro-alloys, 2,688,000 tons of steel, entire railroads, not to mention tons of food including butter which you did without. And if that is not enough to impress you, let me add that what we sent Russia was only two-thirds of what we sent Britain.

And if you are still unimpressed let me further add that the above list is not complete by several railroad systems, several hundred ships, and hundreds of millions of good old American dollars.

When you consider that in addition to all this, we put 12,000,000 persons into the armed services and raised approximately $400,000,000,000 in taxes and loans from our people, I can't help but cry, "Wake up America, what did we fight this war for anyway—to make this world safe for communism?"

Now I purposely omitted the mention of one weapon which we produced that literally overshadows every other single effort of the war—the atom bomb. No words of mine can begin to describe its horrifying potentialities. At the moment it is an American possession; how long it will remain our secret no one knows. But as Winston Churchill says, "It is the new balance of power in the world today." It makes the United States—already armed with the greatest Navy, the greatest Air Force, and the greatest Army—the most awe-inspiring military power the world has ever seen.

So here stands America, a stupendous nation—strong like no other before it—unaware of the vastness of its muscle, unsure in its leadership without which world solutions are impossible.

Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt both campaigned for reelection on a too-proud-to-fight policy. We weren't, and we did. But as I said in 1936—the policy of appeasement meant encouragement to the aggressor.

Now is the time to exert our strength—our determination to have peace—or fight if need be. There is no other nation, or combination of nations that can lick us, and the other democracies. This is not war talk; this is just common sense. I am simply trying to say that in strength and a sure knowledge of that strength is the only road to peace.

If Greece falls into the Soviet group so will Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Italy, and most of Europe. Unless we help China she, too, will eventually become a Russian satellite. But we have pulled out of China because of conditions that are duplicated in Greece. We should return.

Therefore the controlling factor of the Turko-Grecian loan is not only its over-all purpose—but how our other policies are to match this step. That is the crux of the whole matter.

We must make our moves in a way that will leave other democracies in no doubt as to our long-range policies.

Only if Uncle Sam of the big stick speaks with a powerful voice and acts accordingly can we hope to diminish the threat of war clouds.

In all this we must not cease to recapture a sense of the principles for which America stands almost alone in the world today.

Under the new deal and the war to beat the Nazis we went half down the road to socialism. There is great danger that we could go even more totalitarian in our struggle with Russian aggression.

Unless we are on our guard we may not have anything left of our Republic to show for it after it is all over.

Bold united action was never of greater value, nor of greater importance in our entire national history.

There can be no compromises—no vacillating—no procrastination. Now is the time for action. I would either give the President all the power he asks—or I would not give him any of it. For Turko-Grecian aid is the beginning of a long-range stout-hearted American policy for the benefit of the American people.

In my judgment only by giving the President everything that he asks—and only by the President on his part developing a definite, strong, consistent, and intelligent foreign policy in place of a vacillating to the point of nonexisting foreign policy can we hope to achieve a secure and free life.

Economy or Waste in Flood-Control Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Economy or Waste?" published in the Pittsburgh Press of March 17, 1947, which deals with the flood-control problems in Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY OR WASTE?

In their fight to assure continued work on the Conemaugh River flood-control dam, western Pennsylvania Congressmen already have scored heavily.

They have revealed—and they have the data to back it up—that the cost of stopping work on the dam will be so high as to make any such action utterly ridiculous.

Consider the situation at the site of the dam, where work is being done to protect Pittsburgh from disastrous floods:

Sixteen miles of railroad lines are being torn up. Highways have been cut. Utilities have been disrupted. Contractors have moved costly equipment and materials to the site.

Can the Federal Government, in the name of economy, just walk off the job? Well, here's what would happen:

The contractors would have claims against the Government running into the millions, for their costs, profits, and liquidation expense. The railroad would have another claim. So would cocontractors. So would utilities. There would be heavy expenses in restarting the job.

The high cost of not working could far exceed the $5,212,475 which Army engineers say they need in the next fiscal year to keep on working.

Remember, these are just dollar figures in the Federal Government's books. They take no account of the cost to private individuals and companies of recurrent floods, or of the cost in lives and livelihoods. Federal appropriations are only a small part of the cost of floods.

President Truman, when he asked Congress for $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey, pointed out that it was a small part of the sum we've invested in world peace and suggested that Congress consider the alternative.

Let's apply the same reasoning to the Conemaugh Dam. A $5,000,000 appropriation to continue work on the dam will be exactly one two-hundredth part of what the Federal Government will get in taxes from western Pennsylvania next year.

And consider the alternative.

Attitude of Russia in Grecian Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Russia's Answer—and Ours," from the Chicago Times of March 16, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S ANSWER—AND OURS

While neither Molotov nor Stalin has yet deigned to speak regarding our proposed aid to Greece and Turkey, it may safely be assumed that Izvestia's long editorial on the subject reflects their present views.

That Izvestia should have been critical of the move is no surprise. Russia could hardly be expected to cheer.

But what may have surprised some people is the comparatively mild tone of the reproof. Those who anticipated fist shaking or saber rattling will have to await further developments which doubtless will follow.

Rather loftily, Izvestia undertook to lecture the United States upon certain ideological matters. Particularly did the editorial strive to give us the facts of life regarding the "democratic" Greek Government. Sarcastically, Izvestia observes:

"But the matter not only, and not so much, lies in the venal Greek monarchists and their allies, who have been pleasantly presented to American Congressmen as direct descendants of the defender of Thermopylae, the legendary King Leonidas. It is well known that the real rulers of Greece up until now and still are the British military authorities."

Candor compels confession that the Kremlin scores a point.

The editorial caustically reviews the failure of the British to bring tortured Greece peace and quiet; asks whether British troops in Greece had not contributed to the sad state of affairs, whether Britain is not actually responsible for Greek bankruptcy. It adds:

"The American President's message bypasses these perfectly natural questions. The reasons for such delicacy are fully understandable. The United States does not wish to criticize the British practice since they themselves intend following the British example."

We, of course, intend nothing of the kind. Americans are no supporters of King George of Greece.

In other respects, the Kremlin's arguments fail to carry conviction. Izvestia hints that our stated reasons for helping Greece are but a smokescreen for a plan of expansion.

Here the Kremlin is talking through its hat—and knows it. Nothing in America's history sustains such a charge. Perhaps the Soviet is judging from its own standards—as witness Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and a large part of the Balkans.

And naturally the Soviets assiduously avoid referring to the alternative to our plan—which is Communist domination of Greece should we fail to step in. And in that connection some words of Franklin D. Roosevelt are worth recalling:

"Democracy in many lands has failed for the time being to meet human needs. People have become so fed up with futile debate and party bickerings over methods that they have been willing to surrender democratic processes and principles in order to get things done. They have forgotten the lessons of history that the ultimate failures of dictatorships cost humanity far more than the temporary failure of democracy."

This statement is peculiarly applicable to the present situation. In Greece there has been—is—a temporary failure of democracy. That may be conceded.

What Mr. Truman seeks to demonstrate is that democracy can get things done in a hurry. And this has an importance going far beyond Greece and Turkey.

There are in the world perhaps a billion people who are neither democratic nor communistic—people struggling in misery and poverty and political subjugation. Among them all unrest stirs, ideas are beginning to circulate. This great, insensate mass is commencing to come to life.

If democracy can prove to these hundreds of millions that it can offer them not only lofty political ideals, but action—swift and decisive action—in dragging them from their economic slough of despond, they will flock to democracy's banner in such hordes that communism will fade as a threat to the world.

A resolute and vigorous democracy can grow so strong that it can never be seriously challenged. But a weak and fumbling democracy can bring nothing but its own annihilation. And that's just the choice that faces us today.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith an editorial of Spencer Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio, expressing his views on the President's message and a word of caution for the future:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE

President Truman's message on Greece and Turkey Wednesday was no different than the information on which our protesting editorial a few days ago was based. It had, however, the weight in the world which the Chief Executive of our country wields.

It was a challenge to Russia. It plainly said, in effect, to the dictatorial clique now governing Russia under alleged communism: "Thus far may you go, but no farther without fighting the United States."

The right to send military men as well as civilians to the two countries "to assist in reconstruction and to supervise use of the aid" carries that import. Don't let Congress kid itself that it means something else.

Civilians are just as capable men as military ones. The difference is that the soldier's uniform implies military force to back up orders. That would be an affront to the Greek people and a challenge to Russia.

Let no one fail to understand that the President would have Congress embark on a project that inevitably would be considered by the world as imperialistic. Let Congress realize that sending military men to Greece would be exactly like President Roosevelt's sending England 40 destroyers in order to fight Hitler's submarines.

Let Congress realize that, if it accedes to Truman's request, it will be a frank diplomatic message to Russia and her satellites to lay off their aggressions, just as much as was Secretary of State Cordell Hull's message to Japan in 1941 about China.

The outcome was Pearl Harbor and the Bataan Peninsula and war with Germany.

What the President said about the need of relief and about the imposition of totalitarian regimes upon free people certainly reflects the opinion of America; and, when he points out that the United States spent 341 billions to win the recent war as an investment in freedom and world peace, it has some emotional appeal. But the step he advocates might also be considered "sending good money after bad."

It reminds one of the stock market of the 1920's, when suckers who had bought stock on margin, put up additional money to save their price-falling stock from the "bears." Eventually, the market collapse of October 1929, resulted in the financial ruin of thousands, the suicide of many, the depression of the 1930's, the rise of the New Deal, and Roosevelt's defy to Germany and Japan. Does it mean anything that Russia is called the "Great Bear?"

It is possible that the Truman project might bluff the Politburo that is the policy maker of Russia; but a bluff is only good if there be the evident will to carry it through.

The Politburo is believed to be divided into two groups, Molotov and Gromyko hating the United States and Stalin's group being rather friendly to it.

This division might serve to limit Russian aggression without war; but, if we send military men into Greece and Turkey, we must be prepared to expect war just as we got into it in 1941. We are beating a path to it.

If Congress decides to send relief, it should be only with the sanction of the government of Greece that American civilians shall absolutely administer its distribution among the warring factions, not use it to bolster the unstable Greek Government nor to tear it down.

Let us not be a maker of kings nor a Cromwell bent on dethroning one. Let us keep clear of telling the Greek people what government they must have; and let us label everything "U. S." so that Britain will not claim, "See what we are doing," as has been done sometimes in the past.

But, as said previously, the United States cannot do everything for the world that it needs; countries have shown their ingratitude for what we have tried to do for them; we are groaning under our heavy home loads, and we need to set our own house in better order than it is. "The paths of glory lead but to the grave." The path of military help leads to war; and that of world help is leading us to the trough of imperialism. Let us drink from the old spring of freedom for ourselves and others.

Aid to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 13, there appeared in the Chicago Times a very thought-provoking and illuminating editorial under the caption "There is only one choice." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE IS ONLY ONE CHOICE

Americans today can have only one attitude toward their President's proposal to show the world that dynamic democracy in action assumes responsibility for keeping political freedom alive in Greece.

Russia must know that the people of the United States stand behind Mr. Truman as their spokesman against the pressure of totalitarianism.

The Times has thought that the administration should invoke the functions of the United Nations in the Grecian crisis.

We believe that on most matters the Russians do not understand us and that we do not understand them.

Mr. Truman is seeking to make the Russians understand our position in Greece by a policy which recognizes the fact that the United Nations is not yet equipped to act in such an emergency.

The President must depend upon a united America and we think he will get the unity he needs except from extremists who are against him in everything.

There still must be public discussion of Mr. Truman's proposal to support the tottering Government of Greece and the weakening Government of Turkey in order to prevent the spread of communism in those key Balkan countries. The public must understand all of the reasons for the move and especially the broad implications which Mr. Truman said were involved.

The public must understand why the United States and not the United Nations must step in and rescue the Greek Government.

After sober discussion, which should not be too long delayed, Congress must make up its mind whether it is willing or unwilling to meet the responsibilities of world leadership which the outcome of World War II put upon us.

The crumbling power of the British Empire presents America with increased opportunity for world leadership. The imminent withdrawal of British forces from Greece hastened President Truman's bold stand against totalitarianism.

The dangers to world peace which President Truman describes as inevitable if we do not send aid to Greece and Turkey will surely be multiplied if we now rebuke our own President by failing to support him and thus give Russia an invitation to move however and wherever it pleases.

The President, in effect, is asking Americans to fence in communism with American dollars. There always is the danger that American soldiers might be asked to follow the dollars. In fact, the President proposes that American military personnel be sent to Greece and Turkey to help train personnel.

We may assume that such a bold course will be interpreted by Russia as a war gesture. But it is not and need not be if Russia has meant one hundredth part of the agreements she has signed with the United States.

The Atlantic Charter is one such agreement. We're willing to take the chance of being misunderstood by Russia, as Mr. Truman explained, because we believe that the ultimate hope for peace in the world, and security for ourselves, lies in the pledges made in the Atlantic Charter.

One of those pledges was the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. Another of the agreements was made at Yalta. There the big nations agreed they would help the liberated nations or the former Axis satellites, when their right to choose their own government was threatened by internal disorders or economic distress.

That is the situation now prevailing in liberated Greece. Turkey was never in the war, but Turkey has a right to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the Yalta agreement because they are set up in the basic law of the United Nations.

Russia can help if it wants to. It can call off the guerrilla warfare and the infiltration of Communists into the nations involved.

We believe that Russia would get wide popular American support for water rights through the Dardenelles if it would live up to the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta agreement and cooperate to make the United Nations work.

Instead, Russia, by stupid delay and acrimony, has forced our President to ask for action which Russia can construe as aggressive if the Reds cling to the policy which led to ouster of Litvinov.

Whether Russia so construes Mr. Truman's proposal is the key to future developments and relations between our countries.

If Congress lends money to Greece, Americans will insist on a real democracy there. Greece is a sorry example of democracy. Few Americans will favor spending money to prop up King George of Greece. The Fascist and Monarchist gangs must be cleaned up if America intends to give Greece a real injection of democracy. The same goes for Turkey, which is a backward nation prone to totalitarianism, too.

Communism has seemed attractive to some Greeks because they are living in those conditions of starvation and poverty in which communism breeds best. A hungry man may be willing to sell his political freedom for food.

And there has been, and is, hunger in Greece. Some peasants have been reduced to eating grass. In the cities the show windows display pastries, but few can buy. Inflation is so great that food prices are indexed at 600,000,000 compared with 100 in 1939.

It is in this kind of arena that President Truman proposes a show-down between two theories of government, one in which the people run the state and one in which the state runs the people.

We have a chance to show Russia we intend to support democracy as strongly as she supports communism. Eventually such an attitude may prove to be the only way in which the constant clash of ideology can be avoided.

Aid to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Chicago Daily Times entitled "It's 'Now or Never' for Aid to Greece," which is part of a series of stories analyzing the steps that have led President Truman to take his momentous action. It appears to be very timely and the unbiased statements are fully gone into.

IT'S NOW OR NEVER FOR AID TO GREECE
(By Keith Wheeler)

For most Americans, excepting rock-ribbed isolationists and Communist sympathizers, there seems only one clear and certain answer to President Truman's appeal for United States aid to Greece and Turkey.

That answer falls neatly into two sections: One: Good. Two: It's about time.

To those Americans who have studied Greece's plight since the war or have had the luck to observe it first hand, as I did recently, it seems abundantly clear: That Greece needs help badly. That it deserves help far more than other countries to which we have been conspicuously more generous. That unless it gets both help and guidance quickly it may presently be soaked up by the thirsty Communist blotter which presses against it from three sides. That, aside from the moral considerations of helping those who helped us, we will be helping ourselves in the future by helping Greece keep its independence now.

MACEDONIA PERILED

To illustrate how badly Greece needs aid, as long ago as last December many Americans there, including Ambassador Lincoln McVeagh, recognized that Greece could lose Macedonia, its richest province, in about 20 minutes if the British pulled their troops out.

If Greece should lose Macedonia, the lucky finder seems certain to prove Communist Russia. Russia would get Macedonia through the eager agency of Tito's Russia-idolizing Communist Yugoslavia and Greece's own rebellious Communists.

President Truman reported the British have told him they cannot remain in Greece beyond March 31. That is 17 days from today.

It was no small-fry choice the President thrust upon the American people. Probably not since the Monroe Doctrine, in time of peace, have Americans been called upon to decide a matter of policy so grave, so forthright, so loaded with sobering implications for ourselves and the rest of the world.

COULD MEAN WAR

Carried sternly to its conclusion this policy of opposing totalitarian expansion (which seems to mean Russian expansion) could indeed mean war, as more than one Senator yelled yesterday.

And, as other Sentators said in return, a policy of doing nothing until somebody does it to us first can also mean war, as proved in the past.

There was heartening encouragement in the President's uncompromising declaration for those Americans who have worried since the war's end over America's seemingly stubborn refusal to face the facts of life.

The rest of the world has trouble, too, and those troubles may eventually prove more important to us than our present preoccupation with the difficulty of getting a new car.

TIME TO GROW UP

It looked like the first sign of recognition that, like it or not, we are a big boy now and that it's time for us, in the most sober conscience, to take a grown-up's responsibility.

It isn't as though we hadn't known what was happening to Greece. Many American newspapermen have been telling and retelling the story of Greece's rapid decline into chaos and steady slither toward a Communist grab ever since the Germans were driven out in 1944. Less generally known but probably more detailed have been the reports of American military agents stationed in Greece, who, among other duties, make it their business to question captured Greek Communist guerrillas.

The stories of those guerrillas, painstakingly counter-checked for truth, have made it clear enough that the effort to undermine and overthrow democracy in Greece is engineered and supported in and from Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria.

Ambassador McVeagh has known how affairs were moving for many months and has steadily, although privately, urged upon the State Department the necessity of doing something for Greece or letting it slip into Communist hands by default.

GREEK TRAGEDY

Whether or not losing Greece to communism seems bad depends, of course, on how you feel about communism. To those, however, who consider expansionist communism a danger and believe that there is no demonstrable difference between Russian communism and the recent German nazism, seeing Greece absorbed by it would be tragedy.

It would be one more sacrifice of the ideals of freedom and democracy for which we spent $341,000,000,000 and 1,000,000 lives fighting the recent war.

I learned how close Greece had come to losing the game directly from former Premier Constantin Tsaldaris. I talked to this beefy, choleric, long-time politician, one December night in the rabbit warren offices of the Foreign Ministry in central Athens. He was to leave the next morning on his subsequently well-reported begging expedition to America.

"We can do nothing more, we cannot control the rebels. I see no hope for us unless it comes from the United Nations," Tsaldaris confessed to me that night.

COMPLETELY BROKE

Tsaldaris explained that the Greek Government was then completely broke as well as hopelessly tangled in disagreement. (At the time of that visit a Government spokesman told me that the total available resources of the Government were less than $300,000. The same spokesman explained it had been necessary, for example, to quit trying to restore the railroads to operation because there was no money and to print money would mean inflation. Either way—with inflation or without railroads—the country was ruined.)

One thing was the country's poverty—and the concurrent impossibility of restoring either a stable or prosperous economy—Tsaldaris told me. The other was the Communist rebellion, which was directly and inextricably linked to the first.

What money Greece had been able to raise had been used largely fighting the rebels—as well as much of the UNRRA machinery and supplies designed for more peaceful and profitable pursuits.

The expenditure had been fruitless. The leftist guerrillas, fighting and fleeing over mountain-goat paths, had made monkeys of the new Greek mechanized army.

DESERT FARMS

Unless the fighting could be stopped there was not the slightest chance the country could ever struggle back to either order or normal productive work. Because of the fighting farmers were deserting their lands and workers were fleeing from the factories.

A creeping paralysis was growing upon the land—that passionate, courageous little land whose forefathers invented the democratic process and whose sons have been its most ardent champions for centuries.

Haggard, puffing Premier Tsaldaris put his faint hopes in United Nations, believing that if that body investigated Greece's charge against her Communist neighbors—and proved it—Greece might get a chance to work out her salvation.

How faint that hope truly was seemed implicit in President Truman's message, which spoke well of the United Nations but urged the imperative need for action.

LITTLE UN HELP

Tsaldaris got the United Nations investigating commission for which he asked, but it hasn't seemed to do much good.

That was a conclusion which might have been drawn from the first, considering that Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria had ample warning and ample time to erase the evidence before the commission arrived on the scene.

And considering also that the commission for more than a month established its headquarters in Athens—300 miles and more from the heart of the rebellion that threatened, and still does, to deposit half of Greece and a grandstand seat on the Mediterranean square in the lap of Uncle Joe Stalin.

America Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the address of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, BRIEN MCMAHON, at the ninety-eighth annual dinner of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn, held at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N. Y., on March 17, 1947, the president of which this year is Peter Campbell Brown, who also served as toastmaster at the banquet. The Senator has, in his usual fine style and manner, presented an accurate picture of the position of America today.

It is well that we come together on occasions like this to draw strength from one another and from our realization that we have a common cause. It is because we love our country and what she stands for; it is because we are dedicated to the principles of liberty and to the concept of the dignity of the individual; it is because we believe that the state is the creature of men and

not men the creature of the state, and because we believe that we have in this Nation the best of all possible governments, that we in this Nation are determined that it shall persist and develop and grow stronger and greater.

We live in a troubled world. I have indicated what you know already, namely, the distress, the poverty, and the disintegration of European economies. It used to be said that the sun never sets on the British Empire. We can paraphrase it by saying that the sun never sets today on misery and conflict and despair. On conflict in Korea and China in the East; on potential civil war in India and Palestine. On disintegration in Greece, on Turkey armed to the teeth and going bankrupt in the process. On Britain living on a Spartan diet, determined no longer to hold her empire—resigned to its loss and seeking only to eventually raise the standards of her own people to decent levels. On France whose trade unions are controlled by Thorez and Duclos who are agents of a foreign power, on starving Spain, on troubles in our own southern hemisphere. This is the picture and behind it all stands Russia, operating behind an iron curtain and holding sway over 400,000,000 of the world's people.

It seems as though America is an island of health in a sea of malignancy. It stands to reason that we will not have an ordered economy, we cannot have an ordered political life if the world around us is to rot and disintergrate completely. What must we do here in America? I suggest that the first thing that we should realize is that there will never be a "return to normalcy." Most of us will glibly admit that this is true, but we still act as though normalcy was right around the corner.

When Hitler invaded Poland any return to what we would like to term normalcy became, to my mind, impossible. Certainly, when the Japs struck us at Pearl Harbor an era ended in America, and that era will never return. Our people must understand that. Our people must not waste their time in chasing illusions and rainbows, for if we can appraise the true realities of the situation which we now face, then there will be some hope that we can gird ourselves for the duties that lie ahead of us and for the burdens which we are going to have to bear.

America has become the primary power of the world. With that power goes a responsibility and a duty that we cannot escape. We must not act like petulant children when they are faced with the responsibilities of life. We must realize that our own self-preservation and protection can only come through assuming the burdens which world leadership has placed upon us.

Our people must realize that there are two conflicting ideologies in the world today—conflicting all over the world for the possession of men's minds. We must meet that issue fairly and squarely and courageously. The best way to meet it, in my opinion, is to demonstrate to the peoples of the world that which we already know so well—namely, that our way of life is far to be preferred to any other. This is a difficult task. Democracy grows and flowers on order and law, and communism fattens on disintegration, disorder, and chaos. One costs sweat and tears—the other is cheaply procured by intrigue.

We have two great jobs to do in order to see to it that our way of life is that which is embraced by the peoples of the earth. The first job is to make our democracy work better here at home. That means that we can't run a nation on the basis of having first- and second-class citizens. That means that we can't permit great monopolies to fatten at the expense of small enterprise. The trend to ever greater concentration of industrial power was accelerated during the war years. That trend must be reversed and should be reversed by a vigorous and effective enforcement of the antitrust law.

We must restrain the greedy who would seek to shift the tax burden upon those least able to bear it. We must be careful that we do not discourage public service by launching unfounded and baseless attacks upon candidates for public office.

I refer specifically to the campaign which has been carried on against Mr. David E. Lilienthal.

We must endeavor to see to it that the law is enforced without fear and with impartiality.

Lilienthal and the other members of the Commission were nominated by the President on the 15th day of January. It is now over 2 months since those nominations were received. While it is true that the members of the Commission technically can act under their recess appointments, I frankly say to you that there are decisions to be made of the gravest consequence in the operation of our atomic-energy program.

I can well understand the reluctance of the Commissioners to make decisions of far-reaching import until the Senate has passed upon their qualifications. Any further delay in their confirmation is to be deeply regretted.

We hear much today of labor racketeering. It is my observation that you can't run a racket in the labor movement without violating the law. Our prosecutors should be vigilant in the detection and prosecution of those who would seek to prostitute the cause of the working people of our country to private profit and ill-gotten gain.

One of the things that has most contributed to America's becoming the greatest nation on earth is the fact that we advertised to our own people the virtues of the things that we produced. Our people realize that a good and honest product well advertised will sell in ever-increasing quantities. We have a fine product here in America and we must advertise it all over the world. We must fight propaganda with information. For every lie we must tell a truth. We must offer facts instead of distortions. We must tell the people of the earth that our democratic free-enterprise society has so much more to offer the average man than does communism, that it is to our advantage to let the people of the world know the truth and give them an opportunity to make their own choice. Our lows are so much higher than their highs that we have everything to gain by making the facts known. But to men and women everywhere, our system represents not only material benefits but personal liberty, freedom of conscience, and the opportunity to grow and develop to the utmost of one's abilities. And of what we have to sell, the greatest demand is for liberty.

Against the falsehoods and the distortions we must make these facts known. By every available means we must disseminate throughout the world, honest, factual information about America and her way of life. By means of newspapers and magazines, by short-wave and long-wave radio, by moving pictures and books, by every cultural art and by every medium of information, we must tell the plain people of the earth the inspiring and fascinating story of democracy in action.

But the spreading of information is not enough. Along with the facts we must spread the fruits. The story of America's high standard of living will not feed the hungry Chinese peasant or heat the freezing hut of the Polish laborers. When men are hungry and cold, when they are homeless, jobless, and hopeless, they fall easy prey to the red rash of revolution. Thus, by disseminating the blessings of our system as widely as possible, we insure our own perpetuation.

That is why as I see it, we have decided to bring aid and succor and relief to the distressed nations of the earth. That is why we have given liberally of our treasure in an attempt to establish order and health and sanity in place of chaos, misery, and despair. And, there is one further thing that we have tried to do of which I am very proud indeed. And that is the effort on the part of this great country to give to the world security from atomic fear and the blessings that should result from the discovery of atomic energy.

We must see to it that the world knows the story of what we have tried to do. Men everywhere should be told that we have tried to do the decent and honorable and equitable thing.

I confess to you that I am most deeply disturbed by the present status of the atomic-energy negotiations. I say to you bluntly and frankly that unless this problem is solved, there can and will be no peace. Unless it is solved we will head straight for a third world war.

To say that I am deeply disturbed by Mr. Gromyko's latest speech is to put it mildly. I assume that the people who understand the nature of this problem are as deeply disturbed as I am. It is a problem for every adult person in the United States, because I see, in the not far distant future, decisions to be made of the gravest portent—decisions which are going to affect not only your way of life, but the very existence of your continuance in being.

You know that I have been in the vanguard of those who believed that the only solution for the problem lay in the world's acceptance of a fair and equitable plan by which all nations would share in the benefits of this discovery in return for guaranties of an effective quality against its murderous use.

In my opinion we performed our moral duty in offering to the world a prescription for peace through the mutual and beneficial control of atomic energy. If our offer and our plan is to be finally rejected then I say to you bluntly and frankly that we must be prepared for the eventuality which has always resulted from armament races.

How can we conceive of the existence of a United Nations which cannot settle the primary and underlying cause of fear; that cannot solve the problem of armaments so destructive as to sponge out whole peoples and cities.

What a frightful prospect, what a horrible vision of the future is raised by even the thought of such a holocaust. To those of us who have seen the heaped-up rubble of the German cities which still cover thousands of the dead, the prospect of a thousand times more terrifying hurricane of destruction strikes a chill to the heart of even the most calloused and insensitive of men.

But mark this well! Russia will in a period of time make an atomic bomb. That period of time is almost any man's guess, but I say to you now with definitiveness and certainty that anyone who tells you that he is certain that Russia will not have the bomb even 3 years from now is either a knave or a fool.

I have asked this question before and I ask it again. Has not a nation which turns down a fair and equitable solution of the atomic-energy problem committed an act of aggression against the rest of the world?

Does not a course of conduct become aggressive when it is designed to rob us of our substance by forcing us to carry ever larger and more crushing tax burdens to sustain our armaments? Is it not an act of aggression to so conduct your foreign policy as to enchain in the thralldom of fear the minds of men so that we would become a nation of psychotics unable and incapable of pursuing our daily lives?

I hope that our distinguished Secretary of State will be able to accomplish the pacifica-

tion of the European Continent through an agreement on a peace treaty for Germany. I even more fervently hope that Secretary Marshall can reverse Mr. Gromyko's latest outbursts. But, it seems as though the Russians see no cause for hurry. Is it because they see a continuing disintegration in the free world and hope that out of the chaos and despair and misery that accompanies it will come their chance to inherit the earth? Are they convinced that the forces of democracy are indeed so weak that they will continue to crumble even in the New World? If they do, I would beg of them to see and understand that the American people have proved in the fires of conflict that we think well enough of our way of life to die for it; that we will not stand idly and passively by and watch the ways of totalitarianism engulf the earth. It was Hitler and Goering and Goebbels who thought that America was decadent; that democracies were inefficient and incapable of meeting total war. We won our victory over them at incalculable cost, it is true, but win it we did. Two hundred and ninety-six thousand of our best lie forever dead. We drained of our treasure $300,000,000,000. We marshaled our forces with intelligence, executed our war plans brilliantly under the direction of a great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I wish America to carry no chip on its shoulder. I wish and want for America neither truculence nor unfairness in our dealings with any nation on the face of the earth. I wish for America, as do you, the adherence to ethical and objective standards of conduct that can meet the test of today and of history.

I appeal with all of my heart and soul and mind to those leaders of the Russian people who seem to be so adamant to meet us half way both in the German problem and on the subject of atomic energy. Pray God that they come to realize that totalitarian we will not and cannot be. We know that we might better be dead.

I have not been one of those who thought that the cause of peace was advanced by the exacerbation of the feelings of the Russian people or, indeed, of her leaders. I do not speak today in a spirit of anything else but hope that we will see a change in attitude. If that change shall come, if only the iron curtain could be lifted, if we could get an agreement on atomic energy so that its tremendous potential dividends could be declared to the peoples of the earth, then, indeed, would we have cause for gratification and celebration.

I am an optimistic person. The picture, it is true, is not an encouraging one as we see it tonight, but I am hopeful that we will be able to surmount our difficulties and to lead the world into more pleasant and safer seas. All human things are ephemeral, I suppose. It may be that this Government which we love so well and in whose future destiny we believe so deeply will be found at the sunset of some day to have disappeared. But the principles of justice are eternal and that government which adheres to them will last forever—not precisely as she is today, for I know that nothing in nature can remain inert, but I believe that our country will live to the end of time, forever progressive, ever freer, ever stronger, ever more durable. I believe that with each new development of science, with each new element that may enter into the daily lives of men, creating vast additions to our wealth and multiplying the fields of industry, our American system will be found adaptable enough to include them, strong enough to regulate them, and that here will ever flourish the strongest and truest way of life, maintaining institutions which will stimulate patriotism and stand as a beacon light for the oppressed of every land.

No Subsidized Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department being confronted with a deficit of approximately $288,000,000 in the next fiscal year, it is refreshing to read an editorial which is an admission against interest and suggests that the postal rates be increased to lessen this prospective loss. The editorial is from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, a daily newspaper with a circulation of 70,000, published in my district:

NO SUBSIDIZED PRESS

The Post Office Department wants to raise postal rates to overcome a deficit upward of $287,000,000. That's all right with us so long as they don't raise the first-class rate (3 cents an ounce) which is already paying a good profit to the Government. The deficit comes from other services which are rendered by the Post Office Department at less than cost, and the profit from first-class mail is wiped out in that manner.

For one thing the Department would now make a post card cost 2 cents to mail. That seems reasonable too. It actually costs the post office just as much to service and handle a 1-cent post card as it does a 3-cent letter and the difference in rates is unreasonable.

But where the loss really occurs is in the low rates granted to newspapers, magazines, and publications generally. The Government incurs a swamping deficit from this kind of mail and in effect it amounts to subsidizing the publishers.

This was originally adopted as a policy in the early days of the Republic when publications were few and far between and struggling to sustain themselves. It was thought wholesome to give the people access to published material of all kinds and the Government adopted low postal rates as a form of encouragement.

Those days are all in the dim past. Publications today are as numerous as leaves on the trees and self-supporting or ought to be so. There is no dearth of printed material, in fact there is a surplus of it. Under the circumstances why should the Government add millions of dollars to the profits of magazines and newspapers which are already sustaining themselves? And why should this profit come out of the hides of the other users of mail and the taxpaying public into the bargain?

We don't think newspapers and magazines are entitled to any Government subsidy.

A Balanced Budget Versus Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Balance the Budget First," published in the Pittsburgh Press of March 17, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALANCE THE BUDGET FIRST

America's taxpayers have just gone through the agony of settling up last year's income tax, estimating this year's tax, and paying the first quarterly installment of all in excess of the withholding.

It has been painful, but those who are wise have made their plans for this year to conform to the tax rates now in effect. They would like to believe that, come next March, the country will face a brighter prospect and they a lighter burden.

But the political tactics of the House Republican leadership, in driving for a hurry-up vote on a 20-percent across-the-board cut in this year's income taxes, raises doubts that anything at all in the way of tax legislation will be accomplished in this Congress.

If the Knutson tax cut is passed by the House, it is not likely that it will be approved by the Senate. Even if it is, it surely will be vetoed by the President—and the veto sustained. For the country is overwhelmingly behind the President's sound insistence that a balanced budget and public-debt reduction must come first.

Representative KNUTSON and those who vote with him, in their drive for political recovery of the GOP, underestimate both the intelligence and patriotism of taxpayers. For a majority of taxpayers well know that even the heavy exactions they have just paid are less generous to them than the inflated living costs which stem from the Government's continued deficit financing.

The Knutson Republicans could better serve the country by working this year to reduce public spending and the public debt, and by working now on a broad tax reform, eliminating double taxation and other inequities, and making the lower rates applicable to next year's business and income—to the end that people may plan ahead with hope and confidence.

Representative KNUTSON et al. apparently don't think so, but they probably could even get more votes that way.

Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an illuminating and timely editorial published in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of the issue of March 14, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX-PAYING TIME AT HAND—CONGRESS SHOULD ACT NOW TO PROVIDE RELIEF

Tomorrow midnight is the deadline.

By that time Andersonians and other Americans must have filed income tax returns.

This year approximately 45,000,000 returns will be filed. About 6,000,000 of these

will be joint returns of husbands and wives having two incomes.

Some 5,000,000 will show no tax due, because exemptions and credits come to more than net income. But altogether almost one-half of all adults in the United States are now paying income tax to their Government.

Furthermore, 52 percent of those filing returns and paying taxes earn $5,000 a year or less.

This is a far cry from the early days of the income tax. When it was instituted in 1913, exemptions were $3,000 for a single person and $4,000 for a married one, and only about 1 in every 180 adults had to pay.

Even at the lowest exemptions during the First World War, only about 1 in every 13 adults in the United States was paying Federal income tax.

As late as 1932 it was only about 1 in every 45 adults. Now Uncle Sam doesn't wait until March 15 to collect. He takes a bite every week out of the paycheck, but settlement time still comes on the fateful Ides of March.

Meanwhile, what are the chances for a little tax relief for those earning $5,000 and less?

Republicans are still haggling over details. There is one school of thought favoring reducing the public debt before cutting taxes. Another wants to cut taxes first.

What about doing both jobs? Competent tax experts say that it can be done if a stop is put to needless spending among the multitude of Government bureaus.

There is strong argument, too, in favor of reducing tax rates to help business prosper and thus increase the "take" from income taxes, permitting a systematic reduction in the debt.

As for the national debt, the United States hasn't been what you might call "solvent"—debt free—since 1866. The record looks something like this:

1835	None
1866, after Civil War	$2,750,000,000
1899, after war with Spain	1,500,000,000
1920, after World War I	26,500,000,000
1930	16,000,000,000
1933, end of Hoover term	21,000,000,000
1939, beginning World War II	41,000,000,000
1941, on Pearl Harbor Day	55,000,000,000
1947, March	260,000,000,000

Obviously, the time has come when there must be wrestling with the debt, but failure to reduce tax rates and invite depression would in the long run only serve to increase the debt.

If taxes are slashed enough, there's a good chance that improved business would make up the difference in the Government's actual revenue.

One thing is certain: unless the Government ceases forcing every citizen to work 2 days a week to keep the Federal pay roll padded, business wheels will roll just that much slower.

Reduction in Internal Revenue Bureau Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on March 13 an editorial was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "An Inexcusable Budget Cut," from which I read the following:

There is absolutely no excuse for the $30,000,000 cut in the Internal Revenue Bureau's appropriation just voted by the House. It certainly is not an economy move.

* * * * * *

Not less, but more money, if needed, should be supplied by Congress to insure the collection of every dollar justly due to the Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INEXCUSABLE BUDGET CUT

There is absolutely no excuse for the $30,000,000 cut in the Internal Revenue Bureau's appropriation just voted by the House. It certainly is not an economy move.

Bureau officials are able to show from past experience that every dollar spent on uncovering tax evasions brings a return of $20 in additional collections. How could Congress invest the people's money to greater advantage?

According to official estimate, this alleged saving on an appropriation bill would actually cost the Government—and that means the taxpayers—the not inconsiderable sum of $600,000,000.

It is all the more necessary to grant the full appropriation asked by the Internal Revenue Bureau because it was based on a forthcoming expanded tax-enforcement drive, encouraged by last year's success in producing $1,280,000,000 of additional revenue.

Even with its present staff, the Bureau can investigate only about 3 percent of returns, yet half those examined have shown underpayments, either designed or unintentional. Through this procedure it had been hoped to increase collections by more than $2,000,000,000 in the coming year.

That drive will be seriously slowed up unless the Senate vetoes the reckless action of the House. Not less but more money, if needed, should be supplied by Congress to insure the collection of every dollar justly due to the Government.

Roots of the Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in its issue of Sunday last the Washington Post in a leading editorial entitled "Roots of the Truman Doctrine," discussed the recent address delivered by the President of the United States to the two Houses of Congress on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOTS OF THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

President Truman's momentous policy of supporting free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation can best be understood, we surmise, if viewed in its historic perspective. It seems novel and daring largely because the aid which he has asked Congress to extend to Greece and Turkey would go to an area with which we have been little concerned in the past. But when we turn from geography to the principle involved, the President seems to re-echo historic words. And he has acted for precisely the same reasons that prompted a similar step by President Monroe nearly a century and a quarter ago.

The Monroe Doctrine rests, as Elihu Root once said, "upon the right of every sovereign state to protect itself by preventing a condition of affairs in which it will be too late to protect itself." Our young Republic felt the menace and pressure of monarchial and imperialistic systems. Monroe realized, as did some of his predecessors and all of his successors, that if these systems should attempt new colonizations in any part of the Western Hemisphere or subjugate any of the American Republics, our own independence would be endangered. In other words, democracy had to have a favorable climate in which it could thrive and grow, not merely in one country but in the whole of the New World.

It is especially interesting to recall that a dispute with Russia helped to precipitate the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine. A Russian ukase of 1821 claimed jurisdiction over the Pacific coast as far south as Vancouver Island, along with the right to colonize it. This threat synchronized with fears that the more reactionary powers in the Holy Alliance would attempt a reconquest of the Latin-American Republics. Assured of British antagonism toward any such conquests, President Monroe struck out boldly and committed whatever strength our young Republic had to the maintenance of freedom for our neighbors as well as for ourselves.

"We should consider," he said, speaking of the sovereigns of Europe, "any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and have maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principle, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

This is the essence of what President Truman has now said with respect to much wider areas. He has projected the principle of the Monroe Doctrine into the political realities of 1947. In this atomic age, freedom cannot be secure in one hemisphere alone. Our entrance into the United Nations was sufficient recognition of that fact. Security today must be based on global concepts. Consequently, our Government is saying that we shall extend a helping hand to free peoples anywhere, if they need help in resisting totalitarian aggression.

For their own propaganda purposes, the Russians interpret this policy as extending a protectorate over Greece. But it is aimed at preserving the independence of nations, not at destroying it. To be sure, the United States did go through a period of imperialism at the beginning of the present century, and Theodore Roosevelt brought the Monroe Doctrine into disrepute by attaching to it his short-sighted corollary asserting the right of intervention in Latin-American countries which did not meet their obligations to his satisfaction. But that imperialism has long since been supplanted by the policy of the good neighbor. Today the policy of the good neighbor is the corollary of our Monroe Doctrine, and that, of course, ought to shape

the details of the aid we give to Greece and Turkey.

Nor should anyone suppose that this historic American policy has been confined in the past to this hemisphere. The same principle underlies our long efforts to maintain the territorial and political integrity of China. We have acted basically out of self-interest—the desire to protect our own freedom, independence, and right to trade with the rest of the world—but the result has been to strengthen the efforts of many peoples to maintain or to acquire governments of their own choosing. Democracy has thus attained a strength in the world that would otherwise have been lacking. It has survived as a positive, constructive, and expanding force instead of withering before the repeated assaults of tyranny.

We cannot avoid seeing the Truman policy as a fulfillment of the traditional American role on the larger scale of operations that modern science has made imperative. It is not an aggressive policy, and it must not be allowed to degenerate into imperialism. But it does erect new barriers to the encroachments of totalitarianism, while trying to buttress the efforts of independent peoples to work out their own destinies. As we see it, this dynamic expression of our interest in a free world is no less significant than President Monroe's concern with a free hemisphere.

Proposed Grecian and Turkish Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday February 19), 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last evening I had the privilege of participating in a discussion of the proposed Grecian or Turkish loans with Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut, on the radio program Open Hearings over the Columbia network. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOHNSON. I do not like what Russia has done to the Baltic States, or to the Balkans, or to Central Europe, or to Korea, or to China. All along the line her policies have been brutal, selfish, and ruthless. Also I have no sympathy and no patience with our Russian-inspired American Communists in their campaigns of disloyalty, mischief, and vilification. But neither am I in sympathy with British economic and political imperialism as practiced by her all over the world or with her 100 years of monopoly of the commerce of the Mediterranean and its environs. But the solution for the Near East problem does not depend on whether we hate communism more or imperialism less. This issue must be resolved without haste on what is better for America and what likely will prove better for the world in the long run. Russia and her neighbors have every right as free men to share in the rich commerce of southern Europe, and in this day and age a program of containing her is not being realistic. Her huge potential production and her new-born capacity to trade do not warrant such outmoded treatment.

The United States has done much to free and increase world trade; but she is taking a very backward and contradictory step when she tries to quarantine Russian commerce and keep it out of the Mediterranean. The only hope for Russia, and the world for that matter, is to encourage Russia to participate in world affairs. That is an effective way to combat communism. Russia has as much right to the Dardanelles as we have to the Panama Canal and for the identical reasons. For over 100 years Britain has kept her out; now when Britain's "block Russia" policies must fall of their own weight her statesmen are shrewd enough to unload this no-longer-feasible task on any boob nation that will grab the hook. That is where we come in. Or is it? Any people who permit themselves to be ruled by fear and hate deserve to be taken for a ride. That is the error we are toying with. Britain's canny diplomats, correctly calculating our fanatical fear of communism and our frantic hatred of it, are striking while the iron is hot.

Our President, angered and frustrated by the long series of Molotov's stupid policies of negation, advocates a revolutionary change in our foreign policy. The President calls for a policy of 100 percent American intervention in the political and military problems of all the world. These are his words: "It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." Under such a dictum we choose sides and support one faction or the other in every war, civil or otherwise, wherever it may occur.

In Greece, a king with his back to the wall is fighting Greeks who do not like his cruel incompetence. These forces think they are fighting for freedom, but we arbitrarily line up with the king and help him crush them.

The President lays his case before Congress, and Congress also hot and bothered by the long series of Molotov's stupid policies of negation, replies: "Well, we don't like Truman's plan but we are deathly afraid of Communists so we will have to swallow it." Thus the child of desperation is born, and a new foreign policy is launched.

The United States will do all it can to feed the unfortunate stricken people of Greece. No President need plead with Congress for food for starving people. Months ago the Administration set up in its current budget an item of $350,000,000 for the purchase of food for European relief. Every Member of the House and Senate will support that relief measure and vote to increase its total if the amount appears insufficient. But I want to make it crystal clear that the relief of starving people has nothing to do with this new suggested policy of worldwide political and military intervention. The President in this instance is pleading for support for kings and rulers, not hungry people.

Mr. BURDETT. Specifically, Senator, what is your objection to the President's new proposal for some $250,000,000 of economic, political and military assistance to the Greek Government?

Senator JOHNSON. Congress is confronted with a proposal for $250,000,000 to sustain the Greek monarchy with guns, military supplies, and military advisers. To such a project I am unalterably opposed. Why the United States Treasury should support an extravagant, incompetent, backward, and unpopular monarchy in Greece is beyond me. The President says by way of apology that he does not like some of the things this arbitrary ruler has done. Well, I should hope not. If I were the King of Greece and my people had my number and were determined to dump me, I would scream "communism" too. The cry of "wolf, wolf," will be raised by every royal punk the world over but Congress cannot rush to the rescue of all of them with money, guns, and military advisers. We simply do not have enough money to finance wars all over the earth.

But that is not the whole story. The President also wants one hundred and fifty millions to support the ruling dynasty in Turkey. In World War I Turkey fought on the side of Germany. In World War II her sympathies and her secret help were with Germany. However, German reverses made her cautious. Both sides courted her, and she profited tremendously from the war. We owe her nothing except our contempt. But she is in a century-old quarrel with Russia over the Dardanelles, and so we must pay her tribute to encourage her to carry out Britain's obsolete and insane scheme to stop Russia at the Turkish border. Purchasing our way into this ancient British-Turkish-Russian controversy is not statesmanship. It is international suicide.

Mr. BURDETT. Advocates of the proposed new loan to Greece have argued that a very immediate emergency exists there. It has been argued that if we do not give aid at once, there would be chaos in Greece and a probable overthrow of the Government. What is your view, Senator, on this side of the question?

Senator JOHNSON. Parliament has just voted the Greek King $36,000,000, and, frankly, I doubt that there is an immediate Greek crisis. There is a Greek problem, however, but it did not appear suddenly last week. Unemployment, want, misery, and desperation plague the valiant Greek people, but these troubles are not caused by communism manufactured in Russia; they are the result of misrule manufactured in England. Monarchial misrule under British domination is a perennial running sore in Greece. So long as we pour millions of cash into the King's coffers a real crisis for King George may be averted. But that is not a cure; it is an opiate. Something more constructive than support for a king is required from us. The plight of the Greek people appeals to our sympathy. Americans have a deep affection for the people of Greece. Their present-day fortitude and their ancient contribution to the arts and sciences have been an inspiration to us through the years. They have been our loyal allies in wars and in peace. They are thrifty, industrious people, and, given a chance, they will solve their political problems without our intervention.

Mr. BURDETT. Senator, several Congressmen and Senators have pointed out that in this case of Greece, the President proposes to bypass the United Nations. What do you think would be the effects of our proposed Greek action on the future of the United Nations?

Senator JOHNSON. The proposed Greek action will kill UN deader than a mackerel. The very first words of the United Nations Charter spell out its purpose, which was to be—"to take effective collective measures for the suppression of aggression, the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and to bring about settlement of disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." That fits the present problems like a glove.

With deep concern and some misgivings I have voted faithfully for each step toward what I was told and believed was to be a peaceful one world. I voted for the San Francisco Charter and the United Nations Organization, for the extension of lend-lease, funds for the Export-Import Bank, for the Bretton Woods agreements establishing the International Bank and Fund, and for billions of dollars for UNRRA. The cost of these innovations to our Treasury has been over $20,000,000,000. As each of these proposals came before the Senate, we were informed that upon their enactment depended world peace. It was not my understanding that UN was to be a fair-weather organization. I thought it was to serve during the storms. I hope that I was not duped and that the American people were not duped.

If Russia rates huge shipments of lend-lease from this country—and she has been and is still receiving such shipments—if she were a trusted ally in the great war—and she was—certainly the so-called Greek and Turkish crises should have been frankly discussed with her before they were laid before Congress. But that wasn't done. At almost the very hour that our Secretary of State alighted from the frigid air in Moscow the President informed Congress in effect that Russia must be stopped cold on the Dardenelles. Which Covernment is being difficult now? Little wonder that General Marshall's welcome was slightly more frigid than the winter atmosphere of the far north. Moscow at this distance would appear to be a chilly climate in which to begin the friendly discussions of permanent peace for the world.

Mr. BURDETT. It has been pointed out, Senator, that if we did take the Greek question to the United Nations, Russia could then veto any settlement we might propose. What do you think of that objection?

Senator JOHNSON. Contending that UN action might be blocked by the veto is nonsense. In the Russian-Turkish controversy Russia would have no vote. Paragraph 3 of article 27 of the United Nations Charter is proof of my statement. Furthermore, article 33 provides for several methods of settlement of such disputes as the President described to Congress, and article 34 gives the Security Council authority to investigate any dispute or situation. Either the Charter isn't worth the paper it is written on or it should be utilized in this present so-called crisis. To say it is too young and too inexperienced to perform is hog wash.

Mr. BURDETT. The President indicated he did not think there was enough time, in the Greek crisis, to appeal to the United Nations, and wait for it to act. Would you disagree there, Senator?

Senator JOHNSON. Yes; I would disagree. In July the United Nations will be 2 years old. It was created to handle just such situations as the President has presented to Congress. In fact this matter had been brought to the attention of the United Nations and a Commission already had been appointed by the Security Council to explore the troublesome conditions. The Commission has not had time to report, nor has the Security Council indicated what it would do. Without waiting to find out, UN is summarily discarded and sidetracked by the United States.

Yesterday a one world united by the San Francisco Charter seemed logical and likely to work. Today it is a shattered dream. Henceforth, it must be the East against the West with both sides playing power politics and both sides girding themselves for World War III; not one world with a passion for world peace, but two worlds and two armed camps glaring at each other; a communistic world on the one side and on the other a conglomeration of empires more or less decadent, small, bankrupt and tottering monarchies, Western Hemisphere Republics, Canada, and the United States of America.

No one knows who killed Cock Robin but everyone should know now that President Truman, Senator VANDENBERG, and the men who short-circuited UN are teamed up to destroy the dream we called the United Nations. If contemporary observers do not give these men the credit for the crucifixion, I predict they will not escape the historians.

Fear and hate have launched us on an expedition into the devil's work of encirclement and political and military intervention far from home. Under the Monroe Doctrine we claimed a backyard of our own. Under the new doctrine, we propose to keep Russia out of her own back yard—the Mediterranean. Stampeded with fear, boiling over with frustration, we sidetrack the United Nations and assume the responsibility of feeding the whole world and policing its political aspirations.

Mr. BURDETT. Do you see any dangers in a policy of long-range support for the Greek and Turkish Governments?

Senator JOHNSON. There is always grave danger in a policy of long-range support for governments which are not worthy. Eventually, such governments must fall. We dare not stake our prestige on the support of governments which do not entertain our ideals and our objectives. Our slogan should be "millions for the relief of hungry people but not one cent for the relief of questionable governments."

Mr. BURDETT. The President said, "The United States should be ready to give aid to all states that find themselves threatened by outside pressure or coercion." What do you think of that broad principle, Senator?

Senator JOHNSON. The United States should support the United Nations and the United Nations should give aid to all states threatened by outside pressure or coercion. Unilateral security is a poor road to travel. It must result in an all-out armament race and, eventually, war. Collective security is much safer.

Mr. BURDETT. Well, Senator, what is the alternative that you would propose in this case of Greece and Turkey?

Senator JOHNSON. Before the Congress takes this epochal leap-in-the-dark, I urge it to appoint a committee of five Senators and five Congressmen and order them to visit Greece, Turkey, Palestine, the Persian Gulf oil area, and, finally, Moscow, to determine the necessity or absence of necessity for so desperate an undertaking. I should like to see men named in whom the Congress and the country have confidence—men who respect the objectives of the Charter of UN—men whose love for America is certain and whose devotion to collective security through collective action is well established. It is the sort of procedure one should expect from a people's government. Swift and prudent action along this line by the Congress might spare the United States from an early entry into World War III. We owe it to 135,000,000 Americans whom we represent and to the billions of humans inhabiting every part of the earth to undertake our own exploration and reach our own conclusions before we vote for a foreign policy which will eventually destroy civilization.

Live Camels in Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues asked me recently, "JOHN, have you any camels on the deserts of Arizona?" I asked, "Do you speak now of the kind one smokes?" "No," said he, "but I have heard something that led me to believe that you possibly have camels in the deserts of the Southwest." "We probably have none wild today," said I, "but we did have an experimental use of camels, and it constitutes one of the most interesting stories in the history of western exploration. Let me tell you that story."

After I had finished the story, during a prolonged lunch hour recently, my colleague, Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, said, "JOHN, why do you not write that story and offer it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for I have never heard it nor read of it before." Several other gentlemen seated at the same table each declared that he had not heard the story, so here it is.

When Jefferson Davis, distinguished Senator from Mississippi prior to the War Between the States, became Secretary of War in the late fifties of the last century during, the Presidency of Franklin Pierce, he had some distinctive ideas, all his own, regarding the conquest of the West. One of these ideas was that the clumsy, hump-back oriental creatures, often known as the "ship of the desert," might very well be made as useful in transportation across our own American deserts as it had been for ages in the Mediterranean and other eastern countries. Accordingly, he caused agents to go into the Near East and buy up and ship to this country perhaps 200 head of camels to initiate the experiment.

We had just acquired the vast Southwest, reaching from Texas to the Pacific Ocean, and only the most daring souls dreamed of establishing a wagon road from our western frontier to the Pacific Ocean, and scarcely anyone dared to dream of building a railroad to the Pacific. It is true that James Gadsden was thinking about attempting to build a railroad to the Pacific and had just added a strip of land south of the Gila River in order to give a lower altitude route through the mountains and across the Continental Divide for a railroad. At that very time the gold rush to California was on, and new settlements were springing up along and near the Pacific coast in California, and those settlements were clamoring for mail service and passenger service and wanting freight service from their old homes back East to their new homes in the gold fields.

Much of the great intermountain country had not been explored excepting by the mountain men and the fur trappers who had not given much of an account of the land that they knew, and the United States Army was just beginning a series of scientific explorations to find out what lay in the vast unknown. The Army also had to be prepared to fight the Indians and possibly subjugate them. In 1857 an overland mail route was established across the burning deserts of the Southwest. The pony express was operating farther north, but this mail route lay across the desert regions. The Government gave John Butterfield, in 1857, a mail contract for $600,000 annually to carry the mail by stage from St. Louis, Mo., to San Francisco, Calif., by way of what is now El Paso, Tex., and Yuma, Ariz.

To get a rough idea of the Butterfield route, take a map of the United States and a suitable length of string. Hold one end of the string on St. Louis and the other end on the Golden Gate, letting the string loop down to the Mexican border, and it will about cover the stage route. Of course, Butterfield was merely subsidized by the Government, and he hoped to make his profits on passengers. He had a heavy investment in animals and rolling stock; however, that is another story, and I must not go into it here. Suffice to say that great difficulties of transporting persons and freight overland to California led the Secretary of

War to want to improve on the facilities, and he hoped that camels would play a part.

Now, the camel is a vicious brute, given to bad temper, especially if not well handled. The Secretary knew well that the Army mule skinner had no ability or inclination to manage the camels, so camel drivers were imported with the camels. I believe all the men brought with them were Greeks, although possibly some Arabs were brought. I happen to know personally about one of the camel drivers who operated across Arizona and later retired and died at Phoenix. His companions could not pronounce his Greek name, so they called him High Jolly. He is especially honored with a monument in a Phoenix cemetery, and on the monument is an account of some of his exploits of which camel driving was only one. There were not enough camel drivers imported to take charge of all of the animals brought in, and some army mule skinners did make the attempt to handle the oriental brutes, but not for long. As a part of the viciousness of the camel, he can bite an arm off of a man quicker than a Missouri mule can kick his driver, and many men were terribly bitten by these camels. These animals soon fell into disfavor with the Army, and that is putting it mildly.

Several military units tried the camels, and, naturally, wanted to make them successful, because this was the pet project of the Secretary of War, so there must have been a reason why they were not found successful and were later discarded. In fact, there were several reasons why they were soon discarded.

I may say in passing that one commander of the period did use the camels to good advantage and did report favorably on their use to the War Department. That commander was Major Beale, who explored the West along the thirty-fifth parallel of north latitude starting out from San Antonio, Tex., and crossing to California. Major Beale crossed Arizona twice on this round-trip expedition. On one lap of the expedition he crossed Arizona in the summertime, and on the other lap he crossed northern Arizona in the wintertime, which meant that he gave his camels a real test, for in the high altitude around what is now Flagstaff the winters are very severe, with usually heavy snows and often below-zero temperatures.

Major Beale gives the camels credit for saving the lives of his men and the other animals in his expedition when a guide got the party 40 miles from a known water hole and did not know where the next one was to be found. This was in northern Arizona, probably not far from Kingman in Mohave County. On this occasion the camels were used to go back to the known supply of water and carry sufficient water for man and beast in the stranded expedition. It was found to be true that a camel can go a long distance and a long time without water, and they did it in this case.

Why were the camels discarded by the Army? There was another more potent reason than their natural viciousness and the disinclination of American soldiers to fool with them. The chief reason is that the camel is not adapted to the American type of desert. He has a soft padded foot and not a hoof. He can negotiate easily the sandy deserts of the Far East, but he cannot negotiate the vast areas of the Southwest in the foothills and the mountains particularly where sharp-edged rocks are the only footing for man and beast. I do not know whether the Army attempted to shoe the camels, but in any case they found that the camels' feet were cut to pieces by much of the rough country over which they were called on to travel.

When the Army discarded the camels they simply turned several hundred of them loose in southwestern Arizona. A circus management felt that they needed some camels for their show, and hearing of some nearer than Africa sent their agents out to Arizona and rounded up at least 20 or 30 of them and took them on the road. Also a mining company using burros for transport figured that they might use the camel as a beast of burden with greater success than the Army had known. Accordingly, a large number of these camels were captured and put to use by this mining company. But they soon found the same difficulty that the Army had found, that the camel's soft feet would not stand the travel over the rock-strewn areas, so the animals were again discarded. A personal friend of mine, an elderly lady living in Tempe, Ariz., tells me that when she was a little girl 9 years of age she saw the last camel train going through the place of her birth, loaded with ore, for this mining company. That was just before they were discarded the second time.

What became of these ungainly beasts turned loose on the desert? Our story is not ended yet. In those days, long before the coming of the railroad, practically all goods and passengers destined for Arizona Territory were brought to Yuma in the southwest corner of Arizona. Wagon trains carried goods and freight into the interior of the Territory. For years the teamsters were harassed by these camels, for whenever wagon trains stopped at night the camels came into the encampment hoping perhaps to get some oats or hay, but frightening the horses and mules and stampeding them so that the angry teamsters would shoot the camels to get rid of a nuisance.

Shooting these semiwild camel seemed contrary to the principles of the humane society, and a great cry went up against it. The Legislature of Arizona Territory passed a law declaring closed season on camels, and took other measures for their protection, but even so apparently they are now extinct. A live camel has not been seen on the southwestern deserts of Arizona for many years. In fact, we cannot be sure when the last live camel was seen, for many wild tales and legends have sprung up.

The old prospectors exchanged stories around the campfire in which the ungainly oriental beasts figure conspicuously. I have even heard some old men of the mountain declare that there are ghosts of camels stalking the desert at night, and that I can come nearer believing than many of their tales that are more fantastic and less ghostly. One I remember distinctly from an old prospector was to effect that the last camel he had seen was a very large old brute, and he had chained on his back the skeleton of a man. The camel, it seems, never told who his rider had been nor where he was taking the last remains. These assertions about camel ghosts and ghostly cargo may be discounted, but that the camels were used and in Major Beale's case were successful, and that the humane society persuaded the Legislature of Arizona Territory to pass a law protecting these semiwild beasts, are all matters of historic fact and matters of record.

Monopoly and the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address entitled "Monopoly and the South," delivered by Mr. Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, before the Southern Economic Association in Birmingham, Ala., on November 22, 1946.

I am advised by the Government Printing Office that the manuscript of the address will occupy approximately three pages of the RECORD and the estimate of cost is $213.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

More than 8 years ago the late President Roosevelt in a letter to the members of the Conference on Economic Conditions in the South described the plight of the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. You are familiar with the substance of the report of that conference. It drew a glaring portrait of an area rich in economic endowments but baffled in the realization of its potential capabilities by the hold of habit on economic outlook, by waste in economic resources, and by the opposition of entrenched monopoly controls.

Although it is not yet a decade since that report was completed, time has run, and the world has undergone irrevocable change. The South, along with the other great regions of the United States, threw its energy and its spirit into the defense of freedom. In the same way that the immense drama of war and peace has altered economic facts and prospects elsewhere, so the events of these years have left their imprint upon the South. The South is now confronted by many profound questions which must be answered if its economic development is to continue and if it is not to slip back to the doldrums of prewar years. Instead of becoming again a problem area, the South, like the West, undoubtedly will seek to retain its gains and to go forward in the fulfillment of its capacities as a prosperous productive region within an expanding national economy.

It may at once be said that the gains which have been made during the war years are striking. Their extent may be judged from a report recently issued by the Department of Labor. This study, based upon a comprehensive survey of the Southern States, from

Virginia to Texas, offers a far different picture than that which this same region presented in 1938. New industries have grown up, products never made in the South before the war are now manufactured here, and both per capita income and productivity have risen at rates as high or higher than in any other part of the country. The percentage of total national income for which the South now accounts is larger than at any time in history.

During the war years the South has substantially reduced its indebtedness, thereby decreasing its interest-tribute to the North, and increasing southern-owned equity in southern industry. This new equity can be used by southern enterprisers to strengthen their hand in the control and operation of southern industry, free and independent of northern domination. This, in most general terms, constitutes the bright side of the picture. It is a panorama of hope and promise, but it is not enough to warrant complacence about the future.

For the South must progress a long way to reach economic parity with the North and to throw off what has been described as its economic colonial status. The great bulk of southern industry, transportation, and commerce is still controlled by the North. Monopoly during the war strengthened its hand everywhere, including the South. Absentee ownership and control of southern industry and economic assets are still very much in the picture. They represent basically, the major economic problem of the South.

And we must admit that we have not yet coped very successfully with this problem. More than 50 years ago that great constructive southern thinker, Henry W. Grady, was advocating for the South diversification of agriculture, creation of local industries, and the development of manufacturing. Grady was sometimes ironic about the South's lack of economic freedom under its antiquated agrarian system. He once said that a poor man who died in Georgia had a gravestone from Vermont, a coffin from Cincinnati, funeral clothes from Boston and Chicago, and that the South didn't furnish a thing for that funeral but the corpse and the hole in the ground. I suspect that the same situation exists about as it was in Grady's time. The South must now especially be concerned with the concentration of control in economic affairs, because it, like the West, has many new industrial capacities which will be a target for monopolies seeking to extend their control.

In discussing the disparity in economic conditions which works to the detriment of the South, I want to make clear at the outset that it is my opinion that a sound national economy depends on the vigor of the development of all sections of the country. It is not a question of building up one region as against another. It is rather an acceptance of the fact that our country cannot be prosperous if artificial and unnatural impediments are put in the way of each region's developing to the fullest its own industrial potential. Without elaborating the point, it is my belief that when the South or the West are not permitted the maximum development of which they are capable, the East and the North also suffer in the long run.

The South now possesses all of the assets which are necessary to translate opportunity into accomplishment. Its physical resources are profuse and varied. Its soil produces a wide range of agricultural products in addition to those such as cotton and tobacco in which it leads the world. Several hundred types of commercially valuable minerals are found in the South—coal, iron, and bauxite which is essential to the manufacture of aluminum, asbestos, zinc, and many others. More than half of our production of crude oil and natural gas comes from southern States, and nearly all of such important commodities as phosphates and sulfur. The South has abundant water resources and highly developed roads and navigation facilities—and as the basic requisite for growth, the South has a young and abundant supply of labor.

In contrast with this ample heritage of raw materials and people are the practices and accumulated artificial handicaps which for so long retarded southern development. Here again there is no need to recapitulate in detail the story of eroded soil, too often furrowed more by neglect than by use; of unwisely exploited resources, misdirected energies, and the tragedy of waste which has depleted so much of our national wealth without returning a comparable compensation to the people. All of us know too well the toll which such conditions may take from the lives of those who live in an area subject to the ravages of economic error. That story also has been told too well and too bitterly in the past, both in the lower standards of education and the poorer conditions of health that have afflicted large sections. These same factors have accounted for a continuous stream of migration from the southern States.

The scarcity of capital and credit in the South have constituted a tremendous barrier to the development of local industry. Ordinarily the South has had to depend almost entirely on outside sources for the financing of its industries with the consequence that absentee ownership and management have for long dominated many of the larger southern industrial activities. In consequence of this situation southern resources in some cases have deliberately been left unused by absentee owners to prevent the development of competition. In other cases southern production, subject to remote control, has been coordinated with designs of monopoly in other areas not to benefit the Nation or the South but to further the interests of the monopoly group. Both as producers and consumers the people of the South have felt the effects of such monopoly methods more keenly, even if more indirectly, than citizens of New England or of the Midwest.

We do not have to go far to seek examples of the way in which remote monopoly groups have been able in past years to limit southern economic development. This situation has existed in the steel industry over many years. In the case of bauxite nearly all important deposits have been owned or controlled by outside interests. Even though there is an abundance of zinc ore in the South, the zinc has been fabricated not in the South where the ore is found but in other areas. In effect, many southern mineral resources have been limited to the status of colonial mines.

Some of these effects of monopoly on the South can best be illustrated by citing specific examples. There have been many instances in which new southern industries came into being and vanished at the whim of monopoly. One such case occurred during the first World War. When American imports of safety matches were cut off by the war a large match plant was built in Savannah. In 1929 when an international match cartel was formed between the major American producer and the Swedish match company controlled by Ivar Kreuger, one of the provisions of the cartel agreement was the razing of the Savannah plant. At a later date in 1931, the Kreuger group started to build a match plant in Natchez, Miss. Before it could be finished, another cartel agreement intervened and the plant, instead of being completed, was demolished.

In the roster of monopolies and cartels which have been prosecuted by the Department of Justice during the past 10 years are included such basic industries and products as aluminum, chemicals, fertilizers, glass, electrical equipment, incandescent lamps, magnesium, newsprint, dyestuffs, drugs, plastics, photographic materials, foodstuffs, tobacco, and a host of lesser items. Every one of these cases involved at some point questions and issues vital to the emergence of new Southern industry or essential to the welfare of Southern consumers. The total cost of such monopolies is, of course, incalculable, but it has been estimated that the price paid by the South for the existence of just one monopoly, that in commercial fertilizers, was great enough to have provided a college education for every high-school graduate of the Southeastern States.

The weapons of monopoly are as numerous as they are artful and varied. It is for this reason that monopoly conditions have often grown up almost unnoticed by the public until one day it is suddenly realized that an industry is no longer competitive but is governed by an economic oligarchy able to crush all competition. It is all the more important, then, that we should clearly understand the element upon which monopolistic control is generally based. In themselves, these elements are relatively simple but in their operation they are intricate and complex. A monopoly group may acquire control of raw materials. In the past, monopolies of this type were especially important. Today, however, there are only a few industries in which monopoly control of limited natural resources is the real problem.

At the present time, such factors as the control of technology, of research, and of know-how are far more likely to be the basis of monopoly power. Where these are not sufficient, a whole array of ingenious devices may be employed to substitute monopoly power for the free play of competition in the market. Markets may be divided. Fields of production may be allocated among a privileged few. Quotas may be placed upon output. Prices may be artificially fixed and enforced through marketing agreements. Gentlemen's understandings may impose discrimination against individual buyers and sellers. Or, in some cases, by taking advantage of already entrenched positions, monopoly groups may employ their power over credit to squeeze small industries and lesser rivals out of the market.

Beyond such tactics there are many shadowy monopoly practices which have so infiltrated the operation of industry that it becomes extraordinarily difficult to remove them. The use of complicated trade statistics or of carefully worked out basing point systems may be just as effective in accomplishing the will of monopoly as would be the outspoken fiat of an economic autocrat governing industry openly and directly.

Although it would be possible to cite scores of cases illustrating in detail the motives, the methods and the consequences of every stratagem which modern monopoly commands, it will suffice to point out that in all such cases there is at some point an abuse of power and a violation of the laws and principles upon which our free economy is based. Monopolies strike at the root of those qualities of efficiency and progress which the world identifies with American industry in general. Even if there were no other reason to censure monopoly as inimical to the public interest, the inescapable inefficiency which results would demand that we attack it.

Monopoly can be efficient only when it is in a position to compel others to carry the burden of costs and waste. The truth of this assertion was clearly demonstrated in a recent antitrust case in which the defendant was among the world's largest retail distributors of food products. This group employed massed purchasing power and massed selling power to destroy all semblance of genuine competition in the production, manufacture, processing, distribution and sale of food prod-

ucts in a Nation-wide market. This particular monopoly system was integrated both vertically and horizontally, so that all power was concentrated in a small compact nucleus of top management. As the largest organization in its field it was able to place an unusual number of restraints on competition at all levels, and its tactics are instructive. In purchasing supplies it continuously sought to coerce discriminatory buying preferences from manufacturers and producers. A dual threat was employed to this end: Either the monopoly group might withdraw its patronage, or it might manufacture the same commodity as a competing producer. In effect, this amounted to a direct threat of boycott. The secret of the system was a differential price structure under which the monopoly group could pay low prices for its own supplies while all competitors were forced to pay higher prices. The greater the preference it could obtain the higher was the price which then had to be charged to others.

So far as its retail competitors were concerned the monopoly group could make it difficult or even impossible, if it chose, for them to survive. By selecting points of attack it could at any moment throw its full weight against the small rival until he was eliminated from business. How deeply such practices could cut into the fabric of a free economy was shown by the treatment which the monopoly group accorded to independent farmers. Even aside from the constant manipulation by which it could raise or lower the price of farm products through monopolistic demand, this group was not above venting its disapproval upon individuals. For example, after a convention of fruit growers in a Southern State had been assembled and lectured upon the benefits of dealing exclusively with the chain, it was anticipated that unanimous assent would be forthcoming from the audience. Several growers, however, protested that to abandon the open auction which was their custom would permit the monopoly group to skim off the cream of the crop, or conversely, to drop the bottom out of the market for fruit it did not choose to buy. The dissenting farmers thereupon became marked men. No purchases at all were made from them and very shortly they were forced out of business, and in effect out of their livelihoods.

Unfortunately, such cases are not isolated. Such inroads upon the free market constitute an assault upon economic liberty at its source. It is only necessary to translate the significance of such a situation to the veteran starting in business, to the independent inventor seeking to exploit a new discovery and to the average family trying to meet its needs or to achieve higher standards of living. When monopoly has the power to stifle competition, or to impose its own terms upon the market and consumers, it constitutes a denial of that economic opportunity which is the core of our system of free enterprise. Even more, the denial of opportunity not only creates economic difficulties; it presents a crisis to the central values upon which American society is based. If the increasing concentration in American industry were to continue indefinitely we should not simply be confronted with obstacles to the future economic development of the South or of the West or of the Nation; in effect, we should be faced with a catastrophe of those economic and political principles which lie at the heart of American democracy.

There would be no point in describing these dangers, real as they are, if they could not be avoided. The proof that they can be overcome is contained in the magnificent performance of American industry during the war and in the contribution which the South made to that achievement. Given the start that it now has there is no visible limit to the economic development of the South any more than there is a fixed boundary to the growth of the American economy.

At the present time no one can say how far the readjustment of the southern economy will go. As manufactures of all types continue to increase, agriculture also will undergo some changes. It may no longer constitute in years to come the predominant occupation that it is today. It is very likely that much greater diversification will occur, both in industry and agriculture. It is not likely now nor is it ever likely to become the aim of the South to develop into a one-sided, highly mechanized, overindustrialized section. I suppose that what the South seeks and needs is to acquire economic balance and proportion. In this respect the decentralization of industry which began during the war is especially important. The war plants built in this great southern region can and should be a direct boon to southern industries, and these plants must not become additions to the control of existing monopolies.

The scope of our tasks is equalled only by the extent of the cooperation which they require among industry, labor and government. In this respect the South already knows what such cooperation can do. The Tennessee Valley Authority, perhaps the most successful experiment in economic cooperation in American history, has demonstrated what happens when latent resources are brought to light. The returns are immediate and apparent. New enterprise, better health, better education, higher incomes and a constantly increasing range of opportunities and occupations flow from the dams and rivers which have been harnessed by the TVA. The Tennessee Valley Authority has proven its worth both in war and peace. Leland Stowe, the well-known foreign correspondent, once stated that the war might have been delayed months, perhaps years, had it not been for the tremendous addition to American productivity which the TVA represented. The power of TVA not only added to the output of ordinary munitions—it was the existence of TVA which made the South the birthplace of the atomic age when the Government located its major atomic energy center at Oak Ridge, Tenn. In all of its aspects the performance of TVA has been to the South, and to other regions as well, "news about the future"—a preview of accomplishments within the grasp of the present generation.

No discussion of monopoly and the South would be complete if it overlooked the importance of freight rates. Freight rates have been arranged so as to permit the East to draw raw materials out of the South cheaply, and, at the same time, to hinder any attempt of the South to export finished products on a large scale. Thus the rate structure has quite effectively deprived the South of much of the advantage and profit that would come from processing its own raw material. Under existing rates most finished products move much greater distances for an equal amount of money when made in the Northeast than when processed in the South. Thus in any attempt of a southern manufacturer to compete with an eastern manufacturer in a market from which each is equidistant, the southern manufacturer is beaten before he starts.

The system of rate making by which the railroads have covered the country with private agreements maintaining rates at noncompetitive and discriminatory levels has undoubtedly worked against the South's best interest. The manner in which this has been done is most interesting but it cannot be described adequately in the time which is available tonight. To those who wish to pursue the subject, I commend a careful study of the allegations and the evidence in the pending case of *State of Georgia v. Pennsylvania Railroad Company*. This case, as you know, was initiated by Governor Arnall of Georgia as an original action before the Supreme Court of the United States, against the principal southern and eastern railroads. It should be noted that this case is one of those infrequent but very interesting actions provided for by the Constitution to try issues between a State and citizens of another State. The complaint alleged that the defendants had violated the Federal antitrust laws by:

1. Combining and conspiring to fix noncompetitive freight rates;

2. Employing economic coercion to control freight rates; and

3. Combining and conspiring to discriminate in rates against the State of Georgia and other Southern States.

The Supreme Court has already held that the State of Georgia presented a valid cause of action. A special master was appointed and the taking of evidence has been concluded. The case is to be argued before the master early next year. The evidence contains much that is pertinent to the future of the South.[1]

A few instances will show the type of evidence with which the record abounds. On October 11, 1941, the Southern Railway submitted to the Southern Freight Association a proposal for a reduced rate upon logs from certain stations in northwestern Alabama to Altavista, Va., the entire movement being over the lines of the Southern Railway. The Southern Railway in its proposal stated that it felt that the reduced rate was necessary in order to enable the logs to move from the Alabama points. When the proposal was submitted by the Southern Freight Association to its members there were objections predicated upon the supposedly dangerous competitive influences that might be set in motion by the proposed rates.

These freight associations are part of a hierarchy of private organizations that pass upon the rates which individual carriers shall file. The hierarchy is in the shape of a pyramid with fewer and fewer officials from larger and larger railroads composing the committees as the top of the pyramid is reached. There is an elaborate procedure of appeals whereby the action of a committee on a lower level may be appealed to a committee on a higher level. In the instance I am discussing the proposal for reduced rates on logs was disapproved initially by the General Freight Committee by a majority vote. It was then appealed to the executive committee where it was again disapproved by a majority vote. Finally an appeal was taken to the Traffic Executive Association—Southern Territory, where on July 20, 1943, 22 months after the proposal was first filed, it was stricken from the docket.

This illustration demonstrates the power of the organized railroads, acting through their various rate committees and executive associations, to prevent, hinder and delay proposals to reduce rates from becoming effective. Here the entire movement involved was over the lines of the Southern Railway, but even its managerial discretion was subjected to the concerted judgment of the other roads, none of whom were parties to the rate proposed. And in the end the reduced rate was not made effective.

Another instance. On June 24, 1941, the Louisville & Nashville Railroad submitted a proposal to the Southern Freight Association

[1] Only a limited number of copies of the transcript of the evidence will be available, but much of the evidence was placed in the record of the Senate hearings on the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536) which were held beginning March 20, 1946. Copies of these hearings can be secured from the clerk of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.

effecting a reduction on agricultural implements from points in Southern Freight Association Territory to points in official territory. Official territory is, roughly speaking, that part of the country lying east of the Mississippi river and north of the Ohio and Potomac rivers, and it also includes most of Virginia. The Southern Freight Association approved the proposed reduction, and on July 19, 1941, forwarded it to the official lines. Although the proposed rate did not seek parity but only 110 percent of the prevailing northern level, it was rejected by the northern lines on the ground that—

"The only justification offered is commercial competition, that is, competition with producers in official territory at markets in official territory.

"It is our understanding at the present time that there is a movement of agricultural implements from the South to official territory. Generally, quite frequently, it is a movement of items that are not usually manufactured in the North, although this may not always be the case. After careful study of the proposal before us we cannot consistently recommend that this reduction in rating be made, and therefore recommend that the proposition be not concurred in."

Thus culminated a 12-year struggle on the part of southern manufacturers of agricultural implements to market their product in the North—a struggle which David E. Lilienthal, former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, described as an example of the economic handicaps that unequal freights impose on the South.

Many other instances of this type may be cited to illustrate the kind of disadvantage under which the South has long labored. This situation will be partially corrected in respect to some kinds of traffic if the Interstate Commerce Commission's order, which is now being litigated in the courts, finally becomes effective. But, in my judgment, the South will never be freed of these unfair discriminations until the railroads are made to observe strictly the requirements of the antitrust laws.

Although great strides have been made by the South toward becoming a balanced economic region, much remains to be done before the fullest effects of such progress are visible. The hopes of the South depend not only upon the energy and economic imagination of its people but upon their insistence that they shall not be denied equal opportunity. Southern development can find a major stimulus to the organization of new industry and to the improvement of its agriculture in the advances which are now taking place in every field of technology. New chemical techniques are both a challenge and an invitation to the development of new chemical industries in the South. Such products as cotton and wood have potential uses, far greater than any now existing, as raw materials for the new chemical technology. Much of the same is true of advances which have been made in electronics, as power resources are developed and as new methods of communication and lighting are introduced.

There is hardly an area of its economic life from housing, transportation, and health to recreation in which the South cannot find great benefit by taking advantage of the techniques which have come out of the war. All of these goals are within the realm of achievement if southern industry is not subject to the domination of monopoly groups.

No one can deny the existence of urgent and irksome social problems any more than one can deny the unique cultural contribution which the South had made to American life. There is every reason to believe, however, that if the South can sense in its daily life and look forward to the reward of economic development, such problems will become much easier to solve.

One of the most promising signs for the South is the growing number of bold, progressive thinkers who are determined to create a better life for the South. These dynamic leaders were born in the South, they have lived here and they understand your traditions and people. They appreciate to the fullest the true richness and fruitfulness of southern culture. But they are also cognizant of the mistakes of the past and the need of the South to advance at quickened pace if it is to reach its true fulfillment. These new leaders might say in the words of your immortal Sidney Lanier:

> Old past let go and drop i' the sea
> 'Till fathomless waters cover thee!
> For I am living but thou art dead;
> Thou drawest back, I strive ahead
> The day to find.

The South seems to be turning with increasing frequency to these liberal leaders. Their abilities will be a great aid to the South in securing its proper recognition in the affairs of the Nation. Men like Georgia's great Gov. Ellis Arnall have sensed the South's urgent need to throw off the yoke of absentee-monopoly control and to establish local and regional industries on a widespread front.

Other statesmen in the South have also grasped the importance of such a program. Right here in Alabama there are some outstanding leaders who are increasingly attracting the country's attention as men who are in the vanguard of the new, liberal South.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." This proverbial admonition suggests the greatest need of our age, if we are to measure up to our responsibilities. Whether it is on the level of international statesmanship in the creation of world peace, or on the level of the small community seeking to improve the education of its children, men must view what they do today in terms of tomorrow. In economic affairs, as elsewhere, the American people in the years ahead must make some inescapable choices. Their decisions will result either in an expanding economy in which economic freedom and production are constantly increased, or, if our perspectives are shortsighted, in a static economy marked by the growth of monopoly and the further decline of opportunity.

Monopoly thrives in the "chill, reactionary snows" that follow war. Hence it is especially necessary at this time to prevent monopoly power from limiting opportunity in any direction. The answer to the monopoly problem is much simpler to state than it is to achieve. It consists in using every means and every policy available to promote the greatest possible freedom of opportunity. If the vision with which we approach these tasks is sustained by the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and by the encouragement of new and independent enterprise, both the South and the Nation of which it is a part will be able to work in an economy of increasing opportunity and economic justice for all Americans.

Legislative Thievery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the time and the opportunity has now come to expose the studied program of political party carnage and legislative thievery which has been adopted by the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives for the next 2 years.

In order to bring this program and policy out into the open and in full gaze of the public I have today reintroduced an exact copy of a bill introduced by Representative A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, on last Tuesday. This bill known as H. R. 2620 introduced on March 18, 1947, expresses the same purposes and the same intent as the original bill introduced by me on January 6, 1947.

The obvious and admitted purpose of the reintroduction of the bill by a Republican is legislative thievery which is going to be the established procedure of the Republican Party as long as it remains the majority party in the House.

If this is going to be the policy of the Republican leadership then the American public should know about it. I am ready and willing to accept the challenge, and demand those who deny a minority party its rights stand up and be counted in the broad daylight.

The Republican leadership has issued instructions that whenever good and progressive or constructive legislation is introduced in the House by a member of the Democratic Party the legislation is to be reintroduced by a member of the Republican Party and the Republicans are to take full credit for all such legislation and initiative. In effect, it is the policy of the Republican Party to entirely eliminate the Democratic Party in the House for all intent and purposes of constructive legislation.

In this particular instance I headed a committee which has worked for several months on many bills concerning the District of Columbia penal system. Out of the studies and conferences of this committee a revolutionary approach to the alcoholic problem was brought forth. The import of the proposed legislation immediately caught the popular fancy and soon attracted the attention of the Nation as progressive and needed legislation. The alcoholic problem has been declared by the United States Public Health Service as America's No. 4 problem.

This approach to the problem was also an obstacle in the admitted renewed march of the prohibition movement. I am a dripping wet and I am opposed to prohibition, which is the reason I believe those of us who can drink should do something about those who cannot have a social drink without injurious results.

Extensive hearings were conducted on the proposed legislation, and throughout the hearings the legislation is referred to as the Hébert bill.

Without warning to myself or advance notice, the amended legislation resulting from the hearings was introduced by the Republican chairman of the committee. The Hébert bill has now become the Miller bill. Since then I have learned that the gentleman from Nebraska, Representative MILLER, was instructed by the Republican leadership to reintroduce the bill in his name and that the further policy of the Republican leadership is to take credit for all good legislation which has been introduced by a member of the Democratic Party.

The results are obvious. This policy of the Republican Party means the complete elimination and destruction of the rights of the minority party in what is supposed to be a two-party legislative body. It means that whenever any legislation proposed by a member of the Democratic Party meets national approval and acclaim that a member of the Republican Party, acting under instructions of the Republican leadership, will steal the legislation and reintroduce it under the name of a member of the Republican Party, which party will take full credit, although it neither created nor developed the legislation.

This particular legislation and myself as an individual are unimportant, but the principle involved in this policy is most important. The principle involved strikes at the very fundamentals of our Constitution, which, while acknowledging the responsibility of the majority, at the same time recognizes the duty of the minority and the protection of its rights. If the minority in this Natio is to have no voice or right in the affairs of this country, then we are not far removed from a complete totalitarian form of government.

The Republican Party, which has given such lip service to the removal of controls, now advances the policy of absolute control over everything that is good and constructive for this Nation. The party which professes to want no controls wants all control.

It is time that the American people know about this Republican policy instead of a further piece down the road.

For my part, I shall continue to be guided by what legislation is good or bad for this country, whether it is introduced by a member of the Republican Party or a member of the Democratic Party. I shall participate in no party carnage or partisan chicanery, and I shall oppose at every turn the legislative thievery in which the Republican Party now indulges and on which it has set its course.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of East Boston Branch of the Boston Public Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1947.

BIRTHDAY GIFT COMMITTEE,
East Boston Branch,
Boston Public Library,
Boston, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: May I take this opportunity of extending to you my sincere congratulations on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the East Boston Branch of the Boston Public Library.

All of the people of Boston are proud of the great contribution to the community's educational advancement that the East Boston Branch has made. I feel sure that the East Boston Branch Library, the oldest branch library in the United States, will continue in the future as it has in the past to add luster to its record of public service.

It is indeed fitting that on the East Boston Branch Library's anniversary on Thursday, March 20th, the occasion be celebrated by presenting equipment, resulting from public subscriptions and donations from school children, that will enhance its value to the people of East Boston.

I am honored to represent the community containing the oldest public branch library in the country.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Forty Questions About the Greek-Turkey Aid Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, all patriotic Americans are opposed to communism and hope that its spread in this country and elsewhere throughout the world can be stopped without war and by reason of the obvious superiority of our own system in its benefits to mankind. Those of us who have been pointing out dangers of communism for many years are now, at long last, pleased to find it officially unpopular in Washington, D. C. Yet, the President's address to a joint session of Congress on March 12, 1947, raises some questions which need to be answered frankly by the administration. Our judgment is no better than our information. Our information about American foreign policy is not all that it should be by reason of the secrecy with which it has been conducted. It is also a little difficult to tell just what our foreign policy is. It seems to change from day to day and to have no consistent being. In the past 14 years it has ranged all the way from extreme isolation to extreme internationalism. It has witnessed appeasement of Japan, Germany, and Russia with eventual war made against the first two and now thinly veiled threats of war against the latter. It has placed great reliance upon the United Nations yet now bypasses it in favor of imperialism. Today the administration asks Congress to furnish troops and money to be used in the discretion of the President to stop communism in Greece and Turkey.

What I want to know is—

First. Where do we go from here and where do we come out, or do we?

Second. Can democracy be sold at the point of a gun or bought with dollars?

Third. To what extent will our undertaking to finance various foreign nations limit our fulfilling commitments to our own people at home, particularly veterans?

Fourth. What will be the total expense of the President's plan to the taxpayers of the United States?

Fifth. When was our Government first informed that Great Britain desired to cease her aid to Greece and Turkey?

Sixth. What commitments to Great Britain, if any, by inference or in fact, concerning aid to Greece have already been made on behalf of the United States?

Seventh. What agreements, express or implied, made at Yalta, Potsdam, London, Tehran, on the Atlantic Ocean, or in secret meetings at any other place, exist between the United States, Russia, and Great Britain with reference to other countries and peoples?

Eighth. If aid is extended to Greece and Turkey can we refuse similar assistance to other countries threatened by communism and civil disorder?

Ninth. How long is it contemplated that we must finance Greece and Turkey and support them in a military way against the age-old dream of Russia to control the Dardenelles?

Tenth. Has Great Britain given any assurances that if we assume the economic and military assistance to Greece that she will be able to and be willing to carry out her economic and military commitments elsewhere in the world without further help from us?

Eleventh. Who will exercise control of and what will be the extent of control over the expenditure of the money proposed to be made available by us to Greece?

Twelfth. What reason do we have to believe that after the proposed loan is used the Greek Government will have established itself so that it will not need an additional advancement to prevent being absorbed into the communistic fold?

Thirteenth. Has Great Britain agreed to keep her troops for police purposes in Greece or can we expect Great Britain to tell us, after we make the loan, that other commitments require withdrawal of troops as well as economic aid by Britain?

Fourteenth. What reason do we have to believe that Great Britain if she remains will not use the money loaned to establish in Greece a socialist form of government substantially the same as the present government in England which has failed so miserably to meet its responsibilies even though supported by vast loans from America?

Fifteenth. In event the proposed loan is made and our interest then in Greece still becomes menaced by aggression of Russia, what shall be the recommendation of the administration as to the steps to be taken to protect our interest?

Sixteenth. Is it contemplated that the Greek-Turkish-aid-power-politics policy will be revived in China where it failed its first test?

Seventeenth. Why is it anticipated that intervention of this kind will work in Greece and Turkey when it failed in China?

Eighteenth. How can we reduce our national debt when saddled with foreign financial undertakings the conclusion of which is not in sight?

Nineteenth. How many American military personnel and of what types are to be sent to Greece and Turkey?

Twentieth. Will any funds loaned be expended for maintenance of Greek and Turkish military forces?

Twenty-first. Does not our entry into Greece and Turkey under the circumstances proposed by President Truman entail the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine with its established corollary that if European countries keep out of North and South America we will likewise keep out of Europe?

Twenty-second. Does the President's proposal carry with it the abandonment of our hopes and efforts to build a United Nations capable of dealing with such situations as the present?

Twenty-third. Will not this proposed bypass of the United Nations weaken it?

Twenty-fourth. Why is it alleged that there is not time enough for UN to act in this emergency?

Twenty-fifth. Why are not the World Bank and International Stabilization Fund able to furnish the financial assistance required by Greece and Turkey?

Twenty-sixth. If we act outside of the UN when it suits our purposes, can other nations be blamed for doing likewise and will that not nullify the value and purpose of the UN?

Twenty-seventh. Are we laying down a general principle which will govern our policy elsewhere in the world and particularly in China, Poland, Iran, Iraq, Korea, Palestine, Argentina, and India?

Twenty-eighth. What arrangements and security are being or could be provided for repayment of the Greek and Turkish loans?

Twenty-ninth. Is not our proposed move into Greece and Turkey a policy of imperialism and power politics?

Thirtieth. Were any conversations conducted with Russia to persuade her to cease intervention in Greece and Turkey prior to the President's request for intervention by ourselves?

Thirty-first. If an economic offensive is to be launched against communism abroad what steps is the administration prepared to take to fight communism at home?

Thirty-second. What is the danger to democracy and freedom in Communist control of Greece and Turkey provided the people want it in place of the monarchy in one and dictatorship in the other now prevailing and to which we pledge support?

Thirty-third. Why is America, with the largest national debt in history, being called upon to shoulder this burden alone, without cooperation of like-minded fellow nations?

Thirty-fourth. What is there about our administration of German affairs to commend our talents in administering other alien populations?

Thirty-fifth. If Russia regards our entry into Greece and Turkey with the purpose of arming peoples on her borders as an unfriendly act, do we propose to maintain our position by force of arms?

Thirty-sixth. If we are to wage everything short of a shooting war against communism wherever we find it abroad, should we not stop further aid to Russia herself and to her satellites?

Thirty-seventh. If our policy of financing the world leads to bankruptcy and inflation at home will that not be an aid to communism in America?

Thirty-eighth. Will not continuation of government by crisis, a technique of recurrent emergencies we have faced in the past 14 years, mean continuation rather than elimination of Government controls and to that extent play into hands of the Communists in this country?

Thirty-ninth. Since extent of our aid to Greece is predicated upon the survey and reports prepared in a study there by Paul Porter, former head of the OPA, is it contemplated to try OPA-WPA theories in Greece and, if so, what prospect is there that they will work for an international New Deal any better than they did at home where they had to be abandoned?

Fortieth. Will not a policy such as recommended by the President set up political tensions and an armament race between the United States and Russia which would set the stage for an overt act of war as soon as Russia has finished developing the atom bomb?

United States Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to discuss certain remarks which were made of an adverse nature in regard to the Coast Guard during the debate in connection with H. R. 2436 and the report of the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Appropriations.

The chairman of the subcommitee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], a man whom I hold in the highest esteem for his purpose and devotion to the task at hand, has made certain statements with which I cannot agree. Since the Seventy-third Congress, as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have been in close association with the United States Coast Guard and its growth, development, and legislative program, I cannot accept without a word of negation such statements as my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has made to the effect that his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will give you specific examples of the waste, extravagance, and grandiose schemes of the Coast Guard. I know that the committee in placing a ceiling of $79,000,000 for Coast Guard expenditures points out that this is $72,000,000 more than the appropriation of 10 years ago. We are dealing with 1948 values and comparing them with those of 1938. Since 1938 the former Lighthouse Service of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation of the Department of Commerce have been united with the Coast Guard and their appropriations incorporated in one appropriation. In addition, the Coast Guard has by the acts of Congress itself been given still other and additional responsibilities which require funds far in excess of that which were originally requested by this service for its 1948 budget.

In this connection, I quote from the appropriation bill, fiscal year 1947, and the report from the Committee on Appropriations committed to the Committee of the Whole House and ordered to be printed on May 14, 1946:

> Certain new activities growing largely out of wartime scientific developments are now necessary functions of the Coast Guard and serve to increase materially the cost of operation. These activities include loran stations, an entirely new use of radio waves to guide ships and airplanes at sea, weather stations on ships located strategically in the Atlantic and Pacific to furnish weather information necessary to air transportation, an air-sea rescue service made necessary by the great increase in transoceanic air travel, and other duties.

I agree wholeheartedly with the spirit of peacetime economy which must be adopted and do not now debate nor argue the merits of a greatly expanded Coast Guard.

However, I do wish to bring to the notice of the House the fact that it has not been any grandiose idea of this service to expand itself, but that its growth has been brought about by its wartime efficiency and the fact that it has so well performed many duties throughout the world that the Navy and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other executive departments have required the Coast Guard to perform a multitude of tasks. Many of these responsibilities are of such a nature that were they performed by the Army, Navy, or other organization that organization would itself be required to purchase, build, develop, and equip facilities, and to train and educate personnel. For example, if our fleets need aids to navigation, are we going to require the Navy to duplicate the equipment and the service available from the Coast Guard?

I have for long given particular attention to the rating structure and ranks of the Coast Guard, and I have conscientiously served on the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy; in such duty I have been ably assisted by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey. This gentleman states:

> It is not intended to reduce enlisted personnel below the 19,500 ceiling now in effect. * * * If the Coast Guard will carry out the intent of the bill, the reduction will be made in officer ranks.

The figures will prove that the limitations of funds appropriated for pay and allowances will not maintain 19,500 enlisted personnel and a requisite proportion of commissioned and warrant officers. The maintaining of such enlisted strength would in fact probably require the discharge of commissioned officers

for whom the Government has expended considerable sums in education. I do not say that no reduction should be made in commissioned officers, but I do not think that it was the intention of the committee that the hands of the Coast Guard should be tied in this manner, otherwise there would be a complete nullification of the flexibility which the committee claims for its allocation of funds under the different headings. Criticism is made of the number of officers and petty officers in the Coast Guard compared to the number of nonrated men. The Coast Guard has always had a large percentage of ratings because the small floating units operated by the service require petty officers for the deck watches and petty officers are the artificers that operate the machinery. In other words, a small craft with eight or nine men will require ratings for practically the whole crew. If these men were on the larger units such a preponderance of ratings would not be had. It should be recalled that in order to enforce law, the man in charge of a boat or watch must be an officer of some category, either commissioned, warrant, or enlisted. The Coast Guard maintains over one thousand shore establishments, lifeboat and light stations, which necessitate men trained for their specialty and rated for the responsibilities of their positions. These, too, are small groups of men and often the group is composed entirely of petty officers.

I desire also to refer to the statement of the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON]:

> The chairman of the subcommittee has touched on the deep-sea operations of the Coast Guard. Added all together, we have a sordid story of bureaucratic expansion at its worst. The cut the commitee has made is, in my personal judgment, completely justified beyond question.

Such statements as this I regret to see in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD referring to a service with as honorable a record as the Coast Guard. Deep-sea operations in which the Coast Guard is engaged are something for which this service may be proud. That these operations are not due to any grandiose idea of this service, I quote from a recent letter published in the Washington Post of March 11, 1947:

> The report of the Appropriations Committee on the Treasury-Post Office bill states: "It was never the intention of Congress that the Coast Guard should become a 'blue-water' organization, extending its functions far beyond the coasts of the continental United States."
>
> On June 22, 1936, Congress passed and the President signed, the act to define the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard. This act declares it to be the duty of the Coast Guard to enforce all laws of the United States on the high seas. The Pelagic Act (1912), the Northern Pacific Halibut Act (1932), the Whaling Treaty Act (1936), the Sponge Fishing Act (1914), the Migratory Bird Act (1918), the act to afford aid to distressed navigators (1837), the authority to remove derelicts and floating dangers to navigation (1906), the act charging the Coast Guard to extend medical and surgical aid to the crews of American vessels engaged in deep sea fishing (38 Stat. 387), the act implementing the Safety at Sea Convention of 1914 and establishing the International Service of Ice Observation and Ice Patrol, so as to avoid another *Titanic* disaster where a trans-Atlantic liner collided with an iceberg and many lives were lost (49 Stat. 1922), are all acts of Congress extending Coast Guard functions beyond the coasts of the continental United States, most of them necessitating action far beyond those coasts.

I am certain that this service does not deserve such adverse comment as was gratuitously and unwarrantedly heaped upon it by several of the members of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations in justification of its reduction of appropriation and limiting of the scope of the service.

Small Business Unit in Department of Justice Is Excellent Move by Attorney General Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the news of the establishment on January 22, 1947, of a Small Business Unit in the Department of Justice. I particularly call attention to this as it is definitely a step in the right direction. I think it is highly important that the Department of Justice take this action to aid the small businessman in the postwar era, and I believe Attorney General Clark and his associates are to be congratulated.

In announcing the creation of the Unit, Attorney General Clark stated:

> The Small Business Unit is authorized, insofar as the law and budgetary limitations permit, to invoke all the power which Congress has conferred to maintain full opportunity and free competition in business. We are particularly interested in the problems of veterans seeking to engage in new businesses or to reestablish enterprises which they abandoned to enter the armed forces.

Assistant Attorney General Berge, in charge of the Antitrust Division, declared:

> Each request for assistance is treated in confidence and it is not necessary that a small businessman have proof of a violation of the antitrust laws before he can come to us with his problems. It is not necessary that he come to Washington or that he go to one of our field offices. A letter addressed to the Antitrust Division in Washington, D. C., will suffice to initiate a study of the difficulty and an early determination of what, if anything, can be done in the matter by the Department of Justice or by any other agency or department of the Government.

Mr. Chalmers Hamill has been designated Chief of the Small Business Unit, which is under the general supervision of Edward P. Hodges, Chief of the Complaints and Small Business Section of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. Hamill, a native of Marshall, Ill., is a lawyer and former manufacturer, formerly counsel for the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., and secretary of the National Bellas-Hess.

The Small Business Unit will carry on the following functions:

(a) The Small Business Unit receives and studies the complaints, requests, and communications of small businessmen. All such matters presented to the Unit are held in strict confidence.

(b) Wherever necessary, the Unit will make contacts with representatives of Government or industry, either in person or by correspondence, thus saving the time and expense of the small businessman.

(c) It will furnish such advice, guidance, and suggestion to complainants as may be deemed helpful and appropriate.

(d) It will afford the complainant such protection against unfair, oppressive, or predatory business practices as may lie within its lawful powers.

(e) The Unit will refer any violations of the law disclosed by the complaint to the proper division of the Department of Justice.

(f) Veterans' problems will be given speedy attention. While the Department of Justice cannot make loans or award contracts, the Unit will assist veterans in their efforts to obtain equipment or materials which are in short supply and which are being arbitrarily allotted by the supplier on an historical basis of purchase. It will assist them in obtaining a fair opportunity to secure Government contracts and in other matters.

(g) While the work of the Small Business Unit is not litigative but conciliatory in nature, it is a very definite antitrust enforcement. It is based upon the assumption that the antitrust laws are well enforced if, in conjunction with our prosecutions of antitrust violations, an endeavor is made to eliminate the cause of complaints of such violations in their incipiency, without instituting lawsuits. By assigning a small group of men to consider specifically the problems of the small businessman we can, it is hoped, correct situations now existing in the business community which, if uncorrected in their early stages, would ultimately require the institution by the Department of antitrust cases.

Democratization of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, several times lately there have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comments on and extracts from a statement by Secretary of State Marshall at Moscow relative to the democratization of Germany. It seems to me very important that the statement have as wide circulation as possible because in the conflict of ideologies the word "democracy" is given many meanings. Differnt meanings have been given the word in the course of history throughout the centuries, and there are different meanings

today in different parts of the world. The statement of the Secretary was so clear in his definition of what American democracy means that I think the entire statement should be available, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIZATION

The Berlin Conference instructed the Allied Control Authority "to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis and for eventual peaceful cooperation in international life by Germany." We believe that that directive should be made more precise so as to assure unity of procedure within the different German zones.

I realize that the word "democracy" is given many interpretations. To the American Government and citizen it has a basic meaning. We believe that human beings have certain inalienable rights, that is, rights which may not be given or taken away. They include the right of every individual to develop his mind and his scul in ways of his own choice free of fear or coercion—provided only he does not interfere with the like right of others. To us, a society is not democratic if men who respect the rights of their fellowmen are not free to express their own beliefs and convictions without fear that they may be snatched away from their home and family. To us, a society is not free if law-abiding citizens live in fear of being denied the right to work or deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We believe that the reconstruction of Germany on a democratic basis as called for by the Berlin Conference requires that basic law within each German state and the practice of the occupying authorities should assure such rights to every individual and effectively prevent any government or group, however powerful or however numerous, from taking such rights from, or imposing such fears on, any individuals, however weak or however few. We believe that the present control of Germany by the Allies gives us a unique opportunity to demonstrate to the world the sincerity of the democratic goals which were proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations.

Unfortunately, the Allied Council has not yet been able to agree upon the guaranties necessary to assure political and economic freedom in all parts of Germany. In consequence there has been no uniform preparation of the Germans in the different zones for the political reconstruction of Germany.

In the first place it seems clear that there has not been a uniformly effective guaranty of civil rights in all parts of Germany. The protection of the individual in the modern state rests upon the constitutional guaranties of his basic rights and liberties. I assume my colleagues will agree that adequate guaranties of these basic rights of the individual should be contained in every German constitution.

In the second place there has been no uniformly effective guaranty of the rights of political parties in all parts of Germany. Freely constituted political parties should be insured the right to participate in a free competitive election system in which each is accorded equal opportunity to present its views, to win adherents and to obtain just representation.

In the third place, there is no uniformly effective guaranty of the rights of free trade unions in all parts of Germany. The rights of free and autonomous trade unions to carry on customary trade-union activities in accordance with the wishes of their members should be clearly established.

In the fourth place, there is no uniformly effective guaranty of the freedom of the press and radio in all parts of Germany. There is in the opinion of the American Government and the American people a vital connection between modern democracy and a free press and radio. Governmental domination and manipulation of information media in the interest of the Nazi Party were powerful weapons in the hands of the anti-democratic Nazi regime. If anti-democratic ideologies are to be forever eliminated in Germany we must certainly permit the people of that nation to enjoy an unrestricted access to information obtained by means of all media of public information including press, radio, book and magazine publications, films, theater and music.

In the fifth place, there is no uniformly effective guarantee of freedom of movement for persons and goods throughout Germany. Such freedom is essential to the development of a sound political and economic life in a peaceful Germany. The original reasons for restricting movement of Germans internally no longer exist. The German military forces have been disbanded, the great majority of war criminals have been apprehended, the Nazi organizations have been broken up, and active Nazis and subversive elements are under necessary control and surveillance. Since the reasons for restricting free movement no longer prevail, it seems to us that the time has come to terminate any such restrictions that now exist.

I am sorry that the Allied Control Council has delayed in taking the necessary action to ensure the observance of these prerequisites to the agreed political and economic objectives. We will never democratize Germany by the mere negative process of depriving Nazis of their positions and influence. We must rather take an active part in the establishment of the essentials which I have outlined and proceed to restore German economic and political life upon the foundation which they provide.

To make substantial progress in this direction, common agreement among us is essential. The United States delegation regards the principles I have outlined as of fundamental importance. I shall later circulate a proposed directive on the subject which I hope will have your sympathetic consideration.

International Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. McGARVEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the United Nations Human Rights Commission is currently engaged in preparing the first draft of an international bill of rights; and

Whereas this is one of the most important single tasks in modern times since its formulation and implementation are basic prerequisites to a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas newspaper reports of the Commission's meetings indicate the representative of one nation as claiming that only a small layer separates man from the animal and that the difference may simply be that man can think of someone else as well as of himself; and

Whereas other newspaper reports indicate that the representative of another nation claims that the bills of human rights presented for study are wrong because the emphasis is on the rights of individuals whereas the new trends in the world make it impossible to consider individuals except collectively; and

Whereas still other newspaper reports indicate that the representative of another nation urges the deletion of all the following concepts: "The right of life, of personal liberty; the prohibition of slavery and compulsory labor; the right to petition national governments and the United Nations; nonretroactivity of penal laws; right of property; prohibition of unlawful expropriation; freedom of movement; and freedom to resist oppression"; and

Whereas these sentiments are in direct conflict with the natural law, the American Declaration of Independence, and the preamble of the United Nations Charter: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the delegates of the Philadelphia archdiocesan Holy Name Union, regularly assembled at this March 2, 1947, quarterly meeting, hereby respectfully petition the Chief Executive of the United States, President Harry S. Truman, and the several Senators and congressional Representatives of the districts in which we live, to duly instruct the United States representatives on the Human Rights Commission to insist that a bill of rights be drafted that takes complete cognizance of at least the following basic truths:

I. That the dignity of man, created in the image of God, obligates him to live in accordance with law imposed by God. Consequently, he is endowed as an individual and as a member of society with rights which are inalienable; and

II. That the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is endowed by the Creator with inalienable rights antecedent to all positive law. The family does not exist for the state, but on the other hand is not independent; and

III. That political authority is entrusted by God to nations, which are endowed with rights and charged with the obligation of establishing justice, of promoting the general welfare of their citizens and of cooperating with other nations in furthering the universal welfare of mankind; and

IV. That the human family constitutes an organic unity or a world society and the states of the world have the right and duty to associate and to organize in international community for their common welfare.

Improvement of German Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution and petition:

Whereas it is the desire of all Americans who believe in justice, freedom, and humanity, that all necessary steps be taken which will promote democratic ideals and humanitarian concepts among the people of Germany, Austria, and Hungary; and

Whereas America can best promote these ideals and concepts by itself being the leader; and

Whereas it is necessary that these three countries should be assisted in the reconstruction of their industrial life in order to avoid starvation and extreme suffering in the cities of these countries and to enable them to get on their feet so that they will not become a permanent burden upon this or other countries:

Now, therefore, we as liberty-loving citizens of the United States, do hereby resolve and petition that all peaceful, appropriate, and necessary means be employed by our President, our State Department, the Treasury Department, the War Department, the Senate, the House of Representatives, and by all other departments and agencies of the Government to accomplish immediately or as soon as possible the following:

1. To open the Russian zone of Germany so as to permit unhampered relief to be extended and operated by all groups or individuals in charge of relief.

2. To improve the German diet to a minimum of 2,000 calories and increase the fats ration to 15 percent of the total calories, and increase the animal protein diet to 15 percent of the total calories, and inasmuch as all private relief, despite its honorable purpose and good intentions, remains entirely inadequate, it becomes the duty of the Federal Government, whose charges these conquered people are, to increase the budget to the end that these people may have sufficient physical strength to do their daily work in the promotion of self-help and democratic ideals.

3. To make it possible to issue visas for German, Austrian, and Hungarian children so as to allow them to be admitted into American homes for rehabilitation and to cause to be issued nonquota passports to German, Austrian, and Hungarian orphans who will be adopted into American homes and reared to become American citizens.

Respectfully submitted.

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 29, 1947.*

Inequalities of Pay of Federal and State Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Senator John Callan, chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Nebraska State Legislature.

In this letter, Senator Callan points out that the Federal Government is making many raids upon the pay rolls in the State of Nebraska. What is said of Nebraska can be repeated in all of the 48 States.

I am sending a copy of this letter and these remarks to the legislative and appropriation committees in the House. I earnestly believe these committees should give it serious thought.

Certainly the wage scales under Civil Service which might apply in the cities in the eastern part of the country, does not apply to the less populated areas. The burden becomes especially hard for a State like Nebraska, where the Federal Government had as of April 1946 27,500 people on its pay roll. The wage scales paid by the Federal Government cannot be and should not be matched or equaled by the State government. This also applies to private enterprise. The 27,500 people employed by the Federal Government in Nebraska is probably more than was employed by all the State, county, city, and municipal governments in the State.

If this Congress fails to cut down the unnecessary Government activity, they will be rendering a poor service to the taxpayers of this country.

The letter follows:

NEBRASKA STATE LEGISLATURE,
Lincoln, Nebr., March 10, 1947.

The Honorable A. L. MILLER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: The Committee on the Budget of the Nebraska Legislature wishes to call your attention to a matter with which you are probably already familiar, and to ask that you use your best efforts in devising a solution to the problem presented.

A considerable degree of competition exists in Nebraska between certain agencies in the State government and those of the National Government in securing employees. In this competition the State of Nebraska is at a decided disadvantage because of the marked difference in salary scales of the two governments. Engineers in our department of roads and irrigation receive higher offers from the United States Reclamation Service, or from the Army Corps of Engineers. Professors at the University of Nebraska College of Agriculture accept positions with the Federal Department of Agriculture at 40 or 50 percent increase in salaries. Clerical employees in the State capitol frequently resign to accept civil service positions with Federal agencies. The result is that the agencies of the State government are operating under an even greater handicap than would normally be true when there is a scarcity of trained help.

We readily agree that income and living costs have soared, and that salaries must be increased accordingly. We concede the principle that adequate salaries must be paid if competent help is to be secured and retained. Our complaint, however, arises from the fact that the Federal salary scale, at least for some positions, seems unwarrantedly high in Nebraska. It is quite possible that in Washington, D. C., and some Eastern States where both per capita income and cost of living are much higher than they are in Nebraska, the Federal salary scale may be entirely in line with those of both private business and the agencies of the State governments. That, however, is definitely not the case in Nebraska. It is obvious, of course, that when a Nebraskan accepts a position with the Federal Government and is sent to California or the District of Columbia, he must be paid a salary comparable to that of other persons in a like position, but it is difficult to see the necessity for paying salaries in local Federal agencies so much above those paid for similar services by private business or corresponding agencies of the State government.

Hoping that this matter will receive your serious consideration, and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. CALLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
Nebraska Legislature.

Carroll B. Reece and Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, without prolonging an unfortunate controversy born of ineptitude and nurtured in partisanship, I feel a word of commendation should be extended to the distinguished former Member of this body from Tennessee, Mr. Carroll B. Reece, the present chairman of the Republican National Committee, for his forthright refusal to accept the thesis presented by Mr. Gael Sullivan, of the Democratic National Committee, that these two instrumentalities seek to exercise a machine control over the action taken by Congress in the present world crisis.

Mr. Reece has pointed out in his reply, as even the Washington Post candidly admits editorially this morning, the obviously political purpose of the move in that the Democratic National Committee saw fit to release the contents of the letter to the press at the same time it was delivered to him. It is but another instance, as the Republican chairman with admirable restraint refrained from pointing out, of the Democrats jumping on the band wagon and rushing into print in an attack on communism after they had sat back complacently for years and allowed the snake to sink its fangs deep into the sinews of our Government and spew its poisonous venom throughout the land.

Also deserving of commendation are the distinguished gentlemen from Michigan and Texas, Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY, for their disavowal, patriotically with equal vehemence, of this ill-conceived move, to put it charitably, of the Democratic hierarchy. Of course, we take him at his word that the Senator from Texas did not know of this blast from Democratic headquarters. The resentment he expressed on the floor of the Senate is only natural. He has labored shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Michigan to present a united nonpolitical front to the world as they have ably and diligently represented this country in the family of nations.

No less bitter, I am sure, is the resentment of many of the Members of this body across the aisle at this ill-considered, presumptuous, chauvinistic exhibition by the executive director of the Democratic National Committee. I know that they repudiate such tactics as completely as has the Senator from Texas.

The problems which our country faces today in the international field are too grave, too complex, too far-reaching, to be made the objects of political maneuvering for position.

As illustrative of the universal rebuke from the press which Mr. Sullivan's effort at slickness has so justifiably received, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial comment of Mr.

Arthur Krock as it appeared yesterday in the New York Times:

PARTISAN AIM REBUKED—DANGER OF SEEKING POLITICAL ADVANTAGE ON GRAVE ISSUES SHOWN IN SULLIVAN CASE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—The dangers of being too clever and trying to turn everything to partisan advantage—even including the gravest issue of foreign policy in the Nation's history—were not foreseen by the headquarters staff of the Democratic National Committee when it was decided that Gael Sullivan, the executive director, should send the letter to B. Carroll Reece, the Republican national chairman, that was denounced in the Senate today. But after Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG made his dignified protest against it, and Senator TOM CONNALLY followed him, the consequences that should have been obvious were made clear.

Mr. Sullivan is a handsome, self-assured young man from Chicago, brought up in Mayor Ed Kelly's school of politics and the New Deal's school of economics. Last November's election results failed to impress him as proof that there is anything for such alumni to learn if the Democrats are to continue to win Presidential elections. He is used to public jobs and power under that party's dispensation and, like many others, has been affected in judgment by the long tenure of the New Deal.

As pinch-hitter for Robert E. Hannegan, the national chairman of the Democratic Party, Mr. Sullivan is anxious to make a record for alertness and, having been nurtured on the principle that the American people love slickness for its own sake, it was natural that the letter that got bipartisan criticism in the Senate today should appeal to him.

It would, they reasoned around Democratic headquarters, put the Republicans in a hole and get votes in 1948 for the party candidates—which is the business of the National Committee. The Republicans would be put in a hole because, if Chairman Reece signed the manifesto drawn up by Mr. Sullivan—a two-party statement endorsing President Truman's new anti-Communist foreign policy—the Republicans would become the "Me Too" party, despite their control of Congress.

If Mr. Reece refused, the Republicans would be put in a hole because a new charge of isolationism and noncooperation on a vital foreign issue could be laid against them, a charge that was made successfully and with good basis in 1940 and 1944.

Above all, this reasoning continued, the Democratic National Committee would appear very sharp and clever, and the American people reward those qualities with votes. And the letter should be made public before any answer was received, so that full publicity value might accrue.

Mr. Sullivan thought very highly of the scheme and the letter was published. Politics is a trade to its professional practitioners, and that is the plane on which this careless handling of a high explosive was conceived. Even when the material burst in the face of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Sullivan issued a statement announcing Mr. Reece's refusal to be a cosigner, which by its triumphant tone implied that the gravity of the cynical blunder is still unrecognized at committee headquarters.

But, as Mr. VANDENBERG said and as Mr. CONNALLY echoed, bipartisan foreign policy will die in revolt if one party organization seeks to make use of it to gain a partisan advantage over the other. And it is hardly possible to interpret Mr. Sullivan's letter in any other way. The Republican majority in Congress, not its national chairman, must make the decision posed by the President's message. Any maneuver that is taken as an attempt to pressure or embarrass the majority as it faces this heavy responsibility is a disservice to the bipartisan approach.

Mr. Sullivan is a former college lecturer on public administration and economics, a former divinity student and a man with a reputation for ability in certain lines. But he has played politics with a callous city and national machine for many years, which develops a kind of insensibility to the fact that there are some public situations from which the technique of the professional politician is wisely excluded by both moral and practical considerations.

The True Meaning of Conservation of Mineral Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. RUSSELL

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John A. Church, consulting engineer, which clearly sets forth the need of a program for the wise utilization of mineral resources and the true meaning of conservation of those resources:

It has been urged in some quarters that as a Nation we should leave our ore reserves in the ground and depend for our postwar requirements on foreign sources, saving our home supply while we exhaust the world outside. This idea rests on a profound misconception of the art of mining and the development of ore resources. It assumes that every pound of ore in the ground is known, and that we have only to reach out our hands and pick it up when an emergency arises. It also assumes that the extremely complex operations of ore concentration, smelting and refining can be manned and started over night.

The real truth is, that a mine is necessarily a slow growth, and that even in ground known to be mineralized, the precise location of the ore and provision of the means of access to it must be constantly pushed in advance of actual mining, or the mining itself will soon decline and finally come to a stop. It is true that some ore bodies at or near the surface have been almost completely explored and delimited by drill, so that mining can be planned in detail for years ahead. But even these are covered with blankets of barren overburden which must be removed, section by section, before the ore beneath is accessible to future extraction. In underground mines, the continuous search for ore and its methodical opening up in preparation for mining are absolutely prerequisite to maintaining steady production.

Furthermore, in emergency the element of time is vital. To sink a deep shaft requires many months, and to open up a block even of proven ore requires months longer. If by some legerdemain all the copper-ore resources of the United States had been known five or six decades ago and it had been decided to save them untouched for use in the World War, we should have found ourselves on the morning of December 8, 1941, without a pound of domestic copper available and no prospect of getting any for many months to come. Nor during the whole period of the war could we have achieved more than a part of the production we actually enjoyed. The only practical source of domestic ores in emergency is a going industry, working on developed ore bodies and staffed and manned with miners, millmen, and smeltermen who know their work by daily experience.

When a mining industry has once been developed, as ours has been, it cannot be subjected to prolonged shut-down without serious loss of resources. Very few underground mines are dry. They must be constantly pumped out, and frequently the penalty of failure to keep them pumped out is rotted and broken timbering, caved ground, admixture of waste rock, and irrecoverable loss of ore. In a mine operating in heavy ground, maintenance and repair of haulageways and other main workings must be continuous. Where mining is carried on by caving methods, or by shrinkage stopes, in which ore is blasted down and left in the stopes (chambers) to be drawn off later, the caving of barren sidewalls or roof during a shut-down can so dilute the ore as to destroy its value. By value at this point is meant usefulness in a national emergency; the diluted ore would require more manpower, more concentrating facilities, and more time for its beneficiation than the Nation in a great emergency can spare.

These are the physical facts with which mining methods and mining economy have to deal, and the same conditions would be equally effective in damaging our ore resources, if the industry were drastically curtailed by a mistaken attempt to set aside those resources for emergency. In the field of metals it has been shown that the outside world has need for all the metal that it can reasonably insist upon producing. The United States, on the other hand, needs a domestic industry capable of rising instantly to emergency, but no industry, especially a mining industry, can respond unless it is in sound and healthy operating condition when the emergency arises.

The foregoing discussion deals with the practical conditions which govern the use of ore resources. It is a discussion of conservation, and it leads directly into the broader aspects of conservational policy, which cannot be better stated than in the words of Dr. C. K. Leith, one of the world's authorities on mineral resources and a leader in our mineral strategy during the war: [1]

"Conservation is a primary consideration of any mineral policy. By conservation we mean efficient extraction and use, not hoarding. By stabilization we mean the effort of balancing supply and demand of world minerals to avoid bad effects on industry, standards of living, and labor conditions, and, above all, the waste of irreplaceable resources caused by the overdevelopment, overproduction, and violent swings in prices.

"Because mineral resources are exhaustible and irreplaceable, conservation and stabilization are almost synonymous requirements both from the standpoint of the industry and the nations concerned. Efficient extraction of minerals with a minimum of waste requires continuity of operation and prices adequate to permit of conservation practices. Stabilization commonly requires higher than competitive prices when they are at the bottom of their cyclic swings. An outstanding example of conservation through stabilization is the huge saving of oil resulting from the cooperative efforts of the oil-States compact. Excessive competition in the mineral industries in the past has resulted in overproduction and low prices which in turn have made it impossible to carry on the necessary conservational practices of extraction. Excessive taxes have sometimes had the same results. Only the best and high-grade parts of resources could be profitably extracted and the rest was often left in such

[1] Principles of Foreign Mineral Policy of the United States, published in Mining and Metallurgy, January 1946.

condition that it could be recovered only at great expense, if at all."

This discussion makes it clear that in the wise utilization of mineral resources conservation begins, not in total abstinence, but, at the moment when those resources are opened up for use. From that moment onward, the responsibility devolves on the operator to carry on extraction as efficiently and with as little waste as possible, within the limit of his power to control events. But completely outside that power, and reserved solely to the nation at large, is the power to safeguard his operations from overdevelopment, overproduction, and overcompetition in the world beyond the national boundaries.

Liberalizing Postal Restrictions on Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution and petition:

Whereas it is the desire of all Americans who believe in justice, freedom, and humanity that all necessary steps be taken which will promote democratic ideals and humanitarian concepts among the people of Germany, Austria, and Hungary; and

Whereas America can best promote these ideals and concepts by itself being the leader; and

Whereas the present permissible 11-pound private food and clothing parcels to the above countries are entirely inadequate; and

Whereas millions of our citizens are ready and willing to provide sorely needed clothing and food to their friends and relatives in the above countries;

Now, therefore, we petition the President, the Department of State, the War Department, the Treasury Department, the Senate, the House of Representatives, and all other departments and agencies of the Government that postal regulations be liberalized to the extent—

1. That restrictions on gift parcels be lifted to the extent at least that larger and more frequent shipments may be made to individuals and groups in the above-mentioned three countries;

2. That, consistent with necessary security, censorship of mails be removed and a free and unhampered intercourse between the citizens of those countries and the citizens of our own country be promoted;

3. That, consistent with necessary security, the remaining parts of the "postal blockade"—namely, the prohibition of sending letters other than strictly personal and private messages, the prohibition of sending any printed matter including books, newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, catalogs, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, etc., and the prohibition of sending pictures or photos be eliminated.

4. That, consistent with necessary security, full wireless, cable, telephone, and air-mail services between the countries mentioned and our own United States be immediately reinstated.

Respectfully submitted.

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 29, 1947.*

Senator Wiley's Record on Behalf of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that from time to time every legislator should make available to his constituents a review of his record on given subjects, such as agriculture, so that they may obtain a clear and broad picture of his activities along this line.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from various speeches, statements, and other materials, which have largely been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since I came to the Senate in January 1939, reporting on my activities on behalf of the farmers of my State and of other States.

I feel that through these excerpts not only will my constituents have a chance to note my efforts in the past and at present, but from them they will be able to understand the role which I expect to play in meeting their problems in the future—the problems of 177,000 Wisconsin farmers. The problems of the farmers in 1947 and 1948 and in later years will undoubtedly be very similar to problems which we have encountered in the past—problems of surpluses, of foreign imports, of parity prices, of rising costs of production.

The farmer, as I have often pointed out, has always been the backbone of the Nation. I feel that whether he be engaged in poultry activities, in dairying, in fur farming, in truck farming, in bee keeping, in livestock breeding, in logging, or in any other farming activity, he must be given the protection which his vital role in the Nation merits.

The problems of farming cannot, of course, be considered only as of themselves; they are interwoven with every other phase of our economic life—with labor, with business, with transportation. Nevertheless, there are obviously many specialized aspects of farming in which legislators must stand up and be counted.

WISCONSIN'S AGRICULTURAL IMPORTANCE

Wisconsin, I may note, stands first in the Nation in milk production—15,500,000 pounds in 1945—in number of silos, in corn for silage, in number of milk cows, in tame-hay production, in clover and timothy hay, in peas and beets for canning, sweet corn for processing, hemp acreage, cheese output—515,000,000 pounds in 1945, equal to half the Nation's total—and condensery products.

It stands second in alfalfa acreage, in cucumbers for pickles, in cabbage for kraut, cranberry production, and alsike clover seed.

The Badger State ranks third highest in all cattle and calves, creamery butter, red-clover seed, cabbage production, and casein production. It holds fourth place in production of oats, of honey, and of green lima beans for processing.

In the light of these facts, my efforts to promote Wisconsin's agriculture and America's agriculture are reviewed in the compilation which I send to the desk and ask to have printed.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1939

1. MARCH 14, 1939: AS THE DEPRESSION SPREADS RUIN AMONG FARMERS, AN URGENT BILL IS INTRODUCED TO SUSPEND FARM FORECLOSURES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to submit a resolution, which, if agreed to, will authorize the courts of the land to stay foreclosure proceedings upon real-estate mortgages to the United States.

* * * * *

We now have * * * Government mortgages which are being foreclosed by the thousands upon farms from which the farmers cannot get sufficient (income) to live, not because, in a majority of cases, they have not worked hard, but because market conditions of the product they produce have made it impossible for them to exchange that product for a sufficient number of dollars to make a living.

In my own State, where it costs the farmers from $1.80 to $2.60 a hundred to produce milk, they are selling that milk, in the majority of cases, for 70 cents to a dollar a hundred. They are not to blame for that situation. They have worked hard. They are producing the product. Now, the taxes and insurance and interest on Government obligations require payment, and they cannot meet the bill. So the Government forecloses.

In the county immediately north of my county in Wisconsin there are 400 foreclosures. This is one of the greatest dairy counties in America. I am informed that in five counties surrounding my county there are 1,500 foreclosures by Government agencies.

2. APRIL 6, 1939: PROTECT AMERICA'S FUR FARMERS; A BILL IS INTRODUCED TO RESTORE THE DUTY RATE SO AS TO HOLD BACK THE RUINOUS FLOOD OF FOREIGN FURS

In the beautiful Wisconsin northlands—where I hope to see many of colleagues next summer—there are many so-called fox fur farms.

* * * * *

Mr. President (at the present rate of foreign imports) this growing industry in this country will be wiped out. If this continues, the small fox-fur farmer will lose his investment and his business before the year is over. In my State, he is already unable to meet his feed bills. Inside of another year, even the largest fox-fur producers in this country will be forced to the wall.

To prevent this, Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD, relating to the rate of duty on certain fox furs imported into the United States.

3. APRIL 17, 1939: BOOSTING WISCONSIN CHEESE

No meal can really be complete without a bit of Wisconsin cheese. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, there is something about cheese that is productive of good. It does not create gas on the brain, and without gas on the brain, this country will not go to war. [Laughter.]

* * * * *

Mr. President, there are several kinds of cheese that come from Wisconsin, and all of them are good. No matter what one's ailment may be, cheese is the remedy. The science of food chemistry tells us that there

would be less need for rouge if cheese and butter were eaten. There would be fewer divorces, because cheese and butter tend to harmony and rationality. There would be more contentment. Mr. President, you never saw a cheese eater or a butter eater who did not radiate joy. Why? Because these foods are the nearest to Nature's perfect food.

Why? Well, in the summer season out of the juicy grasses, out of the sweet-scented clover, out of the luscious alfalfa and cool spring water, the greatest chemist in the world—the milk cow—makes this food; and in the wintertime, out of the silage from the nut-brown corn, out of ground wheat, and oats, and out of hay and alfalfa, she turns out the same product.

* * * * *

Seventy-five years ago this month the foundation was laid for the flourishing cheese industry in Wisconsin by Mr. Chester Hazen, who built Wisconsin's first cheese factory at Ladoga, near Ripon, Wis., which is famous as the birthplace of the Republican Party 85 years ago, the 29th of last month.

A pound of Wisconsin whole milk cheese represents four quarts of clean pure milk. Wisconsin cheese is a health food. Wisconsin cheese provides high food value at low cost. Wisconsin natural cheeses retain their surprisingly high food value in proteins, in fats, in phosphorus, iron, and calcium, all so essential in the building of bones, flesh, and muscles, and in regulating the functions of the body; but, best of all, Wisconsin cheese contains vitamin A, making Wisconsin cheese a concentrated, body-building and growth-stimulating food of high value. And Wisconsin cheese is economical compared with other foods.

While I realize that many of my brother Senators are at lunch, I desire to say that I have seen many of them taking ABC vitamins for nourishment. I suggest that they use Wisconsin cheese, and see how much better they will get along. [Laughter.]

Wisconsin cheese as one of Nature's most perfect foods contains, in addition to proteins, fats, phosphorus, iron, and calcium, an abundance of vitamins.

Cheese is easy of digestion and is fully absorbed by the body.

* * * * *

Wisconsin cheese is the only food that can be served in any part of the meal from salad to dessert, and at any time, anywhere. Do your body good by acquiring the Wisconsin cheese habit. Eat Wisconsin cheese regularly for its food value, for its economy, for its taste appeal. Wisconsin cheese is good for every American. It is good for you.

4. APRIL 24, 1939: A RADIO ADDRESS ANNOUNCING THE CELEBRATION IN WASHINGTON OF 75 YEARS OF WISCONSIN CHEESEMAKING

The early settlers in Wisconsin were hardy pioneers who drove cattle with them when they came West. Sturdy and industrious people, Scandinavians, Germans, Swiss, Dutch, English, and Irish—contributed to lay the foundation for the 200,000 dairy farms which today make Wisconsin the greatest dairy State in the Nation. These people found in Wisconsin many natural advantages, temperate climate, fertile grasslands, and crystal-clear waters. More than 2,000,000 dairy cows, foster mothers of the human race, today make dairying the backbone industry of the State. Dairying is the largest single agricultural enterprise in the United States.

* * * * *

We are proud to celebrate Wisconsin Cheese Week in Washington, the Nation's Capital, this week with fitting ceremonies and festivities. Tomorrow morning, Tuesday, April 25, at 11 o'clock, the biggest and best cheese in the world, Wisconsin's 2,200-pound cheese, is being exhibited at the east steps of the Capitol Building. Goliath, as the big cheese is called, has come here from Madison, Wis., under the auspices of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and Markets, and will be displayed throughout Washington during the week. A cheese statue of Vice President Garner will be presented to his wife on the Capitol steps tomorrow.

Luncheon clubs and civic organizations are featuring Wisconsin cheese on their menus this week. Stores in all parts of the city are emphasizing Wisconsin cheese sales. As a climax to the week's cheese activities, Wisconsin natural cheese will be served in the Senate and House dining rooms on Friday, April 28, which is the date of the diamond jubilee birthday celebration. Simultaneously, thousands of people will gather at Ladoga, Wis., on the site of the State's first cheese factory, to honor Chester Hazen, the man whose foresight and courage laid the foundation for a great industry in Wisconsin, America's dairyland.

5. MAY 2, 1939: THE FARMERS FACE A CRISIS AND MUST BE SAVED BY COORDINATED ACTION

It is very easy for us to forget that the $60,000,000,000 American farm investment totters on the brink of financial annihilation. In Washington it is perilously simple for us to ignore the gaunt, tanned man who swaps his toil in a losing barter, in which his rightful wage is lost in the shifting sands of commodity price levels.

* * * * *

Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate—and I shall not take more than 5 minutes—the fact that we do not seem to be getting anywhere in solving the farm problem. To me it is the greatest problem before the American people, because the farms of the Nation constitute the economic backbone of the Nation. We sit here and laugh and talk and discuss other issues and let the backbone crack up.

Several months ago, because every sector of our farm group had individual bills introduced, I suggested the need of a coordinated bill wherein every farm section would be represented. Nothing came of that suggestion, so on the 28th of March I introduced an amendment to House bill 5269, calling for an appropriation of $100,000,000, $50,000,000 of which was to be used under section 32 of the AAA Act to buy surplus butter.

* * * * *

Up to date no coordinated bill has been whipped into shape, no bill representing the interests of cotton, corn, wheat, dairy products, and so forth.

* * * * *

My real object, however, in rising to my feet at this time is to pray to this session of Congress that they will recognize, as most of us do not recognize, the serious situation of the farmers. I mean that they are literally bleeding to death. Letters to this effect continually pour in from my State.

* * * * *

On April 27 I submitted to the Senate a resolution the purpose of which was to call to the attention of the Congress and the people a supplementary way of aiding the farmer. In the resolution, I suggested that the President investigate the feasibility of entering into some barter arrangement to obtain materials which we do not produce in this country by exchanging dairy products for them.

Everyone knows that the price the farmer gets for his milk which produces butter and cheese is away below what it should be.

* * * * *

During the past year the Government and its agencies accumulated about 80,000,000 pounds of butter. No effort was made by the Government to dispose of that butter in foreign markets, and no effort is now being made. It hung like the sword of Damocles above the heads of the farmers with the result that the market for butter and milk products dropped to its present ruinous level.

Several months ago I talked to the Secretary of Agriculture about that situation, and I again talked with him several weeks ago, suggesting that this butter be sold in foreign markets even if a loss had to be taken, since the loss the Government would sustain was nothing compared with the loss the farmers were sustaining because of the depreciated market. At that time I was informed by the Secretary himself that he and the President and others felt that the American people would not approve such a step. * * *

While I feel that this decision was honestly arrived at, I think it was a foolish decision.

6. JULY 19, 1939: A BILL IS INTRODUCED FOR PROMOTION OF SOUND DAIRY PRACTICES

Mr. President, back in the spring, I made some remarks on the floor of the Senate in which I characterized the idea that came out from Wisconsin in relation to handling the dairy problem as the "Wisconsin idea." It included dairy products in the so-called basic commodities and provided for parity payments for milk. * * * I ask consent at this time to introduce a bill to provide for the promotion of sound dairy practices and to provide an adequate and balanced flow of milk and its products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

7. NOVEMBER 2, 1939: A LETTER TO A WISCONSIN CONSTITUENT PLEDGING AID TO PRESERVE AMERICA'S MINK PRODUCERS

Thank you for your informative letter. I agree heartily with you that the American mink-pelt market must not be unduly depressed by a dumping of pelts on the American market which might ordinarily have been sold abroad. I have already contacted the State Department on this matter.

1940

8. MARCH 19, 1940: THE DAIRY FARMERS OF WISCONSIN AND OF AMERICA ARE NOT RECEIVING ADEQUATE AID FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The farmer, especially the dairy farmer, is the Nation's No. 1 forgotten man so far as Government aid is concerned. Out of almost a $1,000,000,000 appropriation for agriculture, it seems singularly strange that the dairy farmer does not get much help. The only item in the entire bill that is earmarked for the dairy industry is an appropriation for the Bureau of Dairy Industry, and that provides for total salaries and expenses of $731,405, out of which amount $353,580 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia. That does not leave much for the dairy farmer himself. The bill is top-heavy in its administrative costs and lopsided in its benefits.

We must remember that the dairy farmer gets none of the parity payments. There is also provision for the disposal of surplus commodities, $85,000,000 being appropriated for that purpose, but that, too, fails to pull the dairy farmer out of his economic bog.

"On March 30 last year, I offered an amendment to the bill then pending asking that an additional $50,000,000 be used for the purchase of dairy products.

"Mr. President, I desire to insert in the RECORD certain tables which show how farm income in 1939 compares with the farm income in 1929. They show that Wisconsin, the great dairy State, now ranks forty-second in the list of State farm incomes (in comparison to their respective position in 1929). Compared with other States, she is receiving now only 72 percent of what she received in 1929, whereas other States, which are receiving great sums from the Government, have incomes over 100 percent parity. For example, we can consider Arizona 108 percent, Florida

104 percent, North Carolina 103 percent, and so on.

* * * * *

Average AAA payment, 160 acres, Wisconsin, equals $120.

Average AAA payment, Corn Belt, $400.

9. MAY 27, 1940: SENATOR WILEY'S BILL FOR NATIONAL DAIRY DAY IS PASSED

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am authorized by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to report back, without amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 254; and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, let the joint resolution be stated by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin requests unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 254, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 254) providing for the observance of National Dairy Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

"Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of stimulating the per capita consumption of dairy products the President is hereby requested, by proclamation, to designate a day in the month of June 1940 as National Dairy Day, which may be appropriately observed throughout the United States."

10. NOVEMBER 14, 1940: AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT SHEBOYGAN, WIS., BEFORE THE WISCONSIN CHEESE MAKERS' ASSOCIATION, ON WAYS AND MEANS OF IMPROVING CHEESE-MAKING CONDITIONS

I want you to know at the very outset of our discussion that I stand ready at all times to do anything and everything that I can to assist the dairy farmers and the cheese producers of Wisconsin. That has consistently been one of my major objectives in Congress, and my legislative record on the Senate floor and my activities in the Senate Agriculture Committee will bear me out on this point.

* * * * *

I believe that the marketing of cheese will be materially bettered by a careful study of the packaging problem. We must make cheese easy to handle and easy to sell in attractive containers. * * *

I believe that part of the answer to the problems of the dairy industry and of the cheese maker will be found in scientific exploration—in research. Our modern Wisconsin cheese factory is a far cry from the pioneer farm-kitchen cheese factory, but we must continue our march of progress so that our product becomes even finer and its use even more widespread. With the closing of the European sources of production, there is a new challenge to us, a challenge to make a product which will answer every requirement of those consumers who formerly purchased European cheeses.

It is entirely conceivable also that we may develop new and allied cheese products, new types, and new varieties which may open up new markets. I have a similar hope for the dairy industry in general because I know that when casein is utilized in industry more extensively and when the other byproducts of the dairy industry are properly used, we will be well on our way to solving the dairy problem. I look forward to the day when the byproducts of casein will supplant bone and bakelite in many commercial uses today. Yes, I believe it is possible for the laboratory to make a great contribution to the solution of our dairy problem. * * *

I have personally presented every Senator of the United States with Wisconsin cheese, and too often I have those same Senators return to me with the story that they want to secure more of that cheese but are unable to purchase it in retail stores throughout the East. Part of our problem must be to create a great many more sales outlets. That is the simple economic philosophy which is one cornerstone in almost all sales programs today.

In connection with creating more sales outlets I might mention that a great many States under the so-called police powers granted to them under the Constitution have set up trade barriers which would eliminate Wisconsin dairy products from entering their State. The reasons which are given for these regulations are absurd. There can be no valid reason for keeping Wisconsin milk out of any State.

It can be shipped on fast trains in glass-lined refrigerator cars so that it will arrive at its market in perfect condition. The only possible reason for barring it from any State is merely to create an economic blockade. I am opposed to this economic border warfare between States. I want to see that every State in the Union has the privilege of drinking Wisconsin milk if it so desires.

I introduced legislation to eliminate this guerrilla warfare, and I shall continue to fight against this unwarranted discrimination against Wisconsin products. If we are to have national unity in the larger sense, it is essential that we have it also in an economic sense.

1941

11. MARCH 20, 1941: BRING THE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT'S DAIRY DIVISION CLOSER TO THE FOLKS BACK HOME

There are too many swivel-chair farmers looking after the farmer's interests. We do not need our present great Agricultural Department here in Washington. Why centralize everything here? If the Army employed in that building were put back in the sections where it could operate effectively, where the cotton division could get close to the cotton farmer, where the wheat division could get close to the wheat farmer, where the dairy division could get close to the dairy farmer, we might get results.

12. APRIL 2, 1941: A PLEA FOR ADEQUATE FOREST PRODUCT RESEARCH FUNDS BEFORE THE SENATE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE

I am referring specifically to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. I wish to urge at this time that the laboratory's appropriation be increased from $632,500 to $1,232,000, with the proviso that $600,000 of this $1,232,000 be allocated specifically in equal parts to aircraft research and for other military uses of wood.

During the last World War the Forest Products Laboratory was the only Federal institution concerned wholly with the investigation of the mechanical, physical, and chemical properties of wood and wood products. At that time the laboratory operated on a 24-hour basis. In other words, our past experiences demonstrated its effectiveness in defense work.

* * * * *

At the present time industries related to forest products support, in one way or another, some 13,000,000 people. In order to continue this support it is vital that research in forest products not only be maintained but increased.

I maintain that it is the obligation of Government (and it is a traditional obligation in this case) to carry on research in forest products. If there were no other reason, it would be the obligation of the Federal Government to carry on this research because it is such a large owner of timber in the United States.

I am informed that our Federal Government, at the present time, owns about one-third of the so-called saw timber in the United States. In addition to this there are almost three and one-half million farmers who are small forest owners.

It is impossible for these farmers and small forest owners to participate in any program of research other than the Government program. In other words, the type of forest owner and operator which we encounter in most sections, and in Wisconsin, is usually more of a farmer than an industrialist.

* * * * *

In my State the United States Forest Products Laboratory in 1932 moved from its small quarters to a marvelous new modern structure at Madison, Wis. This building represented limitless possibilities for forest-products research, but throughout the past 8 years of almost unlimited Federal spending, this laboratory has been treated as a kind of step-child, and has consistently received inadequate appropriations, so that its facilities—and this is a Government institution, mind you—have never been adequately utilized and its research has never been as comprehensive as it should have been.

* * * * *

There has not been a single year since 1928 when Congress has appropriated more than $665,000 for research in forest products. At the present time the appropriation is $632,500 and that is $9,000 less than it was in 1932.

13. APRIL 3, 1941: SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE CRITICAL CONDITIONS OF WISCONSIN DAIRY FARMS

About 20 percent of the farmers in Wisconsin who live near cities, within certain milkshed areas, are getting the cost of production or more out of their milk. That leaves 80 percent who were probably getting, during 1939, about 90 cents a hundred for their milk.

It takes on the average 100 pounds of milk to produce 46½ quarts. In other words, 80 percent of the farmers of Wisconsin during 1939 averaged less than 2 cents a quart for their milk.

* * * * *

Two cents a quart is all the farmer received, while on the eastern seaboard, in Boston and elsewhere, consumers are paying 18 cents a quart for their milk. What kind of a society have we arranged that gives to the man who invests and produces and works and sweats less than the cost of production, while it gives all the cream to the man who works 3 or 4 or 5 hours a day?

* * * * *

One of the ways to materially aid the general farm economy, incidentally, is by retaining the American market for the American farmer. We have not determined our prices on our great surplus crops on the basis of American standards and American costs but in the world's market centers.

* * * * *

I am not sure that the head of the Grange does not have an idea which might work into this picture. I give it for what it is worth. His idea is that farmers should be paid something to grow certain products. Such payments are called "incentive payments." Incentive payments could be made to farmers for growing crops which are not now grown. They could be paid to farmers for growing specialty crops needed in the national defense. They could also be paid to farmers for following certain types of agriculture which would benefit the Nation. The incentive-payment program would be designed to pay farmers for doing things, not for what they do not do.

14. AUGUST 12, 1941: A REPORT ON EFFORTS TO PROMOTE THE DAIRY INDUSTRY MADE AT THE BARRON COUNTY FAIR, RICE LAKE, WIS.

I myself feel that I can qualify as one of the dairy farmers—and I am proud to be

classified with that group. I own and operate a dairy farm in Barron County—the same farm which my father owned before me.

Those of us who are dairy farmers, those of us who have tried to balance our milk checks against our expenses, know that the dairy farmer hasn't been getting the cost of production.

* * * * *

I recently made a protest directly to the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the efforts of the Department to popularize synthetic products competing with butter. I feel that it is extremely undesirable for the Department of Agriculture (which should be concerned primarily with protecting the American farmer just as the Department of Labor protects the American laborer) to spend its time and the people's money propagandizing the American people into using synthetic products. That is not only undesirable from an economic standpoint because it affects the dairy farmer adversely, but it is also undesirable from a health standpoint, where it adversely affects the health standards of the American people.

* * * * *

I agree with the Surgeon General when he says we need a nation of people who are more fit, more vigorous, and with higher standards of health. That means we have to put to work our scientific knowledge for the nutrition of all our people. We have the capacity, the facilities for distribution; in fact, every element which we need to raise the standards of public health through better nutrition, which certainly means an increased rather than a decreased use of dairy products.

It has been said that less than one-fourth of our people are on a good diet even when measured by the old standards. The Surgeon General has admitted that our deficiency in diet will require at least a 50-percent increase in our national production of milk and milk products.

15. DECEMBER 15, 1941: HELPING TO PROMOTE SALE OF WISCONSIN CHEESE—A RADIO ADDRESS

Europeans have always consumed three or four times the amount of cheese consumed by Americans. As an American of Norwegian descent, I know that my Norwegian ancestors had cheese regularly, even for breakfast. If we consumed as much cheese per capita as the people of Holland did in happier days, the dairy post-war problem of this country would be solved. That is one of the reasons why there must be an intensive educational campaign.

That is why we must tell the world that a pound of Wisconsin whole-milk cheese represents quarts of milk. That is why we must tell the world that Wisconsin cheese provides high food value at low cost; that it is a concentrated body-building and growth-stimulating food of high value.

* * * * *

If we succeed in selling the American people on the idea of cheese, on each day's menu, we will not only have widened our industry's market, but we will have raised our national health standards. I believe that Government should assist in such an educational campaign and I stand ready at all times to urge assistance by Government in this direction.

I might add that I believe so strongly in the food value of cheese that I have urged the War Department to incorporate cheese in the training-camp menus.

I believe it is desirable for us to secure lower shipping rates on cheese, and in January of this year I wrote the Railway Express Agency with reference to high express rates on cheese. I might add that the parcel-post rate on shipping foods was also extremely high, and I have protested these rates to the office of the Postmaster General. I suggested to the Railway Express Agency that they alter their rate plans, so that it would be cheaper to ship small amounts of cheese, and, consequently, to encourage more shipments by individuals and small concerns, and to encourage a cheaper, more extensive and more widespread use of Wisconsin dairy and agricultural products.

Throughout the year I corresponded on this subject, and on October 25 of this year the vice president of the Railway Express Agency finally agreed to have the Railway Express Agency issue favorable rates on small packages of cheese from all points in Wisconsin to all of the States in the Union. I feel that this change in express rates will unquestionably be of value in the postarmament period when our cheese producers will again be turning to domestic markets.

1942

16. JANUARY 22, 1942: THE FACTS ON PARITY PRICES

Even with price ceilings set at 110 percent of parity, agriculture cannot survive in the face of rising production and labor costs. Agriculture faces heavy production-increase burdens in the Nation's future war economy. Agriculture, particularly dairy, poultry, livestock, and truck farming, faces severe shortage of labor and equipment, which can be had only at drastically increased costs.

* * * * *

The United States Department of Agriculture parity began with actual disparity instead of equality during the base period 1909–14. The average per capita income for farmers, 1909–14, was $134, while the average per capita income for nonfarm groups during that time was $457.

17. DECEMBER 4, 1942: IN THE MIDST OF THE NATION-WIDE GASOLINE SHORTAGE A PLEA FOR ADEQUATE SUPPLY FOR WISCONSIN LOGGERS

Mr. President, lately I have received many letters from farmers and small loggers in the State of Wisconsin. Because of years of experience in the past, many Wisconsin farmers have had to supplement their earnings by small logging operations. Now the War Production Board has demanded a great supply of birch and other veneer lumber. Many hundred farmers in the communities of Wisconsin produce both milk and logs for the War Production Board. There has been great maladministration in the gasoline program in that section of the country, and as a result I receive letters each day stating that mills have shut down and that farmers will not be able to haul their milk to market.

Mr. President, I think I have some good news which should go into the RECORD. I understand that lately the OPA and the ODT got together and issued an order which provided for relief until the first of the year, and it is hoped that their program will thereafter be so arranged that the farmers and the loggers who operate trucks will get the gas necessary to carry on.

1943

18. MARCH 22, 1943: A LETTER TO THE LATE GOVERNOR GOODLAND ENDORSING HIS STAND ON AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Hon. WALTER S. GOODLAND,
Acting Governor, State of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wis.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Thank you for your letter of March 19, and for your courtesy in sending me a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Midwest governors' conference held on March 15, 1943, at Des Moines.

I concur wholeheartedly that agriculture should be recognized as an essential war industry, and I have repeatedly recommended such a recognition.

I likewise agree that farm labor should accordingly be recognized as essential, and I concur with the recommendation for some suitable insignia to those who serve on the farm front. I might point out that on January 8, 1943, I urged Secretary Wickard to adopt a special recognition for farms whose production is outstanding.

* * * * *

I recognize the necessity of making available adequate supplies of fertilizer for the 1943 crop season, and I likewise recognize the necessity for adequate transportation for seasonal agricultural laborers. You may be certain of my active interest in these matters.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

19. MAY 20, 1943: THE POSITION OF WISCONSIN BUTTERMAKERS REGARDING OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. President, let us see just what the situation is.

Does the dairy industry want oleomargarine abolished? Decidedly not. Oleomargarine has its place, but that place is not as an imitation of butter, which is simply—and I am speaking of butter—the fatty constituent of milk separated by agitation after a lactic fermentation of the cream. Oleomargarine is not butter. It has its own characteristics, just as butter has its own characteristics and color.

Even under the new standards, oleomargarine will not contain certain fatty saturated acids which, according to a widely known biochemist of the University of Wisconsin, are exceedingly important to the growth of human beings. What the dairy industry wants is to see that oleomargarine is definitely sold on its own merits, that it does not masquerade as butter, and that its sales are not promoted by Government—I repeat, promoted by Government—to the detriment of the post-armament dairy market. In this age of synthetics and ersatz products, that is a problem which may confront other segments of agriculture; and that is why all agricultural interests are concerned with this precedent, and that is why the public is also concerned.

20. JUNE 24, 1943: BECAUSE OF THE GRAVE MANPOWER SHORTAGE, A PLEA FOR USING THE SERVICES OF ARMY BOYS IN NEARBY CAMPS TO CAN THE VITAL PEA CROP

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. Twenty-five percent of the pea crop will be wasted unless we can get men into the fields.

* * * * *

The important thing now is to get boys out of the camps during the harvest and into the canneries. As I suggested yesterday, the primary problem in our country now is to preserve the food first.

21. JULY 5, 1943: A PLEA FOR FARM MANPOWER AND MACHINERY

Weeks ago I took up the question with the War Manpower Commission. The result has been an attempt to get somewhere.

* * * * *

First, the farmer must have manpower. Farmer after farmer in my State has told me, We have not the manpower to harvest the crops which are coming on. Think of that. Ordinarily we might say that that is the farmer's concern. It is not now. It is the Nation's concern. If we are to feed the boys in service we must have manpower.

* * * * *

Secondly, the farmers must have machinery. If they cannot get new machinery they must have men who can repair the old machinery. That is not simply to aid the farmer. It is for the Nation. Machinery is a part of the production line. In big business we provide machines for the manufacture of ammunition and weapons. There is no more important munition than food, so we must have machinery on the food front.

22. DECEMBER 9, 1943: ANOTHER STATEMENT ON THE OLEOMARGARINE SITUATION—BROADCAST OVER A WISCONSIN RADIO STATION

Fellow Americans, there is pending in Congress a bill to abolish the Federal tax on oleomargarine.

Why is this bill introduced now? If it becomes law, what will be the effect? Why should a Federal tax of this nature be imposed upon a domestic product? What is the tax? These, and other questions, I propose to answer in this brief talk.

At the present time there is a 10 percent Federal tax on oleomargarine which is colored to resemble butter and only a quarter of a cent on uncolored oleomargarine. The question at issue in the oleomargarine fight is largely a question of color. The oleomargarine industry, which consists of 18 manufacturers and their subsidiaries, produces all the oleomargarine made in the United States.

Many people have been deceived by the propaganda put out. It is deceiving and unfair; the public has been led to believe that they are not able to get oleomargarine because of a 10-percent Federal tax which is applicable to oleomargarine colored yellow—an imitation of butter. Ninety-nine and eight-tenths percent of all oleomargarine sold for civilian use in the United States is uncolored margarine which I repeat bears a tax of one-fourth of a cent per pound. This small tax is absorbed by the manufacturer, who makes a tremendous profit on the oleomargarine produced from vegetable oils.

Now, the oleomargarine manufacturers have only one objective, which was clearly indicated by Dr. Carlson, the chief spokesman, before the Senate Finance Committee at a hearing on the Maybank bill last week.

He stated that he "advocated that all whole milk should be used and consumed as whole milk," and I repeat Carlson said that "oleomargarine colored yellow should take the place of butter in the diet of the American people." Do the American people want this? The answer is a decided "No." We have been regimented enough without being ordered what to eat.

It is quite obvious that the sole intent of the oleomargarine industry is to perfect a synthetic product called oleomargarine, and to make it taste, smell, and look like butter so as to deceive the public—having in mind a complete change in the diet of the American people from butter to oleomargarine, thereby increasing the sales and profits of the oleomargarine manufacturers and destroying the dairy industry in this country which consists of nearly 5,000,000 farmers and which is the principal and the largest source of cash income for American agriculture in the Northern States—5,000,000 farmers and families and tens of thousands of communities of the Nation are involved.

* * * * *

To color oleomargarine to look like butter, and sell it in the stores as a butter substitute, is unfair practice. Let those who want oleomargarine on their tables buy it and color it. This they can easily do. But do not take a product which isn't butter, and permit it to be pawned off as butter. That is neither fair dealing nor sound business practice. Such a practice strikes at the security of millions of America's best citizens—the backbone of the Nation.

We shall do our best to defeat this measure. We want no economic paralysis to affect any segment of our society.

1944

23. JANUARY 14, 1944: AN ANECDOTE POINTING UP THE SMALL SHARE THE FARMER RECEIVES FOR SALE OF HIS PRODUCTS

I should like to cite an instance which came to my personal attention in the last few weeks.

It was my privilege to be in New York City, and a gentleman there took me to breakfast. We had some orange juice, a little bacon, some eggs, a little toast, coffee, and a little milk. The breakfast cost $2.20 apiece. When I returned to my home in Washington, I asked my wife how much it would cost to place that breakfast on the table here in Washington, where, as we know, prices are high. Thank God she is the one who cooks my meals for me; it would be unfortunate for me if she did not; she looks after my breakfast and my dinner at night. She figured out the cost of the orange juice, the eggs, the bacon, the toast, the coffee, and the milk, and said the cost would be about 30 cents. Then, I figured out that the farmer to produce the fruit, the bacon, and eggs, did not receive over 15 cents. Now I ask the Senator, if the Government subsidized the farmer's whole product for 15 cents, does he think that would reduce the price of that breakfast in New York City by a cent?

24. APRIL 17, 1944: A PRESS REPORT ON THE BATTLE TO PREVENT RUINOUS DRAFTING OF VITAL CHEESE-MAKING MANPOWER

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, stated to Food Administrator Marvin Jones today that the omission of cheese manufacturing from the list of essential activities would result in the paralysis of the cheese industry of Wisconsin. He said every skilled cheesemaker was working over 70 hours, 7 days per week, with no extra pay for overtime. Over 60 percent of the Nation's cheese is made by 1,700 Wisconsin factories.

The Senator said further that drafting 1 man under 26 would take 30 to 75 percent skilled help from the individual factory affected, and 100 percent in about 150 factories, and many factories would be forced to close.

25. APRIL 18, 1944: A PLEA TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR TRUCKS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MILK

There will soon fall on the transportation facilities of the milk industry one of the most tremendous loads in the history of our State. This increased burden is being piled on a transportation system which is rapidly breaking down beyond economical repair. It is getting to the point where farmers cannot take their trucks in and get them overhauled. The trucks need new motors, but the farmers cannot get new motors. The chassis are going to pieces, even beyond repair. New trucks are what the farmers need and what the milk industry needs.

If the Government has surplus trucks available, it must see to it that the milk industry obtains them in order that milk may be transported. As I have said, already milk is flowing in the gutters of Detroit.

1945

26. SEPTEMBER 10, 1945: ONE MONTH AFTER THE END OF THE WAR, A LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, URGING THE ENDING OF DAIRY RATIONING

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I respectfully submit that with the Nation now well into the reconversion period the time has come and is, indeed, long overdue for all dairy products, including butter and cheese, to be taken off the ration list.

Although the supply of these products may not be sufficient at present to give every would-be purchaser the entire supply that he would like, surely our dealers could informally apportion the limited supplies to prevent hogging.

Removing these items from rationing would not only rid the public of one more annoyance but would also help the dairy industry, whose well-being is so vital to the Nation, to readjust itself to normal conditions.

Looking forward to your early reply as to the Department's intentions in this regard, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

27. OCTOBER 22, 1945: A STATEMENT ON OPA'S UNJUST HANDLING OF THE CHEESE SITUATION

The Government has followed an arbitrary, unfair, and unjust policy of not only discriminating against the Wisconsin cheese industry in particular, but of striking against the entire cheese industry of the Nation. There are a number of charges which I made months ago against Government's unfair orders against cheese. Most of those charges still stand. Just what are they?

1. Wisconsin cheesmakers have been denied proper mark-up for direct sales on the service wholesaler and retail basis.

2. Because of OPA rulings, Wisconsin, which produces over 50 percent of the Nation's Cheddar; has been operating under the lowest ceiling prices on cheese in the country. This is due to the infamous Plymouth-plus formula.

3. Entire types of cheese have been priced off the market. Thus there is no brick and Muenster available throughout the Nation. This has hit particularly the Dodge County area of my State, which for years has produced over 85 percent of the Nation's total output.

4. The Cheddar cheesemakers of Wisconsin are compelled to pay more for their milk than did the Cheddar cheese manufacturers of any other State—and still more important, as I have stated above, the manufacturers of every State received substantially more for the Cheddar cheese than did the Wisconsin manufacturers.

5. Aged and cured cheese have been priced off the market because the Government would permit no differential in price between cheese as it came out of the factory and cheese that was aged.

1946

28. APRIL 1946: THE GRANGE COMMENTS ON SENATOR WILEY'S EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The following is quoted from a number of Grange publications:

"WILEY CARRIES THE BALL FOR FARMERS

"It sometimes takes a show-down in the Senate for farmers to find out who their true friends are and who their fair-weather friends are. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin Republican, never has been considered a Member of the so-called Farm Bloc in Congress, but when the ball was passed to him in an eleventh-hour effort to prevent farmers being squeezed under the 65-cent an hour wage minimum bill, he carried it for a winning touchdown.

"For weeks the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, and the Cooperative Milk Producers Federation had sought to prevent a labor-inspired move from taking away exemptions under the present law.

"The labor move would have added millions of dollars a year to the cost of preparing farm produce for market and would have either decreased farm income or added to consumers' food costs. Under OPA there wasn't much doubt as to which it would have been.

"A few quotations from WILEY'S address to the Senate on behalf of farmers will illustrate the kind of a fight he put up. His address disclosed a deep and sympathetic understanding of the farmer's problem.

" 'During the past decade,' he said, 'approximately 6,000,000 people left the farms. If such an exodus continues, there will not be production, and production is vitally needed throughout the country. Perhaps there are persons in this country who wish to see a grand exodus from the farms.

" 'I know that the farmer is the backbone of the Nation. When I look around this

Chamber and see men who were produced by and on the farms, and when I examine the pages of history and consider the character of great statesmen of the past who came from farms, I do not want to see the source of supply of American manpower come to an end. However, Mr. President, that will take place if we do not make life on the farms more interesting'."

FAIR PRICES FOR FARMERS

"'Why is it inflationary, as some contend, to allow the farmer to receive higher prices for his products and be enabled to meet the higher expenses which are constantly thrust upon him, and yet it is not inflationary to grant increases in the compensation paid to labor, the manufacturer, and Government employees? Why is the so-called farm bloc criticized for asking that the farmer be allowed to receive his cost of production when no word of criticism along that line is heard with reference to the labor bloc?

"'Mr. President, it is time that we remove the blinders from our eyes and give to the farmer what he is entitled to receive. I repeat that I am not speaking only for farmers, 23,000,000 of them. I am speaking for the millions of persons who reside in cities and depend on a maximum production of food. I speak for the economic and physical health of this Nation.

"'I do not wish to see an exodus from the farms. I want to see an exodus from the cities back to the farms. I want to see farm life made more and more interesting. After all, the farm is the laboratory of life. There we see vegetable life and animal life. There we see, going on and on, a part of the mystery of creation.

"'Mr. President, I also stand for the proposition that the farmer is just as worthy of his hire as is the laborer. The farmer must now pay an increased cost for labor and material as well as an increased price for farm machinery. If the farmer wants to obtain help he must meet on the labor market wages which are paid in the city'."

1947

29. FEBRUARY 5, 1947: JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS M'CARTHY AND WILEY IN INTRODUCING AN AMENDMENT TO EXCISE TAX BILL TO END DISCRIMINATION ON FUR-TRIMMED GARMENTS (THIS AMENDMENT IN SLIGHTLY REVISED FORM WAS LATER ENACTED BY CONGRESS)

The discriminatory provision of the present tax against the use of better quality fur for trimming purposes has closed this market for our product.

Evidence of the critical condition the fur-farming industry is in today is substantiated by the fact that a large part of the 1945 crop and all of the 1946 crop is unsold. Besides the cost of production, stored furs depreciate very rapidly. Financial losses to fur farmers are far above any previous year, and our industry is operating on a credit basis.

Something can be done to correct the discrimination in the present excise taxes.

30. MARCH 13, 1947: REPORT ON SUCCESSFUL EFFORT IN SECURING CANS FOR VITAL SAUERKRAUT PACKING

On February 28 I wrote to the Agriculture Department protesting against a foolhardy bureaucratic order which, by denying No. 2 size cans for the sauerkraut industry, was threatening to cause tremendous spoilage in stored sauerkraut and wastage of the cabbage crop. In response to my appeal, I am glad to report, that on March 10 the Agriculture Department wrote stating that the bureaucratic order had just been eliminated and all can size restrictions have been dropped. This is good news, not only to Wisconsin and the Nation's sauerkraut industry, but to cabbage growers and to all those who are anxious to assure adequacy in America's food situation.

Outlook on New Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address entitled "Outlook On New Labor Legislation," delivered by Vincent P. Ahearn, executive secretary of the National Sand and Gravel Association, before the personnel conference of the American Management Association at Chicago, Ill., on February 25, 1947.

Mr. President, I am advised by the Public Printer that to print the address delivered by Mr. Ahearn will require 3 pages of the RECORD, which is one page more than, under the rule, can be printed without an estimate of cost, and that the estimate is $213.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is only one thing which anybody can say with certainty about the outlook for new labor legislation, and that is that Congress is going to write a law and that unions, true to the tradition of entrenched interest, have largely excluded themselves from influencing the legislation by a policy of blind opposition to any change. One can only speculate at the moment as to what direction this change in our labor laws will take, and indeed there are two remaining sources of speculation: Will the President veto whatever law Congress passes, and if so, will the legislation be passed over his veto?

We must all be grateful to the Senate and House Labor Committees for the courage with which they have come to grips with this complicated question and for their manifest eagerness to get the benefit of the advice and counsel of interested people. It is clear that these two committees are actuated by an honest desire to recommend legislation which will serve the public welfare and which will do no harm to the legitimate interests of labor and management.

It is quite easy to discuss in generalities what ought to be done, according to one's point of view. Very few will be heard to justify jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, or the use of violence and coercion by unions for the accomplishment of objectives which in many cases would make it necessary for employers to violate the law; but having accepted the principle that this type of conduct should be prohibited, the job of reducing that principle to specific statutory phraseology is an extremely difficult one.

All of us believe that the function of government should be confined to that irreducible minimum which is compatible with an orderly society and with the protection of our Nation against foreign aggression. Instinctively we are slow to give wide powers to the Federal Government. Employers might be forgiven for being particularly sensitive to any suggestion that unrestricted authority be given to an executive department. We know from bitter experience how that power will be used. Administrative and judicial law making have plagued and harassed employers for many years. They suddenly found themselves confronted with obligations of a bankrupting character. Administrative actions and judicial decisions bypassed the prohibitions of our Constitution against ex post facto laws.

We, out of all the people in this country, should examine with microscopic care any proposal, made even by our friends, which would give an administrative establishment vague and obscure powers, even if the avowed purpose is to make us the beneficiaries of the assertion of that power.

Many bills have beeen introduced in the present Congress. It is possible to summarize the most important basic objectives of this large number of bills, and this I shall attempt to do. First I should like to refer to the proposed Federal Mediation Board, which would take over the present Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, be made an independent establishment (although some would put the Board in the Department of Labor for housekeeping purposes) and have authority to attempt the mediation or conciliation of labor disputes either on its own motion or at the request of one or both parties to the dispute.

There is much support for this proposal. The Conciliation Service, many Members of Congress believe, must be taken out of the Department of Labor if it is really to represent the public interest in the peaceful settlement of labor disputes. Furthermore, the appointment of a Federal Mediation Board seems to some Members of Congress to be a modest way, stopping short of compulsory arbitration, for the Congress to declare that there is a superior public interest in most labor disputes, particularly in industries where strikes affect the public health and safety.

I believe that the chances favor action by Congress to establish a board of this general character and that the Conciliation Service will be transferred out of the Department of Labor; but I must add a personal opinion that any Federal Mediation Board, however unpretentious its power, will keep Washington in the business of settling labor disputes and will surely lead to the failure of collective bargaining in many cases. The board will be forced by public pressure to hold hearings. They will be held at Washington where national news is made. The strategy on the part of unions will be to get their disputes to Washington for hearings before the Board.

The tendency will be for the Board to develop into a sort of compulsory arbitration body through the most subtle means. Unions will be encouraged to make the most extravagant demands; employers will be slow to make proposals in collective bargaining lest they be used as the floor from which the Board would operate in suggesting solutions of the dispute; and employers must have learned by now that a governmental board is generally not concerned with the elimination from contracts of provisions which the employer has found distasteful.

Employers will always be fighting a rear-guard action before a Federal board. If we have learned any lesson in the past 5 years, it is that employers must come forward with proposals of their own for the improvement of collective-bargaining relationships. Too many of our labor agreements are written as though management regarded its function as that of working out the terms of an armistice with a victorious enemy.

Personally I doubt whether an independent status for the Conciliation Service would guarantee its impartiality. I believe its present management is conscious of the fact that its function is not to take sides in labor disputes but to represent the public interest in peacefully and equitably settling those disputes. The Labor-Management Advisory Committee has brought about important changes in policy and practice which, in my opinion, have increased its efficiency and opened up the way for making it possible for the Service to render a greater contribution to the public welfare.

Compulsory arbitration has received little support, although a number of bills were introduced in the House of Representatives

which require compulsory arbitration whenever the President found that a public emergency exists which threatens the public health or safety. While you and I undoubtedly agree that compulsory arbitration would lead to a controlled economy, disastrous both to management and labor, the degree of public support for compulsory arbitration under the circumstances proposed in the bill should prompt us to leave nothing undone which will make compulsory arbitration understandable to all the people.

Compulsory arbitration is wide open to criticism, one being that the President of the United States would be called upon to intervene in many labor disputes, because there is hardly an industry whose paralysis will not eventually produce an emergency which affects health and safety. We discovered during the war that it is simply impossible to distinguish between industries in the administration of a national policy for settling labor disputes.

It is significant that the authors of the compulsory arbitration bill suggest no standards for the guidance of the arbitrators, who would apparently be permitted to issue arbitration awards binding as a matter of law, without even being compelled to say why they had done what they did. I doubt the constitutionality of such a delegation of law-making power, but I am sure that it is undesirable public policy and I do not believe that compulsory arbitration will be approved at this session of Congress.

I should hasten to add to this statement, however, one more sober point: This country faces a series of dramatic possibilities for the gravest kind of public emergencies. The coal truce expires on March 31; there is a threatened telephone strike; the railroads will soon face demands from railroad brotherhoods which would add nearly $1,000,000,000 to the railroad pay rolls; the steel truce is scheduled to expire on April 30; the major automobile companies face renegotiation of their contracts or reopening of unexpired contracts for wage adjustments, and the great electrical manufacturing companies must contend with union demands.

If there are strikes in these industries, no government which hopes to keep the confidence of its people can afford not to seek a drastic remedy. I know compulsory arbitration will not work; you and I understand that compulsory arbitration does not really settle or avoid labor disputes; we see the impropriety of abdication by Congress of its law-making functions. Al' of these considerations will be swept aside, I am convinced, if collective bargaining fails in these industries and strikes follow. An outraged public would demand action, any action.

The President spoke for an indignant people when he asked Congress last year for the most drastic legislation ever recommended in peacetime by a Chief Executive. If Mr. Whitney had not seen the light and called off his strike, I feel confident the Senate, perhaps by a much narrower margin than prevailed in the House, would have given the President a substantial part of the power which he sought. This is so even if we on our side pointed out that the law would victimize an employer not responsible for the strike, would have caused the seizure of properties and the confiscation of assets, but it is well to recall that this proposal was described by Mr. Whitney as an antiunion bill.

The proposal for establishment of labor courts to arbitrate disputes arising during the life of a contract is getting only lukewarm support, but this again is something which has great appeal to the public. On the surface it looks like good common sense to require parties to settle their disputes peacefully by taking them to a court for adjudication, but our courts are engaged in the application of a specific body of law to specific facts, a situation which is wholly inapplicable to disputes arising under labor agreements.

It is my opinion that Congress is prepared to postpone action on this particular legislative proposal, in deference to the statement that statutory compulsion would handicap the progressive development of the agreement reached at the President's labor-management conference that wherever it appears that labor-management relations would be improved by the arbitration of disputes over the interpretation or application of the terms of an agreement, the parties should write into their agreements a provision for the use of arbitration as the terminal point in the disposition of all grievance issues subject to arbitration under the agreement.

It is impossible, let me say before proceeding to other matters, to escape the conclusion that there is really no master solution at all for our problems. The simple fact is that collective bargaining has just got to work; any alternative threatens the long-range interest of the public and the short-range interest of management and labor. We must have collective bargaining done in good faith by men of good will; if it fails, the superior public interest in labor disputes will be asserted, even though its assertion leads to unfortunate complications. This is a time above all when a sense of responsibility must mark the exercise of privileges if we are to continue to have a free society.

Three things have dominated the testimony before the labor committees: Shall there be a Federal Mediation Board? Shall Congress prohibit industry-wide bargaining? Shall Congress prohibit the closed shop?

I have talked about the first and I should like now to talk about the second and third. Quite apart from the fact that industry-wide bargaining is an accomplished fact in many industries and that its being made illegal would cancel out agreements which have existed for many years, I do not believe that the bill making industry-wide bargaining illegal would accomplish the stated objective of reducing the power of unions to paralyze great industries and deprive the public of necessary goods and services.

Industry-wide bargaining would be permitted under the bill in the same labor market area, so long as that area did not include places of employment separated by more than 100 miles. If industry-wide bargaining is necessarily evil, either because it gives union chiefs undue power or leads to an association between management and labor which does violence to the public interest, it can be just as destructive in distances less than 100 miles and should therefore be abolished wherever found. The limitations in the pending bill would still make it possible for unions to tie up the bulk of production in many of our most important industries.

Furthermore, it is a mistake to assume that only unions are interested in industry-wide bargaining. It is preferred by some employers and sought after over union objection in some of our most essential industries. Company-wide bargaining would apparently still be permissible under the proposed law, and indeed many companies might find it wholly unworkable to go through the laborious process of executing a separate agreement for each of its plants distributed over wide areas, except that most companies prefer, for sound reasons, to make area approaches to wage rates.

There is another reason for proceeding with great caution in respect to prohibition of industry-wide bargaining, and that is that the bill would seem to leave untouched the practice of union-wide bargaining. Some of the witnesses appearing before the Labor Committees to express opposition to industry-wide bargaining were not actually talking about industry-wide bargaining, but were protesting their status as victims of a situation in which a strong union with contracts in a number of industries issues an ultimatum that all must accept arbitrary union standards, or must accept the results of collective bargaining with a single company.

International unions have been known to veto collective-bargaining agreements executed between one of its locals and an employer, not because it was not a good contract but because it marked a departure from inflexible union-wide standards. Until it is made clear in the bill that the proposal would do more than simply make it impossible for employers to consult for the purpose of developing an industry policy with respect to union demands applied to the whole industry, I doubt if the bill will pass. Indeed, it is significant that a bill introduced in the House of Representatives would make it necessary for unions to bargain with duly authorized representatives of employers.

The closed shop has no friends among thinking people. The very idea of compulsory membership in a private organization is distasteful; it contradicts every fundamental standard of decency and fair play. Congress wants to legislate on this point, but it seems disturbed about the possibility that even more turmoil might follow from invalidation of the closed shop or other forms of compulsory union membership. Congress is much more likely to act on this issue, however, than it is on industry-wide bargaining.

If a bill is enacted by the Congress with respect to compulsory union membership, I believe that it will categorically outlaw the practice. No cautious or procedural approach will do the job. It would be impossible to compromise the issue by providing for governmental supervision of unions with closed or union-shop provisions in their contracts. The surgical knife is indicated if we are to avoid the creation of a giant administrative establishment.

Almost everybody agrees that changes must be made in the National Labor Relations Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the antitrust laws, not altogether because of the phraseology of these laws but because of administrative and judicial interpretations. It seems safe to predict that Congress will take about the following steps:

1. Unions will be required to engage in collective bargaining in good faith, when they have acquired status as the duly authorized representative of employees.

2. The term "collective bargaining" will be specifically defined in the statute. Both employers and representatives of employees will be compelled to meet at reasonable times to confer with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, but the statute will stipulate that so long as collective bargaining is done in good faith, neither party will be required to agree to a proposal of the other party nor to make a counterproposal.

3. Congress will make it clear that employers will have the right of free speech under the National Labor Relations Act so long as written or oral statements contain no threat of force. It is an interesting commentary on the lack of confidence in the National Labor Relations Board that Congress now finds it necessary to restate a constitutional right. This fundamental right will be written into the statute even if the Board now seems, like another great institution, to be following the election returns.

4. Employers will henceforth have the statutory right to file a petition with the Board for determination of bargaining rights when they are confronted with conflicting claims of representation by labor organizations.

5. Combinations by labor organizations in restraint of trade will be made illegal. The Congress has been shocked by testimony that unions in many cases have acted to restrain trade, to make goods scarce and unnecessarily expensive and to set up artificial trade barriers.

6. Congress is going to do something about boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and sympathy strikes. Just what it will do is impossible to predict. Secondary boycotts directed against employers in order to compel an illegal act will surely be made illegal. Congress is having difficulty distinguishing between primary and secondary boycotts; it may leave primary boycotts untouched but strike at the secondary boycott. I believe, however, there is strong support for amendments to any existing Federal law which denies the Government the right to strike at boycotts and unlawful combinations by unions. Legislation is certain; its details are uncertain.

7. The President has said that jurisdictional disputes must end. If so, a law is necessary. Labor organizations have demonstrated an incapacity to cure the problem. At the very least, Congress will provide that labor organizations may be sued for violation of contract. This should at least discourage jurisdictional abuses but this problem of jurisdictional disputes is the most difficult one of all to handle by law. You can safely assume that an effort is going to be made.

8. Sympathy strikes fall in the same category with jurisdictional strikes. Establishing the obligation of unions to fulfill contracts will be the minimum step, but it is no secret that the labor committees will have considerable trouble in finding ways and means of translating into law the public demand for outlawing sympathy and jurisdictional strikes.

9. Although one cannot say for sure, my opinion is that Congress will not order the preservation of the so-called status quo for 60 days while a mediation board attempts to bring the parties together. I question the workability of this proposal. Experience under the War Labor Disputes Act offers no hope for believing that a status quo requirement would do much more than to introduce emotional obstacles into collective-bargaining negotiations.

10. There is some likelihood that Congress will require a secret strike ballot, making a majority vote for all workers in the plant a condition of the strike. This would reduce the power of labor leaders who call strikes without consulting with the workers much less permitting a vote, and a secret ballot requirement might well strike at some of the evils of union-wide bargaining; but one must not overlook the fact that secret balloting did not curtail strikes in war or since the end of the war. If a secret ballot discloses a great majority of the workers to be in favor of a strike, that fact is used by union leaders in arguing for intervention of governmental authorities or for the appointment of fact-finders to pass on the demands of the union. If union leaders wish in good faith to reach a compromise, they would be handicapped in retreating from extravagant demands by an overwhelming vote for a strike.

11. The status of supervisory employees will be clarified. At the minimum Congress will stipulate that supervisory employees may not belong to a union of production workers or to a union which is affiliated with a parent organization of which the union representing the production workers is a part. This same treatment will be accorded professional, technical and confidential employees; but whether Congress will go beyond this point and provide that employers shall not be required to deal with unions representing supervisory employees is something on which it is simply impossible to make predictions.

It would be unfortunate if Congress did not take affirmative action on the question of supervisory employees, because if employers are required to bargain collectively with unions of supervisory employees, a deadly blow will be struck at the desirable policy of settling grievances as close as possible to the point where they arise.

12. I believe that something will be done about so-called health and welfare funds, particularly when sought by unions now possessing the power to strike down a whole industry. Health and welfare is very dear to the hearts of every Member of Congress; any sensible legislation along this line would be popular. Congress will act to prohibit the wrong kind of health and welfare funds, and the subject will not be left untouched. Apparently Mr. Petrillo has the same idea, because he has just announced that his royalty fund will be used for public concerts. Like the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Petrillo seems impressed by recent elections.

A series of other changes will be made: Some strikes as such will be made illegal, including strikes to remedy practices for which an administrative remedy is available, and strikes intended to compel an employer to violate a law of the United States. I believe it will be made an unfair labor practice for unions to restrain, interfere, or coerce employees in the determination of their bargaining representative; that the right of employers to discharge employees will be clarified, and that the Congress will place sharp restrictions on the right to picket.

It is interesting to recall that the President himself, in his message to Congress on January 6, 1947, proposed legislation to outlaw jurisdictional strikes, which he described as indefensible. He also denounced secondary boycotts "when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act." He asked Congress to prohibit the use of economic force by labor or management to decide issues arising out of interpretation of existing contracts.

He thought Congress ought to investigate the problem of Nation-wide strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest, but made no specific recommendations. In vetoing the Case bill on June 11, 1946, the President said other significant things. He stated his agreement "with the principle that it is fair and right to hold a labor union responsible for violation of its contract." He repeated his impatience with strikes or boycotts arising out of jurisdictional disputes; he said that he did not think it necessary for him to "emphasize the necessity of applying the antitrust laws to combinations between employers and labor designed to restrain competition." He said that the Government should be permitted to seek injunctions in order to "restrain strikes against the Government in cases where refusal to work for the Government has produced a condition of national emergency."

It seems to me a healthy thing that States are beginning to legislate on the labor problem. States should accept their responsibility to establish a pattern for solution of local utility strikes, not only because the experience of 48 States will be helpful to all of the States and the Federal Government in the development of a rational and constructive policy, but also because the failure of States to accept their responsibilities in past years has caused a centralization of authority at Washington which is not good for the country.

States are also legislating on other questions. Perhaps employers will not altogether like the total results, because in the past we have been heard to deplore the lack of uniformity; but confronted with alternatives, I prefer the initial development of labor policy in the States. If States acted to restrain the use of violence on picket lines, Federal action would be unnecessary. I mention this to illustrate my point.

I have indicated to you in this talk that Congress will probably adopt several pending legislative proposals to translate into reality the ideal stated by the minority of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in submitting a report last year on the Case bill: "The desired end of bargaining between management and labor is a contract, equally binding and enforceable on both parties with appropriate safeguards against resort on either side to wrongful and unlawful conduct."

This is another way of saying that the public interest demands peaceful settlement of labor disputes. The demand for corrective labor legislation is not so much an outbreak of sympathy for employers as it is an expression of public impatience with strikes and violence and with interruptions in the production of goods and services. We must not lose perspective on that fundamental consideration.

I have said that Congress will probably postpone action on other proposals. If all legislative action is combined in an omnibus bill, there will be much in that bill which we as employers will not like. Separate statutory approaches would be much better, but present indications are that we shall have an omnibus bill.

This will mean many changes in our laws, principally designed to clarify the obligations and responsibilities of employers and representatives of their employees. We will still have the job of finding a way to live together peacefully; and we cannot do that by legislation alone. Senator VANDENBERG predicts a great era of prosperity for this country "if we quit making senseless war against each other here at home and if we quit abusing our illimitable opportunities." The public simply will not tolerate endless controversy, regardless of who is right. If laws are added to our statute books which prove unenforceable or which fail to accomplish the results which management promised, the hostility of a disillusioned people will multiply our troubles.

This is the one time above all when restraint and moderation are essential. I have been appalled at the intemperate language used in union literature. It deliberately seeks to create an atmosphere of hate for employers which would make industrial peace an impossibility. Too many people have lost their sense of humor. We shall find once more that there is no single solution for our difficulty: Government by itself cannot produce peaceful relationships. Whatever is done by Congress, employers and employees and their representatives will still have the job of showing that our free enterprise system is a happier choice than any other system.

St. Patrick's Day Broadcast of Hon. Eamon de Valera, Prime Minister of Eire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of broadcast made by Mr. Eamon de Valera over Columbia Broadcasting System on March 17, 1947:

On St. Patrick's Day last year I told you how happy I was at being able, after the silence of the war years, to speak to you once more. Almost twenty-eight years have now gone by since first I had the privilege of speaking to American audiences as the representative of our country. I then brought news of the aspirations of the young men

of Ireland, of their desire "to work out a way of life free from coercion," and of their fixed determination to win back the liberty of which their country had for centuries been deprived, despite the many gallant efforts made to regain it. The reception given to my message then, and the encouragement and generous aid steadily afforded to us since, have played no small part in securing the freedom we now enjoy in this part of Ireland.

We here, who have been fortunate enough to have lived through this inspiring period, are endeavoring today so to lay the foundations that on them the Irish nation may be rebuilt in a manner worthy of the devotion given to it, and the sacrifices made for it throughout the long period of its sorrow.

As I read President Truman's message to Congress a few days ago I could not help thinking how truly democratic these foundations are. We here chose unmistakably the democratic way of life "based upon the will of the majority," and our entire state organization bears visibly upon it all the characteristic marks of democracy indicated by the President: "Free Institutions, Representative Government, Free Elections," with "Guarantees of Individual Liberty, Freedom of Speech and Religion, and Freedom from Political Oppression." We made our choice some years ago with the conscious purpose of securing that "the dignity and freedom of the individual may be assured, true social order attained, the unity of our country restored, and concord established with other nations." These are the words of the preamble of our Constitution.

But the foundations are not yet as they should be. There is one grievous defect and it places in jeopardy all that has hitherto been gained. The essential unity of our nation does not at present exist. Our national integrity is destroyed by the unnatural partition of our country, enacted and enforced by coercion from outside.

Last year I spoke to you once again of this wrong and asked for your earnest support towards bringing it to an end. Partition of the United States was rejected by Abraham Lincoln in his time. He fought one of the bitterest Civil Wars in history to prevent it. Partition of India and partition of Palestine are rejected today. Every argument against partition in these instances and others that we know of applies with even greater force in the case of Ireland.

Ireland has been one since the dawn of history, with a boundary unmistakably determined by the ocean. Only a vandal hand would have dared to mutilate it. The part cut off contains the places most hallowed by the events of our history, the places dearest of all others to our people. The inhabitants were not consulted and gave no consent before they were severed from the main body of the nation. A local plebiscite even now would show that in one-half the area cut off the majority desire to be united with the rest of the nation. Of the six separated counties, four taken as a group, and these the four counties, immediately bordering the twenty-six counties, have a majority of their inhabitants in favor of union with the rest of the country. The area cut off is in itself neither a historic, a racial, a political nor an economic entity, and is maintained as an artificial political unit solely by the pressure of an outside power.

It must be obvious that as long as this unnatural and unjust situation exists any genuine cordiality of feeling between the peoples of Ireland and of Britain is impossible, and that the efforts of men of good will who labor to foster such a cordiality are doomed to frustration.

Yet we are living in a time which makes it more than ever imperative that nations which can come together in amity to ensure their common well being and safety should do so. Ireland and Britain are two neighboring islands off the coast of Europe. Their peoples have many interests in common. They are the motherlands of large populations living in harmony side by side over extensive regions of the earth. Their economies can, to their mutual advantage, in many respects be made to be complementary. Were the old conflict ended they might in freedom become each a source of strength and a support to the other. This is obvious, but while partition lasts all such ideas must remain a hopeless dream. Those who help to end partition are assisting in the great work of bringing nations together, and in the great movement towards world peace. The Irishmen who help are securing the foundations for a splendid future for our nation. It is for that reason that I confidently ask all you who are listening to me to lend your support.

Padraic Pearse, in an inspiring lecture which he gave as a young man 50 years ago, on the "Intellectual Future of the Gael," referred to the remarkable vision of Ireland's future written by an Englishman, Cardinal Newman fifty years earlier. Pearse hoped that much of that vision might yet come true. I will read for you portions of the passage from the Cardinal which Pearse quoted: "* * * I look, the Cardinal wrote, towards a land both old and young; old in its Christianity, young in the promise of its future; a nation, which received grace before the Saxon came to Britain, and which has never quenched it * * * I contemplate, he said, a people which has had a long night, and will have an inevitable day. I am turning my eyes toward a hundred years to come, and I dimly see the island I am gazing on, become the road of passage and union between two hemispheres and the centre of the world. * * * I see England taught by advancing years to exercise in its behalf that good sense which is her characteristic towards everyone else * * * thither, as to a sacred soil, the home of their fathers, and the fountain-head of their Christianity, students are flocking from East, West and South, from America and Australia and India, from Egypt and Asia Minor, with the ease and rapidity of a locomotion not yet discovered * * * all eager for one large true wisdom; and thence, when their stay is over, going back again to carry peace to men of good will over all the earth."

Such is the destiny beyond all others which those who have sincerely loved our country and are now gone would have chosen for her. Such is the destiny of service which all her faithful children, living and to come, will earnestly endeavor to secure for her, and such is the destiny which today we pray all our Saints, and in particular our glorious Patron, St. Patrick, to plead for, before the Throne of the Most High.

I should like to stop here but there are questions which I know many of you who are listening would ask me if it were possible for you to do so and would be disappointed if I did not answer. You wish to know how we in Ireland are faring in these difficult times and how our plans for the immediate future are progressing.

We are indeed having our postwar difficulties and these have been made more acute by the unusually severe weather of recent months. This has seriously reduced our fuel supplies, dislocated our transport, prevented the winter sowings and delayed the spring sowings. The bad weather, too, last harvest defeated what until then had been our successful efforts to provide ourselves with the greater part of our bread and with the food for our animals. We are now short of both. We have had to ration bread for the first time and drastically reduce the butter ration. These added hardships make us realize more vividly what other nations have had to endure and how fortunate in comparison we have hitherto been. At this moment we are getting ready to utilize every favorable hour the weather may give us to sow the wheat and other cereals which we require to meet our needs in the coming year. To do this and to sow the potatoes, the beet and the green crops and, at the same time, cut all the turf we need for fuel, will be an extremely difficult task in view of the present shortage of machinery and the many other demands upon rural labor. The penalty for failure, however, is to be short of food and fuel in the coming winter. I am confident that if the weather be favorable our people will combine for the necessary effort now as they did in the harvest.

In regard to our plans for the future I can only tell you that we have resumed the task of building up our manufacturing industries and that in spite of the difficulty in getting supplies of coal and raw materials we succeeded in producing last year a greater volume of goods than before the war, and that the number of persons employed in industry in 1946 was the highest on record.

Our plans to get electric light and mechanical power for our industries by the harnessing of our rivers and bogs for the production of electricity are also being put into operation. So, too, are our plans for the further creation of economic farms for the building of tens of thousands of additional houses and for bringing to the countryside the conveniences of electric light and telephonic communication. A Ministry for Health and a Ministry for Social Welfare have been added to the Departments of State since last I addressed you, so as the better to provide that the sick and the aged, the infirm and those who may be unemployed through no fault of their own may have as much care as the resources of our community make is possible to afford.

I must now say goodbye. I wish you good fortune and happiness in the year ahead and always.

Address of Hon. John L. Sullivan, Under Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Under Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan at launching of U. S. S. *Newport News*, at Newport News, Va., March 6, 1947:

It is a distinct privilege to come to this historic seaport to participate in the launching of a ship which will bear the traditionally famous American name of *Newport News*.

I am delighted to bring you the greetings of the Navy Department and of its Secretary, James Forrestal. Newport News and the United States Navy are not strangers. Your ships have been our ships for a half century—through two great wars and in the intervening years of peace.

During the war years, occasions such as this stirred us to the depths of our hearts because the ships launched here we knew would speed the defeat of America's enemies. Now, though emotions are more constrained, we are no less aware of the real meaning of this launching. Today we dedicate ourselves and this great ship to the goal of universal peace.

This splendid vessel is the handiwork of the men and women of the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. When her crew comes aboard this fall and she is commissioned, she will become a proud unit of our Navy—ready to carry on the gallant traditions of the service and the great heritage of the sea.

Moreover, this ship marks a new trend in design and construction. She is one of a class of three cruisers which will have the distinction of being the heaviest "heavies" in the world. Her over-all length is 716 feet and displacement of 17,000 tons will make her comparable in size with some of the famous dreadnaughts of the First World War. In modernity, efficiency, and seaworthiness, she will be unsurpassed by anything afloat.

The *Newport News* will have a main battery consisting of nine 8-inch rapid-fire guns, mounted in three triple turrets. She is the first ship ever to carry rapid-fire weapons of this caliber. She will also be the Navy's first completely air-conditioned warship. To increase the fighting efficiency of her crew and to improve living conditions on board, virtually all her living and working compartments except the engineering spaces, will be air-conditioned.

This cruiser bears a fine heritage. She comes from the same yard which has produced some of the most famous ships to carry the flag of the United States in World War II. The aircraft carriers *Yorktown*, *Enterprise*, and *Hornet* were your ships. They were built here. On them rests much of the glory for the defeat of the Japanese in the decisive battle of Midway—an engagement the memory of which is perpetuated by another great carrier built here at Newport News—the U. S. S. *Midway*.

I know you are all proud of the *Newport News*. I can see that in your faces. So are we of the Navy. When she sails to join the fleet, you will miss her, but I know that you will follow her course at sea with great interest. There is no doubt that she will fully justify your solicitude and confidence.

To her builders and to the community leaders of the city of Newport News I wish to extend hearty congratulations. The first have done their job well and on schedule. The last may take worthy pride indeed in the name which this ship bears.

May her service in the country's cause be long, honorable, and successful. May her log add luster to the name of Newport News and brighten the annals of the American Navy. May she become an effective unit of the sea-air power of our Navy pledged by President Harry S. Truman to the support of world peace through the organization of the United Nations.

Reduction of the Price Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, a great responsibility rests upon the shoulders of American business today. Generally speaking, American business opposed the Government's policy of price control, especially when it failed to include wages. The failure to include wages is no doubt the contributing factor to its final collapse. Wages are of necessity a part of the cost of production in all instances.

Many of the present-day businessmen passed through the experience following the last war. The repercussions of that tragic period are still fresh in the minds of many of us. If a parallel situation is to be avoided, in a large measure it is up to American businessmen to recognize their responsibility now. Orderly price cuts in all lines of merchandise are urged, and urged now. There is vital need today for more business practices as exemplified by the International Harvester Co.

The accomplishment of American business is perhaps the outstanding contribution to our national American life. Business today can further enhance its influence by recognizing its responsibilities to the public and bringing about now an orderly reduction in the price structure. The American people have faith in American businessmen. They have been worthy of the faith. Action now will enhance their position. Prices must not only stop rising, but through the efforts of business collectively, we must bring about a downward trend.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith an article by Thomas F. Conroy taken from the New York Times, March 9, 1947, entitled "Orderly Price Cuts as Trade Aid Urged" as follows:

ORDERLY PRICE CUTS AS TRADE AID URGED—TOP STORE EXECUTIVE WANTS SLASH OF 5 TO 10 PERCENT AT RETAIL AND PRODUCER LEVELS

(By Thomas F. Conroy)

A voluntary program of gradual and orderly price reductions now, in steps ranging from 5 to 10 percent and involving a squeeze on profit margins, was urged upon manufacturers and retailers by the top executive of one of the country's outstanding stores in an interview here last week.

"Why wait until a price debacle develops and business crashes?" this executive asked.

Such reductions, he said, would stimulate consumer demand, which is still buttressed by high national income and savings. They would tend to minimize the possibility of a 20 to 25 percent decline later when the price structure might crack in the face of diminishing demand. After a decline of these proportions, business would have to struggle painfully to recover its balance, he asserted.

OUTLINES REDUCTION PLAN

Immediate, orderly price reduction on the other hand, he continued, would prove much less severe. The readjustment would break up an impending price jam and provide a basis on which consumer demand could function freely. Manufacturers and retailers could move forward to achieve the goal of larger volume in increased unit sales.

"As matters stand, anything may happen in the price situation," this executive continued. "It is no exaggeration to say that almost the whole merchandising set-up cries aloud for readjustment. With dropping of OPA controls, many ready-to-wear lines, for example, are 30 to 40 percent above OPA levels. Other price advances have been large and uneven. All kinds of maladjustments exist in prices of commodities and finished merchandise. Futures prices are lower than those for spot, indicating the lack of confidence in current levels."

Holding that a depression is man-made and not inevitable if business statesmanship and sound economic policies are followed, this executive paid high tribute to the recent report of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers and in particular to the views of Edwin G. Nourse, its chairman. Late last month Dr. Nourse warned that business should not sacrifice volume to preserve price or profit margins.

The retailer who was interviewed said price reductions are both feasible and necessary at this time on two grounds:

1. Profit margins are still abnormally high in manufacturing and distribution, representing a carry-over from 1946. This was a freak year when consumer spending bordered on the reckless, black-market money was a highly important factor, and the curve of retail sales rose sharply above the national-income line. Retail sales usually follow the income curve very closely. In other words, high-profit margins may and must be cut to obtain greater unit volume.

2. Management efficiency must climb to new postwar heights. Management efficiency was not great during the war and so far has not improved much. In normal times, figures show that one out of seven businesses was eliminated because of inefficiency and, while this is undoubtedly regrettable, the process has got to be gone through again.

NEED OF LABOR ADJUSTMENT

Labor, this executive added, must, to some extent, go through similar adjustments in the move to lower costs.

This merchant revealed that his establishment has had numerous talks with manufacturers on the price question, and has reached the conclusion that textile manufacturers are among the most adamant in their price views. He was convinced, he added, that a very large segment of the consumer goods price situation would be much healthier if the textile people from yarn makers to mills and converters were brought into line.

Terming the textile situation a vital link, this merchant said he was seriously concerned with the outlook for ready-to-wear at the current price levels.

"I personally am looking for a readjustment in ready-to-wear prices, similar to that which has already occurred in furs," this executive said. "The readjustment in furs uncovered strong consumer demand at the lower levels and a similar development may be expected to follow in ready-to-wear.

'Reports indicate the spring ready-to-wear season is opening comparatively poorly all over the country and prices may fall before Easter or after that holiday. The retail shoe situation is bad, with pairage unit sales falling and consumer resistance strong to higher prices.

"The consumer today wants value and resents being overcharged," he concluded. "Industry still has a chance to put statesmanlike price policies into effect by making price reductions from large profit margins. Retailers, too, can participate and are willing to take a squeeze on their own margins to move merchandise in the large unit quantities needed for a healthy economy."

Unequal Freight Rates on Steel Would Retard Pacific Coast Industrial Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the old fight of eastern industrial opposition to western industrial development has shown up again in a recent decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in granting more favorable rail rates to the United States Steel Corp. plant at Geneva than to the Kaiser steel plant at Fontana, Calif.

We feel that this action is unfair and an unjust penalty on a new industry which is badly needed in California. I agree with the following resolution adopted recently by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors urging the

Interstate Commerce Commission to grant equal rail rates on steel to the Pacific coast:

Whereas during the recent years of world conflict, southern California converted itself into an industrial area from its former status as an agricultural empire; and

Whereas the future prosperity of the whole Pacific coast depends entirely upon the further development of industry and foreign trade; and

Whereas this development is hampered by the preferential freight rates given eastern industry, this being especially true in the steel industry, which affects directly the Kaiser plant at Fontana; and

Whereas this plant, if given equalized freight rates, could furnish on a competitive basis a very large part of the steel needed for the development of industry on the Pacific coast: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles at its meeting on March 11, 1947, does recommend to the Interstate Commerce Commission that it take immediate action to equalize freight rates between Fontana and competitive plants in other sections of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Members of Congress from California.

The Current Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a telegram from the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman asking for my opinion of the present crisis, President Truman's speech, and the possible effect on the Budget.

My reply was as follows:

Am inclined to think President Truman made his proposals in the belief that Russia is not ready for another war now and will slacken or possibly abandon efforts to gain control of Mediterranean waterways and Middle East oil reserves at this time.

I would not minimize, however, the critical character of issues raised. Never did I see as many Congressmen gather in groups to discuss Presidential message as on the floor of the House when Truman concluded. Personally believe most serious aspect is in long-range policy rather than immediate effects on national Budget, staggering as they may be.

Can we blanket earth with policemen or should we respect responsibility of United Nations organization in this respect?

Can we send military mission to Greece to "train selected personnel" and not expect assertion of equal right by Stalin or his successor to support friendly governments in Argentine or Mexico when they desire to do so?

National budget of course will burst limitations if we take on this job.

Last year we provided $425,000,000 for feeding occupied countries in military budget, not counting UNRRA's money for liberated lands. Now asked for $300,000,000 to supplement that before July 1 and another $700,000,000 to carry on after that.

Also being asked for $350,000,000 for feeding liberated countries and now $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey with Iran and Irak and Palestine and Saudi Arabia all standing by in need of equal support against pressure minorities. Same plea made for increasing aid to Korea and China.

There can be only one effect on national budget.

President seemed to think only one alternative but there may be other courses of action and personally believe it the duty of Congress and the country to explore them thoughtfully, carefully and prayerfully.

Overextended Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted to me, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Courant of March 3, 1947.

This thought-provoking editorial deals with a subject that I am confident will soon have the attention of the Congress. It follows:

OVEREXTENDED COOPERATIVES

In discussing cooperative purchasing and marketing organizations the use of general phrases may lead to misrepresentation of the issue, especially as it is related to taxation. Also, one may either accept the development and expansion of the cooperative movement as a natural process without direct threat to the system of free enterprise or be wildly alarmed by the implications of the movement. Even some of the spokesmen for cooperatives give cause for the latter attitude. At the annual meeting of National Cooperative Congress last September the president of that organization, Murray D. Lincoln, joined with Walter Reuther, of the CIO, in a plea for a close alliance between labor and farmers, urging cooperatives to be prepared to assume control and management of the Nation's business and agriculture in the coming revolution. At this convention national economics based on the profit motive were lambasted and the nonprofit system of enterprise fervently extolled. That apparently is the objective of the revolution that is to be—at least of Mr. Lincoln's and Mr. Reuther's revolution.

But not all cooperativists are revolutionists, nor are all cooperatives to be condemned for their tax-exempt privileges. A brief statement of the history of tax policy toward cooperatives will illustrate our point and at the same time indicate that Congress should be about the job of rewriting the tax laws concerning cooperatives. Originally a favored tax position was extended to farmer cooperatives engaged in either marketing farm products or purchasing needed materials for farmers. In the latter class falls the Connecticut Milk Producers' Association and also the Eastern States Farmers' Exchange, provided it has not itself gone into fields of production through ownership of mills, mines, or oil refineries and the like. In that qualification relative to the Eastern States, which did a business of $56,000,000 last year, lies the just complaint against the tax policy toward cooperatives. Profits, the preferred word in cooperative nomenclature is "savings," are plowed back into the business instead of being distributed to the members. With these tax-exempt profits on which no Federal or State income taxes are paid, cooperatives have extended their activities into many lines, even to banking, oil refining, drugs, cosmetics, luggage, automotive accessories, and a host of others. In these they are competing with a private industry that must pay every last tax levied on business.

Examples of this type of unfair competition are numerous. The case of the Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis will illustrate the point. This so-called tax-exempt concern had a profit in 1944 of $837,934 on a gross business of $10,176,462. On that amount of earnings at wartime tax rates an ordinary corporation would have paid to the Federal Government a tax of $544,689. But not so with Midland. According to its own financial statement its Federal and State income taxes totaled $20,300. It put $84,256 into surplus on which it paid no tax and distributed stock certificates of $706,544 to its members as patronage dividends. Actually this amount was retained by the cooperative and made part of its working capital. This is common practice with cooperatives, especially those that are expanding into fields other than for the purpose for which they were organized and granted such tax exemptions as they enjoy.

Quite sensibly some individuals high in the cooperative enterprise favor a revamping of the tax law and of the interpretations of the Treasury Department. They are aware that their case rests on rather thin ice. In fact, aside from Canada where some reforms have been introduced, cooperatives in the United States are in a more favorable tax position when compared to ordinary business, than they are in foreign countries such as Great Britain and Sweden. There the movement is older, and more widely accepted and used. Furthermore some of our States, notably Kansas and Maryland, have been taking a serious look at the privileges conferred on cooperatives. Congress should do likewise, not for the purpose of penalizing this movement but of making it carry its fair share of the tax burden. The indisputable fact is that in their zeal cooperatives have changed their character. From being associations of farmers for selling farm products and buying raw materials and supplies for their members, cooperatives are big business. If you do not think so, weigh this: Howard A. Cowden, the head of the Consumers Co-Operative Association, the largest engaged in the petroleum business, returned last November from a conference in Switzerland where plans were formulated to launch an international petroleum cooperative with a capital of $15,000,000 for what he termed a modest start. It is described as just a brokerage operation in petroleum products moving gradually into every phase of the business. Yes, moving with resources retained because of tax privileges not conferred on private enterprise.

Why Small Papers Succumb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hunterdon

County (N. J.) Democrat of March 13, 1947:

WHY SMALL PAPERS SUCCUMB

Within the week, news comes of the demise of the century-old Mount Holly Mirror and the sale of the Belvidere Apollo to the owners of another Warren County publishing enterprise. The Mirror goes out of business altogether, while the Belvidere paper, which has been sold four times in 10 years, will be continued, only because of economies made possible by combining its printing with that of other publications.

Meanwhile, at Washington, D. C., a congressional committee is probing into the reasons behind failure of so many small publications, particularly weekly newspapers. The originators of this investigation are looking for sinister forces which have worked against the interests of small publications and thereby, it is claimed, have threatened the freedom of the press.

At present, one of the major problems facing small publications is the maldistribution of the nation's newsprint supply. Perhaps something will come out of the investigations to improve the situation, which is a natural outgrowth of the war and is temporary.

But it is possible, in their search for a bogeyman, the congressional probers will overlook the worst villain of them all. The greatest enemy to small business in this country today is not big business, but big government. And by that we mean a multitude of agencies, controls, and taxing authorities whose combined efforts make it extremely difficult for a small operator to carry on profitably and at the same time observe all the laws. The problem of handling a pay roll now involves heavy costs for accounting, much of which is done to collect Uncle Sam's tax. And the tax itself is no small item.

There are three kinds of pay-roll tax deductions, in addition to income tax and local property tax. And the income tax for the new business absorbs capital sorely needed to develop an enterprise and make it efficient.

There are controls on hours and wages, expenses for employers' liability insurance, expenses to meet labor laws and many other costs that the average small business cannot absorb as readily as the larger unit. And the combined effect is to confound and confuse the small operator as well as to waste his slender capital.

If government, State and National, would devote some part of the time in simplifying its taxes and controls that has been devoted to making them cumbersome, complex, and expensive to a small owner-proprietor business, there need be no investigation into the plight of the latter. Given some freedom of action, the small operator can usually give healthy competition to his larger, more unwieldy and impersonally managed competitor.

We repeat: The greatest enemy to small business is big government.

Budget Reduction and the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said in the press and on the radio of late to indicate that the stand taken by the House in Concurrent Resolution No. 20 would result in a crippling blow to the armed forces and endanger national defense. I have received, as I am sure have most of the Members of Congress, letters and telegrams from all sorts of people who are sincerely worried about what they have heard. Many of the messages are to the effect that the sender favors economy but deplores a cut as deep as $6,000,000,000, on the assumption that that figure would result in reductions that would cripple the Army and Navy. These fears are voiced by worth-while citizens and by some of our former comrades in arms.

How the estimate is reached that $6,000,000,000 is too great a reduction but that two, three, or four billion is not, I do not know. With me the recommendations of the able leaders of this body and the joint committee on the Budget carry far more weight than the forebodings of columnists and commentators.

It is true that the record of some peacetime Congresses has been none too good when it came to keeping our powder dry. In the past, unwise economy, without regard to the needs of our armed forces has more than once brought us to the brink of national disaster.

I suggest, however, that the Eightieth Congress is still technically a wartime Congress. Moreover, it has a membership with unusual wartime experience. Of the 239 Members who voted for House Concurrent Resolution 20 on February 20, 112 of them are veterans; 74 have served with the Army, 29 with the Navy, 1 with both Army and Navy, 7 with the marines, and 1 with the Coast Guard. Three served in the Spanish-American War, 12 in both World Wars and the remainder in one of the World Wars, 69 in the first and 28 in World War II.

The composite service experience of this group is enormous. They have seen action all over the world in all sorts of capacities and engagements, in ships, planes, and tanks. Their number includes citizen soldiers and sailors and at least one lifelong regular, and a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Most of them have experienced added personal danger and hardship because of national unpreparedness. Many have gone through the unhappy days of maneuvers, using flags to simulate men, broomsticks to represent machine guns, and delivery trucks in place of tanks.

These 112 with their broad combined experience believe that economies can be effected without injuring the services. They also know that a sound national financial structure is as necessary to our defense as efficient personnel and dependable weapons. One need only look at China to see what happens to an Army when its national currency weakens. I am sure none of our veterans would knowingly endanger the forces that have been so much a part of his life and for which he has a fierce loyalty. But most of us believe that $6,000,000,000 can be cut from the Budget without appreciably impairing our fighting strength. That is the carefully considered view of a majority of those of the group with whom I have talked, and of many well informed veterans in and out of the services. If we are shown to be wrong, when the appropriations are taken up in detail, we will rectify our error. I am confident that no temporary pontical expediency would cause anyone of the veterans in Congress to risk withholding any necessities from our Army, Navy, or Air Force.

Therefore, let our former comrades and the general public relax. This Congress will not jeopardize our national safety, even in the interest of economy. Veterans are familiar with the heavy requirements of practical preparedness but they are not blind to certain wasteful tendencies that build up little staffs to big ones with accompanying increases in rank to certain individuals.

This Congress and the voters that elected it are economy-minded. The armed forces must become likewise. When it comes to spending, even for national defense, we must get a dollar's value for a dollar. We are not all from Missouri, but we must be shown.

Arrest of American Merchant Seamen in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the arrest of 18 American merchant seamen, most of them veterans of war service, by the British in Palestine, precipitates an immediate and embarrassing question—what is the Government of the United States going to do about this?

The British have claimed that they imprisoned these sailors because they assisted what the British call an illegal activity. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the bringing of Hebrew refugees into the Holy Land is not illegal in American law, in international law, and is not even illegal under British law.

The civilized nations of the world clearly set forth in the League of Nations mandate their intent that Palestine become a Hebrew homeland. Britain concurred in that intent and eagerly accepted the mandate. She has, in fact, been extremely loath to relinquish the powers the mandate gave her and unbecomingly assiduous in extending those powers.

Through the instrument of the Anglo-American convention of 1924, the Government of the United States became a party to the mandate and underwrote its purposes and mechanism.

The weight of law which supports the action of the American sailors is even heavier than that just indicated. There are also items, which the British have overlooked, of habeas corpus, of procedure with regard to the ships flying friendly flags, whose activity may be called into question—and the right of the British Navy to blockade Palestine at all.

I have not heard of any state of war between Great Britain and the United States, and I know of no declaration of war by the British against Palestine. I suggest that if the Palestine government did not like what those American boys did, it could have turned them, or sent

them away from its shores. Their imprisonment, however, seems unprecedented and unwarranted.

I have heard it said that the Hebrews in Palestine claim they are at war with the British. We have also heard, Mr. Speaker, that the British deny there is a war. Why, then, the blockade? The freedom of the seas has a long history in American interest from the shores of Tripoli to Leyte Gulf. I should not like to see that freedom abandoned on the shores of Palestine. I should especially not like to see it abandoned under circumstances in which every precept of law, honor and humanity asserts its dignity.

Conflict Between Christian Civilization and Marxism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a letter from Mr. Lamar Fleming, Jr., of Houston, Tex. The letter is unique and scholarly. Mr. Fleming expresses most clearly his views on the conflict between Christian civilization and Marxism, and why he feels we should help Turkey and Greece. It follows:

HOUSTON TEX., *March 14, 1947.*
HON. ALBERT THOMAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALBERT: I want to urge you to back the President up in the policy which he recommended in his speech day before yesterday.

A French friend put his finger on what I consider the real question we have to decide. I was questioning him about French internal politics. He said about a third of the Frenchmen are voting for Communists, about a third for leftist center parties, and about a third for more conservative parties. He said a good many of those who vote for the Communists and even more of those who vote for the leftist center parties do so because they feel that France will be without help if she gets crossed with Russia. He says these votes would go for moderate center parties if these voters thought that the United States would back them up if they were threatened by Russia.

I know that the situation in Italy is similar to his description of the situation in France; and I believe the situations are similar, in varying degree, in Belgium, Holland, Scandinavia, Finland, and even England.

We cannot expect any one of these weary little countries to act with courage in the face of Russian threats if we leave it to believe that it stands alone. At the present juncture, the only way to prevent that belief is for us to stand beside them.

If, with our encouragement, these little countries of Europe will assume a courageous attitude toward Russia, their combined strength will be greater than that of Russia. Then, the more exposed countries, like Germany, Austria, and Hungary, and I think even Poland, will feel enough strength at their backs so that they also can face Russia courageously.

On the other side of the world, like decisions have to be made by the Chinese, the Koreans, and the Japs.

As I see it, the greatest danger to us and to our Christian civilization is that we may allow our natural allies in the struggle between Christian civilization and Marxism to be picked off and absorbed one by one. That mistake would be the catastrophe of all history.

Our natural allies in this struggle include all the people who have been brought up under the teachings of the Catholic and Protestant churches. They all cherish the individual spirituality, dignity, and rights which are God-given through divine paternity, and they all believe in, however feeble their observance, the obligations of human brotherhood, through common divine paternity. None of them can accept the subjection and humiliation of the individual which is the first rule of Marxism; nor can Marxism accept any part of Christianity.

The fight between Christian civilization and Marxism is on, whether we like it or not; and we will win only through encouraging and protecting all those who believe in Christian civilization and patiently waiting for those who have had Marxism imposed upon them to learn that they will find greater happiness in our civilization. In the meantime, we must see that those on our side are stronger than they are, which is the greatest hope that bloodshed will be spared to both sides; and we must not get in the frame of mind where we will surrender everything to escape bloodshed.

I do not mean to use the phrase "Christian civilization" in an exclusive sense. Those who subscribe to religions which teach that the Spirit of God is in the individual come within the phrase as I mean it.

Yours sincerely,
LAMAR FLEMING, JR.

Meritorious Niche for Ex-Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, further editorial support of my bill, H. R. 504, to make ex-Presidents Senators at Large, comes from the Soo News, of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and the Stamford Advocate, of Stamford, Conn.

The Soo News says:

MERITORIOUS NICHE FOR EX-PRESIDENTS

Now Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, places a bill before Congress to make all former Presidents Senators at Large. They would be able to speak from the floor and have all the rights and privileges of the Senate, including salary, clerical help, and the like. But they would not vote, since if they did they would upset the balance of the vote of States they happen to represent. The Nation thus would have the benefit automatically of the experience of such men, rather than have their services depend on a chance appointment.

And the Stamford Advocate:

USING EX-PRESIDENTS

What to do with ex-Presidents is a question which has plagued Washington for decades. H. L. Mencken, never noted for meaningless amenities, suggested long ago that they be shot immediately upon completion of their office terms. He also recommended this procedure for unsuccessful Presidential candidates.

A less violent answer might be in using them to good advantage in the service of the Government, much as President Truman has recently done with Herbert Hoover. Certainly, any man who has served his country as Chief Executive for four or more years is capable of rendering additional service in another capacity.

In Mr. Hoover's case, his detailed and practical knowledge of the European food situation, and his previous experience in handling food shipments abroad qualify him for his present position as a sort of ambassador at large, and reporter on world food conditions.

To make better use of ex-Presidents, and put their activity on a permanent, logical basis, Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, has introduced a bill to make all ex-Presidents Senators at Large, with all senatorial privileges except the right to vote. This would insure the country getting the full benefit of an ex-Chief Executive's opinion in a place where it would do the most good.

This certainly sounds better than merely relying on a chance appointment to a particular job.

The same is true of defeated Presidential candidates. Wendell Willkie rendered great service to the Nation through his travels and his book despite the fact that he was defeated at the polls. There seems no logical reason why future Presidential aspirants who are beaten cannot also give useful service, even in a capacity of loyal opposition.

Better to have the Nation gain from their knowledge, than follow Mr. Mencken's suggestion that they be shot.

The Clover and the Harp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, March 17, 1947:

THE CLOVER AND THE HARP

Once harps resounded among the arches of Canterbury Cathedral. This was true in the time of Dunstan, archbishop of that great edifice from A. D. 960 to 988. Dunstan himself loved music and was an expert player on "the hearpe," as the Anglo-Saxons then called their small 11-stringed instrument brought from Ireland. It was from the Irish that Dunstan had learned nimbleness of fingers and poesy of heart, for he'd been born near Glastonbury and gone to school there. At Glastonbury, the deep-eyed Irishmen taught a boy more than letters: they taught him to love God, to be gentle with his fellows, and to harken to the wondrous tunes of earth. Forests, streams, and winds, the bright flight of stars—each had its melody to enrich the human ear and eye. Only let a boy listen.

For 200 years, all during the fifth and sixth centuries, men of Erin had been crossing the waters, carrying Christianity into heathen Britain. Two by two, or three by three, in small boats they dared the Irish Sea and St. George's Channel, carrying their crults, their copies of the classics, their Celtic dreams. With faith and labor, they built schools at

Lindisfarne and Durham and Ripon and at many another fair place, Glastonbury among them. They were the greatest savants of that northern world and they brought fresh color into English life. Dunstan was the son of a West Saxon noble, a lad of lively wit. What he learned at Glastonbury he never forgot. Long seasons after, when the cares of Canterbury were upon him, he still loved to stand his cruit on the sill of an open window and hear the air sing through its strings. Even so, almost 2,000 summers before him, King David, in Jerusalem, had done.

Cruit was the early Irish name for the small harp, which prelates and lay-folk alike carried about on their travels. It was easily slung across the shoulder or tied to the girdle, and there was no pilgrim afoot or ahorse but relished the joy of his harp. At day's end the inns were always sweet with music, and sweet with music were the hearths of homes. The clairsech, or large harp, could not be so readily carried, and it needed deeper skill for its playing. Nevertheless, it found its way up into Scotland at the close of the sixth century, and its name there has not changed since. Many a dour chieftain and war-ridden ruler has been charmed into smiling by the hands of Irish harpers sweeping over strings. Renowned among these was Rory dall O'Cahan, who cheered the court of King James VI, during gray winters in Edinburgh Castle, with ancient airs and lively airs of his own composing. Oh, Give Me Your Hand! and the Lame Yellow Beggar are perhaps most remembered. Like his hapless mother, Mary Queen of Scots, James was unfortunate in his ruling and enjoyed other things more. Quartered on his royal seal is a gold harp with silver strings upon a blue ground.

When he went from Edinburgh to London, in the year 1603, to become James I of England, he took his seal with him and also the King's Band of Musick. His mother's harp—richly ornamented and having 29 brass strings—has its home now among the treasures in Edinburgh's Antiquarian Museum.

Queens have ever loved pretty harps and Shub-ad of ancient Sumeria had her own instrument all of silver, inset with gleaming shell and lapis lazuli. The Sumerians were great musicians—perhaps the greatest of antiquity. They lived along the lower Euphrates in the land once known as Babylonia, but which we now call Iraq. They banqueted to harp music; and with harps in their hands they climbed the terraced tower, the high ziggurat, to sing hymns.

Westward from Sumeria, the harp went on its high mission, easing the hearts of people. The Hebrews became harpers, as Bible readers already know. They formed harp guilds, called themselves "The Sons of Korah." Assyrians, Phoenicians, and Egyptians were all skilled players on the harp, so in a lesser way were the Greeks. Of the early Mediterranean peoples, it was only the Romans whose fingers never grew adept. On the wall of a Pharaoh's tomb, in Upper Egypt, is carved "The Song of the Harp Player"—a beautiful, sacred song dating back to 2100 B. C. or beyond.

Oddly enough, the little isle of Erin had business traffic with Egypt in fairly early days soon after Jesus was born. So, no doubt, the musical art of the more civilized southerly country inspired the men of Erin. At any rate, of all the harpers in history, none have played more valiantly, more sweetly, than those of the Green Isle. For centuries none were so honored as these composers and bards, who wandered from feast to feast, from court to court, singing and sweeping the strings. Gray winding cloaks they wore, with brooches of gold, and circlets of pearls round their heads.

Romance hovered round the harpers and honor traveled with them as they climbed the clover-clad hills. Sweet was the shamrock, the little white clover of Ireland and much sought by bees. With bee-song in their ears and a shamrock-bloom between their lips, the trudging harpers were happy. What more could a man want than his own harp upon his shoulder and the misty earth teaching him music. Beautiful his harp was and fashioned by his own fingers. It had an angel upon it, folding back her gilded wings above the strings. On his banner, the Prince of Leinster put the gold harp and white clover, a thousand summers before America was born. Later it became the flag of all Ireland. Until the year 1916, the clover, the harp, and the legend "Erin go brath" ("Ireland till Judgment Day") flew above the Emerald Isle—the only land in history to make music its emblem.

LUCY EMBURY.

Gen. George C. Marshall and Bernard Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from Collier's magazine of March 22 entitled "Giants in Our Time."

In this editorial tribute is paid to two great Americans—Bernard M. Baruch and Secretary of State George C. Marshall.

Virginia and the South take peculiar pride in the world-wide recognition of these two men, as General Marshall is a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute and is now a resident of Virginia, and Mr. Baruch is a southerner imbued with the traditions and ideals of the South.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIANTS IN OUR TIME

Somebody remarked a while ago that in the person of Winston Churchill we had all been privileged to see greatness in our time. We agree with that estimate. But we'd like to add to the list of present-day greats the names of two Americans, at least—Bernard M. Baruch and Secretary of State George C. Marshall.

In these two men, we think, all Americans can take the highest pride, while any young American can profit by acquainting himself or herself with the life stories and the principles of Baruch and Marshall.

The new Secretary of State, of course, made the bulk of his reputation to date in the Army, as a brilliant young captain under Black Jack Pershing in World War I and as Chief of Staff in World War II.

He went on from there to become the President's special envoy to China, his job being to reconcile the warring Chinese Communists and Nationalists if he could. He failed to bring about an immediate peace; but he did tell the Chinese what ails them, in a brilliant and incisive report which inspired various patriotic Chinese to try again to compose their differences.

Largely because of his performance in China, we're strongly inclined to discount the dour predictions that little good can come of making a top-flight military man Secretary of State. Marshall, like MacArthur and Eisenhower, is much more than just a military man.

Mr. Baruch's services to his country in its two latest wars have been as spectacular as those of any civilian. In the First World War he coordinated and supervised production of war materials, and got in some highly effective blows against inflation. In the second, the Baruch synthetic rubber program, carried through by William M. Jeffers, saved the Nation from a transport breakdown which might have lost the war for the Allies.

The latest Baruch achievement as we go to press is the formulation of a plan for safeguarding the United States through the delicate, dangerous, and self-imposed business of telling the world how we make atom bombs, the ultimate objective being to outlaw the atom bomb everywhere and start a move toward general disarmament.

In selling this plan to the administration and our United Nations delegation, Mr. Baruch ran head on into a crowd of idealists, Russia Firsters and America Lasters who were determined to force disclosure of the atom-bomb techniques without assurances that the knowledge would not be used against us. It was a tough fight, in which our own knuckle heads naturally had the able assistance of Messrs. Molotov and Gromyko, of Russia. But at this writing Mr. Baruch appears to have won the fight completely. Thereby, he may have saved this country from a deadlier war than it has ever yet fought.

Speaking of greatness in our time, we give you, again, Bernard M. Baruch and George C. Marshall.

Income Tax Reductions for Lower Brackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of increased living costs, current Federal income tax rates are placing an enormous burden on taxpayers in the low income brackets. Men with large families, with children in school, are finding it more and more difficult to make ends meet. This is repeatedly being brought to my attention by farmers, teachers, wage earners and small businessmen throughout southeastern Oklahoma.

The so-called twenty-percent-across-the-board plan will not remedy this situation. Under this plan the taxpayer, with a wife and two children, making $2,500 per year, will save only $19 per year. This saving will increase his "take home" pay only eight-tenths of 1 percent. The taxpayer making $25,000 per year will save over $1,700. This will increase his net income by 10.3 percent. The taxpayer making $300,000 will save over $45,000 in taxes and his net income will be increased by about 70 percent. Obviously, this system will not remove the tax burden from the shoulders of the man or woman who is unable to bear it.

In my opinion, the simplest and surest way of granting relief where it is sorely needed is by increasing the personal exemptions of all individual taxpayers.

I have accordingly introduced a bill to raise the personal exemptions from $500 to $1,000, and to increase the credit for dependents from $500 to $750. The bill will also give to married persons and heads of families an exemption of $2,000. A copy of the bill follows:

A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption from $500 to $1,000 and the credit for dependents from $500 to $750

Be it enacted, etc., That section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

(1) Credits: In computation of both the normal tax and the surtax, there shall be allowed the following credits against net income:

(a) Personal exemption: In the case of a single person or a married person not living with husband or wife, a personal exemption of $1,000; or in the case of the head of a family or a married person living with husband or wife, a personal exemption of $2,000. A husband and wife living together shall receive but one personal exemption. The amount of such personal exemption shall be $2,000. If such husband and wife make separate returns, the personal exemption may be taken by either or divided between them.

(b) Credit for dependents: $750 for each person (other than husband or wife) dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the taxpayer, if such dependent person is under 18 years of age or is incapable of self-support.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946.

The New Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Daily Monitor, of Concord, N. H., in its issue of Monday, March 17, 1947, contained a thought-provoking editorial entitled "If Liberty Is Not To Perish." The editorial discusses certain aspects of the recent address delivered by the President of the United States concerning aid to Greece and Turkey. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF LIBERTY IS NOT TO PERISH

The Truman declaration as to foreign policy is, in effect, an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to cover the whole world rather than a single hemisphere. If thus understood, rather than as meddling or imperialism, and if thus applied it should help to keep the world at peace at least longer than if any great power continues a policy of aggression under whatever pretext.

Russian aggressiveness cannot be denied. The roll of States which it has incorporated into the Soviet Union, or which it dominates through occupation and manipulation, is long. Since before the war it has brought into the fold Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, Manchuria, and part of Korea.

In addition to this, Communists are active in about every nation on earth, claiming no less than 100,000 members in the United States, and actually dominating the predominant party or groups controlling the government in such states as France.

Back in the war days the Russians went through the motions of dissolving the Communist International organization, but there was reason then and there is more reason now to believe that the move was designed mainly as a device to move the machinery underground, so that it might be more effective.

The Russians are doing exactly what Japan did in Manchuria, Mussolini in Ethiopia, and Hitler in the Ruhr and Austria and Sudetenland. They are using exactly the same tactics in defending their aggressiveness. That is, when the United States says the spread of Communist totalitarianism must be stopped, the Russians accuse us of pursuing a Hitlerian policy. The timid thinker half believes this.

It has been an age-old stunt by thieves, when they fear apprehension, to cry thief and divert attention to innocent persons, thus gaining time in which to effect their own escape. Russia wants time more than anything else. Each day that passes permits them to consolidate the areas they have gobbled up, and to commit new aggressions. Each day helps them to make Russia stronger, against the day when the peoples in some of the gobbled-up areas revolt, and with the help of nations which have still managed to retain their liberty, war on Russia.

The cry of the Russians and of the weak-hearted in Congress, and throughout this Nation, that the Truman doctrine bypasses the United Nations is another assertion which many readily believe partly. But so long as the United Nations is hamstrung by the veto power which the Russians insisted upon putting into that world organization, reference of problems of aggressiveness to it is a waste of time, and as we have pointed out, it is time which the Russians want more than anything else.

One Russian, through the United Nations, can keep the rest of the world dawdling for months. One Russian can thus accomplish what otherwise it would take great armies to do.

President Truman has ended the babes-in-the-woods policy of his predecessor. Because he does not bypass his Cabinet as did Franklin D. Roosevelt, it must be assumed that what he has done was with the full knowledge of the Secretary of State, General Marshall, and that Marshall feels that his hand is strengthened in foreign diplomacy, in striving to draw the peace treaties in which Russia must participate, and in making the United Nations more truly a world organization.

It would be wonderful if this Nation could withdraw from the rest of the world and let Eurasia stew in its own vile juices. But two great wars in this century, plus the tremendous scientific discoveries of the same period, have made isolation forevermore impractical and foolhardy. The strong can remain strong only by being strong. It was British weakness in keeping hands off when Japan went into Manchuria and Mussolini into Ethiopia that brought Britain to its knees in the past decade. This Nation had the courage to want to stop the Japanese then. Now we cannot wait upon Great Britain or anyone else in these matters. We must make our own decision, and it has been made by our President and those who advise him.

The choice will involve us in many controversial situations. In carrying out the policy we will make mistakes. But at least we have won through to a course of action which is essentially necessary if liberty is not to perish from this earth.

New Bedford, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following historical statement relating to the famous city of New Bedford, Mass.:

New Bedford was wrought up 100 years ago today.

Maybe the townsfolk were not quite as excited as if two or three whaling barks just had come in after several years at sea, loaded to the gunwales with oil and bone. But the bustling, prosperous, cobble-paved, lantern-lighted town of 16,000 population faced the prospect it might become a city within two days. Feeling was strong both for and against such a radical change.

A special town meeting had been called to decide the issue. It is a matter of record today that the ayes prevailed, and New Bedford on March 18, 1847, accepted a charter of incorporation and became a city. But on Tuesday, March 16, two days before the decisive town meeting, a good many persons were hoping anxiously the article wouldn't pass. Others had their hearts set on pushing it through.

It is not hard to imagine what arguments went on around the big cast-iron stoves in the taverns, the whaling outfitters' shops, the banks, and the shipping offices, and in the gray-stone town hall, now the free public library, which then was surrounded by elm trees and a lawn bordered with benches—a pleasant place for loitering in fine weather.

No one could have accused Benjamin Lindsey, Jr., editor of the Morning Mercury, of adding fuel to the controversy. Mr. Lindsey preserved an attitude of genial impartiality until the last moment.

A city government, Ben observed editorially January 20, 1847, might make for more "directness, vigor, and discipline in enacting public ordinances." On the other hand, it probably would "multiply official personages, adding possibly a trifle to the yearly expenses," and it would mean "delegating powers which now are exercised by the people at large according to the unwieldy system of the ancient democracies."

No doubt alluding to opposition predictions, he continued, "We suppose there is little to dread from usurpations of power, or from a too strict exercise of it. No street will probably be run through the town hall or extended to the confines of the outer barbarians—but matters will probably go on much as usual

"To be or not to be a city, that is the question. Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to bear the upbraidings, taunts, and jeers of Salem, Lowell, Roxbury, and Cambridge or nobly to take up arms against selectmen and by opposing, end them," he observed, paraphrasing Shakespeare.

"Let every man be persuaded in his own mind. If we must live in a village or a town, we shall do so with becoming humility. If the people insist upon moving into a city, we shan't be proud, and shall nod as familiarly as ever, albeit a little condescendingly, to the men of Fairhaven."

By March 18, however, Mr. Lindsey found himself definitely on the side of those who favored city status for New Bedford. Urging everyone to be sure to vote, he admitted in his editorial published the morning of the fateful town meeting that he was "for it. Shall New Bedford be the seventh city in

Massachusetts," he asked, "or let Lynn, Springfield, Worcester, Pittsfield, and some other growing towns precede us in municipal honors?"

LARGE POPULATION CITED

"Some zealous Democrats whom we esteem as citizens," he added, indicating the opposition had resorted to frenzied arguments, "would fain persuade the people that the mayor will be a most despotic personage whose fiat will prevent not only the erection of comfortable habitations for the living but even the burial of the dead."

James B. Congdon, a member of the committee to prepare the charter and one of the most honored citizens of the community, commented calmly in the Mercury of February 5, 1847, on arguments for the change and the work the committee had done.

"Our population is large," he said. "There is no place where all the citizens can assemble to act on municipal affairs. There is no place so large as this in New England which has not adopted the city form of government. Every large community has adopted it and no one has ever given it up after they have once tried it."

CITY RANKED HIGH

"We now rank fourth, if not third, in the State in population. We already have five cities in the Commonwealth and Charlestown no doubt soon will be added. Three of the six are smaller than New Bedford. We are a compact population, more so than Roxbury or Cambridge."

Mr. Congdon asserted he believed the proposed charter was superior to any other in the State. Representation of all sections of the community was assured for there was to be an alderman from each ward, four members from each ward in the Common Council, three members of the school committee from each ward, and an overseer of the poor from each ward.

The fateful afternoon finally arrived. "An act to establish the city of New Bedford" was accepted by a vote of 1,150 in favor, to 814 opposed. Election of city officials followed April 20. The wheels of city government began turning with the swearing in of the mayor, Abraham H. Howland, and his fellow officers April 28.

PROPOSAL DEFEATED

The ratification of a city form of government in 1847 climaxed a 5-year effort by men who felt that New Bedford, fourth-ranking seaport of the Nation in point of tonnage (only New York, Boston, and New Orleans had more tonnage), known in every port of the world, ought to take on greater municipal dignity.

Their proposal was nipped in the bud February 5, 1842, by a test vote taken at a town meeting. The vote stood 373 to 320 in favor of the negative resolution offered by Benjamin T. Congdon "that in the opinion of the citizens of New Bedford the time has not yet come when the convenience of the citizens or the public necessities call for an act incorporating this town into a city." By the same resolution, consideration of a city charter was postponed indefinitely.

By 1845 sentiment for incorporation had gained ground. The selectmen were instructed at a special town meeting January 25 to petition the general court for a charter for a city government, and a committee of 20 was appointed to draw up a charter. Members of the committee included a future mayor, Rodney French, and Charles W. Morgan for whom the whaling ship now enshrined at Mystic, Conn., was named.

SPECIAL EFFORT FAILED

The copperplate script of New Bedford's last town clerk, Henry H. Crapo, who later became Governor of Michigan, recorded that the voters refused, February 1, 1845, to have the charter committee report that day on its work, or to set a date for a meeting for that purpose. Obviously, the opposition was going strong again. A motion to reconsider the adverse vote was rejected.

At a special meeting, April 1, the matter was brought up again. "The meeting determined not to adopt the charter," Mr. Crapo recorded, underscoring the words, which was an extraordinary procedure on his part. One suspects he was registering strong emotion, one way or the other.

Another meeting was called April 7 in an endeavor to obtain consideration of the charter committee's report. Someone quickly moved an indefinite postponement. After lengthy debate the motion was withdrawn. A vote was taken. The charter, which had been approved by the legislature, was rejected, 728 to 578. And that was that.

OLD CHARTER USED

The work of the rebuffed committee had not been altogether in vain. The charter it drew up was used as a basis for the work of the new committee appointed in 1847. The townspeople voted, February 6, 1847, to have a committee petition the general court again to grant New Bedford a charter of incorporation as a city.

The opposition still was determined to keep New Bedford a town if it possibly could. It had a special town meeting called March 6 to act on a proposal to memorialize the general court not to grant the charter.

Seth Russell, a member of the charter committee, prevented the opposition proposal from coming to a vote by moving indefinite adjournment the moment a moderator had been chosen.

Moderator Thomas A. Greene had his hands full quelling efforts to debate the motion to adjourn. The excited citizens finally voted on the question by filing past his desk to be counted, first the ayes, then the noes. Those in favor of adjournment prevailed.

The sequel already has been told. The legislature granted the charter, and it was accepted March 18 by majority vote. Now, 100 years later, it is possible to sympathize equally with those who worked so hard for the change and those who so bitterly opposed it.

Herbert Hoover Approves Service for American People To Send Packages to Europe Through Facilities of CARE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF ARKANSAS

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this week each of us received a letter from an organization called CARE. It was signed by Paul Comly French, the general manager, and included the following telegram from Herbert Hoover:

PAUL COMLY FRENCH,
General Manager, CARE,
New York:

I had some hand in the original inspiration of CARE as a private, nonprofit organization to be established along the lines so successful after the First World War. I have had the opportunity to see its operation on the ground. The service is the only sure and efficient way of sending packages to friends and relatives in Europe. The great volume of over 100,000 packages a month to Germany, and over 30,000 a month to Austria, is an important contribution to their food supply. These packages have contained enough food to supplement the government ration of a family of five up to an endurable level for over 3 weeks. Anyone who wishes to serve friends, relatives, or institutions in the countries served by CARE now have a sure and certain way. In fact, there is no other way where there is real certainty that such packages will reach their destination.

HERBERT HOOVER.

I was deeply impressed with the telegram and made a special inquiry into the background, the purpose, and the accomplishments of CARE. I would now like to take a few minutes to report on my findings and to include this brief résumé of the organization, since this matter is of great national interest.

Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., known by its initials C-A-R-E, distributes an average of 200,000 pounds of food a day to individuals or to specified groups in Europe, in the name of individuals or specified groups in the United States. CARE is a nonprofit American organization, run by Americans both here and abroad. These packages are delivered in the name of the American who sent them. One of the unique things about this organization is the fact that this tremendous volume of good-will packages is a strictly American voluntary operation.

When our armies marched into the various countries of Europe they found in most areas that the populations were suffering from years of malnutrition, without food reserves, without adequate clothing. Millions of Americans, with ties of kin and friendship abroad, wanted to send immediate help in the form of food and clothing. But their individual packages sent through the mails were often lost or pilfered or hopelessly battered by the time they were delivered. Some unscrupulous firms charged exorbitant fees for packages and often even those packages never arrived. The major relief organizations in this country concerned with foreign relief decided that there was need for an organization which could help individuals and groups who wanted to send packages to "designated" individuals and groups in Europe.

Twenty-two of these relief groups formed the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc. Since it was incorporated a little more than a year ago, CARE has signed agreements with 13 European countries guaranteeing the entrance of its parcels duty-free, tax-free, and without loss of local rations to the recipient. Another important feature of these agreements is that CARE itself delivers each package in each country, or uses the services of one of its member agencies.

At first, through an agreement with the War Assets Administration, CARE made available surplus Army 10-in-1 rations. Each package contained 30 complete meals. CARE delivered these packages, as designated by the American donor, first for $15, and then later, under terms of a new agreement, for only $10. More than 50,000,000 pounds of food were distributed by CARE through these 10-in-1 packages.

Today, CARE has a new food package with an even higher calorie value than that of the 10-in-1's. The price is still only $10. Each package contains basic items that can combine with foods avail-

able in each country to make nationally preferred dishes. In addition, within the past 2 months, CARE has introduced another package—a blanket package containing two Army-surplus blankets, composition heels and soles, and sewing material to convert the blankets into clothing. Just last week CARE also introduced a woolen-textile package with 3½ yards of fine worsted wool, with cotton lining and with sewing materials—everything necessary to make a full suit for a large man.

It is a simple operation to have a CARE package dispatched to Europe. An application blank, together with a cashier's check on any bank, a postal money order or a personal check, can be sent to CARE offices, 50 Broad Street, New York, and the order will be mailed immediately. Most banks, Red Cross offices and YWCA offices have CARE circulars.

Countries with which the organization has signed agreements are Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland and the American, British and French occupation zones of Germany and all of Berlin.

At the present time CARE cannot accept orders for other countries nor for the Russian zone of Germany.

I am gratified that there is an organization functioning smoothly and efficiently to aid Americans to get food and clothing help to relieve desperate need abroad. And I think it is important that we recognize that all this is being done in the name of the United States of America and that each package is helping to build good will for this country in every home where a CARE package is delivered.

War Veterans in the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 13 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of war veterans in the Eightieth Congress, as compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

It develops that the list, as compiled, was incomplete, and in an effort to correct the many errors, the Legislative Reference Service has furnished me a new list.

The new figures indicate that the Senate has 47 veterans, while the House has 204, or a total of 251 veterans of all wars. The roster of veterans follows:

WAR VETERANS IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

I. ROSTER OF WAR VETERANS IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

(Key to symbols: W1—World War I; W2—World War II; S—Spanish-American War.)

The letters "A," "M," "N," and "C. G.," designate branches of the service to which a member belonged: Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Coast Guard. M. M. designates merchant marine.

Senators

BALDWIN, RAYMOND E., Connecticut (W1-N).
BREWSTER, OWEN, Maine (W1-A).
BRICKER, JOHN W., Ohio (W1-A).
BROOKS, C. WAYLAND, Illinois (W1-M).
BUCK, C. DOUGLASS, Delaware (W1-A).
CAIN, HARRY P., Washington (W2-A).
CAPEHART, HOMER E., Indiana (W1-A).
CONNALLY, TOM, Texas (S-A; W1-A).
COOPER, JOHN SHERMAN, Kentucky (W2-A).
CORDON, GUY, Oregon (W1-A).
DWORSHAK, HENRY C., Idaho (W1-A).
ECTON, ZALES N., Montana (W1-A).
ELLENDER, ALLEN J., Louisiana (W1-A).
GREEN, THEODORE FRANCIS, Rhode Island (S-A).
GURNEY, CHAN, South Dakota (W1-A).
HAYDEN, CARL, Arizona (W1-A).
HICKENLOOPER, BOURKE B., Iowa (W1-A).
HILL, LISTER, Alabama (W1-A).
HOLLAND, SPESSARD L., Florida (W1-A).
IVES, IRVING M., New York (W1-A).
JENNER, WILLIAM E., Indiana (W2-A).
JOHNSTON, OLIN D., South Carolina (W1-A).
KEM, JAMES P., Missouri (W1-A).
KILGORE, HARLEY M., West Virginia (W1-A).
KNOWLAND, WILLIAM F., California. (W2-A).
LODGE, HENRY CABOT, JR., Massachusetts. (W2-A).
LUCAS, SCOTT W., Illinois (W1-A).
MAGNUSON, WARREN G., Washington (W2-N).
MALONE, GEORGE W., Nevada (W1-A).
MARTIN, EDWARD, Pennsylvania (S, W1, W2-A).
MAYBANK, BURNET R., South Carolina W1-N).
MCCARTHY, JOSEPH R., Wisconsin (W2-M).
MCCLELLAN, JOHN L., Arkansas (W1-A).
MCFARLAND, ERNEST W., Arizona (W1-N).
MILLIKIN, EUGENE D., Colorado (W1-A).
O'CONOR, HERBERT R., Maryland (U. S. Naval Reserve)
PEPPER, CLAUDE, Florida (W1-A).
REVERCOMB, CHAPMAN, West Virginia (W1-A).
ROBERTSON, A. WILLIS, Virginia (W1-A).
ROBERTSON, EDWARD V., Wyoming (Boer War).
RUSSELL, RICHARD B., Georgia (W1-N).
SALTONSTALL, LEVERETT, Massachusetts (W1-A).
SPARKMAN, JOHN, Alabama (W1-A).
THOMAS, ELBERT D., Utah (W1-N. G. Utah and U. S. Reserves).
THYE, EDWARD J., Minnesota (W1-A).
TYDINGS, MILLARD E., Maryland (W1-A).
UMSTEAD, WILLIAM B., North Carolina (W1-A).
WHERRY, KENNETH S., Nebraska (W1-N).

Representatives

ALBERT, CARL, Third District, Oklahoma (W2-A).
ALLEN, JOHN, J., JR., Seventh District, California (W1, W2-N).
ALLEN, LEO E., Thirteenth District, Illinois (W1-A).
ANDERSEN, H. CARL, Seventh District, Minnesota (W1-N).
ANDREWS, GEORGE W., Third District, Alabama (W2-N).
ANDREWS, WALTER G., Forty-second District, New York (W1-A).
ARENDS, LESLIE C., Seventeenth District, Illinois (W1-N).
AUCHINCLOSS, JAMES C., Third District, New Jersey (W1-A).
BAKEWELL, CLAUDE I., Eleventh District, Missouri (W2-N).
BARDEN, GRAHAM A., Third District, North Carolina (W1-N).
BARRETT, FRANK A., at large, Wyoming (W1-A).
BATTLE, LAURIE C., Ninth District, Alabama (W2-A).
BEALL, J. GLENN, Sixth District, Maryland (W1-A).
BLATNIK, JOHN A., Eighth District, Minnesota (W2-A).
BOGGS, HALE, Second District, Louisiana (W2-N).
BOGGS, J. CALEB, at large, Delaware (W2-A).
BONNER, HERBERT C., First District, North Carolina (W1-A).
BRADLEY, FRED, Eleventh District, Michigan (W1-A).
BRADLEY, WILLIS W., Eighteenth District, California (W1, W2-N).
BREHM, WALTER E., Eleventh District, Ohio (W1-A).
BROOKS, OVERTON, Fourth District, Louisiana (W1-A).
BROPHY, JOHN C., Fourth District, Wisconsin (W1-N).
BRYSON, JOSEPH R., Fourth District, South Carolina (W1-A).
BUCK, ELLSWORTH B., Sixteenth District, New York (W1-N).
BULWINKLE, ALFRED L., Eleventh District, North Carolina (W1-A).
BURLESON, OMAR, Seventeenth District, Texas (W2-N).
BUSBEY, FRED E., Third District, Illinois (W1-A).
CAMP, A. SIDNEY, Fourth District, Georgia (W1-A).
CANFIELD, GORDON, Eighth District, New Jersey (W1-A).
CARROLL, JOHN A., First District, Colorado (W2-A).
CARSON, HENDERSON H., Sixteenth District, Ohio (W1-A).
CASE, FRANCIS, Second District, South Dakota (W1-M).
CHELF, FRANK L., Fourth District, Kentucky (W2-A).
CHIPERFIELD, ROBERT B., Fifteenth District, Illinois (W1-A).
CHURCH, RALPH E., Tenth District, Illinois (W1-A).
CLASON, CHARLES R., Second District, Massachusetts (W1-A).
CLEMENTS, EARLE C., Second District, Kentucky (W1-A).
COLE, WILLIAM C., Third District, Missouri (W1-N).
COLMER, WILLIAM M., Sixth District, Mississippi (W1-A).
COOLEY, HAROLD D., Fourth District, North Carolina (W1-N).
COOPER, JERE, Ninth District, Tennessee (W1-A).
COUDERT, FREDERIC R., JR., Seventeenth District, New York (W1-A).
COURTNEY, WIRT, Seventh District, Tennessee (W1-A).
CRAVENS, FADJO, Fourth District, Arkansas (W1-N).
CROW, WILLIAM J., Twenty-third District, Pennsylvania (W2-A).
CUNNINGHAM, PAUL, Fifth District, Iowa (W1-A).
DAGUE, PAUL B., Ninth District, Pennsylvania (W1-M).
DAVIS, JAMES C., Fifth District, Georgia (W1-M).
DAWSON, WILLIAM L., First District, Illinois (W1-A).
DEVITT, EDWARD J., Fourth District, Minnesota (W2-N).
DIRKSEN, EVERETT M., Sixteenth District, Illinois (W1-A).
DOLLIVER, JAMES I., Sixth District, Iowa (W1-A).
DOMENGEAUX, JAMES, Third District, Louisiana (W2-A).
DONOHUE, HAROLD D., Fourth District, Massachusetts (W2-N).
DORN, W. J. BRYAN, Third District, South Carolina (W2-A).
DURHAM, CARL T., Sixth District, North Carolina (W1-N).
EBERHARTER, HERMAN P., Thirty-second District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).

ELLIS, HUBERT S., Fourth District, West Virginia (W1-A).
ELLSWORTH, HARRIS, Fourth District, Oregon (W1-A).
ELSTON, CHARLES H., First District, Ohio (W1-A).
ENGEL, ALBERT J., Ninth District, Michigan (W1-A).
EVINS, JOE L., Fifth District, Tennessee (W2-A).
FARRINGTON, JOSEPH R., Delegate, Hawaii (W1-A).
FENTON, IVOR D., Twelfth District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).
FLETCHER, CHARLES K., Twenty-third District, California (W2-N).
FULLER, HADWEN C., Thirty-fifth District, New York (W1-A).
FULTON, JAMES G., Thirty-first District, Pennsylvania (W2-N).
GARY, J. VAUGHAN, Third District, Virginia (W1-A).
GAVIN, LEON H., Nineteenth District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).
GEARHART, BERTRAND W., Ninth District, California (W1-A).
GOFF, ABE MCGREGOR, First District, Idaho (W1, W2-A).
GORE, ALBERT, Fourth District, Tennessee (W2-A).
GRANGER, WALTER K., First District, Utah (W1-M).
GRANT, GEORGE M., Second District, Alabama (W1-A).
GRIFFITHS, P. W., Fifteenth District, Ohio (W1-N).
GWYNNE, JOHN W., Third District, Iowa (W1-A).
HALE, ROBERT, First District, Maine (W1-A).
HALLECK, CHARLES A., Second District, Indiana (W1-A).
HARNESS, FOREST A., Fifth District, Indiana (W1-A).
HAYS, BROOKS, Fifth District, Arkansas (W1-A).
HEDRICK, E. H., Sixth District, West Virginia (W1-A).
HESELTON, JOHN W., First District, Massachusetts (W1-A).
HESS, WILLIAM E., Second District, Ohio (W1-A).
HINSHAW, CARL, Twentieth District, California (W1-A).
HOEVEN, CHARLES B., Eighth District, Iowa (W1-A).
HOLIFIELD, CHET, Nineteenth District, California, (W1-A).
HOPE, CLIFFORD R., Fifth District, Kansas (W1-A).
HORAN, WALT, Fifth District, Washington (W1-N).
JACKSON, DONALD L., Sixteenth District, California (W2-M).
JACKSON, HENRY M., Second District, Washington (W2-N).
JARMAN, PETE, Sixth District, Alabama (W1-A).
JAVITS, JACOB K. (JACK), Twenty-first District, New York (W2-A).
JENISON, EDWARD H., Eighteenth District, Illinois (W2-N).
JENKINS, MITCHELL, Eleventh District, Pennsylvania (W1, W2-A).
JENSEN, BEN F., Seventh District, Iowa (W1-A).
JOHNSON, ANTON J., Fourteenth District, Illinois (S-A).
JOHNSON, GLEN D., Fourth District, Oklahoma (W2-A).
JOHNSON, LEROY, Third District, California (W1-A).
JOHNSON, LYNDON B., Tenth District, Texas (W2-N).
JONES, HOMER R., First District, Washington (W1, W2-N).
JUDD, WALTER H., Fifth District, Minnesota (W1-A).
KEAN, ROBERT, Twelfth District, New Jersey. (W1-A).
KEARNEY, BERNARD W. (PAT), Thirty-first District, New York (W1-A).
KEATING, KENNETH B., Fortieth District, New York (W1, W2-A).
KENNEDY, JOHN F., Eleventh District, Massachusetts (W2-N).
KERSTEN, CHARLES J., Fifth District, Wisconsin (W2-C. G. (T)).
KILBURN, CLARENCE E., Thirty-fourth District, New York (W1-A).
KING, CECIL R., Seventeenth District, California (W1-A).
KIRWAN, MICHAEL J., Nineteenth District, Ohio (W1-A).
KUNKEL, JOHN C., Eighteenth District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).
LANDIS, GERALD W., Seventh District, Indiana (W1-A).
LANE, THOMAS J., Seventh District, Massachusetts (W1-A).
LARCADE, HENRY D., JR., Seventh District, Louisiana (W1-A).
LATHAM, HENRY J., Third District, New York (W2-N).
LECOMPTE, KARL M., Fourth District, Iowa (W1-A).
LEFEVRE, JAY, Thirtieth District, New York (W1-A).
LODGE, JOHN DAVIS, Fourth District, Connecticut (W2-N).
LUCAS, WINGATE H., Twelfth District, Texas (W2-A).
LYLE, JOHN E., Fourteenth District, Texas (W2-A).
MCCORMACK, JOHN W., Twelfth District, Massachusetts (W1-A).
MCGREGOR, J. HARRY, Seventeenth District, Ohio (W1-A).
MCMAHON, GREGORY, Fourth District, New York (W2-N)
MCMILLAN, JOHN L., Sixth District, South Carolina (W1-N).
MACKINNON, GEORGE, Third District, Minnesota (W2-N).
MADDEN, RAY J., First District, Indiana (W1-N).
MANSFIELD, MIKE, First District, Montana (W1-A-M).
MARTIN, THOMAS E., First District, Iowa (W1-A).
MATHEWS, FRANK A., JR., Fourth District, New Jersey (W1, W2-A).
MEADE, HUGH A., Second District, Maryland (W2-N).
MEADE, W. HOWES, Seventh District, Kentucky (W2-N).
MEYER, HERBERT A., Third District, Kansas (W1-A).
MICHENER, EARL C., Second District, Michigan (S-A).
MILLER, A. L., Fourth District, Nebraska (W1-A).
MILLER, EDWARD T., First District, Maryland (W1, W2-A).
MILLER, GEORGE P., Sixth District, California (W1-A).
MILLER, WILLIAM J., First District, Connecticut (W1-A).
MITCHELL, E. (EDWARD) A., Eighth District, Indiana (W2-N).
MORRIS, TOBY, Sixth District, Oklahoma (W1-A).
MORTON, THRUSTON BALLARD, Third District, Kentucky (W2-N).
MUHLENBERG, FREDERICK A., Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania (W1; W2-A).
MURRAY, TOM, Eighth District, Tennessee (W1-A).
NIXON, RICHARD M., Twelfth District, California (W2-N).
NODAR, ROBERT, JR., Sixth District, New York (W2-A).
NORBLAD, WALTER, First District, Oregon (W2-A).
NORRELL, W. F., Sixth District, Arkansas (W1-A).
O'HARA, JOSEPH P., Second District, Minnesota (W1-A).
OWENS, THOMAS L., Seventh District, Illinois (W1-A).
PASSMAN, OTTO E., Fifth District, Louisiana (W2-N).
PATMAN., WRIGHT, First District, Texas (W1-A).
PATTERSON, JAMES T., Fifth District, Connecticut (W2-M).
PEDEN, PRESTON E., Seventh District, Oklahoma (W2-A).
PETERSON, J. HARDIN, First District, Florida (W1-N).
PHILBIN, PHILIP J., Third District, Massachusetts (W1-N).
PHILLIPS, JOHN, Twenty-second District, California (W1-A).
POAGE, W. R., Eleventh District, Texas (W1-N).
PRESTON, PRINCE H., JR., First District, Georgia (W2-A).
PRICE, MELVIN, Twenty-second District, Illinois (W2-A).
RABIN, BENJAMIN J., Twenty-fourth District, New York (W1-N).
RANKIN, JOHN E., First District, Mississippi (W1-A).
REED, CHAUNCEY W., Eleventh District, Illinois (W1-A).
REES, EDWARD H., Fourth District, Kansas (W1-A).
REEVES, ALBERT L., JR., Fifth District, Missouri (W2-A).
RICHARDS, JAMES P., Fifth District, South Carolina (W1-A).
RILEY, JOHN J., Second District, South Carolina (W1-N).
SADLAK, ANTONI N., At Large, Connecticut (W2-N).
SARBACHER, GEORGE W., JR., Fifth District, Pennsylvania (W2-M).
SASSCER, LANSDALE G., Fifth District, Maryland (W1-A).
SCOTT, HARDIE, Third District, Pennsylvania (W2-A).
SCOTT, HUGH D., JR., Sixth District, Pennsylvania (W1-A, W2-N-Merchant Marine).
SCRIVNER, E. P., Second District, Kansas (W1-A).
SEELY-BROWN, HORACE, JR., Second District, Connecticut (W2-N).
SHORT, DEWEY, Seventh District, Missouri (W1-A).
SIKES, ROBERT L. F., Third District, Florida (W2-A).
SIMPSON, RICHARD M., Seventeenth District, Pennsylvania (W1-A).
SIMPSON, SID, Twentieth District, Illinois (W1-A).
SMATHERS, GEORGE A., Fourth District, Florida (W2-M).
SMITH, LAWRENCE H., First District, Wisconsin (W1-A).
SMITH, WINT, Sixth District, Kansas (W2-A).
SOMERS, ANDREW L., Tenth District, New York (W1-N).
SPRINGER, RAYMOND S., Tenth District, Indiana (W1-A).
SNYDER, MELVIN C., Second District, West Virginia (W1, W2-A).
STIGLER, WILLIAM G., Second District, Oklahoma (W1-A).
STRATTON, W. G., At Large, Illinois (W2-N).
TALLE, HENRY O., Second District, Iowa (W1-N)
TEAGUE, OLIN E., Sixth District, Texas (W2-A)
THOMAS, ALBERT, Eighth District, Texas (W1-A)
THOMAS, J. PARNELL, Seventh District, New Jersey (W1-A).
TOWE, HARRY L., Ninth District, New Jersey (W1-N).
TRIMBLE, JAMES W., Third District, Arkansas (W1-A).
TWYMAN, ROBERT J., Ninth District, Illinois (W1, W2-N).
VAIL, RICHARD B., Second District, Illinois (W1-A).
VAN ZANDT, JAMES E., Twenty-second District, Pennsylvania (W1, W2-N).
VORYS, JOHN M., Twelfth District, Ohio (W1-N).
WADSWORTH, JAMES W., Forty-first District, New York (S-A).

WALTER, FRANCIS E., Twentieth District, Pennsylvania (W1, W2-N).

WEICHEL, ALVIN F., Thirteenth District, Ohio (W1-A).

WHEELER, W. M. (DON), Eighth District, Georgia (W2-A).

WIGGLESWORTH, RICHARD B., Thirteenth District, Massachusetts (W1-A).

WILLIAMS, JOHN BELL, Seventh District, Mississippi (W2-A).

WOLCOTT, JESSE P., Seventh District, Michigan (W1-A).

WOOD, JOHN S., Ninth District, Georgia (W1-A).

WOODRUFF, ROY O., Tenth District, Michigan (S, W1-A).

WORLEY, EUGENE, Eighteenth District, Texas (W2-N).

ZIMMERMAN, ORVILLE, Tenth District, Missouri (W1-A).

Recapitulation

Senate:	
Boer War	1
S-A	1
S, W1-A	1
S, W1, W2-A	1
W1-A	28
W1-N	4
W1-M	1
W1-C. G	0
W1-National Guard	1
U. S. Naval Reserve	1
W2-A	5
W2-N	2
W2-M	1
W2-C. G	0
Total	47
House of Representatives:	
S-A	3
S, W1-A	1
W1-A	101
W1, W2-A	7
W1-N	22
W1, W2-N	6
W1-M	4
W1, W2-M	0
W1, A-M	1
W2-A	27
W2-N	26
W2-M	4
W2-C, G, (T)	1
W2-A-N-M. M	1
Total	204
Grand total	251
The Congress:	
Boer War	1
Spanish-American War	4
Spanish-American and World War I	2
Spanish-American and both World Wars	1
World War I (only)	163
World Wars I and II	13
World War II (only)	67
Total	251

Sources: America's Fighting Congress, by William P. Kennedy, Litt. D., S. Doc. No. 94, 78th Cong., 1st sess., Washington, 1943. Official List of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, etc., Eightieth Congress, Jan. 14, 1947. Compiled by John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives (includes a list of the Senators). U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947; 16 pages. New Faces in Congress, Washington Post, November 1946-January 1947; Who's Who in America, 1946-1947.

(This report supplements compilations dated Feb. 20, 1945; Jan. 2, 1945, and Mar. 12, 1946, which are related to this subject.)

LEWIS J. WILLIAMS,
General Research Section.

March 18, 1947.

Outlawing the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter dated March 14, 1947, from Ed Will, of Watkins Glen, N. Y., with reference to outlawing the Communist Party:

WATKINS GLEN, N. Y., *March 14, 1947.*

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: I am taking this opportunity to express my personal views about a matter that I see by the papers is to come up before Congress shortly. It is the matter of outlawing the Communist party.

I think that you know enough about me to know that I can by no stretch of the imagination be considered a sympathizer of the Communists. My leanings are strongly conservative, in a more or less progressive way. The truth is that I have a great hatred of all communism stands for. I have no illusions about it, I fully realize that to a great many Communists, communism is the same thing to them as religion is to a religious fanatic, that they obey the dictates of communism with the same fanaticism that the Moslem dervish obeys the dictate of his creed. I realize that communism is, in a way, a substitute for religion amongst some godless people, and that therein lies its threat to our way of life, rather than being merely a political threat. And I am as alarmed as anybody with the power they have gained by their underhanded methods. In fact, I am personally suffering a severe hardship as a direct result of their power, since I have been waiting for a year for delivery of a tractor from Allis-Chalmers where a Communist dominated union still holds production down to a trickle by a year-long strike. I am in the position of operating a fair-sized farm without a tractor, and without hired help.

Nevertheless, I cannot help but be opposed to any bill that would outlaw the Communist Party. Putting aside all questions as to violation of freedom of speech, etc., I am afraid of the long range effects of such outlawing on the strength of the Communists.

It is a well known fact that the Communists work best of all underground. Can you think of a single country in the world where the Communists have been outlawed where they did not sooner or later emerge from underground greatly strengthened? Take France, for instance. There the Communists were outlawed when they were much weaker than they are at present, but they have emerged from an underground party to practically control the country. The same is partly true of Germany. And in every other instance where they were outlawed much the same thing has happened. They thrived underground; to drive them underground is to play into their hands.

Any student of ancient history, and this happens to be a hobby of mine, knows that never in history has persecution been successful in stamping out any idea. Always it has strengthened. Were it not for the early persecution of Christians, Christianity might today be an obsure religion in isolated parts of the Middle East.

By outlawing the Communists, we will lay ourselves open to the charge that we are afraid that our theories of democracy cannot compete with communism in open competition. You can depend on it that the Communists will know how to make the most of this argument, and how to use it among the great numbers of workingmen who are not overgiven to thinking things out for themselves, but who are only too ready to accept a ready-made thought. "Why did the Government outlaw communism?" They will say to these people "because the Government is afraid of it. The Government is all for the rich, and the rich mucky-mucks are afraid, and had the Government outlaw the Communists." I have been among such people enough to know too well the devastating force such an argument can have amongst certain types of workers, especially those who have not done too well for themselves, and are seeking someone or something to blame for their own inability.

However, I am also against any pampering of the Communists. If a Communist breaks the law, he should be prosecuted as promptly and sentenced to just as severe a sentence as anyone else. There has been too much leniency shown Communists, especially as to passport violations, such as the case of Earl Browder. Also, I am greatly pleased that at last some beginning has been made to weed fellow travelers out of the Government.

In the past, fanatics of all sorts have eventually tended to calm down, unless undeer constant persecution. Many sects of religion that were once extremely fanatical, such as the Mormons and others, once out of reach of persecution, settled down into more conservative and conventional groups. I am convinced that in time, the fanaticism that goes with communism will take the same course. The fanatical period that communism is now going through has seldom lasted more than a few generations in other religions, and I consider communism as a substitute for religion to certain people. Meanwhile, I think that it is our job to try to hold our democratic principles intact against the inroads with as much tolerance as possible. I believe that in Russia, the source of communism, this fanaticism has already grown much dimmer, and a hard-headed realism, together with personal grabs for power, is gradually taking its place. Communism there is more of a business and less of a religion. Eventually this same idea will gradually filter through to Communists everywhere, to be Communists for what they can get out of it, and when this happens, much of the threat of Communism will disappear, for it is in its appeal to fanaticism that communism is dangerous. To put communism underground would be to only delay this eventual change.

Sincerely yours,

ED WILL.

The President's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able column written by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of March 20. This article adds greatly to a fundamental consideration of the long-range implications of the so-called Truman doctrine. As a foreign policy in America is effective only in proportion to its public

support, all discussion leading to public enlightenment is beneficial. Mr. Krock, I believe, has made a real contribution to sound-thinking on this most vital question.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION

SOME QUESTIONS ARISING OVER THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, today listed questions for which he seeks answers from the administration on the meaning, implications, and scope of future of the President's new anti-Communist foreign policy. Senator VANDENBERG, in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, urged his Republican colleagues to compose a questionnaire so that Congress may know as nearly what it will be voting for in the immediate matter of the grants to Greece and Turkey as the administration can or will tell them or, on the basis of information supplied, they can conclude for themselves. And Mr. SMITH is one of the first to publish his response to the invitation.

Doubtless the interrogations will run into the hundreds, many will be repetitious, some stupid, and some insincere. But in composite they will reflect the honestly troubled mind of Congress and of many citizens as the dead line of March 31 draws near. And the cogent part will have grown almost entirely out of one passage in the President's recent address at the Capitol, which was:

"It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

On that policy, Mr. Truman set his proposal for its first expressions—the grants of money and other forms of supervised aid to Greece and Turkey.

This correspondent in the last few days has listened to the views of many persons of influence, experience, and responsibility in foreign policy, both in and out of Congress. His conclusion is that the major questions for which answers will be sought from the administration and on which many votes in Congress will be founded are these:

What is meant by "support"? The President used the word without any hint of reservation as to money or method. Is it an approval of unconditional "support" that he asks of Congress and the American people?

What is the President's definition of "free peoples?" The Palesine Arabs insist they are, but we are exerting "outside pressure" there. The Chinese National Government is resisting an "armed minority," but, since the people under it are certainly not "free," would they be excluded from the operations of the new policy?

Are certain peoples in the Caribbean and in Latin America "free" in the general North American definition? If they are not, does the President mean to suggest that his new policy would not apply to areas essential to our national defense because of the limitation he expressed?

The statement is of a global policy. Is the administration prepared to estimate what the annual budgetary reserve for so vast an objective should be? What should be the immediate budgetary reserve, in view of the situation that already exists in China and Korea within the framework of the words "armed minorities" and "outside pressure"?

If such estimates can be indicated, how will they affect our internal economy, which by common agreement must remain strong if the policy is to be effective? And are the American people prepared to take on a global obligation at an eventual cost which can only be guessed at?

Have any alternatives to the policy stated in the President's words above been canvassed? If so, what are they, and what were the reasons for rejecting them? It has been suggested that the proposed policy, if adopted, should be limited to our assistance (for the reasons Mr. Truman gave) to that part of Europe west of a line from the Oder to the mouth of the Adriatic, to this hemisphere and to strategic areas in the Far East. Was any consideration given to such a program, and, if not, why not?

Did the administration propose to strengthen the Communist regimes in Poland, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, and facilitate the current Communist rape of Hungary, as one of its current bills in Congress would have permitted before it was revised, while at the same time forcefully repelling communism in Greece and Turkey? If so, was this discrepancy merely the result of the haste with which the new policy was conceived, of muddled thinking, or of an administration with two minds and conflicting programs under the same policy?

What assurance is there that, without troops and no more money than the British used, we can do in Greece what they with troops could not do?

The questions are important to a clarification of the issues raised by the President's speech, and it is conceivable that Congress would not act satisfactorily for the administration by March 31, or ever, if answers to some of them are not sincerely attempted. There is no reason to think there is a disposition in the executive department not to do so, for otherwise, however fully this Congress may cooperate, the new policy would begin in a cloud of doubts and fears and would be in danger of crashing on its first flight.

There are questions above to which obviously no human mind could supply the answers; they concern the area of incalculable risk which the policies of great nations necessarily must invade, whether they are interventionist or isolationist. These were listed only because of their sources. But there are enough interrogations which penetrate to the roots of the issue to call for adequate and informed responses. The effectiveness of the decision that is to be made in Congress depends on the vigor with which they are pressed if, as during the lend-lease debate, the effort is to evade them.

The Loan to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman Wants To Police World With United States Dollars and Troops," written by John S. Knight and published in the Miami (Fla.) Sunday Magazine of March 16, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN WANTS TO POLICE WORLD WITH UNITED STATES DOLLARS AND TROOPS

So that our readers will clearly understand what is in store for them, I quote a paragraph from a New York Times dispatch by James B. Reston, their specialist in international affairs:

"What worries President Truman's advisers at the moment is not this loan to Greece and Turkey but the next one."

In that one sentence Mr. Reston epitomizes our future foreign policy: "Fight Communism with dollars."

It is an easy slogan and should go down well with timid Americans who put the covers over their heads every night just in case the Russians might decide to drop a few atomic bombs in their neighborhood for target practice.

The true meaning of the slogan should frighten them even more for actually it means: "Fight communism with dollars—and men if necessary."

The President, influenced by his military advisers for whom he has a profound respect, has in effect told Russia to keep hands off Greece and Turkey although we have consistently encouraged Great Britain to rule the Greeks with force through a puppet king.

In view of the idealistic statements made by the leaders of all countries during the early days of the United Nations, our moral position with regard to the Greeks is highly untenable.

What we are actually proposing to do, although the vast majority of Americans seemingly are failing to grasp its significance, is to assume the burden of world security ith American dollars and troops.

This is a step that goes far beyond our humanitarian desire to aid Greece in her postwar difficulties, the premise upon which many people are blindly accepting the President's recommendations.

With unconscious irony, President Truman's address to Congress was delivered while an 11-nation commission from the United Nations Security Council is in Greece trying to get the facts.

In bypassing the United Nations so casually, the President has dealt that organization's prestige a serious blow.

Did we not accept the UN as the means to world peace, to security for the small nations? Why, then, should the United States take unto itself the full responsibility for deciding how world peace shall be maintained when the problem had been specifically assigned to the United Nations from the outset?

Lest your memories be short, a few quotations from earlier pronouncements by United Nations leaders are in order:

April 26, 1945: "This conference is called upon to consider the problem of setting up an organization to protect the general peace and security of nations after the war. * * * It is obvious that no one wishes to restore a League of Nations which had no rights or power. * * * The Soviet Government is a sincere and firm champion of the establishment of a strong international organization of security. * * * We will fully cooperate in the solution of this great problem with all the other governments which are genuinely devoted to this noble cause." (V. M. Molotov, chairman of the Soviet delegation to the San Francisco Conference.)

July 15, 1945: "We all have to recogize—no matter how great our strength—that we must deny ourselves the license to do always as we please. No one nation, no regional group, can, or should, expect any special privilege which harms any other nation. * * * That is why we have here resolved that power and strength shall be used not to wage war, but keep the world at peace, and free from the fear of war." (President Truman at the San Francisco Conference.)

June 21, 1945: "Both the Greek Government and the people as a whole look friendlily and admiringly at the Soviet Union by whose side they fought, and still fight, for the maintenance of human liberties." (Under Secretary Zakynthinos, of the Greek Press and Information Department.)

November 23, 1945: "What does it concern Great Britain whether Greece is a monarchy or a republic? It is not for us to decide." (Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin.)

February 22, 1945: "The Three Powers pledged joint action to uphold the right proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they shall live." (Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State.)

March 1, 1945: "Vaguely defined 'spheres of influence' are incompatible with the basic principles of international collaboration." (From Franklin D. Roosevelt's report to Congress on the Yalta meeting.)

June 26, 1945: "Establish a special organization for defense of peace and insurance of security, from among the representatives of the peace-loving nations; to place at the disposal of the steering body of this organization the maximum quantity of armed forces sufficient for the suppression of aggression; and to convince this organization, in case of necessity, to send without any delay these armed forces for the prevention and liquidation of aggression, for the punishment of those guilty of aggression." (A. A. Gromyko, acting chairman, the Soviet delegation at San Francisco.)

The noble words quoted above are just as noble today. The tragic difference is that they have been so soon forgotten.

Russia is guilty of obstruction and hair splitting in the councils of the UN while practicing a determined isolationism for her own selfish advantage.

Great Britain, facing economic collapse, loss of empire, and living in fear of Russia, has turned once again to the United States for succor.

Our political and military leaders are so sure that we will eventually go to war with Russia that they have determined to call Russia's hand in the Balkans, a course of action that may ignite the first spark of the war they would avoid.

The fallacy of our position is that:

1. We are not supporting a representative government in Greece.

2. The Greek problem is a world problem and not one specifically reserved to the United States and Great Britain.

3. A political loan to Greece further weakens the United Nations.

4. We are inaugurating a change in foreign policy which commits us morally to bailing out every tottering nation in Europe and liquidating their Communists.

5. The constant drain upon our own resources will eventually make it impossible for us to aid anyone.

6. We are asking for a war with Russia.

Granting that Greece needs money, what about the $9,000,000,000 that are gathering dust in the World Bank of the United Nations? What is being done with Greek assets frozen in London? Why can't the stabilization fund of the UN proceed to stabilize her currency?

American taxpayers have already poured $480,000,000 into Greece since the end of the war. The Greek army, described by President Truman, as "small and ill-equipped, "has absorbed about $44,000,000 worth of equipment, some of it second-hand lend-lease.

Do the dreaded Greek guerrillas from the mountains have more?

When we have made the loan advocated by President Truman, what about the 70 percent of Greece's overseas debts that are held by British banks. Will we pay them too? Or will they be waived by Great Britain in return for our policing her "spheres of influence?"

What do you think?

It was Franklin D. Roosevelt's concessions at Tehran that gave Russia nine-tenths of the Balkans.

Having handed so much to the Communists on a silver platter, we now belatedly determine to save the end piece for Great Britain. We intend to do it by opposing the guerrillas who fought the Germans under British and American orders.

We intend to do it by backing the Greek army which upon Chicago Daily News Correspondent George Weller's authority is "heavily spiked with quisling members and officers of the pro-German security battalions." These are the "democratic forces which new American loans will arm in their anti-Communist crusade against the mountaineers who fought the Nazis."

Weller also asks why, if President Truman's claim that 85 percent of the Greeks support the royalist government, it should cost so much American money for the British-armed five-sixths of the population to annihilate "that sixth man."

I do not believe that American people realize the gravity of the step which President Truman has advocated. It is not a question of sending $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey but rather the assertion of our determination to combat the spread of communism everywhere.

If this policy is carried out to its logical conclusion, it will drain our treasury while destroying any hope that the United States and Russia can ever work together.

Our decision to appropriate the policing functions of the United Nations is a step fraught with such grave potentials that Congress should not be stampeded into giving blanket approval to the President's proposal.

For, as President Roosevelt once said, "You can't shake your fist and then shake your finger."

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Saddle River in the Snow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Jessie Alsop, Ridgewood, N. J., which appeared in the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call of March 19, 1947; a poem so aptly descriptive of a beautiful stream in northern New Jersey:

SADDLE RIVER IN THE SNOW

Snowflakes kissing Saddle River
Frozen darts from Cupid, quiver;
Though the cheek may feel a shiver
Still the heart is warm.

Saddle River's waves are spraying,
Little frozen twigs are swaying,
'Cross the moon as fingers playing,
Love tunes to the dawn.

Saddle River's snows endearing
On the willows, in the clearing,
By the course her flow is steering,
In the sun at morn.

Never weary in her labors,
Filling wells for all her neighbors;
Glistening with bright dancing sabors,
Graceful as a faun.

And the snow of winter covers,
Footprints of her Springtime lovers,
While their love forever hovers,
Where the sedge is torn.

Like a vein or throbbing artery,
Through the Bergen towns and country;
Rippling with her joyous poetry,
Laughing, yet forlorn.

—*Jessie Alsop.*

RIDGEWOOD, N. J.

Real Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most refreshing experiences I have had in a long time was to receive a statement signed by 24 persons, being approximately 44 percent of the total number of employees of a business concern in my district, which statement I am hereafter quoting.

I have obtained the written permission of these 24 employees to insert this statement in the RECORD, without, of course, giving their names.

Among the workers in this particular industry are members of a local of the CIO steelworkers. But all of them are not members of this union. Some are members of other organizations, such as the Patternmakers Guild. Others have no union affiliations.

The signers of this petition who are members of the steelworkers union, fear, and probably with considerable justification, that if their names were disclosed they would lose their jobs, would be blackballed so that they would be unable to get work in the area, and some being married men with families, felt that they could not take that chance. With this feeling I sympathize as deeply as I deplore the conditions which justify it.

Mr. Speaker, the statement of these workers is as follows:

We, as employees of the Trenton Brass & Machine Co., have requested that we be able to put our signatures to the letter written by them to the Congressmen and Senators representing us in the Congress at the present time. We feel that the Congress should pass legislation to make the labor unions equally responsible as corporations and that the check-off and closed shop should be outlawed, so that a man has the right to earn his living where and how he pleased without paying tribute to any organization. Anything that you can do in the way of seeing to it that this legislation is passed will be greatly appreciated by all of us.

James D. Preston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, one of our most beloved human institutions in Washington is Jim Preston. I have known him for many years, and I am happy to call him my friend. He has truly a unique position. In a recent article in the New York Times, entitled "Mr. Washington," an account is given of his life. I ask unanimous consent

that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. WASHINGTON

AFTER 50 YEARS IN THE HALLS OF THE SENATE JIM PRESTON IS A SYMBOL OF THE CAPITOL ITSELF

(By Truman Felt)

WASHINGTON.—Cartoonists evolved the humorless figure we accept as Uncle Sam, but that was before they knew Jim Preston. Today every newspaper man and cartoonist who has worked in Washington long enough to earn his press gallery card knows Jim. His official title is Indexer of the Senate Journal. But in his cluttered, high-ceilinged office, just off the Senate floor, he serves unofficially for a host of newsmen and officials as a sort of living encyclopedia of fact and anecdote.

This month marks the fiftieth anniversary of Jim Preston's first appearance in the halls of the United States Senate. Throughout this long period his relations with life on Capitol Hill have been so intimate, his interest in the men who have made American history so keen, that he seems to personify Government itself. Born in Washington, August 2, 1876, James David Preston has grown up with the Capitol.

Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, said of his old friend once, "You and the Senate press gallery are as indivisible as the Capitol and its dome." To Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, whom Jim initiated in press gallery ways back in 1901, it seemed that Preston must have been there always.

"I well remember," LUDLOW wrote, "when you and Noah and I first came to the Capitol. We have lost Noah, but you and I are going as strong as ever. I recall how mad Daniel Boone and I used to get when you made us park our long-bored flintlock rifles outside before you would let us in the press gallery."

With a reminiscent smile prompted by LUDLOW's whimsy, Preston recalls that correspondents attending the opening of Congress when the McKinley administration took office in 1897 were far from Daniel Boone types. They not only scorned coonskin caps but rivaled the sartorial best of the Senators in silk hats, Prince Albert coats and striped trousers.

Jim Preston himself is not without a flair for clothes in a British week-end way. He has been compared often to Neville Chamberlain, whom he impersonated in one Gridiron Club skit, but the resemblance is only superficial.

The son of a distinguished Washington correspondent, Herbert A. Preston, Jim had worked briefly as a newspaper man before he established his first connection with the Senate. That was in 1897 when Washington correspondents chose him as unofficial superintendent of the Senate press gallery—no such post had yet been created by the Government—at $1,440 a year.

Before Preston's time the superintendent kept the ink wells filled, supplied writing paper, and did little else. But that was not Jim's idea of a press gallery. He gathered copies of bills and committee reports, searched tirelessly for facts needed to interpret the news, and began coaxing Senators to make texts of their prepared speeches available in advance.

More than that, Jim himself was a fund of information vital to correspondents, who before World War I were calling him the Socrates of the Press Gallery.

When he left the Press Gallery after 34 years to become Senate librarian, 365 correspondents obtained permission, never before granted, to use the Senate Chamber itself to conduct mock impeachment proceedings. Preston was speedily found "guilty" of devotion, friendship, and service "beyond the average known among your fellow men," and of deserting those who "leaned upon you as a rock to strengthen and a staff to guide."

As librarian he ferreted from long-forgotten and decaying files many priceless historic documents, including the original handwritten drafts of George Washington's first inaugural address and the Bill of Rights. Then for a time he served in the Archives of the United States, introducing improved British methods of preserving important records. But this took him away from the Capitol, and he soon fulfilled the predictions of his friends by returning to the service of the Senate, this time as indexer of the Journal, the job which he holds today.

On Dissolving the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of March 17, 1947.

ON DISSOLVING THE DRAFT

After a conference with Secretary of War Patterson, the Senate Armed Services Committee last week adopted a recommendation that selective-service records be retained in local board offices throughout the country until nex June 30.

President Truman had recommended that the records be consolidated at State capitals when the selective-service law expires March 31.

The committee's recommendation may or may not be heeded by the Senate and House. The cost of keeping the local boards in operating trim for an additional 3-month period would be approximately $2,000,000, and there will doubtless be some sentiment for saving the money.

However, one can readily understand the uneasiness felt by Army leaders as the day nears for breaking up the selective-service system. A few short months ago everyone expected that by March of 1947 the need for selective service would be nonexistent. The assumption was, that unrest and tension throughout the world would subside.

These fond hopes have not materialized. Instead, President Truman's message on aid to Turkey and Greece has put in motion currents of uncertainty which in a sense are unprecedented for this nation. American military power, greatly reduced since the end of the war, is scattered thinly over the globe. There are a dozen danger spots.

Never before in "peacetime" has the United States faced such a combination of circumstances. The sense of insecurity felt by the man on the street is apparently shared in the top levels of our Government.

The framework of selective service should be retained at least until some of the clouds roll by. This would strengthen the hand of the President and of the State Department during troubled days ahead, when the question of whether or not the United States is actually ready to back up a policy of open opposition to Soviet expansion may become the dominant question in world affairs.

What Congress should do, without further delay, is to set up the system of universal peacetime training which national security requires. Once the necessary legislation in that field is enacted, and the first training begun, the world would have due notice that the United States does not intend to lapse into the disastrous unreadiness which came upon the Nation after World War I.

Economics I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article which appeared recently in the New York Sun:

ECONOMICS I

"Henry Wallace dined with a friend at a midtown restaurant. Highballs were brought to the table, together with the plastic mixers. After the mixers were used to stir the drinks, Wallace snapped them into small pieces. 'Why did you do that?' Wallace was asked. 'They're made of a milk ingredient,' he said. 'When I break them it means new ones have to be ordered. Since they're made of milk, new orders mean increased business for the farmers'" (Leonard Lyons).

The Midtown Association of Restaurant Keepers marched up to the offices of Henry Wallace's New Republic last week, taking with them a bouncer with an ax, a burly chef with a meat cleaver, and a cook with a can opener.

"Open the door, Henry," they cried.

When Henry refused the bouncer said, "O. K., Hank. I'll just bust it open with my ax. Good for the carpenter, you know." (C-r-rash, went the door.) The chef led the way inside, using his meat cleaver on the books as he passed by the bookcases.

"Good for the publishing business," he remarked lightly. The cook with the can opener dug his instrument into Henry Wallace's upholstered reading chair. "The seat's made of leather," he announced. "New orders for leather mean increased business for the cattle growers."

They took Henry's new ball pen and snapped it, making more business for the pen manufacturers; then they took off Henry's pants and tore them up in ribbons as a present to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

"Anything for prosperity, Hank, old boy, anything at all," said the visitors.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN.

The Settlement With Virginia Electric & Power Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Richmond (Va.) News Leader on March 15, 1947, in relation to the settlement of the differences between the Virginia Electric & Power Co. and local

unions of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

The adjustment of this labor dispute is a splendid example of what can be accomplished when labor and management enter into a conference with a determination to settle their dispute without resorting to strike. It is interesting to note the conciliatory attitude on the part of both and it is highly gratifying that the fair and impartial attitude of the Federal conciliator was an important factor in the consummation of an amicable agreement.

The editorial follows:

THE SETTLEMENT WITH VEPCO

Settlement of the differences between Vepco and the eight locals of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers is so welcome that most of us will be inclined to sigh with relief, to ask no questions, and to hope for a similar quick agreement between the company and the foremen's union. This is not the wisest view of the accord for the reason that several new factors distinguished these negotiations and deserve study.

First of all was the attitude of the company and of the union. Both parties, it seemed to us, appreciated the serious import of their conference; neither carried a chip on the shoulder. This was apparent from the outset and was, we think, the basis of accord. Once more we have to say that where there is a will to agree there usually is a way. Die-hards, ambitious leaders or Communists boring from within are responsible for nine-tenths of the impasses that lead to strikes. Reasonable men normally can effect an adjustment.

A second favorable factor was the attitude of the Federal conciliator, D. Yates Haefner. This gentleman is a newcomer in local negotiations. He started out on the principle that his task was what his title indicated—that he was here to conciliate and not to strut his personality or secretly to support one side. Frequently a so-called conciliator is manifestly a sympathizer with the union and works to get the absolute maximum for the workers, rather than to act as a nonpartisan in bringing the parties together. Mr. Haefner set so high a standard and so strongly impressed both the company and the union that he restored the faith of some of the negotiators in the possibilities of conciliation. Either the spirit of the Conciliation Service has changed or Mr. Haefner himself has a temper and a technique distinctly his own.

To what extent was agreement facilitated by the existence of the Public Utilities Act of 1947, passed by the general assembly in anticipation of trouble between Vepco and the union this spring? The correct answer to this question will be disputed. Some union officials will say that agreement was reached in spite of the law and not because of it. Leaders of the Brotherhood believe firmly that Vepco inspired the Public Utilities Act and worked in secret with the governor to fashion a club to hold over the unions' head. So fixed is this conviction that denial is well-nigh futile, but the fact is, the company fears this law as much as the unions do, but for a different reason. The unions think the statute is designed to break strikes; the company believes the operation of the law might place its property in the hands of the State indefinitely, perhaps permanently. Private utility companies, like unions, have their phobias. Government ownership of power is one of them. To Vepco, the Public Utilities Act represents an indirect and an unintended but all the same a dangerous approach to State operation of its properties. It is entirely probable, therefore, that both sides were disposed to reach agreement by direct negotiation because neither side knew what the effect of the new law would be—a most interesting situation.

Spiritually Inspired Homes Prevent Delinquency—Program by League for the American Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, last November a conference was held in Washington, known as the National Conference on the Control and Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. Distinguished men and women, leaders in the movement to study, curb, and prevent juvenile delinquency, took part in it. One of the leaders who attended was Dr. C. E. B. Ward, executive secretary of the League for the American Home, member of the Home Responsibility Panel, whose address is room 1214, Carnegie Hall, New York City. The Washington office is room 1030, Woodward Building. I have known Dr. Ward, and his wife, Blanche Ward, and other members of his family, for more than 14 years. All have given a lifetime of interest, work, and sacrifice to this movement. I know their ambitions and their hopes. For that reason I have asked today for permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include the recommendations made to the conference by Dr. Ward on behalf of the League for the American Home, Inc.

RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations are the outgrowth of a first-hand study, over a period of 19 years, of American home life with several thousand boys (and separate homes for girls), of different nationalities and religious backgrounds—all ages and social strata—the privileged, in the opinion of the world, as well as the underprivileged. These boys were taken into the intimacy of small-unit homes throughout the country, the first of which the boys themselves named "Marvel House." The history of Marvel House, and its outgrowth, the League for the American Home, will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 30, 1946, placed there by the then Representative of the Twelfth California District, Congressman Jerry Voorhis. In 20 such houses in 10 different communities, in 4 States, these young people were cared for in family-sized groups, literally as sons and daughters, by trained mothers or by man and wife, under the personal and general supervision of Blanche Ward.

The results of this incredibly successful home experiment cost for variable periods, according to time required to give the boy a new outlook, an average of only about $52.50 per boy. Checked through approximately 40,000 personal interviews with representative Americans, Mr. and Mrs. Ward gained a cross section of public opinion, and secured counsel in forming a home program for youth. A member of New York Presbytery, Mr. Ward's life work as a clergyman, especially in a large institutional church built during his ministry in New York City, and as interstate field secretary of Christian Endeavor, centered in youth, "a service to which Mr. and Mrs. Ward have given the best of their lives and all their substance."

PROGRAM OF THE LEAGUE FOR THE AMERICAN HOME

This program was presented to the conference in three parts:

I. Emergency program for the control of juvenile delinquency through religiously inspired homes similar to Marvel House Homes created for neglected and delinquent youth whose homes and parents have failed.

Fifty such homes scattered over America—one in each State—established by the Government, supported by the State and/or by local communities, costing a total of $500,000 would demonstrate, on a national scale, the transforming power of spiritually inspired homes, in dealing with delinquents. These homes would prepare annually 10,000 youth for civic and spiritual leadership.

II. A long-range program for the prevention of juvenile delinquency, based on the right functioning of America's 36,000,000 homes, through a trained parenthood for religious education of children from infancy by parents in the home.

III. Top notch testimonials to the supreme importance of spiritual home values for religious faith and the sound character for citizenship in a republic. No other institution has such power in the solution of delinquency and crime; nor is any so potent and indispensable an influence for world peace.

I. EMERGENCY PROGRAM

1. Create homes

Ninety-five percent of delinquents are products of homes which failed to meet their moral and spiritual needs; homes which even started them on careers of crime. Parents quarreled or nagged, indulged or repressed; left children's training and morals to servants or the street. Obviously delinquents should not be sent back to such homes. Neither should they be sent to jails, recognized schools of vice. Nor to reformatories which do not reform but leave a permanent criminal stamp. Nor ineptly, to institutions.

Fair play leaves no recourse but to provide real homes, every child's birthright. Establish homes. Furnish them with emphasis on beauty and comfort. With music, humor, cheer, and service, the socially sick can be nurtured back to moral and spiritual health. Install a devoted mother-hearted woman. Give her a few neglected boys (or girls) not as "inmates," but as members of her family. Offer her every encouragment and assistance in creating a wholesome, happy atmosphere. This is the formula for building worthy citizens. Homes, not institutions.

This first step in any youth program is within the reach of any church, club, group or community sufficiently convinced of its potentialities to give it a try. (For history of Marvel House small group homes for youth see statement in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 30, 1946.)

2. Small unit groups

Emphasize the small group for intimate, individual care and service. Mass production is cheap for commodities but costly for humans. God never made a mother or teacher who can effectively handle at one time a room full of children—to sit down repeatedly by the hour with each of 30 or 40 boys and painstakingly discipline, mold, and inspire, and plan with him for his life career. Obviously, intensive character building is a one-by-one proposition.

Note the economy of the small group home plan: Being personal and intensive, in most cases, an unbelievably short time was required for character transformations, with a consequent rapid turn-over. In Marvel House homes the cost, for variable periods required to give each a changed viewpoint of life, was an average of only $52.50 per boy.

This family-size plan lends itself to segregating youth of different faiths, in separate units when desirable. Also to shifting mothers where the one in charge fails to measure up to her task.

3. In the country on farms

Locate these homes preferably on farms away from the city's distractions, and allurements, amid simple, rugged surroundings to escape artificial environment. The boy should roam fields and woods with a skyline of fences, trees, hills, and clouds. For companions animals, plants, brooks, and wholesome friendly neighbor boy pals.

In Marvel Home a quiet hour for rest and meditation after lunch was the most valuable period of the day. An hour of leisure to ponder, in which to face himself, take stock of his resources, study his past, and chart his future.

4. Plenty of hard work

Programs of recreation and play alone, pale in comparison for health, happiness, character building—and as antidotes to juvenile crime.

A Government bureau declares against too much dependence on recreation. Another bureau recently estimated 18,000,000 children between the ages of 7 and 14 without planned recreation "on the loose"—no adequate home supervision and guidance. Rich soil for spawning crime.

Boys may think they want chiefly recreation, amusement, fun. But, as Marvel House boys would say, what they really want is "worth while work and to be directed—made to do what's right."

5. Vocational guidance

Find him a job in line with native aptitudes and he fits into it, sticks to it, and drives himself in it happily to success. Few factors are as vital for contentment and development as his vocational adjustment. His job will increase his sense of importance. If it does not, he seek this in daring hold-ups or other crimes.

No vocational agent can compare with a good home and wise mother in her 16-to-24-hour-a-day associations. No person can know so well his talents, potentialities, and motivation as the one close to him in the intimacies of home.

6. Homes must teach religion

A noted juvenile judge refused to place children, even of atheistic parents, in nonreligious institutions or homes. Another juvenile judge testified that he had no trouble with children raised in old fashioned homes where faith is taught and exemplified.

In Marvel House most of the boys had made no profession of religion. Seldom had attended church or read the Bible. Knew little about the Ten Commandments or prayer. The daily family devotions with a brief scripture message, lively spirtual songs, an earnest petition for daily guidance, for the welfare of the boys and for world peace awakened dormant Godward emotions which eventually changed their lives. Every effort was made to persuade them to attend church. They rarely consented. But they never missed "the sing," as they called it. All wanted to ask questions, all talking at once, eager to apply the Bible stories to their daily experiences. All had been starved spiritually. If this devotional exercise were delayed, they asked, "Aren't we going to have the songs tonight?"

Religion was the means. The power which effected the transformation.

7. Emphasize the mother

Mothers are the common denominator of boydom. Fathers are essential. Mothers are indispensable. A boy chooses among his heroes a prize fighter, movie star, or top notch general. But in his hour of greatest need or supreme joy it is the mother to whom he turns.

Psychiatrists, educators, theologians may rush in where even devoted mothers fear to tread. An American school axiom is "One mother is better than 100 teachers." A Spanish Proverb reads, "An ounce of mother is worth a pound of clergy."

A mother: An intelligent woman who loves, serves, nurses, counsels, disciplines. And prays. She therefore saves. There is no substitute in salvaging delinquents.

The greatest challenge America faces is the equipping of such mothers for this service—the biggest job on earth.

The public has notably failed in not recognizing mother-vocational possibilities and in not preparing her for this significant part of her service to youth. Hence, the need for emphasis on a Government-sponsored program of training for homemaking and parenthood.

Create in every boy the sense of his own importance and unique destiny. As a Marvel House boy wrote from the California School for Boys, "I learned here that everybody has a special mission which if he fails to perform will never be done."

Home training and influence for all youth is not a debatable question. It is the right of every child born into the world. In self-defense, both as economic and as social measures, men in business and industry, civics and Government must come to the point where they will provide real homes for our children.

Faith and confidence in the boy's innate powers, cheerful companions and comradeship, careful vocational adjustment, and with useful arts, crafts, and trades—and religion—these were the dominant features of Marvel House and will do the job—the simple psychotherapy of spiritual atmosphere and the comfort of a mother with—

"A heart at leisure from itself,
To soothe and sympathize."

This is a boy's first need.

II. LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

1. Family group homes

(See I. Emergency Program)

Urge local communities widely throughout America to create small group homes supervised by trained mothers: (1) In cities as home centers of light for fostering home ideals and methods; (2) in the country on farms where youthful offenders may, in the normal home way of dealing with all youth, be nurtured back to physical, moral, and spiritual health.

2. Home and religious instruction

The importance of thousands of institutions operating outside the home is played up to the *n*th degree. Why not play up the importance of religiously inspired homes? Where the family with home religion is magnified, delinquency and crime slough off. Where they lapse, these evils become rampant. Place the highest possible premium on these much neglected factors. Leave no doubt in the public mind as to their place of supremacy in the welfare field.

(See following top-notch testimonials.)

3. Legislation

Foster legislation for compulsory education in all schools, in preparation for marriage and parenthood responsibilities. The work of even a one man's campaign with governors and legislators for the passage of bills in a drive for such training would accomplish wonders.

4. National Home Week

Conduct a National Home Week, through Presidential proclamation, to spread facts regarding delinquency conditions and the necessity for taking vigorous Nation-wide measures for its cure—through sermons, lectures, broadcasts, syndicated press articles, conferences, forums, mass home rallies, posters, billboards, and advertising, essays and oratorical contests in schools, letters, phones, wires, personal interviews, and house-to-house visitation in every city, town, and rural community.

Make it a week that will indelibly impress on the entire Nation the decisive place of homes with religion for the character development required in American leaders.

To this end attempt as far as possible to organize every community, church, school, men's and women's clubs, welfare agencies, and groups in a program of cooperation for a vigorous campaign of work to eradicate juvenile crime from every corner of the Nation. In short, conduct a war on all conditions which contribute to juvenile crime.

5. National commission

Appoint a national commission for study and research in the home field, to act as a national clearinghouse for all home interests and activities. Reasearch—and then more research. The investment of a few millions in home experimentation and research—in line with the few hundred thousands invested by the League for the American Home—would yield incredible results in ideas and methods, practical suggestions for solving youth and home problems.

6. Education and promotion

Conduct a continuous Nation-wide program of home education and promotion to awaken the public. By every means to capture the imagination as widely and ardently for home-mindedness as, say, for aviation, athletics, movies, and atomic energy, channeling a national enthusiasm into intelligent action.

7. The church's responsibility

Stimulate and aid the church to specialize in the equipment of parents for assuming their responsibilities in the religious education of their children. This should be the most important factor in church growth, and it is the church's prime duty for the character development of youth. It is also the church's first civic, patriotic duty for a mature citizenry and basic for world peace.

8. Special national conference

Call a special national conference to consider a long-range program for the prevention of juvenile delinquency. In this special conference, discussions and programs should center:

1. In the home and mother as the fundamental deciding social factors, instead of in institutions and agents.

2. In the young child at the unconscious and impressionable age, instead of in adult youth.

3. In moral and spiritual training of children in religious faith by parents versus mere secular and scientific training.

4. In the individual responsibility of every American citizen for the creation of a higher type of American home life and training, instead of undue emphasis on government and welfare agencies.

It is worth noting that the fourth White House conference on Children in a Democracy placed its major emphasis on these four points which have been the major theses of the League for the American Home for 25 years.

III. TOP-NOTCH TESTIMONIALS

President Calvin Coolidge: "With the rapid growth of community activities we are prone to forget that the American home is the true civic center. The source of our strength lies there."

Dr. E. Stanley Jones: "Home is the most nearly perfect cooperative unit, therefore nearest to the Kingdom of God."

Roger W. Babson: "A father and mother of character living together with their children do definitely more in making a strong nation than presidents, governors, legislators, educators, or clergymen * * * and settle the character and destiny of a child for time and eternity."

Lin Yutang: "The final test of any civilization is the type of husbands and wives and fathers and mothers it turns out."

Modern Psychology: "The permanent bent of a child's life is determined before it is 2 years of age—in the period when wholly under home influences."

James M. Barrie: "Scotland has five great universities. But her poor, though proud homes, are the greatest of them all."

New York Times: "Endowment funds aggregating three and a half billions are available for charity and education, but when there is question of providing sorely needed homes, capital is lacking. Yet the home is the primal source of all health and education, without which the billions of philanthropy must be powerless. Give the home a chance. This is better than to spend increasing billions correcting errors that might have been avoided * * * if only 5 to 10 percent of the money lavished upon institutions were invested in homes."

Fortune magazine: "The crisis in which modern man finds himself is spiritual. It will be surmounted by the reaffirmation of spiritual values."

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey: "It is a deeply distressing fact that no fewer than 17,000,000 children in our country receive no religious instruction whatsoever. Without religion no nation can survive."

Dr. Henry C. Link: "The strategic time is when a child is too young to understand, but not too young to accept."

Ex-President Lowell of Harvard: "No university can take away the religion a child gets at its mother's knees."

Lincoln: "I remember my mother's prayers. They have clung to me all my life. All that I am and hope to be I owe to my angel mother."

Wall Street Journal: 'What America needs more than railway extension, western irrigation, low tariff, a bigger cotton crop, or a larger wheat crop, is a revival of religion. The kind that father and mother used to have. A religion that counted it good business to take time for family worship each morning right in the middle of wheat harvest. A religion that prompted them to quit work a half hour earlier on Wednesday so that the whole family could get ready to go to prayer meeting."

Dr. John R. Mott: "It is impossible to overestimate the importance of early religious training of children by parents in the home."

The Bible: "These words shalt thou teach diligently unto thy children * * * lest thou forget the Lord."

Count Cavour of Piedmont: "It costs far less to save 400 children than to reclaim 1 criminal."

Thomas Mott Osborn (while warden of Sing Sing) said to the League founders: "What you people are doing through the home will put me out of business."

Judge McIntyre (New York Court General Sessions); "Crime is due primarily to the failure of the home, especially of parents to teach religion to their children."

Judge of a juvenile court: "I have no trouble with children raised in old-fashioned homes who believe in God."

Sing Sing criminal (before execution): "I am here because I had only the street for a home. Tell America to give its young people homes and save them from my fate."

Warden Johnson (Alcatraz Island Federal Prison): "It is absolutely useless to talk about the solution of the criminal problem until fathers and mothers get back on their jobs."

Dr. Prichard: "Ten generations ago, the Hastings family migrated to America and founded a positive Christian home by acknowledging God in a daily family religious experience. All descendants signed an agreement—and kept it—to read the Bible and pray daily in the home. As a result, there has been no delinquency, crime, or divorce in the Hastings descendants for 300 years. There have been distinguished clergymen, organists, and teachers, and all known descendants have been decent, law-abiding citizens. By people of such religious faith and practice America was founded and will be kept free. This is in marked contrast to the Jukes family, where there was practically no home religion but nearly all descendants were criminals."

Senator ALBERT W. HAWKES: "Anyone who can do something for the home has done more for world peace than all peace treaties. For a treaty is worth no more than the character of the persons who make it."

Kirchway: "The schools are doing their best to form character in their pupils. But schools cannot adequately do the job. Character building is primarily the function of the home."

Archbishop Spellman: "In religion alone lies the hope of lasting peace."

The Bible: "Peace on earth among men of good will."

Price Ceilings on Typewriters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Hartford (Conn.) Times of March 17, 1947, with reference to an amendment offered to the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill by my colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM J. MILLER, to remove price ceilings on standard typewriters. I find myself in agreement with this editorial and I commend it to the attention of the House.

MR. MILLER WAS RIGHT

In his wholesome, though unsuccessful, effort to have the sale of typewriters to the Government brought under the conditions of a free market, Representative WILLIAM J. MILLER has disclosed some peculiar quirks in bureaucratic thinking. It seems that in 1913 the Government General Supply Committee asked every typewriter manufacturer in the country to submit bids. This was done with the understanding on the part of the companies that the low bidder would receive a contract to supply the full needs of the Government. No contract was forthcoming but the following year the lowest bid thus received was made the maximum price the Government could pay for typewriters.

This strange procedure was adhered to for about 8 years. Then, in 1922, an appropriation bill was passed specifying a ceiling price on standard typewriters of $70. Regardless of costs of production, or improvements in the machines, the Government decreed $70 as its purchase price for more than 20 years. Last year it was raised to $77.

Mr. MILLER pointed out that there are no such ceilings on adding machines, calculators, or even electric typewriters, and that the machine for which the Government now offers to pay $77 is selling in the open market for $148.50. As a result, the Royal Typewriter Co. refuses to sell at all, the L. C. Smith Co. limits its governmental sales to 500 machines, Remington-Rand to 3,000, and Underwood to 5,000. In this connection Mr. MILLER explained that Royal makes nothing but typewriters and "cannot make up their loss on sales to the Government on some other product."

In the course of the debate, the purchasing philosophy of the Purchase Branch of the Federal Bureau of Supply was brought out by a quotation from the deputy director in charge. This gentleman, Mr. William Freeman, said at a hearing on this typewriter question:

"We feel that a limitation, such as has existed on typewriters—not necessarily at the existing price but a limitation—should continue to exist, and if an increase in that limitation should be considered, that the companies should be forced to show their costs, to prove that the price increase, whatever it might be, would be justified to allow for a reasonable profit, but not an excessive one, in relation to the probable cost to do Government business."

That is to say, according to the chief purchasing officer of the Government, before the Government will pay over $7 more than it paid for typewriters 25 years ago, the manufacturers will be "forced" to open their books for Government inspection and to "prove" that the increase in price allowed them "a reasonable profit, but not an excessive one."

If such is the economics of our Government with respect to the price of typewriters, why should it not apply the same process to the purchase of everything else? Mr. MILLER's proposal to end the arbitrary price mandate was defeated overwhelmingly but it seems an inconsistent action from a House supposed to be sympathetic to the free enterprise system, and opposed to price fixing by governmental decree. The Royal, in refusing to sell at all under such conditions, has adopted an unpleasant but sound policy.

Proposed Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a letter that I have received from one of America's outstanding labor leaders, Mr. Elmer Walker, international vice president of the International Association of Machinists. Mr. Walker, who is a legal resident of my congressional district has long been associated with the labor movement in a number of capacities. During the war, Mr. Walker served our Government in various war agencies. His was a real contribution to the victory that was achieved. In my opinion the counsel that he gives in his letter might well be sought by those who are suggesting legislation to restrict the rights of labor. This warning from Mr. Walker should be heeded, I hope that it is.

HON. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE: I am a registered voter in the Twenty-second Illinois District. My duties as general vice president of the International Association of Machinists require me to be away from my congressional district a great part of my time. Despite this fact, through my local union, Lodge 121, in East St. Louis, Ill., I am kept informed of their views and reactions on all matters pertaining to their economic well-being.

We are all concerned over the interpretation that too many of the newly elected Representatives in Congress are placing on the outcome of last November's elections, namely, that organized labor and the workingmen

of this country are a great menace to the national welfare. During the war it was my privilege to serve in several capacities in Washington—in the War Production Board, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, a member of the Shipbuilding Commission of the National War Labor Board, and as a member of that Board. I know that while our Nation was at war and all-out production by the workers of this country was so necessary to our victory, this including the record purchase of war bonds, praises were heaped upon workers, both organized and unorganized, for the fine job they were doing. When victory was assured all seemed to be quickly forgotten and, as after the First World War, reactionary interests are hell-bent on taking from American workers the gains which have lifted ours to the fullest economy on the face of this globe.

If Congress persists in what at the moment seems to be the enactment of legislation which will emasculate present laws and further restrict or deny rights guaranteed under our Constitution, then certainly the responsibility will rest squarely on the shoulders of those Members of Congress who take this step. With the world condition as it is today, with the ever-lengthening shadow of communism spread over the globe, this is no time to level attacks upon those who, in fact, are America.

As one who has been a member of organized labor since early 1918, it is my judgment that each of you should carefully weigh your responsibilities in this matter before casting a vote which may have a very serious effect on the future of our country. I would make the same statement if legislation were under consideration which would affect any other branch of our whole economy. Certainly, if legislation such as is proposed can be applied to labor, only a fool would believe that the same could not be done to any other group.

I urge you in closing to oppose the enactment of any legislation which would deny rights accorded citizens of this country under our Constitution.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER E. WALKER.

No Easy Way to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "No Easy Way to Peace," taken from the Evening Journal, Lewiston, Maine, March 15, 1947, because it is typical of the constructive, sound, and realistic policy of this publication.

NO EASY WAY TO PEACE

As Secretary of State Marshall stands up under the Soviet hammering at Moscow and as the fears and hopes of Americans alternate in the presence of a great decision about to be made by Congress, words from Marshall's final report on the war are of compelling interest.

Marshall as he wrote them was Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States:

"There is no easy way to safeguard the Nation or preserve the peace. In the immediate years ahead the United Nations will unquestionably devote their sincere energies to the effort to establish a lasting peace. To my mind there is now greater chance of success in this effort than ever before in history. * * * Our own responsibilities to these efforts are great. Our diplomacy must be wise and it must be strong. Nature tends to abhor weakness. * * * If our diplomacy is not backed by a sound security policy, it is, in my opinion, forecast to failure."

Now he is working for that peace. He sees without the hindrance of inexperienced idealism. He hears without the static interference of impracticality.

Again he is confronted with realities that have to be estimated. He must take calculated risks. He has been tempered by fire. He has been wisened by many crises. He has seen and appraised the dangers of weakness.

Marshall had a guiding voice in the decision of President Truman to speak out against a Soviet expansion that knows no stopping and will not stop until a brake is put to it.

Marshall is at Moscow without illusion. By a life training in self-discipline, in constantly estimating what lay before him, he has developed a resistance to pin pricks and deeper thrusts. He will not be diverted by such stinging blasts as Izvestia, the Kremlin's newspaper, directs against President Truman and the United States. He is an old hand at taking it.

It is very well that the United States has such a man and mind as Marshall in the buffeting sessions of the Big Four Conference.

It is fortunate that a man represents the United States who knows that there is no easy way to peace but believes there is now a greater chance of success than ever before.

Democracy means one thing in Russia. Another in the United States. Yesterday, Marshall gave his concept to the Foreign Ministers:

"To us," he said, "a society is not free if law-abiding citizens live in fear of being denied the right to work or deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

A free society also is one that, like the American, permits a discredited former Cabinet member and Vice President of the United States, by press and radio, to give aid and comfort to the country that would stifle a world under its red banner of communism—a union of peoples governed by the tyranny of a few, as is the Soviet. This was what Henry A. Wallace did, knowing full well in his two-by-four consciousness that the Kremlin would broadcast over the air and in its controlled press, his remarks, his castigation of the President, while omitting to publish what the President told America. We wonder why the cunning Wallace doesn't settle in Moscow or Siberia. We think that we know. For if Wallace should get out of sorts with the Communist government and sounded off like he did with safety in the United States, he'd be copy for the obituary column. While we stand for his right to say what he did, we challenge his judgment and his patriotism.

Hotly spoken words from out the mouths of the Soviet masters were expected. If no agreements can be reached at Moscow, this would be a gain. We believe progress will be made at this conference in spite of the rough relations that exist at this moment between the East and the West.

Open Letter to Congress From America's Oldest Labor Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, currently we read and hear much about proposed restrictive labor legislation and these demands are predicated upon the assumption that labor has abused the right to strike, withheld publication of financial statements from the public, and, in the establishment of closed-shop contractual relations, has transgressed upon the rights of free labor and violated basic rights of employers.

It is wholesome, therefore, to enter in the RECORD the open letter appearing in the Washington Star of March 7, addressed to Congress by America's oldest labor union, Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101. I direct attention to the open letter and commend its reading to every Member of the House.

I believe that the membership of this House will learn much of value in reading this communication by Jesse Byron Manbeck, president. It would be superfluous for me to review the letter paragraph by paragraph. The eloquent facts set forth are convincing in themselves and need no explanation from me. The fair-minded individual will recognize the forcefulness of truth contained in the letter. The skeptic will find it difficult to answer Mr. Manbeck on the record.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to state that I have been an active dues-paying member of the International Typographical Union since March 15, 1913, a period of more than 34 years. I am proud of my affiliation in an organization composed of intelligent, progressive, and patriotic trade-unionists. On more than one occasion I have been honored by my fellow craftsmen of Colorado Springs Typographical Union, No. 82, of which I am still a member. At one time I was elected and served this local as its vice president.

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS FROM AMERICA'S OLDEST LABOR UNION

Since January 7, 1815, this labor union has functioned in the Nation's Capital, and in the 132 years of this union's continuous existence its members have been involved in only four strikes—none jurisdictional.

Under its own union laws, the members of America's oldest labor union:

1. Require a three-fourths vote by secret ballot of members in good standing for at least 6 months before a strike can be authorized, and all members must be given reasonable notice such a strike vote is to be taken. A majority vote by secret ballot can call off any strike.

2. Require that itemized financial statements be published every 90 days, after union and CPA audit of same; monthly financial statements are published by the national officials.

3. Require referendum election of its officers, union auditors, and convention delegates.

4. Require that foremen and similar supervisory printers be members of the union, but are unhampered in the issuance of job instructions.

This labor union originated the "closed-shop" idea in America by adopting, in 1842, a resolution prohibiting its members from working with nonmembers. This policy has been in effect for 95 years without a serious objection by management. Our apprenticeship training standards would be seriously impaired under "open-shop" conditions, and GI job training undermined.

Since 1892 our members on Washington newspapers have had the 7-hour day, and since 1933 the 35-hour workweek, by agreement of management.

If America's oldest labor union can function successfully for 132 years right here in Washington, D. C., and grow from 19 members

in 1815 to 3,200 today, with less than 10 percent of this time covered by the Wagner Act;

If this labor union can raise the economic level of its members from $9 per 60-hour week in 1815 to $2.20 per hour today for a 35-hour week for District of Columbia newspaper printers with only 4 strikes in 132 years;

Certainly, if this labor union can voluntarily compile such a 132-year record, without mandatory Federal legislation, then it can be done.

If there must be new labor laws, or old laws amended, the Eightieth Congress should keep in mind that there are different banking laws for national banks than for savings banks, and that the legislation governing fire insurance is different than that for life insurance. Why should there be only one labor law for all labor? There are at least three kinds of labor—seasonal, tenure, and industrial.

Congress should get all the facts, and give labor the same consideration as was given the bankers and insurance people.

Any labor union that can function successfully and continuously for 132 years, and survive six American wars, should be a good example to follow—not less seasoned unions.

We have had only four strikes in 132 years of labor union existence—any new Federal law or amendment which would cause or result in more strikes is no remedy for industrial strife.

JESSE BYRON MANBECK,
President, Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, of the International Typographical Union, AFL.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Five Alternatives Confront America at This Critical Crossroads in the History of Our Foreign Policy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the decision confronting the United States as a result of the situation and recommendations described in President Truman's message to the joint session of Congress which was called to hear the President's message on the conditions in Greece and in Turkey is far-reaching and history shaping. This country has arrived at a crossroads in its foreign policy and the five alternatives which confront us all involve ramifications and possible results which will go far toward directing the entire future of the United States.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for the administration to take the American public completely into its confidence and to make available to it a step-by-step description of the events and conferences which have brought us to the sorry and startling situation in which we now find ourselves.

We have had too many secret conferences, too many secret commitments, too many secrets of every kind in the fashioning of the foreign policies which the White House and the State Department have pursued both before, during, and since the war. Now that the war is over, I see little continuing excuse for denying to our people a completely candid and inclusive account of the events, the agreements, and the concessions which have led up to the present situation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it especially important that the administration make available to Congress and the country photostatic copies of the unexpurgated transcripts of the agreements which were made and signed at the conferences held in Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. It is quite apparent to us all that the implications of the present situation in Greece and Turkey and the vast ramifications flowing from the proposals of the President cannot be divorced from the agreements and commitments made at these historic conferences.

It is generally believed, and vaguely hinted at by the State Department, that these conferences discussed conditions and boundary lines by which our leaders tended to commit this country, insofar as individuals have the power to commit a country which relies upon legislative mandates, to a division of the world into spheres of influence. If such spheres of influence were created by these agreements, this country should know what they involve. We should know what was said at these conferences about Greece, about Turkey, about the Balkan and the Baltic countries, about China, and about the Middle East. It violates the dictates of sound procedure that Congress should now be called upon to make epochal decisions while being denied access to the records of the events leading up to these decisions.

AMERICANS, TOO, SHOULD HAVE THE FACTS

Mr. Speaker, the seal of South Dakota contains the motto, "Under God the People Rule." That concept of government has prevailed in the United States since 1776. I submit that the citizens who rule America have as much right to the records of what transpired in the numerous conferences and secret sessions undertaken by our leaders with Russia, for example, as the citizens who rule Russia have a right to those records. Mr. Speaker, the citizens who rule Russia are few in number but they do have access to those records. These records are available to Mr. Stalin and his politboro; they are available to Mr. Molotov and his associates. Those men rule Russia and they enter into international policies with the benefit of the full record of the conferences forming a background for the shaping of new Russian policies. But, Mr. Speaker, in America the people rule.

We are not the subjects nor the political serfs of the President or the Secretary of State. We rule ourselves. To do this wisely and prudently in these critical times, however, I submit that it is important that our people now have made available to them the full, accurate, photostatic records of all agreements and commitments which form the background of events from which we must now formulate new policies best designed to serve America and the peace-loving people of all the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a time for greatness. It is also, most emphatically, a time for frankness and for candor.

WE FACE THESE FIVE ALTERNATIVES

As I analyze the situation which we now confront, America faces five alternatives in its selection of a course of action by which to meet the unhappy challenges which have been thrust upon us.

Out of the sorry and disillusioning situation which grew up in large part because of the ceaseless and cringing appeasement of Russia which our leaders sanctioned at Tehran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam as well as in countless lesser conferences, there are now but a limited number of alternatives. None of them can be considered attractive. None of them reflect the bright new world we were promised as a result of victory in the war. Here are the five alternatives now being discussed in Washington:

1. Continued appeasement

At Cairo and Tehran we agreed to invade Europe through France and not through the Balkans. At Yalta we agreed to sacrifice Poland, eastern Europe, and the Balkans to Russian control. At Potsdam we agreed to let Russia take the industrial equipment from Germany—out of all zones—and now we face a multibillion-dollar program of feeding Germany during our occupation since that country's buying power has been destroyed.

We permit Russians to map American industries, to circularize American citizens, to buy American patents. We employ Communists in our State Department and in other Federal positions. All that is part—but far from all—of the appeasement program. Should it continue? Apparently, the President's message on Greece and Turkey means no. At least in Greece and Turkey.

2. Take over British commitments

The British Empire faces bankruptcy. The four billion four hundred million loan, now considered here as a gift, we made a year ago is fast running out. There is talk of a new loan. Under the Socialist Government in England, production has decreased steadily; one American workman now produces as much as two and one-third British workmen. Facing financial disaster, Britain is giving up her protectorates over Palestine, Greece, Turkey, and Egypt. She is giving India full independence. Iraq is to be turned loose. Britain is moving out of Iran. Should the United States move in wherever Britain moves out? If we do not, will Russia? If both countries meet each other moving in, do we fight? The President does not know for sure. Neither does anybody else.

The President proposes four hundred million for Greece and Turkey, plus three hundred and fifty million in relief and about five hundred million to feed Germany. Thus, we pay reparations for victory while Germany pays them for defeat. If we can get by, peacefully underwriting and reenforcing Greece and Turkey, should we also take on Egypt, Iran, Korea, India, China, Iran, Syria, Italy, and Hungary? They also say, "If we get no help, we must go Communist." If we help, can we avoid the end result of facing financial disaster which the British tell us their experience achieved?

3. Isolation

Under F. D. R., America adopted the neutrality laws. Later, upon F. D. R.'s advice, we repealed them. Then we

loaned money; then we gave material; then we sent men. Since 1941 isolationism has been an archaic policy in America. Should we again embrace what we previously rejected? In an atomic age, how can one country isolate itself from supersonic weapons, atom bombs, and jet-propelled disaster? Could America maintain the mighty armed establishments isolation would require without facing financial disaster?

4. Fight Russia now

Nobody wants that. But one hears the suggestion every day by those who argue "If we must whip the Reds eventually, why wait until they get strong enough to fight a prolonged war? Why not use the atom bombs which are still exclusively ours and fight them now? Then we can build a free world on Christian principles." But this would be contrary to American tradition. We do not start wars; we fight back. And, who could be sure something as bad as communism might not arise from such atomic chaos just as communism now replaces nazism and fascism as the new menace?

Could a sustained Christian civilization grow from such an un-Christian procedure as atom bombing millions into oblivion? If we atomized Russia who would then occupy it? If it is to cost over a billion a year to occupy Germany, how much would it cost American taxpayers to occupy Russia? Is another war so soon the best dividend we are to get from our new internationalism?

5. Define and support an American foreign policy

Some suggest we cease shaping our foreign policy as a series of reactions to what takes place in Moscow, in the British Empire, or the Far East. They suggest we set aside perhaps a month for a full dress American debate on what our American foreign policy should be. Debate it in the Senate, in the House, over the radio, on the rostrum, in every community large or small. Insist as a forerunner to such debate that the American public be given the full texts of what was conceded and to what we were committed at Cairo, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Our atomic bombs will at least protect the peace during this debate. Out of the debate, let an American foreign policy be created from the area of agreement thus developed. Write it in definite, direct language which neither appeases nor antagonizes any power but which recognizes our world responsibility and describes the steps we propose to take to implement it.

Let the public, the Army, the taxpayers, and the world know what it means in terms as definite as those by which the Monroe Doctrine notified the world of our position in an earlier, easier age, when that doctrine proved sufficient to safeguard our interests. In this atomic age, we need something more and mightier—but is that any reason why it cannot be written with equal clarity? Why must foreign policy now be the secret formula of a few?

Was not one value of the Monroe Doctrine the fact that everybody knew what it was and understood it? Might not a new American foreign policy likewise be made more effective if it were enunciated with equal candor and in equal detail?

Those are the five alternatives. There are no happy choices among them. But we cannot dodge the march of history. This is not a time for quick conjecture or for "I-told-you-so's" or "It-might-have-beens." It is not a time for obstinate decisions.

All of us have been wrong part of the time. All of us have been right part of the time. The imperative challenge of today is that enough of us be right this time to protect and preserve a world in which all of us can live without loss of the right to disagree and the freedom to worship God and shape our plans in peace.

None of the five alternatives from which it is hoped a constructive international situation may emerge proposes American withdrawal from the United Nations although alternative No. 3 envisages limitations on American commitments in the United Nations by the creation of a so-called Western Hemisphere bloc. Likewise, none of the five alternatives reveals any confidence that as now operating and at this time the United Nations is able alone to meet the challenge confronting our world.

Mr. Speaker, America is a strong, courageous, resourceful republic. If the administration will now give our people all the facts and disclose the complete record, we will rally behind whatever decision is necessary to meet the challenges which we confront.

Security for FBI Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Retirement Benefits for FBI Agents," published in the Light, San Antonio, Tex., on March 13, 1947; an editorial entitled "Security for FBI Men," published in the Boston Evening American, on Thursday, March 13, 1947; an editorial entitled "An Earned Retirement," published in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, of Jackson, Mich., on March 4, 1947; and an editorial entitled "Support This War," published in the Miami Daily News on March 11, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light of March 13, 1947]

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR FBI AGENTS

Senators BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and LANGER, of North Dakota, are the cosponsors of a pending bill in Congress which would amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to give retirement privileges to veteran employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The effect of the bill would be to offer an annuity, on his own application, to any agent of the Bureau who has at least 20 years of service and has attained the age of 50.

This is a provision which is no more richly deserved in any other branch of the Federal service than in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and it is long overdue as a compensatory and appreciative policy of the Federal Government.

Similar provision for annuities in retirement are already made by the Government for veterans in other branches of Federal service, including the Foreign Service representatives of the State Department who won that recognition from Congress last year.

Police agencies of many States and communities have long enjoyed the right of compensated retirement.

It is a challenging matter, and really a very shameful matter, that the most efficient and deserving of all Federal employees—the law-enforcement agents, who have substantially reduced the costs and the tragedies of crime in the United States—are denied the sense of security in their hazardous careers which only an earned and adequate retirement program can give.

The lack of such a retirement program, more than anything else, accounts for the frequent resignations from the service of many of its most effective agents at the peak of their careers, private employment offering them not only higher immediate pay, but opportunities to achieve the ultimate security which the Government denies them.

Moreover, the agents who remain in the Federal service to the end of their active years are often lost to the service at the very time when their experience makes them the most valuable—for it is a young man's work done at a killing pace, especially after reaching the age of 50 years.

So it is only natural that, while they are still young enough to do so, the very best men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation take security where they can find it—with private employers picking the fruits of a rich experience which the Federal Government lacks the foresight to assure to itself.

There is no doubt of the justice and wisdom of the amendment proposed by Senators BRIDGES and LANGER, and there is no question of the utter necessity for it.

The competent and resourceful agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation give the country its most effective means of protection against the evils and dangers of organized crime.

They are entitled to adequate compensation for the years so usefully and dangerously devoted to public service, and they are entitled to the right of security in retirement when it is earned—and the Congress should recognize these obvious rights by prompt approval of the Bridges-Langer amendment.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Evening American of March 13, 1947]

SECURITY FOR FBI MEN

Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, are cosponsors of a pending bill in Congress which would amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to give retirement privileges to veteran employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The effect of the bill would be to offer an annuity, on his own application, to any agent of the Bureau who has at least 20 years of service and has attained the age of 50.

This is a provision which is no more richly deserved in any other branch of the Federal service than in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and it is long overdue as a compensatory and appreciative policy of the Federal Government.

Similar provision for annuities in retirement are already made by the Government for veterans in other branches of Federal

service, including the Foreign Service representatives of the State Department who won that recognition from Congress last year.

Police agencies of many States and communities have long enjoyed the right of compensated retirement.

It is a challenging matter, and really a very shameful matter, that the most efficient and deserving of all Federal employees, the law enforcement agents who have substantially reduced the costs and the tragedies of crime in the United States, are denied the sense of security in their hazardous careers which only an earned and adequate retirement program can give.

The lack of such a retirement program, more than anything else, accounts for the frequent resignations from the service of many of its most effective agents at the peak of their careers, private employment offering them not only higher immediate pay but opportunities to achieve the ultimate security which the Government denies them.

There is no doubt of the justice and wisdom of the amendment proposed by Senators BRIDGES and LANGER, and there is no question of the necessity for it.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot of March 4, 1947]

AN EARNED RETIREMENT

One of the most efficient Government agencies is the Federal Bureau of Investigation—the FBI—which gave remarkable service before and during the war. The FBI has organized and directed the fight against crime on a Nation-wide scale, and as a result bank robbery, kidnaping, and many other big money crimes have been greatly reduced. The FBI also has promoted better cooperation between local police departments, sheriff's offices, and other law-enforcing agencies and has helped train their members in better methods of crime detection.

J. Edgar Hoover has been able to do this work because he developed a system of selecting as bureau agents men of ability and intelligence who have made good on the job. The organization is noted for the high type of men it has working for it. He has an organization that works hard, long hours and dangerously.

A bill is now before Congress to provide a more liberal retirement plan for special agents who have served 20 years or more. After 20 years of the strenuous life agents of the FBI must live to keep up to the rigid standards of the organization such a liberalized annuity plan is only fair and just.

The bill which provides for this has been referred to the Senate Committee on Civil Service. It was offered by Senator BRIDGES without knowledge of the FBI simply as a recognition of the kind of service given by the Bureau in recent years. Everyone familiar with the FBI record will approve the better retirement plan for the men who have done that work.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Daily News of March 11, 1947]

SUPPORT THIS WAR

Americans who are so proud of the great peace and war record of the FBI will be shocked to learn that that agency is losing valuable personnel. Miamians, whose city manager is among the ex-FBI agents, will be more likely to recognize that fact than most.

However, the passage of legislation now pending in Congress would help to correct a situation in J. Edgar Hoover's official family that is one of the largest factors in recent resignations. Senators STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota—both Republicans, by the way—propose annuities for the investigative personnel of FBI after 20 years of active service.

This type of law was enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1946 to cover State Department Foreign Service—also suffering from personnel problems—and many State and local police agencies have similar retirement benefits.

Liberalized retirement would induce many special agents of FBI with several years of experience to remain with the Bureau. The FBI, by its very nature, is a young man's organization, but when the pressure, long hours, and health hazards have incapacitated special agents, FBI still needs their experience.

Passage of this legislation would go far toward stabilization of the personnel of FBI and establishing that vital agency as a truly career service. Congress should act for a grateful Nation to say "thanks" to the FBI in a practical way. Floridians who have special reason to be appreciative for FBI's efficient network headquartered in Miami should let Senators FEPPER and HOLLAND and their Representatives know that Florida wants no crippling of the war on crime and saboteurs.

Catholic War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States, which I hope will receive the consideration of every Member of the House. This organization has been in being for the past 12 years and, like other veteran organizations, has rendered valuable service to our veterans both of World War I and World War II. In order that the Members of the House may have the full facts concerning this worthwhile piece of legislation, may I outline to you the history and other interesting data pertaining to this patriotic veteran organization.

The Catholic War Veterans were founded in 1935 by the Reverend Edward J. Higgins, an Army chaplain of World War I. Father Higgins and a group of veteran friends were discussing the inroad of subversive groups in our American institutions and decided that any un-American movement would logically first strike at religion. They then determined that an organization of Catholic veterans who had served their country in time of war, and who held an honorable discharge for services rendered to the country, should organize and dedicate themselves to God, country, and home. From this humble beginning at Astoria, Long Island, the Catholic War Veterans have expanded to an organization embracing a membership of men and women of that faith in each of the 48 States.

The members of the national board of officers and trustees serve without remuneration, defraying all their own expenses in connection with their Catholic War Veterans activities—that this has been a sacrifice in many cases, is an established fact. However, having been elected to the highest office their organization can bestow upon them, they make this additional contribution in an effort to better serve their fellow veterans—regardless of race, creed, or color—for the Catholic War Veterans extend the helping hand to comrades of all faiths, and members of their families, regardless of race or color. Dedicated to God, country, and home, they subscribe to a firm belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and by their example in their communities each day, they live up to these important principles.

Each and every post of Catholic War Veterans has a welfare officer charged with the responsibility of advising, aiding, and assisting all veterans and members of their families, regardless of race, creed, or color. Welfare officers of all Catholic War Veterans units have organized rehabilitation committees, and arrange for one or more members to be present at their headquarters each night, at specified hours, to assist the veteran and members of his family with their varied problems, at no charge.

Two and a half years ago the Catholic War Veterans arranged to syndicate a column, The Veterans Aide, which has been furnished gratis to some 50 newspapers each week and to over 500 in the foreign-language field. This column was established in a sincere effort to be of greater assistance to the greatest possible number of veterans and their dependents. Arrangements are also made with radio station WINS to broadcast from 9:15 to 9:30 each Friday night The Veterans Aide, answering the questions of veteran listeners and their families.

From experience Catholic War Veterans realized that one of the best services to be rendered to veterans and their dependents is authoritative information. When a letter is received from a newspaper reader, or radio listener, which indicates the writer has a justifiable claim or reason for an appeal, the Catholic War Veterans send to him, or her, the proper Veterans' Administration forms with advice as to the proper filling in, and the procedure to be followed in filing same.

Proud of their heritage as Catholic veterans, and in the realization that from the time of George Washington's victorious armies down to the present global war, Catholics have served their country in large numbers, the members of this organization constantly strive to be worthy of the sentiments expressed by President George Washington in a letter to Father John Carroll:

> It is the duty to address public thanks to our Catholic brethren, as to them we are indebted for every late success over the common enemy in Canada.

As well as to the recognition granted by President Abraham Lincoln to the Catholic Sisters of Mercy in Chicago, of whom he wrote:

> *To Whom It May Concern:*
> On application of the Sisters of Mercy in Chicago, of the military hospital in Washington, furnish such provisions as they desire to purchase and charge the same to the War Department.

And again of the words of gratitude of President Woodrow Wilson responding to a resolution unanimously adopted by the archbishops of the United States:

> Makes me very proud indeed that men of such influence should act in so large a sense

of patriotism and in so admirable a spirit of devotion to our common country.

And again the encouraging words of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who, in sending greetings to a National Catholic Action and Rehabilitation Conference of the Catholic War Veterans, said:

It is in the results of conferences by organizations such as yours that the whole world may come to know of the invaluable cooperation which our Government is receiving from its citizens in its efforts to ameliorate the consequences of war.

On behalf of your fellow Americans now on foreign soil, facing enemy steel, I send a fervent prayer for their preservation and the success of our arms, and I wish for your organization continued usefulness, not only in this conference but in the effective execution of such program as may be outlined for the difficult days which lie ahead.

Again last June, the membership inspired to greater efforts upon receiving the greetings at their eleventh annual national convention from President Harry S. Truman, who wrote:

These are days when organizations such as the Catholic War Veterans are becoming increasingly important in the affairs of our Nation by helping direct the thoughts of all our citizens to the vast problems of reconversion confronting us.

I join you in prayer for those brave men who have made the supreme sacrifice for their country and in working for those who must face the future with handicaps suffered in defense of our Nation.

It is my hope that your organization may long endure and prosper in furtherance of its ideals "For God, For Country and For Home."

While actively and intensely assisting their comrades and members of comrade families, they have also been militantly in the forefront as defenders of our American way of life. They have been very vigorous in their opposition to Communism and all other isms. Their association with the other recognized veteran groups has been most cordial and their files contain many letters from the ranking commanders of these groups expressing appreciation for the fine cooperation of their Catholic veteran associates.

Two years ago they presented to the House Military Affairs Committee a statement on compulsory peacetime military training which definitely exhibited the fact that it was no hasty program but that it had been the result of much research; which caused the members present at the hearing to state at the conclusion of National Commander McCaffrey's cross-examination that it was the most intelligent and most informative statement submitted to the body in many, many days of hearings.

More recently their forthright stand on behalf of displaced persons of Europe again produced proof of the sincerity and intelligent approach of the membership of this organization.

Another more important point, which also reflects credit on Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, at the time Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is the fact that the Catholic War Veterans received their recognition as an accredited veteran organization from the Administration, and we quote General Hines:

Because of the showing made concerning the unselfish purposes of the organization and the potentialities of service to a large group of veterans and their dependents.

This in a letter dated July 25, 1940, from General Hines extending the recognition by the Veterans' Administration to Catholic War Veterans.

Harking back a moment to the activities of the welfare officers of the Catholic War Veterans, may we quote briefly from the September 1944 issue of a national publication, of which the writer, after spending several evenings with different representatives of the Catholic War Veterans, reports some of the varied problems their trained welfare officers handled:

Mothers will call and state that not having had a letter from Jimmy in several months they are worried; a father will drop in to tell that his boy has been reported missing in action; a wife will sob the story of the word just received of Tom's capture by the enemy; another mother will inquire about the procedure to follow to have John obtain an allotment for her; GI Joe will stop by to learn what procedure to follow to reenter his college, at government expense, now that he has been mustered out of service; still another will ask for the details of borrowing $1,000 from his Government to aid in reestablishing the business he left to answer his country's call; while another will explain that he was mustered out on a 20-percent disability and now his old firm will not reemploy him as he cannot pass their required medical examination; a man in the service will call to ask that his wife on the west coast—who is expecting a baby—be contacted by the CWV and strongly advised to take advantage of the prenatal care the Government provided for the wives of her sons in arms; another boy in service will advise that he expects to sail soon and his mother in Oregon has been writing letters that are much too cheerful and will the CWV check and make certain that she is well and if not so advise him; a sister calls to ask how the family will go about collecting her brother's Government insurance—he was reported killed in action 3 months ago; a wife whose husband has been overseas for over 2 years requests that the CWV aid her in obtaining for him a furlough home—she's so lonesome; another mother whose boy was brought home wounded and has since passed on at the Government hospital seeks advice on arranging for his burial in a National Cemetery; still another father reports that his son, wounded, has been returned to a west coast hospital, and asks for help in having the boy brought East to a hospital where his mother can visit him; and so it goes night in and night out, countless people with their varied problems all patiently listened to and, more important, properly aided.

Of course, we could go on for hours telling, for example, of the great number of units who during Christmas week this past year provided numerous gifts and varied entertainment for their comrades, still hospitalized from both World Wars, or of weekly, Sunday visits, to veterans' hospitals to wheel patients from wards to chapels to attend mass. But, rather would we stress their youth program; rather would we dwell on the visits made to the orphanages of different communities, of the Christmas parties arranged, of the material help extended, of the lively interest in these young boys and girls—future American citizens. Yes, we might all expect their continuing interest in their comrades in the veterans' hospitals of our country, but we insist that this important, vital interest in these youngsters, who are fatherless and motherless, is important and a great contribution, a sound investment in the future of these United States. The varied activities sponsored by the Catholic War Veterans' units for the youth of their community is indeed a contribution to the continuance of pure, practical Americanism.

Our Catholic veterans take further pride in the fact that during both World Wars the Catholic population of our armed forces were more than double that of their percentage ratio of our national population. Americans all—born and naturalized—they are proud of their heritage as Americans, ever ready to serve the best interests of the Nation—ever ready to oppose our enemies, ever ready to defend our democracy.

Address of President Manuel A. Roxas, of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by President Manuel A. Roxas in Manila on or about the 7th day of March 1947. This address was delivered over the radio from Manila as a message from the Philippine President to his people upon the question of the proposed amendment to the Philippine Constitution granting certain rights to American investors seeking to do business in the Philippines. The proposed amendment was provided for in the Philippine Trade Act passed by this Congress last year and ratified by the Congress of the Philippines. On the 11th day of March last the Filipino people went to the polls and by an overwhelming majority of about 10 to 1 voted to amend their Constitution to comply with the terms of the Trade Act.

To me, as an American, it was refreshing to witness the act of the Filipino people in supporting by such an overwhelming majority what is essentially a program of free enterprise. I am sure that as time goes by, not only will the ties of friendship between Filipinos and Americans be broadened and strengthened by the effects of this trade act, but the very foundations of democracy both here and in the Orient will be given new life and vitality by a rich and ever-growing flood of commerce, based not upon totalitarian state controls, but upon private enterprise thriving in free democracy.

I hope that every Member of this body will read the address of President Roxas.

It is a great utterance, not only in its clear, sane presentation of the issues involved in the recent Philippine election, but also because of the clarity and eloquence with which that Filipino statesman portrayed to his people some of those great principles and truths which must be part and parcel of the thinking of every people who are to remain free, prosperous, and secure in their rights. This address is the final culmination of a heroic battle led by President Roxas—a battle in which a small minority received inspiration from totalitarian sources abroad, sought by every means, even attempted assassination, to confuse, delay, and mislead a young nation seeking to lay the foundations of permanent welfare and liberty. God gave us Washington in our national infancy—He has given Roxas to the Philippines.

At this point I introduce into the RECORD the address of President Manuel A. Roxas:

My countrymen, I address this final message to you on the subject of the so-called parity amendment. I wish to summarize my views as briefly and concisely as possible. My purpose is to review the true nature of the issue at stake.

I will not today enter into a lengthy explanation of the various phases of this problem. I wish merely to synthesize the discussion on the eve of a decision which holds the entire future of our Nation in its grasp.

I cannot conceive of an alternative to the overwhelming approval of this proposition. I cannot understand how any impartial, fair-minded, and patriotic Filipino can, in good conscience, oppose this amendment. I concede that there are apparently plausible arguments against its approval. There are two sides to every question. But the man of impartial mind must weigh all arguments in favor and all arguments against any proposition. The fact that there are points against a proposition must not prevail if there are more powerful arguments in favor. The sum total of the reasons in favor of the approval of this amendment is so overwhelming and the arguments against it are so completely short of the mark that I cannot see how the Filipino people can do otherwise than to give the constitutional amendment a resounding vote of endorsement.

THE PEOPLE CANNOT BE FOOLED

Often I stand back and ask myself how it is possible for a single issue such as this one to become so confused and so obscured with selfish and partisan considerations; never has a simple issue been subject to so many distortions and misrepresentations, many of them willful and deliberate. I am reassured only by the knowledge that the people, in the long run, cannot be fooled or misled by lies and half-truths. They lose faith in continued appeals to passion and prejudice. In this is the great strength and virtue of democracy.

That is why today, although victory for the amendment is certain, I wish to talk to my countrymen, to set the record straight, and to clarify the discussion which has been so thoroughly beclouded by emotional appeals and political harangues.

What is it that we are proposing to do? We propose to amend our Constitution. Is there anything essentially wrong in that? We have amended our Constitution before. We might find occasion to amend it in the future. A nation which is alive and growing, which is vital and dynamic, adjusts itself to situations as they develop. The Constitution is a notable document, drawn by men of vision and of understanding. They did not pretend to be able to foresee all the exigencies and emergencies of the future. They did not pretend to be omniscient. For that reason machinery was provided for amendments to the Constitution. We are using that machinery now. There is nothing sacrilegious in that. It is the democratic way of meeting new needs and requirements. Because men may make errors, erasers were invented, and the way is provided to amend laws, and to amend even the Constitution.

PROCEEDING CAUTIOUSLY

Yet, we do not, in this case, propose to amend the Constitution permanently. We amend the Constitution for 28 years. After 28 years, this amendment will automatically become null and void. It will cease entirely to have force and effect. But if we find sooner than 28 years that we have made a mistake in this amendment, and that it is not working out to our best interest, we can cancel this amendment, on 6 months' notice, or on 5 years' notice. There is nothing irrevocable about it. There is nothing astounding about it. The opponents of this amendment would have us think that we are stepping off a tall cliff and dashing ourselves to destruction on the rocks below. What a melodrama of the imagination.

Actually we are proceeding cautiously with our eyes wide open, moving forward to explore the future, and to take advantage of opportunities suddenly and unexpectedly offered us to escape from a destruction which had suddenly been visited upon us. The opponents of this proposal would paralyze this Nation with fear, and have us remain frozen in the wake of the typhoon which has swept over us, and in the path of another which is heading our way. The storm which passed over us and which wrought such destruction here was war; the typhoon which now threatens us is economic disaster. Yet we can easily avoid disaster. We are avoiding it, and moving on to heights of greater prosperity and glory than we ever knew before. The war brought us misery and devastation but it also brought us a golden opportunity. Shall we stand still in our tracks and look fearfully behind us, or shall we move courageously forward, and achieve by our own actions our salvation? The opponents of this amendment offer no alternative. They suggest no better course of action. They merely try to stampede us with fear. I am happy that they have not succeeded.

WHAT IS PARITY?

Now what is the actual issue on which we will vote? What is its substance? What are its implications? What is parity? The proposed constitutional amendment would grant to Americans, for a period of 28 years, the privilege of equality with Filipinos in certain fields of economic endeavor, namely the development of natural resources and the ownership and operation of public utilities. Those fields are now reserved to Filipinos.

Is this true parity? Of course it isn't. Americans will have no political rights. They will be unable to vote, hold public office, or obtain employment in the regular Government service. They will be ineligible to represent our Government in diplomatic posts abroad, or to participate in any of the deliberations by which this nation makes its sovereign decisions. In our laws, there are hundreds of economic preferences for Filipino citizens: In the practice of the professions, in the distribution of Government lands, and in eligibility for Government contracts. Those preferences will remain unmodified, except as we may, from time to time, choose to amend them. That is not parity. That is not equal rights. That is merely the extension, by our own volition, of certain special rights to American citizens. That extension of rights is provisional and temporary. We can recall it at any time we choose. In any event, those rights will expire in 28 years. Is that an abridgement of sovereignty? Of course not. It is an exercise of sovereignty, by the Filipino people, for good and sufficient reasons of national policy.

NO REASON TO FEAR

It is true that our constitution in its present form reserves to Filipinos alone the special privileges we now propose to grant to Americans. They were so reserved because we rightly feared in the past that if Americans became too deeply involved in the economic life of the Philippines, it would prejudice our struggle for independence. But we now have our independence. And the greatest supporter of our independence and of our freedom today is the United States of America. We have absolutely no reason to fear that the United States Government will in any way modify or diminish her earnest desire that we succeed as an independent and democratic republic.

We had a recent instance in which an American, Gen. Ernest Burt, undertook to buy some church lands which the Government itself desired to acquire for the benefit of the people. The Government took steps to cancel this sale. The United States Government uttered not a single word of complaint, but rather supported us in our program. Is this the kind of Government to fear? Of course, there are unscrupulous individuals of every nationality who will seek unfairly to seize every opportunity for the sake of profit, regardless of the public interest. The Government is, and will be, constantly alert against all such efforts by persons of any nationality. In the case of Americans, you can count on your Government, and we can count on the American Government, to consider the welfare of the Philippine Republic above the interest of any selfish individual.

TO HELP US REBUILD

The United States, as a nation, has gained the greatest glory from its grant of independence to the Philippines. The success of the Philippine experiment in democracy is the brightest jewel in the crown of American policy in the Far East. Does any Filipino believe for a moment that the United States Government would tarnish that jewel for the sake of the few pesos of profit? It is so ridiculous a thought that it is not worthy of serious discussion. But the opponents of parity lean most heavily on this fear, this completely unwarranted supposition. They appeal to your nationalistic aspirations and ask you to believe that the United States, which spent billions and billions of dollars for our liberation, which is spending hundreds of millions of dollars for our rehabilitation, which spent the lives of 50,000 Americans on this very soil to bring us freedom and finally independence, is now going to rob and exploit us. Such a supposition is denied by every obvious fact. It is as if you were asked to believe that your own fathers and mothers, who raised and tended you throughout your lives, should now be locked out of your homes in their old age because of the fear that they might suddenly steal your possessions from you.

The American people, with but few exceptions, look upon us as their offspring, offspring no longer dependent, who must stand on our own feet as soon as possible, but who will retain the love and care of our former guardians as long as we shall live. Any individual American who abuses the hospitality of the Philippines is as much a trespasser against the principles of his own Government as against the Philippines. Our special hospitality is extended to Americans for one purpose, to enable Americans to help

us rebuild our country, to make of it a richer and more fruitful land. It is true that some Americans will make a profit out of this undertaking. That is only right. But in order to make a profit, they will be required to contribute in a much greater measure to the profit of the Philippines. They will give jobs to the people; they will build houses and roads; they will provide electric light and power and buy goods and pay taxes to the Government. Is that a danger to us?

If an American should set up a lumber mill in Mindanao and import machinery from America and hire laborers, and build houses, if he should produce in his lumber mill plywood, and timber, and doors, and sashes, and toothpicks, and boxes, and telegraph poles, and prefabricated houses, would that be robbing the Philippines of anything? Or would it be adding to our national wealth?

If an American explored some of our vast unexplored territory and found chromium ore, and sunk a mine, and established a railroad line to transport that chromium ore and gave jobs to hundreds of our people digging up the ore, and paid hundreds of our laborers to transport it, and paid out of his income thousands of dollars to the Government for the support of schools and for the building of roads and hospitals and community facilities, would we be richer or poorer?

If an American went to any of the cities or municipalities where there are today no busses, electric lights, telephone services, or gas, and established a public utility providing one of these services, employing our people, building plants and facilities, wouldn't we be better off? Yet these are the very things that the opponents of parity are afraid of. These are the things they warn you against. These are the things they would keep out of the Philippines.

WE HAVE THE PRIVILEGE

Filipinos, of course, have the privilege, they have always had the privilege, of doing exactly the same thing as we now propose to permit Americans to do. The trouble is that there are not enough Filipinos who have the capital or who have the knowledge, experience, and technical means to do these things now. The Government, itself, has not and cannot possibly obtain the money to do all these things. Only private capital can do them. The Government will do everything it can. In areas where private capital will not venture, the Government will take the initiative. But the Government will only be able to push ahead with such a program of its own, if it receives income and revenue from taxation of private enterprise, and if the national economy is broad and prosperous enough to warrant the lending of money to your Government.

It should be remembered that the Government has the right, under our laws, to expropriate at any time, with proper compensation, public utilities, if expropriation is deemed by the Government to be in the national interest. The Government is also authorized, under the constitution, to acquire landed estates and agricultural areas, by the process of expropriation, for distribution to tenants and the people. The Government has all the power and authority it needs to protect the public interest and to prevent selfish exploitation. There is not the remotest chance that we will be impeded in any way, at any time, in the legitimate and impartial exercise of that authority by any foreign government, to the prejudice of either our national interests, or the interest of any substantial group of our own people. We have already shown a determination in that direction. The United States Government has not in the entire history of its relations with us, indicated any desire to the contrary.

America was sovereign here for 50 years. At the end of that period, how many American civilians were there in the Philippines? Approximately 10,000. How many of these 10,000 were laborers? I do not know of a single one. They were all businessmen and technical men, traders and engineers, foresters and teachers, bankers and industrialists. America does not export laborers; she imports them. There are 15 times as many Filipinos in the United States as there are Americans in the Philippines. For every American who wants to come to the Philippines, there are a thousand Filipinos who want to go to America. Should we be afraid then that our country will be overrun with Americans?

AMERICANS WILL TRAIN US

When Americans first came to the Philippines how many of our people were engineers, businessmen, plant managers, teachers, and scientists? Very few. The number of Filipinos who entered the managerial and professional class under the American regime was legion. That was part of the process of preparing us for independence. Have we any reason to believe that this process will be lessened now that we are independent? The Americans who come here will train us in the latest methods of technology and science and business management, just as they have been training us for the past 50 years. We should welcome them, rather than express fears, foolish and senseless fears, from their coming.

The argument is made that American capital will come to the Philippines even if we do not pass the parity amendment. This is probably true. American businessmen will come here, sooner or later, to sell automobiles, refrigerators, hardware, electric equipment, just as American businessmen go all over the world to sell these products of American factories. But that is not the kind of capital we need. We have enough traders and sellers in the Philippines. We have no objection to such American capital, but it is not the kind of capital that we are especially interested in.

What we need is productive capital, capital that will be invested in manufacturing, in the very facilities that the Philippines need most of all to build a richer and more plentiful economy. Such American capital will not come here unless our constitution is amended. Such American capital would prefer to remain in the United States where there are unlimited opportunities and where there is an assurance of complete safety. Such American capital, if it is to be exported at all, will be exported to lands where special provision is made to protect and safeguard it. Such provision is being made today in many countries of the world, in Belgium, in Holland, in France, in China, in South America. How much more proper that such capital should come here, to a nation with which the United States is bound by unbreakable ties of friendship, common language, common principles, military cooperation, and a common history?

Shall we not show our trust and confidence in that country and thus induce its citizens to show us a preference in their financial ventures? Or shall we show America that we are suspicious and selfish and mean?

WE ARE DEFENSELESS

If we should make that kind of demonstration by rejecting the parity amendment, America will have reason to reexamine her attitude toward us. Our entire foreign policy, so firmly based on our special relationship with the United States, would have to be reoriented. We must remember, however great our pride in independence, that we are a small nation, presently poor and defenseless. In a world far from stabilized, no small nation today is without its special ties with a greater or stronger power. Do we prefer to establish special ties with China, with Russia, or with France? I do not think so. History has made our decision for us and for this we must be fervently thankful. We have the privilege, for which every other nation in the world would pay in billions, of a special position in relation to the United States. That position is our greatest asset today. It is an asset which we cannot buy for any amount of money. It lends us prestige, strength, security, and economic support.

The United States is one of the world's greatest powers, perhaps the greatest. The Philippines is a small, war-devastated, and newly arrived nation. Our total national income is less than that of the city of San Francisco. The United States treats with us as with an equal and deals with us as with an equal. But we are not actually an equal. How could we be? When the United States Congress passes a law, that law affects 150,000,000 people directly, and the entire world indirectly. When the United States makes arrangements with us, it involves her arrangements with every country of the world. Every detail and aspect of America's activities in the international field are studied intensely in every chancellery of the earth. What we do, scarcely raises a ripple. Actions taken in Washington can spread consternation over the entire earth. A concession to the Philippines sets up a clamor from a score of other nations seeking similar concessions, pointing to similar sacrifices and similar needs. Yet the United States of America maintains with us, both in form and in substance, absolute equality. In most aspects of our relationship, the lack of equality and reciprocity is in our favor, certainly in substance, if not in form.

Under the Bell Trade Act, the United States grants us 8 years of free trade in the American market. The United States would not grant free trade to any other country in the world, regardless of the benefits involved. It is true that American products are granted 8 years of free trade in the Philippines; that is a concession which is virtually meaningless to America.

TARIFF WOULD RAISE PRICES

A tariff on United States goods would be a tax on Philippine consumers. America can sell her goods today and for the next 10 years at her price anywhere in the world. Every automobile that is sold in the Philippines could be sold a hundred times over anywhere else, including the United States. Every refrigerator, every item of construction material, could be sold at the same price anywhere, including America's home market.

If we applied our tariff to American goods, it would not decrease the income to American exporters but would merely increase the price to ourselves. If we applied tariffs to American construction materials and automobiles, iron, steel, refrigerators, typewriters, books, and textiles, our people would be able to buy less because they would be forced to pay more. Prices would go up here to the extent of the tariff. The American exporters would get just as much from us.

The Philippine Government would receive tariff revenue, but it would be revenue from taxation on our consumers and would not result in a peso of additional income for the nation. A tariff would be useless in our present situation, because of the minimum amount of competition from the other exporting nations of the world. For some years to come, a tariff applied to American goods would defeat our primary national purpose of lowering the cost of living. We already levy high consumption taxes on goods from America, as a source of Government revenue. To apply tariffs to canned food, flour, and construction equipment, for instance, would further skyrocket the cost of living and would impose new hardships on the groups of our people least able to afford such an increase.

BAD POLICY

The same would be true, should we apply an export tax, except in that case, our producers would be the losers. All the commodities we ship to America enter a competitive market there. The price for which we sell our goods is established by the price for similar goods charged by American producers and by producers from other countries. If we raise the price to American importers by applying an export tax, we lose the market. The only alternative would be for our own producers to absorb the tax. That, also, is contrary to our national policy.

What we are really planning for is the day when our own home-produced goods can be sold in the Philippine market. When that day comes, we can restrict, by quota or otherwise, the importation of such American goods as come into competition with our own domestic products.

That is the reason America establishes quotas on our exports to the United States. Practically every one of our commodities, with the exception of abaca, comes into competition with materials produced in the United States. If it were not for our special relationship with the United States, we would be able to export, only a few commodities in any amount to America. Let us take copra as an example. Copra finds a ready market in the United States because of a preferential processing tax in our favor. Every pound of coconut oil made from copra from sources other than the Philippines, pays a tax in the United States of two cents more than coconut oil from Philippine copra. The effect of that provision is, in ordinary times, to assure us that all the coconut oil made in the United States will be made from Philippine copra. If that preferential tax were not in effect, eventually copra from Africa and the East Indies and the Caribbean, where wages are now much lower than those in the Philippines, would flood the American market and drive much of our copra from that market.

IN FAVOR OF THE PHILIPPINES

It so happens that there is today a shortage of fats and oils in the world, and our copra is at a premium. But that shortage will not last very long. As soon as the production of fats and oils from other countries regains its prewar level, most of our copra must be sold in the United States, or it will not be sold at all. Under the Bell Trade Act, we are guaranteed a 2-cent preference for our copra for 28 years. The United States gets no such preference in the Philippine market for any American product. This is completely unreciprocal in favor of the Philippines and affects the most widespread industry in all the Philippines. There is no counterbalancing grant of privilege to the United States in the Bell Act.

If we reject the parity provisions, and thus violate the executive trade agreement between our two countries, we stand in early danger of losing our preferred market for copra in the United States. Before long, we would face a crisis in the copra industry. Where would we get any income from abroad? There are no cash markets anywhere in the world to take the place of the American market.

Some of the spokesmen against parity have made the statement that while the Philippines gets free trade in America for only 8 years, America gets free trade in the Philippines for 28 years. That is nothing but a lie. Those who make such a statement make it either out of ignorance or our of pure frantic invention. The trade provisions are exactly reciprocal for both countries—8 years of free trade and 20 years of gradually increasing tariff. Moreover, in the case of coconut oil, cordage, cigars and tobacco, the Philippines is provided free trade for 28 years and not for 8 years, but on a diminishing quota basis. The quota will decrease but there will be no tariff duty whatsoever. That is because any tariff on these products would result in their exclusion from the American market. Here again the United States has made a completely unreciprocal provision in our favor. No such concession is granted to American goods coming into the Philippines; and although we have no quotas on American goods, there is nothing in the law to prevent us from establishing them. There is no reason to establish them now. Should American goods ever come into competition with our own domestically manufactured goods, we can and will establish quotas.

A GENEROUS GESTURE

In all major respects, the Bell Act is completely reciprocal; in some respects it is unreciprocal in our favor. It is unequal, but unequal to the United States rather than to the Philippines. The American Congress was not trying to make a business deal with us when they passed the Bell Act; they were trying to do something generous for us. Any country in the entire world, great or small, would gladly accept the Bell Act in every particular, including the parity provision, if the United States would agree to it. But, of course, the United States Congress would never make such a grant to any other country in the world. And yet some few of us in the Philippines, instead of being grateful, are being contentious and are claiming that the United States is trying to rob us.

Representatives of the Philippine Government of the previous administration begged and implored the United States Government to grant us free trade after independence. Some of the very same people, who even opposed independence because it would cut off free trade, are now saying that free trade is bad for our economy. Permanent free trade with the United States may not be beneficial to the Philippines; but I am convinced that for the immediate rehabilitation and expansion of our economy, temporary free trade is absolutely essential. The willingness of the United States to grant us free trade and preferential trade relations for 28 years shows the generosity and great-heartedness of that country. For that we must be grateful. I believe that a great majority of the Filipino people are, and will be, eternally grateful.

GRANTS US PREFERENCES

There is another aspect of the Bell Trade Act which is not reciprocal, again in our favor. The United States grants us preferences based on the special tariff rates granted many years ago to Cuba. In other words, we not only get the same discount given to the preferred country of Cuba, but we are required to pay only a fraction of the discount price. We grant no such favor to the United States because we grant no discount to anybody. We are coupled with Cuba as a favored customer and are given terms far better than Cuba for a period of 28 years.

The foolish argument is made that we would get into trouble with other countries because we propose to grant special privileges to the United States. We are granting special privileges to American citizens for our own benefit and not for the benefit of America. We are granting such privileges, in association with the tremendous concessions and grants being given us by the United States. I do not know of any other country in the world which is either capable or willing to grant us benefits similar to those coming from America, nor is there any reason for any country to do so. The Bell Act and the Tydings War Damage Act are part and parcel of the program of our economic rehabilitation and reconstruction and are based upon the special relation between our two countries, a relationship sealed in the blood of heroes of both nationalities during the recent war.

The argument is made that Americans, backed by huge combinations of capital, by Wall Street, will run all Filipinos out of business, and that Filipinos will not be able, with their small capital accumulations, to compete. This argument is another emotional appeal which does not bear up under factual examination.

Some American capital is already here, selling American products in the Philippines, and buying Philippine products for the United States. There are American banks here. I have not noticed that they have driven any Filipinos out of business. And whether or not we reject the constitutional amendment does not affect the enterprise of these American firms one way or the other.

NO IMPERIALISM POSSIBLE

The really big accumulations of American capital are not especially interested in the natural resources of the Philippines. There is a very good reason for that. We have very few resources which are not present in much greater quantities in the United States. Our iron ore could not be mined for shipment to the United States. Our coal could not be dug for shipment to the United States. We raise no cotton here for American cotton mills. If American capital could be induced to come here for the development of those resources, it would be only on the basis of industries established here, steel and textile industries, not to supply factories and mills in the United States, but for the purpose of exporting to the Orient, and for the Philippine home market. Yet the very definition of imperialism is the exploitation of the resources of a small country to support the industry of a larger power. No such relationship is possible between the United States and the Philippines.

The big American companies come here to sell and not to buy. They will be unaffected by the parity amendment. The type of capital which we want to induce to come to the Philippines is productive capital for investment in manufacturing, processing, and producing. That kind of capital is small- and medium-sized capital and is almost invariably accompanied by technical skill and know-how, a technical skill and know-how which we in the Philippines largely lack. How many in this country could make nylon, or plastics, or machine tools, or cotton spindles, or even lipstick? Yet those are exactly the kinds of enterprises which we most urgently need in the Philippines; those enterprises are associated with the development of natural resources * * * of timber, iron, coal, and chemical ores. We should and must welcome Americans to help us develop such industries and undertakings.

We single out Americans, because we know and trust Americans, and because we have confidence that the American Government will not abuse the fact that American nationals are engaged in these enterprises here, and is primarily interested in the success of our democratic growth and expansion. We single out Americans, because Americans have the capital and have the know-how. There is no other nation in the world which represents such a happy combination to meet our requirements.

WE NEED TECHNICAL MEN

We want and need scientists, engineers, and technical men who, accompanied by capital for investment, would bring to the Philippines the know-how of the twentieth century, to help us decrease our dependence on hand labor and help us catch up with the rest of the world in technology and modern industrial and agricultural methods.

Is there any threat that Americans will acquire vast areas of our farm land? There is no such danger. In the first place, Americans do not go abroad for agricultural purposes. Their land is rich enough at home. Moreover, we have a law against the acquisition by any individual or corporation of any

agricultural area in excess of 1,024 hectares. We do not intend to repeal that law. We can even acquire any estates now in existence for distribution to the landless.

The argument is made that unless we exercise care we will become another Cuba, ruled from Wall Street. In the first place, Cuba, as Wall Street can well testify, has not for many years been ruled by American capital. Today it is freed from American capital. The same can be said of Mexico.

The American Government did not support the claims of the American oil companies when the Mexican Government expropriated their properties some years ago. The American Government merely insisted that American oil companies be paid a fair value for their properties. If American capital had not developed those oil fields, they would still be unexplored, and all the wealth and all the employment that have been brought to Mexico would have been foregone.

Who knows today, who can predict today, whether 10 years from now oil and coal will still be essential commodities? Atomic power may replace oil and coal as sources of energy. Shall we then leave whatever oil we may have and our other minerals untouched in the ground rather than develop them today with the help of American capital? I say "No, a thousand times no."

TRULY WORTH WHILE PATRIMONY

Let us use our natural wealth for the benefit of our people today, to build up our cities and develop our islands and build homes and roads and bridges and schools so that our children may have a truly worth while patrimony and not merely nominal title to vast jungles and undeveloped timber and mineral deposits. Let us not pass on to our children the job that we should do ourselves. Let us not shirk the duty which history imposes upon us. Let us show that same courage that animated our forefathers in their struggles for freedom and independence. But let us direct that courage today to the new war, rather than the old—the war against want, hunger, and insecurity.

I have closely examined the arguments made by those who oppose parity. They can be reduced to a single word—"fear"—fear of progress and fear of competition. They are afraid that we cannot hold our own against such Americans as may come here. They are afraid that we cannot measure up to the standards that will be raised here by American businessmen and experts. I have no such fear. I have full confidence in our people; I have full confidence in the ability of the Government of our people to protect our essential rights and to advance our essential interests. I have full confidence that Filipinos, given the training and the know-how, will be able to take advantage of the opportunities offered and to grow with the country in its steady forward march. But those who oppose this proposed amendment are not so confident. They are not so courageous. They are not so ambitious. They would rather have you live in a narrow agricultural economy, condemned forever to a life of toil, with carabao and hand-plow, feeding the tables of others and providing income for the very rich.

THE MISLEADERS

There are those among the opponents of parity who are quite content with the present economic structure. They are satisfied that this country should have a thin crust of wealth and luxury on top of a huge mass of poverty and social inequality. They are satisfied with conditions as they are.

And then there are others who are their allies in this issue. They are those of the extreme left, the supernationalists, the Communists, the demagogs and breast beaters. They would like to continue as the misleaders of the people, to prate about social injustice and do nothing about it, to recount the miseries of the poor and yet do nothing to relieve them, to describe the evils of capitalism and yet do nothing to make us all capitalists.

There is something in common between these two schools of thought. I have searched for a long time to find it, and it is this: Neither of them believes in free competition nor in true democracy. Neither of them believe in the development here of a strong home-owning, land-owning middle class. One group believes in a rule by an economic aristocracy; the other believes in a dictatorship by popular demagogs. Both groups have no use for democracy, for the great middle class, for free enterprise, for freedom, liberty, and the dignity of the individual. That is the basis for their alliance. One is a group that believes in rule by a monopoly of the wealthy; the other group believes in dictatorial rule by an oligarchy of political demagogs. Both distrust democracy and the common people. They see in parity a threat to their own selfish ambitions. One group would like the continuation of the status quo; the other group would like to reverse the status quo so that they themselves could have power. But neither group wishes to do anything to make this country grow and expand, to give economic and political equality to all the people, to make this Nation a prosperous, thriving, and free democracy.

VICIOUS ARGUMENTS

Among the arguments which are cited against parity is the one that we need not pay the price of parity in order to obtain war damages, and that since only the rich would receive war damages in excess of ₱1,000, the common people would suffer no injury in rejecting parity. This argument is so vicious that it must be answered. The United States Congress provided $400,000,000 for war damages to private individuals. But Congress stipulated explicitly that the first claim on war damage was to be held by the plain people of the Philippines by those who suffered no more than ₱1,000 in war damages. Was this a provision made by a Congress dominated by Wall Street? No, it was a provision aimed at helping the poor and the unfortunate. Yet it was the same Congress that enacted the parity provision. We know today that $400,000,000 will pay only a fraction of the actual war damages. The large claimants for war damages will receive but a small percentage of their claims. From the viewpoint of our national economic needs, I am not sure that this is a good provision because it would not insure the investment of this money in productive enterprise. But nevertheless it is part of the law. But if we reject parity, none of our large industries and enterprises can be rehabilitated. Sugar mills, coconut mills, and cordage factories will be unable to receive even a small down payment on the money they need to rehabilitate their enterprises. Is it a matter of disinterest to the Filipino people that these undertakings will be left destroyed and devastated? Is it not to our benefit to have our sugar industry and our coconut oil industry revived, so that they may employ our people and pay taxes to the Government? Regardless of what individuals may receive those payments, those payments will be paid in the Philippines for the rehabilitation of Philipine economy. That is another stipulation of the American law. It is short-sighted indeed, and vicious, to say that the Filipino people will lose nothing if these larger payments, which may represent only a small fraction of the whole, are not made. To those who would make such an argument, I advise you to turn a deaf ear. They are nothing but misleaders of the people. They do not have the interests of the Nation at heart.

UNLIMITED FUTURE

Let us think this matter out clearly. Let us put passion, prejudice, and fear behind us. Let us face boldly our unlimited future. Let us not echo the prophets of disaster who say that since we survived under the Japanese we can certainly survive today without the Americans. How many of us would like to return to those dark and evil days? Did we not think during those days that it would be better to die than to continue to live under those conditions? Did we not survive merely by clinging to the hope that America would return and would liberate us?

It is only some of the rich and the unprincipled who fared well under the Japanese. They are the very same people who today are urging you to defeat parity. Do not heed them; do not listen to them. They are the archangels of fear. They are the spokesmen of chaos. They are the adherents of the paganism of eternal poverty strife, and disorder. They are the extreme revolutionaries and the extreme reactionaries who basically distrust democracy. I know the Filipino people will not follow those voices.

There is no alternative to the approval of this amendment. Those who urge its rejection are either blind or recklessly irresponsible. Should this amendment be defeated, we face much more than the immediate loss of certain benefits and payments from the United States Government. That is only the smallest loss we will suffer. Our real loss, the real catastrophe would be the wreckage of the only possible plan we could have for the early rehabilitation and immediate development of our national potentialities. Science is on the march everywhere in the world. Every people is pressing forward to industrialize, to mechanize, to harness the natural elements through the machine, and to master the machine to serve man.

LONG STRIDES

At the same time the warning has been served, by horrible international example, that those people who give up freedom in order to permit the Government to take entirely the place of private enterprise end up as slaves of the machine which should serve them. There is no need to choose between the serfdom of backwardness and slavery to the state. We can guide and regulate private enterprise, and at the same time take long strides in the direction of social justice and well-being for all.

Approval of this amendment will clear the way for a forward surge toward our goals. We remain the masters of our destiny. We remain free men in a free land. We invite the assistance of those in whom we have confidence and who have the ability to help us. We share some of our potentialities in order that they may be transformed into the fruits of well-being for our people. Let us sow the land with loving labor that it may grow rich and fertile with use. The tangled undergrowth, the majestic waterfall, and the earth rich with minerals are miser's richness unless they are used to bring happiness to men. The people must have work and wages, opportunities for saving and the accumulation of wealth, education, and enlightenment, and all proper Government services. The people must also have freedom from want and from fear.

THE GLORIOUS FUTURE

Look up, my countrymen, and see the glorious future which beckons us. The

Philippines is destined to be a strong and prosperous nation. But we must strive to merit that destiny. The approval of parity is but a step on the long road to national well-being. But as one step follows another, the first must be taken. We can make of the Philippines the glory and the pride of democratic people throughout the earth. And we may thus pass on to our children and the generations which will come after them the priceless patrimony of a rich and prosperous nation, dedicated to freedom and consecrated to the proposition that opportunity is the privilege of all Filipinos. Let us strive to be able to say that we of our generation discharged in our day the responsibility of our times and did not hesitate to act in the best conscience, with the guidance of Almighty God, in the best interests of our noble people.

As an illustration of the type of campaign which was waged against the trade bill and the proposed amendment in the Philippines and which campaign of opposition evidently was dominated by Communist agents, I introduce at this point a clipping from the Liberty News of Manila under date of March 7, 1947:

BETRAYAL

March 11, the day of the great sell-out, is fast approaching. To many who naively believe that the plebiscite will be clean, March 11 is the day of the great show-down. To JASPER BELL and gang, it means the day of the great shake-down. And it is typical of the way this Government serves the interest of the people it represents that it has decorated the ineffable Mr. BELL with the Philippines' highest award for the gift of that economic strait-jacket which bears his name.

In a way, Mr. BELL's recent blunt statement of "Take it or else" serves a good and wholesome purpose. We have had enough of double dealing and double talk, of duplicity and deceit, and this conspiracy to undermine our promised freedom and independence for which we have already given up so much in property and lives and for a travesty of which we are now asked to give up more, should do away, once and for all, with all that horse manure that America loves us so much she wants to help us without getting anything in return except the satisfaction of having done a good and noble deed.

The Philippine press was right when it pointed out that with this piece of legislation, the United States of America has crowned its crusade to rescue the peoples of Asia from Japanese enslavement and deliver them to a handful of American businessmen, and that if we are not rendered speechless with gratitude at this monumental event, it is only because we are—unfortunately—not American businessmen. We are just Filipinos—a nation of —— —— thieves—a race of beggars always trying to get something out of Uncle Sam. We are not Americans—liberal, generous, big-hearted.

In the last war, we sold the blood of our people—good Filipino blood—and we sold it for what? For freedom? For democracy? Certainly not, and if you disagree with me regarding the usefulness of that sacrifice, please examine carefully the provisions of the Bell Trade Relations Act—the instrument by which America, we are piously told, proposes to reward and help the Filipinos for their unswerving loyalty to the American flag.

For the dubious temporary advantages of reciprocal free trade between the Philippines and the United States—a relation from which, in the words of honest American Congressmen, Americans stand more to benefit—we are required to change the fundamental law of the land so as to permit American business to help itself to all our natural resources, agricultural, forest, and mineral. Armed with unlimited capital, in 28 years, under the provisions of the Bell Act, American businessmen should be owning all the industries, plantations, and mines in the islands. And in another crisis such as 1941, Filipinos will be asked to risk life and limb in the defense of these industries, plantations, and mines—all owned by Americans. That will be lovely, that will be beautiful. I hope I am no longer around to see it. When that happens and my son, filled with a miserable and futile heroism, shoulders a rifle and gaily goes to war, I'll reach out from the grave and bat his —— —— ears off. One sucker in the family is plenty.

For trying to get a few oil concessions from Iran, Russia was given the bum's rush in the United Nations. With finger quivering in holy indignation, England and the United States of America pointed at Russia as a most pernicious example of a big power bullying a small one. Through the Bell Trade Act, the United States expects to get everything it can lay its hands on, but what is to be condemned in the case of Russia is to be commended in the case of the United States. The United States is only trying to help us, we are told.

There are times when I begin to wonder what in hell did we fight the last war for.

This country has been devastated, its best blood spilled, its commerce and industry and agriculture paralyzed, its homes destroyed—and all for what? Filipinos died in Bataan by the thousands, they died during the death march, in filthy concentration camps; they died in towns and cities that were leveled to the ground by American and Japanese guns and bombs. They died in mass executions, in lonely trails in the hills, and they died in the dungeons of Fort Santiago, living out their numbered days in torment—and for what?

Of course we have the choice, and in the final analysis, when parity is approved—and it will be approved—the blame rests with us. We permitted certain men who betrayed us to the Japs to assume the reins of government once more, and these same men, conniving with some Americans who deny the creed by which their country swears, are today maneuvering quite openly and actively for the betrayal of a whole nation that had thunderingly repudiated the treacherous and dishonorable policies for which they stood during the Japanese occupation.

How To Meet Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered in the Catholic Hour on February 23, 1947, by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, of the Catholic University of America:

HOW TO MEET COMMUNISM

There is much misunderstanding concerning what a nation and a people should do to combat communism. Immediately there comes to mind three ways in which it should not be done.

1. By vituperation, name-calling, and hate. Communism is an ideology and as such is intrinsically wicked, but Communists are persons, made to the image and likeness of God, and therefore should be subjects of our kindness and charity, that we may prove ourselves worthy children of the heavenly Father.

2. Communism should not be attacked on the grounds that it is opposed to the liberal monopolistic capitalism, because from an economic point of view alone, neither system is satisfying.

3. We are not to meet communism on the false assumption that if economic conditions were bettered that we would do away with communism. Communism is not just an economic doctrine; it is a philosophy of life. Conditions were very good in the Garden of Eden, but Lucifer started his revolt there.

This brings us to some positive ways of meeting communism.

1. Politically: Communism can be met politically by choosing candidates in elections not on the basis of parties, not on the basis of class, but on their own moral worth, whether a candidate is a husband of one wife, whether he says his prayers, whether he follows a party line dictated from abroad, whether he believes we ought to live up to the Atlantic Charter, and whether he believes with Washington that religion and morality were essential for national life. A nation always gets the kind of politicians it deserves. When our standards are different, our legislation will be different. So long as the decent people refuse to believe that faith must manifest itself in every sphere of human activity, including the political, they will not meet the challenge of Marxian. If a time ever comes when the religious Jews, Protestants, and Catholics ever have to suffer under a totalitarian state, which will deny them the right to worship God according to the light of their conscience, it will be because for years they thought it made no difference what kind of people represented them in Congress, and because they never opposed the spiritual truth to the materialist lie. St. Paul said: "Woe is me if I preach not gospel." (I Corinthians, 9: 16.) and woe unto us if the believing element in our country do not allow their belief in God and morality to seep down into their action in the polling booths. The first effective campaign against communism is to wage war against our temptation to abandon the spiritual in the realm of the political. Nothing can do men of good will more harm than apparent compromises with parties that subscribe to antimoral and antidemocratic and anti-God forces. We must have the courage to detach our support from men who are doing evil. We must bear them no hatred, but we must break with them.

2. Economic: The economic way to wreck communism is to make capitalists out of workers by a wide diffusion of private property. Before suggesting how this can be done a word about the morality of property is necessary.

It used to be when property was real rather than financial as it is today, that the right to property was inseparable from responsibility. A man owned a horse; he could show a title to it; he could say "it is mine." But the responsibility for the horse was also his. If the horse trampled the neighbor's garden, he had to remunerate the neighbor. But because he owned, controlled and managed the horse, he was also entitled to 100 percent of the profits from the horse.

With the development of finance those two things which were meant to be joined, namely

ownership and responsibility, became separated. Today those who own do not control or manage, and those who manage, do not own. The stockholders are distinct from the management. Since the owners or stockholders have surrendered responsibility to management, they have given up one of the essential notes of property, and hence one of the titles to profits. But the owners or stockholders claim all the profits though they have surrendered 30 percent of the title, namely responsibility. The stockholders are only the passive creators of wealth; the active creators are the workers. For that reason, there should be a modification of the wage system so as to give the worker a share in the profits, management and ownership in the industry wherein he works.

Much of the tension that exists in the economic order today is between the stockholders who do not work and labor which does. There is no doubt as to which has the clearer title to profits; certainly the man who clips coupons and sends in his postcard for a vote by proxy to the corporation is less entitled to the profits of the industry than those who helped create the wealth and the profits. It might be a good idea to do away with stocks altogether in industry unless they were owned only by those who work in the industry. If there were no stockholders in industry except those owned by the employees (bonds caring for loans) then ownership and labor would coalesce. The stocks which are now held by nonworkers could then be replaced by bonds, in which those who had money to loan to industry would be allotted a fixed rate of interest but no share whatever in the wealth someone else's labor helped to create. The man who keeps his stock in a safety vault has less claim to the fruits of industry than the worker who wipes sweat from his brow at the end of a day.

It is wrong for capitalism to claim all the profits as it is wrong for the Communists to claim that the State should have all the profits. Neither side must be excluded from sharing in the profits. By the same token, workers in industry should refuse to accept labor leaders who themselves do not work.

Profit sharing should not be in the shape of a bonus at Christmas, which is paternalistic: It should be a normal and legitimate feature of the contract of employment which will make the worker feel more like a partner than a servant. This dignifying of the worker has been inhibited generally in two ways, by the slowness of capitalists to perceive its merit before the Government began taking excess profits to pour through bureaucracies in which neither capital or labor share. Also, by a lack of statesmenship on the part of labor leaders who constantly demand more and more and more, which may kill the goose that laid the capitalistic egg, instead of seeking for the more flexible, realistic, and sounder principle of participation in earnings.

The advantages of this system are many. It would make class struggle which Communism tries to incite, irrelevant. A man is willing to sit down on someone else's tools but he is not willing to sit down on his own. The way to make labor interested in capital is to give labor some capital to defend. Secondly, there would be a greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men will work harder and more readily when they labor on that which is their own. Thirdly, it would make men less suspectible to foreign ideologies and wild promises of revolutionaries, for no man would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own land afforded him the means of living a tolerable and happy life. Fourth, it is the intelligent answer to the Communists who want to break up capitalism: This solution is in favor of breaking it down. Instead of concentrating wealth in the hands of a state administered by a few bureaucrats, the humane way is to distribute that wealth to those who create it.

Communism advocates giving all productive property to a dictator; Christians advocate giving it to the workers. The Communist solution is putting all the eggs into the hands of a dictator cook, who makes an omelet which is bound to be unsatisfying because not all the people like omelets, and some do not like the way the dictator cook prepares them anyway. The capitalist solution is to distribute the hens so that every man can cook his eggs the way he likes them, and even eat them raw if that is his definition of freedom. By distributing a wide mass of property owners throughout a country with their scattered powers, privileges and responsibilities, one creates the greatest resistance in the world to tyranny either political or economic, for just as a man is on the inside because he can call his soul his own, so he begins to be free on the outside, because he can call things his own. Then property becomes what it was always intended to be, the economic guarantee of human liberty. Deprive a man of his right to fashion things according to his own will, and you deprive him of the social basis of his freedom.

3. Moral: Another way to meet communism would be by the appointment of chaplains in industry from each of the three faiths. By chaplains we do not mean, and here I speak only concerning Catholics, what might be called labor priests; i. e., those who are interested primarily in defending the rights of labor, though there is greater need of defending them than any other group. There is no reason why there should be labor priests any more than capital priests. No class is always and universally right, simply because it is a class. There may be more injustice on one side rather than another, and it certainly has been true that up to the recent past, the majority of injustices were to be charged against capital. But the function of a chaplain would be something like that which he exercised in the Army. He was not the private's chaplain, nor the commissioned officer's chaplain, he was rather the mediator of the two, always operating in the interests of the Army, its order, and its decency. There is no escaping from the fact that once the individual enters into a new human relationship, and one at which he spends most of his waking day, almost his entire week, there is a specific need of ministering to him in that relationship, and not apart from it.

In order that the chaplain might better operate within an industrial group, he should build a church immediately near the factory wherein labor and management, capital and labor, could assist at morning mass, and learn that all who eat one bread are one body. If men would get down on their knees together there would be less need of using fists against one another. But his functions would go beyond the factory church. As the Army camps assign a chaplain an office within the Army camp, so, too, the industry should assign quarters for a chaplain in which he may be freely consulted at all times by both labor and management, for there is no reason why the iron gates of a factory should prevent the modern worker from enjoying what the village blacksmith used to enjoy—accessibility to his priest, his minister, or his rabbi.

In due time the chaplain could establish factory reading rooms, discussion clubs, and even organize factory worship where the minor hates of the working hours could be dissolved in the reminder that all men are brothers, because God is their Father. The supreme advantage of these and other functions of the chaplain would be that men would be organized on a different basis than the competitive one. Communism thrives only by intensifying hatred, opposition, tension, and struggle between a group which buys labor and one which sells it. The value of chaplains in industry would be the organization of men on a noncompetitive or spiritual basis. When the time came to elect labor leaders from the industry, the Communists who thrive in vociferous minorities would find themselves stalemated and checked by those who came out in great numbers, not to pass a resolution favoring Russia's confiscation of Lithuania or Poland, but to insist on the preservation of basic human rights derived from a sovereign God and recognized by a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

4. Education: Another way to meet communism, would be to utilize our schools for adult education. Catholics have to pay for their own schools in addition to paying taxes for public schools. This is done to insure the teaching of religion to the young—and therefore to preserve the moral foundation of our country—a contribution to national well-being which few recognize. These schools are in operation only about 6 hours a day, most of them closing at 3 in the afternoon. It would seem in the present crisis advisable to use the later afternoon and evening hours for adult education. Courses could be given to adults by priests in the diocese, by lawyers and doctors and professional men, but where no tuition would ever be paid, where no teacher would receive any other remuneration than the blessing of God. Among many subjects taught there would be courses in religion, the training of labor leaders, marriage, and property, and also the philosophy of peace. Such adult education would treat religion not in a private way which would result in the pre-empting of the social order by anti-religious forces, but as the lever of society. Our people would learn that the alternative between right and left, is not the same as right and wrong, that social conscience need not make cowards of us all, and that we have to go left to impress our social contemporaries; that it is well not to get behind social movements, but in front of them. But above all else there will be the teaching of religion where people will not only give an orthodox assent to the creed, but will have their heads, hands, heart, and soul so suffused with divine grace that the world will become better because their lives are better.

5. Spiritual: Communism has an appeal to two classes; the simple who believe that communism is interested in the economically disinherited. This appeal does not last long when they come to know either the philosophy of communism or its actual practice, the diffusion of chaos created by a dictatorship over the proletariat. They then reject it as opposed to right, reason, and decency. That is why the Communist Party has such a rapid turn-over, reaching as high as 40 percent within a few years. At one time, those who liked the Nazis joined because the Soviets made a treaty with them to start the war. Then when the Soviets break with the Nazis, the first group leaves and another joins. As knowledge grows among men of good will, communism becomes less satisfying. The second class to which communism appeals are the frustrated, the disillusioned; they gravitate toward it naturally where they can find corporate expression for their pent-up animosities and damned up hates. Toward these deluded people there must be on our part a recognition of their good instincts; their passion for social justice. Deluded though

they are, they are nevertheless unconscious and involuntary instruments of the Holy Spirit. Our task must be to educate them, for their attachment to communism grows in ignorance, and will decrease with education. We must show them that their basic craving for community and social amelioration are better served within the framework of democracy and the fellowship of a redeemed society where reigns the spirit of love sent to us by the Father and Son.

By far the greater appeal of communism is to the disillusioned and the frustrated. The majority of those who follow communism do so not because they are convinced that it is right, but because there is some wrong they want to despise. In every Communist there is a hidden hate against something or somebody. Those who feel individually important to vent their hate upon a person, or a class, or an institution, feel that if they joined communism they could find a corporate expression for their pent-up animosities and their dammed-up hate. Something of this psychology is present in those who love gangster pictures or any movies where there is killing and violence. Through them they find an outlet for their own subconscious hatred; there is at least some satisfaction in seeing it exercised vicariously.

The appeal of communism is not in its theory except to a man who has no rational judgments; it is rather in its hates. That is why communism always has to have a devil, and the first argument every Communist uses, is to incite your contempt of his devil or yours, whether it is fascism—which is never defined—or capitalism, or democracy, or anything you please. A man who is the husband of one wife and is refused permission by the church, to marry a second or a fifth time, is always a potential member of the Communist Party, because through it he can vent his spleen against religion which irritated his conscience. The more he subconsciously feels the wrong he has done, the more violent will be his opposition to religion. That is why the greatest persecutors of religion are those who have been baptized. "The corruption of the best is the worst." Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, and Marx were all baptized and fell away.

When communion reaches a stage where its persecutors no longer have Italian mothers and Polish fathers who are both good Christians, but where they have had only parents who heard about dialectical materialism, their hatred of religion will decrease. Never having lost as much as the older generation, they will be less angry at themselves for having surrendered it.

In the same connection, those who started out with a great lust for wealth and never achieved it, or who became frustrated capitalists will join the Communist Party to get even with capitalists whose wealth they envy and which they now want to possess by expropriation. Those who have felt the sting of uncharitable fellowmen who made fun of their race or color, and refuse to give them the hand of fellowship are also likely material for communism, not because communism can give them recognition, which it does not in practice, but only because they get a chance to get even with these who were unkind. Those, too, who have never been able to think clearly, and who have by much reading and little thinking taken more than they can digest, flock to communism where they will have to do no thinking whatever, but where their very obedience to a dictator will give them the illusion of power. Because they became disillusioned with their freedom which produced chaos in their souls, they looked for a dictatorship outside themselves to organize their chaos. Because they lost the power of self-regulation from within, they sought an imposed regulation from without; because they lost the goal of existence, and the purpose of life, they invited a tyranny to impose a goal and dictate a purpose; because they were isolated from their fellowman, they sought a restoration into a community not on the basis of spirit and love, but matter and force.

The supreme advantage of all these hates is that they enable the frustrated and the disillusioned to combine the strongest social affirmation with the most contemptuous disregard for personal betterment. They could not become Christians—which in their hearts they want—because Christianity would demand personal righteousness, but in communism they can have a seeming sense of righteousness and justice by hating the wrongs of others without any obligation to better their own individual lives. If those who know communism want to effectively combat it, they must start with the assumption that these frustrated and disillusioned individuals are not perhaps so far from the Kingdom of God as it would seem. In fact they are probably much closer than the indifferent who have neither hates nor loves. The charges those frustrated souls bring against society are very often justified, but in their zeal to cure the baby of whooping cough they accepted the solution of cutting off its head. Once they come to see that what they hate is sin, and not a method of production, and what they are seeking is God and not their only miserable atheism in which each one makes himself a god and me an atheist, they are at the very door of that peace that only Christ can open to them.

We must, therefore, always make a distinction between the ideology and the person, between communism and Communists; communism is to be hated as a doctor hates pneumonia in his sick child; but the Communists are potential children of God and must be loved as the sick child is loved. A Christian who starts with the assumption that they ought to be annihilated or sent to concentration camps—which indeed they would do to us—is not worthy of the name of Christ. We are to seek not their extinction, but their transfiguration. Does God hate us because we are sinners, then shall we hate them for being a particular kind of a sinner? Was not Paul in the early church a greater persecutor of religion than Tito or Stalin or Hitler? There must have been thousands of Christians who in their thoughts hoped that God would send a coronary thrombosis to Paul to take him out of this life. Prayers were multiplied before God to send someone to answer that fiery and zealous enemy. Would that heaven would send someone to answer Paul. Well, God heard their prayers, and He sent Paul to answer Paul. God's power is more manifested in the conversion than in destruction, for He knows that the bitterest enemies make the best saints, and not those weak-minded brothers and sisters who hate communism when the editorials condemn, and love it when national picture weeklies carry articles glorifying a dictator. Rome was the greatest persecutor of religion up until Russia in modern times, but Rome became the center of Christianity. What is to prevent God from transfiguring Russia so that from it one day will radiate a light to renew faith in Europe and give it to Asia.

Communists will never be brought to the democratic or the Christian way of life by argument, because communism is antirational. But they will be brought to both by kindness, prayer, and charity. Some years ago one of the Communist newspapers wrote a series of articles against me. What would you do, challenge the editor to a duel?—you would not, given my physique, and then I was a Christian. So I invited the editor to dinner. The first thing he said was "What we have against you is that you refuse to admit Russia is a democracy." I said: "How can it be a democracy in the light of article 125 of the Soviet Constitution?" He said: "What is article 125 of the Soviet Constitution?" "My good man," I said, "I did not invite you here to talk communism. I invited you to talk about your soul." And talk about it I did for an hour. Nine years passed in which there was a prayer every day for that man. He now no longer has to worry about following the party line. He is now a free man * * * His name is Louis Budenz.

We Catholics pray for Communists every day at the end of the mass. How about joining us and saying a prayer for Stalin?

Wise and Moderate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Friday, March 14, 1947:

WISE AND MODERATE

Senator IVES has introduced a bill to amend the Wagner Act which it seems to us gets down close to brass tacks. After all, it is on the foundation of this law that organized labor in the last decade has built its top-heavy empire, and without this law's revision there can be little hope of reducing that empire within the bounds of reason and public welfare. And it is interesting and significant that Mr. IVES should take the lead in the project.

As a member of our own State legislature he became a profound student of the labor movement and of legislation affecting it and made an enviable reputation as the author of much remedial law, none of it repressive. As a Member of the United States Senate and of its Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which Senator TAFT is chairman, he has been regarded as a make-weight between the extremists, possibly holding the deciding vote in the committee. So now he has come forth with a moderate measure which makes a great deal of sense.

In place, for instance, of prohibiting the closed shop, as advocated by Senator BALL, he would permit employers to refuse to bargain on the issue without exposing themselves to charges of unfair labor practice. And instead of prohibiting industry-wide bargaining he would prevent labor from forcing it by refusing to negotiate with the employer's designated representative. Other reforms in his bill would affirm in the law itself the right of an employer to discuss matters of mutual interest with his employees and to petition the National Labor Relations Board for an employee election. (These rights have been acknowledged for some time by the Board but still depend on an administrative ruling.) But most important of all, perhaps, are his provisions specifying unfair labor practices by unions and outlawing jurisdictional strikes. The Ives bill would go far to right the balance of the Wagner Act.

The Senator has made two other proposals, one to create a Federal mediation agency under an administrator to take over the

functions of the United States Conciliation Service, and the other to establish a joint congressional committee to study management-labor relations. Coming from Mr. Ives, and especially after conclusion of the voluminous testimony before the Senate committee, we are inclined to abide by his judgment on these points, too.

Amendments to Natural Gas Act

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been much disturbed by the current gas shortage in the Sixteenth Congressional District and throughout the State of Ohio, as well as other parts of the country. It is most discouraging to see this same gas shortage occur year after year, resulting in the laying off of thousands of workers in the various industrial plants and the serious curtailment of production.

In an effort to assure an adequate and continuous supply of natural gas for the people of Ohio and other parts of the country, I have introduced H. R. 2235 to amend in several particulars the Natural Gas Act.

In the introduction of this bill it was a pleasure to join with my colleagues Representatives RIZLEY, of Oklahoma, and DAVIS of Tennessee, and Senators MOORE, of Oklahoma, and FERGUSON, of Michigan.

Shortly after the introduction of this bill the Federal Power Commission issued a report and press release disclaiming authority of the FPC over the production and gathering of natural gas. Such disclaimer would not have been necessary had the Commission followed the clear intent of Congress as expressed in the Natural Gas Act. Production and gathering of gas in the field of its origin have always been recognized by Congress as matters for the States to regulate. They are inseparable from the conservation of oil and gas and that has always been held to be a State matter.

If there is any logic to the FPC staff report, I feel that it points directly to the need for one of the provisions contained in the bill which the other Members of Congress and I have introduced—namely, the provision specifically excluding from FPC jurisdiction the production and gathering activities and sales of natural gas. There is much to question, however, about the logic of the report.

The staff report first categorically admits that Congress never intended that the FPC have jurisdiction over these activities, but at the same time reveals that the Commission has in the past reached out and taken that jurisdiction in questionable cases. It says that the situation could be clarified better by administrative action of the FPC than by legislative action, and then admits that under any circumstance one could not tell how far the FPC would go in excluding production and gathering from its jurisdiction since it says that definitive standards could not be specified in advance of a study of the facts in each individual case. Who do they think would be satisfied by any such proposition? Those who sell their gas to the interstate pipe lines still would not know whether the FPC would try to take jurisdiction over them.

A reading of this FPC document confirms in my mind the fact that Congress must specifically define the area in which the FPC may operate. My bill clearly sets those limits and would let the Congress, the FPC and the affected producers know exactly where they stood. Obviously, the FPC either is not capable of defining these standards or else it refuses to do so. This is one of the best reasons I can think of why this provision of my bill should be adopted.

Let us assume for the moment that the present members of the FPC understand this matter thoroughly and will seek to carry out the act as Congress originally intended that they should. Who knows with any certainty how long these members will continue to serve, and with another set of commissioners might it not be that the new members may reverse the administrative policy to which the present members have agreed? This would not be new, for it happened some years ago when, in an electric company case, one set of FPC commissioners reversed the administrative policy set up by a previous set of commissioners.

If these present members of the Commission are agreed, as the report indicates, that the FPC is not authorized to take jurisdiction over production and gathering then they should have no objection whatever to having that plainly written in the law.

It appears to me that the FPC, like the numerous other agencies which have been for many years interpreting the laws of Congress in such a way as to give them the broadest possible power without restraint, merely wants to head off legislative action that would curb its power. For when the Interstate case was in the Fifth Circuit Court the FPC had a perfect opportunity to acknowledge its limitations with respect to production and gathering, but it refused to accept this opportunity. One of the judges asked the general counsel for FPC if it were not true that if his line of reasoning were carried out to its logical conclusion it would mean that the FPC could take jurisdiction over the operator of every oil or gas well the gas from which was destined for interstate commerce. The FPC counsel refused to answer this question.

The FPC sought this broad authority so that it could be in a position to take under its jurisdiction any oil or gas operator it felt it wanted to.

It has been successful in having its position upheld in the courts thus far. Thus, I raise this question: Since the law, under the Interstate ruling, is that the FPC has jurisdiction over the operator of every well the gas from which is destined for interstate commerce, why doesn't it enforce the law?

The Commission is now in this position: It must either enforce the law and bring all of these operators in under its jurisdiction or it is guilty of ignoring the law. If it should try to enforce the law, it would find Congress would do something about that. If it ignores the law, that is, just picks out certain particular operators it wants to bring under its jurisdiction and lets the others go, then it is guilty of discrimination, and I know Congress would not stand for that, either.

There is only one proper answer to all of this confusion: Let Congress write into law the standards and make sure the FPC carries out the congressional mandate. I and those who joined me in introducing the amendments to the Natural Gas Act recently propose to do just that. The confusion and the uncertainty among oil and gas producers, State officials, consumers, and gas companies was created by the FPC, which now asks to be trusted to cure its mistakes and willful deviations from the law. It is the familiar plea of an administrative agency for unchanneled authority—for government by men instead of government by law.

Many of the laws which have been passed by Congress would not have been nearly so destructive had it not been for the many interpretations placed on them by administrative agencies, Executive orders and decisions by boards who do not come under the regular jurisdiction of courts of law. All this I am determined to correct if at all possible.

Briefly, this bill contains these general provisions:

First. To prevent the FPC from controlling, directly or indirectly, the end use of natural gas.

Second. To prevent the FPC from taking jurisdiction, directly or indirectly, over direct industrial sales.

Third. To prevent the FPC from taking jurisdiction, directly or indirectly, over production and gathering activities.

Fourth. To prevent the FPC from taking jurisdiction, directly or indirectly, over the activities of local distributing companies.

Fifth. To eliminate the compulsory original cost depreciated method and substitute the field price method, in determining operating costs, for rate-making purposes. An option would allow any company so desiring to elect to use the original cost depreciated method.

Sixth. To compel the FPC to allocate costs properly between jurisdictional and nonjurisdictional classes of properties, revenues, and expenses, in determining rates.

Seventh. To compel the FPC to expedite action on applications for certificates of convenience and necessity.

Broadly, the bill would:

First. Assure the royalty owner and producer adequate markets for their gas.

Second. Assure those selling gas to interstate pipe lines freedom from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction and control.

Third. Assure consumers plentiful and continuous supplies of gas for whatever uses they desire to make of it.

Fourth. Assure local distributors freedom from Federal regulation and control.

Fifth. Assure the interstate transporters freedom to provide, under proper Federal regulation, adequate facilities to properly meet the demands of the expanding markets and reduce the time and burdens of certificate proceedings now imposed upon them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If they would develop the water power on the Ohio River, it would take care of some of that situation.

Mr. CARSON. I will be glad to assist in that, too, or do anything I could to prevent serious curtailment of our production, which results in idleness of thousands of our fine working men and women in the great State of Ohio.

Hearings on these bills will begin before my committee—Interstate and Foreign Commerce—on April 14. Many notable witnesses will appear, as the natural-gas industry now serves an area with a population of over 40,000,000 people in 33 States.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT NODAR, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. NODAR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement made by Mr. Max H. Sorensen, national commander of the Catholic War Veterans, at this veterans' organization headquarters in New York, on March 19, 1947, giving the views of this organization on the subject of communism:

I am an American by choice, an American by personal conviction, and I cherish our Constitution and Bill of Rights, and the privileges guaranteed therein, to me and my fellow Americans.

We of the Catholic War Veterans have no personal animosity toward individual Communists, but, we are opposed to the un-American ideology of the Soviet Union and its many satellites. We declare communism to be the enemy of true democracy and all religion, the outspoken foe of all freedom, and in fact headquarters of the greatest slave mart in the history of the world.

Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach and others in recent days have announced their opposition to participation, on the American scene, of the Communist Party, in our political life.

Seven years ago the Catholic War Veterans called upon Members of the House and Senate, the Governors of the 48 States, and the American people at large to adopt a similar program. At that time, June 12, 1940, CWV sounded the call urging all free Americans, proud of their heritage, to join with us in opposing the farce of extending recognition to a political party, which looked over its shoulder to the Kremlin for its policies and guidance. Loudly we pointed to the insidious betrayal by sneak "fifth columnists" of nations like Finland, Holland, and Belgium.

At the same time we spoke sharply of the dangers of subversive agents who would overthrow our Government and by subtle means spread hate through discrimination because of race, creed, or color; to the end we suggested that more vigorous measures be adopted within the scope of the Bill of Rights of our Constitution, to curtail those so inclined.

We openly, and widely, advocated the following four points:

1. That a relentless fight be waged against communism and its disastrous consequences.

2. That the immigration laws be effectively enforced so as to prevent Communists from entering this country, and that all noncitizen Communists be deported.

3. That all members of the Communist Party be removed from public office.

4. That the Communist Party be officially outlawed and refused recognition as a political party.

Last summer while visiting Europe I made it a special point to talk to the man in the street, the fellow who works for a living. Without exception the story from all was the same—they looked to the United States for leadership—yet they feared that we, as a nation, were being taken in by the cunning politicians of the Soviet Government, the international headquarters of communism.

With fear in whispered voice and eye, they told of dread things that would happen to them and their neighbors were the Communists to succeed in gaining power. They warned us of the deadly effectiveness of the fifth column, and told of the renewed activities of the Communists. Everywhere we saw evidence of the boldness of the Communist approach. We saw them hard at work trying to upset rehabilitation, to spread discord, to enable the Kremlin to set up a government that would bend to its evil will the best interests of the once great nations of Europe.

Vicious black markets and inflation rings were making the lot of the little fellows more bitter each day, softening them up for the approach of the Communist agent, with the promise of Utopia under communism. At every turn we learned from the same little fellows that the one Nation in whom they had explicit trust was the United States, this while the agents of the Soviet Union worked feverishly to discredit the victory of our arms, our supplies, our clothing, ou food, and medicine sent to the undernourished of Europe.

We of the Catholic War Veterans contend that communism, in its every approach, is in direct opposition to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights of the United States. The masters of the Kremlin, as true followers of Karl Marx, are positively committed to world revolution, to destroy all democracy and all religion, the while giving them lip service. We again, 7 years later, call on the people of the United States to join with us, regardless of race, creed, or color, in a sincere determination to preserve our God-given heritage to the end communism be outlawed here.

When a man or woman takes the oath of allegiance to the United States, in exchange for the protection and enjoyment of our freedcms, we have the right to insist that no spoken or mental reservation be permitted. Unless that pledge of allegiance comes from the heart without reservation, that individual is un-American, his pledge is hollow and meaningless. The members of the Communist Party certainly cannot qualify, for they are in fact agents of a foreign power that is dedicated to overthrow our democracy and our established freedoms of press, assembly, speech, and religion. When Communists hold American citizenship they utilize it for personal protection while planning, plotting, and working for the absolute destruction of our Government, and merely give lip service to the freedoms all loyal Americans hold sacred.

We of the Catholic War Veterans submit that all members of the Communist Party and all active stooges of party-line front groups should be registered as the agents of a foreign power, for their first, their basic loyalty, does not lie in the best interests of the United States.

World Federation of Trade Unions Mission to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jonathan Stout in the New Leader for March 15, 1947:

Despite the renewed hope, however, there are still dispiriting developments in Washington. One of them came to light this week when War Secretary Patterson overruled General MacArthur and O. K.'d the sending of a WFTU (World Federation of Trade Unions) mission to Japan.

Despite the adherence of the CIO and the British trade unions to the WFTU, no realistic person doubts that the WFTU is the 1947 version of the 1930 Profintern (Red International of Trade Unions with headquarters in Moscow).

At a time when Russian expansionism is whipping up its Communist agents in the Far East to fevered activities, it seems an incredible stupidity that the wise order of General MacArthur barring the WFTU mission from Japan should be overruled by Republican War Secretary Patterson.

So far as I have been able to discover, Patterson has not the vaguest inclination toward the Communists. Yet, to my knowledge, this is the second time he has permitted himself to be an instrument in assisting the Communists in an important matter.

The first occasion came to my attention just before the election campaign of 1944 when I discovered that a leading Communist had been appointed to a high official position on the United States delegation to the Bretton Woods conference (to which the Soviet Union refused to send delegates).

In the course of investigating the matter I learned that it had been the personal endorsement of War Secretary Patterson which was responsible for the appointment of this Communist. I therefore pursued the inquiry to the War Department.

At the War Department I was officially informed that Patterson knew nothing about this Communist, but had written the letter of endorsement at the request of the White House.

I was shown the letter from the White House asking Patterson to make the endorsement. The White House letter was signed by Lauchlin Currie, at that time one of Mr. Roosevelt's secretaries "with a passion for anonymity."

From Currie's letter one might have inferred reasonably that Currie was merely the go-between in passing the request along. Or it might have left one wondering whether it was not Currie's own iea. It was weaselworded in just about that way.

I took the matter to the White House for an explanation. I got no explanation, only the assurance that things like this made Currie more of a liability than he was worth and that the White House was going to ease him out.

What pressure prevailed upon Patterson this time to shoehorn a pro-Soviet mission into Japan over MacArthur's objections remains as yet unanswered.

Air Power and Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I made at a conference of the American Legion in Indianapolis, Ind., on March 20, 1940:

I appreciate the invitation to speak at this conference. There are many men here who, by training and experience, are better qualified to speak on the technical and professional phases of problems to be discussed here. However, being on the Armed Services Committee of this Congress and having been a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House for 4 years, I have participated in numerous hearings on the problems of national security. From those hearings, including the hearings on the atomic power control bill, I have learned a great deal.

It seems to me that the word "preparedness" should be dropped. It implies that we are preparing for a war and that, sub rosa, we consider another war inevitable. I have not yet given up hope that the world may be restored to a community of law and order without another war. The term national security is a broader and more comprehensive term. National security implies that we are seeking security against war and other types of activity that tend to degrade men, impoverish them, and enslave them. It is a constructive approach, rather than merely a defensive approach.

To me, one of the great problems confronting our military, in which Congressmen can play a very constructive part, is to get across to our people that our efforts and sacrifices for national security are made primarily to prevent wars. That objective was stated as our main mission while the last two wars were being fought. If the people understand that the military men are not really anxious to have war, they will give a more receptive ear to the program of the War and Navy Departments. Many people labor under the impression that the leaders in our military establishments really want war. Because wars give them more power, greater rank, and enlarged responsibility, some people think that the officers of the Army and Navy look forward to a war so they can really demonstrate what great men they are. I know that this is a false premise. Our Army and Navy officers do not want a war any more than a policeman or a fireman wants crime and fires so they can show their skill in solving crime and extinguishing fire.

If our people can once understand that the great military establishment is really dedicated to and essential to preventing war, they will give it more support. I have found that our people are greatly interested in the problem of security. They like to be told how what we are doing in the War and Navy Departments, is helping or hurting our drive toward world peace. They like to know about some of the realistic thinking that our military leaders must indulge in to help us shape our policy so it will prevent war and, if it should come, how they can insure a victory. Consequently I think that these kinds of conferences may be helpful in getting to the American at the grassroots, who pays the bills and also fights the wars, the fundamental understanding that he must have to produce the appropriate reflection through our public officials to get real security for us and our posterity.

The basic concept that we should start with is that basically and fundamentally the purpose of our security system, and its component parts, is to bring us lasting peoce. In the shadow of the great war which we have just fought and in the face of the deadly and staggering realization that the dropping of the atom bomb brought to us in the closing days of the war, we should be in a position to think realistically about our security problems. At this particular time we have a constituency that is receptive to plans, even if it contemplates great expense for military activity, that will bring final peace.

When we consider the loss of 325,000 lives, the maiming and wounding of over a million more, the disruption of the education and life plans of 10,000,000 more, in addition to the terrible money cost of the war, there is only one dividend that will adequately pay for this. That dividend is a peace that will be stable and lasting. Nothing less will do. That being the situation, it must be firmly understood by our people that the world is still governed by force. Paradoxical as it may be, our efforts by persuasion and through agreement to create a world organization that can implement the peace we want, still rest on force. Almost in direct proportion to our military power can we measure our moral suasion to bring peace. We all know that little Norway, Switzerland, Guatemala, or other small nations have very little persuasive force with the nations of the world, no matter how sound or progressive a plan they may advance for world peace. That is because they have no power oehind their words. They cannot withstand aggression, economic, ideological, or military. Unfortunately, the foreign policy of some nations still is that they are entitled to take from others or dominate others, against their will. The only limit to such a foreign policy, which such countries recognize, is the physical capacity to hold what they seize or to enforce their domination over the subjugated group or nation.

Thus we realize that our security set-up should support and supplement the policy of our Government to bring world peace. It should be such that it will be a constant reminder that if nations or a nation does not want peace, we are fully prepared for the eventuality. Our security organization should be such that if and when an international security system is developed, which is effective, our security lay-off can be trimmed down to conform to the lessening responsibility which it will be required to assume.

It should be understood that our security system is the real vehicle that will bring us the peace that we desire with its byproducts of smaller armaments, less likelihood of war, and finally a world of law and equity.

Air power is the key to our military supremacy. We should understand a few fundamentals. Any future war will be a total war. The last one practically harnessed all the productive capacity of the country. The next war will encompass every farm, factory, laboratory, railroad, and mine. It will come without giving us time to prepare, which we had in the last two wars. It may come without much warning, perhaps without any. Every part of our Nation will be subject to attack. The development in long-range aircraft easily forecasts this. It will be a world war such as the last one, but much more deadly.

The Air Forces gave us the edge in the recent war. Its mission today is to be continuously prepared to give our forces the edge that will win, should war descend upon us. In the shrinking world in which we live, every vital center in our country is and will be subject to attack from the principal industrial countries of the world, and we likewise will be able to strike the vital centers of any nation, if we are prepared. The job of striking a decisive blow at the heart of the production center of the enemy would be the first main mission of the Air Forces. They must be ready and able at all times to do this, if we are to be secure in the transition period from now till world peace is assured.

Our Air Force must be kept modern. This is something that requires continuous and unremitting effort. In the last war, we had a chance to get ready. We will not have it in the next one. Not one plane got to the front which was designed after we entered the war. The B-29, our most modern bomber to reach the front, was started to be designed in 1935, about 9 years before it reached the front. Scientific Research and Development is a continuing job. It cannot be stopped and then started again, without losing all our momentum. It must have vast resources and money for basic research to the end that scientists may be exploring the unknown fields of science and gradually push out the frontiers of science. Some of this effort will be useless in its end result, but we must have this type of research so we may block out certain theories that may be false. Its applied science projects must contemplate practically all fields of natural science—physics, biology, meteorology, astronomy, etc. On the scale that it must be carried on to keep ourselves adequately prepared, and able to cope with those with whom we may be called upon to compete, it will be so costly that only the Government can afford it.

The development of remote control planes, guided missiles, etc., may really change the Air Forces, as we now contemplate them. Pilots may be unnecessary, to a large extent. Supersonic planes and guided missiles and long-range planes make us vulnerable every day from every place in the world from which trouble may come. From now on we must be on a continual alert if we are to be adequately prepared to meet any emergency. Our Air Forces is the arm that must be standing by, ready at once to meet any challenge to our security.

No part of our Air Forces, or for that matter any part of our armed forces, has any vested right to be continued. It must continuously prove its value to the ever-changing security system that science research and development will unfold. Every part of the security system must be continually evaluated to test its effectiveness and to determine whether it really adds to the efficiency of our security system. If it does not, it must be displaced.

With long-range planes and increased carrying capacity airborne troops will become a vital and most effective factor in an emergency. The Air Forces must be prepared to handle this assignment.

Air power must be dovetailed with peacetime aircraft production and development.

We must use this industrial establishment so that it will retain and use the necessary engineers and production executives. The industrial technique is more important now than in the last war. It is getting more specialized and requires more rapid results than heretofore, in the event of an emergency. We must keep a healthy national interest in flying for passengers and for cargo. A healthy and developing aircraft industry is essential to our national security. In it are embedded our production plans for military aircraft and for weapons. The close correlation of our Air Forces and the civilian aircraft industry is essential if we are to be secure, while we are working for world peace.

Thus we see that the mission of the Air Forces to give the Army and Navy the edge they must have in any future conflict, is a present and continuing one. It can only be prepared to carry out that mission by continuous effort and complete continuity in all of its activities. It must also be flexible enough to make changes to suit itself to the changing conditions and discoveries.

If air power can be thus kept highly efficient and modern it will become the springboard by which the world can go from a world based on force and physical power to a world of law and order. It can, and I predict it will, be the instrument that will enable us to collect the big dividend of a stable and lasting peace that so many millions of people all over the world are yearning for.

Brief Progress Report—Committee on Education and Labor

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor concluded 23 days of hearings on Saturday, March 15, 1947. Fifty-six labor bills were before the committee.

This is merely a brief progress report.

During 6 weeks over which these hearings extended, 137 persons appeared as witnesses. They were residents of 31 States.

The classification of witnesses was as follows:

Businessmen	53
Labor leaders	32
Congressmen	13
Industry associations	10
Educators	6
Farmers	4
Farm organizations	4
Government officials	4
Miscellaneous	11

Although special care was exercised to assure representation of all of the parties concerned, I must report that the response of the labor leaders was something less than the importance of the subject would seem to call for. However, in view of the concentration of power in labor organizations, the 32 labor leaders who did appear probably were related to a vastly greater number of persons than all of the other witnesses combined.

Now I remind the gentlemen of the House that there are but few countries left in the world where what has been happening before our committee can take place. The constitutional right of petition so dear and so fundamental to Americans today is virtually unknown throughout most of the world.

Many more applied for the opportunity to appear than the time available would permit. But, care was taken to make possible the presentation of evidence relating to all major issues. I believe that the testimony we have received is more than adequate for the present purposes and needs of the committee.

There were a few cases to which special attention seemed necessary. We subpenaed one person. Three subcommittees were appointed to go more thoroughly into outstanding cases than was possible for the committee as a whole to do. These subcommittees have visited local communities in different States. No account is taken in what I have here presented of the number of persons who have testified before them.

The House should also know that our committee has made every possible effort to conform to the principles that I am sure animate the majority of the Members. Our first aim has been and will continue to be that of freeing the workmen of the United States from the shackles that have been fastened on them in the name of labor organization and Government intervention for the most part against their will. Mr. Speaker, it is not the workers of the United States who present the challenge to the Nation in the name of labor. It is but a relative few of their misguided leaders. The workers are honest, humble, law-abiding citizens. Their hopes and aspirations must not be crippled, but liberated from the threats, restraints, and even tyranny we have found.

The Education and Labor Committee is now earnestly at work in drafting the amendments to the Labor Relations Act. We expect to offer a strong but fair bill at the earliest possible moment. It will not be punitive. There has been a great deal of violence in labor matters, much heat and high emotions, for more than 10 years. We hope that is past. We are now addressing ourselves to the present and the future.

Pending introduction of the bill, my associates on the committee who have labored long, arduously and far above and beyond the call of duty will present to you from time to time some of the evidence and issues which were submitted at our hearings.

To enable those who wish to check specific allegations of abuses in labor-management disputes, I am including a ready reference to the charges which can be found in the printed hearings:

American Federation of Labor and affiliated unions

Union and officers	Company	Witness	Alleged action
A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America			
1. Teamsters, unidentified local, Los Angeles, Calif.	Farmer Bros. Co.	Russell E. Parsons	Secondary boycott.
2. Teamsters, unidentified local, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Pittsburgh Brewing Co.	Mead J. Mulvihill	Picketing and violence.
3. Teamsters, unidentified local	Beer distributors in western Pennsylvania.	do	Boycott.
4. Local No. 338, Teamsters, New Canaan, Conn.: Wm. Kennedy	Norman Dairy, Inc.	Abraham Norman	Picketing, violence, violation of contract, intimidation.
5. Local No. 886, teamsters, Oklahoma City, Okla.: H. E. Cranford, J. E. Hamilton.	Quick-Charge, Inc.	A. C. Fletcher	Picketing to force recognition of uncertified union, secondary boycott.
6. Local No. 843, teamsters, bottle-beer drivers	Beer distributors	Roland Rice	Jurisdictional dispute, refusal to work with CIO brewery workers.
7. Unidentified local, Oakland, Calif.		do	Riot resulting from nonunion veterans' trucks going through picket line.
8. Unidentified local, New Canaan, Conn.	New Canaan Dairy Co.	do	Mass picketing in unionization drive, resulting in closing of the dairy. Use of outside pickets.
9. Unidentified local, Midwest States (11)		do	71-day strike in effort to force industry-wide bargaining.
10. Unidentified local, San Francisco, Calif.		H. L. Strobel	Secondary boycott, violence.
11. Unidentified local, San Jacinto, Los Angeles, Calif.	Canneries	do	Violence, closed-shop demand, secondary boycott.
12. Local No. 337, Detroit, Mich.: James Hoffa, local president		S. L. Travis	Attempted organization of independent meat retailers by force.
13. Unidentified local, Detroit, Mich.: James Hoffa, Bert Brannon		do	Closed shop, collusion with 4 companies to force all other companies out of business in the waste-paper industry.
14. Local No. 207, Milk Drivers, Kansas City: R. O. Jackson, secretary-treasurer.	Pure Milk Producers Association.	Athol A. Cummins	Coercion to force compulsory unionism.
15. Local No. 1, general warehousemen, Los Angeles, Calif.: J. H. Wallace.	E. R. Squibb & Sons	H. W. Steinkraus	Secondary boycott.
16. Unidentified local, Salt Lake City, Utah	Utah Poultry Producers Cooperative Association.	do	Do.
17. Unidentified local, Salt Lake City, Utah	Utah Wholesale Grocery Co., Symms Utah Grocer Co.	do	Do.
18. Unidentified local	Norris Stamping & Manufacturing Co.	do	Do.

American Federation of Labor and affiliated unions—Continued

Union and officers	Company	Witness	Alleged action
A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America—Continued			
19. Local No. 544, general drivers, Minneapolis, Minn	Minneapolis Fruit Distributors	H. W. Steinkraus	Secondary boycott.
20. Unidentified local, Philadelphia, Pa	Philadelphia Wholesale Produce Co.	do	Do.
21. Unidentified local, San Francisco, Calif	Gantner & Mattern Co	do	Do.
22. Local No. 737	United Dairymen	do	Do.
23. Unidentified local	Farmer Bros. Coffee Co	do	Do.
24. Unidentified local, Modesto, Calif	Mr. and Mrs. Gerard	do	Do.
25. Unidentified local	Andrew Jergens Co	do	Do.
26. Unidentified local, California	Calavo Growers of California	do	Do.
27. Local No. 202, commission drivers and chauffeurs union, New York City; Joseph Papa, president; Arthur A. Dorf, secretary-treasurer; Frank V. Smith, recording secretary; Vincent Ristuccia, business agent.	Carl Ahlers, Inc	Harold Ahlers	Secondary boycott, violence.
B. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America			
1. Unidentified local, Los Angeles, Calif	Dixon-Boilermaker	Russell E. Parsons	Secondary boycott, union lost election 12 to 2, mass picketing.
C. The Associated Actors and Artists of America			
1. American Federation of Radio Artists, Hollywood, Calif		Cecil B. De Mille	Union shop abuse, denial right to work, refusal to pay political assessment.
D. United Mine Workers of America			
1. Unidentified local, Nation-wide		Forney Johnston	Coercion by strike to force royalty.
E. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers			
1. Unidentified local, Des Plaines, Ill.: Ed. J. Brown	Benjamin Electric Manufacturing.	Hoyt P. Steele	Secondary boycott of products made by CIO.
2. Unidentified local, Englewood, N. J	Kurt Versen Co	do	Secondary boycott of products made by another local of IBEW.
3. Local No. 935, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Englewood, N. J.	do	Kurt Versen	Secondary boycott.
F. American Federation of Musicians			
1. Unidentified local, Interlocken, Mich.: J. C. Petrillo		Jos. E. Maddy	Banning broadcast of students.
2. Local No. 47, Los Angeles, Calif.: "Spike" Wallace, president; Lee MacQuarrie, business agent.	Earl Carroll Theater	Earl Carroll	Coercion to hire more musicians than needed, featherbedding.
G. United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America			
1. Unidentified local	Northern Redwood Lumber Co.	Fentress Hill	Secondary boycott of employer's farms, railroads, retail yards, construction jobs, shipping.
2. Unidentified local	do	do	Mass picketing, invasion of private property.
3. Unidentified local	do	do	Violence.
4. Unidentified local	do	do	Intimidation.
5. Unidentified local	Western pine lumber industry	J. S. Richards	Jurisdictional strike.
6. District No. 9, International Association of Machinists	Granite City Steel Co	Hayward Niedringhaus	Jurisdictional dispute.
H. Building trade-unions			
1. Carpenters district council, linoleum layers	Lampland Lumber, St. Paul, Minn. (out of business).	A. O. Lampland	Jurisdictional strike, secondary boycott.
2. Riggers	Detroit	Samuel L. Travis	Closed shop, charging of nonunion members exorbitant fees for temporary work permits. Union charged in courts with extortion.
3. Baltimore Building and Construction Trades Council, Baltimore, Md.: Frank Clark Ellis.	Southern States Cooperative, Baltimore.	P. C. Turner	Coercion.
4. Seattle Central Labor Council	Sweden Freezer Manufacturing Co.	H. W. Steinkraus	Secondary boycott.
5. Building and Construction Trade Council	Motor Wheel Corp., Lansing, Mich.	do	Do.
6. Central Labor Council	All advertisers in Los Angeles Downtown Shopping News.	do	Do.
7. Central Labor Council	J. W. Robinson Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	do	Do.
8. Building Trades Union	Mortarless Masonry Corp	do	Do.
9. Unidentified local of carpenters; unidentified local of laborers	Building Contractors Association of New Jersey.	Charles Everson	Jurisdictional dispute.
10. Unidentified local of millwrights; unidentified local of iron workers, New Jersey.	General Motors	do	Do.
11. Unidentified local of steamfitters, electricians, hoisting engineers, Princeton, N. J.	Princeton University	do	Jurisdictional dispute, featherbedding.
I. International Brotherhood of Papermakers			
1. Eagle Lodge No. 1, Holyoke, Mass	Holyoke Wire Cloth Co	H. W. Steinkraus	Secondary boycott.
J. Amalgamated Association of Plumbers and Steam Fitters of United States and Canada			
1. Unidentified local, Boston, Mass	The Walworth Co	do	Do.
K. Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America			
1. Unidentified local, Pittsburgh, Pa	Pittsburgh Rys. Co	do	Do.
L. United Automobile Workers			
1. Local No. 182, Lansing, Mich	Motor Wheel Corp	do	Do.
M. United Brick and Clay Workers of America			
1. Unidentified local	Simons Brick Co	do	Do.

American Federation of Labor and affiliated unions—Continued

Union and officers	Company	Witness	Alleged action
N. International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of United States and Canada and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America			
1. Unidentified local	Moving-picture industry	Oscar Schatte	Jurisdictional strike.
O. Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders International League of America			
1. Unidentified local, Brazil, Ind	All restaurants not selling liquor	Gerald W. Landis of Indiana.	Violence in connection with picketing.
P. Metal workers			
1. Unidentified local, Philadelphia, Pa	George D. Ellis & Sons	Herbert K. Taylor	Coercion and intimidation.
2. Unidentified local, St. Louis, Mo	Mid-West Screw Products Co	Helen A. Hagen	Coercion, intimidation, featherbedding, secondary boycott.
Q. Railroad Brotherhoods, independent			
1. Unidentified local	Toledo, Peoria & Western RR	George F. McNear, Jr	Featherbedding.
2. Unidentified local, Gridley, Ill	do	do	Violence.
Congress of Industrial Organizations			
R. United Steelworkers of America			
1. Unidentified local, Columbus, Ohio	Timken Roller Bearing Co	Arthur S. Thorn	Coercion, violence.
2. Locals Nos. 1033 and 1129, Chicago, Ill	Acme Steel	H. L. Bills	Monopolistic practices, industry-wide strike.
3. Unidentified local, Birmingham, Ala	Stockham Pipe Fittings Co	L. B. Bowley	Coercion of nonunion employee. Strike caused by minority of employees.
4. Unidentified local, Milwaukee, Wis	Grede Foundries	Wm. J. Grede	Failure to bargain in good faith.
5. Unidentified local, Smith Steel division	do	do	Do.
6. Unidentified local, Smith Steel and Milwaukee divisions	do	do	Unjustified demands of unions regarding employee status during a strike.
7. Unidentified local, Kalamazoo, Mich	American Tool Die	R. J. Brown	Refusal of international union to permit bargaining by the local.
8. Unidentified local, Utica, N. Y	Foster Bros. Manufacturing Co	Townsend Foster	Refusal of local union to bargain in good faith.
9. Unidentified local, Buffalo, N. Y	Roberts-Gordon Appliance Corp.	L. C. Smyth	Strike called by international union after local votes against strike.
10. Unidentified local, Pittsburgh, Pa	West Penn Machine	Birger Engstrom	Violence; beating up of worker.
11. Unidentified local, Pittsburgh, Pa	Lockhart Iron & Steel	do	Refusal of international to allow local union to bargain.
S. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America			
1. Local No. 174	Kelsey Hayes Wheel	G. W. Kennedy	Strike against WLB order; mass picketing.
2. Unidentified local, Milwaukee, Wis	Allis-Chalmers	Clare E. Hoffman	Nondemocratic sustaining vote for representation of union under NLRB ruling.
3. Unidentified local, Dearborn, Mich	Ford Co	Representative Hoffman	Coercion.
4. Local No. 351, Detroit, Mich	Detroit Steel Products	Edgar R. Ailes	Mass picketing; picketing homes.
T. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union			
1. Unidentified local, San Francisco, Calif		Almon E. Roth	Organized slow-down unloading sugar, 1935-41.
2. Unidentified local, Los Angeles, Calif		do	Organized slow-down, 1946.
3. Unidentified local, west coast		Tyre Taylor	Favoritism of NLRB.
U. International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers			
1. Unidentified local, Canton, Mo	American Zinc, Lead & Smelting.	H. I. Young	Monopolistic practices. National leaders set terms "wildcat" strikes; mass picketing.
2. Unidentified local, Hillsboro, Ill		do	Strike violation of contract.
3. Unidentified local, Mascot, Tenn		do	Strike, delay in vacation schedule.
4. Unidentified local, Athletic Mine, Tenn		do	Strike, refused foreman.
5. Unidentified local, Grosselli, Tenn		do	Strike, because of disciplining worker.
6. Unidentified local, Jarnagin Mine, Tenn		do	Strike to force law violation.
7. Unidentified local, Mascot, Tenn		do	Strike delay in WLB decision.
V. American Newspaper Guild			
1. Unidentified local, Philadelphia, Pa.: Sam B. Eubanks, executive vice president.	Philadelphia Record	J. David Stern	Bargaining in bad faith (with intent to destroy newspaper).
W. Federation of Glass, Ceramic and Silica Sand Workers of America			
1. Unidentified local	Pittsburgh, Toledo, Crystal City, Festus.	Charles E. Hoffman	Fixing of election districts by NLRB to insure election of CIO.
W. United Electrical Workers			
1. Unidentified local, Bloomingdale, N. J	Westinghouse	E. L. Chandler	Strike called by international in violation of contract of the local union.
X. Food, Tobacco, Agriculture, and Allied Workers of America			
1. Unidentified local, Helena, Ark		John L. Dagnett	Undemocratic election of bargaining agency.
Y. International Woodworkers of America			
1. Unidentified local	Western pine lumber industry	J. S. Richards	Failure to bargain in good faith.
Z. Pipefitters			
1. U. A. No. 392, Cincinnati, Ohio	Refrigeration Products Co	Norman Rau	Coercion and intimidation.
Independent unions			
AA. United Telephone Organizations			
1. Unidentified local, city of New York	Idlewild Airport	H. W. Steinkraus	Secondary boycott.
2. Unidentified local (New York), Long Island area	Equitable Life Insurance Society of the United States.	do	Do.
3. Unidentified local, New York	New York Telephone Co	do	Do.

The American Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, in behalf of the American Red Cross, over the facilities of the American Broadcasting System during the Metropolitan Opera period on Saturday, March 15, 1947:

I have been asked to talk to you about the American Red Cross. To do so I must talk to you about America.

We of this generation face problems more critical and more difficult than those any generation has ever faced before. In the broken cities and blasted fields, in the hungers and fears of hopeless peoples, war has left its challenge to America.

In meeting that challenge, we have made—and are still to make—grave decisions affecting the destiny of this Nation and all the peoples of the world.

It is, to me, of the most vital importance that we face that challenge and make those decisions in the true spirit and tradition of the American people. There is no doubt—and can be no doubt—that this Nation confronts a great and generous future, but we must not lose faith, we must not falter, we must be true to ourselves.

It has been said—and well said—that the greatest part of any nation's character is not handed down through a few institutions and a few texts. It is transmitted through millions of daily acts and observances and limitations. It is determined by the example we set for each other in our daily associations. It stems from family life and the influence of father upon son and mother upon daughter.

That is why the American Red Cross is a part of the living spirit of America.

The American Red Cross is you.

It is Mrs. Murphy, who cares for her family and then works her fingers to the bone in the Red Cross sewing rooms.

It is Mrs. Jones—the little lady down the street—who puts on a gray uniform and suddenly becomes an angel of mercy in a veterans' hospital.

It is tough old Kosciusco, who quietly goes around the corner to give his pint of blood at the blood bank.

It is the Red Cross girl serving in a canteen for our forces overseas—somewhere in Japan—or Korea—or Germany—or Austria—or Italy.

It is the doctors, and nurses, and first-aiders, and local volunteers who show up on the scene of disaster to do their heroic work.

The millions of Americans who have served the Red Cross in these and other ways have been serving humanity, but they have also been serving themselves. By setting an example of service and sympathy to others they have kept alive the spirit of human compassion upon which the tradition of American freedom is based.

Through their contributions and devotion they have made the Red Cross a big and powerful institution. Yet its size is no greater than the emergencies and disasters with which it must be prepared to deal, and its power is only the power to serve.

As an institution it performs services too big for the individual and too urgent and too personal for Government.

It is the link between the bedside of a crippled veteran and a hopeful future.

It is the link between Joe who is stationed far overseas and Joe's family who are in trouble back home.

Much more important, it is a link between the great America of the past and a greater America of the future.

The services performed by the American people through the Red Cross are the services of a people who have faith, who know hope, and who know the meaning of charity toward each other.

All these individual contributions and services give us strength as a people. In time of crisis or in time of need, we have demonstrated that we can set our individual differences aside and unite in our sympathy for human distress. Any nation whose people have this capacity for unity is a force to be reckoned with—even in this turbulent world.

We have seen other nations fail. We have seen them at the height of their power, and their folly. We have seen that folly destroy them.

Any nation founded upon internal or external hate and intolerance will not endure. The principles which draw people together and make them strong as a nation are the principles of simple justice and the rules of good behavior.

Of these, human compassion is of greatest importance. Human compassion does not know race or creed or color. It does not know hate, or cruelty, or intolerance. Human compassion is directed toward the need of a fellow being in distress. It is, therefore, recognition of the sanctity of the individual.

Our constitutional government, our system of society, and our way of life are based entirely upon the sanctity of the individual. We must never deviate from that principle.

The Red Cross is the symbol of all these things and therefore stands for all that is best in America. When you decide to give your money or your services to the Red Cross, you are reaffirming your own freedom by that decision. The freedom we enjoy is based upon just such acts and attitudes of service and of cooperation with one another.

A new century of world history is in the making. If we hold fast to the right, as we see the right, it will be within our power to make that century a century of progress.

Your support of the Red Cross is keeping alive the true spirit of America. On that spirit our future depends.

Palestine Situation—Protest Rally Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks made before the "Open the Door, Bevin, Rally" sponsored by the George Washington chapter, Intercollegiate Zionist Federation of America and the American Christian Palestine Committee. The rally was held on February 19, 1947, at the Union Methodist Church, Washington, D. C.

At the recent World Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland, the group voted not to participate in the London Arab-British Conference which has just ended, because the British Labor Government failed to show good faith in its Palestine commitments. Not only did the government of Prime Minister Bevin fail to expedite the Balfour Declaration, and also its pre-election labor platform in regard to Palestine, but it has adopted a policy of Arab appeasement and military law to insure British domination of Palestine.

The British Government has not repudiated the 1939 white paper under which it undertook to restrict immigration of Jews to 15,000 per year for 5 years with no further immigration thereafter and then also expected to establish an Arab state in Palestine after 1949.

Naturally, these policies are not relished, particularly in view of the fact that the League of Nations Mandates Commission, to which the British Government was supposed to report, denounced the 1939 white paper as a violation of the mandate, and also in view of the fact that the British got the mandate as a result of their own Balfour Declaration which is in fact incorporated in the mandate terms, which said the British would seek to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.

Under these circumstances, the world Zionist organization voted not to attend the London sessions formally. They did send observers, and now that the London business has ended in exactly the kind of stupid indecision that everyone expected, the situation is just as it always was.

The Arab argument about the land being theirs is peculiar in view of the fact that there were only about 400,000 of them there in 1919 when the Versailles Conference was held. Today, thanks to the improvements in the country due to Jewish investment and effort, there are 1,200,000 Arabs and 600,000 Jews there. The Arabs have come, attracted by higher wages and better sanitary, educational, and health facilities.

There are Arab states now in Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Syria, and Lebanon. Not one of these raised a finger to aid the Allies. They all entered into the war just before the San Francisco meeting deadline, and the Saudi-Arabian King even said that he was declaring war except for the holy cities of Mecca and Medina, which are just about the only centers of population in the land.

It is indeed an intolerable situation when the survivors of German totalitarianism remain rotting in their death factories. Our Congress and State Department have not spoken loud enough. An active American foreign policy to facilitate the transferral of these displaced persons to their promised land would aid immeasurably the solution of this problem. A just and lasting peace, based upon the "four freedoms," cannot be achieved until these oppressed peoples are liberated both physically from their DP camps and mentally from the smoldering crematoriums.

The following resolution was adopted by the rally:

We university students, protesting the British reign of terror in Palestine, resolve the following:

1. That Britain immediately open the doors of Palestine to admit the hundreds of thousands of those displaced persons of Europe who must immigrate to Palestine.

2. We urge the United States to make available at once American ships to facilitate the entrance of Jewish displaced persons into Palestine.

3. We urge the British Labor Government to discontinue the present terror tactics in Palestine which are destroying basic liberties in violation of the rights of man.

Pennsylvania Painted for Posterity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States an extraordinary project that has been inaugurated in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It calls for the painting of the historic and contemporary life of Pennsylvania by 14 of America's most distinguished artists.

This highly commendable work is being sponsored by the Gimbel Stores of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

The aim of the collection is to create for the citizens of the Commonwealth and the Nation a dramatic record of Pennsylvania and its contemporary people, influenced and molded as they are by the cultural, industrial, geographical, and historical background of the 67 counties. The artists, selected for their position in the world of art, and for their interpretive abilities, will visit every section of Pennsylvania to absorb its flavor and gather at the source the material necessary to fulfill their respective assignments.

Of the artists chosen for the project, five are outstanding painters of the Commonwealth and have been intimately associated with the life of Pennsylvania for many years: George Biddle, Albert Gold, Hobson Pittman, Franklin Watkins and Andrew Wyeth. Selected in addition are nine other artists of national prominence from other parts of the country: Aaron Bohrod of Illinois, Adolf Dehn of Minnesota, Ernest Fiene of Connecticut, William Gropper of New York, Joe Jones of Missouri, Doris Lee of Illinois, Fletcher Martin of Colorado, Edward Millman of Illinois, and Paul Sample of New Hampshire.

The artists will follow a planned list of subjects, but will be given freedom to paint in their own way the most significant and important aspects of Pennsylvania life. It is estimated that the completed collection will consist of 100 oil paintings, watercolors and drawings. Upon its completion in September, the collection will be exhibited in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and other cities throughout the State before being sent on a national tour.

In announcing sponsorship of the program, Arthur C. Kaufman and Jacques Blum, executive heads of Gimbels, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, respectively, stated:

The plan was conceived as an educational one, and was undertaken by us because we believe that our company, serving the Commonwealth's two largest metropolitan districts, had a privilege and responsibility in the matter. We have a precedent in that merchants throughout history have played their part in sponsoring the art and artists of the period. Gimbels has its own precedent for this undertaking, for our stores in Pennsylvania and throughout the country are well integrated in the lives of their communities, and are constantly sponsoring projects of a patriotic, civic, educational, artistic and cultural nature.

The project well under way was started when George Biddle, of Philadelphia, long known as a prominent figure in American art, undertook to depict the agriculture of Pennsylvania and the "Dutch" counties of Buck and Lancaster. Shortly thereafter, Joe Jones, famous young Missouri artist, began work on paintings of the railroads, river traffic, and airfields. Later the steel mills, textile industry, petroleum, and gas throughout Pennsylvania will be portrayed by others, while several artists will undertake to depict the cities of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Bethlehem. The miners and mining of Pennsylvania will be portrayed, as well as the historical meeting houses, universities, and monuments. The scenic beauty and recreation activity of Pennsylvania will also be covered, while through pictures of lake steamers, airfields, and railroads the story of Pennsylvania transportation will be told.

The national tour will extend over a period of 5 years. It is the hope of the sponsors and the people of Pennsylvania that the hundreds of thousands of people throughout the Nation who will view the pictures will come to have a keener appreciation and a greater knowledge of that which is Pennsylvania. Next to a visit to our great mining, manufacturing, and agricultural areas I can suggest nothing better than that you view this collection when it comes to your part of the country. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that this Nation-wide showing of Pennsylvania in pictures will lead beneficent individuals in other States to follow the same course of action.

Forty-eight such collections of fine painting in constant circulation and exhibition in the various States would be an educational and unifying factor of inestimable value.

I commend the sponsors and all participants in this very worth-while undertaking. I know it will be a fine thing for Pennsylvania and the Nation.

The Rights of American Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. SOMERS. Mr. Speaker, 18 young Americans are now being held in a British prison in Haifa, Palestine. Two weeks from now they will be tried on a charge of aiding and abetting what the British call illegal immigration of Hebrews into the Holy Land.

These young men, coming from six different States of the Union, representing both Jews and gentiles, are merchant seamen, many of them veterans of the war, who volunteered to serve without pay on a mission of mercy and rescue. Recruited by the Air Sea Volunteers for Hebrew Repatriation, they manned the ship *Ben Hecht*, and carried 910 Hebrew refugees from Europe to their homeland.

The *Ben Hecht*, formerly a United States Navy patrol ship, was bought with funds raised by the American League for a Free Palestine, a nonsectarian organization of over 140,000 American citizens, through its production of the play A Flag Is Born written by the gentleman for whom the ship was named. The money raised by the American League for repatriation purposes is sent to the Repatriation Commission of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, which, in this case, chartered the *Ben Hecht* from the Tyre Shipping Co., an American firm.

The ship was intercepted by British naval units off the coast of Palestine several days ago. There was no violence. British sailors boarding the *Ben Hecht* were given cigarettes and tea, and were permitted to escort the ship into Haifa harbor. The crew, the American boys and two volunteer Norwegian engineers, was arrested, the ship was confiscated, and the refugees were taken to Cyprus.

In all, the episode was just one of a series of such events. The terms of the League of Nations mandate for Palestine notwithstanding, the British have been turning Hebrew refugees away from their national home and imprisoning them on Cyprus for many months. What makes this incident singular is the fact that the *Ben Hecht* is owned by an American company and manned by American merchant seamen. The confiscation of the ship and imprisonment of its crew confront us with an impasse which was an inevitable outcome of the failure of the British to live up to the terms of the mandate or to deal squarely with the United States on this issue.

President Truman first gave voice to this country's desire that the Hebrews in the DP camps in western Europe be permitted to go home to Palestine over a year and a half ago. Since then, the British have delayed and stalled continuously. When the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry unanimously recommended that those Hebrews be moved immediately, the British Government, which had asked us to participate precisely in order to evolve a set of recommendations upon which it could act with assurance of American approval, defaulted and the recommendation was forgotten.

Nevertheless, getting the Hebrews to Palestine remained American policy. Both parties backed it in their platforms and in numerous statements. The President reiterated it on many occasions. And the American people have made it clear that they desire a quick and constructive solution to the plight of the Hebrew nation.

I want to emphasize then, Mr. Speaker, that the seamen in the crew of the *Ben Hecht* are not now in prison as a result of their irresponsibility or willful

violation of any recognized agreement. Those men are in prison because they carried out what we—again and again—told them we wanted carried out. In perfect good faith, every one of those seamen had reason to believe, and I am sure they were right, that they were serving their country's interest in embarking upon such a merciful venture.

It was our policy they executed, and their present incarceration is our responsibility. We cannot, in justice to them and to ourselves, allow them to remain behind British bars.

First National Conference To Be Sponsored by Advisory Commission of UNESCO To Be Held in Philadelphia Next Week—Members of Congress Invited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, another great forward step in the paramount program of bringing about better international understanding will take place in Philadelphia, beginning next Sunday evening and concluding next Tuesday evening . I refer to the first national conference on UNESCO which will be sponsored by the National Advisory Commission of that organization. Over 500 American organizations are expected to send two delegates each to this important conference on the achievements and the aspirations of UNESCO.

Mr. Speaker, the officials of the National Advisory Commission of UNESCO have advised me that Members of Congress are invited to attend this great planning conference. It is fitting indeed that in the American city in which our constitutional freedoms were born there should now be held this meeting which hopes to do so much to bring the blessings of these same freedoms to people throughout the world.

As the author of House Resolution 215 which gave birth to the movement which has eventuated in the working international organization known as UNESCO, I have been asked to address the final evening general session of this conference. My theme will be, UNESCO, the Ethical Echelon in the Fight for Peace. Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, Milton Eisenhower, chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, Superintendent Stoddard, of the Philadelphia schools, Sir Ramiswami Mudaliar, president of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and many others will address this conference.

For the convenience of Members and others who may desire to attend the sessions of this great mental workshop for peace, I am herewith including the program of this conference as a part of my remarks:

SUMMARY PROGRAM, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON UNESCO

MONDAY, MARCH 24

3 p. m.: Opening general session, Irvine Auditorium, University of Pennsylvania, Thirty-fourth and Spruce Streets.

Presiding: Milton Eisenhower, Chairman of United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Addresses

The Imperatives of UNESCO: A. J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools, Philadelphia.

UNESCO, A Proposal to History: William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State.

8:30 p. m.: Informal reception for representatives to National Conference given by United Nations Council of Philadelphia. Crystal Ballroom, the Benjamin Franklin Hotel.

TUESDAY, MARCH 25

9 a. m. to 10 p. m.: Registration, Benjamin Franklin Hotel.

10 a. m.: Section meetings.

Topics and location

1. Problems of Education Reconstruction. Jefferson Room, Hotel Adelphia. Chairman, T. G. Pullen, Jr., State superintendent of schools, Baltimore, Md.; vice chairman, A. J. Brumbaugh, member, executive committee, Commission on International Educational Reconstruction, Washington, D. C.

2. Community Participation in UNESCO. Crystal Ballroom, Benjamin Franklin. Chairman, Mrs. Louise Wright, executive secretary, Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, Ill.

3. How Do We Teach for International Understanding? Crystal Room, Hotel Adelphia. Chairman, Ben Mark Cherrington, director, Social Science Foundation, University of Denver, Denver, Colo.

4. The Revision of Textbooks and Other Teaching Material. Room 206, Benjamin Franklin. Chairman, Harold Benjamin, dean, College of Education, University of Maryland.

5. The International Exchange of Persons. The Gimbel Auditorium. Chairman, Lawrence Duggan, director of the Institute of International Education, New York City.

6. Press and Radio in UNESCO. Betsy Ross Room (B), Benjamin Franklin. Joint chairmen, Barclay Acheson, director, international editions, Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, N. Y.; Justin Miller, president, National Association of Broadcasters, Washington, D. C.

7. Films and UNESCO. William Penn Room, Hotel Adelphia. Chairman, George F. Zook, president, American Council of Education, Washington, D. C.

8. The Study of Social Tensions. Panel Room, the Gimbel Store. Chairman, Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.

9. Humanities and Philosophy. South Garden, Bellevue-Stratford. Chairman, George Shuster, president, Hunter College, New York, N. Y.

10. UNESCO's Program of Fundamental Education. Independence Room, Benjamin Franklin. Chairman, Henry Holmes, professor, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

11. The Contribution of the Creative Arts on UNESCO. Franklin Room, Benjamin Franklin. Chairman, Helen C. White, professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

12. The Natural Sciences in UNESCO. Betsy Ross Room (A), Benjamin Franklin. Chairman, Arthur H. Compton, chancellor, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

13. Books and Libraries in UNESCO's Program. Oak Room, Bellevue-Stratford. Chairman, Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress, Washington, D. C.

14. Museums in UNESCO's Program. Education Section, University of Pennsylvania Museum. Chairman, Chauncey J. Hamlin, president, American Association of Museums, Buffalo Museum of Science.

TUESDAY, MARCH 25

2 p. m.: Section meetings (see above).

8:30 p. m.: Second general session, Irvine Auditorium, University of Pennsylvania; presiding, Thomas Gates, president, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

Addresses

Today's Challenge to Education: Bernard Drzewieski, Director, Educational Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Section, UNESCO.

The United Nations and UNESCO: Sir Ramiswami Mudaliar, president of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

UNESCO: The Ethical Echelon in the Fight for Peace: The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, Representative in Congress from South Dakota.

Is Utah Sahara Bound?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, because of its public interest and the information which it contains, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a digest of the eleventh annual Frederick William Reynolds lecture delivered at the University of Utah, February 19, 1947, on the subject, Is Utah Sahara Bound? by Dr. Walter P. Cottam, professor of botany at the University of Utah.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS UTAH SAHARA BOUND?

The year 1947 marks a notable milestone in Utah history. One hundred years ago the original band of 143 Mormon pioneers were meticulously preparing their equipment for the long, hazardous journey westward over plains and mountains to this Valley of the Great Salt Lake.

Could we but turn back the clock of time one short century and on the morrow's dawn gaze out over this valley asleep in the morning shadows of the Wasatch Mountains, we would see no human habitation save, perhaps, a few scattered tepees of the red man—no streets, no trees, no smoke. The thought is incredible.

After the arrival of the pioneer band in this valley Brigham Young lost no time in occupying promising sites for settlements throughout Utah and the surrounding areas. Within 13 years most of the important towns from Logan on the north to St. George on the south had been founded. A glance at a Utah map shows a familiar and rather constant pattern of ecological factors determining these sites. Each is located at the base of a mountain front, at an altitude conducive to the growth of a variety of farm crops, on a valley plain of rich soil, where mountain streams supply water sufficient for irrigation and culinary purposes. Sites thus selected for settlement were provided with nearby pasture land that furnished year-round feed for farm livestock and with an expanse of desert range suitable for winter grazing. Mountains nearby provided a perpetual flow of life-giving water, timber for building,

wood for fuel, and forage for the summer grazing of range stock. Each of these factors of habitat thus furnished a vital and necessary link in the economic chain that supported our rural communities. The weakening of any link, as we shall see, necessarily jeopardized the whole human ecological structure.

EVIDENCE OF VEGETATIONAL CHANGE

Many sources of evidence point unmistakably to the fact that tremendous areas of the Bonneville Desert formerly occupied by grass have given way almost entirely to sagebrush. Only casual observations are necessary to see that much of the foothill sagebrush areas are in turn being invaded by junipers. Quantitative studies of these successional phases have been made at the mountain meadows situated about 50 miles west of Cedar City, Utah, on the divide of the Colorado-Great Basin drainage. This particular area was selected for intensive study because fairly accurate descriptions of it at the time of settlement were available. As early as 1844, Capt. John C. Fremont experienced the delights of this mountain retreat, and of it said, "We found here an extensive mountain meadow, rich in bunch grass and fresh with numerous springs of clear water, all refreshing and delightful to look upon. * * * The meadow was about a mile wide, and some 10 miles long, bordered by grassy hills and mountains."

Critical research methods applied to this area have shown that the hillside grasslands as well as the meadow bottoms have in one generation of man seen a complete succession from grassy to shrubby types, and that the latter in turn are now rapidly being invaded by juniper. Population studies show that junipers, once confined to the higher eminences, have in four-score years increased their domain more than six times. The most disturbing fact of the juniper succession is that grass can never again assume dominance on these slopes unless man removes the junipers. Precipitation is not sufficient here to support both junipers and grass and competition certainly would favor the junipers. Unfortunately, the situation at the mountain meadows does not represent an isolated case of juniper invasion of former grassland types; on the contrary, this phenomenon is generally widespread over the foothills throughout the entire basin.

Unquestionably, most of the desert vegetation of Utah has also undergone significant transformation during the past century with respect to quantity and quality of forage. Some types have experienced complete change of aspect. In a critical study of two desert valleys—Pine Valley and Wah Wah Valley, both situated west of Beaver, Utah, and both representative valleys of the Great Basin—data which I helped to secure indicate the probable quantitative changes that have occurred. These are summarized in the following table, and although these data involve only a few thousand acres, still they are important in indicating probable quantitative changes over much of the Great Basin.

Major types	Percent of area, 1937	Percent of area, 1847
Juniper-pinyon	28	10
Sagebrush	11	1
Rabbitbrush	13	1
White sage (Eurotia)	9	25
Shadscale	21	10
Greasewood	5	5
Grass	0	45
Miscellaneous	1	1
Playa (barren)	2	2

Considering briefly the status of mountain vegetation of Utah, it may be said that in all of the vegetation types excepting the alpine tundra where herds rarely graze, there has been significant change, both in quantity and quality of forage, depending of course on the degree and type of grazing use.

In Wasatch County, an opportunity was afforded in 1937 to compare the forage of certain comparable plant types where the only variable seemed to be the grazing factor. A little more than half of Wasatch County was brought under regulation of the Forest Service in 1910.

The 1937 survey showed that, in approximately 15,000 acres of oak-snowberry vegetation the total plant cover outside the forest was 82 percent of a similar type inside the forest, but the forage value was only 50 percent as great. Only 48 percent as much grass, 39 percent as much palatable herbs, and 58 percent as much palatable shrubs grew in the oak-snowberry type outside the forest as grew on the forest lands with better regulated grazing. This can only mean that under severe grazing, less palatable herbs and shrubs tend to replace the more palatable forage.

In a similar comparison between the aspen-snowberry type inside and outside the forest boundary on approximately 30,000 acres, the plant cover was found to be approximately the same on privately operated holdings as on forest lands, while the forage value was only 57 percent as much.

CAUSES OF VEGETATIONAL CHANGES IN UTAH

The widespread and significant changes that have occurred in Utah vegetation must be the result of one or both of the following causes: (1) major climatic changes within the century and (2) biotic causes incident to man's occupancy.

Many people, especially stockmen, believe that climate has changed since the settlement of Utah and that this factor is the primary cause of forage depletion. Certainly the theory lends itself to scientific investigation. The field of dendrochronology offers unlimited opportunity to answer this question. Considerable work in tree-ring investigation has already been done in Utah, but there is no evidence from this source that climate in Utah has changed appreciably, at least during the past three centuries. Studies in levels of the Great Salt Lake show that the recent drought was no more severe than previous droughts, and actual precipitation records dating back to 1870 do not support the thesis of a major climatic change. The records show that a drought as long and almost as severe as the 1928–1936 drought plagued this area from 1837 to 1904. This time it does not, however, stand out in the memory of ranchers of that day as a period of forage impoverishment. Supplemental feeding of livestock was unknown at that time, yet fat cattle were obtained at any season of the year. Fat sheep were marketed on the desert range in midwinter during the decade of 1895–1904. Such an achievement would have been utterly impossible during the recent drought period. The evidence seems conclusive that in the early days the damaging effects of acute shortage of moisture in drought years was unexpressed merely because the period of overuse was insufficiently long to have impaired visibly the recuperative power of the desert forage. Drought is not a new phenomenon of the desert. But disastrous range impoverishment is new.

WATER AND VEGETATION

The mountains of Utah which a hundred years ago definitely predetermined the location of our cities and towns are no less a factor today in the perpetuity of these cities. The controlling factor was, is, and forever must be water. It is the liquid gold of the desert. Without it what could the Midas wealth of our mines avail us or the rich arable lands of our valleys profit us?

The two decades of the 1820's and 1890's saw a tremendous upsurge in sheep population in Utah. The mountain ranges of the Wasatch, the Uintas, and the high plateaus of the Sevier River drainage were mined of their forage cover. From the populated valleys far in the distance the numerous herds of sheep could be detected by clouds of dust created by many hoofs. It is little wonder that the early 1900's saw the beginning pay-off for this extravagant exploitation of the vegetational resources. Floods descended on the helpless towns of Sanpete County with the fury of a ravaged and defiled nature. Some of the hapless communities were on the verge of abandonment when, in 1903, the Manti National Forest was created and the National Government began to take steps to protect these people from themselves. Grazing was prohibited from the entire Manti Creek watershed for the years 1905 to 1909, and plans of grazing management have been in operation ever since. But Nature's wounds heal slowly. The disastrous flood of 1946 that inflicted $106,000 of damage to the town of Mount Pleasant is a sorrowful reminder of those days of unbridled exploitation. Truly the fathers' sins against the land are visited upon their children for generations to come, especially when the children continue in the same transgressions.

The Mount Pleasant flood of July 24, 1946, was the most violent of 12 summer floods that have descended upon this community of 2,500 people since the occurrence of the first flood in 1883. It seems most significant to me that this community was unscathed by floods during the first half century of occupancy, whereas during the last half century it has been damaged 12 times. The causes of the change in the run-off characteristics of this formerly nonflooding drainage basin are etched on the denuded and gullied headwater slopes.

Unfortunately figures on dollar values, disturbing as they are, present only minor aspects of the water problem. Our soil-laden streams, or gullied hillsides, our flood-ravished towns are only outward manifestations of deeper and more basic troubles. The real problem of water conservation in Utah lies in the widespread and accelerated erosion of watershed soils. No more urgent problem than this confronts our inland empire today. Nothing is more likely to determine the economic health of our State 100 years hence than the measures we adopt to restore our depleted mountain soils, and especially the speed with which we apply these corrective measures. The first step in the solution of our soil problems is a public enlightenment of the facts of soil erosion and what these facts mean to every citizen of the State, urban as well as rural. A special survey in the Sevier Lake watershed of south-central Utah revealed that serious soil losses have occurred on all but about one-fourth of the 4,800,000 acres of mountainous lands in that drainage basin since settlement. The enormity of this loss can be realized only if we understand the infinite slowness of the rate of soil formation and the dependence of our multiple use of the land on these precious few inches of the soil mantle.

Floods from impaired watersheds, regardless of where they occur, mean irreparable damage through loss of soil to the areas that generate them, but the disaster is twofold when they strike large populated centers. In 1923 several lives were lost in floods that issued from the canyons along the Wasatch front in Davis County between the towns of Bountiful and Farmington. Again in 1930 floods in the same area brought immense damage to farms, homes, and highways, and boulders weighing up to 200 tons were carried into the valley from the Davis County watershed. The origin of the floods, as shown by excessive gully erosion, is traced primarily to relatively small areas, in the heads of canyons, which in recent times have been depleted of vegetation and denuded of plant litter, chiefly by overgrazing, but to some extent by fire.

It is possible now to construct a fairly accurate ledger of profit and loss in the Davis County watershed grazing venture. In doing so, of course, real but intangible items of

permanent watershed deterioration due to soil loss as well as the destruction of human life must be excluded. From a purely monetary standpoint, the ledger shows in the credit column the single item of grazing income liberally estimated at 10 cents per acre per year. For the 18,500 acres of watershed land there was thus a yearly credit of $1,850 and a total cash income of $148,000 accruing over the 80-year period (1850–1930) of use. On the debit side of the ledger is a total of $1,300,000. One million dollars of this is chargeable to property damage and $300,000 represents the sum expended on flood control.

The flood-control costs of the Davis County watershed project, though admittedly high, are unquestionably worth the price for two reasons: first, the contouring and reseeding of flood source areas seem successfully to have stopped floods. Since the completion of these flood-control measures two high intensity storms greater than any ever recorded in Utah's history have deluged these areas with no deleterious results. Second, the object lessons that the Davis area holds both in regard to the importance of vegetation in watershed protection and to methods in flood control on areas where plant abuses have already occurred are potentially invaluable to an enlightened citizenry. But whether or not the people of Salt Lake City are prepared to accept these objective values and are determined to profit by them only time will tell.

As a notable feature of the centennial celebration we are about to unveil a monument at the mouth of Emigration Canyon commemorating Brigham Young's historic pronouncement "this is the place." From Little Mountain, an inspiring view in pioneer days, there is spread in every direction the most flagrant example of plant resource desecration to be found near populated centers in Utah with the exception of the North Oquirrh Mountains. Along the summit of this historic pass the earth is bare except for an occasional copse of serviceberry hedged as high as a sheep can reach, and for clumps of maple whose exposed roots give silent proof that the soil where once our pioneers trod has long since vanished with the forces of erosion.

Going south from the pass of Little Mountain, the sheep trail, now fenced and barren of vegetation, parallels a huge gully approximately a half mile long, 20 feet wide, and 20 feet deep. The soil from this ugly scar, amounting to about 15,000 cubic yards, now rests on the bottom of Mountain Dell Reservoir, one of the principal sources of Salt Lake City's culinary water. In addition an uncalculated amount of surface soil from a much larger abused area has found lodgment there, together with unnumbered tons of droppings from the herds of sheep that have caused this erosion.

The area adjacent to the Little Mountain sheep trail on Parley's Canyon is now used by the State fish and game department for winter feeding of deer. It is estimated that between 300 and 500 animals are fed hay daily. By springtime the canyon slopes that drain directly into Mountain Dell Reservoir less than a mile away take on the appearance of a huge corral. The carcasses of deer that have died during the winter feeding period are frequently allowed to remain there and to disappear through the natural processes of decay and putrefaction.

MULTIPLE USE OF LAND

The national forests in Utah were established a half century ago at a time when the grazing industry first experienced great distress as a result of forage impoverishment. While limited areas on important watersheds were temporarily withdrawn from grazing use because of flood hazards, the majority of these public lands continued to support livestock, but of course, under definite regulation in regard to animal numbers and seasonal use. To have managed these lands otherwise would have been fraught with economic disaster to Utah in general and to rural communities in particular. What is more important, our democratic process of government, opposed as it is to rule by fiat, left no other course open. Stockmen had to be educated in the scientific principles of range management, and a tremendous amount of research data on plants and soil were required in order to chart a proper course of land rehabilitation.

Fifty years have passed and the over-all gains in watershed conservation are not substantial. Soil losses still continue, the little revegetation of denuded areas leaves much to be desired and the need for further livestock reduction on most ranges is still with us. And worst, the original idea of water conservation as a basis for forest management seems to have been lost in the popular demand for big game and livestock production.

America grew up and Utah was settled under the popular conviction that the highest form of land ownership is the possession and holding in fee simple by the individual. The preemption law passed by Congress before the advent of the Utah pioneers, and especially the homestead acts and private land grants that followed 1862 were expressions of hasty and often ill-considered attempts by the Government to bring all public lands under private ownership. But mere acts of Congress can hardly alter the fundamental land values or land uses imposed by nature, and today 72 percent of Utah's total land area still remains under Federal ownership and control.

In the final settlement of the issue of land ownership, the public and not the private interests should be the deciding factor. We must always remember that these lands, whoever owns them, must serve the multiple uses of water, of grazing and of public recreation where game animals play no mean role. We must decide whether Federal, State, or private ownership would serve best the public interest.

Utah will attain a stabilized prosperity only when and if the public consciously adopts, maintains, and enforces a program of resource use based upon the democratic ideal of "the greatest good to the greatest number—and for the longest time." In a democracy such as ours there is but one sure avenue to such a goal and that lies in conservation education. The responsibility for this needed public enlightenment devolves upon every Federal and State agency charged with the various phases of resource management, upon the public press and especially upon the schools whose business it is to foster a rational, democratic, social philosophy. Like democracy itself, conservation involves a new point of view—a new gospel whose basic objective should permeate every course in every grade from the kindergarten through college. For a student to leave the high schools and especially the universities unfamiliar with the importance of national resources in Utah history, uninformed of the dependence of our economic, social, and religious institutions on resource use, and unsensitized to the evidence of resource waste is a commentary on some very basic failures of the educational program.

Most rural communities of this State could no more survive the loss of the grazing industry than they could have been founded without this resource. The dilemma, therefore, that now confronts us is a program of management that can maintain and increase the income from grazing and at the same time protect and improve the more important resource of water that also depends on the soil. Fortunately there is sound reason to believe that such a program is feasible. Studies conducted by the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station over a period of 10 years and on areas involving more than 300,000 acres of nonforest land have shown that in "Forage produced, whether measured in amount of forage grown or in sheep (and cattle) months of grazing obtained, has been in most cases from 5 to 15 times as great as on the same range before reseeding."

To a public accustomed to the self-glorification expressed by the repeated boast that "we have made the desert blossom as the rose," the title of this paper, "Is Utah Sahara Bound," may have seemed a shocking anachronism. The facts must speak for themselves.

The major purposes of this discussion were to arouse a public consciousness to the fact that serious range and watershed problems do exist, that they are definitely our concern, and that we can do something about them. Although much research is needed, as the governor pointed out in his recent message, the Federal and State agencies charged with the conservation of our natural resources already possess sufficient scientific data to charter a course of action capable of sparing our cities from disastrous floods and stopping "deserts on the march." But in a democracy such as ours these desperately needed remedial measures must await the popular will. Our Government agencies know how to revegetate ranges, but reseeding operations require special money appropriations. Our range experts know what livestock and big game population adjustments are necessary in order to assure the rehabilitation of the plant cover, but they are powerless in the face of special interest opposition. Our game department realizes that too many deer graze the Salt Lake City watersheds, but minority sportsmen organizations forbid their removal. There is not the slightest doubt that unwise grazing use is responsible for soil depleted ranges, yet at this very hour there are bills pending in Congress that seek to divert public lands to private management.

This should be a festive year. It should also be a year of serious reflection and meditation. Every citizen of this State who loves to call Utah "home" and who regards it as a permanent abode for his children and their posterity should become informed of the nature of the resources that support us and of what a century of white-man exploitation has done to them. Are we planning for the day when our obviously expendable resources, such as the Brigham Copper Mine, will have spent themselves? Are the potentially renewable resources of agriculture being managed on a sustained yield basis, or are they too being "mined" of their perpetual productivity? Can this civilization of ours, situated as it is in a semi-arid land, look with complacence to a permanently productive future when history speaks so repeatedly and so eloquently of the failures of Old World civilizations nurtured in a similar desert environment? Must history repeat itself? Are we destined to follow the short road to glory and the long, painful road to poverty and decay that Mesopotamia, the Holy Land, Alexandria, and Greece followed? These are questions desperately important to all of us, and to people best informed they are questions terrifying in their implications.

The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following article by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy Department, Washington, D. C., formerly captain of port, Balboa, C. Z., March 1941 to June 1944:

THE MARINE OPERATING PROBLEMS, PANAMA CANAL, AND THE SOLUTION

(By Miles P. DuVal, Esq.)

SYNOPSIS

Reconstruction of the Panama Canal to facilitate its operation and to increase its capacity is imperative. The present design is a high-level waterway, 85 feet above sea level. An improvement near the Pacific end of the Canal to provide a high-level terminal lake analogous to Gatun Lake on the Atlantic side is discussed in this paper.

The need for the change is explained, based on marine operating and safety considerations. The solution proposed is the physical removal of Pedro Miguel locks, the construction of all Pacific locks in continuous lifts near Miraflores, the elevation of the Miraflores dams, and the creation of a high-level anchorage north of Miraflores. Navigational rather than engineering features are stressed.

This paper was originally presented before a meeting of the Panama section of the society on May 20, 1943. The opinions and recommendations are purely personal, and have no official connotation.

PRESENT CANAL OPERATING PLAN

Any mariner's first transit of the Panama Canal is always a memorable experience. Although he may know only a little of the history of this great waterway, he is always deeply impressed by the magnitude of the Canal and the quiet efficiency of its operation.

His ship passes through the Atlantic (Caribbean) sea level section and enters the three-lift Gatun locks. The ship is locked up to the summit level in one continuous operation. After traversing Gatun Lake, it enters the tortuous and rocky artificial gorge known as Gaillard (formerly Culebra) cut. At the south end of this cut the vessel enters the single-lift Pedro Miguel locks and is locked down to the intermediate-level Miraflores Lake. It then enters a second set of locks at Miraflores and is locked down in two steps to the Pacific sea level.

Many shipmasters observe the Canal and the lock arrangements closely. Instinctively they note that only one lock structure was placed on the Atlantic side, and they wonder why two sets of locks are needed on the Pacific side in what they feel is an improper marine arrangement. They would prefer one structure on the Pacific as at Gatun to avoid (1) slowing their vessels in a rocky gorge and (2) undertaking double handling.

Masters generally do not know the long history of the Canal nor the great struggles involved in its building; so they are reminded that this idea of single-lock structures at the Pacific terminus is not new and that it was considered during construction but had to be discarded because it was claimed that suitable foundations were not available and because no other solution seemed possible. This explanation is accepted; and a transit is usually sufficient to impress masters with some of the marine problems affecting operation of the Canal.

The principal marine problems are the traffic bottleneck at Pedro Miguel, lockage surges in Gaillard cut, fogs, currents, and the suction of banks or lock walls. Only after long service with the Canal and close observation do shipmasters comprehend fully the nature of the operational difficulties and hazards of this waterway.

In addition to the inherent navigational problems of a restricted waterway, the physical lay-out of the Canal for operation is not symmetrical. On the Atlantic side there is a capacious summit level anchorage in Gatun Lake where vessels bound in either direction can anchor safely until ready to proceed. Such favorable facilities do not exist on the Pacific side. The Pedro Miguel locks are located squarely at the south end of Gaillard cut, with no summit level anchorage available as in Gatun Lake. These locks serve as a timing device that restricts the use of the cut to the capacity of the locks, and thus limit the capacity of the Canal.

In spite of these inherent problems, the Canal has operated successfully but it has operated under difficulties. North-bound vessels enter the cut at lockage intervals and no faster. South-bound vessels cannot arrive more rapidly than the locks can be readied to receive them. Hence, the Canal has not been able to develop its maximum obtainable capacity.

This condition can be illustrated by examining a day's traffic in the Canal under the restricted conditions. Vessels start transits on both sides of that Isthmus simultaneously, arriving at Gatun locks and Miraflores locks about 7 a. m. North-bound vessels are locked up to the summit level continously until all north-bound traffic has passed Pedro Miguel locks. Then each proceeds in succession at lockage intervals through the cut into Gatun Lake and thus to Gatun where it enters the locks or anchors to wait down lockage. South-bound vessels are locked up to Gatun Lake where they anchor at Gatun anchorage or wait under way until they are scheduled to enter the cut. After the north-bound traffic clears Gaillard cut at Gamboa, the south-bound vessels spaced at lockage intervals enter the cut.

Thus, Gatun anchorage supplies a stop-over station for both north-bound and south-bound vessels and permits flexible operation of Gatun locks. At Pedro Miguel there is no comparable anchorage to enter. Vessels have to approach these locks in a relatively narrow and rocky passage; they cannot anchor for they would swing into the bank; they cannot slow too much because of the necessity of maintaining steerage way in a narrow, rocky gorge which in the dry season is subject to high winds in the daytime. Thus, vessels must be received as they arrive and they cannot arrive faster than they can be received. This situation creates immense ship-handling and traffic-control problems that cause delays and at time subject both the Canal and the transiting vessels to danger.

For marine operations the location of the Pedro Miguel locks at the end of Gaillard cut constitutes the great traffic bottleneck of the Panama Canal. It was the fundamental error in the design of the Canal.

CANAL CAPACITY

What is the capacity of the Panama Canal? Obviously, if the summit water supply is ample, it is the capacity of the locks. Because of the bottleneck at Pedro Miguel locks, their capacity measures that of the Canal.

Assuming that one side of the Pedro Miguel locks is in operation during biennial overhauls and that the lockage interval for single culvert operations is 53½ minutes, the 24-hour capacity is 27 lockages. This figure has been accepted as the minimum capacity of the Panama Canal.

A more complete picture of Canal capacity was presented in a study by the Locks Division of the Panama Canal in 1938 (table 1). Two methods of operating the Gatun locks are noted. In the one designated "normal" a vessel enters a lock after the vessel ahead has cleared the distant chamber; in the follow-up operation a vessel enters a lock chamber before the preceding vessel has cleared the last chamber. Thus the vessels are always separated by one lock. It should also be mentioned that the filling may be accomplished by the use of either single or double culverts as shown in table 1, for each lock has two sets of culverts.

TABLE 1.—*Capacity of single locks, Panama Canal; based on study by Locks Division, 1938*

Lock	Normal intervals (min.)		Total 24-hour capacity	
	Single culvert	Double culvert	Single culvert	Double culvert
Gatun:				
Follow-up	54	40	26	35
Normal	91	76	16	19
Pedro Miguel	53.5	37.5	27	38
Miraflores	60	48.5	24	29

Thus, the lockage capacity of the Panama Canal is lowest during the overhaul of Miraflores locks, with the rate of one lockage an hour. This capacity is based on uninterrupted lockages and disregards the effect of certain other important factors to be discussed later. It represents the maximum capacity of the Canal under the most restrictive lock operating conditions—that is, during periods of one-side operation at Miraflores when under overhaul.

EFFECT OF FOG

Fog is one of the most frequent and serious interruptions of traffic in the narrow reaches of the Canal. The channel between Pedro Miguel and Bohio is subject to dense fog at frequent intervals, especially in the wet season. South of Pedro Miguel and likewise north of Bohio fog seldom occurs.

Both Guam and Miraflores locks can operate on a 24-hour basis under favorable weather conditions because both Gatun anchorage and Miraflores Lake are relatively fog free. Vessels can lock up from the Atlantic to the summit level and anchor safely at Gatun anchorage without interruption, day or night, and similarly at Miraflores Lake. In fog, vessels cannot enter Gaillard cut because of the danger of striking the bank; but when Pedro Miguel locks are clear, north-bound vessels may lock up to the north approach wall of the locks to await the clearing of fog in the cut. After the north wall is filled to capacity, all north traffic must stop.

Few persons not directly concerned with the control of traffic in the Panama Canal realize the frequency with which fogs affect marine operations. In 1942 there were 223 fog reports from marine signal stations in Gaillard cut during traffic hours, but only 118 fog days. Conditions are worse during the wet season—May to December. Fog forms after 9 p. m., but normally clears by 8:30 a. m.

The Canal capacity is thus reduced from the rated lock capacity at Pedro Miguel to the lock capacity during favorable weather conditions in the cut. During periods of long fog duration the capacity is less than the previously assumed minimum of 27 ships a day.

TRAFFIC RESTRICTIONS

For certain types of vessels, the Panama Canal has strict regulations requiring one-way traffic in Gaillard cut, known as Clear Cut Rules. Ships laden with explosives, oil tankers, unwieldy vessels, ore ships, large warships, and largest merchant vessels are dispatched only when Gaillard Cut will be clear of vessels to pass. For reasons of safety, traffic in the opposite direction is delayed while they transit the cleared cut.

As a result the capacity of the Canal is still further reduced, particularly when the traffic does not arrive at times convenient for safe and prompt locking. The physical lay-out of the Pacific locks prevents any compensatory routing of vessels in groups that would overcome these delays.

ACCIDENTS IN THE PANAMA CANAL

In connection with the writer's duties when he was Captain of the Port, Balboa, C. Z., the records of all accidents in the history of the Canal that had been formally investigated were examined and indexed. The

revelations were impressive. The most serious were found to be lock accidents, groundings, collisions, and accidents resulting from steering-gear failure. The study showed that they tended to occur at definite places, and these danger spots were determined.

Of a total of 1,036 accidents formally investigated between January 13, 1922, and July 13, 1942, 393 were lock accidents (table 2). The most serious were caused by striking the sharp corners of the lock wing walls or ramming them.

TABLE 2.—*Number of lock accidents, Panama Canal, formally investigated between January 13, 1922, and July 13, 1942*

Lock		Entering	In chambers	Departing	Total
Name	Number of chambers				
Gatun	3	87	41	24	152
Pedro Miguel	1	79	15	44	138
Miraflores	2	56	28	19	103

Groundings in Gaillard cut are feared more than any other type of accident. When a large vessel strikes the rocky bank, the hull may rupture and the vessel may sink and close the canal. The records are notable especially for the increasing record of sinkings; out of a total of seven sinkings in the 24 years from 1919 to 1942, five occurred in the final 6 years.

Collisions in the relatively narrow waters of the Canal are likely to be serious—especially in Gaillard cut where the banks are rocky. During this same period there were 50 collisions in the Canal channels, of which Gaillard cut contributed 26, causing one out of four sinkings.

Steering gear failure is always on the mind of a master when his ship is in close waters. This has been one of the most prolific causes of groundings and collisions. Of the 1,118 accidents during this same period, 110 were due to this cause. Steering gear failure in Gaillard cut makes grounding or collision almost inevitable (table 3). Obviously, the cut is the most serious danger spot in the Canal.

TABLE 3.—*Accidents caused by steering-gear failure, Jan. 1, 1919, to July 19, 1942*

Year	Atlantic sea level		Gatun Lake		Barbacoas to Gamboa		Gaillard cut		Miraflores Lake (collisions)	Pacific sea level		Total
	Groundings	Collisions	Groundings	Collisions	Groundings	Collisions	Groundings	Collisions		Groundings	Collisions	
1919					1			1				2
1920								1	1			2
1921							1					1
1922			1				1	1				3
1923			[1]1	(1)			4			1		6
1924	1			1	2	2	3	1		1		11
1925	[1]1	(1)			2		5	1	[1]1	1	2	13
1926	1						3			1		5
1927	1	1	[1]1	(1)	1		4		[1]3	2		13
1928	2						4	2	[1]2			10
1929				1			1		1	[1]2		5
1930							2		1		1	4
1931					1		2	1		[1]1	(1)	5
1932		1					1					2
1933					1		1		1			3
1934							4					4
1935										[1]1	(1)	1
1936	[1]1	(1)			1		2					4
1937	1				1		1	1	[1]1			5
1938												0
1939							2			1		3
1940							1			[1]2	1	4
1941							1					1
1942		1					2					3
Total	8	3	3	2	10	2	45	9	11	13	4	110

[1] Grounding or collision not specified for 1 case.

The failure of steering gear is not by any means the only cause of serious accidents. Another is the phenomenon known as bank suction, experienced by vessels moving in narrow channels or close to walls. Wall or bank suction often causes grounding as vessels depart from locks or as they pass salients in Gaillard cut. Usually suction causes a movement of the ship's stern toward the closer bank, center wall, or salient. If the pilot is unable to break the resulting sheer, the vessel may get out of control, strike the wall or bank, or ground on the opposite bank.

In a study by the Panama Canal in 1939, the positions of many groundings were plotted. They tended to occur at bends after the turns were completed, and in some relation to the degree of curvature. The larger turns had the larger number of groundings.

The subject of groundings has not been exhausted. It is a large field for a detailed study that should be undertaken—leading to a scientific determination of necessary changes in alinement of the channels.

Lock accidents have demonstrated the need of modifying the wing walls of the locks so as to eliminate the sharp corners at the lock entrances. The record of lock accidents and groundings shows that the separation of the Pacific locks into two structures has caused more accidents than would have occurred had the canal plan provided a summit level terminal lake on the Pacific analogous to Gatun Lake on the Atlantic.

The perspective of a quarter of a century or marine operation shows that the separation of the Pacific locks into two structures, the location of Pedro Miguel locks at the south end of Gaillard cut, and the failure to create a commodious summit level terminal anchorage on the Pacific, are the great marine operational errors in the planning of the Panama Canal.

THE 1939 THIRD LOCKS PROJECT

Canal authorities have looked forward to increasing the capacity of the Canal for many years and have made several studies of the subject. However, not until August 11, 1939, was construction of the third locks project authorized by Congress, in those months of hectic activity preceding World War II. The purposes were to increase the capacity of the Canal, to permit the transit of large naval vessels, to attain a greater security from bombing attack, and to facilitate conversion from a lock-type canal to a sea-level canal.

The earliest plans for a third set of locks placed the locks alongside the existing structures. The approach of the war and the resulting desire to disperse lock structures because of the danger of bombing caused the adoption of a plan in which the new locks were placed at a distance from the present structures and bypass channels connected the new locks with the main channels. Except for the segregation of the new locks, the 1939 third-locks project represented no fundamental change in the Canal plan. It was in principle an acceptance of the present Canal arrangement. Its completion would have perpetuated the bottleneck at Pedro Miguel and would have delayed indefinitely any chance of solving the navigational problems of the present Canal.

Instead of improving and simplifying the Canal, part of the project added certain features dangerous to operation. The proposed new bypass channel at Pedro Miguel would intersect the present channel near Cucaracha at an angle of 28°59′. North of the proposed new Pedro Miguel locks there would be a turn of 46°17′ in the bypass channel; and, in Miraflores Lakes, still another turn of 37°30′.

The experience of a quarter of a century has demonstrated that the proposed bypass channel north of Pedro Miguel would be definitely dangerous, and that it should be abandoned. This channel will not simplify or improve the operation of the Canal; on the contrary, it will complicate the existing situation. The turns of the new channel and the intersection of the new cut with Gaillard cut would become new foci of accidents; create the most difficult marine operating problems; and make transit of the Canal more hazardous.

Fortunately the suspension of this 1939 third locks project in 1942 occurred at such a stage as to afford an opportunity to reexamine some of its dangerous features.

SEA LEVEL VERSUS LOCK TYPE CANAL

There has been so much discussion of the so-called sea-level canal as an assumption in the planning of the evolution of the ultimate Panama Canal that an examination of this proposal is essential before focusing attention on the fundamental marine problems that should be solved. The idea is not new. The alluring prospect of the Strait of Panama is an ancient historical conception that has had great public appeal. This idea has even been symbolized in the Canal Zone seal which shows a Spanish galleon sailing through Culebra cut into the waters of the Pacific. Statesmen have made many eloquent speeches setting forth the assumed advantages of the sea-level canal over the lock-type canal. Yet, in spite of all the rhetoric, a lock-level canal was adopted mainly through the efforts of the late John F. Stevens, honorary member and past president, American Society of Civil Engineers. It was completed by the late George W. Goethals, member of American Society of Civil Engineers.

In a recent comparative study of the marine features of the sea-level and lock-type canals, it was assumed that the sea-level canal would follow the same general route as the present Canal; would have approximately the same form; would contain a tidal lock at Miraflores, and possibly would have an anchorage or mooring basin north of Miraflores. In effect, such a waterway would not be a sea-level canal but a tidal level lock canal.

The conclusions as to the effects on navigation were that the low level lock canal would:

1. Extend the length of hazardous channel from 7.69 to 31.18 miles;

2. Increase the number of critical curves (20°+) in the hazardous channel from 2 to 12;

3. Increase the total curvature in the hazardous channel from 129° to 564°;

4. Probably extend the channel length subject to fog;

5. Probably curtail operations during fog periods;

6. Require the use of ship-mooring stations;
7. Extend the collision, grounding, and steering gear failure area considerably;
8. Increase the number of transverse streams;
9. Reduce pilots' vision;
10. Increase the time required for transit;
11. Complicate the traffic-control problem;
12. Subject the Canal to the dangers of great floods in the Chagres Valley; and
13. Reduce the general navigability and operational convenience.

There is only one appreciable marine operational advantage for the sea-level canal and that is the elimination of the Atlantic locks and the consequent reduction of lock accidents. In comparison, the operational advantages of the lock-type canal are overwhelming.

TO SOLVE THE MARINE OPERATING PROBLEM

The principal marine operating problems of the present Canal have been described. The way to overcome them is to remove Pedro Miguel locks from their position at the end of Gaillard cut; to create a large summit-level anchorage in an elevated Miraflores Lake; and to concentrate all Pacific locks near Miraflores in continuous lifts. These changes automatically correct most of the operating problems. This high-level terminal lake plan (fig. 2 (b)) is fundamental from the operational standpoint. It will supply the best canal for handling ships.

The land contours of the Miraflores Lake basin are suitable as an impounding perimeter for a terminal lake on the Pacific and will require relatively small dams and dikes. There are several possible lock arrangements. Of these the best marine arrangement is the one in which the present Miraflores locks are abandoned and all the Pacific locks are placed on a new site that will utilize in some way the excavation for the bypass locks at Miraflores.

The summit-level anchorage is of greatest marine interest to those charged with the operation of the Panama Canal. It contemplates nine 300-yard berths and thirty 200-yard berths, to be obtained by dredging certain areas. The areas of the several berths, classified as to depth, are as follows:

Area (square miles)

Depth, feet:	
20	0.23
30	0.13
50	0.38
Navigation channel	0.29
Total	1.03

The number of berths in this anchorage should be sufficient for the present traffic even without dredging.

The essential points of the terminal-lake plan for the improvement of the Canal are the removal of the bottleneck Pedro Miguel locks from their position at the end of Gaillard cut and the creation of a large summit-level anchorage on the Pacific side. The lake is the key to the solution.

MARINE ADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSED PLAN

Anyone who has made many transits through the Pacific locks, viewed the Miraflores Lake from nearby vantage points, or studied the operating sheets, weather reports, and accident records, cannot fail to discern the tremendous advantages of the terminal-lake plan. Among its marine advantages are that it—

1. Improves and simplifies the operation of the Canal;
2. Increases the capacity of the Canal;
3. Extends the useful life of the Canal;
4. Increases the summit-level water storage by 50 to 75 percent and the watershed by 37.4 square miles;
5. Provides a summit-level anchorage between Miraflores and the entrance to Gaillard cut;
6. Makes the operation of Pacific locks independent of fog;
7. Simplifies the problem of dispatching transit traffic;
8. Avoids the three large turns and consequent groundings in the 1939 third locks project channel between Cucaracha and Miraflores which would necessarily be traversed by the largest ships;
9. Eliminates one lock from the Pacific lock system and the hazards in Miraflores Lake during the approach and departure of vessels to and from Pedro Miguel locks;
10. Reduces the number of expected lock accidents at the Pacific locks;
11. Removes lockage surges in Gaillard cut as factors controlling depth of channel;
12. Simplifies the operations of the Pacific locks;
13. Reduces the channel maintenance operations;
14. Reduces the time of transit about 1 hour;
15. Enables a better distribution of Dredging Division equipment in event of slides;
16. Increases the safety of transit especially for large war vessels;
17. Enables a better handling of transit traffic in the event of slides.
18. Eliminates the lock silting problem in the present Pedro Miguel locks;
19. Improves ship-handling conditions in Gaillard cut because of the elimination of surges and the increase in channel depth; and
20. Removes the dangerous traffic bottleneck of the Panama Canal at Pedro Miguel.

Other operational advantages could be added to this list. So far as known there are no operational disadvantages to this plan. The marine advantages of the terminal-lake plan are so extensive that this plan will have a tremendous appeal to the United States Navy and to all merchant shipping.

The main engineering problems will be involved in the construction of the necessary locks and dams. A study of the topography shows that the configuration of the land is favorable for the creation of the terminal lake by dikes. Geological reports indicate favorable foundations for locks and dikes. The engineering features of the plan have been examined by engineers and have been given preliminary approval. All of them would have to be subjected to intensive and detailed study. The cost of the terminal-lake plan should not differ materially from the revised cost of the 1939 third locks project.

On the other hand, it ... not desired to minimize the problems that will be encountered and that will have to be overcome. Among these are:

1. Inherent difficulties of changing an approved plan now in effect;
2. Relocation of sections of the railroad, highways, and pipe and cable lines;
3. Removal of Pedro Miguel locks;
4. Elevating the spillway and dams at Miraflores;
5. Foundation work at Miraflores; and
6. Maintenance of Canal traffic during construction.

Nevertheless, the navigational superiority of the terminal-lake plan to the 1939 third locks project on the Pacific end of the Canal is so overwhelming that it should be adopted even at considerable additional cost. It is the plan that will meet the marine operating requirements of the Panama Canal, It will make possible the construction of additional sets of locks at each end of the Canal. It should be the plan for the ultimate Canal.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

One of the first questions that is likely to be raised after this discussion is, Why were these fundamental ideas not presented before this year? The answer is that they were, but they were presented differently and by men without marine operational experience.

In recent years Ralph Z. Kirkpatrick, former Chief of Surveys of the Panama Canal, sow the weakness in the present Canal arrangement and submitted suggestions. His main purpose seems to have been to combine the Pacific locks into one structure. His plans were not backed with the force of operating experience and were not adopted.

Before Mr. Kirkpatrick there was the late Maj. Gen. W. L. Sibert, M. ASCE, the builder of Gatun Locks. He wanted to place all Pacific locks between Cerro Cocoli and Cerro Miraflores in one structure as at Gatun. Although he had an excellent grasp of the needs for traffic, his main thesis was economy of construction. His plan was investigated by a board which reported favorably. The report was referred to the President of the United States who decided against adopting the change in the Canal plan because the Pacific locks had been started; because it would have meant a delay in completion date; and because any modification would have given the enemies of the Canal an opportunity to seize it as an evidence of weakness in the lock-type canal at a time when a political attack could have endangered the completion of the Canal.

Before General Sibert there was Mr. Stevens. In 1906 he proposed the combination of all Pacific locks into one structure near Cerro Aguadulce with a summit level terminal lake formed by a dam between Cerro Aguadulce and Cerro de Puente. He was a transportation man and understood the operational implications of his proposal. Unfortunately, his investigations did not establish the existence of suitable foundations for lock structures. Also during Mr. Stevens' time there was the late William Gerig, M. ASCE, who developed the same idea independently of Mr. Stevens.

Still earlier was the proposal of the French engineer Adolphe Godin de Lépinay at the Paris (France) Congress of 1879. He had worked on the Isthmus and knew the problems that would face canal builders. With a plan of unbelievable simplicity he advocated creating large artificial lakes about 80 feet above sea level at each end of the canal with dams as close to the oceans as permitted by the configuration of the land, and connecting these lakes by locks with the sea level sections of the Canal. The problem then would have been simply one of joining the lakes by digging a channel across the continental divide. This is properly termed the high-level, terminal-lake conception. M. de Lepinay probably was motivated by control of the Chargre river and the reduction of excavation, but he emphasized the navigational advantages of his plan. The conception of this plan has brought an enduring fame to its author.

M. de Lépinay's idea was not adopted until many years later, in 1906, when the adoption of the high-level canal with a dam and locks at Gatun was secured mainly through the efforts of Mr. Stevens. Because there was no provision for a terminal lake on the Pacific side, the Canal as completed in 1914 was only a partial realization of the fundamental conception of the Canal as a marine operating unit. The Pacific sector of the Canal when opened for traffic did not conform to the requirements of the full de Lépinay conception.

THE PRESENT ISSUE

The Panama Canal is again in an era of decision. A vast store of operating experience, not available to the early Canal builders, is available for guidance.

When the Canal was constructed, engineering considerations were the chief bases for decisions. Now marine operational requirements rather than engineering problems are the factors that should govern decisions. Just as events forced the relocation of Bohio Dam to Gatun, to form Gatun Lake, the time has come to eliminate the Pedro Miguel locks and dam and to concentrate all

Pacific locks near Miraflores to form a high level Miraflores Lake

Primarily the purpose of this paper is to present a historic ideal of the Panama Canal improvement in its modern conception, fortified by 30 years of marine operations. Discussion of these points should clarify the whole problem: No claim for engineering or construction sufficiency is made or intended.

The issue is clear. The solution of the marine operating problems of the Panama Canal consists of (1) the physical removal of Pedro Miguel locks from their position at the end of Gaillard cut; (2) the creation of a large summit level terminal lake north of Miraflores locks for use as an expansion chamber for traffic; and (3) the construction of all Pacific locks in single structures at Miraflores. That plan should equip the Canal for ages to come. Those who bring it about will bestow a tremendous service on the naval forces of the United States and on the shipping of the world. They will be the real modernizers of the Panama Canal. They will achieve the rare distinction that will rank them with the builders of the Panama Canal.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, Before the Southeastern Pennsylvania Chapter 1947 Red Cross Fund Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Southeastern Pennsylvania Chapter 1947 Red Cross fund campaign, on March 20.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I understand the original plans for this meeting today called for my friend, President Robert Johnson, of Temple, to be here with us. I am sorry he could not be two places at once. Had he been here, I would have begun my talk with a few references to the magnificent work performed by him and by Judge Oliver and the other members of that remarkable committee of Philadelphians in almost succeeding in bringing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations to Philadelphia. Even though Bob cannot be here today, and even though we are discussing a somewhat different subject, I think I'll make some of those references anyway, because they are appropriate.

To say that that committee almost succeeded in its effort to bring UN here is to dismiss too lightly, I believe, the lengths to which members of that committee went, the effort they expended, the imagination they put into the job. Actually, in this case the word "almost" tells volumes, for indeed they did succeed, they succeeded magnificently, even though the final decision went against Philadelphia. I know that every open-minded observer was convinced by this committee beyond any doubt that Philadelphia was really the logical place, the perfect place for the headquarters of an agency for the advancement of peace and of decency among men and among nations.

More, however, Judge Oliver and Bob Johnson and the civic-spirited Philadelphians who worked with them, did something for our town which long has needed doing—they "sold" us Philadelphians on our own city. This sleepy town, as some would call it, shabbily genteel Philadelphia, if you will, in that supposedly futile effort to become the capital of the world, had come alive with such driving energy that I think it surprised us all. I guess we just never believed the old town had it in her.

But now that we know—now that we've had a demonstration of what Philadelphia can really do when it sets its mind to it—let's keep it up; let's not ever again let Philadelphia give the impression it has fallen asleep to dream on its past glories.

This Red Cross drive affords one of those opportunities for Philadelphia and Philadelphians to keep the fires burning under the boiler of our civic consciousness—to keep up the steam. I am sure it will be a real success.

Next to paying our taxes—a somewhat painful thing to speak of this month—I don't know of anything which reminds us more forcefully of our duties—our obligations—in our democracy than the annual drive of the Red Cross.

Obligations in a democracy are few and far between when listed alongside the host of privileges and rights which go with a democracy. They are peculiar obligations, compared with the obligations of citizens under most other forms of government, in that they are so easy to pass off on somebody else—on George—if one has a mind to do so.

You can let George familiarize himself with the records of candidates for office and let George do the voting. You can let George keep an eye on the public officials and let George protest when things are wrong. You can even let George take care of the Red Cross drive, collect the money, donate the money.

There is, then, either one of two results. Either the Georges get to be so few in number that eventually we have no democracy any more—but just a few Georges who do the things they think should be done whether the rest of us think they should or not—or else everybody has to become a George.

When that happens, then, by George—by George, indeed—we have real democracy.

I don't have to give you people here today a pep talk on the Red Cross, and I'm not going to try. You know the need; you know the urgency of the need, or you wouldn't be here in the first place. You know how much is needed, and for what purposes. I know you'll sell the story of that need to the people of our town and that their response will be truly in the Philadelphia tradition.

The Philadelphia tradition, I think, tells the story perfectly.

It is a tradition of decency, of decency among men.

We who have grown up in this town, under this tradition, passing under Bill Penn's hat, walking among the daily reminders of old Ben Franklin, exploring the narrow little streets where Washington and Jefferson and the Adamses and Hamilton and the others lived and talked and worked out a plan of government which grows in stature as it ages, we who have inherited the Philadelphia tradition as our very own and know it intimately sometimes forget, I am afraid, that this freedom, this decency we so cherish among men is not a universal thing enjoyed by all but is, in fact, a luxury so far achieved only by a comparative few.

It is important that we keep this fact in mind. It is, in fact, necessary to keep it in mind, for we have a terrific task ahead of us, a task which is almost frightening in scope.

Our job—a job I am convinced our generation cannot shirk if there are to be other generations—is to spread the Philadelphia tradition—the tradition of brotherhood and of decency among men—over an entire world.

Most of the world is conditioned now for acceptance of that doctrine, but that was true in other years, in other generations, after other upheavals, and the idea didn't take, it didn't catch on. Now there is another opportunity, perhaps the last opportunity, and this time it must be seized.

This symbol we have before us here today, this Red Cross, is an exemplification of the idea we must spread. The Red Cross represents the conviction that the sufferings of each of us are the concern of all of us, that we are indeed our brother's keeper, that starvation and privation and disease, disaster and tragedy, no matter where they strike, are our business.

America has always known this. It has demonstrated its knowledge of this fact in one way or another many times in the past—usually in dollars. Dollars are important, of course. I should say that in what they represent in food and shelter and warmth and medical supplies and hope they are urgently important. But they are not enough by themselves. They must be accompanied by something more precious than gold.

We must export to a whole world America's greatest single product—the ideas which go to make America—ideas which, simply stated, are the things of which our Philadelphia tradition is made—the belief that man is an individual endowed with a God-given right to dignity and to decency.

We must first perfect in our own nation those principles of human dignity to which we subscribe so that they will be enjoyed by every American everywhere. And each American must, in his own way, be representative to the world of the value of a doctrine based on so simple a foundation as decency among men.

The Red Cross has always been an important factor in the spread of this doctrine, and I know it will continue to be one. But, the active help of all Americans and of all like-minded individuals everywhere is required to breathe into all mankind this spirit of oneness among men, of friendship among men, of friendship among nations.

We Americans must sometimes be a puzzling and irrational race to other peoples. We divide openly, noisily, and sometimes angrily over the occupant of the White House, our President, yet join solidly in reverence for the office he holds; we fight bitter partisan political campaigns which are regarded elsewhere as reflections of the disunity and division of America, yet on grave issues facing our Nation, partisanship usually disappears and we are one; our war strategy was continually under attack in the newspapers and in the Congress and yet, on the fundamental tests, it was always supported all the way; our newspaper editors are sometimes hung in effigy in protest against the violence of their views, and yet there is no sincere American who would tolerate infringement of the editor's freedom to speak; our Government owns the air over which the radio stations broadcast and yet those stations are free to broadcast attacks upon that Government.

Perhaps it is too much to expect that all peoples everywhere would want to emulate our form of Government, or could emulate them successfully had they the desire. On the other hand, it is not too much to desire that all of those people who want to might one day have the opportunity to try.

How to provide the fertile soil in which such freedom can germinate is the long-range problem of the world, a problem in whose

solution we who hold to the Philadelphia tradition have a tremendous stake.

I think the first approach to the solution of that long-range problem is a short-range, immediate step—to see to it that all peoples everywhere begin now to obtain at least the very barest minimum essentials of life—food, clothing, shelter—simple things which large elements of the world's population have never really enjoyed—things which now are denied millions. These simple material things do not of themselves breed decency among men; but decency among men cannot thrive without them.

We are taking on this tremendously big job of helping to feed and to clothe and to restore a world and it will cost us money, it will take sacrifice. We have no guarantee that our dollars so spent and our sacrifices so made will pay us the dividends we seek—the establishment of a decent world. On the other hand, however, we know that without our aid, without our sacrifices, there is no hope for the hopeless, there is only despair—the despair which in other crises in other years sowed the seeds of a whirlwind which cost us only recently the blood of more than 1,000,000 American casualties, the lives of more than a quarter-million American boys and of millions of men, women and children throughout the world.

That was a frightful price to pay for the failure of other generations to establish decency as the motivating force among men. Now we have another chance, in all likelihood our last chance.

Our road back to our next try at this task begins right here—in this Red Cross drive.

Knowing the price of failure, can we help but succeed?

American Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why UN Could Not Serve," published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of March 17, 1947; also an editorial entitled "Not Bypassing the UN But Aiding It," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 21, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of March 17, 1947]

WHY UN COULDN'T SERVE

Izvestia, chief organ of the Soviet Government, reproaches the Truman administration with bypassing the United Nations in its policy of aid to Greece. The United States is charged with ignoring its obligation as a UN member.

It so happens that the record of UN in dealing with Greece explains perfectly why recourse to the world organization was ruled out at Washington. Moscow has repeatedly, directly, and through White Russia, sought to get UN action to back up its own policy toward Greece. It had the majority of the Security Council against it all the time, but if it had had a majority in its favor it could have accomplished nothing against the veto of any permanent member of the Council.

President Truman knew perfectly well that attempt to obtain assistance for Greece through UN would have gotten nowhere. The urgency of the situation and the need of haste is the reason he puts forth why appeal to the United Nations was not made. The UN lacks funds and the machinery to render aid and any proposal to empower the United States to act for the world organization in rendering and financing aid would assuredly have been blocked by the Soviet.

UN supporters hope the time will come when the organization can successfully take in hand cases like those of Greece and Turkey. But that would require if not a change in the charter, at least a change of heart in some UN members.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of March 21, 1947]

NOT BYPASSING THE UN BUT AIDING IT

Dean Acheson's belief that American aid to Greece and Turkey to block the spread of communism won't lead to war doesn't mean, of course, that there are no potential war risks in the far-reaching proposals made to the country last week by President Truman.

There is bound to be some danger when the United States embarks on a policy directly opposed to that of the expansionist Soviet Union.

But the Under Secretary of State's calm, well-reasoned statements before the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday carried a measure of reassurance which the somewhat confused people of this country greatly needed.

We would all be glad if the United Nations, rather than the United States, could take over in Greece, Turkey, and other Communist-menaced countries and help their inhabitants to maintain their independence.

But it isn't a fact, in the present case, that the United States is deliberately bypassing the United Nations. The United States, whether we like it or not, of necessity has to assume this defense job because the UN isn't ready for it, and there is nobody else to do it.

The international organization intended to preserve peace is still in its infancy. It has no police force to keep aggressor nations—or aggressive ideologies—in check. It has had no experience to fit it to deal with such a complex situation as exists in Greece. In addition, it would have to try to operate under the threat of a veto by Soviet Russia.

Meanwhile, as Under Secretary Acheson says, time is of the essence. If the Communists were to take over in Greece when the British bow out, nobody can foresee what chain reaction, unfavorable not only to the United States but to all nations struggling against Communist domination, might develop in short order. Such a chain reaction would be a real war peril.

But some of the questions that bewilder the people of this country are: Where is the policy outlined for Greece and Turkey going to take us? How much will it cost? If we follow this line in Greece, why aren't we doing the same thing in China? Does it mean that we are starting a global crusade against communism?

Mr. Acheson's words are encouraging on one significant point. He says the Greece-Turkey case is an emergency and that study is being given to ways in which the United Nations may take hold of the situation after the emergency has passed. That's an objective toward which we certainly should be working.

But it appears to us that, if the United Nations is ever to be made competent to handle great world peace issues, it is absolutely necessary for the United States to step into the breach now. By doing so we will strengthen, not weaken, the UN.

It is impossible to believe that the United Nations can ever be made to work if it has to contend with a chronic veto threat. Nor is it at all likely that the United Nations will ever amount to a hill of beans if all countries back away every time communism prepares to add a new zone to its field of domination.

On the other hand, it is entirely conceivable that bold, courageous efforts by the United States to stem communism's march in eastern Europe will not only hearten small nations to resist Red infiltration, but help to convince the Soviet Politburo potentates that their wisest course is to drop obstructionism and adopt cooperation for peace as the best way to national stability and prosperity.

Whatever we do in Greece, let us do it with our eyes open with all the facts that we can obtain on the risks and costs involved. And let us go into it with the determination that what we do is aimed, not at stirring up more trouble, but at making the United Nation work and insuring lasting world peace.

Bypassing the UN?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very splendid editorial entitled "Who Is Bypassing UN?" published in the Charlotte Observer of March 19, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO IS BYPASSING UN?

The charge by Izvestia, the newspaper published by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, that the United States in proposing to take over the British obligations in Greece is bypassing the United Nations and acting unilaterally, should not, considering its source, need a refutation before an American audience, except that it bears a striking resemblance to editorials that have appeared in some newspapers and to speeches that have been made by some Members of Congress on the floors of both Houses.

If, indeed, the Izvestia article had been published 48 hours earlier, a reader would have been almost justified in deducing that the American editorialists and the Congressmen opposing the President's policy had taken their cue from Izvestia; but, since the order is reversed, it might be assumed that Izvestia took its cue from the American sources.

Those who persist in arguing that the Greek situation should be referred at once to the United Nations and that the United States should stay completely out of it should familiarize themselves with the following facts:

1. The Security Council in December appointed a commission and authorized it to investigate the situation in Greece. That commission is now at work on its task; hence, the Greek situation is already under consideration by the United Nations.

2. The United States, under President Truman's suggestion, will be taking over obligations that Britain is no longer able to perform; that is, these obligations are merely being transferred from one member of the United Nations to another. These obligations antedate the United Nations, because they were assumed by Britain before the United Nations completed its organization.

Since the UN has never asked Britain to relinquish these obligations to it or to any of its agencies, the argument that they bypass the UN is reduced to an absurdity.

3. As we pointed out last Saturday, the Greek situation could be handled by three branches or subsidiaries of the United Nations: the Security Council through its police force; the Bank for International Settlements; and the International Monetary Fund. The Security Council is considering the case through the commission now at work, but its police force is not yet formed. The Bank for International Settlements only this month completed its organization and is just beginning to function; the Monetary Fund is not yet operating at all.

4. Article 51 of the United Nations Charter gives individual members the authority to act in emergencies pending such time as the Security Council is able to take over the case and deal with it. The Council's investigation may take months, and in the meantime Greece could collapse. The United States is acting in the emergency under article 51.

When, therefore, Izvestia and American critics of President Truman's proposal charge this country with bypassing the United Nations, we can reply with the vernacular, "Look who's talking."

The agencies that could handle the Greek situation are not functioning, principally because Russia has refused to join them. Here is a list of those agencies in which Russia declines to cooperate:

The World Bank.
The International Monetary Fund.
The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
The Food and Agriculture Organization.
The International Civil Aeronautics Organization.
The International Labor Organization.
The International Refugee Organization.
The International Trade Organization.

To say nothing of sabotaging the Atomic Energy Commission.

Who's bypassing the United Nations?

He Who Laughs Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the magazine Labor on March 22, entitled "He Who Laughs Last."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE WHO LAUGHS LAST

Just a few years ago three men who then were Senators were fighting for public development of electric power on the Pacific coast. They were George Norris of Nebraska, Hiram Johnson of California, and Homer Bone of Washington.

How the Power Trust fought and laughed, and scorned the three as "impractical dreamers." Boulder Dam, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee and other power developments were socialism and waste of public funds.

Norris and Johnson have gone to their reward. If they had been living this week they could have joined Bone in a "last laugh" over those who called them impractical.

On the front page of the conservative Wall Street Journal appeared a long feature article, pointing out "an acute power shortage in the Pacific Northwest."

"Big as Bonneville and Grand Coulee are, they've proven inadequate to meet the Northwest's power needs," the Wall Street paper says. "That area's industry and population mushroomed in wartime and are still growing.

"By November 1, 1953, it is estimated that new Federal generating capacity of 1,565,000 kilowatts will be required to meet all needs."

As a result of the shortage, the Journal says, private utilities in the Northwest are actually urging Congress to nearly double the appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration. Talk about miracles!

Of course, the private utilities want Bonneville to sell the added power to them so they can retail it to consumers and make a profit. But their changed attitude proves that Norris, Johnson, and Bone, and those who supported them, were not dreamers but mighty practical and far-sighted men.

Only One Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Monday, March 17, 1947:

ONLY ONE CHOICE

Americans today can have only one attitude toward their President's proposal to show the world that dynamic democracy in action assumes responsibility for keeping political freedom alive in Greece.

Russia must know that the people of the United States stand behind Mr. Truman as their spokesman against the pressure of totalitarianism.

We believe that on most matters the Russians do not understand us and that we do not understand them.

Mr. Truman is seeking to make the Russians understand our position in Greece by a policy which recognizes the fact that the United Nations is not yet equipped to act in such an emergency.

The President must depend upon a united America and we think he will get the unity he needs except from extremists who are against him in everything.

There still must be public discussion of Mr. Truman's proposal to support the tottering Government of Greece and the weakening Government of Turkey in order to prevent the spread of communism in those key Balkan countries. The public must understand all of the reasons for the move and especially the broad implications which Mr. Truman said were involved.

The public must understand why the United States and not the United Nations must step in and rescue the Greek Government.

After sober discussion, which should not be too long delayed, Congress must make up its mind whether it is willing or unwilling to meet the responsibilities of world leadership which the outcome of World War II put upon us.

If Congress lends money to Greece, Americans will insist on a real democracy there. Greece is a sorry example of democracy. Few Americans will favor spending money to prop up King George of Greece. The fascist and monarchist gangs must be cleaned up if America intends to give Greece a real injection of democracy. The same goes for Turkey, which is a backward nation, prone to totalitarianism, too.

Communism has seemed attractive to some Greeks because they are living in those conditions of starvation and poverty in which communism breeds best. A hungry man may be willing to sell his political freedom for food.

And there has been—and is—hunger in Greece. Some peasants have been reduced to eating grass. In the cities the show windows display pastries but few can buy. Inflation is so great that food prices are indexed at 600,000,000 compared with 100 in 1939.

It is in this kind of arena that President Truman proposes a showdown between two theories of government—one in which the people run the state and one in which the state runs the people.

We have a chance to show Russia we intend to support democracy as strongly as she supports communism. Eventually such an attitude may prove to be the only way in which the constant clash of ideologies can be avoided.

Let's Take Up a Collection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wyoming Eagle of Thursday, March 6, 1947, entitled "Let's Take Up a Collection."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S TAKE UP A COLLECTION

Now that the war is over, everyone believes the Government should tighten its belt, pay a little on its debt, get set for the hard pull ahead. Even the Democrats are for it—if it's done right.

But it happens that the Republicans are in control of Congress, so it's the Republicans who are to determine where the cuts are to be made, if they are made. But no two of them can agree as to that. With one exception.

The exception is this: Drastic reductions are to be made in appropriations for maintenance of the Post Office Department. Yes, tell it to Ripley, the Post Office Department.

Next to maintaining the Army and Navy, the most essential service provided by Government is carrying the mails. It is conceivable that the country could get along without a Department of Commerce, a Department of Labor, a Census Bureau, or a Weather Bureau. But it is not conceivable that the country could get along without a Post Office Department.

The mail service is the lifeblood of the country—business could not be conducted without it, family relationships would be desolate without it. No department of Government—not even the Army and Navy—could long function without regular daily, fast, safe mail service.

Yet this is the one department on which the new Republican Congress has agreed to economize. Extravagances to please powerful members may be tolerated elsewhere, but not here. Appropriations for the Post Office Department must be pared to the bone.

The war raised heck with the postal service, as we all know. Experienced help was drafted into the armed forces, some never to return. Transportation was tied in knots, and, instead of hours, at times it took days to get the mails through. Carrier service was curtailed from two or three deliveries to one delivery a day. And standing at the end of a long line for service because of undermanned and overworked staffs and too few service windows became a habit.

Things would revert to normal after the war, we all thought. The U. S. A. again would have the fastest, finest, safest, most courteous postal service in the world. Where there had been two or three deliveries a day there again would be two or three. And those much-needed new post-office buildings to replace overcrowded rattletraps in use for many years were to become a reality, we believed.

But we believed wrong—if the politicrats in Congress can get away with it. For as yet no one in the majority party has raised his voice to protest against this injustice—injustice to the most indispensable department of Government, injustice to the most faithful of Government employees, and injustice to the whole people. It is the postal service that is to be cut off at the pockets, and it is being done in the name of economy.

But further curtailment of the postal service is unthinkable. Further delay in restoration of the service to peacetime efficiency is intolerable. Funds must be provided, even though the hat has to be passed—even though the Department has to be supported like we support the churches—by taking up a collection.

State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of February 28, 1947, by Roscoe Drummond:

WASHINGTON.—Congress is showing signs of slowly bestirring itself over the unabated trend of industrial monopoly in the United States.

In the extent to which political leaders talk against but do very little about it, economic monopoly is like bad weather. Both parties are strongly committed to fight great concentrations of economic power, but year after year goes by and the steps taken to check monopoly and the appropriations given the Justice Department to enforce the antitrust laws add up to mighty little—mighty little compared to the size of the problem.

Several factors currently are stimulating Congress to look, listen—and possibly act:

Both the President and the Council of Economic Advisers put a strengthening of the antitrust laws among the foremost safeguards of a sound economy.

Industrial monopoly was tremendously abetted by the war, and the trend is showing no sign of checking itself voluntarily.

Congress recognizes that it gravely weakens its case for checking labor monopoly when it continues to do so little about checking industrial monopoly.

It becomes more evident all the time that the monopolistic restraint of trade is a peril to free enterprise itself, and that regimentation by monopoly cannot fail ultimately to lead to regimentation by government.

The evidence accumulates to show how the whole impact of war production was to cause big business to grow bigger. Two recent congressional reports on monopoly problems underline this trend.

They show that of $175,000,000,000 of prime war-contract orders to 18,000 corporations, more than two-thirds went to only 100 large concerns. While the exigencies of war no doubt justified a procurement policy which stimulated rather than resisted monopoly, its effects are increasingly apparent in the Nation's postwar economy. Thus the allocation of war plants followed the pattern of taking bigness and making it still bigger.

It develops that the 250 largest manufacturing corporations which before the war owned 65 percent of all the productive facilities operated about 80 percent of all the private facilities built during the war with Federal funds. These corporations are in the best position to acquire these facilities now that the war is over.

The continuing concentration of the economy in the hands of the already big is reflected not merely in an accretion of big business. It has been achieved at the sacrifice of small business. There were some 160,000 fewer businesses operating at the beginning of 1946 than there were in 1941.

Numerous antimonopoly measures are beginning to sprout in the new Congress, and the two outstanding antagonists of monopoly are from both parties. They are Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, and Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming. The issue in Congress is not so much a choice between pro- and anti-monopoly as between measures best calculated to break monopoly and insure competition. The more active antimonopolists are agreed on these main lines of legislative attack.

1. Provide for Federal charter of corporations, with strict standards of corporate conduct.

2. Prohibit corporate mergers through acquisition of assets or require Federal Trade Commission approval of such mergers.

3. Revise the patent laws to prohibit attaching restrictive conditions of manufacture, sale, or price to patent licenses.

4. Make corporation officers and directors civilly liable for adequate penalties for violation of antitrust laws.

Among those who count vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws essential to free enterprise there is considerable anxiety over the forthcoming resignation of Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge, in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department. Much depends on the character and talent which goes into this post.

But all the talent in the country cannot enforce the law without funds to carry forward the enforcement. Here Congress long has been deficient—Democratic and Republican Congresses which give the antitrust laws strong praise and weak financial support.

There is no economy in crippling the enforcement of laws so vital to the economic health of the Nation.

Address on Public Works by Hon. Chapman Revercomb, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech which I made before the Regional Highway Conference in New York City on February 20, 1947, dealing with the subject of public works.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The progress and advancement of a nation is closely linked with its advancement in the construction and maintenance of works that improve communication, transportation, trade, and comfort of the citizens. Such structures are monuments to progress. Therefore, if the country lives and grows from year to year, and if it expands in population, there is required expansion in those instruments that improve in general the living of the people in their trade and commerce with one another and with the rest of the world.

There is a reasonable limitation, of course, upon the extent of such undertakings, and that is the limitation of cost. While plans may be made and projected for such work, yet from year to year we must use sound judgment to live within our means and not undertake activities which may create a ruinous burden. Unless such a limitation be followed we could conceivably reach a point where we could not maintain the needed structures that we have built, much less add to them. Unless we follow the rule of reasonable restraint we could find ourselves like a bankrupt man living in a once beautiful mansion that is falling apart around his head. So, therefore, we are always confronted with our ambitions and our plans and with the ever-present necessity of reasonable and sensible restraint. One must be fairly weighed against the other; there is no other sound course.

HISTORY AND TYPES OF PUBLIC WORKS

The meaning of the term "public works" as used with respect to the Federal Government has changed and expanded through the years of our history. In the early days of the Nation's life, the phrase "public works" meant construction needed only in meeting the actual physical needs of Federal activities, such as lighthouses, harbors, post offices, and similar structures.

One of the very first acts of the First Congress was the passage of a bill to construct the lighthouse at Cape Henry, Va., at the entrance to the Chesapeake Bay. This act was passed on March 26, 1790, and the lighthouse was completed and showed a light in 1792. Thus, the Cape Henry Lighthouse apparently has the distinction of being the first completed public-works peroject in America, its beginning antedating the surveying of the District of Columbia as the national seat of government by several months.

For many years expenditures for national public works were limited strictly to those projects controlled by the Federal Government and projects over which the States

had no jurisdiction and were without right of management.

New public demands and needs throughout the growing country expanded the interpretation of the words "Federal public works." As a result, a great variety of services are now included under the term such as forestry, pest controls, and the planning that goes with these undertakings. It might be said that the growth of this field is measured only in terms of public duties, national wealth, and willingness to pay.

The term has long since been expanded to include monetary aid to the States in the construction of projects primarily under the control and jurisdiction of their governments. The public road is a notable example. While the State must map out its plans for its roads, yet the Federal Government must approve such plans and the cost thereof where Federal funds are in any part used.

Only a few years ago the Supreme Court of the United States held that where Federal funds are used by the States in carrying out any of its functions of Government that the Congress may impose any conditions that it sees fit upon the use of such funds. Thus, we have in essence the joint venture of the State and Federal Government where Federal aid is used.

Another example of the expansion of Federal public works has followed the expanding definition of navigable streams. The national Government has primary and exclusive jurisdiction over navigation. There was a time when navigable streams were those which were considered navigable "in fact." Through a course of changing court interpretations all streams now which are substantial feeders or tributaries into a navigable waterway are also considered navigable insofar as Federal control over them and their waters may be concerned. Thus has followed the construction by the National Government of numerous dams and reservoirs and flood control projects upon streams that were not known as navigable in the early days of the country.

In more recent years we have beheld the National Government engaging in other undertakings classified as public works. For relief against unemployment, the PWA, the WPA, the CCC and other Government agencies were used. This was a new concept of the term, and under this concept programs were adopted by the administration that became official policies of government.

CRITERIA OF PUBLIC WORKS

The National Resources Board in 1934 shows how far those in charge of Federal activities went in their prospectus of public works when that Board set up eight criteria to be used in the planning of public works to meet the unemployment crisis. Here we see the term stretched to include instruments of social and economic reform generally.

They were:

1. The criterion of balance, which means consideration of proper proportion between expenditures for the several kinds of public works.

2. The criterion of service standards.

3. The criterion of essential services applicable to such basic needs as water supply, sewage disposal, and fire protection.

4. The criterion of cost.

5. The criterion of relative needs and relative benefits.

6. The criterion of trends, that is, of growth and development potentialities.

7. The criterion of emergency, with application varied according to whether projects are for replacement of necessary public works destroyed by fire, flood, or other catastrophe.

8. The criterion of social and economic desirability.

Of the rules that I have just mentioned, the principal difference of opinion throughout the country has centered and now centers upon the criterion of social and economic desirability. This involves the ever-present and growing problem of using the Government's power of public works construction where it conflicts with private enterprise in the creation of services and needs of the people. Notable in this conflict is that of power projects.

Under the recent administration of the Government a policy grew that went quite far in using public funds for the construction of projects which private industry had generally undertaken in the field, even to the extent of curtailing the expansion of private works.

It seems to me a dangerous course for a government in a country like ours, which in years past fostered private initiative and enterprise, to take any step that would stultify the growth of private work. Some hold to the view that any endeavor impressed with public interest should be controlled by the Government. To follow such a course to its ultimate would eventually mean complete ownership and control of all enterprise engaged in works needful or helpful to the well-being of our people. To carry such a philosophy to its end would place all activities under government control, from the manufacture of electricity to the raising of potatoes for food. And do not think that an exaggeration. We have seen livestock destroyed by Government edict; land subsidized for uselessness; and this year potato raisers were paid subsidies through Government purchase. There may be emergencies for the Government to well meet and give aid, but it is a dangerous course if it becomes a fixed policy, for you may be sure of this—where the Government spends its money it will soon control the activity. If that principle became generally established we would then have a people under strict control of a central government, and freedom of life and enterprise would have ended.

Therefore, there must be a reasonable limitation upon federally controlled enterprises. It seems to me that there is reason in limiting the use of Federal works to those undertakings where private enterprise cannot meet the need. Of course, privately owned enterprise, which deals with the public and is impressed with our present understanding of the term "public interest," will be subject to the control of the several States in fixing the service that it renders and the price that it charges for its product.

Under such a plan private venture will not be stopped. It can expand within its capacity to do so. Where it cannot render the service, the Government will meet the needs of the citizens with public works so that they may not be without the services and comforts of a progressive country.

CURRENT BUDGET FIGURES

You may perhaps be interested in a few figures with respect to expenditures by your National Government upon some of the public works which through the course of years it has undertaken and which have become established functions of the Federal Government.

Under the budget now before the Congress there has been allocated for all items that come under the term "Civil Public Works" the sum of $2,100,000,000 to be expended for the fiscal year 1948, that is, for the year ending June 30, 1948. This may be compared with the figure of $1,700,000,000 which will be expended for the fiscal year of 1947. The proposals for expenditures under this item cover both direct construction by the National Government and grants to the States. I need not tell you that the proposed figure for 1948 will in all likelihood be cut and curtailed by the Congress. Candor requires that I say this to you as my earnest belief. The extent of any cut cannot be stated at this time.

Taxes have become so burdensome upon all the people of this country that there is a demand—and I may say a very just demand—that the expenses of Government be lowered so that not only may taxes be lowered upon the citizens but that payment be made upon the gigantic public debt now in excess of $260,000,000,000.

Sound finance requires an immediate start upon the retirement of this debt which will necessarily extend over a long period of time. Likewise, taxes must be lowered as a first step toward meeting a more settled fiscal condition among the people of this country, not only for this year but for the years to come.

The amount sought by the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for the fiscal year 1948 amounts to a total of $290,350,000 for new construction and for continued construction of projects already begun. And for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, for maintenance, operation, and care the Board of Engineers for such civil functions of the Army has asked an appropriation of $70,000,000.

To those of you who are interested primarily in Federal aid to State roads and the amount expended by your National Government in the maintenance of roads, I may say to you that there has been authorized, as distinguished from appropriated, for each of the first three postwar years, the sum of $500,000,000 or a total of $1,500,000,000. No part of this sum has been appropriated or spent. It was primarily intended to meet unemployment if it arose. There is a move afoot to extend the appropriation to such future years when it may be needed if unemployment arises.

The $500,000,000 for each year has been broken down as follows: $225,000,000 for work on Federal-aid highway system, $150,000,000 for secondary or feeder roads—this has to be spent on a system of secondary roads—$125,000,000 for highways in urban areas in and around cities of 5,000 or more population.

Thus we have a prospective plan for employment now held in abeyance for use when needed. And its plan would give permanent improvements for roads.

COST OF CONSTRUCTION

I have before me a construction-cost index prepared by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, which shows at a glance how construction costs have increased in this country since 1913. I thought that this might be of interest to you because it will indeed be a determining factor, temporarily, in the program for construction in this country.

Using the average for the early years of this century to obtain an average cost for the year 1913 as a normal base of 100, we find that the cost curve dropped to 88.56 1 year later, in 1914. It rose to 92.58 in 1915 and thereafter rose swiftly to a peak of 251.28 in 1920. The swift rise from 1915 to 1920 covered the years of the First World War.

After 1920 costs dropped to a low of 174.45 in 1922 and remained below the World War I peak for many years, reaching as low as 156.97 in 1932. After 1932 construction costs again soared swiftly, and in 1946 reached an all-time high of 345.74.

In other words, construction costs today are approximately three and one-half times higher per unit than in 1913 and more than twice as high as in 1922.

PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS

The States, with Federal aid, still maintain the principal highways throughout the eastern States. Many of the highways through the wide regions of the Western States are maintained with Federal funds. This is one phase of public construction that must go forward as far as possible within our means.

The primary network of highways for the United States is now well advanced, with hard-surfaced and year-round road facilities for a large part of the country. In the densely populated centers something has

been done toward heavy duty roads where planning distinguishes among uses and limits express or heavy traffic to specially constructed lanes.

The next steps in road development would seem to lie primarily in—

1. Continuance of the program of classifying and developing roads for specialized uses, such as heavy-duty highways without grade intersections, freeways, and walkway provisions for pedestrians.

2. Improvement of alinement, grades, and roadsides on greatly widened rights-of-way for existing roads.

3. Continuance of the trend to abolish grade crossings with railroads and with intersecting highways where traffic demands.

4. Development of rural roads.

Each of these four aspects of road work will require large sums of money during coming years. Long range plans carefully related to other methods of transportation, to possible population trends and industrial development, should be prepared in advance to avoid wasteful mistakes.

A great need in much of the country today is the development of rural roads to markets, and it is my hope that the construction of public highways has now advanced to the stage where something may be done toward giving better travel facilities to the farmers and the residents of the rural communities. Much has already been done in my State and in other States in this regard, but there are still vast stretches of the country, thinly populated, which are without hard-surfaced or secondary roads.

The result of failing to construct rural roads in sufficient numbers has frequently been to shift rural populations from the dirt road areas to the hard-surfaced road sections. This has meant a decrease of population on the farms and a corresponding increase of persons seeking work in the urban communities.

New special-purpose roads have already demonstrated their desirability in the more densely populated regions. It is no longer necessary to argue the advisability of bypassing traffic around congested centers and towns instead of forcing it through a great expense of time and money.

Various parkway developments throughout the Nation have illustrated the value of that type of travel way.

The so-called speed highways have accelerated movement of traffic.

Much needs to be done to make our existing highways more useful and safer. Perhaps the chief need today is wider rights-of-way to permit expansion, better curvature, and grades, and roadside improvements. It has been estimated that recreational use forms at least 60 percent of the total use of automobiles, a showing which would seem to justify work done to the control and preservation of roadside appearance.

Many rearrangements of transportation facilities might result from consideration of the effective use of all methods of moving goods and people instead of departmental planning of one method at a time. For instance, extensive highway development has already showed that much of the railway branch line mileage is unnecessary, and the towns on railway branch lines can be better and more cheaply served by the highway. A great deal of money and effort could have been saved had plans been made earlier looking toward this development.

In this connection there are some who think that eventually the airplane will supplant the automobile as a means of transportation, even as the automobile has in a sense supplanted the railroad. Such a development may, of course, come to pass, but I do not conceive of it within the limits of foreseeable probability at the present time. No matter how much the airplane comes into general use the fact remains that human beings are essentially attached to the soil, and highways are and will continue to be the chief avenue of transportation. While the airplane may conceivably lessen the driving time between distant points and extend its use into the movement of goods and commodities which need to be moved quickly, it is probable that the highways will continue to move heavy goods and commodities and also serve for the utilitarian and pleasurable use of automobiles.

The fact that a great deal of the Nation's freight still moves on the waterways is frequently overlooked.

Railroad reconstruction and modernization, highway development, air development, and waterways planning can well be coordinated.

WATER PROJECTS

Water projects command our attention as useful to our progress. And here again is a field in which planning is important. Not only waterways but water supply, sewage treatment, and pollution elimination comprise important subjects for plan. The Federal Works Agency has been supervising extensive plans on these items. Other aspects of this type of work concern flood control, irrigation, and drainage.

PUBLIC WORKS AND UNEMPLOYMENT

At the present time, with the great starved market of America and the world, there is full opportunity of employment in this country. However, we cannot be so shortsighted as to fail to understand that the time will come when this market may be more nearly satisfied, when there will be less demand for the goods and articles that man needs and desires, and when the production of them will be lowered and there will be less employment of our people. Plans must be made for such an eventuality. The Government of this country is not going to permit the people of America to be in want. So long as private industry and employment offers an opportunity of livelihood, as it does today, the immediate problem of work is not a trouble. But plans must be devised to forestall want in this country. It is my belief that public works will be the first step to be taken to meet any margin of unemployment that may arise in the future. If that fails, then there is nothing left but to resort to direct monetary aid to those in need.

To this end plans are being made to meet such a situation if it should arise.

I may say to you that today, under the plan of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, there is a backlog of plans placed on a list of active projects, ready to be proceeded with, in a total cost under present levels of cost of $867,000,000. These are projects that have been authorized but for which money has not been appropriated.

We should proceed to continue to draw public-works plans to meet any possible unemployment in the future, so that if financial depression comes upon us we shall not be forced into the expedient of providing useless work that our people may live.

Those projects should be such as to be of actual lasting benefit to the country as well as immediate relief to those engaged upon them. May the country never again and may the people never again have to contend with a situation such as that which arose under the confused and attempted relief of WPA.

HOUSING REGULATIONS

I have discussed heretofore the advantages of planning in public works, but it must be wise and foresighted planning, otherwise the result may be failure and distress.

The best example of this is to be found in the housing situation. Up to 1932 housing was not thought of as a public responsibility. With the emergence of the new philosophy of government in recent years a variety of housing activities sprang up with different governmental agencies working on them and with a great deal of resultant confusion. These housing agencies were Federal, State, and municipal. In addition, there were private agencies, usually called housing associations of the cities in which they were developed.

The Federal Government set up several agencies of its own, including the Federal Housing Administration; the Public Works Administration, Housing Division; the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; the Division of Subsistence Homesteads; the Federal Emergency Relief Administration; the Alley Dwelling Authority of the District of Columbia; and others.

More recently, we have been confronted with a serious housing shortage due to the allocation of materials to other purposes during the war and the controls which were set up by the Federal Government to insure that the materials of war would not be diverted to some other purpose.

When the war ended the controls remained in effect, and it soon became apparent that the controls and the agencies which had been set up to administer them had so bound up the Nation's economy that the controls were a hindrance rather than a help in solving the housing situation.

Several months ago I came across evidence of how not to plan to solve the housing situation. For instance, at one of the large hardwood lumber mills in this country, I discovered great stacks of hardwood lumber in the yards. Knowing how much this lumber was needed for home building here, I inquired as to why it appeared on the yards in such abundance unused. I found that it had been cut for export shipment and was stocked there to be sent abroad. It could not be purchased or used in the domestic market. It was marked for export to other countries.

About the same time the Chief Executive announced through the press that this country was prepared to import lumber from abroad. And so, as the result of controls, we were confronted with the spectacle of ships sailing from the United States loaded with lumber and meeting on the high seas other ships coming to this country with lumber for us. The controls had backfired.

PRESENT PLANS

Public works throughout this Nation, both by the Federal Government and by the States, must continue at a reasonable pace—we cannot permit a deterioration in the great travel ways of this country such as the roads and the navigable rivers and harbors.

The reclamation projects of the West have justified those gigantic undertakings not only in the reclamation to usefulness of thousands upon thousands of acres of land but also in the continuing amortization and repayment to the Government of money invested in them.

However, undoubtedly the time has come in the financial situation of this country where there must be a retrenchment in spending so that people may be gradually relieved of the burden of the immense public debt which amounts to more than $2,000 for each individual in the country, and so that taxes may be reasonably reduced to permit private expansion and to permit people to use more of their earnings for their own private advancement and well-being. This, frankly, means that there will be less expenditures by your Federal Government and perhaps by the State governments.

Certainly the States must follow the same course of tax decrease or the lessening of Federal taxes will, in fact, help the citizens very little.

There can be no fixed formula as to just what projects will be constructed. The decision must be made with each particular plan to see how far it can be justified. The factors of need, public benefit, and monetary

return will be largely guiding in the public works program for sometime to come.

It would be a very sound and wonderful thing if all of our projects undertaken with public funds could in fact make a monetary return to the till out of which they were financed. This, however, we know cannot be done with all projects. The return from some will be made in the service given the public, for example, over its roads and its waterways.

REORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

One of the important recent developments in the public works field occurred with the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. This act, sponsored by Senator La Follette, attempted to streamline and simplify the functions of the legislative side of the Federal Government, and one of the features of the reorganization was the combination and coordination of overlapping committees.

Section 102 of that act provides that all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters shall be referred to the Committee on Public Works if they cover the following subjects:

1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

2. Public works for the benefit of navigation and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

3. Water power.

4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.

6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, customhouses, federal courthouses, and government buildings within the District of Columbia.

7. Measures relating to the Capitol building and the Senate and House Office buildings.

8. Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

9. Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park.

10. Measures relating to the construction and maintenance of roads and post roads.

It will be readily seen that the new Committee on Public Works is now charged with responsibility for proposed legislation on matters which were previously handled by three Senate committees.

Flood control, rivers and harbors, water power, and pollution of navigable waters were formerly under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. Public buildings and grounds, the purchase of sites and construction of post offices and other buildings in the District of Columbia, measures relating to the Capitol Building and the Senate and House Office Buildings, measures relating to the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution, and parks within the District of Columbia were formerly under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Measures relating to the construction and maintenance of roads and post roads were formerly under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Under the new Legislative Reorganization Act a new concept of the responsibilities and duties of legislative committees has come into being. Heretofore, it has been the custom of the departments of the Government to forward plans for construction projects to the legislative committees with either recommendations of approval or disapproval, based upon the advice of the technical experts employed by the administrative departments. Now the committees are to be staffed with their own technical advisers on the various subjects, and the need, usefulness, and costs of projects will be double-checked before legislation directs proceeding with them.

Urge Action on H. R. 2185

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, anything that can be done to insure adequate and continuous supplies of natural gas at reasonable prices to the people of Michigan will have my unqualified support.

For that reason I want to congratulate my colleague, Representative Ross RIZLEY, of Oklahoma, for having introduced on February 24 a bill, H. R. 2185, for it appears that enactment of the amendments to the Natural Gas Act as proposed in this bill will repair the damage that has been done by the Federal Power Commission in following policies which have resulted in preventing the natural-gas industry from developing its markets.

I have made some inquiry into this matter, and from my study it appears that the natural-gas industry has made every effort to render adequate and continuous service.

But because of the red tape and confusion to which they have been subjected by the Federal Power Commission, it has been humanly impossible for the industry to give my people the service they want and are entitled to have.

In Michigan we have severely cold winters and we must have plentiful supplies of fuel available at all times. Natural gas is the most convenient and cleanest of fuels and many householders want to use it. Unless the FPC follows policies which will permit the natural gas industry to expand and serve its markets properly, those who want to use natural gas are fearful that sufficient supplies will not be available at the very time when most needed, namely in times of extreme cold. If the FPC would stay within the limits of regulation laid down for it by Congress, and let the industry fulfill the job it is capable of fulfilling, I am confident that my people would enjoy to the fullest extent the cleanliness and convenience of adequate and continuous natural gas service, and at a price that is reasonable.

Industrial plants in Battle Creek, Kalamazoo and other communities within my district also feel that they should not be prevented from having the benefits of natural gas for various uses they make of it in their operations. I thoroughly agree with them, and feel that the amendments to the Natural Gas Act contained in the Rizley bill will have this result.

It is most necessary that the interstate transportation of natural gas be subjected to regulation, and I would be the last one to suggest otherwise, but just as emphatically I say that those who administer the Natural Gas Act must not exceed their jurisdiction, as they have done, to the detriment of the public welfare.

I hope that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will hold hearings on this measure as soon as possible and will expedite its consideration of the legislation, so that the natural gas industry can proceed in an orderly fashion to meet the demands being made on it.

Tribute to the Late Mrs. Alben W. Barkley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Paducah (Ky.) Sun-Democrat entitled "Sidelights on Paducah." It might more appropriately be entitled "Sidelights on the Golden Character of the Late Mrs. Alben W. Barkley."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIDELIGHTS ON PADUCAH

(By Fred G. Neuman)

More people visited Mount Kenton Cemetery on the Lone Oak Road over the week end than were ever in that burial ground before. The visitors came from far and wide to see the many floral tributes placed at the grave of Mrs. Alben W. Barkley, who was laid to rest last Wednesday. Most of the designs, original and elaborate, came from out-of-town friends of the family and showed the esteem in which Mrs. Barkley was held both here and elsewhere. Her passing occasioned the largest number of floral blankets, sprays, wreaths, crosses, broken hearts, anchors, and other designs in the history of the city. Since the funeral services last Wednesday hundreds of cars have entered the quiet burial ground and driven around the back of the circle to view the lovely flowers. Over the week end, however, as many as nine cars at a time paused beside the Barkley lot, nearly a quarter acre in size and strewn with nature's choicest blooms. Although the site stands on a slight rise and the weather was cold, few of the flowers had wilted by late Sunday afternoon.

Many kind words were spoken of Mrs. Barkley, both in her lifetime and since she joined the host on the other side. She was one of the most gracious and humble personalities this town ever knew—and that goes for Washington, too, where she spent the last 35 years of her life. The fact that her husband was prominent never turned her head, and she longed to come back among old home folks, hence the farm at the outskirts of town on the Blandville Road, with all its old ways, old days, and old memories. She loved Kentucky with undying affection. She never once forgot her friends and associates in the old home town.

I've read lots of fine tributes to Mrs. Barkley the past few days. But I believe the finest expression came in a letter just received from Miss Mabel Warnecke, of the department of psychology at the University of Kentucky, which touches on a phase of character typical of the good woman who has just gone on. Here is Miss Warnecke's letter:

"These few lines may help you to understand the warm spot that will long be Mrs. Barkley's in the hearts of her many friends.

"Several years ago, when the women's council of her church was holding its first fall meeting, the ladies present were asked to introduce themselves—each in turn giving her name and some identification. Various ladies did so, adding perhaps 'wife of the treasurer of the church,' or whatever was appropriate.

"When Mrs. Barkley's turn arrived, with everyone prepared to hear 'wife of Senator BARKLEY, majority leader, etc.,' what happened? A sweet voice simply said, 'I am Dot Barkley. Linda Brower's sister.' (Linda, of course, having been a faithful worker in the church for many years.)

"Such charm is not often found."

Resolution of Independent Political Slovak Club of Monessen, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution which I have received from the officers of the Independent Political Slovak Club of Monessen, Pa. The officers of this organization are noted for their high degree of citizenship and integrity.

I hope that the State Department will take cognizance of this appeal in behalf of Dr. Jozef Tiso.

The resolution follows:

Whereas Very Rev. Msgr. Dr. Jozef Tiso, the first and only President of the Slovak Republic, proved his loyality to Czechoslovakia as long as it was a practical reality; to wit, from 1918 to 1938; and

Whereas the representatives of the Slovak peoples, duly elected in the fall elections of 1938 by universal, secret, and direct ballot, unanimously proclaimed an independent Slovakia on March 14, 1939, upon the disintegration of Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas Dr. Jozef Tiso was drafted into the highest office of this lawfully erected Slovak Republic, guiding and managing its internal affairs during the trying years from 1939 to 1945 during which period Slovakia progressed culturally, thrived economically, and grew nationally as it never did in the past; and

Whereas the Slovak Republic, under the wise leadership of Dr. Jozef Tiso, had been recognized, before, and during the war, as an independent state, even by many United Nations, to wit: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Great Britain, France, Poland, Yugoslavia, and many others; and

Whereas Dr. Jozef Tiso and his regime had the wholehearted support of the vast majority of his countrymen, because of his just rule in spite of the raving dictates of Hitler; and

Whereas the Slovak Republic was destroyed by the self-appointed communistic political regime, imposed upon the Slovak people without vote by the sheer might of Russian military force; and

Whereas thousands of Slovak inteligentia, men, women, and children were arrested and taken to concentration camps in Russia and Siberia without trial or conviction, where they are enslaved, starved, and dying in camps No. 487 and 242/29B, in Stalinsk, Siberia:

Therefore, we, American citizens of Slovak descent, members of the Independent Political Slovak Club, and residents of Monessen, Pa., in meeting assembled, Sunday, the 26th day of January 1947, hereby protest most emphatically and vigorously the unjust imprisonment and threatened execution of the Very Reverend Monsignor Dr. Jozef Tiso, and demand the release of the Slovak inteligentia from Russian concentration camps.

Be it resolved, (1) That we demand the liberation of Dr. Jozef Tiso; (2) that the case of Dr. Jozef Tiso be placed before duly elected representatives of a free Slovak people; (3) that the Slovak Nation which has lived through a thousand years of oppression, domination, and misrule, be given a chance to exercise its God-given right of self-rule, as have many smaller nations, both in size and population. To wit: Norway, Irish Free State, Switzerland, Belgium, Denmark, Albania, and others; be it further

Resolved, That we protest most vigorously the imprisonment and trial of Dr. Jozef Tiso, because he was in the sphere of the Axis nations, being forced by sheer might to do the will of Axis leaders, many of whom are enjoying liberty and the friendship of the United Nations, to wit: Italian Victor Emanuel, Hungarian Admiral Horthy, and others.

In conclusion we further protest the imprisonment and trial of Dr. Jozef Tiso, because it is purely a political guise on the part of Dr. Edward Benes, the Prague puppet of the Kremlin, and his fellow Red Communists to destroy all political opposition in a country that claims to be free and democratic, and thereby to continue the colonial exploitation of Slovakia, as was the case from 1918 to 1938; it is also

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the proper authorities of our Government so that it will intervene on behalf of Dr. Jozef Tiso and the enslaved intelligentsia in Russia.

Signed at Monessen, Pa., this 26th day of February 1947.

STEPHEN CIRNEZ,
ANDREW B. ZEMPAH,
MILAN PETTKO,
JOHN K. ANDERSKOVICH,
JOSEPH KRUPA,
Officers of the Independent Political Slovak Club, Monessen, Pa.

Tribute to Commissioner Durr, of the Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 19), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute which has been paid by Variety, one of the country's oldest, most distinguished, and most popular trade magazines, to Commissioner Clifford J. Durr, of the Federal Communications Commission. Commissioner Durr represents the very highest tradition of the American civil service, and throughout his notable career his one great goal has been the protection of the public interest. He has frequently been criticized by some spokesmen for the industry which his commission regulates, but it is encouraging to note that the most influential publication in the entertainment industry appreciates what others overlook; that in serving the interests of the public, Commissioner Durr has also served the long range interest of the broadcasters themselves.

This citation to Clifford Durr appeared in the March 12, 1947, issue of Variety.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLIFFORD J. DURR

Clifford J. Durr is one of the few Commissioners in the history of the FCC who has been able to see the woods for the trees. By contrast with the lawyers and engineers who have usually been his colleagues, he has insisted that the decisive criterion of radio service is not primarily the coverage pattern, the balance sheet, or the subtleties of a practitioner before the FCC bar, but what comes out of the loudspeaker: the program. It is preeminently Durr who has refused to lend his assent to Commission decisions which might tend to corrode the foundations of a truly free and unmonopolized radio. It is Durr who has struck out sharply against inflated sale prices for facilities which are primarily the property of the public. And, finally, it is Durr who has not hesitated to state his position publicly and in lucid terms, stumping the country from end to end to preach the gospel of democracy in radio.

To the great dissenter of the present FCC, the guardsman of the American people's stake in the air they nominally own and the most show-management-minded Commissioner on the FCC, Variety extends its esteem and its 1946 award.

Little by Little the American People Are Being Let in on What Has Been Happening to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial from the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News by Mr. Herman E. Gieske.

This statement clearly indicates that the people, particularly in my section of the country, are not going to be fooled by the political gymnastics of the State Department and are going to take a good look at all administration proposals entailing further foreign commitments.

The editorial follows:

OF ALL PEOPLE!

Little by little the American people are being let in on what has been happening to Greece. Paul Porter, formerly an obscure small town New Deal editor, is revealed as "a special investigator in Greece," hurrying home to lay before Congress "first hand" evidence supporting President Truman's program to combat communism in Greece by lending American guns, money, and military to that country and Turkey.

Of all people we can think of, we could scarcely imagine anyone less qualified for this key role than the ubiquitous Paul Porter, whose last role was head of the now nearly defunct OPA. It was he, after Chester Bowles had been ousted, who still tried to sell the American people a bill of political goods on the OPA. And of all the Communist-like agencies of the United States Government OPA was one of the worst in its baneful effects on the American people and its bureaucratic high-handedness.

When Porter got out of OPA, or rather, OPA was cut from under him, we suppose the New Dealites figured he had to have some kind of a political job, so they sent him to Greece. And now he comes up with a characteristic New Deal remedy—more spending, more taxes on the backs of American people, for the sake of holding communism "at bay." This is magnificent irony. We do not recall Mr. Porter ever protesting against Communists infesting our own Government in Washington, or doing anything much about it.

'Tis a strange destiny for the United States that our future should be entrusted to such men at a critical juncture in world affairs.

Southern Industrial Capacity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article bylined by my friend, Fred Thornton, in the Montgomery Advertiser.

The article is an interview with my good friend and the good friend of "you all," Gen. Brehon (Slim) Somervell, who points out in that interview the tremendous potential industrial capacity of our great Southland where you can run an industrial factory for what it costs to heat one in the industrial north country of you "dese," "dem," and "dose" guys:

SOMERVELL ASSERTS SOUTH'S OPPORTUNITIES ARE UNLIMITED

(By Fred Thornton)

"The sky's the limit" on the South's opportunities for development along industrial and other lines, in the opinion of Gen. Brehon Somervell, president, Koppers Co., Inc. The former commanding general of the Army Service Forces arrived in Montgomery yesterday, with Mrs. Somervell, to inspect the local plant of the company he now heads.

"You can run a factory down here on what it costs to heat one up north," General Somervell said. "The South has ample resources, good people, and it has the energy and initiative, too," he added. He reminded his interviewer that this statement was really bragging on his home folks, being himself a native of Arkansas.

General Somervell declined to comment, for publication, on any of the world aspects of military or international affairs. "I have always thought that old retired generals who are always telling those on active duty how to run their business are a pain in the neck" he said. "I definitely do not intend to get in that class, myself."

General Somervell did comment, in optimistic strain, on the domestic situation. "Generally speaking, I will say that in my opinion the domestic outlook is good," he said. "If we can get by without major industrial conflict for this year—and I think the chances are good that we will—then business prospects are good for as far ahead as we can now foresee."

BOTH LOSE

"I believe that labor and management are both becoming increasingly conscious that both sides lose in strife between them," General Somervell declared. "I believe there is an increasing tendency for both to put their respective houses in order, and get together as reasonable men." He added that his own company has been remarkably free of labor-management difficulties. "We try to see the viewpoint of the men, and I believe they are trying to see ours," he said.

General Somervell served under Pershing in Mexico, and in France in World War I. In World War II, in command of the Army Service Forces, formerly Services of Supply, he played a vital role in supplying the armies with the equipment that made victory possible. He was a full general at the time of his retirement.

On May 1, 1946, he assumed the presidency of Koppers Co., Inc., of Pittsburgh, Pa. This company is one of varied, widespread activities. The Montgomery plant, of its wood-preserving division, treats approximately 30,000,000 feet of timber per annum, with a monthly pay roll of around $30,000.

General Somervell was entertained at a party early Wednesday evening at the Jefferson Davis Hotel, attended by a number of Montgomery notables. Later in the evening he was a dinner guest of Col. Weldon Doe, a classmate at West Point, class of 1914. On Thursday, General Somervell, accompanied by a group of representative Montgomery businessmen, will inspect the company's local plant, leaving later in the day for Birmingham.

Who Are the Witch Hunters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I have been one of those charged with witch hunting whenever I have referred to the danger of having Communists holding key positions in the Federal Government, I am inserting an article by Frank R. Kent, March 21, 1947, in the Washington Evening Star, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—SO-CALLED RED BAITING COMES NOW FROM ALL SIDES, WITH NO DENIAL

(By Frank R. Kent)

In these depressing days it seems worth while to report progress—if only a little—in two not unimportant directions. One is recent evidence of an increase in the clarity of political thought in the country generally; the other is evidence that, despite propaganda and clamor, truth does, somehow emerge. In a way these two things are one, in that—first, each has to do with the question of communism; second, the first is dependent on the second.

Only a short time ago anyone who ventured to bring up this subject in print was vehemently announced as a "Red baiter." A favorite epithet of the left-wing columnists and professional liberals was "witch burner." Those who insisted that the CIO and its PAC, the American Labor Party in New York, the Newspaper Guild of that city and many other organizations, constantly mouthing the word "liberal," were saturated if not dominated by the Communists, were indicted as "Roosevelt haters." Those who asserted that many Communists were holding jobs in various Government departments were treated as if they had said something treasonable.

HAS CHANGED NOW

The mildest thing they were called was "scared reactionaries." But that has all changed now. The scared reactionaries no longer have to insist on the menace of communism. The left-wing columnists, the professional liberals and even some of the CIO leaders themselves (in a pained way) are doing the insisting. Conceding the infiltration of that organization and declaring that 25 percent of its unions are Communist-dominated, they are openly battling to keep from being submerged. The so-called Red baiting comes from all sides. Everybody is doing it now—and there is no denial of the charges.

Indictment of the CIO as Communist-dominated, they are, openly by the AFL, and admitted by CIO spokesmen. Fresh testimony of Communist activity on the Government pay rolls is offered before a House committee. In addition, a high Government official, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach (himself a "liberal" and CIO endorsed), a short time ago asked Congress to abolish the Communist Party in this country by enacting a law to make its existence illegal. Apparently Mr. Schwellenbach had the support of Attorney General Clark in this request and it is not likely he would have made it without President Truman's knowledge and approval.

OUTLAWING PROTESTED

In addition, one of the new "liberal" divisions, the Americans for Democratic Action, has publicly banned Communists from membership. There were immediate protests from the CIO and the Communists to the proposal to outlaw the Communist Party, and objections were raised by others that the proposal is not wise on two grounds—(1) that delicate dealings with Russia might be upset; (2) that to outlaw the party might merely drive the movement underground. Nevertheless, the idea has strong support and the 1942 words of former Attorney General Biddle are recalled when he described the Communist party here as an "organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

True, Mr. Biddle was a "liberal" but, so far as this issue was concerned, he was a lonely one and his statement neither diminished the Communist activity in the CIO nor weakened their political support of the administration of which he was a member—quite the contrary. Of course, if Mr. Biddle was right then and the Messrs. Schwellenbach and Clark are right now, the Communist Party is, in fact, a criminal conspiracy under existing Federal law.

SAMPLE OF SITUATION

As to the effect on negotiations with Russia of public agitation and action to halt the spread of communism here, it may reasonably be asked what is the sense of sending millions in money and material to Greece and Turkey to prevent Communist domination of those countries while entirely ignoring its spread in our own?

That seems idiotic. Certainly, it is not the way to win Russian respect or confidence. It is a sure way to confirm the view that we are a Nation of incurable saps.

As a sample of what goes on here, take this quotation from the extremely left-wing New York Evening Post from the column of the extremely liberal labor specialist, Victor Hisel. He says:

"Another of the pro-Communist unions controls enough native and white Pan-American workers to cripple the Panama Canal if a strike were called. Some 20,000 men working for the Army, Navy, and canal administrations are members of this highly politicalized union. They were ordered to reveal their militancy by parading through the streets of the cities at each end of the canal—which they did 2 weeks ago. They are CIO unions."

This does not come from an unfriendly source. It comes from a friendly one. Is it something to be ignored?

Innocence Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Army and Navy Bulletin of March 15, 1947:

INNOCENCE ABROAD

A reluctant America is having thrust upon it the leadership of the western world. The role of international policeman, which has been the sole, and unhappy, responsibility of Great Britain ever since Napoleon went off to St. Helena in 1815, is now being offered to an America that is politically unsophisticated in international affairs. When it became apparent that the British Empire was unable to continue as an international buffer for the western democracies and the American Republics, the one gratifying development was that a traditionally happy-go-lucky race of Americans seemed aware of the portents of this historic hour and did not castigate as Cassandras those who explained the facts of present-day international life.

Our profound apathy apparently was shaken by the realization that the conventional world known to this generation of Americans and its forbears is disintegrating. The reluctance of Prime Minister Winston Churchill to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire was respected by his defeat, only in the nick of time. India, that brightest jewel in the British crown, will leave the fold not later than June 1948. Egypt already has parted company and wishes to carry Anglo-Egyptian Sudan with her. Palestine, with its bitter problems, is being handed by Britain to the United Nations—which to all intents and purposes, in this particular instance, means the United States, because President Truman has made it abundantly clear that Palestine is an American problem.

It was only a question of time until, following the prophecy "Westward the course of empire," our turn came to support and perpetuate the heritage which first stemmed from the Grecian archipelago that we are now called upon to rescue. Great Britain has been going it alone since the beginning of the eighteenth century, and is old and tired. America is lusty and young. It is now called upon to accept leadership from the palsied hand of a great empire now in its twilight and dotage.

The Empire is broke, bankrupt, and in forced liquidation. It is cutting commitments right and left. The Royal Air Force—those few who so recently did so much for so many—is being deliberately curtailed. The Royal Navy, cut another 60 percent, steps down from its ancient high estate to a subordinate role. The heritage of Lord Nelson becomes America's, as Britain for the first time since Trafalgar cuts off the pensions and perquisites of the family of her greatest naval leader, classically referred to as the embodiment of the sea power of Great Britain.

From that British homeland and Empire we received a solid legacy—Magna Carta, habeas corpus, Chaucer, Shakespeare, the common law, and the King James version of the Bible—with all the liberties implied by such enduring monuments. It is this very substantial heritage along with the frothier elements of democracy, the amenities of western civilization, like the customs and manners of the French court Americanized by Emily Post, which we are now called upon to support and perpetuate.

During the generations that Great Britain policed the world, she relied almost entirely upon her navy. In The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, Mahan characterized the British Navy as "Those storm-tossed ships upon whom the grand army never looked stood between Napoleon and the dominion of the world." It is no longer true, as in the great days of empire from Elizabethan England to Jutland, that he who holds the trident of Neptune wields the sceptre of the world. In this air age, Neptune's trident must be joined to the chariot of Apollo. And tragically over all looms the robot-guided atom bomb. Meanwhile sea power and air power—actual and potential—America now has in rich abundance.

As we first comprehend the role of world leadership being thrust into our wavering and reluctant hands, the inventory of our might will be gratifying. Not only is our lead in sea power and air power unchallenged but we remain, with our industrial superiority, the arsenal of democracy. Because of our economic condition we are likewise the granary of democracy. Over all these we have the atomic bomb; and all of these, except the last named, should and will be used by America in its new role of world leader.

So, in response to Britain's sudden cry for help in sustaining Greece, the Mediterranean may become—like the Pacific Ocean—another American lake. There would be United States naval squadrons patrolling from now on out in the Middle Sea. We will become more acutely aware of the Dardanelles. We will oppose Russia's demand for Tripolitania as a quid pro quo for Micronesia. There will be divisions of the United States Air Forces in Greece, and more American troops will come to know the Middle East.

It is said that nature and communism abhor a vacuum. Democracy also cannot tolerate any such condition. Thus, Greece and its rescue become an American must. The United States has sea power and air power, industrial might and vast resources. Russia has land power and manpower. The western allies are the right wing of the United Nations. Russia and her satellites are the left wing. The lines are drawn. The success of democracy depends upon a great domestic issue and a vastly complicated international undertaking.

At home its success demands tranquillity on the industrial front. There is a pressing and urgent need for collaboration between management and labor. Except to make this manifest observation, it is not within the province of the Army and Navy Bulletin to discuss this particular crisis; only to the extent it is necessary to point out that any danger of American inflation will imperil the vast commitments which are now being suddenly thrust upon the United States.

The road elsewhere is clear. In our new role of world leadership the goal should be to transfer these new responsibilities and new duties as soon as possible to a working international organization the United Nations. That organization we feel and hope is now evolving. The New York Herald Tribune in praising the President's recent visit to Mexico and our international defense accord with Canada refers to the "one continent." The Agreement of Chapultepec makes of the New World one hemisphere. Allied in destiny with the New World are a crumbling British Empire and what is left of the Western democracies.

Our number one weapon for peacetime is food. It is the cheapest and most effective instrument for preserving peace in dangerous areas where peace is most threatened. It may not be as positive and quick acting as the atomic bomb but the absence of food, in its naked power as a negative weapon, can be altogether as effective and remorseless and far more efficient and inhumane. Moreover pound for pound bread is cheaper and more agreeable than the A-bomb.

The leader of the right wing of the United Nations will do its most enlightened fighting against chaos and communism with the weapons of calories and clothing. We will need vast appropriations for the Navy in order to carry the flag of American prestige to every corner of the earth. We will need an air force in being. We will continue to be the arsenal of democracy. We will need to support and shore up the crumbling British Empire, because even in its senescence it can be this country's greatest champion and support.

To perform these new and awesome responsibilities will require an awful lot of cash—cash not ever to be repaid in the ordinary way but repaid rather in terms of fewer holocausts, booming world trade and the preservation of human rights. We are going to exceed, and exceed fast, the limit placed by President Truman upon his budget for international relief and international affairs. So, when the Eightieth Congress continues to debate the question of budget reduction on the military and international front, we hope that they are doing no further mischief than engaging, in a bit of innocent merriment.

It is all very well and very necessary to carefully study the President's budget and make arrangements for appropriate economies. It is even more necessary because of the impending commitments which now confront us. If we are going to carry out our new role, we cannot go bankrupt like the British did and it is inconceivable that this country will fail to accept the challenge of communism, or ignore any threats to the democratic way of life.

But none of the disturbing situations which have arisen in the past few weeks lead us to believe that there can be any substantial budgetary savings. It means at best wiser channeling of the funds available. We cannot be top dog on a peanut budget. And, brother, that's what we are, like it or not. There are many who seek and fight for, but never achieve, greatness and responsibility. Some have it thrust upon them. So, while America, hoping against hope for the return to a uterine existence, was busybodying about tax cuts and other local domestic issues, someone dropped a very messy world into its lap. The whole thing should be cleaned up and turned over to the United Nations.

Taxation for Voters Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Washington Daily News of March 21, 1947:

TAXATION FOR VOTERS ONLY

House Republican leaders have agreed on a tax reduction bill. It provides:

A 30 percent cut for those with taxable income up to $1,000, comprising—and not by coincidence—the largest number of voters.

A cut of 20 percent for the next largest number of voters, those with taxable income between $1,000 and $302,000.

And 10.5 percent for the handful whose income is above $302,000 and who are presumed to vote Republican anyway.

This bill, if passed, will diminish the Government's revenues by $3,840,000,000—at a time when the Government's debt is $260,000,000,000, when the budget is still unbalanced, when demands for national security expenditures at home and around the world are rising.

Taxpayers in all brackets would be much better off if Congress held to the present tax rates this year, and used all surplus revenues collected to start paying off the public debt. With prices and living costs still rising, due largely to the Government's continued spending of borrowed money, this is no time to cut taxes. Now may be a good time to start working on a sensible tax cut to become effective next year, after the budget has been balanced and prices stabilized.

And This Is Our Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith a copy of an editorial from the Jefferson Davis Parish News, of Jennings, La., of date March 17, 1947, as follows:

AND THIS IS OUR THANKS

Some of the gratitude for winning the Asiatic war and driving the Japs out of conquered islands is coming home to roost. A little noticed item last week told that the Dutch authorities in Java had unloaded a $3,000,000 cargo of quinine and rubber from the American liberty ship *Martin Behrman* on the grounds that the cargo belonged to British and Dutch plantations.

Of course that was subterfuge and we already have been told that quay charges at Batavia have been raised 200 percent against all foreign shippers, who in turn charge foreign ships are not being allowed sufficient storage space. All nations, save the British and Dutch, are being virtually boycotted from having shipping facilities in the Dutch East Indies.

We had been warned before to stay out, unless we used Dutch and British facilities and further, if we get the commodities we want, we pay black-market prices.

And we must take all this lying down. During the war the Dutch never turned a finger that was apparent to save their colonies from the Japs and when the Japs took them over it was this Nation that had the Homeric task of driving the Japs island from island and the Dutch even gave us hints we didn't work fast enough and should be more vigorous in driving the Nips out of the islands.

It was American blood and manhood and American treasure which freed the islands of the Japs, and politely and gently we handed them back to the Dutch. They might have thanked us but they probably did not. Anyway, it is safe now—the Japs are gone—so the Netherlanders hijack us and force us to pay tribute in black-market sales if we buy anything from those rich islands. For the more we can be gouged—and we need quinine and rubber and other scarce materials so badly, the more profit will accrue to the fat Dutchmen. It is told that 50,000,000 tons of sugar are also stored in Java, and we probably could get some of it at black-market prices, if we would be so kind as to send our military forces over to bring the Javanese natives, who are crying for independence, to their knees.

Things like these make us boiling mad, especially when we think what fools we have been and we wonder if the Dutch think we fought the war to win back their lush plantations while they were hiding in some place of safety. We have made their colonies secure again—for their gain—and they politely turn around and give us a hefty slap in the face.

Simplification of New York Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, New York State leads again. Harassed income taxpayers who have just this last week gone through the throes, not only of scraping together the money to pay an income-tax installment, but also the almost equally burdensome wear and tear on their nervous systems involved in wading through and trying to understand and honestly report their income under our complex Federal income-tax system, will no doubt turn their eyes with envy toward Albany, where Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has just announced his recommendations for simplified New York State income-tax returns.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of his press release issued when this plan was announced, and commend it to the careful study of those in the Federal service charged with preparation of forms for reporting taxes.

This drive to the heart of a pressing problem and attempt to simplify Government operations so that every citizen in every walk of life can understand what goes on and which way his Government is heading is typical of the efficient, businesslike, liberal program of legislation which has marked the administration of the great Governor of New York.

The portion of Governor Dewey's press release follows:

Governor Dewey will recommend to the legislature an amendment to the State income tax law which will permit the most sweeping simplification of taxpayer returns in the 28-year history of the tax.

As a result, the New York State income tax returns of many taxpayers next year may be a form no bigger than a post card which can be filled out in less than 5 minutes.

The amendment, which would strip income tax reporting for at least a million taxpayers to the barest of fundamentals, * * * will make possible the use of a proposed income tax card return, the size of an ordinary bank check, for all taxpayers who have income from only salaries or wages, commissions, dividends and interest. It is estimated at least 40 percent, or about 1,000,000 taxpayers, will be able to use the short card form.

The new form, which will be inaugurated next year if the amendment is enacted, calls for only a half-dozen figures. The entries to be made would be:

1. Your income as employee.
2. Your dividends and interest, if any.
3. Your deduction (10 percent of No. 1 and No. 2 up to $500).
4. Your exemption.
5. Your taxable balance (the difference between the total of No. 1 and No. 2, and the total of No. 3 and No. 4).
6. Your tax—computed at the regular rates by a simple percentage calculation.

It will be as easy as that.

The new card form will be identified as Optional Form 200, taking the place of the present 1-page Optional Form 200 introduced in 1944 as a preliminary measure of simplification.

Savings in administrative costs, resulting from additional revenue and more thorough efficiency and speedier audit, are expected to offset any revenue loss which might otherwise result from the 10-percent provision.

Use of the card forms will permit mechanization of several administrative operations and partial mechanization of others, all made possible by recent developments in the design of tabulating equipment.

The proposed short form will be used by the Tax Commission as a punch card which will make it possible to mechanize mailing of forms, processing of receipts, alphabetizing of returns, controls over installment payments and delinquency, filing and various bookkeeping operations into one fully-integrated system. The short form will also result in a great saving of time now spent in the audit of itemized deductions on returns and will eventually free more space for one of the most crowded bureaus in State government.

Telegram of Ukrainian-American Relief Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues the following telegram which I have received from a group of patriotic citizens of my home city of Ukrainian origin, organized as the Ukrainian-American Relief Committee:

The 500 Rochester Americans of Ukrainian descent assembled on March 16 to honor the memory of Ukrainian poet Taras Shevrehenko, express herewith their fullest support of your new American policy to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. We earnestly hope that in pursuing this policy United States will take into consideration the assistance to Ukrainian people in their struggle to work out their destiny in their own way. A free Ukraine will be stabilizing factor in international relations and will be a strong bulwark against the spread of a totalitarian communism.

UKRAINIAN AMERICAN
RELIEF COMMITTEE.
K. SHEVCHUK, *President.*
R. PRYSTAY, *Secretary.*

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

The Greek Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Washington Post, of Friday, March 21, 1947, by Drew Pearson, pertaining to the Greek situation:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

A Latin-American ambassador was talking off the record about North American diplomacy. A very sage diplomat and a very good friend of the United States of America, he spoke frankly.

"The trouble with your diplomats," he said, "is that they expect the representatives of other countries to act as gentlemen. You expect them to be just as honest as you are. Instead they are tough, shrewd, sometimes very dishonest bargainers. Yet your diplomats haven't learned bare-knuckle diplomacy."

Early in the war, the late Frank Knox, then Secretary of the Navy, complained of the same thing. Talking to a small group of newsmen, he revealed that the United States was not exacting postwar terms from its allies during the war. We were waiting, like perfect gentlemen until the war was over.

Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State, felt the same way. As early as 1942, the first year of the war, Welles began setting up an American commission to work on the terms of the peace. Like any practical lawyer, he believed in collecting Uncle Sam's fees while his client's tears were hot. But he was overruled—and later kicked out—by Cordell Hull.

In the files of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a significant letter from Hull stating that the terms of peace must wait until the end of the war. That tragic mistake accounts for much of our trouble today. Former allies, their tears no longer hot, their backs no longer to the wall at Stalingrad, and the Champs Elysees no longer patrolled by enemy troops, are in no mood to bargain.

The only reason for crying over spilt milk at this time is to prevent more milk from being spilled. And at the moment we are embarking on a vital new chapter of foreign policy, apparently without fixing our terms in advance.

Congress seems certain to approve the Truman aid-to-Greece proposal—as it should. The chips are now down and the USA is playing the international game for keeps.

However, since we are going into this cutthroat game with our eyes open, there are certain terms Congress may want to exact from the British and Greek Governments—in advance. Here are some of them:

1. Cancellation of British loans to Greece. Some of the loans made by British banks carry an interest rate up to 16 percent, and have constituted one of the main obligations of the Greek Government. If British loans are not canceled it merely means that American taxpayers will be paying interest to British banks.

2. Exit of the controversial, Fascist-minded King of Greece. As long as George is on the throne Greek guerillas will never surrender.

3. Organization of a middle-of-the-road coalition government. Some of the democratic Greek opposition leaders who have recently conferred with the State Department could help form such a coalition.

4. Early exit of the British Army as soon as American-trained Greeks can take over.

5. Heavier taxation for wealthy Greeks. Thousands of wealthy Greeks, many of them living abroad, contribute relatively little in taxes to their government.

Finally, we owe it to ourselves and to the pledge we took as a member of the United Nations gradually to transfer the American burden in Greece to the United Nations. While the United Nations may not be immediately equipped to unsnarl the Greek tangle, once the United States has unsnarled the main tangles, the UN should be able to iron out the rest. Furthermore, we are obligated to consult and advise with the United Nations. This should begin immediately, together with word that the UN should get ready to take over later.

Not only does the American taxpayer not want to carry the Greek burden indefinitely, but the United Nations, if it is to gain strength, must learn to use its wobbly legs—and the sooner the better.

Fiorello LaGuardia had some interesting things to say the other day about the taxing of wealthy Greeks. Talking to friends, the former mayor of New York told how he had conferred with the Premier of Greece while in Athens and proposed to him that the thousands of wealthy Greeks living in Egypt, North Africa, and other Mediterranean sectors bear some of the burden of their country's plight.

LaGuardia pointed out that these Greeks had built up large fortunes, sometimes at the expense of Greece, though living outside of Greece, and they should be taxed. The Greek Premier, however, was not enthusiastic.

"Money," he replied, "knows no national boundaries."

That ended the conversation.

Few people realize how bitter most Greeks are against the British. Here is one incident, told by an American UNRRA worker, which illustrates why.

After the British took over Athens, they imposed a curfew requiring all Athenians to be off the streets after 7 p. m. Two nights later, in front of the Acropol Palace Hotel, where the UNRRA mission was quartered, a Greek peddler had made a sale—just before 7. Because of inflation, the counting of the paper money took a minute or so, and by the time the peddler had gathered up his bundles, it was a few minutes past 7 p. m.

At that moment a British armored car came round the corner. UNRRA workers were horrified to see it riddle the peddler with machine-gun bullets. He died in his tracks.

NOTE.—This column will supply the name of the American eyewitness to this tragedy to any committee of Congress that is interested.

Here are other illustrations as to why the Greeks hate the British, all given by Americans who worked in Greece, and who are available for congressional testimony: When the Nazis evacuated Athens, the British failed to pursue them. Instead, the British remained in Athens letting the retiring German armies pillage and burn the countryside. This was when the Nazis did their worst damage. When the British took over Athens, they decreased the wage paid by the Germans to common laborers from $1.40 to $1.20, simultaneously increasing the price of Red Cross rations from 50 to 60 cents for 800 calories. The British-controlled Greek Government has largely supported itself by selling UNRRA food, in turn paid for by American taxpayers. One secret report to UNRRA showed that Greek Government revenue as of last November came from the following sources; taxes, 4 percent; import-export duties, 1 percent; excise levies on tobacco, 9 percent; sale of UNRRA food and supplies, 86 percent. About 30,000 Greeks have been imprisoned under the new "thought control" law which makes it a prison offense to say anything against the King.

Investigation of Subversive Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the legislature of the State of Colorado:

House Joint Memorial 4

Whereas investigations by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation have disclosed that there are, throughout the United States and within the borders of the State of Colorado, certain individuals and organizations that have as their goal and for their purpose the violent and forceful overthrow of the governments of the United States and the State of Colorado and the destruction of the system of free enterprise which is a basic part of our National and State governments and an element in such governments which is essential to the happiness and welfare of the citizens and residents of the United States and the State of Colorado; and

Whereas such individuals or organizations are in many instances subservient or faithful to or connected with certain foreign governments; and

Whereas it is important to ascertain and insure that all employees of the United States Government are loyal to our constitutional form of government, and, because there are apparently many Federal employees who are members of subversive groups and/or adherents to their subversive doctrines, their continued employment in the Federal Government is inimical to the best interests of the United States and the State of Colorado and the people thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the General Assembly of the State of Colorado respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to—

1. Appropriate sufficient funds for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to continue its effective investigations and coverage of subversive organizations and individuals seeking to undermine the constitutional form of government of the United States.

2. Appropriate sufficient funds to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to enable such committee to continue its investigations and exposure of organizations and individuals engaged in all forms of subversive activities, whether they be in the nature of communism, fascism, or nazism, and to publish periodical reports that will be of value in the educational campaign to overcome the complacency of the citizens of the United States concerning the danger of the subversive activities being carried on in our midst.

3. Direct and authorize the investigation and removal of Federal employees who, after careful investigation and careful weighing of evidence, have been found to be of doubtful loyalty to our present form of constitutional government in order that all Communists, Fascists, and their sympathizers may be removed from positions in the Federal Government where they are of potential danger and aid to the subversive forces at work seeking to undermine and overthrow the legal, constitutional form of government presently enjoyed by these United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each of the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, so as to urge their vigorous support in accomplishing the purposes of this memorial.

HOMER L. PEARSON,
President of the Senate.
W. C. BLAIR, *Secretary.*
WILLIAM ALLISON CARLSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
V. C. CRAWSHAW, *Chief Clerk.*

Challenge, Not Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the New Hampshire Morning Union of March 18, 1947, entitled "Challenge, Not Burden":

CHALLENGE, NOT BURDEN

Destiny is certainly pushing the United States awfully hard for a Nation made up of people who just want to be left alone to enjoy the pleasures of postwar television and other mechanical wonders.

The collapse of the British Empire leaves the United States with a very serious and immediate problem. There are very few places in the world where empty spaces remain empty. Someone always moves in and occupies empty spaces.

Therefore, it is impossible for the United States simply to say we have no interest in what happens to the territories which are abandoned.

It is quite true that the United States does not want to be an empire in the sense that Rome or England were empires.

Yet, if we do not assume leadership in these lands abandoned by Great Britain, there is no question as to who will assume leadership there, and that will be Russia. They will impose on these lands a system which is the opposite of everything we stand for, and they will use these lands to strengthen them in their attempt at world domination.

Therefore, there is only one alternative. That is for America to move in, and move in fast. This applies to Greece, to Turkey, and to the Near East. It applies to China. It applies to all those lands where Russia is attempting to press on and overcome and destroy the independence of small states.

It applies also to the backward countries, such as India and Africa. In those countries the United States must assume a position of leadership.

There are many Americans today who insist that they dislike the role of empire building. But there is a distinct difference between the empires of Rome and England, where backward countries were exploited for the benefit of the ruling groups of Rome and London.

The difference is between ruling and leading. The United States can furnish leadership all over the world without dominating the areas in which it leads.

The United States can supply the technical and financial assistance which can make these backward countries flourish and prosper. Under these circumstances those nations will follow the principles on which the United States was founded, not because they are forced to do so at the point of a gun, but because our way is demonstrated to them to be the way of prosperity and happiness.

In that sense, this can indeed be the American century. Seen in that light, the collapse of the British empire furnishes us not with an additional burden, but with additional opportunity to show what the government of the people, for the people, and by the people can offer to all mankind.

W. L.

Potential Resources of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, let me recite now a few facts extracted from a recent talk by the Assistant Attorney General of the United States in a discussion of the potential resources of our great South. The Honorable Wendell Berge said in part:

In discussing the disparity in economic conditions which works to the detriment of the South, I want to make clear at the outset that it is my opinion that a sound national economy depends on the vigor of the development of all sections of the country. It is not a question of building up one region as against another. It is rather an acceptance of the fact that our country cannot be prosperous if artificial and unnatural impediments are put in the way of each region's developing to the fullest its own industrial potential. Without elaborating the point, it is my belief that when the South or the West are not permitted the maximum development of which they are capable, the East and the North also suffer in the long run.

The South now possesses all of the assets which are necessary to translate opportunity into accomplishment. Its physical resources are profuse and varied. Its soil produces a wide range of agricultural products in addition to those such as cotton and tobacco in which it leads the world. Several hundred types of commercially valuable minerals are found in the South—coal, iron, and bauxite which is essential to the manufacture of aluminum, asbestos, zinc, and many others. More than half of our production of crude oil and natural gas comes from Southern States, and nearly all of such important commodities as phosphates and sulfur. The South has abundant water resources and highly developed roads and navigation facilities—and as the basic requisite for growth, the South has a young and abundant supply of labor.

In contrast with this ample heritage of raw materials and people are the practices and accumulated artificial handicaps which for so long retarded southern development. Here again there is no need to recapitulate in detail the story of eroded soil, too often furrowed more by neglect than by use; of unwisely exploited resources, misdirected energies, and the tragedy of waste which has depleted so much of our national wealth without returning a comparable compensation to the people. All of us know too well the toll which such conditions may take from the lives of those who live in an area subject to the ravages of economic error. That story also has been told too well and too bitterly in the past, both in the lower standards of education and the poorer conditions of health that have afflicted large sections. These same factors have accounted for a continuous stream of migration from the Southern States.

Our Friends, the Filipinos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the membership of the House to the splendid editorial in the New York Times of March 13 regarding the significance of the recent plebiscite vote in the Philippines in which the Philippine people voted overwhelmingly to join the United States in carrying on our mutual friendship through the medium of a period of free trade.

Personally, I am particularly proud of the vote because the Philippine Trade Act of 1946, the reason for the plebiscite vote to amend the constitution of the Republic of the Philippines, was sponsored by myself in the Congress.

The New York Times editorial reads as follows:

PHILIPPINE VOTE

The Philippine people, in voting in an overwhelming affirmation for the so-called parity amendment to their constitution giving citizens of the United States equal opportunity with the Filipinos to develop the natural resources and public utilities of the islands, have given evidence of political maturity that would do credit to any electorate.

The demagogic, easily understandable arguments were all on the other side. The unfortunate word "exploitation" was used in section 341 of the Philippine Trade Act, passed by the last Congress, on which the parity amendment was based. Opponents of the amendment did not overlook that opportunity. The arguments for parity were economic. Its benefits lie considerably in the future. Were the Filipinos as undisciplined, as ignorant, as politically immature as their detractors would have the American people and the world believe they are, the vote would have been overwhelmingly against.

The vote really was of considerably more significance than just adoption of the parity amendment. It was a reaffirmation of friendship for the United States and an expression of the Filipinos' belief that our Government and individual American business firms and businessmen will deal fairly with them. The vote also increases the political standing of President Roxas. The size of the favorable majority was a personal victory for him. He made an extensive tour of the southern provinces of Luzon and of the southern islands during December and January to explain the amendment and urge its adoption. It should encourage him to press even more vigorously his program of rehabilitation and reform. With the people thus expressing their confidence in him, he may feel strong enough to do a needed housecleaning in his administration.

It can be hoped that the vote on parity will spur the War Damage Commission, now in Manila, to greater action than has been shown to date (more than 2 years after the freeing of Manila not a cent has yet been paid) and also that it will impress the United States Congress with the fact that in the Philippine Republic we have a sober, loyal, intelligent far eastern friend that should be helped in the solution of its many great and pressing problems.

Mr. Speaker, in a recent press statement Hon. Frank A. Waring, Chairman of the Philippine War Damage Commission, hailed the vote as a "victory for the Philippine people because it should en-

courage private capital in the United States to aid in the development of Philippine industries to the advantage of all concerned." He cited the early history of the United States when British capital played a similar role in developing United States economy, and commented that the building of the Erie Canal which opened the Northwest Territory was a case in point.

Chairman Waring has advised me that the Philippine War Damage Commission, authorized by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 to pay war damages in the amount of $400,000,000 to private claimants and $57,000,000 on public-property claims of the Philippine Government, has advanced $1,000,000 to that Government on a $10,000,000 program providing for urgent work on hospitals and other essential buildings. In addition, the Commission expects to pay to private claimants a total of about $10,000,000 before July 1.

The Commission began to receive claims on March 1, and Chairman Waring has advised me that the speed of payment of claims would depend on the submission and processing of properly documented claims.

While only $10,000,000 is currently available for these payments to private claimants, I feel quite sure that the Congress, realizing the very important role the Philippines will play in far eastern affairs and their importance because of trade, will appropriate the additional funds authorized already by law to carry out this essential program of rehabilitation.

Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave already granted me, I include the following resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island in support of President Truman's position relative to Greece and Turkey:

Resolution commending the President of the United States of America for his forthright action in favor of aid to Greece and Turkey in order to permit the countries to be strong in their efforts to stem the tide of communism

Whereas upon March 12, 1947, the President of the United States of America called on the Nation to devote money, materials, and military skill to halt the world march of communism, specifically requesting $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey, the existence of which is threatened by terrorist activities of a militant minority spearheaded by communists; and

Whereas the President's address, an event of the first magnitude, calls unmistakably for action which will launch the United States on a new and positive foreign policy of world-wide responsibility for the maintenance of peace and order; and

Whereas this is a matter of such significance that it transcends all political party lines as evidenced by the immediate support of the President's action by the influential Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, presiding officer of the Senate and chairman of its Foreign Relations Committee, who made the statement:

"We cannot fail to back up the President at such an hour even though many critical details remain to be settled in consultation with Congress": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations now commends the President of the United States of America for his forthright action in favor of aid to Greece and Turkey, in order to permit the countries to be strong in their efforts to stem the tide of communism, since, as he said, "totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States"; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are earnestly requested to support the President in his unfaltering enunciation of a new foreign policy; and the Secretary of State of Rhode Island is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to them and to the President of the United States of America duly certified copies of this resolution.

This, Too, Will Make Joe Stalin Snicker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Daily Sentinel of Fairmont, Minn., on the importation of foreign agricultural workers:

THIS, TOO, WILL MAKE JOE STALIN SNICKER

Two major agricultural activities in this area, as well as throughout the Nation, are dependent upon imported labor.

They are the canning and sugar-beet industries.

Both require imported laborers, usually from Mexico, in part from the West Indies, for the tilling and harvesting of these special crops.

Nationals from these foreign parts have been permitted, under treaties and at some expense to the taxpayers, to come to this country, work a few months at good wages, then take their earnings and themselves back home.

"Unfair to free American labor," screams the labor trust and demands of Congress that the practice be stopped.

It had been contemplated to put up the gate July 1, 1947, but on a showing that this would be the same as shutting off the labor supply for the entire approaching growing season, Congress now considers January 1, 1948, as the terminal date.

"Without this outside labor we would not be able to produce the crops that enable us to operate," say the canners and sugar refiners.

Strange, but there are certain types of essential work that dignified American workingmen refuse to perform, even if our national economy depends on it. Hand working and harvesting the canning and beet crops are under this embargo.

American workmen are "too uppity," as Aunt Hannah used to say, to do this work. Then they crab about getting those who are efficient, and glad to do it, to come in from foreign countries.

Of course we have a limited supply of our own labor for these purposes, but there are not nearly enough "Okies" to go around. When they do go to work the unions get busy and organize them and demand wages and conditions that cannot be met.

It's a tough situation, especially in its admission that our own people cannot, or will not, manpower industry essential to the maintenance of our own economy.

Perhaps there is poetic, but painful, justice in the situation. If with all our potential abundance we will not do the work involved or let anyone else do it, let's maintain our dignity as we starve to death.

The big canning factories here in Fairmont say they cannot produce the needed crops this year without dependence on imported labor. Congress will probably give the necessary relief for this one season. After that, what?

Grazing on the Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado:

Senate Joint Memorial 2

Whereas the United States Forest Service is, in effect and without sufficient congressional authorization, dictatorially exercising legislative and judicial functions in regard to grazing on the National Forests, instead of limiting itself to the administration of the forests; and

Whereas a general grazing reduction program of from 30 to 50 percent has been announced by forest officials, and if such program is put into effect, it will work a great hardship on and jeopardize the stability of the users of the National Forests; and

Whereas it has been called to the attention of members of this body that the Grazing Service, which is charged with the administration of other Federal grazing lands and which is functioning under a clearly defined law recently enacted by Congress, is exercising a more practical application of conservation and is giving the users a fairer adjudication of grievances and more security of tenure and general stability; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to conduct an investigation of conditions existing in connection with the administration of the National Forests, to the end that legislation may be formulated which will remove existing evils and give all areas of Federal land for grazing purposes uniform, reasonable, and just treatment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each of the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, so as to urge their vigorous support in accomplishing the purpose of this memorial.

HOMER L. PEARSON,
President of the Senate.
W. C. BLAIR,
Secretary of the Senate.
WM. ALBION CARLSON,
Speaker of the House.
V. C. CRAWSHAW,
Chief Clerk.

Control of Export Wheat Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, according to an item appearing in the Washington Post under date of March 20 we were advised that the United States, Canada, and Australia agreed on a maximum price of $1.80 for bread grains in the world export market. This price, Mr. Speaker, is $1.25 below the price wheat reached in Chicago Tuesday, the day before the break.

The same item further advises us that Argentina, another country famous for wheat-producing, refused to go along with other three members of the International Wheat Board. It might be interesting to observe also that Russia did not even attend this meeting.

The article further advises us, that in addition to the top of $1.80 for export wheat, the three English-speaking members agreed on a floor of $1.25 for wheat in world export markets. This action, Mr. Speaker, has been carried out by the State Department by and with the consent of the Department of Agriculture. I ask the question of this Congress: Where does the Department of Agriculture find its authority to make such an agreement?

Is the Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with other nations, setting up an international OPA?

We have heard much in recent months about cartels. They have been referred to in many political campaigns. Is it not reasonable to assume that by this agreement, we are taking the first step in the direction of an international cartel insofar as wheat is concerned?

As one who comes from a State, the major product of which is wheat, I am naturally concerned as to what may follow this program announced here. Is it not reasonable to assume that if the Department of Agriculture exercises such authority in the establishment of international cartels of wheat, that we will probably find ourselves traveling farther down the road, and in due course of time, by international agreement, or international cartels, we will find ourselves confronted with the question of specific, governmental-directed allotment of wheat acreage?

If we are to engage in these practices, I am concerned lest we shall destroy completely our coveted system of free enterprise and representative government in the United States. If we are to stand sponsor for a program of this kind, which is in fact an international cartel, are we not engaging in a practice ourselves which we bitterly denounce on the part of other nations, and particularly other nations with which we have recently been at war?

Can there be any connection with the President's recent request for extension of his war powers to control and allot exports from the United States? The whole plan smacks of regimentation of production and prices. Add to this the control of exports and we will find ourselves under an economic dictatorship governed by a system of international cartels.

It is my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of Congress who come here representing States that are producers of wheat in this Nation should meet at an early hour and demand an investigation to determine from where the authority now so largely exercised by our Department of Agriculture emanates.

Our New World Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith a copy of an editorial from the Jefferson Davis Parish News, of Jennings, La., of date March 17, 1947, as follows:

OUR NEW WORLD ROLE

Those who hoped this Nation could, like it did after the First World War, go back to normalcy, are now sadly disillusioned. Nationally and internationally speaking, nothing will ever be as it was and gone are the splendid days of the old self-security and isolation of the turn of the century.

Nationally, Uncle Sam's neck is out internationally like the turkey's on the Thanksgiving Day block.

Whether we like it or not, we are in European politics up to our necks by a decision which will probably be made at Washington this week. That is our role to be played in Greece and Turkey.

Revile the British Empire as you will and cuss out the imperialism of John Bull, sooner or later you will conclude we were well situated in our fine old isolation and the security between the two seas, as long as His Majesty's Fleet and Government controlled the rest of the world.

But, sad as it is, the British Empire is fading and you don't need a ghost to come out of his grave to tell you that. India is promised her freedom in 1948 and the British frankly tell us now she can no longer carry on her commitments in Greece and Turkey.

This comes at a time when our Government is taking a stout stand against communism. The inference is that only America is left to bolster the Greeks and take over the old English commitments. If this is true in Greece and Turkey, God forbid the next specter to rise—that of asking us to take over and settle the Holy Land issues between Arabs and Jews.

You know the steps—they have become familiar during the last 7 years: First, let the United States agree in principle—then make a loan—then sell goods and arms, next bring the goods and arms to the trouble spot—then send American troops and—after that the deluge.

Root of the trouble is that we have become a rich Nation—a creditor Nation—that is the difference between us at the turn of the century and now. Then we were still debtors—England was the creditor—and we worked hard and paid our debts while England was the creditor, not only here but for the whole world, had to snap the whip to show she wanted her money back and in profits. Now we take over the British role as England fades from a first- to a second-class power. Americans don't like the new role, but the role is here and we are afraid we will need wiser statesmen than we have shown yet at Washington. We have the bull by the tail and can't let go, and we wish we had never got into the fix.

Is the Present Caliber of Our Statesmen Such as Would Impel Us To Have Confidence in Their Ability To Manage the Intricacies of World Politics, in Which the Stakes Are National Life or Death?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial from the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News by Mr. Herman E. Gieske. Mr. Gieske is one of the great editors of the Ohio Valley.

As the time approaches for us to consider the President's proposal in regard to Greece, I think it helpful to know something about what the people back home are thinking.

The editorial follows:

MR. TRUMAN'S ADDRESS

Uppermost in the mind of every patriotic American today will be the grave implications of President Truman's address to the Nation yesterday. He asked $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey and approval of the sending of American military personnel to both countries. We are sorry the President did not mention the Dardanelles by name. But that clearly must be what he meant when he said "the national security of this country" is involved. Turkey flanks the Dardanelles Straits on one side and Greece on the other. It is that narrow waterway which Russia has coveted through the centuries as an exit from the Black Sea, into which her mighty rivers flow, to the Mediterranean. Russia has fought four unsuccessful wars for these Straits, the last one in 1914, 1915, and 1916, until revolution overthrew her tyrannous government in 1917.

Thus, Mr. Truman's address implies no light undertaking for the United States. It means that we intend to stand guard at this key water bastion over which nations and empires have warred almost since the beginning of man. It is not very far from the site of Armageddon, where, according to Biblical prophecies, the last battle on the earth will be fought.

It means, further, the putting of Soviet Russia and the United States almost upon the very frontier of that mighty nation of 8,000,000 square miles and 198,000,000 population. It means forever putting behind us the farewell warning of George Washington and the Monroe Doctrine. It means, in reality, a proclamation that the United States by force of arms and money, intends to become a second Roman Empire, taking over from Britain the responsibilities of the British Commonwealth of Nations, but apparently sharing few, if any, of the assets.

The question is, Do the American people want to launch upon such a course of world-wide imperialism? It is something to think about, to study about, and read about. Is

the present caliber of our statesmanship such as would impel us to have confidence in their ability to manage the intricacies of world politics, in which the stakes are national life or death?

And what has become of the United Nations, that it cannot undertake such responsibilities? Where is the vaunted international police force that was supposed to take care of just such situations?

Further, we must consider whether we are strong enough to undertake such responsibilities? We already have a debt of $250,000,000,000. Will not such responsibilities wreck the American standard of living, just as, apparently, it has wrecked Britain's?

United States Payments for Veterans in State Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado:

House joint memorial 8

Whereas the Colorado State Soldiers' and Sailors' Home, in providing hospitalization and domiciliary care for disabled Colorado veterans, is relieving the United States Veterans' Administration's Hospital load in the State; and

Whereas the cost of such care has increased greatly in the first few years, now averaging $735 per capita per annum, and this upward trend in cost of operation appears certain to continue for several years; and

Whereas similar homes are maintained by 27 other States; and

Whereas under present law, the Federal Government allows only $300 per annum per capita for maintenance of veterans in State or Territorial homes, and grants this aid only from the date eligibility of the veteran is established, rather than from the date of admission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress and President of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to enact such legislation as may be necessary to increase Federal payments for care of disabled veterans in homes maintained by the States and Territories from $300 to $500 per annum per capita, and to provide that such aid shall be payable from the date of a veteran's admission if he is determined to be eligible for care in a Veteran's Administration facility; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

HOMER L. PEARSON,
President of the Senate.
WM. ALBION CARLSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. C. BLAIR,
Secretary of the Senate.
V. C. CRAWSHAW,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Let Congress and American People Have Whole Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter addressed to me from Hon. Ernest T. Weir, president of the Weirton Steel Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., dated March 20, 1947:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *March 20, 1947.*
The Honorable JOHN M. ROBSION,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROBSION: The proposal of President Truman with regard to Greece and Turkey confronts the United States with one of the gravest questions in its history.

Acceptance of that proposal involves complete reversal of our long-standing policy in foreign affairs. It involves intervention and participation in and responsibility for the internal affairs of other nations. It involves an economic drain on the people of this country which, from a relatively small beginning, may proceed to an extent which no one can now foresee. More than that, it involves employment of the military power of the United States—again apparently on a small initial scale but again also with no predictable limits. It projects this country directly into the complexes of both Europe and the Middle East under circumstances which may well lead to war.

It has not been established why it is to the vital interest of the United States to take this step. Nor, if it can be conceded that the vital interest of our country is actually affected, has there been any revelation of the facts in this situation that make hasty action imperative.

All that the Congress or the people have been given is the President's assertion that the vital interest of the United States is involved and that immediate action is essential. And the President's address is much more remarkable for its vagueness and resort to generalities than for any light it has shed on the reasons for making it.

As a matter of plain, common sense, however serious the straits of Greece and Turkey, they cannot become too much worse in the time that will be required for the open and thorough discussion of this situation which alone can give the American people the opportunity to know what they are being asked to do, what the material cost will be, and what commitments of other natures are to be made in their name.

It is the plain duty of Members of Congress to prevent hasty action, to insist that all the facts are made known, to see that these facts are laid before the people in understandable terms, and, finally, to take action in the light of the facts and the expressed will of the people.

Members of Congress can serve no good purpose by premature and ill-considered statements of opinion. Such, for instance, as the one attributed to Senator VANDENBERG to the effect that "we must uphold the hands of the President." Certainly, our history gives abundant evidence that Presidents can make mistakes. The welfare of the country is always a consideration of far greater moment than support of the President in either national or international affairs.

Twice in a single generation our country has become involved in the wars of others. In each case the American people endured the suffering and sacrifice of war for lofty ideals. In neither case have they seen those ideals realized. On the contrary, this country emerged from each war weaker than it entered, and after each war the world in general was in a worse condition than before. We lost men and wealth, we exhausted irreplaceable natural resources, and we bred conditions that caused widespread dissatisfaction and doubt among the American people concerning their principles of government and way of life.

Intrinsically, we are a weaker Nation today than ever before in our history. We appear strong only by contrast with a prostrate world. In this weakened condition are we now to embark on a new adventure about which we know nothing, but which may lead first to war, and, second, to the final demoralization of the world and the disappearance of the slightest hope for an orderly society?

The two World Wars caused the virtual destruction of the great British Empire. Is that not a sufficient example to make us pause before starting down a road which may lead to the same end?

The President said:

"There is no other country (except the United States) to which democratic Greece can turn."

What does this statement mean? That no other country cares anything about Greece as a democratic country? That no other country cares enough to help alleviate the physical want of her people? Or that no other country has the resources to extend aid?

Under any interpretation, the implication of the President's words are far-reaching. There are 2,000,000,000 people in this world. Out of this number can the 140,000,000 people who comprise our Nation be the only ones who can assume the burdens of weaker countries? Is it a practical possibility? If so, can we do it, or even attempt to do it, without destroying ourselves?

The President said:

"The United States contributed $341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II. This is an investment in world freedom and world peace."

Where is the freedom and where is the peace? Is the world we have today the kind of a return on investment that justifies the beginning of a new outpouring of funds?

The President said:

"The assistance that I am recommending for Greece and Turkey amounts to little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of this investment."

Does the President or anyone else think for a moment that the amount he proposes will be the whole amount? Obviously, $400,000,000 will be only the start. It will be followed by other millions and billions in these countries and in other countries which, with Greece and Turkey as precedents, will make claims on our generosity.

The President said:

"The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists."

If a government is so weak that it cannot cope with several thousand armed men under any leadership, there is reason to conclude: (1) That if many of the people of the country do not actually sympathize with the several thousand they at least do not care much one way or the other and, (2) there is little that an outside power can do to aid such a government.

If we take this action in Greece, we will in effect say to Russia, "We are opposed to communism and intend to help the Governments of Greece and Turkey oppose it." Under the circumstances, is not Russia likely to reply, "You are free to do that, but if you do, we will take measures of our own to support communism." It must be remembered that Russia has many means, short of war, to foster

the spread of communism; many more, in fact, then we have to oppose it. Unpalatable as the idea is, we must also realize that many people in countries throughout the world look with favor on communism and regard it as a superior form of government. In our own country, we have a Communist movement which is far from large, yet there is little we can do to halt its acceptance by some of our people. You cannot stop a political growth any more than you can stop a religious growth—particularly by use of force. And the adventure in Greece, whatever its other aspects, is basically a use of force.

At Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, commitments were made for the American people without their knowledge or consent. Secrecy was excused by those who indulged in it on the ground that it was essential to war security. Yet there is little doubt today that those secret deals, in which a few men around a table played with the destiny of nations, were important causes of the world's present condition. There is no excuse now—not even a lame one—for asking the American people to move blindfolded and in haste into a situation of most serious consequence. Certainly, the time has come to end secret diplomacy.

The urgency, the need for haste which the President so strongly emphasized has an artificial quality. It smacks of the rush act of the high-powered salesman. Britain accepted Greece as a responsibility during and after the war. Admitting that Britain's economic condition is unhealthy, why does it suddenly become absolutely impossible for her to continue that responsibility beyond the outside date of March 31—just 19 days after the President's address? Would Britain collapse if she stayed in Greece until April 30 or May 31? Or was an almost immediate date selected to force Americans to act before they could think?

Although it has been mentioned only in passing, the thing of paramount importance in this entire matter to the United States and her people is the interest of the United States—not only the immediate interest but also long-range interest. Certainly if it is not in the interest of this country to take a step, then there can be no other good reason for it in Greece, Europe, the Middle East, or elsewhere. With its present huge debt and the other weakening influences of the war, the United States should regard any commitment with caution. This caution should be doubled and redoubled in the face of a step as grave as that into Greece with all the implications of a continuing economic drain if not the actual threat of another war. Might not the United States best contribution to the world be the rebuilding of her own strength so that she can, in fact, remain the strongest bulwark of free government?

These questions should be resolved before we take an action which may prove to be a costly gamble. Today, the American people do not have the information on which to base either support or rejection of the President's proposal. Congress alone has the power, and it must exercise that power, to see that the people get the facts—all the facts.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST T. WEIR.

Mr. Weir is one of the leading businessmen and industrialists of the Nation. It can be safely said that he is not in sympathy with communism. He warns the Congress of the danger to our country if we should embark upon the proposal of the President to send military and civilian personnel together with military supplies and other supplies to Greece and Turkey. His letter indicates that he has given the President's new foreign policy most careful consideration. In my opinion, he very wisely urges the Congress and the American people not to move into this new field blindfolded or in haste.

No effort should be spared on the part of the Congress and the American people to have brought to light all of the facts. In my opinion, neither the Congress nor the American people have sufficient information to apprise them fully of what this venture may mean to them and to our children. No one has more consistently and vigorously opposed communism than I have. I am thoroughly convinced that Communists in Greece are not as great a threat to the security of this Nation as Communists in key positions in our own Government, maintained at the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation, or Communists who have penetrated every activity in our country. What has been the attitude of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations in this respect?

By all means, let us get busy and clean house in the United States. Some public officials in high places in our own Government have recognized the Communist Party and their right to seek and hold public office. We have been pouring literally billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money into countries dominated and controlled by Communists and allegedly with the backing of Russia. Why send our Navy, Army, supplies, and money to Greece while coddling the Communists in this country and in other countries?

The Closed Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado:

Senate Joint Memorial 6

Whereas there are now pending in the Congress of the United States various proposals designed to remedy the unfair practices resulting from the operation of the National Labor Relations Act, which deprive persons who are willing and desire to work from securing employment unless and until they have become members of labor unions; and

Whereas the recent national coal strike afforded a vivid and striking illustration of the hardships, inconveniences, and sufferings that are caused by the closed shop and by monopolistic practices of labor unions; and

Whereas numerous specific examples have been called to the attention of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, where returning veterans have been denied employment even though employment was available, due to the closed shop and the arbitrary refusal of certain labor unions to permit said veterans to join said unions, which is in contravention of the rights and principles for which they fought; and

Whereas court decisions and rulings have been handed down from time to time declaring most businesses as interstate commerce, the effect of which has brought a major percentage of labor unions under the laws enacted by the Congress of the United States and subject to the rules and regulations of the various departments of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the house of representatives concurring herein), That the Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States from the State of Colorado are hereby urged to vote for the passage of legislation designed to remedy and correct the unfair practices resulting from the closed shop, so that no person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from a labor organization or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor organization; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

HOMER L. PEARSON,
President of the Senate.
W. R. BLAIR,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM ALBIN CARLSON,
Speaker of the House.
V. C. CRAWSHAW,
Chief Clerk.

Recommendations for a Revised Housing Program for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A REVISED HOUSING PROGRAM FOR VETERANS—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS APPOINTED AT THE HOUSING INVENTORY AND FORECAST CONFERENCE, CHICAGO

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

Removing restrictions on owner-occupant and individual for-sale houses is recommended for the reason that (1) the present preference to veterans is largely ineffective insofar as serving the needs of the great mass of veterans is concerned; (2) that this preference for veterans has served to limit the production of such housing since the operative builder is unwilling or unable, because of capital investment required, to proceed with a large-scale program unless sales can be made rapidly during construction. The requirement that such houses must be held for at least 30 days after completion for sale to veterans only results in most builders deferring undertaking additional construction until sales have been consummated. (3) Since a great proportion of veterans desire to rent rather than to purchase houses, the preference on multifamily rental housing should be continued.

Unlike the builder of single-family houses for sale, the builder of multifamily housing is not dependent for his permanent financing on the sale or rental of the structure on completion. The fact that veterans are given preference in rental housing therefore would not defer additional construction since in this type of building, rentals can be made at any time.

HOUSING FOR VETERANS OF LOW INCOME

Because of the high cost of construction at this time, emergency provisions are necessary to meet the housing needs of the families of veterans of low income as well

as the families of veterans in the middle and higher income brackets.

The committee recommends that special legislation be enacted immediately to provide assistance to local housing authorities to finance for veterans of low income 100,000 dwelling units under this program. The resulting public housing should be restricted to veterans and the legislation should contain essential safeguards as to income-rental relationships.

SALE AND RENT CONTROL

The committee reaffirms the position taken by the National Committee on Housing in September 1945 against rent or sale-price control on new construction, but favors the continuance of rent control on existing houses. In view, however, of the increased costs prevailing it seems evident that some adjustment in rentals should be considered at this time. The committee therefore recommends that an immediate analysis be made to determine the extent of the needed adjustments and to determine also whether such adjustments should be made on a locality, regional, national, or other basis.

Approved by the executive committee of the National Committee on Housing, December 3, 1946.

Recommendations committee: Fred Ludwig, president, Merritt Lumber Yards, Reading, Pa., chairman; Ogden Bigelow, president, First National Bank, Greenwich, Conn.; Irving Bjork, assistant secretary, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.; Harold S. Buttenheim, editor, American City, New York; Russell G. Creviston, director, public relations, the Crane Co., Chicago; Joseph D. Keenan, secretary, Chicago Federation of Labor, and former Vice Chairman for Labor, War Production Board; Morris Macht, president, Welsh Construction Co., Baltimore, Md.; Prof. Winfield Riefler, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.; Robert C. Weaver, director, communities service division, American Council on Race Relations, Chicago.

Reference: Housing Inventory and Forecast Conference, Chicago, November 18, 19, 20, 1946; National Committee on Housing, 1 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1947

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan, which appears in today's New York Herald Tribune. The question asked by the Missouri delegation is very pertinent, not only for Missourians but for all the American people. I saw first hand the conditions in Greece when visiting that country in 1945. There is no doubt in my mind that these people are deserving and in 1945 these poor Greeks were suffering from the ravages of the war. There is no one more interested than I am in seeing us, as the leading democracy in the world, finish the job, and I would like to see the fear of want abolished for all peoples.

This move to aid Greece and Turkey is a new and drastic step in our foreign policy. The question is—will our intervention in these European problems become world-wide? Should that become necessary, can we go every step of the way and still maintain our own strength?

I believe it is high time that we Members of the Congress and the American people be given a complete revelation as to what secret agreements were made at Yalta and Potsdam. We shall probably give this aid, but I, for one, want the people to go in this undertaking with their eyes open.

The article referred to follows:

AID TO GREECE VIEWED AS A STEP TOWARD NORMAL WORLD TRADE—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS QUESTION ON COST OF TRUMAN'S PROGRAM IS ONE OF MANY, THE COLLECTIVE REPLIES TO WHICH WILL ENABLE JUDGMENT OF POLICY

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—The present stage of President Truman's proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey is so definite as to be a remarkable development in democratic government. It is a formal process of question and answer. The official askers of questions include the Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and House and many individuals and groups in Congress. The officials to whom the questions are directed include President Truman, the State Department, and other Government officials associated with the proposed action.

Not all the questions and answers can be made officially public in quotation marks, for there must be consideration of diplomatic propriety at a tense time. But the information will reach the public through news interpretations and unofficial statements. By weighing and sifting these, the public will be able to arrive at a judgment.

Yet each of us needs to be careful not to arrive at a conclusion based upon the answer to any single question. For beneath the information brought out by specific questions must be understanding of the meaning and intention of the President's new policy, the over-all answer to all the questions.

COST OF THE PROGRAM

One specific question is in a list of seven formally asked by 11 Republican Senators and Representatives in the delegation from Missouri. The State of their residence has a colloquial American significance. Their question is, "What will be the total expense of the President's plan to the taxpayers of the United States?"

That question is intended to find out whether the present proposed expenditure of $400,000,000 will be followed by further expenditures in the future. The answer is to be found in President Truman's speech, which, on this point as on others, was phrased with special care. Mr. Truman said that with the proposed financial aid would go experienced American administrators, economists and technicians, to insure that the financial and other aids given to Greece shall be used effectively in creating a stable and self-sustaining economy.

Once Greece has been enabled, by American aid and American advisers, to set up a stable and self-sustaining economy, two results should follow: The people of Greece will be in less need of aid from us or any other source; they will be able to support themselves by their own work, with less need, or no need at all, for gifts from the United States Treasury. Further, they will be able to get economic aid from private sources. With a stable economy in Greece, individuals and business institutions in that country can buy goods in the United States on credit. American manufacturers and exporters will be able to find customers in Greece whose standing justifies sale to them on credit of the equipment they need to restore their war-wracked industries.

PRIVATE AID POSSIBLE

To look forward to a time when American manufacturers and exporters can confidently extend credit to Greek industries may seem, in present conditions, a long-distance call on optimism. Even if, for an interval, it should be desirable for the United States Government to guarantee such credit, that would be less of a call on our Treasury than direct gifts are. And, other than Greece, there are several countries close to the stage in which normal extension of credit by American manufacturers and exporters to privately owned industries should be practicable.

Such a normal condition of international trade is what the Truman policy looks to for the world. That condition, when and if it arrives, will end the drain on the American Treasury for relief and rehabilitation abroad. The funds of the American Treasury for that purpose are limited. Concern about whether we can balance our national budget and remain a solvent nation is the reason for the query whether we ought to make the proposed expenditure in Greece. On the other hand, the funds of private individuals and corporations and other institutions in America are enormous. Use of some of them as loans or credits to industries abroad is a desirable policy.

This answer to the question about the total ultimate cost of President Truman's policy to the taxpayers of the United States is part of the over-all answer to all the questions. The whole policy is a constructive step toward checking the falling of one country after another under dominance by Russia and communism—toward enabling countries to have independent governments and free-enterprise economies.

Washington Birthday Address by Hon. A. R. Bergesen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent Washington Birthday address delivered by Hon. A. R. Bergesen, former speaker of the North Dakota House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The month of February stands out among the months of the year because it was the birth month of our two most revered Presidents. As legislators, it is of interest to us to know that both had had legislative experience before they ascended to the Presidency. Both were defeated the first time they ran, but in each case they persisted and succeeded.

George Washington served as a member of the house in the colonial legislature of Virginia from 1759 to 1775. He also became a member of the First Continental Congress. Of his work in that Congress, the great orator Patrick Henry said, "If you speak of solid information and sound judgment, Colonel Washington is unquestionably the greatest man on the floor."

* * * * *

Every house must have a strong foundation if it is to stand. In our Republic, the

States form the foundation. The superstructure is the Union or Federal Government. Washington's great contribution to civilization was in the formation of the entire structure; Lincoln's was in its preservation. Washington worked toward uniting the States to form the Union; Lincoln labored to hold the States together to preserve it. Both men recognized that the success of the Nation depended upon the States as a strong foundation, bound together by the mortar of common purpose.

That brings me to the question I wish to discuss with you this afternoon.

What is the place of local or State government in our American Republic? Where should the authority of the State end and that of the Federal Government begin?

To fully understand this question, it is well to go back to the founding of our Republic.

It will be 160 years next May 25 that duly selected representatives from a majority of the Colonies met in Philadelphia for the purpose of drafting the framework for a national form of government. Serving without compensation and paying their own expenses, these men labored through the hot summer months and emerged in September with a charter of government which the great English Prime Minister, William Gladstone, characterized as the greatest instrument of government ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

These men, familiar with the history of governments and having but recently felt the lash of a despotic ruler, were determined to establish here in America a land in which men might be free—free to express their own opinions; free to assemble as we are assembled here; free to worship God or not to worship as they chose; free to choose their own occupation; free to work or not to work, as they saw fit, so long as they did not encroach on the rights of others. In the Bill of Rights they placed certain definite restrictions upon the National Government for the protection of the individual; guaranteeing the security of people in their persons and homes and against unreasonable searches and seizures; protecting the citizen from deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and guaranteeing the right of trial by jury. They recognized that human rights and property rights go hand in hand. They knew that personal safety and safety of ownership are inseparable. They knew that each is fundamentally essential to the other, if we are to be assured life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

A fundamental principle underlying the Constitution was that the Federal Government acquired only such authority and power as had been given up by the States. To the States was reserved all powers not so granted.

In order to bring these things to pass and to guarantee that there be no infringement of State rights in the future, they set up certain safeguards. These safeguards, today, have been largely destroyed. I shall mention only two.

The first has to do with taxation. These men recognized that the unlimited power of taxation is the power to destroy. The control of the people over the public purse was carefully devised and set up in the Constitution. As one instance, it prohibited any direct tax on the people by the Federal Government unless it be apportioned among the several States on the basis of population.

But in 1913 we changed that. We adopted the sixteenth amendment authorizing the Federal Government to levy income and inheritance taxes according to whatever financial success any citizen might have attained. On that power we place no limitation. Thereby, we let loose an avalanche of new Federal centralization that has carried us far from our original principles of local government. From that day to this, the amount of money the Federal Government can spend has steadily increased, until now it has reached unbelievable figures. With all this money in hand, Congress has been persuaded to appropriate more and more money for more and more functions which had previously been the sole functions of States and local communities. Many of these have been an utter waste of money. Few have been efficiently or economically administered. Some have been important to our general welfare, but they should have been achieved by methods in keeping with our basic American principle of local self-government.

Now that the Federal Government collects its billions in taxes, it is relatively easy for advocates of any new program to put it over. They simply employ the help of some pressure group, head for Washington and concentrate their efforts on the Congress. Congress appropriates a huge sum of money and apportions it to the States on a matching basis on condition that each State conform to certain regulations. The offer is irresistable and the States tax their citizens more in order to get that money. Another Federal bureau is set up in Washington with several thousand additional employees. This system goes on and on, ever expanding. The hold of Washington on the individual lives of the people becomes tighter and tighter, and the participation of the people in their local government becomes less and less.

In 1946 the people of North Dakota paid the Federal Government over $45,000,000 in income and inheritance taxes. That is more than $90,000,000 for the biennium. At the same time you, as legislators, are wrestling with the problem of keeping your appropriations within $20,000,000, the total estimated income of the State for the biennium. National defense and such projects as the Missouri development are nation 1 in character, but the number of projects purely local in character in which the Federal Government concerns itself is appalling. Every dollar sent to Washington is pretty well used up before it returns.

The story is told of a little boy who wanted to build himself an aeroplane. He had no money and he needed $100. At night when he went to bed he prayed to God to send him $100. Night after night he prayed, but there was no answer. So he wrote a letter and addressed it to God. The Post Office Department, not knowing the Lord's address, sent it to the White House. The President felt that such a worthy appeal should be answered and he sent the boy $5. The young lad wrote to God and thanked him for answering his prayers, but, he said, "I think you should know that your letter went by way of Washington, and those bureaucrats took out 95 percent."

No one can seriously question the advisability of income and inheritance taxes. They are among the fairest and most equitable methods of taxation that we have. But we may well question the wisdom of granting the Federal Government unlimited authority to sap the financial strength of our people to such an extent that we do not have left sufficient means to properly and adequately support our own institutions and our own necessary activities. What could we not do for our schools, our institutions, our aged people, our highways, and our other State activities if we had a fair portion of that $90,000,000. What is more, we could use it as we deemed best, without dictation from Washington. It is time that our State and all other States join hands with the State of Indiana (see 1947 House Journal, pp. 509–10) and resist being considered the adopted child of Washington, D. C.

It is only natural that there have been set up in Washington, over the years, individuals and bureaus with almost unlimited authority to solve our individual problems. Their job has been to work out a so-called planned economy. As a result of their planning, we are short of sugar, shirts, suits, underwear, soap—even toilet paper. The things we need most, these we cannot buy. These planners always forget some important factor. Even back in the days of Henry Wallace's Ever-Normal Granary Plan, which sounded so good and useful—Mr. Wallace forgot that he could not control the weather. It proved to be a serious oversight in his plan. There is no politics intended in what I am saying. Mr. Wallace has been both a Republican and a Democrat. I am speaking on a matter of principle only. A bureaucrat is a bureaucrat no matter what his party affiliation may be.

Shortly after the capitulation of Japan, there came from the high places in Washington the bold assertion that corporations could pay increased wages without an increase in prices. Shortly, this country experienced such a wave of strikes and shutdowns as it had never experienced before. As wage increases were granted, the Government found it necessary to grant increases in the price of steel and other basic products and thereby set in motion our present spiral of inflation. One may reasonably ask, why was the Government in there, anyway?

Again, our Government planners overlooked a very important factor. There is nothing automatically good about an increase in wages. In fact, there is a positive loss to all of us in wage increases unless there is an equivalent increase in production. A smart labor leadership and a smart Government leadership after the war would have stressed production, would have encouraged workers to get goods produced to satisfy wants at a reasonable level of prices, while accepting wage increases obtainable by negotiation. Production of more goods by more people for more people brings higher wages and lowers the cost of living. Money is not wealth. Goods are wealth. It's how much we can buy with what we have that determines how wealthy we are.

The second safeguard in the Constitution, to which I shall refer, is that provision preserving to each State the right of control over commerce within its own borders, and granting to the Federal Government control over only that portion of commerce which is "among the several States."

This clause granting to the Federal Government control only over commerce "among the several States" was jealously guarded and protected by our courts, both Federal and State, for almost 150 years. Within the last generation, however, we have acquired a completely new Federal Supreme Court, consisting of men espousing an economic philosophy contrary to that expressed by the framers of our Constitution. Today, by judicial interpretation, the jurisdiction of the Federal Government has become so broadened in its scope and so many fundamental principles of law have been upset, that not even an expert on constitutional law can give an opinion as to what the law is or is not, and be sure that he is right.

For a century and a half the decisions of our courts have given us a fairly accurate yardstick by which to determine what is and what is not interstate commerce. Now, those decisions have been thrown overboard in favor of the Federal Government. In the last session of the Supreme Court of the United States, for instance, despite the language of the commerce clause of the Constitution and despite prior decisions of that Court, it was held that an employee washing windows of an office building was engaged in producing goods in interstate commerce because a substantial part of the building was occupied by a tenant who was a manufacturer of goods which were shipped in interstate commerce. He was not an employee of the manufacturer. He was an employee of the owner of the building. Yet, the Court held, he was engaged in interstate commerce washing windows.

Recently, a Federal court held that a farmer in Illinois who sold milk to his neighbor was engaged in interstate commerce because

the milk came in competition with other milk which was shipped across the State line. So gradually and yet swiftly, the powers of the States are dwindling and the Federal Government becomes an octopus. Local self-government is taken away, and authority rests with the great ruler in Washington.

No court has the right to constitute itself, in effect, a constitutional convention for the purpose of rewriting the Constitution of the United States and more particularly where to do so destroys the balance of power between the States and the central government and thereby destroys the right of local self-government.

What is the solution? We cannot look to the United States Supreme Court as now constituted for relief. The majority of its members have committed themselves to the philosophy of Federal supremacy. Our help must lie with our elected representatives in Congress. I will give you one illustration.

Some 2 or 3 years ago, the insurance world was dumbfounded by a new pronouncement by the Supreme Court. Contrary to a long list of prior decisions, it held that when the agent in one State wrote a policy of insurance for a company whose home office was in another State, that company was engaging in interstate commerce. By that decision the law was changed overnight—not by Congress, not by the people, but by the Supreme Court. The insurance commissioners of the 48 States became concerned. They saw here another step to concentrate all power in Washington. They appealed to Congress. Congress has now taken action nullifying, for the time being at least, that decision of the Supreme Court. In my opinion, one source of hope lies with Congress. I am not the least worried as to what Congress will do when the majority of the people make their desires known.

Ladies and gentlemen, we need to perform some drastic operations in Washington. They must be performed if local self-government is to survive. It must be first on our agenda to return to the States their natural share of governmental responsibility.

But, we cannot rely solely upon Congress. We, as States, must do a better job than we have done in the past. One of the arguments used for usurpation of authority by the Federal Government is that the States are not performing their full functions.

One means of correcting this situation is by closer cooperation with the other 47 States through the Council of State Governments. If we are to keep abreast of the times; if we are to give to the people of North Dakota the best in modern thought for State government, it is necessary that we keep informed on what other States are doing. The Council of State Governments, of which this State is a contributing member, and which has been carrying on its work for more than 20 years is the principal existing agency whereby State executives and legislators, by careful research and exchange of ideas may keep the 48 States abreast of each other and abreast of the times.

This cannot be done by going home at the close of the session and forgetting about the affairs of state until the opening of the next session of the legislature 2 years later. The means of contact between the legislature and the people; and between the legislature and other States, during the interim between sessions, is the Legislative Research Committee.

It is evident from the compensation paid to our legislators that the people do not fully appreciate the worth of a legislator nor the importance of the legislature. Yet, the laws you adopt are the laws which govern our daily lives. Somehow, the legislature has failed in the field of public relations. Our State executives and the courts are in constant touch with the people. The contact of the legislature is for but 60 days every 2 years. Now, the legislature has the opportunity, through the work of the Legislative Research Committee, not only to do a more intelligent job, but also to keep the function of lawmaking constantly before the people of the State.

I pay tribute to the members of the Legislative Research Committee for the fine piece of work which they accomplished prior to the opening of this session. Representing both majority and minority factions, they have put politics aside and have labored solely on the basis of what is best for the people. The results of the few months since they secured the services of a research director are clearly evident in the more efficient work of the present session.

We cannot have good local government without good legislation. You cannot expect to operate efficiently and intelligently as members of the legislature without having the benefit of careful research. The Legislative Research Committee is a vital part of the legislative function of State government.

The thing of transcendent importance is that by putting governmental responsibility back close to the people and into units of government sufficiently small for them to operate, the governmental capacity of the people will be developed by its exercise. The lessons of history teach us that unless respect for law, love of liberty, and the governmental capacity of the private citizen are secured, then the entire superstructure falls.

We are all familiar with the song "America, the Beautiful." America is beautiful. It is beautiful for its lofty mountains and fertile plains; its cities and hamlets; its winding rivers and verdant forests; its pastures of grazing cattle and fields of waving grain; its factories, its farms, and its homes. But more than all, America is beautiful for its liberty-loving, self-reliant people, who have gained and retained their freedom by the constant exercise of self-government.

Destroy local self-government and you destroy the foundation. When that foundation crumbles, our Government will go as Greece and Rome went and as every government has gone that forgot to develop the stability of its individual citizenry. It will die as a tree dies, rooted in the soil which is no longer able to sustain it.

Labor in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague, publisher of the Oregon Statesman, Salem, Oreg. I commend this editorial to your attention as the views and information therein set forth are of extreme interest and value. It follows:

LABOR IN BRITAIN

The British are not going to be counted out of the fight even though snows and floods have dealt them a crippling blow this winter. Prime Minister Attlee, in an address to the nation, Tuesday, assured his people and the world: "We shall win in peace just as we did in war." Those with recollection of the way Britain stood alone through most of 1940 and 1941 have faith that the bulldog quality of the British will pull them through this immediate trial.

Admittedly Britain is in a difficult position because of its necessity of making heavy imports of foodstuffs and raw materials. It lost much of its overseas investment which returned income to pay for these imports and has not increased its exports in volume to bring a balance. Manpower is lacking in industry, and for coal mining a lack of readiness to work. Prime Minister Attlee in his address said his government rejected the idea of compelling workers to enter essential industries, depending still on persuasion to get workers to leave less necessary employment. Yet that is an acute problem in a Socialist government which is based on planned economy. Writing in The Nation, Aylmer Vallance refers to it as the problem which has faced the Labor government ever since it took office—how to carry out effective planning without measures of compulsion repugnant to its conception of political democracy.

Communist Russia entertains no such scruples. It puts men to work where it wants them; and on slight provocation may ship them off to labor camps which are really penal colonies. Whether Socialist Britain can pull through without resort to compulsion in labor assignment is a grave question. That, it may be recalled, is a thesis of Frederic Hayek's much reviled (by leftists) Road to Serfdom: the deprivation of human liberties. If the British can get their work done without forcing labor they will have succeeded at a point critical for Socialist performance.

Vallance draws another conclusion from his observation of the British economic crisis:

"The present stoppage of production due to a month of Arctic weather and the depletion of coal stocks has brought home strikingly to the man in the street the cold, hard fact that full employment cannot be obtained by acts of Parliament or by cheap money but is dependent ultimately on physical resources."

That comment merits reflection here in America where months ago there was urgent demand for legislation to provide full employment, with the prospective use of deficit financing—cheap money—to provide employment. The parallel with Britain is not exact, but the testimony of Vallance is pertinent, namely, that full employment is not guaranteed by a law or by easy money, save in a totalitarian state.

Condensed Skim Milk in Bulk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at various times I have called the attention of the agencies connected with food production, conservation use, the importance of the food value of skim milk. The OPA placed a 14.5 cent per pound ceiling price on the product. The Agriculture Department has recently placed a 10-cent-per-pound floor price on this product. This skim milk in dried form not only has 30 and 35 percent digestible protein but, in addition, contained as much or more calcium, phosphorus, iron, thiamine, niacin, and ascorbic acid as whole milk contains. This floor price of 10 cents per pound means 10 cents for about 6 quarts of skim milk, and after the drying process it leaves the farmer receiving around 1 cent per quart. Of the 653,000,000 pounds of dried skim

milk produced in the United States in 1946, all but 15,000,000 pounds were used for human food. This is by far the cheapest food in the world today, and every effort should be made to prevent the waste of the product.

In addition to the 653,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk produced in the United States in 1946, there were over a billion pounds of condensed skim milk, sweetened and unsweetened, in bulk produced. This unsweetened condensed skim milk was used in very large quantities wherein the condensed unsweetened skim and high-test frozen cream were reconstituted and sold as bottle milk in many districts of the United States that had a short supply.

The production of the sweetened whole and skim milk and the production of the nonsweetened condensed whole and skim milk are shown in the following table:

Sweetened and unsweetened condensed milk

[In thousands of pounds]

Year	Sweetened condensed milk in bulk		Unsweetened condensed milk in bulk	
	Skimmed	Unskimmed	Skimmed	Unskimmed
1930	158,971	62,421	156,212	128,203
1931	140,361	45,887	145,416	110,038
1932	120,623	42,628	138,646	96,052
1933	114,136	40,964	127,197	86,992
1934	120,365	43,383	140,913	92,414
1935	133,417	36,907	164,372	102,833
1936	155,640	49,618	199,404	129,601
1937	154,755	48,293	219,378	133,124
1938	165,136	48,021	230,143	128,594
1939	152,886	54,897	223,001	107,026
1940	166,017	76,138	245,910	128,017
1941	173,658	79,299	326,535	113,965
1942	225,840	75,382	318,379	125,880
1943	306,899	66,588	325,512	102,452
1944	370,049	63,586	367,831	119,405
1945	[1] 494,472	[1] 62,739	[1] 469,324	[1] 129,528
1946 [2]	[1] 654,530	66,673	462,315	116,565

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Estimates.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics—U. S. Department of Agriculture.

It does not make sense during a period of world hunger to allow food products that have required manpower and fertility to produce, be wasted. Nor does it make sense to anyone that has any respect for the Treasury of the United States or for the taxpayers of our country. The $80,000,000 loss of public funds on the 1946 potato crop should indicate that we should have some correlation between production, processing, and distribution of food products.

Johannes Steel

REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested to find a clipping in the Daily News the other day giving the statement that Johannes Steel, who was a Communist candidate for Congress in New York recently, has been found in Moscow as a correspondent. Our State Department, I understand, has refused to accredit him over there. He was not there as one of the accredited correspondents. For some reason or other the authorities in Moscow admitted him, anyway, and he is over there writing as an accredited correspondent as far as Moscow is concerned. You will remember that at the time he was a candidate up there running with Communist support, Mr. Henry Wallace went up there and campaigned for him against the regular Democratic candidate and against the Republican who also ran at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the clipping in question from the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. The clipping is as follows:

JOHANNES STEEL BYPASSES STATE DEPARTMENT; COVERS MOSCOW TALKS

(By Frederick Woltman)

NEW YORK, March 20.—Despite a "grave housing shortage" which caused rigid limitation of American correspondents, Russia has admitted a pro-Soviet ex-radio commentator to the Moscow Conference, although he was denied accreditation by the United States Government, it was learned today.

He is Johannes Steel, darling of the United States Communist Party. Steel obtained a Russian visa, and, according to the United Press, arrived this week in Moscow, where he attended Foreign Minister Molotov's reception Tuesday.

NOT ACCREDITED

Informed that Steel had gone to Moscow, a spokesman for the State Department expressed surprise today in Washington. He said: "It is a mystery to us how Steel got there. He is not accredited as an American correspondent to cover the Moscow Conference."

In granting him admission, the Soviet Government bypassed or ignored the State Department. Only by strong diplomatic pressure did the State Department induce Russia to raise its original quota of 20 newsmen to 36. (The Daily Worker's editor, Morris Childs, was No. 35.)

As foreign editor of the left-wing magazine, Reader's Scope, Steel stood fifty-second on the list of applicants. Representatives of 16 news-gathering agencies ahead of him were cut out.

In a dispatch from New York to Moscow last December, Tass, official Soviet wire service, approvingly referred to Steel as a "progressive commentator."

It was learned that Steel is not attending the Moscow Conference in behalf of any American newspaper, press service, magazine, or radio station.

REPRESENTS NEWSLETTER

He went there in behalf of his private monthly (multigraphed) newsletter, "The Johannes Steel Report on World Affairs," in which he has plugged hard for the Communist Party line since he started it 2 months ago. He is trying to sell 100,000 annual subscriptions at $5 apiece.

Before he sailed for England, March 7, on the *Queen Elizabeth*, the War Department withdrew its permission for Steel to enter the American military zones in Germany and Austria.

Legislative Procedure

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, "the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau." On Thursday, March 20, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an attack on myself as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Recreation of the Committee on the District of Columbia and on the Republican leadership of this House, charging legislative thievery, because a bill he had introduced, H. R. 496, a measure to set up a clinic in the District of Columbia for the treatment of alcoholics, had been reintroduced as H. R. 2620, by myself. The bill had extensive hearings. It was found necessary to make 19 changes in the bill to perfect it. There were two entirely new sections added to the bill.

Had it not been for the fact that my colleague had used this for an excuse to attack the Republican leadership in the House for unfairness, I would have let the matter pass unnoticed, but I see in this instance the "hand" of the minority leadership and its purpose to resume the delaying tactics it so effectively employed during the last Republican administration. There is more back of this than the hurt feelings of an individual Member.

Since this matter has been brought up, I thought it well to acquaint the Members of this House with the policies along this line employed by the Democrats when they were in the majority, and, let me say right here, many Democrats seem unable to learn they are no longer in the driver's seat directing legislation through the Congress.

Soon after I became a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I became aware that no piece of legislation of the slightest importance ever bore the name of a Republican. The Democrats let the Republicans sponsor the Case bill because they thought it was full of dynamite. The bill was vetoed by the President. Examination of legislation passed into law during the last 16 years indicates that our friends on the other side of the aisle seldom let any legislation out of a committee under a Republican's name. Certainly there was no legislation which was policy forming or far reaching.

In order to satisfy my curiosity and place the record before the Members of the House, I made a study of all the public laws passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress just to see how liberal the Democratic leadership in that Congress was with the minority in that respect. Here are my findings. Of the 733 public laws passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, 481 were originated in the House of Representatives. Of these, 79 were intro-

duced by Republicans. Not one of them had to do with policy. All of them were of purely local significance. For instance, 21 authorized the building of bridges over navigable streams within a Republican Member's district or over the boundary of two districts represented by Republicans. Five authorized the granting of medals. The Republican Delegate from Hawaii was permitted to keep his name on six bills having to do with that Territory. Eight had to do with Indian tribes within the districts of Republican Members. The Democratic leadership magnanimously permitted the passage of H. R. 4590, introduced by the then minority leader, now our honorable Speaker, a bill authorizing the Treasury to sell to manufacturers for a period of 2 years, silver owned by the United States at not less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce. One bill affecting the District of Columbia, introduced by a Republican Congressman from Maryland, was permitted to pass. So, my colleagues, this is "the studied program of political carnage and legislative thievery" that has been consistently followed by the Democratic minority for the past 16 years. Is it any wonder they now suspect the Republicans of learning that policy?

Mr. Speaker, for 16 long years, this big, healthy Republican elephant was practically denied the power of creating and guiding new legislation through the Congress. The elephant took all the attacks, and put up with this legislative thievery and political carnage, but, because it has a thick hide, it did survive. Now the tables are turned. The braying New Deal jackass which is symbolic of the Democratic Party now objects to the same treatment the Republican elephant has had to endure. I do not blame the Democrats for objecting, but their mule may well turn out to be a legislative eunuch.

Exports and Imports of Dried Skim Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have called attention to the importance of skim milk and how every effort should be made to prevent the waste of this great food. I have shown the official reports of the United States Department of Agriculture that indicate the diversion of this food from animal feed into human food. These records also showed how the dried skim milk has increased up to over 600,000,000 pounds a year. They also showed that over 1,000,000,000 pounds are now produced in bulk form.

Dried-milk exports were as high as 237,000,000 pounds in 1943 and were down to 167,000,000 in 1946. Anyone who realizes that this dried skim is the very cheapest source of animal protein in the world cannot explain any valid reason why larger amounts of this great food have not been used by UNRRA.

You will note that in 1936 with 25-cent butter and cheese as low as 12 cents in the United States, there was over 19,000,000 pounds of this product imported.

The official table from the United States Department of Agriculture is as follows:

United States exports and imports of dried skimmed milk, quantity and value, 1920–46

Year ended Dec. 31—	Domestic exports				Imports for consumption [1]			
	Milk, powdered (dried)		Milk, skimmed, dried [2]		Milk powder		Milk, skimmed, dried [3]	
	1,000 lb.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 lb.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 lb.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 lb.*	*1,000 dol.*
1920	3,172	1,000						
1921	9,443	1,439						
1922	6,190	786						
1923	2,437	341						
1924	5,529	827			1,870	240		
1925	3,649	717			5,430	531		
1926	2,661	774			5,224	673		
1927	3,326	940			6,828	897		
1928	4,016	1,035			3,895	664		
1929	5,342	1,367			4,186	769		
1930	6,223	1,455					457	27
1931	12,790	1,538					[4]	[4]
1932			1,673	85			5	[4]
1933			891	62			119	
1934			1,430	94			[4]	[4]
1935			1,163	90			285	17
1936			1,927	159			19,965	779
1937			2,116	155			1,391	54
1938			6,372	380			3	[4]
1939			2,097	136			865	24
1940			8,710	588			8	[4]
1941			34,419	2,993			36	3
1942			132,591	18,129			2	[4]
1943			237,499	33,397			[4]	[4]
1944			206,574	34,054			[4]	[4]
1945			180,194	29,536			85	7
1946			167,339	28,676			[4]	[4]
1947 [5]								

[1] General imports prior to 1936.
[2] Not separately classified prior to 1930.
[3] Not separately classified prior to 1932.
[4] Less than 500.
[5] January 1947 data not available as of Feb. 27, 1947.

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States and official records, Bureau of the Census and U. S. Tariff Commission.

Legislation by Litigation Should Be Stopped

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with any study of possible ways of reducing Government expenditures, particularly by cutting down personnel, consideration should be given to a questionable practice that has lately developed among Government lawyers and officials of trying to legislate by litigation. Thus, if some agency or department of the Government is not satisfied with the laws passed by Congress, which it is supposed to enforce and which it has already interpreted, the agency, under the guise of new regulations which it proceeds to promulgate, commences lawsuits in an attempt to change the law to accord with its new interpretation, although the law was in nowise changed by Congress and the failure to attempt any changes clearly indicated that Congress was content with the original interpretation. This sort of legal "pioneering"—as certain Government employees call it—is not only unjustified in that it is an attempt by the executive department of the Government to legislate, but indeed, impose a cruel burden on the "guinea pigs" arbitrarily selected by the particular agency in its campaign to change the existing law or the interpretation thereof.

To illustrate, the press recently carried statements concerning an attempt by the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to find a method for reducing the 58,000 employees in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. A substantial group of these employees are undoubtedly engaged in the so-called guinea pig cases. For many years, for example, the income-tax law relating to such things as family partnerships, family trusts, employee stock purchase plans and a host of other items had been relatively set. Thousands of taxpayers entered into transactions in reliance upon the policy of the Bureau of Internal Revenue established for 30 years, toward these transactions. Then some of the bright young boys determined that the laws and attitude relating to such subjects should be changed. Immediately new regulations and rulings are issued and the entire subject matter is thrown into a state of confusion, while hundreds of lawyers, accountants, and other Government employees start to make new laws. Obviously if any new laws were to be made on these subjects or if the interpretations of the existing laws were to be changed, Congress is the duly organized and existing body for such a purpose. The failure of Congress to act on most of these questions since 1913 provides an indication that Congress was satisfied with the status quo. Unquestionably the new interpretations if ultimately sustained—and it must be conceded that in many cases the Government was successful in persuading the

New Deal courts to adopt its new approach—results in the collection of additional taxes. But again it is the function of Congress to determine in what manner and from what sources taxes shall be collected and it is not the proper function of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to augment collections by new and novel twists in laws or regulations.

Not only does such an usurpation of the functions of Congress create a state of confusion for business in general, but, as noted, it works a particular hardship on the unfortunate group who are selected as guinea pigs in the Government's legislation by litigation campaign. These people find that their family partnerships, approved for years and never even challenged, suddenly get a crushing blow from the revenue agent's office announcing an income-tax deficiency of sizable proportions based upon the new approach, or a family trust set up long ago and consistently passed by the Treasury finds itself under attack despite the fact that Congress has in nowise amended the laws. In practically every case the Treasury is not even interested in trying to settle such cases since their purpose is to make new law. Thus the Bureau insists upon litigation, and if they lose in the Tax Court they insist upon appeals. At the outset of its campaign in most cases the Government has no clear-cut precedents upon which to rely, but simply tries to make precedents as it proceeds in its relentless insistence upon forcing taxpayers to litigate and appeal and litigate some more. During the entire procedure the credit and business standing of the unfortunate guinea pig is seriously impaired, his prospects are endangered, and there is nothing to do except to hold on in the hope that the courts will tell the bureau legislators that they were wrong in the first place, in which case the bureau legislators will say, "Well, at least we tried."

Enlightening indeed would be statistics to reveal the number of cases pending in the Bureau of Internal Revenue which obviously are simply test cases. Even more significant would be a study to determine the number of employees who are engaged in such questionable ventures. It is difficult to imagine lawyers recommending litigation in a case where there is no precedent to support it. Indeed only Government lawyers who are paid the same amount whether they win or lose cases could afford to engage in such frivolous and unreasonable contests. The Government attorney has nothing to lose, but the poor guinea pig has much at stake. Certainly lawyers, whether working for the Government or not, should not be permitted to commence litigation in the hope of reversing established precedents or long-settled rulings. If this part of the Government lawyers and bureaucrats were eliminated, many hundreds or even thousands could be released into private practice where they would find that such frolicking tactics were not feasible or practicable.

They would soon learn that lawyers just do not start litigation with the candid admission that the existing cases are against us but we would like to test them out to see whether they cannot be changed. Such an iconoclastic approach is particularly dangerous and out of place in the field of taxation which so intimately affects each business transaction and where respect for an established precedent is so essential. Please note that the guinea pig is not a criminal trying to evade the law, for no one has sympathy with this class. They are not people who are failing to report their income or evading or suppressing any facts or information in connection therewith. They are simply people who, with a full disclosure of all the facts, determine upon a course of conduct only to find that the rules are changed after the Government begins the game.

Certainly Congress, the largest group of whose members have been trained in the law themselves, should be qualified to write laws that are clear enough to dispense with such machinations. This is particularly true under the congressional reorganization bill which provides experts for the congressional committee and which further provides executive assistants for the Members. They should now be sufficiently talented to frame laws clearly enough so that the executive department of the Government can confine itself to its traditional task of enforcing those laws as written, which would enable the Congress to eliminate so many of the present personnel that are engaged in legislation by litigation.

Let Us Practice Democracy in America While We Purchase It Abroad

REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which I hope will eventually become an organic act for the Island of Guam. My bill proposes no raid on the Federal Treasury and establishes no new instrument of Federal bureaucracy. My bill simply proposes to extend, by act of Congress, to 23,000 loyal American nationals, the liberties and human rights which we ourselves value so highly. It proposes to extend to Guam the guarantees of personal freedom and civil liberty guaranteed other Americans by the Constitution of the United States; it proposes to give them an American system of law and courts with the right to appeal to the courts of the United States; it proposes to give them a measure of local self-government under a civilian governor to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate; it proposes to extend to those permanent residents of Guam who do not already have it, full United States' citizenship.

There is much talk of democracy these days. We are being told that the blood and treasure which we squandered on the battlefields of the world in two great wars in the cause of democracy has not been enough. We are told that two nations—the one a kingdom; the other a dictatorship—are in danger and that we must again rush to the rescue. This time there appears to be no immediate need for American troops; the job can be done with American dollars.

The will-o'-the-wisp which we have pursued for almost two decades—the call to spend, and spend, and spend—is again being sounded from high places. We are told that the goals which could not be achieved in Europe by bloodshed and death on the battlefields of the world can now be purchased in two countries at least with several hundreds of millions of American dollars. Gentlemen, I say to you that if the cause of democracy in Greece and Turkey is in danger of being extinguished it will take more than dollars to rekindle the flame. Democracy is a thing of the spirit—it is in the souls of men—it cannot be nourished with dollars and it cannot be kept alive with bayonets—not even with bayonets purchased with American dollars and wielded by soldiers paid in American dollars and sustained on food purchased with American dollars.

I have not taken the floor today to attack the proposal put forward by the administration to solve the dilemma which now confronts the United States in Europe. If we have reached that unhappy state in Europe where we must organize a political machine of European nations in order to overcome our political enemies, then I say let us do as the administration suggests—it has experience in such matters. I have been told, though, that political machines require an awful lot of oil—even the smallest cog must be lubricated—not just to get the machine started but from time to time thereafter in order to keep it running. If we must now create a political machine of nations in order to save democracy in Europe, I say create it and create it now. Start it with dollars if we must, but let us be careful that we do not create a Frankenstein which will devour more and more of our economic substance and push us further and further on the road of deficit financing.

It is my belief that the real answer to the situation which confronts us abroad is not to be found in bigger and better loans. I believe the answer lies in bigger and better democracy. I believe that we must rouse our democratic ideology from its slumber and again make it alive and militant. We must place it on the highways of the world and make it act and do democracy. We must give renewed vigor and being to our philosophy of government. We must dust off the Declaration of Independence and give it new life in the twentieth-century world. We need a Tom Paine, or a Jefferson, a Washington, or a Lincoln to proclaim democracy abroad in these days of doubt.

I have just returned from a 20,000-mile tour of the Pacific. There as in Europe, the forces of reaction and totalitarianism are at work. Communism threatens in China, in Manchuria, and in Korea. Relentlessly and ef-

ficiently the agents of the totalitarian way of life are boring from within to destroy the democracy which General MacArthur is laboring to bring to life. Yes, democracy in government is fighting for its life in the Pacific as well as in Europe.

Those of us who live in the far West—especially those of us who live on the shores of the Pacific—are also anxious about democracy. We believe that communism and autocracy in the Pacific is as great a menace to the United States as is communism in the Mediterranean. Gentlemen, the millions of Americans on the west coast and in the western United States see danger in the Pacific. We are not opposed to erecting safeguards in Europe but we also want to see safeguards established in the vast areas of the Pacific Ocean—even in Asia itself.

We of the West are aware of the fact that security for the United States does not lie in Maginot Lines of island bases. We do not believe that American democracy can save itself merely by crouching behind walls of defense and waiting for the onslaught. We are convinced that in order to survive, our democracy must move far out into the Pacific even beyond our naval and military bases. We believe that the United States must build the outposts of American democracy not only in the far away islands of the Pacific but in Asia itself. We must build outposts in Asia in the minds and the hearts of men who have come to believe in the democratic way of life and who would fight for what they believe.

The people of the Pacific West believe that the United States should erect two walls of defense in the Pacific. The one should be material. It should be of earth and concrete and steel. It should be bases, fortifications, ships, and planes. The other must be spiritual. It must be constructed of loyalty and love for the United States and the democratic way of life. It must be thousands—possibly millions—of Pacific peoples believing in democracy.

The best defense for democracy in the Pacific is democracy in the Pacific. We should nurture it there and raise it up with all the care and attention at our command. We should build a bulwark of democracy in every island in the Pacific. We should teach these far-away peoples the ways of democracy and should do our utmost to raise them to the level of free beings in a free society. Each little island in the Pacific should be an outpost of our democratic way of life—an outpost which in time of need might well prove to be a forward bulwark of defense.

During the course of the Pacific tour from which I have just returned I visited a number of Pacific islands and far-away places. Among these were Guam and American Samoa. It was by visiting these two islands, which have been in the possession of the United States for almost 50 years, that I came to a full realization of the enormity of the wrong that the United States of America is perpetrating on almost 40,000 loyal American nationals in the name of democracy and national defense. The local inhabitants of Guam and American Samoa—and this includes many American citizens from the mainland of the United States—are governed under a form of military autocracy which is a disgrace to our democracy. It is an absolutism beyond anything I could have imagined even in my wildest dreams. And it exists under the American flag pursuant to authority from the President of the United States and with his knowledge and consent.

Guam was ceded to the United States by Spain at the close of the Spanish-American war. The cession was provided for in the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, in which the United States agreed among other things that the Congress of the United States would define the civil rights and political status of the local inhabitants of Guam. To this date the Congress has neglected to fulfill that pledge.

By Executive order of President McKinley the United States Navy was directed to assume control of the island, establish a form of local administration, and maintain law and order. The government so established exists to this very day. A naval governor, appointed by the President, reigns supreme on the island. He makes the law, creates the courts, and hires and fires the judges and policemen who interpret and enforce his law. There is no appeal beyond the island even in capital cases.

The naval governor's power to legislate is absolute, complete, and all-inclusive. It includes the power to tax and the power to appropriate private property. The writ of habeas corpus as such does not exist; neither the petit jury nor the grand jury has ever been established—not even for the thousands of Americans who have taken up residence on the island. A Guam congress exists but it is an advisory body only whose members serve without compensation and who are subject to removal by the naval governor. Gentlemen, that in short is the democracy under which the 23,000 local inhabitants of Guam and thousands of Americans who reside on Guam must work and live. Gentlemen, that in a few words is American democracy on Guam.

In American Samoa a similar system of government, stemming from similar authority, is administered in similar fashion by an absolute sovereign in naval gold braid. In this American outpost of democracy and national defense the lot of the local inhabitant is indeed sad. As a matter of fact, the lot of the mainland Americans who also reside there is little better than that of the Samoans themselves.

A United States Senate Committee under the chairmanship of former Senator Hiram Bingham visited Samoa in the late twenties and reported on conditions there as the committee had found them. Most of the conditions brought to attention in the Bingham report exist to this day and I shall not repeat them here. I would like however to invite your attention to a few of the tidbits of absolutism which I found in American Samoa on my recent visit.

As in Guam, the governor's absolute authority includes the power to tax. A general personal tax of $10 per annum is levied on each male inhabitant 18 years of age and over. Delinquency in the payment of this tax is treated as a contempt of court and is punished by imprisonment—not by fine or by tax sale of property, but by imprisonment. Another source of revenue is an ad valorem customs duty of 20 percent on practically every item imported into American Samoa. This 20-percent duty is levied even on items of food and clothing. It is applied with equal force and effect to imports from the United States itself. Yes, a 20-percent import duty is levied and collected by the United States naval government of American Samoa on imports from all foreign countries including the United States. In addition to this import duty a flat 2-percent tax is levied and collected by the United States naval government tax gatherer on the value of all merchandise and produce exported from American Samoa.

As in Guam, the only bank on the island is owned and operated by the Navy, which thereby absolutely controls all commercial credit on the islands. Samoans are prohibited from borrowing more than $25 from non-Samoans on pain of fine and imprisonment for the lender. A naval government commodity administrator has absolute authority to regulate imports and exports and the supply and price of food and consumer goods on the shelves of Samoan merchants. Storekeepers are compelled to pay what is called an annual license charge which in reality is a flat tax of 2 percent on gross sales.

That, gentlemen, is only a partial description of the United States naval democracy in Guam and American Samoa. That is the kind of democracy we—the United States of America—have extended to our own possessions. That is the American democracy now in existence in American territory on the authority of the executive branch of the United States Government—the very same branch which is now calling on us—the Congress of the United States—to come to the rescue of democracy in Europe. I say to you, gentlemen, we should practice the democracy we preach. We should take prompt action to abolish the military absolutisms which exist in Guam and American Samoa, and replace them with a democratic form of government under civilian administration. And, gentlemen, this should be done by the Congress on its own initiative.

The bill which I have introduced to extend democracy to Guam should be followed by a similar bill with respect to American Samoa. Although I am not prepared at the moment to submit such a bill, I call on you, my colleagues of the American Congress, not to forget the people of American Samoa when you get around to the business of extending democracy and the American way of life. The people of American Samoa, like the people of Guam, are standing and waiting with the patience so common to the subject peoples of the Pacific islands. They await the day when the United States will at last restore to them the human dignity and the pride in living enjoyed by other free Americans under the American system. They are Americans, gentlemen, loyal Americans who have remained steadfast through the years. They are Americans residing on

American soil—not Greeks, or Turks, or Hungarians, or Bulgarians, or foreigners of any name or brand. They seek only a decent form of government under the American system, and in the process are not asking for one single dollar.

Discharge of Disloyal Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's directive setting up a policy on firing disloyal Government employees was long overdue. For over a decade Communists and their sympathizers have enjoyed a paradise in the United States. For many years the policy of the Government has been to protect, shield, and nurture them. This announced reversal of that program is, therefore, at least encouraging.

However, announcement of a new policy is one thing—its execution is quite a different undertaking. And pray, who is to carry out this program, this housecleaning in the administration? Is it to be done by the rightists or the leftists? You certainly cannot entrust this job to the leftists. They have created the very condition which requires this reversal of policy. The trouble with the leftists is that while he may be non-Communist, he seldom is anti-Communist.

On the other hand, if this job is to be done by the rightists in the administration, they will need all the intelligence, intestinal fortitude, patriotism and devotion they can muster even to make a start. They might as well gird themselves for a battle royal, for the ensuing year will witness a life and death struggle by the leftists and Communist sympathizers for the control of the administration. They did not put Harry S. Truman in the White House just for fun. They are well entrenched in the administration.

The late Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he was President, said in October 1939:

> Extreme rightists and extreme leftists should not be taken out by us and shot against the wall, for they sharpen the argument and make us realize the value of the democratic middle course—especially if that middle course, in order to keep up with the times, is "just a little bit left of center."

In December 1944 he said he had lots of people in his administration who are on the left, and lots on the right, and that on the whole it worked out pretty well.

Using his Supreme Court appointments as a criterion, there is no difficulty judging which appointments preponderated. As to its working out well in his party and administration, we have only to remember Jim Farley, Jack Garner, Al Smith, and others. A house divided against itself cannot stand.

I know something about this struggle and probably, together with the November election, played a small part in bringing about President Truman's directive. I have given an outline of my work in a speech recorded last Wednesday for delivery over WJR in Detroit last Saturday. I present it herewith.

Last year a dangerous Communist spy ring was uncovered in Canada. It involved high government officials. Nevertheless, the Canadian spy ring would, in all probability, still be operating smoothly and under cover except for one fact, namely, that a Russian Communist agent, Igor Gouzenko, turned informer and exposed the whole ring.

The American people would be naive to think that nothing of that kind is going on here. The same Soviet agent, Gouzenko, testified that he believed that similar spy rings were operating in the United States. In fact, the Canadian report on the investigation of this ring proves that the Canadian spy ring used Communist agents in the United States to transfer $10,000 in currency to Communists in Europe.

Reds and "pinks" have a paradise in the United States. It has been the policy of our Government to protect and shield Reds and "pinks" even in Government jobs instead of discharging them. This fact was driven home to me in July of last year, when I was appointed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate communism in the Department of State.

For instance, we have read of Carl A. Marzani, who is now under indictment for perjury. It is alleged that in his application for a job he swore he was not a Communist while in fact he had been a member of the party for years under the alias of Tony Whales.

In tracing his record, I found that on February 25, 1944, the Civil Service Commission, which investigates the record of applicants for Government positions, was subpenaed by the then Dies committee to give the records of 20 persons, and among them Carl A. Marzani, as to their loyalty to our Government and its institutions. The Civil Service Commission turned them down flat with a letter from which I quote part of the last paragraph: "The Commission now declines with the approval of and at the direction of the President of the United States, to comply with certain of your requests only because it believes that it must do so if it is properly to perform its statutory duties." This, notwithstanding that they possessed at that time the facts upon which the present indictment is based.

With such a policy of shielding and protecting from the Congress and the people the Communists and Communist sympathizers of the administration in general, it was not surprising that the same policy of shielding and protecting Reds and "pinks" obtained in the Department of State. I think you will readily come to the same conclusion if I give you a brief outline of my work as a committee of one last year.

Early last summer Representative Cox, of Georgia, made a speech on the floor of the House in which he said that his good friend, Jimmy Byrnes, Secretary of State, was cleaning house in that Department, and that hundreds of Reds and "pinks" had been dismissed, and the process was still going on.

However, this was merely a false propaganda barrage from the State Department to shield the "commies" in their jobs. It misled Mr. Cox, the Congress, and the people, lulling them into a false sense of security, for, as will appear later, not a single "pink" or Red had been fired.

On July 2, Under Secretary Dean Acheson denied the above statement of Cox before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He stated that it was not the policy of the State Department to fire people for belonging to progressive organizations—by which he could mean nothing other than Communist-front organizations.

It was these two events and their implications which a week later led to my appointment to investigate. Under this assignment, on July 12, I had a meeting with J. Anthony Panuch, the deputy to the Assistant Secretary for Administration, whose office had charge of personnel.

Mr. Panuch informed me that the real truth lay between the two statements; that the Department had what they call a Security Committee which made investigations of alleged Red and "pink" activities; that on the recommendation of this committee, 40 employees had been fired for being Reds and "pinks"; but upon questioning, he finally admitted that some of these 40 had been discharged for incompetency. Professing not to know how many had been discharged for being Reds and "pinks" and how many had been discharged for being incompetent.

On the 15th of July I received a long letter which told me all about what departments the 40 had been in, and other history, but not a single word of a break-down on why the 40 had been separated from the Department.

My next step was to demand access to the files. But I was politely told that these were secret and private files, and not open to my inspection.

On July 17 I broke through this barrier, and Mr. Panuch showed me about twenty-odd files of employees who had been recommended for dismissal by their security committee 4 or 5 months earlier. The causes for dismissal were being listed on poll lists as members of the Communist Party, belonging to Communist-front organizations, constantly contacting and associating with known Communists, and other activities which made their employment a security risk.

When asked why they were still on the pay roll and had not been discharged 4 or 5 months ago, the answer was that they could not be discharged until they had a hearing before the Civil Service Commission, which did not take such charges seriously.

To this I countered that the Department was not so bound; that Congress had passed a law known as the McCarran rider, providing that "notwithstanding the civil-service law or any other law, the Secretary of State is hereby given absolute discretion to discharge any person in the Department whenever he deems that his services are not in the best interests of the United States." Panuch's answer to this was that this law was unconstitutional.

I then asked to see some of the files of those of the 40 who were dismissed as Reds and "pinks." Then came the pay-off. After some hem-hawing and stammering, he finally admitted that there were not any, not even one, that had been discharged. But he said in the same breath, "I realize that we have got to go along with you under the McCarran law, and if you will keep these names secret and lay off, I will start dismissing these people at once. I will fire Marzani and Zablodowski tomorrow, and the others in due course."

However, on July 18 nothing had been done, and with the realization that so far I had only the verbal promise of the deputy of an Assistant Secretary, I directed a letter to Secretary Byrnes, asking for a confirmation of this promise.

The next day, Friday, Mr. Byrnes called me up on the long-distance telephone, saying that my letter had just been read to him, and that if I would lay off, he would immediately, upon his return to Washington the following Monday morning, investigate the whole situation, and fire any persons found to be Reds or "pinks," as alleged. I agreed to lay off but urged that, in view of the existing serious neglect, he should act promptly. To this he said, "You must realize, Congressman, that it is a difficult matter to do wholesale firing of people merely because they belong to what is here a minority party, when the same party is the sole and dominant party of a great country with which I have serious

and difficult diplomatic negotiations." There, my friends, was his policy. However, he solemnly promised to take action and apprise me of the results by letter Monday night.

I received no letter on Tuesday, and needless to say, upon inquiry, I found that no action had been taken with reference to the files. After repeated telephone calls, I finally, on the following Friday, received a letter dated July 29 from Assistant Secretary Donald Russell, which proved only that nothing had been done, and outside of that was thoroughly evasive. In fact, on July 26, Mr. Byrnes sent out a letter to a Congressman from Illinois, which was broadcast in the newspapers, stating that 40 had been fired for subversive activities, although Mr. Panuch, 10 days before, had already admitted to me that this was false, and nobody had been fired for this reason.

Congress adjourned on August 2. This was the green light for "pinks" and Reds. On August 5 the Security Committee was discharged—in other words, they fired the Americans on guard without one Red or "pink" having been fired.

This was followed the same week by a barrage of propaganda in which Mr. Russell, through newspaper columnists and other releases, bombarded the millions of Americans with such statements as "witch hunters in Congress carried stupidity to unbelievable length in the closing days of the session—badgering by Members of Congress—Russell stands firmly for fair treatment—40 have already been separated—accused are entitled to a civil-service hearing—the McCarran rider is a dangerous power, a dangerous precedent, etc."

No one was discharged until December 20, and this was that same Carl A. Marzani. And in order to make a typical grandstand play and to pretend vigilance against the Reds, Panuch had him indicted at the same time. The Department knew that Congress was coming back in a few days.

I think these events clearly prove the policy of protecting and shielding the Reds and "pinks." But there came a time of reckoning. With the return of Congress the first of the year there was a housecleaning. All three, Secretary of State Byrnes, Assistant Secretary for Administration Russell and his deputy, Panuch, resigned before Congress could get organized.

The new Secretary, Gen. George C. Marshall, has appointed John E. Peurifoy, a World War II veteran, to supplant Russell. I believe he is going to make a sincere effort to clean out at least the known Reds and "pinks." Already several Communist sympathizers have been separated from the Department and other have cleared out voluntarily.

But this does not mean that we can relax. My investigation was confined to the Department of State, and to those of whom there was evidence to establish probable cause of sympathy with communism. The smartest and most dangerous avoid such exposure. Mr. Peurifoy has a tremendous job on his hands. Last Monday's decision by the Supreme Court that Communist sympathizers have no right to a Government job should strengthen his hands considerably.

But from my investigation I am satisfied that conditions are much worse in other departments. Last week it was officially disclosed that since February 5, 1943, 352 complaints against Reds and "pinks" in the Treasury Department had been received, with only one investigation. And how many do you think were cemented into the Department of Commerce while Henry A. Wallace was Secretary? And what do you think Ickes did to them in the Department of Interior?

But even that is only a fraction of our problem. J. Edgar Hoover made a speech on this subject in California last summer. He certainly knows the subject. He said, "I am not so much concerned about the 100,000 Communists in the United States, but for every Communist there are 10 so-called progressives and phoney liberals." These persons like to call themselves leftists, and the ratio of 10 to 1 exists in the administration as well. They work hand in glove with the "pinks" and Reds.

The only fundamental difference between Communists and leftists, generally speaking, is that Communists belong to a world movement under Joe Stalin, and leftists, while having the same ideologies, are not working for Stalin, but want to establish a despotic dictatorship of their own in this country. Leftists do not believe in an independent Congress or judiciary, free enterprise or individual initiative, but believe that, like the Soviet, these should all be subservient to the dictator. And the greatest danger of the leftist is that, generally speaking, he is not anti-Communist even though he is non-Communist.

For instance, last January Henry Wallace, who has almost found his level, formed the Progressive Citizens of America, a radical leftist movement. This apparently was too communistic for Eleanor Roosevelt, Leon Henderson, and others, so they organized the Americans for Democratic Action, which they said was a non-Communist leftist movement. This is food for thought.

William Bullitt, who spent 4 years as our Ambassador to Russia, says in his recent book, The Great Globe Itself, "The American Communists are potential traitors," who as Lenin taught them "use every ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion and concealment of truth" to gain their objective; "who know when to retreat and use that retreat to consolidate for another attack."

This is the force we are struggling with. There is great tumult and shouting today about whether the whole world is going into despotism and totalitarianism with Russia, or into freedom and republican governments with the United States. Far more fundamental for Americans is the question, "Which way is our great country going?" We still have a choice, but we must make that choice.

We will never be destroyed from without, but destruction, if it ever comes, will come from within. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

Significance of Evacuation Day in an Upset World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on the occasion of Evacuation Day exercises at South Boston, Mass., on March 16, 1947. The address is entitled "Significance of Evacuation Day in an Upset World."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real privilege for me to speak tonight in South Boston at Evacuation Day exercises, an annual occasion which is so symbolic of our country's ideals. In the true sense, we are paying homage tonight to the most priceless heritage of our county—individual freedom and faith in ourselves. Evacuation Day 171 years ago was one of the events in our history which marked the end of tyranny in this country. We always remember, too, that March 17 is St. Patrick's Day. Was there ever a greater exponent of faith, understanding, and Christianity than St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland?

Let us reflect for a moment on how lucky we are to be sitting here tonight. We have only to read the news from abroad to fully realize this. While the terrible shooting war is over, civil war still rages in parts of Europe and Asia. Many people are hungry and cold. Fear of want still lingers in much of the world. Recently we saw bitter blizzards slow the wheels of British industry almost to a stop, something the Nazis could never do. In many countries people are actually worse off than during the war. We surely are lucky to be citizens of these United States on March 16, 1947.

We owe much to that little band of men and women who settled down on Dorchester Neck in the seventeenth century. Those courageous people set an example that we must follow today. They proved that no obstacles, no matter how difficult they may seem, could not be overcome by hard work and an unselfish approach, with plenty of individual initiative, yet founded upon a strong community responsibility.

There was Gen. John Sullivan who was brigadier of the day when the Red Coats sailed away from Boston Harbor; James Foster; Commodore John Barry, one of the founders of our Navy; and Maj. Gen. Henry Knox. They, and many others, took matters into their hands, stood by their guns, and knew that they could get results when they worked hard and worked together.

With this courage and profound faith in their convictions, our forebears founded a country which has grown and prospered ever since. It has become the home of over 140,000,000 people who demand freedom of speech and worship and the right to live their own lives. There is not a man or a woman in this hall tonight whose ancestors or who themselves did not come here for that reason. Since that birth of our Nation, our country has progressed through wars and depressions to become today the strongest nation in the world.

Like our ancestors, who found themselves faced with the responsibility of building for themselves a new country, we find ourselves—with this last World War only 2 years behind us—faced with the responsibility of building a peaceful future for our children in a free country with a world at peace. This responsibility comes because we have grown; because we have learned how to make life in the United States happier, more secure, yet freer than in any other country in the world today. We must meet our responsibilities courageously, realistically, and just as unselfishly as did our ancestors. To win the war we poured forth some 340 billion dollars. We sacrificed the lives of over 400,000 of our boys and girls. Unless we win the peace and continue to stand firm to win it, all these sacrifices will have been made in vain. We must always remember that the aftermath of war is long and tiresome, demanding our utmost patience and courage.

We have in the United States a Government freely elected by our people. Other people who love freedom want to choose their own governments. How far should we, the strongest nation in the world, go to their assistance with money, with men, with advice to help them maintain their freedom of choice? Have we, even with all our manpower and our resources, sufficient strength to support all these countries who want our help? Our first aim above all is the maintenance of a lasting peace. That is the great problem of the world today.

The next few months, whether we like it or not, will go far to determine the relationship of our country with the other nations

in the world. In these months the United States must decide how it plans to meet its responsibilities of world leadership. It is fundamental that no country, however strong, can carry on alone in an age of atomic energy. In fact, many of our ancestors knew that complete self-sufficiency was an impossibility even in the eighteenth century. But, we must always remember, as they did, that our position in the society of nations must be founded on what will best give us in the United States of America a lasting peace. That must always be our primary concern.

Today we watch with deep concern the present internal plight of Greece and Turkey. We know that England can no longer continue her assistance to Greece. Last Wednesday President Truman asked Congress to authorize the United States to give financial aid to Greece and to Turkey. The President went a step farther—he also asked authority to send over military and civilian personnel at the request of those two countries. To a joint session of Congress he said in part:

"The United Nations is designed to make possible lasting freedom and independence for all its members. We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States. * * *

"In addition to funds, I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey, at the request of those countries, to assist in the tasks of reconstruction, and for the purpose of supervising the use of such financial and material assistance as may be furnished."

This, indeed, is a great extension of our foreign policy. Its implications are breathtaking. I believe that the President generally expressed ideals of which we all approve. The great difficulty, however, is to be realistic and practical enough to carry them out. Secretary of State Marshall is now in Moscow. He is there with the united backing of the American people. What will be the reaction in the minds of other world powers if Congress fails to back, in substance, the recommendations of President Truman concerning Greece and Turkey? What will be its effect on Marshall's ability to negotiate treaties? We certainly must support him whole heartedly. No other course is conceivable. We must take no step that will weaken his position in Moscow.

Before we who are in Congress vote on this recommendation of the President, we must understand the facts and realize all the implications. So must the people back home. That is why I'm talking about it tonight. There is one thing sure. We must continue to make our own commitments on the basis of what is to the best interest of our own security and safety. England is stopping her financial assistance to Greece because of conditions at home. We must never go so far as to take over other countries' commitments simply to help that country out of a hole. Our policy must never be dictated to us by any other nation on earth. We must make them our own commitments because it is for our own interest to do so. As a world power and with every country coming closer and closer together through modern means of transportation, it is helpful to us to have other nations healthy and economically sound. On the other hand, we do not want to see our funds go down the sink hole. We must not sign any blank checks.

Recently, former President Hoover reported on conditions in Germany and Austria. He said that the Germans and Austrians must be given food and medicine as relief measures; that United States aid should be sent in the form of United States products on a month-to-month basis; and that all assistance should carry a "please repay" tag. His concluding paragraph on Germany stated:

"If Western civilization is to survive in Europe, it must also survive in Germany. And it must be built into a cooperative member of that civilization. That indeed is the hope of any lasting peace."

The sooner destitute countries are back on their feet economically, the sooner we can stop worrying about relief assistance; the sooner we can expect some trade that will be to our mutual advantage. That is just common sense.

Of course, we would all like to see the Greek situation and similar problems handled by the United Nations. I have faith in the United Nations and I have the will to try to make that organization an effective body to maintain world peace. We must never fall into the habit of bypassing the United Nations by any independent actions. But, unfortunately, that organization today has no relief funds nor policing powers to take on the problems confronting us at this moment. Therefore, until the United Nations does become sufficiently strong we must be realistic and continue to do our part to keep the peace of the world.

President Monroe laid down in 1823 a crystal-clear expression of the American attitude toward foreign nations with his so-called Monroe Doctrine. It may be significant to note that it arose in part out of Russian refusal to allow anything but a Russian vessel to fish in Northwest American waters from the Bering Strait to the fifty-first degree north latitude. Monroe expressed the principle that the American continents were no longer to be considered as a field for colonization by European powers. There was also fear that European countries—Russia, Prussia, and Austria—might seek to conquer and reduce again to colonial status the Latin-American states that had recently revolted against Spain. Monroe stated that the United States would not stand for European interference in the nations of the new world.

Now we hear the question asked: "Are we expanding or reversing the Monroe Doctrine to mean that the United States will assert the same principle in European countries and in other freedom-loving countries of the world?" At the moment, as the President said last Wednesday, it means giving economic and financial assistance to Turkey and to Greece. If this aid is given to these countries now, what may it mean in China, Korea, Germany, Austria, France, and possibly England in the future? Let us not mince words. One of the issues which brought forth the Monroe Doctrine was Russia seeking to fish in North American waters. Now the issue is, Shall the Russian sphere of influence be permitted to spread and inculcate its roots in Turkey and in Greece?—or, put it another way: Shall United States concern itself with communism taking over these countries? What will be the effect on us if this happens? If communism does take over in Greece and Turkey, what will happen in Italy, Spain, and France? What will happen to our trade in those countries? Can we compete even with our superior know-how and assembly lines? Can the United States, the greatest exponent today of the free-enterprise system and of individual liberty, survive with Europe and Asia either completely or substantially dominated by the Communist ideology? That is the great question of policy that faces our Government and every one of us in the United States of America today. It is a question that cannot be decided by us tonight.

Let us look now at the situation from another point of view. The Monroe Doctrine has been a successful policy for 124 years because we have had the strength, the resources, and the will to back it up. For these reasons, no other nation has dared to challenge us to defend this policy. Our power today is even more vibrant than ever.

Before we enter upon a drastic extension of our foreign policy, we first must determine whether we have the strength, the financial ability, and the will to send money and men into the Mediterranean with the implication that this aid may not be enough. Will we in the future have to send over more aid to back up the men and money we have already sent? Are we willing to consider the inevitable implications that these loans will create in the minds of the French, the Italians, the Chinese and the Koreans? Are we willing to help these nations too if they ask us for more help? Are we strong enough and are we determined enough to stand up to the Russians today in support of nations which love their freedom and want the right to determine their own lives?

Until we are sure that the United Nations can give us security by keeping the world at peace, we must keep our country strong at home if we are to support President Truman and Secretary Marshall in their dealings with other countries. There is no alternative. I believe that Russia and other nations in the world today consider the decisions that we make at the peace table in terms of our strength at home. Our Army, Navy, and Air Forces are the largest in our peacetime history. We certainly do not want to maintain an unnecessarily large military force, but we do want our Army and Navy to be efficiently and economically administered, to be well trained, and to be equipped with the most modern, scientific weapons. This will mean some sacrifice on the part of every man, woman, and child in the United States of America. Sometimes we forget this.

Too many people today believe that the atomic bomb and other new and dreadful weapons of destruction make our Army and Navy obsolete or unnecessary. We must not permit the atomic bomb to become the Maginot line of the United States, as Professor Einstein so well stated. We must be prepared. I hope from the very bottom of my heart that there will never be another war, but we must never forget the lessons we have learned so bitterly in this last war.

Furthermore, the Army and Navy can never be prepared with the best of modern weapons unless we are willing to produce the tools, machinery, and goods that have made us the greatest industrial nation in the world. To see what happens when productivity lags, we have only to look at England's plight this past winter. Our level of production is now running high. Let us keep it high. Our productivity means strength at home and thus gives us our best chance to maintain the freedom which so many other countries have lost.

These are indeed crucial decisions to be made by President Truman and Secretary Marshall. It then becomes the duty of Congress, if in its judgment they make wise decisions, to support them with legislation. Congress is elected by the people. They reflect the opinion of the people back home. In these troublesome days the people back home must do their utmost to understand the questions which face their chosen leaders and to help them decide wisely.

I have tried briefly to describe to you the alternatives that face our country. I want our Government to have a firm foreign policy—a policy that will allow other governments of the world to know just how far we will go to maintain our security and the peace of the world. We are not an imperialist nation. We only want our own security. We have seen two wars in our generation. In both those wars your boys from South

Boston have fought bravely. You are justly proud of them; but neither we nor any other nation can survive a third world war.

Let us hope that the decisions that must be made in Washington will keep the respect for our country among the other freedom-loving countries of the world—will maintain our prestige as the strongest nation in the world—and above all—will make crystal clear in the mind of the leaders of the Russian and other world governments just what we intend to do and what we intend to prevent them from doing. They must understand us for what we are—a nation of free enterprise and of individual liberties.

St. Patrick was a courageous saint who stimulated spiritual faith, good will, and self-respect. Our ancestors who took part in evacuation day 171 years ago were imbued with these ideals and St. Patrick's courage. So must we be today.

Report by Hon. Herbert Hoover on Economic Mission to Germany and Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Report No. 3, submitted to the President of the United States by former President Herbert Hoover, who headed President Truman's recent economic mission to Germany and Austria.

This third report presents what Mr. Hoover feels are the necessary steps for promotion of German exports so as to relieve American taxpayers of the burdens of relief and for economic recovery of Europe.

The recommendations which Mr. Hoover makes seem to me to be most timely in light of the pending negotiations in Moscow and the Greek-Turkish crisis.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC MISSION TO GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

REPORT NO. 3. THE NECESSARY STEPS FOR PROMOTION OF GERMAN EXPORTS, SO AS TO RELIEVE AMERICAN TAXPAYERS OF THE BURDENS OF RELIEF AND FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY OF EUROPE

(By Herbert Hoover)

MARCH 18, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am sending you herewith my conclusions upon the problems of reviving German industry and thus exports with which to relieve American and British taxpayers from their burden in preventing starvation in Germany. These problems also involve economic stability and peace in Europe.

Whatever may have been our policies in the past, I am convinced that the time has come to face the realities that have developed. The mission you assigned to me would be less than performed if I did not state the stark situation and make such recommendations as seem to me necessary.

I wish again to express my appreciation to you for your consideration, to my colleagues Mr. Hugh Gibson, Dr. Gustav Stolper, Dr. Dennis A. FitzGerald, Dr. William Sebrell, Jr., and Messrs. Louis Lochner, Frank Mason and Tracy Voorhees, and to our military and civil officials in Germany.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

INTRODUCTION

Inquiry into the economic policies in Germany which would relieve financial support from the United States was one of the subjects assigned to my mission to that country. Aside from a mass of information and statistical material secured on this journey, I have been familiar with German economic problems over many years, including my experience before and after World War I. In view of the gravity of the crisis which confronts the world, it would be an ill service if I did not state my conclusions fully and frankly.

These conclusions are not the product of sentiment nor of feeling toward a nation which has brought such misery upon the whole earth. They are not given in condonement of the enormity of her crimes. They are the result of a desire to see the world look forward, get into production, and establish a lasting peace. They are based upon the stern necessities of a world involved in the most dangerous economic crisis in all history.

At the present time the taxpayers of the United States and Britain are contributing nearly $600,000,000 a year to prevent starvation of the Germans in the American and British zones alone. The drain is likely to be even greater after peace unless the policies now in action are changed. Therefore, entirely aside from any humanitarian and political aspects, policies which will restore productivity in Germany and exports with which to buy their food and relieve this drain upon us are of primary importance.

But our economic interest is far wider than this. We desperately need recovery in all of Europe. We need it not only for economic reasons but as the first necessity to peace. The United States, through loans, lend-lease, surplus supplies, and relief, in the last 2 years, has spent, or pledged itself to spend, over $15,000,000,000 in support of civilians in foreign countries. Even we do not have the resources for, nor can our taxpayers bear, a continuation of burdens at such a rate.

There is only one path to recovery in Europe. That is production. The whole economy of Europe is interlinked with German economy through the exchange of raw materials and manufactured goods. The productivity of Europe cannot be restored without the restoration of Germany as a contributor to that productivity.

Some assumptions

In order to offer constructive conclusions as to economic policies which will relieve the American taxpayer and will promote economic recovery in Europe, I make six assumptions, which I believe will be accepted by sensible people. They necessarily include certain political aspects which underlie all these economic problems.

First. I assume that we wish to establish a unified federal state in Germany, embracing mainly the present American, British, Russian, and French military occupation zones, with economic unity and free trade between the states. I shall refer to this area as the New Germany.

Second. I assume that our objective must be to clear German life of the Nazi conspirators and to punish those who have contributed to this conspiracy, which murdered millions of people in cold blood and brought this appalling disaster upon the world.

Third, I assume that we will not make the major mistake of Versailles, but will complete absolute disarmament of the Germans so that they shall not be able again to engage in aggressions; that this disarmament will embrace destruction of all military arms, fortifications, and direct arms factories, with certain control of industry; that the Germans will have no army, no navy, and no air forces, retaining only a constabulary in which no Nazi or previous army officer may be employed; that this disarmament must be continued for a generation or two, until Germany has lost the "know-how" of war and the descent of militarism through birth.

Fourth. I assume that these requirements must be safeguarded by international guarantees and effective police service by the nations.

Fifth. I assume, in our own interest and that of Europe, that we wish to restore the productivity of the continent, that we wish to revive personal freedom, honest elections and generally to reconstruct the German people into a peace-loving nation cooperating in the recovery of western civilization.

Sixth. I assume that the United States will not join in such guarantees and policing unless the treaty with Germany is so concluded that it contributes to the restoration of productivity and lasting peace in Europe and promptly relieves us of drains upon our taxpayers.

The German economic problems

The German economic problems have two aspects:

First, the long-view, broad economic policies toward the New Germany which alone can produce the reconstruction of Europe and peace.

Second, our immediate problems in the joint Anglo-American military zones during the interregnum pending peace.

I therefore divide this discussion into these two parts.

I

The long-view economic problem

The long-view economic problems involved in the peace with the New Germany and its aftermaths are greatly affected by war destruction, the boundary settlements for the New Germany, the plant removal for reparations, and the policies with respect to war potential of industry.

These effects may be summarized:

1. There was considerable destruction of nonwar industry from the air and otherwise during the war. The loss to peaceful productivity has not been determined, but it is considerable.

2. The proposed annexations to Poland and Russia, and the possible annexation of the Saar Basin by France, will take from Germany, as compared to 1936,[1] about 25 percent of her food supply, about 30 percent of her bituminous coal, and about 20 percent of her manufacturing capacity.

3. The population of Germany in 1936 was about 68,000,000. The population of the New Germany by 1949 will be about 71,000,000, due to the expulsion of Germans from the Polish and Russian annexations, from Czechoslovakia, Hungry, Austria, Yugoslavia, Roumania and the return of prisoners into this area.

4. The Allied economic policies toward Germany are of two categories: The first involves world safety, and the second, reparations for wrong done:

(a) There has necessarily been, or will be, a demolition of all arms plants as part of disarmament. This destruction, however, has included some plants which might have been converted to peaceable production.

(b) Reparations have been provided by assignment for removal to the different allies of certain percentages of usable and complete industrial equipment. What proportion of Germany's peaceable productive plant has been, or is, in the course of removal in the French and Russian zones is not known. Certainly they have been very large from the Russian zone. The total for all Germany

[1] I have adopted 1936 as a basis for economic comparisons because it was a full year before German industry was distorted by her annexations and her most intensive armament activity.

amounts to an important segment of its peaceful productivity. These removals include a large amount of light industry (producing mostly consumers' goods) as well as heavy industry (producing mostly capital goods). The removal of plants from the American and British zones has been halted because of the refusal of Russia and France to cooperate in interzonal economic unity as provided for at Potsdam.

5. In addition to the above courses of action, there have been general policies of destruction or limitation of possible peaceful productivity under the headings of pastoral state and war potential. The original of these policies, apparently expressed on September 15, 1944, at Quebec, aimed at "converting Germany into a country principally agricultural and pastoral," and included "the industries of the Ruhr and the Saar would therefore be put out of action, closed down."

This idea of a pastoral state partially survived in JCS Order 1067 of April 1945 for the American zone. It was not accepted by the British. The pastoral state concept was not entirely absent in the Potsdam declaration. It was partially ameliorated or its name changed for another concept, the level of industry, developed by the agreement of March 26, 1946, and signed by Russia, Britain, France, and the United States. This agreement was a compromise between the drastic terms proposed by Russia and France and the more liberal terms proposed by the other two nations.

One major theme of this "level of industry" concept is to destroy Germany's "war potential." Under this concept certain industries are to be blown up or prohibited, others are to be limited as to production. The emphasis was placed upon the limitation of "heavy industry" with the view that Germany could expect enough goods from "light industry" to buy her food and necessary raw materials.

The absolute destruction or prohibition includes ocean-going ships, shipbuilding, aircraft, ball bearings, aluminum, magnesium, beryllium, vanadium, and radio-transmitting equipment, together with synthetic oil, ammonia, and rubber. Some of these provisions may be essential to disarmament. Such exceptions are not included in the discussion which follows.

Beyond these prohibitions, however, the "level of industry" concept provides elaborate restrictions, mostly on heavy industry. The following items are illustrative:

Iron and steel production to be reduced from 19,000,000 tons (as in 1936) to a capacity of 7,500,000 tons, with a maximum production of 5,800,000 tons, and only the "older plants" to be used.

Heavy machinery production to be 31 percent of 1938.

Light machinery production to be 50 percent of 1938.

Machine tools to be 38 percent of 1938.

Electrical machinery to be from 30 percent to 50 percent of 1938.

Agricultural implements to be 70 percent of 1936.

Automobiles to be 10 percent of 1936.

Trucks to be 67 percent of 1936.

Basic chemicals, including nitrogen, calcium carbide, sulfuric acid, chlorine, and alkali to be 40 percent of 1936.

Cement to be 65 percent of 1936.

Electric power produced to be 60 percent of 1936.

No new locomotives until 1949.

Some "light industries" were also to be limited:

Textiles to be 77 percent of 1936.

Paper to be 65 percent of 1936.

Boots and shoes to be 70 percent of 1936.

Precision instruments and optics to be 70 percent of 1936.

Miscellaneous chemicals to be 70 percent of 1936.

Pharmaceuticals to be 80 percent of 1936.

Dyestuffs (export) to be 58 percent of 1936.

The consequences to food supply

We may first examine what has happened, and what will happen, to the German food supply under all the circumstances of annexation and industrial controls.

Germany in 1936 was, by most intensive cultivation, able to produce about 85 percent of her food supply. This 85 percent has now been reduced by 25 percent through the Russian and Polish annexations, or is down to about 64 percent because even a larger population is to be concentrated in the New Germany.

Her production, however, was greatly dependent upon intensive use of fertilizers. The New Germany will require at least 500,000 metric tons of nitrogen and 650,000 tons of phosphoric anhydride, she having sufficient potash.

Under the level of industry agreement, the domestic production of nitrogen eventually would be reduced to under 200,000 tons; the production of phosphoric anhydride would be reduced to about 200,000 tons. A larger production of nitrogen is allowed pending an opportunity to import. Part of this reduction is due to the "level of industry" steel reduction from which some nitrogen and a large percentage of phosphoric anhydride requirements were obtained as by-products.

From these figures it is obvious that a great discrepancy exists between minimum agricultural needs and the possible fertilizer production under the "level of industry" plan. If we persist in these policies, unless there are large imports of fertilizer, Germany's food production is likely to drop under 60 percent of her requirements even with an austere diet.

New Germany, if there is to be a will to work, to maintain order, and to aspire to peace, must have an average food supply of at least 2,600 calories per person per day, with adequate fats and protein content. (The British average being 2,800–2,900 calories at present and prewar Germany about 3,000 calories.)

Taking the above limitations into consideration and based upon actual experience in the American and British zones, and extending that experience with adaptations to the Russian and French zones, the indications are that New Germany would need at present prices to import over $1,250,000,000 annually in food and animal feed alone.

At the end of the war Germany had a very large nitrogen capacity. Despite losses from war destruction, its potential production was still about 700,000 tons per annum. This capacity, if it had been preserved, would have supplied not only her own needs but large exports to neighboring countries as well. Fertilizers are now sorely needed all over Europe for crop restoration. Therefore through the fertilizer reduction Germany not only loses in her own food production but her export potential to pay for food, and the crops elsewhere in Europe are reduced.

Consequences of level of industry upon heavy industry

The effect of the agreed level of industry is stated in American official reports that the heavy industry products for which Germany was noted will virtually disappear from her exports.

I have exhaustively examined the production and exports of Germany over some years in the light of this level of industry and they amply confirm this statement. What the result may be is indicated by the fact that her exports during peace from now-restricted heavy industries comprised between 60 and 70 percent of the total German exports. In 1936, for instance, a generally prosperous year, they amounted to about $1,900,000,000 out of a total of about $2,700,000,000, both figures converted into present prices. Under the level of industry most of the 60 to 70 percent is to be abolished, and Germany must pay for most of her imports from exports of light industry.

Germany must not alone import food and animal feed, but also reduced amounts of copper, lead, zinc, iron ore, leather, cotton, wool, and other raw materials. Due to the prohibitions, she must import all of her oil and rubber, and considerable nitrogen for fertilizers.

It is indeed a cynical fact that today we are supplying Germany with oil and nitrogen at the expense of the American and British taxpayer, at a rate of $70,000,000 per annum, which, except for the level of industry and the Russian refusal of zonal cooperation, Germany could have produced herself.

Consequences upon light industry

As I have said, the assumption is that exports from the German light industry, from coal and native raw materials, such as potash, can pay for her imports of food and other necessities. There are two reasons for believing this assumption to be completely invalid.

Had there been no loss of light-industry plants by annexation, had there been no destruction of them by war, had there been no removals for reparations, they could not have produced enough exports to pay the food bill alone. And the situation is made doubly impossible by the restrictions now imposed on what light industry is left, as, for instance, on textiles.

If Germany is to buy food and the necessary imports of raw material for the light industry, she would require not only complete restoration to prewar level in light industry but a much larger equipment than she had even before the war.

Then Germany, with the expansion of these industries, would be in a competitive field of consumers' goods with all the rest of the world whose light industries have been little damaged by war.

Some economic illusions

There are several illusions in all this war-potential attitude.

(a) There is the illusion that the new Germany left after the annexations can be reduced to a pastoral state. It cannot be done unless we exterminate or move 25,000,000 people out of it. This would approximately reduce Germany to the density of the population of France.

(b) There is an illusion in war potential. Almost every industry on earth is a war potential in modern war. No industry (except direct arms manufacture) is a war potential if the energies of a people are confined to the paths of peace. If Germany be disarmed in the way I have assumed above, there must be a control commission to see that they do not have any army or any navy. And two score of intelligent men, as part of that commission, could see that there is no arms production and that no industry is manufacturing or storing materials for evil purposes. Moreover, industry is not likely to waste its substance, either by storing or manufacturing for war, when there is no army or navy to use it.

The question here is not "level of industry." The real question is whether the Allied nations will stick to their abolition of militarism itself in Germany. If they do that, there is little danger from war potential in industry.

(c) Another illusion is that the light industry in Germany can be expanded to a point where she will be able to pay for her imports. In my view, it cannot be done for years, and even then it is doubtful in the face of competition with the light industries of other parts of the world.

(d) The over-all illusion is that Germany can never become self-supporting under the levels-of-industry plan within the borders envisioned at present for New Germany.

(e) A still further illusion is that Europe as a whole can recover without the economic recovery of Germany.

Consequences to Europe generally

Thus there is a still wider aspect of this level of industry—the needs of the rest of Europe. Germany had been for a century one of the great European centers of production of capital goods—heavy industry, which I may repeat are construction materials, factory equipment, railway equipment, electrical and heavy machinery. The other nations of Europe are in desperate need of such goods for reconstruction from war damage. Moreover, a considerable part of the European equipment on these lines is German-made, and today they cannot even get replacements and spare parts, in consequence of which their productivity lags.

From the standpoint of other nations, the expansion of light industry to a point of self-support for Germany will, by competition, injure these industries in the rest of Europe. On the other hand, the products of heavy industry is Europe's first necessity for recovery.

It must not be overlooked that Germany was the market for every nation in Europe and such a reduction of her economy will tend to demoralize the industries and employment in those countries. For instance, Germany was the market for over half the exports of Turkey and over one-third those of Greece. In consequence, their loss of this market contributes to increase the relief they seek from us now.

Another illustration is the proposed limits on steel. Large and efficient steel and iron plants, undamaged or only partly damaged, are standing idle in Germany. Formerly the Germans imported millions of tons of iron ore from France and Sweden. These mines, under the level of industry, must remain idle until a new steel industry is built elsewhere. That will require years and an amount of capital that is not in sight. In the meantime, Europe needs steel for reconstruction as she never did before.

To indicate the anxiety of surrounding states, a memorandum of the Netherlands Government of January 1947, in presenting the absolute necessity to the surrounding nations that a productive economic state be created in Germany, said: "The provisions of the plan for reparations and the level of German economy of March 1946 require to be revised * * * it is inadvisable to lay down maximum quota for production of German industries, including the iron steel industries."

The sum of all of this is: Germany, under the level-of-industry concept, unless she is to be allowed to starve, will be a drain on the taxpayers of other nations for years and years to come. In the meantime, if her light industries were built to become self-supporting, she would become an economic menace to Europe; if her heavy industries are allowed to function, she has an ability to export and would become an asset in Europe's recovery. To persist in the present policies will create, sooner or later, a cesspool of unemployment or pauper labor in the center of Europe which is bound to infect her neighbors.

We can keep Germany in these economic chains but it will also keep Europe in rags.

A new economic policy

Therefore, I suggest that we adopt at once a new economic concept in peace with New Germany.

1. We should free German industry, subject to a control commission, which will see that she does no evil in industry, just as we see that she does not move into militarism through armies and navies.

The difference between this concept and the level-of-industry concept is the saving of several hundred millions of dollars a year to the American and British taxpayers. It is the difference between the regeneration and a further degeneration of Europe.

2. The removal and destruction of plants (except direct arms plants) should stop.

3. A further obstacle to building Germany as an essential unit of European economy arises from the Russian Government's acquiring a large part of the key operating industries in their zone. Germany in peace must be free from ownership of industry by a foreign government. Such ownership can thwart every action of control or of upbuilding by joint action of other nations. German industry must be operated by Germans if any international control is to work, if she is to recover production and is to serve all nations equally.

4. There can be no separation or different regime of the Ruhr or Rhineland from the new Germany. That is the heart of her industrial economy. Any control commission can dictate the destination of coal or other exports from that area and even such control would not be needed after the era of scarcity passes from Europe.

II

The interregnum before peace

How long it may be before there is such a constructive peace with Germany, no one can tell. It may be long delayed. In the meantime, we are faced with the feeding of the people in the Anglo-American zones on a level just above starvation until we can develop enough export goods from these zones so that the Germans may pay for their food. I have said, American and British taxpayers are called upon for about $600,000,000 a year for relief.

We have an admirable staff in military government of Germany under Generals Clay and Draper but their administration is constantly frustrated in building up the needed exports to pay for food and minimum raw material imports. A large part of these delays is due to the following:

(a) The Russians and the French have failed to carry out the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement for economic unity in the four zones. The Russian zone ordinarily produces a surplus of food but that surplus is used elsewhere, thus increasing the burden of imports on the Anglo-American zones. Both the Russian and French zones are producing industrial commodities which would relieve necessities in the Anglo-American zones and could contribute to exports with which to pay for food. The net effect is that the United States and Britain through relief are paying Russian and French reparations.

(b) The inability to determine what specific plants are to be the victims of level of industry, or destruction or the removal for reparations, produces stagnation because the Germans do not know where to begin work.

(c) There is lack of working capital with which to import raw materials for such industries as are allowed to function.

(d) An inflated currency and no adequate banking system hampers all forward movement in such industry as is left.

(e) While denazification and decartelization are necessary and important certain phases of them limit recovery. They are so involved as not to warrant description here.

Conclusion as to the bizonal administration

If, however, we cannot get a quick and sound peace on the lines I have recounted, the Anglo-American zones should abandon the destruction of plants, the transfer of plants for reparations, and the level of industry concept, and start every plant, heavy as well as light, which can produce nonarms goods. This will relieve far more rapidly great costs to our taxpayers; it will do infinitely more for Europe than American loans and charity.

Indeed the Congressional Committee on Postwar Economic Policy urged, on December 30, 1946, that the levels of industry be ignored wherever they conflict with exports so that there may be earlier recovery and payment for food.

The violation by Russia and France of the agreement for economic unification of the four zones of military occupation and the additional burdens this imposed upon us in consequence certainly warrant our ignoring all agreements for level of industry, transfer and destruction of nonarms plants.

If this interregnum is to endure for long, we could build a self-sustaining economic community out of the Anglo-American zones alone. This could be only a temporary expedient, not a final solution. Building a lasting peace in Europe should be our objective.

Power of Congress To Remove Members of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday I released a Senate Judiciary Committee print on the subject of Congress' removal power with respect to the Supreme Court. This material had been prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

My purpose in having the Library of Congress prepare this report was to clear the air and provide the legal background on this question. There have been many questions asked as to why the Senate Judiciary Committee, in particular, did not intervene when charges were made regarding the personal conduct of particular Justices of our Highest Court. This committee print then gives the legal picture of Congress' relations with the court, and explains that impeachment proceedings, if desired, must be initiated in the House of Representatives.

Very wide interest has been indicated in this Judiciary Committee report, and for that reason I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD along with a statement which I presented in connection with it.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WILEY

I have asked that there be prepared as a Judiciary Committee print a statement of Congress' constitutional removal power with respect to the Supreme Court.

For some time I have felt the need for a concise summation of the legal basis for Congress' power in this connection, particularly because of reports that have come in from time to time on deep-seated personal differences within the Supreme Court, in addition to reports on the conduct of various Court Justices and pleas for congressional intervention in this matter.

I have, therefore, had this study prepared.

I firmly believe in the constitutional system of three independent and co-equal branches—legislative, executive, and judicial—and I have felt that Congress should approach this matter only on the most cautious, conscientious, and thorough legal basis.

The phases of this study relate not only to the relationship of Congress with the

Court, but also congressional power with respect to the tenure of Court Justices, which, in turn, goes to the very heart of our constitutional system.

This print has been prepared in order that all the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee might have the benefit of a legal summary on this subject. I have given a great deal of study and consideration personally to the matter and have reached definite conclusions, and thereafter asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to check into and brief the matter, which it has done.

A copy of this committee print is being sent to the president of the American Bar Association to the editor of the American Bar Association Journal, and to the presidents of all State bar associations.

REMOVAL POWER OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE SUPREME COURT

The following report, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, at the request of the chairman, Mr. WILEY, is presented for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Article III, section 1, of the Constitution, vests the judicial power of the United States "in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." Article III, section 1, also provides that the judges, "both of the Supreme and inferior courts," shall hold their offices "during good behavior" and that the compensation for their services "shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

The Supreme Court, therefore, is a constitutional court and is the only court established by the Constitution itself. (See *Kline* v. *Burke Construction Co.* (1922), 260 U. S. 226; *Ex parte Bakelite Corp.* (1929), 279 U. S. 438; Harris, The Judicial Power of the United States (1940), 79–81.) Its organization and terms, however, depend upon congressional enactment, subject to the limitations imposed by the Constitution (Harris, op. cit. supra). These limitations, dealing with tenure of office and reduction of compensation, were designed to secure the independence of the judiciary and to protect it from encroachment by the executive and legislative branches of the Government (Carpenter, Judicial Tenure in the United States (1918), 22–33; *Ex parte Grossman* ((1925), 267 U. S. 87)). And it has been the generally held belief that the theory of a paramount authority of Congress over the judiciary is incompatible with the idea of an independent judiciary and the doctrine of the separation of powers.

The doctrine of the separation of powers, although not expressly contained in the Constitution, is now well grounded in American constitutional law (Harris, op. cit. supra, 75–76). The doctrine has been affirmed in many cases, among them *Meyers* v. *U. S.* ((1926, 272 U. S. 52); *Springer* v. *Government of Philippine Islands* ((1928), 277 U. S. 189); *Evans* v. *Gore* ((1920), 253 U. S. 245). Thus it has been held that Congress cannot impair the independence of judgment of the courts by imposing arbitrary rules of decision (*U. S.* v. *Klien* (1872), 13 Wall. 128); cannot impose nonjudicial functions or duties upon the courts established under article III (*Hayburn's Case* (1792), 2 Dall. 409; *Muskrat* v. *U. S* (1911), 219 U. S. 346); and is without power to reduce the tenure or compensation of the judges of the constitutional courts (*Ex parte Bakelite Corp.* (1929), 279 U. S. 438). Nor may the legislative and executive branches, by the passage of directive legislation, render impotent the functions of the judicial branch (*Montgomery Ward & Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (D. D. C. 1944), 56 F. Supp. 502). The doctrine of separation of powers, however, does not require an absolute and complete separation. As a practical matter of government there is a considerable accommodation of power, and each branch has certain authority which necessarily infringes upon the authority of the other branches. (See Ex parte Grossman (1925), 267 U. S. 87; Frankfurter and Landis, Power of Congress Over Procedure in Criminal Contempts in "Inferior" Federal Courts—A Study in Separation of Powers (1924), 37 Harv. L. Rev. 1010). But this interaction does not permit any infringement on the operation of constitutional courts in their capacity as judicial tribunals (Frankfurter and Landis, op. cit. supra).

When the Constitution was drafted, the framers rejected a proposal to vest the selection of the constitutional courts in the National Legislature, because "experience has shown the impropriety of such appointments by numerous bodies." Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention (1, p. 232); Carpenter, Judicial Tenure in the United States ((1918) 29–30, 207). Although not all members of the Convention were agreed on the exact method, it was uniformly thought unwise to leave the choice of judges with any authority administered by a number of individuals (Carpenter, op. cit. supra, 208). With regard to removal from office, the framers also rejected various proposals whereby the judges would be subject to executive or other removal (Carpenter, op. cit. supra, 22–30). Among the methods proposed was the English mode of effecting judicial removal by legislative address. It was felt that such devices were likely to weaken the necessary independence of the courts (Carpenter, op. cit. supra, 101–103). Instead, the framers of the Constitution borrowed from the State constitutions the idea of impeachment and conviction as the means of judicial removal consistent with the independence of the judiciary. It was felt that impeachment was a proper means of securing good behavior, and so the impeachment clause of the Constitution must be construed with that portion of article III, section 1, guaranteeing tenure during good behavior (Carpenter, op. cit. supra, 101–107). Article I, section 2, clause 5, vests the sole power of impeachment in the House of Representatives, and article I, section 3, clause 6, confers upon the Senate the sole power to try impeachments. Within the bounds of the impeachment power, therefore, Congress, of course, may investigate and inquire into the conduct of the judges of constitutional courts.

Shortly after the adoption of the Constitution, the theory was advocated by some that the impeachment power could be used as a check on the exercise of the doctrine of judicial review. When Jefferson and his party came into power an attempt was made to apply this theory in practice, but with the failure to impeach Justice Chase it was abandoned. (See Carpenter, Judicial Tenure in the United States (1918) 108–123; 1 Warren, the Supreme Court in United States History (rev. ed. 1926) 269–315.) During the course of the attempt, however, it was argued broadly that there was nothing in the Constitution expressly insuring judicial independence, and that it was within the right of the House to impeach and the Senate to remove judges solely on the basis that they held opinions not compatible with the best interests of the Nation, however sincere. Nevertheless, even members of Jefferson's own party were not agreed on this theory or united in their efforts to give it effect. Ibid.

After the failure of Chase's impeachment, Randolph proposed a constitutional amendment whereby judges of the courts of the United States could be removed on the joint address of the two Houses of Congress (Annals, 8th Cong., 1st sess., p. 1213). No action was taken on this proposal, and later attempts along the same line also failed (Carpenter, Judicial Tenure in the United States (1918) 123–124, 135–144). Nevertheless, several States have some form or modification of this means of removal, which originated in the English Act of Settlement, guaranteeing judges tenure during good behavior but making them removable by the Crown upon address of the two Houses of Parliament (Carpenter, op. cit., supra, 124–135).

During the course of our history numerous proposals have been made to revise and speed up the impeachment procedure. None of them has been given effect (Carpenter, op. cit. supra). Of later years a different approach has been tried, based on the idea that removal of Federal judges could be accomplished properly by a judicial trial and judgment of removal. The most ambitious of these efforts was H. R. 146, introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress. This bill provided detailed machinery for judicial removal of all Federal judges except Supreme Court justices. It had the backing of the American Bar Association. The method provided was to be cumulative to and did not supplant impeachment, and its constitutionality was well supported by authority. (See Moore, Judicial Trial and Removal of Judges: H. R. 146 (1942) 20 Tex. L. Rev. 352, and other sources and authorities there cited.) Notwithstanding, the measure was not enacted, although it passed the House by a narrow margin. Many Members of the House regarded the bill as unconstitutional. (For House discussion of the bill, see 87 Congressional RECORD (1941) 8142–8168.)

Upon occasion, attempts likewise have been made to adopt a constitutional amendment to limit the tenure of Federal judges to a definite term of years. These attempts usually were the outgrowth of a sincere belief that the doctrine of judicial review concentrated power in the hands of an untouchable judiciary which could thus nullify the acts of the legislature. These attempts so far have not succeeded (Carpenter, op. cit. supra, 154–168).

The conclusions from the above must be as follows:

1. There is no power in the executive or legislative branches of the Government to remove or limit the tenure of Supreme Court Justices, or, indeed, any judges of constitutional courts, except as Congress is expressly authorized to act by impeachment for lack of good behavior. (Also see Shartel, Federal Judges—Appointment, Supervision, and Removal—Some Possibilities Under the Constitution (1930), 28 Mich. L. Rev. 870, 908.)

2. Means of removal other than impeachment and limitations on tenure could be provided for by constitutional amendment. Among such methods of removal could be that of legislative address.

3. Congress perhaps can constitutionally provide for judicial removal of Federal judges for lack of good behavior. (See Moore, Judicial Trial and Removal of Federal Judges: H. R. 146 (1942), 20 Tex. L. Rev. 352; Shartel, op. cit. supra.) While the good behavior tenure clause has never been construed by the Supreme Court, it has been contended that the clause must be read with a view to changing needs, and that Congress, therefore, might define the term so as to allow judicial removal for any form of conduct or neglect which according to modern notions tends to corruption or inefficiency (Shartel, op. cit. supra, 900–903).

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Boston Post of last Saturday, entitled "Reduced Taxes," which contains some very wise observations on the international situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDUCED TAXES

The consideration of a 30-percent Federal income-tax slash for the small-wage earner and 20-percent cut for the higher brackets is lovely to behold—but doomed beforehand to revision if the facts are faced by the millions of taxpayers.

The cash outlay necessary to meet American obligations in a stone-broke world is immense, and, even if the Nation retreats into stern isolationism, the cash needed to balance the Federal budget, keeping expenditures within reasonable limits of prudence and national safety, will not be produced by any such tax slash.

This may be unwelcome news, but it is the stern reality. The time to decide whether the safety of the Nation is of more importance than a glittering and somewhat specious campaign promise is now.

No one can be cheerful over the fact that the immense outlay of public treasure has not secured victory over the noxious things the Nation was fighting, and that we must now spend more and more money to secure peace and safety in a world divided between communism and democracy.

If there is any doubt of the seriousness of the international situation, or any lingering dubiety over our role in power politics you have merely to consult your daily newspaper. We are playing power politics, because there is no other kind to play at the moment.

However we may object to the rampant employment of American money to buy time and good will for the democracies, if the facts are faced, it will be seen that there is no other way short of war.

When the British Commonwealth of Nations had the money it was spent lavishly, if somewhat more quietly, for that very purpose—to buy good will and strategic position in a world economically and politically at war.

There will be a reduction in the income-tax rates, but people can be certain now that it will be nothing like 20 to 30 percent. It will be closer to 10 percent.

Economies can and must be effected in our Federal Government. But the economies cannot be pennywise and pound foolish unless the American people are willing to surrender without a fight to the sinister and ever-active forces of statism.

If you believe in democracy you must support it with more than lip service. It must be supported with cash. No one has yet proposed any other means of direct taxation that will raise the necessary cash other than the present tax set-up. All you get for your money is the privilege and the comfort of being an American—and these are not negligible benefits if the problem is faced honestly.

The Elmore Corp. Profit-Sharing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article from the Rutherfordton (N. C.) News giving the details of a profit-sharing plan which has been put into effect by the Elmore Corp.

Mr. Sam E. Elmore, one of the most public-spirited industrialists in North Carolina, is the dominant figure in this corporation and his plan for sharing profits with his employees, seems to be practical and well founded. A great many industries in my State have adopted some plan for giving the employees a continuing interest in the successful operation of the various plants where they are employed and good results have followed the institution of these plans. It is essential to have the enthusiastic and effective cooperation of all employees. Any fair method of sharing profits with employees or paying bonuses furnishes a splendid incentive to obtaining full production and insuring a satisfied group of workers. Industry generally can well afford to consider the advisability of voluntarily adopting some method of creating among the employees a larger interest in the successful operation of the business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELMORE CORP. HAS GOOD PROFIT-SHARING PLAN—15 PERCENT PROFIT-SHARING FUND ANNOUNCED

The Elmore Corp., of Spindale, has adopted a profit-sharing plan for its 150 employees who have worked at least 8 weeks for the corporation. Mr. S. E. Elmore, president and treasurer, called all of his employees together Monday afternoon in the plant and explained the plan in detail.

The plan will have two 6-month periods each year. The first will end March 31, 1947, as the fiscal year of the corporation ends September 30. Soon after March 31 the net profits of the corporation for the past 6 months will be computed. Twenty cents per share of all then outstanding stock will be deducted. Then 15 percent, not counting taxes will be computed. And if it amounts to $3,500 or more, each employee will get his or her share of the profits. Good wages will continue to be paid.

The second profit-sharing period would end September 30, 1947. The corporation voluntarily adopted the profit-sharing plan as an inducement to each employee to do his best. All who contribute to the success of the corporation should share in the profits is the idea. It works both ways; that is, helps employer and employee. The corporation can discontinue the plan upon 60 days' notice to the employees. Each employee except the president and salesmen will share in the plan.

The plan simply means all working together in a friendly atmosphere for the benefit of all. If the corporation makes no profit, there will be no profit sharing. The more the corporation makes the more each employee will get.

Mr. Elmore stated a time clock would be installed in the front as a double check, as each employee is expected to put in 8 hours per day. No telephone calls allowed to employees except for sickness or other emergencies. Mr. Elmore urged each employee to watch waste and reduce it to minimum. Mr. Elmore also stated that he had studied various profit-sharing plans and thought this the best for all concerned.

The Elmore Corp. is the first to adopt such a profit-sharing plan in Rutherford County, and the results will be watched with much interest. It shows the fine relation between employee and employer.

St. Patrick's Day Address by Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, at the annual dinner of the Hibernian Society, on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, we were extremely fortunate in having in Charleston, S. C., our distinguished colleague the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two accounts of the speech he delivered on that occasion, as they appeared in the Charleston Evening Post and the Charleston News and Courier of March 18, 1947.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Evening Post of March 18, 1947]

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY HEAR TALK BY O'MAHONEY AT BANQUET

America faces the great paradox of perfecting instruments that have made the world so small that in the hands of dictatorial government these instruments can make it impossible to retain freedom, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY declared last night in an address at the one hundred and forty-sixth annual banquet of the Hibernian Society.

An audience of 350 persons heard the Wyoming Democrat, introduced by Eugene G. Skinner, say that the United States remains almost alone as a nation devoted to both economic and political freedom.

"We are the last refuge of the liberties of mankind," he declared.

"The United States was founded by the men who believe that the people are the source of all authority that rightfully may be exercised over them. We have grown great and wealthy because the door of opportunity has been kept open. We have repudiated the doctrine of arbitrary power whether through political imperialism or any false theory of totalitarianism—whether expressed in the economic or political sphere.

"We face a great paradox today in that the very instruments of scientific progress invented and perfected by the United States have made the world so small that in the hands of dictatorial governments these instruments can make it impossible for free men to retain their freedom."

* * * * *

The Reverend William G. Doyle, of Anderson, responding to the toast, "The day we celebrate," said, "St. Patrick stands out as a man among men," for his religious contribution to Ireland and other nations. He termed the noted saint a foe of paganism.

Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, who responded to the toast to South Carolina, lauded Charleston's history and predicted a bright economic future with the development of the port.

C. Fletcher Carter, Jr., retiring president of the society, presided over the banquet in the absence of Joseph W. Welsh, newly elected president, who is confined to a hospital.

Guests at the head table included, besides the speakers:

United States Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, Gen. Charles P. Summerall, Mayor E. Edward Wehman, Jr., Rear Adm. L. T. DuBose, Col. Joseph Kohn, Commander C. J. Sullivan, the Reverend Ralph S. Meadowcroft, Philip Frankel, A. G. Podiesney, and Henry A. Schroeder.

[From the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., of March 18, 1947]

UNITED STATES LAST REFUGE OF LIBERTIES, O'MAHONEY SAYS—WYOMING SENATOR DELIVERS TALK AT ANNUAL BANQUET OF HIBERNIAN SOCIETY

The United States stands almost alone in the world as a nation devoted to both economic and political freedom, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming, told the Hibernian Society last night.

Citing the words of the Irish patriot, Henry Grattan, when he referred to America as "the only hope of Ireland and the last refuge of the liberties of mankind," the United States Senator declared it is now evident Grattan spoke with the tongue of a prophet.

"The United States was founded by men who believed that the people are the source of all authority that rightfully may be exercised over them," Senator O'MAHONEY said in the principal address at the traditional celebration of St. Patrick's Day by the 146-year-old society.

"We have grown great and wealthy because the door of opportunity has always been kept open. * * * We've repudiated the doctrine of arbitrary power whether through political imperialism or any false theory of totalitarianism, whether expressed in the economic or political sphere.

"We face a great paradox today in that the very instruments of scientific progress invented and perfected by the United States have made the world so small that in the hands of dictatorial governments these instruments can make it impossible for freemen to retain their freedom.

"The freedom of opportunity in the field of business and industry and self-determination in the political sphere are both expressions of the basic principles to which this Nation has always been devoted," the Senator continued.

"May we never falter in the will to maintain our role as the last refuge of the liberties of mankind," he concluded.

Senator O'MAHONEY responded to the traditional toast to the United States. About 225 persons attended.

The Reverend William G. Doyle, of Anderson, responded to the toast to "the day we celebrate" by giving a talk on St. Patrick, whom he described as the grand champion of our way of life.

In citing the life of St. Patrick, Father Doyle brought out that he converted all of Ireland in the fifth century.

"It is fitting that the saint whom we honor tonight used a soft tongue rather than an iron hand," he said.

Responding to the toast to the State of South Carolina was Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, who spoke on the future of the State.

"A chief aim of South Carolina today is to develop the port of Charleston into one of the greatest on the Atlantic coast," the Governor declared.

The progress of this State looks exceedingly bright from the standpoint of education, health, income, and the training of our workers to become more skilled, he said.

Among distinguished guests at the annual banquet was Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK.

At a meeting of the Hibernian Society earlier in the day the following new officers were elected and installed: Joseph W. Welsh, president; Eugene G. Skinner, vice president; Louis L. Miller, secretary; and Matthew P. Halloran, treasurer. Mr. Welsh succeeded C. Fletcher Carter, Jr.

New committee chairmen named were Thomas A. Croghan, managing; William J. Leonard, finance; Dr. Norman S. Lea, relief; and Dr. Julius Sinclair Smith, letters; John I. Cosgrove was chosen as historian and the Reverend J. Lawrence McLaughlin was renamed chaplain.

Congress Admonished To Deal Cautiously With the President's Proposed Greek-Turkish Loan

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are very anxious. Their anxiety was not relieved by the address of the President of the United States to the joint assembly of the two Houses of Congress on March 12, 1947. Perhaps they were more anxious and perplexed after they had heard or read the President's message.

Quite characteristic of the secret commitments of his predecessor, were some of the statements of President Truman in his speech of March 12. It was not a statement of plain everyday facts. It was glossed in generalities, and we, even Members of Congress, are about as much in the dark as to factual conditions and circumstances as we were before the President's speech. Many of us Members of Congress think we have not been taken into the President's confidence. The people think they have not been taken into his confidence. We all want to know the facts and truth about conditions as they exist, before the President makes any more commitments for or on behalf of the people of the United States.

Before Congress acts on the President's request for us to authorize and appropriate a loan, which will likely turn out to be a gift to Greece and Turkey of $400,000,000, as representatives of the people, we are entitled to know all about the situation.

Mr. Speaker, the people generally want to see the whole picture before they express themselves, favorably or unfavorably, with reference to the President's proposal. Many of them have written their Representatives to proceed cautiously and without haste. Some have reminded us that the President knew as early as in August 1946 that England would decline to furnish further financial assistance to Greece after March 31, 1947. If the President has known for 8 months before making his recent address to Congress that England would fail in her obligations to Greece, why the delay in passing this information on to Congress and to the citizens of this country generally? Why are we asked now to act so hastily? Why should not Congress have had the benefit of the President's knowledge on this subject in order that the Members of Congress, as the representatives of the people, might have proceeded cautiously?

Is not Congress as much entitled to study the facts and circumstances and all of the implications as the President himself? Does not the President owe Congress that consideration? Are not the people and their duly elected Representatives entitled to that respect and consideration under our form of government?

As typical of the thinking of many of our most serious-minded and patriotic citizens who are not in the habit of going off "half-cocked," but who are deliberate in their actions, I am pleased to quote from a letter I just received from an outstanding citizen of the United States admonishing Congress to deal cautiously with the President's proposed Greek-Turkish loan. I quote:

The proposal of President Truman with regard to Greece and Turkey confronts the United States with one of the gravest questions in its history.

Acceptance of that proposal involves complete reversal of our long-standing policy in foreign affairs. It involves intervention and participation in and responsibility for the internal affairs of other nations. It involves an economic drain on the people of this country which, from a relatively small beginning, may proceed to an extent which no one can now foresee. More than that, it involves employment of the military power of the United States—again apparently on a small initial scale, but again also with no predictable limits. It projects this country directly into the complexes of both Europe and the Middle East under circumstances which may well lead to war.

It has not been established why it is to the vital interest of the United States to take this step. Nor, if it can be conceded that the vital interest of our country is actually affected, has there been any revelation of the facts in this situation that make hasty action an imperative.

All that the Congress or the people have been given is the President's assertion that the vital interest of the United States is involved and that immediate action is essential. And the President's address is much more remarkable for its vagueness and resort to generalities than for any light it has shed on the reasons for making it.

As a matter of plain common sense, however serious the straits of Greece and Turkey, they cannot become too much worse in the time that will be required for the open and thorough discussion of this situation which alone can give the American people the opportunity to know what they are being asked to do, what the material cost will be, and what commitments of other natures are to be made in their name.

It is the plain duty of Members of Congress to prevent hasty action—to insist that all the facts are made known—to see that these facts are laid before the people in understandable terms—and finally, to take action in the light of the facts and the expressed will of the people.

Members of Congress can serve no good purpose by premature and ill-considered statements of opinion. Such, for instance, as the one attributed to Senator VANDENBERG to the effect that "we must uphold the hands of the President." Certainly, our history gives abundant evidence that Presidents can make mistakes. The welfare of the country is always consideration of far greater moment than support of the President in either national or international affairs.

Twice in a single generation our country has become involved in the wars of others. In each case the American people endured the suffering and sacrifice of war for lofty ideals. In neither case have they seen those

ideals realized. On the contrary, this country emerged from each war weaker than it entered, and after each war the world in general was in a worse condition than before. We lost men and wealth, we exhausted irreplaceable natural resources, and we bred conditions that caused widespread dissatisfaction and doubt among the American people concerning their principles of government and way of life.

Intrinsically, we are a weaker nation today than ever before in our history. We appear strong only by contrast with a prostrate world. In this weakened condition are we now to embark on a new adventure about which we know nothing, but which may lead first to war, and second to the final demoralization of the world and the disappearance of the slightest hope for an orderly society?

The two world wars caused the virtual destruction of the great British Empire. Is that not a sufficient example to make us pause before starting down a road which may lead to the same end?

The President said:

"There is no other country (except the United States) to which democratic Greece can turn."

What does this statement mean? That no other country cares anything about Greece as a democratic country? That no other country cares enough to help alleviate the physical want of her people? Or that no other country has the resources to extend aid?

Under any interpretation, the implication of the President's words are far-reaching. There are 2,000,000,000 people in this world. Out of this number can the 140,000,000 people who comprise our Nation be the only ones who can assume the burdens of weaker countries? Is it a practical possibility? If so, can we do it or even attempt to do it without destroying ourselves?

The President said:

"The United States contributed $341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II. This is an investment in world freedom and world peace."

Where is the freedom and where is the peace? Is the world we have today the kind of a return on "investment" that justifies the beginning of a new outpouring of funds?

The President said:

"The assistance that I am recommending for Greece and Turkey amounts to little more than one tenth of 1 percent of this investment."

Does the President or anyone else think for a moment that the amount he proposes will be the whole amount? Obviously, $400,000,000 will be only the start. It will be followed by other millions and billions in those countries and in other countries which, with Greece and Turkey as precedents, will make claims on our generosity.

The President said:

"The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists."

If a government is so weak that it cannot cope with several thousand armed men under any leadership, there is reason to conclude: (1) that if many of the people of the country do not actually sympathize with the several thousand they at least do not care much one way or the other and, (2) there is little that an outside power can do to aid such a government.

If we take this action in Greece, we will in effect say to Russia, "We are opposed to communism and intend to help the governments of Greece and Turkey oppose it." Under the circumstances, is not Russia likely to reply, "You are free to do that, but if you do, we will take measures of our own to support communism." It must be remembered that Russia has many means, short of war, to foster the spread of communism; many more, in fact, than we have to oppose it. Unpalatable as the idea is, we must also realize that many people in countries throughout the world look with favor on communism and regard it as a superior form of government. In our own country, we have a Communist movement which is far from large, yet there is little we can do to halt its acceptance by some of our people. You cannot stop a political growth any more than you can stop a religious growth—particularly by use of force. And the adventure in Greece, whatever its other aspects, is basically a use of force.

At Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, commitments were made for the American people without their knowledge or consent. Secrecy was excused by those who indulged in it on the ground that it was essential to war security. Yet, there is little doubt today that those secret deals, in which a few men around a table played with the destiny of nations, were important causes of the world's present condition. There is no excuse now—not even a lame one—for asking the American people to move blindfolded and in haste into a situation of most serious consequence. Certainly, the time has come to end secret diplomacy.

The urgency, the need for haste which the President so strongly emphasized has an artificial quality. It smacks of the "rush act" of the high-powered salesman. Britain accepted Greece as a responsibility during and after the war. Admitting that Britain's economic condition is unhealthy, why does it suddenly become absolutely impossible for her to continue that responsibility beyond the outside date of March 31—just 19 days after the President's address? Would Britain collapse if she stayed in Greece until April 30 or May 31? Or was an almost immediate date selected to force Americans to act before they could think?

Although it has been mentioned only in passing, the thing of paramount importance in this entire matter to the United States and her people is the interest of the United States—not only the immediate interest but also long-range interest. Certainly if it is not in the interest of this country to take a step, then there can be no other good reason for it in Greece, Europe, the Middle East, or elsewhere. With its present huge debt and the other weakening influences of the war, the United States should regard any commitment with caution. This caution should be doubled and redoubled in the face of a step as grave as that into Greece with all the implications of a continuing economic drain if not the actual threat of another war. Might not the United States best contribution to the world be the rebuilding of her own strength so that she can in fact remain the strongest bulwark of free government?

These questions should be resolved before we take an action which may prove to be a costly gamble. Today, the American people do not have the information on which to base either support or rejection of the President's proposal. Congress alone has the power, and it must exercise that power, to see that the people get the facts—all the facts.

Keating Plan Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of March 20, 1947:

KEATING PLAN GAINS

Any reduction in Federal taxes approved by Congress ought to give the low-income brackets a better proportionate break than the high brackets. This principle has been recognized by the Republican leaders who are trying to work out a tax program to meet the projected cut in the Federal budget, which is expected to be at least $3,500,000,000 and may be as large as $5,000,000,000.

The Knutson bill proposes a straight 20 percent cut in all income-tax brackets. We note that much interest has been shown toward an alternative plan worked out by Rochester's Representative KENNETH B. KEATING which would give the small-bracket incomes a larger reduction than the high brackets. This would be done by lowering the surtax rate 7 percentage points. The goal of this and similar plans is to give cuts of 25 to 30 percent to the smaller incomes and not more than 20 percent to the larger ones.

The Keating plan, according to a dispatch from Washington, "has developed support as a possible compromise with the Knutson bill, since some Republicans believe the latter is too favorable to persons with high incomes."

Another proposal is to raise personal exemptions from $500 to $700, this to apply to both husband and wife and to any dependent. All taxpayers in all groups would have the same exemption. Under this plan the married man with an income of $2,500 would have his "spendable" balance increased by 4 percent over the proposed Knutson plan, the $10,000 man by 2.8 percent and the $300,000 man by only 1 percent.

One objective of a tax-reduction program ought to be to increase the spending power in the lower brackets, where most of the country's spending is done. This is not only hard sense but sound justice to the section of the population that is hardest hit by soaring costs of living.

Is the TVA Carrying Out the Intention of Congress in Providing the Farmers With Fertilizers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the Muscle Shoals Dam on the Tennessee was under construction, Congress was assured that its principal purpose in peacetime would be to provide fertilizers for the farmers of the United States. Without that assurance, the dam would probably never have been constructed. Approximately $1,000,000,000 have now been expended primarily for power on the Tennessee, and the Nation is undergoing a shortage in fertilizer that extends from coast to coast. Farmers are appealing to Congress from every State, and are unable to obtain even small quantities of this material so essential at this time. Is there any good reason why a portion of the surplus power produced on the Tennessee should not now be devoted to carrying out the purpose promised to the farmers?

Statement by Franklin D. Schurz on Proposed Increase in Second-Class Postage Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Franklin D. Schurz, president of the Inland Daily Press Association, on the proposal to increase second-class postage rates.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE SECOND-CLASS POSTAGE RATES

(Statement of Franklin D. Schurz, president of the Inland Daily Press Association)

My name is Franklin D. Schurz. I am secretary-treasurer and business manager of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, which has a circulation of 66,415 daily and 84,647 Sunday. I appear here, however, not primarily to represent the South Bend Tribune, but in behalf of the 407 daily newspapers which are members of the Inland Daily Press Association, of which I am president. These newspapers are located in 17 States comprising the Midwest and Rocky Mountain area, and represent a combined circulation of eleven and a half million.

The 407 members of our association include only 34 with circulations over 50,000, and only 73 with circulations over 25,000. More than one-fourth of our members, 120, have circulations under 5,000. More than half, 237, have circulations under 10,000. Eighty-two percent, 334, of our members have less than 25,000 circulation.

It is these smaller newspapers, and particularly the smallest of them which would be hardest hit by the increase in second-class postage rates which have been proposed. I will shortly demonstrate that. First, let me say that if it can be proved that some increases in second-class rates are justified, I would not oppose fair increases. While I cannot speak for all newspapers, or even for all members of my association, I am sure that most newspapers would not oppose reasonable increases if their fairness can be shown.

Newspapermen, however, have for years been convinced that too great a proportion of the Post Office deficit has been assessed against newspapers because of faulty accounting allocation. Consequently, newspapermen have never accepted as fair the Post Office's claim of subsidized newspaper distribution.

In support of our views the Department's method was specifically rejected as an unsatisfactory basis for rate making or for computation of actual costs by a joint Congressional subcommittee which investigated postal rates in 1924–26. Nor has the Post Office devised a satisfactory system or changed its methods in the 20 intervening years.

Former Postmaster General Walker, in a communication to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee on July 7, 1942, presented further evidence supporting our claim that second-class mailing costs are not justly computed. Walker wrote, "If no second-class matter were in the mails, it would not thereby eliminate a proportionate share of the department personnel, the inspection force, the clerks, the carriers, the laborers, the railway mail clerks, the rural carriers, rent, light and fuel, because it is not possible to eliminate that portion of the personnel, the equipment, the buildings, the mail cars, and the trucks of the Postal establishment that are handling the work-load of second-class matter. We have no post offices, or parts of post offices, designed, equipped, and maintained to handle second-class mail exclusively. We have no railway mail cars or motor vehicles exclusively devoted to second-class mail. We have no post-office clerks or carriers, village delivery carriers, star route carriers, or mail messengers recruited, trained, and employed to handle nothing but second-class matter. The postal system is not composed of mail and service expense compartments which can be automatically eliminated or flatly reduced by the curtailment of expenditures when losses of mail or services occur in a particular category or classification. This elimination might enlighten the burden of the employees, but it is very doubtful that it would work any great saving in manpower. The efficiency and economy of the postal system depend upon the continual maintenance of a high degree of integration of all services and operations."

Walker's recommended solution to some of the Department's problems lay, be felt, in increasing revenue through increasing volume of second-class mail. Certainly if that mail was being carried at a known loss, such a recommendation could never have been made. Further, the change currently proposed, upon which this present hearing is based, with its exorbitant increases of up to 350 percent in newspaper mailing costs, can result only in driving newspapers out of the mails and in immediate withdrawal of millions in revenue now received by the post office from newspapers.

To offset these excessive increases in mailing charges, large newspapers will transfer to trucking routes much current mail circulation, and may lose a high percentage of their remaining mail circulation because of the sharply increased subscription rates. Small papers, unable to finance truck delivery, will be doubly vulnerable since their subscription raises to cover increased mailing costs cannot be passed on to the subscriber without great circulation casualties.

Additional practices of the Department in arriving at costs which the newspapers deem unjust are:

1. Failure to credit the newspapers for money spent performing services which the Post Office Department should render. Full postage charges are paid on more than a million newspapers which, as mail circulation, newspaper employees sort, route, sack, weigh, and transport, at the newspapers' expense, to post offices that in some instances are many miles distant from places of publication.

2. The Department charges against other classes of mail, including second class, the costs of various public policy services such as a large proportion of the cost of RFD services, and a substantial proportion of the cost of star route services. Congress created both of these services for the general benefit of farmers and other citizens living at too great distance from their post offices to make it practical for them to call for their mail. Congress intended that this service should be given irrespective of expenditures or receipts, yet the Post Office Department charges against second-class mail large proportions of the cost of operating these services.

The extent to which the proposed new rates would prompt newspapers to look to other means of distribution, and the oppressive—perhaps suppressive—burden placed upon small newspapers which are least able to shift their mail circulation out of the mails, is indicated by the following tabulation.

The figures which follow are not special cases. They are figures showing the proposed mailing cost increases which would obtain for newspapers chosen at random from our membership.

Newspaper	Total circulation	Mail circulation	Present postage	Proposed postage	Percent of increase
			Annual	*Annual*	
Norwalk (Ohio) Reflector-Herald	4,078	1,390	$418.00	$1,763.60	327
Niles (Mich.) Star	6,108	706	459.16	1,305.72	184
La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus	10,172	2,585	1,431.84	5,084.73	253
Ravenna (Ohio) Record	10,279	1,184	1,800.00	7,200.00	311
Champaign (Ill.) Courier	11,340	2,550	1,105.53	4,118.01	253
Sedalia (Mo.) Democrat-Capital	11,780	5,500	3,300.00	12,900.00	288
Wooster (Ohio) Record	13,551	1,263	2,100.00	8,600.00	310
Rochester (Minn.) Post-Bulletin	14,253	5,600	3,600.00	11,500.00	219
Sandusky (Ohio) Register-Star	15,051	950	1,085.00	2,600.00	139
Elkhart (Ind.) Truth	18,416	2,536	3,939.84	8,865.89	125
Marion (Ind.) Chronicle; Leader	20,263	4,487	3,497.28	9,842.40	181
La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune	26,700	6,200	7,715.00	22,276.00	189
Madison (Wis.) State Journal	31,829	12,415	19,645.20	51,728.60	163
Bloomington (Ill.) Pantagraph	31,161	14,850	13,011.60	40,252.00	212
Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald	32,314	18,000	22,512.00	50,124.00	123
Jackson (Mich.) Patriot	33,324	6,000	8,058.60	26,334.00	207
Topeka (Kans.) Capital and Journal	78,149	30,752	42,956.64	99,800.00	133
South Bend (Ind.) Tribune	86,415	4,500	12,400.60	27,953.84	126
St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat	278,206	59,000	61,812.00	131,061.00	112
Des Moines (Iowa) Register and Tribune	362,685	130,000	170,000.00	360,000.00	112

Higher postal rates hit small dailies hardest

	Percent
Average increase for circulation group 50,000 and up	121
Average increase for circulation group 25,000 to 50,000	179
Average increase for circulation group under 25,000	235

I feel sure it was not the intention of the Post Office Department and will not be the desire of this committee to establish rates which would place such a heavy burden of increase upon the small newspapers, or which would place in jeopardy the opportunity of each citizen of our country, however, remote his home, however lean his purse, to have access to his newspaper—democracy's bulwark.

American Federation of Labor on the WFTU Delegation to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a telegram sent by the American Federation of Labor to the Secretary of War protesting the action of the War Depart-

ment granting permission to a delegation including one Louis Saillant, of the World Federation of Trade Unions, to proceed to Japan and Korea for the purpose of affiliating Japanese unions with the WFTU. This telegram affirms my statement in an address before this House that the World Federation of Trade Unions is an organization definitely hostile to the United States.

Hon. ROBERT W. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.
Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.
Gen. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
General Headquarters, Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces, APO 500.

In the name of its more than 7,500,000 members, the American Federation of Labor protests vigorously against the decision of the War and State Departments acceding to demand of Louis Saillant to proceed to Japan for the purpose of affiliating Japanese unions to World Federation of Trade Unions. We brand projected Saillant visit as actively hostile to highest ideals and best interests of American people and world peace and as intensely detrimental to development of Japan as a peaceful democracy.

Under Saillant's chairmanship, WFTU has persistently vilified our country's democratic policies and consistently glorified every imperialist adventure of Kremlin Commissars who dominate this organization as camouflaged but continuous agent of Soviet aggressionist foreign policy.

Primarily under Saillant's leadership blindly following Russian Communist line, World Federation of Trade Unions have initiated, fostered, and promoted gravest menace to ideals of freedom for the preservation of which American people fought the war. WFTU has been prime mover for generating new totalitarian danger in Germany by seeking to impose forced labor on Ruhr miners. Fearing to antagonize its Muscovite master, WFTU has not dared utter a single word of protest against undermining of democracy in Czechoslovakia through introduction of streamlined system of compulsory labor and penal servitude into that country.

American Federation of Labor further declares it utterly unfair and injurious to rising Japanese trade-union movement to place it in position of hearing only WFTU viewpoint without at same time having A. F. of L. present its case against affiliation with WFTU. This Soviet-directed move to stampede Japanese labor unions into WFTU affiliation and place them under covert but complete Kremlin domination is utilizing American authorization of visit as indorsement of its sinister purposes. This mission is mere continuation of Saillant's antidemocratic procedure which he applied against German unions when French authorities under WFTU and Communist Party pressure prevented A. F. of L. delegation in Germany last November from visiting French zone thereby denying four zonal German labor conference at Mainz opportunity to hear A. F. of L. viewpoint. Furthermore Saillant and his Comrade Frachon, member French Communist Party Central Committee, even phoned American Embassy in Paris threatening A. F. of L. European representative Irving Brown's life if he established A. F. of L. office in France.

Therefore, in addition to our vigorous protest against recognition of and facilitating the work of the Saillant mission in any manner or form by our Government, we call upon the War and State Departments and General MacArthur—

1. To use all their good offices and authority to prohibit any action by the Saillant mission to Tokyo to blitz Japanese unions into WFTU;

2. To have this statement printed in full in Japanese labor and general press so that the workers and people of Japan may be immediately apprised of the vital issues at stake.

MATTHEW WOLL,
Chairman, International Labor Relations Committee, American Federation of Labor.

Protection of American Filbert Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by A. C. Jacobson, general manager, Northwest Nut Growers, Dundee, Oreg., at the hearing on the International Trade Organization, San Francisco, March 11, 1947:

I am A. C. Jacobson, general manager of the Northwest Nut Growers, a cooperative walnut and filbert marketing association which represents over 3,000 Oregon and Washington nut growers.

We have requested this opportunity to appear, not as experts on international trade, nor with any thought of opposing the basic humanitarian principles of the proposed charter, but to register our opposition to the charter as it is now written, on the basis that some of the tentative provisions threaten the very existence of the domestic filbert industry. Our industry is vitally concerned with the problem of international trade and we feel that this is the proper place to discuss these problems in order that adequate provisions can be made to protect our own and other similarly affected agricultural industries.

The filbert industry of the United States is comparatively a young industry, only dating back some 20 years; and although from an international viewpoint the United States filbert industry is relatively unimportant; yet thousands of good American citizens in Oregon and Washington depend for their livelihood upon a reasonable return for their filbert crops.

The States of Oregon and Washington are proud of their pioneering efforts which have demonstrated that the Northwest can produce filberts which excel any competitive foreign offering. Now that the pioneering is over and the demonstration conclusive, the people of the great Northwest can be depended on to fight to the last ditch for reasonable and effective protection, within the limits of fair competition, justice, and reason.

Well over 20,000 acres of fertile land has been planted to filberts in the past 20 years, and from such a small beginning the domestic production has increased to a point where 18,000,000 pounds of filberts in shell were produced last year.

We do not in any sense subscribe to the theory that no foreign filberts should be allowed into the United States. We sincerely feel that the domestic requirements should be taken care of, and if the United States cannot produce a sufficient quantity of filberts to take care of the domestic need, imports should be allowed but only in such volume as will take care of that demand at prices that will assure our American producers of a fair return for their production.

This is not, however, the much-to-be-desired situation in which our filbert industry finds itself today.

Filberts in the shell and shelled have been coming into this country in ever-increasing quantities and at prices that spell financial ruin to our growers.

The United States production in 1946 alone amounted to 90 percent of the entire domestic consumption, that is, production plus imports during the average pre-war years, 1935-39.

The domestic production in 1946 was more than double that produced in the average period above, yet imports during the past year were 425 percent greater. Furthermore, the domestic production of filberts is bound to increase substantially in the immediate future because many hundreds of acres planted before and during the war will be coming into production, and other orchards which have already started producing after 6 or more years of careful tending, will be pyramiding their production as they attain full bearing age.

The largest market for Mediterranean-produced filberts, prior to the war was in continental Europe and the United Kingdom. These markets were lost during the war and it does not seem likely that their buying power will be restored sufficiently for some years to come to enable them to absorb their historic requirements. This, plus an already discriminating low tariff of only 8 cents per pound on shelled filberts as compared to double that amount on other nuts and a mad scramble by foreign governments for American dollar exchange, even to the extent of subsidizing exchange rates on the part of Turkey and Italy to encourage exports to the United States, are the primary reasons for the situation in which the domestic industry finds itself.

Let us look for a moment at the actual results which were brought about by this situation.

Out of the 9,000 tons of in-shell filberts produced in the United States in 1946 45 percent were still in grower or packer hands on January 1, 1947.

Last year grower returns on filberts in the shell was 28 cents per pound, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. On a basis of current prices for shelled filberts, the only market available at this season of the year, grower returns will do well to equal half of the above, for shelled filberts are today being quoted in the low-forties cents per pound while a year ago there was a ready market for them at 85 cents, the price designed to return our growers the parity price which our Congress established as the price to which growers were entitled.

Production, labor, processing, freight and general marketing costs are appreciably higher than a year ago, yet our growers' returns are in a tail spin.

The filbert industry is only one of the first American agricultural industries to feel the effect of what is sure to come to most other agricultural commodities. As the war-torn countries to our east and west return to normalcy more and more exportable agricultural surplus will develop. Even at existing tariff rates we will receive such a flood of imports into this country that a stable agricultural economy will be a myth, regardless of the millions or billions of taxpayers' funds we might pour out in subsidies to American farmers in order that they might continue to exist.

What commodities are foreign countries most interested in importing? Industrial goods? Automobiles, refrigerators, radios, electrical equipment, farm machinery, factory machinery, office equipment and many others.

What commodities are most available for export by foreign governments? Agricultural products.

What currency do they need and want most? American dollars.

What market is the most attractive? The American market.

Where will their agricultural exports go under the above circumstances? To America, of course.

These questions and answers, we believe, throw some light on the American agricultural problem and in that light we recommend that our Government which is of the people, by the people and for the people preserve the solvency of American agriculture thru the maintenance of justified tariffs, yes, and the raising of others as in the case of filberts so that living and production costs between the United States and abroad can be somewhat equalized. We recommend further that quantitative limitations be placed upon competitive agricultural imports, when, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, the volume of such imports places or threatens to place a disproportionate burden upon any segment of American society.

I have concentrated on filberts primarily because filberts at the present time are suffering from foreign competition and refusal of our State Department to take timely action.

The growers whom I directly represent also have a vital interest in walnuts, in fact, last year they produced a crop which turned out close to 5,000,000 pounds merchantable. I understand that Mr. W. E. Goodspeed, program manager of War Food Order 82 and secretary of the Walnut Control Board, who, for the past 14 years has managed an industry-wide program which we believe kept northwestern walnut growers in business during the depression years, is to follow me and will present the problems of that commodity group. Also, that he will be followed by Mr. Carlyle Thorpe, manager of the California Walnut Growers Association, who is recognized as a leader in the field of marketing and cooperative endeavor. We have had the opportunity of reviewing five specific recommendations for changes in the International Trade Organization's charter which Mr. Thorpe has advised he will place before this meeting. The forthcoming recommendations champion the principles currently being urged upon our Government by the entire tree-nut industry and have the hearty endorsement of the Northwest Nut Growers and Oregon Nut Growers, Inc., who together market better than 65 percent of the filberts and walnuts grown in the Northwest.

Unofficially, I feel certain that our views and endorsement would meet with the approval of the entire tree-nut industry of Oregon and Washington and the majority of the people in those States who have an interest in the economic well-being of Northwestern agriculture.

Protect the Home Fires First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times under date of March 16, 1947, written by Kyle Palmer, Times political editor:

PROTECT THE HOME FIRES FIRST

(By Kyle Palmer)

The President of the United States believes this country should appropriate $400,000,000 as an initial fund to combat communism as the world's chief menace to the freedom of man and to the security of freedom-loving peoples.

The Secretary of Labor believes communism in the United States has but one object—the destruction of our form of government.

Members of Congress, including our own Representative SHEPPARD, believe laws should be enacted to outlaw the Communist Party and to suppress activities of Communists and their sympathizers.

THE METHODS

The United States Chamber of Commerce reports that Communist penetration of labor unions is being accomplished by methods generally familiar to blackmailers, blackguards, and panderers.

From innumerable other sources come authentic and competent assurances that the weapons of communism include deception, subversion, duplicity, corruption, and plain old-fashioned prevarication.

We have seen efforts of Communists to stir class conflicts, to instigate clamor, create discord, sow suspicions, incite hatred.

Adopting the recourse of a chameleon, the Communist takes on whatever coloration any given circumstance demands—being a "liberal" or a "progressive" or a "Democrat" or a "friend of the people," but seldom, very seldom, appearing under his true colors, virtually never announcing or acknowledging his true purposes.

WHY DOES HE LIE?

As Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach informed the House Labor Committee, "the first thing a Communist learns is to lie about being a Communist."

Why does he lie? Simply because the truth would discredit him, defeat his aims and thwart his philosophy.

Why has communism, despite its evil methods and its harmful doctrines, made such inroads in a country which abhors dictators and risks its security to fight totalitarianism? Again, the explanation is simple: Because Communists lie, deceive, confuse and follow any other method calculated to disarm those whom they seek to dominate.

A PRACTICAL FACT

If the ordinary American citizen could come to a practical realization of one practical fact about communism, whether found in this country, in Greece, in Turkey, Britain, Belgium, Germany, Japan, or elsewhere, much uncertainty, misunderstanding and actual mischief could be avoided.

The practical fact is this: A Communist outside of Russia, for all effective purposes, is a foreign agent. He believes—or thinks he believes—that the Marxist-Lenin philosophy offers the world its only salvation.

Your Communist, is, in fact, a fanatic, and communism is his religion. With him the end justifies the means, however reprehensible, murderous and brutal such means may be.

To him any religion that involves a belief in God or any being other than Lenin or Marx or Stalin is false, or, in the familiar Communist patter, "narcotic for the people."

And there you have your typical Communist. He regards free enterprise as an abomination, free speech as a downright menace, a free people as a contradiction in political nature.

To each citizen in the Republic of the United States the presence of Communists and the existence of organized communism here present certain specific problems and offer a challenge: What are we going to do about Communists as political agitators and about communism as a calculated subversive movement?

TRUMAN'S REQUEST

First, there is little we can do now about President Truman's request for an appropriation of $400,000,000 to combat communism in Greece and Turkey. Really, we have not—collectively—enough actual information to justify a firm opinion one way or the other.

We must assume, if the President says so, and if a majority of the Members of Congress agree, that the money, goods, and possibly the military advice of our experts are required to insure freedom for the Greeks, the Turks, and other peoples menaced by Communist plans for world domination.

Aside from an approving attitude or a letter or telegram urging our Senators and Representatives to enact laws deemed adequate to protect us from communism here at home, there is little we can do to force legislative action in Washington at this time.

WHAT WE CAN DO

But there is something we can do, both individually and collectively, to combat communism and to defeat the Communist program: We can realize the actual danger of Red plans and plots, we can be on the alert to detect Communist designs behind whatever front they may be advanced, we can engage in active opposition to Communist undertakings.

We need not look to the international scene for an opportunity to strike a blow against this enslaving drive from Moscow; it is not essential right now that we even get into the scramble in the Nation's Capitol to renounce, denounce, and suppress the Communist Party.

We have a much simpler task which is much closer home and much more important to our immediate welfare—we can vote and get others to vote in the April 1 municipal primary which represents our own front-line contact with the Red advance.

QUOTING DENNIS

Perhaps you read the comment of Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States, when Dennis was informed of Secretary Schwellenbach's recommendation that the Communist Party be outlawed.

Dennis was positive that "the American people, the followers of the late President Roosevelt, and especially the labor-union movement, were shocked" by Schwellenbach's suggestion.

Locally, the People's Daily World, which serves as the escape valve for most of the Communist propaganda, is in hysterics. It quotes a long statement of Dennis in which the Red leader attempts to identify the Communist program with "the best interests" of labor and of the people generally.

ELECTION ADVICE

It is this same Communist, Dennis, who wrote an exhaustive analysis of the causes and effects of the 1946 elections, with inferences to be drawn therefrom and with suggestions as to the best methods for recouping Red losses in the 1947 local elections as well as the Presidential election in 1948.

Attention has heretofore been drawn to the keen interest Dennis and his comrades are taking in our own municipal elections, but it may be just as well that the memories of Los Angeles voters be refreshed.

It is not complimentary to our national intelligence that the Communists at home and abroad feel Americans have short memories—as is evidenced by the almost sublime complacency with which the Reds generally ignore the sweet and "enduring" friendship struck up by Hitler and Stalin when, each for his own purpose, they entered into agreements which actually enabled the Nazis to start World War II.

THE CHANGING LINE

But consistency is not among Communist virtues. We should never forget, however, that the United States faced very real danger from Communist sabotage in this country while the Hitler-Stalin "friendship" pacts

existed; here in Los Angeles we should never forget the "Yanks are not coming" propaganda of our own local Reds prior to Hitler's invasion of Russia, nor should we fail to profit from the about-face overnight of the home-grown Communists who, seeing Russia menaced, demanded a halt to labor strife which they had stimulated, and who went all-out for a second front regardless of the cost in American lives.

To get back to Secretary Dennis: Speaking to the plenary meeting of the national committee of the Communist Party last December in New York, Dennis attempted both to explain reasons for Communist set-backs in the 1946 elections and to advance suggestions for Communist successes in 1947 and 1948.

KEY CENTERS

"Unusual consideration must now be given," he said, "to prepare for the coming 200 municipal elections which will take place in 1947, especially in such key centers as Detroit, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Los Angeles."

His suggestions—or orders—are faithfully being carried out here; Communists are working overtime, above and underground, to take over the schools and to retain or elect sympathizers or dupes as members of the city council.

For the time being it seems good sense to allow the President and Congress to explore ways to control Communism abroad; Los Angeles voters have their own opportunity to start the ball rolling right in their own front yard.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF, on March 22, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, in the happy days before World War II I used to welcome many senior classes to Washington each year from schools back home. These boys and girls climaxed their high school careers with a trip to the Nation's Capital and it was my pleasure to greet them in my Washington office and to pose with them in group pictures which was the proper accent to put on such a memorable event. These group pictures still cover the walls of my Binghamton office.

Came the war, and travel of this kind was virtually ended so that I had little opportunity to meet the young people graduating during that interim. But it is interesting to note with the passing of the years, many of the youngsters who traveled to Washington as high school seniors in 1939–40 are now solid citizens, live and work in our home communities and, in several instances, have written to me within the last few months about current problems. Not a few have reminded me of the time they were greeted by their Congressman so long ago on the Capitol lawn.

I am glad to tell you this practice of sojourning to the National Capital is being revived in earnest this year. The members of a dozen senior classes throughout Broome, Chenango and Madison counties are scheduled to arrive Easter week and we will doubtless hear from several others.

I look forward to meeting these enthusiastic young Americans. It is refreshing to witness the profound admiration they demonstrate when they come face to face for the first time with the shining grandeur of the Capitol dome, and when they view the sacred precincts of the Supreme Court Building or when they descend the steps of the White House.

These time-honored institutions sometimes escape the closer scrutiny of the hurried traveler as he keeps an appointment with some Government official, with only an hour to spare in Washington. But to the high-school senior, on his first visit to our Capitol, it is a dream come true, a story book come to life.

So while I am welcoming these young folks this year, I draw your attention to their visit likewise, and emphasize to you the love of country and high degree of patriotism which prompt them to come. Their sincerity constitutes hope for the future and their zeal a guarantee that America will be perpetuated.

At the request of several postal employees, I am taking a moment this evening to reiterate my stand on legislation affecting the Post Office Department.

This division of our Government, efficiently and capably run as it is, needs every dollar we can possibly allow it to maintain mail service to the American people. The Post Office is the oldest department in our Government. The great mass of Americans depend on its workers more than on any others to keep alive the communications and correspondence of millions.

Congress has found it almost impossible and certainly impracticable to chop very much off the Post Office budget. And that is a tribute to the integrity of Post Office personnel and management because it proves there is little or no waste in funds which Congress appropriates for this great work.

To the dairymen of my district and throughout the New York milkshed I wish to express concern over the despairing letters I am beginning to receive from many of you, complaining about the dropping of milk prices paid to producers. These declines might be all right if feed costs were going down. They might be understandable if the consumer were paying less for his milk and dairy products.

But it seems to me there is no justification for the lowering of prices the dairyman is now getting. I would like to know why this is coming about and I think the farmer has a right to know, too. Lower his production costs while you are cutting his income and give the consumer a break in the bargain.

Thank you.

Income-Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Saturday, March 22, 1947, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, entitled "Taxing and Spending":

TAXING AND SPENDING

The House Republican high command talks with more assurance about how to cut income taxes than it does about how to cut the President's budget by $6,000,000,000.

The proposal to cut the taxes of little fellows by 30 percent and to reduce those of virtually all other income taxpayers by 20 percent is good for snagging votes. But we would still like to know how taxes are to be cut and the budget is to be balanced at the same time.

Thus far the only specific recommendation for cutting the President's $37,500,000,000 budget has come from the House Appropriations Committee, which would take a bite of $297,072,750 out of Treasury-Post Office funds.

This is a sham because $800,000,000 of that reduction is simply knocked off the $2,301,000,000 estimate for tax refunds for the next fiscal year. The only way to reduce tax refunds is to reduce the number of taxpayers or cut down on the number of errors requiring refunds. It would be foolhardy to cut appropriations in the vague hope that the number of errors will be reduced or that fewer taxpayers will be required to file returns.

The tax reduction would reduce Federal income by $3,840,000,000. It might be justified if Congress could show how the budget can be reduced by the $6,000,000,000 proposed by the House or even the $4,500,000,000 proposed by the Senate. That would leave something toward retirement of the $260,000,000,000 public debt.

Meanwhile, what about the new demands for Federal spending abroad? The $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey were not foreseen when the President prepared his budget. There is also talk of a possible $500,000,000 for Korea. The Congress is debating $350,000,000 for relief in China and European countries over and above the $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey.

These funds are likely to be a drop in the bucket. Once committed to a program to stem the world tide of communism with dollars, we can anticipate new and heavy demands. Not all of them will have to be met, certainly, but we aren't going to be able to take a swing at the problem and then duck out. We will have to follow through.

Congress should not reduce taxes, adding to inflationary pressure, until the reduction has been considered carefully in relation to foreign policy, a balanced budget, and a reduction of public debt. Thus far, Congress has not shown how these conflicting matters are to be reconciled.

Also an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of Friday March 21, 1947, entitled "Taxation for Votes Only":

TAXATION FOR VOTES ONLY

House Republican leaders have agreed on a tax reduction bill. It provides—

A 30-percent cut for those with taxable income up to $1,000, comprising—and not by coincidence—the largest number of voters.

A cut of 20 percent for the next largest number of voters, those with taxable income between $1,000 and $302,000.

And 10.5 percent for the handful whose income is above $302,000 and who are presumed to vote Republican anyway.

This bill, if passed, will diminish the Government's revenues by $3,840,000,000—at a time when the Government's debt is $260,000,000,000, when the budget is still unbalanced, when demands for national security expenditures at home and around the world are rising.

Taxpayers in all brackets would be much better off if Congress held to the present tax rates this year, and used all surplus revenues collected to start paying off the public debt.

With prices and living costs still rising, due largely to the Government's continued spending of borrowed money, this is no time to cut taxes. Now may be a good time to start working on a sensible tax cut to become effective next year, after the budget has been balanced and prices stabilized.

Typical Views of Many Oklahomans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, since Congress convened, January 3, 1947, and even before that time, I have received literally hundreds of letters from some of the most patriotic and clear-headed citizens of Oklahoma, expressing freely their views on the labor situation, and the New Deal enacted legislation on the subject. Nearly everyone who has written me, except CIO union officials, and a few individual members of various labor organizations, have expressed the view that the Wagner Act should be repealed in its entirety, or at least drastically amended. They frequently refer to other national legislative enactments on the subject of labor, with about as much emphasis in favor of the repeal or amendment of such other acts. Several members of organized labor, union members themselves, have suggested the necessity of congressional repeal or amendment of various acts, or parts of acts, regulating labor. The vast majority of people out our way who express themselves on the subject are thoroughly disgusted with the way the New Deal crowd has dealt with organized labor and particularly with the labor union bosses and racketeers. They all agree that the rank and file of labor is not to blame, but that the bosses and racketeers who profit and profiteer off of the individual worker should be curbed in their activities.

The public has the greatest interest at stake. Management has been restricted and held responsible, and the people generally are demanding that labor unions should have their activities circumscribed and that they should be held equally responsible with management. Neither management nor organized labor should be favored by the law. Neither of them is as vitally interested as the general public, and the public generally is demanding that this Congress enact legislation that will protect the interests of the public and not show any favoritism or partiality toward either management or organized labor.

Typical views of many Oklahomans on this subject is expressed in a letter which I received a few days ago from a very responsible person who generally is accredited with thinking clearly on any subject before he speaks. I am pleased to quote from this letter as follows:

Corrective labor legislation is soon to be given consideration by Congress—we hope. The closed shop is a crime against Americanism, Christianity, and the individual right to provide a living for a man and his family. Why should any individual be forced to pay tribute for the privilege of a God-given right to earn a living?

A few years ago when our plant was being organized one of our older employees, about 60 years of age, came to the writer and stated, "Mr. ———, if I have to join this union I will be unable to work for you any longer." I asked him why. He stated that his religious belief would not permit him to join such an organization. I have respect for every man's religious belief, even though it might seem peculiar. This man had worked for us for 25 years. His earning capacity was greater with us than if he had gone to another concern for employment.

We feel that the Wagner Act should be amended. It has given everything to labor, but has restricted employers from any voice whatsoever.

We are not opposed to unions, if they operate within the bounds of reason and legitimate activities.

In a meeting with organizers some 2 years ago, one of the organizers stated in open meeting that so far as they were concerned—meaning the union—merit was kicked out of the door. That, of course, means that there would be no incentive for the ambitious, industrious, capable individual. All would be placed on the same level, and that level would be the lowest production of the poorest worker.

No doubt you are aware that many States have outlawed the closed shop. The neighboring States of Arkansas, Tennessee, Nebraska, and Arizona have already passed this law, and, of course, many others. I believe the matter is now before the Texas Legislature and I believe that it has passed the Senate.

Would appreciate your giving consideration to our views along these lines.

Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote a telegram addressed to Mr. J. Monroe Johnson, Director, Office of Defense Transportation, by the Northwest County Elevator Association and the Minneapolis Grain Commission Merchants Association. Steps should be taken immediately to assure the great railroads in the Midwest, from which region comes the bulk of the food for our Nation, adequate boxcars in which to move these products to market.

MARCH 11, 1947.

Mr. J. MONROE JOHNSON,
Director, Office of Defense Transportation, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.:

Unless immediate steps are taken to furnish northern grain carriers with adequate supply of boxcars to move wheat now clogging country stations to Minneapolis market, Government must assume full responsibility for further rise in wheat prices and resulting increases in cost of living through higher bread and other prices.

Government already mainly responsible for recent price increases through its purchases of grain and flour for shipment abroad, since Government has been aggressive bidder for the limited supply of grain available in the cash market due to the shortage of boxcars for the movement of grain awaiting transportation in this territory.

Railroads in this area which are large owners of boxcars especially constructed for shipment of grain, today have only small percentage of their total boxcar ownership on their lines. For example: Great Northern has only 52 percent, Northern Pacific, 68 percent, and Soo Line, 57 percent.

Coincidentally, various eastern railroads are reported to have car supplies totaling more than 100 perecent of their ownership.

This condition is ridiculous and indefensible in view of urgent necessity of moving wheat and other grains to this market, as possible means of retarding or reversing constantly mounting prices and cost of living.

Hundreds of elevators on these northern railroads are clogged with grain while buyers compete for small supplies trickling into market due to lack of boxcars.

Major portion of wheat still available for food is in farmers' bins and cannot be marketed until plugged elevators are cleared through increase in boxcars. Farmers wishing to sell grain at present prices unable to do so because of famine of cars.

Promises of relief to date have not been fufilled and unless immediate and extensive increase is ordered and provided in number of empty boxcars furnished to these northern railroads present shortage of supplies in cash market will continue, with probable further increase in prices and cost of living.

Shortage of boxcars also partly responsible for advancing corn prices, and unless this situation is relieved, vast quantities of corn are in danger of spoilage, rendering it unfit for human or animal consumption. This would result in a costly national waste of food.

Only Government can correct this condition, which affects every farmer with grain to sell and every consumer of bread. Association of American Railways has failed to meet situation.

Drastic measures which only the highest authority can apply are required and justified. Unless needed steps are taken at once full responsibility must be be assumed by authorities who fail to act.

NORTHWEST COUNTY ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION,
Grain Exchange Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN COMMISSION MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
Grain Exchange Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

Pinks in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to you some 4 months ago by the Honorable Hamilton Fish, former senior Republican member of both the House Rules Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee:

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: As one who served for 20 years on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and for many years as its ranking minority member, I feel impelled to write to you as the next Republican Speaker of the House urging an immediate investigation of the infiltration of Communists, fellow travelers, pinks, and left-wing New Dealers into places of responsibility in the State Department.

At the proper time, I shall be glad to submit the names of the Communists and fellow travelers who, like a lot of termites, have wormed their way into our Foreign Service and should be summarily dismissed.

The Communists or red Fascists who seek to subvert our American system and to appease Soviet Russia and its satellite nations will be the easiest to drive out of public life on their records. There is another category, far more insidious, of fellow travelers, parlor pinks, and left-wing New Dealers who while denying any Communist allegiance generally follow the party line. These radical and extreme left wingers have been screened into the State Department for the past 14 years and constitute an almost impassible barrier toward the establishment of a genuine American foreign policy that is neither pro-Soviet nor pro-British. For years, left wingers have been deliberately screened into our Foreign Service until today they pass on statistics and results of investigations transmitted to the top policy makers. Thus, they are in a position to, and actually do, distort and color this information with a strong communistic or leftist slant.

If the Republicans in Congress are to have any real cooperation with the administration, we must insist on a complete housecleaning of the Communists, fellow travelers, and extreme leftists from out of positions of trust in our diplomatic service and in other bureaus and departments of the Government. For the best interests of our country we cannot afford to wait until a Republican President is elected in 1948 to have a thorough purge of these communistic and un-American elements.

If the administration fails to cooperate, then the Congress should conduct its own investigation.

The same investigation should inquire regarding the entrance of foreign-born Communists, Reds, and other undesirables into the United States through connivance of the State Department in bypassing legitimate quotas.

Such an investigation might well also ascertain the responsibility for the issuance of communistic textbooks to GI classrooms by the Army advocating prohibition of the right to inherit any wealth and that "land and capital must be socialized if national economic planning is to be effective."

I urge that you adhere to your announced policy of conducting a series of factual probes into the corruption, waste, and malfeasance of New Deal bureaucrats, but above all to reopen the Pearl Harbor investigation and to turn the light of pitiless publicity on the Communist espionage within the United States.

Wishing you every success as the first Republican Speaker in 16 years,

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

NOVEMBER 15, 1946.

The World Situation of U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an editorial from the Carroll County Independent of March 21, 1947, entitled "Strictly on Our Own—Now":

STRICTLY ON OUR OWN—NOW

The discussion on help to Greece and Turkey goes on and on. While we are debating whether or no we shall help those countries, we are also debating whether or no we shall take our place as the world's leading power or hand that position over to Russia.

Russia is a powerful, expanding nation, ruled by men who are intensely ambitious. Russia's leaders secured their background and training in the pitiless school of European power politics. They are avaricious, cynical, and ruthless.

If we give Russia free rein in Europe we can expect to wake up 10, 15, or 20 years from now and find that Russia has organized, consolidated, and rebuilt Europe to further her own objectives with regard for no other nation or people.

In the States we have always considered England and France as our bulwarks against aggression. That is, they have always given us time to train and equip our armies.

Today France is disorganized, with no money, no equipment, and torn by political strife.

England is almost bankrupt. During the war she sold off her investments in foreign lands to meet the expenses of defense. Her standard of living is almost lower than it was in wartime. She owes huge sums to her one-time colonies. She is withdrawing from some of her great possessions. In no sense can England be rated the great power that she was in 1937, 10 short years ago.

That puts the United States squarely on the spot. It is not a question of crusading for democracy, right or wrong, or the four freedoms.

It is simply a question of where the balance of power in the world is going to rest and who is going to have control of that power.

We in the United States have been luckier during the last three decades than any other people in the world. We have not been invaded, bombed, burned out, pillaged, or occupied as have nearly all the nations of Europe and great sections of Asia.

Because misfortune has never come to us is no reason that it cannot or will not come.

From now on, we have no great nations to protect us while we prepare to resist an aggressor. We are strictly on our own.

United States Veterans' Administration Should Take Over St. Albans Naval Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

THE SENATE,
STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, March 21, 1947.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Fifteenth Congressional District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing herewith copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 11, introduced by Mr. Halpern, adopted in the senate on March 13, 1947, and concurred in by the assembly on March 14, 1947, memorializing Congress to establish a veterans' hospital in the Borough of Queens.

Also enclosing herewith copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 68, introduced by Mr Halpern, adopted in the senate on March 11, 1947, and concurred in by the assembly on the same date, memorializing Congress to take appropriate action to authorize the United States Veterans' Administration to take over the St. Albans Naval Hospital.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 68

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, March 11, 1947.

Whereas the county of Queens, in the city and State of New York, has a population of 1,369,000 of whom 207,033 are veterans of World Wars I or II, or of the Spanish-American War, and the adjoining counties of Nassau and Suffolk have a combined veteran population in excess of 140,000; and

Whereas most of these veterans requiring medical treatment or having claims for adjudication must travel great distances to the Veterans' Administration facility in the Bronx or regional office in Manhattan, and such travel causes severe hardship, particularly to those disabled; and

Whereas the naval hospital at St. Albans, Queens County, N. Y., has a plant which fits it admirably for use as a combined facility of the Veterans' Administration providing adjudication service, out-patient service, examinations, rehabilitation service, and an orthopedic section; and

Whereas the St. Albans Naval Hospital, with the Long Island railroad and various bus lines providing service at its door, offers convenient travel facilities to residents of Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties; and

Whereas some of the wards at the St. Albans Naval Hospital are now being used by the Veterans' Administration on a temporary basis and others have been closed or are being used for storage purposes; and

Whereas those facts make it evident that the Veterans' Administration can with little expense, no delay, and no inconvenience to the Navy, establish a combined facility at St. Albans, N. Y., providing convenient and adequate treatment and service for the large veteran population of the three counties named; and

Whereas the shortage of space for rent and the obstacles to new construction generally prevailing make it improbable that such a combined facility can be opened elsewhere in any of the three counties named within 3 years or more: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to authorize the United States Veterans' Administration to take on the St. Albans Naval Hospital to provide adjudication service, out-patient service, examinations, rehabilitation service, and as an orthopedic section; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Administrator of the United States Veterans' Administration, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly: March 11, 1947.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Senate Resolution 11

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN SENATE, ALBANY, *March 13, 1947.*

By Mr. Halpern:

Whereas the Borough and County of Queens, State of New York, is larger in population than many of the States in the United States; and

Whereas Queens does not possess adequate United States Veterans' facilities for hospitalization of wounded and disabled veterans; and

Whereas a large number of men formerly in the armed forces, who now require hospital, medical or surgical treatment, came from localities in or contiguous to Queens

and must travel great distances to receive proper attention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorialize Congress to establish a veterans' hospital and maintain suitable facilities for the hospitalization of such veterans in the Borough of Queens, City of New York and State of New York; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Member of Congress from the State of New York and to the Administrator of the United States Veterans' Administration.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly, March 14, 1947.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

People Demand Federal Appropriation Cuts Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received almost innumerable letters, telegrams, and long distance telephone calls from the people of my district and other congressional districts in the State of Oklahoma, and from other places scattered all over the Nation, demanding that this Congress reduce the Federal budget by drastically cutting appropriations and Federal expenditures. The people are demanding Federal appropriation cuts now.

Typical of the demands of the people, I am pleased to quote the following letter, which speaks for itself:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *March 5, 1947.*
Congressman GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We all know that costs have increased since 1940. Government bungling has increased expense in private industry as well as in our National Government, causing the dollar to be deflated and prices to be inflated.

In our business costs have doubled since 1940. However, the cost of Government is three and one-half times the 1940 rate. We realize a large Navy, Army, and Air Corps has increased costs, but three and one-half is a big number to be used as a multiplier.

The Joint Legislative Budget Committee recommended a ceiling of $31,500,000,000. We feel that is plenty high. Private business is forced to trim expenses, eliminate needless waste, and return to a firm competitive basis. Why can't our Federal Government do likewise? The Army and Navy, through a little real economy, can eliminate sufficient needless waste to absorb the cut proposed in their budget and not in any way impair the Nation's defense. Numerous other Government agencies can be entirely eliminated now, not several months hence, but now. Those agencies which do remain can be reduced 25 percent to 50 percent by eliminating all the dead timber and needless expense without impairing one iota the actual service rendered to the public.

We are not talking in generalities or riddles; we are talking about things we actually know, because we have a lot of contact with many different Government agencies and we see these agencies overstaffed from 40 percent to 60 percent, occupying high rental space, as well as incurring other operating expense. If they were reduced to the actual needs the budget could be reduced to $31,500,000,000 and be able to pay up to $10,000,000,000 on the national debt. It is time for the political pork barrel back scratching to stop or our Nation is going to be thrown into communism and bankruptcy.

Very truly yours,

R. W. ROBBERSON.

The Occupation of Monmouth County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me, I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of these remarks an excellent editorial which appeared in the Asbury Park Press on March 21 entitled "The Occupation of Monmouth County," and I hope it will be read by my colleagues.

Up to the time the war broke out, Monmouth County in New Jersey was fast developing into an expanding farm and home area in the State. It offered unusual opportunities for recreation, having fine ocean bathing and fishing facilities as well as riding, golf, and game hunting. With the war came the Army and Navy with ever-expanding demands which the residents responded to with enthusiastic and unselfish patriotism. Now that the war is over and the time has come to cut down expenses wherever possible, the people properly expect to receive back some of the things that have been taken from them. The Army and Navy should show greater cooperation in this respect than they have.

The Army now proposes to spend $1,175,000 in building 30 additional quarters for officers at the Signal Corps depot at Fort Monmouth, although the personnel stationed there now is much reduced from what it was during the war when they got along without these buildings. Furthermore, if these buildings are really needed—which is open to grave question—they should be built on the presently occupied extensive camp area and not on the country club property as proposed. The country club property should be sold to private owners and restored to the local tax rolls.

Protests have been made to the Secretary of War concerning this and he is conducting an investigation. I am in favor of the support of a strong Army and Navy but I am strongly opposed to this sort of wasteful and unnecessary expenditure. The editorial which well expresses the views of the community follows:

THE OCCUPATION OF MONMOUTH COUNTY

The conquest of Monmouth County proceeds apace. At the present rate it will not be long before the entire county is converted into a military and naval reservation with scarcely any territory left for the civilian population that foots the bill for the occupation forces.

Fort Hancock commands all of Sandy Hook; Fort Monmouth has usurped the heart of a thriving residential area; the Earle ammunition depot consumes a vast stretch of land and divides the county with a private ammunition railroad and highway and blocks the south channel of Raritan Bay with a loading pier; the State encampment at Sea Girt deprives the public of a stretch of fine beach; Camp Evans extends over a large tract of land that was ready for residential development, in addition to occupying a fine hotel; and incidental installments such as Camp Wood deprive the county of hundreds of additional acres of land that has been taken off the tax rolls.

During the war emergency the people of Monmouth County did not resist the occupation forces. They were ready to make any contribution to victory, even though the Army and Navy often seemed to be occupying more land and spending more money than was necessary to win even a global war. But now that the war is over the people of Monmouth County feel that they are entitled to share in the peace. They resent such ridiculous projects as the construction of 30 buildings for officers' quarters on the site of the Monmouth County Country Club. Here was a splendid club and recreation center that paid a sizable tax bill to the borough of Eatontown and the county. It was yielded to the Army during the war but it was presumed that it would shortly thereafter be returned to private owners and to the tax rolls. But the Army, apparently eager to show that it needs larger appropriations by spending every dollar at its disposal, plans permanently to occupy the country club site and spend over a million dollars in erecting officers' quarters, even though abandoned Army buildings elsewhere would supply the accommodations it needs for officers.

Congress, prompted into action by the protests of the people of Monmouth County, should call off this invasion. It should do so to save Monmouth County for the people of Monmouth County and to prevent a waste of funds on military projects of doubtful necessity. We have heard a great deal lately of the billions needed for national defense. Most Americans will be inclined to grant the necessary appropriations. But when the Army wastes its funds by erecting new officers' quarters when satisfactory accommodations are already available there is indication that the national defense budget it requests is subject to further scrutiny.

The United States Marine Corps and Its Part in National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an address by Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, Commandant, United States Marine Corps, at the Navy Council Conference February 5, 1947. This timely and significant presentation reflects the thoughts of many of us who had the honor and privilege of serving under General Vandegrift in the Southwest Pacific.

I do hope that in future legislation we of Congress never allow the identity of

this valiant organization to be lost or forgotten in the shuffle of unification.

Military organizations, like nations and individuals, are subject to nature's laws of survival. With age they acquire dignity and distinction, but sometimes over the course of the years they lose the vigor and robust character that gave them their initial impetus. When this happens, they are replaced. They have lost their usefulness and must give way to a hardier species.

The dead tree topples with the storm while the live oak with its branches extended to the heavens and its roots embedded in the native soil survives as a symbol of life, growth, and usefulness.

The Marine Corps is a live oak, and I am glad to inform its friends here today that it intends to survive. Its roots extend to every town and hamlet in the land which it has served so well and for so long. Its sound trunk is the long roll of its memorable achievements and its branches extended are symbolic of great service yet to be rendered to a nation which supports it and believes in it.

The part of the Marine Corps in national security imposes many obligations. Success in battle is the most obvious, but it can never be attained if we have failed in other fields. Great armies have been vanquished merely because they found no support in the hearts and minds of the people from which they came. Their failure was in the field of moral preparation.

Moral preparation is the opposite of militarism. For Americans in civil life it consists in a steadfast belief that our form of government, our institutions, and our ideals are worthy of preservation, that the freedom which we enjoy gives us each a way of life characterized by a complete liberty to find our individual path toward whatever goal of achievement, happiness, and security we may have set for ourselves. But we never forget that the price we must pay for these benefits is the continuing obligation to defend them. If we should ever come to believe that this debt has been discharged in full then will we stand within measurable distance of losing everything we have created during our span of life as a free nation.

The Marine Corps is keenly aware that it is this motive of good citizenship which has impelled so many thousands of the Nation's young manhood to join its ranks in time of war. It appreciates the depth of the patriotic urge which has led these same young men to accept the hazards of battle in a branch of the service which has historically regarded as its chief honor the execution of the most dangerous and desperate of combat assignments.

In its turn the Marine Corps feels its own distinct obligation to these men who fill its ranks. It knows that the desire to serve one's country in time of war is the highest expression of a responsible citizenship. These men came to the colors to vindicate their belief in the dignity of man—they must therefore be accorded a status and treatment in the service that supports them in their belief. These men answered the call because they have been taught to believe in democracy—they must therefore find an expression of democracy in their military service. Military service is an honorable thing and we fail in our duty if we do not provide the man in our corps with a service in which he can serve with the utmost self-respect and the conviction that his civilian ideals are likewise a matter of daily practice within the military environment in which he has chosen to exercise his right to bear arms in defense of these same ideals.

This is the philosophy of the Marine Corps. It has borne fruit in two great wars. We have had little to offer our young men except a hard and hazardous life, yet there has never been a failure of morale or of spirit or of the will to carry the fight to the enemy. Above all we have had the supreme satisfaction of seeing these men leave the Marine Corps at war's end free from bitterness and recrimination. Wherever they have gone they have carried with them back to our native soil, something that will make our country stronger in mind and in character to replenish that great reservoir of belief, faith, and conviction which is the ultimate source of a great nation's strength. This then is the fundamental contribution of the Marine Corps to our national security that, in peace, it returns to the land in renewed form the strength that it must find in war.

While the roots of the oak may be hidden to the eye, the trunk which they support requires less description. The Marine Corps has rendered 172 years of continuous and honorable military service to the country. It has provided more national defense at less cost than any other comparable military organization and it remains today the Nation's principal force in readiness for emergency use.

But a corps, or in fact any military organization, cannot be fully useful merely by maintaining itself in a physical state of being at the expense of the taxpayer. It must know where it is going and what it proposes to do when it gets there. We have always known where we were going and we have always been confident of our ability to give a good account of ourselves when we reached our destination. I can best illustrate my point by referring briefly to the last 25 years in Marine Corps history.

In 1921, the Marine Corps became convinced that an eventual war with Japan was inevitable; that it would be an amphibious war requiring seizure of island bases required for the advance of our seapower and airpower to within striking range of the heart of the Japanese Empire.

At that time there existed nothing to tell us how this was to be done. We had before us only the ghastly lesson of the Dardanelles campaign where the British had lost so many thousands of brave men in the failure of their landings at Gallipoli. It was a lesson so tragic that military men the world over classified the landing attack as a feat of arms impossible in modern warfare.

Our reply was that the coming war with Japan would require us nevertheless to seize the mighty fortified positions she was erecting in the Pacific. There was no alternative, as subsequent events so fully proved.

We began work in 1921 to create the forces and develop the methods and equipment that had to be found. We studied the problem step by step for 20 years and in the utmost of detail. The seizure of Guam, Saipan, Truk, and the Palaus, names now familiar to every American, were enacted and perfected in the classroom and on the field of maneuver year after year with an approach to reality which in retrospect seems amazing.

We were ready on the day war struck, ready not only to play our own part in the conflict, but to train others and to teach others so that the benefits of what we had created could be put to use by every army and navy of the allied world in waging this new kind of warfare which we alone had foreseen. We knew where we were going, and we helped to point out the way to others; we are as proud of this unseen accomplishment as we are of Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima, and the other historic milestones of the long, hard road that led from Pearl Harbor to Tokyo.

To view the past with a justifiable pride is one thing, but to regard it complacently as a guaranty of invincibility in the future is another. To live the tree extends its branches upward, and a military service must do the same. Its branches are its plans to meet the problems of the future; to prepare for the new danger in anticipation of the event itself.

In some quarters there is a tendency to shrink from the implications accompanying the recent awesome advances in the application of science to warfare. The Marine Corps knows that an epoch in the development of military sciences ended with the dropping of the bomb at Hiroshima. It has examined the facts carefully and appraised them with realism and studied detachment. Its motive is to find an answer with the same hard core of fact that it reached in 1921 when it could so accurately forecast the form and substance of the great amphibious war of the Pacific.

We have reached the conclusion that the principle of sea power in the sense of the use of seas as the great highways of peace and war remains unaffected by any present development or any future development which is reasonably foreseeable. Warring nations will continue to regard the control and use of the oceans as primary objectives for as long as it remains cheaper, easier, and safer to slide cargoes of war through the water than to lift their dead weight through the air.

We will continue for many years then to require our Navy as the primary instrument in the enforcement of sea power and the denial of the ocean's use to enemy powers. The fleets and aircraft of a future war will continue to require bases to advance their striking power to hostile shores in the defense of our own. Upon the Marine Corps, as the Nation's primary amphibious force, there rests the continuing obligation of holding itself in readiness to seize bases required in the prosecution of any war of the future just as in the wars of the past.

An additional factor has in fact now arisen to emphasize the vital nature of our historic mission and to surround it with an extraordinary sense of urgency. In the future, enemy bases established in this hemisphere even beyond our shores might well endanger our cities and industrial centers with long-range atomic missiles. There must be maintained at all times a force in readiness to reduce such threats before they can undo us. This force must be maintained as part of the Navy in an actual momentary state of readiness to strike. We have maintained such a force for many years; it is the Fleet Marine Force, an integral part of the fleet for use in war and peace alike. It is the force which formed the spearhead of the amphibious drive across the Pacific. It is the force which may in some future war prove to be a shield against surprise attack.

But the methods which the Fleet Marine Force used so effectively from Guadalcanal to Okinawa will not suffice in a future war. We have assessed the threat of the atom bomb and the guided missile and we underestimate the potency of neither. We have turned our backs sharply on the past and are grappling with the new problems. Others may slumber complacently in the fox holes of the war just ended, but we will not. If we are to be confronted with the catastrophe of another war, we will not meet it with the antiquated weapons and methods of the past.

Our tentative beginnings have indicated some degree of promise. If I can tell you little of a definite nature concerning them I think you will understand the reason. We do not intend to fail the Navy or the Nation in advancing our amphibious specialty to meet the standards of this new age.

I sincerely hope that we have your confidence that the Marine Corps is aware of its responsibilities and will persist in its efforts. Your confidence is in last analysis the thing that will determine the question of success or failure of the armed forces of a nation. The confidence of a people in their cause kept Washington's ragged Army in the field when no one could, with reason, hope or dream of victory. It sustained us in the black days following Pearl Harbor. That confidence has never been misplaced and it

is a powerful force. For example, the weapon that conquered Iwo Jima was not produced in the vast arsenal of industry, but in the hearts of the American people who were represented there by the finest they could send to do battle with our mortal enemy. It is not too much to say that the future of the Marine Corps, of the Navy, or of the Nation itself rests finally not in our hands, but in your hearts.

Labor Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the House Labor Committee has just finished public hearings on labor legislation. We are ready to write a labor bill and will present it to the House within the next 2 weeks. I realize we cannot solve all labor-management problems by legislation but we can stop some of the red labor leaders and stop labor racketeering. Our main objective should be to enact a labor law which would encourage settlement of disputes between labor and management by collective bargaining, thereby minimizing industrial strife, strikes, and lock-outs.

Our big job is to protect the public from union leaders who have misused their power; however, we must be careful not to restore the abuses of the past on the part of the employers.

As a member of the House Labor Committee for the past 8 years, I wish to discuss important labor legislation to prevent strikes. If the following amendments are adopted by the Eightieth Congress we will stop most of the labor abuses. If the executive department is sincere about cooperating with the Eightieth Congress, I believe the President will approve such a bill incorporating these provisions:

First. Individuals who participate in jurisdictional strikes lose the protection of the NLRA and Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Second. Individuals who participate in secondary boycotts lose protection of the NLRA and Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Third. Individuals who participate in mass picketing lose protection of the NLRA and Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Fourth. Individuals who participate in wildcat strikes lose the protection of the NLRA and Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Fifth. Individuals who participate in a strike to force an employer to commit an unfair labor practice lose the protection of the NLRA.

Sixth. Outlaw strikes against the Government.

Seventh. Make it a Federal offense for violence and destruction of property.

Eighth. Make it an unfair labor practice to bar a qualified person from a labor union.

Ninth. Make it an unfair labor practice to force an employer to hire more help than necessary.

Tenth. Assure the right of free speech to both employees and employers.

Eleventh. Equalize collective bargaining.

Twelfth. Give the employer the right to discharge a subversive individual.

Thirteenth. The NLRB shall not certify a union under the NLRA if the union elects an official or agent who has been convicted under the Alien Registration Act.

Fourteenth. The NLRB shall treat all legitimate unions alike.

Fifteenth. The NLRB shall hold secret elections in voting for bargaining representatives.

Sixteenth. No election shall be directed in any bargaining unit for a period of 12 months except upon petition from more than 30 percent of the employees.

Seventeenth. Give the employer the right to petition for an election in case of a dispute between two unions seeking to act as the bargaining representatives.

Eighteenth. Give foremen the right to join an independent organization.

Nineteenth. Require a 6 months' statute of limitation on filing of charges and issuing complaints.

Twentieth. Separate the powers of the NLRB by placing the prosecution in the hands of the Attorney General.

Twenty-first. Modify the closed shop by requiring a two-thirds vote of the membership.

Twenty-second. Outlaw political contributions and expenditures of labor unions.

Twenty-third. Require labor unions to make financial reports to the Secretary of Labor and their own membership.

Twenty-fourth. Write new definition of "commerce."

Twenty-fifth. Industry-wide strikes which affect the public health and safety of our citizens—30-day mediation, 30-day voluntary arbitration and 15 days to take a secret ballot.

Labor leaders will probably call these harsh and punitive measures, but these amendments will be necessary to create better labor and management relations and eliminate labor racketeering. Labor still has the right to strike and the rank and file of labor will have the right to take a greater part in their problems with the right of the secret ballot. Labor will still have the right to bargain with management on the local plant level, region, or on an industry-wide basis. They will still have the right to the voluntary check-off and the right to bargain collectively on wages, hours, safety measures and better working conditions.

No one should condone jurisdictional disputes, wildcat strikes, secondary boycotts, and violence and destruction of property. A jurisdictional dispute is one growing out of a dispute between two or more representatives of employees. Innocent employers should not be penalized because unions force a strike to settle difficulties between unions. The mine, mill, or factory should continue operating during jurisdictional disputes and wildcat strikes.

Representatives of the lumber industries proved conclusively that the production of lumber lost as the result of strikes and work stoppages alone would have provided enough lumber for 185,000 six-room homes. Most of these strikes were not over wages, hours, or better working conditions.

Secondary boycotts engaged in by labor unions to force a third party, not a party to a primary labor dispute, to force that party to cease using the products of the employer engaged in the primary dispute is an activity which should be made illegal. Secondary boycotts have had the effect of throwing a great many innocent people out of work. As a result of these secondary boycotts many of our citizens have been deprived of the deliveries of milk, bread, meat, fruits, vegetables, and other essentials of life.

A member of the Associated Farmers of California, who testified before our committee, cited many examples how boycotts have cost the Nation a loss of millions of dollars in food stuffs. For instance, the lettuce strike at Salinas in 1936 caused a loss of 2,000 cars of lettuce which would have been distributed over the United States. As recently as last fall 20,000 gallons of "hot milk" were dumped one morning in front of the city hall of Los Angeles. The term "hot milk" is that milk which is barred from the market and sale by the teamsters' union or any other union involved. They embargo the "hot milk" and invoke a secondary boycott against the delivery of any milk which they feel should be milked by union milkers, or hauled by union teamsters, or distributed by union drivers.

Close to $1,000,000 was lost in a similar asparagus strike. Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars worth of asparagus was dumped in one pile in San Joaquin County, Calif., alone. The farmers of California were forced to dump 76 carloads of lemons because they could not get them unloaded and delivered to the markets. In many instances where secondary boycotts have occurred, union trucks have refused to haul products of honest hard-working American farmers. If the farmers or dairymen try to haul for themselves, their trucks are destroyed and their lives threatened. The witness pointed out an example where a lady had built up a business in raising and marketing turkeys. The union served notice on her that she could no longer hire her neighbors to pick the turkeys and help her dress them; that she would have to hire union turkey pickers. She refused and the turkeys were later refused shipment. Other examples were given where there have been huge losses of pears, oranges, spinach, calavos, and other products.

In Philadelphia, local 929 has complete control over the wholesale produce dealers of that city in the sale and movement of perishable fruits and vegetables. The union leaders want the girl clerks of these wholesalers to become members of the teamsters' union. A returning veteran who went into business for himself testified that he was not permitted to use his own truck even though he employed a union driver and helper. The union demands that an employer may be permitted on the firm's premises on Saturday morning provided permission to do so is obtained from the union in advance. The union also demands that where a partnership of two persons exists, but who employ no salesmen, one

member of that partnership must be a member of this union. Therefore, in the event of a strike one partner would be forced to picket the other. By reason of these high handed methods $125,000 worth of perishable fruits and vegetables have rotted because these dealers were prevented physically from either moving or selling them since January 6 of this year.

The Constitution gives us the right of free speech and with this right the privilege of peaceful picketing. However, it does not give us the right to block the entrance to places of employment and prevent employees from entering and leaving. Therefore, mass picketing must be abolished.

Employers and employees must be assured the right of free speech. There was no intention of Congress to deny the right of free speech to anyone under the NLRA. The right of free speech is guaranteed to all citizens in the first amendment of the Constitution. If we are allowed to take this right away from one group, there may come a time when an administration in power would want to take this right away from all groups.

No subversive individual should be allowed to hold office in a labor union. An employer should have the right to discharge a subversive individual at any time. I am certain the rank and file of labor are anxious to remove subversive leaders from their organizations. The NLRB should not certify a labor union under the NLRA if the union selects an official, agent, or attorney who has been convicted under the Alien Registration Act.

No employer should be required to hire more help than necessary. Caesar Petrillo, the czar of the musicians' union decided that our American children must not participate in a musical program over the radio network of this Nation unless the station or a sponsor was willing to pay union musicians to do nothing else but stand by in the studio during the children's program. Thus, the children in 200,000 rural schools in the United States are denied the opportunity to learn to play musical instruments by the dictates of one man—Petrillo.

In conclusion, I would like to ask you, Are any of these proposals contrary to the best interests of the public? Are any of these proposals contrary to the best interests of the rank and file of American workers? You know the answers. This industrial unrest proves that our present labor laws are thoroughly inadequate of attaining industrial peace. And we intend to do something about it in terms of what is best for all of the people.

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

Industry-wide bargaining has been very helpful and desirable in many cases but it has retarded negotiations in other cases. I do not believe we can restrict industry-wide bargaining and add to industrial peace. Many times local unions have bogged down in their negotiations with their employers. Many of these local representatives are untrained and are dominated by elements much more radical than are their international organizations.

If we outlaw industry-wide bargaining I fear we will have industrial chaos in the United States. The proposals which have been introduced in Congress will change collective-bargaining arrangements for Nation-wide and regional areas. Those industries affected bargaining on a national basis are: coal, stove, wallpaper, pottery, glass, elevator installation and repair, and installation of automatic sprinklers. Those industries affected bargaining on a regional basis are: steel, automobile, longshoring, maritime, lumber, shoes, paper, dyeing, fishing, canning, leather, metal mining, and hosiery. Therefore, to outlaw industry-wide bargaining would be unworkable. The national organization would recommend demands to be made simultaneously to competing employers. The same demand made at the same time on all employers would establish common control and concerted action and disqualify many good bargaining agents.

CLOSED SHOP

The closed shop form of union security originated and prevails in those trades and industries where special crafts, requiring high skills and long years of training still predominate. About 30 percent of the organized workers of America belong to closed-shop unions. A closed-shop contract is gained through collective-bargaining agreements. The employer agrees to employ none other than members of the unions carrying membership cards.

At least a majority or two-thirds of the workers in a plant should agree to the closed shop before submitting it to collective bargaining.

I prefer the union shop to the closed shop because the employer is free to hire nonunion workers and is the sole judge of the qualifications of the applicants. Union membership may be acquired immediately following employment or within a stipulated period thereafter.

One of the big labor questions the Eightieth Congress has to face is the consideration of the closed shop, the union shop, and maintenance of membership. If the Congress outlaws the closed shop where old contracts exist we can expect to create industrial strife in closed-shop plants in the next 6 months. If Congress outlaws the closed shop, will it also outlaw the union shop and maintenance of membership?

Several proposals have been offered as a compromise on this issue:

First. Outlaw strikes to bargain for a closed shop, but if management and labor agree on this issue it may be a part of the contract.

Second. Require a two-thirds vote of the total membership of a plant before the labor representatives can bargain for a closed shop, but continue present closed-shop contracts for 1 year.

Third. Give individual States the right to outlaw closed-shop contracts.

CHECK-OFF

The voluntary check-off method is the best because employees who desire to have their union dues checked off are required to sign a formal authorization which may be binding for the duration of the agreement or revocable at any time upon written notice. In many cases the union and employer agrees to the check-off.

Many employers prefer the check-off to stop constant campaigns for dues at the plant gates. Much time is lost on the premise by union officers making collections. Many employees have been checked off for war bonds, Red Cross funds, community-chest drives, sick and death benefits.

Consider Agriculture From the State Level and Standpoint of the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from the able president of the State board of Agriculture of the State of Oklahoma, Mr. Joe C. Scott, emphasizing the importance for Members of Congress to consider agriculture from State levels and from the standpoint of the individual farmer. Mr. Scott sent me a copy of the resolutions of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, adopted at their Detroit meeting, November 18–21, 1946. He checked for my special consideration some of the resolutions which I think should be brought to the attention of Congress. It shows the thinking of the commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture of the various States. Apparently they are somewhat disconcerted about the attitude that has been assumed from the Washington or Federal level. They insist that their local activities be not duplicated by Federal agencies and activities, but that the functions of the Federal agencies be more or less limited to that of cooperation with the State departments of agriculture in the interests of the individual farmers.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to think that these State agents feel that they know the problems of the individual farmers of their respective States and are eminently better qualified to assist and serve the farmers of their States than are the Federal agents with the Washington viewpoint. Whatever is best for the farmers of one State may not be best for the farmers of another State. They do not want to be told from Washington how to handle the problems of the farmers of the individual States. They do not want all of their activities duplicated with a super-duper outfit from Washington. Methinks they want to be let alone and allowed to handle their own affairs in situations that are especially local in character. A lot of duplication has grown up and the Federal agencies should not attempt to duplicate State activities and Congress should not pass appropriations implementing such duplications.

I quote the following resolutions adopted by the national association last fall:

CURTAILMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS TO FEDERAL AGENCIES THAT DUPLICATE STATE ACTIVITIES

Whereas there appears increasing evidence that agencies of the Federal Government are, in the course of their operation, duplicating, setting aside, or carrying on programs conflicting with activities required to be performed by State departments of agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, That the officers of our association be directed to attempt to secure from the Appropriations Committees of the National House of Representatives and Senate agreement to the following policy:

That no appropriations shall be made to any Federal agency for expenditure in any State for the purpose of carrying on programs which shall duplicate, set aside, or conflict with official activities being carried on in such State by its department of agriculture

Marketing activities of the United States Department of Agriculture to be done through cooperative agreements with State departments of agriculture.

Whereas certain Federal agencies are endeavoring to assume the functions of the State departments of agriculture in inspecting, reporting, and marketing activities: and

Whereas this is detrimental to the State departments of agriculture and is contrary to the principles of States' rights: Be it

Resolved by the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, That all work that it is necessary for the Federal Government to conduct in the various States along inspecting, reporting, and marketing lines shall be done through and in cooperation with the various State departments of agriculture by cooperative agreements or such other methods as are mutually agreeable.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COOPERATION

Resolved, That the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture request the United States Public Health Service to confer and cooperate with the legally authorized sanitation enforcement agencies in the State before inaugurating or carrying out any programs of activity relative to sanitation in that State.

SOIL CONSERVATION POLICY

Resolved, That in the formulation of national agricultural policiy major emphasis be placed on soil conservation and that in the execution of soil conservation programs full and adequate provision be made for participation of State departments of agriculture and local subdivision of government and local control vested in farmer committees.

Race Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily Clarion-Ledger of date of March 20, 1947, on the subject of segregation, which I think is very appropriate at this time and should be read by every Member of this House:

SEGREGATION IS NECESSARY FOR PROTECTION OF BOTH RACES

The Los Angeles news story reporting a strike by more than 500 high-school students in protest against the admission of Negroes to the school, the strike being marked by a mass demonstration climaxed by the hanging of a Negro in effigy, is not pleasant but neither is it surprising.

It is another reminder of the fundamental truth that, where large numbers of members of the white and colored races have to live together, segregation of the races is necessary for the protection and best interest of both, and is the only practical way of preventing friction and clashes.

Where the members of one race are a very small minority it is comparatively easy to tolerate racial differences, and segregation may not be necessary. But where many members of both races have to live near each other, with constant contacts, friction, and clashes become almost inevitable without segregation.

In this Los Angeles case, the admission of one Negro pupil last year aroused no protests, but when eight were enrolled this year, the strike followed.

The report of such a story from Los Angeles is not surprising. Similar reports from Detroit or other cities to which Negroes have migrated in large numbers in recent years, as they have to Los Angeles, would not be surprising. If migration of Negroes from the South during the next 5 years attains predicted scales—and some estimate that mechanization of cotton growing will cause 5,000,000 to leave the South—then racial problem will truly become a national problem, and legal racial segregation will become more than a southern institution.

It will be practiced, legally or informally but effectively, in cities of other sections, for the protection of both races, as it is in many cities now.

Our Economy Is Built on Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the March 22 issue of the Belleville (Ill.) Daily News-Democrat. This editorial, entitled "Back to Normalcy?" reflects a very sound insight into the economic problems now facing our country:

BACK TO NORMALCY?

Too often we hear the pessimistic query: "When is the country going to get back to normal?"

Most of us seem to forget and fail to take into account the fact that in this country there is no such thing as normalcy—we are constantly in a process of change.

Our country has been endowed with many national assets. Here we find the highest employment quotient and pay rolls in peacetime history. We have the greatest potential productive capacity, the highest national income, greatest money accumulation, American inventive genius which has brought a new high in industries and an unsurpassed pent-up demand for goods and services—all this plus a land of 140,000,000 persons with a birthright never before possessed by any people.

We are still a young, virile Nation. We have proved that our form of government, backed by a united people, can emerge triumphant from a world cataclysm. We know that our democracy is equipped with all the machinery necessary to cope with the problems of its constituents

Why then should we fear the future?

Without change there can be no progress. This country can stand changes—our economy is built upon them. So let them continue. Let them come more frequently, so that we can move forward with them.

Parentage of American Youth for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 21 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Governor and the Legislature of the State of Michigan are cooperating with our Congress in an effort to halt the spread of subversive propaganda and doctrines by Communists and their fronters. One of these fronts is the American Youth for Democracy and I have prepared a study of the background and parentage of this organization for the consideration of my constituents. It follows:

CITIZENS OF THE EIGHTH DISTRICT: STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

Hon J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, upon accepting the American Legion Distinguished Service Medal, declared, "We are rapidly reaching the time when loyal Americans must be willing to stand up and be counted." Director Hoover was referring to the fight against the growth of the un-American communistic philosophy in the United States. It appears that the time has now arrived when the citizens of Michigan should be willing to stand up and be counted.

Governor Kim Sigler has set about to rid the State pay roll and educational system of Communists and Communist sympathizers. No sooner had the announcement of his intentions reached the public than certain elements vociferously, "Stood up to be counted" and immediately launched a smear campaign to divert attention from the aims of the Governor's inquiry. Sensible citizens will look beyond the smears to the originators of the attacks.

It should be borne in mind that the Communist Party of the United States of America has itself declared: "The Communist Party will systematically and persistently propagate the idea of the inevitability of and necessity for violent revolution and will prepare the workers for armed insurrection as the only means of overthrowing the capitalistic state." In 1942 the Attorney General of the United States (Mr. Biddle) in a "findings of fact" declared "that the Communist Party of the United States of America from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States," and "that the Communist Party of

the United States from the time of its inception to the present time is an organization that causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, and displayed printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

PARTY NOT A PARTY

As pointed out by Director Hoover, "the American Communist Party, despite its claims, is not truly a political party. The Communist Party in this country is not working for the general welfare of all our people. It is working against our people. It is not interested in providing for the common defense. It has for its purpose the shackling of America and its conversion to the godless, Communist way of life. If it were a political party, its adherents could be appealed to by reason. Instead, it is a system of intrigue, actuated by fanaticism. It knows no rules of decency. Its unprincipled converts would sell America short if it would help their cause of furthering an alien way of life conceived in darkness and motivated by greed for power whose ultimate aim is the destruction of our cherished freedom. Let us no longer be misled by their sly propaganda and false preachments on civil liberty. They want civil license to do as they please, and if they get control, liberty for Americans will be but a haunted memory. For those who seek to provoke prejudice and stir up the public mind to angry resentment against our form of government are a menace to the very powers of law and order which guarantee and safeguard popular rights."

AMERICAN YOUTH FOR DEMOCRACY

This is the organization largely responsible for the present investigation of un-American activity now being conducted under the direction of the Governor and in that connection citizens of the State of Michigan should know the background of this organization whose leaders boast that they are operating in the schools and colleges of our State. G-man Hoover ably identified this group when he said: "In our own country and in our own time, we have seen another youth movement arise. It still flourishes. I refer to that high-sounding, idealistic title, 'American Youth for Democracy,' which conceals the evils and the corruption of American communism. This name is but a new one for the former Young Communist League. It reflects all the sinister purposes of the Communist Party of the United States. It employs the same techniques and has the same objectives—namely, the conversion of our haven of liberty and freedom to worship as we choose to a godless, totalitarian state where the adversaries of democracy can do as they please. Their attacks should be proclaimed from every pulpit and headlined in every newspaper in the land."

EVOLUTION OF AYD

Those who scoff at the Governor's attack on the American Youth for Democracy are certainly not acquainted with the evolution of that organization. From 1922 to 1925 the junior branch of the Communist Party was known as the Young Workers League and from 1925 to 1929 it functioned as the Young Workers (Communist) League. For 3 months after May Day 1929 the group operated as the Communist Youth League and became officially known as the Young Communist League on August 1, 1929. It continued to function openly as an arm of the Communist International until it went underground with other Communist organizations in 1943.

NO MERE ACCIDENT.

It did not just happen that the Young Communist League passed out of the picture on one day and the American Youth for Democracy showed up on the next day. Those wanting to know facts should refer to the Communist Daily Worker, page 1, October 16, 1943, where a story appears declaring that over 5,000 young Americans met "as the Young Communist League opened its historic national convention to consider its own dissolution and the building of a new anti-Fascist organization of youth." Two days later the same Communist newspaper announced "a new American anti-Fascist youth organization was born at the Mecca Temple yesterday as 332 delegates representing 190 community clubs and 150 guests and observers ended an organization convention initiated by the Young Communist League. * * * The new convention decided to name the new organization American Youth for Democracy."

Not only did Young Communist League thus take credit for initiating the convention which gave birth to the AYD but the principal officers of the Young Communist League were elected to high positions of control in the American Youth for Democracy outfit. Max Weiss, former YCL officer, and now editor of a communistic monthly magazine, declared, "All Communists will naturally hope that thousands of youth who join the new organization (AYD) will also later join the Communist Party and that many will become leaders of the Communist Party."

MICHIGAN CHAMELEONS

No one should know better than a group of young men and women from Michigan of the ability of young Communists to change their colors for the benefit of public appeal in true chameleon fashion. Michigan has always had sizable representation in the conventions of the American Youth for Democracy and as a matter of fact Michigan stood third among 16 States in the number of delegates to second annual AYD convention in 1946. Surely these young people know of the Communist background of their leaders. It was not mere happenstance that Carl Ross, former head of the Young Communist League in New York, became executive director in AYD. Neither was it a coincidence that Robert Thompson, formerly of the Ohio Young Communist League, was elected cochairman of AYD. Oddly enough, elected to serve as cochairman with Thompson was Naomi Ellison, identified in congressional records as editor of a magazine classified among Communist Party organs. Miss Ellison was a sponsor of the American Peace Mobilization which was listed in United States Attorney General's classification of subversive Communist groups. Claudia Jones, educational director for the New York Young Communist League, was elected a member of AYD's national board, as were Lillian Foss, Faye Caller identified with the Young Communist League's national war service committee. It is significant that a report of the United States Congress says, "Young Communist leaguers occupy all the important positions in the New American Youth for Democracy. * * * In other words, there is not a shadow of a doubt that the present American Youth for Democracy is nothing more nor less than the old Young Communist League."

MICHIGAN REPRESENTATION

At the 1944 AYD national council meeting Patricia Mullison and Paul Endicott, both of Michigan, were very active. Miss Mullison was State director of the "Sweethearts of Servicemen" identified as a Red front. She was elected to the national AYD council. Endicott had charge of the AYD anniversary observance committee. At the 1946 second national convention of AYD Erma Henderson of Michigan was cochairman of the second day's session and Phil Schatz of Michigan was chairman of the constitution committee. Mabel Lee Smith of Michigan submitted a report for the resolutions committee. It was at this AYD convention that Senator Vandenberg along with President Truman and Secretary Byrnes were charged with seeking for the United States the position of dictator among nations of the world, and the AYD complained because we have not been sharing with Russia our control of Japan. They called our present foreign policy pattern for imperialism. They demanded close friendship of the United States and Soviet Union and praised as courageous friends the Peppers, Marcantonios, DeLaceys, Powells and Coffees. The constituents of DeLacey and Coffee repudiated them at the last election.

William Z. Foster, present head of the Communist party in the United States sent greetings to last year's AYD convention and reiterated the Communist line to the effect that American imperialism is driving toward world domination.

The AYD seems to openly boast of its activity in Michigan and one of its volunteer workers is reported to have freely admitted to the Detroit School Board that AYD-sponsored teen-age clubs are flourishing in that city. A Karl Marx Society is now organizing on the University of Michigan campus.

Communists boast of their growth in Michigan—Ann Beiswenger reported at the last National Communist Convention that "We had the most rapid expansion of our organization in Michigan" and, "We reached 170 percent of our original recruiting goal." Within the last few weeks William O'Dell Nowell of Detroit appeared before a committee of Congress and admitted having held membership in the Communist Party. Furthermore, he stated that he was sent to Moscow by the Communist Party of the United States where he was trained at the International Lenin School in the art of conspiracy and sabotage. This witness further testified under oath that Gerhart Eisler, now under indictment by the Federal Government and considered Moscow's No. 1 Agent in the United States met with Communist leaders of Michigan in the city of Detroit (at the party office formerly located at Grand River and Vernor Highway) relative to educational work in the State of Michigan. Eisler's own sister, under oath, has branded him as the perfect terrorist type. Eisler is accused of having been one of the connecting links between the Canadian atom bomb spy ring and Moscow.

Recent developments in the United States and Canada, which show beyond question that the Communists have been and still are operating an espionage ring in the western hemisphere on a gigantic scale, should convince any sane thinking American that we are threatened by an enemy from within. It will be recalled that one member of the Canadian parliament, and educators, scientists and government employees of Canada have been sent to prison within the last year for their part in the Communist espionage plot under which certain US-Canadian military secrets were passed over to representatives of Moscow through channels of native Reds in Canada. By their espionage they conspire against us externally and by their fronts they conspire against us internally.

Small Business Gives Ringing Endorsement to Program for Strengthening Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, during recent years a great deal has been said both in and out of Congress with

reference to preserving the traditional American free enterprise system. It is recognized that the fostering of healthy small businesses is a prerequisite to the maintenance of our free competitive system. The strengthening and more vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws is a necessary part in any program for the benefit of small business.

The National Federation of Small Business, Inc., has a large individual membership in all States of the Nation. It has expressed strong support of a program strengthening the antitrust laws. In the latest issue of the mandate of the National Federation of Small Business the members of the federation voted on two important propositions affecting the antitrust laws:

1. Are you for or against Congress starting immediately to reform and streamline our antitrust laws?

2. Are you for or against Congress ceasing activity on social reform legislation until antitrust laws are strengthened and enforced?

The federation's members voted 96 percent for proposition 1, 3 percent opposed, and only 1 percent not voting. On proposition 2, the federation's members voted 91 percent for, 5 percent opposed, and only 4 percent not voting.

The result of the votes of the federation give a ringing endorsement of the efforts now being carried on in both the Senate and House to stop the increasing concentration of economic power by way of large corporate mergers which have become so prevalent during the past few years.

A bill is now being considered in the Judiciary Committee of the House, passage of which would be the most effective thing Congress could do to halt the onrush of monopolistic mergers. This bill is to plug the loophole in sections 7 and 11 of the Clayton Act.

The Clayton Act was passed in 1914 on the theory that it should be the purpose of the Federal Government to prevent monopolistic mergers by making them illegal in the first instance. The purpose was to prevent monopoly rather than merely to punish it after it had taken place. The intent of Congress at the time the Clayton Act was passed is definite and indisputable. An examination of the reports of the House and Senate Committees and of the debate fully confirms this point. The Congress which passed the Clayton Act had in mind that monopolistic corporate mergers would be accomplished by one corporation purchasing the capital stock of another. This is prohibited in section 7. Section 11 of the same act provides that if, after a hearing, the Federal Trade Commission finds that section 7 has been violated the Commission shall issue a cease-and-desist order and direct the divertment of the stock involved.

Within a few years after the passage of the Clayton Act corporations conceived a means of bypassing the plain intent of the act by purchasing the physical assets of their competitors rather than the capital stock. As a practical matter these two sections became a dead letter in 1926 as a result of the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Western Meat Co.* (257 U. S. 554). The Court held that where a corporation had illegally acquired the stock of competing corporations and had used the control so acquired to obtain transfer to it of the assets of such corporations, the authority of the Commission was limited to a divestiture of the valueless stock of the former competing corporations.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch in its issue of March 14, 1947, carried an editorial which described the purpose of this bill and the necessity of its approval. The editorial is as follows:

A PLEA FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

The air is full of free enterprise oratory, but free enterprise is eventually doomed if the control of business continues to concentrate in fewer hands. The Federal Trade Commission reports that 1,800 businesses have been swallowed up by others since 1940, and that the merger fever has moved apace into such traditionally small-business fields as textiles and foodstuffs. It warns, therefore, that the rapid growth of private supergovernment in industry must be halted, else the minority in control of American industry will become so powerful that a political supergovernment will necessarily rise to impose social controls.

This testimony is addressed to a bill which would plug the hole in the antitrust laws through which a swarm of mergers have poured. The Clayton Act of 1914 forbids one corporation to buy another's stock where the outcome might substantially lessen competition, but it neglected to forbid the acquisition of assets other than stock. In a typical evasion, the acquiring corporation first buys a block of stock, then votes the stock to sell the business out to itself. The stock purchase is unlawful, but the courts have ruled that the merger cannot be set aside on that account unless FTC can get in its decree before the assets are sold. Thus the FTC is left helpless.

So long as the loophole remains unplugged, the FTC correctly points out that the antitrust law actually promotes mergers. The law can and does forbid little businessmen to conspire for price fixing. But the more effective the prohibition is, the greater is the temptation to seek the merger loophole, the completely final way of eliminating competition.

The issue is perfectly clear. The FTC wants the bill, President Truman has declared himself for it. Other friends of private capitalism favor it. If this Congress means half of what its Members say on behalf of free enterprise, it will speedily be written into the law.

The Baltimore Sun, in an editorial of March 12, 1947, set forth the importance of early consideration by Congress of this measure. The Sun editorial is as follows:

THE KEFAUVER BILL

A bill to amend the Clayton Antitrust Act by permitting the Federal Trade Commission to block the purchase of a company's assets if the transaction would promote monopoly has been introduced by Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. With congressional attention centered on more dramatic and politically potent matters, such as economy, taxes, and foreign affairs, a measure of this sort is likely to the shunted into the background. A special report to the Congress by the FTC on the growth of a monopolistic trend since 1940 should serve to focus some attention on the Kefauver proposal. The report reveals some startling developments.

Since 1940, according to the FTC, 1,800 smaller companies have been swallowed up by purchase and merger, and 242 of this number have been bought up by the country's very largest corporations—those with assets above $50,000,000. On the basis of these facts, the Commission urges adoption of the Kefauver bill to halt the rapid growth of private supergovernment in order to prevent the rise of a political supergovernment. The point is well taken, even though the language may seem somewhat extreme. Certainly it must be obvious that our form of government leans heavily on the continued healthy existence of the greatest possible number of small businesses.

Under the Clayton Act as it now stands, the Trade Commission can block acquisitions of stock which tend to monopoly control, and can outlaw price-fixing combinations among different companies. These powers alone, however, as the FTC points out, tend to be self-defeating. They tend to put a premium on the outright purchase of competitors as a device for circumventing existing monopoly restraints.

The concept "monopoly" is a slippery one, as bookshelves of legal opinions on the aluminum situation and reams of testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee prove. It is difficult to determine the precise point at which industrial consolidation to achieve the benefits of mass production ceases to be a virtue. For this reason, the criteria of administrative discretion to be set up by the Kefauver bill should be closely scrutinized by Congress. There can be little argument, however, that the additional antitrust powers proposed are necessary to any effective policing of the situation.

The Government's Policy on Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by a former Member of this body, now Secretary of Labor, the Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, before the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., March 20, 1947, on the subject of the Government's policy on aid to Greece and Turkey.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY ON AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY: SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED

The reporters who were present in the House of Representatives on March 12 have told you of the reception that Members of Congress gave to the President's epoch-making message on aid to Greece and Turkey. They received the message in the spirit in which it was given, with a sense of awareness of the importance in history of the steps that were being recommended to them, and a sense of their own responsibility for the decisions that are to be made.

They felt—we all felt—a sense of that humility which comes to men when confronted with a great decision involving the security of others.

It is with this same sense of humility that I think we should today consider the various aspects of the problem posed by the President to Congress. It is with humility that I would like to discuss with you today some

of the principal questions that have been raised by the American people in connection with the President's recommendations. There are answers to the various questions that have been raised and it is important that they should be brought out in public discussion.

Some writers and commentators have described the President's message as a challenge to a foreign country. Such an interpretation is unfortunate and untrue. The President's message was directed to Congress and to the American people. It was an appeal for support of a policy which the President and his advisers feel is necessary for the security of the country.

If a similar crisis in foreign policy had arisen in some countries, a small group of men would have met, made a decision, and ordered its execution, whatever the cost. There would have been no publicity and no possibility of their action being portrayed by their own writers and commentators as a challenge to the United States or any other foreign power. It would become known only gradually as its results were observed.

If a crisis in foreign policy of this same character had arisen in a country with a parliamentary system, the Prime Minister would have introduced an appropriation bill into Parliament, where he usually commands a majority. This bill would have been advanced and supported by government spokesmen in discreet and general terms, and it would probably have passed without much commotion.

But in the United States, our governmental institutions and our political conditions are such that if the President is to get congressional and popular support for a needed measure of foreign policy, he is obliged to speak in the frankest terms. Without a full explanation of the situation and of the dangers confronting the country, an appropriation bill introduced by the President for aid to Greece and Turkey would have little chance of passage through Congress.

Bipartisan support for foreign policy is today imperative, and it is clear that bipartisan support demands full information and frank speaking on the part of the Executive. Congress will simply not write blank foreign policy checks for the President.

Let us assume that it were possible for the President to speak with each Member of Congress and convince him privately of the need for a certain course of action. It would still be necessary to speak fully and frankly to the public. For Members of Congress are only representatives of the people.

There is no alternative to a foreign policy based upon an informed citizenry. This is why the President found it necessary to speak so plainly to Congress and the American people on March 12. The President was not challenging any foreign country. He was challenging the American people to face the grim facts that dominate the world today, and to accept their proper share of responsibility for world peace and security and freedom.

A second criticism of the President's policy on aid to Greece and Turkey involves the United Nations. There are some Americans who believe that this Government is willfully bypassing the United Nations in favor of a unilateral approach to the problem. They feel that rehabilitation and reconstruction in devastated areas should be undertaken by the United Nations, and that the Security Council should take care of any threat to world peace arising from the situation in Greece.

I believe that public misgivings in this quarter may arise from some confusion as to just what the problem is and what is being done about it.

Greece is faced with four grave problems of varying degrees of urgency. The first is the alleged violation of her frontiers by foreign countries. The second is civil disorder which prevents political and economic reconstruction. The third problem is that of imminent economic collapse. And the fourth is the scarcity of technical personnel required for military, political, and economic reorganization.

In cases where it has been empowered to act the United Nations has already established a record of moving promptly and energetically. The Security Council is already acting in the present Greek crisis to the extent of sending a special commission to investigate disturbed conditions in northern Greece and along the Greek northern frontier. The United States strongly supported the motion which created this commission. The President's proposal for aid to Greece in no way prejudices any findings of the commission, nor will it prejudice any subsequent action that may be taken by the Security Council in this matter.

The appeal that has been made to the United States by the Greek Government, however, is concerned primarily with the country's economic and financial plight. It was urgent and required immediate action, because Great Britain, who has been aiding Greece, has made it clear that she cannot extend further aid after March 31.

The United Nations does not of itself possess funds for expenditures of this kind on behalf of member states. The Economic and Social Council is an advisory body that recommends economic, financial, and social action to member states. The International Bank, which is just now completing its organization, is set up primarily to make self-liquidating loans for long-term reconstruction purposes. The Bank has not as yet made any loans whatever.

It may be that at some future time the United Nations may be organized and equipped so as to render emergency aid to member states of the kind now needed in Greece and Turkey. But, as the President said, the United Nations and its related organizations are not now in position to extend help of the kind that is required.

Suppose that instead of addressing its request to the United States, Greece had approached the United Nations. If that body had decided to recommend assistance it would have had eventually to turn primarily to the United States for funds and supplies and technical assistance. Much time would have been lost, even if the United Nations should agree, and there is no time to be lost if the situation is to be saved.

Continued study and consideration are nevertheless being given by the Government to ways and means through which the United Nations, as its various organs develop strength and resources, may assume responsibilities in Greece and Turkey and in other countries finding themselves in a similar situation. Any agreements or undertakings entered into with Greece or other countries as a result of the legislation asked for by the President will be duly notified to the United Nations under the terms of article 102 of the Charter.

A third question has been raised in connection with the President's policy. Some people ask why the President did not negotiate this question directly with the major powers concerned. I confess that I have very great difficulty in taking this question seriously. It has been raised by responsible people, however, and it requires an answer.

The answer is the record. For several years the United States has been gravely concerned about the maintenance of the freedom and independence of the countries in central and southern Europe, and the Middle East. We have negotiated on this point. We have discussed it often and at great length with the major powers. And we have delivered many protests in regard to violations of agreements entered into. In his message to Congress the President referred to coercion and intimidation, in violation of the Yalta Agreement, in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. The President also stated that there had been similar developments in a number of other countries.

If there are any openings for further negotiations that have not been tried, the Government is not aware of them. Our protests and our efforts in this direction have largely proved ineffective. The time has therefore come when we must implement negotiations with action in order to prevent extension of totalitarianism to free countries. We must take action designed to strengthen Greece and Turkey to the point where they will not be open to intimidation and coercion of the kind practiced on their neighbors. We fervently hope, however, that successful negotiations on these subjects may take place in the future. And we believe that the President's policy will lay a basis for greater success in such negotiations.

Let us now turn to the criticism advanced by some persons that the Government of Greece to which the United States now proposes to give aid is a corrupt, antidemocratic clique that is opposed in Greece by the truly democratic elements. They also say that the Greek Government is a royalist government installed by the British.

These criticisms are without foundation. Greece is a constitutional monarchy, as are Norway, Holland, and England. A year ago elections were held for members of the Greek Parliament. American, French, British, and South African election observers were present at the invitation of the Greek Government. The Greek Government also invited the Soviet Union to send observers but that invitation was rejected. These foreign observers, numbering about 1,200, toured Greece from one end to the other during the 2 months preceding the election, and it was their conclusion that the elections were reasonably fair. The subsequent plebiscite for the King was also observed by American and British personnel, and it was their conclusion that the plebiscite represented the view of the majority of the Greek people. It is true that certain political groups abstained from the election but even allowing for these abstentions, the Greek Government without doubt is supported by the majority of the electorate.

As for the caliber of the present Greek Government, President Truman has already said that we do not condone everything that they have done or will do. The point is that the Greek Government has been democratically elected by the Greek people, who are striving to maintain democratic institutions and freedoms. So long as this is true, the people of Greece can improve their Government and, in the words of the Greek note to the American Government, grow into a "self-respecting democracy." I think we all know what would happen if the armed minority now threatening Greece's political and economic stability were to gain control. Free institutions and human freedoms would disappear, and democratic progress would come to an abrupt halt.

We do not claim that all of those forces that are in opposition to the present Greek Government are Communist. There are among them many elements who honestly, but in our opinion mistakenly, support the Communist-led opposition because they do not like the present Greek Government. It is greatly to be hoped that these elements will take advantage of the political amnesty offered by the Greek Government, and cooperate to make democratic Greek institutions work.

The choice today in Greece is between a totalitarianism and an imperfect democracy. We seek to help an imperfect democracy grow toward a more perfect democracy. Any other course would probably result in the complete disappearance of democracy.

Let us now take a look at the bitter-end isolationist argument. It is advanced in this country by certain people who should know better but who, nevertheless, persist in error.

This argument runs as follows: The United States should not weaken itself by shelling out money to foreign countries. It does not really matter whether Europe and Asia go Communist. We all know that communism will not produce automobiles and bathtubs as well as capitalism. The peoples of Europe and Asia will find this out after a few years. Communism will then recede and everything will be fine.

I do not need to give you the answers to this preposterous line. I doubt that there are many of you here on the west coast who would fall for it. Not long ago this same group argued that we should not help Czechoslovakia or England or China, that we should conserve our strength in the American hemisphere. And then came Pearl Harbor.

I can think of no course that would so certainly lead to world annihilation in a third world war than that proposed by the bitter-end isolationists.

The problem of aid to Greece and Turkey, which the President has declared involves the national security of this country, is one which has its center more than 6 000 miles from the Golden Gate. The President and his advisers are convinced that if we should fail to support the free peoples of the world there may be a collapse of free institutions and loss of independence in many countries, and that the resulting totalitarianism could spread right around the world in a series of chain reactions. The important thing is that the well-being of the citizens of San Francisco can be threatened by developments in Greece.

Greece and Turkey may not be the only countries which might eventually require our assistance. But the need of Greece and Turkey is immediate and it is necessary to act fast if the freedom and independence of those countries are to be preserved. The sum of $400,000,000 which the taxpayers of this country are being asked to provide is a huge sum, however, and the citizens of this country will rightly want to know how this money is to be spent. It is possible now to give some idea of the general purposes for which this money will go. Later, however—during the consideration of the problem by Congress and the country—there will be presented a more detailed program based on reports from all sources, including those from the American economic mission which went to Greece early this year at the request of the Greek Government.

Economic and political reconstruction in Greece will be impossible unless tranquility is restored to Greek villages, and hope to Greek households. For that reason, part of the money made available to Greece will be used for the reorganization and reequipment to Greek Army, to the point that it may be able to restore and maintain the authority of the Greek Government throughout its territory. With internal order restored the country can plan its economic and political future with confidence.

Greece has always been a poor country with a very narrow margin of subsistence. The country suffered severe destruction as a result of invasion and occupation by the enemy. The hardships inflicted on Greece during the war were as grievous as those borne by any nation. The roads and railroads of Greece were left practically unusable. In a country where only about 20 percent of the soil is arable, crops could not under these conditions be cultivated, nor if a crop were harvested could it be brought to market. Greece, which has always imported a large part of its food requirements, had to fall back on her utterly insufficient internal resources. The result has been gravely to impair the material and human resources of the nation. Added to this situation, there has been cruel currency inflation, civil strife, and menace from abroad.

Black as the picture is, however, there is reason for believing that United States financial assistance to Greece may tide that country over while a stable economic base for orderly and representative government is being created.

There are certain recuperative forces in the Greek economy which even now can be discerned. For example, one of the principal items in the Greek balance of payments in prewar years was the earnings of Greek shipping. About 75 percent of Greek ocean-going vessels were lost in the war and the very important coastal shipping was also ruined. Port and harbor facilities were demolished. Several months ago the United States extended to Greece a credit of $30,000,000 for the purchase of up to 70 surplus United States ships. The earnings of these ships in the future should be of help to the Greek foreign-exchange position.

Greece normally makes up a large part of the deficiency in her balance of payments from the large emigrant remittances from Greeks who live abroad. Emigrant remittances have now been resumed in considerable volume. There is also some foreign exchange revenue to be expected when tourists can again visit Greece in numbers.

We intend to make available to Greece, American experts who know their job and can advise the Greeks in fields such as engineering, transportation, foreign trade, civil-service organization, budget procedure, agriculture, public health, and taxation. These are greatly needed. For example, there is not now in Greece a modern system of taxation which is needed to establish a sound means of public finance.

We expect to help Greece tackle its reconstruction problem as an integrated whole. Projects for transport, reclamation, irrigation, and improved farming methods will be considered as interrelated parts of the whole economy. We will also advise on setting up foreign trade, banking and currency controls which for a period will be required to avert the inflationary menace and to rebuild foreign trade on a sound basis.

The extension of American technical advice does not mean that the United States intends to take over Greece and Turkey as some foreign critics have insisted. We simply want to help them help themselves. When our specific job is done we hope to see these countries standing on their feet as living proof that democratic institutions and processes need not be sacrificed to insure internal stability and material prosperity. Too many people today have come to discount democratic solidarity, to believe that democracy is weak and anachronistic, and that it has nothing to offer the economically hard-pressed and sorely doubting peoples of Europe and Asia. Our effort in Greece and Turkey should demonstrate that democracies are able and willing to help each other protect their free institutions and their independence.

Tributes to the Late Oliver Max Gardner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, we have been told of old that national recollection is the foundation of national character. We quicken this recollection from year to year by the observance of the anniversaries of those Americans who, in their day and generation, have proved themselves preeminent for their abilities and patriotism. From the earliest days of the Republic, we have chosen the day of their birth to commemorate rather than the end of their earthly journey.

Saturday of last week North Carolina remembered with pride and gratitude the anniversary of the birth of Oliver Max Gardner. He was born in Shelby, N. C., the youngest of 12 children, 65 years ago Saturday. Some 6 weeks ago, the country he served with such devotion was shocked and grieved by the announcement of his death within a few hours of the time he was to sail for London to enter upon his duties as Ambassador to Great Britain. Many were the tributes paid his memory. I shall not attempt to repeat them here nor to add to them. It seems appropriate, however, in the Senate, where he was so highly esteemed by friends on both sides of the aisle, that we quicken today national recollection of the heritage he has left his countrymen by the example to be found in his life and work as a private citizen and as a public servant.

From the editorial tributes paid Ambassador Gardner's memory from coast to coast several have been selected for insertion in the RECORD only because they represent the high and noble sentiments expressed in all. These sentiments also found most eloquent expression in the citation read by Rev. C. Leslie Glenn, rector of St. John's Church, Lafayette Square, at the memorial service held in Washington Cathedral on the afternoon of the 14th of February last, attended by more than a thousand friends of this great and good American. The citation was written by Mr. Arthur Krock, chief of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times and long-time friend of the ambassador.

On behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and myself I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendx of the RECORD the memorial citation and the editorials referred to, in grateful observance of the sixty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Oliver Max Gardner, of North Carolina, who was born on the 22d of March 1882, and laid down his life in the service of his country on the 6th day of February 1947.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITATION

Through all the days of his life he followed the light that shone on the road to Damascus.

In its warmth and clarity he lived, and in its glory he died.

But to him the light did not come suddenly, as by revelation.

He perceived it in the hour he first saw his mother. To him this light never faltered, or paled, or grew cold.

He met the basic tests of Christianity that were set down by the Apostle Paul who, being the most human and self-deprecatory of all its missionaries, was his greatest guide and inspiration in matters temporal or spiritual.

Reverent without intolerance, compassionate without weakness or patronage, gay without hardness of heart, successful without the loss of humility or the sense of pity for the sorrows of daily life, he was a man, a husband, a father, and a public servant

fit to stand, as he was sure he would, in the presence of Saul "who also is called Paul."

He wronged or hurt no one whom he encountered in his gentle journey through mortality.

He helped and comforted many, and none who knew him will cease to feel the loss of his passing while that one, too, shall live.

Let his requiem be these words of Paul to his young colleague Timothy, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

[From the Shelby (N. C.) Daily Star of February 6, 1947]

O. MAX GARDNER

O. Max Gardner sleeps.

The stout armor with which for more than 40 years he carried the fight for progressive, clean, and honest government is hung aside. He died this morning in New York as he prepared to sail for London to take up his work as the American Ambassador to the Court of St. James's.

The world mourns the passing of a great American.

The tributes to his greatness make clear, if anyone ever questioned it, that he, like St. Paul, was truly a citizen of the world. Indeed, in his last public statement to his friends and neighbors at the First Baptist Church here he viewed London today, like Rome of Paul's day, the crossroads through which were passing at this time the currents he hoped he might there help fashion into a better, a saner, and a more peaceful world. He died carrying the fight for that ideal.

Max Gardner walked with kings and never lost the common touch. When his life slipped away in the St. Regis Hotel there passed an eminent lawyer, a gallant and courageous statesman, a philanthropist who never allowed himself to grow away from the soil and the people whence he sprang. It is significant, is it not, as soon as the radio flashed word of Governor Gardner's death the local telephone system broke down time and time again under the overload of calls as his friends and neighbors sought to express to each other their shock, their sorrow, and their love for the man whom death had taken into its arms at the height of his career.

Max Gardner was so much of and in the city of Shelby and county of Cleveland that he was at once our Ambassador and guide. He was a worker and a planner with a gift for friendship. He was democratic in the finest meaning of that word; his death robs us of a man with a passion for his community as well as his State and his Nation. His greatest love of recent years was for Gardner-Webb College, to which he had given generously of his money, his time, and his interest; further indication of his devotion for his home community.

It is improbable that Governor Gardner's type can be repeated among the leaders of a newer generation, but his essential qualities of friendship, personal charm, and profound integrity will always be hallmarks of greatness.

So long, Max! God rest your great and kindly soul!

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of February 7, 1947]

LIKE NIOBE, ALL TEARS

Yesterday the News and Observer printed, from the pen of Drew Pearson, an unusually fine tribute to O. Max Gardner on the eve of his departure to enter upon his duties in London as American Ambassador and Plenipotentiary Extraordinary to the Court of St. James's. That true appraisement of a golden-hearted statesman warmed the hearts of all North Carolinians.

Today the State sorrows—"like Niobe, all tears"—at the sad news of the sudden death of Ambassador Gardner in New York as he was preparing to sail to enter upon the great office to which he had been appointed. And not only does the death of Mr. Gardner carry grief in North Carolina, but will give sorrow to hosts of friends and admirers in Washington, to his whole country, and also to the British people who had hailed his appointment with much satisfaction.

The career of Mr. Gardner is a proud record of success and leadership in all the positions to which he was called by his countrymen. Native of Shelby, he spent his college days in Raleigh as a student in State College where he became a leader in his studies and on the athletic field and afterward as instructor. As young Democratic leader in his home county he early showed wisdom in politics and in statesmanship in his community which was later evidenced in larger fields as State senator, Lieutenant Governor, Governor, trusted adviser to President Roosevelt in important war policies, serving as Chairman of the Advisory Board on War Mobilization and Reconversion, as Under Secretary of the Treasury, as a most useful trustee of the University of North Carolina, founder of the Gardner-Webb College which he endowed. Mr. Gardner was a wise counselor in the State and National councils of his party, having served as member of the National Democratic Committee. He was a born diplomat in the best sense of that word and his countrymen looked forward with confidence to distinguished service by him as Ambassador to Great Britain.

Well in advance of the 1944 primary Mr. Gardner, at the behest of many friends and in pursuance of a laudable ambition, announced himself as a candidate for the United States Senate. He was practically assured of election when, to the regret of his friends and the surprise of his State, he announced that on the advice of his physician he would not make the race. He had been informed that his heart could not bear the strain of a campaign. His sudden death yesterday as he was on the eve of departure for London shows that the diagnosis was correct.

From the days of his youth Mr. Gardner's ambition was to be Governor, and he almost achieved that ambition when only 30 years old, being defeated in 1920 by a narrow margin. Eight years later he had so consolidated his position that he became the only Democratic candidate who has been nominated without opposition since the passage of the primary law in 1915.

His record as Governor shows he was a progressive and constructive chief executive. He enterprised and carried through important plans, among them the adoption of the Australian ballot, the consolidation of the three higher State institutions of learning into the greater university, and give impetus to his "Live at Home" program and other measures which advanced the State.

The recent appointment of Governor Gardner as Ambassador met with an even greater degree of acclamation. Not only was the nomination approved warmly by members of his own party, but only last week the Senate of the United States witnessed an extraordinary scene when Republican Senators vied with Democrats in praising the appointee to what has long been regarded as the most sought-after diplomatic post in the American Foreign Service.

Mr. Gardner will go down in history as one of the ablest, most constructive and progressive chief executives in the history of North Carolina and as a national leader of wisdom and statesmanship.

North Carolina is in mourning for its most distinguished and beloved son.

[From the Henderson (N. C.) Daily Dispatch of February 8, 1947]

O. MAX GARDNER

Sudden death of Ambassador O. Max Gardner on Thursday in New York was a distinct shock to tens of thousands of his friends in this State particularly, as over the country generally. He had accepted his appointment from President Truman to be Ambassador to Great Britain with gratitude, high enthusiasm, and with a yearning to render his State and Nation the most outstanding service possible. His nomination was given unanimous approval in the Senate of the United States, and there was great satisfaction and endorsement in Government circles and elsewhere generally over the selection.

North Carolinians, who knew this native son better perhaps than any other section of the country knew him, had looked forward to the former Governor setting something of a pace in the conduct of the Nation's diplomatic affairs in London. They had every reason to expect such a career abroad for their fellow citizen. Then death intervened.

The people of this State did not withhold their flowers, their esteem, their kind words, and their confidence until their statesman had gone. Affections were expressed and were known to him. But sudden death brings so much of the past to mind, and in the thought—and grief—it wells up to the surface.

Gardner had made tremendous success in a business way and had climbed high in his State and in affairs of the Nation. Not too many North Carolinians have been appointed to ranking diplomatic posts abroad. Walter Hines Page was President Wilson's Ambassador to the Court of St. James's during the First World War and Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy during the era, was Ambassador to Mexico under the late President Roosevelt. There is every good reason to suppose that Max Gardner would have added new luster to the record of achievements of these distinguished Tar Heels in the Foreign Service, and that he would have ranked with the most outstanding envoys sent from the United States to this station of duty and responsibility, long rated as the No. 1 diplomatic spot in the world outside Washington.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of February 8, 1947]

OPTIMIST IN GOVERNMENT

Max Gardner was an independent thinker. In thinking for himself, he arrived at an economic philosophy which steered a middle course between clashing ideas. It is said, for instance, that he regarded the late President Roosevelt as not quite "liberal" enough in 1932. Yet he differed with extremists in the subsequent New Deal. On a visit to Shelby last August while still Under Secretary of the Treasury, he spoke of the future of America in these terms:

"The war has seen an enormous expansion of our national economy. Surprisingly, many observers appear to regard this growth as short lived. They view our wartime potential as something quite apart from our peacetime potential. In the process of getting back to normal they anticipate a radical shrinkage—as much as a quarter or a third—in the volume of our national income. They fail to see that we have reached a new and higher plateau of productive capacity and that descending national income implies depressed levels of production and employment, and lower living standards. They fail to see that the plateau of the forties has risen above the peaks of the thirties."

This was a bold prognostication for an official of the United States Treasury. It was made at a time when most orthodox economists were predicting a cycle of "boom and bust." It is perhaps a clue to Mr. Gardner's own thinking as a "liberal-conservative" (as he classified himself) businessman.

Max Gardner had had some experience with government at both the State and National levels. He disliked undue interference in business and private affairs. He believed

in a balanced budget and the "preservation of the character, credit, and currency of the United States." Yet he was convinced that critics of Government should play more than a negative role in the vast democratic process. "The best insurance against conditions requiring the Government to step in," he said at Shelby, "is to maintain the flow of private income to individuals through continued high levels of wages and salaries and reasonable profits. Purchasing power thus maintained is the key to a sound and prosperous economy."

These are rather obvious statements, yet their importance, and even their meaning, is sometimes obscured by thundering debate in the economic forum. Max Gardner was, above all, an optimist. It would not be surprising to see his theories substantiated by the test of time.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of February 7, 1947]

O. MAX GARDNER

The death yesterday of O. Max Gardner deprived the Nation of a great political leader and a true liberal. Mr. Gardner was ready to embark on the crowning achievement of his career when death struck. His diplomacy, tact and infinite understanding were being relied on by President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall to give the United States able representation to the Court of St. James's. Mr. Gardner was only recently confirmed without dissent by the Senate for the post as Ambassador to Great Britain.

Although he had lived in Washington since expiration of his term as Governor of North Carolina in 1933, Ambassador Gardner still called Shelby, N. C., "home" and made it a point to visit his home town every few weeks. He was a personal friend of the late President Roosevelt and after establishing law offices in Washington declined numerous proffered appointments until Mr. Roosevelt persuaded him to accept the unpaid post of Chairman of the Advisory Board War Mobilization and Reconversion. President Truman last year prevailed on him to become Undersecretary of the Treasury, a post he held until his appointment as Ambassador to Great Britain.

Mr. Gardner was independently wealthy. He earned his money himself, reportedly making a million dollars or more in the textile business. But his wealth only served to enable him to broaden his scope of service to his State and Nation. His political philosophy was liberal in the true meaning of the word.

President Truman voiced the sentiment of the Nation when he said he was "deeply grieved and shocked" at Mr. Gardner's death. "I have lost a loyal and devoted friend," Mr. Truman is reported saying, "and the country has lost a great American."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of February 7, 1947]

OLIVER MAX GARDNER

Mr. Gardner had a distinguished career in North Carolina before he ever came to Washington. But the nature of his brief experience in the Federal service offers some explanation of his value and standing as a citizen and public servant. James F. Byrnes persuaded him to become chairman of the Advisory Board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and he was retained there by Chief Justice Vinson, who succeeded Mr. Byrnes. When Mr. Vinson went to the Treasury he took Mr. Gardner with him as Under Secretary and when Mr. Snyder became Secretary Mr. Gardner was persuaded to remain, against his personal inclination to return to his own substantial private law practice. These men regarded him highly for his possession of some of those talents mentioned with such genuine feeling yesterday by President Truman—his kindness, courtesy, an urbane understanding of human relationships and a capacity for hard, effective work. They leaned on his judgment and his integrity in matters of policy as well as administration. Such qualities would have gone far in helping him to realize the hopes that the President had pinned on his service as Ambassador to Great Britain and it is a curious fate that intervened so dramatically, on the day he was to sail for London. He has left a great many warm friends in Washington who respected and loved him for his character, molded by the early environment of a fine family and developed through self-dependence throughout his whole life. Not the least of his success was his ability to inspire confidence with affection wherever he went.

[From the New York Times of February 7, 1947]

OLIVER MAX GARDNER

Oliver Max Gardner's nomination in December to be Ambassador to Great Britain was received with the warmest approval by everyone who knew anything about this modest, friendly, and able man. Mr. Gardner had proven himself as a liberal-minded Governor of North Carolina, wartime chairman of OWMR's advisory board and Under Secretary of the Treasury. As this newspaper said of him on this page after his nomination, he was "a good man at finances and a convinced and persuasive advocate of our economic system." No one could have been better fitted to explain the United States to the British. The Senate showed its good judgment by a prompt confirmation, as soon as the flurry attending the opening of the Eightieth Congress was over.

Now, as the steamship which was to have taken him to his post is on the way across the Atlantic, Mr. Gardner lies dead. He cannot know the irony of this untimely taking-off. The rest of us can. He had much to give, and now he cannot give it. All we can do is to pay tribute to a man who served his fellows faithfully and well so long as the strength was in him. President Truman will have to make a wide canvass before he finds a man as well suited for the St. James appointment as Oliver Max Gardner.

Forged To Outlive the Swastika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a fine article which appeared in the March issue of the Le Clerian, student publication of Le Clerc College, Belleville, Ill.:

FORGED TO OUTLIVE THE SWASTIKA

Hearing the voice that defied Hitler, was the privilege of a limited number of Le Clerians, Sunday, February 23.

"It is a fatal error to believe that the state is the highest expression of divinity. War and hate, and not charity and love, prevail in the world today, but the world must remember that it must achieve this love, which excludes no one and encompasses all humanity."

In the very heart of nazism, in Berlin itself, a voice was heard proclaiming Christ's lessons of justice and love. One marvels that arms were raised to cheer the orator. One would rather expect the long arm of the Nazi regime to have smothered that voice before it drew another breath, but Conrad Cardinal von Preysing continued his defense of religious freedom and lives to tell the tale.

Conrad Count von Preysing is a member of an ancient Bavarian family of the twelfth century which belongs to the Royal House of Bavaria. He became an attorney, and during his diplomatic career, met and became a close friend of Pope Pius XII. In 1908 he abandoned his work and 4 years later was ordained for the holy priesthood.

In 1935 he was made Bishop of Berlin and became outstanding for his actions in defense of Christian principles. In his Christmas pastoral letter of 1943 the bishop strongly condemned the prevailing mode of thought and appealed for a change to the principles of justice and right.

Hitler is dead, but the voice of Cardinal von Preysing has reached even to American shores, has echoed in our midst, while the thunders of "Heil Hitler" are stilled into oblivion.

Portal-to-Portal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the following editorial taken from the Washington Post of Sunday, March 23, 1947:

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL BILL

The bill passed a few weeks ago by the House, as well as the bill passed Friday by the Senate, bans all past portal-to-portal pay claims unless the employer has been required by custom or practice, or by express agreement or contract, to make such payments. Both bills have been attacked on the ground that these provisions are much too sweeping. For they would not only outlaw portal-to-portal-pay claims but admittedly eliminate other claims for back pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act—claims that the Wage-Hour Administrator has held to be compensable. A spokesman for the Senate bill admitted that inequities would result from the method followed. But he concluded that the public interest in outlawry of these back-pay claims was a paramount consideration, and that any bill that could be written would be inequitable to some extent.

The remedy is, as we stated in discussing the Gwynne bill, a crude one. But Congress is confronted by an emergency that necessitates prompt and drastic action. For the huge and unexpected retroactive liabilities represented by back-pay claims threaten the solvency of many employers and might result in drastic curtailment of industrial operations along with declining employment and wage reductions. The gravity of the emergency, therefore, seems to us to justify the methods adopted in disposing of past claims.

The real difficulties begin when attempts are made to deal with future pay claims of this type. Undoubtedly legislative action of some sort is needed to prevent continued wrangling. But in endeavoring to deal with this aspect of the problem, both the House and Senate bills are open to severe criticism. The record of the Senate debate would make a thick volume. It is impossible to discuss here in any detail the merits of the proposed legislation. But we think that the opponents of the bills have proved their main point—that those measures would tend to break down safeguards established

by the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act covering Government contracts, and the Bacon-Davis Act affecting Government construction.

Under the House bill all future portal-to-portal claims would be barred unless validated by custom or express agreement. Under the Senate bill, only preliminary and postliminary activities would be noncompensable, unless custom or contract called for payment. The Senate's attempt to distinguish between noncompensable activities and principal activities carried on during the workday raises innumerable questions of definition, to which answers are not forthcoming. Indeed, it is charged with good reason that it would lead to a flood of litigation and make the Fair Labor Standards Act a haven for unemployed attorneys. Other objections to the House and Senate bills grow out of provisions to exempt employers from payment of damages in suits under the Fair Labor Standards Act when they have acted in good faith and in reliance upon administrative regulations. Critics maintain that it would be almost impossible to prove bad faith and that such provisions would, therefore, encourage widespread evasion of the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, especially in dealings with unorganized labor.

Under the circumstances, there is danger that the conference bill will invite a Presidential veto on the ground that it weakens the Fair Labor Standards Act. We think that Congress would have been well advised to restrict legislative relief to back portal-to-portal pay claims, leaving future claims to be dealt with by the Wage and Hour Administrator. Senator THOMAS of Utah takes the right slant on the problem when he says:

"It is my opinion that if the Congress should grant the rule-making power to the Administrator, subject, of course, to the guidance of Congress and subject to court review, there would be no need whatever for such legislation as is proposed in the committee bill with regard to claims for future liability under the Fair Labor Standards Act."

The Bypassing of UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the New York Herald-Tribune of Saturday, March 22, entitled "The Bypassing of UN." As Mr. Lippmann points out, the issue is not whether we should "pass the buck" to the UN in the Greek-Turkish crisis, nor is it whether or not, as some have suggested, we should call the United Nations Organization the scapegoat. The simple question, as I see it, is whether we should take the vitally important step that is being proposed unilaterally, by ourselves alone, or whether we should take the step with the cooperation and full knowledge of the United Nations Organization, and with the clear assurance to the UN that we are looking upon the matter as one which affects the collective security of the entire world.

We should not set the precedent of trying to deal with these matters unilaterally.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THE BYPASSING OF UN

The reason given by Mr. Acheson for the bypassing of UN is that there is an emergency in Greece and Turkey and that "the United Nations and its related organizations are not now in position to extend help of the kind that is required."

It is true that there is an emergency which the UN is not now equipped to deal with. It is true that the United States must deal with it. But these are not reasons for bypassing the UN.

They are reasons why it is our special duty and deeply to our interest to make it plain to the United Nations why in our judgment there is an emergency requiring us to act unilaterally. For the charter was adopted for the express purpose of preventing nations from acting unilaterally and on their own judgment in matters which affect the interests of other nations. Precisely because we feel that the emergency is such that we must make an exception to this rule, we should be seeking the opportunity to recognize the moral authority of the UN, lest the exceptional case establish a precedent which will then be the rule.

If the pattern of our conduct in this affair becomes a precedent, we shall have cut a hole in the Charter which it will be very difficult to repair. The President has told us, quite rightly, that "the seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife." Suppose we cannot all around the world relieve quickly enough the misery and the want. Suppose that in Greece later, or in some other wracked and hungry land, there comes into power by elections like those in Greece a government of the extreme Lefts, dominated by the Communists. That could happen. It could happen elsewhere in Europe, in Asia, or even in an American republic.

What happens then if that government calls upon the Soviet Union for aid, asks it to equip and train its army, to supervise its budget, to plan and direct its economy? What under the "Truman doctrine" do we do if the Soviet government says there is an emergency, that it has been invited to intervene, that the UN is not in position to extend the kind of help required?

Until March 12 we would have been able to do what we did in Iran last year. We would have been able to raise the issue in the Security Council and the General Assembly, and to demand an accounting, and to bring to bear upon the situation the collective opinion of the United Nations. The UN was not any better equipped to act in Iran than it is in Greece. But it was equipped to bring great pressure to bear on the Soviet Union's desire to judge for itself whether there was an emergency which demanded unilateral action.

That is what the "Truman doctrine," as it is being presented to the world, will destroy if we persist in setting this precedent.

And it is so unnecessary. "Time is of the essence," said Mr. Acheson. But no time will be lost in extending to Greece and Turkey the assistance which almost all of us agree should be given, if we choose to recognize the interest of the UN.

It would not take as long to conform to the principles of the charter of the United Nations as it will take to conform to the constitutional processes of the United States. If there is time for Mr. Acheson to inform Congress, there is time for Mr. Austin to inform the United Nations.

But it is not only for the sake of the UN that we should avoid this shattering precedent. It is also for the sake of our own action in Greece.

The official picture of what we are getting into in Greece has been softened and simplified. The emphasis has been put on the need of the Greeks, the dire results of not helping them, and the benevolent and innocuous character of our assistance. This picture needs to be supplemented by a full realization that we are intervening in a civil war, that we shall be responsible for the Greek Army, not only its training and equipment but its strategy and tactics, that since our financial assistance is measured to balance the Greek budget, we shall become responsible for the whole operation of the Greek Government.

Now the Government of Greece has been a European problem ever since the country was liberated from Turkey in 1829 by the combined intervention of Britain, France, and Russia. Never for long has Greece not been an international problem, and while we may be able to succeed where so many others have failed, it is, I believe, extremely unwise on our part to accept the sole responsibility. The British Government, which has dealt with Greek affairs for over a century, has failed and has suffered great moral injury.

If we are wise, we shall seek to spread the moral risk, not to assume the whole of it, as we are now doing. We shall proceed by consultation with those of our allies who share our purposes, and by a scrupulous adherence to the rules we have made with those of our allies who may not share our purposes.

For if we cannot get the agreement of the Russians to what we propose to do, we can still do it, using our own veto to block any attempt on their part to block it.

But in seeking agreement and practicing consultation, we shall not be taking a position which, because it is unilateral, combines the worst features of isolationism and of interventionism.

Finland's Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement signed by patriotic American citizens of Finnish extraction, some of whom reside in my congressional district. The statement which follows is entitled "Finland's Peace":

FINLAND'S PEACE

On this day 7 years ago, the 13th of March 1940, Finland signed in Moscow the peace treaty ending the winter war. This peace was only a truce. The 10th of February this year, in Paris, the final peace was signed—a treaty still harder for Finland than the hard peace of 1940. At this anniversary the undersigned groups and organizations, representing the overwhelming majority of Americans of Finnish descent, want to express their sorrow and their deep anxiety over the destiny of the country of their ancestors.

Independent Finland was always a thoroughly democratic Republic under a constitution very similar to the Constitution of our beloved United States. The freedom and the rights of every citizen were assured as in our American Bill of Rights. All men and

women had the same civic rights, irrespective of race and creed.

Finland's foreign policy was strict neutrality. Fulfilling all her international obligations up to the last letter, Finland wanted to live in peace and cooperation with all other countries, particularly with her great neighbor in the east, the Soviet Union. When Hitler in the spring of 1939 offered the states around the Baltic Sea nonaggression pacts, Finland declined the offer in order to avoid even the shadow of being under German influence.

In spite of her wish to live in peace, Finland was forced to fight in self-defense. After the partition of Poland between Germany and Russia, at that time close friends, and after Russia had brought the Baltic states under her domination, she attacked Finland late in autumn 1939.

The League of Nations expelled Russia, and President Roosevelt branded the attack upon Finland a wanton aggression; world opinion and particularly public opinion in America was with Finland. But Finland had to fight alone, and finally was forced to sign the Moscow peace, March 13, 1940.

In the fateful summer of 1941, Moscow again opened hostilities against Finland. In spite of the bombing of Finnish ships, Finnish cities, and unfortified places, the Finnish Government in circular information to the legations abroad declared their intention to remain neutral. But when the Russian military actions turned into an all-out attack, there was no choice. Then and only then the Finnish Government and Parliament unanimously, and with the support of the people, decided to take up arms and to defend the country.

The Finns fought their separate war for their liberty and independence and for the integrity of their homeland. Every sixth man gave his life for his country—it is as if the United States of America had lost in the war about 3,000,000 men. That was Finland's bloody sacrifice for the sake of the "four freedoms" and the high principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Finland never wanted war. Her fight was a righteous fight; but in spite of that she has been punished. Through the armistice in September 1944 and still more through the definite peace treaty signed in Paris, February 10th this year, Finland lost to Russia 12 percent of her territory, implying a loss of 15 percent of her economic capacity.

One-eighth of the population became homeless. They preferred to leave their centuries-old homesteads and to migrate into what was left of Finland rather than to become Soviet citizens—a plebiscite in itself. A more striking proof could not be given that this transfer of territory was against the lofty principles of article 2 of the Atlantic Charter. The Finnish Army is reduced to practically nothing and purged and Soviet Russia has now a military base only 10 miles from the Finnish capital and the Soviet troops are allowed to use the Finnish railways to reach this place. Furthermore Finland has to pay in goods a huge indemnity, nominally $300,000,000, but in fact about the double of that amount. And finally the peace throws the door wide open for Soviet interference in Finnish politics through the stipulation that forbids all organizations and all activities which the Soviet Union might consider hostile to her democracy.

These are only the most striking features of the treaty. It is futile to conceal that the independence of Finland has become for the time being, only nominal, not real, and that Finland lives under a terrible plight. Wrong has been done to Finland. The fact must be stated. No whitewash or window dressing can alter it.

The Finns will fulfill their obligations under the treaty certainly to the utmost of their possibility. We feel convinced that in spite of all their difficulties and sufferings, they will not give up their noble traditions and old inherited ideals of freedom and democracy.

We American citizens of Finnish extraction who are happy to live in this country of ours, where freedom and justice are the guiding principles, follow with deep anxiety the events in the land of our ancestors. We are proud to believe that, owing to the efforts of our country, the day will come when freedom and justice are fully respected all over the world and the principles of the Atlantic Charter no more allowed to be overridden by the great and powerful.

Central Committee of Finnish Societies of Greater New York, Onni K. Syrjaniemi, president, Sylvia E. Lansilehto, Secretary, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Eastern Finnish Temperance League, Alfred Erickson, president, Quincy, Mass.; Finnish American League of Democracy, Victor Annala, president, Gardner, Mass.; Elis Sulkanen, secretary, Fitchburg, Mass.; Finnish Apostolic Lutheran Congregations, P. A. Heideman, president, Laurium, Mich.; Finnish Congregational Conference in America, Rev. William Hokkanen, president, Worcester, Mass.; Friends of Finland, Walter Mork, president, Berkeley, Calif.; Knights of Kaleva, Lauri Hannula, president, Fitchburg, Mass.; Ladies of Kaleva, Lydia Ibbotson, president, Eveleth, Minn.; Ohio, Pennsylvania and West Virginia Finnish Temperance League, J. O. Myllykoski, president, Painesville, Ohio; Save Finland Committee, Hon. O. J. Larson, president, Duluth, Minn.; United Finnish Kaleva Brothers and Sisters, Vaino Arniokoski, president, Berkeley, Calif.; United Finnish Temperance Council of United States, Alfred Erickson, president, Quincy, Mass.; Rev. G. A. Aho, Painesville, Ohio, president, National Evangelical Lutheran Churches; Dr. A. Haapanen, Hancock, Mich., president, Suomi Synod; Dr. V. K. Nikander, Hancock, Mich., president, Suomi College.

Better Late Than Never

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman in issuing his directive urging the heads of the departments to seek out and separate from the service all employees tainted with communism shows clearly that he remembers the old statement that a good politician stays behind the crowd until he finds out which way they are going, then he rushes to the front, grabs the flag and leads the parade.

That is exactly what the President has done. He did not do it, however, until the American people showed plainly which way they were heading when they elected a Republican Congress of which one of its main points, not only expressed in the platform but expressed for 4 years on the floor of the House, was to stop communism on the home front and to drive Communists off of the Federal pay roll.

And in this connection may I point out that the Civil Service Committee of which I am a member tried to get an investigation to seek out and drive out Communists by that committee in the past session of Congress. Those on the committee representing the administration stalled it off, but finally agreed to set up a committee that would make a recommendation. This committee made a recommendation providing for the appointment of a commission to make a further study of the question of Communists in the Federal Government. This Commission reported to the President on February 20, and President Truman issued his directive Saturday.

The point I want to make is that all of the Communists, all of the fellow travelers, the pinks and reds, were left undisturbed by the administration up until the people spoke in November. All of them backed the administration in power and tried in every way to defeat every Republican Member of Congress. When we came back here after the people had spoken, we Representatives continued our drive until it now has been endorsed, even though belatedly, by the President.

It was a part of our program and may we hope now that the President will endorse the rest of our program—the demobilization of bureaucracy, the reduction of his budget, and the reduction of taxes. Up to date he has only endorsed one plank in our platform, and, I repeat, not until the people by an overwhelming majority had spoken in support of our position.

Snags for an Active Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, New Deal commentators in the press and on the radio have been telling the Nation that the Republican Congress has not made any strides since taking over in January. In that regard I desire to insert an article from David Lawrence's United States News, which actually gives the low-down on what has been accomplished by the Congress. The article entitled "Snags for an Active Congress" follows:

SNAGS FOR AN ACTIVE CONGRESS—PROGRESS AGAINST DELAYS ON LABOR CONTROLS, TAXES, AND ECONOMIES—SELF-REORGANIZATION—PASSAGE OF EXCISES, DEFICIENCY FUNDS, PORTAL-PAY LIMITS—TARIFF TRUCE

A Congress that has given a widespread impression of dawdling turns out, on analysis, to be one of the busiest Congresses in recent years. Splits and factions in the Republican majority have captured the headlines, leaving unnoticed the amount of work that is going on.

Campaign promises to cut taxes, to check-rein Government spending, to curb labor unions and to modify Government controls all have hit snags. Now Congress is asked by the President to determine the direction of United States foreign policy and to do so quickly. Congress thus finds it necessary to turn suddenly to foreign policy despite other jobs that are piling up before it. These developments give the appearance of a do-nothing Congress, an appearance of a Congress bogged down.

Actually, the Eightieth Congress compares favorably with its predecessors. Few Congresses have been burdened with the tasks saddled on the present session, and seldom have those tasks been tackled so speedily. The Seventy-ninth Congress wasted many days a year ago in a filibuster over a fair employment practice bill. The Eightieth Congress in contrast, has put all committees to work, and a look beneath the surface reveals this record:

Action is completed or nearing completion on a number of measures that have been considered urgent.

Excise taxes at wartime rates are continued indefinitely under a law just approved by the President. This retains more than $1,000,000,000 in revenue.

Foot-and-mouth disease control by the United States in Mexico and other hemisphere countries is sanctioned in a law passed by both Houses.

Appropriations have been approved to meet some operating deficiencies for Federal agencies in the current fiscal year. The House also has passed an appropriation bill for the Treasury and Post Office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

Office of Price Administration and the Office of Temporary Controls have been directed to liquidate by June 30, 1947.

Farm labor can be recruited from foreign workers under another bill that is through the House and before the Senate. This provides Federal aid in recruiting workers.

Portal-to-portal pay suits are to be limited by a law that is close to adoption.

Legislative budget, slicing several billions of dollars from the President's budget of $37,500,000,000, has been given approval separately by both the House and Senate. Compromise conferences are under way.

Copper-tariff suspension has been approved by the House and is under consideration by the Senate. This is designed to increase supplies of the metal by lifting the 4-cents-per-pound duty.

The tariff issue itself has been eased by a White House agreement with Senators MILLIKIN (Republican), of Colorado, and VANDENBERG (Republican), of Michigan, on reciprocal trade policy. This compact, reinforced by an Executive order to include escape clauses in agreements so as to prevent hardship to domestic industry, may quiet discussions of tariff policy for another year, but high-tariff Congressmen still have aggressive plans.

In addition to these actions, the Republicans also have completed reorganization of Congress along completely new lines, patterned by the La Follette-Monroney Act of the last session. This reorganization reduced the number of standing committees and was accomplished with dispatch and a minimum of friction. Now Senate leaders—ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, and WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine—have decided on daily and night sessions to speed action on pending measures.

Major campaign promises of Republicans are expected to be whipped into legislative shape in the next month or two.

Labor controls have reached the drafting stage in the Senate, and also in the House. Outcome of agitation for some curbs on unions is likely to be a relatively mild control measure, plus some amendments to the Wagner Act that would equalize the bargaining positions of employers and workers. A law is expected to be passed during May or June.

Tax policy is getting specific attention in the House Ways and Means Committee, which has held hearings on the proposal of Chairman KNUTSON (Republican), of Minnesota, to cut personal income taxes 20 percent across the board. House tax leaders expected to have a bill passed by the end of March. The Senate is barred from considering tax matters until after the House acts. Outlook is for some tax reductions, with a modification of the Knutson proposal.

Appropriations are getting close attention from subcommittees of the House Appropriations Committee under Representative TABER (Republican), of New York. Administrative officials testify that Congress definitely is economy-minded, with budget cuts averaging around 20 percent. These measures are beginning to trickle through the House, which must act first.

Postal rates are being studied by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. A bill recommending higher rates for some classes of mail is likely, but the rise probably will be less than desired.

Government controls are getting attention from a number of committees. A bill is prepared to extend sugar rationing under the Department of Agriculture for another year. The duration of rent controls is being discussed. A rubber-control bill is being drafted, and wool-price supports are virtually promised. Congressional leaders say they will have all control measures ready for administration by other agencies by the time OPA and OTC expire.

Laws dealing with labor, taxes, spending, and controls will complete the domestic platform of the Republican Party, and enactment is promised on most of these matters before summer.

A two-term limit for United States Presidents also is being drawn for submission to the States as a constitutional amendment. Republican majorities have pushed this proposal through House and Senate, but details remain to be ironed out. More time will be required to draft a bill providing for a successor to the President when the office of Vice President is vacant. Passage of such a measure is still in doubt.

Foreign policy has been soft-pedaled as an issue in Congress, but now is coming to the fore and quick action is promised.

Aid to Greece and to Turkey is requested by President Truman by March 31, and Congress will try to give the White House an answer by that time.

World Refugee Organization also is likely to get United States participation with the consent of Congress. This organization would care for displaced Europeans.

Foreign relief for countries that have been aided by the UNRRA, which is winding up its operations, also is likely to be voted before summer.

International trade organization, however, appears headed for the shelf. This proposal, keystone of the administration's foreign trade policy, is getting a cool reception in Congress.

Peace treaties with Italy, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria probably are to be accepted after some debate spurred by minority voting groups in the United States.

Other domestic problems appear to have less chance for final action, but Congress is preparing to consider them despite a heavily burdened schedule.

Army-Navy merger has strong White House support and will be the subject of early hearings by Senate Armed Services Committee. But action is months away.

Universal training is another issue that will be raised and on which the decision is likely to be postponed. Congress is waiting for a White House cue.

Veterans' benefits are before Congress in a number of guises, ranging from bonus payments to higher subsistence allotments and better on-job-training pay. Congressional committees now show signs of sitting on these proposals for a while because of the high costs involved. However, veterans will be given an opportunity to reinstate lapsed war-risk life insurance during the next 5 years.

Building controls are effective until December 31, 1947, under present law, but some Republicans in Congress are talking of ending or modifying them before that date. The administration is likely to beat them to the punch by doing some modifying of its own before midyear.

Railroad legislation is proposed, but adoption is doubtful. A bill to exempt rate-making bureaus from antitrust action is before Congress, but is threatened with a Presidential veto if it should pass. Another measure providing changes in the bankruptcy laws relating to railroad reorganization is being held up until Mr. Truman's attitude is known. He vetoed one such bill last year.

Science research with Federal aid also is proposed in a National Science Foundation bill. This is likely to pass if it gets to a vote.

This Congress, like others before it, is discovering that snarls and delays are part of the process in getting laws written. Major legislation always takes time and work. The legislative list on the calendar, and the activity now going on is a sign that the first Republican Congress in 17 years is by no means inactive.

Honorably Discharged Veteran Wants Congress and Taxpayers To Know About Army Bungling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from many veterans recently honorably discharged from the armed forces, and from some still in the service, complaining bitterly of the waste, incompetency, maladministration, and corruption which they allege exists in our armed services in occupied enemy territories. The same criticism is voiced in communications I have received from civilians, present and former employees of the Federal Government, who worked in close association with the armed forces or directly under their supervision. Some of these are astute young businessmen, alert and successful professional men, and others of that type.

One of the most astounding letters I have received on this subject has just reached me from a man whom I do not know personally, but who says that he has recently been returned from Japan and has been honorably discharged from the Army. He states that he thinks the information he obtained in Tokyo and Yokohama should be brought to the attention of Congress and the American public. His statements are certainly forthright, and should challenge the attention of Congress and the tax-paying public. I respectfully request that you read this veteran's letter, which follows:

DEAR SIR: I have recently returned from Japan and been honorably discharged from the Army.

Since I have been back, I have felt strongly I should write the Representatives of my district in Kansas about what I and thousands of other servicemen considered should be brought to the attention of Congress and the American public. However, I have delayed in writing my own Representative, believing it would amount to little significance.

However, tonight I read an account in the Kansas City Star that made me believe that perhaps you may have interest in my letter.

While I was in Japan, stationed in both Tokyo and Yokohama, there were hundreds of officers totally incompetent, incapable, inefficient, and generally not worth a dime to the country. Many officers really had no job. Many engaged in selling large quantities of sugar and meat to the black market. I, personally, swear to the fact that I ate in a mess hall where there was no sugar on the table for a week yet rations were obtained daily. This fact I am not complaining about merely because we had no sugar but because it was being sold by officers higher up in the quartermaster office. Some of these men were caught and are serving in the Eighth Army stockade, but my point is that many were not caught and are still serving as officers in the United States Army. I do not advocate, sir, that these men be brought to justice but am trying to point out one of the many worthless qualities of hundreds of useless officers drawing their pay at the taxpayer's expense.

Many officers in Japan I observed, came in contact with, or personally knew, had backgrounds and intelligence that should have automatically disqualified them from ever obtaining a commission. I do not want to impress you by giving you numerous examples proving various officers' unworthiness. I am not writing for any personal reasons or because I am sore at being an enlisted man. I sincerely and honestly believe that the taxpaying public should know that they are paying the salaries of many hundreds of utterly useless officers in the United States Army.

I read that the Navy is releasing 6,000 officers. I believe, sir, that Congress should clamp down on the prejudiced War Department and demand a reduction of officers in the United States Army.

I would like to add, also, that the War Department took on a surplus of civil-service workers in Japan. These people are drawing 20-percent pay also and so many of them are excess, doing literally nothing. Perhaps my single letter is not impressive, but I know many men who saw the wasted money spent will confirm my accusations.

Increase of West Coast Lumber Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herein the following letter from a prominent businessman in Minnesota, together with an excerpt from Crow's weekly letter:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 3, 1947.*

The Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: You probably saw what happened to wheat prices when Mr. Hoover came back from Europe and gave his report. They jumped 20 cents or 25 cents a bushel in 2 days.

The same thing is happening on the west coast in the lumber market. As you know, we have given England, China, and other countries enormous credits which, incidentally, will never be paid back to us, and they are using these credits to pay exorbitant prices for west coast American lumber, the market for which is already terribly inflated by domestic demands.

A friend of mine who has just flown in from the west coast has been in my office this morning. He says that in the approximate 5 minutes he was visiting with one of his mill connections, a buyer came in and bought a million and a half feet of 12 by 12 and 20 by 20 for export squares. He paid $75 per thousand for them at the mill, free on board mill. This is conservatively $15 per thousand more than the domestic market for these squares.

In other words, the English and other buyers are using our credits and money, which we will never be paid back, as we all know, to up the prices of our west coast lumber.

A week or so ago the market showed signs of settling down and lumber coming down to a fairly reasonable level on the west coast. But when the export buyer from England, South Africa, China, or some place else steps in and out of a clear sky bids up the price of of our west coast lumber to an unheard of new height it certainly disrupts the market and we will find that his country will never pay us for the lumber.

We understand that it is also happening in southern hardwoods and pine.

In the first place, our lumber is in diminishing supply. In the second place, the consumers of this country desperately need lumber at reasonable prices.

I shall leave out what the direct cost of this lumber that we are shipping abroad is to the American taxpayer.

No expert in the world could exactly estimate the harm this extravagant export buying has done in the terrifically increased rate which the American consumer is forced to pay for lumber. It could, of course, run into many hundreds of millions of dollars with no one being the wiser. That is exactly what has been happening on the west coast now for over a year and it shows no signs of diminishing.

As I stated before, I am not terrifically concerned over the hundreds of millions of dollars we are giving away in the export-import bank, and the credit extended to England and South Africa, China, and God knows what other places, but I am terrifically concerned over the exorbitant prices the American consumer is being forced to pay for certain products as a result of this export buying.

Frankly the export buyers don't seem to care how much they pay for our material. As I say, they will never pay it back, anyway, so why should they care?

Yours very truly.

EXCERPT FROM CROW'S WEEKLY LETTER

There has been a lot of excitement in fir circles this week about the purchases recently made by Great Britain and the prospects of their buying even more lumber. The British timber controller, accompanied by a number of other officials, came to British Columbia the latter part of January, and after extended negotiations contracted for approximately 40 percent of the output of the British Columbia mills for a period which extends over to July 1, 1948. Great Britain in her purchases is taking all grades from No. 3 common through to clear and better and is accepting fir, hemlock, and a considerable quantity of western red cedar, Sitka spruce, and white pine. The prices paid for this stock are attractive, especially on the common grades, and are ample on the uppers. It is well to remember that the Canadian timber controller requires the mills in British Columbia to reserve 35 percent of their production for Canadian markets. That leaves 25 percent open, but we are reliably informed a considerable part of that is already contracted for through the balance of this year. This means that the Canadian lumber available for American markets during the next 15 months will not be enough to have any appreciable influence on the supply.

After the British procurement group had completed their deal in British Columbia they came down to Oregon and Washington and, we are reliably informed, have already placed 250,000,000 feet of fir and related species for shipment during this year. Day before yesterday they were in Washington, D. C., making an effort to get their quota expanded another 50,000,000 feet to replace a footage they turned over to China out of their war quota. Their argument is that since this cannot be shipped to China now it should be given to them. Information we get out of Washington leads us to believe the request will be granted. If it is, they are asking that delivery be made during the second and third quarter of this year, evidently with usual British foresight in trying to protect themselves against the possible inability to get lumber from British Columbia, should labor trouble develop there as it did last year as a result of a request now up for consideration where the unions are asking for a boost of 25 percent in wages. This added 50,000,000 feet could be enough to stop a break in the flow of lumber from British Columbia, providing the American mills kept going while British Columbia plants were idle, should employees there leave the job as they did last year.

The prices which the mills in Oregon and Washington are being paid for the British purchases are very attractive, enough so that it is rumored some of the largest tidewater mills have taken on substantial footages for shipment during the next 10 months. The spread of sizes and lengths is reported to be wide, covering practically everything from a 2 by 4 up to a 24 by 24 with grades ranging from No. 3 common at $60, N list common $65, N list merch at $70, and select merch at $75. As this is for rough stock and it is purchased free along ship's tackle, which saves the loading costs involved in shipping by rail, the desirability of such business can readily be seen. It is said that some attempt is being made to replace part of this order with inland plants where the short haul to tidewater is not excessive, but as it involves inspection and marking which is inconvenient for many inland plants, it is doubtful whether very much of this stock will come from that source, even though it could mean more money for rough green than is being received now on the weak market for short random rough cutting of that type domestically. Three hundred million feet of lumber is quite a footage, yet when it is taken into consideration that last week the over-all cut of the fir mills in Oregon and Washington both in and out of the association was estimated to be somewhere around 140,000,000 feet, it will be seen that over a period of 12 months it is not much of a factor. In all probability this business will be taken mostly by tidewater concerns that normally do only a minimum of rail business. Some folks are complaining bitterly about these export sales. They feel it is grossly unjust, in view of the extreme need for lumber here in our own country for the British to come in and outbid our people for their own lumber with money which we loaned them and which everyone is quite sure they have no intention of ever repaying. Be that as it may, the orders have been placed for 260,000,000 feet and except that it has provided some unusual news with which the rumormongers could toy as they searched for something sensational to hold up as a bugaboo in front of the market, it will in all probability soon be forgotten.

Christian Century Says "No" to President's Request for a Loan to Greece and Turkey

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following magazine article from the Christian Century, under date of March 26, 1947, regarding its attitude in the Greece-Turkey matter:

AN ABSOLUTE NO

Congress should reply with an absolute No! to President Truman's request for $400,000,000 to be used in bolstering with American arms and personnel the military strength of Greece and Turkey against Russia. Mr. Truman has taken the road that leads to war. He solemnly confessed that he was fully aware of the "broader implications" of the course on which he asks this Nation to embark. The tone of his address to Congress was portentous. It was punctuated by such words as "the gravity of the situation," "in this fateful hour" and "the security of this Nation is involved."

Moreover, he conceded that the aid now asked for Greece and Turkey may be insufficient, in which event the President frankly announced that he would return to Congress for more funds and "further authority." This ominous warning served notice that he stands ready to send armed forces for another purpose than merely to suppress terrorists in Greece. The Nation is thus confronted by its President with the sharply defined imminence of World War III. Mr. Truman recognizes that his proposal embodies a policy of defiance and threat toward Russia and is willing to stake American lives on its outcome.

The worst feature of his address was his attempt to justify his proposed course by invoking the principles of the United Nations in its support. Read these quotations, then rub your eyes and read them again: "We shall not realize our objectives [in the United Nations] unless we [i. e., the United States] are willing to help free peoples * * * against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes." "We [i.e., the United States] cannot allow changes in the status quo in violation of the Charter of the United Nations." In the action now proposed "the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

I

How could the President of the United States make so obviously false a claim? The course outlined by him is in reality a repudiation of the fundamental principle of the Charter of the United Nations. That organization was created for no less a purpose than to preclude just such unilateral action by a single nation as Mr. Truman now asks the United States to take. Its Charter cannot be invoked as sanction for a single-handed intervention in the situation which now obtains in Greece and Turkey. When the President pleads for our independent assumption of the responsibility that belongs alone to the United Nations, he cannot conceal the fact that he regards its principles as not binding on the United States. His tribute to these principles cannot be accepted as sincere. His reasoning in support of the proposed action thus constitutes nothing less than a torpedoing of the United Nations. It will be so regarded by all the world.

Who would have thought that in less than 2 years after its Charter had been adopted and after its organization had taken form and begun to function, the United Nations would be repudiated in principle as well as in fact by the very power which had fostered it and by the President who had acclaimed it as alone holding the promise of world peace? Mr. Truman's excuse for bypassing the United Nations is lame and implausible. He says: "We considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis, but the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations * * * [is] not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required."

II

This is incredible. The Security Council of the United Nations is in continuous session only 200 miles from the White House. The full Assembly can be brought into special session as quickly as Congress can adjust itself to the handling of the "crisis." Moreover, the issue would be defined in much simpler terms for the United Nations than for the American Congress. It falls clearly within the purview of that organization, whose fundamental purpose is "to maintain international peace and security and, to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace * * * and to bring about * * * adjustment or settlement of * * * situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." The situation in Greece and Turkey as described by President Truman, perfectly matches the purpose of the United Nations as defined by the opening words of the Charter.

The President now asks the United States to take the law into its own hands. In total disregard of our solemn pledges to maintain international peace by collective action, he proposes to meet the speculative threat of Russian aggression by an overt threat of American military power. And he piously puts forward this unilateral action of ours as a realization of the "objectives" of the United Nations. This is sheer hypocrisy, be it ever so unconscious. Still more amazing is it that men like Senator VANDENBERG and others who helped form the United Nations and paid eloquent tribute to it as the hope of the world, should now be the foremost champions of this proposal to betray it.

The assertion of the President that the United Nations is incapable of dealing with this situation is simply not true. The Assembly is empowered to consider it and to recommend to the Security Council a course of action. The fact that the United Nations has no military forces at its command and no such funds as Mr. Truman now asks Congress to appropriate is no reason at all for disregarding its jurisdiction. Nor need the veto power of the Soviet Union in the Security Council inhibit action. The interpretation of the veto which gives an aggressor nation or one threatening aggression or one believed to constitute a threat to world peace the power to estop action by the Security Council reduces the whole idea of a United Nations to either a monstrous or a childish absurdity. The present case affords an ideal occasion to expose that absurdity.

How could these alleged hindrances to United Nations action in the present situation be overcome? The problem would not be difficult. The Assembly, representing 54 nations, could recommend action. The Security Council could register the necessity of action despite the probable (but not certain) veto of the Soviet Union. For funds, an assessment of a reasonable amount could be levied upon the member nations which the United States would supplement to make up the $400,000,000 the President now asks this Government alone to appropriate. Armed forces not yet having been provided to the United Nations, the United States (or any other country) could be appointed to carry out the collective mandate with respect to Greece and Turkey with whatever military and civilian forces the task would require. If this were done, the entire adventure, even though the burden of its execution was borne by the United States, would wear a wholly different face from that displayed by the single-handed operation proposed by Mr. Truman.

The threat to world peace admittedly existing in the Greco-Turkish situation would thus be recognized as a world problem to be handled by the world organization created for precisely this purpose. The operation would not be an American operation, but a United Nations operation, with the United States acting under the authority and with the backing of the world community. The sharp edge of suspicion with which American political and economic policy is regarded all over the world would be dulled if not allayed by this procedure. The United Nations would be invested with the dignity and respect which it can never possess until it has demonstrated its ability to take decisive action in concrete cases. The present crisis provides that organization with its first opportunity to prove its worth.

The irresponsible unilateral seizure of its most essential function by the United States can result in nothing less than a scuttling of the United Nations. This is the way in which the old League of Nations was rendered impotent. American public opinion has heaped scorn upon the European powers for similar treatment of the now defunct League. This country invites the same judgment upon itself if it takes the Greco-Turkish situation into its own hands.

III

Why did not the Truman administration adopt this obvious course? Why has it taken the ball away from the world organization and run wildly out of bounds in utter disregard of the team play which it called at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco? Plainly, Mr. Truman has something else in mind than world peace. He cannot conceal it under the sentimental verbiage about America's love for little nations seeking "to maintain democratic institutions and their national integrity." Such sentiments Americans do indeed hold, even though they are under no illusions concerning their applicability to Greece or Turkey. But the President is under an illusion, once cherished but long since worn out, when he refers to the free peoples of the world who "look to us for support in maintaining their freedom." The truth is that they do not look to us; they look to the United Nations! They fear us! We think their fears are groundless. But they are very real to them.

The smaller countries, save only those whose governments are the puppets of some imperial power, have unanimously put their hopes in the United Nations. One reason is that they hope the United Nations will protect them against the great powers, including the United States! It is hard for us to swallow this bitter fact. These nations are disturbed at the prospect of the United States extending its power by independent measures outside the functioning of the world organization. To be sure, Greece and Turkey, prompted by Great Britain, have asked us to come over and help them. But even they, desperate as they are, would infinitely prefer that our help came through the United Nations than unilaterally. They prefer it because such intervention would not only promise greater immediate security but would preclude the possibility of imperial domination.

Mr. Truman's excitement over this crisis is not rooted in pure altruism. It reflects the militaristic ideology that has become ascendant in his administration, which is now dominated by military-minded statesmen headed by himself and his new Secretary of State. This mentality has little use for the United Nations. It feels its own power. It feels the great power of the United States. And its policies do not rise above the level of power. It says in effect: "We can clean that situation up; let us, then, hasten to do it!" The long-time consequence of such policies it does not see, or, if it sees them, is willing that the world shall be dominated by a single power so long as that power is in their hands. They see Great Britain bankrupt, its Empire disintegrating, the Mediterranean unpoliced, and they want to take the broken fragments of that Empire—Greece, Turkey, Egypt and the whole Near East with its multibillion investments in oil—under the wing of the United States.

A pax Americana would thus succeed to the pax Britannica. This military-minded statesmanship does not see that by usurping Great Britain's imperial position we would take over also the permanent liabilities which have brought her Empire to ruin, and this without the assets which for two centuries have filled the coffers of the ruling country. Chief among the liabilities will be the sacrifice of the moral position in world esteem which has been our proud possession for more than a century. We shall win an imperial position and hold it only at the cost of being feared and hated by the rest of the world.

All this we could avoid by acting through the United Nations. We should then have the world on our side, not alone in the present crisis, but in the future more terrible crisis which may be irrepressible. That final atomic war, if it should come, would probably annihilate civilization in both Russia and the United States. But our maximum chance of avoiding it is not to invite it as we do by singlehandedly challenging Russia now.

Our foreign policy must be taken out of the framework of imperialism in which the militaristic mentality of our statesmen are projecting it. The American people are not ready to cast their traditions and ideals on the scrap heap. They want to help the stricken peoples of the world, but they do not want to dominate them. They are willing to give millions for humanitarian relief, millions—yes, and billions if necessary—for the support of the United Nations in the discharge of its world mission against every threat of war, but not one dollar for empire!

Amendment of the Nationality Act of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to facilitate the naturalization of our brothers of foreign birth who served in the military or naval forces of our country in World War II. In fact, by its terms this amendment would apply to those so serving at any time when the United States has been or may be at war.

Under this bill certain requirements of the naturalization laws are waived, such as declaration of intention, period of residence within the country, educational tests, and fees for filing petition or for certificate of naturalization.

This action is taken at the request of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, which strongly endorses this measure. There is now on the statute books temporary legislation of a similar character. The purpose of this bill is to make permanent the already declared and laudable intent of Congress in this regard.

No one, I believe, will seriously challenge the contention that the men, few in number, who chose to identify themselves with the ideals and principles for which this Nation struggled, are entitled to special consideration in their efforts to become United States citizens.

Proper safeguards are provided in the bill in that affidavits of two credible citizens attesting to personal acquaintance with and the good moral character of the applicant and his attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States are required, together with convincing proof from military or naval forces of his honorable service. No dishonorably discharged soldier can qualify.

I am grateful and proud to have been selected by my comrades of the American Legion as the sponsor of this bill and hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the House, as a well-merited gesture of appreciation to our brothers of foreign origin who joined with us to crush the forces of tyranny and oppression.

Why "Left" Has Singled Out Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan, from the Washington Post of March 23, 1947:

WHY "LEFT" HAS SINGLED OUT TAFT
(By Mark Sullivan)

An important phase of current politics is suggested by shrewd and long-experienced Frank R. Kent. He says that it is not necessary to hold a brief for Senator TAFT or the Republican Party to recognize one of the sources of the outcry. This source, Kent says, consists largely of left-wing propagandists.

Attacks on a party in power and its leaders are as old as American politics. What makes the present one new and gives it arresting importance is the source that Kent points out.

What is going on is not primarily an attack by Democrats against Republicans, not a case of the outs attacking the ins, as has often happened. There is some of that, though much less than in the past.

The fact is that Democrats refrain from bitterness in attacks upon the Republican Congress and Republicans refrain from bitterness in attacks upon the Democratic President. This restraint is practiced more or less deliberately, especially on the part of President Truman, who is noticeably careful to avoid saying anything offensive about the Republican Congress.

NEW ALINEMENT

This very amity between the two old parties is due to a recognition by both that the party alinement which separated them in the past is now transcended by a new alinement, in which both are opposed by a common adversary.

To describe the new alinement it is necessary to use a new political terminology, which came to America from Europe some 20 years ago. It is an alinement between left and right, between conservatism and the whole gamut of thought which in varying degrees and forms opposes conservatism.

If left-wing propagandists now focus their attack upon the Republicans, it is because that party has come into control of Congress and seems to have a strong chance to win the Presidency next year. In the very recent past the left wing has with equal bitterness attacked the Democratic Party, meaning by that the regular Democrats. Nothing could exceed the violence with which some left-wing labor leaders have attacked President Truman.

And if, among Republicans, the left-wing propagandists single out Senator TAFT, it is because he is the outstanding leader of that party in the Congress which it now controls and is also a leading possibility for the party's Presidential nomination. In both roles TAFT is a symbol of conservatism and a presently active exponent of it.

So far as Governor Dewey comes to the front—and most certainly if he should be the Republican nominee—he would be the target of left-wing fire. So would Senator VANDENBERG or any other who comes to the front. Former Governor Stassen, though classified as a liberal Republican, would not be spared. For that matter, if by a change in the political picture it should become apparent that President Truman is likely to be President again, he would be a target.

All this can be understood adequately only by seeing it in the place it has in the current of history, a current which by now has become a rapids. There has been under way, for the 30 years since the Communist revolution in Russia, a world-wide movement which aims at the destruction of the economic system which Communists attempt to deride by calling it capitalism. To this world-wide movement much of present American politics is related.

About the left wing in American politics no generalization is possible, for they differ greatly in ideology. Some of them, far from being Communists, detest communism. Some of them do not intend the destruction of capitalism but only a modification of it—though not all of them understand clearly just what modification is practicable and what, if attempted, would lead to destruction. These would be shocked to be told that, without intending to, they are furthering the end of communism.

A TESTED TECHNIQUE

As for the Communists, they know what they intend and how to bring it about. By their cunning in the art of revolution they are able to maneuver many who are non-Communists or even anti-Communists. Their technique for the destruction of capitalism includes dragging down, creating lack of public faith in and ultimately destroying not only the institutions of capitalism as such, but the institutions of conservatism, including the two old political parties. For that process, part of the technique is to attack and demean individual party leaders who are symbols and exponents of conservatism.

The classic example of this, after the attempt has ended one way or the other and the history of it is written, will be former President Hoover. Because he was an outstanding symbol of conservatism, he must be made odious. The attacks upon him, prac-

ticed by every art of demeanment, did not cease with his Presidency. The purpose was not limited to preventing his reelection.

The purpose was to picture as odious one of the leading exponents of individualism and opponents of collectivism in the world. To drag down so distinguished a symbol of capitalism would help to destroy capitalism itself. To that end, the demeaning of Hoover was carried on almost up to the present day and not only in America but throughout the world.

Michigan Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the copper mines of Michigan are deep mines and the cost of mining their ores is greater than at the mines of the Southwest, especially the great open pit mines. But there are millions of pounds of the essential red metal yet to be won from the Michigan deposits. The United States can ill afford to lose this copper. These mines produced some 3,500 tons of copper per month during the war and they can continue to produce substantial tonnages if encouraged to do so.

At present copper is selling at a high price. It is in tremendous demand. There is little reason to believe the ore reserves of Michigan will be depleted during this period of high prices. Unfortunately there is no expectation that the price of copper will remain high over such an extended period. If our mines are forced to close before the reserves are mined out, many millions of pounds of copper will be lost, millions of dollars of taxable wealth will be destroyed, and a national asset irretrievably lost as the cost of reopening and reequipping at some future date would be prohibitive.

The bill to suspend the copper tariff for 2 years has just been passed by this House and there is some talk of suspending the tariffs on lead and zinc because of the great demand for base metals and the present insufficiency of domestic production. No one knows how long this condition will last. Domestic production may increase as the shortage of equipment and labor decreases and as exploration and development work neglected during the war is caught up. Consumption may decrease as consumer needs are satisfied. The cost of producing copper from our Michigan mines in some instances even now is greater than the market price of copper—yet we cannot, as I have said, afford to lose these reserves for lack of a few cents per pound.

I wish to call to the attention of the members the bills introduced by Mr. ALLEN, of Illinois, Mr. HARLESS, of Arizona, Mr. HILL, of Colorado, Mr. MEYER, of Kansas, and Mr. RUSSELL, of Nevada, to establish a Minerals Conservation Division to administer a plan by which these Michigan copper ores and other high-cost and scarce strategic and critical minerals and metals can be produced for industry, national defense, stockpiling, and generally to aid in establishing a sound domestic mining industry as a bulwark against a national emergency such as we have just experienced.

What's Wrong With Our Diplomacy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Robert T. Oliver from the March 26, 1947, issue of the Christian Century. Mr. Oliver speaks from his own background and points out the danger that is inherent in the present system.

OUR AILING DIPLOMACY
(By Robert T. Oliver)

Our ailing State Department is being moved from its gloomy old Victorian quarters to a new, brightly modern office building. Many hope that it will benefit from the change of scene. This expectation seems a little naive, however. The malady of the State Department goes too deep to be cured by a dozen roses and new curtains at the windows. It calls for surgery, blood transfusions, and a change of diet.

Peoples all over the world are bewildered by our diplomacy—our defeated enemies as well as our disillusioned friends. This country equipped and spearheaded the drive to win the war, but doesn't know what to do with the peace. We rushed forth like St. George to slay the dragon of evil, but we come back more like a gluttcn old billionaire, with a preponderance of economic and military power but no plans or desire to use it.

NOT A NEW MALADY

The malady of the State Department has been festering for a good many years. Cordell Hull was too ill himself to give it the proper care. Stettinius was too inexperienced. Byrnes was too busy. And Marshall needs an organization able to function at full speed, rather than a patient requiring diagnosis, expert treatment, and long recuperation. Just at the time when an efficient State Department is most needed, it is least able to serve. What is wrong?

The commonest diagnosis of the ailment is poor personnel. In the final analysis this may be correct, but the problem is not a simple one. The system itself is much at fault, especially since December 7, 1941. By definition, our State Department has control over our relations with other nations. But in fact this has never been wholly true, and in recent years it has not been even half true. Pearl Harbor placed direct control of our most important foreign relations in the War and Navy Departments. Presidential and congressional decisions placed other important international functions in such newly created agencies as the Lend-Lease Administration and the Office of Strategic Services. The recently organized Atomic Energy Commission is being given jurisdiction over the most vital problem in international relations. Still other important diplomatic powers are exercised by our delegates to the United Nations.

RESULT OF OVERLAPPING AUTHORITY

But this is only part of the story. The Departments of Justice, Commerce, Treasury, Labor, and Agriculture all have direct and significant functions in dealing with other people and governments, especially at a time when we have occupation forces in Germany, Japan, Austria, and Korea, to say nothing of the military bases we are setting up in many parts of the world. The lines of authority held by all these departments and agencies are interwoven but not interlocking. Hence chaotic confusion.

Two years in Federal service taught me that the chief virtue of the ordinary career man in any division of the Government is astute caution. Federal employees, like other individuals, desire to hold their jobs and win promotion. They soon learn that the best way to do both is to say and do as little as possible.

If a Federal official makes a good decision he is likely to be assailed by the heads of other departments for having infringed on their authority. If he makes a bad decision he is overwhelmed with obloquy from all sides. The easiest and safest thing to do is to make no decisions at all. Keep the problems "under study"; report "progress" from time to time; "consult" with every other agency involved; request more funds occasionally, and when they are not granted point out how the work is being handicapped; defer any decision until "joint action" can be taken, thus simultaneously spreading the responsibility and winning a reputation for careful thinking and cooperation. These are the officeholder's success formulas, known collectively to the citizenry as red tape. No real improvement in the State Department or any other governmental agency can be expected until measures are taken to cut this red tape.

THE SITUATION IN KOREA

The confusion and inefficiency caused by overlapping and ill-defined spheres of authority are well illustrated by the situation in Korea, which I studied at first-hand during an 11-week tour of investigation. The American zone there is ruled by our military occupation force, headed by Gen. John R. Hodge. General Hodge has been assigned the diplomatic function of negotiating directly with General Chistiakov, commander in the Russian zone, in an effort to reunite the severed halves of Korea. In these negotiations Hodge is governed by directives from the State Department. His progress is subject to higher-policy decisions reached in Washington and Moscow.

On all matters pertaining to his military force and supplies, General Hodge is obliged to report to MacArthur in Tokyo but must deal directly with the War Department. As military governor of southern Korea he is subject to the control of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, but the equipment and personnel with which he operates have to be secured from the Pentagon. The Far Eastern Division urges him to give his officers thorough training for specific jobs, and the War Department keeps bringing his officers home and replacing them with raw recruits.

Korea's basic economy has been ruined by division of the country into two zones, so contrived that they separate the industrial and agricultural parts. Hence the Commerce Department has an influential voice in deciding what steps shall be taken to rehabilitate the Korean economy. But the currency of Korea has been inflating steadily during the 18 months of occupation, and the Treasury Department has charge of the problem of stabilizing Korean money so that it can be admitted to the international exchange. However, since our zone is agricultural, no fundamental reforms may be undertaken without the concurrence of experts from our Department of Agriculture.

With so many hands trying to spin the wheel, and no one having authority to call the turn, the result is confusion, stagnation, and increasing misunderstanding. The 30,000,000 Korean people can only sit and wait,

while they—and the rest of the Orient—wonder why our foreign policy is so confused.

OUTDATED INFORMATION

Actually the situation is even worse than this summary indicates. In the first place, many of the so-called experts who gather and coordinate the facts upon which our policies must be based have never been in Korea. Of the few who have visited Korea, most have done so under Japanese auspices, in the days when Japan was laboring to make a case for keeping the peninsula as a slave state. In the second place, Korea is 8,000 miles away, is almost unknown to the American people, has no bloc of voters in this country, and therefore is easily kept on the shelf. And in the third place, there is no effective means by which the responsible officials of the various departments concerned can get together to consider the problem in common.

The case of Korea is not unique; it is simply one specific illustration of how our foreign policy works. The wonder is that our international affairs aren't in even a worse muddle than they are.

The average citizen has no direct contact with the State Department. He can write his Congressman in protest against or inquiry about the Polish election or the occupation of Japan or the division of Korea or whatever problem concerns him. But however much the Congressman may wish to please a constituent, his influence with the State Department is small. The legislative and executive divisions of the Government are both jealous of their own status and powers. The Congressman may criticize or demand, but except when appropriations are requested or a diplomatic appointment is to be approved, there is little effective action that he can take. State Department officials are expert in politely brushing off congressional complaints.

FAR REMOVED FROM THE PEOPLE

If citizens of Oshkosh or Peoria actually get strongly enough worked up over a problem to send a deputation to Washington, some State Department official will courteously give them time to state their case. Then he will smoothly—and accurately—inform them that due consideration will be given to what they have said, but that of course he himself has no authority to pass upon it. It is only when an individual tries to thread his way through the maze to discover (if he ever can) just where the decisions really are made that he learns how cumbersome and far removed from the people our representative democracy is.

One thing people forget when they try to discover what ails the State Department is that its employees are individuals much like everyone else. They range in ability from clerks able to earn $1,800 a year to administrators who can command $10,000. They have their prejudices and special interests and their own quota of ignorance. Most of them are not supermen afire with zeal to reform the world, but simple family men who want security and a living wage. Some are industrious and some are lazy. Most of them do their assigned work with a decent conscientiousness, but when the clock strikes five they want to close up their desks and go home to pursue their hobbies and cultivate their families.

Physicians soon acquire an impersonal, detached attitude toward suffering and disease. State Department officials develop this same professional immunity to international crises. Cases of stomach ulcers are no more frequent among its seasoned functionaries than in any other segment of the population. They know from long experience that one crisis will pass and another will come to the fore. They know that there will be excited editorials and excited deputations demanding action about Perón's pro-German regime in Argentina or the Polish elections or the Korean scandal, and they know that if they sit tight and assert stoutly that "the situation is being carefully studied" the crisis will probably dissolve or at least pass out of public attention. It is only the Bradens and Messersmiths and Hurleys and Crews—the men who try to do something about the problems—that get into trouble.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

We may say then that the malady of the State Department stems from two sources. One is the cumbersome, overlapping, and ill-defined division of authority among too many agencies and departments. The other is that the tremendous problems of a world which has suddenly become one must be handled by little men.

Secretary Marshall has no medicine to cure this ailment. The remedy must fit the dual nature of the disease. There must be, first, a drastic reorganization of the executive branches of the Government to bring all international authority under one head or at least into close working cooperation. Truman and Congress together could do this, but Marshall can't. And second, there must be better salaries, more attractive circumstances, and the pressure of public demand which together will bring wiser and more devoted men into the service of the State Department.

An observer of the Washington scene can discern little hope that either of these remedies will be immediately applied. The failure to apply them is costing us the opportunity we won in the crucible of war to remake the world along democratic lines. It is costing us the respect and confidence of bewildered peoples everywhere, who probably couldn't do better themselves but assuredly expected better of us. And, as we watch the crumbling of democratic defenses before the onward march of communism, we are forced to conclude that this failure may cost us the necessity of waging an atomic war.

Why is the State Department sick? My answer may not be the same as yours. But surely every American voice can join in a crescendo of demand that effective remedies be applied at once to get it well.

American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. MEADE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WBAL, Baltimore, March 23, 1947:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I am deeply indebted to Senator TYDINGS for the privilege of addressing you this afternoon and have chosen a subject of vital interest to every American citizen, that is, the need for an adequate American merchant marine.

In the House of Representatives last week, we were called upon to vote for a bill which provided waivers of certain navigation and inspection laws because our ships were not in condition to pass such rigid regulations. It is, indeed, a sad commentary on our shortsightedness and lack of planning for our future self-protection to have safety laws but no ships capable of complying with them.

The Congress of the United States, through the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, established a United States Maritime Commission and directed that organization "to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine, promote the commerce of the United States, and to aid in the national defense."

The Maritime Commission which we established had hardly wet its feet in a sound program for our merchant marine industry when war broke out in Europe and when this Nation was drawn into the turmoil through the bombing of Pearl Harbor. We as a Nation, and many of the young men in our armed forces who returned home safely, can thank our lucky stars that the program of the Maritime Commission was established and working when we went to war. In World War I the shipyards of this country, tremendous though they were, failed to deliver a single newly constructed dry-cargo vessel before the armistice was signed. Our men and equipment were transported on foreign-flag ships.

During the first year of the recent hostilities the merchant shipyards of the Nation, under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, delivered more than 8,000,000 deadweight tons of cargo shipping into the service of the Allies. The shipbuilding know-how, developed under the 1936 act and vital to the Nation, was paying big dividends. The next year 16,000,000 tons were delivered, and by the middle of the third year the shipping needs of our United Nations had been largely met and our supplies flowed overseas on a bridge of ships. That bridge of ships saved thousands of lives and made a vital contribution to an early end of hostilities. These same ships continued to serve the world in its rehabilitation and relief.

Today that Commission, with its war task successfully accomplished, stands in the unique position of having the world's largest merchant fleet, yet vitally lacking in the elements of a well-balanced fleet, as directed by the Merchant Marine Act.

War did not require the building of passenger-type vessels except as troop ships, nor did it require the building of the latest modern technically improved cargo ships. War demanded only that we get the ships quickly and move great weights of cargoes overseas. Cargo ships became as much an implement of war as tanks, bombers, and battleships.

In the early days of the war our entire passenger fleet was extensively converted in that other phase of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—the national defense. The one hundred and thirty-odd passenger vessels in the active American flag service in June of 1939 became the troop ships and special service ships of the armed services that carried our men safely overseas.

Of that prewar merchant fleet more than one-third were over 20 years of age, the legal lifetime set by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It was part of the Maritime Commission's program to replace these passenger ships as they reached the end of their longevity. War prevented the orderly procedure outlined by the Maritime Commission. That passenger-ship operation is vital to the merchant-marine industry, can best be pointed out by a situation which existed prior to the war. In 1 day foreign-flag ships, in competition with American-flag ships, carried out of New York harbor 5,000 passengers, most of them American, skimming the cream from some $1,500,000 worth of business. The United States needs passenger ships to carry our businessmen and the products of America to the whole world.

Today the United States merchant marine faces world competition again. Practically every maritime nation in the world is rushing the completion of the most modern merchant fleet, including adequate passenger-transportation facilities, yet the shipyards of America have not laid a single keel to replace the vessels lost in war service or those which have become overage, or those whose extensive military conversion makes it too expensive to reconvert them.

Great Britain alone is building 454 vessels; Holland, 91; Italy, 87; Sweden, 66; Norway, 62; and France, 58. How many Russia is building no one knows. Among these vessels are passenger vessels designed to once again skim the cream of American travelers. Compared to these fleets, American shipyards have under construction some 64 vessels, of which the major portion are cargo types carrying relatively few passengers and designed for specific trades.

We do not want to, and we must not, continue to use converted troopships for passenger service beyond the existing emergency. We should replace them with adequate passenger tonnage designed to keep the American flag in the world's passenger business. The Merchant Marine Act directs the Maritime Commission to build a fleet composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, yet today, in the North Atlantic, there is only one passenger ship carrying the Stars and Stripes which meets all the Coast Guard requirements and American standards. That is the flagship of our merchant fleet—the *America*—the largest vessel ever built in this country and admittedly the safest ship afloat. We need more ships with these same characteristics. Some of our prewar passenger vessels are still operating in emergency service under waivers from the Coast Guard. A few are in various stages of reconversion to resume their passenger runs. At the moment that is all that is being done to meet this critical situation, and it falls far short of meeting the directives of the Congress.

A year ago the United States Maritime Commission approved 31 ocean trade routes essential to the economy and defense of this Nation, and immediately laid plans for the design of vessels which would be required to meet such service. This program called for an appropriation of about $250,000,000 and provided for the construction of the following ships:

(a) Three 22-knot passenger liners for the American Export Lines' Mediterranean service, for which Bethlehem-Fore River is awaiting award of contracts.

(b) The 28-knot passenger liners for Moore-McCormack Lines' east coast to South America route, on which the Federal shipyard was low bidder, and whose construction was held up at the request of President Truman.

(c) Two 30-knot Great Circle liners for the trans-Pacific trade, on which the Maritime Commission was about to receive bids, when the President ordered the postponement of the projected shipbuilding program.

(d) Twenty-six modern cargo ships of a new C-3 type to remedy the shortcomings of war-built vessels.

(e) Six passenger-cargo ships for the American President Lines "round the world" service, two modern passenger-cargo ships for Alaska trade, and two combination ships for the Puerto Rican service.

That program was reduced by approximately 50 percent by the Bureau of the Budget and came in for further reductions by the President until the appropriation recommended to the House by the Bureau of the Budget for the 1947-48 maritime construction program provides for an appropriation of only $104,000,000, broken down as follows:

Three passenger ships for the Mediterranean trade, $60,000,000; 6 cargo vessels, $24,000,000; and the balance of $20,000,000 is earmarked for "betterment of ships used during the war." I am told the word "betterment" means reconditioning in maritime language.

The American public has a vital interest in continuation of the shipbuilding industry, for its military security and its economic prosperity.

Baltimore has a shipbuilding tradition. From its Sparrows Point shipyards have come for many years the tankers, refrigerator ships, and other cargo vessels needed to maintain America's foreign trade.

During the war the Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyard in this city established a new record in turning out the bridge of ships that contributed so much to our ultimate victory in World War II. Today the Bethlehem-Fairfield yard is a junkyard—literally so. The ways on which were built the vessels that carried men and munitions to win the global war are now rusting from disuse. Grass is growing in many portions of the shipyard. That part of it which is used is the scene of shipbreaking, not shipbuilding. Possibly in a few more months the same thing may be true at Bethlehem-Sparrows Point shipyard.

Global peace, global prosperity, depends on ships and shipping. As a leading world power, America must have a hand in the shaping of this global peace and global prosperity. To do so requires a merchant marine, of the type best adapted to its needs—these needs cannot be met by war surplus shipping. We must build new vessels of the types required to give us a well-rounded merchant marine. Do you know that foreign trade contributes 10 percent of our employment in the United States? We need ships for an expanding economy; we need ships for national security. We need swift passenger liners to compete with ships sailing under foreign flags, ships suitable for coastwise transport; shallow-draft vessels for river navigation; refrigerated vessels necessary for Central and South American trade; fishing craft for Newfoundland and Alaskan banks; and the Great Lakes transport barge fleets and tugs.

The shipbuilding program recommended by the United States Maritime Commission would be profitable to American business—it would keep 12 shipyards busy for 3 or 4 years maintaining a construction employment of about 90,000 and giving employment to about 590,000 other workers in related industries throughout 32 States of the Nation.

I am a strong advocate of economy in Government but I think curtailment of our shipbuilding program is poor economy. Without sufficient appropriations by Congress to carry out a comprehensive shipbuilding program, the hands of the Maritime Commission are tied and each day our merchant and passenger fleets lose their equitable share of world trade and foreign commerce.

I cannot urge too strongly that the present Congress give full consideration to the carrying out of the directives so clearly stated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of a merchant marine," adequate to carry a substantial share of the world trade and to serve our Nation's defense, a truly well-balanced merchant marine. It was well said, during the war, "The order of the day is the development of a bold and daring plan to insure the retention of the Stars and Stripes upon the seven seas."

Speech of Col. Robert R. McCormick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD a speech made by Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune, which was delivered in Los Angeles, Calif., on Friday, March 21, to open up "Spring" on the west coast.

I urge the members to read this speech carefully because it contains a wealth of factual political information which led to the financial and political decline of France and to the present financial political decline of England.

I am sure it will be well worth your time and indulgence.

The speech follows:

As far back as I can remember, France was considered the most conservative of all countries. It was thought that her revolutions were past; the royalist and imperial parties merely historic organizations; the Republic so strong that it could permit the use of titles as names, conferring no political or economic privileges; the land under the Code Napoleon widely held; most business small and remaining in the family from generation to generation; France was the leading nation in art, and was high in science. Her industries were in the luxury trades. She pioneered the high-priced automobile to be run on the military roads, and after the Wrights invented the airplane, France developed it as an expensive sport. Although the people were freed, almost nothing was done by them in such things as plumbing, electricity, and household gadgets to improve their living conditions. They kept their earnings in cash or Government bonds which became worthless with inflation.

Defeated in all of her grandiose conquests, France had learned to be self-supporting and was carrying on an unprofitable colonial policy of military conquest at high cost, as it was explained to me, to regain her military self-respect.

One thing we did not know was that her bureaucracy remained through all revolutions, continued to grow in size and to enjoy privileges over citizens not existent in America or England, privileges called the administrative law. It was so harsh with dissidents that only men of revolutionary determination dared dissent.

I was in France in 1915 as a correspondent and as a soldier in 1917 and 1918. I billeted in French houses and served with French troops. If confirmation of the French reputation for solidity and conservatism had been needed, I would have furnished it.

We started a newspaper for the Army in 1917. We continued it for 10 years after the war, during every one of which I spent considerable time in France. Year by year I could see the growing degeneration of the French people. Wartime rent controls were continued, demoralizing tenants and preventing new building. The enormous bureaucracy was not liquidated. France continued conscription and a large army when it was not needed, and which had become obsolete and mutinous when it was needed. The victorious generals of 1918 were perniciously active to retain their war rank. Communism grew to the point where workmen would not produce weapons to be used against Hitler, then allied with Stalin.

Rescued by American arms, France has confiscated almost all wealth-producing properties, is operating them badly or not at all. The country is completely bankrupt financially and morally, with no gleam of hope for recovery.

England, on the contrary, was, as Lord Curzon put it, a proud empire. Her wars of conquest had all been successful except our Revolutionary War. As much by diplomacy as by battle, she subdued her rivals Spain, Holland, France, Russia, and Germany.

Britannia ruled the waves. Under this protection, beginning in the reign of Elizabeth, there came a great outpouring of chartered companies and other organizations for trade and conquest. Some of them developed into colonies, of which only the American Colonies achieved independence. The India Company, as we know, acquired a substantial part of India. Cecil Rhodes brought on the South African war and the

conquest of South Africa. Other companies obtained extraterritoriality in China and in Turkey.

The industrial revolution begun in England gave that country a head start. The presence of coal, iron, and tin on the islands in close proximity furnished natural advantages, in trading with countries strong enough to resist aggression but backward in commerce and industry.

During the life of the Long Parliament and the Cromwell dictatorship, merchants controlled the government and greatly expanded British trade. When the Stuarts returned to power and afterward when the aristocracy took over under William and Mary, trade was again given every consideration to keep the middle class contented. With complete command of the sea, other nations could only trade by British sufferance, and with some coercion were required to patronize British banks and British insurance. Britain could import and export whatever she wanted to.

The principle that competition is the life of trade did not find its way into British jurisprudence. No laws preventing restraint of trade or preventing railroad rebates were enacted. Special privilege and monopolies were a definite part of government policy. In consequence the nation became immensely rich with the riches in few hands.

In 1873, Joseph Medill writing from England, said:

"Notwithstanding the enormous, unprecedented riches of Great Britain, the distribution of the wealth is fearfully far from general or equal. There are now 1,000,000 of poorhouse paupers in England whose condition is depicted by Dickens. They literally enough constitute the 'under-crust' of English society. The 'upper-crust' number, perhaps, 100,000 families, or half as many persons as the paupers. One-third of these are born nobles and own all the land; the other two-thirds were generally born rich and own most of the residue of the property in the form of buildings, improvements, ships and railroads, stocks and bonds, goods and chattels, moneys and credits of all kinds. Between these extremes of absolute destitution and over-gorged affluence come the great toiling millions who produced all the wealth and development. They live, as a whole, comfortably; but they have little or no accumulations, but, while self-supporting, subsist from hand to mouth as artisans or on the product of each year's crops as farmers. They own no land and few have a house they can call their own. They are all tenants, and the greater part laborers, depending on their weekly wages for means of existence. The tenant farmers number 500,000 families who, by almost starving a million of hirelings, manage to pay their enormous rents and save a little money. Thus Great Britain is a land of extremes in everything. The British Nation is the most industrious, frugal, enterprising, sagacious, pugnacious people on the face of the earth. They have the richest men in the world and the largest number of paupers and the greatest percent of landless persons."

It was the laws of primogeniture and entail that kept property in few hands.

As protection to themselves, the aristocrats allowed a few successful and rich people from the middle class to be elevated to lower grades of the nobility, upon which their descendants could climb through the generations. Thus it became the objective of businessmen to seek success in order to obtain titles and then retire from active business. As success was never an end in itself, there was little incentive to continue the improvement of an institution. Sons did not take pride in carrying on and enlarging the businesses of their fathers and grandfathers as with us. It was enough for the ennobled owner to ride along on the old momentum and avoid competition by the cartel system and by keeping wages at a minimum.

Life, with the court, the royal enclosure, fox hunting, polo, $1,500 hand-made shotguns for the exclusive use of landowners, was organized for the rich. Commissions in army and navy and livings in the church were confined to the ruling class.

Neglected and ignored, condemned to belong to the lower classes, the workmen became sullen. They refused to accept labor-saving machinery and produced less per man than any other workmen in the world. So strongly established was British control of world trade, however, that it prevailed until the blows of war set it on the road to ruin.

The adoption of free trade in 1853 deprived the treasury of much revenue. The owners of the distilleries and breweries now in the aristocracy were able to prevent substantial excise taxes. The system of income taxes was devised to maintain the Government. It operated to destroy the Empire.

"Imperialism," the doctrine that wars were fought to make money for the insiders, was widely held in the early years of this century. When the English found themselves at war in 1914, because of a secret treaty, many of them thought that it was an imperial war. They failed to enlist, they went on strikes. As one means to conciliate public opinion heavy corporation and income taxes were imposed. So heavy were they and so small was the output of English labor that England the great trading and manufacturing country could no longer compete in the world markets. Foreign investments made in previous years were sold to finance the war so that form of income disappeared. While the war did not come to the island in appreciable extent, considerable wealth in shipping was lost. Drained of capital by these losses, which could not be made good because of overtaxation, the British could not replace obsolete equipment or start any new industries. In 1932 the cartel system, the German and Italian forerunners of fascism, was adopted. Under this system each industry undertook to regulate the quality, quantity and price of the output of each of its members. In the case of the E. B. B. W. Vale Steel Company, that company borrowed money from the Bank of England to build a steel mill on the American pattern. The bank named the competitors of the bank to a majority of the places on the board and they held down the output of the only modern steel factory in England.

The aristocratic system had run its course. A revolutionary election put in the present Socialist government, which is confiscating all property. An interesting sidelight on this Government is that half of its members are from the aristocracy. The aristocracy cannot demean themselves by entering private trade, but they may operate business conducted by the Government without loss of face, but they don't know how to. The character of the Government is illustrated by the following:

A farmer named George Milton Odlum owned a model farm in Wiltshire, stocked with an exceptional herd of Friesian cattle. From the outbreak of the war in 1939 Odlum was bedeviled by Government regulations, promulgated by the ministry of agriculture under R. S. Hudson and applied by the county war agricultural committee. By April 1942 when he had been forced by the committee to part with three-quarters of his herd, Odlum was thoroughly discouraged. At this time, opportunely, a buyer for the farm turned up.

This was none other than Hudson, the minister of agriculture. Odlum named his price for the farm (about $240,000) and Hudson closed the deal with him. On that very same day, a members of the local war agricultural committee directed Odlum to restock his farm with cattle. He was instructed to buy enough to fill his No. 1 shed, which would hold 100 cows. Odlum protested the inconsistency of being forced to sell his quality herd and then being directed to restock mongrel cows which might be diseased. Apparently, however, he complied before Hudson took over the farm 3 months later.

Odlum at no time had recourse under the law. His life was made miserable by the application of the ministry's orders by Hudson's local bureaucrats. In addition, the local committee had power to seize his farm if charges of inefficiency could be proved to the satisfaction of the minister—Hudson himself. He was muscled out of his farm by a cabinet officer coveting that particular farm of all the farms in England.

The scandal finally reached the courts through an action brought by Odlum for libel against one of Hudson's agents. By the time the case was heard, Hudson had been in possession of the farm for 4 years and the libel itself was 3 years old. The hearing developed the facts as to discriminatory treatment against Odlum and preferential treatment accorded Hudson by the minister's own appointed bureaucrats. Justice Atkinson, who rendered judgment for Odlum, expressed amazement when it emerged during the hearing that the ministry of agriculture had undertaken to indemnify the defendant agent of the ministry.

"Why the country should be made to pay the damages," he said, "I do not know."

How terrifying is the Government is shown by the fact that the London newspapers did not cover the trial, except for brief stories about the judgment.

The country is bankrupt and only subsisting on American charity.

Having traced the course of France and England into socialism, tending to communism, let us see whether the same movement under way in the United States can be arrested. I hope so.

America began departing from European ways with the colonial settlements. People left Europe to get away from Europe. This movement was greatly accelerated by the Restoration. While in England the Restoration put a graded society in charge, with its doctrines of privilege and exploitation, which, as we have seen, was only ended by the recent political revolution, in America the Puritan movement continued to grow. Excesses in this country have been excesses of Puritans, not of aristocracy.

Virginia, the most British of the Colonies, developed the republican theory to a greater extent than any of the other Colonies and led all the others in the revolution and separation. The rights of man were adopted as the principles of the country. The privilege of the established church was abolished. Belief in a certain form of government was no longer prescribed by religion. Entails and primogeniture were done away with. Property was divided every generation either by will or relationship. Every man was given an equal chance in life.

During the Colonial period, when enterprise was held down, development was all in the political field. With the coming of freedom, economic improvements began almost instantly. What kinds of improvements were they? Improvements not for the few, but for the many. First came the cotton gin, removing the toil of making cotton. Then the reaper, saving the men and women on the farm from the back-breaking toil of harvesting. The steel plow opened up the prairies to ownership.

The railroads were conceived to benefit the seaboard cities and of course to earn profits, but they brought the farmers' products to the market and immigrants to the land. They supplanted the immigrants' wagons and the stagecoach. We who accept them as a matter of course should read Mark Twain's panegeric over this marvelous invention less than a century ago. Plumbing, almost unknown abroad, is almost universal here. The stove, converted into the furnace, has broken the back of winter for every one. The telephone is an apparent luxury. A hundred million phone calls a day attest its wide use.

Petroleum was developed to put a lamp on every table and when the lamp gave way to the superior electric-light bulb, petroleum remained to drive the automobiles, and what automobiles? Not Rolls-Royces, Mercedes, Panhards at great price, but Fords, Plymouths, and Pontiacs, reached by the purse of almost everyone. They brought in concrete roads for everyone to enjoy, not for cannon to pound over.

With small beginnings, the producers of these popular articles had to amass capital to enable them to meet the demand for their product. It is well known that Henry Ford began with subscriptions of $23,000. The last time I was here in 1933 Harry Chandler told me how he and a number of other forward-looking Los Angeles men endorsed Donald Douglas' note for $10,000 each to start his modest factory. The next day I went to the factory and saw the first DC-2 under construction. These examples are typical of all the industrial developments that have created our civilization. Very few men produced them all. In addition to the leaders I have mentioned you easily think of Edison and Westinghouse, and of Wright, but do you know of Igor Sikorski? You may not know who Roebling was. You have never heard of Curtis, who made newsprint possible. Do you remember Selden, inventor of the automobile, or Hughes of the electric stove? Pullman, who did so much to make Chicago and modern travel, is only remembered for the obstinacy he developed in old age. Supply all the names you can think of. How many are there? The men who created our industrial civilization, our American way of life, are numbered in the hundreds—not even the thousands. They could do it because they had been freed from aristocratic suppression and had not run into demagogic suppression.

The accumulations necessary to production inevitably made their possessors rich, many times richer than the bulk of the people, and made them a cause for envy, upon which demagogues like the Roosevelts and Huey Longs played for their political gain. Slogans were invented to outcry reason. Taxation according to ability to pay developed into confiscation. Share the wealth turned out to be share the poverty.

All advance, as I have said, is the creation of few men, inspired in their respective fields. All the rest benefit from their genius. The car builder benefits me far more than I him. Years ago I used to make frequent trips to Buffalo and put up at its poor hotels. One day I found that a first-class Statler Hotel had been erected. The last thing in the world I would care to do would be to collect a string of hotels, but I am more the beneficiary of the man who does than he is.

Now we have come to the point where there cannot be any more such men, there cannot be any more Ford factories or Douglas airplane works or Statler hotels. From now on, the men who have ideas for the betterment of human life, will not be able to put them into force, for they will not be allowed to accumulate the money necessary to production. There will be no new industries. There will be no new instruments.

Inevitably, existing ones will gradually die off with nothing to take their place. That is the road down which we are traveling, how fast I am not prepared to say.

Both the French and English civilizations went to pieces in about 30 years. Yet without the causes which brought about their decline, we may proceed just as fast to our doom—or not necessarily so. The evils which were so apparent in them have not existed here. If men of vision will have the courage to explain and expound, we may get a change in the tax laws which in the present state of public ignorance, Congressmen are not courageous enough to write.

Isn't this modern and progressive community the place to start such education?

Aid to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio talk by me, broadcast from Station WIBW, at Topeka, Kans., on March 23, 1947, commenting on President Truman's recent request for substantial aid to Greece.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are so many things I would like to talk over with you today that I am just a little bit in doubt where to begin.

There is the wheat market—margins—flurry of the past week.

There is the matter of the Greco-Turkish problem—and its implications, because, of course, the loans or grants to Greece and Turkey, plus the asked-for authorization to use military personnel in connection, are just the opening wedge for a change in the foreign policy of the United States that would supplant the Monroe Doctrine for the Western Hemisphere by the Truman doctrine for the entire world.

In other words, the Congress and the country face in the coming weeks the decision that from now on—until our resources and will to carry on run out—the United States is in world power politics for keeps, and to the limit. And the world power politics game in which Uncle Sam proposes to sit with lots of chips—perhaps more chips than high cards—centers around European power politics.

A not uninteresting feature of the twentieth century game of European power politics is that two non-European powers propose to contest for the control of Europe.

Neither Soviet Russia nor the United States of America, when you get right down to it, are European nations.

Russia, under the czars, under the Comintern, is essentially a product of Asia, of the Orient, although geographically Russia might be classed as European.

The United States is geographically separated from Europe by the Atlantic Ocean; at the same time, it could be said that Americans are more closely related to western Europe than is Russia—whether one considers the Russia of czars or the Russia of Trotzky, Lenin, and Stalin.

If the United States, through congressional action, backed by public opinion, adopts the Truman doctrine and moves into the Mediterranean (we are sending a fleet of naval vessels there this spring to intimate to the world that we mean business), the contest will be a twofold contest.

There will be the often-referred-to contest of two idealogies—capitalism and the individual freedom versus communism and the complete obliteration of the individual into a cog in the machine of the state.

More than that, the contest will be between oriental despotism and western civilization. This is just another way of saying the contest is between the East and the West—according to Rudyard Kipling, the twain which shall never meet.

What happens to the United Nations, which was to be the agency through which the East and West would cooperate for world peace, after the conflict has been resolved as being between the United States (the Western Hemisphere) and Soviet Russia (the Orient) to decide the fate of Europe, I cannot undertake to say at this time.

But it seems pretty plain, despite the protestations to the contrary, that the Truman doctrine by which the United States undertakes to preserve the independence of Europe from the Orient (as necessary to protect the Western Hemisphere also from the onslaught of communism)—it seems pretty plain that the Truman doctrine, if and when adopted by the United States, pretty effectively bypasses the United Nations.

Whether that bypassing of the United Nations is due to the inherent weaknesses of the United Nations organization or is due to the spiritual unpreparedness of the 2,000,000,000 inhabitants of this globe for an international organization capable of preserving world peace and providing or insuring the "four freedoms," I do not undertake to say.

I do say, however, that the recommendation of President Truman that the United States move into the Mediterranean to replace Britain in controlling that area of the world faces the United States with a momentous decision to make.

And very frankly I say to you that I have very grave doubts if the Congress of the United States can make a wise decision on that question before the March 31 deadline that was originally set for us by the Government of Britain.

You probably have noticed in the news columns that Britain now is considering holding on in Greece, and in support of Turkey, until next summer or fall, instead of moving out immediately.

Right at this point I want to applaud Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, for his insistence that the administration give to the Congress, and to the American people, the complete story of what commitments have been made by representatives of the United States to other nations. And also the complete picture of what the administration proposes the United States is to do in Europe, and over the world, after the United States takes the plunge from the Greco-Turkish springboard.

And I must admit that it came as a considerable shock to me to learn, from Senator VANDENBERG's own statement at the conference of Republican Senators, and from his later statement on the floor of the Senate, that he had been kept in ignorance of the administration plans in the Mediterranean area, until called to the White House only 2 weeks ago and informed that the United States was expected to move into Greece and Turkey as the British pulled out.

I had supposed, and I believe the Senate and the House and the country as a whole had supposed, that the White House had been keeping Senator VANDENBERG fully informed of all developments in the field of foreign relations. Senator VANDENBERG, who has been carrying the ball for the administration for the past years in the interest of national unity, certainly was entitled to full and complete information as to developments in the field of foreign relations.

The foregoing is not a criticism of President Truman. I am not at all certain that President Truman himself has been kept fully informed. My information is that the State Department, or at any rate some persons in the State Department, knew last fall that Britain intended to pull out of Greece. However, according to information put out in the past few days, this information was not officially known in our State Department until a short time before President Truman called congressional leaders to the White House and informed them, off the record, of the serious developments in the Mediterranean. And that London had informed Washington that it was up to Washington to decide whether the United States or Soviet

Russia should take over in Greece and Turkey—actually in the whole Mediterranean and the Mideast—when enfeebled Britain pulled out.

You are as familiar as myself with the immediate happenings that followed. After that White House conference, information leaked out as to what President Truman had told congressional leaders. The President flew to Mexico while Congress and the country were trying to get a coherent story, or picture, of what was going on in the Mediterranean.

President Truman returned from Mexico, and told the Congress in joint session what the country had learned through unofficial sources as to the British intentions in Greece and Turkey.

And also, President Truman informed us in his message, the only course open to the United States is to grant him authority to use $400,000,000—in funds, commodities, military equipment and military and civilian personnel—to support the Governments of Greece and Turkey to block the communization of Europe.

By implication, President Truman also indicated that other steps will be necessary. He did not state what these further steps will be, specifically, but a glance at the map and a consideration of developments in Europe and Asia in the past months make it plain that support of Greece and Turkey means ultimately similar support for Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Italy, France, Spain, perhaps Belgium and Holland—and any and all other nations and people threatened with infiltration by communism.

The President did not mention China, Burma, or India. I have had some difficulty, myself, reconciling our pulling out of China so as not to antagonize Chinese Communists there, and only a few days later, advocating that we move into Greece and Turkey in defiance of Communist Russia. The two policies, on the face of it, do not parse.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which I have been a member for the past 25 years, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, are holding public hearings on the President's proposals. Perhaps these questions will be answered at these hearings. I very much hope so, because frankly I am a little puzzled at some of the apparent conflicts in Asiatic and European policies of our own Government.

Another thing that adds to the confusion—at least the surface confusion—is this: Every time there is a meeting of the foreign ministers to whip peace treaties into shape the Russian representatives spring a new commitment which they say was made by the late President Roosevelt at the Teheran or Yalta Conferences.

One of the latest is that President Roosevelt agreed that Germany should make reparations payments to Russia totaling $10,000,000,000, these to be made out of current German production. If that contention is approved, and we keep supporting the German economy, what it really means is that in the long run we will pay the German reparations to Russia. And similarly in Italy, where the Russians expect to collect $100,000,000. The only way Italy can pay such reparations apparently is through a $100,000,000 loan from the United States.

A compilation made by the United States News would indicate that the United States contribution to European rehabilitation, relief, and support of governments to prevent these going Communist is some $31,500,000,000 during the postwar period. We furnished $30,000,000,000 in round figures through lend-lease during the war. Now we are being called upon to furnish a little more than that to promote European peace.

I ask you, Are there any limits to our contributions to the rest of the world? If so, what are those limits? And what are the limits in natural resources that we have to continue making such commitments? What do you think about all this? I would like to hear from you.

Defense Against Red Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the address delivered by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs. This speech was delivered before the Maryland Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution in the Sheraton-Belvedere Hotel, Baltimore. The newly elected Maryland State regent, Mrs. Harry K. Nield, presided at the session. I am glad to note that Dr. Thorning, a scholar whose competence is widely recognized, gives unqualified support to the foreign policy of President Harry S. Truman and Secretary of State George C. Marshall.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Delivering the principal address at the closing session of the Maryland Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, both quarterlies published in Washington, called for "a twofold counteroffensive against the warfare being waged by Red fascism."

"In seizing the initiative from the Marxist totalitarians," Dr. Thorning urged, "first attention must be given to an affirmative program of socioeconomic justice, providing the wage earners with some share in the ownership, or management or profits of industry and farming. Although it may be too much to expect that every man can become a capitalist, every worker can become a property owner. Until each citizen has a stake in our system of private property, the agitation for social revolution will continue. The day on which quarterly dividends are declared for labor, both on the farms as well as in factories and mines, will mark the beginning of the end for the autocrats of the Kremlin. The worker-owner will never be the dupe of Marxism."

To illustrate the operation of this principle, Dr. Thorning, who has lectured in a number of South American universities, pointed to "the growing strength of economic democracy in Costa Rica, where, after the social legislation of 1942, the number of Red Fascists dropped from 20,000 to less than 5,000." The moment the worker has something to lose, the Maryland educator declared, "the natural instinct is to retain and, if possible, to increase his property for the benefit of the family."

Speaking about the second feature of the counteroffensive against the Marxist world revolution, Dr. Thorning urged that "the United States Congress make it unmistakably clear that every Marxist totalitarian be regarded and registered as a foreign agent, exactly on a par with any Nazi-Fascist totalitarian."

The Washington editor added:

"In the Soviet bid for the domination of Europe and Asia, we are witnessing the resurrection of Hitlerism. Stalinism has become a synonym for slavery. Like nazism, it claims allegiance over the mind, the conscience, and the soul as well as over the body. Unlike Hitlerism, which was bold and outspoken in its denunciation of democracy, Stalinism pays lip service to the cause of liberty, democracy, and the right of peoples to self-determination, while it soft-pedals its hatred for the spiritual idealism of the Judeo-Christian heritage.

"Except for the doctrine of racial intolerance, every article in the Soviet creed is identical with the Nazi dogma. God, the home, and private property are reduced to a mockery. Every value in personal and social life is subordinated to the omnipotent, omnicompetent state. In this sense, it can be recognized as a new religious cult: the blind idolatry of political power; the worship of force. Even the propaganda line of the Red Fascists bears a striking resemblance to the promises, threats, and incitements to division that once emanated from Paul Joseph Goebbels. Innocent people are confused and, in some instances, deceived by the barrage of publicity organized by Marxists in the United States. Like their colleagues in the Kremlin, these international traitors and international gangsters try to utilize a vocabulary of virtue. To the vileness of totalitarian propaganda, they add the vice of hypocrisy.

"Good faith is the forgotten principle of the Soviet blackmailers. The last thing to be assumed about a member of the Comintern, whether in Asia, Europe, or America, is that he can be sincere. It is a simple waste of time to ask a Marxist totalitarian whether he is a member of the Communist Party. Opportunism, or convenience, is his only ethic. Therefore, he deserves to be treated like any racketeer, whose sole object in life is to live and thrive at the expense of his law-abiding neighbors.

"To retreat one inch from the foreign policy line that has been drawn by President Harry S. Truman and General George C. Marshall, our Secretary of State, is not only to play into the hands of the most ruthless and most brutal clique of gangsters on the face of the earth, but also to invite disaster for every home, school, and church in the Western Hemisphere. This is a duel to the death to defend ourselves against the Nazi-minded followers of Karl Marx. And, at the conclusion of the struggle, the people of the world should not be, as they are today, half slave and half free."

The Portal-Pay Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Portal-Pay Bills," from the New York Herald Tribune of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PORTAL-PAY BILLS

The portal-to-portal pay bills passed by the Senate and House are not identical and

must therefore go to conference before the final measure emerges for the President's signature or veto. The House bill is the more restrictive of the two and was passed by a vote of 6 to 1 proportions, while the vote in the Senate was 64 to 24. For this reason it is being predicted that any compromise arrived at will be weighted in favor of the House version, in which case a veto seems rather more than likely.

We think neither Chamber has approached the problem with the care and moderation it deserves. Granted that the portal-pay suits against industry, now aggregating $6,000,000,000, represent an emergency which needs very prompt attention. Granted also that their instigation, largely at the hands of Mr. Philip Murray and his Congress of Industrial Organizations, is a reprehensible attempt to soak and possibly bankrupt innocent employers and get by law that which should be left to collective bargaining. Yet, the kind of blanket action proposed may well work injustice in some cases and raise questions of constitutionality.

The Senate bill, for instance, would nullify pending portal-to-portal claims by a declaration that no employer was to be held liable for any activity of an employee which was not payable by contract or by custom in the employer's plant. It would free an employer from payment of any punitive damages in any portal suit which might for any reason remain valid. Is there not a hint of retroactivity in these provisions?

The Senate would impose a statute of limitations of 2 years barring any future claim arising out of violation of the wage-hour law. This is twice as generous as the House bill's limit of 1 year, but neither, it seems to us, measures up to the "reasonable statute of limitations" for which T. Metcalfe Walling, Administrator of the Wage-Hour Act, asked in his last report to Congress. Congress has forgotten, perhaps, that nearly 10,000,000 workers covered by the act are not members of unions and hence would be at a distinct disadvantage in filing legitimate claims under too brief a time limit.

We cite these objections as samples. No doubt some legislation in amendment of the loosely drawn wage-hour law is overdue to prevent the recurrence of any such pestilence as the present portal-pay litigation. But it should be so drawn that it preserves the individual wage earner's rights while protecting the conscientious employer from the undercutting of unscrupulous competitors. We suggest particularly Mr. Walling's constructive suggestion that Congress give the Administrator of the act power "to apply the statute and to make determinations of fact which will be binding on all parties until set aside in appropriate proceedings."

In the meantime, there is the de minimis decision of Judge Picard in the Federal District Court at Detroit throwing out the original suit brought in behalf of the Mount Clemens (Mich.) pottery workers. If this decision, virtually invited by the Supreme Court, is upheld by it, most of the suits subsequently filed should wither on the vine.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial on the pending question of aid to Greece and Turkey, by Mr. John S. Knight, of the Knight newspapers, which appeared in the March 23 issue of the Miami Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYPOCRITICAL APOSTLES OF PEACE ISSUE INVITATIONS TO WAR

CAT CAY, BAHAMAS, BRITISH WEST INDIES.—On this tiny spit of land where seventeenth-century pirates cached their loot and modern nimrods troll the warm Atlantic waters for blue and white marlin, domestic and world problems which furrow the brows of thinking people everywhere are too easily brushed aside.

If it were not for the news broadcasts from the Miami radio stations and the Miami Heralds which arrive on the early morning plane, all realities would soon be forgotten on the sun-kissed beaches of Lou Wasey's island paradise.

It was the radio which first brought us the news that Georgia's Supreme Court had decided against young "Hummon" Talmadge, thereby confirming a prediction I made several weeks ago that despite the breast-beating of the radio oracles and 95 percent of the American press, constitutional government would be sustained in the Cracker State.

I never could understand why our emoting columnists and editorial writers thought the foundations of the Republic were tottering under the impact of a purely local political fight but Drew Pearson had many people convinced that the Georgians had spawned an American Hitler.

Now the "Hummon" Talmadge fracas is all but forgotten, a new emotional crisis is being sold to the American people under the disarming label of "aid to Greece."

This time, however, we really have something to worry about.

President Truman's recommendation that a $400,000,000 "loan" be made to Greece and Turkey is not simply "meat and potatoes" humanitarianism but a firm determination to "stop the Communists" in Greece before they become too strong in the rest of Europe.

If a $400,000,000 gift to the Greeks and the Turks could turn the trick, history would give Mr. Truman credit for having made the best international investment of the century.

But unless we intend ultimately to send American fighting men to Greece, how effective will our State Department's fist-shaking and dollar-supported Greek army be in protecting Greece's frontiers against nearly 1,000,000 Communist-led Albanian, Yugoslav, and Bulgarian troops.

We would all sleep better if the Russians practiced even a little of the idealism they enunciated so clearly at the San Francisco Conference.

There the nations of the world laid the groundwork for a lasting peace with the understanding that the problem of dealing with potential aggressors would be a United Nations problem and not the responsibility of any single nation.

Now we seem so obsessed with fear of Russia that President Truman has committed the tactical error of suggesting by his action that the United States lacks confidence in the UN.

Had the Greek question first been brought to the attention of the UN by Great Britain, Russia's sincerity might have had a real test. By open discussion and debate, Russia's attitude could have been brought out in the open for all the world to see.

Now we simply lay ourselves open to anti-American propaganda by Russia and her satellites, wherever it will best serve the Kremlin's purpose.

We may find it difficult to answer the charge that American democracy is so elastic as to permit financing Britain's puppet king, a nephew of the late Kaiser Wilhelm who hasn't a drop of Greek blood in his veins.

For one, I detest the hypocrisy of political leaders who are once again issuing an invitation to war while professing to be apostles of peace.

1. Why did Great Britain decide so suddenly to abandon Greece in our favor? What private assurance did she have that we would come to the rescue?

2. Why did President Truman bypass the United Nations while an 11-nation commission from the UN was in Greece studying actual conditions?

3. Why did Paul Porter, head of the American Commission to Greece, talk so freely at Washington cocktail parties before he left about spending his last cent to defeat communism, as charged by Harold Ickes?

4. Why did Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson tell the House Foreign Affairs Committee last Thursday that "by strengthening the forces of democracy and freedom, you can do a great deal to eliminate the friction between great powers" when he knows the present Greek regime is neither democratic nor free?

5. Why are we sending a 27,000-ton aircraft carrier and a group of other warships to visit Greek and Turkish waters? Just in case?

6. Do we have the moral right to avoid consultation with other signers of the UN covenant and act unilaterally in Greece when unilateral action by Russia is so regularly deplored by us?

7. If we are committed to fighting communism in Greece with men and dollars, do we intend to wage our crusade wherever Communists exist, including America?

Or will we, as in China, urge those in power to give the Communists proportional representation in their governments?

After the sacrifices and hypocritical double talk of two world wars, the American people have a right to demand the utmost in candor and honesty from their President.

I agree with the Chicago Sun when it says that President Truman's Greek policy needs defining before Congress writes a blank check.

I agree with the conclusion reached by the Chicago Tribune that "the probable outcome of Mr. Truman's program is war with Russia sooner or later * * *. The question is whether that war, if won, will yield us enough to justify its cost in blood and wealth."

I agree with Marquis Childs, who says that the British have spent millions of pounds in Greece and millions of man-hours, yet they failed to do more than maintain precarious order by repression. "Their failure," says Childs, "will be forgotten as we move onto the stage. But if we in turn fail, then the cumulative blame will fall on us."

Opposed to such realistic comment can be found the vast majority of the watered-down editorial pages which preach a meaningless jargon of phrases about "Greek democracy," "unavoidable foreign commitments," and "our sound, practical course."

Then, too, the isolationist cry is being raised against all who dispute the wisdom of the Greek and Turkish loan even though they have been sincere and vigorous supporters of the United Nations from the start.

Men like William D. Pawley, our Ambassador to Brazil, tell us the South Americans are greatly encouraged that a country like the United States—strong enough, big enough, and unselfish enough—is endeavoring to make a reality out of the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter.

What utter nonsense. Why isn't Mr. Pawley frank enough to say that virtually all South American governments now have communism for sale?

The answer? We still cling to the hope that the breeding grounds of world conflict can be cleansed by a strong United Nations.

The Greek question should have been presented to the UN, whereupon Russia would either have had to fish or cut bait. If the UN is to degenerate into nothing more than a debating society, the sooner that is determined the better. There is little point in supporting a world organization for peace that has no sinews.

Should the UN fail, the answer may lie in a United States of Europe, a plan centuries old but again recently suggested by the New Orleans Item and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Both newspapers see in American dollar transfusions a negative policy of merely opposing Russian expansion in Europe. They doubt that such a policy will succeed.

Some students of world affairs believe an expanding Russian Empire would in time wreck itself because of the obligations and commitments it would have to assume.

They suspect that is what actually has happened to the British.

"Let those who call themselves statesmen prick themselves awake with the sharp nettles of necessity," says the Post-Dispatch, "and rise to the roles to which history calls them. Or if it is not in them to react with verve and vision, let them band together and act, as Kipling said, 'from common funk.' Like the famous advice Benjamin Franklin gave to the American colonies for Europe it is case of join or die."

The advice is well given.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Control and Regulation of Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Willis J. Ballinger, economic adviser to the National Federation of Small Business, on behalf of the federation, in opposition to the Senate bill 110.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF WILLIS J. BALLINGER, ECONOMIC ADVISER TO THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS, ON BEHALF OF THE FEDERATION, IN OPPOSING SENATE BILL 110

After careful examination of S. 110, popularly known as the Bulwinkle bill, the National Federation of Small Business desires to register a strong protest against its enactment into law.

In our opinion, the bill would legalize the growth of private monopoly in railroad transportation and reenforce its existence in other fields of transportation such as motor and water carriers and pipe-line companies. Today monopolistic rates in railway transportation are seriously preventing the recovery of private business in the United States.

In 1929 American business went into a profound depression. From that depression the economy has never recovered. From 1929 to the beginning of war mobilization the economic system was sustained by Government spending. As a result of the war there are some billions of war savings, the spending of which, for a time, will give the appearance of a sound forward movement in private business. But when those savings are gone, it is our opinion that the depression of 1929 will return with greater virulence, and that the system will remain locked in depression until the forces causing the collapse of business in 1929 have been remedied. A capitalistic system dependent on Government spending is a capitalistic system in danger of liquidation. If private enterprise cannot afford employment to millions, and Government spending becomes necessary to take care of millions of unemployed, then private enterprise will eventually be replaced by Government control and direction of the economic system.

The break-down of business in 1929 was the result of half a century in which capitalism in the United States was systematically misoperated by an alliance of big businessmen and bankers.

Monopoly controls appeared in finance, industry, transportation, and distribution. Regional competition was also eliminated through a discriminatory freight-rate system on the railroads of the Nation, which prevented the development of more efficiently located industries in the South and West. The purpose of this discriminatory freight-rate system was to protect giant monopolistic corporations from potential competition in the South and West.

The rapid spread of monopoly in American capitalism from 1890 to 1929 caused a progressive loss of productive power in our economic system. This is always the effect of monopoly in a capitalist system. The depression of 1929 registered the fact that private business had become incapable of carrying the employment load of the Nation, shackled as it was by monopolistic restraints placed on trade by big businessmen and bankers. At the same time the elimination of regional competition through the system of discriminatory freight rates had caused a congestion of the population of the Nation in a few giant cities with hideous slums.

But for this system of discriminatory freight rates, the population of the Nation would have been dispersed. Hundreds of vigorous small towns and cities would have sprung up in the West and South. The health and prosperity of the American people would have been materially increased. And from a military standpoint, the productive powers of the Nation in time of war would have been better located from the standpoint of defending those resources from aerial attack. No Communist or Fascist could have thought up a more ingenious scheme to generate mass discontent and to weaken the military defenses of the United States than the men who engineered and have maintained the system of discriminatory freight rates on our railroads.

Who are these men? They are the investment-banking houses who for decades have controlled the railroads because they controlled their credit. They are now asking the Congress of the United States to approve and make impregnable, by passing S. 110, the vicious system of monopoly controls and discriminatory freight rates which they have established in railroad transportation.

Today, capitalism in the United States is headed for destruction unless the controls which have been imposed upon the production and distribution of goods by private monopolists in defiance of the spirit and intent of the antitrust laws can be broken. The task of reform is staggering. But we must accomplish the job or watch free enterprise in America perish as it did in Germany and Italy.

S. 110 should be the joy of those radicals in America who are hoping that capitalism in the United States will fail and be supplanted by an authoritarian state of a Communist, Socialist, or Fascist type, and are, therefore, enthusiastic about policies of big business which are making free enterprise in America unworkable.

For half a century Congress has insisted that railroad rates should be determined on the basis of competition among carriers. We believe this philosophy of Congress to be thoroughly sound. Competition alone offers a possibility of railroad rates adjusting themselves to promote the maximum expansion of business. During the last half century, however, monopolistic controls have been progressively introduced into the railroad industry. Private rate-making bodies have multiplied which, in violation of the antitrust laws, have increasingly put into effect monopolistic rate-making agreements. Toward this growth of monopoly in railroad transportation the Federal Government has been as negligent as it has been toward its growth in banking, in industry, and in distribution. But the effect of monopoly in transportation on the economic system has been particularly deadly. The capacity of monopoly in transportation to restrict production in a capitalist economy is far greater than its capacity in any other field of economic activity. This is so because a monopolistic rate in transportation may be pyramided many times before a product ultimately reaches the consumer. Every pyramiding is a reduction of total consumer income resulting in less buying power and less production.

Under S. 110 the progress of monopoly in railroad transportation, and in other fields of transportation such as motor and water carriers, would be legalized.

If capitalism in America is to be rescued from monopolists, and the system reconditioned so that private business may produce abundantly and furnish full employment to the American people, the field of transportation cannot be left in their hands.

S. 110 would rivet monopoly controls in the vitally important transportation industry and further exhaust the productive powers of capitalistic enterprise in America at a time when democratic capitalism in the United States is fighting for its life.

From the standpoint of small business, S. 110 is especially disastrous. The giant monopolistic concerns existing today in industry and distribution have been largely the work of investment bankers who, many years ago, established and maintained a monopolistic control over long-term credit. Having created these giant corporations their investment banker sponsors have tended to protect them from competitors who could only challenge them by obtaining credit. The control of credit, however, has only been one arm by which giant monopolistic corporations have been protected. The other arm has been transportation.

Investment banking control of railroads has been used to obtain for large shippers railroad rates which would protect them from regional competitors and from the efforts of smaller competitors in the same market. The monopoly controls which have been established in railroad transportation have been uniformly exercised to protect and expand markets for big business and to limit and destroy markets for small business. Small business shudders at the mere thought of legalizing this unjust system. Yet, this is exactly what S. 110 would do. If monopolists in railroad transportation are to be given legal authority to fix rates in the interests of big business, then small business is doomed to economic serfdom.

We urge the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to report unfavorably S. 110. Instead of legalizing the destruction of productive power in our economic system, we urge this committee to in-

sits upon a vigorous application of the anti-trust laws to the field of transportation, as well as in other fields, and to consider other abuses which are causing the transportation system to aid and abet the restriction of production.

We would like to have the committee investigate the reported existence of preferential commodity rates allowed large shippers. We would like to have the committee go into the whole matter of large shippers owning railroads.

Under the Hepburn Act, passed many years ago, Congress specifically forbade any railroad company from owning a manufacturing company. The purpose of this prohibition was sound and clear. It was to prevent any manufacturing company from having its costs of transportation subsidized by its railroad owner, so as to give it an advantage in the competitive struggle for markets. Yet today many large shippers own railroads. The effect of this ownership is to subsidize their transportation costs in manufacturing and to accomplish precisely what was forbidden by the Hepburn Act. These railroads are frequently short-line railroads. They used to be called extensions of plant facilities. Mysteriously these extensions of plant facilities were suddenly incorporated into interstate railroads with the power to issue through bills of lading. These short lines were built up to the tracks of competing regular carriers, and by playing one carrier off against another, they obtained an unfair division of the shipping dollar. These railroads have been enormously profitable. But their profits have been a direct subsidy to the transportation costs of large shippers. Through the profits of railroad ownership large shippers have been able to lay down prices in markets, which can stop small enterprise from attempting to expand in those markets on a basis of legitimate efficiency.

Finally, we urge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to go into the whole issue of railroad freight rates which are discriminating between regions of the United States.

These fields of inquiry, we earnestly believe, offer greater opportunities to promote sound capitalistic enterprise in America than S. 110.

McGregor Asks for Wisdom in Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the huge, sprawling structure of Federal bureaucracy invites and compels waste, confusion, and inefficiency. The whole bureaucracy is too complex for our people to understand, for the President to supervise or for Congress to control. The Eightieth Congress is finding it increasingly difficult to unravel and establish good and sound and efficient Government. The almost incredible duplications of effort and overlappings of authority are baffling obstacles to wise economy.

Recently there were no less than 29 agencies lending Government funds, 3 insuring deposits, 34 engaged in the acquisition of land, 16 in wildlife preservation, 9 in credit and finance, 12 in home and community planning, 10 in materials and construction, 28 in welfare matters, 14 in forestry matters, 4 in bank examinations, and 65 in gathering statistics. In 1932 there were 521 agencies ranking as bureaus or the equivalent, and now 1,141 exist.

The people of my district want to know where their tax dollars are going and how wisely they are being spent. President Truman's recent budget called for two to three times as much money to be spent by each Government department in the coming fiscal year as was spent in any prewar year. Why should it cost taxpayers almost $700,000,000 more in 1947 than in 1946 to operate regular Government bureaus and departments? Why does the operation and cost of upkeep of the Executive Mansion have to be more than three times the amount spent before the war? Do we need over a million more civilian personnel in war agencies today than we did before Pearl Harbor?

The following table lists a few of the major items in the President's budget for the fiscal year 1949, as compared with the actual expenditures for these departments, bureaus, and agencies in the fiscal year 1940:

	Estimated expenditures, 1948	Expenditures, 1940
Independent offices	$8,814,738,291	$3,269,254,403
Department of Commerce	260,814,000	75,116,535
Department of Interior	363,405,058	71,385,280
Department of Justice	117,283,863	59,813,102
Department of Labor	166,242,917	18,570,698
Navy Department	4,510,670,000	344,198,863
State Department	611,972,742	20,829,487
Treasury Department	9,141,861,717	2,125,092,033
War Department	8,254,658,654	925,858,079
Post Office Department	356,679,270	45,953,822

The increase requested for 1948 over expenditures for 1940 for eight of the above departments, excluding Army and Navy, is $14,095,982,958. That is a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know why—and I believe my people want to know why—and I am asking those in authority to tell me in great detail if it is necessary to have these enormous increases. For example, what does the Post Office Department intend to do in 1948 which it did not do in 1940 which would justify the American taxpayer spending an additional $310,725,428 on its operations. I would also ask why the Interior Department needs an extra $292,019,818 increase above 1940.

The Labor Department wants in 1948 approximately six times what it had in 1940, and the State Department asks for more than 29 times what it had in 1940. We all know the State Department will have a whole lot more to do in 1948 than it had in 1940, but in doing this extra work, can it legitimately spend 29 times as much money as it spent in 1940?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to do away with any department, or with any individual, absolutely essential to the orderly functioning of our Government, but I venture the assertion that if the various department pay rolls were gone over carefully, the results would show that some of their pay rolls are havens for displaced bureaucratics and wartime refugees who do not want to go back where they came from.

As I have said many times, the Government is just a big individual, or a big family, and no family ever balanced its budget by arguing that it "could not do without this, that, or the other thing." It has to use the approach, "What can we afford?" So it is with the Government—$260,000,000,000 in debt. We can afford an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force and whatever is absolutely necessary to give us a full and complete program for national defense and protection for our American way of life.

Congress might have to repeal a few laws which provide some services which it once thought essential. But we can reduce by at least 700,000 those on our Federal pay roll, if we start thinking in terms of what the country can afford. When a family can no longer afford a maid and a gardener, Mama goes into the kitchen and Papa mows the lawn. A Government in debt, like a family, has to put into effect the same kind of wisdom.

Soil Conservation in Carroll County, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I extend in the following summary the soil-conservation practices carried out in Carroll County, Ark., in 1946:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
FIELD SERVICE BRANCH,
Berryville, Ark., March 22, 1947.

Hon. JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: For your information we are enclosing a summary of the soil-conservation practices carried out in Carroll County during 1946. These practices represent those for which assistance was offered under the agricultural conservation (triple A) program.

We feel that the accomplishments of this program last year and every year since its beginning in 1936 have brought benefits to farmers and city folks alike. Every citizen, whether he lives in a rural or urban area, has a stake in our Nation's wealth—the soil.

Much has been said during the past few months concerning the farmer's responsibility in maintaining the fertility of his own farm. We feel that not only the farmers but

the consuming public is responsible for keeping the land productive. At the outbreak of the last war, farmers were called upon to produce an abundance of food and fiber, and we know that this production would not have been possible had it not been for soil-conservation practices carried out immediately preceding and during the conflict.

Every individual benefited by this tremendous production, and we believe it is the responsibility of every individual to assist the farmer in restoring the fertility to the soil by offering assistance for carrying out soil-building practices.

As you recall, the President has recommended a $100,000,000 reduction in the appropriations to make payments to farmers in the 1948 program year. We are sure that such a cut would result in decreased participation since more cash outlay would be required by farmers in order to carry out needed soil-conservation practices. We believe, and are sure you do, that the triple A program is a sound conservation program and that such a reduction in funds would spell disaster to a soil-conservation program and invite the return of soil erosion to many of our farms.

It has also come to our attention that plans are being made to reduce the 1947 program funds by $100,000,000, a one-third reduction. Needless to say, such a reduction, coming after the program has been developed and presented to farmers would cause many farmers to lose confidence in the whole program and would cut participation by a large percentage.

This matter has been discussed with many farmers throughout the county and we feel that we can speak for them in asking you to make an effort to prevent a cut in either the 1947 or 1948 funds.

We wish to express our appreciation of your past support of the triple A program and are confident we can count on your continued support of a program that has not only benefited agriculture but the entire Nation.

Yours very truly,

H. E. McMORRIS,
E. A. CONNER,
CTTO G. McCALL,
Carroll County PMA, Field Service Branch, Conservation Committee.

Summary of soil-conservation practices carried out in Carroll County under the 1946 agricultural-conservation program

Practice	Participating farms, extent and value of soil-building practices carried out by practices in connection with the AAA program in 1946		
	Number of participating farms	Extent	Value
Phosphate	539	1,857,800 pounds	$12,254
Limestone	78	1,669 tons	4,589
Ryegrass seeded as cover crop.	436	94,860 pounds	6,640
Lespedeza	586	7,526 acres	10,989
Winter legumes	35	6,930 pounds	670
Sodding Bermuda	60	192 acres	1,152
Seeding pasture grasses and legumes.	214	58,916 pounds	10,211
Harvesting legume and grass seed.	74	574 acres	2,009
Construction of terraces.	7	24,753 feet	247
Construction of stock ponds.	92	63,788 cubic yards.	8,511
Contour farming	31	213 acres	127
Development of springs for stock water.	37	3,561 cubic feet.	1,780
Mowing pastures (weed control).	444	6,912 acres	4,492

Should Special Restraints Be Placed Upon the Communist Party?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it has been said today that the testimony of William C. Bullitt, former American Ambassador to Russia and personal representative of President Roosevelt in Europe during the war, as recorded before the House Committee on Un-American Activities yesterday afternoon, "comprised the most startling and sobering testimony ever presented to a congressional committee at a public hearing." Be that as it may, it should certainly be read and carefully studied by every Member of Congress and by a great many private citizens in this Republic. Copies of those hearings will soon be made available by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

America is at long last awakening to the true significance and menace of communism. For whatever it may contribute to this growing realization of the vicious aspects of communism, Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks a copy of the radio talk I made last night over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the subject Should Special Restraints Be Placed Upon the Communist Party in America?

SHOULD SPECIAL RESTRAINTS BE PLACED UPON THE COMMUNIST PARTY?

As background for my answer to the question, "Should Special Restraints Be Placed Upon the Communist Party?" I want first of all to get before this radio audience the true picture of what is actually involved in the term "Communist Party."

Unlike all other political parties in America, the Communist Party devotes its allegiance not to the United States but to a foreign country. By every test and by every action, the Communist Party in America, as in all other countries, devotes its first allegiance to Russia which is both the ideological home and the directive force of the Communist concept all over the world. For that all-important reason, the Communist Party in America cannot be considered in the same category as any of our other political organizations.

The highly reliable New York Times put this matter clearly in a recent editorial when it said—and I quote—"The Communist Party is not a political party but a conspiracy which uses democratic methods to kill off democracy and resorts to bullets whenever the ballots go against it." These blunt truths are dramatically supported by what has transpired in Hungary during the past 12 months. In that unhappy country, the anti-Communist party known as the Small-Holders Party won an election with an overwhelming majority of some 70 percent. Despite this fact, the brute force of the Russian Communists exercised through their army of occupation has put so many of the anti-Communist government leaders and officials in concentration camps that today the Communists are in control of Hungary.

The United States Chamber of Commerce has also recently undertaken to arouse Americans to the dangers of permitting the Communist Party to flourish unrestrained and unwatched within the United States. It has issued three separate booklets describing the methods by which Communists in this country seek to overthrow our Government. As an aside in this broadcast, I would like to recommend that each of you get all three of these booklets and read them carefully. If you will drop a note to the United States Chamber of Commerce here in Washington, you will be told how you can get these very significant booklets for yourself and for the libraries of the schools and colleges of your community. The first of these three booklets says this—and I quote: "Communism makes no pretense of granting freedom. The Soviet Union and the nations it controls are rigid dictatorships."

Add to this the fact that Prof. Louis Budenz, who was formerly editor of the Communist Daily Worker, published in New York, has now admitted publicly that the Communist Party in America takes its orders direct from Moscow, and you must realize from these unchallengeable facts that the Communist Party in America is a great and genuine menace to our Christian civilization and our way of life.

With that background in mind, let me say to you emphatically, I think the United States is, indeed, heading for trouble and inviting disaster if we permit Communist sympathizers and operatives in this country to dissuade us from placing effective restraints upon the Communist Party since for all intents and purposes it is but the agency of a foreign power operating in our midst.

Last Saturday the President of the United States finally issued an executive order demanding that every department, agency, and bureau of our Federal Government purge its ranks not only of all Communists but also all Communist sympathizers and all other subversive and disloyal fellow-travellers, pinks, punks, and political pustules. In doing this, President Truman was doing merely what the present Republican majority in Congress has insisted must be done as legislation had already been introduced and is now pending which would otherwise have taken precisely the same steps the President has now ordered by executive action.

Just today, the House Committee on Un-American Activities opened public hearings on still other legislation which is designed to restrain and repel the activities of the Communist Party in America. In fact, I have just come from the committee room, where our House Committee on Un-American Activities has been hearing the remarkable testimony of William C. Bullitt, our former Ambassador to Russia. You will read much about this testimony in tomorrow's newspapers.

Not only do I believe that appointment to public office should be denied to all Communists and the dim-witted dupes or designing conspirators who join their front organizations or strengthen their plots as fellow-travellers but I favor additional restraints against American Communists whether they be native born citizens or immigrants who now seek to betray and destroy the country of their adoption.

I think Communists should be denied the privilege of holding office in labor organizations under penalty that labor organizations violating this regulation should lose their rights under Federal labor legislation. I think the privilege of obtaining passports to leave this country to visit abroad only to return with new orders and directives from their foreign masters should be denied to American Communists. I favor the immediate deportation of all alien Communists not here as the accredited representatives of a foreign government.

American citizens engaging in Communist propaganda and activities should perhaps be required to register as foreign agents.

However, the fight against communism in America cannot be won by the Government

alone. Today's critical conditions require that patriots in private as well as in public life take steps to eradicate the evils of communism. Each citizen should help in this crusade. Churches, service clubs, veterans' organizations—individually and collectively there is work enough for all of us. Is their Communist literature in your public library? Is it to be found in the magazine racks or school books of your public schools? Is it being made available in the college or university nearest you? Are Communist sympathizers or agents slyly peddling their doubts, suspicions, criticisms, and propaganda in your community? Have your church, your club, your schools, your labor union, your group affiliates purged themselves of all Communists and all who promote the Communist line? When each of you can convince yourselves that you can give an honest, considered, patriotic American answer to these questions you can then—and then only—take comfort in the fact that you are helping to provide the restraints against communism which we in Government are now belatedly setting into action.

During a critical stage of our national history at Valley Forge, George Washington gave voice to the stern admonition—place only Americans on guard. In conclusion, let me say that I believe it is just as important in Washington now as it was at Valley Forge then to place only Americans on guard.

Government, a Blind Bull in the Wheat Pit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, a week ago wheat was selling in American markets at more than $3 per bushel while potatoes were bringing 1 cent per hundred pounds, sacked, at Kansas City, Mo. Both of these extreme situations illustrate the usual disastrous effects which follow Government regulation and control of production, prices, and consumption of agricultural products.

In the case of wheat, skyrocketing prices were caused by the administration's expanding program of purchasing wheat and flour for export in the face of dwindling available supplies. Originally it was planned that about 267,000,000 bushels of wheat, including 17,000,000 bushels from last year's crop, would be purchased for relief shipment abroad. If purchases had been limited to that total, there would have remained available in the United States a reserve stock of some 200,000,000 bushels, or somewhat less than the normal and desirable reserve. A reserve of only 100,000,000 bushels, under existing conditions, would be regarded as dangerously low.

But what happened? Instead of limiting purchases for overseas shipment to the announced 267,000,000 bushels, the Government increased its purchases under a plan to ship 400,000,000 bushels of grain abroad by March 31 and to continue shipments at the rate of more than 50,000,000 bushels per month, which would have brought total Government purchases to more than 500,000,000 bushels for the season. This program was conceived and carried forward with reckless disregard for the consequences.

By mid-February the damage had been done. Indiscriminate Government buying created a scarcity which even the Government "planners" could see ahead. Government purchasing was suspended, but it was too late. The pattern had been set and conditions created for the extraordinary price increases which followed. The Department of Agriculture was quick to deny all responsibility, which is easy to understand. They assert that they could not possibly be responsible for the price situation because, they say, the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased no wheat in the market since February 17, and then at only $2.07 base price per bushel. What they fail to say is that the Commodity Credit Corporation bought 25,000,000 bushels at that price, thereby further accelerating the climb in price. The market was so stripped of wheat and flour that flour mills have been and are frantic for wheat to keep operating and to supply urgent domestic requirements. At the same time every tidewater port in the country is choked with wheat and flour awaiting overseas delivery. What scant supplies remain in the domestic market are chiefly owned by the Government.

In a clumsy effort to shift blame for the ruinous boom in wheat prices and the damaging reaction which followed, the Agriculture Department has asserted lamely that the price fluctuations were caused by the activities of speculators. This incredible alibi is obviously manufactured, and nobody believes it—not even in the Agriculture Department. The fact is that as late as March 5, 1947, the Production and Marketing Administration declared that "The effort now is to reach the 400,000,000 bushel total as soon as possible, and to exceed it as much as possible during the rest of the marketing year."

From the consumer's point of view, what hope has he for lower prices when parity levels are the highest in history and a loan of nearly $2 per bushel in prospect on the new crop?

And suppose 1947 should bring a crop failure, or a short crop, what would the consequences of this program be? There would be a critical pinch and perhaps an even higher price peak. We have imperiled our own position by a dangerous impairment of our reserve supply of wheat. A normal crops of 740,000,000 bushels in 1947 would compel us to import wheat from other countries for our own domestic needs, if we could get it. Only another bumper crop—the fourth in succession—can protect the American people against the administration's policy of gambling with our wheat supplies.

A statement issued March 14, 1947, by Walter R. Scott, president of the National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades, is exceptionally illuminating, and I quote it:

> Unpredictable Government actions, rather than any speculation, are responsible for fluctuating grain futures, referred to in today's telegraphic request to exchanges that margin requirements in grain be approximately tripled.

The situation in grain futures, referred to in the telegrams of the Commodity Exchange Authority to the grain exchanges, is one of the Government's own making. It has been brought about by the actions of the Government itself and the uncertainties that have resulted from these actions rather than from "speculation talking loud in the wheat market," as recently charged by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Statements that speculation is responsible for the present situation in grain, which has brought about the highest prices in three decades, are completely contrary to the facts. The high prices that are ruling today are directly due to Government policies and activities that have brought about conditions that the entire grain trade views with concern and alarm.

If on the basis of the record as it now stands, the Government intends constantly to revise upward its export goals to the hilt of possible supply, the possibilities of further market reflection are apparent—regardless of margin rules.

Predictions of price trends are futile unless given factors respecting governmental intentions are known. In the light of recent developments, it is apparent that the entire matter of attempting to forecast future grain prices becomes a guessing game as to possible Government moves. These moves, the grain trades have ample warrant to believe, have been closely integrated with what were in effect, price support activities—due to fears of surpluses and threatened price support problems under the Steagall amendment.

The grain exchanges, in common with agriculture and the agricultural trades, have both a desire and a determination to play their full role in extending relief to war-torn peoples.

The Government originally planned to ship about 267,000,000 bushels of wheat abroad for relief purposes. Last November the Government announced completion of those purposes and revoked certain restrictions that had been placed on the usage of some grains. The trade was not prepared for that statement, and there were declines in the market of about 10 cents a bushel. In December, the Department of Argiculture, in a most optimistic report estimated a winter wheat crop of 946,500,000 bushels.

Then the Commodity Credit Corporation announced that it would support wheat on the basis of $1.88 per bushel for shipment in May—a higher price than May wheat futures were bringing in the market. The trade could not figure why the Government should resort to this policy in view of the previous statement by Secretary Anderson that the export program for the season had been concluded. Many believed that it might be a support program rather than one designed for relief purposes.

Should the Government's estimate that a total crop, including spring wheat, of 1,170,000,000 bushels will be harvested next summer be correct, it would establish a new record of four successive billion-bushel wheat crops. However, bumper crops are just as unusual as failure crops, and if we revert to normal crops of 740,000,000 bushels, it is obvious that we may have to import wheat from Canada. It is also obvious that, with the estimated requirements for export and next year's carry-over, the chief reason for high prices is that we are probably shipping larger amounts than are safe for our economy. We believe that there are inherent dangers in letting our carry-over sink to the present levels.

When Government expanded its export program unjudiciously, the futures market stepped into the breach and saved the situation. It probably is the outstanding instance in history of a vital economic function performed by the futures market. The public supplied the hedges against which the grain

trades and the millers were able to book forward contracts with the Government. Cash grains were not available due to a farm withholding movement and a physical shortage of boxcars.

At the present time the Government has decided not to ship any more wheat during May and June, but to confine its activities to flour purchases. In view of the Government's increased purchases of flour, merchandisers and elevator concerns, in order to carry on this business, had to protect themselves with purchases of wheat futures and, at the same time, public traders, who believed the prices to be too high, were predominantly on the short side of the market. Records of large commission firms show that for the first time in twenty years, public participation has been on the short side and not on the long speculative side.

All these factors—the announcement in November of the completion of relief purchases; the backing away of prices; the reentry of the Commodity Credit Corporation into the market at above-market prices; the announcement of greatly expanded governmental export programs; Government activities in absorbing all offers of grain as soon as they became available in competition with the trade—brought about widespread competition for meager supplies. All these conditions—in the face of light movement of grain from the country because of voluntary withholding action on farms and restricted shipping facilities, due to the box car shortage—are the real causes of the highest grain prices of 27 years.

And potatoes? In 1946 a bumper crop, produced as the result of guesswork and improvident subsidy on the part of the Government, found us with a huge potato surplus. To correct this fumbling error the Administration bought the surplus potatoes with $81,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. Distillers bought some of them at low cost. Schools and hospitals were given, free, all they could use. Relief shipment abroad was too expensive. Vast quantities were stored in a cave near Kansas City, Mo. According to information furnished to me they are being sold as animal feed for 1 cent per hundred pounds, sacked. I understand they cost the Government $2.50 per hundred pounds, plus handling, storage, and administration costs. Three things are happening.

First. These potatoes are being used as cattle feed, at 1 cent per hundred pounds—but beef continues to sell at $25 per hundred.

Second. Apparently many of these "giveaway" potatoes are finding their way into trade channels in competition with those commercially grown, with obvious damage to the price in the local market.

Third. The purchaser of the surplus potatoes buys a hundred pounds from the Government for 1 cent, removes the sack, and sells it for 7 cents.

And all the while the Government is reported to be buying potatoes in Florida out of the new crop at $3.30 per hundred pounds; potatoes in New York are retailing at $2.50 per bushel; and a month ago, following the Government's order to dump the rotting remnants of the surplus, potatoes were being used as fertilizer in North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, the crazyquilt policy of the Administration in regard to agricultural production and prices is not only costly to the taxpayer, but is dangerous to our economy. No foreign relief program, however worthy, justifies the impact on our economy which has occurred in the last several months. In the long run, the preservation of a strong America with unimpaired resources and a sound economy is just as important to the needy nations of the world as is our direct aid to them. And certainly in our purpose to be generous abroad we must not neglect to be just to our own posterity.

Better People and More Wealth—Pandit Nehru on India's Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

BETTER PEOPLE AND MORE WEALTH—PANDIT NEHRU ON INDIA'S AIMS

"This government or any government at the center, whether we are there or not, cannot but have the policy of encouraging industry and production in every possible way and we are certainly going to follow that," declared Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, vice president of the interim government, in his inaugural address at the annual session of the federation of Indian chambers of commerce and industry in New Delhi on March 3.

Pandit Nehru said that almost everything depended on adding to India's production. The government was pursuing numerous schemes of development at the present moment, some of them bigger, in extent at any rate, than the Tennessee Valley Authority scheme. They had vast schemes for dams, reservoirs, irrigation, hydro-electric works, scientific research, technical institutions, educational progress, etc. All these were meant to help in the production of a better type of human beings and more wealth in India. Proper distribution also was a highly important factor.

Pandit Nehru hoped it might be possible for representatives of labor, industry, government, and others concerned to meet and find a way out of the vicious circle which had arisen on account of demands for higher wages, strikes, loss of production, and the consequent loss of capacity of the industrialists to pay high wages.

Referring to the industrialists' criticism of the Government's latest taxation proposals, Nehru said they faced a very big deficit and that very large further demands were probably coming from the pay commission. "We can possibly shift the burden or try to shift it to the next generation or to the next few years. This is rather a timid thing to do. It is better to face the burden today and accelerate progress rather than simply carry on and follow what might be considered today a popular and pleasing policy and yet which may involve a greater burden tomorrow" Nehru said. He, however, asked the industrialists to put their suggestions before the Finance Member. "If we find we have committed a mistake we will change that. After all, insofar as this is a popular government, it cannot function away from the people. It must react to the popular will."

Nehru said they wanted industry to grow "in a big way" in India and to encourage the use of India's manpower in every possible way. "When I talk about industrialization for my part I don't see any essential conflict between the development of cottage industries in India and the industrialization of India * * * even if millions and millions come into industry, tens of millions remain." Nehru said that the only right way to plan was to bring up industrially the backward parts of the country so that there could be a balanced economy in all parts of India. Economic factors did not pay too much attention to boundaries. Of course nobody was going to force something against the will of a province; but the whole conception of planning, if it was to become provincial, would become ineffective.

Nehru thought there was no reason why in the future there should not be a place in India for industrialists and businessmen from outside, provided they fitted into the picture that was produced in India.

Nehru exhorted the audience to view India's problems in their larger context. Behind the latest British statement—generous as it is, because it is certainly a brave act to recognize facts occasionally—there is a certain dynamic quality about the Indian situation, he said. "India is going ahead in spite of all manner of setbacks. You cannot stop India. On the political side of it the British Government recognize that, and we must appreciate their wisdom and courage in doing so. But the fact remains, and from that fact flow other facts, that India as she is situated, geographically and economically, is going to be the center of Asia."

Nehru continued: "Recently Dr. Evatt, eminent Foreign Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, delivered a speech in which he said it was necessary to have cooperation between the countries of Southeast Asia for a solution to the Pacific problems. Dr. Evatt thought the cooperation of India was also essential and he asked India for that cooperation. That was a wise speech, and the general line that the Australian Commonwealth has been following in regard to foreign policy has been a wise one because it is thinking in realistic terms of the present."

Nehru emphasized that India could play its important role in Asia and in world affairs only if Indians made good in their own country.

Nehru said the recent British white paper on the economic situation in England was a brave paper because it frankly put the difficulties before the English people and suggested ways of meeting them—ways full of privation.

Concluding, Nehru said we are full of long-term plans but how are we even to think of these when starvation might face millions of our people immediately? "So we have to import food and we have to pay, and we are made to pay by other people through the nose for food we import. It is unfortunate that they take advantage of our need."

Cost of Debt Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, in an address before a New York State banking group in Albany, N. Y., on March 8, 1947, Aubrey G. Lanston, a vice president of the First Boston Corp., and a recognized authority on matters pertaining to Treasury financings, debt management, and fiscal policy, made certain comments with respect to Treasury interest costs

which should be valuable to Members of Congress in general.

Mr. Lanston's address aimed principally at the necessity of returning to the Federal Reserve Board some greater degree of control over the credit situation in the country. As a consequence of war financings and war financing policies, the Federal Reserve's authority has been dominated by Treasury financing desires. The principal obstacle to the termination of this wartime usurpation of power by the Treasury is deemed to be the desirability of keeping the costs of interest on the public debt at a low level.

Mr. Lanston analyzed the principal elements which comprise the appropriation which is classed as for interest on the public debt. This should be interesting to Congress because the way it is now reported this interest cost is going to rise regardless of the Treasury's endeavors to hold it down. Substantially more than 10 percent is not interest on the publicly held public debt. It certainly is misleading to say that five billions is necessary for debt service because the public thereby assumes this means service on publicly held debt. Hundreds of millions of this service is actually compound interest on special types of high coupon obligations held only by public trust funds and other public agency accounts. Such debt service is nothing but an appropriation in support of such trusts and special services. Why should we not appropriate separately for special services and trust funds if necessary, and reduce the appropriations made for debt service?

It seems to me that a clearer understanding of what this five billion of debt service is composed of is a worth-while contribution.

Apparently, the methods employed by the various Secretaries of the Treasury over the last 12 years have been such that future Secretaries of the Treasury, regardless of whether the administration is Republican or Democratic, will have to explain increases in the interest cost of the public debt as it is now reported. These increases will have originated with the present administration and will be continued into succeeding administrations unless we change now. I would like to insert in the RECORD for these reasons the following quotations from Mr. Lanston's address:

This brings us back to politics. Can the Treasury afford to increase its short-term financing costs to 1½ percent? When any increase in rates is suggested, Washington officials always ask, "What can we tell the boys on the Hill?" My answer today is that we can tell them the facts, the facts about interest costs on the public debt. I hope to prove that a new peg of 1½ percent would not serve to increase the Treasury's interest costs. I have already illustrated to you how such a new peg might be sufficiently high as to return to the Federal Reserve some capacity to discharge its legislated responsibilities.

The estimated interest cost for the fiscal year of 1947–48 is $5,000,000,000. This is made up of three principal elements. The first of these is that paid to Treasury trust funds and agency accounts. The second is that attributable to savings bonds. The third is that which is paid on the publicly held marketable debt.

In the year 1946 the Treasury paid to its trust funds and agency accounts some $500,000,000 of interest on special issues. In addition, the funds received interest on about $6,750,000,000 of marketable securities. According to our estimates, the 1948 total figure of interest should total $700,000,000 or more. Over succeeding years the total payments will show further substantial increases. It should not take many years (under existing practices and requirements) for the total to materially exceed $1,000,000,000. Some of these funds receive interest currently at 2 percent, others require more favored treatment; that is, at rates up to 4 percent. For example, the Government life insurance fund receives interest at 3½ percent. The national service life fund receives 3 percent. But this is not all of the story. The interest which is paid to most of these funds amounts to a compound interest. The interest payment of 1 year is capitalized into new debt and, in the succeeding years, the interest must be paid on the original investments plus these increments of capitalized interest. This theory of Government investment in its own securities was devised, in most cases, to provide a means by which they could earn on their assets and reduce the direct appropriations needed but, in essence, the result is to create a series of indirect appropriations. The benefits are not always general. Some go to special groups. If the appropriations were not made under the guise of "interest on the public debt", they would have to be made as direct appropriations to the particular accounts or their enacting legislation changed. The whole theory of trust fund and agency account investments should be reexamined. It seems to me to be misleading, however, to have the interest payments to these funds included as an item of interest on the public debt. Certainly there is only an indirect relation between this interest cost and interest rate and credit problems.

The second element is the amount of interest appropriated for the account of savings bonds. Treasury accounting procedure includes in the annual interest appropriation the difference between the redemption values of discount savings bonds at the end of one period and the redemption values at the end of the prior period. Since the schedule for redemption values accelerates, the amount which will have to be appropriated in succeeding years should be substantially higher. This assumes, of course, that no particular change occurs in the amount, or series distribution, of the outstanding issues. We estimate the 1948 appropriation for interest to be almost $500,000,000 below that which would be the case if Treasury accounting procedure figured E bonds at their 2.90 percent yield to maturity. Again there can be very little relationship between this element of interest cost and the changes outlined for short-term interest rates. These securities tie into the longer-term 2½ percent rate.

The third element of interest is that paid to the public holders of marketable debt. This can be measured on a basis which includes or excludes the Federal Reserve holdings. In recently commenting on the desirability of unpegging Treasury bills Mr. Eccles suggested an indirect means of taxing away any excessive earnings of the Federal Reserve banks. While this method may be less desirable than a reenactment of the franchise tax which was a part of the original Federal Reserve Act, either would remove Federal Reserve holdings from the earnings impact of a higher short-term rate.

Excluding the Federal Reserve holdings, the average weighted cost of interest on marketable Treasury obligations due or maturing within 5 years is about 1.60 percent. For some time the Treasury has indulged in a policy of refunding all such issues into certificates bearing interest at seven-eighths percent. Thus present refunding policies are steadily reducing the payments to public holders of marketable debt, while savings bond interest continues on its original schedule, and payments to trust funds, etc., are increased.

The first point of agreement that would be necessary in order to permit the new peg for certificates to be set at 1½ percent is that the Treasury and Congress be satisfied with the present costs on the currently outstanding total of marketable debt. It is not necessary to defend a plan which would create higher interest costs. The only other point of agreement necessary would be that interest rate and refunding policies will not be combined in an attempt to reduce interest payments while adhering to a policy of rate stabilization.

It seems to me that the average person might be justified in the inference that a policy of stabilizing interest rates implies that the level of interest payments on a given total of debt are low enough—at least for the common good. I go along with the view that reductions in debt should be made via bank-held securities. But I can't go along with a policy aimed at stabilizing interest rates which is then combined with a refunding policy which reduces interest costs without retiring debt, and thereby tends to unstabilize market yields. Holders of short-term securities seek to recover the loss of income that is entailed in the refunding policy by buying longer securities in the market and thus depressing market yields. It is small wonder that Chairman Eccles foresees a future trend toward lower market yields.

Now I would like to comment on two points. The first concerns Government accounting. Two offsetting items cannot be lumped. This is probably standard accounting procedure but it doesn't change the facts of life which are as follows: Treasury interest payments are taxable. One estimate that we have heard of the effective rate was about 30 percent. If this is correct, then the real cost of our third element of interest is less than 2½ billions or one-half of the total gross appropriation. This is the real cost of the debt that can be directly affected by Treasury and Federal Reserve policies concerning interest rates.

The second point is that the interest costs on the debt are going to rise no matter how persistently the Treasury continues to refund with seven-eighths of 1 percent certificates. I might digress to repeat that the further that the Government persists in this refunding policy at the seven-eighths of 1 percent rate, the more it increases the problems of stabilizing interest rates. Eventually it meets up with the necessity of increasing its costs by offering higher securities. The increase in the interest payments called for by the investment requirements of trust funds, etc., will alone far outweigh decreases in payments to the public marketable securities which come from refunding debt costs of about 1.60 percent into seven-eighths of 1 percent issues and occasional offerings of longer securities. When one must add to the increasing cost of interest to trust funds, the increasing costs of servicing savings bonds, the possible offsetting reductions via refunding policies appear even less effective.

The Need for Tariff Protection for Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

attach herewith a statement by Donald Comer, an outstanding southern industrialist, which appeared in the Lafayette Sun, of Lafayette, Ala., under the heading This Morning, a column by John Temple Graves 2d.

Mr. Donald Comer, chairman of the board of Avondale Mills, is the son of the Honorable B. B. Comer, one of Alabama's great governors. His statement on the need for tariff protection for textiles is a thought-provoking one. I commend it to the attention of the Members of the Congress.

When John Temple Graves asked me to write about the need for tariff protection for textiles, I didn't know that I would be writing it from Key West. My little boat is here. From her deck I have had the opportunity of seeing our tariff in action. A schooner from Cuba came in loaded with bananas and tomatoes. I bought bananas; they were duty free. I bought tomatoes with a tariff charge of 89 cents added. Two schooners came in from Honduras with several hundred green turtles. I had turtle steak last night—duty free. This is fair. We are taking from our neighbor stuff that we need—bananas and turtles, duty free. We are taking a few tomatoes out of season after paying an accepted duty. Certainly Cuba and Honduras are taking some of our stuff under similar arrangements.

Extremists point to our reliance on foreign sources, mentioning coffee, certain tobaccos, sugar, hemp, tungsten, quinine, tin, rubber, etc. We need such items and welcome reciprocal trading. The Hull program stated that it was to facilitate exchanging other countries' surpluses that we needed for our surpluses that they needed. No one objects to that. There should be triangular trading also.

Some nations take from us only their needs, but insist on our taking their stuff that we don't need. And that is where cotton textiles enter. In 1925 we have 37,000,000 spindles. Today there are only twenty-three million. Some of these were dismantled and shipped abroad. Others, like the old sow, just went down the road and died. The Economic Almanac of 1945–46 lists investments in textiles and their products in 1925 at $6,487,000,000; in 1941, $4,471,000,000. Net earnings for those intervening years amounted to $991,000,000, which was an average of 1.15 percent earnings on capital invested.

Any industry claiming need of full tariff protection should show not only capacity to care for home needs but also freedom from all collusion for price control. Our industry is sharply competitive; failures all along the route and records of low earnings speak for themselves. We are encouraged that President Truman has just given his approval to Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton's plan for modification of the trade program. I certainly am opposed to any Washington trades that permit entrance of foreign cotton goods which stop Avondale looms. Secretary Clayton now promises industry a public hearing before any such trades. World peace will not come by stopping my looms in order to start looms in Germany, Japan, Italy, or anywhere else. This country is launched on an industrial program based on not how little a wage we can pay but how much more we can pay. And I am in accord with Senator PEPPER'S bill to increase the legal minimum to 75 cents per hour. With high wages there are some things we can make cheaper and which the world will want, but let's take our pay in bananas, coffee, turtles, sugar, tin, rubber, etc.—not in cotton goods. When you speak of swapping goods with our neighbors, be specific—mention the goods that are to be swapped. All industrial nations use the same automatic textile machines. Their wages are much lower than ours. Japanese working at 25 cents per day use the same machines we do. Previous to 1937 Japanese cotton goods were flowing into our country in tremendously increasing percentages. President Roosevelt increased their tariff rate 50 percent. The Japanese, to use their own words, just laughed. The flood from Japan was only stopped by quota agreement.

Protected by tariff we have today a minimum textile wage of 80 cents an hour. The two are tied together.

High labor costs and standards have priced United States shipping out of the world competition.

Our prodigious wartime shipbuilding program has served to build up nearly every merchant fleet in the world, while leaving United States at old prewar level.

What about this? Will our trade treaties provide a place for American merchant shipping? I mean a place in ocean traffic—not rotting at anchor up Hudson River. We are losing our ocean trade; let's protect our home industry.

There is another reason. Key West is a submarine base, warships are training here for our protection; as long as we need them we will need our 23,000,000 cotton spindles for our protection too.

Naval Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution and memorandum:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the United States entered the last two major world conflicts with a Naval Establishment and fleet which, while an efficient force for its size, was wholly inadequate for the responsibilities thrust upon it; and

Whereas during these two national emergencies we had formidable allies who were able to delay the attack and encroachment of the enemy until such time as our industrial and manpower resources could build, equip, and efficiently man a naval force of superior power; and

Whereas we may not in the future depend upon the delaying action of such allies and, furthermore, the speed with which today's armaments can move in an offensive action makes this Nation especially vulnerable if faced with emergencies as we have previously experienced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the below-listed organizations in regular session assembled at Long Beach, Calif., March 2, 1947, do hereby request their respective congressional Representatives, and the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, to take such affirmative stand which has for its objective the holding of budgetary limitations to insure the maintenance of naval shore establishments and fleet, capable of creating international respect and assuring peace and security for the people of the United States, its Territories, and its protectorates:

Terminal Island Naval Shipyard Employees Association.

San Francisco Naval Shipyard Employees' Association.

Navy Yard Association, Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

Master Mechanics' and Foremen's Association, Terminal Island Naval Shipyard.

Master Mechanics' and Foremen's Association, San Francisco Naval Shipyard.

Master Mechanics' and Foremen's Association, Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

Quartermen and Leadingmen's Association, Terminal Island Naval Shipyard.

Quartermen and Leadingmen's Association, San Francisco Naval Shipyard.

Quartermen and Leadingmen's Association, Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

Technical Supervisors' Association, Terminal Island Naval Shipyard.

Technical Supervisors' Association, Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

FEBRUARY 11, 1947.

MEMORANDUM REGARDING CURRENT STATUS OF NAVAL SHIPYARDS

1. Subject shipyards are 11 in number and support units of the United States Fleet in accordance with the geographical distribution of the units thereof. These shipyards are located as follows:

East coast: Portsmouth, N. H. (note, primarily a submarine-design and construction yard); Boston, Mass.; Brooklyn, N. Y.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Norfolk, Va.; and Charleston, S. C.

West coast: Bremerton, Wash.; Vallejo, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif; Long Beach, Calif.; and Pearl Harbor, T. H.

2. These 11 yards are manned entirely by civilian labor under top management of industrially trained naval officers and civilian technicians. Generally speaking, the highly trained, skilled, civilian personnel of these yards are career civil-service employees who have received much of their specialized training in the Government service through apprentice and other schools and the helper grades and represent a rather considerable Government investment. The modern fighting vessel of any class today represents the most highly developed and complicated mechanisms of our mechanical age. The skilled employees under consideration are basically trained in the repair and maintenance of such mechanisms and, it is safe to say, their like cannot be found anywhere in the country other than in naval shipyards. True, highly specialized mechanics are available everywhere in industry, but the general skills represented in shipyards cannot be directly replaced from such sources. For example, a highly trained lathe hand in a factory on shore would be utterly useless to undertake repairs of a battleship's machinery. It would require several days for him just to find his way about the ship, without a guide.

3. It was from these nuclei of trained workers that the country drew many keymen to form the basis for new yards, both governmental and commercial, during the late war. The naval shipyards themselves were built up about tenfold on the rolls by the demands of the war by constant recruitment of available labor from any and every source. These tremendously increased complements were not efficient but they managed to meet the demand in an almost miraculous way. However, their success rested on the foundation of the comparatively small number of basically skilled naval shipyard workers from which our supervisory and instructional personnel was drawn. Without them it would never have been possible to return our many bombed and torpedoed vessels to the front line in time to meet the strategical demands of the naval commands afloat. In this respect, our workers were in direct competition with the shipyard workers of the enemy and that they were far superior to anything the enemy could develop was certainly demonstrated many times especially in the Pacific area where our workers took on successfully the additional handicap of long time-consuming voyages of damaged ships to and from the battle area.

4. These naval shipyard complements of skilled mechanics have already been rather drastically reduced and the relatively unskilled and semiefficient labor is no longer

on the rolls of these yards. The general reduction has now brought most of the yards to about 25 percent of war complement—more than prior to the war, of course, but our two-ocean Navy is also many times greater than before the war, and modern military installations are vastly more complicated and difficult to maintain. If these basically trained shipyard workers are cut still more drastically, they may be permanently lost to the Government service. Many, if not all, of our best naval shipyards are located at a distance from industrial centers where these skilled workers could be readily absorbed and therefore will be forced to move out of the area beyond recall should their services again be needed. Preparedness for World War III, if it comes, will require constant industrial readiness. There is a definite minimum below which any one of these shipyards cannot be cut without seriously endangering its continued existence as an efficient and economic operating unit.

5. The President's 1948 budget provides for these skilled workers under the title in the naval budget indicated as "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships." This title includes other matters than naval shipyard workers and totals $381,150,000 under six basic subheads, as follows:

1. Maintenance of the active fleet	$154,000,000
2. Maintenance of the inactive fleet	29,400,000
3. Miscellaneous operating cost	4,000,000
4. Electronics maintenance	85,000,000
5. Investigation and test	39,520,000
6. Shore establishments	118,000,000
Total	430,670,000
Less adjustments	49,520,000
Final estimate	381,150,000

6. The naval shipyard workers in all shipyards are largely contained in items 1 and 4 of the above, and, to a less degree, in items 2 and 6. Item 6 contains funds for many other workers largely in the class IV (b) category in inspection, supply, design, etc., services in naval stations as well as shipyards. The shipyard personnel included in item 6 consists largely of personnel such as for safety, industrial relations, and other general services chargeable as indirect labor. The real shipyard skilled mechanics are largely charged off as direct labor under items 1, 2, and 4. A general comparison can be made with "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, 1947," which was $443,750,000 and served to support about 100,000 employees in the 11 naval shipyards mentioned. The same title for 1948 would support the employment of about 84,000 employees in the same 11 shipyards. To cut below this would be a serious and drastic matter in the service, to the active fleet in particular. The 1948 budget set-up for the Bureau of Ships has already discounted the increased efficiencies expected from the discharge of relatively untrained workers and also has had to take account of about a 22-percent increase in basic shipyard wages during 1947.

Dropping OPA Suits Bad Policy (H. J. Res. 146)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recommend as forcibly as I can the defeat of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the pending resolution (H. J. Res. 146). His amendment would drop all the prosecutions, running into the thousands, because of violations of the OPA regulations. Already this vast number of cases has been filed and perhaps many more are on the way.

Think what this means. Millions of our people struggled along with rationing, rent control, and all the other controls. They faithfully obeyed the rules and cheerfully made whatever sacrifice was necessary to make rationing and other controls work. Thousands voluntarily worked on boards and in other capacities, without pay and often at great inconvenience, to make war regulations work. The small group that is being prosecuted are the "black sheep" in the flock. They violated the law and broke the regulations to make profits, to get advantage, to break down the rules of the game so they could make more and have more. They are the ones that made things tough for those who administered these necessary wartime regulations and for those that obeyed them.

Now, this group, that by their actions were downright disloyal, are to be made a favored group by having the cases against them dismissed. It is an insult to the great army of loyal and patriotic people I have mentioned to take such a step. It is a terrible example to set by Congress, of all institutions, who make the laws and certainly should expect violators of those laws to be brought to task. This talk about being sued by the United States, and its possible dire consequences, is really child's talk. Why should not a man be sued or prosecuted when he deliberately violates the laws which are supposed to be and are obeyed by 99 percent of the population? This is the kind of action that brings disrespect for the law and lack of confidence in Congress. These big operators and black marketeers would laugh up their sleeves if Congress passed such an act. But more important, it would be a severe shock to the great group of law-abiding, honest, and loyal people who cheerfully put up with wartime regulations and did all they could to make them work.

There might be some suits that will work a hardship or perhaps an injustice. I have enough faith in the courts to think that they will make just decisions—whether made by juries or judges. Just because of the filing of a suit is no reason to conclude that the Government will win. To turn the scoundrels out, without trial certainly will not help the situation.

Of course, what they did is not a violation of the law now. The reason is that the law and rules that they violated are not needed now. They were desperately needed during the emergency and that is the more reason why they should not have been violated and why those who did break the rules at that time, when the country was at war or in the emergency following it, should be prosecuted. When has it been the policy of any sound government to make a citizen account for and even be punished—after trial—for his defiance of the rules of the Government which gives him protection and the opportunity to live a useful and productive life? Such a policy as is proposed in this amendment would in effect be to punish the law-abiding and honest citizens and favor the crooked and lawless citizens. Let those who made their unlawful bed lie in it and if they are found guilty obtain the punishment that they so richly deserve. I cannot believe that the House of Representatives would ever give its approval to such a doctrine as this amendment expresses. Should there be some small technical cases, that might work injustices, they can be handled by the administrative agency in charge of the cases.

True Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in these days of world-wide confusion and uncertainty as to what constitutes freedom, I am inserting under leave to extend my remarks a definition of true freedom:

I call that mind free which masters the senses, which protects itself against animal appetites, which contemns pleasure and pain in comparison with its own energy, which penetrates beneath the body and recognizes its own reality and greatness, which passes life, not in asking what it shall eat or drink, but in hungering, thirsting, and seeking after righteousness.

I call that mind free which escapes the bondage of matter; which, instead of stopping at the material universe and making it a prison wall, passes beyond it to its Author, and finds in the radiant signatures which it everywhere bears of the Infinite Spirit, helps to its own spiritual enlargement.

I call that mind free which jealously guards its intellectual rights and powers, which calls no man master, which does not content itself with a passive or hereditary faith, which opens itself to light whencesoever it may come, which receives new truth as an angel from heaven, which, whilst consulting others, inquires still more of the oracle within itself, and uses instructions from abroad not to supersede but to quicken and exalt its own energies.

I call that mind free which sets no bounds to its love, which is not imprisoned in itself, which recognizes in all human beings the image of God and the rights of His children, which delights in virtue and sympathizes with suffering wherever they are seen, which conquers pride, anger, and sloth, and offers itself up a willing victim to the cause of mankind.

I call that mind free which is not passively framed by outward circumstances, which is not swept away by the torrent of events, which is not the creature of accidental impulse, but which bends events to its own improvement, and acts from an inward spring, from immutable principles which it has deliberately espoused.

I call that mind free which protects itself against the usurpations of society, which does not cower to human opinion, which feels itself accountable to a higher tribunal than man's, which respects itself too much to be the slave or tool of the many or the few.

I call that mind free which, through confidence in God and in the power of virtue,

has cast off all fear but that of wrongdoing, which no menace or peril can enthral, which is calm in the midst of tumults, and possesses itself though all else be lost.

I call that mind free which resists the bondage of habit, which does not mechanically repeat itself and copy the past, which does not live on its old virtues, which does not enslave itself to precise rules, but which forgets what is behind, listens for new and higher monitions of conscience, and rejoices to pour itself forth in fresh and higher exertions.

I call that mind free which is jealous of its own freedom, which guards itself from being merged in others, which guards its empire over itself as nobler than the empire of the world.

In fine, I call that mind free which, conscious of its affinity with God, and confiding in His promises by Jesus Christ, devotes itself faithfully to the unfolding of all its powers, which passes the bounds of time and death, which hopes to advance forever, and which finds inexhaustible power, both for action and suffering, in the prospect of immortality.

Legislative Larceny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, taking advantage of my momentary absence from the floor, attempted to explain away his participation in one of the rawest legislative thieveries ever perpetrated in any Congress.

There was nothing new to his protests of "It ain't necessarily so." The same kind of protests always emanate from the lips of the individual who is caught in the coop with a chicken in his hand.

If I may be allowed the privilege of moving into the realm of the classics, I would paraphrase a bit of Shakespeare and say aloud: Methinks the gentleman doth profess his innocence too much.

The gentleman's defense, or rather attempt to explain away the unenviable position of himself and his party in this current program of legislative larceny in an effort to at least give the semblance of some initiative and accomplishment for his beleagured party, reminds me of the defense of the little boy who shouted, "Well, he hit me first" when he was caught in a fight.

I will not charge the gentleman with deliberately misstating the record. I will be generous and suggest that he has been misled as to the facts in the case.

This is the gentleman's first year as a member of the District of Columbia Committee. I am now entering my seventh year on the committee.

Not once during my many years service on the District of Columbia Committee, except in the present instance, has a bill introduced by a member of the minority, or even the majority party, been taken away from the member of the committee and rewritten in the name of the chairman.

Until the gentleman from Nebraska injected partisan politics into the hearings on the alcoholic clinic bill, which I had introduced, I had never heard the words Republican or Democrat mentioned in the committee deliberations. The District of Columbia Committee has always been a nonpartisan committee until this introduction of the "minority-party-be-damned policy" enunciated by the gentleman from Nebraska who said he was acting on instructions of the Republican leadership.

When the distinguished, able, and persuasive gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] took over the chairmanship of the District of Columbia Committee, he made it a point to emphasize in his opening statement that the District of Columbia Committee was a nonpartisan committee in considering the affairs of the Nation's Capital.

Now partisan politics and party selfishness has taken over full sway. As I pointed out when I first objected to the procedure, all I wanted to know was whether or not this would be the Republican Party policy in all legislation which was introduced by a member of the Democratic Party.

The gentleman from Nebraska made the very frank statement before the members of his subcommittee, before at least three representatives of the Washington press, and before District of Columbia officials that it was their—the Republicans—intention to take all the "cream" and credit for all good legislation.

The gentleman makes no denial that his party has embarked upon a policy of legislative thievery and political thievery.

The gentleman frankly, openly, and unashamedly admits it. I quote his own words from the extension of remarks in the RECORD of yesterday:

He says:

> The elephant stood all the attacks, and put up with this legislative thievery and political carnage, but, because it has thick hide, it did survive. Now the tables are turned.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, "Now the tables are turned" the gentleman says, thereby admitting that the Republican Party is going to adopt as its policy for the next 2 years "political carnage and legislative thievery"' and the gentleman's only justification is that the Democrats are alleged to have practiced it which makes it right for the Republicans to practice in retaliation. If the Republican Party intends to emulate the Democratic Party I think everybody should know about it right now. That is not the song they sang when they were crying for votes in the last congressional elections. At that time they were going to do everything quite different from the Democrats.

Up to now they have not done things differently from the Democrats. They have not done anything at all and we are fast approaching April 1, traditional April Fools' Day. It will be a fitting day for the majority of Americans to observe the fact that they have been fooled and fooled plenty.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been a fanatical party member. My record in this House will show that I have voted for and against legislation regardless of party lines. I am not one who is so narrow as to believe that all the good Americans in this country are in the Democratic Party and all the bad Americans are in the Republican Party. There is good and bad in both parties and any fair-minded and impartial observer will admit as much.

I denounce the present policy of the Republican Party in refusing to grant any member of the minority party the right to sponsor important, progressive, and constructive legislation. I would denounce a similar policy in the ranks of my own party if it ever came to my attention.

The gentleman from Nebraska quotes what purports to be an accurate record of bills introduced and sponsored successfully by members of the Republican party during their lean and hungry years in the Congress. Somebody has said that statistics can prove anything and the gentleman from Nebraska clearly demonstrates it.

He does not point out that the Republicans were not only short numerically in the Congress but that they were also short on initiative and creative legislative powers.

For all his misleading figures and groping to prove statistically what the facts in this legislative thievery are, nowhere and not once does he point out a specific instance in which an individual Member of Congress introduced and sponsored legislation such as I have in this instance, and then had the Democratic Party steal the legislation.

Until he is able to show where there has been partisan politicians in the District of Columbia Committee; until he is able to cite one instance in which an individual Member's legislation has been expropriated by the chairman of a subcommittee on instructions of the party leadership—his puny and weak explanations and attempts to justify this rank usurpation of the rights of the minority party, fall by the wayside.

The gentleman is as inaccurate in his conclusions as he is when he makes the statement: "The bill had extensive hearings. It was found necessary to make 19 changes in the bill to perfect it. There were three new sections to the bill."

The facts in the case are that during the extensive hearings the bill was always referred to as the Hébert bill and never the Miller bill.

The facts in the case are further that the gentleman himself openly admitted that "several small changes" had been made in the bill when his hand was called before his subcommittee, for stealing the bill from my authorship. He minimized the importance of the changes at that time.

The fact further remains that no new sections were added to the bill and only one section was rewritten.

I believe the record speaks for itself. I mean the correct record.

If the gentleman from Nebraska is quoted correctly in the press he made the statement last week, "So all the screaming HÉBERT wants to do will not change the situation."

He is absolutely correct in that my screaming will not change the situation as far as it relates to the policy of the

Republican Party in this House to embark on a rampage of legislative larceny. No, Mr. Speaker, my screams will not affect any individual who defends himself by saying, "You did it first."

The echoes of those screams, however, Mr. Speaker, will not fall on deaf ears when they reach the cities and the hinterlands and come to the attention of those who were followed by false Republican promises in the last congressional election.

My sole purpose in making an issue of this legislative skullduggery is to get it to the attention of the American people who should be informed about the policies and the practices of the party which has carried a self-made halo about its head for so many years but now finds that the halo has become the hangman's noose about its neck.

Could it be that the Republican Party in the Congress, suddenly awakened by the results of the recent Gallup poll and unnerved by the storm of protests which have come to Capitol Hill, are going to attempt to smother any progressive thought from the minority party. Could it be that the Republicans are attempting to hitch their chariot, weighed down with broken promises and multitudinous mistakes, to the fast ascending star of the Democrats. Could be.

Soviet Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Evening Star of March 17, 1947:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Certainly, if the successor to Hitler's dream of a consolidated empire from the Channel to the Urals becomes another totalitarian power hostile to the whole civilization of which America is a part, we have not only lost the peace; we fought the war in vain. That sooner or later, therefore, the United States, as the defender of the West, would have to call a halt to Soviet imperialism—which has already encompassed or obliterated a series of historic European states—was long obvious.

But it is also time that our right hand should know what our left hand is doing.

After Munich gave Hitler the most important strategical points for expansion, Britain and France "guaranteed" Poland. What that guarantee amounted to we now know.

Now, while Congress is being asked to guarantee the freedom of Greece, it is also being asked expeditiously to ratify the Italian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian peace treaties.

I submit that it is impossible, in reason, to reconcile these two policies.

The issue is whether Greece is to become a Soviet colony. The means for securing that end is Marshal Tito's support of the radical elements of ELAS. The factors contributing to possible success are misery, unemployment, hunger, fear, and military incapacity to deal with an armed rebellion supported within Greek territory by external assistance. The Greek Government must be aided to relieve the economic suffering of the Greek people and resist the enemies of Greece for the defense of Europe and the Middle East.

But what, then, of Italy?

Soviet pressure on Greece comes via Yugoslavia. So does the pressure on Italy and Austria. Italy, however, is an "enemy," who must be "punished." What Italy? The Italian people and nation? Former Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt affirmed, with accuracy, that the Italian people were all but unanimously against the war. The Italians were the only people to overthrow fascism on their own initiative. No European resistance movement contributed so much to our victory nor suffered so many casualties in actual fighting on our side.

Italy's government is as democratic as any in Europe. And this government is now asked to sign a treaty which lays Italy wide open to the same Soviet puppets who conquered Yugoslavia and are threatening Greece.

While Italy is forced to abandon her most important naval establishments on the Adriatic, the Soviet puppet, Albania, is creating a powerful naval and air base across the same sea. With a powerful Yugoslav army across her borders, Italy is required to abandon the mountains, which are her only defense on land, and to disarm.

A poor country by nature, and an overpopulated one, she is to be deprived of her chief mineral resources—including most of her inadequate supplies of coal—and prepare to receive into her congested area 250,000 evacuees from less congested parts. Finally, she is to be taxed a reparations bill from current production.

The Italian Communists, in intimate contact with Marshal Tito, profiteer on disillusionment with the west, proclaiming that exploitation of the lost territories and the recovery of the Italian economy can begin only when Italy combines with Yugoslavia.

If we consider these propositions in connection with our stand in Greece, we appear to be running around like chickens without heads.

Hungary has been looted to collapse by the Russians. The anti-Communist parties, representing the vast majority, are being smashed by the Communist machine. The people place their dying hopes only on the United States.

Bulgaria, as much a Hitler ally as any satellite—as was Slovakia, which nobody mentions—is a Soviet pet to be rewarded, though the Dimitrov regime turned even these perennial pro-Russians against it.

Now all these countries are to be pushed away from us by treaties that violate reason, justice, common sense, and pledges, while we take a stand in Greece.

The Senate is not required to ratify these treaties. It should await developments and consider them only in the framework of an all-European settlement.

War Assets Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, what about the War Assets Administration?

Are we safe in saying, "Where there is smoke there is bound to be fire?"

I am of the opinion, and for sound reasons, that our veterans in many instances are being given the run-around by the War Assets Administration.

Presently, and past, I have had specific instances brought to my attention where the veteran's-preference certificate meant no more than a piece of blank paper.

Is it not time that Congress made a complete investigation of the War Assets Administration, asking them to account for the unpardonable manner in which they are pushing our veterans around?

Such an investigation may reveal startling facts, and would be the beginning of a new era for our veterans who are definitely entitled to certain benefits and consideration by the War Assets Administration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Ruston, La., March 18, 1947.

Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PASSMAN: With reference to the attached copy of a superbly asinine letter from the New Orleans office of the War Assets Administration, you will recall that in December 1945 after I became the veterans' service officer for Lincoln Parish in September, I accused the Smaller War Plants Administration in the press and by letter to you and certain other public officials, of gross inefficiency in the handling of veterans' applications for Government war surplus property, implying therein that the condition was due mainly to ignorant, inexperienced personnel, and incompetent administrators. Constant dealing with the SWPC and its present successor, the WAA, in helping veterans of Lincoln Parish in their attempts to obtain various items of surplus property have proven my previous contentions to be entirely wrong; I concede that, from top to bottom, these organizations were and are composed of smart, grasping, mercenary individuals who have worked in such close cooperation that very little Government surplus property has ever been released directly to individual veterans. I predict that future historians will marvel at the gigantic swindle which worked so smoothly, and consistently channeled surplus property away from the individual veteran while an unconcerned Congress was busy with "important matters."

The various systems for disposing of surplus war property were cunningly designed to lead the veteran into a hopeless mass of red tape. If a veteran happened to have the proper assistance, patience, persistence, and insistence enough, some of them actually received a "veteran's-preference certificate" and always along with this certificate came implicit directions cautioning the veteran against taking any further steps as he would be notified "when, where, and how" to procure the article covered by his highly prized certificate. In this parish I doubt if more than 10 percent of these "certificate holders" ever heard anything more; but, in a few isolated instances where the veteran refused to be discouraged, maybe he actually went to the time and expense of attending a sale several hundred miles from his home. This sale, for instance, where the automotive vehicle he was "certified" for was, was purportedly "for veterans only."

As a result of the veteran's persistence, he finds that the sale prices of each vehicle are "fixed" and that their "condition" is magnanimously certified by the Government of these United States as being "as is." This "as is" condition, in most every case, was a guaranty that all such vital parts as batteries,

carburetors, generators, distributors, tires, transmissions, and so forth, had been removed. As practically no veteran went to the expense of having a wrecker accompany him from his home to the sale site, he was very successfully stymied at this point. However, as a further precaution against the insistent veteran, these so-called fixed prices (to individual veterans only) were an insult to the intelligence of a half-wit, but the objective of keeping automotive equipment out of the hands of the individual veteran was thus attained in a great majority of cases. This situation, of course, leaves most of the "as is" vehicles still in the possession of the Government, and a very successful plan for disposing of them to "dealers," many of whom are actually dealers only for the day of the sale, goes into effect the day following the "veterans-only sale." The simple plan that worked to perfection was to accept whatever price was offered by the so-called dealers for large lots of vehicles. In this way our benevolent Government disposed of acres of vehicles to nonveterans and unscrupulous veteran dealers for what the Government had the day before asked an individual for one vehicle. This—not allowing the individual veteran to purchase at a fair price based on the "as is" condition of the vehicles as were the "dealers"—was very effective in prohibiting automotive equipment from reaching the individual veteran. This system also assures the Government of a terrific financial loss, which the taxpayers will have to absorb; the individual veteran has been prevented from getting much-needed equipment essential to his self-employment, and as a last step in this apparently prearranged vicious circle, both the veteran and the public will have to pay exorbitant prices for this property when it appears on the market manipulated by war profiteers.

The system used in preventing individual veterans from obtaining items other than automotive varies somewhat from that described above, in that the individual veteran could obtain another so-called "veterans' certificate to purchase surplus property for personal use" for articles listed on the veterans' only "set-aside list" of property through the assistance of veterans' service offices. The same technique is followed in that with his certificate the veteran was always informed that he would be advised "when, where, and how" to use his certificate. Only a very small percentage ever hear anything further, but if the veteran accidentally learns of a sale at which articles covered by his certificate are to be sold and he is fortunate enough to find a catalog or listing of the articles, he may actually try to purchase a small desk, office chair, filing cabinet, typewriter stand, etc. If this happens, a very effective method of confusing this veteran is to advertise a sale to begin, say, on January 3, and stipulating that purchase orders of veterans who must buy through correspondence (which includes all veterans in Louisiana residing outside of New Orleans) will not be considered if they are received prior to midnight of January 8. After contacting the post-office and railroad agents in an attempt to determine when a letter which will be handled by three public carriers will reach the WAA office in New Orleans as soon as possible after midnight of January 8, the veteran either gives up in disgust or takes a chance and submits his purchase order anyway. In most cases on January 10 he gets a nice mimeographed letter from the WAA telling him his order was received prior to the designated hour and explaining that this procedure was "necessary in order to afford all veterans, wherever located, a sufficient amount of time to place their orders and be given equal consideration after midnight of January 10."

This procedure admittedly makes it possible for some veterans residing in the immediate vicinity of the sale site to submit their orders during the period from January 3 to 7, inclusive, as is borne out by the fact that the "mail order" veteran frequently receives notice that the article which he ordered by an order perfectly timed to reach the WAA at exactly the time stipulated, is not available as it had already been sold (obviously to a veteran who was in position to submit his order in person between the 3d and 7th). Every once in a while though, in spite of these little obstacles, a veteran manages to keep from being tagged out and is actually awarded an item of Government surplus property, say as of November 6, 1946; on November 10 the veteran forwards a remittance to cover the "fixed" price together with shipping instructions and is agreeably surprised on December 11 (it being only approximately 300 miles from the veteran's home to the sale site) to receive confirmation of his purchase and acknowledgment of his remittance. This notice is in the form of Sales Document No. 4955034 for article No. 990511. Then in a day or so he gets an important looking telegram from the WAA which states, "your purchase one desk sales document 4955034 routed truck line. Property located Higgins, La. Unable to ship by truck will rail be satisfactory?" The veteran hastens to reply by wire, "re-tel please ship articles on sales document 4955034 by freight." Being a reasonable sort of person and still having some confidence in our Government the veteran heaves a sigh of relief and begins bragging to his friends that he has bought a piece of surplus property from the Government's "set-aside" property for veterans only. However, on the following March 10, which was nearly exactly 3 months after the exchange of telegrams, the veteran timidly writes the WAA and reports he has never received the article purchased back in last November and requests information as to when he may expect to receive the shipment; his reply to that inquiry is immediate and reads, "please be advised that the office furniture covered by sales document No. 4955034, is located at the Higgins Plant, Michaud, La., and up to this time has not been released for shipment. Since there is no information as to when release of this material may be expected, it is suggested that you submit claim for refund in the amount paid for such material; unless you desire to await further developments. We regret any inconveniences caused you in this matter and trust that your needs may be filled in the near future." Talk about finesse in keeping surplus property from veterans—isn't this just too gorgeous! And brother, it is a profession pursued to perfection by the WAA.

Do you think this veteran will ever get his piece of "set aside" (and how) surplus property if he refuses to withdraw his purchase order? And how many guesses do you insis on taking as to what will happen to this piece of property and who will benefit if the veteran does release his purchase?

What I and many other veterans think of the various agencies involved in keeping veterans from purchasing Government surplus property could not legally be transmitted through the mails, but what is a thousand times worse is the lowering of our inherent respect for constituted authority and the realization that our elected representatives are too busy with "important matters" to be interested in the world's greatest fraud.

Sincerely,

CHAS. B. CARTER,
Veteran World War I and II, Commander, Area B, the American Legion, Member Post No. 3615, VFW, Lincoln Parish Veterans' Service Officer.

Come Home, General MacArthur! America Needs Your Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 38, requesting President Truman in the name of the American people, to invite Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur, United States Commander in Chief, Far East, to return to the United States for a period of at least 30 days.

I am introducing this resolution because I feel that our country has been neglectful in failing to properly recognize and acclaim the accomplishments of a mighty military figure.

As one who served under the command of General MacArthur in the Far Pacific in World War II, I join many others who know him as a military genius, a gentleman, and a statesman.

While the Allies are at loggerheads in trying to administer the affairs of occupied Germany, General MacArthur has demonstrated his leadership and ability by handling the Japanese situation in a superb manner. Truly he is the man of the hour despite the criticism of certain "pop-offs" in the field of journalism.

It is unnecessary to point to the fact that world conditions are alarming. Once again the American people are faced with a crisis as momentous as 1776.

What better stabilizing influence would result to the benefit of the American people than the appearance of General MacArthur before a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives, supplemented by Nation-wide radio addresses to the American people? General MacArthur could analyze world conditions in the light of our national security, infiltration of foreign influences, and the decline in morality. His counsel and advice on these subjects is sorely needed at this time.

Mr. Speaker, in support of House Concurrent Resolution No. 38 I am including as part of my remarks two newspaper articles, one of which is an editorial from the pen of Robert W. Boyer, editor, Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa., and titled "Bring 'Mac' Back."

The other article is written by the well-known columnist, Henry McLemore, and appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer under the caption "Nation owes home tribute to MacArthur."

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune]
BRING "MAC" BACK

This country has been strangely remiss in its duty to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Every top leader of our fighting units has received high honors from the folks at home—all but MacArthur.

We have heard a lot of criticism of him, during the war and since. None of it very serious, none that questioned his ability as a soldier or as a great leader, just little things, about how he was a tough disciplinarian, and

how he liked to make showy speeches, and also was ready for the spotlight.

Yet, this man who, so many said, yearned for the limelight, is the last great American leader to receive it, and as a matter of fact, hasn't got it yet.

It is common knowledge now that General MacArthur drafted the Pacific war plan that put the Japs on the run, when other military men were scratching their heads over the problem of routing the Nips from hundreds of islands.

While the Allies are making a frightful mess of the German occupation, MacArthur has Japan rolling, if not smoothly, at least steadily on the road planned for it.

In every effort, he has demonstrated leadership and ability of the highest order.

It is time he was brought home for the tribute he should have.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

NATION OWES HOME TRIBUTE TO MAC ARTHUR

It is time Douglas MacArthur came home for a few days to receive the tribute owed him by this Nation.

He isn't getting any younger, you know, and the strain he has been under since December of 1941 is enough to have killed a lesser man. It has been 10 years or more since he has been on the shores of the continental United States.

All of our other mighty warriors of World War II, from privates to the shiniest brass, have had their moments in the sun. They have been huzzahed in the large cities and in their home towns. But MacArthur, the man who was once thought to be the biggest limelight-seeker of them all, has yet to hear a single plaudit. He is still thousands of miles away, doing a job without parallel in history.

I wonder how many Americans noticed the abrupt change that took place in Douglas MacArthur once victory was secured. Criticism and ridicule was directed toward his communiques during the dark days of the war in the Pacific. Scholars spoke of them as nothing but purple patches, and the man in the street said they were corny. And they were, but they served their purpose. Those were the days when this country was giving his meager Army little or nothing to fight with, and so he fought back with dramatics, the personal pronoun, purple patches, corn, and anything else he could summon.

Those who fought under him, and reached the Philippines with him, know why he used the much-ridiculed phrase, "I shall return." It was the rallying cry of the Filipino guerillas, and kept them armed and fighting when the cause appeared hopeless.

Sailors sang ribald songs about him, but he must have managed to get along with Nimitz, because time and tide and distance didn't keep the soldiers and the sailors from hitting the beachhead on the split second.

Soldiers had their jokes about him, too. We laughed about "Dugout Doug," and how he flew a plane thousands of miles to get neon lights for his shoulders, but deep in our hearts we knew then, as we know now, that we couldn't tie his shoe laces as a soldier, and that we were under the leadership of a tremendous soldier.

I myself, will never forget the sight of him wading ashore at Morotai when the buffaloes were still bringing in the early waves of assault troops, lemon-colored gloves in hand, and corncob pipe at a cocky angle; or at Leyte, walking about the beachhead apparently as unconcerned about personal danger as if he were in the dugout his GI's had talked about him staying in so much.

Nor shall I forget his headquarters at Tacoban, Leyte. He chose the biggest house, as he would, in town. But it so happened that the biggest house was also the biggest danger spot, as it was situated halfway between the two top Japanese bombing targets—the harbor and the air strip. Those who were with him there will tell you that he never took the trouble to cover himself with a mosquito net at night.

Since MacArthur stood on the deck of the *Missouri*, and accepted the surrender of the Japanese, just try to name one flowery speech he has uttered or one bid he has made for personal popularity.

So, let's bring him home. Here's one former GI who'll borrow bus fare to help line the streets of whatever town is chosen for the parade.

United Nations Status and the Truman Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Durham (N. C.) Morning Herald:

UNITED NATIONS STATUS AND THE TRUMAN POLICY

Charges that the contemplated United States action in Greece will subvert the United Nations have come about primarily as a result of the frankness with which President Truman placed the problem before the Congress and the American people.

It may well have been that if he had simply asked for a loan to Greece as a distressed nation, without going into the political consideration involved, there would have been little complaint.

Perhaps also there would have been no loan.

The President obviously felt that frankness was in order, that he must take the American people into his confidence if he was to expect their support. Perhaps he felt that the American people must be shocked into a realization of the tremendous factors involved.

But through his frank appraisal of the situation in Greece, he brought upon his head the charge that such action as he proposed would be a body blow to the United Nations and an indication of a cynical lack of faith in its effectiveness as a world organization.

Our contemplated action in Greece does not imply any lack of faith in the ultimate effectiveness of the UN. But the Organization is as yet an infant. Its development is not complete. It has not yet realized its possibilities.

And certainly no nation in the world has done more to contribute toward the realization of those possibilities than the United States has done from the very beginning and will continue to do in the future. No other nation in the world is more concerned that it become an effective force for world peace.

Some have charged that Greek aid will set a precedent for unilateral action which may plague us in the future. This argument seems powerful at first but does not stand up well. Those who advance it lose sight of the fact that this is not the first time that a member of the United Nations has indulged in unilateral action, but that it is the first time that such unilateral action has been taken in the very spirit of UN, for it is action to preserve liberties, not to suppress them.

We are not contemplating action to overthrow or otherwise suppress a government but to preserve it against force.

It is one thing to attempt to upset a government, to suppress the liberties of a people, to deny them the right to settle their own affairs through free elections. It is quite another thing to try to assure those liberties, to try to assure them their right to the kind of government—and economic system—which they wish.

We are not going to tell the Greeks what sort of government they must have or what sort of economic system. We want them to be able to say themselves.

The administration hopes that the Greek problem eventually can be taken over by the United States, which could be done now. Certainly the course which we have been called upon to take in Greece is one which even the most democratic among us undertake reluctantly. If the UN could handle it we should be glad to turn it over.

And that the UN is not at present able to handle it indicates the job which is yet to be done. The UN must be made sufficient for such problems. The need for strengthening the organization is now more apparent than ever. And for this reason it is possible that our action in Greece, far from being the body blow to the UN that some picture it, may give to the member nations the impetus needed to make it the effective and powerful organization that it must be.

Sugar Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am including herewith the petition of William H. Emerine of Alvada, Ohio, and other Ohio residents, concerning the rationing of sugar:

STAMSOGAR

A conspiracy intent on controlling all peoples of the earth by controlling the availability of these nine basic products:

1. Steel.
2. Tungsten carbide.
3. Aluminum.
4. Magnesium.
5. Sugar.
6. Oil.
7. Gas.
8. Alcohol.
9. Rubber.

Whereas in this day and age all mankind cannot for very long do without any or all of these basic products; and

Whereas it is now known that 23 powerfully rich men of earth are bent on gaining control of these basic products; and

Whereas those 23 men are determined to control the people of all earth by controlling these nine basic products; and

Whereas sugar affects all of us directly through our diet; and

Whereas sugar is necessary to our diet: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, ask that you, ALVIN F. WEICHEL, introduce a resolution in Congress to remove sugar from all rationing and to investigate as to why not sufficient sugar is being imported into the United States from sugar-producing countries.

William H. Emerine, Mrs. Orie Bard, Mrs. Merritt Milbourn, Mrs. Dorothy Eagleson, Mrs. H. L. Church, Mrs. Frank Phillips, Mrs. L. Wagner, Vern McEwen, Max Shaffer, Louis Lockmiller, Edward Lockmiller, Alexander Gross, Bert

Smith, Mrs. E. A. Rose, Mrs. Mary E. Schreiner, Lettie Roux, Mrs. Earl Sewell, Mrs. David Mankin, Mrs. B. F. Mankin, Mrs. Frank H. Barnhart, L. R. Graham, E. L. Nungester, Mrs. Harriet Nungester, Mrs. Henry Flores, Mrs. Marie Flores, Richard Flores, Henry Flores, Mrs. Harold Daniels, Elizabeth Laws, Mrs. R. J. Rosendale, R. Snyder, Mrs. Grace Daniels, Mrs. Claud Barringer, Henry J. Jones, Mrs. Ladonna Hummel, Mrs. Fred Kinker, Howard Hummel, Mrs. Donald Turney, Cloyce L. Mincks, Mrs. Helen Husek, Mrs. Vevah Donaldson, Mrs. M. J. Franks, Mrs. W. H. Purkey, J. L. Van Ewan, Mrs. Avery Kepp, Arma Simon, Mrs. Norman Barringer, Mrs. Cecil Messner, Mrs. Elwood Jones, Mrs. Ida Brandeberry, George E. Clapp, Mrs. Paul E. Butler, Mrs. Anna Miecko, Mrs. Lucille Simon, D. O. Simon, Merle W. Santmire, Howard H. Campbell, Pearl Barringer, Carl Barringer, Mrs. Cecil P. Henry, Cecil P. Henry, Mrs. Herbert Sewell, Amanda McGrain, V. S. Feasel, E. E. Feasel, W. S. Barnkisel, Harry I. Matthews, C. F. Heminger, G. E. Dennis, Clara Dennis, J. Riley Metz, Mrs. Earl Gooch, M. C. Ziegler, Mrs. Chas. Gobel, Carl Gobel, Mrs. Mary S. Barnhisel, Mrs. Emmett Campbell, Forrest Loe, Stanley Stransbaugh, Mark H. Leathers, Herbert Brooks, Mr. and Mrs. C. F. Mogar, Mrs. Mark Simon, Mrs. Fred Barnhisel, Mrs. Clarence Loe, Mrs. A. D. Ziegler, Mrs. Sylvia Feasel, Mrs. Fred Baird, Mrs. Alice Sisinger, Geo. Walters, Mrs. Geo. Walters, Mrs. Merle Crawford, Mrs. Floyd Swartz, Mrs. J. E. Barbour, J. E. Barbour, Floyd Swartz, James Milliron, Mrs. Vaughan Wonders, Mrs. R. Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Baker, Mrs. Robert Householder, Mrs. F. P. French, Mrs. E. Wright, W. C. Eishen, Alice E. Dennis, J. A. Carter, Sarah Hines, Harold Wright, Mrs. H. B. Russell, Ira Besarcan, Floyd Brandeberry, Kathryn Hamlin, Mary Pierce, Mark Pierce, Marville Spearman, Allie Miller, Mrs. Lester Swartz, Mrs. Ervin Billingsley, Mrs. Charles Griffith, Linda Ickes, H. D. Miller, Mrs. A. E. Rosendale, D. C. Fast, H. W. Leathers, Naomi Bassler, Ernest Bassler, Fay Leathers, Mrs. A. Lynn Leathers, Mrs. J. W. Arent, Mrs. Vance Easley, Mrs. John Beard, John A. Beard, Mrs. George Beard, Karl Matey, Mrs. John Biller, Mrs. Bert Webb, H. D. Billingsley, T. J. McAllen, Lester Coppler, Mrs. Betty Lanning, W. C. Anknog, Mrs. Harold Drake, Mrs. N. R. Weller, Mrs. Anna Louchs, Mrs. E. Drake, Roy Oswald, Glayds Oswald, Mrs. John Macias, Cody Markle, H. O. Rosendale, Mrs. Rella Glass, Mrs. Floyd Cline, Mrs. Kenneth Cobb, Guy Babcock, Avery Rosendale, B. O. Russell, Norma Russell, Mrs. Lowell Stearns, Mrs. Mark Gardner, Arma Cotant, Edith Fry, Wayne Fry, Mrs. Fred Lavery, Fred T. Lavery, Vernon K. Frederick, Reed Nelson, Gilbert Pilton, Mrs. Celesta Pilton, Mrs. Melvin Huff, Mrs. Flo Linhart, Fred H. Rainey, Mrs. Henry Stewart, Mrs. L. F. Whipple, M. H. Shanklin, M. J. Smith, L. C. Benjamin, Mrs. Benjamin, Mrs. Rolla Rosendale, Bessie E. Leathers, J. S. Krenyner, Mrs. Walter Ebler, Mrs. W. W. Swartz, Mrs. C. C. Craley, W. S. Rosendale, Mrs. Cora Mouris, Mrs. Guy Lindquist, Mrs. Hernon Ebler, J. W. Taylor, Mrs. W. G. Leathers, Mrs. Virgil C. Miller, Mrs. Charles Taylor, Mrs. E. A. Flowers, Mrs. Robert Buckingham, Mrs. William Rosendale, William Rosendale, Mrs. Chas. Leslie, Frank Leslie, Mrs. R. G. Little, Mrs. Mabel Ziegler, Mrs. Eldon Elder, Mrs. C. C. Elder, George F. Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Porter Davis, C. D. Feasel, Mrs. Merritt Smith, Mrs. Arvene Graham, Mrs. Fred H. Brandeberry, Mrs. N. H. Holt, Mrs. Clara Stilwell, Mrs. W. E. Donnelly, Harry E. Baker, Albert ". Kuhill, Mrs. H. W. Worstell, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Rager, Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Pésel, Mrs. Belle Bellers, Mrs. Gerald Hardy, Mrs. Ralph E. Purkey, Mrs. E. A. McCullough, Harle Basbrun, Alton E. Starmon, Mrs. Frank J. Phillips, Mrs. C. H. Pendleton, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Echelbarger, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hennings, Mr. and Mrs. C. K. Haughawout, Mr. and Mrs. N. C. Long, Mrs. L. R. Good, Mr. and Mrs. H. D. Lanning, Jr., Harley Lee, P. M. Lee, Mr. and Mrs. N. J. Bockbrader, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Dunn, B. B. Blackburn, F. O. Dennis, Mrs. Harold Miller, Clayton Scottback, Mrs. Norman Marsh, R. A. Buckingham, Mrs. R. A. Buckingham, Mrs. Joe Young, Mrs. James P. Holmes, Almon W. Long, Mrs. E. H. Wright, Mrs. J. E. Gooch, J. E. Wood, Mrs. Obei Weiker, Simon Weiker, Mrs. Charles Weiker, Mrs. A. F. Apple, Mrs. Estel Lee, Mrs. Arthur Nelson, Ward Frederick.

Republican Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 22, 1947, in an editorial, sets forth very forcefully pertinent objections to the Knutson tax-reduction bill, H. R. 1, as amended, and under leave previously granted to me I extend this editorial as a part of my remarks:

REPUBLICAN TAXES

It is a serious and ill-considered responsibility that the House Ways and Means Committee has assumed in adopting Mr. KNUTSON's plan to cut individual income taxes.

If approved by Congress, it would reduce taxes 20 percent across the board for the majority of taxpayers. The limitation of 10½ percent reduction for incomes above $302,000 is added evidence of the unscientific manner in which this vastly important economic problem has been handled. The last-minute decision to give 30 percent relief to persons of less than $1,000 net income must be considered, in the fiscal circumstances now confronting this Nation, more in the nature of a political sop that an intelligent economic judgment.

Thus the committee moves to forfeit tax income that represents about two-thirds of the amount by which the House has recommended that the Truman budget be reduced. This revenue loss comes within less than three-quarters of a billion dollars of equaling the amount that the Senate voted to cut the President's budget. In the light of the performance of the Republicans to date in scaling down that budget, the tax loss would exceed their economies. It is a curious condition in which to find the leadership of a party that, during the spendthrift era of the New Deal, kept preaching the doctrine of responsible fiscal stewardship.

Indeed it is a singular fact that Republican leaders in the House who started promising tax reduction early last fall had to delay reporting a bill because they could not make up their minds regarding the scope and character of tax relief. Even Mr. KNUTSON, whose flat 20 percent reduction proposal has deservedly drawn sharp criticism, found himself in a quandary as the Ways and Means Committee which he heads was about ready to report its measure to the House.

Someone on the committee—it could hardly have been the voice of conscience after all these long months of cogitating—persuaded him at the last minute that the small taxpayers ought to get a better deal. But the gentleman from Minnesota would not harm his brain child, come what may. He accepted the suggestion to give some preferential treatment to the little fellows. But whatever the concession might cost the Treasury, it had to be handled on a 20-percent-plus basis.

It is extraordinary when the Republican Party gives its attention so exclusively to tax reduction. It is unmindful that a balanced budget and reduction of the public debt would both have priority in its planning if it were true to its past traditions and principles in fiscal affairs.

There is no conclusive evidence yet from any quarter, Republican or Democratic, that the budget will be balanced either this year or next. Yet Republicans who have been clamoring since 1933 for a balanced budget are now, in the presence of their golden opportunity, more intent on fulfilling an ill-considered political promise about tax reduction than in taking the Government out of the red.

It is strange, too, to find such national business groups as the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce supporting the Knutson proposal for a 20-percent-tax cut across the board. For more than 15 years, excepting naturally the war period, they have been insisting on a balanced budget.

Yet they must know now, on the record of House appropriations to date for the next fiscal year, a 20-percent-tax cut and a balanced budget are hardly reconcilable. With a third of the 1947–48 appropriations already voted by the House, the slimly balanced Truman budget has been cut only about 7 percent. And most of that cut is not likely to stick. Since when has it been sound Republican policy to be for deficit financing and indiscriminate tax reduction at the same time?

Reduction of Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C., published on Monday, March 24, 1947, and pointing out the fact that the House should not vote a cut in taxes before it ascertains how much money the Federal Government will need for the next fiscal year.

THAT TAX REDUCTION

Speaker JOE MARTIN says the House of Representatives "definitely will" pass that $4 billion income tax reduction this week.

If so, the House will have voted to cut taxes before it finds out how much money the Federal Government will need for the next fiscal year. It will have voted a tax cut in the midst of an international emergency created out of the plight of Turkey and Greece, an emergency into which President Truman has asked the United States to step boldly.

Nobody likes to pay taxes, and any reductions in tax rates are always welcome; but reduction in taxes must be based on something far more fundamentally sound than political pledges.

Members of the House Ways and Means committee which voted 16 to 9 to report the tax reduction proposal pledged with the Republican leadership to postpone action until the dark clouds now hovering over the world disappear or until the United States knows just what its world commitments shall be. The Republicans themselves were split on the measure. Representative ENGEL of Michigan saying the legislation is a "rich man's tax bill."

Speaker MARTIN said the Republicans "promised the Nation lower taxes—and we shall keep faith."

If it were possible to separate party politics from economics, and from governmental functions and commitments considered essential for the peace, protection, and general welfare of the American people, most of us would be able to make up our minds whether the Nation can or cannot afford to cut income taxes $4 billion at this time. To decide the matter objectively we would need also to divorce ourselves from our own elation over the prospect of personal tax relief.

It would certainly seem proper that the Congress decide first what it is going to do with President Truman's request for $400,000,000 with which to bolster the strength of Turkey and Greece against communism before it takes steps to curtail revenues and possibly endanger the reduction of the national debt.

There can be little argument with Speaker MARTIN'S contention that "Government economies and more and more production" must play a much larger part in solving the Nation's fiscal problems. But the Congress which is controlled by the Republicans has yet to say where it will effect "Government economies." It would seem that any reduction in taxes could be arrived at intelligently only after such economies had been effected and the budget determined.

We hope the Republicans are able to reduce income taxes between 20 and 30 percent. The increased cost of living would make such a tax reduction a pleasing windfall to millions of small taxpayers. But there are other things more important to the small taxpayer, as well as to the large. Among them are American fulfillment of its leadership role in world affairs, and the protection of the individual's and the Nation's solvency.

The British Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, appearing in the March 18, 1947, Wall Street Journal, should be read by every Member of Congress. Should America be so unfortunate as to be involved in World War III, it almost goes without saying that we would have very little support from other nations. Indeed, we should be prepared for any eventuality, as it is not at all impossible that some of our former closest allies might even be against us.

THE BRITISH ATTITUDE

It is quite apparent that the present British Government of Prime Minister Attlee is having some difficulty staying in the saddle. It is also apparent that if the Attlee Cabinet is replaced it will be by a government further to the left. Such a prospect should be fully considered when Congress takes up President Truman's proposal for an expanded American role in world affairs.

In the House of Commons yesterday the left-wing Laborites made a very bitter attack on the proposed Truman policy. It was called an "invasion of southeast Europe," and there was voiced the suggestion that the British Government ask the United States to reconsider.

It will, we suggest, be an error to assume that these sentiments are confined to a few extremists. A few months ago there was a surprising display of Laborite hostility to the Bevin policy of cooperation with the United States; in fact, Mr. Bevin had more enthusiastic support from Conservatives than from his own party.

Actualities must be faced. Far from "pulling British chestnuts out of the fire" by sending American aid to Greece and Turkey, there is a reasonable prospect that this country will be undertaking a course which the dominant sentiment in Great Britain very much dislikes. Britain may have a government which thinks more nearly in accord with Russia than with the United States.

We are not here suggesting that President Truman's proposals be rejected. There are very strong reasons for going ahead with them.

What we are strongly suggesting is that the proposals should not be accepted with any illusion that in any show-down this country will necessarily find that Great Britain agrees with its course or is ready to support its course. We strongly suggest that the idea that democracy as Americans understand it and as General Marshall defined it at Moscow has only a very tenuous beachhead in Great Britain and that position is under attack.

Britain has undertaken the managed-economy experiment. So far it has not worked as its advocates thought it would. The remedies being suggested are more stringent measures of management. Avowedly these include more dictation to the individual; such as telling him at what occupation he shall work. The only people who have the stomach really to enforce such measures are the extremists and it is among these that the policy of cooperation with Russia rather than with this country finds its adherents.

These considerations certainly raise questions as to the policy Mr. Truman has proposed. The raising and facing of these questions is precisely the process that must be carried on if the country is to know what it is doing.

United States of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Charlotte News of March 21, 1947, and the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 23, 1947:

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) News of March 21, 1947]

FOR A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Within the next few days Representative BOGGS of Louisiana and Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas will introduce in Congress one of the shortest joint resolutions in the history of that body. It will state simply: "Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

It is no accident that the Boggs-Fulbright resolution will hit Congressional hoppers on the heels of the President's message on the Greek crisis. It is intended to touch off a Congressional debate that will clarify the new, aggressive foreign policy outlined by Mr. Truman. Its single sentence makes its sponsors' point that mere opposition to Russian expansion is essentially a negative, and therefore a futile policy.

The great need in Europe is for positive and united action—action beyond the capacity of the tired governments now struggling to rebuild a score of shattered nations. Russia is offering, or thrusting upon, the nations within her orbit a new political and economic unity to replace the costly divisions of the past. In the view of Representative BOGGS and Senator FULBRIGHT the Russian drive in the East can only be counteracted by comparable unification in the West.

The concept of a United States of Europe is not new. George Washington predicted its ultimate organization in a letter to General LaFayette. Victor Hugo foresaw the day when "two huge unions, the United States of America and the United States of Europe will face and greet each other across the Atlantic." A variety of contemporary statesmen have supported the idea—Winston Churchill, Prime Minister Attlee, Charles de Gaulle, Leon Blum, General Smuts, and John Foster Dulles, among others. In a recent survey of European parliaments more than 600 members in a dozen countries were found to favor federalization; only 12 voiced opposition.

History has now lifted the theory out of the realm of the abstract. It offers, Messrs. BOGGS and FULBRIGHT believe, a practical solution to the most urgent problem of the postwar world, the German peace settlement. The foreign ministers at Moscow are hung on the horns of a dilemma—the need to rebuild German industry to sustain the economy of Europe, and the danger of future aggression if that historically irresponsible nation ever regains her industrial strength. Only as one of the United States of Europe could a strong Germany sustain, without endangering, the nations of Western Europe.

When the USE plan was revived by Winston Churchill more than a year ago it made little stir in the United States. There were valid objections on the ground that such a federation of European states was designed primarily as a barrier against the spread of communism and, as such, was an instrument of power politics incompatible with the concepts of the United Nations. Those objections, in the light of Mr. Truman's latest statement of foreign policy, are now meaningless. American support of a United Nations of Europe is a logical extension of the effort to halt Russian expansion, to which Mr. Truman would commit the Nation.

Clayton Fritchey, editor of the New Orleans Item, who returned not long ago from an inspection of Europe, stated the case for federation in the strongest terms:

"A federated Europe may once have seemed an idle dream, but today it is idle to dream of any other solution. It goes without saying that to rescue Europe by federation will

be difficult, but to save it without federation is impossible. The nations of Western Europe have reached the same crisis that once faced the Thirteen Original American States—they can hang together or they can hang separately."

If we accept Mr. Truman's recommendation for unilateral action in Europe we shall automatically suspend the operating theories of the United Nations. Certainly there can be no greater danger in supporting a democratic federation of European states in opposition to Russia than there will be in supporting the doubtful regimes now in power in most of the states concerned. The choice underlined by the Boggs-Fulbright resolution is between risking war to preserve a doubtful status quo, and taking the same risk to establish a new and vital European federation which will share our own ideals and aspirations.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 23, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Congress now has before it a brief but pregnant proposal that reads as follows:

"Resolved that the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

The resolution was put before the House by Representative BOGGS, of Louisiana. In the Senate it carried the names of Senators FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and THOMAS of Utah. All three men are Democrats.

Thus is projected a matter that carried great promise, that has been considered and favored by many of the world's keenest thinkers, and is now of larger potential value than it has ever been.

Western Europe ought to be in the mood to ponder the possibility of economic and political unity with no less than prayerful attention. It may well spell the difference between democratic liberty and Communist oppression.

It has long been obvious that western Europe could not logically hope to compete with the great single powers economically and industrially unless it pooled its resources on some basis of easier access. There is no single nation in that area that can come anywhere near sustaining itself, but operating as a whole the area could do well.

It is clear as crystal, too, that western Europe must present some sort of a united front if it hopes to maintain a system of free governments. Soviet Russia has engulfed Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. It is so placed as to exert powerful influence on Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. It is a question whether it can be held away from Greece, Turkey, and China. Yugoslavia and Poland are its willing puppets.

The purpose of the Communists to take over western Europe as well cannot be doubted. Germany, Austria, France, and the Netherlands are either prostrate or gravely debilitated by the war. Great Britain is in dire straits, living on borrowed money and faced by the speedy dismemberment of the Empire.

In short, Europe must gain the strength that lies in union. It has neither present strength nor logical hope for the near future. Time is of the essence. The process of forming a working United States of Europe would be costly and difficult, but perhaps insignificant for this Nation and Europe by comparison with the alternative.

A European union could operate within the framework and purposes of the United Nations as appropriately as our own sisterhood of States, the Union of South Africa, and others.

The basic idea seems sound and, if the nations concerned can grasp the meaning of current omens and portents and put their real, rather than their traditional interests first, it could be made to work.

The Russians Made It Hard to Aid Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 1, 1947:

THE RUSSIANS MADE IT HARD TO AID THEM

A few weeks ago the State Department sent to Russia its third reminder that the United States would appreciate an accounting of lend-lease. Up to now, this reminder has received from the Kremlin the same response accorded the previous two—namely, none at all.

A possible explanation of this attitude is the fact that up to now the Soviet Union has done all right without paying much attention to American sensibilities. For example, a considerable proportion of the material which Russia received from us under lend-lease had no ascertainable relation to conduct of the war. According to Gen. John R. Deane, head of the American Military Mission in Moscow during the war, in his frank and revealing book, The Strange Alliance, we sent to Russia in the late stages of the war, industrial machinery, pipe lines, port installations, oil refineries and other items the use of which was very questionable in the prosecution of the war. We even sent a complete rubber-tire plant. The general's opinion is that the American error was one of timing. The Harry Hopkins program of all-out aid to Russia and Soviet priority over everything else made sense when Russia was tottering on the brink of defeat. When the crisis eased, it was time to scan Russian requests more closely. We didn't, and it is natural for the Russians to let such a soft touch ride.

The story of lend-lease aid to the Russians is replete with bizarre and cockeyed episodes which are lacking from our dealings with countries more sophisticated in international manners, as well as in arithmetic. In spite of the U. S. S. R. policy of making it as difficult as possible to aid her, we did manage to hand over ships, tanks, planes, guns, food, and other items, the accumulated value of which, as of November 18, 1946, was $11,266,642,270.26. Translated into materials, this enormous sum breaks down to 450,000 motor vehicles, more than 12,000 airplanes, 11,000,000 pairs of army boots, 29,000 motorcycles, 135,000 machine guns, 6,000 tanks, 2,120,000 tons of steel, 1,300,000 tons of petroleum products, 638,000 tons of industrial chemicals, 97,000,000 yards of cotton cloth, 50,000,000 yards of woolen cloth, and 733,000 tons of nonferrous metals.

The story of how this enormous contribution got to its destination across submarine-ridden seas and suffocating deserts is one of the great sagas of human struggle. But the job was made no easier by the Russians' reluctance to let us provide characteristic American service from factory to customer. In delivering to Russia, lend-lease was dealing with a customer who didn't want us to know what he needed or what he did with the goods we were sending to him. The coyness of the Russians in refusing to permit America to service the complicated machines we were sending over or to give useful advice on shipping and handling made Russian lend-lease a headache. Mountains of canned food spoiled in the incredible heat of the Indian Ocean route because no lend-lease representative was permitted to supervise its handling. Precious engineering equipment was useless because Russian suspicion prevented the admission of enough experts and engineers to supervise its installation. General Deane attributes some of this attitude to Soviet sensitivity at the implication that Russian engineering skill was not adequate to any task that might confront it. Whatever the reason, the result was a comparatively inefficient use of valuable equipment.

At times the Russian demands for materials approached the fantastic. According to a senior assistant lend-lease administrator in charge of operations, the Russians tried to requisition 70,000 pairs of working gloves for a single fishing boat carrying a crew of 30 or 40 men. The crew of one Russian ship at Portland, Oreg., decided that they wanted new fittings in the forecastle, so they chopped the existing fittings to pieces with axes. The local lend-lease administrator gave the ship's captain some lumber and carpenters' tools, and told him to build a new forecastle to suit himself. There is no evidence that Harry Hopkins reversed this toughness by the west coast administrator in dealing with the Russians. In the later stages of the war a requisition for 22 complete hydroelectric plants, whose installation before the end of hostilities was doubtful, was held up by top officials in lend-lease. This time, however, the Russia first statesmen overruled their inferiors, and Russia got 11 of the power plants.

Steel, locomotives, industrial equipment of all sorts flowed to Russia in a continuous stream long after military reasons for such largess had expired. This American material is presumably still there, helping along with the achievement of the 5-year plan and the subjugation of Russia's neighbors. The value of the material capable of nonmilitary use has been broken down to $1,152,214,000 in vehicles and parts; $2,504,276,000 in machinery and parts; $688,502,000 in ships and parts; and $1,339,270,000 miscellaneous. Even after VJ-day the Russians were still permitted to take delivery of lend-lease material held in this country for their account. They refused to take certain items, including $5,000,000 worth of interoceanic cable made to their specifications. They later bought the same cable as surplus from the War Assets Administration at a fraction of the agreed price and laid it across the Gulf of Finland as originally planned. Had they not canceled the original order, it would have been charged against the supplementary loan negotiated by Russia to take care of lend-lease material sent to Russia after the war was over.

We are not likely to get back anything of consequence from what we sent to Russia beyond her war needs and beyond the terms of the lend-lease law, which, as amended April 16, 1945, specifically barred shipments for "postwar relief, postwar rehabilitation, or postwar reconstruction." Since this is so, we agree with General Deane when he says, "The next time we supply the world, I hope we shall realize that repayment will be impossible and at least capitalize on the good will that might accrue from generosity." It is his hope that "the story of American generosity will some day percolate to the mass of the Russian people." It hasn't been permitted to percolate yet.

Ex-Presidents as Senators at Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the many editorials which have appeared in support of my bill, H. R. 504, to make ex-Presidents Senators at

Large, several leading radio commentators have favored the proposal.

Speaking over the Mutual network, Fulton Lewis, Jr., made this statement:

Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, proved today that from time to time there can be something new under the sun, at least so far as ideas are concerned. With every Congress that comes along there is always revived the usual shop-worn collection of proposals for one 6-year term for President of the United States; limitation of the President to not more than two terms; independent election of the Vice President; merging the Senate and House of Representatives, and so forth and so forth ad infinitum.

But Mr. CANFIELD came up with a new one today, at least it's new to my nearly 25 years of experience in Congress, and I think it probably will click with you in a very large way.

He proposed that a new position of Senator at Large be established, in addition to the regular contingent of 96 Senators, 2 from each State, and this position of Senator at Large would be automatically available to every ex-President of the United States, from the time he leaves the White House until his death. It would carry regular senatorial pay, and regular senatorial office and secretarial prerogatives. These Senators at Large would not have a vote like any other Senator, although the retiring President would not have to accept the job if he preferred not to. He could decline.

It would mean that the Nation would not necessarily lose the benefit of the experience and knowledge which a President gains in the White House tenure. Presumably, as Senator at Large he would not indulge in the workaday routine of the Senate, but he would be able, on occasions of really great moment, to participate in Senate deliberations. It would undoubtedly enhance the prestige and the dignity of the Senate, and there have been very few times in the history of the Nation when more than two ex-Presidents have been living at the same time, and most of the time there has been only one; therefore, it would not unduly upset the political balance of the Senate.

In the present situation, of course, former President Herbert Hoover would be the only candidate, but if President Truman is defeated in 1948 he then would be able to return to the Senate for life, and, unquestionably, that would be a very valuable thing for the Nation.

It's worth serious consideration, at least.

USES and the National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to say something in reference to the United States Employment Service and the national security.

In its report, the committee makes a comparison between the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security. I should like to make a comparison the committee overlooked.

Three weeks ago, the Senate and the House in joint session received the report from the President personally on certain aspects of the international situation. The President's report clearly indicated that we cannot slip back to the easy way of things simply because we have beaten down the Nazi aggression.

I wonder how many members of this body realize the important role played by the United States Employment Service during the war in the mobilization of our civilian manpower. Without this agency, the job could have never been done. The return of the administration of the public employment offices to State administration must not constitute a surrender of the national interest in the continuation of a strong nationwide system of public employment offices in this country. Such a system is not only necessary for carrying out our obligation to exservicemen, disabled veterans, handicapped, and other workers, but is basic to our national security.

This Congress before the end of the session will appropriate billions and billions of dollars for national security. This is as it should be. We must continue to man the ramparts of our freedom. The key to a strong America is the means of mobilization of our industrial and occupational know how, and the United States Employment Service is the machinery necessary for this mobilization.

I wish to make one point clear. Under the law the United States Employment Service is responsible for achieving a Nation-wide network of employment offices through the coordination of their activities and assisting these offices to increase their effectiveness by providing them with improved operating procedures and techniques for carrying out their job.

The recommended appropriation will not permit the United States Employment Service to continue its important activities to discharge these responsibilities. Such a cut would be comparable, in Army parlance, to maintaining the great body of troops, but entirely eliminating the General Staff. We cannot afford to save $3,000,000 and wreck the United States Employment Service while at the same time we are appropriating billions for other aspects of our national security. For the sake of national security—and that means a safety margin for all of us—every man and woman in this House and Congress, our sons and daughters, and the security of all other citizens—I would rather have the United States Employment Service and not need it for national security than to need it and not have it. This House will make a serious mistake if we do not provide for the continuation of the operation of the USES as it is today to afford instant mobilization of that without which our Nation cannot survive, when another Pearl Harbor is upon us—the total manpower of our beloved country.

Patience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a realistic editorial by George E. Sokolsky was called to my attention today, and I am taking the liberty of including it in these remarks. It is factual, as everyone familiar with Government in Washington well knows. This editorial should be read by those persons back home who are becoming impatient because the Congress has not already balanced the budget, reduced taxes, passed labor laws, and provided the other necessary legislation leading the country back to a government by law rather than by men and bureaus.

Mr. Speaker, patience is a virtue and that patience will be rewarded. May we hope that those who are inclined to criticize will withhold judgment until an opportunity has been given to accomplish the things which the majority in Congress has determined to accomplish. The editorial reads as follows:

THESE DAYS

Got a letter from a friend in San Francisco who asks: "What's wrong with your friends in Washington? We will soon be calling the Republican Party the party of promises. If you don't get busy, the show-me boys will put you on the spot when the next election comes around."

The present Congress took office on January 3. The first few weeks of this, as of any Congress, are consumed in organization. Committees have to be appointed, staffs hired and organized, hearings arranged for.

This year that was particularly difficult because of the Reorganization Act, which, while well-intentioned, functions crudely.

Actually, instead of having fewer committees, Congress has more committees and subcommittees and the act has proved to be a stumbling block to efficiency of operation. Like so many reforms, it defeats its own purpose.

This year certain particularly important matters are before Congress about which honest men sincerely differ. To mention a few:

1. The Lilienthal appointment consumed time and will consume more time before it is finished and rightly so because this involves more than a man and partisanship for or against a man.

It is a question of the future economic structure of the United States.

2. Labor legislation is not merely a matter of passing any kind of law. It is necessary to pass just legislation, beneficial not to one group but to the Nation as a whole.

A large number of bills have been introduced, some of importance, some trivial.

Senators BALL and FERGUSON have done unusually important work in this field and the hearings under Senator TAFT and Representative HARTLEY have been particularly notable in their direction toward factual data.

The New Deal created the doctrine of "must" legislation, reducing Congress to a rubber-stamp. This Congress is making a valid effort to return Congress to representative Government, which means investigation, discussion and debate.

The New Deal made a fetish of timing. Everything was staged as though Billy Rose were putting on a circus.

The people were softened up. Then the President hit the microphone and he was followed by a cacophony of trained seals on the air and in the newspapers.

At that point Congress fell all over itself to pass what the President wanted without deliberation, thought, or conviction.

Out of it came some badly worded legislation, vague in the transfer of powers from Congress to the Executive, setting up a huge and costly bureaucracy with indefinite authority and confused responsibility.

This present Congress chooses to read, to deliberate, to differ and to consider. Sometimes, particularly among the juniors, they

fuss a bit too much and decline to accept advice and guidance. But from the long range view that is preferable to helter-skelter "ja" voting.

3. Taxes, budget balancing, and other fiscal matters involve much more study than is generally assumed. Have you ever read the budget of the United States? I have before me the budget for the year ending June 30, 1947. The budget itself takes 808 pages, excluding the President's message, which runs to 72 pages. That is followed by summary and supporting tables which run to 89 pages, making, with a preface, a total of 974 pages.

The budget is always loaded. The departments of Government figure on being cut, so they raise the ante.

This year the people expect a cut in taxes. Generally, it is estimated that an average 20-percent cut will meet the essential expenditures of Government.

But is that cut to be made across the board or is it to be averaged out? Men sincerely differ both as to facts and methods and it all needs to be studied and considered.

It makes no sense to rush the job. Most budgets are passed pretty late in the session.

The fact is that after 14 years of Presidential government, during which the powers of Congress were curtailed, the country has become unaccustomed to the more deliberate processes of congressional government.

It is true that congressional government is slower than the fiat of one man, but the despotism of Hitler and Stalin has been infinitely swifter than anything the New Deal produced. Is that what we want for speed?

Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from Hon. John E. Swift, supreme knight, Knights of Columbus, Boston. I would like to bring this letter to the attention of the people of the United States since I believe it to be most interesting and timely. It follows:

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
Boston, March 22, 1947.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On March 29, 1947, the Knights of Columbus will observe the sixty-fifth anniversary of its institution. Over this long span of fraternal life, the society has established for itself an outstanding record for real Americanism and notice of its accomplishments might very well be publicized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the First World War, this society collected and distributed $43,000,000 in welfare and educational work for the American Expeditionary Forces and their associates in war. At the conclusion of that great tragedy and on the return of the boys to America, the accomplishments of the Knights of Columbus were sounded far and near throughout the Nation. Our slogan was "Everybody welcome and everything free," and the order lived up to the import of this slogan 100 percent.

In the Second World War, the Knights of Columbus contributed more than 93,000 of its members to the service of the Allied Forces and more than 1,800 members were killed in action. We are establishing an educational trust fund of a million dollars, with which to furnish a complete college education to the sons and daughters of our members who have lost their lives in World War II, or who may become totally or permanently disabled within a period of 10 years from the termination of the war from service-connected causes. Already nearly $700,000 of this amount has been collected and the balance will be in hand before the end of the calendar year. The money is definitely earmarked and is invested in Government securities. We expect at least 500 sons and daughters to be the beneficiaries of this million-dollar educational trust fund. These boys and girls may select their own college and all expenses at the college, including board, tuition, books, etc., are defrayed by the society. This will be the greatest living memorial that any society could erect in tribute to those who have paid the supreme sacrifice on the altar of their country.

On June 20, 1947, we are to dedicate at our home office at New Haven a huge bronze tablet which will include the name of every member who died in the service and this bronze tablet will be a permanent addition and erected in a conspicuous place at the home office.

While we were in the midst of the European and Asiatic wars, the Knights of Columbus proposed to the world a Program for Peace and distributed thousands of copies throughout America. It is interesting to note that the outstanding principles enunciated in our Program for Peace are the underlying propositions which have been advanced by our President in his recent addresses concerning the peace conference in Moscow.

Last summer, at the Miami Beach Supreme Council meeting, we set forth a Program for the Preservation and Promotion of American Ideals and we are now preparing this program for adoption by 3,000 councils of our order all over the North American Continent. To preserve and promote American ideals is the most important duty before the present generation of Americans and the Knights of Columbus, true to its tradition for patriotism, for education and for the predominance of the spiritual life throughout our land, is making an outstanding contribution to the perpetuity of our American way of life.

We have prepared and distributed six broadcasts entitled "Safeguards for America," and more than 250 radio stations throughout the United States and Canada are broadcasting these six transcriptions as a public service to America. Undoubtedly the greatest radio audience that ever listened to a series of broadcasts will follow these transcriptions week by week. I have no doubt but what the people of our Nation will be put on the alert when they realize the truth with reference to communism and the great peril that is at our door as a result of the infiltration of this philosophy into our American life.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN E. SWIFT,
Supreme Knight.

Red Front Outfit Here Today To Lobby Against Greek Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

RED "FRONT" OUTFIT HERE TODAY TO LOBBY AGAINST GREEK AID

(By Frederick Woltman)

Five hundred delegates of the Congress of American Women are opening a campaign here today against President Truman's plan to save Greece and Turkey from communism. They arrived from New York aboard a special train.

If Senators and Representatives who have given them appointments would check into the organization's background they would find that it is a Communist front on an international scale.

Four of its founders and directors are leaders of the Communist Party, including Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. They were not expected to be in evidence today, however. Most of the national officers are active in Communist fronts. The executive vice chairman, Muriel Draper, is chairman of the women's committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Other officers and directors of the Congress include Dr. Gene Weltfish, of Columbia University, president; Susan B. Anthony 2d, Dr. Bella V. Dodd, Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, Josephine Timms, and Mrs. Fredric March.

The Congress grew out of a Paris conference in November 1945, initiated by the women of the French Communist Party. Soviet women delegates, wearing bemedalled Red Army uniforms, ran off with the show.

What Did America Vote for in the Last National Election?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the following timely and thoughtful editorial taken from the Aroostook Republican of Caribou, Maine, of March 20, 1947:

WHAT DID AMERICA VOTE FOR IN THE LAST NATIONAL ELECTION?

Federal civilian help being paid out of the tax money of you and me numbers 2,300,000 men and women. Eight years ago employees were 900,000. This Nation is supporting a bloated bureaucracy.

Our people believed that in the last national election they voted to stop this continuing to carry on our backs 2,300,000 men and women.

The President asks a budget of $37,500,000,000. How much money is that? It is bigger by $4,000,000,000 than the income of all Americans living west of the Mississippi (except California) in 1 year.

The statement has been made in Washington that Truman padded the budget expecting $6,000,000,000 to be cut from it. Now the House and Senate are fighting to see whether the cut shall be $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000. Either way, if the story of a purposely padded national budget is true, it will still be padded by some billions of dollars if passed as it is.

Is this what the voters asked for in the election last fall?

A few voices in Washington cry feebly through the wilderness of debate for a budget cut that will still leave this country gasping in its efforts to pay with prices driven to the skies for the white-collar worker.

In heaven's name, Senators and Congressmen, forget the next elections and be square with the people who chose you to represent them this term. Get after the blizzards of

bureaucrats and lay them low. When you have done that—which is one thing among others that we voted for you to do—more billions of dollars can be hewed from the budget, not just six billions or four and one-half billions, but possibly ten billions.

Then you Senators and Congressmen, our elected representatives, will be getting into line to do the really sensible thing by a budget cut below that where the President is said to have had it padded so he and his millions of hangers-on could still be in the swim at the taxpayers' expense.

Listen to the gathering storm back home; listen, and as you hear the gale of anger arising, do what you were elected to do, and don't mind the next election or the labor-union vote.

The Northwestern National Life Insurance Co. estimates that the present inflation is costing the average American family $1,000 a year in the increased prices of what they buy.

What's the reason? It is this: Federal and State spending, taxes, and debt.

These United States will either follow bankrupt England and busted France into the twilight sleep of socialism, or into the red dawn of communism, or else somebody in our public life must seize freedom's flag and crusade once more for the principals that under Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln made America great and the envy of the world.

Wake up, Senators and Congressmen. Your constituents are watching to see if you are going to do what they voted for you to do.

Or there may be worse than bread riots.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements and Economic Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which has approximately 3,000,000 members, understands that the threatened attack upon the trade agreements is an attack upon the economic and political peace of the future.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs also understands that a high national income here at home is dependent upon healthy trade with the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of the General Federation of Women's Clubs for State Department hearings on the proposed charter for an International Trade Organization:

STATEMENT FOR STATE DEPARTMENT HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CHARTER FOR AN INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, a national organization of approximately 3,000,000 members, is on record as favoring the creation of an international trade organization under the following resolution adopted at its 1946 annual convention:

"*Resolved*, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, June 1946, reaffirms its endorsement of full participation by the United States in the United Nations and in special agencies for international cooperation in fields including education, science, health, relief, and trade; and further

"*Resolved*, That the General Federation urges prompt ratification by the United States of:

"1. Constitutions of such international organizations as may be established by the United Nations;

"2. Adequate financial support for all such agencies;

"3. Active participation in their work."

The suggested charter for an international trade organization was drawn up by a preparatory committee created by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on which the United States and 18 other countries are represented. It embodies principles which the General Federation of Women's Clubs has long endorsed in connection with the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. Club members vigorously supported the renewal and extension of the Trade Agreements Act in 1943 and again in 1945. The most recent resolution on this subject, adopted by the 1944 convention reads as follows:

"Whereas international trade is an essential element in the intercourse between nations and satisfactory international economic ties are an important factor in promoting the well-being of peoples and friendly relations among nations; and

"Whereas to achieve these ends it is indispensable that artificial barriers to trade be reduced or eliminated, and that economic transactions be conducted with a proper regard for the interests of each party, as well as for the effect on the international community as a whole; and

"Whereas the reciprocal trade agreements program of the United States is based on these principles and should contribute to the realization of these economic objectives in the period following the war: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled April 1944—

"1. Recommends the continuance of the reciprocal trade agreements program by the Government of the United States.

"2. Expresses the hope that other governments will adopt these same principles in their international economic relations not only with this country but with other nations of the world."

Sound and equitable economic relations among nations are basic to the maintenance of peace. Cooperative international action is required to break down barriers to trade and to expand world commerce. Because the proposed charter is a constructive step toward the realization of these ends, the General Federation of Women's Clubs endorses its spirit and purpose, and approves the creation of international machinery for its implementation.

Let Us So Legislate as To Encourage Domestic Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there is a definite trend at the present time, and the trend in general is a healthy one, to do away with subsidy programs. Some subsidies, however, are generally recognized as necessary for the public welfare. Necessity for price support for certain agricultural commodities is generally accepted and is embodied in the law. I want to bespeak the present encouragement of domestic production of strategic and critical minerals and metals.

A good deal of the antagonism to subsidies developed during the war when roll-back or consumer subsidies were instituted. This was a form of swapping dollars which to many seemed ineffective and a waste of money. However, we should distinguish between these consumer subsidies and the producer subsidies which keep our raw material industries operating in competition with cheap foreign imports.

The outstanding example of a successful producer subsidy is the premium price plan, set up by Executive order in 1942 in order to stimulate the domestic production of copper, lead, and zinc at a time when these metals were desperately needed for the war effort. There can be no question as to the success of this plan. The Congress thought so well of it that it was continued by law in 1945 and again in 1946. Under this system of granting individual mines a sufficient operating income over and above the market price received for their product thousands of small and marginal mines were brought into production and have been kept operating.

Although the need for metals in the postwar period does not have the desperate aspect it had during the war, the actual demand is as great. There are world shortages of most of the important metals and minerals. Every pound we can produce here tends to help alleviate our industrial shortages and, probably, to keep prices down. Certainly without such a supply our industrial machine cannot function at full capacity.

In spite of the temporary high price for metals there are numbers of American mines which cannot operate without Government support, and as the inevitable drop in price occurs, more and more of these mines will have to close without such support. This will mean the loss of large tonnages of marginal ores, much of which could not be recovered in the future without great expense and a great deal of which would be unrecoverable. Our economy cannot stand such losses and our national security cannot tolerate it.

While it is desirable today to supply the manufacturing demand for such strategic and critical minerals and metals as copper, lead, and zinc, it is even more desirable and necessary to stockpile the same for national defense. These programs should be carried on concurrently with emphasis upon the encouragement of domestic production. It is a short-sighted policy to neglect encouragement of domestic production. This is especially true for such strategic and critical materials as copper, lead, and zinc, the production of which in this country depends upon a consistent and wise policy of encouragement. This encouragement it is the duty of Congress to furnish by wise legislation.

Letter From Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lakeville Journal, Lakeville, Conn., March 20, 1947:

THE OPEN FORUM

LETTER FROM GREECE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Any news from Greece is most timely now, and the following letter written by a young lady who has served as a member of the Pierce College at Elleniko, Athens, for the past year, gives a vivid picture of the hardships endured in that country. Miss Hodges is the daughter of Mrs. Arthur Hodges, of Lakeville.)

PIERCE COLLEGE,
ELLENIKO, ATHENS, GREECE,
January 20, 1947.

DEAR FRIENDS: It is almost a year since I have been in Greece, and I shall now attempt to make amends for not having written to many of you by trying to give you a picture of our life here.

I landed in Greece on February 1, 1946, to find Pierce College still situated in Athens. Our own buildings were being used by the British Army for one of their military hospitals, with no immediate prospects of their being returned. My two other American colleagues and I lived at the British YWCA, from whence we would start out every morning for our daily walks to the four different buildings in four different streets in which our school tried to function. Apart from our headquarters at Mavromichali 1 (a dark, cold, dreary, old house), we were more or less camping out where we could find room. The British Institute let us use their classrooms in one building, but we had to be out by 11 a. m. Despite these inconveniences, I think we Americans were glad to be in Athens for a while. It gave us an opportunity to get familiar with the city. Athens strikes me as quite modern for a European city, apart from the Acropolis, which by the way is far more impressive in reality than any of those pictures, with which we have been familiar from our childhood, could convey.

When I arrived most Athenians were living in great discomfort. The majority of the people had the minimum amount of heating, as fuel was very expensive and difficult to get, electricity was turned off 4 days a week and water was strictly rationed. We were fortunate to live in the neighborhood of the embassies and consulates so were not deprived of electricity and were allowed running water every day. This winter the situation is somewhat better. More people seem to have some kind of fuel and the electricity is on every day, but water still runs only every other day for a few hours, which means that most people have to continue the use of their bath tubs for storing purposes. The majority of people have not had a hot bath for 6 years. Few Americans understand the extreme discomfort in which the rest of the world lives. We take our cosy houses and constant hot water and electricity so much for granted.

No one can imagine the sheer misery of being cold indoors. I personally could go without light, hot water, new clothes, even food, but not heat. A cold house has a kind of depressing effect on one's morale hard to convey to those who have never experienced it. A cold house to me is like a body without a soul or a person without love. One often hears of hungry people dreaming about tasty dishes, because hunger is such a pervasive feeling that it dominates all other thoughts. The same thing happens in extreme cold. One finds oneself thinking of nothing but being cold, and visions of roaring log fires, sizzling radiators, and glowing stoves cross one's mind. Perhaps this is the greatest hardship that Americans who come to Europe have to endure.

Last winter very few shops were open. Prices were very high and the few goods on display looked shopworn and old, as if they had been hidden away all through the war and had just been pulled out of some musty storing place. Only a handful of rich people could afford to buy materials for clothing. Literally almost the entire population of Greece was clothed by the United States. The members of our faculty were and are wearing second-hand clothing sent in parcels from the States. I am glad to say that there seem to be signs of improvement in that direction also. Many more shops have opened up and many more attractive goods are on display, although prices are still high. There is practically no rationing here and hardly any price control except a ceiling on rents. This country is in marked contrast to England, where everything is so rigidly controlled and a real austerity regime is enforced. In fact, I have been sending food from Greece to England. Such as honey and olive oil.

Last summer, as most of you know, I spent 2 months in England visiting my father and many old friends whom I had not seen since before the war. I returned to Greece by air on October 1 to find that much had happened in the meantime. The British had moved out and we had returned to our buildings after 5½ years of exile. The Germans took over our school on May 31, 1941, and turned it into a military hospital. If you could see the situation of the buildings and the campus between Mount Hymettos and the sea, with the misty mountains of Egina and the Peleponnesos beyond, you would understand why. Incidentally, Elleniko is about 5 miles out of Athens and used to be a very popular summer resort before the war. Traces of the German and British occupations still remain. I have a snap of the German eagle holding the Nazi swastika which was painted above the stage in the auditorium. On the doors there are still some signs such as "Sister's Duty Room," "Operating Theater—No Admittance," and "No Smoking" in the auditorium. The Germans stripped this beautifully furnished and equipped school absolutely bare. When our president, Miss McElroy, came here in November 1944 only the empty buildings were left. All fixtures, plumbing, even the windows, were gone. The British at least made basic repairs. They mended a huge bomb hole in the roof, patched up the windows, dug a well, and paved the driveway. Unfortunately they left us a legacy of hideous tin huts which mar the looks of the grounds and are extremely difficult and expensive to remove as they have been built on concrete bases. On the whole, this first year at Elleniko has been in the nature of pioneer work in practically everything. It was impossible to have a boarding department—there were no stoves, no pots and pans, no beds. Enough furniture was scraped together for us six American teachers and later a few Greek teachers to live here. Fortunately the British had installed a small diet kitchen in the wing in which we now live, otherwise we would not have been able to eat here at all. The only reason we have finally been able to serve hot luncheons to our students is that there were two German field kitchens left on the grounds. These have now been installed in the kitchen, but, of course, only one dish can be cooked in a field kitchen and it cannot take the place of a regular stove. Otherwise, order is gradually being restored.

But I expect you are more interested in hearing about the school itself. Our school is a combination of Greek gymnasium and preparatory college department. Altogether we have 550 girls from about 11 to 25 years of age. The gymnasium department has to conform to the regulations of the Ministry of Education. The gymnasium girls are required to take a very heavy program of study which consists chiefly of languages. These wretched girls have to study ancient Greek, Latin, modern Greek, of which two kinds have to be learned, the "demotic" or popular language taught in the elementary schools and the "katharevousa" or pure language taught in the gymnasium, French, physics, mathematics, history, botany or zoology, geography, psychology, art, music, religion (taught by a member of the Greek Orthodox Church) and English. This means they have 32 hours of government-required class periods plus 5 hours a week of English and 1 hour for class meetings. The consequence is that the girls of the gymnasium have no study periods at school, no opportunity for any library research work, and very little time for physical exercise. They leave at 4:00 p. m. in chartered buses and arrive at home with an evening of much study ahead of them. We are all dissatisfied with this program and attempts have been made to improve it, but with so many requirements on the part of the Government there is not much we can do. The college department, of course, has a free hand and we are able to make out our own program. Despite all these drawbacks, our students seem eager to learn, and I should say that the average Greek standard of intelligence is pretty high.

The English language is very popular in Greece today and will probably replace French as the second language. The popularity of English developed particularly during the occupation, when it was forbidden to be taught or spoken by the Germans. But Greeks were taking private English lessons all over Athens under the Germans' very noses. At that period our school was carried on in Athens by a small group of devoted Greek teachers as a Greek gymnasium, called simply the girls' school. It is a tale of devotion and sacrifice which should be told in detail, but we have only heard fragments. Most of those who lived through the occupation do not care to talk about it much. Occasionally we hear about some incidents and so get a glimpse of what life under the Nazis was like. This past year I have had the occasion to listen to people who experienced the war from two very different points of view, from the Greek angle, occupation and starvation, from the British angle, the blitz and the rockets. One is left with a feeling of amazement at what people seem to be able to endure and of tremendous admiration for both the British and the Greeks, who fought so bravely in this war and who gave and suffered so much more than we ever did or could imagine.

I suppose you are all eager to hear something about the political situation in this country. Now, that is something I probably know less about than you do. The only newspaper we ever see is the army paper, Union Jack, which is just about as good as not having any newspaper at all. We have no radio, so we hear very little except rumors and second-hand news from those who read the Greek newspapers, while you have the best news coverage in the world and many excellent commentators. All that I can tell you is that the political situation really is unsettled here and that most Greeks are extremely touchy on the subject. There is fighting up in the north; people are arrested because they are accused of being Communists and are thrown into jail or exiled to some of the Greek islands; terrorist activities are being carried out by both groups of

extreme right and extreme left in the country districts, while those with democratic, liberal sympathies are unable to accomplish anything.

The present government seems to be leaning toward a party dictatorship of the right. People in the civil service who are liberals in politics and not conside.ed right enough are dismissed. Two such teachers, one of whom is supposed to be one of the foremost educators in progressive methods in this country, were dismissed last year from the public schools for political reasons. We have profited by this situation and they are now teaching here. It is a sad and dangerous state when politics run to such extremes and interfere in so many areas of life. It is impossible to understand the tangled and upset state of this country for anyone in our position. That is a question for a commission of experts, which I sincerely hope the UNO commission sent to investigate conditions here will be. Perhaps we will get some kind of truth and a clearer picture than all the conflicting and opposing accounts we now hear. One thing one can be sure of is that the whole situation is very complicated and made more so by world politics and the actions of outside powers, such as Russia and England, which aggravate the purely internal trouble amongst the Greeks themselves.

I would like to close this rather sketchy and disjointed letter by saying that in spite of all the discomforts, drawbacks, and insecurities of postwar Greece, I am very glad I came out here. I think all of us Americans feel that way. We like and admire our Greek colleagues enormously, we love the colorful beauty of this country, and we find the whole of the Near East a truly fascinating part of the world to be in. At present we would rather be here than in strike-ridden, inflationary United States of America, or in a dreary, rationed England—in fact, we would rather be here than anywhere else in the world.

I send you all my very best wishes for the year and hope that I shall hear from you all even though I cannot possibly write everyone an individual letter.

JULIE C. HODGES.

The Truth About British Housing Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by W. Craven-Ellis, former member of the British Parliament:

THE TRUTH ABOUT BRITISH HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

(By W. Craven-Ellis, Member of Parliament, Southampton, 1931–45)

The problem of housing the working classes has occupied public attention in Britain for more than three generations. It was not until the commencement of the twentieth century that it assumed national importance. The problem was not a shortage of houses—supply has always exceeded demand right up to 1914—but the low standard of a very large percentage of the available houses. Such conditions were inevitable owing to the lack of foresight of both Government and local authorities.

SYSTEM IMPOSES SLUM CONDITIONS

The total number of houses in the United Kingdom is 12,500,000 and of these 2,090,739, nearly 17 percent, are 150 years old. Therefore, they can bear no relations to modern standards in any respect whatsoever. It would be correct to say that when these houses were built they complied with the building bylaws and sanitary requirements operating at the time, so no blame for the present conditions can be attached to the builders or to the present-day owners, although the latter are attacked from every quarter for slum conditions.

One hundred and fifty years ago when the houses were built they would have been keenly sought after and accepted as modern houses. Before building commenced, the plans, as is the custom today, would have been submitted to a responsible authority for approval. This system is as much responsible for the slums of today as it must be for the slums of tomorrow. In effect the approval of plans for houses gives an indefinite life to property. The real problem of housing of the working classes lies in a reform of the system which ultimately imposes slum conditions. The remedy is so simple it seems incredible it has never been applied. All that is necessary is to license all forms of property for a definite period instead of giving approval for an indefinite period. For how long is the license to operate in the case of houses of the working-class type? Experience proves that 80 years is the maximum period. Such a policy would assure that houses built today would never become slums.

On the assumption that 80 years is acceptable as the economic life of working-class homes, the size of Britain's housing problem is a formidable one. The number of houses standing in Britain today which are 80 years old and over is the alarming total of 5,255,-278, and, in accordance with present-day standards, these are insanitary and generally overcrowded slums. Common humanity should compel us to make an end of such conditions, which are so largely responsible for much tuberculosis and other contagious diseases, crime, and social evil, as well as being responsible for much industrial unrest. People who are badly housed as a general rule are discontented and disgruntled workers.

WOULD REQUIRE 245,000 NEW HOUSES A YEAR

Britain has done little to grapple with its slum conditions, which is the very heart of the problem of the housing of the working classes. The largest number of slum dwellings demolished in a single year over the last 90 years was 7,428. At this rate it would take more than 1,600 years to demolish the 12,-500,000 dwellings existing in Britain. If newly built houses are to be licensed for 80 years, as I suggest, a program of demolition of all existing houses becomes essential. Starting with the oldest houses 150,000 slum dwellings would be demolished annually, and a similar number of new dwellings would be erected, so in 80 years Great Britain would have been rebuilt. In addition to the slum program Britain would require 65,000 new houses annually to accommodate the increasing population. These two programs in the aggregate would require the building of 245,-000 houses annually for 80 years on the assumption that the population continues at the rate it has maintained for the last 30 years.

Similar slum conditions exist in every large city in the world and are a discredit to twentieth century civilization. If a program of demolition and construction were undertaken to deal with the tragedy of bad housing, such as I advocate for Britain, the building industry throughout the world would become very active and this would stimulate general industry to a very marked degree. The working classes would enjoy better living conditions, they would suffer less illness and disease, and, in consequence, they would be more efficient in their work and a greater asset to family life and industry. The explanation of an active building industry being so beneficial to general industry is that, of each £100 spent on building or construction projects, approximately £85 is devoted to payment of earned remuneration either as wages in the building and allied manufacturing trades, or in transport, or in salaries. This proportion of the money expended is thus kept in circulation and constitutes a substantial part of the purchasing power upon which general home industry and exporting industries have to rely for their fundamentally important home market. Little harm, and much good, could accrue to the body politic from keeping this money in circulation, even if the projects themselves were not highly profitable but merely in the nature of useful amenities. In point of fact, there is enormous scope for constructional activities which would constitute much more than mere amenities and would indeed create new wealth and, therefore, new sources of public revenue.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BUILDING

At the end of the 1914–18 war the Ministry of Reconstruction issued a report disclosing that Britain would require immediately after the war between 300,000 and 400,000 houses. This proved to be a serious underestimate. Less than 100,000 were built within 2 years following the war. This does not mean that there was heavy unemployment in the building industry, which was mainly engaged in disposing of the arrears of maintenance and repairs accumulated during the 4 years of war. The record of building, however, between 1919 and 1939 was a great achievement.

Local authorities erected with the assistance of Treasury grants, 1,058,068; and without any assistance, 78,389; a total of 1,136,457. Private enterprise built, assisted by Treasury grants, 431,669; and without any assistance, 2,537,381; a total of 2,969,050; making a grand total of 4,105,507.

It should be noted that for every one house erected by local authorities, private enterprise erected two and a half and received Treasury assistance on 431,669 houses as compared with local authorities on 1,058,068. The evidence from a vast field of experience shows that cost o building under local authority schemes has worked out at no less than 19 percent in excess of the cost of exactly the same type of house undertaken by private enterprise. The liability upon the taxpayer and ratepayer as a result of Treasury grants to local authorities over the period for which the subsidies are granted, in some cases 40 years and in others 60 years, will exceed £2,500,000,000. This is a colossal burden, the major part of which could have been saved had private enterprise been left with the full responsibility of carrying out its legitimate function of building houses for the people.

WAGE LEVEL GOVERNS HOUSING PROGRESS

The lay-out of building estates and the standard of houses erected by both local authorities and private enterprise showed a substantial advance over pre-1914. This was largely due to higher standards of living and throughout Britain building estates were developed between the two wars which are not only a credit to the builders but also to the nation. From whatever angle housing is investigated it will be found that progress is governed by the wage level. Competition in the building industry compels the highest standard possible within the wage level. Builders will go out of their way to equip their houses with every possible modern convenience, but they cannot go beyond what the people can afford to pay for. The illustrations of houses which accompany this article are typical examples of the houses built throughout Britain for the working classes

between the two wars. Houses with three bedrooms, a good sitting room, working kitchen, bathroom, watercloset, and entrance hall on plots measuring 25 feet by 100 feet, with roads made and all public conveniences connected, were sold before the 1939 war as low as £360. An English family much prefers living in an individual home to accommodation in large blocks of flats, with the result that flats form a very small percentage of the total dwelling accommodation. London, the largest city in the world, has its own special housing problem and here flats are inevitable for the working classes and others. Glasgow and Liverpool have erected more flats than any other of the provincial cities, although the people in the north of Britain look less favorably upon flats than the people in London. When World War II started in 1939 it could be stated that the saturation point had been reached in almost every type of house and the supply in most districts was commencing to exceed the demand.

Throughout the 6 years of war normal private enterprise building ceased completely. The total built by local authorities over this period amounted to 51,163, by private enterprise 100,389 and by Government departments 10,440, making a grand total of 161,992, but all these houses were essential to the prosecution of the war, were built in outlying areas where munition factories had been erected, and will make little or no contribution to the postwar housing problem except in those cases where the munition factories can be converted to peacetime production.

AGGREGATE HOUSING REQUIREMENT

As a result of 6 years of war Britain is faced with the greatest house-building program ever. In the first place, new houses are required to provide for the annual adjustment of population—65,000 houses per annum are required for this purpose. There are no prewar arrears to carry forward to Britain's postwar requirements; therefore, the real shortage is 65,000 per annum from 1939 to, say, 1947, by which time the house building industry should have been reorganized and be working normally. This means that there is a shortage of 520,000 houses to cover the years mentioned over which arrears have accumulated. To this must be added 300,000 houses completely destroyed by enemy action. A further requirement is 1,415,000 houses to accommodate those people who before the war lived in overcrowded conditions. A still further requirement is 350,000 houses to accommodate the agricultural population. This gives a total of 2,585,000 houses which can be said to be immediately required to be built. To get a full perspective of Britain's housing problem we must add to this figure the prewar houses which are now 80 years old and over of 5,255,278, making a grand total of 7,840,278.

This takes no account of the blocks of offices, warehouses, works, and factories which have been destroyed by enemy action, and are estimated to cost £700,000,000 or similar properties which are over 80 years old and past their economic life. The need for modern factories, warehouses, and offices is as great as the need for modern houses. In addition, there is the building of public schools, town halls, and other necessary public buildings, estimated to cost £150,000,000. And, further, there are 6 years' arrears of property maintenance and repairs estimated to cost £1,250,000,000.

GOVERNMENT POLICY IS DISCOURAGING

As I have already stated, Britain has the greatest building program it has ever had to face in its history. Energetically undertaken and efficiently organized, this program would assure without question full employment for at least 25 to 30 years. The immediate prospects, however, are most discouraging on account of Government policy. Housing of the working classes is, as it should be, No. 1 priority. The Government has made a fatal mistake by appointing 1,469 local authoritie (housing authorities) as the government instrument for providing working class homes to let, and by its policy has put out of business, or is in the process of so doing, tens of thousands of small and medium sized builders, spread over the whole of Britain, who in the past have made the largest contribution to the housing of the people. If the building of houses were made the responsibility of these builders, houses would be provided at a much more rapid rate and at a substantially less cost.

The house builders are tied hand and foot by a most complete system of control and regulation. Before they can do any building the plans of their houses must be approved by the Local Authority, as well as at least half a dozen government departments, such as the Ministry of Works, the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Supply and the Ministry of Transport. It is a tedious and laborious business to get plans approved, it takes months before this bureaucratic monstrosity arrives at its final decision. It is by no means unusual for a builder to have to submit as many as 20, and sometimes over, sets of plans of the same house which somehow circulate through this bureaucratic machine. The type of house which is allowed must not exceed 1,000 square feet in floor area and must not exceed in value in the provinces £1,200, including site, roadmaking, sewering and all public services. In London the limit of value is £1,300. Local authorities are building the same type of house and, while they are tied down to the same floor areas per house, there is no restriction other than by the Minister of Health himself, on the cost, with the result that recent tenders submitted to local authorities have been as much as £2,000 for exactly the same house which private enterprise is compelled to build at a cost not exceeding £1,200. This is only one way adopted by the government to destroy private enterprise, which it is effectively doing so far as the house builders are concerned.

Getting plans approved is only the first bunker to get over. The builder then has to apply for a permit to build. This is another laborious and exasperating business which, in most cases, occupies months of time. If a builder is successful in getting over this bunker, he is then faced with the greatest difficulty of all, and that is to get labor and materials. As I have already pointed out, local authorities are the chosen instrument of the Government and, of what labor and material are available, preference is given to local authority building, leaving the private enterprise builder to struggle along as best he can, with the result there is a substantial black market in both labor and material.

SYSTEM BREEDS DISHONESTY

The Government's policy is a completely dishonest one and is forcing the subjects of the State to be equally as dishonest. Before the war Britons were generally accepted as law-abiding people, but there is no disguising the fact today that the country largely consists of lawbreakers. To endeavor to boost the number of houses built by local authorities, the Minister of Health has issued a regulation that they must only issue permits in the ratio of one to private enterprise for every four houses erected by the local authority. In spite of this, of the 14,918 permanent houses which have been built in the 12 months ending July last, over 50 percent have been erected by private enterprise. This means that some local authorities have ignored Mr. Bevan's regulation. The following is an example, and also shows the depressing effect of socialist ideology: Building was going ahead in a southern urban district. Licenses to build 510 houses were issued, 361 were ready for occupation or nearly so. This progress on the part of private enterprise did not suit Mr. Bevan, the Minister of Health, so he issued an order: No more private building until the number of houses erected by the council for letting is four times the number built privately. That was 6 months ago. During this time not a single house has been completed in the area. A private builder made an offer to the local authority to build 70 houses to let, the proposal was accepted by them, but the Minister of Health overruled the council and the scheme did not proceed. Following this, the council was asked to take delivery of 49 prefabricated houses. A site was found for them, but Mr. Bevan again intervened. He said that no more prefabs would be sanctioned; instead, 54 permanent houses were to be placed on the site. Again a local builder came forward and offered to build 54 permanent houses and sell them to the council for letting, and again the Minister refused the licenses. Reversing their previous order, the Ministry of Health asked the council to erect 24 aluminum prefabricated bungalows on the same site. Is it any wonder that so few houses have been built? And so the state of frustration goes on. In another case, a builder offered to erect more than 2,500 houses containing a floor area and a value fixed by the Ministry of Health. The local authority refused to give approval to the scheme, in this case I would say because the local authority was afraid to meet the competition of private enterprise.

Under such conditions how can Britain with the greatest building program ever lying before it get on with its job? In a few months time the Minister of Health will be boasting in the House of Commons that local authorities have erected houses by thousands in excess of private enterprise, but he will not tell the British public that this is due to the fact that there has been no limit in price imposed upon local authorities and that they have had preference in labor and building materials, sanitary fittings, and equipment. What hypocrisy!

MR. BEVAN DISCOURAGES HOME OWNERSHIP

The Minister of Health, Mr. Bevan, and his colleagues have a deep-rooted dislike, as Socialists, to the building of houses for sale. The policy of the Government is to build millions of small houses to let with the local authorities—as the agents of the State—as the landlords. Home ownership is one of the fundamental desires of the people of Britain and should be encouraged, not discouraged. Before the war about 35 percent of families had either purchased or were in the process of buying their own homes with the help of building society finance. One of the greatest stabilizing factors in our national life is to give the opportunity to all families to have a real and tangible stake in their country. The avenue to social stability is home ownership, it encourages better and more progressive citizenship.

The argument put forward by Mr. Bevan for building only to let is that it keeps labor more mobile. This is completely out-of-date thinking. There is not denying that purchasing a home is a somewhat hazardous affair. It may be the head of a family loses his job, and, if he has purchased a house with the help of a substantial mortgage from a building society, he will be unable to take fresh employment unless it can be found within a reasonable distance of his home, which he may find difficult to sell and, if he does sell it, may lose money. He, therefore, remains unemployed and a charge on the State. In other words, the man becomes immobile. Modern organization makes it possible for a man to take employment in any area and at the same time purchase a home. Such a scheme is only possible where a large number of houses spread throughout the country are in limited ownership.

HOME OWNERSHIP AS WELL AS MOBILITY

The local authorities of Britain own over a million houses and these could be taken

over by public utility housing corporations. A man occupying one of these houses would make a fixed weekly payment which would cover all charges, such as rates, tax, repairs, insurance, and so forth. We will assume a man first occupies a house under this scheme at Southampton. He is there for, say, 5 years or so when his employment necessitates his transfer, say, to Leicester, where he would occupy a house belonging to the Leicester Regional Public Utility Housing Corporation without losing any part of his contributions through rental toward capital redemption which he has paid on the house at Southampton. Later the man may move to Wolverhampton, afterward to Manchester; in fact, he may move several times over the period when he is purchasing a home. This may be any number of years up to 60, and whatever house the family occupies at the end of the purchasing period will be the house to be transferred to the head of the family free of debt. In effect, the Regional Public Utility Housing Corporations would act as trustees during the period the occupiers were purchasing the houses.

Some advantages of the scheme are:

1. Ownership without any of its obligations except the regular weekly payment of a sum which would be comparable to rent for similar accommodation.

2. All repairs and maintenance carried out by the housing corporation.

3. No rates, taxes, water rate, or insurance payments to be responsible for. All these charges would be included in the weekly payment and paid over to the authority by the housing corporation.

4. Freedom to leave a house at any time without further responsibility and without losing the contributions toward capital redemption already made through the weekly payment for the house or houses which have been occupied.

In this way mobility of labor would be assured while at the same time, if a man wished, he could be purchasing his home.

BRITONS ARE RAPIDLY LOSING FREEDOM

It is to be hoped that the United States of America will profit by Britain's unfortunate experience of totalitarianism as practiced by our Socialist government. We are rapidly losing our freedom. Individual initiative is being destroyed. Hundreds of thousands of our best manhood and womanhood, revolting against conditions which are so un-English, are planning to emigrate to different parts of our Empire and the United States of America, where freedom is respected as man's most treasured possession. A young man returning home to Britain after up to 6 years of war fighting for the freedom of Europe, full of ambition and enterprise, finds everything in Britain in a complete state of frustration. There are only a few minor things which he can do without first obtaining the permission of the bureaucracy. So he finds himself in the grip of a totalitarian system which is equal to, if not worse than, the system he has spent 6 years of the best of his life destroying in Europe.

Central Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important struggles against monopoly is the struggle being waged in Congress over the great Central Valley in California.

The people have made an investment in the Central Valley in dams and canals. The question now is whether the people or private monopoly will be allowed to harvest the fruits of that investment.

For 45 years we have had a reclamation law which has protected the people and helped build up the West.

For 45 years the law has placed a maximum limitation upon the amount of water, developed at public cost for private benefit, which may be granted to any one private landowner. That limitation is the amount of water sufficient to irrigate 160 acres. Liberal administrative regulation now interprets the law to permit 320 acres for man and wife.

The fate of this law, threatened by the blows of those who are attempting its repeal, now hangs suspended in the congressional balance.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first part of an address on the Central Valley by Dr. Paul S. Taylor, under the auspices of the Los Angeles League of Women Voters, on January 28, 1947.

The second portion of the address will be inserted in the RECORD March 26, 1947.

THE CENTRAL VALLEY

(Address by Dr. Paul S. Taylor, Burdette Hall, Philharmonic Auditorium, under auspices Los Angeles League of Women Voters)

When we talk about American land policy, about the present attempt to repeal acreage limitation in the Central Valley of California, we are talking about the altars of American liberty and the hearthstones of American democracy. We stand on ground that has felt the tread of the founding fathers and echoed to the voices of the statesmen of the past.

Monopoly of the soil never has received the favor of American people. For three hundred years the land, first and foremost, has furnished Americans with equality of opportunity. In 1776 Thomas Jefferson brought before the Legislature of the Colony of Virginia his famous bill to abolish entailed estates. "In the earlier times of the colony," he said, "when lands were to be had for little or nothing, some provident individuals procured large grants; * * * desirous of founding great families for themselves. * * * The transmission of this property from generation to generation, in the same name, raised up a distinct set of families * * * privileged by law in the perpetuation of their wealth, (and) thus formed into a patrician order. * * * To annul this privilege, and instead of an aristocracy of wealth, more harm and danger than benefit to society, to make an opening for the aristocracy of virtue and talent, which nature has wisely provided for in the direction of the interests of society, and scattered with equal hand through all its conditions, was deemed essential to a well-ordered republic." The colonial legislature deliberated, then under the leadership of Jefferson struck down the legal device of entail by which large landed estates then were perpetuated. Primogeniture went out the same way, and Americans of a former day felt secure that monopoly of the land and of the power over the lives of other men which it confers never would survive in America.

More than a century ago the Massachusetts statesman Daniel Webster pinned his faith to the same banner which the Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, had raised long before. "Our New England ancestors," Webster said, "brought thither no great capitals from Europe; and if they had, there was nothing productive in which they could have been invested. They left behind them the whole feudal policy of the other continent. * * * They came to a new country. There were as yet no lands yielding rent and no tenants rendering service. The whole soil was unreclaimed from barbarism. They were themselves either from their original condition or from the necessity of their common interest, nearly on a level in respect to property. Their situation demanded a parceling out and division of the land, and it may fairly be said that this necessary act fixed the future frame and form of their Government. The character of their political institutions was determined by the fundamental laws respecting property. * * * The consequence of all these causes has been a great subdivision of the soil and a great equality of condition; the true basis, most certainly, of popular government."

If, this evening, we speak at times in the language of dollars and of acres, let us remember that the deeper concern is for the liberty of Americans, for their equality of opportunity, and for the stability of this Commonwealth and this Nation. That, and nothing less, in the stake of America in having this issue settled right.

In the Central Valley are many landowners. Most of them are not large landowners. A few of them own most of the irrigable land.

In the first generation after 1850 when California achieved statehood, while land was to be had for little or nothing, some provident individuals procured large tracts. Land with little population and with less water for irrigation was not hard to obtain for cash, for warrants, or for land scrip. "With great areas of land in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys open to cash purchase the opportunity for speculative profits was unparalleled elsewhere; nor was the opportunity neglected," writes Paul Wallace Gates, of Cornell University, in the American Historical Review. "From 1862 to 1880 land sales and warrant and scrip entries in California were on an enormous scale, surpassing all other States for the period and in some years comprising over half of the sales for the entire country." After a detailed account of the manner of land acquisition in the Valley, an account which is very much more racy than usual to the pages of an academic historical journal, Gates draws this sober conclusion: "Buying in advance of settlement, these men were virtually thwarting the homestead law in California, where, because of the enormous monopolization * * * homesteaders later were able to find little good land."

The manner in which men of an earlier generation acquired land is, of course, no reflection at all upon the present owners, and is not so intended. Irrespective of how they were obtained, it is the perpetuation of great holdings in the Central Valley of California that must be the concern of the people of California and of the National Congress.

In order to bring the land issue in the Central Valley into clear focus, we will use plain language. For 45 years the law has placed a maximum limitation upon the amount of water, developed at public cost for private benefit, which may be granted to any one private landowner. That limitation is the amount of water sufficient to irrigate 160 acres. (Liberal administrative regulation now interprets the law to permit 320 acres for man and wife.) The fate of this law, threatened by the blows of those who are attempting its repeal, now hangs suspended in the congressional balance.

Acreage limitation was enacted by Congress as a device to prevent monopoly of the scarce waters of the West, and to prevent monopoly of the benefits and the generous assistance which the Nation extends when it builds dams and canals to develop those waters. The national reclamation law is the legal vehicle by which, since 1902, Congress has been using the resources of the Federal

treasury to water and to build up the arid West.

Taxpayers from California to New England have been willing to make this provision for western reclamation as a national contribution toward the building of America. They expect that the capital sum will be repaid in easy installments. They expect that the benefits of reclamation will be spread widely, not monopolized by a few. The drive for repeal is a drive on the one hand to retain all benefits of Federal reclamation, but on the other hand to repeal all its protections against monopoly.

Acreage limitation is a device to prevent not only monopoly but also its historic twin-evil—speculation. This time the evil is garbed in the form of speculation on public appropriations for reservoirs and canals. Reclamation law protects the equities of holders of excess lands who, seeking the benefits of reclamation, comply with the law by agreeing to sell their excess; buyers of excess lands are enabled under protection of the law to get land at fair prices. When you are asked to listen to protests registered in tones of indignation, against alleged injustices of the reclamation law, just remember these things:

1. Acreage limitation has received the blessings of Congress—Republican and Democratic alike—a dozen times between 1902 and 1943.

2. Acreage limitation has received and withstood the scrutiny of the courts.

3. Previous attempts at repeal, whenever subjected to full public airing and debate, have failed.

The first California attempt was made in 1905. The citizens of the National Irrigation Congress—founders of reclamation who probably knew the conditions of land holding in Central Valley as well as any person in this auditorium today, voted it down. They knew why they had written acreage limitation into the law, and they wanted to keep it there. Ninety delegates at that convention which repudiated repeal were registered from California.

4. Twice, on small projects in Colorado and Nevada, under cover of a minimum of publicity and without floor debate, large landowners managed to obtain exemption from acreage limitation. The large landholders of Central Valley seem to think that those exceptions gained by large landholders elsewhere, ought to persuade Congress to do the same here. Congress, after holding public hearings on Central Valley in 1944, refused.

Having failed in 1905 and 1944, the large landholders of Central Valley are now seeking repeal for the third time. They do not want to repeal all of the reclamation law; they seek to repeal just that portion of it which limits the amount of the benefits under the law which any one owner may keep for himself.

Why do some landowners in the valley want so badly to repeal acreage limitation?

A great public investment is now being made in the Central Valley of California. Its purpose, to be achieved in a generation and at cost of around $1,800,000,000, is to harness the waters of the valley to the full use of man. All the lands of the valley are privately owned; they passed long ago from the public domain. Since huge appropriations from the public purse are about to be showered down upon them, it is necessary to know who owns them and in what pattern of ownership.

Principal among the beneficiaries are the valley floor lands of Madera, Tulare, and Kern Counties. In these three counties as few as about 4 percent of all the holders of irrigable land together own 53 percent of all the irrigable land. The rest of the landowners—about 96 percent of them—are untouched by acreage limitation and consequently have no direct interest in repeal. Indeed, nine-tenths of all the landowners (89 percent to be exact) own 160 acres or less, and three-fourths of them own less than 80 acres each. So far as that, are the great majority of farmers who make their living in the valley, below the legal limitations. Their interest is against repeal, of course, not for it; repeal would reduce their chances of adding to their holdings, if necessary.

The reclamation law is generous, and I find no one in Central Valley who wants to repeal its generosity. The taxpayers of the Nation from Minnesota to Florida have shown repeatedly that they are willing to put their hands down their pockets, to ask no interest on their investment, and to allow western water-users more than a generation in which to repay capital. Reclamation law extends the benefit of a strong Federal credit, allows use of public power to raise project water to thirsty lands at rock-bottom rates, and foregoes any direct return upon the public investment for irrigation. What the people of the East and South do want and expect in return is that we shall use these Federal resources to build the West in the traditional American way, distributing the benefits widely among citizens. But that much they expect. We have the direct testimony of the author of the act, that without acreage limitation Congress never would have assented to the National reclamation law in the beginning. There is plenty of evidence of which Californians should take heed, that many Senators and Congressmen from East and South today will not favor further appropriations for California except they are made under the protection of acreage limitation.

The British Nationalization of Transport Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum on the British nationalization of transport bill, giving an outline of the bill itself and summarizing the debate for and against it in the House of Commons, December 16, 17, 18, 1946, by Dr. C. S. Duncan, economist, Association of American Railroads; Washington, D. C.:

BILL 12. THE BRITISH NATIONALIZATION OF TRANSPORT BILL

On November 12, 1946, the King opened British Parliament with a most gracious speech. After expressing his solicitude for "my people" at home and abroad and after dealing with certain pressing foreign problems, he came to the domestic situation and proposed a legislative program. In this connection, he declared "a measure will be laid before you to bring inland transport services under national ownership and control."

When the Commons had returned to its own chamber, Mr. Usborne, of Birmingham, proposed a vote of thanks to the King for "the gracious speech." It was seconded by Mr. Hoy of Leith. There then rose a brief skirmish between Mr. Winston Churchill and Prime Minister Attlee with respect to the proposed legislation to nationalize transportation.

Mr. Churchill spoke in criticism of what the government had done, had failed to do and was planning for the future. Upon the subject of nationalization of transport he said he would not claim that there was anything immoral in government ownership of railways if proper compensation be paid, that he, himself, had once (in 1918) advocated that step, arguing by analogy of the Post Office, but since that date the government had managed the affairs of the railways with such bad results that his early enthusiasm was "damped." Further, the rise of road transport had so complicated the problem that it was most unwise for government at this time "to throw all this new sphere into confusion and disturbance and make a large addition to the national debt in order to thrust the clumsy butter-fingers of the State into all this intricate apparatus."

Prime Minister Attlee rose to make reply. He said that he did not expect any disagreement in principle on the nationalization program because it was only carrying forward the trend that had long been evident. He said, further, that in his opinion "it was not possible to deal with railways alone, for the various forms must be complementary and not competitive."

Bill 12, the transport bill, was introduced into the House of Commons on November 27, 1946, by Mr. Alfred Barnes, Minister of Transport, supported by Mr. Herbert Morrison, Lord President of the Council and leader of the House of Commons, Sir John Dalton, Chancelor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the Board of Trade, the Attorney General, and G. R. Strauss, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport. It was moved that the bill be printed and be brought up for a second reading on the succeeding Monday. The purpose of the bill as stated was "to provide for the establishment of a British Transport Commission concerned with transport and certain other related matters, to specify their powers and duties, and to provide for the transfer to them of undertakings, parts of undertakings, property rights, obligations and liabilities, etc."

The bill was not brought up for a second reading until December 16. At that time the Minister of Transport moved "that the bill be now read a second time." He proceeded to speak in explanation of the bill and also in its defense. When he had finished, Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe moved to strike out the word "now" and at the end of the question add the words "upon this day 6 months." After all of these preliminaries, the debate was opened upon what was acknowledged by both sides as the most momentous piece of legislation that had been considered by the British Parliament since the Magna Carta.

The order of the debate had apparently been very carefully planned and the over-all time definitely set. The debate lasted for 3 days. There were 22 speakers on each side, and in addition, there were the summary remarks of Mr. Morrison, Leader of the Commons, in favor of its approval. When the debate was finally ended a vote was taken upon the question, with the result that the House divided 362 ayes to 205 noes. The approval of the second reading was equivalent to the approval of the bill.

THE BILL

The bill upon which the debate was held has for its purpose the setting up in Great Britain of a publicly owned system of inland transport, other than by air, and of port facilities as well.

The most important agency to be created by the act is the British Transport Commission, which is to consist of a chairman and four other members appointed by the Minister of Transport, and is authorized to take over the properties of all transport agencies and to carry goods and passengers by rail, by highway, and by inland waterways, and to own and supervise all public port facilities within Great Britain.

The Transport Commission is primarily to be a policy body under the direction of the Minister of Transport. The actual operating of the facilities is to be done by the executives under the authority of the commission. These executives are to be appointed by the

Minister of Transport, and there is to be one for railways, one for highways, one for docks and inland waterways, and one for London passenger transport service. Provision is also made for the hotels owned by the railroad companies.

For such areas as the Minister may direct a transport consultative committee may be organized, and there may be organized also transport users consultative committees. These bodies may be called in to give consideration to matters affecting services and facilities provided by the commission.

The property of railways, motor haulers, ports, and London Transport Board is to be transferred to the commission, with all the rights and liabilities of these undertakings, on January 1, 1948.

Under direction of the Minister of Transport, the Transport Commission will undertake to devise an entirely new rate and fare structures for all the agencies of transport in Great Britain. There is no direction or statement of principles in the law upon which this revision of the rate structure is to be made.

All cars owned by private industries on the railroads shall pass into possession of the Commission.

All trucks owned and operated under A and B carrier licenses are to be transferred to the Commission and operated by it, with the exception of operations confined to a distance up to 40 miles and for operations within a radius of 25 miles from "its operating center." C licenses for private carriers are limited to operations up to 40 miles from their operating centers. There are definite exemptions for the carriage of liquids in bulk, meat, livestock, heavy indivisible loads, and ordinary furniture.

Road haul of passengers is left to be dealt with later by the Commission, though it has ample powers to take them over.

Compensation for the property transferred to the Commission is to be made in the form of British transport stock, issued by the Commission "of a value equal in the opinion of the Treasury on the date of issue to the amount of compensation." In the case of the purchase of a truck or bus or a privately owned railroad car, where the compensation does not exceed 2,000 pounds, payment in cash may be made.

The basis of compensation is as follows:

"(a) For railway and canal undertakings—on the average market values of securities at certain dates."

(These dates are the average of 6 months prior to the previous election (February–July 1945) or the average of 6 days prior to the King's speech (November 1–8, 1946), whichever is higher.)

"(b) For road haulage undertakings—on the net value of the assets, plus, in certain cases, sums in respect of compensation for cessation of business and severance."

(This means the depreciated value of the rolling stock, plus from two to five times annual net earnings.)

"(c) For local authorities undertakings—payments to cover the interest and sinking fund charges on the date of the undertaking.

"(d) For privately owned railway wagons—values calculated by reference to age and condition and original cost."

In order to deal with questions of rates and services there is to be a Transport Tribunal which is to take the place of the existing railway rates tribunal and other rate bodies. The government is required to submit proposed rates to the Transport Tribunal for confirmation. Of its own accord the tribunal may later, at the request of interested parties, alter these charges and the Minister of Transport may at any time require the tribunal to review the operation of any such rate schemes.

Provision is made in the bill as to the terms and conditions of employment of the staff, pensions and compensation to displaced staff.

The British Transport Stock which the Commission is authorized to issue as compensation to the stockholders, and owners of railroads, highway operations, and others is to be guaranteed by the British Government. The stock is to draw 2½-percent interest. It is calculated that the result of this transaction will mean a reduction of the war rental charge paid by the government to the railroads of £40,000,000 per year to £22,750,000, or a saving of £17,250,000.

THE DEBATE

The great debate on the British transport bill to nationalize all facilities for inland transportation except air opened on the afternoon of December 16, 1946. Having moved that the bill be now read a second time, Sir Alfred Barnes, the Minister of Transport, proceeded to give an outline of the bill itself and to present the general arguments in favor of it. At the close of his remarks, Maj. Sir David Maxwell Fyfe moved that the word "now" be omitted and that there be added at the end of the question "upon this day 6 months." Thus was opened a most earnest and extended debate of this important bill. While there were 23 speakers who argued in favor of the passage of the bill, the chief debaters were Sir Alfred Barnes, Minister of Transport, Sir John Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. G. R. Strauss, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport. The other speakers, all members of Parliament, either repeated the arguments of these three master debaters or gave detailed reports from their districts.

Arguments in favor

The arguments in favor of the passage of this bill are given in outline form.

1. There is a mandate from the people to pass a bill nationalizing transport facilities. It was said that it had always been a plank in the Labor Party platform to nationalize transport facilities. It was so in the recent campaign when the Labor Party won its majority and, therefore, a vote for that party was perforce a vote for nationalization. In some districts, it was pointed out, this was a direct issue, one member stating that 60 percent of his constituents were transport workers and that they overwhelmingly supported nationalization. Furthermore, it was claimed that the bill had the support of the Labor Party, the Trades Union Congress, and the Cooperative Congress. Together these represented a majority of the people of these islands and, consequently, it was argued the majority of the people of the country desired nationalization.

2. There was a great and immediate need for the Government to take over transportation facilities. During the war these facilities were worked hard and suffered from wear and tear since replacement and maintenance were impossible. The roadway, the rolling stock, and the ports had all come out of the war in damaged condition from too much use or from bombing. Very large sums of capital were needed to restore them to a desired degree of efficient operation which private undertakings were unable to raise. Now, therefore, is the time to end the uncertainty that has existed for so long and to enable the people of the country to realize the results of unification. This would conserve capital resources, materials, and manpower. In order that the people might have the best possible service there must be over-all planning and control. This could be done only by government. As for the need of rehabilitation the London and Northeastern Railway was used as the example. Its locomotives averaged 32 years of age, and its rolling stock was of a like character. Its roadway needed rehabilitation, as did the stations and freight houses. Separate undertakings for each of the railroads and each of the highway operations and waterway operations would result in a scramble for materials and manpower. This would be bad for the country, and the Government should step in and control the situation.

3. Transportation is an overhead cost for all the people. Therefore, it is of interest to all the people. Parliament is the body that can and must look at it from this nationwide angle. The government must direct its organization. Out of 18,000,000 men employed in industry, one and one-quarter million were engaged in transport. Under this bill 750,000 would be immediately affected. This great body of men would be directed by government to the best advantage of the country.

4. Nationalization of transport facilities is in line with world trends. Not only are more and more of the transportation facilities of the world coming under government ownership and control but this is likewise true in the British Empire. Fifty-five percent of Canada's railroads are in government hands. In Australia and New Zealand 95 percent is government-owned, in South Africa 81 percent, and throughout the world 45 percent. This bill, therefore, follows the trend throughout the world.

5. The only issue before Parliament is, therefore, a workable program. That is set forth in the present bill. The line of direction is clear, from the Minister of Transport, who is responsible to the Parliament, through the transport commission and the executives, down to the people. It is a practical and workable scheme and its results will be of immense value to the British people.

6. Private industry in transportation has failed. It has not kept its facilities up to standard, as may be seen from the rolling stock, the stations, and the roadways. Within Great Britain travel has become now an unpleasantness to be endured, not a pleasure to be sought. There are areas that lack adequate transportation facilities and it is only by spreading this overhead cost over a unified industry that such conditions can be met. Under the direction of the Transport Commission a revolution in efficiency will be brought about.

7. The proposed method of compensation is fair and just. It is not only fair and just but also simple and easy. "A nationalized public service is quite entitled to have the advantage of public credit." That accounts for the fact that there will be a reduction in the amount of returns to individual owners of securities. There will be no loss of capital to these owners and the low interest rate is due to the strength and capacity of the Nation. A value of railroad property set, for example, at £900,000,000 would represent 25 years of net revenues at £38,000,000 to £40,000,000 per year. That is ample payment to the owners of the securities. They are offered shares of national transportation stock equal in capital value to their present holdings, with a return of 2½ percent guaranteed by the government. The use of the stock-exchange values instead of arbitration, or public hearings or court procedure, is a fair, a simple, a direct and easy way to meet the situation. This is provided for in the bill.

8. The new rates tribunal under Government direction will have the authority and will be directed to simplify the existing rate structure which is nothing more or less than a jungle of rate charges. There are today from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 different rates. This structure is to be simplified on a common-sense basis. Opportunity for public hearings before the tribunal will be afforded.

9. This is to be a Government monopoly of transportation facilities. Such a monopoly is the only means to realize coordination, unification, and integration which the transport situation requires. No one agency will be permitted to destroy the capital or the people, the finances, annual revenues, competition. As an overhead charge on all the people the finances, annual revenues, annual expenses, and annual receipts are all to be pooled. The financial activities are

subject to parliamentary and public examination. The results will be a transport system that is more efficient, will render better service, and have better equipment than has been known heretofore. The workers will be more satisfied and more hopeful. Appeal to them will be made to expend effort for service to all the people and not for profit for private enterprise.

The proponents of the bill were not unanimous as to all provisions in it. On the question of compensation to be paid owners of railways and highway transportation, some proponents thought the terms were overgenerous and some reported from their constituency that nothing should be paid for the property taken over. There were some also who felt that the bill did not go far enough but should be extended so as to include the carrying of passengers as well as of freight. As to the general body of the bill, however, they all seemed to be in agreement.

Arguments against

The debate against the bill was vigorous. Particular phases of the subject had evidently been assigned to the principal debaters so that the voluminous and complex bill could be covered without too great repetition. The leaders among the debaters in opposition to the bill were Maj. Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, Anthony Eden, Sir Arthur Salter, Mr. M. S. Morrison, and Sir John Anderson. The particular angle of the Tory Party was presented by Mr. Thorneycroft.

The arguments against the passage of the bill are presented below:

1. The burden of proof that the nationalization of transport is necessary, desirable, and will improve service and decrease costs rests upon proponents. This fact has been admitted and so stated by Mr. Herbert Morrison in a speech in Canada and elsewhere. The proponents, however, have made no reference to the experience of Government control during the war, when costs rose and service declined to the annoyance of the travelers and shippers. They have cited no instances where Government ownership and operation elsewhere have reduced costs and improved service. They have not and they have not even undertaken to prove their case. It has largely been presented on a doctrinaire basis, the political theory of socialism. What they have offered is "a monopoly which will be cumbrous and top-heavy, whose structural defects are as manifest as its powers are unlimited."

2. A public inquiry into the merits and demerits of the bill has been refused. The proposals in the bill, therefore, have not been put to this crucial test and consequently remain "half-baked proposals." An understanding by the people and their considered reaction, with a full knowledge of what is being proposed, have not yet been had. No claim of a mandate from the people for this bill is valid. One voter, when charged with being a Socialist because she voted for the present administration, become indignant and declared she was not Socialist but Labor. The users of transport have not had an opportunity to express themselves. It is significant that no association or organization of traders or businessmen, the users of transportation, has come forward to support the bill.

3. The bill is self-contradictory. Its aim is said to be coordination and integration but as the bill sets up the organization the result will inevitably be disintegration. There are to be separate and independent executives for each agency and, consequently, there will follow a division along functional lines. One cannot have integration and disintegration or competition at the same time.

4. The Minister of Transport, wielding almost unlimited powers over a wide and complex area, will be vulnerable to political pressure. There is nothing and there is no one to protect him. As a political appointee he will inevitably be susceptible to political influence. And from another angle "this bill gives an unexampled opportunity for political patronage and jobbery."

5. The bill will do a great injustice and injury to the British people just at the time when all should work shoulder to shoulder for increased production. It provides for the taking over by government not only of the rail lines and waterways but also of the A class or common carriers, the B class or contract carriers on the highway, and the C class which includes the traders' trucks handling their own goods beyond a 40-mile limit. This haul is far too short for his operations. Within this orbit of a 25-mile radius, this maximum distance of 40 miles, there will result the wildest cut-throat competition. There is no intimation as to what principles will guide the commission in revamping the rate structure. Traders cannot know what their costs of transport will be. One thing is certain, costs will rise. No promise is made for reduced costs. Traders will be forced to use the agency which the Minister of Transport, through the commission, decides he shall use. The stimulus of initiative will be taken away, for all planning is to be done by government. Traders and the business of the country will be greatly injured. This is not the path to increased cooperation and increased production.

6. The compensation to stockholders, and especially to stock held in trust provided for in this bill, is confiscatory. Stock-market prices are not a valid basis for determining value of the physical property to be taken over. They are affected at a given time by many factors that have nothing to do with such value. Only a small fraction of total securities ever pass through the market, and trustees are, therefore, placed in a quandary. About 29 percent of railroad stock is in trusts. This bill means a reduction in returns by fiat of government affecting innocent parties. The question of compensation is a matter for the courts or for arbitration and agreement. The administration, through this bill, is capitalizing on the low prices which it has brought about, not alone by its uninhibited cheap-money policy but also by its threat of taking over.

7. The condition in the ports will be greatly confused. Some holdings are now Government, and these will be taken over. Some holdings are private and will be in competition with government. In some ports the Government, so far as this bill is concerned, seems to have no interest. They are small ones. What is to happen to them? Ocean shipping is not to be nationalized. How can these private enterprises have a common interest with the Government in these ports. A half fish and half fowl condition cannot be efficient or permanent.

8. The purpose of the bill is "power and influence in the land." It is not to control monopoly, because the railroads have no monopoly. This is a bill of 1936, when there was fierce cutthroat competition on a declining market and it was intended to cut the throat of the virile road competitors. The Socialists know that if they take over the railways and leave open-road competition they will show colossal losses within 6 months. "Monopoly or competition, boom or slump, restriction or expansion, they (the Socialists) have only one sovereign remedy—nationalization. This is a political, not a practical, decision." But the real problem today is how to expand production, increase exports, and cheapen transport costs. The road to this end is through fair and healthy competition. The present bill blocks this road.

The debate ended with a summing up of opposing arguments by Mr. Anthony Eden at 9:10 p. m. December 18, 1946. For the next 49 minutes Mr. Herbert Morrison, Lord President of the Council and leader of the House of Commons, presented the final appeal for the bill. It was very largely a purely political address, given with a smugness and satirical humor characteristic of a man who has a majority vote in his pocket. No new points were made and much repetition occurred. So strong was the contrast between the manner and tone of the address and the momentousness of the occasion and the seriousness of the proposed legislation that the members grew more and more restive, interrupting the speaker frequently. The harangue ended at 9:59 p. m. and Sir Stanley Holmes, of Harwich, leaped to his feet and expressed the feeling, certainly of the opposition and probably of all readers of Hansard, in these words:

"In all the speeches winding up a great debate on a major bill, I have never heard anything more frivolous and less convincing."

The gavel fell. The debate was over. The question was put. The House divided—ayes, 362; noes, 205.

Testimony of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., on Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, one day last week Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, on behalf of the American Veterans' Committee, giving testimony on certain housing bills. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to present the views of the American Veterans' Committee (AVC) on housing legislation to this committee. The AVC is an organization of close to 100,000 World War II veterans who have banded together in the belief that the first major problem of the veteran is his successful readjustment to civilian life. In the last year it has been increasingly apparent that the major obstacle to the veteran in making a satisfactory transition from the armed services to community life has been the acute and continuing housing crisis. The AVC is therefore intensely interested in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866) which proposes a comprehensive national housing program.

The veteran is only part of our society, although today a very large part. Special veteran benefits which are harmful to the rest of the Nation are, in the long run, harmful to the veteran. But the long-range housing bill being considered benefits all citizens and is especially valuable to veterans who have been most gravely affected by the housing shortage.

Veterans want and need housing desperately. They need housing to fit their limited incomes. Today it does not require extended investigation but merely a few conversations with veterans to discover that they are not happy about the current housing picture. Veterans have been reasonable and patient in their housing demands. They have endured a multitude of extreme hardships in living in substandard housing makeshifts which have threatened their health and that of their families. They have doubled up

with in-laws under circumstances which have caused general unhappiness and in many cases broken homes. But despite the patience and the fortitude of our veteran population no American can escape the conclusion that it is the Nation's duty to make a sincere and hard-hitting effort to face and solve the housing problem.

The Bureau of the Census recently announced (March 18, 1947) the results of a veterans' housing survey which it made between July 1946 and September 1946. The surveys were made in 70 selected cities and reveal some of the facts about the veteran's housing desires and his income which must be taken into account in considering any housing legislation. I sincerely hope that every member of this committee will have the occasion to study this survey as it pertains to his own particular area.

The survey concretely presents the housing problem when it shows that from 30 to 40 percent of married veterans are living in rented rooms or doubled up with in-laws. In Los Angeles County, Calif., for example, fully 50 percent of the married veterans in that area are without desirable living quarters. In the New York City area some 44 percent of the married veterans fall into this category. For the New Orleans area in Louisiana, the Detroit area of Michigan, and the Philadelphia area of Pennsylvania the figures are respectively 32, 51, and 43 percent.

The survey also vividly demonstrates that veterans cannot afford either the rental or purchase cost of new housing. The median weekly income of veterans is shown to be between $40 and $50. In the majority of cases they cannot afford to pay more than $40 a month rent, and they cannot afford housing costing over $6,000.

These figures present in the cold language of statistics the crushing problem which is facing the veteran. Even under the Wyatt program new housing costing up to $60 a month in rentals and $10,000 in purchase price was permitted. These figures, as we now know, are rapidly becoming minimums. The Wall Street Journal reported in a survey printed February 17, 1947, that over-all building costs are up 86 percent over 1939 and have reached an all-time peak. Builders are curtailing their programs up to 90 and 95 percent because of the current record high costs, according to the same source.

It is clearly impossible to survey the current housing problem and deny that immediate action is necessary. If the Congress refuses to act it is in effect saying to their veterans: "We know that you face a housing problem and we are grateful to you for having won the war, but don't bother us with your troubles."

We are confident that Congress will not take this attitude and we believe that examination of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill will reveal that it is the major weapon we need to lead the attack on the housing crisis.

I should like to examine briefly some of the major provisions of this bill and point out why the American Veterans Committee has given its complete endorsement to this approach. I shall also describe briefly a group of amendments to the bill which we are proposing in order to provide additional incentives and aids to veterans and builders. The principal purpose of these amendments is to lower the cost of both rental and sale housing so that it will be within the reach of the average veteran.

The major provisions of S. 866 deal with financial aids and guaranties to expand rental and sale housing construction. I am sure there is no need for a detailed description of the provisions enunciated so ably by Senator Taft. The yield insurance provisions with such liberalizations as may be necessary are important as a means of attracting large investment funds and guaranteeing their return just as is done now with mortgage loans. The 50-year period of amortization which is part of the yield insurance plan is both sound and helpful in achieving lower rents and should be extended to the other plans for insuring mortgages for rental and cooperative housing.

The yield insurance plan also contemplates a smaller return on the money invested which should help reduce monthly rents.

Other provisions of the bill provide for longer-term mortgages for rental cooperative and sales housing which, although very helpful, still do not go far enough.

AVC reiterates its wholehearted support for the slum-clearance and redevelopment provisions of S. 866 which should enable a successful attack to be made on the long-accumulated blight of our cities. Those provisions would make it possible for the cleared areas to be reused in whatever manner the cities determine most suitable including private or public housing, commercial or public buildings.

The public-housing provisions are imperative as they represent the only means for providing homes for families of low income. There are many veterans who unfortunately are in the low-income group and S. 866 requires that these veterans be given a preference for a period of 4 years after enactment.

In line with the comprehensive character of this bill we are gratified to see there is an equally comprehensive program for rural and farm areas.

The amendments being proposed by the AVC to S. 866 have been distributed to members of the committee. I regret that the data on these sheets was prepared with reference to the bill which passed the Senate last year and that because of the pressure of time it has not been possible to adapt the amendments, where necessary, to the bill now under consideration. In most cases, however, I do not believe that this will cause difficulty. Mr. Paterson I'm sure would be glad to work with the committee in adapting these amendments to S. 866.

LOWER-RENTAL HOUSING—AMENDMENTS 8, 9, 11

AVC believes the period of amortization for mortgage loans on rental housing should be extended to 50 years and the interest rate reduced to 3 percent. The effect of these provisions would be to reduce a $60 monthly rent to around $48. It is also necessary to provide for insurance of 100-percent loans for rental-housing projects for a period of 1 year, i. e., during the present housing crisis, in order to overcome the hesitancy of investors to invest in large-scale housing projects given the present inflationary costs. Similarly on projects undertaken under the yield-insurance provisions within a year there should be 100-percent insurance of return.

All the above provisions should be equally made applicable to mutual and cooperative projects. Incidentally there is a great veteran interest at present in mutual and cooperative housing because an apartment is considerably cheaper. S. 866 is by the way less favorable for cooperative and mutual projects than S. 1592, as it passed the Senate. Another important provision of last year's bill which should be restored called for a 1 percent advance to cooperatives to enable them to undertake the planning and preliminary work prior to financing.

Amendment No. 11 provides for veterans preference on new rental housing along the same lines as S. 866 does for public housing.

SALES HOUSING—AMENDMENTS 4 AND 7

AVC recommends an extension of the amortization period for home owners to 40 years and reduction of the maximum interest rate to 3 percent.

Amendment No. 4 permits the $5,000 and 95 percent of appraised value mortgages to go up to $6,700 or 95 percent of the Administrator's estimate of necessary current costs.

This amendment as well as amendment No. 3 is necessary in order that the bill may have some realistic application to housing constructed at present day costs. Amendments for the same purpose are necessary on rental housing (amendments Nos. 10 and 8).

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 cover the eventuality that the borrower may be faced with periods of unemployment, sickness or other misfortune, in providing for temporary extensions to meet these emergencies. These amendments are particularly applicable to the veteran who may at present be buying over his head out of necessity.

INDUSTRIALIZED HOUSING

All the amendments described so far relate to reducing financing costs which, although important, are only part of the solution. America's housing future may well depend upon the ingenuity and resourcefulness of the newly established industrialized housing industry. Somehow capital as well as financing costs must be reduced. The use of modern industrial methods in housing production should be encouraged, because they hold the promise of substantially reducing costs in the area where the greatest savings can be effected.

Amendment No. 13 includes several important provisions which are necessary to encourage continued development and expansion of this new housing industry. The first of these would continue until the end of 1948 the guaranteed market program established under the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. That extension is necessary to enable these producers to get financing.

Another provision would transfer $25,000,000 of the unused premium payment money for advances to users for the development and testing of new materials. If the product proves successful, the advances are to be repaid.

Finally the RFC should be authorized to make 90-percent loans to these new producers who, we feel, are real pioneers in developing housing the average citizen can afford and in providing large-scale employment for years to come.

S. 701

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Senator TAYLOR for his foresight in introducing S. 701. Until private enterprise is able to provide housing for veterans of moderate income the Government has a responsibility which it cannot escape to assure that its housing program will meet their pressing need. S. 701 recognizes that this is an emergency problem which calls for temporary financing aid to the localities, which will undertake the projects and operate them solely for veterans of moderate income. Certainly there should be no objection to a proposal such as this, and I hope it can be incorporated into the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

In summary, AVC believes that the bill under consideration aims at reducing the cost of housing, both to the builder and the user. It is, in our opinion, the most practical plan as yet proposed for the solution of the long-range problem of adequately housing all American families. We believe that it should be strengthened by a group of amendments which provide the maximum incentives for lowering the cost of housing and to protect the veteran. We respectfully urge that this committee give them careful consideration.

Intervention in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the most compelling and challenging newspaper article which I have

read on our newest foreign adventure since the President's fateful Greek-Turkish proposal appeared on the financial page of the New York Times, Sunday, March 23. This article is headlined "Intervention in Greece—investment survey" and should be read by every Member of Congress and by every citizen. Therefore I ask that it be publishd in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTNIGHTLY COMMENTARY OF THE VALUE LINE INVESTMENT SURVEY—INTERVENTION IN GREECE

(A day after this letter goes to press, President Truman will address Congress on the subject of American intervention in Greece. We are of the opinion that even if the United States should establish an anti-Communist regime on the Greek flank of the Dardanelles, Russia would not immediately go to war. But American commitments in Greece, if they are to achieve their purpose, would have to be followed by commitments in other parts of the world and such extensive undertakings would weaken capitalism in the American sphere. In so doing they would prove to be self-defeating.)

American investors are deeply concerned over taxation. Taxation far more than communistic infiltration is threatening our way of life. Lest this opening sentence be interpreted as an expression of sympathy for the poor millionaire who is forced now to get along without an extra yacht, let it be stated at the outset that the problem of the rich in this day and age is not lack of money to spend. Faced with enormous inheritance taxes and little possibility of retaining income under existing income-tax schedules, the rich man finds it easier to spend money today than at any other time in history. If he does not spend his money, his Government will. He has every inducement to waste capital and no incentive to save it.

The function of rich people is to accumulate capital with which to produce more goods for poorer people to consume. That they have done so here is proved by the fact that America has the highest standard of living in the history of the world. That they will not be able to do so much longer is proved by the fact that anyone who accumulates income over $100,000 a year, whether for investment in business or personal spending, must pay back about 87 percent in personal income taxes. Under the conditions, the only large capital that is likely to be accumulated is that which the Government takes in the form of taxes and invests in the form of State-owned enterprises, or that which is accumulated by already established companies. In the absence of all possibility of new competition, these established companies gradually develop into national cartels that in one way or another must be integrated into the Government. In short, under existing tax rates, capital formation will in time become the function of either the Government itself or of industrial cartels integrated into the Government. This is the socialist organization toward which we are blindly moving.

It is against the background of American tax crisis that the proposed intervention in Greece takes on added significance. No one could be naive enough to imagine that the United States of America could gain permanent possession of a flank on the Dardanelles, Russia's only outlet to the Mediterranean, for $250,000,000. The cost will come much higher than that, not only in terms of the commitment in Greece but also in the collateral undertakings in the Near East, in Europe, and in Asia—wherever in fact the Russian expansion will have to be bottled up if the new foreign policy is to carry through.

The investor can find no prospect of tax reduction in such a foreign policy. The question he must answer is whether he has a better chance to resist communism by strengthening capitalism or by aiming a gun at the Russians.

THE SHIFT OF BRITISH POWER

The No. 1 fact of life to hold onto in this maelstrom of postwar political readjustments is that the British are shifting their empire. They are moving out of Asia and east Europe to consolidate in Africa and the Near East. Their great adventure is the chance of developing an Arab world and exploiting Africa. From a speculative standpoint, it seems to be good strategy. Britain has neither the economic sinews nor the firepower to hold India and the Far East or to defend Australia and New Zealand. Her land-based planes probably could hold Africa. There she could obtain raw materials produced with cheap labor to be processed in England for export at a profit to Britain. By agreement with either the United States or Russia she might be able to share the rich oil fields of the Near East, whence would come the oil to power the air force and fleet that would defend the African empire. The Arabs offer a brilliant opportunity, for they are a people of great ability and no organization. Their political life is a jigsaw of feudal rivalries. Their economy is totally undeveloped. Their unity lies in their common Semitic race and in their catholic Moslem religion, which tolerates no racial discrimination within the legions of the faithful. A relatively small force could balance the powers of the rival Arab potentates while the traditional Anglo-Saxon respect for the other fellow's religion would permit the strengthening of religious ties. A certain amount of industrialization, carefully planned so as not to compete with British industry, might in time be developed.

The big danger to the British scheme is that the Russians may inject themselves into the Near East and North Africa before the British are able to carry their plans for Africa and the Near East to fruition.

It is here that the next American move becomes decisive. If the United States takes up the position in Greece that the British Army is evacuating, the burden of defending the British sphere in Africa, and the Near East in its formative period falls upon the United States. Not only is Britain's African empire then protected, but Britain is in a strategic position later on to shift her alliance toward a Russia exasperated by American obstruction. Once Britain's African and near-eastern empires are established, she would have stock in trade—Arabian oil that could be shared with Russia, and foreign markets in the Balkans and in Asia that might advantageously be shared with the Russian cartels on some basis mutually satisfactory to the two Socialist governments. The exclusion of American goods from European and Asiatic markets would naturally be required, since England's production competes in export with America's.

The British shift out of the Far East and eastern Europe into Africa and the Near East, and her political reorientation from the American orbit to the Russian will not come to pass in a day. Britain has still to use up her American loan. She can import only from America, because only America is rich enough to export at this time. But in the long run Britain's interests will dovetail with Russia's more closely than our own, and her political alinement with Russia is therefore probable. To think thus may shock the sentiments of many good people. But in the game of power politics, which for four centuries has found England waging wars against Spain, France, Russia, and Germany with complete impartiality, there are no scruples, but only interests.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RUSSIAN POWER

Until only a few years ago Russia was an agricultural country, with practically no industries. In order to build up her industries—her capital—Russia must keep her current consumption down. That imposes a low standard of living upon the people and requires stern government. It will be difficult for the regime to carry out its program of capital formation—just as if we were to levy heavy sales taxes in order to build TVA's—and at the same time retain its popularity. Therefore it would be quite natural to expect the Russian Government to act like any other government which functions without strong popular encouragement: to emphasize the foreign threat in order to preserve internal unity during a difficult period.

At the same time, the Russian Government is desirous of expanding its sphere of influence to contiguous territories for three reasons: (1) for defense through buffer states; (2) for space in which to build up complementary trading areas; (3) for outlets to the sea.

How then will the Russians react if the United States should formulate a foreign policy that has as its obvious purpose control of the flanks on Russia's only warm-water outlet? Imagine, for a moment, that the United States of America were a landlocked nation without Atlantic or Pacific seaports and that our only outlet to the Atlantic was through the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. Imagine then that Russia, disapproving the Alemán regime in Mexico, decided to intervene with arms and money to unhorse Mr. Alemán and substitute a regime sympathetic to and in close collaboration with one of the totalitarian governments, let us say the Argentinian. Even without the Monroe Doctrine, America would spring to arms.

To Russia the American decision to take over Greece must be a particularly bitter pill to swallow, because not only is it a threat to Russia's security as well as her expansion, but it comes right after the Russians gave their approval to America's claim for control of the militarily strategic Pacific islands. The Russians must think that we Americans want the whole world including their back door.

The upshot cannot be favorable for the United States. The Russians will be resentful and even more suspicious than in the past. They will close ranks at home, more willingly suffering a low standard of living in order to build up their industrial potential for defense. They will look to Britain as an ally, even as a partner in the development of oil fields in the Near East, and to the exclusion of the United States.

Almost surely the Russians will not go to war over Greece at this time. Rather, like Germany, they will wait until their industrial potential for war—possibly for atomic war—will be fully developed, at which time they can break the American Maginot line around the Mediterranean as easily as the Germans broke it in France. That kind of a line is more dangerous as an illusion than as a weapon.

THE DEFENSE OF THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

The essential quality of capitalism is this: that it is an economy governed by a free market in which prices, demand, and supply are at liberty to reach an equilibrium without government intervention. Under pure socialism, prices, and supplies are determined by the government and the demand is regulated by rationing.

The free economy is clearly the more efficient except during periods of deep maladjustment when, the socialists assert, the

people are free only to starve. Economists of the Keynes school reply by proposing that the general level of business activity be controlled through compensating Government investments, so that though the market for specific goods remains free, the purchasing power of the people as a whole is held within tolerable limits of fluctuation.

In every instance where the people themselves have had a chance to choose between an economy that has a degree of free determination and an economy of complete government regimentation, the people have always shown a strong preference for the free economy. Since this has been so wherever the two systems came into conflict, it may be concluded that sooner or later the Russian people will themselves insist upon a greater degree of freedom in their country.

To this the foe of Russia replies that there can be no freedom of choice in that country. That is true today. That is not true of tomorrow. Today the Russians must tighten their belts to produce capital enough to build up their income. Once they have forced through their industrialization—a process which the Russians are attempting to complete in a generation though other nations have required centuries—they will be ready to live.

The Marxist theory does not contemplate abrogation of personal liberties. To say that it does is to misrepresent. The Lenin theory of taking the leap from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy in a single life-span does contemplate dictatorship. But it is a temporary dictatorship and it is worth noting that the goal of personal freedom is not lost sight of. The Russians today are spending above five times as large a percentage of their national income for education as the British and about twice as much as the Americans. Illiteracy has been greatly reduced. No conspiracy of tyrants, determined to deprive people permanently of their liberty and individualism, would sacrifice so much for public education.

The Russian people have a sincere admiration for America and American achievement, as attested by the dispatches of many responsible men who have visited Russia. Why, then, is it necessary to prove to them at the point of a gun that our way of life is superior to their own? Especially so when pointing the gun requires that we weaken our own way of life?

It is necessary to be practical. There must be some lines within which the contest for men's loyalties can be fought out by force of example. We are not yet such a perfect race that we can eliminate power politics altogether. But in the practical application of power politics, the first rule is not to bite off more than can be chewed. The natural—the practical sphere—in which to prove the superiority of capitalism and individualism is North and South America and the islands of the Caribbean and Pacific. These happen also to be the territories that the United States has traditionally defended. The area is large enough to be economically self-sustaining. Yet one imagines that if any responsible government authority advocated intervention in South American political and economic affairs, he would be denounced as an imperialist by the very same people who shout isolationist at anyone who is reluctant to see America control the Government of Greece.

There is no such a vast gulf between the Russians and ourselves that we could not live together in peace in our own parts of the world. It is implicit in the Russian program to relax the present regimentation of the individual's life. When that happens the difference between us will be no greater than that between us and the socialist state of Great Britain.

The contest of capitalism versus communism will then get down to a question of which works better. That could be settled without warfare. It would seem to be the part of wisdom for America to strengthen capitalism by removing as many as possible of the controls that make it unworkable, such as tariffs, cartels, subsidized prices, labor monopolies, and income taxes that prevent constructive enterprise. Nobody is going to stop the expansion of communism by sticking a $250,000,000 thorn into the side of Russia. Communism will be stopped by something that works better. Russian Communists are men. They have the same love of God and their fellowmen that other people have. They can learn, but they will not be taught at the point of a foreign gun. Nor will they learn to admire the capitalist economy unless we capitalists see to it that it works. We have more to do in North and South America than on the flanks of the Dardanelles.

The danger to Americans is not the activity of Comumnist agents but the deterioration of capitalism itself. Sensing our own weakness we look for a foreign devil to blame it on. But this is self-deception. Communism would have no chance at all in a world, or even in a part of a world, in which capitalism was working. Rome did not fall because of the power of the barbarians but because of the weakness of the Romans. In weakening capitalism in order to contain Russia by naked military force, we do not defend ourselves intelligently.

The Greek Crisis—Are There Only Two Roads?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of World War II Greece was a monarchial type of government. In modern times Greece has never been a democracy as we are. Her government was very similar to England's and in fact her King was a blood relation of the King of England. For possibly a hundred years Greece has been within the orbit of British influence, both economically and militarily speaking. This has been true of all the small nations bordering the Mediterranean Sea. Great Britain has exercised this influence and maintained this power in the Mediterranean through her financial investments and naval strength. The famous British life line extends, as you know, through the Straits of Gibraltar along the Grecian peninsula, northeast through the Dardanelles into the Black Sea and southeast through the Suez Canal to India, Burma, and China. The raw materials from the Far East have flowed for decades along this line to Britain, and manufactured articles have been returned to her colonial possessions and eastern markets.

During these decades, Russia has always looked with longing eyes toward the warm water outlets on the Baltic and through the Dardanelles. Her far-eastern port, Port Arthur, was too far away for extensive use, and here she was blocked by the Japanese. Her northern port, Murmansk, was closed by ice many months of the year.

The pressure upon Turkey for free use of the Dardanelles has been constant and in fact accelerated in recent years because of Russia's growing strength and the development of oil in Iraq, Iran, and other parts of the Saudia Arabian area. This development of oil has been mainly through American-British and Dutch initiative. The importance of oil in industrial as well as military use is paramount. It is the lifeblood of transportation, whether it be merchant ship or bomber. The desire of Russia to obtain this vital element and the fear of its loss by American-British-Dutch interests is one of the most important factors in Middle East relations. Its complicated tentacles of cause and effect reach into the background of every phase of international relation in the Middle East, from the Palestine problem to the Grecian and Turkish political situation. For over a century the British lion has been strong enough to protect and advance her territorial and economic interests. The picture has not always been a pretty one. Intrigue, bribery, aggression, military threats and action has had its place in maintaining the British Empire and every other empire known to history. In the main, however, order has been maintained. The Pax Britannica, as the Pax Romanas, has been maintained by military strength. But as the Roman Empire finally fell and chaos ensued throughout the Roman orbit, so we today see the dissolution of the British Empire. Great Britain, weakened financially by two great wars and the virtual independence of her most treasured colonial possessions, Canada and Australia, sees now the coming independence of India and Burma in the Far East. She can no longer solve her economic problems on the basis of colonial possessions. The present Labor government is the result of the failure of the former Conservative government, which could not find the answer to the poverty and want of her home-island people. It is a compromise experiment between complete statism and our form of free enterprise.

England, therefore, has been forced to admit that she no longer can carry the burdens of the past. She can no longer police the Mediterranean and maintain a balance of power in the Mediterranean area.

Two roads apparently lie open to the people of the United States. Neither road is smooth, both are fraught with great responsibilities and terrible potential danger.

One road is labeled "nonintervention," which after a period of civil and international wars will either end in chaotic anarchy or the dictatorship of the strongest nation involved. In the background and participating openly or clandestinely, stands Russia—awaiting the prize of the Dardanelles—oil and the extension of her philosophy of life in the Mediterranean sphere.

The second road is labeled "intervention." This is the road which President

Truman has advocated. His statement was very frank and open. There was no attempt to evade or becloud the issues and responsibilities involved.

I will not attempt to repeat his substantiating reasons therefor at this point. One point is very plain: We are challenged as never before to adopt a foreign policy which will assume the world leadership commensurate with our stature among the nations. Once we have made this decision, there is no drawing back into national or hemispheric isolation. Once the die is cast, we will be expected to follow through with every resource at our command—dollars and lives.

Before we take this step along the fateful road the President has pointed out, let us pause and ask a few questions.

Are the American people properly informed regarding the seriousness of this policy of intervention?

Are the American people united in the policy advocated?

Are the American people ready to openly declare that the philosophy of democracy as we practice it and the philosophy of communism as practiced by Russia cannot exist together in the same world?

Are we, the American people, ready to say that there is no field of compromise between these two philosophies of government?

Have we decided that the United Nations organization is a futile and functionless shadow?

Are we ready to go back to the bilateral and unilateral solutions which brought the two great wars of the twentieth century?

Are we ready to junk the multilateral solutions envisaged in the framework of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations organization?

Are we, the American people, ready to go into a third world war, if it becomes necessary, to combat the spread of communism, and culture the spread of democracy in the countries as near to Russia as Cuba and Mexico are to us?

I am not ready to answer all these questions in the affirmative. I do not have enough information from either my President or my people.

I do not know yet that there are only two roads to choose from. There may be a third road as yet undisclosed.

Maybe we can afford to pause a few hours or days in study and prayer before we choose to take either of the two fateful roads now facing us.

H. R. 2455 Should Be Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, although my district does not include the mining areas of Michigan, I naturally am concerned about any measure which may come before this House which benefits my State and this great Nation.

I have had called to my attention H. R. 2455, a bill introduced by my colleague, Mr. RUSSELL, of Nevada, which is intended to stimulate the mining industry of this Nation into new activity, help in the conservation of our mineral resources and provide strategic and critical materials for the national stock piles. The effect of this bill, as far as the Michigan copper mines are concerned, will be to permit them to operate, regardless of the market price of copper, until their precious reserves of red metal are exhausted.

As I read the reports of the Interior Department regarding our domestic mineral position, I believe it behooves us to mine whatever marginal ore bodies we can in mines which already are open and equipped so that this Nation will not lose one pound of recoverable metal in our domestic reserves. Within reason, the cost is not so important right now as is having the metal above ground, where we can use or stock pile it against another national emergency.

As I understand the bill of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL], and the similar bill introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], it is intended to stabilize prices to the mines for all the strategic and critical minerals which we need for the national defense and security without increasing the prices of those materials for industrial use. In other words, regardless of a possible drop in copper prices, where there will be a loss to the national economy, such as would occur if the Michigan copper mines shut down permanently before their ore reserves were mined out, these mines will receive what help is necessary in order to put the copper where it belongs—above ground—and where it will be an asset to our great Nation.

My colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT], in whose district these copper mines are located, understands the economics of mining much better than do I. I understand he is supporting H. R. 2455, and that this bill has the strong backing of his mining constituents. In fact, a future drop in the copper price without some plan to conserve the Michigan ore bodies will not only lose millions of pounds of copper but will ruin a large section of my State.

I congratulate the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL] on his far-sighted measure, and am glad to say that I shall support it when it comes to the floor of this House.

European Voting Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 26 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Recently there have been official references to the democracy of Greece. In this connection it is interesting to note out of 17 European states, only Greece, Belgium, Spain, and Switzerland do not countenance woman suffrage. Also, that only Portugal and Spain have a lower voting record than Greece. Out of a population of 7,500,000, only a little over 1,000,000 votes were cast. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table of European voting statistics.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Europe—Voting statistics

Country	Woman suffrage	Minimum voting age	Percent of population [1] voting in latest election	Votes cast, from latest official sources
Bulgaria	Yes		63	
Iceland	Yes	21	58	
Italy	Yes		54	
Denmark	Yes	25	[2] 54	
France	Yes	21	53	
Great Britain	Yes	21	52	
Hungary	Yes	21	52	
Netherlands	Yes	25	52	
Czechoslovakia	Yes		49	
Germany	Yes	21	[2] 49	
Sweden	Yes	21	47	
Norway	Yes	23	45	
Finland	Yes	21	44	
Belgium	No [3]		28	
Greece	No	21	15	(Report of Allied Mission to observe Greek elections, p. 32:) Total population, 7,500,000. Total votes cast, 1,106,510, equals 14.74 percent.
Portugal	Yes		10	
Spain	(4)			

[1] By latest census figures (source, World Almanac).
[2] Estimated.
[3] Except widows and mothers of members of armed forces and resistants.
[4] No elections under Franco.

NOTES.—1. Only other countries besides Greece without woman suffrage are: Belgium, Spain, and Switzerland.
2. Only countries with smaller popular participation in elections than Greece: Portugal, 10 percent of population; Spain, zero.
3. Only other remaining monarchies besides Greece: United Kingdom, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and Rumania.

Sales Tax on Liquor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have before me excerpts from a statement made by Dr. Clinton N. Howard before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee as printed in Progress magazine for March 1947. I ask unanimous consent that this appeal for a sales tax on liquor advertising be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMANDS SALES TAX ON LIQUOR ADS

My name is Clinton N. Howard, general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, incorporated 1895, and editor of its official publication Progress, which has a paid circulation in every State, with headquarters at 134 B Street NE. and 300-302-306 East Capitol Street.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we favor the passage of the present bill as it stands 100 percent as a choice between what it proposes than to continue the status quo. We would support this bill or any other bill that in good faith sought to rehabilitate the terrifying crop of alcoholics, with the certainty that the present number will increase under present conditions.

KNOW YOUR CITY

It has already been testified by Mr. Donald Clemmer, District Corrections Director, that from 1934 to 1946 a total of 137,073 commitments to District jails, or 61 percent of all commitments were for drunkenness. He placed the number of chronic alcoholics filtering through the courts at 36,000.

This does not include the number who have $10 forfeited to avoid going to court, nor the probable larger number who are not apprehended by the police. It was testified that one day last week there were 539 persons in District prisons on drunk charges.

This does not take into account the high percentage of criminal offenses in which drink is a major contributing factor, many courts placing it as high as 30 to 50 percent. And it does not include those chronic alcoholics suffering from delirium tremens sent to the hospitals, 4,000 of them sent to Gallinger Hospital in 1946, an increase of 100 percent in 2 years.

A TERRIBLE INDICTMENT

James V. Bennett, Director of Prisons, stated that drunkenness cuts across the departments of correction, police, custodial, health, courts, mental disorders, suicide, and crime, and estimated that chronic alcoholism cost the city no less than $2,500,000 annually.

Captain Milliken, chief of women's division, testified that 50 percent of the 7,000 women who pass through the District jails every year are there from drunkenness or disorderly conduct resulting from drinking, many of them women of breeding and intellect, including women lawyers, professors, accountants, stenographer teachers, nurses, social workers and theatrical folks, from some of Washington's first families.

She testified that because women are afflicted more by hypertension than men, alcohol has a worse effect on them. "Add alcohol to hypertension and you have dynamite. It usually takes two policemen to handle a 90-pound package of alcoholic femininity," she asserted.

Without going further into the facts already disclosed in the first 2 days of this hearing it must be apparent that some kind of corrective legislation is imperative. Like Senator MURRAY, we think it was, who said on another bill pending, he would support this bill or something worse rather than endure the present intolerable and inhumane situation.

A CRIMINAL BUSINESS

The bill, H. R. 496, under consideration is what might be considered experimental legislation. It establishes a precedent in dealing with alcohol addicts. While the rehabilitation of alcohol addicts has been attempted with some success in several of the States, the method of financing the cost of clinical operation is new, and to some extent difficult of execution, because it is dealing with an industry and the distributors of its product that has a reputation of concealment, of adulteration, of illegal practices, which legislation in every State and from time immemorial has recognized, whether under prohibition, regulation, or State control. It is unlike any other mercantile business.

NO INHERENT RIGHT

We do not have to establish clinics, nor prisons, courts, nor a police force to take care of the customers of the grocery, dry goods, the restaurant, or any other kind of business. These trades have an inherent right to exist, but the Supreme Court has held that the liquor traffic has no inherent right to exist. "It is a right conferred by a legislative act, a mere temporary permit which can be suspended at any time by a vote of the people." Also it must be remembered that the 5,000 addicts, and the 36,000 estimated confirmed drunkards get their surplus liquors at these licensed outlets, despite the laws which forbid the sale of liquor to drunkards or those who have had a sufficient quantity. But a sign on the wall of a bar which read "No sale to drunkards" had underneath the words, "He is not drunk who on the floor can raise his glass and ask for more."

An old logger came in who had carried a thirst from the camp to town, seeing an addict lying unconscious on the floor, he pointed to the object and said to the bartender, "Give me a quart of that." Of course, he got it, addict or no addict. The drink addicts are as well known to the keeper of the bar as they are to the judge at the bar. They see them oftener. They make them.

Such business should carry its own casualties by the proposed plan or a better one, but, in my judgment, it should be financed by a direct and sufficient appropriation and not upon an uncertain and varying amount, depending upon the quantity of alcohol consumed. That is like letting the fire department depend upon the fire losses, with a lot of fire bugs in the department. Thus you encourage the sale of intoxicating liquors to increase the appropriation to hospitalize and rehabilitate their victims.

ANOTHER BLACK MARKET

The Federal Government has never succeeded in suppressing illicit stills, or the States successful in suppressing or regulating its sale. The proposal to apply a sales tax to the liquor traffic is not an easy one to collect. We fear there would be a large amount of liquors that would escape taxation in the bootleg market, with a revival of the evils charged against prohibition, from the thousands of stills now in illegal operation and those stills and blind pigs that would blossom in the city cellars, or exclusive apartment houses by those seeking to avoid the tax.

Also there is something ironical in the suggestion that the victims of the drink traffic impoverished by excessive indulgence should be assessed a sales tax which would be passed on from the dispenser to the consumer. It also imposes a tax upon those who are able to carry their liquor who have not yet been overcome by this new scientific sickness, making the moderate drinker financially responsible for the sins of the immoderate drinker, the addict and the drunkard.

Last evening at dinner a former prominent Member of Congress, representing for three terms a great industrial district, expressed his conviction that an industry which is responsible for making the alcohol addict should be responsible for the cost of his rehabilitation. I may say that the man was a Hebrew banker and looked upon this legislation as a business proposition and not from a moral or ethical standpoint. He said, "Such a business as the liquor traffic ought to carry its own casualties."

It seems reasonable that the liquor business should hospitalize their own victims, and this bill, however indirectly, does hold the traffic to a modicum of responsibility for supplying their customers with excessive narcotic poison. But we can afford to overlook these incongruities if the legislation proposed would result in the rehabilitation of those who have become confirmed addicts by their excesses until they have lost all semblance of self-control.

UNEQUAL TAXATION

However, we insist this tax upon bar receipts to rehabilitate drunkards is in fact a tax upon the consumers, as the amount collected by the imposition of the tax, whether 1 percent or 3 percent, as in the case of all other taxes, will be passed on to the customers, exactly as the sales tax upon cosmetics, jewelry, handbags, or any other article of merchandise. You ask the price, and the clerk will say, if it is a sealskin coat, "$3,000 plus tax," or if a handbag sold to some poor woman for $2, you get the same story, $2 and 20 percent tax. It does not seem a hardship upon drinkers to impose a 1 or 3 percent tax upon intoxicating drink, when women pay 20 percent tax on their cosmetics.

TAX UPON REVENUE

However, the city could well afford to inaugurate this new and worthy experiment from the tax money which it already receives from the sale of intoxicants. According to the annual report to the Commissioners by the Alcoholic Control Board, the total receipts from District liquor taxes and license fees for the year ending June 1, after deducting all overhead charges of collection and administration, was $3,401,873.31 an increase of $305,821.68 over the previous year. The official budget estimate for 1947 is $4,700,000.

A more simple and direct method of raising the million it is hoped to raise by this tax on gallonage would be to pass an act that would impound one-third of all tax money received from the license fees to rehabilitate those who have become hopeless addicts. The cost of collection and administration would be much less, as it would not set up another bureau and put additional men and women on the public pay roll.

SIMPLE AND SENSIBLE METHOD

If it is argued that the city cannot afford to divert this revenue from rum to the rejuvenation and rehabilitation of alcohol addicts, a simple and quick method of obtaining it without encroaching upon the $4,000,000 now realized from the approximately 1,800 outlets licensed by the ABC Board would be an increase in the license fee, an immediate, inexpensive, and painless method of realizing the needed amount. For example, there are class A liquor stores which do a business of $100,000 per year at a cost of $750, which could be doubled and still be less than 1 to 3 percent of their gross income.

I have taken occasion to examine the ads appearing in the Washington papers under the heading "Business opportunities." In a recent edition of the Sunday Star, I found 35 liquor-serving restaurants, liquor stores, and off-sale groceries listed for sale,

each indicating the weekly or monthly income.

BLACK MARKETS IN PERMITS

One reports a profit of $15,000 yearly, another of $15,000 weekly, another on Connecticut Avenue $425, daily, or an annual business of $133,000, and a downtown restaurant with on-sale liquor license with an annual income of $286,000. These elaborate off-sale liquor stores pay only $750 tax. A class C tax for such restaurants as the Occidental or any one of the six on-sale restaurants on the block adjoining this House Office Building on B Street SE., $500; beer and wine licenses, $200.

The class A license under which they operate costs them $750! The Chairman of the ABC Board testified before a Senate committee last year that the resale value of a liquor license in some instances ran as high as $50,000. Rector's restaurant in the adjoining block was on the market for $40,000. It applied for a class C license. We opposed it because there were already six saloons on that block opposite the Congressional Library. Despite our opposition, which was supported by four of the liquor dealers, the license was granted, and the place was sold for $65,000 within a month, a $25,000 increase on a $500 investment. The proprietor of the Neptune Restaurant four doors away recently bought the half interest of his partner for $40,000, which represents an $80,000 business on a $500 tax investment. This black market in liquor licenses is in constant operation with 1,800 licenses in operation. Doubling the fee would support several liquor clinics without a sales tax on liquor.

TAX ADVERTISING INCOME

But there is another source of income from the sale of liquor that runs up into the millions, which is entirely untaxed, and that is the income of the newspapers from liquor advertisements, wholesale, and retail.

The amount spent for advertising by the distillers of the larger producing capacity is $75,000,000 annually, and by beer of the larger breweries $25,000,000 besides their income from retail stores, night clubs, cocktail lounges and restaurants operating bars, perhaps a total, including beer and wine broadcasts, of $150,000,000.

WET WASHINGTON POST

The purpose of all advertising is to increase sales and the liquor trade recognizes this stupendous sum paid to the newspapers as a good investment. The daily papers in Washington get their share as is evidenced by the scrap books of liquor ads which we have on file at our headquarters. Let me give you a few recent examples. The Washington Post in a recent issue had 50 columns of liquor ads. By contrast the New York Times in an edition double in size had only 14 columns, while the papers published by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER and the Gannett string of 21 daily papers with a total circulation of 10,000,000 do not publish any liquor advertisements and never have. It does not seem unreasonable, therefore, to suggest that the papers of Washington who have an income of millions annually from promoting the sale of liquor should bear at least a part, if not the entire cost of maintaining the clinics for rehabilitating the drunkards they helped to make, with every news and sporting broadcast boosting at both ends Senate, Premium, Globe, National, Arrow, and Valley Forge beer.

This is no argument in opposition to the pending proposal or questioning the good faith of its sponsors; it is a suggestion as to some form of amendment to the pending bill before it gets to the floor which will more quickly, easily, and cheaply accomplish the same result, and at the same time cut off or reduce the supply of drunks, that is making Washington a hissing and a byword from ocean to ocean.

WASHINGTON WETTEST

On more than a dozen occasions during the past several years we have called attention in our official publication, Progress, and in addresses to ministerial meetings and pulpits to the fact that the consumption of liquor, that is high powered spirits, is greater in the District than in any other State or similar area in the country.

Not only greater in gallonage but greater per capita, more than double the consumption, more than three times the consumption, over a period of years. Time and again these figures have been challenged despite their official origin. These figures are obtainable through the Department of Internal Revenue for every State in the Union and confirmed by the District tax collector whose department issues stamps for the sale of whisky, gin, brandy, champagne, wine above 15 percent alcoholic strength, and beer for the District over a period of years, showing a startling upward per capita consumption in all categories of intoxicating liquors, of low and high alcoholic content.

We have here charts giving the consumption for every State in the Union which gives the pennant for alcoholic consumption to Washington, or the District, over every other State, and the District reports twice the gallonage of the 10 wettest States and 3 times as much for the country at large. This is doubtless due to the higher advertising pressure in the newspapers of Washington than is found in any other city of the United States.

FIGURES GIVE FACTS

Now that the facts have been officially presented to this committee by Guy W. Pearson, of the Tax Department, and by the year and in detail by Dr. Joseph L. Gilbert, who has furnished us with a copy of his testimony, they will no longer be denied. Mr. Pearson placed the consumption for the current year at 5,000,000 gallons, or 25,000,000 fifths for hard liquors. That is 12 bottles of whisky like this [holding up a Seagram's pint] for every man, woman, boy, girl, and infant in the District per year.

We restate the totals for the purpose of showing a source of revenue which would finance the alcoholic clinics proposed by this bill without imposing an additional sales tax or setting up a special fund. Note the mounting increase in sales for the past 3 years: 1944 sales of distilled liquor were 3,141,000 gallons; 1945, 4,175,000 gallons; 1946, 4,583,000 gallons.

Champagne for 1945, 22,000 gallons; 1946, 57,900 gallons; wine above 14 percent, 1945, 555,630 gallons; 1946, 880,000 gallons; while wines of 13 percent and under are untaxed, with beer, 31 gallons per barrel at 50 cents.

RETAIL STAMP TAX

Note that the total revenue for the top consumption is $2,000,000 for the first 6 months of 1947, approximately $4,000,000 for the year. This tax is lower than in any other area in the United States. On distilled spirits the tax in the District is 50 cents per gallon, while over the line in Maryland it is $1 per gallon. On champagne, the rich man's drink, the District tax is only 15 cents per gallon, and on wine above 14-percent alcohol the tax is only 10 cents a gallon. On 13 percent wine and under, there is no tax. The line drawn between 13 and 14, 10 cents above and nothing below.

If these taxes were only doubled, and brought up to the national average, it would at once produce the needed $4,000,000 for the purpose of the bill. Indeed, the reduction in the number of alcoholics, and the cost of their arrest and maintenance, would possibly foot the bill, as 90 percent of the misdemeanant population of the Occoquan Workhouse are there on charges of intoxication, at a cost approaching $500,000 a year. The reduction in the cost for the city jails, police, and courts, would more than make up the entire cost of the clinics.

Judge McMahon in his illuminating testimony yesterday said the cost of disposing of drunks in his court was $30,000, and the fines recovered $2,000, represent a loss of $28,000 to the taxpayers on addicts in his court. If the clinics would reduce the addicts by a half only, it would save the taxpayers $14,000 in one court.

JESSE SUTOR QUOTED

In this connection may I quote an illuminating paragraph from the double-column article appearing on the editorial page of the Sunday Star of February 23, from the versatile pen of its long-time and very able columnist, Mr. Jesse Sutor, which is well worthy of your serious consideration.

I suggest also that you read, as I assume you have read, the three illuminating and lengthy articles recently appearing in the Star by George Kennedy with the accompanying editorial in the Star of February 15 entitled "Alcoholism in the District."

A THOUGHTFUL SUGGESTION

Let me quote briefly from the article by Mr. Sutor:

"From the best sources of information it appears that there is considerable community support for this proposed measure but there are those who feel that a companion measure would be of material assistance in accomplishing the desired purposes. In the proposed legal recognition of alcoholism as a 'disease,' there arises an implied obligation to supply preventive as well as curative measures. Without preventive measures the cure of those who have already contracted the 'disease' will be more uncertain and also new crops of alcoholics will be needing the cure.

"Those who adhere to this latter school of thought believe that the excessive number of places in the District licensed for the sale of alcoholic beverages, the elaborate window displays of liquor and the blatent advertising programs of the trade are not calculated to encourage the temperate use of alcoholic beverages but would encourage their wider use." The case could not be more succinctly stated.

Jesus once said to His disciples, "Let these sayings sink down into your ears." Mr. Sutor advisedly says, "In the proposed legal recognition of alcoholism as a disease there arises an implied obligation to supply preventive as well as curative measures," to avoid the creation of a new crop "to take the places of those who have been cured of the disease," and he suggests as a remedy "a reduction in the excessive number of places in the District licensed for the sale of alcoholic beverages, the abolition of the elaborate window displays of liquors and the blatent advertising programs of the trade in the press and on the radio calculated to encourage the temperate use of alcoholic beverages but would encourage their intemperate use." To this we would add, prohibit the advertising of liquors altogether in the press and over the radio in the District, or let them pay the cost of maintaining the clinics for the army of drunkards they help to create.

We suggest that the bill under consideration, in the light of the facts disclosed at this hearing, be recommitted for further study, so that some of these worthy suggestions may be included, not delayed as an amendment, but as a part of the original act. We have waited for years for the bill; we will all be dead when the amendments pass.

Changes in Cloture Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 26 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD several editorials relative to the desirability of a change in the cloture rule, one from the Denver Post, one from the St. Louis Star-Times; then, very interestingly, three from southern newspapers—one from the El Paso Times, one from the Virginian-Pilot, of Norfolk, Va., and one from the Citizen, of Asheville, N. C.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of February 21, 1947]

FREE BUT UNDEMOCRATIC

Another attempt is being made to curb abuse of the ancient Senate freedom of unlimited debate. Senators KNOWLAND, of California and SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts are advocating an amendment of the cloture rule with a view of making filibusters more difficult. They propose that the Senate, by a simple majority vote, be allowed to shut off debate on a motion or a bill. Under the present rule, a two-thirds majority is required. As a practical matter, this means that cloture can be imposed only when the southern bloc is willing.

The principal argument advanced by southern Senators against the proposed rule change is that it would be ineffective. In this connection, they say cloture has been invoked only 16 times in 40 years, that it was voted only 3 times and that in 10 of the 13 failures it would have failed even under a simple majority rule.

Probably no senatorial practice is more disgusting to the American public than the filibuster. By no stretch of the imagination can it be justified as an exercise of the right of free speech and unlimited debate. The purpose of the filibuster is to obstruct. The reason for debate is to clarify. Senators engaged in a filibuster do everything but discuss the merits of the measure they are trying to talk to death. They may read passages from the Bible, whole pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, excerpts from books—anything to kill time.

The theory of the filibusters is that the end justifies the means. With this idea in mind, they feel free to employ any strategy which will prevent a vote on the measure they oppose. That is not democratic. It is indefensible.

The tradition of full debate is one the Senate should cherish. But abuse of a privilege is the most certain way to discredit and lose it. Under the filibuster technique the privilege of unlimited debate is misconstrued as a license to defeat what logically is the ultimate aim of any honest debate—a decision on the issue under discussion.

Apologists for the filibuster device contend that cloture is an infringement upon the right of free speech. But no human right is unlimited. The extent to which one individual may exercise his rights depends upon where and when he begins to interfere with the rights of his fellows. Any citizen has a right to stand on a sidewalk. But when 1,000 people insist upon exercising that right, at the same time, in the same block, they become an obstruction.

Each of the 96 Members of the Senate has the right of free speech. But manifestly all 96 have no right to insist upon speaking at the same time. The very fact that under present rules the Senate reserves the power to vote cloture by a two-thirds majority shows it recognizes that occasions may arise when it is necessary to restrict to stop debate. It is not unreasonable that a majority of the Senate should have power to invoke cloture and prevent or stop a filibuster.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of February 20, 1947]

FILIBUSTER SIDESHOW

While other matters have been occupying center stage in Congress, off in the wings a subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee has been considering a proposal that would end the filibuster. It received little attention until it ended yesterday, and that's a pity. The Nation should not have been deprived of the spectacle of southern Democrats doing a double somersault from the high trapeze of reason without a net.

Hard pressed in logic, the southerners came up with a two-way-stretch argument against the proposal of Senators KNOWLAND, of California, and SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, that debate be closable on a simple majority vote. Present Senate rules—which require two-thirds vote for cloture—are too valuable to be tinkered with, said the Senators. And then, without drawing a full breath, they rushed on to say that the Knowland-Saltonstall proposal wouldn't make any difference anyway, because cloture is seldom called for and, when it is, would fail as often on a requirement for majority as on that for the two-thirds.

How they can have it both ways—important and unimportant—at the same time is, of course, a little difficult to follow. If a double point is to be made, it should be this: The unlimited filibuster puts the will of the majority at the disposal of the whim of a minority, and the realization that cloture is most difficult under present rules frequently keeps the majority from doing anything about it. Only 16 times in the past 40 years has cloture been called for in the Senate. But the number of times a small group of willful men has been able under the protection of the two-thirds rule to talk praiseworthy legislation to death is many times greater. In at least three instances, moreover, a proposal for cloture failed although it did have a majority vote.

Unfortunately for all this logic, the move to throw the anachronism of the filibuster into the discard will probably fail. But at least the prospects for action are brighter now than at any time within long memory. There are more newcomers to the Senate around than Washington has seen in many days, and it is the newcomers who are justifiably annoyed with this device for thwarting the majority.

The Republican freshmen, who have refused to bow to defeatism, but instead are drumming their proposal through the subcommittee, deserve a round of thanks for their fight. And the southerners deserve at least a gallery giggle for their entertaining acrobatics.

[From the El Paso Times of January 26, 1947]

STREAMLINE SENATE DEBATE

A filibuster in the Congress of the United States is not democracy. The man conducting the filibuster may think it is his right to talk as long as he wishes, but, by doing so, he is preventing an orderly vote on a measure. The people of the United States are entitled to more consideration than that.

It is encouraging that resolutions to change the present Senate rule on cloture are to be considered in hearings opening early this week before a Senate Rules and Administration Subcommittee.

The proposals call for applying cloture by a majority vote. Unless cloture is applied, Senate debate is unlimited and filibusters can flourish. Senate rules may be changed by a majority vote.

The rules for procedure in the United States Senate were originally based largely on practice in the British House of Commons. However, the House of Commons changed its procedure 65 years ago so that the majority could limit debate, whereas the Senate allowed debate to be unlimited until 30 years ago, and then allowed it to be limited only by a two-thirds vote.

The change in Great Britain came about because of dilatory tactics employed by the Irish Nationalists to get home rule for Ireland. In 1882 Prime Minister Gladstone obtained the passage of a rule in the House of Commons whereby the previous question could be moved, so as to end debate, whenever the majority of the House obviously wanted a vote to be taken. Gladstone explained that previously all members had deferred to majority sentiment, but since then a body of men had entered Parliament to whom its traditions meant nothing—a polite way of saying that they weren't gentlemen acting like gentlemen.

Now the House of Commons acting through its speaker has additional methods of suppressing dilatory and obstructionist tactics. The Speaker of the House of Commons is expected to be above politics and to function as a political neutral.

At first the rules of the Senate allowed the majority to close debate by adopting a motion for the previous question. This provision was omitted from the Senate rules when these were changed in 1806; there was complaint that it had been abused. It has remained in the House rules, as one of the methods by which debate is strictly controlled in the House.

On February 3, 1917, President Wilson broke diplomatic relations with Germany because of the resumption of unrestricted German submarine warfare. On February 27 he asked Congress to authorize the arming of American merchant vessels against submarine attack. The House complied and 72 Senators said they would vote to comply if given the chance, but with Congress due to adjourn on March 4 the armed neutrality bill was killed by a filibuster of a dozen or so Senators. Thereupon the President armed merchant ships without specific legislative authority.

The new Congress was immediately called into special session, and a conference of Democratic and Republican leaders agreed to comply with the President's demand to provide that debate in the Senate might be limited in the future. The conference agreed on a new rule whereby cloture might be applied by a two-thirds vote. An amendment was offered to make it by majority vote instead of by two-thirds, and there was good reason to believe that the amendment would have carried if put to a vote. But Senator Penrose of Pennsylvania objected that the amendment violated the bipartisan agreement, and its sponsor (Hollis, of New Hampshire) withdrew it. The new rule was then adopted by vote of 76 to 3.

Since then cloture has been applied on only four occasions. Motions for cloture on the antilynching bill in 1939 and on the anti-poll-tax bill in 1942 and 1944 failed to achieve even a majority vote. In 1946 a motion for cloture on the British-loan bill resulted in a tie vote; a motion for cloture on the FEPC bill received a majority but not a two-thirds vote.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot of January 14, 1947]

FORESTALLING FILIBUSTERS

During the brief but bitter filibuster over the seating of BILBO, Senator TAFT warned

the orating Democrats that he and his fellow Republicans might choke them off with a change in the Senate rules. That was a threat uttered in the heat of controversy which may or may not have influenced the filibusterers in their sudden decision to accept a postponement of the issue. But it was—and remains—a long overdue proposal.

Senator TAFT, busy with other matters, seems to have forgotten his statement. But Senators MORSE and KNOWLAND have introduced two bills that would enable the Senate to control any future flow of minority eloquence. Senator MORSE has chosen a relatively restricted target. Noting that most filibusters have been pegged on the device of moving a correction of the Senate Journal and then debating this endlessly, he would have the pertinent rule amended to limit the time available to any Senator on such a topic to three hours. Senator KNOWLAND proposes a more direct attack. He would alter the rules to permit a Senate majority to apply any limitation it wishes to debate on any measure at any time. The present requirement is a two-thirds vote. He would drop it to a majority.

Why not? Unlimited debate has lost most of its meaning except as an obstacle to majority action usually invoked by a small group representing some special interest. Now is a good time, when no deliberate talkfest is on the immediate horizon and the proposal can be considered quietly on its merits, to make such a change in the rules. To wait until another filibuster is launched would be to wait until tempers were again frayed and emotions aroused over the extraneous issue of the point currently in dispute. It is better to repair the roof while the sun is shining than to wait until a storm has broken out.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of December 10, 1946]

TALK WITHOUT END

Our brief for the filibuster as employed in the Senate is—brief. On some occasions it has been used to prevent the passage of punitive legislation bearing on one section or one group. There are times when a worthy minority must be protected against a headstrong majority.

That much said, we agree nevertheless with Senators KNOWLAND and MORSE that some way must be found to prevent unlimited debate—the definition of a filibuster—in the Upper House of Congress. The cloture provision adopted in 1917 after President Wilson had denounced the "little group of willful men" who filibustered his armed neutrality bill to death is a weak and unworkable device. Cloture, which limits debate, requires a two-thirds vote. The fact that it has been obtained only four times in 29 years surely is proof that the method is inadequate.

Senator KNOWLAND has introduced a bill which would enable the Senate to limit debate by a simple majority vote. This measure has a good chance of passage, since the Senate has 21 new Members and 16 others who have only served for 2 years. Usually it is the old-timers who cling to Senate privilege.

No fair-minded legislator can offer a sincere defense of the filibuster. It has been abused time and again. It has been abused even by a minority of one, as, for example, when Huey Long filibustered to death the appropriation for the Social Security Act of 1935. To be sure, the majority may abuse the power of numbers, but we think that the good sense for the whole Congress may be depended upon to assure justice. The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body we know of which can engage in endless debate without ever coming to the point or to a decision. This unique power makes for irresponsibility in representative government. It should be abolished or curtailed.

Our Expanding Oil Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Our new American warlike policy in controlling the Dardanelles can only be explained to me by American interests in the Near East. With respect to this phase of the proposed Greek-Turkish intervention the March 20 Washington letter copyrighted by Malcolm Hobbs on "Our Expanding Oil Interests" is most pertinent. I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of this letter in the RECORD where it will be available to all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR EXPANDING OIL INTERESTS

(By Malcolm Hobbs)

WASHINGTON.—The dramatic political developments surrounding the new United States foreign policy in the Near East have overshadowed recent economic developments in which America has strengthened its holdings in rich Middle East oil fields.

These significant and important economic steps have taken place coincidentally with the evolving of President Truman's policy to secure America's political frontiers in Greece and Turkey.

Two weeks ago, two important American oil companies—Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.—joined with Britain's Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. to form Middle East Pipelines, Ltd. The purpose of the new company is to construct another 1,000 miles of pipe line to connect the oil fields of Iran and Kuwait with the Mediterranean. Stock in the company will be distributed so that Jersey will have 40 percent, Socony 10 percent, and Anglo-Iranian 50 percent. In return for financial backing, Anglo-Iranian has agreed to provide the American companies with "substantial quantities of crude oil for a period of years."

This represents the first return for American oil interests from the deal signed last December 26 in which British interests agreed to share with the Americans in the development of Middle East oil resources. This agreement culminated the uphill struggle of the Americans—started shortly after World War I—against the exclusive control by the British of Middle East oil concessions.

Three weeks ago, contracts were placed for the construction of another pipe line to be controlled by the Arabian American Oil Co., which has exclusive rights over Saudi Arabian resources. Arabian American is owned by Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co. Its pipe line is a big 30-inch project costing $80,000,000, scheduled to be completed by the end of 1949. It will cross the Arabian peninsula to the Mediterranean.

Completion of the two new pipe lines will give American interests a hold on three vital lines stretching into this rich region. American companies already have an interest in the line which carries oil from the Iraq fields to the Mediterranean.

On March 12, the Arabian American Oil Co. announced that an agreement whereby Standard of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum would join Standard of California and the Texas Co., as stockholders of Arabian American awaited only the satisfactory solution of certain British objections to the deal. An agreement in principle giving Jersey 30 percent and Socony Vacuum 10 percent of Arabian American's capital stock had been announced last December. This arrangement will bolster Arabian American's financial structure by about $227,000,000.

Another American oil company—Gulf—has joint control with Anglo-Iranian of the Kuwait Oil Co. Its fields are the newest in the Middle East, located at the head of the Persian Gulf.

The welter of developments in international oil serve to account for two facts, that American oil interests are increasing their international holdings and control by leaps and bounds, and that the American rise is coupled with a British decline. Up until the 1920's the United States had no significant foreign oil supplies. Diplomatic protests over Britain's monopolistic position in the Middle East secured a concession for the United States in Iraq. American engineers discovered the richest reserves in the world in Saudi Arabia after Britain had concluded that the region was unproductive. The recent deals with Anglo-Iranian have strengthened the United States position considerably. The two new pipe lines will bring Middle East oil direct to the Mediterranean, eliminating tanker shipments through the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and the Suez Canal, where the British have been able to collect a toll levy of 18 cents a barrel.

In contrast to the picture after World War I, American oil concessions abroad now equal, if not surpass those of the British. There is added significance to this in that the United States is a big oil producer within its own borders, while Britain has relied completely on foreign oil for security since Winston Churchill's decision as First Lord of the Admiralty to convert the Royal Navy from coal to oil.

Today British companies have concessions in Iran, North Borneo, Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, India, Malaya, Ceylon, Netherlands, East Indies, Trinidad, Colombia, and Venezuela. Americans have properties in all these countries except India and Iran, with additional holdings in Canada, Bahrein, and Saudi Arabia.

In an unheralded but significant speech at Mount Vernon, Ill., on the 13th of this month, Mr. Charles Rayner, the State Department's petroleum adviser, stated that United States interests now own or control 59 percent of the total known oil reserves in the world. He stressed "the increasing importance of our foreign reserves to our national economy."

In terms of the Middle East, Mr. Rayner said, "I cannot stress the importance of this part of the world too strongly. With oil reserves known to be in excess of the known reserves of the United States, it may well be that the Middle East will ultimately become the center of gravity of world oil production. It is not difficult therefore to appreciate how important may be our political relationship with the various countries and small sheikdoms that make up that part of the world."

A Lost Generation in Scientific Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1945, and on page 8632 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I said, among other things:

I also know we are going to wake up 5, 7, or 10 years from now with an acute shortage of doctors, dentists, technicians, scien-

tists, and engineers. I think we have been more foolish than some of our allies. Britain and Russia, and other countries have continued the education of their youth.

This warning I issued long before that time, when we were arbitrarily and ruthlessly drafting the best brains of our country, taking genius from the laboratory to do kitchen police.

Only last Sunday, March 23, 1947, there appeared an interesting article in the Washington Sunday Star, which, under leave to extend my remarks, I include:

A LOST GENERATION IN SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS—ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION PRESIDENT DEPLORES WAR'S WASTE

The increasing availability of money for research in medicine is beginning to embarrass our medical schools. "Where is the trained personnel coming from to make use of these funds?" Raymond B. Fosdick, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, asks in his annual review, a portion of which is made public today. The general public has contributed enthusiastically to such special causes as infantile paralysis, cancer, heart disease, and tuberculosis. Recently, through the National Institute of Health and the scientific branches of the armed forces, the Federal Government allocated over $6,000,000 for similar specialized projects.

But from what source are we to get the scientists and technicians competent to work in these fields? Their training is a matter of years of preparation, and it cannot be extemporized.

There seems to be a widespread public belief in what might be called the magic-wand theory of medical advance. This theory has been stimulated by the dramatic development in recent years of such remedies as insulin, penicillin, the sulfa drugs, and the blood substitutes. According to this theory, our research laboratories stand ready at any time to turn money into scientific discoveries; in other words, the bottleneck to further advance is the lack of funds; it is the lack of capable and thoroughly trained investigators to use the funds. The medical schools, to which we must look for these investigators, do not possess and cannot now obtain the fundamental facilities through which alone this increasing demand can be met. Indeed, many of our medical schools are in the position of a cook asked to prepare a wedding feast for which the champagne has been furnished but no water to boil the potatoes.

Nothing that war touches escapes blight. There is a popular belief that science made rapid progress between 1939 and 1945, but this belief has little basis for support. It is now generally recognized that the feverish activity of scientists in wartime is essentially not scientific. They are primarily engaged in the application of existing knowledge to certain specific and narrow problems. They have no time for pure research, and their contributions to basic knowledge are infrequent and on the whole unimportant. They are drawing on the reserves of the past. They are using up the supply of basic discoveries which an earlier generation has given them. They are digging recklessly into the stock pile of existing knowledge. The gap between knowledge and use in science is always narrow; the effect of war is to close the gap almost to the vanishing point.

It is not in war but in peace that the advance of knowledge, as distinguished from the application of knowledge, finds its most favorable environment. The practical applications of knowledge are the dividends which basic science from time to time declares. When basic science is even temporarily interrupted, then it is necessary to pay these dividends out of surplus, and obviously this process cannot be long continued without bankruptcy.

It is necessary to drive home the point that war does not contribute to basic science. On the contrary, it blocks its progress and, through perverted applications, debases the whole concept of the dignity and glory of man's conquest of nature.

There is another phase of the matter, equally vicious. War interferes with the proper training of scientific personnel. At least, here in the United States we allowed it to interfere. Like any procedure which expends capital resources without providing means of replenishing them, the interruption of advanced training in the basic sciences seems to cost little at the moment, and it serves an emergency by releasing manpower. But it is a policy of desperation which places a crippling mortgage on the future. It grinds up the seed corn of scientific progress in the next generation to make a day's feed for the war machine.

The consequences of this unintelligent policy are now upon us. There is a serious, even an alarming, shortage of adequate personnel in almost every field which requires advanced thinking. Whether in physics or chemistry or the biological and medical sciences, the situation is the same. In subjects like bacteriology, biochemistry, anatomy, biophysics, and physiology, it is almost impossible to find younger men with adequate teaching and research qualifications. We have sacrificed the seed corn. We have lost a generation. Our governmental policy was dictated by considerations of immediate need and was geared to the exigencies of the moment.

But this was not the case in Russia or England. In both these countries policy was guided by the long view far more effectively than with us. In Russia, students of ability in most branches of science were kept in their laboratories, while Great Britain, with some difficulty, to be sure, succeeded not in eliminating, but in minimizing interruption in the training of her future scientific teachers and leaders.

American democracy seems to learn its lessons the hard way. It does not realize, until too late, that human erosion, like soil erosion, can jeopardize the future. Surely out of the bitter experience of this war should come the realization that trained personnel is our most valuable asset in science. It is criminal folly to gamble with the future by policies which dissipate that asset. A nation which loses so much of its technical strength that it runs the risk of being unable to meet the needs of the next generation may find that Pyrrhic victories are as disastrous as defeats.

UNESCO, the Ethical Echelon in Our Fight for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith incorporating in the RECORD a copy of the address which I delivered last night in Philadelphia before the concluding general session of the first National Conference of the National Advisory Commission on UNESCO. This important operating arm of the United Nations is now engaged in a constructive program for preserving the peace which should challenge the attention and secure the support of the well-intentioned people on every continent.

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, Abraham Lincoln was once asked by a friend to answer the question as to what is the proper length for a man's legs. Without a moment's hesitation and with that practical Lincolnian sagacity which the world needs so desperately today, Abraham Lincoln said, "Just long enough to reach the ground."

When I am asked the question, as I frequently am, "What is the real purpose and program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization?" I always reply, "UNESCO has as its goal eradicating the causes of war."

Fellow citizens, I believe that those of us who work in UNESCO and who have confidence in the concept that the causes of war must be removed from the hearts and minds of men before the councils of peace can permanently achieve their objectives can answer questions concerning the size of our task with as much directness as Lincoln answered his questioner concerning the length of his legs.

We must crown our efforts with a full measure of success. To achieve our objectives part way would be of little more avail in the preservation of peace than it would avail a man to have legs which reach only part way to the ground. If, in our efforts to stamp out the causes of war, we permit an area of animosity to exist to whatever fractional degree is required to start another war, we shall have failed in our objectives completely. Our purpose being to prevent wars, we cannot permit ourselves the luxury of half-way measures of success. To fail in a challenge so great in this era of atomic destructiveness would be no less a calamity to civilization whether we fail in full or in part. If the world war returns to this earth, our efforts will be marked by failure. We must by the very magnitude of the task we face permit no other alternative than complete success.

It is because of the enormous importance of the work in which this great consultative conference is engaged that I come humbly before you tonight as the delegate of the United States Congress, as it were, to this great workshop for humanity. This first National Conference on UNESCO of the National Advisory Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has very fittingly selected Philadelphia as the home of its meeting.

Here in this city, long ago, freemen for the first time on this continent reduced to writing rules of tolerance and orderly procedure by which men and women holding differing opinions and nourishing a large variety of ambitions have been able to live and work together with a degree of successful progress unparalleled and unprecedented in the history of the world. It is my ardent hope for this Conference that the inspiration and the information radiating from it will go far toward providing for mankind everywhere the same fair chance for a free people that the Constitution of the United States has guaranteed for all Americans.

Yonder Liberty Bell must veritably be trembling in its historic frame tonight as it envisages the vast potentialities for liberty, freedom, tolerance, and a prevailing peace which are an inherent and important part of this Conference of men and women of good will.

OUR WORK IN OUR WORLD

The objective of this Conference is to strengthen and support the peace-preserving actions of UNESCO by a threefold program: (1) We are met here to carry back to the organizations which we represent the complete story of UNESCO; what it has done, how it is operating, and what it has mapped

out for its future course. (2) This great Conference is called upon to give counsel to those of us in public office whose day-by-day decisions can do so much to make or mar the peace. The ideas of each of you are solicited. The counsel of each organization represented here tonight can be tested in this great crucible of discussion and when an area of agreement has been defined, the National Advisory Commission has not only the opportunity but the obligation to carry your counsel to Washington as well as to our representatives at the Paris headquarters of UNESCO. (3) Through the delegates of the more than 500 organizations represented at this National Conference it is hoped to bring the message of UNESCO to every State and every community in this Republic. Each of you is to be a Paul Revere in your own right, calling out through your organizations to all of the folks in your community not that the redcoats but the right creeds are coming. Yours is a challenge to alert America for peace and not for war. Yours is a message of hope and of confidence rather than a call to arms, but if your zeal is sufficient and your calls emphatic enough it can be heard round the world as surely as the shots fired at Concord were heard in a different era and for a different purpose.

Coming to you as I do directly from Washington where only this morning as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been wrestling with the prodigious problems of our times as they are revealed to us by conditions in Greece and Turkey, let me tell you that the eyes of Congress are upon this Conference. We who labor in Congress recognize perhaps better than any other group of citizens in the world the indefatigable force of public opinion. Against a mobilized public opinion that knows what it wants and has plans how to get it, there is no power in America which can be arrayed successfully. What is true of our country is true in a larger sense throughout the world. We who seek to implement public opinion in Congress by reducing its mandates to legislative form fully appreciate the dynamic possibilities of a world-wide public opinion once it has been marshaled into effective channels for preserving the peace. Yes, Congress is watching your proceedings and listening for your reports.

THE BACKGROUND OF UNESCO

It so happens that it was my honor and proud privilege to be the author of the enabling legislation which has resulted in the creation of UNESCO. I want to give you a few details of the background leading up to this legislation and the attitude of Congress toward the vast potentialities of the force you represent. I shall speak only from the knowledge of personal experience. I do this to illustrate two points: first, I want you to know that Congress has confidence in the educational, scientific, and cultural forces of America and of the world and, second, I want to demonstrate the importance of your making use of this Conference and of your National Advisory Commission as a pipe line for carrying your ideals and your ideas to Washington.

While it was my legislative proposal, House Resolution 215, which was first passed by Congress on May 22, 1945, as the initial step in the long chain of events leading to the actual organization and operation of UNESCO, this was not the first resolution I had introduced on this important matter. I first began work on a somewhat similar resolution back in 1942, and on March 1, 1943, I introduced H. R. 2034. Failing to get action in that session of Congress, on January 24, 1945, I introduced another resolution designated as H. R. 1740 but before action was taken on it the San Francisco Conference came into being so I amended my resolution to make it a mandate from Congress to the San Francisco Conference that an organization be established to provide a mechanism for using the educational forces of the world in the battle for peace.

That third resolution (H. Res. 215) was introduced by me on April 9, 1945, and on April 30, a companion resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senators TAFT and FULBRIGHT. House hearings were started May 10 and the House of Representatives approved House Resolution 215 on May 22, 1945. A week or so later, the Senate gave its approval and word was sent to our congressional delegates to the San Francisco Conference that the United States Congress had mandated them to bring into being an organization for marshalling together the educational, scientific, and cultural forces of the world as an essential counterpart of the United Nations. Such provision was incorporated in the San Francisco Conference and this meeting here this week is just one additional glorious chapter in the sequel of events which followed and which included the London conference and the sessions in Paris.

I want to emphasize, however, that not only has Congress demonstrated its faith and confidence in UNESCO by the almost unprecendented dispatch with which it approved my resolution in order to make it effective while the San Francisco Conference was in session but that Congress continues to hold high hopes that UNESCO will live up to the expectations of us all. You will find Congress sympathetic with your suggestions and you will find Congress generous in appropriating money for the maintenance of the National Advisory Commission and for America's share of the costs of UNESCO. We who have appropriated so much to bring a victorious peace out of a costly conflict are eager to appropriate wisely for a movement which has the power and the purpose to make additional war unnecessary.

Now, let me point out how the history of the enabling legislation for UNESCO demonstrates the fact that conferences such as this and organizations such as yours can have a tremendous part in fashioning the destiny of America.

I told you of my initial interest in this type of peace program back in 1942 and of my first resolution in 1943. Let me tell you now where and how my interest was first stimulated in this type of approach to peace. During 1941 and early in 1942 a group of professional friends of mine on the faculty of Indiana State Teachers College in Terre Haute, Ind., began holding meetings for the purpose of designing methods for harnessing the power of education in the battle for peace. It was only after they had contacted me that I was impelled to introduce the series of resolutions which brought favorable action on the program which has evolved into UNESCO. Thus, to a small group of educators on the campus of a midwestern teachers college goes the credit for initiating a drive which has carried us far. Such a conference as this and an advisory commission such as yours has untold potentiality for public service through the counsel and inspiration which you can bring to bear upon both Washington and Paris.

Before leaving this treatment of the historical background of UNESCO, I would be guilty of serious omission were I not to call attention to two other groups which over the years have demonstrated the importance of collective effort in securing constructive action from officials in Government.

Much of the groundwork for the creation of UNESCO was undertaken by the American Association for an International Office of Education and by the National Education Association. Both of these organizations under the leadership of such able men as James Marshall, of the New York City Board of Education, and Dr. William Carr, of NEA, worked long and hard and fruitfully in the task of bringing UNESCO into being, as did Selma Borchardt, of the American Federation of Teachers, and many other groups. Eagerly enlarging the concept of an International Office of Education to include the forces of science and culture, these organizations marshalled public opinion in support of the program and added one additional bit of evidence to the unbroken chain which demonstrates the power behind public opinion once it knows what it wants and has provided a blueprint for achieving that objective.

THE BIG TEST LIES AHEAD

In presenting evidence in support of the legislation leading to UNESCO before my colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1945, I made this statement, and I quote from the printed committee hearings: "This measure provides a vehicle for advising the San Francisco Conference and the world that Congress is determined to back the battle for permanent peace with the same vigor we have demonstrated in backing the fight for military victory. Ill-advised might will always be able to wreck the strongest of international organizations or institutions. For those to succeed, we must have a recognition of what is right on the part of the people. When the world puts as much energy and effort into training children everywhere to be tolerant and to have a decent respect for the rights of others as it has put into the efforts for war and destruction, we will have a firm basis upon which to build a permanent peace. We have approached peace from the standpoint of a man's stomach in the matter of food supply; we have approached peace from the standpoint of the world's pocketbook in Bretton Woods; we have approached it from the standpoint of diplomatic agreements at San Francisco; but we have never gotten around to approaching peace from the standpoint of a man's heart. This resolution now before you focuses on that point. Therefore, I refer to this program as the ethical echelon in the battle for a permanent peace."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is to you as the task forces and the battle plans of this ethical echelon in the fight for a permanent peace that I desire to devote the remainder of this address.

No more appropriate words could be said or written to describe the challenge which lies before us than those used in the preamble to the UNESCO constitution when it says, "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

Peace is a way of life which must be implanted in the hearts and minds of children when they are young and safeguarded by appropriate international machinery to guard against hazards of war occurring when they reach adulthood. Largely because of the universal world exhaustion and weariness caused by the destruction of the past war, we have reason to hope that we shall have time in which to put the forces of UNESCO into effective action before men and nations once again get in position to dance the tunes called for by the fiddlers for the god of Mars.

The machinery of the United Nations set up to dissipate disputes among the mighty is very new and largely untried, but there is reason to hope it will be able to keep war-weary nations at peace in the years immediately ahead. Over the long pull, however, if peace is to prevail it is essential that the hatreds, the creeds, the selfishness, the avarice, the distrust, and the false concepts of all humanity be toned down and controlled by self-restraints. Men and women everywhere must come to know for themselves that which is right, if wrong is not to conquer and war recur.

THE COIN OF PEACE HAS TWO SIDES

Let us all remember that the coin of peace has two sides. It has its material, and it has its spiritual, side. The United Nations

Organization deals with its material side. UNESCO recognizes the importance of the material side of man, but it concentrates its forces upon the spiritual elements found in the hearts and minds of men.

A Chinese speaker put it cogently one day when he said, "San Francisco gave the United Nations a body; UNESCO gives the United Nations a soul." A soulless machine can no more sustain the peace than an automobile could enter into the kingdom of heaven. We who work in the laboratory of life created by UNESCO deal with the enduring elements of the spirit, and if war is to be banished forever from this earth, our efforts must be unbounded and unceasing. As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he * * * when people everywhere give their heart-urge for peace preeminence over their selfish war-making desires for advantage, we shall have achieved a peace everlasting. That is the end goal of UNESCO.

When battalions of men meet across boundary lines, war is the result. UNESCO proposes to bring about a meeting of the minds of men across boundary lines in the pursuit of peace and the mutual understandings upon which peace is built. We propose, through UNESCO, to exchange and enhance the dividends of science for the advancement of mankind everywhere. We plan to utilize the free flow of culture across boundary lines to enrich the lives of everyone. We are preparing to provide for a world-wide exchange of scholars and students, of textbooks and techniques, so that children throughout the world will be taught the virtues of showing consideration for others and the vices of bigoted and bludgeoning types of state worship.

UNESCO has no creed to serve save peace, justice, and tolerance. It holds allegiance to no State other than that of good order and good will. It recognizes no monarch except the Prince of Peace.

UNESCO is not the exclusive conference chamber of the World's exalted leaders. It is not the meeting room of princes, potentates, presidents, dictators, prime ministers, and kings. UNESCO is the people's foyer leading to the temple of permanent peace

Until the advent of UNESCO, the waging of war was the business of the common people but the negotiations of peace and the devices of diplomacy were considered the restricted right of the rulers of men. But history has condemned out of its blood-stained volumes the legitimacy and effectiveness of this type of arrangement. Since time immemorial, the mighty men of mighty nations have plotted and planned and purposed the international relations which have inevitably and unvaryingly resulted in war. UNESCO proposes an antidote to this anomalous activity. It proposes to give the common people who fight the wars something to say about the international policies which provoke or prevent the wars. It plans to give people everywhere something to do in the waging of peace just as our rulers in the past through their failures have given people everywhere something to do in the waging of war. UNESCO can indeed become the mightiest echelon in history as it dedicates itself to this ethical fight against war.

Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini recognized the force of education in the decades they spent training the youth of their respective unhappy countries to nourish and nurture undying hatreds upon which wars are based. In and out of school, the children of Germany, Japan, and Italy were taught to worship the State and to abominate all that their rulers disliked. They were taught the concept of the master race and denied information which might lead them to believe that it is good to love thy neighbor. They were taught to hate those of different race, or color, or creed, or country. Education did its infamous task effectively. When these warlords were ready to fight, they had available a zealous, zestful, fanatical reservoir of enthusiastic youngsters eager to do battle against what they had been taught to believe were legitimate and loathsome enemies.

What education can do for the purposes of evil, my friends, it can do even better for the forces of good. If schools and communities, everywhere, can be induced by UNESCO to teach tolerance and good international behavior with even a fraction of the devotion that was used to teach our former enemies the seeds of thoughts of war, we shall have made great and effective progress toward a lasting peace. Add to this revised attitude toward education for the children a program of adult training and cooperation based on the axiomatic fact that the similarities among men everywhere greatly outweigh the dissimilarites among men anywhere and we shall be well on the road to a world which is training itself for peace instead of tempting the fates of war.

UNESCO—A CHAIN REACTION FOR PEACE

Do any of you say to me this is impossible? Are there faint-hearted among you who believe the challenge is too great? Because it has never been done, must we believe then it can never be? I urge you to be men and women of great faith. Surely an era which can create the jet-propelled plane, the death ray, and the atom bomb can conquer the problem of the boundary line. Are we to let imaginary lines scrawled by mere man across the face of the earth hold us back from conquering what at most is but a mental attitude in an age when we are conquering the space between planets?

If the chain reactions of a bit of uranium scooped up from the earth can be harnessed and directed so effectively that they can blow a city into oblivion and perhaps devastate a country, can we not use our intelligence equally successfully to create chain reactions of good will to be harnessed into effective world cooperation sufficiently well to prevent our mutual destruction by another war? I think we can if we work in the UNESCO laboratories of peace with the fervor and zest that men have demonstrated as they labor in the laboratories of destruction.

As a Member of Congress, I envisage a future for UNESCO and for this advisory conference which will demand and receive steadily increasing recognition both at home and abroad. We have traveled far since May 22, 1945. In less than 24 months, UNESCO has evolved from a tiny dream into a working organism with headquarters in the Majestic Hotel in Paris and with working delegates from most of the important nations of the world. One wonders what the echoes of that old hotel in Paris—the Majestic, which I have visited several times—must be saying to themselves as they pass each other in the midnight of their eerie existence in these modern times. Used by the Nazi conquerors of Paris as their SS headquarters during the occupation and by General Eisenhower's American forces of liberation as their headquarters shortly after D-day, it is indeed appropriate that this hotel which served so long as a headquarters for war should now be used as one of the great peace headquarters of the world.

UNESCO WILL STAND OR FALL ON PRINCIPLE

We who work in UNESCO have no veto clauses in our constitution to delay our procedures. We have no sharp cleavages along ideological or political lines. Only those who subscribe to the objectives of UNESCO have joined the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and those who sign its constitution subscribe to an exchange of information and a degree of inspection and visiting which is mutually helpful and encouraging. There is no cause for any country to join UNESCO which does not recognize the validity of truth as a basic factor in mutual understanding. All but a very few countries have signed the constitution and have agreed to the precepts upon which UNESCO is based. Those countries still on the outside are always welcome to join UNESCO but we must make eternally sure that we make no sacrifice of principle in the vain hope that by adding member nations we strengthen our organization even though we make concessions in basic principle. Such is not the case. UNESCO can succeed only as it remains steadfast in its allegiance to the doctrine of mutual respect, mutual confidence, and realistically reciprocal cooperation. On that basis, UNESCO invites the world to join. On no other basis can UNESCO effectively serve the world.

Before long, I hope UNESCO attains such importance and conferences such as this develop a program of such significance that yet one additional recognition of it will take place in official Washington. At the Nation's Capital we have two great Government Departments—War and Navy—which deal with the problems of war and the maintenance of our national security. They do their work well and all of us are debtors to their efficient performance. In the field of peace, we have only one great Government Department—the Department of State. By the very nature of things, far from all of the activities of the Department of State are devoted to the advancement of peace. In conclusion let me tell you of a thought which I have in mind in the conviction that the preparation and maintenance of peace might be more productive of lasting results if it could have devoted to it the concentration of effort which necessity requires be devoted to the challenges of war as they confront our War and Navy Departments.

NEEDED: AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PEACE

Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, whose able address you listened to last night, has done much for UNESCO. He deserves our warm praise for his earnest efforts. But Mr. Benton's time is crowded with many other responsibilities. The other duties of his office are sufficient to require the full time of several men and I know that my good friend, Bill, even though he were twins, could not possibly devote to UNESCO the time required when this organization really gets under way with a program geared up in size and in intensity to the scope of the challenge which confronts it.

Some have suggested a separate Department of Peace be established but it appears there are many good reasons why the pursuit of peace is so inherently tied in with the other duties of the State Department that a separation of the various functions might create more confusion than it would cure. As a first step, in all events, I would like to see created within our Department of State a new Assistant Secretary of State who would be charged with the sole responsibility of handling America's representation and responsibilities in the activities of UNESCO.

Let the Secretary of State be authorized to appoint some great educator, perhaps, who is broad enough to understand and appreciate equally the importance of science and culture along with education and have him be placed in charge of a separate division within the State Department which has no other duties and no other responsibilities other than that of promoting the peace of the world through the boundless opportunities presented in a completely activated and universally accepted program such as is being devised in UNESCO. In my opinion, this would be a small investment indeed in the cause of peace but I am confident it would be numbered among one of the most productive investments of our national history.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are engaged in the world's most important work—just as self-preservation is the first law of nature, sustaining the peace has become the first law of self-preservation. I salute you for your good intentions and your great achievements. I pledge you the support of Congress. I predict that your enthusiasm and your energy

will surmount all obstacles. I have confidence in your capacity. I join you in your prayers for success.

You know and I know that you are building the defenses of peace in the only bastion capable of holding back the hounds of war. You are the general-headquarters staff of the ethical echelon in our fight for peace. God speed you in your work.

America Scrapes Bottom on Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 24, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following timely and enlightening article by Richard L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of March 23, 1947. It is high time that our warmongers and internationalists, do-gooders and up-lifters, read, chew, digest, and profit from this very excellent article:

AMERICA SCRAPES BOTTOM ON NATURAL RESOURCES—PRESIDENT TRUMAN PROPOSES CONTROL BOARD AS NATION'S VITAL STOCKS NEAR DEPLETION, THREATENING LONG-RANGE SECURITY

(By Richard L. Stokes)

President Truman's proposal for the creation of a national security resources board, under his Army-Navy unification bill, should ring in the public ear like an air-raid siren. Its emphasis on the conservation of natural resources peals an alert to the fact that in essential areas, particularly those of metals and petroleum, the American people have mounted almost to the continental divide and must soon start on the descent.

The downward turn will necessitate a revolution in national temperament. Into our possession came a store of natural wealth opulent beyond all historical experience. We have looted it like wastrel heirs, on the theory that our riches were inexhaustible and with Mr. Micawber's hope that in case of need something would turn up.

Driven by the profit motive, we have exported to foreign lands many billions of dollars in natural treasure which can never be replaced. We have scattered it to the winds in two world wars. We have poured it into domestic consumption at a rate posing questions as to whether the vaunted American living standard is not the deadliest of foes to long-range security of the American people.

MINERAL EXPORTS HIGH

Since 1880 total mineral production in the United States has soared from less than half a billion dollars annually to almost nine billions. During the last half century mineral exports have consistently exceeded mineral imports. The maximum year's figure for the latter was $700,000,000; that of the former was upward of $1,750,000,000. World War II alone stripped American resources of 7,500,000,000 barrels of petroleum, 5,000,000 tons of copper, 3,500,000 tons of zinc, 2,250,000 tons of lead, 20,000 tons of tungsten, 9,000 tons of vanadium, and 200,000 flasks of mercury.

With 6 percent of the world's population, the American people consume two-thirds of the world's petroleum. We possess 75 percent of all automobiles, 54 percent of all refrigerators and 50 percent of all radios. Each year, largely for our own use, we produce some $3,000,000,000 worth of steel.

The day of reckoning is now at hand. According to Interior Department estimates, we have used up 97 percent of our original stocks of mercury, with which the United States was supplying most of the world in 1877. Altogether we have consumed 85 percent of our silver and lead, 80 percent of our chromium, 70 percent of our vanadium, bauxite, manganese, and tungsten, 65 percent of our zinc, and 60 percent of our copper and petroleum.

LOW ON TIN AND NICKEL

We have less than 1 year's known supply of nickel and tin. Under normal consumption, it is calculated, there is manganese to last only 2 years; mercury and asbestos, 3 years; platinum, tungsten, and antimony, 4 years; vanadium, 7 years; bauxite, 9 years; silver, 11 years; lead, 12 years; gold, 14 years; and petroleum, 18 years. Such periods are no more than instants in the life of a nation.

Within a decade copper and petroleum will shift to import status. So predicts Dr. Elmer W. Pehrson, chief of the Economics and Statistics Branch of the Bureau of Mines. In other words, the United States, which only recently sluiced these materials into foreign markets with a lavish hand, is at the point of becoming dependent for them upon supplies abroad.

Only our unique possession of direct-shipping ores at the Mesabi Range in Minnesota enable the United States to discharge the war's colossal demands for steel. These ores have been so depleted, says Dr. Pehrson, that production will start to decline in the near future and the deposits will be totally exhausted by 1960. Much the same is true of high-grade coking coals.

Out of 33 minerals listed by Dr. Pehrson as essential to national defense and the American way of life, no less than 21 face domestic extinction within 35 years, or one generation. Ominously enough, the fated materials include petroleum, copper, lead, and zinc, in the production of which the United States only recently led the world.

OTHER INDISPENSABLES

Twelve of the list have proved supplies for less than 5 years. At the bottom are flake graphite, quartz crystals and industrial diamonds, of which we have no native stocks at all. Next come tin, nickel, chromite, and manganese, in which this country has always been notably deficient. The other short-lived minerals are asbestos, mercury, platinum, tungsten, and antimony.

Materials expected to last from 5 to 25 years are vanadium, bauxite, silver, lead, gold, cadmium, petroleum and zinc. Copper, fluorspar, natural gas, and sulfur have life expectancies of 25 to 100 years. Only 9 of the 33 essential minerals will remain abundant after a century has passed. They are iron ore, potash, anthracite, molybdenum, phosphate rock, bituminous coal and lignite, salt, magnesium, and nitrogen.

Thus, in the case of 24 out of 33 materials indispensable to industrial civilization, the United States either has never enjoyed self-sufficiency, or has already lost it, or seems bound to forfeit it in periods ranging from a few months to a century. Where can the National Security Resources Board turn for remedies? First, to imports. Second, to exploration of new sources of supply. Third, to development of submarginal deposits which at the present state of technology are noncommercial. Fourth, to creation of "ersatz" products. And finally, in the realm of national defense, to stock-piling of strategic and critical materials.

Now that all of our easily discovered resources are in use, the task of prospecting for more obscure deposits becomes urgent. Blind drilling and wildcatting have grown expensive and unprofitable. Geology emerges more and more as an essential guide through maps of the earth's rock formations on a scale of at least one inch to a mile.

Strange and sad to remark, the United States has never troubled itself to prepare such charts for more than 10 percent of its area. In a geological sense, enormous tracts may be declared never to have been mapped at all. These expanses include a considerable part of Maine and of the South Appalachian region, as well as huge territories in Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. To complete the task, it is maintained, 30 years and $150,000,000 would be required.

Fortunately the United States is plenteously gifted with the two basic materials of armaments and peacetime welfare. These are coal and iron. Our resources of bituminous coal are the greatest in the world, and are enough, according to some estimates, to last 4,300 years at the prewar rate of mining. We are believed to possess 63,000,000,000 tons of submarginal iron ore, the utilization of which will depend on technological advances. There are also large submarginal and highly speculative reserves of bauxite, manganese, molybdenum, and vanadium—sufficient, perhaps, for the next 100 to 500 years.

CONGRESS SAID "BUY AT HOME"

During the last 15 years, despite intensified exploration, petroleum discoveries have failed to keep pace with depletion. The discovery of metalliferous ores has been declining at an alarming rate for half a century. Recent production has been largely due to the application of new technological methods to deposits known for years. Most of our copper is yielded by mines which were operating before 1900. The date was 1916 for the most recent major metal district brought into production. This was the Tri-State lead and zinc area.

Future troubles of the National Security Resources Board may be judged from the gauntlet run by the Army and Navy Munitions Board. Common sense appeared to dictate that our domestic resources should be conserved and a stock pile built up from materials obtained abroad. But Congress, harried by ruthless lobbies, directed the Board whenever possible to "buy American." It also defeated a proposal to admit stock pile components tariff free. Moreover, it opened up first claim on surplus war stocks to private industry.

In order to accomplish its long-range job, the National Security Resources Board will need to be vested with extraordinary powers. It will have to coordinate activities of such departments as War, Navy, and Interior, the last of which has policy-making ambitions of its own in the field of natural resources. It will be compelled to work hand in glove with the State Department in the field of foreign trade. Finally, it will often be in conflict with a congressional majority having a tradition of tenderness toward private interests. The Board Chairman is to be a civilian, with a Cabinet member's stipend of $15,000 a year. He will earn every nickel of it.

Personnel of Border Patrols

REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, just a word on this same subject, which the distinguished minority whip and also my friend from West Virginia have been discussing. Yesterday during the debate on the bill to cut $77,000,000 off the appro-

priation for the Labor Department, which was so vigorously opposed by a few of our friends across the aisle, on three separate occasions I attempted unsuccessfully to get the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to yield for a question. I guess I have only myself to blame because I adopted the wrong tactics.

He was talking about a newspaper editorial wherein it was alleged that $6,500,000 had been cut by this Congress off the appropriation for the Customs Service, which was going to result in wholesale dismissals and lead to unchecked smuggling of all kinds of contraband and illegal entry of aliens along the border, both north and south. He quoted what one John C. Tulloch, the collector of the Port at Ogdensburg, N. Y., had said. Now, the mistake I made, Mr. Speaker, was that when I asked the gentleman to yield I held in my hand, as he undoubtedly noticed, a clipping from the New York Times, published in the gentleman's own city, wherein the exact words of Mr. Tulloch were given, as follows:

> With 156 Federal agencies in Washington, they should forget patronage for a while and economize there instead of taking off the patrol.

I hope that this attention which has been called to the quoted remarks of a public servant who has certainly realistically called the turn, will not result in any punitive or repressive measures so far as he is concerned.

As the gentleman from West Virginia pointed out, this Customs Bureau, which comes under the Secretary of the Treasury, spent $44,430,000 in fiscal 1947 and has been allowed by this body in the 1948 appropriation bill $47,595,000, or better than $3,000,000 more than last year and still they are not satisfied. It is true, in the President's budget they were set up for $54,100,000, or almost $10,000,000 more than last year. Apparently neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor the President, in submitting these swollen figures, took seriously the stated intentions of this Congress to reduce, not increase, the expenses of running the Government.

Now I can tell this Congress with confident assurance, that the people in New York State agree with Mr. Tulloch that this wholesale lay-off of Customs employees all through the country rather than in the Washington offices, where personnel are stumbling over each other to keep out of each other's way, is simply part of a concerted drive by the Government agencies in the Executive Department to dramatize to the people the dire results of any reduction in the staggering and mounting costs of operating the Government, in order to high pressure the Congress into a departure from its avowed and determined position that these expenses will be cut—and cut substantially.

With the respect and deference due your high office, I say to you, Mr. Secretary, and to you, Mr. President, who are chargeable in the final analysis with the policy adopted by these arms of the executive branch, that if this purposeful emasculation of an essential Government service which has been given $3,000,000 more to spend next year than last, is typical of the policy which you propose to follow with other services, and if you insist on hanging onto all the chair-warming jobs in Washington while at the same time you dismiss from the service those out in the field who are really doing the work, it will be resented, and resented very, very deeply by the people of this country.

It is significant that this move on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury was made just on the eve of consideration by the Senate of the Treasury appropriation bill. It is to be sincerely hoped that distinguished body will not fall for this obvious last-minute attempt to browbeat the Congress into alining itself with the waste, extravagance, and malingering on the public pay roll which have characterized the administration of the last 15 years.

Just one word of caution. Under no circumstances do I want my words to be construed as criticism of Federal employees generally, many of whom serve their country ably, faithfully, and diligently.

But I do say to those charged with the administration of the executive departments and to our friends on the other side of the aisle, some of whom, not by all means all, have demonstrated their determined and stubborn resistance, as they did just yesterday, to any effort to reduce public spending that the people of this country, by and large, are asking, indeed demanding, that the Republicans stand firm in their purpose to cut Government costs, to balance the budget, to make a substantial payment on the huge national debt, and to give them relief, as we confidently expect to do tomorrow in our tax-reduction bill, from the depressing tax load they are now carrying, and increase their take-home pay to help them meet their higher living expenses. Many of our Democrat friends, it has already been demonstrated, will follow along with us in this program.

To those obstructionists who refuse to do so and who persistently uphold the strategy of squandering, I have only this to say: The quicker you get in step the better it will be for you, for all of us and, most important of all, for the future welfare and safety of our great country.

Gorizia, Soviet-Imperiled Outpost of Western Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. F. Tompkins, from the New York Journal and American for March 23, 1947:

GORIZIA—SOVIET-IMPERILED OUTPOST OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION—ITALY GATEWAY LIES OPEN TO RED INVASION

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Near Gorizia the iron curtain is a visible actuality.

A few miles east of the city the Morgan Line—a temporary military line of demarcation—runs north and south through steep barren hills.

Where the line intersects the primitive tortuous highways, road blocks have been set up; and at these points the totalitarian east confronts the democratic west in warlike manner.

For here, at Gorizia, is one of the world's most strategic spots, a spot so important in history and in world politics that our military government in Europe has put one of our most formidable combat organizations on guard.

In Venezia Giulia, the Eighty-eighth Division—the famous Blue Devils of the Italian campaign—remains on foreign duty.

Commanded now by Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore, a veteran of the Pacific war who led the One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry Regiment ashore at Guadalcanal, the Eighty-eighth holds 60 miles of the Morgan Line, which bisects the upper reaches of Venezia Giulia.

GATEWAY TO ITALY

In this often-embattled sector, Gorizia is a conqueror's prize because it provides a natural gateway into the Isonzo Valley and down through the Carso Passes into vulnerable Italy.

Marshal Tito has attempted twice to obtain Gorizia for Yugoslavia—and for Soviet Russia.

The first attempt was by invasion, toward the end of the late war.

This effort failed when New Zealand troops reached beleaguered Trieste in time to receive the surrender of its German garrison, while American troops were marching victoriously north into Austria.

NEXT TRIED BARTER

Tito was compelled to accept the Morgan Line and to withdraw his advanced forces from Gorizia pending peace determinations.

Tito's next attempt was by barter.

Through Togliatti, the Italian Communist leader, he offered to forego his claims to Trieste in return for a gift to him of Gorizia—a shrewd proposal which Italy rejected.

Now, however, Soviet diplomacy is about to accomplish what Tito was unable to achieve by either attack or guile.

On February 10 four peace treaties were signed at Paris—with Italy, with Romania, with Bulgaria, and with Hungary.

In terms of economic benefits and of territorial advantages all of these treaties are diplomatic victories for Soviet Russia.

The Italian treaty must also be reckoned as a military triumph for communism.

America has a peculiar interest in the Italian settlement:

OUR WATCH ENDING

First. With the ratification of this Paris agreement our watch in Venezia Giulia will come to an end. The Eighty-eighth Division is to be withdrawn and brought home in July.

Second. While the negotiations were still in progress at Paris, the Italian Premier, Alcide de Gasperi, visited Washington and obtained a loan of $100,000,000 for rehabilitation of his country.

And, by a strange coincidence, under the Paris treaty Soviet Russia is to collect from Italy a war indemnity of exactly $100,000,000.

Third. The Paris treaty takes away from Italy and bestows upon Yugoslavia—Soviet Russia's strongest communistic satellite—a large portion of the province of Venezia Giulia, dominating the entire eastern shore of the Adriatic Sea.

This territorial cession delivers to communism virtually the whole Istrian Peninsula, containing the ample ports of Pola and Fiume, and makes Soviet Russia a Mediterranean power.

During the postwar period the disputed city of Trieste has been administered as a

free zone under an American military governor, Col. A. C. Bowman, of Los Angeles.

Trieste, and a narrow surrounding strip, will remain free—but under the direction of a European governor—and will at best exist as a mere enclave inside the new Yugoslav borders, subject to Communist intrigue and infiltration and—the non-Communist population fears—political kidnapings and terrorism.

Regarding the brief period of Tito's ascendancy in Venezia Giulia, a semiofficial document says:

"It is believed that there were at least 8,000 persons arrested in Trieste and deported to Yugoslavia and that nothing has been heard of them since.

"In Gorizia there were about 2,000 arrested, 1,800 of whose whereabouts is still unknown."

Fourth. Although the inland center of Gorizia continues under the Italian flag, it will be surrounded on three sides by Yugoslav acquisitions cutting into its closest environs.

In fact, Gorizia is dependent for its life upon a reservoir and two hydroelectric plants from which it draws all of its electricity and three-fourths of its water supply, and which will be in Yugoslav territory.

Finally, Italy is to have an army limited to 180,000 men, with a small fighter air force, while there is no limitation upon either Yugoslav or Soviet armaments.

A Communist invasion of Italy would be undertaken by way of Gorizia. And Tito has Red allies on Italian soil.

Today, by virtue of the treaty signed at Paris, a new dark age looms behind the same horizon—the dark age of aggressive communism.

Central Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second half of the address of Dr. Paul S. Taylor on the Central Valley, given on January 28, 1947, in Los Angeles, Calif., under the auspices of the Los Angeles League of Women Voters.

The first half of the speech appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1265.

Just how generous to private landowners is this reclamation law? The Bureau of Reclamation has prepared figures. Let us look, for example, at class I irrigation water to be supplied from Friant-Kern Canal to the southern San Joaquin Valley.

The water rate which it is proposed that users shall pay is $3.50 per acre-foot. What would that rate have to be if the landowners were not given the special benefits and subsidies of the reclamation law, but were charged for water on commercial terms? The answer is, they would be obliged to pay $14 per acre-foot, or $10.50 more per acre-foot than the proposed rate of $3.50 per acre-foot. Without public assistance such as the reclamation law provides, the lands of the southern San Joaquin Valley would go without the water which they need.

In order not to weary you with the details of this document and explain this conclusion, I refer those of you who may wish to procure and examine them, to the Sacramento office of the Bureau of Reclamation, which will supply them upon request.

I want, nevertheless, to present a couple of computations, made from those Bureau figures, which show how much the public assistance extended through reclamation law means to landowners in the southern San Joaquin Valley. For convenience, I round to an even $10 the differential between the $3.50 proposed rate and the $14 rate which would be necessary if reclamation special benefits and subsidies were removed.

First example: What this means to the holder of 160 acres.

(A) If he needs only supplementary water in order to eke out what he already has, say he needs one acre-foot per annum, then the measure of this public assistance to him is $10 times 160, or $1,600 per annum. Not $1,600 once, but $1,600 per annum beyond what he is asked to pay.

(B) If he uses a full water supply from the project, say 2½ acre-feet per annum, then the measure of these benefits, beyond what he is asked to pay for them, is $25 times 160, or $4,000 per annum.

(C) If 320 acres is allowed for man and wife, as present interpretation permits, then these figures must be doubled, to $3,200 if supplementary water only is taken, and to $8,000 per annum if a full supply is used.

Some landholders are not satisfied with this amount of assistance, ranging in value from $1,600 to $8,000 per annum, that is, year after year. They want us to repeal the limitation that holds them down to such a minimum, which to another citizen might look like the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

If repeal should win, the only limitation to the amount of the assistance that landowners can get, beyond what they pay for, will be the amount of land which they hold and to which they can persuade Congress to bring water. Let us see what that would mean to some people. In Tulare and Kern Counties and the Tulare Lake Basin, some 20 landowners own about 360,000 acres of irrigable land. Assuming supplemental water only, and assuming that they take water for their entire acreage, to repeal the acreage limitation would secure to these landowners public assistance valued at $3,600,000 per annum. Assuming full water supply, the value of the assistance which repeal would confer upon them would be $8,000,000 per annum; $8,000,000 year after year.

The demand for repeal is, in effect, a demand for a legal right to receive assistance on this scale from the public. It is the present responsibility of the Congress, before the American people, to make up its mind whether this demand is reasonable or unreasonable, whether it is a proper extension of the strong arm of public help to its needy and deserving citizens or whether it is a raid upon the public purse by special interests.

There are veterans to think of, too. Some veterans—and other citizens as well—are qualified to farm, but can't find land on which to do it. The cover of Life magazine on the twentieth of this month bears the photograph of a homesteading veteran and his family. That veteran was one of 1,500 who applied, and who met the rigid experience, and financial, and other qualifications for a land opening of only 86 farms in the northern part of this State. The inevitable lot of more than 1,400 veterans and their families in that land opening was disappointment. During the month of November the California Department of Veterans' Affairs made only 9 loans for farm purchases. The citizens of California voted $100,000,000 more for veterans' loans early in the same month, and the GI bill of rights, too, has loan provisions; but where, if we repeal acreage limitation, are the farms for them to purchase with the money? Neither repeal nor any other general relaxation of the established acreage limitation can be conceded except at the expense of veterans and of other qualified citizens who want to farm.

When we bring water to the lands of Central Valley, we lay the foundations of the valley of the future. This is true whether the water is used to shore up existing developments with supplemental water, or to provide total supplies where now there are none. To a degree, it is in our power to choose now what that future shall be. The Senate Small Business Committee recently published a study of two valley communities, the one community, Arvin, based upon large-scale farms, the other community, Dinuba, based upon the smaller farms of working farmers. That study indicates the nature of the choices which face us. The dollar value of agricultural production supporting each of these communities is practically the same, and otherwise they are fairly comparable.

The alternatives revealed by the study are briefly these:

1. The proportion of the business and professional classes was found to be twice as great in Dinuba, the working farmers' community, as in Arvin, the industrialized farm community.

2. The proportion of independent farmers was three times as great.

3. The proportion of farm laborers, generally insecure and landless, was less than half in Dinuba what it was in Arvin. In Arvin, two-thirds of all gainfully employed persons were laborers of that class.

4. Dinuba farms supported a larger population, and at a higher standard of living.

5. Dinuba supported many more business establishments than Arvin.

6. Dinuba's retail businessmen did a volume of business 61 percent greater than those of Arvin.

In which type of community would you prefer to go into business, to teach school, to practice your profession, to farm, to settle down and raise a family? If you prefer more balanced, stable communities, your choice logically must be to maintain acreage limitation on the lands of Central Valley.

The effort to repeal acreage limitation began in 1905, disappeared from public view, then reappeared a few years ago. This is not the first round. Its persistence, together with such strength as it musters, is to be explained primarily by two facts. The first of these is the motive of large landholdings in the valley with great advantages to a few as the prize to be gained from repeal. The second explanation is that very few people have fully understood the situation. The manner of conducting the campaign for repeal has been generally more conducive to confusion and bewilderment than to clarification. Of course, I do not refer to the speaker who is to follow me, for I have never heard him present his reasons for repeal, and what I say in this respect doubtless does not apply personally to him. But the campaign for repeal is not new, and the record of its arguments is sufficiently extensive to afford a fair basis for generalization.

Curiously, there seems to be a tendency in arguments for repeal to cite as facts instances which are either exceptions to the general rule (but not the kind of exceptions which prove it), or else turn out to be the reverse of the truth. Sometimes when the facts cited are true, the conclusion drawn is one which simply does not follow: May I give a few examples from the record of current controversy?

Argument No. 1 runs something like this: It is entirely inappropriate to apply acreage limitation to the Central Valley because there are no public lands in the valley, all of its lands are privately owned.

The fact is true, but the conclusion does not follow. The only reason Congress ever had for passing acreage limitations is because among the lands to be benefited by public expenditures were private lands. The provision applies, and was intended to apply to private lands only.

Argument No. 2: Reclamation law, including acreage limitation, applies properly only to lands which are totally reclaimed by Federal aid; it is unsuited to privately developed lands needing only supplemental water

The purpose of the original reclamation law was just the contrary, viz, first to provide supplementary water to imperiled communities of private landholders; then, if more water was available, to provide a full supply to other lands, either public or private. The equities of those who have developed their lands as far as they can, but need help to bring supplemental water are amply protected by the reclamation law. If the privately developed lands don't need Federal help, naturally they don't come under the project and under the reclamation law.

Argument No. 3: The Federal Government is interfering with local affairs, dictating the way our valley should be run.

The truth is, the legislature long ago passed a statute for the purpose of enabling California irrigation districts to make contracts with the Federal Government in accord with reclamation law, which includes acreage limitation of course. In 1933 the voters of California were told that the Federal Government would help to develop the Central Valley, and they voted for it. Reclamation appropriations have been made repeatedly for dams and canals in the Valley; they were hardly foisted upon the representatives of large landholders.

Argument No. 4: One hundred and sixty acres is too small for a family farm, especially in dairying. This argument, be it noted, is used to support a complete repeal, not some "reasonable adjustment" for hard cases, if such exist. The fact is, that organized dairymen in the valley representative of family dairies, oppose repeal, perhaps because they fear that repeal would mainly favor their corporate competitors.

Argument No. 5: Land monopolies will break up naturally, but ought not to be "legislated" into doing so. However true it is that some large landholdings, left to themselves, do subdivide, it is equally true that others do not; also that smaller holdings sometimes are combined to make larger holdings. People who live in the valley are thoroughly familiar with reports of the purchase of thousand-acre vineyards by whiskey distillers during war years, and of the 1946 purchase of a 54,000-acre block by a corporation reputed to be the world's largest cotton factors. Acreage limitation is only for those holdings which have failed to subdivide.

Argument No. 6: The law is unenforceable; landowners will simply put down pumps and draw to the surface the water supplied to underground reservoirs by the project, neither paying for the water nor obeying the law.

Defiance of law seldom is recognized as a good reason for repealing it; especially when the law confers so many benefits, and when the attempt at repeal applies only to that part of the law which the beneficiaries don't like. Maybe the law is enforceable; the persistence of the effort to repeal acreage limitation seems to belie the assertion that it can't be enforced.

Argument No. 7 strikes an ethical note. The United Press reports a declaration from a valley Congressman last month that the Government has no "moral right to lay down the conditions under which that (water) service is rendered."

To a private citizen the truth appears to be the reverse of the declaration: Congress has no moral right to spend the people's money unless it does lay down the conditions under which public service is to be rendered.

Argument No. 8 offers ethical reinforcement to No. 7. The Government is said to without "moral right" maintain the reclamation law especially "since the Central Valley project works were constructed with tax money collected in part at least from those to whom the benefits of the project would be denied." What this argument seems to mean is, if a taxpayer pays something toward a project and is fortunate enough to get something back in direct benefits, he is morally entitled to all he can get. Of course taxpayers in New York, or even in Los Angeles, who contribute some tax money to Central Valley but receive no direct benefit, will see little moral force in the argument and no logic at all. Many people will think it strange to apply a hard word like "denial," and a stigma of immorality to the effort of the Government to maintain some reasonable ceiling on private receipt of benefits from public appropriations.

To say how the public moneys and benefits shall be distributed, to say how the natural resources of a region shall be used, and under what conditions, to lay out main lines upon which communities can grow in size and health in the future—these are elementary responsibilities for the general welfare which no government can escape.

Acreage limitation had been hammered out in the public debates of a decade when first it was inscribed on the statute books. It has remained there ever since, the approved and reapproved instrument by which Congress discharges its responsibilities. If now, at the insistent demand of special interests we should repeal acreage limitation in the Central Valley, neither those from whom we have received a heritage of national land policy, nor those for whose future communities we set the patterns and lay the foundations, will be able to judge our decision except harshly and with regret.

Song of a 1947 Shirt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, that classical poem, The Song of the Shirt, by Thomas Hood, has for many years stood as the best description in literature of what we now describe as sweatshop employment does to human beings. Until very recently it was still a fairly general condition to find sweatshop conditions obtaining in the manufacture of that standard article of clothing—a man's shirt. Not only were the workers who made the shirt paid substandard wages, but the cotton-textile workers who wove the fabric from which the garment was cut and sewn received equally deplorable wages.

During the war years the simple white shirt, so essential to the average urban worker employed in a store or office, almost disappeared from sale. This was due to a determination on the part of the manufacturers to avoid price regulations. The old-fashioned shirt was revamped slightly, called a sport shirt and sold at exorbitant prices. Perhaps the most frequent gripe among the average male citizens during the war years and the recent postwar period was the absence of a straightforward shirt at a standard price within the means of the ordinary run of people.

Within the past few days a nationally known labor research expert has made some most interesting statistical calculations on what has happened to costs, wages, and prices of men's shirts since 1939. An article on this subject appears in the current issue of Textile Labor, organ of the Textile Workers Union of America, based on data supplied by Solomon Barkin, director of research of that organization. This article is as follows:

SONG OF A 1947 SHIRT—PRICE GOES UP $2.30, COTTON WORKERS GET 7 CENTS

A white combed broadcloth shirt which cost a man $1.65 in 1939 now sells for $3.95.

This is the sort of inflation for which unions are taking the rap in the public press. The rise in price is familiar to everyone, including workers. But a mere price comparison doesn't show who's getting the money.

While the consumer is paying $2.30 more for his shirt, cotton textile workers are getting only 7 cents more, including both those who make gray goods and those in the finishing mill. In 1939, their share was 4.3 cents; now, assuming a further increase in New England finishing mills, it's estimated at 11.4 cents.

NOT IN WAGES

Few would begrudge a rise in the historically low wages of the cotton worker from an average of 47 cents to $1.03 an hour. But this doesn't explain the high price of shirts.

The finished, combed broadcloth (136x60, four yards a pound) now sells after bleaching and sanforizing for 50.5 cents a yard, against 11.8 cents in 1939. Cotton cost is up from 4.3 cents to 12.2 cents; gray mill labor cost from 3.86 cents to 10.37 cents, according to accounts of six cotton mills.

As a result the manufacturer's margin for all other costs has leaped from 1.64 cents to 20.4 cents. Though his other costs have also risen, this great difference leaves plenty of room for profit, as current annual statements of cotton firms prove.

A good clue is the old OPA price of 96 cents for gray goods, based on cotton at 36.5 cents a pound Cotton has dropped, but gray goods has risen 11 cents a yard.

To return to the 1939 comparison—the finishing charge was then 2 cents a yard; it's now 7.5 cents. The labor cost was then 0.4 cents; with a new wage increase now being negotiated, it's now about one cent. Thus the finisher's margin is up from 1.6 cents to 6.5 cents, enough to allow a dramatic rise in profits.

TRICK PERCENTAGE

The finished cloth in 1939, costing 11.8 cents, was converted into a shirt selling wholesale for 99 cents. The present 50.5 cent fabric goes into a shirt priced at $2.375 wholesale. The direct factory labor costs has gone from 32 cents to 65 cents a shirt.

Thus the manufacturer's margin, exclusive of direct labor and material (there were 1.25 yards of fabric in a 1939 shirt; today's contains only 1.18), was 52.2 cents in 1939; today it's a luxurious $1.129.

At the retail level, the old mark-up of 40 percent of final price still prevails. But while this brought the retailer 66 cents in 1939, it brings him $1.575 now—or nearly as much as the whole garment cost in 1939.

The Austrian Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. F. Tompkins from the New York Journal and American of March 24, 1947:

THE AUSTRIAN STRUGGLE—SOVIET RUSSIA'S PROGRAM OF ECONOMIC CONQUEST

(By E. F. Tompkins)

When the Moscow Conference was called to formulate a German peace, the battle for Austria entered its third—and perhaps decisive—phase.

The first, or military, phase was undoubtedly a great disappointment to Soviet Russia, made so by the rapid advance of American troops through Italy and Bavaria in the fateful months of 1945.

Following roughly the course of the Ottoman Turks centuries earlier, the Red armies had plowed their sanguinary way across Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, and had accomplished a feat never before attained by conquerors from the East.

They had captured the voluptuous city of Vienna after a destructive siege, and had set up a puppet provisional government over the subjugated Austrians.

Then the arrival of the swift-marching Americans abruptly changed the aspect of affairs.

As in the closely related case of Germany, Austria was divided into four zones under American, British, French, and Russian Military Governments; and Vienna became, like Berlin, an isolated enclave in the Russian zone, with each of the four powers holding an urban district.

Supervised elections were conducted, and a coalition government replaced the Russian puppet authority to fulfill the mandates of the occupying nations under an Allied Control Commission.

With this distribution of responsibility and authority following the cessation of combat, the military phase ended and the second, or economic, phase of the Austrian contest began—a contest, in its political implications, not unlike that in Venezia Giulia, where Yugoslavia, as a Russian satellite, sought and has evidently gained large strategic territorial acquisitions at the expense of defeated Italy.

Undisclosed developments of history, and even the fate of occidental civilization, may turn upon these events.

For if Soviet Russia can dominate Austria, as contiguous Hungary and the adjacent Balkans are now dominated, militant communism will have an unbroken and undefended invasion route in western Europe, just as Gorizia provides an unlocked gateway looking south below the Alps.

The nature of the Austrian economic conflict is unmistakable.

A long series of obstructive or aggressive Russian actions plainly defines the Russian policy.

It is a contest of Russia against America and Britain, for the eventual mastery of a continent, in which Russia ruthlessly and unscrupulously utilizes any weapon in the economic, social, and political categories.

This type of warfare appeared earliest in aviation.

The American forces of occupation, as they moved into Austria, required an airfield in the vicinity of Vienna, and sent a mission in June 1945 to make inspections and recommendations.

The Soviet element arbitrarily debarred our representatives from the east side of the Danube River, and Tulln on the west side was chosen as our Viennese base.

At Russian insistence, non-Russian planes (both English and American included) were restricted to a narrow corridor along the Danube, involving serious and hampering weather and mechanical hazards.

American flights east of Austria may not now extend beyond Budapest in Hungary or Prague in Czechoslovakia, are confined to corridors prescribed by the Russians, and must have Soviet approval.

Meanwhile, on at least six recorded occasions, United States Army planes have been "buzzed" or "trailed" or fired upon by Soviet planes: and on one occasion Soviet fighter aircraft engaged in target practice over the United States Army base at Tulln.

Similar "incidents" in Yugoslavia, where Marshal Tito's men shot down unarmed American transports, killing several American soldiers, were definitely a part of the Russian tactic of obstruction and attempted intimidation in Austria.

Furthermore, in the supposedly "liberated" countries of Hungary, Poland, and the Balkans, civil aviation has become a Russian monopoly, totally excluding Soviet Russia's allies.

Hunger is also being inflicted and exploited in Austria by Soviet Russia as a political instrument.

Austria as a whole has been on a slow-starvation basis ever since the fall of Vienna.

Millions of people, including at one time more than 700,000 displaced persons, have been kept precariously alive by food shipments from the western allies—chiefly from the United States.

Soviet Russia was in a better position than any other country to contribute immediately, if not immensely, toward famine relief measures.

In the division of Austria, Russia occupies the only important food-producing areas—Lower Austria and Burgenland, both in the east.

But not only has Russia failed all along to assume a fair and relatively easy share of the postwar burden: her inhumane government has actually magnified the difficulties, and intentionally increased the misery of the Austrian population in the non-Russian zones, by deliberately withholding or confiscating available Austrian food supplies.

Besides quartering and feeding large numbers of Red troops in their zone, and sending foodstuffs out of starving Austria into Russia, the Soviets have restricted or cut off entirely the transfer of food to the other Allied zones and have seized large domains of arable land for their own use next year and afterward.

Postwar looting and the lawless expropriation of industrial properties have been another Soviet aggression practiced on an enormous scale in Austria.

At the close of hostilities in 1945 the Russians removed from Austria as war booty $435,000,000 worth of capital goods.

Since then, under her own interpretation of an ambiguous Nazi-ownership clause in the Potsdam agreement—an interpretation rejected as false and unconscionable by the representatives of the other Allies—Soviet Russia demands outright and perpetual title to some 80 percent of all Austrian industry as war reparations—and the Moscow Peace Conference has to deal with this unilateral issue on the diplomatic level.

By reason in part of Russia's robber-baron tactics, the United States forces in Austria are compelled to import fuel oil and gasoline, as well as food, for their own essential uses.

Russia has prevented the recovery of coal mining in east Austria and has embargoed the importation of coal from Poland, even during one of the coldest European winters in decades.

Rail and water transportation is also demoralized by Russian aggression and aggrandizement in Austria.

By an Allied agreement, the railroads were to be Austrian operated, with Allied supervision, during the military occupation, and to be restored to full legal ownership thereafter.

Russia has insisted upon retention of numerous controls, besides seeking undetermined quantities of rolling stock to be conveyed to the Soviets as reparations under the vague Nazi-ownership clause of Potsdam.

There is also the Danube, the historic life line of a vast region of Europe, now blocked to traffic by navigational difficulties existing only in the Russian section.

The Soviets, it is officially noted, control the entire Danube with the exception of Austria and are seeking to extend their control over the entire river.

In Communist theory, inflation was designated by Marx and Lenin as a revolutionary implement to extirpate the middle classes and bring on a dictatorship of the proletariat.

And there is no device that imposes more hardships upon a people.

Wherever the Red armies have penetrated to the west, the Russians have resorted to inflation.

By combining astronomical military expenditures with unlimited issues of fiat paper currency, Russian manipulations destroyed the Hungarian pengo—and thereby almost destroyed the shaken postwar Hungarian economy.

The same strategem in Austria was thwarted only by resolute counteraction by Gen. Mark W. Clark, the American military governor, in one of many of desperate controversies with our Russian allies.

On the human side, the Austrian prisoners-of-war question remains unsettled.

Except in Germany, the accumulated problems of Austria, awaiting settlements of peace, are without parallel.

And a democratic fiasco at Moscow—in the third phase of the battle for Austria—will merely confirm a Communist victory on the Danube.

In all probability, if the course of bolshevism in central Europe is not stopped in Austria, it will not be stopped at all east of Cherbourg and Gibraltar, and a Communist Europe will front westward across the Atlantic.

The Development of Natural Resources—The Coming Technological Revolution on the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, presented at a discussion on engineering and human affairs at the Princeton University Bicentennial Conference, October 2, 1946:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES—THE COMING TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION ON THE LAND

(By H. H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture)

Productive land is unlike any other natural resource. It is characterized by the ele-

ment of life placed by nature in the thin mantle of fruitful soil occurring over a limited portion of the earth's surface. It is this life-producing quality that makes some lands productive, and it's the absence of this quality that makes some barren.

Productive land is further differentiated from other natural resources in that it must be maintained and used simultaneously. That is, it must be kept intact while in use. All other natural resources, with very few exceptions, must be taken from the earth—separated from it—in order to be used by man. The exceptions are certain forms of wildlife and those natural areas which, because of their aesthetic values, are kept in their original state.

Productive land is much more limited than commonly has been supposed. It occurs only on the surface of the earth, and only on part of this surface. It is not permanent. Once the fertile topsoil is washed or blown away, it cannot be restored or replaced in any practical way for generations. And what is left—subsoil—usually is far less productive, or sterile, and less stable. There are no undiscovered reserves of productive land of any substantial area.

We cannot dig deeper into the earth and find new productive soil. We cannot pump it from wells, plant it with seeds, or dig it from mines. We must keep what we have or do without, for when soil has been washed or blown into the oceans it is not recoverable. Assorted residues of sand and gravel left stranded along streamways are of small value.

Productive land is the only natural resource without which we cannot live. We are completely dependent on it for the food we eat, except fish. We also depend on it for a very large share of our clothing and shelter. We cannot get enough to feed ourselves or provide our clothing from the oceans. On any large scale, hydroponics would be utterly impractical. We might conceivably turn sometime to some form of synthetic food, as pills, plus a roughage. This appears to be a fantastic extreme, still far away. And likely, if it ever comes, it will be decidedly unpopular.

To protect our source of food, then the only sensible, practical thing to do is to protect the productive land we now have.

There is no doubt about the need for protecting productive land. Year after year, for generations, man has been steadily engaged in ruining millions and millions of acres of this basic resource. Every hard rain falling on unprotected, cultivated, or overgrazed sloping land washes additional tons of soil downslope, downstream, into the rivers, reservoirs, and oceans. Then it is lost. There is no practical way of bringing it back. And every hard wind, blowing across bare, dry soil, whether sloping or level, adds to the damage. Wind lifts the fine soil particles into the air and often develops huge dust storms that destructively scatter the substance of the land. What is left behind, frequently, is infertile shifting sand that smothers out vegetation on neighboring good land.

When the world was younger and our population much smaller, we could perhaps stand such waste. That time is past. It is not defeatism to say the world is fast maturing and must assume now a mature responsibility for its resources. It is not limiting the horizons of the future to say that land exploitation must stop. It is simply a matter of common sense and self-preservation. Besides saving soil and water—the two go together—soil conservation results in increased yields per acre. It is also easier and cheaper to farm on the contour than up and down hill.

Today, throughout our world, there are only about 4,000,000,000 acres of immediately arable land left. Not all of this land is good. The productivity of a great deal of it is only fair to medium. Some of it is poor. Yet we must count on all of it to feed a population reported to be in excess of two billion, and still increasing.

World-wide, we are already face to face with a shortage of good land.

The United States is somewhat better off, from the standpoint of productive land, than most nations. Even though we have ruined more good land in less time, than any other nation in recorded history, we had the advantage of an unprecedented supply to begin with. Now we have little margin left. We still have enough productive land if we take care of it. We cannot hope to maintain our present standard of living if we lose much more; eventually if the losses should continue, the nation would suffer even more seriously.

There are about 460,000,000 acres of really good high-class cropland left in the United States. This includes, in addition to that now in crops, about 100,000,000 acres that need drainage, irrigation, clearing, or other improvements. This is all that is available for cropping purposes. And all but about 70,000,000 of this 460,000,000 acres of high-grade land is subject to erosion if it is not protected. We have no reason for complacence.

Our record shows that we have ruined, for further practical cultivation, about one-fifth of our original area of tillable land. A third of what remains has already been badly damaged. Another third is highly vulnerable. And the erosion process is still going on.

How did we get into this predicament? Why was this allowed to happen? Why didn't you hear about it sooner?

There are a number of reasons, but probably seven main ones.

First. We began losing land to erosion when the world was still young. Those were the days when there was always more land—a great deal more land—just over the hill or across the ocean. People came to regard land as limitless and inexhaustible. This deceptive idea persisted as time went by and it was probably not until the United States was settled all the way to the Pacific coast that people began to have any real doubts about the myth of land plenty.

Second. The apparent abundance of good land for so many generations gave rise to a careless and prodigal attitude. There was nothing of any compelling nature to cause a landowner to take care of his land or have concern about maintaining its productivity. New land somewhere could almost always be had.

Third. In modern times the leaders of thought and nations—and nearly everybody else—too often have had little or no personal knowledge or understanding of the land. They have been trained in the law, finance, philosophy, administration, military science, economics, education, or some field other than agriculture—and especially that part of agriculture having to do with maintenance of the base, meaning the land. With few exceptions they have had neither the incentive nor the training to look at the landscape around them and understand what was happening. The ancient and unchallenged myth of land plenty came down to them, too, through the ages, and was accepted as truth.

Fourth. Too much of the land traditionally has been in the hands of the untutored and the inept. In very recent years, and in a very few countries, this situation has been changing, fortunately, for the better. However, over most of the world, land is still being used by men with little specialized or adequate training for the job. Too many land users have operated on a trial-and-error basis and have been influenced predominantly by habits handed down from the past, whether good or bad. Some have placed greater faith in superstition than in science. Under the names of peasant, farmer, rustic, and country fellow these individuals have been synonymous, for generations, with all that is naive, uneducated, and backward. Possessed frequently of such virtues as thrift and diligence, they have nevertheless often assumed a scornful attitude toward education and the educated. And too often the farm has been the last resort to which men, unsuccessful in other fields, have turned. In short, the most precious natural resources on earth in too many places has habitually been in the charge of those who have had no greater qualifications for the trusteeship than the coincidence of inheritance or birth on the land.

Fifth. Too few farms have produced surplus capital for the owner over a period of years. On the contrary, the farm often has been no better than a marginal or subsistence enterprise. Even in the United States, the farmer rarely has had the personal resources to undertake research or seek out technological improvements. He has generally been almost wholly dependent on outside help, from Government or private corporation, to provide him with improvements in machinery, materials, and methods.

Sixth. Our agricultural scientists failed completely, over bygone years, to recognize land for what it is—an impermanent and complex resource. They considered soil permanent and synonymous with land. As a result of this mistake, both agriculture and the land suffered. Soil is but one part of land. For all practical purposes, land must be regarded in terms of all its component parts of soil, slope, climate, and susceptibility to erosion. The early scientists largely ignored erosion, paid little attention to slope, called the weather inevitable, and took soil samples right and left. In the main, however, agricultural science was not greatly concerned about the land at all. In large degree, it was more interested in the health and breeding of livestock, improvement in strains of grasses, legumes, grains, and fibers; and in modernization of machinery and equipment. All of this was beneficial but it did neglect the capital stock of agriculture and the source of production—the land itself.

Seventh. In agriculture as in other enterprises we often have waited until we are sick before we call the doctor. There is an element of human nature about this and it has operated on the land. We didn't practice preventive medicine. Now we must try to cure a malady—erosion—that has gotten into our system and weakened us.

So much for history. There is little to be gained by a review of past shortcomings except as it will help us avoid similar pitfalls in the future. Today we are profiting from the lessons of the past. We know now:

1. That productive land is neither limitless nor inexhaustible. On the contrary, we have learned that the area of productive land is steadily shrinking before the onslaught of erosion.

2. That land must be expertly cared for, if it is to be maintained in a productive state.

3. That productive land must assume an ever more prominent position in the thinking of the people and their leaders. As the source of food for all people, rural and urban, it must have the regular, intelligent consideration that such indispensable wealth merits.

4. That since society as a whole depends absolutely on the produce of the land for its present and future existence, society as a whole must share in the responsibility and cost of maintaining land in a productive state. The individual landowner or operator has neither the resources nor the ability to carry the burden alone—and he has control only for a life time.

5. That science must inevitably devote an increasing share of its attention to the problems of maintaining the substance and improving the yield or productive land.

6. That action is imperative. Time is running out between the impending pincers of

an increasing population and a dwindling area of productive land.

7. That the technological key to future consideration of land development is scientific analysis of each parcel of land of any important extent to determine:

A. The type of production for which it is best suited, physically, and economically, as between row crops, forage, trees, grain, or wildlife; and

B. The conservation measures, such as terracing, strip cropping, and contouring, necessary to maintain it in a permanently productive state under maximum use.

8. That practical treatment must be based on this analysis—the character of the land and its needs.

All lands are not the same. They vary widely from place to place and even on parts of the same farm or field. Every variation in the combination of soil, slope, climate, and susceptibility to erosion means a variation in the use and treatment necessary to keep the land permanently productive. Thus engineering measures are used to supplement agronomic and fertility measures wherever necessary, and vice versa, according to need, adaptability, and economic limitations.

This is the basic principle underlying the new land technology developed in the United States during the past 14 years by the Soil Conservation Service (first called Soil Erosion Service). It is being applied to an ever increasing area of land by American farmers, acting with the assistance of Service technicians. By the middle of 1947, more than 100,000,000 acres in all parts of the United States will be farmed in this modern conservation way. That is, each of the 100,000,000 acres or more will be used according to its individual capabilities and will be treated according to its conservation needs.

In the United States land technology is spreading through a new democratic device known as the soil-conservation district. The district is a subdivision of State government, brought into being by a process of referendum among the landowners and operators involved. In practical application it is a legal organization of landowners and operators within a designated area for the purpose of developing and carrying forward a mutually desirable program of soil and water conservation. Its principal advantages are in the encouragement of local initiative and in the greater strength that comes with organized numbers—farmers and ranchers working together.

In soil conservation districts the farmers themselves decide what they want to do to improve their land and water resources, and how they want to go about doing it. Then they proceed along this course, working together, and utilizing all the available facilities and services they can command. In almost every instance districts are obtaining technical guidance from the Soil Conservation Service.

On August 15 there were more than 1,670 districts in the United States voluntarily voted into existence by the farmers themselves. These districts encompassed more than 900,000,000 acres and approximately 4,000,000 farms.

Farmers are continuing to organize districts at the rate of approximately 25 a month.

Although democratic soil conservation districts are being employed in the United States to further the application of land technology, other nations may choose to utilize other means. A number, however, have adopted the soil-conservation-district method—as the Union of South Africa, Mexico, and part of Australia.

In the long run, the overwhelming urge of mankind for survival will dictate that every remaining productive acre be handled in such a way that it will continue to produce indefinitely. In the meantime, other factors are combining to speed up the application of technology to the land. From the standpoint of the individual and the Nation alike, the development and application of soil and water conservation technology (the tool of soil conservation science) is good business. It results in greater yields and greater returns per acre for the capital and labor expended. Moreover, it maintains or improves the basic strength and self-sufficiency of individual and Nation. It probably can prevent at least half the potential famines of the future.

By increasing the per acre, per farm, and per Nation supply of food and fiber, conservation technology can provide the basis for an improved standard of living and simultaneously reduce the hunger and discontent among peoples, which so frequently leads to discord, dictatorships, and war.

For these and other reasons, the application of land technology is certain to spread around the world, either voluntarily or by decree. By the year 1996, this world journey probably will be well advanced. By that year or before it will have accomplished changes in agriculture tantamount to a beneficial revolution on the land.

Almost certainly productive land will have become a major factor in national and international deliberations. In all probability there would have been better international relationships if we had worked together more on ways and means of keeping land productive.

Production in the agricultural areas of the world will be more diversified; there will be pronounced increases in the acreages devoted to livestock and trees.

Agricultural production will be restored or improved in millions of communities throughout the world, solving in large measure some of the most difficult problems of food distribution and human nutrition now confronting mankind.

The nutritive value of food produced on land rich in the constituents of plant nutrition undoubtedly will be greater than that from impoverished land, which has been stripped of its topsoil by erosion, with everything the topsoil contains; available elements of nutrition—both minor and major—all that man puts into the topsoil, and everything else. With so much eroded land around the earth, is there any wonder that malnutrition and famine are so widespread?

Development of land and water resources for agriculture—as by drainage or irrigation—will be governed primarily by factual, technological elements of land use and land maintenance rather than by promotional, exploitive, or political standards.

And people will learn that it is easier—easier on machine, horse, and man—to farm according to conservation standards than to follow haphazard methods not fitted to the land. Less fuel and time, for example, are required to operate a machine on the level—on the contour—than up-and-down slopes, and there is less wear on the machine.

The heavy costs of erosion—now running to approximately $3,844,000,000 a year in the United States alone—will be sharply cut.

Farming will become an expert profession; the inexpert and inept will be forced off the land. It is not impossible that the prospective farmer of the future will be required to satisfy society that he is qualified by training and experience to take on the trusteeship of a piece of productive land.

Most important, man will have learned the true value of his most precious natural resource—the land. Tragically, throughout history it has been the most neglected.

On this job of safeguarding the land, thousands of farmers, in addition to various local, State, and Federal agencies, are vigorously pushing ahead with the work. Each individual so engaged is a part of the biggest job, I think, in engineering and human affairs ever undertaken anywhere.

Conditions in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the following article which is contained in today's New York Herald Tribune is an appalling revelation of the shocking state of affairs in Poland under the present Communist regime. It is in my opinion the most convincing evidence to date of the fact that the so-called elections held in that country last January were a farce, that they were not free as promised in the Yalta agreement, but were marked by coercion, intimidation, and violence. The valiant Polish people have always been known to the world as true lovers of freedom. I prophesy that there will never be peace in Europe with conditions as they exist today in this Red puppet state. Something must be done promptly regarding the present tragedy of Poland and the plight of the Polish people who cannot return to their homeland under present conditions.

LANE RESIGNS IN ORDER TO TELL POLISH TRAGEDY—AMBASSADOR CALLS ELECTIONS A FARCE, TELLS TRUMAN HE WILL SPEAK OPENLY

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A Brooklyn-born career diplomat resigned today as Ambassador to Poland so that he can speak out openly—and apparently with the consent and approval of President Truman—about "the present tragedy in Poland."

The man who thus interrupted 31 years of continuous service to America in the field of international relations was Arthur Bliss Lane, 53 years old, who last January 19 observed the "free and unfettered" elections in Poland and today called them a farce.

Letters exchanged between President Truman and Mr. Lane were released today and were significant for these facts:

First. Mr. Lane struck indirectly at Soviet Russia by asserting that the January elections were not free, as required in the Yalta Agreement, to which Russia was a signatory, and asserting that he wanted to be free to denounce them "without being hampered by diplomatic convention."

Second. President Truman voiced appreciation of Mr. Lane's efforts to "persuade the Polish Provisional Government to fulfill its pledges with respect to the holding of free elections." The President said: "I regret that your able presentation of the views of this Government did not achieve its purpose." And he added: "While I appreciate the reasons which have prompted you to sever your connection (with the Foreign Service) I wish to assure you that I accept your resignation with great reluctance."

MAY TELL HIS STORY

Third. The wording of the two letters thus indicated that Mr. Lane had asked for—and had received—a green light to go ahead and tell the American people everything that he, as an inside, authoritative observer, saw in Poland.

Immediately after the news of Mr. Lane's resignation was announced, there were surmises from men on Capitol Hill as to what the repercussions would be.

One guess was that he will be called before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or House Foreign Affairs Committee soon to tell

the legislators some of the things he told the President.

Another was that his testimony may serve to silence some of the criticism heard on the Hill concerning the pending proposals to aid Greece and Turkey to bolster their Governments and keep them out of communism's domain.

A third was that the President, as a rebuke to Poland, may delay appointment of a successor to Mr. Lane or may appoint an individual who will be able to make it clear that the United States fully supports the views expressed by Mr. Lane.

LANE'S LETTER

It was learned tonight that Mr. Lane talked the whole matter over with President Truman last Friday and then submitted a formal letter of resignation which was answered formally today. The text of Mr. Lane's letter was:

MARCH 21, 1947.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to request you to be good enough to accept my resignation as American Ambassador to Poland on the termination of my present period of consultation with the Department of State, that is, on March 31, 1947.

My reasons for asking you to relieve me of the post with which I was entrusted by you and by President Roosevelt are the folllowing: My principal duty in Poland, outside of the protection of American interests, was under the terms of the Yalta decision, to report to my Government regarding conditions in Poland in connection with the elections which were held on January 19, 1947. As you know, these elections were not "free and unfettered" as the Polish provisional government of national unity had previously pledged, in keeping with the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. Quite the contrary, the preelection period was characterized by coercion, intimidation, and violence—thus rendering the elections a farce and indicating on the part of the Polish Government a cynical disregard of its international obligations.

Under the circumstances I feel that I can do far more for the cause of the relations between peoples of the United States and Poland if I should revert to the status of a private citizen and thus be enable to speak and write openly, without being hampered by diplomatic convention, regarding the present tragedy of Poland.

May I take this occasion to express to you my gratitude for your unfailing support of my efforts, however unsuccessful, to persuade the Polish authorities, in their own interest, to fulfill their solemn international obligations. I wish at the same time to assure you that my services are at your disposal, should you require them in the future.

Believe me, my dear Mr. President, with great respect,

Faithfully yours,

ARTHUR BLISS LANE.

PRESIDENT'S REPLY

The text of the President's letter was:

"DEAR MR. LANE: I have received your letter of March 21, 1947, in which you submit your resignation as American Ambassador to Poland to take effect on March 31 of this year.

"I am well aware of the difficulties which confronted you in the performance of your mission to Poland and appreciate the vigorous efforts which you made to persuade the Polish provisional government to fulfill its pledges with respect to the holding of free elections in Poland. I regret that your able presentation of the views of this Government did not achieve its purpose.

"You have had a long and distinguished career in the American foreign service, and while I appreciate the reasons which have prompted you to sever your connection with that service at this time, I wish to assure you that I accept your resignation with great reluctance. In this connection I am pleased to note that I may feel free to call upon you should I require your services in the future.

"Very sincerely yours,

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

Appropriations for Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution from American Legion, Post 347, New Kensington, Pa. This resolution is self-explanatory and needs no further comment, except the observation that the veterans are considerably disturbed, and rightly so, over the proposed attempt to cut the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration.

The resolution follows:

AMERICAN LEGION, POST NO. 347,
New Kensington, Pa., March 14, 1947.

Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

"Resolution

"Whereas the present United States Congress proposes to cut the appropriations to the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year commencing on July 1, 1947; and

"Whereas the contemplated reduction in the appropriations will immediately eliminate the Veterans' Administration subregional offices and throw this load of operations back on the central offices now established; and

"Whereas the hospitalization of all nonservice-connected cases would be adversely affected and cause untold suffering among the veterans of both World Wars; and

"Whereas it is also proposed to reduce disability allowances and compensation to widows and orphans:

"Now, therefore, the American Legion, Post No. 347, New Kensington, Pa., by unanimous resolution, duly adopted at a meeting held on March 14, 1947, hereby urges you to use your best offices to the effect that the present appropriations to the Veterans Administration be maintained and that any reductions in the national budget shall not in any way whatsoever affect the said appropriations."

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN LEGION, POST NO. 347,
NEW KENSINGTON, PA.
By SIDNEY L. SILVERMAN, *Commander.*

The Star and Herald—an Outstanding Latin-American Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding newspapers of Latin America is the Star and Herald, of Panama City, Republic of Panama. It is a modern, up-to-date, capably edited daily, with a circulation that extends widely through the countries of the American Continent. It is the oldest newspaper published in English on the west coast of the continent, north and south. Each day of its issue it is accompanied by its Spanish language counterpart, La Estrella de Panama—the Star of Panama. On the 24th of February 1947 the Star and Herald celebrated its ninety-eighth anniversary, and 2 years later it will reach its one hundredth milestone.

The Star and Herald, throughout, has ably served the Panama Canal project, and has done ever so much to build up and maintain cordial relations between the United States and the Panamanian Republic. For years, under the wise and effective guidance of T. Gabriel Duque, publisher, Gerald Z. Typaldos, general manager, and A. V. McGeachy, editor, this has been the especial policy of the paper; and the value of its efforts in this behalf cannot be overestimated.

Also, it is to be noted, the Star and Herald is oriented aright on other great questions of international import; as, for instance, communism. The red plague has been, with characteristic practices, infiltrating into various Latin-American countries; and, in some of them, has come to be a positive threat to peace and good order. In season, and out, the Star and Herald has cried aloud and spared not; and its editorial utterances, accordingly, have carried much weight at home and abroad.

Because of its amazing vitality and its highly distinguished and useful career, as well as because of its attitude on the indicated subjects, I believe that the thanks of the people of the United States are due the Star and Herald, and its present efficient and statesmanlike staff. Also, our congratulations should be extended to the newspaper upon having attained its ninety-eighth birthday. Let us hope that it may long continue in the good work in which it has always been engaged.

Subjoined are certain editorials recently appearing in the Star and Herald, which are self-explanatory; and they are herewith included as being altogether worthy of this further dissemination.

[From the Panama City Star and Herald of February 24, 1947]

WE ARE 98 TODAY

Today the Star and Herald observes its ninety-eighth birthday. That an English-language newspaper should have survived for nigh unto a century in a Spanish-speaking country, is, indeed, something to talk about. It was already 55 years old when the Canal Zone came into being.

Our paper has been published continuously since 1849, first as a weekly, then twice weekly, and thrice weekly, and since 1850 as a daily, with periodic slip-backs to the twice-weekly and thrice-weekly status whenever the economic sledding got too tough. But it has never been out of circulation, it has never been under suspension during the 98 years of its existence.

The story of our paper has been told in these columns repeatedly. But it can stand repeating for the benefit of those newcomers who are always with us.

Our paper was ushered into the journalistic world as the result of the restless initiative and enterprise of three of those pioneering men who flocked from the eastern United States to the wilds of California, attracted by the discovery of gold.

It was born in the job department of the El Panameño print shop, located on what is today known as Fourth Street, between Central and A Avenues. The El Panameño was a Spanish-language weekly published by José Angel Santos.

In December 1850 the Star half of our paper started housekeeping for itself and established its own print shop on what is today Central Avenue, between Cathedral Plaza and Fourth Street. In April 1851 the Herald half of our paper made its bow to the Isthmian public as a weekly and subsequently was published twice weekly.

The two papers were bitter adversaries—perhaps enemies—from the start. The men who started the Herald were employees of the Star and naturally the senior did not like the desertion because, among other things, it forced the Daily Star back into the three-times-a-week field. The owners of both papers were brothers.

But early in 1853—during the latter part of April—the publishers of the two papers decided to bury the hatchet. One of the owners of the Star elected to return to the activities of political journalism in the southern United States. The owners of the Herald bought him out, the sale being effective on the last day of April.

After a 2-day suspension of the Star and the Herald, on May 2, 1854, the two papers, having merged their interests, decided also to merge their names, and on that date the first issue the Daily Star and Herald appeared and the two weeklies disappeared from the field.

From February 1, 1853, our paper has never appeared without its Spanish-language twin—La Estrella de Panama.

During the period of the French canal construction efforts our paper appeared as a trilingual daily—in Spanish, English and French. But it lost its trilingual characteristic with the passing of the French interests on the Isthmus.

Between 1854 and the year 1904 when the French canal interests passed into the hands of the United States Government, our paper was at times published twice weekly, or thrice weekly, or daily, in response to the pressure of the economic ups and downs of business on the Isthmus.

Because it had its beginning in the Panama Star on February 24, 1849, the Star and Herald is the oldest English-language newspaper on the entire west coast of the American Continent—north and south. Only the Alta California, of San Francisco, established in January, 1849, was older than the Panama Star. However, that paper ceased publication long years ago, in the seventies, we believe.

Two years hence our paper will complete one century of uninterrupted publication at this crossroads of the world, and will strike out toward the second century.

We are hoping that in 1949, we shall have with us the majority, if not all of our readers of today, to join with us in celebrating that one hundredth birthday. Here's hoping.

[From the Panama City Star and Herald of January 25, 1947]

UNITED STATES AROUSED AGAINST COMMUNISM

The Communist menace in the United States has aroused the representative elements of the Nation to the point, where the people are now beginning to sit up and take notice preparatory to doing something about activities of this dangerous group.

The leaders of democracy in the Northern Republic are beginning to show apprehension as to the ultimate effects on American democracy of the current unbridled communistic propaganda in all strata of national life, and the bold invasion of numerous important, though subordinate, positions in the official and industrial life of the Nation by the apostles of communism. The realization is now dawning that these activities, if not forcefully attacked now, will eventually destroy the concepts on which the entire structure of American freedoms rests.

Representative DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, in a speech before the House Thursday, said that "human freedom is still the transcendental problem of the world. Its real enemy is red fascism, commonly known as communism."

Without doubt Representative DIRKSEN is right when he says that "human freedom is still the transcendental problem of the world." Unfortunately, however, freedom cannot be imposed on those who are willing, nay, eager to remain spiritually enslaved.

There are too many in the world today who prate loudly about sovereign freedoms, yet they refuse to be the sovereigns of their own souls which they seem pleased to consign blindly to slavery under an exotic and unproved utopian ideology which preaches and practices regimentation which is the exact antithesis of the individual, democratic freedom on which our western civilization is based.

These spiritual slaves of an alien master, have allowed skillfully planted and cultivated prejudices and phobias to flourish in their slavish souls against the very system of freedom to which they are indebted for the right and privilege of thinking and speaking freely. They have become renegades from the decent life of democracy and have sold their heritage of freedom for a mess of Communistic pottage, though some undoubtedly have enjoyed the largesse of the Kremlin's moguls. Some may be just "joiners" ever ready to sign up as a follower of every new-fangled notion spawned by the mental miscarriage of evil or diseased minds. These have been misled by their own folly. But there are others who thrive in their role as jackals feeding on the leavings of the lions of the Kremlin.

Representative DIRKSEN warns that this menace is "spreading both abroad and at home" (in the United States) and adds that "developments in eastern Europe, France, Italy, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and elsewhere, are only too eloquent on this point." We can only hope that this warning will bring the people everywhere wide awake and to a full realization of the menace which has been with us for a long, long time.

It is to be hoped that the warning will not be limited to words, but that action will be taken. Action to stamp out the threat, and action to cure the social evils which provide the fertile soil in which these destructive ideas flourish. There must be action also which will remove all susceptibilities among the masses to stop and listen to the siren song of the sworn enemies of democracy. Democracy must be made a living reality for all men, rich and poor, the exalted and the lowly. Only so can a real defensive barrier against communism be raised for the perpetuation of democracy.

Human freedom is still the transcendental problem of the world." But, because this freedom has been so long abused, it has become a catch phrase of the demagogues who exploit its emotional values to advance the sinister purpose of those who, determined to live by their wits, seek the ways and means to enslave the world and so live easier.

As the agents of fascism, communism, or nationalism, or as the tools of dictatorships disguised under the label of democracy, these demagogues who berate democracy and who would convince their hearers that communism would be an admirable substitute for democracy, seek only to destroy human freedom everywhere.

Democracy in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Reverend Edward A. Conway, S. J., St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., over the Columbia Broadcasting System Church of the Air on Sunday, March 23, 1947:

Everyone is talking about President Truman's appeal to Congress for aid to Greece and Turkey.

And with good reason. His courageous challenge to an expanding communism was the gravest peacetime pronouncement an American President has ever made.

Even now, after 10 days of Nation-wide discussion, we are just beginning to realize how much his message means.

"Great responsibilities," said the President, "have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events."

Just how great are those responsibilities; how fateful are the choices we are called upon to make?

These are the questions we must answer in even more widespread public debate.

"The American people," said Sumner Welles, "have entered the Valley of Decision. If the United States makes full use of the opportunity afforded by its position, its power, and its resources, it can determine the destinies of humanity. It can save Western civilization."

That, I believe, is in truth the soul-shaking responsibility which the swift movement of events has thrust upon us. That is the role in which Providence has cast our Nation. That is the high destiny America must fulfill.

In this time of tremendous decisions, it is of first importance that we clearly understand the nature of the crisis confronting us.

And we must take careful inventory of those resources Mr. Welles has mentioned.

This crisis, make no mistake about it, is a spiritual crisis; and the struggle which can resolve it must be waged principally on the spiritual plane.

Two opposing philosophies are struggling for the soul of modern man.

The totalitarianism which threatens to engulf the Western World is more than a system of political organization; it is a philosophy of life. It is more than marching armies and infiltrating agents; it is marching ideas, an infiltrating philosophy. It must be opposed by the true democratic idea, by the democratic philosophy of life.

That is the true inwardness of the crisis; and at our peril we dismiss it as just another crisis in power politics.

The swift movement of events, I verily believe, is fulfilling that prophecy which the great Cardinal Newman made more than threescore years ago when he said: "Then will come the stern encounter—when two real and living principles, the one in the Church, the other out of it, at length rush upon each other, contending not for names and words, but for elementary notions and distinctive moral characters."

As we gird ourselves for that stern encounter, what would an inventory of America's spiritual resources show? Would it reveal a democracy vital and vigorous, united by the commonly-shared convictions of its people?

Or would that inventory show a democracy divided against itself, rent by racial, religious

and class contentions, a democracy doubtful about the very values it is now called upon to defend?

America, look within. Look into your soul.

Never before in your history have you so desperately needed self-knowledge.

How shall we test the vitality of our democracy. The French philosopher, Montesquieu, long ago gave the answer.

"A nation's decadence," he said, "begins when it loses sight of the principles upon which it was founded."

We need only ask ourselves, therefore, just how strongly we hold and cherish and live by the principles which guided our founding fathers.

The men who made America believed in God. They acknowledged the existence of an objective standard of right and wrong, of a moral law as unchanging as human nature itself, and known to man by the voice of his reason.

They held that the human personality is sacred, and endowed with rights which no government can take away, since God, not government, has bestowed them.

They held that reason, not will, is the basis of law; that government is of laws, not of men; that only through the supremacy of law can legitimate liberty be preserved.

They enshrined those doctrines in the Declaration of Independence, the preamble of the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

God; the moral law; human rights; the rule of law—do we as a Nation still cling to them?

This is the simple fourfold test of the vitality of our democracy.

But this test, you may object, is too simple; this is too elementary. Yes, it is simple; these are elementary notions. As a fact, they are those elementary notions around which the stern encounter is now raging—that stern encounter which Cardinal Newman predicted.

These are the very truths totalitarianism denies, and seeks to blot from the minds of men. And these same truths are the four pillars upon which our temple of freedom was built.

In this solemn and critical hour, we must make absolutely sure that these foundations of our Democracy still stand.

God, the moral law, human rights, the rule of law. Do our people still cling to them? That question will not down. And the fear arises, as we look about us, that too many Americans have already lost faith in them.

Let me indicate just one reason for such fear. I have before me an address written by a San Francisco attorney, Harold R. McKinnon, entitled "The Higher Law." Its revelations are nothing less than appalling. Basing his charges on copious quotations, he contends that the prevailing teaching of American political and legal philosophers is essentially antidemocratic and totalitarian.

"This teaching," he declares, "denies that there is a moral law which is inherent in human nature and which is therefore immutable, and to which all man-made laws to be valid must conform. It denies that by virtue of this law man possesses certain rights which are inherent and inalienable, and therefore superior to the authority of the state. It denies that the purpose of government is to secure these inherent and inalienable rights."

Isn't it obvious that this doctrine is the same as the teaching of those totalitarians whom President Truman has called upon us to resist in the name of democracy?

And this, be it observed, is the teaching to which most of the influential men in America have been subjected. Can you blame one for wondering whether our democracy is by now anything more than a hollow shell? If you deny that men are moral beings, with rights and duties, and hence moral responsibility, do you not empty democracy of its meaning?

This fear that our democracy has become decadent, that it has departed from the principles of its founders, has aroused a group of our citizens to action. This group, made up of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, has launched a movement called Common Cause. It is not so much an organization, they say, as a force. Its purpose is to revive and strengthen our great heritage of freedom, to reinvigorate our democracy so that it can meet the modern challenge.

Before ever President Truman made his historic appeal Common Cause had proclaimed that "the fate of human liberty in these critical times rests in large measure in the hands of the American people."

By various activities, chiefly educational, Common Cause will work "to clarify the meaning of democracy and to make it a militant faith which will surpass in its sweep and power the faith of any totalitarian system."

I have joined the National Religious Council of Common Cause since I believe that it has correctly diagnosed the root disease of our democracy. I am convinced, with its founders, that "we have arrived at one of the most dangerous crises in world history because we have shown an increasing tendency to relinquish belief in God."

I believe, as they do, that "as a result we have drifted further and further from allegiance to the moral law, which protects individuals in their God-given rights."

I heartily agree with their statement that "all who believe in God and his moral law must unite in a common cause to bring to the American people a clear knowledge of the meaning of democracy, and hasten a return to the principles of the moral law." And finally, I agree whole-heartedly that "the moral law is the indispensable core of such a program."

It is hard to exaggerate the importance of such a citizens' movement in this testing time for our democracy. The arresting thing about it is the fact that it is a Protestant, Catholic, Jewish project. And the exciting thing about it is the fact that laymen predominate among its membership.

Common Cause must appear to the perceptive as a ray of hope in the gathering gloom.

I join the more heartily in this movement because I recall that years ago Pope Pius XII made the same diagnosis as does Common Cause when he declared that "the radical and ultimate cause of the evils we deplore in modern society is the denial and rejection of a universal standard of morality, as well for individual and social life as for international relations." And the Holy Father's prescription is the same as that of Common Cause. Five years ago he urged that "the observance of the moral law must be inculcated and fostered by the public opinion of all nations and of all states with such unanimity of voice and energy that no one may dare to call into doubt or weaken its binding force."

As a Catholic priest I welcome the opportunity to cooperate on the basic of the moral law with men and women like Sumner Welles, Dorothy Thompson, Russell Davenport, Lyman Bryson, and William Montgomery Bennett, because I know how much Pope Pius wants cooperation of this kind. He has gone so far, as a fact, to say that "this disposition, and a readiness to work together in a spirit of genuine brotherly harmony, not only answers to the moral obligation to fulfill one's civic duties; it rises to the dignity of a postulate of conscience, sustained by love of God and of one's neighbors, and stimulated by the warning signs of the moment and the intensity of effort called for in order to save the nations."

Common Cause must succeed. But it can succeed only if it becomes a great citizens' crusade. It can succeed only by mobilizing into a great militant pro-God, pro-democracy front the millions of Americans who still believe in God, in His moral law, in human rights, and in the rule of law. May God speed the day.

Greece—the Disappointed Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from an American businessman and citizen stating his observations on the conditions in Greece. I think that this letter is well worth reading by every Member of the House.

What is true in Greece also applies to all the other European countries. All of the Europeans that immigrated to the United States came here, not because they wanted adventure and excitement in a new land—they came to the United States not because they hated their home country and all their relatives and friends. They came here to struggle in a new land, without any friends, and in most cases unable to speak the American language—because of the terrible and unbearable economic and political conditions in their native lands. After the First World War we saw four imperialistic dynasties crushed and smashed. They were the Hohenzollerns of Germany, the Hapsburgs of Austria, the Czars of Russia, and the Ottoman Empire of Turkey. After this World War the peoples of Europe want an end of the royalist regimes of King Carol and Madame Lepescu, the King Peters, the King Georges, Emmanuels, Umbertos, and so on. The day of the rule of the royalists and the landed aristocracy is ended. The United States will get nowhere by supplying bayonets, bullets, and machine guns to uphold these old decrepit and discredited governments that gave the people of Europe poverty and hunger. You cannot win a war against hunger with bullets. The people are crying for bread and for economic relief. They want neither fascism nor communism. Neither do they want to return to a rule by royalists and the upper classes. They are crying and pleading for democracy. Let us not make a mistake and find ourselves flopping around Europe in British imperialist boots that are already outworn and have been discarded by the British people themselves. Let us not replace hatred of the British by hatred of America. Let us spend $1,000,000,000 for food, economic relief, and democracy, but we should not spend 1 cent to uphold reactionary royalist governments anywhere.

The letter follows:

THE DISAPPOINTED CITIZEN

I will attempt to analyze and explain some of the tragedies in Greece.

I was born in a village in northern Greece in 1885. When I was of school age, I did not

attend the school until I was 9 years of age. Then I only attended school 2 years. The Greek Government, at that time, was in bad condition financially, and could not pay a grammar school teacher $7.50 per month. In Greece, all the school teachers and the educators are paid by the Federal Government. In my school days, the ruler was then in Greece, King George the First.

The King was receiving from the poor, barefooted, ill-clothed and fed Greek people, $300,000 a year; his wife, $50,000 a year. He had about six children, each of these receiving $25,000 a year. All that is net wages. The doctors and nurses and all the King's servants were paid for by the poor Greek people.

Every year he would take a trip. For instance, he would go to Monte Carlo, England, or Russia. All that expense was paid by the Greek people. At that time, the population of Greece was four and a half million people. In other words, it costs the poor Greek people more than one million and a half dollars a year for the royal family. Now then, the Greek Government was too poor to pay a grammar school teacher $7.50 a month. Can you imagine that? The King received a million and a half and yet it could not pay $7.50 a month for school teachers.

What I have learned, as far as schooling is, was what my grandmother taught me, God bless her soul. And I thank God that I immigrated to America in 1905 and have lived here ever since.

From what I learned and study about kings, there never was a good king. I have pictured kings in my heart and soul as the greatest tyrants in the world, a tyrant with every sense of the word.

King George, that is today, has caused the greatest catastrophe, the greatest massacre, and homicide in Greece. Brother killing brother, father killing son, and son killing his father. And what is the cause of it? The great King George, the British "stool pigeon."

I am not surprised about the British wanting to keep the King in Greece, but I am very much surprised that the American politicians also helped to keep the King in Greece. I cannot conceive the idea of American democrats, who are born in a democratic country, with democratic ideas in their hearts, and yet they shove the King down the Greeks' throats, a king, such a tyrant ruler.

The American boys fought and died for liberty, democracy, and freedom. The blood they shed, they shed in vain, because the politicians have not done their duty. The boys fought to put down the tyrants and Fascists and others of such, and now the politicians have established a Fascist's government in Argentina, Spain, and the latest, in Greece. The next Fascist's government to be reestablished will be in Germany and then we will start the fireworks all over again. What a terrible mistake we are making! The atrocious catastrophes in Greece will not stop soon, but will continue as long as the King George remains in Greece. If the revolution in Greece is not stopped soon, I fear it is going to be the starting point of another conflagration and this time it is not going to be another world war, it is going to be a world cease.

There is today a democratic party in Greece. After the liberation of Greece from the Axis, the Greek people cried, not with tears in their eyes, but with tears running down their cheeks, crying to the Americans in the American Embassy in Greece, saying, "O Roosevelt, O America, please, please give us the same government you have in America." And the answer was Royalists mow them down, down with machine guns because the then Prime Minister Churchill, of Great Britain, had a king for them. The Greeks were still crying to America for a democratic government. There was no American politician to say anything in behalf of Greece. President Roosevelt had only three words on behalf of Greece, "Wash my hands." Then Secretary Stettinius said two words, "Hands off." If America had supported the democratic party in Greece, the democratics would have won and all this great catastrophe in Greece today would have been avoided.

The British are first-degree murderers of Greece. Now it is left between Great Britain and America to stop the revolution in Greece, if they want the world to exist. If the revolution is not stopped, there will be only a few people left on the face of the earth. You may shun this writing, you may do that if you wish, but it would be advisable to invest these writings among your souvenirs for future reference.

The British propaganda have branded the democratic party in Greece as Communist. They have told the American representatives in Greece there are only two party politicians in Greece—Royalists and Communists. And we must support the Royalist Party in Greece. In America we have two principal party politicians, Democratic and Republicans. The President is elected by the people for a 4-year term. He may run for a second term, that is 8 years. Many of us think that is too long. In Washington today they are trying to pass a law that no President can serve more than 2 terms. Now, some of these politicians object to any President serving more than two terms, but they support the British idea in Greece. The kind of ruler not to serve one term, not two terms, not for three terms, not for life, but forever. The British and American politicians have condemned the Greek people not for 4 years, not for 8 years, not for life, but forever. What a great crime.

The American Government should advise King George of Greece to abdicate, not to some other King, but to the democratic party in Greece, and leave the country, on the ground that he is not capable of bringing peace to Greece, and that the continuation of the revolution in Greece endangers the peace of the world.

English as World Language—Address by Hon. Robert L. Owen, Former United States Senator From Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to the excellent address by former Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, given today to the Oklahoma congressional delegation in the Speaker's dining room.

Senator Owen's address dealing with the making of English a world language, and his means for attaining this goal for peace and understanding with all people should interest every Member of the House.

Mr. Owen's address is as follows:

WHY MAKE ENGLISH A WORLD LANGUAGE AND HOW?

1. Because in the United States we have created the most powerful agencies to produce food, clothing, and shelter in the world.

2. Because in the United States, through our democratic-republican Constitution, we have established in the highest degree, liberty, justice, and the rights of the individual man, woman, and child to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

3. Because, under our magnificent system of education, we have raised the average of human intelligence to a higher level than any other nation in the world having a like number of people.

4. Because with over 250,000 individual churches with their teachers and preachers, with over 250,000 lodges of fraternal brotherhoods, we have established principles of human brotherhood, mercy, justice, and loving kindness.

5. Because with our magnificent educational processes and the services of 900,000 school teachers, and with our schools from kindergarten to elementary to high schools to colleges to universities and to technical laboratories, we have established the greatest mechanism for the production of goods and services desired by the human race. The average per capita production of the people of the United States for the year 1945 was approximately $1,500 in merchantable goods and services. Having 6 percent of the population of the world, the American people produced two hundred and six billions of dollars of merchantable goods and services, as compared with one hundred and fifty billions for the 94 percent of the people of the world. Practically two-thirds of the people of the world were entirely ignorant of the production achieved in the United States under the free competitive system.

6. The most glorious achievement in the history of mankind is the establishment of the good-neighbor policy of the Western Hemisphere. Led by the Monroe Doctrine, the good-neighbor policy in the last 30 years has brought about the most magnificent achievement in the history of the human race, to wit, the United Nations organization, its General Assembly, its permanent headquarters established on the Hudson in New York City, with a charter pledging the nations of the world to a world of brotherhood, a world of peace, justice, a world of mutual understanding, of universal education, with equality of sovereignty for the small nations as well as the great, with a world in which government rests upon the dignity of the human individual and his personal rights.

These are the forces which have made the people of the United States and the Government of the United States the moral, constructive, productive, commercial, financial leaders of the world. These achievements have been accomplished by people speaking the English language, by people who have made it their business, through over 125 foreign mission societies, to teach the doctrine of Christ, of human brotherhood throughout all of the illiterate nations of the world.

Over 60 different nationalities have come to the United States as a place of refuge, and they have learned the English language as a secondary language.

The knowledge with regard to the production of food, clothing, and shelter, the knowledge with regard to all mechanic arts and sciences, the knowledge of the preservation of human life, through medical schools, the surgeons, physicians, and nurses, and hospitals throughout the United States, have raised the longevity of the American people to a high degree. This knowledge should be made the common property of the world through the English language and through the books, magazines, papers, and publicity agencies, including particularly the glorious services established by a thousand broadcasting stations from one end of America to the other.

Be it remembered that these broadcasting stations have over 66,000,000 receiving sets in the United States, more than 15 times as many per capita as the balance of the world combined. Be it remembered that not only do they teach the sound doctrines of brotherhood, but teach all forms of knowledge, all

forms of entertainment, all forms of sports, all forms of music, fun and jokes which delight and charm our people 24 hours a day. All of these things America is in a position to give to the illiterate people of the world. The people of the world appreciate what America can give and have joined, joyously, unanimously, by vote of the citizens of 56 nations pledging their loyalty to the United Nations, now at long last happily established with headquarters on American soil.

We have already entered a new world of peace, liberty, justice, mutual understanding, and loyal cooperation as one world.

We deeply need one world language, as demanded by Laubach, the voice of the Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, whose services in overcoming illiteracy of the world are so great that no words can describe the indebtedness of the human race to these consecrated servants of the brotherhood of man. No greater epic of human service was ever written within this country than Laubach's book, The Silent Billion Speak, whose last edition, chapter 8, describes the marvelous reception of the republics of the Western Hemisphere through their educators, their churches, their governments, their people.

The question arises, How can English be made a world language? In recent years, it has been clearly demonstrated that it only requires about 1,000 words to read, write, and speak any language. The basic English system, developed by C. K. Ogden, of London, and Professor Richards, of Harvard, employ only 850 words to express any thought or translate any book printed in current English.

The teachers at Webster School in Washington City, Tenth and H Streets, teach people of many languages to read, write, and speak English within a comparatively few months, using highly cultivated teachers, using the phonograph, moving pictures, blackboard, personal instruction.

The School of Foreign Languages of the State Department, under the direction of Dr. Henry Lee Smith, Jr., a most highly cultivated, energetic, public servant, is teaching foreign languages to our diplomats and sending them to the ends of the earth. They are taught to speak a foreign language by the same mechanism within a comparatively few months.

There is no difficulty in teaching these languages by these highly developed processes.

It must be remembered, however, valuable as these processes are, in dealing with the world it is of supreme importance to have an alphabet by which an illiterate can learn to read and write his own language at once, within a day, and by which an illiterate can teach another illiterate to read and write his own language within a day. The "each one teach one" plan was established by the Moros in 1932, when they made it a rule that every Moro who was taught to read and write his own language by the Moro phonetic alphabet of 16 letters was duty bound to teach it to at least one other illiterate. This plan worked so brilliantly that within a comparatively few years the Moros abolished illiteracy and raised their percentage of literacy to 95 percent.

This example has been followed in innumerable nations throughout the world under the Laubach system. The most recent example is that of the great and friendly Republic of Mexico, who by law required those who learned to read and write the Spanish language, phonetically, to teach it to another. Great has been the success in Mexico of this system. This system is receiving the enthusiastic support of the other Latin-American Republics.

It was my knowledge of the subject matter which caused me, after Pearl Harbor, to give my entire attention to perfecting a mechanism by which the illiterate of all nations could be taught not only to read and write their own language, but to read, write, and speak the language of any other nation in the world within from 10 to 20 weeks.

The mechanism by which this is accomplished has been fully set forth in the Global Alphabet Guide Book, a copy of which has been furnished to each of you here present and which is available for the whole world. The mechanism by which the Spanish may read, write, and speak English and the English enabled to read, write, and speak Spanish will be available in April for the public. It is being published by the Cuneo Eastern Press at Philadelphia.

It is not necessary for me to do more than to say that this mechanism not only speaks for itself, but it is approved by the ablest linguists in the world.

Even Rev. Frank C. Laubach, who has personally taught over 88 nationalities how to read, write, and speak their own languages with phonetic alphabets, says unequivocally that the Owen alphabet is the best he has ever seen; that it is perfect; that it deserves to be adopted by merit.

The World Language Foundation, which is charged with the duty of publishing and distributing these books at present, is a nonprofit, educational, charitable corporation, established for the purpose of enabling the whole world to have one language—one language of the greatest possible utility to the world, one language which can be learned by the mechanics proposed within 10 to 20 weeks.

The mechanics of the global alphabet are simple to the last degree. It consists of 37 letters and 1 vertical capital bar, with which any language in the world can be written with the pen at high speed; can be typed with the Underwood global typewriter at twice the speed of any other system; can be printed by the offset method at an incredibly low cost.

No global letter is ever silent. Each global letter has only one form for typewriting or for handwriting. The global alphabet can be learned within 2 hours by any person of average intelligence.

Special attention is called to page 3, Guide Book in which Mario A. Pei, Ph. D., associate professor of romance languages, Columbia University, New York, explains how young children can be taught to read and write English with this alphabet within a few weeks. The Guide Book speaks for itself and no man can successfully contradict the truth of it.

The Guide Book contains a list of 1,143 words, 569 of them words of one syllable, 472 two syllables, and 102 words exceeding two syllables. The entire list of these words can be spelled word by word in English and pronounced with global within 2 hours.

With this mechanism completely developed and ready for the printer, English can be made a world language and increase the production of the world 1,000 percent and make this world a world of superabundance. It can quickly enable the people of the world to produce their own food, clothing, and shelter, and relieve the producers of America of the enormous drain on American food which now is employed to feed the starving throughout the world.

The benefits of this world reform are beyond all present human calculation. I, therefore, appeal to all men to give their immediate support to the extent of their time and to the extent of their charities for 1947 and to the extent of their unemployed funds, that this work may go into immediate action through the organized membership of the United Nations, which is now a going concern.

In making this appeal, I ask no personal favors. I make it as an humble messenger representing the justified hopes of the whole world.

Abuse of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpt from an editorial which appears in today's Washington Post is a timely substantiation of the position I took on the floor yesterday and the day before, during our consideration of the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill and, in particular, of the item which cut almost $600,000 from the Conciliation Service and denied funds for the positions of Director and 101 other employees of that vital service. I trust the Senate Appropriations Committee will see fit to rectify this unfortunate mistake.

ABUSE OF POWER

No alien agent could devise a doctrine more pernicious or more subversive of American political principles than the proposal now being put forward by certain Members of Congress that the appropriation power be used to rule the personnel policies of the executive branch of the Government. If this proposal is permitted to prevail, Congress will have annulled the separation of powers which the framers of the Constitution deemed essential to the maintenance of American freedom. The legislature, designed to serve as one of three coordinate elements of a system delicately balanced to forbid tyranny, will have assumed absolute control through a coup d'etat. The result will be a form of dictatorship—no less dictatorial and no less alien to American traditions if exercised by a group of men than if exercised by one man alone.

If Congress can use its appropriation power to oust, say, the Director of the Conciliation Service, then it could do the same, if it chose, to the Secretary of Labor or even to the President of the United States. And if the Supreme Court interposed a judicial prohibition, Congress might sweep it aside by the same device of withholding the funds requisite to its support. That the power to do this is inherent in the appropriation power does not make the use of it any less evil and despotic. Each element of the tripartite American Government is expected to employ its power with restraint and in conformity with the spirit animating the Constitution. Our political system can survive only as this spirit is respected.

There is a lesser yet by no means negligible danger entailed in the projected congressional usurpation of the executive power to hire and to fire. It tends to make Federal employment intolerable for all but the most docile, insipid, uninspired, and conventional men and women. Any individual whose mind transcends the bounds of narrow political ortndoxy stands liable to dismissal on the ruinous charge of disloyalty to his country. The procedures for loyalty investigation established by the President at least afford oppportunity for review of charges by impartial boards. But what is proposed now is that Congress itself act at once as prosecutor and as jury, proscribing and stigmatizing Federal employees in accordance with the ideological whim of a transient majority.

Tax Bill Hits Poor—Karpinski Says GOP Tax Cut Would Be Gift for Wealthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article that appeared in the Michigan Daily, and also a copy of the letter that was sent to the editor by Louis C. Karpinski, professor of mathematics at the University of Michigan:

The Republican-sponsored $4,000,000,000 tax cut will hand a full silk purse to the wealthy and a sow's ear to the lower income groups, according to Prof. Louis C. Karpinski, of the mathematics department.

Twenty-five million taxpayers will "get a gift of $34 on the average, including the nine million who get nothing," Professor Karpinski said in a statement to the Daily. But only 209,000, the rich minority, will get an average of $1,100 rebate each.

More than one-fifth ($785,500,000) of the $3,840,000,000 reduction will benefit 65,000 men. "Every man of these has a net income of over $60 per working day (not per week)," Dr. Karpinski said, and each of them "gets a rebate of $12,000."

Using figures taken from the Statistics for Income for 1942, published November 1945, Professor Karpinski's analysis is similar to one he presented to the House Ways and Means Committee, debunking the Ruml tax plan in 1943.

Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota, sponsor of the present tax bill, always counts the 9,000,000 who will get nothing "as receiving 37 percent benefit," Dr. Karpinski charged. "They receive nothing, and 37 percent of nothing is still 0, buys no milk."

Professor Karpinski has his own suggestion for tax economy. "A cut of all taxes on incomes below $2,000 net would cut off half the income taxpayers, saving millions of dollars of expense of collection," he said.

INCOME-TAX CUT

To the EDITOR:

What incomes are cut by the Republican Knutson reduction $3,840,000,000 out of $16,000,000,000, 1947 personal income tax:

First of all, 65,000 men get seven hundred eighty and five-tenths millions rebate.

Every man of these has a net income of over $60 per working day (not per week). Every one gets a rebate of $12,000, $40 for 300 working days.

Then 144,000 men get $160,000,000 rebate.

Every man of this group has left after taxes $30 per working day. Every one has a gift of over $900 up to $2,600—average $1,100.

These 209,000 above get $940,000,000 gift; 25,000,000 people under $60 per week ($3,000 per year) get $850,000,000 rebate; 9,000,000 no income tax; 12,000,000 under $1,500 per year net income.

These 25,000,000, 120 men for every 1 that gets about $1,000 gift—the 25,000,000 get a gift of $34 on the average including 9,000,000 who get nothing. KNUTSON always counts these as receiving 37 percent benefit. They receive nothing and 37 percent of nothing is still 0, buys no milk.

Three and four-tenths million people receive 274,000,000 of rebate. This group have net incomes before taxes between $3,000 to $5,000.

One million people (950,000) people receive $284,000,000 of rebate. This group has between $5,000 and $15,000 annual net income before taxes. Everyone receives $284 gift.

The figures above are taken from the Statistics of Income for 1942, published November 16, 1945, but apparently not distributed before 1946.

The infamous Ruml, that minion of the wealthy, talked about the workmen. In the rebate of seven to eight billions the workingman whom Ruml continually mentioned got about $1,000,000 but the wealthy—above $5,000 net income—received six to seven billions.

The ten billions given largely to the wealthy would give every family in America 2 quarts of milk every day for 2 years. The present reduction would furnish milk not only to all the Hottentots for many months, but to all the inhabitants of Africa.

A cut of all taxes on incomes below $2,000 would have cut off half the income taxpayers saving millions of dollars of expense of collection.

LOUIS C. KARPINSKI.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *March 23, 1947.*

Army and Navy Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an editorial from the Millville Republican, which is a very thoughtful approach to the subject of the legislative budget, particularly with reference to the supposed danger of cuts in the military appropriations:

From the War Department and from the Navy Department have come emphatic objections to any attempt by Congress in shading their budget appropriations as presented by President Truman.

We believe that most Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, as well as almost all informed citizens, are acutely aware of the necessity of maintaining an adequate Army and Navy. But it appears to us that Army and Navy officials think Members of Congress and citizens are a gullible lot if they expect us to accept their statements against curtailed expenditures at their face value.

Proposed expenditures for national defense in fiscal 1948 are eleven and a half billion dollars. Secretary of War Patterson has painted a dismaying picture if even $1,000,000,000 is slashed from the Army budget. Secretary of the Navy Forrestal has declared "A reduction in the amount of a half billion dollars would so greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Navy as to render it practically immobile and impotent as an instrument of national policy."

Now that is not keeping the record straight. The difference between an impotent Army and Navy and a potent Army and Navy should not be, and cannot be, in a difference of approximately 15 percent in total expenditures. We surmise that overemphasis has been placed on the curtailment that will have to be made in order to reduce spending from a level that the Army and Navy desire.

It is apparent that expenditures must be greater now than before the war. But a comparison per man in the armed forces shows that in the fiscal year 1939 this was about $3,600. The proposed expenditures per man in fiscal 1948 is $6,900, and in 1945 when we were at war the expenditures per man were less—$6,500.

We fear that the War Department and the Navy Department are not being frank and fair.

How President Truman and leaders of his war party can justify a continuance of wartime spending in many branches of our Federal Government has never been explained. If the administration is made to be more realistic and to forget many of the questionable practices that have crept into our conduct of national affairs, there will be no trouble in reducing the cost of general departments and bureaus by billions of dollars.

Mason and Dixon's Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the Honorable Jennings Randolph, a former Member of the House of Representatives, by Mr. Dale Ireland. This letter contains little-known facts regarding the historical Mason and Dixon's line:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 20, 1947.*

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Recently I participated in a discussion with a group of friends during which a point concerning the Mason-Dixon line was raised. I was amazed at how uncertain most of us were of the pertinent facts concerning this historical line, so at the first opportunity I consulted the World Almanac and my encyclopedia just to obtain the facts as I found them.

This line was surveyed by two English astronomers, Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, between November 15, 1763, and December 26, 1767, to settle a boundary dispute between the descendants of William Penn and the Lords Baltimore. This dispute arose in 1682 when William Penn met Lord Baltimore in the city of New Castle (now Delaware), and was referred to Mason and Dixon in 1760.

The line lies parallel with the latitude at 39°43'26.3". Originally it was marked by milestones, every fifth one bearing the coat of arms of William Penn on one side and that of the Lords Baltimore on the other. It is now accepted as the official boundary between the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania.

The Mason-Dixon line is often referred to as an imaginary line separating the free States from the slave States. This practice started in 1820 when, during the debate on the Missouri Compromise, it was referred to as such by one John Randolph, of Roanoke, Va.

These few minutes of research have shown me that the facts behind even small events in history may prove very interesting.

Respectfully yours,

DALE IRELAND.

The Budget Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, according to the Constitution, appropriations originate in the House, but it looks as though the Senate is assuming this authority when it undertakes to increase the appropriation passed in the House which called for a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the President's proposed budget by voting a reduction of only $4,500,000,000. While this question is being considered by the Senate-House conference committee, I wish to extend my remarks by including an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of February 18, entitled "The Budget Debate":

THE BUDGET DEBATE

Members of Congress differ as to the maximum limit to be set on the amount of money this session will appropriate. A responsible committee has suggested a figure of $31,750,000,000. A middle group would raise this by from $1,000,000,000 to $1,500,000,000. Others believe that President Truman's budget proposal of $37,750,000,000 should not be touched.

This is a significant debate in which both sides advance weighty arguments. There is nothing improper about the existence of differences. The disturbing phase seems to us to lie in the way the matter is being presented to the public through the Washington publicity channels.

The proponents of the lower figure, one might gather from reading and listening, are at the very best a doltish lot of people who fail to understand the true inwardness of things; at the worst their conduct is reprehensible to the point of treason. Certainly many Washington press and radio commentators who mix expressions of opinion with their reporting would leave that impression. Some of the straight news accounts which are supposed to be unbiased scarcely conceal the opinions of their writers.

It is quite true that this country has undertaken some international commitments. It is equally true that to see these commitments through, very large expenditures will be necessary.

However, there are some other things which are equally true. One of them is that the quickest and surest way to render this country impotent in world affairs is to bankrupt it or, short of that, to reduce its productive strength and to injure the morale of its people. And unless the taxes that the people are called upon to pay are reduced and reduced speedily something like that will happen and the happening will not be long delayed.

This newspaper has no disposition to condemn the many excellent men who believe that it is wise to go slow in reducing Government expenditures; there is no reason to question their sincerity. Nevertheless, the preponderant Washington attitude that it is completely wrong even to raise questions concerning that course is a startling manifestation of a flight from all reality. Nothing could render the armed servibes more unpopular than to seem to resist real economies in their operation. Nothing could more quickly produce isolationism than to tell the American people that our foreign policy will require limitless expenditure for an indefinite number of years.

Sometimes we think that periodically people in Washington ought to be required to leave those pleasant surroundings where they congratulate each other on the possession of superlative wisdom and pay a visit to those common folk who dwell in the United States, and, who, incidentally, pay the bills.

The Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HCUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday March 26, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to point out certain matters which are due the Coast Guard for its outstanding war service.

Recent charges against the Coast Guard have been made in the House, particularly against the large budget submitted by the Coast Guard and its grandiose schemes for expansion. Because the Coast Guard estimated sufficient funds properly in its opinion to carry on its peacetime work with the large accumulations of extra functions added to it by executive authority in order to prosecute the war, its estimates have been called a "sordid story of bureaucratic expansion at its worst." "Deep-sea operations of the Coast Guard" has been used as a disparaging epithet and a committee report states:

The committee is firmly convinced that it was never the intention of Congress that the Coast Guard should become a blue-water organization, extending its functions far beyond the coasts of continental United States.

It should be recalled that pursuant to Congressional authority the Coast Guard has maintained an Ice Patrol in the North Atlantic since 1912, derelict searches, and the patrolling of the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea, to name a few of the statutory duties of the Coast Guard away from our coast.

We must remember that at Pearl Harbor this country entered the war with a demoralized, disrupted and severely damaged Navy. From a position of great disadvantage but by the indomitable character of our naval forces we were able, by the smallest margin, to hold our enemies in check until the full weight of our industrial strength could be felt. A noteworthy part was played in these days by the Coast Guard which did not fail in its role on the deep sea or blue waters, but instead sent its cruising cutters across the North Atlantic in the awful winters of the first few years of the war. The Coast Guard lost many men and it lost ships, but it saved lives of merchant seamen from torpedoed ships, adrift and afloat in the icy waters off Iceland, and it safely convoyed ammunition and oil tankers badly needed by our allies. This service expanded its total military personnel of about 19,000 in 1941 to the staggering figure of 171,000 in the latter years of the war. These figures do not include 40,000 or 50,000 temporary reserves guarding our ports and water fronts. No question was then raised of the grandiose ideas of the Coast Guard, but the Congress and the country were proud and grateful for this nucleus of trained personnel that could in a few months expand, train, equip, and put forth a force which took part in every amphibious operation, manned transports carrying troops to every active front, convoyed on every ocean and guarded our coasts as well as our ports and harbors.

Let us not forget that the first capture of the war was made by Coast Guard cutters in the seizure of the sealer *Buskoe* and a German weather station established in Greenland, and that the first German submarine sunk in these waters and prisoners taken was off Charleston on May 9 1942, by the little Coast Guard cutter *Icarus*, designed for prewar rum patrol. Let us not forget those surfmen who, being experts in small boat handling, left the beaches, crossed blue waters, to steer our landing crafts at Guadalcanal and subsequent invasions.

Let us also think temperately regarding the number of brass hats and realize that the Coast Guard on account of the long service of its senior officers, a promotion from commander to captain, to commodore, to rear admiral, is an honor which in many cases brings absolutely no additional emolument and hence costs the Government nothing.

Congress should decide the extent of the activities of the Coast Guard but this service has received an undue amount of adverse criticism for its honest attempt to carry out mandates from higher authority and for its capacity for thoroughly doing them.

Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MONROE M. REDDEN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I received a petition from a group of very outstanding North Carolinians of my district, relating to S. 265, which is a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and broadcasting such advertising over the radio.

This petition is signed by people, most of whom I have known all my life. They represent the Christian ideals which have made this country great, and I ask that their recommendations be given serious consideration.

Undoubtedly, publicity of alcoholic beverages has caused many young men and women to become addicted to the use of alcohol. The advertiser in this line of business is shrewd. He knows the language to use and the pictures to display in order to make his drink appear harmless but yet very enticing.

This type of advertising is a virtual fraud upon the American people. If it has any effect, and we all know that it

does, the effect is in the wrong direction. Why should anyone be permitted to advertise something that is degrading and can only have a bad influence upon the moral and spiritual life of our people.

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the halls of Congress know what the good people think of a few things, and I believe also it is about time for us to heed their appeal.

I have never known of this Congress making a mistake affecting the morals of this Nation when it acted upon the advice of Christian leadership.

The petition follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

Mrs. J. C. Sales, J. C. Sales, Fletcher, N. C.; Roy Schreyer, Arden, N. C.; W. S. Burge, Mrs. W. S. Burge, Hendersonville, N. C.; Mrs. L. C. Clayton, Mrs. Ida Livingstone, Fletcher, N. C.; Mrs. James Lee, Arden, N. C.; Mrs. E. E. King, Mrs. J. W. Parker, J. F. Baldwin, L. C. Youngblood, J. N. Youngblood, C. E. Lance, O. C. Tandy, E. E. King, C. B. Lewis, Fletcher, N. C.; H. E. Hare, Homerene Bagwell, Arden, N. C.; Louise Bagwell, Fletcher, N. C.; Mrs. Perry Greene, Arden, N. C.; Mrs. Idalee Lance, Fletcher, N. C.; Mrs Harley Hare, Mrs. Roy Ashworth, Arden N. C.; L. C. Clayton, Fletcher, N. C.; George W. Lindsey, Mrs. George W. Linsey, N. G. Bagwell, Arden, N. C.; J. K. Bagwell, J. W. Parker, M. J. Spann, Fletcher, N. C.; G. P. Greene, Arden, N. C.; Ira M. Baldwin, Fletcher, N. C.; Mrs. Roy Schreyer, William A. Schreyer, Oak Park, Arden, N. C.

Condemnation of Totalitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday Times, Cumberland, Md., March 23, 1947. This article was written by Rev. P. J. Bradley of Frostburg, Md.:

CONDEMNS TOTALITARIANISM, BE IT CZARIST OR COMMUNIST

EDITOR, SUNDAY TIMES:

A letter from the pen of M. E. Fiske appeared in the Sunday Times March 16. May I ask you kindly to give me space for some comments thereon.

The substance of Mr. Fiske's letter really amounts to a defense of communism. From his letter one would gather that Soviet Russia is a democracy.

Democracy! What sins are committed in thy name.

Clever insidious propaganda to picture communism as the panacea for all the ills of man. In sober truth, communism would degrade men and women to the level of the brute. Atheistic communism, does not believe in God. Therefore with Communists there is no hereafter. So there is no difference between them and animals. The Atlantic Charter promised four freedom to all nations big and small. The Soviet Government has grabbed Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, part of Finland, Poland, and dominates several other countries.

While Hitler and Joe Stalin were bedfellows in the rape of Poland, Communists in this country sabotaged many of our industries.

Their allegiance is to Soviet Russia. They bite the hands that feed them. By their fruits you shall know them.

Why the iron curtain around Russia? Is its purpose to build a terrestrial paradise? I am from Missouri. I feel that the iron curtain is maintained to hide the misery of an enslaved people. Communists are traitors to America, and should be treated as such.

I am glad that America is waking up to the menace and taking appropriate steps to stop communistic aggression. Too many of us have been duped too long. In plain language Soviet Russia is not democratic and its totalitarian policy is ever worse than Hitler's or Mussolini's. I sympathize with the good Russian people who have suffered for many centuries from oppression, first under totalitarian Czars and now under totalitarian Communists. I hope they will soon enjoy the four freedoms promised by the Atlantic Charter.

To all patriotic Americans I say that if we are ever conquered it will be by the foe within, not by the foe outside. Stop, look, and listen before it is too late.

Rev. P. J. BRADLEY.

FROSTBURG, MD.

Soil Conservation in the World Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Dr. H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, before the annual meeting of the Soil Conservation Society of America, Chicago, Ill., on December 12, 1946:

Soil conservation is one of the biggest of all the jobs confronting us. It is as large as the world, as important as anything that remains to be done. It is essential to life and vital to the future of civilization. These are the facts of the matter when you look at the problem as a whole and in true perspective.

Soil conservation is the only known way to protect the productive land of the world. This is the land we depend on for food and fiber, for trade, and for a great many of the most important raw materials of industry. This is the land—our productive land—that we must maintain at all costs. It is the land on which progress depends. It is the land we may also have to look to in order to produce supplemental fuel that we may have to count on if we run short of other sources.

Most important of all, it is the land without which we could not survive. At all times we must have, somewhere in the world, enough good land to produce enough food to feed the families of the world. That is the rock-bottom minimum. Failure to maintain such a minimum would lead us, with the utmost certainty, into the most serious kind of trouble; for good land is an utterly indispensable resource of man.

Actually, we are already in a race. The sides are already drawn. On the one side we are faced with a steadily increasing population. Year after year, even during the war, the number of people on earth has grown larger. No one can say with authority where or when the growth will level off. On the other side, we can see our remaining area of productive land shrinking steadily before the onslaught of erosion.

These are the forces we must deal with. Regardless of what can or should be done about the matter of population, we can and must do something about erosion. No nation—or the world, for that matter—has too much fertile land. Neither the world nor any nation can afford to lose any more productive land. Too many nations have much too little now. In relation to world population, our total ability to produce food has already arrived precariously close to the danger line. In some countries the danger line was crossed long before World War II.

As scientists we must recognize that we have reached a point where the loss of productive land anywhere on the globe affects the people and the nations of every other part of the globe. Also, every acre which goes out of production means that, to some degree, the pressure is increased on the remaining good acres. If this understanding is not reached, and something done about it, those people having insufficient productive capacity will be consigned to a future of poverty and the discord that almost invariably follows. And this is the stuff of which strife is born.

So every acre we protect against erosion in the United States is a step in the right direction, not only for our own individual and national interests, but in the larger terms of humanity.

What I have attempted in this paper is to outline, in a very broad way, the urgency and the size of the soil-conservation job ahead, for the world. It is a vital undertaking which can be delayed too long—has been delayed too long. It is also a task worthy of much more serious thought by responsible officials of individual nations, and the United Nations, without further postponement.

A national magazine, a few weeks ago, called me a gloomy soil-saver, a prophet of doom. Maybe I have sounded that way at times. I must admit there have been periods during the past 25 or 30 years when I have felt pretty gloomy about our soil-saving situation. And you may know I'm not one to keep such feelings to myself. I have tried over the years, as honestly as I have known how, to tell as many people as possible what has been happening to the land. In the beginning I bore down pretty hard on the menace of soil erosion. I couldn't see any reason for hiding a fact which I understood full well as a grave national menace, especially behind a curtain of darkness conducive to complacency and inaction. Lately it has been a very real pleasure to report also on our excellent progress with soil conservation. Two decades ago I must confess there seemed little hope of my ever seeing accomplished even a small fraction of what has been done today.

I have an idea that most of you here tonight have heard me before, perhaps several times. Most of you know the facts about the land. I am not going to repeat them. Instead, I am going to give you my opinions about the future of soil conservation.

First, let me say it is my considered opinion that we are going straight ahead with the Nation-wide job of protecting our agricultural lands from impoverishment or ruin by soil erosion. It is likely to take about 20 years full speed ahead to get the basic conservation measures applied to the land. After that is done, necessary maintenance and improvement work will be required, but this will be comparatively easy and cheap.

Twenty years is not a long time to apply the basic conservation measures to so vast an agricultural area as ours. Nor is it a long time when you remember that we must deal with the land damage which has developed over more than a century of unbridled erosion. As a matter of fact, the achievement of primary protection for our agricultural lands within such a period would be progress at a remarkably rapid rate. I think it can be done.

Second, I want to mention a practical matter of politics. A friend of soil conservation asked me, not so long ago, how the Republican victory in the recent congressional elections would affect the soil conservation program. I imagine some of you have been wondering about the same thing. My answer is that the soil has no politics. Republicans and Democrats alike recognize this fact. The soil conservation program has been, and will continue to be, nonpolitical. It is a well-known fact that members of the Republican Party, in and out of Congress, are among the outstanding supporters of the soil conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service. The work of the Service has not even been controversial; it has been widely recognized as the most effective and practical, as well as the cheapest and most rewarding, program of land improvement and protection we have ever had in the country.

I have full confidence that the new Congress will give maximum cooperation when it comes to soil conservation—comes to saving a resource without which there can be no Congress, no vigorous nation.

Furthermore, in connection with the nonpolitical nature of soil conservation, it should be noted that in soil conservation districts all across the country farmers who vote Republican and farmers who vote Democratic have joined forces, in a thoroughly nonpartisan way, to achieve joint soil conservation objectives and halt the common enemy—soil erosion.

Third, I believe it is important to mention the mental attitude of the people generally, for this has its effect on soil conservation. Today there seems to be a great deal of doubt and concern about the future. People everywhere wonder what tomorrow will bring. They search for something solid and genuine they can count on. Many of the old slogans they once believed in have proven false. Few standards and values remain that are not subject to questioning, especially by the young men and women of our times. These are years of great change and no one can predict the outcome, except that it may be unlike anything we have ever known before.

Out of this frame of mind, a new interest in the land is growing by leaps and bounds. You can notice it on all sides. Men and women who would normally have little or no concern about such a matter as soil erosion are spending great amounts of time and energy to help blot it out. These are signs of the times. People are beginning to see in productive land something that is good and tangible. They have discovered that productive land, properly safeguarded against erosion, is something a man and his family can see, and feel, and count on, to a very great extent, through periods of trouble as well as in years of prosperity. Take care of the land and the land will take care of you is a good way to look at it.

This idea extends beyond the farmer. Throughout our society there is developing a deeper respect and appreciation for productive land as a source of strength and wealth. Not only farmers, but businessmen in the cities and towns across the Nation—manufacturers, merchants, those engaged in transportation, bankers, professional people—are putting their support and influence behind the job of real soil conservation. The same is true of educators and the church, of the newspapers, the broadcasters, and the magazines. Indeed, for a great many people, soil conservation has taken on the stature of a great national crusade and action program.

Back of it all, I believe, is the growing realization that productive land is one of the real foundations on which a people can build and prosper. I think this is part of a new American attitude toward life which is emerging out of the trials of the recent war, the great depression of the thirties, and the unprecedented midcontinental drought of the same period.

I hardly need add that men and women who recognize the true worth of productive land will not stand idly by and permit erosion to ruin it; these people will be soil conservationists.

Fourth on my list, though in many respects first in importance, is the unprecedented development of soil-conservation districts. Brought into being by the votes of farmers and controlled by the farmers themselves, these districts have proven to be a popular and a powerful force for soil conservation. With the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service available to them, they are getting the job done effectively, scientifically, democratically, and, by all reasonable standards, permanently.

Next year, some of the districts will celebrate their tenth anniversaries. While it may have escaped the attention of some, this audience should take particular note that soil conservation districts are now an established part of the American system of Government—self-government. Their experimental days are over; they are a fast-maturing institution to be reckoned with. In the months and years ahead, you can count on them to make known their wishes with respect to soil conservation.

Two months from now, in this city, I am informed, the permanent organization of a National Association of Soil Conservation District Governing Bodies will be completed. This association, with direct lines of communication to the soil conservation districts of the country, is dedicated to the advancement of soil conservation through the spread of understanding and education. I am confident its work and influence will be felt.

My fifth point concerns the Soil Conservation Services. And right at the outset, I want to say publicly that I am 100 percent proud of the service and the men and women who compose it. I am proud of their record during the war and I am proud of their record in getting soil conservation measures on the land in yearly increasing amount and of steadily good quality. They have stuck to their job and maintained a spirit of public service which I claim is not surpassed anywhere.

The Service has worked for and won the respect and confidence of the farmers. As a flat statement, I say the farmers like the way the Service works. They like the Service program, which is carried on cooperatively with the individual farmer, not indoors, but out in his own fields, pastures, wood lots, gullies, idle lands, where the job of conservation must be done. The steady, rapid growth and continued active cooperation of soil-conservation districts with the Service all over the country is the clearest proof, as I see it, of the favorable farmer reception of our program.

Further, the Service has won the support and the confidence of citizens, organizations, and business concerns far from the farms. We have won it on the demonstrated basis of getting a necessary job done well, with frugal use of money, full regard for the rights and preferences of the individual, and a policy of productive cooperation and sticking to our knitting.

In short, the Service has the backing of the people of the country. We are proud of this support, and aim to keep it by continuing to earn it. As the technical arm of the soil-conservation program now moving ahead so splendidly in all parts of the Nation, in cooperation with soil-conservation districts, the support and confidence of the people is a factor of the utmost importance. It is a constant spur and stimulus, under friendly conditions, to greater effort, higher quality, and faster progress.

I can't resist telling a story here, as a kind of aside, about an incident of several years ago. On very short notice one day, I was called into the office of one of the top officials of the Government. He was smiling when I got there, so when he asked me how I was feeling, I told him I was doing pretty well.

"Dr. Bennett," he said, "how is the Soil Conservation Service getting along?"

I told him I thought it was doing all right. Things weren't perfect, I added, but the job was getting ahead in good fashion.

"I thought so," he said. "The Service must be doing a really good job. Somebody else wants to absorb you. I've noticed something about the Government. Every time an agency does an outstandingly good job, there's always a move by someone else to take it over. That seems to be the penalty of success."

It wasn't hard to agree. In retrospect, it seems that somebody has always been trying to take over or absorb the Soil Conservation Service. The attempts are still being made, but with each passing month I think they are less likely to succeed.

Getting back to my estimate of the immediate future for soil-conservation work, however, I would summarize by saying the prospects look good. The major, important factors are favorable to a sustained, strengthened program in the years just ahead. Farmers are approving the program and speaking out for it. They are steadily organizing new soil-conservation districts and are making established districts work in a manner that is most gratifying. Urban and educational interests of all kinds are stanch backers of the program. The indications are that Congress will continue its support and perhaps even strengthen it. And I know the Soil Conservation Service stands high in the regard of the people generally. They know that we have stuck to our job from the very beginning.

Tonight, you see, I cannot be called a gloomy soil-saver.

Even though the future may look promising, I think it is scarcely necessary to remind you that now is not the time for soil conservationists to rest on any fancied laurels. Like liberty, the price of opportunity is eternal vigilance. And eternal work. First and most important it is necessary to maintain and improve quality and keep up a good rate of progress. And there may always be a few who would like to wreck the program on one pretext or another; some, I am afraid, would like to take it over—even though they never knew anything about the erosion problem in the beginning and never at any time raised a hand to do a single thing to get the program under way.

During the next 20 years I look for the United States to make the greatest soil conservation effort that's ever been undertaken in history. I look for the United States to become the first major Nation in the world to take the steps necessary for effectuating permanent protection of its irreplaceable soil resource. This is not just wishful thinking. It is based on my belief in the good business judgment of the people and the Congress of the Nation.

Consider this: The cost of not going ahead with a scientific, acre-by-acre, soil conservation program during the next 20 years, as we have planned, would probably amount to not less than $20,000,000,000. That means

the cost of inaction would average out at around $1,000,000,000 a year. This is the minimum price we would pay for not doing the job, as well as can be estimated. The chances are the bill would run higher. It would be levied against us in terms of reduced yields, lost plant food, and reduced productive capacity, increased flood damage, increased damage to highways and railroads, increased silting of rivers and harbors, etc. Furthermore, always remember that those losses which permanently reduce productive capacity cannot be calculated. How can you place a proper value on a lost productive capacity which would have produced commodities over many scores or hundreds of years?

By contrast, the cost of doing the job—of protecting the indispensable soil and water resources of our farm lands—would be a great deal less. In all probability, the total cost of doing the job would be less than one-third the cost of not doing the job.

The Federal Government's share of the cost of protecting our farm land soil and water resources during the next 20 years would amount to about one-twelfth of the Nation's total bill if the conservation job is not done.

And remember, too, that after the 20-year period—after the basic conservation measures are applied to the land—the bulk of the job will be finished. After that is done, necessary maintenance and improvement work will be much easier and cheaper.

What a frightful lack of foresight, and what terribly false economy it would be, if we did not go ahead with the soil-conservation job!

Let's now consider it from another point of view—that of our continued existence as a healthy, productive Nation, capable of standing steadily, effectively on its own strong feet. In this light, soil conservation is one of the two most necessary jobs confronting the country. The other—equal in importance—is to keep the Nation out of another war. Failure in either will cost the life substance of our civilization.

The 20-year period for completing the basic work of conservation could be extended, but at the same time the cost would be extended and increased. Moreover, if we postponed and put off in this way for too long, our supply of good land would dwindle to a level insufficient for our national needs. If we were to turn from scientific soil conservation and adopt the costly, unscientific practice of applying poultices of alleviation to the patient, we would wind up probably in less than a hundred years with the outright loss of the productive capacity of at least 50,000,000 additional acres (500,000 one-hundred-acre farms) and severe damage to all but about 100,000,000 acres of our best land.

We couldn't continue to function as a healthy, sound Nation under such inconceivable circumstances. We would be a sick Nation in many ways and year after year we would have to look abroad, to foreign lands, for the food to feed ourselves.

On the other hand, within 20 years we could do the basic or main conservation job on 400,000,000 acres of cropland and 600,000,000 acres of other kinds of farmland needing treatment at a maximum cost of $2 an acre as an average for governmental—assistance—Federal and State—and a maximum cost of $4 an acre as an average to the farmers of the country. I say these would be "maximum costs" because accruing benefits of the work would sharply reduce these cost figures to both the Government and the farmers. The benefits might equal or even exceed the cost in that time; they would certainly exceed costs within a few years after completion of this job.

So, from the standpoint of national economy and our survival as a productive nation, there is no valid alternative to a strengthened soil-conservation program of the kind now being advanced through soil-conservation districts. I feel sure the Nation will insist on it.

What else will be happening, with respect to the land, during the next 20 years, and in the 30 years thereafter? Some of the developments, I think, can be foreseen with fair clarity. Here in the United States, for example, conservation of soil and water resources will first become a major national objective and then it will become an accepted, customary part of the American conduct of affairs.

With few exceptions, each acre will be treated according to its needs and used according to its capabilities. This will become a fundamental practice among American farmers. I am sure of this because no other method of handling the land will protect it against erosion or insure its continued productivity. That is a certainty based on the physical facts involved with our complex conditions of land, climate, and types of agriculture.

Agricultural production will be more diversified and the per-acre yields will be increased, both here and in other countries practicing soil conservation.

That other nations around the world will adopt soil and water conservation measures must be regarded as a foregone conclusion. The overwhelming urge of mankind for survival dictates such a course. Before many more years have passed it will become at once apparent and imperative to all that every remaining productive acre must be handled in such a way that it will continue to produce indefinitely.

As a result of soil and water conservation work, agricultural production will be restored or improved in millions of communities througthout the world. This, in turn, will help solve to a considerable degree some of the most pressing problems of famine, food distribution, and human nutrition now confronting mankind.

The development of land and water resources for agriculture—as by drainage or irrigation—will be governed primarily by factual, technological elements of land use and land maintenance, rather than by promotional, exploitive, or political standards.

Some of the fantastic patterns of land ownership, such as can be found in parts of Europe and Asia, and even to a limited extent in parts of the United States, will be corrected. The operation of very narrow segments of land, resulting from progressive axial division among heirs, does not permit the owner to engage in economic production or practical soil-conservation work.

Various governmental encouragements, such as preferential real-estate tax rates during the period of applying soil-conservation measures, may possibly be adopted.

Farming will tend to become an expert profession; the inexpert and the inept are likely to be forced gradually off the land.

Most important, man will have learned the true value of his irreplaceable most priceless natural resource—productive land.

The groundwork has been laid. Ahead, for soil conservationists and for the science of soil conservation, is one of the biggest, most interesting, and rewarding jobs ever undertaken for the improved welfare of mankind.

At this point I am going to propose an eight-point soil- and water-conservation program for the United States and a six-point program for the world, which I believe soil conservationists and other scientists interested in natural resources, as well as responsible citizens everywhere, can subscribe to readily. I will not undertake to enlarge on these points here, except to state that they are based on the pioneering experience in soil and water conservation that we have had to date in the United States.

For conservation of soil and water resources on the farmlands of the United States I propose:

1. An acceleration of the soil- and water-conservation program, through soil-conservation districts, on the basis of the needs and capabilities of the land itself. The program should be geared to complete, within the next 20 years, the basic conservation measures required to maintain and improve the productivity of the farmlands of the Nation.

2. The drainage of some 30,000,000 acres of good land to improve the production of that part now in cultivation, and to bring into cultivation, as needed, certain areas now too wet for tillage of any kind, although consisting of potentially high-class cropland. Much of this wet land is in soil conservation and drainage districts and most of it already has been cleared for cultivation. (Such drainage work would help toward a needed shift away from cultivation on an equivalent or larger acreage of steep, erodible upland, which should go out of cultivation and into a permanent protective cover of trees, grass, or legumes.)

3. The rehabilitation, development, and better utilization of land and water resources on approximately 12,000,000 acres, largely in subhumid areas.

4. Purchase by States, soil-conservation districts, or the Federal Government, of lands in hazardous areas which are in acute need of protection for soil and water conservation, especially where proper treatment cannot be accomplished by individual farmers. When such lands have been properly treated and brought into productive use, the policy should be to sell them to responsible buyers on the open market, with adequate safeguards, as to use, for their continued productivity.

5. Quick completion of a land-capability survey of all the farm lands of the country.

6. A broadened educational program, through the school and university system of the country, and through all other appropriate avenues for the dissemination of information, to acquaint children and adults alike with the importance, condition, and needs of their basic agricultural resources.

7. The initiation of scientific investigations, on a comprehensive basis, into the relationship between soil health, with particular emphasis on the effects of erosion, and human health and nutrition. Authoritative information on this promising approach to human betterment is wholly inadequate.

Separate Field Operations for Military Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following copy of a letter from the New England Council and a report of the New England Council Aviation Subcommittee on the Investigation of the Desirability of Separate Field Operations for Military Aircraft:

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
Boston, March 24, 1947.

Hon. H. SEELY-BROWN, Jr.,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SEELY-BROWN: A report of a subcommittee of the New England Council's aviation committee recommending separate commercial and military airports to

insure safe and efficient operations is enclosed herewith for your consideration.

The committee, which has been studying the situation for the past year, is of the unanimous opinion that "operation of military aircraft from civilian fields in New England would seriously weaken civilian aviation and interfere with the safety of air-line operations without furnishing the National Guard and Reserve Air Force units suitable bases from which to carry on efficient training operations."

The committee further recommends that "in any New England State where no airport suitable for military operations exists, or where the use of such an airport would be detrimental to civilian aviation, the Federal Government should take steps to construct a suitable airport for the use of military aviation."

The importance of continuing a strong national defense air system was a basic consideration of the committee. Factors which led the committee to make its study included the pending activation of National Guard air squadrons, increased flying activity of the Air Force Reserves, and the assignment of jet-propelled aircraft to military fields in the region.

The entire aviation committee of the New England Council, which is composed of representatives of New England business, supports the recommendations of its subcommittee and urges that it be given the very serious attention of military, Federal, and State officials concerned with the development of aviation.

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS S. MURPHY,
Chairman.

REPORT OF NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL AVIATION COMMITTEE'S SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE DESIRABILITY OF SEPARATE FIELD OPERATIONS FOR MILITARY AIRCRAFT

In the investigation of the desirability of maintaining separate field operations for military aircraft, your committee has from the start of its investigation, kept two salient thoughts always in mind:

1. That the national defense must not be relegated to a secondary position.

2. That the ever-present hazards of civilian flying must be minimized by a network of all feasible safety regulations designed to guard against these hazards.

In arriving at its recommendations your committee has talked with many officials connected with both civilian and military flying, with air-line officials, civilian and military pilots—men of wide experience and sound judgment.

The over-all program of national defense as regards the Army Air Forces calls for a strong National Guard air arm, made up of groups and squadrons, and a large AAF Reserve of air crews and ground personnel, as our first line of reserve.

These National Guard and Reserve units are to be equipped with late-model pursuit, bombardment, and reconnaissance aircraft. Such pursuit aircraft as the P–51 Mustang and the P–80 Jet, together with fast twin-engine attack bombers have already been assigned.

Military flying differs from civilian flying in that the safety factor, both in the aircraft and in the type of operation, has of necessity been subordinated to the accomplishment of the missions for which the aircraft are intended.

This committee feels that whereas there should be no appreciable increase in the hazards to civilian flying by the use of civilian airports by military pilots flying primary, basic, or advanced military training planes, for the purpose of maintaining their flight proficiency, or by flight operations of Civil Air Patrol, the operation of military aircraft on tactical training missions, from civilian airports that are used by air lines and/or for nonscheduled flight operations by commercial, private, or student pilots, would, in its opinion, result in tremendous increase to the hazards of flight at and near the airport. In addition to interfering with the economics of civilian airport operations by interruptions of both scheduled and nonscheduled flights, it would also result in a lowering of morale among the military personnel, who would be obliged to carry on military training operations under conditions that at best are "a court of last resort" as far as military proficiency is concerned.

Relatively slow, comparatively small civilian aircraft together with air liners, operating under a network of CAA safety regulations, simply will not mix with fast military aircraft, operating on tactical training missions governed by Army Air Force regulations, without a tremendous hazard to all concerned.

The committee thoroughly understands that the national defense comes first and that air power has become our first line of defense. However, there can be no such thing as true air power without a strong and healthy civil aviation and an air-line system second to none. Military aviation is really the spearhead of the over-all picture called air power.

In the opinion of this committee, operations of military aircraft from civilian fields in New England would seriously weaken civilian aviation and interfere with the safety of air-line operations, without furnishing the National Guard and Reserve Air Force units suitable bases from which to carry on efficient training operations, thus weakening the broad over-all picture of air power and the national defense.

The committee realizes that whereas suitable airports, from which purely military training operations could be carried on, exist in some of the New England States; in others, setting aside a suitable airport for the sole use of the military, would result in a severe set-back to civilian aviation.

Bearing in mind that our whole military air defense plan is predicated on a strong and efficient National Guard and Reserve air arm, the committee recommends, that in any New England States where no airport suitable for military operation exists, or where the use of such an airport would result to the detriment of civilian aviation, the Federal Government should take steps to construct a suitable airport for the use of military aviation. Such action should be considered a part of the Nation's first line of defense, even as the Federal Government has taken steps to build armories, where none have existed before.

In submitting their report, the committee is unanimous in the belief that the use of civilian airports in New England by our military air arm, whether it be Regular, Reserve, or National Guard, engaged in tactical training operations, could only result in greatly increasing the ever-present hazards of flying to all concerned, and in a severe lowering of efficiency of both civilian and military flying operations, and that therefore, civilian airports should not be used as bases from which to conduct military-training operations.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN F. BROWN,
Chairman.

MARCH 6, 1947.

NOTE.—Members of the council's aviation subcommittee making this report were: Col. John F. Brown, chairman, wing commander, New Hampshire Civil Air Patrol, Concord, N. H.; Milton V. Smith, president, Northeast Aviation Co., Portland, Maine and W. Allen Traver, president, Franklin Process Co., Providence, R. I. Francis S. Murphy, publisher of the Hartford Times, Hartford, Conn., is chairman of the council's aviation committee.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a thoughtful letter from Mr. Ernest T. Weir, of Pittsburgh, Pa., as follows:

The proposal of President Truman with regard to Greece and Turkey confronts the United States with one of the gravest questions in its history.

Acceptance of that proposal involves complete reversal of our long-standing policy in foreign affairs. It involves intervention and participation in and responsibility for the internal affairs of other nations. It involves an economic drain on the people of this country which, from a relatively small beginning, may proceed to an extent which no one can now foresee. More than that, it involves employment of the military power of the United States—again apparently on a small initial scale but again also with no predictable limits. It projects this country directly into the complexes of both Europe and the Middle East under circumstances which may well lead to war.

It has not been established why it is to the vital interest of the United States to take this step. Nor, if it can be conceded that the vital interest of our country is actually affected, has there been any revelation of the facts in this situation that make hasty action imperative.

All that the Congress or the people have been given is the President's assertion that the vital interest of the United States is involved and that immediate action is essential. And the President's address is much more remarkable for its vagueness and resort to generalities than for any light it has shed on the reasons for making it.

As a matter of plain common sense, however serious the straits of Greece and Turkey, they cannot become too much worse in the time that will be required for the open and thorough discussion of this situation which alone can give the American people the opportunity to know what they are being asked to do, what the material cost will be, and what commitments of other natures are to be made in their name.

It is the plain duty of Members of Congress to prevent hasty action—to insist that all the facts are made known—to see that these facts are laid before the people in understandable terms—and finally, to take action in the light of the facts and the expressed will of the people.

Members of Congress can serve no good purpose by premature and ill-considered statements of opinion. Such, for instance, as the one attributed to Senator VANDENBERG to the effect that we must uphold the hands of the President. Certainly, our history gives abundant evidence that Presidents can make mistakes. The welfare of the country is always a consideration of far greater moment than support of the President in either national or international affairs.

Twice in a single generation our country has become involved in the wars of others. In each case, the American people endured the suffering and sacrifice of war for lofty ideals. In neither case have they seen those ideals realized. On the contrary, this country emerged from each war weaker than it entered, and after each war the world in general was in a worse condition than before. We lost men and wealth, we exhausted irreplaceable natural resources, and we bred

conditions that caused widespread dissatisfaction and doubt among the American people concerning their principles of government and way of life.

Intrinsically, we are a weaker nation today than ever before in our history. We appear strong only by contrast with a prostrate world. In this weakened condition are we now to embark on a new adventure about which we know nothing, but which may lead first to war and second to the final demoralization of the world and the disappearance of the slightest hope for an orderly society?

The two World Wars caused the virtual destruction of the great British Empire. Is that not a sufficient example to make us pause before starting down a road which may lead to the same end?

The President said:

"There is no other country (except the United States) to which democratic Greece can turn."

What does this statement mean? That no other country cares anything about Greece as a democratic country? That no other country cares enough to help alleviate the physical want of her people? Or that no other country has the resources to extend aid?

Under any interpretation, the implication of the President's words are far-reaching. There are 2,000,000,000 people in this world. Out of this number can the 140,000,000 people who comprise our Nation be the only ones who can assume the burdens of weaker countries? Is it a practical possibility? If so, can we do it, or even attempt to do it without destroying ourselves?

The President said:

"The United States contributed $341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II. This is an investment in world freedom and world peace."

Where is the freedom and where is the peace? Is the world we have today the kind of a return on investment that justifies the beginning of a new outpouring of funds?

The President said:

"The assistance that I am recommending for Greece and Turkey amounts to little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of this investment."

Does the President or anyone else think for a moment that the amount he proposes will be the whole amount? Obviously, $400,000,000 will be only the start. It will be followed by other millions and billions in those countries and in other countries which, with Greece and Turkey as precedents, will make claims on our generosity.

The President said:

"The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by the Communists."

If a government is so weak that it cannot cope with several thousand armed men under any leadership, there is no reason to conclude: (1) that if many of the people of the country do not actually sympathize with the several thousand they at least do not care much one way or another, and (2) there is little that an outside power can do to aid such a government.

If we take this action in Greece, we will in effect say to Russia, "We are opposed to communism and intend to help the governments of Greece and Turkey oppose it." Under the circumstances, is not Russia likely to reply, "You are free to do that, but if you do, we will take measures of our own to support communism." It must be remembered that Russia has many means, short of war, to foster the spread of communism; many more, in fact, than we have to oppose it. Unpalatable as the idea is, we must also realize that many people in countries throughout the world look with favor on communism and regard it as a superior form of government. In our own country, we have a Communist movement which is far from large, yet there is little we can do to halt its acceptance by some of our people. You cannot stop a political growth any more than you can stop a religious growth—particularly by use of force. And the adventure in Greece, whatever its other aspects, is basically a use of force.

At Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, commitments were made for the American people without their knowledge or consent. Secrecy was excused by those who indulged in it on the ground that it was essential to war security. Yet there is little doubt today that those secret deals, in which a few men around a table played with the destiny of nations, were important causes of the world's present condition. There is no excuse now—not even a lame one—for asking the American people to move blindfolded and in haste into a situation of most serious consequence. Certainly the time has come to end secret diplomacy.

The urgency, the need for haste which the President so strongly emphasized has an artificial quality. It smacks of the rush act of the high-powered salesman. Britain accepted Greece as a responsibility during and after the war. Admitting that Britain's economic condition is unhealthy, why does it suddenly become absolutely impossible for her to continue that responsibility beyond the outside date of March 31, just 19 days after the President's address. Would Britain collapse if she stayed in Greece until April 30 or May 31? Or was an almost immediate date selected to force Americans to act before they could think?

Although it has been mentioned only in passing, the thing of paramount importance in this entire matter to the United States and her people is the interest of the United States, not only the immediate interest but also long-range interest. Certainly if it is not in the interest of this country to take a step, then there can be no other good reason for it in Greece, Europe, the Middle East or elsewhere. With its present huge debt and the other weakening influences of the war, the United States should regard any commitment with caution. This caution should be doubled and redoubled in the face of a step as grave as that into Greece with all the implications of a continuing economic drain if not the actual threat of another war. Might not the United States best contribution to the world be the rebuilding of her own strength so that she can in fact remain the strongest bulwark of free government?

These questions should be resolved before we take an action which may prove to be a costly gamble. Today, the American people do not have the information on which to base either support or rejection of the President's proposal. Congress alone has the power, and it must exercise that power, to see that the people get the facts—all the facts.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST T. WEIR.

Icebound American Seamen Plead for Fair Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from 230 American seamen who are on five ships which are icebound at Karlskrona, Sweden, where they have been since last January. These seamen have asked me to bring to the attention of Congress a resolution which they adopted at a mass meeting held in the frozen harbor where their ships are stranded.

Following is the resolution and the names of the seamen who signed it:

To the Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States of America:

We, who are members of the merchant marine of the United States of America, want to go on record, that is to be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following resolution regarding antilabor legislation.

We feel that certain individuals who are affiliated with big business are not fulfilling their honor and integrity in dealing with measures regarding labor.

"*Resolved*, That Senate bill 70, which was passed by the House, is very detrimental to all forms of labor. There is no need to quote the Gwynne bill to you, as already you are familiar with it.

"The following bills which also deal with antilabor are as follows: S. 55, Taft-Smith-Ball bill; S. 105, Antiunion Security bill; S. 133, Antibargaining bill; S. 316, Wagner Act amendments.

"Gentlemen, we who are members of the undersigned labor unions who have chosen their respective bargaining agents as their intermediary officers and who wish to keep these officers to act for us between labor and industry want to go on file as against these bills.

"This bill known as the Case bill, H. R. 725, is another antilabor bill which is being pushed through against the wishes of the working people. After all, the working people means us. Will you deprive us of a living which we earn, by trying to lower the standards of our labor unions? When you do this you are denying us our right to exist as a democracy on which our country was founded. We ask in all fairness to us to vote against this bill.

"H. R. 17, 34, 68, 75, and 76: These antilabor bills that have been proposed by five Republican Congressmen give the President the power to break strikes which are our only means of action after negotiations have failed. We do not ask for the impossible. We only ask that our employers give us a decent livable wage so that we may be able to support ourselves and our families. Striking is a method of freedom of speech which cannot be denied any American. We demand that these measures be defeated in the interests of national welfare.

"Our labor unions have kept faith with us, the working people; we want to keep faith with them. Do not deny us this right; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the method that American shipowners are using in registering their ships under foreign flags and thus denying American seamen of a livelihood should be stopped immediately. This is a very deplorable situation and unless the Congress of the United States takes action in this matter, our American merchant marine will cease to exist; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the situation regarding the use of 50 of our Liberty ships to transport supplies to and from the country of Germany, using German seamen, should not be tolerated. By doing this you are creating a severe unemployment situation amongst the seamen of the United States."

Members of the following seamen's unions have signed this resolution. All are members of the crews: National Maritime Union; Seafarers International Union of North America; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards; Marine Firemen, Oilers, Wipers, and Watertenders Union of the Pacific Coast; Sailors Union of the Pacific; Marine Engineers Beneficial Association; National Organization of the Masters, Mates, and Pilots; American Communications Association.

S. S. *Clarksville Victory*. Richard V. Klemens, Alfred J. Weaver, Ohio; Daniel J. Gallezzo, Massachusetts; Leon H. Manucy,

Florida; Matthew Cravaglia, Rhode Island; Edward McKnight, Florida; Rudolph J. Nelson, Virginia; Marion T. Loomas, Vincent McCloud, William E. Walters, Ernest Coklup, Florida; Olive Guthrie, New York; W. E. Hampton, Florida; Walter Olinez, Maryland; Joseph Sharp, Virginia; Earl Walker, Georgia; Dan Newman, Maryland; Manuel Quirino, Florida; H. Pollard, New York; Arthur Maxwell, Georgia; C. Caswell, Joseph Sugg, Florida; Herschel Forrester, Kansas; Augustus C. Sides, Ohio; Roderick W. McCaffrey, Louisiana; Robert E. Patter, California; George E. Jorgenson, Virginia; J. N. Bucholz, New York; J. E. Brammen, Massachusetts; Lloyd G. Bouch, Louisiana; Lawrence O. Posey, North Carolina; Richard W. Fulsaas, California; Edwin A. Foderingham, New York; F. H. Parsons, Ohio; H. C. Roper, South Carolina; Albert E. Smith, New York; Berry E. Talburt, Louisiana; Roland H. Clark, Ohio; Kenneth V. Ryan, California; William Smith, Lester Green, Georgia; Walter Kirkland, Florida; James A. Loberson, W. J. Hickey, New York; John R. Cooper, Virginia; Richard Spivey, North Carolina; James Grant, John D. Cole, Leon Small, Edward E. Myrick, Boyd V. Suber, Jr., Georgia; John Machavych, Pennsylvania.

S. S. *South Bend Victory:* W. R. Chernault, M. S. Maxwell, Maryland; J. Sczygiel, Michigan; R. J. Keck, S. H. Beuke, Missouri; M. J. Laws, Idaho; John C. Bond, Maryland; John Becca, Ohio; Ernest E. Franklin, Virginia; Lewis Humphries, North Carolina; D. E. Smith, South Carolina; Robert G. Gambrill, Charles Glanville, Maryland; Jack D. Wise, North Carolina; Douglas E. Treadway, South Carolina; Ral H. Thompson, Kentucky; Harold G. Kelly, Maryland; Peter Hrenyo, Pennsylvania; John Sanches, Hawaii; Frederick W. Kroll, Florida; Heywood B. Fivey, California; Michael J. Harty, Jr., New York; Boyd Myron Aldrich, Florida; George W. Moores, Maryland; Walton C. Thompson, Virginia; T. L. Brozier, H. A. Wertz, Maryland; Alan Brown, Pennsylvania; Karl R. Trisdale, North Carolina; Robert B. Harper, Georgia; Robert L. Harrell, Virginia; Robert Maflom, Massachusetts; Lester W. Beuce, Georgia; Marvin L. Wright, Virginia; Robert L. Kayl, Missouri; W. G. Breedlove, Georgia; Gerald R. Wheatly, Florida; Bert Price, Missouri; Claude J. Hill, Georgia.

Steamship *Morgantown Victory:* James Phelan, Iowa; Clarence Hawkins, Virginia; Giulbourne Carnes, Georgia; Clarence R. Johnson, Indiana; Thomas E. Darieng, Georgia; LeGrand Corley, South Carolina; Samuel H. McBurney, Michigan; Robert L. Harris, Virginia; Johnnie Lee Hunter, Georgia; Huey Roy McGehee, California; Max M. Mizzelle, North Carolina; Richard A. Hargett, Georgia; Sam J. Beasley, North Carolina; Willie Wright, Willie Jones, Florida; Leroy Johnson, Georgia; Zygmount Horofs, New Jersey; Edward W. Dobson, North Carolina; Herman C. Parker, Willis Albight, Georgia; John H. Squire, North Carolina; Othello H. Williams, James Harley, Georgia; Eugene W. Jarvis, Virginia; Henry Fenner, Woodrow Ferguson, Georgia; LeRoy Ryan, Missouri; Joseph L. Neeland, Virginia, Daniel Woods, Robert Brown, Georgia; Robert Jones, Louisiana, Kenneth J. Rufener, Ohio; Ramand E. Pitt, Georgia; Oswell Varador, Louisiana; Robert E. Lee, Georgia; Doss Pearson, Washington, D. C.; Oscar Osmund, Elmer Osmund, Virginia; Herbert R. Hall, North Carolina; Edwin E. Daniel, Georgia; W. T. Kosyk, New York; James F. Underwood, Alabama; Thurmen Hoff, Jr., Georgia; Wayne F. Staley, North Carolina; Bruland Spalberg, New York.

Steamship *John Whitter:* M. Henry, B. R. Scott, California; Arne Mackie, Minnesota; Sabino Agueror, New York; Lee E. Moore, Kansas; Dan Reynolds, Utah; Charles B. Hamilton, Louis Hollins, William A. Sargent, Harold M. Redfield, William T. McCauley, California; Robert Nelsen, New York; Louis E. Bishop, New Jersey; Jacob Reiken, South Dakota; Fred A. Gould, Arkansas; Dimitios Foutrakis (alien), Greece; George T. Pollard, Ohio; Narciso Lopez, California; Floro de Souza, New York; Edward J. Cammack, Kentucky; Clifton Bollong, Ho Ming Tak, L. F. Barnett, Andrew Calmese, Jr., Charles E. Walker, California; Sam Moran, Ralph B. Watson, Arizona; Thomas Sydon, Pennsylvania; J. Revels, Ashton H. Reeves, California.

Steamship *Mount Whitney:* S. J. Samcrash, Connecticut; William Everett, New Jersey; Severn Hughes, North Carolina; Robert James, Washington; William M. Summet, Virginia; Edwin M. Nifong, Ralph Faircloth, North Carolina; Hobart Smith, Ohio; Jabian Boyce, Virginia; Julian R. Hamilton, Robert B. Fitch, North Carolina; W. O. Bolling, Virginia; R. F. Corter, Florida; Kenneth W. McGraw, Arkansas; Frank Edmonds, North Carolina; Lloyd D. Richardson, Virginia; Billy C. Doby, North Carolina; Henry Kennedy, Washington; Ralph Watts, North Carolina; Melvin Fisher, California; John W. Perry, Calvert Teamer, Jerome Leonard, James M. Howe, Virginia; John Pietz, Oklahoma; V. V. Marshall, North Carolina; Felix Kleinhamph, Bohemia; R. Balman, Illinois; LeRoy Haskins, North Carolina; Roy M. Green, Missouri; Lewis Fuller, Georgia; Mathew W. Bates, Virginia; F. B. Hogab, Georgia; Frank Boyd, William E. Runn, Virginia; Arthur H. Ehusole, California; S. Scott Morris, Maryland; E. R. Chappell, Virginia; Fred C. Prior, North Carolina; Leonard Sears, Louisiana; William C. Walter, New York; Carl Schwartz, Maryland.

Long-Range Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 26, 1947, entitled "Wanted: A Long-Range Foreign Policy":

WANTED: A LONG-RANGE FOREIGN POLICY

Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson has indicated that we may have to pour quite a few millions into southern Korea. The object: to overcome conditions created by the usual overriding iron-curtain type of Russian domination in the northern half of that haplessly "liberated" country.

This suggestion calls for a very long leap from the admittedly acute and imperative problems presented in Greece and Turkey to Korean difficulties which may still be susceptible of localized adjustments.

And, on the broader implications, we doubt that the national purposes of the American people or their pocketbooks are capable of traversing the tremendous distances both might be required to go in order to set up a system of dollar defenses at every global point where we might see or fear the Red tide.

It is essential, therefore, to have more than the present deeply disturbing glimpse of where we are headed. We have got to see clearly. American foreign policy must be well considered, well planned. It must not be a mere hopeful course of action, reacting to emergencies, but a thoughtful design. It must reflect the highest honesty of which we as a people are capable. And it must be wisely designed for the long pull of hard years ahead.

Very nearly every American, we are satisfied, has a pretty correct idea of the situation in Greece. The country is financially prostrate. It is torn by civil strife. The evidence is overwhelming that this has been fostered by Red intrigue and the overt acts of unfriendly Communist-dominated nations above the northern Greek border.

Britain, struggling with her own economic distress, is forced to withdraw financial and military aid hitherto accorded to Greece. We know what impends. If we don't shove in with our money communism will take over. And it wouldn't stop there. It would gobble up Turkey and instantly dominate or overrun the whole Middle East.

Should we let all this go, the entire world balance, already so delicate, would fall heavily toward the side of Soviet Russia. The problems of peace and recovery would then assuredly become infinitely more complicated than they now are; perhaps impossible of solution.

Admittedly, therefore, the United States has an emergency on its hands—no time for exhaustive debate, less time to drop it in the laps of the United Nations.

Either we must act about Greece and Turkey, pour in our millions, or turn our backs and let the Soviet landslide go its way.

But beyond this emergency we must carefully consider our road. Shall we be called upon to carry on a dollar crusade against communism at every threatened spot on the earth? Are we to take care of all of Britain's problems and interests—in India, for instance? Neither blunderingly nor designedly should we follow such a course.

The power and resources—the dollars, if one pleases—of the United States will probably have to be expended lavishly in many parts of the world to aid struggling peoples and, we need make no bones about it, to help them to be free as we are free. But we can't afford to act blindly or on a perpetual emergency basis.

Everything we may be able to do anywhere with our money or by any laudable means, to establish tranquillity and revive courage, liberty, and justice, we must do. That would be anticommunistic only in the sense that where those great factors are able to take over communism cannot flourish. But we must know what we're doing—and we must think our problems through.

It is vital for the United States Government to construct at once a long-range foreign policy which can be fully understood at home and cannot be misunderstood abroad. It must be a policy that will show unmistakably where we are headed, as straight as we can go with probity and wisdom toward world peace.

Raise Wages by Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Malcolm Forbes and appearing in Forbes magazine, March 15, 1947:

RAISE WAGES BY TAX CUT

Within the next few weeks labor contracts expire in many major industries, and unions are requesting another round of 18-20 percent pay increases. Such a vicious twist to the wage-price spiral could easily be the catalyst for our long-heralded recession.

An obvious, simple, sound way to avoid such a dangerous step is available—the most effective, healthy way to raise wages at this

critical juncture is through reduction of individual income taxes.

Take-home pay to most workers constitutes their wages; surveys show that the withholding tax, social-security deductions, etc., make a peculiar impression on labor. Their pay, so far as they are concerned, is what's in the envelope, and the arithmetic about deductions leaves them unimpressed, indifferent.

An income-tax reduction would mean more take-home pay. So far as the worker is concerned, his wages will have been increased, just as much as if his hourly rate had been upped over-all with no change in the present tax structure.

The Republican majority is committed to both debt reduction and income-tax reduction. Both are of tremendous importance, but tax reduction should not be looked on as secondary, as a luxury to be taken up with what's left of surplus income after the budget is pruned.

A cut in individual income taxes will increase wages without imposing another big over-all raise that could touch off a painful period of economic adjustment.

Effect of Unification on Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Move to Undermine Marine Corps Is Seen—Armed Forces Merger Bill Could End Organization," published in the Washington Star of March 27, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVE TO UNDERMINE MARINE CORPS IS SEEN—ARMED FORCES MERGER BILL COULD END ORGANIZATION

(By David Lawrence)

The Marine Corps is again fighting for its life. Despite the wonderful record made by the Marines in World Wars I and II and the sacrifices made by its officers and men in some of the toughest fighting that troops have ever faced, a program of legislative sabotage is under way to undermine the future of the Marine Corps.

Marine Corps officers from top to bottom are disturbed over what is happening and are calling on their friends everywhere to become informed on what is going on.

The problem lies in the utter vagueness of the proposed bill which is supposed to merge the armed services. Almost everything is left to Executive Order. The Marine Corps, which has hitherto enjoyed the protection of a statutory definition of its role and mission, could be abolished overnight if the pending bill is passed.

EXCLUDED FROM STAFF

The bill before Congress, which is supposed to reflect the administration point of view, gives the new Secretary of Defense authority to modify or redistribute functions in the future as he sees fit. As the bill is now written, marine officers are excluded from serving on the Joint Chiefs of Staff or as aides or assistants to the Secretary of Defense. The reference in the present bill is to "officers of the Navy." This phrasing according to legal experts, would not include Marine Corps officers. Also the Secretary of Defense has absolute power over the budget and could decline to recommend funds for the Marine Corps any time he wished to do so.

Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, already has announced that he will not vote for the merger bill unless functions are more specifically defined in the statute than is done in the pending bill.

It is significant that President Truman in his message to Congress on June 15 last did include a clear and satisfactory definition of the roles and missions which he favored for the Marine Corps, so the President can hardly blame the Marine Corps for being disturbed by the sins of omission in the present bill. Mr. Truman recommended, in identical letters to the Senate and House committees, that roles and missions such as he outlined be enacted into legislation.

It is puzzling that the commandant of the Marine Corps should not be given the right to participate in conferences of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff. He was not even put on the list of witnesses in connection with the hearings, though individual members insisted on calling him for next week.

SPECIALIZATION IGNORED

When General Vandegrift, the hero of Guadalcanal, testified last year he referred to secret papers in the War Department General Staff containing discussions looking toward the crippling of the Marine Corps. It seems certain that publication of these will be forced, and this will bring into the open something which the public has a right to know—the deliberate effort to wipe out the Marine Corps as it has been previously known.

The marines, it appears, would be relegated to the status of light units of the commando type. This would be a blow to the security of the United States. For experience teaches that the Marines are the finest kind of troops. They are, in fact, an intelligent variety of suicide troops, for they take objectives, such as were faced in Saipan and Iwo Jima, in a manner that has won the admiration of fighting men the world over.

It isn't that other American troops are any less brave. On the contrary, it is not a matter of bravery merely, but of specialized training and corps spirit. To make a merger on paper which deprives America of the marines—whose units have been fighting, especially in amphibious operations, since 1789—is to ignore specialization and set the clock back in amphibious warfare.

Thirty-eight Reasons Why Merger of Our Armed Forces Is Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, advocates of the so-called merger plan for the Army and Navy are continually talking of the economy that will result from such a union.

Without any breast thumping or fanfare, the Army and Navy have, for months, been carrying out a policy of coordinating their efforts in practically every phase of activity in both branches of our armed forces.

The following are some of the more consequential boards or committees which are in existence today and which, through avoiding duplication, through clarification of responsibility, and through coordinating efforts of the services, are instrumental in saving money:

ARMY-NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD

Formulates and maintains plans and policies for industrial mobilization in an emergency to assure the development of the total industrial requirements of the United States and the full application of the Nation's resources toward supplying such requirements in the shortest possible time; coordinates the work of the War and Navy Departments with regard to industrial matters, including procurement plans for the services; supervises such joint bodies as are or may be created to consider any subject falling within the scope of the Army-Navy Munitions Board's responsibility; exercises supervision over and be responsible for the work of all elements or subordinate echelons of the Army-Navy Munitions Board.

In support of the Army-Navy Munitions Board in carrying out the functions assigned above are the following joint committees:

ORDNANCE PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Considers joint ordnance procurement problems in light of the experiences in World War II, to the end of effecting the maximum standardization and the maximum practical economies from joint procurement or single procurement for both services.

MEDICAL PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Responsible for the development of procurement policies with respect to medical and surgical equipment and supplies.

CONSTRUCTION MATÉRIEL AND MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE

Achieves standardization between the Army and Navy construction matériel and mechanical equipment; effects interchange of information and data concerning procurement and procurement planning; recommends and advises Munitions Board on standardization and procurement of matériel and equipment.

MARINE LIFESAVING EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE

Makes recommendations to the Army-Navy Munitions Board with reference to standardization and procurement assignment of marine lifesaving equipment, except vessels, both sea and air.

VESSELS AND VESSEL PROPULSION COMMITTEE

Makes recommendations to the Army-Navy Munitions Board with reference to standardization and procurement assignment of vessels and vessel-propulsion equipment.

SPECIFICATIONS BOARD—JOINT ARMY-NAVY

Sets up operating methods and procedures; establishes working committees space requirements, and personnel complements to carry out the functions of the Army-Navy Munitions Board; obtains close coordination of specifications covering similar items, materials processes, and standards issued by War and Navy Departments.

PACKAGING BOARD—JOINT ARMY-NAVY

Coordinates the activities of the Army Packaging Board and the Navy Packaging Board and resolves differences between them; publishes uniform instruc-

tions relating to packing and packaging in War and Navy Departments so contractors will pack more economically and efficiently for both services; studies procedures on the subject and prepares authoritative specifications.

TEXTILE AND CLOTHING PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Makes recommendations to the Army-Navy Munitions Board regarding procurement assignment of textiles and clothing.

STRATEGIC MATERIALS COMMITTEE

Advises the Army-Navy Munitions Board on all matters related to the stock piling of strategic materials, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law No. 117, Seventy-sixth Congress, and section 2 of Public Law No. 457.

STOCK PILE STORAGE COMMITTEE

Advises the Army-Navy Munitions Board on matters of storage of strategic materials.

MATERIALS REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE

Advises the Army-Navy Munitions Board on matters relating to requirements for raw and processed materials under current and subsequent mobilization plans.

NONFERROUS METALS COMMITTEE

Assists the Army-Navy Munitions Board in all phases of its work related to nonferrous metals (including copper, aluminum, and magnesium).

IRON AND STEEL COMMITTEE

Responsible for assisting the Army-Navy Munitions Board in all phases of work relating to iron and steel.

CHEMICALS AND DRUGS COMMITTEE

Assists the Army-Navy Munitions Board in the development of features of the industrial mobilization plan related to chemicals and drugs as specifically covered by Army-Navy Munitions Board directives.

INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Assists the Army-Navy Munitions Board in the development of industrial mobilization plans related to or dealing with industrial facilities; determines the productive capacity of industry for the range of raw materials to end items; compares industrial capacity with mobilization requirements; recommends retention, expansion, or conversion of existing facilities, or the construction of new facilities needed to assure sufficient productive capacity to meet all requirements.

INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE

Assists the Army-Navy Munitions Board in all phases of work related to industrial equipment.

END PRODUCTS AND COMPONENT PARTS COMMITTEE

Assists and advises the Army-Navy Munitions Board on matters relating to the War and Navy Departments requirements for end products and component parts under current and subsequent mobilization plans.

UNDERGROUND SITES COMMITTEE

Explores the general subject of underground caverns and working in relation to their suitability for certain military purposes; compiles comprehensive records to be available to all military activities; and coordinates any planning which may be directed for the use of suitable underground sites.

OCEAN SHIPPING COMMITTEE

Receives all proposals of the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission; War Shipping Administration for the acquisition of port terminal facilities; determines if conflict of interest exist and, where possible, adjusts such conflicts; and approves clearance for the Army and Navy Munitions Board of those proposals on which there is complete concurrence of the committee.

LUMBER POLICY COMMITTEE

Establishes policies and procedures for the Army-Navy Lumber Agency and supervises the observance of the policies and procedures in accordance with the objective of the Army-Navy Munitions Board.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY COMMITTEE

Receives, clears, and answers questions referred to either Department on the subject of military interest in foreign trade.

AIRCRAFT COMMITTEE

Assists the Army-Navy Munitions Board in the development of features of the industrial mobilization plan related to aircraft as specifically covered in Army-Navy Munitions Board directives. In the performance of its duties the committee will, among other things, report on: availability of productive capacity to produce aircraft and their components; recommended procedure to provide for a deficiency of capacity or to release surplus capacity; recommended dispersal including installations underground; recommended plant capacity allocations; recommended scope and forms for a survey of the aircraft industry necessary for industrial mobilization planning; legislation required to implement industrial mobilization plans pertaining to the aircraft industry.

CATALOGING COMMITTEE

Examines systems of cataloging in order to determine the most practicable methods and procedures for accomplishing a common system of cataloging for the armed services.

RUBBER COMMITTEE

Assists the Army-Navy Munitions Board in the development of features of the industrial mobilization plan related to rubber as specifically covered by Army-Navy Munitions Board directives.

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Under the direction of the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff consult together on matters of joint concern to the armed forces, advise the President as to their use, and take appropriate action to implement his plans and policies as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

In support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the following major boards and committees:

JCS ARMY-NAVY PETROLEUM BOARD

The agency of the Joint Chiefs of Staff charged with performing for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appropriate agencies thereof, the Army-Navy Munitions Board, and the Aeronautical Board those duties relating to petroleum and petroleum products, including storage and containers therefor, responsibility for storage, distribution, issue, statement of requirements, purchase and coordination of specifications and standards.

JCS JOINT LOGISTIC COMMITTEE

As the primary logistics advisory and planning agency of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recommends appropriate actions to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to establish the relative military urgency of new production of supplies and equipment which are necessary to support war plans.

JCS JOINT MUNITIONS ALLOCATION COMMITTEE

Allocation of finished munitions among forces to the Army and Navy in accordance with over-all logistics plans.

JCS JOINT MILITARY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Advises the Joint Chiefs of Staff on administrative and operational matters concerning military overseas transportation; coordinates overseas transportation movements; advises other various Government activities on requirements of shipping and makes allocation necessary to support war plans.

JCS JOINT COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

Advises the Joint Chiefs of Staff on communications policies; coordinates methods, procedures, applications, and operations of communications matters; recommends procedure and methods concerning research and development of communications equipment.

Other major agencies, not subordinate to the Joint Chiefs of Staff or to the Army-Navy Munitions Board, include the following:

AERONAUTICAL BOARD

Investigates and reports on all questions affecting development of aviation of the Army and Navy; recommends action to establish sufficiency and efficiency of coordination of effort as to aviation.

JOINT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Coordinates all research and development activities of joint interest to the War and Navy Departments; its scope includes the subjects of aeronautics, atomic energy, electronics, geographical exploration, geophysical science, and guided missiles.

MILITARY LIAISON COMMITTEE

Consults with Atomic Energy Committee on those atomic-energy matters which relate to military application.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE GROUP

Acts as the executive agency of the National Intelligence Authority; collects, evaluates, and disseminates intelligence required in our national defense; coordinates the intelligence activities of other Government agencies.

STATE-WAR-NAVY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Reconciles and coordinates the action to be taken by the State, War, and Navy Departments on matters of common interest; establishes policies on politico-military considerations.

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Includes representatives from the State, War, Navy, Post Office, and Commerce Departments, and the Civil Aeronautics Board; examines international and domestic aviation problems and

developments affecting one or more department or agency; coordinates activities of the interested departments or agencies and recommends integrated policies and actions.

BOARD TO STUDY FACILITIES SUSCEPTIBLE OF COMMON UTILIZATION BY THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCES

Explores the possibilities of increased economy and effectiveness through common use of certain facilities of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, paying particular attention to port facilities, communications, medical, transportation, service, post exchange, recruiting, supply, and others. Coordinates with similar studies initiated by Army and Army Air Forces.

UN Control for Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it has now been over a year and a half since Japan surrendered. I believe the American people endorse General MacArthur's proposal that the United Nations take jurisdiction over the control of Japan as soon as possible.

Our military authorities have constructed a foundation for democracy in the island of Japan. The American soldiers, sailors, and marines now in the Far East are anxious to return to their native land. Their mothers, fathers, and loved ones are waiting their homecoming.

H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind., has interpreted the thoughts of the American public in the following editorial:

UN CONTROL FOR JAPAN

General MacArthur proposes that a Japanese peace treaty be written as quickly as possible, and that the United Nations be given the task of handling whatever controls are imposed on Japan. The suggestion was something of a surprise; indeed, it is reported that he spoke without prior consultation with Washington. But that does not affect the merits of the proposal.

The suggestion comes at a good time. The United States, through MacArthur, is now the actual boss of Japan. A move to give up our authority there and shift it to the United Nations should be accepted by Russia as evidence that we have neither imperialist motives in the Far East nor a desire to use Japan as the base for an attack upon the Soviet.

The Charter of the United Nations provides for the UN type of trusteeship, as suggested by MacArthur, as well as a trusteeship under one or more nations. Control could be placed in the hands of the General Assembly, where there is no veto power.

Such a trusteeship would give the United Nations a task of importance. It is essential that the UN soon be given such a job, lest it retrogress to the status of an international debating society.

MacArthur believes the work of demilitarizing Japan has been done. The task of political rehabilitation also is near completion—or as near as can be achieved under an occupation, he believes. Economic reorganization cannot be advanced far until a peace agreement is reached. Economic strangulation by the allies is continuing, MacArthur points out.

There has been almost no question concerning the work MacArthur has been doing in Japan. If he thinks the United States can get out and that the remaining supervision can be handled by the United Nations, we're strongly inclined to endorse such a program.

Aid for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William L. Shirer from the New York Herald Tribune of March 16, 1947:

HELP FOR PRESENT GREEK REGIME IS QUESTIONED—SHIRER SUGGESTS UNITED STATES AID MAY GO TO A LEADERSHIP NO MORE DEMOCRATIC THAN COMMUNISM—AND ASSURE AN EVENTUAL COMMUNIST TRIUMPH

(By William L. Shirer)

To oppose Russian expansion and the spread of communism by assuming our responsibilities as the great democratic world power that we undoubtedly are is all well and good. But I wonder if there is just a possibility that in our unreasonable world you cannot buy world peace and stability nor even purchase resistance to Marxism, no matter how many good Yankee dollars you are ready to shell out.

Is it barely possible that it may take something more?

I am not suggesting that American troops be sent to the far-flung periphery of the Soviet Union to halt the Red menace. No one in the Government or the Congress will stand for that, and the Kremlin knows it.

I am suggesting that it may not be enough merely to dole out dollars to prop up rickety and dubious regimes which happen to be anti-Communist and anxious to stay out of Russia's orbit. Such a practice, in fact, is most likely to lead to failure and indeed to play into the hands of the Soviet Union and communism.

It may be in the end that, annoying and troublesome though it will be, we will have to sprout an idea and formulate an American policy that will be both different and better than that pursued by the British. It might even have to take into account that in Asia the old order has either collapsed, as in India, Indochina, and Indonesia, or is threatened with collapse, as in China, and that even in the Mediterranean world, where the threat of Soviet expansion is most immediate, you cannot set the clock back.

A lot of human beings, millions upon millions of them, live in these regions on the periphery of the Soviet Union. Their lot, judged by American standards, was never a very happy one, and it has been made immeasurably worse by the ravages and dislocations of the terrible war. Most of these people are, in fact, desperate today and, rightly or wrongly, are demanding a change.

That change could be to communism and an alinement with the Soviet Union. But it need not be. It need not be if the American power is wisely used to aid domestic forces other than those which for too long have ground down the masses, keeping them in abject poverty and denying them the very democratic rights which have made us Americans so strong and prosperous.

The mass of the Chinese people, who are peasants, are not interested in communism. They want only the end of slavery to vicious landlords and money lenders and corrupt officials and the whole feudal system that has kept them in such shocking misery. Is that an unreasonable desire? Is it one the American people are determined to oppose under the mistaken impression that by so doing we are saving China from Red tyranny?

And yet unconditional American support for Chiang Kai-shek's feudal, corrupt, and reactionary regime, which General Marshall castigated on his recent departure from China, would help, for a time, to chain 300,000,000 Chinese peasants to their starvation existence. It would also help, in the long run, to drive them into the camp of the Chinese Communists, whose major achievement so far has been in land reform in the considerable areas under their control.

LACK OF POLICY BLAMED

The necessity of the President's plea to Congress last week for funds and arms for Greece might never have arisen had the American Government had an inkling of a policy of its own for that valiant land after its liberation from the German barbarians. We had none, and stood idly and rather stupidly by while Mr. Churchill stumbled from one blunder to another until he had paved the way for Greece's present tragic condition, which we are now to cure—we think—with a quarter of a billion dollars, to begin with.

It might be helpful if Americans could recall how Greece came to its present plight.

Though Mr. Churchill vehemently denied it, I think there is little doubt that the principal resistance movement in Greece was the EAM, with its combatant branch known as ELAS. The secret documents of the German high command which I saw at Nuremberg left no doubt that the German Army considered ELAS as almost the only serious armed resistance movement it had to deal with. A British general who had worked with ELAS for 2 years told Allied correspondents in Athens after its liberation that the only real resisters and fighters against the Germans were the ELAS, a remark which seems to have resulted in his sudden withdrawal from Greece.

There seems to be little doubt either that the leadership of EAM-ELAS came in time to be dominated by Communists, though its mass following was non-Communist—a coalition of moderate Republicans, agrarians, Socialists, and Communists. There is no evidence that during the German occupation ELAS got any help at all from the Russians. The only outside help they received was from the British, who maintained regular army officers with them as liaison.

British intelligence reports confirm that at the time of Greece's liberation the country was overwhelmingly Republican in sentiment. Mr. Churchill, however, wanted a royalist government and determined on the restoration of King George II, whose chief claim to fame previously had been his responsibility for setting up the Metaxas Fascist dictatorship in Greece, second only to the German in its brutality and its stamping out of democratic liberties. There is no record that the American Government offered any objection to the King's return, and today it is his feeble, undemocratic regime which President Truman has now come to the rescue of.

EAM PROMPTLY DESTROYED

The EAM movement was promptly destroyed by American-armed British troops with the help of two curious Greek detachments little known to the American people. The first was the royalist Mountain Brigade, specially trained by the British. The second consisted of the so-called security battalions, a Greek quisling militia formed by the Ger-

mans and wearing German uniforms. These two strange units later became the core of the royalist Greek army which is now to receive American arms to put down the leftist guerrillas.

Is that a worthy object for American arms?

Is it sheer lunacy, at this stage, to suggest that the best—and perhaps the only—way to halt bolshevism and Russian expansion is to back the genuine democratic elements which are so numerous along the periphery of the Soviet Union—the kind of people who prefer our kind of democratic freedom to the tyranny of either the Chiangs and King Georges or the totalitarian Communists?

Let Us Be Sure We Are Right Before We Go Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CARCLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include therein an article by Hon. Harold Ickes:

MAN TO MAN—PROPOSED LOANS TO GREECE AND TURKEY BECOME LESS CLEAR WITH MORE LIGHT

The more light that is shed upon the "quickie" recommendation by President Truman that we lend $250,000,000 to Greece and $150,000,000 to Turkey, the less clear it becomes. For instance, Acting Secretary Dean Acheson, whose ability I greatly respect, testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee last Thursday that "It seems to me that by strengthening the forces of democracy and freedom you would do much toward removing the causes of friction between the great powers." This was in response to an inquiry by Representative MANSFIELD, of Montana, "if he thought the grant of funds, arms, and administrative help to those countries would lead to war."

This was an interesting reply to a question that must be in the mind of every thinking American. But to me it was not a reply at all. It was a diplomatic circumlocution that ignored important facts which should have been stated frankly so that the Congress and the country might draw their own conclusions as to the possibility of eventual war.

Acting Secretary Acheson did not elaborate on what he meant by "strengthening the forces of democracy and freedom." Why "decorate a lily and scent a rose"? Does he regard Turkey as a democracy or as a champion of the cause of freedom? Where was Turkey during the First World War? And just what in the way of aid or comfort did it hold out to the Allies when they were so hard-pressed by the Nazi gangsters during the second conflict? While tragedy was threatening "democracy and freedom" everywhere in the world, Turkey "black marketed" its valuable chrome—an essential war material—to Hitler. No one will deny that modern Turkey is strongly nationalistic and wants to live unto itself. However, it hardly knows the meaning of the word "democracy," except possibly as an interesting abstraction.

Perhaps it was King George of Greece and his entourage that Secretary Acheson had in mind when he spoke of the forces of democracy and freedom. High-mindedly the State Department seems to think of King George as an unimportant figurehead. But would we be upholding a real democracy in Greece with King George still occupying the throne, supported by the most selfish and reactionary elements in Greece?

If we send these huge sums of money to Greece and Turkey, they ought to be to invest in democracy. Undoubtedly Greece needs financial help now more than Turkey. Greece had no chrome on which to build up a great war fortune, in addition to which Greece was in the war on the side of the Allies and so learned by personal experience how cruel and deadly the Nazi gangsters were.

King George III is sustained in power by the wealthy Greeks. And they are buttressed in their position by an inequitable tax system which rests most heavily upon the poor. It is one thing for this country to propose to share the burden of maintaining Greece, but it is another thing for us to permit the money that we pour into Greece to be siphoned off into the hands of a few, including the court. Those who now hide secure behind a tax system designed to favor the well to do should also be willing to make the same kind of sacrifices that the income taxpayers in the United States are about to be called upon to make.

We ought not to establish a new doctrine that the United States helps those who do not help themselves.

WHAT OF ARGENTINA?

Another question that might have been asked of Acting Secretary Acheson or some other representative of the State Department is whether we are undertaking a holy war against communism or against all forms of totalitarianism. If we are opposed to totalitarianism and not merely to communism, which is only one phase of it, what do we propose to do about the Fascist regime of Peron in the Argentine? If we are too deeply involved in Greece and Turkey to bother about this dangerous example of Nazi totalitarianism that is much closer to us, would we be willing that the United Nations, or one of our allies, helped to sweep our own doorstep clean while we are engaged elsewhere? Perhaps Great Britain, or even Russia, might undertake to act as the deputy of the United Nations in cauterizing Nazism in the Argentine.

The fact seems to be that while we now become so belligerent at the very thought of communism, our blood turns to skim milk when we are asked to face the menace of fascism, which is so much the twin of communism that they cannot be distinguished. We have allowed Peron, the dictator of Argentina, to thumb his nose at us. While Spruille Braden is still an Assistant Secretary of State, he has apparently been hamstrung.

Meanwhile, we are misrepresented by Ambassador George S. Messersmith, who has endeared himself to this totalitarian apple which has the potentialities of corrupting all of the others in the South American barrel.

Committee on Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, the chief clerk of the Armed Services Committee, Robert H. Harper, reports that while it is entirely too soon to appraise the work of any committee, it appears that the Committee on Armed Services has done fairly well considering the fact that it is a complete new set-up including chairman and staff, as well as a completely new set of responsibilities and functions.

There have been 251 bills introduced and referred to the Armed Services Committee since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress. Forty meetings have been held by the subcommittees since the committee began functioning on February 1. Thirty-two bills have been reported to the House; 16 of which have passed the House and two of which have become law.

With the exception of one Army proposal and one Navy proposal, every measure sent to this committee by the War and Navy Departments has either been reported, considered in subcommittee, or scheduled for hearings. I am informed by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy that this is the first time that any congressional committee has so completely considered their legislative proposals.

A Bigger Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 19, 1947:

A BIGGER PANAMA CANAL

When the *Oregon* had to round the Horn to join the fleet in Caribbean waters during the Spanish-American War it was obvious that the digging of the Panama Canal could no longer be deferred. But was it to be a sea-level or a lock canal? For many months the controversy raged. In the end the sea-level project was rejected chiefly because the deep cut required would have complicated the control of slides and because of the greater cost and delay. The old controversy now flares up again, since Congress must consider the matter of enlarging the Canal to meet traffic demands which are bound to overtax the present twin locks by 1961.

The construction of a third set of locks was authorized by Congress in 1939. Work began in 1940, but was stopped in 1942 because of the wartime drain on manpower and materials. We have some yawning excavations which have cost us $75,000,000; they could be transformed at no great additional cost into locks that would be behind the technological times. Even if the finished new locks can accommodate our largest carriers, which the old ones cannot, a revision is necessary. What gives both the Army and the Navy most concern is the relative vulnerability of lock and sea-level canals. Even before the atomic bomb appeared it looked as if a few block busters of the type dropped on German cities during the last year of war might cripple both old and new locks, separated as they would be by only half a mile at most. The atomic bomb increased this apprehension. It follows that we must consider the relative merits of sea-level and lock canal in the light of new exigencies.

As matters stand, the argument seems to be in favor of the lock canal which the Navy recommends. A sea-level canal is not much less vulnerable to atomic bombs than a lock canal, and in any event there would have to be a lock on the Pacific side to overcome the

difference in level that prevails there over the Atlantic side. Both the Army and Navy agree that a large lake or basin should be provided on the Pacific side in which ships can anchor when fog makes it dangerous to go through the narrow Culebra Cut and that a sea-level canal would require much dredging. No doubt Congress will weigh the relative advantages of the two types of canals, but in its present temper it is likely to vote for the Navy lock canal, which will cost about $500,000,000, as compared with a billion and a quarter and possibly two billions for the sea-level plan. When engineering opinion is so equally divided, lower costs are likely to prevail.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., on March 22, 1947, which points out the fact that the House GOP Members are carrying out the promise they made to the people of this country during the last campaign. The editorial also comments favorably upon the outstanding contribution made to the tax program now before this House by my distinguished colleague and fellow Washingtonian, the Honorable HAL HOLMES.

The editorial follows:

HOUSE GOP ATTACKS TAXES

One of the chief Republican campaign promises last fall was that if the voters would do the right thing a GOP majority in Congress would try its best to force a radical reduction in the crushing tax rates built up over the last 14 years by the New Dealers.

The voters did the right thing from the Republican' point of view.

When the new bosses of Congress a few weeks ago decided not to cut the 20 percent wartime excise taxes on various luxury items, a lot of people, ourselves included, were inspired to remark that it looked as if a welshing, reneging spirit had moved into Republican circles from somewhere.

It is all the more pleasant now, therefore, to see the House Ways and Means Committee get busy and frame a bill for some genuine tax cuts, retroactive to January 1, and clear the road for early passage of the measure. The House can pass the bill next week if it wants to.

As now written, this is a modification of Representative HAROLD KNUTSON'S, Republican, of Minnesota, original proposal for a 20-percent-personal-income-tax cut across the board. We think the modifications are an improvement on that first Knutson plan.

The scheme now is to reduce taxes 30 percent on net incomes of $1,000 or less, to drop them 20 percent on those of $1,000 to $302,000, and to limit the brackets above $302,000 to a 10½-percent reduction.

A novel feature of the bill is that it grants an additional $500 exemption for taxpayers over 65 years of age, provided they report tax-exempt income from such things as social security pensions or railroad retirement benefits.

This quick action in the House committee was spurred mainly by some of the new members — freshman Congressmen — prominent among whom were Representative ROBERT W. KEAN, Republican, of New Jersey, and HAL HOLMES, Republican, of Washington. These men deserve considerable applause, we think; and their exhibition of drive and initiative might well be carefully noted by various Republican Senators we could mention who have been resting in comfort on the November 5 election returns ever since the Eightieth Congress convened.

That this is a real tax reduction bill is shown by the size of the revenues the Treasury will lose by it if it becomes law.

A total of $3,840,000,000 will be cut from Treasury income tax receipts per year, assuming taxable incomes run along as at present. That is not hay, even in these times.

These $3,800,000,000 which the Government will have to do without will go into more food, clothes, houses, radios, and so forth, for the lower-income groups, and, it is to be hoped, into investment in new business or plant expansion by a lot of people in the upper brackets.

TAX REDUCTION AND PROSPERITY

All this should make new jobs, preserve many jobs now in existence, and stimulate business generally. It happened that way after the other war. The Republicans reduced taxes, business spurted, and this increased business paid taxes so copiously that the Republicans were able to make heavy payments on the principal of the national debt.

Of course, the big 1929 bust came along in due time, one reason being that tax reduction had been overdone. With a national debt some 10 times as big now as it was then, however, it is hard to see how taxes can be reduced dangerously any time soon. After all, there is a fixed charge of about $5,000,000,000 a year on that debt, before the Government can spend money for anything else.

So we are hoping that the Senate and House will pass substantially the tax bill written by the House Ways and Means Committee, and too bad about the lamentations of the "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect" New Dealers. They've had their fun, and we've all paid for it through the nose.

If the Republican majorities in Congress will pass this bill with reasonable speed, they will probably appease many of those who voted for them last November and are now asking why that mandate to clean up the New Deal mess isn't being carried out.

Though it is a fact that you can't rectify all the mistakes of 14 years' mismanagement overnight, you can at least roll up your sleeves and get started. It's gratifying to see that this truth has dawned on many of the Republicans in the last few days—and none too soon.

Announcement by Otto E. Passman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following announcement which appeared in the Monroe (La.) News-Star of March 24, 1947:

ANNOUNCEMENT

I will make my quarterly tour of the Fifth District in accordance with the schedule of dates and times listed below.

On account of my urgent duties in Washington, it will not be possible for me to spend much time in any of the places listed. The Fifth District covers a wide area, therefore, my visits must be hurried in order for me to be able to return to Washington without undue delay.

Interested persons are invited to contact me regarding any of their congressional problems, be they veteran claims, agriculture, drainage, flood control, or pending legislation, and I shall do my utmost to be of assistance.

SCHEDULE

Tuesday, April 1: Bastrop, 9 a. m., courthouse; Oak Grove, 12 noon, courthouse; Lake Providence, 2:30 p. m., courthouse; Tallulah, 5 p. m., courthouse.

Wednesday, April 2: Farmerville, 9:30 a. m., courthouse; Bernice, 12:30 p. m., post office; Ruston, 3 p. m., courthouse.

Thursday, April 3: Rayville, 9:30 a. m., courthouse; Winnsboro, 12 noon, courthouse; St. Joseph, 4 p. m., courthouse.

Friday, April 4: Harrisonburg, 11:30 a. m., courthouse; Jonesville, 2:30 p. m., post office; Ferriday, 4:30 p. m., courthouse.

Saturday, April 5: Columbia, 11:30 a. m., courthouse; Jonesboro, 3 p. m., courthouse.

Monday, April 7: Alexandria, 7 p. m., flood control.

Wednesday, April 9: Monroe, entire day, Monroe office.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Congressman, Fifth Congressional District.

Antidiscrimination Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News of March 3, 1947:

ANTIDISCRIMINATION BILL

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

Recently in Columbus the Ohio Chamber of Commerce issued a hocus-pocus kind of statement which said that it was for the fair employment practices law (FEPC) in principle, but that the whole idea was somehow strangely un-American and unworkable.

Last week the Dayton Chamber of Commerce followed suit. It, too, declared the law was fine in principle, then charged that it (S. 10) would lead to "bureaucratic rule by men and not by law," an important-sounding, if meaningless, grouping of words.

The sole object of an antidiscrimination law is to insure that workers shall be hired strictly on the basis of their abilities to produce, and are not discriminated against by management because of their creed, color, or national origin. What has a person's complexion or his ancestry got to do with whether or not he can produce? Yet much of management, with its feet still firmly planted in an earlier age, chooses to forget that this is the century of the common man, the year II of the atomic age, and seeks to continue such anachronisms as discrimination.

New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut Legislatures, in tune with the times, have enacted FEPC laws. And progressive Ohio forces are determined on passage of Senate bill 10, which would help keep our State in step with the forward march of its sister States and the world.

The Ohio Pastors' Association, meeting early last month, unanimously passed a resolution calling for an FEPC law with teeth in it. The CIO, long pledged to the abolishment of every form of discrimination, has

enthusiastically endorsed the bill. The Progressive Citizens of America (Ohio chapter), the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Jewish Congress, Americans of Italian Descent, the International Workers Order, the American Slav Congress, and many other bodies have called for its enactment.

Only the chamber of commerce and the Ohio Manufacturers Association have opposed the antidiscrimination bill, even as they fought the temporary FEPC which, for the duration of the war, so effectively consolidated labor's efforts in producing the material needed to win the great victory. Certainly it is no secret that the chamber of commerce and Ohio Manufacturers Association speak for the largest interests within management. Nor is it secret that the monopoly forces in business have, on numerous occasions, seemed positively eager to feed upon divisions within the workers' ranks, playing off white workers against Negro workers, Italian workers against German workers, Jewish workers against gentile workers, wherever and whenever they could effectively create a split. This policy is easily recognizable as the age-old game of divide and rule, divide and conquer, a technique which Ohio big business apparently considers essential and seeks to perpetuate in order to weaken the entire working-class movement.

It therefore becomes imperative that members of all minority peoples, and all progressives, demonstrate their active support of a fair employment practices commission. If we permit the giant forces of reaction to get by with their slick trick of keeping us divided from our brothers, we most certainly will be conquered and destroyed, as in Fascist Europe—piecemeal.

Obviously race and religious prejudice has an economic base. Discrimination can be defeated, however, partly by direct political action, and partly through education for democracy. The law plus education complement each other. When reactionaries, misguided liberals, and some unthinking civil libertarians insist we cannot legislate away discrimination, it is good to point to New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, where FEPC is working to the deep satisfaction of all men of good will. It may be well also to remind the skeptics that the laws of one generation frequently have become the good manners of the next generation.

LEWIS BOOTH,
Member, Executive Committee, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
DAYTON.

House Tax-Cut Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

HOUSE TAX-CUT BILL

The Knutson income tax-cut bill, as revised by the Republican steering committee in the House, was approved by the Ways and Means Committee yesterday by 16 of its 25 members—15 Republicans and 1 Democrat. Of the 10 Democratic committeemen 9 voted against approval. Thus the measure will go to the House next Wednesday as a Republican project. According to Speaker MARTIN it will go in under a closed rule, barring amendments. In all probability therefore the House vote will be cast closely along party lines. There is a possibility, of course, that some Republicans may balk, but no apparent likelihood of an intraparty division sufficient to prevent its passage.

As revised by the steering committee, the income-tax reduction will amount to 30 percent for the small-income group, estimated to include some 20,000,000 taxpayers; 20 percent on incomes in a wide middle range, and 10½ percent on incomes above $302,000. Mr. KNUTSON had urged a 20-percent cut across the board. The total over-all reduction is estimated by Washington dispatches at $3,840,000,000. The reductions are made retroactive to January 1 last—subject, of course, to Senate approval.

This retroactive feature may bring a fight in the upper house, where Senator TAFT and other Republicans favor July 1 as the effective date. Also there has been evidenced among the elder statesmen some doubt of the wisdom of drastic tax reduction at this critical time when demands for added expenditures are being pressed. Nobody can say precisely, at this moment, what the Government's monetary needs may be for the fiscal year ahead. And not even the Republicans themselves can be sure that their Spartan stand for drastic budget cuts to justify their hefty tax cut can be maintained in their own camp when the pressure for appropriations reaches high tide. Finally the important question of national debt reduction must be faced in the final reckoning and on that, too, intraparty division is foreshadowed.

From the statistical and economic angles and in the light of the uncertainties ahead, the Congress Democrats stand on solid ground in opposing the modified Knutson project. But political exigencies as the majority sees them prompts the drive for the sweeping tax cut for which a good many folks are clamoring loudly regardless of its ultimate effect. The House majority, after weighing the one set of considerations against the other, seems bent on taking the political road.

The Crisis in Our Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me on March 20, 1947:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen: Let me begin by expressing my appreciation to Station WGAN for giving me, along with the others who have the honor to represent the State of Maine in the Congress, the courtesy of their network to discuss questions of interest to our people at this time.

I shall talk to you tonight about what is being widely referred to as the crisis in our foreign affairs. This expression seems to me rather misleading. There has been a continuing crisis in our foreign affairs ever since the rise of Adolf Hitler to power in 1933. In some weeks or months we may be more acutely conscious of the crisis than we are in others, but the crisis is always there. It is presented by the rise of totalitarianism dictatorship in great nations, the tendency of that type of dictatorship to aggression, and the dislocations, displacements, and ruin occasioned by aggression. The continuing crisis has presented a series of problems for this country and imposed burdensome responsibilities which are felt with especial force by those of us obliged to render a decision as to this alternative or that.

Everybody knows, but it is easy now to forget that while the war was in progress, Russia was our ally. Had she not been our ally the present situation would scarcely have arisen. We supplied the Russians enormous quantities of war material without which they could probably not have had the striking military successes which they had. However, the collaboration between Russia and this country was never on the same cordial footing as the collaboration between Britain and the United States. The Russians in their dealing with us have always been timid, suspicious, and grudging. They have been even more so in their relations with the British. There is nothing surprising about this. This country has not been friendly to communism either as an economic philosophy or as a political force. Neither were the British in years past. Both of us invaded Russia in 1919. Our troops actually occupied Archangel and Vladivostok in that year. Back of that in 1907 it was American support which brought about the Treaty of Portsmouth which cemented the Japanese victory over Russia and the loss of Korea and Manchuria. Russian memories are probably good.

At the meetings at Teheran in November 1943 and at Yalta in February 1945, there were discussions not only with Russia about the conduct of the war, but apparently about the spoils of war. President Roosevelt in order to stimulate Russian cooperation in the European war and to procure Russian aid in the war against Japan made various promises to Russia, the nature of which has not yet been fully disclosed, and may never be fully disclosed. We do know, however, that at Yalta, Russia was promised the transfer of the Kurile Islands from Japan and apparently occupation of northern Korea and we agreed to a delineation of the Polish frontiers which I think was unduly favorable to Russia. And we either assented to Russian activities in Poland or acquiesced in their activities in such a way as gravely to prejudice the future of the Polish state. I fear that history will say that our wartime concessions to our Russian ally were excessive.

In the final war conference at Potsdam there were discussions about the future of Germany and an agreement was reached, among other things, that Germany should be administered as a single economic unit. Pursuant apparently to an agreement reached at Potsdam, Russia came into the war against Japan a week before it ended, but the Russian participation in the war against Japan was insignificant and involved none of the overwhelming sacrifices which Russia undeniably made in defending herself in Europe. We seem to have paid dearly for Russian aid against Japan and gotten a poor bargain.

Since VJ-day, as everyone knows, our relations with Russia have been getting steadily more difficult. The Russians were not willing to adhere to the agreements made at Potsdam to administer Germany as an economic unit. Over and beyond that, the Russians have succeeded contrary to the terms of the Yalta agreements, in dominating completely the governments and policies of most of the eastern European states. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, nations which established their independence from Russia in 1918, were completely extinguished as national entities. Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria have been suffered to retain a nominal independence but have become in all respects puppet states of Russia. In central Europe, Hungary alone was for a time able to preserve some semblance of independence which is now virtually gone. At the extreme south of the tier of east European

states, Greece was able to preserve her freedom through British intervention at Churchill's instance in September 1944.

It is probably true, as Walter Lippmann has said, that we went about peacemaking the wrong way. Instead of beginning with the major European job—peace with Germany and Austria—we first made treaties with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, concluding those treaties only on February 10 of this year.

General Marshall, our new Secretary of State, is now in Moscow in an attempt to settle the future of Germany and Austria. Their problem could never be easy. Germany is in the heart of Europe and millions of people depend for livelihood on her productive capacity. Her industries were highly developed even before Hitler diverted them to war production. Germany was second only to this country as an industrial nation. Europe cannot sustain itself without the productive capacity which Germany had. Without a decent living standard in Europe there can be no peace. But with Germany producing for war there can be no peace either. The problem is to revive at least a substantial part of Germany's productive capacity and economic sufficiency and not to revive her war potential. This problem could be solved with Russian cooperation. It can't be solved if, as seems likely, Russia wishes to destroy the German economy in the name of reparations and then buy German aid for her future aggressions by promises to restore it.

The awful truth is that even today, nearly 2 years after the German surrender, most of Europe is homeless, hopeless, hungry, only one notch above chaos. Perhaps nothing can put the truth more literally than to say vulgarly, "Europe was shot to hell."

While the aggressions and sinister machinations of our late ally Russia present a serious difficulty, on the one hand, we are embarrassed much more severely than most people realize by the troubles of our other late ally the British.

From the British victory at Waterloo in 1815 down to 1914, Britain was undoubtedly the world's dominant power. She had the largest navy and the largest merchant fleet in the world and boasted with some justice that "Britannia ruled the waves," that the sun never set on her dominions. Rudyard Kipling writing of Queen Victoria could sing:

"Walk wide o' the Widow at Windsor
For 'alf o' Creation she owns.
We 'ave bought 'er the same with the sword and the flame,
An' we've salted it down with our bones.
* * * * *
For the Kings must come down an' the Emperors frown
When the Widow at Windsor says stop."

England governed the vast eastern spaces of India, Burma and Malaya. Hers was the dominant interest in the Middle East. By controlling Gibraltar, the Suez Canal and Egypt, Britain effectively controlled the whole Mediterranean Basin. Portugal and Greece were particularly subject to British influence.

All this activity of the British was known as British imperialism and was widely denounced as such by many people. Nevertheless, the functions which the British performed in their own selfish interest were extremely useful to this country in the maintenance of world peace and order which in the last century we were not strong enough to take care of alone. Thomas Jefferson recognized this as early as 1802 when he advised us to "marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation."

Madison wrote to President Monroe in 1823: "With the British power and Navy combined with our own, we have nothing to fear from the rest of the world; and in the great struggle of the epoch between liberty and despotism, we owe it to ourselves to sustain the former, in this hemisphere at least. I have even suggested an invitation to the British Government to join in applying the 'small effort for so much good' to the French invasion of Spain, and to make Greece an object of some such favorable attention."

But since 1914 we have had two world wars which have left the British desperately weak while leaving us at least relatively strong. Forced alike by public opinion and their own weakness, the British have committed themselves to granting independence to India and their other possessions in the Far East. They have removed their troops from Egypt. Most important of all, their economic position at home is a desperate one.

The British Isles have virtually no raw materials except coal, and their coal output per miner is only about one-sixth of ours. Britain is forced to buy from abroad a good part of all her food and many of the necessities of life, and must pay for what she buys with exports produced in her factories, which also have to be fed with raw materials from abroad. Britain's immediate problem is to create exports enough to supply her with the necessary imports. To what extent Britain can get on her feet again no one can prophesy with too much confidence. Many Britons are still optimistic, but they have had to lower their living standard to a point substantially below what it was during the war, and far below anything they have known since the Napoleonic War. The weather has been unkind to them this winter, and they now have a Socialist Government, a luxury which I do not think that they can afford. Hence, no well-informed person in Washington was surprised at the news that Britain would have to give up the aid which they have been giving to Greece since before the end of the European War.

Obviously, we cannot compel the British to go on, and the only practical question is whether we shall take over the work they have done in Greece or accept whatever alternatives there may be. No one here doubts that the immediate alternative will be to make Greece like Yugoslavia—a puppet state of Russia. Turkey, already hard pressed by Russia and virtually on a war footing with a million men under arms, will then be encircled, and Iran, Iraq, and the whole Middle East will lie virtually helpless before the Russian expansion.

Forced with this situation, we must think clearly. No question is now involved of helping Britain. In last year's credit to Britain we took that step, though perhaps inadequately. What we must appraise now is the danger of Russian expansion, and the appropriateness of aid to Greece and Turkey as a counterpoise against that expansion. I believe that the dangers to us in uncontrolled Russian aggression cannot be overestimated. If half a billion or even a billion dollars will preserve the integrity of Greece and Turkey, I think it money well spent.

If in 1936, this country had insisted with the help of Britain and France in keeping Hitler out of the Rhineland, it could positively have been done and done at no great cost. Defeating Hitler in the 41 months from December 7, 1941 to May 7, 1945 cost us $341,000,000,000 in money alone. We do not want by neglecting precautions now to repeat that mistake.

If we are to give aid to Greece and Turkey, it goes without saying that every possible safeguard should be thrown around the administration of relief and as little room as possible left to local corruption and intrigue. The Government of Turkey is reputedly better and more stable than that of Greece which seems to lack any moderate center party between the extreme right and the extreme left. But in both countries there should be enough Americans on the spot to know exactly what goes on.

This is an issue which we must decide before the British quit on March 31 and it will preoccupy our thoughts while it is being decided and long afterward. I have no doubt but that Congress will vote to give the aid substantially as the President has recommended.

But when we have done this, we still have new problems created by this vast Eurasian nation rich in resources and manpower, nourishing behind its iron curtain alien ideologies and great ambitions, while our old allies the British, with whom essentially we have so much in common, struggle precariously for their existence. And let us not deceive ourselves. The liquidation of the British Empire if it comes about will shake the earth as profoundly as the liquidation of the Roman Empire.

Fortunately the new order is not as Adolf Hitler planned it, but it is a new order all the same and not a happy one.

Radio Station WKYW, Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me on March 26, 1947:

Fellow Kentuckians and my friends across the line in Indiana, I am delighted to have this opportunity this afternoon to pause for a few brief moments from my duties on the floor of the House of Representatives, here in Washington, to record my tribute to the untiring efforts of an energetic, enterprising, and public-spirited group of Kentuckians who have made the radio voice of WKYW, Louisville's newest radio station, a reality.

I want to congratulate all of the splendid officers and staff of WKYW, and all of the people of Louisville and central Kentucky where this station will be heard. I am especially pleased to learn that WKYW has a normal coverage of approximately 70 miles and that it will reach a tremendous number of the 300,000 folks of the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing here in Congress.

Personally, I believe that Louisville and Kentucky are extremely fortunate in being able to secure radio station WKYW. Their coverage of the news, current events, topics of the day, music, entertainment, and many other worthwhile contributions to our people, combined with Louisville's other splendid radio stations, WHAS, WINN, WAVE, and WGRC, will afford them the latest and best source of information, education, news, and enjoyment.

My friends, there is not a child of school age who does not know and appreciate what radio actually means to the health, welfare, safety, happiness, prosperity, and economic and spiritual life of a given community, county, and State.

During World War I radio was in its embryonic stage. During World War II radio had reached its majority and with it we heard announcers with portable radio transmitters actually accompanying our troops into battle where the roar of cannons, machine guns, and bombs could be heard above the muffled voice of our radio correspondents, which gave us the advances and successes of our own GI's and those of our allies.

My friends, at this particular moment, may I pay tribute to those many brave radio, yes, and newspaper, correspondents who sacri-

ficed their lives as did thousands of your sons on the battlefields, in order to give us here at home the story as it was written in gold upon the pages of eternal history. Not only was radio the first to bring us the glad tidings of VE- and VJ-day, but likewise it played a prominent role and made an invaluable contribution to the winning of World War II.

At the present time, and during the days that lie ahead, radio is bringing, and will continue to bring, a play-by-play description of the speeches, efforts, and actions of our statesmen, representing us not only at the peace conferences but in the Congress of the United States. Not only has radio proved its worth in war and in peace, but it has become a definite part of our American way of life.

Those of us who are privileged to live in a democracy should be everlastingly grateful for radio and the newspapers which are the unbridled champions of the constitutional amendment which guarantees to us our freedom of speech.

In conclusion, let me say that it is a high honor that as a Representative in Congress of the great Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky, I am privileged to share in the dedication of this new milestone of progress in radio in Kentucky.

To the owners, managers, and sponsors of radio station WKYW, and to all of you good Kentuckians within the sound of my voice, I wish good luck, a full fruition of your dreams, and a happy realization of your endeavors.

Conscientious Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of January 5, 1947:

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Just before Christmas President Truman appointed an Amnesty Board, headed by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, to examine appeals for executive clemency from 11,000 violators of the Selective Service Act. Some 5,000 of these are conscientious objectors. Some were convicted when they refused either noncombatant service or work in public civilian service camps.

For the 25,000 conscientious objectors who served in the armed forces as noncombatants and about 12,000 who served in the civilian work camps there is no necessity for amnesty, no question of abrogation of civil rights. Those convicted, however, have lost their civil rights, including the right to vote and to hold public office. The principal functions of the new Board will be to pass on applications for restoration of those rights. It will not exercise any jurisdiction over men still serving a prison term. But all these will be automatically paroled after serving 12 months (now the period for Army service of draftees) and may appeal for clemency on their release.

"Freedom of conscience is basic in our American tradition of individual liberty," the President said in establishing the new Board. It may be expected to recommend pardons and restoration of civil rights by setting up approved categories so that all convicted on similar grounds may receive the same treatment. Its task is, however, a ticklish one. The courts themselves have divided in passing upon objections based on moral and philosophical, rather than on purely religious grounds. Forgiveness now to all bona fide objectors impelled by conscience to refuse war service seems to us in keeping with the American tradition of individual liberty.

Certain Claims of the Sioux and the Indian Claims Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore given, I offer for the RECORD a letter I wrote to Ralph H. Case, attorney for the Sioux Tribe of Indians, urging that certain claims be presented to the Claims Commission as soon as it is organized for business. Following my letter to him is his reply. Now that the President has nominated the membership for the Commission, I believe that the matters herein discussed are of such equity that they should receive early consideration.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 2, 1947.

RALPH H. CASE,
Attorney, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAJOR CASE: During my visits at various councils and with individual members of the Sioux Reservations in South Dakota the past fall, I found a great deal of interest in the meaning of the new Indian Claims Commission Act.

In response to various questions, I said that there were definitely three claims which I thought should be prepared and presented as soon as the Commission organizes. They are:

WOUNDED KNEE CLAIM

(1) The so-called Wounded-Knee claim, which has never been adjudicated. I think the evidence developed in the hearing on a bill I introduced in the House a few years ago which is embodied in the committee hearing report will be of help in preparing such a claim.

OLD-AGE LIENS

(2) Refunds to the Indians concerned of liens which were levied for old-age assistance. Under the holding of the court in the Black Hills claims, the Government of the United States promised to take care of the Sioux people until they were self-supporting, or words to that effect. The court held that this promise was, in effect, payment for the Black Hills. On that ground the court denied that the Black Hills were taken without compensation.

Since the Government itself fell back upon that promise to avoid liability for the taking of the Black Hills, it does not seem right to me that the Government should now turn around and make the allotments of the Indians themselves pay for providing that care.

The granting of certain land was made at the same time as a part of the compensation, and I can see no justice or equity in forcing the aged Indians to use a part of the payment made to them to discharge the other part of the payment which the Government promised them.

Working on this about the time the war started, I asked Governor Sharpe for figures on the amount of money which had been expended for old-age assistance to aged Indians. At the time the figures were compiled I believe the amount totaled $900,000. Perhaps it is double that by this time. The pressure of the war and the possibility that the Indian Claims Commission might be established led me to defer further action until the Commission bill passed, in the hope that we might be able to get this claim considered by that Commission.

The Commission bill became law and now that the President is about to appoint the Commissioners, I feel this claim should be among the first presented.

FORCED SALES IN GUNNERY RANGE

(3) A third claim should be presented, in my judgment, on behalf of those members of the Pine Ridge Tribe who were forced from their homes for the creation of an aerial gunnery range in the north part of the reservation for the use of the Army Air Base at Rapid City.

You recall that a few years ago I was successful in getting legislation passed to reimburse Indians and counties who had lost moneys by reason of the issuance of forced patents on allotments, in violation of the trust. The courts held that when patents were issued without the application or consent of the allottee that the Government made a mistake, by violating the trust.

In the gunnery-range situation, the patents were forcibly issued to the Indian allottees without their consent. In fact, they did not even see the patent. The Superintendent accepted for them the payment which appraisers for the War Department said was the value of land taken.

Then that money was deposited to the credit of the individual Indian allottee and his name was stricken from the old-age-assistance rolls. He was then required to give up the proceeds from his forced patent.

In my judgment, this was a double wrong done to these individual allottees. In the first place, the same wrong was committed as in the so-called forced-patent cases. The Government has the right of eminent domain, but the Indian Office should either have given the individual Indian allottee his patent outright and let him protest the payment proposed by going into Federal court, the same as any other citizen had a right to do whose lands were taken, or the Superintendent of the agency should, in my opinion, have asked for a court determination of the sufficiency of the price offered.

The second wrong is a compounding of the injustice done in the claim I mentioned above with respect to the filing of liens against Sioux Indians for old-age assistance, when the Government as a part payment for the Black Hills promised to provide for them until they were self-supporting.

Again, I do not see how the Government could require Indians to use a portion of the payment made for the Black Hills (that is land allotments) to discharge the other part of the payment which the court held the United States obligated itself to make.

It is commonly reported that the President expects to name the members of the new Commission within a short time; presumably the Commission will organize shortly thereafter. I am writing you this memorandum letter, covering the subject as we have discussed it in our recent conferences, in the hope that it will serve as a suitable memorandum on which you as the recognized attorney for the Sioux Tribe of Indians will take such steps as are necessary to get these claims before the new Indian Claims Commission for early placement on the Commission's docket.

With kindest regards and best wishes for the new year, I am

Sincerely yours

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative in Congress,
Second South Dakota District.

THE ATTORNEYS FOR THE
SIOUX NATION,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1947.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASE: I regret I have been delayed in answering your two letters of January 2. I have been so closely engaged in matters for the Sioux Nation and other Indian tribes that it has not been possible to prepare a proper reply to the questions presented in your letters.

SIOUX TRUST FUND CASES

I now have reference to your letter in regard to the Sioux Trust Fund cases, six in number. You are correct in your statement in your paragraph 4 as to the amount of the recovery of $6,000,000 which should have been allowed by the Court of Claims, but which was wiped out by the Sioux benefit offset of $8,438,038.38. These are the cases in which I filed petition for certiorari, August 5, 1946. In October 1946 the Supreme Court denied my petition.

This appeared to be the end of the cases. I was not satisfied with this result, and in November last I filed a motion asking the Supreme Court to reconsider the entire matter. I also asked that the cases be sent back to the Court of Claims for further proceedings.

I set up the act of August 13, 1946, the Indian Claims Commission Act, and pointed out to the Supreme Court that this act was signed after I filed my petition for certiorari. I also pointed out that the act of August 13, 1946, amended the Sioux Jurisdictional Act and prohibited the use of set-offs or counterclaims for educational purposes or for health, highway, bridge, administrative, and other purposes. I stated in my motion that the Sioux Tribe was entitled to a new trial on the basis of the new act.

SUPREME COURT GRANTS MOTION

On December 9 and 16, in two separate decisions, the United States Supreme Court granted my motion, vacated its own decision, granted my petition for certiorari, and remanded all the cases to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in accordance with the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946. All six of the cases have been referred to Commissioner Ewart W. Hobbs, of the Court of Claims. It is his duty to find the facts and report the facts to the Court of Claims.

I am now engaged in the work of preparing a set of requests for findings. The cases now pending are No. 11, the Land Opening of 1889; Nos. 18 and 19, Rosebud Trust Funds; No. 21, Crow Creek Trust Fund; No. 23, Cheyenne River Trust Fund; No. 24, Standing Rock Trust Fund.

It is my position that the payments called Sioux benefits were educational in their nature. Their purpose was to enable the Sioux people to learn to be farmers. Farmers were to be employed to teach the Sioux how to raise crops and livestock. Therefore, I say the expenditures are barred by the Indian Claims Commission Act.

TWO OTHER CASES—20 AND 22

There remain of the old Sioux cases, No. 20, Pine Ridge, where expenditures for highway and bridge construction were disallowed by the Court of Claims. I shall move for a reopening of this case by the Court of Claims, and I hope the court will grant this motion in view of the decisions by the United States Supreme Court. If this motion is not granted, then this case should be filed with the new Indian Claims Commission.

There is also case No. 22, Lower Brule. This case was for 30,000 acres taken from the Lower Brule Reservation by an erroneous survey. The Court of Claims found that the claim was just, but that it was filed by way of amendment in 1934.

The Court of Claims held that it did not have jurisdiction to consider it. This claim necessarily must go before the new Indian Claims Commission whenever that Commission is appointed and organized for business.

I have told the representatives of the Lower Brule people that this particular claim will be filed and prosecuted vigorously.

The foregoing covers all of the matters suggested in your first letter of January 2. In regard to your second letter of January 2, my reply is as follows, and I follow the numbers of your paragraphs:

ON WOUNDED KNEE

(1) The Wounded Knee claim, which has never been adjudicated. The Wounded Knee Survivors Association comes within the definition laid down in the Indian Claims Commission Act as a "recognizable group of Indians." Their claim must be presented to the Commission and should include loss of life, loss of property, injury of a personal nature, or other losses sustained by the people of Big Foot Band of Indians.

Action should be taken by the survivors' association to authorize the prosecution of this claim.

If the survivors' association wishes me to act for them, I will do so, but only upon the understanding that I will not charge, nor will I accept compensation for my services. As I stated before the subcommittee which considered this matter several years ago, I refuse to accept any compensation for a recovery of what I regard as blood money.

The claim should be prosecuted. It is valid, it is just, and it comes within the Claims Commission Act.

OLD-AGE-RELIEF LIENS

(2) Answering your paragraph No. 2, no Indian of the Sioux Tribe who was or whose ancestors were parties to the treaty of 1868 or covered by the act of February 28, 1877, should be charged with old-age assistance or any other form of relief, particularly including rations or provisions.

Section 5 of the act of February 28, 1877, places the obligation on the United States to furnish all aid in the education of the Sioux Nation and all its people and guarantees that provisions will be furnished until the Sioux people are able to support themselves.

The United States cannot escape this liability. The Court of Claims and the United States Supreme Court have held that the liability is a continuing obligation and that the obligations contained in section 5 of that act are part of the payment for the Black Hills.

UPHOLDS MY CONTENTION

Your statement in regard to the legal and the moral situation is exactly in accordance with the facts, and the law as decided by the courts. The State of South Dakota should not be required to advance any money to Sioux Indians for relief or for old-age assistance.

These are matters which fall within the obligation of the United States. Under no circumstances, should the estate of any deceased Sioux Indian be charged with matters of this nature. The Sioux people are entitled to provisions as may be necessary as part payment for the Black Hills. All of those payments should be made out of the Treasury of the United States.

THE BLACK HILLS CLAIM

A further question should be presented to the Indian Claims Commission as a claim for the value of the Black Hills. It is my position that the Black Hills claim will never be settled until it is finally decided on the basis of honesty and fair dealing.

The Black Hills claim was denied by the Court of Claims on the ground that the Sioux Jurisdictional Act did not give the Court of Claims the right to go behind or change, in any way, the act of Congress which took the Black Hills from the Sioux people. That claim must, by all means, be presented to the new Claims Commission, whenever it is appointed and organized.

The new Commission does have the power to consider this claim under paragraph 2 of the Claims Commission Act. That paragraph is as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Commission shall hear and determine the following claims against the United States on behalf of an Indian tribe, band, or other identifiable group of American Indians residing within the territorial limits of the United States or Alaska: (1) claims in law or equity arising under the Constitution, laws, treaties of the United States, and Executive orders of the President; (2) all other claims in law or equity, including those sounding in tort, with respect to which the claimant would have been entitled to sue in a court of the United States if the United States was subject to suit; (3) claims which would result if the treaties, contracts, and agreements between the claimant and the United States were revised on the ground of fraud, duress, unconscionable consideration, mutual or unilateral mistake, whether of law or fact, or any other ground cognizable by a court of equity; (4) claims arising from the taking by the United States, whether as the result of a treaty of cession or otherwise, of lands owned or occupied by the claimant without the payment for such lands of compensation agreed to by the claimant; and (5) claims based upon fair and honorable dealings that are not recognized by any existing rule of law or equity. No claim accruing after the date of the approval of this act shall be considered by the Commission.

"All claims hereunder may be heard and determined by the Commission notwithstanding any statute of limitations or laches, but all other defenses shall be available to the United States."

ALLOWANCE FOR OFFSETS

"In determining the quantum for relief the Commission shall make appropriate deductions for all payments made by the United States on the claim, and for all other offsets, counterclaims, and demands that would be allowable in a suit brought in the Court of Claims under section 145 of the Judicial Code (36 Stat. 1136; 28 U. S. C. sec. 250), as amended; the Commission may also inquire into and consider all money or property given to or funds expended gratuitously for the benefit of the claimant and if it finds that the nature of the claim and the entire course of dealings and accounts between the United States and the claimant in good conscience warrants such action, may set off all or part of such expenditures against any award made to the claimant, except that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that moneys spent for the removal of the claimant from one place to another at the request of the United States, or for agency or other administrative, educational, health, or highway purposes, or for expenditures made prior to the date of the law, treaty, or Executive order under which the claim arose, or for expenditures made pursuant to the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), save expenditures made under section 5 of that act, or for expenditures under any emergency appropriation or allotment made subsequent to March 4, 1933, and generally applicable throughout the United States for relief in stricken agricultural areas, relief from distress caused by unemployment and conditions resulting therefrom, the prosecution of public work and public projects for the relief of unemployment or to increase employment and for work relief (including the civil-works program) shall not be a proper offset against any award.

* * * * *

"SEC. 11. Any suit pending in the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States or which shall be filed in the Court of Claims under existing legislation, shall not be transferred to the Commission: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 2 of this act, with respect to the deduction of payments, offsets, counterclaims, and demands, shall supersede the provisions of the particular jurisdictional act under which any pending or authorized suit in the Court of Claims has been or will be authorized; *Provided further*, That the Court of Claims in any suit pending before it at the time of the approval of this act shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear and determine any claim based upon fair and honorable dealings arising out of the subject matter of any such suit."

I suggest that the broad provisions of the quoted jurisdiction section be given consideration by the Sioux Nation. I know you are familiar with it, but it certainly permits the Sioux Nation to refile and retry the Black Hills claim.

CLAIMS IN GUNNERY RANGE

(3) I now have reference to your Claim No. 3 on page 2 of your second letter. This relates to the members of the Pine Ridge Tribe who were forced from their homes for the creation of an aerial gunnery range in the north part of the reservation.

This matter has never before been presented to me. The injustice which was done to the people of Pine Ridge is almost beyond comprehension. You make a complete statement of a valid claim against the United States and this claim certainly should be filed with the new Indian Claims Commission.

It will be necessary for the people who suffered losses, due to the creation of the aerial gunnery range, to organize as a group of Indians and in such form that the Indian Claims Commission will recognize the group in accordance with the Indian Claims Commission Act.

It will be necessary for the new group, by whatever name is chosen, to employ counsel to file and to prosecute their claim. I do not regard my contract with the Sioux Nation as covering this particular claim. All claims previously discussed plainly come within my contract, but this new claim I feel is not included in my present contract.

I can only account for the whole situation created by this aerial-gunnery-range procedure as a matter arising in wartime when many of the rights of the citizens of the United States were overlooked.

I know the Sioux people are extremely patriotic and it appears to me that they endured the terrible injustice shown by your letter without protest at that time, largely because of their well-known patriotism. The injustice done to them, however, should not be overlooked.

CITES PAYMENT PROMISED

I feel very strongly that they are entitled to recovery of just compensation for their land and certainly they should not be charged with any expenditures which previously were guaranteed by section 5 of the act of 1877 which took the Black Hills from the Sioux people.

That section is as follows:

"Article 5 of this agreement reads in part as follows:

" 'In consideration of the foregoing cession of territory and rights, and upon full compliance with each and every obligation assumed by the said Indians, the United States does agree to provide all necessary aid to assist the said Indians in the work of civilization; to furnish to them schools and instruction in mechanical and agricultural arts, as provided for by the treaty of 1868. Also to provide the said Indians with subsistence consisting of a ration for each individual of a pound and a half of beef, (or in lieu thereof, one-half pound of bacon), one-half pound of flour, and one-half pound of corn; and for every one hundred rations, four pounds of coffee, eight pounds of sugar, and three pounds of beans, or in lieu of said articles the equivalent thereof, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Such rations, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be continued until the Indians are able to support themselves."

It is my position that the United States should allow payment of the value of the Black Hills lands. As against this amount it is entirely proper to charge the payments for provisions and education which were guaranteed by section 5 of the Black Hills Act.

In other words, if the United States is willing to pay just compensation for the Black Hills, then the Sioux Tribe is willing to give credit for partial payments received any time up to final settlement.

I trust the foregoing covers the questions in your two letters and with your consent, I would like to have your letters and this letter placed in the hands of the people on the several reservations in South Dakota, North Dakota, and Nebraska, who are interested as members of the Sioux Tribe.

Please accept my very sincere thanks for your continued, highly intelligent interest in behalf of the Sioux Tribe. I know the Sioux Tribe is deeply grateful to you for your aid and your understanding of their complicated problems.

Very sincerely,

RALPH H. CASE,
Attorney for the Sioux Nation.

Penny-Wise, Pound-Foolish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of March 25, 1947:

PENNY-WISE, POUND-FOOLISH

All enlightened Americans earnestly favor governmental economy. But in view of the breadth and depth of the protest already registered against action or inaction at Washington which would effect an $80,000,000 slash in the Treasury Department budget for the new fiscal year, Congress will do well to reconsider, and the facts call loudly for the Presidential veto in case they do not do so.

The Senate has failed to act on a $50,000,000 emergency appropriation measure to tide the Customs Division over, and of the hundreds of agents yesterday handed their notices of dismissal, the Boston staff alone stands to lose 72 trained customs officials in various branches of the service, leaving only 10 to cover all Massachusetts ports of entry. There will doubtless ensue a happy holiday for all types of smugglers and saboteurs.

With respect to the Internal Revenue Bureau's budget, the House proposes to the Senate a $30,000,000 retrenchment in expenditures. This would necessitate the discharge of hundreds of special agents just as this Bureau is about to expand a drive that already has brought in an added $1,000,000,000 ascribed to tax evasions.

Economy is a virtue, but neither of these Treasury agencies seems to be a field in which to practice it under conditions as they are and are likely to continue to be.

What of Tomorrow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by William S. Livengood, Jr., secretary of internal affairs, before the Philadelphia Chapter of American Institute of Banking, at Philadelphia, Pa., March 22, 1947:

Yesterday we fought a Second World War to save that which we perceived to be the truth. Today we see that truth assailed on every hand—in many instances by those for whom and by whose side that war was fought.

We see England, the mother of parliaments, forsake the ways of freedom for the will-o'-the-wisp of governmentally guaranteed security.

We watch that great bulwark of freedom beaten to pieces by the waves of socialism. We learn that there 17 different agencies of the Government now have authority to enter private homes without a search warrant, and know that in the land of the Magna Carta a man's house is no longer his castle. Small wonder then that the people of America cry out, "What of tomorrow?"

We are this hour being committed to a program single-handedly and alone to save the world and the truth of government as we know it.

As we face this new role and this new tomorrow, it is well that we take stock of our assets and liabilities.

The Nation as a whole—and Pennsylvania in particular—during the late war paid a frightfully heavy price for preservation of the ideal that is America.

Three hundred and fifty thousand of our young men died for it.

Three hundred and forty-seven billion dollars were spent for it.

Huge inroads were made in our natural resources to assure it, and now millions must live lives of devotion to preserve it.

Never did a State pour out more blood and treasure in defense of an ideal than did Pennsylvania in the recent world conflict.

Now, as good citizens and wise businessmen, it behooves us not only to count the cost but take an inventory of our spiritual and material assets.

We fought only for an ideal. We endured the loss of blood and treasure solely for preservation of the freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of action, and freedom of worship which constitute the basic principles upon which the Republic was founded, and without the perpetuation of which it must go down into oblivion as have countless nations that have turned their eyes from the altars of freedom to worship the false gods of security and expediency.

Let us ask ourselves then, what of these spiritual values for which we fought?

Have they increased in luster as a result of the bloody and costly sacrifices made in their behalf?

Is the shadow of a large cross to continue to cast its redeeming rays across the great fields of other crosses that mark the last resting places of Americans, the world around, who died, that they might give life to the ideals their fathers fostered when they brought this Republic into being? Or are they to be replaced by the black shadows of materialism?

The difference between this beneficent system of ours and that by which we are challenged is that ours is founded on the

dignity of man, guided toward a bright destiny by a star and a cross, while that other is symbolized by a hammer and a sickle; founded on the conception of man as a creature of the state.

This spiritual asset of ours we must cherish and strengthen. With it as our pillar of fire by day and pillar of cloud by night we shall be led safely through the wilderness of confusion that is the world of today into the promised land of tomorrow. If it be dimmed, or lost, in our mad desire for temporary security, we shall, as a people, perish by the way, and the last great light of a groping world shall be forever dimmed.

But, as man cannot live by bread alone, so man cannot live without bread.

As Israel learned of old, godliness and prosperity not only are not incompatible—they should be true partners; they often have been in the past, they must be so now. While selfishness and materialism lead only to sackcloth and ashes, the wisdom and thrift that were Joseph's lead at once to rectitude of conduct and the comforts of enlightened civilization.

Along with our spiritual blessing, we of Pennsylvania have inherited the God-given blessings of natural riches in the form of huge deposits of minerals which have been made the basis for that prosperity which has meant so much to us in times of peace, and which enabled us to become the arsenal of freedom in time of war.

During the years of conflict, and before, we poured out this wealth with reckless prodigality. Now it is time to take stock. Before we undertake to save the world, we must know with what and in what manner we propose to accomplish that salvation.

As a chart for postwar industrial planning, the department of internal affairs brought forth a book entitled "Pennsylvania's Mineral Heritage," in which we attempted to present a picture of these natural assets and the possibility of their future use for the benefit of all our people.

By reason of these widely diversified mineral resources, plus the initiative of an enterprising and energetic people living under the blessings of our free government, Pennsylvania evolved from a wilderness into the greatest mineral and mineral industries State in the Union. Pennsylvania is now paying the price for pioneering, and for the war waste of her great resources, and is rapidly losing many of her initial advantages. Pennsylvania has come to a place where it must fight to hold what it has won.

To wage that fight we must know precisely what we have left and how it may best be used.

From the earliest date up to 1935, Pennsylvania led the United States in the production of mineral wealth. In 1935 Texas, favored with a great flood of petroleum, took over first place and has retained it to date. As a producer and processor of mineral products Pennsylvania has no rival, and it is this fortunate combination of mineral raw materials, fuels, and technical skills upon which the industrial life of the Commonwealth is dependent.

Before 1900 the workers in the mineral industries of Pennsylvania produced about one-half of the total mineral wealth of the United States. Since 1900 there has been a constant decrease in the percentage of the Nation's total mineral wealth that is produced by our State. This decline is relative and is due not to a drop in actual production but to the increase in production in some of the States to the west and southwest. The general industrial stagnation of the 1930's was accompanied by a substantial decrease in output. The widespread stimulation of all activity by the war has caused capacity operation of our mineral industries. It is significant that the annual dollar valuation of mineral production in Pennsylvania has exceeded $1,000,000,000 in four separate years, a record not yet attained by any other State.

Measured by quantity, Pennsylvania is the leading producer of anthracite, raw clay, mineral paints, stone, cement, coke, and associated byproducts, pig iron, ferroalloys, steel, glass, and refractories. It is second as a producer of lime and bituminous coal. It also leads the country in the production of metallic zinc and sulfuric acid obtained from sulfide ores originating outside the State.

Pennsylvania's minerals have dominated and do dominate its economy. In strictest sense the "Commonwealth" has been, and is now, mineral wealth.

For this reason it is that as secretary of internal affairs, I am about to supplement the vast accumulation of information already on file in the department with a more complete and exact inventory of every mineral in the State, what we have, how much we have, and where it is to be found.

Such is the progress of technology that truly the stone which yesterday the builder rejected may tomorrow become the head of the corner.

Let me give you an example. Years ago ganister was considered a mere cumberer of the earth—cursed as less than worthless by lumbermen and land-hungry farmers alike. Then came the discovery that from it could be made excellent firebrick, and today it is the basic material for many refractories, employing thousands of men.

With chemistry and engineering what they are, and the atomic discoveries just beginning, the most worthless mineral of today may become the source of untold wealth of tomorrow and it behooves us to list our mineral assets more fully and more carefully than ever before.

It becomes important also, as western reserves are rapidly depleted, to make a complete new survey of our vast acreages of so-called low grade iron ore, to which our steel industry must shortly look for additions to waning supplies from other sources.

I propose to start this new inventory of mineral resources at once and to push it to an early completion, so that in Pennsylvania we may know today the assets upon which we must depend to face tomorrow and whatever problems that tomorrow may bring.

So must we take stock of all our resources, natural, physical, industrial, financial, and agricultural.

Here is a field in which Government can truly serve the people. Let us have less governmental control and more governmental service: less Government in business and more business in Government.

The labor of America will supply the thrift and the skill; the industry of America will supply the tools and the methods; the banks of America will render financial assistance where warranted; the farmers of America will supply the food; and the people of America as a whole will supply the courage with which we can face tomorrow unafraid. These, with intelligent use of the resources that God has given us, will, if allowed to work under a Government that is a servant and not a master, enable us to know the truth in a world of propaganda and knowing the truth we shall be forever free.

The Lilienthal Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the headline "Fury rages as Lilienthal debate opens—United States Ambassador 'fired' in reprisal against McKELLAR," written by William Moore, and published in the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal of Tuesday, March 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FURY RAGES AS LILIENTHAL DEBATE OPENS—UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR "FIRED" IN REPRISAL AGAINST MCKELLAR

(By William Moore)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—The long awaited debate over David E. Lilienthal began late today with such dramatic fury and bitterness as has rarely been heard in the Senate.

Lilienthal is seeking confirmation as $17,500-a-year Chairman of the Federal Atomic Energy Commission.

The debate began a few minutes after the Chicago Tribune was informed that John D. Erwin, American Ambassador to Honduras, had been fired in a State Department reprisal against Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, for MCKELLAR's opposition to Lilienthal. Erwin received his appointment through MCKELLAR's sponsorship.

The debate was touched off by a eulogy of Lilienthal from Senator HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa. HICKENLOOPER is chairman of the Senate Atomic Energy Committee, which heard witnesses testify that Lilienthal permitted communism to flourish in the Tennessee Valley Authority while TVA Board Chairman.

HICKENLOOPER struck at the emotional innuendo, insinuation, and suggestion of the evidence heard by the committee, much of which was brought out by MCKELLAR.

Senator BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio, the only member of the committee to vote against the New Deal in its campaign for a committee recommendation of the proposed confirmation, promptly challenged HICKENLOOPER. In the space of 45 minutes, nine Senators sprang to their feet in angry clashes.

One was MCKELLAR himself, who moved a chair out into the great center aisle separating the Republicans and Democrats. There he sat, swiveling about to face each new speaker that arose.

Fighting with the Republicans, MCKELLAR supported and enlarged upon their charges that Lilienthal refused to make the customary Goverment accounting of TVA funds as TVA Chairman.

Recalling that Lilienthal became TVA czar after the late President Roosevelt ousted Dr. A. E. Morgan as TVA board chairman, MCKELLAR roared:

"Dr. Morgan built the TVA dams. Lilienthal never had anything to do with the building of the dams. As soon as Morgan got through with the dams, Lilienthal came here and honeysuckled around our good friend, Roosevelt.

"He just sat around him and pussyfooted with him and teased him and begged him and got him to give him Dr. Morgan's place."

One of the most spectacular outbursts came after Senator BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire, told the Senate nobody but the best qualified man in the United States should be confirmed for the all important atomic energy post, which controls the atomic bomb and all atomic energy development.

"I certainly hope," retorted Senator HATCH, Democrat of New Mexico, "that the people of New Hampshire never adopt such a rule when they elect one of their Senators, lest we might lose one of our most distinguished and valuable Members."

"I will take my chances in New Hampshire," BRIDGES shouted, "as long as the Senator from New Mexico will in New Mexico. And I'll be in the Senate as long as the Senator from New Mexico."

HATCH apologized and offered the explanation that he had failed in trying to be funny.

Senator OVERTON, Democrat of Louisiana, proposed that Lilienthal himself ask President Truman to withdraw the nomination in view of the opposition. This brought minority leader BARKLEY, Democrat of Kentucky) to his feet to support the White House campaign for Lilienthal.

BARKLEY said there had been strong opposition to confirmation of both former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes and the late Associate Justice Louis D. Brandeis of the Supreme Court. BARKLEY said the Nation wou'd lose the services of good public servants if nominees under fire asked their own withdrawal.

BRIDGES hurled a rebuke at BARKLEY for linking Lilienthal with Hughes and Brandeis and said:

"I for one resent having Lilienthal placed in the same category or on the same level with those two great men."

BARKLEY replied that he was just recalling two outstanding cases.

Erwin has been the American representative in Honduras since 1933. He has just been informed of his dismissal by Acting State Secretary Acheson, who is leading the State Department's crusade for Lilienthal. Acheson acted in the absence of Secretary Marshall.

MCKELLAR confirmed the firing of Erwin and said Erwin attributes it to MCKELLAR'S stand against Lilienthal. MCKELLAR quoted Erwin as saying the dismissal order gave no reason and failed to mention the choice of a successor.

Members of the Senate, informed by the Tribune of Acheson's action, called it a strategic blunder that will increase the Senate opposition to Lilienthal.

Senators said the State Department will win no votes for Lilienthal by venting its spleen on an American diplomat to punish a Senator who dares oppose the Department. In fact, they said, such disciplinary action may change the attitude of some Senators who had decided to bow to the administration demand that Lilienthal be confirmed.

Many of the Senators have not had opportunity to study the testimony on Lilienthal taken during 6 weeks of hearings by HICKENLOOPER'S committee. Eastern newspapers have presented the case as a vindictive personal campaign against Lilienthal by MCKELLAR, and published little of the testimony.

But BRICKER and other Republicans who have not succumbed to the administration's global philosophies plan to bring out the facts in the Senate debate, which may last a week.

Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John R. Andu from the Washington News Digest for January 1947:

A NEW NATION IS BORN: INDONESIA

(By John R. Andu)

World War II has awakened the colonial peoples of the world to a consciousness of national patriotism. This national awakening is particularly strong in south and southeast Asia. In the Philippines we witnessed the proclamation of a new Republic under sponsorship of the United States. Great Britain has been compelled to grant India an interim Indian Government, which is to prepare the Indian masses for independence. The peoples of Indochina fought against the return of French imperialism. The French recognized the Viet-Nam Republic. The last area that is now being stabilized is Indonesia. With the end of the war in the Pacific, the situation in Indonesia was unruly and explosive. The peoples of Indonesia revolted against the Japanese masters even before their official surrender to the United States. In a few days most of the Japanese were locked in jails and their weapons were captured by Indonesians.

On August 17, 1945, Indonesia proclaimed its own Republic. This Republic included Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, Moluccas, New Guinea, and the Lesser Sunda Islands, and has an area of 735,000 square miles. The population is 75,000,000.

In the meantime a republican form of government was set up in the capital, Batavia. The Government consisted of a president, a vice president, 17 ministers, and a central committee of 200 delegates from all the islands. Main leaders of the Indonesian Republic are President Soekarno, who is called the George Washington of Indonesia; Dr. Mohammad Hatta, Vice President, and a well-known economic expert; Sutan Sjahrir, Premier, a former youth leader and fighter in the underground movement against the Japanese. The first two leaders are Mohammedans, while Sjahrir and also Mr. Amir Sjariffoedin, minister of defense, are Christians.

INDONESIANS TAKE CONTROL

When the British and the Dutch arrived in Java and Sumatra, the Indoensians were in complete control of the government, communications and the economic life. As a matter of fact the British and the Dutch were looked upon as unwanted intruders. The Indonesians felt that they have had enough of colonial exploitation. They had been ruled for nearly 350 years by imperialist powers. First, by Portugal, then came Holland, then a British intermission period in Java, and finally by the Japanese Empire for nearly 4 years.

During these centuries of foreign rule, the conditions of the people and the country have improved only slightly. The literacy percentage was only 7 percent. Wages averaged 20 cents a day. No serious attempt was made to educate the masses. The Dutch spent for education only 5 percent of the annual budget of the Dutch East Indies Government. The Japanese occupation was even more cruel. During the Japanese rule, over 1,000,000 Indonesians died from starvation and mistreatment.

It is but natural that the Indonesians want to prevent their country from being colonized again. The first signs that warned the British and Dutch about this sentiment were the slogans that were painted on walls, buildings, streetcars—everywhere—"We want government by the people, of the people, and for the people." "Freedom is the birthright of all nations." "Better to be in hell than to be colonized again"—and more.

The Indonesians want to do more than merely plaster up slogans. Millions of young men took up arms to defend their country against any return of colonialism. Many of them fought valiantly against penetration by the British and Dutch military forces, and sacrificed their lives in doing so.

American newspapers have carried reports of the fighting in Soerabaya, in Semarang and in Bekassie. In Soerabaya, alone, the Indonesians sacrificed 40,000 men, women, and children in their fight against British tanks, bombers, and machine guns. Many of the Indonesian soldiers were armed only with bamboo spears. In most instances the Dutch pushed the British troops into the forefront, while Dutch soldiers came into the areas after the British had pacified it.

DUTCH ARROGANCE

The game was soon over for the Dutch, however. Especially so, when the Dutch officials once more acted arrogantly toward everybody and committed repeated cruelties on the native populations. Thousands of British-Indian soldiers deserted their ranks and joined the Indonesian fighters for freedom. At the same time the British discovered that the Indonesians had set up a stable government and wanted genuine democracy.

The Indonesian Republican Army assisted the British in repatriating the Japanese nationals and prisoners of war. Dutchmen in detention camps in the interior of Java were gradually released from the Japs by the Republicans, even though as soon as they were released the Dutch Government recruited them to become soldiers.

CAPABLE LEADERS

The reason that the Indonesian problem did not develop into a full-scale war between Indonesia and Holland is due to the able leadership of the heads of the Republic who restrained the population from taking aggressive measures. When Dr. Sutan Sjahrir was first appointed as Premier he issued a pamphlet called, "Our Struggle," in which he urged his compatriots to cease all radical actions and extremist activities. Intead he urged all Indonesians to follow moderation. With the Indonesian Government reorganized, elections were held for muncipal, provincial, and state councils. At the same time assistance was sought from abroad, especially in the technical, economic, and educational field. The leaders admitted frankly that the Republic was by no means perfect, and that therefore Indonesia needed foreign help. A political manifesto issued on November 1, 1945, declared that Indonesia was very eager to trade with all industrial nations of the world.

Indonesia is rich in raw materials: sugar, rubber, rice, spices, quinine, tapioca, tea, coffee, copra, citronella oil, kapok, teakwood, oil, tin, coal, iron, and gold. Surpluses of these materials are available at this time. For instance, in Java, there are 1,500,000 tons of sugar ready for shipment abroad; also about 250,000 tons of crude rubber. Under a recent trade agreement with India, Indonesia will send 750,000 tons of rice to famine-stricken areas in exchange for textiles, tires, trucks, bicycles, and agricultural implements. The program of the new government calls for similar deals to be arranged with other countries of the world.

POLITICAL CONFERENCES

Today negotiations are going on between high Dutch and Indonesian officials to settle the political situation. Reactionary Dutch forces are trying to hang on to the old political relations. On the other hand, Indonesians want complete independence at the earliest moment. On November 19, 1946, a text of a proposed compromise agreement between the two forces was published to the world. The plan contained therein must be approved by both the Dutch Government and the Indonesian Parliaments. Criticism of the plan is to be expected both in Holland as well as in Indonesia.

Holland is willing to recognize a republic for Java, Sumatra, and Madura. It is proposed that other islands be held under temporary Dutch tutelage until 1949. By that time these territories are to be handed over to the republic. The republic and these outer states will then form a sovereign democratic state on a federal basis, to be called the United States of Indonesia. It will then apply to join the United Nations. Indonesia and Holland will join in a Netherlands-Indonesian union. 1949 will witness the birth of a united democratic nation in southeast Asia.

AMERICAN-INDONESIAN RELATIONS

Before that time arrives, however, 75,000,000 Indonesians are most anxious to establish the very closest relations between their country and the United States. One of the possible obstacles in the path of a realization of such close cooperation is the discriminatory immigration policies of the United States toward the people of those islands. In fact, the Indonesians in the United States today face deportation, because they are not allowed to become citizens or even remain as residents. The reason is that no immigration quota has been established for Indonesia. Seventy-five million Indonesians breathing freedom for the first time, after centuries of servility, strain their eager eyes across the far stretches of the Pacific toward their pattern of liberty and ask as one of the first friendly gestures of the United States be, through its Congress, a lifting of this humiliating exclusion.

Program for Americanism Adopted by the Fleet Reserve Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following forthright declaration of policy on Americanism adopted by the Fleet Reserve Association is highly commendable, and I am confident it will meet with the approval of all patriotic citizens of the United States.

The Fleet Reserve Association is one of the most valuable and dependable organizations of Navy veterans that we have. They have served the Nation with honor during all wars and always stand ready during times of peace to be called to duty if their services are needed.

Their adopted policy on Americanism is as follows:

THE ENEMY WITHIN

Since from the dawn of history man has been struggling up from the mire of slavery to the sun-washed peaks of individual liberty; and

Since 168 years ago our forefathers established on this continent a nation dedicated to the principle of freedom of the individual; and

Since our forefathers fought, bled, and died to attain and maintain that freedom from generation to generation; and

Since we, the members of the Fleet Reserve Association, have fought, some one, some two, and some three wars, to carry on the tradition and hold high the torch of liberty to light the whole world on the road to freedom; and

Since it is our utmost desire to see our children receive, maintain, and pass on to their children the same freedom we have enjoyed; and

Since there have of late years sprung up various totalitarian isms such as fascism, national socialism, and communism, all stemming from Marxian socialism; and

Since said socialism is the absolute opposite of liberalism, and absolutely denies to the individual his freedom as we have known it, since socialism is merely an elaboration of the earliest form of government, namely, dictatorship by the head of the family; and

Since our free way of life under our Constitution and Bill of Rights has made the United States of America the greatest and most powerful nation on earth, with the highest standard of living ever known to man; and

Since believers in these alien isms have infiltrated into our schools and colleges and into the various Government departments, including the Army and Navy, with the avowed intent to steal our freedom from us, while we were fighting the greatest of all wars to maintain that freedom and to advance it to all corners of the earth; and

Since in our law, the definition of treason is "to conspire to overthrow the Government of the United States by force"; and

Since the Communists in national convention assembled in the year 1945, while this Nation was at war, did spawn a recrudescence of the Communist movement, including infiltration into the armed forces of the United States of America, and "The Revolution of the Proletariat"; and

Since communism is dedicated to world conquest and requires of its disciples every effort to destroy all other forms of government, "by force if necessary"; and

Since no person holding Marxian beliefs or sympathies can truly take the oath of office, either civil or military, of the United States of America; and

Since we, the members of the Fleet Reserve Association, have each and every one of us taken the oath, which requires that we "uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America against all its enemies from within or without"; and

Since we so subscribe in the Preamble of our Constitution; and

Since in strict conformity with that oath, and with absolute determination to do our utmost to prevent the treasonable attempt of alien isms to undermine and destroy our Constitution and Bill of Rights, the open declaration of which intent, while this country was in a state of war, we believe to have been a treasonable act; and

Since we, of the Fleet Reserve Association, have given the major portion of our lives to the defense of our beloved country and are still willing to, in the words of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, "Pay the last full measure of devotion" in said cause; and

Since these alien "isms," spawned of envy, laziness, and incompetence have raised their obscene voices to such a pitch that they bring confusion and strife into our national life, we, the members of the Fleet Reserve Association, in convention duly assembled do declare that the time has come for all those who truly believe in the American way of life, that is, the freedom of the individual, to stand up and be counted, to the end that their voices shall become a mighty roar in the ears of those whom we have elected to carry on our government, thus drowning out the squealing of those totalitarian-minded vermin; and

Since we are forthright speaking freemen who, in the words of that great American, Theodore Roosevelt, do not "pussyfoot" or use "weasel words" to express our beliefs.

We, the members of the Fleet Reserve Association, do place ourselves on record as setting forth the following as our Americanism program:

(a) Recapture by the Congress of its full constitutional power and authority and return to the constitutional system of checks and balances wherein the Congress initiates and passes laws, the President approves and executes them, and the courts hear and determine the meaning thereof; thereby abandoning the lately assumed prerogative of the courts to determine public policy, and of the President to dictate to Congress what laws it shall pass.

(b) Abolishment and liquidation of all emergency wartime agencies and Government corporations.

(c) Complete abatement of all bureaucratic propaganda and abolishment of all public relations offices and officers pertaining thereto.

(d) Removal from public office, from the civil service, from commissioned, warrant, noncommissioned rank in the armed forces; from positions as police or peace officers or in fire departments; or from any other employment whatsoever, the pay or remuneration for which is derived from public funds, goods and/or services, howsoever collected or disbursed, of the Federal, State, or municipal governments, or of any political subdivision thereof, or of any corporation which is maintained or contributed to, in whole or in part, by said funds and/or services: or from employment in any school, college, or university or other institution of learning which is maintained, in whole or in part as herein set forth, or by tax exemption, or in any labor union or other organization which is granted any special privileges or protection by law; of any and all persons, without regard to sex, race, color, or creed, who believe in, or have sympathized with, contributed anything of value to, or in any way or manner, knowing the same to be such, forwards, harbors, disseminates or promulgates, the principles or literature of any form of marxism, or of any other ism which is in conflict with our true republican form of government as set forth in the constitution and bill of rights of the United States of America; or which advocates, or in the past has advocated, the overthrow of our government by force for any reason or under any circumstances whatsoever.

(e) That it shall be prima facie an act of treason for any person described in paragraph (d) to attain any such office or position as set forth in said paragraph (d).

(f) That any labor union or other organization which knowingly admits any such person to membership shall lose all such special privileges or protection at law as described in paragraph (d).

(g) Strict vigilance by all agencies of government to see that the above conditions are permanently maintained.

(h) Return of the Supreme Court to the condition of a nonpartisan, nonpolitical tribunal.

(i) That the United States Senate be empowered to "withdraw" its consent in the same manner as now given to the appointment of any person to office who holds said office by reason of "appointment by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate," such withdrawal of consent to constitute an immediate removal from office of the person so affected.

(j) No more than two terms of 4 years each for any President of the United States.

(k) Positive opposition to any further socialistic legislation; revival of thrift and individual pride; absolute denial of the idea that the state owes the lazy and shiftless a living; decentralization of government; return to the several States of their full constitutional rights and powers.

(l) Absolute assertion of the right of every person to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, i. e., the right of every person to sell the product of his brain and/or brawn wheresoever he finds a market and to whomsoever desires said product, at whatsoever price or wage he sees fit to accept without let or hindrance from anyone, including government, without prejudice to the right of the Government to maintain national security.

(m) Liquidation of planned economy and return to the law of supply and demand and free competition in labor and management.

(n) Equal opportunity and responsibility for labor and management.

(o) Positive opposition to the expenditure of any Federal public funds other than such as are appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose named in the appropriation as constitutionally provided.

(p) Advocacy of constitutional amendments where necessary to implement the above program.

Respectfully submitted.

NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMITTEE,
MELVIN A. HAWLEY,
Chairman and Past Regional Vice President.
CORNELIUS E. ANDERSON,
Member and Past National President.
HENRY J. WILLIAMS,
Member and Past President, Branch No. 2.
JAMES H. VAN SLYCKE,
Member and Past National President.
ROBERT F. BONAMARTE,
National President, Member Ex Officio.

Appropriations for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Gallup poll with reference to the Army and Navy budget:

THE GALLUP POLL—MILITARY CUT OPPOSED

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

Among voters who say they have followed the arguments in Congress over the Army and Navy budget, the majority is opposed to any reduction.

President Truman's budget called for about $11,500,000,000 for national defense, by far the largest item in the budget.

Any substantial reduction of this amount, military chieftains claim, would seriously hamper our military power and prestige abroad. Critics of the budget, however, have maintained that there is always some water that can be squeezed out of any budget and that in this case appropriations could be cut without too much damage.

FOUR IN TEN INFORMED

In testing public sentiment on the matter, the institute first asked voters whether they had followed arguments in Congress for and against reducing the Army-Navy budget. Slightly more than 4 in every 10 (43 percent) said that they had been following the issue, while the rest said they had not been following the arguments of both sides.

Those who said they had followed the arguments were asked:

Do you think Congress should reduce the amount of money which the Army and Navy have asked for?

	Percent
Should reduce	34
Should not	60
No opinion	6

The point of view of the largest number is that so long as no general European peace settlement has been made and Russia continues her expansionist foreign policy, we should maintain our military strength.

THE ARGUMENTS

Typical of this attitude is the opinion expressed by a business executive interviewed in Boston:

"We'll never be able to bargain effectively with the Russians by tying one arm behind our back. This is no time to deliberately weaken ourselves; it will make the rest of the world think we're soft and flabby."

The main argument in favor of cutting the military and naval budget, as seen by voters, is typified in this opinion from a housewife in Cleveland:

"People who pay taxes will get fed up with having to carry the load of a big army in peacetime."

Generally speaking, the American public has for many years taken the Army's side in arguments over defense appropriations. During the 1930's polls found public opinion substantially in accord with plans to build up the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

FAVOR TRAINING

There is wide public support, too, for peacetime compulsory military training to maintain a large reserve. Even before the war ended polls were finding large majorities in favor of such a program.

The attitude has remained unchanged; the most recent poll, reported last month, found 72 percent in favor, 23 percent opposed, and 5 percent undecided.

Veterans' Job Placement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, based upon information that I have been able to secure from the field, that is, on the State level, the Veterans' Employment Service has been doing a splendid job in finding employment for returning veterans. They have been especially successful in securing positions and in the placement of the blind, the amputees, and others suffering severe physical handicaps in good positions. Any reduction in the appropriation for the Veterans' Employment Service will seriously affect those veterans who have not been placed to date. This is highly specialized work, and it takes a great deal of time to train field personnel to effectively promote the interest of the employer in the disabled veteran.

Common sense dictates that a veteran is not wholly rehabilitated until suitable employment is found for him. It follows, therefore, that now, of all times, is not the time to interrupt such an important phase of the veterans' rehabilitation program.

There has been some discussion and opposition to the Veterans' Employment Service on the grounds that it duplicates the work of the State employment service. I have been unable to find any sound basis for this statement, whereas, according to my information, just the opposite is true.

I have authentic information that the personnel employed, charged with veterans' job placement, has been working in close cooperation with the State employment service offices and do not duplicate the work but, rather, supplement and assist the State employment service offices in extending the facilities of the offices to the veteran.

Representatives of the veterans' organizations are very much opposed to any reduction in this appropriation, as they believe it will materially affect the welfare of all veterans, especially the physically handicapped.

It should be remembered that as our demobilization of the armed forces is nearing completion, it becomes more and more difficult for those being discharged from the armed services to find suitable employment. Let us not forget, also, that under our educational and training program for veterans, the time is here when these veterans are completing their institutional and other training and are now in need of assistance in securing positions in industry. In this connection, the Veterans' Administration records show that as of February 28, 1947, there were 1,659,142 veterans in schools, colleges, and universities. As of the same date there were 625,719 veterans in training on the job. The report for February 1947 shows that 2,984 have completed their period of eligibility or their entitlement had been exhausted.

As of February 28, 1947, 64.3 percent were in schools of higher learning, or 1,066,018, leaving 593,124 in other schools, making a total of 1,659,142.

As a result of the information regarding the effective work of the Veterans' Job Placement Service and the need of the veterans for assistance in finding jobs, especially the disabled, I shall try to have the amount the Appropriations Committee took from the Veterans' Service restored. I remind the House that if the veterans are placed in jobs, money is saved to the Government as unemployed veterans can draw unemployment insurance. I voted both for the Van Zandt and Forand amendments, to restore appropriations for the Veterans' Job Placement Service.

Future Political Structure of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Star of March 26, 1947:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Secretary of State Marshall's statement to the Council of Foreign Ministers in Moscow, setting forth his views on the future political structure of Germany, restored what has long been lacking from international conferences: namely, exactitude of expression.

Mr. Marshall uses words to convey meanings, not to obscure them. The mind that formulated the proposals of the United States delegates so crisply that they are contained in a thousand words or less reveals itself as orderly, candid and precise. One needs but compare the Marshall statment with those of Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, or even with the preamble to the San Francisco Charter, to see the difference between fuzziness and clarity.

For that matter, one need but compare Mr. Marshall's statement with that of Mr. Molotov, made at the same time, to see the enormous difference between two minds and two cultures. Mr. Marshall says exactly what

he means, and nobody can possibly misinterpret him. Content and form are perfectly fused, and thereby the English language at least is rehabilitated.

Mr. Marshall has restored style to public documents. Style has been singularly lacking, not only from statesmanship but from statementship, during the war and postwar periods. Words like "peace loving" and "democratic" have been liberally sprinkled into every policy statement, their meaning reserved for anybody's interpretation. The results have been disastrous. In Mr. Marshall, at long last, we have a leader whose statements we can read with pleasure.

Mr. Molotov continues to speak in the peculiar hobble-gobble jargon of Communist idiom, which has hitherto seemed infectious. Soviet words are deliberately designed to convey at least two meanings—one to the international Communist church, well versed in interpreting Communist cabalism, and the other to the trusting innocents outside. The Yalta declaration, a statement of incredible sloppiness, leaving all the "i's" undotted and "t's" uncrossed, thus conveyed to the world Communist movement the news that the Soviets had triumphed and the Lublin Camarilla made certain of tenure. Meanwhile, everyone else took comfort in the promise of democratic elections, which might reverse or modify the coup de force.

Mr. Marshall, however, in demanding a democratic German state, defines in six points exactly what he means by such a state. Had Yalta been as precise in definitions, the recent elections would have had to be canceled by the UN.

1. All political power is recognized as originating in the people.

2. Popular elections held at frequent intervals. * * *

3. Conducted under conditions in which freely competing parties submit programs and candidates.

4. Political parties * * * voluntary associations of citizens * * * no party enjoys any privileged status.

5. Basic rights of free speech, freedom of religion, assembly, association * * * guaranteed.

6. Individuals protected against arbitrary arrest, search and seizure * * * equality under law.

In point six, Mr. Marshall—for the first time in any postwar document, and including the four freedoms—seeks to reestablish the primary and most important of all freedoms, namely, habeas corpus—security from arbitrary arrest. There is all the difference between Mr. Marshall's statement and "freedom from fear." It is the difference between clarity and ambiguity; between a specific pledge and a Utopian promise; between saying what you mean and hoping that events will give the "correct" interpretation to a pious hope.

If Mr. Marshall's longed-for lucidity is that of a military mind, thank heaven for some qualities of that kind.

When the military mind designs and orders an operation to achieve an objective, it dare not describe it in terms open to a dozen interpretations by the commander. In matters of life or death, meanings must be crystalline. But peace is also a matter of life or death; the fate of frantic millions hangs on the meaning of words.

Let the words, therefore, be honest, clean, limpid, candid, factual, committal, affirmative, civilized.

And down with weasel words, shaded meanings, noncommittal.

Down with adjectives that destroy the noun, and adverbs which disarm the verb. Down with the language of conspiracy, obscurantist, cabalistic. Down with the destroyer words; the undermining words; the words that make an anarchy of language.

And up with the words of order and of law.

Dixie in Black and White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by A. G. Mezerik from the Nation of March 22, 1947:

DIXIE IN BLACK AND WHITE

(By A. G. Mezerik)

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.—Alone of the regions in the United States the South has a tradition of a hereditary aristocracy, of landed bourbons. Their philosophy, molded by generations of slaveholding, has been contemptuous of those who work in trade, industry, or the learned professions. These bourbons were and are the great resisters of change, the strong defenders of their yesterdays.

The virtues and vices of the southern bourbons are not confined to their class, but have set a stamp on the whole society. The South has glorified physical prowess and adventure, the exploits of the hunter, the pomp and courage of the military man. It has nourished a strangely distorted code of chivalry which expresses itself even now in duels, fights, and horsewhippings. It exalts sportsmanship and gives a high place to horseracing, cock-fighting, and feuding.

The legacies of the plantation mind are apparent to this day in the opposition to progress in education, health, industrialization, unionization, and religious practices. Religion has felt this hand of the past very heavily, perhaps because spiritual aspirations are conditioned by other goals. The South has always had the largest percentage of church members of any section in the country; it has, in fact, been derisively called the "Bible Belt." The God of the Southern Protestant Churches has been, much more than in any other region, a personal God, watching over the individual, assuming responsibility for his luck or misfortune, supporting him in his fights and feuds. The aim of the church has been the good individual rather than the good society.

This is the setting in which the South has matured. There have been some changes, but until recently they have lagged far behind the needs of the people. The great crisis of 1930 ushered in a violent awakening. And with the advent of Roosevelt in 1933, factors which would begin the transformation of the social, political, and economic status of the South came into being. The waste of land was slowed by programs to correct soil erosion. The farmer, accustomed to thinking of himself as a lone individual who had no interest in a society bigger than his family clan, found that a Nation was interested in his welfare. Without markets for his produce, with hunger penetrating his kitchen, the farmer awoke to the meaning, in his own life, of Government purchases of his crop at prices far above the open market. His brother in the villages and the towns found that in work relief, PWA and WPA, society was showing an interest in him, too, and he reciprocated that interest. Farmer and townsman began to think about their Government, to go to the polls, and to look around at the bigger world.

Farm security brought the first freedom from the fear that a man might work hard to create a home and a farm and lose his all to a bad crop—and it would be no one's business, for, in the bourbon ideology, no one cared. Social security erased a few of the lines in southern faces with the hint that old age might not be the years of the unwanted they had always been. Laws on minimum wages and maximum hours brought a tiny surcease from the never-ending struggle to earn a bare living and to get some resting time that wasn't also worry time. And the TVA was being built, providing work and a new way of life for a region.

The towns which dot this rolling countryside are lovely. Raleigh, Durham, Charlotte, and Greensboro have a warm ingratiating quality which seems to insure ease of living. There is a pervasive feeling that things move slowly, that the even tenor of old ways could not easily be disturbed. Yet the old is giving way to the new.

On a sunny, cool morning of November, in the beautiful mountain resort of Asheville, the North Carolina Baptist Convention was holding its one hundred and sixteenth annual meeting. The "messengers," as the delegates from the local churches are called, listened to the report of the committee on social service and civic righteousness. The committee made recommendations, and the chair asked for a vote. The report was unanimously adopted.

The Baptists, the religious denomination to which BILBO and Talmadge belong, had voted to support hospitalization, education, and suffrage for Negroes, with facilities and opportunities fully equal to those enjoyed by whites. They stood foursquare for an end to segregation in the church, and the committee's report told why:

"If there is an equality of all men by virtue of their relationship to an impartial Creator, and an equality of all believers who share in the redemption of Christ, such equalities must be respected in the body of Christ, which is the church. Therefore, segregation of believers holding to the same tenets of faith, because of color or social status, into racial or class churches is a denial of the New Testament affirmation of the equality of all believers at the foot of the cross, and alien to the spirit of Christ, the head of the church."

This was unprecedented, and the final planks in the platform were just as revolutionary. The North Carolina branch of the Southern Baptist Church moved into politics to achieve Christian aims. The messengers of the church asked for the immediate passage of a Federal antilynching bill. And in full acceptance of the logic of the times they went on to call for equal wages and equal treatment for Negro workers and the passing of such legislation, both State and national, as would assure fair treatment.

The teletype brought the news to North Carolina's many independent newspapers. Liberal editors were bewildered. Not one wrote a paragraph in praise of the Baptists' action. Fair Employment Practices had suddenly come out of the closet, and they didn't know what to do. A southern editor, however enlightened his other policies, had never felt he could support the FEPC in his columns; his readers, he thought, would not stand for it. Then came this bolt out of the blue; the preachers of the Bible belt, he discovered were ahead of him. Nor did the liberal and labor organizations mobilize support for this grass-roots moral renaissance. Though they were publicly on record for the FEPC, they had not looked hard enough at the change being wrought in the people on the farms and in the towns to be prepared for the stand taken at Asheville. Not so slow to act were those on the other side, the Baptists who had long rendered lip service to their church but in their personal, social, and political decisions had violated its spirit. Overnight the convention received 3,000 indignant telegrams, and the telephone circuits to Asheville were unable to cope with the number of calls for the assembled religious leaders from old familiars who opposed their action.

The onslaught was effective, and the next morning the messengers reconsidered. The session was hectic. By a vote of 253 to 158 the convention rescinded the ringing passage quoted above, which would have banned segregation within the church. And with this back-tracking went a watering-down of the crucial FEPC resolution, which was changed from a demand for legislation to one for equal treatment. The demand for an antilynching law and for equal hospitalization, suffrage, and education withstood the attack. While the original resolution is no longer on the record, what was so eloquently said will live. All through the South the FEPC is on the lips of people who formerly dismissed any discussion of it on the ground that southerners—particularly the churchgoing folk—would die rather than accept it.

The Baptists had already made forays against race prejudice in Virginia, Florida, and Georgia. In Florida the Ministerial Association of Greater Miami, shocked by an attempt to revive the Ku Klux Klan in the name of Protestantism, had acted with swiftness and vigor. They declared:

"As ministers of the gospel of Christ we not only oppose the position and principles of the Ku Klux Klan, but we also strongly advise our people to have no part in furthering its organization. We are not alone opposed to the Ku Klux Klan, but also to the apparent tendency on the part of many people to assume that the Klan is a Protestant organization. We do not consider the Ku Klux Klan as representing Protestant Christianity in any condition or expression, since it is a denial of Christianity itself. The Ku Klux Klan is the precise denial of everything truly American and democratic."

In Georgia the Reverend Joseph Rabun, pastor of the church to which the late Gene Talmadge belonged, demanded more teeth in the resolution on racial relations submitted to the messengers at the Georgia Baptist Convention. In the struggle of the old against the new the Talmadges and Bilbos find themselves fighting a growing movement within their own churches. Whipping up race hate does not serve them in fighting churchmen. Nor can they go into their accustomed routine and berate Baptists as Yankee meddlers. The argument falls on deaf ears, for the Southern Baptist Convention came into being on the issue of secession. Its tradition and record make the demagogs' claim to being the sole guardians of sectional patriotism look pallid indeed.

The old misleaders so familiar to the South have new antagonists, born of the changes which have slowly been taking place in the southern people. That these should be joined, or led, by the Baptist Church is truly heartening, for no other spiritual influence is so widespread and powerful in the region. The Baptists have large and wealthy congregations in the cities; in the rolling country of the agrarian South no village is without a Baptist minister. The church has lived with the people of the city and of the farm. It has also been an integral part of the company town, where the evolution of a new attitude on race has lately been strikingly demonstrated.

Thomasville, N. C., one of the many company towns that dot the Piedmont, is the domain of the Thomas Chair Co. The company has made the rules for the residents and enforced its own conception of the proper social pattern, including segregation. The Thomas plants run down one side of the main street in Thomasville; stores line the other. The railroad parallels the street, and its smoke and noise are always present. None of the beauty and quiet of the North Carolina landscape penetrates the town, nor for a long time did any sense of community responsibility.

Then came a strike. The 350 Negroes and the 954 whites employed in the plant walked out together—uncertain of where they were going, of whether they could trust each other, of what the all-powerful employer might do. In the forefront of everyone's mind those first days were two questions. The first was, if the strike lasted, how would the strikers and their families continue to eat? For the wages they had received had permitted no savings. The other could not be asked aloud; the etiquette of Southern bourbons had made it taboo. The Negro wondered how he should behave to the white man on the picket line and in the union hall. The white man was perplexed by that and a related question: what would his neighbors say if he let down the old barriers?

The answer to the economic question came speedily. The merchants supported the strikers. They gave credit to the families of the men so they could buy food, and many business and professional people contributed $10 a week to the strike fund. It was a long strike. Repeated "back-to-work" movements initiated by the employers failed. The company's greatest effort enrolled 22 scabs, not one of whom was a Negro.

In the long days and nights on the picket line, in union meetings, and at crude canteens the relations between Negroes and whites were clarified. Before long they marched together before the gates; soon they ate together; and after a time they sat down together and played cards. Forty-five strike leaders met constantly in the union hall to plan their course, and there were nearly as many Negroes as whites on this steering committee. When they had finished for the day, they had coffee and doughnuts, continuing in mixed groups their never-ending discussion of how to win the strike. It was not a recognized process of cementing race relations—that ticklish subject was never more than touched upon. The strike could not be won if the workers were divided. And everybody understood.

They understood so well that on Labor Day, when the strikers marched down the smoke-blown street, white man walked next to Negro, white woman beside black. There was no defiance of native prejudices in that parade; friends and fellow-workers marched quite unconsciously side by side. At last the day of victory came, and there was a real celebration. Outside the union hall the strikers clustered, gay now, doing little dances, congratulating each other. Upstairs there were jigs, songs—and a new union contract. This, though it said nothing of the rights of Negroes or the obligations of whites, was, in a moving sense, a charter for both.

The State's educational institutions have felt the same influence. In the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill the ferment of change has long been working. Years ago Howard Odum and Frank Graham picked up the gauntlet of progress. Dr. Odum propounded the theories of regionalism, and the National Government in Washington began to translate them into political and social realities. Farm security, the restoration of soil fertility, the TVA were logical outgrowths of the ideas which came out of the University of North Carolina.

The traditional progressivism of the university finds notable expression in the publication of the magazine Christian Frontiers, called by its editors a journal of Baptist life and thought. This magazine is attuned to the thinking which brought the Asheville resolution into being, to the morality which condemns as sinful the white man's sense of racial superiority. In the past few months other significant events have occurred on the campus. Dorothy Maynor, the Negro soprano, sang at Graham Memorial Hall to a nonsegregated audience, and white and Negro ushers escorted thousands of Carolinians to their seats. This was another manifestation of the awakened fervor of the southern churches, for the concert was sponsored by the Council for Religion in Life and the proceeds were for the benefit of the Fellowship of Southern Churchmen.

In Raleigh, for the first time in history, a Negro student recently presided over a mixed meeting of North Carolina students. Thirty-four delegates from State Negro college and 79 white students joined together to elect a Negro as pro tempore president of their organization.

The southern world is definitely on the move, and in North Carolina the pace at which each segment of society is adjusting itself to the new conditions can be seen more clearly than in other Southern States. The liberal who once thought his position so daring now finds he is no longer out in front. While he kept saying, "Don't press us; what we want to do will take a long time; it's got to come slowly," the majority moved beyond him. The weakness of the gradualist position was unwittingly revealed to me by one of North Carolina's liberal editors. Relations between Negroes and white, he said, were much better now than in the time of his father, and he had no doubt that they would be wonderfully improved by the time his infant child was grown up. As he spoke it apparently dawned on him that this slow process might not appeal to persons undergoing the degrading imprisonment of segregation. After a long pause he said, "If only the Negroes will be patient."

If good liberals have been left behind, think what has happened to the bourbons. Their point of view was clearly enunciated by a textile magnate who organized the flood of telegrams and telephone calls to Asheville designed to head off the Baptist resolution. "What made the Baptist messengers pass their resolution?" I asked. The answer was prompt: "Too many red Baptists—the State is full of them."

The Magazine Federal Science Progress Discontinued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include an article from today's issue of PM, and I wish to take issue with PM as to the accuracy of its conclusion. We Republicans made a pledge to the people of this country to eliminate as much unnecessary expense in the operation of the Federal Government as possible. This includes the wasting of paper on projects of the various departments in the field of publications, in which they have no authority to trespass.

It was not the protest of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., or any other publishing company, that was responsible for the discontinuance of the publication Federal Science Progress by the Department of Commerce. The truth is that after I called the attention of the House of Representatives to it in a speech delivered on February 13, 1947, there was a determination on the part of the Republican Members of the House to the effect that the Department of Commerce had no business publishing such a magazine, and they insisted upon its discontinuance. I, therefore, in a very humble

manner, desire to take at least some credit for the discontinuance of this publication.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES SCIENCE MAGAZINE CLOSED AFTER M'GRAW-HILL PROTEST

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Protests of unfair competition by McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., which issues numerous popular business and science magazines, have resulted in death of the Commerce Department publication, Federal Science Progress.

Federal Science Progress was begun in February to review and call attention to nonsecret reports of work carried on with Government funds.

A highly readable, well-printed, and attractive monthly magazine, it carried in a typical issue reports of work done with the Geiger counter—which detects radiation—airplane instrument landing systems, airport lighting, and preservation of valuable records in the National Archives.

The attractiveness of Federal Science Progress was its downfall.

McGraw-Hill, which issues Science Illustrated, protested both to Secretary of Commerce W. Averell Harriman, and to powerful members of the House Appropriations Committee.

Federal Science Progress, charged McGraw-Hill spokesmen, is a lavish publication, which would cost a private publisher nearly $100,000 a year and directly competes with at least seven private publications.

While the Commerce Department is charged with the duty of spreading Government technical and scientific information, McGraw-Hill representatives said, it should not do so through a popularized magazine.

Warnings that the House Appropriations Committee would cut off funds for Federal Science Progress after June 30 were sufficient to persuade the Commerce Department to close the magazine, which had passed a 6,000 circulation with the May issue.

Probe Requested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter written to a Member of the other body asking an investigation of the activities of certain high Government officials, and others, in the sale of war surplus material. The letter follows:

MARCH 26, 1947.

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: In accordance with my conversation with your secretary, Oliver Dompierre, I am forwarding the following, along with copies of the complaints before the Federal Trade Commission and photostatic copies of evidence in connection with the subject.

Evidence recently has been presented the Federal Trade Commission that a ring of ex-convicts with strong political connections are engaged in the sale and distribution of some of our scarce and most valuable war surpluses. They have reportedly operated on a world-wide scale.

Testimony given the Commission alleged that the ring was obtaining the materials through the aid of a cabinet officer and one of the Nation's leading political figures. The names of a United States Senator and others prominent in public life also were linked to the ring.

Law enforcement officers in New York City reportedly are of the opinion that many of the materials sold by the ring were sold illegally—that the ring was operating an extensive black market in surplus war goods.

The Federal Trade Commission investigation was launched after complaints had been received that Carlisle Rowntree, an individual trading as the Export Finders Bureau, 8 Bridge Street, New York City, was violating the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The Commission stated in its complaint that Rowntree had stated in widely circulated advertisements that he could make prompt delivery on scarce textiles, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals, steel products and machinery, and other merchandise.

At the time Rowntree's advertising was appearing, most of the products he was offering for sale were under strictest Government control. Priorities for their purchase were required in most instances. The Trade Commission complaint was filed after Rowntree customers complained to it that he was failing to fulfill his contracts.

Copies of contracts and other papers executed by Rowntree with Erwin "Bud" Arvey, son of a prominent Chicago politician, for fabulous quantities of almost unobtainable barbed wire and corrugated galvanized sheet steel, are on file with the Commission. Sums mentioned in these contracts ran into millions of dollars.

Elmer R. Steinmann, who in an appearance before the Commission as a witness on January 29, 1947, identified himself as a steel engineer, testified as follows about a contract between Arvey and Rowntree for the purchase of 50,000 tons of barbed wire:

"This barbed wire is purported by Mr. Arvey to originate at a source down in Washington through a Mr. H. Gordon Fischer, who, in turn, disposed of the barbed wire for sale through Mr. Richard Ascher, at 92 Liberty Street, New York, who, in turn, is supposed to have had a contract with Mr. Rowntree.

"Telephone calls were made by Mr. Arvey from the Gotham Hotel, which are on record in the Gotham Hotel, to a Mr. Gael Sullivan, Assistant Postmaster General, and to Mr. Robert Hannegan, Postmaster General. Telephone calls also were made to Senator SCOTT LUCAS.

"It was admitted by Mr. Arvey that Mr. Hannegan and Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Fischer were the owners of the barbed wire. It was also admitted by Mr. Arvey that the barbed wire was purchased for $25 a ton and it was to be disposed of by Mr. Gordon Fischer to Mr. Ascher and to Mr. Rowntree for $100 a ton, and Mr. Rowntree was to get all he could over $100 a ton. All that was made over $100 a ton was Mr. Rowntree's."

Fifty thousand tons of barbed wire, it is estimated, would fill an entire city block to a height of eight stories. Fifty thousand tons of barbed wire would represent approximately one-sixth or more of all the barbed wire produced in the preceding year.

The Commission's transcript of its hearings in the Rowntree case to date is more than 1,500 pages long. It describes in detail many of the deals in which Arvey, Rowntree, Ascher, Fischer and the others were involved.

Rowntree has a long police record, having been released from the Federal Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., in 1941 after serving five years for swindling. Ascher is said to have a police record but denies it. Steinmann, who acted as a procurer of customers for Rowntree in several instances, has a police record and currently is out on parole on a swindling conviction.

I believe that you will agree with me that the sale of scarce war surplus commodities by persons known to have police records as swindlers should not be permitted.

I submit that the operations of this ring in war surpluses and its connections, if any, with government employees, should be the subject of an inquiry by the Senate War Investigating Committee and the findings made public, regardless of political consequences.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL W. SHAFER.

More Relief for the Rich?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the principle of progressive taxation, meaning taxation based on ability to pay, has always been considered a cornerstone of democracy. In the United States, however, for the past 8 years at least, there has been a steady shifting of the costs of government away from wealthy individuals, and corporations and onto the shoulders of the low- and middle-income groups.

In 1939, individuals earning less than $5,000 a year paid less than 10 percent of the total individual income-tax bill. In 1942, they paid almost 50 percent of this bill. While figures for later years are not yet available, this regressive soak-the-poor trend has continued with each new revenue law.

The Revenue Act of 1944, passed over the veto of President Roosevelt, who labeled it "relief for the greedy and not for the needy," embodied a refund of excess-profits tax of over $3,000,000,000 to American corporations already bulging with war profits. The act of 1945 embodied an additional gift—elimination of the excess-profits tax—of over $3,000,000,000 to the same corporations.

Is the Revenue Act of 1947 going to contain another multi-million-dollar gift to the greedy at the expense of the needy? The Republicans, who promised the hard-pressed voters tax relief during the last campaign, are trying to put it over in the form of a 20 percent across-the-board cut in everybody's income tax.

It sounds fair, on the surface, does it not? But if we look at the concrete effects of this impartial cut, we can see that it again favors the wealthy taxpayers at the expense of those in the lower and middle brackets.

For example, under this proposal, a married man with two children earning $3,000 a year—and 70 percent of our families have incomes of less than this—would have his taxes reduced by $27.40 a year, or 53 cents a week, enough to buy a pound of chopped meat. By contrast, the corporation executive receiving $100,000 a year would have tax savings of $12,460 a year, or $239 a week.

Not only does it grossly violate the democratic principle of progressive taxation, but it does little or nothing to bolster the shrinking purchasing power of

the great masses of consumers upon whom our economy depends. It will do nothing to cushion the effects of the coming depression, made inevitable by the inflation we are now undergoing. Those who opened the gates to this inflation are now digging deeper the ditch for the coming depression.

A TAX PROGRAM TO SUPPORT

First. Raise exemptions: In a country such as ours, which has an abundance of wealth, everyone should enjoy tax-free a sufficient amount to provide his family with a minimum standard of health and decency. Therefore, the exemption for single individuals should be raised from the present $500 to $1,500, and for married couples from the present $1,000 to $2,500, with the existing exemption of $500 for every child or other dependent retained.

Second. Relieve small business: Small business, like small taxpayers, should receive tax relief so that its competitive position against monopolies is strengthened. A graduated tax, starting at 10 percent on the first $10,000 of net income, should be enacted, rising to the present 38 percent rate at $100,000 of net income. The current corporate tax rate should be retained on net incomes of $100,000 and over.

Third. Repeal excise taxes on necessities: Sales taxes and most excise taxes are regressive taxes, which fall far more heavily on low-income groups than on the upper brackets. The taxes on the $5 opera ticket and the $1,000 fur coat are lumped together with those on the movie ticket and the $5 pocketbook and called luxury taxes. All taxes on low-cost necessities—and in this we do include the movie ticket, should be separated from the true luxury taxes and repealed.

Fourth. Tax corporations: A powerful drive is being carried on by big business to eliminate or reduce taxes on corporations. Their profits in 1946 were at an all-time peak and were not hampered by the present 38-percent tax rate. Abolition of the corporate tax would not only increase their already very large profits, but would make it necessary to replace the loss in revenue by adding still heavier burdens to the low and middle-income groups.

The excess-profits tax should be reimposed, without carry-backs and with a $100,000 exemption for small business, to cover the loss of revenue incurred by raising income-tax exemptions.

Fifth. Close tax loopholes: Loopholes in the income-tax law make a mockery of the principle of taxation in accordance with ability to pay. The most flagrant example of tax avoidance is the exemption of large amounts of income from Federal, State, and municipal securities. All income from such securities should be taxed at the regular rates.

Another major loophole is the option of filing separate tax returns for husbands and wives. This enables wealthy families to avoid the upper brackets where they properly belong. Mandatory joint family returns should be required.

Hoarding of undistributed profits by large corporations is another means of tax avoidance by wealthy taxpayers. From 1940 through 1945, American corporations made $53,500,000,000 in profits after taxes. But only $25,900,000,000 were distributed as dividends while $27,600,000,000 were retained as undistributed profits. Less than 1 percent of stockholders receive 60 percent of dividends, and wealthy taxpayers gain tax advantages when dividend payments are postponed. They are in high surtax brackets, and hence prefer to keep undistributed profits in corporate treasuries until leaner years to minimize tax payments. The present provision in the tax law against unreasonable accumulation of undistributed profits is obviously ineffective since their volume is today at record-breaking levels. A steeply graduated tax on undistributed profits would provide revenue for the Government and curb a major tax-dodging device.

ACTION NEEDED

A grass-roots campaign against the proposed tax steal and for a program which will distribute the burden equitably and bolster purchasing power is long overdue. Taxes affect the standard of living of all of us; they vitally affect the economy of the country, yet the average citizen shows a vast lack of interest in the subject of tax legislation. His Congressman rarely hears from him, while hearing constantly from the corporation lobbyists who well understand the importance of this subject to their clients. We Representatives in Washington must be made to realize that we were elected to represent the 92 percent of the people who earn less than $5,000 a year and not the 8 percent in the top income brackets.

Reduction of Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, there is no purpose in participating at length in this debate. I do want to go on record as favoring this tax-reduction bill and I shall vote for it. Taxes are not popular and no tax bill is wholly satisfactory, but this bill providing a 30-percent reduction for the lowest brackets including, I am informed, about 24,000,000 taxpayers, and a 20-percent reduction for most other taxpayers, will be a boon to the patient American people who have almost forgotten what tax reduction is like.

Mr. Speaker, I am wholly unable to understand the philosophy of the Democrats here in the House. They are offering a great variety of excuses against tax reduction, and it is pretty clear that they are not opposing this bill so much as they are opposing any tax reduction at all. The excuse most frequently advanced is that we ought not to have tax reduction until the national debt is paid off. The national debt is over $260,000,000,000. It may be paid off in a century if we have a century of peace. I am interested in giving today's taxpayers at least some tax relief, and I really do not feel that they should have to wait another 100 years.

If it were possible to offer amendments to this bill, I would ask that it incorporate the provisions of my own bill, H. R. 71, providing for the exemption of Federal, State, and municipal pensions up to $2,000, and thus give to our retired teachers, policemen, and firemen, or their widows, very much needed relief at comparatively small cost to the Government. Since this is not possible today, I shall ask the Ways and Means Committee to give attention to my bill as soon as they consider general tax revision.

The Congress could not do a finer thing for thousands of faithful public servants and good citizens than to exempt these pensions.

Selling Democracy Round the Globe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Peter Edson, from the Washington Daily News of March 27, 1947:

SELLING DEMOCRACY ROUND THE GLOBE

(By Peter Edson)

The much-heralded show-down between democracy and communism brings up the matter of what the United States proposes to do about selling its particular brand of freedom in a naughty, misguided world.

It is generally agreed that the Russian Commies are better at this propaganda racket than anybody else. There is no break-down of the Russian budget to show what the Soviet Government spends on its educational activities in other countries. It has been estimated as high as $100,000,000 a year—more than all the rest of the world put together spends on informational and cultural relations.

RUSSIA LEADS PARADE

About 30 leading governments indulge in this national good-will building in other countries. That the Russian propaganda builds more ill will than good will is beside the point. The point is that they seem to get their line across in ways that do the most damage to democracy, which is their purpose.

In connection with the proposed grants of $400,000,000 aid to Greece and Turkey, the question for the United States is how to offset in those countries the Communist propaganda that this is American imperialism seeking control of their governments and economy. To counteract that propaganda, what has to be sold is American democracy.

On purely informational programs to tell Greek and Turkish people about the United States, the American Government this year is spending $115,000 in Greece and $192,000 in Turkey. That's enough to keep a couple of people in each country, pay tolls on special information cables from Washington, contact the native press and radio, keep open American libraries and information centers in Ankara and Athens. The United States has not been beaming its "Voice of America" shortwave broadcasts in Greek and Turkish, but will begin soon.

Broke as the British are, they have been spending 10 times as much as the United States for information work in Greece and Turkey. On a world-wide basis, the British informational program calls for about double this year's United States appropriation of $25,000,000.

UNITED STATES 7 YEARS BEHIND

The $6,000,000 United States cultural relations program now is limited by law to Latin America, the Philippines, and Liberia. This is the program set before the war, when American foreign policy was largely concerned with the Western Hemisphere. This limitation may now be said to be 7 years behind the times. For the newly declared Truman foreign policy has as its principal aim the spread and protection of democracy around the world.

To promote this objective the State Department and half a dozen other civilian agencies of Government have just sent to Congress proposals for a bill which would authorize world-wide cultural relations and information activities.

This isn't exactly a new idea. It was presented to Congress last year as the Bloom bill, which never got passed. But the Greek and Turkish crises make it more than timely now. Estimated cost of this program is $12,000,000, plus the $6,000,000 for Latin America.

Four types of activity are proposed:

Exchange of students and professors, books, and other educational materials. This would supplement the Fulbright bill passed by the last Congress, under which receipts from the sale of surplus property in foreign countries will provide fellowships for American students and professors in foreign schools.

Assignment of American technical experts to foreign countries for aid to agriculture, health or industry. Most of the expenses for these scientific missions are paid for by the countries receiving the aid. In the plan to aid Greece and Turkey, however, expenses for the extraordinary technical assistance would be paid out for the $400,000,000 appropriations.

Setting up joint scientific services, such as weather stations, aids to navigation and civil aviation. Expenses of these projects usually are shared between two or more governments.

Expansion of the international information service. This is the touchiest project of all. It has been severely criticized as Government propaganda. There is some sentiment in Congress for abolishing it altogether.

To take off some of the curse, Assistant Secretary of State William Benton has in the past year worked out a plan to get the Government out of shortwave broadcasting and turn it over to a semiprivate corporation. Legislation to set up a 15-man International Broadcasting Foundation has just been proposed to Congress. Under outside management, Mr. Benton believes the voice of America programs would have more freedom of expression and get better talent more truly representative of United States public opinion.

What Is the Future of Our School-Lunch Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks inquiries and requests from school authorities all over the State of Arizona have come to me concerning the school-lunch program. Some of these communications refer to the immediate future of that program, asking for a deficiency appropriation adequate to carry it through the year and other communications urging that it be guaranteed as a fixed and permanent policy. I personally know of the importance and value of the school-lunch program in the State of Arizona and have always given it my wholehearted support. I wish to continue that program but am unable in the light of actions and utterances in this Chamber to give much assurance to my friends in education in regard to it.

Under leave to print, I hereby reproduce a telegram received this morning and which is self-explanatory in regard to this subject. The telegram is as follows:

BUCKEYE, ARIZ., *March 26, 1947.*
Congressman JOHN R. MURDOCK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Salt River Valley Elementary School Superintendent and Principals Association, consisting of 81 administrators representing all the elementary schools of Maricopa County, Ariz., met on the evening of March 25 and unanimously passed the following motion: That the associations go on record as favoring the national school-lunch program as a basic part of our educational program and as an important step toward the improvement of the health and physical resources of our Nation. In line with the above motion, this association urgently requests that sufficient funds be appropriated for next year to meet the estimated requirements of the program and that a deficiency appropriation be immediately secured to continue the program for the remainder of the current school year.

T. W. PYLE,
Secretary.

Organized Veterans Oppose Proposal To Combine the Army and Veterans' Administration Hospital and Medical Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post on March 26, 1947, carried a statement by General Eisenhower, Army Chief of Staff, presented to the Senate Armed Services Committee which indicated that the Bureau of the Budget had under consideration a proposal to combine the Army and Veterans' Administration hospital and medical services.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans, I vigorously protest this proposal which is designed to bring our veterans hospitals under military supervision and control. Our disabled veterans are private citizens disabled in the service of their country, and the hospitalization with medical treatment accorded them is at most an infinitesimal effort on the part of a grateful nation to bind their wounds and make them whole again. We owe it to these men to resist any effort that would change their present status as civilians to patients in Army hospitals. The Veterans' Administration with all its facilities is an agency of the Government, set up for the assistance and rehabilitation of our veterans, and should remain as an independent agency under civilian control.

The following letter from Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director, National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, very definitely puts his organization on record as strongly against the proposal:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1947.
Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: In recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, General Eisenhower indicated that the Bureau of the Budget had under consideration a War Department sponsored plan to combine the Army and Veterans' Administration hospital facilities.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is deeply concerned that this plan might gain congressional support and thereby deny to our disabled veterans the nonmilitary hospitalization which is rightfully theirs. The disabled veterans in hospitals of the Veterans' Administration are private citizens and as such are no longer under military control or supervision. We would be remiss in our duties to the hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans if we did not insist that they be treated as private citizens, and that those administering to their needs remain private citizens and not officers of the military or naval service.

In behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I beseech your earnest consideration of this matter with the hope that you will resist any effort that would deny to the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration their rightful status as an independent agency under civilian control and supervision.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purely personal reasons I expect I should vote for this tax bill, but I cannot in conscience do so when I know that so many people in lower income brackets than I are denied the benefits, under this bill, that are rightfully theirs. With the high cost of living since controls have been lifted, it is a wonder to me that men who are attempting to raise a family on salaries of $1,500 or $2,000 a year are able to keep themselves from being thoroughly impoverished. Certainly I should like to vote for a tax reduction, but this bill means so little to the average man that I cannot bring myself to do so.

Then there is the question in this $3,800,000,000 tax reduction of whether the

Congress will be able to reduce the national debt if taxes are reduced. Besides the insurance companies and the banks, there are 85,000,000 holders of Government bonds. It would seem to me to be a wise business procedure to strengthen the equity behind these bonds by reducing the national debt. Another question that poses itself is how can taxes be reduced without impairing the strength of the Army and Navy and reducing benefits to veterans. These things should come first today. If there is any saving over this, let us apply it to the national debt for the time being. With continued prosperity in America, we could reduce taxes perhaps next year when we learn what to expect in the way of national income.

With your permission, I am inserting an excerpt from a letter which came to me today from a man who works in a steel mill back home, a friend of mine who is an excellent citizen but who is struggling, like so many of his coworkers, to make a living for his family under existing conditions:

As you probably know, I receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD through the courtesy of Senator MYERS, and you may be sure that I read it. Readers of the public press are sure getting fooled into a false sense of security when it says the lawmakers in Washington are going to take the one-sidedness out of the Wagner Act. What they mean to do is to kill the power of labor unions. By reading some of the bills now proposed, I am convinced that it will be a crime to demand a wage increase as a group and for a group. The veiled words in some of the bills will even take away freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and other rights guaranteed to us by the Constitution.

I have no objection to the outlawing of jurisdictional strikes, but how is one to know whether such disputes are provoked by management, as some are, you may be assured. Neither do I object to outlawing the wildcat strike, but again how can the lawmakers know that the wildcat strike is not the result of management's failure to remedy some outstanding and longstanding grievance. But I must, however, object when the lawmakers say that a group of workers within a collective bargaining unit cannot strike for higher wages or better working conditions. For instance, did not the meat packers strike, the soap makers, etc., etc.? Yet no punitive legislation has been proposed to curb such actions on their part.

You can believe me when I say that the majority of our membership is pretty much worried about the future of our union. Especially are the older people worried. I once had the occasion to defend the rights of a man who was pretty well up in years and whose hard-working days were over. As an officer of the union I was instrumental in having him placed in a job which he could handle. I ask you, what do you think would have happened to that particular man if he did not have the union to rely on? By checking on his Federal social security benefits after retirement I found that he would have been entitled to the grand sum of $27 per month. How would he live on that amount? What would happen were the unions not in existence for the protection of people like him?

Do you not think that more and improved social legislation is the answer to the present labor unrest, rather than the punitive measures Congress seems about ready to pass? I feel that if the day arrives when unions are so badly hamstrung that they cannot operate it will destroy our standard of living. Everyone knows but some will not admit that our living standards have risen since that great man Roosevelt went into office. Now those living standards are going to be driven downward by people who do not realize the harm that can be done.

The high cost of living is another matter that should take precedence over labor busting legislation. Don't some of the legislators eat? If they do, they should know that food prices are rising higher and higher; but what is being done about it? Nothing is being done, especially by those in Congress who are so intent upon rushing through punitive labor legislation and a 20-percent cut in my income tax, which, incidentally will save me exactly 30 cents per week. What a joke! They wipe out rent controls which will cost me $10 per month and which I am expected to pay with the 30 cents they are saving me on my income tax. No thanks, I would much rather have rent controls and be about $8 per month to the good.

I read the masterful speech the Congresswoman from California, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, made on the floor of the House the other day. She certainly laid the basket of expensive groceries "right in the lap" of the Republicans where it belongs. Some one should follow it up with another and another until something is done about it.

People are grumbling about the high cost of living, and no wonder. It has gone sky high. The papers say the people are not buying so much. They call it buyers resistance, but don't let that fool you. People just don't have the money to buy the things they need. Something will have to happen soon, and they are looking for people like yourself to do it. You must keep faith with them.

I am sorry that this letter has been dragged out so long but I feel that you possibly do not know the conditions which exist among the wage earners as I do. I am right among them, at work, at meetings, at social gatherings. Things are serious, and they look to Washington and you for correction.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 19, 1947.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: May I as president of the Methodist Federation for Social Action (unofficial), whose membership includes 17 Methodist bishops and 4,000 ministers and laymen, call your attention to a resolution adopted by the March meeting of the executive committee of which I happen also to be the chairman. The action relates to your proposal for economic and military intervention in Greece and Turkey, and I have been requested by the committee to say that it deplores the pursuance of such a course, especially since it bypasses the United Nations and in our opinion carries with it a serious threat of armed conflict. Such a struggle might conceivably develop into the "holy war" against which Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, former president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and vice president of our organization, has uttered repeated warnings. It is possible also that the proposal in relation to Greece and Turkey might result in the worst depression we have ever known. We are, of course, wholeheartedly in favor of feeding hungry peoples, but we believe such a service should be carried forward on a nonpolitical basis and that the whole proposal be handled by the United Nations and not by the unilateral action of any one nation.

Mindful of the right of every American to choose his own political party, our committee was also shocked by Secretary Lewis B. Schwellenbach's proposal to outlaw the Communist Party, coming as it did in the same week with Secretary of State George Marshall's definition of democracy which provides for:

"Freely constituted political parties * * * insured the right to participate in a free and competitive election system in which each is accorded equal opportunity to present its views, win adherents and obtain just representation."

Any citizen is entitled to the free choice of his political party, whether Democratic, Republican, Prohibition, Socialist, Communist, or other.

Further, our committee remembers your assurance that with the coming of peace you would end your diplomatic representation at the Vatican. We respectfully urge you to do so.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS O. HARTMAN,
Bishop of the Methodist Church.

Resolutions adopted at the March meeting of the executive committee—Methodist Federation for Social Action.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

Whereas Secretary of State Marshall has declared in a definition of democracy enunciated in Moscow that: "Freely constituted political parties should be insured the right to participate in a free and competitive election system in which each is accorded equal opportunity to present its views, win adherents and obtain just representation:" and

Whereas this definition of Secretary Marshall's is in complete accord with the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is the right of American citizens to espouse any political party, be it Republican, Democratic, Prohibition, Socialist, Communist or any other; and

Whereas any trend toward a one-party system would constitute a serious threat to democracy: Be it therefore

Resolved, That our committee ask Congress and President Truman to reject Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach's recent proposal which would outlaw the Communist Party in the United States, a proposal which we regard as subversive of the basic principles of American democracy.

AMERICAN INTERVENTION

President Truman, bypassing the United Nations, advocates unilateral economic and military intervention in royalist Greece and totalitarian Turkey—the beginning of world-wide economic and military intervention. This policy would ruin the great power cooperation which Secretary Marshall has urged, undermine the Moscow Conference, undercut the United Nations, and lead a peace-hungry world to war. It involves America's pursuing a pattern of imperialism which the British people themselves have rejected as unworkable and immoral. Too costly for Britain, the policy also threatens the United States with depression and bankruptcy.

We are heartily in favor of feeding starving people in Greece and elsewhere, but on a nonpolitical basis and through the United Nations. Not less but more food is needed for these unfortunate peoples.

The executive committee of the Methodist Federation for Social Action deplores the President's proposals as dangerous to America and the world, and urges the Congress to reject them and to stand firmly by the United Nations, as the proper instrument for bringing about peace and good will.

Reduction of Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening intently to the arguments for and against this bill, presented by my colleagues from both sides of the aisle. The arguments for this tax bill are not convincing to me; and moreover, the timing is extremely bad.

My constituents, just as taxpayers throughout the Nation, are clamoring for tax reduction, and tax reduction is needed, but it has been my observation that the thinking people in my district place the financial stability and general welfare of the Nation above immediate tax reduction. They want to know where we are going. I want to know where the sponsors of this bill are leading us. Certainly the information which has been available to me does not present any clear idea that its passage will lead us into prosperity or into financial stability. Conversely, I am fearful that the enactment of this legislation may have the effect of creating chaos rather than stability.

It is unquestionably true that in view of the increase in costs of living, people in the low-income brackets need to retain a greater percentage of their earnings in order to meet actual living costs. It is also recognized that the prospect of greater earnings would provide some inducement for the wider employment of investment capital. Recent tax collections have caused the Treasury Department to make upward revisions in its revenue estimates for the current fiscal year. This is all to the good, and it indicates a larger national income than was previously anticipated. It would appear therefore that present tax rates—burdensome as they are—have not proven in the past year to be as much of a deterrent to business activity as many people would lead you to believe. I would like to see, just as quickly as possible, tax legislation that would stimulate wider employment of venture capital, but to enact it now would be at the risk of deficit financing in the 1948 fiscal year, and at the concurrent risk of being unable to retire any of our national debt.

I had been hopeful that justifiable ways could be found to sharply reduce appropriations for the 1948 fiscal year. The reductions achieved in the appropriations bills thus far passed are insignificant. In the light of the nominal reductions thus far approved, and in view of the importance of the functions of those agencies for which appropriations have not yet been made, there is a serious doubt in my mind whether our final 1948 appropriations will represent any reduction in the total amount recommended by the President. In view of the need for certain unexpected appropriations it is entirely within the realm of possibility that this Congress may yet appropriate funds in excess of the original Presidential figures. If this should occur and if we should encounter in the coming year even a slight business recession, we shall have undermined our financial structure and invited its collapse.

To me it appears of utmost importance that we defer any tax reduction legislation until we have finally determined the total extent of our 1948 appropriations. We must balance our budget and it is imperative that we inaugurate a sound, systematic program of debt reduction. Such a program should be undertaken during this period when national income is still relatively high.

Again, I want to know where we are going. After our budget has been balanced and a debt-retirement program undertaken, we should then consider tax reduction legislation based soundly upon anticipated revenues. The element of timing is of utmost importance, and, after that, we must give consideration simultaneously to tax relief for those in the low-income groups and those in the larger brackets who, through exercising business initiative create wider employment.

Roosevelt As Appeaser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the brand of diplomacy engaged in by the former President, Mr. Roosevelt, is gradually coming to light. He no doubt will rank in history as the great appeaser of Russia. Slowly but surely his secret deals indicate that he was playing a day-to-day game with an adversary he greatly underestimated. Mr. Robert Bliss, able young editor of the Janesville Gazette, Janesville, Wis., very cogently calls attention to Mr. Roosevelt's appeasement policy in connection with Russia. As part of my remarks I include an editorial by Mr. Bliss which appeared in the issue of March 20, 1947:

ROOSEVELT'S SECRET DEALS WITH RUSSIA

It is appeasement and duplicity, secret agreements and a show of weakness that have brought this Nation to the difficult situation it now holds. Stalin managed to keep the upper hand in the conferences at Yalta, and Mr. Roosevelt, after giving away much of China's control of her own wealth in the north, apparently signed secret agreements which now place this country and its top officials in a most embarrassing position.

It is a shock to the people of the United States, and apparently to Secretary of State Marshall, to learn at this time of secret deals made at Yalta. We had been led to understand that it was a fair deal. Now we are bluntly told, to our dismay, and by the Russians themselves, that our then President made deals on reparations which he did not confide in his own people.

The announcement makes Secretary Marshall's job much more difficult and places a new obstacle in the way of agreement upon the basis for a German peace.

Of all moments in history there was never one calling more insistently for great men, for visionary leadership. President Truman has made a pronouncement that involves an entirely new foreign outlook from these shores. He has stated a firm policy which would establish direct opposition to further Russian expansion, backed by the power and resources of the United States in Turkey and Greece.

It is tragic that at this moment Russia can spring upon us an agreement made by our own representative in secret and one which embarrasses our hand in negotiations at Moscow.

Secretary Marshall must have the full support of the people of this country, who should be kept fully apprised of their personal danger by facts presented in the press. There is no alternative for peace with honor and freedom.

Price of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Post of March 27, 1947, entitled "Price of Appeasement":

PRICE OF APPEASEMENT

The pictures last Sunday of 28,000 Italians leaving Pola (population 31,000) bring into poignant relief the sacrifices of principle we have made to appease Russia. Pola is the Italian naval port at the Istrian tip of the Adriatic. It was obvious to every American official engaged in the peace negotiations that by rights it should be included in the new free zone of Trieste. But we agreed with Russia that it should go to her satellite, Yugoslavia. It was the kind of wrong that, as a German philoscpher put it, increases in geometrical ratio of wrongness as time goes on. The excuse for our action was that it was the price of Russian agreement to discuss peace treaties.

Since VJ-day this appeasement of Russia has accounted for many other wrongs we have committed. Not one country but several have been the victims of them. It would not take a skilled lawyer to prove that in more than one item of the Italian peace treaty we have violated our own armistice agreement with Italy. Our scruples also went overboard at the expense of Austria. This is the country which we and the Russians had agreed should be liberated. But at Potsdam we gave the Russians carte blanche to collect German assets in Austria in the name of reparations. It was only the superb administration of Gen. Mark Clark in Vienna that saved all Austria from being collected.

Again we swallowed all our qualms in accepting the Russian thesis that Germany should be split up into zones of occupation. To be sure, we thought we had salvaged this mistake by getting Russian assent at Pots-

dam to the administrative treatment of Germany as an economic unity. But we found ourselves out on a limb when the Russians treated the compact as a scrap of paper. The result is that we have been paying reparations to Russia in the shape of succor to the Germans—those Germans who had been deprived of the food which Potsdam promised them from the eastern or breadbasket Russian zone. Toward France, finally, our attitude has been cavalier, and all because we gave in to Russia. Russia, inquiring scornfully what France had done in the war, denied France admittance to Potsdam. We were so anxious to keep Russia propitiated that we did not even inform France of what we had done at Potsdam, and then expected her to cooperate in carrying out Potsdam.

These are merely a few of the blunders we have made in our postwar diplomacy in an effort to keep the Russian Bear appeased. Some of them have been inexcusable on moral grounds. It was a throwback to medieval barbarism, to take just one example, to consent to shifts of population all over Europe. For the spectacle at Pola is only one of many such spectacles. Whole peoples are being hounded from one country to another as an item in what is ironically called a general pacification. It is painfully apparent nowadays that this kind of peacemaking creates only terror and turmoil among the "pacified."

What is worse is that in appeasing Russia we have only whetted her appetite. The incidents she has manufactured or justified by way of asking for more have left the Security Council as well as the affected nations helpless. On Tuesday (to take the latest illustration) the Security Council was reduced to paralysis in face of even such a monstrous crime as the mining of British ships in Corfu Straits by Russia's puppet, Albania. Mr. Gromyko with his use of Russia's veto power ended all possibility of UN action. And before the curtain went down the members were compelled to listen gravely to the Albanian delegate insisting that the British had blown up their own ships and men.

This terror and this turmoil are now being visited on the borders of Greece and Turkey. Mr. Hoover is quite right when he says that the raising of just one finger in the Kremlin would restore peace and order. In default of such a move the President has at last suggested to the Congress that we should put a stop to it. He has had the straightforwardness to say so. He might have gone about the job circuitously by persuading Congress to let Greece and Turkey have access to the Export-Import Bank. But he refused to resort to subterfuge. He as much as said the time had come for a show-down with Russia.

The liberal Munichmen in our midst who are opposing the Truman policy are the very ones who lambasted the British when they appeased Hitler at Munich. Senator PEPPER talks about an appeal to a special session of the General Assembly for appropriate action. Does he not know that under the terms of the Charter the Assembly is unable to take action? Does he not know that the UN hasn't the money to call any such special session? His is the recurrent theme of wishful thinking from a head buried in the sands that produces wars. As Thomas à Kempis said a long time ago, "Everybody desires peace, but few people want to do the things that insure peace." One can almost hear our latter-day ostriches repeat after Neville Chamberlain, "Appeasement is the only way to stop chaos."

Surely we know differently from our experience with Moscow. That experience has made us accessories to such crimes against civilization as are being enacted at Pola. Pursuit of it is the way to bring on disintegration in our souls as well as in the soul of Europe. Our mission, as the only nation without fear and with resources, is to restore an atmosphere in the world fit for the United Nations to live in. As in Europe after the Napoleonic wars, "A Kalmuck prince is trying to overturn Europe." We have allowed the process to go on, instead of stopping it, as Castlereagh and his colleagues did then (so giving Europe a century of general peace) and showing that we stand for the major purpose of the United Nations, viz, peace and security.

The Wool Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 25, 1947.*
Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR BILL: As you know, I testified before the House Committee on Agriculture relative to the wool situation. I think I pointed out that the wool problem would be automatically solved by an increase in the tariff.

This would be in accord with H. R. 1825, which was introduced as the result of a letter from Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, to Speaker of the House Joe Martin. H. R. 1825 provided that the President be authorized to levy import fees on farm products receiving price support.

The authority requested under H. R. 1825 was unnecessary legislation. The Tariff Commission, under a provision of the Tariff Act of 1930 has the right to recommend an increase in tariffs to adjust the difference in American and foreign costs of production.

In addition, the President has the authority, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, to increase the duty on wool 50 percent or 17 cents per pound above the present schedule. This is ample authority to solve the wool problem permanently as it is my understanding that an increase of much less than that amount would protect the domestic producer.

Therefore I would suggest that a resolution be introduced requesting the President to exercise his present authority and increase the existing tariff on wool to a level with its support price or the cost of production price of 51.8 cents per pound as determined by the Tariff Commission.

Also, it is suggested that the addition to the present tariff be flexible so as to automatically represent the difference between the domestic parity (cost of production plus normal profit) and the foreign price on all farm products. Wool is merely one item, and other farm products will require similar action. A simple resolution of this kind could be made to apply to all farm products and to raw materials.

I would like to point out that such a tariff increase would not increase the cost to the American people. The duties collected could help balance the national budget, in lieu of other taxes.

To alleviate the present situation of wool accumulations, I would suggest that 250,000,000 pounds be transferred to strategic and critical stock pile for national defense, as provided by legislation in 1946. Under this act, they can pay an additional 25 percent under the Buy American Act. This is ample leeway for the Purchasing Division under the Permanent Stock Pile Act to take over the amount of wool I have suggested as a permanent reserve without any loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Such a resolution would eliminate the need of subsidies from the Government.

Sincerely yours,

CARL H. WILKEN,
Economic Analyst.

Not Bypassed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Concord Monitor, of Concord, N. H., of March 25, 1947, entitled "Not Bypassed":

NOT BYPASSED

Those who are skeptical of the Truman doctrine have seized principally upon the fact that the Mediterranean problem has not been referred to the United Nations. That would accomplish nothing now, when something must be done.

The United Nations is not prepared to undertake many of its prospective functions, and even if it were, in this instance such proposals would inevitably be blocked through exercise of the veto power by Russia. To recognize this and take the action which President Truman proposes is not to lose hope in the United Nations, but to point to its present deficiencies, deficiencies which this Nation should work to correct.

When the United Nations Charter came up for ratification its fundamental weakness, the veto power, was obvious to anyone. Yet there were many prominent political leaders in Washington who convinced themselves that it was a safeguard for this Nation as well as for Russia. So convinced, they voted for ratification. Now they are beginning to realize that the price of yielding to the Russians as to the veto at San Francisco was responsible for what the Nation must do.

It was in a similar situation, though there was then no League of Nations, or a United Nations organization, that this country adopted by Presidential declaration the so-called Monroe Doctrine. That doctrine was notice to all nations of the Eastern Hemisphere that they must keep hands off the Spanish-American Republics or be held accountable by the United States. That doctrine did serve to keep the European nations out of South and Central America, and it did not involve us in war, unless the sinking of the Maine, never explained, could be charged to Spanish intrigue.

Today, even though there is a United Nations, it is not yet strong enough to alter the fact that the doctrine we adopted as to Central and South America must now be extended to cover the earth, if we are to protect the world from aggressor nations with despotic governments which would enslave other peoples. That we need to so protect the world, in the absence of United Nations action to that end, is the lesson we have learned, or should have learned, from the two great wars we have been through in this first half of this century.

Even if the United Nations was not blocked by the inevitable veto it is not ready to put a United Nations armed police force into any nation which needs such protection. It is not ready to pour in financial assistance or other forms of aid. It should be able to do these things, and this Nation should work to that end, but so far it is not.

This country is left no other logical choice except to approve the Truman doctrine and proceed with its application. It does not matter what the Russians may say or do. To compromise further with them is to ignore our own national security and that of most of the nations on earth. To compromise further is to aid and abet the continued impotency of the United Nations, rather than to take the steps which in the end are the only hope of strengthening that organization.

The Russians have to learn what democracy is. Their leaders know, and fear democracy, and so they have by every means, fair and foul, sought to keep the Russian people as a whole in the dark. For democracy is what all peoples yearn for in the end.

Tax Reduction Bill Grants Bonanza To Wealthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I seriously question the wisdom and justice of this tax bill (H. R. 1) which the House is now considering. It seems to me that it represents an attempt to shift the tax burden from the higher income groups to the lower—from those who are best able to pay taxes to those who can least stand to continue heavy tax payments. This bill would give the lowest income groups a mere pittance in tax relief, and grant a bonanza to the wealthy. This Republican version of tax justice may well be characterized as tax relief for the greedy instead of for the needy.

In considering the question of tax reduction, two facts should always be kept in mind. In the first place, the most important test of the fairness of a tax is the ability of the taxpayer to pay the tax without undue hardship. To state this principle in another way, simple tax justice requires that the burden of taxation should be distributed in such a way as to bear most heavily on those who are most able to pay it.

PURCHASING POWER VITAL

In the second place, the tax must be adjusted in such a way as not to lower mass purchasing power. Business prosperity and full employment depend upon the maintenance of adequate purchasing power in the hands of the great masses of consumers. Retrogressive tax laws which cut it to the people's purchasing power invariably result in lower standards of living. At the same time, such tax policies lead to depression because they siphon off consumer purchasing power, and make it impossible for consumers to buy the goods on the market.

The Knutson tax bill ignores both of these simple economic facts. This 20 percent "straight-across-the- board" tax reduction with a little sugar coating for the lowest income groups, is most inequitable. It gives a highly generous reduction to the wealthiest section of our population, and a token reduction to those in the lower-income brackets. For example, this tax bill would give a tax reduction of only $11 to a married couple with a net annual income of $1,200—a savings of only about 1 percent of their spendable income. On the other hand, a married couple with an annual income of $100,000 would receive a tax reduction of $12,625, which amounts to an increase in spendable income of 34.2 percent.

The effect of this tax bill, therefore, is to shift a greater percentage of the entire burden to the lower income groups by giving a major portion of the 4 or 5 billion dollars income-tax reduction to the wealthy.

CORPORATE PROFITS RISING

Such a reduction has no relationship to the ability of the different sections of our population to pay taxes. Statistics show that corporate profits after taxes for 1946 were at an all-time high of $12,000,000,000, and there is every indication that corporate profits for 1947 will be still higher. In fact of these great profits, it is difficult to understand why anyone would suggest that income taxes be reduced on the higher income groups to a point below prewar levels.

On the other hand, the lower income groups urgently need tax relief. The shortening of the workweek at the end of the war has reduced the take-home pay for the average laborer. The inflationary rise in the cost of living of over 50 percent in the last 8 months has reduced the real wages of the wage-earner and salaried person by one-third. These are the people who need tax relief rather than those who are enjoying the lushest profits in American history.

BILL ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND

The failure of the Knutson bill to adequately provide this relief to lower income groups is economically unsound. It ignores the need for maintaining consumer purchasing power as a bulwark against economic depression. President Truman, in his economic report to the Congress, pointed out that it is "of utmost importance at all time that we be concerned as to the volume of purchasing power of the Nation and its relation to the volume of production goods and services."

At the same time, the President pointed out that the purchasing power of wages had dropped seriously, and that the wartime savings of American families is rapidly being depleted. In spite of the sharp reductions in purchasing power, my Republican colleagues refuse to substantially lower taxes on low-income groups. Failure to do so means the continuation of income taxes at levels which cut into consumer resources which are now vitally needed to buy the necessities of life. Such a short-sighted policy can only increase the dangers of depression.

The only aspect of this bill which has my approval is the provision that gives tax relief to people over 65 years of age. Our old people living on persions, annuities, and savings have suffered greatly from the increasing costs of living, and deserve such relief. In fact, the personal exemptions for old people found in this bill are not large enough; they should be increased by another $500.

ROAD TO DEPRESSION

There is a real need for tax relief, but such relief should be given to those who are least able to pay taxes. This can be accomplished by simply maintaining the present income-tax rate, but increasing the present $500 personal and dependency exemptions to $1,200 for a single person, $2,000 for a married couple, and $600 for each dependent. Such a proposal would give tax relief to those who need such relief, and at the same time would maintain the volume of Federal revenues.

In conclusion I want to go on record as being opposed to the Knutson tax bill. It is inequitable, unjust, and unsound. It amounts to a sell-out of the millions of wage earners and salaried people in the lower income groups in favor of the wealthy taxpayers. It fails to recognize the need for maintaining consumer purchasing power and thus increases the chances of a business slump and another depression. I have no choice but to vote against this unwise tax measure.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, a recent editorial in the Bridgeton Evening News points so clearly to a problem which has been in my mind, that I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD with the hope that some of my Democratic friends may answer it.

It seems that the Democratic Party is so thoroughly accustomed to extravagance in government, that it has become a cardinal principle, and they cling to it notwithstanding recent indications that "tax and tax, spend and spend," does not always "elect and elect."

BY THEIR POLICIES ARE THEY KNOWN BEST

The Democrats in the House have already served notice that they will fight any plan to reduce income taxes now. They feel that it would be unwise to trim levies with the Nation's fiscal situation in its confused state.

They seem to overlook the fact that our economy would emerge from its present plight if some type of stabilization was placed in effect, starting with relief in the weekly pay envelope.

First, the Democrats complained that the outright 20-percent cut in income taxes wouldn't benefit the little fellow. The Republicans promptly countered with a proposal to reduce small income brackets 30 percent.

All of which proves that the Democrats are attempting to create some vague fear and uncertainty about the immediate future of the country. It is their old technique of making every effort possible to protect the extravagance they have espoused during the past decade.

The Republicans insist that salaries do not have to be taxed as heavily during peacetime. It is only logical to expect some relief

now and most American citizens naturally cannot understand why the Democrats should think otherwise.

The Republicans should go ahead with their plans to reduce taxes. They have already stated that it can be done without weakening our military or international commitments in any way. Waste is on its way out in Washington—and it will be a good thing for the country when it happens.

The Displaced-Persons Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems troubling the conscience of millions of Americans is that of the seven or eight hundred thousand persons still in the displaced persons camps of Europe. One of my most trusted friends, a physician who has been closely associated with these camps told me on his return recently that some of these persons were bad characters or at least indigent to begin with, that many more who were high-grade people originally are gradually deteriorating until they are now almost parasitic and incapable of rehabilitation, but that most are still persons of ability and integrity and that these and especially the children ought to be removed as soon as possible and given a chance to find new homes, new hope.

One of the most comprehensive reviews of the problem and various proposed solutions which I have seen is an article in the February issue of Survey Graphic, by William S. Bernard, a specialist in ethnic problems who has taught at the University of Colorado and at Yale University. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article herewith:

THE DISPLACED PERSONS PROBLEM

(By William S. Bernard)

In the American zones of Germany and Austria, at least 750,000 men, women, and children are enduring their second postwar winter of confinement in segregated camps and centers. These people are cut off from their backgrounds and their homes. Their present is a bleak, abnormal, psychologically dangerous existence. Whether or not there is a future for them depends in large measure on the American people, and upon our representatives in the Eightieth Congress.

THEY FOUGHT FOR FREEDOM

The "displaced persons"—DP's as the world now knows them—were among the first victims of totalitarianism and war. * * * They are, a large part of them, the men and women who first dared to oppose dictatorship—and fled their homes rather than submit to it. They are the men and women who found religious and political freedom more precious than security. They are those who have had the fortitude, the physical strength, and the mental stamina to withstand the years of persecution to which they have been subjected. Most of them represent, in more than one sense, the survival of the fittest.

They come from no single economic or industrial group; no one race or religion. Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Yugoslavs, and Estonians make up the largest single nationality groups, but all told, some 15 or 20 different nationalities are included in their numbers. All major religions are represented, with Christians (Roman Catholic, Protestant, Greek Orthodox, and others) comprising 80 percent and Jews about 20 percent. Before the war a majority of them were agricultural workers, but there were also shopkeepers, artisans, skilled workmen, professionals, students, homemakers.

This remaining group of displaced persons is the hard core of nonrepatriables. Today the towns, cities, and farms of their homelands are, for all practical purposes, closed to them. They cannot go home because they have grounds to fear religious or political persecution; or to fear that if they do return they will lose their liberties—perhaps their lives. In a very real sense, they gave up their right to a familiar homeland when they chose the hope of freedom. If they return today, even that hope may be forfeit.

There is another reason why they do not go back. That reason is psychological—no less compulsive than the fear of physical persecution. The villages and farmlands which they left are the scenes where their families and friends were tortured and killed, sometimes before their eyes. They cannot forget this and return to the terror and grief their old homes represent. Can we who have been spared their ordeal ask them to do so?

Neither should we ask them to live out their lives in dreary camps. As humanitarians we recoil at such a living death for such people. We cannot bring ourselves to hold that the lack of a passport is a crime—or the lack of a country of refuge that can and will welcome them.

Together mankind must find a better answer—an answer which can benefit us all and the refugees as well. We Americans have stated, officially, that we do not believe in compulsory repatriation.

Since repatriation is impossible, resettlement is the only acceptable alternative. There are 500,000 to 1,000,000 of them, what statisticians call "a trace" in the population figures of western Europe. Somewhere on earth homes must and can be found for these homeless men, women, and children.

LAWS THAT BAR THE DOOR

Unfortunately for the displaced persons, however, logic and immigration laws do not always march hand in hand. We may live in one world, but we do not live in a free world so far as migration is concerned. Every sovereign state has developed codes of law governing the admission or exclusion of immigrants, some simple, some elaborate, most of them highly selective. It is, of course, the right of each nation to legislate such matters as it sees fit. And much immigration legislation, both here and abroad, has been of demonstrable value and effectiveness in the past.

But special problems and special needs require some special treatment. Laws which may be both wise and just under normal circumstances must be temporarily amended when they do not solve the problem at hand. Such changes need not alter established immigration systems either fundamentally or permanently. They merely take into consideration an emergency job to be done, and provide a feasible means of accomplishing it.

Certainly, from either a warmly human or coldly practical viewpoint, the time has come to amend immigration laws long enough to resettle the war's displaced persons. The newly created International Refugee Organization of the United Nations is stymied, for it can be effective only insofar as the various nations are willing to receive displaced persons. Only our individual understanding and massed concern will permit the United States to take the lead in such a program. And realism suggests that the United States must take that lead, and signify our willingness to admit a fair share of them.

HOW MANY SHOULD COME HERE?

What would that fair share be? Suppose we take the arbitrary figure of 850,000 as representing the number of displaced persons left after repatriation has run its course. (Estimates run from 500,000 to 1,000,000; 850,000 is the figure suggested some months ago by UNRRA.) If the 850,000 were distributed among the major potential immigrant-receiving nations on a basis proportional to the relative population strength of those nations, our share would be 433,500. Over the course of the three or four years which the resettlement program would include, it would mean an addition to our population of between 2 and 3 persons per 1,000 during the period.

In other words, in the course of 3 years, a community of 5,000 people would be expanded, on the average, by 10 or 15 displaced persons. Even the most wary among us scarcely can find that alarming.

As a matter of fact, there are good reasons why we might well welcome additions to our population. Our rate of growth is slowing up; our birth rate is low, despite the temporary rise during the war years. And our population is growing older. It will reach a stationary condition perhaps by 1970, when, the experts estimate, births and deaths will balance each other. By that time more than half our population will be over 30 years of age. We shall have fewer young men in the productive years as compared with other countries where the population is still young and still increasing.

By 1970, as the accompanying table indicates, while we shall not be as badly off as some nations, we shall be worse off than others.

Estimated populations in 1970

Country	Population	General trend of growth rate
Soviet Russia	250,000,000	Increasing rapidly.
United States	160,000,000	Stationary
Japan	87,000,000	Increasing.
Germany	69,000,000	Increasing, but at a diminishing rate.
England and Wales	37,000,000	Declining.
France	37,000,000	Do

To the extent that a growing population is of practical economic and political value, our future possibilities are not as auspicious as they might be. They can be changed only by an increase in the birth rate, or, as was the case for many decades, by addition to our population by immigration.

Naturally, were we to admit our fair share of the displaced persons, we should wish to be sure that they would not disrupt our economy or endanger our institutions. This assurance is automatic under our regular immigration requirements, which could remain untouched.

Our laws bar from the United States any person who is a criminal, an anarchist, an advocate of overthrowing our Government by violence, a pauper, a vagrant, anyone whose health does not meet specified standards, or anyone likely to become a public charge. All immigrants are screened on these and other counts, which would apply equally to displaced persons admitted under a special dispensation.

In addition, under the Truman directive of December 22, 1945, displaced persons coming into this country must be vouched for by the individual or corporate affidavits of friends, welfare organizations, or philanthropic groups which guarantee that these immigrants will not be allowed to become public charges. Responsible elements of American society have stood behind these affidavits. They have indicated that they will continue to do so. Only the method of admitting the displaced persons remains to be decided. Thus, the future happiness, security, well-being, and freedom of thousands of desperate unfortunates rests on a

single decision—a decision which it is ours to make.

Why not admit the displaced persons under our present immigration laws without any modifications, however temporary? For the simple reason that it won't work. We have tried it for over 12 months, and the result has been pitifully small.

On December 22, 1945, President Truman ordered the State Department, the Department of Justice, and other agencies concerned to resume our admission of immigrants, largely suspended during the war; and to utilize the central European quotas particularly for displaced persons. Those quotas were estimated at about 39,000.[1] It was hoped that at least this many displaced persons per year could thus be rescued. One year later, however, fewer than 5,000 people had been admitted under the directive. The plan failed to take cognizance of the fact that the German quota made up some 26,000 of the total available—and that few displaced persons can qualify for these German places since they were not born in Germany. For this, and other minor reasons, the program—as intimated by the President himself—was a failure.

If we are to be of any concrete help to the men, women, and children dependent on our good will and active interest, clearly we must modify our immigration laws—slightly and temporarily—until their plight is relieved. There are several ways in which this might be done.

SHALL WE DRAW ON THE FUTURE?

One method suggested is to adopt a system of "borrowing" from future quotas for current use. The impracticality of this method is apparent when the number of displaced persons (excluding ex-enemies and those unclassified) is compared with their respective quotas under present law. The numbers given in table I are tentative.

These figures show that even if we were willing to borrow extensively from the future, it would take an average of 15 years' quota to allow 433,500 displaced persons (this country's reasonable share) to come in. Further, the borrowing plan would make us exceed our annual limit of 154,029, if added to regular immigration. And there is another point against it: borrowing against future quotas would work a hardship on many deserving people who might wish to immigrate to the United States in the years ahead. We do not wish to penalize these possible future citizens, any more than we wish to continue the misery of the DP's.

Consider, then, a second temporary modification of the law. At present, quota numbers are available only during a stated month or year. If they are not used by the nations to which they are allocated, they are lost forever. Since 1930, the countries with the largest unused quotas have been those whose people have not been displaced, and who, therefore, have the least critical need for quota numbers at present. Great Britain, for instance, had 947,689 unused quota numbers between 1930–45; the Irish Free State, 252,478; Switzerland, 20,968. If, instead of letting unused quotas lapse, we applied them to the nationalities represented among the displaced persons, we might help them substantially, without exceeding the over-all quota limit.

Such a plan is obviously a gamble. It is based on the supposition that for the next few years the quotas of at least some of the major quota countries would not be used. We have no way of guaranteeing this possibility. But gambling with the fate of the displaced persons seems wholly unjustified

True, quotas were not used up during the 1930–46 period. But may this period of world-wide depression and war be taken as normal? Between 1932–36 (years of depression and unemployment, when immigrants were not attracted to the United States of America) more aliens left this country than entered, table II shows the figures.

In the prosperous 1920's, on the other hand, the quotas of even major countries tended to be used pretty close to one hundred percent. Herein lies the gamble. Adverse economic conditions might produce a drop in quota utilization; but favorable conditions might again create a fuller quota use—forcing the displaced persons to remain longer in the camps.

A PRACTICABLE PLAN

To borrow, to gamble—each presents a possible plan for alleviating the plight of the displaced persons. Neither is satisfactory. But there remains a third possible course of action—a simple, temporary modification of our laws that has real possibilities. Past unused quotas have technically lapsed, of course, but Congress, through special legislation, could recapture them. It could make available to eligible displaced persons a number of quota visas equal to the desired number of quotas not used in the past. To be effective, the "recaptured" quotas would have to be allocated among the DP's regardless of their national origins, rather than in strict accordance with our present law. "Recapturing" would also create a special displaced persons quota outside the regular prescribed quotas.

Nevertheless, it can be argued with practical force that such a process of recapture would compensate to some degree for immigration we expected and were prepared to accept—but did not get, especially during the war years.

Let us look at the facts. From 1940 through 1946, allowable quotas, if completely filled, would have given us 1,076,733 immigrants—153,774 a year for 1940 through 1943, and 153,879 for 1944–46. We actually received 161,971. Thus, 914,762 quota numbers were never used. Even if we set our fair share of the displaced persons at 400,000, this would make up less than 50 percent of this wartime loss—would welcome less than half of the number of immigrants Congress and the people of the United States had been ready to admit from 1940 through 1946. Therefore, simply by changing our law temporarily so that half these lost quotas may be recaptured, we would make it possible for our fair share of the displaced persons to enter the United States of America.

Whatever we do, whatever temporary change in our law we decide to make, it will be ineffective unless available quota numbers are assigned to qualified displaced persons without regard to their specific national origins. Trying to carry over proportional quota distributions of the present law into the plan for displaced persons will not work. The nationalities to whom the smallest quotas were assigned in 1930, as we have seen, are those with the largest numbers of displaced persons. Any modifying legislation contemplated must take this fact into account.

RECENT IMMIGRATION

There is a good deal of popular confusion and ignorance of just what has happened in respect to immigration in recent years. The country has not been flooded with immigrants. Temporary visitors, admitted during the war and earlier in the period of Hitler terror, are now required to leave the United States. Many have gone. In 1945 it was estimated that only about 15,000 remained out of a total of 293,976 who came from refugee countries between 1933 and 1944. Those who later returned to this country for permanent residence have been under the quotas of their respective countries, except such people as are nonquota—for example, the wife and minor children of an American citizen.

The admission of our fair share of the displaced persons over a restricted period of time—even in addition to normal immigration—would be a much smaller annual increment to our population than was added from 1880 to 1930, the very years which saw America rise to a position of world supremacy industrially and militarily. The figures in table III compare the population of the United States by decades since 1880 with immigration for the same period, both by decades and annually.

A CHARGE ON OUR CONSCIENCE

As a nation we have received over 38,000,000 immigrants in the course of our history. Better than a quarter of our population is still made up of people of foreign birth or mixed parentage. With this heritage we cannot longer ignore our international responsibilities or our moral obligations. Many among us are coming to regard displaced persons as one of the foremost charges upon American conscience. The American Federation of Labor, the CIO, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of American Veteran Organizations, and scores of other religious, educational, philanthropic, and civic bodies have all passed resolutions urging the enactment of legislation permitting the United States to admit its fair share of Europe's displaced persons.

There are some who oppose any revision of our immigration laws, however temporary. They include many well-meaning people, proud of their communities, fearful of the changes which might come. But the knowledge that in the course of 3 years an average of only two to three people will come for every 1,000 of our population should reassure them.

There are others sincerely interested in the country's welfare who fear that the displaced persons will become an economic burden. But they may be reassured by the affidavits which vouch for the DP's financial security and by our own actual need for labor, such as farm and domestic workers.

Col. Paul H. Griffith, national commander of the American Legion, has said that that organization of some 3,500,000 veterans will oppose all plans to admit displaced persons, lest they deprive former servicemen of jobs and housing. Similarly, some labor groups see in any modification of the immigration laws a threat to the jobs of their own members. These objectors overlook the facts—particularly the negligible size of the group that would be added to any one community were we to scatter 400,000 displaced persons over this vast country.

And there is the opposition of those who view all foreigners with suspicion, in spite of the fact that the contributions of some 38,000,000 immigrants have helped to write the history of America. That is worth remembering.

There are those who favor drastic curtailment or complete foreclosure of immigration for a period of years. Last year this viewpoint was represented by two types of bills introduced in Congress. One bill provided that immigration be reduced by 50 percent for the next 10 years, and was barely defeated in committee. Another took the form of a proposal that no immigration be permitted so long as there are 1,000,000 unemployed. This would be tantamount to a permanent and complete closing of our gates, inasmuch as in an advanced technological

[1] In 1930, the so-called national-origins plan was put in force, which limited the total annual quota to about 150,000 (since raised to 154,029 by various additions) by restricting the number of immigrants from any country to the percentage that persons of that national origin by birth or descent contributed to our population as a whole in 1920. For example, persons born in Great Britain and those whose ancestors came from there, were estimated to constitute about 42.7 percent of our population in 1920. Therefore, Great Britain received 42.7 percent of the annual quota or 65,721. Similar computations were worked out for other eligible nationalities, with minimum quota of 100 for any one.

economy that amount of unemployment is "normal" even in prosperous years. Similar bills probably will be introduced in the Eightieth Congress.

But the action Congress will take depends in the last analysis on the votes of the citizens of the country—on their enlightened viewpoint, and on their strong determination. In a very real sense then, we, the people of America, will decide the fate of those men and women and children waiting patiently for us to welcome them—or to turn our faces from them. Perhaps it does not matter whether our help stems from our own self-interest or from our sympathy and understanding. Only the action that we take counts now—and few among us would let that action damn the war's displaced persons to a useless, wasteful life—without homes, without hope. For in our hearts we know too well that there, but for the grace of God, indeed, go we.

TABLE I.—*Estimated numbers of European displaced persons by major nationalities involved, with quotas for each nationality*

Nationality	Number	Quota
Polish	572,920	6,524
Latvian	97,820	236
Lithuanian	60,500	380
Yugoslav	51,530	845
Estonian	31,910	116
U. S. S. R.	11,620	2,712
Czechoslovak	11,300	2,874
Italian	4,290	5,802
Greek	3,110	307
Dutch	2,020	3,153
French	1,330	3,086
Belgian and Luxembourgeois	730	1,304
Total	849,090	27,345

TABLE II.—*Admission and departure of immigrants, quota and nonquota, 1932–36, with excess of admission over departure*

[Excess of departures over admissions, resulting in a net loss, is indicated by a minus sign]

Year	Admissions	Departures	Excess
1932	35,576	103,295	−67,719
1933	23,068	80,081	−57,013
1934	29,470	39,771	−10,301
1935	34,956	38,834	−3,878
1936	36,329	35,817	512

TABLE III.—*Immigration by decades and average annual immigration contrasted with population by decades, 1880–1940*

Census	Population of United States in that year	Total immigration during preceding decade	Average annual immigration during preceding decade
1880	50,155,783	2,812,191	381,219
1890	62,947,714	5,246,613	524,661
1900	75,994,575	3,687,564	368,756
1910	91,972,266	8,795,386	879,538
1920	105,710,620	5,735,811	573,581
1930	122,775,046	4,107,209	410,720
Quota		(1,840,194)	(184,019)
1940	131,669,275	528,431	52,843
Quota		(308,341)	(30,834)

Purchase of Gold From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter which I addressed to Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, on March 19, 1947, and the reply which I received dated March 20, 1947, and signed by Paul McDonald, Acting Administrative Assistant to the Secretary:

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Does the Treasury favor continuing buying gold from Russia?

Very truly yours,
FREDERICK C. SMITH.

Hon. FREDERICK C. SMITH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: For the Secretary, I am acknowledging your letter of March 19, 1947, asking whether the Treasury favors the continuance of buying gold from Russia.

A report on this matter will be forwarded to your office as soon as practicable.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL MCDONALD,
Administrative Assistant to the Secretary.

Is the TVA Carrying Out the Intention of Congress in Providing the Farmers With Fertilizers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, statement in regard to the failure of TVA to furnish fertilizers to the farmers of this country, as contemplated and promised at the beginning of the work for power improvement upon the Tennessee River. I have since heard from quite a number of people in regard to the matter and I enclose herewith letter received from Mr. James E. Cassidy, C. E., consulting engineer, who was quite familiar with the subject. His letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 25, 1947.*
Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In view of the fact that I initiated studies of the Tennessee Valley 18 years before the TVA came into existence I was very much interested in your short address (extension of remarks) in the House March 24, 1947.

In an unofficial capacity I was the technical adviser to Chairman McSwain, of the House Military Affairs Committee, in the drafting of H. R. 5018, which was the original bill on which the TVA was created. The House not only passed the bill because it was for fertilizer for the farmer but had the House had an idea that the fertilizer program was to be discarded, the conference report would not have been adopted.

You will recall that when the conference report came to the House, Chairman McSwain would not sponsor its adoption because, as he told me at the time, it was a fraud on the public, for it was known in the conference committee that, under the loose provisions, the fertilizer end would not be carried out, and that is why he could not ask the House to adopt the conference report, which was sponsored by LISTER HILL. As adviser to Chairman McSwain I was fully informed of everything that went on, and it was galling to McSwain, who was so honest he leaned backward, to know that a fraud was being perpetrated on the public and that the House was voting under false allegations.

As a matter of fact, the only constitutional grounds for the TVA were found in the National Defense Act of 1916 (sec. 124), which I helped to write, and when the fertilizer end was discarded the constitutional basis for the TVA was scuttled.

I have written a 486-page manuscript covering the whole subject from "cradle to the grave" and which I hope to get published sooner or later. This manuscript was written from my own studies over a 30-year period, and with some 150,000 pages of data collected over that period. Had the House been given the facts in the case, the conference report would not have received a 10-percent vote when it came to the House for consideration. The chairman of the committee made that statement to me many times, and I knew it to be a fact of my own knowledge. If I ever get my manuscript published, the whole story will be before the public.

Yours very truly,
JAMES E. CASSIDY,
Consulting Engineer.

Col. Florence A. Blanchfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, Col. Florence A. Blanchfield, Director of the Army Nurse Corps, was honored at a luncheon given by Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON in the Speaker's dining room at the Capitol on Monday, March 24, for her long and valuable service in the nursing profession. Present were members of the Armed Services and Veterans' Committees of Congress, Army and Navy officials, including the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Public Health and representatives of civilian nursing groups.

In her remarks about Colonel Blanchfield, Mrs. BOLTON referred to the long and arduous task of bringing that recognition for the accomplishments of the nurses.

H. R. 1943, establishing a permanent Army and Navy Nurses Corps and Woman's Specialists Corps of the Army, is on its way to becoming a law.

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] did not tell her listeners of the great contribution she herself has made, both as Mrs. BOLTON and as the Representative from Cleveland, Ohio, but in response to her introduction, I said:

The two major factors most responsible for the present status of the Army and Navy Nurses are (1) The excellent, the magnificent service and record of the nurses themselves, and (2) FRANCES P. BOLTON.

The House approved H. R. 1943, the legislation for a permanent Army and Navy Nurse Corps on a commissioned basis, March 13—the fifth anniversary of Colonel Blanchfield's promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel. Her retirement from active service on March 31, 1947, after 29 years of faithful and

untiring service in the Army, will mark the forty-first anniversary of her outstanding record in the nursing profession.

Colonel Blanchfield, whose home is at Shepherdstown, W. Va., entered the Army Nurse Corps in July 1917, serving overseas during World War I with Base Hospital No. 27 and other units of the Medical Corps.

After the war she was detailed on a series of nursing duties which included two assignments in the Philippine Islands and one in China. In 1935 she was assigned to the Office of the Surgeon General and was promoted to the grade of captain February 1, 1939. On March 13, 1942, she was promoted to lieutenant colonel and assigned as first assistant, Army Nurse Corps, an assignment she retained until her elevation to Superintendent. Her appointment by the Secretary of War as Superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps became effective June 1, 1943.

As superintendent, she was responsible for one of the most important jobs of the war—that of establishing and maintaining efficient nursing care for the thousands of American sick and wounded soldiers all over the world.

Among Colonel Blanchfield's recommendations which were responsible for the outstanding record of accomplishment by the members of the Army Nurse Corps during World War II were:

First. The establishment of basic-training centers for newly appointed nurses.

Second. The establishment of the Army Nurse Branch of Technical Information in the office of the Surgeon General, which served as a medium for disseminating information to civilian organizations which assisted in recruitment of nurses to serve with the military forces. Extensive morale-building activities were also promulgated through this branch.

Third. Assignment of nurses to field and evacuation hospitals near the front lines in order to provide expert nursing care immediately following front-line surgery.

Fourth. The establishment of policies used in expanding the corps from a few hundred nurses to more than 57,000, displaying in this procedure wise administrative and executive ability.

Fifth. In 1944 she was largely instrumental in securing full military rank for nurses, which was granted by Congress in July 1944 on a temporary basis. The legislation passed by the House March 13, 1947, if enacted into law, will establish the Nurse Corps in permanent commissioned status.

Much of Colonel Blanchfield's time was spent in the field where her interest in the welfare of the nurses, their living and working conditions and in the type of professional service they were rendering lent encouragement to their efforts. Her wise understanding of nurses and their problems was a major factor in the success of her organization. She made an extended tour of the European and Mediterranean Theaters of Operation in 1944, the Antilles Department in December 1945 and the Pacific Theater of Operation in August and September of 1946. In addition to these tours, frequent visits were made to the Medical installations in the United States.

She was awarded the Distinguished Service medal in June 1945 for her outstanding ability and devotion to duty as Superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps.

Why An Arms Investment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why An Arms Investment?" published in the Chicago Sun of March 26, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY AN ARMS INVESTMENT?

It now seems certain that the Truman administration will make some belated gesture to recognize the United Nations' interest in our policy toward Greece and Turkey. That is all to the good. Serious damage to the United Nations' cause may already have been done, and the administration should repair it, if possible.

But gestures don't change policies. The unhappy fact appears to be that from the very beginning the administration not only bypassed but completely ignored the United Nations and all that it stands for in terms of collective rather than unilateral action.

The apologists have made much of the argument that the UN is not equipped, financially or otherwise, to handle the situation in Greece. But why is it not equipped? The record shows that it was our own government which insisted on the termination of UNRRA by March 31. Our own government killed the project for a United Nations relief fund to succeed UNRRA in such areas as Greece. We are scarcely in a position to condemn the UN for impotence when we ourselves helped to make it so.

It is not the case, then, that in Greece and Turkey we resort to unilateral action because collective action is impossible. The truth is that we propose a national policy there because some of the objectives are national.

All the testimony in the congressional hearings on what UN can and cannot do leaves unshaken the conviction that UN agencies could administer the economic assistance which Greece so badly needs if our Government wished to do the job that way. If there is no money in the UN treasury, we could put it there, along with any other nations able and willing to help.

What the United Nations cannot do is to back the Greek Government's military offensive against its political opposition, or to pay the expenses of keeping the Turks at peak mobilization. The charter of the world organization was not written with the idea of enabling governments to shoot down their citizens or maintain military forces in excess of their economic capacity.

So let's be frank about it. We are acting on our own in Greece and Turkey because the Truman administration considers a military investment necessary. That is a national, not a United Nations, objective.

The question of why this military investment is necessary deserves far more extensive discussion than it has had in Congress. In Greece, such outlay is said to be needed to insure order, and thus make our economic aid effective. But the crux of the issue is Turkey.

Turkey has no serious problem of internal security. The present Government has an overwhelming majority in Parliament, and since its inauguration last August has suppressed two Socialist parties, eight newspapers, and several workers' clubs. We could say the Turkish Government has things well in hand. Certainly it has no armed minority to deal with.

Unlike Greece, Turkey escaped the devastation of war. She made a lot of money selling chrome to the Nazis and at the same time received substantial aid from us despite her refusal to enter the war when we asked her to in December 1943. Now the Turks say they fear a threat to their integrity. They are keeping more troops on the alert than they can afford to pay for. If they go on spending half their budget for military expenses, they may get into economic trouble, which might be the breeding ground for internal unrest. So Mr. Truman proposes, in effect, that American taxpayers foot some of the bills for the Turkish Army.

There is no denying that Turkey is under pressure from Russia in the same way that Colombia was under pressure from us when we wanted the Panama Canal. Russia wants, and has made no bones about saying so, a share in the defense of the Dardanelles, which were used against her during the First World War, and would undoubtedly be used against her in another.

This is, of course, not a Communist but an ancient Russian ambition. The question for us is how the claim can best be met. Mr. Truman's policy seems to be one of resisting it at all costs, and arming Turkey for that purpose. Apparently no attempt whatever has been made to reconcile what Russia considers her strategic necessities with what we consider ours—no attempt, for example, to work out a form of United Nations control that will admit Russia to a fair share of jurisdiction over the straits.

Perhaps no middle ground can be found, but the tragedy is that evidently the Truman administration is not trying to find one. It has uncritically taken over the same policy toward the Dardanelles which Britain pursued for a hundred years. Congress ought to ask whether that policy serves the national interest better than a policy based on United Nations cooperation.

Threatened Telephone Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered over the radio by J. A. Beirne, president of the National Federation of Telephone Workers, on the subject of the threatened telephone strike.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends, whether or not telephone workers will conduct a Nation-wide strike on or after April 7 will be decided by the policy committee of the National Federation of Telephone Workers which meets next week. For

the past week the telephone workers have been voting on the question of accepting contract terms presented by the telephone management or authorizing the policy committee to call a strike. Telephone workers know that labor relations problems like other problems are capable of solution if given objective treatment accompanied by a firm determination to arrive at a solution. For almost 4 months telephone workers have been seeking a solution. They want industrial peace—but also justice. Over 325,000 of them are organized in the National Federation of Telephone Workers and they seek their answer together.

With an understanding of the Bell System set-up and with almost 10 years of continuous experience in dealing with the management of the various companies, the telephone workers, last November, established a way of insuring the industrial peace which everyone, including telephone workers, wants. They concluded that the better way of insuring the country against a Nation-wide tie-up was to provide machinery for meeting the policy makers or top management of the industry. Since last November a committee empowered to represent all of our members has been willing and ready to meet with Bell System representatives for the purpose of settling contract disputes. The Bell System has ignored this planning. It has left settlements of the bargaining items to more than 200 people in different parts of the United States. With control of the industry in New York City it is quite impossible to reach agreement in 40 scattered parts of the country.

Even Senator BALL, who is proposing legislation to outlaw industry-wide bargaining, stated publicly that he believed our federation could negotiate with the A. T. & T. system under his proposal.

Last year we were confronted with the prospect of a Nation-wide telephone strike. No strike occurred. This was due largely to the efforts of the Department of Labor and Secretary Schwellenbach, to the top management of the Bell System, and to this federation. Fifteen hours before the deadline the Bell System management coordinated their activities in a single spokesman. When these men with authority spoke for the industry it was a relatively simple matter to reach Nation-wide agreement. We want to prevent a repetition of last year's dispute. Valuable time has been wasted in acting out a comedy on collective bargaining throughout the United States. The Bell System—and due to legal technicalities only the Bell System—can make negotiating efforts really work. This may sound like a self-serving statement of a labor union official in defense of his organization's action. I'd like to dispel, if possible, such an opinion by quoting from a public document, the Telephone Commission's report to the National War Labor Board. This Commission was composed of two industry representatives, two labor, and two public representatives. This unanimous report stated in part and I quote, "The unified influence of the A. T. & T. appears in the close similarity of most nonrate aspects of the wage structure of the various associated Bell companies. Each Bell company, for example, has the same four major operating departments. Further, these same four departments in all companies carry almost identical job or task titles and task routines. This same unified influence is evident also in the existing interrelation of the Bell System wage rates, not only among departments and specific jobs of each company, but, likewise, among the other wage-rate structures of the companies themselves." That statement was a unanimous conclusion of a public agency, concurred in by the official representatives of the Bell System.

Yet there has been no unified bargaining action since contract demands were made many weeks ago.

The telephone industry itself is dominated by the Bell System. Of the total telephone business in this Nation 90 percent is handled by the Bell System; the other 10 percent is divided among some 6,000 independent companies. The practices of the System are monopolistic even to the extent of regulating the collective-bargaining relationship throughout the entire country.

Someone listening to me tonight may have the opinion that telephone workers are a well-paid group of workers who have excellent working conditions. Let us determine if such a conclusion is justified.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that telephone workers since 1937 have been among the lowest-paid group of workers in the whole United States. We receive $8 a week less, on an average, than the workers in light and power; $10 less than street, railway, trolley, and motor-bus workers; $3 less than telegraph workers. We cannot find a public utility which pays less on an average than our people receive.

It is significant that the average gross earnings of our members in 1939 was $1,661 and in 1946, after taxes are paid, gross earnings amount to $1,499. One hundred and sixty-two dollars less than 8 years ago. No one can be expected to be satisfied if his living standards are going downward. In the March 14 issue of the magazine called the United States News an article appeared on page 16 which stated that the buying power loss of telephone workers average some 16 percent. Other sources, all impartial, and certainly outside the sphere of our influence have reported the deteriorating wage position of the telephone worker.

Our wage demand is designed to correct the present inequality. At the same time it permits the telephone system to be operated efficiently. We appreciate the fact that no one should bargain with a management unless they have some understanding of the company's financial position. Therefore, we look at the Annual Report of the Bell System to the Federal Communications Commission. Total company revenues in 1946 were well over two billion. It earned $10.23 on every share of its stock. It has laid aside in depreciation reserve over $2,250,000,000. It has paid the same annual dividend to stockholders for the past 20 years, even through the depths of the depression. Its net profit, after taxes, last year was over two hundred and fifteen million. These figures point to a healthy financial empire. It is to the public's advantage as well as our own, as workers in the industry, that it be in a healthy shape. The companies have never pleaded inability to pay.

I will take a moment to tell you about those workers who comprise the bulk of our membership—the operators. They sit on high stools, in a prescribed bodily position, work under immediate and constant supervision and are required by practice to respond to your call within a matter of seconds. They face a panel of lights which flick on and off all day long and they must listen to all kinds of voices and must respond pleasantly to the various moods of the public. It is a tough job and takes a lot out of the person who stays in the business year after year. For this they receive rates of pay which start at $26 in a city like Milwaukee and $31 in the city of Detroit.

The highest paid operator in the Bell System receives $45 a week and it takes her 8 years to reach this amount. Operators in other industries such as the newspaper offices or in the Government in Washington receive from $50 to $54 a week in from 5 to 7½ years. Our girls are acquainted with these facts and realize that something should and must be done to correct the self-evident injustice. I use only a few comparisons here but our statistics paint the same picture throughout the country. In a city like New York our skilled craftsmen start at $29 a week and after 8 years receive $80. In Washington after 8 years they receive only $76. All of them do not progress to the top rate, and even if they did, we find by way of comparison that the radio-broadcast technicians, doing much the same work receive approximately $30 a week more in 3 years' less time.

Craftsmen in the tool industry and the electrical industry receive in almost every case between 8 and 10 dollars more per week than our members.

Our wage demand is for $12 a week. It is not a figure picked out of a hat. Rather, it is the result of studies by our research department and the mature and considered judgment of trained and practical people. Telephone workers firmly believe they should receive something to offset the rise in living cost since last year. They are also convinced, and I think you will agree with them, that they are entitled to wage levels which are in proper relationship to those of the workers in other industries, yet, the companies have not offered one penny of wage increases.

It is quite possible that the reason for lack of proper bargaining in the telephone industry is management's desire to wait for Congress to legislate labor unions out of existence or for some other industry to make a break in correcting its wage inequalities. If such is the case, it is decidedly unfair, as well as illegal. Under the law, management is required to bargain in good faith. Even the present Congress would not tolerate a situation where a management, while waiting for Congress to act, violates one of the country's laws requiring an employer to bargain in good faith with the representatives of his employees. If management in our industry is waiting for some other company to lead off, a vicious cycle is established which would act as a bar to any industrial harmony. If each management waits for the next, no one acts.

It is understandable why the telephone industry would hope for Federal, and State legislation and wait for settlements in other basic industries. They would be in a better bargaining position. However, a strike of telephone workers is too serious a matter to be recklessly provoked by any responsible management. Seizure by Government or unconstitutional compulsory arbitration by Congress or State legislatures will not establish long-range harmony or continued efficiency. Good labor relations can succeed only where both labor and management want them to succeed. Telephone workers have laid their demands on the top of the table, backed by fact and reason. They have shown they want bargaining to succeed.

Next week our policy committee will assemble in Washington and will make a determination of the collective will of the telephone workers throughout the United States. A decision will be reached on the bargaining and strike questions. The decision will be made gravely and in accord with the highest ideals of our American institutions and our way of life.

Some Election Results in the Third Congressional District of Texas

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from page 125 of the Congressional Directory, Eightieth Congress, first session, issued February 1947:

LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Democrat, of Upshur County, Tex., Gladewater, Route 2; born on

farm, Kaufman County, Tex., June 30, 1913; lived in Henderson County; the son of O. J. Beckworth, who came to Smith County, Tex., from Georgia in 1900 (father taught in Upshur, Camp, Erath, and Palo Pinto Counties) and the late Josie Slaughter Beckworth of Van Zandt County, Tex.; grandson of Elder W. W. Slaughter, 90-year-old Primitive Baptist preacher of Edgewood, Tex., who was born in Anderson County; nephew of late H. T. Beckworth, who taught in Smith, Gregg, Trinity, Palo Pinto, Karnes, and San Patricio Counties; has twin sister, Linnie, who attended Mary Hardin, Baylor and Stephen F. Austin Teachers Colleges (she taught in Upshur, Gregg, and Rusk Counties); father married recently Mrs. Pearl Sloan Phipps of Comanche County, who now teaches in Upshur County; reared on farm; attended schools in Upshur and Camp Counties, East Texas State and Sam Houston State Teachers Colleges, and Southern Methodist University; taught school 3 years; studied law at Baylor University and Texas University; admitted to bar in 1937; member of the Texas House of Representatives, 1936–38; received a clear majority over five men (the first primary) in 1936 to be elected State representative; married Eloise Carter of Tyler, Tex., June 27, 1942, daughter of Mattie Palmer Carter and Barney Carter who lived in Mills, Brown, Stephens, Taylor, Nolan, and Eastland Counties; three children, Gary, Carter Otis, and Mary Eloise; Baptist, Mason, Odd Fellow; nominated for the Seventy-sixth Congress in the Democratic primary of 1938, defeating the incumbent who had served 18 years, and three others, carried six of eight counties; renominated for the Seventy-seventh Congress, carried all eight counties; renominated for the Seventy-eighth Congress, carried seven of eight counties; renominated for the Seventy-ninth Congress over two opponents first primary, carried seven of eight counties; renominated for Eightieth Congress over two opponents first primary, carried seven of eight counties.

Truman Purge Is Far From Jeffersonian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Purge Is Far From Jeffersonian," written by Kenesaw M. Landis 2d, published in the Chicago Sun of March 26, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TRUMAN PURGE IS FAR FROM JEFFERSONIAN

(By Kenesaw M. Landis 2d)

LOGANSPORT, IND.—President Truman has supplied further proof, if any is needed, that we are losing our minds over the communism issue.

There can be no doubt that he sincerely believes in democratic freedoms, and abhors the totalitarian features of the Soviet system.

Yet, in his desire to protect democracy, he has ordered loyalty tests for more than 2,000,000 Government employees—all the way down to the janitor in the post office.

It is not enough for you to believe yourself loyal. If you want to work for Uncle Sam, your loyalty must be certified by loyalty boards, which are to be set up in each agency and department.

Heretofore only questionable persons have been checked, but from now on all Americans in Government service must be investigated.

The investigation will be in the hands of the FBI.

Do reasonable grounds exist for belief that you are disloyal to the Government of the United States?

This doesn't mean that you must have voted for Mr. Truman. Not yet. But suppose you have publicly opposed his loan to Greece?

One of the tests of disloyalty is "acting so as to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interest of the United States."

Have you been serving the interest of Russia? It isn't for you to decide. It is for the loyalty board, and the man from the FBI should jot down the suspicious circumstance.

Are you a Catholic? Do you remember when Catholic teachers were fired by Klan school boards on the ground that they owed their first allegiance to a foreign potentate, the Pope?

It is not necessary for you to have done anything disloyal yourself. You can be blackballed if you have been seen in suspicious company. Are you a Mason?

If you are a member of, or in sympathetic association with, any group designated by the Attorney General as "totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive," you are presumed to be disloyal.

Under these standards, Mrs. Roosevelt could be purged because she once spoke before a youth group which Westbrook Pegler discovered to be Communist-sponsored.

If you belong to any labor union, especially a CIO union, this same Pegler can prove that you are as guilty as all-get-out.

Do you have any personal enemies? To encourage them to inform on you, the Government is authorized to keep their identity secret, and you will have no right to cross-examine them when your case comes up for hearing.

A central master index is to be kept of all persons on whom loyalty checks have been made, so that all hiring agencies can refer to it.

One thing more, before I am purged. Is this the country of Thomas Jefferson?

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if I understand correctly there was offered for the RECORD today an editorial from the Knoxville Journal opposing the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal. On October 29, 1946, the same newspaper published an editorial entitled "Selection of Lilienthal To Become Chairman of Atomic Energy Committee Most Logical." It was one of the strongest editorials that I had read in support of Mr. Lilienthal. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, may I inquire whether this editorial has previously been placed in the RECORD?

Mr. SPARKMAN. So far as I know it has not been.

Mr. STEWART. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTION OF LILIENTHAL TO BECOME CHAIRMAN OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION MOST LOGICAL

There will be no dissenters in this section, we are certain, to the assertion that President Truman, in the nomination of Mr. David Lilienthal for chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, made a brilliant selection.

The Knoxville Journal has frequently not seen eye to eye with the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority's board of directors, but there has never been any question in our minds about his intelligence, or his ability, or the steadfastness of purpose which made it possible for him to mould the form of TVA almost from its very inception, long before he was actually made chairman.

Not only was the Truman nomination logical from a standpoint of Mr. Lilienthal's personal qualifications, however, but even more so from the background of familiarity with the whole question of atomic energy control.

As a member of the Byrnes committee, Mr. Lilienthal spent 5 or 6 months in shaping the Baruch proposal for international control, as finally submitted to the subcommittee of the United Nations. The report itself was a credit to the TVA Chairman and his colleagues, as was pointed out here at the time it was made public. The plan advanced was only as near workable as any such plan could be—at a minimum it provided notice to cooperating nations in case one decided to make use of atomic energy for war purposes—but it did not ignore, or belittle, the precedence to which our own country was entitled by reason of our being first to perfect at atomic manufacturing process. To say it another way, the Lilienthal proposal did not contemplate, under any circumstances, the sharing of atomic secrets until the other nations showed beyond all question their good faith.

The country may feel confident, taking the Baruch proposal as a basis in forecasting what the Lilienthal approach to the important questions before the Atomic Commission will be, that the matters before the Commission will be in safe hands.

It may be anticipated that the nominations of Mr. Lilienthal and his four colleagues will be approved overwhelmingly by the Senate when it convenes and the same thing will be true of Mr. Gordon Clapp, former general manager who is now to become TVA Chairman.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio address recently delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

March 12, 1947, marked a turning point in American history. It is not a Greek crisis that we face, it is an American crisis. It is a crisis in the American spirit. That which I feared when I wrote President Truman last July has come upon us. Only the American people fully aroused and promptly acting can prevent disaster.

President Truman, in the name of democracy and humanitarianism, proposed a military lend-lease program. He proposed a loan of $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey as a down payment on an unlimited expenditure aimed at opposing Communist expansion. He proposed, in effect, that America police Russia's every border. There is no regime too reactionary for us provided it stands in Russia's expansionist path. There is no country too remote to serve as the scene of a contest which may widen until it becomes a world war.

President Truman calls for action to combat a crisis. What is this crisis that necessitates Truman going to Capitol Hill as though a Pearl Harbor had suddenly hit us? How many more of these Pearl Harbors will there be? How can they be foreseen? What will they cost?

President Truman says that the people of Greece are homeless, hungry, and ravaged by the losses of war. We all know this. It is not only the Greek people who are suffering from the war, it is the peoples of all Europe, of Russia, of China, and of many lands.

WHY WAS UNRRA ABANDONED?

Americans agree with President Truman that we must aid the people beside whom we fought. Americans ask: If aid to the people of the world is our objective, why did the President and the Congress allow the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to die? Why are we doing so little to help the million displaced persons without homes in Europe? Why are we speaking of only $400,000,000 when the need is far greater? Why is $150,000,000 of those $400,000,000 to be given to Turkey, which was no ally of ours and which is in no urgent need of food and supplies?

All Americans agree with President Truman that freedom is the most cherished of human goals, and should be helped to grow in all countries. These same Americans ask: How does support given to the undemocratic Governments of Greece and Turkey aid the cause of freedom?

TURKEY LENGTHENED THE WAR

Turkey is a nation which fought against us in the First World War and which in this war refused to help the United Nations. Turkey fattened herself off the Germans and the Allies by offering her vital supplies of chrome to the highest bidder. Out of these sales she built up a gold reserve of $200,000,000. Turkish neutrality lengthened the war by months. It is utter nonsense to assert today that the Turkish Government is representative or democratic. Turkish sources state that the $150,000,000 that President Truman proposes to give Turkey is to be used to maintain her army of a million men—equivalent to 7,000,000 men in terms of the United States. In what sense is this an army of freedom? Many Allied divisions were immobilized throughout the war because we never knew on whose side this same Turkish Army was preparing to fight.

GREECE NO DEMOCRACY

Everyone admires the Greek people who fought on our side. They urgently need economic aid. I would be strongly for economic aid to Greece. As Secretary of Commerce I was for a Greek loan for such purposes when most of the administration was against it. But President Truman has made it clear that very little of the $250,000,000 loan to Greece is for economic reconstruction. It is a military subsidy to the Greek Government to continue its efforts to stamp out all opposition. It is utter nonsense to suggest that the present Greek Government is a democratic one. Three weeks ago our Secretary of State General Marshall condemned many aspects of that government. He called for a political amnesty, substantial unity and many reforms in the the government as the conditions of American aid to Greece. Why did President Truman abandon the conditions set by his own Secretary of State? The President asks only that American civilian and military personnel supervise the use made of American supplies. What do the activities of American Army officers in Greece have to do with peaceful reconstruction?

One year ago at Fulton, Mo., Winston Churchill called for a diplomatic offensive against Soviet Russia. By sanctioning that speech, Truman committed us to a policy of combating Russia with British sources. That policy proved to be so bankrupt that Britain can no longer maintain it. Now President Truman proposes we take over Britain's hopeless task. Today Americans are asked to support the Governments of Greece and Turkey. Tomorrow we shall be asked to support the Governments of China and Argentina.

CHANGE CANNOT BE PREVENTED

I say that this policy is utterly futile. No people can be bought. America cannot afford to spend billions and billions of dollars for unproductive purposes. The world is hungry and insecure, and the peoples of all lands demand change. American loans for military purposes won't stop them. President Truman cannot prevent change in the world any more than he can prevent the tide from coming in or the sun from setting. But once America stands for opposition to change, we are lost. America will become the most-hated nation in the world.

Russia may be poor and unprepared for war, but she knows very well how to reply to Truman's declaration of economic and financial pressure. All over the world Russia and her ally, poverty, will increase the pressure against us. Who among us is ready to predict that in this struggle American dollars will outlast the grievances that lead to communism? I certainly don't want to see communism spread. I predict that Truman's policy will spread communism in Europe and Asia. You can't fight something with nothing. When Truman offers unconditional aid to King George of Greece, he is acting as the best salesman communism ever had. In proposing this reckless adventure, Truman is betraying the great tradition of America and the leadership of the great American who preceded him.

WHY BYPASS THE UN?

Coming 2 days after the opening of the Moscow Conference, President Truman's speech has undermined General Marshall's assignment of cooperating with Great Britain, France and Russia in writing the peace. The United Nations, our great hope for peace, rests on the continued cooperation of these nations and will be gravely weakened if America follows the course that Truman recommends. The United Nations Commission is now in Greece investigating the threat to Greek security. If Greece is in danger let the United Nations tell us the facts and recommend action. America will do what the United Nations recommends. Why should President Truman undercut its action? How can we wage a war of nerves against Russia and expect her to take in good faith our proposals to the United Nations on atomic energy.

PREPARATION FOR EVENTUAL WAR

When President Truman proclaims the world-wide conflict between East and West, he is telling the Soviet leaders that we are preparing for eventual war. They will reply by measures to strengthen their position in the event of war. Then the task of keeping the world at peace will pass beyond the power of the common people everywhere who want peace. Certainly it will not be freedom that will be victorious in this struggle. Psychological and spiritual preparation for war will follow financial preparation; civil liberties will be restricted; standards of living will be forced downward; families will be divided against each other; none of the values that we hold worth fighting for will be secure.

DISASTER AHEAD

Most Americans fear that the actions proposed by President Truman will lead to disaster. That is why congressional leaders were prepared in advance for the President's message. That is why the program was presented piece by piece, and not as an overall program that Americans could look at and judge as a whole. No hypocritical appeal to the generosity and decency of the American people should be permitted to draw us into a commitment for which there is no end in sight. Americans are for democracy and for economic reconstruction. As one American citizen, I say: No loan to undemocratic and well-fed Turkey: No loan to Greece until a representative Greek government is formed and can assure America that our funds will be used for the welfare of the Greek people.

To authorize the loans proposed by President Truman will bring the world nearer to war. To defeat these loans will not bring peace. I recognize that there is grave danger of eventual war in our present policy of drift. All nations are responsible for this drift to war; all nations must work together for peace.

No one wants war. If war comes one day, it will be because we have failed to think on the scale required for peace. Roosevelt thought on that scale. He foresaw generations of peace and plenty. Two years later President Truman asks us to look forward to generations of want and war. President Truman has summoned in a century of fear. I say this can be the century of the fulfillment of the American dream.

SEND EUROPE PLOWS, NOT GUNS

This is the time for an all-out worldwide reconstruction program for peace. This is America's opportunity. The peoples of all lands say to America: Send us plows for our fields instead of tanks and guns to be used against us. The United Nations is waiting ready to do the job. We should start with an economic plan for the Near East financed by the International Bank and backed by the United Nations. The dollars that are spent will be spent for the production of goods and will come back to us in a thousand different ways. Our program will be based on service instead of the outworn ideas of imperialism and power politics. It is a fundamental law of life that a strong idea is merely strengthened by persecution. The way to handle communism is by what William James called the replacing power of the higher affection. In other words, we must give the common man all over the world something better than communism. I believe we have something better than communism here in America. But President Truman has not spoken for the American ideal. It is now the turn of the American people to speak.

Common sense is required of all of us in realizing that helping militarism never brings peace. Courage is required of all of us in carrying out a program that can bring peace. Courage and common sense are the qualities that made America great. Let's keep those qualities now.

The President's Proposals for Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The President's Proposals for Aid to Greece and Turkey," prepared by Alvanley Johnston, grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 21, 1947.*

STATEMENT BY ALVANLEY JOHNSTON, GRAND CHIEF ENGINEER, BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, AND A. F. WHITNEY, PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS FOR AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

President Truman has stated that the independence of Greece is threatened by economic chaos and hunger and by Communist-led elements. Turkey, he has stated, also faces a threat to its continued independence. For Turkey he has asked military aid and for Greece both military and economic assistance.

Although the President did not mention Russia directly, he implied that Russia was behind the threat to the independence of both Greece and Turkey. If true, we believe the Russian challenge must be met squarely with firm, decisive measures holding the hope of peace and of relief for suffering peoples.

The Russian challenge, as we see it, is a dual one; it is both physical and ideological. It is the challenge of Russia as a strong nation affecting the destinies of smaller, surrounding nations and the challenge of communism as an idea or way of life. The two challenges require separate and distinct treatment.

Communism as a way of life wins support chiefly from people who are hungary and oppressed, hopeless, and desperate. These conditions exist in Greece today. They can be removed, in large part, by the grant of assistance from the United States to feed the starving people and to enable the stricken Greek economy to recover, spreading prosperity throughout that land.

We advocate dispatching immediate relief in the form of food and clothing for the suffering people of Greece, with the provision that distribution should be supervised by United States personnel.

We also favor extending economic aid to Greece for the purpose of reconstructing and developing her economy. We urge Congress, however, to insist that Greece carry out the internal reforms necessary to assure wise and efficient use of this assistance. These reforms were aptly stated by Secretary of State Marshall prior to his departure for Moscow when he expressed the hope that there would be the "broadest political cooperation of all loyal Greek parties and that partisan differences will be submerged in a dynamic program of amnesty coupled with the disarming of illegal bands, just and rigorous tax reforms, modernization of the civil service, realistic financial controls and the even-handed dispensation of justice."

The challenge of Russia as a powerful nation, threatening the independent existence of surrounding states, is not one which the United States should meet alone. For that reason we are opposed to the proposal that the United States send military assistance to either Turkey or Greece.

If a threat to the independence of these countries exists, it is a threat to the entire world and not only to the United States. This is exactly the type of threat to the peace of the world which the United Nations was established to handle. The United Nations should immediately examine this question and take whatever action is necessary.

It has the power to act: it is the agency to act. For the United States to move by itself to bolster, with military support, nations who feel their independence threatened will cripple the United Nations and with it the hope of the world for peace. It also carries the risk that the United States action will be misinterpreted abroad as intended to divide the world into hostile camps. Should that tragedy develop, the world will head inevitably toward war.

This is the first big job which the United Nations has faced. If it is ever to function, now is the time. If it cannot function, let us learn by experience and not by the tragic process of bypassing, leaving the stranded world organization doomed to helplessness.

J. Edgar Hoover and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, March 26, 1947:

The aims and responsibilities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are the same—the protection of the internal security of this Nation. The methods whereby this goal may be accomplished differ, however.

I have always felt that the greatest contribution this committee could make is the public disclosure of the forces that menace America—Communist and Fascist. That is why the venom of the American Communist and the now defunct German-American Bund has been directed at this committee, as it has also been directed at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This committee renders a distinct service when it publicly reveals the diabolic machinations of sinister figures engaged in un-American activities.

THE ROLE OF THE FBI

The FBI has great responsibilities to the Nation. In addition to being charged "with the duty of investigating violations of the laws of the United States, collecting evidence in cases in which the United States is or may be a party in interest and performing other duties imposed * * * by law," the FBI has been charged by Presidential directive dated September 6, 1939, "to take charge of investigative work in matters relating to espionage, sabotage * * *." In implementing this charge the President called upon all law-enforcement officers to promptly "turn over to the nearest representative of the Federal Bureau of Investigation any information obtained by them relating to espionage, counterespionage, sabotage, subversive activities."

The FBI is essentially an investigative agency. It is our duty to get the facts. We do not establish policies; that is the responsibility of higher authority. We do not make decisions as to prosecutions; that is the responsibility of the Attorney General, his assistants, and the various United States attorneys.

To the end that our responsibilities may be discharged it is necessary not to lose sight of the fact that our chief responsibility is the duty to obtain information and to protect confidence. Thus, when a citizen furnishes information on a confidential basis his confidence must be respected. In any intelligence operation, security of information is of primary concern. I recall in the prewar years that the FBI was criticized on the ill-founded premise that nothing was being done to meet the Nazi-Fascist-Japanism threat to our internal security. The real facts are now a matter of record. What was being done, and done successfully, could not then be discussed and publicized. When the time came to act the FBI was fully prepared to carry out its responsibilities. There was not one successful enemy-directed act of sabotage during the war and enemy espionage was kept under complete control.

In one of our espionage cases a spy ring was kept under close surveillance for over 18 months. The arrests, when made, broke the backbone of the Nazi spy system in America. I shudder at what might have happened had there been a disclosure of our operations and our sources of information in the initial days of that investigation. That was the very time we were most criticized for inaction. I hope this committee will understand our situation and I know you will readily agree that there are many questions that you might like to raise which I would for obvious reasons be unable to answer in a public hearing.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY

My feelings concerning the Communist Party of the United States are well known. I have not hesitated over the years to express my concern and apprehension. As a consequence, its professional smear brigades have conducted a relentless assault against the FBI. You who have been members of this committee also know the fury with which the party, its sympathizers, and fellow travelers can launch an assault. I do not mind such attacks. What has been disillusioning is the manner in which they have been able to enlist support often from apparently well-meaning but thoroughly duped persons.

Anyone who opposes the American Communist is at once branded as a disrupter, a Fascist, a Red baiter, or a Hitlerite, and becomes the object of a systematic campaign of character assassination. This is easily understood because the basic tactics of the Communist Party are deceit and trickery.

The great god of the American Communists, Comrade Lenin—whose writings are their bible—in various speeches and writings urged the use of deceit and trickery and his converts live by his injunction:

"The strictest loyalty to the ideas of communism must be combined with the ability to make all necessary practical compromises, to maneuver, to make agreements, zig-zags, retreats, and so on, so as to accelerate the coming to power." (Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder, pp. 75–76, vol. I, Lenin, International Publishers Co., Inc., 1940.)

Lenin's views were incorporated in the Thesis on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International, and the following provision is familiar to all American Communists:

"In all countries, even the freest, 'legal and peaceful' in the sense that the class struggle

is less acute in them, the time has fully matured when it is absolutely necessary for every Communist Party systematically to combine legal with illegal work, legal with illegal organization. * * * It is necessary immediately for all legal Communist Parties to form illegal organizations. * * * Illegal work is particularly necessary in the Army, the Navy, and police."

Continuing, the thesis states:

"The absolute necessity in principle of combining illegal with legal work is determined, not only by the sum total of the specific features of the present period, the period of the eve of the proletarian dictatorship but also by the necessity of proving to the bourgeoisie that there is not, nor can there be, a sphere or field of work that cannot be won by the Communists." (Volume X, Selected Works of Lenin, pp. 172–173; International Publishers Co., Inc., 1943.)

The Communist movement in the United States began to manifest itself in 1919. Since then it has changed its name and its party line whenever expedient and tactical. But always it comes back to fundamentals and bills itself as the party of Marxism-Leninism. As such, it stands for the destruction of our American form of government; it stands for the destruction of American democracy; it stands for the destruction of free enterprise; and it stands for the creation of a soviet of the United States and ultimate world revolution.

THE HISTORIC MISSION

The preamble of the latest constitution of the Communist Party of the United States, filled with Marxian double talk, proclaims that the party educates the working class in the course of its day to day struggles for its historic mission, the establishment of socialism.

The phrase historic mission has a sinister meaning. To the uninformed person it bespeaks tradition, but to the Communist, using his own words, it is achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat; to throw off the yoke of imperialism and establish the proletarian dictatorship, to raise these revolutionary forces to the surface and hurl them like a devastating avalanche upon the united forces of bourgeois reaction, frenzied at the presentiment of their rapidly approaching doom.

In recent years, the Communists have been very cautious about using such phrases as "force and violence;" nevertheless, it is the subject of much discussion in their schools and in party caucus where they readily admit that the only way in which they can defeat the present ruling class is by world revolution.

The Communist, once he is fully trained and indoctrinated, realizes that he can create his order in the United States only by "bloody revolution."

Their chief textbook, The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is used as a basis for planning their revolution. Their tactics require that to be successful they must have—

1. The will and sympathy of the people.
2. Military aid and assistance.
3. Plenty of guns and ammunition.
4. A program of extermination of the police as they are the most important enemy and are termed "trained Fascists."
5. Seizure of all communications, busses, railroads, radio stations and other forms of communications and transportation.

They evade the question of force and violence publicily. They hold that when Marxists speak of force and violence they will not be responsible—that force and violence will be the responsibility of their enemies. They adopt the novel premise that they do not advocate force and violence publicly but that when their class resists to defend themselves then they are thus accused of using force and violence.

PARTY FOUND ILLEGAL

On May 28, 1942, Hon. Francis Biddle, then Attorney General, in reviewing the deportation proceedings of Harry Bridges, found that the Communist Party from the time of its inception in 1919 believes in, advises advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

Since then, much has happened. In 1944, the party dissolved and became the Communist Political Association. The constitution of the new CPA in 1944 omitted reference to Leninism and the historic mission. That was the era when Browder was preaching a second front and all-out production. But, even then, they secretly held to their historic mission, for in an injunction to party members, Eugene Dennis, now general secretary of the party, said:

"Irrespective of name, we are and shall continue to be an American working class political organization, guided by the science of Marxism-Leninism."

But that era was short-lived. Immediately after Jacques Duclos, the French Communist leader, blasted the American Communists as deserting the Marxian cause, Browder was repudiated, the CPA was relegated to oblivion and the present Communist Party of the United States was reborn. A new constitution adopted in July 1945, as I have already indicated, referred to the party as basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism, and reincorporated the reference to the party's historic mission.

In establishing the party's illegal character in 1942, the then Attorney General Biddle based his findings on the contents of the same Communist publications which today are being sold and circulated in party circles. The American Communists, like the leopard, cannot change his spots.

THE PARTY LINE

The Communist Party line changes from day to day. The one cardinal rule that can always be applied to what the party line is or will be is found in the fundamental principle of Communist teachings that the support of Soviet Russia is the duty of Communists of all countries.

One thing is certain. The American progress which all good citizens seek, such as old-age security, houses for veterans, child assistance and a host of others is being adopted as window dressing by the Communists to conceal their true aims and entrap gullible followers.

The record of the American Communists conclusively proves their true feelings. In the prewar days, when they were allied with Hitler, they marched on Washington protesting selective service, lend-lease, shouting "the Yanks are not coming." The American peace mobilization picketed the White House until the day before the Nazis marched into Russia and then within less than a month reconverted it into the American people's mobilization, demanded all-out production, and started the chant for the second front.

We are witnessing the same tactics today. Since Secretary Schwellenbach advocated outlawing the Communist Party, and President Truman called for aid to Greece and Turkey, the Communists have been mobilizing, promoting mass meetings, sending telegrams and letters to exert pressure on Congress. The American Communists fail to realize that already they have outlawed themselves in the minds and hearts of loyal Americans.

The mad march of Red fascism is a cause for concern in America. But the deceit, the trickery, and the lies of the American Communists are catching up with them. Whenever the spotlight of truth is focused upon them they cry, "Red baiting." Now that their aims and objectives are being exposed they are creating a committee for the constitutional rights of Communists, and are feverishly working to build up what they term a quarter-million-dollar defense fund to place ads in papers, to publish pamphlets, to buy radio time. They know that today it is a fight to the finish and that their backs will soon be to the wall.

STRENGTH OF THE PARTY

A few days ago word leaked out that the annual Communist convention scheduled to be held in Chicago had been shifted from July to September in order that they might carry on their campaign of obstruction to American foreign policy and increase their membership. They have been conducting an active membership campaign as the leadership is concerned over the manner in which membership has slipped.

The numerical strength of the party's enrolled membership is insignificant. But it is well known that there are many actual members who because of their position are not carried on party rolls.

New York leads in the number of enrolled party members (30,000), followed by California (8,553), Illinois (6,500), Ohio (3,838), Oregon (3,654), Washington (2,752), New Jersey (2,487), and Michigan (2,135). The Daily Worker boasts of 74,000 members on the rolls.

What is important is the claim of the Communists themselves that for every party member there are 10 others ready, willing, and able to do the party's work. Herein lies the greatest menace of communism. For these are the people who infiltrate and corrupt various spheres of American life. So rather than the size of the Communist Party, the way to weigh its true importance is by testing its influence, its ability to infiltrate.

The size of the party is relatively unimportant because of the enthusiasm and ironclad discipline under which they operate. In this connection, it might be of interest to observe that in 1917 when the Communists overthrew the Russian Government there was 1 Communist for every 2,277 persons in Russia. In the United States today there is 1 Communist for every 1,814 persons in the country.

One who accepts the aims, principles, and program of the party, who attends meetings, who reads the party press and literature, who pays dues and who is active on behalf of the party shall be considered a member. The open, avowed Communist who carries a card and pays dues is no different from a security standpoint than the person who does the party's work but pays no dues, carries no card, and is not on the party rolls. In fact, the latter is a greater menace because of his opportunity to work in stealth.

IDENTIFYING UNDERCOVER COMMUNISTS, FELLOW TRAVELERS, AND SYMPATHIZERS

The burden of proof should be placed upon those who consistently follow the ever-changing, twisting party line. Fellow travelers and sympathizers can deny party membership, but they can never escape the undeniable fact that they have played into the Communist hands, thus furthering the Communist cause by playing the role of innocent, gullible, or willful allies.

PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES

The Communists have developed one of the greatest propaganda machines the world has ever known. They have been able to penetrate and infiltrate many respectable and reputable public-opinion mediums.

They capitalize upon ill-founded charges associating known honest progressive liberals with left-wing causes. I have always entertained the view that there are few appellations more degrading than Communist, and hence it should be reserved for those justly deserving the degradation.

The Communist propaganda technique is designed to promote emotional response with

the hope that the victim will be attracted by what he is told the Communist way of life holds in store for him. The objective, of course, is to develop discontent and hasten the day when the Communists can gather sufficient support and following to overthrow the American way of life.

Communist propaganda is always slanted in the hope that the Communist may be alined with liberal progressive causes. The honest liberal and progressive should be alert to this, and I believe the Communists' most effective foes can be the real liberals and progressives who understand their devious machinations.

The deceptiveness of Communist "double talk" fulfills the useful propaganda technique of confusion. In fact, Lenin referred to their peculiar brand of phraseology as "that cursed Aesopian language which compelled all revolutionaries to have recourse, whenever they took up their pens to write a 'legal' work." Lenin used it for the purpose of avoiding censorship. Communists today use it to mislead the public.

The use of the term "democracy" by the Communists, we have learned to our sorrow, does not have the meaning to them that it does to us. To them it means communism and totalitarianism and our understanding of the term is regarded by them as imperialistic and Fascist.

The Daily Worker on Independence Day last year, for example, proclaimed: "It is a dramatic fact that on July 4, 1946, the independence of other countries is menaced by the United States in the grip of trusts and tories."

CORRESPONDENCE CAMPAIGNS

Communists and their followers are prolific letter writers and some of the more energetic ones follow the practice of directing numerous letters of protest to editors but signing a different name to each.

Members of Congress are well aware of Communists starting their pressure campaigns by an avalanche of mail which follows the party line.

RADIO

The party has departed from depending upon the printed word as its medium of propaganda and has taken to the air. Its members and sympathizers have not only infiltrated the airways but they are now persistently seeking radio channels.

MOTION PICTURES

The American Communists launched a furtive attack on Hollywood in 1935 by the issuance of a directive calling for a concentration in Hollywood. The orders called for action on two front: (1) An effort to infiltrate the labor unions; (2) to infiltrate the so-called intellectual and creative fields.

In movie circles, Communists developed an effective defense a few years ago in meeting criticism. They would counter with the question, "After all, what is the matter with communism?" It was effective because many persons did not possess adequate knowledge of the subject to give an intelligent answer.

Some producers and studio heads realize the possibility that the entire industry faces serious embarrassment because it could become a springboard for Communist activities. Communist activity in Hollywood is effective and is furthered by Communists and sympathizers using the prestige of prominent persons to serve, often unwittingly, the Communist cause.

The party is content and highly pleased if it is possible to have inserted in a picture a line, a scene, a sequence, conveying the Communist lesson, and more particularly, if they can keep out anti-Communist lessons.

INFILTRATION

The Communist tactic of infiltrating labor unions stems from the earliest teachings of Marx, which have been reiterated by party spokesmen down through the years. They resort to all means to gain their point and often succeed in penetrating and literally taking over labor unions before the rank and file of members are aware of what has occurred.

With few exceptions the following admonitions of Lenin have been followed:

"It is necessary to be able to withstand all this, to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into the trade-unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs." (P. 38, Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder, vol. I, Lenin, 1934, International Publishers Co., Inc.)

I am convinced that the great masses of union men and women are patriotic American citizens interested chiefly in security for their families and themselves. They have no use for the American Communists, but in those instances where Communists have taken control of unions, it has been because too many union men and women have been outwitted, outmaneuvered, and outwaited by Communists.

The Communists have never relied on numerical strength to dominate a labor organization. Through infiltration tactics they have in too many instances captured positions of authority. Communists have boasted that with 5 percent of the membership, the Communists, with their militancy, superior organizational ability, and discipline, could control the union.

They regard as political every movement of the working class which seeks to gain concessions by exerting pressure from without as a political movement. Thus, as Lenin puts it: "The economic strike develops into a political strike and the latter develops into insurrection." (P. 12, Left-Wing Communism, * * * vol. I, Lenin, 1934, International Publishers Co., Inc.)

That the Communists feel themselves ordained for a special mission in penetrating labor is revealed by the statement made by Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States of America, at a recent party meeting: "No trade-union or people's organization," he said, "not even the great CIO, could long remain progressive if it were to exclude or to attack Communists."

The Communists have long viewed with envy the A. F. of L. They admit they play a very small role with only a handful of Communists active in the A. F. of L. locals. Recently there has been agitation in the party to reorganize to influence the A. F. of L.

A few months ago a Party functionary said it was imperative that 3,000 party members be infiltrated into the A. F. of L. without publicizing this fact. They say this action is necessary because of the danger of a third world war and the need to fulfill the Communist plan of creating a third party.

If more union members took a more active role and asserted themselves it would become increasingly difficult for Communists to gain control. Patriotic union members can easily spot sympathizers and party members in conventions and union meetings because invariably the latter strive to establish the party line instead of serving the best interests of the union and the country.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GROUPS

The party for the past 18 months has been giving special attention to foreign language groups and has called for a sweeping self-critical examination of its work in this field. As long ago as 1945, in urging the importance of penetrating these groups, party leaders said, "We need only mention the Polish, Italian, Yugoslav and Greek questions," and in characteristic party double talk observed that they occupied an important relationship "to the entire democratic camp and to the broader peoples movements." In other words, the Communists now seek strength from foreign groups who may have relatives in countries which Russia seeks to influence.

GOVERNMENT

The recent Canadian spy trials revealed the necessity of alertness in keeping Communists and sympathizers out of Government services. In fact, the high command of the Communist party regards such assignments of sufficient importance to demand that party members not contact fellow members in the Government and if such Government employees are carried on Party rolls at all they are assigned an alias. Last fall a high-ranking party leader instructed that all party membership cards of Government employees be destroyed and that party organizational meetings in Government circles be discontinued although informal social or union gatherings which could not be identified as Communist meetings could be continued. The dangers of permitting Communists or sympathizers to work in Government circles are too obvious to mention.

There has developed, however, as a result of Communist propaganda, some fanciful feeling among Communists that no distinction should be drawn and that Communists have a right to Government jobs.

Since July 1, 1941, the FBI has investigated 6,193 cases under the Hatch Act, which forbids membership upon the part of any Government employee in any organization advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

For the purposes of investigation the Attorney General has ruled that a number of organizations in addition to the Communist Party are subversive under the Hatch Act because of Communist influence.

One hundred and one Federal employees were discharged as a result of our investigation, 21 resigned during the investigation, and in 75 cases administrative action was taken by the departments. A total of 1,906 individuals are no longer employed in the government while 122 cases are presently pending consideration in the various Government agencies.

The FBI does not make recommendations; it merely reports facts and it is up to the interested Government department to make a decision. Almost invariably, of course, subjects of investigations deny affiliation with subversive groups, often despite strong evidence to the contrary.

The following is a case in point:

The FBI submitted a 57-page report to the Federal Security Agency on March 7, 1942, on Doxey Wilkerson. The investigation recorded interviews with persons who stated he was a member of the Communist Party. Following the submission of the report we were advised by the Federal Security Agency that further investigation failed to show that Wilkerson was subversive or "disloyal to our Government." Wilkerson subsequently transferred to OPA and resigned on June 19, 1943. Within less than 24 hours he announced his new job as a "Communist Party organizer." He was subsequently appointed a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party. To be eligible for service in the national committee one "must have been a member of the party in continuous good standing for at least 4 years."

MASS AND FRONT ORGANIZATIONS

The united-front program of the Communist Party was launched at the seventh world congress of the Communist Internationale in 1935. The Communist Party in the United States immediately took up the program and a systematic plan was worked out of infiltrating existing organizations with Communists.

For the most part, front organizations assumed the character of either a mass or membership organization or a paper organization. Both solicited and used names of prominent persons. Literally hundreds of groups and organizations have either been infiltrated or organized primarily to accomplish the purposes of promoting the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States, the promotion of Soviet war and peace aims, the

exploitation of Negroes in the United States, work among foreign language groups, and to secure a favorable viewpoint toward the Communists in domestic, political, social, and economic issues.

The first requisite for a front organization is an idealistic sounding title. Hundreds of such organizations have come into being and have gone out of existence when their true purposes have become known or exposed while others with high sounding names are continually springing up.

THE AMERICAN YOUTH FOR DEMOCRACY

Illustrative of how the Communists bury one organization and conceive another is the Young Communist League. In convention assembled in New York City, the Young Communist League was dissolved on October 16, 1943, and the next day The American Youth for Democracy was born.

At first the Communists denied paternity for the AYD, but in April of 1946 the Party's National Board indicated that the AYD was the successor to the YCL. William Z. Foster, the Communist Party head, at the AYD National Intercollegiate Conference in New York City in 1945, told the delegates in the concluding session that, "The atomic age is the age of socialism, of Communism. This is the greatest lesson that the youth of America has to learn." This new front set up youth centers ostensibly to combat juvenile delinquency. More properly, these centers could be terms Communist youth recruiting centers.

THE TEST OF A FRONT ORGANIZATION

I feel that this Committee could render a great service to the nation through its power of exposure in quickly spotlighting existing front organizations and those which will be created in the future.

There are easy tests to establish the real character of such organizations:

1. Does the group espouse the cause of Americanism or the cause of Soviet Russia?
2. Does the organization feature as speakers at its meetings known Communists, sympathizers, or fellow travelers?
3. Does the organization shift when the party line shifts?
4. Does the organization sponsor causes, campaigns, literature, petitions, or other activities sponsored by the party or other front organizations?
5. Is the organization used as a sounding board by or is it endorsed by Communist-controlled labor unions?
6. Does its literature follow the Communist line or is it printed by the Communist press?
7. Does the organization receive consistent favorable mention in Communist publications?
8. Does the organization represent itself to be nonpartisan yet engage in political activities and consistently advocate causes favored by the Communists?
9. Does the organization denounce American and British foreign policy while always lauding Soviet policy?
10. Does the organization utilize Communist double talk by referring to Soviet-dominated countries as democracies, complaining that the United States is imperialistic and constantly denouncing monopoly capital?
11. Have outstanding leaders in public life openly renounced affiliation with the organization?
12. Does the organization, if espousing liberal progressive causes, attract well-known, honest, patriotic liberals or does it denounce well-known liberals?
13. Does the organization have a consistent record of supporting the American viewpoint over the years?
14. Does the organization consider matters not directly related to its avowed purposes and objectives?

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Communist Party of the United States is a fifth column if there ever was one. It is far better organized than were the Nazis in occupied countries prior to their capitulation.

They are seeking to weaken America just as they did in their era of obstruction when they were alined with the Nazis. Their goal is the overthrow of our Government.

There is no doubt as to where a real Communist's loyalty rests. Their allegiance is to Russia, not the United States.

A top functionary of the Communist party recently said: "A war by the United States against the U. S. S. R. would be an unjust war, which is why it must be fought against, but that if it should come the Communist Party in the United States would be with Russia, and make no mistake about that."

In another section of the country another Communist leader made the following statement: "I believe that everyone should know that we are for Russia and if need be we will die for the cause. I don't mean that war with Russia is coming soon; I hope not, so that Russia will be better prepared."

WHAT TO DO

What can we do? And what should be our course of action? The best antidote to communism is vigorous, intelligent, old-fashioned Americanism with eternal vigilance. I do not favor any course of action which would give the Communists cause to portray and pity themselves as martyrs. I do favor unrelenting prosecution wherever they are found to be violating our country's laws. As Americans, our most effective defense is a workable democracy that guarantees and preserves our cherished freedoms.

I would have no fears if more Americans possessed the zeal, the fervor, the persistence and the industry to learn about this menace of red fascism. I do fear for the liberal and progressive who has been hoodwinked and duped into joining hands with the Communists. I confess to a real apprehension so long as Communists are able to secure ministers of the gospel to promote their evil work and espouse a cause that is alien to the religion of Christ and Judaism. I do fear so long as school boards and parents tolerate conditions whereby Communists and fellow travelers under the guise of academic freedom can teach our youth a way of life that eventually will destroy the sanctity of the home, that undermines faith in God, that causes them to scorn respect for constituted authority and sabotage our revered Constitution.

I do fear so long as American labor groups are infiltrated, dominated, or saturated with the virus of communism. I do fear the palliation and weasel-worded gestures against communism indulged in by some of our labor leaders who should know better but who have become pawns in the hands of sinister but astute manipulations for the Communist cause.

I fear for ignorance on the part of all our people who may take the poisonous pills of Communist propaganda.

I am deeply concerned whenever I think of the words of an old-time Communist. Disillusioned, disgusted, and frightened, he came to us with his story and concluded:

"God help America or any other country if the Communist Party ever gets strong enough to control labor and politics. God help us all."

The Communists have been, still are, and always will be a menace to freedom, to democratic ideals, to the worship of God, and to America's way of life.

I feel that once public opinion is thoroughly aroused as it is today, the fight against communism is well on its way. Victory will be assured once Communists are identified and exposed, because the public will take the first step of quarantining them so they can do no harm. Communism, in reality, is not a political party. It is a way of life—an evil and malignant way of life. It reveals a condition akin to disease that spreads like an epidemic and like an epidemic a quarantine is necessary to keep it from infecting the Nation.

Second-Class Postage Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Greensboro News Co., Greensboro, N. C., pointing out that the proposed increase in second-class postage rates, insofar as they apply to first and second zones, are unjust and discriminatory:

RE PROPOSED INCREASE IN SECOND-CLASS POSTAL RATES

GREENSBORO NEWS CO.,
Greensboro, N. C., March 26, 1947.

Hon. CHARLES B. DEANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEANE: The effect on our cost of pound postage if the proposed postal-rate changes are approved will be an increase of approximately $17,695.60 per year.

In making this analysis we used our zone statement of October 1946 and our newsprint consumption of the week ending February 22, 1947. The 1947 consumption figure was selected as being more representative of our probable newsprint tonnage of this year.

Our zone statement showed that approximately 97 percent of our mailing is in the first and second zones, so for practical purposes the increase in cost to us is that suggested for zones 1 and 2, or 66⅔ percent.

In several respects it seems to me that the increases proposed are largely arbitrary and make no attempt to conform to the pattern established for postage costs.

You will note that the charges for mailing to the various zones has always reflected the greater cost of shipping parcels or periodicals to more distant points, but the present proposed increase singles out zones 1 and 2 for a 66⅔ "soaking," whereas zone 7 for instance, would only be increased 16⅔ percent and zone 8, 14 percent. It seems to me pretty clear that the purpose behind this legislation is simply to pitch upon the volume mailings of the daily newspaper and increase this category whatever is necessary to overcome the claimed deficit. From a standpoint of the ease of handing, a fairer figure of increased rates would be something approximating 5 or 10 percent for first and second zones and greater increases in the more distant zones, as parcels or mail bags must be transferred and handled by different crews before they finally reach destination in remote areas.

The proposed increase for zones 1 and 2 would—

(a) increase costs enormously for that portion of the publishing industry least able to absorb them; or

(b) increase the cost of the newspaper to that class of the population least able to pay it.

There is submitted herewith schedules showing the percentage of mail to the total circulation of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan newspapers. It will be noted that the proposed increase would affect only 3.3 percent of the circulation of the metropolitan newspapers, whereas 29.1 percent of the circulation of nonmetropolitan papers would be affected.

If the smaller papers were able to pass on to the consumer all, or a part, of the proposed increase, it would fall on that portion of the population most vulnerable to economic recession, the farmer. There would be no increase in cost to the $100 a week

plasterer or plumber; he would continue to receive his daily paper by carrier boy at the same rate. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that 90 percent of the mailings of the small newspaper go to rural route readers. If this rank discrimination goes into effect, what becomes of our boasted rural free delivery?

Another reason why the proposed increase would be unjust is that the smaller newspapers are already paying the Post Office Department for complete service but receive only fragmentary service. The second-class postage rates presuppose that the postal service receive at a local post office mail sacks or outside United States mail news dealer packages and furnish transportation to destination. This, however, rarely obtains. All these smaller newspapers have to haul at their own expense on equipment owned or leased by themselves a large proportion of their mail sacks to post offices throughout the territory they serve, because the Post Office Department does not provide adequate space or schedules to handle this mail. As an example: We must haul more than 50 mail sacks to eastern Carolina, distances up to 200 miles, but we pay exactly the same postage as if the Post Office Department were furnishing this transportation. I might add that we must also haul our own sacks to towns like High Point, Burlington, Reidsville, etc., because the Post Office Department either lacks space on trains offering satisfactory schedules or has no schedules at all. Train and star route space and schedules are designed for the accommodation primarily of first-class mail and parcel post. All newspapers will testify to this inadequacy which forces the daily newspaper to provide its own transportation while at the same time paying the Post Office Department the full second-class rate.

SUMMARY

The proposed increase in second-class postage rates, insofar as they apply to first and second zones, is unjust and discriminatory because it—

1. Does violence to the accepted pattern of charges for mailings in the various zones, in that they would increase zones 1 and 2 66⅔ percent, while other zones would be increased very little—zone 8, for instance, only 14 percent.

2. Place a grievous financial burden on the smaller weaker daily newspapers while the comparatively wealthy metropolitan papers would go scot free. The metropolitan newspapers (group 1) with a combined average daily circulation of 6,789,967 would pay this increased cost on only 227,187 daily copies, whereas the financially weaker newspapers (group 2) with a combined average daily circulation of only 1,357,434 would have to pay this increased cost on 394,883 copies. Percentagewise the strong newspapers would pay the increase on a negligible 3.3 percent of their circulation, while the weaker newspapers would see this tax go on 29.1 percent of their total circulation business.

3. It would raise the cost of the daily newspaper to that portion of the population least able to pay it, because mailings in the first and second zones are almost exclusively to farmers on rural routes.

4. It would thwart the manifest intent of the Congress by a discriminatory tax which would kill the idea of rural free delivery.

5. Newspapers, particularly weak nonmetropolitan newspapers, are already paying for services they do not receive because they are providing at their own expense transportation for most of their copies sent through the mails; all the Postal Department does in most cases is to hand to their rural carriers labeled copies which have been neatly bundled in conveniently small packages for easy handling.

You will probably be interested to know that insofar as I have been able to discover no other class of postal service on a zone basis is to be increased as much as that suggested for newspapers and other second-class publications in their first and second zone.

Trusting that the information developed here will be of some help in placing this in the proper light before our representatives, I am,

Yours very truly,

GREENSBORO NEWS-RECORD.

Percent of circulation of metropolitan newspapers affected by proposed second-class postage increase

Newspaper	Average daily circulation	Mail	Percent mail of total
Chicago Tribune	1,076,045	99,184	9.2
New York Times	538,914	39,144	7.2
New York Herald Tribune	358,855	23,177	6.5
Washington (D. C.) Post	167,261	8,511	5.1
Philadelphia Inquirer	606,664	22,278	3.7
Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald	262,216	7,816	3.0
Washington (D. C.) Evening Star	210,256	2,725	1.3
New York Sun	303,776	3,778	1.2
Philadelphia Evening Bulletin	715,201	4,209	.6
Los Angeles Examiner	379,746	1,620	.4
New York Journal American	673,708	1,339	.2
Chicago Daily News	491,046	12,273	.2
New York Daily Mirror	1,006,279	1,133	.1
Total	6,789,967	227,187	3.3

Percent of circulation of nonmetropolitan newspapers (that is, those least able to absorb drastic cost increases) affected by proposed second-class postage increase

Newspaper	Average daily circulation	Mail	Percent mail of total
NORTH CAROLINA NEWSPAPERS			
Raleigh News and Observer	94,245	37,976	40.3
Greensboro Daily News	68,404	20,329	29.7
Asheville Citizen	29,429	5,737	19.5
Durham Morning Herald	24,505	4,473	18.3
Charlotte Observer	123,685	19,847	16.0
SOUTHERN			
Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser	54,029	17,294	32.0
Macon (Ga.) Telegraph	34,549	10,901	31.6
Roanoke (Va.) Times	43,343	13,130	30.3
Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle	26,131	6,423	24.6
Shreveport (La.) Times	70,005	11,625	16.6
Little Rock (Ark.) Gazette	87,909	12,837	14.6
EASTERN			
Burlington (Vt.) Daily Free Press	23,258	8,539	36.7
Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot	22,466	6,346	28.2
Syracuse (N. Y.) Post Standard	85,581	20,335	23.8
Portland (Maine) Press Herald	44,946	10,691	23.8
Waterbury (Conn.) Republican	19,211	2,369	12.3
CENTRAL			
Springfield (Mo.) Daily News	24,837	12,764	51.4
Lexington (Ky.) Herald	27,067	12,296	45.4
Evansville (Ind.) Courier	52,401	16,656	31.8
Springfield (Ill.) State Journal	50,486	12,695	25.1
WESTERN			
Sioux City (Iowa) Journal	52,941	36,025	68.0
Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum	43,007	21,502	49.3
Madison (Wis.) Capital Times	36,240	14,845	41.0
Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital	57,642	20,268	35.2
Madison (Wis.) State Journal	31,529	10,484	32.0
Boise (Idaho) Statesman	28,745	8,689	30.2
St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch	100,043	19,807	19.8
Total	1,357,434	394,883	29.1

Report and Question Periods Needed To Inform All Members of Congress on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, some days ago Senator VANDENBERG suggested that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee prepare questions to be answered by witnesses appearing before the committee with reference to the Greece-Turkey bill. This is the first step proposed in House Resolution 17. The second step is that the questions would be answered on the floor of the House where all Members of Congress could hear and not before the particular committee preparing the questions. An edtiorial of the Baltimore Sun of March 25, 1947, describes the advantages of the proposal contained in House Resolution 17. The editorial is as follows:

NEW FOREIGN POLICY FUZZLES AND THE KEFAUVER QUESTION-PERIOD PLAN

If you have a copy of the first (1790) volume of the Executive Journal of the Senate handy, turn to page 55. There you will encounter a notation to the effect that President Washington had just sent to the Senate a draft of a secret article to be inserted in a treaty with one of the Indian tribes. Mr. Washington closed his message of transmittal with these words: "If the Senate should require any further explanation, the Secretary of War will attend them for that purpose."

Representative KEFAUVER, of Tenneessee, has seized on this passage from the old Senate Journal to defend his plan for a question period in the House of Representatives. Mr. Acheson's current appearances before the House and Senate Committees on Foreign Relations should focus attention on the Kefauver proposal all over again. For Mr. Acheson is speaking on matters of transcendent importance not merely to the Foreign Affairs Committees but to the whole Congress. Yet the general membership of the National Legislature can hear him, if at all, only as spectators.

What Mr. KEFAUVER wants is the passage of a resolution providing for a question period in his branch of Congress, the House of Representatives. This period would be up to 2 hours long. During it a Cabinet man or the chief of an independent agency would have the privilege of the House floor to answer questions framed by any House Member, no matter what his committee. The first part of the question period would be given over to the answer of formal written questions submitted in advance. Toward the close of the question period, the Cabinet member would be open to oral questions from the floor.

The advantages of such a procedure are apparent. Every Member could get a chance to push the questions troubling him most. Every Member would be able to listen to the visitor's testimony, to see his behavior under questioning, to form his opinion on great questions with the fullest availability of evidence at his command. The procedure would be similar to (without in any way approximating the constitutional theory of) the British method by which Cabinet members are open to question in the Parliament. Rather than speaking, as Mr. Acheson is

doing, to single committees of the Houses, the visiting Cabinet man could, in a single Chamber appearance, address all committees and all Members of that Chamber at once.

That the device has great merit is apparent from the piecemeal approaches to it already resorted to in Congress. Representative KEFAUVER made his question-period proposal directly after having attended a session in the Congressional Library at which War Department officials brought Members of both Houses up to date on the status of the war in the fall of 1943. Mr. Acheson has been guided in some part in preparing for the current committee sessions by a formal series of questions on the Greek-Turkish policy worked up by Senator VANDENBERG.

Mr. KEFAUVER simply wants to bring all these informational devices together in the kind of question period which President Washington took for granted as a necessary part of the collaboration between executive and legislature under the Constitution.

Los Angeles Industry Penalized by Phantom Freight Rates on Steel Imposed by Interstate Commerce Commission and Approved by Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there has been widespread misunderstanding concerning the position of southern California manufacturers and businessmen with regard to the application for a reduction in the freight rates on steel from Geneva, Utah, to Los Angeles now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Freight rates on the delivery of steel are always paid by the purchaser. Southern California manufacturers who use steel expect to pay these costs, but they believe such charges should be equitable and based upon actual shipping expenses.

Under the present rates, a buyer of steel in Los Angeles must pay the same charges for freight on steel delivered from Geneva, Utah—or, for that matter, from Fontana in southern California—as he would pay on steel delivered from Baltimore, Md., or Pittsburgh, Pa.

Industry in Los Angeles is being penalized by this inequality in freight rates imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and approved by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation because of its loan to the Fontana steel plant. Los Angeles steel buyers object to this unjust "phantom freight" principle. For this reason, they have supported the application for a reduction in the freight rate on steel from Geneva, Utah, to Los Angeles.

The following statement, prepared by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, sets forth the facts in the freight-rate controversy and explains why some adjustment is necessary for the expanding industrial area in Southern California:

Hearings have recently been held before the Interstate Commerce Commission relative to the application for a reduction in the freight rate on steel from Geneva, Utah, to Los Angeles.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and chambers of commerce throughout the West supported the proposed freight-rate reduction.

We were criticized in some quarters for our position on the basis that we favored a mill in Utah as against the Kaiser steel mill at Fontana.

We wish to state definitely the facts do not warrant this criticism.

Steel is the basic material of industry.

Los Angeles County has become an industrial area.

Two hundred forty thousand people work in our factories.

The price of steel and its availability are strong determining factors in our industrial welfare and the permanence of the 240,000 industrial jobs.

Los Angeles industry pays the highest price for steel among American industrial areas.

This limits the markets for our products, and, in addition, makes it difficult in many cases for local manufacturers to meet eastern competition right here in Los Angeles.

It is necessary that our steel cost be lowered.

There are two ways to reduce the price of steel. One way is to reduce the base price of steel. The other way is to reduce the freight cost on steel. The buyer always pays the freight cost on steel.

Los Angeles industry expects to pay full freight costs on steel shipped to us from the East when actual freight service is rendered. Los Angeles industry, however, objects to paying "phantom freight" charges on the steel it buys.

What do we mean by "phantom freight"?

EXAMPLE A

A manufacturer in Vernon buys steel from a mill in Los Angeles. The steel is trucked to his plant. When he gets the bill he finds that he is charged an amount equivalent to the freight bill for shipping the steel from Baltimore, Md., or Pittsburgh, Pa., to Los Angeles.

EXAMPLE B

A Los Angeles manufacturer buys steel from Fontana. It is shipped 45 miles to Los Angeles. The freight rate is $1.30 per ton, but when the buyer gets his bill he is charged an amount equal to the freight cost of shipping the steel from Baltimore, Md., or Pittsburgh, Pa., to Los Angeles. This amounts to approximately $12 per ton.

The "phantom freight" principle to which we object is a penalty on Los Angeles industry.

Fontana charges "phantom freight" because of the loan the Reconstruction Finance Corp. has on the plant.

We believe the Fontana loan should be reduced using the sale price of the Geneva mill as a yardstick so that Fontana will not be unduly penalized.

We have so informed the Kaiser Co.

The Fontana mill cannot supply all of the steel Los Angeles needs. We must buy steel from Geneva, too.

The United States Steel Corp. which owns the Geneva mill agreed not to charge "phantom freight" when it bought the mill from the Government.

But the freight rate from Geneva to Los Angeles by rail was higher than the rate from Baltimore to Los Angeles by water.

Consequently to make Geneva steel available to Los Angeles industry, the railroads serving Geneva and Los Angeles reduced the rate on steel from $14 a ton to $9.60.

The buyer pays the freight.

The reduced rate lowered the cost of Los Angeles steel $4.40 a ton.

How important is this saving?

EXAMPLE C

A pipe line is under construction to bring natural gas from Texas to Los Angeles. Geneva steel is going into the pipe line: A saving of $4.40 a ton on the steel going into the pipe line totals close to a quarter of a million dollars.

This is $250,000 saved by gas consumers of Los Angeles who will ultimately pay for the pipe line since gas rates are based on capital costs.

The Government of the United States spent $200,000,000 to build the Geneva mill. The lower freight rate means that the mill will not stand partly idle, but can be put to the best possible use to make jobs not only at Geneva, but right here in Los Angeles.

Is this new rate unfair to Fontana?

It costs Fontana $1.30 to ship a ton of steel to Los Angeles.

It costs Geneva $9.60 a ton under the new rate.

Fontana has an advantage of $8.30 a ton over Geneva in reaching Los Angeles.

Fontana brings its coal from Utah.

Fontana feels its freight rate on coal should be reduced by the same percentage as the Geneva rate on steel is reduced.

Los Angeles industry must have cheaper steel.

Los Angeles industry must be free of the phantom freight penalty.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce will support every move that helps to accomplish these objectives.

This puts us in a position where we were bound to support the Geneva freight-rate reduction.

It means that we are in favor of an adjustment of the RFC loan on Fontana.

Mine Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. HOWES MEADE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Washington Post of today.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the entire membership of both sides of this House join with me in expressing condolences to the loved ones and survivors at the Centralia Coal Co. mine in southern Illinois. Many of those families and friends of these entombed miners are at this minute waiting at the mine entrance hoping against hope that by some miracle their father, husband, or son might survive.

Someone is responsible for this grave national tragedy. Only a short time ago in my home State many miners were killed in a similar explosion at the Straight Creek coal mine. These miners were without protection against unsafe working conditions, and their families were unprotected against financial suffering, as there was no provision for compensation, nor had there been any welfare fund provided for these crippled survivors or the families of the deceased miners.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of this Congress to first look to the protection of the lives of these miners who brave death every working day and to the protection for the survivors of the world's most hazardous occupation before considering ways and means of taking away from these men their right through collective bargaining to enforce safety as well as welfare provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the membership on both sides of the House will join with me in an effort to provide first for the human welfare of these brave men and their families. Let us pass laws to protect, rather than laws to neglect.

The editorial follows:

MINE RESPONSIBILITY

Another coal-mine disaster this time in southern Illinois at the cost of 111 lives, again brings the issue of mine responsibility sharply to the fore. At the outset this tragedy seems to exemplify the same shameful process of buck passing that has been evident in most of the recent mine explosions. For this eventuality was anticipated. Bad safety conditions in this particular mine were the subject of at least two inspection reports. Thus the determination of the Senate to probe the whole disgraceful affair is decidedly in order. It is particularly timely because a large part of the responsibility in this case belongs to the Federal Government, in the Department of the Interior and the Coal Mines Administration.

Under the Krug-Lewis agreement governing Federal control of the coal mines, the Government's duty is clear to enforce the safety code recommended by the Federal Bureau of Mines. That agency reported the existence of hazardous conditions and practices in the mine of the Centralia Coal Co., where the explosion occurred, in an inspection last November. United Mine Workers' officials have stated that they repeatedly called the situation to the attention of Secretary of the Interior Krug and Capt. N. H. Collisson, Federal Coal Mines Administrator. As recently as March 18, an inspection by the Illinois Bureau of Mines recommended immediate correction and noted that previous inspection reports had not been complied with.

Thus the weak excuse of Captain Collisson that the Coal Mines Administration had insufficient personnel to check the mines is in reality no excuse at all. If personnel was insufficient, that situation should have been exposed and adequate numbers obtained, either from the Navy, which is in nominal charge, or from other sources. Similarly, the argument that the Government is only in technical control of the mines also is invalidated by the fact that the Coal Mines Administration has the power to remove any representatives of the mine ownership who do not follow instructions.

Submission of the Present Problems of Greece to United Nations Might Destroy That Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State. His long experience in handling international problems should make him a good judge of what might happen if the present troubles of Greece are dumped into the lap of the newly born babe known as the United Nations. I commend to my colleagues a careful reading of what Mr. Welles has to say:

AMERICAN AID

(By Sumner Welles)

ARE WE DESTROYING THE UN?

The line that Soviet propaganda will follow in its effort to combat the administration's foreign policy is clearly indicated in the editorials already published in Izvestia and Pravda.

These first attacks have harped upon two main issues. One is the charge that the proposed assistance by the United States to Greece and Turkey represents nothing more than imperialistic expansion under the guise of charity. This argument will not cut much ice in the United States. But it will prove effective in Europe, and it will serve to arouse nationalistic suspicions in the Near East. It may well raise a continuing backfire against this country.

The second issue is the charge that President Truman's proposals will destroy the United Nations. This charge is meeting with considerable popular support in the United States and Great Britain. It will be employed more and more frequently by the direct and indirect accomplices of the Soviet Union in the western democracies.

The Soviet-controlled press claims that, were the President's recommendation to be carried out, United States support for the United Nations would be rendered valueless, and declares that, while "Mr. Truman in his message mentioned the United Nations several times, this was obviously necessary in order to disavow this organization despite the existing obligations of the American Government toward the United Nations."

Such propaganda is highly effective because of the sincere belief of many hundreds of thousands of persons in this country, that because the United Nations has now been established, it must consequently be prepared automatically to solve every problem that may arise. They feel that any failure on the part of this country presently to submit to the United Nations questions whose solution must vitally affect its own safety amounts to sabotage of the international organization.

The only way in which Soviet propaganda of this kind can be successfully met is for every American citizen to be willing to take the trouble to familiarize himself with the present status of the United Nations, and to try to recognize its present limitations.

The truth is that the United Nations is in the first stage of its formative period. The Security Council has no law-enforcement agencies under its control. It has so far been unable to agree upon the constitution of an international police force, a program for disarmament, or a statute for the control of atomic energy. Neither the Assembly nor the Economic and Social Council has at its disposal funds with which economic emergencies can be relieved.

The crux of the matter is, of course, that the objectives sought by the Soviet Union and by the United States in the eastern Mediterranean are diametrically opposed. Moscow desires the extension of Russian influence over Greece and Turkey notwithstanding the bitter opposition to communism of a great majority of the people of those two countries. The United States seeks to make sure that these two nations are going to be able to maintain their independence and to preserve their political integrity.

At this stage of its development the United Nations can take no positive action through the Security Council, unless the Soviet Union and the United States are in accord as to the policies to be pursued. In the light of this self-evident truth, how could the United Nations today try to take any action in the case of Greece without thereby accentuating existing international antagonisms and risking a head-on collision between the world's two major powers?

The policy announced by President Truman is designed to promote the second purpose of the United Nations as set forth in article 1 of the Charter, namely, "respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples." It is a policy which can only make for the growth of world conditions under which the United Nations can gradually become stronger and eventually assume all of its rightful responsibilities.

A crisis such as that which has arisen in Greece could only be handled by the United Nations with some prospect of success after the major powers have agreed upon the peace settlements, after the organization obtains the power and the authority needed to carry out the purposes for which it was established, and after each one of the major powers has been brought to realize that there exists in the world force sufficient to check all further attempts at military or ideological expansion, and reaches the conclusion that its individual security will be best safeguarded by universal respect for the "equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

It will be a healthy thing for this democracy if every American citizen will analyze the propaganda with which this country is now going to be flooded in the light of these cold, hard facts. If he does so, he will see that the policy recommended by President Truman will not destroy the United Nations but will, rather, make it possible for it to survive. What would in truth destroy the United Nations, and destroy it quickly, would be for this Government to force that Organization to take cognizance of basic international controversies which at this stage of its existence it is altogether unprepared, and wholly unable, to resolve.

Pfc Oliver Bacon, of Winslow, Ariz.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 26, 1947:

HIGHEST WAR OFFICERS PAY RESPECT TO A PRIVATE

WASHINGTON, March 25.—With a five-star admiral, a five-star general, a four-star general, and half a dozen lesser luminaries in the room, an Army private was the center of attraction in the Senate caucus room this morning before hearings on the unification bill commenced.

General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower spotted the soldier, Pfc Oliver Bacon, of Winslow, Ariz., formerly of the Sixty-third Infantry Division, sitting in the audience and strode over to shake his hand. General Eisenhower beckoned to his colleagues, Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz and Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, Air Forces Chief, and soon the three members of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff were clustered around the soldier.

Private Bacon stood erect to accept their handshakes, but kept one hand on his cane. The private, who is stationed at Walter Reed Hospital, is blind.

False Yardstick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from a life-long Democrat, but not a New Dealer, expressing his views on some of the New Deal power programs. The author of this letter lives in an Oklahoma town close to the border of my district, where he has been operating a a small business of his own for some 35 or 40 years, and is a highly respected citizen of his community.

Without further comment, I quote the letter and the newspaper article referred to in my friend's letter:

The enclosed article is along the lines I have been fighting for, for some time.

It is my candid opinion that the act of Congress providing for expenditure of taxpayers' funds for flood control did not authorize the expenditure of said funds for the building of power plants. After enumerating the things that were authorized, these four words were added, "And for other purposes." This was construed by Mr. Ickes and the administration, as authority for the building of such power plants. Therefore, we contend that such plants belong to the taxpayers and should be operated by the standing army at commercial rates for the purpose of paying off our enormous national debt.

Thanking you for anything you may do in this behalf, I am,

——— ———,

FALSE YARDSTICK

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

In this period of debunking the ballyhoo of the earlier period of magnificent nonsense, it is important to reappraise the view that public power constituted a yardstick for measuring private utilities.

This concept was a basic tenet of the New Deal which was repudiated at the polls by the voters on November 5, last.

Dr. Arthur V. Morgan, one-time president of Antioch College and first chairman of the Tennesee Valley Authority and himself an enthusiastic advocate of public power, was among the first of the insiders to reject the yardstick idea. In resigning in protest, Dr. Morgan said that the records were being fudged, and the cost sheet was being manipulated through shifting to flood control and other categories items which he deemed chargeable to the generation and distribution of public power.

But it now appears that even when the acccunting is thoroughly objective that it is a delusion to assume that public power constitutes a yardstick for private power.

There are 4 points of basic difference between public power and private power, which make the belief that the results are comparable to a sheer illusion.

First, Government-owned power projects enjoy artificial advantages in costs through tax preferences.

Secondly, government-owned projects enjoy artificial advantages in costs of capital through their special privilege of issuing low coupon tax exempt bonds. Frank McLaughlin, president of Puget Sound Power and Light Co., of Seattle, who is now east for his annual stockholders' meeting in Boston next week, estimates that these tax privileges give public power an advantage of 30 cents on every income dollar, and he believes that this handicap is too great to be overcome by any miracle of management.

From the standpoint of the national economy, however, these "savings" by public power are not true economies. For if the national bookkeeping is completed in double entry form, it appears that the tax preferences enjoyed by public power merely transfer the burden of supporting Government from such privileged enterprises to others.

In the case of the apparent savings on the cost of capital, the effect is even more antisocial, for in giving tax exemption on the earnings of capital entrusted to public projects, the Government transfers the tax load which otherwise would be borne by investors to others.

This means in part that the tax load which should be borne by so-called unearned income on capital is shifted to those who earn income through the sweat of their brow or their brawn.

Thus government is in a conspiracy to lighten the burden on capital and shift the burden to labor.

Such shifting would be self-defeating if government ownership of industry became general.

Thirdly, where private power coexists with public power, as in the city of Seattle, a difficult situation is created. The Government-owned agency has certain inherent advantages that stem from being an instrument of government. In general, private business must depend on voluntary orders, whereas government has the latent power to exercise the big stick and use force. One manifestation of this is in reported instances of tie-in sales, where, for example, willingness of the city to extend water mains may be tied in with the suggestion that the industrial user agree to take power from the city.

Fourthly, with its city franchise expiring in 1952, Puget Power faces the reality that the power to extend or refuse to extend its franchise lies within the discretion of its competitor, the municipality of Seattle, which owns City Light, the competing agencies for distributing current for power and light.

In light of such circumstances, what becomes of the claim that the records of Government-owned utilities become yardsticks for measuring the efficiency of private companies?

Obviously a yardstick is meaningless for measuring activities that are incomparable.

Public power does not carry its full load of the cost of government. It gets capital at a discount through conferring privileges of tax exemption, which deprive government of revenue, which must be recouped from others.

Businessmen, who as opportunists take advantage of low rates offered by public power, are inviting socialization of their own industries by the extension of the logic in which they acquiesce.

The Border Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Syracuse Post-Standard.

I have been much concerned about the propaganda that has been published in respect to the recent Treasury appropriation bill. Due to this type of publicity I have received considerable mail relative to the immediate curtailment of the border patrol. I was pleased to see that one newspaper which is from my own district came out with an editorial which explains my feelings on this subject and certainly contains the truth in respect to this bill.

POLITICAL SHENANIGANS?

The Treasury Department is operating on a budget of $695,400,104.49 this year.

The House of Representatives, giving first consideration to taxpayers, cut the budget $80,000,000 for the coming fiscal year.

It still will have far more than it did before the war. Why, then, is it necessary to cut down on the border patrol? Why not eliminate some of the wartime bureaus no longer absolutely essential?

It looks very much as if there may be some political shenanigans in the situation, even though the Customs Bureau was cut by $6,500,000.

The situation, with border patrol leaders hollering to high heaven that the border will be "wide open" to narcotics, refugees and other illegal goods, seems to reflect seriously on the Republican House.

Yet it is also probable that bureaucrats are trying to hang onto their jobs and are reluctant to go into the business of firing help now nonessential and shifting funds to provide for more essential divisions.

The Treasury Department, promised $615,000,000 in funds, certainly ought to get along all right if it is directed with efficiency and sound common sense.

Seventy-two Pearl Harbors Every Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1947

I. SUMMARY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 100, authorizing the appropriation of $50,000,000 with which to marshal the world's scientific resources for an all-out attack on cancer.

Cancer is the failure of medicine.

By 1950 it is estimated that cancer will kill more persons than the total number of fatal casualties for the United States Army in World War II.

Cancer kills 72 times as many people in a year in the United States than the total casualties at Pearl Harbor.

Today cancer kills one person every 3 minutes.

Cancer has been known from the most ancient times.

Despite scientific advancement, the cancer death rate rises steadily.

What is needed is an all-out attack.

No other disease can compare with cancer as a killer.

The situation requires a fresh, independent effort.

II. CANCER IS THE FAILURE OF MEDICINE

"Cancer is the failure of medicine." This accusation, frequently heard, is a

reflection of public bitterness in the face of a defeat among many medical triumphs. For the triumphs of medicine have been many and have led the world to expect miracles. And yet, the mystery of cancer is still as great, its control still as far away as at the time of Hippocrates. Cancer now takes a greater toll of human life than it did in ages gone by. While the death rate for many common diseases has been steadily declining, the death rate for cancer has been increasing. The grim and ironic paradox is that medical science has taught us how to save our children from smallpox, from diphtheria, from scarlet fever, from dysenteries and diarrheas, only to have them reach an age at which they may be killed by cancer. Medicine has succeeded magnificently in the effort to prolong life, so that a baby at birth is said to have a life expectancy of almost 65 years. But though the chances for each baby to reach adulthood are good, the chances for an adult to die of old age have improved hardly at all.

III. CANCER DEATHS

Three thousand and six people died of cancer in New York City in the 3-month period, October, November, and December 1939, as compared to 120 deaths of benign tumors, 264 suicides, 66 people murdered, and 3 who died peacefully of old age.

Cancer is essentially a disease of adults. It is because human beings are living longer that cancer is now assuming an importance which it formerly did not have. As more persons reach maturity, their chance of being stricken by cancer increases. A woman at 35, a man at 45, enters upon the period of greatest danger. At the very age when a person is at the height of his usefulness to his family, to his community, and to his country, he is struck down by this insidious killer. That is why this menace will continue to increase, the misery and suffering it produces will increase, and its cost to society will increase as the progress of hygiene continues to lower the general death rate.

Figures from the National Cancer Institute, just released, confirm this continuing increase in the number of deaths from cancer. Plotted on a graph, they show a trend which is progressively upward and which as yet shows no sign of leveling off. In 1930, 117,623 persons died of cancer, in 1935 the number had risen to 137,549; in 1940, 158,335; and in 1944 the toll was 171,171. By extrapolating present trends, Dr. Louis I. Dublin, the eminient statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., has predicted that the annual death rate from cancer in this country alone will rise to 203,000 in 1950 and to 270,000 in 1960.

IV. CANCER VERSUS WAR

For comparison, the War Department figures as of June 30, 1946, give the total number killed in action and dead of wounds in the Army of the United States in World War II as 201,925. According to the above prediction, in the single year 1950 as many persons will die of cancer, and 10 years later the number will exceed our World War II Army dead by almost 68,000.

Four thousand one hundred and eighty-nine Americans lost their lives in the taking of Iwo Jima. Cancer kills 40 times that many each year. On the entire western front, in the period covering the battle of the bulge, we lost 4,083 men. Cancer kills 41 times that many. Fatal casualties at Pearl Harbor totaled 2,343. Cancer kills 72 times that number of persons every year in the United States. Seventy-two Pearl Harbors a year! Should we not mobilize immediately and thoroughly and with all our forces, financial and intellectual, against an enemy inflicting such damage?

Today, cancer kills one person every 3 minutes. During the half hour that it will take me to make this plea for Government action to eradicate this plague, 10 people will have died of it. On January 26, 1947, we were shocked and horrified to learn that our beloved Grace Moore had died in a plane crash in Denmark. On that same day 480 persons in the United States died of cancer. The horror of a plane crash causes the press to be filled with cries of anguish and outrage; there are demands for action to prevent these tragedies. Yet when 480 persons die in 1 day of cancer there are only expressions of pity, gestures of despair, and shrugs of futility.

V. THE NATURE OF CANCER

What is cancer; why is it dreaded so and why have we not yet succeeded in finding a cure for it, or a method of preventing it? Cancer is a disease of the cells of the body. It differs from other diseases in that its cells are those which belong to the body proper. In the words of Dr. R. R. Spencer, director of the National Cancer Institute, "a cancer is a clump of body cells that have gone wrong, that live at the expense of the body and contribute nothing. In other words a bunch of parasitic gangsters."

The cell is the fundamental unit of life. All of us are made of cells, and we begin our existence as cells. Each of us begins as a single cell which by the time of birth has multiplied into 200,000,000,000 cells. Adults have trillions of cells and in the process of development, some mysterious power in our bodies separates these cells into tissues and organs. It is these tissues and organs which are organized into the structural and functional harmony which we know as our bodies.

This structural and functional harmony is the greatest mystery in nature, for it is essentially the riddle of life itself. And yet attached to this mystery is another, equally great, for it happens that sometimes this harmony is disturbed. For some reason, or reasons, as yet unknown, cells which have settled down to their preordained functions suddenly begin to multiply. The cells run wild and there is a continuous unrestrained and unorganized new growth of tissue which spreads throughout the body and ultimately causes death. If this growth can be recognized and treated early enough a large number of those so afflicted may be saved. But unfortunately the diagnosis in a majority of cases is made too late and the victim is doomed to a lingering ordeal of suffering which ceases only with death.

What is the cause of this autonomous new growth of tissue? To this simple question there is no simple answer. The fact is that we do not know what makes a normal cell divide, we do not know what it is that causes cells to aggregate themselves into tissues and organs, we do not know what makes normal cells stop growing and multiplying. Until we have answers to these fundamental questions we cannot begin to know how some cells escape from the normal controlling mechanism which governs all other cells.

Human gangsters are generally the result of unfavorable social conditions. There is considerable evidence to suggest that some unfavorable environmental condition is responsible for the beginning and continued growth of cancer. There lies the riddle of cancer. For only when we know what it is that causes certain cells to go berserk can we institute preventive measures, kill off the potential invaders, and thus accomplish a cure.

VI. HISTORY OF CANCER AND CANCER STUDY

Cancer has been known from most ancient times. Some of the oldest medical works in the world, the Egyptian medical papyri, mention it. Hippocrates, the greatest physician of antiquity, named the disease, and from his day to this cancer has been an object of study among medical men. The history of investigations into the causes and cure of cancer can be divided into three stages. The first and longest stage may be called the speculative stage. For man's knowledge of this subject did not for many centuries advance beyond the stages of superstition and speculation. The second stage may be called the descriptive stage. During this period, extending roughly from the sixteenth through the nineteenth century, cancers were minutely studied and classified. The invention of the microscope in the seventeenth century and the advent of the cell theory in the nineteenth century added much to our knowledge of cancer, its varieties, and how it could be differentiated from other types of tumors.

The third stage in cancer study is the modern period, scarcely 50 years old, which can be called the experimental stage. It can safely be said that in the last 50 years, by the use of the experimental method, we have learned more about cancer and its causes than in all the preceding centuries.

We have learned, for example, that there is no single cause of cancer in the sense that the tubercle bacillus is the cause of tuberculosis or treponema pallidum is the cause of syphilis. According to R. R. Spencer, Director of the National Cancer Institute, all investigators have been impressed with the multiplicity and complexity of the factors that play a part in initiating the process.

VII. RECENT RESEARCHES

Cancers may now be induced at will experimentally by:

First. Genetic manipulations, inbreeding and cross breeding.

Second. Hormonal imbalances and disturbances.

Third. Injection or feeding of more than 200 different chemicals some of which are organ specific.

Fourth. The energy agents—X-rays, gamma rays, ultraviolet rays, heat, and so forth. Recent work suggests that neutrons produced by the cyclotron may actually induce cancer. Neutrons were widely hailed as a possible curative agent.

Fifth. A combination or one or more of the foregoing factors.

These are, in brief summary, the results of various researches undertaken in recent years by individuals and groups working more or less separately. They are of importance, not only in themselves, but as pointing out promising paths for further researches, deserving all of money and brain power that the country can muster for them.

Despite a great amount of work on the problem of the possible causation of cancer by an infectious agent, particularly viruses, such agents have not been demonstrated, up to the present time, to be the cause of any human cancer.

VIII. THE DEATH RATE FROM CANCER GOES UP AND UP

Added to our increased knowledge of the biology of cancer are the encouraging results of treatment. With the advent of radium, X-rays, and improved techniques of diagnosis and surgery, many persons are alive today who, without the benefit of these recently discovered techniques, would have died of cancer. We are told by experts who have devoted their lives to the study of cancer that "an early cancer is curable; a late one usually is not." And yet, despite the vast amount of knowledge which we have gained, despite the impressive record of patients alive today who, without modern treatment, would have been dead, despite all the efforts and funds expended by numerous laboratories, hospitals, and research institutes, the grim fact remains that more persons are dying today of cancer than at the beginning of this century when the experimental attack upon cancer was launched. Thus in 1900 the mortality rate from this disease per hundred thousand of the population was only 64.0, by 1925 it had risen to 92.0, and in 1940 to 120.3. Making due allowance for the fact that part of this rise may be attributed to improved methods of diagnosis, and part to the fact that more persons are living to attain the "cancer age," the increase is sufficiently great and alarming to cause us to regard cancer as one of the most urgent of our public health programs.

IX. AN ORGANIZED APPROACH IS NEEDED

Why have we not progressed further in our efforts to control this disease? Certainly, not for lack of brain power. Some of the greatest minds in the scientific world have devoted themselves to the study of this problem and much that we do know about cancer is the result of their efforts. Our failure to conquer this disease is not due to a lack of understanding of its difficulty, nor to a lack of trained experts—although we need many more than we have. It is due to our lack of an organized approach to the problem, an organized approach supported by adequate financial resources. It is becoming increasingly obvious that a haphazard, small scale approach to this problem is inadequate.

The amazing scientific advances of this past war have demonstrated convincingly what an organized approach supported by adequate funds can do. The story of penicillin is an example of this. In 1929, in an obscure London hospital, Doctor, now Sir, Alexander Fleming discovered a contaminating mold upon one of his bacterial cultures which seemed to be destroying the germs with which he was experimenting. Dr. Fleming seized upon this accident, for, as the great Louis Pasteur once remarked, "Chance favors the prepared mind." He began to study this phenomenon and discovered that the mold secreted a substance which destroyed bacteria. He named this substance penicillin. For 10 years this discovery went unnoticed although Dr. Fleming made repeated efforts to interest his medical friends. Helpless for lack of funds and assistants, he was obliged to put his discovery aside. And then in 1939, at Oxford, the young and brilliant Dr. Florey, aware that the impending war would place enormous demands upon medical science for new agents to combat infection, began a systematic study of certain antibacterial substances which were produced by micro-organisms. Because of this fact they were known as antibiotics. So Florey began a systematic study of these agents. Note, please, I emphasize the word systematic. In other words, he was making a planned, organized study. One of the first members of the group which he chose for study was penicillin. Among his assistants, for Florey was not a lone worker like Fleming but the director of a team, was Boris Chain, a Russian-born biochemist, and Leslie Falk, an American-born physician and bacteriologist. In a short time the remarkable properties of penicillin had been confirmed and tested on man. The attention of our own National Research Council was attracted to this work and Florey and one of his collaborators, Heatley, were invited to this country in 1941 where they helped to initiate research. Within 30 months after that visit, after an expenditure of $20,000,000 and the mobilization of our best experts and the assignment of vast facilities in the way of buildings and equipment, penicillin was being produced in a volume which made it possible to fill not only all the military needs but also to make this drug available in civilian hospitals. The number of dollars which this enterprise cost can easily be added up. No one is yet able even to estimate what the development of penicillin has meant in terms of lives saved.

But perhaps the most outstanding example of a monumental advance in science is the development of the atomic bomb. For 50 years scientists in various parts of the world had, singly and in pairs, in isolated laboratories, been knocking at the atomic nucleus, attempting to reveal its nature.

The mobilization of a vast number of scientists, engineers, and technicians did not alone create the atomic bomb. The expenditure of billions of dollars could not in itself insure success in the undertaking, but the expenditure of this amount of money by competent experts in a planned, organized, and sustained effort did bring about the desired result.

It is appropriate, in planning our campaign against this enemy, that we keep in mind the words of the wise Hippocrates, father of medicine and namer of the disease.

The art of medicine—

He says—

has from the earliest ages contained everything in itself, a principle as well as a method, by means of which, in more spacious times, many beautiful discoveries have been made; the rest will yet be found out if capable investigators, knowing what has already been achieved, commence their research from that point. (Neuburger, Max, History of Medicine, London, Frowde, Oxford, 1910. Vol. 1, p. 132.)

Seventeen million people in this country alone, now living and in health, will die of cancer unless the problem is solved and solved quickly. The chance of saving these lives is slight under present conditions, the work being without central organization and hampered in many cases by lack of funds. Will $50,000,000, with a coordinated effort of the best scientific minds, give us the answer? No one can say. Our chances of finding the answer, however, will be tremendously increased. Fifty dollars is not too much to pay for a good chance of saving 17 lives. Then why not fifty million for 17,000,000 lives?

X. WHY THE EMPHASIS ON CANCER AND NOT ON OTHER DISEASES?

It has been suggested, and will be suggested again, that we should attack, rather than cancer, any of several other diseases such as heart disease, the common cold, and tuberculosis. But heart disease, so frequently listed as a cause of death, is seldom really a disease of the heart but rather an effect of innumerable possible causes ranging from obesity to overexertion. The study of its cause and cure, therefore, would require effort over a field even wider than that of cancer, and to be useful, would be obliged to produce hundreds of answers—one to each possible cause—while it is quite possible that the cancer problem may be taken care of by the isolation of one or two causative agents. The seriousness of the common cold is beginning to be appreciated and it is well that it should be. Though never, I believe, directly the cause of death, it opens the door to many types of infection that may be permanently damaging or fatal. Economically, it is of prime importance as the principal cause of employee time lost from work. Yet I submit that it is not an enemy worthy of comparison with cancer, which so frequently gives its victim a year of torture and slow wasting into death. Tuberculosis is a formidable enough disease to warrant any expenditure of effort, but does not now need the type of thorough study proposed for cancer, simply because the basic facts of tuberculosis are known, and encouraging progress is being made in its treatment and cure, and still more important, in its prevention.

It may be proposed also that we keep the project of a thorough, coordinated

study of cancer, but include one or more of the other diseases mentioned, as joint aims. That notion reminds me of the man who flung himself upon his horse and rode madly off in all directions. If anything can ever be safely prophesied of future discoveries, it can be prophesied that the projected cancer research will produce great numbers of discoveries in medicine, chemistry, biology, and physics, that we could not now call to mind as at all likely in this connection. It may well be that some of the discoveries will be of tremendous importance in the treatment or prevention of heart disease, colds, or tuberculosis. But we must not handicap a tremendous effort at research by pointing to two or more different mountain peaks and then shouting encouragingly to our climbers, "Excelsior."

XI. EXISTING AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT NOT ENOUGH

It may reasonably be asked why it is not contemplated in this bill, as in similar bills that have been offered, that the work specified be done by or under the direction of such institutions as the United States Public Health Service and under it the National Cancer Institute and the National Advisory Cancer Council. What I wish is an agency free of the geographical, political, and financial limitations of the United States Public Health Service—an independent coordinating agency, in a position to deal with foreign government agencies, scientific societies, and individuals. I wish also an agency free to hire anyone anywhere in the world, either to join in researches here or to continue researches elsewhere, to the end of supplying information of value, not only to the United States but to the whole world. This is a world question, not a local one, and we are hampering our project unnecessarily if we give it to an advisory council and a subagency. The cancer research program's budget should not be within the budget of the Public Health Service, nor its widespread operations subjected to the administrative control of that agency. What we need is a new start—an independent momentum.

XII. CONCLUSION

To sum up, what we need is total warfare against cancer—fundamental research in biology, physics, chemistry, medicine, on any question that offers the slightest hope of a connection with the subject of cancer; practical direct study of cancer itself, in animals and in human beings, with pooling and tabulating results; and constant widespread publicity to keep doctors informed of the latest results of researches, and to bring home to possible cancer victims the vital importance of early diagnosis and prompt treatment. Making this effort, we will greatly improve the chances of living for 17,000,000 Americans now doomed, and the chances for our children and grandchildren to live out their lives to a peaceful death of old age. And, however this chance may work out, for our $50,000,000 we may be confident of receiving at least $50,000,000 worth of incidental discoveries in varied scientific fields, making life safer, happier, and richer for America and for all the world.

Can We Buy Off the Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with great interest an interview which Mr. George Dixon had with a very distinguished Member of Congress. The impelling logic with which an international problem was discussed is worth inserting in the RECORD.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a portion of the article by Mr. George Dixon, which appeared in the Times-Herald, Friday, March 28, 1947, for the benefit of the membership of the House:

WASHINGTON SCENE
(By George Dixon)

I was pottering around the Capitol the other day, trying to learn how much we owed to a Grecian urn, when I bumped into Senator OWEN BREWSTER of Maine. He asked me if I could spare $1,000,000.

I said I was a little short for the moment, having transferred all my ready money into cash, but that, just to satisfy an idle curiosity, what did he want with $1,000,000.

"I want to change it into $10 bills," he said, "so that if anybody comes up to me and says he is going to turn Communist unless I give him some money I can buy him off."

I said that was ridiculous; that you couldn't buy anybody not to become a Communist, and he said: "Are you sure?"

I said: "Positively." And he said: "Then it looks as if we were going to throw away a lot of dough for nothing."

I asked him not to talk in parables and he said he wasn't trying to be parabolic at all, if that is the word, which I greatly doubt.

"It seems that all anybody has to do to get money from us," he said, "is to threaten to go over to communism unless we kick in. It is getting to be the approved way of affecting a quick tap.

"We are going to have to buy off a lot of people if the idea gets around that we are always in the market. Heaven knows where it will end."

"But," I protested, "the threat of communism is real and actual in the world. I have just come from Latin-America and the Commies are making alarming inroads there, too. They are spreading their poisonous tentacles everywhere and——"

"And," interrupted Senator BREWSTER, "you think we can remove the poison from their tentacles with our money?"

"That's what these nations seem to be implying," I said. "The idea, as I get it, is that if we kick in with a few billions, or maybe trillions, they will not go Communist. It seems that nations with a few trillions of our dough are satisfied to struggle along with democracy."

"Well," replied Senator BREWSTER, "just think it over. If you knew you could touch somebody for $100 every time you threatened to join the Elks, for instance, don't you think you might figure the touchee was pretty easy pickings?"

Senator BREWSTER said all we can really do in the long run for the other nations of the world is show them how to do things for themselves.

"How do you make paupers?" he asked. "By continually feeding them."

The Crisis in American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I was scheduled to speak this morning before a meeting of the Alabama Education Association, at Birmingham, Ala., on the subject The Crisis in American Education. I was unable to be present at the meeting because of the pending business before the Senate, the question of the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In my absence from the meeting my address was read by Mr. McClellan Van der Veer, the distinguished editor of the Birmingham Age-Herald. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We live today in the air age. We are entering the atomic age. We realize only dimly, and fearfully, the wonders of atomic energy, of jet propelled aircraft faster than sound, of radar which literally gives man eyes to see in the dark.

We think of these things today almost entirely in terms of war. To most of us atomic energy means the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. The jet motor means a fighter plane or a rocket carrying death and destruction.

But to mankind, these great scientific developments mean vastly more than this. If we are to survive, they must mean more than simply new ways to kill and destroy. They bring new and inexhaustible sources of power to ease man's age-old burdens, to run his machines, to give new sweetness and light to his civilization. They bring ways of travel and communication which make other peoples of the world our next-door neighbors.

We must hasten to harness these forces for peace.

For all its science and machines, the world is still a world of men. If mankind is to move forward using scientific knowledge for good, rather than move backward toward atomic destruction and the jungle, all the people in our democracy must understand the meaning of the vast technological developments of recent years. All the people must be educated to take part in their control and constructive use.

Understanding and control of these vast forces cannot safely be confined to the scientists, the military, and the politicians. "The will of the people is the only legitimate foundation of any government." In this swiftly moving age, it must be a will based upon knowledge.

Upon the slender shoulders of our children rests the hope of Alabama's future. Indeed, upon them rests the hope of our Nation and the world for enduring, prosperous peace—the hope for life in a Christian world. Our children must be trained not only to meet the problems of Alabama, but the problems of the Nation and of the world. The quality and completeness of their education will determine the destiny of our great State. Their contributions to the Nation will determine the kind of world they live in.

Our children must be trained as world citizens.

The task of educating our children for tomorrow rests largely upon you who sit here today—the teachers of the public schools of America. We cannot exaggerate the importance of that task.

Let me quote you the views of a great American on the job education must do.

"It is up to the schools to provide future generations in all countries with education, leading to a respect and understanding for the people and the problems of every nation. For your own part, you should teach our children to abstain from prejudgment of other nations and races, and to strive for as full a knowledge as possible of America and the rest of the world, without hatred and without prejudice."

Those are not the words of an educator. They are the words of a great soldier, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Are we doing all we can to build an education system equal to this need?

With 3,000,000 adult Americans who have never attended any kind of school, what can we answer? Ten million have had so little schooling that they are practically illiterates. They cannot read or write well enough to earn a decent living. They cannot even understand the basic facts about the world they live in.

This year 5,000,000 children will receive inferior education and an additional 2,000,000 will suffer a major impairment in their schooling. Seventy-five thousand unfortunate children will receive no education of any kind this year.

That is what is happening to the minds which must build the United States of tomorrow

America cannot very long keep its place in scientific achievement, its economic and cultural vitality, its moral leadership, unless it seeks out and trains among its youth the intellect which can maintain this leadership.

Other nations already are acting to conserve and develop their human resources. The United States, richest Nation in the world, is spending only 1.5 percent of its national income for education. Great Britain spends 3 percent and Russia spends 7.5 percent.

If we would keep the strength and the greatness that is America, we cannot longer delay action.

What we must have is a new realization of the importance of the school teacher to our American democracy. The teacher is the central figure in the education process. Inevitably the qualities and influence of the teacher are woven into the character of the Nation. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, no surer foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness than public education.

We entrust the minds and characters of our most precious resource—our children—to the teacher for many hours in the day. We look to the teacher to mold the child for the responsibilities of manhood and womanhood.

Yet, in the face of this, we are guilty of shocking neglect of our teachers. Last year there were 25,000 teachers in America who were paid less than $600 a year. More than 4,000 of those teachers were here in Alabama. Over the whole Nation the average teacher's salary in 1944 was $1,755. Janitors and charwomen in public buildings were paid more.

Teaching is so unattractive today as a profession that only 7 percent of the students in college plan to become teachers. In 1920, 22 percent of all students wished to enter the teaching profession. Only 2 percent of the million veterans now in college plan to teach.

Right now the legislatures of a good many States, alarmed by empty classrooms and emergency certificate teachers, are cautiously opening their pocketbooks with the idea of "buying" more teachers. But frugal increases in State education budgets will not remedy the shortage of competent, trained teachers. Price rises which have already taken place will cancel out most of these salary increases. As of July 1946, a salary of $2,100 was needed to match the buying power of the average salary of $1,470 which was paid to our teachers in 1941.

The Miami Herald recently contrasted the pay of Florida teachers with that of grooms at the race track. "The groom with a minimum salary of $2,400 a year doesn't need much education. He does what he's told by the trainer and knows how to curry a horse, apply liniment and bandages. He leads the horse off the track after the race. The teacher must have a college degree, starts at $1,400 a year, and in 10 years can work up to a salary equal to that of the groom. His job is to shape the destinies of the Nation, teach the children of America, dress neatly, set a good example, and be looked upon as a leader."

For too long America has tried to get by with "bargain counter prices" in education. We have not been willing, for the vital job of training our childen, to pay adequate salaries which would attract and hold outstanding men and women of imagination and intellectual courage.

As a result, the public school teacher has become the Vanishing American.

The Nation's public school classrooms are normally staffed by about 900,000 teachers. Since 1939, more than a third—350,000—have abandoned their chosen profession. Many thousands of teaching positions have been kept filled only by employment of three or four different persons within a single year. Increasing work has been piled on fewer teachers. In January 1946, there were 109,000 teachers with emergency certificates. Experienced teachers could not be found.

Such a turn-over of employees would wreck a business or industry. A school system cannot go bankrupt. It can only reveal years from now that the children it professed to train are educationally bankrupt.

Crowded classrooms, poor and inadequate equipment, short school terms mean that our children fail to fill the golden minute with 60 seconds distance run. They mean that our children are denied their birthright of a minimum American education.

A 6-month survey of the Nation's schools by a distinguished authority for the New York Times brought the conclusion that although American schools did not suffer a single air raid, "they are being wrecked just as surely as though they had been blasted by heavy bombers."

We have been disposed to pass off the worst aspects of this condition as an emergency due to war. A year and a half has passed since VJ-day and the number of emergency teachers is still going up. The emergency did not end with the war. Instead it has grown worse.

We should be grateful that many teachers, out of their fine loyalty and their devotion to the children they teach, have stayed on the job. To them we pay tribute. But we cannot expect these teachers to stay on and on in the classroom, at inadequate pay, while the cost of living goes up and other jobs pay more.

We might as well admit that there is no cheap way to education.

The hour demands a Bill of Rights for the teacher. A Bill of Rights guaranteeing a salary which will enable the teacher to enjoy a good standard of living, permit recreation and travel, continued study and educational growth, and insure security in old age.

This Bill of Rights must go further. It must recognize the essential worth and dignity of the teacher and assure him full opportunity to take part in the life of the community—outside the classroom. The teacher must be free of the petty restraints and interferences with his personal life so often imposed in many communities.

Teaching has for a long time been called a profession. It is time to make it a profession in fact—appreciated and honored in the community, adequately paid, and acclaimed for devoted public service.

The immediate question is, how can this be achieved?

A Bill of Rights for the teacher does not establish itself. It requires public understanding and public support to become a reality.

First, there must be a new consciousness by the public and by State and local officials of their obligations.

I call for action by the people on problems which can be solved by local action. I say to the parents: Join with your school boards, your State representatives and officials to meet here at home the problems you can handle at home.

Second, we must recognize that there are broad discrepancies in the opportunity for education provided within the States. Even in the wealthier States, some school systems are well financed while others are at the poverty level. Generally the rural schools are the poorest. The States should act to equalize educational opportunity within their borders by establishing a minimum financial support in all school districts.

But there is a third indispensable step. For even when the States have done all they can, not every child in America can have a free, adequate education. Some of the States, and generally those with the most children, simply do not have the income to provide a minimum American education. As it has been well put: "The children are where the money ain't."

The Federal Government must step in. The problem of poorly educated Americans is the whole country's problem. The low-income States, as a group, already are trying harder than the richer States to support their schools.

The 10 States ranking lowest in educational opportunity spend more of their income on education than the 10 highest ranking States. New York, for example, is first in the amount spent per classroom, but only twenty-seventh in amount of State income devoted to education.

Here in the South, we carry the burden of high tax rates for schools, but we have far less education money to spend per child than any other section of the country.

Much of the wealth of the richer States has been drawn from the poorer States. But the poorer States cannot tax this wealth.

We know some of the reasons why Alabama's income is low. It is an old story: A hundred years of high tariff policy that sapped our economic strength. Twenty-five years under a freight rate structure devised deliberately to choke our economic development. Financial policies at Washington that worked against us. Other systems for exacting tribute from the South designed by private interests.

Some of our fights for economic justice have been won. But the lost years cannot be recaptured. Systems imbedded in our national economy cannot be rooted out in a day.

Alabama, predominantly an agricultural State, still sends millions of dollars each year into other States for the purchase of automobiles, farm machinery, clothing and manufactured goods of all kinds. Alabama cannot get a penny of taxes from the profits derived from the millions of Alabama dollars sent out of her borders.

The same is true in all other Southern States.

But we can insist that since our economic system recognizes no State boundaries the child born in Alabama shall have the same opportunities as the child in Detroit, or Pittsburgh, or New York.

Through Federal aid to education Alabama can get back some of her dollars. Federal aid may be looked upon as a small measure of return for the tribute the South has been paying to other sections through the years.

The drain upon the South does not stop with her material resources and her dollars. It extends to her human resources as well.

By offering greater economic opportunity other sections siphon away her manpower and intelligence. Inevitably the Southerners who leave our region are those of ambition and education. Fed, clothed, and housed during their unproductive childhood; educated at Southern expense, the young men and young women who leave the South represent an investment which pays dividends to other sections.

Our national security in time of war, our economic prosperity, our capacity to lead the world to peace—these draw no State lines.

In time of national danger we had to make use of all the country's manhood and womanhood to wield the weapons and man the machines.

The experience of the Selective Service has shown clearly that in this day of specialists, the illiterate can contribute little to national defense. During the war we were forced to reject because of educational deficiencies almost as many men as we deployed in combat divisions in the entire Pacific war. Selective Service rejected more than 2,000,000 men for other deficiencies which for the most part could have been prevented through an adequately supported public-school program.

The relationship between education and individual earning power has been made clear by many studies, among them a recent survey by the United States Chamber of Commerce. Recall the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "Efficient universal education is the mother of prosperity." Consistently, in all States and in all occupations, the higher the level of education, the higher the income.

For more than 20 years I have been in the fight to have the Federal Government meet its responsibility to equalize educational opportunity by providing aid to the States.

My concern with the problems of education goes back to 1917, when at 22 years of age, I was elected president of the Board of Education in my home city of Montgomery. A few years later when I was sent to the Congress by the people of my District, this early experience gave me a deep sense of the Nation's obligation to its children, a keen awareness of the insufficient concern for our teachers. I joined then the struggle for Federal aid which year by year has gained recognition. I have watched support grow in the Congress and over the Nation.

In the early days of the fight, we literally were ringed in on three sides by the foes of Federal aid.

Even in the ranks of education there were many who did not see the necessity and the fundamental justice of Federal aid to equalize the opportunity for learning in America. There was necessary, indeed, a process of education among the educators themselves.

On the political front, many raised the false issue of States' rights. I know of no right of a State to have its citizens ignorant. Still today we hear the cry that Federal aid is the camel's nose under the tent—the first step to Federal interference with State educational systems.

No one stands more strongly than I against any such interference. All legislation proposing Federal aid which I have sponsored has contained specific safeguards against any Federal interference with State administration and control of the public-school systems.

Actually, what is the history of Federal aid to education in America? It began with the Ordinance of 1785 issued under the Articles of Confederation. And since 1802 the Congress has passed more than 150 laws authorizing some form of Federal aid for public education.

The worthy agricultural and educational programs at Auburn, our land-grant college, have been financed from the very beginning largely by Federal funds. The University of Alabama also has received substantial Federal funds. Education in Alabama's high schools and trade schools has benefited tremendously by generous Federal grants for vocational education.

The threat to States' rights in Federal aid to education is a bogeyman which frightens few people today.

And still ranged against us in the fight for Federal aid we find the old familiar faces of reaction. Since Revolutionary days our citizens have had to fight against those who opposed the "diffusion of knowledge" among the people—against those who never believed in the people's right to know.

Now, as then, they believe in monopoly of power—whether it is money, political rights, or education. For knowledge, too, is power. Just as they would monopolize money, lands, and economic power—just as they would restrict the vote and political preference to a small group—so do the reactionaries still seek to keep tight the ranks of the educated.

They fight a losing battle. But they are not yet put to rout. If you doubt it, remember that 3,000,000 adults have never been to any school, that 10,000,000 more are practically illiterate—remember the one-room schools, remember that one out of every four teachers receives less than $25 a week.

No, the forces against equal opportunity for education are not yet defeated. But believe me, my friends, we are moving steadily forward.

Today the bill in the Congress which would authorize Federal aid for education, sponsored by the National Education Association, was jointly introduced by members of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. That is the significant thing, the important thing. This cause which began with so few friends has now won the support of outstanding members of both major political parties. It has become a bipartisan goal.

Like the insuring of lasting world peace, the education of America's youth is so urgent that neither major political party can disclaim responsibility for it.

How fast Congress moves to the goal depends upon the people back home. We in Washington cannot move faster than the will of the people decrees. You, the teachers, have a responsibility. From your first-hand knowledge, you must let the people know the plight of education in America. You must let them know the desperate condition of their schools.

If we would get action, you must do everything you can.

America today must render her decision: Will we be true to future American generations or will we quibble over educating our youth for world leadership and world peace?

We have at this moment our opportunity to lead mankind forward and upward over a new frontier and into a new era. We failed to grasp such an opportunity at the end of the First World War. Destiny has now blessed us by giving us a second chance. It may be the last. We cannot count on a third.

Today we sound "forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat."

America's children shall be educated.

America's teachers shall be honored and adequately paid.

America shall maintain her leadership in the building of a world of peace with freedom and justice.

Portal-Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Portal-Pay Bill," from the Washington Evening Star of March 24, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTAL-PAY BILL

Those who oppose the current effort of Congress to deal with the problem raised by the flood of portal-to-portal suits have centered their heaviest fire in support of the contention that the pending legislation would destroy the Wages and Hours Act. It is difficult to believe that this contention has merit.

Both the House and the Senate have passed measures designed to deal with the problem. There are differences between the two bills, however, and these will have to be reconciled in conference. But since the essential complaints have been aimed at the Senate bill, it is against its provisions that the criticisms can best be appraised.

It is clear from the debate that the authors of the bill, Senators DONNELL, of Missouri, and COOPER, of Kentucky, had no thought that it would emasculate the Wages and Hours Act, and since it is the congressional intent which governs, their views are entitled to respect. What they have tried to do is to draft legislation which would be adequate to cope with the abuses that have sprung up in the wake of the tortured meanings which the Supreme Court has read into the law, particularly the $6,000,000,000 in suits which have been filed against employers.

They concede that some inequities may result. But they also take the view that inequities are inevitable in any event, and that the larger public interest requires that there be a legislative ban placed on portal-to-portal suits based on a court-made definition of the term workweek.

In doing this, according to Senator COOPER, there has been no interference with the wage and hour administrator's control over the period of principal activity. In other words, the provisions of the wage-hour law and the authority of the administrator remain undisturbed so far as what might be called the generally accepted workday is concerned. It is only with respect to the periods immediately preceding and immediately following the usual working period that the Senate bill, in its main aspect, undertakes to legislate. These are the periods during which the portal claims have arisen and it is these claims which the amendments are designed to strike down.

If experience shows that, in fact, the wage-hour law has been vitiated, there will then be time enough to take remedial action. Meanwhile, it is to be hoped that the pending legislation, after conference adjustment, will be passed.

Price Makers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an excellent editorial entitled "Price Makers," which appeared in the Washington Post of March 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE MAKERS

Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, does not hold with the theory that industrialists can do nothing about high prices, because prices are established by impersonal market forces. On the contrary, Dr. Nourse declares that "over large areas of economy prices and the course of business are determined by highly personalized administrative decisions made by officials of business organizations." He is quite right in concluding that the forces of competition do not dictate the price policies of a society dominated by giant corporations, big financial institutions, and Nation-wide unions. Within limits, a dominant corporation may set price standards for an entire industry and often does. If the policy of the dominant management is to charge as much as the traffic will bear, prices may be higher than they would be under a system of competitively fixed prices. Or if the policy looks toward expanding sales, prices may be set below competitive levels.

Of course, there are limits to this personalized, administrative price-fixing, because of changing production costs. If a dominant trade union succeeds in raising wages and hence production costs, management may be forced to raise prices as an alternative to selling at a loss. No businessman is a completely free agent, even if he possesses monopolistic powers. Nevertheless, there is a choice open to many industrialists of either exploiting scarcity by boosting prices to the limit or else adjusting prices so as to yield fair profits. A few leaders of industry have had the long sight to realize that they can best serve themselves and the public by resisting inflationary trends.

A similar choice is open to labor unions. They may be compelled to demand some wage increases as an offset to rising living costs. But they can do much to arrest further advances in prices and the cost of living by moderating their demands. To sum up: Price making is not the automatic process that some apologists for high-price policies allege. Competition has always worked imperfectly and under present unbalanced conditions of demand and supply, it is a very defective mechanism upon which to rely. That is why a trained economist such as Dr. Nourse can criticize those who push prices upward aggressively and denounce them as foes of the private-enterprise system without injury to his professional reputation.

A Return to Local Self-Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject A Return to Local Self-Government, delivered by me at the annual dinner of the Bar Association of St. Louis, in St. Louis, Mo., March 24, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF GOVERNING OURSELVES

This very pleasant occasion comes only 9 days after March 15, a black day on our calendar, indissolubly connected in all our minds with the payment of the income tax. This year a Pittsburgh man was moved to write an open letter to Congress in which he declared that he was astonished to find his Federal taxes were 37 times as great as his local taxes. "A comparatively small amount (one thirty-seventh as much as my Federal taxes)," he said, "paid for all public-school facilities, all police protection, sanitary service, including street cleaning and garbage collection." He said further: "A similar comparison could be shown by practically every taxpayer in this country, whether he pays much or little. Unless we have embarked openly on a policy of confiscation of property of the citizens, Federal taxes must be reduced until they are in line with other taxes."

To see why this taxpayer has now reached the point at which he finds himself astonished, we need only look at two items: (a) The size of the Federal debt, which, according to official sources, is presently $261,500,000,000, an increase in 15 years from $19,500,000,000, or 1,241 percent; (b) the number of civilian employees on the Federal pay roll, which was at the end of January 1947 in excess of 2,200,000, an increase of over 1,500,000 from 15 years ago, or 301 percent.

Today Congress is under constant pressure to extend the scope and character of the services rendered by the Federal Government. New avenues of spending are constantly being opened up. In the first month of the Eightieth Congress over 30 bills were introduced increasing the powers of the Government at Washington. The effect of every one of them, if enacted into law, would be to make the Federal Government bigger and to cost the taxpayers more money.

For my part, I am convinced that the only way out of the difficulties in which we find ourselves is to reverse this trend and return to the principle under which America grew great and strong—the principle of local self-government. I should like to address myself briefly to this subject tonight.

II. ADVANTAGES OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

Mr. de Tocqueville, the Frenchman, who objectively and understandingly observed the American experiment in government soon after it was launched on this continent, said:

"The American practices the art of government in a small sphere within his reach; he accustoms himself to those forms which can alone insure the steady progress of liberty; he imbibes their spirit; he acquires a taste for order * * * and collects clear, practical notions on the nature of his duties and the extent of his rights."

If our experience of 112 years since this book was first published has shown us anything, it is that the active, informed, and intelligent interest of the individual citizen in the affairs of his local community must be aroused, if we are to have good government at any level. The level of intelligence, efficiency, and integrity of larger units cannot rise above the level of these qualities in the smaller units in which the citizen lives and works.

Thomas Jefferson was a practical theorist rather than a doctrinaire visionary. He sought certain results from government—chiefly the freedom and welfare of individuals—and, although he held strongly to defined notions about how these ends were best obtained, he was willing to put aside his preferences where a satisfactory result seemed more readily obtainable under other methods.

Jefferson described the New England township system as "the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government." By an efficient system of local self-government, Jefferson hoped to accomplish two major objectives relating to administration: First, to make the management of governmental affairs subject directly to the oversight and control of the people, and, second, to avoid the creation of a bureaucracy of professional officeholders by giving each citizen, to the greatest practical extent, a personal share in the business of public administration.

Let us check Jefferson's theories against the observation and experience of a competent present-day observer. In an address at Chicago on January 16, 1947, Hon. Millard F. Caldwell, the Governor of Florida, said:

"The present tendency of the people to slide back into indifference and look to some higher authority for the solution of all of their problems and a way out of all of their difficulties must be reversed. The citizenship must be aroused to a sense of civic responsibility and to the exercise of civic energy and initiative if democracy is to survive. The trend cannot be reversed as long as the State attempts to solve local problems and the Federal Government attempts to solve State problems. Neither can the people be stirred from their apathy under a something-for-nothing policy. As far as is feasible, the unit which spends the money should have the burden of raising it. Federal and State hand-outs do not make for strong local government or responsible citizenship."

III. WHEN AND HOW FEDERAL POWER IS INCREASED

There have been four periods in our history during which the power of the Federal Government has been increased and that of the local government has been reduced at an accelerated rate:

1. During and following the Civil War;
2. During and following World War I;
3. During and following the depression of the early thirties
4. During World War II.

We now find ourselves in the period following World War II. The question is: Shall the trend continue?

There are a number of ways in which this increase in Federal power has been accomplished:

(a) Amendments to the Federal Constitution: This system was used following the Civil War when the control over certain qualifications to vote was denied to the respective States. Most important is the sixteenth amendment, which gives to the Federal Government the power to levy the income tax. It is interesting to recall that in 1894 Mr. Joseph H. Choate, appearing before the Supreme Court as counsel opposing as unconstitutional the first income tax law (*Pollock* v. *Farmers Loan and Trust Co.* (157 U. S. 759)), said to clinch his argument, as a *reductio ad absurdum*, that if such a communistic march be continued we might see 20 percent of a man's income taken as a Federal tax.

(b) Encroachment by the Executive: The executive department has been able by a process of attrition to enhance the power of the Federal Government at the expense of the States. Executive directives have granted to Federal departments authority and control over many State functions. This has frequently occurred in agriculture, where the President has, by Executive order, authorized control and regulation over functions normally under the jurisdiction of the States. The executive branch of the Federal Government has also influenced State legislation.

(c) Supreme Court decisions: The Federal courts have gradually enhanced the Federal power by interpretation. The stern arbitrament of arms in the Civil War established the principle that the Federal Government, through its courts, is the final judge of its own powers. Probably, the greatest expansion of Federal power ever received from Federal interpretation was the result of the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 1). By

this decision and those that followed it, Federal jurisdiction was extended over substantially all industry in the United States. The only limitation is the good sense and the conservative temper of the people of the United States, who generally agree that giant corporations doing business in several States are, through their very nature, outside the field of local regulation. The strong arm of the Federal Government should deal with them. Where there is a concentration of economic power, there must of necessity be a concentration of governmental authority.

(d) Treaties: The treaty power is also used to increase the Federal jurisdiction. An example is the treaty entered into between the United States and Great Britain concerning the destruction of migratory birds passing between the United States and Canada. This treaty was in conflict with the game laws of many States. The State of Missouri challenged these restrictions, but in 1920 the Supreme Court upheld the treaty (*Missouri* v. *Holland* (292 U. S. 416)).

(e) Emergency agencies: Activities of Federal agencies created under the emergency of war have greatly enhanced Federal power and reduced State jurisdiction. Federal control of public works, new labor laws, legislation for emergency relief of agriculture, social security and unemployment legislation, have resulted in the exercise of Federal power where before it was considered to be solely within the State jurisdiction. Of course, no one criticizes the granting of any power required by the central government in the prosecution of the war during the period of the war.

(f) Subsidies: Time will not permit us tonight to wander far into the wonderland of Government subsidies. One difficulty of such an adventure is that none of the Government departments can agree on what a subsidy is. The Budget Bureau, on request of Senator BYRD, has worked out one list of 31 subsidies. To thicken the fog, there is a baker's dozen ways to pay subsidies. Some keep prices up—some keep them down. One thing they all have in common. Each is a method, authorized by law, more or less explicitly, to siphon money out of the Federal Treasury.

Items in the President's budget that can be identified as subsidies totaled $2,500,000,000 ending last June 30. That figure dropped off to $718,000,000 for the current 12 months, and the President's budget calls for $442,000,000 in the next 12-month period, which isn't exactly hay.

Federal subsidies are part and parcel of the same process of centralization by which Hitler made 80,000,000 Germans goose-step and cry, "Heil Hitler." The first thing he did when he came into power was to wipe out the states of the German Republic. Then, by subsidies, he undermined self-reliance and destroyed personal initiative. He removed the counterbalance of local government. What a train of human suffering followed.

(g) Grants-in-aid: In 1857 a bill was introduced by Congressman Morrill for the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college in each State to teach branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts. This bill was strenuously opposed by the Southern States as an attempted usurpation of power of the Federal Government, and after passing both Houses, President Buchanan vetoed it.

In 1862, after the Southern States had seceded, the bill was again passed and became law. This is known as the Morrill Act and is generally considered to be the inception of Federal grants-in-aid to States. From this small beginning, the Federal aid principle has grown until in the year 1940 the State of Missouri received Federal aid of nearly $125,000,000.

Great oaks from little acorns grow. There are today in operation Federal-aid programs in the general fields of (1) forestry and agriculture, (2) education, (3) health and welfare, (4) public assistance, (5) unemployment compensation, (6) emergency unemployment relief. Let this be clearly understood: I regard many of the purposes for which Federal aid is being used as among the prime and beneficent purposes of government. The point made is that they are not, for the most part, proper activities of the central government in a federal union of states. Many bills are pending in the present Congress for the purpose of extending and amplifying the principle of Federal aid into new fields of far-reaching implication—for instance, into the fields of medical care and nursing and slum clearance. The one that opens up the largest field for spending Federal money is perhaps the bill which proposes to appropriate, after the second year, the sum of $250,000,000 annually, to be divided among some of the States for public education. While the advocates of the bill disclaim any intention to introduce Federal control of education, to many of us it seems that this would follow as night follows day.

The committee on education at the recent annual convention of the National Grange made this forthright statement:

"Your committee does not believe that the remedy for our present difficulties in the field of education is to be found in securing Federal appropriations for the support of the public schools. Our best hope of preserving American democracy lies in preserving the independence and sovereignty of the States. If the States want to remain sovereign and independent, they must perform the functions which naturally fall within their sphere. Education is one of those functions.

"The grange has always stood for local and State control of our public schools, because in that direction only lies the path of true progress in educational affairs. In the long run, Federal appropriations for the public schools and Federal control would go hand in hand."

It is nothing short of prodigal (or shall we say illogical) for the Federal Government, with a public debt in excess of $261,000,000,000 and unable, for at least 16 years, to balance its budget, to make princely gifts to the States, only one of which did not have a balance in its general funds at the end of 1945. As compared to the Federal debt, the total public debt of all 48 States in 1945 was less than $2,500,000,000, and the balances on hand reduced this liability to but little more than $1,000,000,000. It can reasonably be assumed that it is now less. Why should the Congress appropriate as gifts to financially sound States money that it does not have and can obtain only by borrowing upon the credit of the American people, to be repaid by our children sometime and someway?

IV. A REVERSAL IN THE TREND

The need is for better coordination or correlation between the Federal and State Government. Jefferson likened our Government to the planetary system, with each unit revolving within its own proper constitutional orbit. This requires a generally recognized understanding as to the fields in which each unit will operate, both with reference to taxing and spending. The necessary harmony cannot exist when one unit is poaching on the preserves of another.

We have learned from a somewhat extensive experience in this country that the voice of a commission is not the voice of God. With full knowledge of this I am bold enough to suggest that a commission drawn from both the executive and legislative branches of the Federal and State Governments study this matter and make recommendations as to the proper fields of endeavor for each. Competition for the tax dollar should cease. Certain taxes, as for instance the gasoline tax, should be designated for the exclusive use of the States. Care should be taken that the sources of revenue allocated to the States be adequate, so that the States will have the means to discharge their constitutional functions. They should not be heard to say that they are stepping aside for the Federal Government because they do not have the money to do what they ought to do.

The available evidence indicates that the people desire to return to the principle of local self-government. They have tried bureaucratic government at Washington and have learned that it is always expensive and often inefficient. They have weighed the principle of centralization in the balance and have found it wanting.

In 1945 there was introduced in the Missouri Legislature a resolution to "give notice to the Congress of the United States that Missouri now takes the lead among the States in helping solve the Federal debt crisis and that it will refrain and forbear the demanding of further grants from Congress."

Perhaps the State of Colorado is entitled to the credit of being the first in the field, since in 1944 Colorado turned down United States funds for vocational training program, stating bluntly that it could do a better job.

But it remained for the State of Indiana to go in to win with characteristic vigor. In January this year the General Assembly of the State of Indiana passed House Concurrent Resolution 2, in which it said:

"We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States. * * *

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully petition and urge Indiana's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county courthouse and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come home."

The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. The fever chart of liberty is a record of resistance, not of supine acceptance.

We are on warning to withstand all beginnings of encroachment. "For the saddest epitaph," Mr. Justice Sutherland said, "which can be carved in memory of a vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while yet there was time."

It is later perhaps than we think, but there is yet time to return in this country to the principle of local self-government.

In the closing days of the convention that framed the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin was asked what kind of a government was set up in the new Constitution. He said, "We have given them a republic if they can keep it." We Missourians have always loved the republic of our fathers. Let us do our full share to save it in its constitutional form as a Federal republic—to cherish and preserve it for ourselves, for our children and our children's children.

Abuse of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful editorial entitled "Abuse of Power" appearing in the Washington Post of March 26, 1947. This editorial points out the dangerous trend of congressional encroachment upon the appointment function of the executive branch of our Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABUSE OF POWER

No alien agent could devise a doctrine more pernicious or more subversive of American political principles than the proposal now being put forward by certain Members of Congress that the appropriation power be used to rule the personnel policies of the executive branch of the Government. If this proposal is permitted to prevail, Congress will have annulled the separation of powers which the framers of the Constitution deemed essential to the maintenance of American freedom. The legislature, designed to serve as one of three coordinate elements of a system delicately balanced to forbid tyranny, will have assumed absolute control through a coup d'état. The result will be a form of dictatorship—no less dictatorial and no less alien to American traditions if exercised by a group of men than if exercised by one man alone.

If Congress can use its appropriation power to oust, say, the director of the Conciliation Service, then it could do the same, if it chose, to the Secretary of Labor or even to the President of the United States. And if the Supreme Court interposed a judicial prohibition, Congress might sweep it aside by the same device of withholding the funds requisite to its support. That the power to do this is inherent in the appropriation power does not make the use of it any less evil and despotic. Each element of the tripartite American Government is expected to employ its power with restraint and in conformity with the spirit animating the Constitution. Our political system can survive only as this spirit is respected.

There is a lesser yet by no means negligible danger entailed in the projected congressional usurpation of the executive power to hire and to fire. It tends to make Federal employment intolerable for all but the most docile, insipid, uninspired and conventional men and women. Any individual whose mind transcends the bounds of narrow political orthodoxy stands liable to dismissal on the ruinous charge of disloyalty to his country. The procedures for loyalty investigation established by the President at least afford opportunity for review of charges by impartial boards. But what is proposed now is that Congress itself act at once as prosecutor and as jury, proscribing and stigmatizing Federal employees in accordance with the ideological whim of a transient majority.

Representative COX has carried this concept to its ultimate absurdity by proposing that David E. Lilienthal, even if confirmed by the Senate after the most exhaustive inquiry into his character and qualifications, be denied office through a denial of funds to his vital agency. Thus the constitutional authority of the President to nominate and of the Senate to confirm could be set aside by a mere majority in the House. Government service, subject to such hazards, would scarcely seem alluring to men of originality and initiative. This is a formula for restricting public office to the second rate.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, before the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, on March 27, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the intensive issues in America today is whether the Communist Party is an American political party or a fifth column of foreign agents engaged in an undercover conspiracy against the welfare and safety of the United States.

In view of recent developments at home and abroad, I believe it is essential for the Congress to outline a policy definitely fixing the status of Communists and the Communist Party in the United States.

The evidence is conclusive that Communists are a disruptive force in American industry and labor, and that their constant undercover movements are designed to create chaos and conflict and to cripple our productive system in every way they can.

What most Americans want to know is whether these disruptive tactics are inspired and motivated by Soviet Russia; whether American Communists owe their loyalties and allegiance to Rusia.

I think they do. Most Americans think they do. But the Government, based on facts, must determine whether the American Communist is or is not a foreign agent.

When I suggest that course, I am not concerned about the legitimate political activities of Communists or any other minority group. I believe that under the Constitution, an American citizen has a right to advocate a collectivist form of society in this country if he so desires. The Socialists advocate a form of economic collectivism, but no one accuses them of disloyalty or conspiracy. They are loyal Americans who operate within the framework of our constitutional system.

America has never been afraid of new ideas. We welcome them in all fields—political, economic, and social. The free play of ideas is the strength of democracy. It is the competition of ideas which makes America strong. But sedition is not competition. It is conspiracy.

Consequently, I am concerned about the conspiratorial activities of the Communists. I am concerned about the charge that Communists in this country are foreign agents and that the American Communist Party is in fact an arm of an international conspiracy whose purpose is to overthrow this Government by force and violence.

Conspiratorial activities do not constitute legitimate political activities and they should not be tolerated under that guise. There is no constitutional immunity for sedition, subversion, or treason.

But when we consider specific legislation dealing with the Communist Party we must make sure that we don't chip away our freedoms to get at conspirators. It would be evasive to contend that nothing should be done; it would be folly to do anything which might, in the long run, prove as harmful as the things we seek to correct. By word or deed we must never give the impression that Communists are outside the pale of the law's protection. There is no legitimate prey for manhunts in the United States; such things are repugnant to the moral sense of the American people. The protection of the innocent is still supreme; there is no higher duty under our American system of jurisprudence.

I would rather have the Communists on the ballot than risk the danger of undermining the right of franchise. I would prefer to extend the Communists every right to propagate their beliefs by means of the written or spoken word than to risk the danger of undermining the right of free speech. The Bill of Rights is not selective. It is not to be extended or withdrawn by whim, caprice, or arbitrary choice. It is a sacred part of the fundamental law of the land. It expresses the very essence of American belief.

These are some of the dangers we must avoid in dealing with this issue, dangers not to Communists, but dangers to ourselves.

Nevertheless, we are not powerless to do something about the Communist Party.

This committee and this Congress have the responsibility to determine whether the American Communist is a foreign agent owing his loyalty to a foreign power or simply an American who wants to change our economic and social system by constitutional means.

If it is determined and agreed upon by all branches of Government that the American Communist Party is in fact a fifth column, disloyal to the United States, then I have these recommendations:

1. I believe that, as conspirators, they are no more entitled to immunity from the law than any other conspirators. If their actions are criminal in nature, they should be dealt with as such. If their actions are treasonable in nature, they should be dealt with as such.

If the treason and sedition laws are adequate to deal with their conspiratorial activities, enforce them.

If these laws are inadequate, strengthen them.

I'm talking about legal processes. In this country, we prosecute and we don't persecute. Here in America, a man is considered innocent until he's proven guilty.

2. The President has ordered a loyalty check for all employees of the executive departments of the Federal Government. It is implicit in this policy that a Communist is disloyal to the Government.

Equally important to the destiny of America are the actions of our free associations—the corporation, the cooperative, the union. If a Communist cannot be trusted as an employee of government, he cannot be entrusted with posts of leadership in directing the affairs of those free associations. Can anyone justify a double standard in dealing with Communists in America?

They should not be allowed to hold office in a corporation, a cooperative, or a union where they are in position to pursue their disruptive tactics. They have no loyalties

to these associations just as they have no loyalty to America.

3. What a Communist most dreads is to be labeled a Communist. Expose a Communist to the pitiless spotlight of publicity, and his potential for harm is immediately isolated. But tag him we must. I indorse wholeheartedly the principle of Mr. William Green's recommendation to this committee that management and labor must work together to expose and to eliminate Communists in industry and in unions.

If management and labor don't do this together, then the wrong kind of people will be using the Communist tag to smash unions.

We must be scrupulous to avoid indiscriminate labeling. Every time you tag an innocent person with the red label you play into the hands of the Communists. I'm not interested in the pastel shades—the parlor pinks or the salmon-colored zealots who fall for every fad that comes along. My concern is the red conspiracy, the man who uses the freedoms of democracy to destroy democracy.

I wish now to comment on an observation made before this committee yesterday by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He described how the Communists have reached out to employ the radio and the motion picture in their propaganda activities. Mr. Hoover said that several years ago the Communist underground directed its agents, in effect, to infiltrate Hollywood and do everything possible to poison the screen.

But if the Communists set out to capture Hollywood, they have suffered an overwhelming defeat.

Here is the evidence: American films are the target for bitter, organized attack by Communists all over the world. The Communists hate and fear American motion pictures. It is their No. 1 hate.

Relatively few foreign peoples read American publications or hear American radio programs. But millions of them see American motion pictures daily. They not only see them; they welcome them and love them.

In most countries which are Communist dominated there is virtually a complete ban on American films. In other countries our pictures are under constant attack by vigorous Communist minorities.

About a year ago our Government made a fair and reasonable film accord with France. French Communists made a bitter attack against the accord, and they have waged a constant campaign of vituperation against American pictures ever since. In countries behind the iron curtain Communists resist the showing of American films and use every bait possible to lure the people into houses showing Soviet films. In some cases they even offer free tickets and free transportation. But the bait is no good—the people still clamor for American films. That story, in one form or another, has been repeated time and time again.

American Ambassadors abroad have urged us to do everything we could to hasten the reentry of our pictures into countries from which they were excluded during enemy occupation.

The American motion-picture industry at great financial sacrifice is supplying pictures for the occupied countries of Austria, Germany, and Japan to assist in the reorientation of these former enemy peoples. In Germany alone this operation has cost the industry more than $500,000 so far.

The industry can well be proud of this contribution to our national policy in former enemy countries.

I also want to point out the great service being performed by American newsreels. They are in demand everywhere. They are factual and informational. They tell more graphically than any other medium the day-to-day story of free America.

American films give the lie by visual evidence to totalitarian propaganda. The old tale about the break-down of capitalism in America becomes pretty flimsy stuff after people have had a chance to see our pictures and draw their own conclusions. Pictures which are produced under a democratic form of government inevitably reflect democratic habits of thought and life and action. They are bound to convey some of the virility, the zest, and the joy of living which are characteristic of life in our country. These are qualities which other peoples need most at this time, and these are the qualities which make American films hated and feared by Communists everywhere.

The best evidence that Communists have failed to poison American motion pictures is the campaign they are now carrying on to block these films from the screens of the world.

Cleveland Plain Dealer Writer Interviews Greek Foreign Minister

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by John Leacacos, in last Sunday's Cleveland Plain Dealer:

SWEEPING FIVE-POINT SOLUTION OF GREEK PROBLEM OFFERED BY ATHENS OFFICIAL—RFC LOAN SEEN POSSIBLE IN PINCH

(By John Leacacos)

ATHENS, March 22.—Foreign Minister Constantine Tsaldaris, of Greece, proposed tonight a sweeping solution of the explosive Greek problem that was at the same time calculated to ease Russian fears concerning Greece's role in international affairs.

The Tsaldaris proposals, imparted exclusively to this correspondent, as follows:

1. That Generalissimo Stalin both as chief of the Soviet Union and as chief of the world's largest and original Communist Party should make a public declaration of policy to followers of communistic doctrine in all countries to the effect that Russia's Communist Party in the interests of world peace prefer to see the victory of the philosophy of Communism through peaceful democratic means and popular elections rather than armed revolutionary tactics.

2. That a neutral zone 10 to 20 miles wide should be fixed at the northern frontiers of Greece by an international or UN committee into which zone Greek guerrillas can enter freely and safely to surrender their arms to a neutral force of Americans, British, French, and Russian soldiers or those of any other nations designated. Greek military operations against guerrilla bands would naturally stop prior to this event.

3. That guerrillas who have surrendered their arms be given a free choice of their future course. Among the many alternatives might be for them to cross any frontier they choose, emigrate or remain in Greece proper under guaranteed police protection. Or, if feeling insecure about returning to their native villages because of fears of personal vendettas, they may be settled in other Greek towns where they are not personally known.

4. That new Greek elections be held 3 to 6 months after the surrender of arms, under international surveillance if necessary, before which a wide and liberal amnesty would be granted to all guerrillas and all political prisoners now in custody under a program which again an international committee may supervise, if so desired.

5. That both Yugoslavia and Bulgaria be given free customs zones in the port of Salonika by new treaties to allow these countries access to the Aegean Sea.

"Then if by regular democratic methods and arguments the Greek people want to elect Communists to the majority or strong representation in the National Assembly, the Communists are welcome to it," said Tsaldaris.

The Greek Foreign Minister and Deputy Prime Minister had further comments on his five-point program:

"The Communists in France, Italy, and Belgium have won considerable power and influence through normal participation in the political life of their countries," he pointed out. "Why can't the Greek Communists do the same?"

The Greek Government views as an unsatisfactory solution the prospect of having finally to wage outright battle against the Communist bands to enforce the authority of the Greek state.

Consolidation of America's Overseas Air Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the provisions of the bill which I introduced yesterday, dealing with America's overseas air services, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY

The salient points of the bill to consolidate America's overseas air services are these:

1. It declares that the interests of the Commerce of the United States, the national defense, and the postal service, require that the international air transportation of this country should be consolidated into a single company, to be formed under a plan approved or prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and to operate in the national interest under private ownership and management, but with appropriate Government regulation. This company is to provide for the United States a system of international air transportation (a) sufficient to carry a substantial portion of our own international air commerce as well as a fair share of air commerce between other nations of the world, and to provide communication on all routes essential to the national interest, and (b) capable of serving the military forces of the country in time of war or national emergency.

2. In order to assure coordination between the company and the Government, the bill sets up a policy committee under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State and consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, and the chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The most important specific duty of the policy committee is to advise the Civil Aero-

nautics Board in matters relating to the national policy and the national security.

3. Special emphasis is laid on the importance of keeping America's international air transport system equipped with aircraft of the most modern design, not only to meet foreign competition, but equally to assure a stable market for our vitally important aircraft manufacturing industry and a steady inducement for progress on the part of our students and scientists.

4. In lieu of the mail rate subsidies now in effect, the bill provides financial arrangements comparable to our existing international shipping law. In order to equalize competition against the low-wage cost foreign air lines, payment for construction and operating differentials is authorized if needed.

5. The bill provides for consolidation of existing air-line companies in the international field subject to the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board after public hearing. By the terms of the bill the approved plan must include certain definite provisions, such as the performance of existing employment agreements, an undertaking that the consolidated carrier will render air transportation service between the United States and other countries, regulation of the consolidated carrier's minimum and maximum passenger and freight rates by the Civil Aeronautics Board, equitable sharing of through traffic between domestic carriers, and provision for the Government to take over the consolidated company in the event of national emergency. As to the capital structure of the consolidated company, there will be two types of stock which will be identical as to devidend, asset, and voting rights. The ordinary stock will be held by the public, no person to hold more than 3 percent. The carrier shares will be held by the domestic air lines of the United States, the railroads,* and the steamship* companies, all of whom will be appropriately represented on the board of directors, and none of whom will be permitted to own more than 3 percent of the total stock.

NOTE.—(*) Asterisk means the American railroads would interchange traffic with the United States flag international air lines, and the extensive organizations of the American steamship companies abroad would work harmoniously with the consolidated air-line company in soliciting traffic, arranging sea-air passage for travelers and in maintaining personal contact with important shippers of ocean freight.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Plea to America," written by Elliott Roosevelt, and published in the March 29, 1947, issue of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEA TO AMERICA
(By Elliott Roosevelt)

Less than 2 years after the conclusion of the war our top Government officials have announced a new foreign policy for the United States. Mr. Acheson, our Under Secretary of State, has proclaimed at a congressional hearing that Communist governments in Greece and Turkey would be dangerous to the security and the future of the United States. This, in so many words, means that the Soviet Union is an enemy nation in the eyes of our Government. This statement of policy was put forward to explain why President Truman had asked for loans and military aid to the present Governments of Greece and Turkey. The theory behind this proposal is that by making such loans we shall bolster the present Governments of these two countries and prevent internal revolt leading to eventual Communist regimes.

What kind of governments are these which we are proposing to bolster? Are they democratic? Not even the most reactionary newspapers in this country have claimed that the present Government of Greece or that of Turkey can be classified as a democracy. The fact is that they are much more nearly totalitarian than democratic. There is little free speech. There is oppression of minorities—and of majorities, too, for all we know. But our Government chooses to support this totalitarianism rather than risk the spread of communism.

Did we fight the last war for no purpose? Should we have tossed our armies in the fight on the side of Hitler to help bring about defeat of the Soviet Union?

Our Government leaders seem to think that communism is a threat to the future of a democratic United States and that they must fight the Communists in Greece. I have read that there is a small, very militant element of the Greek population which is Communist. But why Turkey? I have never heard that there were any militant pro-Soviet Communists threatening the Turkish Government. In fact, it is hard to understand the interest in Turkey at all unless we are planning to encourage Turkey to bait the Soviet Union by creating incidents on the border between the two countries, thereby risking a third world war. Is that our purpose?

Turkey was definitely not friendly to our cause in the last war until it became quite evident that we would win. Turkey certainly is not threatened internally with communism. Turkey today cannot be described as a free, democratic country. Why Turkey?

What is the truth of the postwar threat of communism enveloping the world? The truth is that Russia does not have hundreds of millions of dollars with which to spread the doctrine of communism throughout the world. It is unable to export thousands of tons of food to help the starving people of the world. But communism is spreading in many countries. Why?

At the end of the war the peoples of the Far East and Middle East and of all Europe looked with admiration and burning hope to the United States to lead in the establishment of free and truly democratic governments in their countries. They looked to the United States to back up militantly the doctrines of the Atlantic Charter. What did they get? We made no protest when the European powers moved with force to reestablish their colonial empires. We failed to lead the way in uprooting nazism in Germany. We did participate in UNRRA, but we later killed that organization and put relief on a political basis. We now use relief for the starving millions of Europe as a gun in the back to force them to support governments of which we approve. Is that democratic procedure? No wonder communism spreads.

The people of Europe have become discouraged. The people of the Far East have become bitter. We have not established any principles. We have failed to give force and effect to the United Nations. In fact, by our action with regard to Greece and Turkey we have openly flouted the United Nations and possibly signed its death warrant.

The actions of our leaders have been based on the theory that we could never reconcile our differences with the Soviet Union. They believe that communism and democracy cannot live side by side in the world, at peace with each other. I do not agree with this premise. There must be men of integrity and courage in America who can reconcile the existing differences between ourselves and the Soviet Union and bring peace with honor to our country.

If the leaders in both the Democratic party and the Republican party continue our present foreign policy the result will be a divided world which will arm itself again for inevitable conflict. Huge military budgets will remain, and economic disaster will result for the world and the United States within a few years. This will be followed by a war of destruction that will reduce the population of the globe by billions, not millions.

It is my belief that when the chips are down the best answer to the threat of communism is a living, working democracy such as ours can be. I devoutly hope that the people of our country will realize that it is not just their dollars which are being risked in this gamble today. If we destroy the United Nations the last chance of peace will disappear.

Appraisal of Current Air-Line Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an illuminating address delivered by Mr. W. A. Patterson, president of the United Air Lines, Inc., before the Bond Club of Chicago, Ill. The address is entitled "An Appraisal of the Current Air-Line Situation."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The very people who just a few months ago were most optimistic concerning the future of the air transportation systems of our country are today the most pessimistic. Their pessimism toward the future is no more justified today than their optimism was last year. They didn't observe what the air transportation industry was going through 3 years ago and they have failed to observe the significance of what is happening today.

I welcome the opportunity to express my views in the hope that we can avoid the extremes in optimistic and pessimistic evaluations of this industry, but view it realistically with a balanced appraisal of the current air line situation.

All of us will agree, I believe, that the industry was on a sound financial footing as we entered the war and that it was making steady progress, and it will for many years to come, in the development of increased business. The conditions under which we operated during the war, and which gave rise to false optimism, are an important factor in analyzing this entire subject and should be reviewed.

WARTIME OPERATING CONDITIONS

At the start of the war, the airlines in the United States operated 359 airplanes. The airport facilities for handling these aircraft, buildings and hangars which we had at that time were already being taxed to their very

limits. Unlike other industries which expanded during the war, the air lines were forced to reduce their combined fleet of airplanes. Early in 1942, 183 airplanes were taken for Army use, leaving the airlines a fleet of 176 planes. Despite this reduced number of airplanes, however, the airlines surprised themselves by actually increasing the total tonnage carried. This was accomplished mainly by increasing the utility of aircraft from 6 hours a day to as high as 13½ hours a day. This was accomplished by operating airplanes at times of the day to suit our operating convenience and not the desires of our patrons for convenient departure or arrival time.

The passenger occupancy of our planes increased from a high of 70 percent to an average of 98 percent plus for the later war years. It was not necessary to promote new business. It came naturally. Eighty percent of all passengers carried during the later war years as well as cargo shipments were mainly booked and controlled by military priorities offices.

There were no seasonal fluctuations in traffic. Demand was constant 365 days out of the year. Many people flew not by choice but by necessity. Very few were paying their fares from personal income. Directly and indirectly, travel expense was being charged to the cost of war. Overhead expenses of the air lines were at a minimum—not always by choice, but because of shortage of manpower. Government contracts for special services for flying and certain phases of manufacturing gave further spread of an already abnormally low overhead cost. In addition, many fully depreciated airplanes were in use. Wage stabilization prevented wage adjustments which were justified and this had further effect on low operating costs. These conditions were the most perfect that could ever be expected to produce air-line profits—but they were abnormal in every respect. There will never be another repetition of those conditions except in case of war which none of us ever wants.

During this entire period, I am sure we will all agree that the air lines rendered the most outstanding service in flight and on the ground that was being offered in the entire transportation field. It was a main subject of conversation among experienced travelers. But by reason of the restriction of air line space by military priorities, many who would like to have traveled by air during the war years could not get seats.

MISINTERPRETATION

As is frequently the case during such abnormal periods, particularly when they are periods of success, people lose their sense of judgment. They fail to analyze current conditions, although if one wanted to take time to view the circumstances objectively, it was fairly easy to see that everything was abnormal and that the existing situation could by no means be used as a measuring stick for the future.

It is not difficult for outsiders to reach wrong conclusions about the air-line business, particularly those who do not have any responsibility for the success of the air lines. However, during the war period many of the operators themselves further encouraged the public impression of an unlimited air-line future by their own optimism. In addition, the Civil Aeronautics Board, by statute charged with the responsibility for developing a sound and economical air transportation system, must also have permitted enthusiasm to outweigh better judgment. Otherwise, I believe the Board would have been more conservative in some of the decisions made during this period.

We in United Air Lines, who were trying to guide the future of our company along sound and conservative lines, recognized that the trend being followed was not as conservative as it should be. However, our views were cast aside lightly as coming from people who have no faith in the air-lines' future. Actually, it was not a case of lack of faith. Our views were influenced by real confidence in the future of our business. Because of its great future we wanted to see that air-line progress was kept on a sound foundation.

IMMEDIATE POSTWAR CONDITIONS

The honeymoon ended on VJ-day.

First, the psychology of the traveling public changed overnight. The public considered that the end of war automatically brought the end of inconveniences. The tolerance of people to wartime conditions evaporated overnight.

Although demand for travel was greater than at any time during the war, all transportation restrictions were removed and priorities eliminated. This resulted in the air lines facing the necessity overnight to handle an uncontrolled demand for air travel. Everything had to be done at once.

We had one advantage from which to start; it was our good fortune to have a strong pilot and mechanical personnel to assure a high standard of safety. No air line would have undertaken this rapid expansion had it not been for that fact.

Additional airplanes had to be acquired. New airplanes had been on order for years, but we couldn't wait the necessary two years for the airplane factories to stop military production and build our new planes before we made any effort to break the bottleneck. The only immediate source of supply was from war surplus, and from that source we acquired four-engined transport airplanes. It was necessary practically to rebuild all airplanes received from war surplus at a cost almost equalling the prices we were paying for new airplanes of the very same types prior to the war. Because of the new postwar airplanes on order and to be delivered within 18 months to two years after surplus planes were put in service, it was only natural that their periods of usefulness would be extremely limited.

Meanwhile a threefold expansion of personnel was necessary. Thorough training was given all new employees and the cost was extremely heavy because our new employees were like the new employees in other industries. They were not too sure just what they wanted to do, and the resulting turn-over ran as high as 4 percent a month.

Our employees are human beings, and like all others, they relaxed slightly from the strain of war pressure.

It was impossible to obtain working space overnight for these new employees. It was necessary to double up in quarters that were inadequate in 1941, when the onset of the war froze the expansion of plant facilities. Additional telephone equipment could not be supplied immediately. Although several million dollars of new construction work was contracted for a year ago, because of shortage of materials and manpower, no complete new facility is yet available.

The industry now has about 600 planes with 16,000 seats, compared to a prewar high of 359 planes with 6,734 seats and a wartime low of 176 planes and 3,416 seats. With few exceptions, 1941 facilities, which were hardly adequate for handling the volume of traffic 5 years ago, are all we have to work with today.

* * * * *

Considering all these problems, I feel confident from my own experience and observations in other fields that the air lines have done and are doing an outstanding job in the face of these difficulties. The fact is that by the close of 1946 the air lines were flying almost three times as many seats as during 1941.

Postwar cost of operation: Air-line employees were underpaid prior to and during the war. Wage stabilization prevented adjustment. One of the first actions was to increase salaries and wages, particularly in the lower wage groups. These have increased on an average of 28 percent, and 38 percent in the lower groups. Termination of Government contracts threw the full burden of overhead on commercial operations. New airplanes have reintroduced the item of heavy depreciation as a cost of operation. Inefficiency of newer employees, of whom 50 percent have been in the air-line business less than 1 year, coupled with inadequate working facilities, have resulted in an efficiency of only 70 percent of that obtained in normal times.

* * * * *

Now we must consider the factor of revenues. The bottleneck in travel was broken shortly after Labor Day. The demand is now more in line with supply. I wouldn't say that the demand has been exhausted, but irregularity of operation has again brought about seasonal fluctuations. The present average air-line capacity is approximately 74 percent, while the break-even point during this conversion period is approximately 80 percent. Increases in passenger fares or in mail rates or in both are inevitable. United Air Lines is delaying its action on application for such adjustments because we recognize that fares will have much to do with attracting new business, and whatever increase we recommend will be the very minimum in the face of conditions.

Today we know that there are certain inefficiencies and expense items within our control which should be corrected before we penalize the public and ourselves. I mention the possibility of penalizing ourselves because I feel it is a very important point. * * *

EXPANSION

False optimism has caused some illogical expansion. False enthusiasm has caused unrealistic forecasts of the volume of business to be forthcoming in the immediate future. These forecasts range from 10,500,000,000 passenger-miles in 1949, which happens to be the one in which our company agrees, to an extremely optimistic forecast of 25,000,000,000 passenger-miles. The 1946 volume is estimated to have been approximately 6,000,000,000 passenger miles. When we order new airplanes, we must start estimating our requirements from our own forecast of the volume of business. Therefore, we find that the number of new airplanes ordered by the different air lines differs as widely as the forecasts of the various companies.

* * * * *

The wide difference of opinion among airlines on future volume of business has influenced materially their expansion ideas. We can only judge the wisdom of some of the expansion which has taken place by the financial condition and the credit standing of the different companies in different categories. I am certain that some are having a rude awakening as they look at their balance sheets and seek necessary financing to carry out their earlier dreams.

Expansions which certain air lines sought are not working too well in all instances. This emphasizes the danger of aggressive expansion under abnormal conditions. It is true the air lines initiated all but foreign expansion and furthermore that no expansion has been forced on any carrier; nevertheless, the Civil Aeronautics Board, which I again emphasize is charged with the responsibility of establishing a sound and economical transportation system, approved all expansion and, therefore, must share with those of us in air-line management the weaknesses in the end result.

* * * * *

There is no disgrace in subsidy to an air line serving a territory that needs service but yet is not sufficiently populated to permit the air line to be self-supporting. However, in certain cases, the course was taken to expand smaller companies into more heavily populated areas in competition with companies that were inherently larger because of the territory they served. All air lines can't serve the same territory without com-

plete duplication. Some of them must be satisfied to be small and successful.

It seems obvious that the air lines having the greatest difficulty today are those which were expanded with the idea of making them bigger and stronger, and, instead, it looks as though they may have been made weaker.

The big question now is: Are we going to look at our own mistakes and go back and correct them or are we going to continue to ask the Civil Aeronautics Board to give us something else we think we may want which may possibly remedy earlier mistakes? This might only be a case of piling mistake on mistake and lead to final chaos in the industry.

DAY OF RECKONING

The period we are now passing through is a day of reckoning. False impressions were created by war operation, including the mistaken idea that we could expect unreserved public acceptance before we could complete perfection of our product. We can look at this experience, in a way, as a most fortunate occurrence. The public can be assured that air-line management will be more realistic in considering the immediate problems and in correcting the mistakes of the past. This is where the commercial and investment banker is performing an outstanding service. It has been made known to many in the business that there is no interest in making loans or providing additional capital until illogical decisions of the past have been corrected.

It is fortunate that any weaknesses in our business became obvious before we went too far in financing our future program.

I believe that 2 years ago any air line could have gotten practically what it asked for in new capital or loans. Corrections would not then be in process as they are now. We might have seen bankruptcy in a relatively new business, which would have served as a permanent stigma. Instead, there is now the opportunity to make some adjustments and start off on a sound basis, assuring investors and lenders of a constructive and conservative program during the next few years. If the commercial and investment bankers are strict enough in their conclusions, there is no question in my mind in regard to the future financial success of this business.

* * * * *

THE FUTURE

The basic difference of opinion between the conservatives and the enthusiasts in no way involves the extent of ultimate future of air transportation. The difference is strictly in the matter of timing.

I believe that regardless of the potential market, the product must be right. Today the public wants safety above all. They do want dependability of schedule performance and regularity of service, but when we advise them that at this stage of development we cannot offer that regularity and still be consistent with safety, they are satisfied.

Now, why am I so optimistic concerning the ultimate future of air transportation? It is because now, as a result of wartime development, we are getting the specific facilities which offer for the first time a potential regularity and dependability of service regardless of weather that will compare with surface transportation. The inability to fly at very high altitudes, with fuel supply to deviate substantially from bad weather areas, now causes cancellation of flights when unfavorable weather conditions develop en route.

* * * * *

Cancellation of flights at terminals results from low ceilings and inadequate visibility. The human pilot can do an excellent job in bringing an airplane down to a general airport location with accuracy. However, he does require proper ceiling and visibility to make final observations during his approach for final landing. Today the development of the automatic landing pilot, identified by the layman as the electronic pilot, will permit the entirely automatic landing of an airplane.

Mechanical devices need checks and double-checks. The ground control approach system, a type of radar, will permit observation of the plane by monitors on the ground to avoid any discrepancy in course which might result from maladjustment of a mechanical device. In addition, there is the opportunity for the installation of radar on the ground for general observation of all airplanes in any particular sector. Finally, with air-borne radar in the airplane itself, there is the opportunity for the pilot to make ground observations through overcasts.

These are not speculative possibilities. They represent the major contribution from all the technical development forced by war But no air line is going to start to use all this equipment immediately. There will come first the training, installation of proper ground equipment, and an adequate test period of flying present weather minimums with the mechanical devices to insure their reliability.

* * * * *

Construction of ground facilities is moving much faster. We hope that by the midsummer much of hangars, buildings and other plant facilities will have been completed and in use. Airport construction and improvement has been decided upon in practically every strategic city in the United States. All this work is on the move.

One other thing we will do immediately will be the establishment of more practical schedules, planned for the maximum convenience of the traveler. We must sacrifice some utility of equipment to give better service. For example, adequate reserve airplanes must be stationed at points to minimize delays whic' might arise from minor mechanical difficulties. Instead of basing airplane schedules on the maximum cruising speed of the airplane, we will set schedules so that the pilot will have the opportunity to make up lost time by a more flexible use of reserve power.

If the air lines themselves will benefit from the lessons of this past period and be more conservative in their future expansion and show a little patience in waiting for increased volume to justify such expansion, I would say that this industry is "over the hump." We have all learned valuable lessons and we are making use of them.

A business which makes possible shrinking the United States and the rest of the world to a fraction of the distances measured in past relationships and which will therefore have a profound effect on the social and economic habits of all people, wherever they may be, cannot fail to flourish.

We are just passing through a shake-down period. Rather than viewing this period with pessimism, I look upon it as an experience that will make air transportation stronger and greater than any of our earlier expectations.

Veto Threat Against Aid to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine editorial entitled "Veto Threat Bars UN Aid to Greece," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 27, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETO THREAT BARS UN AID TO GREECE

By vetoing a Security Council rebuke to Albania, a Soviet satellite, Russia's Andrei A. Gromyko has provided at least one answer to the question a good many worried Americans have been asking:

Why doesn't the United States toss to the United Nations the issue of helping Greece and Turkey defend themselves against communism instead of tackling the ticklish job itself?

It's easy to see now—if there ever were any doubt about it—what Mr. Gromyko would do if the problem of anti-Communist aid to Greece came before the Security Council. He would throw in his veto so quickly that the Greeks pleading for aid in the preservation of their independence wouldn't have a chance.

In the latest case Gromyko vetoed a 7-to-2 decision of the Security Council to accuse Albania of at least indirect responsibility for the Corfu Channel mine explosion which killed two score British sailors last October.

Why did he do it? Presumably because Albania is now within the Soviet sphere and Moscow feels some kind of obligation to support its vassals when they get into trouble.

But Mr. Gromyko didn't merely reject the majority ruling against Albania. He broke into the debate to complain bitterly about the present Government of Greece.

Americans realize fully that the Greek Government falls considerably short of democratic perfection. But they also know that communism is a threat to freedom not only in Greece but throughout the world.

The facts about the Albanian incident in the UN are noteworthy. It was the tenth time the Soviet had swung its veto at a decision favored by most of the Security Council delegates. The veto also came on the first anniversary of the United Nations in this country.

And although it was the first use of the veto since last September, the Russians, in again resorting to it, showed that they were unimpressed by the storm of complaints in the General Assembly of the UN some weeks ago against abuse of the veto power.

The truth is, of course, that the time has come to ask whether the United Nations will ever get anywhere so long as the Soviet Union is determined to invoke its veto privilege in any situation which Mr. Gromyko regards as endangering Moscow's interests.

But if the Albanian veto has proved nothing else, it has demonstrated why it was necessary for the United States to go it alone in the Greek-Turk emergency without inviting time-wasting, morale-killing vetoes in the United Nations.

As matters stand, we have not bypassed the UN. The United States has asked the Security Council to put the Greek disturbances at the top of its schedule for Friday, and American Delegate Warren R. Austin has announced that he will explain the whole problem to the Council.

These things are important to keep in mind as President Truman urges upon Congress the need for haste in making aid to Greece and Turkey available. The British have announced that their help to Greece will end on March 31. There is no time to be lost if United States' efforts to plug the Balkan hole against communism are to succeed.

And it is also important to keep the facts of Russia's obstructionism in the United Nations in mind when opponents to the President's plan for aid to Greece and Turkey air their views in Washington or elsewhere.

It would be unfair to hold that all who oppose American emergency aid in Greece are Soviet sympathizers. But there can be no question that Communists and their shadowy fellow-travelers are violently against it.

Debatable on many grounds as this issue is, it appears to us that help in this specific instance to eastern European areas menaced by communism is an American responsibility. We support the President in his plea for prompt action by Congress.

Tariff Protection on Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Senator BUTLER Fights Farm Tariff Cuts," from the Farmers Guild News of February-March 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BUTLER FIGHTS FARM TARIFF CUTS—NEBRASKA SENATOR GIVES FARM VIEWS ON RECIPROCITY

Nebraska's fighting Senator, HUGH BUTLER, who has waged many battles on behalf of United States farmers is once again standing like a rock to protect their interests in event Congress extends the life of the reciprocal trade agreements. Senator BUTLER farms about 3,000 acres in southeastern Nebraska, and speaks from practical experience on the problems of farmers in respect to reciprocity.

Mr. BUTLER has introduced S. 719, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, which provides "if an agricultural group shall complain to the President that articles are being imported into the United States in quantities that seriously endanger domestic production," an investigation shall be made by the Tariff Commission and if such facts exist, "the President shall direct that such articles shall no longer be admitted at the rate of duty specified in any reciprocal agreement." The bill concludes that if such are sold in the United States at less than domestic cost of production it shall be presumptive evidence that domestic production is seriously endangered.

THE SENATOR'S VIEWS

"The Tariff Commission has been making practical application of cost-of-production standards in the actual setting of rates for many years," said Mr. BUTLER, "and one of the principal arguments for the trade agreements has been the claim that administration experts could determine rates more scientifically than could Congress.

"I favor reciprocity properly administered, but the present program is not reciprocal at all. We are asked to make all the concessions and we gain nothing in return. We should cooperate with foreign countries and expand our trade, but I don't think it is necessary to destroy our tariff protection completely to do that.

"Members of Congress were invited to help form the political end of our foreign policy; but we are never invited to join in negotiations of trade agreements affecting our economic policy. We are tired of economic disarmament in the form of tariff concessions on a one-way street."

The trade agreements which have characterized the New Deal administration were first proposed in 1934 to "aid recovery and put 3,000,000 men to work by September." Three years later 10,000,000 were still unemployed. In 1937 the reciprocal trade treaties were proposed "as a way of achieving world peace." On October 5 of that year President Roosevelt proposed to "quarantine aggressor nations." In 1940 the treaties were revived as "a method of keeping the United States out of war." In 1943 Congress was asked to extend them as "a supremely successful experiment that holds in it the hope of the world." At present the renewal is requested to "aid reconversion and maintain full employment," although the slogan may be changed by the time the proposal reaches Congress.

Method of Electing President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief editorial from the Boston Post and one from the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, regarding the proposed constitutional amendment introduced by me, providing for the election of the President of the United States by popular vote.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Post of March 21, 1947]

THE RIGHT WAY

The straightforward way to elect Presidents is that proposed by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, who would have the popular vote alone decide the issue. As he points out, any arrangement, such as the electoral college, that makes it possible for a man to win the Presidency without the support of a majority of the voters is archaic and unfair. The bill should be passed with little ado.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Sunday Standard-Times of March 23, 1947]

MR. LODGE'S AMENDMENT

Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, has proposed an amendment to the Constitution which would make a fundamental change in the method of electing a President. It would do away with the so-called electoral college, and would provide that the total popular vote of the Nation should be determining. In support of his amendment he points out that under the present system a President may be elected who has not received a majority or even a plurality of the popular vote.

Prior to the election of 1824 there is no record of the popular vote. Since then there have been cases where candidates polling less than a majority of the total vote have obtained a majority of the electoral votes as required under the Constitution. The almost universal practice in the election of public officials in this country is that a plurality is sufficient to elect. In other words, a candidate who receives less than half the vote, but who gets more than any other candidate, is elected.

Benjamin Harrison in 1888 and Woodrow Wilson in 1912 received fewer votes than all their opponents, but more than any one of them. John Quincy Adams trailed Andrew Jackson in 1824 in both the popular and the electoral vote, but as no candidate had a majority of the latter, the election was thrown into the House, and Adams won. Later Hayes, who did not have even a plurality of the popular vote, was declared elected in 1876, after a dispute over the electoral votes of certain Southern States had been decided in his favor by an electoral commission.

Except in the cases of Adams and Hayes, which were exceptional, all Presidents chosen under the present system have polled at least a plurality of the vote of the people, and a plurality is universally held to be sufficient to elect.

It is interesting to examine Mr. LODGE's proposal with reference to the one-party States of the South. In the 1944 election 10 States in this area gave Roosevelt 115 of his 432 electoral votes. Only three of them had ever gone Republican since the end of the reconstruction era following the Civil War, and they violated the solid-South rule only once in the Hoover-Smith election of 1928. Their electoral votes in 1944 were a trifle more than one-quarter of Roosevelt's total, but their popular vote gave him more than two-thirds of his majority in the country as a whole.

The electoral votes in some of these States are out of proportion to the total vote cast in them, as shown in the case of South Carolina, where the Roosevelt vote was 90,601 and the Dewey vote 4,547. Even under the present system of electing a President, the solid South's almost unbroken habit of voting Democratic gives the Democratic candidates for President a substantial advantage, and that advantage would be enhanced if Mr. LODGE's plan were adopted.

Ascension Parish Schools Are a Splendid Example of Improvement of Community Life Through Education in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1947

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the work being accomplished through the Ascension Parish schools, Louisiana, under the able guidance of Larry Babin, superintendent, which work I believe is outstanding, and in pace with the changing world:

IMPROVEMENT OF COMMUNITY LIFE THROUGH EDUCATION

(By Larry Babin, superintendent, Ascension Parish schools, Donaldsonville, La.)

That the school should assume leadership in improving the varied aspects of community life has become the accepted philosophy of progressive educators throughout the Nation. This philosophy is particularly applicable to rural areas where standards of living have been, in the main, relatively low. The school people of Ascension Parish, who have been working to put this philosophy into practice for the past few years, are certain that they stand on sound and firm ground. Their program has received and is receiving recognition from educational leaders of State and national repute. Certain phases of the program have developed to the extent that the parish is now reaping the fruits of the foresight and labors of its leaders.

Particularly helpful is the fine spirit of cooperation and understanding which exists among the various agencies engaged in rendering social, education, religious, and

economic service to the people. For several years the agencies of Ascension Parish, as well as State agencies having responsibilities in the parish, have been coordinating their thinking, planning, and efforts to the end that the children and adults of the parish may have at their disposal, in an organized way, the services and assistance that each agency can render. Such an approach not only minimizes gaps in service and duplication of activities, but also results in increased use and development of all resources, both human and natural.

To facilitate understanding and mutual cooperation, several procedures have been used. In 1944, a master chart of the over-all program for the improvement of community life was prepared and printed. Supplementing this were detailed charts depicting the activities of the various local agencies. Work and evaluation conferences have been held by a particular agency, such as the schools, as well as occasional meetings of representatives of all agencies. These devices have helped in developing mutual assistance.

The schools of Ascension Parish, working as one of the cooperating agencies in the over-all program for the improvement of community life, serve strictly agricultural areas. The educational program which they are developing is one designed to improve rural life. To attain maximum success with this program, the schools must offer a well balanced school program—one which encompasses the teaching and mastery of the traditional and fundamental school subjects; provides opportunity for wholesome, democratic living; makes provisions for the improvement of the health and nutritional habits of children; provides opportunities for pupil initiation and participation in those activities in which they live together at school, at home, and in the community; and assumes the initiative in contributing to a better and fuller life for the people served by the school—these and many more.

Realizing that education today means contributing to the development of the entire child, his parents, and the community, and knowing that a healthy child learns best and is happiest, the Ascension Parish schools have a planned and functional health program. The children are served hot, appetizing, nutritious lunches in attractive, sanitary lunchrooms. In some of the schools, school gardens furnish part of the produce used in the lunches. Serving each lunchroom are a corps of paid workers and several different mothers, who come in daily from different sections of the community. Through this experience, most of the mothers learn to know one another, the teachers, and the school better; they also obtain helpful nutrition information.

As a result of correlation of lunchroom experiences with classroom instruction, the children know how to evaluate in terms of protective foods the meals served them. A food-habits survey made in connection with the parish nutrition education research project showed certain deficiencies in the diets of the children. To help correct this situation, lunchroom menus include the necessary protective foods in an amount equal to 50 percent of the child's daily needs. Because of the nutritional program of the schools, many families are growing and eating a better variety of nutritious foods.

Other health activities are carried on in cooperation with various agencies of the community. The children are tested for visual deficiencies and corrections are made, if needed. Teeth are inspected, dental caries noted, appointments with dentists made, and transportation to the dentist provided for, if circumstances require. A preschool clinic is held during the summer, at which time children who will enter school in the fall are examined and immunized. Guiding all health and nutrition work is the school health committee. This committee has conferences with teachers, supervisors, and lunchroom workers in order that effective planning can be put into operation.

The school program of Ascension Parish is being adapted to the needs of the community and of individual citizens in a number of other ways. Work conferences which have been held for three consecutive summers have given teachers an opportunity to discuss their mutual problems and formulate plans of instruction, which are resulting in improved adjustment in the academic subject areas, as well as in health and social adjustment. As an outgrowth of this planning, a great variety of teaching aids are being used, thus adding to the interest and effectiveness of instruction. Teaching is done in terms of problems, rather than topics, so that facts are not learned in isolation, but in relation to situations that are meaningful to pupils. Informal studies of the community, in which older pupils sometimes participate, have indicated conditions, problems, and facts in the local situation upon which work in science, mathematics, vocational agriculture, homemaking education, industrial arts, and other special fields is based.

In evaluating the program in Ascension Parish, the report published by the parish school board in November 1946 makes this statement:

"While we are encouraged over the progress we are making, we do feel that much remains to be done if we are to meet the needs of our pupils whose adult world will certainly be different from ours. Continual planning, evaluation, modifying, and supplementing will be necessary, for we certainly do not have all the answers. However, there is no such thing as standing still. We either go forward or backward. In this fast changing world schools must keep pace."

Tax Vote by House Shows Public's Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by David Lawrence in the Washington Star of Friday, March 28, 1947:

When the House of Representatives passes a tax-reduction bill by virtually a two-thirds vote, it may be taken for granted that the measure represents a preponderant public sentiment.

The best indicator of this is the fact that 40 Democrats, out of the 173 who voted; cast their ballots for the bill along with 233 Republicans. Considering that only 3 Republicans voted against the bill, out of 236 voting, it is evident that the Republican majority is not only cohesive but it can command support on the Democratic side, too.

For several weeks there has been a smear campaign waged against the Republican Congress. It has been argued that tax reduction would unbalance the budget and bring other dire consequences. The truth is the Democratic Party is badly split. One group is politically sagacious and is envious because the Republican Party has been given the opportunity to gain prestige through tax reduction. The other group, of course, wants to keep on spending indefinitely.

TIME-CONSUMING STEPS

The spenders in the Democratic membership in Congress are still the more numerous inside the minority party and one wonders what would have happened if the Democrats had regained control of the House in last November's elections.

If the Democrats were in control today, the economy-minded would have been outvoted by the spenders and it is questionable whether any such vote for tax reduction could have been mustered even with Republican help.

Without a promise of tax reduction the Nation today would be in the midst of runaway inflation and economic chaos. The New Dealers have been denouncing the Republican Congress, and the left-wingers have been assiduously cultivating the impression that the Republican Congress has been bungling its job. The truth is that delays were encountered because the entire congressional structure has been reorganized pursuant to legislation passed last year, and no Congress in history has had to face the reorganization of committees and the rearrangement of procedures which have been imposed on the present Congress by statute.

Notwithstanding these time-consuming steps, the Republican majority in the House has given an example of resoluteness in passing—within 90 days of the day the session began—a tax bill which not merely fulfills the promises made to the people in the autumn elections but dramatically reverses the tide of spending which, if not blocked, would have bankrupted the Nation.

BUREAUCRATS HID TRUTH

The trouble about the tax-bill controversy is that the bureaucrats in the administration have been concealing the truth. First, they put figures in the budget estimates which were plainly padded. Not only were receipts underestimated but the expenditures were placed much higher than they should be. Then the President took the ridiculous position of opposing tax reduction—a blunder in politics if there ever was one.

The Republicans refused to be swayed by the smear campaign and put through a tax bill. It will be revised in the Senate, but the final bill is not likely to be vetoed unless Mr. Truman wants to commit political suicide in 1948.

The fact is the American people are tired of spendthrift government and now want economy and an end to spending. The consequence of the House action will be felt throughout the whole economic system. It is a breath of fresh air after nearly 14 years of wasteful spending by the New Deal.

The Republican determination to fulfill the wishes of the people for reform should not be discounted. The time to appraise the Republican record is when the present session adjourns. And, incidentally, there probably will not be as many presidential vetoes as the left-wingers, with whom the wish is father to the thought, would like to see.

Results of Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting a copy of the questionnaire which in March 1947 I attempted to place in the hands of as many citizens of my district as possible. It was humanly impossible to send such a questionnaire to

each citizen of my district, but I believe the replies received fully cover the opinions of the majority of the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District which it is my honor to represent.

My district might well be considered the Main Street of our Nation. We have approximately 50-percent urban, and 50-percent rural populations, all labor and farm organizations represented, as well as large industries and small business, two colleges and two universities.

The questionnaire was sent to each committeeman and committeewoman, both Democratic and Republican, labor groups, farm groups, attorneys, barbers, business and industry, housewives, newspapers, professional groups—doctors and dentists, and so forth—public-office holders, salesmen, and school teachers. A total of 2,500 questionnaires was sent and the number of returns received—1,260—proves to me that the people are anxious to express their views on issues before the Congress for consideration.

The questionnaire and results are as follows:

Questionnaire from Honorable J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, Seventeenth Ohio District.

1. Do you think it is necessary for the United States to loan money to foreign nations in order to bring about world recovery? Yes, 45 percent; no 55 percent; total vote cast, 1,141.

2. Should all reciprocal trade agreements be submitted to Congress for approval? Yes; 85 percent; no, 15 percent; total vote cast, 1,238.

3. Do you favor raising our entrance quotas for immigrants from Europe? Yes, 16 percent; no, 84 percent; total vote cast, 1,215.

4. Do you believe that we have sufficient Federal laws to safeguard the rights of labor and management? Yes, 22 percent; no, 78 percent; total vote cast, 1,162.

5. Do you favor a Federal law prohibiting "closed shops"? Yes, 77 percent; no, 23 percent; total vote cast, 1,226.

6. Do you favor a Federal law prohibiting mass picketing? Yes, 83 percent; no, 17 percent; total vote cast, 1,200.

7. Do you feel that the Federal Government should participate in and give financial aid to local communities through a Federal works program? (That is, granting Federal money for planning and construction of schools, hospitals, sanitation, etc.) Yes, 49 percent; no, 51 percent; total vote cast, 1,198.

8. Do you favor a tax reduction of $4,000,000,000? Yes, 25 percent; or do you favor a tax reduction of $6,000,000,000? Yes, 62 percent; none, 13 percent. (Even if it means no Federal-aid projects in your community.) Total vote cast, 1,136.

9. Do you favor 1 year of Federal compulsory peacetime military training? Yes, 49 percent; no, 51 percent; total vote cast, 1,205.

10. Do you favor abolishment of all Federal rent controls? Yes, 51 percent; no, 49 percent; total vote cast, 1,204.

Signature.....
Address.....
Occupation.....
Date .....

Please write on the back of this page your suggestions that might aid me in giving better service as your Congressman.

Please return this questionnaire to 1434 House Offic. Building, Washington, D. C.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I asked my constituents to sign their names and give their occupations and this information enabled me to secure the opinions of individual groups and how they feel about the legislation that is paramount at present. Following is the percentage distribution of replies to the questions, according to occupational classifications:

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire

Question 1. Do you think it is necessary for the United States to loan money to foreign nations in order to bring about world recovery?

	Yes	No
	Pct.	*Pct.*
Total replies	45	55
Attorneys	69	31
Barbers	22	78
Business and industry	47	53
Farmers	38	62
Housewives	44	56
Labor	27	73
Newspapers	54	46
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	62	38
Public officeholders	65	35
Salesmen	56	44
School teachers	72	28
Retired	48	52
Occupation not given	35	65

Question 2. Should all reciprocal trade agreements be submitted to Congress for approval?

	Yes	No
	Pct.	*Pct.*
Total replies	85	15
Attorneys	55	45
Barbers	75	25
Business and industry	89	11
Farmers	89	11
Housewives	92	8
Labor	88	12
Newspapers	91	9
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	82	18
Public officeholders	84	16
Salesmen	90	10
School teachers	76	24
Retired	75	25
Occupation not given	80	20

Question 3. Do you favor raising our entrance quotas for immigrants from Europe?

	Yes	No
	Pct.	*Pct.*
Total replies	16	84
Attorneys	25	75
Barbers	15	85
Business and industry	12	88
Farmers	12	88
Housewives	21	79
Labor	11	89
Newspapers	10	90
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	26	74
Public officeholders	24	76
Salesmen	15	85
School teachers	26	74
Retired	19	81
Occupation not given	12	88

Question 4. Do you believe that we have sufficient Federal laws to safeguard the rights of labor and management?

	Yes	No
	Pct.	*Pct.*
Total replies	22	78
Attorneys	12	88
Barbers	22	78
Business and industry	23	77
Farmers	19	81
Housewives	29	71
Labor	26	74
Newspapers	0	100
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	25	75
Public officeholders	21	79
Salesmen	23	77
School teachers	21	79
Retired	30	70
Occupation not given	22	78

Question 5. Do you favor a Federal law prohibiting closed shops?

	Yes	No
	Pct.	*Pct.*
Total replies	77	23
Attorneys	67	33
Barbers	65	35
Business and industry	76	24
Farmers	84	16
Housewives	79	21
Labor	69	31
Newspapers	82	18
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	85	15
Public officeholders	82	18
Salesmen	84	16
School teachers	58	42
Retired	81	19
Occupation not given	69	31

Question 6. Do you favor a Federal law prohibiting mass picketing?

	Yes	No
	Pct.	*Pct.*
Total replies	74	26
Attorneys	78	22
Barbers	70	30
Business and industry	87	13
Farmers	92	8
Housewives	87	13
Labor	63	37
Newspapers	83	17
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	84	16
Public officeholders	88	12
Salesmen	94	6
School teachers	63	37
Retired	78	22
Occupation not given	74	26

Question 7. Do you feel that the Federal Government should participate in and give financial aid to local communities through a Federal works program, that is, granting Federal money for planning and construction of schools, hospitals, sanitation, etc.?

	Yes	No
	Pct.	*Pct.*
Total replies	49	51
Attorneys	33	67
Barbers	61	39
Business and industry	48	52
Farmers	48	52
Housewives	55	45
Labor	56	44
Newspapers	50	50
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	48	52
Public officeholders	39	61
Salesmen	61	39
School teachers	44	56
Retired	60	40
Occupation not given	53	47

Question 8. Do you favor a tax reduction of $4,000,000,000, or do you favor a tax reduction of $6,000,000,000, or none, even if it means no Federal-aid projects in your community?

	Yes		
	$4,000,000,000	$6,000,000,000	None
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Total replies	25	62	13
Attorneys	29	59	12
Barbers	17	70	13
Business and industry	28	62	10
Farmers	21	70	9
Housewives	23	72	5
Labor	27	53	20
Newspapers	30	70	0
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	24	63	13
Public officeholders	38	56	6
Salesmen	21	61	18
School teachers	29	48	23
Retired	30	59	11
Occupation not given	14	66	20

Question 9. Do you favor 1 year of Federal compulsory peacetime military training?

	Yes	No
	Pct.	Pct.
Total replies	49	51
Attorneys	55	45
Barbers	39	61
Business and industry	50	50
Farmers	31	69
Housewives	43	57
Labor	55	45
Newspapers	91	9
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	55	45
Public officeholders	50	50
Salesmen	66	34
School teachers	47	53
Retired	53	47
Occupation not given	58	42

Question 10. Do you favor abolishment of all Federal rent controls?

	Yes	No
	Pct.	Pct.
Total replies	51	49
Attorneys	63	37
Barbers	65	35
Business and industry	50	50
Farmers	66	34
Housewives	57	43
Labor	47	53
Newspapers	42	58
Professional (doctors, dentists, etc.)	44	56
Public officeholders	61	39
Salesmen	42	58
School teachers	33	67
Retired	50	50
Occupation not given	45	55

Mr. Speaker, the total response indicates a vote cast on the questionnaire of approximately 1,260. I am one, Mr. Speaker, who firmly believes that the people back home are a part, and want to be a part, of our National Government. I will always welcome their opinions and their suggestions.

Mr. Lewis' Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this afternoon there appeared in the Washington Star a very temperate and well-considered editorial entitled "Mr. Lewis' Memorial." It deals with the controversy between John L. Lewis and Secretary Krug. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate it in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. LEWIS' "MEMORIAL"

Secretary of Interior Krug is well advised in his refusal to enter into a controversy with John L. Lewis which necessarily would center around the Centralia mine disaster that claimed the lives of 111 men.

In proclaiming his 6-day "memorial," Mr. Lewis has attacked Secretary Krug with characteristic abandon. According to the boss of the United Mine Workers, Mr. Krug is a murderer, is guilty of criminal negligence, and has dishonored his word. Mr. Lewis does not trouble himself to bolster these charges with specifications, but, broadly, they rest upon the theory that Mr. Krug is personally responsible for the Centralia explosion because he has failed to enforce the Federal Mine Safety Code which became effective last July 29.

There is much that Mr. Krug might say in answer to this. He might point out that, during the Lewis contempt case, Mr. Lewis himself was contending that Federal possession of the mines was more nominal than real—a sort of legal fiction set up for the purposes of the court action against him. He might also point out that it was recognized that all of the provisions of the safety code could not be put into effect immediately upon its adoption, that the safety record in the mines has been better under Government possession than when the private owners were in control, and that the man in charge of the operation of the safety code was hand-picked by Mr. Lewis.

This is a line of argument, however, which would be of little avail against the fact that 111 miners have been killed. The only thing for Mr. Krug to do is to await the findings of the investigations now under way—investigations which presumably will determine the fact as to whether the disaster was due to Federal negligence or to some other cause.

Meanwhile, if Mr. Lewis, whose cup of bitterness is filled to overflowing, chooses to seize upon this tragedy as an occasion and excuse for intemperate personal attacks upon Mr. Krug, there is nothing to stop him. Most people, however, will prefer to await disclosure of the facts before reaching a judgment in the matter.

House Tax Bill Lightens "Little Fellow's" Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, individual income taxpayers in the bottom brackets, so-called little fellows, for a change would get a better break proportionately than the so-called big fellows in the tax-reduction bill passed by the National House of Representatives March 27 and sent to the Senate.

The largest percentage of tax relief carried in the House bill, 30 percent, would go to the small-income group.

Sixty-one percent of the reduction provided in the Republican-sponsored bill would go to persons receiving net incomes of $5,000 or less a year. Of this amount, 71 percent would go to individuals with net incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

That is not the way the Democrats treated the little fellows when they had control of Congress. They talk a lot about the common man, but when crucial tests come they play the Democratic administration's game to regiment him.

When the Democratic Party was in control of Congress in 1945 they voted the country tax relief. It was a puny 5 percent. Did they give the little fellow a break? They did not. It was a flat 5 percent on net incomes of all individual taxpayers.

Fifteen times the Democrats increased taxes—nearly every year from 1933 to the end of their control of Congress. The Republican Party pledged tax reduction. The House bill keeps that pledge, which prevailed despite overwhelming opposition of the Democratic members of the House.

This official show-down again furnishes evidence that the Republican Party is the genuine friend of the "little fellow" and every other segment of the population.

Low-income taxpayers—much the larger group—have been hit the hardest by the rise in the cost of living in recent years of new dealism.

Therefore the Republican House tax-cutting bill would give special attention to these millions of citizens now.

These tax cuts would be equivalent to a wage bonus to help the "little fellow" meet the high cost of living and should be multiplied as the Republican-controlled Congress puts the ax to costly bureaucracy fastened onto the country by Democratic administrations at Washington.

Special attention also would be given in the GOP House bill to the aged and infirm whose earning ability has been reduced. The House bill would allow to each taxpayer 65 years of age or older an additional exemption of $500, making a total personal exemption of $1,000.

Many of these senior citizens, who have done their bits in building America, are retired school teachers, policemen, municipal workers, and persons living on small, fixed incomes.

President Truman repeatedly has stated that he is against giving the people tax relief now. President Truman, as recently as March 26, reiterated his opposition to newsmen. He said his position was stated in his January message to Congress.

At that time he told Congress, "I cannot recommend tax reduction," and he made the amazing statement that at present "high taxes contribute to the welfare and security of our country."

The Republican Party believes that with a restoration of efficiency and economy in the Government taxes can and must be reduced for the welfare and security of our country.

The following tables show how the Republican-written and Republican-passed House tax bill would lighten the tax burden of the many millions of persons receiving net incomes of $5,000 or less a year:

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Present tax	H. R. 1	Reduction
$500			
$600	$19.00	$13.30	$5.70
$700	28.00	26.60	11.40
$750	47.70	33.25	14.25
$800	57.00	39.90	17.10
$900	76.00	53.20	22.80
$1,000	95.00	66.50	28.50
$1,200	133.00	93.10	39.90
$1,500	190.00	133.00	57.00
$1,600	209.00	153.00	56.00
$1,700	228.00	173.00	55.00
$1,800	247.00	193.00	54.00
$1,900	266.00	212.80	53.20
$2,000	285.00	228.00	57.00
$2,500	380.00	304.00	76.00
$3,000	484.50	387.60	96.90
$4,000	693.50	554.80	138.70
$5,000	921.50	737.20	184.30

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

$1,000			
$1,200	$38.00	$26.60	$11.40
$1,500	95.00	66.50	28.50
$1,500	152.00	106.40	45.60
$2,000	190.00	133.00	57.00
$2,100	209.00	153.00	56.00
$2,200	228.00	173.00	55.00
$2,300	247.00	193.00	54.00
$2,400	266.00	212.80	53.20
$2,500	285.00	228.00	57.00
$3,000	380.00	304.00	76.00
$4,000	589.00	471.20	117.80
$5,000	798.00	638.40	159.60

MARRIED PERSON—2 DEPENDENTS

$2,000			
$2,500	$95.00	$66.50	$28.50
$3,000	190.00	133.00	57.00
$3,100	209.00	153.00	56.00
$3,200	228.00	173.00	55.00
$3,300	247.00	193.00	54.00
$3,400	266.00	212.80	53.20
$3,500	285.00	228.00	57.00
$4,000	380.00	304.00	76.00
$5,000	589.00	471.20	117.80

Aid to Greece—George's Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of March 27, 1947:

I LIKE IT HERE—AID TO GREECE, GEORGE'S WAY

(By George Grim)

OWATONNA, MINN.—George Boosalis left Owatonna with thousands of dollars in his pocket—and came back with $3 even. In between, George lived a story everybody in town is talking about.

You meet George—well groomed, prosperous—in the candy kitchen in back of his restaurant. For 29 years he has been there. Dreaming of a day he might return to see his folks in Greece. His was the dream of many a boy—to return to his home village, a success. And to bring the folks and neighbors things they needed.

"Greece had a bad time in the war," said George. "And, right after, I heard about the clothing they didn't have."

The day he received that first letter, George started sending packages. Townspeople brought their clothes to George. In 10 months he had sent 1,600 pounds of clothing, 200 pounds of flour, 50 pounds each of rice and spaghetti. But he wanted to see his parents. His mother was 79 his father 86. So George stuffed his pockets with cash, told everybody in Owatonna he was off for Greece, and headed for Chicago.

BUYS TICKET TO ATHENS

"It wasn't so easy, even if I did have a passport and a visa," said George. "But when I told them about wanting to see my folks once more—and not having seen them for 35 years, they softened up. I peeled off $1,100 and got a ticket for a plane right from Chicago to Athens."

During the few days he waited for the plane, George visited friends in Chicago. Each gave him some cash, and an address of relatives in the old country. Soon, George had more than $6,000 in his hip-pocket wallet.

"I wasn't afraid," he says. "I just walked straight and nobody bothered me."

Soon George, who sold peanuts on New York City streets when he arrived in America 35 years ago, was flying in a four-motored plane on his first air trip. He had sent ahead 1,700 pounds of clothing in 44 cases. When he got to Greece, he found them in a dock area, hired a huge truck to bring them to his little village of Niata, 385 miles into the mountains from Athens.

"It was wonderful coming home," said George. "People were on the street of our little town. I recognized my father. And one of my brothers ran and recognized me—which was pretty funny because he wasn't born yet when I left Greece."

Arriving at his modest home, George discovered that the village was testing him. Inside, there were five women. All his mother's age. Sitting in a row. All smiling.

KNOWS MOTHER RIGHT AWAY

"They didn't fool me," he chuckles. "I went right up to my mother first thing. Who they think they fool? I know her right away. My mother, who had 10 kids and seven operations and still looks wonderful."

Soon there was the distributing of George's gifts. All of the Boosalis relatives—there were 44 of them—were clothed. So were members of some 94 other families. For 8 weeks, George stayed in the village. Then he dutifully made the rounds of 48 families in Athens, handing them the money he had received from the relatives in Owatonna and Minneapolis and Chicago.

When he boarded the plane in Athens, he had $46 in his pocket. And in December, when he reached home in Owatonna, there was an even $3.

Now George is telling groups in Owatonna, and his customers at the cafe and candy shop, about Greece. What he saw. Why America ought to help. Of the real job that UNRRA did, helping with food, clothing, medicine.

And George is on the job himself. I saw shoes and clothing neatly stacked in a corner of his candy kitchen. Candy for his customers Clothes for the folks back home in Greece.

To whom George is all the things Uncle Sam yearns to be.

Russia Again Attempts to Dictate Peace Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the controversy which has developed during the Moscow Conference between the United States and the Soviet Union over the question of reparations from Germany again illustrates the wide divergence in understanding, in principle, and in reasoning that exists between the Governments of these Nations.

Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov, on March 18, 1947, released the secret Yalta protocol on German reparations, and now maintains that its terms must be accepted by the United States and Great Britain as part of the final treaty with Germany. Let us examine the terms of the protocol:

[Text of the hitherto secret Yalta protocol on German reparations, as released in Moscow on March 18, 1947, by Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov]

Protocol on the talk between the heads of the three Governments (the United States, Russia, and Britain) at the Crimea Conference on the question of German reparations in kind:

The heads of the three Government agreed as follows:

(1) Germany must pay in kind for losses caused by her to the Allied nations in the course of the war. Reparations are to be received in the first instance by those countries which have borne the main burden of the war, have suffered the heaviest losses, and have organized victory over the enemy.

(2) Reparations are to be exacted from Germany in the three following forms:

(a) Bulk removal within 2 years from the surrender of Germany or the cessation of organized resistance from the national wealth of Germany located on the territory of Germany herself as well as outside her territory (equipment, machine tools, ships, rolling stock, German investments abroad, shares of industrial, transport, navigation, and other enterprises in Germany, etc.), these removals to be carried out chiefly for the purpose of destroying the war potential of Germany.

(b) Annual deliveries of goods from current production after the end of the war for a period to be fixed.

(c) Use of German labor.

(3) For the working out on the above principles of a detailed plan for the exaction of reparations from Germany an Allied reparations commission is to be set up in Moscow, consisting of representatives of the U. S. S. R., the United States, and the United Kingdom.

(4) With regard to the fixing of the total sum of reparations, as well as the distribution of it among countries which suffered from German aggression, the Soviet and American delegations agreed as follows:

"The Moscow Reparations Commission should take in the initial stages as a basis for discussion the suggestion of the Soviet Government that the total sum of reparations in accordance with points (a) and (b) of paragraph 2 should be $20,000,000,000, and that 50 percent of it should go to the U. S. S. R."

The British delegation was of the opinion that, pending consideration of the reparations question by the Moscow Reparations Commission, no figures of reparations should be mentioned. The above Soviet-American proposal has been passed to the Moscow Reparations Commission as one of the proposals to be considered by the Commission.

Signed by:

CHURCHILL.
ROOSEVELT.
STALIN.

Secretary of State George C. Marshall has taken a firm stand in opposition to the acceptance of the Yalta protocol. His answer to Mr. Molotov states clearly the position of the United States and reaffirms our stand that the Potsdam agreement supersedes any preliminary agreements concluded at Yalta.

The Yalta protocol was obviously a preliminary agreement to be used as a basis for a further study and final treaty. Its suggested terms for the treaty gave Soviet Russia the greatest share of reparations based on a method of property evaluation that represented an additional advantage to the Soviet Union. At Potsdam, after further study, this method of property evaluation was discarded, and a proposal to take repara-

tions by zones was adopted as less likely to lead to friction between the Allies.

Today the final peace treaty is under discussion. If Russia would abandon her selfish policy of blind tenacity, holding out for every gain for Russia when world peace may hang in the balance, the Moscow Conference could reach speedy agreement on the issues under consideration.

I urge the Members of the House to study the Yalta protocol and then to read carefully the following statement by Secretary of State Marshall, which clearly defines American policy on agreements between this Nation and Russia on German reparations:

[Text of statement on reparations by George C. Marshall, United States Secretary of State, at Council of Foreign Ministers at Moscow, March 18, 1947]

I wish to make completely clear the position the United States has consistently taken with regard to the relation of the Potsdam agreement on reparations to the Yalta protocol.

Immediately on his return from Potsdam, before any question was raised as to the scope or meaning of the Potsdam agreement and of its relation to the Yalta agreement, President Truman, in a public address on August 9, 1945, clearly stated his understanding of the Potsdam agreement, and I will read to you exactly what he said:

"At the Crimea Conference a basis for fixing reparations had been proposed for initial discussion and study by a reparations commission. That basis was a total amount of reparations—$20,000,000,000. Of this sum, one-half was to go to Russia, which suffered more heavily in loss of life and property than any other country.

"But at Berlin the idea of attempting to fix a dollar value on the property to be removed from Germany was dropped. To fix a dollar-value share each nation would be a sort of guarantor of the amount each nation would get—a guaranty which might not be fulfilled. This formula of taking reparations by zones will lead to less friction among the Allies than the tentative basis originally proposed for study at Yalta."

In July 1946, at Paris, the question of German reparations was discussed in the Council of Foreign Ministers. At that time Mr. Molotov presented the same arguments regarding the Yalta agreement which he put forth here. Secretary Byrnes, who was present at the Yalta Conference and who as Secretary of State took an active part in working out the Potsdam agreement on reparations, stated the view and position of the United States Government that the Potsdam agreement took the place of the preliminary agreement reached at Yalta. Secretary Byrnes pointed out the irrefutable fact, and I quote from his statement:

"The language read by Mr. Molotov showed what Mr. Roosevelt agreed to was only to study as a basis for discussion the suggestion of the Soviet Government. The language of the protocol shows that the Soviet proposal was passed to the Moscow Reparations Commission as one of the proposals to be considered by the Commission."

The position of the United States Government regarding reparations is that the agreements at Potsdam supersede the preliminary agreements previously reached at Yalta. We will not follow Mr. Molotov in a retreat from Potsdam to Yalta.

The long-sought-for peace depends on faith, understanding, and cooperation between the three great powers—the United States, Great Britain, and Russia. Russia, as usual, is the stumbling block—this time using the tentative terms agreed to at Yalta to force her point. Secretary of State Marshall is not impressed or convinced.

Dr. Muzzicato Reports on Second Mission to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report made by Dr. Charles Muzzicato on medical conditions in Italy, as he saw them during his second survey, made in the form of a speech which he delivered on the occasion of a testimonial banquet given in his honor by the Federation of Italian-American Societies in Buffalo, N. Y.

As national chairman of the American Medical Relief for Italy (AMRI), Dr. Muzzicato's mission had the full approval of the President's War Relief Control Board. His survey was facilitated by the military permit granted him by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States of America and by his attachment to the Allied Commission—Public Health Subcommission—immediately upon his arrival in Italy. Dr. Muzzicato won great distinction as a New York State senator, and to his present duties he brought a background of wide experience acquired while serving in the senate as chairman of the committee on public health.

The report is as follows:

DR. MUZZICATO REPORTS ON SECOND MISSION TO ITALY

Last year I undertook to make a survey of medical conditions in Italy, with special emphasis on its hospital needs. Upon my return I issued a report in which I described the suffering, hungry, malnourished, and destitute people of Italy. It was a tragic sight, one so filled with human sufferings that I wondered whether it was true, and how it was at all possible for human beings to live under such conditions. At that time it was, for the people of Italy, a matter of keeping body and soul together in the face of disease and increasing death rates due to many causes.

I have just returned from another visit to Italy where I again spent some 2 months surveying the problems facing the Italian people today. What I saw there filled me with admiration and respect for them. During my first journey I never thought that it would be possible for a nation to pull itself up from such depths of misery; for its people to show such progress in their struggle against want, sickness, and death—a struggle which had the tinge of hopelessness.

I can tell you now that the people of Italy have performed one of the great miracles of our time. It is truly a miracle since all the visiting experts, authorities, scientists, and doctors had predicted almost certain doom for them.

Yet these people with their own bare hands and with the exertion of a determined will, are demonstrating to the world that they still have the virility to restore themselves in every phase of living. They are proving that with just a little aid they could pick up the scattered pieces and join them together into a working whole again.

* * * * *

Thanks * * * are due the people in this country who have answered our appeal and have provided the means of alleviating the distressed condition of the Italian people as it existed when the war ended. * * * This has been done with contributions of food, clothing, medicines, and surgical supplies. The number of lives which has been saved cannot be counted. The desperation I saw during my first trip had vanished substantially and in its place now there is hope.

Hope, in fact, is the one word which can best characterize the present attitude of the Italian people and we can be proudly happy to know that all of us here tonight together with hundreds of thousands more throughout this land helped bring this about. Everywhere I went, in the little towns, in the big cities, and out in the rural areas of Italy, I found this renaissance of hope.

When I had the great honor of being received for a second time by His Holiness Pope Pius XII, I found him more optimistic and in better spirits. During the occasion of my first trip, he had appeared tired and worn; he looked thin, pale, and very much perturbed. In contrast, he reflected a great change on the occasion of my second audience with him. He looked better and more energetic. When I remarked this he smiled and said, "Yes; it is because I am so hopeful that America will continue to help."

As I traveled from place to place, I saw the Italian people busy at work, and I marveled at their untiring efforts to get the most from the little they had to work with. For instance, I was surprised to see that most of the bridges that had been destroyed by the war were now reconstructed—and that transportation, one of the bottlenecks of the country, was fast resuming its stride. Every means of transporting goods from one part of the country to the other is being used to the utmost advantage. Telegraph lines and other communication facilities have likewise improved. Persons can still be seen daily acting as human mechanisms, pulling carts and carriages loaded with vegetables and other foodstuffs to the market place. Animals of every description are being utilized to the limit. Transportation relics are seen commonly along the roads. But nevertheless things are moving.

All through southern Italy and throughout Sicily I saw men and women of every age, even little boys and girls, nourishing the soil—the soil which means so much to them. And I'm happy to say their labors have been fruitful, for Italy this year has had a good harvest.

With the medical and surgical supplies we sent to Italy, Italian doctors have worked wonders. They were able to hold back the rising tide of death. They labored under the most adverse conditions night and day to check diseases, to rebuild bodies with medicine, to save the health of the nation.

If this is a rosy picture of conditions in Italy, I am sure that you will understand that it is only a comparison between my first visit and my recently completed tour.

The comparison ends right there. For were we to attempt a similar comparison with our own conditions here in the United States, the tragic plight of Italy would still appear great. One might very well compare Italy's condition with that of a patient who has just come out of a major surgical operation successfully. No doctor would leave that patient on his own until he is able to walk about on his own two feet. Italy has come through the operation successfully. But she cannot be left alone now. The Italian people must be assisted in their recuperative period. This will require still more food,

more clothing, and more medicine, and it is imperative that this material aid be extended immediately. If we fail the people of Italy in the last phase of needed aid, all of the good that has been done will be negated.

This second trip which I made to Italy convinced me that the Italian people could restore themselves more speedily and could return to normalcy quickly if they felt sure that the future would not be laden with threats of economic strangulation. New obstacles must not be placed in their path of reconstruction and rehabilitation.

It would be childish to disregard the dark clouds that hang over Italy's future. The economic destiny of the nation seems not to be entirely in its own hands, but in the hands of the Big Four empowered to draft the peace treaties. The psychological reaction brought about by the decisions of the foreign ministers of Russia, England, France, and our own Secretary of State, can stymie very well the prodigious efforts of the new Italy.

The promises made to the people of Italy during the war years have remained in their minds. To them these promises presented the hope of a new world, a new society of nations, where justice for all would insure economic tranquility and lasting peace for both victors and vanquished. To state that many of these promises have yet to be realized is surely an understatement. The people of Italy are aware of the factors involved. And it is this that makes them feel that the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" have been discarded for power politics. Such a realization has made them lose some of the faith they had built up in the Allies especially when they were told that they would be amply assisted if they overthrew their dictatorship and embraced a democratic form of government. History has documented the fact that the Italians did everything we asked them to do and they did it at a colossal cost to themselves.

I mention this only because it affects the future of Italy and her ability to rehabilitate herself. It is an important consideration in picturing the present conditions of Italy and the mental attitude of her people.

On my way back to the United States I stopped in Paris where I had the opportunity to meet United States Secretary of State Byrnes. In my capacity as chairman of American Medical Relief for Italy I had sent him a communication stating my belief that much of the relief we had provided would be endangered if Italy did not get just treatment at the peace conference. When I met and talked with Mr. Byrnes in Paris my communication was remembered, and after our meeting I felt certain that Italy's future position was greatly strengthened by his attitude and efforts in her behalf.

I was fortunate also to be at the Paris airport when Senator VANDENBERG arrived to counsel with Secretary Byrnes. The Senator and I had a brief meeting. I was happy to learn from him that he was familiar with the purpose of my mission to Italy and he endorsed it completely and revealed a staunch friendship for the Italian Nation.

As a doctor, naturally, I was distressed to find during my second survey that the health of Italy's people is still poor. Tuberculosis is widespread. The mortality rate of infants is painfully high. Infectious diseases and malnutrition are still prevalent.

The people of Italy want to live. They have the energy and the ambition to survive their greatest disaster. But the problem of the present and the future is whether Italy's friends are going to help her to get back and stay on her own feet again. Aside from the humanitarian standpoint, it is to the interest of world peace that Italy recover completely. To bring this about we must not fail the people of Italy. We must not forget the promises we made to them. We must keep faith because they believed in us. And to those of us who helped them meet their great crisis in the past years by sending food, clothing, and medicine to combat starvation, disease, and death, the call for a final spurt to bring them over the danger line is most urgent and must be heeded.

Just a little more help from Italy's friends will insure the gains which were made in the past year. Just a little more medical aid will save the lives of hundreds of thousands of Italians. I am sure that if each and every one of you had been with me during my trips through Italy and seen conditions as I had you would not hesitate a moment now to give that additional aid.

Let me leave you with this thought:

Here is Italy the country which, more than any other, produced what is finest in art and music and science; the home of a people who through the centuries have contributed immeasurably to the culture of world civilization. But, having been led, unwillingly, to disaster for which she has paid and is still paying a terrible price, will we stand by and allow her to remain a sick nation, when she knows so well how to create the good and the beautiful?

If there is any compassion in us, we will not leave her to such a sorry fate. We Americans of Italian ancestry have been greatly fortunate; we have the blessings of the old Italy nurtured by the strength of this wonderful free country of the United States; we are endowed with riches and there is within us enough skill, enough heart, and enough strength to bring the Italian people back to health. Will we summon that strength and provide food and medicine as humanitarians with a deep responsibility?

Look upon Italy as I suggested earlier in my speech as a patient woefully weak after a major operation. She needs nursing to bring her into convalescence and eventual recovery. You and I can provide it. We have the means if we have the will. Are we going to provide it?

Yours will be the answer, and I know it will be right.

CHARLES MUZZICATO, M. D.,
National Chairman, American Medical Relief for Italy (AMRI), New York, N. Y.

Monsignor Carrol-Abbing, former director of medical service assigned to ENDSI (Ente Nazionale per la Distribuzione dei Soccorsi in Italia) and now foreign representative of American Relief for Italy, Inc., has sent Dr. Muzzicato the list printed below which represents hospitals in which medical supplies and equipment donated through the AMRI organization have been distributed:

Province and city	Hospital
Agrigento:	
Agrigento	Ospedale civico.
Canicatti	Ospedale civile.
Licata	Ospedale civico "S. Giacomo di Altopasso."
Sciacca	Ospedali riuniti "Triolo."
Ancona:	
Ancona	Ospedale civile "Umberto I."
Chiaravalle	Ospedale civile "Principe di Piemonte."
	Ospedale della C. R. I.
Fabriano	Ospedale civile "Umberto I."
Jesi	Ospedale civile "Vittorio Emanuele III."
Osimo	Ospedale civile "Umberto I."
Ostra	Ospedale civile.
Sassoferrato	Ospedale "S. Antonio."
Senigallia	Ospedale civile.
Apuania:	
Apuania	Ospedale civile "SS. Giacomo e Cristoforo."
	Ospedale civico.
Fivizzano	Ospedale "S. Antonio Abate."
Pontremoli	Ospedale civile "S. Antonio Abate."
Arezzo:	
Arezzo	Spedali riuniti di "S. Maria sopra i ponti."
Castiglione Fiorentino	Spedali riuniti.
Cortona	Spedali riuniti di "S. Maria della Misericordia."
Bibbiena	Ospedale "Vittorio Emanuele III."
Foiano	Ospedale di "S. Francesco."
Montevarchi	Ospedale della Misericordia.
S. Giovanni Valdarno	Ospedale "Alberti."
S. Sepolcro	Ospedale della Misericordia.
Subbiano	Ospedale "Boschi."
Ascoli Piceno:	
Ascoli Piceno	Ospedale civile "Mazzoni."
Fermo	Ospedale civile "Umberto I."
Montegiorgio	Ospedale "Diotallevi."
Offida	Ospedale civile.
Porto S. Giorgio	Ospedale civile "S. Gaetano."
S. Elpidio a Mare	Ospedale della Misericordia.
Avellino:	
Ariano Irpino	Ospedale civile.
Avellino	Do.
Monteforte Irpino	Do.
S. Angelo dei Lombardi.	Ospedale civile "S. Maria."
Solofra	Ospedale civile "A. Landolfi."
Andria	Ospedale civile.
Bari	Policlinico.
Barletta	Ospedale "Principe Umberto."
Trani	Ospedale "S. Nicola pellegrino."
Benevento:	
Benevento	Ospedali riuniti.
Piedimonte d'Alife	Ospedale civile.
S. Agata de Goti	Do.
Bologna:	
Bentivoglio	Ospedale "C. A. Pizzardi."
Bologna	Istituto ortopedico "Rizzoli."
Budrio	Ospedale "Umberto e Margherita."
Castel S. Pietro d'Emilia.	Ospedale civile.
Imola	Ospedale civile "S. Maria della Scaletta."
	Ospedale psichiatrico provinciale.
Medicina	Ospedale ricovero.
Molinella	Ospedale civile.
Porretta Terme	Ospedale "Costa."
S. Giovanni in Persiceto.	Ospedale civile.
Vergato	Do.
Cagliari:	
Cagliari	Do.
	Ospedale dalla C. R. I.
Carbonia	Ospedale "C. Avanzini."
Iglesias	Ospedale "S. Barbara."
Oristano	Ospedal civile.
Caltanissetta:	
Caltanissetta	Ospedale "Vittorio Emanuele III."
Mazzarino	Ospedale civile "S. Stefano."
Niscemi	Ospedale civile.
S. Cataldo	Ospedale "M. Raimondi."
Campobasso:	
Campobasso	Ospedale "A. Cardarelli."
Isernia	Ospedale circondariale.
Larino	Ospedale "G. Vietri."
Venafro	Ospedale civile.
Catania:	
Acireale	Ospedale "S. Marta."
Caltagirone	Ospedale "Umberto I."
Catania	Ospedale civile "Vittorio Emanuele."
	Ospedale sanatoriale "Ferrarotto Alessi."
Linguaglossa	Ospedale "S. Rocco."
Paterno	Ospedale "S. Salvatore."
Randazzo	Ospedale dei Poveri.
Catanzaro:	
Catanzaro	Ospedale civile.
Crotone	Ospedale civile "S. Giovanni di Dio."
Nicastro	Opedale civile.
Tropea	Ospedale civile "I. Toraldo."
Vibo Valentia	Ospedale civile.
Chieti:	
Atessa	Ospedale "Vittorio Emanuele."
Chieti	Ospedale civile.
	Ospedale sanatoriale.
Guardiagrele	Ospedale civile.
Lanciano	Ospedale civile "Renzetti."
Vasto	Ospedale civile.
Cosenza:	
Corigliano Calabro	Ospedale civile "G. Campagna."

Province and city	Hospital
Cosenza—Continued	
Cosenza	Nuovo Ospedale civile "Principe de Napoli."
Rossano	Ospedale civile "N. Giannattasio."
Enna:	
Enna	Ospedale "Umberto I."
Leonforte	Ospedale "Ferro-Branciforti-Capra."
Nicosia	Ospedale "Basilotta."
Piazza Armerina	Ospedale civico "Chiello."
Ferrara:	
Argenta	Ospedale "Mazzolani-Vandini."
Buondeno	Ospedale "Borselli."
Cento	Ospedale civile.
Comacchio	Ospedale "S. Camillo."
Codigoro	Ospedale "Vittorio Emanuele."
Copparo	Ospedale "S. Giuseppe."
Ferrara	Arsispedale "S. Anna."
Portomaggiore	Istituto "Eppi."
Firenze:	
Borgo S. Lorenzo	Ospedale.
Castelfiorentino	Ospedale di S. Verdiana.
	Ospedale della Misericordia.
Empoli	Ospedale "S. Guiseppe."
Fiesole	Ospedale "S. Antonino."
	Ospedale "Camerata."
Figline Valdarno	Ospedale "Serristori."
Firenze	Arcispedale di S. Maria Nuova.
	Istituto Ortopedico Toscano.
	Ospedale "S. Giovanni di Dio."
	Casa di cura chirurgica "O. Basilewsky."
	Ospedale Oftalmico fiorentino.
	Ospedale "S. Giuseppe."
	Sanatorio "Careggi."
	Ospedale "Galilei."
	Ospedale Sanatoriale.
	Sanatorio "Ponte Vecchio."
	Ospedale psichiatrico "S. Salvatore."
	Ospedale "Monte Oliveto."
	Ospedale "S. Gallo."
	Ospedale Orbetello.
	Ospedale della Maternita.
	Ospedale Ebraico.
Firenze	Ospedale della C. R. I.
	Ospedale sanatoriale al Salviatino.
	Ospedale degli Innocenti.
	Ospedale "Villa delle Rose."
	Ospedale "Villa Pepi."
Fiorenzuola	Ospedale "SS. Annunziata."
Fucecchio	Ospedale "S. Pietro Igneo."
Greve	Ospedale "Rosa Libri."
Luco	Ospedale civile.
Marradi	Ospedale di S. Francesco.
Prato	Ospedale della Misericordia e Dolce.
Tavernelle	Ospedale "Naldini."
	Ospedale "Galdini."
Forli:	
Cesena	Ospedale civile "M. Bufalini."
Forli	Ospedale civile "G. B. Morgagni."
Forlimpopoli	Ospedale Caduti in Guerra.
Mendola	Ospedale civile.
Rimini	Do.
	Ospedale della C. R. I.
Santarcangelo di Romagna	Ospedale civile.
Frosinone:	
Alatri	Ospedale S. Benedetto.
Anagni	Ospedale civile.
Arpino	Ospedale "S. Croce."
Cassino	Ospedale "De Bosis."
Castro de'Volsci	Ospedale civile "Umberto I."
Ceccano	Ospedale del SS. Sacramento.
Ceprano	Ospedale civico "Ferrari."
Ferentino	Ospedale civile.
Frosinone	Ospedale "Umberto I."
Isola del Liri	Ospedale civico "Caduti per la Patria."
Monte S. Giovanni Campano	Ospedale civico del Crocifisso.
Pontecorvo	Ospedale civile.
S. Antonino	Do.
Sora	Do.
Supino	Ospedale "Principe Umberto."
Veroli	Ospedale civile.
Grosseto:	
Castel del Piano	Do.
Grosseto	Ospedale della Misericordia.

Province and city	Hospital
Grosseto—Continued	
Massa Marittima	Ospedale civile "S. Andrea."
Orbetello	Ospedale civile "S. Giovanni di Dio."
Pitigliano	Ospedale "F. Petruccioli."
Scansano	Ospedale civile.
Taranto Ionio: Taranto	Ospedale "Acanfora."
L'Aquila:	
Avezzano	Ospedale civile "SS. Filippo e Nicola."
Castel di Sangro	Ospedale civile.
L'Aquila	Ospedale civico "S. Salvatore."
Ortucchio	Ufficio di Sanita.
Pescina	Ospedale sanatoriale "S. Rinaldi."
Rocca di Mezzo	Ospedale civile.
Sulmona	Ospedale civile "Casa Santa dell'Annunziata."
Tagliacozzo	Ospedale civile "Umberto I."
La Spezia: La Spezia	Ospedale civile "Vittorio Emanuele III."
Latina:	
Cori	Ospedale S. Maria Salute degli Infermi.
	Ospedale della C. R. I.
Fondi	Ospedale civile S. Giovanni di Dio.
Latina	Infermeria comunale.
Minturno	Ospedale civile.
Priverno	Ospedale civile "Regina Elena."
Sabaudia	Ospedale civile.
	Ospedale della C. R. I.
Sezze	Ospedale civile.
Terracina	Do
Livorno:	
Campiglia Marittima	Ospedale di Maremma.
Cecina	Ospedale civile.
Livorno	Do.
Piombino	Ospedale "Vittorio Emanuele III."
Portoferraio	Do.
Lucca:	
Barga	Ospedale di S. Francesco.
Camaiore	Ospedale "SS. Vincenzo e Michele."
Castelnuovo di Gerfagnana	Ospedale "S. Croce."
Forte dei Marmi	Ospedale civile "S. Camillo."
Lucca	Ospedale Riunito.
Pietrasanta	Ospedale civile.
Serravezza	Ospedale "Campagna."
Macerata:	
Camerino	Ospedale civile Maria della Pieta.
Cingoli	Ospedale civile.
Corridonia	Ospedale civico "S. Salvatore."
Macerata	Ospedale civico.
Matelica	Ospedale di S. Sollecito.
Recanati	Ospedale civile "S. Lucia."
S. Severino Marche	Ospedale "Bartolomeo Eustachio."
Tolentino	Ospedale civico "S. Salvatore."
Matera: Matera	Ospedale civile "Vittorio Emanuele III."
Messina:	
Barcellona Pozzo di Gotto	Ospedale civile "Cutroni Fodda."
Lipari	Ospedale civile.
Messina	Ospedale civico "Piemonte."
	Sanatorio dell'Arciconfraternita dei Rossi.
	Ospedale psichiatrico.
Milazzo	Ospedale civile.
Mistretta	Ospedale civile "S. Salvatore."
Patti	Ospedale civico "Barone Romeo."
Modena:	
Carpi	Ospedale "B. Ramazzini."
Castelfranco Emilia	Ospedale "Regina Margherita."
Finale Emilia	Ospedale "S. Spirito."
Mirandola	Ospedale "S. Maria Bianca."
Modena	Ospedale Policlinico "Ramazzini."
Ravella Nel Frignano	Ospedale civile.
S. Felice Sul Panaro	Do.
Sassuolo	Do.
Napoli:	
Arienzo S. Felice	Do.
Aversa	Casa Santa dell'Annunziata.
Capua	Ospedale "F. Palasciano."
Caserta	Ospedale civile.
Castellammare	Ospedale civile "S. Leonardo."
Forio D'Ischi	Ospedale "S. Maria a Loreto."
Frattamaggiore	Ospedale civile.
Giuliano in Campania	Do.

Province and city	Hospital
Napoli—Continued	
Gragnano	Ospedali Riuniti di S. Antonio e di S. Maria.
Maddaloni	Ospedale civile.
Marcianise	Do.
Marignano	Do.
Napoli	Ospedale "S. Maria della Pace."
	Ospedale "S. Maria di Loreto."
	Ospedale degli Incurabili.
	Sanatorio "S. Maria della Vita."
	Instituto "Vittorio Emanuelle III."
	Ospedale "Lina Fieschi Ravaschieri."
	Istituto ortopedico "Teresa Ravaschieri."
	Ospedale psichiatrico.
	Ospedale "Principe di Napoli."
	Ospedale "Gustavo Morvillo."
	Ospedale "Elena d'Aosta."
	Ospedale "Cardinale Ascalesi."
	Ospedale Militare.
	Ospedale "D. Cotugno."
	Ospedale dei Pellegrini.
Nola	Ospedale civile.
	Ospedale sanatoriale.
Palma Campana	Ospedale civile.
Pollena Trocchia	Ospedale "R. Apicella."
Pozzuoli	Ospedale "S. Maria delle Grazie."
S. Giorgio a Cremano	Nosocomio "Dentale."
S. Maria Capua Vetere	Ospedali Riuniti S. Giuseppe e Melorio.
Sessa Aurunca	Ospedale "S. Rocco."
Sorrento	Ospedale "Lauro."
	Ospedale civile di S. Maria della Misericordia.
Teano	Ospedale "Ave Gratia Plena."
Torre Annunziata	Ospedale civile.
Torre del Greco	Ospedale "A. Maresca."
Vico Equense	Ospedali Riuniti "De Luca e Rossano."
Novara: Orta San Giulio	Ospedale S. Bernardino e Rocco.
Nuoro: Nuoro	Ospedale S. Francesco.
Palermo:	
Bagheria	Ospedale Sanatoriale.
Carini	Ospedale S. Spirito.
Castellammare Golfo	Ospedale "Vittorio Emanuele.
Cefalu	Ospedale civico "G. Giglio."
Monreale	Ospedale civico "Umberto I."
Montelepre	Ospedale "Di Bella."
Palazzo Adriano	Ospedale "Regina Margherita."
Palermo	Ospedale civico "Benefratelli."
	Ospedale per bambini.
	Ospedale sanatoriale "Bucheri e la Perla."
	Policlinico "Feliciuzza."
	Sanatorio popolare "Cervello."
	Sanatorio "Casa del Sole."
	Ospedale "S. Severino."
	Ospedale "Aiuto Materno."
	Ospizio marino ed Istituto per rachitici "E. Albanese."
Partinico	Ospedale degli Infermi Poveri.
Termini Imerese	Ospedale civico "SS. Trinita."
Parma:	
Busseto	Ospedale civile.
Colorno	Ospedale civile S. Mauro.
Fidenza	Ospedale civile.
Parma	Ospedale Maggiore
Perugia:	
Citta di Castello	Sanatorio "Casalsole."
Foligno	Ospedale civile "S. Giovanni Battista."
Perugia	Ospedale "XIV Settembre 1860."
Pesaro Urbino:	
Fano	Ospedale "S. Croce."
Fossombrone	Ospedale civile.
Pesaro	Ospedale civile "S. Salvatore."
Urbino	Ospedale civile "S. Maria della Misericordia."
Pescara:	
Citta S. Angelo	Ospedale civile "S. Giovanni Battista."
Penne	Ospedale S. Massimo.
Pescara	Nuovo Ospedale Civile.
	Ospedale sanatoriale.
Popoli	Ospedale "SS. Trinita."

Province and city	Hospital
Piacenza:	
Borgonovo Val Tidone	Ospedale civile.
Castel S. Giovanni	Do.
Fiorenzuole D'Arda	Do.
Piacenza	Do.
Pisa:	
Pisa	Spedali Riuniti "S. Chiara."
Pontedera	Ospedale "Felice Lotti."
S. Miniato	Spedali Riuniti.
Volterra	Ospedali Riuniti "S. Maria Maddalena."
Pistoia:	
Pescia	Ospedale dei SS. Cosimo e Damiano.
Pistoia	Spedali Riuniti.
S. Marcello Pistoiese	Ospedale "Pacini."
Tizzana	Ospedale "Casilli."
Potenza:	
Melfi	Infermeria S. Giovanni di Dio.
Potenza	Ospedale civile "S. Carlo."
Ragusa:	
Modica	Ospedale Maggiore.
Ragusa	Ospedale civile.
Scicli	Ospedale Ricovero "Busacca."
Vittoria	Ospedale civile.
Ravenna:	
Barnocavallo	Ospedale Infermi.
Brisighella	Ospedale S. Bernardo.
Cervia	Ospedale Infermi Poveri.
Faenza	Ospedale civile.
Lugo	Ospedale "Umberto I."
Ravenna	Ospedale "S. Maria delle Croci."
Reggio Calabria:	
Melito di Porto Salvo	Ospedale, Provinciale "G. Garibaldi."
Oppido Mamertina	Ospedale civile.
Palmi	Ospedale "Regina Margherita."
Reggio Calabria	Ospedale Riunito "G. Melacrino e F. Bianchi."
Taurianova	Ospedale civile "Principessa di Piemonte."
Reggio Emilia:	
Castelnuovo di Sotto	Ospedale della Beata Vergine della Misericordia.
Correggio	Ospedale civile "San Sebastiano."
Guastalla	Ospedale civile.
Montecchio Emilia	Ospedale civile "E. Franchini."
Reggio Emilia	Ospedale di "S. Maria Nuova."
Scandiano	Ospedale civile "C. Magati."
Rieti:	
Amatrice	Ospedale "F. Grifoni."
Magliano Sabina	Ospedale civile.
Rieti	Do.
	Ospedale degli Incurabili.
	Ospedale Psichiatrico.
Roma:	
Albano	Ospedale civico "S. Giuseppe."
Anzio	Ospedale civile.
Ariccia	Instituto Ortopedico.
Bracciano	Ospedale civile.
Campagnano	Ospedale del Gonfalone.
Carpineto Romano	Ospedale civile.
Civitavecchia	Do.
Frascati	Ospedale "S. Sebastiano Martire."
Genzano di Roma	Ospedale civile.
Marino	Ospedale civile "S.Giuseppe."
Monterotondo	Ospedale del SS. Gonfalone.
Nettuno	Ospedale civile.
Palestrina	Do.
Roma	Ospedale Fatebenefratelli.
	Ospedale "Virgilio."
	Ospedale "Corradini."
	Ospedale "S. Carlo."
	Sanatorio "C. Forlanini."
	Sanatorio "B. Ramazzini"
	Sanatorio "C. Battisti."
	Ospedale "Monteverde."
	Ospedale "S. Giovanni."
	Ospedale "S. Spirito."
	Instituto Ospedale Dermosifilopatico "S. Gallicano."
	Ospedale di Cinecitta.
	Ospedale Sfollati di Forte Aurelio.
	Ospedale Psichiatrico.
	Ospedale del "Banbin Gesu."
	Ospedale "S. Giacomo."
	Ospedale "Regina Elena."
	Ospedale dell'isolamento del Governatorato.
	Policlinico "Umberto I."
	Ambulatorio "Maria Gabriella."
	Clinica "S. Stefano Rotondo."
	Ospedale della Salute.
Roma—Continued	
Segni	Ospedale civile.
Subiaco	Ospedale civico "A. Angelucci."
Tivoli	Ospedale civile.
Valmontone	Do.
Velletri	Do.
Salerno:	
Cava dei Tirreni	Ospedale civile "S. Maria dell Olmo."
Nocera	Ospedale civico "Umberto I."
	Ospedale Psichiatrico.
Oliveto Citra	Ospedale civile.
Pagani	Ospedale civile "A. Tortora."
Polla	Ospedale civile.
Positano	Do.
Roccapiemonte	Do.
Salerno	Ospedali Riuniti "S. Giovanni di Dio 'e' Ruggi d'Aragona."
	Ospedale sanatoriale.
S. Arsenio	Ospedale civile "SS. Annunziata."
Sassari:	
Alghero	Ospedale civile.
Bonova	Ospedale sanatoriale.
	Ospedale della C. R. I.
La Maddalena	Ospedale "G. Garibaldi."
Ittiri	Ospedale di Carita "Alivesi."
Ozieri	Ospedale civile
Sassari	Ospedale civile "SS. Annunziata."
	Ospedale sanatoriale.
Tempio Pausania	Ospedale civile.
Thiesi	Infermeria
Siena:	
Chiusi	Ospedale civile.
Colle Val d'Elsa	Ospedale "S. Lorenzo."
Montalcino	Ospedale "S. Maria della Croce."
Montepulciano	Ospedale Infermi.
Pogeibonsi	Ospedale civile
Siena	Spedali Riuniti "S. Maria della Scala."
Sinalunga	Ospedale "S. Maria delle Nevi."
Torrita di Siena	Ospedale "Maestri."
Siracusa: Lentini	Ospedale civile.
Noto	Ospedale civile "Trigona."
Siracusa	Ospedale civile "Umberto I."
Teramo:	
Atri	Ospedale civile "S. Liberatore."
Giulianova	Ospedale civile Maria SS. dello Splendore.
Sant Omero	Ospedale civile.
Teramo	Ospedale civile "Vittorio Emanuele III."
	Ospedale sanatoriale "Alessandrini."
Terni: Orvieto	Ospedale "S. Maria della Stella."
Torino: Vigone	Ospedale "Oggero Bessone."
Trapani:	
Alcamo	Ospedale civico "S. Vito e S. Spirito."
Castelvetrano	Ospedale "Vittorio Emanuele II."
Erice	Ospedale civico "Arcangelo Raffaele."
Marsala	Ospedale "S. Biagio."
Mazara del Vallo	Ospedale civile.
Trapani	Ospedale "S. Antonio."
Viterbo:	
Acquapendente	Ospedale e Convalescenziario.
Bagnoregio	Ospedale "S. Antonio."
Capranica	Ospedale civile "S. Sebastiano."
Caprarola	Ospedale civile.
Cassino	Do.
Civita Castellana	Ospedale S. Giovanni Decollato.
Montefiascone	Ospedale dei Poveri.
Orte	Ospedale Uniti.
Soriano del Cimino	Ospedale "S. Giovanni di Dio."
Sutri	Ospedale civico.
Tarquinia	Ospedale civile.
Vallerano	Ospedale "Ricciardi."
Vetralla	Ospedale Consorziale.
Viterbo	Ospedale civile.

OBSTETRICAL CLINICS

Bari, Bologna, Cagliari, Catania, Ferrara, Firenze, Genova, Messina, Milano, Modena, Padova, Palermo, Pavia, Perugia, Pisa, Roma, Sassari, Siena, Torino.

PEDIATRIC UNIVERSITY CLINICS

Bari, Bologna, Cagliari, Cantania, Ferrara, Firenze, Genova, Messina, Milano, Modena, Napoli, Padova, Palermo, Parma, Pavia, Pisa, Perugia, Roma, Sassari, Siena, Torino.

PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS

Agrigento, Alcamo, Alessandria, Ancona, Aquila, Arezzo, Ascoli Piceno, Bari, Belluno, Bergamo, Brescia, Bologna, Catanzaro, Como, Cuneo, Ferrara, Firenze, Genova Gorizia, Lucca, Macerata, Mantova, Massa Marittima, Messina, Napoli, Novara, Padova, Palermo, Parma, Pavia, Pesaro, Perugia, Piacenza, Pisa, Reggio Calabria, Reggio Emilia, Rieti, Roma, Rovigo, Salerno, Siena, Siracusa, Sondrio, Teramo, Torino, Trapani, Treviso, Trieste, Udine, Varese, Venezia, Vercelli, Verona, Vicenza.

PSYCHIATRIC UNIVERSITY CLINICS

Bari, Bologa, Ferrara, Firenze, Genova, Messina, Milano, Napoli, Padova, Palermo, Parma, Perugia, Pisa, Siena, Torino.

Reduction of Customs Bureau Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday night last, for the first time in over 70 years, the world's greatest port of New York and its vast water front was open and unguarded as the result of the phoney economy program of the Republican National Committee. The following newspaper article by Sidney Fields, published in yesterday's New York Sunday Mirror, is an accurate glimpse into their sabotage of our Customs Bureau and their unwarranted discharge of our loyal and veteran port patrol officers:

ONLY HUMAN—LETTER TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

(By Sidney Fields)

DEAR SENATOR: You're about to fire Anthony Zinnanti from his job as a port patrol officer. So I'd like you to meet him. Matter of fact, you're going to fire 743 of the 843 port patrol officers in New York. Tony is a veteran and has four kids and his mother lives with him, too. Now chew on this, Senator: Of the 743 to be fired, 624 are vets, and over 300 of them have war disabilities.

In the picture (not printed) Tony is displaying just some of the contraband he and other port men grab in their 24-hour-a-day watch—all kinds of dope, guns, brass knuckles, knives, opium pipes, and diamonds and jewelry hidden in the heel of a shoe.

If you haven't counted up the score yet, Senator, here it is: The House sliced $3,500,000 from the funds to be given to the Customs Bureau. That cut is now before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations. Almost all of the 1,410 port and border patrol officers in the Customs Service have already been notified that they're canned as of April 25

Know what that means? Our Canadian border will be completely unprotected. There will be just an ineffective force on our Mexican border, and 23 American harbors will have practically no protection. Don't look now, Senator, but you're leaving all American doors wide open for smugglers, dope traffic, rivers of contraband, and a deluge of crime.

And irony of ironies. Among those to be fired is Lawrence F. Murray, the young vet

who recently seized that 459 ounces of pure heroin, worth over a million dollars.

But ask Tony Zinnanti about the day-to-day jobs he and his crowd do. They're a pretty hawk-eyed bunch, Senator. Nothing, but nothing, gets by them. They lift dope or a smuggled diamond from under a bandage on a man. They find stuff in adhesive tape under someone's arms, or even under their groin. They turn up jewelry in the waistband of someone's pants, a gun under a garter, or a harmless little bottle of perfume in a lady's handbag, which turns out to be a liquid narcotic.

And since we decided to stand up to Russia you can expect a lot of nasty subversive literature. Tony and the boys generally find that in notes on sheet music, in the middle of harmless records, and under fake book titles. You see, Senator, these boys have a seventh sense about all such things. They spot anything phoney where you and I couldn't if we looked twice. Sometimes it's the look in a man's eye, or how he walks. Often he'll be carrying his coat, and his sleeve will be tied up, and it will hold a load of stuff like ammunition, liquor, or watch movements. They always watch the chap who runs over to greet momma as she gets off the ship, and then he walks off with her fur coat.

Why, last year they made over 4,100 seizures and detentions. These past 3 months they grabbed 28 hauls of heroin, cocaine, opium, morphine, and marijuana. There's old Sam Schermer, 62, and in his 30 years of service Sam has nabbed over a million in jewelry that otherwise would have been smuggled in.

Figure it out yourself, Senator. That $3,500,000 slice means their upkeep is 2½ cents per person in America. Pretty cheap, isn't it, when you add up the millions they save us every year?

Only recently the boys hooked a man who had 18 ounces of pure cocaine hanging in a silk bag from his legs. He bought it for $100 in Valparaiso and was to get $200 for it. It was worth $800,000 in the dope market. Tony Zinnanti once grabbed a fellow with 56 vials of morphine plastered against his thighs and stomach. That all adds up to a lot of money, Senator.

All port patrol men in New York remember the woman who showed up at the piers every time a certain ship would come in. They investigated quietly, found her to be the owner of a respectable dress shop. But one day they took her in, and the matron found a little zipper on he corset. That led to a compartment holding 12 bricks of opium. It also let the narcotic boys smash a ring in Italy and America that they had been after for 8 years.

Listen, Senator: The other day a seaman walked off the boat openly holding 14 bottles of rare perfume. The port patrol officers seized him, searched his quarters, and found 10 more bottles. It was so blatant they asked him:

"How the devil did you ever expect to get away with this?"

"Well," the man answered, "I read that there weren't any more of you port patrol guys around."

While we are on this subject, permit me to also include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 26 last entitled "Who Gets Trimmed?":

WHO GETS TRIMMED?

It may be, as some Members of Congress have charged, that the publicity given Treasury plans for the firing of large numbers of internal revenue and customs agents was of the "inspired" variety. And it may be that some of the accounts have given what Representative DIRKSEN characterized as an "exaggerated" picture of the effects of the $80,000,000 budget slash which the House decreed for the Treasury.

Inspired or not, exaggerated or not, the fact remains that the cuts, insofar as they affect operations of these two revenue-protecting agencies, were made at the expense of two branches of the Government which for years have paid their own way. More than that, they have returned to the Treasury profits many times in excess of the initial investment. If it is true, as the Treasury maintains—and there is no reason to question the figures—that the eight-thousand-odd revenue agents slated for dismissal under the budget reduction produced more than half a billion dollars in additional taxes last year, the wisdom of "saving" the relatively small salary cost of this profitable enterprise is hard to comprehend.

Treasury estimates of personnel reductions in the Customs Service necessitated by the prospective fund decrease have been described as "misleading and unfounded" by Chairman CANFIELD of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which proposed the reduction. The Treasury will have an opportunity to justify its estimates later this week, when Senate hearings on the bill begin. The conflicting views of Treasury and House spokesmen on this important phase of the economy program should be thoroughly aired.

Certainly Congress should move slowly in effecting budget savings which, in the end, might administer more of a trimming to the taxpayers than to the current budget.

Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. Max Rheinstein, of the University of Chicago Law School, in regard to impressions which he formed as a member of our military government in Germany during the time when he served in that capacity.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the manuscript herewith submitted will exceed by about three-fourths of a page the two pages of the RECORD allowed under the rule without a statement of cost. I am informed that the cost will be approximately $195.25.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, friends, it is a pleasure for me to be among you tonight, and an honor to be your speaker. Of course, I am aware of the fact that your interest attaches not to me, but to the topic about which you think that I can tell you something. This topic is of importance indeed. What is happening today in Germany and concerning Germany will be a decisive factor in the struggle for world peace. With the work that is now being carried on by United States military government in Germany, I have been connected for the last 18 months. I have, of course, been occupying on the staff of military government a position of very limited scope. The organization is big and highly departmentalized and, except for a few men on the very top of the pyramid, the ordinary staff member has but a limited scope of activity and observation. However, I have been over there for a comparatively long time and almost from the very beginning of military government. I have kept my eyes open and I have had the advantage of not only speaking the language of the country, but also of knowing something about it. After all, I had been living there for quite a long time. This acquaintance with the country has also given me an opportunity for talks and personal contacts with a large number of Germans and I think I can say that I have come to know something about their opinions, attitudes, and reactions. Finally, the Legal Division of OMGUS, with which I have been connected, has been an unusually advantageous place for making observations, because lawyers, as you well know, have to have their fingers in every pie.

In contract to United States military government in Japan, our military government in Germany has not had a good press. High praise is being heaped upon General MacArthur's work in Japan, but of our work in Germany the American press has been highly critical.

Much of that criticism is, or, at least, was at some time justified; other criticism has not been well-founded and some of it has been outrightly unjust and moving in the wrong direction, sometimes with the unfortunate result of driving military government into incongruous actions. One of the major criticisms which I have to make myself is the oversensitiveness of military government to press compaigns at home; its overly great openness to the influence of loudmouthed and often ill-informed newspapermen, or, shall I say, the fear of adverse publicity at home, has done great harm, especially with respect to denazification, an issue in which only one group of public opinion, viz, a partisan group, has shown an interest, while the majority of the public has been looking on in bewilderment. About that issue, I shall have something to say in the course of this evening.

But, lest I be misunderstood, let me state it clearly that I believe that military government in Germany has done a good, nay even a very good, job under the most trying circumstances.

When we compare military government in Japan and in Germany we recognize immediately two important disadvantages for military government in Germany. In Japan the local government remained intact and could be used immediately as a well-established, smoothly functioning machinery for the enforcement of occupation policies. In Germany we were faced with administrative chaos. For reasons, the wisdom of which is debatable, not only the central but also the local governments were dissolved by the occupying powers and military government had to perform the twofold task of, first, running by itself the complicated administrative machinery of a country which had fallen into complete disruption, and then, later, that of reestablishing from scratch new German governmental agencies on the local, the county, and the state level. American efforts to reestablish German administration also on the federal level have failed, primarily because of French opposition.

This last statement already indicates the other great difficulty with which we are faced in Germany. In Japan General MacArthur's word is the law of the land, even in the small part of the country which is occupied by British troops. In Germany we have to share the occupation with three other powers, the interests of which are, to put it mildly, not always harmonious. Each power immediately established its own zone as an iron-tight compartment, prohibiting all interzonal trade and traffic that would not be expressly authorized by the respective zone commander, and such authorization is being given only reluctantly. Different policies are being pursued in different zones in almost every important respect, and each zone commander

has shown a tendency to establish his zone as a self-sufficient economic unit, with the result that they are all equally insufficient, because, after all, Germany has been an economic unit which is now cut into four, or better, five slices by the artificial and purely accidental zone boundaries.

To make things even more complicated, an undefined number of affairs is carried on centrally by the Allied Control Authority, especially the Control Council, a quadripartite body which can only act unanimously. A similar situation exists for the fifth zone, the city of Berlin, whose German administration is supervised by another quadripartite agency, the Allied Kommandatura.

Under these circumstances one can but wonder that United States military government has achieved as much as it has, especially when one furthermore considers the difficulty of finding suitable personnel that would not only have the moral qualities to withstand the temptations to which the foreign occupant of a subject enemy country is of necessity exposed, but who would also know at least something about the country which they are supposed to govern. Finally, military government in Germany has for a considerable time been hampered by the lack of clearly defined United States policy with respect to Germany. Only in recent months, such a policy seems to have been emerging. It has not been officially announced, but it seems to have taken shape and, although never formulated clearly, to have influenced the action of military government. This policy seems to view the German problem as an aspect of a much broader problem, a problem which we may call indeed the basic one of United States and world policy of the postwar time. This problem is that of finding a way which renders it possible for two such fundamentally different powers as the United States and the USSR peacefully to live together in one world. By this one problem every other problem of international relations is now being overshadowed. For reasons which it would be going too far to discuss tonight, it would be unrealistic to be afraid of any new aggression on the part of Germany alone. In a world dominated by the United States and the USSR a lone wolf Germany would not have a shadow of a chance, and the people who know that best are the Germans themselves. The only chances Germany would have in any future war would be as an ally of either the United States or USSR, since we are neither thinking of aggression nor even of disturbing the delicate balance of power which is now emerging between the two giants, we have no intention of wooing Germany as an ally. But we must also see to it that Germany neither becomes somebody else's ally nor that the German space becomes a battleground for competing interests. Faced with the alternative of a partition of Germany into an eastern and western half, or into a whole group of independent or semi-independent states on the one hand, and the preservation or, better, reestablishment of Germany as a unified country, the responsible makers of our foreign policy seem to have come to the conclusion that only the latter solution is more conducive to peace. Nothing would be more disturbing than a political void in central Europe. One Balkan has been enough. United States policy, as it has been formulated by ex-Secretary of State Byrnes, seems thus to be aiming at the reestablishment of a unified Germany, which, in order not to constitute a threat to the world, must be able to maintain for its population a decent standard of living and must also be demilitarized, completely neutral, and therefore thoroughly democratic. The new Germany is to constitute a larger Switzerland, which can fulfill its function in the world only if it becomes as democratic in spirit as Switzerland has been. This whole policy is thus based upon the assumption that Germany can be democratic. But after all, the majority of the population of Switzerland is as German as that of the Reich.

The lines on which United States military government has been working in recent months are in accordance with such a policy. In this respect we have to note first the efforts of the military governor to induce the control council to implement those provisions of the Potsdam declaration which provide for the establishment of central German agencies in the fields of economic administration and to remove the boundaries between the several zones of occupation. That the former efforts have not yet succeeded at all, and the latter to a very limited extent only, has not been due to any lack of vigor on the part of the United States element in the Allied control authority, but solely to the opposition encountered on the part of the French and, perhaps, also the Soviet. However, American initiative has brought about at least the economic unification of the zones of occupation of the United States and of the United Kingdom and the invitation to join in this unification is still being held open to the other two occupation powers. It has been consistently the United States which has maintained the principle that Germany ought to be preserved and, therefore, administered as a unit. What little constructive legislation has so far been adopted by the control council has overwhelmingly originated with American delegates, who have also consistently been striving for the maintenance of uniformity of legislation in all those branches of the law in which lack of uniformity would impede economic unity. For the same reasons, United States military government, when it began to reestablish German self-government, has refrained from creating any central German administration upon a zonal basis, the existence of which might later stand in the way of central government of the whole country. The basic units of the new self-government are three Laender (states), which have been organized in such a way that they can be fitted in at any moment with the structure of a new federal Germany. For those cases in which common or uniform action of the three Laender is required, a council of states (Laenderret) has been carefully designed so as not to stand in the way of a future reunification of all parts of the country.

The policy of democratizing Germany is being pursued vigorously, consistently, and in various ways. The influence of undemocratic elements is sought to be broken through the process of a radical denazification and demilitarization of the personnel of all branches of the public administration, of economic life, and of cultural activities. The methods by which this end is being pursued are subject to criticism, but whatever may have to be said against the methods does not affect the fact that the policy of denazification and demilitarization is being carried on firmly and energetically.

The positive aspects of democratization have found visible expression in the organization of all levels of self-government in the United States zone. Village and town, county and State governments have all been established in accordance with the principles of democracy. On all these levels government is now carried on by representatives of the people freely elected in truly democratic fashion. The constitutions of the three Laender of the zone have been deliberated in democratically elected conventions, have been submitted to the people in free plebiscites and embody in their contents the best institutions of democracy.

Under a long-range point of view, a program of educational reforms has been initiated, which is aiming at the education of the younger generation in the spirit of democracy. With the same end in view an extensive program of athletics, discussion groups, clubs, and other youth activities has been undertaken under American auspices, which is especially aiming at getting German youth acquainted with the ideas and practices of democracy. Quite recently there have also been made beginnings of semiofficial personal contacts between members of the staff of United States military government and individual Germans in discussion groups and at social events, to be carried on for the purpose of interpreting American democracy, of building bridges and of establishing that atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence in which alone institutions of democracy and international cooperation can grow.

In pursuance of the policy of economic rehabilitation, United States military government has embarked not only upon an extensive program of alleviating human suffering through large-scale food supplies, public-health work, stimulation of repair work, and reconstruction of housing, and help in the harvesting of crops, but also upon a program of revitalizing industry, preventing inflation, organizing exports, and removing internal barriers of trade caused by the zone boundaries and the dislocation of the system of transportation.

Considerable achievements have been made in all these respects, but yet we have to observe that with respect to economic rehabilitation the United States zone seems to be lagging behind the others and the German reactions to our efforts to establish political and social democracy have become more complex, as time has been going on; yes, we may even say that the willingness to accept the democratic way is decreasing rather than increasing. An evil saying is presently making the rounds in Germany: "Ever since the sun of democracy has been shining over us, we are getting browner and browner." (Brown, it is to be noted, was the color of the shirts of the storm troopers.) This saying may contain an exaggeration, but there exists a danger, into the causes of which we should closely inquire.

It is my own conviction that, at least in part, these dangerous developments are due to certain inconsistencies of our own policy. While by and large adhering to the policy which I have just tried to outline, certain parts of the organization and certain individuals are still pursuing, probably unconsciously, policies which, as for instance the fortunately defunct Morgenthau plan, are incompatible with that of reestablishing a democratic self-sustaining Germany. Quite a few members of the personnel have also not yet sufficiently grasped this very policy which, for various reasons, has never been explained to them. They are still thinking and acting, as so many people at home, too, under the influence of war-engendered passions, hatreds, and prejudices. Finally, in one important respect, viz, denazification, military government has been unfortunate in the choice of its methods. This latter circumstance is, in my opinion, responsible for more of the shortcomings than all other mistakes taken together. Of such other shortcomings there should be mentioned first the frequent disregard of the democratic principle of the rule of law by our Counter Intelligence Corps (CIC), which has often been acting in a high-handed, arbitrary manner, quite particularly due to the unfortunate personality traits of quite a few of its members, many of whom seem to have been selected solely because of their ability to speak and understand German. What is even more serious is the frequent practice of CIC as well as of certain other agencies of military government to proceed against German individuals and to subject them to serious detriments without even telling them what charges there are against them. Add to that arbitrary arrest by the military police and

the constabulary and the application of third-degree methods. Understandably, people are wondering whether a denial of the possibility of defense is democracy and occasionally one can hear the prayer: "O Herr, schicke uns das fünfte Reich! Das vierte ist dem dritten gleich." (O Lord, send us the fifth Reich! The fourth is just like the third.)

The Legal Division of OMGUS has consistently fought against such methods, but coordination among the various United States agencies is not always close enough to guarantee a complete abandonment of such abuses. Remarkable successes have been achieved, but the rule of law is still not completely recognized as the general standard for dealings of military government with the German population.

Another matter which has created much unnecessary resentment is the billeting practice of the occupation troops. Contrary to the practice of former wars and to that even presently observed by the Soviets and the French, American personnel is never billeted in one house together with Germans. Wherever a house is needed or wanted by American personnel, all German occupants are removed, even if only a fraction of the space is being used by the new occupant or occupants. This policy is a remnant of the old policy of nonfraternization, which was motivated by the fear that American personnel might be infected by the Nazi poison; a result of the prejudice that all Germans are Nazis. If this danger were real, it would find an ample source in the numerous other contacts which now exist between Americans and Germans. Let us only think of the general use of German personnel in American offices and households—not to speak at all of the Fraulein. When a German home is requisitioned, the owner has to leave behind his furniture, linen, kitchenware, and so forth, frequently to see such articles end up in the United States as "liberated" goods, at least in the early months of the occupation, when inventories were sloppily taken and only irregularly checked. Furthermore, the requisitions have often been carried out with unnecessary ruthlessness, the occupants being ordered to leave within an hour or two, irrespective of whether or not they have any other shelter. In general, the people do not grudge the Americans their good living quarters; they understand that men who had to come involuntarily from across the ocean are entitled to decent living quarters. They also understand that ruthlessness has often been inevitable under combat conditions. But what they do not understand is ruthlessness under settled conditions, the waste of living space in places which are frightfully overcrowded through war time destruction and the influx of civilians or German expellees from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and other countries, and quite particularly the constant shifts of billets with constantly repeated new requisitions. "Whenever 1,000 Amis have been sent home," they say not without injustice, "2,000 billets are being requisitioned." Time and over again military government has tried to stop such abuses, but until quite recently its chief, the Deputy Military Governor, has not had command powers over the tactical troops and frictions between military government and tactical troops have not been infrequent. The recent appointment of Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, the Deputy Military Governor, as Commanding General, United States Forces, European Theater, will probably improve the situation in this respect.

Another source of growing disrespect for American ways and institutions has been the lawlessness, misconduct, and corruption of a part of the American personnel. What has been reported in the press about drunkenness, assaults upon peaceful German people, black market activities, and immorality is, unfortunately true, although occasionally exaggerated. However, marked improvements have taken place in these respects, and one would be mistaken in believing that all Americans in Germany are corrupt. By nobody are such practices condemned more strongly than by the numerous conscientious and decent men one can find in military government as well as among the tactical troops. But, whenever such conduct occurs or is being condoned, its deleterious effects upon respect for democracy are obvious. Every individual case of misconduct or corruption is water upon the mills of the detractors of democracy.

That the most serious dangers for German democracy have arisen from the methods applied in our denazification program, has already been stated. This program suffers two defects: First, its net is spread too far, and second, the purpose of purging public life has been coupled with other purposes, especially punishment, property control, or rationing of housing space, purposes which are in many respects incompatible with each other.

In the first phase of the occupation, as soon as a town was occupied by the American troops, military government would close down all public offices, courts, schools, etc., and would not allow their reopening until there had been found a reliable staff of non-Nazis. This task would not have been very difficult: The real Nazi bigwigs had disappeared and of the remaining officials, judges, teachers, etc., the population knew quite well who was a Nazi and who not. Of course, the people who know their fellow citizens did not go by formal membership in the NSDAP, the SA, or HJ, but by acts, character, and reputation. They knew quite well that formal membership was an unreliable test, that there were plenty of people in the party who had joined up not because they were Nazis at heart, but because they either just wanted to jump on the band wagon, or had yielded to pressure, or perhaps because they had felt that the threatening disaster, if at all, could be prevented only by boring from within. On the other hand, the population knew that there were quite a few vicious Nazis and Nazi profiteers who had been too clever formally to join any organization. Had military government officers followed the advice of the German anti-Nazis and non-Nazis, denazification would have been an easy and quick operation. Instead, it has turned out to be a festering cancer and a problem the liquidation of which will take many years, and which is threatening more than anything else the success of our efforts to democratize Germany.

The trouble began when our military-government officers came into Germany armed with voluminous instructions on denazification which had been worked out months in advance at some office in Washington or at SHAEF, obviously by people who knew enough about Germany to see the outward facade, but not what was behind it. These instructions obviously were motivated by the idea that all Germans were Nazis and that you cannot trust any single one of them. We were neatly caught in our own war propaganda which, for reasons which are still obscure, obliterated the fact that the very first victim of the Nazis had been the German people themselves and that a clear distinction had to be made between non-Nazi Germans and Nazis. The lists our men brought with them were long catalogs of persons who were to be removed from important public office. Now, these people were listed not by names but by categories, categories of organizations and categories of offices. Whoever had been a member of the NSDAP or anyone of about 60 additional organizations, or whoever, even without belonging to any such organization, had held any one of the higher public offices listed, was to be removed mandatorily. With respect to certain other categories, removal was to be discretionary. Finally, there was a third group, constituting by and large a part of the mandatory-removal group, whose members were to be automatically arrested as security threats. The categories were of necessity established formalistically; one who had joined the NSDAP before May 1, 1937, was a mandatory-removal case, but if he had joined after that date, his removal was only discretionary. In the judiciary the distinctions singly depended on rank and on date of promotion or appointment. Everyone, for instance, who had received his first judicial appointment after a certain date fell within the automatic-arrest category. The results of this mechanical method were, sometimes, absurd. In Bavaria, for instance, it has been a long practice for a young candidate for the bench to enter the career service as a public prosecutor, to be appointed to the bench after several years of service in that capacity. Now, we had quite a few cases where the Nazis made a man from assistant district attorney into a judge just because he was not a Nazi; as a judge he would be employed in such a politically innocent job as that of recorder of deeds (a judicial office in Germany), registrar of corporations, or commissioner to administer oaths. Besides, a judicial salary in such a job would be smaller than an assistant district attorney's. Under the regulations, anti-Nazis who had been treated in this way had not only to be removed from office, but also sent to an internment camp. In one small city we had the case of a senior prosecutor, whom the Nazis had removed to there from a big city, with a corresponding loss in salary, because he was known to them as a Catholic opponent. Under the regulations we had to remove him from office. The man whom military government itself, after a most careful investigation, had appointed minister of justice of a state because of both his expert competence and his outstanding anti-Nazi record, was arrested by CIC a few hours after his appointment, simply because he had held, for a short time, a certain office which figured on the list of automatic arrests.

The situation was absurd and became even more so when, yielding to a press campaign at home, the scope of denazification was extended both to cover business as well as public office and in the latter field was no longer limited to important public office. A scrubwoman, who fell within any one of the mandatory removal categories, was fired just as well as the mayor of a city or a switchman in a freight yard. Among the Germans the story began to be told of the street cleaner who was being watched by an idler. "Well, Herr Hubert," says the idler, "I didn't know you were a street cleaner." "Oh, Herr Maier, I wasn't until last week. But I was a PG (party member) and so the Amis are making me clean the streets." "Why, that's funny," says the idler, "until last week I was the street cleaner and the Amis threw me out."

That joke illustrates another aspect of denazification: whoever lost his job was to be assigned to menial and distasteful labor, was threatened with being thrown out of his home and was subject to the blocking of his bank account and other property. Insofar as these measures were hitting real big Nazis, nobody had any quarrel. However, they were equally hitting innumerable little fellows, clear non-Nazis and even anti-Nazis, while, on the other hand, they left untouched many a fellow who should have been touched. By the end of 1945 it had already become obvious that the situation had gotten out of hand and that something

drastic had to be done. Almost a year since the surrender and after all the mischief had been done, there was done what should have been done at the very outset, viz, dumping the whole mess into the lap of the Germans. That, of course, was also to mean individualization of treatment: each man should be dealt with according to his own merits. However, we were not ready to abandon our elaborate formal categories, only from now on they were to constitute mere presumptions. Whoever falls within any one of the categories is presumed to be black, but he can go before a German board and have himself whitewashed. Until he is cleared he is out of office or business, out of his home, and of his property and of the franchise, but inside a labor gang and inside of a block of millions of people, who, by being made social outcasts, are driven into embitterment and opposition. In that situation he will remain until the Spruchkammer gets around to deal with his case, which time has been estimated at anywhere between a few months and 60 years. The cases are several millions and whenever the boards are trying to make a beginning they are told first to mete out punishment to the bad Nazis.

Meanwhile, the people who could, and eventually will, be cleared are left waiting. Their number goes into the millions, they are in that position because they happen to fall into those formal categories which have already been proved to be unworkable, and among them is Germany's best managerial talent. The unfortunate results are twofold: Economic rehabilitation is delayed and the millions of outcasts are being welded into a solid block of malcontents and desperadoes who are driven back to nazism or driven into it for the first time. It is thus no wonder that the economic reconstruction is retarded even beyond the measure conditioned by other circumstances, that public offices and schools are understaffed, with serious consequences for public administration and education, and that there is a real danger of a renaissance of nazism. If we had not been misguided by hatred, prejudice, and propaganda, if we had not fallen for Goebbel's vicious lie that 98 percent of the German people were Nazis, we might have a sound democracy in our zone already now. Under nazism the majority of people there had learned their lesson and were ready for sincere conversion. Our denazification methods are making martyrs of inconsequential little fellows, are hitting too many wrong people, bar the road toward conversion of the former Nazi who has learned his lesson, retard economic rehabilitation, thus prolonging semistarvation, i. e., the worst possible climate for democracy, and are driving into sterile hatred and resentful opposition millions of people who might otherwise have been sincere democrats.

The dangers of this situation have finally been recognized, and under the recent Christmas amnesty about 800,000 small people have been released from discrimination. To a considerable extent the situation has thus been ameliorated, but the number of people waiting for clearance is still too high, especially when one considers that the income limit of 3,500 reichsmarks excludes from the amnesty the skilled talent of the economy and the public administration. Yet the burden of the denazification boards has been considerably relieved, and the whole process will be expedited, provided the boards will no longer be compelled to give priority to the cases of the bad Nazis. These people, most of whom are under arrest, can wait. But further delays in those cases in which a clearance is to be expected would render acute a potentially dangerous situation and would thus threaten to render nugatory the excellent and constructive work that has been and is being done by our military government in Germany.

Appropriations for United States Conciliation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor of the New York Times, appearing in the issue of that newspaper of March 26, 1947, relating to the reduction of appropriations for the United States Conciliation Service. I should like to call attention to the eminent educators in the field of industrial relations who have signed this joint letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRONG CONCILIATION SERVICE—ADEQUATE FUNDS SEEN AS NECESSARY TO MAINTENANCE OF IMPROVED SERVICE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Times of March 22 reports that the House Appropriations Committee has recommended a substantial reduction in the appropriations for the United States Conciliation Service.

In the field of labor-management relations there are few points upon which unanimous agreement can be secured. One of these points is the importance of the voluntary processes of conciliation and mediation when initial negotiations fail to produce agreement. There is virtually universal agreement that existing conciliation facilities should be strengthened and improved.

The President's National Labor-Management Conference in November 1945 unanimously recommended: "Congress should immediately make available funds for improving and strengthening the [Conciliation] Service." Recently the Committee for Economic Development recommended that the Conciliation Service "be staffed by persons of high professional competence and given funds sufficient to permit it to deal effectively with the responsibilities assigned to it." Many witnesses before congressional committees have reiterated similar views.

During the last year much has been done to improve the impartiality and competency of the Conciliation Service. A labor-management committee now advises the director on all matters of policy, a group of special mediators has been established for service in major cases, a national panel of arbitrators, jointly approved by labor and management, has been formed, and the list will be published shortly; a training program within the Service, set up as a result of the unanimous recommendation of the labor-management conference, is making significant contributions toward a well-trained service currently abreast of developments in the field of industrial relations.

Adequate funds are of the utmost importance if a conciliation service, regardless of where it may be placed within the Government for administrative purposes, is to attract and retain individuals of the highest possible competence and assured impartiality. The cut proposed by the committee would make impossible the attainment of this goal.

We need to carry forward, rather than abandon, the improvements which have recently been made. The necessary cost of an able and impartial conciliation service is a small price to pay for the contribution such a service can make to industrial peace.

E. WIGHT BAKKE.
DOUGLASS V. BROWN.
J. DOUGLAS BROWN.
SUMNER H. SLICHTER.
GEORGE W. TAYLOR.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *March 24, 1947.*

The Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the first paragraph of the following editorial, which appears in this morning's Washington Times-Herald, very appropriately voices my thoughts on the desperate housing situation. I include this editorial under the permission granted by the House:

HOUSING BOGGED DOWN

We Americans have done a lot of talking about our housing shortage in the 19 months since VJ-day. But the actual figures indicate that we've done only about a third as much sawing of wood, glazing of windows, and laying of brick as we intended.

One of the latest reports on this discouraging situation has been given out by New York City's Mayor William O'Dwyer. He states that his city is in desperate need of 150,000 new dwelling units for 1947, and will be lucky if it gets 50,000. On top of this, approximately 600,000 New York houses and apartments are in such bad shape that they should be torn down and replaced.

Reports from the rest of the country tell about the same story. Our Nation's sick building industry was able to erect only 450,000 homes last year, as against the approximately 1,200,000 which President Truman had declared necessary, and thought possible. The prospects, according to the experts, don't look much better for 1947.

One veterans' group cracked, the other day, that out of the many housing promises we made to our returning soldiers, only one has been fulfilled to date. Our homeless vets were promised 48,000 automobile trailers in 1946, and they did get 53,000 of these coop-size shelters.

So what makes with us ingenious Americans who can fabricate automobiles, trailers and airplanes by the millions, but seem unable to build a house?

SENATE HAD AN ANSWER

Well, most of our Government experts, real estate men, building contractors and building trades labor spokesmen have agreed that housing is probably our country's toughest problem. We don't have an easy answer for it either. But we do feel that our House of Representatives lost a lot of precious time last year when it failed to approve the housing bill written by Senators WAGNER, Democrat, of New York, ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, and TAFT, Republican, of Ohio.

The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, a careful 150-page job, provided for the construction of 10,000,000 public and private housing units, at the rate of 1,000,000 per year. It specified carefully that this building was to be done with a maximum of Federal help, and a minimum of red tape. The whole program was geared to cost the taxpayers no more than $143,000,000 per annum, not a

gigantic sum in these days of nine-figure loans to minor foreign powers.

This W-E-T plan was first introduced in the Senate on August 1, 1945, was passed by the Senate in 1946, but died in the House, along with the Seventy-ninth Congress itself. It reappeared in the current Congress, with some minor modifications.

In the meantime a former public servant, ex-Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, has come up with a set of lively thoughts on the housing problem, which may be read in the current Look magazine. Arnold hasn't bothered to pull his punches in telling how American housing, up to now, has been sadly hamstrung by the antics of many of our builders, real-estate speculators, and construction labor unions.

Speculators, Arnold points out, have too often succeeded in skyrocketing the costs of housing sites. Building contractors have frequently monopolized their fields, and have extracted unreasonable profits.

SHORT-SIGHTED UNION TACTICS

Last, but not least, many of our building-trade unions, despite warnings from responsible labor leaders and the Government itself, have done little to reform their short-sighted ways. Such unions still fight trivial jurisdictional battles, the cost of which eventually goes on the bill of the helpless home builder. Too many of them deliberately keep building expensive by refusing to permit the use of such key items as electrical assemblies, plumbing units, and prefabricated wall sections. All of these could be assembled much more cheaply in efficient manufacturing plants using union labor.

Mr. Arnold seems to feel that selfish, expensive monopolies like these should be broken up before they wreck our housing prospects completely. We don't know of anybody who would disagree with him. We also don't know of anybody who doesn't agree that housing is our No. 1 domestic headache today, and who doesn't hope that our lawmakers will get around to doing their best about it soon.

Address at Annual Meeting of Agricultural Limestone Division of the Pennsylvania Stone Producers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at the annual meeting of the agricultural limestone division of the Pennsylvania Stone Producers' Association, March 24, 1947, at Harrisburg, Pa.:

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I am mighty happy to be here with you today and discuss the soil conservation program from the Washington angle.

I propose to be brutally frank and maybe some of you will say when I am finished that I was just plain brutal. I have listened to several addresses made here by men representing the Department of Agriculture, and to me their arguments have been illuminating, enlightening, and revealing. So far the program has been definitely one-sided.

I propose to forget for the time that I am a Member of Congress. I want to talk from the standpoint of the farmers, for that is what I really have been. I want to tell you that my interest in soil conservation began more than 40 years ago when I was reading the Breeders' Gazette in the days when Joe Wing was writing for that paper, and when he was going all over the world, down into the Argentine, over into England and Europe, crawling around on his knees in pastures trying to find out why certain grasses and legumes were growing or did not grow. Joe found that the application of lime and acid phosphate, in most cases, answered the purpose.

There was a time when I boosted, and I am stilly quite proud of the fact, that I have grown all of the legumes that Maul ever advertised in his seed catalog. I am one of the farmers who really loves the good earth. I want to see the farmer independent; I want our agricultural economy to be sound, and our agriculture to be strong.

Like every good farmer, I love to see the corn grow tall, glory in 40-bushel wheat, alfalfa and clover knee high, and blue-grass sod that never tramps through.

Following World War I, I started out to develop a 40-acre bluegrass pasture. The application of lime made that a pasture of which I was always proud, and from time to time, small applications of lime and acid phosphate made this a pasture that always carried more than an average number of livestock. It was seldom through those years when I had visitors at the farm that I did not proudly walk them over the pasture to show what I had accomplished. Now, I have been through pasture areas of the Middle West, old Viriginia and West Virginia, and on many occasions have pointed out to stockmen what limestone and acid phosphate would do for their sods only to have them reply, "That takes too much work."

I remember when we used lime years ago, how we went to the kiln with six-horse teams and carried the dusty, hot lime up planks onto the wagons in big wooden bushel measures. We hauled it over the newly plowed ground which had been marked off and dumped it in third-bushel piles. After a few days when the weather had slacked that lime we went out with shovels and spread it evenly over the land. At the end of the day a fellow was raw inside and outside from the dust and really wondered whether he would live through the night. More than once I felt like cursing the land that needed the lime. Today, that same field can be limed before breakfast with the mechanized equipment now available to farmers.

Soil conservation was not started by the New Deal. Our grandfathers practiced it, and when one drives through the country and sees these many farms that are contoured, sees fields rearranged to make long rounds, it does not always mean that that farmer is cooperating with the soil conservation program. It ofttimes means that he has purchased a tractor.

Many of the claims made by these men representing the Department of Agriculture are not altogether correct. For instance, we have just heard the gentleman tell how Congress "says, says, and says," but the fact is, Congress only appropriates the money and the bureaucrat somewhere along the line does the "saying" and the spending. I remember one time when the Department of Interior supplied one of our committees with photographs of evergreen trees in the Shelter Belt which they claimed had grown 15 feet in 3 years in that very dry soil. More trees in the Shelter Belt have blown out of the ground and drifted into barbed-wire fences than have ever grown 15 feet in 3 years.

Certain propagandists, as well as a few farm leaders who have sold out their organizations to the New Deal, are telling us the farmers want this program and that it pays the Government to finance it. Now, the fact is that no farmer ever asked for it. In fact, the administration had to apply a great deal of pressure to sell the program to the farmers. And if it is profitable for the Government to pay a farmer to contour his fields, apply lime and fertilizers in order to improve his farm, then it would be just as sensible to assume that the Government should pay the farmer to paint his buildings and keep them in good repair.

Now I want to discuss certain phases of the soil-conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture. I realize that the administration propagandists down in Washington have labored diligently to convince the farmers of America that without this program and the services of a swarm of bureaucrats connected with it that our farms would soon go to rack and ruin and the entire Nation would be doomed. Be that as it may, I believe that many of the farmers know better than to swallow all the glittering propaganda emanating from Washington, and I am sure that every person here knows that the taxpayers do not get something for nothing out of any Federal bureau.

Right here would be a good place for us to look into the matter of what the soil-conservation service costs the taxpayers and farmers of this country. I have consulted the volume entitled "The Budget for Fiscal Year 1948," which is as fat as any telephone directory you ever saw, to find out what the President estimated the program would cost for 1947 and what he is asking for in behalf of the Department of Agriculture to run this program for 1948. And this is what I find.

The estimated appropriation for soil conservation for 1947 is $42,887,000, quite a chunk of money, you will admit. But the President, who claims he is interested in economy, apparently isn't satisfied with such a sum of money to do the job for 1948. He is asking Congress for $48,276,000 for soil conservation for 1948—more than $5,000,000 more than this year. To carry on the program the President wants a personnel totaling 12,514 people, including 312 stationed in Washington and 12,202 in the field.

These many field offices, scattered throughout the length and breadth of the country, constitute pipe lines for New Deal propaganda. This is a political asset not overlooked by Washington.

Just how many other bureaus want money to overlap the operations of the Department of Agriculture, I do not know exactly because it is not always simple to ascertain functions of certain agencies from the descriptions given, but I have noticed that the Department of the Interior is asking for $3,000,000 for 1948 for soil and moisture conservation operations after having had $1,509,830 appropriated for this purpose for 1947.

Perhaps the most official statement on what the soil conservation is and does is that of the President himself in the budget message. "The basic purpose," he declares, "is to aid in bringing about physical adjustments in land use that will better human welfare, conserve the soil, establish a permanent and balanced agriculture, and reduce the hazards of floods and sedimentation. This purpose is served by the development of a well-rounded, coordinated program of soil and water conservation and land use involving the planning of individual farms, group facilities for the use and disposal of water as it affects the land, work with State-created soil-conservation districts, and the application of the best-known conservation practices and treatments on the different kinds of land in accordance with their needs and capabilities as shown by detailed land-classification surveys."

The President continues, "In cooperation with State agricultural experiment stations, Federal research agencies, and interested organizations and citizens, the Service conducts a practical research program designed to develop, refine, and improve soil and water conservation practices for use in its field operations. Approximately 7,000,000 acres of

submarginal land in 33 States, basically unsuitable for cultivation, are owned by the Government and managed by the Service. These lands are improved primarily for grazing and forestry and leased to farmers and ranchers for uses consistent with the conservation and restoration of the land resources."

Then the President explains why additional funds are needed for 1948. He says, "Additional funds are provided in 1948 for the operation of newly organized soil-conservation districts, offset by a reduction in the amount provided for the purchase of surplus war equipment for district operations. An increase of $1,700,000 is provided for the rehabilitation and repair of certain dams on the submarginal land projects in the interest of protecting life and property. Unexpended balances for the water-conservation and utilization program will provide for a continuation in 1948 of this activity at the current level without additional funds."

Let me make it clear that I am just as strong for soil conservation as I am against sin. The point I have my doubts about is whether our farmers in this district and State, and throughout the United States, have so little business sense, pride in their property and independent spirit that they prefer to help support a bureaucracy of over 12,000 pay rollers to tell them what to do and how to do it than practice soil conservation measures themselves and thereby eliminate most if not all of the nearly $50,000,000 expense estimated by the administration spenders.

No doubt there are some farmers who have been sold a bill of goods and would not be inclined to oppose the Government going as far as it liked in soil conservation work. But as far as I know, the soil conservation program was never sought by the farmers, and is not a program set up because they clamored for it. Somebody in Washington had the bright idea, no doubt, and the New Deal adopted it as another sop to the farmers in the hope of swinging some votes. The farmer knows that participants in this and other New Deal programs are put under obligation of one sort or another, and a blue print always goes with these welfare programs. In other words, the farmer has to comply with certain regulations.

Soil conservation fits into the general New Deal pattern and scheme based on curtailment of cultivated crops, and the principle that the less you produce the more you get paid. Don't think for a minute that the soil conservation program can be divorced from the over-all concepts of control and hand-outs of such false prophets of economics as Henry Wallace and other screwballs who have found refuge in the Department of Agriculture. While I appreciate the difficulties and problems faced by Secretary Anderson in taking over the Department, I do not for one minute believe that he has cleaned out all the left-wingers, misfits, and incompetents he inherited from his predecessors.

In fact, I can tell you that there are some dangerous characters running around loose in the Department of Agriculture advocating theories of government and economics contrary to our traditional American way and our Constitutional heritage.

Just the other day I got the benefit of the thinking of a veteran Government employee formerly connected with the soil conservation program. This employee of the Government spoke enthusiastically of the soil conservation program objectives, but freely admitted that the trouble was that the wrong kind of people in many instances were handling the program and the administration was not everything it should be.

Very frankly, this person declared that there were at least three bugs in the program as seen from close-range observation. City slickers, mere kids, and playgirls should never be sent out into the field to deal with farmers on such a program, was one admonition. A local man that the farmers knew and trusted, a man with standing in the community, who would demonstrate the value of good soil conservation practices and thus set an example for his neighbors, would be worth more than a whole bureau of patronage boys and ward-heelers just putting in their time, was the thought of this outspoken individual. Now I want to go one step further and suggest that this community or any other community does not need a lot of transients—sometimes referred to as parachutists from Washington because they seem to drop from the skies without warning—coming in and telling honest-to-goodness farmers how to take care of their soil. Some of these field men are actually an insult to the intelligence of our farmers. If they were put on a farm and obliged to make a living off the soil, I am convinced most of them would starve to death.

Another piece of advice to the Soil Conservation Service is, watch your engineers and don't put bridge engineers in charge of contour furrowing. I am reliably informed that this has been a source of trouble in the past.

The administration has a lot of programs like the Soil Conservation Service that look good on paper, but they don't always work out along the lines of the stated program and objectives. The ideological boys, do-gooders, welfare workers, internationalists and pinks that seem to load every New Deal pay roll, especially the good-paying jobs from seven or eight to ten thousand dollars a year, seldom worry about the real purposes of any given program, even if specified by an act of Congress. They just go merrily on their way, carrying out their own pet ideas, experimenting on the taxpayers like a lot of guinea pigs, and improvising from day to day.

Like the Soil Conservation Service, the Rural Electrification program is considered by New Dealers as beyond reproach and criticism from any quarter. And yet, I am reliably informed, the highly paid lawyers formerly with the Rural Electrification Authority when it was an independent agency, are now in the solicitor's department of the Department of Agriculture handling the REA legal work. A large number of these lawyers are radicals, and they are active in the left-wing union, the United Public Workers of America, headed by the Russian-born Abram Flaxer. Other lawyers temporarily assigned to REA work in the spring of 1946 have declared that they were solicited to join UPWA, which consistently follows the Communist line, and they also observed that some of the REA lawyers and their secretaries spent Government time in preparing documents, resolutions, and other papers for use at CIO meetings.

It is unfortunate that the Congress cannot keep its collective eyes on all Government employees to see that they are doing the job which they are supposed to do and for which they are well paid out of the hard-earned dollars of the taxpayers, but it just can't be done. But Members of Congress do not have to accept without examination all the propaganda put out by the bureaucrats, and neither do the farmers or any other taxpayers. When you pay for something you have a right to expect benefits, and if you prefer to practice soil conservation without interference from Washington, you certainly have a right to express yourself on the subject and to do something about it.

I have long ago decided that the way to cut taxes, reduce the budget, get industry and agriculture out of the strait-jacket where it is now, is to push the Federal Government back into Washington where it belongs and trim it down to button-hole size. This is my program.

Conciliation Service Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today when this House was considering the annual supply bill for the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency I pointed out with all the vigor at my command the fact that the majority of members of the Appropriations Committee were virtually wrecking the Conciliation Service by refusing to supply funds for the salaries of its able Director, Mr. Edgar L. Warren and 100 other capable employees. The majority of this House saw fit to defeat my amendment which would have restored the funds necessary to retain Mr. Warren and to keep the Conciliation Service at its present peak of efficiency. The following editorial contained in this morning's New York Times entitled "The Ax to Conciliation," entirely justifies my action in fighting to prevent the liquidation of this most important branch of our Government:

THE AX TO CONCILIATION

Among the several follies committed by the House of Representatives in the pursuit of economy, chopping down the Conciliation Service in the Labor Department is one that calls for correction when the Senate takes up that supply bill. Edgar L. Warren, Chief of the Conciliation Service, was the unhappy target of this ax-swinging. It seems that some 10 years ago Mr. Warren, who has been with the Government since 1933, was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy and the Washington Book Shop, a cooperative. These organizations were later described in some quarters as Communist fronts. Mr. Warren says that he has not been a member of either organization since 1939. In 1945 Mr. Warren said that "on a theoretical basis" he saw no reason why Government employees should not have the right to strike. We do not agree with this position at all. Mr. Warren, a few months after he took it, corrected his attitude by saying: "I should like to have the record clearly show that I am opposed to strikes of Government employees."

So it is plain that Mr. Warren, like most of us, has made some mistakes. The record does not show many. Since 1945 he has been Chief of the Conciliation Service, which attempts to settle disputes betwen labor and industry and, when they get that far, strikes. In trying, with considerable success, to improve and vitalize this agency he has apparently trod on the toes of some Members of Congress. He has brought in some "bright young men," we are told, and some of these—no matter how able they were at conciliation—perhaps have not had the preliminary initialing of political patrons. This, we submit, is in Mr. Warren's favor. But the main question, in congressional action, is not what happens to Mr. Warren himself but to the Conciliation Service. The cut made by the House would not only eliminate his position but also those of 100 other officials and employees. It is an action that would wreck the service which has played a part in averting recent utilities strikes, has reported in a single month its settlement of 304 strikes involving 318,000 workers, and in 3 days alone last fall effected settlements in 20 strikes, all of which had lasted 30 days or more.

We believe that such an agency as the Conciliation Service is a beneficial influence in avoiding and reducing the damaging effects of strikes, and that Mr. Warren has worked hard and earnestly to improve that Service under difficult circumstances. This view is confirmed in the tribute paid to Mr. Warren's leadership by representatives of both unions and industry. Mr. Warren is a "loyal and patriotic American," in the opinion of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee of the Conciliation Service, and has "conscientiously discharged the duties of his office."

Under the permission granted me I also include the following newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1947:

LABOR-INDUSTRY GROUP BACKS UP WARREN IN FACE OF HOUSE ATTACK

A group of businessmen and union officials today issued a statement defending the record of Edgar L. Warren, Director of the Labor Department Conciliation Service, who has been under fire in Congress.

The indorsement of Mr. Warren and of his work was made by the Labor-Management Advisory Committee of the Conciliation Service. The committee's seven members, representing both business and organized labor, said they had found Mr. Warren has "conscientiously discharged the duties of his office."

FUNDS FOR SALARY ELIMINATED

The House on Tuesday eliminated funds for the payment of salaries to Mr. Warren and about 100 of his top aides from the Labor Department's appropriation after the charge had been made that Mr. Warren at one time had belonged to two "Communist-front organizations." Mr. Warren said he had resigned from the groups in 1938 when he discovered their Communist tendencies.

The advisory committee statement said:

"Our committee has the responsibility for making recommendations to the Secretary of Labor or to the director of the Conciliation Service with respect to the policies, procedures, organization and development of adequate standards and qualifications for the personnel of the Service. We believe substantial progress has been made in the last 12 months and that Mr. Edgar Warren, as Director of the Service, has conscientiously discharged the duties of his office.

"LOYALTY TO UNITED STATES DEFENDED

"We have no doubt that the Service, under Mr. Warren's leadership, has sought to represent the public's interest in the peaceful settlement of labor disputes, and we are of the opinion that all who have been associated with Mr. Warren regard him as a loyal and patriotic American."

The statement was signed by Louis Ruthenburg, president of Servel, Inc.; Vincent P. Ahearn, and Clarence O. Skinner, former industry members of the War Labor Board; Frank P. Fenton and Boris Shishkin, of the AFL, and Clinton Golden and Alan Strachen, of the CIO.

New England Governors Support Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement made by the Governors of the six New England States in support of the purposes and policies set forth in President Truman's message to Congress on March 12, 1947.

MARCH 14, 1947.

We, the Governors of the six New England States, desire to express to the Members of the Senate and the House from New England our unanimous conviction that the peace and security of our country and of the world require support of the purposes and policies advocated by the President in his message to the Congress last Wednesday.

GOV. HORACE A. HILDRETH,
Maine, Chairman.
GOV. CHARLES M. DALE,
New Hampshire.
GOV. ERNEST W. GIBSON,
Vermont.
GOV. ROBERT F. BRADFORD,
Massachusetts.
GOV. JAMES L. MCCONAUGHY,
Connecticut.
GOV. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Rhode Island.

The Greek-Turkish Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement made today before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the President's Greek-Turkish proposal, by our former colleague, Hon. Hamilton Fish. His long service in the House and on our committee, his wide experience, and his unquestioned patriotism, will cause the House to weigh and consider carefully his views on this issue, and I therefore believe his general statement should be placed in the RECORD at this time. His further testimony in answer to questions will be available, of course, when the hearings are published.

SPEECH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE HAMILTON FISH BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1947, URGING THE DEMILITARIZATION OF THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE OF GLOBAL INTERVENTION

On March 12, 1947, President Truman proclaimed a new and momentous doctrine in our foreign relations. The pendulum of appeasement has swung. The years of Roosevelt appeasement, often craven appeasement, toward Soviet Russia have been reversed. Now the Nation is faced with a policy of global intervention and imperialism, starting with aid to Turkey and Greece. Communist totalitarianism and Stalin now replace Nazi totalitarianism and Hitler as consequence of World War II. Whether you favor or oppose the Truman doctrine, it is admittedly a dangerous departure from our traditional foreign policy and in effect sabotages the Monroe Doctrine.

We cannot eat our political cake and have it too. The doctrine of Monroe kept European empires from the young republics of South America for 124 years. The doctrine of Truman puts the American empire on the shores of the Mediterranean in a single day. By economic and military intervention in Europe and elsewhere we invite similar intervention in the American Hemisphere. If this policy of global imperialism is consummated, the doctrine of Monroe is dead.

Few will disagree with the goal of stopping communism throughout the world. Common sense would seem to dictate that first we stop it here at home. That means that every Communist, every fellow traveler, be cleared out of our own State Department—and out of every other agency of the Government—before we undertake to clear them out of Europe and Asia. The labor unions should also clean out the Communists among their officeholders and so should all loyal American organizations. The teaching of communism in our schools and colleges should be prohibited.

The Communist Party advocates the overthrow of our Government by force. By escape clauses and weasel words it denies this fact. I am not interested in escape clauses and weasel words in face of its advocacy of world revolution. There can be no compromise between Americanism and communism. By putting our own house in order we will eliminate most of our own industrial unrest.

Time, chaos and despair play directly into the hands of world communism. I am in favor of reasonable relief to such countries as Turkey and Greece to help alleviate the disastrous conditions there. Military intervention is another thing. It is both dangerous and un-American. Sooner or later, it will lead us into war. I am opposed to inciting or provoking war, or to initiating "preventive" wars.

While chaos and famine prevail, time is on the side of the Soviet. If relief will lessen these conditions abroad, time will be turned against the Soviet. This seems to me a more rational approach than a subtle declaration of global war. The new Truman doctrine is virtually a peacetime lend-lease. Even former Gov. Alfred Landon now states that, "We decided for war with Germany when lend-lease was passed." (Associated Press March 19, 1947.) If the Congress gives President Truman a blank check, he will have the power just as Franklin D. Roosevelt had of waging an undeclared war anywhere and at any time.

Century-old British imperialism will then be replaced by a streamlined American dollar imperialism backed by atom bombs.

As to food and contributing toward rehabilitation of devastated economy, we are on safe ground. We are not on safe ground in again following the road of money, munitions and men that led to World War II. The Americans know from said experience these steps toward war and don't want them repeated.

War with Soviet Russia over the control of the Mediterranean is not inevitable.

The Truman doctrine, followed to its logical fulfillment, means global imperialism in our time. It means intervention in France, Italy and China as it does in the Near East. Then, why not face realities? Why not ask Congress to declare war on the Soviet at once? I dislike hypocrisy almost as much as war and am adamantly opposed to both.

Actually there are more Communists right next door in Cuba than in Greece and Turkey combined. While the Truman strategy focuses our gaze on the middle east, the seeds of hatred against us are being sown throughout Latin America. Cuba is the center of the Communist network. Why not protect our own interests near home before we engage in international civil wars in Greece, Turkey, and Korea?

I see no reason why we should again go to war to safeguard British lines of communication through the Mediterranean. Nor do I see why we should go to war to safeguard British or American oil interests in the Near East. Such a program will cost billions of dollars and perhaps millions of lives. We must not assume military responsibilities nor enter into secret war commitments.

The Truman doctrine calls for bigger and better internationalism, interventionism, and imperialism.

If it is the real purpose of the Truman doctrine of dollar imperialism that we alone

without the cooperation of other nations are to finance and police the world, we had better get ready for another war. There will always be an America if we do not give it away.

I am emphatically opposed to our even attempting to police the world, singlehanded, against communism, totalitarianism, or armed aggression. That is the one sure road to war.

No one is more in favor than I of a firm stand against the aggressions of Soviet Russia. I even subscribe to the doctrine that communism delenda est. I do not believe, however, that the United States has the financial, economic, or military power to stop communism by dollar diplomacy encirclement. I doubt if the establishment of a cordon sanitaire by dollar imperialism can halt world communism short of war.

Our people are weary of wars. They do not want to be maneuvered into another. Most of our people are willing to risk lending money to democratic nations for relief and defensive armaments. They are not willing to approve a military program that will provoke World War III in Greece, Turkey, the Dardanelles, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Palestine, India, Korea, or China.

President Truman has no mandate from the people to force a global policy of unilateral military imperialism on them. The question has never been submitted to the people. Intervention is intervention no matter what you call it.

Do the American people want to take over the responsibilities, commitments, and liabilities of British imperialism—with none of its assets? Do the American people want to finance and police the world? Do they want to quarantine the world status quo with American blood and money? Before the Truman doctrine of dollar imperialism, limited in this bill (H. R. 2616) to Greece and Turkey, is made world-wide we must be sure that a majority of the American people understand just what it means. Are they ready to sacrifice American lives and resources and perhaps the Republic itself for world leadership, dollar diplomacy, and military intervention?

The destiny of the American Republic is at stake. The fateful decision must be made by the people themselves.

They must force this issue to mature and open debate. Then, if they decide for a global policy of intervention and imperialism at the risk of prolonged warfare, that is their right.

America's destiny is in their hands.

The American people have a right to know that this time, if we furnish the tools, will the Greeks and Turks finish the job without trying to drag us in. Because of my opposition to world communism, I am willing to risk granting funds for relief, rehabilitation, and arms in Greece and Turkey, provided the program is definitely divorced from military intervention. All the perfume-oil in Arabia will not sweeten this little hand of military intervention.

Inasmuch as the administration cannot guarantee the new doctrine of dollar imperialism as being short of war, I propose three simple amendments in order to demilitarize the bill:

First. Our military and naval missions shall be limited to 50 officers in Greece and Turkey.

Second. No military or naval personnel shall be used with active combat troops.

Third. Our military or naval personnel shall not supervise, except for training purposes, the military or naval operations of the armed forces of Greece or Turkey.

I also suggest an additional amendment: To prohibit the use of any of these loans to repay the British Government or British private bankers.

The Greek Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WWRL on March 30, 1947:

It is now exactly 18 days since the President made his momentous speech to a joint session of the Congress recommending that the United States come to the immediate rescue of Greece and Turkey with money and with technical personnel, civilian and military, in order to save them from totalitarian regimes. Since that historic date, this pronouncement has been the subject of consideration by free peoples everywhere. We may even safely assume that some people living under controlled regimes have been talking it over, too. It is fitting that this great decision should have been made in the cause of the Greek people, for Greece rose to such heroism in the defense of freedom along her own borders in the dark days of 1940 that she is truly a flaming symbol of all that we mean when we speak of the self-determination of peoples. The sufferings of Greece have been acute and her contribution to the victory great; she should be properly our first care in the days of recovery.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, I have heard much testimony in the last 18 days on the reasons why we should help Greece and Turkey. I have also heard some opposition. The decision to help Greece to reconstruct herself appears to me to be a natural one. The objections raised deal with how, by whom and when it shall be done.

It is argued that the Greek Government is not truly democratic or truly representative of the Greek people; that we should act in Greece only through the United Nations; and that we should confine ourselves solely to economic aid. It is said, too, that we are taking the road to war not peace. I see no adequate reason for this fear; I believe on the contrary that a forthright and truly United States policy designed to help Greece to help herself, allowing her full freedom to determine her own government and utilizing the United Nations agencies wherever possible, will be considered the road to peace, not war. We have a three-fold mission in the world: To bring higher standards of living to other peoples through lending them our technical skill and productive power; to protect other peoples in the maintenance of free institutions and individual liberty; and to relieve the hungry and oppressed wherever we find them. We are deeply committed to the development of the responsibilities and the authority of the United Nations and its affiliated international organizations throughout the world, and are convinced of the wisdom of seeking to perform our mission by international action. So long as we pursue these high objectives and work wherever possible within the United Nations, we shall be neither belligerent, which we have no intention of being, nor the harbingers of a new imperialism or a new colonialism. We shall, on the contrary, be promoting the dignity of the individual, the integrity of nations, and the progress of mankind toward international peace.

It is likely that in the days to come we shall be faced with the problems of reconstruction in countries other than Greece and Turkey and of helping other free peoples to retain their freedom. Constantly the same question will arise. Shall we use American men and money? Shall we utilize the United Nations and its agencies and what shall be our relationship to existing internal governments? I think, therefore, it may be useful to suggest a six-point program which could be made applicable to Greece now and to countries in a similar situation in the future: (1) Immediate shipment of relief items of food, medical, agricultural, and clothing supplies to be distributed under direct United States supervision—for Greece, this means passing now the $350,000,000 relief bill, which has been reported favorably by the House Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member; (2) The reform of the internal economic situation of any country receiving our aid and utilizing United States technical personnel in order to be sure that such country is doing everything possible to help itself; (3) Strong support for action by the Security Council of the United Nations to eliminate external pressure or infiltration in any country's internal affairs seeking to overthrow its government by force—in Greece this means strong support for the efforts of the Security Council to seal off Greece's northern border and to prevent future interference in Greece by Communist-dominated countries to the north; (4) Strong financial backing for plans of the agencies of the United Nations to reconstruct and rehabilitate the industry, agriculture, and transportation system of the country seeking our aid—in Greece this means putting into effect the plans of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization which calls for $100,000,000 to be spent for internal reconstruction; (5) Insistence that the International Bank do its job of lending money for reconstruction to its members—like Greece—at the same time that we aid directly with United States money; (6) Insistence that governments receiving our aid must be truly free and democratic, representative of the people and willing to stand the test of their support—in Greece this means acceptance by the Greek Government of the fact new free elections must come as soon as reasonably peaceful conditions within Greece can be attained. This requires a final offer to the guerrillas to put down their arms—before the Greek Army is equipped to the extent required to bring about internal order in Greece by force of arms—on these conditions and to take their place with the rest of the people of Greece in good faith in a program of national reconstruction under lawful and constitutional government.

We can begin to implement this six-point program immediately, tying in the United Nations and its agencies as soon as they are ready to assume responsibilities. In this way there is no danger that our mission will be stopped by a veto in the United Nations and yet the United Nations will be fully recognized as our main reliance for international peace.

If we could pick the time when crises come upon us, we should have waited with this crisis until the United Nations and its organizations were better prepared to handle it. But as fate has denied us this opportunity, we must first of all deal with the crisis and second make our measures as consistent as possible with our deep and permanent faith in joint international action, through the United Nations and its agencies. The people of the United States and the people of Greece pray together that we may be successful in this great endeavor.

Atomic Energy Control Should Be Free of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the work of American scientists in the development of atomic energy will mark the beginning of a new era in the history of the world. No one can envision with any degree of accuracy the beneficent advantages that may come to the human family by reason of this great work. On the other hand, all of us are horrified when we contemplate the terrible disaster that may follow the use of atomic energy in war. If we knew that atomic energy would be used only for useful purposes to benefit the human race, we would not be so vitally concerned as to whom or what agencies should have control of atomic energy and its possibilities. But since we know the terrible consequences that may follow the development of this great discovery, we should exercise every care as to whom or what agency is given control over it.

The American people are wondering why so much propaganda and agitation should be carried on to place Lilienthal in the position of Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It would seem to me that this position is of such great importance to the life and safety of the world that even the best-qualified man in the Nation would hesitate to seek the position and would accept it only with a feeling of greatest humility and with a feeling of his possible inability to fill the same as it should be done.

The whole country is agitated by the most subtle and selfish propaganda that has ever been used in an effort to put Lilienthal at the head of the Atomic Energy Commission. I think the people understand the situation now and that the public sentiment is overwhelmingly opposed to this important position being considered as a political matter. They are demanding that Congress and the Government take charge of this matter in a manner free from political or selfish interests of any kind.

I am in full accord with what I think the people are demanding and I have introduced a bill providing for the establishment of an Atomic Energy Control Board to consist of five members. The Secretary of State should be the Chairman of the Board and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy should be members of the Board. The other two members should be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The bill which I have introduced reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (Public Law 585, 79th Cong.) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Atomic Energy Control Board:

"(1) There is hereby established an Atomic Energy Control Board (herein called the Board), which shall be composed of the Secretary of State, who shall be Chairman of the Board, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and two additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In submitting the nomination of any appointive member to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and the qualifications of the nominee. Three members shall constitute a quorum of the Board.

"(2) The term of office of each appointive member of the Board shall be 3 years, except that (A) the terms of office of the appointive members first taking office after the date of enactment of this amendatory act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 2 years and one at the end of 3 years, after the date of enactment of this amendatory act; and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Any appointive member of the Board may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each appointive member shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. No appointive member of the Board shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Board.

"(3) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Board or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of its powers in any place. The Board shall hold such meetings, conduct such hearings, and receive such reports as may be necessary to enable it to carry out the provisions of this act.

"(4) There are hereby established within the Board—

"(A) a General Manager, who shall discharge such of the administrative and executive functions of the Board as the Board may direct. The General Manager shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Board may make recommendations to the President with respect to the appointment or removal of the General Manager.

"(B) a Division of Research, a Division of Production, a Division of Engineering, and a Division of Military Application. Each division shall be under the direction of a Director who shall be appointed by the Board, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 per annum. The Director of the Division of Military Application shall be a member of the armed forces. The Board shall require each such division to exercise such of the Board's powers under this act as the Board may determine, except that the authority granted under section 3 (a) of this act shall not be exercised by the Division of Research."

SEC. 2. The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (Public Law 585, 79th Cong.) is hereby amended by substituting for the word "Commission" wherever it occurs the word "Board."

It is my sincere hope that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to which the bill has been referred, will report this bill out immediately for consideration by the House of Representatives. I feel sure that if the House of Representatives can get a chance to vote on this bill that the membership of the House will feel it their duty to stop this selfish and subtle agitation in the country and will place the full and complete control of atomic energy in recognized governmental agencies.

The people have confidence in the patriotism and in the honor and integrity of these high officials who have been selected by the President to assist him in carrying on the executive activities of the Government. Our Secretaries of State have, of course, varied in mental equipment, but at no time in the history of the country have we doubted the patriotism of any of those who have served in this great capacity. Our War Department and our Navy Department have been tried on the fields of battle during the whole existence of our Republic, and no one has ever accused them of lacking in patriotism or in fidelity to our country and all of its traditions.

I think it is the duty of Congress to rescue this position from the plight into which propaganda and personal ambitions have placed it. This matter is of sufficient importance to be given special attention by the leadership of both political parties in the House. This legislation, if passed, would not hamper in any way the President, because it recognizes the heads of three of the most important Cabinet positions, all of whom have been appointed by the President. It also gives to the President the right to select the other two members of the Board.

I shall do what I can to encourage immediate consideration of this proposed legislation, and I hope that I may have the assistance of all of the Members, regardless of political affiliations. This is an important matter which concerns the lives and destinies of all Americans—yes; of all of the peoples of the world.

Appropriations for the Customs Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. W. J. Johnson, Commissioner of Customs:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS,
Washington, March 28, 1947.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Reference is made to your telephone request of March 26 for detailed facts as to why we shall have to separate border-patrol and port-patrol personnel if the action of the House of Representatives on our 1948 appropriation is approved.

The President recommended to Congress an appropriation of $36,000,000 for collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year 1948 and the House allowed $32,500,000. The amount allowed is apparently $3,150,000 in excess of the amount of $29,350,000, appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 in the regular customs appropriation.

The apparent increase is not actual, since it does not include funds for paying mandatory salary increases required by the Federal Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390) and certain other unanticipated expenses for

which a deficiency estimate in the amount of $850,000 is now pending before the House Appropriations Committee.

These two additional amounts will bring the funds actually required for operating the customs service during the fiscal year 1947 to $33,997,000, or $1,497,000 more than the $32,500,000 allowed by the House for the fiscal year 1948.

Because of insufficient personnel the current level of customs service to the public is below the reasonable standard the public has a right to expect. Even this substandard service can be maintained to the end of the present fiscal year only if no unusual lump-sum payments for annual leave to separated or furloughed employees are necessary and if the aforementioned funds are available, as follows:

Appropriation for collecting the revenue from customs, 1947	$29,350,000
Deficiency appropriation to meet the cost of pay increases required by Public Law 390 (H. Doc. 117)	3,797,000
Deficiency appropriation to meet unanticipated increases in operating costs (H. Doc. 59)	850,000
Total funds required for 1947	33,997,000

This is not all. It will be necessary to increase this amount by $729,110 to a total of $34,717,000 to provide for mandatory salary increases under the Mead-Ramspeck Act in order to maintain the present level of employment through the fiscal year 1948.

The financial position for the Bureau for the fiscal year 1948 without any change in the level of employment would therefore be:

Total funds required for the fiscal year 1947	$33,997,000
Increased salary expenses in fiscal year 1948 for present number of employees, due to Mead-Ramspeck promotions	729,110
Total required to maintain present level of employment during the fiscal year 1948	34,726,110
Amount allowed by House in H. R. 2436	32,500,000
Amount that must be absorbed	2,226,110

This deficit of $2,226,110 requires the dismissal of about 800 employees, since 93 percent of our appropriation is for personal services and the small balance is for such inelastic items as transportation of examination packages, supplies and materials, equipment, rents and utility services, communication services, and travel expenses.

The possibilities for meeting this situation have been thoroughly canvassed since the press first carried accounts of a congressional intention to reduce the President's budget estimates drastically. This long study satisfies me that the only activity that can be discontinued without a substantial revision of statutory law is that directed toward the prevention of smuggling. Other functions of the customs service create bottlenecks through which all carriers, goods, and travelers entering the country must pass. The treatment to be given these carriers, goods, and travelers is prescribed by law and the customs service must operate to permit their passage through customs control in accordance with law and within a reasonable time. We must maintain our records and accounts as required by law in connection with these movements and the collection of the revenue incident thereto.

It is clear to me that if the $3,500,000 cut stands the $2,226,110 calculated above must be met by the separation from our service of about 800 employees, practically all from the customs border patrol that operates against smuggling on the Mexican and Canadian boundaries and from the port patrols that operate against smuggling of narcotics, jewelry, watches, and other articles at seaports and against theft of merchandise from customs custody.

The remainder of the $3,500,000 cut reflects a disallowance of additional employees to cope with the recognized increase in customs activities. Its disallowance means that essential manpower must be supplied by abolishing positions for one activity in order to supply the additional employees absolutely required to collect the revenue from customs and maintain an orderly movement of carriers, goods, and passengers. This will mean a further depletion of the port patrol force and the separation of those present incumbents of port patrol officer positions who cannot meet the eligibility requirements for the positions which must be filled to avoid a break-down of the other activities of the customs service. This will require the reassignment or separation of about 600 port patrol officers.

If the House action is approved the redeployment of forces this will necessitate will permit the Bureau to furnish a minimum of reasonable service to regular business.

Very truly yours,

W. R. JOHNSON,
Commissioner of Customs.

Richard T. Leonard Pleads for Adequate Appropriations for NLRB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a letter from Mr. Richard T. Leonard, vice president of the International Union, United Automobile Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO, to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, pleading for adequate appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board, so that they may operate effectively:

MARCH 27, 1947.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: For some time I have been watching closely the efforts of the National Labor Relations Board to operate effectively with its wholly inadequate appropriation. I was shocked to read that the House, on Tuesday, March 18, 1947, reduced the NLRB's requested budget of $7,994,000 to $4,330,700. This cut, I am assured, will mean the laying off of another hundred employees of their already depleted staff.

I feel sure that Congress is anxious to prevent the reoccurrence of strikes in order to gain recognition. The NLRA was passed so that a more peaceful method might be used for deciding this fundamental point. The effectiveness of the act depends upon the ability of the NLRB to dispose of cases with the utmost dispatch. Today, because of insufficient appropriations and the resultant reduction in staff, the Board has 5,300 cases awaiting action. This has been exceeded only twice in the Board's history—namely, in September and October 1946. It is anticipated that March may establish a new high record of cases on file.

At the present moment, it takes an average of 6 months from the time a union petition for a simple representation case is filed until the Board hands down its final decision. In the case of an "unfair labor" charge, the average is 20 months. This is excluding the Federal court action which might be necessary to enforce the Board's order.

Very few union organizational situations can allow for a 6-month delay before an election is held. Without any recognition or bargaining right, it is next to impossible for a union to hold together. These delays, which are increasing because companies are refusing to consent to elections, are having a detrimental effect on the unions' efforts to organize new plants. Again it has become the favorite dodge of companies to provoke the union so that in order to keep their self-respect they are forced to file an "unfair labor" charge, thereby delaying the case still further. Strike action, therefore, becomes the only alternative for a union.

You will notice in this letter I have said nothing about the labor policy of the NLRB and neither do I intend to. My sole concern at the present moment is the administrative functions of the Board which are slowly but surely making it ineffectual because of its inability to handle cases promptly. This can be traced almost exclusively to an inadequate staff.

I know you, as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will take these matters into consideration when discussing the budget for the NLRB, and I can only hope that you will see fit to rectify the action which has already been taken in the House.

I am

Very truly yours,

RICHARD T. LEONARD,
Vice President, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO.

Period of Mourning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I have inserted in the RECORD the following editorial from the Washington Daily News, March 31, 1947, which sets forth the hazards of coal mining and emphasizes the importance, to the American people as well as the miners, of removing these hazards without delay. The miner should not be subjected to such unsafe working conditions.

PERIOD OF MOURNING

If it lasts only 6 days, the coal-mining stoppage ordered by John L. Lewis as a period of mourning for victims of the Centralia (Ill.) disaster will not seriously injure the national economy.

The soft-coal miners have been working steadily and well since December, when Government action ended a strike. Production has run higher than in the same

period a year earlier, and nearly a month's supply of coal is now above ground.

In any case the Government apparently can do nothing about this stoppage. Mr. Lewis, we think, acted within his technical legal rights under his union's contract with the Government. It is easy now to see that the contract should have put a limit on the length of the memorial periods it authorizes. This one might have been ordered to continue for a month or a year instead of a week.

It is easy, too, to suspect Mr. Lewis of seeking an excuse and seizing an opportunity to demonstrate his power in spite of the Government and the Supreme Court. But we see no useful purpose to be served by questioning his motives.

The fact is that 111 miners were killed by an explosion in a mine under Government operation, where there was clear Federal responsibility for safety-code enforcement and mine inspection. Mr. Lewis has attempted to fix the blame on Interior Secretary Krug. Getting the truth is an imperative duty of the Senate committee which has been named to investigate the Centralia tragedy.

But whatever the committee may find in this specific case, it unquestionably is true that the men who mine the country's coal need better protection than they ever have had. There is bitter truth in what Mr. Lewis says—that public sorrow for the victims of a mine disaster is brief and soon forgotten. And it is no sufficient answer to say that, over the years, there has been improvement in the safety of an occupation from which it probably never will be possible to remove all hazard.

In ordinary circumstances, with the mines in private operation, there is Federal inspection but no Federal power to enforce safety codes. State safety enforcement is good in some cases, in others deplorably poor. The long casualty lists which follow occasional major disasters do not begin to measure coal mining's annual toll of deaths and injuries. John L. Lewis is right in saying that—

"The American people must be aroused to the stark realities of the situation and the casualties of the coal industry. Coal is already saturated with the blood of too many brave men and drenched with the tears of too many surviving widows and orphans."

If this period of mourning for the men who died at Centralia serves that purpose—and it should—a few days' loss of coal production will be a small price for the country to pay.

Appropriations for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid letter I have received from Reuben B. Gryzmish, president of Allis & Fisher Co., of Boston, Mass., manufacturers of the J. A. Cigar. There are countless substantial and large taxpayers throughout the country who feel the same way Mr. Gryzmish does.

MARCH 9, 1947.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: I am prompted to write this letter by some of the speeches made in Congress about which I have read and heard. I am writing this as neither a Democrat nor a Republican.

I am definitely in favor of eliminating every bit of waste and inefficiency in Government spending, but at the same time, nothing should be spared to keep our military and naval services up to maximum efficiency. We have a duty to perform to the people of the United States to protect them from the inroads of communism; this can only be done by a strong military establishment.

If we go back to the isolationism now being preached in Congress, we will not only regret it, but our descendants will, also. Have we not paid dearly enough for our previous isolationist tendencies, not only in money, but, more important, in our children's lives?

Whether we like it or not, we must give Greece, at the very least, financial assistance. We fully realize that a democratic Greece will be a bloc to unhampered Communist control of the Balkans, the Near East, and, eventually, all the Orient. A country like ours, with a national income of more than $160,000,000,000 and a total wealth of untold thousands of billions of dollars, must regard the expenditure of an extra two or three billions for national defense as cheap insurance for the preservation of democracy, not only in this hemisphere, but also in the western part of Europe and the Orient.

As a large income taxpayer (my taxes amount to many thousands each year) I consider it far more important to keep our military forces in a state of efficiency to meet any emergency, rather than to reduce taxes, until the conditions of the world become more settled and the spread of communism is halted.

Never again should it be said, "Too little and too late."

Very truly yours,

REUBEN B. GRYZMISH.

Address at Opening Ceremony, Veterans' Hospital, Bedford, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Deputy Administrator C. H. Nance at the official opening ceremony, Veterans' Administration Bedford Hospital, Addition for Women Patients, Bedford, Mass., on March 28, 1947, and also an address by Dr. Burrier, administrator of the hospital:

ADDRESS BY DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR C. H. NANCE AT THE OFFICIAL OPENING CEREMONY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BEDFORD HOSPITAL ADDITION FOR WOMEN PATIENTS, BEDFORD, MASS., MARCH 29, 1947

Dr. Burrier, Dr. Adams, Archbishop Cushing, Congresswoman Rogers, invited guests, veterans of Bedford Hospital, ladies and gentlemen, today we have come here to open officially our new building for women patients.

The Bedford Veterans' Administration Hospital now enjoys the distinction of being one of the first to have such construction for the special purpose of caring for our women veterans.

Dr. Adams has already referred to the active part played by Congresswoman ROGERS in making these plans possible of fulfillment. I add my own appreciation of her efforts. By observation so far, I may say, I am convinced now that we have Building 70, her watchful interest will always assure its proper use.

While I find it a source of great satisfaction to take part in this ceremony, to witness the completion of this project, to realize that at long last we can begin to minister adequately to the special needs and comforts of our disabled women veterans, I must confess that I do not stand here today in pride of accomplishment.

Rather, it is with a feeling of deepest reverence for the woman veteran, who in World War II, particularly as war became more "total," stepped from her hereditary role of homemaker to endure discomforts, to brave dangers, to witness death and destruction, to fight almost shoulder to shoulder with her menfolk.

We must remember that war takes its toll not only among men. World War II shattered the health of many women who served in the WAC's, the WAVES, the SPARS, and the Marine Corps. And, in particular, those who served as war nurses and medical specialists in the Army, Navy, and Air Corps were often taxed to their utmost ounce of strength.

We do not like to think about it, but not a few women made the supreme sacrifice. They died on the beach heads, in the dressing stations close behind the line, in the ships that went down at sea. They also suffered wounds or fell ill to disease, just as did the men, and they, too, suffered the mental scars—the wounds which do not show.

The figures already cited by Dr. Adams indicate, in some degree, the repercussions of conflict. Coldly factual too, is the record that 180 Army and Navy nurses died in active service.

But statistics can go only so far.

The contribution the woman veteran made cannot be measured in terms of the mere numbers who served.

The extent of her patriotism cannot be gaged alone by the number of graves or the numbers disabled in hospital beds.

The woman who took part in the last war was a true fellow soldier. Whether she drove a staff car in Washington, plowed through the snow and mud of the Apennine winter, tended the sick in Africa, or snapped to a smart salute in Australia, she demanded no special privileges because of her sex.

She did her job with a good will and a stout heart. Her very presence in the field brought a prayer of thanksgiving to the lips of men tortured by wounds, by fatigue, by homesickness.

What a lift there was when, now and then, the clear American voice of a WAC operator at Army headquarters or some base installation reached far forward over the Signal Corps telephone net. How much easier became the fight when once the sick and wounded gained the protective zone of care of the trousered, but still feminine, nurse in the evacuation hospital.

Since the earliest days of our country the Veterans' Administration and the organizations preceding it have paid pensions to women who served it in wartime.

In the Revolutionary War, at the Battle of Monmouth, Molly Pitcher, carrying a pail of water to the battlefield, manned her husband's cannon when he was struck down and performed her husband's duties with great skill and determination. The soldiers named her Major Molly, and a grateful Congress voted her a sergeant's warrant with half pay through life.

Some women who were staff officers during World War II might find a counterpart in Anna Carroll, of Maryland, who displayed unusual military sagacity in serving President Lincoln in the Civil War.

In that same war, women were employed under contract to nurse the sick and

wounded. Contract nurses also went to Cuba and the Philippines during the Spanish-American War. In the First World War there were 35,000 women enrolled, many of whom served overseas both in England and in France.

And, of course, to overlook no one, we must pay grateful homage to the women in all of our country's wars who, out of uniform, served in the home, the factory, and the field.

I said a moment ago that the woman veteran had demanded no special privileges because of her sex. In the field of hospitalization for women, the distinctions being made in Government hospitals are only those which normally exist in private institutions. This distinction has necessitated separate provision for their own comfort, convenience, privacy, and recreation, and in order that hospital services provided for the much larger group of men may not be disturbed.

But generally women veterans still are treated the same as men, and thus the spirit of parity of the fighting days is maintained. I am sure she would have it so.

It is perhaps fitting to recall the saying that a man cannot be thought of as every being truly alone. Always there is beside him, either in reality or in spirit, some woman dear to him.

That woman may be the mother who gave him breath, who taught him his first steps, who sheltered his earliest years.

That woman may be the childhood sweetheart who walked with him to school, who encouraged him when he was despondent, who believed in him.

That woman may be his wife who bore his children, who cooked his meals, who mended his clothes.

But always that woman is there. Without her companionship and help and devotion, few men could stand alone.

All of these things are why this ceremony this afternoon has more than a passing significance. It transcends any physical evidence of brick and stone and mortar in the new building; it even goes beyond the justified presumption that our medical service, the best in the world, will play its full part in care and rehabilitation.

It is a tribute and a memorial, too, to the American woman veteran of all wars, the woman who truly has earned the title of "partner."

SPEECH BY DR. BURRIER, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT BEDFORD, MASS., MARCH 29, 1947

Friends of the veteran, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen of the personnel, we welcome you most cordially to this formal opening of the women's building of our hospital, which, by reason of its expanded services to veterans, is one of the largest in the New England area. It has the further distinction of being the only Veterans' Administration hospital where a building has been especially built for the care of women veterans who have played their part in establishing the military triumphs of our great Nation.

We have Congresswoman ROGERS to thank for her untiring efforts in order that this building might be erected. It was no easy matter to convince the Congress of the need of appropriating nearly $500,000 for these special facilities, and today we take great pride in showing you this monument to her efforts. Credit should also be given to those responsible for the planning of this complete modern hospital unit. The building was begun in February 1945. After encountering many delays due to wartime shortages, it was finished in December 1946.

The need for increased facilities for women veterans is recognized by the Veterans' Administration with the allocation of 2 percent of the number of beds in the new construction. For all hospitals principally for neuropsychiatric care, the proportion is to be 5 percent. This percentage is anticipated because of the relatively inadequate neuropsychiatric screening of women in the armed forces during World War II. Therefore, we may anticipate caring for increasing numbers of women veterans as time goes on. There are at present 20 Veterans' Administration hospitals which admit women patients in the whole United States. During 1946, 4,592 women veterans out of the 370,000 veterans of World War II received care through the Veterans' Administration. Nine hundred and forty-one of these are receiving neuropsychiatric care.

Our new building is a three-story, brick-and-cement, fireproof structure with a capacity of 89 patients. To date we have admitted 31 patients, and it is our plan to accept patients to the fullest extent as soon as personnel are available. Food is prepared in the main kitchen and transported in heated food trucks three times daily.

From the treatment viewpoint, we are fully equipped in the building itself, with the exception of major operating facilities, to render all the neuropsychiatric care in keeping with the most modern concepts and methods approved by the Veterans' Administration for the rehabilitation of patients. There is available psychiatric treatment which includes narcosynthesis, electro- and insulin-shock therapy and prefrontal lobotomy in selected cases when such treatment seems indicated. All the services in the main hospital are represented; namely, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, special services, inclusive of recreation and entertainment, library, dental, chaplaincy, and social services.

I would like especially to invite your attention to the hydrotherapy department where the latest type of equipment may be seen; also to the occupational and recreation departments. In this connection I suggest that the guests also visit the beauty parlor where a trained beautician is on duty. This department has been a popular and busy place this past week, and I know you will agree with me that it has a distinctive and an important place in therapy. Shortly after this department was set up, cosmetics arranged, and all accoutrements in place, an S O S was sent out from the beauty department indicating that one of its essentials was missing. Investigation revealed that the shampoo soaps had been omitted, which was indeed serious. Fortunately, through the combined efforts of our organization, a gallon of this very valuable solution was obtained and the wheels of operation set in motion. It is considered that this therapy is most important by experts in the care of the nervous.

At this point I think I may speak for the staff at Bedford. Through the years we have been proud of the task assigned us in caring for the thousands of male veterans—those who needed the refuge of an institution, with relief from the stress and strain of civil life. In like vein, we are glad to now offer this same service to the women of our wars who need the same care. We rejoice in the Administration's ideal, which is to furnish the finest medical care known to science. We are happy to contribute our part to the national service in extending such care to those who need the kind of treatment our hospital provides.

With gratitude toward those who have labored before us, and with good will toward all who labor with us to make this an outstanding hospital, we welcome you not as guests alone but as fellow citizens and fellow workers whose support inspires us with the impetus to forge ahead in this worthy cause. Since this hospital belongs to the Nation, it was built to serve those who have served the Nation. It holds a sacred place in the hearts of all the people of our country; therefore, we welcome you as worthy representatives of this Commonwealth.

America's Share in the Total Out-of-Country Purchases of All of the Principal Trading Nations of the World Grows Smaller Under the So-Called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program. Instead of Expanding It, Our Foreign Trade Is Now Threatened With Extinction

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I have been so many times assured by earnest advocates of the so-called reciprocal trade agreement program that our trade opportunities in the markets of the world were constantly improving under its beneficent influence, that it occurred to me that it might be well to make a study of various more important foreign markets to ascertain just how America has fared in each of them, first, under the bumper-protective tariff years of 1926 to 1929, inclusive, second, under the depression years from 1930 to 1934, inclusive, and third, under the trade-agreement years from 1935 to 1938, inclusive.

According to figures which I have obtained from League of Nations sources, it is revealed that in nearly all of the countries of the world, our share in those markets has dwindled, the lowest figure usually appearing during the years that reciprocal trading has been the order of the day. Can we infer from this that the Trade Agreements Act has served us well? Well, let the figures speak for themselves.

Unanimous consent of the membership having been granted, I hand the results of these studies to the Public Printer to be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the tabulations to which I have just referred are the following:

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States

[Value of figures in thousand dollars—old gold, 1926 to 1932, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
UNITED KINGDOM				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	6,030,825	100	1,112,095	18.4
1927	5,929,057	100	974,508	16.4
1928	5,818,380	100	917,080	15.7
1929	5,944,873	100	952,083	16.0
Average				16.6
The depression years:				
1930	5,080,506	100	748,131	14.7
1931	3,901,130	100	472,689	12.1
1932	2,455,254	100	293,772	11.9
1933	3,784,324	100	425,716	11.2
1934	3,685,815	100	413,001	11.2
Average				12.2

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figures in thousand dollars—old gold, 1926 to 1932, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
UNITED KINGDOM—continued				
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	3,705,962	100	429,015	11.5
1936	4,219,976	100	463,785	10.9
1937	5,081,564	100	561,137	11.1
1938	4,495,847	100	576,854	12.8
Average				11.5
ITALY				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	1,006,688	100	218,141	21.6
1927	1,051,340	100	204,237	19.4
1928	1,153,015	100	211,198	18.3
1929	1,120,881	100	187,259	16.7
Average				19
The depression years:				
1930	912,432	100	133,497	14.6
1931	606,603	100	69,137	11.3
1932	424,126	100	56,850	13.4
1933	655,136	100	98,267	14.9
1934	657,146	100	82,092	12.4
Average				13.3
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	642,446	100	72,607	11.3
1936	440,361	100	65,270	14.8
1937	733,520	100	80,966	11.0
1938	593,021	100	70,405	11.8
Average				12.2
FRANCE				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	1,931,917	100	253,359	13.1
1927	2,077,444	100	266,853	12.8
1928	2,094,674	100	243,683	11.6
1929	2,284,757	100	281,371	12.3
Average				12.2
The depression years:				
1930	2,058,424	100	241,007	11.7
1931	1,654,469	100	148,979	9.0
1932	1,168,488	100	113,664	9.7
1933	1,885,715	100	194,666	10.3
1934	1,517,210	100	143,872	9.4
Average				10.0
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	1,384,554	100	118,032	8.5
1936	1,520,194	100	151,123	9.9
1937	1,701,782	100	161,914	9.5
1938	1,336,600	100	153,126	11.4
Average				9.8
CANADA				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	927,329	100	609,720	65.7
1927	1,030,893	100	687,023	66.6
1928	1,108,956	100	719,436	64.8
1929	1,265,679	100	868,012	68.5
Average				67.4
The depression years:				
1930	1,248,274	100	847,442	67.8
1931	906,613	100	584,407	64.4
1932	452,614	100	263,549	58.2
1933	401,214	100	217,291	54.1
1934	511,275	100	291,775	57.0
Average				60.3
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	544,730	100	308,309	56.6
1936	632,801	100	368,127	58.1
1937	808,058	100	490,000	60.6
1938	672,670	100	421,221	62.6
Average				59.4

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figures in thousand dollars—old gold, 1926 to 1932, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
NETHERLANDS				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	979,220	100	103,445	10.5
1927	1,022,346	100	107,673	10.5
1928	1,078,929	100	105,796	9.8
1929	1,106,424	100	109,409	9.8
Average				10.1
The depression years:				
1930	972,139	100	84,943	8.7
1931	760,879	100	59,547	7.8
1932	552,370	100	34,469	6.2
1933	822,156	100	52,849	6.4
1934	699,623	100	46,633	6.6
Average				7.1
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	634,783	100	43,883	6.9
1936	647,394	100	46,015	7.1
1937	859,265	100	75,652	8.7
1938	778,250	100	84,367	10.8
Average				8.3
BELGIUM				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	751,284	100	85,575	11.3
1927	808,286	100	88,971	11.0
1928	888,932	100	86,119	9.6
1929	990,341	100	94,702	9.5
Average				10.3
The depression years:				
1930	964,420	100	86,347	9.9
1931	666,385	100	58,447	8.7
1932	456,598	100	39,543	8.6
1933	716,988	100	67,208	9.3
1934	638,194	100	46,529	7.2
Average				10.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	630,532	100	47,756	7.5
1936	720,641	100	49,912	6.9
1937	927,752	100	79,916	8.6
1938	763,518	100	84,084	11.0
Average				8.5
DENMARK				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	424,959	100	68,923	16.2
1927	444,162	100	67,221	15.1
1928	465,234	100	60,860	13.0
1929	480,677	100	64,071	13.3
Average				14.4
The depression years:				
1930	463,409	100	52,059	11.2
1931	367,961	100	38,708	10.5
1932	214,829	100	16,479	7.6
1933	320,187	100	19,226	6.0
1934	304,697	100	18,509	6.0
Average				8.2
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	291,082	100	15,283	5.2
1936	329,736	100	17,532	5.3
1937	369,385	100	19,247	5.2
1938	354,728	100	27,920	7.8
Average				5.8
SWEDEN				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	398,673	100	53,354	13.3
1927	424,768	100	53,628	12.6
1928	457,732	100	67,474	14.7
1929	477,784	100	70,057	14.6
Average				13.8

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figures in thousand dollars—old gold, 1926 to 1932, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
SWEDEN—continued				
The depression years:				
1930	445,463	100	61,439	13.7
1931	363,448	100	44,977	12.3
1932	213,303	100	23,058	10.8
1933	320,141	100	32,953	10.2
1934	339,000	100	39,912	11.7
Average				11.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	373,080	100	47,729	12.7
1936	418,288	100	54,004	12.9
1937	541,205	100	74,932	13.8
1938	524,579	100	85,254	16.2
Average				13.9
SWITZERLAND				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	455,626	100	36,252	7.9
1927	482,490	100	42,429	8.7
1928	512,171	100	47,052	9.1
1929	515,785	100	46,173	8.9
Average				8.6
The depression years:				
1930	487,527	100	39,528	8.1
1931	427,458	100	31,370	7.3
1932	330,047	100	22,183	6.7
1933	506,458	100	29,483	5.8
1934	457,166	100	24,574	5.3
Average				6.6
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	408,336	100	22,592	5.5
1936	368,965	100	20,952	5.6
1937	412,227	100	28,944	7.0
1938	363,322	100	28,648	7.8
Average				6.4
ARGENTINA				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	757,931	100	186,886	24.6
1927	825,103	100	209,757	25.4
1928	807,256	100	187,439	23.2
1929	820,018	100	216,112	26.3
Average				29.7
The depression years:				
1930	618,217	100	136,204	22.0
1931	344,702	100	54,420	15.7
1932	215,084	100	28,968	13.4
1933	484,911	100	61,537	12.6
1934	502,360	100	44,782	14.8
Average				15.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	324,099	100	46,564	14.3
1936	388,197	100	56,512	14.5
1937	469,082	100	76,824	16.3
1938	430,374	100	75,960	17.6
Average				15.6
BRAZIL				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	390,682	100	114,626	29.3
1927	387,542	100	111,186	28.6
1928	442,290	100	117,511	26.5
1929	416,626	100	125,552	30.1
Average				28.6
The depression years:				
1930	251,011	100	60,638	24.1
1931	132,230	100	33,212	25.1
1932	108,131	100	32,532	30.0
1933	313,970	100	66,034	21.0
1934	207,738	100	49,045	23.6
Average				24.7

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figures in thousand dollars—old gold, 1926 to 1932, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
BRAZIL—continued				
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	224,796	100	52,328	23.2
1936	246,718	100	54,661	22.1
1937	330,554	100	76,410	23.1
1938	295,369	100	71,518	24.2
Average				23.1
GERMANY				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	2,380,336	100	381,828	16.0
1927	3,390,587	100	492,645	14.5
1928	3,340,700	100	483,452	14.4
1929	3,201,681	100	425,676	13.2
The depression years:				
1930	2,475,648	100	311,272	12.5
1931	1,602,390	100	188,520	11.7
1932	1,111,560	100	140,968	12.6
1933	1,694,199	100	194,573	11.4
1934	1,752,600	100	146,743	8.3
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	1,674,187	100	96,891	5.7
1936	1,699,707	100	93,581	5.5
1937	2,198,506	100	113,506	5.1
1938	2,430,602	100	182,562	7.5
JAPAN				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	1,120,271	100	320,504	28.6
1927	1,033,137	100	319,394	30.9
1928	1,019,310	100	290,311	28.4
1929	1,021,687	100	310,519	29.5
Average				29.3
The depression years:				
1930	763,595	100	218,739	28.6
1931	609,929	100	168,954	27.7
1932	402,384	100	143,325	35.6
1933	652,355	100	211,276	32.3
1934	678,282	100	228,663	33.7
Average				31.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	709,697	100	232,507	32.7
1936	802,076	100	246,062	30.6
1937	1,088,344	100	365,502	33.5
1938	757,775	100	260,667	34.3
Average				32.7

Cost of Postwar Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the "kitty" is growing. Already the United States has pledged $20,000,000,000 for postwar aid. Certainly, a huge sum is needed to get world economy back on the track, after the most devastating war in history. The assessed valuation of all private property of all the States west of the Mississippi, not including Texas and California, is about $20,000,000,000. Now we are asked to make the first down payment of $400,000,000 to build an American Maginot line on the Dardanelles. I say "first down payment" advisedly. If we are to stop Russia on the Black Sea it will cost us $400,000,000,000, not $400,000,000. In this connection, the New York Times, on Sunday, March 30, carried an interesting article under the headline "$20,000,000,000 Paid for Postwar Aid." I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY BILLIONS PAID FOR POSTWAR AID—THAT IS THE COST SO FAR OF OUR HELP TO OTHER NATIONS AND THE AMOUNT IS BOUND TO INCREASE

(By Bertram D. Hulen)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—The Truman doctrine of providing assistance for free nations that are in imminent danger of succumbing to Communist pressure has thrown into high relief our entire program of foreign assistance since the cessation of hostilities.

While precise figures are not yet available in exact amounts down to the last dollar, the round estimate is made that the total of such payments since the end of the war is approximately $20,000,000,000. This probably will not be found far off from the final official figure that is arrived at through the present study.

Admittedly, $20,000,000,000 is a sizable figure. It approaches the total of our debt as a result of our participation in World War I, even though it is only a fraction of the debt produced by World War II.

As matters stand, the budget for the fiscal year 1948 that will begin on July 1, 1947, calls for appropriations of nearly $3,500,000,000 for the several purposes covered in our foreign programs.

This figure, of course, does not include the requests made by President Truman for aid to Greece and Turkey. He has asked for $400,000,000 for them and in circumstances that do not necessarily mean that this will be all as the program of assistance proceeds.

ESTIMATE IS UNCERTAIN

The approximate estimates that are thus far available include not only actual expenditures but also commitments and funds that have been earmarked for specific purposes, all covering foreign financing, relief and rehabilitation, credit, supplies, and, in general, the many aspects of our far-flung activities.

Of the major items, the British loan amounts to $3,750,000,000. Our contributions to the International World Bank call for outlays of $3,175,000,000 and to the International Monetary Fund of $2,750,000,000.

We increased the capital of the Export-Import Bank after hostilities by $2,800,000,000 to $3,500,000,000, practically all of which has been expended or earmarked so that the bank is scraping the bottom of the barrel.

The cost to us of winding up lend-lease, of emptying the pipe line after hostilities, is placed at $1,200,000,000. But $700,000,000 should be added to this sum in the calculations because of an authorization to China after VJ-day in that amount as regular wartime lend-lease.

Surplus-property disposals are estimated to have cost us over $5,000,000,000. Goods valued after deterioration at $7,200,000,000 have brought a return of only $1,700,000,000. Yet, it is not considered fair to place this in the rank of outright contributions, since the sales represented a liquidation operation.

OCCUPATION COSTS

Similarly the costs of our armies of occupation are so involved in the set-up of the regular military establishments that it is difficult to arrive at a true figure in terms of net outlay. But our officials have not liked pouring $200,000,000 into Germany on this account and for relief every year.

Outlays for the Maritime Commission are placed at a net of $107,000,000 since the war. Expenditures in behalf of the Philippines involve $700,000,000 for war damages, rehabilitation, surplus materials, and budget purposes.

The budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1948 contemplated $730,000,000 in Export-Import Bank loans, $1,200,000,000 in further withdrawals by the British from their loan, $650,000,000 for costs of occupation, $555,000,000 for the UNRRA and relief purposes, $137,000,000 for rehabilitation and other purposes in the Philippines, $40,000,000 on an old RFC loan to the United Kingdom, and $12,000,000 for the lend-lease pipe line.

Now to these are to be added the costs on behalf of Greece, Turkey, Korea, and perhaps other countries.

Communist Activities in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Nashville Banner, published on Thursday, March 27, 1947. This is a very timely and well-written editorial concerning the activities of the Communists in the United States. As has heretofore been pointed out by our Secretary of Labor, the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, this editorial takes notice of the fact that all Communists and fifth columnists go by aliases. Either ashamed of their own names or afraid to let their correct names be known, because that would probably identify them as being un-American, they choose to steal real American names. This is true concerning the individuals as well as the Communist-front organizations. As stated in this editorial—and well stated—"communism is the living lie, the black is white, the end justifying the means, always holding in contempt the American institutions of truth and freedom which give it shelter."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SKUNK BY ANY NAME

America might have more respect for the Communist Party if its members and fronts had more respect for the truth. These progressives, who go about the country shouting their love for true democracy and their contempt for fascism, are afraid to give their right names.

The true American has great pride in identifying himself.

The House Un-American Activities Committee has suggested the worthy plan of preparing a master list of Communist-front organization names, but it would be an endless task. The various shades of pink nomenclature would change like the chameleon.

Communist names are long names, hypocritical and misleading. The longer the moniker the more commies can hide behind it. When they get too hot, the big words

can tumble like tenpins and reappear in a different arrangement.

That was the case with the Young Communist League. When the FBI got too close the quick-change artists got to work and the next day there appeared the mock-patriotic title of American Youth for Democracy, the latter now seeking to replace the disfavored American Youth Congress once sheltered by the White House in the Roosevelt ian era.

All fifth columnists go by aliases.

Witness the spectacle of the man who went before the Un-American Activities Committee Wednesday as Eugene Dennis, secretary of the Communist Party and top Red-policy maker, only he wasn't Eugene Dennis. He refused to say who he is.

Who is the Communist Party?

There you have the transparent heart and soul of communism. It is the living lie, the black is white, the end justifying the means, always holding in contempt the American institutions of truth and freedom which give it shelter.

End of Sugar Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Takes a Long-Shot Bet on Sugar," published in today's Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS TAKES A LONG-SHOT BET ON SUGAR

(By Peter Edson)

Congress has taken a terrible political gamble by voting to end all sugar price and rationing controls October 31.

Sugar experts believe it will develop like this:

Normally, October is the time when United States sugar stocks are at lowest levels. The home canning season is over. Ice-cream sales are down. The Christmas candy makers have acquired all their stocks and are processing them.

At this same time sugar supplies are flowing into the United States at the lowest rate. The last of the Cuban and West Indian crop, which is major source of supply, is harvested in June and comes to market in July and August. Only the Hawaiian crop, which is harvested all year round moves to the mainland in quantity during the late summer and early fall. The United States domestic cane and beet sugar crop isn't harvested till October, doesn't get to market till November.

HERE'S THE CATCH

The catch in this situation for consumers is that anyone in the sugar business, knowing that controls are coming off October 31, may start holding his supplies in September or August or even in July—hoping to make a killing at high prices in November and December.

Midwestern and California beet-sugar areas and Florida and Louisiana cane-sugar areas also stand a chance to make a killing. Their crops are harvested in the fall, their sugar hits the market in November. While this domestic sugar industry is planting heavily this spring, the size of the crop is limited by the capacity of the mills. It's about 2,000,000 tons for beet sugar, 500,000 tons for cane. Just enough for a nice fall clean-up.

It was political pressure from these cane and beet areas which was largely responsible for removing controls October 31. Republican Representatives JESSE WOLCOTT and FRED CRANFORD, of Michigan. Democratic Senators JOHN CVERTON and ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana. Republicans JOE MCCARTHY from Wisconsin, HUGH BUTLER and KENNETH WHERRY from Nebraska.

In debate on the floor, the whole issue was put on the high ground of getting more sugar for the housewife. Actually, the principal motive of the politicians seems to have been a desire to get rid of controls—even if they were good controls.

PEPSI WANTED OUT

In hearings before Senate and House Banking Committees which handled this legislation, practically everyone in the sugar business favored retaining the controls till next December 31 or March 31. There was one exception. That was the Pepsi-Cola Co., whose spokesman wanted controls taken off immediately. 'll the others agreed that decontrol now would bring only chaos.

Another argument which the congressional supporters of decontrol advanced was that there were larger sugar supplies in sight than was generally admitted. Early reports from Cuba indicate that the 1947 crop may be five and a half or six million tons, instead of the 5,000,000 tons originally estimated.

If these bumper crop predictions are fulfilled, the situation may be saved. If there should be a crop failure, the shortage would be worse than is now anticipated.

No responsible sugar expert will predict now how short the supply might be next fall, nor how high the price might go. But if there is a shortage, it is generally agreed that the industrial users will stand a far better chance to get what there is and that consumers will be left on the short end.

NO HOPE OUTSIDE

World production outside the United States and the West Indies offers little hope for additional supplies. European sugar-beet production may be better than last year but still not back to normal, which was never enough to take care of European needs. The Philippines will have little export sugar before 1948. Nobody knows what the situation is in Java, which produced no export sugar in 1945 or 1946.

Brazil, Peru, and the Argentine may have better yields than normal. There will be plenty of competition for these crops at high prices. Only the import controls of the extended war powers act can prevent American sugar dealers from bidding up the world price in frantic efforts to get sugar for next fall's boom market.

In general the sugar industry is afraid of high prices, even if it does mean big quick profits for one year. Too many sugar men remember what happened after World War I, when sugar went to 40 cents a pound. Next year they were all broke.

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from a very lively and alert weekly newspaper, the Lake County Banner, published in Tiptonville, Lake County, Tenn.

This editorial concerns the so-called hot-lunch program for schools; and it points out that, while there may be some debate as to the right of the Government to continue, on a permanent basis, to obligate the Federal Government for money for the things which have been subsidized during recent years, nevertheless there is little justification for discontinuance of Federal aid to the school-lunch program. The editorial well states that the benefits accruing to the Nation from this program justify its continuance. The editorial states that statistics on the subject show that children are less inclined to play truant or otherwise be absent from school when they know they will get a hot lunch in the middle of the day at the schoolhouse.

This editorial also points out that the Parent-Teachers Association is largely responsible for the continuance of the hot-lunch program.

Disturbed somewhat by the report that the program of economy may cause the discontinuance of this important aid, the writer of the editorial calls upon people to give very careful consideration to the good that hot lunches in schools do to the children, before the ax is wielded in the name of economy.

This is a good editorial, Mr. President, and a well-considered one; and I should like to add my endorsement to it, and to point out that the total cost of this program is, by comparison, so small that when all considerations are taken into mind, it will be seen that it would prove to be false economy and serious evidence of short-sightedness on the part of Congress to permit its discontinuance. We are told that the total cost of this program throughout the entire United States was but about $57,000,000 in 1946; yet we talk of lending 10 times that much money to Greece, and we have already loaned nearly 100 times that much to Great Britain.

A well-balanced, nourishing, and tasty hot meal given to a child in the middle of the day does him untold good. I have talked to teachers who have seen the benefits of this lunch program, and they tell me that the students are far better off, both physically and mentally, by reason thereof. I hope it will not be discontinued, and I say this in the interest of the health and general welfare of the children of this country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID AND HOT LUNCHES

That Federal aid and subsidies to State and smaller governmental units and aid to economic groups, such as adjustments for farmers, tariffs for industry, and so on, are justified permanent obligation of the Federal Government is debatable. These benefits caught on during the New Deal regime in efforts to break the economic log jam of depression, and the American public is not showing an overamount of militancy to shake the "gimme" psychosis and to strike out on the old basis of laissez faire—"sink or swim"—the credo of our more robust past.

We feel that there is, perhaps, more justification for Federal aid to school-lunch programs than for most any of the numerous

types and kinds of Federal grants of assistance. The benefits that accrue to the national entity from this program are varied. A prime return on the outlay for the low-priced hot lunches served in the public school is better attendance and less truancy. Statistics have shown that children in localities where penalties are not enforced against truancy are induced by the lunch program to a higher percentage of school attendance than would be true without the serving of lunches.

Another benefit of hot lunches lies in the proved potential of the program for improvement of health of the growing youth. The nutritious diet of the school lunch insures that the participating children will get one balanced meal each day, at least. This will pay lifelong returns through the improved sturdiness of those coming from all the levels of society, not only through giving the children better diet as students but in the cultivation of good eating habits in the formative years of youth.

The hot lunch program is still young, but it is growing rapidly, and is now nation-wide in scope. The program expanded rapidly in Tennessee this year—in fact, so many new schools began participation in the program that the Tennessee allocation of the Federal appropriation for hot lunches has been exhausted as of March 15. It is due to this exhaustion of Tennessee's share of the Federal aid that the Lake County school lunchrooms are faced with the necessity of finishing the last 2 months of school without the 8-cent Federal contribution per meal served, which has been paid up to now.

Serving of hot lunches is well established in Lake County schools. It began with WPA and Federal surplus commodities assistance, was later supported by cash donations and gifts of foodstuffs by individuals over the county, and for the past 3 years has been supported by a program of planned Federal aid. This aid supplements the nominal charge of 15 cents, or thereabouts, which has been assessed on the school children for meals eaten in the lunchroom.

The parent-teacher organizations of the county are responsible for the continuous existence of the program and for the improvements and expansions in the program, their sponsorship preserving the continuity of the work through the devious course of Federal and State grants leading up to now. They realize the worth of their work, and this realization has prompted them to respond with the resourcefulness which will allow the lunch serving to continue to the end of the school year, even though no more Federal help is forthcoming.

There has been some hint out of Washington that the program of economy to which the Republican Party has paid such abundant lip service may strike out any appropriations for Federal school lunch aid for the next fiscal year.

This infant Federal school-lunch program is the last place where we should want or expect to see the ax wielded in the name of economy in Washington. Administered as the program is on the local level by civic-spirited and public-serving nonprofit organizations interested only in seeing better schools and better fed children, here is probably a lesser percentage of the appropriated dollars for hot lunches lost in the morasses of bureaucracy and administrative costs, than is true of any other appropriation by the Congress.

We hope and trust that the Tennessee Members of the House and Senate in Washington will do all that they can to preserve this program, and to increase the appropriation to take care of potential expansion through participation of additional schools, rather than to pare it down or eliminate it entirely.

Activities of the Greek Royalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, today PM published a confidential report showing the extent of wild speculation by the Greek Royalists. It appears that a huge influx of American dollars is needed now to replenish the sums drained off by Greek profiteers who were protected by the government in their black-market operations.

I commend this confidential report to all who would understand why Greece is prostrate today. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MONARCHISTS RUINED GREEK ECONOMY—CONFIDENTIAL UNRRA REPORT SHOWS EXTENT OF WILD SPECULATION

(By Alexander H. Uhl)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—One of the most obvious weaknesses of President Truman's program for assistance to Greece is the dependence which the administration is placing on the cooperation of the Greek monarchist government and its powerful wealthy supporters.

Quite apart from the political double talk that has been necessary to make the Maximos-Tsaldaris government of King George a foundation for Greek democracy, the economic and financial record of the past 2 years of Greek reactionary rule has been disastrous.

TRUMAN POINTS OUT MISTAKES

President Truman in his message to Congress felt it necessary to point out that the Greek regime had "made mistakes," and the United States did not "condone" everything that it has done or will do.

Paul Porter, in testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee last week, also had to condemn some of the financial and economic policies followed in Athens and to lay down a program of strict controls as a condition for American help. He insisted, however, that the present regime should be supported, that it was the best instrument available, and that he had confidence it would follow out American suggestions.

WHAT IS THE RECORD?

Is the record of the monarchist regime such that it should inspire so much confidence?

PM has obtained a copy of a confidential report made to UNRRA on February 15 by the economic analyist of its Greek mission. It is important because it deals in facts and figures which the State Department has been extremely chary of making public.

Here are the high lights of the report, which confirm fully the picture painted in PM during the past 2 weeks of why Greece is bankrupt and in so desperate a situation that lack of American help, as Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson has said, would cause almost immediate collapse:

Gold and foreign exchange: The report states that Greece's foreign exchange was largely dissipated by the end of 1946, adding:

"That this situation was an inevitable consequence of the policy of the Government during 1946 had been well known to most foreign observers for many months. Periodic warnings by certain Government service members of the currency committee and the UNRRA mission went largely unheeded."

DETERIORATION OF ECONOMY

Deterioration of the Greek position was described as follows:

During 1946 total assets declined by $130,200,000 equivalent. This net loss of foreign-exchange assets was divided as follows:

	Value	United States dollar equivalent
Sterling	£17, 734, 326	$70, 937, 304
Dollars	50, 217, 700	50, 217, 700
Gold (ounces)	258, 327	9, 044, 445
Total		130, 199, 449

The Greek Government position was that the sale of gold and foreign exchange was necessary in order to combat the terrific inflation which had set in. On this point, the report said:

DEPENDENT ON CONTROLS

"The only justification for such a policy rested in the willingness of the Government at the earliest possible moment to substitute more orthodox and less expensive means of inflation control; i. e., direct controls such as price control and production control through allocation and indirect controls such as taxation, inducement of saving, judicious use of Government credits, etc.

"Almost no such measures were initiated during the year. * * * Greece faced 1947 with seriously depleted foreign-exchange assets and not even preparatory work done on anti-inflation controls to substitute for foreign-exchange sales."

The Greek Government, representing the interests of the well-to-do Greek royalists, apparently was unwilling to ask its followers to make the necessary sacrifices to put the economy of their country on a sound basis. It depends, instead, on the British and American Governments to pull them out of the hole.

The British announced early this month that they were unable to continue. The United States of America is taking on the job.

Foreign-exchange sales and Greek private profits: Discussing the sale of foreign exchange, the report says:

"Because this counterinflationary object was considered primary, foreign exchange was committed with relatively little regard to the more basic economic requirements of the country. Exchange was freely granted for many categories of imports which did not require import licenses.

"Qualitative distinctions between various classes of imported commodities were based on the importer's margin of profits obtainable, rather than on the physical needs of the population; all too frequently the two criteria were divergent, sometimes almost diametrically opposed."

PROFIT IS BIG MOTIVE

If you break down this economic jargon the picture is clear. Greeks with money were able to buy the country's previous foreign exchange to bring goods back into Greece not in terms of what the country desperately needed for its reconstruction and rehabilitation, but in terms of the profits that they could make.

This meant all sorts of luxury and consumer goods that they could sell on the black market at fabulous profits which, in turn, they could convert into more foreign exchange and thus build up their personal fortunes until the foreign exchange ran out.

It is largely because of that private profit spree, which the Greek Government did not stop, that American assistance is needed today. Obviously it accounts, too, for a lot of Greek Communists.

Again discussing the responsibility of the Greek Government, the report says:

"Lacking voluntary saving, the only possibility for reaching a reasonable equilibrium between expenditures and revenues is the application of subsequential taxation and the reduction of certain expenditures. Neither measure was taken in a substantial degree."

There again, if you put it in simple language, the story is one of "class" finance. "Substantial taxation" which would have hit the profiteers and black-marketeers, who were more interested in making profits than in rebuilding their country, was not established.

Income from UNRRA supplies, which in the last quarter represented more than 36 percent of the country's revenues, was substituted for an adequate taxation system based on ability to pay. To make the situation more iniquitous these UNRRA supplies were sold at such high prices—in the interests of the budget and Greece's wealthy—that UNRRA more than once complained bitterly but without avail.

What happened to Greece's monetary resources? Paul Porter the other day said there was no way of finding out how much capital in private Greek hands was available for Greek reconstruction. The UNRRA report, however, says there was "an evident reluctance on the part of large segments of the business community to invest in productive enterprise, reflecting serious misgivings on the part of these people with respect to both the political and economic future of Greece."

It is the hope of the American economists in the State Department that this capital will be coaxed out by the restoration of political and economic stability through American aid.

The unknown factor now is whether Greek capital and the Greek Government are prepared to play a more constructive and responsible role than they have in the past 2 years. The record, thus far, is not encouraging.

Even a Dog Gets a Hearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by the former mayor of New York City, Fiorello H. LaGuardia. As Mr. LaGuardia points out, even a dog gets a hearing.

[From PM, New York, N. Y., of March 30, 1947]

LA GUARDIA: EVEN A DOG GETS A HEARING

(By Fiorello H. LaGuardia)

On March 22 the President issued an Executive order prescribing procedures for the administration of an employees' loyalty program in the executive branch of the Government.

The right of self-preservation is inherent in every government. It has existed from the very beginning of the most primitive form of government. The protection of government goes to its existence and continuity, but not, at least in modern times, to individuals holding office under it, and surely does not cover opposition to a political party that may be in power.

The standards contained in the Executive order for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in the Government service are specified:

"Sabotage, espionage, or attempts or preparations therefor."

Everyone should be in full agreement with this provision.

"Treason or sedition or advocacy thereof."

That is the law and universally established.

"Advocacy of revolution of force or violence to alter the constitutional form of government of the United States."

That, too, is the law today to which no reasonable person can take exception.

"Intentional, unauthorized disclosure to any person, under circumstances which may indicate disloyalty to the United States, of documents or information of a confidential or nonpublic character obtained by the person making the disclosure as a result of his employment by the Government of the United States."

This constitutes an overt act of disloyalty of a criminal nature and fits properly in standards for refusal of or dismissal from employment.

"Performing or attempting to perform his duties, or otherwise acting, so as to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interests of the United States."

That seems quite logical. Surely a railroad company would not employ as passenger agent the president of a competing air line. Nor would the Dodgers employ as a coach anyone serving the interests of the Giant Baseball Club. Neither would the CIO employ as an organizer an official of the American Federation of Labor.

The great danger lies in the administration of the order and the procedure of proving the guilt of the person charged with committing any of the above acts. These are all overt acts susceptible to proof.

The Executive order should be amended and amplified to make clear that a person so charged will have a fair trial and be proven guilty in accordance with established procedure and custom. As the order now stands, while the accused is given the right to appear before a trial board, with counsel to present evidence in his behalf, the burden is placed upon him to prove his innocence. That surely is contrary to all of the guarantees contained in the Constitution and known to American justice, which the Executive order seeks to protect.

It does not appear that the serious charges against the officer or employee are to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt or even with a preponderance of evidence. In fact, it may well be construed that all the Government has to do is to say that its information indicates that the person comes within any of the above categories or is a member of any of the organizations listed by the Attorney General. The officer or employee is then left to disprove these charges on which he may have no detailed information.

Seemingly, under the order, he is not entitled to a bill of particulars or even the names of witnesses, for it is provided only that "The charges shall be stated as specifically and completely as, in the discretion of the employing department or agency, security considerations permit." True, the employee has a right to a hearing but, unless he knows the particulars and has the right to examine the witnesses against him, a blanket indictment affords him no opportunity of a real defense. A mere accusation under our system is not sufficient. Even the charge of a violation of a trivial ordinance or a slight misdemeanor requires positive proof.

The charges here are most serious—sabotage, spying, treason, sedition, advocacy of revolution by force or violence. No one can deny that a conviction on any of these charges, resulting in dismissal, is equal to a life sentence. Such a convicted officer or employee could hardly find employment, once dismissed under such charges. Not only individually but his family, particularly his children, would carry a stigma for life. Every safeguard should be provided to reduce the possibility of injustices, abuse, and oppression.

The most heinous crimes that a human being can commit are required to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. The most despicable criminal is protected up to the point of having been found guilty. He is given an open trial; the right to be confronted with his accusers; the right to examine witnesses; and the burden of proving guilt in our country remains all through the trial with the prosecution.

Not only human beings, but a dog would not be convicted in our country without proper proof, under established, accepted rules, and definite preponderance of evidence. I mean a dog. Suppose an agent of a humane society or a "society for the suppression of mad dogs" should capture an unleashed dog on the street and bring it to court, seeking an order for the dog's extermination. In accordance with the required proof that the dog had bitten at least three persons; he had seen the bites. Then the agent adds that these three persons could not be brought to court, for they were very useful in providing information to the organization; that it would be embarrassing for these people to appear, but that he had interviewed them and had written down the facts at the time he made the investigation, all contained in the report presented to the court. In no jurisdiction in this country would the court order the extermination of the dog on such evidence.

Even in brutal, cowardly cases of assault, where the exposure of the victim causes great embarrassment and sometimes shame, the appearance and testimony and the opportunity to cross-examine are necessary in order to obtain a conviction.

One provision, rather loosely drawn, might well be used as a catch-all or as a witch hunt and a weapon of oppression. It reads:

"Membership in, affiliation with, or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons, designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive."

It will be noted that the organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons need be only designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive. Seemingly he could do so as the result of an investigation or a report coming from any of several designated sources, without giving such organization an opportunity of being heard. It could all be done ex parte. A decision of such far-reaching effect and susceptible of implicating a large number of innocent people should be based on ascertained facts, after a hearing and an opportunity for the organization to know the charge against it and a chance to present facts in its own defense. The administration of this provision requires a carefully prepared and considered procedure.

If mere membership, affiliation, or "sympathetic association" is sufficient to brand an individual for life, to hold him and his family to public scorn and disgrace, surely these organizations, associations, movements, groups, or combinations of persons should be listed and publicized.

The Executive order brands these organizations as disloyal and subversive. Some of them, in all likelihood, should be so branded. But every organization is entitled to a trial and to have the proof against it presented, and an opportunity to defend itself and disprove the charges. The Executive order is short in this respect.

From time to time incidents take place that create a great deal of feeling against a

particular country. Unless proper safeguards are provided, individuals may well find themselves embarrassed because of conditions over which they have no control. We have gone through many periods of hysteria in our country. This is not the first time that drastic measures have been invoked. It has been tried before and in every instance it has proved a failure.

It was tried in 1798—the famous alien sedition laws. Hundreds and hundreds of people were persecuted, convicted, and jailed. Thomas Jefferson, on becoming President, liberated every person convicted under the sedition laws, and Congress appropriated to refund all of the fines paid under them.

Following World War I, there was hysteria similar to the present. The attack then was on the Socialists. Now it is on the Communists.

Many bills passed the Legislature of the State of New York following a witch-hunting investigation by the Lusk committee. Every one of these bills was vetoed by Gov. Alfred E. Smith. Yet nothing happened in our State because these bills did not become law. Five duly elected members of the assembly were expelled from that body simply because they were members of the Socialist Party. The State will never live down that shame.

It is now admitted that the espionage laws of 1917 were too far-reaching and that many injustices were committed and oppressions inflicted under their provisions.

Let us not become hysterical. By all means, traitors, saboteurs, advocates of force and violence to overthrow the Government should not be pampered. Their continuance in government should not be countenanced. But let us provide a fair trial, under the American way. Let no innocent person be persecuted and punished. Let's not depart from the very principles that we seek to protect and perpetuate.

There are a great many people in our country who do not see any immediate, imminent, or even remote danger to our institutions. These people have confidence in our form of government; would give their lives to defend it. This very Government and the principles that we would give our lives to defend embrace protection of the individual and abhorrence to despotism and tyranny, to attainders and one-sided persecution.

It is safe to predict that the very people who urged and now approve the Executive order will realize that it is entirely too one-sided and smacks too much of autocratic power, methods of a police state, and contains many of the attributes which we criticize in other countries and which are repulsive and repugnant to American tradition and American principles.

Asks Low Tax Rate in Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the voice of the people is still a potent influence in legislation. Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, March 19, 1947:

ASKS LOW RATE IN CITIES

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—A break-down of the tax-bill vote yesterday of New York State's 45 Representatives showed today that DONALD L. O'TOOLE, of Brooklyn, was the only Democrat among them to split from his party and vote with the State's solid Republican delegation for the measure.

Representative O'TOOLE told the New York Herald Tribune this afternoon why he took the stand that gave him eminence among the New Yorkers, who divided as follows:

For the bill: Twenty-seven Republicans and one Democrat. Paired for the bill: One Republican.

Against the bill: Thirteen Democrats and one American-Laborite. Paired against the bill: Two Democrats.

The story that Representative O'TOOLE related for the information of his 299,278 constituents (1940 count, that is) and for the enlightenment of other tax-conscious citizens really begins with the proud boast he makes in his brief biography in the Congressional Directory.

This states that he is serving his sixth term, and adds:

"Is an independent Democrat who has successively defeated in the primaries the Kings County Democratic organization, reputedly the strongest in the country."

"HALF A LOAF"

It continues with his forcefully expressed opinion that the tax bill passed yesterday by the House and sent to the Senate is "half a loaf that is better than no loaf at all," and with a novel proposal of his own for a method that might be used to equalize the tax burden as between residents of New York City and, say, Painted Post.

The tax bill, as it now stands, would cut 1947 income taxes by 20 percent for most taxpayers, with a 30 percent reduction for those with the lowest incomes, and a 10½ percent reduction for those with the highest.

"Do you know my district?" Mr. O'TOOLE asked when he got to talking about his vote. "Well, I have the Bay Ridge area.

"I found out that everybody you spoke to at home said: 'When are you going to cut those damn taxes?' Literally everybody.

"Then you would start to give them the argument that, well, the Republican bill would not help people in the lower brackets much. And then they would say: 'Well, it will help some. And if you people buck it, we will get no cut at all.'

"I do not believe," Mr. O'TOOLE continued, "that the bill is a good one since it does not take proper care of the people in the lower brackets. But it was the only bill the Republican committees would allow out. And if we did not vote for it, those of the lower brackets would get absolutely no relief at all. I did not see that I had any other choice."

Representative O'TOOLE emphasized that as long ago as January 29 he told the House that the proposed Republican tax bill would be "of little benefit to any individual earning less than $10,000 a year." He said that on that day he argued for "an honest and sincere revision of the excise tax law," stating: "If excise taxes are eliminated on necessities and lowered on seminecessities, the lower-bracket man with a family will have a greater saving than he would under the proposed tax bill."

WOULD RAISE EXEMPTION

Today, Mr. O'TOOLE said he would soon propose that exemption for an individual be raised to $1,500 to decrease the burden of the lower bracket man.

He then put forward this new proposal:

"One thing that is wrong about this entire income-tax set-up is that exemptions are the same all over the country. Now, we who live in a large metropolitan area pay high rents, high prices for food, and high prices for everything else. But the fellow that lives in Oshkosh, he lives cheaper than we do, and so his exemptions mean something.

"If we could establish a system where people living in cities of, say, over 300,000 could have one exemption and people living in rural area another, it would be fairer. You take a letter carrier in New York City who's getting $2,100 a year. Why, it's a starvation wage. But if he lives in Painted Post, he's the highest paid man in town, and he shouldn't have as big a tax exemption as the New Yorker."

(Parenthetically, it can be noted, for those who have always thought Painted Post was the name of a wild-west town, that it isn't. The only Painted Post in the Official Postal Guide is a village in Steuben County, N. Y.)

Representative O'TOOLE was asked whether his action in voting with the Republicans and against the Democrats on the tax bill might injure his chances for reelection in his district.

"Hell, no," he said.

Training of Forest Service Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the legislature of the State of Oregon:

Senate Joint Memorial 4

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas there is urgent need for the establishment of a Federal institution for the training of diplomats, economic advisers and military attachés in the foreign service of the United States, to the end that the representatives abroad of the United States may be prepared to meet the responsibilities of their offices; and

Whereas the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN has introduced into the House of Representatives H. R. 1770, which provides for the establishment and maintenance of an academy for the instruction and training of students in the theory and practices of international and diplomatic relations, to be known as the United States Foreign Service Academy; and

Whereas the enactment of H. R. 1770 will meet this Nation's growing and obvious need for the training of personnel in its foreign service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact H. R. 1770, to the end that an academy may be established for the training of personnel in the foreign service of the United States; and be it further,

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by Senate March 11, 1947.

M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.

Concurred in by House March 19, 1947.

JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.

Prospects for One World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

UNBRIDGEABLE CHASM

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Honest Americans who complain that the Truman doctrine will "split one world into two" had better take a deep breath and snap out of their trance.

Whoever may be responsible for the "split" it is certainly not Mr. Truman. All he has done is call attention to a state of things that has existed ever since the Soviet Union was born in 1917.

Politically our "One World" never got beyond the aspirations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie; physically it is a fact but the Russians will have none of it. If we had listened to them we should have been less surprised. Their frankness has been complete. Lenin himself insisted upon the "unbridgeable chasm" between the Soviet Union and the "imperialist world" (meaning us). Stalin unremitting echoed this belief. The difference between the two was that Lenin expected the gap to be bridged by world revolution. Stalin is confident that it will be overcome by the expansion of the Soviet Union. For both, the presence of powerful non-Soviet countries is "capitalist encirclement" of socialist world. This will gradually, Moscow believes, give place to "socialist encirclement" of the "imperialist capitalists." In this conception non- or anti-Soviet socialist states like Britain are particularly pernicious because they incorporate a false collectivism that is worse than capitalism.

As the capitalist order decays (to Bolsheviks it must decay by definition) the "socialist encirclement" advances, carried by the Red Army. The Slavic States of Europe, Soviet Germany and North Korea, and Communist China—these are "socialist encirclement." Finland and Hungary soon will be. France and Italy are hopes. In these last two countries Communists already exercise "dual power" within the government and within the masses.

Why should Soviet leaders relinquish "socialist encirclement" for participation in any Roosevelt-Willkie type of one world? They have a one-world hope of their own. Back in the twenties, Stalin stated it.

"For the slogan 'the United States of Europe' we will substitute the 'Federation of Soviet Republics of Advanced Countries and Colonies' which have fallen out of, or are falling away from, the imperialist system of economy."

There is a vast evidence that he has not altered his aim by one tittle. This aim is: two wofids until such time as there can be one Soviet world.

The amazing thing is not that President Truman has decided that the non-Soviet order must defend itself or perish. The amazing thing is that honest non-Communist Americans from Henry Wallace through Ray Swing to Max Lerner and Freda Kirchwey persist in affirming that the Soviet Union constitutes no danger.

Soviet Ambassador Gromyko has twice refused the only existing scheme of atomic control that offers some chance (not too much) of preventing A-bombs from being used in any coming struggle. With complete logic, he has insisted on the full preservation within the United Nations Security Council of a veto that protects the Soviet Union from being sucked into the Roosevelt-Willkie type of one world. Gromyko, like his master Stalin, means what he says.

Soviet diplomats and generals have been saying "two worlds" ever since western generals and diplomats began meeting them face to face within conquered or liberated territories back in 1944. They said it when they took over Rumania and Bulgaria in the teeth of American representatives. They said it through Tito's fighters in Yugoslavia who shot down American passenger planes. They said it in Hungary. They are saying it now in Korea where their unwelcome army is Sovietizing half of that unfortunate country. They are saying it in the collectivized industries and atomized estates of Soviet Germany. They are muttering it through EAM in Greece, shrieking it in wild radio invitations to the Turkish people to rise and kick out their government.

Communist Mao Tse-Tung's machine guns and hand grenades bark it all over China. Prize puppet Ho Chi-Minh (real name Nguyen-Ai-Quoc) announces the message in Indochina (disguised as freedom). In a thousand cafes throughout the Middle East, subtle-tongued agents are inciting to revolution.

The tune differs from place to place. The message is everywhere the same, "Maintain two separate worlds until we can realize our socialist world."

Now the American administration and the wiser Members of the Congress are asking the American people to defend themselves against further Socialist encirclement.

Does this mean a split that must widen finally into open conflict? In my judgment, stern resistance now offers the best, perhaps the only chance, of avoiding war. It may even lead to the creation of our type of one world.

For despite great technical and territorial advances Russia is still a weak and backward state, its natural genius crushed between the twin burdens of tyranny and serfdom.

If the democratic peoples keep themselves economically strong and politically free, Russia may come to prefer membership in a real world federation to isolation behind the iron curtain and the "unbridgeable chasm" will be bridged.

Hawaiian Veterans Grateful to Congresswoman Rogers of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a message received by Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, over Station W3, an amateur radio station, at Wahiawa, Oahu, T. H., as follows:

On behalf of the many veteran amputees, their families, close friends, and the community, we take this opportunity to extend deepest gratitude and sincerest aloha to you for your excellent work on the veterans' behalf. Bless you, and may success be yours always.

Aloha Nui Loa,
THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
WAHAIWA, OAHU, T. H.
By CHARLES C. PETER.

DAR Versus Communism—Speech of Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the statement of Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, president general of the Daughters of the American Revolution, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on March 26, 1947.

Mrs. Talmadge is one of the great women of this country, and the DAR is one of the outstanding patriotic organizations this Nation has ever known.

I trust that every Member will read her entire statement, and I wish it were possible to place it in the hands of every real American.

The matter referred to follows:

Chairman THOMAS and members of the House Un-American Committee, for many years the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution has advocated, urged, and fought for many things including:

1. To secure adequate national defense.
2. To stamp out communism in the United States.

The first objective seeks to protect our country from without. The second objective, of course, is to protect our country from destruction within.

These two defense policies fit in with the Americanization program of the Daughters of the American Revolution. It is a broad program dealing largely with educating youth, helping the underprivileged, and aiding aliens to become true citizens of our country.

Under our bylaws we have three objectives, one of which is:

"To cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom; to foster true patriotism and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty."

We are criticized frequently for our stand on the issues of national defense and communism. We have been called militant trouble-makers because we urge preparedness and adequate defense. We have been pictured as red-baiters and false-alarmists because we have always warned of the dangers of communism within our borders.

At long last, however, the country has learned, or at least is learning, the value of preparedness. The people of the United States are now aware of the dangers confronting not only our country, but all democratic governments because of the encroachment and spread of communistic doctrines.

The infiltration of communism, as we all know, has vastly increased since the end of World War II. Perhaps we have been too concerned about the problem of a lasting peace and have failed to recognize the insidious spread of the poison in our own country.

Now we are confronted with a real menace. We know for a fact that communism is firmly rooted into our labor organizations; into many branches of our Government; into many of our organizations and even into our schools.

I was impressed by a recent statement of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that Communists have

made their greatest advance in America during the past 5 years. Mr. Hoover declares that in our vaunted tolerance for all peoples the Communist has found our Achilles heel. The head of the FBI, and he should know, flatly declares that "The divide-and-conquer tactics did not die with Hitler—they are being employed with greater skill today by American Communists with their boring-from-within strategy. Their propaganda, skillfully designed and adroitly executed, has been projected into practically every phase of our national life."

At the present time we are facing a grave crisis and we must determine what our policy shall be in aiding Greece and Turkey and other nations which are threatened with Communist domination. We of the Daughters of the American Revolution, therefore note with deep satisfaction that the Congress of the United States and the heads of various Government departments are alert to this crisis and are studying the entire problem in an effort to determine what must be done to protect and preserve our form of government and our institutions.

I have been asked by your chairman to express an opinion upon the various bills now pending before the Congress, which strike at communism and communistic activities.

I have studied three bills, and I declare my support to all of them. Moreover, it is my intention as president general of the Daughters of the American Revolution to bring these measures before the members of our resolutions committee at the Fifty-sixth Continental Congress of our National Society, which will convene in Constitution Hall in this city on May 19. It is my hope that our organization with over 156,000 members will wholeheartedly endorse this pending legislation and urge passage of the various bills.

The bill of Chairman THOMAS, H. R. 2275, as I understand it, would create a Federal Loyalty Commission to ferret out disloyal Government employees and see to it that they are discharged from holding Government employment.

It is my judgment that this legislation is necessary, because, as we all know, it is exceedingly difficult to prove that a person is a Communist. Few indeed will admit their true identity. We all know that Communists work in secret. They are quick to deny their communistic affiliations. It is to their advantage to work under cover. Consequently, a commission set up with the power to investigate and secure proof against suspected Communists is needed if we are to keep Communists or those with communistic beliefs from spreading their poison as Government workers.

The bill of Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, whom I know well, merits solid DAR support. It is H. R. 1884. It is time to stop the spread of communistic propaganda through the mails. It is time to stop the teaching of communistic doctrines, no matter how subtle, in our public schools. It is time to prevent election of candidates to Federal or State office who are avowed enemies to our form of government.

Likewise, the measure of Representative SHEPPARD of California, H. R. 2122, is in accord with DAR policies. This sweeping measure strikes directly at the Communist Party and the communistic organizations. It also strikes at organizations engaging in political activities which are affiliated with foreign governments or with foreign political parties.

I certainly believe legislation is needed to stop the subversive activities which are going on around us. Communism should be outlawed in the United States lock, stock and barrel.

We are now faced with the President's proposal to loan $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey in an effort to close the front door against totalitarian infiltration. Are we going to leave the back door wide open for Communists and fellow travelers to spread their poisonous work inside our own country?

Communism can be outlawed in the United States, because those preaching communistic doctrines are not merely finding fault with our Government. Their real objectives are to undermine and destroy our Government so that a totalitarian government under the Moscow pattern can be substituted.

I realize, of course, that much of the subversive propaganda carried on in the United States is boldly distributed because of the guarantee of free speech. I would like to make it clear that members of the DAR stand firmly behind the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. We would be the first to object to any infringement on the right of free speech. It is one of the priceless liberties for which our ancestors fought.

Those who preach communistic doctrines within the United States and who are citizens of our country might argue they have the right under free speech to say what they please. They have the right up to a certain extent.

Americans can criticize their form of government, their public servants, their lawmakers, and the laws under which they live. No thinking American fails to appreciate these rights.

However, when Communists and their kind advocate the destruction of our form of government, and the substitution of communism it is time to take action. That is why I say legislation is needed to curb the activities of Communists and outlaw communism in the United States.

Many DAR members realize the danger to our country in the spread of communism, not only in governmental circles and in the ranks of labor, but also in our schools and in our patriotic organizations.

Members of the Daughters of the American Revolution oppose the Communist Party and are not identified with any of the communistic fronts now masquerading under high-sounding patriotic names. Our members pledge their allegiance to the American flag. They also subscribe to the American's Creed.

I believe it would be a good thing to require every public school teacher in the United States to swear to the oath of allegiance and also support the American's Creed. Every American should know the American's Creed of which your own William Tyler Page is author.

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established under those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

Every American citizen should believe in the Constitution of the United States and in our principles of government. An American citizen should hold no allegiance whatsoever with any foreign political party or with any subversive organization working to destroy our form of government.

I have been told that in many instances there is no check whatsoever on the political beliefs of college professors and teachers or of teachers in our high schools and also those who teach our children in the grade school.

We are face to face with the fact that communism is an organized movement that has pushed its way into our schools. It has reached a place of power in our labor organization. It not only controls eastern and most of western Europe, all of the Balkans except Greece, but it is in control of Manchuria, northern Korea, and northern China. It is ready to engulf Turkey and the Near East. It has gained a strong foothold in Canada and its ramifications within the United States are amazing.

In this country expansion of communism has been helped through various "front organizations." Most of these have patriotic names and are seemingly peace societies or democratic organizations. It is difficult to trace direct communistic connections with some of these organizations, but their activities often betray them.

The DAR has long been an organization singled out for attack by these "fronts." They have sought to ridicule our society, to obstruct its work, and to destroy it by seeking to spread discord and strife within our ranks. We are a favorite target.

Our organization and similar organizations will continue to be the object of communistic attacks until proper legislation is adopted which will restrict such un-American activities and will unmask the true identity of those behind the attacks and their real motives.

The time has come when the mask must be stripped from these organizations with deceptive names whose real purpose are to promote communism and the spread of subversive propaganda.

We should revise the definition of the word "traitor." Just how far can a person go in seeking to destroy our form of government before he is committing an act of treason? How far can a person go in plotting to overturn our Government before he can be branded a traitor?

Bouvier's Law Dictionary defines treason in criminal law, as "a betraying, treachery, or breach of allegiance." The Constitution of the United States defines treason against our country to consist in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

The Law Dictionary says "every person owing allegiance to the United States who levies war against them, or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere is guilty of treason."

We are still thinking in terms of Benedict Arnold when we think of traitors and of treason. The terms should be revised.

The United States is the leading Nation of the world. It cannot afford to permit communism to flourish within its borders. It is time to clean house.

We must set an example for our good neighbors of the Western Hemisphere. They too are beset with Communists and communistic propaganda.

Legislation to combat communism within the United States will not only protect this country but will also point the way for Canada and to the nations of Central and South America to rid their countries of this menace. We must remain united and strong.

I thank you.

Hurrah for the House!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is evident by the response from most every source that the people of the country are tremendously pleased with the tax bill

passed by the House of Representatives last week by an overwhelming majority.

Today I submit for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial by Mr. Herman E. Gieske, editor of the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News, which I think gives you a good idea of the opinion of the majority of the folks in my section of the country.

The editorial follows:

HURRAH FOR THE HOUSE

The best news in many a moon—you might say the best news in the last 14 years—was the 273-to-137 vote in the United States House of Representatives to cut income taxes on a 30 to 20 percent basis for 50,000,000 income taxpayers in the United States.

We have so long been a state of peacetime "emergency," or war, that we doubt if the politicians in Washington, especially those affiliated with the Truman administration, have any idea how the people feel about the enormous taxes that are being extracted in peacetime. These administrative bureaucrats have seemingly got to the point of indifference to the people's suffering that they are not unlike the French nobility on the eve of the cataclysm in 1789. For over 14 years, now, the great game of spend and spend and elect and elect has been carried on to the point where we have a debt of two hundred and fifty billions and outstanding currency of twenty-eight billions.

Now comes the Republican-controlled House of Representatives with a deep dish slash that will bring relief to a majority of American families and point the way to still further relief should the electorate decide they have had enough of war-mongering and imperialism in Washington. We, the people, cannot go on forever carrying on our backs the remaining 2,000,000,000 of people who now inhabit the earth. We trust that the United States Senate, which seems to be hankering after more glamorous spending, will take heed from the outpouring of gratitude to the Members of the House for their courageous action.

Americans were not born to toil in tax corvee, or labor forced by its own government, for all the other people of the world. As long as we make wars easy and comfortable and painless financially for them, there will be more wars in which we could only expect to be the losers. There will be general national rejoicing over the courageous action of the House.

Tax Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of March 26, 1947:

BATTLE LINES ARE DRAWN

It's going to be an all-out test of political strength when the tax-reduction bill sponsored by the Republicans comes up for action. The Republicans are well organized in their determination to give some relief to American taxpayers, and the Democrats, although only a minority, are organizing on the opposite side of the fence, hopeful that their control of the White House will mean eventual defeat for the measure.

It might be a sound idea if the Democrats, before engaging in this tug-of-war, should consult their constituents to learn how many of them honestly feel that a political jealousy should be placed before a popular benefit.

The Democrats are conscious of the value of this reduction to Republican political fortunes, so they are blindly opposing it. They even have President Truman in a frame of mind that indicates that he, too, may go all the way in his opposition by exercising his veto power, which, we think, would not help his chances for reelection.

People in all parts of the country who feel that they have carried this heavy income-tax burden long enough and who are aware of the fact that leading economists have said that the cut can be made without weakening the financial stability of the Nation, should, if they are represented in Congress by Democrats, get their viewpoint on record in Washington before it is too late. Possibly some of these recalcitrant Democrats would forget their political pulling and hauling if they were given to understand that the people at large have some very definite views on the subject of income taxes.

Exemption of Prisoners of War From Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon:

House Joint Memorial 15

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas under the present acts of Congress and regulations governing the collection of certain Federal income taxes, it was provided that prisoners of war held in the Philippine Islands and certain other territories were exempted from a portion of the Federal income tax; and

Whereas the terms of such actions discriminated against prisoners of war who had been removed from the possessions of the United States for internment in Japan and in other localities; and

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States certain legislation proposing an amendment to section 251 of the Internal Revenue Act; and

Whereas in fairness to the prisoners of war who were removed from or interned in the possessions of foreign countries, some legislation should be passed placing such prisoners upon a status similar to that providing for prisoners interned in the possessions of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to pass such legislation as will result in providing for prisoners interned in foreign countries a status similar to that provided for prisoners of war interned in the possessions of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United Sates and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Oregon.

Centralia, Ill., Mine Disaster—Whose Guilt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the sympathy of the Nation is extended to the families of the brave coal miners who lost their lives in the disaster which occurred in a mine of the Centralia Coal Co., located in the northeast corner of Washington County, Ill., in my congressional district.

The disaster brings forcibly to light the hazards under which miners work—it should awake the Nation to the danger which coal miners face as a daily routine.

On the occasions when it has been necessary for the miner to fight to better his working conditions and to increase his earning power as the price of living mounted rapidly around him, I have repeatedly said that a coal miner who day after day goes down into the pits of the Nation at the risk of his life would still be underpaid even if granted double the increase in wage he was seeking.

The editorials included herewith should be carefully read. In placing the guilt for the tragedy at Centralia the facts contained in these articles should be carefully weighed.

I give my full support to the resolutions offered in Congress for an investigation of the Centralia mine disaster—and I want this investigation to be thorough, exhaustive, and nonpolitical.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include herewith as part of the RECORD, the following editorials taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for March 26 and 27, 1947, as well as one taken from the Belleville (Ill.) Daily News-Democrat for March 28, 1947:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 26, 1947]

WHOSE GUILT?

The blood of the men who lost their lives in the mine disaster at Centralia is on the hands of the mine operators who continued to run the mine in the face of repeated warnings of an "explosion hazard." It is also on the Illinois State Department of Mines whose inspectors have authority to close mines which do not comply with safety requirements.

Staff Correspondent Harry Wilensky's on-the-ground investigation shows that a warning of excessive dust in the mine was dated as long ago as December 13, 1945. The most recent notice was posted just a week ago when the mine inspector directed that "recommendations of previous inspections not complied with, should be complied with."

Why was this mine permitted to operate in the face of these warnings? The Centralia Coal Co. knew the hazard existed. If it did

not care sufficiently for the safety of its employees to shut down while the dangerous conditions were corrected, the authority of the State should have compelled its closing. Inspection service is of little value if its findings are not enforced. Indeed, there is a false security in such a situation; miners think their lives are being protected when such is not the fact.

This tragedy makes all the more despicable Governor Green's use of the State mine inspecting force to shake down mine operators for donations to the Republican campaign in the Chicago mayoral race. No mine inspector should be placed in the position of soliciting a favor from any mine operator. Director Medill's State mine department cannot put itself in politics without compromising the enforcement of its inspection service.

Governor Green, who has flown down from Chicago, cannot bring back the lives of the entombed miners. He cannot comfort the grief-stricken survivors. But there is one thing he can do: He can find out why this mine was not closed in accordance with repeated warnings. And he can contemplate the consequences of tying an inspection service into politics in such a way as to wink at nonenforcement of safety requirements.

Governor Green shrugged off queries about the shakedown when the Post-Dispatch disclosed it a week ago. He cannot shrug off the mass death of these miners 540 feet underground.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 27, 1947]

THE MINE DEAD SPEAK

The man on whom responsibility for the horrible loss of life in the Centralia Coal Co. mine falls more heavily than on any other is Dwight H. Green, Governor of the State of Illinois.

Failure to be vigilant can be charged up to others as well—to Governor Green's director of the State department of mines, Robert M. Medill, to the operators of the coal company, to Federal authorities who were legally in control of the mine.

None of these other failures mitigates in the least the responsibility which is Governor Green's.

On March 3, 1946—more than a year ago—Local No. 52 of the United Mine Workers at Centralia sent a letter of protest to Gov. Green. This protest was against the hazardous conditions under which they were compelled to work since Governor Green's State department of mines had refused to close the mine notwithstanding the reports of explosion hazard by the mine inspector.

The dead speak in this letter. They cry from behind the debris-closed walls in which many of them are still entombed.

The dead cry out that they were ignored by Governor Green's State mine department.

They cry out that the inspector did his duty and wrote honest reports.

They cry out that if the laws were not enforced, there would be "a dust explosion at this mine just like happened in Kentucky and West Virginia."

They cry out that when they finally got an official investigating commission it contained a boss of the mine and that it would not permit the miners to call attention to unsafe conditions.

They cry out that when the report of the commission was at last obtained it "found insufficient evidence to revoke the certificate of the mine manager and superintendent."

They cry out that they sent Governor Green a copy of the inspector's report, that they asked him to check it with the commission's report and with the Federal mine inspection report of July 1945.

They cry out that they asked the governor to go to the mine and make a personal inspection in order to see how unfair his department of mines was to the miners, how its refusal to do its duty had placed their lives in grave danger.

They cry out that they were writing to the governor because they did not believe he knew how unfair his mining department "is toward the men in this mine."

They cry out that they hoped for "an early personal reply from the governor stating your position in regards to the enforcement of the State mining laws."

Yet in the face of a warning like this, Dwight H. Green could be so unmoved as to do in effect absolutely nothing. Worse than that, he could permit his State mine department to become a political tool this month for the collection of funds for the Republican mayoral race in Chicago. For it became a chore of his mine inspectors to shake down mine operators for campaign contributions.

In face of a record like this, he could permit his inspection service to be further compromised, to be placed under obligation to mine operators!

Has ever retribution for what amounts to criminal negligence followed swifter or in a more terrible form?

Dwight H. Green is the first man to answer.

[From the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat of March 28, 1947]

BUNGLED STATE GOVERNMENT

The appalling completeness of the breakdown of governmental agencies in Illinois under the administration of Gov. Dwight H. Green steadily becomes more and more apparent.

Newest evidence that this has happened turned up in the mine tragedy at Centralia on Tuesday afternoon when scores of miners perished in a coal pit following a terrific explosion. There is little doubt that this disaster, which was the worst in the entire history of coal mining in Illinois, could have been averted by strict enforcement of safety codes.

But this was not the case. Repeatedly the operators of that colliery had been warned of the highly hazardous conditions that prevailed in their mine. In fact, the violations were on such a wholesale basis as to warrant appeals by the miners themselves for gubernatorial intervention in their behalf.

This was not forthcoming. Nor was there enforcement of even the most fundamental safety regulations. The death-trap conditions at Centralia were not of short standing. They were nothing new, for they had been allowed to continue for some years.

If recommendations of the State mining inspectors are ignored and the State consistently refuses to take the necessary measures to rectify a hazardous inferior situation, there isn't much point in conducting inspections at all.

The trouble at Centralia is but another link in a long chain of evidence to support the contention that many State functions have been permitted to degenerate to impotence. The Green administration is so thoroughly riddled with petty politics and shot with favoritism as to render State regulations not only worthless but a distinct liability to the people of Illinois.

Right now members of a legislative group delving into the activities of the so-called welfare department are having their eyes opened by the shockingly deplorable state of affairs existing in this State's mental hospitals.

The legislature may well look into the department of mines and minerals too, and others on down the line. The whitewashing days of Mr. Green's clique are numbered. And high time, too.

Congress Keeps a Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Clarksburg Telegram, Clarksburg, W. Va., entitled "Congress Keeps a Promise":

CONGRESS KEEPS A PROMISE

The Clarksburg Telegram has been on the right side in advocating cutting down expenses and reduction in taxes for several years.

On yesterday, as had been promised by the Republican leaders throughout the Nation, a bill reducing income-tax rates was passed by a vote of 273 to 137. Of the 273 Members, 233 Republicans were joined by 40 Democrats for the bill. Against the bill were 133 Democrats, 3 Republicans, and 1 American Labor Party Member from New York City. This same Member voted against the previous tax bill.

This bill will cut taxes in the lower-income group 30 percent, and all others 20 percent. It is probably the fairest tax bill presented and passed by any legislative body in a number of years.

No bill can be perfect, and no bill presented will ever suit everyone. But there is such a thing as having a fair, equitable, and honest tax bill. Just because a man happens to be a little prosperous and makes a little money, that is no reason why he should be robbed by the Government. But that seems to be the idea of some.

It is shown we have in this country at present a real American Congress. We have men who fulfill their promises. No one can take all the credit for the passage of this important legislation, but there is enough credit for all Republicans and all Democrats who joined in and supported this important measure.

Speaker of the House JOSEPH MARTIN, formerly minority leader, has proved himself to be a leader. He had the cooperation and loyal support of a large majority of Republicans and on many occasions a number of Democrats. No man can be a leader unless he has the respect of both those who belong to his party and the opposition. For a number of years Speaker MARTIN worked hard holding the party in line, protecting the interests of the American people, many times when the road was rough. But he never flinched. When Republicans had a majority in Congress, he was elected Speaker by a unanimous vote. The Republicans made no mistake in this selection.

One of his important cogs in the wheel, Representative HALLECK, of Indiana, now majority leader, has proved to be a man of sterling qualities and honor. Too much credit cannot be given to the Ways and Means Committee headed by KNUTSON, of Minnesota. He never weakened. He favored a tax cut, he promised one. Not only did his committee by unanimous vote carry out the recommendation for tax reduction, but one Democrat from Texas voted with its members.

This will no doubt go down in history as the greatest victory of any Republican Congress holding power in many years. One reason is everything was against the Repub-

licans particularly 25,000 or 30,000 agitators, trouble makers, and parasites holding high jobs who did not want to see taxes reduced as they would lose their jobs. Former heads of all the committees and those who wanted to be big boys but who had been trimmed down to proper size gave out statements night and day in order to throw cold water on tax reduction. These boys had a lot of influence under the New Deal, but on yesterday not only were their wings clipped, but the feathers taken out as well.

It will be a long time before they can fly again.

Republican leaders throughout the country, including the National Committee chairman worked hard to bring about the election of these Congressmen. They openly promised the American people they would reduce taxes, cut expenses and take thousands of parasites holding office off the pay roll. This promise was made in good faith. They wanted to carry it out. Now the Republican Congress has fulfilled its promise to the people, and it has gained the people's confidence.

The noise made by some of the opposition was like a small boy beating a drum—just noise. When the counting of votes arrived, no one paid any attention to these noise makers. When a man who has given out statements for months, has made speeches in opposition to certain measures continually receives only two or three votes on his side, it is shown noise making is of no avail.

Great publicity and propaganda was given in opposition to the tax bill. A common ruse was warning the President would veto the bill and the American people should say, "Veto the bill and be damned. That is your privilege. Had you carried out the policy we are carrying out, a different story may have been told. If you do not want to carry out the policy of the American people, that is not the fault of the American people. But a way will be found to make them carry it out. The lower House of Congress is elected every 2 years. It can veto any appropriation or bill the same as the Senate or President."

If the President does veto the bill, as some of his advisers threatened, it can be passed over his head, or the American people can be promised in 2 years a President who will stand up for them and make tax reductions retroactive January 1, 1947. This can and we think will be done.

Still another ruse was used which fooled some but not many for the reason the average man who works has more intelligence than a man who sits around and talks. Propaganda was issued to the effect this bill helps the rich man and does not help the poor man. Of course, that is not true. It helps the small taxpayers more than the large ones. Every honest taxpayer who receives a decrease in his taxes wants the other fellow to receive a decrease also in proportion. This propaganda was spread on the air, in the press and by speeches.

But, as stated before, the American Congress passed the bill as promised. This will do more good to stimulate business, to keep down strikes and help the man earning a small salary and those with fair salaries more than anything that has happened in a number of years.

It will show also for the first time in 14 years we have an American Congress that will fulfill its promise. Many other changes will be made before the year is out to give protection to the American men and women who have suffered the past 14 years.

The vote by Congress yesterday should be evidence to the spenders throughout the country that the time has come to halt. Those who pay taxes will surely eliminate the spenders from public office in the future.

Col. Florence A. Blanchfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on Monday last to gather together an outstanding group of people at luncheon in the Speaker's dining room in honor of Col. Florence A. Blanchfield, whose tour of service as superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps ends on May 31 of this year.

Those who came to pay their respects to a fine leader in the field of nursing included: Representative Walter Andrews, chairman, Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; Representative Margaret Chase Smith, chairman, Subcommittee No. 9 of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; Representative Edith Nourse Rogers, chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives; Representative John Rankin, ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives; Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, The Surgeon General, United States Army; Maj. Gen. Willard S. Paul, Director of Personnel and Administration Division, War Department General Staff; Rear Adm. C. A. Swanson, The Surgeon General, United States Navy; Brig. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, Deputy Surgeon General, United States Army; Brig. Gen. Ira P. Swift, Chief of Military Personnel Management Group, War Department General Staff; Dr. Thomas Parran, The Surgeon General, Public Health Service; Col. Howard W. Doan, Executive Officer for the Surgeon General, United States Army; Col. Francis P. Kintz, Acting Chief of Personnel for the Surgeon General, United States Army; Capt. Ira H. Nunn, Legislative Counsel for the Judge Advocate General, Navy Department; Capt. Nellie J. DeWitt, Superintendent, Navy Nurse Corps, United States Navy; Dr. Robert C. Cook, Deputy Medical Director, Veterans' Administration and representing Gen. Paul Hawley; Lt. Col. Mary G. Phillips, Assistant Superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps, United States Army; Lt. Col. Ida W. Danielson, Chief of Nurse Personnel, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army; Lt. Col. Margaret Schafer, assistant personnel officer, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army; Lt. Col. Katherine Baltz, education consultant, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army; Mrs. Ruth Freeman, Director of Nursing, National American Red Cross; Miss Matilde E. Dykstra, Deputy Director of Nursing Service, Veterans' Administration, and representing Miss Dorothy Wheeler, the Director, who was ill; Miss Edith Beattie, representing the American Nurses Association; Mr. Robert J. O'Connor, Acting Chief, Legal Division, Office of the Surgeon General, United States Army; Mr. Robert Smart, of the professional staff, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives; Miss Anne Claypoole, retired, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army; and including the following Members, assigned to Subcommittee No. 9, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives: Hon. Carl T. Durham; Hon. L. Mendel Rivers; Hon. Leon K. Gavin; Hon. Philip J. Philbin. Unfortunately, Congressmen William W. Blackney, Arthur Winstead, and Resident Commissioner A. Fernos-Isern were unable to attend.

On Thursday, March 27, Congresswoman MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, chairman of subcommittee No. 9, of the Committee on Armed Services, inserted in the RECORD a very excellent history of Colonel Blanchfield and her 29 years in the service of the Army Nurse Corps. It is not my purpose to duplicate. I do, however, want to say a very personal word relative to Colonel Blanchfield.

During the 8 weeks that I spent in our hospitals in England and France in 1944, I found the constant evidence of her watchfulness in everything that related to an increasingly fine service to the wounded. It is my considered opinion that perhaps her greatest contribution to the wounded was her securing the assignment of nurses to the field and evacuation hospitals near the front lines. I talked to man after man who said he owed his life to the fact that right there at the front, expert nursing care was there, with the peculiar spiritual lift given by the actual presence of the nurses who had volunteered their services. Colonel Blanchfield saw the front first hand, not only in the ETO but in the Pacific. She pursued her fine strong course of determined action to give immediate and continuing care to our wounded with a spirit of consecration that permeated every unit.

Although her citation for the Distinguished Service Medal appeared on the pages of the RECORD of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I want to insert it at this point that we of the Eightieth Congress may salute her as she finishes her long and valiant service in the Army Nurse Corps of the United States, and I would assure her that the Members of this House wish her well in the many years that lie ahead:

CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL

Col. Florence A. Blanchfield demonstrated outstanding ability and devotion to duty as Superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps from June 1943 to May 1945. By her precept and example, she inspired her corps, the oldest group of militarized women in the armed forces, to establish a glowing record of achievement in caring for our wounded soldiers on all the far-flung battle fronts. She was responsible for policies used in expanding the corps from a few hundred nurses to more than 52,000, displaying in this procedure administrative and executive ability of the highest order. In 1943 she supervised the establishment of basic-training schools in the nine continental service commands and in all overseas theaters. In 1944 she was largely instrumental in securing full military rank for nurses. She exerted great efforts to enlist the support of civilian

nurses' organizations, inaugurated a public-relations program, and engaged in extensive morale-building activities. High moral and professional standards which she established resulted in an extremely low discharge rate for the corps. She planned and put into operation a program which took nursing teams close to the front lines for surgical duty—a new procedure which helped save lives by insuring prompt nursing care. Much of her time was spent in the field. She made an extended tour of the European theater of operations to insure superior care of casualties. Colonel Blanchfield's wise understanding of nurses and their problems was a major factor in the success of her organization. Her contribution to the war effort merits the highest praise; her contribution to humanity, through the feats of her valiant corps, can be told adequately only by those who have suffered in battle.

Treatment of Jews by Russian Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the bloody and murderous political gang that is operating the affairs of the Russian people under the banner of the Communist Party have maintained for many years that they were the friends of persecuted Jews all around the world, and for many years they have devoted special attention to unfortunate Jews in an effort to convert them to the so-called Communist doctrine, which we of the Un-American Activities Committee know is actually a political plot to create treason in every democratic nation of the world.

The real attitude of Russian Communists toward distressed Jews was revealed yesterday in a news story in the New York Times. Without further comment I place in the RECORD here the entire story of how Russia actually treats Jews, and I trust that all of the Jews of America will read it:

VIENNA, March 29.—The arrival of 350 Austrian Jews from Russia yesterday gave startling verification of reports of the hard fate of many Jews who fled from Hitler to Russia.

The 350 were in a shocking condition. Their clothes were rags. They were half starved. Members of the group said they had been on the way from a Russian work camp at Kazakistan in Central Asia for nearly 3 months.

They said they had so little food on their trip that they would have starved if the Joint Distribution Committee in Rumania had not learned of their plight and provided food.

When they arrived here they were in such a weakened condition that other Jewish refugees in the Rothschild Hospital refugee center gave up their dinner so the newcomers could eat.

The Vienna municipality housed them in various former military barracks. Jewish groups here plan special programs of relief because most of them are destitute and many need a long rest or hospitalization.

There have been many reports of similar conditions from Polish Jews who passed through Vienna. Refugees who spent the war period and a good part of the postwar period in Russia were said to have been housed in work camps and used for heavy manual labor. Most of them seem to possess little or nothing. Many are exhausted and ill from exposure and the hard tasks assigned to them.

Members of the Austrian Jewish group that arrived yesterday said they had worked in mines with former members of Hitler's elite guard. They charged that Hungarian and Austrian Jews who remain in Central Asia are forced to work in mines with German prisoners of war.

Small Business Sees Democracy at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are so accustomed to hearing complaints and being maligned by various groups throughout the country that they have pretty well learned how to take it. However, every once in a while we find a bouquet among the brickbats, a kind word or a compliment that is welcome indeed.

I am taking this occasion to call to the attention of my colleagues a rather unusual, but nevertheless welcome letter which was addressed to me recently by a businessman who appeared before Subcommittee No. 6 of the Armed Services Committee.

In response to many complaints by small businessmen from all over the United States, the Armed Services Subcommittee on Procurement and Supply, of which I am presently chairman, has been conducting hearings on the Navy Department's new policy of centralized procurement for ships' service stores. The writer of the following communication was one of the complaining witnesses and his comments should be encouraging to all citizens who still believe in a system of free enterprise and democratic government.

IWAN RIES & CO.,
Chicago, March 24, 1947.

Hon. JACK ANDERSON,
Congressman From California,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: This is the first chance I have had to write to you and express my appreciation for your courtesies during the recent hearing before your committee relative to supplying by distributors to the Ship Service Stores.

As you know this is my first experience with Washington and I would like to express to you, as well as the members of your committee, how deeply I was impressed with your knowledge of our problem. Having heard many stories about the way Congress worked, I was totally unprepared for what took place. I am sure the general public does not realize the amount of work you gentlemen do. When I stopped to consider that each of you are on several committees and that each week brings forth different problems to each committee, I began to get a small understanding of your task.

In discussing you with my friends I have discovered that most of them had the same impressions I did, and I would heartily recommend that you find some way to bring businessmen to Washington to see you gentlemen in action.

To me the most impressive thing both on the floor of the House and at the committee hearing was how you gentlemen are looking out for the welfare of the general public. I know now why our country is great and will continue strong. We have a good board of directors who are watching for our welfare constantly.

Again many thanks for your courtesies and with kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

IWAN RIES & CO.,
STANLEY B. LEVI, *Secretary.*

To Give to Labor a Sense of Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine:

TO GIVE TO LABOR A SENSE OF DIGNITY—THAT MUST BE OUR GOAL, SAYS ERIC JOHNSTON, WHO OFFERS A PROGRAM FOR PEACE IN INDUSTRY

(By Eric Johnston)

America will soon begin living under new labor laws. A turbulent, dramatic, fateful decade in our industrial history is drawing to a close. One chapter ends. Another chapter begins.

The last chapter opened with legislation—the Wagner Act. It was hailed by labor as a sure-fire formula for labor peace. Even the preamble of the act said its whole point and purpose was to bring labor peace. It didn't.

The new chapter also opens with legislation. But again, legislation of and by itself won't do the whole job of building industrial peace. It will help. It is needed. But we mustn't deceive ourselves.

If we pin too much faith on legislation to solve our industrial relations problem, we are chasing illusion. Disillusion can follow fast. Legislation might put industrial strife to sleep for a while—a year, 2 years, perhaps more; but the awakening will be costly, the problem worse than ever, combustive from confinement.

Before relying solely on law to cure our industrial ills, take a look at Britain. She tried it. We can benefit from British experience.

Exactly 20 years ago Britain adopted a comprehensive new labor law. A general strike in 1926 had culminated months of industrial warfare. It tied up the whole nation. The nation's economy was paralyzed. The public clamored for new labor legislation, and got it.

Britain passed the Trades Dispute and Trades Union Act. Then it sat back thinking its troubles were over. The provisions of the act have familiar rings.

Britain said: We must make strikes against the Government illegal. They are treasonable. No democracy can tolerate them. So Britain prohibited strikes against the government.

Britain said: We must do something about breaches of labor contracts. "Wildcat" and "quickie" strikes must be outlawed. Union leaders must be made responsible. So Brit-

ain provided drastic penalties for those guilty of such infringements.

Britain said: There is no moral justification for secondary strikes or boycotts. So Britain fixed jail sentences for those guilty of such acts.

Britain said: Mass picketing breeds violence and disrespect for law. So Britain provided jail sentences and fines for mass picketing. She outlawed picketing homes, on the traditional Anglo-Saxon theory that a man's home is his castle, and therefore inviolate.

Britain said: We must regulate the political contributions of unions. Union bosses should not be allowed to set up huge slush funds by taxing the workers. So Britain adopted regulations. She outlawed political contributions by any union from its general fund.

Britain said: Unions ought to publish financial reports. Britain so ordered. She required detailed accounting of all union funds.

British labor leaders feared that new legislation would strangle labor unions. The great British middle class hoped devoutly that the law would bring peace in industry.

British industrials believed that a new, substantial foundation had been laid for the perpetuation of capitalism and the free-enterprise system.

That was the fear, hope, and belief in Britain 20 years ago, but things turned out differently.

We can learn three things from Britain's experience: (1) legislation didn't destroy unions; (2) it didn't solve the industrial relations problem, and (3) now British capitalism is dying rapidly in the strangling clutch of socialism.

Let American labor take a look at lesson No. 1 from British history:

If labor looks, it might stop wringing its hands about labor legislation destroying unions.

Labor's tactics in opposing all legislation are not original. American industry used the same tactics when it was under fire in the 1930's. It merely opposed. It offered nothing. It was agin' everything.

Sane labor legislation isn't going to put labor unions out of business. No one can convince me that jurisdictional disputes benefit unions. No one can convince me that union violation of contracts doesn't give unions a black eye. No one can convince me that regular conventions, secret elections of officers and financial accounting aren't good for union prestige. Union leaders may protest publicly, but in their minds and conscience they know we need legislation to cure these and similar abuses.

Elimination of abuses will help union growth in America. That's what will happen in America.

Now take a look at lesson No. 2 from Britain. Legislation didn't solve Britain's industrial relations problem.

British management never did grasp the core of the problem: that good industrial relations means individuals getting along together on the job. An act of Parliament didn't change the workers' attitude. It didn't bring the boss and the worker any closer together. It didn't make the worker feel he had a stake in the enterprise or in the system. He believed the boss was still his enemy.

We can't afford to make that same mistake in America, and I don't think we will make it.

The basic approach to good employer-employee relations lies within this phrase: "The dignity of man." America was founded on that concept. It was the first State to spell out and give to the world the philosophy that man has certain inalienable rights which the State can't give him or take away from him.

The machine age and mass production, in their very nature, subordinated the individual. No one is particularly to blame for that. We've been so busy perfecting the techniques of the machine age that we've lost sight of the individuals who run the machines.

Figures from a recent Roper poll on this point are shocking. They show roughly 50 percent of workers in American industry have no interest in their jobs. They are frustrated and unhappy—not from poor wages or lack of security, but from hating what they do on the job. From 7 a. m. to 3:30 p. m., they hate what they have to do. For them life begins at 3:30.

Contrast this with the nearly 90 percent of American professional men and executives who, the poll shows, like their work, and the roughly 80 percent of American farmers who are interested in their work.

Admittedly, there will always be a percentage of frustrated individuals, no matter what anybody does. But the percentage of job-bored workers in mass production industries as shown in the poll is far too high. We've got to find and develop compensations for the lack of interest in a noncreative occupation which afflicts the factory worker.

There is no easy-to-follow blueprint from which to build better relations and job satisfaction. But finding an answer takes precedent over new products and new markets. We must sharpen the accent on the worker as a person, not a hand. We must distinguish between man the tool and man the individual.

What I am stressing is this: We must see to it that the individual has a stake and a status in our industrial society.

Now let's look at lesson No. 3 from Britain.

Twenty years after Britain passed its corrective legislation, it got socialism.

It's true, Britain's legislation made unions and their leaders socially and financially responsible, but it did not give them a new sense of responsibility toward British capitalism. In fact, the exact opposite was true. Union support for socialism was intensified. One of the best-selling Socialist penny pamphlets of the period was How to Get Rid of Your Boss for a Penny.

And the workers and the unions did just that.

British management ignored two significant, vital facts of modern economic life. They didn't appreciate that free unions, like free business in a free-enterprise system, are dynamic forces. Nor did they appreciate that either unions will have a stake and a status in the existing system or they will try to build one in which they do.

Because they didn't meet these issues squarely, the struggle and friction in industry were merely transferred from the economic to the political prize ring.

British management wanted capitalism. British workers preferred socialism. The workers, being in the majority, repealed capitalism.

British experience convinces me that it is fatal to depend entirely on legislation. The heady wine that law will give us unity and harmony in industry can produce a terrific hang-over. So let's not rest our case on legislation we are about to get. We must look beyond that.

What, then, is the answer?

In the final analysis, the primary burden of providing an answer rests squarely on the shoulders of management and labor. They live with the problem; they know the problem; they are the best qualified to solve it.

This leads me to make a suggestion. What I propose is not new—but if it works it will be new.

What I propose is a permanent council of management and labor, appointed by the President of the United States. The council would confer regularly with the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce and with the chairman of the Senate and House Labor Committees. It would make an annual report to the President on the state of the Nation's industrial relations. This would be comparable to the President's Council of Economic Advisers who report to him annually on the Nation's economic health.

The reasons for such a council or variation of such a council are obvious. Management and labor would be on the spot. They would have to fish or cut bait. The public would look to them to be continuously grappling with the never ending, constantly changing employer-employee relations.

I know this has been tried before, and it failed. But is it too much for the public to ask management and labor to try it again and give America peace in industry?

I know of no other approach. For the past 8 months I have been chairman of a committee of businessmen and distinguished labor economists brought together by the Committee for Economic Development to study and report on this vast, perplexing problem. They recommended some new legislation, but their over-all conclusion was this: that we must have a permanent management-labor council. It was agreed by all that this was the approach most likely to succeed in our free society.

If such a council can succeed anywhere in the world it can succeed here. This is the only country in the world where labor supports capitalism. All opinion polls make this unmistakably clear. A large percentage of the workers may have a dull outlook on their mass production jobs, but they have a bright outlook on our capitalist system.

In fact, a marvel of today's industrial world is that while capitalism is sick or dying elsewhere, it is stronger in America than ever before. The reason isn't hard to find. American capitalism is unlike the Old World style of capitalism, as much so as our standard of living is unlike the old world standard. It's a partnership capitalism, a people's capitalism. They benefit from it, and so they support it.

The virtue and strength of the American brand of capitalism are more readily seen by contrast. One of the myths of the day is that the American economic system has congealed, and that communism is the great experiment. That myth is exploding every day. Communism is as old as despotism. America is still the great experiment.

The great human experiment of the last few centuries was launched on this continent 170 years ago. It raised man, the citizen, to new heights of dignity. Consistent experiment ever since has increased his economic welfare and his political privileges.

Socially, we are still in the test-tube stage. The way must be found to dignify man, the worker, as we have dignified man, the citizen. When we have found that way, we will have found the key to industrial peace.

Control of Grazing on the Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McDOWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
PENNSYLVANIA GAME COMMISSION,
Harrisburg, March 28, 1947.

Hon. JOHN McDOWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDOWELL: The public lands of the country are again the focal point for a frontal attack. This time it is

the control of grazing on public domain and national forest lands.

The stockmen of the West are again rebelling against Federal efforts to prevent overgrazing. If the agencies now in charge fail in their duty these lands will be ruined. Then the very people who now benefit greatly will lose; the public watersheds will suffer irreparable damage; and the wildlife resources will be literally starved out.

The livestock interests are promoting measures in Congress to raid the Nation's public lands (which they now use at very reasonable fees) by transferring them to private ownership—practically as a gift. If this should be done history would merely repeat itself; abuse and final abandonment would ensue. Ultimately the Government would have to finance the costly job of trying to rehabilitate millions of acres of abandoned lands.

All conservationists are opposed to allowing private interests to raid public lands, regardless of their location or use. We therefore unhesitatingly join with conservation groups everywhere in urging you to use your best efforts to help defeat all such proposals coming before Congress.

Very truly yours,

PENNSYLVANIA GAME COMMISSION,
By SETH GORDON, *Executive Director*.

Government Control of Sources of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am including these remarks in an article of mine which appears in the current issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. This article deals with one of the contemporaneous trends which is plaguing the world and perplexing America.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION

(By KARL E. MUNDT)

Never before in history has the censorship of peacetime news been so tight as it now is in certain areas of the world, and never before has Government control of the sources of information been used so vigorously and so effectively as a propaganda weapon at home and as a means of psychological warfare abroad as is the case in this fretful period following World War II. To control the actions of people, their thinking is directed by carefully selecting the passing events about which they are permitted to read or hear; and when an undesirable fact can no longer be withheld, it is so colored and slanted as to pervert its true significance.

Governments control the sources of information by a fourfold operation which involves censorship and direction of the press, the radio, the public platform, and the book and magazine literature, including textbooks and fiction. To these avenues of communication are usually added such cultural activities as the stage, the screen, the opera, and painting and sculpturing. In fact, the modern totalitarian state overlooks nothing in its determination to subdue and seduce a people by controlling its sources of information.

FREEDOM MAY BE LOST

We who live in the United States with its unchallenged and, I hope, unchallengeable rights of free press, free speech, and free assembly have difficulty in understanding the tremendous power of a propaganda machine which censors all undesired information and feeds the populace a steady stream of adroitly prepared information. Such information comes slowly but surely to dominate the thinking of an entire nation.

Most of us accept our American freedoms with complacency, feeling that of course "it can't happen here," and worry very little about the small clouds of propaganda and censorship which occasionally appear on the American horizon. Yet practically all the countries which are now completely entangled in the black web of controlled information were once free from it. They all demonstrated, long before the final iron curtain was rung down between them and the outside world, that their statesmen, their educators, and their comon people had become apathetic regarding the value of free expression. Even in the United States, our free way of life enjoys no sacred immunity; we too can slip into the dungeon of controlled thought and action if we are not alert to its hazards both at home and abroad and if we fail to recognize and cry out against the first faint tendencies in that direction.

IMPLICATIONS OF CONTROL

Just one year ago, as a member of a Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I was sent abroad to spend over two months making economic and political studies in twenty countries in Europe, Africa, and Asia. It was then that I became fully aware of the vast area of the world now living under governments which control all the sources of information, and appreciated the effectiveness of such control in directing the actions and attitudes of people living in this modern age.

To be sure, I had been dimly aware that certain great nations were controlled by what, for want of a better term, we call "totalitarian governments," and that because of censorship it was difficult for Americans to get a true picture of conditions there. I had also realized vaguely that the peoples of those countries found it impossible to understand American opinion because the combined devices of censorship and propaganda kept them effectively blacked out from the rest of the world. I had known that there really was an "iron curtain" dividing our "one world" into two great areas, so that neither half could learn the true facts about the other. But I had hoped it was a curtain of meshed screen through which at least some honest information could trickle, rather than a curtain of sheet metal stubbornly shutting out all light.

Somehow, I had hoped that with the defeat of Hitler's regime of poison propaganda and callous censorship, of Mussolini's governmental madhouse and of Japan's closed-shop government with its Thought Police system, the world might again enjoy something resembling the free flow of information, the exchange of students and scholars, the simulus of unrestricted visits by tourists, artists, and scientists, and all the other benefits which can stem from hands and minds and hearts which reach and touch across the seas. I now know that under prevailing conditions this great objective is still far from realization. Government control of the sources of information not only interferes with our enlightenment; in this second year of the atomic age it has become a frightening barrier to enduring peace.

As the one who in the United States House of Representatives had authored and introduced House Resolution 215, the resolution whose passage by both Houses of Congress prepared the way for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, I had held high hopes that bringing the educational and cultural leaders of all nations around the conference table would enable the world to evolve certain basic concepts of international good behavior which would help mightily to preserve the peace. I believed that only as the values and virtues of enduring peace are implanted in the hearts and minds of people everywhere can we create ties strong enough to hold in check the hounds of war.

UNESCO has now become a functioning reality, it is an operating branch of the United Nations, it has adopted a working and workable constitution. But up to the time this article is written, Russia has refused to participate. Thus in our struggle to reduce suspicion and prejudice throughout the world we run into the same obstacle that bars the way to peace—government control of sources of information.

While the methods by which the Communist rulers of Russia propagandize their people are not much different from or worse than those now employed in Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia, and other totalitarian countries, this article will deal with their operation in Russia alone. Russia is much more important than any of the other iron curtain countries today, and without her aid, encouragement, and sometimes insistence, the other blackouts of information would quickly be raised.

OBSERVATIONS IN RUSSIA

Our congressional subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs spent a little over a month behind the iron curtain. During that time we traveled in our own plane across more than 3,000 miles of Russian territory, stopping where we desired and visiting whom we pleased. We were granted unusual latitude in this regard because we were designated as the official committee to make to Congress a report on economic conditions which would in large part determine whether Russia should receive relief aid from the United States and from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. We not only conferred with the men of the Kremlin but talked with factory workers and peasants, with store clerks and housewives, with shopkeepers, and with minor officials of various cities and of the state. We visited schools, hospitals, museums, theaters, motion picture houses, and art exhibits. We brought back several hundred pages of typewritten notes, which came through without censorship because they were brought out in a State Department dispatch case of the United States Government.

In our official report[1] the following statements appear:

"The present leaders of Russia are a group of exceedingly able and extremely self-confident men, who evidence no disposition whatsoever to depart in any degree from the established communistic system. They are concerning themselves first of all with keeping an iron control over the populace lest the first symptoms of possible discontent should grow, increased by contacts their armies have had with the easier ways of living in the capitalistic countries. * * * Russia today is definitely being operated as a tightly policed state. Freedom as we understand it does not exist in the U. S. S. R. In complete opposition to the concept of freedom dedicated, as ours is, to the theory that the individual is of importance, that his rights as an individual shall be protected against interference even from his government, and that he shall have the right to criticize and oppose the administration in power, the present 'Russian phenomenon' controls all things with an iron hand through the

[1] European Study Trip Report to 79th Cong., 1st sess., United States Government Printing Office, Public Document No. 89214.

NKVD.[2] In the U. S. S. R., no newspaper writer, no radio commentator, and no speaker from a public platform is permitted to criticize the government. A state police system known as the NKVD operates throughout the empire to arrest and deal with anybody who engages in criticisms of the rules of Russia."

It is virtually impossible to exaggerate the close control which the Russian state, under the direction of its "Politburo,"[3] exercises upon the thought and actions of the 185,000,000 Russian people who do not belong to the Communist Party. Every act of the 185,000,000 is determined by the tightly organized group of 5,000,000 men and women who comprise the Communist Party membership in Russia.

Time reports the following recent statement by Andrei Zhadanov, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Russia: "Our literature is not a private enterprise. * * * We demand that our comrades, as leaders of literature and as authors, should be guided by that without which the Soviet system cannot live—Politics."[4] Zhadanov is currently engaged in spearheading a 4-month campaign to clean up Russia's intellectual front. The magazine Leningrad has been suspended, a million-ruble movie, The Monogrammed Diary, was spirited away without a trace after one viewing by the Cinema Ministry, and the distinguished composer Dimitri Shostakovich's Ninth Symphony was criticized as being hopelessly lacking in warmth of ideological conviction.[5]

APPLICATION TO THE UNITED STATES

By observing and evaluating the results of government censorship and propaganda in other countries, we freedom-loving Americans—especially educators, legislators, and students—should become more determined to keep this Republic free from the oppression and restraints which inevitably accompany such controls. As one who has observed freedom of expression both as a Member of Congress for 8 years and as a teacher in college and high school for 14 years previously, I am firm in my conviction that only through such freedoms as we enjoy for our sources of information can representative government succeed.

Wartime controls appear to be an essential concomitant of war; but as long as they cease with the end of the war the irritations they caused and the excesses to which they led may do as much to strengthen our desire for free sources of information after the controls are removed as they did to bewilder and plague us while they lasted.

Certainly in peacetime America there is virtually no Government control of the public press. Likewise, there is no Government control of American textbooks or of the reading material available to adults. Insofar as the Federal Government and the State governments are concerned, there is equally complete freedom on the public platform for speakers to voice anything but treason in proclaiming their pet theories, nostrums, or creeds. Unfortunately, on rare occasions we hear of a mayor or a police chief or a school board which denies use of a public platform to some purveyor of a quack social, economic, religious, or political doctrine. Such misguided zeal to protect the public from hearing unorthodox or "un-American" doctrines usually results in magnifying the importance of the man and his message rather than in reducing his influence; but it reveals that there are mentalities even in freedom-loving America who would resort to Government control of the sources of information if they had sufficient authority to do so. It is temptingly easy to favor free speech for those with whom we agree; it is less easy to protect it for those voicing doctrines repugnant to our ears. Unless we do the latter, however, the former soon becomes a right without significance or substance. Even the worst dictators of Europe authorize full "freedom of speech" for those who enunciate the party line or who conform to the status quo.

RADIO REGULATION

Except for these occasional excesses of personal authority by shortsighted city officials or organizations which make mistaken attempts to "protect our freedoms by denying them," Americans today are remarkably free from governmental control over their sources of information except in the field of radio. Since, for technical reasons, only confusion can result from a complete absence of control of the number, the nature, and the size of broadcasting stations, the Federal Communications Commission was established, with authority to evaluate the work of radio stations on the basis of their "public interest, convenience, or necessity." Since 1927 every person desiring to operate a radio station has been obliged to obtain the consent of, and secure a license from, the Commission. Every 3 years he must prove his fitness to have his license renewed. Hence each radio station has a sword of Damocles hanging over its head; it constantly fears that some program or speaker may cause it to lose favor with the Federal Communications Commission. Some radio chains have invested millions of dollars with no assurance that they can continue to exist unless they court the favor of the FCC.

All government commissions love authority and thrive on power. The FCC accordingly has interpreted its authority (and the United States Supreme Court a few years ago upheld that interpretation)[6] to include the power "to determine the composition of that traffic"; in other words, it has arrogated to itself the right to consider the composition of radio programs as one of the factors determining whether it shall grant a new license or renew an old one.

Thus, the power of censorship has clearly been placed in the hands of a Government agency, the Federal Communications Commission, insofar as American radio is concerned. Whether that power is positively exercised or simply used as a threat to enforce compliance with what the FCC considers "proper radio-program traffic," it is clear that the American freedoms enjoyed in the realms of the press, the platform, and the schools do not exist in the field of radio. It is to this first but significant departure from our rule of freedom that enlightened citizens, educators, and legislators in Congress should devote their active, prompt, and effective attention.

Some of the more public-spirited members of the Federal Communications Commission have recognized the evils of our present system for licensing broadcasting stations. Commissioner Craven, for example, put it this way:

"Freedom of speech and freedom of the press are, in simple terms, merely freedom from fear of Government reprisals or pressures for what is said or printed or for what is not said or printed. * * * The real freedom of the press guaranteed by the Bill of Rights is freedom in the true sense to criticize the Government without fear of reprisals. If the Bill of Rights is to mean anything for radio, it should mean freedom from governmental reprisals or pressures administered by the radio licensing authority, namely, the Federal Communications Commission."

Commissioner Craven was eternally correct in that statement. As any student of radio programs or anyone conversant with the radio industry knows, however, such freedom as that envisaged by the Bill of Rights does not exist in the realm of radio today. We have already had some ugly instances wherein radio newscasters and commentators expressing views distasteful to the administration in Washington were "pressured" off the air by not-so-vague hints that unless their critical comment was softened or stopped, the Federal Communications Commission might be very loath to renew broadcasting licenses for the recalcitrant stations.

THE REMEDY

What is the remedy for this first faint sign of controlled information as it exists in the Government-radio relationship today? Since technical conditions make the limiting and licensing of radio outlets essential, the licensing should be done by a revamped Federal Communications Commission composed of representatives selected equally from both major political parties. A six-member FCC could, for example, "take politics out of radio" if three were selected from the Democratic Party and three from the Republican Party, provided the party leaders in each case were permitted to nominate their own choices for this important position. Simply making it mandatory that three members of each party must be chosen would be ineffective if the appointments could be made by the President from those who are registered as Democrats or Republicans but whose fidelity to the party may be suspect. If the President were required to appoint the members nominated from each party by the respective party leaders themselves, there would be no possibility of packing the supreme court of radio.

Furthermore, the terms of the members of the FCC should be comparatively short, with expirations so occurring that some experienced members would always remain on the Commission and that the equality of representation between the two parties would always be maintained. Since all actions of the Commission would thus require a bipartisan vote, radio would be freed from the present threats to its liberty of action.

While not pertinent to this discussion, which is limited to governmental controls of sources of information, it should not go unnoticed that freedom of speech on the radio is also imperiled by the fact that rich advertisers or sponsors can buy up important wave lengths on large radio chains and thus subsidize opinion which they desire to disseminate. Action can and should be taken to ensure that the radio diet of the listening public is not too heavily seasoned in conformity with the tastes of the fattest purses of the land. Competition in the field of newspapers and magazines is a check against such mental malnutrition; since adequate competition in radio is technically impossible at the present time, other safeguards must be found.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, it is relevant to point out that our present comparative freedom from

---

[2] Russia's NKVD is its state police force, organized and operating almost exactly like Hitler's Gestapo and the Thought Police of Japan. Recently the NKVD has been renamed the MVD, but its Gestapo-like functions have not changed.

[3] The group of 14 top Communists who, with Premier Stalin, determine all Russian policies.

[4] Time, October 14, 1946, p. 35.

[5] For more detailed information on how communism is presently utilizing all sources of information to regiment its people, see I Chose Freedom by Victor Kravchenko, and The Great Globe Itself by William C. Bullitt, both published by Charles Scribner & Sons, New York.

[6] U. S. Supreme Court Report (October term, 1942), vol. 319, p. 190.

Government control of the sources of information in America is not necessarily permanent. Other countries have had such freedoms and lost them. Some lost them abruptly. Some lost them by the slow processes of attrition and neglect. We who work in the field of free expression in America have a responsibility to our craft. We should expose propaganda for what it is, wherever and whenever it raises its ugly head. We should oppose censorship in peacetime no matter by whom it is tried or for what purpose. While we should caution our associates not to abuse our inherited freedoms, we should resist to the utmost any attempt of Government at any level to substitute political control for self-restraint. Free men and women cannot protect their liberties without access to free sources of information, and an enduring peace cannot provide security for all humanity until and unless all the world is finally freed from the shackles of propaganda and censorship imposed by the self-seeking rulers of unenlightened peoples.

Theory and Composition of Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject Theory and Composition of Our Armed Forces, published in the March–April 1947 issue of the Army Ordnance Magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTH BY MONTH

Col. HENRY CABOT LODGE, United States Senator from Massachusetts, has raised a series of questions about the theory and composition of our armed forces. He is without doubt the best qualified Member of the United States Senate to propound such questions and to assay the answers. He has come closest of anyone thus far in getting down to brass tacks—with or without the advice and consent of the brass hats—as to the basic principles and policies which must underlie our national-security policy, already dangerously delayed. But the delay will be less costly if, in the long run, we make haste slowly and give utmost attention publicly and officially to the correctness of the conclusions rather than the speed with which they were reached.

The Senator, whose military record in peace and in war is of outstanding character, addressed his questions to Dr. Karl T. Compton, distinguished scientist and educator, who is chairman of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. Here are the questions propounded by Senator LODGE:

"1. Is the Government of the United States, acting through its legislative and executive branches, organizing the total human and material resources of the Nation to provide national security against total war?

"2. Does the Government of the United States possess conclusions which are at one and the same time authoritative, impartial, comprehensive, and up to date regarding the effect of modern science on national security in the light of the facts of the world situation and of the capacity of our economy?

"3. Are these conclusions sufficiently firm to enable the American people to tell what are the just demands to be made on their money and their manpower?

"4. Do these conclusions include definite information on the following points? (a) The effect of recent scientific developments and future scientific probabilities on the nature of air, ground, and sea warfare. (b) The most effective method for allocating manpower as between industry, labor, agriculture, essential scientific research, and other civilian occupations on the one hand, and the armed services on the other. (c) The method for allocating manpower among air, ground, and sea forces. (d) The length of service for air, ground, and sea forces. (e) The most effective way to procure needed manpower. (f) The probable importance of fifth-column activity and biological warfare in any future war. (g) The need for underground installations.

"5. What is the present ability of the United States: (a) To hold strategic air, ground, and sea bases? (b) To provide immediate defense against air and surface attacks? (c) To undertake counteroffensive action on all types? (d) To discharge our immediate responsibilities, viz.; the occupation of Germany and Japan, the provision of military forces for the United Nations, the support of American foreign policy in north China and Trieste, and the maintenance of communications to overseas bases? (e) To mobilize rapidly? (f) To eliminate efficiently the deadwood in the personnel of the Regular air, ground, and sea services? (g) To get quick decisions on matters affecting the air, ground, and sea services?

"6. What is the present degree of American supremacy in scientific research and development?"

In reply, Dr. Compton said that the Commission under his chairmanship is considering and attempting to secure authoritative information on most of the subjects raised by the Senator since they are inherent in the general problem. In accepting the Presidential assignment last November, Dr. Compton himself went on record with this very cogent observation:

"I believe that there are other very important aspects of national security in addition to a reservoir of citizens with military training. These include, of course, our Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force, together with the National Guard. I think it is especially important that we establish a highly mobile striking force equipment with the most powerful weapons which can be devised and highly trained on the technical side to use these weapons and prepared on minimum notice to strike any place in the world where aggression against us breaks out.

"I, also, am convinced that our security demands an exceedingly active, forward-looking, and continuing program of research and development on new weapons. If the past war taught us anything about military tactics, it was to the effect that no new war will be fought by the old weapons and devices. Our security demands that we be in the forefront of new weapon development.

"It seems to me that the most important problem of national security is to determine as best we can the relative emphasis which should be devoted to the factors mentioned above in order that our country may have the maximum military strength in return for the amount of money from our national budget which Congress and the country will make available for military-security purposes.

"Therefore, before advocating an all-out program for universal military training I think we should have some sound basis on which to judge whether the proposed military-training program fits in proper proportion into the larger program. For example, if the money necessary to operate universal military training were so great as to prevent proper strength of our permanent armed forces or prevent the establishment of a mobile striking force or curtail the program of research and development on new weapons, then I would feel that the universal military training program is an unwise investment of public funds and effort."

Here we have from two eminently qualified experts the closest approach yet attained toward a sound preparedness policy in the light of our experiences, our successes and failures, and our national and international obligations growing out of World War II. At long last the problem of maintaining our armed forces is to be viewed as an integrated and not a piecemeal undertaking. Throughout these studies it should be made abundantly evident to all our people that science and industry are equally if not more important segments of our national security than manpower.

Indeed, a reading of the war record prompts the belief that the development of small strategic and tactical forces—small in manpower, that is—is far more advantageous than the doctrine of the big battalions and that, coordinately, a dollar spent on research and development of the new weapons will be worth many spent on universal military training. This is particularly true in this atomic age when new inventions and discoveries are crowding one upon another.

Since cost to the taxpayer must be an important consideration for years to come, an equally cogent observation is that the preservation of the national economy must not be overlooked in framing the over-all security policy. Taking a leaf from the book of the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, those who decide upon our over-all national security policy should not even unwittingly sit in at the dismemberment of the American economic system which outproduced in men and munitions the Socialist and Communist economies of our principal allies.

Senator LODGE has expressed the attitude of countless numbers of his fellow countrymen. His logic is sound and his expression of it timely. This and the findings of Dr. Compton's commission bid fair to be the closest approaches yet made toward a policy of national security which will take into consideration all and not merely a few of the essential factors.

It is to be hoped that munition power through long-range programs of scientific research and development will come out of it all on at least equal terms with manpower. To do less will be to blind ourselves to one of the gravest and most costly lessons of World War II.

Keeping the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, is it not about time that the administration stops shipping war materials to Russia? Has this administration learned nothing from the ghastly consequences of arming Japan? How reassuring is the conduct of Russia in these perilous and decisive hours in our peace negotiations?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article by Marquis Childs which appeared March 28, 1947, in the Washington Post:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

MATTER OF RECORD

In the argument over the proposed program for Greece and Turkey, a lot is made of the fact that the United States bypassed the United Nations. Those opposing the program try to make it sound as though this country had deliberately set out to knife the UN.

A little tact might have prevented this phase of the argument. In early conferences on the proposal, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG argued that we could do two things:

1. Notify the UN what we intended to do and why we were going to do it; and

2. Ask the UN to keep jurisdiction over the border dispute while we supplied aid for the rehabilitation of Greece.

Those steps, it seems to me, should have been taken. We would now be on sounder ground.

But when it comes to giving the UN the cold shoulder, it would be well to look at the record before too much blame is heaped on the United States. The record shows that the Soviet Union has ignored or turned down most of the UN's specialized agencies. These are the agencies intended to implement the decisions taken in the UN Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. This briefly, is the record:

World Bank and International Monetary Fund: Russia accepted invitation to Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 and took active part. In reply to a question whether she intended to become a member of the fund, Russia replied the following year that the decision was under consideration. Through 1946 a place was left open for the Soviet Union and, in August of that year, Moscow was asked whether or not a Russian delegate would like to sit in on the board meetings as an observer. No reply was received.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: While Russia originally agreed to discuss such an Organization, she turned down an invitation to attend a conference called to implement it. When the executive committee was set up, a place was left for the USSR. Last July the committee met, with Russia not present. An agreement between UN and UNESCO was ratified last December, with the Soviets not voting.

Food and Agriculture Organization: Russia attended original conference at Hot Springs and approved the plan of organization. By May of 1945, 22 countries had accepted. In October of that year the Soviets said further study of the Organization was required, and after that nothing was heard from Moscow.

International Civil Aeronautics Organization: A seat was held for Russia but, in spite of repeated coaxing, the Soviets declined.

International Labor Organization: Russia was at one point listed as a member of this League of Nations inheritance, but withdrew in 1940. The USSR was invited to the conference in Paris, but declined.

International Refugee Organization: Russia voted against constituting IRO when the constitution was adopted by the general assembly. The Soviets have taken the stand, vigorously opposed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as a United States delegate, that refugees should be compelled to return to the nations of their origin.

World Health Organization: As in the case of several other of the specialized agencies, Soviet delegates took part in drafting the charter in June of 1946 and have attended meetings of an interim commission. But if and when who is ratified, it will be the first specialized agency Russia has joined.

As the record shows, repeated efforts were made without success to draw the Soviet Union into this specialized work of the UN. Soviet refusal to join in has held up UN organization on several fronts.

Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson was asked why we did not continue to support UNRRA, the UN relief organization, which might then have been used to aid Greece. He replied that politics in the UN had blocked earlier efforts to get larger relief supplies to Greece.

As a debating society between two rival teams, the UN cannot be very effective. Too often that is what it seems to be at the level of the assembly and the security council. To wait for lengthy debate to decide whether UN relief would go to Greece would be to wait for Greece's downfall. We must take some blame for UN's feebleness, but those Americans who would put all blame on us at this point reveal merely their own prejudice.

Mr. Bullitt's Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the High Point (N. C.) Enterprise:

A WARNING

William C. Bullitt was the United States' first Ambassador to Russia following this Nation's recognition of the Soviet Union. He went to Moscow as one anxious to cement real friendship between Russia and this country—so anxious that at the time some denounced him as a dangerous radical. He served between 3 and 4 years. He has kept in constant touch with Russia—insofar as that is possible for one outside the iron curtain—and with the relations between the two countries ever since. He should be an authority on Russia and its attitude toward the outside world in general and the United States in particular.

Yesterday Mr. Bullitt, during prolonged testimony before a committee of Congress, expressed the emphatic opinion that Russia plans an ultimate attack on the United States—in accord with the Communist Party doctrine that communism cannot live in a world with democratic and capitalistic countries. He voiced his belief that if Russia had had the atomic bomb and we had not, already it would have launched an attack. He declared, as many another has during the last 2 years, that through the infiltration of Communists into the Government and organizations of the United States—some admitting that they are Communists but many others lying about it in accordance with the dictates of Moscow—Russia is doing its utmost to weaken the Government and morale of the United States.

Does anyone believe that Mr. Bullitt is a crackpot whose warnings are to be dismissed without serious consideration?

Is it not obvious that the Communists are already boring from within, seeking to stir up strife, using whatever organizations it can influence and whatever posts its fellow travelers can acquire for its own subversive ends?

Mr. Bullitt said that the American Communist Party and its counterparts in other nations is used by Russia as a fifth column "just in the way Hitler used them—only much more effectively."

"The existence of a fifth column of a national Communist Party in the United States is even a greater threat than was Hitler's fifth column," he added. "Its aim is to weaken the American Government for the ultimate assault which the Soviet Union intends to make on the United States. We know there is a group of men so important to the Soviet Union that they are not allowed to reveal that they are members of the party. I do not believe that we have sufficient information on all these groups to put our hands on them effectively."

All that comes, please remember, from the man who took the lead in an effort to make friends with Russia, following his appointment by President Roosevelt—from a man whose greatest efforts have been to study Russia and its government.

Are we to say that this man is a scatterbrained alarmist?

Or are we to heed Mr. Bullitt when he urges the United States demand that Stalin call a halt, mean it, and prove it before Russia is ready for its "ultimate attack"—and when he urges that we rid our Nation of the Communist rats boring from within?

It is upon the answer to such questions that our Nation's future—and that of the world—in large measure depends.

Resolution of Rochester Diocesan Holy Name Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 I called the attention of the Members of the House to the grave injustice practiced upon Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac of Zagreb.

Every Member should read his stirring words uttered in his own defense at the travesty of justice called his trial.

I have now received from the Rochester Diocesan Holy Name Union of Rochester, N. Y., a resolution adopted by that organization, protesting against the despotism now rampant in the world, so poignantly symbolized by the Stepinac incident.

Because this resolution bespeaks an acute awareness on the part of an important segment of my constituency of the problems which face our Christian country and its leaders today, and because Holy Week is the period in particular when we should turn our thoughts toward the suffering in body and mind of our brethren in foreign lands, sons with us of one Father, under leave to extend my remarks I include this resolution:

ROCHESTER DIOCESAN
HOLY NAME UNION,
Rochester, N. Y., March 20, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was adopted at a meeting of the Rochester Diocesan Holy Name Union:

"We wish to register a vigorous protest against the despotic violation of human rights now being practiced in that area of eastern Europe figuratively described as 'behind the iron curtain.'

"As American citizens devoted to respect for the dignity of human rights, we appeal

in behalf of those victims of tyranny whose tragic fate is symbolized by the unjust imprisonment of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, of Zagreb.

"In the face of such tyrannous violation of the American doctrine of four freedoms, we Americans must not remain silent nor rest until all men everywhere enjoy true liberty in fact as well as in theory.

"We respectfully call upon all political leaders in the United States to raise their voices clearly and continuously in behalf of those millions in eastern Europe now trapped in the bondage of tyranny and weighed down with the fetters of despotism.

"We urge our statesmen, the heirs of Washington and Lincoln, to unite in a moral protest against the reign of terror now raging behind the iron curtain.

"If we Americans are sincerely dedicated to a world of four freedoms we must not turn our backs on the plight of those millions now crushed by ruthless oppression."

Very sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. SCHUR,
President, Rochester Deanery.

What Should American Policy Be in the Middle East Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me on March 18, 1947:

My fellow Americans, this is, of course, a very broa subject and I feel that a detailed answer cannot be made until the administration has provided more information particularly with respect to those aspects of the President's message which deal with innovations in our foreign policy. In the meantime, however, I think certain comments in broad outline are clearly indicated. We are faced with a grim choice. I believe that the President has chosen the lesser of two evils.

Nevertheless, if we are to assume the vastly increased responsibilities which the President suggests, we must not only define these responsibilities but undertake them for the purposes proclaimed by the President. He said to the Congress: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." It was on this basis that he requested the cooperation of Congress. It is on this basis that I believe cooperation should be given.

In the meantime, it is to be hoped that the administration will lay all the facts before the Congress in order that the details of this crisis may be exposed to public view.

It is also vital that the administration adhere strictly to its own policy. In other words, we should not on the one hand add to the already heavy tax burden of the American people while on the other hand we are increasing that burden by making concessions to the very forces with which we appear to be in continual disagreement.

We have seen in the course of the last 30 years that the world's wars are a matter for our deep concern. Our generation has lived in an almost continuous state of emergency in which the alarms outside our frontiers have had a tremendous impact upon the lives of our people. We have tried to learn our lesson. In the brief months which have elapsed since the termination of World War II we have talked of one world as enthusiastically as we once spoke of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine proclaimed our interest in what might become of South America then 30 days distant. The President's proclamation declares our interest in what may happen in Greece now 30 hours distant. Self preservation demands that we face the issue as presented to us and that we realize that the President's pronouncement is based on the advice of our high military authorities.

It is time that we became aware of a few basic facts and thereby bring our understanding of our predicament in line with the preternatural power of the atom bomb.

First: Let us recognize once and for all that there is no sharp dividing line between war and peace. Wars are but extensions of peacetime conflicts—the final confession of man's inability to solve his differences by peaceful means. Accordingly, if we were justified in participating in the world's wars, we are at least as justified in participating in the world's peacetime conflicts. Second: We must abandon the idea that we can oppose the disruptive forces now at large in the world without interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. We must interfere. We must interfere in order to bring relief and economic aid to those who need it rather than to those who do not and who use it to destroy the very principles which are still widely cherished. We must interfere in order that these nations shall not be a constant drain on our resources. We must interfere in order that we may rehabilitate rather than pauperize these destitute human beings. We must interfere in order to protect the American people from the use of their money in the cause of communism. More than $2,000,000,000 in relief and economic aid have been expended since the war's end and largely through UNRRA. This money did much to strengthen the anti-freedom forces. It helped the very forces to which we are opposed. It assisted Communist and terrorist minorities to impose their will on freedom-loving majorities.

I am relieved that the administration has at last seen the error of its ways. I am happy that it has abandoned a policy of appeasement.

There is no question that the betrayal of Poland at Yalta, the help we have furnished to Tito, the hands-off policy in China, the uncontrolled expenditures of millions of the American taxpayers' dollars, as well as many other incidents in the administration's confused approach to postwar problems, have contributed to our present predicament. Had the administration been more decisive and clear-headed, we might not now be confronted with this grave crisis. Let us hope that the discords and confusions of the past can provide the harmonies of the future. Let us face the actualities as they are presented to us by our President. We must do more than use the power of money. We have been asked to "authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey at the request of those countries and for the purpose of supervising the use of such financial and material assistance as may be furnished." This means involvement. In order to bring this about, in order to shoulder these responsibilities, we must do more than simply export American dollars to relieve human distress. True charity means more than the writing of a check. True participation means more than financial and economic aid.

Now, that does not mean that we should be warmongers. In a nation of our demonstrated power, in a people of our mighty achievements, a show of truculence would be as unfitting as it is unnecessary. It does mean, however, that we should stop apologizing for our share in the recent war. It does mean that we must renounce the hope that we can prevent World War III by methods which failed to prevent World War II. It does mean that we should place our faith in the force of principle rather than in the power of appeasement. It does mean that we must bolster these principles, not only by our industrial and military might but by a dynamic concept of our own convictions. It is my profound belief that a peaceful accommodation can more easily be predicated on American strength than on American weakness.

We can perhaps indulge the hope that self-assurance and firmness now will reveal the essential debility of communism. To quote from Abraham Lincoln: "In our intercourse with other nations it behooves us to be at once compromising and stern. If international understanding can be perpetuated by giving a little more and taking a little less, why then let us give a little more and take a little less. But never must we do all the giving. Rather in the case of a long threatening misunderstanding let us prepare for the worst and work for the best."

We can work for the best through the good offices of the United Nations and we can best prepare for the worst by an abiding sense that until the United Nations has gathered vital momentum the choice for the world lies between a Pax Sovietica and a Pax Americana. This is the issue. This is the salient fact. This is the essential challenge of the hour.

Are we prepared to nullify the tragic sacrifices so gallantly made in World War II? Are we now ready to consign the rest of the world and ourselves along with it to the ash-heap of a totalitarian subjugation which differs but little from that which recently engulfed millions of lives? "There is a tide in the affairs of men which taken at the flood leads on to fortune." Make no mistake about it. This is it. This is the tide. It is at the flood. The rest is up to us.

MODERATOR. Congressman LODGE, one question that has been asked in Congress and elsewhere, and has been worrying many people, is that of the United Nations. By going into Greece alone, in a situation affecting, as the President said, international peace, are we by-passing the United Nations? Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. LODGE. The United States, in taking the action recommended by the President, is not undermining the United Nations. On the contrary, it proposes to take action in defense of the charter which the United Nations is incapable of taking in time. The United Nations already has a committee making an on-the-spot investigation. But, as is well stated by the New York Times "it will be poor service to the United Nations if Greece has been engulfed by a Communist tide by the time the committee makes its report." Furthermore, the United Nations has neither the money nor the power to act. Moreover, it is almost certain that if the United Nations had the money and the power the Soviet Union would veto such action.

It is also to be noted that the United Nations has not yet arrived at agreements with member nations with respect to military participation.

In spite of all this, I think it highly important that we reaffirm our loyalty as a member of the United Nations by stating our position to the United Nations through the secretary-general and request Mr. Austin to explain our proposals to that body. In that fashion we would do much for the moral authority and prestige of the United Nations by giving a clear indication that we have no intention of evading our obligation to consult with them. Mankind's aspirations for a peaceful world demand that the United Nations receive encouragement while the Greeks and the Turks receive our aid.

Hamstringing USES

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Washington Daily News of March 31, 1947:

HAMSTRINGING USES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

In the numerous drastic economies which the House voted a few days ago in the Labor Department's appropriation for next year it carved the United States Employment Service down to such a skeleton that it will be incapable of maintaining a national employment system.

That was the purpose for which it was created, back in 1933, in the midst of depression. In the Wagner-Peyser Act, Congress recognized unemployment as a national problem by setting up USES to cooperate with State employment services in finding jobs.

In the years since, USES has justified itself for its services, in cooperation with the States, to industry, labor and, more recently, to veterans. It functioned so effectively, built up standards and procedures for job placement so well, that when the war came it was assigned the task of channeling millions of workers into war industry, a big job which it did most capably. Because of the emergency, USES was given temporary control and direction of State employment systems. The system, in short, was federalized.

After the war Congress restored the Federal-State cooperative system, turning control of State employment services back to the States. USES, though, was to continue its functions of coordinating and assisting the States as provided by law.

That is, until the House last week knocked its appropriation to $900,000, a 74-percent cut below President Truman's budget recommendation. That will require the agency to reduce its staff from 875 to 202 and to close all of its regional offices with the possible exception of one on the Pacific Coast. About all it would be able to do would be to serve as a fiscal agent to review State budget requests for funds appropriated for maintenance of State systems and to audit accounts.

Protests are coming in from certain types of business that require seasonal labor, particularly canners, which indicates the need of a national clearing house for transient labor. But, further than this, the USES also serves all sorts of business and industry of stable employment. The search for skilled help and the search of skilled help for jobs know no State lines.

During the war, USES compiled a job dictionary which listed some 30,000 job classifications and kept this constantly up to date, so that the call from one locality for certain types of skills could be met from another locality through the clearing house.

This sort of service would have to be stopped under the appropriations cut. Congress would be taking quite a responsibility in doing away with it—with at least the prospect of a recession being forecast by economists. This will be one concern that will face the Senate when it considers the Labor Department bill. States are unable individually to perform this clearing-house function adequately.

But that is only one function that would be affected. Another is a job-occupational analysis carried on in cooperation with industry that industry has found valuable. Still another is a job-placement program just started in connection with colleges and universities for GI students who will graduate as specialists of one sort or another. This is a service USES provides among others, for the Veterans' Employment Service, the appropriation of which was itself cut 34 percent to $1,756,800, so that the staff of that Service also will be reduced here to only a handful.

What is seen, if the House action is upheld by the Senate, is a slow deterioration of the national employment system, for the USES also helped, by its surveys and its surveillance, to keep up standards in States to protect labor. There is a tendency in States, under pressure of special interests, to whittle down standards.

Playing Politics With Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by R. H. Markham, from the Christian Science Monitor of March 28, 1947:

PLAYING POLITICS WITH FOOD

(By R. H. Markham)

Representatives of the Communist-dominated Yugoslav Government have asked America for food through the International Emergency Food Council. They say that no fewer than 5,000,000 persons in western Yugoslavia are about to undergo the worst crisis of the last two critical years.

The United States Government refused the request because of more urgent needs elsewhere, and the Yugoslav Ambassador in Washington has again pressed the appeal.

I believe that Americans should do everything possible to help all hungry men, women, and children. But I would also urge that they form a clear picture of the conditions that have deprived Marshal Tito's countrymen of food. Americans are asked to feed Yugoslavs because Tito's policies have made them hungry. The famine is largely political, not meteorological.

Yugoslavia, since its establishment in 1918, has been a food-exporting country. It produces large quantities of wheat, corn, potatoes, pork, and poultry, considerable cheese, and fruit. It is an abounding land. Practically the only staple food it ever imported was rice, and that in small quantities—never as much as 25,000 tons in a year. It exported eggs, livestock, wheat, and corn, sometimes a tenth of the whole corn crop. Yugoslavia's food and timber exports always exceeded its importation of manufactured articles, giving it a favorable trade balance.

Yugoslavia's arable land, covering about a third of the surface of the country, was unevenly distributed. Large regions in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia and Montenegro are "passive," while Slavonia and Voivodina (northeast Yugoslavia) are extremely productive. Serbia produces more food than it consumes and Macedonia is normally self-supporting. Each year, without exception, food must be sent from the "active" to the "passive" areas. After this annual equalization, much is left over for export.

During the recent war, parts of Yugoslavia were badly devastated, but they were the "passive areas." The fertile valleys of the Save, Drave, Tisza, and Danube were not ravaged to any large extent. Serbia remained largely intact and with considerable food reserves. Macedonia underwent little demolition. The principal loss in the agricultural area was of livestock.

Also, there has been no extreme general drought in Yugoslavia. Weather conditions have been fair in most of the productive regions.

In addition, the war ended in Serbia by Christmas 1944, in the rich Banat a little later, and in the whole of Yugoslavia by May 1945. Most spring planting in 1945, all fall planting of that year and all planting during 1946 could proceed without external interference. Most of Yugoslavia has had 2 years in which to replenish its food supply.

Another favorable element in the situation is the fact that practically all Yugoslav agriculture is small-scale farming. The whole village family is ordinarily engaged in production and they work with simple tools, such as hoes and sickles. War does not radically derange such farming. It's fairly easy to get out the old hoe and scythe.

The main cause of the present food deficiency is Tito's antipeasant policy. He, not the weather man, produced the atmosphere that dried up the fields. The Serbian peasant leader, Dragoleub Yovanovitch, has called Tito's agrarian policy a "stab in the back for the peasants." Many Yugoslav peasants have been treated as "enemies of the people." The regime confiscated large areas of excellent Danubian farm land—formerly belonging to non-Slavs—and set up state farms or Sovhozi.

It also brought in colonists, whose only qualification was that they had become Communists. It imposed a rigid food collection upon the Serb peasants. It suppressed all genuine Peasant Party activity. It kept Croatian peasant leaders in prison. It launched a crusade against the Serb peasant leaders, resulting in brutal physical attacks. It set up Communist-dominated administrations in the villages, causing distrust and deep enmity. It shattered confidence in private ownership of land and ownership of crops.

As a result of all this, some fields weren't planted, others were poorly tended and production fell, while part of what was raised was hidden.

Yugoslavia has millions of acres as fertile and well watered as those in the Mississippi Valley. At least 90 percent of them are normally planted to cereals. Its peasants are among the most enterprising and industrious on earth. It has received more than $400,000,000 worth of aid from UNRRA, equal to about two annual state budgets. The great Yugoslav rivers have flowed without diminution, fair rains have fallen, peasants have stood ready with hoe and plow. Yet Ohio, Iowa, Kansas, and Canada are called upon to help feed a third of the Yugoslavs (5,000,000).

The main reason is Tito's antipeasant policy. He is making humble women and children pay for his Communist crusade. His might was built from the hunger of "the weary and heavy laden." The people are the victims of Tito's people's government.

Incentive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Melrose (Mass.) Free Press

of March 27, 1947, a splendid weekly published in my own home city seems to me worthy of a wider reading and I therefore call it to the attention of my colleagues by appending it hereto under leave to extend my remarks:

INCENTIVE

It becomes increasingly apparent that all too few present-day Americans realize the dynamic force of incentive, and the tremendous part it has played in creating here the greatest productive economy and the finest social system in world history.

Now, there is nothing mysterious about incentive—it is quite easy to understand and from that understanding to appreciate why it contributes so much to human welfare wherever it is allowed to operate. When incentive is in action, the more work one does, or the better work one does, the greater the reward one receives. It's just as simple as that.

Even Josef Stalin recognizes the value of incentive. When he became Dictator of Russia, practically the first thing he did, was to proclaim that the worker who worked harder or better was to have better food, better clothing, a better home to live in, etc., than his less industrious and less skillful fellow worker.

But there is a force at work in America which deliberately or mistakenly is trying to destroy incentive, working through our Federal Government. When the Government, through taxation withholds or withdraws money from a worker, even though such levies are used to provide him with goods and services, there is less incentive left to induce him to do more or better work. The reasons for this are obvious. The goods and services thus provided by Government are available to him without any need for more or better work on his part; and in many cases those goods and services are not what he would choose if he had freedom of choice.

Money deducted from wages and taken from employers for such things as social security and unemployment benefits, may contribute to a worker's welfare and security, but it does take away considerable of his incentive to do more and better work.

It follows, therefore, that if the Federal Government should undertake to give additional goods and services, such as is contemplated under the proposed free medical and hospitalization legislation, it will be forced to take more money out of the pay envelopes of the workers and from employers. And in rendering these additional services, the workers' incentive to do more or better work will be further decreased.

The reward for doing more or better work cannot be greater than the value added to the work. When a man whose work was worth $60 a week begins to produce work worth $75 a week, unfortunately under the present set-up, he cannot be given a fair share of the additional $15. The tax collector is on hand to take a slice of that $15. While it is true that he gets some benefits for those tax deductions, he would still get them even if he didn't work the extra $15 worth. Thus incentive is at least partially destroyed.

The danger inherent in this is that there is a point at which deductions from wages would become so great that incentive would be wiped out. There lies the fundamental defect of all public services paid out of taxes or by any kind of compulsory levy. These taxes or levies purchase for the worker services and things that he may wish to have, or that may be good for him, but they decrease the amount of money which he otherwise would have available to spend on the things he personally wants.

Only money which the worker can earn to spend personally is an incentive to him to work harder or better. No one ever heard of anyone working harder or better in order to be able to pay more taxes. Yes, definitely, there is a limit to how much of the worker's wages can be withdrawn in taxes and levies, without completely destroying his incentive to do more and better work. And if we ever reach that limit when incentive is a "dead pigeon," it will mean economic and social suicide for America.

Relief of Starvation in Moldavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

MARCH 11, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that last month the President of the United States gave instructions that 7,000 tons of food en route to the United States Army overseas be diverted to Rumania for distribution without charge, in order to relieve starvation in Moldavia.

In this connection, I shall appreciate it very much if you will be so kind as to answer the following questions:

1. To what funds will the purchase of this food be charged?
2. What is the amount of the funds so used?
3. From what source did the State Department learn of the Moldavian famine?
4. Have representatives of the United States Embassy in Bucharest checked Moldavian famine conditions on the spot?
5. Will the State Department show the Committee on Foreign Affairs such Bucharest Embassy reports as pertain to the Moldavian famine?
6. Will the distribution of American food within Moldavia be supervised by American personnel?
7. Will the Rumanian Red Cross be charged with a part of the distribution of such food?
8. Is the Rumanian Red Cross free from the control of the Rumanian Government?
9. Approximately how much food was exported to the Soviet Union from Rumania in 1946? If the approximate amount is unknown, is it your opinion that the amount withdrawn has made an appreciable drain on Rumanian food resources?
10. Approximately how much local food has been consumed by the Soviet armies garrisoning Rumania in 1946? Has this requisitioning of food been a considerable drain on Rumanian food resources?
11. Is Soviet Russia at the present time helping to relieve Moldavian famine conditions?

I thank you in advance, Mr. Secretary, for your courteous attention to this matter.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

MARCH 19, 1947.

The Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LODGE: In response to your letter of March 11, I am herein answering the questions which you have asked concerning the shipment of 7,000 tons of relief food to Rumania, as recently directed by the President.

Nos. 1 and 2: The 7,000 tons of food consisted of 4,500 tons of 10-in-1 rations and 2,500 tons of dried beans originally consigned to the United States Army for feeding displaced persons in Austria. This food was originally bought and paid for by the United States Army out of their civilian relief appropriation. When the ship was diverted, however, the American Red Cross assumed financial responsibility up to $3,500,000, to cover the cost of procurement of additional food plus the handling, transportation, and shipping charges as a replacement to the displaced-persons program.

Nos. 3 and 4: Reports on the crop failures this year throughout the lower Danube Basin, and specifically in Moldavia, have been received from many sources including our mission staff, special representatives of the Department of Agriculture, officials of the International Emergency Food Council, and officials of the American military mission in Rumania. The urgency of the situation was recently reported in personal cables from General Schuyler, United States military representative; Allied Control Commission, Rumania; the American Red Cross representative in Rumania, Mr. Sigerist; and from the United States representative in Rumania, Mr. Berry.

No. 5: Although a number of the cables referred to above are now classified, the Department will be glad to make available, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, any pertinent information on the Moldavia famine which is unclassified, together with paraphrased summaries of the cables in question.

No. 6: Distribution of the relief supplies within Moldavia are under the direct supervision of the American Red Cross. They are being assisted in the supervision responsibility by members of the staff of the American representative and by members of the staff of General Schuyler. I am attaching copies of (a) the President's statement of February 17, which outlines the specific terms required of the Rumanians concerning the handling of the relief supplies, and (b) cables which describe in detail the actual receipt and delivery of the supplies within Rumania.

No. 7: The Rumanian Red Cross is charged with the actual distribution responsibility under the supervision of the American Red Cross.

No. 8: The Rumanian Red Cross is free from the control of the Rumanian Government. The American Red Cross, however, required a guarantee from the Rumanian Government concerning specific and direct aid in handling shipments. A paraphrased copy of the cable concerning these requirements is attached. Evidence that the Rumanian Government has actually fulfilled these specific requirements is outlined in a cable from General Schuyler, a copy of which is attached, and referred to in No. 6 above.

No. 9: Although the quantity of food exported from Rumania to the U. S. S. R. in 1946 is not known here, there is no doubt that considerable shipments were made from grain produced in the 1945 crop year. Corn production in Rumania in this crop year, however, was so greatly reduced by the drought, which was general throughout the lower Danube basin, that shipments to Russia and other areas were immediately curtailed. You will notice that one of the conditions on which supplies are being shipped from the United States is that no food shall be exported from Rumania to Russia or any other area as payment on reparations, against loans, or for any other reason so long as this emergency exists.

No. 10: We have no direct knowledge of the amount of food consumed by Soviet armies garrisoning Rumania in 1946. Such a reduction in stocks from the previous crop year placed Rumania in a very difficult position to face the type of crop failure experienced there in this crop season.

No. 11: The U. S. S. R. is not helping to relieve the Moldavian famine conditions and, as a matter of fact, is not in a position to help. The same drought which has caused such devastation in Moldavia has also been experienced over a large part of the best grain producing area of Russia.

Should you require any additional information concerning this transaction I shall be glad to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs.

Dangers and Remedies in the Greece Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Erwin D. Canham, from the Christian Science Monitor of March 20, 1947:

DANGERS AND REMEDIES IN THE GREECE PROPOSALS

(By Erwin D. Canham)

This is an important week in postwar history. We remain in the very midst of a major crisis. The issue is still this: Are we moving toward or away from conflict with Soviet Russia? Will our newly stiffened attitude warn and sober the Russians, or will it intensify the tendency of the world to solidify into two armed camps?

Our new policy includes three dangers. These have come to light; they are much criticized in European capitals which might otherwise be friendly, and they are being discussed in the congressional hearing. It is important that Washington should clarify American policy on these three points so that the world can no longer misunderstand our intentions.

The first danger is that the United States is deliberately bypassing the United Nations and thus has dealt it a severe blow. It is now pretty well agreed that President Truman's statement was not well drafted on this point. It is perfectly clear that the United Nations could not have done—at present—the job that is needed in Greece. But an act of faith by the United States in support of the United Nations is gravely needed. That is the purpose of Mr. Austin's speech before the United Nations Security Council today.

The second danger is that the United States, in setting up barriers against Communist penetration in Greece or elsewhere, will be in the position of defending indefensible reaction. It is not clear that Washington, and the State Department in particular, adequately appreciate this danger. Some of the statements from State Department sources have gone very far indeed in the defense of ultra-reaction in Greece.

Therefore, we must make clear to the world that we wish to support genuine democracy, not simply the neo-Fascist regimes which have sprung up in some of these border areas. We are not seeking to defend broken-down monarchy, nor corrupt vested interests. The sooner our hands are clean on this score in Greece, the better.

There could be no sounder basis for our policy there than the report just published by the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization. This group, headed by President Harris of the Utah State College of Agriculture, and whose vice chairman was Panos D. Caldis, an executive of the California Packing Corp., has clearly exposed the corruption and vested interests in Greece, and has drafted a practical program of aid.

It is to be hoped that this committee, as well as Paul Porter's group, and Mark Etheridge, the Louisville publisher who was sent by the President to Greece, will have a large hand in drafting the final American program. If they do, perhaps we can purge ourselves of the charge of supporting small, corrupt, reactionary elements.

The third danger in the Truman proposals—and, you will note, these are all dangers which can be removed by decisive action—is that the United States will stand to the other nations of the world in a position of dollar diplomacy, of imperialism. Our proposal of a loan and of military aid has struck much of Europe as a repetition of our dominating attitude toward Central America back in the twenties.

This is a misunderstanding, but a natural misunderstanding, of what President Truman said and meant. We do not have to put ourselves in the position of imperialism to do the job that is necessary to stem the tides of Russian expansion. But as long as we seem to act unilaterally, without the instrumentality of the United Nations, we will be in a vulnerable position. We must clean our hands of that charge, too, because it is highly important that we should not lose the confidence and support of the nations which occupy the vast borderland between ourselves and Russia.

The French, wavering between Communist and democratic forces, will be repelled by dollar diplomacy and imperialism. An important part of liberal British opinion is already deeply alarmed by American leadership which appears to be ruthlessly imperialist. Our moral force in the world is in grave danger tonight because of the position we have put ourselves in.

But, as the hearings in Washington are bringing out, many Americans in and out of Congress are aware of these dangers. President Truman himself is far from being an imperialist or dollar diplomatist, and his support of the United Nations is deep and sound. The same is true of Secretary Marshall. But they have to a degree put themselves in the position of saying things which neither they nor the great majority of the American people really believe.

America wants one thing: Peace. Not peace at any price, however, but peace in terms of a stable world where individuals and nations have a chance to work out their own problems in freedom. We tried a year of semi-appeasement with Russia, and the Communist aggressions continued without stint. Now we are trying extreme firmness. That is a language the Russians apparently understand.

During the days of appeasement, as the publication of the Yalta texts this week indicates, we paid a big price to get what we called big power unity. Big power unity is still a desperately needed thing. It is the alternative to two armed camps. And we must seek unity again, this time on a basis of realistic principles to which we ourselves must be true. In resisting communism, we must not fall into the pit of reactionary fascism, whether political, clerical, or economic.

The Grain Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to me by the National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades, Inc., Chicago, Ill., and also their analysis of the current grain situation. It is a comprehensive and factual analysis of the grain situation in the United States today. It emphasizes the fact that under the present procedure of operation the Federal Government is endangering the security of our own people by reducing grain reserves to a dangerously low level which unfavorable weather conditions would make disastrous. Also, the indefinite and unpredictable Government buying policies are conducive to a chaotic market condition with all of its disastrous implications. These conditions should be corrected at once.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the manuscript herewith submitted will exceed by about three-fourths of a page the two pages of the RECORD allowed under the rule without a statement of cost. I am informed that the cost will be approximately $195.25.

There being no objection, the letter and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
COMMODITY EXCHANGES
AND ALLIED TRADES, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., March 29, 1947.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senator From Delaware,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: We have noted with a great deal of interest, and with approval, your statement on the floor of the Senate regarding current conditions in the commodity markets. You properly attribute current fluctuations in the grain market to heavy Government buying. You are also eminently correct in the conclusion that this is "not the first time that Government purchases have demoralized our commodity markets."

In view of your correct analysis of a technical corner in the grain market by the Government and your long experience in the grain business, it occurs to us that you will like to have some pertinent observations from the commodity trades.

At the outset, we agree wholeheartedly that a congressional investigation of present conditions in the grain market is most desirable. You cite the confused public thinking and charges that current high prices result from the abandonment of OPA as reasons for such an inquiry. We believe that it is also essential that responsible Federal officials be called upon to explain why they seek to mislead the public in the belief that speculation rather than Government scraping of the bin is responsible for current high prices and the extent to which our country is lending support to proposals for world regimentation of agriculture.

Certainly there is some reason for the too frequent attempts to discredit the commodity trades in the eyes of the public, even to the point of deliberately ignoring services rendered. For example, without the sound operation of the futures market, the Government would have been totally unable to buy cash wheat to meet export goals under present market conditions.

We believe strongly that an unbiased investigation of conditions in the grain market will spotlight the following conditions:

1. That high prices are the premium the American consumer must pay for our foreign economic operations. It is the normal operation of the law of supply and demand. Federal officials should not attempt to discredit the commodity trades by the questionable tactics of sidestepping direct responsibility for the present high prices. The public should also be advised by the Government as regards any risks involved to our food supply during periods of thin reserves.

2. That the Government be required to formulate definite buying policies to meet export demands. Conflicting statements and shifting programs have caused Government intention to continually hang over the grain market like the proverbial sword of Damocles.

3. That humanitarian and economic operations abroad be clearly distinguished from agricultural support programs. There is widespread fear that Government humanitarian activities have been integrated with support activities to avoid the problems of surpluses. Such fears should be promptly dispelled.

Since the end of the war, economists have been predicting that agricultural prices would be the first to drop and lead the postwar leveling off in prices. Due to constant upward revision of export goals the trend of agricultural prices has not followed these forecasts.

In this connection, the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture, under date of March 5, with reference to the export program for all grains said:

"The program originally called for the exportation of 400,000,000 bushels of grain and grain products during the period July 1946 to June 1947. As previously announced, the targets have been raised in view of the continuing great need for United States grain abroad, and the higher rates of shipment which have been reached. The effort now is to reach the 400,000,000-bushel total as soon as possible, and to exceed it as much as possible during the rest of the year."

We started the crop season on July 1, 1946, with production and carry-over of about 1,250,000,000 bushels of wheat. On the assumption that we shall consume at home slightly less than 800,000,000 bushels it is quite apparent that there were 450,000,000 bushels for export and for our next carry-over. At the present time, the Government hopes to ship 350,000,000 bushels before the next harvest. This would cut our reserve at the end of the season to about 100,000,000 bushels, or about the same as we carried into the present crop.

This situation has already had a very marked influence on price levels. When it is considered that a normal annual carry-over stock for the past 10 years was 235,000,000 bushels, it is immediately evident that our Government may have entered upon an overly ambitious program, even assuming that humanitarian considerations were at stake.

Under the circumstances there are one or two alternatives which might ease the situation.

Distribution is extremely important. Naturally any large quantities on the Pacific coast would immediately result in deficiencies elsewhere. Due to the fact that navigation has been closed since the early part of December, the Government, for matters of convenience, has taken too much wheat out of Southwest positions, and shipped it via Gulf ports, so that in many localities millers are already finding difficulty in obtaining supplies, and some of the industries may actually be forced to close.

With a fair amount of wheat owned by the Crop Insurance Corporation, it would be our suggestion that some of these supplies be sold back and replaced by later delivery. The farmer would just as soon be paid in cash as by receiving wheat. It would be more economical for the Government and would save transportation.

During the period of heavy accumulations by the Government the commodity exchanges have performed a valuable public service. It would have been difficult at any time to have bought such quantities of cash wheat as were required to fulfill export goals, except for the fact that merchandisers were able to enter into negotiations with the Government for the sale of millions of bushels. They were protected by purchases of similar quantities of futures, thus having the risks of market fluctuations eliminated. For several months now merchandisers and elevator concerns, despite small visible supplies, have thus been able to carry on the business, and gradually as cash wheat is obtainable they are selling out their insurance, which in this case are long futures which were held for this very purposes. Thus the Government, with no risk to itself and without actually having to enter the grain business, has been able to carry on exports and, for the most part, was sole agent in participating in the business.

A short time ago our association undertook an analysis of the current grain situation in which we attempted to present the facts and high light some of the considerations involved. We are sending you a copy of this analysis herewith.

We are confident from your remarks in the Senate that we have a common goal in the endeavor to bring order out of chaos in the grain markets. We assure you our full support and cooperation in this highly important objective.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. HIGGONS, Jr.,
Executive Vice President.

[National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades, Inc., Chicago, Ill.]

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT GRAIN SITUATION

Last summer's wheat harvest was the largest on record. Due to previous heavy export shipments, our reserve stocks had been reduced to nearly 100,000,000 bushels compared with 235,000,000 bushels, the 10-year average. Nevertheless, the statistical situation at the beginning of the season appeared to be about as follows:

	Million bushels
Winter and spring wheat production	1,156
Carry-over reserve	101
Total supplies	1,257
Disappearance (BAE estimate):	
Food	525
Feed	180
Seed	87
	792
Balance for export and next carry-over	465

The Government originally planned to ship about 267 million bushels of wheat abroad for relief purposes, which included 17,000,000 bushels from the previous crop. On that basis it was considered likely that the reserve stock on July 1, 1947, would be nearly 200,000,000 bushels, or only slightly below average. Purchases of wheat and flour were made from time to time, and the program was being carried out in an orderly way, so that by November 29 the Department of Agriculture revoked certain restrictions that had been placed on the usage of some grains. Accompanying the release was a statement that the Government had purchased, or had under contract, enough wheat, plus the amount of flour to be shipped, to equal the 267,000,000 bushels for export on this crop. The trade was not quite prepared for this statement, figuring that CCC purchases would continue almost indefinitely. The result was that in the following 2 days there were declines in the market of about 10 cents per bushel, carrying May wheat down to about $1.84 per bushel. On December 19, the Department of Agriculture issued about the most optimistic report that was ever handed to the public. They estimated winter wheat sowings at 56,400,000 acres, or an increase of slightly over 4,000,000 acres from the previous year, and almost 10,000,000 acres larger than the 10-year average. The condition of the crop was reported at 93 percent, indicating a prospective yield of 946,500,000 bushels. Such a crop would be approximately 100,000,000 bushels larger than the combined 10-year average outturn of both winter and spring wheat. It was only a few days later that word came from Kansas City that Commodity Credit Corporation would support wheat on basis of $1.88 per bushel for shipment in May. This was a higher price than the May wheat future was bringing in that market, and it immediately had a firming tendency. The trade could not figure out why the Government, in making purchases so far ahead, should resort to this policy, in view of the previous statement made by Mr. Anderson that the export program for this season had been concluded. Some believed that it might be a support program rather than one designed for relief purposes. However, as time went on, we were told that in view of a larger prospective crop, it would be possible to carry on the export program with greater vigor, and that the Government planned to ship 400,000,000 bushels of grain by March 31 and to continue shipments at the rate of 56,000,000 bushels per month to the end of the season, bringing the season's total to between 500,000,000 and 550,000,000 bushels. The increased goal it was stated would include 350,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour equivalent, or 83,000,000 bushels more than the original goal.

It is quite true that we have raised three successive billion-bushel wheat crops, but it must also be borne in mind that only once before in history did we achieve such a record: namely, in 1915, when we had a total crop of 1,008,000,000 bushels. Should the Government's estimate be realized and a total crop of 1,170,000,000 bushels be harvested next summer, we shall have a 4-year record as follows:

Peak production

	Million bushels
1947	1,170
1946	1,156
1945	1,108
1944	1,072

However, bumper crops are just as unusual as failure crops. Therefore, it is well to bear in mind that during the drought years we raised less than we actually consumed, as the following figures will illustrate:

Crop failures

	Million bushels
1933	552
1934	526
1935	623
1936	629

It is not fair to figure on either bumper crops or failure crops in trying to make comparisons. Therefore, we call to your attention that in the 10 years prior to the war average wheat production in this country amounted to only 740,000,000 bushels. However, that was sufficient because during that period our consumption was only 677,000,000 bushels, which included 479,000,000 bushels for food, 81,000,000 bushels for seed, and 117,000,000 bushels for feed. Consequently, it was possible to have small quantities for export and carry-over. At the present time our domestic consumption is estimated at 792,000,000 bushels; so if we revert to normal crops of 740,000,000 bushels it is quite obvious that we may have to import wheat from Canada. Likewise, it is almost a necessity if we are to continue relief programs in Europe to maintain production on a tremendous scale. Most people lose sight of the fact that since World War I our population has increased by about 30,000,000 persons. Those people consume about 1,300,000,000 bushels of all grain, which is just about the amount that our production has increased during that period. It is quite evident, therefore, that we are no longer as dependent on export markets as we were 25 years ago.

From the figures given at the beginning of this report it is also obvious that with 465,000,000 bushels for export and next carry-over the only reason for high prices is because we are probably shipping larger amounts than are safe for our economy. True, the outlook for next summer's wheat crop is still very good, but crops are never made in March, and many of the hazards are still ahead of us. We believe there are inherent dangers in letting our carry-over reserve sink to a level of about 100,000,000 bushels, for the reasons that have already been explained. At the present time the Government has decided not to ship any more wheat during May and June, but to confine its activities to flour purchases. However, in the final analysis this is all the same, and it makes little difference whether we export wheat or flour, because in the end it will mean a small reserve stock.

Very little cognizance was ever taken of the severe car shortage, which made it impossible to build up supplies at terminal markets. On September 24, the commercial visible reached its peak at 106,000,000 bushels compared with 174,000,000 bushels the year earlier. Chicago, which is the largest grain market in the world, had only 3,700,000 bushels at that time, and both Chicago stocks and the total visible have declined substantially since that period. In view of the fact the Government insisted on buying greater and greater quantities of flour, it meant that merchandisers and elevator concerns, in order to carry on this business, had to protect themselves with purchases of wheat futures, and at the same time speculators who believed the price to be high were predominantly on the short side of the market. Thus each time that new business developed, it meant that the shorts were squeezed, and the merchandisers remained long futures until such time as they could buy cash wheat. Actual wheat, of course, was tight because the mills were competing for purchases, and likewise the car shortage prevented ample supplies from coming forward. This situation was just the reverse from ordinary years when there are stocks of wheat held in elevators and when short hedges were in the market. Thus minor crop scares had more than the usual effect in scaring speculative shorts in, and we have had consistent advances in the market in the past 2 months.

It has been known for a long time that European conditions had been very bad. Supply and distribution has been unsatisfactory in Germany, Austria, Italy, Greece, and Rumania. In Italy food supplies for nonfarm consumers averaged less than 2,000 calories per person. The same has been true in Austria and in the American and British zones of Germany. Finland, Poland, Hungary, Spain, and Portugal were able to supply their population with only about 2,000 calories on an average. In continental Europe there was only Czechoslovakia, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark enjoying 2,600 calories or more. Bread was rationed in the United Kingdom and total quantities are slightly lower than a year ago. Recently further cuts in rations for unemployed dependents have been announced in the Soviet Union even though production of food in 1946 was better than the year before. UNRRA officials have on several occasions painted an alarming picture of the food needs in those countries which are no longer receiving their aid. Likewise the Secretary-General of the Emergency Food Council stated that Britain's stocks of wheat were at their lowest ebb, that France was making urgent appeals, and that conditions in Germany were desperate. He also said that Hungary and Rumania were begging for cereals. So it was no surprise that Mr. Hoover's report should have confirmed these truths. What actually happened was that few surplus countries outside of the United States were making heavy contributions toward European import requirements. As a matter of fact, since August 1 to the present date, shipments of wheat and flour from the four major exporting countries have been as follows:

[000's omitted]

	Aug. 1 to present date	Year ago
	Bushels	*Bushels*
Canada	120,137	223,145
United States of America	161,289	231,122
Argentina	[1] 21,426	36,645
Australia	[2] 25,400	11,016
Total	328,252	501,928

[1] Revised.
[2] Partly estimated.

It will be seen from the above that actually 173,000,000 bushels less has been shipped this year than in the corresponding period last year. If our own export goal is met, we shall probably furnish about half the world's shipments for the season.

Now, a word about corn: We harvested a crop of 3,287,000,000 bushels, which was a record for all time. Crops in excess of 3,000,000,000 bushels are likewise exceptional, as there have been only five of them in history, of which four were successive since 1943. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the corn-hog relationship should stand at about 18 for January, which was a near record for the third consecutive month. In other words, even with tremendous prices being paid for hogs, corn sold at relatively low levels for the reason that consumption on farms will probably be somewhat smaller, and it is likely that the carry-over at the end of the season will be much larger than last year. About 40 percent of the corn crop goes for hog feeding, and on January 1 the number of hogs on farms was about 4,000,000 smaller than last year, and the lowest since 1941. The hog population is far below either 1943 or 1944. The reduction in the number of hogs in 1946 was due chiefly to the 11-percent reduction from the previous year in the size of the 1946 fall pig crop. On the other hand, our exports of corn will be large, and a few weeks ago when the Government found that it would be difficult to ship larger quantities of wheat, they focused their attention on corn. This immediately started a buying spurt with the result that prices advanced about 30 cents per bushel, and many felt since the sharp increases in wheat prices were due to the Government program, it would have a similar effect on the corn market, despite other considerations.

As matters now stand, the Government intends to export about 20,000,000 bushels monthly, and while this quantity may appear small in comparison with the 3,000,000,000-bushel crop, yet it looks large in comparison with the primary receipts which for a number of years have run as follows:

Primary movement of corn to terminal markets

	Million bushels
1941	255
1942	330
1943	297
1944	257
1945	388
1946	296

In an ordinary year 85 percent of the corn never leaves the county in which it is grown. Therefore, if one hundred to one hundred and fifty million bushels or more is exported, it naturally takes a large percentage of the grain from terminal stocks, preventing accumulations. Likewise, with the shortage of cars and the commercial demand, it can only be regarded as a sustaining influence.

II. SUMMATION AND ANALYSIS—WHEAT

It will be seen from the foregoing how completely control of the entire situation is in the hands of the Government. Any attempted prediction of price trends would be futile unless given factors respecting governmental intentions were known.

The words "governmental intentions" are used in this case significantly, as there is believed to be good warrant for the widespread conviction held in the trade that governmental humanitarian activities recently have been closely integrated with what are, in effect, price-support activities—due to fears of surpluses and threatened Steagall price-support problems.

If, in the spirit of realism, this is conceded to be so, and if it is going to continue, then it immediately becomes apparent that the entire matter of attempting to forecast future grain prices becomes a guessing game as to possible Government moves in the course of its gigantic dual-purpose operations.

It is not being considered within the province of this memorandum to examine the integrity of governmental operations of the nature stated above. Rather, an attempt will be made to analyze objectively the possible market effect of such future governmental objectives as have become discernible and deducible to date, and to point out both on a near- and long-term basis certain outstanding risks and dangers, both economic and social, that are inherent in indicated governmental policy.

All signs point to the fact that it must be considered that the pattern for the balance of the current crop year will continue to be of the same hybrid character as that believed established at the year end. As set forth at the beginning of the first part of this memorandum, a reasonable program apparently had been established for the current crop year resulting in an indicated near-average stock on July 1, 1947, of 200,000,000 bushels after allowing for relief commitments of about 267,000,000 bushels.

Subsequent chronological developments speak for themselves:

1. The Department of Agriculture announced completion of relief purchases as of November 29, 1946.

2. Prices backed away from levels ruling at approximately 100 percent above prewar average (1936-41).

3. Commodity Credit Corporation reentered market for deferred positions at above-market prices.

4. Announcement made of greatly expanded governmental export program.

5. New market pattern established with futures market furnishing hedging facilities and affording cheapest coverage for the trade's sales of grain and flour to Government.

6. Government actively absorbed all offerings of grains as they became available, competing with trade for cash supplies.

7. Highest prices of 27 years were established as the result of widespread competition for the meager supplies in the face of light movement of grain from the country because of voluntary withholding action on farms and restricted shipping activity due to boxcar shortage.

NEAR-TERM TECHNICAL PRICE CONSIDERATIONS

At this very writing March wheat is selling in Chicago at a premium of 14 cents over May. There have been no deliveries yet, and though this is the largest grain market in the world, there is less than 1,000,000 bushels of wheat stored here, and the bulk of it probably belongs to CCC; at Kansas City a similar situation exists. Cash wheat is bringing 20 cents over the May future, and in another 2½ months cash and futures must come together. If the Government continues its aggressive buying policy futures will have to advance to a price that the Government is paying for actual wheat. Thus there are great dislocations being brought about by this ambitious export plan that were probably never anticipated by those who studied statistics, but lacked practical experience. No wonder that markets are fluctuating violently every day, in these circumstances. Even though we raised the largest crop in history, the total visible supply is less than 36,000,000 bushels, and each week inroads are being made on these accumulations, which have had a marked effect on prices thus far, and will probably be greatly accentuated as our supplies dwindle further.

MARKET CONSIDERATIONS

From a technical base as above, the market is faced with explosive possibilities due to the fact that the Government's reputed export program has been stepped up to the point where it will require full realization of the bumper crop of 1,170,000,000 bushels indicated in the last crop report to prevent the creation of a supply condition that would be dangerous in this country. With an indicated 100,000,000 bushel reserve, latest reports are that intentions exist to export another 350,000,000 bushels from the next crop.

As stated earlier, crops are not made in March. Any failure of the crop from this point on could lead to disaster.

Two decades ago, with a population of 120,000,000 people, a minimum safe carry-over was considered to be 125,000,000 bushels. Last year it was only by virtue of an all-provident nature that our reserve of 100,000,000 bushels carried us through without trouble.

The market cannot and will not ignore the implications of what is—whatever its purpose—a highly dangerous program.

While it is true that prices rose rather sharply during the past month, yet it is a fact that the Government agencies could not have obtained their flour commitments except for the fluid market which permitted flour mills to protect themselves. During the period that cash wheat was moving slowly from first hands, long hedges were the only insurance offered. Strengthened demand was reflected in higher prices, but at least wheat and corn futures made it possible for merchandisers to satisfy the demand for grains and flour, thus making the automatic adjustment of consumption to production.

If, on the basis of the record as it stands, the Government intends constantly to revise upward its export goals to the hilt of possible supply, the possibilities of further market reflection are apparent.

In this regard, the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture, under date of March 5, with reference to the export program for all grains stated:

"This program originally called for the exportation of 400,000,000 bushels of grain and grain products during the period July 1946 to June 1947. As previously announced, the targets have been raised in view of the continuing great need for United States grain abroad, and the higher rates of shipment which had been reached. The effort now is to reach the 400,000,000 bushel total as soon as possible and to exceed it as much as possible during the rest of the marketing year."

Orthodoxy in market analysis has ceased to exist. The situation is right in the palm of the hand of the Government, subject to the will of nature

PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

In addition to the tangibles set forth in the foregoing, a psychological market factor of extreme potency is increasingly present in the way of the constant stream of pronunciations emanating from official and semiofficial quarters hinting that this Government intends to enter into all manner of short- and long-term socialistic programs, arrangements and agreements, including that of meeting various nutritional targets for peoples all over the world.

Agriculture, and the agricultural trades of America, have both a desire and a determination to hold out the helping hand of relief to war-torn peoples. They are well able to distinguish between this category of activity and that of international socialism.

The ever-present threat of being involved in the latter is causing perpetual foment in the psychology underlying our grain markets.

MARCH 1947.

Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege a few weeks ago to visit in the home of one Mr. William J. McKinley, of Convent, N. J.

Like most Irishmen, he has a heart that sings, and I learned he had written poetry. I should like to read one of his poems into the RECORD. My justification for doing so, Mr. President, is that it would not be a bad idea if in this august body we would go apart from our daily activities now and then and listen to some good poetry. An eminent psychologist said on one occasion that if he could devote 15 minutes a day to going apart and reading Scripture, listening to fine music, or fine poetry, it would increase his efficiency. I personally feel of late that there has been too little "reaching for the stars" and too much of criticism and innuendoes which, as Emerson said: "Fall indiscriminately upon every lovely thing, like the frost upon the flowers."

I ask that Mr. McKinley's poem entitled "Home," be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOME

Take me back to my old thatched cottage
In far off Donegal,
Where the thrushes sing in the evening,
Beside the waterfall.
I'm tired of the noise of the city,
I long for the peace of the plough,
Where the seagulls circle above me
As I wipe the sweat from my brow.
I long for the sounds of the horses,
The cows, coming down from the hills,
The bleat of the lambs in the springtime,
The song of the lark, how it thrills!
I want to go back to the heather,
The roses that cling, 'round the door,
The hawthorne, the primrose and daisies,
To my childhood again, as of yore.
Take me back to my dear old mother
In far off Donegal,
Where the thrushes sing in the evening,
Beside the waterfall.

Address by Senator McCarran Before Izaak Walton League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] at the national convention of the Izaak Walton League of America, on March 28, in Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, your executive director, Mr. Kenneth Reid, is responsible for my appearance here this afternoon. I am glad that circumstances made it possible for me to accept the invitation. I was glad to have the opportunity of appearing before such a large and representative gathering of the Izaak Walton League of America. What is more, I am sure that after this meeting is all over, I shall still be glad I came.

I say this in spite of the fact that I have been warned that the purpose of the invitation extended to me was to put me on the spot. In fact, I understand this program has been carefully and deliberately planned for the purpose of making a monkey out of PAT MCCARRAN. At least, an official of the Izaak Walton League so stated, quite recently, before a fairly substantial audience.

In that regard, I want to say that I do not think it is necessarily beyond the powers of the Izaak Walton League to make a monkey out of this particular Irishman. I have grandchildren who do that with great regularity. And I take some solace from the

certainty that not even the Izaak Walton League of America can make an Irishman out of a monkey.

Seriously, the reason I welcomed the opportunity to come before you is my knowledge that the Izaak Walton League is made up of sportsmen and sportswomen, and my firm belief that such men and women are as fair-minded, reasonable, and reasoning as any group in the country. Mr. Reid assured me of that in his letter of invitation; and whether or not he had his tongue in his cheek when he wrote it, I still believe it to be true.

The recently aroused interest in the use and disposition of these western lands is a source of great satisfaction to me. Such an interest is a healthy and desirable thing. I regret, however, that in many discussions of this question there has been far too much use of intemperate language. There has been too much mere name calling; too many charges not based on fact, and that cannot be supported.

I hope that what I am able to say here may, to some extent, help to clarify some of this thinking, and to bring it nearer to the realities.

The open public domain is the greatest natural asset this Nation has.

This vast area of public land, on which hundreds of thousands of livestock graze, and from which have flowed and will flow billions of dollars' worth of metals and minerals, is a matter of concern not only to the people of the West but to the people of the entire country.

The fair and impartial administration of this great area of public land, in the manner best suited to advancing the interests of those who use the land and who mine it, and of the States in which this land is situated, is a most important factor in the development of the West; and the development of the West is one of the greatest projects, if not the greatest project, now confronting the people of the United States.

Legislation is urgently needed to stop further withdrawals of public land, to terminate many of the withdrawals already made, and to provide that no future withdrawal shall suspend precious metal mining.

All public lands withdrawals should be reported to Congress annually, and should terminate after 2 years unless Congress authorizes their continuance. All outstanding public lands withdrawals, except those included in national forests, national parks, and other projects and reservations authorized by statute, should be required to be similarly reported, and should also terminate after 2 years unless specifically authorized by Congress. Effective withdrawals of public lands should be limited to those specifically authorized by law and those ordered by the President, in a time of emergency, for the use of the armed forces. Emergency withdrawals in the latter class should terminate whenever the emergency terminated.

I have covered these points in my bill S. 32, now pending in the Senate Committee on Public Lands.

Our national forests are not a part of the open public domain, but they are the greatest and most important of our renewable natural resources. They provide vital watershed protection for thousands of communities and millions of our citizens. They provide lumber for the urgent housing program and afford recreational opportunity for a tenth of our population annually. They give shelter and food for 34 percent of the big game in our country, and in them rise the sparkling trout streams which provide sport for my friends, the Izaak Walton League members, and for a few million other sportsmen who do not have the good fortune to be members of your organization

Nearly 200,000,000 acres of national forests are found in the continental United States. Within them are found more than 80,000,000 acres suitable for the grazing of livestock. Last year 1,290,332 cattle and horses and 3,896,258 sheep and goats found their food in these forests, and lessened by their weight the critical shortage of meats.

The saw-timber requirements of our Nation are slightly over 53,000,000,000 board feet annually—but the annual growth amounts only to a little over 35,000,000,000 board feet. We are cutting down this wealth 50 percent faster than we grow it.

It is the responsibility of the United States Forest Service to manage these many uses of the national forests. They should be managed in such a way as to give the highest efficiency and the best results to those who use them, whether they be stockmen, timber operators, sportsmen in pursuit of the game, or recreationists bent upon seeking pleasure and relaxation. There is one qualification that must be imposed on this statement, and that is that the resources of the forests shall not be wasted or destroyed.

I want to say emphatically that I do not now want, and never have wanted, to turn these forests over to the States or to private ownership. They belong to the people of all the States. The Federal Government is the custodian and the manager. If that management falls down, if it does not reflect the wisdom of our people, then it becomes the responsibility of the Congress to give such direction and make such changes in the law as will bring the administration into harmony with the will of the people. Bureaucracy is not always right: quite frequently it lags behind the people whom it is set up to serve.

We of the West feel that we know our country and the responsibility it has toward the rest of the Nation. There we have hardy pioneers in every walk of life having to do with the plains, the forests, and the mines. These men live their lives in producing many needs of the rest of the country.

Livestock is an important, essential industry. It plays a vital role in our national economy. The urgent plea for some years has been to produce beef, and mutton, for not only our own people, but for our forces abroad and the hungry people of desolate Europe. Those who thought the end of the war would bring an end to all the pressure from our foreign commitments have learned that they were mistaken. Even without foreign commitments, the task of supplying the needs of this Nation for meat is greater than the private and public domain grazing lands of the west can undertake. The forest grazing lands are essential to this national responsibility.

The United States Forest Service is the manager of this enterprise of grazing livestock on these forest ranges. Due to excessive use during and immediately after the First World War, these ranges suffered deterioration through overstocking. All told, about 26,000,000 acres became sick and scarcely fit to give sustenance to livestock. The Forest Service began to cut down on both the number of permittees and the amount of stock that could be grazed. The situation from the viewpoint of the West became so critical that the stock growers in many instances would go bankrupt under the regulations and be forced out of business.

In the lower House of Congress, Congressman RICHARD WELCH, of California, chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, notified the Secretary of Agriculture that a subcommittee of his would make an investigation of, and I quote: "The widespread complaints by users of the range in the western forests on the proposed reduction in permit allotments, particularly in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and California." Congressman WELCH asked the Secretary to withhold action on the proposed reductions until the subcommittee had concluded its hearings and made its recommendations.

Secretary Anderson replied stating that the allotments had been made for this year but that he would withhold making them for 1948 in order to give time to the committee to conduct its investigation In his annual report to Congress the Secretary said, and I quote: "Large areas of national forest range are now in good shape, and prospects are good for keeping them that way. Many national forest ranges, however, have not recovered from past misuses. * * * Range reseeding will restore depleted ranges and increase grazing capacity."

I have introduced a bill, S. 2, which provides that 10 percent of all forest revenues shall each year be used for the making and maintenance of range improvements, including development of range water resources, reforestation, and reseeding. I hope to get favorable action on this bill.

Last session, early in 1945, and again this session, I introduced Senate bill 33, which seems to have aroused the ire of the Forest Service and some of its supporters. Just why this should be so is beyond my understanding, for this bill is a sound approach to a wise management of the grazing resources of the national forests. Nowhere does it do the things that have been charged against it.

Section 1 of my bill, S. 33, apparently is the controversial feature of the bill. In effect, this section provides that holders of 10-year permits to graze livestock in a national forest shall not be denied renewal of their permits, or forced to accept reduction of their grazing rights, unless the Secretary of Agriculture, after according the permittee an opportunity to be heard, shall find that such denial of renewal, or such reduction, is necessary either (1) to protect such lands from overgrazing, (2) to preserve public resources from destruction or improvident impairment; or (3) for the orderly administration of the use or uses to which such lands shall in fact be put for reforestation, recreation, wildlife conservation, mining, public watershed protection, or public water storage and flood control.

Section 1 further provides that "in the event of such denial or reduction, the Secretary, upon the request of the permittee affected, shall set forth in writing the grounds upon which such denial or reduction is based."

Section 2 of the bill defines what property shall be considered commensurate, and simply implements section 1, as reports from the Interior and Agriculture Departments have recognized. Sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill would enact into law what is admittedly the present practice with respect to local advisory boards. These sections provide, in effect, for the constitution and election of local boards, to consist of not less than 3 nor more than 12 members each, who shall in each case be national forest grazing permittees in the area for which the board is constituted and recognized. It is further provided that a wildlife representative may be appointed, as a member of each board, by the State game commission or corresponding public body of the State in which the advisory board is located. The function of the wildlife representative would be to advise the board on wildlife problems. The bill also provides that proposed modifications or denials of renewals, or reductions in grazing permits, or the establishment or modification of an individual or community allotment, shall, upon request, be referred to a local board in each case, and that the board shall be allowed 30 days within which to file a recommendation with respect thereto. The bill goes on to provide that if any such recommendation is overruled, disregarded, or modified, the local board shall be furnished in writing with the reasons for such action. The Secretary of Agriculture would not have

to follow any recommendation of the local advisory board; but the bill would require him, if he did not follow it, to give his reasons for his action; and I believe that a public servant should be willing to do that.

Section 6 of the bill provides that "nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting or restricting any right, title, or interest of the United States in any lands or resources." So it is clear the bill is not a land grab, no matter how many times it may be so characterized.

On January 25 of this year, the American Forestry Association issued a press release attacking this bill. The press release condemned what it called attempts being made by private interests to invade the public lands of the West; and specifically condemned my bill, S. 33. This release stated that—and I quote—"S. 33, it is asserted, would give holders of 10-year grazing permits on the national forests virtual perpetual rights in the forest ranges." This statement seems carefully phrased to avoid direct responsibility, through the use of the words "it is asserted"; and the statement apparently takes no notice of the fact that section 1 of S. 33 specifically permits a denial of a renewal application, or a reduction of a grazing permit, if such denial or renewal is necessary to protect from overgrazing, to preserve the public resources, or for orderly administration in the interests of reforestation, recreation, wildlife conservation, and so on. This press release of the forestry association contains numerous inflammatory phrases. It says "The stockmen's proposals are bold and insidious." It speaks of "a raid upon public resources, astounding in its audacity." It predicts "a conservation storm that before the Eightieth Congress is over may rock the American people." This press release apparently is the motivating factor in the rise of widespread opposition to the bill, particularly in the press.

Let me make this perfectly clear: My bill, S. 33, has nothing to do with the public domain, and has no connection whatsoever with any proposal that public-domain grazing lands should be transferred to private ownership. On the contrary, S. 33 has relation only to the management and administration of national-forest grazing lands.

I will not take personal issue with any man just because he attacks S. 33, or any other bill I have introduced. He has a right to make such an attack, though I will admit to the belief that, in doing so, he should not misrepresent the facts. But it is not altogether fair to attack me personally for bills I have not introduced. Yet a number of bills for which I am being roundly attacked, in a widespread campaign now underway—a campaign which, I am sorry to say, has been joined by at least some of the officials of the Izaak Walton League—a number of bills for which I am being attacked are not my bills at all. In fact, the alleged bill that appears to be the center of this attack upon me, and upon the livestock associations, is still only in the discussion stage, so far as I have been able to learn. I have not been consulted regarding the terms of this proposal, nor has it been suggested to me that I author it in the Congress, if eventually it should be introduced as a bill. I am informed that this proposal has not been approved by the two national livestock associations; and since these groups hold their annual conventions in January, it would appear that this vitriolic attack is being waged against a prenatal child, still some 9 months away from birth. Nor is there any assurance that, even without this attack, the child would ever be born. There is still a considerable difference of opinion within the groups of organized livestock men as to the economic feasibility of any such proposal.

I refer, of course, to a proposal that a means be provided whereby grazing lands administered under the Taylor Grazing Act may be permitted to pass to private ownership. It is my understanding that the proposal under consideration does not include any of the lands in the national forests. In other words, the lands involved are those poorest remnants of the open public domain whose one economic use is for grazing purposes. And I am informed that the proposed transfers to private ownership need not involve the subsurface rights. Perhaps this proposal may have some merit; but it is definitely not my baby, and I do not see why I should be called upon here and now to defend it. However, I want to make my position perfectly clear. I have seen no bill embodying this proposal. I do not believe there is such a bill. I have not been asked to write or to sponsor such a bill, and I would not write it nor sponsor it if I should be asked. I have seen no bill to turn national-forest lands over to administration under the Taylor Grazing Act. I do not believe there is such a bill. I have not been asked to write such a bill nor to sponsor it; and I would not write it nor sponsor it if I should be asked.

I do not have definite information as to the underlying source of the current vitriolic campaign directed against this proposal and against me in connection with it. But I think that it would not be difficult to put a finger upon that source. Most of you doubtless know that during the past 6 years I have had the honor of being the chairman of a subcommittee of the United States Senate which has conducted a long and careful and detailed investigation of the use and administration of the public lands. Many public hearings have been held throughout the public land States and in Washington, D. C., and many highly unsatisfactory situations and practices and policies have been brought to light, particularly in the administration of the public grazing lands. The record is available in the voluminous printed hearings, and in five separate reports by my subcommittee. These findings have trod pretty hard upon certain bureaucratic circles and officials. It is not at all unusual for such officials to seek and find allies in certain pressure groups, or even to seek to bend wholly worthy organizations, such as the Izaak Walton League, to their purposes, in attempts to pull their chestnuts from the fire. And, all too frequently, the groups or organizations so used, particularly the rank and file membership, have little real knowledge of how their influence is being applied or misapplied. Sometimes the bureaucratic officials are also officers in some of the groups thus used, and that makes it easy for them to sway the membership their way.

In the present instance, it should not be overlooked that a publicity campaign directed at discrediting me might well be a useful device to those who fear that through my efforts there might be brought about some loss in authority and positions on the part of the grazing administrators.

I think that at this point it would be well to review briefly the extent of public lands, and their vital importance in the economy of the West.

The area of the lands owned by the Federal Government within the limits of the 48 States is approximately 455,000,000 acres. This is 24 percent of the total area of all of the States. Ninety percent of these Federal lands lie within the boundaries of the 11 Western States; and these States comprise 40 percent of the area of all the States. More than half of the total land area of the 11 Western States is federally owned. In 3 of these States, more than 70 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government; and in my own State of Nevada the proportion reaches 84 percent. If the area of Alaska is added to that of the 48 States, we find that 86 percent of the total land area of the continental United States is owned and administered by the Government in Washington.

Now, my friends, these are not just statistics. They are facts of the most vital concern in the life and the development of each of the 11 Western States. These public lands contain a high proportion of the natural resources of the West; and in a very real sense, the development of this vast region, the expansion of its industries, the employment of its citizens, are dependent upon the orderly and proper development of these resources.

The existence of these high proportions of public lands in many of the Western States means that there is a very narrow base of taxable property available for the support of the State and local governments. There are many counties throughout the public land States in which more than 90 percent of the land areas are in Federal ownership. Upon such narrow tax bases, it is with exceeding difficulty that the local governments can be maintained with even the very minimum of essential functions and services.

The great bulk of the public lands of the West are the remainder of the original public lands. They have never passed to private ownership under any of the public lands laws. However, for more than a decade there has been an increasing tendency on the part of Federal departments and agencies to acquire considerable acreages of land from private ownership, under various land-purchase programs. This process, of course, was accelerated, just prior to and during wartime, by the acquisition of many large bombing, gunnery, and other training sites for use by the armed forces.

Coincident with these Federal land acquisitions, there has been a virtual stoppage in the passage of the public lands into private ownership. It has been the studied policy of the Department of the Interior, wherever and whenever possible, to prevent the public lands under its administration from going to patent. For 8 years the Grazing Service has made a complete mockery of those provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act intended to permit homesteading and the purchase of isolated tracts of public grazing lands within the grazing districts.

The net result has been a steady increase in the acreages of the public lands in the Western States. Along with this increase in the areas of public lands has gone increasing restrictions upon the uses of such lands. I am not now referring to the restrictions imposed by the multitudinous and often burdensome administrative rules and regulations, but rather to the restrictions imposed by Executive order withdrawals.

The abuse of Executive-order withdrawals has grown to one of major proportions. It is no exaggeration to say that there remains in the West today scarcely an acre of public land not covered by a withdrawal; and much of the land is covered by two or three or more overlying and overlapping withdrawals with varying degrees of restrictions. In most instances the lands are withdrawn from settlement, entry, location, and sale. The bulk of the withdrawals are so-called temporary ones, since that is the only kind that the Executive is authorized to make under the General Withdrawal Act of 1910, as amended. But the temporary withdrawals usually stand indefinitely. There are temporary withdrawals in effect today issued as early as 1862.

A high proportion of the withdrawals are issued in aid of legislation or for classification of lands, and they remain in effect indefinitely, long after all legitimate purposes have been served. Many of the withdrawal orders are intended to have, and do have, the effect of circumventing or nullifying acts of the Congress.

The withdrawal order is the favorite device of certain Government agencies, particularly those in the Department of the Interior, to

bring additional public lands under their direct administration and control. Usually the orders include far more land than could possibly be justified for the purposes stated therein.

The keystone in the public land program of the Izaak Walton League of America and its kindred organizations, as I understand that program, is contained in the statement that the public lands are the property of all the people; that all citizens everywhere have an equal interest in them; an equal voice and concern as to how the land shall be used. So far, and as a purely abstract proposition, and as long as the lands remain the sole property of the Federal Government, we of the West may not be prepared to challenge that position. It is with the corollaries which many of you attach to that premise that we cannot see eye to eye with you.

We cannot agree that, because these lands now are in the possession of the Federal Government, they have suddenly acquired a sacrosanct status which should not be subject to alteration. We cannot forget that most of the land in the United States at one time or another has been public domain. We cannot forget the historic land policy under which our country has been settled and developed, and we do not believe now that that policy was a mistaken one.

Most of these western public lands are still public lands because no one has been able or could afford to acquire them under any of the existing public lands laws. Our homestead laws and policies were developed earlier in our history and were adopted to meet the conditions in the more humid regions of the country, where generally a quarter section of land served as a base for a family farm unit. Those laws did not so well meet the needs of settlement in the desert and semidesert open-range country. We do not believe that because of these accidents of time and rainfall a whole new philosophy of land settlement and ownership should be applied to these western public-land States.

What I have said here is not with reference to the ownership or control of those public lands in the higher elevations, upon which the flow of our streams and the sources of our irrigation and domestic water supplies are so vitally dependent. Nor am I discussing the forested public lands. I do not understand that these lands are involved in the present controversy. I do not know of any proposal or any suggestion that these forest lands might be proper subjects for private ownership. And I certainly would not agree with any such proposal.

What is involved here are those poorer left-over desert lands used and usable only for grazing. No one but the livestock men could put them to a useful purpose. They are not recreation lands, though they do support some wildlife. They do not contain streams, for the areas bordering useful streams have long since passed into private ownership and become incorporated in ranch or other properties.

These lands are low in their carrying capacity for livestock and very low in economic value per acre. However, they are large in total area. There are 142,000,000 acres of public lands within the boundaries of the grazing districts. They can be utilized only by those who own or control nearby lands and waters. They do, however, furnish the seasonal grazing essential to round out an operating livestock set-up. In fact, most of the ranches in these areas cannot operate without the use of these lands.

These public grazing lands and the nearby ranches are interdependent. They have been developed together, over a long period of years. If you take away these public lands, you would destroy most or all of the values in the nearby ranch properties, for the latter could no longer provide a means of livelihood for the rancher and his family. And conversely, without the use of the nearby ranches and waters, most of these public lands could not be utilized at all. To anyone acquainted with the nature of the public lands which we are discussing, it is therefore difficult to understand the sudden and violent interest in these lands, evidenced by groups which are in no way affected.

At this point, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make it clear that I am and always have been a firm believer in a proper and common-sense program of conservation. By conservation I mean the prudent and orderly utilization of our resources without unnecessary waste. That, I believe, squares with the concept of Theodore Roosevelt and those other farsighted leaders who brought the conservation movement into being.

I do not conceive of conservation as a philosophy or a process for the locking up of our resources, a blind withholding of them from present use. Such practices, applied to surface land uses, not only result in the wastage of an annually renewable resource, but they are likely to lead to immediate damage to the land much greater than could possibly result from the reasonable utilization of the products on that land. I refer here not to any sensible and justifiable restrictions on grazing, but to the practice of the National Park Service, in seeking to eliminate grazing entirely from national parks and monuments. This inhibitory practice only results in increasing the fire hazard and fire losses and damage, as representatives of the Forest Service testified in hearings before my committee.

I should like to express further my conviction that there is no group of citizens in the western country more genuinely or directly concerned with soil and resource conservation than those engaged in the livestock producing industry. And in this I speak from a lifetime of close association with the problems and the members of that industry. These men are vitally interested in the conservation of the lands they utilize because their welfare and their means of livelihood are directly concerned. They cannot afford, and they know they cannot afford, to misuse the lands they own or control. They know that the penalty for misuse will come home to them directly, and will be paid for out of the income from the business from which they earn a living for themselves and their families.

We all have read and heard much, and some of us have seen much, of the effects of overgrazing upon the western public range lands. But most of this overgrazing and resulting soil damage occurred during the long years of the unregulated open public domain. Under that system, or lack of system, the livestock man could not protect the public land that he used because he had no control over it. Fortunately those days and those practices are past. There can be no doubt that the public lands suffered grievous damage during that epoch.

It is important to remember that this history of overgrazing and damage to the lands did not occur under a system of land ownership. Regulation of the public grazing lands has brought considerable relief to the hard-pressed stockman. It has given him some degree of continuity in his operations—some assurance that, if he properly protects the lands that he uses, he will have the opportunity to profit thereby. Regulation, with all of its faults, has brought more stability to his business, and he is properly appreciative. But the livestock man is thoroughly convinced from his own experience that greater stability, in a business that is highly hazardous at best, and better protection for the grazing lands that he uses, can only come with full recognition of the interdependence to which I have already referred. At the same time I know that a majority of western stockmen would resist, as I would resist, any effort to turn the national-forest grazing lands over to administration under the Taylor Grazing Act, or otherwise to further centralize bureaucratic control of all grazing lands.

Before I close, I want to speak briefly on what might be termed, in the Senate, "a question of personal privilege."

I have received through the mail a copy of the minutes of a recent meeting of the Chicago Conservation Council. These minutes throw some interesting light upon the current campaign of vituperation to which I have previously referred. A representative of your executive director addressed that meeting. I shall quote from the minutes a part of the statement therein with respect to what he said.

Your representative said, "Many bad bills were being dumped into Congress, especially by Senator McCARRAN, which represents an attempt to steal public lands and practically give them to a small minority of western stockmen. Senator McCARRAN is determined to make available for private ownership all of the public domain now in Taylor Grazing Act lands and in the national forests. The stockmen now hold leases, but they are making an all-out effort to get actual possession through purchase. Their insatiable demands were evident at a recent meeting in Denver. * * * Their proposal is that the land should be sold only to present permittees and that no one else should be allowed to buy for 15 years. The price proposed is 60 cents an acre. * * *

"The roster of Congress shows that, with few exceptions, the legislators from Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah are controlled by this group of stockmen. McCARRAN'S name on any bill means a steal by some group. The Senator ignores other valuable uses of these public lands, namely, watershed protection for western irrigation, recreation, wildlife and fisheries conservation, and timber production."

My only comment on this statement, attributed to the representative of the Izaak Walton League in the official minutes of the council he addressed, is that it contains more misstatements of fact and opinion than I can recall having ever before seen in a statement of similar length. Mr. Reid is a well-informed man and he should know the facts.

My friends, I did not come to challenge you. There is no more reason why I should pick a quarrel with the membership of the Izaak Walton League than there is for one of your officers to attack me personally, impugn my motives, and deprecate my good faith.

It was in the hope that I could shed some light upon the confused thought surrounding my bill that I accepted Mr. Reid's most cordial invitation to speak at your convention. I have the greatest respect and a profound admiration for the Izaak Walton League, and its announced purposes of defending our woods, waters, and wildlife. It is a cause in which every American can join wholeheartedly, in the knowledge that what he is doing will make for a better country. Our heritage in our forests is a priceless asset. Let us use it wisely for the benefit of all our people.

Communist Party Counterattack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the following article by Sidney Shalett in today's New York

Times showing what a frantic drive the Communists are making to prevent Congress from putting a stop to their subversive activities in this country.

The matter referred to follows:

COMMUNISTS GIRD IN SECRET SESSIONS TO COMBAT ATTACKS—PARTY LINE OF DEFENSE LAID DOWN BY "AMERICAN KREMLIN," LEAKS FROM REGIONAL TALKS—NINE POINTS ON PROGRAM—LEADERS CHART BATTLE AGAINST "ANTI-SOVIET" ACTS ABROAD, FBI "SMEAR," UNION AID

(By Sidney Shalett)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—The Communist Party of the United States, agitated over the recent trend in American foreign and domestic policy against communism, is attempting to organize a counterattack.

A report has leaked out on discussions conducted at a recent secret meeting of the local Communist Party executive committee in Washington, and on a similar meeting that took place in Pittsburgh.

At these meetings, which presumably were duplicated in other key cities, the "party line" for the counterattack was laid down by the "American Kremlin," as Communist Party national headquarters in New York City is called.

Proposed anti-Communist legislation and alleged intensification of the anti-Soviet policy of the United States, as the American Communists view it, are the two developments which bother the party most. Recent trends toward antilabor legislation, which have developed in Congress since the rash of postwar strikes, also have the Communists worried.

BACKS AGAINST THE WALL

President Truman's March 12 speech, in which he called for aid to Greece and Turkey to bolster their political resistance to the Soviet Union, was viewed by some of the speakers at the Washington conference as putting our backs against the wall.

The meetings on which the reports leaked out all preceded the March 22 Executive order calling for removal from Federal employment of all persons of doubtful loyalty. The President's order was based on recommendations of his six-agency temporary commission on employee loyalty, which has been investigating the problem of possible subversion within the Government.

However, the discussions at the Washington and Pittsburgh meetings virtually anticipated the effect of the President's order.

At the Washington meeting, held on March 12, according to report, district chairmen of the Communist Party reported on the meeting which they had been summoned to attend at national headquarters in New York City the previous week end. The message they brought back was that national headquarters was frankly worried.

BASES OF COUNTERATTACK

A counterprogram which may be summed up in nine major points is being mapped out. These include:

1. The Communist Party will engage in a campaign bringing in as many supporters as it can swing to attempt to stifle or at least postpone domestic anti-Red legislation. Anti-Soviet acts abroad also will be battled.

2. A smear attack aimed against the Federal Bureau of Investigation is planned. The Communists will attempt to link the FBI with the House Un-American Activities Committee; will seek to paint the FBI as anti-trade-union, and will try to make a cause célèbre of the case of Gerhart Eisler, the alleged representative of the Communist International in America, whose activities are under inquiry by the House committee.

3. Liberals—particularly among public figures who go along with the party in every respect but have not actually joined—may be urged to join the party openly for the effect on public opinion.

4. All Communist front organizations will be brought into the pressure campaign in behalf of Eisler.

5. An intensive recruiting campaign for party members will be launched. At the Washington meeting it was said that the party actually had only 60,000 bona fide members, although Communist publications have set the total as high as 74,000.

6. A money-raising campaign, with at least $250,000 as the goal is being considered.

7. Protest demonstrations may be staged in the capital early in May. "Big names" will be sought to appear on the programs.

8. The Communists would like to bring the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations together in key American cities to fight proposed antilabor legislation through some spectacular means. A 1-day country-wide strike is being discussed by the Communists.

9. Emphasis will be put on attempting to delay through pressure and propaganda, any definite legislative action against domestic communism until after the summer recess of Congress.

TOP LEADER AT REGIONAL TALK

At the Pittsburgh meeting, reportedly held the day after the New York parley adjourned, a representative from the party's national secretariat was present. He went over much the same ground for a small group of Communist officials who are key men in the Pennsylvania organization.

Considerable discussion was devoted to possibilities for using veterans sympathetic to communism in the demonstrations planned for May. The meetings probably will be staged from May 8 to 10 to give them a VE-day flavor. The speaker said the party must hammer away at "restating the love of the Communist Party of the United States for America." Contributions of American Communists to the war will be stressed.

There even was discussion of the advisability of asking Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to send a VE-day message to the Communist-sponsored celebrations, and of attempting to send a delegation to the White House.

Twelve States Have Ban on Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a country-wide awakening to the menace lurking in the Communist virus that is being spread among the present and also the next generation of Americans is now in evidence. It is a strange paradox when we legalize the Communist Party, which has for its avowed purpose the overthrow of our form of Government by violence if necessary, by dignifying it with a place on the ballot.

The question now widely discussed is how to isolate the Typhoid Marys of the Communist stripe. It has been suggested that the party be banned from the ballot. Some have suggested this will drive them underground. They have achieved their present standing as underminers of the Republic by underground operations. Can they get any lower underground? Communists, now legalized as a party, do not run around spreading their poison against this Government while wearing big red lapel buttons bearing the Communist Party insignia.

Twelve States now have laws denying a place on the ballot to parties, the tenets of which include overthrow of our form of Government. Miss Helen G. Lohm, of the State Law Section of the Library of Congress, has prepared at my request a summary of State laws prohibiting the Communist Party from appearing on the ballot. The summary follows:

STATE LAWS PROHIBITING COMMUNIST PARTY FROM APPEARING ON THE BALLOT

ARKANSAS

An act to amend section 4910 of Walter L. Pope's Digest of the Statutes of Arkansas, the same being an act to bar un-American parties from the election ballot. No political party (a) which is directly or indirectly affiliated by any means whatsoever with the Communist Party of the United States, the Communist International, or any other foreign agency, political party, organization or government; or (b) which either directly or indirectly advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets the overthrow by force or violence, or by any unlawful means, of the Government of the United States or this State; or (c) which directly or indirectly carries on, advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets a program of sabotage, force and violence, sedition or treason against the Government of the United States or this State, shall be recognized, or qualified to participate, or permitted to have the names of its candidates printed on the ballot, in any election in this State. (Dig. Stat. (Cum. Supp. 1944), ch. 55, sec. 4910, p. 192.)

CALIFORNIA

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this code, no party shall be recognized or qualified to participate in any primary election which uses or adopts as any part of its party designation the word "Communist" or any derivative of the word "Communist."

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this code, no party shall be recognized or qualified to participate in any primary election which is directly or indirectly affiliated, by any means whatsoever, with the Communist Party of the United States, the Third Communist International, or any other foreign agency, political party, organization, or government, or which either directly or indirectly carries on, advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets the overthrow by any unlawful means of, or which directly or indirectly carries on, advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets a program of sabotage, force and violence, sedition or treason against the Government of the United States or of this State.

The Secretary of State shall, with the advice and consent of the Attorney General, determine which parties are qualified to participate in any primary election. Such determination shall be subject to review by the courts in accordance with law. (Codes (Deering, 1939) Elections Code, secs. 2549.3, 2540.4, 2540.9, p. 118.)

ILLINOIS

That no political organization or group shall be qualified as a political party hereunder, or given a place on a ballot, which organization or group is associated, directly or indirectly, with Communist, Fascist, Nazi, or other un-American principles and engage

in activities or propaganda designed to teach subservience to the political principles and ideals of foreign nations or the overthrow by violence of the established constitutional form of government of the United States and the State of Illinois.

That no political organization or group shall be qualified as a political party * * * or given a place on a ballot, which organization or group is associated, directly or indirectly, with Communist, Fascist, Nazi, or other un-American principles and engages in activities or propaganda designed to teach subservience to the political principles and ideals of foreign nations or the overthrow by violence of the established constitutional form of government of the United States and the State of Illinois. (Rev. Stat. (1945) ch. 46, sec. 7-2, p. 1517.)

INDIANA

No political party or organization shall be recognized and given a place on or have the names of its candidates printed on the ballot used at any election, which advocates the overthrow, by force or violence, of the local, State, or National Government, or which advocates, or carries on, a program of sedition or of treason, and which is affiliated or cooperates with or has any relation with any foreign government, or any political party or group of individuals of any foreign government. Any political party or organization which is in existence at the time of the passage of this act, or which shall have had a ticket on the ballot one or more times prior to any election, and which does not advocate any of the doctrines the advocacy of which is prohibited by this act, shall insert a plank in its platform that it does not advocate any of the doctrines prohibited by this act. No existing or newly organized political party or organization shall be permitted on or to have the names of its candidates printed on the ballot used at any election until it has filed an affidavit, by its officers, under oath, that it does not advocate the overthrow of local, State, or National Government by force or violence, and that it is not affiliated with and does not cooperate with nor has any relation with any foreign government, or any political party, organization, or group of individuals of any foreign government. The affidavit herein provided for shall be filed with the board of election commissioners of the State or the county or city or town having charge of the printing of the ballot on which such ticket is to appear. The board of election commissioners with which such affidavit is filed shall make, or cause to be made, such investigation as it may deem necessary to determine the character and nature of the political doctrines of such existing or proposed new party and the expense of such investigation by the State board of election commissioners shall be paid out of the general funds of the State treasury not otherwise appropriated, provided the amount of such appropriation shall not exceed $500; and the expense of the investigation by any other board of election commissioners shall be paid out of the funds in the treasury, not otherwise appropriated, provided the amount of such appropriation shall not exceed $300, of any other political subdivision with whose board of election commissioners such affidavit is filed; and if the board is of the opinion that such existing or proposed new party advocates doctrines which are in violation of the provisions of this act, or that any of the statements in said affidavit are false, the board shall not permit such ticket or candidates on the ballot. (Laws 1941, ch. 138, p. 386-387.)

KANSAS

No political party (a) which is directly or indirectly affiliated by any means whatsoever with the Communist Party of the United States, the Communist International, or any other foreign agency, political party, organization, or government; or (b) which either directly or indirectly advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets the overthrow by force or violence, or by any unlawful means, of the Government of the United States or this State; or (c) which directly or indirectly carries on, advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets a program of sabotage, force, and violence, sedition, or treason against the Government of the United States or this State shall be recognized or qualified to participate or permitted to have the names of its candidates printed on the ballot in any election in this State. (Gen. Stat. Ann. (Supp. 1945), ch. 25, secs. 25-116, 25-117.)

OKLAHOMA

No political party shall be recognized or qualified to participate in any primary, special, or general election in this State which is directly or indirectly affiliated, by any means whatsoever, with the Communist Party, the Third Communist International, or with any foreign political agency, party, organization or government; or which either directly or indirectly carries on or advocates revolution, teaches or justifies a program of sabotage, force, and violation, sedition, or treason against the Government of the United States of America or of this State, or which directly or indirectly carries on, advocates revolutions, teaches, or justifies, by any means whatsoever, the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of this State, or change in the form of government thereof by force or violence.

No person shall be eligible to file as a candidate for nomination of any political party or as an independent or nonpartisan candidate who is directly or indirectly affiliated with the Communist Party, the Third Communist International, or any foreign political agency, party, organization, or government, or who advocates revolutions, teaches, or justifies a program of sabotage, force, or violence, sedition, or treason against the Government of the United States or of this State or who directly or indirectly advocates or teaches by any means whatsoever the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of this State, or change in the form of government thereof by force or any unlawful means. (Stat. (1941), title 26, sec. 6.1, p. 1079; title 26, sec. 162b, p. 1103.)

OHIO

No political party, or group, which advocates, either directly, or indirectly, the overthrow, by force or violence, of our local, State, or National government or which carries on a program of sedition or treason by radio, speech, or press or which has in any manner any connection with any foreign government or power or which in any manner has any connection with any group or organization so connected or so advocating the overthrow, by force or violence, of our local, State or National government or so carrying on a program of sedition or treason by radio, speech, or press shall be recognized or be given a place on the ballot in any primary or general election held in the State of Ohio or in any political subdivision thereof. (Code Ann. (Throckmorton, Cum. Supp. 1945) sec. 4785-100a p. 343.)

OREGON

No person shall be a candidate for public office in this State who is a member of, or affiliated with, any organization which teaches the doctrine of, or advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

The name of no such person, as a candidate, shall be placed upon any ballot in connection with any election in this State; nor shall any such person be eligible for appointment to a public office. (Comp. Laws Ann. vol. 5 (1943 pocket part) ch. 13, sec. 81-1309, p. 62.)

PENNSYLVANIA

That the words "political party" and the words "political body," as hereinabove defined, shall not include any political party, political organization or political body composed of a group of electors, whose purposes or aims, or one of whose purposes or aims, is the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of the Government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or the United States of America by the use of force, violence, military measures, or threats of one or more of the foregoing. (Laws 1941, No. 213, sec. 801 (d), p. 527-528.)

TEXAS

No person shall be permitted to have his name appear upon said official ballot as a candidate for any office in this State unless and until he shall file with the Secretary of State his affidavit, in a form to be prescribed by the Attorney General, that if elected to the office which he seeks, he will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States and of Texas. Said affidavit shall further recite that such candidate believes in, approves of and if elected will support and defend our present representative form of government, and will resist any effort or movement from any source which seeks to subvert or destroy the same or any part thereof. Use of the masculine term herein shall be construed to include the feminine.

The name of no candidate or nominee of any political party whose principles include any thought or purpose of setting aside representative form of government and substituting therefor any other form of government shall be permitted on said official ballot.

It is specifically provided that no candidate or nominee of the Communist Party, or the Fascist Party, or the Nazi Party, shall ever be allowed a place on said official ballot. (Stat. (Vernon, Supp. 1942) art. 2978a.)

WISCONSIN

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, no party shall be recognized or qualified to participate in any election which is directly or indirectly affiliated, by any means whatsoever, with the Communist Party of the United States, the Third Communist International, or any other foreign agency, political party, organization, or government which either directly or indirectly carries on, advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets the overthrow by any unlawful means of, or which directly, or indirectly carries on, advocates, teaches justifies, aids, or abets a program of sabotage, force and violence, sedition or treason against, the Government of the United States or of this State.

The secretary of state shall, with the advice and consent of the attorney general, determine which parties are qualified to participate in any election. Such determination shall be subject to review by the courts in accordance with law.

This section is declared to be enacted in the exercise of the police power of this State for the protection of the public peace, safety, and general welfare of the residents of this State (Stat. (1945) sec. 5.225, p. 98).

WYOMING

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this law no party shall be recognized or qualified to participate in any primary, or general election, which is affiliated, by any means whatsoever, with the Communist Party of the United States, the Third Communist International, or any other foreign agency, which carries on, advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets the overthrow by any unlawful means of, or which directly or indirectly carries on, advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets a program of sabotage, force and violence, sedition or treason against the Government of the United States, or of this State (Laws 1941, ch. 9, p. 11-12).

To Strengthen, Not Weaken, the UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Strengthen, Not Weaken, the UN," from a recent issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO STRENGTHEN, NOT WEAKEN, THE UN

American Delegate Warren R. Austin's statement on Greece and Turkey to the Security Council of the United Nations yesterday helped materially to remove misconceptions regarding the effect on the UN of our plans to aid those two nations at the gateway to the Middle East.

There has been a great deal of argument that President Truman's proposal to extend this aid—to the extent of $400,000,000—means "bypassing" the United Nations.

The Austin declarations at Lake Success show conclusively that this is not the case. Instead, as Mr. Austin's analysis demonstrates, the program of the United States to meet an emergency which could be met in no other way should strengthen the UN.

There can be no question that collapse of Greece would create instantly a dangerous, probably explosive, situation, in the Balkans. Greek independence could hardly survive. The ominous plot to dismember Macedonia from Greece would sure be intensified.

The Dardanelles issue, serious as it has been made by inordinate Soviet pressure upon Turkey, would become acute. A series of other critical questions would swiftly ensue.

If all this were thrown into the United Nations it would have a crisis on its hands of immeasurable proportions. It is not too much to say that such a crisis at this time might wreck the UN and the great peace movement for which it stands.

The UN has no money to help Greece. Mr. Austin also brought out forcibly the point that under prevailing circumstances the Greeks could hardly turn to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a loan. And the UN, unhappily, even at this late date has no armed force to protect either Greece or Turkey.

World faith and hope centered in the UN would sustain terrific shocks if Greco-Turkish problems were brought before it and that step ended in failure.

But there is something vital the United Nations can do immediately and much more it can achieve eventually. Mr. Austin called attention to the UN commission which has been investigating the long-continued, well-organized Communist-inspired forays and assaults on Greek territory along the borders with Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia.

He urged a report—at least, a preliminary report—by this commission to the Security Council in the shortest possible time. He urged that its members be called back to New York to consult with and advise the Security Council. And, further, he proposed that the commission leave representatives to watch conditions along the border, because the dangers of still more serious guerrilla activities are greater now than before.

Here is a job that is up to the UN. It is pressing and vital: To get the truth about the Greek border fighting before the Security Council and before the world and to take every practicable step to end it.

But if the United States Government should rest on its oars and await such proceedings, or otherwise leave the ominous prolems of Greece and Turkey to the unprepared UN, the Greek border commission's findings would very rapidly cease to have any importance under the impact of far graver developments.

Turkey and Greece are entitled to the kind of governments their people want, to independence, and to the fullest opportunities to sustain both. These are among the great fundamentals underlying the United Nations Charter.

Our own Nation must not be false in its allegiance to them. It must act, as it alone is capable of doing at this time, to assist the people of these two imperiled countries to win their struggles. It must continue to strive to make the United Nations the effective protector of peace, order, and liberty throughout the earth.

Editorial Comment on Former Governor Earle's Statement on the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very well considered editorial on the subject of communism. This editorial was published in the Knoxville Journal, of Knoxville, Tenn., on March 29, 1947, and was inspired by the statement of former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, concerning the danger to the people of America by reason of Russia's knowledge of and ability to manufacture atomic bombs.

The editorial favors anti-Communist legislation by the United States Congress, and proposes also that Communists be prohibited from holding public office and also that they be prevented from assuming leadership roles in union labor organizations in this country. The editorial very forcefully states:

The American Communist must be brought face to face with not only political but social ostracism. He must be made to realize that the traitor to his country is today in exactly the same light as he has been down through all the centuries of mankind's history.

I commend the reading of this editorial to Americans. It comes from a patriotic Tennessee paper, which is edited by a very fine, patriotic, and courageous American citizen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR EARLE IS NOT SO MUCH AN EXTREMIST AS MILLIONS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS ASLEEP TO RED THREAT

A great many United States citizens who read reports almost every day of testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee are passing it up as just so much conversation. Many of our people are not bothering to read it at all. In this apathy on the part of the general public toward a world conspiracy lies its greatest advantage.

If the masses of Americans could be prevailed upon to recognize the Communist threat to their freedom for what it is, so much pressure would be exerted upon Congress that there would be no question about whether anything was to be done to combat communism, but only a question of what would accomplish the results most effectively.

Representative PARNELL THOMAS, of New Jersey, wants legislation to outlaw communism as a political party, and to bar Communists from holding either political office or places of leadership in labor unions. Such a law should be passed, with proper safeguards to protect all citizens from unjustified assault upon their rights,

But it will be recognized from the outset that the drafting of such a measure and its enforcement will offer the greatest difficulties. The first rule of communism is to lie. Only the stupid Communists admit their party membership, and these are the least dangerous of all. The really dangerous ones are those who deny being Communists, yet believe everything the Communists believe and seek all the political and social objectives the Reds advocate.

This is to say that communism cannot be fought down successfully by the simple expedient of passing the legislation desired by the House committee or by any other law. We shall not be safe from the Communist threat until the masses of our people have been educated to a recognition of what it really is, until our people have ceased to regard it complacently as the ideology of a harmless cult, and understand that in every country it is a threat to individual freedom and, internationally, is a movement for world domination.

The basis, the moral justification, for any loyal citizen's opposition to communism is the fact that it is, in this or any other country, undeniably an instrumentality of an alien government's foreign policy

It follows as a matter of rudimentary logic that citizens of this country who subscribe to communism, and ally themselves with its causes, are unquestionably guilty of treason.

It is comprehension of the truth of this assertion that must be relied upon to support whatever legislation Congress decides to enact for the formal effort to repulse communism. The American Communist must be brought face to face with not only political but social ostracism. He must be made to realize that the traitor to his country is today in exactly the same light as he has been down through all the centuries of mankind's history.

Furthermore, anti-Communist legislation should go a step further than has been proposed, barring Communists from office-holding and union leadership. If we are right about this matter of treason, then no subscriber to communism deserves to claim as his right the constitutional guaranties of citizenship. The law should provide for the forfeiture of such rights automatically by the individual.

Every observer of the way the Communist works in this country recognizes that if he were deprived of his rights of citizenship, he would be shorn of many n advantage he now has. Every Red in the country is at all times ready to demand, through his attorney, his constitutional rights. In effect, he makes use of rights laid down in the Constitution to carry on activities which have as their purpose the scrapping of that document and the destruction of the freedom of all of us under its provisions. If the Communist were automatically assigned to alien status, we would have gone a long way toward driving home in the minds of the masses the character of this modern traitor who frequently parades his perfidy in arrogance.

We would also prevent the Communist from hiding behind the skirts of the Constitution in carrying forward his evil works.

Testifying before the Thomas committee yesterday former Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, asserted that probably only 10 percent of those of us living today would be here within 5 years, in case the Russians are able to manufacture an atom bomb.

Many a newspaper reader, considering the testimony of this recent Minister to Hungary and Turkey, will conclude that the man is an alarmist, that he has allowed his fear of communism to lend him the views of an extremist.

Acknowledging the spectacular character of Governor Earle's predictions, our own conviction is that the real extremists among us are those citizens who cannot see, or refuse to see, the lethal threat of communism. It is possible that the Pennsylvanian is overstimulated by his close, first-hand observation of communistic activity in Hungary and Turkey, but what shall we say of the masses who maintain complete complacency in the face of identical danger signals everywhere in their own country?

Child Delinquency

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a fine thing to come down here in the well of this House and talk about Good Friday and the sacrifices that were made on that day for the redemption of mankind. But, God only works with the tools He has got, and as far as juvenile delinquency is concerned, the tools He works with are the parents. I came down here the other day and had something to say along that line. I have been criticized by about six people in the country, after getting Nation-wide favorable comment, and I want to say that one of the editorial writers who criticized me was a columnist who was thrown out of the public schools as a teacher for contributing to child delinquency. I want to say that after all we parents must make ourselves responsible. We are the tools that God is working with on the children of this country, and if we give them an example and exercise authority, they will go along all right.

I will insert in my remarks a column by Paul Mallon, appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer, dealing with child delinquency and making the parents responsible. The article is as follows:

LAWS TO CURB CHILD CRIME NEED BACKING

(By Paul Mallon)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—The latest juvenile outbreaks around here have shown puzzling new aspects. Two 11-year-old girls broke into a house to smear the walls and furniture with ink. A 12-year-old boy went on a campaign stealing rings from the doors of new Buicks. Numerous homes have been entered and ransacked, but jewelry or money has not been taken, only a few pistols and fishing poles.

These children all come from the better-class homes and all involved are under 14. All are far from undernourished, are not at all ill clad, and apparently have too much spending money. They seem to have in common a complete lack of respect for property, adults, or consequences.

Now, we had juvenile delinquency back when I was a boy, but it never then involved 10-to-14-year-old children, but, rather, gangs of kids turning 16. Obviously the 10-to-14's are, or should be, completely under parental domination. They have not yet reached the age of reason. The guilt in their cases clearly rests on parental delinquency.

Indeed, there is practically no truly juvenile delinquency here now which cannot be attributed to parental delinquency. As the parents are among groups known as the better class, no one knows what to do about it.

The neighborhood seems agreed a law should be passed making parents responsible for the acts of their youngsters who have not reached the age of reason. I made some investigation and found there already is such a law in many States.

A standard juvenile court act, originally drafted in 1925 by the National Probation Association, contains a provision which reads as follows:

"Any person who commits any act or omits the performance of any duty, which act or omission causes or tends to cause, or encourage, any child to come within the purview of subdivision 1 of section 111 of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, may be tried for such offense in the juvenile court, and upon conviction may be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

This section outlines a specific offense generally known as contributing to delinquency, or neglect. States which have accepted this principle include Arizona, District of Columbia, Indiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, and Wisconsin, while parts of the act have been adopted by California, Connecticut, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, and Virginia.

The trouble, then, is that the act is not being enforced. What is needed is some public impetus demanding enforcement.

Some communities are taking steps. The New York City Police Department announced January 28 it would bring parents to trial for crimes committed by their children.

In San Francisco, parents brought into court for delinquencies are being given suspended sentences provided they attend a parents' school, which, they say, is quite successful.

In Hornell, N. Y., a delinquent-parents court has been set up. Parents in eight flagrant cases were brought in and tried before a city judge. The parents were released after warnings, and police there report only one repeater case has developed.

At Altadena, Calif., civic groups have set up their own unofficial courts to try parents. In social circles, considerable discussion has developed about the Altadena plan. Personally I am opposed to it. Citizens should not be permitted to establish their own courts, but should be required to rely on established courts and established law.

Freedom for Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter addressed to Hon. Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of England, and signed by the Anti-Partition of Ireland League of Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE HONORABLE CLEMENT R. ATTLEE, PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND

MARCH 17, 1947.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: In the many and serious difficulties with which your nation is confronted, permit us to put forth a few suggestions, the adoption of which should not alone inure to the benefit of your own country, but should prove to be an aid in the establishment of an era of universal peace founded upon mutual confidence and goodwill.

Despite your expressions of grave concern for the welfare of minority groups throughout the world, and particularly within the British Empire, we respectfully bring to your attention the fact that there are many persons who analyze your pronouncements with skepticism, and view your actions with suspicion.

Various and well-founded reasons for this widespread feeling of mistrust unfortunately exist. It is difficult, for example, to reconcile the public policy of your government toward India with that toward Ireland, where in the former case you strive to achieve the very things you thwart in the latter. In India, your government desires harmony among the many social, political, and religious groups as a prerequisite to national independence; in Ireland, the policy of your government generates and perpetuates religious and political hatreds and discord among a homogeneous people in order to frustrate their aspirations to national independence—and this even at the price of rendering genuine goodwill and peace impossible between that ancient nation and your own. While you shed figurative tears for the welfare of minority groups in far-off India, who now seem hopelessly torn asunder following 200 years of a policy of divide and rule, you callously ignore the national aspirations of almost 80 percent of the Irish people. And while you fear the expansion of the unspeakable antidemocratic philosophy of Russian communism, you stifle the voice and ruthlessly suppress the operation of the democratic process in Ireland.

Multitudes are perplexed as they learn of your inability or your refusal to maintain your troops in democratic Greece—troops who are there with the sanction of the Government of that country—while a portion of Ireland is overrun by a British army of occupation in defiance of the wishes of the Irish people. They are amazed to learn of your unwillingness to extend financial support to a legitimate government, while you persist in subsidizing an antidemocratic puppet junta in northeastern Ireland.

You speak betimes of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, but profess your inability to implement them. You talk of peace, but withhold a principal ingredient by failing to take action where you may speedily and with ease prove your sincerity of purpose.

These things, and many others, contribute to a wide-spread suspicion that your solicitous words lack sincerity; that your public actions are nullified by secret counteractions. While international statecraft engenders such suspicion, it is impossible to lay the foundation of an enduring peace.

On your part, we submit, you can remove immediately, if partially, that polluted atmosphere of mistrust by forthright and honest acquiescence to the wishes of the Irish people. The presence of this age-old grievance offers an ideal opportunity to prove to the peoples of the world that your government is sincerely and impartially interested

in the establishment of peace based upon justice.

The many conflicting interests that may be involved in other problems inherited from your Tory predecessors are not involved in the case of Ireland. It is unnecessary to refer further to its simplicity here. The justice of the Irish grievance is beyond question. Suffice it to say that the immediate withdrawal of your armed forces from the portion of Ireland they now occupy, together with the dissolution of the Quisling government and the unnatural division of that country, should contribute to the establishment of international confidence and goodwill to a degree out of proportion to the size of the territory or the number of inhabitants involved.

Such a voluntary demonstration of goodwill should certainly mean more to the cause of universal peace than volumes of pious platitudes. By such action the fears of apprehensive millions of oppressed peoples throughout the world will be assuaged; your government will enlist the sympathy and admiration of liberty lovers everywhere—a factor which it would be the sheerest folly to ignore, particularly in the crises through which your country is passing.

The people of Ireland wish to forget those centuries of suffering and oppression which their forebears experienced at the hands of imperialism. Reparations they do not seek; but they do demand their country. If your government is sincere—if it has really broken with imperialist tradition—this centuries-old demand of theirs—for complete and absolute freedom—should soon be realized.

What can be accomplished, directly and indirectly, in this instance, can fundamentally alter the course of history.

Sincerely,

THE ANTIPARTITION OF IRELAND LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA.

Return of Atomic Energy to the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article printed in the Nashville Banner on March 27, 1947, with a Washington date line and the United Press identification, dealing with a statement made by Louis E. Starr, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which proposes that control of atomic energy be returned to the military in order to warn all challengers of democracy that America means business. Mr. Starr says that he can think of no better psychological approach in these disturbing times to show that this Nation is prepared to support our position on the "four freedoms."

Mr. President, I am glad to note that so outstanding a man as Louis Starr, commander in chief of the VFW, is fully awake to the seriousness of the present world situation, and has so quick and ready a solution for showing to our principal prospective enemy in a future war that we not only have the means but the determination to make use of such means in the event it should happen that conflict comes.

Mr. Starr, in his statement before the House Un-American Activities Committee, said that we can turn our thoughts to the development of peacetime and benign uses of atomic energy when the Congress by concurrent action revises the Atomic Energy Commission, if and when world conditions become more settled. There is not a doubt that the atomic bomb is the one weapon which America should keep within ready reach and fully develop and improve. We are told that with it we can win any war: without it victory would be hopeless, and that to have a peacetime, civilian commission in control when war clouds hang heavy and low, is in actuality a grotesque sort of humor. Mr. Starr is 100 percent correct and I hope everyone will read and give thought to his timely statement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VFW LEADER URGES ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROLS RETURNED TO MILITARY TO WARN "CHALLENGERS"

(By Grant Dillman)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Louis E. Starr, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, today proposed that control of atomic energy be returned to the military to warn challengers of democracy everywhere that we mean business.

Testifying before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Starr said he could think of no better psychological approach in these disturbing times to show that this Nation is prepared to support our position on the "four fredoms."

"If and when world conditions have become more settled," Starr said, "and our thoughts can turn to the development of peaceful and benign uses of atomic energy, the Congress, by joint concurrent action may revive the Atomic Energy Commission, and relegate the military to an advisory capacity."

Starr said that atomic energy and the atomic bomb were developed under military control and "to date, atomic energy remains largely an instrument of war in the form of a super explosive.

"As such, I can think of no better or safer hands in which to repose it, than those who led us to a great victory, our military leaders, with supervisory control exercised through the President and Congress."

Chairman J. PARNELL THOMAS (Republican, New Jersey) and Representative MCDOWELL (Republican, Pennsylvania) agreed enthusiastically with Starr on control of atomic power."

"I am with you 100 percent," THOMAS said.

"If we put the atomic bomb in the hands of a group of Milquetoasts we can be certain we will just hurry the day when the bomb will be used against us."

The VFW staff, he said, is weighing and analyzing "the implications that it may violate the Constitution or tend to drive the communistic movement underground." He said before such a drastic program is adopted, a public-education campaign must be waged to bring about a rebirth of Americanism.

He recommended:

1. That American labor organizations, and virtually every type of religious, industrial, fraternal, and patriotic groups apply the same loyalty tests to their ranks as recommended last Saturday by President Truman for Government employees.

2. National and State laws be amended and strengthened to provide close scrutiny and publicity of funds spent for candidates and special prohibition of funds supplied directly or indirectly by a foreign government.

3. Strengthen education laws to provide for screening of textbooks and courses in public education.

4. A continuing program of public education be formulated to expose subversives.

Meanwhile, Committee Chairman THOMAS said legislation would be approved soon by the House Administration Committee to provide the money to broaden the committee's work.

Other members said the action should enable the committee to expand its check of Communist infiltration of the radio and movie industries. FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover said yesterday it was urgent to root Communists out of public-opinion fields.

Hoover, who testified on legislation to curb or outlaw the Communist Party, charged that American Communists are trying to overthrow this Government. In case of a Russian-American war he said, they would support the Soviets.

"The Communist Party of the United States," Hoover said, "is a fifth column if there ever was one. It is far better organized than were the Nazis in occupied countries prior to their capitulation."

Hoover said he would hesitate to recommend outlawing the Communist Party. He said it might put the Reds in the position of martyrs and cause them to draw an even tighter curtain of secrecy about their activities.

Hoover said that on a percentage basis there are more Communists in this country now than there were in Russia at the time of the bloody 1917 revolution. In case of war with Russia, he said, they would be a "definite menace."

"There is no doubt as to where a real Communist's loyalty rests," he said. "Their allegiance is to Russia, not the United States."

He said the best antidote for communism was "vigorous, intelligent, old-fashioned Americanism with eternal vigilance." Part of this program, he said, is rooting out and exposing Communists in posts where they might influence public opinion.

Communists in the motion-picture industry, Hoover said, have succeeded "amazingly well" in inserting pro-Communist material in movies and deleting all anti-Communist material. But he said that was only part of the picture.

The Communist Party, he said, stands for the destruction of the American form of government, destruction of American democracy, destruction of free enterprise, and for creation of a "Soviet of the United States" and eventual world revolution.

The Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Electoral College" published

in the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of March 21, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

If the United States is to consider itself a full-fledged democracy, it is time that the electoral-college system of choosing a President and Vice President should be abandoned. These two highest executive positions should be occupied by men who receive a majority or plurality of the popular vote, and no other system should be considered.

That is the objective of a bill that has been introduced by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., of Massachusetts, who candidly calls the electoral-vote system obsolete.

The United States has been using this method of choosing its President and Vice President for over 120 years. Because the successful candidates can be elected by a minority of the popular vote, it is undeniably undemocratic, and because methods of communication and tabulation have been improved a hundred times over since the system was first conceived, it is no longer necessary.

When the electoral system was first adopted, in the earlier part of the nineteenth century, its originators argued that it was the only way of ascertaining the outcome of a national election within a reasonably short time.

Communications were slow and labored at that time, and methods of tabulation and verification were likewise time eaters. The sponsors of the electoral system were probably not exaggerating when they said that it would take 4 or 5 months to count the national popular vote for President.

That is all history now. Rapid communications can easily provide for having the total popular vote cast in all 48 States in a central counting location within a matter of hours after the polls close, and modern, mechanized tabulating machines can provide the verified, grand totals within another period of a few hours.

The electoral system may have served a good purpose in the days of the pony express, but it is wholly out of step with our democratic principles today.

One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Chris J. Agrafiotis on March 25, 1947, on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of Greek independence.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. Today, March 25, marks the one hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of Greek independence. It was on March 25, 1821, that Bishop Germanos proclaimed freedom at Patras, which was the signal for that memorable struggle for Greek independence.

March 25, however, is not a day to be remembered only by the Hellenic world, but a day of marked importance to the whole Christian world. History reminds us that the Hellenic people not only defended but successfully prevented western civilization from Asiatic conquest. For centuries the Hellenic nation served as the unbreakable barrier between the two continents, Europe and Asia.

The glory that was Greece is an impression of gratitude for the cultural heritage that we have received from that ancient nation. Greece of antiquity was the cradle of our civilization. That treasured word in our language, "democracy"—meaning the rule of the people—was derived from the ancient Greek. Democracy was founded in Athens.

When Greece of the early Christian era, the home of so many saints, fathers, and doctors of the church, fell to the pagan conqueror, the word "democracy" vanished through the ages, only to be revived by our own glorious Nation at its foundation.

It was on May 29, 1453, when Constantinople, the then capital of the Hellenic world, was conquered by the Turks, that the long struggle between the cross and the crescent began. From that day on the Greeks were subjected to the most ruthless and tyrannical rule that any nation has ever been subjected in the history of the world.

Not until March 25, 1821, 368 years later, were the Greeks able to revolt against their invader, and once again to become an independent nation. It was during this heroic struggle for independence that we find the United States, though a young nation just over its own struggle for independence, put aside its own problems to voice its opinion and render its moral support to those few daring Greeks who undertook to liberate the nation that had been under the Turkish yoke for more than 300 years.

President Monroe in his annual message to Congress said:

"The name of Greece fills the mind with the highest ideals, and arouses in us the most exalted emotions which exist in the human nature. It is natural therefore that their contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

In the words of Senator Clay on the floor of the United States Senate, we find him saying:

"From the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Maine to the Gulf of Mexico, the sentiment of approbation blazes with the rapidity of electricity."

In one of the many resolutions that were urging Congress to recognize Greek independence, we find the following words:

"Having read the appeal of the Messinian Congress to the United States, can we any longer shut our hearts to such an appeal? No."

Webster's resolution to Congress, that an agent be sent to Greece, occupies 20 pages of the annals of Congress. In defending his resolution, Webster said:

"We must fly beyond the limits of social order before we can turn away from memorials of ancient Greece.

"'Go home, if you dare, to your constituents,' thundered Clay, 'and tell them that you voted down this resolution, that the specter of scimitars and crowns and crescents gleamed before you and alarmed you.'"

President John Quincy Adams, in his annual message to Congress, December 4, 1827, said:

"We hope that the Greeks will obtain relief fron the most unequal of conflicts which they have so long and so gallantly sustained; that they will enjoy the blessing of self-government, which by their suffering in the cause of liberty that they have richly earned, and that their independence will be secured by those liberal institutions of which their country furnished the earliest examples in the history of mankind, and which have consecrated to immortal remembrance the very soil for which they are now again profusely pouring forth their blood."

Then there was Col. Jonathan P. Miller, of Vermont, who fought in the siege of Mesolonghi with distinction. Lt. Gen. George Jarvis gained the confidence of the Greeks by rendering great service to their cause, and was made lieutenant general. Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, of Cambridge, Mass., headed the Greek medical force and many other Americans, too numerous to mention here, were fighting side by side with the Greeks.

Perhaps Monroe, Adams, Clay, Webster, and many other great Americans were reciprocating for the services that the Greeks rendered previously to this young Republic.

In 1804, to defend our sovereign rights against the aggressor, we invaded north Africa in the war with the Barbary States. While our Navy won glorious victories, a military force was necessary. It was organized in north Africa under the command of Gen. William Eaton and Col. Tobias Lear. A considerable number of Greeks enlisted in this task force, and fought valiantly alongside the United States Marines. Their repeated assaults brought the war to a successful conclusion with the capture of the Tripolitan capital of Derne. The Greek companies were repeatedly mentioned in the dispatches for their courage and sacrifice.

General Eaton in his dispatch to Commodore Samuel Barron, concerning the assault upon Derne on April 29, 1805, states:

"Our forces ashore successively assaulted Derne, led by Priestly N. O'Bannon of the marines along with our Greek companies. The loss in killed and wounded this day were mostly Greeks. They well supported their ancient character."

Thus, we see that the people of Greece, even though under the Turkish yoke, found time and courage to assist our infant Republic in its early struggles.

The Hellenic nation is ever so grateful for the moral, physical, and material aid that was given by the United States in its struggle for independence.

On March 25, 1821, the Greece of modern times became an independent nation through the increasing faith, hope, and courage of her people. In the century that followed, Greece has struggled to preserve her freedom with the same indomitable spirit of the ancient Lacedaemonians at Thermopylae. In World War II, Greece thrilled the world by her aggressive stand against the invading Axis Powers. Overcome by the might of the invader, Greece was subdued but not conquered. However, the invader in the hope of breaking the Greek spirit, imposed the terrible ordeal of starvation. Thousands of men, women, and children perished.

Today, as Greece stands resolute as a pillar of western civilization, the specter of hunger still haunts this proud land.

During the dark days of 1940, the Greeks chose the hard way. They chose to fight rather than surrender to the invader. They were determined to show the world that Greece, which had taught the world how to live, now would teach it how to die, while defending their homes and their liberties.

They died fighting by the thousands—their country was destroyed—they were robbed and pillaged of their treasures, their economy was destroyed. And when the invader was gone, they were left to die from starvation.

The United States must on this day recognize the contributions of the Greeks to the world, and resolve that these heroic people will not be left alone to die from starvation and poverty.

Juggling Figures and Contorting Facts To Justify Trade-Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, when the Assistant Secretary of State, the Honorable William L. Clayton, made use in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on Friday, March 28, 1947, of the rather threadbare and thoroughly untenable assertion that our exports to trade-agreement countries had, during the administration of the trade-agreements program, increased much more rapidly than had our exports to nonagreement countries during the same period, I recalled that I once asked my friend, Dr. John Lee Coulter, who is, incidentally, one of the greatest living experts on foreign trade, to make a careful study and analysis of the facts and figures upon which such assertions are based in order that the truth might be revealed.

Because the report which Dr. Coulter released in response to my request demonstrates quite conclusively some startling facts and conclusions which should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the country, I ask that the results of this study, a document which this eminent scientist has entitled "Unfortunate Use of Statistics by the Government in Connection With the Trade-Agreements Program," may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

And in tendering this most interesting manuscript for inclusion in the RECORD, I cannot help but wonder who it could have been that so ingeniously juggled the figures and contorted the facts and then palmed them off upon the then Chief Executive who trustingly incorporated them in his message to the Congress of March 26, 1945.

But all this notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, the report of Dr. Coulter to which I have just referred speaks for itself. It is the following:

MAY 1, 1945.

UNFORTUNATE USE OF STATISTICS BY THE GOVERNMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

In order to make it appear that the Trade Agreements Act has served a useful purpose and, among other things, that it has resulted in a measurable increase in volume of mutually profitable foreign trade, Government agencies have resorted to the use of combinations of figures which call for objective examination.

The most recent illustration of such use of statistics in this manner is the statement put out over the name of the President in the form of a special report to Congress about a month ago, on March 26, 1945.

In this special report the then President is quoted as saying:

"The record of how trade agreements expand two-way trade is set forth in the 1943 report of the Committee on Ways and Means. This record shows that between 1934–35 and 1938–39 our exports to trade-agreement countries increased by 63 percent, while our shipments to nonagreement countries increased by only 32 percent; between these same periods our imports from agreement countries increased by 22 percent as compared with only 12 percent from nonagreement countries. The disruptions and dislocations resulting from the war make later comparisons impossible. The record, published in 1943, is nevertheless as valid today as it was then. We know, without any doubt, that trade agreements build trade and that they will do so after the war as they did before. All sections of our population—labor, farmers, businessmen—have shared and will share in the benefits which increased trade brings."

This quotation, or the same figures, have now been used during testimony before the Ways and Means Committee by several witnesses and on several occasions. The table to which reference is made appears on page 7 of the report of the Ways and Means Committee above referred to, and reads as follows:

[Values in millions of dollars]

	Average		Increase	
	1934–35 value	1938–39 value	Value	Per cent
Exports (including reexports):				
Total, trade-agreement countries	[1] 758	[1] 1,232	475	62.8
Total, nonagreement countries	[2] 992	[2] 1,306	314	31.7
Total, all countries	2,208	3,136	928	42.0
General imports:				
Total, trade-agreement countries	[1] 774	[1] 942	168	21.6
Total, nonagreement countries	[2] 772	[2] 868	97	12.7
Total, all countries	1,851	2,139	288	15.6

[1] These figures do not include Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela, and the United Kingdom, Newfoundland, and non-self-governing British colonies with which agreements have been concluded but where the period during which the agreements have been in effect is too short to justify inclusion for purposes of comparison.

[2] The apparent discrepancy shown by these figures in comparison with the other totals is due to the noninclusion of trade with Ecuador and the United Kingdom and its crown colonies.

Attention is particularly called to the exclusion of Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela, and the United Kingdom and crown colonies, because of the short time the trade agreements were in effect. The trade experience of this group of countries excluded from the table was as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Average		Increase	
	1934–35	1938–39	Value	Per cent
Exports (including reexports)	476	662	186	39.1
Imports (general)	329	362	33	10.1

The first observation is that the trade experience of the group excluded by Government spokesmen was even worse than the experience of all of the non-trade-agreement countries combined (excluding countries at war). Little wonder that they were excluded from the table.

The second observation is that during 1938–39 several countries were already in a state of war or interior revolution and yet these were all thrown in with the non-trade-agreement countries. These included Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan, and China (including Kwantung). Actually exports to that group fell off $20,524,000, and imports from them fell off $14,714,000 between 1934–35 and 1938–39. If it was proper to exclude one group of nations to make a good showing for the trade-agreements group, would it not be equally proper to exclude countries engaged in war or revolution in order to get a fair comparison?

For the record, it must be remembered that Japan seized Manchuria during 1931–32 and the invasion of China began in 1937. It must also be remembered that Italy attacked Ethiopia in December 1934, and the invasion of Albania began in April 1939. In the case of Spain, while the Republic was established in 1931, the revolution began in April 1936 and was not completed until March 1939. German occupation of Austria was during 1938 and the seizure of the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia took place during the first 10 days of October 1938. The general invasion of Czechoslovakia began in March 1939. The invasion of Poland began September 1, 1939.

Separating these two groups, we have made a comparison of our exports to and imports from by groups of nations, which will be found in the table.

From the table it appears that when contrast is made between (1) the completed trade-agreement countries in effect during all of 1938–39 and (2) the non-trade-agreement countries carrying on normal trade, the increase in value of exports to the trade-agreement countries was 62.8 percent while the increase in exports to the non-trade-agreement countries was 57.3 percent or differed only slightly. From this there is no indication that exports were stimulated as a result of trade agreements.

When we turn to an examination of general imports (without again listing the countries omitted from the trade-agreements group or those included in the non-trade-agreements group) we find that (1) imports from trade-agreement countries increased 21.6 percent while (2) imports from the other non-trade-agreement countries increased 24 percent. These were naturally substantially the same, since concessions to one were extended to all—except Germany.

The only other point of significance is that exports increased almost three times as fast as imports. This is entirely accounted for by the tremendous volume of exports of automotive equipment, electrical and industrial machinery, agricultural implements, office appliances, etc. These items were largely exported by important domestic industries who believed that the world market was getting into position to absorb very large quantities. Actually, exports of these items increased between 1934 and 1937 about 120 percent.

Here, again, the point of greatest significance is that when the countries in a state of war or revolution are excluded, the exports were larger in amount and increased at a more rapid rate to the non-trade-agreement countries than to trade-agreement countries, as follows:

Increase to trade-agreement countries, $144,322,366, or 117.9 percent.

Increase to non-trade-agreement countries, $216,267,277, or 126.4 percent.

In addition to the reason just stated for more rapid expansion of exports over imports, it is important to remember that during 1937–39 important agricultural products were exported with benefit of export subsidies. Furthermore, many foreign countries were already beginning to build stock piles in anticipation of a possible outbreak of new international conflicts. It was during this period that the United States exported unusual amounts of iron and steel scrap, high-octane gasoline, and many other materials particularly needed in connection with military operations. All of these factors tended to stimulate exports entirely apart from any possible influence of foreign concessions in reciprocal trade agreements.

For detailed comparisons of exports to and imports from trade-agreement and other groups of countries, see following table:

United States exports and imports for the period 1934–35 contrasted with those for 1938–39

[Values in millions of dollars]

	Average		Increase [1]	
	1934-35	1938-39	Value	Per cent
Exports (including reexports):				
To trade-agreement countries with agreements in effect during—				
All of 1938-39	757	1,232	475	62.8
Part of 1938-39 [2]	476	662	186	39.1
To non-trade-agreement countries—				
Those in war and revolution [3]	473	452	−21	−4.4
All other	502	790	288	57.3
Total exports	2,208	3,136	928	42.0
General imports:				
From trade-agreement countries with agreements in effect during—				
All of 1938-39	774	942	168	21.6
Part of 1938-39 [2]	329	362	33	10.1
From non-trade-agreement countries—				
Those in war and revolution [3]	324	309	−15	−4.5
All other	424	526	102	24.0
Total imports	1,851	2,139	288	15.5

[1] Minus sign (−) denotes decrease.
[2] Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela, United Kingdom, and the Crown Colonies.
[3] Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan, China and Kwantung.

State Inspector Places Blame for Centralia, Ill., Mine Disaster on His Superior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an enlightening article from the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of Monday, March 31, 1947:

DIRECTOR ORDERED $25,000 LUG ON COAL OPERATORS—QUOTES ILLINOIS OFFICIAL AS DECLARING THAT GOVERNOR GREEN WAS SATISFIED AND MONEY IS ROLLING IN

(By Harry Wilensky)

CENTRALIA, ILL., March 31.—A slashing and bitter attack on Robert M. Medill, director of the Illinois State Department of Mines and Minerals, was made today by State Mine Inspector Driscoll Scanlan, who declared he had begged Medill to close the Centralia Coal Co. mine No. 5, where 111 men lost their lives last week, predicting a dust explosion that would sweep from one end of the mine to the other.

"We'll just have to take that chance," Medill was quoted by Scanlan as replying.

Asked why Medill refused to close the mine to prevent the greatest mine disaster in the Nation in 19 years Scanlan said, "It probably was due to favoritism to the coal operator." Medill, he said, was known as an "operators' man."

Medill was more interested in collecting political campaign contributions from mine owners than he was in enforcing mine safety rules, Scanlan said.

Medill was quoted by Scanlan as telling the mine inspectors that Gov. Dwight H. Green of Illinois was "satisfied" with the collection efforts, and that "the money is rolling in."

Mine inspectors, as the Post Dispatch revealed March 19, were used to solicit from mine operators funds for the Republican mayoral campaign in Chicago. Details of that collection effort were revealed by Scanlan today.

In Chicago the Post-Dispatch learned that Medill solicited funds from the large coal operators himself, at the express order of Governor Green. The Governor, it was reported, called in his department heads and gave them instructions for collecting political campaign funds.

Medill was reported to have visited the nine large coal firms with headquarters in Chicago. Each firm, it was reported, was expected to give $1,000.

"I considered this nothing more than asking for a bribe or extortion," Scanlan declared with heat. He said he had refused to participate in the political collection.

"I refused to play politics with the lives of the coal miners," he asserted.

For this, and for his efforts to enforce safety regulations Scanlan said he was berated by Medill for being "too honest," and he felt his job was in danger.

"If we inspectors were on a real civil service," Scanlan declared, "I'd have closed that mine half a dozen times. Or put it this way—the first time I would have kept it closed. They'd have known I meant business."

"Who, in your opinion, is responsible for the death of these miners?" Scanlan was asked.

"The operators of the mine," he replied, "and the State mining board, including Director Medill and his assistant, Robert Weir." (The mining board is under the department of mines; Medill is a member of the board, but is director of the department, and Weir is his assistant.)

Interference with mine safety work by Medill did not cease when the explosion last Tuesday ended the lives of the 111 men working in the mine—as had been predicted—Scanlan said.

Medill's handling of the rescue work delayed recovery of the bodies by at least 48 hours, he said. Not only did Medill's handling of the work precipitate a revolt of rescue workers, who felt their lives were endangered by the State mine department head's orders, but Medill was in opposition there to Federal Bureau of Mines inspectors, Scanlan said.

Scanlan also charged there was a delay in starting a sufficient number of rescue teams to the site of the mine disaster. William Williams, mine rescue superintendent at Springfield for the Department of Mines and Minerals, telephoned Scanlan's wife an hour and a half after the explosion, Scanlan said, and suggested she drive to the scene "to see if the teams really were needed."

Scanlan was bitter about the move to use mine inspectors as political campaign fund collection agents. At a meeting in Medill's office last January 31, he said, Medill declared a quota of $25,000 had been set "by the boys" for the department of mines and minerals.

Later, last March 7, he said Medill called another meeting of mine inspectors at Springfield.

"Medill said the Chicago newspapers had been calling him about solicitations," Scanlan said. "He added that anything this big couldn't be pulled off without publicity.

"Medill told us not to worry about it. He said as long as 'the boss' was satisfied we had no worries. By 'the boss' he said he meant Governor Green."

Scanlan quoted Medill as stating he had told the Chicago newspapers he "hadn't heard a thing about the campaign collections himself, but would call in his inspectors and ask them about it." There was a good deal of laughter among the inspectors at this, Scanlan said.

Medill also told the inspectors, Scanlan said, that he "had some newspapermen all taken care of."

At the earlier meeting of inspectors, when the department quota was announced, Scanlan reported "Medill said he himself would take care of the major companies. He said he already had called on four of these firms and that 'two have come through with $1,000 each.'"

This account of Medill's personal activities in connection with the collection was verified by a Post-Dispatch reporter in Chicago.

"Medill said one of the firms which contributed," Scanlan continued, "was the Peabody Coal Co., which operates a group of mines in Illinois and has its headquarters in Chicago."

The 1945 report on the Peabody Coal Co. Mine No. 18, at West Frankfort, Ill., in the Springfield office of the Department of Mines and Minerals, shows that four men were killed there in mine accidents. During the same year 69 men were injured in the mine. R. M. McPhail is superintendent of the mine, H. C. Harris is local mine manager, and James R. Mitchell is State inspector for the district.

The Post-Dispatch revealed March 19 that Louis F. Lumaghi, Jr., of St. Louis, who operates a mine near Collinsville, had been solicited for political funds by an Illinois mine inspector, R. R. Schiber. Lumaghi refused to contribute, writing Medill a sharp protest.

The St. Louis coal operator pointed out in letter to Medill that "the State mine inspectors in Illinois are entrusted with the duty of enforcing the mining laws to protect the lives of the men who work in the mines. * * * Under these circumstances we do not consider it proper for them to solicit contributions from companies whose mines they inspect."

INSPECTORS GOT SMALL FIRMS

While Medill made political fund collections from the large mine owners, Scanlan said the inspectors were to solicit the small, independent companies.

"My first reaction," he said, "was to quit. However, I happened to know that Governor Green was out of the State and it was possible he might not know what was going on, so I figured on staying to see what happened."

Later, however, Medill reported to the inspectors that he had discussed the matter with Mark Saunders, one of Governor Green's aides. It was then, Scanlan said, that Medill reported that Governor Green was satisfied.

"I want to tell you boys you are doing a good job," Scanlan quoted Medill as telling the inspectors. "The money is rolling in."

Several of the inspectors shared Scanlan's resentment at being used as political collection agents, he said.

"I told Medill that one mine at Centralia, the Marion County Coal & Mining Corp., a cooperative mine, had had a lot of hard luck and couldn't afford to contribute," Scanlan said.

"Medill asked me how many men worked at the mine. I told him about 145 or 150. He said, 'Good. Go out there and tell 'em to give you $1 apiece.' He also said we could get $50 each from the mine managers and superintendents, in addition to the contributions by the firms.

"Medill said he would contact the Bell & Zoller Coal and Mining Co., connected with the Centralia Coal Co. mine, although he would have preferred that I do it."

In praising the collection efforts, Scanlan said Medill announced that John E. Jones, safety engineer for the Old Ben Coal Co., had sent in his personal check for $50.

LOSING FIGHT FOR SAFETY

While Medill was concentrating his efforts on collecting political funds, Scanlan said he tried to enforce safety regulations. It had been a losing effort for some time, he said.

March 14, 1945, he said, "I became so agitated over conditions in the Centralia Coal Co. Mine No. 5 that I made a special trip to Belleville to see Medill, there attending a safety meeting.

"His hotel room was full of mine operators when I got there, but I waited around until they left. Medill already knew how bad things were at the Centralia mine, from my previous reports, but I wanted to tell him in person.

"I told him this mine was in such a dusty and dirty condition, and insufficiently rock dusted, to keep the coal dust down, that if the coal dust was ignited an explosion would sweep from one end of the mine to the other, and that every man in the mine would be killed."

It was then that Medill told Scanlan that they would have to take that chance, Scanlan said.

"I begged him to let me shut down that mine," Scanlan said. "And later I took it upon myself, without Medill's permission, to order a partial shut-down, so the mine would operate 4 days a week and the other 3 days would be spent cleaning up.

"I knew I was risking my job, but I got by with that because for some reason the company didn't complain. If the company doesn't complain they don't appoint a commission to overrule you."

Scanlan said he doubted if Medill ever discovered that the Centralia Coal Co. mine had been ordered closed 3 days a week for 3 or 4 weeks.

Asked what Medill said when Scanlan urged him to close the Centralia mine, Scanlan said:

"He said he would take it up with Mr. Young (W. P. Young, vice president of Centralia Coal Co., president of the associated Bell & Zoller Mining Co.).

"Mr. Young promised he would clean the mine up in the near future, but they did not clean it up."

JUST TOO DAMNED HONEST

All the years he served under Medill, Scanlan said he was "in trouble with Medill from time to time. He told me several times that I had a lot of ability and could go places in the coal industry, but I was just too damned honest."

Scanlan also said: "Medill called me to his office in Springfield March 13, 1946. I'm satisfied it was his intention to fire me. After giving me quite a lecture, he told me he wanted me to cut down the size of my reports.

"He said that those damned 'hunks' at the Centralia mine wouldn't know the conditions of the mine if I (Scanlan) didn't bring them to their attention. When I left he told me: 'I think you understand now what kind of reports I want to come in here.'"

When rescue operations were in progress last week at the mine, Scanlan said he had started crews working on 8-hour shifts.

"Then Medill came in and ordered shifts cut to 5 hours," he said. "This meant that there was a lot of time lost between shifts. More time was lost because Medill and his men from Springfield kept arguing with the rescue crews about conditions in the mine. Medill didn't know anything about it.

"He was lost, half the time, looking at the mine map. But he made rescue crews come up every 5 hours and confer with him.

"Then the Federal Bureau of Mines inspectors raised hell and Medill consented to have the crews work 6-hour shifts."

By staying in the mine with his crew for 7 hours, Scanlan said he managed to find 15 bodies, put up four temporary walls sealing off parts of the mine already inspected, and do preliminary work enabling the next shift to find 15 more bodies. For this, he said, he was called in and reprimanded by Medill.

Scanlan said he wanted to talk to a Post-Dispatch reporter about Medill's record as head of the department while the rescue work was in progress.

"I didn't dare, however," Scanlan said. "I was afraid he would pull me off the rescue job."

LAYS DELAY TO MEDILL

Scanlan declared that, "if Medill and his department heads had not interfered with the rescue work we could have recovered those bodies at least 48 hours sooner." He said, however, that none probably could have been saved alive, expressing the opinion that "those men died between 6 and 7 p. m., Tuesday." The explosion occurred just before 3:30 p. m., Tuesday.

"It was a dust explosion, all right," Scanlan said.

"I'm sure of that. However, we were not able to locate the source of the ignition of the dust."

Scanlan, blaming the disaster itself on politics and public indifference, declared that rescue work further was hampered by two representatives of Mr. Krug (Secretary of the Interior Krug, under whose department the mines are operating). One of these representatives, he said, was Jones—whom Scanlan also had said contributed to Governor Green's political fund.

The two men from Krug's office, Scanlan said, were involved with Medill in the attempt to turn on the power machinery in the mine during rescue work. When Scanlan objected and the rescue workers refused to go into the mine if power machinery were used tests were made of the air in the mine and an explosive mixture was found to be present, which he said might have been ignited by sparks from the machines. All of this, he said, caused a delay of 3 or 4 hours.

Scanlan, 43 years old, son of a mine foreman and a man whose mine experience began at the age of 16, has been a State mine inspector since 1941. He made his statement to a Post-Dispatch reporter while resting at his modest frame cottage near the waterworks at Nashville, Ill., where he lives on a salary of $3,300 a year. He had taken a leading part in the rescue work at mine No. 5 and is idolized by the miners there. For the first 3 days and nights after the disaster struck Scanlan did not take off his clothes.

At a press conference today Scanlan repeated to other newspapermen some of the things he had told the Post-Dispatch reporter previously. He criticized the political set-up of the whole Department of Mines and Minerals, and of the lack of civil-service status for inspectors—and rescue squad members—in particular.

Earlier he had told the Post-Dispatch reporter this newspaper "deserves credit for having exposed political contribuions of mine owners without waiting for the disaster."

He said, however, that most newspapers and radio stations had begun reporting conditions in the mines only after the Centralia disaster had occurred. "If they had done it before," he said, "this disaster probably could have been prevented."

RESCUE SQUADS ARE VOLUNTEERS

Scanlan pointed out that rescue squads are volunteers, not full-time employees. It is difficult to round them up in cases of emergency, he said, and when they are called at a mine they are paid by the mine, not the State. He advocated that they be made full-time employees.

"Some mine operators," Scanlan said, "put dollars ahead of the miners' lives. Some operators, however, do a good job and there are a lot of good superintendents, who do their best to take care of the miners."

Since he was so critical of so many persons involved in the Centralia disaster, Scanlan said he wanted to praise those who deserved praise.

"I want to praise the honest and qualified State inspectors—and there are a number of such men. I want to say that I had complete and excellent cooperation from every Federal Bureau of Mines inspector who assisted in this disaster.

"Every mine rescue team who worked on this job deserves the highest praise, including the Bell & Zoller team from Zeigler. John Lyons, Bell & Zoller safety engineer, is a fine man who did a good job. The utmost praise goes to the Navy boys (operating under the Department of the Interior), for the Army men from Scott Field, the Salvation Army, churches, and the Red Cross."

Governor Green Saturday night ordered all mines in Illinois "operating in violation of safety regulations" to be closed immediately. Green said he had ordered Medill to "conduct a survey" to see what mines should be closed under the order.

More About Milton Mayer and His "Haul Down the Flag" Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, when an irascible pedagog, a professor in the service of the University of Chicago, one Milton Mayer, by name, arose in a One-World meeting in Syracuse, N. Y. on February 15, 1947, to declare—

We must haul down the American flag. And if I wanted to be vulgar and shocking I would even go further and say haul it down, stamp on it and spit on it—

It aroused many a patriotic editor to raise his voice in emphatic protest against subversive pronouncements, among them being the forthright editor of the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard who wrote and caused to be printed in that highly influential journal a blistering editorial of which the following is a copy:

MAYER HARMS WORLD CAUSE

"If full acceptance of world government means hauling down the American flag and denying our patriotism toward the United States, then it's time to stop such fantastic international nonsense right now."

That was a fairly common reaction yesterday as central New Yorkers discussed the sensational remarks made in Syracuse Saturday night by Milton Mayer, of the University of Chicago.

Although Mayer broadcast a confused denial yesterday that he had advocated hauling down, stamping, and spitting on the American flag, the quotation attributed to him by a Post-Standard reporter was substantiated by responsible persons who were in the audience.

Aside from the extreme pacifists who have blindly opposed the United States Government since long before Pearl Harbor, the sincere advocates of world government recognize that Mayer has done their cause almost irreparable damage.

His crackpot theories have even undermined popular support of the United Nations,

in the opinion of some loyal and patriotic citizens.

As Norman Thomas and Col. C. A. Edson, head of the Federal social-security office in Syracuse and organizer of the local world-government group pointed out after Mayer spoke Saturday night, the best way to serve humanity and the broader world cause is not by casting off the established loyalties to home, family, city, State, and Nation.

When such persons as Milton Mayer take the view that the American flag should be reviled as a sign of world loyalty, their infantile opinions turn thinking citizens away from all internationalism, however sound. Loyalties are built on loyalties, not on disloyalty and treason.

If we are not careful, the professional pacifists will head us back on the road toward the narrowest of nationalism—and war.

Displaced Persons in Europe

REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] stated a few minutes ago that he is introducing or will introduce a bill for the relief of displaced persons. On January 6 of this year I introduced a bill, H. R. 464, to permit the immigration to the United States of certain suffering displaced persons whose homes have been destroyed and who cannot return to the respective countries of their birth.

My bill proposes that approximately 154,000 displaced persons be admitted from the 850,000 who are still held in the camps in American occupied territory. While the immigration quotas for 1940 to 1946 was over 900,000, my bill only provides for the use of unused immigration quotas that were not used in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948 and most of which would be granted to women and children and few, if any, to workers.

President Truman, in his message of January 6, 1947, urged legislation to relieve the unfortunate suffering of these people, but, so far, no action has been taken, notwithstanding that all outstanding religious and veterans' organizations have recommended favorable action. Besides these organizations, many outstanding gentlemen who have studied the existing conditions in the displaced-persons camps all strongly urge and recommend that we permit a fair share of these unfortunate people, as provided in my bill, be admitted.

I feel that if the membership and the American people would read an editorial appearing in the United States News by David Lawrence, a very capable writer, and the report of Cecil Holland, of the Chicago Sun, who conducted an exhaustive investigation of conditions in the camps, they would insist that favorable action be taken. Under the permission granted me, I am inserting the editorial and report of these gentlemen in the Appendix, and I earnestly urge they be read.

Foundation for a Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the March issue of the Country Gentleman contains an editorial entitled "Foundation for a Farm Program."

In the belief that the suggestions contained in this editorial are of interest to every Member of Congress, I am including it herewith as a part of my remarks:

FOUNDATION FOR A FARM PROGRAM

A new farm program will soon be in the making. Its importance is indicated by the time and care which the House Committee on Agriculture is preparing to devote to it and the desire of Chairman HOPE for the fullest possible discussion so that all proposals may have the test of public opinion.

This is a wise beginning. A new farm program deserves all the thoughtful consideration that can be given to it. The welfare of the Nation depends upon a prosperous and permanent agriculture. The next farm program, so far as it is possible, should constitute a means to that end.

If it is to do so it will have to supply something that has been lacking in the farm programs of the past 13 years. In that time we have tried many devices—the Federal Farm Board, acreage controls, crop loans, the ever-normal granary, subsidies both to reduce and to increase production, and now price supports. Most of them have been helpful. But, after all this experience, we are back where we started—with the need again for an effective farm program.

The reason may be found in the nature of the measures tried. They were mainly designed to meet some emergency or temporary condition and so were too shallow-rooted to be of lasting value.

The new farm program must avoid this defect. It can do so only by getting down to the permanent source of agricultural wealth and well-being. This is the land.

A national land policy should be the basis for the new program. It should set forth explicitly the Nation's interest in the land, with the maintenance of our land resources as the prior consideration. All other parts of the program and all future farm measures, whether subsidies, controls, crop adjustments, or goals, should be keyed to the basic principles of this land policy.

Certainly it is time the country had such a recognized policy. There has been none, definitely stated and publicly accepted, since pioneer days. The object of that long-past policy was to bring land into immediate cultivation and to use it to its full limits. We have reaped a mixed harvest from that policy—a country of abundance but with overproduction at times that meant ruinous prices for farmers and a steady loss of our soil resources that will mean too little for some future American population if the rate of deterioration is unchecked.

These recurring cycles of too much, with their wastage of the financial and soil capital of agriculture, would not happen if land generally were being used in the best way to conserve and maintain its productivity. By making this the primary object, a program based on a sound land policy would get at the very heart of farm troubles. And it would safeguard our future ability to produce enough. It would not be a cure-all. There is none. But Country Gentleman believes that no solution to the difficulties of agriculture, immediate or future, is possible without a start being made at this vital point.

The time to make this start is with the new farm program. Enough information is available to show the need for a national land policy and to guide its application to other farm measures. Country Gentleman feels that the great majority of American farmers are ready to cooperate in such a policy, so far as their individual circumstances permit. They realize, better than anyone else, the necessity of preserving their soil capital and the crime of its waste in producing unwanted surpluses. Their interest in the work of the prewar land use planning committees and the rapidity with which they are setting up soil-conservation districts amply demonstrate their attitude toward their own and the Nation's most important asset.

We believe that farmers would respond to a program based on a real land policy for another good reason. It would represent something solid and permanent and in the long-time interest of all.

Insane Spending

REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, considering the existing shortage in housing, boxcars and other railroad equipment to transport supplies, scarcities in other merchandise, and high prices, it is evident that the people are viewing with grave apprehension the policy of this administration in continuing to give away our resources and the products of our labor.

After giving to the nations of the world $50,000,000,000 in lend-lease and making new loans and gifts of many billions of dollars, now—2 years after the war—we find these nations are unable or unwilling to go to work and support themselves.

From this history it appears that they will not go to work as long as this administration assumes the obligation of their support and places the burden on the backs of the American taxpayer.

All in all this program presents a nauseating picture. Our people are paying the bill and doing without many of the necessities of life and they will, no doubt, observe with dismay that our generosity has not diminished one iota.

An Associated Press dispatch in Sunday's paper reports a speed-up in the rate at which foreign countries are using up the credits advanced to them by the United States.

The credits are composed of money loans and sales of property by the Government in return for promises to pay later.

At the start of this year, as reported by the Department of Commerce, there were 58 countries with "active credits" from this country—meaning credits that had not been used up fully or debts for loan funds used but not yet repaid.

These active credits, according to the item, totaled $9,279,800,000 including $6,633,100,000 in money loans, but the foreign borrowers still had $5,786,700,000

of that to draw upon. One reason they are slow in using it is the shortage of goods to buy.

Britain and France together accounted for 71 percent of the active credits, or $6,595,000,000. Others included Russia $241,800,000, China $199,800,000, Greece $93,700,000, Turkey $40,800,000, Italy $204,500,000, the American Republics $576,900,000, Belgium $147,200,000, Czechoslovakia $72,000,000 and the Netherlands and possessions $562,600,000.

This presents an unbelievable situation. Here we see Russia and Turkey, along with other countries, with a backlog of credit awaiting the time that we produce sufficient merchandise for them to buy.

Thus in this manner they maintain scarcities and high prices in this country and at the same time we are being requested by the President to vote an additional $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey with a prospect of $600,000,000 for Korea.

If we are to remain a solvent nation, this insane spending must be terminated now.

If Railways Are To Be Permitted To Supplement Their Service With Planes, Trucks, and Busses, Why Shouldn't Our Ships of the Seas Be Permitted To Supplement Their Service With Airplanes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, though simple justice requires that the same privilege of supplementing their service be accorded to our ships at sea as is freely permitted our land carriers, the Interstate Commerce Commission persists in their unreasoning refusal to permit shipping companies to synchronize air travel with their surface operations. Why the commission continues to adhere to this thoroughly indefensible rule surpasses understanding. Yet their previously announced position remains unchanged—even in the face of a practically unanimous public protest.

In order that the issue may be the better understood, I ask unanimous consent that a public service advertisement which recently appeared in a number of metropolitan newspapers in various sections of the country may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The article to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

UNITED STATES SHIPS NEED THE RIGHT TO FLY—WHAT DOES THAT MEAN TO YOU? PLENTY

Part of every dollar you get comes from world trade. Foreign commerce contributes more than $10,000,000,000 yearly to our national income, enough to keep three and a half million Americans in steady jobs.

Prosperous foreign trade means prosperity at home. American shiplines have been engaged in developing our foreign commerce for more than a century. They learned long ago that foreign commerce and transportation are a business. To them ships are simply tools of the trade, and aircraft are the modern tools they need in their kit to cope successfully with foreign competitors in the struggle for world trade. American steamship lines are now deprived of the right to use these modern tools by their own Government. At the same time the Government freely grants the privilege to their foreign competitors.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has consistently denied the applications of United States steamship companies to operate scheduled air service over the ocean routes they have pioneered and developed. But Congress did not intend that steamship companies should be precluded from operating scheduled airlines. A congressional committee reported:

"We were deceived. The Civil Aeronautics Act has been interpreted by the CAB as rigidly limiting the right of steamship companies to engage in aviation; and, as a part of Congress, we have been grossly misrepresented to have established a policy which was further from our thoughts and intentions." (H. Rept. No. 1944, 78th Cong., 2d sess.)

UNITED STATES SHIP LINES MUST MEET FOREIGN COMPETITION

Foreign nations have been quick to recognize the tremendous value of the sea-air partnership in foreign trade. In developing their international air services they are making effective use of world-wide shipping organizations built up over many years.

They have their first team in the race. They are using experience where experience counts.

Under bilateral agreements foreign air lines, wholly owned or effectively controlled by foreign steamship companies, have obtained the right to fly to United States shores. These foreign steamship interests are in direct competition with America's steamship lines.

Meanwhile our own old China hands are helpless on the side lines because of CAB rulings. The collective experience of our own steamship companies is ignored. Their personnel, facilities and know-how in foreign trade are disregarded.

The development of our foreign commerce is placed instead in the hands of those least experienced and least equipped to handle it. We cannot hope to meet foreign competition successfully until we put our own first team into the race for world trade.

UNITED STATES SHIP LINES PIONEERS IN OVERSEAS AIR TRANSPORT

Air transport is no new found love of America's merchant marine. United States steamship companies long ago anticipated the essential role of aircraft in overseas transportation. They were among the first to encourage and develop its use.

Early in the 1920's United Fruit Co. was flying routes in Central America. The Grace Line and the Matson Navigation Co. joined Pan-American in pioneering the first air-transport services across the Pacific, down the west coast of South America, across the Andes.

American Export Lines filed application for an overseas route, before any domestic air line, and flew the North Atlantic during the war under a temporary certificate. Many other steamship companies were early applicants for international air routes.

Three steamship companies have operated nonscheduled air service overseas. One company, which has been trying unsuccessfully since 1940 to obtain an air-line certificate from its own government, recently acquired interests in a foreign air line to protect its own trade routes.

UNITED STATES SHIP LINES STRONGLY OPPOSE AIR MONOPOLY

American steamship companies do not seek control of international air transport. They do not contend that because they have carried the American flag over the trade routes of the world, and have made huge investments in developing these routes, they are automatically entitled to air certificates. But they do contend they are entitled to equal consideration along with those who now, for the first time, are engaging in overseas transport.

The American steamship lines do not ask exclusive rights to provide air service even over their own routes. All they ask is the right to provide a complete transportation service in areas they now serve—by adding aircraft to their merchant fleets.

It has never been a part of United States Government policy to prevent carriers from using other means of transport. Railways and shipping companies are not forbidden to operate bus or truck lines.

Nor is there a basis for the sometimes expressed fear that steamship companies might stifle development of air transport. Self-interest alone would preclude such action. Confronted with the powerful sea-air combinations of foreign countries American steamship companies could only hope to compete by offering better sea-air service.

As Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, former Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet, has pointed out, a high degree of integration between air and surface carrier explains much of our sea-air success during World War II.

How ironical that the Nation which developed those combined operations so remarkably in wartime should ignore that lesson of experience in peacetime.

America's merchant marine has been a backbone of American defense since the founding of the Republic. A modern merchant marine, on which our national security depends so heavily, must fly as well as float.

Twice in our history we allowed America's merchant marine to wane—only to have to rebuild it desperately in time of need. We should not make that mistake again.

American security, as well as American prosperity, is endanagered by neglecting wings for ships.

America's steamship companies need the right to fly in America's national interest—now!

Wake up—America needs wings for ships.

The Sea-Air Committee: American President Lines, Ltd.; American South African Lines, Inc.; Atlantic, Gulf & West Indies SS Lines; Grace Lines, Inc.; Matson Navigation Co.; Moore-McCormack, Inc.; Oceanic Steamship Co.; Seas Shipping Co.; United Fruit Co.; United States Lines Co.; Waterman Steamship Corp.

Maine Is First State To Ratify Amendment Limiting President to Two Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, Maine again leads the way—she holds true to tradition and to her motto—"Dirigo"—meaning, "I lead." Maine is the first State to ratify the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would limit the Presi-

dent to two terms. This is indicated by a telegram received this morning from the clerk of the house of representatives, now in session at Augusta, which reads as follows:

MARCH 31, 1947.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Legislature today ratified constitutional amendment. Please advise Maine delegation.

HARVEY R. PEASE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Relief of Injustices in Estate Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement which I have received from Mr. John J. Giltinan outlining some of the injustices at the present time under the estate-tax laws. On January 29, 1947, I introduced in the House a bill, H. R. 1439, to relieve from the additional estate tax members of the armed forces dying in active service, which would correct some of the injustices under the present law.

Mr. Giltinan's statement follows:

In all fairness to our lawmakers, it must be concluded that in the rush of other legislation the Seventy-ninth Congress simply overlooked the passage of legislation to extend relief from estate taxes on the transfer of taxable estates to servicemen dying in the service of their country. Such a measure had been introduced in the House of Representatives, but died in committee.

Most of the States, likewise, have failed to grant exemption from this type of taxation to their residents who made the supreme sacrifice for their country.

As a result, the estates of servicemen dying in the last war are fully taxed. Further, the basis upon which they are taxed—the fair market value of the gross estate less allowable deductions and exemptions—is increased by including in the gross estate GI insurance; also included are any income-tax refunds (sec. 421, I. R. C.) to which the serviceman was entitled.

This present taxing of estates of servicemen dying in the Second World War did not exist in the First World War. The Revenue Act of 1917—approved October 3, 1917—section 901 provided that the war estate tax "shall not apply to the transfer of the net estate of any decedent dying while serving in the military or naval forces of the United States during the continuance of the war in which the United States is now engaged, or if the death results from injuries received or disease contracted in such service, within 1 year after the termination of such war."

Granting further relief from this unjustifiable penalty for giving one's life for his country, the Revenue Act of 1918—approved February 24, 1919, amending the Revenue Acts of 1916 and 1917—provided that the estate-tax provisions of those acts were not to apply to estates of decedents who had died prior to such enactment, or who would thereafter die while serving in the armed forces of the war then in progress, and further provided that if any such tax had been paid it would be refunded to the executor.

Why then does not the present Eightieth Congress at this late date take some action granting relief? The fighting of the Second World War ceased more than a year ago, no congressional action has been taken. Congress in the First World War granted relief during the fighting (act approved October 3, 1917) and granted further relief about 3 months after the termination of the war.

Last year, June 25, 1946, almost a year after the firing ceased, a bill granting relief similar to that granted in the First World War was introduced by Representative John H. Tolan. This bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. In August 1946, the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned, no action on the Tolan bill having been taken.

Between December 7, 1941, and the termination of the last war—many gallant servicemen died. At the present time their taxable estates have doubtless been appraised, according to law, the taxes determined and paid. As has been said this unfair discrimination against servicemen of the Second World War is so un-American it cannot be that Congress so intends it.

Up to the present time three bills have been introduced in the Eightieth Congress, one each by Representatives ALLEN of California, DURHAM of North Carolina, and SCHWABE of Oklahoma. These bills afford some measure of relief, although they do not specifically provide that if any such taxes have been paid, they should be refunded to the executors or administrators of the servicemen's estates.

The most favorable bill to the families of the dead servicemen should be enacted into law at the earliest possible moment.

Investigation of Cost of Living

REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am introducing today a resolution which provides for the creation of a select committee of this House to conduct a study and investigation of the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, I am impelled to introduce this resolution because the cost of living problem is one of national scope, although it may vary in degree in the different sections of the country. However, from a broad national viewpoint there is a direct influence upon our national and international policy inherent in this problem. The high cost of living is directly related and interrelated to the many important problems confronting our people and this Congress. For example, this House in its wisdom has gone forward courageously in carrying out the wishes and desires of the people of our country to eliminate waste and inefficiency in our Federal Government and thereby to reduce the national debt and to give our people some measure of tax relief. In the immediate future this Congress, in the interest of all the people, intends to provide some needed revision of our laws affecting the relations of industry and labor. Furthermore, this House is unhesitating in its efforts to free our people of bureaucratic control and regulation. In fact, I may say that all of these important matters are in the nature of relief from bureaucratic domination of our national life. Furthermore, all of these measures should have a great deterring influence upon the rising cost of living for they are intended to result in increased production and in due course a natural and proper reduction in prices.

Nevertheless, it is evident that other factors are tending to maintain the present high cost of living. It is, therefore, a matter of the most pressing nature that we ascertain at once what these causes are and how they may be overcome or eliminated. It has been suggested from some sources that the bureaucratic domination of our national life is attempting to maneuver national and international matters in such a manner as to retaliate upon our people for the decision made last November to eliminate waste and inefficiency and to free our people from bureaucratic control and regulation.

I cannot say whether there is any merit in this suggestion. Yet I do know from experience that bureaucracy is so accustomed to being in the saddle that it will relinquish only most unwillingly and with the most ingenious resistance its powers and control of our national destiny—the Congress and duly elected representatives of the people notwithstanding.

It is further suggested by some sources that unconscionable practices are prevailing in other quarters which are causing an unnecessary rise in the cost of living. These, too, should be brought to light so that corrective measures may be undertaken.

There are many other aspects to this problem, with reports and studies from a variety of sources alleging this and that as reasons for the rise in the cost of living.

In any event, we do have a national problem on our hands. In line with the courageous policy of this Congress in carrying out the wishes of our people, it therefore seems essential that a proper study and investigation be made in order that the public and the Congress may properly know and evaluate the factors influencing and affecting the high cost of living. Then, directly and intelligently, such remedial action as may be necessary can be taken.

In view of these factors, I am introducing this resolution today on behalf of all the people so that the true facts underlying the high cost of living may be determined and clearly set forth for public scrutiny. I deem this to be a better, more effective, and more democratic method of finding a suitable solution than a return to certain bureaucratic methods which again are being suggested and hoped for in certain quarters.

Resolved, that there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the

cost of living existing, or hereinafter arising, with particular reference to (1) whether agencies, departments of the Federal Government or Government owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the public interest in their influence upon the cost of living; (2) whether the public interest is being treated fairly, with due regard to the profit system, by all phases of our national life having an influence upon the cost of living; (3) the need for a sound program for the solution of the postwar problem involved in the high cost of living; (4) the effect of world conditions upon our cost of living and the need of a sound program to offset the hardships that may result to our people; (5) whether the production and distribution facilities available are reasonably and efficiently utilized in their influence upon the cost of living; (6) whether there are unconscionable practices in any quarter which unnecessarily drive the cost of living up and weaken our national economy and free enterprise system.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports and recommendations as it deems advisable; and, as soon as practicable during the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report and recommendations on the results of its study and investigation. Any report or recommendation submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the continental United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpena may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Purchase of Gold From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, dated March 31, 1947, which is in response to a letter written him March 19, 1947, in which I asked the following question:

"Does the Treasury favor continuing buying gold from Russia?"

Mr. Snyder's letter implies that the Treasury does favor continuing buying gold from Russia. Is this policy consistent with the Truman program for halting further Russian aggression? Mr. Snyder's reply follows:

Hon. FREDERICK C. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: This is in further reply to your letter of March 19, 1947, asking whether the Treasury favors the continuance of buying gold from Russia.

It is the policy of the Treasury Department to buy gold offered to it by governments and central banks of countries with which we maintain financial and commercial relations, when these countries want to acquire dollars either for expenditure within the United States or for the settlement of international balances with third countries. Such gold purchases are subject only to the gold declaration of February 22, 1944, a copy of which is enclosed, which was issued by the United States simultaneously with similar declarations by the United Kingdom and Russia, and to which most of the United Nations members subsequently subscribed.

The Treasury believes that the purchase of gold in accordance with this established policy is necessary to the continued use and free acceptance of gold as an international medium of exchange.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The gold declaration mentioned in Mr. Snyder's letter refers to Axis gold that might have been finding its way into the United States during the war.

Turkey and Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Rev. Edgar M. Wahlberg, at present pastor of Mount Olivet Community Church, of Dearborn, Mich., was born and educated in Colorado. For many years he was an outstanding civic leader and minister in my State. During the war he was associated with UNRRA, and in that capacity he gained some valuable first-hand information on conditions in Greece. A few days ago this beloved divine and my close friend made some important observations on Turkey and Greece, and they have been printed in his church paper. I ask unanimous consent to insert his statement in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURKEY AND GREECE
(By Edgar M. Wahlberg)

The average American is more or less stunned by the swift maneuvers of President Truman in relation to the proposed gift of $400,000,000 to Turkey and Greece. He is just now beginning to ask a few questions prompted out of his common sense perspective, and his hazy but instinctive knowledge of the facts.

The first question is, "Why Turkey?" He knows that Turkey was an enemy nation during the First World War and a pro-German neutral in the Second World War. Turkey fared well between wars and took advantage of all economic opportunities during the Second World War. President Truman's announcement is the first suggestion that Turkey is in urgent economic need. Mr. Average Citizen wants to know more about the pressures which have directed Mr. Truman to make such a spectacular demand. The American citizen is sensibly softened to an appeal in behalf of starving people of Europe and China. Turkey is a new angle. Is Mr. Truman mixing military expediencies and relief? It would seem that Turkey is not in need. Why, then, should we help her? America has to date avoided participation in the age-long messy European and Balkan political intrigues. There would not seem to be a single justification for setting up military expediencies via Turkey. Before Mr. Truman's plan is approved, the public is entitled to all the facts and emotions which have so stirred the President.

Greece is in need. All Americans know this and are sympathetic to the gallant ally of the Second World War. Perhaps this knowledge is the basis of Mr. Truman's technique for swiftly pushing through a program which may not help Greece and which may foreshadow the decline of the United States of America.

Greece emerged from under the heel of Turkey in the nineteenth century, and was immediately subject to European powers and interests, as they were, from time to time, related to Russia, Turkey, the Balkan nations, and Germany. In her reverses with Turkey in 1922, Greece lost a large territory and had to transplant to her smaller area 1,500,000 Greek refugees. This was a terrific burden to a population of less than 6,000,000. Then came the war with Italy, which Greece won. Germany stole the glory of this victory and Greece was forced to endure a brutal military occupation.

Many Greeks fled to the mountain areas and organized the Greek army (ELLAS) and a Greek government (EAM) to carry on the Allied fight against the enemy in Greece. One thousand eight hundred burned and destroyed towns and villages and the wanton destruction of transportation and other facilities testify to the ferociousness and courageous tenacity of the Greeks against the Germans. EAM and ELLAS were assisted by the Allied Nations, particularly Britain and the United States through supplies and personnel from 133 and OSS. They were pro-Britain, pro-United States, and pro-Russian. The government included the Communists but tended to be middle road in political and economic policies. Some of the most widely trusted and respected men of Greece were participants and leaders. Friction began when it was evident that Greece was expected to receive and respect an exile government. This was done with some degree of grace for a short time, but when the interests of the exile government coincided more and more with rightest and royalist regimentation, the situation became intolerable. Greeks thought this was a problem of internal privilege and moved in to solve it in the only pattern that was available. When outside nations stepped in to defend the royalist nationalists, they were dismayed and felt betrayed. This was the reason for the intensity of the fight against such terrific odds.

Britain occupied Greece, disarmed ELLAS, discredited EAM, and proceeded to reinforce a rightist coalition by training and outfitting a Greek Army, Navy, and Air Force. This was a Churchillian mistake and should be recognized as such. UNRRA poured in large amounts of supplies, much of which were sold and the receipts were used to bolster up the Government. In spite of all this, one conservative government after the other fell, including one government with an 86-year-old so-called liberal as Prime Minister. The archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church acted as the British-designated agent until the King was brought back. This was done following a reported free election. It could hardly be free when there were 18,000 political prisoners and over a thousand leftists murdered, and while they were 40,000 foreign troops in Greece. One hundred thousand nationalist troops screened politically by Greek governmental officials and 40,000 armed civilians belonging to the royalist organization patrolled Greece. Greece had the

largest standing Army in her history at a time when Greece was financially bankrupt. The average Greek believed that what little help he received was dependent on voting the way the British and Americans wanted him to vote. It was pretty confusing to the Greeks, but they voted or didn't vote in the easiest way that they knew.

Very little in the record suggests that all of this has been good for the Greeks. As far as the average Greek is concerned, there has been little gained. His condition is hopeless. Now we are asked to carry on this unending debacle. Our danger is that we in turn will get something by the tail as Britain has done and then won't be able to let go.

There is no question that when Britain gets out Greece will elect a more liberal and perhaps a leftist government. Russia won't necessarily have a thing to do about it. Russia has been politically and internationally correct in the Greek situation. People in trouble do not turn to conservatives for help. They go left. They do not favor the occupation of any nation. They are rid of Turkey and Germany. Why not Britain, the United States, and Russia?

Greeks have a tremendous respect for democracy. Our problem as Americans is to be friendly with the Greeks and with all people, regardless of government. Greece doesn't need an armed force. She cannot afford a military establishment. It is artificial and futile for Britain to continue its support and for the United States to pick up where Britain left off. A small country cannot defend itself even if it boasts an army of 100,000 and 400,000 reserves. Turkey and Greece are not as yet allies, even so, they could not represent military power. Greece needs rehabilitation and relief. Americans should give to Greece free of political or military considerations. Let Britain withdraw her army. It should not have occupied Greece as it did in the first place. Big nations must stop setting military and political expediencies and alliances with smaller nations apart from the interests of all the nations.

The United States must not by-pass the United Nations. Let us leave international military and political consideration to this body. The United Nations should guarantee the democratic rights and security to small nations and give them an opportunity to deal with pertinent human needs. Let us face Russia squarely across the conference tables of the United Nations. If the Greeks and other nations should be more friendly toward the Soviets than to the United States, it will be our own fault. Why should the choice of national friendliness on the part of smaller nations invite our bitter opposition or our paternalistic co-operation. Let us be consistent in our support of the democratic rights of people. In such consistency we will grow strong. Let us as Christians understand that nations can build a friendly world and live in it, in spite of differences. We cannot long support an alternative policy of force and international intrigue.

Federal Mine Inspection

REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the duty of Congress to put some "teeth" in our Federal Mine Inspection Act. Coal mines operating in violation of safety regulations should be closed for the protection of the miners.

Whenever a Federal inspector finds that the operation of a mine is endangering the lives of the employees he should have the power to close the mine until pronounced safe by Federal authority. I am today introducing legislation to amend the Federal Mine Inspection Act incorporating the above provision.

Statistics from the Federal Bureau of Mines shows that in the last 35 years there have been 66,140 men killed, an average of 1,889 a year, in addition to 2,135 permanently disabled. If 80 percent of these 66,140 men were married and each left a widow and 3 children, there would be 211,649 widows and orphans and 2,135 incapacitated men living with a family of 5—and the bread winner totally disabled. The public and the Congress should be immediately furnished a full report of the welfare investigation made in the coal fields by the United States Navy.

I wish to quote from the agreement between the Government and the miners on the mine safety program:

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY CODE

As soon as practicable and not later than 30 days from the date of the making of the agreement, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, after consultation with representatives of the United Mine Workers and such other persons as he deems appropriate, will issue a reasonable code of standards and rules pertaining to safety conditions and practices in the mines. The Coal Administrator will put this code into effect at the mines. Inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Mines shall make periodic investigations of the mines and report to the Coal Mines Administrator any violations of the Federal safety code. In cases of violation, the Coal Mines Administrator will take appropriate action which may include disciplining or replacing the operating manager so that with all reasonable dispatch said violation will be corrected. From time to time the Director of the Bureau of Mines may, upon request of the Coal Mines Administrator or the United Mine Workers, review and revise the Federal mine safety code.

MINE SAFETY COMMITTEE

At each mine there shall be a mine safety committee selected by the local union. The mine safety committee may inspect any mine development or equipment used in producing coal for the purpose of ascertaining whether compliance with the Federal safety code exists. The committee members while engaged in the performance of their duties shall be paid by the union, but shall be deemed to be acting within the scope of their employment in the mine within the meaning of the Workmen's Compensation Law of the State where such duties are performed.

If the committee believes conditions found endanger the life and bodies of the mine workers, it shall report its findings and recommendations to the management. In those special instances where the committee believes an immediate danger exists and the committee recommends that the management remove all mine workers from the unsafe area, the operating manager or his managerial subordinate is required to follow the recommendation of the committee, unless and until the Coal Mines Administrator, taking into account the inherently hazardous character of coal mining, determines that the authority of the safety committee is being misused and cancels or modifies that authority.

The safety committee and the operating manager shall maintain such records concerning inspections, findings, recommendations, and actions relating to this provision of the agreement as the Coal Mines Administrator may require and shall supply such reports as he may request. Nothing herein shall operate to nullify existing State statutes, but this agreement is intended to supplement the aforesaid statutes in the interest of increased mine safety.

Mr. Speaker, according to the United Mine Workers Journal, nearly 58,000 men were hurt or killed in accidents at United States coal mines in 1946. Although no major mine disaster occurred in the bituminous coal mines last year after the Federal Safety Code was in effect, the United Mine Workers Journal has received from the Coal Mines Administration copies of second notices to over 100 bituminous coal mines directing immediate correction of code violations that were reported by Federal mine inspectors.

The coal mine disaster at Centralia, Ill., is definite proof that there must be no violations of the Federal Mine Safety Code. Statistical evidence shows that most accidents take place at the end of the day. Therefore, this indicates that the miners' working hours should be reduced from 9 hours per day to 8 hours portal-to-portal. I reiterate that it is the duty of Congress to put some teeth in the Federal Mine Inspection Act.

Address of Rear Adm. O. L. Colclough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past week end I had the privilege of attending the first annual convention of Reserve officers of the naval services which was held in my home city of St. Louis.

It was most encouraging to see the continuing interest of the officer members of the Naval Reserve in naval affairs and in the security of our country. The Reserves comprised approximately 85 percent of the fighting forces of our country during World War II and we should all be proud of such evidences of interest and devotion to national defense and security.

The convention was attended by delegates from every part of the Nation and was addressed by the Secretary of the Navy, by Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey, Jr., and by the Judge Advocate of the Navy, Rear Adm. O. L. Colclough.

The address of Rear Admiral Colclough is as follows:

It is my purpose to discuss the general legislation which the Navy Department considers should be enacted by the Eightieth Congress in order that the Navy will be capable of performing more effectively the functions for which our Navy is intended.

I use the term "general legislation" in contradistinction to fiscal legislation. The latter is by no means less important, but the situation with respect to it can be summed up by the simple statement that we have deep

concern regarding the adequacy of appropriations which the Eightieth Congress may provide for the national security.

The Navy Department's legislative program has been formulated with a view—

First of all to the preservation of an effective and adequate naval force;

Second, to a perpetuation of the lessons learned during the war;

Third, to effectuating the readjustments made necessary by the transition from war to peace; and

Last but not least, to a particular emphasis upon activity in the field of scientific research and development.

SHIPS AND PLANES

Items of vital importance in discussing any program concerning the Navy are, of course, ships and aircraft. We have at the present time statutory authority to construct ships of appropriate tonnages and authority to acquire aircraft. We are restricted by law, however, in expending appropriated funds for that purpose. To put it briefly, the shipbuilding program has been confined since VE-day largely to completing certain ships the construction of which had been commenced at that time. Generally, speaking, no new keels are being laid. The acquisition of aircraft is proceeding at the reduced rate brought about by the end of hostilities and by fiscal restrictions. In the construction of ships and planes, every emphasis is being placed upon advances in scientific research and development, in the development of prototypes. We are taking advantage of the lessons we learned during the war. We are also taking advantage of any superior qualities which our enemies may have attained in their own weapons.

In the field of ship and plane construction, the Navy to date has found it necessary to seek enactment of only three measures.

The first of these will, if enacted, make balances of certain appropriations already made by Congress available for the construction of two experimental submarines. This measure has been passed by the House of Representatives. Developments in submarine and antisubmarine warfare and the increased emphasis which the atomic weapon places upon underwater transportation and attack has made necessary, even vital, extensive advances in submarine design and construction.

Another measure which the Navy Department expects to submit to Congress soon would authorize radical conversions in ships already built. The conversion program as authorized would involve complete changes in the types of some ships. For example, a cruiser might, under conversion, become a rocket ship or a platform for launching guided missiles. Funds appropriated for the construction of ships cannot, in general, be used to alter them materially after the ships have been accepted for service for more than a year. Hence, it is necessary that we secure congressional approval to make conversions, since some of the ships in the conversion program have been in service more than 1 year.

The Navy Department is asking that Congress repeal those provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act which place a limit on the profit which a shipbuilder or aircraft manufacturer may make; which require that 10 percent of the aircraft procured by the Navy be manufactured in Government plants; and which require that the first and each succeeding alternate vessel of each category be constructed in Government shipyards. These restrictions impose a disability upon the shipbuilding and the aircraft industries from which other industries which contribute to our naval power do not suffer.

To summarize briefly, in the field of ships and planes, we wish to construct two experimental submarines, we wish to convert some ships from the purpose for which they were originally designed, and we wish to remove from the ship and aircraft building industries certain restrictions placed upon them by the Vinson-Trammell Act.

PERSONNEL

In the field of personnel our problems are much more substantial and much more complex. The transition from war to peace requires some major adjustments. The Navy Department, therefore, is seeking enactment of three major measures, each of which I will discuss separately, as I believe, the interest of your membership is great in regard to matters affecting personnel of both the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve. The three major measures to which I refer are:

(A) A comprehensive revision of present laws relating to the promotion, involuntary retirement, and distribution in rank of all officers in the Regular Navy;

(B) A revision of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 to effect necessary changes in the present law in order better to establish and maintain the postwar Naval Reserve; and

(C) A measure to provide a modified form of retirement pay for commissioned and enlisted personnel of the reserve components of the armed forces.

THE PROMOTION BILL

This bill has been submitted to Congress. It has been introduced in the House of Representatives as H. R. 2537 and in the Senate as S. 902. Hearings on the bill H. R. 2537 have been scheduled by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House. The measure is applicable to both the line and the staff corps of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps.

The bill has the following generalized principal objectives:

(A) An immediate return to a statutory system of promotion based upon the selection of those who are best fitted for promotion and based upon a fixed percentage distribution of officers in the various grades;

(B) Reestablishment of permanent appointments and seniority based upon actual permanent strength, with provision for additional temporary appointments required during the interim period while the Regular Navy is stabilizing toward its authorized strength;

(C) Provision of broader opportunities for outstanding enlisted men to attain permanent commissioned rank in specialties for which they may be qualified by virtue of experience and demonstrated ability; and

(D) An improved system of promotion that will permit the best fitted officers to be promoted at appropriate ages and assure greater opportunity to all officers.

(E) A so-called accelerated promotion feature, under which outstanding officers may be selected for promotion without jeopardizing the opportunities of those above them.

The Navy has employed the principle of promotion by selection for the past 30 years. The current promotion bill represents no abandonment of that principle. It represents instead a reaffirmation and refinement of promotion by selection, modified to bring officers to command rank at appropriate ages, to preserve for further service those whose value lies in specialized abilities, and to provide for the major portion of those who must leave the service because they cannot be profitably employed to do so at an early age when greater opportunities for them in civil life will be available.

Our over-all objective in this bill is to provide increased opportunity for a reasonable career to the well-qualified officer. Above all, we seek to insure equality of treatment and opportunity for the Reserve and temporary officers who have transferred to the Regular Navy.

One of the new features of the bill is that it introduces for the first time selection within the grade of rear admiral. Officers who have completed 5 years in that grade and a total of 35 years of commissioned service will be considered by a selection board for continuance on the active list. The forced separation of certain numbers of flag officers is provided whenever necessary to assure a prescribed flow of promotion. Thus the Navy would be consistent in its application of the selection principle in its top grade.

As a result of extensive cost analyses, it has been determined that the cost of the promotion bill compares favorably with costs under existing law. This feature combined with its other highly desirable provisions affecting the efficiency and morale of the Navy have convinced us that the proposed plan is both sound and economical and that its enactment into law would be in the best interests of the Navy and the Nation. Before leaving this subject, it is of interest to note that the Army is proposing to Congress a selection system. This is a departure from its long-established system of promotion by seniority.

REVISION OF THE NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938

The Navy Department has submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a measure which would bring about a complete revision of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938. In the main, this revision preserves most of the provisions of existing law, but makes some important additions to that law.

The most important feature contained in this proposed measure is that which would permit in time of war or national emergency the transfer to the Regular Navy of all personnel ordered to extended periods of active duty. The philosophy behind this provision is that it will do much to remove many apparent or real discriminatory tendencies between Regulars and Reserves when serving together in time of war. During the war just past the Army combined its Regular components with its Reserve components to form a third component known as the Army of the United States. The present proposal of the Navy Department, in time of war or emergency, would simply assimilate its Reserve components into the Regular Navy.

The measure would add women as a component part of the Naval Reserve. Present statutory authority to appoint or enlist women in the Reserve will expire 6 months after the termination of the present war. The services of women have come to be considered vital to our shore activities in certain capacities, and the termination of their services would be a real loss. Under this proposed bill, women would constitute a permanent part of the Naval Reserve and would receive appropriate training to prepare them for immediate mobilization in time of emergency.

The Nurse Corps Reserve would likewise become a permanent constituent part of the Reserve.

The proposed measure would fill a long-felt need by providing for the transfer of individuals between the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve without first requiring separation from one group and then subsequent enlistment or appointment in the other group.

RETIREMENT OF RESERVISTS

Title III of the bill H. R. 2744, introduced in the House of Representatives on March 24, 1947, contains provisions for the retirement with pay for officers and enlisted men of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The provisions of this title have been agreed upon by the Army and Navy.

The measure provides for the establishment of a United States Naval Reserve retired list which would include the names of all Reservists, Navy or Marine, retired with pay.

Reservists upon attaining the age of 60 years, who have completed 20 years or more

of satisfactory service, become entitled to retired pay under the proposal in accordance with the following schedule of minimum service requirements:

Any type of service prior to enactment of title III	Active service	Active service subsequent to enactment of title III
0	3	3
1-5	3	2
5-10	4	1½
10-15	4	1
15-20	4	½
20 or more	4	0

Those granted retired pay under the provisions of title III would have such pay computed at the rate of 2½ percent for each year of active service and at the rate of one-half of 1 percent for each year of service other than active. An upper limit of retired pay which may be received is fixed at 75 percent of active duty pay. The active duty pay upon which retired pay is based is the base and longevity pay of the highest grade, temporary or permanent, satisfactorily held by the Reservist during his entire period of service.

Satisfactory completion of prescribed drills or other training shall be considered as the equivalent of 30 days' active service. While the bill as introduced omits the period of prescribed drills, I am confident that period is 1 year.

Disbursements of retired pay under title III would be made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs out of appropriations made to the Veterans' Administration for that purpose. No back pay or allowances would accrue by reason of enactment of title III.

STATE BONUS LAWS

I have endeavored to outline briefly those items of the Navy Department's legislative program in which I believe your organization is most interested.

I am, of course, unable to predict with any degree of accuracy the action the Congress will take on any of these measures. There is very real interest in all our problems and a consciousness of their importance in these disturbed times. Nevertheless, as you are all aware, the Eightieth Congress is faced with a tremendous legislative load, covering all functions of the Government. Furthermore, the Legislative Reorganization Act of the last Congress provides for adjournment on July 31 unless the Congress takes action to the contrary. It is apparent, therefore, that it is going to be difficult to have enacted some meritorious measures.

I would like now to invite your attention briefly to a matter in which your assistance would be of considerable benefit to the Navy.

I have reference to a problem presented by reason of the enactment of State bonus laws.

To date six States (Illinois, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont) have enacted State bonus laws for veterans. As a general rule payment of the bonus is made contingent upon factors which can be substantiated from discharge documents in the possession of each individual. However, a differentiation made by some State laws between "domestic" and "foreign" service is a noteworthy exception. Thus there may be imposed upon the Navy an implied necessity for distinguishing between "domestic sea service" and "foreign sea service."

In order to distinguish between these two it will be necessary to go beyond the record of the man concerned to the records of the unit to which he was attached, such as ship's logs and muster rolls, in order to determine the periods of time spent in each category. This process entails a terrific amount of clerical work and expense and will require years to complete.

It would seem that if in their statutes providing for payment of a bonus the States would accept a simpler definition under which all sea duty would be classed as foreign duty, the Navy Department would find itself in a position to cooperate much more effectively than seems possible at present.

I suggest, therefore, for your consideration the cooperation of RONS with the Bureau of Naval Personnel and from the headquarters of the Marine Corps to dig out the exact nature of the difficulties which are being encountered with a view to securing remedial legislative action not only by the States which have enacted bonus laws but by those States which contemplate doing so. It would be difficult, and perhaps inappropriate, for the Navy Department to make adequate representations in this matter throughout the entire Nation whereas your organization is in a position to explain the difficulty locally with chance of more positive results.

Open the Door, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there was brought to my attention today an editorial appearing in the United States News, written by David Lawrence, whom everyone recognizes as a capable writer but with whom I do not often agree. Nevertheless, his editorial entitled "Open the Door, America!" is so striking and so humane, giving such a splendid factual presentation of the distressing displaced-persons situation and carrying an appeal for these suffering peoples, that I am impelled to insert it in the RECORD in the hope that it may be read and will aid me in obtaining favorable action on my bill to permit the admission of some of these people into the United States by the use of unused immigration quotas that were not used in 1946, 1947, and 1948.

OPEN THE DOOR, AMERICA!

(By David Lawrence)

United States once again has opportunity to be haven for suffering and persecuted peoples—as trustees of abundance we must offer to share our resources with world's homeless—the facts about war's "displaced persons."

There's a closed door to which the American people have the key.

It's a door that shuts out human beings—suffering men, women, and children without homes.

It's a door behind which selfishness lurks and materialism hides.

It's a door which needs to be opened because, by doing so, the humane soul of America will be liberated.

Has the awfulness of war left us repentant? The millions whose sons have been spared are grateful. But do they ask what they can do now to acknowledge the good fortune which divine providence bestowed upon them?

The essence of this life is service. The whole philosophy under which Christianity is professed is that man is brother to man. The life and teachings of Jesus spell one thought above all others—that all of us owe a solemn duty to each other to help, to befriend, to share our worldly goods to the end that suffering may be alleviated.

It is the whole basis of charity, of philanthropy, of civic welfare. In fact, we have prided ourselves in America for generations that we sympathize with oppressed peoples everywhere and that we give a haven of refuge to those who have been the victims of political persecution.

If individually we answer, "Yes" to the cry, "Am I my brother's keeper?" then collectively we do likewise.

There are homeless people abroad. Their miserable plight is indescribable. Are we closing the door of our hearts to them? And why?

Is it possible that we think our material possessions might be diminished slightly? Are we afraid of competition from a small number who might enter the ranks of our gainfully employed? Or are we merely allergic to all who may be foreign—as if God drew boundary lines and delegated selfish power to us to keep His children from moving to places where crops are abundant and natural resources are more than adequate for those who already abide in green pastures?

Do we have the right of absolute ownership to these lands and resources or do we serve as trustees who some day must answer to our Maker and give an accounting of what we have done during our brief existence?

It is a matter of simple humanity or simple selfishness.

Here is a chance to help. Hundreds of thousands of persons in Europe have been displaced by war. We should read the facts, and then ask ourselves whether we are ready to recognize our duty as responsible individuals—as human beings responsible for what we do with our power and our possessions.

There's an organization known as the National Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. In one of its leaflets is given the essential facts which every American should know. It says:

"1. Two years after the war there are still some 850,000 people in Europe who live in detention camps.

"2. These men, women and children are the displaced persons—the survivors of Nazi concentration camps. They are victims of all forms of religious and political persecution, of barbarism and Nazi terror.

"3. They represent almost all religions. Some 80 percent are Christians of various denominations; 20 percent are Jews.

"4. Most of the displaced persons are natives of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. Others come from Finland, Yugoslavia, Greece, France and various other European countries.

"5. More than 50 percent of the displaced persons are women and children. There are 150,000 children below the age of 17. Of these 70,000 are estimated to be under 6 years of age.

"6. The displaced persons' most cherished desire is to start a new life in a country where there is freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of movement.

"7. Since VE-day, 11,000,000 displaced persons have been repatriated. But the remaining 850,000 cannot be returned to their original places of residence.

"8. These people do not wish to and cannot return to their homes of origin because they fear oppression for religious, racial or political reasons.

"9. The Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and France officially declared that no people would be forced to return to their homelands against their will. The United Nations has endorsed the same principle.

"10. Unless reasonably quick action is taken for the permanent resettlement of displaced persons, these people may form the nucleus of an international relief problem of long duration.

"11. By remaining in central Europe, they may become a source of international discord. All thinking men and women are aware that the plight of displaced persons constitutes one of the gravest cancers gnawing at the peace so dearly won.

"12. The United Nations established the International Refugee Organization to deal with the displaced persons' problem. Its charter is signed by the United States. But the IRO cannot solve the problem unless immigrant-receiving countries make special provisions to receive a fair share of displaced persons.

"13. The United States, as a leader in international affairs, must take the first step in this direction. The rest of the world would follow suit.

"14. In the 1920's the United States Congress passed immigration laws which permit 154,000 quota immigrants to enter this country annually.

"15. During the 1940–46 war period, only 15 percent of the total world quota was used. In other words, the United States lost 914,762 people who could have entered this country legally and whom we were ready and prepared to receive.

"16. The United States is one of the few countries that has not been ravaged by war. It has been estimated that a fair share of displaced persons to enter the United States would be about 400,000. This number would equal less than half of the number of quotas that were not used during the war years.

"17. Having lived under the brutal tyranny of dictatorship and totalitarianism, the displaced persons can truly value the ideals of democracy and the principles on which this country was founded.

"18. The displaced persons, like any other groups of immigrants, would be screened by Federal authorities before permission to enter this country is granted. No person advocating the overthrow of the Government by violence, no anarchist or criminal could enter the United States.

"19. No displaced person entering the United States could become a public charge. Every individual, corporation, or agency sponsoring a displaced person must furnish an affidavit to that effect.

"20. The bulk of the displaced persons are workers. There are some 177,000 farmhands among them; some 20,000 are housemaids. Many are skilled workers; some are professionals; others still are business people.

"21. There is a great shortage of farm labor and domestic service in the United States. New immigrants who are not workers tend to open noncompetitive business shops. A recent study in a metropolitan city showed that each refugee entrepreneur in business created a job for seven Americans.

"22. The displaced persons will not take homes away from veterans and other Americans. They would be housed by relatives or friends who would not sublet rooms to strangers.

"23. Some of the organizations which have gone on record as favoring the admittance of a fair share of displaced persons to this country are: The National Catholic Welfare Conference; the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; the American Jewish Committee; the American Jewish Conference; the Congress of Industrial Organizations; the American Federation of Labor; the National Conference of Union Labor Legionnaires; the United Council of American Veteran Organizations; and many other civic, educational and religious groups.

"24. In his State of the Union message, delivered before Congress on January 6, 1947, President Harry S. Truman said: '* * * I do not think that the United States has done its part. Only about 5,000 of them have entered this country since May 1946 * * * definite assistance in the form of new legislation is needed. I urge the Congress to turn its attention to this world problem in an effort to find ways whereby we can fulfill our responsibilities to these thousands of homeless and suffering refugees of all faiths.'"

How many Americans know these facts?

How many will take the little time and make the effort to tell their representatives in Congress that America should open its door to some of these homeless people? It's not a difficult chore to do.

For in opening the door to these displaced persons, America will be opening her heart.

Maybe, then, as we pray for peace, for contentment, for a better world, God will listen. For we cannot expect to receive the blessings of life if we do not give of ourselves in service to others.

How To See Through Mantle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Independence (Kans.) Daily Reporter:

HOW TO SEE THROUGH MANTLE

Recent utterances in the Cabinet and Congress indicate that Americans whom they represent are getting stirred up about communistic manifestations in the United States.

In its decision on the Harry Bridges deportation case, the United States Supreme Court threw a mantle about Communists by a decision which makes it virtually impossible to take action against a Communist unless he admits that he is one. Of course, that is the last thing the majority of them will do—especially is this true of the most dangerous ones who are operating as cells within organizations to promote communism by stealth.

Muddled liberals who cannot distinguish between Communists and what they view as open-minded thinkers are given a check list in a recent issue of Look magazine. You can know Communists or fellow travelers by these identifying marks:

"1. The belief that the war waged by Great Britain and her allies during the period from August 1939 to June 1941—the period of the war before Russia was invaded—was an imperialistic war and a game of power politics.

"2. The support of a foreign policy which agrees with that followed by Soviet Russia, and which changes as the U. S. S. R. policy changes.

"3. The argument that any foreign or domestic policy which does not fit the Communist plan is advanced for ulterior motives and is not in the best interests of either the people or world peace.

"4. The practice of criticizing only American, British, and Chinese policies, and never criticizing Soviet policies.

"5. Continually receiving favorable publicity in such Communist publications as the Daily Worker and the New Masses.

"6. Continually appearing as sponsor or coworker of such known Communist-front groups as the Committee to Win the Peace, the Civil Rights Congress, the National Negro Congress, and other groups which can be described as Communist inspired because they fall within the classifications set forth here.

"7. Continually charging critics with being 'Fascists,' no matter whether the criticism comes from liberals, conservatives, reactionaries, or those who really are Fascists.

"8. Arguing for a class society by pitting one group against another; and putting special privileges ahead of community needs as, for example, claiming that labor has privileges but has no responsibilities in dealing with management.

"9. Declaring that capitalism and democracy are 'decadent' because some injustices exist under those systems.

"10. Actual membership in the party (difficult, of course, to prove)."

Our Future at Stake in Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield:

WHOLE FUTURE AT STAKE IN COURSE UNITED STATES TAKES

(By Louis Bromfield)

If we have had a wavering foreign policy or none at all up to now—as many critics have claimed—the time has come when we have had one forced upon us. A very few wise and informed observers have known for a long time that the affairs of Great Britain were near to collapse and that any hopes of things growing any better was built upon false optimism and wishful thinking. Even as recently as last June, when the writer predicted what was already then a fact, supposedly informed book reviewers accused him of irresponsibility bordering upon insanity. The collapse has been in progress since 1914 at least. Two wars hastened it by two generations. The Greek episode merely precipitated the fact in a form which the world could not fail to understand.

It must be clear by now that we as a Nation must make up our minds about a number of things. In the face of a ruined world, it is not possible any longer for the one great and secure power left in that world to shilly-shally or to shift, now one way and now another.

First. We shall have to decide whether or not we shall undertake the economic rehabilitation of the whole world and risk the ruin of this still powerful Nation. It is doubtful whether we should be able to survive such a course simply because we have not enough money, enough real wealth in the form of raw materials, enough food, or even enough manufactured commodities. Beardsley Ruml has suggested that giant loans from this country would be a profitable course because all the money would be returned here since the ruined world can scarcely buy the commodities it needs—from machine tools to food—anywhere else. Ruml, I think, fails to consider the enormous drain such a policy would represent upon our oil, our minerals, our timber, our soil fertility, indeed the whole of our natural wealth. And in return for this drain we should only be getting back money, and money which we had loaned out in the first place; money, which by adding its might in vast quantities to that already in circulation here, could serve to create higher and higher living costs, increasing scarcity of goods and general inflation.

Second. If we decide that we could rehabilitate the whole of the world, we shall have to decide which nations we are to help and upon what basis. This makes imperative a definite foreign policy, indeed an extremely definite one. Shall it be that we will underwrite the failing British Empire or all western Europe, or what?

In a weakened world the power of money, credits, and supplies of all sorts are a great power but it also is a very costly power in terms of taxes, especially in a nation which is burdened with $300,000,000,000 of debts and where taxes have already reached the point of diminishing returns. It was ravenous taxes, amounting virtually to confiscation, which throttled capital investments, industrial modernization, and contributed heavily to the disorganization and collapse of Britain's great industries.

In some respects we are today at about the same point of economic insecurity which Great Britain reached in 1920. One more war or one more vast expenditure, either in the form of loans and credits or even in exports which would be virtually on a lend-lease basis, might well topple us over into the situation of Great Britain today. Even this second choice, with its limitations determined by a definite foreign policy, is an extremely dangerous one.

Third. This third course is a return to hemispheric isolationism—not an isolationism of ideology but of given economic necessity—in which this Nation, together with Latin America, sets out to care for itself if there is to remain one corner of the earth which is to be preserved from total collapse, not only of economy but of civilization.

The state of the world is far more grave than the average man in the street realizes. It will require great sacrifice and cooperation among nations to save themselves, and great brains and statesmanship to find a solution of world troubles. Neither cooperation nor brains nor statesmanship seem to be in evidence in great quantity anywhere in the world today. It may be that the situation is so serious that the only course is to let things level off and then make a fresh start, simply because there is not enough wealth or food or money in the Western Hemisphere to set things going again.

For one, I am by no means confident that the underwriting of British support in Greece and Turkey will in the end make any more difference than the unfortunate British-American intervention in Siberia and Manchuria after the First World War. We run the risk of spending vast amounts of money and some lives without affecting the final result in the least. Indeed, for the comfort of those who desire the weakening and ruin of Russia, I can think of no quicker or surer way than to let her take over the problems of Europe. She is in no condition to cope with them. Perhaps the best way to end communism is to let more nations have a test of it.

Someone has said that this crisis is as serious as that of Pearl Harbor. That is an understatement. Pearl Harbor was one lost battle. We are faced now with decisions which will affect the future existence of the Nation itself as anything but a ruined state burdened by taxes and an incredibly low standard of living. Byzantinism fell trying to save the Roman Empire, which had embraced the whole of the known world. Our own task in a world in which virtually every nation is depending upon us for salvation is not much different from that of Byzantinism. In any case, the time of decision is at hand.

The Tax Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

TAFT VERSUS KNUTSON

Senator TAFT and Representative KNUTSON are engaged in a puerile dispute over the revenue loss entailed by the Knutson tax-reduction bill. The Senator, who is opposed to a retroactive cut in taxes, estimates that the bill just passed by the House would entail a loss of revenue next year of $5,700,000,000. Mr. KNUTSON puts the reduction in tax collections next year at only $4,200,000,000. The difference is due to Senator TAFT's disregard of the time element. Mr. KNUTSON points out that part of the tax refunds made necessary, under his bill, would not be paid until the fiscal year 1949. But the final result would be a loss of the magnitude indicated by Senator TAFT, although the budget for the coming year would not bear the full brunt of the tax-cutting assault.

The public will, however, have $5,700,000,000 more to spend than had been anticipated if the KNUTSON program is enacted, and that windfall would be just so much more money added to the volume of purchasing power that has been the prime cause of inflation. During 1946 the Federal Reserve Bulletin points out that the volume of deposits and currency in the hands of the public expanded by nearly $13,000,000,000. Half of that total represented a shift of funds from the Treasury to private accounts, while the remainder resulted from an expansion of bank loans. The only way to reverse the expansionist process and bring about a reduction in cash and deposit balances is to build up budget surpluses and use those surpluses to retire debt. With commercial bank loans expanding rapidly, a very considerable budget surplus is required for the purpose even to offset the inflationary effect of credit expansion. Yet the Republicans are planning to use a good part—maybe all—of prospective budget surpluses to put more money in the pockets of taxpayers.

Report of President of National Association of Women Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the message and report of Adele I. Springer, the new president of the National Association of Women Lawyers:

MESSAGE FROM THE NEW PRESIDENT

It is with a profound feeling of humility that I acknowledge the distinguished honor you have conferred in electing me president of the National Association of Women Lawyers in these grave times. I pledge you every effort within my power to vindicate your faith.

The membership of our association represents a fair cross section of the greatness which is America. Though the accidents of parentage we are of various races and religions. Also some of us were born of affluence while others have slowly and painfully fought our way up from poverty to whatever station in our chosen professions we today respectively occupy.

Equality before the law and equality of economic opportunity are synonymous with the words "United States of America." Along with our brothers of the law, we women have taken an oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States and of our own home States—to the end that there shall be available to generations yet unborn the freedoms so nobly stated in our Declaration of Independence, and so fearlessly guaranteed in the Constitution.

Yet constitutions and freedoms are not things of parchments. Documents decay. They must be written on the hearts and in the minds of freedom loving peoples of each succeeding generation so as to become a part of the "ethos" of the people, as the ancient Greek philosophers so well knew.

In no other country of the present world do women occupy the status that they occupy in the United States. Wherever and whenever equality before the law and equality of economic opportunity have not existed in any region of the globe and wherever they once existed and have since disappeared, the status and position of women is a degraded and servile one. With all the vision and courage we can muster, the women of America must fight to preserve and extend the blessings made a reality by those who have gone before us.

They were noble and courageous women who birthed and trained the Washingtons, Marshalls, Jeffersons, Lincolns, and countless others who met and conquered the difficulties which have arisen from time to time in America since the establishment of the settlements at Jamestown to this day. We are the successors of such women; our opportunities for unselfish service are even greater than were theirs.

The entire world is sick almost unto death. In only a few nations is there any pretense of freedom and equality under law or any pretense of equality of economic opportunity. Assaults on even these liberties and equalities are taking place daily, yes, hourly, in those countries where they yet continue to exist.

There are as many, if not more, women in the world than there are men. Women lawyers, trained in government and laws, should and must furnish to women the leadership which the world must either have soon or perish in what will be conflagration of a Third World War with pilotless loads of atomic bombs.

That the masculine leadership of the world has not saved the women and children of succeeding generations from the horrors of war, is too plainly apparent to merit argument. Whether the leadership of women by women can succeed where the men have failed, remains to be seen. All we can say now is that it has not been attempted. The greatest unreleased power in the world today is womanpower. Men and women, both, must be prevailed upon to accept women as a vital part of the machinery of government. As the home has been endowed, the world can be enriched, by having the influence of both sexes contributing to the well-being of this Nation. I am not sanguine enough to believe that this leadership can be attained during my term of office, but we can at least make a beginning.

Behind us, and aiding our every effort, are the teachings of love and forbearance of all the religions; the heartaches and loneliness of millions of women for their loved ones—now resting in unnamed graves on the recent battlefields of the world or in the restless waters of the seven seas; and the hope of the world for peace. Above all we have with us the God of Mercy of all peoples.

We can, and I hope will, carry on, to an even greater extent, the usual committee work and studies in which the association has been engaged for many years. I trust that we may be able to contribute something by these studies to the store of human knowledge and accomplishment. All of this customary work will not be neglected as we unitedly strive to make this indeed a better world.

Today, as an association, either we stand on the threshold of great new achievements and progress, or we face retreat. In choosing the course to follow, the decision must rest with the members.

I beg the active assistance and advice of every member of this association, wherever she may be located, in the work to which we have set our hearts and hands, with unequivocal fidelity to our unequaled form of government, to bring about that day when the bloodshed, death, and destruction of war shall be abolished from the face of the earth.

ADELE I. SPRINGER,
President.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

(By Adele I. Springer, of the New York bar)

Program: Our program for the year will be marked by several important activities that had the earnest attention of preceding administrations and to which further attention will be given in carrying them forward. New major projects will be undertaken in recognition of changing conditions and expanding needs.

Legislation: Legislative activity has advanced so rapidly in recent years that it taxes the ingenuity of the trained mind to keep abreast of it. We have accordingly entered a subscription for a legislative service so that all bills before Congress and all congressional debate can be channeled through to our respective committees for study, report, and recommendations, to provide for appropriate action throughout the legislative year.

Committees: A number of committees have been added to the standing committees for concentration of specialized effort on the various subjects of law. While only a limited number of the hundred committees will consider major projects, the object of them all is to afford members a fuller participation in the fields of their special interests and to make the association more effective. Members who have not yet designated their choice for committee service may yet be added to available committees.

There are opportunities unprecedented in our history for the launching of new projects on every scale.

Public office: One of the immediate projects on our program is an effort to increase the number of women lawyers in judicial positions, in policy-making posts of the Government, in the United States delegation to the United Nations and in Congress and the State legislatures. Members are asked to inform headquarters of judicial vacancies occurring in their respective localities.

Jury service for women: Another major project will be a determined effort to achieve jury service for women in all States. Sixteen States do not permit women on juries. Of the 32 States now allowing such service, only 16 are on a basis equal to that of the men. A Nation-wide committee on jury service for women has been established with a chairman in each State, for united and vigorous effort.

Uniform marriage and divorce laws: Another project of parallel importance is the subject of uniform marriage and divorce laws. We have long been conscious of the social chaos, particularly to women and children, resulting from the varying State jurisdictional requirements, ranging from 6 weeks to 5 years, and the differences in grounds for divorce in the respective States. In South Carolina divorce is not even permitted. In New York it is permitted only for adultery. In other States the grounds vary, such as desertion, 46 States; cruelty or imprisonment for crime, 42 States; drunkenness, 39 States; neglect, nonsupport, and insanity, 22 States. The resulting evils in matrimonial status and the status of children well merit the attention of a Nation-wide committee. This committee, with a chairman in each State, will consider whether uniformity in marriage and divorce laws should proceed along lines of States' rights or through Federal constitutional amendment. After this exhaustive study has been completed and conclusions reached, appropriate action will be taken to implement the same.

Juvenile delinquency: Of equal importance will be our Nation-wide committee on juvenile delinquency, cooperating with the United States Attorney General's Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency, reported elsewhere in this issue of the journal.

Labor relations: Another subject of major attention is that of discrimination against women in industry, for which a Committee on Labor Relations has been created. The disturbance to our national economy and the vast social and industrial losses resulting from industrial strife, with 113,000,000 man-days of idleness from this source last year, is an example of the importance of pursuing vigorously this committee's objectives.

Taxation: Another new committee of Nation-wide proportion is our Committee on Taxation, to study and take action on the problem of placing the Nation's financial house in order. The people of this Nation, the heaviest taxed in the world, are daily becoming more tax conscious. Too many governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy. We are today confronted in the fiscal field by unparalleled conditions. We face a staggering national debt of approximately $275,000,000,000, not including contingent liabilities, equivalent to over $1,850 for every man, woman, and child in this country. The national welfare demands a sound fiscal policy—a reduction in expenditures, public debts, and taxation, each in its own time and place.

International relations: In the field of international relations, the growing fear and defeatism which mark the current state of the world give urgency to the efforts of all who seek world peace. Our first section of the association, the newly created section on international relations, with a separate division devoted to the work of the United Nations, gives an opportunity for a more careful consideration of problems connected with international law and relations. The status of our association, accredited by the State Department as an official observer of the United Nations, affords unparalleled facilities for making a valuable contribution to the many subjects in this vital field of law and human relations. Let us face squarely the fact that all the ignoble motives of the last war continue to prevail, if not increase, and that the Charter of the United Nations must be implemented to provide for sanctions. The special United Nations division of our section on international relations will support strongly the United Nations. The section as a whole will accept our full measure of responsibility in world affairs and will endeavor to fulfill a mission.

Launching of program: Our activities for the year were launched with a luncheon meeting at headquarters in tribute to the women representatives of the United Nations General Assembly. Some of the inspiring addresses by women representatives on that occasion are reported elsewhere in this journal. In addition to the address by the adviser to the Chinese delegation, part of her ensuing letter is here quoted: "I was much indebted to your persuasion to attend your luncheon so that I could witness such an array of great and earnest-minded personalities. It will be through such able and sincere women that war can eventually be abolished. Our women at home will be very much impressed with the happening of your significant occasion."

Public relations: The legal profession has a pressing problem of public relations. The assistance of professional aid in public relations has been arranged at headquarters and a committee on professional ethics established to guide the scope of such activity.

Library: The headquarters has also made possible the beginnings of a library. A committee is accumulating a library of official and other documents and books as to the United Nations and other law for the information and use of the committees. Members of the association who have need of documents or information for the purposes of the work of the association will have access to the library's facilities. Contributions to the library will be gratefully accepted.

Regional meetings: One of the objects of our association is to cherish a spirit of fellowship among all members. Meetings of the association in various regions will be held throughout the year, to foster such relationships. The dates and places will appear in the next issue of the journal.

Reorganization: The challenge we face is clear, but our task is difficult. If we are to succeed, our first task is to correct any defects in our own association. It would appear obvious that in this undertaking we should begin by revising our entire constitution and bylaws. A drafting advisory committee has been appointed to study the feasibility of such revision, modeled on the basis of a senate and house of representatives, to allow more proportionate representation to the various localities and more direct and wider representation on our governing board.

Women's cooperation: Women lawyers can lead the way and can assist, but cannot alone produce the results which are required. Concerted understanding and action with other women and organizations are essential. Your president and other officers or representatives of the association have attended all official and other conferences on invitation, including such meetings as the Attorney General's Conference for the Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency, Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women, United Nations Conference of Accredited Representatives of Voluntary Organizations on UNESCO, UNRRA, the Food and Agriculture Organization, conferences of the women's organizations of the United Nations, and of other women's organizations. We, too, are inviting other women's organizations to participate with us, and copies of our board's resolutions were sent to hundreds of other women's organizations. Our cooperation is also extended to the American Bar Association, Inter-American Bar Association, and the newly formed International Bar Association. Our association's application for membership in the latter is pending.

Legal aid: Assistance to other women's groups with common objectives, embraces more than mere resolutions. Cooperation with our sisters in medicine will take the form of legal aid. Our new committee on legal aid will find a gratifying outlet for future service to charity patients in the social-service department of the women doctors' planned new medical center—a noble project of the New York Infirmary, all-woman-staffed hospital built by the first woman doctor. How the medical women solved our common struggle for a place in the profession makes absorbing reading. Their story appears elsewhere in this issue. Our support of their endeavor is well merited.

Appointments: One woman is not a bar association. Each committee must devote itself without stint to the tasks over which it has jurisdiction. United teamwork is vital. Committee appointments in the association are being made in accordance with the members' choices of interest, so far as possible, and with geographical and background balance. Outstanding experts in various fields have already accepted service as chairmen and as members of committees. Thanks are extended to all who returned the committee questionnaires with such assurances of cooperation. The committee personnel will appear in the next issue of the Journal.

Journal: The Journal, as a spokesman for the women lawyers, can be improved and the scope of its influence widened. Your suggestions will be valued. Items of lawyers in the news, local bar activities, and articles, will be appreciated by the editorial board.

Progress: If we act with solidarity we can perfect and strengthen what we have built. The answer lies today, as always, in the power of the individual to rise above self, to make a contribution of self to the solution of the many ills that confront us not only in Federal, State, and local communities, but in the world.

Dr. Sherwood Eddy

REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention by some representatives of the American Legion that Dr. Sherwood Eddy is conducting an extensive lecture tour of the country among its colleges and universities under the auspices of the YMCA.

I understand Dr. Eddy was born in America but spent most of his life, or a large part of his life, abroad in various countries such as India, Russia, and China. He has written a number of books on World War I, on economics, on social systems, and religion.

I do not know Dr. Eddy personally. He may be a loyal American but unwittingly serving the interests of communism and socialism in this country. I am not the judge of that. However, I do know that he is speaking in the colleges and universities throughout the land in connection with Religious Emphasis Week in our sacred institutions. I am told by the president of one college that he expected to hear a great sermon uplifting the religious ideals and spiritual qualities of young men but instead heard a lecture lauding the virtues of the totalitarian Russian Government and praising the Russian economic system and disparaging our own. According to some newspaper accounts of his address, his is a dangerous doctrine.

One student at a university told me that it was not uncommon to find some of these speakers in connection with religious activities extolling a socialistic trend of thought. However, America was founded on the principles of genuine old-time religion, individualism, personal liberty, and freedom of thought and action. It is my opinion that these same principles will save America in this great crisis through which we are now passing, and I believe it to be the duty of our institutions of higher learning to secure genuine Americans who believe in the future of America, who believe in democracy, who believe in the freedom of the individual, to make addresses and speeches to the youth of our country.

I am reluctant, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House, to pass judgment on a man whom I have never seen. It might be that he is unknowingly serving the enemies of our country and advocating a system of socialism which is in contradiction with those principles and ideals of the founding fathers of this republic. However, I feel it my solemn duty to have inserted in the RECORD the record of Dr. Sherwood Eddy as compiled by the Committee on Un-American Activities. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this record speaks for itself.

[Information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, U. S. House of Representatives, March 6, 1947]

For: Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN.
Subject: Sherwood Eddy.

A leaflet, For the Rescue of Refugees, published by the American Committee To Save Refugees, contains the name of Sherwood Eddy in the list of persons who signed a public statement appealing for emergency legislation for refugees. This organization, the American Committee To Save Refugees, was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944.

This same report also cites the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as a "front." (See pp. 82 and 116.) According to a letterhead of the organization, dated February 21, 1938, Sherwood Eddy was a member of the (executive) committee of this group. In 1939, according to the Daily Worker, February 1, 1939, page 2, Eddy endorsed an appeal to lift the Spanish embargo which was sponsored by the American Friends of Spanish Democracy.

According to the Daily Worker, April 8, 1938, page 2, the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy held an Easter drive. One of the sponsors of this drive was Sherwood Eddy. In three of its reports (January 2, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944), the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as a Communist-front organization. Furthermore, Attorney General Biddle said: "The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International," and it was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683–7684). A letterhead, dated May 18, 1938, of the China Aid Council also lists Sherwood Eddy as a sponsor of the Council.

One of the "Representative individuals" of the Coordinating Committee to lift the embargo was Sherwood Eddy, according to page 9 of the booklet, These Americans Say, published by the organization. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo as a Communist front in the committee report of March 29, 1944.

An article by Sherwood Eddy, in which he denounced Trotzky, appeared in the Daily Worker, June 11, 1937, page 6. This newspaper is an official Communist organ.

Sherwood Eddy was a member or sponsor of the Descendants of the American Revolution, cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of June 25, 1942. The Daily Worker, Feb. 13, 1939, page 2, lists Eddy as a member of the organization and a pamphlet, "Descendants of the American Revolution," back cover, lists him as a sponsor.

According to a letterhead, November 18, 1936, Eddy was a member of the Committee of the Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, cited as a Communist front on pages 82 and 116 of the March 29, 1944 report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

This same committee report cited the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist front. A letterhead, July 6, 1938, of the Medical Bureau lists Eddy as a national sponsor, and the Daily Worker, January 30, 1939, page 2, lists Eddy as one of the sponsors of an appeal of the organization.

Sherwood Eddy was connected with some of the meetings held in New York to celebrate the Soviet Constitution. The Daily Worker, November 30, 1936, page 5, lists him as one of the sponsors of a meeting to greet the Soviet Constitution. Another meeting was described in testimony by Walter Steele before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on August 16, 1938. (See: Public hearings, p. 376). Mr. Steele said:

"On December 3, the same year, 1937, again led by Professor Lamont, another throng gathered in New York to celebrate the adoption of the new Constitution by the Soviet Union. These included in addition to some 2,000 individuals, the following: Prof. Corliss Lamont, Harry Elmer Barnes, Edwin Burgum, Louis Budenz, Jessica Smith, Max Bedacht, Malcolmn Cowley, H. W. L. Dana, John Elliott Lovejoy, Sherwood Eddy, John Kingsbury."

A news release, dated December 26, 1941, of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties contains the name of Sherwood Eddy as one of the signers of the release. He also was a signer of an open letter of the organization, according to the booklet, 600 Prominent Americans, page 19. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited twice as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (see committee reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944), and Attorney General Biddle said that it was part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.) Another open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which Eddy signed, denounced Attorney General Biddle's charges against Harry Bridges and the Communist Party.

Eddy was connected with three more organizations cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its March 29, 1944, report. According to the leaflet, Protestantism Answers Hate, he was one of the sponsors of the Call to this dinner forum sponsored by the Protestant Digest. He was a member of the advisory board of Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., according to one of its letterheads, dated March 20, 1926. And, according to a New York Times article, October 9, 1944, page 12, Eddy was a signer of the open letter to Governor Dewey which was sponsored by the Schappes defense committee.

The pamphlet, Children in Concentration Camps, back cover, shows that Sherwood Eddy was treasurer of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, classified by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as one of the "front organizations" of the Communist Party. (See committee report, January 3, 1940, p. 9.)

In connection with Spanish aid organizations, Eddy's name appears in some testimony in the public hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. In the testimony of William E. Browder, State treasurer of the New York State Communist Party, on September 12, 1939, before the special committee, the following questions and answers appear:

"Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Sherwood Eddy, and what was this payment for, Mr. Browder, in the amount of $25 on May 3, 1939?

"Mr. BROWDER. That apparently is some donation; I don't know whether it is in connection with some dinner; we may have bought some dinner tickets.

"Mr. WHITLEY. On behalf of the movement to aid Spain?

"Mr. BROWDER. That would indicate it was probably a dinner given in which we bought 10 or 12 tickets.

"Mr. WHITLEY. Taken by the State organization?

"Mr. BROWDER. That is right." (See public hearings, p. 4859.)

Appeals of Employees of Boston Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and opinion of the United States Civil Service Commission:

UNITED STATES CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1947.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Reference is made to your interest in the cases of a group of veterans who were reduced from leadingmen to journeymen positions in the Boston Naval Shipyard.

The Commission has given most careful consideration to the representations made by the Navy Department and the veterans or their representatives, and has decided the cases in favor of the veterans. A copy of the Commission's opinion is enclosed.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,

WM. C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

[Enclosure 9625.]

OPINION OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN APPEALS MADE BY EMPLOYEES OF THE BOSTON NAVAL SHIPYARD UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 14 OF THE VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

SUMMARY OF OPINION

The Civil Service Commission agrees that under the language of the Veterans' Preferenct Act of 1944 the Navy Department has the right to consider the efficiency of the service in connection with any demotions which it decides to make. However, in making demotions it must proceed in the manner specified by the Congress in enacting section 14 of that act.

The Commission has decided that it did not so proceed in the notices given the appellants in the cases before it, and therefore its decision is in favor of the appellants (veterans).

OPINION

A group of veterans who were demoted from leadingmen positions in the Boston Naval Shipyard have appealed to the Commission under the provisions of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

The appellants point out that a group of leadingmen were demoted to journeymen positions and that, after this action was taken, nonveteran quartermen were demoted to some of the positions which became vacant as a result of the demotion of the leadingmen.

The appellants contend that this action on the part of the Navy Department was in violation of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

The Navy Department, however, contends that under the Commission's reduction in force regulations quartermen and leadingmen are not in competition with one another. The Department points out that, in determining what leadingmen were to be demoted, and then later in determining what quartermen were to be demoted, it complied with the Commission's reduction in force regulations.

We have also had presented to us another group of cases in which the same type of action was taken. These cases differ from the first group, however, in that notices were given simultaneously to both the quartermen and the leadingmen. The notices were so timed, however, that no quarterman was demoted to a leadingman position until after all of the leadingmen had been demoted.

In the first group of cases the regional office of the Civil Service Commission decided the appeal in favor of the Navy Department. The Board of Appeals and Review has recommended that the decision of the regional office should be affirmed.

In the second group of cases the regional office decided in favor of the appellants on the ground that the notices were given simultaneously to the quartermen and the leadingmen. The Board of Appeals and Review has recommended that this action on the part of the regional office should be reversed on the ground that, although the notices were given simultaneously, the demotion of the quartermen did not, in fact, take place until after the leadingmen had been demoted.

In considering both groups of cases, the distinction between a "reduction in force" and a "demotion" must be kept in mind.

The Commission's retention-preference regulations define "reduction in force" as follows:

"Reduction in force means the involuntary separation from the rolls of a department or furlough in excess of 30 days of one or more employees in order to reduce personnel."

In our Federal Personnel Manual, we have included in the chapter on Reduction in Force (ch. R-3) the following statement:

"There are several ways to cut down the number of employees in a particular line of work at a particular place. Employees may be transferred or reassigned to other positions, separated for cause, or demoted without regard to retention preference regulations. Actions other than separations and furloughs for more than 30 days are not subject to those regulations because they are not regarded as 'reductions in force.'"

The following additional statements have also been included in this chapter:

"If the personnel official is going to reduce the number of employees in higher grades by demotion, his office must know how to select the employees for the demotion. Although demotions are not 'reductions in force' as defined in the regulations, retention order can be used fairly and reasonably in selecting employees for demotion. However, demotion in grade made in conjunction with reductions in force may not result in displacement by the demoted employee of another employee in a higher retention subgroup. Demotions may be made before, during, or after a reduction in force."

The inclusion of these statements in the Federal Personnel Manual chapter on reduction in force is in conformity with the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 in that section 12 of that act deals only with the question of "reduction in personnel."

The only reference to demotions in the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is in section 14. That section reads in part as follows:

"No permanent or indefinite preference eligible who has completed a probationary or trial period employed in the civil service or in any establishment, agency, bureau, administration, project, or department, hereinbefore referred to shall be discharged, suspended for more than 30 days, furloughed without pay, reduced in rank or compensation or debarred for future appointment except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service, and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose discharge, suspension for more than 30 days, furlough without pay, or reduction in rank or compensation is sought shall have at least 30 days' advance written notice * * * stating any and all reasons, specifically and in detail, for any such proposed action. * * *"

The cases now before us very clearly fall in the category of demotions and not reductions in force.

We must, therefore, consider the appeals under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act. In doing so, we recognize that the Navy Department in determining what persons, in a specific competitive area, were to be selected for demotion conformed to the retention preference regulations issued under section 12. In doing so, the Navy Department, insofar as this particular aspect of the matter is concerned, went beyond the requirements of the Veterans' Preference Act. This is clearly indicated by the Commission's own statements in the Federal Personnel Manual chapter on Reduction in Force when we point out that the retention preference regulations are not applicable to demotions.

It is necessary for us, however, in the consideration of these appeals to determine whether or not the Navy Department did conform to the requirements set forth in section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act.

Under section 14 there are two basic requirements. The first requirement is that the person to be demoted "shall have at least 30 days' advance written notice." The Navy Department did comply with this particular provision in these cases.

The second requirement is that the notice shall state "any and all reasons, specifically and in detail, for any such proposed action."

In these cases the Department's notice stated that the action was being taken because of lack of funds.

The appellants in these cases contend that this notice did not state "any and all reasons, specifically and in detail" for the proposed action. They point out that the Navy Department defends its actions on the ground that they were "for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service," in that these actions made it possible for the Navy Department to retain its most experienced and best qualified persons in supervisory positions.

The appellants maintain that if this is the Navy Department's real reason for the actions taken it should have so stated in the notices which were given to the leadingmen. The appellants allege that if this had been done it would have enabled them to join issue with the Navy Department in these cases on the question of whether or not the proposed actions were necessary in order to "promote the efficiency of the service." We feel that this point is well taken.

We are, therefore, deciding these appeals in favor of the appellants (veterans) on the ground that the notices given by the Navy Department did not conform to the requirements of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act.

In making this finding, we recognize that the information brought out at the various hearings indicates very clearly that the Navy Department feels that the actions taken are necessary actions in order to "promote the efficiency of the service." We find, however, that the reasons for arriving at such a conclusion should have been set forth by the Navy Department in its notices to these appellants, so that, if they so desired, they could join issue with the Navy Department by appealing under the provisions of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act. If such appeals were taken, it would then be necessary for the Commission to determine whether the actions taken by the Navy Department were actions which were permissible under the Veterans' Preference Act because they were of such a nature as to "promote the efficiency of the service."

In other words, we agree that, under the provisions of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act, the Navy is given the right to consider the question of efficiency in deter-

mining how its force is to be reorganized as a result of a reduction in its available funds. But, in giving consideration to this factor, it must do so in the manner specified by the Congress in enacting section 14.

Approved by the Commission March 24, 1947.

Democracy in Industrial Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary L. B. Schwellenbach before the California Institute of Industrial Relations, Berkeley, Calif., March 20, 1947:

DEMOCRACY IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

During the last year and a half our Nation has faced the most difficult and complicated economic problems of its history. These arose because of the necessity for the reconversion of our economy from war to peace. Outstanding among these problems were those which arose because of differences between industry and labor. I would be the last to attempt to minimize the importance of these conflicts. I was in no sense surprised that these differences arose. What has surprised me most has been the apparent belief that it would be possible completely to rearrange our economy and at the same time avoid any strife between industry and labor.

Increasingly throughout the conflict our economy had been geared to war—patterns of production and employment underwent profound changes. The wage and salaried workers of America were called upon to meet the huge and unprecedented demand for war equipment while maintaining a remarkably high level of civilian goods and services.

This achievement, which hastened the day of final victory, was more than a triumph of men and machines. This achievement proclaimed the enduring strength of our democratic traditions and our devotion to the principles of human freedom.

For remember that our participation in World War II was so vast and intricate that it required much greater control and direction of the national economy than we had ever experienced in the past. Yet the measures which we adopted and the methods which were used owed much of their success to the very fact that they did reflect both unity of purpose and faith in the free American way of life.

The period of reconversion, with all its trials and difficulties, called for a basic decision. The Government and people of this Nation faced a choice between continuing war controls and resuming the free pattern of life. In many respects, and especially in the field of labor relations, that was not an easy choice. But I am convinced, and I think the record proves beyond a doubt, that the return to free collective bargaining was a wise one—the only choice for a Nation conceived in liberty.

I certainly need not remind this audience that the problem of industrial relations is fundamentally a problem of human relations. And by the same token, laws which seek to regulate or control this relationship should not neglect or overlook this fundamental aspect.

I mean to discuss some of these proposals with you, but first I want to set in true perspective certain important facts. One of the most outstanding is the immense productive capacity which this Nation has developed. America at war was able to maintain production for civilian needs at record levels and also turn out war materials with an annual value exceeding $60,000,000,000. America at peace is moving toward an era of unprecedented output.

This huge production potential, enlarged by technological advances already under way, points to higher levels of living than we have ever known. The great task that lies before us is to achieve an economic balance and stability which will promote the wise use of all our resources in men, materials, and machines.

If that achievement is to be of lasting benefit—if it is to endure down through the years—it must have as its basis the American ideal of a free democratic economy—free for management to exercise its natural function, free for labor, so that all who are willing and able to work can find jobs under satisfactory conditions. By definition this excludes abnormally long hours of work or wage scales that impose substandard living conditions. It demands a firm basis of mass purchasing power among the Nation's wage and salaried workers, since these groups comprise such a large segment of our economy.

Put it this way: The problem seems simple, but in reality any program which seeks a sound economic balance must reckon with other less tangible factors. Some of these factors are still not clearly understood, some of them are deeply rooted in the habits and customs of our people. The decisions which we reach and the programs which we adopt must fit the pattern of a free society.

That is how the Department of Labor approaches its tasks, and that is how I shall approach the subject of industrial relations and legislation bearing upon it.

I cannot escape the conviction that the best attitude is one which asks:

First. How will this proposal affect the well-being of the American people?

Second. Will it help us to achieve and maintain economic stability?

Third. Will it encourage full production and employment and the widest possible distribution of goods and services?

Fourth. Will it improve the relationship between labor and management?

Fifth. And, finally, does it jeopardize the basic freedom upon which our democracy rests?

I believe that the great majority of Americans would endorse that approach. But perhaps a good many of them might be inclined to wonder just what such questions have to do with proposed labor legislation. Most of the proposals now before Congress have to do with some phase of collective bargaining—and collective bargaining is now an integral part of our industrial structure.

Today, some 50,000 union contracts affect the welfare of 15,000,000 workers and their families. The agreements which are reached are not only bread-and-butter contracts to millions of wage earners, they also affect the profits of industry, the volume of consumer purchasing power, and other factors that can stimulate or retard the smooth functioning of our economy.

In other words, collective bargaining today offers labor a voice in determining the shape of our economy. And this new role begins at a moment in history when our Nation has proved that we can produce an almost unbelievable flow of goods and services—provided we can reach an economic balance which will insure full and continued distribution.

It is common knowledge that much of the labor legislation which is before Congress was offered as a means of curbing labor and restoring equality at the bargaining table. Are such curbs needed to give us a better economic balance? Is there a real danger that labor, through collective bargaining, will demand and get too large a share of the national income? A share so large that industry could not function successfully?

This involves a question around which most of the debate between representatives of industry and labor has been waged. Each side in this debate has employed economists. These economists have made studies, have issued reports, the American public has been deluged with figures, all of which has resulted in confusion, disputes and strife. I am not an economist. However, it seems to me that the problem is of such a nature that one need not be an economist in order to arrive at a correct conclusion concerning the issues. I think the most important thing is that those who attempt to reach a correct conclusion be not special pleaders for either side of the controversy. The labor economists say that with living costs increasing, wage increases are necessary in order to maintain the standard of living of the American workers. No thoughtful person can combat the correctness of that position. On the other hand, the economists for industry say that wages form an important part of the cost of production. Therefore any wage increase must be reflected in the price of the products produced by those who have secured a wage increase. No thoughtful person can combat that philosophy. Therefore, what do we have? A constantly increasing spiral of wages and prices from which nobody benefits. The editors of our papers and of our magazines, most of our commentators and columnists, have argued that there is a very simple answer which should be recognized by labor. That is, that labor should realize that any wage increase simply reflects in a higher price for the products of labor and that therefore labor should be satisfied and desist from making demands for increase in wages. What these gentlemen neglect to say is that industry also should recognize that with every price increase there follows as a necessary corollary a further demand for wage increase. Therefore the value of price increases is only temporary and ephemeral. What both industry and labor should understand is that ultimately they, together, are going to price the products which they produce out of the market, which will be a disaster not only to each of them, but to our whole national economy.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers and President Truman's Economic report to the Congress had this to say concerning it:

"Chief among the unfavorable factors is the marked decline in real purchasing power of great numbers of consumers. * * *.

"If price and wage adjustments are not made—and made soon enough—there is danger that consumer buying will falter, orders to manufacturers will decline, production will drop, and unemployment will grow."

This is another way of saying that our free Nation cannot keep the balance sheet of industry in the black if the balance sheet of labor is in the red. Look, for example, at what has happened since VE-day to the buying power of factory workers who represent about 30 percent of all workers who are not on farms.

Moreover, the financial news indicates that management itself is concerned over this same situation.

There is one further point I wish to make before discussing specific labor legislation. The Department of Labor has consistently maintained that this whole question of labor-management relations and legislation bearing upon it cannot be treated as a thing apart. We must never forget that industrial strife is a symptom of basic economic maladjustments. Therefore, legislation designed

to promote industrial peace must also be geared to the larger national purpose which seeks increased security and well-being for all of our people.

I have not taken the position, nor do I take the position, that I oppose every piece of legislation which attempts to restrict the activities of labor unions. The organized labor movement in the United States has grown by leaps and bounds in the last 10 years. It is but natural that such rapid growth would bring with it abuses which, if the labor movement is not willing to correct, the Government must correct. Certainly the employer and the public should not be penalized by the inability of labor unions to agree as to which union has jurisdiction in a certain plant or factory or industry. In 1934 we in the Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act which gave to labor unions the machinery by which it could be determined what was the proper bargaining agent for the employees of any employer. Organized labor hailed this act as its magna carta. It should be compelled to use the act and to accept the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, not only in reference to disputes between employers and workers, but also in reference to disputes between the various branches of organized labor. Particularly, as the President pointed out in his State of the Union message, labor should be prevented from using the secondary boycott as a device to thwart the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board. With the growth of the labor union movement, it is certain that unions should be compelled to make public their financial transactions. As a matter of fact, most of the unions do this already.

A study made by the Labor Department shows that among 25 international A. F. of L. organizations, 22 provide for regular reports on finances either directly to the local unions or to the union's convention and three provide for regular publication of financial reports. Of the 36 CIO international unions, 31 provide for regular financial audits by a certified public accountant. Thirty publish financial reports available to anyone and five provide for financial reports to local unions or to members.

I agree also that labor unions should be made subject to suit in the event of violation of contract upon their part. The fact is that in 35 of our 48 States they already are subject to such suits, both in the State courts and the Federal courts. The only objection I have taken to the legislation proposed on this point is that it is so designed as to set labor unions apart from everyone else or from every kind of organization in the country by allowing suits in Federal court, regardless of the amount in controversy and in defiance of the constitutional provisions that jurisdiction of such private suits in Federal courts shall be limited to those controversies in which there is a diversity of citizenship as between the parties.

There are several bills before the Congress which feature the creation of a mediation board. Some would set up a board outside the Department of Labor; others would set up a mediation board within the Department but would make the board practically independent and give to it the work of conciliation and mediation now being carried on by the Labor Department's Conciliation Service.

I am opposed to these measures because I do not believe that either approach will promote industrial peace. There are several compelling reasons for my conclusion.

The establishment of such a board would interfere with and disrupt not only the work of the Conciliation Service, but a much larger area of voluntary collective bargaining between labor and management.

Inevitably, both sides would tend to carry important issues directly to the board without making any serious effort to reach a voluntary agreement among themselves. During the war we saw this happen time and time again—the parties were so anxious to have their dispute reach the National War Labor Board in Washington that in thousands of cases the preliminary negotiations were little more than a dress rehearsal for the big scene in Washington.

That is one of the reasons why the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations all strongly oppose the creation of a mediation board.

And these four groups know the value of the United States Conciliation Service because they have had a great deal of experience with it. Last year, for instance, Commissioners of Conciliation aided in the peaceful settlement of 13,000 industrial disputes. What's more, in 90 percent of the disputes where Commissioners were called in before work had halted, no stoppage occurred.

Last year our conciliators also helped settle 3,400 strikes. Nearly two-thirds of these had begun before either side asked the service to step in.

Moreover, as you know, all of these settlements were reached by voluntary methods, carried on with the friendly help of an impartial moderator.

I am convinced that we would be very unwise to jeopardize or bypass this highly useful machinery in order to set up a mediation board. But there is another reason why such a board would fail of its purpose. The solution of labor disputes is such a many-sided and complicated task that no board—regardless of the character, ability and experience of its members—would have the necessary background to mediate the enormously varied range of disputes that arise along our industrial front.

Now, let us examine a very different set of proposals—those designed to prevent industry-wide bargaining or to enact other restrictions which will limit the scope of a given union agreement within an industry. We here on the west coast have had considerable experience with agreements of this sort. We know how flexible such contracts are and what a wide range of problems and conditions they are designed to meet. And I believe most of you share my belief that these bargaining systems have helped bring stability into industrial relations and that they indicate maturity of development.

The avowed purpose of limiting proposals is twofold. They seek to prevent complete or widespread shut-downs as the result of a labor-management dispute; and they seek to protect employers within an industry from the economic pressure which unions might otherwise be able to exert.

So far as the first purpose is concerned, I see no reason to suppose that a ban on industry-wide bargaining will achieve it. Witness the fact that there was no industry-wide contract in steel when the industry was sharply curtailed early in 1946. Nor would such a prohibition cope with the problems raised by disagreements affecting such public utilities as gas, light, or local transportation companies.

In this connection I would like to cite a study recently made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics entitled "Area of Bargaining With Associations and Groups of Employers." This compilation shows the important industries which now bargain on a national or industry-wide scale, those which bargain by geographic or regional areas and those bargaining within a city, county, or metropolitan area.

The study clearly indicates that proposals which would narrow the scope of bargaining, either within an industry or a geographic area, would also disrupt established procedures in such industries as glass and glassware, dyeing and finishing textile, hosiery, lumber, maritime, metal mining, rubber, men's clothing and women's clothing, paper and pulp, to name only some of the more important sectors. In most of these industries area-wide bargaining has worked very well and employers themselves are not desirous of a change.

As I look back over the troubled period of reconversion I find little reason to think that these proposed limitations would have contributed anything substantial toward industrial peace.

This desire to localize negotiation seems to rest somewhat on the belief that both sides are more apt to reach a peaceful settlement under such conditions. My experience since VJ-day does not bear this out. Time after time when local union committees and their employers were deadlocked, I have called upon the heads of international unions, and they were able to reach a settlement.

Regarding the second purpose—to restrict the economic power of unions at the bargaining table—I can see no justification for this approach unless it can be demonstrated that labor is receiving a disproportionate share of the national income. To date, I have seen no evidence to support this view.

In this connection, it is only fair to say that some employers feel that organized labor now threatens management's "right to manage." While I do not question the sincerity of this viewpoint, I do believe that such fears are based upon a lack of real familiarity with the collective bargaining process. Because of the increase in union membership during the war and because of changes in union and business management, many representatives of both groups got their first taste of free collective bargaining in the last year.

Undoubtedly there were instances where one side or both took extreme positions, but I do not think this fact warrants any curtailment of the sort proposed. Moreover, I am convinced that these limitations would encourage further strife. It is significant, too, that the trend of successful bargaining has been to increase the range of subjects which are open for discussion. For example, many employers who once objected to discussing anything but wages and hours, have found by experience that grievance machinery, safety and health and other matters are proper subjects for collective bargaining.

Witness, also, the recent letter which President Truman received from the Advisory Board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion—discussing a report on the guaranteed wage, the Board unanimously concluded:

"Adoption of guaranteed wage plans should not be the subject of legislative action, but should be referred to free collective bargaining * * *

"Stabilization of employment and its effectuation through wage or employment guaranties, wherever possible, are matters of mutual concern to employers and employees. Each party has the definite responsibility of seeking to stabilize operations within a plant or industry in order to advance the level of general economic security of the Nation."

Another group of proposals is aimed at the closed shop and kindred forms of union security. By forbidding any contract which makes membership or nonmembership in a labor organization a condition of employment, these bills presumably would outlaw the closed shop, the union shop, maintenance of membership, and possibly preferential hiring.

As of last April, 77 percent of the workers in this country who belonged to organized labor and worked under union contract would have their status changed by these bills. Here are the figures, by type of agreement:

	Percent
Closed shop	30
Union shop	15
Maintenance of membership	29
Preferential hiring	3

Neglecting other considerations, it is plain that such proposals would open the doors to prolonged industrial chaos in America. Union security is the very heart of these contracts. In many cases these security provisions were won after long struggles and against the bitterest opposition from open-shop employers. Given this historical background, and the undeniable fact that some employers still are anxious to get rid of unions, I do not see how a ban on union security could fail to provoke industrial strife.

But I also know that many employers, after direct and long experience with union security clauses, found that they were desirable and would object seriously to any legal ban on such provisions.

Let me be more specific and cite some definite examples. The National Foremen's Institute, Inc., an advisory service on labor matters for employers, recently surveyed the attitude of 1,000 companies that have some form of closed shop. The Foremen's Institute reported—in some astonishment—that nearly one-fifth, 19.2 percent, of these employers believe that closed-shop contracts made for better relations between employers and employees. Less than 15 percent reported that union security clauses had worsened labor relations in their plants. The remainder, almost two-thirds of the employers, could see little difference one way or the other.

In case you think the Foremen's Institute poll was not typical, let me refer you to a very recent issue of Business Week. This magazine sent its reporters to interview businessmen on this subject. Altogether, their reporters talked to employers who manufactured just about everything from aircraft to razor blades. Each one had some form of union security—and what was the result?

Fifty-eight percent said that the effect of such elimination would be bad for management.

There is one particular reason why many businessmen should prefer some form of union security. So far as I know, every authority in the field of industrial relations favors the inclusion in labor contracts of provisions for handling grievances.

As some of you will recall, there was no dispute at the President's labor-management conference on industrial relations in November 1945, on this question. Enlightened employers and labor unions have come to recognize through experience the necessity of including in their contracts sound provisions for the settlement of minor disputes—even up to the point of providing a terminal point in the form of arbitration or an umpire system where disputes within the operation of the contract can be decided. These are the day-to-day disputes, the inevitable frictions that are bound to arise where men work together. In the over-all scheme of things, any single one may be unimportant. But unless they are handled properly they breed discontent and frictions which in a short time would break down good industrial relations.

I doubt if you could find a management representative who is active in the field of labor relations who would question that conclusion. Now, if through a ban on union security, a substantial proportion of employees in any establishment would fall outside the union which has done the bargaining and would be compelled to deal individually on every grievance, the most substantial advance that has been made in industrial relations in many years would be lost.

The question of democracy in unions is another case in point. Of course, the affairs of unions should be conducted democratically. And this does not always hold true. Yet here, as in every other phase of human relations, the preponderance of evidence must be given great weight. My own experience and observation leads me to conclude that union rules and practices are not behind other segments of American life in the practice of democracy.

In this connection, let me cite a recent article by Joseph Shister, of Yale University. Entitled "The Locus of Union Control in Collective Bargaining," the article appeared in the Quarterly Journal of Economics for August 1946.

One of the points which the author makes in his summary and conclusions is of particular interest. I quote:

"The ultimate control over collective bargaining in most unions does rest with the rank and file. * * * True, the full power of settlement is sometimes vested in the negotiators, but the significant point is that this power is voluntarily entrusted to the leaders by the rank and file in most instances. It is true further, that especially in national negotiations, the actual control over the bargain—in practice—rests with a small subcommittee of the negotiating group. But here again the condition has been brought about by necessary structural conditions, and was not imposed on the rank and file by leadership."

A third group of legislative proposals revolve around amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. In general, these bills would "equalize bargaining power" and seek to discourage strikes by depriving workers of certain rights they now have under the act.

Passed in 1935, the Wagner Act has been attacked and defended in court and out. As you recall, its constitutionality was upheld by the Supreme Court early in 1937. During the next 10 years a great body of law has been developed in interpreting the act and its meaning. In many respects the provisions of this law are enmeshed with the collective-bargaining process itself and it is very difficult to know just how far-reaching any given change might be. So much is involved—including the attitudes of many employers when and if a new power equation is created. Therefore I have strongly urged the Congress that this whole question be made the subject of a special study by a commission, as the President recommended in his state of the Union message.

It goes without saying that such a study should look closely into the basic causes of labor disputes. And I would further recommend the kind of approach that I have indicated, paying close attention to the real goal this Nation seeks in the years ahead—secure abundance in a world at peace.

Right here I would like to add a word or two about compulsory arbitration. To some people this looks like a fair and simple solution to the strike problem. But let me remind you again—if compulsory arbitration is to succeed in eliminating walk-outs and lock-outs, it can only do so by abolishing or restricting the right to contract.

Compulsory arbitration simply means that the Government writes a contract for the parties. Proponents of such legislation seem to believe that Government intervention would apply primarily to wages, perhaps even to hours, but not much else because they hold that these are the most frequent matters in dispute. But many labor agreements contain numerous detailed provisions concerning working conditions, safety measures, benefits and grievance procedures. Disputes can and do arise over these matters. The arbitrator, if the dispute is to be settled, must arrive at a just and equitable settlement. Those who are most strongly opposed to Government control and planning have not been slow to point out the impossibility of government effectively regulating the infinite details of economic activity.

The principle of compulsory arbitration does violence to our whole Anglo-Saxon concept of law. Many people say that it is customary under our system when two people have a dispute to take that dispute into court and let the court decide which side is right and which is wrong. So far as contractual relations between parties is concerned, it has never been within the purview of the court's power to write contracts for people. Once contracts have been written and agreed upon the courts will interpret and enforce them, but no court has attempted to write contracts. That is what those who advocate compulsory arbitration would have the board of arbitration of a court do for the parties. It must also be realized that if an arbitrator writes a contract which, by increase in wages or by any other device, increases the cost to the employer, it will then be necessary for the arbitrator or for some governmental agency to determine what price the employer may charge for the products which he manufactures and sells. Just as sure as night follows the day the second step must follow the first. The Government cannot control the industrial relations side of the problem without controlling all of the other steps and the manufacture, distribution and sale of the goods produced. Therefore, those who unwittingly believe that there is a simple answer through the medium of compulsory arbitration have not looked further down the road which must be followed if such compulsory arbitration is to be effective. I don't think the American people want such a planned economy as the compulsory arbitration proposal would require.

Both management and labor oppose such an extension of control for they know that if a free-enterprise economy is to be preserved, the terms of labor-management agreements should not be dictated by government. This relationship touches the most vital activity of an overwhelming majority of our adult population. Freedom to contract in the sense that parties are free to refrain from entering into contracts, even where public policy requires the setting of some of the terms, is basic to the preservation of a free society.

My position on certain boycotts and other unlawful combinations should be well known. As President Truman said in his State of the Union message, the use of the secondary boycott to further jurisdictional disputes or compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act is indefensible. But as the President's recommendation pointed out, not all secondary boycotts are unjustified. He carefully distinguished between boycotts intended to protect wages and working conditions from those in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes.

The bills dealing with this subject go far beyond the President's recommendation. They are aimed at all boycotts. I strongly urge that legislation dealing with this matter be so drawn as to come within the purview of the President's recommendations.

The months that followed VJ-day were anxious ones for industry and labor. During the war, to a very large extent, the normal processes of collective bargaining had given place to patriotic sanctions, including the no-strike pledge and a wide range of wartime controls. Necessarily this meant that many problems were left unsettled and many questions remained unanswered.

When Japan surrendered, these old questions rose to plague us. But unless I am very much mistaken, we have come a long way since August 1945. Both labor and management have a much more constructive attitude. The Nation has boldly reaffirmed its faith in freedom, its regard for human dignity and human rights. Let us keep these principles constantly before us as we move into the world of tomorrow.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at the University of North Carolina, under the sponsorship of the Carolina Political Union:

Tonight I wish to discuss briefly the President's proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey, which illustrates clearly the direction and meaning of American foreign policy in the year 1947.

You are already familiar with the reception in the House of the President's speech. Only twice did applause break out and then it rippled fitfully across the crowded hall of Congress and died. Reporters noted that never in recent history had a Presidential message been received with such a deep sense of awareness of what that message might eventually mean to the security of this country and to the peace of the world. The President, as you well remember, stated that "Greece must have assistance if it is to become a self-supporting and self-respecting democracy" and that Turkey must also have assistance if it is to maintain its security.

This preoccupation of the United States with those countries that form the bridgehead between the peoples and civilizations of the East and the once powerful, now destitute and suffering people of Europe, is no new one for the United States. It was not President Truman who said, "a strong hope has long been entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world would take a deep interest in their welfare." It was not President Truman but that able, cautious man, who first enunciated the doctrine that placed American strength behind the guarantee of freedom for the Western Hemisphere, James Monroe.

I support the President's proposal for assistance to the Governments of Greece and Turkey. I feel it to be essential to the security of our country. I propose here to give the reasons for my belief.

Long a cornerstone of our foreign policy has been the belief that American security would be dangerously threatened if the continent of Europe or that of Asia were dominated by any one power. We fought in 1917 when it appeared that Germany would break the thinning lines of the French and the British and win through to domination of the European Continent. We fought again in 1941 to oppose the domination of Asia by the Empire of Japan. We fought in Europe to prevent the fall of Britain and of Russia and the consequent subjugation of Europe and Africa and the Middle East.

The atomic bomb and guided missile has not yet weakened that cornerstone. We would still fight, I believe, to prevent Europe and Asia from becoming dominated by one great military power and we will oppose bitterly, I believe, the suffering people of Europe and Asia succumbing to the false, soporific ideology of Red totalitarianism.

Our proposed assistance to Greece and Turkey, therefore, is not turning the page to a new chapter in American foreign policy. Our foreign policy is the same as it has always been from the day that the discerning Monroe first enunciated the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. It merely means that time and space have brought a new interpretation to that historical document.

We have only to look at the map to see what might happen if Greece and Turkey fell into the Communist orbit. The road to the Middle East would be flung open. The traditional goal of the Russian foreign policy, an opening to the Mediterranean, with all of its strategic implications, would be gained. If we give way and Greece and Turkey succumb it would have tremendous strategic and ideological repercussions throughout the world. It would be a sign to all of those hard-pressed governments now resisting those disciples of the party line, who feed on the misery and despair of the postwar world. Our neutrality would strengthen greatly the prestige of Soviet Russia. The barriers would be down and the Red tide would flow across the face of Europe and through Asia with new power and vigor.

I should like to deal with some of the objections which have been made with regard to the proposals for assistance. One of the most frequent objections, and one which is to be carefully considered, is that the proposed loans are unfriendly acts and enhance the prospects of war.

It seems to me that war with Russia might arise in two ways. The greatest danger is a war which would be waged by the conscious decision of the leaders of Russia some 25 or 35 years from now. At that time, Russia will have a greater population than all the rest of Europe, and could challenge even this country in steel production and over-all power. She will have the atomic bomb, the planes, the ports, and the ships to wage aggressive war outside her borders. Such a conflict would truly mean the end of the world and all our diplomacy and prayers must be exerted to avoid it.

I do not believe that Russia wants war now. Nevertheless, as General Eisenhower said the other day, "All wars are stupid and they can occur stupidly." There is real danger that Russia may stumble into a war which she may not want because of a series of bad guesses and bad information. The Russian information and intelligence services are, I believe, among the poorest in the world despite all the glamorous nonsense which seems to be written about them. The reports which these services supply to the Kremlin cannot be checked against any independent sources of information. You will not find in the world today freely traveling Russian newspapermen, foreign traders, tourists, or residents abroad. The Kremlin's view of world affairs, therefore, is bound to be limited.

This, to my mind, enhances the short-term danger of a conflict with the Soviet Union. Let us suppose that puppet governments are installed in Greece and Turkey which then establish still closer relations with Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and the Soviet Union. The centuries-old Russian dream of domination of the straits and access to the vast areas to the south and east would be realized, and realized with practically no sacrifice. We may then well imagine that she might decide to round out her Mediterranean bastion by annexing a few crumbs of territory here and there, say in northern Iran or the eastern provinces of Turkey. She would expect to get such trifles at little cost only to be bitterly shocked and surprised to discover that she had touched off a world war.

If you consider this fantastic, look for a moment at Hitler's Reich. After the diplomatic failures at Munich and the subsequent swallowing up of Czechoslovakia, Hitler's information services told him that the British and French and Americans would do nothing about Poland. They were wrong about Britain and France, and the result we know.

To me all this adds up to the fact that the use of American dollars and credits in Greece and Turkey now will make it possible for us to avoid sending men later, and will avert a repetition of the process I have just described.

The second objection to the President's proposals, and one which is most often heard, I believe, is that we are willfully bypassing the United Nations. It is extraordinary what strange bedfellows this crisis has made and what sudden friendships have come to the aid of the United Nations! Imagine Henry Wallace and Senator Wherry on the same side!

Many people do, however, sincerely feel that the United Nations has been slighted. I think the feeling arises from some confusion as to what the United Nations can do. It is not equipped to deal with every problem in international affairs nor is there anything in the concept of the United Nations which precludes one nation from asking another for assistance as Greece has asked the United States.

The United Nations is now ready and able to deal effectively with that part of the problem which arises from outside Greece's borders, and is doing so. Greece has charged before the Security Council that armed bands operating within her territory are partly supplied, trained, and given refuge in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania, and that these bands are moving back and forth across the border. Greece has asked the United Nations for help in dealing with this situation and the Security Council has appointed a commission which is now investigating Greek charges on the spot. The United States took an energetic part in setting up this commission and, I am sure, we hope that its findings will afford the basis for a settlement of at least that part of the question.

However, Greece has asked this country for economic and financial assistance, for supplies and funds to cope with its internal difficulties. UNRRA and the British have been helping Greece with these problems, but the present crisis has arisen because these supports must be withdrawn.

There is no organization in the United Nations which is ready to give such support. The World Bank is primarily designed to make loans of self-liquidating character and it is doubtful if it could or would take up a Greek loan. Furthermore, the Bank simply is not organized to function at the present time. It is only just beginning to consider applications and as yet has made no loans whatsoever.

The United Nations has had neither the funds nor the organization to do a job of this character. We cannot afford to wait until it has, or even to go through a long pro forma effort which we know will be futile in the end.

Moreover, we must remember that the whole concept of the United Nations is that of the evolution of law backed up by force utilized under the guidance and restraint of the Security Council. So far, no progress has been made in establishing the military contingents which are to back up Security Council decisions. Why? Because the Soviet Union has dragged its feet constantly in the discussions of the military staff committee which was to draw plans for the enforcement measures. Besides all this, there is yet no settlement of the territorial problems arising from the last war, no peace settlement in fact, and no generally accepted plan for the control of atomic weapons, nor for the regulation of armaments.

Nevertheless, the United Nations is the great hope for the future. I do hope per-

sonally that the administration will inform and keep the United Nations abreast of all moves that it will take in this Greek and Turkish matter. We already have the administration's assurance that it is studying measures whereby the United Nations can help. Senator Austin is making a statement to the Security Council tomorrow which may throw some light on the problem. It would, however, mean an early collapse of the United Nations organization if we were to place on its infant shoulders a burden which it cannot yet bear and with which it was, in fact, never intended it should deal.

Another objection to the President's plan is based on the allegedly undemocratic and reactionary Greek Government, which our loan would support in power. The facts are these: In accordance with the Yalta agreement, a civil mission composed of the representatives of the United States, England, and France (Russia refused to join) was sent to Greece to determine the fairness of the recent election. In the conclusion of the report this mission unanimously stated "that notwithstanding the present intensity of political emotions in Greece, conditions were such as to warrant the holding of elections, that the election proceedings were on the whole free and fair, and that the general outcome represented the true verdict of the Greek people." Not only were the elections closely observed by the mission, but polls were taken which substantiated the results; 1,117,000 votes were recorded out of a possible 1,850,000. The Communist-dominated EAM as a matter of policy abstained from voting, and it is estimated by the mission that they reduced the number of those voting by about 15 percent. Thus the election was free and fair. The Greek Government now contains elements of all parties with the exception of Communists.

The United States Government is not, as the President stated, endorsing or in any way condoning any of the past actions of the present Greek Government. But it recognizes full well that the alternative to the present government is not liberal democracy, but communism. An orderly liberal government will come into being when an orderly middle class exists in Greece.

The President has called for a loan to Greece and Turkey of $400,000,000. One hundred and fifty million dollars will go for relief of the civilian population of Greece, whose suffering during the war was well known. This amount will include imported materials and equipment for the reconstruction of the railroads, roads, transportation system, electrical utilities, farm machinery, food-processing equipment, and raw materials for many peacetime programs.

An additional $150,000,000 will be devoted to making available to the Greek armed forces the clothing, arms, food, and equipment to deal effectively with the guerrillas and to place some stability in the military position of Greece as a whole.

In addition to equipment, special missions will be sent to Greece which will include experts in many fields, but will not include any troops.

The remaining $100,000,000 goes to the Turkish Government. The general economic conditions in Turkey are more favorable than those in Greece, and thus nearly the entire $100,000,000 will be devoted to equipment for the Turkish armed forces and for projects such as the rehabilitation of the Turkish railroad system which will contribute most directly to the maintenance of security in Turkey. Turkey occupies a strategic position of great importance, and lives under a heavy shadow thrown by its great neighbor to the north and to the east.

The proposed assistance to Greece and Turkey is an integral part of American foreign policy of 1947. It is part of the policy developed by Secretary Byrnes to prevent the spread of communism by supporting those governments that are standing up against Russian expansion. To some of those countries we have given outright loans, such as our recent loan to Great Britain; to others, relief shipments which have helped prevent sheer misery and starvation from driving the sufferers into the hands of the Communists. In Italy, Japan, and Germany, we have kept occupation troops. In Korea and China we retained elements of the American Army and marines, and we have taken a firm stand on Trieste, the Dardanelles, and the freedom of the Danube. All of these independent events add up to the central theme of our American foreign policy—the prevention of Russian domination of Europe and Asia. This is the foreign policy that I support most vigorously. Upon it depends our security, and I believe the best hope of peace. The manifest destiny of Russia can best be contained by, in the words of Louis Fischer: "Blocking the Russian territorial expansion by an effective international organization and blocking Russian ideological expansion by increasing the contentment and cohesion of the countries in her path."

Our aim is not to dominate by dollar imperialism the Governments of Greece and Turkey, but rather it is to assist them to live in freedom.

From Greece has come much of the culture and civilization upon which the institutional and political life of this Nation has been based. We seek to give to the Greeks an opportunity to rebuild their country; and to the Turks an opportunity to maintain their security.

One hundred and twenty-three years ago Greece was struggling for her liberty. The voice of America spoke then as it does now, when Daniel Webster stood up in the Hall of Congress and said, "Mr. Chairman, there are some things which to be well done must be promptly done. If we even determine to do the thing that is now proposed, we may do it too late. Sir, I am not one of those who are for withholding aid when it is most urgently needed, and when the stress is past, and the aid no longer necessary, overwhelming the sufferer with caresses. I will not stand by and see my fellow man drowning without stretching out a hand to help him, till he has by his own efforts and presence of mind, reached the shore and safety, and then encumber him with aid. With suffering Greece now is the crisis of her fate—her great, it may be her last, struggle, sir. While we sit here deliberating, her destiny may be decided."

The decision is up to us. The path is clearly marked. It must be clearly followed. It is the only path by which we will reach security and peace.

Management Protests Supreme Court Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Danville, Ill., Commercial-News, the largest newspaper in my district, for the reason that it reflects the feeling of a large and important section of my constituency, and for the further reason that it bears directly on one of the most pressing problems now facing the Congress. It reads:

MANAGEMENT PROTESTS SUPREME COURT RULING

The Supreme Court of the United States, on March 10, 1947, rendered a decision of unusual importance in labor-management relationships.

According to this decision, which was handed down in the case of the *Packard Motor Car Co. v. National Labor Relations Board*, the legality was affirmed of foremen being entitled as a class to the right of self-organization, collective bargaining, and other concerted activities assured to employees generally by the National Labor Relations Act.

The Supreme Court was divided in this important matter 5 to 4, indicating that the decision was as close as well could be. As a result, foremen may now be represented for the purposes of collective bargaining.

In opposition to the organization of managers, most employers have held to the principle that foremen are an integral part of the management organization and should not belong to a union, on the basis that the interests and activities of foremen are much more closely related to management than to employees generally.

There is now pending in Congress important labor legislation affecting all future relations between employers and employees, and the importance of this proposed legislation should not be underestimated by employers, since it deals with the question of excluding foremen from the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act.

Management throughout the Nation is protesting the Supreme Court decision because it is felt that its results may be a source of difficulty. The opportunity is now offered for Congress to determine the status of foremen by legislation.

Members of Congress as a whole are anxious to assist in the solution of problems of their constituents, if such matters are brought to their attention. We suggest, accordingly, to the Illinois Congressmen that they subscribe to the legislation now pending with relation to the status of foremen.

Why Not Prosecute?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 31, 1947.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: You will recall that on October 7, 1946, I wrote to you and requested that you prosecute the Communist Party of the United States and its officers for violation of the MacCormack Registration Act, (52 Stat. 631), which requires that "Every person who is an agent of a foreign principal shall * * * register with the Secretary of State," and the Voorhis Act (54 Stat. 1201), which requires that "Every organization subject to foreign control which engages in political activity; * * * shall be required to register with the Attorney General." (The Voorhis Act further provides that "Every organization,

the purpose or aim of which, or one of the purposes or aims of which, is the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of a government or subdivision thereof by the use of force, violence, military measures, or threats of any one or more of the foregoing; * * * shall be required to register with the Attorney General.")

The Committee on Un-American Activities today filed with the House of Representatives a report entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power." I am enclosing herewith copies of this 56-page report which to my mind establishes beyond any doubt that the Communist Party of the United States is now, and has been since its inception, an agent of a foreign government, and I respectfully request that you take immediate steps to prosecute the Communist Party and its officials for failure to comply with the McCormack Act and the Voorhis Act.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has just completed a full week of public hearings on certain legislative proposals which seek to curb or outlaw the Communist Party. The committee has had before it a number of very competent and qualified authorities on this subject including your Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, and it was the unanimous opinion of all these authorities who appeared before the committee that the Communist Party, and its agents, are acting in the interest of a foreign government.

I call your attention to the following quotation from Mr. Hoover's statement before the committee:

"The Communist Party of the United States is a fifth column if there ever was one. It is far better organized than were the Nazis in occupied countries prior to their capitulation.

"They are seeking to weaken America just as they did in their era of obstruction when they were alined with the Nazis. Their goal is the overthrow of our Government.

"There is no doubt as to where a real Communist's loyalty rests. Their allegiance is to Russia, not the United States."

I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. Attorney General, that from these very statements of Mr. Hoover, there is very little question but that the Voorhis Act and the McCormack Act should apply in the case of the Communist Party and its officers, and I again urge you to take prompt action against this fifth column within our midst, and that they be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

Sincerely yours,

J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

California Assumes National Importance as Manufacturing Area; Los Angeles Ties Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the State of California has entered into a new era of development, and expanding industry, especially in the southern part of the State, has now brought California into prominence as one of the leading industrial centers of the Nation.

The war boom which created so many serious problems of overcrowding in California with resultant shortages in housing and many other materials in short supply has carried over into the postwar era, and the present trends justify an optimistic outlook for the economy of the State in spite of existing shortages.

Population in California has increased from 6,900,000 in 1940 to 9,350,000 in 1946, a gain of 35 percent. During the same period employment rose from 2,514,000 to 3,632,000, a gain of 44 percent. Income in the State soared from $5,605,000,000 to $13,500,000,000, an increase of 141 percent. Farm income jumped 212 percent, factory pay rolls showed a gain of 277 percent, and retail sales gained 153 percent.

Recent surveys by the California State Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission indicate that the wartime economic boom will now continue as a postwar economic boom and industry and agriculture in the State will continue to expand.

The greatest change in the economic pattern of California has come through the development of manufacturing, particularly in southern California, in food processing, apparel industry, and steel and steel-using industries. The city of Los Angeles has now climbed from eleventh place among the Nation's manufacturing centers into a tie with Pittsburgh for sixth place.

California no longer can be regarded as an agricultural State. Her industries have now become an integral part of the national economy, and California is now entitled to full recognition as one of the most productive States in the Union.

CALIFORNIA KEEPS GROWTH—WAR BOOM CARRIED INTO PEACE

(By United Press)

SACRAMENTO, March 24.—California not only has retained its wartime economic growth, but has exceeded the highest expectations in reconversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy, the State Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission said today.

In its third report to the governor and the legislature, the commission pointed out that while population jumped from 6,900,000 in 1940 to 9,350,000 in 1946—a gain of 35 percent—employment rose from 2,514,000 to 3,632,000—a gain of 44 percent.

INCOME UP 141 PERCENT

During the same period, the commission reported that total income in the State rose from $5,605,000,000 to $13,500,000,000 or 141 percent. Farm income, alone, the report said, jumped 212 percent from $637,000,000 in 1940 to $2,100,000,000 in 1946.

The report also listed a gain of 153 percent in retail sales in the State from $3,658,000,000 in 1940 to $9,250,000,000 last year. Factory pay rolls showed a gain of 277 percent from $705,720,000 to $2,661,000,000 during the same period.

The report made the following general predictions:

Population: Certain to grow at a rate higher than that of the Nation as a whole.

Labor force: Expansion of the labor force probably will be slower than population growth, but the proportion of population in the work market should resume its long-range downward trend, temporarily reversed by the war.

Income: California will continue to receive an increasing share of the national income due to heavier population growth * * * per capita income should continue substantially above the national average.

Agriculture: Completion of each additional phase of the Central Valley project will result in more extensive use of land for farming * * * continued upward trend in cash farm income per acre * * * continued increase in the number employed in agriculture.

Industrial development: Outlook favorable * * * manufacturing and sales areas shifting west and will reach significant proportions by 1950.

Manufacuring: Future prospects excellent * * * particularly in the apparel and steel and steel-using industries, and in food processing.

Construction: Enormous backlog of construction probably cannot be disposed of prior to 1960; State will need 1,000,000 new homes by 1960.

LOS ANGELES TIES FOR SIXTH SPOT AS MANUFACTURING CENTER

Los Angeles has climbed from eleventh to a virtual tie for sixth place among the Nation's manufacturing centers, it was shown today.

A preliminary census indicates 248,900 factory workers are employed in the Los Angeles industrial area, nearly twice the prewar figure and 53.4 percent of the total manufacturing employment in California.

The industrial surge has boosted Los Angeles to an approximate tie with Pittsburgh as a manufacturing area, led only by New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Boston.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the bill to grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii has been unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am chairman. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolutions with reference to that bill:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, adopted March 28, 1947, and House Resolution 45, adopted March 26, 1947, by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the thanks and gratitude of the people of Hawaii be, and they are hereby, extended to the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, for the courtesy, sympathy, and efforts of said committee on the bill now pending before Congress to admit the Territory of Hawaii to statehood, and: Be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

THE SENATE OF THE
TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, T. H., March 28, 1947.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on March 27, 1947.

CLEMENT LOMES,
President of the Senate.
ELLEN D. SMYTHE,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, T. H., March 28, 1947.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on March 28, 1947.

M. G. PASCHOAL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
O. P. SOARES,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

H. R. 45

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the twenty-fourth session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be extended the sincere appreciation of this house for the many courtesies extended to the four members of this house who attended the hearings before said committee on H. R. 49 and for the prompt and unanimous action taken by the committee in endorsing statehood for Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, T. H., March 26, 1947.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was this day adopted by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

M. G. PASCHOAL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
O. P. SOARES,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

A Slight Misrepresentation of Tax Facts—Railroad Workers Support Own Retirement Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a glaring example of how th public is misinformed on tax matters can be found in an article written by Margot Grubb for the March 22 issue of Collier's magazine, titled "Here's Where Your Money Goes."

Mrs. Grubb lists the Railroad Retirement Act, social security payments and income tax rebates as "benefits" which the average citizen "helps to finance" by payment of income taxes.

Railroad workers were quick to see the fallacy in Mrs. Grubb's reporting. Employees of railroads contribute to their retirement fund—and aside from their employers, are the sole contributors to the fund. No part of income tax, which railroad employees quite naturally also pay, goes into the railroad retirement fund.

And so it is for social security—workers and employers build up this fund with a special tax, exclusive of income tax.

An article in the March 29 issue of Trainman News, official weekly publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, goes more thoroughly into Mrs. Grubb's article. It is included herewith:

TAX STORY IN COLLIER'S FAILS TO TELL FACTS

CLEVELAND.—Margot Grubb is guilty of an immature, inaccurate, and just plain lousy bit of reporting in the March 22 issue of Collier's magazine.

In an article titled "Here's Where Your Money Goes," Mrs. Grubb lists the Railroad Retirement Act, social-security payments and income-tax rebates as "benefits" which the average citizen "helps to finance" through income-tax payments.

Collier's claim that their staff writer was "dodging billions thrown at her in her dreams." They should have continued and said she dodged the facts and dreamed up the figures thrown at the magazine's readers.

Railroad retirement pay costs income-tax payers $617,019,000 according to a two-page color spread in Collier's.

Probably the best answer to that is supplied by H. S. Clarke, secretary of the BRT Wisconsin Legislative Board, who wrote Walter Davenport, editor of Collier's.

After questioning whether Collier's would actually pay for so much misinformation, Clarke says:

"The Government does not finance the Railroad Retirement Act. It is a direct payroll tax on those covered by the act, assessed at the rate of 5¼ percent of monthly wages up to $300.

"I might suggest that no crocodile tears be shed in sympathy for railroad employees because of the tax," Clarke wrote. "We as men of organized labor and God-fearing people believe in doing unto others as we would have them do unto us."

Social security is not paid for out of income taxes. It, too, is a tax on the worker and the employer, yet Collier's lists it as an $1,870,680,000 "expense."

Income-tax rebates "to persons who paid more money than they should" can hardly be classed as an expense. If they had not overpaid, or, more likely, if the Government had not withheld too much, there would be no excuse for Mrs. Grubb to list this item as an expense of $3,034,380,000.

We figure roughly—we didn't do the grubbing the gal did—that she has made a mistake of $5,522,079,000.

Mrs. Grubb says in an editorial note, that she now "feels capable of splitting a luncheon check into properly proportioned parts."

We doubt it.

Webster Gave Congress a Precedent for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just 123 years ago in the Eighteenth Congress, first session, that Congress faced the question that is now faced by this Congress with reference to extending help and assistance to Greece.

Daniel Webster, the outstanding Member of Congress from Massachusetts, on the question of extending help to the suffering Greeks declared, "A part we must take in all the civilized world." Today this Nation faces the same problem of extending help and assistance to Greece and the Greek nation. It is more or less of a coincidence that this Congress is considering legislation similar to that which was considered by the Eighteenth Congress in which Daniel Webster played so important a part.

The Members of this House might be interested in reading Daniel Webster's speech appealing to the House of Representatives to send aid to the Greeks, who were then seeking their liberty from the Turks. His speech is found on page 1083 of the Eighteenth Congress, volume 18, part 1, and was delivered on January 19, 1824, on the subject of the Greek cause.

This is a most interesting speech and a very strong appeal to extend aid to the Greeks when the foreign policy of our Nation was far from believing in internationalism and at a time when this Nation did not have the power and the great leadership that it has today.

Among other things said by Daniel Webster on the occasion of this speech to extend aid to Greece, the gentleman from Massachusetts said:

I am aware that it is a very easy thing to urge the good old maxim of its being the soundest policy for each one to take care of his own concerns. That maxim, sir, is very true, but very inapplicable to the present occasion.

Ours is now the great Republic of the earth; its free institutions are matured by the experiment of half a century. As a free Government, as the freest Government, its growth and strength compel it, willing or unwilling, to stand forth to the contemplation of the world. We cannot obscure ourselves, if we would; a part we must take, honorable or dishonorable, in all that is done in the civilized world.

With suffering Greece, now is the crisis of her fate. They look to us as the great Republic of the earth, and they ask us, by our common faith, whether we can forget that they are struggling, as we once struggled, for what we now so happily enjoy.

False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 28, 1947:

PENNY-PINCHING

The saving of money is not necessarily economy. When it is accomplished at the expense of vital and valuable services, it may prove very uneconomical indeed. Need

is a relative thing, of course, and the importance of desirable services must be weighed against the importance of tax reduction and budget balancing. We can call to mind at least two Federal undertakings now threatened with extinction in order to save money, the abandonment of which, in our judgment, would be plain penny-wise foolishness.

One of these is the school-lunch program. This involved, for the fiscal year 1946–47, less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the Federal budget—actually about $75,000,000. The program will come to an end on March 31 unless a deficiency appropriation is provided to carry it on. The money that will be saved by withholding an appropriation will be paid for in the health of some 5,000,000 school children now benefiting from nutritious lunches furnished at their schools through intelligent Federal-State-local cooperation. In a good many cases, these lunches have meant the difference between physical well-being and malnutrition. It would be an exceedingly myopic economy to cut off this sound investment in the health of the country's school children 3 months before the school year ends.

It seems to us that there is equally short-sighted penny-pinching in the proposal to liquidate the Division of Labor Standards by excising from the Labor Department's appropriation the $800,000 needed for the division's work. Here is a modest Federal agency functioning in close cooperation with State agencies, helping them to develop sound administrative standards and to keep work places safe and healthy. Along with State labor departments, it works with management and labor to reduce industrial accidents, to minimize the evils of child labor, and to encourage peaceful and productive collective-bargaining procedures by training representatives of both sides. The cost of carrying on this division is far less than the cost of industrial accidents and strikes which its activities prevent. Economizers would do well to remember the shoe that was lost for want of a nail, the horse that was lost for want of a shoe.

Conditions in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial, I am glad to make available to my colleagues an editorial written by Mr. Barnet Hirsch which recently appeared in the Monmouth American, of Long Branch, N. J. The Monmouth American was founded in 1917 and is edited and managed by Mr. Benjamin Boisseau Bobbitt.

There is no doubt that it is very difficult, as Mr. Hirsch says in his editorial, to handle the Near East situation in Europe without including Palestine. If the United States is to take over the British responsibilities and obligations in Greece and Turkey, it would be only logical that the British would also liquidate their responsibilities in Palestine.

The more the proposal made by the President is studied, the more we are forced to the realization that the implications contained in his recommendation are far-reaching and, if accepted, will seriously affect the future of America.

BARRING REDS IN GREECE ON BRITISH TERMS SEEN PERIL

Overshadowing topic of the week is President Truman's request that Congress appropriate $400,000,000 to help Greece and Turkey resist Russian aggression, beginning a sort of new lend-lease against communism in the Near East.

The Monmouth American has invited Barney Hirsch, prominent local merchant who is also an able magazine writer and who is a thorough student of and understands conditions in the Near East probably better than any other person in this vicinity, to contribute a guest editorial on the subject. This was so clear and reasonable that it is being featured on the first page. It reads:

"We have it today in our power to become, by virtue of our military, material, and moral positions, a force for real good in a chaotic, confused, and intrigue-ridden world.

"For that reason we need to approach the problem of support to Greece and Turkey, as requested by our President, with a good deal of caution, with clear thinking and with frankly expressed statements.

"True it is that under no circumstances may we permit Communist infiltration into these two countries. But are we to undertake this immunization on British terms? Are we to forget that Greece, since the Nazis were driven out of there, is being governed by an iron despotism of British inspiration and origin which is no less severe and repugnant than that dictatorship which reigns rampant today in Poland, which is Soviet inspired, and against which we but recently so vehemently and articulately protested? King George and his prime minister are as much creatures of the British Foreign Office, maintained in quisling power by 10,000 English bayonets, as are Bierut and his ministers puppets of the Kremlin, installed and maintained by sheer force of Russian arms!

"No, if our intervention is at all to be justified it must be on the basis of true democracy, untainted republicanism and unbiased justice.

"And yet, the picture is not complete. To deal with the Soviet specter in Turkey and Greece and ignore the British destructive designs upon the Jewish Homeland in Palestine would be fruitless and fragmentary on the one hand, and playing the role of an ignoble accessory to anti-democratic projects on the other.

"For Palestine is an integral and organic portion of the Near East mosaic. If the English are permitted to work their lethal imperialist will on the hard-beset Jewish community of Palestine then our efforts will be a travesty in Greece. For we will merely be making it possible for the British to withdraw their military garrisons from Helas to install them in the Holy Land in order to complete the utter liquidation of the only genuinely democratic entity in the entire Near East.

"If the situation in Greece and Turkey is so urgently desperate as to warrant our immediate intervention before it is referred to the United Nations, is not the Palestine problem incalculably more in the nature of an emergency, requiring America's immediate inclusion of it in the total Near East pattern?

"Only by a combined, coordinated, and comprehensive effort, embracing the entire Near East, including Palestine, can we both seal off Communist influence in that region of the world and at the same time prevent British attempts at liquidation of the democratic Jewish national home, to the establishment and growth of which America is irrevocably committed by the Anglo-American Convention on Palestine of 1924, by the many pronouncements of every American President since Woodrow Wilson, by the political platforms of both major American parties, and by the joint congressional resolution of 1945, which strongly supports a democratic Jewish state in Palestine."

What the United States Does To Solve the Problem of Refugee War Victims Is a Test of Our Sincerity in Seeking Just and Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Chicago Sun for March 16, 1947, an article written by Cecil Holland, a reporter whom many of us know for his accuracy and his quality of objective writing.

Mr. Holland describes the work of the Citizens Committee for Displaced Persons in this article.

It is a work which all of us should know about.

Probably in no other field has so much misinformation gained currency as fact.

Repeatedly it has been charged that aliens are illegally entering the United States by thousands; that all sorts of rackets are involved; and all the bogeys of the ultranationalists have been trotted out to frighten the American people.

Passing over entirely for the moment the moral, economic, and legal questions involved in the basic questions of immigration, the fact is that during the war years less than 15 percent of available quotas were used, and that since the Immigration and Naturalization Act was passed the annual total of immigration has been less than contemplated by Congress under that act.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I insert here the article from the Chicago Sun to which I have referred:

UNITED STATES NEARING SHOW-DOWN ON WORLD REFUGEE ISSUE—ACTION OF CONGRESS TO BE VIEWED AS REFLECTING NATION'S GOOD FAITH IN SEEKING PEACE

(By Cecil Holland)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—Congress will be called on soon to pass upon another matter vital to the position of the United States in world affairs. It will be a decision as to whether this country will assume its fair share of the burden of giving refuge to the displaced persons of Europe.

The action Congress takes on the issue will be widely viewed as reflecting, in a large measure, the good faith of the United States in seeking world peace. It is a problem which hardly can be solved without the full assistance of this country.

FEAR FOR THEIR LIVES

The humanitarian aspects of the problem are obvious. In Europe there are an estimated 850,000 persons representing a hard core of "nonrepatriables." They are individuals who cannot or will not return to their land of origin because of fear for their lives or liberty or because of psychological barriers raised by the horrors they underwent at the hands of the Nazi persecutors.

These persons are now living in camps scattered throughout central Europe. Some

place in the world must be found for them. The success of that undertaking depends largely on the action taken by the United States through the Congress.

There are two immediate actions facing Congress. They are:

1. Approval of United States participation in the International Refugee Organization set up by the United Nations.

2. Relaxation of immigration laws to allow the entry of 100,000 displaced persons a year into the United States for 4 years.

Legislation authorizing United States participation in the IRO has been approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is now pending on the Senate Calendar. Senator TAFT, Republican, Ohio, chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee, has listed it as one piece of legislation he hopes to see disposed of within the next 2 weeks.

DIRECT ACTION NEEDED

This participation, if approved, will probably be accompanied by a $75,000,000 appropriation as the American contribution to the $151,000,000 budget proposed for IRO.

If carried out, this action would throw American financial and organization support to the problem of caring for the displaced persons. But more direct action is needed and needed urgently.

That is why the United States Congress is being asked to pass legislation permitting the entry of 400,000 refugees into this country over a period of 4 years to establish homes and a new life far removed from the scenes where they suffered tortures and disillusionment.

HEAD OF COMMITTEE

Spearheading this humanitarian movement is an organization known as the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. Its head is Earl G. Harrison, dean of the law school of the University of Pennsylvania, and former United States Commissioner of Immigration.

The committee's primary objective is to get the United States to take the lead in working out a resettlement program for the European homeless and set an example for the rest of the world to follow by permitting them to enter this country outside the regular quota system.

Contrary to much misrepresentation, this would not be letting the bars down to wholesale immigration from middle Europe.

In the first place, the legislation being urged by the committee would definitely limit the entry of displaced persons to 100,000 a year for 4 years. After that the regular quota system would prevail as it does now.

ONLY 15 PERCENT OF QUOTA USED

In the second place, the entry of 400,000 homeless refugees into the United States would be far less than the number that would have been admitted during the years of war. Only 15 percent of the 154,000 quota of immigrants permitted annually by the immigration laws passed in the 1920's were used during the war.

Quotas are not allowed to accumulate, and for this reason there is no way legally of making up the deficit of immigrants during the war years. Many of the displaced persons come from countries which had a very small quota.

For this reason, it is proposed that there shall be no nationality restrictions on the persons who can enter under the program.

From 15 to 20 nationalities are represented in the displaced persons. The largest groups are Poles, Balts, Yugoslavians, Ukrainians, and Austrians, in that order. Although some of them still bear the effects of brutality, they represent in a sense the survival of the fittest who escaped or endured what many others were unable to survive in torture and privation.

BASED ON 1946 FIGURES

The estimate of 850,000 persons who cannot be repatriated is based on a 1946 tabulation of 1,179,420 persons. Since that time some repatriation has occurred. Of the 1,179,420 originally listed as displaced persons, 572,920 were Poles, 97,830 were Latvians, 60,500 were Lithuanians, 51,530 were Yugoslavs, 31,910 Estonians, 37,330 were Austrians, 11,300 Czechs, and 11,530 were Russians.

About 80 percent of the displaced persons are Christians. Roman Catholics, comprising slightly more than 60 percent of the total, are the largest group, followed by Protestants, Greek Orthodox, and others. About 20 percent are Jews.

The present immigration restrictions on health, morals, and politics would be kept in effect in admitting the refugees. In this way no undesirables would be able to get in, as all would be screened by the Army and other Federal agencies.

NO ECONOMIC BURDEN

In a very real sense such immigrants would strengthen the United States population without becoming an economic burden. Before they can be admitted immigrants must provide proof that they will not become public charges. Welfare organizations and individuals are being used to give this guaranty now, and it is expected that the system would be continued with the refugees.

On December 22, 1945, President Truman ordered that Central European quotas of 39,000 be made available primarily to displaced persons. Only about 5,000 entered the United States in 1946.

The United States, then, is faced with the need for doing more as an expression of its faith in the United Nations—and in a larger sense in world peace.

VFW Stand on Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D. C. The sentiments expressed herein are to be covered by a proposed amendment which I will present to the committee when hearings are opened on this subject. The letter reads as follows:

MARCH 28, 1947.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am quoting below for your serious consideration a statement recently released to the press by Louis E. Starr, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, concerning the United States Marine Corps:

"It is a matter of some concern to the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the armed services unification bill now under consideration by Congress places the United States Marine Corps in an embarrassing position. It is entirely possible within the structure of the pending legislation that the Marine Corps can be relegated to an insignificant status within the armed services by Executive order, by a single directive of the Secretary of National Defense, or by departmental budgetary restriction.

"It is highly significant that the United States Marine Corps is mentioned only once in the entire bill. As the bill is now phrased, officers of the Marine Corps can be excluded from serving as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Director of the Joint Staff, as members of the Joint Staff, or as military assistants to the Secretary of National Defense. Surely, this does not augur well for the future of the corps, which for 172 years has heroically defended this Nation and its ideals.

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars has taken a positive stand with regard to continuance of the Marine Corps. Our organization urges Congress to amend the proposed unification bill to the end that the future duties of the Marine Corps and the part they shall play in our armed services be spelled out and not left dangling in space, subject to possible whims, of interservice intrigue."

In behalf of our great overseas veterans organization of approximately 2,000,000 members, I urge your favorable consideration of amending pending unification legislation which would insure for the Marine Corps a permanent retention of its mission as the Nation's primary landing force.

Respectfully yours.

Veteran at School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the dean of women of Evansville College, Miss Wahnita DeLong, has expressed in verse her reaction to the many GI students now attending that school. This poem appeared first in the January issue of Ohio Wesleyan Magazine, an alumni publication of Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, from which Miss DeLong was graduated. I think it is a fine description of our GI's in school and worthy of inclusion in the RECORD:

VETERAN AT SCHOOL

Always before, I played at teaching men.
But now that you have come
Fresh winds blow through my classroom;
What had become routine you find important,
Apathy gives way to earnest seeking;
And getting-by is done with.

You bring in life:
The world of bread and butter,
Of rising rents,
Of children's shoes and family doctor bills;
You work night shifts at factory pay
To supplement your GI benefits
And yet not once have you come unprepared.
Fresh winds blow through my classroom
And sweep it clean.

You bring in too
That other world you dreamed
Out of the blood, the hate, the hunger
Even before you found confusion here at home—
Labor and management, white and black,
Christian and Jew.
War has made you gentle,
Human beyond your years,
Sharp-eyed and unafraid.

The fresh winds sweeping through my classroom
Carry the one hope for peace in our time.

Harmony and Progress in the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, despite insistent propaganda to the contrary, this Congress has made an excellent legislative record in an atmosphere of harmony on the majority side. Last week Mr. Charles V. Stansell, associate editor of the Kansas City Star, was in Washington for a close-up study of national and international affairs. In an article published in the Star on March 27, Mr. Stansell analyzes the situation with clarity and objectivity, and concludes that the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress to date have been substantial, constructive, and in fulfillment of the campaign platform of the Republican Party.

As a part of my remarks I include his penetrating article, and commend it to the reading of the House:

AHEAD ON LAWS—REAL PROGRESS ON DIFFICULT ASSIGNMENT SHOWN BY GOP CONGRESS, WRITER DECLARES—SEES NO MAJORITY RIFT—PORTAL PAY BILL, PRESIDENTIAL TENURE VOTED—PROGRESS ON ECONOMY AND TAXES—MUCH TOUGH COMMITTEE WORK ALSO DISPOSED OF, CHARLES V. STANSELL POINTS OUT

(In Washington for a close-up view of the national scene, Charles V. Stansell, associate editor of the Star, looks at the record, to date, of the Republican-dominant Congress, and finds the lawmakers forging ahead on a difficult assignment.)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Repeated charges of majority division and delay in the new Congress do not stand up well under examination.

These reports were started early in the session and have continued to the present, when nearly 3 months of it have passed. Strangely enough, the reports have persisted despite abundant evidence to refute them, evidence that seldom has been cited by the majority in its defense. Republican spokesmen indicate they are perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself, especially when the session has ended. Only then, they explain, can the accomplishment be fully gaged.

But a brief survey of the last 90 days is revealing now. It includes several basic points that are commonly overlooked by the critics, who are mainly columnists and commentators in search of a subject—if not a little biased in the effort—the remnant of the New Deal in Congress and out, and a few other Democrats who do not object to making political hay regardless of the season.

MANY ANGLES INVOLVED

Here are considerations that must be taken into account in any fair-minded appraisal of the majority's legislative task in the earlier part of this session.

The Republican Party took over Congress for the first time in 14 years. In that extended period it had been able to exercise but little influence and therefore had felt only limited responsibility for what was done. Despite campaign statements last year, its leaders were surprised when they were given control of the Senate, as well as the House, and were forced to realize that entire responsibility for the achievements of the Eightieth Congress had been dropped into their laps. The fact they could not also be given control of the Presidency was a great handicap.

At the same time this relieved President Truman of a responsibility which he had had no great success in discharging with his own party in control of Congress. He had attempted to get through much of the warmed-over New Deal program, and on that conservative Democrats had balked by voting rather consistently with the Republicans.

STRAIN OFF TRUMAN

Now, Mr. Truman can sit back in comparative ease, making only his recommendations to Congress, leaving that body to respond with such attention to the popular reaction as it might deem safe and advisable for its own good.

Later, if the President should find it expedient to veto certain major bills sent to him by Congress, the majority could prevail only in the event it could muster a two-thirds vote, and the Republicans can't do that in either the Senate or the House without Democratic aid.

Except possibly on such measures as the portal pay and labor bills, the Republicans will have difficulty in lining up the two-thirds. That suggests the political phase of it.

But the new majority has had to take over just at the time the sweeping Congressional Reorganization Act became effective. This meant, for one thing, a complete shake-up of the traditional committee system, with the number of committees reduced by the two-thirds or more right when a flood of new Members wanted recognition and when old Members wanted the old seniority rule respected. This caused some friction, with complaints from the so-called freshmen especially. But these now have largely subsided and the majority is getting down to serious business.

BIG JOB FOR COMMITTEES

Some of its more aggressive spokesmen contend it has been so engaged from the beginning. They point to the prodigious labor of committees in their prolonged study and extended hearings on major bills. Proposed labor legislation is cited as an example. The other day a columnist reported that the House Labor Committee at least was getting around to hearings on a labor bill, when as a matter of fact this same committee had already held hearings for nearly 7 weeks—and not on a labor bill but nearly three-score such bills. Now the committee will be able to report its own bill out within a few days.

Various committees have worked day and night on major proposals and still are not through. But results are beginning to appear.

The bill outlawing the bulk of portal-pay suits and designed to make a repetition of such claims impossible has passed both Houses with more than the two-thirds majority required to override a veto, should it be forthcoming.

The resolution limiting Presidential tenure to two terms or the equivalent also has been adopted by both Houses with the required two-thirds majorities. It does not go to the President but to the States, where it must be ratified by legislatures or conventions in three-fourths of them if it is to become a part of the Constitution. Whether it is to be legislatures or conventions is a point that must be determined in the adjustment of certain differences between the Senate and House proposals.

ECONOMY PLAN PENDING

In addition to these two measures, both the House and the Senate have voted for an economy program—another major achievement. The fact that the House approved a budget cut of $6,000,000,000 and the Senate only $4,500,000,000 has necessitated conference sessions to adjust this difference. The inability of the conference groups to agree at once on such a proposal is a familiar if not a customary experience. But here again has arisen the charge of delay and division.

The House also is now advancing the much-discussed tax-reduction bill. It is expected to have tougher going in the Senate but to be passed there, even with major revision, either to give greater consideration to the small incomes or to reduce the percentages of cuts, if not both.

But it is pointed out that on all these measures to date the new majority in Congress has voted as a unit or approximately so. There has been minor Republican protest over the House tax reduction bill and more opposition already is coming from the Senate. But it is believed that in the one case as in the other there will be ample votes to put a sizable reduction through, with some assistance from the Democrats. There is, however, more partisan opposition to this measure than has appeared against most others. The writer hopes to show the reasons for this in a later discussion.

On the whole the majority record to date has not been bad and the session is not yet half over. Under the Reorganization Act Congress is expected to adjourn not later than July 31, unless it should agree upon some other date. Few members at this time would venture an opinion as to the actual close of the session.

Furthermore, the Eightieth Congress will have another session before all Members of the House and one-third of the Senate must report to the people on what has been accomplished. On the basis of the showing thus far, majority leaders profess satisfaction. They profess an ability to take it now, to move ahead in their none-too-easy tasks and finally to make good on most of their promises at least.

New England Needs a TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Bill Cunningham which appeared in the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., Friday, March 28, 1947:

NEW ENGLAND NEEDS A TVA—DAMS IN OTHER SECTIONS CAN MEAN POVERTY HERE

(By Bill Cunningham)

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., March 26.—The latest dispatches from Washington reveal that the Senate still is having difficulty in making up its august mind concerning the ideological acceptibility of Mr. David Lilienthal.

Michigan's Senator HOMER FERGUSON charges that the gentleman, while possibly not a Communist personally, was too indifferent to the presence of some communistic influences in the TVA. "Some," where communism is concerned, is too much, says Senator FERGUSON.

IN POSITION TO REPORT

I wouldn't be able to do much reporting on Mr. Lilienthal's personal politics, but I'm now in handsome position to report on his magnus opus, the TVA, having taken an intensive course in the subject these last 2 days, examined its dams, ridden its waters, viewed the aged areas it has restored and revivified and the once murky cities and

towns it has magically turned into blazing electrical show places.

I have talked with enraptured representatives of the many who love it and with some of the few who still decry the idea while admitting the unbelievable transformation it has brought to this formerly hard-bitten valley. This was and is all Lilienthal's. He did it. None denies it nor tries to contend it wasn't done with amazing vision and solid efficiency, granting, even as the critics insist, that saving money was no object.

Personally, I am against the idea of socializing anything or anybody, and the works of the New Deal to me were and are anathema. I am even prepared to argue that anything they did well was done by accident. But here in the valley of the Tennessee River, forgetting such intangibles and imponderables as possible governmental trends and probable long-range significances, disregarding any issues of the Lilienthalian political philosophy, ignoring the fact that Willkie fought it, Roosevelt blessed it, the Democrats claim it, and the Republicans attack it—forgetting all that and merely pondering this mammoth project, now in its virtually completed state as a fait accompli, one is forced to concede it is the most amazing job of creation since at least the garden of Eden.

A man would need all the space represented in the full rack of volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica to describe this tremendous world's wonder in all its phases, present performances and future possibilities. I shall do my bounden best to sketch at least a recognizable portrait of it in next Sunday's Herald, and the people of New England, whether humble or lordly householders, poor farmers or plutocratic industrialists, will do well to peruse it carefully, if not prayerfully. This is one we should have thought of first.

NEW ENGLAND JEOPARDIZED

Maybe it's not too late even if we've thought of it last. Not only should we have one in, say, the Connecticut or the Merrimac River Valleys, built and operated by private enterprise preferably; but the chances are that if we don't get one in, say, the next 50 years, these things are likely to make peasants of us. Other sections are after them. The Missouri Valley now wants one. So do the regions along the Arkansas River. A half-dozen strategically situated dams could well put New England out of business in the next few generations. But read here Sunday and learn that the TVA is really a major development in the history of mankind and not just a dam of some sort on the Tennessee River—and a lot of damns from an old beezark named Senator McKELLAR.

For the moment, however, I'd like to report that the getting of this story has been one of my happiest journalistic experiences. It began in a strange sort of way. I was fishing languidly off the sea wall of that hotel at Belleair without much hope of raising trout when a nice-looking fellow-guest sauntered down and asked how I was making out. I told him the usual, and he said he'd been there before and he thought there was a better place farther down, and why didn't we drive down there in his car?

I said that would be fine and as we walked over to his handsome hansom, I noticed the Tennessee license plate and told him this was a coincidence inasmuch as I was planning to go by Tennessee on the way home and try to see what in thunder was the TVA and was wondering just where to go and who to see.

"Well, you can see me, for one," he said; "my name is Probasco, Scott Probasco. I was ag'in it. Still am, in principle. I was on Willkie's board of directors. Joe Gill, head of Tennessee power, is my best friend. They licked us. I'm against 'em in principle, but I've got to admit they've done a great job for the people of Tennessee and the towns of Tennessee. I can give you that side of it, but to do a real job you'd want to talk to some people on the other side of course.

STATES RIGHTS FINLEY KEYMAN

"You come to my town, Chattanooga, and I'll put you in touch with States Rights Finley, and he can give you the other side."

"How's the best way to get a hotel reservation?" I asked.

"I'll take care of that," said Mr. Probasco. "Just wire me when you're coming."

The madam and myself in due course found ourselves in what must be quarters of especial reserve in the city's best hotel.

"Scott called up and said there was a Yankee newspaperman coming to town," the manager said, "and I said 'well you just send him on. We'll take good care of him.'" They eminently did.

Mr. Probasco, who turned out to be the head of a bank, had me down in his office and produced States Rights Finley, a former Clemson football star who heads the power board of Chattanooga. They kept calling him "States Rights" and "States," which I thought was a gag. I could see from some reports and things that his initials were S. R., and, since he was finally calling me Bill, I eventually asked him what his name really was.

And, believe it or not, his legal, baptismal praenomen is really States Rights. He's furthermore named for an uncle who was a general in the Confederate Army and whose baptismal name was States Rights Gist. More than that, Mr. Finley has a son named States Rights Finley, Jr. You gather that these people believe in states' rights. Then one, or both, produced a Mr. Emmett Newton, who has a beautiful new cabin cruiser no more than 2 weeks old, and a Mr. Paul Mathes, who is the State commissioner of conservation.

States Rights produced a charming Mrs. States Rights, and Scott Probasco a lovely Mrs. Probasco, and we all boarded that yacht along with reports, arguments, conversation, charts, maps, fried chicken, deviled egs, and all affiliated refreshments and if there's anything about that river, how it's harnessed, what it does and whom it serves that I don't know at this point, I'll guarantee to swim it with States Rights in my teeth.

It really is a tremendous story, and these are wonderful people. If the rest of us had to pay $700,000,000 to buy somebody some dams, it helps a little to know it happened to folks such as these.

Hon. Charles Aubrey Eaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Honorable CHARLES AUBREY EATON, the distinguished and lovable chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and a Member of Congress from the great State of New Jersey, celebrated his seventy-ninth birthday.

Many tributes were paid to Dr. EATON on that occasion, including a surprise birthday party which was arranged by the members of his committee. While many well-deserved compliments have been paid the venerable leader of the Foreign Affairs Committee, none in our opinion were more deserved or more appropriate than one which appeared in the Newark Evening News (Newark, N. J.) of Friday, March 28, in which the Congressman from New Jersey was referred to as the "conscience of the House of Representatives." This tribute to this Republican Member of Congress from New Jersey, it should be pointed out, came from one of the leading Democratic papers of that State. And that is as it should be, for while the able statesman from New Jersey is affiliated with the Republican Party his devotion is first to his country. In his approach to the momentous problems confronting this country in this critical period of international affairs, Dr. EATON recognizes no party lines. The foreign affairs of the United States could not be guided by a firmer or more patriotic hand.

The editorial referred to follows:

SALUTE

CHARLES AUBREY EATON will be 79 tomorrow. You wouldn't believe it. The voice of the Representative from New Jersey's Fifth District still booms without aid of microphone, his stride is vigorous, his big hand offers a bear's grip, his eyes are clear and merry, and his mind is free of cobwebs. His 23 years in Congress, where he has served with credit to himself and his State, have made him neither timid nor turgid.

Mr. EATON says what he thinks with youthful candor, and he thinks with considerably more foresight than many of his colleagues. The November election made him chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. Seniority could not have produced a happier result.

Representative EATON was never an isolationist, and, through the years when insularity was a fundamental American policy, he boldly preached international cooperation. So ill he feared he might die, he nevertheless accepted President Roosevelt's appointment as a delegate to San Francisco and there helped found the United Nations, of which he had dreamed for decades.

Now, with health restored, he finds himself in a powerful position to promote the policies which he believes offer the world its sole hope of enduring peace.

"The earth has shrunk to a neighborhood and commerce is now a matter of continents and hemispheres," he said as long ago as 1901. "Into the matrix of a common life all civilizations are flung and must give and take what they can. * * * All peoples will be modified in ideals, institutions, and methods. The mighty hand of God is pressing the nations together."

No wonder Mr. EATON has been called the conscience of the House of Representatives, for he upholds with eloquence and sincerity the ancient aspirations and virtues. There he stands, the symbol of what is good and great in American life.

Duty of United States to Support Free Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very important part of an address made recently in Boston, Mass., by Rev. (Fr.) Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., regent of the School of Foreign Service,

Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.:

In condemning aggressive war at Nuremberg the Government of the United States committed itself not only to prevent as far as possible the launching of any further aggression but to forestall conditions which might lead to later armed conflict. The issue was squarely faced and bluntly formulated by President Truman in his forthright recommendation to Congress on March 12, 1947. Recognizing that the American democracies cannot long exist in a world where totalitarian regimes were being imposed in increasing numbers on free peoples, he related conditions in Greece and Turkey to the survival of freedom everywhere:

"This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free people, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States. * * * I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. * * * If we falter in our leadership we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of this Nation."

Here was affirmation of a new foreign policy which involved a collateral application of the principles established at Nuremberg. Sometimes a blinding flash of lightning will illuminate a conventional landscape and set some massive landmark in such stark perspective that it takes on new and unrealized contours. It was always there, to be sure, but reposed indistinct and undefined in a murky atmosphere. In that address to Congress, which is bound to mark a transitional moment in American history, President Truman extended the principles of the Monroe Doctrine beyond the territorial limits of the Western Hemisphere to the world-wide realm of human freedom. Just as the warnings of James Monroe in his seventh annual message to Congress on December 2, 1823, were not only directed against the Holy Alliance—as is commonly supposed—but emphatically against the territorial encroachments of imperial Russia on the North American continent, so the Truman doctrine of 1947 clearly indicated Russian communism as the fountainhead of the spiritual menace threatening the present generation.

To be sure, the designs of the Holy Alliance of which Russia was part, and the possibility of European intervention in South America, played their role in clarifying the issue in the mind of the American President and his Secretary of State. That contingency was variously estimated at the time and there is a difference of opinion among latter historians respecting the degree and immediacy of the danger. But the significant fact remains that in the celebrated doctrine of December 2, 1823, the phrasing used to formulate the basic noncolonization principle of the message was virtually identical with the language of the peremptory warning communicated to the Russian Minister 4 months previously. And the reference to Russia occurs in the opening paragraphs of the message—much earlier than the passage concerning the relations of Europe to the Latin-American Republics.

The full implications of the Truman doctrine will become apparent when one weighs the obligations arising from it and compares them with the burdens implicit in the Monroe Doctrine. Hemispheric defense was both the limit and the extent of the former and its essence was negative in character—a prohibition against any encroachment of the monarchical system on the territories of the recently won democracies of the New World. It was not a philosophy of freedom for the Old World nor a direct political application of the Declaration of Independence to the actualities of the post-Napoleonic Age. There is only passing reference to the general welfare of mankind but much emphasis on the security of the United States through enlargement of a defense area. It was due warning to Alexander I of Russia that his policy of a creeping advance down the west coast of North America, based on his sovereignty over Alaska was sure to involve him in conflict with the United States. His ukase of 1821 prohibiting non-Russian vessels from approaching within 100 Italian miles of the northwest coast of America brought his claims down to parallel 51, well into the Oregon Territory, while his Russian colonies and forts were pushing steadily southward in the Pacific Northwest until they had approached San Francisco. There is still a reminder of those times in modern San Francisco—Russian Hill. Secretary of State Adams tells us in his memoirs, under date of July 17, 1823, that he lodged a vigorous protest with the Czar through the Russian Minister in Washington:

"I told him specially that we should contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subjects for any new European colonial establishments."

The noncolonization of new areas by Communist aggression is now declared to be a cardinal principle of American foreign policy and support is pledged to any people seeking to maintain their freedom against direct or indirect attempts to establish a Marxian dictatorship over them. The speed with which the American principle of free democracy rushed in to occupy the political vacuum created by the announced withdrawal of British power from the Middle East is an index of awakened responsibility in high places. It was a question of immediate response to an impelling emergency or else progressive surrender to the calculated advance of world communism. If nothing had been done, the conquest of Europe by communism would have been immeasurably advanced; if the Truman doctrine is not now supported by the Congress and by the people of the country, we shall face the steady decline of the good name of the United States, particularly in the estimation of smaller nations who have been hesitating between East and West.

It is not probable that Russia will reply with any warlike attitude. She is in no position to challenge the power of the United States at this time, in view of the cruel devastation suffered under the Nazi invasion and in consequence of the exhaustion of her people after the prolonged war effort of past years. She will bide her time. She will wait until she is in possession of actual manufactured atomic bombs and until the Communist Parties throughout the Western Hemisphere have infiltrated further into the defense installations, the industrial plants, the governmental structure, and the general populations of North and South America.

The action of the President does not imply either weakening or usurping the authority of the United Nations. A fire had broken out while the fire department of a new community existed only as a paper project. To wait until the issue in Greece and Turkey could be submitted to some distant meeting of the Security Council where it would still be subject to a sure veto by Soviet Russia would have been default in statesmanship, vision, and courage. The measures advocated by the President were the means most urgently needed; relief of distress and stabilization of the national economy. Military personnel was included as a collateral and advisory subsidy. If the dollar can be used to improve agriculture in the Balkans, build bridges, construct railroads, multiply electric power, increase the number of schools, hospitals and welfare facilities, stimulate industry, expand trade and commerce, feed the starving, clothe the naked, and generally improve the lot of the ordinary citizen of Greece and Turkey, then the boon will be a domestic blessing and the bitter grapes of communism will wither on the vine. And no beneficiary need fear that one square mile of his territory will be annexed to the donor's empire, no firing squad will accompany the invasion, no alien secret police will stalk him by day and terrorize him by night, no occupying army will consume his meager food, no convoys of prisoners will be deported to Siberia in the name of the proletariat, and no concentration camps established for political opponents. Small wonder that the vision has thrilled and sustained the inhabitants of those beleagured outposts of non-Communist society in the Mediterranean world.

The timing of the Truman doctrine was one of its most significant features, and the gesture which accompanied it was something more than lip-service to the ideals of the brotherhood of man. Words became deeds and the violent reaction of Soviet spokesmen is sure index of their thwarted hopes for a Communist seizure of power in Greece. One must not only be right in great historic crises but one must be right at the right moment. It is just as fatal to be right at the wrong moment as wrong at the right moment. President Truman was right at the right moment.

Assistance to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial relative to assistance to Greece and Turkey, written by John S. Knight, owner of the Knight newspapers, and published in the March 9, 1947, issue of the Miami Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN SPREAD OF COMMUNISM BE HALTED BY YANKEE DOLLARS?

Pleas by the Greek Government for substantial assistance to prevent that stricken country's economic collapse should be viewed realistically by the people of the United States.

Sentimentally, our hearts go out to the Greeks who are torn by civil dissension resulting from Great Britain's insistence that King George II, a listless and near-Fascist ruler, be returned to the throne.

We share also her fears of Russian aggression and sympathize deeply with a gallant people facing up to the inevitable break down of an already tottering economy.

Since Great Britain, Greece's traditional protector, has served notice that she can no longer support a substantial army in Greece to preserve order, the problem is thrown squarely in our laps because we are so closely tied to British foreign policy.

The State Department is apparently committed to Greek assistance in the amount of $350,000,000. It is explained publicly that a sum of this size is necessary to purchase food, clothing, and other emergency essen-

tials. Additionally, the Greek note to the United States explained that American technical experts are needed to help the country to her feet.

What neither the State Department nor the Greek diplomatic dispatch did say, and this is the real issue, is that American money and perhaps her soldiers must be used if we are to prevent the spread of communism throughout the Balkans and the rest of Europe.

The argument, freely used by high officials and military leaders in off-the-record sessions with Washington newspaper correspondents, is "fight communism with dollars."

It is a cry that will be heard much more frequently and openly in the months and years to come.

It is an assertion that should be sharply challenged before it becomes, through public inertia and Government propaganda, the pattern for our future foreign policy.

Isn't it high time that we came to grips with the facts?

American dollars failed to resolve the political differences in China between Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists. We threw away hundreds of millions in a vain effort to bring order out of chaos and came away with nothing but the bitter taste of another political retreat.

George Weller, of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, says that the postwar policy of "pay, preach, and retreat," which has failed on a gigantic scale in China, has failed in the Balkans, too, and it has cost the American people in postwar aid nearly $500,000,000 to lose their political shirts at the "little table" in tiny Greece as at the "big table" in China.

The Miami Herald favored the British loan as an outright gift with no thought that it ever would be repaid. We believe that the gift of a few billion dollars would prove either that Great Britain could survive as a great power with this assistance or that her economy had disintegrated so badly that it could no longer be propped up even with American financial support.

The British are now back in the market for another loan.

We made a very sizable loan to France, timing it to provide a potent argument for the Rightists in the French elections.

Yet France, with no semblance of strong leadership or direction, continues to drift gradually to the left.

In the case of Greece, British insistence upon restoration of the monarchy prevented the people from having a government of their own choosing.

We have backed the British experiment in Greece to the hilt and now find ourselves the unhappy legatees of a moral and material bankruptcy.

Can we fight communism with dollars?

The projected $350,000,000 gift to Greece is but another in a series of well-intentioned but utterly futile efforts to buy off the Communists at so much a head.

The history of the world proves that individuals with strong ideological convictions are not for sale at any price, except when it suits their purpose to be cooperative until the money has been spent.

There might be some military justification for the Greek gift if, in return, we obtained a few naval bases in Greece and Turkey.

Financially, it could be justified if Britain agreed to transfer Greek credits frozen in London to the United States so that Greece could buy some of the things it needs with its own money instead of borrowing from us.

It might even be morally justifiable if it meant a thorough political house cleaning in Greece with new elections so that the people might select the type of government they prefer.

But, as George Weller points out, we are in effect only throwing more money into the bottomless kitty of nations who have anti-communism for sale.

Can we fight communism with dollars?

For one, I am convinced that we cannot.

The tragic plight of the Greeks can be alleviated through privately supported groups such as the Greek war relief association which has had years of experience in this field.

Our government should be ready to ship surpluses of food and supplies and let their distribution be supervised by trained and competent organizations who understand the problem.

But the policy of paying Greece to support a token force of British troops as a bulwark against the vastly superior Russian armies in the northern Balkans is unrealism at its worst.

For once, I agree with Senator CLAUDE PEPPER in his suggestion that the Greek question be referred to the United Nations on the theory that it is a global problem vitally affecting the peace of the world.

As time goes on and international difficulties increase, it will be impossible for the United States to patch up the remnants of shaky regimes and empires the world over.

If the United Nations is to refute the rising tide of cynical comment that it is just another debating society, the Palestine and Greek problems must have its immediate attention.

At this point, someone may well ask: "If we are not to fight communism with dollars, what is the solution?"

Unfortunately, the very simplicity of the question makes the answer more difficult.

There seems to be almost universal agreement that Communism is abhorrent to free men.

But who shall say that the people of any nation may not have communism if that is what they desire?

If the ideological and military conflict with Russia is as inevitable as the wise men of the radio proclaim it to be, another little nation or two gone communistic won't prove to be the deciding factor in an atomic war.

Let them demonstrate whether the communistic system can be successful. Let it be shown that people are happier without free speech, free elections and freedom of opportunity.

The capitalistic system is under constant attack from disaffected Americans who emphasize its imperfections while enjoying all of its benefits.

Perhaps the communistic system can provide better living conditions, more abundant crops, finer cars, superior household accessories and greater liberty than we have in America.

Possibly, some people could be happier living under the constant scrutiny of the secret police. Even a few of our sons and daughters see considerable merit in the communistic system. Let this be shown. We might all be convinced.

Meanwhile, efforts to combat communism in the Balkans with American dollars are not likely to succeed.

Then, when we have bankrupted ourselves trying to bail out the staggering nations of Europe, communism will have a field day in the United States.

Of course, the capitalistic system will be blamed for the debacle when actually it is being drained so systematically that even today it has considerably less than an even chance to prove its worth.

We have poured forth a golden and seemingly endless stream of American dollars in our policy of "pay, preach and retreat."

With nothing to show for our immature generosity except more calls for help, the time has come to call a halt before we join our friends in the international breadline.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Yalta Secrets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as one who has spoken out repeatedly against both the methods and the decisions of the Teheran and Yalta Conferences, it is perhaps worth adding some of the postscripts now appearing—tragically too late. But surely it is still not too late for the United States Senate to repudiate officially the iniquitous and illegal provisions of these deals, made without its advice or consent, in which we blithely agreed to the giving away of territory and rights here and there which do not and never did belong to us. Mr. Speaker, America must get her own hands clean before we can rightly condemn others.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from World and two articles:

[From World]

PEACE TREATIES BUT NO PEACE—CHINESE CLAIM LOSSES FROM TREATIES GREATER THAN DAMAGE SUFFERED IN WAR

Last month a group of liberal Chinese in Shanghai issued a statement declaring that the Yalta agreement, designed to secure the peace, had been more damaging to China than 8 years of Japanese aggression.

So far as World could discover, the statement did not get into the papers. Yet here, in simple terms, was a capsule picture of peace in our time, a situation where boundaries and peoples and access to raw materials are pushed back and forth on a human chessboard—by diplomats backed by armies, rather than by the armies themselves.

The Yalta agreement was drawn by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin as the price of the Russian 6-day war on Japan. China was not even present, although she later accepted the terms in her treaty with Russia.

As a result, China lost Mongolia's 623,000 square miles and 850,000 people.

She lost through Russian stripping $2,000,000,000 worth (United States money) of industrial equipment in Manchuria, as well as $2,000,000, of United States gold bullion directly confiscated. (Figures by United States Reparations Commissioner Pauley.)

She lost half interest in the Chinese Eastern and South Manchuria Railways, lost sovereignty over Darien and Port Arthur. The railway is not being jointly operated, Chinese Government troops are still awaiting Russian permission to enter Darien, no Chinese ship has been permitted to dock at Port Arthur. Soviet recognition of full Chinese sovereignty in Manchuria has been technically observed, but this heart of Chinese heavy industry lies shattered and picked clean.

EUROPEAN TREATIES

Last month in Paris five more treaties were signed, peace treaties officially ending World War II for Axis satellites, Finland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Italy. There was no indication that the documents were any better liked.

Four of the nations (all but Finland) as well as two allies (Yugoslavia and Greece) asked for treaty revisions the next day. Yugoslavia, with a blast against the Allies' stubborn incomprehension, stated frankly

that she was not giving up her claims to Trieste and other areas. The Vatican denounced all the treaties as diktats, commenting:

"The Atlantic Charter ship, flying the battle penant of 'four freedoms,' has cause to rest on these rocks."

YALTA SECRETS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Foreign Commissar Molotov's revelation of the Yalta secret agreement on reparations shocks me.

Not because of our late President's willingness to see Russia broadly indemnified for damage inflicted by Germany. I believe that the aggressor must not only be punished but pay to the full extent of what is generally desirable. It seems to me right that German plants should be sent abroad to replace plants destroyed, often wantonly, by Germans. I have no objection against limited reparations out of current production provided they do not become a pretext for rebuilding German industrial power above the danger line.

Moreover, it seems to me only natural that Germans should be made to rebuild physically the plants and houses that Germans destroyed. Collective guilt always has been inherent in the sovereign nation system. If it were not, how exact are any reparations at all? The individuals who inflicted the damage can certainly not be segregated and made to work for their victims. The whole defeated aggressor nation has to work. Between producing at home to repair wrong done by one's nation and being sent abroad and working the difference is only of degree, not of kind. If the principle of slave labor is involved in the latter, then it is also involved in the former as well.

Therefore, I sincerely trust that the Russians receive all practical compensation.

What shocks me in the Molotov revelation was that it was kept "top secret" for nearly 2 years after the war ended. Apparently the mystery bags of Teheran and Yalta are bottomless. "We the people"—allegedly sovereign—do not and apparently cannot know all the undertakings which our late President took in our name.

After the Yalta meeting a communique was issued. It was then stated that nothing further had been decided. Hardly was the ink dry when strange things began crawling out of the mystery bag.

There was the amazing decision to buy Russia's entrance into the Pacific war—a fight they could not have been paid to stay out of—by giving them privileges in Manchuria and possession of the Kurile Islands.

There was the revelation that Stalin was to have three votes in the United Nations against one for us.

Somewhat later came the stunner—our President, not Premier Stalin, had hamstrung the new international organization from its birth by his insistence that each of the five bigger powers possess a veto over action.

After each revelation, officials who had been at Yalta hastened to insure worried Americans, including me, that the latest revelation was positively the last.

Only it wasn't.

New revelations of secret agreements secretly arrived at can follow any time.

President Truman has very properly—in my view—called upon all citizens to back his new doctrine of opposing aggression everywhere. This need resulted from policies, good or bad, pursued by our late President during the war.

Are American citizens never to be told precisely when, where and why decisions were taken, to repair which they now are asked to give their treasure and, if necessary, their lives.

During the war—let us admit—some secrecy was necessary. But don't let them kid you. The Germans were perfectly aware that if they lost the war they would pay.

To have published the Yalta reparation agreement would have done no harm. The same is true of many other agreements. For the most part they were kept secret less because of any danger in letting them become known to the enemy than in the inconvenience to the Administration in letting them become known to American citizens. For if known, they would have been subject to public criticism.

The champions of secret statecraft know this. That is why they are so anxious to prevent the full publication of his official memoirs by ex-Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau. For if he tells all, a lot of officials' faces are going to burn brightly.

Citizens should welcome the Morgenthau memoirs because they will reveal what our Government did in secret in our name. Or is American democracy to be built upon blind trust in an elected person or persons—a leader complex?

The defense will not be lacking. The President, it will be claimed, acted strictly within his constitutional powers.

That's right. That's just the trouble. The American Senate has never insisted that the constitutional phrase "with the advice and consent of the Senate" must mean that said advice and consent be obtained by a President before he makes decisions.

Nevertheless, ever-increasing secrecy can stultify democracy.

A safeguard might consist in the creation of a congressional committee of five members representing both Houses and parties. This committee should have access to all secrets. If it also had a veto power over decisions affecting foreign policy that the President wished to take in secret, Citizen Mowrer would sleep better.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

ROOSEVELT OUTTRADED BY STALIN AT YALTA

(By Jay G. Hayden)

The late President Roosevelt's amazing secret generosity to Premier Stalin at Yalta has again been evidenced in the publication at Moscow of the agreement of these two, with Churchill dissenting, on a $20,000,000,000 total of reparations from Germany, 50 percent of it for Russia.

Secretary of State Marshall disputed Molotov's reassertion of this claim on the ground that it had been superseded at Potsdam, and Foreign Secretary Bevin said it was of no standing anyhow because Churchill refused to sign it.

The ink scarcely had dried on the joint communiqué, following the Yalta Conference, before it became apparent that much more went on there than was immediately revealed.

The communiqué was issued on February 12, 1945, and just a week later it cropped up that the Atlantic Charter had been revised. As originally written, this document said its signers, Roosevelt and Churchill, wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

AGGRESSOR NATIONS

At Yalta there was added to this sentence the words, "by the aggressor nations," the obvious purpose being to exempt territories taken forcibly by so-called nonaggressor nations, such as Russia's conquests of the Baltic States and portions of Poland, Finland, and Rumania.

Since the Atlantic Charter was issued solely by Roosevelt and Churchill, presumably they had the right to change it in the same personal fashion, but it is doubtful if this is so of other secret agreements which were subscribed to at Yalta.

On February 27, 1945, Churchill for the first time revealed details of the agreement respecting Polish borders, including modification of the Curzon line to give Russia the important city of Lwow, and allotment to Poland of the German province of Upper Silesia and "such other territories east of the Oder River as may be decided at the peace conference."

The latter referred to the Oder-Neisse River line, transferring to Poland territory containing 9,500,000 Germans.

In his Stuttgart speech last year Secretary Byrnes began trying to mitigate that commitment and Secretary Marshall is expected to do the same.

Yalta was little more than a month old before it leaked out successively that the Ukraine and White Russia had been recognized separately in order to give Russia 3 votes in the United Nations, and that Russia's insistence on an individual veto in that body also had been acceded to.

BIGGEST CONCESSION

Not till February 1946, did there come to light the biggest concession of all to the Soviet. This was the grant to her in exchange for a promise to enter the war against Japan "within 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered." To win that assurance Roosevelt and Churchill signed away to Russia, Outer Mongolia, the whole Kurile chain of islands, half of the island of Sakhalin and in Manchuria, exclusive occupation of the Port Arthur naval base and a half share with China in control of the commercial port of Dairen.

China was not even consulted before this purloining of her territory, and as subsequently developed, Russia's entrance into the Japanese war, on the very last day of her commitment, bred nothing but trouble. Ever since, the United States and Britain have been trying to get the Russian armies back home.

Not the least interesting element in all this was President Roosevelt's assumption of the right single-handed so to commit the Nation. Members of Congress have searched in vain for any provision, constitutional or otherwise, that invests the President with such broad right, except as his proposals later may be submitted to the Senate and approved by it.

In this instance also there is the fact that Mr. Roosevelt, at Yalta, was reduced both physically and mentally. He died 2 months later. It is no wonder, perhaps, that he was outtraded by Stalin, but this circumstance calls all the more for some action to assure that this sort of thing shall not happen again.

Let's Avoid Escapist Illusions Regarding UN and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin:

LET'S AVOID ESCAPIST ILLUSIONS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

As the day's news seldom fails to remind us, we are living in a time of disagreeable alternatives, hard choices, difficult decisions. This makes it all the more necessary to rule

out the pleasant pastime of wishful thinking, to distinguish rigidly between sound and quack ideas and never to confuse the world we are living in with some ideal utopian world. We may be sure that we shall not solve any real problem by hugging escapist illusions.

One of the most familiar of these illusions is to imagine that we can get away from difficulties by dumping them into the lap of the United Nations. The time may come in some distant future when individual nations will be willing to cede substantial attributes of sovereignty to the United Nations and give that organization some of the power and dignity of a parliament of man, to recall Tennyson's phrase.

But that time is certainly not now. As it is now constituted, the United Nations cannot take decisive action in the face of a veto by one of its five principal members. What is perhaps still more important, it possesses neither independent finances nor an independent military and police force.

So the suggestion that the Turkish and Greek situation should be referred to the United Nations, however attractive in theory, would have only led to indefinite delay and sterile recrimination when prompt action is necessary. Our interest in Greece and Turkey is primarily to stave off a crumbling process that would pave the way for Soviet domination of these strategically located countries. Would it be realistic to expect the Soviet Union, as a charter member of the United Nations, to cooperate in curbing its own aggressive and expansionist designs? Yet this is what reference of the near-eastern crisis to the United Nations would imply.

THE BRITISH BACK DOWN ON PALESTINE

The British decision to refer the Palestine question to the United Nations is a confession of failure and weakness, rather than a symbol of hope for that divided and tormented country. It is improbable that the United Nations can work out any scheme that has not already been weighed in the balance and found wanting by the harassed British administration. It would have been far more hopeful if the British Government had proposed a plan for Palestine as equitable both to Jewish and Arab communities as possible and then asked for United Nations sanction and endorsement.

It is also an illusion to suppose that we should get over the growing pains of the transition from imperialism to greater self-government for colonial countries by placing the United Nations in charge of those countries which are not yet politically and educationally prepared for full independence. Experiments in joint administration of colonial areas usually lead to confusion worse confounded. A good example is the Franco-British condominium over the New Hebrides archipelago in the South Pacific. This is sometimes referred to as the pandemonium. If countries with broadly similar institutions like England and France could not work out a satisfactory system of joint administration for the New Hebrides it is easy to imagine the obstacles that would confront a joint American-Soviet trusteeship for Korea. What would seem right and natural to an American administration would often seem wrong and unnatural to his Soviet colleague, and vice versa.

The most grievious and dangerous illusion, perhaps, was that we could get rid of worries about the atomic bomb by turning it over to the United Nations. What this would amount to in practice would be unilateral American disarmament in favor of the Soviet Union. The sound sense of the American people has pretty definitely ruled out any such naive proposal, although our wishful thinkers wistfully revert to it now and again.

THE FRIENDLY COMPETITION IDEA

There is another fallacious idea which seems reasonable in the light of previous American experience and which is sometimes voiced in circles where there is no sympathy with communism. This is that our system and the Soviet Communist system are engaged in a kind of peaceful competition as to which can provide a better life for more people. Opposition to communism in the international field, so this argument runs, is futile. For, if our system is better, it will automatically win in the competition. If the Communist system is better it will win.

Every American could be happy if the issue were as simple as this. By every ascertainable test of human well-being American free enterprise is far ahead of Soviet communism, and gives every promise of remaining ahead. We should have nothing to fear from the results of a prolonged period of free and peaceful competition.

But the fallacy in this argument lies in the fact that communism, once clamped down on a people, cannot be shaken off by peaceful means. Communist regimes, once established in power, cannot be voted out of power, no matter how dissatisfied the peoples under their rule may be. This has been amply demonstrated by experience not only in Russia, but in its satellite states with Poland as a vivid illustration.

COMMUNIST STATES HARD TO UNSEAT

Accustomed to voting a party out of power when they are dissatisfied with it, Americans assume too easily that peoples under Communist domination can resort to the same painless and easy process. This is unfortunately not the case. There is not a single country where communism won majority in a genuinely free election. Yet communism dominates a considerable part of the surface of the earth.

If our foreign policy should be governed by the soothing idea that we are engaged in free, peaceful competition with communism, in which we should be entirely passive, we should see Communist regimes come into power in one country after another by the familiar methods of intrigue from without and coup d'etat from within. And the peoples subjected to these regimes would not be able to get rid of them as we substituted a Republican for a Democratic Congress at the election. Nor would these peoples be given the slightest opportunity, so far as their rules could prevent it, to make an accurate and honest comparison between conditions under communism and conditions under free enterprise.

Totalitarian communism is just as opposed to free ideological competition as it is to freedom of trade and commercial opportunity.

Coal Mine Deaths Call for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Centralia coal-mine disaster stands today as a reproach to the Government. No other conclusion can escape the fair-minded man as he contemplates the loss of 111 lives in the face of the record.

The Director of the United States Bureau of Mines, Dr. R. R. Sayers, in a letter dated March 28, 1947, to John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers of America, reveals that in 3,345 mine inspections in 1946 only 2 mines were found to be complying entirely with the Federal Mine Safety Code.

He further reveals that in 1,723 inspections made during the period of Government operation of the coal mines between July 29, 1946, and March 27, 1947, the approximate average number of violations of the Federal Mine Safety Code was 27 per mine.

And in this connection, the United Mine Workers call attention to the fact that the wage agreement executed at the White House May 29, 1946, provided, among other things, that "a reasonable code of standards and rules pertaining to safety" should be put into effect at the mines and that the Coal Mines Administrator was made "the exclusive agency charged with the enforcement of this code," and that he should take "immediate action to cause all employees to be removed from the unsafe area until any imminent and serious danger is removed."

Mr. Speaker, it would be strange, indeed, if there were not bitterness in the hearts of the families of the dead coal miners today, as they contemplate these facts.

The responsibility of the administration in this terrible disaster is squarely placed in the following excerpts from the bituminous wage agreement, executed at the White House, Washington, D. C., May 29, 1946, signed by J. A. Krug and John L. Lewis, to which the United Mine Workers called attention in their release of Saturday, March 29, 1947:

2. (a) Federal Mine Safety Code:

As soon as practicable and not later than 30 days from the date of the making of the agreement, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, after consultation with representatives of the United Mine Workers and such other persons as he deems appropriate, will issue a reasonable code of standards and rules pertaining to safety conditions and practices in the mines. The Coal Mines Administrator will put this code into effect at the mines. Inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Mines shall make periodic investigations of the mines and report to the Coal Mines Administrator any violations of the Federal Safety Code. In cases of violation the Coal Mines Administrator will take appropriate action which may include disciplining or replacing the operating manager so that with all reasonable dispatch said violation will be corrected.

Excerpt from Federal Mine Safety Code promulgated July 29, 1946, pursuant to agreement:

ARTICLE XIV—ENFORCEMENT

Section 1. Enforcement:

(a) The Coal Mines Administrator is the exclusive agency charged with the enforcement of this code and the correction of violations thereof.

(b) * * * In special instances where a Federal coal-mine inspector finds that imminent and serious danger to employees in the mine exists, he shall promptly advise the operating manager or his representative at the mine, as provided in article XII, section 5b, and report by telephone to the Director of the Bureau of Mines, who shall report the

matter immediately to the Coal Mines Administrator. The Administrator or his representative shall take immediate action to cause all employees to be removed from the unsafe area until any imminent and serious danger is removed.

Mr. Speaker, it has not been popular in the past year to speak a kindly word for John L. Lewis, but the general dislike for the methods he sought to employ must yield in this instance to the stark tragedy which has pointed his appeals in behalf of safety for the men who mine the Nation's coal.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the fact that Congress, itself, has a responsibility. Along with our efforts to obtain legislation to avoid stoppages of work by having better labor laws, we should make sure that Congress also does its part to eliminate these conditions in the coal-mining industry which make such tragedies possible.

On January 6, the first Monday of this Congress, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 11, a bill to study the mining and distribution of coal. The resolution proposed to direct a joint study by the Committees on Education and Labor of the two Houses of Congress "of all factors affecting the mining and distribution of coal in the United States," with special reference to "the conditions of the workers in the coal-mining industry, their safety, housing, wages, and comfort."

I proposed that this study be made and conclusions be reported not later than March 1, 1947. As I said on the floor of the House, at the time, the purpose of that date was to make it possible for the House to consider remedial legislation before the so-called dead line of April 1, 1947, which would have been the date for the commencement of a new strike, or the expiration of the truce, had not the Supreme Court upheld the Lewis contempt citation.

Today is that day, and it has been ushered in by the terrible tragedy of last week at Centralia. The Lewis conviction, no doubt, eased the urgency for remedial legislation in everyone's mind.

The Centralia disaster, however, gives a sad and solemn emphasis to my statement of January 6, 1947, that possibly there were special conditions in the coal mining industry which warranted a special study and special legislation.

Mr. Speaker, no one has taken a more constant position than I that the Congress should pass and the President should approve sound labor legislation. The record has been clear on that point, and none will dispute it. I want the record equally clear that I have proposed and urged that we determine whether there are conditions in coal mining that call for special legislation to protect the safety of miners and the welfare of their families.

The Congress did not write nor did it have any responsibility for the enforcement of the safety provisions in the bituminous wage agreement. We could not have prevented the disaster at Centralia. But we may prevent future Centralias. We have it in our power to authorize and direct a study of coal-mining conditions which may lessen the chances of any such disasters in the future.

We cannot reconstruct the past but we can do something for the future. I urge, most earnestly, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress now authorize the study proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 11, and thus make a fitting and constructive memorial to the lives that were snuffed out in the Centralia disaster.

Under permission granted by the House, I place the letter from Director Sayers to Mr. Lewis in the RECORD at this point:

MARCH 28, 1947.

Mr. JOHN L. LEWIS,
President, United Mine Workers of America, United Mine Workers' Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: In compliance with your request of March 28, 1947, I am submitting the following information:

1. Total number of mine inspections made during the calendar year of 1946 by qualified inspectors of the Bureau of Mines is 3,345. This figure includes inspections made prior to the effective date of the Federal Mine Safety Code (July 29, 1946).

2. The number of mines found to be complying entirely with the Federal Mine Safety Code, clear of all violations is two.

3. The approximate average number of violations of the Federal Mine Safety Code per mine in Government possession is 27. You will note that this average covers only those mines in Government possession, and does not apply to reports on inspections made prior to July 29, 1946.

4. The total number of inspections of bituminous coal mines made under the Federal Mine Safety Code from July 29, 1946, to March 25, 1947, is 1,723. This information was not requested in your letter, but it may be of particular value in applying the approximate average number of violations (27) of the code recorded in paragraph 3 above.

The final report on the March 1947 inspection of No. 5 mine, Centralia Coal Co., Wamac, Ill., is expected to arrive in Washington later today. As soon as it is received here, it will be delivered to you by special messenger.

If we can be of any further service, please advise.

Very truly yours,

R. R. SAYERS,
Director.